Appendix

Spiritual Values in the Confederacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1961

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therewith a magnificent sermon by that peerless chaplain of The Citadel, Col. Robert Hall, titled "Spiritual Values in the Confederacy." Colonel Hall is one of the outstanding speakers ever to hold the position of chaplain at that venerable institution known as The Citadel—the Military College of South Carolina. The occasion of this sermon was at the centennial of the firing on the *Star of the West*. This incident precipitated the Confederate War.

SPIRITUAL VALUES IN THE CONFEDERACY

(Memorial address by Chaplain Robert S. Hall, Summerall Chapel, January 8, 1961)

In considering the clergy in the Army of the Confederate States, we are brought face to face with the most amazing display of spiritual power ever witnessed among fighting men on the American continent.

During the early days of the conflict, however, many of the chaplains in gray fell victims to the lowered ideals so often prevalent in a time of war.

The first months of the war were marked with romantic adventure—few felt that it would continue for more than a short time. Following the First Battle of Manassas, the tide of southern optimism rode high. During this period an unworthy type of chaplain put in his appearance. He was of the hail-fellow-well-met type. Caught up in the excitement, he rushed to the colors more from the thrill of being a soldier than from that of being a minister of God. The devout Gen. "Stonewall" Jackson could not restrain his criticism:

"Some ministers ask leave of absence for such trivial objects, that I fear they give occasion to others to think that such ministers do not believe that the salvation of the soul is as important as they preach. It is the special province of the chaplains to look after the spiritual interests of the army, and I greatly desire to see them evincing a rational zeal proportional to the importance of their missions."

The reverses of 1862 began a speedy riddance of this unworthy type of chaplain. It began to dawn on him that this was to be more than a holiday excursion; that it would hardly be a war among gentlemen. It was already shaping up as one of the bloodiest of conflicts. He disappeared as suddenly as he had come. Then from the ranks and from the churches came men of God from every denomination whose sole desire was a spiritual ministry, that of preaching the word of life to dying men.

Typical of such men was Rev. A. C. Hopkins, formerly pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Martinsburg, W. Va. Being a man of pronounced Southern sympathies, Mr. Hopkins voluntarily went into exile when Federal troops marched into Martinsburg in July 1861.

Because of the low repute into which the army chaplaincy had fallen in 1861 and early 1862, Mr. Hopkins offered his services to the Second Virginia Regiment as a soldier of the line. The officers of the regiment, however, had other plans for the preacher. Accordingly, on May 3, 1862, he received a commission as chaplain of the regiment.

Only 1 day after Chaplain Hopkins received his commission, General "Stonewall" Jackson opened his amazingly successful first Valley Campaign. The Stonewall Brigade, to which the 2d Infantry belonged, was destined to play a big part. As regimental chaplain he found that he was succeeding the valiant Chaplain McVeigh, who had recently been captured in battle.

Immediately the new chaplain found himself in the midst of battle. He entered his first combat at the little village of McDowell, W. Va., after only 3 days of service.

On May 16, 1862, Chaplain Hopkins led the regiment in a day of fasting, humiliation, and prayer as proclaimed by President Jefferson Davis. Two days later he conducted the regular Sunday services near Mossy Creek. He threw his whole heart into his work, for he realized that the men must be prepared spiritually for the hard battle ahead. On the following Monday morning, Jackson began a hard march to outflank General Banks at Front Royal. The fight lasted from May 23 through May 25, with Banks retiring in disorder. For 2 days the troops rested. General Jackson desired that all of his men might have an opportunity to attend divine services during this time.

When Jackson began his strategic withdrawal on May 29, Chaplain Hopkins, with less than a month in the army, was a confirmed veteran.

Entering immediately the bitterly fought Seven Days Battle near Richmond, the chaplain began to show fatigue. Having marched all day in the hot sun and having spent a sleepless night in ministering to the wounded soldiers, his strength was gone. The following day he attempted to preach to his men as they lay on the line. In the midst of his sermon he fainted. He was carried by the soldiers to the rear and was lost to his regiment for the next 10 days. When he returned, it was to find that two of his best friends, a colonel and a major, both officers of the regiment, had fallen at Cold Harbor.

The heavy losses his regiment sustained at Malvern Hill distressed him. He found that he must draw heavily upon the resources of the spirit if he were to be of service to his men.

The Second Battle of Manassas was fought from August 23 through September 1. Hopkins and the other chaplains of the brigade spent all that first night with the wounded. The fall of 1862 was spent in camp near Bunker Hill. It was there that the fires of revival began to give the promise of breaking out.

General Paxton took command of the brigade in November and urged the chaplains to build regimental chapels with volunteer soldier labor. The chapel finished, services were conducted daily. Bible classes were organized and flourished. By the end of February 1863, there was a noticeable increase in religious devotion throughout the brigade. Chaplain Hopkins said that chaplains became better acquainted, more interested in one another, and more cooperative. Scores made professions of religion and were baptized by the chaplains.

The first Chaplain's Association took form on March 16, 1863, and for the first time there was a planned and coordinated work. The spirit of revival did not leave the commanding general of the brigade untouched. After discussing the matter of religion with Chaplain Hopkins, he finally made a profession of his faith and united with his home church. Talking with the chaplain one evening, the general confided that he had a premonition of death. A few days later General Paxton was killed while leading his first attack as brigade commander. In the summer of 1863, Chaplain Hopkins organized prayer groups throughout his regiment. By Christmas he was supervising the construction of a chapel near Pisgah in Orange County. Materials were extremely scarce at this time, and the regimental chapel was not completed until January 31, 1864.

As spring came it was obvious that the Federal armies were planning new assualts. Chaplain Hopkins worked feverishly to win converts to Christ. On May 4 the Union armies, 118,000 strong, began their advance. Lee's 60,000 men steadied to receive the blow. For 2 weeks the "Stonewall" Brigade fought with all its strength. But when the Battle of Spottsylvania Courthouse was at an end, so was the famed brigade. Only fragments of the organization remained. These and remnants of other Virginia brigades were collected to form a new brigade under Gen. William Terry. Chaplain Hopkins was reassigned to the field hospital of the Second Corps and continued his service until the end of the war. He had faithfully carried out his duties to the bitter end.

When the call to arms rang through the South, the pastors were among the first and most enthusiastic to respond. Noted ministers who buckled on the sword were Gen. W. N. Pendleton, Episcopal minister, chief of artillery in the Army of Northern Virginia; the eminent Presbyterian theologian, Dr. Robert L. Dabney, who became Chief of Staff to General Jackson; the renowned Baptist minister, M. P. Lowery, of Mississippi, who became a general; the celebrated Lt. Col. D. C. Kelly, who served on the staff of Gen. Nathan Bedford Forrest and was a Methodist minister; and Leonidas Polk. He was born April 10, 1806, in Raleigh, N.C., and was a cousin of James Polk, president of the United States. He was educated at West Point but afterward studied theology and took orders in the Protestant Episcopal Church in 1831. In 1838, became missionary bishop of the Southwest, Arkansas, Indian Territory, Louisiana, Alabama, and Mississippi, and in 1841 he was consecrated bishop of Louisiana. His work in the church was largely of an educational kind, and he played a prominent part in movements for the establishment of higher educational institutions in the South. At the outbreak of the Confederate War in 1861, he resigned his bishopric and, like many other clergymen and ministers of religion, entered the army which was raised to defend the Confederacy, with the rank of major-general. He fortified the post of Columbus, Ky., the foremost line of defense on the Mississippi, against which Gen. U. S. Grant directed the offensive reconnaissance of Belmont in

the autumn. In the following spring, the first line of defense having fallen, Polk commanded a corps at Shiloh in the field army commanded by Albert Sidney Johnston and Beauregard. In October 1862 he was promoted to lieutenant-general and thenceforth he commanded one of the three corps of the Army of Tennessee under Bragg and afterward was in charge of the Department of Alabama, Mississippi, and east Louisiana. He was killed in the fighting in front of Marietta, while reconnoitering near Pine Mountain, Ga., on the 14th day of June 1864.

From the very first there were ministers in the field with the Confederate troops. Pastors of churches near Confederate army camps ministered to the needs of troops as best they could. Each organization requesting a chaplain was given a wide choice in the matter. First, it was determined by vote of the troops which denomination the chaplain would represent. Having settled this, the regiment or other unit sought out a minister considered suitable. Having located one, they "called" him. He might be called from a civilian pastorate, from the ranks of the unit, from the ranks of a neighboring organization, or from among ministers volunteering as chaplains. Having been so chosen, he was certified to the adjutant general for appointment. When called from a pastorate the minister might accept or reject. If he accepted, he must furnish his horse and pay his own transportation to the unit. At first there was a tendency for the chaplains to have little fellowship with ministers other than those of their own faith or denomination. This arose partly from their belief that the war would be of very short duration, partly from the fear that too close fellowship would bring the wrath of the civilian ministry down upon their heads. Such an attitude is not hard to understand in the light of the intense denominational rivalry of the day.

Gen. "Stonewall" Jackson was especially helpful in his suggestion concerning the work of the chaplains. Due largely to his own ardent personal exertions, his Second Corps was better supplied with chaplains than was any other of the Army of Northern Virginia. His standards were quite high, but simple: "Denominational distinctions should be kept out of view, and not touched upon. And, as a general rule, I do not think that a chaplain who would preach denominational sermons should be in the army * * *. I would like to see no question asked in the army of what denomination a chaplain belongs to; but let the question be, 'Does he preach the Gospel?' "

At war's end the rapid reconstruction of southern churches and institutions was due in part to the spirit of the returned chaplains. Defeat had indeed been a bitter experience, but it was interpreted as the will of God. Now they were returning to their penniless, heartbroken, scattered, disfranchised people. Many of their churches had been seriously damaged or destroyed. The Presbyterians alone reported 100 churches destroyed. In all, there were about 500. Practically all colleges and universities had been forced to close their doors.

The example set by Chaplain Benjamin Morgan Palmer, who was serving in South Carolina at the close of the war, was typical of the attitude of other southern chaplains and ministers in helping to rebuild the postwar South. Just as soon as the situation in Columbia permitted, he returned to his beloved First Presbyterian Church in New Orleans. The New Orleans Times carried an account of his return:

Yesterday was quiet and pleasant—a Sabbath of the soul. The churches were very largely attended, particularly the First Presbyterian Church, where Dr. B. M. Palmer had returned. He seemed to be more chastened, subdued, than he ever was before. With an humbler hope he looked up to the bow of promise which spanned the sky, and with a gentler persuasion, he called for a renewal of the covenant of grace. As for the dead past, he was anxious to hide it away in the solemn tomb. Henceforth, no word should escape his lips such as was meet for an humble servant in the temple of his God and King. Wherever called to minister in the land of his birth and of his love, he would emulate the example of Paul the Apostle, by preaching Christ and Him crucified, and his song should be the song of the angels: "Peace on earth, and good will toward men."

In 1886, while visiting in New York, he was invited to preach in the church of Dr. Henry van Dyke. He spoke on the text, "I Will Send You Another Comforter." After the service, a veteran of the northern army inquired as to the identity of the speaker. When he learned his name, he said, "An arch rebel of that name! He preaches like an archangel."

Just how successful were the efforts of southern religious leaders may be seen in the fact that 9 out of every 10 students for the ministry, immediately after the war, had determined to enter the ministry while serving as Confederate soldiers. Their former ranks ranged from private to general.

At The Citadel there were 13 clergymen out of 240 graduates from 1842 through 1864: S. B. Jones; A. Buist; P. F. Stevens, superintendent of The Citadel 1859–1861. First honor graduate of his class, he became Reformed Episcopal bishop of South Carolina in 1890; J. T. Zealey; O. A. Darby; J. B. Cottrell; J. W. Murray; W. P. Dubose, chaplain of Kershaw's Brigade; H. D. Moorer, chaplain, 12th Alabama Regiment; S. S. Kirby, killed at River's Bridge in 1865; Ellison Capers, who became an Episcopal bishop of South Carolina after entering the ministry in 1867. He later became Chancellor, University of the South. He was a brigadier general in the Confederate war. For his commencement address to The Cidadel, July 28, 1886, he spoke of the 240 graduates (and 18 who were within 3 months of graduating in 1865): "not a single idler appears." He was famous for his grace:

"Lord of love look from above
Upon this tainted ham
And give us meat that's fit to eat,
For this ain't worth a damn."

From 1842 to 1864, there were 240 graduates. Of these, there were 42 teachers, 36 merchants, 34 lawyers, 31 physicians, 27 farmers, 27 civil engineers, 13 clergymen, and 28 graduating in 1861, 1862, 1863, 1864 who died in the armies of the Confederacy.

The educational institutions of the land made a phenomenal recovery. New churches were erected over the ashes of the old. Mission efforts were greatly expanded. Denominational strength showed unprecedented gains.

The spirit of the Confederacy as best represented in the life of Sidney Lanier who was born in Macon, Ga., February 3, 1842. He was of Huguenot descent on his father's side and of Scottish and Virginian on his mother's. From childhood he was passionately fond of music. His subsequent mastery of the flute helped to support him, and greatly increased his reputation. At the age of 14 he entered Oglethorpe College, where, after graduating with distinction, he held a tutorship. He enlisted in the Confederate Army in April 1861, serving first in Virginia. After the Seven Days Battle around Richmond, he was transferred to the signal service. About this time the first symptoms of consumption appeared. He subsequently served in a blockade-runner, but his vessel was captured, and he was confined 5 months in a Federal prison. Exchanged early in 1865, he started home on foot, arriving in a state of exhaustion that led to a severe illness. Later he took charge of a country day school in Alabama and was married to Miss Mary Day of his native town. The next year he returned to Macon in low health. Finally, work had to be abandoned on account of growing feebleness, and in 1881 he was carried to Lynn, N.C., to try camp life, and there he died on the 7th of September. He is considered the leading writer of the New South, the greatest southern poet since Poe, and a man of heroic and exquisite character. He wrote:

"Into the woods my Master went,
Clean for-spent, for-spent;
Into the woods my Master came,
For-spent with love and shame.
But the olives they were not blind to Him,
The little gray leaves were kind to Him,
The thorn-tree had a mind to Him,
When into the woods He came."

Four Million Dollars Offered for GI Home Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article on veterans' home loans by S. Oliver Goodman, financial editor of the Washington Post, which appeared in the Tuesday issue of the Post, February 28, 1961:

FOUR MILLION DOLLARS OFFERED FOR GI HOME LOANS

(By S. Oliver Goodman)

In an effort to revive the GI housing program, the First Federal Savings & Loan Association of Washington yesterday announced it is immediately making available $4 million for veterans' home loans in this area.

The move, according to W. Franklin Morrison, executive vice president of the local institution, is in line with the Kennedy administration's effort to stimulate the housing industry.

Morrison revealed the action in a report to Chairman OLIN TEAGUE of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, who had requested Morrison to review and analyze pending GI housing legislation.

"If other lending institutions will make a serious effort to make available private funds for the GI housing program," Morrison reported to Representative TEAGUE, "there will be no major need for congressional legislation to stimulate the veterans housing program this year."

During the past 2 years, the GI housing program has declined sharply due to what industry circles described as unattractive interest rates. Currently, a GI home loan carries a 5¼-percent interest rate and the maximum term is 30 years. Conventional home loans have been carrying 6 percent or better, although in recent months there has been a lower tendency.

To offset the 5¼-percent GI rate, some lenders have been demanding and getting "points." Five points on a $10,000 loan would mean that the borrower gets only $9,500, although paying interest on $10,000. Currently, the GI discount rate in this area is about 5½ points, and has been as high as 11 points.

Morrison declined to comment on the terms under which his institution will make the $4 million available for GI home loans,

except to say they will be "favorable in the present market."

He added: "The termination of the Government's tight money policy has produced a lowering in interest rates generally. In an effort to stimulate the economy, President Kennedy has called for lower mortgage interest rates to expand housing operations."

First Federal Savings made the first GI loan in the Nation in November 1944.

Textiles and the Import Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include the following editorial published by the Winston-Salem Journal in its issue of February 25, 1961. A healthy textile industry is essential to the future well-being of our country and the editorial expresses the concern of many people connected with this industry. The Executive actions of the new administration, which are cited in the editorial, should add emphasis to the need for some realistic controls over textile imports. The editorial follows:

TEXTILES AND THE IMPORT THREAT

Textile industry visions of an administration receptive to demands for protection against low-cost foreign imports are beginning to pale. It is debatable whether the visions were widely shared or whether they had any solid foundation in the first place.

There is still reason to hope, however, that President Kennedy will go further than did President Eisenhower in using Executive authority to provide relief for segments of the industry badly damaged by unfair foreign competition.

More extensive use of such authority was promised by Candidate Kennedy—and he made much (during campaign talks with North Carolinians) of his textile-State background. It is too early in the new administration to determine whether the promise is to be kept, although Mr. Kennedy's first decision on a clear-cut question of free trade versus protectionism must have disappointed many textile people.

Earlier this month, the President, rejected a request from the two Senators of his own State—Massachusetts—that import restrictions on twine and cordage be continued. The decision reflected a turnabout; as a Senator, Mr. Kennedy successfully urged the U.S. Tariff Commission and President Eisenhower to impose the restrictions in 1956.

The twine and cordage import threat may have eased; we have no figures available to us. Yet the President's turnabout indicates that it will take a lot of convincing to impel him to use his authority.

Commerce Secretary Luther Hodges, an ex-textile industrialist, also had something to say about imports this month. He said the damage to the textile industry involved a few "isolated instances," and he referred industry complainants to the Tariff Commission.

Thus it seems that not even this week's hike in cotton support prices and cotton export subsidies is likely to result in a measurable gain for the textile industry's campaign for a country-by-country quota system. The emphasis remains on executive action for specific segments of particular industries, and that only after exhaustive research.

This is as it should be, provided the need for study and research is not an excuse for inaction. The rise in cotton subsidies gives the textile industry a basis for reopening its cotton case before the Tariff Commission (a case that was unsuccessfully presented last year) and for stepping up pressure for a large-scale appraisal of the effect of imports on the industry as a whole.

Restoring Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM V. MOOREHEAD
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. MOOREHEAD of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the sustaining source of strength of any nation beset with the burden of leadership in an epic ideological struggle lies in the understanding and dedication of its people in the concepts which activate its historical progress. For want of a better word, this is patriotism, a term which has fallen strangely out of fashion. As the German-American Carl Schurz said, drawing upon his experiences with the tyranny of 19th century Europe and the challenge of the America of his day, "Ideals are like the stars; you will not succeed in touching them with your hands. But like the seafaring man on the desert of waters, you will choose them as your guides, and, following them, you will reach your destiny."

Today, we sorely need a reidentification of this Nation's faith in its purpose and its ideals. That our press and information media are speaking out to reawaken patriotic vigor meets a basic need. I, therefore, recommend to the Congress the following statement by Francis A. Emmert, in the February 23, 1961, issue of the Somerset Press, of Somerset, Ohio:

RESTORING PATRIOTISM

A number of editors, statesmen and military leaders are joining in an effort to restore patriotism to its proper place in the American way of life. This newspaper is more than willing to lend a hand in the campaign.

The greatest single piece of evidence showing what has happened in this country—what has happened to the burning patriotism and dedication of the American way of life—came during the Korean conflict. In that war many U.S. soldiers who turned obviously lacked an enthusiasm and an understanding of the Government and the country.

Some fell prey to Communist propaganda because they did not know enough about the United States and its history and government to refute clever Communist arguments. Others simply lacked patriotism and conviction when it came to the United States and the democratic system it represents.

This—many statesmen, military leaders and scholars have concluded—is the result of a period of deterioration in the homes, schools, movies, television, etc. which began in the 1930's, when it became popular to be cynical and to criticize the American system. And, of course, there is room for criticism of the American system. It is not perfect.

But it is possessed of many admirable qualities and features and is the best system of freedom and independence man has yet devised on the democratic level. The system has brought more things, materially, to more people, than any other system on earth—giving the American people the highest standard of living in the world.

The words of Commodore Perry—"Don't give up the ship," should stir a feeling of patriotism in every young heart. John Paul Jones' immortal words: "I have just begun to fight" are of the same vein. This is the spirit we need in the sixties. This is the spirit of devotion and dedication which will assure our survival as a nation.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, one of the problems of greatest concern to the American public is that of education. Many persons believe there is a critical need for Federal shoring up of our public school system. Many others are at least equally alarmed at remedial measures proposed by the new administration.

On this point, and with unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD two thought-provoking editorials on the subject of Federal aid to education, which appeared respectively on February 23 and February 25 in the Herald-News, published in Passaic, N.J.

THE PRESIDENT'S EDUCATION PROPOSAL

President Kennedy's aid-to-education program, if enacted into law, will be an expensive luxury for New Jersey.

The Federal aid will be distributed according to a formula which will give the so-called poor States a larger share than the so-called rich States. New Jersey is classified as one of the richest States and will be eligible for the minimum.

The aid program provides for the distribution of $5.6 billion over a period of 3 years. The first year, $666 million is to be distributed. According to the tax foundation, New Jersey residents are taxed to pay for 4.25 percent of Federal spending. That is their share of the burden of maintaining the National Government. Thus, New Jersey taxpayers will pay into the Federal Treasury the sum of $28.9 million to make possible the distribution of $666 million.

Our tSate will get back, however, only $14.4 million in aid. Each of those Federal aid dollars will cost us $2.

It is fair to ask why, under these circumstances, there is so much support in our State for Federal aid to education. The answer is that it is easier by this method to hoodwink the taxpayers. It makes life easier for the local officials and spenders.

Local officeholders are not blamed for high Federal taxes, like the income tax. It is relatively easy for them to obtain local approval, should it be necessary, to spend money which comes from Washington and, in the popular mind, is something for nothing. The same voters, if asked to approve the expenditure of money which would be collected directly from them in local taxes, might go on a rampage of protest.

Someday, New Jersey taxpayers may awaken to the realization that the Federal dollars are obtained at exorbitant cost to them. They will then understand that the $1 million school built with Federal aid has actually cost them $2 million, and that the $500 pay increase given to teachers with Federal aid is actually costing them $1,000.

President Kennedy's program is supposed to last 3 years. No reasonable person will believe that if it is enacted it will have that brief a life, however. It is more likely to become a permanent spending program, into which New Jersey taxpayers will continue to pour $2 to get $1 back.

Barnum was right.

THE DANGER IN FEDERAL SCHOOL AID

It is the sincere conviction of many opponents of Federal aid to education that it presents a very real danger of control of our schools by the National Government.

What difference would that make? The distinguished Washington commentator, Arthur Krock gives the answer:

"Yet it is a matter of record that nationalized public school systems in other countries have been successfully employed by the dominant political party to influence the thinking of pupils through teachers who look to the capital for promotion and pay. If therefore Congress * * * accepts this part of the President's proposed subsidy for education, then in that particular the United States will have become federalized beyond the concept of the founders of the party of that name."

The retort of the proponents of Federal aid to education is that the people do not need to worry, because the National Government does not want to control education. It does not make sense to accept the assurances of those who attempt to speak for all national administrations to come. It is safer to heed the warning in the bit of folk wisdom which goes, "He who pays the piper calls the tune."

Comment on the Chet Huntley-NBC Report on Employment and Unemployment Televised February 19, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, on February 2 I read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an analysis of the CBS show produced by Edward R. Murrow and entitled "Harvest of Shame." In this morning's mail I received a copy of a letter from a good constituent of mine addressed to Mr. Chet Huntley, of NBC, commenting on his February 19 report on "Employment and Unemployment." I believe the letter speaks for itself and since it is so well written, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be reprinted in its entirety at this point in the RECORD. The letter follows:

PEORIA, ILL., *February 24, 1961.*

Mr. CHET HUNTLEY,
National Broadcasting Co.,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. HUNTLEY: I have followed with considerable interest, and at times with some alarm, your weekly NBC-TV program which is sponsored by Kemper Insurance Sunday afternoons in the Peoria area.

What follows is not intended as a reflection on your capabilities as a reporter of news. I am concerned by the growing tendency on the part of reporters to project a news item into a special report for apparent propaganda purposes. Unfortunately, TV creates the opportunity for one man or staff to influence millions of listeners but, unlike the press, offers no means to reach these same people for purposes of rebuttal by those who disagree.

On February 19, 1961, the theme of your report was "Employment." For about 30 minutes you showed unemployment conditions and backed this up with reportorial comment which seemed designed to shape public opinion to accept the administration's plans for tampering with the economy. Your treatment of the subject was biased, ignored natural economic laws, omitted facts, and advanced illogical opinions.

For instance, you casually referred to technological advances and automation as contributing factors to unemployment as if these were strange new demons which have come to plague us. They are, in fact, as old as civilization. An economy is continually in transition and this is what makes for both progress and competition. Is the transition from the steam locomotive to the diesel locomotive any different, economically, than that from the horse and buggy to the automobile? Do not most new developments replace old ways because they are better and in the process thereof cause employment dislocations? Have we not, until the advent of the New Deal, weathered many such dislocations without Federal meddling with the economy and emerged stronger, richer and better in every way?

It is shortsighted and unfair to write off unemployment without thoroughly airing the complicated contributing factors. What about the effect of strikes, labor union tactics, featherbedding, pump priming, lower or static productivity by workers, spiralling wages, deficit spending, and taxation? These increase the cost of production and, hence, costs to the consumer.

The economics can be simply stated. Products must sell at a price the consumer is willing to pay. Labor must produce at a reasonable profit for the employer and shareholders. Labor is entitled to additional gain when accompanied by a proportionate increase in productivity or skill. When these factors are in balance, the economy is vigorous and healthy. When out of balance, we have recessions and depressions. Due to cumulative wage demands, the cost of production is out of balance because labor is being paid more but is not yielding a proportionate increase in output. Hence, the cost to the consumer exceeds what he is willing to pay. Business is caught in a profit squeeze, inventory accumulates, and production is cut back. This results in layoffs which further reduce purchasing power and so the stage is set to have the Federal Government intervene with a spending program, creating additional taxation on those still gainfully employed and again reducing total purchasing power.

The point is this: You are not honestly serving the public if, by incomplete coverage of an issue, you promote crisis psychology. If you choose to discuss "Unemployment" let's get down to all the hard, unpleasant, and unpopular components. What is the annual loss in purchasing power due to strikes? Why are workers staying in a locality after job opportunities are gone? Why do people ignore work which jeopardizes their unemployment income? What responsibility do labor unions share in our recent recessions? What is the inflationary aspect of profligate governmental spending and the creation of artificial demands for goods and services?

I contend that you, the network and the sponsor have a heavy responsibility when you present a broad issue to the public. This responsibility is to present all sides of the proposition fairly, factually, completely and impartially. If allocated time does not permit such coverage, then it should be given in serial form, handled by another media or not presented at all. Any other approach results in propaganda which oversimplifies the complex and overmagnifies the small things having special appeal to minorities.

I am taking the liberty of distributing copies of this letter as follows: Senator Everett Dirksen, Representative Robert Michel, Mr. N. J. Flanagan, president, Kemper Insurance.

Sincerely,

L. H. MELIZA.

Allan Sproul Says "United States Can Thread Way Through Tangled Situation of Payments Balance, Recession"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech given before the Commonwealth Club of California on Friday, February 17, 1961:

ALLAN SPROUL SAYS "UNITED STATES CAN THREAD WAY THROUGH TANGLED SITUATION OF PAYMENTS BALANCE, RECESSION"

(By Allan Sproul, former president, Federal Reserve Bank, New York)

With the exception of 1957, when the Suez crisis distorted trade routes and capital movements, the United States has had a deficit in its balance of payments in every year since 1949. The deficits in the earlier years of the decade were welcomed as easing the dollar shortage.

Our interest in this reversal of our international position was intensified by the fact that the domestic economy lapsed into recession midway in 1960.

Our balance of payments is a set of statistics born of double-entry bookkeeping. When you enter all payments to foreign countries and foreign nationals by the United States and its nationals on one side of the ledger, and all payments received by the United States and its nationals from foreign countries and their nationals on the other side, the balancing items so far as current discussion is concerned are the increase or decrease in foreign short-term liabilities and in the gold stock of the United States.

TWO-PRONGED ATTACK

In 1960 we had a basic balance of payments deficit of $1.5 to $2 billion, and a deficit representing the ebb and flow of short-term funds of almost another $2 billion. This suggests a two-pronged attack on our problem.

The long-range goal must be to bring the basic balance of payments nearer to equilibrium, not every year of course, but on the average. The immediate problem is to reverse the influences which have led to a heavy outflow of short-term funds and accelerated our gold losses.

The special position of the United States in the world today, which has given our Government the responsibility of supporting large oversea military expenditures, and large loans and grants for foreign economic development, and which caused us for years to encourage an outflow of private capital,

has placed a heavy burden on our balance of payments. To help carry the load the United States has to develop a current account surplus proportionately greater than do most other countries.

WILL TAKE TIME

We made great progress on this score in 1960 when our surplus of exports of goods and services rose to $5.8 billion, as compared with $2.2 billion in 1959, primarily because of an increase in exports. But further gains will become increasingly difficult with advances in productivity in other industrial countries.

It is only idle conversation which finds a quick correction of our basic balance-of-payments deficit in sweeping admonitions to increase our export surplus and slash our programs of foreign military and economic aid. It is going to take more time to bring our basic international accounts back into equilibrium without abandoning major national goals.

We must expect an ebb and flow of short-term funds between countries in a world of convertible currencies, but it must not become all ebb.

SHOULD ACT QUICKLY ON GOLD SPECULATION

It is common knowledge, highlighted by the gyrations of the price of gold in the London gold market last fall, that the outward pull on these funds was increased by speculation and fears concerning the value of the dollar. The estimated outflow of such funds, on all counts in 1960, was between $2 and $2.5 billion.

Here is something we should do something about quickly. We cannot allow the dollar, the key currency of the free world, to remain as completely exposed as it has been recently to the special interests, vagaries and fears, of a variety of holders of dollar balances at home and abroad.

It has become a first task of economic statesmanship to dispel present fears about the value of the dollar, and to establish confidence in the resolve and ability of the nationals.

This suggests the kind of interrelated program, the constituent parts of which would not do violence to one another, which would accomplish the overall job.

There is no bar to our success if right and resolute action is taken.

Answers to written questions from floor:

Question. Could we return to the gold standard?

Answer. As to domestic gold standard, we neither can nor should. It would be a step backward in monetary evolution; but we should retain international gold bullion standard which we are preparing to defend.

Question (Robert Elkus). Why, economically, must we have a gold reserve?

Answer. Difficult to make logical case for unused gold reserve, though people still think our currency is better with it than without it, and that it restrains profligacy of politicians. Between maintaining a static reserve and using it to defend the dollar's international position, I would use it—not to the zero point but only to the point where the demand is reversed.

Question. Do you foresee a "buy American" campaign?

Answer. "Buy American" flared up recently with our change in balance of payments position. The larger view is whether we should seek the best use of available world resources by the least interference with goods and services. Any step backward from present policy of minimum trade barriers is not necessary for balance of payment problem.

Question. Do you favor Government subsidy to gold-mining industry?

Answer. To subsidize an industry because it is nonself-supporting is like subsidizing the buggy or horse industries.

Question. Re our gold position, are long-term U.S. investments abroad good or bad?

Answer. If the tax advantage is removed from investment in the advanced countries, I should not be too fearful. In underdeveloped countries, private capital often can do a better job than government and there is reason for a tax advantage.

Question. How does the Federal Reserve keep short-term interest high and long-term interest rates low?

Answer. It is a misconception that Board works to keep short-term rates high and long-term rates low. These rates fluctuate with money markets. There is no natural relationship and no need for a superintelligence to fix them. The Board may influence the trend of rates. The President has not suggested raising short-term rates but trying to prevent them from going lower so foreign rates will be less attractive. He has acted to reduce long-term rates through Federal Housing influence.

Forty-third Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, as they do every year, the Maryland chapter of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America observes the anniversary of Ukrainian independence, to encourage those under the yoke of Russian oppression, and to explore every avenue of helping them to regain their independence and freedom. The occasion was commemorated this year on January 22, and again it was my privilege to be with them.

Under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members the resolutions which were adopted by the group at that time, and also my remarks to them:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED ON THE OCCASION OF COMMEMORATING THE 43D ANNIVERSARY OF THE JANUARY 22, 1918, PROCLAMATION OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

INTRODUCTION

We, the delegates and representatives of the Ukrainian American organizations who are organized in the Baltimore chapter of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, have assembled on this historical day of January 22, 1918, proclamation of Ukrainian national independence, to discuss and deliberate problems which have a direct bearing upon us, as citizens of this great and democratic Republic, the United States of America.

On this occasion it is fitting to recall that our organization, founded in 1940, at the time when the world was gravely threatened by the totalitarian forces of nazism, fascism and communism, has proved to be one of the most spirited and ardent antitotalitarian and anti-Communist organizations in the country.

Even during World War II, while so many in this country recklessly glorified Stalin as a trusted ally and even a democrat, our organization never permitted opportunistic exigencies and political expediencies of the moment to besmirch its democratic ideology or to becloud its realization of the ever-growing universal menace of Russian colonial Communist imperialism.

Strongly supporting the efforts of our Government in maintaining peace, our organization boldly and without hesitation stated, that a lasting peace could not be achieved without granting freedom and independence to the nations enslaved by the forces of Russian colonial communistic imperialism, among which nations is Ukraine, the country of our fathers' origin.

President Harry S. Truman in the past, and President Dwight D. Eisenhower in recent years, have lauded the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America for its courageous support and assistance it has extended to the enslaved Ukrainian nation, which fights for its freedom and independence. Conversely, the Soviet press and Soviet officials have bitterly denounced the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, castigating it as a "tool of Wall Street and American imperialists."

A. The United States of America

The United States of America has given shelter and refuge to many thousands of Ukrainians and other people from eastern and central Europe, proving once again that America is still the beacon of liberty and the hope of the oppressed. As in 1940, at which time our organization fully supported the peace effort of the U.S. Government, so do we now fully and unequivocally state:

"Whereas the present international peace is gravely threatened by the deadly tension created by the systematic aggressive and expansionist policies of the Kremlin, the self-appointed leader of a vast Communist conspiracy to enslave the world and to subordinate it to the dictatorial power of colonial Moscow, the traditional center of enslavement and despotism;

"Whereas the American people have long accepted the basic principles set forth in the American Declaration of Independence, which stresses the tenets that 'all men are created equal,' that they are entitled to the enjoyment and exercise of freedom and independence, and that they believe these principles are universal and applicable to all nations everywhere, at all times and under all forms of government: We do

"Resolve,

"1. To support fully and unhesitatingly the ever-increasing endeavors of the United States in its policy of maintaining peace in the world and in its growing determination to oppose and challenge the aggressive and imperialistic policies of the Soviets, whose ultimate goal is imposition of slavery upon this country and the destruction of its freedom and independence, as it has already done in Ukraine and in many other non-Russian countries of central and eastern Europe and Asia.

"2. To call the attention of the U.S. Government to the fact that the Soviet Union, with a population of 200 million is not a monolithic state of the Russian people, but a conglomeration of many nationalities, among whom the non-Russian peoples comprising 110 millions were conquered by Moscow by force and are kept in colonial slavery and subjugation against their will. Their desire for freedom and independence presents the weakest link in the Soviet system which if properly capitalized upon could greatly enhance our chances of success in combating Soviet imperialistic and colonial communism.

"3. It is extremely important for the American people to know that 103 years ago Taras Shevchenko, poet and prophet of the enslaved Ukrainian people, pointed to George Washington, Founding Father of our great Republic, as a symbol and liberator of the American people from the colonial rule of a foreign power, a liberator whom he con-

sidered a model and predecessor of a similar liberation of the Ukrainian people.

"The Ukrainians, through this reference of Shevchenko to the Father of Our Country, knew over a hundred years ago that George Washington liberated America and established a 'new and righteous law' that is a true democracy, a rule of the people, by the people and for the people.

In erecting a statue of Taras Shevchenko in Washington the United States will give full expression to its understanding and appreciation of Taras Shevchenko and all that he means to the Ukrainian people.

Such a step would constitute a great psychological weapon against the Communist propaganda systematically being disseminated among the Ukrainians to the effect that only Moscow is a friend of the Ukrainian people, while the United States and other Western Powers are capitalist enemies of the Ukrainian people, bent upon their enslavement and exploitation.

"This step is all the more important because in Ukraine under the Communist rule special preparations are underway now to observe the 100th anniversary of the death of Shevchenko with the usual Communist propaganda fanfare to the effect that Shevchenko was a true proletarin poet and fighter for Communist emancipation, which obviously would be a total misrepresentation of the great Ukrainian poet and fighter for freedom.

"In 1917 it was the poetry of Shevchenko that inspired the Ukrainian movement for independence and encouraged the Ukrainian National Republic (proclaimed on January 22, 1918) in its desperate struggle, alone and unaided, to protect itself against the aggression of the Russian Communists. It was Shevchenko's poetry that encouraged the Ukrainians, forced within the Soviet Union, to continue their struggle for freedom and in World War II encouraged and fostered the Ukrainian opposition to both fascism and communism. It is only fitting that the statue of such a national hero, who taught the American ideals of patriotism and service to man, should stand in the Capital of the United States as this is stated in the resolution of U.S. Congress No. 86-749. In 1961, Ukrainian people all over the free world will observe the centennial anniversary of the death of Taras Shevchenko. The U.S. celebration of the Shevchenko centennial will demonstrate to Moscow that we are perfectly aware of and sympathize profoundly with the freedom aspirations of the Ukrainian people and other captive nations in the present Red Russian colonial empire.

"4. That the 'Voice of America' be strengthened by increasing the number of non-Russian-language programs (Ukrainian especially) beamed to the Soviet Union and that the program content be governed by the overriding need to present to the peoples behind the Iron Curtain the unvarnished truth about world affairs, and above all, about national and cultural traditions and aspirations of the enslaved nations which are being subjected to communization and russification. If economy in this vital work is a pressing need and our psychological warfare is to be regulated by the ceiling of budgetary expenditures, then priority attention should be given to reducing the already overweighted broadcasts in the Russian language so as to make needed provision for more non-Russian-language broadcasts to central and eastern Europe and Asia."

B. The enslaved Ukraine

"The sufferings of the Ukrainian nation have been largely due to the brutal, colonial, and enslaving policies of Soviet Russia, which fact is recognized today by everyone save the stooges of Nikita Khrushchev and die-hard Russian imperialists. Mass deportation and executions of Ukrainian patriots, ruthless destruction of all Ukrainian churches, Russification of Ukrainian culture and language, the unrestricted genocidal policy of Moscow with respect to the Ukrainian people—all these crimes express the fundamental and traditional Russian policy aiming at the destruction of the Ukrainians as a nation, as separate ethnic entity.

"The Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev, in his article 'On Peaceful Coexistence' in Foreign Affairs, October 1959, described the resolution of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives favoring the liberation of Ukraine, Byelorussia, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Armenia, Azerbeijan, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Turkestan, and even a certain Ural area as 'an act of provocation.'

"In other words, Khrushchev has publicly denied the right of the above-mentioned non-Russian Republics" freely to secede from the Soviet Union, as is provided for in the Soviet Constitution.

Moreover, in comparing them to American States of the Union, such as Texas, Arizona, and California, Khrushchev attempted to convince public opinion of the integrity of Soviet Russia as a homogeneous nation.

"Today the homeland of Ukrainians, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, is a member of the United Nations and its Russian Communist representatives vote consistently with the Soviet delegation in the solid bloc that stands opposed to the principles and ideals of the democracies of the world. The Soviet Union regards its representatives as on a par with those of Poland and Czechoslovakia as eligible for election to the Security Council. These representatives do not however, speak for the Ukrainian people, for the Soviet authorities lose no opportunity to stamp out Ukrainian nationalism, one of the worst doctrinal heresies to affect the Soviet Union. Ukrainian national independence, if it were to be achieved, would strike at the heart of Russian imperialism, be it red or white.

"The Ukrainian question is today one of the most important in Europe, for it involves the largest group of people with a share of European traditions that is compelled to be silent. It enters into all plans for the future of Europe, for the securing and maintenance of peace, for the welfare of the United Nations, for the welfare of the United States and of humanity.

"If Ukraine is only a creature of propaganda, as its enemies assert, why was it admitted to the United Nations? If it is an independent nation of independent people, why should it be dominated by Moscow, why should it be the colony of Moscow? Above all it is high time to understand, that Ukraine is not a "part of Russia" and the Ukrainian question is not an internal problem of the Russian nation or state which was yesterday called Tsardom and today the Soviet Union. All moral and material forces should be put in motion in order to help the Ukrainian national elements to keep alive their unconquered spirit, to prove by deeds that the Ukraine is not forgotten and that she stands equal in the thoughts of freemen with all other captive countries. This could be done by openly demanding her full sovereignty and by acknowledging her equality in the family of free nations.

"There are well over 2 million Ukrainians and their immediate descendants in the free countries outside enslaved Ukraine. They constitute a formidable force which constantly champions the cause of freedom. Among them are some 250,000 recent Ukrainian political refugees from all corners of the Ukrainian land, whose experience with tyranny is fresh and who work and strive for a common ideal: liberation of their native country.

"Whatever the future of Ukraine and the Ukrainian people may be, the Ukrainian community abroad is far more unified and consolidated than it has ever been before. It can be counted upon to play a major part in the undying movement to restore the freedom and independence of Ukraine, as a vital and indispensable element in a free Europe and in a free world.

"Meanwhile we salute those stalwart men and women who in 1918 made an independent Ukraine possible; and all those legions of heroes who have fought against hopeless odds these past 43 years.

"The heroes are dead or imprisoned, but the Ukrainian nation lives on. We do

"Resolve,

"1. To support fully and unswervingly the aspirations of the 45 million Ukrainian people in their efforts to regain their political freedom and national independence. We call the attention of the U.S. Government and the free world at large to the fact that the Ukrainian people had achieved their full freedom when on January 22, 1918, they proclaimed their independence, and on January 22, 1919, they united all the Ukrainian ethnographic territories into one independent and sovereign Ukrainian Democratic Republic, established through a due process of democratic election and endorsed by the overwhelming majority of the Ukrainian people.

"2. To make it known that the legal government of the Ukrianian Democratic Republic forcibly expelled from the country by the aggressive forces of Moscow and that today the Ukrainian National Council, which functions in Western Europe, is the continuation of the legal government of the Ukrainian people in exile. Therefore, the so-called Ukrainian Soviet government, installed by Moscow in Kiev, is not the representative government of the Ukrainian people.

"3. To call the attention of the U.S. Government and the free world at large that in Ukraine there exists and resists Russian domination an indomitable Ukrainian insurgent army (UPA) and its political leadership, the Supreme Ukrainian Liberation Council, as well as the entire network of underground resistance, which oppose the domination of Moscow and strive for the attainment of a free and independent Ukrainian democratic republic and a free world as well."

C. Appeal to the U.S. Government

"Whereas the U.S. Government is solely able to rally all the enslaved peoples behind the Iron Curtain toward a hopeful and meaningful free world of tomorrow; and

"Whereas the enslaved peoples of eastern and central Europe and Asia look forward to our moral and political leadership: We do

"Resolve, a. To appeal to and urge the U.S. Government to make it known to the enslaved peoples behind the Iron Curtain on the forum of U.N. that it upholds the rights of the non-Russian peoples within the present U.S.S.R. to their basic and inalienable freedoms which include the right of unqualified self-determination and independence. In so doing the U.S. Government will bring encouragement and hope to those peoples oppressed by Moscow (Ukraine in the first place) the most terrible colonial empire ever known.

"b. To appeal to and urge the U.S. Government to act frankly in accordance with the spirit of the Captive Nations Week resolution in ideologic offensive with a universalized declaration of independence that would insure for us a power of initiative and would place the Kremlin gangsters on a perpetual defensive."

REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN GARMATZ ON THE 43D ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE, YWCA—INTERNATIONAL CENTER, JANUARY 22, 1961

I am indeed grateful for the honor and privilege of again having been invited to join with the members of the Maryland branch of the Ukrainian Congress of America

and your other distinguished guests on this solemn occasion commemorating the 43d afiniversary of Ukrainian national independence.

It is fitting and proper that as we assemble this evening, we manifest our gratitude to Almighty God and to those freedom-loving people of the world who 43 years ago assisted the Ukrainian people achieve their national independence; and at the same time, express the sincere hope that the time will soon come when we may make this anniversary observance a cause for total rejoicing, because we know only too well that the yoke of oppression still exists for the people of the Ukraine under communistic domination—that the struggle continues and there is the need for each and every one to reassert and renew his efforts as well as encourage one another to work for the regaining of the independence proclaimed in 1918 at Kiev.

We know the Ukrainians have borne the yoke of the Kremlin longer than all other groups that are bent beneath its crushing weight—biding their time with smoldering patience, against the day of liberation which will surely come.

We know that despite every effort to suppress it, the yearning for liberty is unquenchable among Ukrainians and that tyranny has only served to stimulate it rather than stifle it.

As I have stated before, Ukrainians have suffered more than the other oppressed national groups in the Soviet Union—in concentration camps, slave-labor camps, in prison, and in the desolate Siberian wilderness.

But we take courage in the fact that these brave people are spiritually and physically endowed with the necessary strength and fortitude to withstand the tyranny to which they are still subjected.

In the end, truth and justice will prevail—that is our hope, that is our prayer, and, God willing, it will be so.

Let us unite with President Kennedy and the new administration which has just entered upon the solemn obligation of guiding the affairs and destiny of this Nation so that not only peace will prevail throughout the world, but freedom-loving people everywhere will be liberated and be able to live without fear of oppression of any kind. As your Representative in the Congress of the United States and as your fellow American, let me assure you that this beloved country of ours has not and will not abandon her interest in the news and welfare of the freedom-loving peoples of central Europe. We will carry on with every means at our disposal the efforts to resist further aggression and to lead the way toward the liberation of oppressed peoples everywhere.

School Aid Could Be Accomplished by Federal Tax Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, the issue of whether or not the Federal Government should enter directly into the field of helping to finance our entire public school system was brought once more to the attention of the American people by the President's special message on education. I have a deep-seated fear of the Federal Government gaining control over and direction of our education system. It seems to me the very basic principle of the responsibility of American people to direct and finance the education of our children is involved here. The best argument for Federal aid is the tax burden presently on the shoulders of the local people. It always makes me suspicious of the objectives of the proponents of Federal aid that they never suggest as a solution to the problem a revision of our Federal tax system.

The Fargo Forum in its issue of February 24 carried a good editorial on the subject of Federal aid to education, which points up some of the realities of this question. Under unanimous consent, I insert this editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD, and I commend it to the attention of all House Members:

LET US KEEP THE CONTROL OF SCHOOLS AT HOME BASE

In presenting his $5.6 billion Federal aid to education program to the Congress, President John F. Kennedy makes the point that what he proposes is just a "limited beginning." That probably is the fact if the Federal Government is going to take over the direction of our schools. It cannot but be recalled that other Government programs started with a limited beginning have mushroomed into ever-expanding programs.

But aside from that, there are things about Federal aid to education that should cause the American people to stop, look and listen, before accepting change. The fact is, of course, that the President's proposal is a revolutionary one. It goes contrary to the long-held idea respecting American education—the fact that it should be under State and local control. True, Mr. Kennedy, in his message, stated that "education must remain a matter of State and local control." That undoubtedly is his intention. But his text says that the "educational base of our economic and military strength is a responsibility of the Federal Government and has been since the earliest days of the Republic." The Federal Government is concerned, of course, but it remains that until now, Federal support of our multibillion-dollar educational program is held to have amounted to less than 1 percent of the cost.

Those who favor Federal intervention in education always try to make it appear that those who cling to the long-held American principle of State and local control are against education.

That is a silly contention. It isn't supported by what State and local areas have done in the last few years to build new facilities and to promote the strengthening of educational instruction.

When Mr. Kennedy implied that a goal of building 600,000 new classrooms in the next 10 years could be reached only with the help of the Federal Treasury, it would seem that his sources of information have misled him. There are figures available which show that, without Federal aid, a rate of more than 70,000 new classrooms a year has already been attained. That would be 700,000 in a decade.

America's locally governed and locally financed schools are spending much more than in the past, and they will spend substantially more in the future. That is the trend—and it is a marked trend.

One opponent of Federal aid has put the matter succinctly. He says: "The important issue is not whether Uncle Sam proposes to pay $19.75 per pupil or $1.97 or $197. It is not whether the Federal money would be spent for school construction and teachers' salaries or to meet less justifiable school costs.

"The principle objection of Federal aid is that through it the Federal Government could and would buy its way into the Nation's locally run school systems."

After extensive research, Roger Freeman published a book in 1958 entitled, "School Needs in the Decade Ahead." This book, it is said, did more than anything else to forestall crash programs in Congress. He has now written another book entitled "Taxes for the Schools."

He says that in 1958 the public schools cost the States and local districts $12 billion. He estimates that with pupil-teacher ratios declining and teachers' salaries rising, by 1969–70 the annual school expenditures will reach $24 billion. His estimate is almost exactly that of the Rockefeller Fund and the Committee for Economic Development.

State and local communities, he contends, will have less difficulty in raising adequate money in the 1960's than in the 1950's, but the total will rise only 20 to 22 percent in the 1960's. In the 1950's the school expenditures rose faster than the national income. Since the States and local communities, he says, were able to increase their school expenditures by $1 billion a year in the past 10 years, there is no reason why they will not easily be able to raise the necessary funds in the 10 years ahead. He remarks, in explanation, that while there will be more children, there will also be more parents.

One commentator says, and what he says needs to be given serious thought: "Once a substantial part of school costs are placed on a national footing, wrapped into one bundle with defense and other Federal expenses, State and local concern about the school will decline sharply. As citizens pay and pay and pay the Federal collector, they will feel both irresponsible and helpless about local schools."

In this connection it may be interesting to note that Senator GOLDWATER, Republican of Arizona and ranking minority party member of the Senate Labor and Welfare Committee, has made a proposal. He suggests that every taxpayer be allowed to subtract from his Federal income tax the full amount of property taxes for schools up to $100 and to deduct from taxable income up to $2,000 a year for each child in college. Besides that, he would establish a thousand scholarships of up to $3,000 a year, to be awarded in a national competition.

It is Mr. GOLDWATER's contention that the amount of money thus made available for State and local taxing if needed would be greater than the sums contemplated under any of the other Federal aid to education bills which are under consideration.

Whether one agrees with any or all of Mr. GOLDWATER's suggestions or not, the fact remains that his direction is right.

In the final analysis, the people would have to pay for whatever the Federal Government would spend on schools under Mr. Kennedy's proposals. Our money would go to Washington and then come back to the schools, minus the brokerage fees.

Why not keep the money at home and spend the full amount on the schools?

Congressman Gilbert's Annual Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB H. GILBERT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1961

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, at the close of the present session of Congress, I shall prepare and include in the CON-

GRESSIONAL RECORD my annual report to my constituents. The report will cover legislative work done by the Congress, and my efforts in behalf of the people I represent.

Renegade Lao Kong Le Finally Trapped in Red Web

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, as we seek to maintain our best possible relations with friendly nations throughout the world in an effort to stem the tide of communism, and bring political freedom to everyone we can, it is distressing, indeed, to read a recent news story by Robert N. Branson, of Federated Publications, which appeared in the Lansing (Mich.) State Journal.

Mr. Branson has just returned to Washington from an extended trip to Asia, where he was able to judge, firsthand, the attitudes of many persons toward the United States.

I believe my colleagues in the House will also be much disturbed to learn of the defection of Kong Le of Laos, a stanch ally, trained at our Government's expense, who is somehow no longer interested in working for freedom in Laos. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the news item. The reasons behind this failure to make a steadfast ally certainly should be of much concern to all of us:

RENEGADE LAO KONG LE FIRMLY TRAPPED IN RED WEB

(By Robert Branson)

VIENTIANE, LAOS, February 10.—The file drawer marked "Kong Le" contains dossier material that illuminates a puzzling human case.

Capt. Kong Le, 26, is the renegade paratrooper who now leads Lao rebels against the West. He has become a fiery new symbol in Asia—communism's latest pinup boy.

Less than a year ago, before some inner fuse ignited, he was regarded by U.S. officials as one of the most promising officers in Laos. He had been picked for special training and sent abroad at American expense.

Off duty, Kong Le strolled Vientiane in red beret and paratroop fatigues with U.S. magazines under his arms. He had many American friends with whom he enjoyed drinking beer and talking politics.

Among westerners who knew him, there seem to be few, if any, who did not like him, though some say he asked questions so naive that a long talk became wearing.

LOST ON ECONOMICS

"He was lost on economics and political science," says one U.S. official whom the captain used to visit. "The Kong Le speeches and manifestos now being broadcast by the Communists are obviously written by someone else."

On military ability and zeal, Kong Le rated high with westerners. Here is one extract from official files:

"He is considered honest and dependable, and an excellent leader."

That was before the day that Kong Le blew up.

At dawn last August 9 he led his 2d Paratroop Battalion in a blitz revolt that took Vientiane and the rival Lao Army by surprise. Odds against 400 soldiers seizing the Government seemed impossible but the coup succeeded.

Kong Le, all at once the most powerful man in the land, declared himself neither pro-Western nor pro-Communist. He said his aim was a neutral, peaceful Laos cleansed of corruption.

He said he was fed to the teeth with watching his superior officers riding in Mercedes-Benzes and playing tennis while he and his men beat the jungles in a hopeless war manipulated by foreign giants who made Laos a deadly plaything.

He had fought the Pathet Lao guerrillas as hard as he knew how, Kong Le said, but no more. The world must now leave Laos to itself. Corruption-fattened Lao generals and politicians must get out.

Western authorities are inclined to think Kong Le's revolution was sincere and that he meant well for his country. But they say he found himself in a game too big for him and broke under the strain.

In the 5 months his power held, he became psychiatric material.

Kong Le is a tiny man, 5 feet 2, 125 pounds. Friends who knew him as quiet, modest, and hard working found him starting to strut like an oriental Napoleon.

He assigned the tallest Lao he could find, a soldier about 5 feet 11, to walk behind him as he passed up and down the business section shaking hands and soaking up acclaim.

Never before a speechmaker, he began stopping his jeep wherever he found a crowd and delivering involved lectures.

Meanwhile Kong Le's own regime, fronted as premier by a basically pro-Western prince named Souvanna Phouma, was floundering as opposition by rival politicians grew. A new coup built steam and burst last December 16.

Kong Le and the prince fled Vientiane in a rain of artillery fire from Gen. Nhoumi Nosovan, the present strongman (who claims to be the West's best friend ever).

The December coup sent Kong Le north—straight into the arms of the Kremlin. Communist broadcasts announced he was taking over as head of his former adversaries, the Pathet Lao rebels, and Soviet aircraft have been shuttling war cargo to him ever since.

The bitter little captain today is considered too deeply enmeshed in the Communist web to extricate himself even if he wanted to.

OVER HIS HEAD

"He'll be a Pathet Lao figurehead as long as it suits the Russians and then you'll see him tossed on the scrap heap," an American predicted. "Too bad. He was an able officer and a nice guy. He got in over his head."

The record shows that Kong Le was born March 6, 1934, of peasant parents at the rice village of Muong Phalang. A good linguist, he learned French, English, and Thai but went into the French Army before finishing high school.

In 1952 he switched to the Lao Army as a captain. His ensuing failure to win promotion despite the outstanding record may have been one of the things that led to his blowup.

American military funds paid his way to Manila in 1957 for training in guerilla tactics at the Philippine Scout Ranger School. He got top grades.

Like many Lao, Kong Le has married more than once. He wed a general's daughter last year while reportedly still married to a northern country woman and perhaps others.

He also shares Lao beliefs in spirits, furies, and magic—a trait Americans found hard to reconcile with his grasp of military logic.

On his body Kong Le wears a tattoo said to protect him from being killed by any means except poison. It is widely stated that he can let a hand grenade explode in his palm without getting scratched.

Address by Senator Aiken Before the GOP Club of Frederick, Md.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to draw to the attention of Members of the House a speech by the Honorable GEORGE D. AIKEN, senior Senator from Vermont, before the GOP Club of Frederick County, Md., Republican Club's Washington's Birthday dinner, February 18, 1961:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE GEORGE D. AIKEN

I these days when the world is striving to prevent the tide of history from being reversed, it is a pleasure to be with you here in Frederick where more history has been made than in almost any other spot on the Western Hemisphere.

The first I heard of Frederick was when I was a very small boy and used to hear our old Union veterans refer to Monocacy, Gettysburg and, of course, to Frederick.

Monuments today stand in recognition of the prowess of soldiers from my State of Vermont both at Gettysburg and Monocacy.

And, then, when a little older, I studied about General Braddock who set out from Frederick on his ill-fated attempt to conquer the territory to the west.

The town of Frederick was indeed a new frontier in those days when the term had a real physical meaning and was not merely a catch phrase designed to lure the gullible voter into voting the Democratic ticket.

They had their "missile gap" in those days, too.

It was not merely another political catch phrase.

A missile gap in the days of Braddock was the difference in the time it took to fit two arrows to the bow and the time it took to reload a musket.

As it turned out, the missile gap was not in Braddock's favor.

And after Braddock, I learned how the first President of the United States, John Hanson, was from Frederick—of Francis Scott Key and Chief Justice Taney, whose famous decision in the Dred Scott case changed the course of history in the United States.

And, while we are commemorating the birthday of George Washington, let us not forget that it was a Frederick patriot, Thomas Johnson, who nominated Washington to be Commander in Chief of the Continental Army.

When I think of the part that the men and women of Frederick and of a thousand other communities in the United States have played in the struggle for freedom and equality and opportunity—how they sacrificed and worked and prayed down through the generations, it occurs to me that after all the fight of the American people for a freer and happier life did not begin on the 20th of January, 1961.

Another reason why I am glad to be here tonight is because here in the Sixth District

of Maryland you Republicans showed that determination and commonsense and hard work can win elections.

When that same brand of sound thinking permeates enough districts in the United States, the Republican Party will again come into power both in the Congress and in the executive offices of Government.

How do we win elections?

A few years ago, I was speaking to the Women's National Republican Club in New York and in the course of my remarks made this statement:

"To win elections we have to have candidates the people will vote for.

"All the way from the precinct up, we need candidates in whom the people have confidence.

"Whether we get this kind of candidate or not depends upon our willingness to attend party caucuses and conventions and to vote in primary elections and to serve when called upon."

Apparently you folks here in the Sixth District had a candidate the people would vote for and from what I have already seen of MAC MATHIAS you are going to keep him in Washington for a good long time.

In 6 weeks' time, he has impressed his colleagues with his ability, his friendliness, his courage, and his determination to follow the course of his conscience.

I congratulate you on your selection of MAC MATHIAS to the House of Representatives and GLENN BEALL and JOHN BUTLER to the U.S. Senate.

They work hard for you.

They are constantly watching out for your interests and they serve their country well.

Last November, we Republicans lost a national election.

We lost it by so small a margin that the Monday morning quarterbacks are still figuring out how many different plays we could have used to win it.

I can think of quite a few ways myself.

However, we lost, and the years 1962 and 1964 are coming up—and fast.

So let's not waste any time weeping over the last and lost election, but start looking ahead and plan and work for victories to come.

As the largest and strongest citadel of democracy in the world today, the United States is not in a particularly enviable position.

Why do so many people claim to dislike us?

As a matter of fact I don't believe that many people in other countries do hate us. They envy us.

There are mighty few in the world, even Mr. Khrushchev himself, who would not gladly change places with us if it were possible.

Those nations which are oppressed either by poverty or tyranny look to us for help which we are finding increasingly difficult to furnish.

Those nations whose aim is to destroy freedom in the world keep up an incessant attack upon our institutions by every Machiavellian method which they can devise.

The promoting of riots and revolutions has now become a well established commercial business in the world.

This business is so well organized that riots can be turned on or off in any country almost by pushbutton operations.

In meeting the threat posed by the cold war, we must be a united people.

There is little place for partisan politics when the security of our country or our democratic institutions is in danger.

The domestic economy of the United States which reached an alltime high in terms of production, employment, and income under President Eisenhower has shown some signs of decline during recent weeks.

However, if you remember back 8 years, we Republicans didn't find things all milk and honey when we took over.

We found a good sized war on our hands.

We are constantly being challenged by our own successes—technology reduces the need for manpower and increases our productive capacity; so in agriculture—in industry—in business and commerce and in the professions we have to constantly adjust to changing conditions.

There may be some who fear change. I happen to be one who welcomes it for change is the surest evidence of progress.

It should be a matter of pride to all Republicans that during the Eisenhower administration, our country not only reached its economic apex, but that the value of the dollar was fully protected during this period.

The sound dollar like a sound heart is not a glamorous subject for discussion.

In fact, it is almost a dirty word in certain circles.

Yet if it were not for the sound heart of our economy created by the Republicans all the mascara, rouge and perfume sold by the Democrats during the campaign wouldn't amount to a tinker's damn.

Besides the problems posed by the cold war and the need for continuing adjustments in our economic system, we have to jealously protect the political system under which this Nation has grown strong and its people have prospered.

In our zeal to find short cuts and easy solutions to our problems, we could easily take steps which would slowly but steadily undermine the very institutions which have made us what we are—the envy of the world.

With the foreign and domestic situations as they are today, what is the role of the Republican Party?

We have three important jobs to do.

First, the Democrats now control all departments and agencies of Government.

The President is asking for a lot of new legislation.

We may be sure that our opponents will try to shape that legislation in such a manner as to perpetuate themselves in office.

This is a perfectly normal reaction on their part. They wouldn't be human, and they certainly wouldn't be Democrats, if they don't make the most of this opportunity.

They will try to vest more power in themselves and create more dependency upon the Federal Government.

Efforts to scrap much of the Civil Service are already apparent, and let no one kid himself about that. Already 1,100 post office opportunities have been recalled. Who do you think will get these jobs?

Their efforts will become intensified as they become more settled in office, and as another election draws nearer.

As Republicans, we should spare no effort to see that the balance of power between branches of Government is preserved, that the constitutional rights of the citizen are protected, and that the strength of the Nation is promoted.

Although Congress will be the front line in this effort, it will be necessary to mobilize public opinion in order to succeed.

That is a job for the folks back home.

We may have to use a little mascara and lipstick ourselves to get this job done.

Second, as the opposition party, Republicans will be the guardians of clean government, constantly watching out for inefficiencies—inequities and malfeasance in the conduct of public business.

I do not advocate harassment of public officials, but prompt and fearless exposure of wrongdoing in government is important to the public interest.

Third, we have to do a selling job for America.

We have a lot to sell and have to counteract the impression that the American economy is on the rocks.

I do not understand the thinking of those who depict the United States as a poor business risk.

How can we expect people to invest in new business when the President himself paints such a discouraging picture of our economy?

In spite of the fact that right now much of our country has two feet of frost in the ground and employment is consequently adversely affected, the United States still offers the best opportunities in the world and, as Republicans, we have to demonstrate our faith to the world.

No less important than faith in our economy is our standing with the nations of the world.

We are not, as is frequently inferred, weaker than Russia militarily.

We have not relinquished our position of leadership in the free world.

We must maintain our standing in the eyes of other nations.

As George Washington said in 1793: "There is a rank due to the United States which will be withheld, if not absolutely lost, by the reputation of weakness."

It is time that every American demonstrates his pride in being an American.

It is time to tell the whole world of our faith in America.

It is time to serve notice of our determination to defend our country against all enemies from without or within.

If we do these things, we will find that the United States will retain the prestige to which we are entitled.

Looking to the States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, as this Congress carries on its deliberations during 1961, legislatures in 47 States will be in session. Let us pause to consider the vital role the States play in our Government and the importance of their activities.

The first governments to arise on American soil were those of the 13 seaboard colonies. From them developed the governments of the Thirteen Original States and the general pattern of State government now prevailing from Maine to California and on to Hawaii and Alaska. At the time our Constitution was drafted, the States were the major governmental unit. The framers of the Federal Constitution wanted a National Government able to meet the country's needs, but they had no intention of condemning the States to obscurity. On the contrary, they anticipated that the States, with their deep historical roots and their broad undefined reserved powers, would continue as one of the principal theaters of governmental and political action.

The 10th amendment of the Constitution underscores the division of power under our federal system by stating:

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

In the Federalist Papers, James Madison noted that—

the State governments may be regarded as constituent and essential parts of the Federal Government.[1]

[1] No. 45.

Practically all the drafters of the Constitution had been active in the governments and politics of their States. Many had helped frame constitutions, sat as members of legislatures, or held executive or judicial offices. The federal system they devised gave certain specific powers to the National Government while the remaining unspecified powers were retained by the States. This division of power between two levels of government established a tension that is necessary for each level to maintain its entity and not relinquish any of its prerogatives.

The strength of our federal system has been its flexibility as the needs of the people and the circumstances of government have changed. When Lane Dwinell, then Governor of New Hampshire, testified in 1958 before the House Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, he observed:

> One of the great strengths of the American system of Federal Government is the singular opportunity it affords for periodic review of intergovernmental relationships. This in part is what makes us independent and free. As a consequence, the operation of the federal system requires continuing attention to insure its vitality and to retain, through strong State and local government, this elasticity of popular decision.[2]

It has been pointed out that:

> Our Nation is the United States of America; and while the activities of the National Government attract more attention and get more headlines in the newspapers, the States nowadays, on their part, make and enforce more regulations, render more services, employ more civil servants, and spend more money than ever before. Practically every citizen of the United States is at the same time a citizen of some State, as well as an inhabitant of a subdivision of a State called a county, and of some fraction of a county known as a town, township, village, borough, or city; and the governments touching him at the greatest number of points are those of his State and of local units which that State has created and endowed with power. Indeed, scarcely a period or an activity in the life of the average person is not in some measure, either directly or indirectly influenced, regulated, or controlled by State laws, or by local ordinances deriving their authority from such laws.
>
> Of practical uses served, three require a word of emphasis: (1) As primary jurisdictions, the States carry a heavy share of the load of government; (2) without the facilities which the States provide and the functions they perform, the National Government, on its existing constitutional basis, could not operate. The President is chosen by electors grouped by States and chosen by the people of States; Senators are chosen likewise by the people of States; Congressmen are chosen in districts laid out by States and under State election laws administered by State officials; and States determine who may vote in all of these elections. For amending the Constitution, also, State action is required. In a different field, political parties are organized on a State pattern, with national committees, conventions, and the like forming only a sort of superstructure; and persons who come to the top in National Government and politics usually have received their training and got their start on the State and local levels. Incidentally, too, county, city, and other local governments would lose all legal basis if the State constitutions and laws on which they rest were estinguished; (3) finally, the States provide means by which Vermonters, Virginians, Iowans, and Californians can have governments and laws to their own liking, instead of being forced to a single uniform pattern.[3]

Heading the executive branch in each State is the Governor. The State governorship has descended directly from the office of Governor in colonial times. Prior to the American Revolution, the Governor of each Colony, who had often been appointed by the king granting its charter, exercised great powers. When the colonial system ended and States were established, much of the Governor's power was delegated to the State legislature and to the council he had appointed to assist him became the popularly elected State senate. In all but 2 of the original 13 States the Governor was appointed by the legislature, and in 10 of the States his term of office was restricted to a single year. The office of Governor was largely a ceremonial one at that time, and the criterion imposed on candidates was how they would look on a horse.

Gradually, as State problems became more complex, the pendulum of power moved in the other direction. As new State constitutions were drafted, more and more duties were given to the Governor. The new constitution of my own State of New Jersey, which was adopted in 1947, typifies modern thinking in establishing a strong executive who appoints the other members of the executive branch.

Frank M. Bane, who for 20 years was executive director of the Council of State Governments and as such probably has known and worked with more Governors than any other man in American history, in discussing the qualifications a present-day Governor needs, stated:

> Every Governor should have—and if he is to be an outstandingly successful Governor he must have—the gifts of popular leadership, executive ability, decisiveness, studious inquiry, and the skill of political competence in the broadest and most constructive sense. * * * In order to lead, a Governor must have definite policies and he must have a dynamic program. His policies and his program are the keystones of his administration and everything else is built around them.
>
> Throughout his term of office, from beginning to end, the Governor will give most of his time and attention, inevitably, to the development of these policies—and to seeing to it that the legislature enacts the program he bases upon them. This requires of him initiative, imagination, understanding of the legislative process, and the ability to lead the major officials associated with his administration into a cooperative endeavor to seek legislative enactment of the essential measures. Above all, it calls for effective liaison and relations with legislators and legislative leaders.[4]

Today the Governor's office has expanded to such an extent that he is not only the chief executive, but he has also been called the chief legislator. Dr. Harvey Walker, professor of political science at Ohio State University, notes that this is due to many factors:

> (1) his uniqueness as the head of the executive branch, which makes him a prime source of news; (2) his power of veto * * * (3) his power to send messages to the legislature and to secure wide publicity for his recommendations; (4) his exclusive power to convene special sessions * * * (5) his power of appointment to executive posts, which may be used to influence legislative action or inaction; and (6) his power to initiate budget estimates * * *.[5]

In discussing his years as Governor of New York, Theodore Roosevelt commented that "more than half of my work as Governor was in the direction of getting needed and important legislation."

While the Governor has certain legislative tools at his disposal, the main legislative authority is given to the upper and lower assemblies in 49 of the States and to the unicameral legislature in Nebraska. Professor Walker has summarized that their role is threefold:

> (1) to serve as the defender of popular rights and liberties; (2) to serve as the guardian of the collective conscience; and (3) to serve as the primary decisionmaker.[6]

In the Federalist Papers Madison predicted that—

> The first and natural attachment of the people will be to the governments of their respective States. Into the administration of these a greater number of individuals will expect to rise. From the gift of these a greater number of offices and emoluments will flow. By the superintending care of these, all the most domestic and personal interests of the people will be regulated and provided for.[7]

Those of us here in the House of Representatives are well aware of the importance of the State legislatures in setting up congressional boundaries. However, our respect for these bodies and their members is much deeper. For many of us, including myself, State legislatures were the sites of our most intensive political experience prior to entering Congress. Five other members of the New Jersey congressional delegation, Congressmen CAHILL, GLENN, THOMPSON, DWYER, and OSMERS, and U.S. Senator CLIFFORD CASE also served in the New Jersey Legislature. U.S. Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS, JR., joined the Senate after experience in this House. A study of five Congresses, covering a 10-year period, showed that roughly one-third of all the Congressmen in each of the Congresses had been former State legislators.

---

[2] State government, April 1958, p. 66.

[3] Ogg, Frederic A. and Ray, P. Orman, "Introduction to American Government," 10th ed., New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1951, pp. 794–795.

[4] "The Job of Being Governor," State Government, summer 1958, p. 185.

[5] "The Role of the Legislature in Government," State Government, spring, 1960, pp. 99–100.

[6] Ibid., p. 102.

[7] No. 46.

State legislators in Congress[1]

	Number	Percent of total	Average length of State legislative service (in years)
71st Cong.:			
Senators	33	34	4.2
Representatives	154	35	4.3
Total	187	35	4.3
72d Cong.:			
Senators	34	36	3.3
Representatives	161	37	5.2
Total	195	37	4.3
73d Cong.:			
Senators	35	36	3.2
Representatives	149	34	5.6
Total	184	35	4.4
74th Cong.:			
Senators	31	32	(2)
Representatives	143	33	(2)
Total	174	32	
75th Cong.:			
Senators	39	40	3.8
Representatives	145	33	4.9
Total	184	35	4.4

[1] "The State Legislature as Training for Further Public Service," the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, January 1938, p. 178.
[2] No data.

In the accompanying article Dr. John Brown Mason, then a member of the Santa Ana Junior College faculty, commented:

We must recognize the fact that the various State governments, and especially the State legislatures with their thousands of members, are a prep school for further public service of a legislative, executive, and judicial character which also transcends State boundaries as the former State legislators invade the national political field. In this capacity, the State legislature performs a service of inestimable value to the Federal Government in all its branches, to the men holding elective or appointive positions in it, and to all citizens affected by it.[3]

Dr. Mason found that many Governors had graduated from State legislatures. In glancing through a list of chief executives of New Jersey I noted that our Governors with legislative background included Govs. Robert B. Meyner, Alfred E. Driscoll, Morgan F. Larson, and James F. Fielder. In Massachusetts Dr. Mason found that 74 percent of its Governors had served in its legislature while in Nebraska 70 percent had.

In discussing the value of their legislative background, Dr. Mason wrote:

It is the natural and strong desire of every Governor to work in harmony with the legislature. In his position, he is the logical leader of the legislators, and if he has been one of them he probably has gathered valuable experience in finding out their strong and weak points and in getting along with them—a knowledge which comes in handy when he occupies the executive chair. Having represented a smaller district himself, he should also have been closer to the needs and the sentiments of the average voter, the people in general, than nonpoliticians suddenly catapulted into the Governor's mansion. Generally speaking, we would conclude that legislative experience can only be an asset to a Governor or other high State official, and, further, that most State legislators have found appreciation in the form of higher positions in the State than is often believed.[3]

Mr. Speaker, it has been well stated by wise King Solomon in his proverb, "Where there is no vision, the people perish." Today I think we should acknowledge our debt to the States for their role in the Federal system and for providing a training ground where we have been able to grow in governmental wisdom.

[3] Ibid., p. 177.

[3] Ibid., p. 17.

Golden Anniversary of Marquette University College of Journalism: A Tribute to Dean J. L. O'Sullivan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD an article which appeared in the February 25 issue of America magazine, about Dean J. L. O'Sullivan of Marquette University College of Journalism.

This is a fitting and timely tribute for at least two reasons: First, because Marquette University College of Journalism is this year celebrating its golden anniversary; and, second, because Dean O'Sullivan is completing 32 years of outstanding service as the dean of that college.

I am pleased to commend the article to the attention of the House, and to extend my congratulations to Marquette University College of Journalism and its famous dean, Dean O'Sullivan.

I may add that on Friday, April 14, in connection with the golden anniversary year program, four alumni of the college of journalism with long experience in writing foreign news will conduct a foreign correspondents institute at Marquette University Union. The alumni are: Mr. Wallace Carroll, Washington news editor of the New York Times; Mr. Fred Zusy, president of Continental Press; Mr. Paul McMahon, travel editor of the Milwaukee Journal; and Mr. Cack Casserly, Rome correspondent for Headline Service. The event promises to be very interesting and informative.

The article which I mentioned follows:

SECOND THOUGHTS
(By Donald McDonald)
HIMSELF ON PAPER

This year the Marquette University College of Journalism is noting its 50th anniversary, and I would be something of an ingrate were I to let the occasion pass without recording publicly my own debt to the college and to the great man who has been its dean for the last 32 years, Jeremiah L. O'Sullivan.

My first contact with Dean O'Sullivan was in October 1945. I was 25, just a month out of the Air Force, and determined to take advantage of the GI Bill of Rights to secure a college education. But I was undecided whether it would be journalism at Marquette or business and finance at Pennsylvania.

After weighing the matter, I followed natural inclination. I called Dean O'Sullivan just a few weeks before the opening of the November 1945 trimester. Could I still be admitted?

"Sure, come on down," boomed the deep voice of O'Sullivan at the other end of the long-distance line.

Even in those days of relatively little admission red tape, I was impressed by the ease and alacrity with which Dean O'Sullivan cut through it.

This mark of realism, of utter objectivity, of the dean and his school, the relegation of the administrative ritualism and formalism of the academy to a distinctly subordinate role in education, seemed to me then exactly right for 25-year-old, married, 4-year military veterans who were college freshmen and who had a lot of intellectual catching up to do. It seems to me now that it is also eminently right under any circumstances. Administrative rules and operating regulations in a university are not made to be broken. But they are made to serve the teaching and learning process, and if they do not do that, they must be set aside.

In those days, Dean O'Sullivan waived rules freely. The mature war veterans with demonstrable writing facility were excused from the freshman English composition course.

Students engaged in writing novels were excused from attendance in the reporting class, though they did have to make periodic progress reports to the dean.

A second and greater quality in Dean O'Sullivan is his compassion.

On one occasion when the heating system in one of the old postwar barracks classrooms broke down on a winter day, Dean O'Sullivan, overcoat and muffler still on, began lecturing to the students in the cold room. After a moment or two, he closed his notebook, reached for his hat and rasped: "Class dismissed. Let's go get a cup of hot coffee."

A student once made the mistake—in a personality-profile writing assignment—of poking fun at the physical features of the person he was describing. This occasioned an impromptu, unforgettable lecture by the dean on charity and the hideousness of its opposite.

We came to see, in the course of a year's time in O'Sullivan's reporting class, that the Negroes, the poor, all the little people whom a bourgeois society either despises or ignores, were of inestimable worth and dignity; indeed, that in a sense it was impossible to separate their dignity and their suffering which purified and fortified it. This understanding we received not in the form of sermons from Dean O'Sullivan but in the way he naturally responded, as a man, to persons and events that either challenged or supported his convictions.

When Richard Davis of the Milwaukee Journal wrote his classic editorial on the concert by Marian Anderson in Milwaukee, he described a concert that saw wealthy whites and the impoverished Negroes of the community united in the Milwaukee Auditorium for an hour in their mutual love of great art and a great artist, but then separated after the concert, the Negroes returning to their Sixth Ward ghetto and the whites to their comfortable homes. Dean O'Sullivan read the editorial the next day in class as an unequaled example of contemporary rhetoric, which it was. But it was also a powerful, burning lesson in the bitter irrationalities of racism.

One of the legitimate pleasures—needful stimulants, indeed—of college literary life is literary conversation, argument, and discussion, but this can also be fatal to literary production. It is temptingly easy to pretend

one is immersed in the mainstream of literary life when all one is doing is playing the crow, attracted to the glittering fascination of mere talk.

Dean O'Sullivan never discouraged literary conversation. But he kept it honest by demanding a piece of written work—short story, essay, poem, article—three times a week for every one of the 40 weeks in his reporting class. If he'd had a motto, I suppose it would have been: "Writing's the Thing."

It was Dean O'Sullivan who introduced us to the world of H. A. Reinhold, Dorothy Day, George Shuster and Don Sturzo, not to mention Milton Mayer, Heywood Broun and Gerald Vann, and Bernanos, Bloy and Peguy. Down in Chicago, John Cogley and James O'Gara were starting a Catholic monthly, Today, for high school and college readers; and Ed Willock and Carol Jackson were starting Integrity, which, before it published indefensible last-word tracts on technology, communications and advertising, printed incomparable translations of Cardinal Suhard's incomparable pastoral letters on postwar, post-Christian man in this century.

And Dean O'Sullivan was bringing all this very exciting material into class and into our lives and we began to see that writing, if it was to ring true, could not be merely a detached exercise of the man called Writer. It had to involve the man himself, his most fundamental convictions, but, at an even more elemental level, it had to be torn from him and be a part of himself on paper.

If writing is a vocation, Dean O'Sullivan seemed to be saying, then it is the man who is called, not simply his writing skill or technique. And it does matter, contrary to the cynical journalist's pretext of unconcern, it does matter how things turn out. The journalist is not, then, simply an observer of contemporary history, he is a part of it, and what he writes, or fails to write, helps to give that history its final shape and significance.

What Dean O'Sullivan was interested in producing was not neutralist technicians, but men who cared and who had the competence and craftsmanship to lead others to care. If he had not constructed and developed a curriculum for journalists that was 75 percent liberal arts and, even in its formally journalistic area, heavily weighted on the side of the principles of writing and publishing as these relate to man and society, I doubt whether many of the 2,500 or 3,000 young men and women who studied under Dean O'Sullivan would have learned to care or would have understood the radically spiritual nature and social irreplaceability of the journalist and his vocation.

Mission to Israel: Summer of 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MILTON W. GLENN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to give a summary of impressions and observations of modern Israel by Rabbi Martin M. Weitz, who was invited to visit the State of Israel for the first 17 days of July 1960. This was his second visit to Israel—the first was made in the summer of 1955. The summary follows:

A second exposure to ancient and modern Israel, in a span of 5 years, changes an itinerary into a pilgrimage. Old sites, sacred in memories, are centries for the spirit, alongside the new sights, significant for human needs. An exhilarating example of this is a set of concrete reservoirs that tap and cap the subterranean sources, the underground streams, that flow from the veins of the Judean hills, not too far from Tel Aviv, where they form and flow to the Mediterranean as the Yarkon River. Here they are channeled for irrigation nearby and for the distant Negev, and harnessed too for the local stream to the sea, north of Tel Aviv. A medieval Crusaders' fortress stands as reminder of the past, while at the end of the stream, north of Tel Aviv, is the powerhouse and lighthouse that serves the present. At the southern tip of Israel is a similar reminder: Pillars of Solomon, near the ancient copper mines, utilized by King Solomon, astride the new copper factory-refinery that recovers the very ore latent in the surface rocks nearby. Ancient memories blend with contemporary creations almost everywhere to make us realize that time and space are one in ancient and modern Israel.

A second trip to Israel does more than recapture ancient phantasy and distill modern poetry: It sorts out impressions by comparison, for the old views one beheld 5 years ago are still there, cherished as before and even more, while the new is newer and larger and better than ever before. A second visit also widens horizons, deepens knowledge, and heightens perceptions. It helps clarify confusion and classify vital data, as well as recapture previous and almost forgotten responses with a new reference of values.

Israel, at the western window of Asia, covers approximately 7,882 square miles. It has a varied topography of mountains and hills, valleys and plains, lakes and deserts, rivers and seas, all in a matter of miles or minutes, depending on one's direction. Its storied and gloried rivers are the Jordan, Yarkon, Alexander Janai, and the Kishon, while its lakes are the Huleh (practically drained and dry), the Sea of Galilee, and the Dead Sea. Its highest point is Mount Jermak, almost 4,000 feet above sea level, while its lowest depression, the Dead Sea, is 1,290 feet below sea level. A Mediterranean climate pervades throughout Israel, even in winter, with many sunny days.

The population at the end of 1959 was 2,088,685, of which 229,844 were non-Jews. The Arabs—151,500 of the non-Jews—were Moslems largely, with 57,600 Christians, 21,500 Druzes, and 200 B'hais. Population has more than tripled in a short span of a dozen years.

The miracle of Israel is the ingathering of men, women, and children to the four corners of Israel, from the four corners of the earth. In a matter of a year or two, a medieval fragment of being is transmuted into a human being, with adequate housing, freedom from sickness, and sense of adequacy. The ingathering of the exiles truly is the miracle of the 20th century, where broken people are made whole and lives bereft of speech, gifted again with song in the lyric of rebirth.

Stern are the hills of Judea, and sacred is the citadel of Jerusalem, as a core of man's hopes. Here are great tombs of judges bereft of their coffins, but not their living hopes. Here shrines, sacred to three faiths, are benumbed by time into eternity.

To the south and west of Tel Aviv lies the future of Israel, as it did with our forefathers; the Negev, moving sands and empty lands, corrugated hills filled with flame, subdued with shadow, down to the Dead Sea and beyond that to the coral shores of the Red Sea.

Israel is the land of yesterday, yet translated into today for tomorrow. Memories and fears are redone into hopes in the golden fantasy of the faiths of mankind.

During the Jerusalem sojourn of 5 days, a number of outstanding visits and conferences helped the writer immensely in appreciating new values in modern Israel and their relationships to vistas of ancient Israel. Finest of these hours I shall always recall are: the early morning and evening conversations with Dr. Nelson Glueck, inspired and inspiring archeologist-author-president-prophet of the Hebrew Union College, who helped discover and uncover over 1,000 sites of the Jordan and who introduced me to the new Hebrew Union College in Jerusalem, next to King David Hotel; Dr. Yigael Yadin, General of the Israeli Army and also world-famous archeologist of the Hebrew University (whose father, the late Dr. Sukenik, helped decipher as well as discover value of Dead Sea Scrolls now in the University); Dr. M. Mazur, President of the Hebrew University, Dr. M. Rachmilewitz, dean of its medical college (with whom I discussed proposal of Ventnor Foundation to have annually five or so medical interns from Israel for a year's study in the United States); Ben Chorin, a founding father of Progressive Judaism in Jerusalem, who helps conduct its services and encourage its efforts; M. Ish-Sholom (Friedman), mayor of Jerusalem, who seemed proud of the golden key I brought from Mayor Joseph Altman of Atlantic City.

The cities of Israel are as members of a family. Each has its own personality, even though the Israeli household occupies so little area. Though they are in different sizes, they also have different tempers—and temperaments.

Tel Aviv is like a lady with a large brood. It's a home of small and fairly large businesses, and much activity. Its personality has variety as well as energy. It's the theater center, the Times Square, and the playground of the country. It has as many dailies as New York City and five full-time companies for theater.

Jerusalem is the patriarch, the man with the long beard, but is strong, erect, unbent, and unspent. It is quiet, meditative, reflective in its mood, with a long-range look to all its efforts. Here is the Kiryan, capital of government, the Hebrew University, center for learning, very little private business in contrast to Tel Aviv, the world-famous hospitals as Hadassah, Yeshivoth (academies for faith) and other cultural-religious storehouses.

Haifa is as a young dedicated man with an upward look and boundless energy. If Tel Aviv is the city of the present and Jerusalem, the city of the past, Haifa is the city of the future. It is a port city with a third of its people living off the water rather than the land, off the literal "littoral," as it were. It is anchorage for Jewish boats, Jewish longshoremen, and is crowned by a new technion, in which oils and chemicals are feature ingredients and basic for its worth to Israel and the world.

Beersheba is as a growing lovely maiden still with her mother, as a Biblical Ruth rather than her teenage counterpart in America. She has a number of suitors, and not all of them are as Boaz. Hers is an old story, with growth arrested during years of neglect, but with a sudden almost startling adolescence since a decade ago—in new Israel's saga of life. A new road and rail to the Negev, the Dead Sea and its minerals, are as a new lifeline for Israel itself and the dams and irrigation pipes and reservoirs are reflected glory of Abraham and the ancient wells he discovered in Beersheba.

Ashkalon is as a youngster in braids or curls, depending on her mood and what day it is. This seting recalls the deeds of Samson, and suggests "scallion," an English word that comes from "Ascalon" when it implied a source for green vegetables, notably onions. Ten years ago, this was all a memory, now it is reality, a marketplace, a factory for cement pipes, largest in the world. It's a youthful girl looking to the sea and looking to the desert.

Elath is the infant in the family of cities of Israel. It was not exactly left on its doorstep, as cradled in its commerce, culture, and conscience. It is the infant-hope of the story of the Red Sea and beyond it, world destiny. It is terminus of railroad to be, several oil pipelines in the making, alternates to Suez Canal, road already reality, as well as memory of Solomon's port and factorycity of Etzyon Geber. It is also a great port city for ships, and, because of that may become a winter resort, as an Israeli Riviera. All cities, as members of the family, are fondly coddling this lusty infant so that it takes its rightful place among them all.

The Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD a speech entitled "The Bill of Rights," which was written by Jay Knight, a sophomore at South Pasadena High School in the congressional district I represent.

Jay Knight wrote and delivered this talk to the South Pasadena Republican Women's Club Federated recently.

I feel that his talk displays a very keen understanding of the basic principles on which our great Nation was founded and therefore bring it to the attention of the membership of the Congress:

THE BILL OF RIGHTS

(By Jay Knight, South Padadena High School)

The first 10 amendments of our Constitution of the United States known as the Bill of Rights, have played an important part in the preservation of individual privileges. After the Constitution was finally completed, Jefferson and other patriots were still fearful of centralized government, so they demanded that a bill of state and individual rights be added. This bill insured three undisputed rights for man—life, liberty, and property.

Liberty is freedom from all but the laws of nature and those society has made for the preservation of man. Government enforces the manmade laws. The rewards for man's labors become his own private property to do with as he sees fit.

In order to protect life, liberty, and property, our forefathers formed government as a servant of the people. But what has happened to our Government? Is it serving the people or taking care of them? Is it helping them or robbing them? A strong Central Government tends to weaken individual responsibility.

A recent newspaper article told of an unskilled laborer capable of earning $28 a week. If he didn't work, the Government paid him $35 plus free milk for his seven children. He choose not to work. Is this the American way? Is this rugged individualism? Is this what the architects of the Bill of Rights and the Constitution sacrificed and fought so hard for?

One false theory for America's success is based upon the belief that we have greater natural resources than other less fortunate countries. But the key to our success lies in the ideas as set down in our Bill of Rights. Let's keep our key shining and bright for other nations to see and use as a model to free themselves. But can we keep our liberty?

I have always thought of the foundation of America as three great pillars—first a faith in God; second, private enterprise; and third, a constitutional government. Our country was founded on the belief of a supreme being. In their quest for freedom, our forefathers turned in prayer for guidance. Private enterprise stimulates the competition which improves man's way of life. Constitutional government insures individual freedom as stated in our Bill of Rights.

All three pillars are essential for the foundation and strength of our great country. It is this generation's responsibility to preserve our American heritage for generations to come.

A year ago, shortly before retiring as chief of the Army Ordnance Missile Command, General Medaris said: "We seem to feel that we have bought freedom and have a title to it which we can retain until the end of the world. But all we have is a lease on freedom, and if we won't pay the lease every year, we can very well lose it."

The choice is up to you.

Should State and Local Governments Look to Washington for Help?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in October, last year, I had the opportunity of addressing the annual conference of the Governmental Research Association, meeting in St. Louis. At that time my topic was "Should State and Local Governments Look to Washington for Help?" I should like to insert this speech in the RECORD at this time:

SHOULD STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS LOOK TO WASHINGTON FOR HELP?

(Remarks of Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri, at the annual conference of the Governmental Research Association, Tiara Room, Park Plaza Hotel, Oct. 4, 1960.)

I always enjoy having a title for a speech picked for me, particularly when the title contains good negative and affirmative pregnants. In the process of picking out the overtones hidden in the semantics one sometimes can develop a much clearer presentation of the real issues involved. The title I have, "Should State and Local Governments Look to Washington for Help?" is a beauty. It contains just about all the overtones a speaker could ask for.

First, I believe almost everyone believes that State and local governments should look to themselves before looking anywhere else for help. So one of the issues hidden in the title is whether the State and local governments have done everything they can for themselves and therefore are appropriately in a position to look to Washington for help.

Second, I think almost everyone believes that there are many areas which by their nature may be essentially State or essentially local and yet require coordination or direct action on the part of each other and on the part of the Federal Government. There is considerable room for discussion and debate concerning the balance between Federal, State, and local governmental action, and may I add action by private enterprise in these areas. The essential point to drive home, however, it that it is not a question of black and white. I know of no one who wants to abolish the Federal Government on the theory that it has no place to play in the complex of our society. On the other hand if there are people who would abolish State governments they are certainly in the minority and would not admit it openly and therefore we may assume for the sake of debate there are none. Certainly there are none who would abolish local governments. Therefore, lest I be caught in a semantic trap by the title of this address if I were to answer its question by saying "No," which is my inclination, I have to make it quite clear that I believe there are many areas where the Federal Government must and should act and if it failed to act State and local governments would be hard pressed to meet the obligations I believe they have. Insistence on the part of local and State governments that the Federal Government meet its obligations would not fit under the term "Look to Washington for help." In these instances, they would look to Washington for fulfillment of its obligations.

What I am trying to say is that a large part of the discussion before us should relate to the pros and cons of where Federal, State, and local jurisdictional boundary lines should be drawn from the standpoint of present efficient handling of our social problems with regard to future abilities to meet these social problems. If one of the three layers of government is not meeting its responsibilities based upon whatever is agreed as the best division of responsibilities I suggest that the question should then direct itself to the layer of government which is derelict to see what if anything can be done to redeem it.

I have set forth the ground rules for a discussion, now let me see if by applying these ground rules to specific issues I can make what I have been trying to get across clear.

Before doing this, I want to get the whole situation of local, State, and Federal Government into better perspective. There has been so much loose talk about public squalor vis a vis private opulence, particularly by politicians with economic backgrounds, that a good look at a few statistics is necessary. I am indebted to the excellent paper of one of your panelists, Dr. Roger A. Freeman, entitled "Tax Burden in the 1960's, and the Means of Financing It," for getting this matter into better perspective. Dr. Freeman quotes an article in Harper's for July 1960, by Peter F. Drucker as follows: "This tremendous expansion of the (local) governments has gone more than half way toward restoring the prenew deal balance between the national and local governments in the domestic field. It has made the (local) governments at least potentially the really dynamic, expansionist, innovating organs in American social policy." I believe the statistics support this statement. As Dr. Freeman points out, the National Government share of all public revenues shrank from 79 percent in 1944, to 64 percent in 1959. Two other points from Dr. Freeman's paper: "During peacetime, State and local governments, with all their much vaunted disabilities, managed to expand their revenues at a more rapid pace than the National Government." "Two-thirds of the State legislatures raised taxes in 1955, and again in 1959. Counties, school districts, and other local governments have been pushing up their taxes, gradually and consistently year after year."

I must try to dispose of another misconception before moving to the meat of my discussion. The economic statistics completely belie the allegation of public squalor. Whatever indicator one would wish to take,

miles of highways, per capita, miles of sewer lines per capita, per capita number of homes serviced by sewage disposal plants, or miles of streams no longer contaminated, airport facilities per capita, parks per capita, or usage per park, hospital beds per capita, medical facilities of all sorts per capita, classrooms per school population, teachers per pupil capita, the record of recent years in all areas of the public realm shows a magnificent growth rate. Furthermore, the quality increase in all of these areas of public domain is equaly remarkable. There has also been a very healthy productivity increase of the worker in these areas which assures us in the long run of lower costs.

I find that each time I seek to set the record straight by responding to the critics of our affluent society they issue a barrage of non sequitur by alleging that I and those who hold my views by citing these figures showing progress are complacent and that we don't want more progress in these areas. This is completely false, of course. We certainly do not believe the United States is heaven on earth, although I will say it is the only society I know which has emerged from an economy of scarity to an economy of plenty. As a result we do have some entirely new problems and new bases upon which the solution to these problems must be found.

I believe the best way to get increased growth or progress in the field of community facilities and education is to examine those communities which have progressed to see how they have met their problems, and then examine those areas which have not progressed as well and see why they have failed to meet their problems. I recall at the time of the 1958–59 recession I was asked to be the Republican spokesman to address the jobless who had ridden, not marched, to Washington. I followed Senator JOHNSON, the majority leader of the Senate, who spoke in behalf of the Democratic Party. Senator JOHNSON said he was going to introduce a resolution immediately to create a joint committee which would go into the depressed areas of our country to see what was wrong. I rejoined that I thought a joint committee to look into the nondepressed areas to see what was right might be a more fruitful exercise in assisting the areas where things were wrong.

I might add neither Senator JOHNSON'S resolution nor my suggestion were implemented because the recession had already ended, it was April 1959. Regrettably, as usual, the Congress with the pressure off addressed itself to other things. I still think the time to repair a roof is when the sun is shining, and I regret that the subcommittee which has jurisdiction of unemployment insurance, of which I am a member, did not dig into the problems of present-day unemployment. I am certain we will find the best solution to depressed areas problems in improving the Federal-State unemployment insurance system rather than the direct approach which is contained in most proposals for Federal aid to depressed areas.

I want to call attention to an editorial appearing in last night's Post-Dispatch entitled "Encouraging Pollution Control":

"Missouri should give serious consideration to a proposal that it adopt an Illinois statute permitting mandamus proceedings to compel local governmental units to issue revenue bonds for sewage treatment and disposal.

"The proposal comes from the general counsel of the metropolitan sewer district, Charles B. Kaiser. Illinois has won national and even international recognition for its accomplishments in abating water pollution. It led the Nation last year in the amount of sewage treatment work under construction. Its antipollution laws have been adopted as a model by Japan. What are the legislative forces behind these brilliant results?

"The most telling force, Mr. Kaiser believes, allows the State water pollution board to apply to the attorney general for action. That official must then file suit in State court to compel municipalities or other local governments to issue the necessary revenue bonds. Illinois has used this power 25 times in the past 10 years. Its model statutes also provide that a governing body can issue revenue bonds without an election unless 15 percent of the voters raise an objection. If objection is raised, a simple majority vote decides.

"Some such force as the Illinois mandamus idea is probably going to be required to get things going in Missouri's worst problem spots. The job is estimated to cost more than $9 million in St. Joseph, $70 million in Kansas City, $60 million to $80 million or more in St. Louis. St. Joseph voters have twice rejected a bond issue and the U.S. Department of Justice has been asked to bring the first suit under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act against it. Kansas City is defying an order by the State water pollution board to issue no more sewer extension permits until it makes a start on a sewage program. St. Louis is so far best off of the three cities, though a year behind schedule.

"The Governor of Missouri will have a great deal to do with the way in which this large and growing problem is met. What do John M. Dalton, the Democratic candidate for Governor, and Edward Farmer, the Republican candidate, think of Mr. Kaiser's suggestions?"

I don't know what Mr. Dalton or Mr. Farmer have to say, but I know what I have to say, as a Federal legislator, I say, "Hurrah, let's get to it."

The Federal Government has an interest in the subject of controlling water pollution even though it is essentially a local and State problem. The Federal Government's concern arises from its jurisdiction over navigable streams. The Federal Government is taking an active part in abatement of water pollution both from the standpoint of meeting its responsibilities as they relate to this basic jurisdiction, but also from the standpoint of serving as a gatherer and disseminator of information of what is being done in the area of water pollution abatement by the States and local communities and by the private persons and businesses.

However, the recent bills before the Congress on Federal aid to assist the States and local communities in combating water pollution would have the Federal Government directly help to finance sewage disposal plants and other facilities which many of us believe are more efficiently financed by the local governments.

Just what happens to the citizens of the State of Illinois who have moved forward to assume their responsibilities if the Federal Government steps in and provides moneys taken from Illinois citizens as well as other citizens to meet the problems of Missouri? Is that the way to encourage States and communities in the future to face up to the problems they are best suited to meet? I hardly think so.

The issue should be determined, not by whether Federal funds can help the laggards, but by whether the Federal Government is better suited to handle the problems than the State or local government.

Incidentally, I have a bill I introduced to help in the water pollution problem which I believe would help more than 10 times the amount of money proposed be spent directly by the Federal Government in this area. My bill simply provides that business may amortize more rapidly for Federal income tax purposes the cost of building sewage treatment plants to properly care for industrial and other wastes which pollute the streams. There is no question that there is a great cost involved in building these disposal plants and more businesses could and would build them if they had a more adequate way of financing them. My bill would provide a practical answer.

The point I am making however relates not to the merits of my proposal or the Illinois program as set forth in the Post-Dispatch editorial, but rather to the question of whether our society meets social needs and problems and how do we most efficiently meet these needs.

May I now discuss the issue of Federal aid to education, whether it be school construction or teachers salaries or what, to get across a few points? Most Americans are of the opinion that education advances more surely and steadily in both quantity and quality by maintaining control of educational matters at the local level. Even those who have been advocating massive Federal expenditures to education give lip service to this doctrine. The arguments for Federal aid to education have been placed on the basis of the alleged inability of the communities to cope with the social needs for more and better education.

In 1956 I voted for Federal aid for school construction, rather reluctantly I might add. Let me tell you why I did. I felt we had an emergency situation which had been produced by four rather unexpected and unusual developments: (1) During World War II we had built practically no new schools, so we hadn't even kept pace with the normal population increase through births; (2) we had a phenomenal baby crop during World War II. The birth rate has remained high to the near present although quite recently it seems to be tapering off; (3) we experienced the rapid suburbanization which has been going on all over the country since World War II. Children moved out of interiors of cities and from rural areas into the suburbs so many school classrooms in existence were abandoned or not fully used; (4) we experienced a severe inflation which devalued the dollar.

The impact of heavy inflation on the real estate tax system was extremely damaging to education. The real estate tax system, of course, is the basic tax system for raising revenues for schools and local communities. The dollar expenditures in the budgets of the school districts rose with inflation, therefore it became necessary to increase real estate tax revenues to make up for this increase. Real estate taxation is based upon a system of real estate assessment which in almost all communities is a continuing process without any built-in provisions for reevaluation to reflect any fluctuation of the value of the dollar. Residences and buildings erected before 1946 had been appraised in terms of the pre-1946 value of the dollar. Residences and buildings erected after 1946 were appraised in terms of the inflated dollar. Any increase in the rate of real estate taxes therefore bore more heavily on the newer properties which already were being taxed inequitably because of the different dollar value with which they originally were appraised. Furthermore, the newer residences, by and large, were owned by the younger families who already were bearing the heavy cost of raising children and the heavy initial cost of starting a household. Increasing tax rates was a very difficult burden on the "little people" whom all politicians love.

There was only one real fair answer to the situation and this was a difficult job both mechanically and politically. The answer was to reevaluate all the real estate on the assessment books in terms of the new dollar. Many communities faced up to this difficult task and are now over the hump as far as this problem is concerned. Many communities have still failed to face up to the task and they are still experiencing difficulties.

I felt the Federal Government through its fiscal policies was largely responsible for some of the difficulty the local communities

and school boards were experiencing right after the war. I felt that the danger to local control of our schools by the Federal Government assisting in meeting the emergency situation by providing funds for school construction until the communities could make the necessary adjustments was minimal if it were, by definition, temporarily tied to the emergency. Education to me is always an emergency. Kids are kids such a short time and temporizing with the problems of their education leaves us with untrained adults or possible juvenile delinquents which is real waste.

I was shocked to find some of the most stalwart supporters of Federal aid to education who claim they are not interested in getting the Federal Government into education on a permanent basis resisting the two amendments offered by those who went along with the emergency theory to be certain that it was temporary and did relate to an emergency. These amendments were: (1) To base the allocation of Federal money upon need rather than upon per capita student population; (2) to require matching funds on the part of the State and local governments. I can only conclude from the actions of these federalists that they sought to use the emergency as a device to get the Federal Government further into the field of education on a permanent basis. Why won't they argue their case openly? There is plenty of fair argument, although I disagree with it, that can be advanced in behalf of the Federal Government moving further into the field of education permanently. Let's start debating the issue.

Let me pose another problem that has created difficulties for some communities in meeting their educational and other problems. Many of our new residential suburbs have become what have been called bedroom communities. These communities failed to zone their municipality to permit industry, business, and sometimes even commerce and professions to enter. The result is that the entire tax base is the real estate tax on family residences. It requires a very wealthy community to finance education and community facilities on such a narrow tax base. Many communities have zoned themselves with a great deal more intelligence. Let me illustrate by a local community in St. Louis County almost nonexistent 10 years ago, now having a population of over 10,000, almost all in the medium-income brackets. The village of Crestwood. Crestwood zoned itself with great understanding and care. A passing visit to the community would make one think it was just another bedroom community, so well have they zoned their industrial and commercial areas. Yet Crestwood derives 75 percent of its revenue from the tax on its industries and commercial enterprises. Crestwood has little or no bonded indebtedness, and yet it has met its obligations for education and community facilities in a commendable fashion. Its residential tax rate is relatively low.

The pressures on the Congress to assist local communities and school districts largely come from those communities and districts which have failed to reset up their real estate tax systems to correct for the damage of the World War II inflation, which have failed to zone or rezone with care and intelligence, which have failed to consolidate with other districts or communities when they are in their very nature too small a base upon which to operate community facilities.

I pose this question. Just what effect does Federal aid to these grasshopper communities have on the ants * * * those who have faced up to their problems and responsibilities? Under the Federal tax system the ants who have already paid for their own facilities will have to assist in paying for the grasshoppers who have not paid and yet still have it in their power to pay.

I appreciate the argument of the federalists who state that there are certain communities that do not have the ability to pay even if these corrections were made. For years I have been challenging that statement as it referred to alleged poor States, particularly States in the South. I have examined into the tax base and the industry of these States and I don't believe a case can be made for anyone of them. They all have it within their abilities to meet their problems if they desire to do so. However, a real case can be made for equalization within a State, and I believe all States have equalization laws. The need for equalization laws, particularly for education at the State level, is rarely disputed anymore. Yet, here is where a great deal of improvement is needed to meet the problems of certain communities and certain areas within a State in our dynamic economy. There is a basic inability of certain areas to meet the costs of modern education and up-to-date sewage facilities, among other things. The Ozark areas of Missouri is an example. But Missouri with the metropolitan complexes of Kansas City and St. Louis is certainly in a position to handle the job.

Due to the racial problem we have many other areas where proper zoning has been thwarted. The communities where the problems exist are experiencing real difficulty in providing the facilities needed to meet the desired high standards. However, this is not really a cost problem. It is a difficult social problem and though some people may regard it as too difficult to handle, it still must be handled. Certainly, to pass it off as a cost problem, as we have done in many of our Federal housing problems, tends to aggravate rather than to relieve the problem.

The Federalists argue that the States cannot meet these problems because of a built-in error in their political structure. They point to the unequal representation of urban areas vis-a-vis rural areas in the State legislatures. There certainly is this unequal representation, but an analysis of the development of America or any industrial society would reveal why this is so at any given point of time, and will continue to do so, unless our society stabilizes. America started out 90 percent rural. Today it is only 20 percent rural. Political institutions reflect what was, not what is, and we are always catching up with what is. I don't find it alarming to find representation on the basis of what was 20 years ago if I can be fairly certain that it will be modified although I, too, may become impatient with its slowness. Our entire history shows that we do modify our political structure to reflect the switch in populations. I regard this argument, to a large extent, as an excuse on the part of the Federalists as to why States should not deal with the problems right at hand. Furthermore, reapportionment within the State so that representation catches up with population changes and shifts is fully within the power of the people including the Federalists who are people of the State to implement. States are constantly facing up to this problem and meeting it. I know of no States except our very newest which have not had reapportionment laws in their histories.

Let me revert to the problem of education to make another point. A great deal of the problems of the increased costs in education regretably reflect the basic human resistance to change on the part of those who are in control of the institution which needs to grow. The NEA which has become a great lobby group for Federal aid to teachers salaries has to a large degree been responsible for the inability of communities to increase teachers' salaries as much as we all would like to see. First, the State components that go to make up the NEA have a stronghold, a stranglehold in some States like Missouri, on the teaching profession at the primary and secondary school levels. College graduates cannot become teachers by passing examinations or meeting other reasonable standards; they can only become teachers if they go to State-run teachers colleges.

The graduates of some of our finest private schools find it difficult, if not impossible, to become primary or secondary teachers in Missouri's public schools. This downgrades quality and productivity in the teaching profession itself. The Teachers Union has been resisting for years the innovation of teachers aids. By utilizing persons with lesser skills for the routine type work connected with teaching, we could increase teacher productivity greatly and increase salaries within the present budgets for the competent teachers in the process. The innovation of educational TV, which many top educators have hailed as being as great a revolution in teaching as the innovation of movable type was in the beginning of the 14th century, has also been resisted. I have heard professors, as well as secondary and primary teachers, present their objections to educational TV this way: "Does anyone believe that TV and visual aid can replace the lecture and the book?" This is a false presentation. The printed book did not replace the lecture, but it certainly provided such an amazing supplement that it is difficult for us today to realize that the first academy had no books and was all lecture. So it is with educational TV. It will not replace books, or lectures, but it certainly will nobly supplement them. Through educational TV all our students all over the country can hear the best lectures of our brilliant teachers, not just a limited few, even after the teachers have died. Just imagine the increased productivity in the teaching profession from the development of this new and amazing teaching mechanism and skill. I dwell on increased productivity because through increased productivity we can increase not only our quality of education but also the salaries of our teachers without the need to increase the budget.

There is another area of basic reform and progress which would permit us to upgrade education, both to increase its quality, extend it quantitatively, and lessen its cost. Presently we use our school plants and overhead only 9 months out of 12 months each year. The reason for this obvious uneconomic situation has its origin in another more basic social need which existed in the past, though it no longer exists today. We needed our children in agriculture enterprise 3 summer months each year.

Today we are no longer an agricultural society and there is no longer any reason for operating our schools in such an inefficient manner. I hasten to state that I am not talking about extending the school year for teacher and pupil from 9 months to 12. Perhaps for good educational reasons we may wish to keep the 3 months leisure for the individual pupil and teacher. However, Dartmouth College has gone away from the traditional two 4½-month semesters to the three, 3-month trimester in order to lay the groundwork for four 3-month quarters each year. So our primary and secondary schools can easily do the same. We might have to air-condition our school buildings in order to utilize the summer months, but we would have more than enough immediate savings, let alone future savings, from this kind of efficiency to take care of these costs. Right off the bat we would have an easing of need for new classrooms. We would also have additional funds with which to pay teachers and increase their salaries.

By delving in deeply into one of the areas where there are great pressures today for State and local governments to look to Washington for help, I have tried to point up my main thesis. Do they need help from Washington? Is the real help they need right at hand in analyzing and facing up to the

problems that confront them? Have other communities faced the same problems and met them? I believe we must answer these questions first before there should be any looking to Washington for help.

On the other hand, there may be areas where the Federal Government should be doing a job. Let's look into this briefly. I believe the Federal Government has a big job to do in education which, by the way, it is doing to some degree. A failure of the Federal Government to do its job may indeed put the communities in a position not to ask for help; but rather, to raise cain because the Federal Government is not meeting its responsibilities. I think the Federal Government must be a gatherer of information and a disseminator of information about what is going on in education. In other words, if a local school board is thinking about an educational innovation and wonders whether it has been tried any place before and, if so, with what success or with what failure, the Federal Government should be able to supply the answer. I believe the Federal Government has a big job today, which it has hardly touched, of developing nomenclature for the skills that exist and are needed in our society and relating those skills to whatever training or educational processes there may be for creating and improving these skills.

This is a continuing process and it is more difficult the more rapidly our society is advancing technologically. New skills come in, old skills become obsolete and of no social value. It is in this area that we should grapple with what is referred to as distressed areas. These areas are almost invariably areas where frictional or technological unemployment has hit a basic industry of the area. The greatest area of frictional unemployment today is our rural areas where the amazing technological advancement in agriculture has occurred so rapidly that millions of people who used to be able to depend upon their agricultural skills for a livelihood find that these skills have become obsolete and unneeded. One man and 1 acre can provide the food and fiber that five men and 5 acres formerly could provide. This continuing social problem could be handled admirably by tying it to our excellent Federal-State unemployment insurance system. We must relate frictional unemployment to retraining, rehabilitation, and education and treat it as an essential economic cost of doing business.

Whenever I try to tackle this subject I feel frustrated. I have spent most of my time defining what I believe are the real issues and exposing those which I believe to be false issues. In this process I end up finding I have had little time to debate that which I would love to debate. At which level of government do we best handle these various social problems we have placed in the public sector of our economy? This kind of debate can only come about when we have eliminated the stagnation which today exists in public discussion. This stagnation arises when one school of thought alleges that only that school is interested in meeting the social problems of the day and those who are in disagreement with the proposed solutions are thereby uninterested in the problems or are so blind or calloused that they are unaware of the problems. I would also call for a cessation of the kind of discussion which emanates from the other extreme group which dubs any suggestion of the Federal Government doing this or that as "socialism." I must confess that my sympathies are much more with those who utter the cry "socialism," because this term at least has a dictionary definition which we can refer to for intelligent debate and accurate rebuttal. And, indeed, a further expansion of the Federal Government can rightly be called socialistic, however, not with the nasty overtone that the user of the word frequently seeks to impart.

May we start discussing the questions of the part the Federal Government is playing, should play, or might play in various areas of the public domain from the standpoint of efficiency in getting the job done with proper regard for retaining the necessary posture to meet the continuing aspects which most social problems present. May the day soon come when we can begin this type of adult discussion. Too long have we been in the never-never land of TV westerns, the good guys against the bad guys.

Highway Progress: Past, Present, and Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MILLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House of Representatives an excellent address by our very able former Federal Highway Administrator, Bertram D. Tallamy, before the 16th annual convention of the National Limestone Institute, Inc., Washington, D.C.

I am sure the contents of Mr. Tallamy's remarks will prove to be most interesting and of benefit to us all.

Mr. Tallamy's address follows:

HIGHWAY PROGRESS: PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE

(Remarks of B. D. Tallamy, Federal Highway Administrator, Bureau of Public Roads, U.S. Department of Commerce, at 16th annual convention, National Limestone Institute, Inc., Hotel Statler Hilton, Washington, D.C., Thursday morning, January 19, 1961)

This is a busy week in Washington. The city is the center of one of our periodic, American-style revolutions, when one set of officeholders is bowing politely out, and another set is bowing politely in. Convention delegates such as you can combine business with pleasure, and enjoy ringside seats at one of the great pageants of American history.

Tomorrow we are inaugurating a new President, and his administration is almost certain to bring new and different approaches to foreign relations and domestic affairs. We also will have a new Federal Highway Administrator. But the expanded highway program he will direct will not be new. It has already been 4½ years on its way, and has been eagerly accepted by the country as a whole. In its broad outlines, it is unlikely to change. The program was bipartisan in its conception and execution, and was not an issue in the presidential campaign. Everybody wants good roads, no matter what his politics, and there is general agreement that the country has been using the right methods to get them.

The subject assigned me is "Highway Progress: Past, Present, and Future." So far as the past goes, I think this audience would prefer that I begin with July 1, 1956, when the historic Federal-Aid Highway Act of that year went into effect.

Let's take a look at the job that the legislation gave us—meaning by us, the Federal Government, the States, the contractors, and the suppliers—and see how well we have done. The order was to accelerate the construction of the Federal-aid highway systems, since many of them were inadequate to meet the needs of local and interstate commerce, and the national and civil defense. One of the principal objectives the law put into words was early completion of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. Congress said its intent was that the Interstate System, 41,000 miles in length, be brought to simultaneous completion in all States. The assumed date of completion was 1972; the system was to be designed for the types and volumes of traffic forecast for 1975.

That was the chief assignment that we undertook in 1956, and it was quite definite. Let's see how far we have got with it. More than a quarter of the 41,000 miles of the system are open to traffic today. The precise year-end figures are not available yet, but telegrams from the field tell us that cars and trucks are now traveling over more than 10,400 miles of the system. Over 5,500 of these miles have been completed with Federal aid since July 1956. The remainder represents mileage of toll and free roads incorporated into the Interstate System as provided by law. In addition, another 4,500 miles of the system are under construction, while engineering and right-of-way acquisition are proceeding on an additional 10,000 miles. Thus nearly 25,000 miles of Interstate System are improved or have work underway as of now.

The second assignment was to accelerate the work on the primary Federal-aid highways (other than interstate), and on the secondary, or farm-to-market roads, and the extensions of both in urban areas. Since the middle of 1956, improvements have been made on more than 110,000 miles of such roads, and at last reports work was underway on another 24,000.

Statistics may be the heart of democracy, as somebody has said, but they are lifeless figures. If you look around, you will see more meaningful results of the highway program. The changes in the landscape include not only the new stretches of pavements and new bridges that are part of the growing systems but new industrial parks, new shopping centers, new housing developments, and revitalized central cities.

The visible changes have been accompanied by a strong stimulus to the economy. Highway building has been good for business.

And I think we have proved a number of things. We have demonstrated, for example, that the roadbuilding partnership of the States and the Federal Government, which was founded in 1916, can be efficient and successful even on the tremendous scale of the interstate program. This great roadbuilding team, of course, includes the construction industry and the suppliers of equipment and materials.

So far as the Federal financing goes, we have paid for our 90 percent of the interstate costs and our half of the costs of the other systems on a sound, pay-as-you-go basis.

We have shown the American public that highways can be built that will handle the country's rising traffic problem. And the State highway departments have overcome much of the public misunderstanding and opposition that arose at first when, in order to serve all the people, it was necessary to inconvenience the few.

In the four and a half years there have been substantial advances in highway technology. Research sponsored directly by the Bureau of Public Roads or jointly with the States has brought steady improvements in engineering and in equipment. To the extent possible, routine calculations have been turned over to electronic brains, thus releasing engineering talent for more important work.

In its own headquarters, public roads has set up a computer program library, which

contains some 30 programs that have been converted into library versions, expressed in English and mathematical terms, so that they may be coded for use in any digital computer. It is planned to increase the number of library versions to about 80 covering the problems most frequently encountered in highway building.

The largest research project ever undertaken in the study of highways is the AASHO road test near Ottawa, Ill. The traffic phase of the test was completed late last year with the application of the one-millionth truck axle load on the sample pavements.

The date so far available have been useful in the preparation of reports that Congress ordered to be submitted at the opening of the present session. When the analysis of the records has gone far enough, the Secretary of Commerce will be able to make recommendations to Congress on the maximum desirable weights and dimensions of vehicles operated on the Federal-aid systems.

Besides its research and its support of the construction programs conducted jointly with the States, the Bureau of Public Roads does important work that rarely receives attention. In the nearly 4 years since I became Administrator, we have helped many foreign countries with their highway problems. It will soon be possible to drive in all weather from the United States to Panama City, over the Inter-American Highway. The Bureau has worked since 1930 in cooperation with the six Central American republics toward completing the section south of the Mexican border. Since 1956 it has supplied technical missions to some 15 foreign countries elsewhere, and has purchased in the United States and shipped to those countries $40 million worth of road-building equipment and supplies. Congress has provided direct funds for the inter-American work, and the missions overseas have been supported by the International Cooperation Administration and several other agencies.

In the last 4 years, the Bureau's direct construction projects in the Federal domain areas have involved about 5,000 miles of highway, and are estimated to cost $260 million. One of Public Roads' own propjects still underway is the $15 million Woodrow Wilson Bridge across the Potomac not far from this hotel.

In its direct work and in the Federal-aid programs, the Bureau has done its best to safeguard the taxpayer's dollars. In 1957 we set up a Project Examination Division to audit and spotcheck the Bureau's field offices and the State highway departments. The Bureau has referred to the Department of Justice a number of cases of irregularity it has uncovered, and has held up Federal reimbursement to the States concerned.

This brings me to the rash of rumors and allegations about corruption in the highway program. There has been no general reform in human nature, and it would indeed be surprising if cases of poor judgment and misconduct has not cropped up in a program the size of ours. Perhaps a million and a half people have been involved in one way or another. In the irregularities reported, a few State employees and contractors have been implicated, but I am glad to say that no charge has been made against a Federal employee. And in proportion to the magnitude of this, the greatest peacetime public works undertaking in history, the misdeeds have been remarkably few.

Naturally the Bureau has been disturbed at any possible loss, however small, and has tightened its inspection and other safeguards. Likewise, carrying out the partnership concept, the States have moved to plug any possible leaks.

To measure the importance of these actions it is necessary to go back to the statistical record. For example, it may come as a surprise to some of you that Federal funds paid to the States during these 4½ years have exceeded Federal-aid highway payments in all the preceding 40 years of the Federal-State partnership. Total apportionments to the States since July 1, 1956, have amounted to $16.6 billion, or more than one and one-half times the total of all prior apportionments since the beginning of Federal aid.

On the interstate program alone, more than $9.6 billion has been put to work, with the Federal share 90 percent. Work completed has cost $4.66 billion, and as of December 31, work estimated to cost $5.24 billion was under way or authorized.

On the ABC systems, construction contracts completed have cost $7.06 billion; and others costing $2.54 billion were underway December 31. In addition, $466 million of engineering and right-of-way work has been completed, and $326 million more is in progress.

So much for the present. The future starts tomorrow, when my successor, Rex M. Whitton, takes over. He is an excellent choice as Administrator, a fine highway official with 40 years of experience in the Missouri State Highway Commission. He will take over a smooth-running machine, comprising the Bureau of Public Roads, the State highway departments, and the highway construction industry. I am sure that all of us will give him our full support.

His real problems, I am sure, will be fiscal, not administrative. As a magazine writer recently put it, "the highway program has always been underfinanced." Secretary of Commerce Mueller sent to Congress last week a revised estimate of the total cost of completing the Interstate System, prepared by the Bureau with the cooperation of the States. The total remains at $41 billion, unchanged from the previous estimate.

The Federal share of this $41 billion amounts to $37 billion. Toward this Congress has authorized $25.4 billion in the Federal-Aid Highway Acts of 1954, 1956, 1958, and 1959. To complete the Interstate System as planned, another $11.6 billion in authorizations will be necessary.

The choice confronting Congress and the new administration, is between providing additional funds and allowing the interstate program to stretch out possibly through calendar 1976.

The decisions will not be easy to make. However, I am confident that ways will be found not only to keep up the present revenues of the highway trust fund, but to raise the additional sums needed to achieve completion by 1972.

In this connection, you are naturally interested in the demands that may be made upon you for materials. Highway construction expenditures (excluding right-of-way and preliminary engineering costs) are estimated to exceed $5.9 billion in 1961, an increase of about $511 million from 1960. Construction expenditures on the Interstate System will account for slightly less than one-third of the total this year, and nearly three-fourths of the total will be expended on the various Federal-aid systems.

The suppliers of aggregates, including crushed limestone, may expect a substantial demand for highway construction during the remainder of the accelerated highway program. I am told that 579 million tons of aggregate were used in all highway building during 1960, and that the estimate for 1961 is 600 million tons. For the period 1961 through 1972, the total is expected to be 13 billion tons. Crushed limestone, I believe, constitutes about 25 percent of all aggregates used in highways.

These really have been challenging years, but rewarding years. All the members of the highway team—the States, the Federal Government, contractors, labor, and the suppliers of material and equipment—have done their job well. All may take considerable pride in what has been accomplished since 1956. Also, I believe we may look forward with confidence to completion of the Interstate System by the target year 1972. And what is of enormous importance, I believe that the highway program will continue to flourish under the historic partnership between the State highway departments and the Bureau of Public Roads.

With these comforting observations and the knowledge that the program is entrusted to the leadership of such a fine, dedicated Highway Administrator as Rex Whitton, we can really tighten our belts and continue our efforts with enthusiasm. We are sure to reach our goal.

Norstad's NATO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therewith an address made by that great military leader, Gen. Lauris Norstad, commanding general, Supreme Headquarters, Allied Powers, Europe, which we commonly refer to as NATO, on February 4, 1961.

General Norstad visited my city of Charleston, S.C., at which place he was given an honorary degree by our incomparable military college, The Citadel. His thorough knowledge of the conditions in Europe, and his complete understanding of the mission of NATO, coupled with his brilliant military genius, qualify him to speak with authority. No living American or representative of the free world is better qualified to occupy the difficult position he now holds. America and the world are fortunate to have Lauris Norstad.

GEN. LAURIS NORSTAD'S REMARKS BEFORE THE SOUTH CAROLINA CORPS OF CADETS, THE CITADEL, CHARLESTON, S.C., FEBRUARY 4, 1961

This is my first visit to Charleston—a city well known, not only in the United States, but also throughout the world wherever our American past is studied, wherever the effect of our present actions are felt, and wherever the aims and ideals of our country bring hope and confidence. It is a particular pleasure for me to be here at The Citadel—whose reputation first impressed me when I was a cadet at West Point and whose record for producing citizens and soldiers has kept me well impressed ever since. The honor you have done me today is doubly appreciated because it comes as recognition from a place which I admire and respect; it also serves to give me a lasting personal association with you and with this fine school. I thank The Citadel, and particularly those who have been instrumental in making my visit here today something that I shall always remember.

It also gives me great pleasure to meet again with a friend of many years, Gen. Mark Clark. It is certainly not necessary for me to speak of General Clark to the people of Charleston or to the cadets of The Citadel. You read about him before you knew him, and now that you have known him directly for the last 7 years you must

believe what you have read; you have seen in action those qualities which made him such an outstanding contributor to his country and to the free world as commander of the 5th Army and the Allied 15th Army Group in Europe during World War II; and, almost 10 years later, as commander of the United Nations forces in Korea. As a man and as a soldier his life reflects the highest standards of personal conduct and public service. We are grateful to him for the lesson of his example.

As I stand here today I feel quite close to you cadets—close in time as well as in space. This is perhaps a folly of my age; it is the wisdom of yours which tells you clearly that something more than 30 years separates us. But, in spite of those years, I am struck by how much we have in common; I am impressed by the similarity of the questions and the problems of today and those current when I was a cadet, or even when I was a small boy.

One of my earliest recollections is of discussions in my father's study during which I overheard frequent references to "new threats," "these changing times," "the promise of the future," and other expressions which we hear almost constantly today. Although these early memories of mine go back in this case to before the First World War, thinking people were concerned then, just as we are now, with such things as peace and freedom. Today these subjects are, indeed, our main preoccupation, as they should be. I would like to discuss with you this morning, as we look to the future, one aspect of these great issues.

When the last war ended, we all hoped that we and our children could live in a world free from the threat of war—a world of normal, friendly relationships between men and between countries. But little more than a year later we were shocked by the Soviet use of political aggression and military threat to emphasize their fundamental intentions—to gain their ends. By 1948, when Czechoslovakia was forced behind the Iron Curtain and when the brave people of West Berlin were beseiged by a blockade, 12 free nations of the West, who saw a common danger and who felt a common sense of responsibility, moved to unite their efforts for collective defense and for the preservation of peace and security. This led to the creation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, which was formally established by the signing of the treaty in Washington in April 1949. Later, just 10 years ago this April, the political authority of this alliance, the NATO Council, decided to create an organization to develop and to unify our defense means, and for this purpose organized Allied Command Europe and the Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe—SHAPE.

What is NATO? What does it mean? To some it means armed forces—army, navy, and air forces—deployed on or near the Iron Curtain for the purpose of defending the people and the territory of the Atlantic Community. This is certainly correct, but perhaps incomplete. When NATO is mentioned, others seem to think only in terms of great and growing atomic armaments. Although it is true that such weapons do exist and must exist within the NATO arsenal, to think only in these terms presents a tragically distorted picture. These many and varied reactions suggest that NATO has many facets; that what each of us sees is affected by the particular position from which he looks. I think balance was introduced into the composite idea of the alliance by a writer in a London newspaper a year or two ago, who said that "NATO has itself come to be synonymous with other combinations of letters which also stir deep emotions in the hearts of men—freedom, peace, independence, human comradeship, and the will to survive."

I think of NATO first as a set of principles to which we have dedicated our efforts, and then as responsibilities which correspond to or derive from these principles—responsibilities which we are firmly committed to meet.

In the simplist and most direct form, the aims of the alliance are stated in the preamble of the North Atlantic Treaty. In that document, the member countries reaffirmed "their faith in the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and their desire to live in peace with all peoples and all governments." They voiced their determination "to safeguard the freedom, common heritage, and civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law." They expressed their desire "to promote stability and well-being in the North Atlantic area" and, as I have said, they "resolved to unite their efforts for collective defense and for the preservation of peace and security."

This morning I do not propose to discuss the achievements of the last 10 years; I will not trace the development of our concept and strategy, nor give you the details of the strength, the very real power, which has been created and maintained since 1951. We must note, however, that the increased effectiveness of weapons has permitted us to think in terms of a true forward strategy, and this has given an expanded function, a greater opportunity, to the armies, the navies, and the air forces deployed in Europe—our shield forces. These shield forces have become an active and essential ingredient of the deterrent. As military forces deployed along the NATO frontiers, they contribute directly to the prevention of war by their presence and by their power. Added to the moral strength of which they are a symbol, they give us confidence that freedom can be preserved, hope that war may be prevented. This, as I have reminded you, was the concern of responsible men early in this century; it is now, as then, the aim of U.S. policy; it is the purpose of the Atlantic alliance.

The deterrent of which I have spoken is made up of several essential elements. One is, of course, the retaliatory forces with which we are all generally familiar, and for this reason I shall not discuss them at length. In this connection, I wish only to remind you that both defense and deterrence require that our military posture be built upon a foundation of an adequate strategic striking force, in being and effective. Another element of the deterrent is the allied shield force, made up of the soldiers, sailors, and airmen of 14 nations who serve in allied command Europe.

This shield covers a long line, from the North Cape of Norway, well above the Arctic Circle, to eastern Turkey—a distance of more than 4,000 miles.

Among the missions of this command is the traditional or classic one of defending the people and the territory of the NATO countries. To crib from something I said a year or two ago, the presence of allied forces in the forward areas—perhaps particularly the presence of the American element of these allied forces—supplies silent but constantly visible evidence of allied strength and determination.

Just by being there, for peaceful men and women to see as they pursue their normal life, they nourish the spirit of the Alliance; they give reality to the hope for peace; they certify to the watch being kept over their lands, their villages, their cities.

Another most important task of Allied Command Europe is to contribute to the prevention of war—to complete the deterrent. To do this, we must be prepared to meet with appropriate means the demands of any incident, intentional or unintentional, from the smallest consequence of an aggressor's miscalculation to conditions approaching those of all-out general war. If we have the forces in the forward area in Europe strong enough to meet an action while it is developing, we can force a pause before we pass the point of no return. During this pause we must be able to compel an aggressor to make a deliberate choice between ending the action or permitting it to grow. He must face this decision, realizing that expanding the incident will place on him the moral responsibility for starting general war, and will bring to bear the full weight of the retaliatory forces and the full strength of an alert and ready Shield. These forces, with their ability to meet a threat with a strength in men and weapons appropriate to the situation, to provide a response adequate to the challenge, have a unique quality. They can create this pause, gain some time for thought, and, we would hope, prevent force and reason from parting company.

A third purpose of the Shield Forces is to contribute validity and credibility to the great strategic retaliatory forces. If, because of insufficient strength, inadequate equipment or improper deployment, we were permitted no option, no choice of response between all-out, full-scale retaliation and no response at all, doubt could be cast on the deterrent value of all forces, perhaps particularly on the heavy strategic forces. Designed to meet the requirements of all situations up to those approaching general or total war without necessarily depending upon the intervention of the strategic element of the deterrent, the Shield's purpose is to bridge the gap between all or nothing. It should provide a means of defense appropriate to the measure of the threat, and thus give validity to the principle of deterrence and credibility to the role of the heavy strike forces.

It is NATO policy, and I believe a sound one, that we must not use more strength than is necessary but we must meet an attack with a counter effort that is clearly adequate. The force to do this, as defined in our plans and programs, consists of army, navy and air force elements of suitable types and provides a balance of conventional and nuclear weapons. Our plans reflect the substantial dependence which we must place on nuclear weapons; nevertheless, as conventional capabilities improve or increase, I believe it may be possible in many cases to raise the level of involvement at which such weapons would have to be introduced into the battle. Certainly, where the military situation permits, our forces must be able to operate without resorting to arms and weapons equipped with nuclear warheads. This will require Shield Forces of at least the general magnitude being provided under our present programs. It is perhaps no secret that I wish for even more.

It is my own opinion that the basic combat elements should be so organized, trained and equipped that, in the event of an incident, they would normally respond with conventional weapons.

If, however, nuclear weapons must be introduced into the battle, the threshold of action at which this step would be taken should be a high one and the use of these weapons should result only from a specific and deliberate decision made at a level consistent with the policies and plans of NATO. This level should, under any circumstances, be above that of the commander of the basic combat elements.

Throughout our planning and our training we must give greater emphasis to the need for conventional forces, the need for adequate manpower and for nonnuclear weapons and equipment of the most modern type; but we must also have suitable atomic units associated with our conventional forces, units which could be used if the situation requires, thus forming a balanced team to force the pause, to halt the aggression.

The mobile force which SHAPE is now organizing is an interesting illustration of this balanced team. This force has recently been activated, and we are now pressing vigorously to give it real life and substance.

The purpose of this mobile force is to provide a prompt reinforcement to any point within NATO where a threat might have developed and where the force could be effective in countering such a threat. The general principle of being there "firstest with the mostest" is, of course, even more applicable today, more important than in the days of Forrest. While in the mobile force application, the "mostest" may be relatively small in numbers, in terms of timeliness, in terms of potential firepower, it could be more than the most which has ever been employed in this manner up to this time.

There is also a political function which such a force could serve. The NATO political authorities could direct its use to demonstrate NATO solidarity and unity of purpose in a threatened area, to make it clear to an aggressor that an attack against one is an attack against all, not only in the abstract words of the North Atlantic Treaty, but also in solid reality.

We are making up the mobile force of land, sea, and air elements which may operate separately or in combination. Four of the nations now deploying forces in the central European region have assigned the initial components. Eventually we hope that all or nearly all the nations of the alliance will be represented.

Each land force element will consist in general terms of a reinforced battalion of infantry with light conventional military weapons and supporting arms and services, all of which would be air transportable. There would be available, if required, atomic support units, equipped with Honest John or similar battlefield type weapons. Air and naval transport units will be earmarked to give strategic mobility for the mobile force. Naval and air forces will also be available to provide such fire support as may be necessary. When completed, this will give us a mobile force made up of appropriate land, sea, and air components, representative of the alliance, trained and ready.

The decision as to the exact size and composition of the force required for a particular occasion would not be taken until the time the need arises. In fact, the different components of the force may be regarded as building blocks which would be put together for the specific task at hand. This provides a high degree of flexibility within the force; flexibility in the choice of nations providing units, the political coloration; flexibility in the number and type of combat and support elements.

In speaking to you thus far, I have emphasized conventional forces and weapons with the hope that in this way, I might contribute to a balanced consideration of the important weapons question. But, I am aware that this very emphasis may tend to distort. In order to bring the nuclear-conventional balance back into sharp focus, as well as to establish again my own views, I would like to refer to a statement made in the press about a year ago. A very respected European newspaper stated that Saceur—that is I—believed "that any penetration of the land frontiers ought to be stopped decisively, at once, if necessary, by the use of nuclear weapons." This is what I believe. Can anyone who bears responsibility for the defense of millions of free people take as a goal anything less than this? I think not.

It is all very well for us to talk in terms of grand strategy, but the planners, political and military, must never forget that their plans have no purpose but to serve people, and that people's hopes and fears are and must be factors of the greatest weight in the calculation of our country and of the alliance. The military planner's idea of where a defense line might best be drawn may not always accord with the geography established by the facts and habits of life. In principle the only line on which a strategy can morally stand is one that shelters people and protects their homes. If we as a Nation or as an alliance are to deserve confidence, we must believe this and, believing, we must keep the watch on the forward line.

I would like to summarize what I have said to you this morning by giving to you some of the facts, some of the assumptions, some of the objectives which I have stated in directives to my planning staff.

1. The particular purposes for which the NATO forces are being created in Europe and the general principles which govern their deployment and use are not only valid but may be of even greater importance in the period of nuclear plenty and missile delivery into which we are now moving.

2. The forces presently planned for deployment in Europe should be generally adequate to meet the minimum requirements, but their weapons and their survival posture must be improved. Substantial dependence must be placed on nuclear weapons under almost any circumstances. Nevertheless, as conventional capabilities improve even within the proposed program, it may be possible to raise the level of involvement at which such weapons would have to be introduced into the battle. If additional forces are made available above the proposed requirements, even greater latitude in the choice of response should be achieved.

3. The forces of allied command Europe must be organized, equipped, trained, and deployed to permit them to react promptly and effectively with:

First, conventional weapons, when such weapons are adequate to the military situation.

Second, atomic weapons when the use of such weapons is necessary.

4. Except in certain well-defined cases, where authority has been clearly established, atomic weapons should be introduced into battle only after a particular decision to do so has resulted from the operation of an established decisionmaking process. Such a process should insure that such a decision would, in all cases, be taken by an authority at a level higher than that of the basic combat unit, and that the level of the threat would have been raised above that which could be dealt with by conventional weapons.

5. Midrange ballistic missiles, sea based and land based, and with great mobility, should be made available to NATO as part of the weapons modernization program to meet the requirements of the present functions of Allied Command Europe.

6. Consideration should be given to guaranteeing to the alliance the availability of the atomic weapons essential to the direct defense of Europe and to giving to the alliance a greater role in nuclear defense.

7. Finally, I would like to emphasize that the threat continues. It is, by its nature, political, economic, and military. It is found throughout the world. Until other real guarantees can be found, the security of the West demands military strength, and this is particularly true in the critical European areas.

I am a military commander, and I have spoken of manpower and weapons, of capabilities and of requirements, because these subjects fall to my direct responsibility. But there are other aspects of defense, perhaps even more important, such things as the courage to face the problem, the wisdom to make the right decision, the energy to create the means to carry out policy, the ability to believe in something, to hope.

I have always been impressed with the words of a great American, the Secretary of War during World War II, Henry Stimson. He said, "We must not let ourselves be engulfed in the passing waves which obscure the current of progress. The sinfulness and weakness of man are evident to anyone who lives in the active world. But men are also good and great, kind and wise. Honor begets honor; trust begets trust; faith begets faith; and hope is the mainspring of life. I have lived with the reality of war, and I have praised soldiers; but the hope of honorable, faithful peace is a greater thing, and I have lived with that, too. That a man must live with both together is inherent in the nature of our present stormy stage of human progress, but it has also many times been the nature of progress in the past, and it is not reason for despair."

Referring, then, to the generations who must bear the active part in the work ahead—and this has particular relevance for you in this audience—Mr. Stimson continued, "Let them have hope and virtue, and let them believe in mankind and its future, for there is good as well as evil, and the man who tries to work for the good, believing in its eventual victory, while he may suffer setback and even disaster, will never know defeat."

These words encourage us, but, more important, they charge us to face the future with courage and with strength. My best wish for you is this: When 30, 40, 50 years from now, you look back, I hope you will not think of your life in terms of success or of failure. I hope each of you will be able to say, "In my entire life there has been no fighting in a military sense, but I have known battle to the very limit of my strength, and it's been fun.

The Foreign Aid Program and Its Increasing Cost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: As chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations, I must through necessity familiarize myself with the many aspects of the foreign aid program and its increasing cost. Believing that the verified information I have put together will be of interest to you, I am attaching, hereto:

1. Recapitulation of the amount of foreign aid funds available for obligation and expenditure for the present fiscal year 1961, and

2. Recapitulation of budget receipts for a period of approximately 172 years.

Notwithstanding the fact that Federal revenues for the past 8 years exceeded by $53 billion the total revenues received in the 164 years from President George Washington to President Harry Truman, inclusive, we borrowed an additional $23 billion during the same 8-year period and spent that.

Certainly the documented information in the attached tables is sufficient proof that the mutual security expense outlay is excessive and should be drastically reduced.

Your committee has endeavored to improve

the foreign aid program by reducing the amount available to controllable proportions. The results of our efforts may be creditable but leave much to be desired when we take into account that dollar assets of foreign nations have more than doubled in the past 8 years. During the same period, gold holdings in foreign nations have increased approximately 50 percent, while our gold reserves have been dangerously depleted and the balance of payments deficit remains alarming.

Assuring you that it is a privilege to furnish this information, and with best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

OTTO E. PASSMAN,
Chairman, Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, OTTO E. PASSMAN, CHAIRMAN

Foreign aid funds by program and amount available for expenditure, fiscal 1961

		Total available for expenditure
1. Military assistance:		
Unexpended, June 30, 1960	$2,044,246,000	
New funds:		
Fiscal 1961	1,800,000,000	
Reappropriated	35,000,000	
Other	40,000,000	
		$3,919,246,000
2. Defense support:		
Unexpended, June 30, 1960	758,601,000	
New funds, fiscal 1961	675,000,000	
		1,433,601,000
3. Development Loan Fund:		
Unexpended, June 30, 1960	830,598,000	
Unobligated, June 30, 1960	326,398,000	
New funds:		
Fiscal 1961	550,000,000	
Loan repayment	14,300,000	
		1,721,296,000
4. Development assistance: Unexpended, June 30, 1960	57,769,000	57,769,000
5. Special assistance:		
Unexpended, June 30, 1960	223,489,000	
New funds, fiscal 1961	231,500,000	
		454,989,000
6. President's Asian fund: Unexpended, June 30, 1960	61,247,000	61,247,000
7. President's contingency fund:		
Unexpended, June 30, 1960	138,695,000	
New funds, fiscal 1961	250,000,000	
		388,695,000
8. Technical cooperation, bilateral:		
Unexpended June 30, 1960	168,417,000	
New funds fiscal 1961	150,000,000	318,417,000
9. Technical cooperation, United Nations:		
Unexpended June 30, 1960	14,400,000	
New funds fiscal 1961	33,000,000	47,400,000
10. Technical cooperation, Organization of American States:		
Unexpended June 30, 1960	$1,308,000	
New funds fiscal 1961	1,300,000	$2,608,000
11. Joint control areas: Unexpended June 30, 1960	14,000	14,000
12. Atoms for peace:		
Unexpended June 30, 1960	9,423,000	
New funds fiscal 1961	1,500,000	10,923,000
13. North Atlantic Treaty Organization: Unexpended June 30, 1960	89,000	89,000
14. Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration:		
Unexpended June 30, 1960	9,200,000	
New funds fiscal 1961	6,700,000	15,900,000
15. United Nations Refugee Fund:		
Unexpended June 30, 1960	900,000	
New funds fiscal 1961	1,300,000	2,200,000
16. Escapee program:		
Unexpended June 30, 1960	4,520,000	
New funds fiscal 1961	3,350,000	7,870,000
17. United Nations Children's Fund:		
Unexpended June 30, 1960	10,926,000	
New funds fiscal 1961	12,000,000	22,926,000
18. United Nations Relief and Works Agency:		
Unexpended June 30, 1960	10,957,000	
New funds fiscal 1961	16,500,000	27,457,000
19. Ocean freight:		
Unexpended June 30, 1960	1,473,000	
New funds fiscal 1961	2,000,000	3,473,000
20. NATO science program: New funds fiscal 1961	1,200,000	1,200,000
21. Administrative expenses, ICA:		
Unexpended June 30, 1960	7,056,000	
New funds fiscal 1961	38,000,000	45,056,000
22. Administrative expenses, State:		
Unexpended June 30, 1960	839,000	
New funds fiscal 1961	8,000,000	8,839,000
Total funds available for expenditure in fiscal year 1961		8,551,215,000

RECAPITULATION

1. Unexpended funds (from previous years) June 30, 1960	$4,713,665,000
2. New funds (appropriated) fiscal 1961	3,781,350,000
3. New funds (from sales receipts) fiscal 1961	56,200,000
Total funds available for expenditure	8,551,215,000

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 1, 1961.

To Whom It May Concern:

The following verified recapitulation of Federal revenues, from the beginning of our Government's accounting, is submitted in the belief that it will be of interest to you:

Total tax receipts

157 YEARS—(WASHINGTON TO TRUMAN)

Apr. 30, 1789–Jan. 1, 1946, total	$233,124,696,392

7-PLUS YEARS—(TRUMAN)

Jan. 1, 1946–Jan. 20, 1953:	
1946	42,867,772,454
1947	42,911,827,900
1948	43,098,474,025
1949	39,833,226,896
1950	40,510,854,464
1951	56,842,879,512
1952	69,336,974,951
1953 (to Jan. 20)	2,259,855,220
Total	337,661,865,422
Total revenues received, George Washington to Harry Truman (inclusive), 164 years	570,786,561,814

8 YEARS—(EISENHOWER)

Jan. 20, 1953–Jan. 20, 1961:	
1953 (from Jan. 20)	65,811,590,850
1954	66,894,388,427
1955	69,613,680,692
1956	78,233,911,713
1957	82,091,696,351
1958	79,285,472,618

Total tax receipts—Continued

8 YEARS—(EISENHOWER)

----------	$84,515,760,844
1960	94,877,939,172
1961 (to Jan. 20)	3,163,831,564
Total revenues received, Eisenhower—8 years	624,488,272,231
Eisenhower revenues over all other Presidents	53,701,710,417

Sincerely yours,

OTTO E. PASSMAN,
Member of Congress.

Address by Maj. Gen. Keith R. Barney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1961

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, on February 4 the Vicksburg Harbor was dedicated. This was a significant occasion for Vicksburg, for Mississippi, and for the Midsouth. Harbor development is an integral part of our program for economic development.

The importance of the occasion was well expressed by Maj. Gen. Keith R. Barney, the Deputy Chief of Engineers for Construction, in his remarks at the dedication, which I here include under unanimous consent:

REMARKS BY MAJ. GEN. KEITH R. BARNEY, DEPUTY CHIEF OF ENGINEERS, U.S. ARMY, DEDICATION OF VICKSBURG HARBOR PROJECT, VICKSBURG, MISS., FEBRUARY 4, 1961

INTRODUCTION

It is a pleasure to return to the historic city of Vicksburg and meet with my many friends here and those from elsewhere in the lower valley. This project which we dedicate today is a monument to the foresight and determination of the people of Vicksburg. It is an honor, indeed, to be invited to participate in this ceremony.

I might say, too, that we have a fine dedicated group of Corps of Engineers employees here as has been the case for a number of years. I feel that their participation in this project was with an extra sense of pride that one has when he does something for his hometown. We are proud of that participation.

Your congressional delegation is well represented here today. I would be remiss if I did not remind you of the effort that has been expended by them over the years to make this harbor a reality. I can say, too, that they have contributed in no small way to all of the many projects in the great Alluvial Valley.

The contractors are to be complimented, also, for their part on the project. The Ford Construction Co. did an excellent job in providing the retaining dikes for the industrial fill, even though they had adverse weather and high river stages at times. The

dredge *Paul F. Janche*, owned and operated by Janche Services Corp., completed the dredging with no serious delays.

THE VICKSBURG HARBOR

This facility that we dedicate today is certainly a far cry from those it replaces. It has a large industrial fill with an elevation sufficient to render it free from floodflows. The ultimate development of its full potential will provide you with an industrial park that would be a credit to any community. The harbor and approach channels are adequate to serve the needs of navigation for many years to come.

Even with the inadequate facilities now replaced, you have been able, in the last decade, to virtually double the waterborne commerce handled at Vicksburg. With this new modern facility you are in a position to share a larger portion of the ever-increasing waterborne commerce on the Mississippi River. Furthermore, you have been able to attract several large industries even though you had inadequate facilities for shipment by water. Your task of attracting other large industries should now be easier. I must say, however, that this new habor was a challenge from the beginning—its future development will remain a challenge. The enthusiasm you display here convinces me that you will certainly do your share to realize the harbor's full potential.

When you have done this you will gain, and the State and Nation will gain, from the addition of this new link in an expanding navigation system throughout the country. We now estimate that this project will provide benefits of $2.80 for each $1 spent to provide it. It can provide greater benefits, but that will require much effort. It is up to you and I believe you can do it.

I note that you intend to spend almost three-quarters of a million dollars initially to construct and operate adequate terminal facilities and necessary public utilities open to all on equal terms. Ultimately, you intend to spend an additional $2 million for other facilities to provide an adequate harbor installation. These expenditures are a part of the challenge I spoke of for the future.

ELSEWHERE IN THE VALLEY

Many of you here are vitally interested also in other features of the overall Mississippi River and tributaries project of which this harbor is an important part. Work throughout the valley is moving steadily forward on a realistic schedule. Measured in terms of costs of construction, it will be about 70 percent complete in June. The levees are well advanced. The four reservoirs here in the Yazoo Basin and Wappapello in the St. Francis Basin are complete except for recreation facilities which are being constructed now. The floodways are ready except for a portion of the Atchafalaya Basin in Louisiana. Foundation conditions there require slower construction schedules. The cutoffs on the main river are complete and our large channel improvement program is proceeding well. Over $70 million is now being appropriated annually for this important program in the seven alluvial valley States.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, as we dedicate this new project here, I would like to emphasize that over the years there will be other harbor projects completed here in Mississippi and elsewhere in the country. There will be other water resource projects also. This is necessary if we are to achieve the economic growth essential to our proper role in the free world. This has been emphasized to the new administration by our mutual friend, Congressman FRANK SMITH, whose district borders Warren County. The report of his Natural Resources Advisory Committee which he recently submitted to the President also points out that the economic growth required will accompany full development of our water resources for all purposes.

Furthermore the report of Senator KERR's Select Committee on National Water Resources, released this week, concludes that there are five major categories of effort needed in the future for meeting prospective demands on a long-range basis so as not to inhibit national or regional economic growth. These are streamflow regulation, pollution abatement, better use of underground storage, increasing efficiency with which water is used, and increasing water yield by artificial means. Appropriate recommendations to accomplish these aims are contained in the report.

Accordingly, this dedication here should be a rededication of ourselves to the task of carrying forward the great programs required for the full improvement and control of our water resources to provide for the common good of all of our people. May the Vicksburg Harbor project serve you and your children well and increasingly for countless years to come.

U.S. Plan Revives Poor Rural Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very interesting article dealing with depressed rural areas, which appeared in the New York Times on February 26, 1961:

U.S. PLAN REVIVES POOR RURAL AREA—JOB SURVEY DRAWS INDUSTRY TO ARKANSAS BACKWOODS

(By Donald Janson)

BATESVILLE, ARK., February 23.—There is a new climate of hope in one of the country's most depressed rural areas.

An unusual Government project has paved the way to new jobs here for people who seemed overrun by the technological revolution in agriculture.

This town of 6,000 in the scenic White River Valley is the trade center for four counties of marginal farmland in the Ozark foothills. The farms are too small and unproductive to compete in an age of bigness brought on by mechanization and advancing technology.

The terrain keeps them small because mountainous ridges separate the fields. Lack of capital keeps them poor.

Per capita income in the four counties was $780 in 1958, a third of the national average.

Twenty percent of the labor force, including those who could no longer make a go of it on thet farm were unemployed last year. Another 20 percent got by on part-time work. Farmers had long been reduced to uprooting their families annually to join the stream of migrant workers that harvests fruit and vegetable crops in other States.

Each year a few of the migrants stayed away. Each year boys graduating from high school were obliged to leave the area if they were to make a living.

The rate of departures now is half of the graduates annually. The average age in the area is moving up.

The counties—Independence, Sharp, Izard, and Stone just south of the Missouri border—lost 22 percent of their population in the last decade. Sharp lost all its physicians and dentists and all but one of its nine cotton gins.

All four counties seemed to be dying when the Federal Departments of Labor and Agriculture stepped in last year to see what could be done. At the same time the departments started similar projects in single economically depressed counties in Wisconsin, Kentucky, and Tennessee.

The effort has been productive here. The employment security division of the Arkansas Department of Labor took on the monumental task of interviewing all the unemployed, underemployed, and unsatisfied workers, as well as potential new workers among wives and students, in the four counties.

The response was good and the result was a mass measurement of skills and potential skills on a scale never before attempted in a rural area. Along with the men, hundreds of women, some of them nursing children, submitted to hours of testing in the hope of becoming family breadwinners.

LABOR SUPPLY INVENTORIED

The survey provided a fuller inventory by far than any part of Arkansas had ever had before on a commodity bound to be of interest to outside industry—the area's supply of eager, inexpensive labor.

The information that the zone had 6,750 persons of considerable aptitude ready to work was turned over to the Arkansas Industrial Development Commission, a branch of the State government under the chairmanship of Winthrop Rockefeller, who lives on a mountain near Morriton.

Although the commission sells the merits of all of Arkansas, it was now armed with its most reliable set of facts—the labor and household inventory of the four counties in the pilot project. As a result, an Ohio company has begun construction of a small plant in Batesville that will manufacture rubber soles and heels for shoes.

A St. Louis company is building a factory here that will make gas tube burners. A food concern has purchased a local creamery for expansion to make cheese products.

Some of the area's former unemployed are now on the construction forces building the plants. Others are receiving training in special skills that will be needed in the plants. Hundreds will be on a payroll, some for the first time in their lives, by the end of the year.

Cave City, a town of 500 in Sharp County north of here, nearly landed the area's biggest prize of all. A New York garmentmaker wanted to produce shirts there if the locality could guarantee a work force of 3,000 women.

There were not enough housewives and daughters available in the surrounding hills, and the plant went to Gaffville in a county adjacent to the pilot area. But it will hire some of the zone's jobless women.

SEEK WORK IN ARKANSAS

One of the construction workers at the new rubber plant here is Glen Horn, a rugged middle-aged farmer in the Cave City area who five times had been forced by the economics of life in his hills to take wife and children on the 2,450-mile trek to the orchards of the State of Washington. This time he did not have to go.

"It's a hard trip," he said as he stood in his yard of red Ozark clay. "We'll stay here as long as I can get work. It's home."

Others who had undertaken the journey, or traveled north to the tomato fields of Indiana or the canning plants of Wisconsin or even endured the privations of the migratory life of the cottonpicker in the Arkansas bottoms to the east, agreed almost to a man.

"Wish we could all find something so we didn't have to go," said Calvin Stone, a strapping young man who now has no other way than migrant work to support his wife

and three children. "I don't believe there's anybody around these parts who wouldn't work right here if they had a chance."

The pilot project has resulted in giving some of his neighbors a chance and its initial success has stimulated hope that more small industries will come.

And under the impetus of the success of the labor survey, the State department of education has broadened its biennial all-household pupil enumeration to provide the Rockefeller commission with statewide information on labor potential.

The pilot project has also stimulated an interest in vocational adult education to capitalize on demonstrated aptitudes for acquiring skills.

Inequity in Wheat Import Regulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, the Legislature of the State of North Dakota has just adopted a concurrent resolution urging more restrictions on importations of seed wheat from Canada. It seems rather inconsistent for this country to maintain a wheat production control and price support program and at the same time allow the importation of around 10 million bushels of wheat per year from Canada.

The point under consideration in this resolution is the provision and import regulations carrying a lower import duty on wheat classified as being "unfit for human consumption."

Inadvertently, the present methods of treating seed wheat for the prevention of smut and other diseases, because of the poisonous nature of the treatment, actually renders the wheat which is to be used for seed unfit for human consumption. The fact that it is brought into this country for seed and not for consumptive purposes does not eliminate the loophole which allows the lower import duty. I have joined with other members of the North Dakota congressional delegation in introducing legislation which would prevent this abuse of our existing regulations. This concurrent resolution just passed by our State legislature points up and emphasizes the concern of our State and the need for legislation to correct this unintended inequity. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include this Senate Resolution B passed by the 37th Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota in the Appendix of the RECORD:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION B

Whereas seed wheat imports are increasing annually with approximately 7 million bushels of seed wheat being imported the past 2 years in the one customs district consisting of North Dakota and part of Minnesota; and

Whereas such abnormal importations of seed wheat, over and above the established import quotas, is extremely harmful to the economy of North Dakota, Minnesota, South Dakota, Hard Red Spring wheat farmers, and U.S. wheat farmers generally; and

Whereas this commodity is presently in surplus and is supported in price and storage costs by the U.S. taxpayers; and

Whereas the present seed wheat is being imported at about one-half the regular duty rate of 21 cents per bushel: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of State, and National Congress are hereby urged to take all possible action in raising the import duty rates in relation to U.S. market prices on seeds that are in surplus supply in the United States and being subsidized by the U.S. taxpayer, particularly in the case of seed wheat; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of State, chairmen of the U.S. Senate and House Agriculture Committees, and the North Dakota, Minnesota, and South Dakota congressional delegations.

ORVILLE W. HAGEN,
President of the Senate.
HOWARD F. DOHERTY,
Secretary of the Senate.
R. FAY BROWN,
Speaker of the House.
GERALD L. STAIR,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Hon. Walter M. Mumma

SPEECH
OF
HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1961

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week many Members of the Congress paid eloquent testimony to the high esteem in which WALTER MANN MUMMA was held by his colleagues.

An editorial appearing in the Harrisburg Patriot, Tuesday morning, February 28, would appear to refute the statement "A man is not without honor save in his own country."

As a further tribute to WALTER, I insert the editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD, at this time:

[From the Harrisburg (Pa.) Patriot, Feb. 28, 1961]

WALTER M. MUMMA

A good many years ago, WALTER M. MUMMA started from scratch—all on his own—and built up one of the major construction companies of midstate Pennsylvania.

A self-made man in business, Mr. MUMMA turned in his later life to politics and public service. And he made good there, too, all on his own.

Last November, this newspaper endorsed Mr. MUMMA's candidacy for his sixth consecutive term in the U.S. House of Representatives in recognition of his political independence and courage and because of his decade of experience at Washington. We emphasized that these traits of character and this seniority, which meant so much to his district, far outweighed the differences we had had with the Congressman on past legislative issues.

Mr. MUMMA's greatest legacy to the congressional district he represented and the Congress in which he served, it seems to us, can be the realization that political independence and political courage, even to the extent of opposing legislation heavily favored by many constituents because he thought it was wrong, count for so very much.

At a time when many bemoaned the passing of rugged individualism, WALTER MUMMA remained a rugged individualist to his dying day. He never was afraid to "fight city hall." He never was an organization man—in business, or politics, or private life. He was simply his own man.

This showed up in the character of Congressman MUMMA, and it was reflected in his personality. No great shakes as a stump orator, the Congressman was at his best in a person-to-person contact. Nobody could know WALTER MUMMA and not like him, whatever political or philosophical differences they might have with him. You could argue with Congressman MUMMA's viewpoint on some issues and you could challenge his voting on some legislation, but you always wound up liking and trusting and respecting him.

This is an extraordinary achievement for any man, let alone one who plunged into the rough and tumble of business and the even rougher tumble of politics throughout his adult life, as Congressman MUMMA did.

There was a shining simplicity to Congressman MUMMA's life. He liked people very much, and people liked him. We will miss him very much.

Minority Views

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, may I call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to an excellent editorial appearing in the February 25, 1961, edition of the Monterey (Calif.) Peninsula Herald, entitled "Minority Views":

Some of the opponents of the House Un-American Activities Committee have been stressing the importance of minority views.

Mrs. Milton Mayer, of Carmel has written us: "I need not argue that a majority of the American people, or of any people, may be wrong; this is democracy's classic disadvantage which freedom for unpopular opinion tries to offset."

Another correspondent has reminded us of the old saw that minority views of today may be the majority views of tomorrow.

We are in full agreement. We believe that minority views are entitled to careful, respectful and critical examination. This is precisely the treatment we have been according the minority views in the case of the Un-American Activities Committee.

We haven't questioned the right of people to hold such views. We have merely questioned their right to impose their will on the majority through a sustained campaign of attacks on the committee backed by little or no evidence.

It is true, of course, that minority views, unpopular when first expressed, have sometimes come to be accepted as right.

We can all recall the cases of Galileo and Columbus.

The minority idea that utlimately becomes a majority idea is the one we hear about. But certainly there have been many other minority ideas which were discarded and forgotten by later generations.

In fact, we'd estimate that less than one-tenth of one percent of minority ideas ever

became majority ideas. Let's consider a few cases.

In the 1840's there was a minority idea in this country that the world would come to an end on October 22, 1844. It was accepted fully and devoutly by the Millerites, a sect numbered at between 50,000 and 100,000 people. That was a quite sizable minority for that time. Some of them gathered on hills in white robes in upper New York State on the appointed day.

In that case the minority did not prove to be right.

The Ku Klux Klan, Single Tax, Popularism, Technocracy, Free Silver, Wilber Glenn Voliva's theory that the earth is flat, the Greenback Party, the Whisky Rebellion and the cause of slavery all have represented minority views at one time or another in this country. None has ever become a majority view, at least not yet.

On the other hand, if we look over our majority views, we shall find that a great many of them have been generally accepted since the beginning of recorded history.

So on the basis of the evidence, we wish to propound a two-point law which may shock and astonish some of the opponents of the Un-American Activities Committee:

1. Majority views are not necessarily wrong but will usually be found to have stood the test of time.

2. Minority views are entitled to a hearing, but are not invariably right, and will usually be a laughing matter in the future.

Hospital Ship "Hope" Lends Hand: Two Doctors To Attend 500,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1961, and on February 23, 1961, I had the privilege of inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the first and second series of news articles by Dr. Alex Sahagian-Edwards, a constituent of my district, who is an instructor in medicine at Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons. Dr. Sahagian-Edwards, together with other medical men, completed a tour of duty abroad the mercy ship *Hope*, a privately sponsored hospital ship, staffed by medical men bringing their talents and medical knowledge to newly developed countries.

In his first article, Dr. Sahagian-Edwards described his experiences in Djakarta and Surabaja. In his second article, he described the work and his experiences in Bali, Indonesia. In his third article, Dr. Sahagian-Edwards describes his work in Sumbawa, Indonesia, a little island in the Java Sea. The trials and tribulations of two doctors attending 500,000 people are detailed, and Dr. Sahagian-Edwards describes the assistance that this ship of mercy rendered to this teeming population. The newly arrived benefactors were overwhelmed by sheer numbers. On this Java Sea island, this hospital clinic was flooded with patients with advanced diseases. The difficulties encountered by the doctors on this *Hope* ship point out the desperate need of medical doctors and medical treatment. The third report by Dr. Sahagian-Edwards follows:

SUMBAWA, INDONESIA.—We were sandbagged in Sumbawa. This little island in the Java Sea was our next port of call after Bali. It has a population of 500,000 served by 2, count them—2, physicians.

We dropped anchor off the capital, Sombawa Pesar, on December 28 and within 24 hours had admitted 50 patients to the ship's hospital. After another 24 hours we were organizing an outpatient clinic on the beach which also served as a screening and admitting operation.

The events leading up to this operation rival "exodus" in scope and that's being modest. As soon as we set foot on the island we were met by a German doctor who is here under contract to the Indonesian Government and is responsible for all the medical problems of 180,000 people. He is very thin.

PALACE CONVERTED

Taken to the Sultan's palace, we saw it had been converted to an emergency infirmary in anticipation of our arrival. These patients had been selected in the hinterlands and brought to the capital city for immediate attention.

The sight that greeted our eyes was enough to make strong women faint and weak men join civil defense. The palace rooms had been emptied of furniture and on the floor on bamboo mats were 150 patients in various stages of far-advanced disease.

Most of them were accompanied by their families and as far as the eye could see there was a mass of half-naked, bandaged bodies. It looked like the Atlanta scene in "Gone With the Wind." There was no place to examine these people so we set up the corners of the rooms as examining areas.

GOITERS SIZE OF MELONS

There were patients with goiters the size of large melons hanging under their chins. Some had generalized skin eruptions that were bleeding and infected. Others had huge hernias. One woman had such tremendous abdominal swelling from an ovarian tumor that she couldn't lie down but had to be transported by chair. She was subsequently relieved of a 48-pound mass by surgery. It was a little less than half her total body weight.

At the pier some of these patients were placed on the ship's launches. We were warned that the monsoon season was due to start any day and the *Hope's* captain, Jack Windas, announced that Sumbawa Bay was notoriously treacherous. There would be no recourse but to pull up anchor and go out to sea if the weather got bad.

We began to envision a ship full of frightened sick patients as they found themselves sailing away from their island. Nevertheless, we loaded them on and started surgical operations immediately.

In the meantime, it was decided that we could best handle the nonsurgical patients on shore, but as close as we could get to the ship. This meant the harbor area, so we "liberated" a wooden shed used by the customs officials and set up a clinic. There was no electricity, no running water and no toilet facilities.

We solved these problems by using gasoline lamps, bringing our own supply of water from the ship, and erecting a metal latrine. The latter was accomplished by one of our Indonesian nurses who collared a group of dockworkers and pressed them into service. They not only set up a lovely "water closet" 150 yards from the shed, but magically produced the equipment to build it. The mysterious East.

As in Bali, when the word spread that the *Hope* had set up a polyclinic, the number of patients increased in geometric progression. From 20 patients a morning the total increased to more than 60. We then invoked the assistance of Dr. Poch, the German resident physician, to screen patients before being sent to us.

Oddly enough, with all of the real disease around us, we began to see psychosomatic disorders and hypochondriasis. It was a little difficult to maintain clinical equilibrium when one saw a case of tropical yaws followed by a military policeman who just wanted a checkup.

NO INSULIN ON ISLAND

One of many heartbreaking discoveries was that insulin is not available here. A diabetic is doomed unless he is lucky enough to have the kind of diabetes that responds to diet and oral hypoglycemic agents. We tried to workup as many of these patients as possible and control their disease but most required insulin. The only thing we could do was to recommend they move to the only area of Indonesia where insulin is available, i.e., Jakarta.

The department of radiology organized a chest survey and more than 200 schoolteachers were brought on board for chest X-rays. The whole island should be screened for tuberculosis contacts since this disease is almost endemic here. Since this was not feasible, we decided that adults working with children should be the priority group.

Fortunately, streptomycin and isoniazid are obtainable, but the word sanitarium is not in the Sumbawa dictionary. Speaking of dictionary, we were faced with a new problem. Up to now, our Indonesian nurses had acted as interpreters, but the natives in Sumbawa speak a different language from Bahasa, Indonesia, and the language barrier loomed taller than ever. A three-way translation was required for many patients. English to Bahasa to Sumbawa and back again. It took 5 minutes just to find out the patient's chief complaint.

Our reception here was even more dramatic than in Bali. These people never see Americans. Yet English is taught in the high schools. There were welcome signs on the pier and on the road leading into town. The religion here is Islam and the atmosphere is entirely different from Bali.

There is very little exposure of the body, indeed, most of the women wear heavy head veils. Those of us wearing Bermuda shorts were regarded with considerable bemusement. (Much like people walking down Madison Avenue in their underwear.)

We are known mainly by the impact of the movies. There is no question that the United States is regarded with awe and admiration. Even Elvis Presley is known here. Children of 10 know the results of our recent elections and one little boy volunteered the information that President Kennedy is 44 years old. Attention U.S. Information Service:

We leave soon for the Celebes. There is fighting there between the Sukarno government and the revolutionary guerrillas. There is a rumor that doctors are popular prey for kidnapers ($10,000 apiece—alive). Of course, these reports are usually exaggerated and it's only a coincidence that I'm leaving for the States the day after we arrive in Makassar. Project Hope continues for another 3 months in Indonesia.

The schedule reads Ambon, Timor, Bima, Lombok, and back to Java. In May, the ship goes to Singapore for servicing, and the last 3 months of the maiden voyage will be spent in South Vietnam.

There is no question in my mind that the mission has been an unqualified success. Never before has an entire American hospital with highly trained personnel

visited these areas and gained direct insight to the medical problems. No agency or organization has worked in closer contact with doctors and patients.

We have experienced a few "Ugly Americans," but the sorry state of medicine and health in Indonesia is not due to them. If the United States wants to play an effective role in providing medical help to this country, I urge a long session of conferences with the medical officers of the *Hope* when it sails back to San Francisco in the fall of 1961.

Unemployment and New Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1961

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from a recent edition of the East Oregonian does an excellent job of setting forth the need for action on the problem of long-term unemployment:

[From the East Oregonian (Pendleton, Oreg.), Feb. 17, 1961]

UNEMPLOYMENT AND NEW JOBS

Special aid for the long-term jobless and their families was urged by President John F. Kennedy in his message to Congress on January 30 as the first step to combat the current recession. Kennedy reported that "During each month some 150,000 workers are exhausting their already meager jobless benefits." To meet this situation, he promised to submit to Congress within 14 days "a measure to improve unemployment compensation through temporary increases in duration on a self-supporting basis."

While the President did not go into detail, it seems clear that his proposal will closely follow provisions of the Temporary Unemployment Insurance Act of 1958. That measure offered the States loans to finance extension of benefits, under the Federal-State unemployment insurance system, from 26 or fewer weeks to a maximum of 39 weeks. Seventeen States took advantage of the offer and five additional States independently financed an extension of their benefit payments. Altogether, temporary benefits totaling more than $500 million were paid to 2 million workers.

Unemployment compensation has been the economy's first line of defense against the loss of income that accompanies loss of jobs. Paul A. Samuelson, economics professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, said in a special task force report to Kennedy on January 5 that "For the immediate future, emergency legislation is needed to permit all States to continue paying unemployment benefits for at least 39 weeks, regardless of the condition of their insurance reserves." Samuelson emphasized that Federal standards were needed to provide for adequate financing and solvency of a revised insurance system.

The executive council of the AFL–CIO agreed with Samuelson that longer term measures needed to keep down unemployment should include, among others, aid to depressed areas, expansion of urban renewal and public housing program, Federal assistance for school construction, and a large public works program.

The chronic unemployment that may be caused by automation and by migration of industry confronts the new administration with harder problems than those posed by the acute unemployment of recession periods. And the long-term problems are compounded by the steady growth of the labor force. It has been said that it will be necessary to create more than 1¼ million new jobs in each of the next 4 years merely to keep the gap between the supply of jobs and the demand for them from getting wider.

Unemployment, following a generally raising trend in the past decade, has become a problem even during periods of relative prosperity. Within the past 7 years the labor force has grown by more than 6 million persons, but total employment has increased by fewer than 4 million and many of those holding jobs have been working only part time. Farm employment has declined by over a million in 10 years, and factory production and maintenance jobs have declined by nearly 1.6 million.

During the next decade, the total labor force (including the Armed Forces) is expected to rise from the current level of 74 million to about 87 million. Projections indicate that 58 million members of the present labor force will be working in 1970, when they will have been joined by 26 million new workers and 3 million women formerly in the labor froce. This expansion will be about 40 percent greater than that of the past decade.

Jobs for the 14 million young workers who will enter the labor force during the coming decade will not be forthcoming unless the growth rate of the economy is stepped up. President Eisenhower agreed in his last economic report, January 19, that output in the next 10 years would have to be increased at "a still higher rate than has been experienced in the years since the Employment Act (of 1946) was passed." Economists consider that a growth rate of 5 percent a year is necessary to create enough new jobs in a period of rising productivity and technological change.

Kennedy, speaking as a presidential candidate at Flint, Mich., last September 5, said that "We must greatly expand our job training programs to prepare men out of work in new skills and techniques that will help them find new jobs." He advocated assistance to industry to provide job-training programs to prevent "undue hardship to employees" in factories introducing automation.

As new industrial processes are perfected, the demand for skilled technicians may be expected to increase, but youths entering the labor market without adequate training will not be able to meet the requirements. Jobs in industries such as aircraft, chemicals, communications and electronics all require highly developed skills. It has been estimated that by 1975 the United States will need 75 percent more professionals and technicians than are now available.

A Blow to Home Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL FINDLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I believe in unemployment compensation. As a citizen of Illinois, I expect my State government to take action in this field, and it has. For several months, Illinois has had a 39-week program for unemployment compensation. I am confident the fine people in the Illinois Department of Labor will carry out this program efficiently and well.

I oppose Federal activity in this field. Federal aid has already weakened State control of unemployment compensation and altered its original concept. This bill would be one more step toward destruction of States rights, and that is why I vote negative.

If we are to protect home rule and curb the wild growth of our Central Government, the place and time to start is here and now.

House Un-American Activities Committee: A Calm Review

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, so long as the Communist bloc continues its efforts to undermine our form of government and to subvert the minds of our people, I feel that we must have the House Un-American Activities Committee on the alert to expose these insidious threats to our way of life and to recommend legislative action.

My constituent, Thomas F. Coon, of Dumont, N.J., has written an excellent factual review of the activities of the Un-American Activities Committee. It appeared in the February 11, 1961, issue of the magazine, National Review.

Mr. Coon has made a careful study of this subject and his statements go straight to the heart of the controversy about the future of the committee. In view of the wide national interest in the subject and pending House action at this time, I include the article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

HUAC: A CALM REVIEW

Seldom has any organ of the National Government been as bitterly criticized, denounced and buffeted around as the Committee on Un-American Activities. The Communists, who know better, and their dupes, who should know better, have strained every fiber to eliminate this committee which has done so much to embarrass the party by throwing publicity on its goals and methods. They have been so successful that today many Americans unconsciously assume that there must be something intrinsically evil about the committee and its activities.

Why was the committee created? How does it operate? How valuable is its work?

The present House Committee on Un-American Activities came into being in 1945 and has continued as a standing committee of the House to the present time. It consists of nine members—five from the majority party and four from the minority party. The chairman is a member of the majority party, and regardless of whether his name is Harold H. Velde or FRANCIS E. WALTER, whether Republican from Illinois or Democrat from Pennsylvania, is a prime target of the Communist Party.

The Committee on Un-American Activities is authorized to investigate (1) the extent, character, and objectivity of un-American propaganda activities in the United States; (2) the diffusion in the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda; (3) all other questions related thereto that will aid

the Congress in drafting remedial legislation. In addition, under the House rule XI, section 26, the committee is assigned certain watchdog functions. It is its job to ride herd on those administrative organs charged with carrying out the provisions of the Internal Security Act of 1950, the Communist Control Act of 1954, and various provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act and the Foreign Agents Registration Act.

It is often charged (1) that the committee has never revealed any important espionage activities and (2) it accomplishes nothing that the FBI could not do better. Such remarks are uttered out of naiveté or, in many cases, with the deliberate objective of deluding the public and lessening HUAC's effectiveness. It was this committee which brought to light, to state just a few, the espionage activities of Arthur A. Adams, J. Peters, Gerhart Eisler, Nathan Gregory Silvermaster, Harry Dexter White, William W. Remington, Alger Hiss, as well as the atom bomb spy ring at the University of California Radiation Laboratory. Concerning the second charge that there is no need for HUAC, it is argued that the FBI is the investigative agency of the executive branch of the Government which is primarily charged with responsibility for developing evidence upon which to base criminal prosecutions. This overlooks the fact that in our system of government, it is the responsibility of a committee of the Congress to seek and receive public information upon which to base legislative recommendations either to strengthen our present laws or suggest new laws to plug vacuums in our internal security program in general.

A recent research study conducted by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress reveals among others the following legislative recommendations by HUAC:

1. Legislation to bring about the immediate mandatory deportation of alien spies and saboteurs.

2. Legislation to outlaw every political organization which is shown to be under the control of a foreign government.

3. Legislation to stop all immigration from foreign countries that refuse to accept the return of their nationals found under American law to be deportable from this country.

4. Added legislation to place restrictions on the distribution of totalitarian propaganda, when that distribution involves any cost to the American taxpayers, and when such propaganda emanates and is shipped from foreign sources.

5. Legislation to restrict the benefits of certain tax-exemption privileges now extended to a number of Communist fronts posing as educational, charitable and relief groups.

Recommendations by HUAC in the past have brought about enactment of the Internal Security Act of 1950, the Communist Control Act of 1954 and various provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. Many other recommendations covered such diverse fields as: increased penalties for seditious conspiracy; single espionage statute for peace and war; foreign agents registration; publication of names of foreign agents; compulsory testimony in congressional investigations, etc.

As one by-product of its activity, the committee has produced a series of research studies. These include collections of original documents of the Communist movement, and the more recent multivolume project, "Facts on Communism," which has begun with outstanding monographs on Communist ideology by Prof. Gerhart Niemeyer and on Soviet history by Prof. David J. Dallin.

Is the committee fair to those who come before it? Any witness may consult with his lawyer whenever he so desires during the course of a hearing, and submit any statement he wishes. Before a scheduled hearing, the witness may confer with the committee in confidence. If any citizen feels he has been in any manner wronged, he can demand and get a public hearing in which to state his case.

Finally, how about the cost? It is, as Committee Chairman FRANCIS E. WALTER pointed out in the 1959 annual report, relatively insignificant. "A nuclear submarine," said WALTER, "costs $49 million, an attack carrier $280 million, a guided missile destroyer $34 million. The committee operated last year—and made its contribution to our defense effort in the vital field of information and legislation—on a budget of $327,000, a small fraction of the cost of any major weapon in our military arsenal."

Aufbau Reports on an Interview With Prime Minister Ben-Gurion, of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, with unanimous consent, I have the pleasure of placing in the RECORD an article which appeared in the outstanding German-language newspaper of the United States, Aufbau, on January 6, 1961. The article is of great significance and will give millions of Americans an opportunity to become acquainted with the views of Prime Minister Ben-Gurion, of Israel, on certain subjects which he has not heretofore expressed in public.

Prime Minister Ben-Gurion is one of the world's most respected statesmen, and his views carry considerable impact throughout the free world and other areas as well. The report in Aufbau is based upon an interview held with the Prime Minister in the fall of 1960 by the staff of Maariv, the most widely read newspaper in Tel Aviv. Through the interest of Maj. Gen. Julius Klein, U.S. Army, retired, of Chicago, I have been furnished with a translation of the interview.

The substance of the document in relation to certain important subjects follows:

NO VISIT TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Since the interview took place shortly before the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations, with a participation of heads of state, prime ministers, princes, and one king—a precedent for a U.N. meeting—the Prime Minister of Israel was asked if he intended to go to New York for the Assembly. "No," replied Ben-Gurion, "I have not considered it. With regard to the leaders of the new African states, the old leaders and the new ones, whose participation in the Assembly would afford an opportunity for direct negotiations, this trip would not be necessary as we are already in close contact with Nkrumah and the others. Only today, one African, who is shortly going to become prime minister of his country, came to see me."

COMMUNISM CONTRA THE BIBLE

On which side is Israel in the global quarrel between the Communist and the Western bloc? Shouldn't we define this quarrel as an ideological struggle between the Communist bloc and the world of the Bible?

Prime Minister Ben-Gurion: "Yes and no. The word of the Bible is not united. In one passage the Bible says of God that he is avenging the sins of the fathers on the children. Ezekial and Jeremiah, however, teach that each sinner has to suffer for his own sins. The anti-Communist world is itself not united. It cannot be said that the philosophy of life and the statesmanship of the English are the same as those of the Americans. They are only the same on one point: namely, freedom of mankind. We firmly believe in the proverb of the Bible about the rise of a world of "chessed," mercy and charity. This is more than just "zedek," justice. As it says in the book of the prophet Micha, "The Lord is asking you to keep the word of God and to practice love." Ben-Gurion is well read in the works of the Greek philosophers, which he reads in the original texts. Does he share the view of Plato that men of intellect should be the heads of state?

A PHILOSOPHER IS RULING BURMA

"This," replied Ben-Gurion, "has been realized in our days in only one state, namely, Burma. Plato teaches that the philosophers should rule their people; philosophers not in the sense we understand today; those who do not want to rule of their own accord but are being made to do so. This is what happened in Burma. It is a true miracle since all around Burma military dictators are in control." What is the situation in Israel in this respect?

Ben-Gurion: "First, one has to define the term 'man of intellect.' What does it mean? Someone who is practicing an intellectual profession? There are people who do not practice an intellectual profession but who are, nevertheless, men of intellect. For instance, we have in the Knesset one Sholomo Labie, an old Kibutznik of Ain-Charod. I have known this person since his childhood. We come from the same town. Maybe my thesis will not be accepted by the university professors, but I consider Labie a man of intellect, an ideologist, and a creative thinker, who moreover is living in accordance with his convictions.

"We are in close contact with the intellectual men of our people. Important books in world literature are being published in the Hebrew language. Many meetings and congresses of scholars often take place in Israel. I intend to organize in Israel in the near future a congress of representatives of Jewish students from America. America has today approximately 200,000 to 250,000 Jewish students. The majority is not familiar with Jewish living. I have suggested that each college should send one delegate to this congress, which will deal with two subjects: 'The Jewish People in World History,' and 'Israel of Our Days.' I hope that this congress will take place next year."

MEETINGS IN GERMANY

Events of last year were discussed. The meeting between Ben-Gurion and Chancellor Adenauer in New York last year was mentioned.

"It is no secret," remarked the interviewers, "that this meeting has set off contradictory feelings among the Jewish people. What did you feel when you met Adenauer?"

"I felt," replied Ben-Gurion, "that I was going to a meeting which might turn out to be a blessing for Israel. Up to the present, I have no reason to believe that it was a mistake. I have the highest esteem for Adenauer and bear him no ill feeling. With regard to the crimes committed by the Nazis against us, I feel like any other Jew. But toward those Germans who condemn these crimes, I bear the same feelings as I would toward anyone else. I met Heuss and Carlo Schmidt, the latter saying with tears in his

eyes, 'The horrible crimes of the Nazis should never be forgotten.' I know that this was no pose, but spoken from the heart. So to me he is just like anyone else. One should never forget the past; but one must see reality as it really is. To me, a decent German is no different from a decent Englishman, Frenchman, or anyone else.

"I know that Chancellor Adenauer has never been a Nazi. I have had the opportunity to speak to others—Germans and Austrians—who hate Adenauer. But they were all of the same opinion that he has always been correct toward the Jewish cause. Therefore, I bore him no ill feeling when meeting him in New York. I felt that it could become a blessing for Israel. And I still believe so today. It would be too early to say anything more in this matter. But as soon as a cornerstone has been laid for this project, the world will get to know more about it."

The New Rules Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARLETON J. KING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial published February 27, 1961, in the Glens Falls Times, Glens Falls, N.Y.:

THE NEW RULES COMMITTEE

The American people were sadly misled on a most important issue by Government leaders. Even President Kennedy joined in the strong chorus calling for democracy in the House of Representatives through liberalization of the Rules Committee. We were assured that the packing of the committee would halt that group's stop light action on measures to be considered. Important matters would no longer be held back from the entire House by a small group.

The actions of that committee on Tuesday clearly indicate that all the fuss over the Rules Committee and its hampering of the democratic process was nothing but a cover-up for seizure of power by the liberals. In important votes on that day, the committee killed two resolutions which were, strangely enough, opposed by Speaker RAYBURN.

On identical 8–6 rollcall votes, the measures were bottled up by the committee, and the entire House will never have a chance to consider them, at least in this session. One bill would have authorized House committees to permit coverage of their proceedings by radio and television. The second would have outlawed backdoor spending procedures under which continuing programs are financed through authorizations that do not depend on regular appropriations. Both bills have merit. It might be noted, with regard to the broadcasting measure, that the Senate already permits such practices. In the second case, it seems as if a sound fiscal policy would be difficult to maintain in view of these spending procedures. At any rate, the bills were well worth consideration by 437 Representatives, not just 14.

It is now clear that the democratic motives for packing the Rules Committee were in reality just so much hogwash. And any bill which does not satisfy his majesty, Speaker RAYBURN, will remain forever in that new-found liberal limbo, never to see the light of House consideration.

Advertising and the Open Mind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1961

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, and notwithstanding the fact that the Public Printer estimates there will be an additional cost of $182.25, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix a talk by the president of the Sperry & Hutchinson Co., William S. Reinecke, entitled "Advertising and the Open Mind":

ADVERTISING AND THE OPEN MIND

Mr. Chairman, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am greatly honored to have been invited to appear before this distinguished group here in Boston today.

As you know, I am president of the Sperry & Hutchinson Co. The Sperry & Hutchinson Co. is a trading stamp company. It was founded some 65 years ago, back in 1896. The trading stamp, while originally conceived as a discount or reward for the payment of cash, has essentially a promotional effect. It attracts customers. It is not, as some people have believed in the past, a form of advertising in the ordinary sense of the word. We view trading stamps as something to be advertised.

I say this so that we can clear up any misconception there may be that my firm competes with advertising. The fact is that normally where stamps are used, the result is an increase in advertising lineage. We have carried out numerous studies documenting this fact.

You may wonder why I accepted this invitation to talk to you here today about advertising. My answer to that is that both advertising and trading stamps have historically been the victims of attacks based more often than not upon prejudices and emotions, attacks which challenge our very right to exist. To the extent that this kind of attack succeeds against either trading stamps or advertising, each has been hurt because we both make essentially the same kind of contribution.

I am not alarmed, and I am sure you are not, over resourceful critics who direct their energies at improving advertising as it appears on television, on the radio, and in our magazines and newspapers. I consider this to be healthy. It is part of the process by which we grope toward greater skill and competency in our various fields.

My concern has arisen out of attacks which are directed against the basic process of advertising, against advertising as a legitimate, necessary, and constructive function in our social and economic scheme of things.

Whether trading stamps or advertising is the target, any criticism aimed at questioning the very functioning itself must include a very careful appraisal. Advertising cannot be judged as an isolated phenomenon. It must be judged in total context.

So let us take a fresh and thorough look:

First, at what our society is all about as it relates to you and me. What it is trying to accomplish.

Second, we can then examine the part our economic system plays in contributing to the total scheme of things.

Third, it will then be possible for us to examine the role of advertising as a part of our economic system—where it fits and what it contributes.

Fourth, we will look briefly at the nature of some of the current, intense criticism.

Fifth and finally, we can ask the question: what is needed to assure constructive contributions from critics and to assure a healthy development of advertising?

"THE END OF MAN IS MAN"

So, first let us take a brief look at what our society here in America, taken as a whole, appears to be all about. What is its purpose? What does it appear to be trying to accomplish?

A great deal of discussion has been going on within the last year or two pertaining to this fundamental question. I do not consider myself to be by any manner of means a philosopher. I am a lawyer and a businessman. At the same time, like any conscientious American, I have spent a fair share of time pondering some of the problems of fundamental purpose. Any serious businessman must do so if he is to satisfy his own sense of purpose.

I think that the Commission on National Goals, in reporting to President Eisenhower last week, expressed in clear terms what our society is all about. I quote:

"Our enduring aim," the Commission said, "is to build a nation and help build a world in which every human being shall be free to develop his capacities to the fullest."

This idea is neither new nor complicated. It is, however, a fundamentally important idea.

During the course of the past year, the Columbia University Press published a volume by Shepard B. Clough, entitled "Basic Values of Western Civilization." In this book, Mr. Clough raises some of the same questions we are asking here. He answers them by saying, "The end of man is man." He continues:

"The evidence which we have marshaled indicates that the West holds the individual—his life and his development toward a higher good—to be the basis of its value system. It is the individual, in the last analysis, who is glorified above all else and for whom the energies of society are employed. His welfare is considered to be above the welfare of any one group or any human institution."

Mr. Clough asserts that this attachment of importance to individual man by a society is not nearly so common as we who have long been accustomed to it might imagine. In fact, he holds it to be unique to present-day Western culture.

So, we have here an idea which, while obvious to us, which while simple as to concept, has had a profound effect upon what we do and how we do it.

Certainly we do not have to dwell upon the fact that our political system is built upon a belief in the importance and integrity of the individual. This belief is built into our Constitution. It is the very basis of the Bill of Rights. It is manifested in the process by which we govern ourselves. Therefore, man, his freedom, his ability to choose among alternatives, is the rock upon which our political system is erected.

Mr. Clough declares also that the Christian ethic is built upon this principle. Our legal system, our medical practices, our educational systems—all are consistent with acceptance of this fundamental regard for the individual and the idea that his development and fulfillment are our fundamental purpose—a justification for what we do.

Out of our deep respect for this end comes our passion for freedom, our guarding of individual choice. And out of this likewise comes persuasion as the chief tool for implementing man's exercise of freedom—in

contrast to the coercion which is fundamental to totalitarian societies.

Each of us is free to do what he wishes, just so long as in the exercise of his freedom he does not impinge upon certain fundamental rights of others. I might here paraphrase a remark attributed to one of your former fellow citizens, Justice Holmes, who said that every man has the right to swing his fist, just so long as its stops short of another man's nose.

BUSINESS AND THE INDIVIDUAL

Our economic system, commonly called the free enterprise system, makes a contribution, which, because we are accustomed to it, can escape notice unless carefully reexamined from time to time.

Our system rewards the individual for individual effort. This is the profit system. Each man benefits by participating in creating a product or service helpful to others.

To operate successfully, the system must permit a wide range of choice for men—choice of what they are to do to make a living, choice as to how they shall enjoy the rewards of successful individual enterprise.

Money as the means of common exchange offers a tool which can be converted, once acquired, into many things to satisfy man's wants and desires. It can be converted into charitable contributions. It can be converted into the possession of a famous painting. It can be converted into products, such as washing machines, automobiles, radios, television sets. Or it can be converted into the pure enjoyment of recreation—or for that matter, just lolling about.

Man thus contributes to the economic system as an individual and takes from it as an individual.

As we all know, today this system, with the development of business enterprise, has brought about mass production of goods, transportation to get goods to people, mass communications to tell people about the availability of goods and services, and thus mass distribution.

The system is based upon competition. Producers of goods and services must compete first to win people's attention and then their patronage. As producers vie with one another to make personal profit, they are contributing toward accomplishing the fulfillment of man's needs. And, as in the political system, the only weapon at their disposal is persuasion—expressed in terms of an attractive price, better quality, or of other attributes the producer feels will attract the consumer seeking to satisfy his needs.

Man is in constant search for the new and the better. What satisfied him yesterday is only the starting point for tomorrow. The economic system is perfectly adapted to man's needs in this respect. As it works under the pressures of competition it, too, is marked by a constant search for the new and the better.

As an economic system it has not only worked, it has become the marvel and envy of much of the civilized world. It has provided more of everything for more people than any preceding or contemporary system.

ADVERTISING AND INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM

Let us look at the function of advertising.

We have said that under our system aimed at serving the individual, we are free to act just so long as our actions do not impinge upon certain fundamental rights of others.

As our system has grown increasingly vast and complex, our organized individual acts have come to have an impact upon an increasing number of others—not only in the United States, but throughout the world. In one sense this ever-increasing interdependence has required restricting individual action. We naturally need more rules for a team game like baseball than for checkers. In a more basic sense, however, this added complexity and interdependence has brought greater freedom for all. For the complexity is a product of our vastly expanded well-being, enjoyed by every segment of our society. The American standard of living has doubled every generation for the last century, and will continue to do so. Virtually every household has had enormously growing opportunities to exercise initiative and action as the result of the facilities of modern transportation and communication, together with rising real incomes.

No amount of scornful criticism, based upon prejudice and emotion, can truly belittle any of the key elements in our economic system.

Advertising is beyond any shadow of doubt one such key element.

If we are to strive to provide all men with opportunity, with freedom of choice, with a selection of goods and services to satisfy their ever-emerging desires, we are confronted with a stupendous task.

However, we human beings make do as we go. We do the best we can. The test can never be that we are doing an adequate job. Even as we meet adequacy today, it becomes inadequacy tomorrow. New demands arise from man's constant search for something new and better. Moreover, new consumers are coming along every day.

It is impossible under today's circumstances to know every individual desire, and to meet it perfectly.

Marketing really involves two fundamental research processes. One of them uses public opinion research to try to measure existing needs and to fulfill those needs. The other involves industrial and scientific research in an effort to come up with new and better products which will once their merits become known, create consumer demand.

Advertising as a communications device has the job of carrying to potential customers the story of old and broadly accepted products and the story of new products.

The role of advertising is thus part information and part persuasion. Its task is gigantic. The simple job of effectively bringing home to our vast population awareness of a new product is staggering.

Moreover, people have not only to be initially reached, but constantly reminded. However, as our production machinery has grown, so have our means of marketing and distributing. The newspapers, the periodicals, radio, television, handbills, direct mail, subway posters, car cards and billboards—all of them are carrying out a never-ending job of attempting to inform and persuade.

This function of advertising, the instrument of mass communications, is of course far from perfect. As advertising men themselves would be the first to admit, they are learning as they go. The process has many shortcomings ind imperfections. Even so, the function of advertising is a part of a circle involving respect for and assertion of individual freedom, involving man's livelihood, his standard of living, involving mass production, speedy communication, swift transportation; in a word, our entire marketing system. As a function, therefore, advertising cannot be eliminated without imperiling the system itself.

SOME CRITICISMS—AND PREJUDICES

Constructive criticism of advertising, like constructive criticism of any institution in our society, is part and parcel of the very system itself. Our strength lies in the very fact that as individuals we are seeking constantly to improve whatever we do. This applies to advertising as well as to anything else. So criticism of advertising does go on, and it will go on. And it should go on. It is not this kind of healthy, constructive criticism which we need fear.

The astonishing thing about a great deal of the current criticism of advertising as a function is its origin. Much of it appears to spring from a welter of emotion, prejudice, and frustration.

To understand the criticism some background must be taken into account.

First, part of the criticism springs from some of the thinking about what economists call perfect competition. Perfect competition is a model of our system built by systematically assuming away one element of reality after another, until far from the reaches of daily living, a model of how competition might work if men didn't participate in it emerges. It envisages producers with perfect knowledge of consumer needs, consumers with perfect knowledge of all goods and services available to meet their needs, perfect mobility of all production resources, with all producers and consumers in effortless contact with one another. Fundamentally, scholars recognize that while such a model has an analytical use, it does not represent what happens in the marketplace.

Some, conceiving this model of perfect competition to be a realistic possibility, view any activity that intervenes between production and consumption as waste. Thus, they come to the view that advertising is waste.

Second, many of the present critics grew up in the depression era and imbibed deeply of then popular antibusiness attitudes.

Third, another element of background springs from the nature of the human mind, and its constant search for order. Order realized is simplicity. Complexity at times represents fatiguing challenge. Complexity partakes of the unknown. It is fraught with hidden and possibly perilous problems. It is a short step from this to the view that the complexities of modern society with its advertising is something undesirable. Compounding this are vague moral elements arising from our puritanical traditions. Before we know it, the undesirable has become the bad.

Fourth and finally, is an element which can be termed a form of nostalgia. The simplicity of yesterday takes on all the charm of a lost love. All of its hardships disappear, and only the pastoral simplicity remains.

Out of this welter of background, come the following kinds of criticisms today.

First, is the charge that much of our advertising dwells upon differences among products that are inconsequential, and at times ridiculous—and thus advertising represents a form of waste. This leaves out of account that while growth and progress cannot be perfect, men vying in competition must seek, if they are to attract the customer, to provide some desirable distinction to their product. Differences that seem small to some people are important to others. These critics fail to recognize that this road, while it at times does manifest itself in differences of little consequences, also leads to the major breakthroughs of progress—the new invention, the new drug, the revolutionary new piece of machinery.

A few among this group of critics look about them and see areas needing significant improvement—our schools and our highways, for example—and proceed to compare the money spent on advertising with that spent in other areas. The group goes on to suggest that the money might be better spent on public projects.

This criticism, sincere though it may be, makes the mistake of assuming that the situation is "either-or." It fails to take into account that only by growth and increase in our national production, only by the creation of more and more wealth, can more and more money be moved into our tax reservoirs for public purposes.

A second major criticism insists that advertising, in its manifestations, is debasing man's tastes. One critic may be quoted as saying, "Without doubt, the advertisers are partly responsible for the American worship of goods, and any kind of goods for the savage emulation, for the cheap, shallow,

noisy, blatant, bombastic, materialistic spirit of the people." That is quite a statement—and reflects intense emotional feeling.

Third and finally, some critics of advertising view with a jaundiced eye the use of persuasion at all in advertising. They feel that the lure of advertising is overwhelming the common sense of the common people.

It is impossible to provide any documented answer to these last two criticisms—first, because the charges are fundamentally expressions of fear and, second, because no final answer can be made until the future itself has revealed our destiny. We could bring out figures concerning the increasing numbers who are being educated in our schools; we could bring out the dramatic increases in statistics on symphony and theater attendance; we could point to our growth and development in the Arts, and to any of the other encouraging signs of a soundly developing culture; but none of this would satisfy such critics because what they say reflects a lack of faith in a process involving individual choice.

These latter criticisms are in their way an ironic commentary on those who make them; for most of the critics view themselves as lovers of human freedom. Many designate themselves as "liberals." It is ironic that they of all people should profess a fundamental lack of faith in the ability of men to carve out their own destinies under a democratic system designed for that purpose.

THE OPEN MIND—A CONTRIBUTION

The preceding analysis has demonstrated that advertising is an essential function, an integral part of a total system linked to the very fundamental and serious purpose of serving mankind. No amount of criticism should ever make us lose sight of this basic fact.

Looking toward the future, I am optimistic.

Nothing I have said should detract one iota from the fine and constructive critical work embracing the field of advertising that is going forward in scores of universities under the guidance of very able men.

I admire the academic mind and the constant, continuing contribution it makes in analyzing and criticizing our system. Our aim must be to encourage this kind of criticism and analysis.

I would issue a plea for the open mind in all the circles that judge advertising in its basic role—as it manifests itself imperfectly but, hopefully, with increasing competence, skill, responsibility, and service as part of the total society in which all of us live and work—in which we are privileged to carve out our individual destinies.

Looking ahead, I would expect a second thing to come about. I would expect that people like yourselves and other advertising leaders would spend an increasing amount of time and energy in bringing an understanding of the role of advertising to an ever-widening segment of our society. A great deal of effort can profitably be spent among our own ranks. Some vigorous, constructive, and laudable work has been done along this line by such magazines as Printers' Ink and Advertising Age.

It has been my experience that the best advertising men are those who go about their jobs with a clear understanding of where advertising fits, with a deep conviction concerning the importance of its role, and with deep and abiding pride in the work they do.

May I thank you for your patience, and again express to you my deep pleasure at having been with you today.

Remarks of Robert F. Ellsworth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I ask permission to insert an editorial column from the Lawrence (Kans.) Daily Journal-World, date of February 25, 1961.

Mr. Dolph Simons, Jr., writing the Saturday Column, discusses business conditions in the thriving mid-American city of Lawrence. The businessmen of that city admit that they are having to work hard to maintain their volume but they are optimistic about business prospects. This note of cheer and determination is most welcome in the midst of the gloom and despair which is more frequently voiced.

THE SATURDAY COLUMN

(By Dolph C. Simons, Jr.)

How is business in Lawrence?

If someone were to estimate local conditions based solely on business, employment, and economic reports from Washington, he would probably guess Lawrence was rocking along pretty much the same as last year. Along with the same sales figures, costs have gone up, consequently the average Lawrence businessman probably would not be expected to be as well off today as he was the same time last year.

Washington reports indicate business in general is not likely to show an upturn until sometime this fall. These economists continually point to the large number of unemployed persons. Congressional legislation is being prepared for distressed areas and there is even some talk of a tax cut later in the year to help get sales back on the upswing.

Secretary of Labor Goldberg recently made a highly publicized trip in the eastern half of the United States to study the bad labor situation and to see the effect of this on the areas he visited.

It is a shame Mr. Goldberg did not visit Lawrence.

About the best way to find out how business is in Lawrence is to talk to the merchants. Judging from these reports, Lawrence must be one of the garden spots in the country—if things are as bad as the Washington experts say they are.

No firm names will be used in the reports below and no specific businessmen will be quoted by name, but if there is any doubt as to the figures quoted, this reporter will be glad to give the firm names to those doubters so the latter can check them.

How about the car business? If conditions are bad the car industry certainly would be one of the first to notice any buyer reluctance to spend a sizable amount of money.

Three of the largest car dealerships in Lawrence were contacted. The first said, "Business is good. January was a good month, better than January 1960—and February has been the best February since I've been in the business in Lawrence. The first 10 days of February were real good, the middle 10 days were slow and now the last part of the month we've really been humming. Profits are better, I've cut out some overhead and I'm tickled with business." The dealer reported the increased number of units he had sold so far this year and then said, "Lawrence is a great place in which to be in business. The city is growing, we have more people working than ever before, and we look for 1961 to be real good for us. I'm very optimistic."

Perhaps this might be a case of just one dealer being happy, how about another?

The second dealer reported similar conditions.

This man said, "The used car business is excellent, our truck business is 50 percent better than at the same time last year and the new car business is good enough that we are having trouble getting some specific models." He added that collections and repossessions are a good barometer in the car business and he said, "Collections are in good shape, and in 1960 we only had two repossessions. I'd have to say Lawrence is in a sound business position and we are certainly looking forward to a good business year."

The third dealer said he was expecting a good sales and profit year for 1961, "unless we let ourselves be talked into not buying. We're having a better February than last year, in fact we are heading for the best truck month we have ever had. The whole month has been well balanced. January was an average month—but we are looking forward to a fine year."

How about farmers living in the area. Are they buying? A farm equipment dealer answered, "Great, great," when asked how business had been. "Nationally our company is running about 61 percent ahead in tractor sales this year over the corresponding period last year. I wouldn't be surprised if I'm ahead of this figure."

A local resident in the grain and feed business said there is every indication 1961 is going to be a good year for the farmer, and if it is a good business year local businessmen are sure to benefit. "The moisture situation is good," he said. "The 1960 crops were excellent in this area, our livestock men are getting good prices and the price of eggs is good. I can't see how 1961 can keep from being a good year for everyone in this area. It sure is starting out that way."

What do the retail merchants along Massachusetts Street say about business? Are their sales figures going up? The manager of one large department store said, "February will be approximately 12 percent better than February 1960, and for the year we are running 14.3 percent ahead of a year ago. I'm budgeting a 15 percent gain in sales for the year. I'm real optimistic." Another department store manager said, "So far this year we have shown a moderate gain over a similar period last year—and 1960 was one of our best years. We anticipate a good gain for the year."

Some doubters might say, "Well it's obvious he only picked out businesses which are doing well. How about others?" The manager of one of the city's largest department stores said, "Business is pretty good. January was very fine, and February is nip and tuck. In fact the last couple of days in February may make the difference of topping last year's figures. I don't see any assurance or guarantee that business is going to come easy, as we are going to have to work for it. But what's wrong with that? It's the ones who are not willing to work for the business that usually do the complaining. We plan to work hard for increases and we are budgeting for a nice sales increase during 1961."

A men's clothing merchant said he had an 8 percent sales gain January and was heading for a 10 percent or better gain in February. "I don't think there's any doubt but

that we'll have a good year. Of course, the guys who sit around and cry about their business being poor should perhaps sit down and analyze themselves. Perhaps the blame should be on them rather than on poor business conditions. It's still up to the individual merchant himself to run a good business operation."

The first druggist contacted said his business had shown a 20-percent gain in January, with February likely to create a 24-percent increase over last year.

A shoestore owner reported a 30-percent gain in business in January, with February's business about the same. "I'm budgeted for a 12- to 13-percent gain for the year" he said, "and I think we will hit it."

A large supermarket reports business is running "above last year" and he said, "we are looking forward to a good year. We are going to have tough competition, nevertheless we're aiming for an increase."

An appliance dealer said, "Last year was extremely good. So far this year business has been good—in fact we're ahead of last year."

These remarks show that business is good in Lawrence. This also points up the fact that none of those quoted above thought good business in the coming months is "in the bag." They do think, however, they can have a good year if they work for it rather than sitting around worrying because some other areas of the United States are in a business slump.

The only worry expressed by the merchants is that people will begin to base their actions on the reports of bad business and unemployment in other areas of the country.

It is too bad there are so many unemployed across the United States and it is to be hoped this number can be reduced—but at the same time everyone should be aware that even with this high unemployment figure, more people are working and taking home paychecks in the United States than ever before.

Maybe it's time to quit singing the blues and start shouting about all the good things such as high-employment figures and record-breaking paychecks.

Address of Hon. John S. Gleason, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1961

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the members of the American Legion National Rehabilitation Conference were privileged to hear the Honorable John S. Gleason, Jr., recently appointed by our great President, to the office of Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, at their conference held at the Legion headquarters in Washington on February 28.

His treatment of the problems confronting the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs was interesting and informative. He approached a subject, which ordinarily would be dull and uninteresting, with a spicy oratorical treatment that held the undivided attention of his audience and impressed them with his down-to-earth statistical approach to the subject.

The Illinois Members of Congress are proud and happy to welcome their fellow Illinoisan to his new duties, although for many years Comrade Gleason has functioned in services to veterans in the field that he now administers. The veterans of the United States are fortunate in having one of their own, who understands the problems of the veteran so that there will be no delay in the administration of veteran matters within the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration.

His address to his comrades reflects the greatness of past national commander of the American Legion, John S. Gleason, Jr., and reveals his high sense of humility as a dedicated servant to the Nation:

REMARKS BY HON. JOHN S. GLEASON, JR., ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS, BEFORE THE AMERICAN LEGION NATIONAL REHABILITATION CONFERENCE, FEBRUARY 28, 1961

I am very happy to be here among so many men I am proud to call my friends.

I hope you will still consider me one of your friends, 1, 2, or more years from now, for our relationship will be a little changed—officially, at least.

A few years ago I had the great honor to serve as your national commander. I now stand before you as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, a post that I am proud and humble to have been appointed to by the President of the United States.

And so our official relationship shifts. Although I certainly count on continuing to be a part of your family, there may be times when you view me as something of an in-law.

But I hope you don't ever think of me the way one of our bank tellers thought of his mother-in-law.

His boss confronted the teller and said: "Joe, you're a liar. You asked for yesterday off to bury your mother-in-law, and yet I met her walking in the park this morning."

Joe thought fast, then said, "Sir, I didn't actually say she was dead. I just said I would like to go to her funeral."

My job is new to me, and as I view my assignment it will be to work as hard as I can—to the very best of my ability—to serve all veterans who fought for the United States of America.

But to do this I'll need all the help, all the cooperation, all the understanding I can possibly get from the American Legion and from other responsible veterans organizations.

And I am not too proud to go hat in hand to ask for it. For I know that the American Legion—and especially, you men sitting here today are the very embodiment of service to veterans.

Yet, today there are those who charge that leaders of veterans organizations are self-servers who continually lobby so that veterans may gorge at the public trough, or ride a perpetual gravy train of underserved benefits.

Such irresponsible allegations have been heard before, and they will be heard again. These charges are not new—and certainly they are not true.

Those who voice them should acquaint themselves with the facts. They should learn—as I have—that men like you and other leaders in this work have a sense of responsibility, high purpose and sincere dedication that is unexcelled in any walk of American life. To claim a disregard of national interest by veterans organizations is not to know—or to simply ignore—your many programs which are aimed at a stronger and better America.

For the past few weeks I have been learning about this vast Veterans' Administration I now head. Although I was not absolutely green about the agency, I have been amazed by its dimensions—up, down, in, out—measure it in any direction and the VA represents one big package.

The Veterans' Administration employs about 170,000 people—more people by the way, than live in Pasadena, Calif., Bridgeport, Conn., or Topeka, Kans.

The Veterans' Administration receives more mail each year than all of the people living in a city the size of Pittsburgh.

VA hospitals use more sheets and pillowcases per year than the combined amount used by 150 of our biggest hotels.

I've learned that the Veterans' Administration purchases more than 100 million eggs each year, and over 22 million aspirins annually.

Our people provide guardianship services for mere babes-in-arms, and pensions for Civil War widows and old Indian war fighters, to say nothing of benefits and services for millions of veterans of more recent wars.

As Administrator I find that I even hold title to some 66 cargo vessels that were torpedoed by U-boats in World War I. This makes me, I suppose, VA's Admiral of the Sunken Fleet—which is quite a title for an Army man.

I knew that the VA had to keep lots of records, but I was a little surprised to find that we have master index record cards on more than 30 million veterans, living, and dead. As you might expect, there are lots of Smiths on this roster—300,000 in fact—and about 13,000 of them are named Bill; 12,000 named Bob, and 11,000 named John.

I learned that I am keeping good company on the list along with 394 other John Gleasons, and there are 133 John F. Kennedys, including a former PT boat commander who now lives across the park from the VA building.

(Despite all this duplication, we found only eight Robert M. McCurdys, which just proves what I have always believed—you have to go a long way to find people like Bob McCurdy.)

Now, my purpose in detailing these statistics of magnitude and complexity is not to impress you. It is to ask your indulgence.

This I ask, because in an agency as vast as the VA there have always been and there always will be problems.

I am just beginning to get a closer look at some of the present areas of concern—at questions that deserve earnest consideration. Knowing the short time I've been on the job, it would be an insult to your intelligence for me to presume to know all the answers.

But I do want to emphasize this:

We will recognize and never hide from our problems, and.

We will identify the areas of concern whenever and whatever they might be.

Above all, we plan to meet our problems head on, and do our level best to achieve proper and reasonable solutions.

The very foundation of the Veterans' Administration is a sound and durable structure of benefits built by the Congress, in response to the will of the American people.

At the very core of this entire structure stands this single fundamental principle—service to veterans.

For in the Veterans' Administration, our job is to serve veterans, their widows, and their orphans in keeping with the laws of the land.

It may be that I'm old fashioned—or call me a fundamentalist if you will—but I happen to believe that service to veterans is the very reason for our existence. I believe that all projects and undertakings in the VA must be aimed at this goal of service.

Earlier this month when I first came with the Veterans' Administration I received my initial marching orders personally from President Kennedy. The President said he wanted a "speed up" in the payment of the quarter-billion dollar 1961 GI insurance

dividend as an aid to some 5 million veterans and as a stimulus to the Nation's economy. It is early in the game, but I have learned already that when the President wants action—he does mean action—and he means right now.

Considering that it normally takes a full 12 months to pay the dividend, the question we asked ourselves was, "How fast can we do it?"

At first we set our sights on completion by not later than June 30—which would cut in half the normal payment schedule—but we were determined to beat that date if we could.

Let me now give you the very latest report, which in my mind stands as a tremendous tribute to the willingness and energetic enterprise of all the people associated with our Department of Insurance.

As of today—VA employees who are working overtime—have completed the processing of over 3 million dividend payments.

Right now—at this moment—this program has pumped over $140 million into the American economy at a time it needed a lift.

What's more, it looks now like we will have this crash program completed by March 17, St. Patrick's Day, begorra.

This would mean completion of the crash program within about 6 weeks from the time President Kennedy ordered full speed ahead.

The VA has problems and challenges, but it also has friends and supporters, and you men in this room are typical of them.

And speaking of friends and supporters, I personally—the Veterans' Administration and veterans everywhere have lost one of their stanchest friends in the death of Watson B. Miller. He was a man of abiding wisdom and great understanding, truly a standard bearer for veterans of America.

But his spirit will go on, his great pioneering work will be carried forward by the Bob McCurdys, the John Corcorans, and by all of you.

Any Administrator of Veterans' Affairs needs lots of help and assistance to do his job. Fortunately, I have good help and great assistance right in the VA family, and at this time I would like to salute the loyalty, the dedication, and the competence of my coworkers that make the VA the great organization it is.

An administrator needs the cooperation and guidance that Congress can provide, and here again I consider myself blessed. The chairmen of the committees especially important to us—Senator BYRD, Senator MAGNUSON, Senator HILL, Senator YARBOROUGH; Congressman ALBERT THOMAS—and members of these committees are men of stature and sincere interest in the welfare of veterans.

But the veterans of America owe an even greater personal debt to Congressman OLIN TEAGUE, chairman of the only congressional committee devoted entirely and exclusively to their affairs. OLIN TEAGUE is tough, he is honest, he is kind, and he is fearless. The Veterans' Administration and its Administrator are most fortunate to have this man, and the dedicated members and staff of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs as our advisers on the Hill.

Perhaps most of all, however, I need the grassroots kind of understanding and constructive criticism that only the American Legion and other responsible veterans organizations can provide.

I am counting on your support, and I assure you that I will perform my job as Administrator to the very best of my abilities in order to merit your support.

Even with all this help, I might still need just a wee bit of the luck o' the Irish.

With my name and my face, it doesn't seem to me that this is too much to ask.

Thank you for inviting me to join in your sessions. It is good to be with old friends once again.

Revaluing Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. BARRY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, one of the smaller, but better, newspapers in this country is the Feather River Bulletin of Plumas County, Calif. Its editor is Rodney Alden, a man for whom I have great respect. Today an editorial of his came to my attention which was so thought provoking it seemed appropriate to bring it to the attention of the Congress:

REVALUING GOLD

When in 1934 the Roosevelt administration raised the price of gold to $35 an ounce it was to the accompaniment of dire predictions that the country would be ruined. After the fact, however, the prevailing sentiment was generally favorable—and in a great many cases the same voices that had been raised in opposition were now raised in approval. It illustrates one of the peculiarities of human nature, which instinctively assumes, as Voltaire put it, "that everything is exactly as it should be in this best of all possible worlds."

We have not the slightest doubt that voices of those opposed to increasing the price of gold again will again be heard largely in praise of the move—if it is ever taken. Indeed they indicate clearly, as they did before, that their opposition is based on instinct rather than reason. They tell us that to increase the official value of gold "would be, er, well, it's inflationary; I don't think it would be good for the country's economy."

There no doubt are those who, if the price of gold is to be boosted, would like to get their hands on as much of the stuff as possible and move it outside the United States until the new price becomes effective. Aside from that we see no evidence of any special interests at work, sitting behind the scenes and pulling strings, as the popular notion often has it in situations like this. It is simply a widespread instinctive opposition to change.

A recent headline on the financial page of the San Francisco Chronicle caught the eye. It said, "San Francisco Poll Opposes Gold Price Boost." Examination of the accompanying article disclosed it was about a poll taken by the Commonwealth Club of California among its members. Seven questions had been asked, the seventh being, "Should gold be revalued?". To this question 748 had answered yes, 1,187 no.

This is only about 3 to 2 against revaluing gold, which considering everything indicates a much more favorable sentiment than might have been expected. Take the same group a month after gold has been revalued and ask, "Was this the right thing to do?" and a good three quarters of the group would say yes.

As long as no change is made in the price of gold, just so long will the notion persist among some—probably the majority—that it should not be changed. The notion that somehow, in some way that can't be described or defined, control of the price of gold controls the economy, rather than the opposite. The notion that the gold is a symbol, or something, not a commodity—whereas in truth and in fact it is the commodity. The notion that to revalue gold is a basic, fundamental step to tinker with values, rather than the true fact values already have adjusted themselves. The notion that by being stubborn, by standing in defiance of the truth and the facts, bureaucracy can effectively prevent the workings of the law of supply and demand.

The truth is Uncle Sam's gold supply is draining away at an alarming rate. The truth is the price of gold is so artificially depresed that very little new gold is being mined in the United States. The truth is that if this situation is allowed to continue there will come a time when the U.S. Government has virtually no gold at all—when the real laws of economics prevail against the theories of the bureaucrats. When that time comes our bureaucrats in all probability will place a new official value on gold—and everybody who then holds gold, all over the world, will make a tidy profit. It's a pity the revaluation can't come before that happens—so as to solve a crisis before rather than after it arrives, and so as to make a little profit for Uncle Sam rather than for other people throughout the world.

Chicago Vote Frauds: Fact or Fiction?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD R. FINNEGAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 17, 1961

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, now that the furor has died down over the "alleged" vote fraud in Cook County, Ill., in the November election, it is possible to appraise with some objectivity the allegations that were sprayed with less than shotgun accuracy in the press across the United States. For those who prefer hearing both sides of a dispute before adjudging the defendant, our fair city of Chicago, guilty or innocent, I commend to them the following article by Mr. Robert Lerner of Lerner Home Newspapers of Chicago entitled, "Political Scientists Take Chicago Daily Newspapers to Task for Building Vote Fraud Allegations Into Fact," as published on February 14, 1961.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Three University of Chicago political scientists have concluded an exhaustive study of the November 8 general election in Chicago, and concluded that the charges of vote fraud were unsubstantiated in fact and amplified by the Republican bias of Chicago's four daily newspapers.

Profs. Herman Finer, Jerome Kerwin, and C. Herman Pritchett made the study, admitting that they were Democrats, saying their goal was to make a sober evaluation of the "charges which have created such an adverse image of Chicago."

In the 13-page introductory statement, the professors wrote, "the 1960 election in Chicago was, in fact, according to Republican U.S. District Attorney Robert Tieken, 'cleaner than usual.'"

"And yet," the statement continues, "this election was made the occasion for an unjustified and unsubstantiated attack of extraordinary violence on Chicago's civic reputation. The assault was led by the official heads of the Republican Party in Illinois and especially Cook County, and was aided by the Republican National Committee.

"But indiscriminate and irresponsible charges of thievery, corruption, and fraud are not an acceptable method of contesting election results. This fact was recognized by the Vice President (Richard) Nixon at his farewell press conference (when he said), 'I believe, first, that the time to work for correcting such evils is before election day. And, second, I must point out that no party has a monopoly on this type of cheating.' "

However, the professors see Chicago's four daily newspapers as almost solely responsible for the image of fraud built up to nationwide proportions.

"The Chicago newspapers printed these charges," the introductory statement concludes, "seldom pointing out the lack of supporting evidence for them. Moreover, the newspapers themselves became participants in the campaign to picture the election as fraudulent, and on their own account repeated, multiplied and pyramided the charges of fraud in day-to-day crescendo.

"To meet the requirements of the campaign, minor incidents and irregularities were repeatedly blown up into the appearance of major and intentional frauds. (The report) covers an ample and representative sample of the stories that appeared, and shows the pattern and technique of the propaganda campaign conducted by the metropolitan press."

The heart of the professors' charges against the newspapers lies in one paragraph in the introduction:

"The newspapers may argue that they only carried the quotations of officials, candidates and others who were active in the election—that they did not themselves make the charges and accusations. But what actually happened in many cases was that the newspapers would carry stories of the allegations; then make the allegations charges; then make the charges facts; then make the facts conclusions—the conclusions being that the election was stolen in Chicago."

The statement recapitulated five facts about the 1960 election, facts that are intended to support the claim that the impressions given by Chicago's daily newspapers are erroneous.

They are:

1. A recheck of the voting machines gave Nixon a net gain of 312 votes out of 1,780,000 cast, "an amazingly accurate reporting of the vote."

2. The recheck of the voting machines in the State's attorney's race resulting in a net gain of 435 votes for Adamowski.

3. On the "discovery recount" of paper ballots, Adamowski gained a net of 6,342 out of 417,000 votes, leaving him 20,000 votes short of victory.

4. The State electoral board of four Republicans and one Democrat certified the Kennedy victory in the State on the grounds that there was not sufficient evidence of fraud in Cook County to change the results of the canvass.

5. The first assistant U.S. attorney, Albert F. Manion, was quoted extensively in the press regarding the possibility of a number of indictments being returned by the Federal grand jury, and hundreds of complaints were reported as having been referred to the grand jury for possible prosecution. Yet the December grand jury returned only two indictments and the January jury didn't return any.

The 35-page actual report is entitled "Analysis of Chicago Newspaper Stories in the 1960 Election," and rips apart the meanings of the headlines appearing in all four newspapers between November 9, 1960, and December 15, 1960.

To quote a few of the examples made in the report:

"One of the first charges of election irregularities was made by the Committee on Honest Elections headed by David H. Brill. This committee claimed to be nonpartisan and permanent. In fact, practically all its members were Republican. It seemed to have been set up just before the election for the purposes of the November 8 election alone.

"On November 8 and 9, in the Daily News, the committee alleged its clean election drive had prevented a minimum of 100,000 fraudulent votes in Cook County. The very word fraudulent prejudged the case, and no basis for the 100,000 figure was ever given, although it became a figure often repeated by top Republican officials and newspapers."

"The term 'fake votes' was used in a very heavy headline by the Daily News on November 9, giving the reader the impression that fake votes were proven, whereas they were only an allegation made by interested parties."

On November 9, "the Chicago Tribune began to participate. Its headline article put the word 'error' in quotes in the allegation that 10,000 had been denied the right to vote. Without any evidence it charged 'names illegally taken from lists.'

"In the body of the article thus headlined, all that appeared was that Mrs. (Marie) Suthers (the one Republican on the three-man board of election commissioners) charged that the names were omitted from the lists. She blamed laxity on the part of precinct captains during October, and so far she did not charge fraud."

On November 10, the American's heavy headline said, "Hundreds Face Vote Fraud Quiz." To that, Professors Finer, Kerwin, and Pritchett comment, "It would have been more faithful to the public to have said, 'hundreds face possible vote fraud quiz.'

"The tentative nature of the information actually at its disposal may be seen from some subsequent lines in the same article (quoting Manion). The American says, 'Entire first ward precinct may be summoned before jurors to answer complaints about chain voting, multiple voting, and the buying of votes.' "

"The reader should notice," says the political scientists, "the terms 'may be' and 'complaints.' What has been done here is to call names by false information in the headline and then to hedge in the body of the article."

Later in November, when the seal had been broken on a ballotbox, and it was revealed that it had been broken simply because ballots were in the wrong place and had to be removed, the Sun-Times headlines screamed, "Voting Records Disappear" and "Grand Jury Begins Fraud Search Today."

This indictment of the headlines and stories in the four daily newspapers is a powerful one, coming close to accusing the newspapers of out-and-out use of propaganda techniques in its news columns. None of the daily papers is exempted from blame, and the professors indicate that the papers intentionally played light with the facts in order to lead the public into the Republican camp.

The professors cite a number of people as being responsible for the "irresponsible and unsubstantiated charges" that gave the newspapers constant fuel. Among them are Adamowski, Francis X. Connell, George Dapples, Ralph Berkowitz, Manion, William Fetridge, Frank Durham, Homer Hargrave Jr., Thruston Morton and Elroy Sandquist Jr. All are Republican leaders.

At one point the report attempts to investigate the motives that prompted the newspapers to "keep up the attack" even though there was no proof, no substantiation, and possibility of changing the results of the election.

"On November 27," the report declares, "the Sun-Times gave away the motive for the many accusations of fraud. It printed a story headed 'Illinois GOP Has an Issue for 1962: Vote-Fraud Charges.' This article, written by Art Petacque, states:

" 'The party has a ready-made issue for 1962, when Illinois will again elect a U.S. Senator and a slate of Congressmen.' And then the reporter points out what he believes to be the motive for the vote fraud charges.

" 'If their recount effort comes to naught, and if their charges produce not a single indictment, Republicans, nevertheless, can sit back and watch the Democrats juggle the sizzling vote fraud issue, and make plans for its use in 1962 by keeping it in the public eye.' "

This statement, which indicates that the Republicans are yelling vote fraud—with the newspapers' help—simply to discredit the Democrats in the hopes of improving the GOP position in 1962, is considered an accurate one by Finer, Kerwin and Pritchett.

The efforts at raising issues without reference to fact is represented by the November 12 Daily News, which quotes Fetridge (chairman of the Midwest Volunteers for Nixon-Lodge), as having recalled that "in 1952 Secretary of State Carpentier was an apparent loser by 10,000 votes, but the recount made him a winner by 9,000."

The professors chide the Daily News with this statement: "But the fact is that there was no recount in the 1952 election for Secretary of State. Surely the files of the Daily News would have readily revealed this fact."

Col. Roger Taylor: A Distinguished Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therewith an editorial which appeared in the Charleston, S.C., News and Courier on February 28, 1961, extolling the fine character of Col. Roger Taylor.

Charleston has lost one of its outstanding citizens. As a distinguished military leader Colonel Taylor possessed the unusual ability of handling one of the most difficult military assignments in our section of America during World War II. In his retirement, he was one of Charleston's most valued citizens.

The character of Col. Roger Taylor made him singular among men. The memory of the life he lived will endure in my community as long as this community itself endures.

COL. ROGER TAYLOR

A soldier in two wars, Col. Roger Taylor commanded the Army Ordnance Depot at Charleston from 1937 to 1944 during a period of great expansion. After retirement he settled here as a permanent resident. Colonel Taylor and his wife, a native Char-

lestonian, were welcome additions to Charleston society.

A gentleman in all the best senses of the word, Colonel Taylor also was a man of keen intellect, conservative judgment and patriotic motives. Along with these qualities he had a sense of humor and courtesy of manner that made his company always agreeable. A metallurgical engineer by profession, Colonel Taylor had a notable business career before entering military service in World War I. He remained in the Army, and even after retirement toward the end of World War II, served his country in a civilian capacity in New Caledonia, until 1946.

The News and Courier expresses in behalf of the community a sense of profound regret at the death of this good citizen at the age of 82. We shall miss him and cherish his memory.

The Crisis in the Precious Metals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in my remarks an address delivered by Dr. Elgin Groseclose, of Washington, D.C., before the Colorado Mining Association in Denver on February 18. The title of the speech is "The Crisis in the Precious Metals." I am sure the remarks of Dr. Groseclose will be of great interest to the Members of the House. The speech follows:

THE CRISIS IN THE PRECIOUS METALS

(By Elgin Groseclose)

Members and friends of the Colorado Mining Association, I welcome this opportunity to be in Denver again to meet many old friends and to make new friends.

I welcome this occasion to discuss recent monetary developments affecting the precious metals, gold and silver, and the industry that produces them. I will speak first of the happenings as they affect gold producers. The gold drain from the United States that is now troubling statesmen is, of course, front-page news. What is not so generally known is that the drain has been in progress for over 10 years and that the decade is the first in American history to record a net loss in the country's gold reserve. What heightens the gravity of these facts is that the drain has been going on in a period of extraordinary commercial and industrial activity accompanied by an expansion of monetary transactions that required increasing the gold reserves to maintain their validity.

THE SITUATION SUMMARIZED

Here are some of the basic facts of the situation:

1. Industrial output in the Western World has been expanding at the rate of about five percent per annum.

2. In the decade 1950–60 free world currency supply increased by about 60 percent. In North America this increase was 16 percent, in Latin America 400 percent, and in Europe 100 percent.

3. Free gold supply to support this currency expansion has increased less than 15 percent.

4. To provide acceptable reserves for these currencies, governments have been turning more and more to dollars, in the form of deposits in U.S. banks and holdings of Treasury bills. Such holdings by foreign central banks and institutions increased from less than $3 billion in 1949 to $10 billion currently.

5. Further to strengthen their reserves foreign banks have been buying gold from the United States to the total of $7 billion since 1949.

6. Foreign private interests, not completely trusting their own currencies, have been leaving their money on deposit here and have been buying Treasury securities, long-term bonds, stock market securities, or even currency. The total of such holdings, including the official holdings referred to above, have increased by $27 billion since the end of the war and currently stands in excess of $31 billion net of corresponding short-term assets held abroad by U.S. citizens. This $31 billion represents the size of the potential claims upon U.S. gold stock, since all of these assets are relatively liquid and convertible through the international banking mechanim.

SOURCE OF PAYMENTS DEFICIT

At this point the question arises: Where did foreigners get the money to buy all those gold and dollar assets? Year after year we have continued to export more merchandise than we have bought. It is true that we spend sizable sums abroad on sightseeing and souvenir buying, and our churches and charities are continually remitting large sums for various worthy causes. But these expenditures have not been important enough to offset our favorable trade balances, investment, and other income. The explanation, long denied in official quarters, but now reluctantly admitted, is the heavy international commitment for the maintenance of world peace by bases and garrisons abroad and a global program of foreign aid.

Total expenditures under various postwar programs is in excess of $80 billion. This is not the place to argue the validity of much of this expenditure, but we may remark on the quixotic nature of a policy that finds merit in balancing the international accounts of other countries at the cost of our own balance, and in incurring budget deficits at home to meet budget deficits of other countries.

THE U.S. GOLD POSITION STATED

It is what all this has done to our own monetary and fiscal position that is here of interest. Let me summarize a few points:

(a) In 1949 the Treasury held a gold stock of $24.4 billion as final reserves against banking and currency liabilities of $170 billion; currently a gold stock of $17½ billion supports banking and currency liabilities of $260 billion. The gold reserve ratio, less than 7 percent, is now at the level just preceding the great crash of 1933.

(b) The deficit in the balance of payments in 1960 was $3.8 billion, plied on top of a $7.3 billion deficit for the preceding 2 years, all contributing to a continuation of the gold drain and further weakening of the U.S. monetary position.

FATUOUS AND FEEBLE REMEDIES

We now turn to some of the proposals that have been put forward to correct the condition and stem the deterioration of the dollar. Because of the eminence of their advocates they deserve careful examination.

The first proposal is one so seemingly reasonable, innocuous, and touching so few interests, that it was promptly put into execution by means of a Presidential order on January 14. This order forbids any U.S. citizen or resident of the United States to acquire, hold in his possession, earmark, or retain any interest in any gold coin, gold certificates, or gold bullion situated outside of the United States, or even to buy or hold securities substantially secured by gold.

This order should be examined in the light of our historic tradition, and its conformity with the national tendencies and purposes. These purposes, since 1776, have been to proclaim and establish a more perfect liberty among human beings.

The process of extinction of human liberty always begins at the fringes. Tyrants, autocrats, dictators, and bureaucrats never assault the citadel; they begin in areas of agreement, or where the deprivation of liberty affects only a few and these, generally, who seem to be the privileged few. Once the principle is accepted by which the minority are squeezed from their foothold, a larger step is taken.

GOLD ORDER AND BRITISH NAVIGATION ACTS COMPARED

I mention these considerations because of the similarity between the Presidential order forbidding U.S. residents to acquire gold abroad and British legislation of the 17th century enacted with almost identical purpose. The imposition upon human liberty that finally led to the Battles of Lexington and Concord began with a seemingly appropriate measure to prevent a drain on the British monetary resources. This was the Navigation Act of 1651, which required the products of the colonies to be transported in British ships, thereby saving this much for the national account.

The reasoning behind the Presidential order is deceptively logical and appealing. Residents of the United States, it is explained, have been prohibited since 1934 from holding gold in this country, and it is only natural that the prohibition be extended to prohibit the holding of gold anywhere by U.S. residents. A collateral reason, one distinguished exponent of this viewpoint stated, is that "the purchase of gold abroad is, in practice, a privilege of rather limited availability".

The Presidential statement frankly conceded that the measure is one of limited effect. "It is not believed that a large amount of gold is being held abroad in this manner", it said.

One wonders, in the light of this admission, at the growing effrontery of officialdom is encroaching upon individual liberty.

Here, I respectfully submit, is an illustration of the process by which a free people are skillfully maneuvered into a state of submission to bureaucratic tyranny without their being aware of it.

Since only a few persons are in a position to buy gold abroad, it is easy to rouse an emotional resentment against them by means of a superficial logic. Once they have been compelled to submit to a fiat from Washington it is a simple matter to extend the power and authority of Washington to other classes of the citizenry.

PRECEDENT SET FOR OTHER SEIZURES

Now, I have heard of a well-to-do gentleman in Washington who is the proprietor of a French vineyard, acquired while living abroad. Surely this is a privilege of rather limited availability. I have heard of other well-to-do citizens who hold expensive grouse shooting preserves in Scotland and Kenya. If holders of gold may be compelled to divest themselves of their ownership in the hope that it will solve the embarrassment of a monetary regime in Washington, may we not expect the next step to be a prohibition of Americans owning vineyards and hunting preserves abroad, and after that lands and estates of any sort, or art objects, or even Paris gowns? And what shall we say of the branch factories and installations of U.S. business abroad? To what ends may this autocratic exercise of power proceed?

Let us touch upon another dilemma in this ill-conceived regulation, as carelessly thought through as the order compelling families of our troops in Germany to return home—now happily rescinded.

How do you go about enforcing such an order? Let us note that the vineyard owner

in this country must pay a stamp tax on the wine he makes from his grapes. Adopting the logic of the Presidential order, shall the Internal Revenue Service attempt to compel the unlucky proprietor of a French vineyard to buy revenue stamps for each gallon of wine produced from his grape harvest?

Note a further absurdity of the order. It applies to any person "subject to the jurisdiction of the United States." This includes French citizens and other foreigners resident here. Will the Treasury attempt to compel a French citizen here to divest himself of any gold he may have in his bank over in France?

GOLD AND THE NATIONAL INTEREST

It is argued that gold stands in a special category, that national policy is involved in gold as in the case of no other commodity. Let us examine this viewpoint. A few years ago it was national policy to forbid the manufacture or sale of alcoholic beverages. During the era of the most fervid enforcement of prohibition, did any one rise to assert that an American citizen should also be forbidden to have a cellar in his London club, or to ferment, bottle, consume, or otherwise dispose of the product of his French vineyard, assuming he were the fortunate proprietor of a French vineyard? It is generally believed that with the repeal of prohibition the country passed from an era of irrationality into one of sanity. It may be noted that the same year that witnessed the repeal of prohibition witnessed the suspension of currency redemption and the disappearance of gold from private posession. In the fanaticism with which the prohibition upon the ownership and trade in gold is being enforced, we may rightly conclude that we are still in an era of irrationality.

Here is what a distinguished banker says: "When people living here buy gold in foreign markets, observers abroad tend to exaggerate the significance. The buying of speculators and eccentrics is likely to be mistaken for signs of concern among responsible investors."

Speculators, you will note, are equated with eccentrics and both are likely to be confused with responsible citizens. This would suggest that Europeans are sadly lacking in discrimination or that the difference between responsible citizens and eccentrics is a hairline.

GOLD AS A GOVERNMENT MONOPOLY

The fact is that the monetary theories in vogue today lead to such absurdities as to justify the conclusion that the monetary theories themselves are absurd. Let us examine the basic absurdity behind these lesser absurdities. This is the notion that gold is good for governments to possess but not for individuals.

"We should make clear," says a leading banker and exponent of the new monetary economics, "what our gold is for, namely, for making international settlements, not for redeeming our currency and deposits."

Upon this logic, it is being urged in several high circles that we abolish our 25-percent gold reserve requirement against notes and deposits and use the whole gold reserve to settle our foreign balances.

Now, the obvious question is, if gold is of no use to individuals, of what use is it to governments? Why should governments continue to buy up annually about 85 percent of new mine production of gold? Why don't they use this money to pay social security benefits, pay off the debt, or whatever governments use money for?

The answer is that gold is valuable because it is the ultimate form of wealth, and the monopoly of gold is the most effective monopoly of power so far available. The monopoly of gold is, in short, the denial of all democracy and individual liberty, and all the traditions of our history that assert that the monopoly of power should rest with people, rather than the government.

The monopoly of gold in central bank vaults is not only the essence of political tyranny but in practice is a political absurdity. In theory, the monopoly is for the purpose of stabilizing the currents of economic life; practically it fosters inflation by means of speculation and hoarding of other forms of wealth, notably securities. May I illustrate the process by an example from personal experience?

During World War II, Iran faced a condition of runaway inflation, caused by flooding the country with paper currency to meet the financial costs of the British, Russian, and American troops, then occupying the country. From the standpoint of monetary theory, the paper rial was the most highly backed in the world, secured as it was with all the financial power of the three greatest sovereignties of the world, and with dollar and sterling exchange as well as with gold in New York and South Africa. Moreover, it was freely exchangeable with dollars and sterling at a fixed rate. Actually, it was becoming well nigh worthless.

The trouble was that the sterling and dollar exchange were of no immediate value, since they could not be used for buying goods, and the gold was in South Africa and New York, instead of Iran, where it was needed. Distrusting the depreciating rials, the well-to-do were buying up coils of copper wire, or copper bars,and jars of wheat, as a means of conserving their savings. Copper was in need for firearms and wheat was so scarce that near famine prevailed. Such, however, is human nature, and money is an instrument for dealing with the exigencies of a world filled with imperfect human beings.

In January 1943, I went to Iran as one of a group of advisers to the Iranian Government, and was appointed to the statutory post of Treasurer General by action of the Iranian Parliament. My chief task was to devise means of combating the inflation, and my chief resource was my experience 20 years earlier in the hard money economy in Iran and a fantastic inflation in the nearby Soviet Caucasus.

On examining the situation against the background of this earlier experience, I recommended that gold be put to its historic use as a store of value. I proposed that instead of financing the occupation costs with dollar and sterling exchange, gold be brought out and put on the market. Happily, my recommendation was adopted. Gold was freighted out by air and put on sale. People began to turn in their coils of copper, their Ali Baba jars of wheat, for pieces of gold, which in any case, were better for the purpose of hoarding. Goods began to reappear in the market, the value of the Iranian rial steadied, the inflation was curbed, and the fiscal policy of financing military costs by gold was extended throughout the Middle East war theater.

The point will be made that we in the United States are in an advanced stage of civilization that no longer requires gold in circulation as a store of value, a medium of payments. This view ignores two fundamentals of history—one, the psychology of prestige; the other, the services of the precious metals in times of emergency.

IMITATION OF BAD EXAMPLE

As to the first, we must note the profound influence throughout the world exercised by the policies and practices followed in this country. Potentates in remote areas of Africa must have motorcycle outriders as they drive through their dusty capitals, because the President of the United States has motorcycle outriders. "My Fair Lady" is as much a standard of musical excellence in Moscow as in New York. And the policy of a government holding 40 percent of the world's gold stock that forbids its citizens to hold gold or trade in gold is regarded as the epitome of political wisdom among emerging and inmature sovereignties of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East. In imitation of our managed money practices they institute central banks of issue and hold symposia on reserve ratios, exchange quotas, and the balance of payments while their children run naked in the bush and their servants puzzle over the incomprehensible hieroglyphics on the paper they receive as their wages.

The attempt to operate managed money systems is a major cause of the economic ills we are seeking to cure by our multibillion-dollar aid programs. We can see the disaster of managed money wherever we look, but we will direct your attention to one country only. Brazil is a land of fabled wealth; its cities are places of enchanted beauty; from its fields and mines pour a wealth of products into the export markets. But Brazil is in chronic economic difficulties and has been bailed out repeatedly by Export-Import Bank loans and other financial assistance from abroad.

If you seek an explanation of the recurrent crises you can do no better than to examine the hodgepodge of exchange rates by which business is compelled to make its transactions, and note the erratically downward tendency of the Brazilian cruzeiro, which has slipped during the past decade to about a sixth of its former value.

The Export-Import Bank and the International Monetary Fund have repeatedly pressed the Brazilian authorities on their currency mismanagement, but to what effect? What example of sound money practice do we offer them? I am reminded of Aesop's fable of the two crabs. The mother crab scolded her offspring for walking continually sideways. "Do you show me how to walk straight, and I will follow", said the wise young one.

The International Monetary Fund was organized by some 28 nations as a mutual provident association to provide a hospital bed for sick currencies. Promptly 28 currencies jumped into bed leaving the dollar to act as nurse. Now that the dollar is sick, who is to act as nurse?

PRECIOUS METALS AS STRATEGIC RESERVES

Second, the precious metals are the most important reserves in the economic arsenal of a sovereignty. While mercantilism—the direction of the economy of a nation to the accumulation of precious metals—has passed off the scene since the industrial revolution, its basic premise has not lost validity. In times of national and personal emergency, forms of movable wealth are highly convenient. They sustain a country's credit, they maintain the independence and security of the individual.

DEPLETION OF GOLD AND SILVER RESERVES

In this era of peace, our stocks of gold and silver are being depleted at a rate that would suggest that we are in the midst of a life and death struggle with a mortal enemy. Since I have mentioned silver, let me illustrate my meaning with a few recollections from history. Beginning in 1871, the sovereignties of Europe and the United States demonetized silver, replacing the metal with gold as the standard and paper notes for circulation. Beginning in 1900, those powers demonetized silver in their colonial dependencies, and good silver coinage became scarce throughout Asia. When World War I broke out, the population of India lost confidence in the paper money secured by British sterling. To save India from collapse, the British Treasury was compelled to provide the Indian authorities with large quantities of silver for the purchase of needed war mate-

rials and services. To find this silver the British Government had to appeal to the United States, and under the Pittman Act some 250 million silver dollars were melted down and shipped to India.

WARTIME DEMAND FOR SILVER

Following World War I, the process of demonetization was resumed, and much of this demonetized silver found its way to the U.S. Treasury through the Silver Purchase Act of 1934. At the maximum on May 6, 1942, the Treasury held 1,366 million ounces of seigniorage silver—that is, silver not included in the monetary reserve. With the outbreak of World War II, the conditions of 1918 returned. Throughout Asia, people refused to accept paper money at its face. Fearing Japanese invasion, fearing famine or unemployment, and the necessity of flight, they wanted easily movable wealth. Rajahs and maharajahs might sew diamonds and rubies in the lining of their clothes when they had to flee; the wealthy could perhaps hide a few bars of gold; but for the peasant, the servant, the cobbler, and the carpenter and the little shopkeeper in the alley, a few pieces of good silver would serve. To meet the insistent demand from these inchoate millions, the Treasury vaults were again opened and over 400 million ounces were shipped abroad.

More than this, it was suddenly discovered that in our electronic and nuclear age, silver was a metal of vast strategic potential, and over 900 million ounces were lent to industry for various war uses.

MONETARY REVOLUTION IN SILVER

Now, in the years since the war, to the great surprise of economists who have long denigrated silver as money, a monetary revolution in silver is in progress. Parking meters, automats, coin laundries, and vending machines are voracious users of silver. To fill their capacious maws over 46 million ounces of silver were minted last year. All over the free world, coinage and industrial demand require over 320 million ounces annually or over 1½ times the new mine output, estimated for 1960 at 202 million ounces.

Silver mining, as you, of course, know, has been depressed for close to a century. Some two-thirds of newly mined domestic silver comes as a byproduct of copper, lead, and zinc production. Silver has been depressed because of the competition it has had to face since 1870 from melted-down silver coinage coming into the market. Very little of that now remains. Handy and Harman identify something like 150 million ounces of demonetized coins in India and Mexico. Silver prices have been gradually moving upward since the end of the war, until they bumped against a ceiling 3 or 4 years ago. Since 1956 the Treasury has been a seller in the market at 91 cents an ounce under the discretionary authority given the Secretary by the act of 1946.

TREASURY SALES OF SILVER DECRIED

As a consequence of its sales to industry and its own coinage requirements, Treasury free stocks have now dropped to a tenth of their 1942 maximum and today stand at less than 120 million ounces, or about 3 years supply at current rate of outgo.

Silver miners are justified, I think, in their position that the interests of the Government, both in maintaining an adequate reserve of silver for its coinage and its stategic needs, and a virile domestic mining industry, demand a cessation of sales to industry. My own view goes somewhat further. While I have never supported a bimetallic standard, I have long been convinced that silver continues to have a monetary role as significant as that of gold. In the Northern Hemisphere this role is as subsidiary coinage, but among the vast populations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, silver should be restored to the standard of value.

We are spending billions of dollars every year to stabilize the economies of their regions, to meet the deficits in capital formation and to promote greater capital formation.

Now capital formation is simply an economist's 5-dollar word for "a penny saved is a penny earned." People will not save—as we know in this country—when they see the value of their savings eroded by the depreciation of their money. And in those countries where the paper note issues have been expanding at rates of up to 40 percent a year, there is no incentive to save.

SILVER AS AN AGENCY OF ECONOMIC REFORM

But you can encourage saving—capital formation—if you give them good money. Among people so generally poverty stricken as these a piece of silver the size of a quarter represents wealth. In the old days these pieces were accumulated, one by one, to form a necklace or an anklet, and the man's wife became his savings bank against the day of famine and disaster—or happily the day of opportunity to buy a shop, or a piece of ground. We could do much to put these countries again on the road to prosperity and political contentment, and save ourselves billions of dollars in aid money, if we would encourage their governments to restore good silver money to circulation in place of the fiat and depreciating paper issues that now so inadequately serve the purpose.

Regrettably, I am pessimistic about the outlook. I find no appreciation in official circles of the tremendous potential which good silver money can exercise in promoting healthy, expanding economies. Nor do I find any serious effort toward abating the burden on the American economy and stopping the gold drain by reducing our foreign aid and military commitments. I am not hopeful that the measures so far offered will meet the condition. They all reveal an unwillingness to face the realities.

From the standpoint of the producer of precious metals, these conditions are a forecast of a better relationship between revenue and expense, and more profitable operations. It is becoming generally evident that the Treasury cannot much longer maintain a ceiling on the market price of silver through its policy of sales at 91 cents. When the Treasury's silver stock is exhausted, in the course of the next year or so, we may look for silver prices to move upward to the level of $1.29 an ounce. Some fear that this upward movement may be explosive or erratic, to the disruption of markets and hardships of all including the miner. They would like to see the Treasury taper off its sales and use its remaining stock of free silver not to supply the market, but to stabilize the market and to maintain an orderly movement of prices.

At the $1.29 level, a new factor enters. At that price the nearly 2 billion ounces of monetary reserve silver becomes available. At that price, or a little above, it will become profitable to turn in silver certificates for silver. When this situation arrives, we may hope that the higher price will have brought sufficient new production into being to satisfy the industrial demand and to keep the silver mining industry in a state of modest profitability.

OUTLOOK FOR GOLD

The timetable for gold is not so predictable, but the signposts are plain as to where we are headed.

There is a scarcity of gold in the world to meet the monetary commitments based on gold. Some further successes may be achieved in economizing gold—to use the sophistry of monetary economists—but a revaluation of currencies in terms of gold is inevitable. The U.S. gold stock is diminishing and the claims on it continue to increase. The burden upon the falling U.S. gold stock is heavier than in 1932.

We can watch the clouds gathering; we can foretell the storm, we cannot foretell the hour; but we can be certain it will not pass.

Birmingham's Festival of Arts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, since 1961 is the centennial year of the War Between the States the "Festival of Arts" in Birmingham chose as its theme "Salute to the South." This Festival of Arts is an annual event and consists of a number of cultural and social events.

This year the principal event of the Festival was a "Celebrity Homecoming" to which a number of Birmingham natives and southerners with Birmingham connections were invited. All of these people have achieved considerable success in their chosen fields of endeavor and are widely known for their accomplishments and renown.

The list includes people who have had success in the entire gamut of human activities from sports to Nobel prize winners. Included are artists, actors, architects, admen, journalists, writers, and window dressers. It is a list which reflects the cultural vitality of a city of which the Nation can indeed be proud.

I include herewith the list of distinguished guests at the 1961 Birmingham Festival of Arts:

CELEBRITIES INVITED TO THE FESTIVAL OF ARTS, 1961

Hugh Abernathy, drama; May Allison (Mrs. Carl Osborne), Cleveland, Ohio, movies; Mel Allen, radio; Mary Anderson (Mrs. Leon Shamroy), Hollywood, Calif., movies; Buddy Anderson, in care of Lou Snitzer and Al Fritiz, Hollywood, Calif., movies.

Tallulah Bankhead, drama; Jack Barefield, New York, N.Y., playwright; John Baragray; Gene Bayliss, Westport, Conn., drama; Reuben Bell, Sylacauga, Ala.; Bill Berney; Nash Burger, New York Times; Gage Bush (Mrs. Richard Englund), New York, ballet; J. K. Buttersworth, Mississippi A. & M. College, Starksville, Miss., writer, "South of Appomatox"; Jimmy Britton, Manhattan Beach, Calif., drama; Joe Braswell, New York, decorator; Joe Bell, Alpha Portland Cement Co., New York; Johnny Mack Brown, Hollywood, Calif., movies; Ben Baldwin, Chicago, designer; Barrett, dean of School of Journalism, Columbia University, New York, journalism; Betty Baldwin, Denver, Colo; Bonnie Bolding, Corpus Christi, Tex., movies.

Jerry Cadek (Mrs. George Lucktenburg), Conservatory of Music, Chattanooga, Tenn., violin; Hodding Carter, Greenville, Miss., journalism; Alice Chalifoux, Cleveland, Ohio, harpist; Mr. and Mrs. Valentine Crescenzi, Dallas, Tex., decorators; George Cornish, journalism, ex-managing editor, Herald-Tribune, New York; Helen Claire, Montgomery, Ala., drama; James Saxon Childers, Tupper & Love, Inc., Atlanta, Dunwoody, Ga., writer; Frank Moore Cross, Jr., Lexington, Mass., oriental scholar.

Jeff Davis III.; Mr. and Mrs. Borden Deal, Tuscaloosa, Ala., both writers; Martha Dean; Evelyn Dahl, Mobile, writer.

Genie Earle, Crestline; Douglas Edwards, Columbia Broadcasting Co., New York, radio-TV; Lehman Engel, New York, composer.

Wilson, Folmar, New York; William Faulkner, University of Virginia, writer; Louise Fletcher (Mrs. Jerome Bick), Los Angeles, Calif., TV; Peter Flourny, Dick Fitzpatrick, Mr. and Mrs. Scott Forbes, London; Ray Furr, Mississippi State College for Women, Columbus, Miss., radio-TV.

Lili Gentle (Mrs. Richard Zannuck), Beverly Hills, Calif., movies; Eddie Gilmore, London, England, journalism, Associated Press reporter; Virginia McDavid Goodson, Miss Alabama, TV; Mrs. Sterling Graydon, Greenwood, S.C., writer; Alex Grammas, St. Louis Cardinal, St. Louis, Mo., baseball.

Gwen Harmon, Hollywood, Miss Alabama, singer; Ossie Hawkins, Metropolitan Opera, New York; Sarah Henderson Hay (Mrs. Nikolai Lopatnikoff), Pittsburgh, Pa., poet; Bob Hiden, London, England, decorator; Senator and Mrs. Lister Hill, Washington, politics; Sally Hill, Progressive Farmer, journalism; William Bradford Huie, Hartselle, Ala., writer; Congressman and Mrs. George Huddleston, Birmingham; Frank House, Cincinnati Reds, Cincinnati, Ohio, baseball; Emmett Holcomb, New York, florist, decorator.

Charles Ireland, Ambassador East, Chicago, Ill., vulcan materials executive; Colleen Ireland (Mrs. Charles Henri Sevene), Versailles, France—La Filolie, St. Amand de Coly, Montignac, Dordogne, France, winemakers of France.

Scott Jackson; Irene Jordan (Mrs. Arnold Caplan), New Rochelle, singer.

Harnett Kane; Charles Kleibacker, New York, designer.

Douglas Leigh, New York; Harper Lee, New York, writer; Arthur Lipkin, Hotel Sachur, Vienna, conductor; Nan Leader, Pasadena Playhouse, Beverly Hills, Calif., actress.

Ellen and Hugh Martin, Asa Maynor, Linda Meade, Natchez, Miss., Miss America; Mary Ann Mobley, Brandon, Miss., Miss America; Gene Moore, in care of Tiffanys, New York, window decorator; Martha Moore, King Merritt, New York, Sally Lee Maloney, Mobile, Ala., drama.

John Newfield, Columbia Motion Pictures, Publicity Dept., New York, Lula Jean Norman, Dale Nunnlay.

Gail Patrick, (Mrs. Cornwell Jackson), Hollywood, Calif., actress; Gov. and Mrs. John Patterson, Montgomery, Ala.; Sylvia Pizitz, New York; Robert Kelly Posey, Office: Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, Scarsdale, N.Y., architect, Skidmore, Owings & Merrill.

Nell Rankin, New York, Wayne Rogers, Beverly Hills, Calif., actor on TV, Stagecoach West; Catherine Rogers, Camp Hill, Ala., Rella Rudolph, Paris, France, artist; James H. Rives, Fauquier County, Va.; Dr. Paul Rudolph, dean of architecture, Yale School of Fine Arts.

Elise Ayres Sanquinetti (Mrs. Philip Sanquinetti), Pittsburgh 13, Pa.; Jack Smith, Washington, D.C., architect; Zeke Smith, Baltimore Colts, Baltimore, Md., football; George Kitter Smith, architect; Senator and Mrs. John Sparkman, Washington, D.C.; Bill Sprating, Taxco, Guerro, Mexico, ceramics; Arthur Stewart, Cannarie Island, artist; Hudson Strode, University, Ala., writer; Hugh Stubbins, Jr., Cambridge, Mass., architect; Syd Ricketts Summer; Robert E. Sessions, Evansville, Ind., Mead-Johnson vice president.

Mary Elizabeth Talmadge, New York, advertising executive Young & Rubicam, New York; Guy Taylor, Phoenix Symphony, Pheonix, Ariz., conductor; William Taylor, airlines executive; Raymond Teague; Frances Tillotson, Tuscalooso, Ala., writer; Harry Towne.

Allen J. Wade, Schenectady, N.Y., vice president, General Electric; Elise Sparrow Watts (Mrs. Harry D.), New York, Miss Alabama; Rebecca Webb, dancer; Dorothea Warren (Mrs. Chas. Fox), R.F.D. No. 3, Newfield, Conn., illustrator; Mildred Martin Welden, TV set designer; Eudora Welty, Jackson, Miss., writer; Lois Wilson, Beverly Hills; Andrew B. White, Music School, Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa, singer.

Unions Meet Automation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues, the following report by AFL–CIO President George Meany to delegates at the conference on automation of the New York City Central Labor Council, AFL–CIO, on November 29, 1960:

Change is about the oldest problem which mankind has had to grapple with since the dawn of civilization. Conceivably, the day the caveman began to use the lever, or manufactured his first crude wheel, or discovered fire, the problem of social change became an impulsive force in human society.

Today, we describe the new era of industrial change by the word, "automation." In and of itself, automation is not the problem. After all, in any industrial society there is always the problem of technical change. Automation is merely the third industrial revolution in human history; an era of a faster rate of change affecting more types of workers.

The first industrial revolution came with the substitution of the machine for manual labor and tools, the rise of mass production techniques, and the organization of the factory.

The second industrial revolution, beginning with the 20th century, introduced the techniques of scientific management to factory administration. That meant specialization of workers into limited functions, as on the modern assembly line. Measuring devices and procedures such as, time study, budgeting, and accounting, were applied to all branches of production. These innovations meant a swift increase in man-hour productivity in this country.

AUTOMATION: THE THIRD INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

The industrial revolution in the second half of the 20th century is symbolized by the replacement of men in the performance of mental operations. The tools include the transfer machine, servomechanisms, electronic computers. But whatever their fancy names may be, their purpose is fairly simple—displacement of clerical, manual, technical, and professional workers by machines which take over human jobs.

The machines, however, don't make the problem for human society. The problem is the adaptation of human society to change. Where the adaptation process lags and the automation process proceeds without any social controls, then worker-consumers become victims of irresponsible change and all of society naturally suffers.

The great depression of the thirties was not produced by mechanization. It was produced because American society and Government were unaware that significant deteriorating changes in the economy were taking place and laborsaving devices were disgorging employees at a faster rate than new jobs and buying power were being created.

SCIENCE AND AUTOMATION CHANGE JOBS

Today, workers and employers are feeling the consequences of a higher rate of industrial change. Older skills and experience have become obsolete. Blue- and white-collar workers, must find jobs in new fields of employment. Automation is hurrying the birth rate of new products and industries. Competitive industries, such as synthetic fibers, plastics, aluminum, and natural gas are displacing older industries.

Just think of how American industry has been changed already and how it will be changed tomorrow with the developments in space technology, atomic power, solar energy, instrumentation, industrial research, electronic, and communication revolutions.

Just think of what computer automation means—the automatic handling of information by use of electronic systems. Or, "Detroit automation," whereby machines in production are linked together by means of automatic transfer devices. Or, the meaning of process control systems whereby computer servomechanisms operate oil, chemical, and atomic plants. Or the use of numerical controls which by the use of tape and other automatic devices can direct the operation of machines and whole machine systems.

TECHNICAL AND AUTOMATION CHANGES ARE INTERNATIONAL

One of the things to keep in mind about these new changes is that other advanced or some underdeveloped countries are equally capable of introducing computers and electronic controls and devices. A backward country may be unable to build a computer but there is no reason why, if it gets a computer, somebody can't be trained to run it and, even possibly, maintain and repair it.

And not only can democratic countries use automation but Communist countries as well. The Soviet Union, which has long suffered from a shortage of skilled labor, has been introducing automated assembly lines to meet that problem.

RATES OF PRODUCTIVITY ARE RISING

These technologically revolutionary changes have led to significant increases in the physical output per man-hour. Although the percentage increases may seem small, in total effect they have meant enormous increases in the output per worker. In other words, in the same 8 hours, a worker today can produce far more than he could have 70 years ago.

The annual rate of increase in physical output per man hour is:

Years:	*Increase (Percent)*
1889–1919	2.0
1919–47	2.4
1947–57	3.4

EFFECTS ON EMPLOYMENT

When a nation's economy is on the upgrade, as in the immediate postwar period, automation is faced confidently by most people. A worker who loses his job to a machine can go out and get another one and even, perhaps, a better one, at a brand new plant. But when the economy gets stuck in the mud of stagnation, then there are no new jobs, no new plants. Laborsaving investment dominates rather than new growth, depressed areas increase, unemployment keeps rising and the jobless worker becomes immobilized because he has no other job to go to.

AMERICA IS NOW STAGNATING

The United States is now in an era where the only figure which shows an increase is unemployment. Gross national product is declining. Whatever increase is visible in the employed work force is primarily due to an increase in part-time workers.

Let's look at some of the figures so that we can understand what has been going on in the United States over the past 7 years.

TABLE 1.—*The United States is now in an era of economic stagnation*

Real per capita gross national product (1959 dollars):

Year:	Amount	Index (1953=100)
1953	$2,617	100.0
1959	2,725	104.1
1960 (1st 9 months)	[1] 2,768	[1] 105.7

UNEMPLOYMENT

Year:	Number (millions)	Rate percent of labor force
1953	1.9	2.9
1959	3.8	5.5
(1960 (1st 9 mos.)	3.9	[1] 5.3

[1] Seasonally adjusted annual rate.

TABLE 2.—*Rise in work force primarily, part-time workers*

INCREASE IN LABOR FORCE, FIRST HALF 1953 AND FIRST HALF 1960

Type:	Million
Total	6.0
Full-time workers	.7
Part-time workers	2.9
Not at work (because unemployed, vacations, illness, etc.)	2.4

THE JOBS AMERICA WILL NEED

Demographers are people who study the statistics of population, the probable increases and the declines. The demographers tell us that at the next census in 1970, the population of the United States will be 208 million as against 180 million in 1960. The work force which is estimated today as 74 million people will increase by 1970 to 87 million people. Where are the jobs going to come from?

If you take a pencil, you can figure out the problem America will face. Between 1960 to 1970, the work force will increase by 13 million people who presumably, will be looking for jobs. Divide 13 million by the 10-year difference between 1960 and 1970 and you get an increase of 1,300,000 persons in the work force each year—or to put it simply—we will need almost 4,000 new jobs each day just for the people entering the army of job-hunters. More jobs will be needed for people displaced by automation, in addition.

Will the American economy have these jobs available? They certainly are not available right now. Will they be available tomorrow?

NEW YORK UNEMPLOYMENT EXCEEDS NATIONAL RATE

Rates of unemployment

	United States	New York City
1955	4.4	5.5
1956	4.2	5.0
1957	4.3	5.3
1958	6.8	7.6
1959	5.5	6.0
1960	5.5	5.8
(9 months)	(3,830,000)	(263,000)

Source: New York State Department of Labor.

The rate of unemployment in the New York metropolitan area since 1955 has been above the national level. In New York City, unemployment is higher than in the surrounding districts in the region.

The unemployment problem in this region has been more serious than that of the country as a whole.

What can we do about it?

A LABOR PROGRAM FOR MEETING AUTOMATION

1. Plant and unit collective bargaining goals

A. Advance notification of union and workers by management on a regular, scheduled basis of all innovations in machinery, methods of production, work complements, and assignments of work force to provide for internal adjustments to minimize displacement of workers.

B. Policies to facilitate adjustment:

1. Restrict new hirings to allow for transfer of displaced employees to other jobs to be provided at no cost to workers.

2. Establish refresher and retraining programs to qualify employees for new jobs.

3. Prescribe specific transfer rights of present employees to new jobs.

4. Provide organized training programs for jobs to which transferred.

5. Guarantee former earnings to employees transferred to new jobs.

C. Jobs, department and plant seniority systems which insure maximum security for long-service employees.

D. Job, wage-rating systems which compensate for increased responsibility, higher conceptual skills, and greater productivity.

E. A specific job transfer and placement program for older employees.

F. Benefits for displaced employees:

1. Guarantee all accrued holiday and vacation pay benefits and medical and hospital benefits while unemployed.

2. Supplementary unemployment benefits.

3. Severance pay for permanent employees.

4. Full vesting of pension benefits for employees released for technological reasons irrespective of length of service.

5. Preferential rehiring rights under company or industry agreement.

2. Company and industry collective bargaining goals

A. Transfer and rehiring rights for employees to jobs in other plants of a company or other companies of an industry with provision for covering costs of relocation and retraining.

B. Limitation on the hiring of new employees to absorb the displaced employees of a company or industry.

C. Establishment of a joint labor-management development agency to promote introduction of new products, and development of new uses for old products, derived from active basic and applied research.

3. Community facilities and services in New York area

A. Identifying physical sites and civic services stimulating outmigration of industry and institute corrective measures.

B. Identify further possibilities for advancing New York City and metropolitan area as headquarters for the American economy, fashion, travel, and service center and take steps to implement them.

C. Assure adequate educational facilities for preparing the young, and updating and retraining adults for the changing job patterns in our society.

D. Improve facilities for helping new Americans adjust to our social and economic society.

E. Eliminate all vestiges of color, ethnic, or religious discrimination in our midst to assure adequate economic opportunity for all.

F. Improve public and private welfare agencies to assist individuals and families adjust to changing economic status.

G. Initiate additional programs for accelerating improved housing.

4. State and national governmental programs

A. The Federal Government must be dedicated to the maintenance of a full employment economy.

This demand cannot be subordinated to any other domestic objective.

The New York City Central Labor Council dedicates itself to demanding Federal policies and programs to realize this goal.

Besides initiating needed Federal programs for modernizing our public and communal facilities and developing our resources, the Federal Government must stimulate research and development activities to provide new materials, products and services to help the American people lead a fuller life and assist the newer countries attain economic and political security and higher living standards for their people.

B. Federal Government must guide and assist financially in the redevelopment of distressed urban and underdeveloped rural areas.

C. Adequate adjustment program for displaced workers:

1. Improved insurance benefits for at least 39 weeks.

2. Relocational allowances.

3. Improved interstate job notification system.

4. Programs of technical and vocational retraining.

D. National standards or minimum guarantees:

1. $1.25 minimum wage.

2. Adequate unemployment benefits.

3. Disability benefits.

4. Hospitalization and medical benefits.

5. Pensions.

E. Early retirement benefits for technologically displaced persons under the social security system.

5. The shorter work week

We urge the American people and Government to take immediate steps to provide productive work for all who desire.

Let us make a reality of the Employment Act of 1946. A shorter work week will permit Americans to share in our higher output and assure jobs to all.

America needs the added production that automation makes possible—to provide an adequate national defense; to improve living conditions, particularly of low-income families; to provide public services; to provide financial and technical assistance for the people of the less-developed regions of the world.

But the mere existence of automatic and semi-automatic machines provides no assurance that the new technology will be used fully and wisely. America needs government and private policies that will encourage full employment and the maximum use of productive equipment.

Organized labor insists that the burdens of rapid technical change must be cushioned, that government and business assume their responsibilities to minimize social dislocations and to provide adequate cushions that will protect workers, their families and communities against the hazards of radical technological advances.

A Vote in Favor of Continuing the House Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, has stated that "we are already at war with the Communist world, and that we are losing that war." This is a dire statement, and one which should give all loyal, freedom-loving Americans reason for pause. This struggle, which may go on for our lifetimes, or which could end in a thunderclap of nuclear horror in a few minutes, must not be lost.

We can best wage this war against communism with the weapons given to us by our forebears and a beneficient providence: truth, moral and military strength, and a profound faith in the legal machinery of our Republic. This is no time for amateur or hysterical anti-communism. The Soviets face us with an advance guard of skilled, ruthless professionals. Their lines are manned by quiet, coldly cynical men—diplomats, propagandists, and experts in subversion.

We must counter their professionalism with quiet, unstinting efficiency, their skill with greater skill, their ruthlessness not with greater ruthlessness but with vigilance, strength, and a profound regard for the democratic processes we defend. They must be met head-on by men like Mr. Hoover and his superb organization, who know communism's means and deceit. They must be challenged by a vigorous Justice Department, working within the framework of a Constitution that has protected us from domestic and foreign tyranny for nearly 200 years.

The job of waging this war belongs in these hands, but these hands must ever be guided and restrained by the rule of law, not of men. Thus, the Congress, the lawgivers, must be responsive to the need for safeguarding both our Nation's security and its tradition of freedom and equality. The fine line which we must tread in fulfilling these responsibilities is sometimes lost sight of in our zeal to turn back a frightening menace. In this event, we are backstopped by the courts, which maintain a lofty and unfettered vantage from which to judge and determine constitutional right or wrong.

I suggest, however, that this need for coolness, for judgment, for efficiency, and—yes, for restraint—is ignored too often by men whose loyalties, if not judgment, could never be questioned. I ask if our Nation, faced with its most perilous challenge, can long afford the luxury of such irresponsibility. Can we long afford to have high-placed officials calling for suspension of constitutional safeguards when the uncommitted nations of the world cry out for greater, not less, freedom?

I do not accuse the members or body of the House Committee on Un-American Activities of being witch hunters. They have made serious errors in judgment, in my opinion, but such error is always a threat when you are trying to combat so awesome and deceitful an enemy as communism. But this fact does not undo the harm, or retract the ill-considered pronouncement of the committee and its members in the past.

Actually, the greater harm comes, not from within the committee, but from without. For the committee, by its mere existence and the nature of its public image, stimulates among many impressionable Americans an unhealthy and sometimes frightening super-patriotism. This superpatriotism manifests itself in causes of questionable Americanism and loyalty. I speak of such causes as the impeachment of our Chief Justice and his fellow jurists on the Supreme Court. I speak of groups like the swastika-banded new Nazis, offspring of a scourge which 30 million people died to eliminate less than two decades ago. I speak of every advocacy or attempt to overthrow the constitutional traditions of our Republic by any group, whether they call themselves American Nazis, or the Committee To Impeach the Supreme Court, or the American Communist Party.

I submit that the House Committee on Un-American Activities helps create just the sort of hot, dank atmosphere in which these frightful spores can grow and thrive. I cannot agree that this is the atmosphere we need to successfully combat communism. Need one un-Americanism be fought only with other un-Americanism?

Least of all do I accuse the membership of these organizations of being disloyal. I feel they are being misled, in many cases, by wild-eyed extremists. They are home-loving and freedom-loving Americans, most of these followers, who are deafened by the strident cries of these leaders, who ride out armed with ammunition provided too often by the committee whose appropriation we consider here today: an arsenal of half-truths, generalities, irresponsible accusation, and inconclusive findings.

But probably the greatest harm is that done to the serious struggle against communism. The superpatriots have done nothing but cloud the atmosphere of enlightened anticommunism. Control of subversion is not a matter of emotion and brute force, except perhaps in the Soviet Union. Under our system of government, it is a matter of detection, surveillance, and above all law. Nobody wants to see our way of life swept aside by godless communism. But neither do responsible Americans want to see our freedoms lost or suspended by irresponsible anticommunism. I would hope one day that this distinguished body would see this clear danger and act accordingly, in the interest of a better America.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I should like to extend my remarks further with two editorials, one from the Los Angeles Times entitled "Criticism and the Committee," and another from Concern, a publication of the general board of Christian Social Concerns of the Methodist Church, entitled "Operation Abolition: An Honest Film?" I suggest that these two publications uphold positions of unchallenged patriotism, but point out nevertheless some of the clear dangers in the committee which I feel need expression as I cast my vote in favor of the appropriation for the House Committee on Un-American Activities:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Jan. 20, 1961]

CRITICISM AND THE COMMITTEE

The Congress is again being deluged by demands that the House Committee on Un-American Activities be abolished, that a halt be called to this controversial legislative inquiry into the shape and extent of the Communist threat.

It has been suggested by the committee's defenders that all of its critics are subversives or dupes. They are not. There has been responsible and justified criticism of both the personnel and procedures of the committee.

The issue, however, is not whether the performance of the committee has been ideal but whether its imperfections justify its elimination. We think not.

No thoughtful person would seriously state that the danger of Soviet subversion has ended or even lessened. It is a constant aim and continuous effort of the Communists to try to undermine this Nation by any means possible.

If the threat then persists, it is surely the obligation of the Congress to concern itself with the problem and to seek information and remedies.

Many opponents of the Committee on Un-American Activities would say that the combatting of subversion should be left entirely to the FBI and Central Intelligence Agency and similar bodies. Does this mean that they want their elected representatives to abandon any direct interest in the matter?

We would not argue that the committee has fulfilled its difficult task perfectly—any more than we would claim this for any other congressional group. HCUA members have demonstrated overzealousness and an overconcern for the publicity value of their hearings and findings. Yet this is hardly something unique in a committee of the Congress.

Nor should this committee, in the final analysis, be judged solely according to some arbitrary formula that states that X number of hearings should produce Y number of proposed bills. The function of legislative inquiry is too vital to be circumscribed by such specious criteria.

To concede the committee's faults is not to condone them. They should be corrected but not by abolishing the committee. The potential usefulness of the Committee on Un-American Activities outweighs, we feel, any responsible argument for its elimination.

[From Concern, Jan. 15, 1961]

"OPERATION ABOLITION"—AN HONEST FILM?

(By the Reverend Robert W. Moon, pastor of the First Methodist Church, Fresno, Calif.)

A dangerous piece of propaganda is being distributed throughout the country in the form of a movie called "Operation Abolition." It is being widely shown at schools and clubs and churches, usually under the sponsorship of a patriotic organization.

WHAT IS IT ALL ABOUT?

The incident it describes happened in May 1960, in San Francisco at a hearing called by the House Un-American Activities Committee. The HUAC subpenaed several alleged Communists for public interviews.

Students from several bay area colleges and universities decided to exercise their lawful rights of protest and petition by picketing the hearings. Among other things they were concerned about the committee's refusal to publish their sources of information and the refusal to allow witnesses the opportunity to cross examine their accusers.

The students took careful precautions to guard against infiltration of their ranks by outsiders. Each wore an identifying arm band. They agreed that there was to be no violence, that they would follow their own chosen leaders and not be misled by any subversive persons who might be around.

Some of them were provoked beyond their ability to maintain their self-imposed disciplines. Provocative factors included the failure of officials to keep a promise that some of the students would be allocated seats in the hearing room and the fumbling and brutality of policemen. The students became noisy, too noisy. Finally officers dragged and washed them out of the building with fire hoses.

THE MOVIE, "OPERATION ABOLITION"

After it was all over, the HUAC subpenaed films of the demonstration taken by bay area

television stations. Without compensating the people who took and owned the films, they were turned over to a private commercial organization, Washington Video Producers, Inc. The film company deleted and edited the films into a movie, "Operation Abolition."

The movie carries no credit lines. Apparently no organization is willing to admit responsibility for it. Congressman FRANCIS E. WALTER, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, the chairman of the HUAC, is shown at the opening of the film and appears as one of the commentators. An employee of the committee is the narrator.

The movie sets out to prove that the students were inspired and led by Communists. It is a very disturbing film and often has provoked in the viewers fascistic tendencies which may be innate in each of us.

IS IT AN HONEST MOVIE?

It is not an honest movie. The men with the scissors cut out all pictures of the provocative acts by police officers. A reporter for the New York Post said: "Never in 20 years as a reporter have I seen such brutality." Police brutality was also reported in the stories carried by the New York Times, the San Francisco Chronicle, and the Oakland Tribune.

The film does not show the care taken by the students to prevent infiltration, violence, and rioting. The narrator of the movie talks about violence on the part of the students, but there are no pictures of student violence. With a few minor exceptions, there was none. By the use of scissors the producers were able to change the chronology of events so that acts that did not happen consecutively are shown as if there were a casual relationship between them, when there was not.

In the introduction to the film, Congressman WALTER dramatically warns that the audience will see known Communists at work. He names them. He deliberately plants the implication that the Communists were there to inspire and lead the student demonstration. The truth is that the Communists were there because the committee had subpenaed them.

DISTORTED TRUTH

Our concern is not to defend the students. Some of them were provoked into doing things they should not have done.

Our concern is that an agency of our Government has so grossly distorted the truth of what happened that the net effect is a lie. The HUAC has had a great deal to say about the dishonesty of Communists. Yet the committee has resorted to the same tactics. It has been subversive of the American ideals of truthfulness, fair play, and justice. This kind of propaganda does not contribute to an informed public.

We are also concerned about the emotional response provoked in viewers of the movie. The response is often fascistic in nature and doubly evil since it is inspired by a deliberate misrepresentation of the truth. The chief investigator for the HUAC on the west coast has publicly admitted, on the Goodwin Knight television show, that the film contains inaccuracies and distortions.

WHAT CAN YOU DO?

There are several things that you can do about this film.

1. Get additional information. See the article in the Reporter magazine for November 24, 1960. Send 15 cents to the Bay Area Student Committee, 2317B McGee Avenue, Berkeley 3, Calif., for a copy of "In Search of Truth."

2. If you hear that an organization is planning to show the movie, go to the leader and tell him the facts, trying to persuade him not to show the film. If the film is shown try to get permission for an informed person to appear on the program to give the other side of the story.

3. Ask your Representative in Congress to join with others who are seeking public rebuke for House Un-American Committee and its part in this un-American activity.

Speaker Sol Blatt, Great Jewish American, Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I insert in the RECORD at this time a newspaper article from the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier concerning Solomon Blatt, speaker of the South Carolina State House of Representatives, honoring his 65th birthday. Coming, as I do, from a State that espoused the cause of freedom long before 37 other States of the Union were born, you will excuse my immodesty in pointing out to this House that Solomon Blatt, the great speaker of the House of Representatives of South Carolina, is of Jewish faith.

We have been accused of many things in South Carolina because of our beliefs in the fundamental rights of man and the basic principles of the cause for which our Founding Fathers fought.

Thus I cannot refrain from calling to the attention of those who seek to implant ferment and discord in our State, based upon little understood or false impressions of the heritage and traditions of South Carolina, the greatness of a State which elects as her speaker a man of a minority faith and a man from a minority ethnic origin, who has risen to one of the highest offices in the State of South Carolina. Let those who cry bigotry and discrimination look to the State of South Carolina and observe democracy in action. We do not shout our accomplishments from the rooftops, nor do we cry "wolf" on every occasion, as do those who do protest too much. Instead, we place men of honor and men of accomplishment in positions of high importance in all walks of life in South Carolina, based upon their ability, their devotion to their own beliefs, and their patriotism to America.

I hope those from some of the other States will one day be able to approximate the State of South Carolina in its acknowledgment of the dignity of man.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News & Courier, Feb. 28, 1961]

MR. SPEAKER REACHES 65 BUT PLANS TO STAY ON JOB

COLUMBIA.—Solomon Blatt, gavel-pounding speaker of the State house of representatives, observed his 65th birthday Monday, but "Mr. Speaker" is giving no thought to retirement.

"My greatest wish," says Representative Blatt, "is to continue to serve as long as my people want me and I'm physically able. It is a great comfort to know that I have served as speaker of this legislative body longer than anyone in the entire Nation has served in such a post."

Mr. Blatt has filled the speaker's chair for the last 21 years, but only in a figurative sense, for most of the time he is on his feet guiding the house through its legislative business and reminding house members why they were elected.

A portrait of Mr. Blatt hangs in the hall of the house in the State capitol. Blatt, a son of Jewish immigrants from Russia says, "The fact that my portrait hangs in this chamber is the highest evidence of the fine qualities of South Carolinians and damns the tongues of evil men who call us intolerant.

"South Carolinians don't care which side of the tracks a man comes from or what his religion is. They accept a man for what he really is," states Blatt fervently.

Mr. Blatt received his law degree from the University of South Carolina in 1917, and thereafter served with the 81st Division of the U.S. Army during World War I. After the war he returned to his native Barnwell County and opened a law practice which has achieved great success throughout the years.

The biggest change in his 21 years as speaker of the house, says Blatt, is "the rise in caliber of our State government," which he asserts is "the soundest State government in America."

Replying to the question of how he has been able to maintain such a great popularity with house members, Blatt says, "always telling the truth and never saying I would do something when I would not. You cannot mislead men of the ability of our representatives."

A Statement on Our Unemployment Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include my recent statement on our unemployment situation.

Fourteen years ago one of the important statements of public policy ever adopted was enacted into law. The Employment Act of 1946 declared that it was the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power. Despite this explicit directive, unemployment continues at a dangerously high rate throughout the Nation with no Government action to counter it.

Now, during a time of supposed prosperity, this terrible human problem continues with unemployment hovering at 5 percent of the work force month after month. If this period of recession is prolonged, the effects could be disastrous. Some economists have predicted that as many as 8 million could be unemployed.

The fixation about inflation and budget balancing has measurably fostered continued unemployment. The tight-money policy of the Federal Re-

serve Board has badly hampered the normal growth of business and industry. As a result, the annual rate of growth of our economy has been only about 1.5 percent in the last 6 years—too little expansion to employ all who seek work.

The Government can stimulate our economy by giving more aid in such badly needed areas as housing, education, health, and slum clearance. Older persons can be helped by more adequate social security benefits. The minimum wage rate can be increased. By increasing purchasing power through such efforts, the economy would be put back into full operation.

The age groups in our population which are increasing at the greatest speed—the young and the old—are also the groups among which there is the most unemployment.

The older worker finds it very difficult to obtain new employment. In a fast moving age, skills quickly become dated. Industry is less willing to train an older worker even though his capacity may be equal to that of a younger man, and his experience may be greater.

Technological advances and changing demands in a dynamic economy are bound to cause the decline of some industries and the growth of others. Some temporary dislocations and unemployment are bound to occur.

Unemployment is caused by other reasons too—shifting markets, the inability of a firm to compete, and decentralization. Sometimes the closing of a plant is prompted by motives less worthy or compelling than economic necessity. Many industrial moves are made solely because another State offers "come-on" taxes, or to escape to an area where wages are lower because unions are prevented from organizing.

One answer to this challenge is area redevelopment legislation whereby millions of dollars are appropriated for relief in areas of substantial unemployment. The money would be used as both loans and grants for the rehabilitation of existing industrial facilities or the creation of new facilities for the retraining of workers, for technical assistance, and for the improvement of public facilities.

One of the Three

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM V. MOOREHEAD
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. MOOREHEAD of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the people of the 15th Congressional District of Ohio, which I have the honor to represent here, are tremendously proud that Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, of the Marine Corps, has been selected by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration as one of its three astronauts to be considered for our Nation's first space flight. Glenn's career has been marked by outstanding achievement which has already brought great credit to himself, his family, and his Nation in the advancement of science. We know that, regardless of whether this seasoned modern pioneer or one of his two colleagues is selected for the first flight, Glenn will have contributed the limit of his skills to the success of Operation Mercury.

I wish to commend to the House of Representatives the following tribute to Lieutenant Colonel Glenn, which appeared in the February 26, 1961, edition of the Times Recorder of Zanesville:

ONE OF THE THREE

The first manned space flight, expected to be attempted by the United States in the next couple of months, holds more than normal interest for the people of southeastern Ohio because the man in the capsule may be Marine Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, who was brought up at New Concord.

The balding speed flier was one of three Mercury astronauts selected last week from a list of seven as candidates for the historic mission.

Colonel Glenn, highly skilled, physically fit and eager to get on with the big test, naturally is aware of the risk involved but this is overshadowed, no doubt, by his complete confidence in American scientists and engineers.

Possibly as early as April one of the select three will be tucked into a bell-shaped capsule mounted on top of a Redstone rocket for a flight 115 miles into space and about 290 miles over the Atlantic from Cape Canaveral, Fla. The same flight plan was tested last month by the flying chimp named Ham.

The attention of the whole world will be centered on the great venture and Col. John Glenn could be the man to write a great page in history.

Communist Strategy and the High Seas Sequel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in an address to the House on January 16, 1961, I stressed the relation between the movement to extend the width of territorial seas and the operations of the so-called international Communist conspiracy.

In this address was quoted an illuminating article on this subject by George Winder in the December 1960 issue of American Opinion, which I commended for study by all concerned with the matter of territorial sea width and a protection of our vital interests.

It is highly gratifying, therefore, to read the resolution on "Territorial Sea Width," adopted on February 2, 1961, by the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies at its annual meeting in Washington, which I quote:

TERRITORIAL SEA WIDTH

Whereas a fundamental principle of international law, developed over centuries by experience and agreement among civilized nations, and affirmed in 1930 at the Hague Codification Conference, is the 3-mile limit for territorial seas; and

Whereas Afro-Asian nations, with Communist support, are endeavoring to extend the present 3-mile limit to a 12-mile limit, which extension, by transforming more than 3,000,000 square miles of international sea into territorial waters closable at the will of its sovereigns, would impair the principle of freedom of the seas; and

Whereas the United States delegation to the 1960 United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, in substantial degree conforming to Soviet strategy for the high seas, voted to compromise with this principle by agreeing to a 6-mile limit, which move was defeated by only one vote; and

Whereas any such compromise in principle would affect adversely the vital interests of the United States and other maritime nations by making strategic sea routes and air above subject to closure, among them such important arteries of trade as the Straits of Gibraltar, Bab-el Mandeb, and Malacca;

Resolved by the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, Inc.,

1. That the United States adhere to the fundamental principle of international law providing for a 3-mile limit as the width for territorial seas; and

2. That the Congress conduct comprehensive inquiries into the influence in the Department of State responsible for the attempted compromise of this principle in favor of a 6-mile limit; and

3. That copies of this resolution be sent to (a) All Members of the Congress; (b) the President; (c) the Secretaries of State, Defense, Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Address of President John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, on February 13, President Kennedy delivered an address at the luncheon meeting of the National Industrial Conference Board that I believe should be called to the attention of every businessman in the United States. It is no secret that many in our business community were not only highly skeptical but actually honestly afraid of what a Kennedy administration might do to them.

While only time can fully convince many with these doubts and misgivings I am confident that any reasonable man after reading this address will understand the President's goal—a full partnership between businessmen and Government to bring this Nation and all of its citizens to the highest standard of living, the greatest era of prosperity and the greatest defense potential the world has ever known. As the President points out, this can only be done by sound businesslike methods which maintain a strong dollar and equal opportunities for all. Attaining these goals under proper governmental supervision can not help but improve the Nation's business in my opinion:

Under unanimous consent I insert the President's address in the RECORD at this point:

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT TO THE LUNCHEON MEETING OF THE NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL CONFERENCE BOARD, SHERATON-PARK HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. White, Dean Sayre, distinguished guests, gentlemen, I want, first of all, to express my personal thanks to all of you for having come to our city, and for participating in what I hope will be a most useful and helpful proceeding which will benefit this Government and our country.

It has recently been suggested that whether I serve one or two terms in the Presidency, I will find myself at the end of that period at what might be called the awkward age—too old to begin a new career and too young to write my memoirs.

A similar dilemma, it seems to me, is posed by the occasion of a Presidential address to a business group on business conditions less than 4 weeks after entering the White House—for it is too early to be claiming credit for the new administration and too late to be blaming the old one. And it would be premature to seek your support in the next election, and inaccurate to express thanks for having had it in the last one.

I feel, nevertheless, that I can claim kinship here, and have that claim allowed. For I am convinced that the real spirit of American business is not represented by those involved in price fixing, conflict of interest or collusion. The real spirit is in this room—in your recognition of your public responsibilities, your pursuit of the truth, your desire for better industrial relations, better technological progress and better price stability and economic growth. And because your organization portrays that picture of American business, I am delighted and proud to be here with you.

The complaint has often been made in business circles that the Federal Government is a "silent partner" in every corporation—taking roughly half of all of your net earnings without risk to itself. But it should be also realized that this makes business a not always "silent partner" of the Federal Government—that our revenues and thus our success are dependent upon your profits and your success—and that, far from being natural enemies, government and business are necessary allies.

For example, the 1960 drop in expected corporate profits of some $6 to $7 billion also caused a loss in Federal revenues of over $3 billion—enough to pay the Federal share of all of our anti-recession, health, and education proposals for the next fiscal year and still have enough left over to start closing what the Democrats in this administration used to call the missile gap.

An equally critical gap separates the tax revenues of a lagging economy from those which are potentially within our grasp: A gap of at least $12 billion. Even after we are able to launch every program necessary for national security and development, this amount of revenue would still leave a substantial surplus—a surplus essential to help defend our economy against inflation—and, equally important, a surplus that, when applied to the Federal debt, would free additional savings for business investment and expansion.

In short, there is no inevitable clash between the public and private sectors—or between investment and consumption—nor, as I have said, between Government and business. All elements in our national economic growth are interdependent. Each must play its proper role—and that is the hope and the aim of this administration.

If those of you who are in the world of business, and we who are in the world of Government, are necessarily partners, what kind of partnership is this going to be? Will it be marked by mutual suspicion and recrimination, or by mutual understanding and fruitful collaboration?

On behalf of my associates in the Cabinet, I want to be very precise: We will not discriminate for or against any segment of our society, or any segment of the business community. We are vigorously opposed to corruption and monopoly and human exploitation—but we are not opposed to business.

We know that your success and ours are intertwined—that you have facts and know-how that we need. Whatever past differences may have existed, we seek more than an attitude of truce, more than a treaty—we seek the spirit of a full-fledged alliance.

Today, I would briefly mention three areas of common concern to which that alliance must be devoted in the next few years: economic growth, plant modernization, and price stability.

I

First. Economic growth has come to resemble the Washington weather—everyone talks about it, no one says precisely what to do about it, and our only satisfaction is that it can't get any worse.

The economic program which I have set before the Congress is essentially a program for recovery—and I do not equate recovery with growth. But it is an essential first step. Only by putting millions of people back to work can we expand purchasing power and markets. Only by higher income and profits can we provide the incentive and the means for increased investment. And only when we are using our plant at or near capacity can we expect any solid expansion.

Capacity operation is the key. No matter what other arguments or stimulants are used, the incentives for investing new capital to expand manufacturing plants and equipment are weak as long as manufacturers are operating at less than 80 percent of their capacity. From 1950 to 1958, we put only one-sixth of our total output into capital formation, while Japan, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Canada, and Sweden were all investing one-fifth or more of their total output in capital goods. So it is not surprising that each of these and other nations over the past several years have all surpassed us in average annual rate of economic growth.

I think we can do better. Working together, business and Government must do better—putting people back to work, using plants to capacity, and spurring savings and investments with at least a large part of our economic gains—beginning not when our economy is back at the top, but beginning now.

II

Second. New plant investment not only means expansion of capacity—it means modernization as well. Gleaming new factories and headlines about automation have diverted our attention from an aging industrial plant. Obsolescence is slowing down our growth, handicapping our productivity, and worsening our competitive position abroad.

Nothing can reverse our balance-of-payments deficit if American machinery and equipment cannot produce the newest products of the highest quality in the most efficient manner. The available evidence on the age of our industrial plant is unofficial and fragmentary; but the trend is unmistakable—we are falling behind.

The average age of equipment in American factories today is about 9 years. In a dynamic economy, that average should be falling, as new equipment is put into place. Instead the available evidence suggests that it has been slowly rising.

Private survey of machine tools used by manufacturers of general industrial equipment found less than half of these tools over 10 years old in 1949, but two-thirds over that age in 1958. Nineteen percent of our machine tools were found to be over 20 years old.

Meanwhile, other countries have been lowering the average age of their fixed capital. The German example is the most spectacular—their proportion of capital equipment and plant under 5 years of age grew from one-sixth of the total in 1948 to two-fifths in 1957.

All of these facts point in one direction: We must start now to provide additional stimulus to the modernization of American industrial plants. Within the next few weeks, I shall propose to the Congress a new tax incentive for businesses to expand their normal investment in plant and equipment.

But modernization and productivity depend upon more than investment in physical resources. Equally essential is investment in human resources. And I think that this is obvious to those of us who have considered the problems of unemployment and depressed areas. There is no doubt that the maximum impact of a reducing economy falls upon those who are at the bottom of the educational ladder. The first people unemployed are those with the least education, the last people to be hired back are those with the least education. So there is a direct connection between increased emphasis on education in this country and also upon increased productivity and technological change.

Without strengthened programs for health, education, and science and research, the new modern plant would only be a hollow shell. Many of these programs are within the province of State and local governments. Full recovery will increase the tax revenues that they so sorely need. But the Federal Government will have to pay its fair share of developing these human resources.

Finally, Government and business must turn their attention to the problem of price stability. Concern over the resumption of inflationary pressures hangs over all our efforts to restore the economy, to stimulate its growth and to maintain our competitive status abroad. In recent days, complaints have been voiced in some quarters that this administration was not meeting its responsibilities in this area. But the facts are that, whatever one may regard our responsibilities to be, we are almost totally without direct and enforceable powers over the central problem. A free government in a free society has only a limited influence—provided that they are above the minimum—over prices and wages freely set and bargained for by free individuals and free enterprises. And this is as it should be if our economy is to remain free.

Nevertheless, the public interest in major wage and price determinations is substantial. Ways must be found to bring that public interest before the parties concerned in a fair and orderly manner.

For this reason, I have announced my determination to establish a Presidential Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy, with members drawn from labor, management and the public. I want this Committee to play a major role in helping promote sound wage and price policies, productivity increases, and a betterment of America's competitive position in world markets. I will look to this Committee to make an important contribution to labor-management relations, and to a wider understanding of their impact on price stability and our economic health. And in this undertaking, I ask and urge the constructive cooperation of this organization and its members.

Economic growth, plant modernization, price stability—these are all intangible and elusive goals. But they are all essential to your success, and to the success of our coun-

try. Initiative, innovation, hard work and cooperation will be required, on your part, and on ours.

But I have confidence in our Nation, confidence in our economy, and confidence in your ability to meet your obligations fully. I hope that my associates and I can merit your confidence as well. For I can assure you that we love our country, not for what it was, though it has always been great—not for what it is, though of this we are deeply proud—but for what it some day can and, through the efforts of us all, someday will be.

Thank you.

The Sixth Maccabiah Games

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, with the unanimous consent of the House, I take pleasure in calling attention to the fact that the sixth Maccabiah games, which will take place in Tel Aviv, Israel, from August 29 to September 5, 1961. This is another example of the principle that competition in sports among nations is one of the soundest means of fostering international goodwill. An article concerning the forthcoming games, written by Mr. Norman Miller of the United Press International, and which appeared in the press, nationwide, on Sunday, February 19, follows:

NEW YORK, February 18.—A delegation of more than 100 American men and women athletes embark next summer on a goodwill mission to Israel, where they will compete in the 6th Maccabiah games.

The United States is 1 of approximately 25 nations whose athletes of Jewish faith will participate in the games near Tel Aviv, next August 29 to September 5.

Americans will compete in 14 of the 19 sports on the Olympic-style program and once again are expected to dominate the more popular events.

Besides the "Jewish Olympics," the weeklong sports festival in this tiny nation will include a golf tournament pitting four-man amateur teams from each country.

Max Lovell, chairman of the U.S. Maccabiah games committee, said that athletes are being lined up for the oversea mission with the help of the National AAU, the NCAA, and U.S. Olpmpic committee.

At least two Olympic athletes are expected to be included in the U.S. team. They are Isaac Berger, of New York, who won the 1956 Olympic gold medal in the featherweight weightlifting class, and Abe Grossfeld, former University of Illinois gymnastics star.

However, the strongest U.S. showing undoubtedly will be made in America's own-invented game of basketball. Among the leading collegians from which the U.S. team will be chosen are: Art Heyman, of Duke; Mike Cinsiger, of Brown; Jeff Cohen, of William & Mary; Dave Waxman, of UCLA; Sandy Pomerantz, of Washington University of St. Louis; Julie Cohen, of Miami (Fla.); and Rick Kaminsky, Yale freshman from Houston, Tex.

The swimming delegation likely will be headed by Pete Fogarasy of North Carolina State, the AAU breaststroke champion; Dave Karetsky of Yale, in the butterfly event; Dave Abramson of New York, the junior AAU 400-meter freestyle champion; and Dickie Morse of Nashville, Tenn., in the 3-meter dive.

Mike Herman of New York, who won the Maccabiah decathlon championship in 1957, will be back to defend. Other trackmen will be Lou Steiglitz, former Connecticut 2-miler, and MM Gary Bubner, standout NYU freshman shotputter.

Thus far, the two leading women's entries are Judy Shapiro of California, who finished third in the Olympic women's quarter-mile trials last year, and Kathy Flicker of Summit, N.J., in the 3-meter dive.

The Maccabiah clubs were started many years ago for the physical development of inhabitants of the ghettos throughout Europe.

The games began formally in Israel, then Palestine, in 1932 and following World War II were held three times, in 1950, 1953, and 1957.

Now far removed from their original purpose, the games are designed to promote international goodwill and the fellowship of sports in this tiny young nation.

U.S. Trade Associations Typify American Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, there is much speculation today regarding automobile sales. Most people seem to agree that increased automobile sales will strengthen our economy. I believe the article by Mr. E. John Lehman pinpoints the need for strong associations in this field.

[From the Akron Beacon Journal, Feb. 26, 1961]

U.S. TRADE ASSOCIATIONS TYPIFY AMERICAN WAY

(By E. John Lehman)

The Akron Automobile Dealers Association is in its 35th year of operation. To answer the questions—"What is it? What do these people do?—requires some explanation.

Simply put, it is a group of highly competitive businessmen engaged in a common business who are making a diligent and serious attempt at self-government on a voluntary basis.

The net result of a successful operation becomes a distinct service to the general public since confidence and reliability are direct byproducts of a combined effort to raise the standards of the individual members.

We are very little different from thousands of other trade or professional groups who are actively engaged in trade association activities. Each business or profession needs to exchange ideas and methods with fellow members within the same trade or profession.

Through the trade association office, a library of exchange is available to aid newcomers in the field. Older members can be kept abreast of the times and through cooperative action, the industry can give to society the best efforts of modern times.

The trade association is a democratic way of self-expression in methods that promote good principles in the modern business world. To know more of trade associations today, perhaps we should look into their history and review the philosophy that gives them birth and sustains them as living testimonials.

The American businessman, as well as the American society, generally, is distinguished from the businessman and societies of other countries by their inherent desire and energetic devotion to do things in a cooperative manner.

The voluntary movement of self-government has been a feature of American life since pioneer times. We are all familiar with "barn raisings" and "harvest festivals" and similar rural examples of togetherness. Early police and fire departments, insurance policies, minutemen voluntary armies, all were originated and maintained on a voluntary basis. Virtually every need which we had was met by a group of volunteers joining together to accomplish some public purpose. Trade associations and civic organizations are a natural reflection of this voluntary way of doing business.

Unfortunately, today, all over the world, this concept is being severely challenged. Under other systems of government, the people are not trusted to do what is best by voluntary groups but are organized into groups which are government sponsored and government controlled. The whole concept is one of government from the top, rather than government from the bottom up.

The threat is not all from abroad but increasing from within. Our own American customs are severely leaning. We are being told that modern civilization, the modern way of doing things, does not permit the old-fashioned, time-consuming, and voluntary idea and way of doing things, even though everything we have are fruits of cooperative action. They say life has become so complicated and so fast that decisions must be made promptly. We cannot wait for the old slow methods.

This just is not so. True, the business and social world cannot stand idly by to simply let nature take its course. This we have not done.

Every business trade or profession has organized its own trade and professional associations that are working diligently and to a high degree of efficiency through committees and clubs to express that same high degree of voluntary expression.

Every American citizen should know and must know that these trade associations are one of the strongest defense and enlightened voices in the American way of life today. In doubtful times, we must move forward and be prepared to accept even greater challenges and responsibilities to defend as well as promote the principles of self-government.

Trade associations are doing this job by separate trade groups but they must cooperate with other trade groups in supporting association membership, as well as supporting them with patronage in a commercial way.

Every trade or business has its parasites who try to enjoy all the trade and society benefits without contributing financially to the organization that has raised the standards and defended their right to express voluntary opinions.

They express a personal derogatory opinion in the hope they can overshadow the stigma of nonmembership. Unfortunately, they get some converts to this minority opinion, just as any nonconformist by nature, is prone to do.

But the trade group does not falter. They move progressively ahead in the sound knowledge that cooperative action is sound, both for the business itself, as well as for the country in general. Each association must share in the responsibility of informing the public of these facts.

In this country today, we have a physical well-being and a mode of living which exceeds that known to any civilization at any time in past history. We have available

creature comforts such as no civilization has ever produced for its citizens.

It is unfortunate that these same creature comforts should seem to bring with them suspicions of a weakening spirit. There is a serious question whether our moral standards have kept pace with or have improved in the same proportion as have our living standards or our improved business standards.

All of us should be aware of these problems and take comfort in the knowledge, trade associations and professional groups are active in the vineyards of democracy.

We can face them with confidence if we maintain the idea of voluntary associations, voluntary groups—meeting openly to discuss problems and to arrive at conclusions and then proceed to take voluntary action.

Trade associations have a great responsibility to you and to our country. We will do everything in our power and diligence to see that we continue to go forward. We will examine ourselves, improve our methods of operation, and resolve to try to do every year a better job than we did the year before.

But you too, can help and should help.

For every product or service you need as a consumer ask this one simple question? Is this company or person a member of his trade or professional association? By so doing, you will help to keep alive one of the basic elements of our American civilization.

Embargo on Cuba?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the steady deterioration in the relations between the United States and Soviet Cuba since early 1959 reached their logical culmination at 8:30 p.m. on January 4, 1961, with the United States breaking diplomatic relations with that island country.

At that time there was much discussion about bringing about a hemispheric quarantine of this Communist beachhead. The idea, however, seems not to have gotten beyond the talking stage, for business between the two countries, though not generally recognized, has continued.

This commercial activity, as described in a news story by Dom Bonafede in the February 5, 1961, issue of the Miami Herald, seems to be greater today than it was when the United States imposed a partial Cuban embargo in October 1960.

In order that documentation for this assertion may be available to the Congress and other cognizant agencies of our Government, the indicated news story is quoted:

[From the Miami Herald, Feb. 5, 1961]

U.S. FIRMS SHIP CATTLE TO CUBA

(By Dom Bonafede)

Airborne flights of U.S.-bred livestock from Miami to Havana are replenishing Fidel Castro's once-empty stockyards.

Since October, when the United States imposed a partial embargo against Cuba, more on-the-hoof stock has been flown out of Miami International Airport to Cuba than in all of 1960.

Being flown out daily by Cuba Aeropostal, a Cuban nationalized cargo line, are thousands of purebred cattle and hogs, and hundreds of thousands of hatching chicks and pullets.

The Miami manager of Cuba Aeropostal, Alfred J. Canal, acknowledged that six or seven flights to Cuba are scheduled daily.

A. E. Arthur, U.S. officer in charge of the airport animal quarantine section, reported: "There has been a tremendous increase in trade to Cuba within the last few months."

As a result of Castro's newfound trade sources, there is little likelihood that his regime will come tumbling down because of economic reasons.

Today, he is buying goods and equipment from U.S. allies and from behind the Iron Curtain which he formerly imported from the United States.

Huge seaborne shipments of farm products, lard, and other commodities are exchanged between Havana and West Palm Beach aboard the U.S.-owned West India Fruit & Steamship Co. And recently Cuba increased its trade with Canada by flying in cargoes of fruits and vegetables.

Miami airport figures show that last year 2,550 stock animals were shipped to Cuba.

In 4 months since October, the amount has jumped to 5,045.

Almost all animals involved in the trade are breeding animals. About 12 head of cattle can be assigned to a plane, and 35 or 40 large-size hogs.

The cattle mainly came from Wisconsin, Connecticut, Ohio, and Michigan. Although of pedigree stock, they are reportedly of poor grade and American dealers are glad to get rid of them.

No exact figures are available on the number of chickens, turkeys, and ducks being flown out from Miami but it runs into the millions.

Canal said that 45,000 pullets can be packed aboard one plane.

Records show that among the dealers are the Airport Livestock Corp. of Miami, F. A. Gailbraith, of West Palm Beach, and Swindell Farms, of Fort Lauderale.

Mrs. Gailbraith told the Herald that her firm has sold "several hundred dairy cows" to Cuba since last April for around $300 each.

"We deal with businessmen over there just as we do with Americans, but I imagine that they work with the Cuban Government," she commented.

She added that the purchases are paid in American dollars through letters of credit on U.S. banks.

In addition to filling Castro's breadbasket, the U.S. farm shipments are bolstering his propaganda campaign at home.

Once they arrive in Cuba, the products are labeled as Cuban-raised—tangible evidence of the "glorious progress" made under the revolutionary movement.

Veterans' Disability Ratings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the bill which I am introducing today is in line with legislation heretofore enacted in the 83d Congress, which provides that where a veteran had total disability rating for 20 continuous years it should not thereafter be changed. This was true for compensation, pension, and insurance purposes. My proposal is a very simple one, namely, to reduce this 20-year period to 15, thereby assuring greater protection for the individual veteran.

I think we can all agree that any person who has been rated totally disabled for 15 years or more should not have his disability rating disturbed. The cost of this proposal would be negligible, and this certainly is an equitable step which should be taken at the earliest possible time.

Pastoral Letters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the RECORD a pastoral letter issued separately by the Most Reverend Thomas J. McDonough, bishop of Savannah, Ga.; the Most Reverend Francis E. Hyland, bishop of Atlanta, Ga.; and the Most Reverend Paul J. Hallinan, bishop of Charleston, S.C., a document on morals and race relations well deserving of insertion into the RECORD.

The pastoral letter, issued separately to each of the three dioceses by its own bishop, speaks with clarity and intelligence:

MY DEAR PEOPLE: In time of crisis, our people look to the church to state moral principles and apply them to practical situations. With racial tension mounting, the church must speak out clearly. In justice to our people, we cannot abandon leadership to the extremists whose only creed is fear and hatred.

This fear is unworthy, and in large measure unjustified. All peoples have a pride of race, a pride which they naturally desire to maintain and preserve. This pride is not destroyed, however, when people recognize the rights of others. It is the failure of many to understand this that causes fear.

The hatred is neither Christian nor American. If there is one virtue that marks the true follower of Christ, one virtue dearer to the heart of Our Divine Lord than any other, surely it is the virtue of charity. For He said: "A new commandment I give you, that you love one another: that as I have loved you, you also love one another. By this will all men know that you are my disciples, if you have love for one another."

Our Lord died upon the cross to exemplify this love, not just for those who loved Him, but for those who hated Him—for all men. This is the Christian way, and we cannot brush aside, or rationalize, or close our minds to this truth of our redemption.

We cannot ignore the teaching of the sacred Scriptures, that in the beginning, God created man after His own image and likeness; that He breathed into him an immortal soul; that He gave him an eternal destiny. We cannot forget that all human beings, without regard to differences that are purely accidental, are created in the same way. We cannot ignore that Jesus Christ

our Lord, the Eternal Son of God, became man and died for all men, that they might be saved by His grace.

With these Christian truths in mind, the great Americans who wrote the Declaration of Independence set forth the fundamental principle of our Government: "That all men are created equal, and endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

The issue of racial justice is not new, nor is it only southern. Only the urgency is new, and this is true in every part of the United States where racial discrimination is practiced. Twice in recent years, in 1943 and 1958, the Catholic bishops of the United States have outlined the Christian position. In their annual letter of 1958, these two vital points were made:

1. "It is unreasonable and injurious to the rights of others that a factor such as race, by and of itself, should be made a cause of discrimination."

2. "Legal segregation, or any form of compulsory segregation, in itself and by its very nature imposes a stigma of inferiority upon the segregated people."

All Catholic people in the United States are coming to realize, as the bishops said, that "the time has come to cut through the maze of secondary or less essential issues, and to come to the heart of the problem. The heart of the race question is moral and religious. It concerns the rights of man and our attitude toward our fellow man."

The influence of the Catholic Church in the South has not been based on great numbers, but upon great faith. When changing times have called for fresh application of the eternal God-given principles, our loyal people have not wavered. Nor will they waver now.

To assure all men that the church is moving steadily toward the full Christian solution, we affirm this policy for the diocese of Charleston:

1. Catholic pupils, regardless of color, will be admitted to Catholic schools as soon as this can be done with safety to the children and the schools. Certainly this will be done not later than the public schools are opened to all pupils.

2. The Negro schools will be continued as long as there is need for them. Their purpose is to reach and teach the Negro, not to segregate him.

3. During 1961, this diocese will undertake a program of preparation for its people. Pastoral letters, sermons, study clubs, and school instruction will explain the full Catholic teaching on racial justice.

This affirmation for our diocese is not just a minimum approach to full Christian justice. In a region where our Catholic population is less than 2 percent, it is an honest effort to influence a way of life that has prevailed for many decades. Millions of people have accepted this way of life in good faith. Now, both whites and Negroes face a tremendous challenge—to live in a community with full Christian justice for both.

This is only one of many tasks facing our church. The racial problem does not exist in a vacuum. It must be solved in the wider context of our missionary work. The bishop, therefore, will prudently judge the appropriate time and conditions in such a way that the schools and the children, whether white or Negro, will not suffer by the change.

This same statement is being made today by the Most Reverend Thomas J. McDonough, bishop of Savannah, Ga.; and the Most Reverend Francis E. Hyland, bishop of Atlanta, Ga. It is being published at this time to prepare all our Catholic people for the future, and to assure all men that with justice and prudence, the Catholic Church in the Deep South will continue to meet her moral commitments. Of all men, of whatever region or race, we ask their prayers and their understanding.

As this holy season of Lent begins, I ask our Catholic people especially to offer their daily prayers and sacrifices to God for the peaceful solution of this issue. May He bless us with His love. May we respond with our love. "By this, will all men know that you are my disciples, if you have love one for another."

DISCRIMINATION AND THE CHRISTIAN CONSCIENCE—STATEMENT OF THE BISHOPS OF THE UNITED STATES, 1958

Fifteen years ago, when this Nation was devoting its energies to a world war designed to maintain human freedom, the Catholic bishops of the United States issued a prayerful warning to their fellow citizens. We called for the extension of full freedom within the confines of our beloved country. Specifically, we noted the problems faced by Negroes in obtaining the rights that are theirs as Americans. The statement of 1943 said in part:

"In the providence of God there are among us millions of fellow citizens of the Negro race. We owe to these fellow citizens, who have contributed so largely to the development of our country, and for whose welfare history imposes on us a special obligation of justice, to see that they have in fact the rights which are given them in our Constitution. This means not only political equality, but also fair economic and educational opportunities, a just share in public welfare projects, good housing without exploitation, and a full chance for the social advancement of their race."

PROGRESS MADE

In the intervening years, considerable progress was made in achieving these goals. The Negro race, brought to this country in slavery, continued its quiet but determined march toward the goal of equal rights and equal opportunity. During and after the Second World War, great and even spectacular advances were made in the obtaining of voting rights, good education, better paying jobs, and adequate housing. Through the efforts of men of good will, of every race and creed and from all parts of the Nation, the barriers of prejudice and discrimination were slowly but inevitably eroded.

Because this method of quiet conciliation produced such excellent results, we have preferred the path of action to that of exhortation. Unfortunately, however, it appears that in recent years the issues have become confused and the march toward justice and equality has been slowed if not halted in some areas. The transcendent moral issues involved have become obscured, and possibly forgotten.

Our Nation now stands divided by the problem of compulsory segregation of the races and the opposing demand for racial justice. No region of our land is immune from strife and division resulting from this problem. In one area, the key issue may concern the schools. In another it may be conflicts over housing. Job discrimination may be the focal point in still other sectors. But all these issues have one main point in common. They reflect the determination of our Negro people, and we hope the overwhelming majority of our white citizens, to see that our colored citizens obtain their full rights as given to them by God, the creator of all, and guaranteed by the democratic traditions of our Nation.

There are many facets to the problems raised by the quest for racial justice. There are issues of law, of history, of economics, and of sociology. There are questions of procedure and technique. There are conflicts in cultures. Volumes have been written on each of these phases. Their importance we do not deny. But the time has come, in our considered and prayerful judgment, to cut through the maze of secondary or less essential issues and to come to the heart of the problem.

QUESTION IS MORAL AND RELIGIOUS

The heart of the race question is moral and religious. It concerns the rights of man and our attitude toward our fellow man. If our attitude is governed by the great Christian law of love of neighbor and respect for his rights, then we can work out harmoniously the techniques for making legal, educational, economic, and social adjustments. But if our hearts are poisoned by hatred, or even by indifference toward the welfare and rights of our fellow men, then our Nation faces a grave internal crisis.

No one who bears the name of Christian can deny the universal love of God for all mankind. When Our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ, "took on the form of man" (Philippians 2: 7) and walked among men, He taught as the first two laws of life the love of God and the love of fellow man. "By this shall all men know that you are my disciples, that you have love, one for the other." (John 13: 35) He offered His life in sacrifice for all mankind. His parting mandate to His followers was to "teach all nations." (Matthew 28: 19)

Our Christian faith is of its nature universal. It knows not the distinctions of race, color, or nationhood. The missionaries of the church have spread throughout the world, visiting with equal impartiality nations such as China and India, whose ancient cultures antedate the coming of the Savior and the primitive tribes of the Americas. The love of Christ, and the love of the Christian, knows no bounds. In the words of Pope Pius XII, addressed to American Negro publishers 12 years ago, "All men are brothered in Jesus Christ; for He, though God, became also man, became a member of the human family, a brother of all." (May 27, 1946)

Even those who do not accept our Christian tradition should at least acknowledge that God has implanted in the souls of all men some knowledge of the natural moral law and a respect for its teachings. Reason alone taught philosophers through the ages respect for the sacred dignity of each human being and the fundamental rights of man. Every man has an equal right to life, to justice before the law, to marry and rear a family under human conditions, and to an equitable opportunity to use the goods of this earth for his needs and those of his family.

From these solemn truths, there follow certain conclusions vital for a proper approach to the problems that trouble us today. First, we must repeat the principle—embodied in our Declaration of Independence—that all men are equal in the sight of God. By equal we mean that they are created by God and redeemed by His Divine Son, that they are bound by His law, and that God desires them as His friends in the eternity of Heaven. This fact confers upon all men human dignity and human rights.

PERSONAL DIFFERENCES AMONG MEN

Men are unequal in talent and achievement. They differ in culture and personal characteristics. Some are saintly, some seem to be evil, most are men of good will, though beset with human frailty. On the basis of personal differences we may distinguish among our fellow men, remembering always the admonition: "Let him who is without sin * * * cast the first stone * * *" (John 8: 7) But discrimination based on the accidental fact of race or color, and as such injurious to human rights regardless of personal qualities or achievements, cannot be reconciled with the truth

that God has created all men with equal rights and equal dignity.

Secondly, we are bound to love our fellow man. The Christian love we bespeak is not a matter of emotional likes or dislikes. It is a firm purpose to do good to all men, to the extent that ability and opportunity permit.

Among all races and national groups, class distinctions are inevitably made on the basis of like-mindedness or a community of interests. Such distinctions are normal and constitute a universal social phenomenon. They are accidental, however, and are subject to change as conditions change. It is unreasonable and injurious to the rights of others that a factor such as race, by and of itself, should be made a cause of discrimination and a basis for unequal treatment in our mutual relations.

ENFORCED SEGREGATION

The question then arises: Can enforced segregation be reconciled with the Christian view of our fellow man? In our judgment it cannot, and this for two fundamental reasons.

1. Legal segregation, or any form of compulsory segregation, in itself and by its very nature imposes a stigma of inferiority upon the segregated people. Even if the now obsolete court doctrine of "separate but equal" had been carried out to the fullest extent, so that all public and semipublic facilities were in fact equal, there is nonetheless the judgment that an entire race, by the sole fact of race and regardless of individual qualities, is not fit to associate on equal terms with members of another race. We cannot reconcile such a judgment with the Christian view of man's nature and rights. Here again it is appropriate to cite the language of Pope Pius XII: "God did not create a human family made up of segregated, dissociated, mutually independent members. No; He would have them all united by the bond of total love of Him and consequent self-dedication to assisting each other to maintain that bond intact" (Sept. 7, 1956).

2. It is a matter of historical fact that segregation in our country has led to oppressive conditions and the denial of basic human rights for the Negro. This is evident in the fundamental fields of education, job opportunity, and housing. Flowing from these areas of neglect and discrimination are problems of health and the sordid train of evils so often associated with the consequent slum conditions. Surely Pope Pius XII must have had these conditions in mind when he said just 2 months ago: "It is only too well known, alas, to what excesses pride of race and racial hate can lead. The church has always been energetically opposed to attempts of genocide or practices arising from what is called the 'color bar'" (Sept. 5, 1958).

ECONOMIC AND EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

One of the tragedies of racial oppression is that the evils we have cited are being used as excuses to continue the very conditions that so strongly fostered such evils. Today we are told that Negroes, Indians, and also some Spanish-speaking Americans differ too much in culture and achievements to be assimilated in our schools, factories, and neighborhoods. Some decades back the same charge was made against the immigrant—Irish, Jewish, Italian, Polish, Hungarian, German, Russian. In both instances differences were used by some as a basis for discrimination and even for bigoted ill-treatment. The immigrant, fortunately, has achieved his rightful status in the American community. Economic opportunity was wide open and educational equality was not denied to him.

Negro citizens seek these same opportunities. They wish an education that does not carry with it any stigma of inferiority. They wish economic advancement based on merit and skill. They wish their civil rights as American citizens. They wish acceptance based upon proved ability and achievement. No one who truly loves God's children will deny them this opportunity.

To work for this principle amid passions and misunderstandings will not be easy. It will take courage. But quiet and persevering courage has always been the mark of a true follower of Christ.

PLANS SHOULD BE BASED ON PRUDENCE

We urge that concrete plans in this field be based on prudence. Prudence may be called a virtue that inclines us to view problems in their proper perspective. It aids us to use the proper means to secure our aim.

The problems we inherit today are rooted in decades, even centuries, of custom and cultural patterns. Changes in deep-rooted attitudes are not made overnight. When we are confronted with complex and far-reaching evils, it is not a sign of weakness or timidity to distinguish among remedies and reforms. Some changes are more necessary than others. Some are relatively easy to achieve. Others seem impossible at this time. What may succeed in one area may fail in another.

It is a sign of wisdom, rather than weakness, to study carefully the problems we face, to prepare for advances, and to bypass the nonessential if it interferes with essential progress. We may well deplore a gradualism that is merely a cloak for inaction. But we equally deplore rash impetuosity that would sacrifice the achievements of decades in ill-timed and ill-considered ventures. In concrete matters we distinguish between prudence and inaction by asking the question: Are we sincerely and earnestly acting to solve these problems? We distinguish between prudence and rashness by seeking the prayerful and considered judgment of experienced counselors who have achieved success in meeting similar problems.

VITAL THAT WE ACT NOW

For this reason we hope and earnestly pray that responsible and sober-minded Americans of all religious faiths, in all areas of our land, will seize the mantle of leadership from the agitator and the racist. It is vital that we act now and act decisively. All must act quietly, courageously, and prayerfully before it is too late.

For the welfare of our Nation we call upon all to root out from their hearts bitterness and hatred. The tasks we face are indeed difficult. But hearts inspired by Christian love will surmount these difficulties.

Clearly, then, these problems are vital and urgent. May God give this Nation the grace to meet the challenge it faces. For the sake of generations of future Americans and indeed of all humanity, we cannot fail.

Signed by members of the administrative board, National Catholic Welfare Conference, in the name of the bishops of the United States:

Francis Cardinal Spellman, archbishop of New York; James Francis Cardinal McIntyre, archbishop of Los Angeles; Francis P. Keough, archbishop of Baltimore; Karl J. Alter, archbishop of Cincinnati; Joseph E. Ritter, archbishop of St. Louis; William O. Brady, archbishop of St. Paul; Albert G. Meyer, archbishop of Chicago; Patrick A. O'Boyle, archbishop of Washington; Leo Binz, archbishop of Dubuque; Emmet M. Walsh, bishop of Youngstown; Joseph M. Gilmore, bishop of Helena; Albert R. Zuroweste, bishop of Belleville.

Billy Hamilton in Baseball Hall of Fame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I was very happy indeed to learn recently that my late, lamented friend, and outstanding baseball player from my home town of Clinton, Mass., Billy Hamilton, had been elected to the Baseball Hall of Fame.

I had been interested in Billy Hamilton's election to the Hall of Fame for sometime past and over a period of time now have urged the committee in charge to give favorable consideration to his name. It is quite inspiring and gratifying to realize that at last Billy Hamilton's great feats on the diamond have been appropriately recognized by his admission to the Hall of Fame.

Hamilton's lifetime batting average during his 14 years in the majors is now officially listed at .344, although many claim it should be .351, a figure that was carried on the early record books.

Only Ty Cobb, Rogers Hornsby, Joe Jackson, Pete Browning, Ted Williams, Lefty O'Doul, Dan Brouthers, and Ed Dalahanty are credited with higher lifetime batting averages than Hamilton.

His accomplishments on the diamond have been considered to be almost legendary. The story in Clinton has it that when Hamilton played with the Phillies in Boston, it was his custom to doff his uniform as soon as the game was ended, dash to the Back Bay station and board the train for Clinton in order that he might spend a night at his home. It is reported that he consistently followed that routine after he was traded to Boston and he returned home after each game.

Hon. Orra L. Stone, late distinguished editor emeritus of the Clinton Daily Item, and an old and valued friend of mine and a friend of Hamilton's for many years, has written an authoritative story on Hamilton which I am inserting in the RECORD. Mr. Stone recalls how Hamilton used to come home at night folowing the baseball game and join the boys in the center of the town relating the highlights of the day's game in which he had played.

I had the pleasure of knowing Billy Hamilton when I was a high school student. At that time he was retired and used to attend many of the football, baseball, and basketball games of the local high school teams. He was a rabid fan, so to speak, and always found time to speak an encouraging word to the players. In his personal life, throughout his baseball career and at all times, he was a model athlete and was truly a lofty example for young people to follow.

Many will be pleased with the honor that has come to the great Billy Hamil-

ton, and I am proud indeed that my hometown of Clinton can boast of such an illustrious, baseball figure who at the same time represented such a fine high code of sportsmanship and conduct.

I heartily congratulate the hall of fame for its wisdom in including his name among baseball's greats.

Also, I congratulate my valued friend, Mr. John T. Morgan, of Wheelwright, Mass., peerless sports follower and statistician, upon his warm interest in and effective work for Billy Hamilton's admission to Baseball's Hall of Fame.

The material follows:

[From the Clinton (Mass.) Daily Item, Jan. 30, 1961]

LONGSTANDING WRONG IS RIGHTED: BILLY HAMILTON MAKES HALL OF FAME

(By the Observer)

William R. Hamilton, formerly of Clinton, Lancaster, and Worcester—the greatest gift to baseball Clinton ever produced—was unanimously elected to the Baseball Hall of Fame Sunday at Cooperstown, N.Y., by a special oldtimers' committee of the Baseball Writers' Association.

His name will be officially inducted into the shrine July 24 and he will probably be represented by his sister Mrs. Robert Jones, of Ozai, Calif.

Hamilton's election righted a longstanding wrong which has mystified baseball fans from coast to coast, especially among Clinton fans who were around during the gay nineties era.

It topped with success the efforts of many years by John T. Morgan, of Wheelwright, Mass., to give the Clinton star his rightful and well-deserved niche among the greats of the national pastime.

BORN IN NEWARK

Billy Hamilton was born in Newark, N.J., and in early life came to Lancaster, with his parents and later to Clinton and spent the last years of his life, after his retirement from the diamond, in Worcester.

During his sports career, with the Boston team, in the National League, Billy by thrift and frugal living, saved enough from his salary to erect the six-apartment building known as the Hamilton block, at 512 High Street, corner of Plain, where he and his wife resided, for many years, until they moved to Worcester.

Known as "Slidin' Billy" during his playing days with Philadelphia and Boston from 1890 to 1901, Hamilton stole 115 bases in 1891 with Philadelphia and in 1894 scored 196 runs—both marks which have stood the test of time.

What makes Hamilton's records all the more remarkable is that he set them playing shorter seasons than have been played since. He stole his 115 bases in 133 games, while second place Ty Cobb could do no better than 96 in 156 games. His 196 runs were scored in 131 games and runnerup Babe Ruth tallied his 177 in 152 games.

In all, Hamilton is variously credited with a career record of 796 and 937 stolen bases. In dispute are 140 bases he swiped with Kansas City of the old American Association, considered by some a major league.

ONE HUNDRED RUNS A SEASON

A centerfielder, his career included 100 runs a season for 11 years, 10 of them in a row and is also tied with George Gore, formerly of the Chicago Cubs, for the most stolen bases in a single game. Both stole seven in a game.

He began to play baseball, in Clinton, but got his real start in Worcester.

In 1887, he left Clinton to play in Waterbury, Conn., but came to the Worcester club, in 1888, which played on the old Grove Street grounds.

He was sold that year to the Kansas City club for $2,500, a big price for a minor leaguer at that period.

In 1889, he stole 117 bases with Kansas City and caught the eyes of big league scouts. He was bought by the Phillies in 1890 and played with that team through 1895. He was sold to Boston and played with the Hub team until 1901, helping them win National League pennants in 1897 and 1898.

His legs, which made him the league's speediest base runner, began to go and Boston released him, in 1901. Dr. Patrick J. Carney, later a baseball coach at Holy Cross, replaced him.

BECAME MANAGER

In 1903, he became the manager of the Haverhill New England League team and in 1 year brought it from last place to the top. In 1905 and 1906 he managed the Harrisburg club, in the Tri-State League, an outlaw outfit, but returned to organized baseball with Haverhill, in 1907.

He left, in 1909, to manage the Lynn club for 2 years and 1911 and 1912 he scouted for the Boston Nationals.

Next he went to Springfield, Greenfield, and Fall River and in 1916 returned to Worcester to manage the city's Eastern League team.

His National League batting average was .344 and he led the National League in hitting in 1901 with a mark of .338. He batted .300 or more for 12 consecutive seasons.

Following his retirement from the national game he entered the employ of the Graton & Knight Co., of Worcester, and during World War I he served as one of the welfare directors of the plant.

He retired in 1935, and died in 1940 at the age of 74 years.

LIFETIME AVERAGE

His lifetime average during his 14 years in the majors is now officially listed at .344 and many oldtimers claim it should be .351—a figure carried in the early record books.

Only Cobb, with 367, Rogers Hornsby, Joe Jackson, Pete Browning, Ted Williams, Lefty O'Doul, Dan Brouthers, and Ed Delahanty are credited with higher lifetime marks than Hamilton.

His baseball accomplishments are legend. He rarely missed being included with his old pal and intense rival, Jesse Burkett, of Worcester, among baseball's elect and with a small group who hit .400 in their respective careers.

When Hamilton played with the Phillies, in Boston, it was his usual custom to doff his uniform as soon as a game was over, dash to the Back Bay station and board a train for Clinton in order that he might spend a night at his home. He consistently followed that program after he was traded to Boston and came after each game.

LOCAL HERO WORSHIPERS

Arriving in Clinton between 6 and 7 o'clock, on a train via the northern division of the New Haven Railroad, he hurried to his High Street home, ate supper with his wife and then walked up High Street to the corner of Church where he leaned against the front of the Brimhall block and calmly related to a dozen or more local fans, all of whom were hero worshipers, including the Observer, the highlights of that day's game in which he had played.

NO BOASTING

Never boasting of his prowess on the diamond, he would answer questions covering the score, the number of hits he made and his stolen bases, if any, and the total of runs he scored, even admitting to his eager audience his errors, if any, which were few and far between.

It must be recalled by the reader that in the 1890's no radios or television sets had been heard of and the only other way local baseball fans could learn the details of a major league game was to await the appearance of the box scores in the newspapers of the following morning.

LOCAL TOP EVENTS

These nightly summaries so willingly given by Hamilton were the top events of every day that Billy appeared on the scene and the fans became crepehangers on rainy nights when they missed the résumé of a major league game in the Hub in which Billy played.

PRIDE OF MANAGERS

Hamilton was the acme of perfection under every manager he served and was never fined or verbally chastized by a manager for an infraction of the training rules. He did not smoke or drink, was not a night owl, never gambled or bet on games, horses, or prize fights, generally was abed by 9 o'clock and reported for each game in perfect physical condition, with clear vision and an earnest desire to play it to the hilt.

Caribbean Security and Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on September 17, 1960, the day officially designated as "Constitution Day," the people of the United States were shocked to read in the press that President Eisenhower, by Executive order, had struck the American flag in the Canal Zone. This startling action, taken in contemptuous defiance of mandates of the Congress, precipitated a chain reaction of critical discussions that has not yet ended.

In an address to the House on January 4, 1961, I emphasized the constitutional question issued by the President's reprehensible order, and quoted a series of press releases made by me subsequent to it.

The response of the American people to this challenge has been splendid. Anyone who has read the letters which have deluged the Congress can have no doubt as to how they stand with respect to the President's ill-advised action.

To their voices have now been added the protests of patriotic organizations, the latest being resolutions on Caribbean security, and on Cuba, adopted on February 2, 1961, by the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies at its annual meeting in Washington.

Consisting of more than 100 patriotic groups in many parts of the country, the total membership of the constituent bodies represented is estimated to exceed 4 million persons.

In order that the views of these influential groups may be given to the Nation at large, I include the texts of the indicated resolutions as part of these remarks:

RESOLUTION ON CARIBBEAN SECURITY

Whereas since the 1956 Suez crisis the Caribbean has become a fourth front against the United States with the Panama Canal as the key target in the struggle for control

of the Western Hemisphere by the world revolutionary movement known as the international Communist conspiracy; and

Whereas the Government of the United States, in meeting this challenge, has persistently adopted practices of reacting to crises rather than leading from policies of strength derived from a reasoned line of thought; and

Whereas the foreign policy of the United States for the past generation has been, in the very largest measure, the treatment of symptoms rather than causes, and replete with surrenders of basic rights and principles with consequent intensification of diplomatic problems; and

Whereas our Caribbean policies have tended to bring about a long series of diplomatic failures adversely affecting the security of the United States and other parts of the Western Hemisphere; and

Whereas these failures have contributed to the establishment of a Soviet beachhead in Cuba, threats to our naval bases at Guantanamo, Cuba, and Chagaramas, in Trinidad, overthrow of the constitutional governments of Venezuela and other countries fronting on the Caribbean, and the formal raising of the flag of the Republic of Panama over the Canal Zone territory; and

Whereas the most unfortunate and reprehensible order of the President in striking the flag of the United States in the Canal Zone, issued under pressure of Communist-inspired demands of radicals in Panama and on advice of the Department of State in clear violation of our traditional interpretation of the treaties of 1903, 1936, and 1955 with the Republic of Panama, and in contemptuous defiance of mandates of the Congress, has aided and abetted the subversive forces behind the program for Caribbean conquest; and

Whereas the repeated diplomatic failures of the Government of the United States to carry out its recognized responsibility for the security of the countries bordering the Caribbean, has served to encourage invasions of various countries by revolutionaries from Soviet Cuba and raises the question of whether or not there are in our Department of State communistic or other subversive influences that are still hidden:

Resolved by the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, Inc., (1) That the Congress of the United States conduct thoroughgoing and comprehensive investigations relative to subversive influences in our Department of State; and

(2) That the Congress, by appropriate measures, take steps to accomplish the following:

(a) Make definite, and reaffirm, the principle of the Monroe Doctrine as applying to intervention by the subversive forces known as international communism; and

(b) Make definite, and reaffirm, U.S. policies for exclusive jurisdiction in perpetuity over the Panama Canal or any other isthmian canal that may be constructed in the future; and

(c) Repudiate President Eisenhower's order directing display of the Panama flag over the Canal Zone territory as violative of law, treaty, international usage, and the historic policy of the United States and invalid; and

(d) Legislate for the formation of a permanent Caribbean patrol force; and

(3) That copies of this resolution be sent to the following:

(a) The Congress of the United States;
(b) The President;
(c) The Secretary of State;
(d) The Secretary of Defense; and
(e) The press.

RESOLUTION ON CUBA

Whereas Cuba has become a 100-percent Soviet satellite, only 90 miles from our shores; and

Whereas, as always, bloodthirsty Communists have passed the ultimate in perfidy as they have scourged and defiled Cuba, destroyed all elementary decency and obliterated every right and freedom; and

Whereas unless broken and thrown back, communism will surge on to engulf and destroy other sister republics, some may sink any moment, the Caribbean overnight may become a red lake; and

Whereas it would be inhuman to abandon our Cuban friends to Communist slavery; and

Whereas we cannot risk having a Communist satellite state at our very threshold, controlling the Caribbean and the approaches to the Panama Canal and the Mississippi Valley; and

Whereas the United States of America must dictate and control its own policies, especially when the very lives and freedoms of its citizens are at stake:

Resolved, That the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, Inc., makes the following recommendations:

1. Recognize a responsible Cuban Government in exile, just as we recognized the Free French and others during World War II.

2. Give that Government our full support, morally and materially, with arms and money.

3. Invoke a pacific blockade of Cuba to take care of trading by the Communist nations.

4. Continue U.S. cooperation and guidance after the Communists have been driven out of Cuba in order to rehabilitate that poor country and bring it back to freedom and constitutional representative government.

Is the Outlook Inflation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. QUIE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, those of us here in this House are fully aware of the recent economic policies enunciated by the new administration, and many of us here have expressed varying degrees of alarm lest such policies are tending toward economic instability. The February 27, 1961, edition of the Wall Street Journal carried an extensive analysis of our country's present economic position, and the proposed economic programs of the new administration. I believe my fellow Members will be interested in reading this article.

THE OUTLOOK—APPRAISAL OF CURRENT TRENDS IN BUSINESS AND FINANCE

(By George Shea)

The Kennedy administration is offering the world a classical lesson in how to lay the seeds of future inflation. It is doing so by proposing new Federal programs in new areas of the Nation's life.

To understand what is going on as clearly as possible it is necessary to review briefly what causes inflation. It is often said that the issuance of money so that its supply exceeds the availability of goods in the cause. However, this is something of an oversimplification. It is necessary also to go back of the issuance of the extra money to see what causes it, and to examine the circumstances surrounding the decision to issue the extra money.

The reason for this further examination is that economists have found a good many cases where the issuance of extra money was not followed by generally rising prices, and others where prices rose without the kind of money issuance generally regarded as the most inflationary. Reasoning from these varying situations, economic students nowadays in most cases agree that an essential factor is whether capacity to produce is fully employed or not.

If capacity is not fully employed, new spending through the issuance of new supplies of money is more likely to raise production than it is to raise prices. But if there is no unemployment and no unused capacity, new spending through the use of new doses of money will raise prices.

Actually, if capacity and workers are fully employed, any kind of new spending effort will tend to push prices up, whether it be Government spending or private spending. The more inflationary kinds of spending, furthermore, are the kinds that do not produce immediately consumable goods. If the spending is on new productive capital, such as a more efficient factory, it will at first have an inflationary effect, but later it will enhance the supply of goods, thus offsetting its first inflationary effect. But if the spending is on guns and shells to be used up in a war, there is no direct offset afterward, which is why inflations resulting from wars persist.

One of the clearest examples of inflation as a result of capital spending is in Russia today, although few people think of the Russian experience in these terms. The whole Russian postwar effort has been concentrated on building up capacity to make heavy industrial goods and armaments. People employed on these works, as well as most members of the Armed Forces, have naturally had to be paid but have produced nothing currently consumable. Thus their buying power has competed for the consumable goods produced by the rest of the population, and there has been a continuous shortage of such goods. As a result, the Russian ruble has been devalued three times since World War II, the latest devaluation having taken place at the start of this year.

One conclusion that can be reached from the foregoing considerations is that much Government activity and employment is inflationary in nature. True, some governmental activity is clearly necessary, if only to keep people from hurting each other. To the extent that it prevents wasteful violence or otherwise creates better conditions for production, it is in its own way productive since it permits greater production than would otherwise be possible. But beyond that it is very difficult to draw the line between governmental activities that are basically productive, and those that employ people in nonproductive work so that they have to live, in essence, entirely on the production of others.

What the Kennedy administration is proposing is a new expansion in Government activity in several directions. There's to be a medical care for the aged, although expenditures of the Federal old-age trust fund (mostly benefits) have risen from $3.5 billion in 1954 to more than $11 billion in the latest fiscal year.

There's to be aid to education State by State, although Federal aid of all kinds to States and localities has already grown from $2.7 billion in 1954 to $7.4 billion in 1960. Furthermore, this proposal would include a formula for rapid acceleration of aid expenditures: Any State whose effort fell short of the national average would be expected to bring it up to the average. Because any increase in a component figure below an average automatically raises the average, the sheer arithmetic of this kind of competition

would soon force the national average up to the level of the most lavish spender.

And there's to be Federal spending of new kinds on national resources, including desalting of sea water, which private enterprise is avid to develop even without Federal help. Of course, all these things are desirable. Better education is desirable, better medical care is desirable, and development of national resources is desirable. But medical care has been improving, as witness the growth in the average person's life span, and education has been getting better rapidly, too.

To some extent, these Federal efforts would merely duplicate efforts that would have been made anyhow, and to some extent they would go beyond them. But whichever is the case, the generous Federal hand on the job would mean the employment of more people than would otherwise be necessary—even if only for the Federal supervision of local efforts that would be added. Furthermore, with Federal help added, much of the normal and practical limits on spending which local management often can impose would be swept aside.

One has only to look at some of the historical trends of Federal spending to know what would happen. Federal trust fund spending of all kinds has grown from $7 billion in fiscal 1954 to more than $22 billion in 1960, all of it over and above the regular budget. Whether within or outside the budget, much of what is proposed would tend to add increasingly to the nonproductive expenditures of the Nation—the kind which must be supported by the productive portion of the populace and which, therefore, intensify the inflationary bias that always has existed and always will exist in government.

Ball-Bearing Gap: Should We Help Russians Close It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Roscoe Drummond appears in this morning's Washington Post.

The article is very revealing in that it points up once again that we have no firm policy in regard to Russia and the Communist takeover of the world.

In other words, we shilly-shally; one day one policy promulgated by some secretary, the next day another suggested by some new man.

As this article shows in the case of these high precision ball bearings that can only be made in this country and that the Soviets want to buy from us for the perfecting of their missiles, the only firm and knowledgeable voice that has been raised is the voice of Senator DODD of Connecticut. This Senator is not of my party, but I regard him as one of the most dedicated fighters agaist communism in the United States, and what is more important, if that is possible, one of the best informed and the most intelligent.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to defeat communism we must fight it here and now. If communism should win, its major victory will have been achieved through misguided American dupes and apathetic public opinion.

BALL-BEARING GAP—SHOULD WE HELP RUSSIANS CLOSE IT?

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Should the United States help the Soviet Union close one of its own "missile gaps?"

This is no classroom question. It is immediate and high policy. You might think that the answer should be simple. Perhaps it should be but so far the Eisenhower administration and the Kennedy administration has each answered it both ways.

At stake is whether the Soviets are to be permitted to buy from the United States $1,500,000 of newly developed, very complex machines capable of producing high-precision ball bearings as small as fifteen one-thousandths of an inch.

This is not just another commercial transaction. The reason is that these ball bearings are predominantly used in the guidance systems of military missiles and spacecraft and other highly complex military weapons.

So far American industry has in total operation only about 72 of these very special machines. The Soviets want to get 45 like them delivered real fast.

Naturally, the U.S. manufacturers would like to sell them—if the Government is prepared to issue the necessary export license.

The Department of Commerce, which makes these licensing decisions, has been on all sides of the question.

During the latter months of the Eisenhower administration the Department first decided that the sale could be made, then that it couldn't, and later that it might.

When the Kennedy administration took over, Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges found himself inheriting a whole series of position papers, most of which favored letting the Russians buy.

Secretary Hodges had to decide yes or no. He decided yes, but lately, since Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, vice chairman of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, has been raising pointed questions and apparently acquiring fresh information, Mr. Hodges has held up the license until Senator DODD can give the Department his report.

Mr. DODD is reporting:

That the sale of this machinery might well save the Soviets several years' delay in closing their present gap in the "miniaturization" of their missile and spacecraft-guidance systems. (It is this miniaturization which makes it unnecessary for the United States to have such powerful thrust for its own missiles.)

That, according to industry experts whose findings Senator DODD is submitting to Mr. Hodges, these machines the Soviets want to get from us cannot be duplicated elsewhere at the present time.

All the arguments are on one side.

The ban on the sale of precision tools to the Soviets was removed by the Eisenhower administration some time ago on the ground that what we would sell the Soviets, they could get elsewhere.

At one stage only the Defense Department member of the Advisory Committee on Exports objected to the issuance of the ball-bearing license.

Obviously the U.S. manufacturer does not lightly want to throw away business which means jobs as well as profits.

What is really disconcerting is that it should take so long to get the pertinent facts together in one place and that in the end the Department of Commerce, which has the authority to decide these matters, did not appear to have full knowledge until it was provided by a Senate investigating committee.

It is well to have skeptical Congressmen scrutinizing the executive branch of the Government but they can't do the job regularly. The yes-and-no and yes-and-maybe-not handling of the ball-bearing decision suggests that the whole procedure of granting export licenses needs to be reviewed.

None of this means that former Commerce Secretary Frederick Mueller or Secretary Hodges wants to help the Soviets. It does mean that the mechanism for getting the facts fully and promptly is dangerously pretty creaky.

The United States Clearly Leads in Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 17, 1961

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has announced, as of February 24, 1961, an authoritative "International Satellite and Space Probe Summary." The following space vehicles are in orbit as of this date:

Name and country	Launch date	Transmitting
Explorer I (United States)	Jan. 31, 1958	No.
Vanguard I (United States)	Mar. 17, 1958	Yes.
Lunik I [1] (U.S.S.R.)	Jan. 2, 1959	No.
Vanguard II (United States)	Feb. 17, 1959	No.
Pioneer IV [1] (United States)	Mar. 3, 1959	No.
Explorer VI (United States)	Aug. 7, 1959	No.
Vanguard III (United States)	Sept. 18, 1959	No.
Explorer VII (United States)	Oct. 13, 1959	Yes.
Pioneer V [1] (United States)	Mar. 11, 1960	No.
Tiros I (United States)	Apr. 1, 1960	Yes.
Transit I-B (United States)	Apr. 13, 1960	No.
Spacecraft I (U.S.S.R.)	May 15, 1960	No.
Midas II (United States)	May 24, 1960	Yes.
Transit II-A (United States)	June 22, 1960	Yes.
NRL Satellite (United States)	do	Yes.
Echo I (United States)	Aug. 12, 1960	Yes.
Courier I-B (United States)	Oct. 4, 1960	Yes.
Explorer VIII (United States)	Nov. 3, 1960	No.
Tiros II (United States)	Nov. 23, 1960	Yes.
Samos II (United States)	Jan. 31, 1961	(2).
Sputnik VII (U.S.S.R.)	Feb. 4, 1961	No.
Sputnik VIII (U.S.S.R.)	Feb. 12, 1961	No.
Venus probe [1] (U.S.S.R.)	do	(2).
Explorer IX (United States)	Feb. 16, 1961	No.
Discoverer XX (United States)	Feb. 17, 1961	No.
Discoverer XXI (United States)	Feb. 18, 1961	Yes.
Transit III-B (United States)	Feb. 21, 1961	Yes.

[1] In solar orbit, others in earth orbit.
[2] Not available.
[3] On command.

Current summary (Feb. 24, 1961):

Earth orbit:	
United States	20
U.S.S.R.	3
Solar orbit:	
United States	2
U.S.S.R.	2
Transmitting:	
United States	11
U.S.S.R.	1

Complete summary (launched to date):

Earth orbit:	
United States	36
U.S.S.R.	[1] 9
Solar orbit:	
United States	2
U.S.S.R.	2
Lunar impact:	
U.S.S.R.	1

[1] Lunik III passed once around Moon, then into Earth orbit.

Still Needed: A Tax Incentive for Home Improvements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB CASEY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, within a few weeks, the Bureau of the Census will bring before us an ugly picture of national shame. It will be painted for all to see in the statistics of the 1960 housing inventory.

We will be told that in this land with the highest standard of living on earth there are 10,952,000 substandard units of housing.

We will be told that 639,000 units of housing stand dilapidated and vacant.

We will be told that 888,000 substandard homes are occupied by the owners.

Two weeks ago in his program for economic recovery and growth, President John F. Kennedy called for a tax incentive for business to spur on our lagging economy.

The White House informs me that specific proposals will be submitted to Congress by the President at a later date. This is, indeed, heartening news for our businessmen.

But in our drive to spur on a lagging economy with tax incentives, let us not overlook the perennial forgotten man, the American homeowner. Upon his weary shoulders rests the heaviest tax burden. He is school taxed, city taxed, district taxed, county taxed, State taxed, Federal taxed—taxed until it nears the state of being confiscatory.

In the last Congress, I introduced a bill to provide a tax incentive for home improvements. The need for passage is even greater now, and I am pleased to advise my colleagues I have this day reintroduced the measure.

This is a multipurpose bill. Basically, it will permit income tax deductions as an incentive for home and property improvements. But in addition, this bill if enacted will give a tremendous shot in the arm to our sagging economy.

Plumbers, electricians, carpenters, roofers, glaziers, paperers, contractors, hardware and lumber stores—all phases of the building and construction industry would benefit from a surge of business.

The President is asking that we expend millions in extending unemployment benefits. Here, in my opinion, we can take a positive approach to the problem by enacting this bill. The upsurge of activity in the business world would heavily overcome any loss of revenue generated by its passage, and thousands of our unemployed would be put to work.

But consider this point as well: our State and local governments would benefit tremendously as substandard housing is repaired and its valuation increased on the local tax rolls.

This, to me, is where our Government and this Congress can enact legislation and properly assert the claim of Federal aid. This is the type of aid I believe most Americans and local governments would prefer to see—aid our citizens and our local governments to help them selves.

My bill, briefly, would permit a taxpayer to deduct a maximum of $750 during a taxable year for expenditures made to repair or improve property used as his principal residence. In addition, the owner of rental property would be permitted to amortize over 60 months the expenditures made for repairs, replacements, or improvements intended to increase the livability, utility, safety, or value of property. Improvements or additions which would increase the total amount of floor space used for dwelling purposes would not be deductible.

It is tragic that under our existing Internal Revenue Code, a homeowner cannot deduct any expense for major improvements to his home. He can, if he itemizes deductions, subtract only the interest paid on a loan for such improvement or repair.

Nor has this Congress given landlords any incentive to repair substandard housing. While they can declare depreciation, they are not permitted to deduct expenses for capital improvement such as remodeling, replacing a roof, and so forth.

Again I ask the Members of this body: Is it any wonder that so much of our greatest national asset, our housing, is substandard?

And again I must say that the answer is obvious—and the fault is ours. Through our restrictive tax laws, we have built in an incentive for home and property owners to keep housing sustandard, for they can ill afford to make needed repairs.

I ask that you reflect but briefly on the billions spent in the past decade for public housing and urban renewal. Yet the shame of substandard dwelling for millions of our citizens is with us still.

Passage of this bill will bring a new meaning to urban renewal, for it will enlist the aid of the homeowner to rehabilitate existing substandard housing. But equally important, it will be a giant step toward prevention of blight and decay among homes not yet substandard.

How many homes in each of your districts are now in need of paint and repair, and how long will it be before such areas become part of a slum? While we have spent billions fighting the effect of blight and decay we have neglected entirely the cause.

I know full well there will be those who argue that passage of this bill will cost the Federal Government in revenue—that the answer lies in huge expenditures for urban renewal and public housing. Again I say it is a fallacious argument. The street of the Federal dole is a street of no return. Its destination is fiscal insolvency, dependency, and bureaucracy.

The bill I have introduced points a positive way to cure one of our Nations greatest ills—a way to assist our tax-burdened homeowner—a way we can extend the hand of cooperation to our State and local governments.

I sincerely urge my colleagues to consider the measure closely and join with me in seeking its early adoption.

Wall Street Journal Views "The Most of the Worst"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in an editorial appearing in the February 28 issue of the Wall Street Journal, attention is directed to the recent comments of America's new President on the state of the Nation's economy. It comments upon "distortion of the whole by preoccupation with a part" and urges, as I urged in my statement to this House on February 17, that "when one wants to improve, he must see not only his weaknesses but also his strengths." I believe that this sound evaluation of our economy deserves the attention of the country and for this reason I request that it be inserted into the RECORD at this point:

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK—THE MOST OF THE WORST

In one of his recent messages to Congress, President Kennedy stated:

"A recent survey of a very large elementary school in one of our major cities found 91 percent of the children coming to class with poor diets, 87 percent in need of dental care, 21 percent in need of visual correction, and 19 percent with speech disorders."

That's an alarming picture, and the impression created is that it's a rather broad picture, that children all across the country are going to school in pathetically neglected condition.

But all the President's statement really tells us is that a survey was made. We don't know where or why or by whom. We are told it was made in "a very large" school, but not whether the school is representative of schools in the major city in which it is located or of schools in the Nation as a whole. Nor are we told what the surveymakers considered a poor diet or how they judged the need of dental care.

What we're told is that some children in this country unfortunately do not get the nourishing diet or careful medical attention of the great majority of American children. No one can take exception to that, or to the suggestion that the community has a responsibility toward truly needy children.

Nonetheless, by dwelling on the most unrepresentative part, the whole is submerged, and the needs of the few cast a pall of inadequacy over the well-being of the many. The image of our society and ourselves is distorted. And because the need is expanded by overstatement, the argument for expanding Government to meet it is given a more persuasive ring.

Distortion of the whole by preoccupation with a part is not uncommonly met nowadays. We hear grim reports of widespread unemployment. Business, we are told, is going to pieces. The economy is said to be stagnant, the pace of economic growth snail-like. We hear how the lack of missiles sometime in the sixties may seal the national doom. In distant corners of the world, angry mobs storm through the streets, and we are told it is the prestige of the United States being trampled underfoot.

Yet these indictments focus on narrow parts of broad pictures, and what truth they may contain is thus reduced by the truth they ignore. Certain areas of the country are hard hit by unemployment, but the Na-

tion as a whole is enjoying near-record employment. Business is down in some lines, up in others, and, on the whole, only slightly below the peaks of record prosperity. In comparing national rates of economic growth, we give ourselves the worst of the argument two ways: We ignore the impact of war recovery and reconstruction in Western Europe, and forget that our half-a-billion-dollar gross nation product can grow absolutely larger than other nations at a rate well below theirs.

Similarly, the uproar over the "missile gap" some months ago confused the potential rate of Soviet missile production with overall strategic capability—an error, surely, which Kremlin strategists do not make. Nor does their propaganda reflect the alleged "decline" in U.S. prestige. The United States remains the standard of every Soviet economic boast and the target of every propaganda effort.

This is not to say that all's well; all's obviously not. And perhaps it is useful for the Preesident to remind us more of our society's small failures than its large successes. Certainly, we see no merit in a Pollyanna sort of positive thinking.

But if there's little to be gained by patting ourselves on the back, there's even less to be won by beating ourselves down to the point where a crisis, a calamity, or an "unmet need" looms at every turn. Almost anything, after all, can be blackened by speaking of its faults only. When one wants to improve, he must see not only his weaknesses but also his strengths. For only by understanding our achievements are we able to grasp the true proportions of what remains to be done.

Throughout their history, the American people have been blessed with a divine dissatisfaction; they are self-critical by nature. They should listen closely to those who would make the best they have done even better, but it will profit them little to listen to those who make the most of the worst.

Outlook for 1980

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. QUIE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, in the February 27, 1961, edition of the Wall Street Journal, I read with interest an editorial commenting on the sweeping Federal programs being proposed by the present administration. Because I believe the observations made in this editorial merit the consideration of all my fellow Members, I request that it be presented in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK: 1980

In his message to Congress last week on national resources, President Kennedy took the long view:

"We now use over 300 billion gallons of water a day. By 1980 we will need 600 billion gallons a day.

"Through 1980, according to present estimates of the Federal Power Commission, total installed capacity (of electric power) should triple if we are to meet our Nation's needs for essential economic growth."

And in this span, too, the President foresaw a doubling of our timber requirements, the need for providing 3 billion pounds more of seafood and tripling the Nation's recreation facilities, not to mention unspecified requirements for more city sewage disposal and for better breathing air over metropolitan areas. It was a comprehensive message, ranging from trout streams in the hills to the seashore beaches.

Although these precise measurements of need are little more than figures grabbed from an unlimited supply of air over Washington, a reasonable man might guess them to be conservative. If this country grows as freely and as rapidly as it has in the past, it will need much more of everything.

But the President's long view was not limited to foreseeing the Nation's future needs. Some other phrases suggest some rather far-reaching plans on what's to be done.

"We need an effective Federal air pollution control program now.

"I have requested * * * a progressive, orderly program of starting new (water) projects * * * Uninhibited commercial and residential development in such areas increase ultimate acquisition costs and may result in pressures against the project * * * I urge Congress to enact legislation permitting the reservation of known future reservoir sites * * *.

"Unfortunately, efforts to reduce flood losses by constructing remedial works are being partially offset by rapid industrial and residential development of flood plain lands.

"The role of the Federal Government in supplying an important segment of this (electric) power * * * must continue. * * * In marketing Federal power, this administration will be guided by the following basic principles. * * * Preference in power sales shall be given public agencies and cooperatives.

"A more difficult and unresolved forest situation lies in that half of our forest land held in small private ownership. * * *"

Now, if these phrases mean anything, they say that the villain in the picture—the reason why we are not meeting our water problem, or our timber problem, or whatever—is what is called the private sector of the economy. People, left alone, will uninhibitedly develop plain lands that the Government may later want to put at the bottom of a reservoir; or small private owners of timber land will impede the Government's forest program.

Left to its own devices the private electric industry, like the private lumber industry, would presumably fail to meet the Nation's needs; or at the least it wouldn't sell electricity so as to encourage widespread use and thus recognize the rights of the general public to have electricity.

So it follows, then, that the Federal Government must do something about it. And in this message the President proposes Federal programs for flood control, power development, timber management, urban sewage, city parks, seashore beaches, offshore oil digging, deep-sea fishing and air filtering.

We suppose this is all not too surprising when you reflect that the Government is already proposing to manage our education as youths, our care as old people, and our food and housing in the years between. Still, if this bias against the private sector is not exactly new, it's nonetheless interesting that the President should pick 1980 as the target date for all these Federal programs to take care of all our problems.

Readers of George Orwell's fantasy about the State that provided everything, from the people's necessities to their pleasures, will note this blueprint is 4 years ahead of 1984.

Predator Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Predator Control," appearing in the March issue of National Wildlands News:

PREDATOR CONTROL—AN UNSAVORY MESS

(By Marguerite Angelo Smelser)

Every year in these United States, under pretext of economic necessity and game protection, men in the Predator and Rodent Control Branch, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and in State and county departments of agriculture are seeing to it that they are paid millions of taxpayers' dollars to poison, shoot, trap, and club to death hundreds of thousands of largely beneficial wild animals—the so-called predators.

These animals are the carnivores and insectivores—foxes, bobcats, coyotes, badgers, skunks, cougars, golden eagles, and the like. The racket sustaining this killing hides under the pretty euphemism "predator control."

Men on the payroll of Government predator control agencies have taken advantage of the occasional legitimate need for control to develop programs of widespread senseless killing. For example, during 1959 in California, 29,228 wild predators were reported by these agencies as "taken"—the respectable word for killed—11,737 in Colorado; 42,909 in South Dakota (by bounties and government trappers); and 1,865 even in little New Jersey, which employs 6 trappers. Colorado supports 42 trappers; California, in 1957, supported 87.

IT'S YOUR MONEY

And you, in addition to being made to pay millions of dollars every year for this slaughter, are being forced to pay more millions for the pseudobiological propaganda to keep you sold on it, and still more millions for poisons to get rid of the rodents and insects which the predators, if left alive, would have helped to keep under control without cost.

You should understand that the evil inherent in indiscriminate predator control is no longer a matter of doubt, and every competent authority has long known this. Only those not financially dependent on the racket have been willing to admit it.

The scientific examination of thousands of wild animal stomachs, by the agencies that did the killing, has shown that the bulk of the predators' diet consists of gophers, squirrels, rats, rabbits, insects, and carrion.

On the basis of this evidence, and as a result of field observations, honest men in State departments of fish and wildlife are trying to eliminate their own predator control programs; but they are hampered by their political bosses' collusion with officials of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Predator and Rodent Control Branch and by legislators and certain influential sportsmen who, despite evidence, contend that predators decrease the sportsmen's supply of live targets.

The California fish and game department, attempting to divest itself of its own costly predator control program, lost the struggle

when certain State legislators, in 1959, passed Senate Concurrent Resolution 40. Aimed at the department, it presented the complaints of the wool growers' associations, and purported to represent the sportsmen and all citizens of this State.

Walter Shannon, director of the department, testified that 15 years' observation showed predator control to be a virtual waste of money in game production. Every coyote and bobcat killed cost an average of $35; each skunk $6 to $7; each mountain lion, $629.

But the legislature, representing a handful of selfish interests, ordered the department either to increase its control program, or to allocate funds to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to broaden that agency's program in California. Results: The department paid out $25,400 to the Federal agency, and the department was directed to use its own personnel and $30,000 of its funds to kill the lesser predators.

LOSING A VALUABLE ASSET

Early in the century, the Biological Survey, predecessor of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, made a study of predator-prey relationships, in which predators were evaluated as principally an asset to agriculture. In a Survey bulletin (No. 932), D. E. Lantz wrote: "Coyotes, foxes, wildcats, badgers, skunks, minks, and other flesh-eating animals are among the most potent agents in preventing an undue increase of mice, ground squirrels, pocket gophers, and the like; and much of the damage now done by rodents is due to the increasing warfare that has been waged against their enemies, the carnivores."

Nevertheless, at the demand of a few ignorant stockmen, sportsmen with no knowledge of ecology, and upon a nebulous, unspecified, anonymous, alleged general demand, Government agencies, in 1915, began getting public money for poisoning and trapping predators. The campaign is being expanded today, using Western stockmen as lobbies, but with never an objective review being made.

A DESTRUCTIVE FEDERAL AGENCY

In 1931, the American Society of Mammalogists characterized this arm of our Government as "the most destructive organized agency that has ever menaced so many species of our native fauna," and asked for an investigation.

In 1934, nearly 150 leading naturalists of our largest museums and research institutions petitioned for a thorough investigation to be prosecuted by disinterested and properly qualified parties. The Emergency Conservation Committee has fought the poisoning and trapping operations of the Government for more than 25 years. In spite of all, the Bureau has remained untouchable, and today is more firmly entrenched than ever, with its political affiliations, its cooperation with the U.S. Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, agricultural departments, and the poisoning and trapping programs of these agencies.

"This whole business of predator control is an unsavory mess deriving its perpetuation from the bureaucratic edifice it has built up and the moneys that can be dispensed in its name," writes Richard W. Westwood, formerly editor, Nature magazine. "If the Government wishes to exercise some economy, here is an excellent place to begin."

CONGRESSIONAL LIPSERVICE

To save money by abating predator control to a necessary minimum is furthest from the intentions of those in charge. Each year representatives of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service appear before a congressional Appropriations Committee requesting funds for more slaughter; yet not once has the committee questioned the spending of millions of taxpayers' dollars to kill first the rodent and insect eaters, and then spending millions to poison the rodents and insects. With "we just must not waste a dime" lipservice, Congress gives all that is requested. State legislatures and county governments are doing similarly, yet to pay for proven damage would be far less costly.

"It is well known that popular reports in support of Government control programs are not distinguished for being critically impartial," writes Biologist Durward Allen, formerly of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, in his book, "Our Wildlife Legacy."

Biased and padded reports take many forms. On file is a letter written in 1957 by a district manager of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in reply to an inquiry regarding the Federal trapper and poisoner in Riverside County, Calif. "We are unable to take care of the numerous requests for work in Riverside County," he complained.

THE DEPLETED LAND

Yet at that very time, turkey raisers in that county told this writer that a Government trapper called at their ranch soliciting the privilege to trap out their premises. (Such solicitation is not unusual.) His services were refused. The poultry growers were having no problem with predators, despite their ranch being on the edge of wild country. In fact, in their 7 years of poultry raising they had had only two instances of predation, each of which they had handled themselves.

Tenant cattlemen and sheepmen graze public lands—your lands and mine—at fees so low that they would not pay taxes on comparable private lands, and even this pittance is returned to them for predator control and range improvement practices, some of which deplete the land to an extent incredible to those who have not seen it. (This writer has seen it.)

The Bureau of Land Management and the U.S. Forest Service cooperate with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in poisoning and trapping across millions of acres of our public lands. They allow overgrazing along with the slaughter of wildlife until the acres are bare as the palm of your hand. Then they propagandize you—with your money—to mislead you into believing "scientific management techniques of the open range" have developed lush forage, as shown on the current range conservation 4-cent stamp, where cattle are pictured standing knee deep in grass. You should read the scandal of public land mismanagement, of which indiscriminate predator control is an integral part, in Politics and Grass, a factual exposé by Prof. Philip O. Foss, Department of Government, San Francisco State College.

THEY KEEP THE STOCKMEN IGNORANT

A high official in predator control activity makes the allegation (off the record) that stockmen are not sufficiently enlightened to adopt the system of eliminating only the occasional predator that may be doing damage. This commonsense approach has worked in Missouri for 15 years to the satisfaction of farmers with savings to taxpayers.

If it is true that stockmen are "ecologically ignorant," you may be sure the control agencies are refraining from educating them. Write to any Federal, State or county control department and you will receive stanch arguments for the necessity of killing to the extent it is being done in order to protect the farmers and the sportsmen.

J. Frank Dobie, author of the book, "The Voice of the Coyote", in a letter to this writer in 1959, stated: "I found out while writing my book on the coyote that the hierarchy of the 'control' care nothing at all except to keep killing and to keep increasing their jobs."

INTELLIGENT CATTLEMEN

Of course there are intelligent cattlemen who want predators left alive. (In her article "Uncontrollable 'Control'," this writer included testimony from enlightened ranchers, many of whom say Government agencies put pressure on them to allow poisoning and trapping on their own and leased lands.)

Some of these cattlemen appeared in 1960 before the National Advisory Committee, in Washington, D.C., to voice their protests against killing coyotes, hawks, and other predators. They were opposed to the use of Compound 1080—a vicious chain-acting poison now in general use. However, a spokesman for the Predator and Rodent Control Branch, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, brushed off these protests with dispatch.

BUT THE WOOLGROWERS

Almost to a man, the well-subsidized woolgrowers have no knowledge of ecological principles and couldn't care less. That the coyote played a part in making and keeping the range good, is beyond their comprehension. Their sheepherders follow the instructions of the "bossaman."

To save the trifling expense of guarding their flocks against the occasional destructive predator, the woolgrowers prefer instead to let the taxpayers pay for the wholesale destruction of wildlife on our public lands. Before thousands of sheep are turned onto the range, Government poisoners and trappers go in like a wave of death to kill every wild animal that might conceivably cause monetary loss to some woolgrower, together with every beneficial animal of the same species.

A COZY AFFILIATION

For this the trappers are rewarded with public money. They actually call themselves "The Government" on signs which they print at your expense and mine, and which they tack up in regions where they carry on their work. So cozy is their connection with politicians that they have had a law passed—Federal Penal Code, section 47—to prevent the public from trying to save any of its wildlife from them. If you release one suffering, broken-legged animal dying of thirst in one of their steel traps, you will get up to 5 years and a $5,000 fine.

In its propaganda, the Government has built in advantages beyond the means of private citizens or genuine conservation organizations. With our money, the control operators reach press, radio, and television; and Government public relations men talk before civic groups, chambers of commerce, 4–H clubs, and in schools.

Indicative of this is the 1959 report of a director of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service operations in Arizona. He admits that his 16 fieldmen have reduced the coyote population—competent Arizonians say "to the verge of extinction"—but he does not suggest cutting down on trapping and poisoning. He relates how his men have educated the public about the necessity of control as he practices it, and as to the alleged benefits of compound 1080. He scoffs, "Many people, including some of Arizona's leading biologists, believe that predators control rabbits and rodents."

PUBLIC FUNDS FOR RIDICULE

It should be a matter of grave concern that public money is used to publish material containing a paucity of scientific truth but a plethora of biased reporting and even ridicule. A sample is the piece titled "Policies and Philosophies of Predator and Rodent Control." The author refers to the protests of that large and growing but as yet unorganized citizenry opposed to indiscriminate predator destruction—among them biologists, ecologists, naturalists—as the "maudlin sentimentalities of the Peewit Twitter Societies."

Cattlemen will tell you that in as many as 40 years of cattle raising they have never found proof that coyotes or other predators kill calves; and that they know from experience that predators are insurance against too many rodents. "Stock die of many natural causes, and a coyote found eating a carcass is blamed as the killer," says lifetime cattleman John W. Cummings, of Nogales, Ariz., who, with his son, is vehemently opposed to Government predator control programs.

"It is common knowledge that all predators do not prey on livestock and poultry," reports the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks, in a 1959 pamphlet. "Where such losses occur it is usually one or a few individuals which are doing the damage. Removal of these few usually ends such losses. A 12-year investigation of the coyote bounty in Missouri showed no relationship between coyote numbers and complaints of coyote damage, indicating that the losses were caused by a few individual coyotes."

TRUTH FROM THE INFORMED

You may be sure the control departments are not putting out such information, nor are they publishing the opinions of such eminent biologists as Frank and John Craighead, Edson Fichter, Daniel McKinley, Marston Bates, Robert Rudd, Charles Elton, William Albrecht (professor of soils), or Durward Allen.

Dr. Clarence Cottam, formerly Assistant Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, has made thundering accusations against Government propaganda which attempts to gain public support for blanketing millions of U.S. acres with poison. At the 1960 congressional hearings on the Pesticide Coordination Act, Dr. Cottam stated that in his opinion there has been "misinformation, unfounded assertions, inaccurate reporting, and scare campaign propaganda, if not bold deception, fed the American public." Whereas he was speaking primarily of the fire ant fiasco of the U.S. Department of Agriculture in the South, he testified: "It isn't only in the field of entomology that problems may arise. The predator and rodent control programs of the Department of the Interior constantly need review and objective appraisal."

There is a handful of U.S. legislators who agree that a truthful appraisal is needed. They will help get such an appraisal if the public demands it; but we should make certain that it is not done by the profiteers of control. Like appointing bank robbers to investigate their robberies, that is what has been done in the past, with the results foisted on the public as being factual.

A NEEDLESS LOSS OF LIFE

Ill-advised poisoning campaigns have resulted in the death of thousands of ducks, geese, pheasants, and deer by actual count; while uncounted thousands of predators have died from eating the flesh of creatures already killed by poisons. In California, last year, 258,460 pounds of 1080 bait was used by the State department of agriculture alone.

According to the Humboldt Star, 33 Government hunters and trappers killed 4,480 predators in a 6-month period, in Nevada, but "officials of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service estimate that compound 1080 and other lethal materials were responsible for several times the accredited catch."

There has grown up in this century a kind of scientific investigator: the specialist. The channelized thinker, he has been aptly called. "Specialization in the world of modern knowledge is necessary," writes Marston Bates, professor of biology, University of Michigan in "The Forest and the Sea," "but generalization is also necessary if we are to fit our jig-saw pieces of information together into meaningful patterns."

WHAT DIFFERENCE DOES IT MAKE?

An example of specialist thinking was voiced at an agricultural experiment station by an official who asked this writer, "What difference does it make if whole species are wiped out? We'd get along very nicely without them. Whoever misses the bison and the passenger pigeon?"

The science of ecology began about 40 years ago. Every day it becomes clearer that even remote interdependencies between man and the flora and fauna of this earth are crucial to man himself. "It is not a sentimental but a grimly literal fact that unless we share this terrestrial globe with creatures other than ourselves, we shall not be able to live on it for long," writes Joseph Wood Krutch in "The Voice of the Desert."

All too often, specialists at our tax-supported universities are strongly biased in favor of whatever ups agricultural production, in spite of an $11 billion farm surplus. They do indeed know how to kill insects and mammals with increasing use of poisons put out by the chemical companies who furnish grants to the universities.

Biologists in the same institutions who dare to question the end results do so at their peril, while those who protest on the outside are termed religious fanatics, humane crackpots—ignorant or even subversive.

SCARE PROPAGANDA

Because the truth about predation and the value of biological controls are becoming more widely known, the control agencies are redoubling their propaganda. Scare items appear regularly in the newspapers: "Predators Are Increasing" is a charge that many professional trappers who know the finagling of reports say bluntly is "a damned lie." "Rabies Among Wild Animals on the Rise" is the kind of subject newspapers accept without question. The pronouncements of public officials have the political authority of power, which is a very different thing from the authority of knowledge—and too seldom the twain meet. How much of this rabies scare is based on fact, and how much on the intent to bolster predator control? Here is what Dr. William Brady, widely quoted physician, has to say:

"There is nothing scientific about the diagnosis of rabies in animals. It is all a purely empirical question, a question of individual opinion. Even finding of so-called Negri bodies, regarded by some pathologists as characteristic of rabies, is a matter of personal opinion merely."

While alleged agricultural benefits and game production become discredited as excuses for predator control, rabies scares can fill the gap.

SPREAD TRUTH

"Do we want to comprehend the natural laws of the biotic community into which we turn our sheep and cattle?" asks Zoologist Edson Fichter of Idaho State College. "Do we want the self-sustaining yield of a healthy land, or do we prefer the 'fast buck,' regardless of the cost it imposes upon the land? Will we choose the preventive medicine of natural control of potential pests, or will we continue calling upon the perennial pattern of poison baits and paternalism to treat the sick land's symptoms while the illness lingers on?"

Do we want to know the truth, or do we want to protect empires?

Where Is Our Economy Heading?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I have for some time now been concerned about the general direction our economy is heading, and I note that I am not alone in my concern. The business and financial editor of the Christian Science Monitor, Mr. Nate White, in the February 25, 1961, edition of that newspaper, clearly reflects some general areas of concern and alarm over the present trend of our economy. Since I believe his observations are worthy of notice, I recommend the full reading of his article to my fellow members:

TREND OF THE ECONOMY: REVERSE COURSE

(By Nate White)

BOSTON.—It is fashionable these days for newsmen and commentators to write in surprised fashion about the moderate course of the new Kennedy administration in economic affairs.

Nothing could be more deceptive.

It is not a moderate course. It is a diametrically opposite course from that in which the United States has been traveling. It is deliberately so. It is not accidental.

The economy is changing daily before everyone's eyes. It is a change in the direction of informed, balanced, central planning, but it is the direct opposite of the kind of political and economic thought developed under the Eisenhower administration.

It is to President Kennedy's credit that this turn around has been accomplished in 36 days without shattering the structure of the economy. It is to the economy's credit that the Nation is so maneuverable.

A reverse course of a great ship can be an exciting, shocking, tremulant experience. Or it can be achieved full circle so quietly that no one except those in the deckhouse and the close observers of the skies might notice.

We are in the latter kind of turn around. We are pointed in the direction of the most tightly planned, directed, and controlled economy in our history.

The clearest indication of the new direction is in President Kennedy's special message to the Congress on the development of the Nation's natural resources.

The objectives are for the benefit of the general public. The President has even included all types of electric-power developers—public, private, and cooperative—in the plan. He has called for a massive expansion of power, all types, well knowing that in power capacity lies the genuine basis of economic growth. But it implies massive central planning.

This is a point which the Soviet Union understands well. The U.S. power development is massive. But as the saying is, when the full impact of the Kennedy program is understood, the public "will not have seen anything yet."

The development of water resources, to desalt seawater, purify the streams—these are fundamental measures in the economy which require the financial backing of the Federal

Government, its conception, blueprinting, and execution.

The cost of the projects which will stem from the Kennedy natural resources message cannot even be guessed at. They will be paid for and amortized, undoubtedly, in much the fashion of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The point is: The Nation is on the way. And the direction is directly opposite from that in which it has been traveling.

Some other definite points are coming clear, if one reads between the lines.

The Nation's defense posture has stiffened.

At the same time the administration is exploring every avenue of arms control.

Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara told the House Armed Services Committee that the Nation's weapons arsenal must be capable of a decisive counterblow after a massive nuclear attack has occurred.

This type of defense or survival posture requires massive development of highly mobile forces. It is significant that the preceding day, February 22, Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, the Chief of Naval Operations, said in Fort Lauderdale (and his address must, under the new rules, carry White House clearance) that the Navy needed many new aircraft carriers so that "we can project naval air power where we need it, when we need it."

The high-speed carrier, Admiral Burke said, "is the closest thing to an all-purpose weapon that has ever been devised." He explained: It can reinforce the drooping courage of friendly nations; it can obtain and maintain control of airlanes where and when needed; it can support amphibious or parachute landings; it can give the right amount of punch to halt an aggressor; it can send nuclear weapons as a retaliatory force.

The first act of Secretary McNamara was to strengthen the Nation's capacity to handle small-scale warfare. The Nation clearly is moving also in the direction of massive mobile retaliatory power.

At the same time, Ambassador Llewellyn E. Thompson, Jr., has returned to his post in Moscow readied with the Kennedy administration's desires to pool research in space exploration and in other peacetime directions, and also to discuss with the Soviets how to begin to negotiate for arms control.

Does this mean an international nuclear power compact in which the U.S.S.R. and the United States police the world?

Meanwhile, the economy is in the obvious first stages of an economic upturn. The administration's programs to stimulate it will add to the momentum. A vigorous recovery, plus a vigorous stimulant, can mean only one thing: large and rapid inflation, unless the new labor-management-consumer presidential commission can exert a firm stabilizing force.

Credit plans indicate a large increase in the money supply. Housing plans indicate more liberal Federal-guaranteed mortgages. Union, business, and consumer spending plans, on top of those of Nation, States, communities, can exert massive economic pressures this year.

In 36 days this has happened. And a few people still write of the "moderate" young man in the White House.

The Late Honorable Walter M. Mumma

SPEECH
OF
HON. J. IRVING WHALLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1961

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was indeed saddened to learn of the untimely passing of our good friend and colleague, WALTER MUMMA.

As a member of the Pennsylvania State Senate for some years, I had long been acquainted with his devoted service to his district and his State and his Nation, and upon my election to the Congress, I soon came to regard him as a personal friend and trusted adviser.

WALTER MUMMA was a man of ability, integrity, courage, and good will, and this country has suffered a great loss in his passing. He will be sorely missed by his colleagues, his family and his countless friends, but we may find consolation in the fact that his dedication to duty and his adherence to principle will be a living memorial to this great American.

I join with my colleagues in expressing my deepest sympathy to his fine family.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Appendix

Resources for Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on February 27 Col. Christian Hanburger, the U.S. Army district engineer for Alaska, addressed the Greater Anchorage Chamber of Commerce on various phases of the work of his office.

The Alaska district was created in 1946, and since that time the interests and work of the district described so well by Colonel Hanburger have ranged over the vast area of Alaska.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the speech made by Colonel Hanburger.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY COL. CHRISTIAN HANBURGER

I would like to review with you today something of what has been accomplished in military defense construction in Alaska during the last 20 years, and then briefly to glance to the future.

The military construction program has been an important factor in Alaska's phenomenal growth. It very likely has affected every person—resident of Alaska—during the 20-year period, either directly or indirectly.

Dating back to 1946, this program has been administered by the U.S. Army Engineer District, Alaska, the organization that I represent. The district was created to continue the work started in Alaska by engineer troops in 1941. Both are elements of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Engineers in uniform began the construction in the months preceding an attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941. After war was declared, the work was expanded in scope and increased in tempo. Their mission was to build facilities needed for defense and offense.

In this they were singularly successful. They built the Alcan Highway, forerunner of the Alaska Highway, and numerous bases from Annette Island to Nome and from Nome to Attu. These rightfully have been called "stepping stones to victory."

Following the war, the construction mission inherited by the district was modified to fit the world situation. The Alaska district continued to build or adapt facilities for defense, but not for the offensive. These were needed by a Nation at peace, which at the same time was engaged in a cold war.

The first work undertaken by the Alaska district in 1946 was at Anchorage and Fairbanks where wartime bases were converted to modern, permanent installations. Afterwards, a network of defense warning stations and secondary bases were established radiating out from these centers to the most remote corners of this large State.

This work of the first 20 years has been successful. Most of the defense work I described has been done. We have work remaining to do, but the spadework is done.

More was achieved in this period than the mere building of a defense network, no matter how vast or intricate in a frontier country. It was during these years that Alaska experienced an unprecendented period of growth—a growth that I am sure will continue. The presence of a large civilian construction industry numbering over 2,300 at peak periods certainly has been a factor in Alaska's growth of the last 20 years.

This defense program will continue as the needs of the Nation dictate, and it will continue to contribute to Alaska's economy in the future; but not, barring the totally unforeseen, on a scale that it did in the past 20 years.

The hard, costly pioneer work has been done. The remote stations have been built. The large jobs, Clear being the latest, have been virtually completed.

Projects starting this year are perhaps as varied in design as they were in the past, but they are smaller and they are not as difficult of access.

They include the relocation of an alert hangar, runway work, chapel construction, an airmen's dormitory, radar tower work, construction of runway extensions, building of a dry cleaning facility, and family quarters.

In the Anchorage area we will start building a storage cubicle magazine, a missile assembly shop, taxiway lighting, and utilities at Elmendorf.

The estimated value of work that we expect to place this year is $27 million. For last year, this was $95 million or slightly more than three times as much as this year.

Last year was one of the big years in military construction in Alaska. It ranks with the annual programs undertaken in the period from 1950 to 1959. It was during the fifties that military construction reached its peak. In 1953, the value of placement peaked out at $150 million. The average annual placement was $96 million. The program is down noticeably from its peak.

In the 20 years of military construction, a total of slightly more than $2 billion was spent in Alaska. Such a sum would be helpful in any economy, no matter how rich it was otherwise.

The question will arise now as to what the effects will be on the economy resulting from the reduction in military construction. I can only say that Alaska being Alaska, it will find other roads to economic independence. Alaska is a land of promise due to its many virtually untouched resources and its vigorous people.

I think that Alaska's future depends on the development of its resources. If its resources are developed, then its future will be better than its past or present. If this is not done, then I do not know how it will continue to grow. My advice is to develop them as rapidly as possible. This job is much larger than any which has been performed in the past.

Much of the preliminary work leading to full resource development has been done. I feel I can speak with authority on this subject. Shortly after Alaska came under the American flag in 1867, Army Engineers came here singly or in small groups to conduct trail explorations, waterway explorations, and to chart Alaska's resources at a time when their fellow countrymen still considered Alaska as "Seward's folly."

They continued this work beyond the turn of the century. In this century, before the start of World War II, they have dredged channels for ocean shipping and built and expanded harbors. They were charter members and continued to serve on the original Alaska Road Commission for 33 years; they helped to survey and build the Alaska Railroad.

Our work directed along these lines was interrupted for several years due to the immensity of the war work, but in 1949 the responsibility for continuing the civil works was given to the Alaska district. The first assignment of our civil works people was in the tradition of their forerunners. The old-timers would recognize it as a typical large order. They were assigned to map the water resources of Alaska and to report their findings to Congress. The potential of hundreds of streams and lakes and coastal waters in all parts of Alaska had to be gauged to fill the order.

Our civil works men have completed this survey of water resources in Alaska and soon will make their final report to Congress. They examined the resources for navigation, flood control, recreation, and hydroelectric potential. What they found in hydropower potential exceeds Alaska's gold by many multiples in economic possibilities, if not in glamor.

Alaska has about 18 million kilowatts potential in hydroelectric power at sites ranging from the very small to the mammoth.

I would like to review briefly a few hydropower developments and what contributions to the economy can be expected from them.

On the Kenai Peninsula southeast of Homer, a site at Bradley Lake has been subjected to a detailed engineering study. This site is located near enough to Anchorage so that it could supply low-cost power that will be needed here in the near future. Bradley is a medium-sized project having a potential capacity of approximately 64,000 kilowatts. The estimated cost of construction is $45,750,000.

The project has been recommended for constructed by the Alaska district and favorably reviewed by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in Washington, D.C. It is fully expected that the project will be presented for appropriation of construction funds. Conceivably, Bradley could be built and producing power in 1965 or 1966.

In the meantime, the Alaska district is continuing to investigate the feasibility of a hydroelectric project on the Yukon River at Rampart Canyon, northwest of Fairbanks. This project is of such magnitude that, if it is carried through to completion, it will stand with the hydroelectric giants of the world, having a capacity in the neighborhood of 5 million kilowatts.

Detailed engineering studies are being made of Rampart. This spring we will make drill tests through the ice for foundation data.

Another study will soon be launched under the direction of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Alaska Department of

Fish and Game to determine the effects of the completed project on the wildlife of the area.

In the near future, we expect to announce that a world-renowned firm has been retained to conduct an economic study of the effects of the project on the economy of Alaska and the Nation as a whole.

Rampart is frequently thought of as being a remote project—something that may be built in the next generation. This is not necessarily so. The studies made by Army Engineers indicate that Rampart could be producing power for industry by 1971–72 if full authorization and funding are forthcoming.

Even Rampart's total capacity will be insufficient for the future demands of power-hungry industries—industries which process metal ores through electrical processes and industries that are auxiliary to these.

Among those industries that use electro-processing—that is, electricity as a raw material and ingredient rather than as a source of power—are the processors of aluminum, magnesium, titanium, zirconium, hafnium, electric steel, electric pig iron, electrolytic copper, zinc, nickel, ferroalloys, chlorine, and caustic soda, calcium carbide, elemental phosphorus, artificial abrasives, and many others.

The amount of energy required is enormous. For example, one ton of aluminum consumes 15,000 kilowatt-hours of electrical energy, and one ton of elemental phosphorus consumes 13,000 kilowatt-hours. Even the smallest processing plants of this nature use large amounts of power, and it must be low-cost for them to compete. The power cost is their main expense, and they will, as they must, locate where power is the cheapest.

The cost of Rampart power delivered at tidewater at Anchorage has been generously estimated at 3 mills. There is not another project in Alaska in the plannnig stages which could be built on the line in 10 years with this kind of low-cost power.

I realize that Rampart's vastness is the subject of concern, but I must say that it is too big only if there will not be a market for its power. As a matter of fact, there is a demand for this amount of power in the Nation and the world, and this demand is expected to grow in the future.

The cost of building Rampart is estimated at $1,300 million. It is a lot of money, but I have recommended that engineering studies be pushed ahead as rapidly as possible because the development is needed.

Recently a board of civilian advisors has been appointed to assist the Alaska district and the Corps of Engineers with the Rampart studies. They include Mrs. Irene Ryan and Mr. Stanley McCutcheon of Anchorage. Other Alaskans named to the board are Mr. W. T. Kegley, president of the First National Bank of Juneau, who will represent Governor Egan; Mr. Frank H. Mapleton, a mechanical engineer of Fairbanks; and Dr. William R. Wood, president of the University of Alaska. Other than Alaskans, the board consists of Dr. Edward Steve Shaw, an economist for Stanford University; Mr. Samuel B. Morris, a prominent consulting engineer of Los Angeles; and Mr. Gus Norwood, executive secretary of the Northwest Public Power Association of Vancouver, Wash. The assistance of these highly qualified people will be invaluable in planning and developing Rampart.

It has been a pleasure to meet and talk with you today. I am glad that I have the vantage of the corp' 20 years of military construction experience as a basis from which to make my remarks on Alaska's economy. These remarks would be difficult to boil down to one statement.

If I attempted, the result would go something like this: Alaska's future growth depends, now more than ever, on the wise and rapid development of its tremendous resources.

Civil War Centennial Observance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, New Jersey began its Civil War Centennial observances on February 21, with a unique program which also managed to state a few truths about this Nation and other free nations.

Dr. Roy P. Basler, Chief of the Reference Division of the Library of Congress, spoke before more than 650 New Jersey legislators and guests at a special joint session of the legislature commemorating Abraham Lincoln's historic appearance in Trenton on February 21, 1861. Dr. Basler, in describing the validity in today's world of Lincoln's beliefs, said:

It is always the hope of elders that the young may learn without making the mistakes their elders made, but let us judge fairly and calmly those who are striving today to establish or maintain in other lands around the world the governments of their choice.

Lincoln's own words to the State senate and general assembly 100 years ago were spoken by actor Anthony Quinn. Assemblyman Herbert H. Tate was in the chair, as speaker pro tempore—the first Negro to preside over a joint session of the two houses. Assemblyman Tate, who is assistant minority leader regularly, was named to the honorary post by assembly speaker LeRoy D'Aloia.

Mr. President, the occasion was a memorable one. It contributed to the national understanding of the great conflict which tested men and principles of this Nation. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Dr. Basler's address and the two addresses made by Abraham Lincoln, in Trenton.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ABRAHAM LINCOLN'S ADDRESS BEFORE THE NEW JERSEY SENATE, FEBRUARY 21, 1861 [1]

Mr. President and gentlemen of the Senate of the State of New Jersey, I am very grateful to you for the honorable reception of which I have been the object. I cannot but remember the place that New Jersey holds in our early history. In the early revolutionary struggle, few of the States among the old thirteen had more of the battlefields of the country than old New Jersey.

May I be pardoned if, upon this occasion, I mention that away back in my childhood, the earliest days of my being able to read, I got hold of a small book, such a one as few of the younger members have seen, Weems' "Life of Washington." I remember all the accounts there given of the battlefields and struggles for the liberties of the country, and none fixed themselves upon my imagination so deeply as the struggles here at Trenton, N.J. The crossing of the river; the contest with the Hessians; the great hardships endured at that time, all fixed themselves on my memory more than any single revolutionary event; and you all know, for you have all been boys, how these early impressions last longer than any others. I recollect thinking then, boy even though I was, that there must have been something more than common that those men struggled for.

I am exceedingly anxious that that thing which they struggled for; that something even more than national independence; that something held out a great promise to all the people of the world for all time to come; I am exceedingly anxious that this Union, the Constitution, and the liberties of the people shall be perpetuated in accordance with the original idea for which that struggle was made, and I shall be most happy indeed if I shall be an humble instrument in the hands of the Almighty, and of this, his almost chosen people, for perpetuating the object of this great struggle.

You give me this reception, as I understand, without distinction of party. I learn that this body is composed of a majority of gentlemen who, in the exercise of their best judgment in the choice of a chief magistrate, did not think I was the man. I understand, nevertheless, that they came forward here to greet me as the constitutional President of the United States—as citizens of the United States, to meet the man who, for the time being, is the representative man of the Nation, united by a purpose to perpetuate the Union and liberties of the people. As such, I accept this reception more gratefully than I could do did I believe it was tendered to me as an individual.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN'S ADDRESS TO THE NEW JERSEY GENERAL ASSEMBLY FEBRUARY 21, 1861 [2]

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I have just enjoyed the honor of a reception by the other branch of this legislature, and I return to you and them my thanks for the reception which the people of New Jersey have given, through their chosen representatives, to me as the representative, for the time being, of the majesty of the people of the United States. I appropriate to myself very little of the demonstrations of respect with which I have been greeted.

I think little should be given to any man, but that it should be a manifestation of adherence to the Union and the Constitution. I understand myself to be received here by the representatives of the people of New Jersey, a majority of whom differ in opinion from those with whom I have acted. This manifestation is therefore to be regarded by me as expressing their devotion to the Union, the Constitution, and the liberties of the people.

You, Mr. Speaker, have well said that this is a time when the bravest and wisest look with doubt and awe upon the aspect presented by our national affairs. Under these circumstances, you will readily see why I should not speak in detail of the course I shall deem it best to pursue. It is proper that I should avail myself of all the time at my command, in order that, when the time arrives in which I must speak officially, I shall be able to take the ground which I deem best and safest, and from which I may have no occasion to swerve.

I shall endeavor to take the ground I deem most just to the North, the East, the West, the South, and the whole country. I take it, I hope, in good temper—certainly no malice toward any section. I shall do all that may be in my power to promote a peaceful settlement of all our difficulties.

The man does not live who is more devoted to peace than I am. [Cheers.] None who would do more to preserve it. But it may be necessary to put the foot down

[1] "The Living Lincoln," edited by Paul M. Angle and Earl Schenck Miers, Rutgers University Press, 1955.

[2] New York Tribune, Feb. 22, 1861.

firmly. [Here the audience broke out into cheers so loud and long that for some moments it was impossible to hear Mr. Lincoln's voice.] [He continued:] And if I do my duty, and do right, you will sustain me, will you not? [Loud cheers, and cries of "Yes, yes; we will."]

Received, as I am, by members of a legislature the majority of whom do not agree with me in political sentiments, I trust that I may have their assistance in piloting the ship of state through this voyage, surrounded by perils as it is; if it should suffer attack now, there will be no pilot ever needed for another voyage.

Gentlemen, I have already spoken longer than I intended, and must beg leave to stop here.

Lincoln's Meaning to New Jersey and the World

(Address by Roy P. Basler before the special joint session of the New Jersey Legislature, commemorating Abraham Lincoln's visit to the statehouse on February 21, 1861)

It is most gratifying that we meet today, in commemoration of an event 100 years ago, under circumstances vastly different from those which confronted the men whom we honor. Without detracting from the seriousness and solemnity of this occasion, may I remind you of a humorous aspect of that time when Abraham Lincoln addressed your predecessors. I quote from the account of the ceremony printed in the Philadelphia North American and United States Gazette on the following day: "Arrangements were made by the State legislature to admit only such parties as might adorn, but not embarrass the ceremonies. Members of either house were debarred from entering the other." Whatever the reasons may have been for such vigorous attention to preserving the respective autonomy of each chamber, both the senate and the assembly gave Abraham Lincoln their unreserved pledge of the "continued devotion of this State to the Constitution and the Union founded by our fathers, and that our people will cooperate with you in all constitutional efforts for a speedy and peaceable settlement of the differences which now distract our country * * *." Today it is gratifying that both chambers are met in joint session to commemorate the separate occasions of 100 years ago.

Humbly reflecting on scenes invoked by Mr. Quinn's reading of the words spoken a century ago by the greatest American who ever appeared before the senate or general assembly of this heroic and historic State, and proudly grateful for the spirit of the man that was Lincoln, let us renew his pledge and theirs of "devotion to the Union, the Constitution, and the liberties of the people."

We should also be, as Lincoln said he was, anxious that the principle of freedom and equality, "that something more than national independence; that something that held out a great promise to all the people of the world to all time to come * * *" shall be perpetuated. We are human beings first, and Americans second. Whether consistently or intermittently, most of us are partisans only at third hand. As one whose traditions are divided in politics, I have at different times, I believe, voted for both good Democrats and good Republicans. Let this centenary remind us that the right to choose is, and always has been, the guarantee of continued freedom, and that responsibility is the guarantee of the right to choose. And let it remind us also that when the people have chosen, they have the right to change or corroborate their choice at succeeding elections, but that the choice of the majority must be honored until a succeeding election affords another opportunity to change. This is what your predecessors recognized a century ago by honoring the man who had been chosen by the people of most of the then States of the Union, even though a plurality of the people of New Jersey had at the same election voted for an opposing candidate, and had chosen a majority of State representatives and Senators from the opposing party.

This is, in simple, what the Civil War was about. As Lincoln phrased it in his message to Congress in special session on July 4, 1861, the Civil War was to "demonstrate to the world, that those who can fairly carry on election, can also suppress a rebellion—that ballots are the rightful, and peaceful, successors of bullets; and that when ballots have fairly, and constitutionally, decided, there can be no successful appeal, back to bullets; that there can be no successful appeal, except to ballots themselves, at succeeding elections. Such will be a great lesson of peace; teaching men that what they cannot take by an election, neither can they take it by a war—teaching all, the folly of being the beginners of a war."

As a nation, we did not learn this lesson easily, but a century of peace among ourselves testifies that we learned it fairly well. In fact, we seem to have learned it so well that we are sometimes impatient as a nation with other younger republics that have not learned it yet. We forget that nearly a century intervened between the establishing of our Government under Washington and the preserving of it under Lincoln. Shall we expect more rapid or more effective learning on the part of nations younger than ourselves? Let us remember that with the exception of the little Republic of San Marino, we are the oldest republic on the earth, and with the exception of England, the oldest country with a history of continuous constitutional government in any form. It is the hope of elders always that the young may learn without making the mistakes their elders made, but let us judge fairly and calmly those who are striving today to establish or maintain in other lands around the world the governments of their choice. As we did not learn quickly or easily, as we have not yet learned fully, that "all men are created equal;" and "that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights," should we not try more earnestly than ever before, to set a better example at home after nearly 2 centuries of national existence? As we have required so much to teach us and so long a time to learn, should we not do all we can to aid those who are just beginning?

Abraham Lincoln was a problem to the party that nominated him for the Presidency, as well as to the party that opposed him, and he has remained a problem to both parties for a hundred years. Both can quote him for their respective purposes, and either suffers the penalty for not living up to what is quoted. He was a conservative bent on conserving the state existing, as a means to the state becoming; a conservative bent on preserving a degree of permanence while making desirable change; a conservative bent on conserving above all else the right of individuals and of classes of people to improve their condition, even when that improvement required major adjustments in the condition and privileges of other people. This kind of conservative is not easy for a political party or a nation to live with, but both parties and the nation learn in the long run that this kind of conservative is the only kind they can live with.

Nine days before Abraham Lincoln addressed the Senate and Assembly of New Jersey, he addressed a group of representatives of eight German workingmen's societies at Cincinnati, Ohio. These immigrant laborers had left the country of their birth in quest of the freedom and equality for all men, which, Lincoln said, held out hope to "all the people of the world to all time to come." As new American citizens, they came to greet the President-elect and to pledge him their whole support in whatever lay ahead, because they knew, perhaps better than their native-born compatriots, what would be lost if the new President could not preserve it.

In responding to their pledge, Abraham Lincoln said this:

"Mr. Chairman, I hold that while man exists, it is his duty to improve not only his own condition, but to assist in ameliorating mankind; and therefore, without entering upon the details of the question, I will simply say, that I am for those means which will give the greatest good to the greatest number."

Today, we should also remember this, in New Jersey and in every State of the Union, because the people of the world remember it, if we do not. The concept that the United States was created to preserve and extend freedom and equality to all men, which Lincoln believed and struggled for, was not a something for Americans only and if we today fail to remember this, we may expect to be judged accordingly. The United States is judged among the people of the world by the extent of our success or our failure to live up to the ideal of Jefferson and Lincoln, both at home and abroad. Men like Jefferson and Lincoln, and their ideal of freedom and equality, were and are our greatest asset in the eyes of the world, but when that asset is not put to work at home, and shared abroad, it becomes a liability. If Lincoln's commitment to "ameliorating mankind" is replaced by a commitment to "maintaining the status quo," we cannot expect people in search of amelioration to be so ignorant as not to know the difference. The image of Abraham Lincoln and the image of Uncle Sam are not by any means synonymous in the eyes of the world. I am reminded of a cartoon drawn by a French cartoonist in one of the Paris newspapers in 1873. In it, the figure of Abraham Lincoln holds in the palm of his hand a Tom Thumb figure of Uncle Sam. The cartoonist's message cannot be misundertsood, and we may well wonder whether the enormous expansion of our material power as a nation in the 20th century has altered this relative assessment of Abraham Lincoln and Uncle Sam in the eyes of the world.

We do not have to "sell" Abraham Lincoln to the masses of the people in the world any more than we have to "sell" the ideal embodied in the Declaration of Independence. But we do have to show them that the people of the United States still believe in the principle embodied in our Declaration of Independence, as a principle for all the people of the world, as Lincoln believed in it. This is seldom, if ever, easy, but it is particularly difficult when what we think is our interest comes in conflict with what people in other lands think is their interest. Apropos of our once peculiar interest in slavery, Lincoln said, "The plainest print cannot be read through a gold eagle." I trust that the disappearance of the gold coin, as well as the devaluation of the dollar, will not lessen the point Lincoln was making, if we substitute for "gold eagle" the twenty dollar bill, or the hundred ruble note for that matter, since the difficulty in reading through material wealth is by no means confined to citizens of the United States.

On our part at least, should we not continue most carefully to weigh this matter of our interest, in the conservative spirit of Lincoln, recognizing that "ameliorating mankind" is the only ultimate interest worthy of ourselves and our Nation? Let us seek the best means today by which "that something that held out a great promise to all the people of the world to all time to come * * * shall be perpetuated." This is what Abraham Lincoln

means to the world; this is what we should strive to make Uncle Sam mean to the world. Although it is fitting and proper that we should commemorate this day, we can do even better everyday, by continuing to extend the principle upon which our Nation was founded.

People Need Encouragement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, people out in the country are becoming discouraged as a result of so much talk about depressed areas and recession. My mail has been full of letters from people down home who report that morale has been shaken and confidence undermined by the pessimistic pronouncements from the White House concerning business conditions.

The Charlotte News of February 28 reports that the members of the Charlotte Merchants Association have become disturbed over the continued pessimistic talk and that the president of the association recently dispatched a telegram to the President of the United States urging him to help rebuild the confidence of the people in the future of our country.

Since the text of the telegram from the president of this association has been made public, I feel at liberty to quote it as a part of my remarks. I call this telegram to the attention of my colleagues in case they may see fit to bring it to the attention of similar organizations in their districts. If the attitude of the people in Charlotte, as set forth in this telegram, is typical of sentiment in the country, similar groups in other sections might wish to follow the example of the Charlotte Merchants Association. I believe a concerted effort to persuade the President of the United States to follow the recommendations of the Charlotte Merchants Association might be effective.

Following is the text of the telegram mentioned above:

As merchants as well as members of a large trade association, we are in close and constant communication with the consumer.

In the past few weeks we have been made aware of the fact that the working people are becoming more and more depressed because of the great amount of adverse publicity being given about depressed areas, which is having a depressing effect on the people of all areas, thereby affecting the morale of the public and our national economy.

In view of your effort to bolster the economy in depressed areas, it is unfortunate that the national publicity tends to paint a dark picture for all America.

Could the story be told of the depressed areas and not make it appear to be nationwide?

We believe in America and we believe in the American people, but unfortunately national publicity is shaking the confidence of the people in America.

We solicit your influence in the direction of building the confidence of the people in America. Your comments will be greatly appreciated.

Our Nation's Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the February 23, 1961, issue of the Calhoun Times, of St. Matthews, S.C., which is ably edited by Mr. Craddock Morris, contains two excellent editorials which make very important points concerning the future of our Nation. One is entitled "Rome Went Out of Business," and the other "Socialism and Cupidity." I ask unanimous consent that these two editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROME WENT OUT OF BUSINESS

There is a common wish among people to peer into the future but the future cannot be visualized except through history—which often repeats itself. Due to the wide belief that the Federal Government should provide an endless list of benefits from welfare to education with centralized bureaucracy replacing local responsibility it is well to ponder possible results. The fate of the Roman Empire suggests what might happen to the United States.

The Encyclopaedia Britannica says this about the decline and fall of the Roman Empire: "* * * nothing could compensate for the lack of self-determination, and although during the first century and a half of imperial rule a flourishing local patriotism in some degree filled the place of the wiser sentiment, this gradually sank into decay and became a pretext under cover of which the lower classes in the several communities took tool of their wealthier fellow citizens in the shape of public works, largesses, amusements, etc., until the resources at the disposal of the rich ran dry, the communities themselves in many cases became insolvent, the organs of civic life became atrophied, political interest died out and the whole burden of administration, as well as that of defense, fell upon the shoulders of the bureaucracy, which proved unequal to the task. The gigantic bureaucracy of the fourth century proved, in spite of its undoubted services, an intolerable weight upon the energies of the Empire."

History, let us remember, has a habit of repeating itself.

SOCIALISM AND CUPIDITY

According to figures just released by Tax Foundation, Inc., the per capita burden of Federal, State, and local taxes was $109 in 1940, $369 in 1950, and $715 in 1960.

In virtually all State and local governments, no less than the Federal Government, proposals are advanced for more and more tax revenue. Unless the people restrain their demands on government, and put their foot down on unnecessary government expenditures that curry favor with pressure groups, Karl Marx's plan "to wrest all capital from the bourgeoisie," may become a reality in the United States.

If socialism engulfs our country, it will be due to the cupidity of people who think they can get something for nothing from government.

Beware of the Campaign To Restrain the Growth of Railroad Piggybacking

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, there is presently underway a campaign to deprive the public of one of the most promising transportation developments of our time. That development is piggybacking, which is the colorful term used to describe the movement of truck trailers, automobiles, and containers on railroad flatcars.

In recent weeks, some Members of the Congress including myself have received numerous letters demanding Government action to restrain the growth of piggybacking, especially for the movement of new automobiles, on grounds that it is enabling railroads to take business from trucks and hence putting truckdrivers out of work.

In a recent edition of the Teamsters monthly magazine, as well as in several specially prepared publications, teamsters and their wives and friends have been urged to write Members of Congress demanding special measures to curtail piggyback growth and thereby protect teamsters from railroad competition.

I can remember, as I am sure many of you can, when virtually all new automobiles moved by railroad. Then came vast Government expenditures for the construction of fine new highways and with these, the development of new type trucks and trailers capable of carrying several automobiles direct from factory loading ramps to the dealer's door.

This was a service that appealed greatly to the automobile manufacturers. And because the costly highways and other required facilities were provided largely by Government, it was also competitive in price. The result was inevitable. The automobile companies turned to trucks, and the railroads lost virtually all of the new automobile traffic.

Now the railroads have devised means of providing a still better service at lower cost. Piggybacking is proving itself not only in the movement of new automobiles, but also for a wide range of commodities. Its development particularly in the last few years has been little short of spectacular. Last year, with most other classes of railroad traffic on the decline, piggyback traffic showed an increase of about one-third. As compared with 1958, the increase was more than double.

Underlying this remarkable growth is a firm foundation of technological improvement, which includes not only such general improvements as dieselization,

fully automatic freight classification yards, and centralized traffic control, but also a wide variety of technological breakthroughs in particular problem areas. Among the latter are developments in methods and equipment for loading and unloading trailers and in new types of freight cars, some capable of hauling two fully loaded trailers and the trilevel automobile carrier handling up to 12 standard size automobiles or 15 of the compact variety.

Improvements of this kind are the real reason for the railroads' improved competitive capability. As always the real beneficiaries are the users of transportation and the public as a whole.

The Teamsters' publications have stated that the ICC favors railroads, is railroad oriented, and have charged that the ICC has been packed with prorailroad people.

Nothing could be further from the truth. Of the 10 Commissioners presently on the ICC—there is 1 vacancy—only 2 have had railroad experience of any kind. One of these spent 6 years in railroad work, leaving in 1925; and the other 3 years with a State railroad association, leaving in 1949.

Nine of the Commissioners have legal backgrounds, and all 10 had distinguished themselves in private or Government work before their appointment to the Commission. One is a former Lieutenant Governor of Kentucky, president of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, and special circuit judge; another is a former assistant attorney general of Colorado; another is a former assistant attorney general of Texas; and another a former Member of Congress and general counsel of the U.S. Post Office Department.

The Nation is fortunate indeed to have attracted men of such high caliber to direct the affairs of this unit of Government.

One of the Teamsters' publications asserts that—

> It is a matter of undisputed fact that the trucking industry is paying more than its share of the cost of the Federal highway program.

If this be an undisputed fact, it is certainly news to the Congress, which in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 directed that a study be made for the purpose of making available to Congress information on the basis of which it may determine what taxes should be imposed by the United States, and in what amounts, in order to assure, insofar as practicable, an equitable distribution of the tax burden among the various classes of persons using the Federal-aid highways or otherwise deriving benefits from such highways.

The Bureau of Public Roads in its recent report to Congress declares that the heavy vehicles, particularly the vehicle combinations—as compared with light vehicles and automobiles—are not bearing their share of highway costs. Further information on this subject will be available after results of the recently completed Illinois road test have been analyzed and submitted to Congress about the middle of the year.

The Teamsters also express concern that loss of truck traffic to piggyback will mean reduced revenues from the fuel tax and from license and registration fees for Federal, State, and local goverments. Overlooked is the enormous reduction in highway wear and tear and the positive and very substantial benefits in increased safety and convenience for other users of highways.

Another point one of the Teamsters' publications asserts is that in time of war the railroads, despite their boasts, would be the least effective and least dependable form of transportation. As a member of a special armed services subcommittee which last year conducted an extensive investigation into the adequacy of transportation systems in support of the national defense effort in event of mobilization, I should like to call attention to our conclusion which appears in the report of October 10, 1959, as follows:

> No plans for transport dependence can fail to take into account the railroad industry.
>
> The versatility and adaptability of rail transport, as thoroughly demonstrated on a worldwide basis under all kinds of conditions, is but one of the reasons why military logistical planning is built around the railroads for the bulk of its freight and passenger movements. The other forms of transport, important as they are to the total need, are auxiliary and supplemental to the railroads.

Our subcommittee is not alone in this conclusion. It is shared generally by the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, the Department of Defense, and other authorities in the field.

The Teamsters sometimes contradict themselves. On the one hand they charge that railroad piggyback rates are so low as to cover only out-of-pocket costs or less; on the other they quote figures to show that earnings of the average piggyback car are over seven times higher than those of the average boxcar and conclude by saying:

> These figures illustrate what a lucrative operation piggyback really is.

Clearly the Teamsters cannot have it both ways. If piggyback is a lucrative operation for the railroads, and there is every indication that it is, then it cannot be held that piggyback rates are below cost, or meet only out-of-pocket costs.

With these reckless charges of unfair competition and ICC prejudice exposed, the Teamsters' real purpose becomes unmistakably clear. That purpose is to require railroads to maintain rates higher than necessary.

The concern of the Teamsters is the alleged loss of employment for truckdrivers, which they foresee if piggyback is allowed to expand. Naturally we all sympathize with anyone who loses his job and is forced to seek another, whether for reasons of advancing technology or any other. But let me remind the Congress what has happened to employment opportunities for railroadmen during the last generation, due in no small part to loss of business to trucks.

During the past 30 years, railroad employment has been cut in half: from 1,511,000 in 1930 to fewer than 750,000 today. Employees thus displaced have had to find productive employment in other fields, which is what anyone else would have to do, whose job has been abolished.

My answer is simply this: I am not now and never will become a party to an effort to block progress in any field, especially in transportation. Nor will I be party to any attempt to subordinate the public welfare to narrow interests, and I am confident that the answer of my colleagues in this body and in the Senate will be the same.

Renewal Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the following editorial from my hometown newspaper, the Lowell Sun. To me, it illustrates the finest in Federal-local cooperation in the area of urban renewal.

RENEWAL PROGRAM

The Lowell Planning Department urgently recommends that five new urban renewal projects should be launched in the city this year, taking full advantage of State and Federal aid now available.

We heartily agree with the proposal and suggest that the proper authorities here and in Boston give City Planner Charles Zettek's ideas their enthusiastic and undivided support.

The city of Lowell, primarily because of the anticipatory work of the planning department, has a jump on most New England cities in the vital field of urban renewal. The Church Street project will be under construction as soon as weather permits, and the Northern Canal project, fully planned and approved, will soon become a reality.

The five developments proposed by Mr. Zettek are in the Acre, the Hale and Chelmsford Streets zone, Back Central Street, lower Belvidere, and the central business district. The extension of the Lowell connector, from its present terminal on Gorham Street and by way of a circuitous course that would end on Pawtucket Street, is linked to all projects, with the possible exception of the Acre redevelopment.

Aside from the outstanding changes in the appearance of our city through the razing of so much substandard and antiquated properties, we are impressed by the figures which have been issued by Mr. Zettek. By using all available State and Federal support and adding an estimated investment of $5 million by the city, new private investment would have a $50 million potential—with proportionate and lasting benefits to the city treasury.

Thus, for 10 percent of the ultimate value, Lowell could not lose.

Older cities, such as Lowell, must make the most of these opportunities; they provide powerful guarantees for the future. We cannot risk any lag, resulting from dickering and bickering or from simple procrastination.

This work is realistically and immediately before us. It must be promoted at once.

A Letter to the President of the United States—Protest Against Increase in Residual Fuel Oil Import Quota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, it would take some real national eye shutting to ignore the ignominious effects which importations of foreign residual fuel oil have upon the economies of our coal-producing States. Fortunately, our new and excellent Secretary of the Department of the Interior, Mr. Stewart L. Udall, is wide awake to this situation, and conducted a lengthy and grueling hearing on the matter on February 20.

Nor is President John F. Kennedy uninformed as to the serious economic decline which foreign residual oil imports have caused in many areas of our coal-producing States. But to strengthen his hand in forging an equitable solution to this most inequitable matter, I sent him a letter dated February 27, 1961, which 17 of my senatorial colleagues cosigned.

This letter contains many of the pertinent facts regarding the situation, and I believe that other Members of the Congress who are interested in the security of our Nation, as well as in the economic well-being of our depressed areas, should have the opportunity to read this letter. For this reason, I ask for unanimous consent to have this letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As you have clearly proclaimed, the deterioration of markets, decline of job opportunities, and economic diseress throughout the coal-producing regions of America are intolerable and dangerous to our very security. The Members of the Congress of the United States representing these many areas, the welfare and prosperity of these regions, the Nation's coal producers, members of the United Mine Workers of America, operators and employees of the coal-hauling railroads, and others so vitally concerned are solidly determined that such conditions must be corrected. We, therefore, wish to present for your attention facts regarding the injurious effects upon the coal and rail industries resulting from increasing imports of residual fuel oil.

In February 1955, there was issued a report prepared by an Advisory Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy, established by the President on July 30, 1954. In part, the report contained the following:

"An expanding domestic oil industry, plus a healthy oil industry in free countries which help to supply the U.S. market, constitute basically important elements in the kind of industrial strength which contributes most to a strong national defense. Other energy industries, especially coal, must also maintain a level of operation which will make possible rapid expansion in output should that become necessary."

We maintain that the coal industry does not today enjoy a level of operation which would make possible rapid expansion in the event of a national emergency. Residual oil imports, having risen from 53 million barrels in 1948 to 230 million in 1960, have made dangerous inroads into coal's east coast markets.

The 1960 imports of residual oil were the equivalent of approximately 55 million tons of bituminous coal. About 75 percent of the oil which is imported is competitive with coal. Therefore, this competitive element last year displaced 41,250,000 tons of coal. The average value per ton of bituminous coal, F.O.B. mines, being around $4.86 (1959 figure), the loss of a market for 41¼ million tons of coal meant a loss of $200,475,000 in gross revenues for coal producers. This meant a loss of $100 million in miners' wages, or a year's work for nearly 20,000 men. It meant a loss of $100 million in new equipment, taxes, development of new mines, and return on investment. Additionally, the railroads lost well over $100 million in lost freight revenues, to say nothing of the wages lost to railroad workers. One could further cite the loss in taxes to Federal, State, and local governments.

It is doubtful that any other major industry, vital to the economy of the Nation, has experienced anything approaching the depressed financial condition of the coal mining industry over the past 20 years. In 1953, producers who accounted for 80 percent of the coal mined realized a calculated net profit of less than three-fourths of 1 percent of the gross value of the coal produced. It is not difficult to see, therefore, that the coal industry is in a precarious financial situation, and it simply does not have the resources to engage in research, to purchase high priced equipment for use in the highly competitive fuel field, and to maintain the cost upkeep of machinery and operative mines ready to expand production in a moment of emergency.

Moreover, an industry plagued by declining employment for a generation cannot raise a new generation of skilled and experienced coal miners in a day of peril. As the number of personnel regularly employed in the mines has been sharply reduced, there has been a steady reduction in the relative number of younger men employed in the coal industry. In 1951 the percentage of miners under 30 years of age was 18.6. In 1957 it had fallen to 6.5 percent. This alarming trend emphasizes the importance of retaining young workers in the bituminous coal industry in order to assure an adequate supply of experienced and skilled workers in the event of war.

With reduced coal freight tonnage, 25 percent of the rolling stock of the B. & O. Railroad is presently in need of repairs, and the situation is equally bad with other railroads. Railroad workers have been laid off, railroads are not buying new cars as fast as old ones are headed for the scrap heap, and this great medium of transportation would find it difficult to respond to the requirements which must be met in an hour of national peril.

The domestic oil industry has suffiered as a result of increased foreign imports, because domestic exploration and production are discouraged. Meanwhile, the great industrial plants on the east coast have become increasingly dependent upon foreign residual oil. It may be noted that the foreign sources which supplied but 26 percent of the east coast residual oil requirements in 1940, now account for something in excess of 70 percent of the residual oil requirements of the same area. If war should come, the foreign sources which supply these requirements would become utterly undependable. To be reminded of this, one has only to read pages 87 and 88 of the Interior Department's "History of Petroleum Administration for War, 1941–45." That document, in referring to the sinking of 50 tankers along the east coast in 1942 and the resulting fuel supply situation, has this to say:

"Although the boats had to keep running to supply military requirements, no one could doubt the decline of tanker shipments for civilian needs in the face of those 50 sinkings. From then on, until the last year of the war, tanker deliveries were an insignificant factor in supplying the oil needs of the east coast."

It is obvious, in the light of the foregoing, that to permit increasing quantities of residual fuel oil to be imported into this country is to invite economic disaster in the coal, domestic oil, and railroad industries in time of uneasy peace and to invite military disaster to the country in time of war.

We appreciate that you are quite familiar with the fact that the ordinary home does not use residual oil for heating purposes. Most of it goes into industry, because special equipment is required for preheating purposes. While U.S. refineries are very advanced and efficient, the residual fuel oil yield in South American refineries may be as high as 60 percent. In order to dispose of residual oil, the oil companies are willing to sell it at almost any price, and it is dumped on utility and large steam plants that have multiple burning equipment. They provide the focal point for the residual-coal competition when there are excess supplies of residual oil caused by imports. Consequently, there is no stability of price, and the objective is to "undersell" coal at any price. This type of competition is unconscionable and simply cannot be met by the coal industry. The results are closed mines, unemployed men walking the streets looking for work, and families with no food other than Government surplus commodities.

We, the undersigned, do not ask for complete elimination of residual fuel oil imports. This would be unreasonable and unthinkable. But we do ask for a substantial reduction. We maintain that the quotas on residual oil imports should be so designed to permit the coal industry, the domestic oil industry, and the transportation industry to meet the needs of exploration and research, repair and replace damaged and obsolete equipment, recoup employment losses, and maintain a capability to meet the expanded needs of a national emergency. We believe that it is unwise to permit residual imports in any year to rise above 1957 levels, and we hope that a thorough reevaluation of the residual oil import quota program will reveal the necessity for a gradual reduction of quota levels to a point where coal might be permitted to regain a part of its markets, at least, and the domestic oil industry may be encouraged to find new sources of supply so as to eliminate the necessity for our having to depend, in the event of war, on foreign sources which will likely be unable to produce and on tankers which will surely be unable to reach our shores.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. BYRD, JENNINGS RANDOLPH, FRANK J. LAUSCHE, FRANK CARLSON, J. J. HICKEY, HOMER E. CAPEHART, GALE W. MCGEE, THRUSTON B. MORTON, STEPHEN M. YOUNG, JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL, VANCE HARTKE, WALLACE F. BENNETT, ERNEST GRUENING, E. L. BARTLETT, MILTON R. YOUNG, FRANK E. MOSS, QUENTIN N. BURDICK, U.S. Senators.

High Pay Linked to Jobless Rate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1961

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I was quite impressed by an article which appeared recently under the pen of J. A. Livingston on the problem of wages for American workers. Since we shall soon be required to reach an important decision on the matter of wages and hours, I feel that this article should be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for further study by the membership of Congress.

The article follows:

HIGH PAY LINKED TO JOBLESS RATE
(By J. A. Livingston)

Once upon a time, there was a rich, powerful, industrious nation, whose economic well-being was envied by peoples throughout the world. As in all countries, inequalities prevailed, not only between the captains of industry and the workers, but among the workers, bituminous coal miners, and steelsome workers received more than $3 others less than $2.

Three broad classes of workers were in an elite over-$3-an-hour group—construction workers, bituminous coal miners, and steel workers. One day an economist, ruminating over some labor statistics, noticed this striking fact: The unemployment rate among these three types of workers was also highest in the Nation—16 percent for construction, 13 percent for bituminous coal, and 14 percent for steel.

Vexatious questions passed through his mind. Could this be rough—really rough—economic justice? Could unemployment be the unhappy counterpart of high wages? Do people with high pay, pay for it with unemployment?

WAGES 80 TO 85 PERCENT OF COSTS

His eye idled further along the statistics. He noted that automobile workers, with 9 percent unemployment, were fifth highest in hourly wages. Could this be pure happenstance? After all, the national average for unemployment was about 6.8 percent of the labor force.

Pondering these imponderables, the ruminator recalled his early economic indoctrination. Wage and salary costs—all along the line from production of raw materials, the transport of them to workshops, processing them, and bringing a finished product to market—range from 80 to 85 percent of the retail price.

Were some workers pricing their skills out of the buying reach of other workers? Indeed, were workers pricing their skills too high for some employers? Was this a cause of chronic economic malaise in Detroit, in coal areas, in steel centers?

In the coal mines, for instance, a great labor leader pushed up the hourly pay so high, including fringe benefits, that for some mines economics became all too simple: mechanize or die.

Many mines "died." Other mineowners mechanized. Output per miner rose. Simultaneously, idleness per miner rose. Out of the blessing of increased efficiency came the curse of human desuetude.

STEEL SUFFERS, TOO

In construction, too: As wages of carpenters, bricklayers, plumbers increase, homebuilders try to find ways to cut costs. Building blocks supplant bricks and the greater labor of bricklaying. Concrete is poured into molds, replacing many masons and carpenters. Spray painting takes the place of brush—and so on.

In steelmaking, itself, massive mechanical improvements require highly skilled but fewer workers. And the competition of materials—plastic, aluminum, copper—becomes more intense as steel prices increase.

The economist was distressed by another correlation. His country had the highest unemployment rate among industrial nations of the world. At the same time, its employers paid the highest wages and its workers enjoyed the highest standard of living.

Was this rough economic justice, too? Is his country exporting employment and importing unemployment? Are corporations investing abroad to hold markets there, because they no longer can export at competitive prices? Do they even import parts because of advantageous prices?

LOWER PRICES FOR BETTER LIVING

The economist wondered if a new frontier in labor relations were coming—an era in which both management and labor seek improved productivity; an era in which labor leaders accept gains for workers through greater efficiency, lower prices, and a wage dollar of greater purchasing power rather than through increased wages.

He wondered if a newly established Government-labor-management committee would be able to persuade management to moderate the stress of unemployment—through retraining and relocation of workers displaced by the "invisible hand" of unseen economic forces.

Heretofore, businessmen, fearing high taxes, have consistently opposed social legislation. Heretofore, businessmen have protected profits or cut losses—by early layoffs.

In exchange for labor's consent to riddance of featherbedding, etc., would management bear some of the burdens of technological adjustments? Neither management nor union leaders can be happy with the ups and downs of production in, say, autos.

Labor leaders can afford to swap wage demands for greater assurance of work stability—for economic security. The economist recalled the longshoremen in the western part of the country agreed to full-scale mechanization in exchange for payment by employers into a "technological retirement" fund.

Only in this way, he reflected, can costs be held down and men work at their greatest efficiency. Only thus will the Nation hold its share of the world markets. Only by being able to buy more of what one another produce, will workers create jobs for themselves.

The economist sadly observed that in this great county, in contrast with other countries, unemployment rose simultaneously with employment. This wasn't using manpower well. If high wages didn't create full employment, he wondered if a Government-labor-management try at lower prices might.

Bulgarian Liberation Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, with so many peoples of the world fighting against the yoke of oppression, it is most appropriate that we mark Bulgarian Liberation Day.

It was 83 years ago today that the act of San Stefano restored independence to the Bulgarian nation after centuries of foreign domination.

Against the wishes of her people, Bulgaria has been a satellite nation since 1944. Yet within her borders the hope of the restoration of full national sovereignty has been kept burning brightly.

On this liberation day, the Bulgarian people, and the sons and daughters of Bulgaria all over the world, will join in prayer that soon will come the glorious day when Bulgaria is again a free nation.

Golden Age Ahead for Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Golden Age Ahead for Northwest," which appeared in the Tri-City Herald of January 22, 1961.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

News stories reporting some $50 million in President Eisenhower's budget for construction of Columbia and Snake River dams in the Tri-City area made no mention of Inland Empire Waterways Association.

Such an omission is common, although it is widely recognized that IEWA for more than a quarter century has been the moving force in development of our northwest rivers. Virtually every project authorization, every appropriation, can be credited to the tireless, and inordinately patient, work of the IEWA, and its able, ubiquitous executive officer, Herbert G. West of Walla Walla.

He and a handful of other men seemed almost hopelessly visionary when they first began to dream aloud of linking this great, semidesert country to the Pacific Ocean with a series of water stairsteps.

This vast and almost empty land then was inhabited mostly by jackrabbits, coyotes, and rattlesnakes. There seemed little urgency for construction of the network of multipurpose projects which Herb West and his few, at first, supporters began to talk about to whomever would lend an ear.

The dams already built are impressive monuments to the zeal and persuasiveness of these men. But the budget requests of President Eisenhower, which he made just before yielding his office to Democrat John Kennedy, must give them as much satisfaction.

An example of what this development has meant can be seen in the Walla Walla, Kennewick, and Pasco port districts.

The Eisenhower policy of no new starts for western reclamation and hydroelectric projects has been a barrier for nearly 8 years to IEWA plans. It did not halt the program—northwest Senators and Congressmen managed some starts over the President's opposition—but it was slowed drastically, lagging behind general development of the Northwest to a degree where it appeared the area's growth might be stunted.

The last Eisenhower budget amounts to a right-about-face. It is recognition at last by the Republican leader as valid the basic IEWA premise, from which it never has

wavered, that development of the Northwest's water resources, particularly for navigation and hydroelectric purposes, is justified not only by the regional benefits but by those to the Nation as well.

President Kennedy is committed to active support of multipurpose hydro projects. The IEWA, and its now-legion supporters, can look confidently to the future. A golden age of development lies ahead. The dream will be shaped into concrete and steel.

Broadcasts to Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Let's Step Up the Broadcasts," published in the St. Petersburg Times of January 19, 1961.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S STEP UP THE BROADCASTS

One of the most astonishing things about our position in the cold—and sometimes not so cold—war is that as the principal developers of mass communications and propaganda techniques we make so relatively little use of them.

As Cuba went unmistakably into the Communist orbit, while both Russia and Red China stepped up their drives for Latin American support, what have we been doing to try to offset their propaganda?

Have Voice of America broadcasts, for instance, been stepped up? Have we attempted through this means to reach not only the masses of Cuba but of all Latin America to restate our principles and broadcast the truth? We have not.

But, meanwhile, Fidel Castro has been building and soon will put on the air a 120-thousand-watt broadcasting station, capable of reaching all of Latin America.

This new "Voice of Fidel Castro" will be more powerful than all but a few U.S. stations, and will be 2½ times more powerful than the anti-Castro station now operated in the Swan Islands, off Honduras.

There has been a lot of brave talk about the battle for men's minds, but precious little action. We should have been flooding Cuba, at least, with broadcast truth. Even the campesinos could understand this—assuming, of course, that we were thoughtful enough to use their own language. Even if our broadcasts were jammed, we would score a point, because the very act of jamming would raise suspicions against Castro.

Congress, of course, with its strange penury when it comes to propaganda appropriations, is largely to blame in our communications shortcomings. But surely some emergency funds have been around somewhere.

Considering that the Communists are spending in Latin America, alone, more than we spend on propaganda throughout the world, and that the average salary for our U.S. Information Agency officers in the field is only $6,000—and, perhaps that is all they are worth—a new, hard look needs to be taken at our information activities. The rectificaton is long overdue, but it is never too late.

Red Storm Warnings in the Orient

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, most of us do not have an opportunity to make an extended visit to Asia to learn firsthand the true state of affairs. Therefore, I feel it is helpful and necessary that we read carefully the experiences of other Americans as they travel in the Orient to try to determine what is happening there.

Mr. Robert N. Branson, of Federated Publications, a former foreign correspondent, has just returned from a 50-day trip to Japan, Korea, Okinawa, Formosa, Quemoy, Hong Kong, the Philippines, Thailand, and Laos. He found Red storm warnings up and widespread feeling among Western experts that Asia may prove to be the Kennedy administration's most perilous testing ground.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include one of the articles Mr. Branson has written about the situation as he saw it. This news story appeared in the Lansing (Mich.) State Journal on February 19:

Washington: A Chinese Nationalist general invited a group of American visitors to his Formosa headquarters not long ago and put on a demonstration they will never forget.

He unveiled a sandtable mockup of Nationalist plans for recapturing the China mainland. The table was a realistic panorama of land and sea, complete with molded mountains and painted cities. Colored electric bulbs lit up the invasion pattern.

In white gloves, the general flicked switches and pushed toy armadas into place. Then came the kicker. To dramatize the invasion's impact, he set off firecracker-size charges wired inside the imitation China.

Enemy cities and harbors were supposed to go snap-crackle-pop. But the electrician had miscalculated the size of the charges. Instead of pop-pop, the table blew up with a deafening bang, showering the general and his audience with paint, glass, sand and splinters.

The general apologized profusely and promised stern punishment for the erring electrician. One of the guests, a U.S. Army officer, recalled:

"We all stood there brushing stuff out of our hair, a little dazed and angry. Then it dawned on us that we had received a classic lesson. Someone told the general graciously: 'Sir, I have never seen the Asian military picture summed up so concisely.'"

In 20 years of struggle for supremacy in Asia, the great world powers have poured forth enough munitions—and gold—to boobytrap everything from Manila to Mandalay.

In southeast Asia, particularly in the science fiction realms of Laos, Cambodia and Vietnam, the best of diplomatic minds cannot be sure today where the firecrackers are planted—let alone who may flick the detonator tomorrow.

The nervous breakdown rate among U.S. officials in Asia is said to be the highest anywhere, including Africa. Oriental politics is a brand of witchcraft that defies the graphs, charts, projections and logic upon which Western minds rely.

Take Laos—an upside down kingdom where the falsehood is viewed as truth, where corruption is honesty, where superstition is wisdom, where democracy is fantasy and ignorance is bliss.

The present Premier of Laos, Prince Boun Oum, depends for guidance upon a grisly magic amulet. It is a smoked human foetus which, worn about the neck in a bamboo shell, is said to protect the wearer by making his body itch if any secret enemy or traitor approaches.

This is the man the State Department has to champion today as a leader of enlightened democracy.

Boun Oum is only the latest of the pro-Western premiers we have backed since U.S. aid began in 1954. The plan looked fine on paper, and in 6 years the outlay has been $310 million—more riches than Laos had amassed in all past ages.

Results: More communism in Laos than when we started, more losses than gains by the Lao Army we equipped, everspreading control by rebels whose manpower is less than half of our side's.

Our Lao allies report nonexistent battles and invasions, bar Americans from the field, insult and hamstring the Western press, lie brazenly to U.S. Ambassador Winthrop Brown and his staff, "lose" American aid in vast quantities and demand more.

These are not a reporter's guesses. They are flat assertions, stated privately, by official sources at the top level in Vientiane.

Political black magic and military incalculables are not confied to Laos. The whole of southeast Asia strikes the traveler as a clouded crystal ball in which two facts alone stand out as keys to the future:

One is Red China's desperate hunger.

The other is the rich abundance of the rice countries south of the Chinese border.

Plotted graph style across the 1960's, these two Asian realities appear to converge as inevitably as red curves on a collision course.

Communist China's food problems go beyond the crop failures and blights of 1960. Even if bumper harvests follow for 10 years, there will not be enough to feed a population that already is the biggest on earth and multiplies faster day by day.

The lands to the south overflow with what the Communists need. South Vietnam, Cambodia, Thailand, and Burma are rice-surplus nations. Beyond them lie Malaya and Indonesia, rich not only in food but in rubber, oil, tin, and other natural treasure.

"The hungrier China grows, the greater the peril," said one of the West's senior diplomats. "Pressure on the pro-Western rice countries is going get worse instead of better over the years. Holding the line is going to get harder and harder. A starving monster doesn't negotiate. It grabs."

Swallowing Laos would enable the Communists to sink prongs into Burma, Thailand, Cambodia, and south Vietnam. For six-sided Laos, a key jigsaw piece, adjoins all four of those nations as well as Communist north Vietnam and China.

What if Laos falls? Some western analysts think Communist control is only a matter of time there, as well as in South Vietnam where western hopes are pinned on a regime both corrupt and shaky.

Such questions bring conflicting replies. Some U.S. strategists say Communist conquest of Laos (or South Vietnam) would plunge the world into war. Others say such losses might be weathered provided the rest of southeast Asia holds firm—especially Thailand.

Thailand is the West's new bulwark. Politically it is considered the soundest nation in the bloc. Strategically it guards Malaya, Burma, and Indonesia. Militarily it is heavily fortified with U.S. weapons—far more so than Laos.

No one in Asia can tell you where the next crisis may erupt. Like the Chinese general's mockup, the region is loaded with powder. International friction supplies more than enough electricity to touch it off anytime.

The British, French, and Dutch have withdrawn or been driven from southeast Asia since World War II, leaving the United States with the bag. Red China is a notoriously reckless foe and a hard-pressed one. It seems obvious that the Kennedy administration is going to need at the very least, courage, skill, judgment, and luck.

Capsule impressions elsewhere in the Far East:

Japan: Basically friendly to the United States despite anti-Yankee outbursts. Having tasted nuclear war, the Japanese are superallergic to any defense plan that might make them a sitting duck again.

South Korea: With two U.S. divisions and 535,000 ROK troops holding the fort, no new Communist invasion is foreseen.

Okinawa: Armed to the teeth with the heaviest concentration of battle gear west of Hawaii. If the United States has to go to war in Asia, Okinawa will supply the big punch.

Formosa: An efficiently run military dictatorship with Chiang Kai-shek still firmly in the saddle, though growing old.

Quemoy: A bone in the throat of Red China and a real danger spot. The Formosa Government insists it will hold Quemoy at any cost, and the Kennedy administration has yet to propose a workable alternative.

Honk Kong: Where East meets West. A badly overcrowded but richly scenic crossroads, easily this reporter's own choice as the most intriguing city in the world.

Manila: Sadly run down at the heels, bled white by politicians who have been skirmishing for power ever since the popular President Ramon Magsaysay was killed. This year's Philippine national battle shapes up as the bloodiest in years.

Bulgarian Liberation Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, it will be my privilege, tomorrow, to speak to the people of Bulgaria through the Voice of America. March 3 commemorates for the Bulgarian people a birth of freedom. On that day 83 years ago, a proud country finally regained the independence it had lost several centuries before.

I will tell these people that in the modern history of the peoples of the Balkan Peninsula, there has been a continual record of subjugation. This ugly record finally was broken late in the 19th century. Siding with the victorious Russians in the Russo-Turkish War, Bulgaria was able to obtain its independence. By the Treaty of San Stefano, Bulgaria's freedom was guaranteed. Thus, the Bulgarians after over five centuries of foreign domination were finally liberated by the Russians.

It is one of the sad ironies of history that today Russia, under Communist rule, dominates Bulgaria. After suffering the miseries of two World Wars Bulgaria still is not free. As a result of the Second World War she lost her freedom in the peace that followed to the very country which claimed to have liberated her.

It is within the context of the modern plight of Bulgaria that March 3 looms so large upon the horizon as a symbol of freedom. Today in Bulgaria there is no more liberty than under Turkish rule, and it is tragic that even in a country so desirous of freedom it cannot exist. Let us all pray that the brave Bulgarian people will soon be able to realize their heritage of freedom that we today are commemorating.

Recession?—Make Sure of the Patient

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, evidence accumulates that the constant barrage of pessimistic statements emanating from the White House is creating a condition of despair out in the country. While no one would advocate that the President of the United States should mislead the people of our country concerning domestic problems, reports from my district indicate that the pessimistic talk is having an adverse influence upon the morale of our people, and a depressing effect upon business.

It is my hope that President Kennedy, in his wisdom, and after considering the adverese effect his repeated pessimistic utterances are having, in at least one section of the country, will see fit to say something encouraging to the people who are becoming scared and discouraged about the future. The importance of doing so is made manifest by the following editorial which appeared in the February 28 issue of the Charlotte News, which editorial I include as a part of my remarks on this subject:

RECESSION?—MAKE SURE OF THE PATIENT

News Reporter Dick Gorrell's survey of the Charlotte economy prompts the question whether it is wise for the administration to talk with growing dourness about that great abstraction, "the economy." In fact, there are many "economies," looking at the country from one angle, and Charlotte's—and North Carolina's generally—is fairly healthy. Mr. Gorrell's thorough probe for "recession" here found only one soft place in an otherwise muscular local economy. And that one soft spot, heavy construction, is partly offset by plans now on the architects' tables, and compensated by healthy growth in employment, retailing, private housing, and other vital indexes.

This not only explains the "who, me?" attitude with which so many greet talk of economic slide. It suggests that economists may oversimplify matters by talking altogether about one economy, when they should more carefully pick and choose from State to State and from city to city. A wholesale treatment of the economy, which is understandable when revenues and expenditures must be calculated on national balance sheets in Washington, may have an unfortunate effect on the still-dominant economies which don't feel the present isolated pinches.

The truth about today's recession, nationally, is that all, or none, or some of the symptoms of depression and long-term sluggishness may show up at scattered points. Thus a dour tone about the economy as a whole may be accurate, but may be beside the point. There are plenty of plateaus to emphasize, just as there are plenty of troughs, as the economists like to call them.

This is not to suggest that the pockets where serious economic problems exist can be ignored, for while most of the country is economically robust there are certain trends that touch even the most prosperous parts of the country and they are to be watched.

For instance, total employment and total unemployment can grow flank by flank—as they have been growing in Charlotte and in national figures. Either figure can be misleading unless something is known of the total work force and how fast it grows. Then, there are not only pockets of economic slowdown across the country, there are—as Charlotte's heavy construction business shows—pockets within cities or States; and meat for one pocket may be poison for another.

Among other nationwide indexes which the administration much watch are a reluctance to be venturesome with capital, which even prosperous businesses in prosperous areas may show; the increasingly rounder bite from the consumer's dollar being taken by services, from education to plumbing, which forces producers of goods to be wary. The Federal Reserve's just completed survey of buying plans for this year, covering mainly household goods, is down and may reflect not only a temporary shakiness about purchasing but a longer trend to make durables last. Finally, credit buying has paused from a long expansion and—most importantly—technological changes, including everything from the lightning-fast change of taste in automobiles to increasing automation, are coming more rapidly. They are breaking into places where rapid technological change is unaccustomed.

The administration, then, has a tough problem monitoring these subtle shifts underneath the surface which may mean health or illness for the national economy. But broad diagnoses and prescriptions applicable to a depressed area may dismay a prosperous area and give it an unnecessary case of hypochondria. When possible, the patient should be pinpointed by name and locality.

Alice Widener Speaks Out Against Emergency Civil Liberties Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Alice Widener, columnist, publisher, and editor of that splendid magazine U.S.A., has written an excellent article, entitled "ECLC and Our Industrial Security."

Mrs. Widener, out of the wealth of her wide experience, clearly, concisely, and effectively helps the American people to understand the objectives of perhaps the most notorious Communist-dominated

and controlled organization in the country, the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee. Her article follows:

ECLC AND OUR INDUSTRIAL SECURITY

The platform adopted by the National Council of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee (1959) states in part, "We will seek the introduction and passage by Congress of bills to repeal the Smith Act, the Internal Security Act, the Communist Control Act, the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, and various industrial screening provisions."

The Emergency Civil Liberties Committee (ECLC) is described as "an instrument of the Communist Party" by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Loyal Americans are well informed about many dangerous aspects of the ECLC's abolition campaign against the congressional investigating committees. They would be wise to become equally well informed about the dangerous ECLC activities against our industrial security provisions and personnel screening processes.

Obviously, the ECLC wants Americans to drop their industrial security guard. If this were done, then Communist espionage agents and saboteurs could imperil our entire military defense.

In his state of the Union message to Congress, President Kennedy said that our Nation is in an hour of national peril, and is drawing nearer, day by day, to the hour of maximum danger.

ATTITUDES AND SECURITY

In our times, we cannot afford to have a confused attitude toward the problems of political, military, economic, and industrial security. Actually, security is an attitude, a fact that was brilliantly discussed, last June, at the Second North East Regional Conference of the American Society for Industrial Security by Joseph E. Loughran, Chief of the Security Division, New York Air Procurement District. The following passages from Mr. Loughran's speech should be studied and heeded by all loyal Americans, not only those employed in industry but also those wishing to assume personal responsibility for the safety and welfare of our Nation:

"Many of you are familiar with one of the most effective security posters published during World War II. It pictured a torpedoed troopship and bore the simple slogan 'Loose Talk.'

"A recently published poster points up the effect of security violations. It pictures a steel chain with a broken connector, and the slogan 'The Missing Link.' The lack of a positive attitude toward security is a missing link. Without it, the chain secures nothing and accomplishes no worthwhile function.

"Security is the order of the day in these tense times of rapid change. 'Where will it end?' is a comment often heard. More important to us should be the question, 'Where does it start?'

"I think the whole security program stands or falls on the individual attitude displayed by each one of us. A security attitude is a state of mind, a mood, or a position which we assume.

"Our security attitude should not be confined to mere compliance with routine safeguarding procedures laid down for us in the Industrial Security Manual. There seems to me to be a whole area of security that is inadequately stressed—the cold war propaganda put out by Communists at home and abroad. Unless we develop the will and the capability to counter their insidious propaganda, we shall find ourselves isolated, then divided, and ultimately conquered.

It becomes imperative, therefore, that our attitude toward security be broadened, that it include not only the diligent practice of routine security procedures but also encompass a continuous intelligent study and dissemination of information concerning the ideals and freedoms we are defending, the alien concepts we are opposing and why we oppose them.

"How can this be done?" you may ask.

It can be done through the medium of security education programs.

We have established within the ranks of the military a code of conduct which sets forth the obligations binding on our uniformed military members to reject the Communist propaganda efforts to subvert them. Similarly, a code of conduct should be established for those individuals who work behind the man behind the weapon in order to insure both our own survival and that of the military. Such a code of conduct must reflect a positive and aggressive security attitude.

I believe that the vast majority of our people possess the native intelligence to recognize Communist propaganda when it is stripped of its trappings. It only remains for Government and industry, who have the know-how, to present it in its proper perspective.

It is in, and through, and by our daily attitude toward security that our essential freedoms will be maintained.

PROPAGANDA PETITION

A main pro-Communist antagonist of our national security program is the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee. Ceaselessly, it seeks to abolish it by means of propaganda.

On February 9, 1961, the New York Times carried a 2-page paid advertisement entitled "Petition to the House of Representatives of the 87th Congress of the United States." The petition called for elimination of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Close scrutiny of the several hundred signers of the petition shows that among them were the following members of the National Council of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee:

Royal W. France, lawyer, New York.
Prof. Stringfellow Barr, New Jersey.
Prof. John Ciardi, writer, New Jersey.
Earl B. Dickerson, lawyer, Illinois.
Prof. Thomas I. Emerson, Yale University, Connecticut.
Joshua W. Gitt, Pennsylvania.
Prof. Fowler V. Harper, Connecticut.
Prof. Erich Kahler, New Jersey.
Prof. Curtis D. MacDougall, Illinois.
Carey McWilliams, editor of the Nation, New York.
Prof. William A. Williams, Wisconsin.
Prof. H. H. Wilson, Princeton University, New Jersey.

Other signers of the February 9 ad in the New York Times who are active in the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee are Dorothy Marshall of California, Samuel L. M. Barlow of New York City, and Prof. Alexander Meiklejohn.

POISON FROM THE NEW YORK POST

Four days before the abolition ad against the House Committee on Un-American Activities appeared in the Times, there also appeared in the New York Post a column by William V. Shannon from Washington, D.C., with an attack on President Kennedy and Attorney General Robert Kennedy for having "thus far touched nothing labeled 'security'" and having maintained the entire security program. Shannon then launched into the following vicious attack on the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation:

"Our civil liberties cannot be restored to their full vigor as long as J. Edgar Hoover remains as head of the FBI.

"The whole weight of his reputation, his congressional connections, his newspaper allies, and his secret dossiers is thrown against any security reform, great or small. The House Un-American Activities Committee, and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee could not function if it were not for the information and support supplied by Hoover and the FBI. Hoover is the symbol and the source of much of the confusion in the public mind on security issues."

The foregoing attack on Mr. Hoover is evidence of the wisdom in Joseph E. Loughran's speech "Security is an Attitude." It is indeed. Mr. Shannon's attitude is obvious. The Emergency Civil Liberties Committee deems it to be of such help that reproductions of Mr. Shannon's column were mailed out to the members of that organization and to the public with the statement: "Compliments of Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, 421 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y." Along with the Shannon column, the ECLC mailed an announcement of "a meeting to discuss what William Shannon in the enclosed article calls the 'Blind Spot' of the new frontier." The ECLC meeting is scheduled for February 24, and the announcement bears the boxed statement: "Representatives [WILLIAM FITTS] RYAN of New York and [JAMES] ROOSEVELT of California will soon appear before the House Administrations [sic] Committee to oppose the third of a million dollars the HUAC gets annually for attacks on the American people."

MRS. F.D.R. IN FOREFRONT?

It is interesting to note that Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt was a signer of the abolition ad which appeared in The Times, February 9, and was also a key member of the reform group in New York City politics which backed WILLIAM FITTS RYAN for election in 1960 and helped to send him to Congress. Thus both Members of the House of Representatives whom the ECLC alleges will oppose appropriation of funds for the House Committee on Un-American Activities are related to Mrs. Roosevelt—one is her son, the other her political ward.

A perfect illustration of the truth in Mr. Joseph E. Loughran's statement "Security is an Attitude" was published in the January 2, 1959, issue of U.S.A. magazine in an article "Communism in the United States" by John J. Alessio, who reported on a meeting of the ECLC held at the Hotel New Yorker in Manhattan, December 15, 1959.

Mr. Alessio reported that Dorothy Marshall (who signed the February 9, 1961 ad in the Times along with so many ECLC members) said at the meeting she had been to see several Congressmen about the ECLC abolition campaign against the House Committee on Un-American Activities and that JIMMY ROOSEVELT had told her he needed to be sure of grassroots support for it. "So during the campaign this year," she continued, "whenever he spoke at a meeting or a rally, you can be sure we saw to it that the question was raised."

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

All questions possible are being raised by Communists, pro-Communists, fellow travelers and dupes about the need for an effective internal security system in our country. The Emergency Civil Liberties Committee is the instrument being used by a hard core of braintrusters wishing to abolish every form of security screening in our country and all industrial security provisions.

Many patriotic Americans are either uninformed or ill informed about the reasons for and methods of our industrial security program.

"Our military weapons system," explains Joseph E. Loughran, Security Chief, New York Air Procurement District, "continues to grow in size and complexity, and this condition results in increasing emphasis on the security classification of documents and the components of these technical systems. This makes it imperative for our enemy to try to obtain information regarding our latest de-

vices as early in the developing and manufacturing stage as possible in order to nullify their effect through countermeasures. It is essential, therefore, to insure the same uniform standards of enforcement in all industry both large and small."

President Kennedy gave Congress and the Nation a clear warning of our national peril and maximum danger. The Soviet Union and Red China maintain the tightest secrecy systems possible. These Communist nations also maintain cruel and ruthless secret police systems to control the entire population.

In our country, every single activity of the FBI is controlled by laws enacted in a Congress of which the representatives are freely elected by American voters casting a secret ballot. The Director of the FBI is appointed by the President of the United States who is himself elected by the people. And every single aspect of our national security program is controlled by congressional legislation and appropriation. Thus our security program expresses the will of the people.

What will be our attitude toward the ECLC?

Shall we permit this "instrument of the Communit Party" to thwart our will? Can we afford to let it conduct a program designed to undermine our vitally necessary industrial security program?

U.S. Loses Export Markets as Imports Rise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a report on 3 years of textile foreign trade as compiled by the Textile Information Service of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte 2, N.C.:

U.S. LOSES EXPORT MARKETS AS IMPORTS RISE

The textile import record for 1960 has now been written. It is now a fact that the prophecies of 1958 and 1959 have come true. There has been no let up in the sharply rising levels of textile imports from lands whose workers' wages are at rates illegal in the United States. Cotton cloth and cotton yarn imports are representative of what is happening throughout the textile industry.

In 1958 U.S. imports of cotton cloth were approximately 142 million square yards. These imports increased to 242 million square yards in 1959—nearly doubling from the already high 1958 level. Cotton cloth imports jumped to a new record high of 455 million square yards in 1960.

This trend is unmistakable. Not only is the import level at a record high, but the rate of increase is such that, if it continues unchecked, the entire market for domestic cloth will be supplied by foreign production.

An even sharper rate of increase is seen in cotton yarn imports. After a steep rise from 1958 to 1959, cotton yarn imports shot up from about 1.4 million pounds in 1959 to 15.1 million pounds in 1960.

No fiber and no fabric of the U.S. textile industry is insulated from this onrush of foreign competition. For example, imports of manmade fiber fabrics, which averaged about 5 million pounds in 1958, doubled to more than 11 million pounds in 1959 and continued at over 10 million pounds in 1960.

Woven wool cloth imports moved up from about 34 million square yards in 1958 to 47 million yards in 1959 and attained a new level of 62 million square yards in 1960.

Broad silk fabrics, recorded at about 55 million square yards in 1958, rose to 81 million yards in 1959 and continued at 72 million yards in 1960.

The same alarming trends appear beyond the cloth manufacturing end of the textile industry—in apparel import statistics. From a level of $138 million worth of apparel products in 1958 to $202 million in 1959 there was an additional increase of 13 percent to $220 million worth of apparel products imported in 1960.

While other examples can be drawn from the multiplicity of textile products that flow into the United States from low-wage countries, it is significant to understand that U.S. textile trade has been reversed in recent years. The United States has lost its historical position as a net exporter of textile manufactures.

The United States moved $1.4 billion worth of textile manufactures into world markets in 1947 and absorbed $366 million worth of foreign-made textile manufactures. By 1957 these textile exports had dropped to $667 million, but imports had increased to $635 million. In 1958, exports of textile manufactures of $600 million failed to equal the $636 million imports. The import balance was $36 million. By 1960 imports had risen to $932 million, while textile exports were $694 million—a net import balance of $138 million worth of textile products.

The impact of these trends on the U.S. textile industry with its billions of dollars invested in machinery and equipment is clear to see. Uncertainty about spending for new plants and equipment in the United States and increased search overseas for possible investment in textile plants in countries where foreign government favor the development of industry is the logical outcome.

At the same time, the U.S. Government continues to pursue a two-price cotton program under which domestic mills must buy U.S. raw cotton and pay 25 percent more than the special export prices provided to foreign mills. And wage rates paid by these same foreign manufacturers range from one-half to as low as one-tenth the average wages paid by U.S. industry.

Such raw material cost and wage advantages held by foreign textile manufacturers, over which the U.S. textile industry has no control whatever places the U.S. industry in an intolerable competitive position due to factors beyond its control.

3-year summary of textile foreign trade

U.S. merchandise	1960	1959	1958	Percent change from—	
				1959 to 1960	1958 to 1960
Trade (millions of dollars):					
Exports	20,299	17,383	17,725	+17	+14
Imports	14,654	15,207	12,982	−4	+13
Textile manufactures (millions of dollars):					
Exports	694	634	600	+9	+16
Imports	932	837	637	+11	+46
Cotton cloth (thousands of square yards):					
Exports	436,749	472,299	500,501	−8	−13
Imports	454,898	240,371	141,540	+89	+221
Cotton yarn (thousands of pounds):					
Exports	10,690	13,772	12,921	−22	−17
Imports	15,141	1,380	835	+997	+1,713
Manmade fiber fabrics:					
Exports (thousands of square yards)	154,449	168,004	156,767	−8	−1
Imports (thousands of pounds)	10,215	11,012	4,865	−7	+110
Woven wool cloth (thousands of square yards):					
Exports	1,348	713	853	+89	+58
Imports	62,020	46,610	34,328	+33	+81
Broad silk fabrics (thousands of square yards):					
Exports	1,439	1,641	1,589	−12	−9
Imports	71,942	81,374	54,827	−12	+31
Apparel (millions of dollars):					
Exports	81.1	71.4	72.5	+14	+12
Imports	229.6	202.4	138.4	+13	+66

Retire on $3,000 a Year?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, in these days when we get letters from people stating they do not think the Government is doing quite enough for them, it is refreshing to read that in my State of Vermont there are two sisters, young ladies, both over 80, who have found a way to get along very nicely and are not asking for any additional assistance. The names of these ladies are Mrs. Selma E. Divers and Miss Anna Ockerblad.

The story of how they get along and how their income and expenses are broken down is discussed in an article which appeared in August 1960 in Changing Times, the Kiplinger magazine.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RETIRE ON $3,000 A YEAR?—SEE HOW FOLKS MANAGE ON $150 TO $300 A MONTH

Can a retired person or a couple live comfortably and without too much financial strain on $2,000 or $3,000 a year? If you are in your young or middle years, your answer probably will be "No." Two or three thousand dollars just doesn't sound like a living wage. Yet the truth is, millions of retired people, perforce, are living on such incomes and many of them do rather well. They are able to do it, first, because they have to; second, because they find that upon retirement, taxes and certain expenses fall and there is less need to save. By that time, too, there usually is no mortgage on the home. In fact, many retired people have no debts at all.

There is one fly in the ointment, however, and often it's a vicious one. That is the ever-present threat of heavy medical expenses. Older people are vulnerable. And the threat comes at a time when they are least able to handle big and unexpected bills or the drain of chronic illness. Medical insurance is not always available. In most States, financial assistance is reserved for the needy.

By and large, however, despite worries over health and despite the limitations that a rigidly restricted income impose on recreation, travel and most luxuries, the sample of retired people that Changing Times interviewed seemed to be making out remarkably well. They are neither bitter nor steeped in self-pity. Rather, they are too busy with projects and hobbies and the business of making their income go as far as possible. And they are able to make it go a lot further than most working families would imagine possible.

TWO SISTERS IN VERMONT

Burlington is the largest city in Vermont, but its population is only 35,000. On its western edge lies a grassy park that looks out over the blue waters and fir-covered islands of Lake Champlain. Drive eastward up its sloping, tree-shaded streets and you will pass the town square and then the campus of the University of Vermont and finally you will come to the edge of town and gently rolling farmland. Here, on a quiet street in a rambling yellow house with a gnarled elm tree in front, live Mrs. Selma E. Divers, a widow, and her sister, Miss Anna Ockerblad.

These two ladies are so quick and busy that you would never guess that they are 80. Nor would you guess that they are living on less than $3,000 a year. But such is the case, and on this amount they live not in any mean, pinchpenny way, but comfortably, pleasantly, and usefully. The trick to it, says Mrs. Divers, is to be a Vermonter of Scandinavian descent.

Their father, a florist and gardener, was born in Sweden; their mother, in Norway. This couple moved from Staten Island to Burlington in 1882 and about 50 years ago bought the house their daughters now live in. As a young woman, Mrs. Divers taught business methods and accounting in colleges in New York City. After her husband died, she moved back to Burlington and in 1936 took a job in the business office of the University of Vermont, where she worked until her retirement in 1954.

Miss Ockerblad stayed home all those years, earning her living as a dressmaker. She worked at it full time until she was 75. Now, because of eye cataracts (she has had one operation and anticipates another) she no longer does dressmaking regularly, though she still does some altering at home.

Years ago the two sisters discovered a way to make a separate apartment out of the upstairs of their house. This involved transforming a big upstairs closet into a kitchenette and a downstairs pantry into a bathroom. The stairs were routed through a hall closet to the front porch, making a separate entrance. Because they live within walking distance of the university, the sisters have no trouble keeping this apartment rented for $75 a month. In fact, it has not been vacant for years.

Being thrifty Vermonters, Mrs. Divers and Miss Ockerblad put in a 60-by-100-foot garden each spring. Plowing costs $3.50. Thereafter Mrs. Divers does the cultivating with a little electric rotary tiller. It has 125 feet of cord and is handled much like a vacuum cleaner. For fertilizer, Mrs. Divers uses poultry manure from the university's farm and homemade compost. Last year the ladies froze or canned a bushel of peas; half a bushel of limas; two bushels of green and wax beans; half a dozen boxes of beets; 98 pounds of asparagus; 62 quarts of strawberries; 77 quarts of raspberries, 2 bushels of grapes (made into juice and jelly); an undetermined amount of sweet corn, tomatoes and tomato juice. They bought windfall apples at $1 a bushel for canning and applesauce. They ate fresh vegetables all summer and sold enough raspberries and asparagus to pay for plowing and part of the yard work.

Miss Ockerblad is a great breadmaker and has won 16 blue ribbons for both white and whole wheat at the Barre farm show. She makes four loaves of each at one time for freezing. These ladies keep alive another old-fashioned art: They make their own soap.

What do they do in their "spare time"? Mrs. Divers works occasionally in the accounting office of the university. She also does publicity for the church, reads five magazines, knits and sometimes watches TV, although most shows the considers a sinful waste of time. Miss Ockerblad sews and grows flowers. Occasionally they drive to Hanover, N.H., to visit another sister. Their 1954 Chevrolet, bought secondhand, logs 4,000 to 5,000 miles a year and is stored in a garage during the rugged Vermont winter.

Here are the income and expense figures for this household.

	Annual income
Social security	$1,560
Apartment rental	900
Dividends	986
Part-time work	100
	3,546
	Annual expenses
Electricity	58
Gas	98
Telephone	75
Water	16
Oil for heating	211
Real estate tax	314
Sewage tax	11
Food	500
Clothing	500
Services (yard care, trash, storm windows)	80
Repairs and replacements	340
Magazines	23
Doctors and medicine	30
Blue Cross	127
Car	300
Fire insurance and extended coverage	38
Church and benevolences	150
Total expenses	2,871
Available for saving	675

As you can see, these spry and thrifty Yankee ladies not only live on $300 a month but manage to save $50 of it. They keep $1,200 to $1,500 in the bank and over the years have put additional savings into blue chip stocks that now pay handsome dividends. They owe not a cent. Truly, being a Vermonter of Scandinavian descent seems a valuable trait.

Bulgarian Liberation Day, March 3, 1878

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the Bulgarians are the most resourceful and defiant fighters against all their enemies, but they are perhaps best known as gallant warriors against their oppressors.

Their little country in the Balkans was a powerful kingdom during the middle ages, and they constituted a real power there for centuries. Then early in the 15th century as the Ottoman Turks overran the Balkan Peninsula and parts of southern Europe, Bulgaria became an Ottoman province in the Ottoman Empire, and the Bulgarians a resolute minority struggling against Ottoman despotism. For more than 400 years they carried on their struggle against formidable odds, and all these attempts ended in failure because without effective outside help they could not cope with the then powerful Ottoman forces.

In the Russo-Turkish War of 1877–78 they had their chance. The Bulgarians were fighting on the side of the Russians, for the war was waged in the name of the Balkan peoples. Early in 1878 the Turks were thoroughly vanquished, and when Russia was dictating her peace terms, she insisted upon Bulgarian freedom. Thus their freedom was guaranteed in the treaty signed on March 3, 1878, and since then Bulgarians everywhere, in and out of their homeland, think of that day as their holiday and celebrate it as such. Since those days the Bulgarian people have endured much misery, have gone through two devastating world wars, and both of these have had tragic consequences for them. Today, after all the sufferings and sacrifices, they are not free in their homeland. Even so, these stanch fighters for freedom, these dauntless and hardy peasants, under the most oppressive of tyrannies continue to work and hope for their eventual freedom. There under Communist totalitarianism, and totally sealed off from the free world, they work for their ruthless taskmasters, yet cling to their most cherished ideal, their freedom and independence. It is sad but true that while they attained their freedom with the aid of czarist Russian forces 83 years ago, today they are robbed of their freedom in their homeland by Communist Russian agents. All friends of freedom-hungry Bulgarian people hope that they will again regain their freedom and live in peace in their homeland.

Decade of Progress for Schools in Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today the Nation faces the job of further improving and expanding its educational system.

The increasing school population and greater demands upon our people for knowledge and training require that a larger effort be directed toward providing more high quality schools, teachers, and training facilities.

The challenge, of course, will require local-State-Federal cooperation.

Across the country, States, like Wisconsin, are making realistic efforts to provide adequate educational opportunities for our youth.

During the past 10 years, for example, Wisconsin has spent about a half-billion dollars for new schools, and additions or remodeling for existing ones. Also, teacher preparation has advanced and schools are providing ever-higher quality programs.

Recently, the Milwaukee Journal published an article by Robert L. Dishon, entitled "Decade of Progress for Schools in State." Reflecting the forward-looking way in which Wisconsin is attempting to meet its local-State obligations in the field of education, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECADE OF PROGRESS FOR SCHOOLS IN STATE—WATSON REPORTS MANY IMPROVEMENTS BASED ON MAJOR CHANGES IN 1949

(By Robert L. Dishon)

MADISON, WIS.—Public schools in Wisconsin built remarkable improvements from 1949 to 1959 on a foundation established by the legislature, the State superintendent of schools has reported.

In his biennial report, George E. Watson reviewed what has happened to public education since major law changes were authorized in 1949. He called the report "Decade of Progress."

In the 10 years, Watson said, teacher preparation advanced, the number of inefficient school districts was reduced, more schools developed higher quality programs, auxiliary services like transportation and lunch programs expanded.

FRAMEWORK SET UP

"Actually," Watson said, "these legislative enactments do not guarantee a better educational program. They rather set up a framework in which local districts can more effectively help themselves as they strive to offer an increasingly broader and richer educational program for their children."

In the last decade, Watson said, the people of the State spent nearly a half billion dollars to erect new schools and additions and remodel existing schools.

Operating costs rose from $100 million in 1949–50, with State aids totaling $17.5 million, or 17.4 percent of the expense, to $245 million in 1959–60. State aids that year totaled $59.2 million, or 24.2 percent of the cost.

AGENCIES COOPERATED

Watson said that in 1949, when the first of the war babies began to hit the elementary schools, 2,535 out of 12,900 elementary teachers had less than 2 years preparation for teaching. Ten years later, those with less than 2 years numbered 268 out of 18,333.

The change resulted from cooperation of his department, school administrators, teachers, school boards and teacher education institutions, according to Watson. His office has the responsibility for certifying teachers.

At least 60 percent of the elementary teachers now have at least a bachelor's degree and more than 70 percent of the 28,846 elementary and secondary teachers have such a degree, Watson reported. Requests from superintendents for special permits for teachers to fill up staffs have fallen below 1,000.

AIDS HELP PROGRAMS

School district reorganization and State aids are connected with the aid formula set up in 1949. Part of the aid formula is the guaranteed property valuation behind each school child. The State pays flat aids and basic and integrated aids per pupil. Integrated aids are for the better quality programs.

In 1949–50, a total of 151,680 or 32 percent of the pupils were in integrated level programs. Last school year, the basic programs had 88,741 or 13.9 percent of the enrollment and integrated programs had 548,294 or 86.1 percent of the pupils, reflecting major changes toward improvement.

DISTRICTS DECLINE

Integrated schools must have a certain number of teachers and must offer a minimum curriculum. To meet the State standards, many districts have had to merge in order to get an adequate tax base to borrow money.

The State had 6,273 school districts in 1949. Ten years later, the number had been reduced to 53.7 percent to 2,904. An average of about 300 districts disappeared in Wisconsin each year in the 10-year period, Watson's report said.

One of the major legislative changes in 1949 was establishment of county school committees to develop master plans for school development. Part of their work is reflected in the reduction of one teacher schools from 4,133 to 1,691 and nonoperating districts from 1,053 to 30.

PUPILS TRANSPORTED

Tied to district reorganization, and annexation for school purposes is transportation of pupils. Part of the 1949 legislation called for school boards to provide bus service for pupils living more than 2 miles from schools.

In that year, 78,000 pupils were transported. Last school year, 209,601 pupils living more than 2 miles away and 42,207 living less than 2 miles were transported to schools.

Part of the reason for the growth of the school lunch program is the transportation of pupils. More youngsters remain at school all day. The number of schools in the lunch program increased from 1,380 to 1,667 and the number of pupils from 68,388 to 169,918 in the 10 years. The cost has jumped from $2 million to more than $7.5 million a year.

The State and local districts will have to continue their school efforts, Watson said, because enrollments will continue to climb.

Enrollments have increased over the last 10 years from 475,000 to nearly 650,000 last year. Watson said school construction would have to continue this decade and perhaps have to be stepped up in the 1970's.

Former Congressman J. Harold Flannery New President Judge of Court of Common Pleas of Luzerne County, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader of February 21, 1961, which comments on the designation of the Honorable J. Harold Flannery to be the new president judge of the court of common pleas of Luzerne County. Judge Flannery, who recently announced his candidacy for a third 10-year term, will be remembered by many Members of the House as the Representative of the district which I now have the honor of representing, Pennsylvania's 11th Congressional.

The editorial follows:

J. HAROLD FLANNERY IS NEW PRESIDENT JUDGE

A notable career of public service was climaxed yesterday afternoon when J. Harold Flannery was sworn in as 17th president judge of the court of common pleas of Luzerne County, succeeding John J. Aponick who collapsed in court on Wednesday and died on Thursday.

The designation of the West Pittston jurist as president judge by Gov. David Lawrence came less than a week after he had announced his candidacy for a third term. The new eminence he has attained by virtue of seniority on the bench will enhance his prestige.

In his new capacity, President Judge Flannery follows in the footsteps of 16 prominent citizens who distinguished themselves, not only in the law, but in the service of the community, the Commonwealth and the country. In the order of service, the list includes: Seth Chapman, John B. Gibson, Thomas Burnside, David Scott, William Jessup, John N. Conyngham, Garrick M. Harding, Charles E. Rice, Stanley Woodward, John Lynch, George S. Ferris, Henry A. Fuller, William S. McLean, Jr., Benjamin R. Jones, William A. Valentine, and John J. Aponick.

The 11th Judicial District, now limited to Luzerne County, once included Wayne, Susquehanna, Bradford, and Tioga Counties. Subsequently, Pike, Monroe, Columbia, Montour, and Wyoming Counties were added. Lackawanna then was a part of Luzerne County and also was included.

The new distinction that has come to President Judge Flannery inevitably is accompanied by greater responsibility. As a member of the legal profession for 40 years, 20 of which were spent on the bench, he is well equipped to discharge the duties of the post. His impressive record of public service includes a tour of duty in Washington as a Member of Congress and in the district attorney's office.

While the community mourns the passing of President Judge Aponick, it will be comforted by the knowledge that an experienced jurist and good neighbor is available to carry on. The hope will be the vacancy on the bench, created by President Judge Aponick's death, will be filled by the appointment of a lawyer of comparable stature.

Cuba's Communist Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, Cuba is a Communist satellite. Cuba's leaders are as communistic as the Red bosses of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, or Red China, and still we are sending Fidel Castro dollars at the rate of $65 million a year by purchasing Commu-

nist-produced Cuban goods. The United States is unwittingly helping Fidel Castro to finance his program of chaos, strife, revolution, and bitter anti-Americanism. Incredible as that statement may seem, the facts bear it out.

Twice I have written to the Secretary of State asking that this policy of folly be halted and that an ironclad embargo be ordered to prohibit all imports from that Communist island. On February 19 the Palm Beach Post-Times printed an editorial entitled, "Cuban Imports Help Communism," which presents a strong argument in favor of a full embargo on Cuban goods. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CUBAN IMPORTS HELP COMMUNISM

Whatever may be thought of their methods, Americans can only applaud the stated aims of longshoremen picketing the port of Palm Beach in protest against importation of Cuban fruits and vegetables.

Two decades ago we found that it was impossible to do business with Hitler. We did business with the Japanese—to our sorrow—almost up to the eve of Pearl Harbor, when some of our scrap iron exports came back to us in the form of shrapnel in demolition bombs.

Since that time, we have learned the folly of trying to do business with the Communists; but for some strange reason we continue to do business with Castro, the Kremlin's stooge in the Caribbean.

Although a partial embargo has been placed on U.S. exports to Cuba—excepting only food and medicines—Cuban imports of fruits and vegetables still continue to pour into this area, with a corresponding export of U.S. dollars that strengthen the Castro-Guevara Communist regime.

Cessation of this business would, of course, hurt some local interests. But there is no logic in "business as usual" during wartime. And although we are not technically at war with Communist Cuba, we are—or should be—vitally concerned in helping the island republic to throw off its Red shackles. Every dollar that goes into the Castro coffers has the opposite effect.

Aside from this, there are valid reasons for halting this traffic with Cuba. Citrus and tomatoes, particularly, are glutting the market and depressing prices to the detriment of south Florida growers. Even though, as a nation, we appear to be fond of aiding "underprivileged" peoples at the expense of our own economy, this appears to be carrying the principle a little too far.

It could be stopped by executive action. And it's high time.

Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, since President Kennedy yesterday announced the signing of an Executive Order establishing a Peace Corps on a temporary basis, it is interesting to recall that a number of years ago Mr. Heinz W. Rollman, an industrialist of Waynesville, N.C., and the Republican candidate for Congress in 1960 from the 12th Congressional District, suggested a similar idea in his book "My Plan for World Construction." Mr. Rollman summarized some of his ideas in an article which he had published in the Mountaineer, of Waynesville, N.C. Our former colleague, the Honorable George A. Shuford, of North Carolina's 12th District, inserted Mr. Rollman's article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 20, 1954.

Since the entire article was placed in the RECORD by former Representative Shuford, I will not include all of it again but will include, as a part of my remarks, excerpts from it. Those interested in Mr. Rollman's full statement are referred to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 20, 1954. The excerpts from the article, bearing upon the question of a "Peace Army", which I believe will be of interest today in the light of the President's Executive Order and message to Congress of yesterday, follow:

In order to accomplish such a vast program of teaching our know-how to populations all over the world, the services of approximately 3 million persons will be required. These 3 million would constitute a peace army who would go abroad, not with hate and guns, but with love and respect of our fellow human beings and bring their civilian skills with them. Each teaching member of the peace army will not be required to teach more than an average of 200 persons during his or her 3-year period of service with the peace army. Teaching would be conducted with small groups or even individuals. Subjects to be taught would not be limited to industrial techniques or agricultural techniques. The program, in order to create a sound basis for spiritual and political growth and maturity of the recipient countries, would have to encompass every phase of life and activity that should be a part of a democratic way of life. In this manner we could teach 600 million persons to live and produce the way we do here within a very short period. The members of the peace army will teach subjects which they are qualified to teach on the basis of their regular civilian skills and occupations.

To quote from the book "My Plan for World Construction": "Not only must we send overseas experts in banking to teach people how to bank, grocery clerks who know how to run supermarkets, engineers who know how to build steel mills, but it is equally important to send people overseas who know how to milk cows, how to put on diapers, and how to run a democratic government."

A Blow Against Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the stepped up assault on the House Committee on Un-American Activities, it is my feeling that every Member of the Congress and reader of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD should have the opportunity of seeing David Lawrence's column on March 1, 1961, concerning the decisions of the Supreme Court in the Wilkinson and Braden cases, resulting from contempt citations from the Committee on Un-American Activities:

A BLOW AGAINST COMMUNISTS—FIVE JUSTICES' DECISIONS LAUDED IN FREEDOM OF SPEECH CASE

(By David Lawrence)

It seems incredible that, with a cold war going on and with billions of dollars being spent by the Soviet Government to infiltrate every democratic country in the world, there should be issued by four members of the Supreme Court of the United States—Chief Justice Warren, Justices Black, Douglas, and Brennan—an opinion which appears to brush aside the Communist menace.

Fortunately, five other members of the Court—Justices Stewart, Clark, Frankfurter, Harlan, and Whittaker—see the Communist menace in its realistic form. By their latest decision, they make it clear that the empty claim to protection of free speech will not save suspected Communists in the United States from investigation by an authorized congressional committee.

The four dissenting justices insist that witnesses, when asked by a congressional committee whether they are Communists, need not even take the 5th amendment but can refuse to answer on the ground that their rights of free speech under the 1st amendment are being transgressed.

The argument solemnly proclaimed by the four dissenting justices is that no agency of the Federal Government, be it legislative, executive or judicial, may "harass or punish people for their beliefs, or for their speech about, or public criticism of, laws and public officials."

This doctrine would make it possible for any citizen to decline to tell an investigating committee about rackets, monopolies, payola, or any irregularities in human behavior on which it might be desirable to pass remedial laws. The witness could merely claim that the congressional committee was harassing him for his criticisms of the committee and was trying to punish him for his beliefs. Congressional efforts to get information on which to base regulatory laws could thus be frustrated.

In the latest opinion—the case of Frank Wilkinson, who refused to give even his place of residence to the House Committee on Un-American Activities—the majority of the justices repeated a statement from a previous decision, which said:

"To suggest that because the Communist Party may also sponsor peaceable political reforms the constitutional issues before us should now be judged as if that party were just an ordinary political party from the standpoint of national security, is to ask this Court to blind itself to world affairs which have determined the whole course of our national policy since the close of World War II."

What the majority of the court says is supposed to be "the law of the land," but it is being scorned—in the companion case of Carl Braden—by Justice Black, with Chief Justice Warren and Justice Douglas agreeing. In this dissenting opinion these words of defiance are issued.

"The founders of this Nation were not then willing to trust the definition of first amendment freedoms to Congress or this Court, nor am I now."

But to accept the idea that Congress cannot investigate or that the Supreme Court cannot rule on the case of a man who may be serving or helping a hostile government—an enemy—is to deprive the Nation of any power of self-preservation. The pur-

pose of these congressional investigations is to expose the espionage and subversive activities of the whole Communist apparatus in the United States. Loyal American citizens are expected to cooperate with their own Government in all its branches. The Communists have stolen atomic secrets. They have at times infiltrated the departments in Washington. The Supreme Court in the past has taken the view that it isn't a "right of free speech" falsely to cry "Fire," in a crowded theater. Nor does the "free speech" clause of the Constitution give anyone immunity from an investigation to determine whether he belongs to a party that is financed by, instigated by, and often directed by a foreign government which is seeking to damage the United States and possibly to bring on a war.

Justice Black argues that editors and newsmen who have criticized a congressional committee now could be brought before that same committee and punished for refusing to answer questions. But whenever there is a basis for suspecting that a newspaperman is paid by or working for an enemy government, he shouldn't be able to claim immunity under the first amendment, either.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities is under attack these days by so-called "liberals" who will be encouraged now by the dissenting opinions of the Supreme Court to carry on their campaign to curtail, if not abolish, the work of the House committee and also of the Senate Internal Security Subcommitte. But the defenders of America's safety against the Communist enemy will find an irrefutable argument in the two opinions rendered this week by Justices Stewart, Clark, Frankfurter, Harlan, and Whittaker.

Preservation of Natural Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the Senate Interior Committee has completed hearings on S. 174, the wilderness bill. We have had some constructive proposals for clarifying amendments and the hearings have been of real value. Of course, over the past 4 years we have built up considerable records of hearings and studies dealing with wilderness legislation. Much has recently been written in the press concerning the preservation of wilderness areas and there is a heightened interest generally in the problem of national resources.

I ask unanimous consent that two articles bearing on this subject be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CRISIS IN NATURAL RESOURCES

Ranking in importance with the message on education that he had sent to Congress only 3 days earlier is President Kennedy's exciting and comprehensive statement on the development and conservation of the Nation's natural resources.

The President covered virtually the entire field: Water, power, forests, public lands, ocean resources, and recreation. He laid out a program that the Nation will ignore literally at its peril. In some ways even more significant than the program itself is the fact that the President clearly showed an understanding of the most basic fault of our natural-resource policy: the failure to look at it as an integral whole; the failure to put a stop to the rivalries, duplications and exceedingly harmful conflicts in the field and in Washington between various arms of Government; the failure, in short, to coordinate the management of the Nation's dwindling resources, or to provide adequately for their wise use and preservation.

In an effort to correlate the work he proposes some immediate administrative steps. We regret—as we have already stated on this page—that he did not go the whole way and present a full-fledged plan for creation of a Department of Natural Resources.

As to the substance of his message, the President devoted most attention to the problem of water resources, stressing the vital need for comprehensive river-basin planning. We have our reservations about the necessity for many additional large dams and flood-control projects; there has been too much pork barrel in the past for us not to be skeptical for the future. But if the planning is properly and objectively done the projects may be fewer and their necessity less doubtful.

The President is far from being merely a big-dam advocate. He recognizes the value of land zoning to reduce flood damage; of acceleration of the very useful small-watersheds program; of promoting soil conservation; of taking effective steps to control the increasing menace of water and air pollution; of intensifying research into the conversion of saline water. The power policy he enunciated is progressive but hardly radical.

The urgent need to improve the management of much of the Nation's commercial forest land, especially that 50 percent in small-woodlot ownership, cannot be too greatly emphasized. Mr. Kennedy's program to improve the dreadfully deteriorating condition of the public domain is most encouraging. Here he will have a fight with some heavily vested interests on the range. Even the resources of the coastal ocean do not escape his attention, and he suggests a national program for oceanography.

We are particularly pleased by the President's wise words in respect to the great scenic and recreational resources of the country, which are now meeting pressures such as they have never known before—pressures that will only increase in the foreseeable future. Conservationists will be delighted by his advocacy of the pending wilderness bill (S. 174), a modest effort to preserve for future generations some of the natural quality of primeval America. It is essential that Congress delay no longer on his recommendation of three new national seashore parks; but this is only the beginning of what must be done about new parks, and done quickly—before it is too late to do anything.

RENEWED VIGOR IN CONGRESS DRIVE TO ENACT LEGISLATION FOR PARKS

(By Ann Cottrell Free)

President Kennedy's message to Congress on natural resources and the scheduling of a number of major conservation meetings here gives new urgency to the "call of the wild."

The President made it clear that the call had gone too long unheeded and the time has come to reexamine the Government's often conflicting natural resources policies.

"If we fail," he said in Thursday's message, "to chart a proper course of conservation and development—if we fail to use these blessings prudently—we will be in trouble within a short time."

Efforts soon to be undertaken at the White House level to make some sense out of the patchwork and jigsaw pattern of conservation efforts might well lead to an administration proposal to establish a department of natural resources.

CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS SET

Fittingly, detailed study of the conservation crisis—and man's role in causing it—will be undertaken thoroughly in coming days. Congressional hearings and national conservation meetings are bringing naturalist and wildlife experts by the hundreds here.

They will seek to keep our wildlands wild, to restore the balance of nature, and, in effect, to keep the bulldozer from the wolf's door. And above all, they will try to preserve the best values of the old frontier. And just as in those days there will be unity against common enemies—such as fire, flood, and city-slicker exploiters.

Today the enemy also includes the polluter of streams, indiscriminate user of traps, poisons, and pesticides and destroyer of wildlife habitat.

Unity among conservationists against man at his predatory worst will be seen, for instance, on March 9 at the Smithsonian Institution. Six wildlife, humane, and naturalist groups have joined with the Defenders of Wildlife to present the crusading Scot, Dr. Harry R. Lillie. The naturalist-physician's subject: "Man—Menace to the Planet."

But conservationists are beginning to realize that it is almost easier to rout the common enemy than to parcel out the land among themselves. For now, unlike frontier days, the land shrinks with the birth of every baby.

NEED FOR ZONING SYSTEM

And the naturalist, hunter, reclamationist, public power adherent, recreation seeker—as well as the commercial interests—want to be served.

Therefore, a need for a system of zoning is becoming acute.

This need will be illustrated, for example, tomorrow, when men who love the land solely for the sake of the land, journey once again to Capitol Hill. They will ask for a third time that some of our land be left forever as wilderness. It would remain, then, as a living museum for future generations and always as a source of spiritual renewal.

The controversial "wilderness bill" asks only that about 5 percent of our Federal estate—national forests, parks, wildlife refuges—be protected from exploitation. Their administrators would be relieved of all pressures to change the present character of these areas of thorn and rock, velvet green and dancing stream. The authority to change, limit or increase would be given the Congress.

THE OPPOSITION

It will be opposed again—as for the last 5 years—by mining, timber and livestock interests at the hearing before the Senate Interior Committee tomorrow.

Due to the administration's backing, vigorous sponsorship of Committee Chairman CLINTON P. ANDERSON of New Mexico, and the educational efforts of the Wilderness Society, the bill's chances in the Senate seem good. The outcome in the House is a greater question.

Growing interest in nonurban zoning, known as multiple use, will be exhibited here this week at the 3-day annual meeting of the National Wildlife Federation. "Multiple Use" is the meeting's theme and also of National Wildlife Week, March 19–25.

Realization that many ancient civilizations perished because of poor land management contributes to this demand for more equitable use of the land. Under the ideal national policy, no one interest would be developed to the detriment of the other. Such a policy is now in effect for this Forest Service.

WHO WOULD ADMINISTER IT?

But this concept leads to the question: Who would administer this policy?

Experts are divided. Kennedy, during the campaign, favored a council of resource and conservation advisers in the Office of the President. It would work with a joint congressional committee. A bipartisan bill, with 90 cosponsors, has been introduced in Congress.

There are others who believe that the national interest would best be served by a natural resources department. But this would mean taking power away from other arms of Government reluctant to part with it.

Nevertheless the passing of the coordination problem by Mr. Kennedy to his already madeup Council of Economic Advisers and a special advisory committee—including concerned Federal department and agency heads—may be the first step toward the proposal of such a department. The President, at any rate, believes this approach would have more teeth than the one he made during the campaign.

But whoever or whatever the coordinator, people still pose the problem. And the North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference, meeting here March 5–8, recognizes this. Its theme: "Planning for Population Pressures."

The problem that increases every day has been reduced to an equation by the Forest Service: More people plus more money, leisure, mobility equals more demand.

The first task, clearly, is to find more land for public recreational use, particularly beach areas. Along the 3,700-mile coast of 18 Atlantic and gulf coast States only 270 miles are set aside for public use.

Suburbia with its split levels and ramblers—is eating into the potential park areas, too. But the idea to make suburbia vertical (ramblers into skyscrapers) instead of horizontal may not get far.

Interior Secretary Udall may have started machinery for greater acquisition of land for State and Federal recreation use by his recent moratorium on public land sales. Speculators have been grabbing up too much that might better be used for the public good.

Establishment of a youth conservation corps could also help to reclaim and develop land for many good uses.

Mr. Udall is also reexamining the thorny problem confronting Mission 66 in developing our 29 national parks so they can take care of 80 million persons by 1966. Today about one-third that number visit the parks. The charge has been made that the parks are being overdeveloped to take care of people at the price of impairing nature. Lodgings, ski lifts and other fun and comfort aids belong nearer the gates, not deep inside some critics say.

The Secretary is faced, too, with working out a policy in regard to wildlife that will meet the objections of those who fear that the Predator Control Division of Fish and Wildlife is destroying too many of our foxes, golden eagles, coyotes. As a result—due to stockmen's insistence—the balance of nature is off kilter. Also the policy of public hunting within some wildlife refuges and sanctuaries is questioned.

Dakota Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HJALMAR C. NYGAARD
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to the joint effort of nine North Dakota daily newspapers in presenting a "Dakota Territory Centennial" section to their readers, marking the 100th anniversary of Dakota Territory.

This special section is not only beautifully printed and exceptionally well written, but I believe it constitutes a signficant contribution to the historical documents of our State.

Cooperating in the writing and production were the Bismarck Tribune, Devils Lake Daily Journal, the Dickinson Press, the Fargo Forum, the Grand Forks Herald, Jamestown Sun, Mandan Daily Pioneer, Minot Daily News, and Valley City Times-Record.

I feel sure the introductory editorial will prove most interesting to my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

PEACE GARDEN STATE BUILDING ON A NOBLE HERITAGE

A significant 100th anniversary is being celebrated in North Dakota this year.

What we are marking is 100 years of law and order, of organized government on one of America's frontiers, an epoch which commenced in 1861 with the creation of Dakota Territory, of which North Dakota was a part.

Dakota Territory itself lasted only 28 years. It was succeeded in 1889 by statehood. Yet the territory was a notable political entity in the history of our Nation, and the occasion of this centenary is momentous.

It is a time to pause and take note of the beginnings of civilization in a wilderness country, to take stock of what has come out of these 100 years.

Throughout this centennial edition are articles and pictures reviewing those beginnings, from the remote past to the present, reflecting what has happened, what has been accomplished for weal and for woe. Much of it is glorious and we can look back with pride.

We need to remind ourselves that we must know our first beginnings and our heritage. We need to know well the land and the conditions under which we have lived and what has happened here.

We cannot otherwise plan the future of our State. The hope of realizing the stirring prospects we may envision and which surely lie before us in the days to come rests to a large degree in the lessons learned from the past.

As a people we are the result of the heritage of State as well as family.

Not all of it may be acceptable to us. In part we would reject it and go in another direction. In greater part we can accept it and build upon it.

Have we but a celar picture of how and whence we came, we can the better understand where we now are and where we are going.

The past is not always pleasant, but we cannot discard it. If we deny it, it haunts us in our subconscious. It appears in our prejudices and reveals itself in our tacit assumptions and patterns of behavior.

What are our mistakes and what our accomplishments? What are our liabilities and what our assets? What is possible and what is not possible? What can be hoped for and what must be abandoned?

These facts we must know well and face realistically. Having appraised ourself and our potentials we must join hands to build the future.

The slogans on the billboards calling North Dakota the land of unlimited horizons is true. The best is yet to come. We have but to grasp a vision of what can be done and begin.

One condition attaches itself automatically. Political and sectional disputes, petty differences and self-interest must be cast aside for the greater good, the welfare of the State itself. For the State is but a name for all of the people.

What we need is a flaming spirit of patriotic ambition, to stimulate the desire of unselfish men to add something to the enrichment of our State which shall endure for all time.

Significant beginnings have lately been made in appraising North Dakota's past, in seeing ourselves as we are, and suggesting realistic plans for the days to come.

Historians have frankly disclosed our obviously brash course of too muchness in certain aspects of our physical development. Much has been revealed about blundering overexpansion in certain fields.

Conference and study in recent years is resulting in the creation of wiser legislation. We are beginning to pay heed to the counsel of trained investigators. We are less prone to file studies away in pigeonholes.

We are beginning to take stock of our heroes, and are beginning to reach agreement on our standards of values.

We need to know and revere the great men of our State, to call the attention of our children to their lives and accomplishments, that their example may not be forgotten.

The reputation of a State and its heroes maintains a constant appeal to its citizens to maintain its integrity and greatness.

It appeals to our pride and our patriotism. It is a potent living incentive to every citizen to so sacredly guard it that the historian of the future may find no blot upon its honor.

North Dakota has many problems, some peculiar to itself, some common to all States. Some, perhaps many, are capable of solution. Some may not be fully solved. In some instances it may be best to rely on remedies effective years ago rather than weak modern solutions.

We need to know more about the probable final effect of the mechanization of agriculture in our economy.

What the future of oil, lignite, power, and water resources may eventually mean.

What to do about the exodus of our native sons from our colleges and universities to other States.

How to attract more people and more industry.

How to overcome the problems which seem related to our brisk winter climate.

Fellow North Dakotans, you can participate personally in seeking the best course for your Peace Garden State in the 100 years ahead.

You can involve yourself by becoming articulate, by joining in group study of the State's problems, by speaking up, by willingness to make a sacrifice of time and energy for the good of your State.

Let us pick our goals and make our dreams come true. The next 100 years can be the greatest of all.

Economic Problems of Expanding and Declining Communities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by Mr. Solomon Barkin, research director, Textile Workers Union of America, New York City, which appeared in the February 1961 issue of the magazine, Social Action, published by

the Council for Christian Social Action of the United Church of Christ.

Mr. Barkin's article follows:

ECONOMIC PROBLEMS OF EXPANDING AND DECLINING COMMUNITIES

Economic change is being propelled by various forces in our society. The simplest is the mere multiplication of our population. To maintain the same level of per capita wealth, national product and income, it is essential that we use more resources and more capital, build more houses, create more communities and extend existing ones. Therefore, even in a period of so-called economic stagnancy there is much change.

In addition, even in the relatively stable era when our per capita growth is not being improved economic shifts of various kinds are being made. People are moving from one place to another; transfers are occurring in economic activity; worn out or obsolete facilities have to be replaced; new products are coming on the market to displace older ones.

Even in periods of declining economic wealth, movement is common. People are withdrawing from existing activity. They are abandoning previous living levels. They are shifting back to communities in which they will find familial support. Business contracts and eliminates economic operations. Surpluses become available; vacancies increase; and idleness grows.

But the process of change is accelerated in periods of rising per capita income, national product, and wealth. Such progress is being effected through various methods. Increased efficiency in operations is one basic technique. Machinery substitutes for labor; the organization of work is improved; management becomes more effective; expensive and rare materials are displaced by cheaper and more plentiful ones; more efficient building structures replace obsolete ones; long-distance communication eliminates the need for way stations; automatic controls displace human ones. As such technical changes are effected, new products arise, new raw materials are needed, new services required. Manufacturing and service industries relocate to more economic areas. People flock to the new job opportunities and the industrial and population maps get altered radically.

Advances in the rate of growth are accelerated by new forces, most important of which are organized research and scientific investigation. These are providing a cumulating fount of new technical knowledge from which will flow more radically different technologies and societies. The practical applications of these findings have hardly begun. When this flow is tapped, they will truly gush forth with many innovations.

A second force accelerating our rate of progress is savings made in our investments both human and physical. Physical, mental, and vocational rehabilitation of individuals is becoming commonplace. Similarly, we are learning through urban renewal and redevelopment of distressed urban and rural areas to preserve our large-scale capital, thereby conserving more wealth and further accelerating our total progress.

With the new accent on conservation of human, natural, and physical wealth, we are closing the circle of attitudes. Progress and growth do not mean merely the introduction of the new but also the alteration of the old to make them better serve us in this rapidly changing society. The challenge ahead for us is to facilitate our adjustments and capitalize on our human and physical resources for the greatest national and individual good.

In no field is there greater need of maintaining the quality and benefits of past investment than in the area of the community. Its resources include human, natural, and physical capital. The well-being of its citizenry and of the community agencies and their economic soundness depend upon their easy adjustment to change. They must be adapted to the newer needs, which means that the older ones are to be scrapped only if they cannot economically be rehibilitated, redeveloped, and renewed to serve the newer needs. We must not create a scrap heap of human beings for our investment in them is great and they are really the raison d'être of all social and economic activity.

CONTRAST IN PROBLEMS OF EXPANDING AND DECLINING COMMUNITIES

Governmental and semipublic agencies have the responsibility, in expanding and declining communities, to help individuals adjust and to create the institutions necessary for the fullest realization of individual and comfunity potentialities. The difference between these communities lies in the nature of the economic foundation available for solving their problems and for financing these programs. They are more readily available in the expanding than in the declining community.

But even the observation may not be wholly appropriate since the economic base in expanding areas may be inadequate, as in places where the existing industrial pattern precludes realization of prevailing American income standards. Second, there are expanding communities with such a backlog of deficits, unemployment or underemployment, and insufficiencies of community resources and facilities that they have a long way to go before they can be considered adequate.

In many cases of expanding communities, therefore, and in all instances of the contracting community, the foremost challenge is to designate a pattern of economic development which would assure the maximum utilization of the human, natural, and capital resources to advance the living standards and opportunities of the individual citizens. This preliminary responsibility must be shouldered by most communities with the possible exception of those whose economic future appears adequately safeguarded and where the levels of income and employment are among the most favorable.

PLANNING FOR GROWTH

The major challenge confronting each community is to organize itself for effective economic growth. There is no single theory, formula, or method of projecting the future which will provide a sure course. Neither diversification nor specialization is a safe solution. The only answer is continued alertness to economic trends. It requires an intimate knowledge of the economic structure of the community which is possessed by few in this country. The cloak of privacy of economic information which has in the past kept the community ill-informed must be removed, for knowledge is not only the key to the future but also a source of warnings of adversities to be prevented by appropriate early action. The community has the continuing responsibility of creating an environment which fosters economic growth and rising incomes.

Relevance of national trends

Besides focusing upon local economic trends and conditions, each community has as great a responsibility for national trends. In fact, it may well be argued that the primary interest of most areas must be the maintenance of a national full employment economy. During periods of great national activity, local communities are likely to share in the benefits and are better able to deal with local economic issues. It is during such periods that private industry expands and is constantly on the lookout for new areas in which to locate. The task of attracting new economic units is much easier in periods of plenty.

Even in times of high national unemployment, in one of which we are now living, the community cannot resign itself to the reverses. Its responsibility must always be to assure the maximum development of its own structure and employment on the best terms for its people. While supporting programs for high national growth and employment, it must be hard at work at rebuilding and reactivating its own local economy.

The agency for planning for such economic growth must be built around the groups keenly interested in the community's development and the rise in the income level of its population.

Resistance to change

Unfortunately, there always are vested interests of one type or another which resist such goals. Some are afraid that new industry will increase the demand for employees and force higher wages. Others fear that growth will expand the local buying power and induce larger national corporations to seek sites for business. Still others resist any change in pattern simply because they are accustomed to the existing one. Finally, some leading citizens resist advances because they fear that their own positions might be endangered in the distant future.

Nevertheless, each community has an obligation to proceed on such planning ventures. The real challenge is to find the spearhead for the undertaking. While the business community is most immediately prepared to understand the issue, it may not be interested. You then turn to civic, political, trade union, and professional leaders, as well as to the universities.

Economic studies as planning aids

Of the types of economic studies which have been employed for such planning, the "economic core study" is most useful, since its emphasis is upon the locational advantages of the community. Beginning with an understanding of the forces which have favored the location of existing industries, "the economic core," the planning group, is in position to determine whether these considerations are becoming less or more critical in economic growth and to determine whether they are sufficient to attract new industries. If not, the alternative issue is that of determining which other assets the community can develop or build up to favor more expansion. The goal must necessarily be to define and favor the creation of a new nucleus of economic growth upon which an industrial complex may be constructed.

For this purpose, the planning group must assemble a varied set of facts. These would include an inventory of resources such as power, water, minerals, forests, and others. Other data would consist of an income flow analysis to define the relative contribution of each current sector to the local income, "value added" and employment. The third item would be input-output studies which can define the sources of new industries by highlighting the specific services needed and products not now provided in the community. The study of the income levels would reflect on the consumption patterns and potentialities which they offer. The description of the qualities and capacity of the population is important in defining the gaps that have to be closed, the amount of upgrading required, and the human resources now available. Studies of migration allow the group to understand the losses being incurred and the attitudes of the people themselves. In the population study, it is particularly important to isolate the entrepreneurial and professional talents and competences. This will enable the planners to determine whether the community will have to depend solely upon outside resources or whether it can expect some local initiative.

The sixth study would provide information on current and potential uses of avail-

able lands. It can help define the types of economic activity which can be favored and the public works necessary for building them up.

The seventh and final study would appraise the major local institutions. The character, reputation, and quality of local government must be described and information furnished as to the taxes and other charges it levies and their effect on business. In addition, the study should contain an evaluation of the quality and character of semipublic and public institutions such as hospitals, libraries, churches, social service agencies, cultural institutions, and trade unions. A similar analysis of the organization and enterprise of the business community would be helpful.

Unfortunately, we do not have legislation designed to aid local communities financially to undertake such overall investigations and appraisals. The nearest approximation was a provision in the area redevelopment bills passed by Congress in two successive sessions but vetoed by former President Eisenhower. These would have provided such funds for general economic area redevelopment. There are, however, available funds for advanced public works planning. Other planning funds are provided for specific types of projects such as urban renewal, flood control, soil conservation, and road construction. There is urgent need for Federal and State legislation to aid local areas by offering them financial grants for such studies.

Community facilities

With these analyses and plans, the community is prepared to focus on the action program. First it must upgrade the community's own facilities, where they have deteriorated, and close those gaps in services which have not been provided. Modern industry requires many more local amenities than previously. Moreover, the employees in modern industry usually possess a higher level of education and make greater local demands for housing and cultural and civic facilities. Without meeting these tests, many local communities are unable to compete for new industries. Many are the cases of industries which have rejected specific sites because of these deficiencies.

The great deficit in facilities has attracted national attention so that Federal aid, both long-term and emergency, has been promoted to overcome economic recessions. The Federal aid programs emphasize sewer and water facilities, hospitals, pollution controls, schools and other educational facilities, public buildings, roads and streets, highways and airports, flood control, rivers and harbors, nursing and convalescent homes, farm product markets, parks and recreational facilities, forests, power, and other utilities. Together, these aids, though spotty and qualified, provide a real base for modernization and completion programs.

Industrial development and redevelopment

Three remarks must be made before the analysis of industrial development proceeds. First, a number of economists emphasize as a difficulty of redevelopment the necessity of helping people to move from distressed areas. Actually, most urban distressed communities can be redeveloped. They now contain such large amounts of social and personal capital and such intimate personal values that they provide a ready base upon which to build new economic structures.

Second, the decline of many communities has been due to the shrinkage or loss of the core industry or some of its satellites. The first step in reclaiming such communities is to aid the redevelopment of this industry. Many an industry which has almost disappeared has been revived by deliberate research and study of new products and processes. Unfortunately, many of these industries are unable to undertake such research and redevelopment programs because they are unable to coalesce their constituent units into cooperative programs. One objective which the interested communities might well promote is the establishment of national facilities for encouraging such research through the finances of these constituent industries.

Third, the development authorities should place their emphasis upon finding new industries which can serve as the nucleus for spontaneous economic growth and which are capable of spawning satellite and affiliated industries within the same area. Many an agency has had the unfortunate experience of financing the location of a fly-by-night enterprise, only to find that it closed down long before it had even paid the cost of the special facilities built for it. The development program should be designed to provide long-term growth rather than merely short-term jobs. Similarly, the goal must be to raise the income level in the community rather than depress it by filling the structures with low-wage-paying industries.

Development authorities having an understanding of the potentials for their locality and a plan for the improvement of the community and its natural resources are ready for the search for businesses to be established on these sites. The alternatives are to find some enterprises within the community and to import others. Unfortunately, too little has been done in the first direction. With the vast degree of centralization of banking, managerial talent, and resources in the larger communities, small ventures need more encouragement at the local level.

Some development agencies have provided "shell" or other new enterprises, thereby enabling them to attract new industries, but they represent a considerable risk and have had only modest results. Industrial parks have been built as readymade centers for industrial development.

One final caution is that voluntary efforts are often insufficient for such projects. Professional assistance can often advance the program at a considerably faster pace. Smaller communities have cooperated with one another to hire specialists in order to benefit by such expertise.

PEOPLE

The key factors in industrial development are the people and their work qualifications. It becomes extremely important in modern society that we assure the highest degree of competency among them. Education and vocational qualifications must meet the needs of industry. Physical and mental health is essential for good production. It is this realization that has prompted more and more groups to support the expansion of governmental facilities in these fields. Without a qualified, competent, and healthy work force, a community is truly handicapped in growth and redevelopment.

To maintain the morale of our work population in face of the current rising rate of change, a number of different programs have to be improved and extended. Unemployment insurance benefits must be liberalized to 39 weeks at a level which more nearly approximates two-thirds of the employee's regular earnings. Medical care must be provided to sustain the physical well-being during periods of unemployment. Vocational rehabilitation and training are vital for people who have been displaced.

CONCLUSION

Community leaders have a great responsibility to keep abreast of the economic developments within an area. The level of income and the promise of growth, or the threat of decline, will not only determine the resources, and the degree of satisfaction which the community will be able to provide, but also affect the people's moods. Basic to the attainment of life's goals, is the achievement of an income with which to finance the loftier objectives.

American society has hitherto depended completely on private individual initiative to stimulate and account for economic activity. We are becoming increasingly aware that the Nation, and the community, have an intimate concern for the effectiveness of the private economy. Where it fails or lags, it injures the entire community and Nation. The society cannot remain indifferent to its shortcomings, whether they be due to a lack of initiative and enterprise, or to poor administration. When its failings produce an economic recession, or a declining community, the burdens are thrown back on the community, and the Nation. Private enterprises are the stewards of the society. The Nation and community must constantly take an accounting of the manner in which this stewardship is being discharged. When necessary, they must intervene to reinvigorate private enterprise, compensate for its deficiencies, or guide its performance. The goal is that of providing continuing economic growth and higher living standards, and individual opportunities. The Nation and the community must assure their realization.

Alaska Roundup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERNEST GRUENING
OF ALASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, news letters giving the lowdown or inside dope, variously known as scuttlebutt or poop on what is taking place in a given area or in a certain field, are always intriguing. One that is particularly newsy and interesting has just made its appearance. It is edited and published by John J. Ryan, who has been recently appointed editor of the Daily Alaska Empire, the newspaper published in Alaska's capital, Juneau. Mr. Ryan is an experienced newspaperman, having previously been editor of the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner, and is also an author of note, having published an excellent book on fishing in Alaskan waters called "The Maggie Murphy."

As the first item is entitled "The Battle of the Budget," I should make clear that this refers wholly to the budget of the State of Alaska and not to the Federal budget, over which there is also almost invariably a battle. The ferry battle, to which Ryan's "Alaska Roundup" refers, has to do with an important project to establish a ferry service to connect the lower 48 States by way of Prince Rupert, British Columbia, with the interior of Alaska, supplying thereby what is properly called a "marine highway" through a region—southeastern Alaska—which cannot, because of its numerous islands and mountainous terrain, be connected by a single land highway. A bond issue of $23 million to finance this ferry and another one connecting the Kenai Peninsula with Kodiak Island was approved by the voters at the last general election in Alaska. However, the project requires implementation by the legislature.

I ask unanimous consent that Jack Ryan's "Alaska Roundup" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the newsletter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The battle of the budget, and the ferry battle, which promise to be two of the major conflicts of the 1961 legislative session, will be opened shortly. It is impossible to predict just how these battles will turn out. Let's look at them separately.

The $59 million budget is generally defended by the Democrats, attacked by the Republicans. Governor Egan's budget will be fought out largely along party lines. Democrats claim Alaska can afford this budget, needs the expenditures to maintain proper services, growth under statehood. Republicans say Alaska cannot afford this budget, though it would be nice to have the things it provides. Principal objection of the Republicans is the fact that statehood transitional grants and other nonreoccurring sources of revenue are fully spent on operational expenses. They fear Alaska is building up to a letdown, will have to "face the tiger," in 1962 or 1964.

Presuming that the budget battle is fought mainly on party lines, the Democrats hold the edge. Their control is not overwhelming, but when chips go down on an administrative-backed measure, they can't expect to do worse than a 10–10 split in the Senate. It appears doubtful that many Democrats will bolt party leadership in this budget battle. It is still anybody's fight, but the edge goes to the budget largely as it stands.

The ferry system proposal as it stands in House bill 44 is in trouble. Compromise appears to be in the air. Legislation to create an authority to operate the ferries undoubtedly will be submitted to pacify opponents of the measure. This would take the operation from the control of the Governor. When debate opens, expenditures for the ferries may be sliced down. Some opponents say the Kodiak ferry will be cut, southeastern Alaska reduced from three ferries to two or one ferry. Those who back the Marine Highway claim this would be like opening a restaurant with all kitchen facilities, cook and waitress, but putting in only one stool. There will be debate, and compromise. It is not known how the "ice block" legislators from the northwest district will line up. The outcome of this battle cannot be predicted right now.

Here are some statistics concerning the impact the ferries will have on truck transport in Alaska. They'll open up southeastern to overland freight service. They'll save 1,500 miles per roundtrip between Seattle and Fairbanks or Anchorage. Big truck and trailer rigs operate at a cost of about 65 cents per running mile. This means a saving of about $500 per roundtrip when ferry fare is deducted. The saving amounts to almost 20 percent of total present costs for a roundtrip. The ferries will give trucks a better position in the Alaska transportation picture, if and when the ferries go into operation.

This brings up the matter of competition with other carriers. A top official of a steamship line serving Alaska told us that if the ferry system subsidized truck transportation to Alaska, his concern would fight the ferries. Offering an economical new service and charging fares that are profitable isn't a subsidy. But problems will no doubt arise in this field. If the ferries lose money, they are subsidized.

One other factor: Up to 2,500 cars a month travel the Alaska highway, both northbound and southbound. Canadian as well as American traffic will now be diverted to the Marine Highway if it is established. This cuts out 750 miles of road in Canada, each way, where travelers are spending money. Alaska highway money will be diverted to Alaska ports where it has not been spent before.

Aside from the budget and ferry bonds, there are other major issues to be resolved by this legislature. Boroughs are up for consideration, but probably nothing will be done about them. They were written into the constitution to provide local government outside cities, similar to a metro district. Trouble is Alaskans haven't caught on to the idea. Borough hearings are usually attended by only a handful of people who generally oppose boroughs. People fear more government and more taxation. They don't "dig" the name borough which is not familiar to them. There is no clamor in Alaska for boroughs, even in areas where they are needed. It appears that the constitutional convention wrote into the document a unit of government that is not acceptable to Alaskans. This will have to be altered at the next constitutional assembly.

Other major items to be considered include ESC bill amendments, moves to give some of the Governor's power to boards, election code changes. Tax increases hinge on outcome of the budget battle. The increases proposed are in State income tax and fuel tax fields. A State property tax has been talked, but it appears unlikely that action will be taken.

Aside from the legislature, news was made in Alaska this week by fisheries experts who gathered here from all over the west coast, British Columbia and Alaska at two conferences. They were here to study salmon and other fishery problems, to coordinate their research. Most of them saw fisheries a sad picture right now due to depletion of stock and foreign encroachment.

One prominent fisheries scientist stated flatly that the only sure way to restore salmon fishing in southeastern Alaska was to close the area to fishing for 5 years. He readily admitted this would probably touch off great protests from fishing areas.

The scientists expect to see a great expansion in the Russian fleets fishing off Alaska. This expansion will be in the form of bottom fishing fleets which will operate not only in the Bering Sea, but off the southeastern and gulf coasts. They'll be fishing just outside the 3-mile limit from Sitka to the Arctic coast.

Rich trawling grounds not being utilized by Alaskans will attract the Russians. One fisheries authority told us that American research vessels have found excellent bottom fishing off the southeastern and gulf coasts. In an area seaward from Yakutat, a U.S. research ship found a huge undersea bank that abounded with 20-inch sole and other valuable bottom fish. A Russian ship was studying this area when the U.S. vessel arrived. The Soviets have prospected the entire Alaska coast. They have scheduled a 400-percent increase in fishing operations, using modern equipment. They'll be operating all along the Alaska coast in the near future, possibly next summer. There is no way to prevent this bottom fishing by Soviet ships that stay beyond the 3-mile limit. Sad part of it is that fisheries experts believe that this rich Alaska resource could be profitably developed by Americans under certain conditions. For instance, New England bottom fishing fleets experienced economic problems, but were assisted by subsidies. The Government now pays up to one-third of the construction cost of vessels to be used in the ground-fishing industry. Such assistance is not available in Alaska.

Next summer's construction program in Alaska is not exactly a bright picture. Military construction will amount to about $29 million, down from $90 million last year. In years past, $200 million was a good season. Private construction is expected to boost the total for 1961 to about $50 million at the most. In addition, the State has $38 million to be spent on roads, but it all cannot be spent in one season. The Statae road program is getting into gear, after being hampered by a shortage of top engineers, and other factors.

There is a big bright spot in Alaska's economic future. This encouragement was contained in a statement by a top Army official who was widely quoted in the press. This military authority termed the Polar Sea the Mediterranean of the next war. He pointed out that a major missile base in Alaska would be within range of virtually all of our potential enemies. He made it clear that the Army regarded Alaska as being highly strategic in the missile era. It has been reported that the Army is pushing for at least one large missile base in Alaska, but the Defense Department has held up the move because of high costs. A new administration has taken over, and more money is being spent on defense. Alaska's military picture could change very suddenly. Just one missile base would be a $150 million construction project, bring a permanent garrison of well paid technicians to some area of Alaska.

We've reported on slow business conditions in many Alaskan cities. Here's a report on a community where things are booming. Nenana was once a quiet Alaska Railroad stop and river port with one short main street and a declining economy. Nenana's principal store sold bacon, traps, canned goods to natives and white trappers in the area. Recently, the United States commenced to build a giant international ballistics missile detection site at Clear, 17 miles away. Up to 1,000 men have been working on construction, 1,200 are scheduled to be stationed there permanently when work is done. Two trailer camps housing 50 families have sprung up in Nenana. The store now stocks TV dinners, cut meats, and baby food. An effort is being made to obtain financing for 65 modern homes in a wilderness area north of the Tanana River. By next fall, Nenana will be linked with Clear and Fairbanks by paved road. The future of this river community is enhanced by rumors that RCA will not build company housing close to the site because the powerful radar radiation there is harmful to human health. No matter how things turn out, Nenana is destined to become a prosperous, growing city. Some other area of Alaska may enjoy similar good fortune, for persistent reports say that another detection site is slated for Arctic Alaska.

A report recently released by the State shows that Alaskans drank 549,000 gallons of whisky, 174,000 gallons of wine, 2,933,000 gallons of beer in 1960. This report interests us because if you divide the total number of adult Alaskans into the above grand total of gallons, you come up with enough fluid to fill each resident's swimming pool. We'll admit that Alaskans consume their share of these beverages. But we submit that figures prove that it is the visitors who must be doing the heavy work in this field.

A Timely and Legitimate Protest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the following letter, protesting the distorted and unfair treatment of the medical pro-

fession on the CBS television documentary "CBS Reports," Thursday night, February 2, was sent to Frank Stanton, president of the Columbia Broadcasting System, by AMA's nine-member board of trustees meeting in Chicago. It was signed by Julian Price, M.D., Florence, S.C., chairman:

FEBRUARY 3, 1961.

Mr. FRANK STANTON,
President, Columbia Broadcasting System, New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. STANTON: The medical profession, which has dedicated itself unceasingly for generations to advancing the medical arts and skills toward the continuing goal of better health for all people, was profoundly shocked Thursday night, February 2, 1961, at the caricature of medicine and its aims on "CBS Reports."

The board of trustees of the American Medical Association strongly protests the misrepresentations, bias, and distortions which composed the show from beginning to end.

A commentator represented that the AMA had cooperated in the production of this monumental travesty of the medical profession. Although the AMA assisted CBS in the belief the network intended to give the American people a thoughtful, balanced and objective examination of the myriad problems of medical care for our citizens, the result made a dismal mockery of AMA's cooperation.

The AMA office in Chicago has been flooded with hundreds of telephone calls, many of them from laymen, protesting the misrepresentations in this program.

It is deeply disturbing and disheartening to those of us who are informed about the manner in which this program was assembled that the real truth about AMA's position on medical care lies on some CBA cutting room floor.

It is the considered judgment of physicians in all corners of America that this CBS report was designed to project the worst possible image of those who see in socialized medicine not just a threat to the quality of medicine but the loss of individual freedoms as well.

The test of fairness, it seems to us, could rest alone on the amount of time given AMA to present its views—a total of about 4½ minutes out of the hour program. The filmed interview with Dr. Leonard W. Larson alone, requested by CBS, lasted 5 hours.

However, the lack of fairness was not confined to a question of time. The producer of the program selected the most unrepresentative quotes from AMA, twisted them out of context and positioned them in a manner most favorable to the cause of friends of government medicine.

We are amazed that a major national television network, with its grave responsibility to safeguard the truth in examining the great issues of the day, would permit such a distorted program to be presented in the guise of objective reporting.

We believe that CBS has performed an historic disservice to the people of this country.

Sincerely,

JULIAN P. PRICE, M.D.

Depressing Depressed Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOFFMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Congress may be asked in the near future to consider legislation to give aid to depressed areas of the Nation. In this consideration we should look closely at the legislation to determine whether these proposals actually give aid, or whether they will increase the present depressed areas. Some of the hard facts for your consideration of this matter are set out in an editorial which appeared in the March 2 issue of the Chicago Daily Tribune. The editorial follows:

HOW TO DEPRESS LARGER AREAS

Secretary of Commerce Hodges, appearing before the House Banking and Currency Committee to argue for President Kennedy's $390 million scheme to aid depressed areas, conceded that it could cost $60,000 to provide one job for one man. That would be the necessary investment in land, buildings and machinery to put the man to work.

On this basis, the whole Kennedy appropriation would provide jobs for only 6,500 men—a total of such pitiful inadequacy in the light of the number of jobless Mr. Kennedy would help that the depressed areas program would be as futile as trying to ladle up the Atlantic ocean with a teaspoon.

Mr. Hodges, apparently sensing this embarrassment, was quick to explain that the $60,000 investment would be required only to create a job in heavy industry. He said a job might be made in light industry at a cost of perhaps no more than $2,200, and that the average cost calculated to provide a job was $10,000.

The Secretary did not attempt to justify these computations, but, accepting his average of $10,000 per job, the Kennedy program would make work for no more than 39,000 unemployed.

The conclusion to be drawn from the Secretary's own analysis is one of two things: Either the depressed areas bill is a fraud and a fake which will make no real dent in areas of chronic unemployment, or the starting figure of 390 million is merely a come-on for a spending program that could cost tens of billions of dollars.

General Motors has announced that this year it will put $1 billion into expansion—a sum more than 2½ times that envisioned by the Washington central planners—yet it is obvious that the Kennedy administration thinks this won't turn the tide against unemployment. Otherwise, it wouldn't be barging into the field itself.

So if a billion dollars of private investment is a mere drop in the bucket, what would be the possible dimensions of public spending to get the country around the corner? On that, you could write your own ticket, but, remember, you'll pay for it if the administration has its way. The prospective cost could turn the whole country into a depressed area.

The Peterson Breeding Farm—An American Success Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, one of the leading poultry breeding firms is located in the little town of Decatur, Ark., which is near my hometown of Fayetteville.

The growth of the Peterson Breeding Farm is truly an American success story. This firm now operates on an international scale and has captured 30 percent of the national market for male birds in a period of only a few years. I am proud that an Arkansas firm has been so successful in the highly competitive poultry breeding business.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Arkansas Gazette of February 26 concerning the Peterson Breeding Farm.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILLIONS

(By Ernie Deane)

A little northwest Arkansas town is bringing international notice to our State, all because of the roosters it produces.

The town is Decatur, and it's only about 10 miles from Oklahoma and 15 from Missouri. Its population is around 400.

The roosters are known in world poultry circles as Peterson males, much in demand for breeding stock now—but famous for only a few years.

Lloyd E. Peterson is the 48-year-old founder and president of the Peterson Breeding Farm, where eggs and chickens, too, are counted by the million. Thirty years ago he was the manager of a cooperative grocery store in Decatur, who later tried his luck with 500 Rhode Island Red chicks and cleared $107.

Today, they say, Peterson is several times a millionaire—doing business throuhgout the United States and in foreign countries, and still expanding.

His vice president for international relations suggested I visit the highly integrated operation in and around Decatur. He is F. R. L. Tuthill, a retired admiral of the U.S. Navy who took a friend's suggestion to settle in the Arkansas Ozarks and take things easy. Peterson recognized the value of Tuthill's long experience in foreign lands, in helping the firm to expand overseas, and so put him in a key position on the staff.

Tuthill was on a mission in Puerto Rico when I met him recently for the first time. Peterson is getting into broiler raising on that Caribbean island where so much American money and know-how are already at work. Tuthill has been to Europe and elsewhere outside the United States, studying markets, contacting interested persons, and so forth.

Not all the Peterson breeding farm's international dealings are carried on in this manner, however. To Decatur come people from as many as 20 nations a year, to see at first hand the physical plant and production operations, and to talk with Peterson and staff. Just recently Danes, Italians, and Frenchmen were there. Peterson has already learned the advantage of producing his advertising and promotion literature in several languages.

It's the Peterson male on which his company's reputation is being built at home and abroad. Although the firm has been in the chicken business since the 1930's, only in the past 5 or 6 years has the emphasis been on the breeding and sale of pedigreed cockerels. Peterson says he has captured 30 percent of the national market for male birds in that time.

As mentioned earlier, he started experimentally with Rhode Island Reds and made a small profit 30 years ago. As his operation grew, and he got into the breeding end of the industry in a serious way, he decided to produce a white chicken—something the industry did not have at the time, he says.

His poultry today is all white, a combination of over half a dozen strains of birds—Cornish in appearance, although males used for breeding actually have less than a third Cornish blood.

Research is a vital part of the Peterson operation. I met a young scientist of the staff, W. Dane Kimmell, a specialist in poultry heredity.

Kimmel showed me how records of blood types are kept on individual fowls and their progeny, generation after generation; how the laboratory has developed antibiotics; where tests are run, and the like.

He and Tuthill took me on a guided tour of the egg production operation, and showed me how each egg is marked according to both rooster and hen, and records maintained on each chick that's hatched.

So big is the Peterson operation that electronic business machines are used in the recordkeeping and research work.

The constant goal, Kimmel explained, is to improve hatchability, fertility, growth, and livability, and also the quality of the finished product.

Peterson ships out both eggs and day-old chicks from his Decatur center of operations, many of his deliveries being made in his own airplanes which are based on his own airstrip. In addition to his hatchery at Decatur, each of his branches also has a hatchery—at Gainesville, Ga., Guilford, Conn., and Thorntown, Ind. Canadian, Mexican, and Latin American points are served through these establishments, in addition to the nationwide market.

He has also established branches in Europe, at Le Foeil, France, at Milan and Fonzaso, Italy, and at Barcelona, Spain. These also service customers in Austria, Belgium, Holland, and Portugal.

The Peterson breeding farm is situated in a 700-acre tract at Decatur, not counting the headquarters building and part of the hatching and feed production operation downtown.

The company has worked out its own designs for the various types of buildings. It has its own construction and maintenance crews. Automation in the daily feeding and watering of some 2 million fowls has been developed to a high degree.

Peterson has said previously, in explaining the development of his company, that there was a time when most decisions were made by himself, "based on the best advice I could get, plus intuition." Now the operation is so big and complex, he relies heavily on group conferences of his key men, and finds himself delegating more and more responsibility.

Whatever the system—past or present—it obviously has worked extremely well, and that's why the names Lloyd Peterson and Decatur, Ark., are known internationally in the poultry business.

Our Country Needs More Reservists for Modern War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1961

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, in the February issue of the very fine monthly magazine The Officer, published by the Reserve Officers Association, appears an article by ROA's first president under the heading "Our Country Needs More Reservists for Modern War."

This article was written by Brig. Gen. Henry J. Reilly. General Reilly, who is now 80 years old, is in a veterans' hospital in New York, but he writes from long years of experience and his views have considerable significance.

The Officer, in an editorial, has this to say about General Reilly:

REILLY RIDES AGAIN

Henry J. Reilly is 80 years old, largely confined to bed and wheelchair, and under the continuing eye of doctors. But his intellect is sharp, his memory long, his experience broad, and his wisdom deep.

Reilly, a Reserve brigadier general retired since the end of World War II, has seen and/or participated in 25 wars about the globe since he finished West Point in 1904. He has seen nations' fortunes rise with their national will to preparedness and ebb with the seizure of their national will by pacifism. In World War II, General Marshall called General Reilly in and used him as a lecturer on use of modern weapons at our infantry and artillery schools.

General Reilly is ROA's first national president. But his voice should be heard because he always has been first a patriot. He helped bring ROA into existence because he was a patriot.

General Reilly is bringing to us, out of his concern for America, a new message which is being printed in The Officer. It is not easy for him to write, but in this one he has done a magnificent chore. All ROA should read and ponder his words. They then should pass them on to others who should read and ponder them.

General Reilly's article reads as follows:

OUR COUNTRY NEEDS MORE RESERVISTS FOR MODERN WAR

(By Brig. Gen. Henry J. Reilly, AUS, retired; first national president of ROA)

When Elihu Root was Secretary of War, he had published the uncompleted manuscript of Gen. Emery Upton entitled "The Military Policy of the United States." It had been lying in the War Department, unfinished, since the general's death. Up to and including 1863, it gives the facts and figures showing how this country has suffered in war, and afterward, due to its failure to prepare in peace, as George Washington had strongly urged this country to do.

It is a disgraceful record of defeat risked, of lives and limbs unnecessarily lost, and dollars wasted.

The main reason for this has always been the afilure to train a large Reserve force to rapidly expand our small Regular Army and Navy into the necessary war force. Our greatest failure has been the absence of trained Reserve officers, with all the evil results that an improperly raised and trained military force suffers from. Now we have a third service, the Air Force, which has a greater proportion of officers to enlisted men than do the other services.

When the Spanish-American War broke out in 1898, this author saw a practical example of what happens when a country fails to prepare for war in time of peace. The Regular Army at that time was 28,000; the Navy also was small. There was no Air Force; there were no reservist officers or men. The National Guard of the various States was organized into units, none higher than a regiment, without any regard to the units organized into divisions.

The President called for volunteers, simply assigning a certain number to each State, leaving it to the Governor to provide the units.

His father, a Regular officer, being bound for Cuba, the author enlisted in a volunteer infantry regiment, giving his age as 21, when he was 16. About a week later, this was discovered, and he was eliminated. However, he had gotten a close view of the inefficient method used for providing troops for war. The officers were political appointees of the State Governors. There were insufficient stocks of uniforms, equipment and arms.

Of the total number of troops raised, only a few regiments fought at Santiago de Cuba, in Puerto Rico, and in the Philippines.

As all these volunteers were enlisted for the war with Spain, when the Philippine Insurrection broke out in 1899, only those few regiments of volunteers, who voted to continue in the service until they could be replaced, saw any fighting against the Filipinos. To replace them and supplement the Regulars, the U.S. Government raised 30 regiments of infantry and one of cavalry to fight in the Philippine Insurrection.

Of course, the taxpayer paid the additional costs of these troops.

Thanks to the National Guard having been federalized and Villa's raid on Columbus, N. Mex., indicating that the planned Mexican invasion of the United States, so as to keep us out of the war with Germany an Army was concentrated on the border. Eight thousand five hundred eighty-nine officers and 123,605 men of the National Guard were not mobilized. The mobilized National Guard, the Regular Army, including the Philippine scouts in the Philippines, totaled 5,025 officers and 102,616 enlisted men. The Navy, including the Marine Corps, was 4,370 officers and 66,607 enlisted men. There were, as the author remembers, less than a dozen aviators in the Signal Corps.

When we entered the war with Germany, besides these forces, the Army had 4,649 enlisted reservists and a small number of officers, who had been to training camps, but who were not ready for active service and were sent back to training camps. The Navy had 638 reserve officers and 9,170 enlisted reserves.

At the time of the Armistice in 1918, these small forces had been swollen to an Army, which included the air service, to 188,434 officers and 3,485,454 enlisted men and the Navy to 25,134 officers and 476,291 enlisted men.

Therefore, during the war, 174,820 new officers had been added to the Army, and 20,106 to the Navy.

The enlisted men of the Army had risen from 230,869 to 3,485,454 of 15 times its strength, while the enlisted strength of the Navy had risen from 20,106 to 73,777, or 3½ times its strength.

The trained reserves of officers and enlisted men should have been in existence at the time the war broke out, as well as the arms, equipment and clothing.

This would have insured the arrival of a considerable number of divisions in France by the end of 1917, when both the British and French were in serious difficulties, due to the large number of infantry and guns being transferred from the Russian front to the Western front, because Russia had left the war. Instead, only four divisions arrived in 1917; the bulk of them arriving in the summer of 1918, just in time to stop the German offensives and allow the Allies to take the final offensive, which won the war.

In 1939 the total for the Army, including the Air Corps, the National Guard, and the Navy, including the Marine Corps, was 41,876 officers and 1,492,135 enlisted men. The Army Reserve was 116,719 Reserve officers and only 22,356 enlisted men. The Navy Reserve was 12,986 officers and 41,935 reserve enlisted men.

Yet, in 1945 we had 1,265,109 officers and 10,863,346 enlisted men.

These figures show what a tremendous number of absolutely new officers and en-

listed men had to be taken into the armed services during the war.

Three months training is not nearly long enough to make a good enlisted man in any of these services.

Far less is it sufficient time to teach an officer what he should know.

Bravery in battle is not sufficient.

One of the most important things is that an officer should be so indocrinated, that he does it without thinking, is taking care of the men under his command first and then of himself. Such privileges as an officer has are only given to him so that he may carry out this fundamental duty.

He must thoroughly understand and be quite sure in his own mind of the proper tactics for his command, so as to get victory with the minimum of losses.

He must be certain that his men are always properly clothed, fed and given the maximum amount possible under the circumstances of recovery from fatigue.

Nothing is more important than that an officer should know how to maintain discipline without a long list of trials by court-martial. To do this, he must know as much as possible about each man under his command, and what difficulties that man may be having, not only in the service, but at home.

In the Regular service, an officer has always been considered a poor one if he has to court-martial many men.

In between battles, this author has always found that a large part of his time was taken up, tearing up charges preferred against enlisted men by officers who thought they were maintaining discipline by promptly writing out charges against any man who failed in any way.

Naturally, all these attributes take time to acquire and, therefore, the need to have sufficient reserve officers in time of peace to train them properly for war.

On his graduation leave from West Point in 1904, the author went to Europe. He had letters of introduction to German Guard Corps cavalry officers, with whom he spent 10 days at Potsdam, and later 10 days at the cavalry school. One of the numerous impressive things was the way in which the German Reserve officers, undergoing training, became an integral part of the regular regiments.

Later, he saw the same thing in France. Both countries had universal service, with the result that they had enough trained Reserve officers and enlisted men, not only to promptly mobilize and concentrate a large army at the front and their navy at sea but also to fill the depots for replacement purposes.

On various trips to England, he learned that while the navy, due to its reserve system, could be promptly mobilized for war, the army, like ours, had been neglected. While having a reserve of enlisted men who had finished their service in the regular army, it had back of that nothing but a relatively small force, the Territorials, roughly corresponding to our National Guard before it was federalized. Therefore Britain was unprepared to fight a first-class war.

When the war broke out in 1914, the results were immediately apparent. The author arrived in France during the first battle of the Marne. There were approximately 1,500,000 French trained troops in that battle, not more than 50,000 British, with probably as many Germans as French.

Later, on the British front in north France, he saw British replacements of regulars, who had completed a long period of service in the regular army, joining their regiments in the trenches. These were all middle-aged men, undoubtedly mostly married and fathers. This while millions of young civilians at home were being called upon for volunteers for Kitchener's new army. The Territorials had, in some cases, been sent to India to replace the regulars. The rest had not yet been sent to the front. It was not until 1916, that Britain adopted conscription and finally got an army of approximately 2 million into France.

In World War II the author flew back to Paris from London the day before war broke out. The French immediately mobilized 101 divisions, due to their reserve system. The British had immediately available only four divisions to send to France. Later, six more were sent, the last one arriving just in time to be captured.

The British statesmen had guaranteed Poland, but they had failed to provide the armed forces which their army knew to be necessary to carry it out. As in the United States, foreign policies and military ones were not complementary.

Throughout our history, our statesmen have decided upon policies without providing the military forces necessary to carry them out.

In 1905, the author took a leave from the Philippines to see some of the Russo-Japanese War. The two principal clans in Japan were the Chosu and Satsuma, both of which were badly beaten. These two fights convinced the Japanese that their military casts of Samurai were not sufficiently numerous or properly armed to fight a war with a Western Power. They, therefore, adopted conscription. They first had their army trained by the French and then after the Germans had beaten the French, by the Germans. Their navy was copied after the British.

When the Russo-Japanese War came, the Army units were not only filled to war strength by reservists, but well beyond it. Thus, when their units went into battle, they were of much greater strength than the Russians had expected. They let the first battles whittle the units down to war strength.

In peacetime, their Navy crews were larger than the war strength crews. When war came, the captain of each ship, picked out the inefficient officers and sailors, and sent them ashore, thus bringing his ship to war strength.

Every first-class nation, except Great Britain and the United States, has a military system which trains enough officers and men to bring their units to war strength and to furnish replacements thereafter. This applies to armament as well.

In World War I, the 42d Rainbow Division, in which the author served, on several occasions received replacements at night, just before a dawn attack. We were armed with excellent Springfield rifles. The replacements had been trained with the British Enfield rifle, which was not nearly as good, as well as the replacements not being familiar with it. This, for the reason, that when we entered the war, our industry had been manufacturing large numbers of the British Enfield rifle, while there was no reserve of Springfield rifles.

The same way our industry had been manufacturing rifle barrels and other parts for the French field gun to send to France, but we had no large reserves of our own field gun.

In World War II, before we entered, President Roosevelt, not only took arms from our arsenals, but also from the ROTC, and, in some cases, parts of the armaments of regular regiments to send to England. We held maneuvers with cardboard silhouettes representing machine guns and tanks, because we didn't even have enough for our relatively small army.

While the professors, scientists, and other civilians, who lack experience in war, write books on nuclear war, the indications are that, like the war in Korea, we will have to fight unlimited wars in difficult terrains, with few and poor roads and plenty of forestation. In other words, we will have to fight under circumstances which do not favor the methods used in Europe. The forestation will badly limit effective use of aviation; good targets for missiles will be few and far between.

In Korea, the greatest number employed was in 1952, consisting of 148,427 officers, 1,447,992 enlisted men. The Navy had 98,660 officers, 957,572 enlisted men, the Air Force had 128,742 officers, 854,579 enlisted men.

Of course, the total number of officers and men of our Armed Forces used in that war, is much greater because of casualties and, above all, the rotation system.

There is nothing new in the talk of a short war. The author remembers a luncheon in Paris with a number of French generals, shortly before World War II broke out. One of them agreed with the French civilians, who were quite convinced that a war with Germany would be a short one.

No one who read the Italian General Douhet's book, shortly after it came out, will forget his prophecy that World War II would be over in a few days, instead of which it lasted nearly 6 years.

That nuclear bombs and weapons will do great damage cannot be denied. Neither can it be denied that the United States, Russia, and China are full of immense stretches of territory which contain no cities nor industrial targets.

It is well known, by those who keep up-to-date, that the Russians, with their large army, well supported by its own aviation, and armed with plenty of missiles, intends to take advantage of these spaces.

The Russians have universal service. So after several years active service depending upon arm and branch, they pass to the Reserve where they spend the rest of their active life. When in the Reserve they have periods of active service depending upon their age bracket.

International Travel Regulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in this jet age, it is heartening to note the growing number of countries which are removing obstacles to travel by waiving the visa requirement for American tourists. It would be highly commendable if our own country also made it possible for overseas tourists to come to our shores for limited visits without cumbersome visa procedure. International travel is a great promoter of understanding and cultural exchange. It helps to break down artificial barriers that keep people apart, reduces prejudice and misconceptions and establishes truth in place of propaganda.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the table entitled "Tourist Documents and Regulations," published in the New York Times of February 26.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOURIST DOCUMENTS AND REGULATIONS

The U.S. citizen has a new, plastic-covered passport in a light blue to lead the list of documents and official papers required to smooth his path across the frontiers of the world. It is supposed to be more convenient than the old passport, which is more than can be said for all the other documents the pleasure traveler needs and all the many and varied regulations he must observe as he moves from one country to another. This list of documents is larger than last year's, but that is principally because the independent nations of the world have multiplied in the past year. There are 22 more nations listed here this year, 3 new ones in Europe and 19 in Africa. And each has its own special brand of documents, health requirements, and customs and currency regulations with which the traveler must conform. Incidentally, the local Passport Office wishes natives of New York City would get an early start on their private documentation before applying for passports. It is reliably reported that it takes 10 days to get a birth certificate in this city, and that venerable document is essential for obtaining a passport. This is not to be construed as an attack upon the bureaucracy of New York City, because it is always advisable to set out in behalf of documents and the information required by different governments long before one plans to leave home. Many an itinerary has been dislocated for lack of a paper unobtainable away from home. This is true not only of the Iron Curtain countries and some African and Asiatic nations, but also of the United States of America.

EUROPE

Country	Papers	Currency restrictions	Tobacco admitted duty free
Austria	Passport, no visa for 3 months	No limit on schillings in, 10,000 out	400 cigarettes.
Belgium	Passport, no visa for 2 months	None	Do.
Bulgaria	Passport, visa, $1.20 fee, 3 pictures	No leva in our out	400 cigarettes, 50 cigars, or ½ pound of tobacco.
Cyprus	Passport, no visa up to 3 months	10 British pounds in or out	½ pound of tobacco.
Czechoslovakia	Passport, visa, $6 fee, 3 pictures	No crowns in or out	400 cigarettes, 50 cigars, or ½ pound of tobacco.
Denmark	Passport, no visa for 3 months	No limit on kroner in, 2,000 out	400 cigarettes.
Finland	do	20,000 marks in or out	400 cigarettes or 100 cigars.
France	do	No limit on francs in, 250 new francs out.	1,000 cigarettes, 250 cigars, or 4½ pounds of tobacco.
West Germany	do	None	400 cigarettes.
Great Britain	Passport, no visa	Only 50 pounds out	400 cigarettes, 50 cigars, or 1 pound of tobacco.
Greece	Passport, no visa for 3 months	1,000 drachmas in or out	200 cigarettes.
Hungary	Passport, visa, $9 fee, 2 pictures	50 forints in coin in or out	400 cigarettes, 50 cigars, or ½ pound of tobacco.
Iceland	Passport, visa with 1 picture	No Icelandic currency in	100 cigarettes.
Ireland	Passport, no visa	50 British or Irish pounds out	1,000 cigarettes, 200 cigars, or 2½ pounds of tobacco.
Italy	Passport, no visa for 3 months	No limit in, only 50,000 lire out	400 cigarettes.
Luxembourg	Passport, no visa for 2 months	None	Do.
Netherlands	Passport, no visa	1,000 guilders out	Do.
Norway	Passport, no visa for 3 months	1,000 kroner in, 350 out	Do.
Poland	Passport, visa, $9.90 fee, 3 pictures	No zlotys in or out	400 cigarettes, 50 cigars, or ½ pound of tobacco.
Portugal	Passport, no visa for 60 days (visa needed for all overseas possessions, except Madeira, $3.67 fee).	None	400 cigarettes.
Rumania	Passport, visa, no fee, 3 pictures	No lei in or out	400 cigarettes, 50 cigars, or ½ pound of tobacco.
Soviet Union	Passport, visa, no fee, valid up to 30 days, 1 picture	No rubles in or out	200 cigarettes, 25 cigars, or ½ pound of tobacco.
Spain	Passport, no visa for 6 months	50,000 pesetas in, 3,000 out	400 cigarettes.
Sweden	Passport, no visa for 3 months	6,000 kroner in or out	500 cigarettes.
Switzerland	do	None	400 cigarettes, 100 cigars, or about 1 pound of tobacco.
Turkey	do	200 liras in or out	50 cigarettes.
Yugoslavia	Passport, visa, $1 fee, valid 1 month, or visa at border, $2 fee	1,500 dinars in or out	200 cigarettes.

WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Argentina	Passport, no visa up to 90 days	None	500 cigarettes.
Bolivia	do	do	200 cigarettes.
Brazil	Passport, tourist card from transportation company, valid 30 to 60 days, 2 pictures (no charge), return ticket.	do	Reasonable amount for personal use.
Chile	Passport, no visa for 3 months	do	500 cigarettes.
Colombia	Proof of nationality or passport, tourist card, no fee, 2 pictures, valid 90 days for multiple entry within 4 years, return ticket.	do	200 cigarettes.
Costa Rica	Proof of nationality, tourist card for 30 days, $2 fee for 30 days, entry to be within 90 days of issue, return ticket.	do	Do.
Cuba	Passport with special validation by U.S. Government, visa (from Czechoslovakian Embassy in Washington).	Only 50 pesos in or out	Do.
Dominican Republic	Passport or proof of nationality, tourist card from transportation company, $2.24 fee, valid 15 to 60 days.	None	Up to $5 worth of tobacco.
Ecuador [1]	Passport, tourist card, $1 fee, valid 90 days, 2 pictures, proof of trip from transportation company or return ticket.	do	300 cigarettes.
El Salvador	Proof of nationality, tourist card valid 90 days from day of issue, 1 picture, no fee, entry within 90 days of issue.	do	2.2 pounds of tobacco.
Guatemala	Passport or other proof of citizenship, tourist card for 6 months, to be used within 60 days of issuance, $2 fee.	do	400 cigarettes.
Haiti	Passport or proof of citizenship for tourist card issued on arrival, $2 fee, valid 30 days for multiple entries within 2 years, return ticket.	do	2.2 pounds of tobacco.
Honduras	Passport, visa, valid 90 days, no fee	do	200 cigarettes.
Mexico	Proof of citizenship, no passport for tourist card, $3 fee, valid 6 months	do	600 cigarettes if arriving by land or sea, 800 if by air.
Nicaragua [1]	Passport, visa valid 30 days, no fee, 2 pictures, letter from transportation company, police certificate, or, for U.S.-born citizens, tourist card from Pan American World Airways in Miami, valid 1 month, return ticket.	do	200 cigarettes.
Panama [1]	Proof of citizenship for tourist card, 2 pictures, $2 fee, valid 30 days, extendable to 90 days, proof of financial responsibility, return ticket.	do	Reasonable amount for personal use.
Paraguay [1]	Passport, visa, 50-cent fee, valid for 6 months, police certificate or letter of reference from business concern.	do	Do.
Peru	Passport, tourist card from transportation company, $2 fee, valid for 90 days	do	400 cigarettes.
Uruguay	Passport, no visa	do	200 cigarettes.
Venezuela	Passport or birth certificate for tourist card valid 30 days, 4 pictures, letter from employer stating it is a pleasure trip, return ticket.	do	Do.

AFRICA, ASIA, AUSTRALIA

Afghanistan [1]	Passport, visa, 8 pictures, no fee, letter of reference, visa valid 4 months from date of issue.	50 afghanis in or out	Reasonable amount.
Australia	Passport, visa, no fee, valid 3 years (2 pictures on landing)	25 Australian pounds out, only 5 pounds sterling and English banknotes in.	400 cigarettes.
Burma [1]	Passport, tourist entry visa, $3.15 fee, 4 pictures, valid 1 month, or tourist transit visa, $1.05 fee, 1 picture, valid 10 days.	No limit on dollars, only 100 kyats	200 cigarettes.

Footnote at end of table.

AFRICA, ASIA, AUSTRALIA—Continued

Country	Papers	Currency restrictions	Tobacco admitted duty free
Cambodia [1]	Passport, visa, valid 7 days, $4.30 fee, 2 pictures, letter from travel agency	400 riels in or out	1,000 cigarettes.
Cameroon [1]	Passport, visa, 3 pictures, visa for next country, round trip ticket or onward ticket.	Not available	Do.
Central African Republic.[1]	do	do	Do.
Ceylon [1]	Passport, visa for 3 months, $2 fee	140 rupees in or out	100 cigarettes.
Chad [1]	Passport, visa, 3 pictures, visa for next country, round trip ticket or onward ticket.	Not available	1,000 cigarettes.
China (Taiwan)[1]	Passport, visa, 2 pictures, valid 4 years for multiple entry for stay up to 14 days, no visa for stay up to 3 days.	Only 500 Taiwan dollars in	200 cigarettes.
Congo (Leopoldville)[1]	Passport, visa on arrival for 48 hours, extendable, 3 pictures on arrival, return ticket, police certificate.	None	Do.
Congo (Brazzaville)[1]	Passport, visa, 3 pictures, visa for next country, round trip ticket or onward ticket.	Not available	1,000 cigarettes.
Dahomey [1]	do	do	Do.
Ethiopia [1]	Passport, visa, 4 pictures, fee $4, financial statement, police certificate	Only $60 (U.S. worth) of Ethiopian currency out.	100 cigarettes.
Gabon [1]	Passport, visa, 3 pictures, visa for next country, round-trip ticket or onward ticket.	Not available	1,000 cigarettes.
Gambia [1]	Passport, visa, $2 fee, valid for entry within 6 months	do	Not available.
Ghana [1]	Passport, visa, 3 pictures, $2 fee, valid 3 months from date of issue, letter from transportation company.	5 pounds in or out	400 cigarettes.
Hong Kong [1]	Passport, visa, fee $2, valid for multiple entry for 12 months for stay up to 3 months.	None	200 cigarettes.
India [1]	Passport, visa, $2 fee, 4 pictures, valid 6 months for stay of 3 months	75 rupees in or out (Ashok Pillar design).	Do.
Indonesia [1]	Passport, visa, 4 pictures, valid 30 days, $2.20 fee per person and $1.10 per passport, proof of transportation in and out of country, letter from travel agency that traveler is bona fide tourist, visa valid 6 months from issuance.	No rupiahs in or out	Do.
Iran	Passport, visa, 2 pictures, no fee, letter from travel agent regarding financial status.	No limit in, no rials out	100 cigarettes.
Iraq	Passport and visa, either transit visa good for 15-day stay, no fee, or entry visa for stay up to 3 months, 2 pictures, $6.18 fee, letter from transportation company listing all countries visited on trip.	None	200 cigarettes.
Israel	Passport, no visa for 3 months	No Israeli currency in or out	200 cigarettes or 9 ounces of tobacco.
Ivory Coast [1]	Passport, visa, 3 pictures, visa for next country, round-trip ticket or onward ticket.	Not available	1,000 cigarettes.
Japan [1]	Passport, visa, no fee, valid 4 years for multiple entry for stay of 60 days, round-trip ticket.	No limit in if personally carried, only 20,000 yen out.	200 cigarettes, 50 cigars, or ½ pound of tobacco.
Jordan [1]	Passport, visa, 2 pictures, no fee, valid 4 years, letter that traveler is a Christian	5 dinars in or out	200 cigarettes or 25 cigars.
Kenya and Uganda [1]	Passport, visa, $2 fee, valid for multiple entry within 1 year for up to 2-month stay in Uganda, 6 months in Kenya.	Not available	Not available.
Laos [1]	Passport, visa, valid up to 3 months, $2.50 fee, 3 pictures	Only 2,000 kips in	100 cigarettes.
Lebanon	Passport, visa, 1 picture, $5 fee, or transit visa, valid 3 days, $2.50 fee, visa for next country.	None	200 cigarettes.
Liberia [1]	Passport, visa, $2 fee, 2 pictures, police certificate	do	1 pound of tobacco.
Libya	Passport, transit visa, 2 pictures, valid 5 days, 56-cent fee, or tourist visa, $2.80 fee, valid 1 month, 2 pictures, letter stating purpose of trip.	10 British and 10 Libyan pounds	200 cigarettes.
Malagasy Republic [1]	Passport, visa, 3 pictures, visa for next country, round-trip ticket or onward ticket.	Not available	1,000 cigarettes.
Malaya [1]	Passport, no visa for 3 months	No more out than in	200 cigarettes.
Morocco	do	do	Do.
New Zealand	Passport, visa, no fee, letter from travel agent confirming booking to and from New Zealand.	Only 7 New Zealand pounds out	200 cigarettes, 50 cigars, or ½ pound of tobacco.
Niger [1]	Passport, visa, 3 pictures, visa for next country, round-trip ticket or onward ticket.	Not available	1,000 cigarettes.
Nigeria [1]	Passport, visa, valid for entry within 3 months for stay up to 28 days	10 pounds in	50 cigarettes.
Pakistan [1]	Passport, visa, no fee for 2-week transit visa, or tourist visa for longer stays, good for multiple entry within 4 years, visa for next country and proof of onward transportation, financial guarantee needed for stays over 14 days.	5,000 rupees in, 20 out	200 cigarettes.
Philippines [1]	Passport, visa, 1 picture, no fee, valid 6 months for stay up to 59 days, transportation and visa for next country, letter from travel agent.	20 pesos in or out	300 cigarettes.
Rhodesia (Federation and Nyasaland).[1]	Passport, no visa	None	100 cigarettes, 25 cigars, or ½ pound of tobacco.
Senegal [1]	Passport, visa, 3 pictures, visa for next country, roundtrip ticket or onward ticket.	Not available	1,000 cigarettes.
Sierra Leone [1]	Passport, visa, fee $2, valid for entry within 6 months	do	Not available.
Singapore	Passport, no visa for 3 months	200 Straits dollars, 300 Thailand ticals, 3,000 rupiahs, 270 Indian rupees.	200 cigarettes.
Somalia [1]	Passport, visa	None	Do.
South Africa	Passport, visa, no fee	No more out than in	Do.
South Vietnam [1]	Passport, no visa for stay less than 1 week, or visa, valid 6 to 30 days, 2 pictures, $5.60 fee, letter from employer.	400 piastres in	400 cigarettes.
South Korea [1]	Passport, visa, no fee for stay up to 15 days, visa, 2 pictures, $10 fee for longer stay, letter from travel agent.	None	200 cigarettes.
Sudan [1]	Passport, transit visa (valid 5 days), 3 pictures, $1.45 fee, or entry visa (valid 1 month), 3 pictures, $4.30 fee, bank reference.	10 pounds in or out	100 cigarettes, 25 cigars, or 4 ounces of tobacco.
Tahiti	Passport, visa, 2 pictures, visa for next country, round-trip ticket	200 new French francs out	400 cigarettes.
Tanganyika [1]	Passport, no visa for 6 months	Not available	Small amount for personal use.
Thailand [1]	Passport, no visa up to 90 days, 3 pictures on landing	Only 3,500 ticals in foreign currency in or out.	200 cigarettes.
Togo [1]	Passport, visa, 3 pictures, visa for next country, round-trip ticket or onward ticket.	Not available	1,000 cigarettes.
Tunisia [1]	Passport, no visa for 4 months	Only 30 dinars out	400 cigarettes.
United Arab Republic (Egypt, Syria).	Passport, visa, 2 pictures, $1.75 fee, letter from travel agent	No more out than in	200 cigarettes or 20 cigars.
Upper Volta [1]	Passport, visa, 3 pictures, visa for next country, round-trip ticket or onward ticket.	Not available	1,000 cigarettes.
Zanzibar [1]	Passport, no visa for 14 days	do	Not available.

[1] In addition to vaccination certificate, other types of inoculation or a certificate of good health are required or recommended. Check local consulates or transportation companies for detailed regulations.

Health documents: Entry into the United States requires a valid certificate of vaccination against smallpox no more than 3 years old. Many other countries also require this certificate. The geography of travel sometimes makes other health papers necessary. Persons who pass through yellow fever areas may be required to produce certificates of yellow-fever immunization before entering some foreign countries. In case of doubt, inquire in advance of U.S. health officials and at consulates of countries on the itinerary.

Where proof of nationality is asked for, it may sometimes be established satisfactorily, especially in Western Hemisphere countries, by showing an expired passport, a birth or naturalization certificate, or a voter's registration card. Naturally, the best evidence a tourist can present is a valid U.S. passport.

Birth of an Ancestor Links Biddle to Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article that appeared in the Washington Star on February 25, 1961. The subject of this article is the Honorable Anthony J. Drexel Biddle, Jr., major general, U.S. Army, who for the past 6 years has been adjutant general of Pennsylvania, and who has been selected by the President to be the next Ambassador to Spain.

The article follows:

BIRTH OF AN ANCESTOR LINKS BIDDLE TO SPAIN

HARRISBURG, PA., February 25.—A. J. Drexel Biddle, tapped by President Kennedy to be Ambassador to Spain, said today that country has a very special place in my heart.

His grandfather's grandfather was born in Andalusia Province in Spain.

"So naturally as a boy I heard the family talk about this, and it stimulated my interest in the country and its customs," the 64-year-old socialite-soldier-diplomat added.

Mr. Biddle, member of a wealthy Philadelphia family, said he has visited Spain frequently in the past and was looking forward to his first meeting with Generalissimo Franco.

"One thing particularly impresses anyone who visits the country, I believe, and that is the fact that Spanish people are just naturally friendly," he said.

GLAD TO RETURN

Mr. Biddle, tall and straight as an arrow in build, said he was glad to be returning to diplomatic work—a field in which he spent 9 years during the period just before Adolf Hitler began his march on Europe.

As to his mastery of the Spanish language, he noted:

"Right now I speak Spanish enough to get around. But I know I will have to brush it up and I intend to do so. In each country that I have been assigned in a diplomatic or military post, I have made it a matter of prime importance to master the language."

He speaks French and German fluently and has a working knowledge—as he called it—of Norwegian and Polish gained from previous oversea assignments.

STARTED CAREER IN 1935

Mr. Biddle, a Democrat, started his diplomatic career as U.S. Minister to Norway in 1935. He became Ambassador to Poland in 1937, and when that country was invaded by the Germans and Russians, he accompanied its beleaguered Government to France.

He also served as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the overrun countries of Poland, Belgium, the Netherlands, Norway, Greece, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia and Luxembourg with headquarters in London during the Second World War.

He retired from diplomatic service in 1944, to resume an Army career that had been interrupted temporarily after World War I. He held various top staff and liaison posts with Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers in Europe and was active in planning which led to formation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

KEEPS IN SHAPE

Mr. Biddle looks like an athlete, even at 64. He keeps in shape by taking turns at swimming, golfing, skiing, and tennis.

The handsome, silver-haired Mr. Biddle possesses a quick wit and a warm, friendly manner than seems to light up a room when he makes an entrance. His charm has infected hard-core politicians and the most cynical of newsmen alike in this State capital.

Since 1955, he has been Pennsylvania's adjutant general and, as such, commander in chief of the State's National Guard. He holds the rank of major general in the Army Reserve. When he retired from active military duty in 1955, he was a brigadier general and special assistant to Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, then Army Chief of Staff.

He has been known to spin many a tale about his experiences before and during the war in Europe, but the one newsmen talk about most is how Mr. Biddle made his exit from Poland before the German-Russian invasion.

It seems as though the word of what was happening reached Mr. Biddle in the early morning hours while he was in the middle of a shave. He hastily gathered his belongings together and darted into the street.

"It was really quite a picture—there I was darting around with all that lather still on my face," Mr. Biddle recalls.

Full name: Anthony Joseph Drexel Biddle, Jr.

Claim to fame: New Ambassador to Spain.

Home: Annville, Pa.

Birthday: December 17, 1897.

Education: St. Paul's School, Temple University.

Jobs: Shipping and mining business. Diplomatic posts, including Ambassadorship to Poland, Belgium, Netherlands, Norway, Greece, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia during World War II. SHAPE and NATO postwar assignments.

Family: Married and has two sons and a daughter.

Hobbies: Swimming, golfing, skiing, tennis.

Know Your America Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, on November 22, 1960, it was my honor and pleasure to participate in the program of the Queens County chapter, Catholic War Veterans, U.S.A., in observance of Know Your America Week.

The Queens County Chapter of the Catholic War Veterans is an active and effective working group, working always for the good of the veteran and this Nation.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a résumé of the aforementioned program which I am sure will be of interest to my colleagues and Americans everywhere:

RÉSUMÉ OF PROGRAM OBSERVING KNOW YOUR AMERICA WEEK, TUESDAY EVENING, NOVEMBER 22, 1960, HELD AT DOMINICAN COMMERCIAL HIGH SCHOOL, JAMAICA, N.Y., FREDERICK F. STAFFORD, AMERICANISM CHAIRMAN

The program, attended by 300 members of the Catholic War Veterans, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Jewish War Veterans, the Disabled War Veterans, and other patriotically minded citizens of the county of Queens, New York City, was opened with prayer, led by Francis X. McBarron, first vice commander of the New York Department, CWV.

First to address the audience was the Honorable Thomas J. Cuite, councilman of the city of New York, and national chairman of the All-American Conference To Combat Communism. Mr. Cuite cited the CWV for bringing the Know Your America Week program to the people of Queens for the third successive year, and congratulated the public for participating in the program.

Commander Melvin Wolinsky, head of the Queens County American Legion, congratulated the CWV on its forthright stand in observing Know Your America Week again, and urged all the people of Queens to follow the leadership in the fight for the American way of life, which such programs offer.

Judge-elect Albert H. Bosch, Queens County Court, and retiring Congressman from Queens County, praised the CWV for its patriotic program and expressed his pleasure, as a Congressman, in expending his efforts in behalf of our constitutional Republic. Defining communism, he drew on its effect upon the national scene and advocated, as a better ideology for Americans, truth and good to combat the Communist conspiracy.

Kenneth Brown, senior vice commander of the Queens County Jewish War Veterans, praised the CWV for extending leadership in patriotic activities and issued a challenge against those un-American influences which discriminate against religious groups.

Vincent Hartnett, Consultant to TV and radio producers, issued an alert to all in Queens regarding the Communist infiltration in the entertainment mediums, and called for a boycott of movies such as "Spartacus," "Exodus," and "Inherit the Wind"—each of which was written or produced or acted by Communists or Communist-sympathizers. He urged all educators to produce an "army of competent writers" who, in adult life, would join the fight against the Communist influence in the communication arts.

The senior vice commander of the Queens County Disabled War Veterans, John J. Roach, added his praise of the CWV's "program of patriotism" and assured the population of Queens County that they can look forward to greater programs in successive years.

Highlight of the evening's program was the address of Rear Admiral Ellis M. Zacharias, U.S. Navy Retired, who delivered the following message:

"I have no political affiliations and the statements presented herewith are facts as I see them, with no political connotations. This is emphasized because domestic politics have interfered not only with our international relations, but also with our survival.

"We are in the most important time of our history, though not too critical, for we hold the cards and if they are played properly, the proper outcome is certain.

"International problems outweigh domestic issues, except for deficit spending and bankruptcy. The United States has a direct interest in every country in the world and isolation is gone forever. Let's examine the issues discussed in the recent political campaign, but which were never debated properly:

"Prestige: At the end of World War II, we were at the highest peak because we saved the world; the U.S.S.R. was at its lowest peak. The two could move at the same time—one downward and the other upward. We should not care that some people do not like us; we should desire respect—a

product of strength and basic national character.

"Defense: Admiral Burke said 'We are powerful; why all this fear?' I subscribe to this sentiment and have long said 'The Russians will never become involved with us in a military way unless they are certain they can win. They have never been in that position, are not in it today, and will not be in it in the forseeable future.'

"Cuba: The responsibility lies in the lap of the New York Times since its H. L. Mathews gave incorrect views to the State Department. Our CIA should have known the facts and prevailed accordingly. We must not allow a Communist base to be set up in Cuba or any Latin American state.

"Quemoy and Matsu: This issue is resolved; we cannot recognize Red China or allow it to join the U.N. We should resolve the dangerous situation by having the United States set up a U.S. Trusteeship of Formosa for the Formosans, since we have never disposed of Formosa as stipulated in the Japanese peace treaty.

"Congo: Situation is still nebulous. It is unfortunate that the Belgians were forced out of the Congo before the country was ready for self-government.

"Algeria: This is a most important trouble spot. We long ago should have supported DeGaulle on any course to stop that war, and we ought to stop pestering him about contributions to NATO.

"Middle East: Things here could not be worse. We must use all the pressures available to us—and they are sufficient—to resolve this situation quickly.

"Latin America: These states prospered during the war, but they squandered their earnings instead of developing their own resources. We can better this situation immediately by visits of our ships (which impresses their populations highly), by sound advice, technical help and realism.

"Foreign Aid: This is another war time effort that was allowed to drift. We ought to make those whom we have helped pay now, so as to limit help to others who need it."

The Admiral also stated that the new administration has the greatest opportunity for many years but that it will take courage, vision and radical action in our own country's interest.

He indicated that of all the prospective candidates for Secretary of State, all but one have eliminated themselves from proper consideration. This one is David Bruce, who served both parties, who was an effective diplomat with a fine record to show, and who was a former OSS officer with the courage and realism necessary for the job. He knows the scope and importance of our most effective weapon today—political and psychological warfare, of which we need a much greater amount to preserve this land of freedom.

He urged all the people to express their desires and wishes to our representatives in the Congress and to the President so that we would no longer be at the mercy of venal politicians, complacent industrialists, ambitious union leaders, who often are dominated by gangsters and Communist supporters.

The program was concluded with a brief question-and-answer session, followed by the playing of our national anthem and a salute to the flag.

Among the notables in the audience were Representative-elect Joseph Addabbo; Norman Dodd, consultant to the Reece Committee on Foundations; Matthew Shevlin, Americanism chairman of the Queens County American Legion; John Lautner, ex-Communist, representing the Oriel Society; and William R. Plumme, chairman of the New York State Constitutional Party, and Frank Thornton, president of the Queens County Ancient Order of Hibernians.

The Maturing of the Junior College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1961

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the National Education Association Journal of February on junior colleges reflects the increasing interest in these important institutions of higher learning and sets forth some of the reasons for that interest. As you know, I have proposed legislation (H.R. 16) which would provide Federal assistance for the further development of this part of our educational structure, a development of which the recent report of the President's Commission on National Goals listed as one of the six important things that should be done in the educational field:

THE MATURING OF THE JUNIOR COLLEGE

(By Erwin Knoll)

"A relatively new public institution whose roles are so diverse as to be bewildering." The Carnegie Corp., of New York, used those words last year in a report on that amazing development in American education—the junior college.

Among the most bewildered by this diversity, the report might have added, are high school students looking for a higher education, and their parents. Even some teachers and guidance counselors have been unable to keep up with the phenomenal growth of the junior college movement and with the broad diversity of its purposes and programs.

Take, for example, the counselor in a suburban high school who recently told an outstanding student: "But you don't need to go to a junior college. You can get into almost any school." The boy, who felt he was not ready to leave home, had expressed an interest in enrolling in a nearby community college, a reputable institution with an impressive record of placing its 2-year graduates in the junior year of distinguished four-year colleges.

Or take the mother who was urged to enroll her daughter in a junior college where the girl could begin to acquire the study habits to match her obvious intelligence.

"But we can afford to send Judy away to school," the mother said.

"It's time the junior college came into its own," says Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., executive director of the American Association of Junior Colleges. "Some still consider it a temporary expedient or a last resort. It is an institution in its own right."

The junior college is also, increasingly, a doorway to higher education for the Nation's youth. In recent years it has become obvious that the 50-year-old prophecy of President David Starr Jordan of Stanford University will be realized: "We look upon the junior college movement which is now spreading throughout the United States as the most significant occurrence in American education in the present century."

When the President's Commission on National Goals issued its final report a few months ago, it listed development of junior colleges "within commuting distance of most high school graduates" as one of the six "important things that should be done" in education.

In an essay on education which accompanied the Goals Commission report, President John W. Gardner of the Carnegie Corp. declared that "there should be roughly within commuting distance of every high school graduate (except in sparsely settled regions) an institution that performs the following functions:

"a. Offers 2-year terminal programs for students not going on to a 4-year college career.

"b. Offers transfer programs for students who do wish to complete a 4-year program

"c. Serves as a technical institute for the community, serving local needs for vocational and subprofessional education.

"d. offers continuing education to adults."

Dr. Gardner added, "States should expect these institutions to take care of a substantial percentage of the future college population—perhaps 50 percent of all who enter college for the first time."

Already, one student in every four beginning higher education in the United States is enrolled in a junior college. From a total of 8 such institutions at the turn of the century the number has grown to 677, serving more than 900,000 students last year in all types of programs.

It has been estimated that by 1970 most communities with populations of 50,000 or more will have at least one junior college. In his recent book, "The Community Junior College," James W. Thornton, Jr., of San Jose State College predicts that we can expect these institutions to accommodate at least 2 million students in 10 years.

Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE of New Jersey has proposed legislation to use Federal funds to expand junior college facilities in the United States.

Recent junior college activity in just a few States illustrates the ferment across the country. In California, which has pioneered in developing a strong junior college system, enrollments increased by 13 percent last fall. More than 400,000 are taking courses at 71 institutions, and 100,000 are enrolled on a full-time basis. That number will grow to 270,000 in 10 years under a "master plan" for education adopted last spring by the California Legislature.

In New York, which established its first community-sponsored junior college only 11 years ago, a State commission has called for facilities to accommodate 50,000 students by 1965, 100,000 by 1970, and 125,000 by 1975.

Florida, which now has about 16,000 full-time junior college students, expects to have 60,000 by 1970. Four new institutions were opened last year, and the goal is 35 before the decade is over. Ultimately, Florida hopes to have higher education opportunities available within commuting distance of 99 percent of the State's population.

Within recent months, a Colorado legislative committee proposed establishment of eight new junior colleges. The university system of Georgia plans to add two or three to the seven now in operation. Kansas is considering providing State aid for its 14 junior colleges.

The Citizens' Advisory Council of the Detroit area has recommended that five new community colleges be started immediately for the 6 counties around Detroit and that at least 15 be planned for the future.

In Maryland, which has seen the number of its junior colleges grow from 2 to 17 since World War II, there is talk of 5 junior colleges for Montgomery County alone. An advisory group to the Minnesota State Board of Education has proposed that the State pay at least half the cost of building and maintaining junior colleges.

And in New England, which has lagged behind other regions in the junior college movement, the first public junior college under the Massachusetts Regional Community College Board was opened at Pitts-

field last year and three more are expected to be in operation in the fall of 1961.

What are these junior colleges, and what do they do? The nomenclature alone is enough to confuse many: Some are called technical institutes, others seminaries, others city colleges or community colleges or just plain colleges. Most are 2-year institutions, but some also offer 1-year or 3-year sequences.

About 275 are private or church-related institutions, many with residence facilities and some with fees as high as $2,500 a year. But the largest number, enrolling about 85 percent of all junior college students, are publicly supported and offer higher education free or at nominal cost to students within commuting distance.

Often their programs are designed to meet local needs. The schools are usually under the direction of local boards of education. Some started as evening sessions in high school buildings, but most are now developing their own well-equipped campuses.

For the student planning to transfer to a 4-year institution as a junior after 2 years of junior college work, the community college offers the basic liberal arts program common to freshmen and sophomore work—courses in English, foreign languages, sciences, mathematics, social studies, and philosophy.

For the terminal student seeking the 2-year associate in arts degree, the community college offers a broad range of technical or semiprofessional training. Some 60 institutions now have degree programs in nursing, usually in affiliation with local hospitals. Students may earn the associate in arts degree while qualifying for State registered nurse exams.

Other vocational programs, often geared to the demands of local industry, include secretarial and business training, data processing, police science, nursing, dental laboratory techniques, agriculture, auto mechanics, drafting, machine shop, electronics, printing, sheet-metal working, woodworking, welding, and food technology. In some community colleges, classroom instruction is combined with on-the-job experience, giving students the opportunity to earn pay while learning their trade.

Financial considerations must, of course, play a considerable part in planning for higher education. The economy of living at home and paying only modest fees will be an overriding factor to many students. But there are other factors, and they are important.

"If a student is clearly motivated toward a bachelor's degree program and graduate work, if his objective is clear, if he has the necessary financial resources, intellectual potential, and self-discipline, he might well move immediately into a 4-year program," says Dr. Gleazer. Who, then, should be counseled to go to a junior college?

1. The able student who, because of finances, family responsibilities, or a lack of maturity, desires to attend college close to home.

2. The able student who desires training for specialized semiprofessional and skilled technician positions needed in his community.

3. The able student who is uncertain of his ultimate educational objective but who wants to start on his higher education.

4. The student who has underachieved in high school but who has the intellectual potential for higher education.

5. The student who wants only a 2-year general education background.

The junior college may offer a unique opportunity to the student who needs to find himself. Its faculty is usually not concerned with research or graduate work and therefore may devote more time to the individual student's needs.

"I can cite thousands of cases of youngsters who did failing work in high school, but who blossomed into excellent students in junior college," says Julio Bortolazzo, president, College of San Mateo.

The striking motivational effect which the presence of higher education opportunities can stimulate is illustrated by Chipola Junior College in rural Jackson County, Fla. When the college was established in 1947, only 7 percent of the county's high school graduates went on to higher education. This year, 52 percent began college careers—45 percent at Chipola.

In the fall of 1958, about 2,500 junior college graduates entered the University of California as juniors. More than half of them would not have been academically eligible to enter the university 2 years earlier as freshmen. Yet these students earned a grade average at the university almost as high as that of their eligible classmates, and 73 percent went on to graduate.

This is a partial answer to the parents who ask: "How good are junior colleges?" But no general answer is possible, of course. Many are accredited by regional evaluation groups. Some of the schools are excellent; some are mediocre; some are very poor. From the prospective student's point of view, all deserve the same close scrutiny as senior colleges.

In general, junior colleges can point with pride to their record in placing students in 4-year institutions, though some senior colleges still resist the notion of transfers. The student with a specific college in mind would do well to check in advance.

William H. Neal, registrar of Montgomery Junior College in suburban Washington, D.C., reported recently that in the 12-month period ending June 30, 1960, some 650 students requested transcripts of their academic work sent to 174 colleges and universities. The college expects more than 50 precent of the 1,600 students currently enrolled to continue their higher education.

Thorough studies in California have indicated that students who transfer from 2-year to 4-year colleges experience a first-semester drop in academic performance—a common occurrence in all transfers—but quickly recoup their losses and thereafter hold their own with other students.

Undoubtedly, some junior colleges are still having growing pains. So, for that matter, are some senior colleges. But, by and large, junior has gotten to be a very big boy indeed, and even the name may have to go some day.

To hard-pressed educators trying to meet the coming college enrollment surge, to State officials confronted with the need for doubled higher education facilities, to students confronted by ever-tightening admission requirements, and to parents faced with the problem of costs, the junior college looms large as an answer.

Arthur S. Adams, who retires this spring as president of the American Council of Education, wrote recently:

"We are approaching the time when 2 years of college, either to develop a vocational skill or to prepare for further college education, will be as necessary and commonplace as is graduation from high school."

At tremendous effort, the opportunities are being provided. To a large extent, high school teachers and counselors will determine whether these are used.

The 4–H Club Members Serve America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, National 4–H Club Week will be celebrated this year from March 4 to the 11. The nearly 2⅓ million members of this national youth organization are indeed worthy of our recognition and encouragement for by their participation in 4–H Club activities now they are preparing themselves to be responsible, well-trained citizens of tomorrow.

From an inauspicious beginning around the turn of the century, the extensive system of 4–H Clubs now encircles the globe and more than 40 countries have adopted all or part of the plan. This phenomenal growth is due not only to the appeal of the 4–H Club program but also to the fine guidance of three major groups who lead as a team to carry on national 4–H Club activities: The Cooperative Extension Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and State land-grant colleges and universities, the National 4–H Club Foundation, and the National 4–H Service Committee. These groups join together in their common endeavor to assist 4–H members to make the most of their abilities, to utilize scientific advances in farming and homemaking, and to render more efficient service to their community, State, and Nation.

At the local level, direction and instruction are provided by county agents, home demonstration agents, parents, businessmen, teachers, and older 4–H'ers who give generously of their time and talents to insure the success of 4–H Club work. In the Second District of Kentucky and in Kentucky generally we are fortunate in having many such outstanding men and women whose efforts are apparent in the impressive success of the 4–H program in Kentucky. They deserve our wholehearted gratitude for working for a better America through the youth of our Nation. Only through an informed citizenry, directed by high moral values and a sense of responsibility, can we rightfully assume the leadership of the free world.

The continuing theme of National 4–H Club Week is "Learn, Live, Serve Through 4–H," and I believe it clearly expresses the high purposes to which these young people are dedicated. Through their 4–H Club work, boys and girls learn better ways to farm, prepare food, make clothing and numerous other skills which will be of assistance to them in later life.

The 4–H Club members strive to live each day in a manner which will reflect credit upon themselves, their families, and their organization. Individual perfection in their intellectual and moral life as expressed in the 4–H Club motto "make the best better" is also stressed.

Perhaps the most important word of the theme is "Serve," because it is through service that these young people put into practice the training they have received in their 4–H Club projects. Not only do their families, communities, and States benefit from their knowledge, but they are made aware of the satisfaction and joy resulting from service to one's fellow man. This willingness to serve will carry over into the future and they will become the leaders of tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to commend all present members of the 4–H Clubs in Kentucky

on their outstanding achievements, and to thank the many men and women in my section of the State who are contributing so much in time, energy, and enthusiasm to this fine youth organization.

The Courage To Doubt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which was sent to me by a former constituent of mine, Miss Susan Suritz, whose family formerly lived in Rock Hill, S.C. This article was written by Mr. Tom Marchant, and was put into the University of South Carolina's Gamecock, the excellent student paper which is managed, supervised and edited by the students at the university. I consider this an excellent article, and I congratulate the author and Miss Susan Suritz for calling it to my attention, and I am glad to place it in the RECORD at her request:

THE COURAGE TO DOUBT

(By Tom Marchant)

I recently read an article in a Unitarian magazine entitled "The Courage To Doubt." As I pilfered through it, it occurred to me that perhaps the number of people in my generation who have the courage to doubt is rapidly diminishing.

This is not an inference of religious connotation. Rather, it is a statement of doubt of the social courage of my fellow students.

The bond between a man and his God is a very personal one and certainly shouldn't be subjected to public scrutiny. It would seem however that man's interrelationships with his fellow man is a fit subject of debate and discussion.

THE FUNCTION OF YOUTH

Youth's historical function down through the centuries has been the questioning of the values of the age. The point has been made by Herbert Vetter, and I think correctly so, that the men of noblest faith have been men of strongest doubt.

Out of Gautama's doubts about the Hinduism of his age emerged one of our world religions, Buddhism. From the doubts and soul searching of Luther sprung that dynamic religious wave known as Protestantism. From a young man's doubts about his rather mysterious origins came the concept of Evolution. And out of the doubts of a number of young men about King George's sovereignty emerged the foundation of this democracy we now enjoy.

It is not easy to admit that one's country was founded upon treason, until one develops a historical perspective and realizes that democracy in 1776 was generally viewed with about as much suspicion as communism is viewed today.

DOUBT IS NOT BLASPHEMY

The purpose? Simply to elucidate the nature of doubt. Doubt is not blasphemy. Denial perhaps, but not doubt.

One must realize that if man had never experienced doubt, he would have never conceived the idea of progress. I do not wish for you to go away weeping. I do not wish to impart to the subject of discussion any connotation of fatalism.

As a matter of fact, we are producing people who not only talk, but think. And what is even more vital, act.

CHANGED TEMPO

Indeed, the tempo of history has doubled and tripled in the past few decades, and social changes that once took several decades are now taking place overnight.

The youth of this Nation is coming of age. Some of us are just now seeing the world which our elders have made for us. We do not like what we see. We fear that our leaders in their infinite wisdom have created a set of circumstances which may terminate the progress of the human specie.

Better educated and less tradition-bound than past generations, we often feel as though we are separated from our parents by centuries. And I suppose, in a sense we are. Our principals boast enthusiastically of a crackling new intellectual atmosphere in our high schools. Where children once complained of too heavy a workload, we now find that they are clamoring for better qualified teachers and less frilly curriculums.

TEENAGERS CHOOSE

Look magazine presented a number of U.S. teenagers with a list of possessions ranging from a new car to a Ph. D. degree and asked them to designate which possessions would make them most look up to a person. For better or worse, 62 percent answered "a Ph. D." Musical ability rated 16 percent, a large book collection 12 percent, a beautiful home 4 percent, and surprisingly enough, a new car rated less than 1 percent.

Young people in general do not seem to be turning away from materialism so much as turning toward the new intellectualism. This is also indicative of our state of mind. It is no longer "I just can't do it," but rather "I just gotta do it."

This is not just youthful exuberance. This is a new intellectual positivism, kindled probably by the critic's charges during the past few years, that American teenagers are "fat, dumb, and happy."

ANGUISHED PARENTS

This new, almost unthinkable intellectualism is causing some parents considerable mental anguish. They've sent their little cubs off for a degree, not an education. On their value scale, it would be better to hold a 6-week training certificate in salesmanship than a Ph. D. in Greek literature. A good steady job, money in the bank, new car every year—that's what counts, brother.

Scorn for our parents? No. Ironically enough, if it weren't for our parents we wouldn't exist—not just in the physical sense, but even more in a spiritual and psychological sense.

Our parents, growing up during the depression, emerged hungry for the material advantages of life, something that they had never had. We, the so-called beat generation, have never known what it means to be really hungry. We have never felt the humiliation of standing in a breadline or the empty feeling in the pit of our stomach when the man said he was firing us.

TAKE FOR GRANTED

It is only natural that we, who have always had the material advantages of life, take them for granted. We want something more than a Cadillac and a sexy wife, or at least we should.

Yet we really cannot seem to pinpoint our nebulous ambitions. They are not so concrete as a beautiful home, a big car, or any of the other status symbols which we see our parents scrambling for.

American youth—fat, dumb, and happy? I don't think so. Scientific studies show that American youth are more conscious of the world about them, more sensitive to the terrific problems which confront them, and more education minded than any other generation in our history. They may seem to flounder around and simply splash a lot of water, but one thing is certain—and that is that no one will ever be able to call our beat generation the beaten generation.

What America Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the Columbia Evening Republican has been printing a series of three guest editorials by Columbia High School students on "What America Means to Me."

I ask unanimous consent that the three editorials "What Can I Do?" by Jane Schaefer; "New Glory for Old Glory," by Lynda Bell, and "What Is Capitalism?" by Bonnie Reynolds, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT CAN I DO?

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—February 22, the birthday anniversary of George Washington, will be Youth Freedom Appreciation Day at Columbus High School. In observance of this day. The Evening Republican will print guest editorials by Columbus High School students, today, Tuesday and Wednesday and on Wednesday will have a page of statements on "What America Means to Me," written by students at the school. This is the first guest student editorial, written by Jane Schaefer, on "What Can I Do for America?")

At his inauguration, President Kennedy implored us, his fellow Americans, to ask not what our country could do for us; rather, what we could do for our country.

We are accustomed to the fact that, in the United States, there is no limit to what we may achieve for ourselves through effort. It is easy to forget that we have freedoms because we are Americans. "I want" and "give me" are two phrases that have become habit forming. If we wish to preserve our freedoms, we must use these phrases less and become more concerned about what we can do for our country.

In our world communism poses an ever-present threat to democracy. We must appreciate the freedoms of our free enterprise system and unite to defend them. We must realize that communism is our enemy; that Communists stop at nothing to further their ideology. To a Communist any act that promotes his doctrine is good and just.

We must become familiar with the Communist doctrine. Communists want peace, but theirs is a peace existing when communism conquers the world. None of us want this peace. We must not only be aware of these dangers, but also be prepared to fight them.

Therefore, because we know that our system of government is the best system and because we are proud of our heritage, we must always be squarely facing present problems and be preparing for future problems. Our system of government is not flawless; we do not claim that it is. Because it is right, we must work to preserve it. We have the

privilege of choosing our officials. We must exercise this right and our other rights. Our Government can be only as good as the people who govern it.

Not only does America need the help of each of us to protect her from such threats as communism, but also to guard inward corruption. Throughout her history the United States has been strong and victorious. This strength gives no cause for lethargy.

History also illustrates taht nations cannot long survive if corruption exists within them. We must continue to uphold and improve our educational system, our individual freedom, our political system, our economic system, our standard of living, and our morals. God has truly shed his grace on America. A Vice President of the United States once said that we should not worry about whether God is on our side, but whether we remain on God's side.

What can we do for America? There are many things, small things, whose sums are great things. One person alone could not accomplish everything that is necessary, but together we can accomplish great things. President Eisenhower said, "The future will belong not to the fainthearted, but to those who believe in it and prepare for it."

We must believe in the future because by choice we believe in America. We must prepare for the future to preserve America.

NEW GLORY FOR OLD GLORY

(EDITOR'S NOTE—Wednesday, George Washington's birthday, is Youth Freedom Appreciation Day at Columbus High School. This is the second in a series of guest student editorials on America, this one by Lynda Bell on "New Glory for Old Glory." A third student editorial will appear in Wednesday's paper, in addition to a page of statements by students on "What America Means to Me.")

The United States is yours and mine; and, thus, it's outcome is in our hands. It is not your Representative's, or Senator's, or President's responsibility to maintain the status of our country; it is your responsibility. It is past time for the American people to reevaluate what place freedom holds in their lives. But since it has not been done already, it must be done now. We cannot afford to be indifferent to our country's fate and heritage any longer.

We must not only wish that our country remains a land of progress, justice, and democracy; we must each and all work for this goal. Our political and economic systems are based on the individual, not the masses. That individual is you. Our representative democracy will exist only so long as people are interested in its existence. It takes spirit and enthusiasm to keep the fires of democracy blazing to illuminate the world. On our shoulders rests more than the responsibility to keep democracy alive in our country; ours is also the responsibility for the free world's cause.

But before we can help in the free world's cause, we must be positive that our country's foundation is firm. And is it? Certainly not as firm as it could be. At this stage, though, the reasons for this are somewhat secondary; the factor of prime importance is what we are going to do to strengthen our democracy.

The first action that you can take is to vote. This is so much more than merely a word or action; it is an imperative component in our democracy. You have heard and read so much about voting that you are probably tired of it. Why then don't you do something about it? The small percentage of qualified voters that exert the effort to vote once a year is appalling and pathetic.

Teenagers cannot understand why those who are qualified don't vote. We teenagers look forward with great anticipation to the time when we can have a part in our country's destiny, when we can help mold its future.

From this day hence, when you salute your flag let it be not only with your hand but also with your heart and soul, determined to build a more steadfast country. Let's keep Old Glory with its new glory forever waving "O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave."

WHAT IS CAPITALISM?

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Today is Youth Freedom Appreciation Day at Columbus High School and this the final in a series of guest student editorials appearing in the Evening Republican. "What is Capitalism" was written by Columbus High School Senior Bonnie Reynolds.)

According to the dictionary, capitalism is an "economic system based on the private ownership of the means of production and distribution and their operation for profit, under more or less competitive conditions."

And, it is our belief that nearly every Columbus high school senior cannot only quote this or a similar definition, but also tell you what living under this system means to him.

As young Americans we know that if Dad works in a factory, he has the right not only to express his grievances to the boss but to strike or even quit if this is deemed necessary. If Dad is the boss, he runs his business at his own discrimination, taking the risk of either going broke or making money.

The Government acts only as a mediator in regulating the economy. Compared to the socialistic and communistic systems, these capitalistic elements are unique.

In these systems, the government or state has control of industry. Their idea is to have equal distribution of wealth, thus depressing incentive. We understand, too, how this supposed economic security appeals to underdeveloped nations.

As young Americans we realize that the capitalistic economy has brought us a standard of living second to none. We realize that nowhere in the world do teenagers enjoy the luxuries we do. But, it is also our belief that nearly every senior is coming to know the responsibilities, and, yes, even the pitfalls, that accompany this abundance.

When all is said and done, however, is how young Americans define capitalism the critical issue right now? It seems to us that how young Africans, Panamanians, Cubans, et al., define and evaluate capitalism that will count in the years ahead.

We are cognizant of the fact that America's future lies in the hands of our generation. It will be our job to uphold and spread what we believe to be the best government and economic system.

Good Citizenship Reflects Faith in Our Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, Miss Janice Miller, a student at the Partridge, Kans., Rural High School, won the citizenship essay contest sponsored by the Seventh District General Federation of Womens' Clubs, with her essay entitled "Good Citizenship Reflects Faith in Our Heritage." Janice has written a fine statement on citizenship, one of interest to all citizens. Under unanimous consent, I insert the statement in the Appendix of the RECORD:

GOOD CITIZENSHIP REFLECTS FAITH IN OUR HERITAGE

Heritage is defined in the dictionary as that which comes, or belongs, to one by reason of birth. Our heritage is much more than that. Our heritage consists of the ideals our forefathers fought for in the Revolutionary War: equality, freedom of speech and worship, the right to a trial by jury, and the right to run our Government as we ourselves see fit. When our forefathers fought for these things, they were thinking of us, the future generations. They wanted to leave their descendants something to be proud of, so they left for us the best they could leave—freedom.

Once America's freedom was established, the great men of that time began improving the education, health, welfare, and defense of the new Nation. This improvement has been carried on for 171 years. Today our country has the highest living standard in the world.

Are we going to keep improving so our descendants will have even more of which to be proud, or have we reached the point of perfection? We are by no means perfect. No country is, or ever will be, perfect. Our large cities still have slums. Many people in the poverty-stricken areas can barely read. The ignorance of many of our people make them very susceptible to dishonest propaganda. Our prisons are overcrowded and many of the prisoners need unavailable psychiatric help. All over the United States mental institutions have large waiting lists and are understaffed.

Do we want to leave this to our descendants? With the large increase in population we can be assured the situation will get worse, unless we act now. We, as citizens of America, have the power to change these situations. To do this, we must practice good citizenship and sincerely believe that our American heritage must be handed down to our descendants. We must fight Communist infiltration, obey the laws of our land, and the international laws. We should learn the history and customs of foreign people so we can understand them better. We must work to better our education, and wipe out racial differences. We should learn how our Government is set up, and vote when we become of age. We must stamp out juvenile delinquency and the crime waves in the larger cities. We must spread Christianity to the primitive and uneducated people of the world.

These are but a few of the things we can do to be good citizens. Good citizenship shows that we believe our forefathers fought and died for what was right. Good citizenship reflects faith in our American heritage.

The Value of the Social Studies and Humanities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, we see increasingly widespread public recognition of the need for high quality educational opportunities for a large number of young people in the general field of science and technology.

This is as it should be. We need scientists and engineers to help maintain our national strength, to help build the better world we seek for all mankind.

Nevertheless, it will be a dangerous tragedy if we ignore the lessons to be learned from the social studies and the humanities. The poet, the philosopher, the theologian, the economist, the political scientist, and the historian have vital contributions to make to our national welfare, and we endanger our democracy if we stifle their development or ignore them.

Dr. Paul H. Giddens, president of Hamline University in St. Paul, recently discussed the value of the social studies studies and the humanities in the 1961 winter issue of the Hamline University Bulletin. He points out that the major problems which face us throughout the world today have their roots in the social studies and the humanities, and he comes to the conclusion, with which I heartily agree, that:

There must be as much emphasis and financial support given to the study of human affairs as to science.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this excellent article by Dr. Giddens be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARE THE SOCIAL STUDIES AND HUMANITIES OF NO VALUE?

Within the last 60 years the United States has been transformed from a relatively simple agricultural state into a highly industrialized nation. As this industrial revolution progressed, it required a greater and greater number of highly trained and educated men and women for all kinds of positions in business and industry. To meet the demand, more and more emphasis was placed upon the teaching of science in high schools and colleges and universities. Corporations, business firms, and foundations made grants for scientific research and established scholarships and fellowships at leading universities to further graduate study in the sciences.

SCIENCE EMPHASIZED AT ALL LEVELS OF EDUCATION

In more recent years the development of the atomic bomb gave further impetus to the study and teaching of science. The launching of Sputnik I and other space satellites by the Soviet Union resulted in putting huge sums of money into the study of science in high schools, undergraduate colleges, and in graduate and professional schools. Public school programs in science have been developed and extended down into the elementary grades. In addition to workshops, conferences, and symposiums, summer institutes in science for gifted high school juniors and seniors and for high school and college teachers were established. Gifts to colleges for new science buildings have been conspicuous. Grants for science equipment and research projects on the undergraduate college level have been many and large. More and more fellowships with generous stipends and allowances have been established to encourage more qualified young people to go into science. As recently as November 1960 the President's Science Advisory Committee recommended a "massive" increase in the Federal Government's role in financing and otherwise facilitating basic research and the training in the physical sciences. It urged that American science must "double and redouble in size and strength" in the next generation.

THE GREAT IMBALANCE

The need for excellence in science training and basic research, for more and better educated scientists, and for more money to assure excellence is natural, understandable, necessary, and widely recognized. It is distressing, however, to note the great and rapidly growing imbalance between the sciences and the social studies and humanities and the lack of appreciation for the latter. Compared with science, there seems to be relatively little interest in or financial support for the study of economics, government, history, English, foreign languages, philosophy, sociology, psychology, and other liberal arts subjects. Relatively little money is being spent to encourage gifted high school and college students and high school and college teachers in the social studies and humanities and provide them with opportunities similar to those in the sciences. For students and teachers in these areas, this neglect is most discouraging and a cause for low morale. Worse yet is the fact that no one seems to be greatly concerned or alarmed over the disparity that continues to increase. It is particularly surprising that businessmen, of all people, do not show more interest than they do in providing financial support to strengthen the study of economics and government.

SOCIAL STUDIES AND HUMANITIES PERTINENT TO SURVIVAL

The need for emphasizing the social studies and humanities is just as great and pertinent to our survival as science. How can we possibly operate our democratic form of government successfully unless we have citizens and leaders who have a knowledge and understanding of the complicated economic, social, and political problems that confront us? How many citizens have sufficient knowledge to vote intelligently and make a rational decision on such current issues as taxation, inflation, civil rights, the farm problem, medical care for the aged, the flight of gold, foreign aid, and the regulation of business by government?

We are even less prepared to make intelligent decisions on foreign policies and international issues. If we are to deal successfully with the thorny international problems that plague us and avoid war, there must be greater emphasis placed upon the study of the nature of communism and the history, language, economic system, politics and government, religion, and philosophy, and the culture of Russia, Europe, Africa, the Middle East, the Far East, and Latin America. If we are unable to cope successfully with these domestic and international issues, all of which have their roots in the social studies and humanities, spending more money on science will not enable us to survive. There must be as much emphasis and financial support given to the study of human affairs as to science.

Fight Against Recession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, daily we hear of and see evidence of a slowdown in American business and the resultant unemployment. We know that American business and know-how can pull us through. As long as we have people who are willing to expand present industries and start new businesses, we know that we shall not again experience a repetition of the thirties.

I am proud to inform this great body that in the State of New York the first new manufacturing company in 1961 is located in Jamaica, N.Y., in the Fifth Congressional District. Industrial Plywood Co., Inc., known as Plywood City, opened last week. This new plant and its developers must be commended for taking the initiative in the fight against the recession. It is indeed gratifying to me that this has happened in my own congressional district. I extend to these forward-looking citizens my sincere good wishes for every success.

The Communist Tyranny Over Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution passed by the American Lithuanian Lawyers of Illinois and the Lithuanian Jurists in Chicago, urging our Government to continue to condemn the domination of Lithuania by the Soviet Union and to take action in the United Nations to secure the withdrawal of Communist tyranny from that land.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Lithuania, an ancient nation from prehistoric times and a modern republic, was illegally and forcibly seized by and incorporated into the state of the Soviet Union in 1940; and

Whereas, after seizing Lithuania, the Soviet Union agents arrested Lithuania's legal government, replacing it with a puppet regime, and introduced a reign of terror in Lithuania; and

Whereas the Soviet Union's regime in Lithuania deprived the Lithuanian people of their human rights and fundamental freedoms, confiscated their properties and business enterprises, converted them into slaves of the Soviet Union, deported approximately 300,000 of them to Siberia, and other parts of Russia; and

Whereas the Soviet Union's acts of aggression against Lithuania and her people are crimes not only against Lithuania and the Lithuanians, but also against the world peace and humanity, as provided in the Charter of the International Military Tribunal, of which France, Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and the United States of America are signatories: Therfore be it

Resolved, That we, the convened American Lithuanian Lawyers of Illinois and the Lithuanian Jurists in Chicago, find it necessary on behalf of the Lithuanian people to condemn the rulers of the Soviet Union as aggressors against Lithuania and enemies of peace and humanity; be it further

Resolved, To request the Government of the United States of America and the governments of other countries, through their delegations to the United Nations, to declare the Soviet Union an aggressor and demand the withdrawal of its military forces and various agents from Lithuania, and to liberate the Lithuanian people from the Soviet Union's subjugation; and be it further

Resolved, To mail copies of this resolution to the Secretary of State of the United States of America, to the delegations of all countries to the United Nations, and to the press and other media of public information.

A Journey to Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include another in a series of articles on Ireland written by Mr. Thomas Heffernan, editor, Sunday Independent, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., which appeared in that newspaper on February 26, 1961. Mr. Heffernan wrote the series following an extended tour of Ireland last fall.

The article follows:

A JOURNEY TO IRELAND—ANCIENT SPORT OF "HUNTING" MEANS CHASING FOXES ON HORSES WITH HOUNDS

(By Tom Heffernan)

One of the pleasures we had in Ireland was at long last a chance to try the hunting—and on the British Isles or on the continent "going hunting" does not mean what it does here, when it indicates a chap has picked up his gun and gone for game in the Poconos, the North Mountain country or where-have-you.

Instead, in those lands, "hunting" means only foxhunting—riding horses to hounds.

No firearms are used—none whatever.

When, over there, a person does go out with his rifle or shotgun he is going—not hunting—but "shooting."

And there was shooting to be done in Ireland, too, with a couple chaps staying at the hotel bringing in 30 or so snipe and a couple pheasants each day they tried.

But back to hunting which is, to the horseman, the last word and the ultimate in riding.

It does not demand the great skill and finesse of the show ring and the championship jumping courses.

These skills can be used but you can get away with hunting without them and still enjoy yourself.

FOX CHOOSES THE COURSE

But as it calls for riding wherever the fox may choose to run, over hills, through fields, over stone walls, fences, and the famous Irish banks, one gets a chance to put to practical use all that he has learned of riding.

For us, though we have been riding all our life and in quite a few places, we found it the hardest riding we ever have done.

With the sparse population of the Limerick-Tipperary area there was plenty of country to ride all day in, and it was steep, rugged, and—always—with those fearsome Irish banks and ditches that are both steep and wide.

"Don't look down," we were counseled, "look across."

The idea is that if you looked down into those ditches you might change your mind about trying to jump them.

HOW A HUNT IS CONDUCTED

A fox hunt starts with the meet—which is merely the gathering of the followers of the hunt at the site selected and well in advance.

About 11 in the morning the hunt starts off, led by the master (master of foxhounds), the whips who handle the hounds and who often are employees, and the huntsman, also usually an employee unless the master acts as his own huntsman.

With that pack of fine foxhounds, the hunt leaders and then the followers—who make up the field—moving down a country road, with a few scarlet jackets here and there, the colors of other hunts, the hunt leaders and the ladies usually wearing hunting caps and the men either bowlers (reinforced derbies) or high silk hat (often well battered from falls) it is a colorful scene.

HOUNDS PUT TO WORK

The hunt moves off to a previously selected place, where the huntsman and the whips take the hounds into the area where is known there are foxes.

This may be a section of many acres covered with a thick growth of smaller trees or heavy bushes.

The way the big pack of hounds handles would delight any Luzerne Countian who likes any kind of hunting dogs and it is wonderful to watch as they move back and forth, under perfect control, in search of their quary.

There are 20 to 25 couples of them, meaning 40 to 50 hounds.

If they find one and it breaks from the cover—and you are certain it is the fox the hounds are after—you call, the hounds are brought up, put on the scent, take off in chase giving tongue in their chorus, someone shouts, "Gone awaaaaay" and off goes the field in the thundering mob, everyone trying to be first.

The idea is to keep up with the hounds, if possible, no matter where he goes or what kind of obstacles are met, and sometimes it is a mad spectacle.

And when there may be just one place where a horse can be jumped out of one field to get into the next in which the fox and hounds have gone, the scramble can get sticky.

ABOUT THOSE IRISH BANKS

As we mentioned, there are some stone walls to be jumped now and then, but seldom a wooden fence.

Usually, however, it is the ditches and banks and you might ask what they are.

As it happens, due to Ireland having to be a wet country to be so green, practically all fields in the wet areas are surrounded by ditches for drainage.

Over the centuries these ditches can become big and also wide.

Furthermore, the dirt thrown out as they are dug creates a bank beyond the ditch.

The ditches can be from 3 feet wide to 8 and the banks can be from 2 feet high to twice that much or more.

Then, in most places and causing the scramble to find a way through, most of the banks are overgrown with ancient bushes and such, some of which have developed heavy branches.

The requirement is to jump the ditch—usually from a muddy field—to land on the bank where a landing is possible.

THE "DOUBLE BANKS"

Then—with usually a pause as he places his feet on the bank after landing—the horse jumps down into the field beyond, which usually seems much lower than the field out of which you came.

Finally, Limerick is famous for its "double banks."

It is a "double bank" when there is a ditch on both sides of the bank and when these ditches happen to be of the wide variety while also around 5 feet deep, there is that much more of a demand on the horse and rider.

On other occasions, especially in the case of those banks which have not become overgrown, a bit of a barbed wire fence is built on that side of the bank opposite the ditch.

(Usually a part of the wire is dropped to let the field through but not always, even though wire is one of the real hazards of hunting.)

LUCKY IN CHOOSING LIMERICK HOUNDS

Our luck held good when, entirely by chance, our first experience with fox hunting in Ireland or any place else, was with the County Limerick Hounds, whose master is Lord Daresbury—a splendid English gentleman who, among other things, is also a newspaper publisher.

Lord Daresbury, who has the reputation of "working like a dog" to provide good sport for the followers of his pack, a task which also must be quite expensive for him, is a quiet, most unassuming and splendid gentleman. He is also as might be expected, an excellent horseman. He and the members of his field made us welcome and were cordial and helpful in the most unostentatious manner possible.

A leading spirit in the hunt is Lady Hilton, also from England and who personally is as beautiful as is her riding. Actually, Lady Hilton is a daring rider and usually, when there was a particularly difficult or rough passage to be opened to get over a dangerous ditch and overgrown bank, Lady Hilton would show the way.

Another good feature for a beginner was the fact that there were but some 15 riders in the field that first day. Later groups of 40 or more were met and, we have heard, the field in fox hunts in England frequently numbers more than 100.

DAY OF HUNTING CALLS FOR RIDING

A day of fox hunting means getting on your horse a little before 11 a.m. and, if you are lucky enough to have no spills, you are in the saddle for quite a few hours.

Usually, hunting continues until 4 or 4:30 in the afternoon and for the five to five and a half hours you do some easy riding, some standing in wait, some riding in a bit more of a hurry and then, when the hounds take out after a fox, you are off as fast as you can and over or through whatever gets in the way.

Frequently, when the day of hunting ends, you have a ride of up to 5 miles back to where the horse trailers are and where you turn over your mount.

In the actual chasing of the fox, the longer the chase the higher it is esteemed and, before we got there, the Limericks one day had one run of nearly an hour.

Best we ever had was of some 35 minutes.

The Yuletide Message of Andy Razaf

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, Andy Razaf, now a resident of Los Angeles, is one of the Nation's leading songwriters and lyricists. He was formerly a resident of Englewood, N.J. Even though

he has lived in California for several years he is still held in highest regard in New Jersey. His yuletide message, though brief, has given me inspiration which I would like to share with the other Members of the House and those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

MY YULETIDE MESSAGE

(By Andy Razaf)

"Merry Christmas," "Happy New Year"
Are the empty words we hear;
In a world of Nuclear weapons,
Hatred, Hunger, stress and fear.

"Peace and good will"; Still are strangers,
Due to leaders who are blind;
To the good of brotherhood
And the Needs of all mankind.

Oh, if this Yuletide could bring us
Universal unity,
Freedom, truth, and equal justice;
What a heaven earth would be.

The 1960 Valley Forge Patriots Awards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I recently had the great privilege of meeting and talking with five of the winners of the 1960 awards made by the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge in the category of "Letters From Armed Forces Personnel."

The thoughts expressed so well by these winners should serve as an inspiration to us all and as a tribute to the ideals on which the Freedoms Foundation is based.

I warmly commend these writings to my colleagues and to patriots everywhere. I ask unanimous consent to insert these prize-winning letters in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE 1960 VALLEY FORGE PATRIOTS AWARDS

(By Sp4c. Philip J. Webster)

MY VOTE: FREEDOM'S PRIVILEGE

I am 21 years old and a citizen-soldier in the Army of the United States. This year, for the first time, I am eligible to vote.

I am thus called upon to examine one of my most basic, and perhaps most-taken-for-granted freedoms. I am asked to pose this question of myself. What is there about my vote which makes it alone so very important?

Outwardly, my vote is only an X on a ballot, one of thousands of X's on countless numbers of ballots. At first glance, my vote is an impersonal thing, totaled up with millions of others by giant tabulating machines. In comparison with the votes of all my fellow Americans, my vote is as minute as an ant in a colony of anthills, or an atom on the head of a pin.

But inwardly my vote is very personal and vastly important.

My vote, freedom's privilege, is a precious right and a sacred trust—one which has been won for me in a variety of places by hundreds of thousands of men.

My vote was conceived in the minds of men named Washington and Jefferson and Hancock. It was born at Yorktown and Valley Forge, Lake Erie and Fort McHenry, Chancellorsville and Gettysburg. It was nurtured by Admiral Perry and Abraham Lincoln and Robert E. Lee. My vote grew up at San Juan hill and the Argonne and a little beach called Omaha by those who knew it well. It came of age at Iwo Jima and Pearl and Old Baldy and Heartbreak Ridge. And it was kept free by a variety of Americans named Sergeant York and General Patton and just plain Joe.

My vote this year is different from that of my father or grandfather. It is no longer simply a domestic expression of choice. My vote now has international implications. It's the difference between an Eisenhower and a Khrushchev, a Macmillan and a Castro, a De Gaulle and a Tse-tung. It bridges the gap between Dag Hammarskjold and men who answer to the strange sounding names of Mazurov, Tito, Gomulka, Kadar, Zhivkov, Shehu, and Ulbricht.

My vote this year is a shining light which penetrates the darkness behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. It's a guiding beacon to all who hate tyranny and abhor oppression You can hear my vote in the laughter of happy children and the intermittent beepings of a strange aluminum ball named Echo I. It's seen in the long strides of a young Negro athlete named Rafer Johnson and the bright lights of West Berlin's Kurfünstendamm. It's felt by a hungry little orphan gulping a bowl of soup on Quemoy, and by an African chieftain being inoculated against yaws.

Essentially my vote this year is the voice of a freeman, flaunted in the faces of those who wish to bind the world in chains.

I want to keep it that way. That's why I vote.

THE 1960 VALLEY FORGE PATRIOTS AWARDS

(By Capt. Jimmie A. Chezem)

MY VOTE: FREEDOM'S PRIVILEGE

My vote is the privilege, the symbol, and the basic power of freedom. It is a birthright inherited from our forefathers at no personal effort. It must be preserved at all costs and passed on to future generations as a guarantee of their freedom.

My vote is powerful, especially when I use the right of assembly to meet with fellow citizens to openly discuss, dispute, and compromise as a means of arriving at a democratic conclusion based on the principle of the greatest good for the greatest number. By this means, my vote makes the laws under which I live. By its group power I can elect, reject, or impeach the leaders of my country from the highest to the lowest. It enables me to exercise those freedoms guaranteed by the Bill of Rights of our Constitution.

My vote elevates me above the state and its manmade institutions and makes me the supreme reason for the state's existence. It protects me from being subservient and endows me with human dignity through the knowledge and use of my rights as a creation of God. By use of my vote I am an active member of a humanitarian government in which the well-being of the individual is the primary goal. My vote is the basis of the superstructure of the most revolutionary system of government ever developed by man for man.

The authors of our Constitution envisaged my vote as the main weapon in the fight against those minority groups who attempt to dictate government policies for their own benefits. Those authors fought and won against such tyranny and oppression and bequeathed me the rich spiritual and material benefits of their victory. Yet these benefits of freedom have a price tag attached: eternal vigilance and a heavy fist. Tyranny is again threatening the privilege of my vote. Communism seeks to destroy our humanitarian government and replace it with a system which destroys freedom, human rights, human dignity, and the worth of the individual. It seeks to make me a robot of a pseudoutopian system wherein my right to property, religion, family, freedom of speech, thought, and even life are forfeit. Communism is a throwback to the Dark Ages and feudalism, not in terms of science, but in terms of human rights and liberties. It took our forefathers at least 15 centuries to achieve freedom from such conditions, and during the two short centuries since, we have realized undreamed of benefits therefrom.

I choose to throw my lot with those who gave us the Magna Carta, the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights, and our Constitution. And, like them, I choose to live with liberty and freedom or perish protecting that precious heritage, my vote, freedom's privilege.

THE 1960 VALLEY FORGE PATRIOTS AWARDS

(By Pfc. Timothy J. Chwala)

MY VOTE: FREEDOM'S PRIVILEGE

If all other rights were suddenly denied, and only the freedom to vote remained, what fool would cast the first ballot? Man never chooses tyranny. He carelessly abandons freedom and prepares the way for more powerful dictators who might allow him this one privilege if only as the most distinctive relic to mock the hope of yesterday's democracy. The least understood and most neglected of our privileges could easily become the worst form of despair under tyranny.

Not all citizens who should vote, necessarily do, and not all those who vote, necessarily take an active part in other important government affairs. Yet if freedom fails, the fault is not in our ideals, but in ourselves. The importance of my vote is clearly understood, not merely as a part of the entire democratic process, but as a vital part of the nature of man.

The true nature of man can only be understood in relation to his Creator. Since God has entrusted man with the highest office in the physical world by giving him reason and free will, man can honor that trust by accepting and defending the highest office of the human commonwealth, a citizen of a free society. Both offices require certain responsibilities no greater than man's innate capacity to assume.

If either office were unattainable, then man's search for his rightful place in the universe and society would mean more than an endless flight to a never never land. But man not only has the capacity to love and know the truth, he has the stubborn genius to act upon it. He not only has the capacity to love freedom, but the invincible courage to act upon it, fight for it, and die for it if necessary. His ideals are a part of his innermost being, electing his thoughts, governing his actions and leading him to victory in the hour of crisis.

Without truth, my free will and reason are meaningless, and without freedom, my vote is insignificant. Yet if I fail to use my free will and reason to search the truth, if I abandon the most important responsibility of freedom, personal decision, then I not only fail in both offices, as man and citizen, but for tomorrow's heritage.

Communism reduces man to less than an ape, and the citizen to a puppet of state, yet lie cannot efface the truth. The state is a poor substitute for man, for while it robs him of his rightful place before God, it cannot devour the rights that belong to man alone, and still pretend to be beneficial to all men.

The ultimate victory of freedom is found in its universal truth. It never betrays the true nature and dignity of man. If we are faithful to this truth, freedom is faithful to us, and in the final test, a reality for all men.

With a new sense of pride and gratitude for all the centuries of struggle and sacrifice in the long campaign that made this, my first election, a reality, I fully accept my office as citizen of a free nation knowing that each time I cast my vote, freedom votes for me.

THE 1960 VALLEY FORGE PATRIOTS AWARDS

(By Maj. Benjamin W. Eakins)

MY VOTE: FREEDOM'S PRIVILEGE

My vote: freedom's privilege? No. My vote: freedom's privilege!

Freedom places sometimes forgotten and occasionally ignored obligations on those privileged to live apart from slavery and other forms of restraint. We are obligated to support ourselves, to protect ourselves, and to govern ourselves if we are to preserve our freedom. As a group, we collectively maintain our freedom and fulfill our inherent obligations through our individual choices of those who will represent our group as a local, State, or National entity.

My vote reflects my choice of those persons and principles most likely to preserve the freedom I cherish as an individual. My vote is a sacred right, guaranteed to me in our ageless American constitution, but guaranteed only so long as it is exercised continuously and with wisdom. As an American, my vote is especially sacred because it can be exercised without the constraint or guidance imposed in many nations.

In a free society, everyone "votes," whether one fills out a ballot or stays away from the polling place. Either we actively vote to preserve our way of life or passively and by default, we jeopardize all that we hold dear by ignoring our voting right. Voting or not, we are expressing a preference. Shall it be freedom or constraint? Shall it be life under God or life under communism?

But if I exercise my voting right, what can my single vote mean when millions are voting? President Eisenhower has answered that question for all eligible American voters. In the elections of 1884, 1916, and as recently as 1948, just one vote per precinct in one or several of the key States decided the national election in those years. My vote is important. And the weight of my vote becomes greater and its importance more crucial because nearly 40 percent of my fellow Americans who are eligible to vote will not exercise freedom's cherished voting privilege in a positive way by casting their ballots.

Perhaps we need to return to the now obsolete definition of the word "vote." Long ago it meant: "a vow," "a prayer," "an ardent wish or desire." In 1960 we must recapture the zeal and fervor suggested in these old definitions. May each of us actively vote, prayerfully and zealously, for those Americans and those principles we admire and support.

Does this rephrased Mother Goose nursery rhyme really exaggerate the importance of my vote? And your vote?

"For want of my vote

"For want of my vote, my choice lost;
For want of my choice, the nation lost;
For want of my nation, freedom lost;
For want of freedom, God lost;
For want of God, the world was lost,
And all for the want of my vote!"

THE 1960 VALLEY FORGE PATRIOTS AWARDS

(By Lt. Col. Winfield S. Williams)

MY VOTE: FREEDOM'S PRIVILEGE

(A letter to my son on his 11th birthday)

FEBRUARY 3, 1964.

DEAR JOHN: One Sunday afternoon about 3½ years ago, we stood together looking out over the battlefield at Yorktown. You asked me, "Daddy, why did George Washington fight the Redcoats here?" I told you the story of our Revolutionary War and you seemed satisfied.

Later on, while we were watching the two presidential candidates on television, you asked, "Which one is the good guy?" Mother told you they were both "good guys," so your curious little mind wanted to know "Why do we have two men running for President if they're both good guys?"

Son, now that you are about to become a Boy Scout, and learn the meanings of the Scout oath and the Scout law, and your duties to your country, let me answer those questions you asked so long ago.

First, why did George Washington fight the Redcoats? As you know now, the Redcoats were the soldiers representing the King of England and the Governors of the American Colonies. We did not have a United States then, but 13 Colonies of righteous, thinking, God-fearing people who wanted to have representation in their Government. In the beginning, they did not seek a government of their own, but only the right to vote on the matters that affected them. Their watchword became "Taxation without representation in tyranny."

So, what was George Washington really fighting for? Yes, the right to be heard in the matters of government. He and his fellow patriots gained for us a new freedom and established a new way of life in the world because they wanted the right to vote.

Under our form of government, we choose our leaders. Each of us when we become 21 years old, is given the right to vote. Although our Constitution grants us this right, we must earn it by being loyal and trustworthy citizens.

In the election that you became aware of 3 years ago and wanted to know "which was the good guy," we had two principal candidates to choose between. Each man believed in America, in our democratic way of life, and in the safety of our country. It was only the way in which each proposed to accomplish his ideas that was the difference. So, after listening to their arguments, weighing their records, we chose one to become our President for the next 4 years. Both mother and I voted for the candidate of our choice.

Now, if we do not like the way he guided our Government, at the end of his term, it is our privilege to choose someone else. If the man that I voted for did not win, I may have been all the more critical of the man in office. But because I did vote, I have the right to speak out for those things that I believe in. And John, if the man I voted for became President, who knows—maybe it was my one vote that made the difference.

Yes, son, in our great country, just one vote can make the difference as to which candidate is elected. That is why it is so important that everyone who has the right to vote, does vote. Now that you are growing up, more and more you will have to make decisions. Sometimes in your school classes, in your scouting, or in your play groups, you will have to choose between two ways of doing things when it concerns many people. Under our American way, you will vote on these things. Now is the time for you to learn to choose your sides well.

You have inherited from your forefathers a country of free people, governed by free people. It is for you to grow strong in mind and body so that when you become a man you will be ready to accept the privileges of voting and the responsibilities of freedom.

Love,

DAD.

Federal Funds for New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1961

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, on January 26 of this year, I introduced legislation in this House calling for $4,404,000 of Federal funds to assist New York City in defraying the extraordinary expenses incurred during the fifth General Assembly of the United Nations last fall.

My objective in the introduction of this bill was to reimburse the city of New York so that they could compensate their police force at time and a half rates for the overtime duty of these men at the U.N. last fall.

I believe that everyone agrees, the heroes of the New York City summit were the policemen. They truly proved themselves as "New York's finest," during the most sensitive and tense days in the city's history. Any dereliction of police duty could have resulted in a holocaust for the entire Nation. Surely these men are entitled to be paid for the overtime they put in.

Mr. Speaker, surely the people of America want to share in this significant expression of gratitude.

The other day I received a letter from Mr. John J. Cassese, the able president of the Patrolmen's Benevolent Association of New York. I should like his comments included in the RECORD as substantiation of the need for these funds:

PATROLMEN'S BENEVOLENT
ASSOCIATION OF THE
CITY OF NEW YORK, INC.,
New York, N.Y., January 27, 1961.

Hon. SEYMOUR HALPERN
House Office Building,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HALPERN: I wish to take this opportunity to convey the sincere thanks of our members for your comments on their discharge of duty during the Fifteenth General Assembly of the United Nations.

As has been recognized by the majority of United Nations' dignitaries and all the Nation's major news media, the slightest divergence from the most diligent discharge of duty by New York City's policemen during this period could well have been responsible for an international incident.

As is well known to you, Congressman HALPERN, members of the force worked as many as 30 consecutive days without any time off. In addition, there were numerous instances in which the members performed 16 hours of duty within a 24-hour period. Notwithstanding this sacrifice, the morale of the men left nothing to be desired during the entire period of the emergency, a factor which positively proves that New York's Finest are always prepared to give their all when the exigencies so require.

In view of the hardships borne and the unquestionable devotion to duty by those men, the request that they be compensated at the rate of time and a half appears to be a most reasonable one, particularly in view

of the relative amount of additional remuneration, i.e., $1,468,000, required to justly compensate for this extraordinary display of devotion to duty.

Be assured that your efforts in behalf of New York's policemen are deeply appreciated and I might add that they feel confident that you will exert every effort to have them compensated at the rate of time and a half.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN J. CASSESE,
President.

Canadian Trade With Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, for some time there have been disturbing reports that Canada was stepping up its trade with Cuba following the action by the U.S. Government in halting the export of critical and strategic materials from our country to the Castro government. Such reports were not only disturbing but also puzzling to me for I am convinced—as I am sure every Canadian is convinced—that the problem of a Communist government penetrating the vitals of our hemisphere is just as massive a threat to our sister nation of the north as it is to the United States, or indeed to any nation in our hemisphere. To every country and to every citizen in both continents communism is the common enemy—the implacable enemy.

I wish to report, therefore, I was greatly relieved to read a recent article in the Miami Herald of February 6 reporting that a private research group has openly stated that Canada is not encouraging trade with Cuba. In stating Canada's position, the report says:

It should be emphasized that the Canadian Government has taken no initiative to encourage such trade. The Cuban Government's flamboyant claims that Canada can be closely linked with Iron Curtain countries as "friends" of Cuba leaves most Canadians disturbed.

The Castro government has launched a broad propaganda effort to make Americans believe that Canada wants to increase and encourage its trade with Cuba. I think that it is important that we do everything possible to nail that lie. I ask unanimous consent that the article in the Miami Herald be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CANADA NOT ENCOURAGING CUBAN TRADE, LEADERS SAY

WASHINGTON.—Fears that Canada has stepped in to fill the trade void between Cuba and the United States are unfounded, a private research group reported Sunday.

The Canadian-American Committee said Cuban propaganda efforts and press reports have given the impression that Canada is encouraging trade with the regime of Cuban Premier Fidel Castro.

"It should be emphasized that the Canadian Government has taken no initiative to encourage such trade," the group said. "The Cuban Government's flamboyant claims that Canada can be closely linked with Iron Curtain countries as friends of Cuba leaves most Canadians disturbed."

The committee said the Canadian Government "has provided no special encouragement to Canadian business to explore export opportunities in Cuba and it has taken no action to encourage imports from Cuba."

The committee, composed of business, agricultural, labor and professional leaders from both sides of the border, was established 3 years ago to study problems affecting Canada and the United States.

It is headed by Robert M. Fowler, president of the Canadian Pulp & Paper Association, and R. Douglas Stuart, board chairman of the Quaker Oats Co.

"Economic relations between Canada and Cuba did not deteriorate after the Castro revolution," the committee said, and thus "Canada obviously did not have a basis similar to that of the United States for economic sanctions against Cuba in its own national interests."

The Cuban Government has sought to encourage the view that Canada can fill the economic gap created by the U.S. embargo against Cuba, the group said in a report.

"It is important for people in the United States to recognize that this is propaganda and, moreover, that such propaganda is not received with any enthusiasm in Canada," the committee said.

The report said that no "serious conflict of views between Canadian and United States Government officials" exist on the question of Canadian trade with Cuba.

Indiana's Gateway to the Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the Fort Wayne Journal-Gazette recently had an editorial concerning efforts to construct a public port on Lake Michigan in Indiana. This will be Indiana's gateway to the St. Lawrence Seaway.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIANA'S GATEWAY TO THE SEAWAY

Future history will show that the bill to create an Indiana Port Commission to construct a public port on Lake Michigan will be the most important bill to come before the 1961 session of the Hoosier general assembly.

This port will be Indiana's gateway to the St. Lawrence Seaway.

It will be a portal to growth and prosperity for the entire State.

The senate already has passed the bill by a nearly unanimous vote.

The house is expected to do likewise. And there is every reason why it should.

This bill is not a partisan matter. It has the support of the leaders of both parties.

It is not a political matter. It affords a rare economic opportunity.

The State must not let slip such a golden gift for the want of enabling legislation.

The port of Indiana will place our State upon the seven seas.

It will permit us to have access to raw materials which have never before been available.

We can ship our manufactured products and our agricultural surplus direct by water to the markets of the world.

Indiana will have new factories, increased employment, astounding growth, higher property values and a new burst of general prosperity.

The money which the port will cost can be considered a sound investment.

The revenue bond issue which is proposed to finance the port facilities will be self-liquidating by new wealth created.

W. M. Kiplinger, nationally known writer on business and financial matters, says in his book entitled "Your Guide to a Higher Income," that the Middle West will be the big industrial center of the Nation during the next 20 years.

He predicts that the area will add some 20 million people during the next two decades. He declares that no single group of States will add as many people as the five States of Indiana, Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, and Wisconsin.

The great opportunity is holding out its hands to us. All we have to do is grasp them.

Let's pass the port of Indiana bill, build the port, and go forward to meet our destiny.

Right To Vote Denied

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Evening News, of Newburg, N.Y., sums up very neatly the situation brought about by the recent change in the Rules Committee.

The writer of the editorial has seen through all the talk of letting the House work its will. The House will work its will when and as it always has. The power of the Rules Committee has merely been shifted back to where it was in the days of Speaker Cannon, but the power remains greater than ever.

The editorial follows:

RIGHT TO VOTE DENIED

Those who were critical of our Hudson Valley Congressmen who voted against Speaker RAYBURN'S packing of the Rules Committee said they did not approve of the Rules Committee's ability to prevent the House of Representatives from voting on a bill.

The critics (and they included some rather loud voices from our section) held it wasn't proper for a committee like Rules to be able to bottle up legislation and keep it from coming to the floor.

Those who opposed packing of the committee, including our own KATHERINE ST. GEORGE, J. ERNEST WHARTON, and ROBERT BARRY, held that enlarging the committee to permit Speaker RAYBURN to add the necessary votes to give him control of the committee would only shift to him the power to prevent a floor vote.

They were proved right last week, but we doubt if the advocates of congressional right to vote ever can admit it.

The Rules Committee had before it a measure to let the House permit broadcasting of its activities—a measure long opposed by Speaker RAYBURN. Another would have prohibited Federal spending not covered by appropriations.

Did the Rules Committee let these measures come up for vote on the floor of the House?

It did not. By a vote of 8–6 (thanks to the two additional votes controlled by the Speaker), the Rules Committee voted not to let either matter come to the floor of the House.

There has been a strange silence from those who said the Rules Committee should not be permitted to bottle up legislation.

Can it be these critics were not opposed to the committee's power to bottle up legislation? Can it be they only cried when the committee had the power to bottle so-called liberal legislation?

Area Redevelopment: A Must in 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1961

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that on February 27, 1959, I submitted testimony to the Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency in support of area redevelopment legislation. Two years later—in fact, to the day—on February 27, I was scheduled to appear before Subcommittee No. 2 of the House Banking and Currency Committee—again in support of this legislation. Unfortunately, I was unable to personally testify on this long overdue program because of a recent illness. However, I was given the privilege of submitting a statement to the subcommittee. I hope, Mr. Speaker, this Congress will see fit to preserve for all of the Nation's citizens opportunity and human dignity by enacting area redevelopment legislation. My statement to the subcommittee follows:

Mr. Chairman, it is with much regret that a recent illness prevented my personally appearing before your subcommittee last Monday, February 27, in support of the area redevelopment bill. However, I appreciate having the opportunity of submitting a statement in support of this much needed program.

Since the 84th Congress I have been exerting every effort toward the support of legislation to provide extended Federal assistance to depressed areas. I refuse to become discouraged because of past presidential vetoes of bills which, in my opinion, were desperately needed to protect this Nation's great human resources. Again this year, as in the past, I am prepared to fight with all my God-given strength to see the Area Redevelopment Act born to reality.

It is with honor and privilege that I represent the people of the 14th District of Michigan. I am entering my 25th year of service—and through this quarter of a century I have been a part of their efforts to build a finer community and to respond to the call of our Nation through wars and national emergencies. This time, it is my district which needs the response and support of its mother Nation—for this day thousands, yes, 165,000 citizens of this great city of Detroit, cannot find gainful employment, cannot support their families, and they are begging for an honest day's work. But these people have been pushed off that magical path of opportunity through no fault of their own.

This is not a peculiar situation happening only to Detroit or to just one industrial center, but one that is like a growing cancer which has spread to communities large and small—industrial and agricultural—throughout our Nation; and, if not treated now, it can eat its way into our economic backbone and produce irreparable damage to our national strength.

These communities and their States have tried desperately to fight this curse of unemployment. They have cried time and time again for help through their legislative representatives. The Congress responded twice—only to have been answered by Executive vetoes.

Mr. Chairman, we must renew our fight. We must muster all the strength of this legislative body which speaks for the people. We must provide the laws necessary to recapture the vitality of our national economy and give to the people of our Nation a program providing the methods to enable our distressed areas to achieve lasting improvement and to enhance their domestic prosperity by establishing stable and diversified local economies. This legislation will give us strength not only at home but will, indeed, prove to the world we are still one nation under God striving to preserve for all its citizens opportunity and human dignity.

On behalf of the 165,000 unemployed in Detroit and hundreds of thousands in other depressed areas, I urge the committee to favorably consider the area redevelopment bill and to report it at the earliest possible moment.

Thank you.

New Gag on House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARLETON J. KING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following editorial published February 27, 1961, in the Saratogian, Saratoga Springs, N.Y.

NEW GAG ON HOUSE

For sheer political hypocrisy, nothing outranks the pious professions of devotion to majority rule voiced by House "liberals" in the Rules Committee fight.

They said that all they wanted was to make sure the full House had a chance to vote on all liberal legislation blocked by Rules Committee Chairman HOWARD W. SMITH and his conservative coalition. And so they got the House to okay, by a narrow margin, the backing of the committee with two more Democrats favorable to their legislative cause.

Since then, Chairman SMITH (not without some political vindictiveness) has advocated passing along all bills on the committee's calendar for full House vote. This week, these happened to include laws proposing televised proceedings of House committees and an end to wasteful "back door" spending without appropriations.

Did the new Rules Committee majority let these bills reach the House floor? Not on your life. Speaker SAM RAYBURN, who engineered the committee-packing operation, opposes these measures. So his faithful followers put them back on the shelf, eliminating any chance of a House vote.

One power group has replaced another. It's as simple as that, and democracy has nothing to do with it.

Paper Reports Crack Combat Troops Used as Waiters and Dishwashers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I bring to the attention of the House an editorial from the Overseas Weekly a publication widely circulated among military personnel and their families in Europe.

No comment is necessary. The editorial speaks for itself.

Here is the text of the editorial from the Overseas Weekly:

WHILE BACK AT HEADQUARTERS

Exercise Winter Shield II has been one of the most realistic, effective training maneuvers for NATO defense troops in the history of that postwar hemispheric alliance.

But even as some 50,000 troops were fighting the mud, snow and bitter cold—in addition to their simulated enemy—interesting sidelights were taking place back at "Cyclone," the command headquarters in Vilseck.

Here are some items:

1. Almost 70 crack combat troops from the 9th Cavalry's border reconnaissance units traded in their panzer helmets and tank-mechanics' tools for "waiters' whites" and special training in dishwashing for visiting VIPS.

Seventh Army, which handled the mammoth maneuver, tagged B Troop of the 24th Infantry Division to play waiters and KP's to the nearly 500 observers who dropped into Vilseck. These same GI's who have become world famous for their sturdy watches on the East German and Czechoslovakian borders, became known as "GOB (Guest Observer Bureau) slaves," to the troops living under field conditions.

The men were sent to a special 2-day class in how to serve and how to make sure that every plate and glass was sparkling clean. They served each other at mock meals and the best 48 were selected as waiters. Those who didn't come up to snuff were sent into the kitchen.

Orders were cut for 24 cooks, 3 salad men and 4 bakers to report to duty at Vilseck. Ten of these men were hand selected out of the 111 messes under the supervision of W3 George T. Hanlon, 7th Army Support Command food adviser.

These combat troops served 2,300 meals daily in two special mess halls, one for generals and colonels and another for lower ranks and civilian guests.

"We were feeding more meals than any damn hotel in the world," Hanlon said, "and we were established like a hotel with special men for salads, desserts, meat, soups and gravies."

While some of the tankers turned out command performances as waiters, others rushed

around in the clubs wiping ash trays and delivering drinks.

"Most of our recipes came right out of Gourmet magazine and after each meal we had a critique for the waiters to see what they were doing right and wrong," Hanlon said.

Although the meals were alleged to be standard QM issue, the menus (two selections each meal) included such treats as lobster, steaks soaked overnight in wine and garlic.

2. Billeting and feeding 500 guests made necessary one of the biggest administrative complexities in Army history too.

The roster of notables included 9 full generals, 16 major generals, 64 lieutenant generals, 55 brigadier generals, 119 colonels and over 100 visiting newsmen, all of whom were given red carpet treatment and, reportedly, a healthy allotment of the maneuver budget.

Under wartime conditions, neither the generals nor the press would be afforded hotel accommodations or valuable Army officers to escort them wherever they went, checking on their needs and comforts.

3. As the maneuver came to a close, a top official disclosed that gas for observer vehicles was at a premium. The reason was that jeeps, staff cars, and helicopters had been requisitioned from most commands to ferry VIP's around Germany to follow the battle and bring them back to the Vilseck club at night.

Defense budgets being what they are, officials could do well to reevaluate next year's Winter Shield and give visiting VIP's more of the taste of mud and simulated combat and less luxury at public expense.

Cincinnati Says, "No, Thanks"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON H. SCHERER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, shortly the Members of Congress are going to vote on a Federal aid to education bill. I am proud of the position taken by both the Cincinnati Board of Education and Archbishop Karl Alter on the subject. Their attitude and that of Cincinnati generally is set forth in an excellent editorial in the Cincinnati Enquirer of Monday, February 20, entitled "Cincinnati Says, 'No, Thanks' ":

CINCINNATI SAYS, "NO, THANKS"

It would be a salutary thing if every school district in America spoke up with the same kind of frankness, honesty, and courage that characterized last week's statement from the members of the Cincinnati Board of Education. The subject was Federal aid to education, and the seven board members, acting as individuals rather than as a board, took a strong stand against Federal financial support for Cincinnati's public schools and for the Nation's.

Several weeks ago, Archbishop Karl Alter made a similar declaration in opposition to Federal aid to education.

The impressive thing about the statement of the Cincinnati Board of Education members is that it comes from the individuals most intimately acquainted with Cincinnati's educational needs. The same, of course, is true of Archbishop Alter's statement in behalf of the Cincinnati area's Catholic school system. Both statements similarly came from individuals keenly interested in education. Neither can be dismissed as the utterance of those who put economy ahead of an adequate and educational program.

The members of the board of education based their opposition on two convictions:

They believe, first of all, that Cincinnati, at least, needs no program of massive Federal activity in the field of education. They, of course, are the individuals best equipped to know.

They believe, secondly, that Federal financial contributions to State and local educational systems will inevitably and eventually mean Federal control. And just as Cincinnatians are better equipped than anyone in Washington to know Cincinnati's financial needs, so are Cincinnatians better equipped than the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to measure Cincinnati's educational needs.

The national record shows that only 1 school district in 200 has indebted itself to the legal limit to build classrooms. Only 1 district in 200, in other words, has done all it can do to solve its own educational problems.

That fact alone would seem to discredit those who contend that the Nation's educational system is crying out for relief from Washington.

The statements of Cincinnati's educational authorities discredit these cries even further. If school officials in the other cities of America should speak up with equal candor, the cause of Federal aid to education would be doomed.

Testimony of Gov. David L. Lawrence, Before the House Committee on Banking and Currency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the distinguished Governor of my State, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Hon. David L. Lawrence, appeared before Subcommittee No. 2 of the House Committee on Banking and Currency in support of H.R. 4569, the proposed Area Redevelopment Act. He was accompanied by the Honorable William L. Batt, Jr., secretary of labor and industry of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, as well as the Honorable J. Eric Jones, deputy secretary of the Pennsylvania Department of Commerce.

A copy of Governor Lawrence's excellent statement before the committee is set forth below:

TESTIMONY OF GOV. DAVID L. LAWRENCE, OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY ON H.R. 4569, PROPOSED AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 1, 1961

The citizens of Pennsylvania strongly favor the passage of an adequate and effective Area Redevelopment Act. We ask for the passage of this legislation not as an act which will benefit only Pennsylvania and a few other States, but as a measure to promote the general welfare of the entire Nation.

We in Pennsylvania are keenly aware of the need for area redevelopment legislation. This is only natural. After all, we have more than our share of the problem. With only 6½ percent of the Nation's labor force, we have 17 percent of the chronic unemployment areas and 21 percent of the total number of workers jobless in chronic unemployment areas.

Nevertheless, we ask our sister States to keep in mind that the benefits of this legislation will accrue to every section of the Nation, regardless of its rate of unemployment.

This should not be surprising. We see evidences every day of the complex interrelationships of our society. When an automobile plant in Detroit closes down, steelworkers in Pittsburgh lose their jobs. And, when steelworkers in Pittsburgh lose their jobs, farmers in Kansas, hatmakers in Connecticut, clothing workers in New York, and appliance manufacturers in New Jersey find that their own economic positions have worsened. And so on down the line.

We are all part of the same organic whole, and if I may paraphrase Benjamin Franklin, gentlemen, we must surely pull together on this problem or most assuredly we will all be pulled down separately.

It is our hope that there is no question by this time of the fact that long-term chronic area unemployment exists; that it is costly not only in terms of money but also in terms of wasted human resources; that it is caused by declining industries in once-prosperous places; and that it is causing a great hardship to many people.

These are the points which we and others have made time and time again in testimony before this and other congressional groups. But, for the record, let me review them briefly:

First, we know that there is such a thing as long-term chronic area unemployment. The Department of Labor reports that 94 out of a total 270 classified labor market areas are suffering from chronic long-term unemployment. These areas produce a large percentage of the long-term unemployed. These are people who hardly ever work, in good times or in bad.

Pennsylvania is a case in point. While employment was growing nationally by 11 percent, during the so-called fabulous fifties, Pennsylvania's total employment dropped by 3½ percent; in our chronic unemployment areas, the drop ranged from 6 to 31 percent.

This unsolved problem is costly almost beyond belief. If we had had high employment in our surplus labor areas in Pennsylvania during the past 5 years, we would have saved some $375 million in unemployment compensation and public assistance alone—almost the entire cost of the bill which is now before you. And, this does not take into account lost taxes. Also consider how much higher business sales would have been in these areas if we had had high employment. And consider how much more farm products would we have consumed.

This condition is not a result of any particular sin or blunder on our part. From 1950 to 1960, we lost some 230,000 jobs in only 4 industries—anthracite mining, bituminous mining, textiles, and railroad. For the most part, these losses stemmed from the general economic advancement of the country. For instance, when the railroads started using oil, we lost jobs in both railroading and mining. We favor economic progress; but we'd like some help in getting a little bit of the same medicine for ourselves.

Look at a map of Pennsylvania and you will see how areas of substantial and persistent labor surplus blanket the State. Look at a chart and you will see how our rate of unemployment has consistently been higher than the national average.

However, you would have to come to Pennsylvania to bring yourself face to face with

the human misery that results. You have to see the number of persons on public assistance rolls who are neither children, nor older persons, nor disabled. You have to see the shacks and the shanties. You have to talk to the men whose wives work in the garment factories while they stay home.

Some people do not believe that the Federal Government should help solve this problem. However, this is a national problem and not a local one, as I have already stated. It transcends State boundaries and hurts everyone.

There are a few who hold that a Federal bill involves too much Federal control, and that this would be distasteful. Yet, we have had State legislation of this type for 5 years, and we have not yet had one complaint from a locality that we were unduly interfering in its affairs.

I am also familiar with the argument that the bill will not work, that industrial loans are not effective in creating employment in depressed areas. Fortunately, we in Pennsylvania have some tangible proof that the bill will work. The Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority has loaned a total of $17,492,323 for new plants or expansions of existing plants. Total costs of these projects over the 5 years the plants have been in existence, are $55,934,724. As you can appreciate, this in itself can have an important impact on the economy. These loans have been distributed in 41 counties and in 69 separate communities.

But the State does not go it alone in these efforts. Nonprofit community agencies have participated in these projects with loans totaling approximately $11 million. And banks and other private lending agencies have added more than $26 million.

Most importantly, in the 5 years since its creation, PIDA has accounted for 26,002 new factory jobs with estimated annual payrolls of $93,099,658.

If there is one thing certain, it is that the Pennsylvania State Legislature will continue, and will increase, this effort to create new job opportunities in Pennsylvania.

The roster of companies lists many blue chips. Contrary to the oft-repeated fallacy that only fly-by-night concerns are attracted, leading industrial firms such as RCA, Eberhard-Faber, SKF, Fruehauf, and Mergenthaler have moved into, or expanded within, our surplus labor areas as a result of our industrial loan program.

Another familiar argument which you gentlemen have undoubtedly been getting from opponents of the bill is that it would subsidize uneconomic areas; that natural laws ought to come into play; that if the people in distressed areas had any gumption, they'd move out.

These arguments are all wrong. Our surplus labor areas are prime industrial locations. We have abundant water, magnificent transportation (which will be even better in the next few years as our vast new road-building program gets going), a reasonable and competitive tax climate, a most advantageous location to markets, unsurpassed recreation and scenery, and a hard-working, skilled labor force. Most of the companies which have expanded within, or moved into, Pennsylvania have done very well, indeed. Some of our best industrial development salesmen are the executives of the companies which benefited under our industrial development program.

Moreover, those members of our population who can leave have done so. As you gentlemen know, we may lose three seats in the House of Representatives because our population growth has not kept pace with the rest of the Nation.

Many of our unemployed have moved from our labor surplus areas into other States; and even within the State there has been a dramatic shift of population from the labor surplus areas into the labor markets with better employment prospects. Many people from depressed areas commute long distances to work. Many young people have left. The president of one community college reported that more than 90 percent of his graduates had to leave the area to find employment.

Some people find it easy to leave their home communities. Others cannot. Their roots go deep. They have strong emotional and cultural attachments to families, to friends, to churches, and these are not easily tossed aside. Many have reached the age where it is difficult, if not impossible, to find employment in a strange city. Many have all their savings in their homes—homes for which there is no longer any market.

You will hear one more argument, I am sure, before this bill is finally decided upon. Someone will state that the recession will be over before the bill's provisions have time to take effect. I certainly hope that it will be.

But this bill is not an antirecession measure. The current unemployment figures bear little relationship to the need for this bill.

The Area Redevelopment Act is designed to reduce long-term chronic unemployment among people who live in labor surplus areas. It is not a substitute for legislation to help those who have exhausted their unemployment compensation benefits.

We in Pennsylvania fervently hope that other antirecession measures taken by the President and the Congress will soon have their effect. When and if they do, and if this bill is still under consideration, we earnestly ask that you disregard an improving economic situation and look behind the immediate short-run employment gains to concentrate on the insidious, steadily growing, long-term chronic area unemployment.

That is what we are trying to get at in this bill, and we must not allow false issues to obscure the real objective.

Three factors in connection with the bill itself need mention:

First, I hope that you will not reduce the authorized amounts for the various programs covered by the bill. Indeed, measured by the great cost of area unemployment and by the great need for a bold and substantial program, these are modest amounts. Even by standards of this Nation's aid to foreign countries, they are small.

We have shown in Pennsylvania that substantial sums of money can be put to productive use in a program of this type. We are confident that once our sister States begin moving at our rate of industrial expansion, there will be little enough to spare—especially in the industrial loan program.

Second, we are particularly interested in those provisions of the bill which will make it possible for us to clear more blighted areas for new industrial projects. We have 45 urban redevelopment authorities at work in Pennsylvania, and, with the exception of Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, the Commonwealth is matching their expenditures dollar for dollar.

Incidentally, this—like the PIDA program—is just another example of what we are doing to help ourselves. We are not sitting back and waiting for Federal programs in area redevelopment. We are pulling just as hard as we can, and we would welcome a strong partner in the harness.

Third, we would like the record to show that we prefer an independent agency to administer this bill, as outlined in the version now being considered in the Senate. This is a new concept at the Federal level, and it will require bold and imaginative thinking. Existing agencies tend to hesitate too long in the implementation of a new program.

However, we are mainly concerned with the passage of this legislation, and we would regret its delay or abandonment as a result of a disagreement on where responsibility should be placed for its administration.

There will be many difficulties in the way of success for an area redevelopment administration. We should make sure that instead of placing roadblocks in the way, we provide a vehicle which has the ability to go all the way.

This is not the first time that Pennsylvania has testified on behalf of an area redevelopment bill of this type. But I sincerely hope that it will be the last time. It is not that any of us from Pennsylvania find the journey down here onerous or the Congress unfriendly. On the contrary, it has always been a pleasure.

Nevertheless, it is time now for Congress once again to pass a bill, and this time we can be sure that a good bill will not be vetoed by the President. We are all confident that the Congress will indeed pass a good bill. And when the President finally affixes his signature on that bill, we will have come to a turning in a long road.

The new road will also be long. It may even be twisting and rocky. Yet, I am confident that we can traverse that road successfully and reach our goal. When that day comes, we can, all of us—those who have worked for the bill in and out of Congress—take credit for a notable achievement in conquering human misery and contributing to a healthy and prosperous Nation.

Here's Junket Which May Make Us Dollars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a clipping about a trip which two members of my committee took in order to get information on the travel bill which was introduced last year and which has been reintroduced this year. One of the members is a member of a subcommittee of which I am chairman, and was present during the consideration of the legislation last year before the subcommittee. These men have put in quite an extensive report, and I include the enclosed story from the Fort Worth Press showing their purpose, and our purpose in the travel legislation which can make dollars for the United States. I am convinced that we can do that:

HERE'S JUNKET WHICH MAY MAKE US DOLLARS

(By Jack Steele)

WASHINGTON.—A round-the-world "junket" by two Members of Congress may pay off this year by speeding the creation of the Government's first official travel bureau. Its aim would be to encourage foreign tourists to "see America first"—and thus help ease the current U.S. dollar shortage.

The two world travelers—Representatives LEO W. O'BRIEN, Democrat, of New York, and ROBERT W. HEMPHILL, Democrat, of South Carolina—joined today in an enthusiastic endorsement of plans to set up such a travel bureau in the Commerce Department to seek a bigger slice of the world's tourist dollars for the United States.

O'BRIEN and HEMPHILL predicted such a Government travel agency could bring this

country at least $250 million a year—and perhaps as much as $500 million—in increased revenues from tourism.

This, they noted, would put a big dent in the Nation's so-called "balance of payments" deficit and possibly head off more drastic moves, such as restrictions on the travel of Americans abroad, to curtail the escape of gold and dollars.

Americans now spend at least $1 billion a year more in overseas travel than foreign tourists spend in the United States. This is one of the major sources of the steady drain in recent years on the Nation's gold reserves.

The gold shortage helped spur the Senate last June to pass a bill, sponsored by Senators WARREN MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington, and JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, of New York, to create such a travel bureau. But it was sidetracked in the House Commerce Committee, where Representative HEMPHILL was one of those who dragged his feet.

Last month HEMPHILL joined O'BRIEN, ranking Democrat on the House Interior Committee, on a world tour to look into the need for such a bureau. They visited, among other places, Australia, New Zealand, Japan, Hong Kong, London, Edinburgh, Copenhagen, and Oslo.

They were amazed to find, they reported today, that other governments—even those of tiny and supposedly impoverished countries—are spending millions to lure tourists while the United States is doing nothing.

"In London we found that British tourists who were interested in visiting this country cuoldn't even obtain U.S. maps," HEMPHILL noted.

HEMPHILL said he was drafting a new bill to create the proposed travel bureau in the Commerce Department and predicted that it would win quick committee approval. O'Brien said he would do all he could to help speed it through the House.

The Senate bill would have provided up to $5 million a year to finance such a bureau. It did not spell out how it would be spent, but presumably most would have gone for advertising the United States abroad as a tourist attraction. The British government now spends about $2 million a year on tourist advertising in this country alone.

HEMPHILL and O'BRIEN have another idea about how the travel bureau should spend its money.

They suggested travel offices be set up in all major countries which now send tourists to the United States to promote and encourage such travel.

Odd Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following editorial published February 27, 1961, in the Saratogian, Saratoga Springs, N.Y.:

ODD AID

President Kennedy's program for Federal aid to schools is a grab bag with a few apparent rules about the grabbing. It makes no concessions to the valid arguments that many States don't bother to spend enough for education and provides no incentive for them to spend more.

Most Americans would sympathize with a bill to provide Federal aid for poverty-stricken communities where youngsters cannot be given proper educational facilities. With proper safeguards to compel matching effort by recipient States, a bill to press school construction where it is urgently needed might also draw nearly universal support.

But the Kennedy program is the same old, tired proposal to take money from the rich (such as New York State taxpayers) and give it to the poor, such as those in Mississippi. The poor, many of whom are not making nearly the proportionate effort to educate their children they could and should, would not be compelled to increase their effort.

The Presidential message says they would be "expected" to do more. The expectation is naive. Gifts from Washington do not have that utopian effect.

If this bill is defeated, as it should be, perhaps a more limited, realistic program can be pressed. When States such as Kentucky bind themselves constitutionally not to borrow more than $50,000 a year for any purpose, why should taxpayers from Saratoga County be called on to pay the education bill for them? This area has a magnificent record for taxing itself for schools and teachers' salaries. Before Federal aid is given anywhere, there is a moral right to insist that the same effort, in proportion to income, should be made by all.

A Neighborly Idea Pays Off

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE M. KILGORE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, my congressional district, the 15th of Texas, borders on the Republic of Mexico; therefore I am keenly interested in inter-American relations. Because of this, I was especially impressed by a recent article in the Austin, Tex., American. It tells a compelling story of an individual good neighbor plan put into effect some years ago through the efforts and support of the able Senator from Texas, WM. A. BLAKLEY.

Senator BLAKLEY'S one-man good-neighbor program has made it possible for a number of Latin American lawyers to do graduate work at Southern Methodist University in Dallas in the law, institutions, and governments of American nations.

One of the conditions Senator BLAKLEY imposed on this program, however, was that his contribution be kept anonymous. For several years this was possible, but because of the uniqueness of the program, his effort was publicized first by word of mouth of those participating and later by newspaper stories.

The program is a continuing one. Already it has accomplished much that, in the words of the president of the Southwestern Legal Foundation is "stimulating and rewarding." It is an excellent example of private enterprise helping build up better relations in Latin America.

Because of widespread interest in a program of this nature, I ask unanimous consent that the newspaper story of this inspiring project be carried in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

A NEIGHBORLY IDEA PAYS OFF

(By Lorraine Barnes)

A good neighbor idea that found a good friend in U.S. Senator WILLIAM A. BLAKLEY is reaping benefits for the United States around the free world.

A summary of the results has just been made by Robert G. Storey, president of Southwestern Legal Foundation, Dallas, and dean of Southern Methodist University Law School. He called the 9-year-old project stimulating and rewarding in what it has accomplished for U.S. relations in Latin America and Asia.

Under the program, which BLAKLEY has financed through the legal foundation, lawyers from Western Hemisphere Republics and elsewhere come to the SMU campus for a full year's graduate study of the law, institutions and governments of the American nations. A number of them now occupy topranking positions in their own governments.

"In 1951 I made a proposition to BILL BLAKLEY to start the Law Institute of the Americas," Storey said. "He listened and then agreed to do it provided his own contribution would be anonymous."

Grinning, Storey supplied the exact quote. "He said, 'I'll do it if you won't tell a soul.'"

BLAKLEY'S support of the program was not known until a few years ago, and even now the amount of his contributions has not been made public.

A successful businessman, lawyer and rancher, BLAKLEY believes strongly in inter-American cooperation based on mutual liking and respect. He has repeatedly described "a family of friendly nations" as the strongest bastion against communism, and warned against letting United States-Latin American relations deteriorate.

The Law Institute of the Americas quickly drew attention outside the Western Hemisphere. Storey began to get inquiries about the program from Far East countries—Korea, Japan, Thailand—striving to adapt age-old judicial concepts to modern needs. Could some of their bright young men come to Dallas, too?

Storey presented plans for a similar project to other prominent men—among them the late Fred Florence and Karl Hoblitzelle—and in 1955 the Academy of American Law was founded. It provides a program of study in the theory and practice of American legal institutions and the American legal system for lawyers outside the Western Hemisphere who have not had training in the common law.

"So the original idea expanded into a worldwide program. This would not have been possible but for the success of the Law Institute of the Americas, which BILL BLAKLEY quickly and wholeheartedly recognized the value of," Storey said. "It all goes back to him."

Fellowships are awarded to lawyers who have had at least 2 years of experience—in practice or as professors or judges. Tuition, fees, books, room, and meals are provided along with a monthly allowance for incidental expenses.

Well over a hundred of the institute's alumni are scattered through the Western Hemisphere. Storey and BLAKLEY have met many of them on trips through Latin America, and they are impressed with the quality of leadership the program has fostered.

Dr. Julio Cueto-Rua of Buenos Aires, one of the institute's first graduates, served as minister of industry and commerce in Argentina's post-Peron provisional government. "He did a marvelous job," Storey said, not-

ably in management of his country's mineral resources and negotiating the first contract with a private firm for development of Argentine oil.

Youthful (37), brilliant and capable, Cueto-Rua is the leader of Argentina's conservatives and a much-discussed presidential possibility. (Anti-American elements taunt Cueto-Rua with the charge that his daughter has a "Yankee" name. It is true. She is named Maria Dallas, for the city in which she was born.)

Among others, graduates include two ministers of the Republic of Columbia, two or three ambassadors to the United Nations, many distinguished judges, attorneys and professors. A 45-year-old Thailand judge (oldest student to be admitted to the program) made the highest grades; he is now a member of Thailand's supreme court. A Korean woman lawyer—first of her sex to be admitted to the Korean bar—also studied American legal procedures at the Texas-based academy; she is now married to Korea's foreign minister. A Cuban student who became general counsel of the Atlantic Oil Co. of Cuba is presently living in Spain, an exile from the Castro regime.

Representative John Brademas, of Indiana, Named Young Man of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, last Thursday night the South Bend Junior Chamber of Commerce named Representative JOHN BRADEMAS Young Man of the Year.

Representative BRADEMAS has done an excellent job in representing the citizens of Indian's Third Congressional District. He has been extremely sensitive to the problems which have confronted the district due to unemployment and he has worked hard here in Washington to provide relief for both individuals and businesses which have been injured. John Brademas and I have worked together on many of these matters and I have enjoyed this association.

He came to Congress as no stranger to the workings of the legislative branch. He had served on the staffs of several Members of Congress and he was an executive assistant to Adlai Stevenson when he was the Democratic presidential candidate.

JOHN BRADEMAS is a member of the important House Committee on Education and Labor before which much of the legislation designed to assist areas of high unemployment has been considered.

I congratulate Representative BRADEMUS on receiving this award as South Bend's Man of the Year.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article from the South Bend Tribune of February 28, 1961, entitled "BRADEMUS Named Man of the Year."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRADEMAS NAMED MAN OF YEAR

(By James Donahue)

U.S. Representative JOHN BRADEMAS, was named the 1960 Young Man of the Year, Thursday night at the 13th annual Distinguished Service Award dinner sponsored by the South Bend Junior Chamber of Commerce at the Indiana Club.

"I am deeply grateful for the high honor you have done me this evening," BRADEMAS told an audience of about 300 persons upon acceptance of the award.

He praised the Jaycees for their work and commented on the increasing importance of young men in world affairs today.

"I have noticed in Washington that the majority of Ambassadors from Africa and other underdeveloped countries are in their early 30's, or even late 20's," he said. "We must be able to talk to these persons but to do this we must first listen and understand them."

UNIQUELY QUALIFIED

It is the young men who are uniquely qualified to do that, BRADEMAS added.

Concerning the particular economic problems in and around South Bend and Mishawaka he appealed to the Jaycees to continue their efforts and leadership in this area.

"I am sure that if we have leadership that is confident we can meet the present difficulties, conquer them and move on to greater heights than we have ever known before," he asserted.

BRADEMAS was born in Mishawaka in 1927. He received his elementary and secondary education in South Bend schools and served in the Navy in 1945 and 1946.

WINS RHODES SCHOLARSHIP

He graduated from Harvard where he received high honors, and in 1950 he won a Rhodes scholarship to Oxford University in England and received his doctorate degree there, specializing in political science.

He served as executive assistant to Adlai Stevenson, and also served on the staff of several Members of Congress before being elected to Congress in 1958. He was re-elected in 1960.

In Congress, Representative BRADEMAS is a member of the House Education and Labor Committee and has been referred to by President Kennedy as, "one of the new breed of statesmen ready to seek solutions to the new problems that face Americans and the world."

The award was presented by Franklin D. Schurz, editor and publisher of the Tribune, who served as head judge for the panel of 13 South Bend business, political, and religious leaders who selected the winner.

The principal address at the dinner was delivered by Sherwood H. Egbert, newly elected president and chief executive of the Studebaker-Packard Corp., who outlined what has been done and what must still be done to get this firm back on its feet.

"I am not an overnight specialist," Egbert stated, "but I am mindful of my obligations because of what the Studebaker Corp. means to South Bend."

Recently returned from an 11-day tour of 23 cities throughout the country, in which he and his associates met with more than 750 Studebaker dealers, Egbert presented his findings with an optimistic attitude.

"Our product is a quality piece of merchandise," he said. "Every dealer I talked to has told me this. There also were no complaints concerning the price of the product," he added.

Egbert described the loyalty of the dealers as "tremendous."

On the debit side of the ledger he listed the firm's advertising as a specific weak point.

"Our advertising has been too sterile," Egbert said, "but this has recently been changed. A new and completely different program has been started which you will soon be witnessing in newspapers, radio, and television."

BID ON TRUCK CONTRACT

He also stated that the Studebaker Corp. was presently bidding on the contract for the manufacture of a 6½-ton truck which will provide employment for 456 people.

"However, the acquiring of this type of contract does not mean that we are de-emphasizing automobile production," he affirmed. "We are principally an automobile business."

Egbert stated that defense contracts are also being sought by Studebaker. He said that 30 percent of the work of all top companies is defense work.

"We are not looking for a 'handout' from the Government," he insisted, "but given a share of defense contracts we could continue to operate smoothly during times of economic setback."

SPEAKS ON JAYCEE STORY

William J. Reinke, president of the South Bend Jaycees, spoke briefly on the Jaycee story, emphasizing the importance of young men working together for the advancement of the community and the country.

Mayor Frank J. Bruggner also addressed the Jaycees, stating that each member is "deserving of the award for having given of themselves to our children and our community."

James W. Oberfell, former Jaycee president and winner of the Distinguished Service Award for 1959, was master of ceremonies.

How To Slay the Dragon Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Jack Anderson as it appeared in the Miami Herald of February 26, 1961:

A MEMO TO THE PRESIDENT: HOW TO SLAY THE DRAGON WASTE

(By Jack Anderson)

WASHINGTON.—Memo to J.F.K.:

Among the dragons you must face and fight in the White House, not the least is the Dragon Waste. It is a ravenous monster that gorges upon greenbacks.

The ordinary citizen, thumbing through his wallet, knows when he has wasted a dollar. But on a national scale we have become so accustomed to the dizzy swirl of billions that fiscal figures have no more meaning than the mileage to the stars. We must get back to earth, Mr. President.

Our national debt has soared beyond the $289 billion mark. The run on our gold reserves has reached an alarming $3 billion a year. Yet we cannot risk reducing the great expenditures needed to muscle up national defense and to meet the economic challenge of the surging Soviet Union. More, not less, spending is needed to keep our country, safe and secure.

Where is the money to come from? There is a way to finance our thrust into the space age without raising taxes or tightening belts. If you can slay the Dragon Waste, Mr. Presi-

dent, you can recover billions for the Nation's urgent needs.

This is no haphazard claim but the estimate of experts. I have consulted the most responsible and respected of fiscal authorities. Our staff has searched the bogs and quicksands into which the taxpayers' dollars have been disappearing for years. Though this was by no means a complete survey, we found several ways to save money without impairing our national strength.

The greatest devourer of dollars, of course, is the Defense Department. Your predecessor, President Eisenhower, tried to slow down the drain. He set spending ceilings, laid down dollar dictums, pasted the Pentagon with economy slogans.

But he resolved every dispute over dollars by compromise. He permitted the separate services to waste money on expensive duplications, such as the Jupiter and Thor intermediate range missiles. Each service struggled to equip itself as if it would fight the next war by itself.

You might begin by getting rid of the costly, outdated military installations. At least two dozen posts, built for an earlier era, can be cut out, cut down, or consolidated.

Another example: The Army, an unlikely outfit to be in the shipping business, operates the Panama Line which takes freight away from the commercial companies. The taxpayers, in turn, help make up the private loss in the form of shipping subsidies.

The general accounting office after an exhaustive audit concluded that the principal purpose of the Panama Line is "the carrying of Canal Zone employees and their families to the United States for periodic vacations and back to the isthmus."

* * * * *

To justify its steamship business, the Army insists that all Government freight going to the canal must be carried in its ships. Goods from the West, which could be shipped more cheaply down the Pacific coast, must be hauled all the way across country to sail from New York.

The Armed Forces also offer cradle-to-grave benefits to our men in uniform. These inducements, justified as most of them may be, sometimes seem excessive. Example: The taxpayers provide free veterinary care for servicemen's pets and, in some cases, free burial for those pets that don't survive the free treatment.

The most massive saving of all can be achieved in military procurement. Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Illinois Democrat, estimates the taxpayers could save a minimum of $2 billion a year by more competitive bidding, cutting out duplicate buying, and using up the $10 billion worth of goods sold off each year by the Armed Forces as surplus.

One service often won't transfer surplus to another except at inflated prices. For each service is jealous of its budget credits and doesn't want to give anything away to a sister service. This has forced the Army, say, to go into the public market for articles that are lying idle in the Air Force's warehouse.

It's a big dragon, Mr. President, waiting to be slain.

Claude McMillan: Genius

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Claude McMillan, South Carolina's chief highway commissioner, was one of the greatest men our State has ever produced. No on in the history of South Carolina contributed more to the progress and improvement of our State than the late Claude McMillan.

Mr. Speaker, Claude McMillan was not only a great South Carolinian, but a great American. Highway officials in every State were aware of his genius in developing the best system in the United States. Other States and countries beyond the seas benefited from his engineering and methods. Foreign nations sent representatives to South Carolina to study Claude McMillan's highways. These roads are considered the best and most economically constructed in the world.

Claude McMillan was a brother of our own esteemed and beloved colleague, JOHN L. MCMILLAN.

The following editorial from the Greenville (S.C.) News, is a fitting tribute to this great American and genius of our modern highways:

CLAUDE MCMILLAN, BUILDER OF ROADS

South Carolina, or any other State for that matter, seldom has seen the likes of Claude R. McMillan as a public servant and is not likely to do so again soon. For he was a powerful and unique personality who combined the talents of an engineer with great executive skill that seldom is found in one man.

Claude McMillan devoted his life to the development of South Carolina's splendid highway program, starting as a young engineer in 1923 and becoming chief highway commissioner in 1947.

Building highways and improving South Carolina's administration of its highway system was his chosen life's work. The capabilities he brought to that task and which he applied until his terrible illness robbed him of his last ounce of strength, together with his personal charm, winning manner, suave attractiveness, his ability to make decisions no matter how hard and to stick by them would have carried him to the top of any organization.

Mr. McMillan was one of South Carolina's highest paid officials, elective or appointive, but he would have been worth several times as much to any corporation fortunate enough to secure his services.

As chief engineer for many years and as chief commissioner for nearly a decade and a half, Mr. McMillan was one of the principal architects of what has been described as one of the best highway programs in the United States.

To put it purely negatively, the Federal highway program in South Carolina, particularly the new $50 billion Interstate System, has been free of the controversy and scandal which has marred it in certain other States. But this is merely what we had come to take for granted in South Carolina. We have long been accustomed to efficient planning, skillful construction, and honest administration.

We have been more fortunate than we knew.

On the positive side, we have gotten much more than this. We have had the benefit of executive and engineering imagination and long-range planning. These things just don't happen. Somebody has to make them happen.

Many years ago, as the Federal-State highway program developed gradually, Mr. McMillan and his associates had a vision of the highways of the future and they began to prepare for them long before the present Federal Interstate System was proposed.

They built some of the first dual-line highways to be constructed in any of the States, other than some of the vast toll-road turnpikes in the larger metropolitan areas. They persuaded the general assembly to enact legislation to permit the construction of limited-access highways which could be entered or left only at certain points and with parallel roads to carry local traffic.

They gradually won public acceptance of bypass highways which would carry through traffic around major population centers. This took a lot of selling, because local businessmen often felt they faced ruin if the major stream of traffic was diverted, but they quickly saw the wisdom of the policy and the bypass not only is accepted but frequently is demanded.

Meanwhile, Mr. McMillan was quietly leading a movement, not only to upgrade the quality of our roads for the sake of safety and rapid movement of traffic, but to raise vehicular and driver requirements to protect the motoring public.

He and those about him advocated adoption, a bit at a time, of the nationally approved traffic code. They inspired the beginnings of what we hope will be someday a really effective driver responsibility law. They gained legislative acceptance of the point system which results in the temporary or permanent revocation of the license of a driver who repeatedly violates traffic laws.

They built up the State highway patrol in numbers and in degree of qualification. They instituted a thorough training program and a system of discipline which at one and the same time encouraged the conscientious officer and summarily punished the careless and inefficient one.

In all of this, the hand of Claude McMillan was always apparent. He did not hesitate to allow himself, rather than his department or its program, to become the center of controversy. He subjected himself to criticism and even abuse in the general assembly and in public meetings in communities where highway projects were at stake.

His method of doing his job required the talents of a master engineer, a consummate politician, a bureaucratic statesman. That was Claude McMillan, a man of vision, courage, and diplomacy.

As chief commissioner, he won nationwide recognition. The Federal Bureau of Public Roads respected his wisdom and ability and paid tribute to the administration of the South Carolina program.

As a member and former president of the Association of State Highway Officials, his opinions carried great weight among the men who build and manage the country's highways.

One of Mr. McMillan's last public appearances in the Greenville area was at the groundbreaking for the new YMCA. He was then a sick man, but people sought him out to pay their respects and to talk to a soft-spoken man who was basically kindly but who could be as stern as necessary to carry out what he felt was his duty.

We, along with all South Carolinians mourn his passing. And we extend to his family our deepest sympathy and to his associates best wishes in carrying on in the tradition they helped "the chief" to establish.

What Ike Wanted, J.K.F. May Get

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the Kansas City Star, in an editorial on Feb-

ruary 27, pointed out that this year will see a number of moments of truth develop. I invite the attention of my colleagues to this editorial and ask that they keep it in mind in the months ahead. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial:

WHAT IKE WANTED, J.F.K. MAY GET

It would be revealing to check the voting record of this Congress, a few months hence, against the voting record of the last three Congresses. Certainly some of the lawmakers on the Democratic side will be facing some hard decisions. They may hope that the past will be forgotten, in the interests of maintaining a facade of legislative consistency. For what are they to do when a President of their own party asks for some of the things that Mr. Eisenhower consistently asked and was refused?

For example, there is the matter of those Federal judges. Repeatedly President Eisenhower recommended the creation of additional judgeships. Repeatedly, there were delays in the Democratic-controlled Congress. Cases piled up in the courts. But a Republican President would have made the new appointments. That was politically unthinkable. Now Mr. Kennedy has proposed 59 new judgeships. We assume that many legislators who in the past did not act on the Eisenhower plea may now respond. A Democratic President will make the appointments.

Then there is the problem of the gasoline tax. It is reported from Washington that President Kennedy will, as did his predecessor in his own budget, recommend a 4½-cent tax. Mr. Kennedy wants to step up the Federal road program and he wants to do so on a pay-as-you-pave basis. That is what Mr. Eisenhower wanted to do last year. But Congress would go only part way with an increase to 4 cents, and on a temporary basis. Many Democratic Congressmen opposed even that much. What to do this year?

Postal rates may be mentioned, too. In his budget message, Dwight Eisenhower again recommended a rate increase. A similar proposal went over with a dull thud in the congressional gatherings of 1959 and 1960. There are indications that President Kennedy may have his own suggestions on new rates. What will a Democratic Congress do then?

Charitably, we may conclude that Congressmen have their problems when the executive branch changes from one party to another. Charitably, too, we may recognize that consistency is not an expected virtue on Capitol Hill. Circumstances alter cases.

For the 87th Congress, little isolated moments of truth will arrive. This year however, all things may be different. For they will be moments of Democratic truth.

Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB H. GILBERT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1961

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have reintroduced my bill to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits under the Social Security Act. My bill also provides that full benefits under the act, when based upon the attainment of retirement age, will be payable to men at age 60 and to women at age 55.

Fifteen million elderly American citizens are suffering humiliations, frustrations, and real hardships under our present mixed-up discriminatory social security law. Under existing law, social security annuitants are permitted to earn only up to $1,200 per year; if they earn more than this sum, they are penalized; deductions are made from their social security payments, and in certain cases they can lose the social security benefits completely for long periods of time. This ceiling of $1,200 stems from 1937, when $1,200 had four times the purchasing power of today.

The law as it stands now hurts the very people for whose benefit it was originally enacted—those who work for their living. If the morale and well-being of our older citizens is to be restored, the limitation must be removed.

No one can possibly support a home on his social security check. When social security payments represent a pensioner's entire income, if he wishes to enjoy a dignified, comfortable existence and not become an object of charity, he must find employment to splice out his income. Skyrocketing living costs, high rentals, increased cost of medical care, medicines, high taxes, are a terrible burden, and our senior citizens are suffering anxieties and discomfort and lack of proper medical attention in their later years.

Circumstances have combined to prevent them from reaping the harvest of pleasant days and leisure time toward which they labored for so long. The vast majority have dependents or other family obligations, and so they must find employment. Under our present unfair law, the pensioner has great difficulty in finding employment, because employers do not want him walking off the job when his earnings have reached $1,200. If he assures the employer that he will remain—then he takes a financial loss, after the $1,200 mark has been reached.

We deny him the right to hold a steady job when we limit his earnings; we are now inflicting hardship upon millions of pensioners who prefer to work rather than be forced into substandard living conditions.

A paradoxical situation exists in that if a pensioner makes a fortune from investments or annuities or prizes, or even gambling, he can still receive his full social security payments—we only prevent his receiving "wages" or "earnings."

Another important amendment provided in my bill would enable men to collect full social security benefits at the age of 60; women could collect at the age of 55.

Many workers who wish to retire at an earlier age and are financially able to do so, when they can include social security payments, should be given that opportunity. They are entitled to enjoy their later years in leisure after many years of toil. Also, by retiring, they provide vacancies for the younger men and women who need employment.

There are many workers in poor health and barely able to do so, who must struggle to work in their last years because they cannot afford to quit, looking forward to the advanced age of 65 and their social security benefits and a lessening of their hardships. A realistic approach to the problem of assisting our senior citizens is to reduce the age limits as provided in my bill.

I urge the Congress to take speedy action on this legislation; I trust that it will be passed in this session of Congress.

Sylvester C. Smith, Jr., Nominated President-Elect of the American Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, the State of New Jersey, and the 11th District in particular, is proud and happy at the latest honor to come to one of its most distinguished sons, Sylvester C. Smith, Jr., of West Orange.

Mr. Smith, who is general counsel of the Prudential Insurance Co., has been nominated president-elect of the American Bar Association. He will be elected to the post at the annual meeting of the association in August and will assume office in 1962.

His selection reflects the esteem and admiration Mr. Smith's brilliant attainments have earned for him from members of his profession—sentiments which are shared by all who have the privilege of knowing him. To his exceptional legal ability, evident in the demanding post occupied by him with Prudential Insurance Co., Mr. Smith adds a broad understanding of world problems and a keen interest in securing world peace through law.

He has been an able and eloquent champion of the development of world law to achieve peace, freedom and progress for all peoples. Lawyers have historically been the leaders of men, and the Nation is fortunate that a man of Mr. Smith's caliber will head the legal association in a critical era. The leadership, courage, wisdom and foresight that have characterized his career will make him a most effective president. In honoring him, the Bar Association honors itself. I should like to insert at this point an editorial from the Newark News of February 22 together with interesting sketches of Mr. Smith's record that appeared in the Newark Star Ledger of February 22 and the Newark News of February 26.

[From the Newark News, Feb. 22, 1961]

HONOR FOR MR. SMITH

The presidency of the American Bar Association is an honor that only two New Jersey men have enjoyed, Cortlandt Parker and Arthur T. Vanderbilt. Now a third, Sylvester C. Smith of West Orange, general counsel of the Prudential Insurance Co., has been chosen for this distinguished post.

The bar association forehandedly selects its president a year in advance. Mr. Smith will take over the presidency in 1962.

The ABA presidency has been adorned by such names as Root, Taft, Choate, Davis, Hughes and Kellogg. Mr. Smith's associates in the bar have known him a long time and they have no doubt of his qualifications. Neither have his friends and neighbors in New Jersey.

[From the Newark Star Ledger, Feb. 22, 1961]

NAME PRU'S SMITH TO HEAD BAR GROUP

CHICAGO.—Sylvester C. Smith, general counsel to the Prudential Insurance Co. of America and one of New Jersey's most distinguished attorneys was nominated yesterday president-elect of the American Bar Association.

The nomination puts him second in line to succeed to the presidency of the 99,000-member lawyers association, within which he has held top policymaking positions for the past decade.

Smith will be formally elected president-elect at the August convention of the ABA in St. Louis. He will succeed to the presidency a year later.

NATIVE JERSEYITE

A native Jerseyite, and a resident of West Orange, Smith, 66, is a former Warren County prosecutor, a post he held from 1921 to 1938.

He is treasurer of the New Jersey Highway Authority, vice president of the Newark Bureau of Municipal Research, and a past president of the New Jersey Bar Association and the Association of Life Insurance Counsel.

Born in Phillipsburg, Smith, the son of an attorney, graduated from Lafayette College in 1915 and was awarded his law degree at New York Law School in 1918.

He holds an honorary doctor of law degree from Lafayette, awarded in 1951.

He joined the Prudential in 1938 as an associate general solicitor and in 10 years rose through the positions of general attorney and general solicitor to the top legal post in the company.

HELD MANY ABA POSTS

He was at one time mentioned as a candidate for attorney general of New Jersey at the beginning of Governor Meyner's first term in 1953.

Within the American Bar Association, Smith has served as chairman of the rules and calendar committee and chairman of the House of Delegates, the top policymaking body of the organization.

He is a fellow of the American Bar Foundation and he holds membership in the American Judicature Society, the New York City Association of the Bar, and the Essex County Bar Association.

A widower, he lives at 1 Merrywood Drive, West Orange, and is a member of the Essex Club, the Down Town Club, Harkers Hollow Golf Club, Northampton County Country Club, Bay Head Yacht Club, and the New York Yacht Club.

[From the Newark Sunday News, Feb. 26, 1961]

ATTORNEY OF MANY TALENTS: SYLVESTER SMITH'S CAREER VARIED

(By Thomas J. Hooper)

With equal facility and a note of authority, Sylvester G. Smith, Jr., of West Orange, lawyer, can talk about the Cat Swamp murder case, complex legal problems in the insurance sphere, and the rule of law as a substitute for the rule of force in international relations.

Each of those subjects represents major achievements in the 44-year law career of the new president-elect of the American Bar Association and each is close to his heart and mind. They represent, too, the diversity of a career which has carried a young country lawyer to the top of his profession.

Smith, who is general counsel of the Prudential Insurance Co., one of the most desirable private legal positions in the Nation, won the nomination for president-elect of the 100,000-member ABA last Tuesday at the group's midyear meeting in Chicago. He will be elected to the post, for which he is unopposed, at the annual meeting in St. Louis in August and will become president the next year.

It was as Warren County prosecutor in the early 1920's that Smith became involved in the case with the unlikely name—the "Cat Swamp" murder. The crime took place in Sussex and he was assigned to it as a special deputy attorney general.

GRIM SUBJECT

Although the subject was a grim one—an innocent bystander was gunned down in the aftermath of a silk truck robbery—Smith recalls his role in the case fondly, the grimness eased by the passage of years. The case had all the elements of a moden TV thriller—gang leader surrounded in a hideout, an exchange of shots, his ultimate capture and two dramatic courtroom trials that sent two men to the electric chair and imprisoned a third for life.

It was back in the 1920's, too, that Smith cultivated an interest in the American Bar Association, an interest that grew with the years and found him deeply involved in the association's myriad affairs.

He became a close collatorator of Arthur T. Vanderbilt, later chief justice of New Jersey, in affairs of the bar, and nominated Vanderbilt for the ABA presidency in 1937. Smith will be only the third New Jerseyite to hold that high office in its long history. The other was Cortlandt Parker.

Smith, who politically is a Democrat, identifies himself with the forward-looking wing of the ABA, which has a strong conservative faction. He prefers "forward looking" to "liberal."

This approach was demonstrated at a meeting of the State bar association last November in Atlantic City during a debate on the so-called Connally reservation which restricts this Nation's role in the International Court of Justice.

LIBERAL APPROACH PLEA

Although the older members of the bar appeared to be generally against repeal, Smith stood up and in the deliberate manner of the slow-speaking country lawyer, a trait he has not lost, he gave a reasoned plea for a liberal approach. In the vote that followed, his side won.

In that vein, also, he believes that the association should be ahead of its time in promoting the administration of justice. He promises that under his presidency, the ABA's program of "world peace through law" will be continued.

"We in the ABA," he pointed out, "are trying to get the legal profession to lead the movement among all lawyers of the world for the development of principles whereby nations will decide their differences by rules of law rather than by armed force."

He has been in the forefront in other areas when a forward-looking approach was called for. He was chairman of the committee which in 1936 created the ABA's house of delegates as a representative body and the next year he was a leader in opposing President Roosevelt's attempt to "pack" the Supreme Court.

One of his interests is legal education, a continuing education, that is, that goes on so long as a lawyer remains at the bar.

One of the defects of the bar which he believes reflects a weakness of the law schools is the scarcity of good trial lawyers.

"We must impress upon the law schools that we need more young men trained in advocacy and trial work," he asserted, adding that he is an admirer of the English system that separates lawyers into office and trial men.

Smith is a native of Phillipsburg, the son of a noted lawyer and Warren County prosecutor. After Lafayette College, he won his law degree from New York Law School, and went into practice with his father. At 21 he was Phillipsburg town attorney and when he was named prosecutor in 1921 at the age of 26 he was one of the youngest ever to hold that post anywhere in the State.

He served as prosecutor until 1938 when he was named associate general solicitor of Prudential. He became general solicitor 3 years later and general counsel in 1948. He now directs a staff of more than 160 lawyers.

He has many interests outside his profession, including the Garden State Parkway, which he serves as a member of the operating unit, the New Jersey Highway Authority.

Smith's wife, the former Thalia E. Graff, died in 1958. He has two daughters, Mrs. William S. Bigelow of Maplewood and Miss Thalia Barbara Smith, who lives with him at 1 Merrywood Drive, West Orange.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to two editorials against Federal aid to education which have been published in the two daily newspapers of Rockford, Ill., on February 21, 1961. The editorial from the Rockford Register-Republic is entitled "Federal Aid With Strings," and the editorial from the Rockford Morning Star is entitled "Nothing Worse for Schools."

I ask unanimous consent that both of these editorials be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Rockford (Ill.) Morning Star, Feb. 21, 1961]

NOTHING WORSE FOR SCHOOLS

President Kennedy has sent to Congress a $5.6 billion program of massive Federal aid to education that would put the heavy hand of Federal bureaucracy in every public school district in the Nation and extend it in our colleges. The program calls for Federal grants of $2.3 billion for public school construction and teachers' salaries over the next 3 years. This outlay would provide an average of $19.75 for each child in average daily attendance the first year, increasing to an average of $24.22 the third year.

In addition to the grants to public elementary and secondary schools, the Kennedy education program would establish a 5-year program of State-administered scholarships for "talented and needy" college students at a total cost to the Federal Government of $577,500,000. The scholarships, averaging $700 each, would go to 25,000 students the first year, 37,500 the second, and 50,000 thereafter. Colleges and universities would get $350 a year additional for each scholar-

ship winner enrolled. The college-housing loan program would be extended 5 years at a total cost of $1.3 billion. A similar program for erection of college classrooms would cost $1.5 billion. The aggregate of these costs is $3.3 billion.

The Kennedy program faces tough sledding in the Democratic-controlled 87th Congress. The Democrats controlled both the House and Senate in the 86th Congress, but Kennedy, as a member of the Senate, and his fellow advocates of heavy Federal spending for local school districts couldn't get such measures through Congress. The politically motivated Federal-aiders pushed through the Senate's bill which would have poured out $1.8 billion over a 2-year period for school construction and teachers' salaries, but the measure died in the House.

House Speaker SAM RAYBURN recently served notice that he will continue to oppose Federal contributions to teachers' salaries. The House has shown that it is aware of the danger of permitting the Federal Government to usurp the responsibility of local school districts in providing for teachers' salaries. Former President Eisenhower last year stated well the case against use of Federal funds for teachers' salaries when he said the Federal Government should not be in the business of paying a local official.

President Kennedy's proposals are somewhat more modest than the recommendations of his special task force on education, headed by President Frederick Hovde of Purdue University, which would have provided $30 for each student in average daily attendance. The issue involved, however, is the intervention of the Federal Government in local school districts. Illinois and other States are handling very well their responsibility of providing for classrooms and teachers' salaries. The taxpayers of the communities and States are continuing to meet the real needs of their elementary and secondary schools. The Kennedy program would shunt aside local responsibility, which has made the American educational system strong.

[From the Rockford (Ill.) Register-Republic, Feb. 21, 1961]

FEDERAL AID WITH STRINGS

President Kennedy, operating on the theory that States and local communities cannot meet their educational needs despite ample evidence to the contrary, has proposed a program of Federal assistance to schools and colleges that goes far beyond the most liberal measures submitted to Congress in recent years.

The President's omnibus program, carrying a price tag of $5.6 billion, would include a 3-year program of outright grants to States for use in building classrooms or raising teachers' salaries, with the States deciding how the money would be spent. It would set up a 5-year college scholarship program, for up to 212,500 talented and presumably needy students at public and private colleges and universities; grants would average $700 per student, with the college getting an additional $350 for each Federal scholarship holder.

Long-term, low-interest loans to colleges and universities for dormitory construction would be continued 5 years, and a similar loan program would be established for construction of college classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and related academic facilities.

Mr. Kennedy made a strong bid for southern support by proposing a formula under which poorer States would get relatively larger grants for public elementary and secondary schools. Federal funds could go to racially segregated schools if the States so decided, but no money could be used for private schools established to circumvent Court-ordered desegregation.

Use of Federal grants to pay teachers' salaries will be strongly opposed in Congress. House Speaker RAYBURN objects to that program, and President Kennedy himself has said there are 90,000 nonqualified people now teaching. Federal funds thus would go to the inept as well as the proficient teachers; no distinction could be made.

The President did not accept the recommendations of his special task force on education that calls for Federal grants of $30 per pupil, plus $20 per pupil in poorer States and another $20 per pupil in cities of over $300,000. The Kennedy plan calls for a minimum of $15 per pupil and an average of $19.75 per student, with Mississippi getting the highest per capita grant of $29.67.

Illinois would be one of 10 States getting the minimum of $15 per pupil. It is the old story of taking tax money from States which are meeting their school needs—and whose needs are the greatest—and of redistributing it among States unwilling to assume their responsibility.

Without Federal aid, 680,000 classrooms have been built since World War II. Those constitute more than half the classrooms now in use. In the past 10 years, teachers' salaries have increased 99.8 percent while the cost of living went up 23.6 percent. These figures clearly show that neither building needs nor teacher salary scales have been neglected.

Federal aid to education, despite all pious claims to the contrary, will mean Federal control. There are plenty of strings attached to President Kennedy's proposals—from formulas to special inducements.

Address by Vice Adm. John T. Hayward on the Occasion of the 154th Annual Meeting of the Washington Light Infantry

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therewith a magnificent address by the distinguished Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, Development—Vice Adm. John T. Hayward—on the occasion of the 154th annual meeting of the Washington Light Infantry, that venerable National Guard organization in Charleston, S.C., which bears the name of the Father of our country, delivered in Charleston on February 22, 1961:

Admiral Hayward's address not only inspires us to fight for our traditions and the perpetuation of our way of life, but it reminds us of the need for eternal vigilance if this Republic is to remain a republic:

It is a distinct pleasure to be here tonight to talk with you. Today is the birthday of the father of our country, George Washington, whose name your organization has carried for many years. You have a fine tradition and one to be proud of in these days. Tradition is not the evil some people would have us believe. Past is but the prologue and as Santanya said, "A nation who doesn't know history will be forced to repeat it." So in many ways it is good to look into past events and the challenge freemen have had to face in history.

We face a challenge now as serious as freemen have ever faced in the history of man. Twentieth century America is not accustomed to an underdog strategy that was expertly used by our Founding Fathers in time of peace as well as war.

Our people seem puzzled and upset that many choose the opposition over us. We are inclined to believe in many cases we are in a popularity contest. The truth of the matter is we are paying the penalty of leadership. In every field of human endeavor he that is first must live in the white light of publicity.

In art, literature, in music, in industry the reward and the punishment are always the same. The reward is widespread recognition; the punishment—fierce denial and detraction.

When a man's work becomes a standard for the world it also becomes the target for the shafts of the envious few. If your work is mediocre, you will be left alone—if you achieve a masterpiece you will set a million tongues wagging. Whatsoever you write or paint or play or sing or build, no one will strive to surpass or slander you unless your work be stamped with the seal of genius. Long after a great work has been done, those who are disappointed continue to cry out that it cannot be done.

Our forefathers led by George Washington did it. We are the leaders. We must understand the penalty of leadership. If the leader truly leads, he remains the leader.

This brings me to the point where I want to tell you how we in the Navy are facing this challenge to free peoples and to our country. Like our country we have a penalty of leadership to understand and use. We have been the leaders in our profession. The control of the sea has been ours for so many years people give little heed to the problems many psuedo experts lulled our people into thinking it didn't matter in the age of atom weapons. Fortunately, many people didn't believe this.

The slight shudder that went through the United States when Cuba became a forward Communist base was greatly diminished for we controlled the seas—the surface, the depths and the air above the seas. We would have been in a very tenuous position if this had not been the case.

The problem at sea does not resolve itself into a simplified solution. As you know, the Polaris system is our strategic system in the deterrent phase of our national policy. However, there are many other things we must do at sea. The reason for this, of course, is quite apparent in that the free alliance is, in truth, a maritime alliance. We have to be able to protect our power across the sea to help our friends and, if necessary, bring the battle to the enemy. This force must be a discriminating one to permit our policymakers to use only the necessary tools to accomplish our objective.

When one is faced with a limited situation it is necessary that we not incinerate our friends, but help them. We must have precise delivery of weapons on military objectives. The underlying philosophy that governs the entire approach to control of the sea by the Navy is based on the fact that we must be prepared to wage not only nuclear war, but war with conventional explosives. This requirement thus brings into being all of the present forces we have to do our tasks. It is not a question of submarines or something else, but of a balanced approach to the entire spectrum of the problem.

The tools of war change rapidly and always will. The Communists realize this and have instituted a change in philosophy on

war. They are the students and strong proponents of the protracted conflict covering man's entire actions so it is difficult to draw a line between actual war and peace any more. I am sure you have read of their approach to this protracted conflict philosophy. Their actions may vary and change and blow hot and cold but their objective is still clear; that is the domination of the world.

George Washington understood the value of seapower and his writings bring this forth very strongly. His greatest victory at Yorktown was dependent on seapower. Our country has long understood this necessity and particularly the people of this area. When you saw the U.S.S. *George Washington* proceeding to sea last fall you were witnessing one of our best technical developments in this time period. This system is as great a break with the past as was the famous *Monitor-Merrimac* battle. However, I want to emphasize it only meets one part of the challenge.

The rest of our technical developments and progress are made in many other areas. Our manned aircraft which, contrary to popular opinion, are not going to be replaced by missiles, are the finest in the world.

This vehicle will be with us for many years for obvious reasons. The flexibility of the manned vehicle, particularly in situations across the sea where we are helping our friends, is quite apparent. We most assuredly will use missiles from this vehicle to assist us in our job.

The Navy really does its tasks with many different types of vehicles. The manned airplane is only one. You have the surface ship and the submarine that go along as partners in the team. They all have their job to do and can do a particular task better than either of their partners. As an example, the airplane is the best vehicle for area search, whereas the surface ship can keep to the seas in all kinds of weather and for many days. The submarine is our best listening platform in the job of keeping control of the depths of the sea.

As we have a Marine Corps which is part of the Navy-Marine team which has the job of obtaining control of objective areas, we are also faced with many of the problems that the Army has. So you see with these various tools to do the job we have all the tasks in development that are associated with aircraft, ships, submarines, and amphibious forces. This makes our program very broad and complex.

I am glad to be able to tell you of many good things we have done in these various areas. I will just give you a few highlights. Our new Vigilante North American plane holds the world's record for load carrying to altitude.

It carried a thousand kilograms to 91,000 feet. Our McDonnell fighter goes at speeds well over twice that of sound. Our nuclear submarines are unsurpassed in the world today. We have combatant nuclear surface ships in process. These are all accomplishments that the United States can be proud of. We have many problems we have not solved, however, and I would be the last one to give you the impression that all is fine. However, I do say that we will work as diligently on these and as hard to make the same progress in the years to come.

Back in the days when our country was fighting for its existence John Adams wrote the commissioning document for the Brig *Lexington* in 1775. It was to be commanded by John Barry. The document stated the following: "Neither nature nor art have partitioned the seas into empires. The treasures of the oceans belong to all free men. Upon this ultimate foundation do I build and go forward to fortify freemen's rights".

I want to assure you that the U.S. Navy will continue to live up to that document and it could have been written today for the commissioning of any one of our new ships.

Support for Resolution To Curb Back-Door Federal Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 17, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be an author of a similar resolution to the one introduced by my distinguished friend and colleague from Arizona [Mr. RHODES]. This is a resolution to curb the budget-busting practice of a backdoor approach to the Treasury. Therefore, I was delighted to find that editorial support for Mr. RHODES' measure had been given in the San Diego Tribune.

Under unanimous consent, I include this excellent newspaper endorsement in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of all House Members—especially those eight members on the Committee on Rules who voted against this resolution to restore control of the Federal purse to Congress:

CONGRESS SHOULD IMPROVE HOLD ON REINS OF FEDERAL SPENDING

Representative JOHN J. RHODES, Republican, of Arizona, has introduced a resolution in the House of Representatives aimed at tightening congressional control over Federal spending. It deserves the thoughtful attention of every believer in sound fiscal practices, in and out of government.

"Every year millions of dollars are spent by the Federal Government without ever going through the regular appropriations process," RHODES said. "It is known as backdoor spending and, in my opinion, clearly violates the intent of the Constitution."

Back-door spending has been attacked by Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, and others in Congress, and by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Congressional control over the Nation's purse strings has been weakened over the years in several ways.

Some Federal programs, involving the expenditure of vast sums, are administered through trust funds which do not show up in the budget and over which the Congress has no control. These are for such things as social security, highways, and railroad retirement. There is little chance of changing this type of financing, once it is established.

There is an opportunity, however, for greater congressional scrutiny of proposed legislation that carries its own built-in financing. Once such measures pass, future Congresses are committed to cough up the cash for them, come what may.

Thus, it would be possible for a Congress, under a runaway spending spur, to put the Nation in hock for years for vast and costly projects which our elected officials in the future couldn't lay a finger on.

Another way in which your taxes can be spent without specific congressional appropriation is through the contract authority of Federal agencies.

Most projects involving Federal spending of your money usually go through two steps. There is a bill to authorize such an undertaking. Then there has to be an appropriation of money to get it going.

But, as RHODES pointed out, under the Second Liberty Loan Act of 1917, drafts may be made on the Treasury to pay for programs which have been authorized, but for which the money has not been appropriated. Contracts may be entered into obligating the Government for amounts which Congress then must authorize because it has no other choice.

RHODES' resolution would prohibit Federal agencies from creating obligations by contract in advance of appropriations. It also would prohibit legislation authorizing the spending of Federal funds which have not been provided for in congressional appropriations acts.

The Constitution states: "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law."

The Founding Fathers gave the House of Representatives the responsibility of initiating all revenue bills. The Senate may propose or concur with amendments, as on other measures.

The sound theory behind this power to tax and to spend in the House is that Representatives, having to face election every 2 years instead of every 6 (as do Senators), are more readily responsive to the will of the people.

This control, exercised through elected Representatives, should not be weakened by back-door spending.

Oil King School Provides Care for Migrant Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. F. SISK
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, we have been told about the deplorable living conditions of migratory laborers in this country during the past few years. I realize these conditions are very bad.

For example the television program "Harvest of Shame" showed evidence of these conditions. But I believe this program tended to cause a distorted picture of the situation because it did not show what is being done to improve the conditions of migratory laborers. It did not show the positive efforts of many State and local governments to solve the problem of migratory farmworkers.

I am going to speak of the efforts taken by Californians because I am most familiar with their problems. This does not mean I believe the problems are being completely resolved and that there are not things yet to be done. It means that I believe the problems of these workers are not being ignored.

I want to give an example of the positive efforts of one school in my district. The Oil King School near Coalinga has done an excellent job of training children of migratory farmworkers. This is pointed out in an article in the Fresno Bee on February 19, 1961, by Karl M. Kidder.

I want to commend the school; its superintendent, Mr. William S. Green; its faculty; and the school trustees for an exceptionally good job in providing for the needs of migratory workers' children. Also I want to commend Mr. Kidder for writing this story and the Fresno Bee for publishing it. This is a real public service in news reporting.

So my colleagues may learn about the positive program at Oil King School, I would like to read Mr. Kidder's article:

OIL KING TEACHERS PROVIDE FOOD, CARE AS WELL AS INSTRUCTION FOR MIGRANT CHILDREN

(By Karl M. Kidder)

COALINGA.—When Rodolfo Ruiz shows up at the Oil King Elementary School near here without his shoes—which is often—he is not scolded. Instead, the 11 year old is hustled into the dispensary closet to find another pair.

Then, with his sister and four brothers, Rodolfo sits down at a table in the cafeteria and has a piping hot breakfast before classes start for the day.

The lack of a scolding for losing his shoes, and getting another pair and breakfast, are all part of the curriculum of what perhaps is the richest school district in Fresno County.

Almost 90 percent of the pupils are children of migrant agricultural workers. Their stay at Oil King depends on how long their parents are able to find work on the big west side ranches, or how long it is before they harken to whatever it is that keeps them on the move.

William S. Greene is the superintendent and principal of this unique school. His goal is to instill in as many of his pupils as possible the idea that perhaps their present home environment is not the best in the long run.

"We hope to turn out children who will want to get away from their environment," Greene says. "We want to help them obtain a liking for education and an appreciation of the fact they are American citizens."

Quite a chore, but Greene and the eight teachers on his staff, as well as the custodians, the bus drivers and the three members of the board of trustees are dedicated to reaching it. They work on the principle that each child at Oil King needs, and gets personalized attention.

To accomplish this, the faculty has established and supports its own social service fund. From it they buy glasses for children with eye problems, shoes for many like Rodolfo whose parents cannot furnish them, and warm clothing and dental work.

The rule at breakfast, provided by the fund, and at lunch, paid for by the State and Federal Governments, is "fill them up." Second and third helpings are there for the asking.

Oil King has no parent-teacher association, so the faculty conducts its own rummage sales and frequent parties for the children. Food, favors, and prizes are paid for out of the social service fund.

The entire curriculum has the blessing of the district's trustees—Frank L. Lemmon, the chairman; O. Harry Niemela and L. James Anderson. They represent some of the major oil producers in this district whose taxes largely support the school.

Oil King started as a school about 1905, with a one room plant. In 1958, the district completed construction of a modern plant which cost $237,000. In the old days, most of the pupils were from oil families. One of these was Mrs. Harriet Whitney Haney, who attended the school in the 1920's.

Mrs. Haney went back to Oil King in 1952 as administrative assistant, and drives to school from Coalinga every day, about 10 miles. Greene commutes from Hanford. The Ruiz children and the others, take a long bus ride every morning to get to class.

The Ruiz youngsters are typical of a large segment of the pupils. Six of them attend Oil King. Four others stay home with their mother. Their father works when there is a job available. They share a spotlessly clean one room shack in a labor camp.

Greene admits the nomadic character of the parents of his charges makes his curricular goals difficult of attainment. He has an idea of following, if he can, the scholastic progress of the youngsters after they leave Oil King.

"I have in mind a 10-year study to try and determine whether our program is as effective as we think it is," he says. "These people need money for necessities, surely. But this is not the greatest need. We want to give the children, at least, a sense of direction by proving to them we are interested in each one individually.

"We go overboard to establish a common bond of friendship and a feeling that all of us at Oil King have the welfare of everyone at heart. The children are told that we hope they will go on to higher grades, if the time comes when they must leave here.

"That is when the true test of our program will come—what happens after the children leave."

As for Rodolfo, his mind already is made up. Instead of following the crops, as his father has done for years, Rodolfo wants to be a policeman. His twin brother, Adolfo, says he will become a teacher just like those at Oil King.

Education Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues the first installment of a two-part commentary on the subject of Federal aid to education, written by an extraordinary ordinary citizen of my district, Dr. Eugene Myers. As soon as I have the second installment, I will bring it to the attention of the House. Dr. Myers' comments appear as guest editorials in the Iola Register, Iola, Kans.:

EDUCATION PROBLEMS

DEAR MR. SCOTT: Your editorial, "Fallacy," in Thursday's Register, reveals a very important issue in the question of Federal aid to education. It also brings up two questions related to the issue, namely: Is this lot of money really necessary from either the State or Federal Government in the amount proposed? And, why did the Federal Government happen to get involved in the education question which has for 170 years been considered to be an area delegated to the States or to the people, by the Constitution?

Let's reverse the order and try the second question first. I doubt that all experts immediately look to the Federal Government to solve any problem which exists. Is it not more reasonable to suspect that when problems exist which the local and State governments have failed to recognize or to attempt to solve, that the Federal Government finally is called upon to find a solution?

Following are a few areas where we as individuals may soon observe three fingers pointing toward ourselves as we point one toward the experts and bureaucrats:

1. Failure to modernize our tax system to keep pace with modern economic changes. The ad valorem tax system began in Kansas 100 years ago at which time most wealth was visible and tangible. In an agricultural society, lands, homes, livestock, crops, household goods and implements were easily seen and taxed. Real estate mortgages, which were recorded, were almost the only investment of money. It was natural that these things formed the basis of revenue of all kinds of government support. But there have been changes.

2. There has been a steady decrease in assessed valuation of tangible property in the face of increased building and of property values. (A decrease of $2 million in assessed valuation in Allen County in 2 years, and at least one school district has a smaller valuation now than it had 25 years ago during the depression.)

3. Although we have had some form of State aid to elementary schools for some years, State aid to high schools was first adopted in 1955, and together this revenue amounts to only about 23 percent of the total school revenue. Now that the threat of Federal aid is imminent the cry is heard. "Education is a responsibility of the State."

4. Education is a responsibility of the State. Yet read the front page of Thursday's Register where a bill has been introduced into the House to consolidate small districts. The bill would allow a minimum of 300 pupils in grades 1 through 12. After authorizing the expenditure of $150,000 for a State school survey, which recommended a minimum of 1,200 pupils from kindergarten through grade 12 where possible (and there are only 18 counties in the State which in 1958, had fewer than 1,200 pupils and one of these had already obtained a county district), the legislature proposes to cut the school size by 75 percent from the recommendations of the survey report.

How well the State accepts the responsibility.

5. The only reason for school districts is for the purpose of maintaining a school to teach children. Yet there are 318 districts (1958) which levy some taxes, yet maintain no school. Two such districts were reported in Allen County as of 1958.

6. We continue to allow—even foster and promote—the continuance of small, inadequate high schools which may exceed $2,000 per pupil to maintain, through the complicated formula for distributing State aid. Smaller schools are allowed more money per pupil than are the larger schools. No one considers what the taxpayer is buying. Schools of 100 pupils or less may receive $275 per pupil, but schools of over 500 receive only $160 per pupil. Schools of 100 pupils may offer a total of 18 to 25 courses in the 4 years, while schools of over 500 pupils may offer from 50 to 75 courses in the 4 years.

The taxpayer is getting gypped—but it is the children that end up bankrupt.

Defense Strategy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, numerous concerns have been expressed recently that President Kennedy is planning to make major changes in the Nation's military strategy. These concerns have most frequently focused on the conjecture that the President is planning to downgrade nuclear weapons in favor of conventional armaments.

James Reston, writing in the New York Times March 1, has placed the problem of our national defense and President Kennedy's intentions in sharp perspective. He has astutely pointed out the administration's desire to achieve a

balance in our weapons arsenal which would enable us to deal with conflicts of both a global and limited nature.

This is a particularly pertinent article and I commend it to my colleagues:

DEFENSE STRATEGY

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, February 28.—There was a big flap in Washington today over reports that the Kennedy administration was changing its military strategy.

This seems to be the way it is every time a new administration comes to power. Much the same thing happened when Harry Truman gathered his military advisers in Key West to discuss the roles and missions of the various services. It happened again during the Eisenhower administration when John Foster Dulles announced the strategy of massive retaliation. And now it is Secretary of State Rusk who is in the middle of a swirl of rumors and denunciations.

Actually, there is nothing sensational in what is happening. The Secretary is merely saying what President Kennedy promised would be done during the campaign. He is talking of the need to strengthen the conventional or nonnuclear arsenal of the United States.

There is no plan in the State Department or anywhere else, so far as one can discover, to weaken the arsenal of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons. John J. McCloy, President Kennedy's disarmament chief, was hard at work today in preparation for the forthcoming conversations on arms testing and limitation, but pending agreement on an inspected arms control system, the production of the big weapons is going to continue.

What is going on, therefore, is a study to make sure that the Nation has the weapons and the air and sea lift to meet small or conventional wars with conventional weapons.

THE LOPSIDED ARSENAL

In the opinion of many officials here, our defenses had become lopsided, with big weapons to fight the big nuclear war nobody really expected, and with not enough small weapons to fight the limited wars almost everybody thought were bound to come.

The situation in the Formosa Straits illustrates the problem. There some of our best military minds felt that we did not have enough conventional weapons and air-sea transport readily available to meet a large-scale invasion from the Chinese mainland.

This raised the serious question of having to use nuclear wepaons to deal with such an invasion and thus to risk the danger of nuclear retaliation.

All the administration is saying now is that we must be in a position to make the punishment fit the crime. Neither the President nor the Secretary of State wants to use a sledge hammer to kill a fly.

This does not mean that they would stand aside and rely wholly on conventional weapons if the superior ground forces of the Communists were overwhelming our ground forces in areas vital to our security. No doubt any weapon would be used to assure the safety of the command in direct conflict with the Communists.

The administration does, however, want to be sure that it is prepared for any kind of conflict anywhere from Korea or the Congo to Cuba and that it is able to deal with the intermediate ranges of conflict without resorting to nuclear weapons except as a last resort.

HOW MUCH IS ENOUGH?

Two things have happened to force a review of the Nation's military strategy. This country now has enough atomic and hydrogen weapons to wipe out most of mankind so that while new and more spohisticated weapons are being developed all the time, the need for unlimited production of nation-busters is obviously declining.

Also, the strategy of massive retaliation with nuclear weapons, while preventing the big war, has not deterred the Communists from waging small conventional wars. For example, the threat of nuclear retaliation did not keep the Communists from continuing the limited war in Indochina.

Accordingly, President Kennedy has already ordered more strenuous training for antiguerrilla warfare and no doubt more scientific brains will be diverted to improving the capacity of the armed services to fight this kind of war more effectively.

All this, however, was foreshadowed weeks and months ago in public statements, and if this had been candidly explained, as it was finally by Secretary Rusk to the Foreign Relations Committee today, much of the usual hullabaloo over Pentagon "leaks" and inaccurate reporting would have been avoided.

Evaluation of the United States Versus the Soviet Union in Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 17, 1961

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, little more than 2 years ago the United States was startled by the orbiting of the first sputnik. In the intervening brief span of time this country has made unusual progress in the field of space exploration and technology.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration has prepared an evaluation of the United States versus the Soviet Union in space which I am sure will be of interest to all Members.

I also insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial on the same subject which appeared in the Washington Star February 28, 1961:

FATEFUL RACE

In a special report prepared for the House Science and Astronautics Committee, our top experts on the subject have declared flatly that the United States is far ahead of the Soviet Union in space research.

The report's main point is simply this: that although the Russians have achieved a number of spectacular "firsts" in putting heavy payloads into the high heavens (important propagandistic attainments made possible by the present superiority of the thrust power of their rockets), their spatial experiments are as yet not nearly so advanced, sophisticated or informative as ours. Further, we have sent into orbit and on interplanetary probes many more vehicles than they have, and the vehicles have been much better instrumented than theirs in terms of capacity to send back to earth data of great significance.

Thus, in the words of the report—which was drafted by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration at the request of Representative OVERTON BROOKS, chairman of the House committee—our country "has picked up momentum from a standing start and now surpasses the U.S.S.R. effort in its breadth of interest, originality of concept, and volume of research. * * * The contrast between the output of the U.S.S.R. space research program and our own cannot have failed to impress the Soviet scientific community itself and some elements of the U.S.S.R. Government. The contrast is, in fact, so great that we may expect a counter-reaction from the U.S.S.R. in the form of a greater emphasis on scientific effort in their space program."

In reporting all this to the House committee, NASA's experts have been at pains to warn, implicitly, that the United States—even though it appears to be very definitely ahead in the science and technology of space, as President Kennedy has said—has no reason whatever to feel the slightest degree of complacency. Far from it. Actually, as the experts have indicated, our country cannot hope to win this fateful race unless it undertakes something like the 10-year program that NASA has already advocated before Mr. Brooks' committee—a program designed to enable us not merely to catch up with the Russians in rocket thrust power, but also to wrest leadership from them, permanently, on the roadway to the stars.

Calling for expenditures of around $1.5 billion a year, this program would entail no fewer than 260 major experiments in space between now and 1970. The experiments, involving progressively heavier payloads and increasingly difficult missions, would include the launching of revolutionary new satellites, round-trip manned orbital flight around the earth, exploratory lunar shots, deep probes in the neighborhood of Mars and Venus, and numerous other celestial ventures preparing the way for human travel to the moon and beyond, conceivably in the early 1970's.

True, for this sort of thing the Russians have propulsive power far superior to ours. But it is a power that we can be confident of equalling, if not excelling, in the next 3 or 4 years. Meanwhile, judging from NASA's latest evaluation, we enjoy a decided advantage in the know-how of space, and this is something we ought to be able to maintain as we move ahead—as fast as possible—in developing rocket booster systems much more tremendous than anything now existing on either side of the Iron Curtain. This is how we shall win the race if it is ever to be won.

EVALUATION OF U.S.S.R. VERSUS U.S. OUTPUT IN SPACE SCIENCE

GENERAL IMPRESSIONS

The average quality of Soviet scientific research is the same as that of the United States. This conclusion is based on perusal of their literature, and on personal contacts between scientists of both countries in conferences held between 1956 and 1960, both in nuclear physics and in areas related to space research.

The range of ability of Soviet scientists is also approximately the same as that of U.S. scientists. A few are brialliant, as good as this Nation's best physicists, and the majority do conventional but necessary research.

It is a striking fact that in spite of equality of talent in the United States and U.S.S.R. science, nearly all of the highly original work in space research has come out of the U.S. program. The first two sputniks had little or no scientific apparatus, apart from a biological experiment; and while the third sputnik had a great deal of interesting geophysical apparatus, this flight was never followed up by the second generation of experiments with which the Russians could have capitalized on their experience with Sputnik III. However, these references relate only to basic scientific investigations and not to technology. The U.S.S.R. has achieved a number of successes, such as the Lunik III moon shot and the recent space cabin launchings, which were great achievements in space technology.

The United States, on the other hand, has been responsible for:

1. First detection of trapped energetic particles (Van Allen belts);

2. Launch of Explorer VI and Explorer VII energetic particle satellites; measurement of energy distribution and time variation of radiation in the Van Allen belts; coordinated observations of radiation belt and red auroral arc over Colorado;

3. Launch of Pioneer V space probe; communication with earth out to distance of 23 million miles; study of properties of interplanetary space; detection of cloud of energetic particles sweeping over Pioneer V en route from sun to earth at the time of a solar storm; correlation between ground-based atmospheric data and data received simultaneously from Pioneer V in deep space and from Explorer VII near to earth;

4. Correlation between solar weather activity and atmospheric density, via satellite drag measurements; first measurement of air density at an altitude of 1,000 miles, using drag data from the Echo satellites;

5. Launch of the ionosphere satellite; measurement of ionospheric disturbances electrons and ions in the upper atmosphere; measurement of ionospheric disturbances during the solar storm of November 1960;

6. Satellite contributions to geodesy and celestial mechanics: Precise measurement of variations in sea level, gravitational perturbations by sun and moon, effect of solar radiation pressure;

7. Tiros cloud-cover photographs; and

8. Echo passive communications experiment.

Another significant fact appears in the comparison of United States and U.S.S.R. papers published in the periodical literature or presented at international conferences: The United States and U.S.S.R. papers are of comparable quality but the number of United States papers greatly exceeds the U.S.S.R. contribution. This very sizable discrepancy in the level of effort constitutes the most significant difference between the United States and U.S.S.R. space research programs. The U.S.S.R. has capitalized skillfully on the advantage in payload capability which it acquired from its early successes in missile development. It has concentrated on a small number of flights, and has chosen its missions for these flights with close attention to their impact on world opinion and their effectiveness in reinforcing the public image of U.S.S.R. strength in science and technology. Yet the U.S.S.R. has done relatively little in space science, considering the resources at its command in payload capability. It is very difficult, for example, to understand why the U.S.S.R. failed to follow up the remarkable flight of Sputnik III with further geophysical satellite experiments.

Perhaps the explanation is that Soviet scientists are not in close contact with their program planning authorities, and have not been able to participate effectively in the formulation of their space program. The gathering momentum in the U.S. space science program, and the remarkable variety of fields in which highly original results are being obtained, must be credited, in part, to the insistence of U.S. authorities on the development of a sound and broadly based program in space science, and to their continuing efforts to enlist in the program an increasing fraction of the country's scientific community.

There is another circumstance which has probably had a major effect in determining the relative levels of effort in United States and U.S.S.R. space research. This is the fact that the United States has had a tradition of strong support for research over the last several decades, and has developed a powerful base for scientific operations in this country, including many large laboratories with highly trained staffs. This is true in nuclear physics and solid state physics, as well as in the earth sciences and other disciplines from which space research draws its problems and techniques. The base of research in the U.S.S.R., on the other hand, is not as deep as in the United States. It is new and relatively thin. For this reason the U.S.S.R. scientific effort is spotty, with excellent work in certain fields on which Soviet interest has been concentrated for one reason or another, whereas work in other fields of equal scientific interest is poor or entirely missing. Because the United States has tremendous scientific resources at its command it has been able to develop a vigorous program in atmospheric physics, auroral phenomena, geophysics, sun-earth relationships, and trapped particle research without appreciably reducing its level of effort in other fields of research. We have in fact developed an entirely new field to a very high level of activity in the short space of 2 years. The Russians may not have the reserve strength in laboratory facilities and trained talent to do this without disrupting established areas of research, and perhaps this is the primary reason for the paucity of their achievements in space science thus far.

It is important to note that this reflects the situation at the present moment. In making an assessment of the Soviet position it is also important to look at the rate of change of their effort, in addition to the current level. The U.S.S.R. is believed to be training its scientists at a rate several times greater than the rate of training in the United States and it is entirely possible that the U.S.S.R. may strengthen the weak spots in its scientific structure and move ahead in an effort to overtake us in every important area of research, in the course of the next several years or perhaps the next decade. It may be noted again that the intrinsic ability of the Russian scientific community is in no way inferior to that of our own; and that, therefore, there is no reason why they cannot overtake us in this period if we do not continue to develop and to strengthen our program.

Figures on the number of papers presented at international meetings suggest that the Russian level of effort in space science has not increased appreciably between the Moscow CSAGI meeting in 1958 and the Nice COSPAR meeting in 1960 in spite of the greater rate of training of scientists in the U.S.S.R. It is possible that the talent being trained in this area is still at the graduate student level and has not yet reached the level of responsibility at which this effect can be felt in Soviet contributions to conferences. It is the impression of a U.S. authority on upper atmosphere theory that this is the case in atmospheric physics and in sun-earth relationships. In any case, the contrast between the output of the U.S.S.R. space research program and our own cannot have failed to impress the Soviet scientific community itself, and some elements of the U.S.S.R. Government. U.S.S.R. scientists may succeed soon in persuading their government to initiate a more vigorous program in space physics under the stimulus of our own successes in this field.

In summary, the U.S.S.R. space science program has dissipated some of its momentum after the initial successes of the sputnik launchings; while the U.S. program has picked up momentum from a standing start, and now surpasses the U.S.S.R. effort in its breadth of interest, originality of concept, and volume of research. However, we should anticipate that the Russians will respond to this challenge with a more vigorous space science program of their own in the future.

SPECIFIC IMPRESSIONS

Quality of presentations

U.S.S.R. papers cover the same range as those in the United States. The top stratum of individual talents in the U.S.S.R. scientific community is also comparable to ours, according to impressions gained in meetings and by an examination of the translated literature. The Russians have very capable people working in some fields, such as cosmic radiation and energetic particle measurements and are also strong in mathematics, celestial mechanics, astrophysics, seismology, and observational aspects of oceanography. In certain other areas of the earth sciences and astronomy, either directly or indirectly related to the space program, the U.S.S.R. makes a less favorable showing in comparison with the work in the United States.

For example, the U.S.S.R. has published little on the geodetic applications of satellites, a most fruitful field of endeavor in the United States, and a major source of important developments in geophysics. The analysis of satellite orbits to obtain density data also has been carried out at a high level of activity by several groups in the United States. In particular, the discovery of a correlation between satellite drag and solar activity, one of the most significant developments in this field, was made by L. G. Jacchia at the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory, and his work has since been refined and extended to reveal important diurnal variations. There has been relatively little U.S.S.R. work published on this important and interesting problem.

It is possible that this particular field of geodesy is considered sensitive by the Russians, and that for this reason a substantial amount of U.S.S.R. material has been held back from publication.

Quantity of presentations

The United States stands strongly to the fore in the quantity of work, in its volume, and in the number and variety of fields in which we have been doing original work. The contrast between the level of our effort and that of the U.S.S.R. appears both in the comparison of presentations at international meetings, and in the survey of U.S. and U.S.S.R. scientific periodicals.

Presentations at international meetings. Two major international conferences in space research have been held in the last few years. The first of these was the CSAGI Conference in Moscow, in July 1958. The United States sent a large delegation to this Conference. U.S. contributions to the program were varied and extensive, and gave an impression of strength in our incipient space science effort, in spite of the weakness of our vehicle capability at that time. The next international meeting in the field was arranged by COSPAR, and convened in Nice in January 1960. The number of U.S. and U.S.S.R. contributions to these meetings is listed below:

	United States	*U.S.S.R.*
CSAGI (1958)	39	15
COSPAR (1960)	40	10

The U.S. and U.S.S.R. numbers are about the same for the two meetings. It might be noted that the Goddard Theoretical Division alone read five papers to the COSPAR meeting, half as many as the entire U.S.S.R. contribution, and ranging over the fields of celestial mechanics, geodesy, the moon and planets, meteorites, and trapped particles. A perusal of the table of contents of the recently published proceedings of the COSPAR Conference drives home the point that the U.S. program contrasts very favorably with the U.S.S.R. effort in its breadth and in the fullness of participation of the American scientific community.

Volume of publication. A bibliography has been compiled of U.S.S.R. periodical literature in space physics, appearing in reputable Soviet publications (proceedings of the Soviet Academy, Geophysics Bulletin of the Soviet Academy, Soviet Astronomy, Soviet JETP, Soviet Physics Express) and also the (British) Journal of Planetary and Space Science.

For comparison, NASA has examined the contents of the Journal of Geophysical Research for the years 1958–60. The Journal of Geophysical Research is the principal medium for the publication of space physics in the United States and contains approximately half of all papers on this subject and related topics in the earth sciences.

The Soviet series, Artificial Earth Satellites, has not been included in the U.S.S.R., lists because it does not constitute a part of the periodical literature on current research to be compared with the Journal of Geophysical Research.

The table below lists U.S. and U.S.S.R. contributions gathered from these sources for the years 1958–60. The 1960 figures are extrapolated from the volume of publications for the first 6 months of 1960.

	1958	*1959*	*1960*
U.S.S.R.	5	8	17
United States (JGR)	5	64	111

We see that the United States and U.S.S.R. efforts started at comparable levels, that the U.S.S.R. effort has shown a moderate increase in the last three years, and that the U.S. effort has shown a greater increase. It appears from these figures that the United States has reacted vigorously to the challenge of the first Russian successes in space rocket technology. Our pace program has been able to draw on the resources of U.S. research, and has greatly exceeded the modest increase in the Russian effort over this period.

The contrast in the level of United States and U.S.S.R. efforts in space physics is in fact so great that we may expect a counter-reaction from the U.S.S.R. in the form of a greater emphasis on scientific effort in their space program. There may in fact be a hint of this development in a recent unusual display of initiative on the part of the U.S.S.R., through its proposal for the organization of a conference on problems of lunar research to be held in Leningrad in December of this year under the joint auspices of the U.S.S.R. Academy and the IAU.

Detail of publication; openness at meetings. In the first post-sputnik period, U.S.S.R. reports on satellite experiments and calculations were sketchy, both at meetings and in the periodical literature. The papers lacked the details needed for the formation of an independent judgment regarding the validity of results presented. It should be noted that this secretiveness was confined to the rocket and satellite area; in other fields of physics and the earth sciences U.S.S.R. publications and presentations have been relatively open and detailed. Another factor may contribute to the sketchiness of some of the Russian presentations. It appears to be the practice of the U.S.S.R. to send a relatively small delegation of leading Soviet scientists to these meetings, who then read review papers on the work of a large number of their colleagues. For this reason some of the areas of research covered in their papers may lack the intimate understanding of the subject which is required to answer pertinent questions.

Since 1958 U.S.S.R. publication policy seems to have relaxed to some degree, although U.S.S.R. publications on orbit data and tracking systems are still virtually nonexistent.

Timeliness: Originally, the U.S.S.R. appeared to favor newspaper releases over publication in the professional literature, for early reports on their satellite results. After the Moscow CSAGI meeting, this situation improved considerably. Preliminary notes on U.S.S.R. results have been appearing as promptly as in the United States, about 6 to 8 weeks after launch, for the most interesting results. For example, Lunik I was launched on January 2, 1959, and the Vernov note describing cosmic ray and trapped particle measurements was submitted for publication in the U.S.S.R. Academy proceedings on February 25, 1959. Lunik III was launched early in September of 1959, and the paper describing the photographs of the hidden face of the moon was received for publication in the U.S.S.R. Academy proceedings on November 14, 1959.

These examples refer to the publication of preliminary notes, equivalent to our letters to the editor. The detailed papers appear somewhat more slowly than in the United States, typically after a delay of 12 months versus 6 months in the United States.

Channels of communication: As noted above, in the first period of the U.S.S.R. space program, the Russians appeared to prefer qualitative newspaper accounts for the layman to quantitative publication in serious scientific journals. An examination of the literature suggests that this is no longer the case. As in the United States, newspaper articles on achievements of exceptional interest appear in the Russian press or public media at approximately the same time their preliminary scientific reports are published. The impression of this earlier, but no longer valid circumstance, has persisted because the newspaper stories are picked up immediately and translated quickly by the Department of Commerce and other agencies for distribution to Government personnel; whereas the academy proceedings and scientific literature do not appear in translated form until a much later time. For this reason U.S. scientists often obtain their first reports on interesting results through a Pravda translation.

It appears that the Moscow CSAGI meeting was responsible for the change toward normal channels of scientific communication and away from the public press. The detail presented in the U.S. papers at the Moscow meeting, and the strongly critical attitude of the U.S. delegation regarding Soviet suppression of detail, seemed to have had a beneficial effect. The dates of publication quoted above for the Lunik I and Lunik III experiments demonstrate this clearly. It seems reasonable to say that Soviet officials and scientists have shown a positive response to U.S. criticism in these matters, and can no longer be censured as severely on this basis as in 1958. An exception is the area of tracking systems and orbit information, in which U.S.S.R. disclosures are still inadequate.

Project Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 17, 1961

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, in seeking for ways toward a better understanding between the peoples of the world, Project Hope has been unparalleled in its universal appeal. Here is a program that everyone can support, regardless of his political beliefs.

I was profoundly touched recently when I heard of the efforts of 107 kindergarten and first grade students of the Walnut Street School, Lansing, Mich., to assist Project Hope financially through their own personal efforts. Since I attended this school myself, I can't help but have a personal pride in their accomplishments.

It was a privilege recently to read a heart-warming letter from Miss Armida Stewart, a teacher at the school, describing how these children raised money for the project—even to making and selling peanut butter and jam sandwiches.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have this letter appear in the RECORD so others may share the experiences of these compassionate children. They worked long and hard to raise a total of $30 to help Project Hope to continue the good work and good will of the American doctors, nurses, dentists, and medical technicians who are assisting to train and teach their southeastern Asian counterparts. As you will see from the letter, there was particular interest in the project because physically handicapped children in the city of Lansing are sent to the Walnut School for special attention.

I want to say that it is through efforts such as were made by these youngsters that this true people-to-people concept of Americans aiding the less fortunate of other nations can continue. I hope that all of us here in the Congress will show our full endorsement of the efforts and work of the People-to-People Health Foundation, Inc., Project Hope, and especially to those dedicated American men and women who are aboard the SS *Hope* the first.

The letter follows:

WALNUT STREET SCHOOL,
Lansing, Mich., January 15, 1961.

WILLIAM B. WALSH, M.D.
President, the People-to-People Health Foundation, Inc., Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. WALSH: This check for $30, to the Hope project is sent with a true desire for friendship from 107 Kindergarten and first graders to Indonesian children who need medical care. These children have all had immunization against polio. They think that shots are no fun but will keep them safe and well. They want other children to have protection too.

The children earned half of the money by making and selling peanut butter and jam sandwiches in their own school. A group of mothers, pleased with the childrens efforts, donated bridge club prize money and one grandparent also sent a contribution.

The Walnut School children were motivated in this project through the theme, Understanding Our Friends, Near and Far adopted by our school for study during American Education Week, 1960.

Ours is also the orthopedic school for the city of Lansing and our normal children must learn to work, play, live with, and help the abnormal group. The children visited in the clinic and the special rooms. They learned about the work of the doctors, the physical therapists, the occupational therapists, the speech therapist, the visiting nurse, the dietician, and the special room teachers. They learned to appreciate the courage, effort and achievements of these children. Here were our nearby friends to know and understand.

Through My Weekly Reader and articles in Life magazine, the newspapers, and TV, the children found out about the *Hope* ship and its mission of bringing medical aid and education to people in far away places.

They constructed a ship, modeled after pictures of the *Hope* ship, to display in a store window during American Education Week. They converted the doll corner into a hospital ship where they cared for sick dolls that recovered with amazing alacrity only to be desperately ill again in a short time.

The culmination of their project was the sandwich sale and milk and sandwiches for

themselves at afternoon lunch period. Enclosed are additional pictures of the children and their ship. I hope this résumé of our project may be of some help to you.

Sincerely,

ARMIDA STEWART.

India: Its Plans, Its Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 17, 1961

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an article recently published in the Miami Herald of Miami, Fla. It was written by Mr. Don Shoemaker, editor of the editorial page for this leading newspaper, following his completion of an extensive tour through the young nation of India.

Mr. Shoemaker is a graduate of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and began his newspaper career in that State as a reporter and telegraph editor of the Greensboro Record and in 1941 became associate editor and director of the editorial page for the Asheville, N.C., Citizen, a morning paper. He later was appointed executive director of the Southern Education Reporting Service and resigned this post to accept that of editor of the editorial page for the Miami Herald.

During the course of his career, Mr. Shoemaker founded and was first president of the Thomas Wolfe Memorial Association, a community enterprise memorializing the famous author of "Look Homeward, Angel." He was president of the Asheville Community Chest in 1951, was a director of the Asheville Chamber of Commerce, active in State organizations, and chairman of the first United Nations Association in western North Carolina. In 1952, he received a fellowship from the American Christian Palestine Committee for travel in the Middle East. From this trip came "Middle East Journey." In 1957 he planned and edited "With All Deliberate Speed," published by Harper & Bros. and now in its second printing. The book was widely and favorably reviewed and was featured on such TV programs as the CBS "Report in Integration," Dave Garroway's "Today" show, "Night Beat," and "Celebrity Parade."

As editor of the editorial page of the Miami Herald, Mr. Shoemaker will have additional opportunity to enhance what is already an outstanding career in the field of journalism. The Miami Herald is not only one of the finest newspapers of our country, it is distinguished in its keen interest in international affairs and its vital understanding of the problems and desires of people of all nations of the world.

Articles of this nature perform a very vital public service. Through the medium of firsthand, detailed accounts such as this by one of our country's leading newspapermen, our people are given background data on the history and social and political traditions of other peoples of the world. This is basic to a realistic understanding of their efforts to overcome their present-day problems and attain the goals they have set for themselves.

The first of Mr. Shoemaker's penetrating analyses of 20th-century India deals with the rampant poverty of 95 percent of its more than 400 million population in the midst of a land which is wealthy in agricultural production and industrial potential. This article undertakes the development of the 5-year plans under which this 13-year-old country has attempted to overcome its problems.

The article follows:

INDIA—ITS PLANS, ITS PROGRESS

(By Don Shoemaker)

(This is the first of four articles in a comprehensive report on the India of today—and tomorrow. It was written after an extensive tour of the multi-faceted young nation.)

One out of every seven humans is an Indian.

According to his racial strain he may be dark (Dravidian) or light (Aryan). According to his schooling, he may be functionally illiterate which the majority are, or he may be one of India's many philosophers. According to his income, which averages $60 per capita per year, he may enjoy hardly any of the fruits of life or a moderate portion.

But in any case he is an Indian, and proud of it.

His country is about half the size of the United States with more than twice the population. Disease is being conquered, but his life expectancy at birth is still only 32 years.

If he lives in the hill country of the north, where the great Himalayas were an agelong buffer against conquest, he huddles over a fire in winter. If he comes from the open spaces of the south, he hovers over a fan.

His land has nearly every known crop, except beef cattle (beef cannot be eaten by the Hindu), and practically all minerals save lead and tin.

His forests are rich in teak, satinwood and palm, and he has more land under irrigation and more power dams building than any other nation.

Yet India is desperately poor. The Government's planning commission estimates that 95 percent of the people live in poverty. And India's total income in the first year of independence was less than that of the United States for a single month.

One reason is that there are so many Indians—1,000 of them to the square mile in one State.

Another is the lack of domestic capital. Only 1 million Indians are rich enough to pay any income tax whatever.

Still another is the vast illiteracy of the people, most of whom live on the land and are accused of lack of ambition by their ambitious leaders. It will take another 5 years just to complete the enforcement of any kind of compulsory education—and then for the very young children only.

Further, India, despite its avowed pacifism and apparent neutralism, has enemies. Red China's antics in the past year have shaken India into a state of jitters.

To overcome most of these problems the people are engaged in a massive social experiment. They call it democratic planning.

Everything in India today is planned step by step—income, industry, farming, education, transportation, culture—even families.

By teaching methods of birth limitation and by sterilization of willing parents of large families, India hopes to halve the birth rate and cut the size of the average family from 6.5 children to 3.

To realize all these aims, India since 1950 has operated under a series of 5-year plans. A third plan begins in 1961 and a fourth is taking some shape.

Planning is arranged in two sectors, private and public. In the 1954 words of India's Parliament, the broad objectives of economic policy should be to achieve the socialist pattern of society.

The word "socialism" is flashed about liberally, and it gives some visitors the creeps. The fact is, however, that in real terms private enterprise is growing in India and that foreign investors are clamoring to get a lock on this huge, protected market. From oil in Assam to rubber factories in the Punjab, economic opportunity excites the foreign businessman. At the end of 1958 U.S. investments totaled well over $150 million, and they were just beginning to grow.

The work of the planning commission is carefully scrutinized by Parliament, which is dominated by the conservative Congress Party.

Parliament and the Congress evidently are not alarmed by the Socialist pitch of Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru and others. Nor are some foreign observers. A highly placed exindustrialist calls it an exercise in semantics.

Mr. Nehru simply explains that India must get done what it needs to get done by any available method, whether capitalistic or socialistic. Often the Government seems to prefer private enterprise, as in the case of aluminum, fertilizer and coal production.

In any case the emphasis is on democracy, and the heroes are Jefferson and Lincoln. There is complete freedom of the press and of assembly, and though the Government has in force a "preventive detention" law (under one like it the British Raj kept hundreds of Indian nationalists on ice), less than 100 persons have been in jail at any one recent time. Most of these are not subversives or political enemies of the state but criminals with notions of common violence.

On the farms, where nearly 80 percent of the people live and work, the Government is engaged in a giant community program which aims to elevate village life.

The countryside is organized in blocks of 100 villages containing 60,000 to 70,000 people. Each group of six or seven villages is served by what we would call a farm agent. These men and women are trained at centers which are often backstopped by consulting American farm specialists under contract with American universities. Each village has a council, or panchayat selected by the people. It in turn helps select state assemblymen, and so on up to Parliament. Indian democracy starts at the bottom and works up.

The third 5-year plan which begins in 1961 builds upon the success—some partial—of the two previous plans. It contemplates the spending of $21.4 billion. The first plan cost about $9 billion. New taxes must be found to finance the investment in the public secter, which is India's official term for Government spending.

The obvious base for much of this increase in expenditure and (it is hoped) in national income is new and expanded industry. Indians are now making more goods than you could shake a sikh at.

Even so, national demands and expectations continue to rise. India has reached what Mr. Nehru calls the age of the bicycle, at least one of which every Indian seems to own, and it might be added even in a mud-hut village where the people literally have no possessions but the clothes on their backs.

With the aim of doubling its per capital income to $120 by 1973–74, India would cut its village population to 50 percent of the whole and put the rest to work productively in the new factories. "Fifteen years from

now," says Deputy Planning Chief J. J. Anjaria, "we should have a fairly strong industrial base."

Whether India can beat its way into the 20th century via this route and not get bady sideswipped is the question of primary pertinence. The planning commission sets forth:

"The directive principles of state policy in the constitution have placed before the country the objectives of securing adequate means of livelihood and the right to work, to education, and to public assistance in cases of unemployment, old age, sickness and disablement, and in other cases of undeserved want. They have also affirmed that for realizing these goals, the ownership and control of the material resources of the country should be distributed as best to subserve the common good and that the operation of the economic system should not result in the concentration of wealth and economic power in the hands of a few. The successive 5-year plans which the country undertakes have to keep in view these basic considerations."

To the Indian who resembles Bill Arp's Confederate veteran, this may sound like heaven. Along with Johnny Reb, he has nothing and nothing to get nothing with and nothing to put nothing in.

To the student of government and economics it would appear that India is flirting with totalitarianism.

Whatever it is doing, it is humming. To the old Asia hand, the Orient was never like this.

Forty-third Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, for 21 years the Republic of Lithuania has been a Republic in name only. In actual fact, it has been under Communist domination with no freedom, no liberties, only oppression and practically slavery. Why then observe the 43d anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day on February 16?

The fate of Lithuania and other Baltice nations, among the first to be swallowed up by Russian Communist expansion, serves as a reminder to all of us that freedom is not free. It is not something that once gained, is a permanent possession. The people of Lithuania know what it means to have had it and to have lost it. Rather, freedom requires eternal vigilance, something to be constantly defended from foes from within as well as from without; something we must be ready to protect at all times and to fight for when necessary. I am confident that the people of Lithuania would be eager to fight to regain their freedom, if given the opportunity to do so. Therefore, the annual observance of the anniversary of their former independence, should strengthen all of us in our determination to continue our efforts, through every available means, to restore freedom and independence to Lithuania and the other captive countries. It should bring encouragement and strength to the people of those captive countries, knowing that they have not been forgotten but are of continued concern to the free peoples of the world everywhere, not only to those of Lithuanian descent.

As it has done for many years, the Council of Lithuanian Societies of Baltimore, commemorated Lithuanian Independence Day with a dinner, which I was privileged to attend. Both the Governor of Maryland and the mayor of Baltimore proclaimed February 16 as Republic of Lithuania Day in the city and State:

THE STATE OF MARYLAND, EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT—GOVERNOR'S PROCLAMATION: REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA DAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1961

Whereas the people of Lithuania were deported, enslaved and mass-murdered by Communists; and

Whereas their religion was repressed and their freedom obliterated; and

Whereas a liberty-loving nation is not easily shackled, particularly when that nation has known the experience of freedom; and

Whereas the plight of Lithuania is known to all of us, and we cannot, as Americans, take a casual view of the loss of freedom by any nation; and

Whereas those whose ancestors came from Lithuania, and their friends of all national origins, join them in their hopes and prayers for liberation from communism.

Now, therefore, I, J. Millard Tawes, Governor of the State of Maryland, do hereby proclaim February 16, 1961—the 43d Birthday of Lithuania's Independence—as Republic of Lithuania Day in this State, in recognition of the faith and courage of the Lithuanian people and in support of all men who fight for freedom.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Maryland, at the city of Annapolis, this 30th day of January, in the year of our Lord, 1961.

By the Governor:

J. MILLARD TAWES.
LLOYD L. SIMPKINS,
Secretary of State.

PROCLAMATION BY MAYOR J. HAROLD GRADY, CITY OF BALTIMORE, DESIGNATING THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1961, AS "REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA DAY" IN BALTIMORE

Whereas on the 16th day of February 1919, the Republic of Lithuania declared itself an independent, free and sovereign nation; and

Whereas in later years, this freedom-loving nation was crushed and destroyed by the imperialistic expansion of Soviet Russia; and

Whereas despite this oppression, the freedom-loving people of Lithuania behind the Soviet Iron Curtain, and those of Lithuanian descent throughout the entire world, constantly work and pray for the hour when, once again, their homeland can enjoy the status of a free, sovereign, and independent nation; and

Whereas annually, on February 16, Baltimoreans of Lithuanian descent join with those of Lithuanian ancestry throughout the world to observe the Independence Day of Lithuania, and to offer up prayers that their beloved mother country will soon be enabled to enjoy the blessings of freedom; and

Whereas the city of Baltimore is justly proud of its many citizens of Lithuanian birth or ancestry, who have made important contributions to the civic, social, and religious life of our community, and who have been enabled to enjoy here the freedom denied their compatriots in Lithuania.

Now, therefore, I, J. Harold Grady, mayor of the city of Baltimore, do hereby proclaim Thursday, February 16, 1961, as Republic of Lithuania Day in Baltimore, and do urge all our citizens to join with the people of Lithuania, and people of Lithuanian descent throughout the world in praying and working to the end that the blessings of liberty and justice will again return to Lithuania and to the entire world.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the city of Baltimore to be affixed this 7th day of February, in the year of our Lord, 1961.

J. HAROLD GRADY,
Mayor.

Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include also a resolution unanimously adopted by the council on this occasion:

Resolution unanimously adopted at the 43d annual banquet held under the sponsorship of the Council of Lithuanian Societies of Baltimore, held on the 11th day of February 1961, at the Lithuanian Auditorium, Baltimore, Md.

"Whereas the 16th day of February will mark the 43d anniversary of the declaration of independence by the people of the Republic of Lithuania; and

"Whereas the people of Lithuania are still suppressed by tryannical Communist dictatorship, her culture distorted and many thousands of her people deported into concentration camps; and

"Whereas the U.S. Government on July 23, 1940, condemned the aggression and refused to recognize Soviet occupation of Lithuania: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we Lithuanian Americans reaffirm our adherence to American democratic principles of government and pledge our support to our Government and our Congress to achieve lasting peace, freedom and justice throughout the world;

"*Resolved*, That our Government's foreign policy include the liberation of the enslaved Baltic and Central European nations as an integral and inseparable part of its program;

"*Resolved*, That toward the attainment of this end the U.S. Government introduce to the United Nations General Assembly the problem of enslaved Lithuania and demand that the Soviet Government withdraw all occupation troops and control from Lithuania, allowing the people to freely select their own form of government and to reestablish Lithuania as a sovereign nation with strict guarantees; and be it finally

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be submitted to His Excellency, John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, to the Ambassador to the United Nations and to the Members of the Congress representing the free State of Maryland.

COUNCIL OF LITHUANIAN SOCIETIES OF BALTIMORE,
THOMAS G. GRAY, *President.*
LUCY LASKAUSKAS, *Secretary.*

Right, You Are Right?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following letter appeared in the Daily Princetonian of February 27.

This letter is written by an undergraduate and is for that reason especially noteworthy.

We are being told that this is the era of youth, although in Washington we see little but retreads, back where they were 10 years ago. So it is refreshing to see a young man of independent views expressing himself clearly and intelligently. This is a hopeful sign for the future of our country. It is true progress when youth can break away from the teachings of the past and chart out his own course into the future.

RIGHT, YOU ARE RIGHT?

To the CHAIRMAN OF THE DAILY PRINCETONIAN:

Upon hearing of the faculty and administration reaction to the pending "aid to education" bill, I was not only surprised, but shocked. I was surprised that such learned men as Dean Brown and Mr. Strong should be blinded by the bright lights of Utopia when the record clearly shows that as state aid to education increases, so do undesirable state controls. And I was shocked to hear a statement that dripped greed: "Princeton would stand to benefit from both aid to construction projects and scholarship grants." I believe that Princeton is currently involved in raising $53 million for both construction, scholarship and faculty benefit; on the other hand, I see other worthy colleges—Connecticut College in New London, for example—whose total endowment is not even 10 percent of what we are raising in one five year period. And we want more. With this attitude prevailing, perhaps we do need Federal supervision to insure a more equitable and reasonable distribution of the nation's wealth.

Unlike most "conservatives," I am not worried that Federal aid to education would "limit states' rights"; my principal concern is that educational standards be raised. But I am fully convinced that local governments can do a more effective job of raising educational standards than can the Federal Government.

There are many areas in the country which view themselves as being unable to raise their education standards. However, as Arthur Krock pointed out in Thursday's New York Times, the facts show that these areas are more "unwilling" than "unable." The area which first comes to mind is the South. Accustomed to Federal assistance in developing their resources in the postbellum period, and used to coddling in the Roosevelt era, the Southern states simply do not know how to employ their local resources to the best possible advantage. The truth of the matter is, according to the President's Council on Education in 1958, that there are only 230 school districts in the country which have reached their bonded borrowing limit with regard to school construction. There are roughly 42,000 school districts in America. Thus, advocates of Federal aid are discussing a plan that is needed by only one-half of 1 percent of the country.

The local communities—which, I believe, are responsible for the education of the local children—have been far from stingy in their support of the local schools. Since World War II, Americans have built 550,000 classrooms at a cost of $19 billion, which was largely raised at the local level and State level. These classrooms have provided space for 15 million school children; during the same period of time, the school age population has increased by only 10 million. I think then, that the traditional method of handling school problems is more than adequate.

Still, however, the school problem is acute in one specific area: quality. There is no question that the quality of public schools, especially at the grade school level, can be improved. And again, the most effective way of improving the local school is to bring pressure upon the local board of education.

There are many good arguments in favor of Federal aid to education, the most outstanding of which is that local communities are negligent in taking the required action to improved local educational facilities. It is necessary, I believe, to prod these erring areas into action; but a gift of money does not prod, it only gives a false assurance that now everything is OK. That more money can be put to good use cannot be argued—who cannot use more money? But additional money is not a panacea; the real answer to the education dilemma is in internal improvement of the schools through force at the local level.

I am confident that if Americans do not panic but view the problems in a safe perspective and chart a sound course for improvement, that improvement will come.

Respectfully,

GEORGE H. GILLIAM.

Address by Dr. Wernher von Braun

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 17, 1961

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, recently, Dr. Wernher von Braun spoke to a group of American educators about the important part that youth can play in the advancement of the space age. Because of the major role that Dr. von Braun, director of the Space Agency's Marshall Space Flight Center, is playing in this new field of endeavor, I feel his words will be an inspiration to our young people.

Under unanimous consent, I therefore insert Dr. von Braun's remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

It is a distinct pleasure for me to meet here with you in one of the more widely known and respected cultural centers of our country—Columbia, S.C.

It is always a special privilege for me to speak before such a distinguished body of educators. Because it is you and your associates who are not only the instructors of tomorrow's leaders, but the inspiration as well.

But it is actually our American youth, more than the older generation, that has a profound understanding of the significance of the space age. Young minds appreciate the true meaning of the big rocket and rocket boosters that we are developing for the exploration of space.

With the mystery of outer space beckoning so strongly to them, it is little wonder that some impatient young men and women want to leapfrog the difficulties of mastering physics, chemistry, English, calculus, and so forth. They want to take off immediately for the moon without first getting a basic, well-rounded education. But it pays, as I know from an early experience, to get a good grasp of the fundamentals.

Shortly after the Russian sputniks went up there was a wave of breastbeating surging throughout America. Wild statements were made that American schools were no match for the Soviet educational system.

Although it is true that the Soviets have challenged us very seriously in the number of engineers they graduate each year, the quality of our schools need not fear a comparison. American schools need not apologize for the great men they have produced. Men of science, letters, and the arts. Men like the inventive Wright brothers; Harold C. Urey, Nobel Prize winner, chemist, nuclear physicist, astronomer, and one of the outstanding scientists of the 20th century; Architect Frank Lloyd Wright, a bold and brilliant innovator; Lee De Forest, inventor of the vacuum tube; William Faulkner, another Nobel Prize winner.

So you see, our schools can indeed produce the kind of men and women needed to accept and meet the challenge of space. At the same time, our schools can fulfill their obligation of giving to the Nation and the world—and even to the universe—men and women of culture, integrity, imagination, initiative, and usefulness to humanity.

I should like to mention a thought expressed by one of my principal associates, Dr. Ernst Stuhlinger. He said that the destiny of our Nation is being decided in today's classrooms. He also pointed out, "We have come to value a nation according to the esteem in which it holds its scholars."

I subscribe fully to these thoughts, and I should like to add this: More than ever before, our young people are being stimulated to develop their imagination, to satisfy their curiosity about the universe.

I would even go so far as to say that man's curiosity is the world's greatest resource. It is what sets his apart.

For example, the curiosity of a handful of people about "What makes the sun shine?" led to the discovery of the thermonuclear reaction.

When a 20th-century bacteriologist became curious about some physical reactions taking place in common mold, his efforts to satisfy his curiosity gave us penicillin.

But it takes curiosity and more than our schools, our teachers, and our parents to inspire today's youth to greater heights. It also requires informed public opinion. Our youngsters must obtain their knowledge of the world and of themselves from all possible sources in order to develop into mature, responsible citizens.

Every medium of information should be available to our younsters so they miss no chance to become—and remain—informed people. Even more so than some of their parents, I hope.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Award by Reserve Officers Association of the United States to Hon. Hugh Meglone Milton II, Former Under Secretary of the Army, as Minuteman of 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 3, 1961

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, last week the Reserve Officers Association of the United States held its annual midwinter national council meeting in Washington. The members of this association came from all parts of the United States and our oversea commands, including Europe and the Far East, to discuss programs relating to national security with our military leaders as well as leaders of the Congress.

They had a most interesting and productive meeting as many of us who attended can testify.

One of the highlights of the week's program was the annual ROA national council banquet at which the "Minuteman of 1961" title was bestowed upon the Honorable Hugh Meglone Milton II, the former Under Secretary of the Army. General Milton is well known to all the Members of the Congress as well as to many of the citizens of these United States for the great service he has rendered to his country. This award was made in behalf of ROA by the distinguished senior Senator from the State of Georgia and chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, the Honorable RICHARD B. RUSSELL, who himself was the winner of this award in 1959. Because of the significance of his remarks I am submitting the text of his presentation here, together with a telegram referring to the occasion from the Honorable Wilber M. Brucker, the Secretary of the Army under whom Mr. Milton served. I should also like to include in these remarks the text of the introductory remarks by the national president of ROA, Maj. Gen. Carl T. Sutherland. General Sutherland is the commander of the 81st Infantry Division. This outstanding Army Reserve division draws its men from Tennessee, Georgia, and South Carolina. I have personal knowledge of the very fine service of this division. It has also been a privilege to be a close friend of General Sutherland, and I know of his dedication to the welfare of this Nation as well as his outstanding confidence in serving as president of this great association of citizen-reservists. I ask unanimous consent that this material be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address and telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TELEGRAM

My presence as speaker at Rainbow Division reunion in Columbus prevents my attendance at Reserve Officers banquet tonight at which time my valued friend Hugh Milton is scheduled to receive your magnificent Minuteman of the Year Award. I can imagine no one more deserving of this superlative honor than Hugh Milton who has been a stanch, loyal, and enthusiastic champion of the preservation of the whole vital reserve structure for the defense of our country. Please convey hearty congratulations to Hugh Milton and count me present in spirit on this occasion as he receives this well deserved tribute.

WILBER M. BRUCKER.

REMARKS OF HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL, OF GEORGIA, IN PRESENTATION OF ROA AWARD TO HON. HUGH MEGLONE II, MINUTEMAN OF 1961, FEBRUARY 24, 1961

Mr. President, honored guests, members of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, ladies and gentlemen, it is a great personal pleasure, as well as a high privilege, for me to present you to our honored guest.

I have always had a high regard for the Reserve Officers Association of the United States.

One of the most highly prized honors of my life was that which came from you 2 years ago.

The symbol of that award hangs in the most prominent place in my office, beside my desk. It is a continuing source of inspiration, and satisfaction, to me.

I know that this feeling of pride, tempered with genuine humility, is shared by the two others here on this platform, who have received this honor during the past several years—Gen. David Sarnoff and Col. Bryce Harlow.

More than a century and a quarter ago, that great orator of our early history—one who inspired our forefathers in those "Days of Giants"—Daniel Webster told his fellow countrymen:

"A sense of duty pursues us ever. It is omnipresent, like the Deity. If we take to ourselves the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea, duty performed or duty violated is still with us, for our happiness or our misery. If we say the darkness shall cover us, in the darkness, as in the light, our obligations are yet with us."

We honor a man tonight who symbolizes the citizen-reservist tradition, who always has been pursued, it seems, by a sense of duty. The honors he has achieved in a life rich in service to his country, and deep in devotion to our national ideals, are too numerous to recount.

Let us consider at this moment the significant acts of his life—acts on his part—which are notably accountable for this award.

As a boy, he left his college campus as a volunteer and was a member of the great American Armed Force which fought and won the war to make the world safe for democracy.

It was during that war that he earned his first commission as a lieutenant.

With victory in World War I, he went back to the campus of the University of Kentucky, in his native town of Lexington, and finished his work toward his degree. In 1919 he entered the field of education, accepting a position on the faculty of Texas A. & M. University. He later became president of the New Mexico State University.

With the outbreak of World War II, he again responded to a call to military service, and he gave again of himself to his country in some of the toughest, most grueling campaigns of the war. He became chief of staff of the XIV which fought its way from the Solomons to the Japanese home islands.

As American troops doggedly and heroically fought their way back up the Luzon peninsula, our honor guest tonight so distinguished himself in his valorous leadership that he merited promotion on the battlefield to brigadier general. After victory, he went back to education, becoming superintendent of New Mexico Military Institute.

Yet a third time he was called like Fabius, to exchange civilian life for the sword. In 1950 he donned his uniform again and accepted the assignment as chief of reserves and ROTC for the U.S. Army.

I submit that this man's service is in the very best citizen-reservist tradition.

That he continued to serve after retirement from the military, as Assistant Secretary and then Under Secretary of the Army, is not part of our story tonight, but we should not fail to note perhaps the most amazing part of his career—that he survived 10 years in the Pentagon.

But I can remind you that in his service, he had followed George Washington's reminder, "When we assumed the soldier we did not lay aside the citizen."

We all know, and we admire and hold in genuine admiration and deep affection, our honored guest tonight—Hugh Meglone Milton II.

"RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES

"Annual citation to the citizen who has contributed most to national security in these times, 1961, Hugh Meglone Milton II."

AN ASSOCIATION RESOLUTION TO THE HONORABLE HUGH MEGLONE MILTON II

Because throughout your career—

(a) Profoundly knowledgable in the concept of freedom which was born and nurtured in our Nation, you have aided as a citizen and soldier in safeguarding this thought;

(b) Keenly aware of the citizen's obligation, three times you have laid aside your citizen's role to answer the call to serve in defense of your country; you have at personal sacrifice and with extraordinary effectiveness given of your talent and energy to the Nation;

(c) Nobly motivated in your public service, you have shunned narrow considerations including partisanship and have fixed your course on the highest standards of national interest;

(d) Deeply dedicated to honor and duty, you have given your strength and ability far beyond the call of duty.

In the name of the Nation's first minutemen, who gave our forefathers the instinct and the genius to contest to death for the liberty which is the life and breath of our Nation, this association proudly and humbly recognizes your service as a patriot, and

your meaningful contribution to national security which is shared by every citizen of the United States.

For the association, by the national executive committee, February 24, 1961:

CARL T. SUTHERLAND,
National President.
JOHN T. CARLTON,
Executive Director.

REMARKS OF MAJ. GEN. CARL T. SUTHERLAND

We are much pleased that so many of the members of the national council and of our various action committees have come here from many parts of the world to participate in our deliberations and to adopt resolutions to serve as guidelines to the national officers and to express our views and recommendations to our leaders in the Pentagon and on Capitol Hill.

These dedicated members have worked long hours during the past 3 days. For their fine cooperation and serious application to the business of the association, I express sincere appreciation.

We are of the firm conviction that our efforts in support of a strong defense system cannot be relaxed, indeed, they need to be intensified in these days of increasing world wide tensions. We are gratified that our own most distinguished member, the brilliant young President of the United States, has thrown to every citizen the challenge that we in the Reserve Officers Association long have accepted, "Ask not what your country can do for you; rather ask what you can do for your country." We take renewed inspiration from his forthright challenge to the American people and to people of all the world.

We invite our guests to join us in our renewed dedication to the cause for which we were founded 39 years ago, "to support the establishment and maintenance of an adequate system of national defense."

The Honorable Walter M. Mumma

SPEECH
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, WALTER MUMMA was an especially good friend of mine and I always had high regard for him as a statesman for his keen adeptness in alayzing all phases of legislation.

This session of Congress, he moved to the important Ways and Means Committee which made him so happy and with his background he could have made many, many contributions to this great committee in the House of Representatives.

It is unbelievable that his career would be stamped out at this important stage of his life with this new challenge before him to further serve his country.

Having served with him for many years in the Congress, I shall not only miss him as a great statesman but as a good friend whose warm personal charm, great sense of humor and enjoyment of life enriched all who knew him.

My deepest sympathy goes to his son, Robert, and his grandchildren.

Resignation of Maj. Gen. Ralph J. Olson, Former Director of Wisconsin Bureau of Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 3, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the history of our country is star-studded with the work of outstanding individuals who have contributed selflessly to public service and progress in a great many fields of national endeavor.

At this time, I want to pay tribute to one such citizen, Maj. Gen. Ralph C. Olson, former director of the Bureau of Civil Defense for the State of Wisconsin.

Today, I received from Major Olson, a letter notifying me of his resignation as director of civil defense. I regret that he now finds it necessary—because of other broad-scope responsibilities—to relinquish his duties. He deserves, I believe, commendation for a job well done.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD this letter, which reflects the dedicated way in which he has not only performed his duties as civil defense director, but also continues to maintain an active interest in the program after his resignation.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF WISCONSIN,
BUREAU OF CIVIL DEFENSE,
Madison, Wis., February 27, 1961.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: This is to notify you that I have resigned as State Director of Civil Defense for the State of Wisconsin, effective 1 March 1961; and Governor Nelson has announced that Mr. Willian K. Chipman will be the new State director.

I have considered this for many years because of the increasing responsibilities in the adjutant general's office, but was particularly anxious to remain on the job until we had completed and published the State operational plan and passed a State law which should greatly strengthen the civil defense program in our State. I do not believe it is possible to do justice to two jobs of this magnitude.

Naturally, I leave this job with mixed emotions. Having served as State director since 1950, I recall our early meetings with James Wadsworth when civil defense was more or less a stepchild in the National Security Resources Board. I saw the organization develop into the Federal Civil Defense Administration, under the leadership of Governors Caldwell, Peterson and Hoegh; and more recently when it was combined with ODM as the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization in the executive department of our Government, under the able leadership of Gov. Leo A. Hoegh. We have endured the growing pains on the National, State and local levels, and we can all take pride in the fact that with our national and State plans we have the opportunity to develop an effective and realistic program.

I treasure the friendships made during the past 10 years, and I hope there will be opportunities to renew these acquaintances in the future.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH J. OLSON,
Major General, AGC, Wisconsin ARNG, the Adjutant General, Director of Civil Defense.

The Sick Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GALE W. McGEE
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 3, 1961

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I call attention to an article, by Walter Lippmann, on the state of the Nation's economy. In the article Mr. Lippmann quotes to a considerable extent from an objective study of the economy, written by Paul Samuelson, president of the American Economic Association.

Because of the sobering judgment set forth therein and the seriousness of some of the matters dealt with, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 2, 1961]

TODAY AND TOMORROW: THE SICK ECONOMY

(By Walter Lippmann)

There is as yet no evidence, unless it be in the behavior of the stock market, that recovery from the recession is underway or in sight. Unemployment is continuing to increase, steel is operating at half capacity, the automobile business is very poor. All in all there is a growing disposition to ask whether the extremely moderate measures proposed by the President will be sufficient to turn the tide.

The President's task force, which was headed by Prof. Paul Samuelson, the president of the American Economic Association, advised Mr. Kennedy in January that the first measures might not be adequate, and that if the upturn did not come by April, stronger measures would be needed.

Professor Samuelson does not hold any public office. But in many ways he is the economist to whom the administration economists listen most closely. He has just written an article for a Japanese newspaper, the Nihon Keizai Shimbun. The article discusses the Kennedy program as it has been formulated to date. Professor Samuelson thinks that "when you come to add up in quantitative terms what the whole package of programs can be expected to accomplish, you realize how limited the total package really is."

Professor Samuelson does not say this in criticism of the administration program. As a matter of fact, the current administration program is about what his task force recommended last January before the President was inaugurated. But the advice at that time was accompanied by the warning, which President Kennedy himself passed on to the country, that the first measures might have to be reinforced by a second set. It is a fair inference from Professor Samuelson's article in the Japanese newspaper that he is now

rather expecting that a supplementary package will be needed.

These ideas stem from the belief that the present recession, following upon a poor recovery from the recession of 1958, and coming at the end of several years of sluggish economic activity, is much more serious than Congress or the mass of the people who are not unemployed have yet realized. "It is well," says Professor Samuelson, "to have no illusions about the magnitudes of the proposed (Kennedy) measures."

Even, he says, if the economy begins to turn up by the middle of the year, "there is little reason to think that the end of the year will find us with unemployment much better than at the present time." What is more, a quickening of economic growth to the American average rate of 3½ to 4 percent, will have to wait until the second and third years of President Kennedy's term of office.

These are the hard judgments of a cool and expert mind. They will be unwelcome to many. They will be unwelcome to those who take the view that with words of confidence and optimism a recession like this one can be talked away and that the somber truths should be glossed over and suppressed. The more innocent among them go so far as to say that this recession and this slowdown are being prolonged, indeed made worse, because the Kennedy administration is telling the country that the economy is very sick.

There is everything to be said for keeping up the confidence of a sick patient. But an essential ingredient of that confidence is that the patient be convinced that the doctor is not deceiving himself. If, as seems so probable, we face a long, hard effort to revive the American economy, the confidence of the people will best be sustained by convincing them that the economic doctors are not treating nice words as a substitute for real actions.

Virginia Kelly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, to many of us who come to Washington to take part in the Government of our country meeting and working with Columnist-Reporter Virginia Kelly has been one of the unexpected and pleasant rewards of public life. Recently the Long Beach Independent, Press-Telegram ran a short biography of Mrs. Kelly which I know it will please her many friends in the Capitol and throughout the country to read.

The article is as follows:

BUSY VIRGINIA KELLY—TAFT STORY STARTED HER NEWS CAREER

A 5-foot-3-inch, 112-pound newswoman—who at the age of 4 complained to her father that she was "ashamed of being ignorant and unable to read the comics"—today is part of the Independent, Press-Telegram team covering Washington, considered one of the world's choicest newspaper beats.

And Virginia Kelly, wife of Rear Adm. Thomas J. Kelly, U.S. Navy, retired, after almost 15 years on the Washington scene knows her way around the Capital byways.

"Its not easy to get a job as a newspaper reporter—and even harder to get a job as a Washington correspondent," she explains. "Especially for me—I had no journalistic training, no newspaper experience except on my high school paper in Paris, Tenn., and my husband didn't own a newspaper."

But she made the grade when she covered a Senate speech by the late Senator Robert Taft and sent a story in to the editor of The Press Telegram—"because I had lived in Long Beach and had been a subscriber."

"To my amazement—and I'm still amazed—I received a letter and a check, plus a tear sheet with my bylined story. In every mail thereafter, the paper received a blizzard of stories from me," she says.

Some were bought, she says, and before long the editors decided it would be more economical to put her on the payroll.

In a kind of perpetual motion in those first years, I raced from the White House to the Capitol to the State Department to the Pentagon. I was the most ignorant, greenest, and most scared reporter in town, but I wrote everything from art to sports," she recalls.

Since then she has met three Presidents—Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy—most of the Kings and Queens of the world, numerous heads of state, congressional leaders, Ambassadors, Pulitzer prize winners, the world's leading musicians, artists, military men, poets, writers, and such leaders in their field as Jimmy Hoffa, Alger Hiss and Whittaker Chambers.

One of the best stories she helped cover, the newswoman maintains, concerned former Senator William Knowland.

"At the time, Assemblyman Bruce Allen was trying to put through legislation which would take taken all of Long Beach's oil royalty money. Malcolm Epley, executive editor of the newspaper, called from Sacramento to ask me to get a statement from Senator Knowland that might help Long Beach.

"Washington was closed tighter than a bank vault—it was Saturday—but Allen had the votes to get his bill out of committee on Monday. Senator Knowland's legislative assistant said it would be useless to talk to the Senator because he never commented on State legislation. I located Senator Knowland at his apartment and the statement I got is credited with stopping the Allen legislation."

But sometimes a newspaper's most important contributions to public welfare are never in print, she says.

For example, helping parents get a passport on Saturday to visit their critically ill son in England, or stopping the deporting of a young war bride less than 8 hours before she was to be taken aboard ship.

Mrs. Kelly, who attended Ward-Belmont Junior College in Nashville, Tenn., Peabody Conservatory in Baltimore, and the Pittsburgh Musical Institute, has had a varied career.

"During the depression, as a struggling young musician, I tramped from church to church and from radio station to radia station to get jobs. I've traveled by almost every means of conveyance, lived in every fashion in this country and abroad," she says.

As a Red Cross volunteer she helped nurse wounded servicemen and served in hospitals in the "locked" neuropsychiatric wards. She has sung in prisons and hospitals.

"The metropolitan daily paper is an encyclopedia produced in new editions daily," she says. "Most newspaper people are dedicated to truth, liberty, and learning, and to share—even in a modest way—in this profession is thrilling, inspiring, and challenging."

NATO Approaching New Phase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 3, 1961

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, almost daily there appears in the press some article pointing up the fact that many problems besetting the North Atlantic Treaty Organization are going unresolved.

One of the latest of such articles is a Paris dispatch by the distinguished foreign correspondent of the Washington Star, Crosby S. Noyes. This article appeared in the Star on Wednesday, February 22.

In the dispatch, Mr. Noyes analyzed the unresolved and vexing problem of giving NATO an atomic deterrent, and concluded, in his words:

What is needed is nothing less than a full-scale review of the whole Western defensive picture and NATO's part in it.

Until such a study is completed, Mr. Noyes writes, NATO will have no solid basis on which to lay its plans, and the decisions on which the future of the alliance depends must be postponed.

There are, of course, confronting NATO many other problems equally perplexing and also unresolved and also deserving of prompt attention. These lie in the political and economic field; and until these, too, are given a full-scale review, the entire underpinning of the alliance will remain in doubt.

I wish to remind the Senate that the 86th Congress enacted, and the former President signed into law, Senate Joint Resolution 170, authorizing American participation in just such a review.

Under this resolution, which I was privileged to sponsor in the Senate, representative citizens of this country would join leading citizens of the other NATO nations in an Atlantic Convention—

to examine how greater political and economic cooperation among their peoples may be promoted.

Time is running out, for under the resolution the U.S. Citizens Commission will cease to exist on January 31, 1962.

I respectfully urge that those charged with the implementation of Senate Joint Resolution 170, of the 86th Congress, take steps at once to appoint the Citizens Commission, so that the Atlantic Convention can be held this year and some of the urgent problems facing NATO can be attacked.

I also ask unanimous consent that Mr. Noyes' article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATO APPROACHING NEW PHASE

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

PARIS.—There is plenty of evidence in Europe to back up Washington's belief that

the North Atlantic Alliance is indeed "on the eve of a new phase."

A fairly sweeping reappraisal of NATO, its aims, its scope and its basic strategy is in fact already in full swing here. Our allies have not waited for the lead from the new administration in Washington before coming up with many pointed questions of their own.

Of these, some of the most urgent queries are concerned with NATO's military defenses and its future reliance on atomic weapons as opposed to conventional forces. Specifically, they raise doubts about the wisdom of the American proposal to equip NATO with the medium-range Polaris missiles as a major element in the defense of Western Europe.

This offer—or rather suggestion—was made by former Secretary of State Herter at the last NATO council meeting in December. Although it has not as yet been renewed by the Kennedy administration, the permanent NATO council has been debating the proposal with vigor during recent weeks. And the debate so far has raised a good many more difficult questions than answers as to how the scheme would work.

THE PROBLEM OF CONTROL

Some of these were raised and deliberately left dangling by Mr. Herter at the time of the December meeting. The American proposal was simply that the council might wish to consider buying some 100 mobile Polaris missiles having a range of some 1,500 miles for dispersal in and around the NATO area. In addition it was suggested that a fleet of five Polaris-carrying submarines might be assigned to the NATO command.

One major problem which immediately was obvious was control of the missiles and nuclear weapons which they would carry. The idea clearly was for an independent NATO deterrent with the weapons under NATO—rather than exclusively American—control. But who, in case of an emergency, should decide whether or not the weapons should be used? The more they have mulled over the question, the greater the doubts of our NATO allies have become. The concept of "15 fingers on the trigger" seems hopelessly unwieldy, particularly if consultation of the NATO ambassadors in Paris with their home governments were required before action could be taken. The alternative idea of having a smaller NATO type of security council entrusted with the fateful decision raises many difficulties.

In fact, the more they think about it the better the present control system for NATO's nuclear weapons appears. Bilateral arrangements under which local forces control the means of delivery and the United States retains possession of nuclear warheads may still turn out to be the most workable system after all other possibilities have been explored.

FULL REVIEW NEEDED

Beyond the problem of control, however, more fundamental doubts about the value of a NATO nuclear deterrent are being raised. The British, supported by the Danes and Norwegians, have submitted a list of some 50 questions to the NATO Council which go deeply into NATO's basic military strategy. The main point raised is whether NATO is not already too committed to the use of nuclear weapons for the defense of Western Europe and whether in the coming era of missile gap or nuclear stalemate, more emphasis should not be placed on building up the conventional forces of the alliance.

The argument being heard frequently in NATO circles is that the Polaris offer would do little to provide any real deterrent power in the NATO area and might, in fact, increase the area's vulnerability. For anything short of all-out war, NATO already has a wide variety of tactical atomic weapons at its disposal. And the addition of longer range weapons might tend to change the posture of the alliance—in Russian eyes, at least—from defensive to offensive.

Even in its preliminary stages, however, the debate has shown clearly that NATO cannot by itself supply the answers to its own questions. What is needed is nothing less than a full-scale review of the whole Western defensive picture and NATO's part in it. Until such a comprehensive study is completed in Washington—and it can hardly be made anywhere else—NATO will have no solid basis on which to lay its plans. And the decisions on which the future of the alliance depends must be postponed.

Bulgarian Liberation Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the people of Bulgaria and to Americans of Bulgarian descent on the 83d anniversary of the liberation of Bulgaria from the yoke of the decaying Ottoman Empire. On March 3, 1878, the Treaty of San Stefano between imperial Russia and Ottoman Turkey reestablished the Bulgarian nation after 500 years of foreign oppression. Although the frontiers of the new nation were narrowed by the subsequent Congress of Berlin, the modern Bulgarian nation then came into existence. The liberation of Bulgaria followed a long struggle by gallant patriots, which won the sympathy and support of the free nations of the West, led by the great British Prime Minister William Gladstone.

A freely elected national assembly adopted the democratic Tirnovo Constitution over the opposition of czarist Russia. This democratic constitution was finally destroyed by the Communist satellite regime which was imposed on Bulgaria at the end of World War II.

From the time of their liberation from Turkish rule to the present day, the Bulgarian people have resisted the aggressive pressures of Russian imperialism, both czarist and Communist. At the end of World War II a Communist satellite regime was imposed on Bulgaria by the Red army. The Soviet Union violated its solemn promise in Bulgaria as it did all throughout Eastern Europe and permitted no free elections to be held. The Bulgarian people, like all of the subjugated peoples of the Soviet Empire, retain their hope and faith in ultimate liberation.

The Bulgarian National Front of America, which represents the patriotic younger generation in Bulgarian politics, has since 1954 organized solemn observations of Bulgarian Liberation Day in America.

It is eminently fitting, Mr. Speaker, that we in this body join with our fellow Americans of Bulgarian descent, with the Bulgarian people who bear the yoke of an alien totalitarianism, and with all freemen in commemorating the day of Bulgarian liberation from Ottoman tyranny and in expressing the hope that the day of Bulgarian liberation from Communist tyranny will not be long delayed.

The Old Order Changeth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 3, 1961

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, a wide variety of reasons have been given for inflation that has eroded more than 50 percent of the value of the 1939 dollar, a wide variety of reasons have been given for great unemployment in the year in which both the produced national income and the gross national product reached an all-time high, but no reference has been made of the type of effort that went into the building of our Nation in the days of the first settlers in Virginia and Massachusetts down to the end of the 19th century. Hence, the enclosed news item—from the March 2, 1961, issue of the Clarke Courier entitled "Notice to Employees"—may serve as a pertinent reminder, as we move toward a new frontier, of how the old order changeth.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the news item from the Clarke Courier.

There being no objection, the news item was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOTICE TO EMPLOYEES

(This notice was actually posted in an American factory in 1872 as a policy statement for employees of the Mount Cory Carriage and Wagon Works.)

Effective September 15 the following rules will apply:

Office employees will daily sweep the floors, dust the furniture, shelves, and showcases.

Each day fill lamps, clean chimneys, and trim wicks. Wash the windows once a week.

Each clerk will bring in a bucket of water and a scuttle of coal for the day's business.

Make your pens carefully. You may whittle your nibs in your individual taste.

This office will open at 7 a.m. and close at 8 p.m. daily, except on the Sabbath, on which day it will remain closed. Each employee is expected to spend the Sabbath by attending church and contributing liberally to the cause of the Lord.

Men employees will be given an evening off each week for courting purposes, or two evenings a week if they go regularly to church.

After an employee has spent 13 hours of labor in the office, he should spend the time reading the Bible and other good books while contemplating the glories and building up of the kingdom.

Every employee should lay aside from each pay a goodly sum of his earnings for his benefit during his declining years, so that he will not become a burden upon the charity of his betters.

Any employee who smokes Spanish cigars, uses liquor in any form, gets shaved at a barber shop, or frequents pool and public

halls, will give me good reason to suspect his worth, intentions, integrity, and honesty.

The employee who has performed his labors faithfully and without fault for a period of 5 years in my service, and who has been thrifty and attentive to his religious duties, is looked upon by his fellow men as a substantial and law-abiding citizen, will be given an increase of 5 cents per day in his pay, providing a just return in profits from the business permits it.

Tribute to Ambassador Thomas Whelan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON R. YOUNG
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 3, 1961

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, a very fine editorial appeared in the Grand Forks Herald, published at Grand Forks, N. Dak., under date of February 14, 1961. This editorial pays well-deserved tribute to a fellow North Dakotan, Thomas Whelan, who has been Ambassador to Nicaragua for the last 10 years. Ambassador Whelan has done a truly remarkable job as Ambassador to Nicaragua. This is attested to, I believe, by almost every Member of Congress who has visited Nicaragua the past 10 years, as well as by many others. We should have more "Tommie" Whelans. We in North Dakota are very proud of him.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHELAN'S DISTINGUISHED RECORD

Thomas E. Whelan, of St. Thomas, who is retiring after nearly 10 years as U.S. Ambassador to Nicaragua, will return to his home in North Dakota with an exceptional record of service to his country.

The only North Dakotan ever appointed to a U.S. ambassadorship, Mr. Whelan has done his State proud in his difficult assignment. Not only his hometown but the State as a whole will welcome him back to his place in our business, political, and social life.

President Truman named Whelan to his Central American post on recommendation of the late Senator William L. Langer, who was actively supported by North Dakota's then junior Senator, MILTON R. YOUNG.

Mr. Whelan's selection proved a happy choice for he had marked success in winning the favor of the Government and the people of Nicaragua. In this he was ably assisted by competent and persuasive Mrs. Whelan.

Nicaragua became a pro-American stronghold in its opposition to communism, and it had a significant part in resisting the Communist movement in Guatemala. In this, Ambassador Whelan had an important role as a contact for his Government.

In the domestic life of the country, Whelan's knowledge of farming gained in practical experience in his own agricultural ventures with his brother, Louis, proved an effective medium for winning the friendship of the farm folk of Nicaragua. From him they gained new knowledge that helped them improve their agricultural practices.

While Mr. Whelan is expected to again take an active part in the business of Whelan Bros., at St. Thomas, farm operators and grain dealers, there is an expectation that he also will resume his interest in North Dakota politics.

He had long been active in Republican circles in the State before he became Ambassador, and he also had an important role in the affairs of the American Legion—an interest he has retained during his State Department assignment.

Whelan has made no statement regarding his plans, except that he has wanted to get back to private life for the past 2 years, but the Communist-created turmoil in Central America made it advisable for him to stay with his post.

This newspaper has no inside information regarding any political ambitions Whelan may have—in fact, it has been told definitely that he has none. However, it is within the range of possibility that he could be persuaded to get into the political picture on a statewide basis. He might be the man to oppose Senator QUENTIN BURDICK in 1966.

Quite apart from political and other considerations of a public nature, the Herald is happy to join with the rest of the State in welcoming his return to St. Thomas and North Dakota. He has made a considerable mark as the State's first citizen to represent this country in an ambassadorship.

Participation in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 3, 1961

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, as even the most casual observer knows, many of the barriers to free world unity are economic in character; they run the gamut from balance of payments to tariffs.

In recent days, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has been conducting hearings on a proposed treaty by which this country would participate with other free world nations in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, commonly known as OECD.

One significant feature of OECD is that it would include as participants European neutrals, as well as member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Ratification by each participating nation has been a primary goal of the NATO Parliamentarians Conference, whose past four sessions I have been privileged to attend. I hope this body will vote to ratify that proposal when it is reported from the Foreign Relations Committee.

In an editorial in its February 22 issue, the Washington Evening Star set out in precise terms the need for OECD, and effectively exploded some of the myths about it. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRACTICAL ECONOMIC UNITY

Spokesmen for the administration have made a good case from the outset for U.S. adherence to the new Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. In simplest terms, this grouping of 20 nations of the Western free world would provide the machinery for economic coordination and planning of a sort which could create a firm line of defense against Premier Khrushchev's blustering threat to bury capitalism under an avalanche of Communist competition.

In other words, in the field of international economics, it parallels in some respects a defensive military alliance in which the strength of each member supplements and supports that of the others. In this respect, it is particularly timely from our own standpoint that such collaboration be formalized. In the last few years, most of the West European nations that have signed the OECD convention have reached a very high level of economic strength and recovery from the exhaustion of World War II. At the same time, it has become recognized that we cannot continue indefinitely our own massive expenditures abroad, public and private, to the point of an every-year deficit in our balance of international payments. Economic assistance to underdeveloped nations, for example, is a responsibility in which many of the now-prosperous countries of the new OECD are able to share, and this is one of the major projects to be worked out at the council table of the new organization.

Fear has been expressed that the group will turn into some sort of supranational body by which, for instance, American tariffs would be lowered to permit a flood of imports. Of this criticism, it seems significant that the first member of the Kennedy administration to urge strongly that our membership in the OECD be ratified by the Senate was Secretary of Treasury Dillon, who as a Republican and Under Secretary of State in the Eisenhower administration, was a leader in drafting the convention and was a signer for our Government. Neither Mr. Dillon personally nor the Eisenhower administration has been identified as "free traders" to a point of disregarding the welfare of American industry. Assurances have been given, furthermore, by Mr. Dillon, by Secretary of tSate Rusk, and by Undersecretary for Economic Affairs George Ball that there will be no infringement on the tariff-making functions of Congress, and that the objective of the OECD is to expand economic activity, including the markets available for American exports, not to contract it.

Critics of the new international agency will have their opportunity, of course, to present and explain their objections to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. It seems certain, however, that the weight of evidence will support our full participation.

Award by Reserve Officers Association of the United States to Don C. Alexander, Chaplain Corps, U.S. Navy, as Chaplain of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 3, 1961

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in connection with the annual midwinter council meeting of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, the Chaplain of the Year Award was presented to Lt. Don C. Alexander, Chap-

lain Corps, U.S. Navy. Chaplain Alexander is a native of Greenville, Tenn., and has distinguished himself in many ways in his field which is so important to the morale and welfare of our military personnel. Chaplain Alexander and Mrs. Alexander were honored by ROA in the presentation of the Chaplain of the Year citation, the text of which is as follows:

Recognizing his extraordinary contribution to the welfare, morale, and effectiveness of those he has served, and acknowledging the nobility and clarity of his precept and example among those who must continually be aware of the spiritual value of life under freedom, this association, in humility and admiration, designates Lt. Don C. Alexander, Chaplain Corps, U.S. Navy, as ROA's Chaplain of the Year, 1961.

In connection therewith, I am submitting as a matter of unusual interest the attached article from a recent issue of the Officer, monthly magazine of ROA, which reflects the basis for this highly merited award. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROA'S CHAPLAIN OF YEAR FOR 1961 IS CIRCUIT RIDER FOR EIGHT SHIPS—ONE OF THE BEST OF GOD'S GOOD MEN

ROA's chaplain of the year for 1961 is a "circuit rider" for eight ships. He is Lt. Don C. Alexander, of Greeneville, Tenn., a youthful clergyman who marked his 27th birthday last November 13.

He will be honored at ROA's midwinter conferences in Washington, D.C., on February 24 at the Sheraton Park Hotel.

In choosing Lieutenant Alexander for the honor, ROA's awards board had this to say about him:

"Chaplain Alexander, a clergyman of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, has an outstanding record demonstrating force and initiative in his daily work. He has a warm, friendly personality. He is an effective preacher and has awakened interests in religious matters. As one commanding officer said, 'He is always completely cooperative himself and creates the same effect in others through his interest, sincerity, and response * * * demonstrates great maturity, sound thinking, and deep understanding of problems and solutions for personnel * * * outstandingly effective through his feeling and consideration for others.'"

Capt. Merle N. Young, fleet chaplain, Atlantic Fleet, added this about Chaplain Alexander:

"The Reserve Officers Association has selected a topnotch capable and dedicated person as chaplain of the year in the choice of Lt. Don C. Alexander, Chaplain Corps, U.S. Navy. He is a destroyer chaplain, circuit riding in eight ships, and in every way represents the highest ideal of the ministry of the Armed Forces chaplain. I know of his constant labors on behalf of men. I have seen him serve unstintingly and have heard him preach. He is one of the best of God's good men."

Chaplain Alexander is the son of Verna and Dale Alexander, the latter a famous major league baseball player who won the American League batting championship while playing with the Boston Red Sox in 1932.

The youthful chaplain was graduated from Bethel College, McKensie, Tenn., in 1955, and Cumberland Presbyterian Theological Seminary in 1958. In college, he won athletic letters in baseball (four) and football (one). He was president of his senior class, and is a member of Omega Phi fraternity, Cumberland Club.

He was ordained to the Gospel ministry by East Tennessee Presbytery of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, November 27, 1955, and was pastor of the Union Cumberland Presbyterian Church, Fulton, Ky., December 1956–July 1958.

In the summer of 1954 he was with the Monsanto Chemical Co., and played on the championship baseball team of the State of Tennessee which placed seventh in the Nation at the National Baseball Congress, Wichita, Kans. In 1956, he supervised the summer recreational program for Gleason, Tenn., and was assistant football coach at Gleason High.

Chaplain Alexander entered the Navy in July 1958. He attended the Chaplain School, Newport, R.I., and was assigned to the Naval Air Technical Training Center, Jacksonville, Fla., for 13 months. He was ordered to his present assignment with Destroyer Squadron 28, in November 1959.

ROA's honoree for 1961 married Carolyn Ann Roberts, of Union City, Tenn., in 1955. They have two sons, David Dale and Dudley Don.

What a Peace Corps Man Could Do Overseas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1961

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy has sent to the Congress his proposal for a Peace Corps in which young American volunteers may serve overseas in technical assistance missions as part of a worldwide war against hunger, poverty, disease, and ignorance. In carrying out the Peace Corps program, we are fortunately able to draw on the experience of various American voluntary organizations. Prominent among these is International Voluntary Services, Inc., of 3636 16th Street NW., Washington 10, D.C., of which Dr. J. S. Noffsinger is the executive director. The IVS has done a superlative job in its limited but thoroughgoing oversea ventures.

I include a copy of a newsletter recently sent to his friends in America by Don Schmidt, a University of Wisconsin volunteer in the IVS agricultural aid program in Vietnam.

I hope that those who are denouncing the Peace Corps program as a "boondoggle" read Don Schmidt's letter with profit:

THAP CHAM, VIETNAM,
February 14, 1961.

DEAR FRIENDS: Albert Schweitzer is 14 months behind in answering his correspondence according to author Norman Cousins in the book, "Dr. Schweitzer of Lambarene." From one point of view it is a remarkable achievement that the great jungle doctor, who has been in Africa over 40 years, is only 14 months behind. I have been in Vietnam merely 10 months but have a 6-month backlog of unanswered letters and the pile grows every week. Your letters of encouragement are much appreciated and I would like to answer each one personally but seriously doubt if I'll be able to do so.

The weather here during December, January, and early February has been very comfortable. The high daily temperature reaches 85° to 90° F., the humidity is neither too high nor too low and a pleasant northeasterly ocean breeze blows most of the time. This period of agreeable weather is sandwiched between two extremes. During the 2 days of November 26 and 27 a tropical typhoon dumped 20 inches of rain on the area. (While the average annual rainfall of this area is only slightly more than 20 inches, one of the other climatic characteristics is that the actual rainfall in any 1 year may deviate widely from the average.) In a few weeks we will be in the midst of the hot, dry season when temperatures are about 100° F. for a considerable portion of each day.

In my two earlier letters I tried to describe my impressions of the land and people of South Vietnam. In this one I will try to present a brief account of some of the IVS work activities with which I am familiar.

Jim Green from West Virginia, our Vietnamese interpreter Quy, and myself are now living in the village of Thap Cham. Most of our work is divided between the Nha Ho Livestock Experiment Station 8 miles from here and the Pasteur Institute near Nha Trang which is about 60 miles up the coast.

Our primary efforts at Nha Ho are devoted to research aimed at the efficient production of feed crops necessary for an expanding livestock industry. We are introducing and testing various forage and grain crops. These include corn, sorghums, forage grasses, and legumes. IVS personnel were the first to plant alfalfa in this area. This potentially valuable crop has shown promise here but much remains to be learned concerning adaption of different varieties, seedling establishment, fertilization, and insect control.

One especially intriguing crop we work with is ramie. This plant is unusual in that the stems produce the strongest of vegetable fibers and the leaves are a source of high protein livestock feed.

Positive contributions toward an improved livestock feed program will probably take quite some time before the results are of benefit to the farmers. We are also experimenting with crops which we hope positive results may be passed on to the farmers more quickly. Our experience with beans, one such crop, has taught us a valuable lesson. The Vietnamese farmers have been growing a small black bean for many years. My first impression of this bean was that it could easily be replaced by superior types. However, we have had a rather ambitious program of evaluation some 200 bean strains from 36 countries and only three of these approach the performance of the local strain. This area is heavily infested with a stemboring insect which killed or severely weakened most of our introduced strains. The local bean, however, apparently has natural resistance to the insect. This experience certainly taught us to appreciate the merits of what the illiterate but intelligent Vietnamese farmers themselves have developed and learned. It also points up that improving agriculture in a country such as South Vietnam is not a simple matter.

Our experimental plantings of kenaf, a fiber crop, are believed to be the first in this coastal plain area. We have hopes that it may be a new cash crop for the farmers here. By the way, the expanding industrialization of Japan is providing a market for fiber crops grown in this part of the world.

The Pasteur Institute, named in honor of the great French scientist, is a philanthropical organization devoted to benefit mankind through the advancement and application of science. The station near Nha Trang produces vaccines and serums used in South Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, and other southeast Asian countries. Over

300 head of horses, cattle, sheep, and goats are now used in producing the vaccines and serums with this number to be increased. We are trying to help in the development of a feed production program for the livestock. The promising results from our plantings of introduced forages and the splendid cooperation received from the manager at this station are very encouraging.

The primary objective of IVS is to carry out a people-to-people aid program. An introduction to Cu, a 12-year-old Vietnamese boy who lives in a neighboring village, provides an example of this phase of our work. Cu lost the use of his legs from an accident incurred when he was 3 years of age. He has been able to move about by pushing and pulling himself along on his knees which have open sores most of the time. Cu's mother is dead; he lives with his sickly father who earns about $20 per month tending a guard gate at a bridge used jointly by trains and highway traffic. A few months ago, several Vietnamese soldiers guarding the bridge were killed by raiding Communist guerrillas in the front yard where the boy and his father live.

Contributions of money sent by the Sunday school of the Ashland Methodist Church, ladies groups from the Arlington Evangelical United Brethren Church, and other friends were used to buy bicycle wheels, iron rods, angle iron, and bolts and nuts. Jim and Quy combined their mechanical ingenuity with these materials and built a wheelchair. A few days ago we had the pleasure of presenting this gift from Americans to an overjoyed Cu and his grateful father. This experience helped us to understand the plea of St. Francis of Assisi when he prayed, "Lord, let us be instruments of Thy peace."

Sincerely,

DON SCHMIDT.

Ethical Issues in the International Age of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 3, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States entitled "Ethical Issues in the International Age of Agriculture," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I commend the National Council of the Churches of Christ for this excellent resolution urging that our God-given abundance be shared with our less fortunate fellow human beings.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ETHICAL ISSUES IN THE INTERNATIONAL AGE OF AGRICULTURE

(Resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., December 9, 1960)

INTRODUCTION

God's concern for the needs of all his children for nourishment, both for body and soul, is revealed in His act of creation, and in the gift of His Son, Jesus Christ. Our Lord made perfectly clear that man's duty to God includes the production and sharing of the material necessities of life. He described the conditions of salvation at the ultimate judgment to include the fact that we did—or did not "feed the hungry and clothe the naked."

In today's world the gap is wide, and in some areas widening, between the need for food and available food supplies. A large proportion of the world's population still lives in malnutrition and hunger. A few nations enjoy plenty; with us agricultural surpluses are a continuing problem. Such nations have achieved a major breakthrough in agricultural technology.

In fact, so great has been the advance in the science of agriculture and in the potential for producing reasonable food supplies for all people, that the era now emerging, and in prospect, has been characterized as the international age of agriculture.

Its major challenge is to devise ways to make available to the areas of greatest need both surpluses of food now being produced, and the knowledge of how to increase the production of food from their own fields. Growing populations present a further problem and, even with our present rate of technological advance, it cannot be taken for granted that we can continuously feed the growing population of the future.

Our responsibility in this country for effective sharing of our agricultural abundance has long been a concern of the churches. This was strongly affirmed by the general board of the National Council of Churches in a statement adopted on June 4, 1958.[1]

As a people, we inherited an abundance of God-given natural resources for the production of food, such as few other nations enjoy. To many hunger-ridden nations the use of our abundance for ourselves, and our mounting surpluses seem to indicate that we are spiritually isolated from their cry for food elsewhere.

To others our donation programs seem primarily motivated by a paternalism or for our own national advantage in the cold war. Many hold that we could transform our surplus from a problem into an asset by finding new uses for surplus commodities, new outlets for their marketing, and new ways of sharing them. This would lessen the fears that our surplus disposal programs may disrupt world markets upon which their own economies depend.

The spirit and manner of attempting to share our abundance and technological knowledge are, therefore, vital if this sharing is to serve the cause of peace and to enhance the sense of dignity on the part of the people with whom we share, as well as to meet the need for food.

As indicated in the earlier statement by the general board and supported by official actions of many of our constituent churches, these considerations lead Christians to renew their call for more vigorous action by our Government and, at certain points, by our religious and other voluntary organizations toward three major goals—food distribution, technical assistance, and economic development.

[1] "In Christian perspective the abundant agricultural production of America should be viewed as a blessing. * * * Efficiency in production must be matched by effective distribution, to the end that all people may be fed and clothed. This requires application of imagination and good will, both at home, and abroad, through expanded programs of trade, economic aid, and programs of distribution carried on by the churches and other voluntary agencies. * * * American policy should give both moral and financial support to the United Nation's Food and Agriculture Organization, and other pertinent international bodies. * * * Programs of technical and economic assistance to underdeveloped areas should be promoted with vigor."

SHARING OUR FOOD SUPPLIES

A traditional limitation of our national food policy has been a preoccupation with disposal of surplus as such. By itself this aim is too short sighted, too money minded, and too commodity concerned to result in policies commensurate with our production potential and today's needs.

Despite this tendency to a too-restricted outlook, our country has distributed large quantities of agricultural commodities abroad, both on a donation basis and for sales in foreign currencies under the authorization of Public Law 480. This legislation, enacted in 1954, has been continuously reviewed and substantially expanded through the years. Churches and church leaders should become increasingly aware of its vast significance and exert their influence on behalf of its full use and further development.

We welcome the fact that a broader idea of surplus utilization is now being put forward by responsible national leaders under concepts of "food for peace." The main focus is not on reduction of our stockpiles and storage bill, but on the need of permanent freedom from hunger here and elsewhere.

President Eisenhower, in his recent presentation to the United Nations, gave encouraging stimulus to our own efforts toward more effective distribution of food supplies and called upon other surplus-food-producing nations to join in this undertaking under the guidance and direction of the United Nations. This proposal was approved by the U.N. General Assembly after amendment aimed to assure that the program would be carried out with due regard to problems of the world market and the economies of the various food-producing nations.

Other constructive proposals now under consideration for both national and international approaches to this whole problem include development of world pools of surplus commodities under international control; extension of the sale of U.S. surpluses in needy countries for their own currencies by methods designed to cause the least possible disturbance to the farm economies of the nations involved; enlargement of the total flow of goods in international trade thus further expanding the movement of farm commodities from surplus to deficit countries; utilization of food as a form of capital for international economic development.

Pioneering programs along these and other lines still to be devised are greatly needed if hoped for progress is to be made by the surplus-producing nations in sharing their abundance of food and fiber with a needy world.

SHARING TECHNOLOGICAL KNOWLEDGE AND EXPERIENCE

We have the opportunity and responsibility to share with others the skills and knowledge which have been so important in the development of our own agriculture.

We commend the progress that has been made in recent years through both government and privately supported programs of technical assistance. Experience has shown the need for steady expansion of these programs, with the following considerations:

a. Continuous effort is necessary to identify and remove the basic causes of hunger and inadequate agricutural productivity.

b. With roughly 80 percent of the population of the developing areas of the world engaged in agriculture, technological development in agriculture is a first essential to them if there is to be any substantial release of manpower to commerce and industry.

c. Working through the U.N. and other multinational programs is increasingly important as this makes it possible to utilize skills wherever they may be found and to

minimize the fear of political manipulation within the recipient countries.

d. The rate at which technical assistance is made available must be governed by the recruiting and adequate training of personnel and the capacity of the receiving countries to use the offered assistance for the welfare of those who need it most.

e. All who participate in these programs, as well as possessing competence in their professional fields, need to be well trained in regard to the spiritual values, social organization, and mores of the people to whom they are sent.

The churches have a responsibility to assure continuance of the notable contribution of their missionaries. We believe there should be more who are trained in agriculture and home economics.

Many church members have been and more should continue to be recruited to serve in the Nation's governmental and private corps of technical agricultural advisers.

SHARING ECONOMIC AID FOR AGRICULTURE AND FOOD PRODUCTION

Peoples in the early stages of economic development desperately need capital resources. The gap between this need and the capital resources available from Government and private foreign investments is still wide.

This problem is closely related to achieving greater freedom from hunger because (a) it is largly through increase in industrial productivity (together with a rise in the levels of education and health) that buying power is created for food and clothing among nonagricultural workers; (b) in developing countries an increased supply of agricultural products is important to prevent inflation wherever increased industrial employment and wages occur; (c) aid for economic development directly affects food supplies when it is specifically designated for such projects as land resources development, dams with associated irriagtion systems, processing, and fertilizer industries, highways and transport systems, and food marketing institutions. It is equally effective when applied to raising the level of education and health of those who work on the farms and related food industries.

In supporting, as they do, enlarged programs of economic aid to underdeveloped countries both by this country and through the United Nations, church people with their deep concern for relief of hunger, should stress the need for special attention, among others, to these types of projects which directly promote food production and distribution.

ROLE OF RELIGIOUS AND OTHER VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATIONS

The National Council of Churches and its predecessors have consistently pressed concerns for economic development and raising the levels of life of people around the world. Especially through its departments of international affairs and church and economic life, the churches have conducted major campaigns of education and action, have set forth policies, have represented the concerns of the churches to the United Nations and the U.S. Government, and have stimulated both corporate and individual Christian responsibility in relation to humanity's problems of hunger and need. Our Christian faith, our experience in this field, and the desperate plight of most of mankind, all impel us to continuing and more effective efforts in these concerns.

The National Council of Churches also, through Church World Service, has cooperated with other nongovernmental organizations in the distribution of food to persons in need throughout the world. These agencies and their oversea affiliates carry on programs for distribution of relief supplies (including food furnished through the U.S. Government under Public Law 480) and technical assistance in over 100 countries. A recent report to the President with reference to the food distribution phase of Public Law 480 stated that "75 million American people support this program through their gifts, their work, and their membership in these voluntary organizations." In spite of many complex problems involved, experience has demonstrated both the economic effectiveness and the humanitarian value of this program through voluntary agencies. It should continue to receive the generous support of churches and church people.

A MAJOR GLOBAL PROGRAM

Also commended by President Eisenhower for support by governments and people of every nation is the worldwide, 5-year freedom from hunger campaign launched this year by the U.N. specialized agency, the Food and Agriculture Organization. Designed to engage the energies and resources of both contributing and receiving nations, this program seeks to build upon and apply in the best way suited to each developing nation any or all of the aids available through surplus food distribution, exchange of technical knowledge and assistance, economic development projects, and encouragement of still wider participation by voluntary groups and agencies. The basis of this program is self-help and its objective is not relief but permanent elimination of malnutrition and hunger.

In both purpose and scope this program is commended to our churches and their members. It received the endorsement of the central committee of the World Council of Churches at its meeting in August 1960. Our churches and church people are contribute tangibly to this constructive effort by informing themselves of the specific needs and objectives of the campaign; encouraging our Government to increase its support of the FAO and projects related to its freedom from hunger campaign; and giving generously to Church World Service so that it with other religious agencies may support projects of self-help and development encompassed by this worldwide program.

CONCLUSION

Our Lord taught His disciples to pray, "Give us this day our daily bread." Christians should continue to seek to achieve the goal implied in this prayer by breaking the barriers which persist between agricultural abundance and human need. Through their informed and sustained efforts toward this high goal Christians will thereby serve Him who provides and cares for His children everywhere.

Schenectady Union-Star, Radio Station WSNY Receive Special Awards From the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 17, 1961

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, it was with a sense of pride that I learned the other day that the Schenectady Union-Star, one of the great newspapers in my district, and radio station WSNY, of Schenectady, an outstanding community radio station, both received the George Washington Medal Award from the Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge, Pa., for the outstanding campaign which they jointly conducted last year in the "Speak Out for America" contest.

We in New York are proud that these two great institutions have been honored in this way for their positive contribution to keeping American principles of freedom and democracy alive and meaningful in the present day world.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from a recent issue of the Schenectady Union-Star describing this award and the campaign which led to it:

UNION-STAR, WSNY GET FREEDOM AWARDS FOR "AMERICA" DRIVE

The Union-Star and radio station WSNY have been selected by the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge to receive the George Washington Medal Award for the "Speak Out for America" campaign conducted jointly by the newspaper and the radio station last year.

Freedoms Foundation said the campaign was "an outstanding achievement in helping to bring about a better understanding of the American way of life."

Fostered by Steve Fitz, programing manager of WSNY, the "Speak Out for America" campaign became a joint sponsorship venture of the Union-Star and WSNY, assisted by the American Legion and numerous volunteer workers.

More than 4,000 workers signed "Speak Out for America" petitions, which were delivered by Fitz to the White House last Veterans Day. Accompanying Fitz and his wife were Henry Button of Mont Pleasant High School and Miss Nikki Ann Nagorka of Niskayuna High School, winners of a high school essay contest on patriotism.

Among those who signed the petitions were President Kennedy, former Vice President Richard M. Nixon and Henry Cabot Lodge, the Republican candidate for Vice President. Their signatures were obtained when they made campaign visits to Schenectady.

The Union-Star and WSNY were selected to receive the award in the general category by the trustees, directors, and officers of Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge.

The "Speak Out for America" petition said "Freedom and justice are the most precious concepts of human liberty in the world. To uphold them, and if need be defend them, is not only a sacred obgliaiton but a privilege. We accept this responsibility with the confident pride that no force is greater, no belief is stronger, than our own unshakable conviction that the United States is the greatest nation in the world. We shall together dedicate ourselves to the ideals of freedom and peace for all and fear for none."

Last year the George Washington Honor Award was presented posthumously to James Barstow, Scotia artist, for a cartoon which appeared in the Union-Star. The award was accepted by Mrs. Barstow.

Washington: The Master Mason

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 3, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, George E. Stringfellow, of New Jersey, past imperial potentate of the Shrine, recently delivered a George Washington's Birth-

day address in Philadelphia which I feel merits a place among the great testimonials to our country's first President. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON: THE MASTER MASON

(Address by George E. Stringfellow, of East Orange, N.J., past imperial potentate and for many years a daily business associate of the late Thomas Alva Edison, before the Pennsylvania Masonic Veterans Association, Masonic Temple, Philadelphia, Pa., February 22, 1961)

Thank you for inviting me to join you in honoring the memory of Past Worshipful Master George Washington, of Alexandria Lodge No. 22, Alexandria, Va. This is a great occasion and I am happy indeed to participate.

I recall very vividly addressing you on another occasion and am complimented by the return engagement.

I bring you the greetings of the Imperial Council of the Ancient Arabic Order of Nobles of the Mystic Shrine, which I had the privilege of serving as imperial potentate for the year ending July 9, 1959.

The shrine is not a part of Masonry, but it is Masonic in its birth and traditions. It will ever remain so for there are in Masonry the elements of truth and honor which George Washington exemplified and symbolized.

While the struggle for libert was still underway, a French-American firm, desiring to present a token of their respect to General Washington, arranged with nuns in Paris, France, to make a Masonic sash and apron of the finest satin on which the French and American flags were combined with various Masonic emblems embossed in gold. These were sent to the general with a letter from Lieutenant Watson, who in 1775 had been in charge of a convoy of powder from Providence, R.I., to the American camps at Boston. Watson, a Mason, wrote to Washington:

"We hasten to offer for your acceptance a small pledge of our homage. * * * Your glorious career will not be confined to the protection of American liberty, but its ultimate effect will extend to the whole human family, since providence evidently selected you as an instrument in His hands to fulfill His eternal decrees.

"It is to you, therefore, the glorious orb of America, we presume to offer Masonic ornaments as an emblem of your virtues. May the Great Architect of the Universe be the guardian of your precious days, for the glory of the Western Hemisphere and the entire universe."

Washington replied:

"If my endeavors to avert the evil with which the country was threatened by a deliberate plan of tyranny should be crowned with the success that is wished, the praise is due to the Grand Architect of the Universe, who did not see fit to have his superstructure of justice to be subjected to the princes of the world, or to the rod of oppression in the hands of any power on earth."

Washington, and your own Benjamin Franklin, who was the first grand master of Masons in Pennsylvania, were ever true and faithful to the teachings of our fraternity. Washington laid the cornerstone of our Nation's Capitol with Masonic ceremonies. It was thus fitting that the last human act before his body was entombed at Mount Vernon, Va., was the dropping of sprigs of acacia on his bier by his brothers from Alexander lodge. Washington lived Masonry as a way of life and, above all, as service to his fellow man.

In the long and glorious history of our Republic, there has been no other like him. He saved us from tyranny and for posterity, as the hope of the world.

It may well have been, as Watson said, Washington was selected by providence, or the Grand Architect of the Universe, as an instrument to fulfill His eternal decrees. There have been none in our history with his perception of liberty and its preservation.

"The lessons I learned on my admission to Masonry," said the father of our country, "were of encouragement in later years when I encountered * * * severe trials, especially those of the commencement and during the Revolution. There is no doubt in my mind," he continued, "that Masonry and its lessons were helpful throughout the Revolution, both on the battlefield and in the legislative assembly."

The lessons which Washington and his associates learned in our fraternity doubtless helped to hold together his little band of patriots at Valley Forge and thus made us a free people.

When Washington retook Philadelphia from the British, he and his keymen celebrated their great victory by attending religious services in a Masonic lodge here in Philadelphia.

I have felt for a long time that inasmuch as our way of life was virtually born in Masonic lodges, we 4 million Masons have a greater responsibility to keep America American than any other segment of our human family.

We Masons who practice the ritual in our daily lives, radiate good will which is more precious than a gold nugget and much harder to find. Good will is the measure of a man's success and often determines his usefulness to society. That is why our Masonic forefathers set such store by good will and decent living.

We Masons, who would save the world from tyranny, must, if we are worthy of our great heritage, emulate St. Paul who, crying that the days were evil labored to improve them. We must not follow Hamlet who cried that the days were evil and cursed them. We must be positive in our approach to all problems. We should be guided by what is right rather than who is right.

In his Farewell Address, Washington said, "All obstructions to the execution of laws, all combinations and associations, under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract or awe the regular deliberation and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of the fundamental principle that the power and right of the people to establish government presupposes the duty of every individual to obey established government."

This should, in my opinion, be required study for every American. The best of all governments, in my opinion, is that which teaches us to govern ourselves.

We may realine ourselves into new political groups, to establish the right of choice in the determination of the principles this Nation will follow, but unless the officials and the laws they enact, interpret and administer, reveal the same high quality of honor and integrity taught in our Masonic lodges and exemplified by Washington, then this great American experiment in freedom will be lost. Then the tyranny of despots will return to plague our people until another Washington arises to accept, teach, and apply the principles of Masonry that create an aura of freedom so dear to us.

Social Progress in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 3, 1961

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, it is often illuminating to look back into history and see how ideas which are now totally accepted were condemned when first presented. Change for the better never comes easily, for the forces against change are strong, at least vocally.

Today, as our Nation attempts to move forward toward new frontiers of all kinds, the forces for change and against change are again pitted against each other.

Mr. Nathan Straus, owner of radio station WMCA in New York City, recently broadcast over that station an editorial entitled "It's Socialism." In it, he traces the long and often difficult route of social progress in our Nation from the time when public education was attacked as communistic until the present when we are confronted with the problem of meeting the health care needs of our aged.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Straus' editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT'S SOCIALISM

(By Nathan Straus)

The man who wants change asks us to think. Thinking is difficult—yes, painful. It is so much easier to believe than to think, to trust what we have been taught, rather than to doubt. In every age, the doubters, the men of ideas, have been disliked and feared. A new idea is more painful than a toothache.

We call such men idle dreamers, or dangerous radicals, or eggheads. When they ask us, not only to change our ideas and prejudices, but also to mend our ways, we damn them as Socialists. To fight current wrongs is socialism.

Let us look back at a few historical examples. Anyone who raises objection to our public school system today, would be known as a crackpot. But in 1878, public education was bitterly attacked not by crackpots but by some of the most respected people in the community.

The Reverend Dr. Joseph Le Conte, a teacher at California State University, wrote to a Senator: "I fully concur with you in your opposition to compulsory State education. This certainly strikes at the integrity of the State, for it makes children the 'wards of the State' ".

As late as 1886, only 75 years ago, Zachariah Montgomery, later an Assistant Attorney General, was one of a large number who characterized free compulsory education as, this communistic system of public schools.

In 1961, all agree that transportation is vital to our country and that highway building is a proper function of the Federal Government. Congress recently appropriated $50 billion for road construction. But in 1893, Gov. Roswell P. Fowler, of New York,

wrote that the cost of national highways would be inconceivable and that building them would overwhelm the Government.

In 1933, the prices of farm products had fallen so low that tens of thousands of farmers were faced with ruin by foreclosure of the mortgages on their farms. There was rioting in the farm States, defiance of the forces of law, bloodshed—and a real threat of civil war. Nevertheless, legislation recommended by President Roosevelt to provide relief was denounced by Congressman JOSEPH W. MARTIN, of Massachusetts, in these words, "We are on our way to Moscow."

The decade which began in 1920 and ended in the Hoover panic of 1929 has been described by historians as a fantastic era in Wall Street. Millions of dollars of the hard-earned savings of people of small means were wiped out as banks throughout the country closed their doors in bankruptcy. There had been scandalous abuses in the stock markets, such as artificial rigging of prices and gross misrepresentation of facts about securities. But when President Roosevelt sent a message to Congress asking for legislation to put an end to such fleecing of the public by unscrupulous bankers and brokers, the reforms that he proposed were denounced and ridiculed.

James H. Rand, Jr., of Remington Rand, who was chairman of the so-called Committee for the Nation, said this legislation was deliberately designed to push the Nation "along the road from Democracy to communism."

The president of the New York Stock Exchange, Richard Whitney, said to the congressional committee which was considering the bill: "You gentlemen are making a great mistake. The exchange is a perfect institution." But in 1938 Mr. Whitney was indicted, convicted, and imprisoned for grand larceny. He pleaded guilty to charges that he had used the securities of his clients for personal financial ventures.

There is food for thought when we reflect that the sanctimonious people, who consider themselves and the institutions which made them rich to be perfect, so often turn out to be characters of very dubious morality.

When a social security system was suggested in 1932, George P. Chandler of the Ohio Chamber of Commerce was one of several business leaders who maintained that, "With unemployment insurance no one would work; with old-age and survivors' insurance no one would save; the result would be moral decay, financial bankruptcy and the collapse of the Republic."

And when in the early days of the Roosevelt administration, concrete steps were being taken to enact a comprehensive social security program, the legislation was bitterly assailed by prominent individuals in the Republican Party as well as by leaders of industry, banking and by many of the great newspapers of the country. The voice of reactionary big business, the National Association of Manufacturers, intoned, it means the "ultimate socialistic control of life and industry." The Republican National Committee warned workers, "Under Roosevelt's so-called social security, in 1937 you will be assibned a number; that will be your number wherever you work as long as you live—no name, just a New Deal number."

After those dire predictions, it was not astonishing that the Republican candidate for President, Governor Landon of Kansas, said that, if elected he and his administration would bring about repeal of the Social Security Act.

Anyone who has read the history of social progress could foresee that President Kennedy's recommendations for righting social wrongs would be opposed by the reactionaries of 1961 just as every previous step in social progress has been opposed.

President Kennedy has asked Congress to enact a bill for universal medical care for the aged. This bill would benefit 14.5 million elder citizens, by providing health care and hospitalization. The bill also would increase Federal support for medical training and for research.

The passage of this bill is of the utmost importance. Sixteen million Americans over the age of 65 cannot afford adequate medical care. Indeed, nearly one-half of those over 65 have incomes of less than $1,000 a year. More than 2 million of them are officially classified as paupers. Yet these facts do not disturb the reactionaries, those who believe that present conditions should continue regardless of needless suffering.

The American Medical Association, an organization with a long record of protecting the vested interests of doctors and disregarding the interests of patients, has called the Kennedy program, "socialized medicine." Of course, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and other like-minded conservative business organizations have joined the hue and cry.

Those who flaunt the banner of conservatism when they obstruct all social progress are not true conservatives. In his second inaugural address, President Franklin D. Roosevelt said: "The true conservative seeks to protect the system of private property and free enterprise by correcting such injustices and inequalities as arise from it. The most serious threat to our institutions comes from those who refuse to face the need for change."

If Federal payments for medical care constitute socialized medicine, then public parks must be socialized recreation, public schools, socialized education, and public roads, socialized transportation.

There are again today, leaders with imagination who want to right social wrongs. These men realize that a plan of medical care for the aged is a vital step forward for America. Passage of this legislation will show that the protection of the health of its citizens and the protection of their rights are both the concern of our Government.

Elimination of Bloc Voting by Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 3, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution recently passed at the annual farm bureau meeting of the State of Rhode Island endorsing the elimination of bloc voting by co-ops, as set forth under the provisions of S. 660.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELIMINATION OF BLOC VOTING BY CO-OPS

Whereas Federal milk marketing orders throughout the United States allows the directors of farmer cooperatives to vote their entire membership in or out of an order; and

Whereas at Federal referendums held here in Rhode Island in 1958 with the above procedure of bloc co-op voting, the Federal Order No. 90 affecting all Rhode Island producers as well as those in southeastern Massachusetts was instigated; and

Whereas many co-op members feel bloc voting has destroyed the constitutional right of the individual: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Southern Rhode Island Farm Bureau approve bill S. 3207 introduced March 15 in the 1960 Congress by Senator WILLIAMS of Delaware but pigeonholed in committee, or a bill with similar intent which will be presented again during this session of Congress.

FEBRUARY 1961.

Wage Earners' Problems in Bankruptcy Proceedings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 3, 1961

Mr HILL. Mr. President, the Honorable Clarence W. Allgood, of Birmingham, Ala., has served as referee in bankruptcy, U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Alabama, since July 1938, just a few short months before the effective date of the Bankruptcy Act of 1938, which had been signed into law by President Roosevelt on June 22 of that year. Since that time, Judge Allgood and his associates in cooperation with businessmen, creditmen, and attorneys of the Birmingham area, have compiled an outstanding and commendable record in connection with chapter XIII of the Bankruptcy Act which permits the court to assist a debtor to work out a reasonable plan with his creditors to pay his debts out of future earnings. By virtue of the concerted program established by Judge Allgood and by virtue of his wisdom in utilizing chapter XIII of the act, untold thousands of honest debtors have been able to successfully combat the threat and stigma of bankruptcy and thereby rehabilitate themselves to the extent that they have again become productive workers and good credit risks. The success of Judge Allgood's program is demonstrated by the fact that it has long served as a model to other referees in connection with the establishment of their proceedings in bankruptcy.

On February 9, 1961, Judge Allgood delivered an address at a meeting of the Alabama Consumer Finance Association regarding the experiences of his court in connection with chapter XIII of the Bankruptcy Act. I strongly commend the address.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech of Judge Allgood be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The consumer bankruptcy committee of the American Bar Association has been kind enough to invite me to explain why wage earner proceedings have been so singularly successful in Birmingham. It is not a new

question, nor is chapter XIII of the Bankruptcy Act any longer the new and untested vehicle it once was for the solution of wage earners' problems. Inherent in the question and its answer are some of the fundamental concepts of bankruptcy and morals about which much has been written.[1]

Perhaps it is appropriate to answer the question by pointing to the problems we confronted when wage earner proceedings were initiated in Birmingham, and by relating what we have been able to accomplish through their use.

We first had to satisfy referees, credit men and business interests generally, that chapter XIII could be used successfully to combat bankruptcy, and that it offered the honest debtor a method for the payment of his debts out of future earnings without the stigma of bankruptcy and the loss of self-respect. We believed then, as now, that chapter XIII provided a means of economic rehabilitation to the wage earner who would otherwise be overwhelmed by financial pressures to the prejudice of his work and credit standing in the community.

We realized early that if chapter XIII was to do the job we intended for it to do, we had to make sure that the debtor's agreement to pay his debts out of future earnings was carried out. The only answer was to enlist the aid of the larger employers in the district, and to get them to make deductions of the debtor's payments for the court.

These people were quick to realize that our plan had possibilities. They were acutely aware of the fact that volunteer wage earner bankruptcies had for a number of years been creating such a hardship on the smaller businesses in the district that almost anything to better the situation deserved a try. They also realized that an employee harassed and worried by debt could not do a good job, and that without having his mind on his work he could be dangerous to himself and to his fellow workers. They were painfully aware that the cost of garnishment clerks and answering garnishment orders from the State courts had become a major cost item.

In the very beginning, the larger employers, such as United States Steel Corp., Woodward Iron Corp., Republic Steel Corp., and U.S. Pipe, agreed to work with the court and to make deductions for us. Today we have over 350 companies making deductions for the court. Others, mostly railroads and companies who have their payrolls made up out of the State, prefer to send the entire paycheck to the trustee.

Eleven companies, mostly small employers, usually fire any employee receiving a garnishment or an order from the court to deduct or send the entire check in. Strangely, one of these companies is involved as a creditor in a majority of our cases, and it always wants to get ahead of other creditors. It never seems to understand why we find it necessary to dismiss some cases.

There is also a small number of companies making deductions who are very slow in remitting collections to the court. Our cases involving these companies are naturally watched very closely.

From the beginning, creditmen have given us every chance to succeed. The creditman or attorney representing creditors who has not given us his wholehearted cooperation has been the exception instead of the rule. He is usually a new man from out of town who perhaps has had bad experience with chapter XIII in another district or who, more often than not, has had no experience at all with debtor cases.

The bar association has always given us its complete cooperation. By adopting a more than reasonable scale of recommended fees to be charged in these cases, they have helped us hold the cost of debtors' cases down so that the debtor could afford to file such a case rather than a bankruptcy. This fee is at all times controled and set by the referee. The suggested scale ranges from a minimum fee of $15 on up based on liabilities listed and actual work done. The average fee when last checked by the National Retail Creditmen's Association several years ago was $38.73. It is probably larger now due to the fact that our cases have listed much heavier indebtedness during the past 2 years than at any other time in our experience.

There can be no doubt that our bar association has had a large part in persuading the public in our area that to bankrupt is disgraceful; that it should be done only as a last resort; and that before taking such a step one should try, through the use of chapter XIII, to work out a reasonable plan with his creditors and, with the assistance of the court, to pay his or her honest debts out of future earnings.

Due to the combined effort of all of these groups we have virtually eliminated bankruptcies in this district. In fact we have been so successful that many of our business people have forgotten or, in case of the younger group, have never been aware of the many hardships worked on all business people by a flood of bankruptcies.

We receive some complaints about the debtors court, and we realize we are not perfect. We always want to do a better job, but we have learned the paradox that by doing a better job, we create a problem for ourselves and for creditors. It is only natural that the more successful you are in concluding cases the more cases you will have filed. For many years now we have had more cases referred to us than we could handle in the manner that we would have preferred. We have tried to remedy this situation by refusing to take cases where we are reasonably convinced that no feasible or fair plan can be worked out. As an illustration we do not allow domestic servants to file under chapter XIII. We have simply let it be known that we will not confirm such cases. We try not to confirm cases where the employment is such that our past experience leads us to believe that the debtor cannot be forced to make payments and where we do not believe that he will voluntarily do so.

We have learned as a general rule that taxi drivers, waiters, and waitresses, filling station attendants, and part-time and seasonal workers are hard to work out.

We probably make a mistake in confirming many cases that should be bankruptcies in their inception, yet we find it difficult to insist that a debtor bankrupt. We have fought bankruptcy for 23 years, and we are thoroughly convinced that in the long run no one can really benefit from a bankruptcy. More often than not, the debtor bitterly resents being told that he should bankrupt. Many, both men and women, actually break down and cry when so advised. They will almost always insist that they be allowed to pay their debts; that they are honest debts and must be paid. Many tell us that it is against their religion to bankrupt.

Should we discourage this attitude which frowns upon bankruptcy? We think not, especially when experience has taught us that many of the cases we initially think should be bankruptcies eventually pay in full. We always make a memo on these cases so that we can later see what happens to them. So many of them have fooled us that we are about to decide that we know very little about evaluating a case. We have literally hundreds of people paying half of their earnings to court. We are constantly amazed at the small amount of cash money some people can and do live on.

Our average overall costs, including attorney's fees, is slightly over 14 percent of the total claims paid in each case. Due to the fact that basic filing fees are the same regardless of the size of the case, the costs may be too high in the smaller cases and too low in the larger cases. In one case recently concluded in our court a debtor paid creditors $5,331.72 at an overall cost of $591.92, including attorney's fees. It took 5 years, 10½ months for him to pay the case in full.

No personal finance company could afford to lend money that cheaply. We certainly do not want to put the court in the position of competing for business that legitimate loan companies should handle. It is important that costs be held at a reasonable level. In the larger cases certain charges should be increased.

The authors of the amortization sections of the Chandler act deserve unlimited credit for their outstanding work. Very few amendments to the act have been required. Its terminology is so clear and so easy to understand that very few appeals have been taken to the higher courts.

Since my appointment as a referee in July of 1938, just a few short months before the effective date of the Chandler act, we have disbursed $26,395,389.41 to creditors. For the 3 years prior to 1960, we disbursed over $3 million a year; however, due to business conditions in the district, our disbursements were down to $2,367,006.32 last year.

There are figures which prove beyond question that we are justified in our claim that chapter XIII can be used effectively to reduce straight bankruptcies.

For the year 1938, the first year in which chapter XIII was in existence, cases filed under the chapter constituted 33.8 percent of all cases filed; 66.2 percent or 2,200 cases were filed in ordinary bankruptcy.

Each year from 1938 to 1949, with one exception, saw an annual reduction in the proportion of ordinary bankruptcies and a similar increase in the use of wage-earner petitions.

In 1939 only 52.7 percent of the cases filed were ordinary bankruptcies;

In 1940 there was a reduction to 42.6 percent;

In 1941, to 38 percent;

In 1942, to 37 percent;

In 1943 (a year of low total filings), the percentage of ordinary bankruptcies increased to 42.8 percent of the total; however, in 1944, we again find a decrease to 34.8 percent and in 1945 a further decrease to 33 percent of the total cases filed.

The reduction in 1946 was to 28 percent;

In 1947, 20.7 percent;

In 1948, 12.2 percent; and

In 1949, 10.3 percent of the total cases filed were ordinary bankruptcies, the balance being debtor cases.

Since 1949, the ordinary bankruptcy cases have leveled off to between 9 percent and 11 percent of the total of all cases filed, the balance of cases filed being debtor cases.

This represents a reduction in the ordinary bankruptcies and other cases from 2,200 in 1938 to a level of about 800 cases a year; and this occurred during a period when bankruptcy cases generally were showing a substantial increase.

There has been a steady and alarming increase in the number of straight bankruptcies filed in the United States since 1958.

In the northern district of Alabama, made up of 31 counties, several of which have been

[1] See, e.g. "Wage Earners' Plan", by Referee E. R. Sloan, Journal of the National Association of Referees in Bankruptcy, vol. 33, No. 1, p. 5 (January 1959), "Is Chapter XIII a Milestone on the Path to the Welfare State?" by Referee Ronald Walker, op. cit., p. 7; and "Chapter XIII—Referee Allgood of Alabama Replies to Referee Walker," Id., vol. 33, No. 2, p. 5 (April 1959).

designated as disaster areas, there has been a slight increase from 780 cases to 842 cases in 1959. In 1960, a year in which bankruptcies were increasing all over the country, our filings were reduced by 28 cases to a total of 814 cases. (These figures include all types of bankruptcies, both individual and business, voluntary and involuntary.)

In 1958, 6,258 chapter XIII cases were filed in the northern district of Alabama; in 1959, 5,409 cases; but in 1960, there was a reduction to 4,562 cases.

This year, we are considerably ahead of average; 545 cases were filed in January of this year, and in the first week of February, 129 petitions were filed.

Few parts of the country have received chapter XIII with the enthusiasm and regard we have for it in Birmingham. Perhaps these are some of the reasons:

1. Some few States have little or no need for bankruptcy or chapter XIII. Budget firms and voluntary plans have been successful in some areas.

2. Some referees, like many other professional men, have been reluctant to abandon the concept of ordinary bankruptcy in favor of the more challenging potentialities of chapter XIII.

3. The hostility of credit men, unfamiliar with a vigorous wage earner amortization operation, has also been partially responsible.

The record reflects, however, that there has been much improvement nationally in the past 10 years.

Why have we been successful? One visiting referee, after spending several days in our courtroom, expressed the whimsical belief that it was because people here were more honest than the people in his district. Of course, this is not true. While many factors are involved, we think the main ones are probably these:

First. This was the first district to attempt wage earner amortizations by use of the Bankruptcy Act. An earnest attempt was made to modify and adopt the procedure of section 74 to wage earner adjustments. Special procedures were molded and later incorporated into the Chandler act. We have been the beneficiaries of an early start.

Second. A referee who had never handled bankruptcy cases and who thus was free of predilections favoring straight bankruptcy, was appointed to the full-time task of handling wage-earner amortizations under chapter XIII. And he had specific instructions from the district court that appointed him to do everything possible to help people in financial distress pay their obligations through the court.

Third. The debtors' court, as it is called, has always enjoyed the full support of the district judges and other referees in the district. My associate, Referee Herbert Maulitz, deserves much credit for the success of the court. In addition to being learned in the law, he is a good hardheaded businessman with practical business experience. He is understanding, patient, and wise. It has been a real privilege and pleasure for me to work with him. We have no disagreements as to the law or on policy that we do not resolve promptly and without difficulty.

Fourth. The appointment of a salaried, full-time trustee to serve in all chapter XIII cases has proved beneficial to creditors and debtors alike. We were fortunate in the beginning to have a man well trained in accounting and in collections. He has, over the years, developed a highly trained and efficient staff to do the work in his office. At this time he employs 28 persons and has just signed a contract for the installation of IBM equipment. Mr. John A. Stubinger received his appointment in 1938. His training and dedication have been responsible in large measure for the success of our court.

And last but not least, we have had the full and complete support of credit men, business interests, and of our bar association.

There is no reason why districts with problems similar to ours cannot be equally or even more successful than we have been in the use of chapter XIII. Each year sees an encouraging increase nationwide in the use of this relief section of the Chandler Act.

Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1961

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill H.R. 4806, to provide for the establishment of a temporary program of extended unemployment compensation, to provide for a temporary increase in the rate of the Federal unemployment tax, and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the chairman of the committee will not be offended later on in the year when I remind him of his concern about preserving States rights in this program and in the integrity of the States with respect to it, because as long as he holds to that position he will always find me on his side. I would mention to the Members here that that is an issue that will no doubt face us one of these days, because there is no secret being made of the fact that the present administration does intend to ask this Congress for the establishment of Federal standards and to superimpose our judgment on the States. I serve notice at this time that I shall oppose any such proposals and oppose anything in that direction with every capacity that I have at my command.

The legislation before us today, however, Mr. Chairman, I put in an entirely different light. It is not a Federal standards program. It is a temporary program. I will admit it is a program of Federal benefits with a Federal tax tied to the current Federal unemployment tax, but it does not involve a change of State systems. I will agree that this is not a perfect solution of problems we face in periods of general economic declines, where we have a high rate of unemployment over a protracted period of time.

I would suggest, as I suggested to the Secretary of Labor when he appeared before our committee, that we have two distinct problems with respect to unemployment. One is the problem incident to normal unemployment; the technicians refer to it as frictional unemployment. And to meet the problems of that type of unemployment we set up years ago the system of Federal-State unemployment compensation. I am proud to say that Wisconsin was one of the forerunners in establishing such a system. But it was never intended, and I do not think that it should be intended today, that the system should meet every kind of unemployment that may exist under all circumstances.

I think we have a special problem with relation to those periods when unemployment is for a protracted period and at a high rate, call it recession unemployment, if you will. In that situation we should recognize that a person who becomes unemployed has a much more difficult task of finding suitable employment in what would be considered a reasonable period of time.

I suggested to the Secretary that consideration should be given to the development of a permanent program of temporary assistance to the unemployed during periods of high and protracted unemployment. We should have a permanent program of some kind either at the Federal level or at the State level, or a combined Federal-State program that would be triggered into effect to take care of the problems of the unemployed when the rate and duration of unemployment is unusually high. We should not encumber the present Federal-State system of unemployment compensation that has worked so well with the responsibility of taking care of conditions that arise in a national recessionary period.

Mr. Chairman, the question now before us, however, is what our attitude should be with respect to the specific proposal before us. I think we have to ask ourselves two questions. No. 1, should anything be done at this time? Do we have a problem in many of the States and in the country which gives rise to a concern and a need for doing something for the people who are unemployed and who have been unemployed for some considerable period of time and who are unable to find jobs, and whose unemployment compensation benefits have expired? Frankly, I think we are justified in considering their plight and in doing something to alleviate that situation. I think we must recognize that although some States have taken some action which automatically triggers an extension of their unemployment programs in the case of protracted unemployment, the number is very, very small. We also know that the problem of doing it in each State presents serious difficulties if it is going to be of any particular effect at the present time. I come to the conclusion that something should be done.

Then we face the question of what should be done. We have no permanent program. We have only one thing to do; that is, we can look back to the experience this Congress and the country faced in 1958. What did we do then? Because of the fact that it takes time to develop the kind of program that we would be willing to enact on a permanent basis, we must find a temporary solution to this temporary problem. The people we want to help need help now. They are not going to need the aid, we hope, in September or October or November. If there is a need, it is now. The economists point to the fact that there is every expectation of an upturn in the economy.

I should say at this point that I think we would get that upturn faster if the President would stop talking about how bad everything is and how bad things might be tomorrow. But these people need something now. So if we are to do something we must act as soon as possible. To do this, we have to look at what experience we have had and what has been tried before. That is what we have done. In general we have taken the 1958 program as it related to the determination of who would be entitled to benefits, the amount of the benefit, the duration of benefits, and how they should be paid. This is not identical to the 1958 program, however, because, as has been pointed out by some of my colleagues, we do finance it in a different way.

I want to compliment the committee for not accepting the program in financing as sent to us by the administration. The administration proposed to finance the program by an increase in the base against which the tax rate applies, and they also proposed a permanent increase in the unemployment tax. The committee has made this a temporary tax that coincides with the temporary aspect of the benefits involved. This program is therefore separate from the regular program. It is not tied in with the general unemployment compensation program. A separate benefit, and a separate tax, both of which have definite expiration dates. Instead of increasing the base, as recommended by the administration, the committee bill increases the tax rate and does not disturb the base. This is a much more desirable way to raise the additional funds. To pay back the moneys advanced by the general funds of the Treasury under the administration proposal would have taken up to 6 years. We said no, we should pay it within a reasonable period of time to get it behind us, and not have it hanging over our heads. I believe this too was a wise decision. It will be financed in 2 years rather than 6.

I think one of the mistakes we made in 1958 and we still have it hanging over our heads today is that the States were not expected to begin paying back the loans until 1963. The very fact that that is hanging over the heads of a number of States made it inadvisable to have another loan program which would be put on top of a loan program already in existence which has not been repaid.

What we are faced with today is a matter of finding the most expeditious, the most equitable, and the soundest way of providing aid to those currently unemployed who have exhausted their normal unemployment compensation.

I think the bill before us is about the best we can do. As a temporary program, I support this bill. I would hope, however, that after the rainy day and in the sunshine we may consider doing something to repair this roof with a permanent program to take care of these temporary situations.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHENCK. I understand this program is one which is administered entirely by State officials and under State laws. Therefore, we as the U.S. Congress have no part in determining any rules or regulations as to eligibility.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. As to eligibility or the amount of benefits or duration, that is generally true.

Mr. SCHENCK. Yes. Several suggestions have been made in various State legislatures, I understand, to require those applying for unemployment compensation to meet some duty for remaining eligible. I think we will agree that probably unemployment resulting from automation will be a continuing problem, and that the people most adversely affected will be those who are the least trained.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I would agree with the gentleman.

Mr. SCHENCK. Therefore, I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, if any suggestion could be made to the appropriate officials of the several States to suggest to them that as a requirement of eligibility, they might ask those who are receiving these benefits to attend a vocational school at night in facilities already available in these communities, and whether or not the gentleman feels the new skills learned and whether such educational opportunities might be helpful in meeting the problem of automation and also the problem of unemployment.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I would say to the gentleman there is no question in my mind that the need for greater emphasis on vocational training must be recognized if we are to cope with the problem of unemployment resulting from automation. Certainly, there is nothing that would prevent the States from taking action along the line suggested, but I would caution my colleague because I would not, under any circumstances, want to start writing here the criteria and conditions and standards that the State laws must comply with because as soon as we do that, we might just as well take the whole system into the Federal Government and operate it as a Federal system. I would be opposed to our dictating to the States, but I certainly hope the States read the remarks of the gentleman and perhaps get the idea.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Imports Rise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the following is from the Associated Press newsticker:

WASHINGTON.—Last year, for the first time since the Government started keeping cotton statistics, imports of cotton goods exceeded exports.

Preliminary figures gathered by the Agriculture Department for 1960 show imports increased 64 percent to a new high of the equivalent of 566,000 bales of raw cotton, exports were the equivalent of 522,000 bales.

The Story of Robert Hatton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 3, 1961

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, excerpts from a historical address entitled, "The Story of Robert Hatton," recently delivered by Dr. Frederick Taylor Wilson, Nashville author and lecturer, before the senior class of Lebanon, Tenn., High School.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

All wars are curses, and the scourge of mankind. One of the most unfortunate in our American history was our so-called Civil War, the 100th anniversary of which is now being celebrated. There are in both North and South many lonely cemeteries where lie many onetime promising youths, slain in battle, of many of whom it might well be said as Gray expressed it. "Some mute inglorious Milton here may lie."

For years there has stood in the center of the square here in Lebanon, Tenn., the bearded, life-size statue in memory of one of the many noblemen who gave in the Civil War the full measure of their devotion. His name is Robert Hatton who died at Seven Pines near Richmond, Va., 8 days after becoming a brigadier general in the Army of the Confederacy.

Robert Hatton was born near Youngstown, Ohio, November 2, 1826, and spent the first 9 years of his life in eastern Ohio and western Pennsylvania, after which time his father moved to Tennessee and lived the remainder of his years in Davidson, Sumner, and Wilson Counties.

Robert Hatton came to Cumberland University from Gallatin as a junior when 19 years of age. He was one of the four members of the class of 1847. The following year was spent as a tutor in Cumberland, after which he entered its newly formed law department. After 1 year there, for financial reasons, he returned to Sumner County for 1 year as principal of a well-known academy.

In 1850, he came to Lebanon and was associated for the next 5 years in law with two of the great Lebanon legal lights, Jordan Stokes and Nathan Green. He later was chosen to represent Wilson County in the State house of representatives (1855). Before that he had won distinction as a leader for this section in an effort to raise money for the building of the Washington Monument in Washington, D.C. The completed State capitol was first being used. Andrew Johnson was Governor and Neil S. Brown, a former Governor, was speaker of the house. Hatton's major effort in the legislature was to get established a State normal school in Tennessee. He got his bill through the State house only to see it fail by only one vote in the State senate. That was more than 50 years before Tennessee finally established its present great normal colleges.

The next year (1856) was an eventful one for Hatton, then only 30 years of age. He was the elector for this district of the newly formed Know-Nothing Party, whose candidate for President that year was the former Whig President Millard Fillmore, of New York, whose running mate was Andrew Jackson Donelson, a Tennessean and nephew of Mrs. Andrew Jackson.

In 1857 Robert Hatton was the aggressive nominee of the Know-Nothing Party for

Governor of Tennessee. He lost. But the political bee of Hatton continued to buzz, and 1 year later he won a seat in Congress. As a new and studious Congressman he began service in the present Hall of Congress at its first session there (December 1859). John Brown had recently made his history-making raid at nearby Harpers Ferry, and Hatton as a student of history clearly saw arising in the distance the ominous clouds of war. Two months were spent choosing a Speaker of the House, and Hatton found Congress anything but a bed of roses as tension daily increased.

Like a majority of Tennesseans, at that time, Hatton first opposed secession and spoke ably both in and out of Congress against the threatened division of the Union. He was a native of the North and a loyal adopted son of the South. But, like Robert E. Lee, under whom he later served as a soldier in Virginia, when the die was cast and Hatton had to choose between fighting with or against his adopted people he turned soldier first as a captain, next as a colonel, and finally as a brigadier general, all within the period of 1 year. He fell in battle on May 31, 1862, still under 36 years of age. A few years later his body was brought home to rest forever in our local cemetery.

Such are the wicked ways of war. Let all passers-by who view the historic Hatton memorial, the only such monument between Nashville and Knoxville, ever recall the tragic days of a century ago. Though the name Hatton may be vaguely remembered, the story of the cause for which he died will be told and retold until the last syllable of recorded time.

Hon. Walter M. Mumma

SPEECH

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1961

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly shocked and saddened to learn of the passing of our beloved friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. MUMMA. I had a very special spot in my heart for WALTER MUMMA and I know that, like my colleagues, I too will miss his presence in this Chamber.

WALTER MUMMA and I were from different parties and had different points of view on some issues. But I never found a man who had a warmer sense of friendship or who went out of his way to be pleasant to his colleagues than WALTER MUMMA. We represented districts in this House which had many similarities. Both included major urban areas as well as substantial rural sections, and he and I in particular shared a concern for legislation that would be helpful to our dairyfarmers.

As a freshman Member of this body I found WALTER MUMMA a real friend and an understanding counselor. He served the people of his district with great distinction and his warm human personality and his outstanding ability as a legislator will be missed in these Halls of Congress.

To his son and family I extend my deepest sympathy.

Migrant Farm Labor in New York State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 3, 1961

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, there has been considerable discussion over the past few months of the plight of migrant farmworkers. It is my impression that, although many people are vitally concerned about this subject, there is a serious lack of accurate information about the earnings of migrant workers and the conditions under which they are employed.

New York State has taken a number of significant forward steps to protect and register migrant farmworkers. This action has served as a model for other States and for the Federal Government. For example, the migrant farm crew leader registration bill which I introduced last year with Senator JAVITS was was based upon New York's crew leader registration requirements. I am a cosponsor this year of a similar bill to register migrant farm crew leaders and labor contractors.

In 1959, the New York State Department of Labor made another major innovation consistent with the State's long-standing concern about the problems and needs of migrant farmworkers. The department launched a careful and intensive investigation into the conditions of migrant farmworkers throughout the State. The results of this study are very significant, especially in light of the growing national concern about this problem.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that an article which appeared in New York State Department of Labor Industrial Bulletin for February 1961 on the department's investigation into the conditions of migrant farmworkers be printed at this point in the RECORD in order that those interested in this problem will have an opportunity to review and study a summary of this very useful and excellent document.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SURVEY REPORTS ON EARNINGS OF MIGRANT FARMWORKERS

There is an old song relating to railroad workers that contains the line—"whaddaya maka John, on the Delaware Lakawan?"

A 1959 investigation by the New York State Department of Labor asks a similar question of interstate migrant farm workers employed by contractors. At the peak period in 1959 the 23,000 interstate migrant farmworkers in the State constituted 60 percent of the temporary farm help employed. Included in the study were the three farm areas in the State that use the largest number of such workers. The remaining seasonal work force consisted of migrant workers employed by growers or processors, local workers, workers from other areas of the State, so-called offshore farmworkers, and foreign workers.

Each year a stream of migrant farmworkers moves up the Atlantic coast from Florida to New York and beyond to harvest the various crops as they come to maturity. In the past few years this movement has diminished somewhat in size as mechanical harvesters and chemical weeding lessened the need for hand labor.

With the objective of obtaining information on the total earnings of a sample of interstate migrant farmworkers throughout their stay in New York State as well as their employment patterns, 62 crews were selected (about 10 percent of those coming into the State) and an attempt was made to record earnings and collect employment data on each member of these crews during his entire stay. This technique was an innovation in this kind of investigation and was made possible by compliance on the part of farm labor contractors with a law passed in 1958 requiring the maintenance of records of wage rates, hours of work, wages earned, and legal deductions from wages for interstate migrant farmworkers. The law applies to farm labor contractors who bring in 10 or more migrant workers.[1]

The survey and the subsequent report, "Employment and Earnings of Migrant Farm Workers in New York State," covered three major farm areas in the State which demand the largest number of farmworkers; the Rochester area (Genesee, Livingston, Monroe, Ontario, Orleans, Wayne, Wyoming, and Yates Counties); the Utica area (Herkimer, Madison, Montgomery, and Oneida Counties); and the Suffolk County area.

Farm labor contractors in these three areas employed the bulk of the 23,000 migrant workers who are part of the interstate movement. That figure represents about 60 percent of the hired farmworkers employed during the height of the harvesting season. Although some interarea shifts by migrant crews were expected, only one crew moved out of its original area and this crew was followed to its new place of work.

Earnings data were obtained for the whole or part of the stay in New York State for a total of 3,945 interstate migrant farmworkers. For a smaller sample of some 1,158 workers, complete data were available for the entire period in which they were members of a crew working in the State.

A summary of the findings regarding earnings and employment patterns in the three principal areas studied follows.

THE ROCHESTER AREA

This eight-county area features a diversified crop pattern. Among the crops that required seasonal labor was the fruit crop—apples, cherries, peaches, pears, plums, and grapes. There is also a large vegetable acreage concentrated along Lake Ontario and adjacent to the urban centers. Migrant labor is used in harvesting snap beans, broccoli, cabbage, celery, cauliflower, onions, potatoes, and tomatoes among other crops.

Typical piecework rates for harvesting important Rochester area crops included apples, 12 to 14 cents a bushel; cherries, 2 to 2½ cents a pound; and tomatoes, 10 cents a hamper; snap beans, 50 to 75 cents a bushel; strawberries, 7 and 8 cents a quart.

Hourly work rates included: "pitching" peas (machine feeding), $1 to $1.10; pitching hay, 90 cents to $1 an hour; hauling, 75 cents to $1 an hour; general day farm labor, 80 cents to $1 an hour.

Rates for other work related to the harvest: topping onions, 10 cents a box; cutting cauliflower or broccoli, 20 to 35 cents per 25 pounds.

Average daily earnings of 1,505 interstate migrant workers in 23 crews in the Rochester area including earnings from both fieldwork and work in or related to canneries was $6.39

[1] In March 1960, this law was amended also to cover growers who bring into the State 10 or more migrant workers.

a day for days on which there was employment. Men's earnings per day, which averaged $6.47, exceeded those of women by 43 cents a day. Most of this difference may be attributed to the factory-type work done by some males for which higher wages were paid. Average daily earnings for farmwork were $6.27 for men and $6.04 for women. Men averaged $7.54 a day in factory-type work.

Average earnings of migrant farmworkers by type of work performed—Rochester area, 1959

Type of work	Daily		Seasonal	
	Number	Average earnings	Number	Average earnings
Total	1,505	$6.39	437	$298
Farm work only	1,367	6.23	402	282
Farm and factory work, primarily farm	138	7.50	35	515

THE SUFFOLK COUNTY AREA

In the southeastern part of the State the principal employers of interstate migrant farmworkers are the potato growers. Much of the harvesting work has been mechanized and as a result, the chief activity is potato grading. Workers employed in this work were included in the study although the main center of interest was in the earnings of fieldworkers.

The prevailing piece rate for hand harvesting of potatoes was seven cents a bushel. Potato grading, the work in which more migrants were employed than at any other job, was paid for at hourly rates, usually $1.15 for men and $1.05 for women.

At these rates the average daily earnings of some 560 workers employed at potato grading amounted to $5.92 a day. Fieldworkers engaged in harvesting work averaged $3.95 a day in this area while those who combined fieldwork and some factory-type work averaged $5.85 a day. Because of the differential in wage rates between men and women employed at potato grading, men's earnings in this work averaged $6.13 a day while women's earnings averaged $5.15.

It was only possible to obtain the complete earnings for the season for 50 workers in this area largely because some crews disintegrated and individuals shifted frequently to crews not included in the study. Overall, average earnings for the season amounted to $306 for crewmembers employed in Suffolk County. Potato graders earned an average of $488 during the season while other workers averaged $288.

THE UTICA AREA

The chief crop in the Utica area which requires employment of interstate migrant farmworkers is snap beans although some employment is available for harvesting a variety of other crops. The piece rate of 50 cents a bushel for harvesting beans has remained unchanged for many years. Recently, a few growers have paid 52 cents a bushel but this rate is rare.

Other piece rates for crop harvesting included green peas, 50 cents a bushel; potatoes, 7 cents a bushel; and strawberries, 5 cents a quart. Rates for hauling were $1 an hour; day farm labor, $6 a day, pitching hay, 75 cents to $1 an hour; pea vinery work, $1 to $1.25 an hour (mostly $1), and potato grading, $1 an hour.

The average daily earnings of 1,803 members of migrant labor crews employed in this area were $4.45 with the great majority (1,702) employed in the fields and earning an average of $4.34 a day. A smaller group of 101 workers, who also had some factory-type work in pea vineries, earned an average of $8.73 a day. Fieldworkers of both sexes had about the same wages per day.

In this area the average number of days worked in the season was 48 and only 16 percent of the crew members averaged more than 56 days of employment in New York State. The proportion of crew members who stayed with the crew from the beginning to the end of the season was larger than in other areas studied, but their season was shorter.

Total earnings during the season for the 671 workers for whom the information was available was $208 and $203 for the fieldworkers. A group of 32 workers who had some factory employment earned $330 for the season.

Obtaining data on the wages and hours of migrant farmworkers is a far different undertaking than obtaining similar information for factory workers and procedures were developed to validate the information on the payroll record to the extent possible.

Average earnings of migrant farmworkers by type of work performed—Utica area, 1959

Type of work	Daily		Seasonal	
	Number	Average earnings	Number	Average earnings
Total	1,803	$4.45	671	$208
Farmwork only	1,702	4.34	639	203
Farm and factory work, primarily farm	101	8.73	32	330

Some difficulties were encountered when investigators sought to resolve ambiguities in the payroll records through worker interviews, but fortunately this was not a frequent occurrence. However, as a result of such experiences it is felt that although these data which were obtained from payroll records are far superior to those obtained through interviews only, not all reporting errors have been eliminated.

The sampling unit for the purpose of this survey was the "crew," a group of workers of fluctuating size and changing composition under the leadership of a crewleader who was responsible for organizing the starting group and bringing them into New York State and recruiting additional workers during the season. The crew leader usually obtains employment for the group, provides or arranges transportation and exercises some general supervision. The crew leader—also called the farm labor contractor—is responsible for keeping the payroll records and for filing a registration statement with the industrial commissioner.

Crew work is, of course, not the only kind of seasonal work on farms. Individuals return to former places of employment and in other ways seek their own jobs or are recruited for them on an individual basis. These individual migrants are not included in this study.

As has been pointed out, the turnover rate of individuals in various crews is very high. In 14 out of 40 crews in which it was possible to obtain turnover information, fewer than half the original crew members were on hand at the end of the season. To some extent therefore, the seasonal earnings reported are those of the more stable elements in the crew.

The amount that a seasonal migrant worker earns depends on a great many factors including, most frequently, the basic piece rates paid, the availability of work, and the availability of the individual for work.

When a migrant worker arrives in New York for the season, neither he nor his crew leader nor even the grower to whose farm he goes can foresee clearly how much work there will be for him. The experience of waiting for work starts immediately for some crews which arrive at their destination only to find that the crops are not quite ready for picking. Two-thirds of 58 crews in the sample which reported on this point stated that they had to wait at least 1 day (not counting the day of arrival or weekends) before starting to work. In this group were five crews that waited 13 or more days before starting work.

During the season there are additional periods during which no work can be done because of inclement weather or because no work is available. A total of 37 crews reported on the number of days in the season on which the entire crew was without work. Of a total of 3,716-crew days spent in the State there was no work on 31 percent of the days for the following reasons: more than 19 percent, no work available; and more than 11 percent, weekends.

Worker unavailability—whether the result of personal illness or other reason—is also a factor in the seasonal total earnings. More than half of all workers in the survey who remained with their respective crews for the entire season had one or more weeks with no work at all during their 1959 stay in New York State either because of personal factors or because no work was available. (Division of Research and Statistics, New York State Department of Labor.)

Electric Utility Company Participation in Nuclear Power Development

SPEECH

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, American electric utility companies are engaging in a broad program aimed at the development of economically competitive nuclear power, both independently and in cooperative efforts with the Atomic Energy Commission. Table I lists this participation according to plants in operation, plants under construction, plants under design, plants under contract negotiations, and projects in various planning stages. Table II indicates the estimated expenditures by these private investor owned organizations in the total effort. Table III lists individual companies participating in each of the 17 projects set out in table I and additionally lists 9 study, research, and development groups carrying on various efforts within that category. Table IV sets out the foregoing participation according to the types of reactors involved.

This is, indeed, a creditable and substantial effort of real value to the Nation and to the world. It will bring closer the day when the peaceful benefits of nuclear discoveries can become available not only to citizens of the United States but to the world at large. Since the effort is not as well known to the public as it deserves to be, it is my purpose to set out here some of the details of the 17 projects.

PLANTS IN OPERATION

First. Dresden Nuclear Power Station was designed and built by General Electric Co. for a firm price of $45 million. Bechtel Corp. was the engineer-constructor. Of the contract price, $15 million was paid as a research and development expenditure by Commonwealth Edison Co. and the other members of Nuclear Power Group, Inc. The remaining $30 million plus the $6,300,000 cost of the site and company overheads was capitalized by Commonwealth Edison Co. First criticality was achieved on October 15, 1959; first electricity was produced on April 15, 1960. The plant went in commercial operation on August 1, 1960, and was dedicated October 12, 1960.

Within its license limitation of 630 megawatts thermal, this dual-cycle boiling water reactor plant has demonstrated a net capability in excess of 180 megawatts. The plant has met or bettered all design specifications. Edison was preparing to apply for a modification of its operating license, to permit ruhning at a higher thermal level, when a metallurgical problem developed involving part of the control rod mechanism. The plant was shut down in November and General Electric Co. is now in the process of correcting the drives. Operating data accumulated prior to shutdown was as follows:

Reactor service hours	2,711.5
Turbine-generator service hours	2,239.58
Megawatt-days, electrical	11,482.4
Megawatt-days, thermal	37,597.9

During the above extended period of operation at various power levels, the plant demonstrated ease of operation and rapid response to system load requirements.

Second. The Yankee Atomic Electric Co.'s 136,000 kilowatt—net electric—pressurized water reactor at Rowe, Mass., has now been essentially completed and is in preliminary test operation a bit ahead of schedule and materially within the cost estimate. The fuel elements are stainless steel clad uranium oxide. Experience to date indicates that the plant's performance will somewhat exceed specifications.

The project was undertaken as part of the power demonstration reactor program and was estimated to cost $50 million. When all costs are booked, they are now expected to amount to less than that estimate. Arrangements have been made to finance up to $57 million, including cost of the initial core, working capital, and preliminary operating costs. In addition, the Atomic Energy Commission is contributing the equivalent of $5 million in the form of research and development work toward the completion of this project.

Third. The Shippingport Atomic Power Station, the country's first large-scale nuclear power station, was constructed as part of the Atomic Energy Commission's reactor development program. It is jointly owned by the AEC and the Duquesne Light Co. Shippingport was designed to function both as a test facility and as a power producer. Hence a large amount of instrumentation for the conduct of tests was incorporated in the plant's original design. Construction of the station was initiated in September 1954, and completed the latter part of 1957. Criticality was achieved on December 2, 1957, and on December 23, 1957, 60,000 kilowatts were attained. Over 600 million kilowatt-hours have been generated through November 30, 1960.

During 1960, as was the case during the previous years of the station's operation, extensive valuable information was obtained on uranium oxide fuel element performance, core reactivity changes and associated control problems, and the technical problems associated with operation and maintenance of nuclear powerplant systems and equipment, including health physics, radiochemistry, and waste disposal problems. More than 350 different tests have been performed, some of them more than once, resulting in a total number of tests in excess of 600.

In addition to its use as a test facility and power producer, Shippingport for several years has been used as a training facility for supervisors and technical personnel of other nuclear power stations, both in the United States and in other countries. The course provided has been formal in nature and covers, in detail, the operation at Shippingport.

Several years ago in keeping with Shippingport's role as a project producing data of value to all concerned with atomic power, information on the operation of Shippingport has been made available on a current basis to the electric utility industry in the form of monthly operating reports and early in 1960, a book was published on the "Shippingport Operations—From Start-Up to First Refueling, December 1957 to 1959."

On October 9, 1959, Shippingport was shut down preparatory to beginning the first refueling operation—replacement of the enriched uranium element in core No. 1. Following this refueling, the station was returned to active service on May 6, 1960, and testing and training were resumed.

Fourth. The Vallecitos atomic powerplant in California, a joint project of General Electric Co. and Pacific Gas & Electric Co., was started in 1956. It was completed and began feeding electricity into Pacific Gas & Electric Co. lines the latter part of 1957. It operated through 1958 and 1959, and generated over 25 million kilowatt-hours of electricity. Late in 1959 the plant was shut down for an extensive modification program designed to permit increased power output from the reactor. All reactor internals were removed and a new high-density core installed. Additional pumps were provided and the turbine was overhauled. The reconstruction was completed in the fall of 1960 and the plant is now undergoing an extensive testing program prior to being restored to full power operation.

Fifth. The Santa Susana plant—the sodium reactor experiment—is a part of the AEC's reactor development program. It was designed, constructed, and is being operated for the AEC by Atomics International. The reactor facilities which are operated for the AEC by Atomics International have been out of service for cleanup, refueling, and modifications from July of 1959 until September of 1960.

Since going critical on its second core loading, the reactor has been operated at very low power for the purpose of conducting the usual new core type of physics measurements. Consequently the steam-electric portion of the plant has been out of service for the entire past year. It is presently scheduled to resume operation shortly.

PLANTS UNDER CONSTRUCTION

Sixth. Construction of Consolidated Edison Co.'s 275,000 kilowatt Indian Point nuclear opwerplant is nearing completion. At the end of 1960 approximately 90 percent of the construction work at the site was completed. The cost of the plant is estimated at $100 million not including research and development or the cost of the first core. Construction work will be complete in mid-1961 and the plant is scheduled for operation in the fall of 1961.

Seventh. The Pathfinder project is a joint undertaking of Northern States Power Co. and Central Utilities Atomic Power Associates. In 1957, a contract was signed with the AEC to cover research and development assistance for this project under the third round of the power demonstration reactor program. This contract was modified in 1959 to include work on an internal nuclear superheater for the Pathfinder reactor. The construction permit for the plant was issued on May 12, 1960. Site construction work is 40 percent complete for the plant which is located on the Big Sioux River about 5 miles northeast of Sioux Falls, S. Dak. The preconstruction researeh and development program is reaching completion and equipment manufacture is well underway with the plant scheduled to be in operation in 1962. Northern States Power Co. will own and operate the 66,000-kilowatt plant which is expected to cost a total of about $33 million including research and development work. The CUAPA organization is contributing $3.65 million for research and development work with the AEC contributing $10.3 million for research, development and waiver of fuel use charges.

Eighth. The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. has completed the development program and is now constructing a 60,000-kilowatt advanced boiling water reactor near Eureka, Calif. This project, scheduled for criticality in the summer of 1962, is being financed entirely with investor funds, including research and development. Bechtel Corp. is designing and constructing the plant on a regular commercial basis. General Electric Co. is supplying the nuclear and electrical equipment. The total cost of the plant is now estimated to be $21 million. Escalation has added $1 million to its cost since it was authorized in 1958. During the past year the development program on pressure suppression containment which cost P.G. & E. about $400,000 was brought to a successful conclusion. Exclusive of this program and related costs, the pressure suppression design is esti-

mated to cost approximately $650,000 less than conventional containment. This unique containment design is believed to be a significant advance in the art. With it, in the event of an operating accident, escaping steam from the primary system would be quenched in a water pool, thereby limiting pressure rise. The construction permit incorporating this feature was granted by the AEC on November 9, 1960.

Ninth. The Enrico Fermi atomic powerplant is sponsored by the Power Reactor Development Co. and the Detroit Edison Co. Atomic Power Development Associates, Inc., is performing research and development and furnishing the reactor design for the project. In addition, APDA will assist in the nuclear testing of the reactor. Major construction began in August of 1956 and the entire plant was essentially complete by the end of 1960.

As of January 1, 1961, the general contractor had about completed its assignment with only personnel on the site for minor installation work and closing out the accounts. All subcontractors, except two, also had completed their work. The plant operating force had assumed control of the project and, together with APDA, were engaged in extensive nonnuclear testing. Fueling of the reactor could begin on farily short notice but must await a final decision of the U.S. Supreme Court concerning licensing problems now before it, and the issuance of an operating license by the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

Cost of this plant to the utility organizations concerned is expected to be $84,250,000. The AEC is contributing the equivalent of $4,450,000 toward this project, being constructed as part of the AEC first round power demonstration program, in the form of research and development work.

Tenth. The Carolinas Virginia Nuclear Power Associates, Inc., formed in 1956, made a proposal to the AEC in August of 1957 under the third round of the power demonstration reactor program for the development and construction of a heavy water moderated and cooled pressure tube reactor nuclear steam generator. The proposal was accepted as a basis for constructural arrangements by the AEC in May 1958. In January of 1959, a contract with the AEC covering the project was executed and a contract with Westinghouse Electric Corp. covering research and development work required for the project was completed in June of 1959.

The proposed plant having a design capacity of 17,000 kilowatts—net electrical—is scheduled for completion in 1962 and will be constructed on a site located at Parr, S.C., but changes in proposal may cause some stoppage. The associates under the proposed agreement would pay estimated capital cost of about $22 million. The cost of operating the plant will bring the total CVNPA expenditure to about $29 million. Total estimated cost to the AEC would be about $15 million. A construction permit for the project was granted in May 1960.

As of January 1, 1961, the plant was about 7½ percent complete. The foundation work is about one-third completed and over half of the structural steel has been erected. The vapor container is almost half finished.

Eleventh. A construction permit for the Saxton project was received from the AEC on February 11, 1960. Excavation for the containment vessel was started the week of February 8, 1960. Containment vessel erection was started June 28, 1960, and was completed September 30, 1960. The concrete foundation under the containment vessel has been completed and the concrete work inside the containment vessel is approximately 75 percent completed. The walls of the two-story control and auxiliary building have been completed and the steel joists for the second floor and roof have been erected. Roof slabs have been installed, but the floors have not been poured. Excavation for the waste treatment plant has been completed and concrete form work has been started.

All major equipment has been ordered and the pressure vessel is scheduled for delivery about now. Some of the smaller equipment such as pumps, valves, heat exchangers, and fans have started arriving at the site. The concrete work in the containment vessel is ready for the installation of equipment.

The concrete work in the waste treatment plant is approximately 35 percent completed. The floors and interior portions of the control and auxiliary building, and steel work and foundation work in the existing power stations are also substantially completed and ready for the installation of equipment. The facility is now scheduled for construction to be essentially completed by August 1961, and for reactor criticality in November 1961.

Twelfth. A construction permit was issued to Consumers Power Co. on May 31, 1960. Construction work on the Big Rock Point plant began immediately on issuance of the permit and proceeded on schedule through 1960. Erection of the containment sphere and initial testing is complete. The other major structures on the plant site were enclosed to permit work to continue throughout the winter season. The project is on schedule for a target date of fuel loading by September 1962.

Contract negotiations between Consumers Power Co., the Atomic Energy Commission, Bechtel Corp., and General Electric Co. have been completed and all contracts have now been signed. Selection of the supervisory staff for the Big Rock Point plant is complete and a program of academic and practical work training was started in the summer of 1960. Work has begun on all of the necessary environmental studies, including hydrology, meteorology, and background radiation.

PLANTS UNDER DESIGN

Thirteenth. A research and development program directed to advancing the gas-cooled heavy-water moderated pressure-tube-type reactor is being conducted jointly by the Atomic Energy Commission, East Central Nuclear Group, and Florida West Coast Nuclear Group.

Fourteenth. In November 1958, and in response to an AEC invitation, a proposal was made by Philadelphia Electric Co. in cooperation with the nonprofit High Temperature Reactor Development Associates, Inc.—a 53-company association—to design, construct, and operate a prototype high-temperature, helium-cooled, graphite-moderated nuclear powerplant. The plant will be designed to be capable of producing 40,000 electrical kilowatts and will be located at Peach Bottom, Pa., on the Philadephia Electric Co.'s system in 1963. The original plan called for the initial core to be metal clad and the initial capacity to be about 28,000 kilowatts. The initial core will now be graphite clad and when the plant is completed in 1963 it should have full rated capacity with the first core. The plant is being constructed on a fixed-price contract for $24.5 million. In addition, AEC will contribute toward research and development performed by General Dynamics an amount not to exceed $14.5 million, including $2 million in postconstruction research and development. AEC will also waive up to $2.5 million in fuel use charges during research and the first 5 years of operation. Research, development, engineering and layout work for the Peach Bottom project are progressing on schedule.

Some of the major conventional equipment has already been ordered and bids have been received on certain of the nuclear steam supply components. Application for a construction license has been filed and a hearing held with the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards. The advisory committee has requested additional information on the research and development program, which may delay the issuance of a construction license.

PLANTS UNDER CONTRACT NEGOTIATIONS

Fifteenth. The Southern California Edison Co. has reached a preliminary understanding and is in the course of negotiating definitive agreements with Westinghouse Electric Corp. and Bechtel Corp. for the construction of a 375,000-kilowatt nuclear reactor plant at an estimated cost of $78 million. Construction of the project is dependent upon completion of the negotiation of such agreements, the negotiation with the AEC of contracts covering research and development and waiver of fuel-use charges, and the acquisition of a satisfactory plant site.

PROJECTS IN VARIOUS PLANNING STAGES

Sixteenth. A large-scale nuclear powerplant has been authorized for construction by the board of directors of New England Electric System. There is no material change in the status of this project since a year ago. The date for completion and the type have not yet been decided, but it is planned to be of the order of 200,000 to 300,000 kilowatts—electric—for operation not before 1966. Fossil fuel prices continue at a low level compared with 3 years ago. Installation of larger conventional units at Salem Harbor and at the new Brayton Point plant, the latter with two units scheduled, one each for 1963 and 1964, has deferred somewhat the original timetable for the New England Electric System reactor.

This plant must, of course, take its place in the orderly development of the future power supply program for the system. It is conceived as a production plant, not an experiment or prototype. In view of the proposed completion date, the system has as yet no necessity to freeze on the reactor's precise type or design, and can continue to analyze and take into account continuing developments in reactor operations and design.

Seventeenth. Pacific Gas & Electric Co. is studying manufacturers' proposals for a large-scale reactor. Efforts will continue to be given to the project until a satisfactory conclusion is reached. The utility is hopeful that a decision on the matter can be made in the next few months. A powerplant site suitable for a large nuclear powerplant has been acquired.

As far as I know, no other nation has a nuclear power developmental program as comprehensive as that of the United States and in which private enterprise has played such a large role. We have utility size power reactors in operation to give us necessary operating and maintenance experience and at the same time a broad diversified developmental program stressing research and prototype reactor construction. Time has indicated that such an approach is sound and that improvement in technology and not kilowatts is the essential ingredient for the ultimate success of our Nation's program.

TABLE I.—*Electric utility company participation in nuclear power development*

PLANTS IN OPERATION

Name of participating utility companies and plants [1]	Type of reactor	Electrical capacity of plant (kilowatts electric)	Owner of reactor	Operator of reactor	Estimated cost to utility organization	In operation
(1) Commonwealth Edison Co. (Dresden).[2]	Boiling water-dual cycle	[3] 180,000	Commonwealth Edison Co.	Commonwealth Edison Co.	[4] $36,300,000	August 1960.
(2) Yankee Atomic Electric Co. (Yankee).	Pressurized water	[3] 136,000	Yankee	Yankee	[4] 57,000,000	1961.[6]
(3) Duquesne Light Co. (Shippingport).	do	[3] [7] 60,000	Atomic Energy Commission	Duquesne Light Co.	[8] 25,149,000	December 1957.
(4) Pacific Gas & Electric Co. (Vallecitos).	Boiling water—Prototype for Dresden unit.	5,000	General Electric Co.	General Electric Co.	[4] 572,000	October 1957.
(5) Southern California Edison Co. (Santa Susana).	Sodium graphite	7,500	Atomic Energy Commission	Atomics International	[9] 1,697,000	July 1957.

PLANTS UNDER CONSTRUCTION

Name of organization and plant [1]	Type of reactor	Capacity of plant (kilowatt electric)	Location	Estimated cost to utility organization	In operation by
(6) Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc. (Indian Point).	Pressurized water-thorium-uranium converter	275,000	Indian Point, N.Y.	$100,000,000	1961
(7) Northern States Power Co-Central Utilities Atomic Power Associates (Pathfinder).	Boiling water with internal nuclear superheater	66,000	Sioux Falls, S. Dak.	22,800,000	1962
(8) Pacific Gas & Electric Co. (Humboldt Bay)	Advanced boiling water	60,000	Eureka, Calif.	21,000,000	1962
(9) PRDC-Detroit Edison Co. (Enrico Fermi)	Fast breeder	100,000	Monroe, Mich.	84,250,000	1961
(10) Carolinas Virginia Nuclear Power Associates (Parr Shoals).	Pressurized water-pressure tube, heavy water moderated.	[3] 17,000	Parr, S.C.	29,000,000	1962
(11) Saxton Nuclear Experimental Corp.	Water type	5,000	Saxton, Pa.	8,520,000	1961
(12) Consumers Power Co.	Boiling water, high power density	50,000	Big Rock Point, Mich.	30,000,000	1962

PLANTS UNDER DESIGN

Name of organization and plant [1]	Type of reactor	Capacity of plant (kilowatt electric)	Location	Estimated cost to utility organization	In operation by
(13) East Central Nuclear Group-Florida West Coast Nuclear Group.	Gas cooled, heavy water moderated	50,000	Florida west coast	$34,898,000	1965
(14) Philadelphia Electric Co. High Temperature Reactor Development Association, Inc.	High temperature, helium cooled, graphite moderated.	40,000	Peach Bottom, Pa.	24,500,000	1963

PLANTS UNDER CONTRACT NEGOTIATIONS

Name of organization	Type of reactor	Capacity of plant (kilowatt electric)	Location	Estimated cost to utility organization	In operation by
(15) Southern California Edison Co.	Pressurized water	[10] 375,000	California	$78,000,000	1965

PROJECTS IN VARIOUS PLANNING STAGES

Name of organization	Type of reactor	Capacity of plant (kilowatt electric)	Location	Estimated cost to utility organization	In operation by
(16) New England Electric System	Not yet selected	200,000 to 300,000	New England		1966–67
(17) Pacific Gas & Electric Co.	Light water	300,000 or larger	California	[11] $60,000,000	1964–65

[1] See table III for utility company members of respective groups.
[2] Research and development expenditures of $15,000,000 were paid by Nuclear Power Group, Inc.
[3] Net.
[4] Exclusive of research and development expenditures paid by Nuclear Power Group, Inc.
[5] Final costs are expected to amount to less than the estimate.
[6] Critical August 19, 1960, commercial operation 1961.
[7] Initial net capacity, ultimate of 100,000 kilowatts gross expected.
[8] Includes $20,150,000 for the conventional portion of the plant and the site, and $5,000,000 toward cost of reactor.
[9] For turbogenerator portion.
[10] Gross.
[11] Approximate.

TABLE II.—*Electric utility company participation in nuclear power development with estimate of expenditures by electric utility companies for nuclear power development* [1]

	1956 and earlier	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962
Expenditures for plants [2]	36,908,000	34,777,000	50,621,000	99,535,000	107,348,000	79,266,000	41,736,500
Other expenditures [3]	3,598,000	2,648,000	4,379,000	2,603,000	3,766,000	5,807,500	4,952,000
Total by years	40,506,000	37,425,000	55,000,000	102,138,000	111,114,000	85,073,500	46,688,500
Cumulative	40,506,000	77,931,000	132,931,000	235,069,000	346,183,000	431,257,000	477,945,000

[1] Based on information obtained from the major nuclear power groups and previous surveys made by Edison Electric Institute.

[2] Estimate of expenditures by electric utility organizations for the following plants in operation, under construction or contract, including accompanying research and development work, but exclusive of operating costs.

Dresden.
Yankee.
Shippingport.
Vallecitos.
Santa Susana.
Indian Point.
Pathfinder.
Humboldt Bay.
Enrico Fermi.
Parr Shoals.
Saxton.
Big Rock Point.
ECNG–FWCNG project.
Peach Bottom.

[3] Includes expenditures by individual companies and groups of companies for nuclear power study, research and development. These figures do not include expenditures associated with any of the projects listed in (2) above. Included in this category are the following groups:

Empire State Atomic Development Associates.
Texas Atomic Energy Research Associates.
Southwest Atomic Energy Associates.
Nuclear Power Group.
Rocky Mountain-Pacific Nuclear Research Group.
Atomic Power Engineering Group (up to 1959).
Pacific Northwest Power Co. Group.
Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. project (up to time of cancellation).
Pioneer Service & Engineering Group.

TABLE III

ELECTRIC UTILITY COMPANY PARTICIPATION IN NUCLEAR POWER DEVELOPMENT

Names of electric utility companies participating in nuclear power study, research, development, operating, and construction projects

Projects in Operation

1. Commonwealth Edison Co. (Dresden)—Nuclear Power Group: American Electric Power Service Corp., Central Illinois Light Co., Commonwealth Edison Co., Illinois Power Co., Kansas City Power & Light Co., Pacific Gas & Electric Co., Union Electric Co.

2. Yankee Atomic Electric Co. (Yankee): Boston Edison Co., Central Maine Power Co., Central Vermont Public Service Corp., Connecticut Light & Power Co., Eastern Utilities Associates, Hartford Electric Light Co., New England Electric System, New England Gas & Electric Association, Public Service Co. of New Hampshire, Western Massachusetts Electric Co.

3. Duquesne Light Co. (Shippingport).

4. Pacific Gas & Electric Co. (Vallecitos).

5. Southern California Edison Co. (Santa Susana).

Projects Under Construction

6. Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc. (Indian Point).

7. Northern States Power Co. (Pathfinder)—Central Utilities Atomic Power Associates: Central Electric & Gas Co., Interstate Power Co., Iowa Power & Light Co., Iowa Southern Utilities Co., Madison Gas & Electric Co., Northern States Power Co., Northwestern Public Service Co., Otter Tail Power Co., St. Joseph Light & Power Co., Wisconsin Public Service Corp.

8. Pacific Gas & Electric Co. (Humboldt Bay).

9. The Detroit Edison Co. (Enrico Fermi)—Power Reactor Development Co.: Alabama Power Co., Central Hudson Gas & Electric Corp., Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co., Columbus & Southern Ohio Electric Co., Consumers Power Co., Delaware Power & Light Co., Detroit Edison Co., Georgia Power Co., Gulf Power Co., Iowa-Illinois Gas & Electric Co., Long Island Lighting Co., Mississippi Power Co., Philadelphia Electric Co., Potomac Electric Power Co., Rochester Gas & Electric Corp., Toledo Edison Co., Wisconsin Electric Power Co.

10. Carolinas Virginia Nuclear Power Associates, Inc. (Parr Shoals): Carolina Power & Light Co., Duke Power Co., South Carolina Electric & Gas Co., Virginia Electric & Power Co.

11. Saxton Nuclear Experimental Corp. (Saxton): Pennsylvania Electric Co., Metropolitan Edison Co., Jersey Central Power & Light Co., New Jersey Power & Light Co.

12. Consumers Power Co. (Big Rock Point).

Projects Under Design

13. East Central Nuclear Group—Florida West Coast Nuclear Group: Appalachian Power Co., Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co., Columbus & Southern Ohio Electric Co., Dayton Power & Light Co., Indiana & Michigan Electric Co., Indianapolis Power & Light Co., Louisville Gas & Electric Co., Monongahela Power Co., Ohio Edison Co., Ohio Power Co., Pennsylvania Power Co., Potomac Edison Co., Southern Indiana Gas & Electric Co., West Penn Power Co., Florida Power Corp., Tampa Electric Co.

14. Philadelphia Electric Co. (Peach Bottom)—High Temperature Reactor Development Associates, Inc.; Alabama Power Co., Arizona Public Service Co., Arkansas Power & Light Co., Atlantic City Electric Co., Baltimore Gas & Electric Co., California Electric Power Co., Central Illinois Electric & Gas Co., Central Illinois Light Co., Central Illinois Public Service Co., Central Louisiana Electric Co., Inc., Central Power & Light Co., Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co., Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co., Delaware Power & Light Co., Detroit Edison Co., Gulf Power Co., Gulf States Utilities Co., Hawaiian Electric Co., Ltd., Idaho Power Co., Illinois Power Co., Iowa Public Service Co., Kansas City Power & Light Co., Kansas Power & Light Co., Kentucky Utilities Co., Louisiana Power & Light Co., Mississippi Power Co., Mississippi Power & Light Co., Missouri Public Service Co., Montana Power Co., New Orleans Public Service, Inc., New York State Electric & Gas Corp., Niagara Mohawk Power Corp., Pacific Gas & Electric Co., Pacific Power & Light Co., Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., Philadelphia Electric Co., Portland General Electric Co., Potomac Electric Power Co., Public Service Co. of Colorado, Public Service Co. of New Mexico, Public Service Co. of Oklahoma, Public Service Electric & Gas Co., Puget Sound Power & Light Co., Rochester Gas & Electric Corp., St. Joseph Light & Power Co., San Diego Gas & Electric Co., Sierra Pacific Power Co., Southern California Edison Co., Southwestern Electric Power Co., United Illuminating Co., Utah Power & Light Co., Washington Water Power Co., West Texas Utilities Co.

Projects in Contract Negotiations

15. Southern California Edison Co.

Projects in Various Planning Stages

16. New England Electric System.

17. Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

Study, Research and Development Groups

18. Empire State Atomic Development Associates, Inc.: Central Hudson Gas & Electric Corp., Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc., Long Island Lighting Co., New York State Electric & Gas Corp., Niagara Mohawk Power Corp., Orange & Rockland Utilities, Inc., Rochester Gas & Electric Corp.

19. Texas Atomic Energy Research Foundation: Central Power & Light Co., Community Public Service Co., Dallas Power & Light Co., El Paso Electric Co., Gulf States Utilities Co., Houston Lighting & Power Co., Southwestern Electric Power Co., Southwestern Public Service Co., Texas Electric Service Co., Texas Power & Light Co., West Texas Utilities Co.

20. Southwest Atomic Energy Associates: Arkansas Power & Light Co., Arkansas-Missouri Power Co., Central Louisiana Electric Co., Inc., Empire District Electric Co., Gulf States Utilities Co., Kansas Gas & Electric Co., Kansas Power & Light Co., Louisiana Power & Light Co., Mississippi Power & Light Co., Missouri Public Service Co., New Orleans Public Service, Inc., Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co., Public Service Co. of Oklahoma, Southwestern Electric Power Co., Western Light & Telephone Co., Inc.

21. Atomic Power Development Associates: Alabama Power Co., Baltimore Gas & Electric Co., Central Hudson Gas & Electric Corp., Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co., Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co., Connecticut Light & Power Co., Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc., Consumers Power Co., Delaware Power & Light Co., Detroit Edison Co., General Public Utilities Corp., Georgia Power Co., Gulf Power Co., Hartford Electric & Light Co., Indianapolis Power & Light Co., Jersey Central Power & Light Co., Long Island Lighting Co., Metropolitan Edison Co., Mississippi Power Co., New Jersey Power & Light Co., New York State Electric & Gas Corp., Niagara Mohawk Power Corp., Pennsylvania Electric Co., Philadelphia Electric Co., Potomac Electric Power Co., Public Service Electric & Gas Co., Rochester Gas & Electric Corp., Southern Services, Inc., Toledo Edison Co., Wisconsin Electric Power Co., Wisconsin Power & Light Co.

22. East Central Nuclear Group. (See item 13.)

23. Nuclear Power Group. (See item 1.)

24. Rocky Mountain-Pacific Nuclear Research Group: Arizona Public Service Co., California Electric Power Co., Pacific Power

& Light Co., Portland General Electric Co., Public Service Co. of Colorado, Public Service Co. of New Mexico, Utah Power & Light Co., Washington Water Power Co.

25. San Diego Gas & Electric Co.

TABLE IV

ELECTRIC UTILITY COMPANY PARTICIPATION IN NUCLEAR POWER DEVELOPMENT

Reactor types

1. Pressurized water reactors: Shippingport, Yankee, Indian Point, Saxton, Southern California Edison project.

2. Boiling water reactors: Big Rock Point, Vallecitos,[1] Dresden, Humboldt Bay, Pathfinder.

3. Fast sodium-cooled reactors: Fermi.

4. Thermal sodium-cooled reactors: Santa Susana.[1]

5. Gas-cooled reactors: Peach Bottom, ECNG–FWCNG.

6. Heavy water reactors: Parr Shoals.

7. Epithermal thorium reactors: Southwest Atomic Energy Associates.

[1] Have made capital contributions to and participated in the operations of the conventional equipment only.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

The American Institute of Architects Deplores the Apparently Impending Destruction of Certain Buildings Fronting on Lafayette Square and the Construction of Large Federal Buildings in Their Place

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I have been assured by Joseph Watterson, editor of the Journal of the American Institute of Architects, that the American Institute of Architects "deplores the apparently impending destruction of certain buildings fronting on Lafayette Square and the construction of certain large Federal buildings in their place."

Mr. Watterson goes on to say that—

Although by now many of the buildings on the square may be of a nondescript architectural character, the flavor and charm of the square have not been destroyed. It is still a fitting forecourt to the White House—which it must always be. This fitness would be lost with marble monumentality flanking the square—east and west.

Mr. Watterson makes, I think, a major contribution to the current consideration of the famed Lafayette Square when he adds that—

Since the Decatur House, on the northwest corner of the square, and the Blair and Lee Houses, on Pennsylvania Avenue, are to be preserved, and the new Executive Office Building designed to surround them with low wings and courts, it would seem that the same approach could be taken on the east side of the square. The Madison House, on the northeast corner, and the Tayloe House, in the middle of the block, are worthy of preservation and restoration, both historically and architecturally. Rather than preserve them purely as monuments, suitable uses can be found for these buildings, as is done in so many of the old cities of Europe. It is a brash generation, indeed, which will destroy all physical evidences of its great heritage.

I include herewith as part of my remarks the letter I have received from Mr. Watterson, as well as an excerpt from a brilliant article by L. Morris Leisenring, FAIA, which was published in the February 1961 issue of the Journal of the American Institute of Architects:

THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS,
OFFICE OF THE JOURNAL,
Washington, D.C., February 28, 1961.

Representative CARROLL D. KEARNS,
1034 New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KEARNS: I am sorry that you were unable to see me last week, for we have noted with great interest the bill (H.R. 3982) which you introduced in the House February 7.

The American Institute of Architects is of course a strong supporter of any proposed legislation which would strengthen and improve the cultural opportunities here in Washington—or anywhere in the Nation, for that matter. But at the moment it is the last part (section 3) of this bill which prompts me to write you. The AIA has always had an active interest in the planning and architecture of the city of Washington, ever since its part in the inception of the McMillan plan of 1901, in the formation of the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Planning Commission, etc. Consequently, the institute deplores the apparently impending destruction of certain buildings fronting on Lafayette Square and the construction of large Federal buildings in their place. Although by now many of the buildings on the square may be of a nondescript architectural character, the flavor and charm of the square have not been destroyed. It is still a fitting forecourt to the White House—which it must always be. This fitness would be lost with marble monumentality flanking the square—east and west.

Since the Decatur House, on the northwest corner of the square, and the Blair and Lee Houses on Pennsylvania Avenue, are to be preserved, and the new Executive Office Building designed to surround them with low wings and courts, it would seem that the same approach could be taken on the east side of the square. The Madison House, on the northeast corner, and the Tayloe House in the middle of the block, are worthy of preservation and restoration, both historically and architecturally. Rather than preserve them purely as monuments, suitable uses can be found for these buildings, as is done in so many of the old cities of Europe. It is a brash generation indeed which will destroy all physical evidences of its great heritage.

I enclose for your interest and information a copy of the February issue of the Journal of the American Institute of Architects, which contains an article on Lafayette Square. Its author makes no plea for preservation of buildings on the square, for the article was commenced months ago, when their destruction seemed inevitable. It is rather a somewhat nostalgic lament for their passing. However, with the interest displayed in the square by the President, and by the introduction of bills in the Congress, new hope has been aroused that perhaps the square is not doomed after all. This article has been widely circulated in Washington and has aroused considerable interest and comment in the newspapers as well as in Government circles. I hope you will find something of value in it.

Meanwhile I wish to assure you that support for this or similar bills will be forthcoming from the AIA and its 13,850 members all over the country.

Cordially yours,

JOSEPH WATTERSON,
Editor.

[From the Journal of the American Institute of Architects, February, 1961]

LAMENT FOR LAFAYETTE SQUARE

(By L. Morris Leisenring, FAIA)

What manner of people is it that destroys its shrines? True, our Nation has preserved many shrines—but it is now, in the name of progress and efficiency, everywhere destroying more than it is preserving. Our grandchildren will place the blame on our heads. As a people, we pay little heed to the voices of the few who cry a halt to this destruction. More shame to us.

Lafayette Square has been the scene of few great events in our Nation's history, but it has been always, since our beginnings, the forecourt to the home of our Presidents and the site of the homes of generations of the great and the near-great.

Although the square itself is not now to be destroyed, most of its surrounding buildings are, thus completely altering its character as the front yard of the White House.

As the journal has said before, and will, upon proper occasion, say again, the rebuilding of Washington is the concern of the entire Nation. It is not only our Capital, it is our national symbol.

Thus it is with pride and deep concern that the AIA Journal presents this story of Lafayette Square, written by a senior member of the Washington-Metropolitan Chapter AIA, its preservation officer and holder of architect's license number 3 of the District of Columbia.

In L'Enfant's first conception of a plan for the Federal City, two elements of the Federal Government, the Congress, and the President, were emphasized in his first report and shown on his subsequent plan of 1791. In all adjustments made in this plan, by Andrew Ellicott and others, the location and relative importance of these has remained unchanged—the Congress House with its Plaza and the President's Mansion with its park, joined by broad parked areas, one directly west from the Capitol along the "Grand Avenue"—now the Mall—to the site of "the Monument," a proposed equestrian statue of General Washington, authorized by the Congress in 1785, and from there on a cross-axis directly north through the President's Park and his mansion to H Street, extending east and west from 15th to 17th Streets. So here, at its northern limits, lies Lafayette Square, now as always a part of the President's Park, its present dimensions determined by a required traffic lanes and desired building areas, a beautiful foreground to the President's home and grounds.

The importance of the square in the city plan is emphasized by broad avenues extending from it to the northeast and northwest. Its north axis on broad 16th Street, extending out to Meridian Hill, is almost the exact north-south axis of the corners of the original "10 miles square." The President's House—the White House, as it has been called from the first years of its building—was placed on a direct line with the Capitol down broad Pennsylvania Avenue, a vista carefully preserved until the reputed impact of President Jackson's cane and his words "Build it here." Now we see the Treasury instead. Neither the L'Enfant nor the Ellicott plan shows the square separated by a street from the White House, but connection between New York and Pennsylvania Avenues early became necessary, so now the south boundary of the square is determined by the extension of Pennsylvania Avenue. The east and west boundaries were indicated by Ellicott and have become established highways very important in the square's history—Madison Place on the east and Jackson Place on the west. The land had long been the farmstead of the Pierce family from whom it had been

purchased, and there were still some orchard trees and the remains of the family graveyard there when the ground was graded after 1800.

L'Enfant had envisoned this as an area of residences fit to adjoin that of the President, and James Hoban's fine Georgian mansion has given good reason for great care to be taken to surround the square with buildings of proper scale and character. The area was slow in development, and when John and Abigail Adams, the first residents of the President's House, looked out over the square when they moved in during November 1800, it was not a thing of beauty. Fortunately its surrounding buildings lots were in no way suitable for development by the speculative syndicates building quite creditable groups of buildings during the 1790's, on Capitol Hill, on Greenleaf Point near the old Arsenal, and on Pennsylvania Avenue out toward Georgetown. Even in 1814, when President and Mrs. Madison had to find shelter while their home was being rebuilt after the fire, the unfortunate incident of August of that year, the White House was still the only building on the square.

By the time President and Mrs. Monroe moved into the refurbished mansion in 1817, building had begun on the square and before the end of his administration it was well underway. Happily, the first was a church, St. John's Episcopal Church, built north of the square on the corner of H and 16th Streets in 1816. It was planned as a Greek cross, by Benjamin H. Latrobe, and by 1820 the nave had been extended to form the present Latin cross with portico. After the church, residences gradually filled all three sides of the square and up adjacent streets and avenues, and until the end of the century and beyond, the square lived a life of glorious historical record not matched by any other American community and few abroad. As an architectural heritage it offered a picture of development from the Georgian, the Early Federal, the Classic and Greek Revivals, up through the post-Civil War period, the early and late Victorian and at the last, an example of H. H. Richardson's best in residential design.

The "Diagram of Lafayette Park and Its Surroundings," from Frank Leslie's Popular Monthly of April 1891 (from the Library of Congress) is a valuable document, for every one of the buildings shown was in place and occupied at that time, except those absorbed by the construction of the Arlington Hotel after 1869. The "Key to the Diagram" reads like a biographical index of those prominent in this formative period. It also shows the fluid quality of American political life as changing administrations brought new residents, anxious to be near the home and office of their Chief.

Before outlining briefly the history of some of the important buildings, it is well to remember that Washington was really a southern city, lying between two slave States, many of its residents slaveholders, with sentiment strongly divided and loyalties finally brought to a real test. From the very first it was a city of political and sometimes social antagonisms and these were nowhere more intense than around the square. Here there was no lack of drama nor of tragedy. The old houses had their share in these.

The buildings are listed below in approximate order of their age:

St. John's Church, 1816, often called the court church, as it was the parish church of the first Presidents, Madison to Buchanan, and frequently attended on special occasions by all the Presidents regardless of their denominational connections.

The Decatur House, 1819, the first residence. Built by Commodore Stephen Decatur on his return from his brilliant victories in the Barbary wars. This fine house, Latrobe its architect, with garden and dependencies, has been preserved almost intact. But Decatur and his lovely wife had not long to enjoy it, for in 1820 he returned to die here after his duel at Bladensburg with Commodore Barron—the square's first tragedy. Later came Henry Clay while Secretary of State to the second Adams. The year before he moved into the house a second duel occurred when he called his neighbor, the picturesque John Randolph of Roanoke, out to the Virginia hills, but this time with no physical injury. Later it was from here that Mrs. Clay and Mrs. Calhoun carried on their social vendetta against brilliant Peggy O'Neal Eaton, an innkeeper's daughter and wife of Senator John Henry Eaton, a special protege of Gen. Andrew Jackson, which almost disrupted his Presidential administration. In 1836 John Gadsby, an Alexandria tavern keeper, took over the house and auctioned slaves in the high walled garden. During the Civil War it was commandeered by the Government and later was bought by Gen. Edward Beale, under whose grandfather Decatur once served as ensign. Its last owner, Mrs. Truxtun Beale, restored it and deeded it to the Nation under the aegis of the National Trust for Historic Preservation. Many of Latrobe's original drawings were available for the restoration. Some years previously, in a wise move to save it from threatened destruction by Government intrusion, Mrs. Beale provided for the use of the carriage house area by the Truxtun-Decatur Naval Museum.

The Dolly Madison House, 1820, was the second residence on the square. Built by Richard Cutts, brother-in-law of Dolly Payne Madison, a simple colonial-type townhouse, given to Mr. Madison in payment for a debt, it was never occupied by him but was the scene of Dolly's triumphant widowhood. From 1837 to her death in 1849 this was a center of the social and political life of the Capital. The house was then taken over by Commodore Wilkes who added a third story to it and moved the entrance to H Street. It was occupied during the war by General McClellan while Wilkes was on sea duty. A dramatic incident illustrating the wide range of loyalties on the square was the arrest by Captain Wilkes of his neighbor, Senator John Slidell of Louisiana, who naturally had joined the Confederacy and had been appointed Minister to France. On his way he was taken off the British steamer *Trent* by Captain Wilkes, causing the famous Trent affair and a violent controversy with Great Britain. From 1887 to 1952 the house was the home of the Cosmos Club, involving more alterations. Still intact, it is now the property of the Government, and faces early destruction.

Greetings to the Estonian National Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, in greeting you on the 43d anniversary celebration of Estonian Independence Day I sincerely share your sentiments for a free and independent Estonia. The joys of February 24, 1918, have been short lived, but I am indeed pleased to know that the spirit of freedom, the love of liberty, which brought about the birth of the Estonian Republic 43 years ago is very much alive in today's Communist-dominated Estonia. Through their unstinted sacrifices, and with the aid of their friends and sympathizers, the Estonian people will again regain their freedom. Just as their sufferings under czarist autocracy schooled them in adversity, so the more tyrannical and almost unbearable yoke of Communist totalitarianism steels them in their struggle against their oppressors. Let us pray for the victory of their righteous cause, and for their freedom.

Temporary Telephobia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1961

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article and editorial from February 27, 1961 issue of Broadcasting:

TEMPORARY TELEPHOBIA

As everyone predicted, the House Rules Committee has again shelved the proposal to permit televising of House committee hearings.

Arguments of Representative GEORGE MEADER, Republican, of Michigan, that there's no better way for the people to know what their Representatives are doing than through radio and television met a stone wall of indifference from the political henchmen of Speaker SAM RAYBURN. Arguments that President Kennedy is relying heavily on television to sell his program to the Nation and reminders that many Senate committee hearings have been televised failed. The committee vote was 8 to 6.

Broadcasters may console themselves that the RAYBURN victory can be only temporary. The fact remains that our Government is a people's government and the voters have the right to see and hear their elected Congressmen in action. As more elected officials use broadcasting to report their problems and their activities it will be more and more difficult for reactionary forces to operate entirely behind closed doors.

Even though eventual victory seems assured, broadcasters must do their bit to hasten its arrival. Congressmen should be reminded at every opportunity of the advantages which live television and radio reporting can have for our form of government. Every vote helps in the effort to break down these artificial barriers to reporting the news as it happens.

RULES UNIT WON'T WAIVE THE RULES—RAYBURN BLOC BLOCKS HOUSE VOTE ON TV COMMITTEE COVERAGE

House Rules Committee Chairman HOWARD W. SMITH, Democrat, of Virginia, won new fame as a needler last week when his group held hearings on a proposal to permit the televising of House committee hearings.

But Speaker SAM RAYBURN, Democrat, of Texas, the object of the needle, had the votes, and used them to shelve the issue 8 to 6.

The Speaker has consistently ruled against radio-TV coverage on the ground that it would impair the dignity of House proceedings. However, broadcasters did cover committee hearings during the Republican-controlled 83d Congress, when Representative

JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Republican, of Massachusetts was Speaker.

Calling up the TV measure, known to be anathema to the Speaker, was Chairman SMITH's reaction to the House vote last month to increase the size of his committee and, in effect, transfer its control to Speaker RAYBURN.

That fight was over the issue that Chairman SMITH bottled up too much legislation. But last week it was Speaker RAYBURN's loyal majority that put the stopper on bills.

The Rules Committee action on electronic coverage was on a resolution submitted by Representative GEORGE MEADER, Republican, of Michigan, who since 1955 has vainly urged adoption of a rule that would authorize committees to permit camera and microphone coverage of their hearings, as presently authorized by Senate committees.

The hearing originally was scheduled for two resolutions authored by Representative MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, Democrat, of Michigan. They called for opening the House Chamber as well as its committees to radio and television coverage.

HAVE BILL, WILL TRAVEL

But Representative GRIFFITHS, who has been introducing these resolutions since 1956 to no avail, was in Detroit when the hearing came last week. She said she needed more time, but some observers suggested she was absent on Speaker RAYBURN's advice.

Representative MEADER, whose resolution would give House committees discretion to set the terms for broadcasts of their hearings, said, "If self-government is to work, people have to know what their Representatives are doing." And there's no better way, he contended, than through radio and television.

He also appealed to the committee members' pride in their House. Pointing out that President Kennedy uses television to get his views across to the Nation and that some Senate committee members have become household figures because of televised hearings, he said, "Why should there be a blackout in the House? Won't that downgrade House Members?"

Representative MEADER received support from the only other witness to be heard, Representative J. ARTHUR YOUNGER, Republican, of California. He said the Un-American Activities Committee is an example of a House committee that would benefit from television. "It would show the public what that committee is up against and the public would have a different attitude toward it."

INDUBITABLE

The questions and comments of the Rules Committee members, however, removed whatever doubt there was as to how the vote would go.

Representative JAMES J. DELANEY, Democrat, of New York, remarked that the New York City Council permitted television coverage of its proceedings but had to end it when the meetings became a burlesque and a comedy show.

Representative RAY J. MADDEN, Democrat, of Indiana, indicated the extent of his interest by inquiring about color television, "Do we have to go into makeup rooms?" he asked. And Representative CLARENCE BROWN, Republican, of Ohio, expressed fear for the lives of many House Members who might get killed rushing to get in front of the cameras.

It was Representative BROWN, however, who gave the resolution's proponents the stiffest going over, even though he is presumed to have voted to clear the proposal for the floor. (He normally votes with Representative SMITH in the conservative coalition that previously dominated the committee.)

Representative BROWN's concern was with "doctored" telecasts of committee proceedings. "Would the TV camera be permitted to pick up what it wants to pick out and neglect what it wants to neglect?"

PLASTIC SURGERY

He observed that words can be erased and even transposed on tape, and film edited, and added: "A clever editor sitting in New York could change completely the picture of a committee hearing." Representative BROWN has introduced legislation to prohibit the broadcast of recorded discussion programs edited without the express consent of those involved.

"If it's broadcast live, that's all right," he said. "But if it's broadcast later, then it can be altered and edited. Many TV stations and national organizations are concerned about it, according to the mail I've received," he said. "They feel the programs are getting into the area of propaganda."

Representative MEADER conceded the possibility of distorted television, but said, "I have more faith in the honesty of telecasting than that."

The day after the defeat of his measure in the Rules Committee, Representative MEADER went to the floor of the House to score the Rayburn majority for being unwilling to let the House pass judgment on the resolution.

It Is a Brash Generation Indeed Which Will Destroy All Physical Evidences of Its Great Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished editor of the Journal of the American Institute of Architects, Joseph Watterson, has written me that:

It is a brash generation indeed which will destroy all physical evidences of its great heritage.

Mr. Watterson mentions the well-known interest of President John F. Kennedy in the preservation of the buildings fronting on Lafayette Square, an interest demonstrated in the most forceful and significant way when, on March 24, 1960, he introduced S. 3280 and, in a speech on the floor of the Senate at that time, declared that:

There is pending before the Public Works Committee a plan to locate the Court of Claims in Lafayette Square. This means that many of the historic buildings now fronting that square will be torn down. The Dolly Madison House, the Benjamin Tayloe House, and the Belasco Theater have long served as an inspiration to generations of Americans who have visited their Capital City. Certainly, berore any irrevocable action is taken to destroy these buildings to provide a site for a courthouse, other sites should be investigated.

In his letter to me Mr. Watterson says that:

With the interest displayed in the square by the President, and by the introduction of bills in the Congress, new hope has been aroused that perhaps the square is not doomed after all.

Mr. Watterson ended his fine letter by saying that support for the bills which Senators JOHN SHERMAN COOPER and WAYNE MORSE have introduced in the other House, and which I have introduced in this one, that is, S. 1020 and H.R. 3982, "will be forthcoming from the AIA and its 13,850 members all over the country."

This is very encouraging news indeed. Only the other day the 600,000 member National Federation of Music Clubs advised me that it has launched a national drive in the 50 States to mobilize support for saving the buildings on Lafayette Square.

In a memorandum to its national officers, its board of directors, its State presidents, and its State legislative chairmen, it is pointed out that:

It is even more important from the standpoint of history, culture, and economy that similar protection to that given historic buildings elsewhere throughout the United States, such as Philadelphia's Independence National Historical Park, and New York's Carnegie Hall, be given the historic buildings on Lafayette Square.

The fine old buildings on Lafayette Square give the Nation's Capital its distinct flavor and charm, and they teach significant lessons in patriotism to the youth of the Nation.

Tourists who come to the Nation's Capital from all over the world as members of conventions, or to attend national meetings, or as families intent on seeing the buildings and the sites where so much history has been made, spend, I have been informed, $300 million a year.

How many will take the trouble to visit the Nation's Capital if all of its buildings, which are such an intimate part of our Nation's history, are destroyed for the convenience of a few individuals? Not many, I am sure.

Only last year the Congress authorized the spending of up to $33 million, or one-third of the cost, to save the ancient treasures of the Nile Valley.

Perhaps the people of ancient Egypt will now reciprocate, and help us save our own buildings in this time when our young people feel so restless and so rootless, and when they so badly need to have the history of our Nation emphasized in every possible way.

I include as part of my remarks an excerpt from an article on Lafayette Square written by L. Morris Leisenring. The article appeared in the February 1961 issue of the Journal of the American Institute of Architects:

The Ewell house, about 1820, built by Thomas Ewell of the Navy, father of the famous Confederate Gen. Richard S. Ewell. From 1824 to 1834 it was occupied by three successive Secretaries of the Navy, but it is best known as the home of Dan Sickles, Representative from New York, who on Sunday afternoon, February 27, 1859, crossed the square and shot the brilliant young attorney, Phillip Barton Key (son of Francis Scott Key) whose affair with Sickles' young wife had long been a scandal. Key was carried into the John Rodgers House, then the Washington Club, where he died. Sickles' wife confessed; her husband was acquitted and forgave her. A few years later he was the famous Union General Sickles of Chancellorsville and Gettysburg. With one leg gone, he was a familiar sight on the square when he returned from the war to stump around his old neighborhood.

The Benjamin Ogle Tayloe house, built in 1828 by the son of the Col. John Tayloe who had built the Octagon in 1798–1800. This charming house, a distinguished design of the period, with garden and dependencies, had as a frequent visitor, William Henry Harrison, the owner's warm friend. Later it came to be called the Tayloe-Cameron house due to its long occupancy by Senator Don Cameron during the years of his greatest influence, then again the Little White House, as the home of Sen. Mark Hanna during President McKinley's administration. It still stands but will soon be lost.

The John Rodgers house built in 1830 by the commodore, one of the heroes of Tripoli. This site is said to have been secured by him from Henry Clay in exchange for a blooded Andalusian jackass, brought by Rodgers from Spain. This commodious square brick building was the scene of many events. While used as Washington's first important club it was here that Phillip Barton Key died. While the home of William H. Seward, Secretary of State, on the night of April 14, 1865, a near tragedy occurred when Lewis Payne, one of the conspirators of the Lincoln assassination plot, stabbed and dangerously wounded Secretary Seward. The Lafayette Square Opera House, later the Belasco Theater, was built on this site in 1895.

Another building on the east of the square facing the avenue, not shown on the diagram, the Gunnel house, was built in 1836 by Dr. Thomas Gunnel, a prominent dentist. This was the only framehouse on the square. It was a typical Maryland small-town house with a long two-story gallery on the square side and a fine garden. The incident most often told of this old place is that once the doctor, having received a hurry call from President Van Buren, his neighbor then in the White House, hastened there with the tools of his trade, expecting an emergency. Instead he returned with the appointment as postmaster of the city. The house has been gone for years, and its site is now occupied by the massive Treasury Annex of 1919 vintage.

It would be well to note that neither Madison nor Jackson Place was named or paved until several years after the Madisons had owned their house on the corner and General Jackson's statute had graced the square's center. Before then they had been gravel drives without names.

The Daniel Webster house, later known as the Corcoran house. Built by Thomas Swann, of Alexandria, the records say in 1822, though this seems very early for a design of Italian villa type such as this. Presented to Daniel Webster by admirers when he became Secretary of State in 1841, it was famous for his lavish entertainments. Webster sold the house to W. W. Corcoran, the philanthropist, who occupied it until his death in 1888, except for a short period during the war when, because of his strong southern sympathies he leased it to the French Ambassador to avoid its confiscation by the Government. With its beautiful garden reaching back to I Street, and with its next door neighbor, the dignified Greek Revival house built by Commander Stockton and the home of Senator Slidell, of the "Trent Affair," it survived until destroyed for the construction of the monumental building of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Ashburton house, built by Matthew St. Clair Clarke in 1835, some say earlier. This very English, broad and high brick house, later brown stuccoed, was the British Legation and the scene, in 1845, of the signing of the Webster-Ashburton Treaty establishing our Canadian boundaries and other matters of mutual interest. In 1849 it was again the British Legation under Sir Henry Bulwer, brother of the novelist Bulwer-Lytton. Sir Henry's secretary was his nephew, Robert Bulwer, who wrote "Lucille," some maintain while stationed here. This fine old house still stands as the parish house of St. John's Church.

George Bancroft, patriot and historian, Minister to England during the war, took up his residence in this simple classic revival house with its extensive garden. Here he completed his monumental history of the United States, was the literary lion of his day, and gained fame with agriculturists by developing the American Beauty rose.

The Hay and Adams houses, built in 1884, designed by H. H. Richardson, for the two friends, John Hay and Henry Adams. Surely no two more famous men could have joined forces in adopting the square for their homes. Hay had come to Washington during the war as a secretary to Mr. Lincoln. Adams was the grandson of John Quincy Adams, a historian and writer of the first magnitude. Here for 20 years was centered the social and literary life of Washington. Hay died in 1905 after serving as Secretary of State for William McKinley and Theodore Roosevelt. Adams was the oldest of all the old square residents when he died there in 1918. The site of their houses is now occupied by a hotel, the Hay-Adams. Some might question the compatibility of the two Richardson houses and the White House. At least they were in scale, residential in character and fine examples of the development of architecture in the United States.

The Blair-Lee houses, just off the square on Pennsylvania Avenue, examples of the Federal period, were built in the 1820's. Both considerably altered, they now serve to house the official guests of the Nation and are to be preserved as such in the coming demolition of all but the Decatur house in this block. Both are historic, particularly Blair House. Here, at the request of Montgomery Blair, President Lincoln's Postmaster General, came Col. Robert E. Lee, from his beloved Arlington high above the Virginia shore of the Potomac, to be questioned as to his stand in the coming conflict. Colonel Lee returned to Arlington and his Virginia and determined that his loyalty with with his State. It has been well established that the President's intention would have been to place the colonel in command of all the Union armies. A few years ago a faithful guard was killed by a wild group bent on entering Blair House to assassinate President Truman, who with his family had temporary quarters there duirng the recent reconstruction work at the White House.

At the square's center is the remarkable statue of Gen. Andrew Jackson, rampant in every sense of the word, dedicated with ceremony in 1853. His rearing steed balances on two hindlegs by the help of a full-flowing heavily vermiculated tail. The work of Clark Mills, our first native American sculptor, it was cast in nearby Bladensburg of bronze cannon captured by the general in the War of 1812. The statues at the four corners came much later, Lafayette in 1891, Rochambeau in 1902, and Steuben and Kosciusko in 1910, all men who came from their home countries to aid in the Revolutionary Army. The square's name did not come from the statue. It had been given long before by the people, after the ceremonies attending the visit of General Lafayette in 1824 and not officially adopted until 1852 as Lafayette Park, later Lafayette Square.

Born as a part of the President's Park before the end of the 18th century, with its first house occupied by the President in the first year of the 19th, the square lived its first century with a glorious historic record and with a growing exhibit of our architectural development fully as worthy of preservation as a Boston or Philadelphia square. Too bad that the AIA was not then preservation minded or that the National Trust was not yet organized or that Congress had not yet enacted the Historic Sites Act of 1935, giving to the Secretary of the Interior great responsibility for the preservation of historic buildings and places—or that no civic organization saw and acted to save what it was about to lose.

For now came the McMillan Commission and the plan of 1901. It was and still is considered by many rank heresy to question any part of this plan devised by the foremost architects and planners in the country. In restoring the principles of the L'Enfant plan they swept away railroads, cherished departmental English gardens and the violently expressed opinions that L'Enfant's straight line was anathema and that "curved is the line of beauty." They re-created the Mall and established its architectural character and boundaries, a wonderful achievement. But when they turned north they changed the President's House and home and established it as the Executive Mansion, and in their thirst for sites for the executive department they swept the square of every historic element and assigned to it every side executive department buildings only.

It is hard to believe it, but this was approved. More difficult of belief was the advocacy of the design shown to surround the three sides of the square with the columns of the Treasury. This was actually begun in 1919 with the construction of the Treasury Annex, the first section of a proposed single building the length of Madison Place. The deed was done. Good bye to the Benjamin Tayloe and Dolly Madison Houses, St. John's Church, Daniel Webster and George Bancroft, the Decatur and all other buildings on the west. With its mind on planning alone the AIA approved the plan and soon did the National Commission of Fine Arts. No little plan had been made here—nor one with even a little consideration for historic values.

In line with this pronunciamento the Government soon bought all remaining property on Madison Place. The occupants were allowed to remain on short notice to vacate. More recently the Government has completed purchase of all property in the block between Jackson Place and 17th Street, except the Decatur House and the National Grange—an organization politically too difficult to move except to a site around the corner where it has built itself a new office building. On Jackson Place the Grange, the Brookings Institution, and others had built so as to change much of the old character. On H Street, the Government has done nothing and all ideas as to maintaining residential character have been lost, commerce has taken over and it is no longer a real part of the square. The first offender was the 10-story Veterans' Administration building that in 1919 took over the site of the Arlington Hotel. Little of the old will remain—St. John's Church, saved by the grace of God, and the adjoining Ashburton House, by the militant ownership of two elderly gentlewomen who wished to live in their ancestral home and more recently by its acquisition by the church. The Decatur House was saved by the same militant ownership and resistance to Government pressure and now by its ownership by the National Trust. Finally, we shall apparently always have the White House, by grace of the efforts of the Institute's resident Secretary Glenn Brown and his influence with President Theodore Roosevelt, as well as the talents of Charles Follen McKim, when during that administration the building was threatened by designs of a Government agency with many extended wings and columns. That is not all the danger it has faced. In the McMillan Commission report of 1902, three methods were considered for its greatest use: First, additions at the east and west ends (not advised). Second, to give it up entirely to public business and build a residence for the President "on one of the commanding hills overlooking the

city" (not recommended as being unpopular). Third, remove all executive offices and devote the President's house entirely to residence purposes. ("Favored by the present Chief Executive; and to the Commission it seems to be the best solution of the problem possible at this time.")

But the Square was treated roughly: "The location of the building to contain the Executive offices is a more difficult matter; but the Commission are of the opinion that while temporary quarters may well be constructed in the grounds of the White House, a building sufficient in size to accommodate those offices may best be located in the center of Lafayette Square. This suggestion must be taken in connection with the full development of the plan outlined below."

Here in a long paragraph is a statement of departments that needed quarters, ending, "The proper solution of the grouping of the executive departments undoubtedly is to be found in the construction of a series of edifices facing Lafayette Square." It had been previously written that these should be convenient to the White House, "which is their common center."

The die has been cast. Since the plan of 1901 there apparently has been no hope of preserving the old square, so now it must be seen to that the buildings facing it on the east and west complement in every way the President's House, so that the square remains as its beautiful foreground and visual approach. Some very bad designs have been proposed for these areas and wisely abandoned. Under the present program, much better results can be expected. Recent acts of Congress have directed that on the complete block west, there be a building for the Executive Offices of the President, and on the east, a building for U.S. courts. Franklin Floete, former Administrator of the General Services Administration, the Government agency responsible for nonmilitary Federal building, with two Washington members of the Institute, Leonard L. Hunter and J. Rowland Snyder, in charge of architectural design, engaged two well-known firms to collaborate on the designs for both buildings. He made known a letter he received from President Eisenhower expressing his desires as to these buildings. In his letter he said, "It is extremely important that the architecural plans for these buildings be carried out with the greatest of thought and with attention to the present and future dignity and beauty of Lafayette Square and its historic past." In it he requested that all plans be approved by the Capital Planning Commission and the Commission of Fine Arts. Mr. Floete has named the architectural firms which will collaborate in these important designs. They are: Perry, Shaw, Hepburn, and Dean; and Shepley, Bulfinch, Richardson, and Abbott, both of Boston.

There was a recent controversy over the proposed building for the courts on the east of the square, in which the author, as preservation officer for the Washington chapter, joined, partly to save for a time at least the remaining historic buildings, but largely to advocate the legislation proposed by three Senate bills introduced separately by Senators Kennedy, Morse, and Humphrey. These advocated the construction of a group of U.S. court buildings near the Supreme Court.

This grouping of the national judiciary was such a forward look that, invited to a hearing before the Senate Subcommittee on Public Housing, the author joined many civic groups in warmly endorsing the temporary saving of the old buildings and grouping the courts elsewhere. Furthermore, three courts needed quarters and there is room for only two on Madison Place. But the honorable judge of the Court of Claims appeared. He had been disposessed from the old Corcoran Gallery near the square and he intended to stay in the area. The Senate sided with him. The House had already done so without a hearing. Though a good judge of claims, he was not a good judge of city planning, but he had been a Representative in the House—and he came from Texas.

A word as to the President as Chief Executive. In his house the early occupants did much homework. Most of the diminutive departments found rented quarters after their move from Philadelphia. Just east toward 15th Street there was a small two-story building for the Treasury almost ready when Mr. Adams moved in, and soon after, one to the west for the War Office, later the Navy. After the War of 1812, larger buildings were built in front of these facing the avenue, on the east, the State Department, on the west of the War and other departments, separated from the White House grounds by what became the East and West Executive Avenues. Robert Mills' neoclassic Treasury was begun in 1836 and gradually completed. Then in 1869, by act of Congress as to location and dimensions, came the State, War, and Navy Buildings, designed under direction of a Commission headed by A. B. Mullett, Supervising Architect of the Treasury. It is interesting to compare the dates of design of these three buildings and the architectural thought of the Nation from the English Georgian White House, 1798, to the neoclassic Treasury, 36 years later, to the French Mansard 33 years after that—a historic sequence that should be preserved.

We may be thankful that the massive buildings proposed by the plan of 1901 did not immediately surround the square, but that the departments found the triangle to the east and the rectangle to the west. We may be grateful also that GSA is progressing as now planned and that we can leave the square as a park in the care of the National Capital Parks and the National Park Service.

Diplomatic Pusillanimity at Panama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, since the 1956 Suez crisis, I have made many addresses in and out of the Congress on its repercussions at Panama. Featured widely in the press of Latin America, these addresses have worked a large response through informative letters from well-posted observers on the isthmus and elsewhere.

The picture presented by these informants has been of the highest value. They made it possible to predict with remarkable accuracy the 1958 planting of the Panama flag in the Canal Zone, the two 1959 attempts of the Panama mob to invade the zone, and, finally, the servile surrender by our President to Panamanian mob rule, on advice of our Department of State, in which the President directed the hoisting of the Panama flag over the Canal Zone territory. The last was one of the most shocking executive actions in American history.

Unfortunately, the press of our country, despite the documented presentations that have been made in the Congress by members of both major political parties, has tragically failed to present an objective and adequate picture of this crucial situation to our people. The result is that many have been misled by what appears as a studied campaign of downright misrepresentation and inevitable confusion.

Of course, our people wish pleasant relations with Panama, and this, of course, is the desire of the Congress. But such relationship can never be established except upon conditions of mutual fair play and respect. They cannot be realized by a continuous policy on our part of grovelling and obsequiousness, with the surrender of rights indispensable to the proper maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Congress who have been in touch with informed observers of the Isthmian scene, have not been confused and cannot be, and this despite nationwide telecasts of the controlled public information media. They understand too well to be misled.

As examples of the reports received from independent observers, I quote three recently received letters, omitting the names of the authors because of the possibility of official reprisals or even personal injury.

These letters confirm what every informed and objective American student knows of the Panamanian situation. The practice of servile surrender on the part of our Department of State and our Ambassador at Panama are ominous indeed for the future security of our country and subject our citizens in the Canal Zone to the utmost shame and humiliation.

The situation involved is so grave that our Department of State and its diplomatic appeasers sent to the isthmus have brought us into an unprecedentedly low state in the estimation of the Panamanian Government and people. By precedents thus being made in the isthmus they have emboldened communistic and other radical leaders in various Latin countries to make ever-increasing demands against the United States and to lower our prestige in those countries.

All these facts further stress what I have heretofore said on this subject and reemphasize the absolute necessity for a thorough and impartial investigation of subversive influence in our State Department.

The letters which follow are commended for reading by every Member of the Congress, especially those on committees charged with investigations:

BALBOA, CANAL ZONE,
February 18, 1961.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I have enclosed a clipping from the Panama American, the anti-American English language newspaper in this area. As you can see, anything you or the House does becomes a matter of satirical interest to our Panamanian friends.

When last I wrote you and asked your advice relative to a proposal to rent space in a national magazine, to lay our case before the people of our country, you advised only that we, the citizens in the zone, continue to present a united front against appeasing the ultranationals in Panama. Shortly after I received your letter, it was announced that Governor Potter was leaving and that there would be a change in the American Embassy in Panama. In view of

these changes we adopted a wait-and-see attitude. Needless to say, we saw what we feared most—a complete and abject surrender to the Republic of Panama—a surrender that is so abject and servile as to cause many of us the greatest shame. In addition, no citizen on the zone had better forget that an "insurbordinate attitude toward the constituted authority" has recently become cause for removal of housing privileges. Of course, this is a veiled threat and can be interpreted two ways but nobody hereabouts feels up to making the test.

As for the raising of the flag of Panama in the zone, we all wondered what had happened to the intent of the Congress as was expressed following the November 1959 riots. The newspapers made much ado about this intent, in a lampooning way, of course. The flag went up and, as you pointed out, the State Department was the big "thief." The State Department has been more than that hereabouts. They have led the way in appeasement, they have "knuckled under" to such an amazing degree that it is hard for me to realize that this is the State Department of the U.S. Government. With the visions of the riots, desecration of the flag of our country, destruction of Government property, still fresh in his mind, Mr. Ambassador Farland led the entourage to the Presidencia where they presented the President of Panama with $3 million—money virtually picked from the pockets of our own people. Then the Eisenhower administration pathetically makes the big announcement concerning the gold-deposit depletion. This is an incongruity to which I cannot bring myself to understand. The State Department, under the able guidance of Mr. Farland, has seen to it that Panamanians of political influence are permitted to patronize the post exchanges of the Armed Forces. He has chosen, also to modify the Remon-Eisenhower treaty of 1955, by permitting certain influential Panamanians to trade at Canal Zone commissaries, while the peons are denied that privilege. American parents in the zone withdrew their children from a swimming meet in Panama when several of the American buses, carrying the children, were stoned and spit upon by Panamanians. Mr. Farland turned his oft-smote other cheek and invited the Panamanians to the military reservations and the use of the servicemen's pools. This is not the only case where State finds it convenient to use military facilities and funds for its particular purposes. CFN, the local Armed Forces station, must carry hourly spot announcements on "Operation Friendship" and how Panama was founded "100 years before the Pilgrims landed on Plymouth Rock" (this is an exact quote). This is an amazing bit of "statehood" in that my history book shows the date to be 1903 and as a result of Teddy Roosevelt's holding the Colombians at bay. This is another bit of propaganda which must be causing our schoolchildren no end of confusion. The latest is the new decal appearing on the doors of the Embassy cars: two hands in a clasp, one sleeve bearing the U.S. colors, the other the Panama colors. It was felt that the Great Seal of the United States was a bit too much like a show of force so this magnificent, weakling innovation was put in its place. So much for Mr. Farland. I could go on but it would only sicken you. Needless to say, the citizenry of Panama (those on top) petitioned our Government to retain Mr. Farland at his present post, which has been done.

Major General Carter, U.S. Army, the present Governor of the zone, has conducted himself in a parallel manner. Numerous photos of our Governor appear in Panama papers showing himself dancing the tamborita, a local style of dancing, similar to square dancing, and wearing a little straw hat, the type worn by the chollos or Indians of the interior. On the chollos it looks asinine, on the Governor of the Panama Canal Zone, it appears positively ridiculous and unworthy of his stature. The President of Panama, of course, does not deign to appear in such a ridiculous posture. Only our American Governor. The chauffeurs—two of them—who are assigned to drive the Governor and his family, used to be armed with a police revolver. This was something introduced by Governor Potter and with good cause. A small bleat appeal in a local Panama paper about this custom and it was promptly discontinued. However, I believe the Governor is on the spot and is doing what he has been told to do as a good soldier.

As for the flag on Shaler Triangle, two Canal Zone policemen were detailed to raise the flags. They spent hours practicing in order to avoid raising the American flag first—an act which might be misunderstood. As it was, and you may be interested in this fact, the President of Panama snubbed the ceremony and sent his chief of protocol to stand alongside our Governor at the ceremony. This, of course, endeared him to the hearts of his countrymen and—on this side of the boundary—caused the other cheek to be turned, again.

Thelma King, a deputy in the national assembly and an avowed friend of Fidel Castro, is a longtime and bitter enemy of the United States. She will stoop to anything. Her latest is the campaign to force the release of a Panamanian who is in Gamboa Penitentiary. This man is a felon, a convicted rapist. Thelma King is striving to make him a national hero. Coincidentally or not, a soldier of ours is presently in a Panamanian jail, where he has languished for months on as trumped up a charge as you can find in the annals of law. The Embassy, for all of their ability at shaking hands, cannot obtain his release. Not being a citizen of Panama he is denied bail and, of course, was returned to the Panamanian authorities when a kindhearted judge mistakenly let him out on bail. General Bogart, the commanding general in these parts, saw to that. Of course, I believe his mind was relieved of any hesitancy by Mr. Farland. This unfortunate lad was delivered to his persecutors by our own Armed Forces and suffered a delightful Christmastide in jail. If you have ever seen a Panama jail you can realize what he went through.

I hope it is to your advantage to receive this letter and that you can do something about this mess which embroils us more every day. * * * Incidentally, I am a retired soldier—23 years service, infantry in two wars—and find myself unable to secure employment in this area due to the new policies which tend to grant preference to Panamanians rather than to Americans.

Respectfully yours,

RETIRED SOLDIER.

P.S.—Note the additional clipping regarding the TV discourse on our troubles with Panama. It might interest you to know that this entire U.S. news team stayed at the Panma Hilton where they were feted, wined, and dined from day to day. This, of course, could have no bearing on the outcome and the slanted version being given to the public.

BALBOA, C.Z., *February 10, 1961.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: By now you have my last letter concerning Mr. Farland and his capers in Panama. This letter includes the latest news clipping reporting his customary antics.

What remains the mystery of the whole affair is that Mr. Farland ostensibly is ignorant of what all of us know. Mainly, that these little people whom he is being so condescending toward are not the ones with whom we should be doing business. The weight and voice of these people mean nothing to the ruling classes of Panama. The latter group for the past 6 months has been very, very quiet insofar as lambasting the U.S. Government is concerned. Mr. Farland thinks this is due to his efforts in the field. He is sadly mistaken. The small group of ruling families have been shaking in their boots for fear that Castro will include Panama in his program. They know that were Castro to come to power in Panama their dynasty would be at an end. For this reason, and no other, they have found it prudent not to irritate Panama-United States relations—at least, not until Castro becomes a thing of the past. This same class I speak of smirk at Farland behind his back. He is considered a spineless, ingratiating buffoon, for whom they have absolutely no respect. Latins are particular about foreign representatives. They appear to affect the haughty pride of the Conquistadores, and any government which deems it necessary to approach them in servility is making a grave error. Mr. Farland's home at the Embassy has been looted by Panamanian vandals twice in 3 months. To this he merely smiles his most winning smile and continues on his backslapping campaign. He is most effective in selling the honor and dignity of the United States right down the Chagres River.

The next item enclosed is a clipping from the Star and Herald announcing the recent little dig by Panama's golden boy at the U.N. This item has stirred up the malcontents again and the murmurs are getting a little louder. It also ties in with the third clipping about a Mrs. Quintero, whom the USIS has hired to handle our information programs to the Latin people. I maintain, as do others, that had we capable people in USIS, those who have made our Government's interests their own, we could effectively counter these and other incidents. Certainly the current TV program making the rounds in the States and this speech were nicely timed. The only thing State finds convenient to do by way of counteraction is to hire a dedicated Panamanian to disseminate the viewpoints of our Government, after she does her little work of editing, clipping, etc. Jobs of much lesser responsibility in other branches of the Government are considered security jobs and can be filled only by U.S. citizens. An enlisted man assigned to I. & E. work in the Army (they usually have one of these for each company) must be cleared for "secret." It is difficult to believe that information and education given to our enlisted people in the Army is of a more critical nature than our Voice of America programs. The American Embassy in Panama is loaded with Panamanians. Not long ago I went to the Embassy. I saw six people and not one of them American. Still a U.S. citizen in these parts is hard put to find employment of any kind.

Respectfully yours,

RETIRED SOLDIER.

PENSACOLA, FLA., *February 15, 1961.*

DEAR MR. FLOOD: In connection with the Huntley telecast February 14, I wish to make some comments. (I worked many years on the Canal Zone as an employee, and, thereafter, for 5 years as a contractor in the Canal Zone and in the Republic of Panama.)

The implications of the Huntley report seem to be that the U.S. Government has moral and political obligations to increase vastly the yearly take of the Panamanian Government, and sheds tears of compassion for the assorted mestizos, mulattoes, and Negroes which make up the population.

I wish the people here could know all the truth about the Panama Canal and the Panama Canal management. There have been dumped there sums of money beyond all reckoning, certainly $2 billion and probably more, since its opening in 1914.

The Panama Canal Company may claim it is not losing money, but if so, they are ignoring a very large part of the cost and probably padding their toll receipts by interdepartmental charges. For instance, perhaps charging tolls for Government floating equipment. This is like a house-

owner charging himself a high rental for his property, and saying, "Hurray—I am getting rich." If the Panama Canal Company makes any such claims, it is by falsifying their books.

In short, the history of the Panama Canal has been a long, long record of bungling and waste. No other nation in the world would tolerate such management.

I doubt very much if you have ever heard of the Panamanian money scandal, which was uncovered in 1934. It was that year (at long last, after 30 years, mind you) that the Treasury Department became aware that Panamanian silver money was being received in Canal Zone post offices at a fictitious value, thereby extending U.S. Government credit to cover all coinage by the Panamanian Government; also to cover the external debt of Panama. This is a direct violation of the Constitution, article I, section 8.

Our sorry State Department tried to legalize this in the Panama treaty of 1936, but in fact, this cannot be legalized without a constitutional amendment. As far as I know, this is going on right now.

During the war, irresponsible Army officers were throwing the money around like confetti. I knew one contractor, working within a stone's throw of my own job, who on an item of $440,000, was able to make a profit of $400,000. Not bad, eh? (There was a commission sent to modify excessive profits, but it was not very effective.)

To summarize, the only one to profit by the canal has been the Panamanian Government, which is to say, the 20 families who run the country, and own about everything worth owning. All the benefits have gone into the big pockets. During the war, the big landowners * * * were renting land to the U.S. Government at rentals more than they had paid for the land. A real saturnalia of waste, and all for the benefit of the big owners.

The story of Latin-America, over 400 years, has been an unbroken tale of insurrections, assassinations, rioting, looting, destruction, and monstrous brutality. * * *

Sincerely yours,

RETIRED CONTRACTOR.

Cochrane Concoction: Killer of Farm Freedom—Rx From the White House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives is expected to consider the feed grains bill tomorrow, and prior to its consideration I want to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix two articles from a current publication called Farm and Ranch magazine. The Farm and Ranch articles were written by Bill Kennedy, the editor and a writer of unusual discernment, since he seems to have the ability to winnow through the chaff of legal phraseology in the bill and come up with what I believe to be the kernel of legislative intent.

I sincerely wish every farmer in the Third Nebraska District, every farmer in the Nation for that matter, had the opportunity to digest all these articles before we consider the feed grain bill. Unfortunately, all will not have, but I want to insert the articles in the Appendix anyway in the hope that my distinguished colleagues will have the time to read them and then, perhaps, be a little more aware of the position they are imposing on American agriculture if they support this measure.

The articles follow:

WASHINGTON WIRE: COCHRANE CONCOCTION: KILLER OF FARM FREEDOM

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The Kennedy administration has made its farm move, a la Orville Freeman. And a scary sight it is. The bill represents their first broken campaign promise—not to atempt controls without farmer referendum. It also shows that they think the stench of the Government-created farm problem can only be sweetened by more Government meddling.

The corn and feed grains bill is touted as a stopgap program. Actually, it's a tipoff to plans for other farm products. It is now being rushed through Congress for two too obvious reasons: (1) The administration wants to push the impression of doing something and (2) it wants to get in a lick for Government supply and price control while Kennedy's popularity is at its height (and before reaction sets in from the grassroots). The excuse for all this hurry is that it's planting time. (Truth is, planting has already started in the South.)

This bill is a move toward socialized agriculture. Charlie Shuman, of the Farm Bureau, wrapped it up when he said it is an attempt to set "an entering wedge to take control of marketing of all farm products." There is no better place to put that wedge than in feed grains, since they have heavy influence on all livestock, dairy, and poultry farming. An important key.

If this law passes, it will be the first time one man has held in the palm of his hand the right to absolute supply and price control. It gives the Secretary of Agriculture, whoever he may be, the power to drive feed grain prices down to any level he chooses, simply by dumping CCC stocks—the dictorial power to use surplus Government stocks to manipulate prices and force compliance.

Secretary Freeman hedged when asked if his long-term program for both wheat and feed grains would follow this same pattern (which is plenty evidence that it will). He said, "that is being considered." He also admitted that he wanted programs for all commodities that would dovetail with this one. His ridiculous move to chase after the strong market price of soybeans with a higher price support (which he promises, to encourage more planting) is a hint that crops now in good shape may not stay that way for long.

Freeman presented his case for the bill to committees of both Houses of Congress in a spirit of complete cooperation. There was no attitude of unyielding position. In fact, he seemed too cooperative at times. In Representative POAGE's (Democrat, of Texas) Feed Grains Subcommittee—during a half-day session in the witness chair—he offered to accept changes in every major portion of the bill (as different Congressmen suggested them), including an amendment which he brought in that morning.

All was sweetness and light during most of the House committee session, and the Secretary received mostly high praise from its members. It was pretty obvious this committee would go along with him.

Congressman COOLEY, Democrat, of North Carolina, who is chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, paid his respects during the subcommittee hearing. And although obviously there are parts of the bill he doesn't like, it is reported that he, too, will go along. (Rumor is he has to get himself "back in" at the White House because of his vote against the stacking of the Rules Committee—correct a right with a wrong.)

In Senate hearings, Freeman wasn't quite as royally accepted, nor was he so smooth. Repeated probing questions got him confused—so much so that he confused many listeners—and even the doubletalk of his economist, Dr. Cochrane, couldn't straighten it out. At one point Freeman said, "Cheap feeds mean cheap meat." A few minutes later, he was asked if higher grain prices would mean higher meat prices and he said, "We think not."

Actually, the bill is a Cochrane concoction. That's no recommendation for adoption. Dr. Willard Cochrane is the self-styled farm legislation expert who sits at Freeman's right hand. He sat in with the task force committee that recommended the bill; then supervised the writing of it. Someone said, during congressional hearings, that "This sounds like a wild dream out of the warped mind of some college professor who has little practical knowledge of agriculture." And Cochrane is his man. (No recommendation for either Freeman or Kennedy.)

He is (supposedly) a trained farm economist, who years ago joined in a sweep—all too widespread on college campuses—to prove with figures and sickly theories that a socialistic economy is the only salvation for America. He came to the Secretary's staff from the University of Minnesota, from which post he has spouted theories of Government-regulated farming subscribed to only by leftwing farm organizations.

While Freeman himself is a polished politician, Cochrane is not. And his attitude of childish stubborness and condescension irritated lawmakers time and again. Even Senator HOLLAND, Democrat, of Florida—who is by no means unusually rough on witnesses—halted the proceedings at one point to say, "I resent the attitude of Dr. Cochrane. * * *"

This is the man Freeman has now named Director of Economics (see "News"). One report is that Cochrane has a leave of absence from his college job until June. If the Secretary is as sharp as he seems, he'll either send him back there—if they'll have him—or stick him so deep into a cubbyhole that the public will never lay eyes on him.

The bill may be changed enough by the time it passes—if it passes—to pull the teeth out of it. If not, and it goes through with its power tools left intact * * * we are off on a freeway to complete Government control of all agriculture, with little time left in which farmers can find a limited exit. And Congress will have cut the right-of-way.

RX FROM THE WHITE HOUSE: FEED GRAINS BLAZE "FRONTIER" TRAIL; FIRST AID OR HABIT FORMING?

The administration's first move in the field of farm legislation is a corn and feed grains proposal that started out as H.R. 4510. It was labeled "a 1-year emergency plan" by Department of Agriculture officials who presented it to Congress, but was considered to carry far more significance by schooled observers, who see it as a sign of things to come.

The bill did not carry a Freeman (Secretary of Agriculture) tag; but was labeled "White House" from the start. Nevertheless, it created the hottest controversy caused by a farm proposal in several years. Whether a sense of urgency, plus the magic of Kennedy's popularity, could get it through Congress intact on time was a question mark at press time. (It is No. 5 on the President's must list.)

The bill itself deals only with corn and feed grains (not wheat). Without referendum, it would urge producers to put 20 percent of their allotted grain acreage (based on 1959–60 plantings) into a land retirement program. Per-acre payment for the acreage

would be made in cash, each farmer receiving support price for 60 percent of his average production.

A complier in the first part of the program would be eligible to take out an additional 20 percent of his allotment, for which he would receive payment-in-kind certificates. Certificates would be good for two-thirds his average yield on this acreage. He could present the paper to CCC and get the grain out of Government stocks—or take cash for it at market price—in which case CCC would sell grain on the open market to make the payment.

The program is described by its backers as voluntary. However, it has a controversial section 3, which makes it possible for the Secretary of Agriculture to force heavy participation. This section provides that he could sell stocks out of CCC at any price he chooses. He would be required to sell enough grain to cover the payment-in-kind disbursements—plus as much as necessary to pay all over $500 million paid out in the cash program.

This would give the Secretary power to use CCC stocks to drive the market price as low as necessary to force participation. By merely threatening to put it on the market at a given low price, he could frighten producers into the program, even on a 1-year basis. (They would have to come in to get the $1.20 price provided by the loan.)

It is claimed that the plan would cost only $500 million. However, this figure does not take into account the cost of grain in stock and the Government's investment in its storage. Assuming 100 percent compliance, which could be manipulated over a long pull as described above, the Government would be taking in all corn produced (at $1.20 per bushel) and selling it back at a so-called market price.

Secretary Freeman announced that he would also increase the support price on soybeans (to about $2.30 a bushel) in order to encourage grain producers to switch part of their feed acreage to that crop. (Soybeans presently enjoy a strong market, are selling at well above support prices.)

The bill received excited and immediate endorsement by the Farmers Union, and somewhat less enthusiastic approval by the Grange. But it got one of the sharpest blasts ever issued by the American Farm Bureau and was soundly lambasted by such groups as the National Grain Trade Council, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and soybean people.

President Charles Shuman, of AFBF (the only nationwide farmer organization), pulled out all the stops—said the thing is an ill-conceived "pig in a poke," a "blank check" for the Secretary. He said it is "compulsory, not voluntary;" and that it would "cost billions," not $500 million.

"All this talk about the 'temporary' nature of this bill amuses me," Shuman concluded. "It is an obvious move to get control of all commodities; it's an entirely new concept of using Government stocks to manipulate prices.

"You cannot defend this bill before the people or the farmers," he told lawmakers. "Agriculture is too complicated for us to risk this kind of experiment."

President Hershal Newsom of the Grange said the proposal does not concur entirely with the position of his organization, but "we feel that we must make some concessions. We support it." Roy Battles, legislative director of the Grange, admitted that price fixing is dangerous, but feels "the alternate choice is even worse."

Reuben Johnson, who testified for the Farmers Union, suggested just one change—that the support price be raised to $1.30 (for corn). And Fred Heinkel, MFA, Missouri, who was chairman of the President's task force recommending the legislation, agree that it should be $1.30. Johnson said he wouldn't want to trust "some past secretaries" to set prices, but this one he would trust.

In Secretary Freeman's presentation of the bill he estimated that participation would be about 70 percent, which would take some 14 million acres out of grain production. He said another 2 million acres will be shifted to soybeans by increasing soybean price supports (not a part of the bill).

Asked if his long-term program, including wheat, would be approached along these same lines, Freeman said, "It is being considered."

He urged the Congress to pass the law by March 15.

Pattern for Patriots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to acquaint my colleagues with an exceptionally valuable address given by C. D. DeLoach, chairman, National Public Relations Commission, the American Legion, February 22, 1961 in Washington, D.C.:

ADDRESS BY C. D. DELOACH, CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL PUBLIC RELATIONS COMMISSION, THE AMERICAN LEGION, UPON THE OCCASION OF THE COMMEMORATION OF GEORGE WASHINGTON'S BIRTHDAY, AT THE WASHINGTON MONUMENT, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 22, 1961

PATTERN FOR PATRIOTS

The German poet, Heine, once said: "If all Europe were to become a prison, America would still present a loophole of escape; and, God be praised, that loophole is larger than the dungeon itself."

That poet was born in 1797. The very same year the man whom we honor today—and who more than any other individual was responsible for making America a haven of freedom from the tyrannies of the Old World—was quietly completing 45 years of utterly devoted, utterly selfless, and wholly distinguished service to his country.

Almost 8 months earlier, the aging statesman had advised his saddened countrymen of his determination to retire. He spoke of the weight of years admonishing him, and added that while choice and prudence invited him to leave the service to which he had devoted the greater portion of his lifetime, patriotism did not forbid it.

"Patriotism did not forbid it." Surely if any one word can be said to have been a ruling influence in the life of George Washington, that word is "patriotism." To him, patriotism meant a deep love of country, and the proof of that love was exhibited in a dedicated devotion to duty in service of his country. That unwavering devotion to duty marked every recorded thought and every recorded deed throughout his lifetime. It made him, more than any individual American, the pattern for patriots. It made him, during his lifetime, so revered that when the final page had been turned, and the book of his life was closed, a saddened Congress—itself comprised of scores of patriots who bore the marks of battle in their country's service—heard "Light Horse Harry" Lee sum up the Nation's feeling on the death of its first President: "To the memory of the man, first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen."

And it was in such terms that generations of grateful and indebted Americans thought of George Washington. The first President's deep love of country, his devotion to duty, his utter selflessness made him the true symbol of the honor of America. And generation after generation rallied to the standard he had raised.

The totalitarian enemies of the spirit which America represents learned that as long as Americans upheld the standards set for them by that first great pattern for patriots, America would be invincible. And they set out to weaken and destroy those standards. Within our lifetime, we have witnessed the "debunking" of the heroic figures who earned our freedom with their effort, their blood, their sacrifices and, in many instances, with their lives.

We have heard the slick, the shallow, and the subverter attack those early Americans with the snide undercut. We have seen them wisecrack at a human weakness and deemphasize superb accomplishment. We have seen attempts to destroy the character of men who were, after all, only men even as you and I—yet who rose to heights of magnificence in their selfless service to God and country. We have witnessed attempt after attempt to devalue and weaken the blueprint which they gave us in pointing the way to preservation of our freedom—the Constitution of the United States. Never let us forget our debt for that marvelous, flexible means of government of which a great English Prime Minister said: "I have always regarded that Constitution as the most remarkable work known to me in modern times to have been produced by the human intellect, at a single stroke (so to speak), in its application to political affairs."

Today, ugly totalitarian forces are increasing the attack against all aspects of Americanism.

What do I mean by Americanism? Just what the dictionary says: loyalty to the United States, its traditions, interests, and ideals. We in the American Legion believe that means adherence to the standards set for all Americans by the Founding Fathers of these United States. We believe it means—in all things—placing God first, country second, and self last.

We believe it means preserving the freedom of the individual. We believe it means building America into a bulwark—both mental and physical—against the materialistic regimentation of encroaching atheistic communism. We believe it means standing up proudly for those principles which made America great and which are the only guideposts by which she can progress to higher pinnacles of greatness. We believe it means emphasizing the spirit of man—the soul—that sacred something which God gave to man alone, of all living creatures, and by which, God helping, man is enabled to design his destiny. We believe it means living for our country, but even more, in the words of a great American general, we believe it to mean: "Only those Americans who are willing to die for their country are fit to live."

The American Legion honors the memory of those first legions of Americans who served under George Washington. We feel that first commander in chief of all American forces believed with all his heart, and being that the men under his command had dedicated their lives to upholding the truths, enunciated in an immortal document given to the world on a hot summer day in Philadelphia. That dedication to something which was essentially of the spirit gave additional meaning to the word "American." The word no longer applied to all who resided on these shores. It no longer embraced the Tory who, throughout the great struggle, remained true to England. The word "American" came to mean those who held certain "truths to be self-evident," and who dedicated their lives, their fortunes, and

their sacred honor to upholding such truths. Washington unconsciously expressed his feeling that such men were, somehow, special, in an attributed remark based on his circular letter to regimental commanders on April 30, 1777: "Put none but Americans on guard tonight."

But if any test were needed to prove the meaning of the word "American," if ever a pattern were cut to which the word "patriot" might truly fit, that test was made, and that pattern was cut, at the site of Washington's encampment during the bleak winter of 1777 and 1778.

Some years ago, a magazine, no longer published, carried an excellent series entitled "The American Tradition." One feature was entitled "The Barefoot Patriots." It portrayed with cruel clarity the crucible of Valley Forge. It revealed the manner in which that small force of men earned their right to be termed, in the truest sense, "American." And it disclosed the manner of man who was their leader.

George Washington was a resourceful individual and a stern disciplinarian. He was the one strong, dependable, unifying force among the soldiers of the 13 widely diverse Colonies. When he led his handful of men—only an approximate 8,000, though more were on the rolls—into winter quarters 18 miles from Philadelphia, even he could not anticipate the agony of that terrible winter. Gen. Sir William Howe and his well-fed and well-equipped troops were wintering comfortably in Philadelphia. Washington dared not allow the English general's men to dominate the whole of eastern Pennsylvania and drive a wedge between North and South. He must, by threat of the Continental Army's presence, keep them in the city. And in mid-December he led his ragged soldiers into the triangle where creek and river joined and where the little Army was, in truth, to go through the times that try men's souls. The sunshine patriots were gone. The trials of Valley Forge put iron in the souls of those who remained. The ordeal is set out fully in "The Barefoot Patriots."

The first weeks sped by with men working, wrote Thomas Paine, "like a family of beavers." The straw-covered, rough log and mud cabins were only 16 feet by 14 and only a little over 6 feet high. The earth floor was cold and often wet. Oiled paper let in the only light except that from the smoky burning logs. Three-tiered bunks were meant to accommodate 12 men, but in daytime there was scarcely room to move and nothing to do if they could move. Quarrels broke out. Morale dropped. The patched rags of summer uniforms disintegrated. Replacements were not to be had. A general wrote that half of the troops were without breeches, shoes, and stockings and that some thousands were without blankets. By February, the plight of the Army was pitiful. Baron von Steuben wrote that the men were literally naked, some in the fullest sense of the word. Men on guard duty borrowed clothes from their hut mates and even then some were forced to stand on their hats to keep their feet out of the snow. A Massachusetts colonel wrote he had seen soldiers turned out to do their duty in such poor condition that he could not refrain from tears. There were, in truth, bloody footprints in the snow at Valley Forge.

But the shortage of clothing was by no means the worst of the trials in that crucible of cold. There was almost no food. Five hundred horses died of starvation. Men hitched themselves to carts to haul in wood and what little provisions were to be had. For days on end the sole food was firecake—a hard biscuit made of flour and water. A week before Christmas there was no food at all. Men sickened and died. Lafayette wrote that frozen limbs blackened and had to be amputated. Consumption and pneumonia ravaged the camp. Smallpox hit and, worst of all, typhus. A hospital was set up not far away and it had its own epidemic. Forty men of one unit were sent to the hospital. Only three survived.

Then, slowly, supplies began trickling in. Washington, having held the scarecrow Army together, began to hope. On the day after his birthday in that dreadful winter of 1778, Baron von Steuben arrived and began drilling troops. The spirit of purposeful preparation spread, and long before the dogwoods bloomed at Valley Forge, the Continental Army was an effective fighting force.

Who were some of the men tried in that most terrible time of testing? There was a young Frenchman of 20 with a wound in his leg and the rank of major general who had left his home and wealth to range himself on the side of liberty—the Marquis de Lafayette.

There was another 20-year-old freedom fighter from the British West Indies with the rank of lieutenant colonel—Alexander Hamilton.

There was a still younger major who had fought through the summer and now shared the winter hardships with his men—James Monroe.

There was a man of 22—John Marshall—who later wrote that it was at Valley Forge that he "was confirmed in the habit of considering America as my country, and Congress as my government."

These men—these youthful men—must truly be counted among the Founding Fathers. And, like their 45-year-old leader, Valley Forge was for them truly the test from which emerged the pattern of a patriot.

But when the war ended in victory, the task of the patriot was not complete. The fledgling country needed stronger ties than the Articles of Confederation, and in May of 1787, the Constitutional Convention met. George Washington was chosen to be its Presiding Officer. Two years later, the fruit of that Convention—our Constitution—was ratified.

Congress met in March of 1790, and counted the votes for President and Vice President. George Washington received the entire 69 votes cast and was declared President.

As a statesman, General Washington served as selflessly as he had as a soldier. And when he neared the close of that 45 years of service, he left, in his final address to the American people, a document rich in wisdom and advice not only for Americans of that age but for the ages. How long has it been since you have read his Farewell Address?

Washington warns of the ways in which freedom may be lost. He warns of ways in which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men might be "enabled to subvert the power of the people, and usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterward the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion."

He warned against factionalism. And when change in constitutional powers is found to be necessary, he noted earnestly, "Let is be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there by no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed."

He speaks of the indispensable supports of political prosperity—religion and morality, and states plainly that "reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle."

He admonishes us to observe good faith and justice toward all nations, yet warns "against the insidious wiles of foreign influence."

Soldier and statesman—first in war, first in peace, first in the hearts of his countrymen—George Washington, true pattern of a patriot.

Imports Cause Layoffs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, some 5 million American workers are presently unemployed. A portion of this unemployment results from foreign competition, which in effect has transferred American jobs abroad. Japanese imports have been especially harmful to Wisconsin industry in several fields including plywood, textiles, and related products. In this connection I ask permission to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Victor Riesel which appeared recently in the Milwaukee (Wis.) Sentinel.

The article, entitled "Japanese Batteries Spark Layoffs in Mineral Point" follows:

WILWAUKEE.—Our Japanese friends will Pearl Harbor us again—politically speaking, of course.

More and more of their powerful labor and management chiefs are allying themselves with their counterparts in Communist China. We get the polite bows. The Sovietized Chinese get the fraternal arm-around-the-shoulder embrace. Our intelligence service can, for example, tell you of a meeting in the headquarters of Sohyo in Tokyo February 8.

Sohyo is the American-hating Japanese national federation of labor. To its offices this day came honored guests Li Chieh-po, head of a Peiping Communist labor delegation visiting Japan. In Sohyo offices he was warmly received by Kaoru Ota, national and all-powerful chairman of Sohyo.

There is a tape recording to prove that Ota expressed gratitude to his Communist Chinese brother for the support given the Japanese workers during the Sohyo's drive against the Japan-United States security treaty. Ota added quite fervently that the "unity between Japanese and Chinese workers should be strengthened" to enable them to fight—guess who? That's right. Us.

Comrade Li said he was "deeply impressed by the fact that the Japanese workers had staged as many as 23 united actions against the Japan-United States security pact. Also, Comrade Li added that he expected Japanese workers to continue to oppose military alliance between Tokyo and Washington. Ota rose to the occasion. He said Li could count on it.

I report this exchange of profundities while I am in Milwaukee, because Wisconsin is one of the areas I've been visiting in search of industries threatened by Japanese imports. I seek a complete list of such industries so I can trace their Nipponese competitors. Then I will be able to pinpoint the Japanese unions in those Oriental plants—and it will be proved that most of them have members living off American dollars, but always plotting against American democracy.

One of the industries, for example, centered in Wisconsin and threatened by Nipponese imports is the production of dry cell batteries. Nationally, the dry cell battery business is not king size. But some 8,000 men and women do earn $35 million a year turning out this material. But size is not indicative of national importance. Without this industry—about a quarter of which is in Wisconsin—we would have no proximity fuse, no walkie-talkie, no communication system of the type used in World War II and in Korea and which would be needed in another military emergency.

But now this little industry is being pushed around by imports from Japanese factories—manned by members of Sohyo Peiping-loving unions. In 1961, it is expected that the Japanese battery industry will dump some 20 million transistors into the United States. This will be more than half their national production. And it does not include the transistors prepacked in some 3,500,000 Japanese radio sets sold in the United States last year.

How can U.S. batterymakers—part of our defense as well as civilian economy—exist if their $2-an-hour average wage must compete with 30 cents an hour paid in transistor factories in Japan?

How can our little industry compete with the Japanese who can sell a "216"-type transistor at our port of entry for 15 cents—while our manufacturers must sell it for 70 cents?

We can't compete. So, little by little, our people lose their jobs. We become so accustomed to vast figures that we overlook the human equation.

They told me 34 workers were laid off in tiny Mineral Point, Wis. They were employed by the Burgess Battery Co. In New York and Washington 34 more jobless are just a minute statistic. But 34 more jobless in Mineral Point is a very large and sobering figure to the people of the town—so distant from the Communist workers who bumped them from their bread and butter.

An injury to one is an injury to all our people. I, for one, would rather have the 34 folk eat regularly in Mineral Point, than save four bits by buying a Japanese gadget made by a Sohyo worker pledged to hate us.

Strategic Implications of the Lao Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, the Communist drive into the little known country of Laos created another serious crisis for the free world.

Unfortunately, the objectives of the Communist master-planners who are directing this crucial drive into southeast Asia are not fully understood and appreciated by many in the Western World.

What is in many ways the most concise and informative analysis of Red strategy in Laos and southeast Asia recently appeared in the January 1961 issue of the VFW American Security Reporter, the monthly magazine on defense matters published by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars, of which Ted C. Connell, of Texas, is the national commander in chief, has taken a leading and most constructive role in alerting our Nation to the persistent and crucial danger posed by Communist aggression in southeast and far east Asia. This article, "Strategic Implications of the Lao Situation," by Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, the director of national security and foreign affairs for the VFW, discusses the immediate and long-range objectives involved in this Communist thrust into Laos. This brief article differs from many other strategic analyses in that it offers an affirmative line of action to counter the Communist expansion through all of southeast and southern Asia.

This article reiterates the sound strategic reasoning behind the recent public statements of VFW Commander in Chief Ted C. Connell who has vigorously urged the establishment of a U.S. Indian Ocean fleet in order to fill the vast power vacuum that extends between southeast Asia and the Mediterranean. It is this power vacuum, I believe, which encourages and facilitates the consistent Communist incursions into that area.

I recommend this article to the attention of all Members of the House.

STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS OF THE LAOS SITUATION

(By Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, USMC (retired)

Communist aggression into Laos has profound strategic significance. It carries Communist power to the borders of South Vietnam, Cambodia, Thailand, and northern Burma. Thus each of these still independent, non-Communist nations are exposed to Red infiltration, subversion, and the threat of actual invasion. Strategically, Laos is like a broad corridor leading from the Communist power base in the north, southward splitting the anti-Communist nations of the crucially important southeast Asian peninsula.

Aside from the immediate threat to these struggling nations, the drive into Laos poses grave long-range problems.

Once Communist aggression reaches the southern shores of the southeast peninsula, bases will be established from which Red Chinese and Russian submarines and surface units will be in a position to threaten the vital sea lanes through the South China Sea to India, Africa, and the Middle East.

Another reason for this Red thrust is that southeast Asia is a rice-surplus area. Red China needs this "rice basket" as insurance against crop failures at home. Also, control of this food supply would give the Communists powerful economic influence over the Asian peoples who now depend on the rice from southeast peninsula.

There can be no doubt that the ultimate objective of this southern thrust is the key base of Singapore, controlling the straits of Malacca, all of which is part of the Communist master plan for the isolation and eventual subjugation of India and Pakistan. Every Red advance in southeast Asia weakens India's protection flank in the east and combined with Red Chinese pressure from Tibet against the border states of Nepal, Sikkim, and Bhutan in the north, draws the noose ever tighter around the subcontinent of India.

The timing of the Communist Laos offensive closely following the Moscow meetings strongly indicates that while Khrushchev and Mao may differ in detail as to the conduct of a Red aggression, there is a basic cooperation and understanding between them.

It should not be forgotten that the Communist aggression against South Korea was closely preceded by Russian-Chinese talks that laid the diplomatic basis for the Korean venture. Thus the typically methodical steps of Chinese-Russian coordination, preparing the diplomatic groundwork for impending aggression, have again been closely adhered to in Laos.

Communist aggression in southern Asia, with India the big target, is facilitated by the power vacuum existing in that vast area. India no longer is protected by the British Empire against Russian encroachment. No longer does the British fleet control the Indian Ocean. In the broad strategic sense, it was British sea power that thwarted, for almost 2 centuries, Russian land power in the continuing struggle for domination in that section of the world.

Controlling and utilizing the sea, England could support her forces in India more efficiently than could Russia who was confronted by the deserts and mountains of the Indian frontier.

The increasing seriousness of the Communist thrust in southeast Asia, and the continuing Red pressure toward India, underlines the necessity for the immediate creation of a U.S. Indian Ocean fleet.

If the course of the East-West conflict demonstrates anything, it is that if the West doesn't quickly fill a power vacuum, communism will.

Youth and Personal Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH L. CAREY
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the text of an address delivered by a distinguished resident of my district, Mr. John E. McKeen, chairman and president of Charles Pfizer & Co., Inc., at the annual distinguished service awards dinner of the Brooklyn Junior Chamber of Commerce, honoring Brooklyn's Young Man of the Year, Robert E. Fitzpatrick, humanitarian; and also a resident of the 12th Congressional District of New York.

This is a signal and refreshing departure in that the junior chamber sought out a man to honor, not in the scientific, economic, or business field, but rather, in the humanitarian and social welfare field of endeavor.

It is heartening and perhaps prophetic, that this year's pioneer acknowledgement of a worthwhile contribution to mankind, is that of a creative guidance of our youth by broadening the scope of their interests, the seeking of worthwhile associations, and the providing of opportunities for useful service.

As a member of the board of St. Vincent's Home for poor and friendless boys, sometimes known as the newsboy's home, I have been in a position to personally witness the administrative capabilities and deep personal devotion of the recipient of the award, Mr. Robert E. Fitzpatrick.

As Mr. Fitzpatrick indicated in his acceptance of this well deserved encomium, from his initial contact with the challenge presented by the needs of this orphan and homeless group, he has demonstrated that the very charity and care which improved their lot also broadened and enriched his personal status in the community.

He also paid homage and gave credit justly due to his mentor, a towering figure in the field of youth care and welfare, the Very Reverend William M. Casey, director of the home.

That our community is appreciative of its indebtedness to such individuals as these, and aware of the compass which should determine our contribution, is well evidenced in the text of "Youth and Personal Responsibilities" which I commend to my colleagues, as follows:

YOUTH AND PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY

A talk by John E. McKeen, chairman and president of Chas. Pfizer & Co., Inc., at the annual distinguished service awards dinner of the Brooklyn Junior Chamber of Commerce, Towers Hotel, Brooklyn, N.Y., February 9, 1961

Look at a thin filament of thread in the early light of dawn, or in the fading twilight at nightfall. The eye can scarcely perceive any difference between a thread which is black and another which is white. And yet to the Moslem this difference has a profound significance, for it guides his worship in the month of Ramadan—the month in which the sacred book of the Koran was revealed to the prophet Mohammed. Throughout this sacred month, the faithful follower of Islam must fast from food and water from dawn to dusk, from the moment at dawn when his eye perceives the difference between a white thread and a black thread. It is the personal responsibility of the Moslem to make this distinction, as indeed, in a larger sense, it is the personal responsibility of all men to distinguish in life the black thread from the white.

Man is never more seriously intent than when he ponders this, when he recognizes that the great gray fabric of human destiny is the interlacing of black and white threads, that among these threads can be found profound truths about man and his destiny and that these truths are neither collective, nor socialized, nor organizational. They are deeply personal truths and they demand personal responsibility.

In America, there is a new generation emerging. It is a toughminded generation, wary of being deceived, skeptical, knowledgeable. And most heartening of all, it is a generation which seems eager to assume the individual responsibility that has been the source of man's progress down through the centuries.

There is a youthful face now in the White House, a young first lady and their children who belong to this new generation. Perhaps it is this youthful President—by the mere fact of his age—who has inspired a new sense of importance in the young.

These young people have been born into a world of deep trouble, a world in which our very way of life is imperiled. We face monumental problems and I do not think we can solve them without recourse to the fundamental spiritual truths of freedom, justice and personal responsibility that have remained at the root of man's progress while civilizations rose and fell down through centuries. That is why it is heartwarming that there exists among the young an image of this country and its destiny which has survived all of the accusations that this generation is apathetic, or too security minded, or concerned with nothing beyond its own personal problems.

If it is true that we are in danger of losing sight of our spiritual heritage, it is equally true that there is a growing realization among youth that without an underlying sense of idealism, of devotion to God-given principles, we stand a good chance of losing what we have so painstakingly gained.

All of this has meaning to you members of the junior chamber of commerce of this, our beloved Brooklyn, because you recognize how important it is to distinguish the black threads and the white, because you understand how vital it is in these times that man aline himself fixedly to principles that guard his freedom. And most important, you recognize that these principles are valid because they are God-given and not manmade.

This junior chamber is dedicated to the ideal of civic service through the organized efforts of young men of the community. You are attempting to better yourselves by promoting the welfare of the community and its citizens. Your principles embody the most cherished ideals of western civilization:

(a) That faith in God gives meaning and purpose to human life;

(b) That the brotherhood of man transcends the sovereignty of nations;

(c) That economic justice can best be won by free men through free enterprise;

(d) That government should be of laws rather than of men;

(e) That earth's great treasure lies in human personality;

(f) And that service to humanity is the best work of life.

These are noble thoughts of the kind that have inspired the scholars and humanitarians throughout history and they are forever at the root of man's freedom and his genius. But are they practical guides for today? Cynics will say, "No. After all, we live now in the rough-and-tumble world of competition; leave such ideas to the philosophers."

But just look at the dramatic and revolutionary events that are literally reshaping the world around us. Consider the sit-in strikes in our own South. The propriety of these strikes can be argued until doomsday. What cannot be argued is that those students believed deeply that segregated lunch counters were a violation of human dignity. What they did, they did with moral conviction, and a tradition that had lasted for generations began to fade away. This combination of moral force with decisive action is the new power of youth.

There is a story about Abraham Lincoln. During the Civil War Gen. George B. McClellan was conducting a waiting campaign in the field and was being so careful to avoid tactical blunder that little progress was being made at the front. So Lincoln sent him this dispatch: "My dear McClellan, if you don't want to use the Army, I should like to borrow it for a while."

So it is with some of our youth today. They are impatient. They seem suddenly eager to get things done, and they are not content to see a force stand idle while there is an adversary in the field.

Few ideas have so touched the hearts and imagination of young Americans as the proposal for a peace corps of young people to work in the underdeveloped lands abroad, contributing technical assistance and hard work—taking part in the building of a new nation. It is an opportunity for individual young Americans to lend a helping hand, to put their idealism, their faith in democracy, to work in the most heartwarming terms, and to participate in a personal counteroffensive against the Soviet's effort to influence people with a philosophy that means the destruction of personal liberty.

We have inspiring examples of what can be done through personal involvement by such men an Albert Schweitzer, the late Dr. Dooley of Medico, and others like them who have dedicated their lives to treating the sick in the most remote regions of the world. It has been our privilege at Pfizer to contribute drugs to these humanitarian causes, and I cannot help feeling a personal sense of satisfaction in being associated with Medico as a member of the board. Indeed, I can assure you that all of our people at Pfizer feel this same satisfaction in the knowledge that these medicines are helping some less fortunate humans. It gives everyone a sense of personal participation in the humane work of those medical missionaries.

Nationalism and the spirit of freedom run deep within those people now struggling against poverty. They will not trust us—nor should they—unless we show the same devotion to freedom. That is the practical need for idealism among young people in our national life. We cannot go into these countries as exploiters. We must be willing to share in their problems and contribute to their progress and prosperity. So over the past years, wherever Pfizer has built abroad—and we now have operations in more than 100 countries—we have gone to stay as local citizens, and not as visiting businessmen.

A leading Russian economist has predicted that in the next few years the ruble will supplant the dollar as international currency and that by 1965 the Communist-ruled countries will dominate world trade. That is why we need men of resourcefulness, ingenuity, boldness, and deep convictions. Let me assure you gentlemen that those who go into business today will find themselves very directly competing with Russian trade missionaries. They offer powerful inducements to the less developed countries who so badly need money for capital investment. They offer to build and finance factories at extremely low interest rates. Against this we offer free enterprise and modern technology.

This kind of bargaining—the free economy against state control—is going on this very day in many parts of the world.

At the international bargaining table, our young businessman must convince the world not only that we have better products and better technology, but a better ideology as well. If we do not have this capacity as a nation and as individuals we may fail in history's most challenging moment.

Wherever Pfizer has built abroad, our company has gained, the nations abroad have gained, and equally important, our own economy has benefited as gold and dollars have begun to flow back to the United States.

This is good business taken from any viewpoint, and it amply justifies the truth of another of the Brooklyn chamber's principles—that economic justice can best be won by freemen through free enterprise. We say this with conviction—but we say it with caution as well. We must be cautious lest we mistakenly believe that the economic and technological machinery of free enterprise is the principle itself. It is not. Our factories are marvelous and efficient beyond compare, our engineers and scientists have gained tremendous power over material things, and in so doing they have given us an unrivaled standard of living. We are rightly proud of the technological progress we have made and equally proud of the abundance our free economy has produced. But our pride can have real significance only if our progress is accompanied by a deepening awareness of the ethical principles of human dignity that are at its roots. A state-controlled economy, as we have recently seen, is also capable of tremendous feats of production and technology. But what they cannot provide, and what we cannot fail to provide, is individual personal liberty, freedom of choice, and freedom of action within the limits of the law, the moral law as well as the civil law.

When I mention this last point, I am touching on still another of the beliefs affirmed by this group of young men: That government should be of laws rather than of men. But it is men who make laws, and men who administer and interpret them. It is an irony of democracy that it carries within itself a self-destructive seed. Men who are free to make laws are able to make bad laws as well as good ones, or through indifference, they may give up the freedom the law was designed to insure in the first place. I hope the new, eager generation of Americans understands this.

I hope too that young people understand that what they profess to believe is not something to be taken out on special occasions, and polished and shined. It is rather something to be lived with their families, their

friends, their business associates. The things a man believes most profoundly—his philosophy of life—are seldom on the tip of his tongue or the top of his mind. They lie deep somewhere in his consciousness, there to be called upon in making life's daily decisions

There is a meaningful little story about a Scotsman who some 80 years ago rescued a boy from drowning. The boy turned out to be the son of a nobleman who, in gratitude, offered to rear and educate the Scotsman's son. In time, the Scotsman's son was graduated from St. Mary's Hospital Medical School. His name was Sir Alexander Fleming, the discoverer of pencillin. During the war, the nobleman's son was stricken with pneumonia. Fleming's penicillin saved his life. The nobleman's son was Sir Winston Churchill.

Here are two great men of our century whose lives and fortunes—and indeed the lives and fortunes of millions of people—are touched and changed by a series of human events that began 80 years ago. I know of no better illustration of the truth that, for better or worse, all of humanity is inscrutably bound in a single unity, and that no one of us can act without somehow affecting all of mankind.

We observe a similar unity, in fact, among all living things, and I cannot help thinking now of the rows of test tubes arranged on racks in a special vault at the Pfizer medical research laboratories in Groton, Conn. There are some 40,000 of them. Inside each is some form of microbial life—the seeds of molds or bacteria. They lie dormant in a state of frozen animation, freeze-dried and motionless. Many of them, like Fleming's penicillium mold, are capable in the hands of science of producing life-saving antibiotics. They are the progeny of the earth's most primitive organisms. If we guard them carefully, we can at will bring them to life and start them producing medicine. But if by neglect or mischance we do not take care to preserve that viable spark, then they will be snuffed out and with them will go this wonderful ability so carefully nurtured from one generation to the next.

Equally fragile in this day and age are the spiritual truths that have shaped man's progress down through time So if the young are concerned about their place in the world, they will listen with their hearts as well as with their ears to the words of our new President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, on the occasion of his inauguration.

"Let the word go forth from this time and place, to friend and foe alike, that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans—born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage—and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this Nation has always been committed, and to which we are committed today at home and around the world."

This appeal to the young generation focuses attention where it properly belongs tonight—on the man who is honored here, Robert Fitzpatrick. It is a wise and well-deserved honor that goes to him. In choosing him as Brooklyn's Young Man of the Year, the junior chamber recognizes the truth of one of its tenets—that service to humanity is the best work of life. I am sure that he is one of those who long ago learned to distinguish the black threads from the white, and to recognize that it is in the acceptance of personal responsibility that we find the richness of life.

At St. Vincent's Home for Boys, he has taken homeless youngsters who might otherwise have been a burden or a harm to society and made them responsible, adult citizens. He has seen the value of psychiatric guidance, and he has instituted programs at the home that have helped many a young boy find his place in life. He recognizes that wholesome recreational activities can help build a man's character, and he directed the purchase and organization of a 70-acre camp at Columbia, N.J., some 7 years ago. He knows the value of a good, sound education and I am certain that the boys from St. Vincent's whom he has guided into college will prove worthy of his confidence. He knows how much the warmth of family life can help a homeless boy, and he has devoted a great effort to placing his boys in fine foster homes. This community will benefit greatly from Mr. Fitzpatrick's work, as will the boys who are under his care.

I am sure that he would agree that the one precious thing we can give to the young is a heritage which recognizes that though we live in a wonderful age of machines, it is man, his rights and his dignity, which must always be the subject of our study. Our problems are manmade problems, and the solutions we find for them, with God's guidance, will be manmade ones.

"Supremacy in Aerospace Is Essential to the Survival of the Free World"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, on February 2, 1961, one of our outstanding Air Force generals, Gen. Sam E. Anderson, commander, Air Materiel Command, addressed the National Solid Propellant Rocket Conference in Salt Lake City, Utah, and discussed in a general way how the Air Force might carry out its objective of assuring aerospace supremacy. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include General Anderson's timely address:

ADDRESS BY GEN. S. E. ANDERSON, COMMANDER, AIR MATERIEL COMMAND TO NATIONAL SOLID PROPELLANT ROCKET CONFERENCE, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, FEBRUARY 2, 1961

I was honored to receive your invitation to speak this evening. The National Solid Propellant Rocket Conference, which you are conducting here, is one of the significant scientific events of this still young year of 1961.

It is an honor, also, to meet so many distinguished members of the American Rocket Society, one of the Nation's foremost scientific organizations. It also must be one of the Nation's fastest growing organizations.

It is significant that in 1959 the society's membership totaled 13,700. But by 1960 it had jumped to 17,800. It is hard to believe that as late as 1948, this organization had a grand total of 809 members—now a total of over 18,000.

The work done by Rocket Society members—a voluntary contribution of time and talents—is of immense value to the advancement of science and to our national defense program. The Utah section of the society, host to the conference, also deserves congratulations.

Although it won't be 2 years old until next March, it already has a membership of 180. It is the society's youngest section ever to act as host to a national conference such as this.

Many of those who are here this evening have been attending sessions, classified and unclassified, on the current state-of-the-art of solid propellants. That subject, I am sure, has been completely and competently studied. So tonight with your permission I will discuss in a general way how the Air Force might carry out its objective of assuring aerospace supremacy.

This supremacy in aerospace is essential to the survival of the free world. The threat to our survival from any military force must be recognized and dealt with accordingly.

We cannot boast of the scientific superiority we held prior to World War II over any nation. In recent years, technological progress of great significance has been spectacularly demonstrated by some of the heretofore backward countries.

Any threat to the free world has made it imperative that we possess a true deterrent to war. It happens that "deterrence" is a word about which there is a great deal of misunderstanding.

However, it is a term that should be understood by every American. It should be understood that to possess a true deterrent we must have the ability and will to prevail.

Some may wonder why I emphasize the word prevail. If deterrence succeeds and there is no war, why do we need the strength to win?

The true meaning of deterrence gives the answer. Deterrence is the effect produced in the minds of potential enemies when they understand the enormous striking power of our military forces and when they understand that it is our national will and intention to use this striking power swiftly and decisively if the need arises.

The conclusion is obvious: power that cannot prevail will not deter.

The Air Force concept is that a true deterrent requires forces capable of destroying any aggressor's military power to the point that he no longer has the ability to wage war.

That is what is meant by "counterforce"—a force that can win. The purpose of military power remains what it has always been—to destroy the military power of the enemy if necessary.

There are some who contend that a lessening of our defenses would be viewed as a good-will gesture, a sort of proof of America's desire for peace. They are mistaken. One of the grim realities of the world in which we live is this: Peace must be enforced: And weakness never enforced anything.

What sort of power is needed to provide a true deterrent? In general terms it is a carefully prepared and maintained blend of strategic weapons, both manned and unmanned.

There can be no doubt that missiles are playing an increasingly important role in our deterrent airpower. The ratio of manned to unmanned weapon systems is already shifting as we achieve reliable, operational models of both guided and ballistic missiles and phase them into our active inventories.

During this decade the unmanned aerospace systems will continue to increase in importance. However, for as long as now can be foreseen a blend of the manned and unmanned systems will be necessary, each complementing the other and each contributing its peculiar characteristics to our total capability.

The future needs of the Air Force that can be visualized are so numerous, varied, and complex that they could be covered only in a series of talks, articles, and books. I will mention two.

One is the development of a mobile striking force of nuclear powered aircraft that can penetrate enemy territory from any direction and at a choice of altitudes. Such a force would be able to range for days on airborne alert without refueling; it would be capable of sustained low-altitude flight.

Another use for long-range aircraft developed for such a force would be in defending against intercontinental ballistic missiles. Armed with air-launched anti-ICB's and equipped with supersensitive detection devices, they would have an excellent chance of destroying enemy missiles in the early phase of their flight. They also might have great value for extended antisubmarine patrols.

Our ballistic missile forces could be greatly augmented by the development of strategic missiles capable of high-speed, sustained low-altitude flight.

It is obvious that in order to develop aircraft and missiles with such long-range capabilities we will have to greatly improve our propulsion systems.

This brings us to the necessity of developing and putting into practical use different sources of power. Work is progressing on the development of airborne nuclear propulsion and—farther in the future—the development of ion propusion. I will have more to say a little later about these programs.

Let me digress here for a few moments to discuss the Air Force's ballistic missile program. Development of the intercontinental Atlas, Titan, and Minuteman, and the intermediate range Thor, required the greatest marshaling of men, money, materials, and scientific endeavor in American history.

Many laymen do not realize that the larger proportion of the national investment and effort in these programs is not in the missiles themselves, but in the ground environment—construction of sites as well as the maintenance and test equipment which supports the missiles.

As you know, since last July, managing the construction, installation, and checkout of missile sites has been the responsibility of the Air Materiel Command. Encouraging progress has been made.

The construction job involved is enormous. It is estimated that currently approved ballistic missile programs will use enough structural steel to build 26 Empire State buildings; enough concrete for 7 Pentagons; enough air conditioning for 29,000 6-room houses.

When you consider that the Air Force missile program is only a part of the total defense effort, you realize the tremendous impact that effort has on the national economy from the standpoint of employment and purchasing power.

Let us pause to examine the impact on the State of Utah. This area, in just a few years, has developed into a major center for rocket propulsion systems. Defense contracts in force in Utah during 1960 had a total value of a little over $500 million. The Air Force awarded approximately $431 million of these contracts, including more than $160 million for solid propellant systems.

Defense plants now in operation in Utah have a total value of nearly $60 million, and this figure will be increased by $15 million with the completion of two plants now in the initial stages of construction. The value of military installations in the State is in excess of $1,100 million.

Most recent figures show that 26,373 persons are engaged in defense activities in Utah, with a total annual income of $160,526,000. Of these, 19,570 are Air Force personnel, civilian, and military, including 4,565 working on solid propellant systems.

In Utah, where labor costs are about the same as the national average, the percentage of unemployment is below the average for the United States—4.9 percent compared with the national figure of 5.5.

The construction of ballistic missile sites is, as I indicated earlier, a job of immense proportions. I am happy to be able to report tonight that good progress is being made in this program.

An explanation of the background and organization of this effort may be helpful.

In July of last year, with the Atlas on the way to becoming operational and Titan and Minuteman moving forward under priority pressure, the Air Force assigned management responsibility for the site activation program to the Air Materiel Command.

Concurrent with that action, I placed Maj. Gen. Tom Gerrity in command of the Ballistic Missiles Center and charged that organization with the site activation job.

The Air Force immediately assigned senior military officers as site activation task force commanders, each directly responsible to General Gerrity for control of all phases of site activation. In turn General Gerrity is directly responsible to me.

The next priority requirement was for a system of rapid communication which would enable the Ballistic Missiles Center to keep abreast of activation progress and problems on a day-to-day, sometimes hour-by-hour, basis. This was accomplished by the establishment of command control posts at each complex, feeding into a central command post at headquarter BMC.

The use of sound management and communication techniques, we feel, has had the desired results. We are now able to voice the expectation that the established dates for delivery of the sites to SAC will be met.

Some of the weapon systems are already in place and being exercised. Bases at Warren I and Vandenberg are now operational. The complexes at Warren II and Offutt Air Force Base will become operational in the very near future. These are to be followed by Fairchild and Lowry later this year.

We realize the United States still has a long way to go and there are a number of factors that can interrupt and delay our program. I refer to labor disputes; difficulties of geography, and weather; slippage of industrial delivery schedules; and technological problems, such as propellant-loading systems—a major problem, and many others.

We are continuing to work under the concept of concurrency by which we simultaneously develop, buy, produce, and test any and all components of ballistic missiles. In a program as complex as this, with its ever-changing requirements, unforeseen problem areas can and do arise overnight.

That is why we must have improved and accelerated quality control procedures at manufacturing sources, and even at the lowest subcomponent level. That is why we must have maximum continuing effort on the part of everyone concerned with this program within the Air Force and industry. Having our ballistic missile sites constructed and operational is one of the most important factors contributing to our national survival.

Maintaining our aerospace capability demands constant advances across the whole spectrum of science and technology. It isn't necessary for me to recount the tremendous strides that have been made in solid-propellant rocketry. You are well aware, for example, of the technological breakthrough represented by the development of the Minuteman. You realize the enormous boost the Minuteman, successfully fired for the first time 2 days ago, gives to our ability to deter war—and our ability to win if war is forced upon us.

However, in spite of the great progress that has been made, I think you will agree that we have not yet developed the ideal propellant—either solid or liquid—the kind of propellant that could power the types of future aircraft and missiles I mentioned earlier.

As you know, the advantages of solid propellants—economy and instant reaction, to name two—are offset to some degree by advantages of liquid propellants, such as greater controllability, throttling, the ability to stop and restart.

This competition between the advocates of solid and liquid propellants is an excellent example of the American way of doing things. By no means does it represent a wasteful duplication of effort. This matter of alleged duplication of effort, incidentally, deserves some discussion. It is a subject about which there is much public misunderstanding.

Sometimes there are programs in the applied research area which have the same objective but are seeking alternate solutions. This is necessitated by the different performance requirements of weapon systems or the needs for information on which to base a choice among the various possible systems.

There are interservice committees on propellants and rockets where common problems are discussed and information is exchanged. Air Force rocket engineers assist NASA on various rocket programs and program information is exchanged on a regular basis. You can see that there are enough channels of information to assure that each Government agency is well aware of the other's programs.

The services, as a matter of fact, regularly take advantage of each other's research and development programs, regardless of sponsorship. Here are a few examples: The Air Force's use of Navy hydrogen peroxide developments in the X–1, the early Navaho rocket, and the superperformance rocket for the F–86; the Army and Navy's use of Air Force-developed ammonium nitrate propellants for target drones and gas generators; the Army's use of the Air Force Thor rocket engines for the Jupiter missile; NASA use of Air Force and Army rockets to put their satellites in orbit.

Returning to the situation of solid propellants as opposed to liquid propellants, you may be sure that the Air Force has no favorites. In developing and planning for the weapon systems and space vehicles of the future, we will use whatever materiel provides the best performance for a given function.

Economy, of course, is of great importance. On that score—as on many others—the Minuteman stands as a remarkable achievement. It is the first advanced weapon system to cost less than its predecessors—probably more than 75 percent less.

Important as it is, however, economy cannot be the sole decisive factor as we plan the weapons and vehicles we need to retain aerospace supremacy in the years ahead. It would be sheer folly to invest in a product just because it is cheap, if it cannot do the required job.

So, I am glad to say that a demonstration ion proplusion engine is being developed under contract for the Air Force and it may be sent into space in the near future for the purpose of testing its design. Still, there is a growing fear that Russia will put an operating ion engine into space before we do. In this, as in other fields bearing on our future aerospace capability, we cannot be content with second place.

Even though we must press forward toward the relatively long-range goals of airborne nuclear proplusion and ion proplusion, we know that for many years to come chemical propellant systems, solid and liquid, will remain the major source of aircraft and missile propulsion.

That is one reason why the great progress that has been made in recent years in the area of solid propellants is so heartening. The dedicated research people and scientists who are responsible for that progress deserve the highest praise.

Incidentally, I often have the feeling that there is not enough public awareness of the great extent to which the survival of human freedom depends upon our scientists.

That freedom is safeguarded by weapon systems that are beyond the wildest dreams of our ancestors. Members of our military forces have set records for speed, altitude, and range that once were considered unattainable.

The truth is that none of these accomplishments could have been possible without the hard, persistent and skillful efforts of those who labor in the fields of basic and applied research, in industry as well as in Government service.

The military has been able to do its job because we and the scientists have developed the tools—because we have overcome obstacles that not so long ago seemed insurmountable.

The obstacles that lie ahead—the numerous problems crying out for solution—are tremendous. Though much distance has been covered there are countless barriers along the road into the future. Many of those barriers have been put up by nature, but the chief one—the one that is the most difficult to overcome—is in ourselves. This is the barrier of our inadequate knowledge.

I believe the Nation and the free world can be confident that people gifted with talent and spurred by a sense of dedication—people like those who have attended this conference and are present at this meeting tonight—will be able to break through the knowledge barrier.

Ladies and gentlemen, I want to thank you for the privilege of visiting with you this evening.

Challenging Questions Asked by Dr. Edward L. Litchfield

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the following challenging questions which Dr. Edward H. Litchfield, chancellor of the University of Pittsburgh, included in his address to the graduates at the midyear commencement exercises of the University of Buffalo, Buffalo, N.Y., on February 22, 1961.

Taking as his text, George Washington's prayer, "Bless Our Land With Honorable Industry, Sound Learning, and Pure Manners," Chancellor Litchfield told the graduates that America's willingness to work, in education and in industry, may decide her survival as a free nation. In appraising America's future prospects, he posed these five thought-provoking questions:

1. Can we afford our failure to educate the many who could benefit from higher education?

The Soviets see that all of those capable of such an education get one. In America 50 percent of the top 20 percent of our high school graduating classes never go on to college. In Pennsylvania, this percentage is even higher—58 percent, and lack of motive rather than lack of money is responsible.

2. Can we afford to use our educational facilities for only three-fourths of the calendar year?

"By dividing the year into three parts and teaching around the calendar," Dr. Litchfield said, "we can educate more students and enable individual students to get a better education. We have been doing this at the University of Pittsburgh for two years with great success.

"It has been estimated that capital expenditures for institutions of higher learning, to meet increased enrollment within the next few years, will cost us $10 billion. If these institutions operated on a year-round basis, we would need to spend only $6 billion for new facilities."

3. Can we afford our present attitude to the shorter workweek?

4. Can we afford our present attitude toward retirement?

"Setting 65 as an arbitrary time for retirement is a waste of experience and leadership in many instances. Industry is simply unwilling to exercise judgment by determining who is old at 65 and who is still young enough to contribute to the economy."

5. Can we afford the loss of our woman power?

"In Russia 35 percent of the faculties in colleges and universities are women; so are 39 percent of the engineering students and a majority of the surgeons.

"Why not plan for a productive life for women whose children have grown up. At 45, a woman still has a life expectancy of 37 years. Today there are 12 million women from 45 to 82 who are unemployed."

The vigorous, youthful chancellor of the University of Pittsburgh stated emphatically:

"In the world we live in today, we cannot afford business or school as usual. We cannot afford leisure as a greater value than 'honorable industry' or work.

"Above and beyond the urgent and practical necessities of our physical survival, stands the moral compulsion for this thesis—a command for full performance which we must recognize as valid if the very basis of our culture is valid.

"For surely, only by using his capacities to their maximum, does the individual faithfully reflect the universal, of which we believe him to be an expression.

"Thus did he find meaning; from that meaning does he derive his right and do we postulate the dignity of man."

American Industry Needs Tax Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Camden Chronicle, Camden, S.C., of March 1, 1961:

During the campaign and following his election President Kennedy has advocated tax reform measures for industry which would stimulate investment, and enlargement and betterment of our industrial plant. He has been specific about this. On one occasion he said: "We must stimulate plant modernization programs, which are vital both to increased production, and to the building of industrial facilities which can compete successfully with the modern plants of Europe and the Soviet Union. Wherever we are certain that tax revision—including accelerated depreciation—will stimulate investment in new plant and equipment without damage to our principles of equity, we will proceed with such revision."

The accelerated depreciation need is at the heart of the problem. And so, along with it, is liberalization of depreciation allowances. As matters now stand, a producing enterprise can recover the cost of a machine or some other piece of necessary physical equipment over a long period of years. But, as a result of inflation, and also of increasing complexity of equipment, the new machine which is needed may cost 2, 5, or 10 times as much as the original. The money to make the exchange just isn't there. Most authorities think that depreciation, under present laws, is spread over much too long a time.

Henry Hazlitt has dealt with the matter in recent Newsweek columns, which have been reproduced in the Reader's Digest for February. He pinpoints it in these words: "America leads the world today in man-hour productivity because it has provided each worker with more and better tools than any other nation. * * * But today our growth is retarded because we are not replacing our tools of production fast enough to keep pace with the world's rapidly advancing technology and our own economic potential. If we are to increase our productivity and maintain our lead over foreign competitors, American industry must invest substantially more than $19,300 for each new job it provides for our growing population."

Mr. Hazlitt goes on to show that our tax laws and policies are the most restrictive of any leading industrial nation when it comes to plant modernization and new investment. In this we are behind Canada, Britain, France, Germany and others. All of these allow much faster writeoffs of equipment, and also allow much larger allowances. The result is constant improvement of their industrial plant. Liberal depreciation policies, for example, played a major role in the miraculous recovery of Germany.

"In this country, on the other hand," says Mr. Hazlitt, "leading economists and accountants have estimated that costs of replacement are outrunning depreciation allowances by $5 to $8 billion a year." The inevitable result is increasing obsolescence, and a steady weakening of our ability to compete.

An objection to liberalization of depreciation laws is that the Government would lose revenue. Mr. Hazlitt, like other writers on the subject, has the answer to that. There would be some loss at the very beginning. But, over the long pull, the Government would get the money. There would just be a longer time factor.

Second, and much more important, the new investment would be followed by increased production, employment, and earnings. And these in themselves would automatically increase the Government's tax take.

As Mr. Hazlitt sees it, "There is no more urgent task before the new Congress than to make this reform in our tax laws." He is not alone in this. A poll of leading American economists, made by the American Economic Foundation, shows that 70 percent of them favor liberalization of the depreciation laws.

Bulgarian Liberation Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, March 3, 1961, marked the anniversary of the liberation of Bulgaria and her restoration as an independent state.

We in America have always been conscious of the people of Bulgarian extraction who are among us and we have marked with satisfaction their many contributions to the stature and security of the United States. And we have learned from their long years of suffer-

ing beneath the tyrant's heel the extent that dedicated people can endure hardship and then regrasp the sword of freedom when it is handed to them.

Those of us who adhere to the Christian persuasion owe much to those Bulgarian stalwarts who were able to keep their faith unsullied even though under constant pressure from the Turks in the centuries they were under the domination of the Ottoman Empire. The world will also recognize its indebtedness to Slavic culture and the Slavs in turn will render constant homage to Sts. Cyril and Methodius for the literary traditions that continue to this day.

American citizens everywhere should join in tribute to these great people and also in the pledge that we shall keep green the memory of Bulgarian sacrifices. It should be our purpose to continue to emphasize that so long as they are held in thralldom no man anywhere can feel secure and that we must work for their liberation from Soviet enslavement or accept a similar fate for ourselves.

Hon. Julia Butler Hansen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, my able colleague from the State of Washington, Mrs. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, has been signally honored by the adoption of House Joint Resolution 35 by the Washington State Legislature.

The resolution expresses the appreciation of the legislature and the people of the State of Washington for the outstanding leadership and service rendered by Mrs. HANSEN during 22 years in the legislature before her election to Congress last year.

I wish to associate myself with the sentiments expressed in this resolution, which follows:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 35

(By Representatives Robert M. Schaefer, William C. Klein, and Shirley R. Marsh)

Be it

Resolved, by the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled:

Whereas Congresswoman JULIA BUTLER HANSEN of Wahkiakum County has been recently elected from the Third Congressional District of the State of Washington to the U.S. House of Representatives, being the first woman Democrat from the State of Washington to be so elected to U.S. Congress; and

Whereas JULIA BUTLER HANSEN ably and conscientiously served the citizens of this State, and more particularly the citizens of the 18th legislative district, for 22 years in the Legislature of the State of Washington; and

Whereas JULIA BUTLER HANSEN earned an outstanding reputation in the house of representatives in many fields, particularly those of education, institutions, public assistance, State government, and highways; and

Whereas under the leadership of JULIA BUTLER HANSEN as chairman of the house highways committee and chairman of the western interstate committee on highway policy program of the 13 Western States, the State of Washington has achieved national recognition in the field of highway research and progressive highway legislation; and

Whereas Mrs. HANSEN has always demonstrated unusual astuteness in legislative matters, showing extreme fairness and responsibility which were reflected in the measures which came on the floor in her name or the name of her committee, the results of which were seldom questioned in either house; and

Whereas JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, while maintaining a successful career as a businesswoman and a mother and housewife, still gave unstintingly of her time to devote herself to the interests of the citizens of this State and the progressive betterment of the State of Washington: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the house of representatives and senate, do hereby express to JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, not only as individual members but as spokesmen for the constituents whom we represent, our deep appreciation for her outstanding leadership and contribution to the State of Washington and our warmest wishes for all success in her new position in the Congress of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent by the chief clerk of the house to the President of the United States, to Congresswoman JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, to the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to other Members of Congress from the State of Washington.

Passed by the house February 21, 1961.
JOHN L. O'BRIEN,
Speaker of the House.
Passed the senate February 22, 1961.
JOHN A. CHERBERG,
President of the Senate.

Bulgarian Liberation Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 3, 1961

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, today, March 3, 1961, marks the Bulgarian Liberation Day. One might ask why we in the Congress of the United States should note this occasion. The answer is simply this—that we Americans, who have been brought up in the tradition of liberty and freedom, have a natural sympathy with those who also long for independence and the right of self-determination as a free nation.

In order to keep the light of emancipation bright in the hearts and minds of the Bulgarian people, the Bulgarian National Front of America was formed 10 years ago. I should like to point out that this organization is an anti-Communist, democratic association of free Bulgarians in the United States. It rejects any kind of dictatorship, either from the left or from the right, and strives for the establishment of parliamentary government in Bulgaria. One of the major interests of this group is to promote friendly relations between the peoples of the United States and Bulgaria. Every March 3 for the past 83 years has been commemorated by the entire Bulgarian people, irrespective of political considerations, as their liberation day. Today, we join them in their celebration, ever remembering that in 1944, that brave nation was attacked and invaded by the Russian armies and the Bulgarian Democratic Party overthrown. It is, unfortunately, still held as a captive country by its Soviet overlords.

We, who hold liberty precious, pray with fervent hopes that our fellow human beings in Bulgaria may, in the not too distant future, also enjoy freedom and independence from the ruthless dictators in the Kremlin.

Judge William V. McDermott

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, on February 24, the good people of the city and county of Mobile and of the State of Alabama lost one of our outstanding jurists, Circuit Judge William V. McDermott. Bill, as he was affectionately known by thousands of his friends, was my close friend down through the years, and just last fall, we had one of the most successfull and enjoyable hunts at my hunting preserve at McIntosh that we have ever had, and Bill McDermott invited all of his friends from Mobile County. He was truly one of God's noblemen, and it is a tragedy that we must lose men of his caliber.

Under leave to extend by remarks in the RECORD, I include a tribute paid to Judge McDermott by one of his colleagues on the bench, Hon. Dan T. McCall, Jr., at the memorial exercises in the circuit court of Mobile County, on Monday, February 27. The presiding judge, Hon. Robert Ervin, had requested Judge McCall to speak for the judges. The remarks follow:

Judge Ervin, ladies and gentlemen, we come here this morning to honor the memory of our departed friend whose call from our midst was so unexpected, and came so suddenly that none of us had that final opportunity of saying, "Farewell."

This now hopeless desire persists in our loving memory of him and lingers in our hearts like an empty dream, because Judge McDermott had truly gained the respect and admiration of all who knew him. His loss reminds us of a poem by an early New England colonist:

"They never quite leave us, the friends who have passed
Through the shadows of death to the sunlight above,
A thousand sweet memories are holding them fast
To the places they blessed with their patience and love.

Truly, Judge McDermott was a man of patience and Christian love under the precious influence of which he finished this life and entered into his eternal home. His devotion to his family, his church, and his country were natural virtues of the three sides of the equilateral triangle of life which he so truly typified in his daily pursuits.

Although his friends were innumerable, he never chose as one, the false, for sincerity and impartiality are parts of the character of a good magistrate, and Judge McDermott was a good magistrate. He sought the truth incessantly, because even an error of judgment disturbed his mind to no end; consequently, there were only few errors.

Judge McDermott commenced the practice of law soon after he became 22; and, following the advice of the sages of our profession, he spent a term in the legislature at our State House. This stood him in well in his law, and later, when the call came for him to ascend to the bench on February 27, 1957, 4 years ago to this day, he was prepared. Certainly, he put his talents to use, and he labored consistently with diligence and forthrightness.

So we have lost a good man, but heaven has gained a Christian. We must always keep in our hearts our love for him, and remember that this is a better world, because he lived in it.

Without pretense, as he was, perhaps our friend would prefer that we not eulogize him, but think of him in the manner described by Alfred Lord Tennyson in his beautiful poem, "Crossing the Bar":

"Sunset and evening star,
And one clear call for me!
And may there be no moaning of the bar,
When I put out to sea,
But such a tide as moving seems asleep,
Too full for sound and foam,
When that which drew from out the boundless deep
Turns again home."

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of March 4, 1961:

The tempo of legislative activity, in committee and on the House floor, is accelerating. The Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1961 (see last week's newsletter) passed after floor debate, 392 to 30 (10 not voting). Twenty-nine Republicans and one Democrat opposed the bill. Interesting enough, 12 of the 21 new Republican Members voted against it. A closed rule, with all points of order waived, without possibility of amendment (except by the Ways and Means Committee), accompanied the bill, prescribing the rules of debate. Tax bills customarily are presented to the House with the right of amendment excluded. This closed rule as a procedural matter is disapproved by many, including myself, because this limits the House Members in working their will in floor debate. Three hours time for debate proved adequate despite the technical nature of the bill.

Principal criticisms revolved around the treatment of an insurance bill as a relief and welfare program. Oddly enough, this is in fact an insurance measure but it is called compensation, while social security, a welfare program, is called insurance, examples, it seems to me, of politically befogging the nature of these Federal programs. Another oddity is the use of the 1935 congressional report on unemployment compensation which describes the danger today to unemployment compensation in these words: "Unemployment insurance cannot give complete and unlimited compensation to all who are unemployed. Any attempt to make it do so confuses unemployment insurance with relief, which it is designed to replace in large part. It can give compensation for a limited period and for a percentage of wage loss."

The basic provision of the bill is simply stated—that the workers of any State who have exhausted all their unemployment compensation under State law (Texas has a 24-week maximum) can receive an additional 50 percent more through Federal aid (Texas maximum of 12 weeks), if the State chooses to accept the help. The tax imposed is mandatory and compulsory. Every employer of four or more will pay $12 per worker more per year, regardless of State tax rates in effect. Naturally, it will be difficult for the States to refuse the employees within the State this additional aid which the employers are paying for anyway. Further, coercion on the State is provided by the promise of increased Federal reimbursement or aid if the State increases its present maximum (Texas, with 26, can then get 13 weeks more aid). So we have employer coercion in the tax and State coercion by offer of Federal aid and reimbursement—States' rights out the window, the beginning of Federal standards. Without any doubt the Kennedy administration is readying a permanent law of inflexible standards to replace completely existing State law. And so goes the Republic's balance of power down the drain in yet another area.

This is not the whole ticket. The added cost of this program, which is going to be passed on eventually to the people, the people of modest income, will be in addition to other increases these same people will be asked to pay for what they believe the Government is giving them. On January 1, 1963, under existing law and without any liberalization the social security tax goes up 1 percent. This is a cost on payrolls of $2.2 billion. Then there will be the administration changes asked of us in connection with social security for an additional cost of one-half of 1 percent, or $1.1 billion. Beyond that, there is the health care bill financing which is another one-half of 1 percent, or $1.1 billion. Then we have additional financing of health care by raising the taxable wage base from $4,800 to $5,000—this again hits the folks in the smaller income brackets by another $700 million. And the unemployment compensation bill will cost $1 billion. These figures total $6.1 billion increased taxes on payrolls. Who, then is really looking out for those of modest income unless it is those of us who are trying to keep down these ever-increasing Government-increased costs which constantly reduce the American citizen's take-home pay. It is the old cry of the bureaucratic government paternalist who suffers from that malady known as "federalitis," who says, "The Government can spend the taxpayer's dollar better than the taxpayer can."

The House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) won a resounding victory—and so did patriotic American citizens fearful of Communist infiltration and subversion of our beloved country. The resolution authorized an appropriation of $331,000 for continuing the investigatory activities of the committee. The vote approving the committee was 412 to 6 (14 absent). We learned through the vote and debate that the ruckus in California pictorially known as operation abolition, was Communist inspired, and that the concern of the six Members, as they expressed it, was the violation of basic rights of our citizens through the HUAC investigatory activities. Most important, we were reminded that the Communist conspiracy is not just another political party movement, but a conspiracy to overthrow our Government by any means, including force and violence, this and much more. Why any Congressman oppose the HUAC really is beyond me when I look objectively at the pros and cons.

The highway message sent to us by the President asked for a speedup in construction and an increase in tax. I agree with the pay-as-you-go plan, but I do not believe we should increase taxes or spend more (requiring tax increase) until we eliminate the waste and irregularities which we know exist in the program. Why accelerate corruption?

Politics Can Destroy Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, early this year I had the opportunity of addressing the Baltimore Estate Planning Council meeting in Baltimore, Md. At that time I discussed the social security program in this country and pointed out some of the threats which I find in today's proposals relating to it. I should like to enter my speech at this point in the RECORD:

POLITICS CAN DESTROY SOCIAL SECURITY

Two basic points must be kept in mind in any public discussion of the OASDI (Old Age Security and Disability Insurance) program.

1. The program is only 24 years old. It will not reach full maturity until the year 2026 when three generations have passed and it is 90 years old. It follows, therefore, that no one can say at this stage whether or not the program has been a success. It can be asserted with some justification that the system has provided a better method for government to finance the years of retirement for our indigent citizens than the old age assistance program of the States, which utilize the need's test and require the social workers to budget the elder citizen, just as the old age assistance program was an improvement over the country or State poorfarm.

This does not mean that the program might not turn out to be a complete success. An examination of the first 24 years of the program's existence should reveal only whether it is basically sound enough to warrant its being kept alive awhile longer.

Many premature statements are being made by casual observers that the program has proved successful simply because it has not broken down during its childhood and youth. If the general public were to adopt this premature judgment, damage and ultimate destruction of the system might follow. If these statements as time goes on prove not to be true, they will have prevented action to correct errors that honest constructive criticism might have called to our attention.

The second basic point I wish to make is that whether the social security system is sound or not, the fact remains that the bulk of the people in our society are relying upon it as a base or a part of their retirement programs. The people have been taught that the OASDI system is an insurance program even though it is not. Indeed, the subterfuge went so far that in 1940 the Social Security Act was amended to include the word "Insurance" in the title of the program. It is certainly wrong to call a program an

insurance program where the past beneficiaries have received $100 for each $1 they paid in premiums, and the beneficiaries presently receiving benefits are averaging about $10 of benefits for every dollar they and their employers paid in social security tax. Furthermore, unlike private insurance programs or pension programs, including civil service retirement programs and the railroad retirement program the OASDI does not constitute a contract which the beneficiary can enforce in a court of law against the Federal Government. The social security beneficiary has no enforceable legal right. What one Congress has given, another Congress can take away. The basic protection of the social security beneficiary lies in the political realities of life. Congress is going to be quite circumspect in taking away rights which the voters have been led to believe they possess.

Lest anyone still believe that social security is insurance consider the fact that the social security benefits have been held by the U.S. Supreme Court not to be income which the recipient must report in his income tax return. Why?

Because the Court held that social security payments were gratuities—unpaid-for gifts. If social security was insurance a Federal income tax would be due on it just as it is due on private annuity and insurance payments.

However, with the bulk of our people relying upon the soundness of the social security system for their retirement, it is equally wrong for critics of the system to allege that it is insolvent or broke simply because it is in a state of maturing. Furthermore, any criticism which by its nature might destroy the confidence of the people in the system should be closely connected with affirmative proposals, if at all possible, to correct the errors. Certainly there should be proposals which would minimize the damage that will ensue to our people if the system proves out to be as unsound as some critics allege it to be.

I believe we can and should approach the social security system in a constructive manner to determine whether, after going one fourth of the way toward maturity, it has revealed any basic structural flaws. We should agree to improve the system where we can if the flaws prove not to be basic and to minimize the damage if we have been pursuing a fundamentally unsound program.

An avoidance of public discussion or a negative approach in public discussion can destroy the social security system. Political discussion to date has not been healthy from either standpoint and a system that might still be saved is being doomed by the very people who claim to support it. Furthermore, the method of political discussion of the social security system has been such that the objective of the social security system, to assist people to finance the years of their retirement from the labor market, is being damaged. If the system is fundamentally unsound, for the sake of the retirement program of our people, the system should be abandoned as soon as possible and a sound system set up in its stead; if the system only needs some good correction and patching, the failure to apply the light of constructive criticism to it to reveal the flaws damages the retirement program of our people.

In my judgment, the basic concept of the social security insurance system is sound. It is a preferable way to meet the problems of the indigent aged than the old age assistance program which require the needs test and budgeting for the recipients. Furthermore, the social security insurance system operates on the basis of prepayment for retirement and insurance protection of a sort for dependents. The extension of the system to cover the risk of loss of earning power from total disability is likewise a basically sound concept. I think it is sound to make the system a cost of doing business as the use of the payroll tax to raise the necessary revenues does.

However, the system got off the track early in its conception. Instead of relating the objectives of social security to protecting against indigency, and handling the problem of indigency, the program was extended to cover large portions of our society where the problem of indigency is not and has never been present. It is interesting to note how the coverage of people to be included in social security has progressed. It has not progressed along the line of a philosophy relating the program to those who might become indigent. It has followed a course of pure expediency. What groups could be fitted into the program with a minimum of administrative and political difficulties were voted in by the Congress. Groups were excluded merely because of political action on their part and groups were included because of political activity on their part. Groups were excluded because of administrative difficulties, and groups were included because there were no administrative difficulties.

The act, as originally written, sought to get around the Supreme Court decisions which declared special and earmarked Federal taxes unconstitutional. This was done through the fiction of saying the social security benefits were unrelated to the payroll tax. The proceeds from the payroll tax were directed to go into the general treasury and were not specifically earmarked. It has been years since anyone has paid any attention to the original fiction that the social security tax was not a special tax, and so unconstitutional. I mention this only to demonstrate further the lack of philosophy contained in the original concept of the act, and the constant resort to expediency as it has developed.

I am satisfied an examination of the social security program as it exists after 24 years of growth reveals that it does contain within it the seeds of destruction. Yet I believe that those seeds can be successfully plucked out and the system made sound and whole so that it can be developed to a successful maturity. In 1954, I introduced an amendment to the Social Security Act and made a speech for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to explain the importance of it. This proposed amendment was to pluck out the seeds of destruction in the system. Also, this amendment was to make the social security system conform to our Constitution and our basic ideas of the place and function of our Federal Government.

The amendment which I reintroduced each Congress provides that any person who desires can take out his own retirement and dependency protection program. If adjudged by the Bureau of Internal Revenue to provide the equivalent benefits to the social security system he may remove himself from the social security program. This person and his employer then would escape the social security tax. The retirement and dependency protection program in lieu of social security, however, would require that if the person dropped it, the equivalent amount of social security tax that the person and his employer would have been paying into the social security fund, with interest, would be paid into the social security fund out of the cash value of the abandoned, program. The person would then go under social security and stay there unless he later wanted to take out another qualified private program of his own.

The criticism against this amendment has been this: "What fool would take out such a policy? No private retirement program can provide what social security provides for the same cost." This may be true today and this probably will remain true for a few more years. However, as the social security matures, the picture changes rapidly. In 1980, for example, the young employee who starts paying social security tax will find that he and his employer will pay a heavy premium for the next 45 years, until he reaches 65, and can start drawing his benefits, and the total amount will be more than he can anticipate will be paid to him in benefits. It is at this point that persons will not be such fools to take out their own private programs in lieu of social security.

But what difference does it make if we provide now the option for "fools" who might want to provide for their own retirement and not be in a governmental program? These people will be taking care of their own retirement and will not become a charge on society later in their life. Furthermore, the social security system presently will benefit from their withdrawal from the program because at this time they pay in much less than they can anticipate drawing out.

Why the opposition to my amendment? Is it just casual or is it fundamental opposition? I am afraid that it is fundamental opposition. The question arises whether those who originally conceived and developed the OASDI program to date sought to set up a system to solve a social security problem or whether their purpose has been to use a social problem, indigency, or possible indigency, as a vehicle to socialize the retirement programs of all of our citizens. The result of any socialized program like this increases the power and authority of the Federal Government. I will return to this question later.

Let me first turn to an analysis of some of the fiscal aspects of the present social security system wherein lie the seeds of destruction. The solvency of the social security system has been based upon a series of concepts. First, an actuarial system that is based upon the identification and limitation of the people who will receive social security benefits. The system is an insurance against loss of earning power through loss of wages received from employment. It has no relation to loss of income derived from other sources, such as inheritance, savings, and investments. The $1,200 a year limitation on income a beneficiary may receive from salaries or wages, modified somewhat by the 1960 amendments to the social security law, is an example of the criteria to which the actuarial system relates. Any liberalization of the limitations upon which the actuarial tabulations are based, of course, throws the social security fund out of balance. The actuarial estimates made from time to time by the Social Security Administration both as to increasing benefits and liberalizing limitations have been good and honest I am pleased to state.

The second concept upon which the fiscal soundness of the social security system is based is speculative and questionable. It presupposes an expanding population. We have been quite fortunate in the population increases which have occurred in the past 24 years. However, any leveling off of population increase can spell real trouble for the social security system.

The third concept is likewise speculative and not so sound. It presupposes an expanding economy. A review of what happened to the social security fund during the slight recessions since World War II demonstrates the insecurity of the expanding economy concepts. I hope we will never experience again a depression like that of the 1930's; however, a projection of a depression the size of that which we experienced in the 1930's into the actuarial estimates for the social security system would spell disaster and certainly calls for sober thinking.

The fourth concept is exceedingly infirm. This concept presupposes Congress by law will from time to time increase the social security tax rate according to a specific schedule. The experience of the past, where

many Congresses have failed to increase the tax rate as scheduled and where Congresses have increased the benefits and liberalized the concepts upon which the actuarial figures were based, leads any thoughtful person to question how many Congresses in the future are going to face up to the difficult task of increasing social security tax rates. This becomes particularly questionable as the rates reach higher levels. Even today people are beginning to look at the social security tax rates with some seriousness. I know from personal experience the difficulty those of us on the Ways and Means Committee have had in the past few years in making the principle of increasing taxes in accordance with schedules and to meet increased benefits stick. The demagogues have it all over us in appealing to the people on this score. They love the people, they say, and it is only mossbacks that prevent the people from getting the benefits to which their needs entitle them. How long can the line be held now is a crucial question, let alone for the future.

The social security system received an unexpected boost in its solvency picture from the impact of the post-World War II inflation. I trust that we will not look in the future to this kind of boost. It is illusionary in the long run. This same inflation took a big bite out of the hides of our older people who were on social security, pensions, and other fixed incomes. Inflation, by increasing the dollar amounts of wages and salaries, put the bulk of the people under social security into the full base wage bracket to which the social security tax applied. In order to relieve one damaging impact of inflation on the social security system—that of minimizing the spreading of benefits to reflect differences in wages, the promoters of the social security system argued for increasing the base salary or wage upon which the social security tax was levied. The result is that today the tax is levied on the first $4,800 of income.

In the process of increasing the base upon which the tax is levied, the Social Security Administration found a technique which assisted in making the program more solvent. The amount of benefits received from the tax on the first thousand is more than the benefits received on the same tax paid on the last thousand. Therefore, increase the amount of wages upon which the tax is levied and the income-expenditure ratio improves. In other words, built into the social security system is the seed of a graduated tax where the higher income groups pay more tax for less proportionate benefits than the lower groups. This is a more tangible reason why my proposed amendment is being fought by the Social Security Administration. The Administration counts not only upon the present graduated feature in the social security tax to keep it solvent, but would like to increase the base further and provide more graduation in the tax rate. Incidentally, Congressman JAMES ROOSEVELT introduced a bill to make the wage base $10,000 last Congress. Though this move failed there is no doubt the Social Security Administration counts on further graduation to assist in keeping the program solvent.

It is true that a complete graduation of the social security tax to make it more like the Federal income tax by basing it upon ability to pay, rather than upon insurance where everyone gets the same benefits for the same premium, can be the salvation of the system. I suspect, indeed, that this is where its original promoters look for salvation. In that event, however, the play will then be fully out in the open and all the original fiction which was used to get the program installed will be abandoned. It will not be insurance. It does not relate to the indigent. The program will then be what I am now convinced its original promoters planned and hoped it would be, an open, unashamed socialization of the retirement programs of our people.

If there were no other good way to see that our people had adequate and good retirement programs, I might be willing to go to the Federal Government to establish these programs. This hardly is the case. Quite the contrary, the retirement programs being set up in the private sector of our society exceed in goodness, and in flexibility any Federal program, including civil service retirement, which at one time was definitely a leader in the field.

I conclude my remarks with a reference to my earlier warning. Even though the social security program is now being unmasked for what it is * * * the base upon which it was inaugurated still must and should be retained. Government has a legitimate concern about our people, when retired, being able to live out their lives in comfort and dignity. The poor farm was a rotten system for caring for those who, for reasons unnecessary to consider here, many times as a result of forces beyond their control, had not provided for themselves. The State old age assistance programs were an improvement over the poor farm system. The social security insurance concept is a vast improvement over the OAA program which, in time, it will eliminate.

Furthermore, the Federal Government has already been in the picture for 24 years, and the bulk of our citizens are relying upon the solvency of the social security program in their present retirement plans. We cannot permit the errors of the system to damage their plans. I believe a gradual move to get the system back to the indigent or those who might become indigent is the correct way to proceed. As we get the program back to the less than 5 percent in our society who might fall into this category and free the 95 percent who have not needed and will not need Government help, if they are freed so they can do their own providing and planning, we will have a system that we can handle adequately and with reasonable ease. My amendment will accomplish this objective.

The social security fund as the present system matures will have to be increased to $50 or $60 billion. That is entirely too large a sum to be left in sterile investment, which investment in Government bonds essentially is. The retirement funds of our people ought to be invested in the growth of our economy. This can be done through private programs and should never be done through Government programs. But don't think the Socialists are not looking at this point with scheming eyes. Already there have been proposals that the social security funds be invested in public works bonds. These proposals are based upon the logic that the funds for the retirement of our people should not be sterile. But what will the Government moving into the investment field in this fashion lead to? The answer to this question, if not the answer to the other question I have posed, should make everyone in our society wake up to the realization that government of, by and for the people along with the private enterprise system is meeting some of its greatest tests today. Have we indeed lost faith in the basic concepts that have brought this society of ours to the highest point of achievement reached by any society in history? Faith in the individual in the field of economics which spells out the private enterprise system. Faith in the individual in the field of government which spells out the representative system of government. Have we indeed lost that faith?

Jobs for the Handicapped: A Community Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, the Governor's committee on employment of the physically handicapped recently conducted an essay contest among Kansas high school juniors and seniors on the subject entitled "Jobs for the Handicapped: A Community Challenge." I am proud to state that a constituent, Sondra Lee Chance, a senior at Frankfort High School won first place with her essay. Sondra and her teacher, Mrs. Leo McMullen, will be in attendance at the annual meeting of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped to be held in Washington on April 27 and 28. Sondra's travel expenses will be paid by the Kansas State Federation of Labor, AFL–CIO. Also, she will receive a $200 scholarship from the Kansas State Chamber of Commerce to be paid to any college of her choice. Mrs. McMullen's expenses will be paid by the Governor's committee on employment of the physically handicapped. I am sure that all Members of Congress will be interested in reading Sondra's essay.

The essay follows:

THE GOVERNOR'S COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED PRESENTS SONDRA CHANCE, A SENIOR IN FRANKFORT HIGH SCHOOL, AND HER ESSAY IN A CONTEST AMONG JUNIORS AND SENIORS IN KANSAS HIGH SCHOOLS ON "JOBS FOR THE HANDICAPPED: A COMMUNITY CHALLENGE"

"Left face. One, two. Well gang, you know I can't go with you, so do your best. This is where we show our stuff."

These words led me to the remarkable man whose friendship will influence my thinking and acting for the rest of my life.[1] This is how it was: Band Day 1960. Drumbeats. Vivid color. The personnel of 35 bands impatiently waiting for parade time. As all other drum majors, I stood beside my director. In front of us was a band in striking blue. A tall, slender man in a brown suit, lightly resting his hand on the shoulder of a uniformed boy, was saying, "Well gang, you know I can't go with you * * *." I turned a questioning look to my director and she smiled and said, "He's blind." My first thought was. "How fantastic—a blind man trying to direct a marching band." Then a wave of pity swept over me for this man. How tragic to miss all the bright colors, the intricate formations, the reflection of the sun on a thousand instruments. Whistles began shrilling commands and I lost sight of him as each band became a coordinated machine moving down the street. But that was where it all began—Band Day 1960.

I had been searching for something special on which to write a research paper. Seeing this director I felt that at last I had

[1] This is my personal experience. The man referred to indirectly throughout the essay actually teaches in a Kansas high school. His name is withheld upon request.

found exactly what I had been looking for. He granted me an interview. I remember how apprehensive I felt as I walked into the the school that day expecting to be confronted by a rather tragic situation. How could an individual, suffering a major handicap, hope to fill a position as demanding as that of a music director? However, he greeted me so normally and had such an air of self-confidence and genuine enthusiasm about him, that I lost all apprehension about the interview. Never again will the words "physically handicapped" hold the same meaning for me.

He told me that he had become permanently blind at the age of 14. My admiration grew for this man, who had continued his education and received a degree in music. He spent 5 years in his first teaching position and then had the opportunity to accept a position in this beautiful new county high school. School was in session and he invited me to accompany him to his classes. As I watched him direct his 60-member girls' glee club, I marveled at the efficiency with which he handled this group. It was as though he were no more handicapped than you or I. Then I realized, that for the first time, I was seeing his abilities and not just his disability.

As I watched him go about the building, up and down stairs, in and out of rooms, I marveled that he seemed to always know exactly where he was going. That was what impressed me most about this remarkable person—he always seemed to know where he was going, what he was doing and why he was doing it. I talked with some fellow faculty members and learned that he was not only an excellent teacher but an inspiration to them. He did so much more with his abilities than they did with theirs, that he was a constant challenge to them.

As I left the school that day, his last words lingered in my mind. He had pointed out to me that he had all the senses I had except sight. Should that make such a difference in our abilities? I began to appreciate the enlightened individuals in this community who had seen a well educated and gifted teacher, rather than focusing on his one handicap. I felt a growing admiration for the student body and the people of the community, for they have accepted him wholeheartedly for just what he is—a wonderful person.

Questions and more questions flashed across my mind. Are all communities this alert to an individual's abilities rather than just to his disabilities? What is the history of the treatment of the handicapped? What facilities are now available for rehabilitation? So the search began for the answers to these and many other questions.

Now, months later, I have found many of the answers. I have learned that the problem of the handicapped has always been with us. In ancient times the Spartans killed their physically handicapped. They were considered a risk to the group's safety and economic well-being. During the Middle Ages they were allowed to live but were objects of ridicule and jesting. As centuries passed, care and education were provided, but not until the 20th century did society realize that it must also prepare the disabled person to be a self-supporting, useful member of his community. This realization resulted in the establishment of the State-Federal vocational rehabilitation program in 1920.[2] Amendments to this law were made in 1954 and were designed to increase the number of disabled persons rehabilitated annually.[3]

[2] "History of the Treatment of the Physically Disabled," the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, Washington, D.C., pamphlet.

[3] "Government and the Handicapped," George R. Weir, p. 5.

The tremendous task of rehabilitation must begin within the disabled person himself. He must become physically and spiritually adjusted to his handicap and must then concentrate on the abilities he has left. No amount of expert counseling and training can rehabilitate him if he hasn't the determination to succeed. Counselors then help the individual select the vocation for which he is best suited, and he is given excellent training in his specialized field. At last he is ready to compete with his fellow man once again and to prove that he can live a normal productive life.

None of us in this modern 20th century would consider ourselves "Spartans," but every time we refuse to give a handicapped person an equal opportunity we kill something within him. Every American, who believes in the basic principles upon which our country was founded, owes it to himself to become informed concerning the employment of the handicapped. By looking about his community he can see the excellent job the handicapped are doing when placed according to their abilities. He can read good books such as Henry Viscardi, Jr.'s "Give Us the Tools." He can study surveys on the records of the handicapped in industry. He can become personally acquainted with the handicapped so that they are no longer simply a statistic in his life.

Let us consider one of the thoughts Dr. Anne Carlsen expressed, as she accepted the President's Trophy for "Handicapped American of the Year," "No man is an island and the handicapped are no exception. They need the help of family, friends, employers, and the community. With that help they can become contributing members of society and in the process be happy, useful citizens."

"Most barriers to employment of the physically handicapped are community made * * * and it is the community that must remove them."[4] The handicapped individual neither needs nor wants pity. All he asks is to be given an equal opportunity in your community and mine. Is this too much to ask in this great Nation which advocates so strongly the equality of man?"

[4] "A Window to the Future," ed. President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped. Pamphlet (back cover).

Don't Be Fooled—Communism Can Happen Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from the Gaffney Ledger, Gaffney, S.C., of February 28, 1961:

DON'T BE FOOLED—COMMUNISM CAN HAPPEN HERE

(By Louis Sossamon)

Our Nation's heritage of freedom—too often taken for granted by Americans—is the subject of an intensive national program by Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, Pa.

The Foundation's "Freedoms Roll-Call" campaign is aimed at focusing national attention on the values and responsibilities of freedom under our Constitution and Bill of Rights, and calls for a personal rededication by all Americans to the principles of freedom.

It is a strange paradox that American citizens, beneficiaries of the abundance that springs from the efforts of freemen in a free land, need to be stimulated to thoughtful consideration, understanding and appreciation of the free system which made this good life possible.

Time was when faith in America and its free market economy was as implicit as the knowledge that robins will appear in the spring. We were a young country then, opening new horizons, striving for national greatness, and boldly proud of our unique American system of free men.

Unfortunately, with many, success has produced indifference and complacency. The privileges and safeguards which are ours by constitutional guaranteee no longer seem to require vigorous defense.

It is unfortunate—and dangerous—that many of us fail to realize that these guarantees can easily be whisked away, by default, unless we jealously guard them.

Freedoms Foundation, in a farsighted program, is offering all of us an opportunity to provide proof that Americans intend to remain free to speak their minds, to raise their children as they see fit, to risk their judgment and their dollars in business of their own choosing and to worship where and how they please, free from the dictates of an omnipotent, autocratic system of government.

We hope that every American will show his devotion to our American spirit in this repledge of our hearts and minds to our country.

Freedoms Foundation is worthy of your tax-exempt contributions. Your attention is invited to the message on page 6 [not printed in the RECORD] entitled "It Can Happen Here." The Ledger is pleased to print this message as a public service for the readers.

The Late Honorable Edith Nourse Rogers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD a resolution of condolence adopted by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Department of North Carolina, at a meeting held on the 18th day of September 1960, in Sanford, N.C.

Mr. Speaker, our late beloved colleague, Edith Nourse Rogers, served in this House with great ability and distinction for a long number of years. She was held in high esteem and was a dedicated public servant. The veterans of our wars never had a more faithful champion than Edith Nourse Rogers, and I am certain that the sentiment expressed in the resolution I am now presenting is a very sincere reflection of the feeling for, and admiration of, this honorable woman.

RESOLUTION OF CONDOLENCE: EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

Whereas the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Department of North Carolina, has learned with profound regret of the death of the Honorable Edith Nourse Rogers, a Member of Congress from the State of Massachusetts, United States of America, who was a sincere friend of this organization and all who answered our Nation's call in time of war; and

Whereas the deceased was a most honest, courageous, and faithful public servant being ever mindful of the problems of the veteran and his dependents; and

Whereas the members of this organization were shocked and grieved to learn of her death: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Council of Administration of the Department of North Carolina Veterans of Foreign Wars in regular meeting assembled, That all officers and members of the council shall, in pursuance of this resolution, manifest their sympathy and condolence to her next of kin and other relatives; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the next of kin of the Honorable Edith Nourse Rogers, and that a copy thereof be laid up among the permanent records of this Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of North Carolina; and be it further

Resolved, That a request be made to Congress that this resolution be incorporated in the book of memorial addresses printed in honor of the deceased.

Adopted on this, the 18th day of September 1960, at the VFW Council of Administration meeting at Sanford, N.C.

JOHN R. DICKERSON,
Department Commander.

Shall This Be Known as Kennedy Depression?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1961

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I have been disturbed, as I know many other Members of Congress have, by the pessimistic picture of the American economy often painted by prominent Members of the Kennedy administration. Recently in a message to Congress, the President described the highway program as being in peril. In almost every message we receive we are warned of some peril which we are supposed to be facing.

The following are excerpts from the editorial of February 23, 1961, in the Tucson Daily Citizen of Tucson, Ariz., which contain some questions I think should be asked and answered. Under permission previously granted, I am inserting these excerpts in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I hope the President has an opportunity to consider these questions. The excerpts follow:

SHALL THIS BE KNOWN AS KENNEDY DEPRESSION?

A battle of words has been raging in Washington over the Nation's domestic situation. One question which has not been fired yet point blank may well become a focal point of the controversy.

Is the current recession, or business slowdown, or economic adjustment—whatever you label it—to be described correctly as "the Kennedy depression"?

* * * * *

We can't readily forget that in 1958 the country hit one of those inevitable low spots in a free economy. The welfare staters, the proponents of big centralized government, and many leaders of the Democratic majority in Congress all tried to use the situation to promote their favorite brands of panaceas.

President Eisenhower stood fast against the onslaught, firm in his belief that the Nation's economy would right itself—which it did—and confident in his assurances given the people that welfare state panaceas were neither necessary nor desirable. Economists at that time credited the public's continued confidence, buoyed by Presidential leadership, with a rapid business revival.

* * * * *

Whatever the causes of the present situation, what does President Kennedy hope to accomplish by his extreme pessimism? It is time that question be asked.

* * * * *

It does not take a pollyanna to find that the true picture of America's economy is not possibly as grim as President Kennedy keeps trying to make it out. And this is not to disregard some decline in production and the extent of unemployment.

Is President Kennedy trying to make the economic picture all black in order to provide a favorable situation for the imposition of welfare State programs?

* * * * *

The next few months alone may provide the answers to all these questions. We will continue to hope that undimmed public confidence will not permit a "Kennedy depression" to occur and that American initiative and independence will not yield before the imposition of Washington's will under the guise of national welfare.

Resolution on State and Federal Legislation in Development of Nation's Water Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following resolution, adopted by the Kansas Engineering Society at its 53d annual meeting held in Great Bend, Kans., on February 23–25, 1961:

RESOLUTION ON STATE AND FEDERAL LEGISLATION IN DEVELOPMENT OF NATION'S WATER RESOURCES

Whereas the Federal Government is expending large sums of public money in the development of the Nation's water resources; and

Whereas it is recognized that both Federal Government and the States have certain governmental duties and responsibilities and that there is need for legislation to define them in order that each may effectively carry out their respective duties and responsibilities; and

Whereas there is a need for acceleration of research, basic data, and development programs; and

Whereas the population and the economy of the State of Kansas and of the Nation is expanding and requiring ever increasing quantities of water to meet the complex needs of this modern civilization, there is need for more emphasis on water supply development for domestic, municipal, industrial, agricultural, and recreational facilities; and

Whereas the water resources committee of the Kansas Engineering Society has studied and endorsed the "Report to the 1961 Kansas Legislature Concerning State Water Policy and Program Needs" as prepared by the Kansas Water Resources Board: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Kansas Engineering Society urge enactment of State and Federal legislation to effectuate the following principles and policies:

1. Through the provision of additional funds between now and fiscal year 1964 to bring primary State water activities up to a level of program operations commensurate with current assigned responsibilities;

2. Through active support for creation of a Federal evapotranspiration research center in Kansas and provision of sufficient funds to permit the Kansas Agricultural Experiment Station to prepare a summary report on the evapotranspiration problem;

3. Through establishment of a policy of State assumption of financial responsibility for the initial costs of obtaining needed conservation storage in the major reservoir program and the watershed program;

4. Through the establishment of a policy of State financial assistance to watershed districts and other local units of government in carrying out flood control projects, either singly or in cooperation with other governmental units or agencies, whenever the projects will benefit lands outside the territory of the local unit and whenever the projects in question are determined to be an integral part of a State water resource development plan;

5. Through a legislative council study on means of implementing the new policies recommended in items 3 and 4; and

6. Through a concurrent resolution designed to satisfy the Chief of Army Engineers and the U.S. Congress relative to desired Kansas legislative assurance of recognition of the non-Federal obligations involved in providing water supply in the Milford Reservoir, and to provide similar assurances relative to the four other reservoirs for which similar requests for water supply storage have been made; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the U.S. Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources and to the Kansas congressional representatives, and to the Water Resources Committee of the Kansas State Legislature.

Training for Rural Population: Indian Government's Hopes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 17, 1961

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the Members an article by Mr. Don Shoemaker, editor of the editorial page of the Miami Herald, in which Mr. Shoemaker capably outlines the target of full community development by 1963 through which the Government of India hopes to provide education and training to its rural population in cooperative farming, marketing, and actual farm management.

The article follows:

(By Don Shoemaker)

Contrasts as sharp as the green shades of an Indian ricefield help to make this a land of fascination.

India's economic problems are yawning big, yet its largest bank has deposits of only

$300 million. India is a land of philosophers with a thin but rich crust of intellectuals, yet it has only three or four daily newspapers with as much as 100,000 circulation.

These contrasts extend particularly to the economic development of the country, all of which is according to plan—5-year plans.

The first plan (1951–56) was a brass-bound beaut. It was "instrumental in bringing about a marked improvement in levels of production both in agriculture and in industry and the inflationary pressures could be kept under control" pronounced the Indian Merchants' Chamber of Bombay.

The chamber, which is a rough copy of our National Association of Manufacturers, is not opposed to planning or to the Government, but it is a right pert critic of both.

It points out that the second plan (1957–61) has missed some of its goals in the public sector (while exceeding them in the private sector) and that there is some considerable inflation. Further, the Government has had to engage for the first time in deficit financing.

The dose of inflation is not a mild one, but it seems nearly at an end. In 4 years prices rose by about 25 percent, or 5 percent a year. They have now leveled off.

India started out the second plan with substantial reserves of foreign exchange. However, deficit financing to the initial tune of $1.5 billion (in September it was trimmed to $1.1 billion) has cut seriously into India's resources. Its sterling balances are now down to 140 crores of rupees, or about $300 million. The average safe margin is Rs400 crores.

(The rupee is worth about 21 cents on the official market, 16 cents on the black side.)

In the next 5-year plan, beginning in 1961, India will need $6.6 billion in foreign credits to take up some of this slack. Right now it is highly embarrassed by a lack of foreign exchange, and has just clamped the most rigorous import controls even on Indians who travel out of the country: they can bring in no more than $15 worth of goods.

To counter this economic depressant the Government, under planning, is employing the usual devices but it is also hastening industrial development. Every little factory has on its bulletin board a progress chart noting foreign exchange earned by manufacture and export.

Americans here quickly note that the Indians make good industrial workers. This country had some industry under British rule, but its basis was not as diversified as it is today. There are many things Indians do not yet make, but the only one I noticed personally was camera film—and a French company will finance this venture soon.

India's avowed socialism disturbs some of its capitalists, who point to such statements in the draft of the third 5-year plan as the Government's power to assume direct responsibility for the future development of industries over a wider area.

But this has not deterred foreign investors. Most of the outside capital in India is British. It is even said that there are more Britons here than there were before independence. They, with the Americans, seem enthusiastic about investment possibilities. The giant redstone Ashoka Hotel in New Delhi has a daily caravan of trade missions smelling out the spices of new investment.

The reason that pickings are plump is pretty obvious.

Because it lacks foreign exchange to pay for imports, India wants to make all it needs within India. So it offers the investor a highly protected market clamoring for all kinds of goods. Government people say solemnly, "There is no element of risk."

Profits appear high. However, a British plant manager will tell you that taxes are prohibitive, and Britons in a Calcutta club will echo him.

But nationals of another country will assure you that the investor gets a fair shake. It is a fact that both dividends and capital may be repatriated. Further, the base tax rate on corporations is 45 percent, against our 52 percent, and there are tax remissions and depletion allowances which are, at the very least, attractive on paper. India and the United States also are signatories of a treaty for the avoidance of double taxation with respect to taxes on income and they agree that there will be just compensation for any properties which are expropriated.

Where India seems to shine in these respects is in the complete candor with which industrial development is laid out.

Some areas are public, some private. The industrial policy resolution of 1956 carefully spells out the public ones which are to be developed by the state. They include iron and steel, transport, communications, shipbuilding, most mining and electric power.

Yet, stockholder industries exist side by side in this broad area with government plants, and they seem to prosper. The giant Tata steel complex competes favorably with two government steel plants. The USHA sewing machine, which is produced with just about the highest wages in India, competes in the United States with a Japanese make. It has always occupied the private sector.

Indian manufacture seems efficient, but it varies. One of the nation's oldest jute mills, which is also in the U.S. market, employs more than 5,000 workers at a marginal wage. The management blandly explains, however, that the same production could be achieved in America or Britain with 600 hands. Hence the low pay and the antiquated, safety deviceless machinery.

On the other hand, a machine tool plant in Bangalore set up with Swiss help reached its estimated 1961 capacity in 1958—3 years early.

The Indians I saw in aluminum mills, motor coach factories, electronic plants and even in the cottage-type handicraft industries so dear to Gandhi, made like beavers. Some of these, too, were women.

Imagine a country only 13 years old in its own name and lacking any manner of industrial self-sufficiency a few years back, and you have the case history of India.

It aims at an annual increase of 8 percent in industrial production and it has already achieved a 3-million-ton steel industry. It is expecting aid from all countries yet it wants to be free of that aid in 10 years.

It is building up quality control and it is latching onto export markets in developed and underdeveloped countries alike. Those bicycles, for example, are sold in England. And Japan is getting iron ore and manganese. Russia sends machinery (I asked if it worked, and they said it did) and collects shoes and textiles on a self-balancing basis, plus a $600 million loan repayable over 12 years at 2½ percent.

Under the second 5-year plan the public sector of industry generally has trailed the private one in the achievement of goals. This does not seem to disturb Government planners, who in normal socialist circumstances might take reprisals against private firms.

Actually, in recent months the Government has conceded the aluminum and fertilizer development field to private enterprise, and it has encouraged U.S. firms to get into rubber production exclusively.

But this is no paradise for private business. (Where is there one, to be sure?) The loudest outcry is against Government bureaucracy.

Import licenses sometimes take months to acquire. The Government says that this is because it must have assurance of proper financing, since it cannot issue a license and then back up with its own currency an industry that needs to import some vital commodity.

The truth probably is that there is some little slippage in the governmental machine. The Orient simply does not change overnight.

But there is no absence of foreign businessmen hungry to cut into the Indian pie. The U.S. Embassy here had four trade missions through recently. Capital investors have bid for concessions like bridge players at a summer resort. If India in the Nehru vision of good means to a good end makes a a go of its capitalistic socialism, the dollar, the pound, the lira, the mark, and even the ruble will be swinging their weight along with the fabled rupee.

Our Foreign Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Gaffney Ledger, Gaffney, S.C., of February 25, 1961:

OUR FOREIGN RELATIONS

The President has vast powers. A decision made, an order issued in the White House can set a tremendous machine in motion and the effects may be felt around the globe. This is especially true in the field of foreign relations where, constitutionally and by statute, the President's authority is virtually supreme.

Yet it is often a long way from the Executive desk to the actual administrative levels where policies are put into being. The channels are often complex—and they can be and sometimes are clogged to the point of impotence.

The lead article in the February issue of the Reader's Digest deals with an extremely important example of this. Written by Charles Stevenson, it is entitled "What We Must Do To Win the Cold War." At the beginning he observes that President Kennedy pledges that this country will take the initiative in that war. "But before he can make a start," Mr. Stevenson writes, "our new Commander in Chief must face up to a shocking and bitter reality. He must capture control of the defiant, faceless bureaucracy firmly entrenched in Washington. Its weak-kneed efforts merely to hold off communism instead of fighting back are leading us to defeat even as it tries to keep the White House from interfering."

These are strong words, but Mr. Stevenson supplies evidence to back them. For instance, he tells of a secret mission assigned by President Eisenhower to Nelson Rockefeller in 1955 to improve our cold-war strategy and tactics. This mission, Mr. Rockefeller now says, "was bitterly resented by the State Department," and was ultimately abandoned.

The point, as Mr. Stevenson sees it, is that "* * * too many men in the State Department have persisted in the dangerously wistful belief that if we don't annoy the Reds, they are bound to see how well meaning we are and will stop harassing us." The result is negative policy. By contrast, he goes on, the Soviets conduct extraordinary efficient cold-war operations. He cites the Japanese riots that caused the cancellation of President Eisenhower's visits as an outstanding

example. These were organized to the last possible degree, by highly trained experts. Every possible weapon was used to influence the Japanese, and to infiltrate schools and labor organizations. "This is cold war, Russian-style," writes Mr. Stevenson. "They have a name for it; agitprop—planned conflict in which agitations, propaganda, trade diplomacy, threats of war, and promises of peace are coordinated in an ever-changing, worldwide offensive." And it is all master-minded in the Kremlin.

Mr. Stevenson goes into much detail in pointing to our own weaknesses in cold-war maneuvering. We have, it seems, an entrenched bureaucracy bent on maintaining a status quo which is rigidly opposed to new or aggresisve policies. We also, he believes, have an appalling lack of understanding of Communist tactics—a lack which extends into high areas of government. One solution he believes urgent is creation of a Freedom Academy—a West Point to teach our own cold-war managers, diplomats, and others "the full scope of the Communist strategy and to equip them with the ways to carry the war back to the Communists and win."

Actually, a bill to create such an academy was passed by the Senate last session, but time was running out and the House didn't act on it. It is needed now with the utmost urgency, Mr. Stevenson is convinced—and so is a cold-war commander, who will work close to the President and head a professional staff skilled in the arts of total political warfare. Then we'll begin to win cold-war battles.

Savings Bonds Perk Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Sylvia Porter as it appeared in the Washington Evening Star of Februray 28, 1961:

SAVINGS BONDS PERK UP
(By Sylvia Porter)

Not in a long time have we been buying as many U.S. E and H savings bonds as we are now.

For the first time in two and one-half years, monthly sales of new savings bonds are exceeding cash-ins of the outstanding securities. In January new sales hit $456 million, up 8 percent from a year earlier, while cash-ins totaled $441 million, down 22 percent and in February the trend has continued. For the whole of 1961 the Treasury's sales goal is $4.6 billion of new E- and H-bond sales, a rise of 7 percent over last year, and the national director of the program, William H. Neal, expects redemptions will run 10 to 20 percent below 1960.

The upswing in sales reflects the fact that Americans generally have been saving more. To the extent that this mirrors the business downturn the savings rise is a mixed blessing.

It also reflects the fact that, under a 1959 law, the Treasury raised the maximum rate on savings bonds from 3¼ to 3¾ percent.

PROGRAM PROMOTED

And the upswing reflects the fact that the program is now being promoted more intensively because 1961 marks its 20th birthday.

On May 1, it will be 20 years since President Roosevelt bought an E-bond from former Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau, and so set off the volunteer savings drive.

In the years since, close to $100 billion of series E bonds have been sold and over 2 billion individual E-bonds have been issued. Right now more than $43 billion of the E- and H-bonds are outstanding, an alltime peak total and representing 15 percent of the public debt. Today 8 million employees put an average of $20 a month in the bonds via payroll savings plans offered by 45,000 corporations.

NEST EGG STRESSED

While the savings bond program obviously is still alive and purchases help the Treasury manage the public debt in a sound way, does it still make sense for you to buy them? The "patriotic" appeal hasn't the pull it had in wartime. Critics rightfully point out that you must own a bond 7 years and 9 months to get the 3¾ percent interest, and many financial institutions pay this and more in interest annually. Lots of banks and others grumble that in peacetime the savings bond unfairly competes with private institutions.

An honest answer to the question, I think, is: Yes—for a part of your basic nest egg—yes. After you've built your basic nest egg in cash or savings bonds, you should diversify and invest in other mediums. But at least a part of your savings well might be in bonds, because:

First, the discipline of saving via these bonds is unrivaled. When you buy under a payroll savings plan, the money is automatically deducted from your paycheck before you have a chance to fritter it away. And little weekly savings mount into big annual totals.

Second, the 3¾-percent rate is fair for the long-term saver. Over the years ahead, it is unlikely that the average price level will rise by this amount per year. After you pay taxes on the interest, you won't have much net left, but you'll have some.

Third, the absolute safety of the bonds is a great virtue. You can't lose in dollars. You have peace of mind that will be worth a great deal in an emergency. You can cash in your bonds at any time.

It is fitting that the program should be perking up on its 20th anniversary. I still think its virtues amply justify its place in the basic savings nest egg of American families.

Mr. Speaker, obviously our citizens still have the utmost confidence in the American dollar and are relying on President Kennedy's statement that it will not be devalued.

Operation Abolition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 17, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, during recent weeks, there has been much written about the film "Operation Abolition." The following editorial in the February 23, 1961, issue of the Daily Report, published at Ontario-Upland, Calif., is very significant. By unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I bring this editorial to your attention, and to the attention of my other distinguished colleagues:

"OPERATION ABOLITION"

Discussing the rioting at the U.N. in his column on today's editorial page, Ralph De Toledano declares: "U.N. officials and U.S. intelligence sources say flatly that Communist-led rioting will be repeated, both here, and in every capital of the free and neutralist world, and that it will grow bloodier and more determined."

"Operation Abolition," began long before the adult led rioting by students in San Francisco last May. That was only one more development in this international program which De Toledano is discussing. However, so successful was this San Francisco riot and its ensuing propaganda usefulness that it has become the Communist Party's model of what can be done on that score.

Making the House Un-American Activities Committee a special target up and down the Paicfic coast is a further part of that operation, for the House committee has done an outstanding job of exposing these Communist-directed demonstrations for exactly what they are. Thanks to steady perseverence and publicity, however, the Communist Party has been able to make the House Un-American Activities Committee, and in turn its film, "Operation Abolition," a prime target even among people who have no intention of helping communism.

The party has attracted this unwitting support of highly respected individuals and organizations by constant reiteration of charges that the House committee has violated individual civil rights. These charges are never documented. Yet right here in the West End area attacks upon both the film and the Committee on Un-American Activities already have been made by well-meaning groups and individuals who were obviously so blinded by their own prejudices against the committee that they have failed to recognize the root connections of this hate campaign with which they have allied themselves.

Without questioning, these people accept the doctrine that individuals reliably identified as members of the Communist Party, which in turn has been reliably shown to plan the destruction of the free government of the people of this country, must be given the benefit of every protection under the guise of civil rights. Yet the elected representatives of the people of this country have no right to inquire into the beliefs or motives of these people identified as Communists in order to formulate legislation to protect this Nation from internal destruction. To do that, they cry, means prying into personal beliefs. Nobody must do that, they say. Even if some of these people have engaged in activities that may have been contrary to the best interests of the United States, these were all private affairs.

As a result of this steady drumbeat of propaganda, some fantastic situations have arisen, even here in this community. Prominent individuals with a large stake in the preservation of liberty, and of our free economic system, have protested against exposure in the film "Operation Abolition" of the Communist technique of utilizing riots to launch hate campaigns because the film was controversial.

Who made this film controversial? Who made the House Un-American Activities Committee controversial? Every West End citizen should read the answers to these questions in two slender Government reports. One is entitled "Operation Abolition," released by the Committee on Un-American Activities on November 8, 1957. (Note that date. This is not a new hate campaign at all.) The other pamphlet is the FBI's report on the stage-by-stage development of the Communist-directed student riots in San Francisco May 12–14 last year, entitled, "Communist Target—Youth." (A summary of this report was

published in an editorial appearing in the Daily Report last July 20.)

This has become a serious situation. The ease with which the world Communist organization has spread its base of support across large segments of the American public that never knowingly would ally itself with the Communist cause is something to shake the most hardy American. The real issue today is not whether a particular film or a particular congressional body is controversial, or even whether it is doing properly the job for which it was intended. We have normal means of adjusting any bona fide, proven abuses without resorting to riots. The real issue is whether the American public any longer recognizes an enemy maneuver when it sees one, and whether the people any longer have the resolution necessary to defend themselves in this age of tranquilizers.

Are we for communism, or against it? That is the real question.

Freemen and Mr. Freeman and Farm Philosophy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. BEERMANN. In addition to two earlier articles that I have submitted—"Cochrane Concoction: Killer of Farm Freedom" and "Recipe From the White House"—I would like to add two more—"Farm Philosophy" and "Freemen and Mr. Freeman"—both from the March 6 issue of the Wall Street Journal. While all four articles make strong points against passage of the feed grains bill, one, "Farm Philosophy," by Mr. Joe Western, confirms an opinion of mine that this bill is the first step toward a complete Federal takeover of the American farm.

The two articles follow:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 6, 1961]

FARM PHILOSOPHY—ADMINISTRATION IDEA IS HOOKED TO AMBITIOUS CONTROLS

By Joe Western

WASHINGTON.—Orville Lothrop Freeman has a problem. He's firmly convinced that only strong controls by the Federal Government can save farming from its recurrent economic trouble. Yet, he knows from experience that the farmer is a most difficult fellow to control.

As Agriculture Secretary, he's about to try to engineer what promises to be the most ambitious program of controlled farming ever attempted by the Federal Government—President Kennedy's "managed abundance" farm philosophy.

Mr. Freeman will undertake this monumental task with the knowledge that the farmer he's seeking to help, though perhaps outwardly pleased with the jingle of extra coins in his jeans and gladdened by the departure of Mr. Freeman's predecessor, Ezra Taft Benson, nevertheless inwardly harbors an abiding sympathy with the free farming concept that Mr. Benson so tenaciously espoused. For, Mr. Freeman spent 6 years as Governor of farm State Minnesota, and he's keenly aware of the farmer's near-religious reverence of the soil's productive capacity and his resentment at being told what to grow and—more to the point—what not to grow.

To call the new scheme ambitious and far-ranging is perhaps an understatement. Under the new Democratic farm philosophy Uncle Sam will attempt to determine as closely as possible the actual human nutritional needs—not only domestic but global as well—and gear production directly to them.

Perhaps the best summary of this theory comes from the man who masterminded it, Willard W. Cochrane, former professor of agricultural economics at the University of Minnesota and now special economics adviser to Mr. Freeman. Says Mr. Cochrane: "By supply control I mean the conscious adjustment of supply to demand commodity by commodity, year after year, to yield prices in the market that have already been determined fair by some responsible agency."

The evil that the Cochrane-Freeman approach seeks to correct is demonstrated by the fact that by next July 1 Government-owned surpluses could mount to as high as 1.5 billion bushels of wheat. (Much of it piled up as a result of previous efforts to control farming.) That's enough wheat to satisfy domestic consumption needs for 2½ years, and the surplus of corn and other commodities equals about a half-year's production. Yet, Mr. Freeman points out, at the same time the Government has no surpluses of such protein foods as meats, oils and fats; thus the Kennedy administration, its storage bins bare, must buy these products in the open market for distribution to needy families, school lunch programs, and for other welfare projects.

THE GLOBAL SITUATION

According to the 43-year-old Agriculture Secretary, a similar situation exists in world markets. Sure the United States has mountains of wheat to dispose of abroad but so do Canada, Australia, and Argentina. Consequently, this country's wheat disposal program can have a disrupting impact on world markets. On the other hand, some items that are needed abroad, such as dry milk solids, are considered noncompetitive and would be ideal for oversea disposal. The problem, says Mr. Freeman, is that these products are not in surplus here.

In short, then, the Kennedy "managed abundance" farm philosophy seeks to cut surpluses that are not needed and create surpluses that will be considered desirable by the planners. Mr. Freeman has taken a few preliminary steps in this direction. He's asked the State Department, the International Cooperation Administration and his own Agriculture Department for a country-by-country breakdown of foreign people's food and fiber needs. He's also talking with heads of nonprofit foreign relief agencies about just what good has been accomplished with U.S. food distributed all over the world, who's benefited, and how to do the job better.

But when the preliminaries are over, the big programs will come. The first outlines probably will appear in President Kennedy's farm message to Congress this week. And before he's through, Mr. Freeman can be expected to produce a host of new schemes to jerk farm production up or down at the pull of Federal puppet strings—for, by his own admission, the Minnesotan is open to any and all ideas.

Nevertheless, Mr. Freeman demands that Federal controls be effective in what they set out to do. Take acreage allotments, for example. The Agriculture boss recognizes that this familiar system of production control has its limitations. For one thing, farmers may thwart Federal goals simply by pushing up yields on their limited acreage. To tighten the Government's grasp, therefore, Mr. Freeman believes commodities should also be controlled in the marketplace. At his confirmation hearing, he told Senators that eventually Government planning will have to include pounds and bushels marketing controls in combination with acreage controls.

Those who talk to Mr. Freeman about the soil bank—Mr. Benson's innovation, unsuccessfully designed to cut production—get another clue to his thinking. Democratic farm policy probably will include some form of soil bank to pay farmers for taking land out of production because most major farm groups favor the scheme. But the Agriculture Secretary has a new twist. As leisure time increases Americans need more parks and recreational areas, he argues. Doesn't it make sense to convert some of the soil bank land into public use? It could always be turned back to crops and pastures in an emergency.

Though the objectives of Mr. Freeman's plans are readily discernible, just how far he will dare go remains uncertain. Some of the ideas being tossed at him almost defy comprehension in their complexity, yet they come from reputable sources. Grapple, if you will, with Mr. Cochrane's proposal to control the production of feed grains—corn, oats, barley, rye, and grain sorghums.

Feed grains pose a special difficulty because many farmers feed most of these grains to their own livestock and sell the balance. The problem is how to measure what is fed to animals. Mr. Cochrane suggests that feed grain nutritional values be converted into something called total digestible nutrients or "TDN's." The Government, with advice from interested groups, would calculate (1) what level of prices would be fair for a given year for all livestock; (2) how many animals of various kinds would have to be marketed to achieve these prices; (3) how many TDN's it would take to produce that many animals; (4) allot TDN's to feed grain producers according to production history of their farms.

A conversion factor for each would convert the TDN allotment to bushels. That is, a bushel of corn would be worth so many TDN's, oats would be worth about half as many, and so on. A farmer then would be allowed to grow whatever feed grains he pleases as long as the total does not exceed his TDN allotment.

RURAL ARITHMETIC

When planting time comes, the farmer converts his TDN's to bushels of grain; the bushels are then converted into acres on the basis of average yields in the area. Finally, the farmer sows. When crops begin showing above the ground, an Agriculture Department agent computes the acreage planted to each grain to one-hundredth of an acre. If the farmer has done his arithmetic correctly, he may do whatever he wishes with the feed grain he harvests—feed it or sell it. If the farmer exceeds his acreage, he must agree to destroy the overage or pay a stiff penalty.

At the end of the marketing year, Government economists would review the nationwide results. If too many animals were marketed, the national TDN allotment would be reduced. In theory, this would make feed scarce causing a price rise that would prompt a cutback in livestock production. If too few animals were marketed, more TDN's would be decreed.

To be sure, there's no suggestion that Mr. Freeman has any intention of quickly adopting the Cochrane feed grain scheme; the temporary 1961 Democratic feed grain program recently sent to Congress proposes a comparatively simple formula: raising price supports for farmers who cut back acreage. But as the Government becomes more deeply involved in farming, there's no telling what new ideas may be tried. The point is, the administration is willing to try almost anything that may work.

How much will the greater Federal involvement cost the taxpayer? Mr. Freeman insists that tighter Government control of farming does not necessarily mean that Agriculture Department spending must rise enormously, whatever has been the result of past control efforts. Though Mr. Freeman probably wouldn't admit as much, the solution this seems to suggest is that through higher farm prices the consumer may become the prime candidate to bear the added cost of boosting farm income.

And, from the farmer's point of view, there's an argument of sorts that shoppers should pay more for food and fiber. It goes something like this: Americans pay far more for processing and marketing services than for the original cost of food; the wheat in a 1-pound loaf of bread costs roughly 3 cents, while bread sells for 20 cents or more. Yet, while farmers continue in a chronically depressed state, Americans in 1960 paid only an average of about 22 percent of their disposable income for food—compared to about 45 percent in Italy, 36 percent in Austria, and even more in other countries. Whatever the validity of such reasoning, it nonetheless is being offered by some close to the new farm planning.

MODERATE PRICE RISES

Mr. Freeman, himself, will argue that moderately higher consumer prices, with the Government keeping supply and demand in balance, are preferable to what he considers the alternatives: A continuation of farm poverty, or a soaring retail price level that would result if, in his view, the Government steps out of farming and allows a tight combine of corporate farmers to assume control. But some critics are already suggesting such price rises under the new Government plan would not be so moderate either.

So, this will be the philosophy Orville Lothrop Freeman will be trying to sell—to Congress, the consumer, and the farmer. In the end, the farmer may prove to be the toughest customer. If the Government does not engineer production, the Agriculture Secretary is convinced the result will be a population of poor and angry farmers. Yet, he knows that as the Government tightens its control, the farmer, though perhaps more prosperous, will resist the yoke.

Perhaps because he realizes the inevitable consequences of this dilemma, Mr. Freeman already has reached one decision: He does not want to become the whipping boy for the plan. Whatever new programs are produced will be carefully attributed to the Kennedy administration; there will be no Freeman plan.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 6, 1961]

FREEMEN AND MR. FREEMAN

We wonder, sometimes, if Secretary of Agriculture Freeman is going to have as much difficulty getting his farm program put into law as he seems to think he will.

The farmers, we are sure, are not going to like that program. For as our Mr. Western notes this morning, it envisions a system of direct controls over what the farmer does with his land that can hardly be matched much this side of the Iron Curtain. There will be no more of those loose acreage controls that farmers, with their skill and ingenuity, can outflank. The farmer will get his orders from Washington on what crops to plant, right down to how many seeds he can put in the ground. And there will be no ifs, ands or buts about it.

We are not sure either that the rest of the country will like this program as its full dimensions become clearer. For coupled with this direct control of the farmer there is a plan for Washington to decide on our nutritional needs; that is, what we ought to eat and what we ought not to eat, and to use these farm controls to see that our tables are set according to the grand designs of Government.

But like it or not, there is an inexorable logic behind Secretary Freeman's thinking. From the premises of long ago the consequences for tomorrow follow with an inevitability that would please any philosopher of Marx's historical imperative.

For consider: The Nation's farmers have already accepted the idea that it is a duty of Government to provide them with a fair share of the national income, the fairness of the share being measured by the Government. They have accepted the idea that to win this they will take their rewards not from the marketplace but from the public treasury, taxes being levied upon all to pay benefits to farmers.

In the beginning, more than a generation ago, many farmers thought they could receive the benefits without any regulation or control upon their production. This hope quickly passed, but the controls enacted at first did not seem too onerous, or at least a rather small price to pay for the rewards.

But as by now everyone has discovered, these controls are inadequate to deal with the consequences. The Government is guaranteeing the farmers higher prices than they would otherwise receive, and the inevitable consequence of this is that every farmer tries to produce as much as he can. And with advances in technology and the application of more capital to farming, yield-per-acre outstrips all efforts of the Government to curtail total production by curtailing acreage.

This has naturally led to all manner of other devices to hold down production while still holding up the farmers' fair share of income, the latest of these being the soil bank program. Inevitably, all these have failed too. And so the farm problem has grown from a little scandal to a big scandal to an impossibility.

An impossibility, that is, so long as the farmers insist upon both eating their cake and having it. So the Nation is approaching the time, inexorably, when the farmers will have to pay the true price of all their handouts from the Government, that price being the loss of their freedom to run their own farms. The Government cannot, and will not, continue indefinitely to pay them artificially high prices and at the same time permit them to produce as much as they want to sell at these prices. It's that simple.

True, the farmers could free themselves from the public trough and so retain their freedom from Government dictation. But it will not be easy for men, so long supported and sheltered by a benevolent State, to walk upright again by themselves.

And unless they can, they may talk all they please about being freemen, but in the end they will come to the kind of serfdom foreshadowed for them by Mr. Freeman.

Civil Defense: Resolution in Behalf of Fallout Shelters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DALE ALFORD
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, one of the resolutions adopted by the National Association of State Civil Defense Directors at their last conference, deals with the importance of providing adequate fallout shelters. Because of the significance of this topic, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The resolution follows:

Whereas shelter is the key to survival in a thermonuclear war: Be it

Resolved, That Federal action, including necessary legislation, be initiated to assure protection from radioactive fallout for all the people of this Nation, and that such action and legislation include the following general provisions:

1. Require that all existing places of residence have by (date to be determined) a place providing a specified minimum fallout protection for all regular occupants; such minimum protection to provide an attenuation factor of 100.

2. Require that new places of residence of all types started after (date to be determined), include the same minimum fallout protection for all regular occupants.

3. Require that existing business, commercial and industrial premises, schools, hospitals and other buildings of a public or semipublic nature, meet the following objectives by (date to be determined).

(a) Available protection should be surveyed and all reasonable measures taken to make available in each instance minimum protection for at least all those occupants who cannot be expected to reach their homes within 1 hour after attack.

(b) If such minimum shelter protection cannot reasonably be provided without undue hardship, the best alternate protection plan that is feasible should be submitted to the local enforcement authority. This authority may approve the plan, prescribe modifications or supplement it with other available protection under its jurisdiction and control.

4. Require that new business, commercial and industrial structures, schools, hospitals and other buildings of a public or semipublic nature after (date to be determined), include a specified minimum shelter protection for all regular occupants who cannot get home in 1 hour.

5. Require that the minimum survival supplies for planned shelter locations be added after the required dates of shelter construction. Survival supplies must be provided by owners who occupy their own residence and by tenants in rented residences. In hotels, clubs, dormitories, and roominghouses, etc., the owner must be responsible. Business and government must be responsible for those employees for whom they provide shelter.

6. Require the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization to make plans for, and to guide the States and local governments in protecting the general public, i.e., transients, shoppers, those in transit, etc., who cannot reach home in 1 hour.

7. Require city, town, and village authorities be primarily responsible for the administration and enforcement of the fallout protection program in a manner comparable to present enforcement of building and fire-protection requirements.

(a) Require the State offices of civil defense be responsible for administering technical standards of protection or variations from prescribed procedures, with local civil defense authorities having the power to authorize local variations within the statewide standards.

(b) All required to provide shelters should have the right to appeal for relief where full compliance would be an undue hardship for financial or other reasons. Appeals procedures should be simple and be handled expeditiously by the local authority. Cities, towns, and villages could arrange a county appeal board, if desired.

(c) Appeals regarding residence shelters and from business regarding shelters for its employees whether for hardship or other rea-

sons, should go to the local city, town, or village department.

8. Supplement, if later experience proves it desirable, present sources of loans to finance shelter construction and equipment by private lending agencies. FHA guaranteed mortgages and home improvement loans with a national fallout protection finance agency. This agency could assist in financing the construction of shelters, particularly in cases where individuals may not be able to obtain credit or in other cases of hardship or unusual circumstances.

9. Encourage early compliance and help relieve the financial burden of the fallout protection program on all citizens by enacting the following tax relief measures:

(a) (1) Exclude the cost of reasonable shelter construction from local assessment for tax purposes; (2) exclude the cost of reasonable shelter construction from any applicable Federal tax based on the cost of real property; (3) the maximum exclusion for either tax computation purposes under 1 and 2 would be (dollar amount to be determined) per planned shelter occupant.

(b) Permit deduction of shelter construction and equipment costs, both residential and nonresidential, from taxable income for Federal income tax purposes, up to a maximum of (dollar amount to be determined) per planned occupant, the deductions to be taken over a period of 5 years.

10. *Be it further resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be furnished to the President of the United States, each Governor, the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, each U.S. Senator, each Member of the House of Representatives, each Congressman-elect and to the President of the U.S. Civil Defense Council.

Kansas Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, on February 28 the Kansas State Legislature adopted House Concurrent Resolution 27, commending the U.S. Navy for the formation of a Kansas centennial company honoring the 100th birthday of the State of Kansas, and further commending the U.S. Navy upon the 50th anniversary of naval aviation. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to thank the Department of the Navy for making this special company available for the centennial year of the State, and under permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, call the attention of my colleagues to the resolution:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 27

(A concurrent resolution commending the U.S. Navy for the formation of a Kansas centennial company honoring the 100th birthday of the State of Kansas and the patriotic young Kansans enlisting in the Kansas centennial company, and further commending the U.S. Navy upon the 50th anniversary of naval aviation)

Whereas this year of our Lord 1961 is the 100th anniversary of the admission of the State of Kansas into the Union; and

Whereas the U.S. Navy has honored the great State of Kansas by forming a special Kansas centennial company of 100 select Kansas youth, to be trained as a unit under a Kansas officer and allowed to bear the flag of the great State of Kansas at all formations and official functions; and

Whereas, 100 young men of Kansas have answered the call to their country's service by enlisting in the U.S. Navy as members of the Kansas centennial company, in keeping with the fine example and high tradition of many Kansans of the past and present who have and are serving with great distinction in the naval forces to the lasting credit of the citizens of this State; and

Whereas the State of Kansas for several decades has been closely associated with naval aviation by having units of the naval air training command located within the borders of this State and having furnished a great number of young men and women for service in said forces; and

Whereas the year 1961 is the golden anniversary of naval aviation, thus warranting recognition for its service not only to the people of this State and Nation but to all peoples of the free world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas (the Senate concurring therein), That the U.S. Navy be commended and the appreciation of the people of the State of Kansas be expressed for the Navy's recognition of the centennial anniversary of this State; be it further

Resolved, That the following members of the Kansas centennial company shall be and are hereby commended upon their voluntary entry into the services of our country in the finest Kansas tradition:

James Dean Adkins, Topeka; J. C. Anderson, Kansas City, Kans.; George Hershel Bettis, Plainville; Gary Lee Bilyeu, Kansas City, Mo.; Richard Louis Bilyeu, Kansas City, Kans.; David Lee Boedeker, Natoma; Ray Carl Breeden, Topeka; Coy Dean Brown, Kansas City, Kans.

Sydney Louis Cain, Wichita; David Franklin Caldwell, Kansas City, Mo.; Stephen Charles Casey, Manhattan; J. J. Cecil, Hutchinson; J. L. Cheever, Hutchinson; Eugene Edward Clark, Jr., Wichita; Charles Lee Chancellor, Kansas City, Mo.; James Samuel Coleman, Haysville; William Clarence Cooper, Kansas City, Kans.; John Stephan Corson, Roeland Park.

Steven Lee Courter, Arkansas City; Donald Myron Cress, Mayetta; Larry Jean Cyre, Manmattan; Wayne Alan Dissmeyer, Bonner Springs; Roger Lynn Dix, Kansas City, Mo.; Richard Dean Dobkins, Topeka; Robert Dale Dobkins, Topeka; Teddy Lynn Edwards, Wichita; Robert Claude Enslow, Kansas City, Mo.

Raymond Eugene Farmer, Shawnee; K. L. Feezor, Hutchinson; John William Filbert, Lansing; Ernest Wilson Fisher, Pittsburgh; A. R. Folkerts, Salina; Donald Deforest George, St. Joseph, Mo.; Rodney Irvin Green, Kansas City, Kans.; Frederick Allen Hall, Sylvia; Ronald Dean Harkness, Hays; Bobbie Eugene Haviland, Thayer; Rodney Roy Hays, Manhattan; Hector Edwin Hernandez, Parsons.

John Robert Hill, Manhattan; Merle Julius Ice, Wichita; Larry Ray Jeffries, Grandview, Mo.; George Vern Jones, Sylvia; L. D. Jones, Kansas City, Mo.; Trostle William Kalebaugh, Raytown, Mo.; Floyd Raymon Kannarr, Humboldt; Larry Joe Karman, Kansas City, Mo.; John Christopher Kramer, Topeka.

Raymond Leven Kramer, Atchison; Wayne Arthur Kratzer, Hutchinson; Ronald Norman Lavielle, St. John; Richard Dwayne Logsdon, Arkansas City; W. G. Long, St. Joseph, Mo.; Clifford Cornelius Lott, Bennington; Henry Patrick Malone, Jr., Kansas City, Mo.; John Robert Martin, Effingham; Larry Dean Massey, Salina.

James Michael McDonnell, Kansas City, Mo.; Johnny Lawrence McMurtrey, Salina; David Lee Milks, Parsons; Ronald Anthony Miller, Coffeyville; Bernham LeRoy Mundy, Ottawa; A. O. Myers, Independence, Mo.; Joe Lewis Newsome, Kansas City, Kans.; Dewight Mac Norton, Holden, Mo.; William Clyde Osborn, Hutchinson; Willis Leslie Piepergerdes, St. Joseph, Mo.

Robert Lee Roy Pond, Hutchinson; Darrel Wayne Pummill, Topeka; George Smith Pursell, Marysville; Francis Ralph Rees, Wichita; James Douglas Reynolds, Bates City, Mo.; Johnie Roy Roberts, Winfield; James Wesley Rupe, Horton; Howard Earl Saxton, Netawaka; Floyd Hayward Shaver, Jr., Kansas City North, Mo.; Donald Max Sheldon, Ness City; S. J. Smith, Kansas City, Mo.

Gerald Walter Soeliner, Kanorado; William Henry Spiker, Jr., Willis; Leonard Lee Steinhardt, Hutchinson; James Lee Steinmetz, Valley Falls; David Ray Stonehouse, Fowler; E. H. Suhler, Hutchinson; John Ernest Swengel, Concordia; Larry Clarence Taylor, Osawatomie; G. E. Thomas, Kansas City, Kans.

Klaus Michael Thomas, Junction City; Patrick Michael Towle, Topeka; Edward Patrick Varnal, Overland Park; Everett Harold Walker, Wichita; George Washington Walton, Wellington; Clifford Lee Wesemann, Harrisonville, Mo.; L. W. Williams, Hutchinson; Jerry Francis Willis, Willis.

David Charles Wilson, Cottonweed Falls; Robert Samuel Wilson, Willis; Gerald Lynn Wisegarver, Topeka; Harvey Lee Wright, Independence, Mo.; Richard Alan Zaman, Overland Park.

Be it further

Resolved, That the State of Kansas extend its hearty best wishes to the U.S. Navy upon the golden anniversary of naval aviation; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to transmit enrolled copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Navy, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air, and the commanding officer, Naval Air Station, Olathe, Kans., and each member of the Kansas congressional delegation. That the clerk of the house of representatives forward a copy of the house journal in which this resolution is set out to each member of the Kansas centennial company.

I hereby certify that the above concurrent resolution originated in the house and was adopted by that body February 28, 1961.

ALLAN L. MITCHELL,
Speaker of the House.
A. E. ANDERSON,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Adopted by the senate February 28, 1961.

HAROLD H. CASE,
President of the Senate.
RALPH E. ZARKER,
Secretary of the Senate.

Our Crumbling Military Position in the Carribean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, as a longtime student of the Caribbean Basin and developments likely to affect the security of this strategic area, I have watched with growing concern the steady deterioration of the position of the United States in it.

Despite the vital importance of having friendly governments and peoples in these regions, long recognized as the

Mediterranean of the Americas, the conduct of our foreign policy in recent years has been a succession of failures, which, to say the least, appear not to have been entirely accidental.

Unfortunately, the editorial and news media in our country, have tragically failed to alert our people as they should have done to the growing dangers, with resulting public apathy.

Thus it was indeed refreshing to read an admirable summary of "Our Crumbling Military Position in the Caribbean," by Harold Lord Varney, distinguished author and editor, who is now president of the Committee on Pan American Policy, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

Because of his clear and vigorous treatment of the subject, I quote the article as part of these remarks and commend it for study by all interested in hemispheric defense, especially cognizant committees of the Congress, executive agencies, editors, and publicists.

The article follows:

OUR CRUMBLING MILITARY POSITION IN THE CARIBBEAN

(By Harold Lord Varney)

The stabbing fact about Latin America is that the strategic Caribbean area is no longer safe for the United States. The whole carefully constructed American Caribbean defense system stands perilously breached. And the irony of the situation is that the United States has only itself to blame for the present plight.

Only a few years ago, the United States seemed invincible in the Caribbean region. The ring of great islands which girdle the approaches to the United States and which shield the Panama Canal were in the hands of governments firmly committed to American policy. Cuba, the Dominican Republic, and Haiti were our unquestioning friends, bound to the United States by many threads of common interest. Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands were integral parts of the United States. Jamaica, still a British crown colony, was our stanch friend.

The South American mainland nations beyond the Caribbean were similarly friendly. Venezuela and Panama were ruled by anti-Communist and pro-American governments. Colombia was politically unsettled but remained in the American orbit. British Guiana was afflicted with a strong Communist minority but its leaders were barred from power by an unyielding London anti-Communist policy.

Central American, while presenting some trouble spots, had been fairly insulated against communism since the expulsion of Arbenz from Guatemala in 1954. Mexico, as always, was benevolently neutral.

The Caribbean of 5 years ago seemed securely locked against Communist penetration.

Hall a decade has witnessed an abrupt and frightening change in this tranquil situation.

Today, the island chain is a soggy marsh of widespread political uncertainty.

Cuba, thanks to the stumbling policies of our State Department, has been allowed to slip into the anti-American hands of the Communist Castro. Khrushchev himself placed the satellite seal upon Cuba by his lionization of Castro at the U.N. General Assembly. The Dominican Republic, which wanted to be our friend and ally, was publicly humiliated at San José in 1960, with the United States in a maudlin attempt to please Venezuela's Betancourt, leading the hue and cry. Haiti, as these words are written, is rocked with Communist-inspired rioting. Jamaica is no longer the fortress of British rule in the Americas: a new retreating British policy in London has shed British responsibility in the West Indies, leaving Jamaica to unpredictable self-rule. Only Puerto Rico remains as the unweakened part of the once impenetrable island shield.

On the mainland, America's position has reversed itself with equal sharpness. British Guiana, after repeatedly refusing to permit the Communist, Cheddi Jagan, to take power, weakly reversed its stand on the orders of London and accepted Jagan as its First Minister. In Venezuela, the pro-American Government of Perez-Jimenez was allowed to fall in 1958 and a jittery State Department placed its support behind the tarnished figure of Romulo Betancourt, the former leader of the Venezuelan Communists, and a lifelong baiter of the United States. Panama, stirred by the Canal Zone issue, has been drifting into an anti-American stance. Colombia, under President Alberto Lleras Camargo, is still anti-Communist but is a wavering ally of the United States in OAS and hemispheric decisions. Central America, while presently peaceful, has growing Communist troublemakers in Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala.

It is a situation loaded with dynamite for the United States. It has flared up with such paralyzing suddenness that few Americans have yet adjusted their minds to our reversed status. And the shame of the situation is that virtually every trouble spot which now faces the United States has been either encouraged or created by the softies in the State Department in Washington or by their opposite numbers in the British Foreign Office in London.

If this nightmarish situation confronted us in another hemisphere—in Europe or Asia or Africa—America's position would be perilous but not necessarily fatal. The significance of what has happened in the Caribbean is that it has happened in our part of the world. The danger is at our own doorstep. The countries which are now careening toward disorder and communism are links in our own inner defense system. Castro's Cuba—the No. 1 danger spot—is only 90 miles from our Florida Keys.

Can the United States exist in safety if the strong points in the Caribbean pass into the hands of Communists and unpredictable Socialists? The answer, of course, is, "No." Our soft southern underbelly would then be under the continuous threat of enemy missile bases, submarine pens, and air staging bases planted in Russia's satellite countries. Our whole Nation would find itself exposed to a sneak attack from the Caribbean which would reenact Pearl Harbor.

The peril is not fanciful. Already, credible news reports tell of the shipment of large quantities of Russian and Czechoslovakian tanks, artillery, and other war material to Cuba. One estimate from informed sources is that $300 million worth of military supplies has been sent by Communist nations to Cuba since the initiation of the Castro regime. Mystery Russian submarines have been sighted in Cuban waters. Hush-hush projects, presumably for missile base construction, have been reported in closed areas of Cuba.

What does all this mean to the United States?

A glance at the Caribbean map plainly indicates why it is imperative for our future that the Caribbean be kept American.

For over half a century, the primary objective of American policy in this area has been to safeguard the approaches to the Panama Canal. The nation which controls Cuba, the Dominican Republic and Haiti, flanked by Central America, holds the key to the canal. Hence the No. 1 Caribbean security policy of the United States has always been to make certain that the governments of these nations are friendly to the United States. The overriding importance of this objective has been so clearly recognized by past American administrations that we have repeatedly intervened with armed strength to supplant governments in the Greater Antilles and in Central America when they became dangerously unfriendly to U.S. interests. A security-minded Washington, in past years, has recognized unquestioningly that the security of the United States must always be paramount over any idealistic consideration of civil liberties or nonintervention in this vital area. Thanks to this attitude the United States for 138 years has kept this hemisphere free from foreign intruders. Interventions, when they were found necessary, have always been dictated by our basic security, not our choice.

Unfortunately our recent policymakers in Washington appear to have lost sight, almost completely, of this fundamental duty. Faced by a Communist challenge in Cuba, in its most poisonous form, the State Department has seen fit to pass the problem on to an indecisive and lukewarm Organization of American States, which, at San José, in August 1960, irresponsibly washed its hands of the whole Cuban problem and refused to condemn Castro by name. Empty, meaningless idealogy has replaced the exercise of firmness and force in our Latin American relations. An effete State Department has preferred to place America's whole future in jeopardy rather than revise the unworkable OAS structure of hemisphere defense. In a historic crisis, we are glued to a dogma.

What are the nature of our defenses in the Caribbean which are now being imperilled by the Communist advance Few Americans have a clear picture in their minds of the strongholds upon which our defense of the Caribbean rests.

No. 1 in our defenses is Guantanamo Bay in Cuba. The ousting of the United States from this position is high on Fidel Castro's unfininshed business, but hitherto he has found no way of doing it. Preferably, he hopes to get this powerful base bloodlessly by some weak gesture of appeasement which a pacifist minded Washington might offer in the future. He has little hope of getting such a gesture from President Kennedy.

Guantanamo Bay is not a new or temporary American position. Its 45 square miles have been an American leasehold since 1902. At that time, the Republic of Cuba wrote into the Cuban Constitution the provision that two naval bases should be leased to the United States, thus accepting the principle that the United States was responsible for the protection of Cuba. In 1934, the leasehold at Guantanamo Bay was reaffirmed by a treaty between Cuba and the United States. It was stipulated that no change could be made in the agreement except with the consent of both parties. In other words, there can be no unilateral repudiation of the Guantanamo lease by Castro's or any future Cuban Government. The only other stipulated situation which could break the agreement would be the abandonment of the base by the United States—an admittedly remote possibility.

Guantanamo Bay is also the site of two vitally important U.S. airstrips—McCalla Field for propeller planes and Leeward Point for jets. This air coverage proved of prime importance in detecting German submarines in World War II. With Castro providing facilities for Russian submarines, such protection is continuously necessary for the United States.

The role of Guantanamo Bay in our hemispheric defenses makes the political climate of Cuba a matter of major concern to the United States. This fact is sharply realized by responsible men in the Pentagon. It is being airily disregarded by many of the irresolute Inter-American strategists in the State Department.

A second link in the outer rim of American defenses in the Caribbean is the U.S. Guided Missile Tracing Station at Sabana de la Mar

in the Dominican Republic. Despite the breaking off of diplomatic relations with the Dominican Republic by the United States, Generalissimo Trujillo has stated publicly that he is willing to renew the Sabana de la Mar lease in 1961, when it expires. The possession of this tracing station gives the United States highly valuable surveillance protection against enemy missiles, in the event of hostilities.

A third defense position is Roosevelt Roads in Puerto Rico. This base, of course, is secure as long as Puerto Rico remains loyal. But without McCalla Field and Leeward Point in Cuba and Sabana de la Mar in the Dominican Republic, the Puerto Rican base can supply us neither complete surveillance against enemy planes and missiles, nor secure protection in an emergency.

The fourth link in our belt of Caribbean defense comes from the bases on the British islands which were leased to us on a 99-year basis by Great Britain in 1941. Here again our present position is full of anguished uncertainties.

Originally, we developed four bases on the British West Indies—in Trinidad, in Jamaica, in Antigua, and in Saint Lucia. After the conclusion of World War II, three of these bases were allowed to fall into disuse. Only one was maintained in full preparedness—Chaguamaras Bay on the island of Trinidad. This is a major naval base, complementing the great base of Guantanamo. It gives us protection for the southern approaches to the canal.

Then the British pulled the rug out from under us. In 1958, the British possessions in the West Indies with the exception of Bermuda and British Guiana were given self-government and their sovereignty transferred to the new West Indies Federation. This immediately put our tenure of Chaguamaras Bay in doubt.

Trinidad is now ruled by a Socialist, anti-American government headed by Dr. Eric Williams. Williams, a strong racist, had made the American presence in Chaguamaras Bay his principal political stock in trade. He demanded loudly that the U.S. Navy get out of Chaguamaras.

Eventually, the issue was decided after a series of talks in London in November 1960. Under the demand of the West Indies Federation, the U.S. lease on Chaguaramus, which ran until 2040, will now expire in 1977. In addition, the United States agreed to relinquish 21,000 acres which were included in the original lease. It was an agreement which showed the United States in a posture of retreat before its reluctant allies.

To salve American feelings, the federation agreed to permit the United States to retain 900 acres of its leased base in the island of Antigua. A missile and space station will be constructed here. Also, the United States will be permitted to modernize the airstrip.

The picture of United States preparedness in the Caribbean is not a reassuring one. As contrasted with our situation of 5 years ago, the present is fraught with uncertainties.

The problems which this weakening of the United States in the Caribbean have raised would not be so urgent if Soviet Russia had not openly indicated its intention to meddle in the Caribbean. Khrushchev has already raised the question of subjecting the Panama Canal to United Nations control. He has threatened to retaliate with Russian rockets if the United States takes armed action against the Castro regime in Cuba. He has powerfully armed Castro with Russian and satellite weapons and has sent Russian technicians to train the Cubans. He has given sweeping economic aid to Cuba.

For the first time since Napoleon III's attempt to install the ill-starred Maximilian in Mexico we are confronted by the problem of European power insolently invading our exclusive area of influence. In the case of Maximilian, the United States unhesitatingly told the French to go, and they went. Today's more irresolute national leadership draws back uncertainly from such a logical ultimatum to Russia. As Communist arms flow unhampered into Cuba, Washington makes no effort to throw an embargo against Cuba imports from Russia. In a life and death situation for America, our rulers are sitting on their hands.

The tragedy is that every year of delay sees us growing progressively weaker in the Caribbean. The trend, if not halted, will inevitably confront us with a crisis. In the shadow of a catastrophe, Washington continues to play blind man's bluff. We waste time in games of make-believe with the OAS, instead of taking resolute unilateral action.

We are approaching 11 o'clock in the Caribbean. The Eisenhower administration failed miserably in its Latin American cold war task. As the new Kennedy administration takes over the reins of power, it has an historic opportunity to reverse our retreat from greatness.

Agrarian Reforms in the Americas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to promote the latent resources of our hemisphere, President Kennedy has pledged to our sister Republics of the south "a new alliance for progress."

One step in the direction of this hemispheric progress is understanding. In this regard I would like to bring to your attention a recent editorial in the respected newspaper of Colombia, South America—El Tiempo—the Times—regarding a speech delivered before the 12th Inter-American Bar Convention by an eminent American lawyer, Mr. David Hume.

Mr. Hume, who presently practices law in Maryland, was born and raised in Eagle Pass, Tex. He graduated from the University of Texas and received his law degree with honors from Southern Methodist University. His father, David Hume, Sr., is one of our Nation's most prominent international lawyers, respected and loved the world over.

Mr. Hume's early exposure to and continued interest in the culture of our Latin friends have given him a most perceptive insight into their problems and feelings. Nowhere is this intense sensitivity and understanding better displayed than in his recent address in Bogotá.

On February 9, Senator GEORGE SMATHERS took the floor of the Senate and in the course of his remarks on Latin America inserted into the RECORD Mr. Hume's brilliant address on the complex problem of agrarian reform, praising it as "one of the finest and most perceptive speeches on this subject I have been privileged to read."

The El Tiempo editorial concurs with Senator SMATHER'S observation describing the address as one of the "most serious and important papers" of the day, "underscoring Mr. Hume's profound knowledge of the problem." The faculty of the Javeriana University in Bogotá were so impressed with the speech which was delivered by Mr. Hume in Spanish, that they are having the address reprinted for use by their students.

I urge all to read Mr. Hume's address since it is likely to be one of the most notable contributions a citizen of our country has made to the betterment of mutual understanding between ourselves and our Latin American neighbors. It is this kind of expert analysis we need for real hemispheric progress.

The above-mentioned editorial follows:

ON THE AGRARIAN REFORM

Mr. David Hume, member of the American delegation at the 12th Inter-American Bar Convention, in his paper presented before committee 15 of the convention, gave a most interesting dissertation on the "Agrarian Reform in the Americas," echoing one of the most serious problems of vital concern to all nations in the hemisphere. Mr. Hume's talk not only underscores his profound knowledge of the problems which face the various countries, but above all a purpose of making a valuable contribution to the science of jurisprudence, theoretic and practical debate which have been advanced in this field.

The most dominant aspect of the remarkable and searching study of Mr. Hume is his research into the historic background of agrarian reform. In this sense, the eminent American jurist reaches the remotest past events and facts, to build upon them a true balance of ideas, projects, movements and campaigns which have taken place over the years on the very concrete problems of landholding and the inherent socioeconomic implications.

On such a solidly documented fundation, Mr. Hume presented likewise a very critical analysis of the statutes drafted on agrarian reform at various times and in different parts of the world. From these he draws fine points of reference, of an inestimable value in appraising most recent attempts in this field. It is necessary here to underline that Mr. Hume analyzes and studies the problem of agrarian reform, basically, as a change in the ownership of the land, organized and directed by the state, to obtain a better distribution of the land, to be followed by additional measures to insure an increased agricultural production. From this one must realize that his conclusions are highly authoritative on the economic progress that an agrarian reform would bring about in the nations which approach it solidly and soundly to suit their own reality.

In the final part of his analysis, the author of this paper refers to the programs which in this regard are currently under development by the United Nations and the Organization of American States, particularly as concerns a study of the social and economic substrata, of the resources for technical and financial assistance which could be relied upon to support a sound and healthy agrarian reform. On the other hand, he lays great stress on the terms of the Bogotá Charter, and the special chapter devoted to the achievement of an effective and sound agrarian reform, as a prerequisite for social progress of our people.

Taken all together and in all its aspects, Mr. David Hume's dissertation on "Agrarian Reform in the Americas" may be given the unreserved and unqualified accolade deserved by one of the most serious and important papers brought to the 12th Inter-American Bar Convention.

Riot Film Not Far Off Base

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, because of the controversy surrounding the film entitled "Operation Abolition," I submit herewith a report by the competent observer, Mr. Harry Farrell, political writer for the San Jose Mercury-News:

RIOT FILM NOT FAR OFF BASE

(By Harry Farrell)

No one will ever reconstruct with any great accuracy the total scene in San Francisco's city hall rotunda last May 13, when a protest against the un-American activities hearings erupted into a full-scale riot.

Too much happened in too short a time, over too wide an area, to make such a reconstruction possible. Witnesses at different vantage points got totally different impressions.

A couple of weeks ago the Santa Clara County Democratic Council issued a report denouncing the widely shown film, "Operation Abolition," concerning the riot, as a flagrant distortion of what occurred.

The CDC committee which prepared the report, headed by Sunnyvale Attorney Joe Lewis, says it took 500 man-hours to compile.

DISTORTION

It is the impression of this writer that the bitter critics of "Operation Abolition" are presenting as distorted a view as the film itself.

My statement is not based on 500 hours of research, but on a much simpler credential: I was there.

I covered the hearings and the riot. I was in the thick of it. I was sprayed with the firehoses, in fact.

And in many respects, "Operation Abolition" reproduces with great authenticity the flavor of what happened at San Francisco City Hall.

BIAS

It is true that the film gives the "committee view" of the events, and that its detractors have pinpointed several substantive errors. Allowing for these errors, "Operation Abolition" still contains much that is valid.

To reject it totally, as propaganda alone, is as senseless as to accept it totally.

Attorney Lewis was also an eyewitness to the events in San Francisco. He was there in the very proper, but certainly not unbiased, role of legal counsel for two of the hostile witnesses before the Un-American Activities Committee.

QUESTION

One of the central questions about the riots is whether the demonstrators were Communist-led dupes or sincere protestors of what they considered a trampling on their rights.

It is always dangerous, of course, to assess the motives of others.

But this much can be said with certainty of the students and others in the city hall rotunda: Whether they were Communist inspired or not, their actions and words were the actions and word of hoodlums.

Their refusal to comply with lawful orders of the police was deliberate and taunting. Perhaps the decision to turn on the firehoses was unwise; perhaps not. Perhaps certain officers were unduly rough. But what are police to do when confronted with outright defiance—surrender?

Veterans' Home Loan Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1961

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs will begin hearings on Tuesday, March 14, 1961, on bills concerning the veterans' home loan program. We will hear from officials of the Administration, building and lending groups, veterans' organizations, representatives of the AFL–CIO, and spokesmen for the industrial, teachers, and public employees retirement funds.

The bills under consideration will be H.R. 4848 and companion bills. The bill provides that veterans' home loan securities will be sold to the public at an interest rate that will attract the vast pension and welfare funds of our country. The securities will be guaranteed by the Treasury and the proceeds of the sale of the securities will be used by the Administrator to make loans to veterans any place in the United States where a veteran cannot obtain a loan from a private lender. The bill will place the entire VA home loan program on a self-sustaining basis and will not require periodical withdrawals from the Treasury. It is true that the bill will place the securities in competition with other Treasury issues but I feel that there is ample room for such competition for I have faith and confidence that the private funds that are not invested in Government bonds will be greatly interested in investing in these veteran home loan securities, not only to help veterans, but to help the economy of our country, plus obtaining a reasonable yield on their investment.

We feel that legislation of this type is necessary because of the difficulties veterans are experiencing in obtaining mortgage financing. The tight-money policy of the previous administration brought the veterans' home loan program to the lowest point in its history. The veterans' housing program has been the Nation's leading residential housing program. During the 15 years it has operated the Veterans' Administration has made 5,600,000 loans at a face value exceeding $50 billion. In addition, it has made 177,000 direct loans in the amount of $1.4 billion.

Despite this large volume of business there has been a great fluctuation in the past 15 years in mortgage financing for veterans' home loans. For most of that time money has not been available to veterans outside the major financial centers and large communities of the country. More than one-third of the eligible veterans reside in the small towns and rural areas. On an average, about 10 percent of these veterans have obtained a home loan. More than 40 percent of the veterans residing in the 125 large communities in America have received a home loan.

There is still a great demand for mortgage financing in the rural areas and small towns and cities of America where money is in short supply. It is the purpose of the committee to find ways to make the veterans' home loan program operate in those areas. We have been operating the direct loan program, which functions in small towns and rural areas, and loaning funds at the rate of $150 million a year. Despite this active program, there are 29,000 veterans on the waiting list today and I am sure that this list would be much larger than it is if it were not well known throughout the country that it takes 6 to 9 months to reach the top of the waiting list.

The direct loan program has been a success and has accrued a surplus, which has been paid into the Treasury, exceeding $65 million. Foreclosure experience in the direct loan program has been very favorable and the record of repayment by veterans in both the direct loan and guaranteed home loan programs exceeds the performance of nonveterans in repayment of conventional mortgages.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-four and nineteen hundred and fifty-five were the best years in the veterans' housing program. There were 300,000 new home starts during each of these years. In 1956 this number dropped to 200,000. In 1957, 1958, and 1959 it dropped to a little over 100,000 starts per year. Nineteen hundred and sixty was the low point of the program. We had only 74,609 starts during that year.

The Veterans' Affairs Committee has maintained an active interest in the veterans' home loan program; nevertheless, there has been a tendency on the part of other committees to seek to make changes in the program. We have asked other committees not to invade our jurisdiction and, on occasion, have been forced to resist these changes on the floor. Another such change is being proposed. H.R. 4931 has been introduced and released with a statement emanating from the Housing Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee. This proposal assumes jurisdiction over the veterans' home loan program by providing a mortatorium on veterans' home loan payments in certain depressed areas. Not only does the bill invade the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Affairs Committee but the proposals of the bill, as they effect veterans' home loan payments, are not necessary.

Section 1820 of title 38, United States Code, sets out in detail the powers of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. Under this authority the Administrator has issued regulations to encourage forbearance and indulgence in cases of default to prevent foreclosure on veterans' homes.

The Veterans' Administration regulations and procedures now in existence to encourage holders of guaranteed mortgages to cooperate in the extension of indulgence in hardship cases has proved satisfactory to date.

The holder may extend the loan, that is, lengthen its maturity, thus reducing monthly payments in order to cure an existing default or to avoid an imminent default. Also the lender may agree to reduced payments, or no payment at all, by the veteran during a temporary period until his income is restored. During

such periods of indulgence the interest continues to accrue and is charged to the guaranteed indebtedness so that the lender runs no risk in the event that the borrower does not recover from his default and foreclosure becomes necessary. Similarly, proper advances for taxes, insurance, ground rents, and necessary repairs or maintenance may also be charged to the guaranteed debt.

Normally these avenues of forebearance and indulgence should be sufficient to encourage lenders to hold off foreclosure action. However, even if the lenders' apprehension over the level of real estate values should become pessimistic to the point where he feels compelled to institute foreclosure proceedings, VA's procedures offer another course of action which would dispel such apprehension.

Thus, under existing regulations and procedures VA may go so far as to specify an amount which will govern in the event of ultimate liquidation of the property, and which will protect the holder against any marked decline in property values which otherwise could result in the holders' sustaining a loss on the unguaranteed part of the loan. For example, if the balance of the debt is $8,000, VA's guaranty liability would be $4,800—assuming a 60-percent guarantee—and the holder would be protected against loss so long as the property value does not decline below $3,200 plus liquidation expenses. The VA could, if the holder insists, specify an amount based on the current property value—perhaps $5,000—which will be the figure used in the event liquidation ultimately becomes necessary.

Also as a final resort in case individual lenders insist on foreclosure, perhaps because they do not believe that the economic dislocation is temporary in nature, the VA under existing regulations may refund the mortgage by paying the holder the amount of the outstanding debt. Under the assumption of a temporary economic difficulty it is not anticipated that there would be many cases where VA would have to buy the loan. As stated, this would be only a final resort and would be avoided if possible since such a method of solution requires additional Federal expenditures.

Insofar as direct loans held by VA are concerned, VA can and does extend forbearance and indulgence to worthy veterans who are in financial difficulties. This includes extending or reamortizing the loan, agreeing to accept reduced payments, or no payments, and making advances, if necessary, for taxes, insurance premiums, ground rents and necessary repairs or maintenance. Where inability to make payments is due to unemployment, VA is very lenient and does everything possible to assist veterans in retaining their homes.

I have requested the chairman of the Housing Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee to delete references to the veterans' housing program from the bill when it is considered by the committee. If the bill should be reported by the committee, retaining the references to the veterans' housing program, I shall be forced to oppose it.

Mr. Speaker, the veterans' housing program has been a great success. It has been one of the major instruments providing housing for the young families of this Nation. It has created a great and wholesome influence on the lives of the people of this Nation. It has provided employment for the Nation's workers and has been of benefit to the Nation's industries, and it is sagging at a time when it should be in full operation.

I believe the method of financing provided in H.R. 4848 will bring money from private investors into the program and will do so without calling directly on the Treasury of the United States. We have contacted many of the managers of these pension funds and they have indicated an interest in this type of investment. We believe this legislation can go through the Congress in a short time and provide additional financing for veterans' homes for this building season and in time to assist the Nation in its economic recovery.

Our Expanding Foreign Markets for Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, all persons interested in building foreign markets for American-grown agricultural products will be interested in the splendid speech delivered by our former beloved colleague, Hon. Clifford R. Hope, of Kansas, at a dinner meeting in Washington on the evening of February 28, 1961.

The title to his speech, "Our Expanding Foreign Markets for Agriculture," was very appropriate and the speech was well received. Those of us who had the honor and privilege of serving in Congress with Cliff Hope will always regard him as one of the grand champions of American agriculture. Never on any occasion during his long service in this House was he prompted by partisan politics in dealing with the problems of farmers. During the time he served as chairman of our Committee on Agriculture, seldom, if ever, was partisan politics permitted to lift its ugly head. Cliff is a statesman in the truest sense of the word, and he is held in high esteem by all who have known him well. I take great pleasure in presenting his recent speech for the RECORD:

OUR EXPANDING FOREIGN MARKETS FOR AGRICULTURE

(A speech by Clifford R. Hope, president, Great Plains Wheat, Inc., at a congressional dinner in Washington, D.C., sponsored by six commodity groups, cooperating with the USDA, February 28, 1961)

The outstanding feature of American agriculture today is its tremendous productivity. Year after year we keep breaking records with monotonous regularity. Our capacity to produce has seemingly outrun our capacity and the world's capacity to consume. The result is surpluses, so-called, and surpluses are supposed to be problems. And problems they are perhaps, from the standpoint of management and their effect upon transactions in the normal channels of trade.

So much has been made of surpluses in recent years that some people in this country, perhaps a lot of them, have the idea that farmers have been guilty of some sort of a crime in becoming efficient and abundant producers.

Let us grant that there are some problems in surplus management. Let us grant that we need to do a better job in surplus disposal. Let us grant that perhaps temporarily we are going to have to put some restrictions on the production and marketing of a few crops where supplies at present seem somewhat overlarge, but heaven save us from the idea that there is something sinful or wrong about our present capacity to produce food and other agricultural products when they are as badly needed as they are in the world today.

I am sure there is no country which does not envy the efficiency and productivity of this Nation in the field of agriculture. Khrushchev may be able to boast of accomplishments in some fields but agriculture is not one of them. About all we've heard from him in that line has been wholesale firings of the people responsible for agricultural production in Russia. And I wonder if the rulers of China, where tens of millions are said to be starving or on the verge of starvation, think that we have agricultural problems in this country.

Agricultural productivity of the kind we have in this country is an asset and a blessing in more than one way. In fighting the cold war it is our most effective weapon. If you doubt this, just contemplate what the situation would be if the places of this country and Russia in the field of agricultural production had been reversed during the last 10 years.

And if our efficiency has resulted in an accumulation of supplies beyond our present power to absorb or distribute, any look at the projections of world population during the years ahead should convince us that we must increase rather than decrease productivity. Today world population is roughly 3 billion. Projections for the future call for 4 billion by 1975 and 6 billion by 2000.

These figures show that agriculture in this country and the world can't stand still if the world's people are to be fed, clothed, and housed.

Whatever measure we adopt to curtail or dispose of present surpluses, they must not be such as to impair the future efficiency and productivity of our farmers.

This productivity and efficiency didn't just happen. It is the direct result of enlightened and progressive policies followed for many years on the part of both government and farmers. Research and education largely on the part of the State and Federal governments in the fields of improved practices, eradication, and control of plant and animal diseases, better varieties of crops and strains of livestock have played a great part. Our system of farm credit, private, cooperative, and government, has made an important contribution. Soil and water conservation have been important. Mechanization and its acceptance by farmers has been a big factor. What we have seen in the last few years is spectacular but it is the natural and to be expected result of 50 years of research and education.

Where we have failed has been in not assigning an equal role during this time to research and education in marketing and distribution. While it would be wrong to say that no consideration has been given this

subject, it is a fact that only during the last few years has serious consideration been given in a systematic way, either in government or trade circles, to developing markets for agricultural commodities.

In 1946, Congress passed the Research and Marketing Act. Previously, in fact back in 1935, legislation was passed providing for marketing agreements and orders. This has been used to a considerable extent in the marketing of milk and fresh fruits and vegetables. Legislation relating to cooperative marketing has been helpful in stimulating marketing efforts. In the main, activities under these acts have related to domestic marketing.

In 1954, the pressure of accumulating stocks of nonperishable agricultural commodities, coupled with the existence of distress and shortages of food and fiber in many of the developing countries, brought about the enactment of a most significant and important piece of agricultural legislation. This was the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954. Although this is generally referred to as Public Law 480, I like to use the full title so that everyone will understand that the basic purpose of the act is to develop markets for agricultural commodities.

This act, as amended and as it has been administered, has been an excellent vehicle for the development of foreign markets for American agricultural products. Among other things, the law provides that foreign currency derived from the sales of surplus agricultural commodities should be used "to help develop new markets for U.S. agricultural commodities on a mutually benefiting basis."

While provision was made for the use of such currencies for other purposes, the act itself and its legislative history including extensions shows that it was the intention of Congress that foreign currencies be used to the maximum extent possible for agricultural development and that first priority be given this use.

During the 6½ years since the passage of Public Law 480, producers and distributors of agricultural products have made increasing use of it. Under its provisions they have worked on a cooperative basis with the competent and experienced people in Foreign Agricultural Service and our fine corps of agricultural attachés in all parts of the world.

These commodity groups are matching the Government's contribution by substantial contributions in money and services. So far they have contributed about $12½ million of their own resources toward foreign market development programs. But this is only a part of the story. Equally and perhaps more important is their contribution of talent and technical skill and know-how.

There are sound reasons for this interest in market development. One reason, as I have already pointed out, is the continued increase in agricultural productivity, an increase beyond our capacity to consume domestically. In the meantime world population has increased so that today there is an actual or potential demand for all our production, great as it is. Some of this demand comes from countries which now lack hard currency sufficient to supply their needs for food and other agricultural commodities.

On the other hand, there are many countries formerly short of dollars which are now enjoying the most prosperous era in their history with ample supplies of gold and dollars. I'm referring now to Western Europe and Japan and scattered countries throughout the world which are particularly blessed with natural resources.

If there was ever a golden opportunity and need for market development, it is now. While world trade is increasing, competition is becoming keener. Economic and political shifts are taking place so fast it is difficult to keep up with them. Who knows, for instance, what effect the organization of the European Common Market is going to have with respect to foreign trade in the countries involved, and other countries in Western Europe.

And now with the crisis which has arisen because of our loss of gold due to the imbalance in international payments, the importance of expanding our agricultural exports has become even greater.

In his recent message to Congress on the balance of payments, President Kennedy was explicit on this point and said: "Our agricultural industry, which is of unparalleled efficiency, must make its full contribution to our payments balance. I am directing the Secretary of Agriculture to report on all feasible and internationally desirable means of expanding our exports of farm products and to emphasize the need for great expansion as a primary objective of our new farm programs."

I am sure that I am speaking for all of the agricultural and industrial groups engaged in this program when I say that we are in thorough accord with the views expressed by the President and want to cooperate to the extent of our ability.

And having further cooperation in mind, it is perhaps appropriate for me to take a little time now to summarize some of the progress which has been made in expanding agricultural exports in recent years, followed by references to specific commodity programs.

On that point, let me call attention to the brochures at each of our places entitled "Building Foreign Markets for U.S. Agriculture." Because this information is available to you in this way, it is possible for me to condense my remarks on this point to some extent.

The period since the passage of Public Law 480 in 1954 has been one of unparalleled progress in the foreign marketing of agricultural products. The marketing year ending June 30, 1960, saw the greatest volume of agricultural exports in our history. The value of these exports, $4.5 billion, was exceeded only by the record $4.7 billion of 1956–57, at a time when prices were higher; 1959–60 was a record year also in that agricultural exports were approximately one-fourth of total exports, the highest in any recent year. In 1959–60 dollar sales exceeded 70 percent of total farm exports, notwithstanding the amounts which moved out under food for peace and other special export programs.

Now, may I refer to some of the specific commodity programs. One of the oldest and most extensive of these is that of Cotton Council International. Cotton has been an export crop from our earliest days. In recent years it has had its problems with extensive production increases in other exporting countries and severe competition from synthetics. But cotton has been fighting back. Cotton Council International is now carrying out in the international field the same type of programs which have been so successful domestically, including advertising, merchandising, sales training, public relations, press service, and educational programs. These activities cover 17 countries.

In these efforts, CCI works closely with foreign industry groups which last year spent $1.5 million of their own money in this connection.

In the 1959–60 marketing year, cotton exports had one of the best years in recent history, doubling those of the previous year. Credit for a substantial part of this increase is given to the promotion program.

Wheat is another crop to which the export market has traditionally been important. Yet until market development activities were undertaken in recent years, both the quantity and quality of our exports were erratic. Three separate organizations, the Millers' National Federation, Great Plains Wheat, Inc., representing Great Plains growers, and Western Wheat Associates in the Pacific Northwest States, have cooperated in extensive foreign programs, including more than 60 countries on 5 continents.

Activities have included, among other things, market surveys, trade fair exhibits, nutrition education and promotion, technical assistance to millers and bakers, participation in school lunch programs, bringing in trade teams from importing countries, and kitichen demonstration buses.

Western Wheat Associates and Great Plains Wheat maintain joint offices for market development in Tokyo, New Delhi, and Karachi. Great Plains Wheat has offices in Rotterdam for Europe; in Lima for South America; and in Washington for the Caribbean area. Wheat exports including flour for the last 3 marketing years are as follows: 1957–58—410 million bushels; 1958–59—440 million bushels; 1959–60—512 million bushels. They are considerably higher so far this year.

Tobacco is a commodity with an export history going back to colonial days. It is still a leading agricultural export. During the past 5 years, U.S. tobacco trade groups have undertaken market development projects in 14 foreign countries. Four principal types of activity have been undertaken: market surveys, advertising of cigarettes which contain U.S. leaf, bringing of officials and personnel of foreign tobacco firms to the United States, and trade fairs.

Major advertising campaigns have been carried out in Japan, France, Thailand, and Burma on behalf of cigarettes containing high percentages of U.S. tobacco. These efforts are meeting with success. Japan is now using 12 million pounds of U.S. leaf annually, compared with 5 million pounds when the advertising project was started 5 years ago.

Large crowds have been attracted to U.S. tobacco and cigarette displays at trade fairs. Trade organizations cooperating in this program are the Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Leaf Tobacco Exporters Association, and Tobacco Associates.

One of the most active groups in foreign market development is the Soybean Council of America, Inc. This organization is now working in 54 countries.

Its principal foreign office is in Rome, with other offices in Madrid, Jerusalem, Bombay, Rotterdam, Cairo, and Hamburg.

Activities of the council have included two international animal nutrition symposiums, livestock feeding seminars, exhibits at trade fairs, overseas study trips for U.S. industry representatives, and bringing foreign teams to the U.S. from Spain, Italy, Japan, and Israel.

Since 1955–56, soybean exports have increased from 67.5 million bushels to 142 million bushels. Oil exports have increased almost 75 percent, and meal, more than 50 percent. Increases in West Germany, Italy, Spain, Israel, and other countries where active market development projects have been carried out, have been even more dramatic.

Another brand new industry as far as export markets are concerned is poultry. When Public Law 480 was enacted, exports of poultry except to Canada, were practically nonexistent. Market development programs had to start from scratch.

In 1956, the Institute of American Poultry Industries, was designated to formulate and carry out foreign market development programs for the industry. Western Europe was selected as the most promising area in which to begin operations.

Almost immediately, it was found that the greatest problem was artificial trade barriers. Considerable progress has been made in overcoming this handicap, but much more remains to be done.

In the meantime, market development programs have been instituted in West Ger-

many, Switzerland, the Netherlands, Italy, and Spain. Techniques similar to those already in use in the United States to increase consumption are being used.

Results have been spectacular. Average annual exports in the 1952–55 period were 17 million pounds; in the 1958–59 marketing year, they were 125 million pounds; in 1959–60, this had increased to 180 million pounds. All of this represents a new dollar market for American feed grain and poultry products.

The most recent major market development activity is that of the newly organized U.S. Feed Grains Council. Its program includes providing foreign buyers with price, supply and grain movement information, including U.S. grades and standards; expanding contracts with trade groups; joint projects for feed grain utilization; demonstrating feeding values of U.S. grains; teaching economics of feed substitution; and exchange visits between foreign and American agricultural leaders.

Its activities are worldwide with much emphasis on Western Europe and Japan, where rapidly rising living standards have increased livestock, dairy, and poultry consumption.

The organizations to which I have just referred are the principal cooperators with Foreign Agricultural Service on market development. But there are some 40 others which directly or indirectly deal with FAS in market development programs. Among these are programs dealing with dairy products, hides, and skins, livestock, rice, and tallow. A complete list of all cooperating organizations will be found in the brochures at your table.

Now may I make a few further observations before concluding.

The cooperators in market development programs for whom I am speaking tonight believe that the way to avoid surpluses and to dispose of those which have accumulated is to assign the same importance to marketing agricultural products as we have heretofore given to producing them.

Our phenomenal increase in agricultural exports, particularly in the case of commodities on which cooperative programs between market development groups and Foreign Agricultural Service are now in effect, proves the value of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954. It expires this year and must be extended if programs are to continue in the field of foreign market development.

We must give attention also to domestic market development, but I think it must be realized that in a country like this where living standards are high and where most people already have enough to eat, that in the case of food products at least, consumption can be expected to increase only as population increases, although shifts may occur between commodities.

Thus, it comes about that increased consumption sufficient to equal our present and prospective production must in the main come from an expansion of world markets where demand and need are almost limitless. Of course, there are limits in the quantity of gold and dollars available.

This is where the special programs provided for in the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, such as sales for foreign currency, barter, and grants, come into play. Such transactions while dependent on the availability of surplus commodities, are to an even greater extent based on the maintenance of peace and the desirability of strengthening free nations throughout the world. Recognition of the importance of this program is shown by the fact that the agency dealing with it operates directly under the president.

My friends, while we have the most productive and efficient agriculture in the world, its strength and well-being can continue only if it has markets for its products. Farmers wil be able to benefit from the greater productivity of their land and their machines only if larger markets can be found for the greater output. In the long run, it is only by expanding markets at home and abroad that farmers can hope to avoid the heavy burden of surpluses and the hardship of restriction in the full use of their agricultural resources.

Rural Community Improvement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, at the 19th annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, a resolution was passed urging early legislative approval of an effective area development program. Under permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to call this timely resolution to the attention of my colleagues:

RESOLUTION BY NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION

Whereas the rural electric systems serve most of the rural areas of this Nation that are identified as areas of underemployment and low incomes, and are heavily engaged in rural development work to improve rural incomes and rural living conditions; and

Whereas many of these areas are burdened with economic and related problems which exceed local means for dealing effectively with them, despite their inherent capability for natural resources and rural industrial development; and

Whereas the decline of population in these areas has resulted in large and still growing numbers of idle services, threatening the ability of many rural electrics to deliver low-cost dependable area coverage service and to repay REA loans; and

Whereas we have great faith in the ability of rural people to create new opportunities for themselves which will revitalize their communities if the tools for doing the task are made available; and

Whereas we believe that this age of international perils makes it imperative that the United States have, among all her citizens, the dynamic strength and economic and social health which underlie her supremacy among nations; and

Whereas the Rural Electrification Administration has established a record of more than 25 years, unmatched by any lending institution, public or private, in administering a loans program to help rural people help themselves; and

Whereas Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, and others have introduced in the Senate, and Representative FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, and others have introduced in the House, bills which provide area redevelopment loans, grants, and technical and retraining assistance for rural as well as urban areas which we deem vital to the success of the rural development work we have underway; and these bills are currently under consideration by the Committees on Banking and Currency of the Senate and of the House of Representatives: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, and the members of the Committees on Banking and Currency for the Senate and for the House of Representatives be advised that we strongly endorse the position that assistance to rural areas, such as is provided by the bills introduced by Senator DOUGLAS and Representative FLOOD and others, is vital to the welfare of low-income rural areas and of the Nation as a whole; and be it further

Resolved, That all of these persons be advised that we urge that primary responsibility for leadership of area redevelopment assistance to rural areas be placed upon the Rural Electrification Administration; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge each cooperative to take steps to make an appropriate survey in its area and make plans to set up the organizing machinery necessary to aid in implementing the rural community improvement program.

Panama Line Must Be Preserved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, one of the pressing problems now before President Kennedy is that of the fate of the Panama Line.

The ships of this line, and its predecessor, the Panama Railroad Steamship Line, both agencies of the U.S. Government, have served the construction, maintenance, and operation of the Panama Canal enterprise throughout the years in the most efficient and indispensable manner. Like the Panama Railroad, also a governmental agency from the beginning of the U.S. canal effort at Panama, these ships have carried the great tonnage of concrete, machinery, and defense materials for the construction, maintenance, and fortification of the Canal; and also the great numbers of employees engaged in the canal work, during this period.

If our Government has been compelled to rely solely on private shipping, no one can say what delays, and what increased expenditures in all of these canal activities, might have been incurred. But having had its own ships as instruments for the accomplishments of the tremendous responsibilities assumed by our Government, the canal was built, fortified, and has since been successfully maintained and operated.

Now, at one fell swoop, and at the perisistent insistence of private shipping interests, already heavily subsidized by our Government, the effort is being made to liquidate the Panama Line, and to dispose of its ships.

The late administration gave an order for such liquidation but, because of the grave protests against such action, the new administration has temporarily suspended the order with the idea of reappraisal of the entire situation.

Like the Panama Railroad, the Panama Line not only forms gravely important services for the canal enterprise, but like the Panama Railroad, it also constitutes a policy of insurance for the better protection, maintenance, and operation of the canal in emergent situations.

Another consideration is the fact that the operation of the Panama Line serves as a corrective agency for the maintenance of equitable transportation rates in the Caribbean area.

Also, it must be kept in mind that the Panama Line serves Haiti as regards the transportation of passengers and frieght—a most important factor in the overall equation—and apparently, no private shipping line will undertake this service, at least in no comparable way. Thus, the termination of the Panama Line service to Haiti, which is altogether adequate, would constitute a powerful factor against the struggling economy of Haiti and have the effect of removing a most stabilizing influence in the affairs of the Caribbean countries now under the most serious communistic infiltration and attack.

We must also remember that the Panama Line has always operated without subsidies and still does so.

In addition to the considerations just indicated for the intention of the Panama Line is the fact that in Panama the proposed extinction of the Panama Line would be a severe blow to the Panamanian economy. This is particularly true of Panamanians who are engaged in the shrimp and banana industries, which have been rapidly growing in volume. The leaders in these businesses believe that their industries would gravely suffer if the Panama Line were discontinued because its ships are especially adapted for handling these products in exports; and they are not satisfied with the assurances of private shipping companies that the latter would meet these Panamanian requirements.

Again, as in the case of Haiti, the economy of Panama should be considered.

In addition, another very strong and most convincing reason against the proposed liquidation of the Panama Line is that the Secretary of the Army and the Panama Canal Company have opposed it. They are the immediate responsible governmental agencies as regards the canal and undoubtedly have spoken from the standpoint of national defense and the successful operation of the canal.

It must be fresh in the minds of all those who have followed Panama Canal history that a similar effort was made in 1955 to liquidate the Panama Railroad. This was only averted through the timely and effective intervention of the Congress. It was my privilege to join with all the vigor I possess to prevent the consummation of an act which would have been so unwise and hazardous for the operation and maintenance of the canal.

Now we have a similar problem facing us in the attempted destruction of the Panama Line; and we need to summon to the task of defeating this instant effort the same forces which united to save the Panama Railroad from extinction.

The labor organizations on the Canal Zone proved effective factors in the struggle to save the Panama Railroad; the Star & Herald, and perhaps other units of the Panama press, joined to aid the cause of such retention and powerful voices in the Congress were lifted in the same behalf.

The effort was successful and the Panama Railroad is still functioning as a most effective agency in and about the operation and maintenance of the canal, and stands ready, as always heretofore, to serve the canal enterprise in every normal and emergency situation that may arise, either in peace or in war.

The interest of any private shipping company should not transcend the interest of the Panama Canal itself nor the permanent obligations which our Government has assumed with respect to the operation of the great waterway. The overall national interest involved should be the prime concern. Our subsidies, coming from the tax money of our people, is intended to offset conditions of difficulty with which American shipping is confronted. The relatively small income received by our Government from the operation of the Panama Line, when compared to the tremendous subsidies that we have paid, and are still paying, to American shipping, is a comparatively insignificant item in the entire shipping pattern. Yet, for the reasons now urged, and for many other reasons which could be added, the Panama Line forms a peculiarly vital and effective service with respect to the Panama Canal and national defense. The situation must be faced realistically and not be influenced by selfish considerations.

If the Panama Line is liquidated, then the Panama Canal enterprise will be at the mercy of private shipping and will be unable to protect itself from the likelihood of increased shipping rates and failure of services in a time of need. Why take so great a chance in a matter of such vital and tremendous importance?

Mr. Speaker, I have studied Panama Canal problems from all significant angles that I can find and can think of none more important than maintaining the morale of our employees in the Canal Zone, which depends so much on the continued efficient operation of the unsubsidized Panama Line.

Bulgarian Liberation Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of a message I sent to the Bulgarian National Front of America in connection with their annual banquet and ball commemorating Bulgarian Liberation Day on March 3. The message reads as follows:

FEBRUARY 27, 1961.

Dr. KALIN KOICHEFF,
Secretary, Bulgarian National Front of America, Grand Central Station, New York, N.Y.

DEAR DR. KOICHEFF: Please extend my greetings and best wishes to all those attending the annual banquet and ball of your organization in commemoration of Bulgarian Liberation Day.

I join with all of you in hope and prayer on this historic day, which began as a day of freedom for your people in Bulgaria, and has since turned into a nightmare of oppression for them.

Since 1944 your ancestral homeland has been suffering under the yoke of communism. The people of Bulgaria are today a silenced people, unable to speak their minds, and unable to live as a free and independent nation. Their indomitable will for freedom, however, has not been crushed and will never be crushed. They are waiting silently and grimly, yet patiently and hopefully, for a better tomorrow, for a brighter future.

This indomitable will, this patience and hope, must be kept alive under all circumstances. To lose courage means to lose all hope for the future. By holding aloft the torch of freedom, Bulgaria becomes another great symbol, together with all other captive and oppressed nations, who are joined in the struggle against mankind's greatest and most ruthless enemy.

The anniversary of your people's liberation day occurs at a time when the United States is embarking on a new era and under a new leadership. Let us hope it will prove to be an era of freedom for all peace-loving nations, including the enslaved nations of Eastern Europe.

Sincerely yours,

VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
Member of Congress.

A Bill Relating to Import Regulations of Lead and Zinc

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BAKER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill relating to import regulations of lead and zinc. This bill, with only two minor changes, is the same one I introduced last year, H.R. 11584. It is largely based on the March 1960 report of the Tariff Commission, made pursuant to Senate Resolution 162, 86th Congress, and adopted unanimously by the other body on August 21, 1959.

Mr. Speaker, on August 17, 1960, the Ways and Means Committee considered H.R. 11584 and reported favorably thereupon with an amendment, and recommended that the bill, as amended, pass the House of Representatives. On June 18 the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. KERR, of the other body, introduced a companion bill; and, subsequent to the passage in the Ways and Means Committee, the Committee on Finance in the other body considered H.R. 11584, and reported favorably thereon and recommended that the bill, as amended, do pass. H.R. 11584 was an amendment to H.R. 5547. The vote relating to adopting an import tax on lead and zinc in the Committee on Finance was 12 to 2.

Because of the rush in the closing days of the 86th Congress, and the anxiety of all to return to their respective States and campaign for the coming election, it was considered that the time

was inadequate to debate the subject of imposing import taxes on lead and zinc. The lead-zinc issue is one which has become increasingly familiar to us over the course of the past 8 years, and only last year the U.S. Tariff Commission, on March 31, released its fourth report on the subject since 1954. I feel it is again my responsibility to propose legislation which will implement the exhaustive findings of this competent agency of the legislative branch of our Government.

It will prove valuable to refresh our memories by outlining the tortuous and frustrating path the domestic lead-zinc industry has been following since 1953 in its attempt to obtain lawful protection from injurious import competition. As we all know, the so-called escape clause provisions of section 7 of the Trade Agreements Act provides that upon establishment of injury or threat of injury to a domestic industry from absolute or relative increases in imports of a like or comparable article, the Tariff Commission shall report its findings to the President along with recommendations for appropriate protective measures.

After the cessation of hostilities in Korea, it became apparent that the domestic lead-zinc industry was qualified for relief under this provision of the law. As a matter of fact, in 1953 the Congress itself recognized this position in the form of a request that the Tariff Commission report to it a finding of fact on this industry's then current condition. Shortly thereafter the industry itself initiated an escape clause request with the Tariff Commission. The two reports were made to the Congress and the President, respectively, in the spring of 1954. The Commission was unanimous in its finding of injury and its report to the President recommended increases in the specific rates of duty on lead and zinc.

As a substitute for these duty increases the administration instituted a lead and zinc acquisition program under the sponsorship of strategic stockpiling and agricultural bartering. As anticipated, these programs had the desired effect of increasing the prices of the two metals, but it later became abundantly clear that the programs also encouraged the development of new production of the two metals far beyond the amount which could be absorbed in the program.

Consequently, for logical fiscal reasons the administration was forced to halt these programs in the spring of 1957. The result was inevitable. Domestic and world prices for lead and zinc declined over 25 percent in 5 short months and by November of the same year, 1957, a second escape-clause request was before the Tariff Commission. Again the finding of injury was unanimous and again higher levels of specific duties were recommended to the President, although at this time it was the opinion of three of the Commissioners that the industry's position was so acute that higher duties should be coupled with a temporary imposition of absolute import quotas.

The recommendations were made to the President in the spring of 1958. For the second time the administration deemed it unwise to implement the recommendations for higher duties, and on October 1, 1958, absolute import quotas on lead and zinc metal and ore were imposed. These quotas remain in effect today. The increased duty levels twice found appropriate and twice recommended by the Tariff Commission to the President remained unimplemented.

For the third time on March 31, last year, the Tariff Commission has found serious injury and for the third time recommended increased duty rates as the only practical solution to the lead-zinc industry's problem.

I emphasize the word only since this most recent report positively rejects quotas as a suitable instrument for the protection of lead-zinc products.

However, I wish to point out to my colleagues that in the two previous cases the Commissioners unanimously recommended increases in duties in varying amounts, but in this last case four of the Commissioners felt that recommendations could be extralegal in their nature and two Commissioners made the duty recommendations. I wish to further emphasize that the Commissioners unanimously reiterated that there was serious injury and rejected the use of quotas.

I quote from the Tariff Commission's report, pages 109–110:

> Import quotas affecting such a large and complex industry as lead and zinc have not proved a satisfactory means of curtailing excessive imports of these metals. The quotas adopted are rigid and inflexible and being incapable of adjusting the changing elements of domestic supplies to the changing and varied needs of industrial consumers, have tended to increase rather than to reduce instability of market prices, and thereby to thwart the best interests both of domestic producers and consumers of lead and zinc. The system of import quotas has been discriminatory in its effects upon various producers, importers, and consumers, and has created unusual difficulties for some while it has brought windfall advantages to others. In zinc smelting, especially, the absolute quota system has tended to eliminate small, though efficient, producers who, with little or no control over domestic ore supplies, are rendered increasingly dependent upon precarious foreign ore supplies. On the one hand, this has tended to reduce nearby markets for ores produced by domestic mines in areas near the location of such smelters. On the one hand, it has tended to concentrate control over domestic ore supplies in the hands of a few powerful integrated corporations, and, with imports strictly limited by quotas, to increase their control over domestic supplies and market prices. Finally, import quotas have seriously interfered with normal trade relations between smelters or importers and their suppliers and between producers or importers and their customers, thereby forcing unusually, unnatural, vexing, and often uneconomic adjustments.
>
> At public hearing before the Tariff Commission in January 1960, all interested parties, domestic and foreign alike, spoke against continuance of import quotas. Even the representatives of the domestic lead and zinc mining industry, which the quotas were designed to protect, made no defense of them and proposed import duties or import taxes in place of quotas.

With this background I feel sure my colleagues will understand and support my decision to introduce legislation which is designed to permit the prompt withdrawal of the quotas as unanimously recommended in this most recent report of the Tariff Commission and to substitute a reasonable tariff at levels not greater than those recommended by the two Commissioners who included specific recommendations in their report.

My bill does just this; for the basic unmanufactured products of lead and zinc ores and metals, except that at certain price levels the rates are reduced. As further recommended in last year's report, it provides the necessary commensurate protection for a limited number of semimanufactured products whose substantial or chief value is lead or zinc and the prices of which usually change with changes in the price of these metals.

The bill provides a tax on lead ores of 1.4 cents per pound on the lead content and on lead metal of 2 cents per pound; a tax on zinc ores on the zinc content of 1.05 cents per pound and on zinc metal of 1.5 cents per pound, with commensurate protection on related products. If the average price of lead is less than 13½ cents for 3 months, or the average price of zinc is less than 12½ cents for 3 months, there is an additional tax of 0.7 cent per pound on the lead content of lead ores, and 0.7 cent per pound on the zinc content of zinc ore, and 1 cent on each of the metals, together with a commensurate increase in the tax on the related products. When the price of lead is 14½ cents or more for a 3-month period, or the price of zinc is 13½ cents or more for a 3-month period, the additional taxes shall be removed.

I wish to emphasize that this bill follows the recommendations previously mentioned and such recommendation in its entirety cannot be implemented at this time under escape clause action within the terms of the Trade Agreements Act.

Two years ago the State of Tennessee became the Nation's largest mine producer of zinc. East Tennessee is responsible for 100 percent of this production.

There are a substantial number of unemployed zinc miners in east Tennessee. Their unemployment is due entirely to the low price of zinc ores and zinc metals, which is directly brought about by the conditions I have hereinbefore described.

I am reliably informed that the quota system imposed by the previous administration has not caused a single lead or zinc mining operation to be put back into production, and there are many lead and zinc mining operations and smelting concerns completely shut down.

Due to extensive prospecting at great expense, it has been proven that there are zinc reserves in the Knoxville and Mascot areas of east Tennessee to last a hundred years of normal production.

Neither lead nor zinc can be produced in the United States on a profitable basis in competition with the substandard wages and working conditions abread. Recent past history has proven conclusively that a healthy lead-zinc industry in the United States is vital to our na-

tional defense and to the well-being of our Nation's economy.

It is high time that we in this country take steps to protect the well-being of our own people.

Enactment of my bill, which would impose a very modest import tax on lead and zinc, will go a long way toward revitalizing the lead-zinc industry and in returning to work thousands of lead and zinc miners and smelter workers.

May I emphasize here that in the case of hard-rock mining, such as lead and zinc, reasonable protection by legislation has a chronological implication of the utmost importance. The risk capital required for exploration and development of new deposits generally will require 5 or even up to 10 years before return on investment can be anticipated. Only legislation will afford a durable solution because of the length of time required to develop new production. This is why tariffs rather than quotas are the appropriate solution. Tariffs permit the market to function and respond to changes in demand. Quotas do not.

Eight years is long enough to ponder this problem. We have the facts and the recommendations of the Tariff Commission and now we should translate them into sound, proper, and constructive legislative action.

Based upon testimony adduced in executive session in the Ways and Means Committee last year when my bill, H.R. 11584, was being considered, in addition to stabilizing the price and production of lead and zinc, this bill would produce revenue to the Federal Treasury of approximately $36 million a year, which, to me at least, is a matter of substantial and material importance.

Fountainhead of the Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include a letter from Maj. Gen. D. W. McGowan, Chief of the National Guard Bureau in Washington, together with an article on the 182d Infantry, Massachusetts Army National Guard, which appeared in the March 1961 issue of the Army Information Digest:

DEPARTMENTS OF THE ARMY
AND THE AIR FORCE,
NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU,
Washington, D.C., March 3, 1961.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives

DEAR MR. LANE: The enclosed copy of the March 1961 issue of the Army Information Digest contains an article (starting on p. 46) on the 182d Infantry, Massachusetts Army National Guard.

This article is one of a series published by the Army Information Digest on units of the components of the Army with historical significance. In addition to being one of the two oldest National Guard units (the other is also a unit of the Massachusetts National Guard), the 182d Infantry has an illustrious history of service.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts may well take pride in this record of service for the common good of the early settlers, the Colony and the State, as well as for the defense of the United States.

We trust this inclosure will be of interest to you.

Sincerely,

D. W. McGOWAN,
Major General,
Chief, National Guard Bureau.

FOUNTAINHEAD OF THE GUARD

(By Tom Monahan)

From colonial train band to Pentomic battle group, the 182d Infantry of the Massachusetts Army National Guard has forged—along with the Massachusetts 101st Engineer Battalion—the longest continuous history of any military unit in the Nation.[1]

The 182d traces its origin to 1636, when a band of loosely disciplined but rugged pioneers joined together under Col. John Haynes, of Boston, to form the North Regiment of militia in the Massachusetts Bay Colony. Because danger of attack from hostile Indians was always present, these men kept themselves in instant readiness, carrying their muskets even to church.

The regiment first saw action with other militia units of the Massachusetts Bay Colony in the Pequot Indian war. In subsequent decades, as the threat of war waxed and waned, regimental discipline was often modified with the spirit of fellowship. But the history of the regiment demonstrates that when patriotism and courage were needed its members unfailingly responded, participating in almost every principal national war or local emergency that came along since that day.

Today the unit has come full circle in its readiness, for once again, like their forebears of three centuries ago, the men of the 1st Battle Group, 182d Infantry, are disciplined and ready to face an enemy who might strike without warning.

The North Regiment was formed on October 7, 1636, from train bands, or groups of trained militia, which had been instituted in the colony 6 years earlier. The regiment's commander, Colonel Haynes, had served as Governor of the Massachusetts Bay Colony and later became the first Governor of the Connecticut Colony.

In 1643, when Massachusetts Bay Colony was organized into counties, the unit was renamed the regiment of Middlesex County, and it is still known in its home communities as the Middlesex Regiment.

During the century, the regiment was twice redesignated, and defended Middlesex County in two more conflicts—King Philip's War (1675–77) to put down the bloody uprising of the Wampanoag Indians, and King William's War (1689–97), one of the European struggles between England and France that had its counterpart in a series of intercolonial wars in North America.

During much of the 1700's the regiment continued as a relatively informal organization, but the growing conflict with England imparted new urgency to local defense. As a result, all the regiments of Massachusetts were required to organize part of their numbers as minutemen, and as such, ready to take the field at a minute's notice. Thus, the predecessors of the 182d were among the first to bear the appellation that is so cherished by the National Guard today.

REVOLUTIONARY WAR RECORD

Immediately before the American Revolution, the minutemen of Middlesex County were among the patriots that made Massachusetts a hotbed of revolutionary sentiment. At this time the 182d had the designation 1st Regiment of Middlesex. When the colonial craftsman Paul Revere rode to every Middlesex village and farm it was to the minutemen of this famous regiment that Revere and his companions were giving the alarm.

One of the regiment's officers, Capt. John Parker, was in command of the company of 70 minutemen that waited on the Lexington Green at sunrise on the morning of April 19, 1776. It was Parker who is reputed to have said: "Stand your ground. Don't fire unless fired upon. But if they mean to have a war, let it begin here."

By the time the British Regulars reached Concord, other members of the regiment had gathered, and a small company went out to meet the Redcoats. It was this action by the rude bridge that arched the flood that Ralph Waldo Emerson hailed as "the shot heard round the world."

At this time, the regimental commander was Thomas Gardner of Cambridge. Therefore, when Gardner led many members of the regiment into the Massachusetts Army for the siege of Boston, this group was designated Gardner's regiment. The remainder of the regiment was thereafter called the 1st Middlesex County Regiment of Militia.

The strategic key to the siege of Boston was the control of Charlestown and Dorchester Peninsulas. So it was that on the night of June 16, 1775, the American patriots fortified Breed's Hill on Charlestown Peninsula. The orders had been to fortify Bunker Hill, a variation which gave birth to the misnomer of the ensuing clash and the anomaly of Bunker Hill Monument being perched atop Breed's Hill.

Gardner's regiment and the other patriots held their fire until they could see the whites of their eyes, and helped to repulse the first two assaults of the Redcoats. Conspicuous among the regimental units was Josiah Harris' Charlestown company, the indomitable defender of the rail fence that marked the patriots' weak left flank.

When the Colonials had to retire for lack of ammunition after the third British assault, and Gardner had been killed in the fierce hand-to-hand fighting, it was the brave Charlestown company under Harris that saved the withdrawal route to the mainland. The Charlestowners' attack was the only American offensive of the day. The regiment was called out several more times during the Revolution and responded to calls for replacements in the regiments of the Continental line.

It was in 1806 that the regiment first became the 5th Regiment, a designation it carries parenthetically today. In the War of 1812, the Charlestown companies of the 5th Regiment were called into Federal service and guarded Chelsea and Charlestown bridges for the safety of the U.S. Navy Yard. The regiment was redesignated the 4th Regiment in 1840, but regained its traditional "5th" in 1855.

CIVIL WAR SERVICE

The 5th was standing by on April 18, 1861—the 86th anniversary of the fighting at Lexington and Concord—when orders came to report for its first of three tours of duty in the Civil War. The initial service was for a 3 months' period, and was not over until the

[1] The 182d Infantry and 101st Engineer Battalion, both Massachusetts National Guard, were organized in 1636 as the North and East Regiments, and for many years before World War I were designated as the 5th and 8th Massachusetts, respectively. The 101st Engineer Battalion also carries the honors of the celebrated Marblehead or Marine Regiment, which manned the boats that carried Washington's army across the Delaware to fight the Battle of Trenton.

regiment had fought bravely at Bull Run. On the way down to Washington, the regiment was paraded amid wild cheering in New York City, and the New York Tribune said the 5th was "as fine a looking body of men as can be found."

The 5th was quartered in the U.S. Treasury Building and drilled on the grounds of the U.S. Capitol in the weeks before the Bull Run combat. On the day of the battle, the 5th crossed the ford at Sudley Church and advanced to a nearby hill under withering rebel fire. Their coolness and order under the terrific fire caused the green militiamen to be mistaken for regulars.

The 5th was one of the few regiments to behave like regulars that day and its withdrawal was in marked contrast to the confusion that generally prevailed. Most of the casualties of the 5th were suffered in some of the bravest action of the battle, when the 5th supported New York's Fire Zouaves in three times routing the Confederates from Ricketts' battery in the give and take of the engagement.[2]

In September of 1862 the 5th volunteered for 9 months' service and was sent by sea to North Carolina where it participated in several engagements, most notable of which resulted from the Goldsboro expedition in December of 1862.

Goldsboro was an important station on the main railroad line between Richmond and the extreme South; and the expedition was aimed at cutting Robert E. Lee's southern communication line while he faced the Army of the Potomac at Fredericksburg. The 5th helped drive the Confederates from Goldsboro, set fire to the railroad bridge, cut telegraph wires, and tear up a mile of track. Then the 5th climaxed the action by driving off a rebel attack as the expedition made its way back to New Bern, N.C.

In its third tour of duty in the Civil War, the 5th volunteered for 100 days service in July 1864. Garrisoned in Baltimore, the regiment supervised the movement of recruits and convalescents and guarded the polls when Marylanders adopted their new constitution.

Following the Civil War, the regiment reverted to its former State organization and was called upon several times for State emergency duty, particularly the Boston fire of 1872. In the Spanish-American War, the regiment served in the United States as the 5th Regiment Massachusetts Infantry, U.S. Volunteers.

IN FEDERAL SERVICE

The 5th responded to calls by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for the Chelsea fire in 1908, a civil disturbance in Lawrence in 1912, and the Salem fire in 1914. But its next call to Federal status did not come until 1916, when the regiment went into training at El Paso, Tex., during the Mexican border service.

The 5th was again mustered into Federal service on July 2, 1917, but a few weeks later about 1,400 officers and men were transferred from the 5th to the newly formed 101st Infantry of the 51st Brigade, of the 26th Division. In February 1918, the 5th was redesignated as the 3d Pioneer Infantry Regiment, and underwent training at Camp Wadsworth, S.C., for duty as corps troops.

[2] A score of men from the 5th were taken prisoner at Bull Run and spent 10 months in Confederate prisons before their exchange. While at first housed in a Richmond tobacco factory, they were under the immediate charge of two Confederate officers, Capt. Henry Wirz and Lt. David H. Todd. The former was later to gain notoriety as the commander of the Andersonville prisoner camp and the latter was Mrs. Lincoln's half-brother.

Arriving overseas in September 1918, the Third Pioneer Infantry was assigned to duty with G–4 and participated in the Meuse-Argonne offensive. As part of the Army of Occupation, the regiment was detailed to the Chief of Ordnance for destroying German ammunition in the Meuse-Argonne area, and later the third served as the railroad police regiment of the AEF. Meanwhile, these men of the former 5th transferred to the 101st Infantry contributed to the distinguished combat record of the 101st.

Following World War I, the unit was returned to State status and reorganized first as the 5th Infantry before being designated in March 1923 as the 182d Infantry. When floods imperiled Massachusetts during March and April 1936, the 182d was called out for emergency duty at Lowell. The regiment was called out again in September 1938, as a hurricane struck New England and caused widespread wind damage and flooding.

PACIFIC ACTION

As the threat of war mounted late in 1940, the 182d again received orders for Federal service. After intensive training, the 182d was separated from the 26th Division and on January 23, 1942, it was sent to the South Pacific with task force 6814, the foundation of the famed Americal Division.

While other Army units had made attacks in order to repulse Japanese invasion forces, the Americal Division began the U.S. Army's first offensive combat in World War II when it was sent to Guadalcanal to reinforce the 1st Marine Division.

Beginning what was to be one of its proudest chapters, the 182d landed on the rugged tropical island on November 7, 1942. The regiment had its first taste of combat even while the ships were being unloaded that day as 30 Japanese fighters and torpedo bombers struck the anchored convoy. Members of Company H used one of their machine guns to bag one of the 26 planes shot down.

A few days later, the 1st and 2d Battalions of the regiment helped establish a bridgehead west of the Matanikau River against heavy Japanese opposition. All battalions of the regiment participated in the later operations that eliminated the stubborn Japanese resistance on Guadalcanal. For this initial and significant campaign, the 182d proudly carries a Presidential Unit Citation (Navy).

The 182d was then stationed on the Fiji Islands until it was sent with the Americal Division to Bougainville late in 1948. The 182d was in the front lines when the Japanese launched their last-ditch counteroffensive in March 1944. It has been said that heroism became routine in the 182d's determined 19-day fight for Hill 260, where the regiment engaged in some of the most bitter fighting of the campaign. It was here that Company E earned a Distinguished Unit Citation for its relentless courage in the face of staggering casualties.

In spite of heavy casualties, the 182d made repeated counterattacks before it shattered Japanese resistance. Until early in December 1944, the 182d maintained almost continuous contact with the enemy as the Americans subdued the remaining Japanese forces on the island.

In January 1945, the 182d landed in the Philippine Islands for the final stages of the Leyte campaign. The 1st Battalion liberated the Island of Samar; the 2d Battalion was assigned to patrol and guard missions in the Capoocan area and the 3d Battalion was responsible for elimination of remaining resistance in the Camotes.

On March 26, 1945, the 182d made an assault landing on Cebu in the southern Philippines and surged forward despite mine fields and suicidal demolition parties. The regiment took Cebu City 2 days later, and met heavy enemy fire throughout much of April 1945 as it took several strategic hills beyond Cebu City.

After helping to mop up the last remains of enemy opposition on Cebu, the 182d began training for the invasion of Japan. The regiment earned a Philippine Presidential Unit Citation for the period covering the Leyte and southern Philippines campaigns. Following the Japanese surrender, the 182d was among the early units to begin the occupation of Japan, going ashore at Yokohama on September 8, 1945.

POSTWAR ORGANIZATION

The 182d returned to the United States late in November 1945 and was reorganized December 5, 1946 as an element of the 182d Regimental Combat Team. The regiment was not called into Federal service during the Korean war, but more than 400 individual members of the regiment volunteered for active duty. Continuing its fine record as a unit of Massachusetts, the regiment came to the aid of the State several times during recent years including service during hurricanes in 1954 and 1956 and forest fires in 1957.

In May 1959, when the 26th Infantry Division was reorganized under the pentomic concept, the 182d became one of the division's five battle groups. Training for the atomic battlefield, the battle group is a far cry from its musket bearing predecessor, and its key position in the Nation's second line of defense fails to compare with its initial role as a community defense against Indians. But as a safeguard for free people, its elemental purpose has not changed in 325 years.

Bulgarian Liberation Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed pleased to join in the observance of Bulgarian Liberation Day. I do this gladly because I have always been interested in the fate of the gallant Bulgarian people, and am very much concerned with their present plight. In this connection the solemn observance of their liberation day is of great significance.

We all know of the valiant attempts of the Bulgarian people, during their long subjugation to the Ottoman sultans, to free themselves. We also know how many of these attempts ended in veritable bloodbaths perpetrated by their ruthless oppressors. And of course we cannot forget their last and greatest fight in the years 1876–78 which brought them their freedom. Yes, the treaty of peace signed on March 3, 1878, between Russia and Turkey assured Bulgaria's freedom, thus paving the way for its complete independence in 1909.

Since Bulgaria's initial liberation, since that joyful March 3 of 1878, fate has not been too kind to the Bulgarian people. Though they regained their freedom and eventually set up a sovereign and independent state, wars have spelled tragedy to them, and the last war has once more robbed them of their freedom. Today these sturdy and dauntless fighters for freedom find them-

selves once more under the rule of alien tyranny in their homeland, a tyranny imposed upon them by Communist totalitarianism, one that is more ruthless than any they had known before. Therein is the tragedy of their fate today. Their life and their destiny is harnessed to the giant Soviet steamroller directed and controlled by the men in the Kremlin. But the Bulgarian people, schooled and trained during most of their modern history in the school of adversity, are not downhearted and are not in despair. They still cling to their love of freedom, and have no doubt of their eventual deliverance from Communist tyranny. I join in the observance of Bulgarian Liberation Day and wish patriotic Bulgarians in Bulgaria more power in their struggle for freedom and democracy.

Government Surplus Sales Hurt Production at This Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1961

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I believe the Congress and the American people are interested in the adverse effect on production of Government surplus sales at this time. My good friend, William E. Clark, president of the Dravo Corp., of Pittsburgh, Pa., a large industrial, shipbuilding, and public works construction company of Pittsburgh, in whom I have much confidence, has sent me a copy of his letter of March 2, 1961, to Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara. I hope Congress will join with me in urging Secretary of Defense McNamara to stop surplus sales at the present time, as they are having an adverse effect on national production and the economy.

The letter follows:

DRAVO CORP.,
Pittsubrgh, Pa., March 2, 1961.

Hon. ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense,
The Pentagon, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Recently the Government through its consolidated surplus sales office, specifically the Atlanta (Ga.) General Depot under the direction of Cameron Station (address: Duke Street, Alexandria, Va.), Department of the Army, sold standby items under the designation of sale No. 61–22 January 24, 1961, specifically items 78, 79, and 80, all being harbor tugs. At the same time the Government offered for sale items 73 through 76, being 149-foot light tugs, ocean-going; these were, however, later withdrawn from sale when another Federal requirement for them developed.

Respectfully, we protest this sale and similar future sales as not being in the best interest of the shipbuilding industry or the national economy in this period of business recession. For some time now the shipbuilding industry has been distressed. The sale of surplus boats by the Government can only serve to depress it further and cause layoffs of employees.

A few years ago Dravo Corp. spent over a half million dollars to develop a revolutionary-type tugboat and upon conclusion of its successful test runs decided to build several of these vessels. We have been negotiating for the sale of these tugs, but already because of the Government action a slowdown has occurred, leading us to believe the prospective purchasers are contemplating either buying from a broker, or waiting for further sale by the Government of bargain tugs.

We are also manufacturers of heavy duty cranes. It is rumored the Government plans to dump its surplus cranes on the market. To a company like Dravo, employing over 4,000 people, this again means loss of production and jobs.

It is our earnest belief that in this period when President Kennedy is doing everything possible to stimulate the economy it is unfortunate, if not indeed inconsistent, for the Government to place surplus goods on the market, thus hampering the efforts of concerns like ours to keep our heads above water in a tight competitive market.

Sincerely yours,

W. E. CLARK,
President.

Education Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I bring to my colleagues' attention the second and final installment of a two-part comment on the education situation by Dr. Eugene Myers, of Iola, Kans. Dr. Myers' comments have appeared as guest editorials in the Iola Register, Iola, Kans.:

EDUCATION PROBLEMS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Following is the second half of a commentray on educational problems by Dr. Eugene Myers, former chairman of the Allen County School Survey Committee. The first half, dealing with primary and secondary schools, appeared here yesterday.)

DEAR MR. SCOTT: 7. Now to elevate our sights to the field of higher education to see if there is any waste or continuation of primitive fantasies, the elimination of which might allow the poor taxpayer to rest easier on his couch.

Dr. Keller's report on the higher education survey concluded with three major recommendations.

(a) An immediate need of an additional 477,000 square feet of classroom facilities.

(b) An immediate increase of 20 percent in faculty salaries in order to retain our faculty.

(c) An increased enrollment of 25 percent in the next 5 years.

There was offered no plan for accomplishing the tasks which needed to be done, except by the same method that the Federal Government intends to do it—increase taxes.

However, Dr. Kirk, president of Columbia University, has reported a plan that might be worthy of consideration and which seems on superficial examination to be a solution to part of the immediate problem. Dr. Kirk suggest the universities and colleges convert to a trimster system, thus:

(a) Allowing the student to obtain a 4-year course in 3 years.

(b) A 25-percent increase in enrollment could thus be housed in present classrooms—continuing of course the replacement of obsolete facilities.

(c) The $6 million plus which we are now planning to use for expansion would be unnecessary.

(d) By extending the school from 36 to 42 or 45 weeks, faculty salaries would of necessity be increased, but the additional fees of the extra trimester would certainly aid in making such funds available (60,000 students times $100 per student equals $6 million).

8. Another aid to the taxpayer, student and parents of students, which has been achieved by some States, is being studied by others and which seems worthy of close scrutiny in Kansas is the organization of a statewide system under control of the State board of regents. They should be situated in such areas that the majority of the students would be able to live at home, have a minimum enrollment of 350, utilize existing private college facilities, where those colleges will accept some degree of State control during the first 2 years, and maintain a vocational school.

Such facilities would:

(a) Decrease the enrollment at the 4-year State schools, with a corresponding decrease in the expansion of those schools.

(b) Encourage more high school graduates to continue in school for 1 or 2 additional years, learning a skill which they can use to enjoy life more fully and to contribute their share of the taxes which the new frontier is going to allow us to contribute.

(c) Provide additional incentives for industry to move into Kansas.

(d) Decrease the cost of college education. (The prediction has been made that by 1970, the annual cost of a college year will be $3,400, or double the amount in 1960).

(e) Allow small private and denominational colleges to upgrade their faculty and curriculum.

One example of the junior college with a vocational school is the Coffeyville Junior College, where 65 percent of the high school graduates attend the college, although only 20 percent of the JC graduates continue to a 4 year college.

The above are only some of the sins of omission and commission which may be responsible for the Federal Government stepping into the void which we have created through apathy and the American version of ancestral worship. Federal aid, however, is not the messiah that will wash the educational system white as snow, for the crown of glory, which the proponents of Federal aid would keep glittering before us is that the Federal Government would have no control over the schools which are to be the recipients of the Federal blessing.

There is no assurance that additional money will alone improve the quality of education. When over 50 percent of the high schools of the State have fewer than 75 pupils enrolled and 267 high schools are rated by the State below a class "A" rating, it is doubtful that Federal funds distributed on a per capita enrollment basis will elevate the scholastic standards to any measureable degree.

Federal aid—if we must have it—however, could be a tremendous incentive to raise the standards of our schools. By limiting funds to those schools which maintain a certain standard of excellence, as defined by a qualified council of authorities in the field, a great improvement could be obtained; it is also possible that by doing this many school districts would find that Federal aid was unnecessary.

For some reason, which is not completely clear, the idea of any degree of regulation of Federal funds for education, sends chills through the entire body of educators as well as a good percentage of all American citizens. I know of no other area where Federal funds are dispensed on a loyal or State basis without some rules as to the method of distribution. We accept the idea of FHA loans, Hill-Burton funds, social welfare money, social security, highway funds and even a portion of the salaries of vocational agriculture and vocational home economics teachers, without having a bureaucrat peering at us at all times. In fact the papers took considerable space for several days recently to expose the contractor who failed to build a highway according to Federal regulations. If money for highways should be regulated why should not funds for education?

Yours truly,

EUGENE MYERS, M.D.

Back-Door Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1961

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, in support of the passage of Congressman HOWARD SMITH of Virginia's resolution, House Resolution 125, and my similar resolution, House Resolution 186, I am asking to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the editorial of the Pittsburgh Press for Sunday, February 26, 1961, entitled "Back-Door Spending."

The editorial follows:

BACK-DOOR SPENDING

In its first action, the newly packed House Rules Committee has smitten the taxpayer with a grievous action. It has voted 8 to 6 to bottle up a resolution which would have barred back-door raids on the U.S. Treasury.

For years, Congress has been permitting this "back-door" spending. It does this by authorizing Government agencies to "borrow" from the Treasury, instead of making specific appropriations for these agencies.

This "back-door" spending isn't counted in the budget. But it is spending all the same. And it is one of the reasons the national debt continues to pile up, all out of hand.

It is like giving a blank check to a profligate offspring. There are few, if any, limits on how much will be spent. And no control by Congress.

This is in direct violation of the Constitution, which plainly says:

"No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law."

In the House, a "committee against back-door spending" had been organized and 130 of the 437 Members had signed up. This group was back of the resolution eight members of the Rules Committee now have killed. Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Virginia Democrat, has a similar resolution in the Senate, and we hope the Senate Finance Committee will not treat it so recklessly.

The aim of these resolutions, as explained by Representative THOMAS M. PELLY, Washington Republican, one of the sponsors, is to "combat inflation, create confidence at home and abroad in our dollar, and give assurance to the taxpayers that their elected representatives can control the spending of their money."

As it is back-door spending enlarges the debt and stimulates inflation.

The elected representatives do not control Government spending, or even know the why and wherefore of it.

All this tends to diminish confidence in the dollar for the simple reason that unsound spending practices by the Government make people, at home and abroad, uncertain about the future value of the dollar.

As Senator BYRD says, the need for orderly and intelligent control of Government spending is "obvious." Nothing is more obvious.

G.E.'s Role in Nation's Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a report on General Electric's contribution to the jet engine business, as outlined to me by R. L. Miles, manager, relations and utilities operation of the small aircraft engine department, General Electric Co., in West Lynn, Mass.:

Congressman THOMAS J. LANE,
House Office Building
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANE: This year of 1961 marks the 20th anniversary of the jet engine business which began right here in Lynn in 1941. We here at the small aircraft engine department, of course, are proud of the role our engines have played in the Nation's security.

I thought you might be interested in an occasional note about the kind of progress we're making here with our engines and with our employment. The small aircraft engine department, as you may remember designs, develops, and manufactures small aircraft gas turbines for military and commercial aircraft.

Some notes of interest:

We shipped 138 engines in 1959, 339 in 1960, and built up to a rate that will permit us to ship 1,000 engines in 1961.

We started 1960 with 4,300 employees, added 600, and finished the year with 4,900. (Figure includes 550 employees at our Rutland and Ludlow, Vt., plants.) In 1961 we anticipate increasing by another 300 bringing the employment total to 5,200.

The 3-week strike in October was a setback not only to individuals but to the department. We were, and still are, concerned about the complicated Massachusetts law which makes it virtually impossible to obtain injunction relief prohibiting violence and misconduct on the picket line.

Our department has demonstrated its confidence in this business by continuing to invest considerable sums of money in development work and additional facilities here in Lynn.

In 1961 we are involved not only with a busy production schedule, but a vigorous worldwide marketing effort. We'll keep you informed on our progress.

Both Gerhard Neumann, our general manager, and myself extend to you best wishes for an outstanding congressional year.

Sincerely yours,

R. L. MILES,
Manager, Relations and Utilities Operation.

International Voluntary Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I want to include an article entitled "So You Want To Be a Volunteer," prepared by my good friend, Dr. Daniel Russell, a field program officer for International Voluntary Services, Inc.

Dr. Russell is a professor in rural sociology at the A. & M. College of Texas and was a former instructor of mine when I attended his course. Dr. Russell has always manifested a sincere interest in world affairs and has contributed much of his own money and time in an honest endeavor to bring about friendly relations with foreign countries. He has actively been engaged in CROP—Christian Rural Overseas Program—and other movements of this nature. He is a good Texan, a wonderful American, and I believe that his article will be of interest to a number of Members of this body:

SO YOU WANT TO BE A VOLUNTEER

(By Daniel Russell)

Just before you drop your application in the mail you should pause long enough to answer the question, "Why do I want to be an IVS volunteer?"

Do you want to sign up so that you can travel abroad, visit and live in "enchanted lands" you have read about so that you may know and understand "strange" people in distant places? Such an objective would be valuable for your country because the United States, the greatest of the free world powers, needs many of its people to know better the people and their problems in foreign lands. It would hardly be worth the sacrifice to you, however, to take 2 years out of your life just for this purpose.

You may want to be a missionary to these people. If so you may be sadly disappointed because absolutely no preaching or proselytizing is allowed. You will be sent back home at once if you start it. You will be working under a contract between your Government and the host government where you will live. You are a U.S. Government employee under contract as well as an IVS volunteer. The Founding Fathers of our country made it clear and plan that church

and state must be forever separate. You are in name and in fact a social and economic missionary to raise the level of living of the people with whom you work and bring them a better way of life. Christ, you remember, spent more of His time on this earth improving this area of peoples' lives than He did in preaching. Also the way you live among these people every day in the true Christian spirit may preach a greater sermon than all the words you could utter. This will be excellent training for you if you want to serve your church later as a missionary.

Do you want to be a volunteer so that you can render great service to needy mankind? This you certainly can do, but this, as worthy as it is, is hardly enough. Just a "do good" attitude will hardly be enough to sell your idealism overseas. The people with whom you live will not follow you if you have a condescending or superior attitude because they want to think of you as an equal, as a friend, and a neighbor. People in these countries have a civilization that is thousands of years old, while American civilization is a babe in the wilderness. You will learn more from them than you will teach them. Put yourself in the attitude of the student. Then the people will accept you, adopt and use gradually your great American know-how and give to you graces and arts of living that will mean much to you.

Infact, should you not want to be a volunteer because you will have a chance to infinitely broaden your horizon, mellow and enrich your personality, test your strength of character, temper and harden the weak spots of your lives, make you tolerant and understanding of other people, teach you lessons of self reliance and independence, test your life's training and skills, teach you to adjust to difficult and quite different situations? In other words are you not getting your final testing for the great life's task that lays out before you? Some of us who have had rich foreign service late in life can see how much better it would be for us if we had gotten this experience earlier in life, as you have a chance to do.

You should because of this experience have an infinitely richer life as a foreign service worker, teacher, research person, missionary for your church, writer, artist, extension worker, business man or what-not. If this is your aim come on aboard. If you expect it to be easy don't apply. The going will be rough some time, but never so rough to cause your fine spirit to despair. You will be living out away from the population centers with conveniences often comparable to what your pioneer American forebearers had, but if you are not afraid of such inconveniences the experience will be mountain top for you. You then will have a chance at world travel, to render service to your fellow man, to be a real missionary of the kind described, and broaden yourself for your future life's work no matter what field you chance to follow.

You as American youth are ambitious and eager beavers who want to get at the job and get it done at once. Put some brakes on this part of your personality for a while. Many adult foreign service personnel are told to wait 6 months before they start a program. You should not have to wait this long. However, spend the first 2 or 3 months studying the language intensively (help will be given here), meeting the people, analyzing the situation and preparing yourself for the work ahead. If you can team with a volunteer of several months' experience it will help a lot.

Because you are living in an undeveloped area, don't get the idea you can go back to nature, with abbreviated, dirty, slovenly dress, unshaven beards or other ill manners. Dress, shave, act like you do on the farm in rural America. These people are seeing America through you. What kind of America are you letting them see? You are not an individualist, but a member of a team. Only by team spirit, loyalty, and cooperation can success be obtained. You have an adult leader. You follow him as you do your adult leaders back home, your parents, your county agent, or teacher. If he tells you to wash your hands and put on a shirt before coming to the dinner table, or suggests that you ought to get a shave or haircut, he does it for your own good.

In America a favorite pastime is criticizing the Government and public officials. Don't expect the same prerogative overseas. You are a guest under contract with the local government. If you cannot say something complimentary, be quiet. Certainly you will learn of graft, but remember that is back home, too. Remember you do not like to hear or read about foreign people criticizing our Government. The shoe is on the other foot now. Sometimes native people will try to get you to express yourself unfavorably about the local government and local government officials so that they can go tell their officials what Americans think of them. Because of snares and traps, be careful.

In America we rightly honor our youth and give them high positions of responsibility. In the Orient and most of the rest of the world, they revere and show deference only to the elder. Elders are approached by youth with diplomacy, deference, and humility. Don't ever criticize, correct, and show an elder person to disadvantage. Oriental people love their children dearly. Often an elder can be won through his children by praise, flattery, and special attention. However, do not ever do anything for or with the children without the approval of the elders. Subtly and indirectly valuable lessons can be taught and demonstrations given.

There are diverse social forces in foreign as in American communities, only more so. These forces must be understood, won over, or at least neutralized for you to have success. These forces may be Buddhist bonzes, Moslem sultans, Catholic priests, Protestant missionaries, army commandants, police chiefs, provincial governors, medicine men, Animists, schoolteachers, village council chiefs, businessmen, opium merchants, or a combination of all these and more. Most of you likely will be Protestant, although a volunteer can be one of any faith or possibly no faith at all. Be friendly and cooperative but be careful not to show partiality to the Protestant missionaries. The first job you may be asked to do is to help the bonze repair the Buddhist temple. If you can do it, pitch in with all your might and help. Many friends and supporters may be gained. If there is a church of your choice in the village, attend as regularly as you can. They will expect that of you, but be friendly and cooperative to all.

Now you see why you had better not rush into your job as anxious and ambitious as you are. Take plenty of time to analyze the situation carefully before you set forth. Yes, you will come to know some announced Communists. Don't cooperate, but live around him and all others so as to make a blank wall out of his propaganda of what Americans are like. Thus, you will heap a ton of coals on his head and neutralize his influence where he works.

You are a volunteer so your pay is $60 a month so you will never accept the place for financial reason. All of your travel, maintenance (room, board, and laundry), and clothes are furnished to you. If you do not drink alcoholic beverages or smoke heavily, or have to be entertained often by commercialized amusements, the $60 is quite adequate and some to spare. It is a wonderful opportunity to learn, make a contribution, and live ruggedly for 2 years. Why not come aboard? Be a volunteer.

President's Endorsement of "Soapy" Hard To Swallow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, we are all acutely aware of the unrest, confusion, intrigue, and tension that makes the continent of Africa the tinderbox of the world; and we are all equally aware of the furor that our new Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs has fanned with nearly every breath he takes on his current tour. I realize that many are genuinely alarmed about the effect this visit may have upon our world position and I thought that my colleagues might be interested in a Michigan view of its ex-Governor's African diplomacy.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD an editorial from the Flint (Mich.) Journal, dated March 2, 1961, and entitled, "President's Endorsement of 'Soapy' Hard To Swallow." Certainly if we are to be concerned with our prestige in that troubled and crucial area, already none too good, we must make every effort to insure that our position is not further jeopardized.

The editorial follows:

IN OUR OPINION: PRESIDENT'S ENDORSEMENT OF "SOAPY" HARD TO SWALLOW

In view of the diplomatic storm which the ill-conceived statements by G. Mennen Williams blew up in Africa and Great Britain, it is difficult to swallow President Kennedy's vote of confidence for our former Governor.

The President reminded those in attendance at his Wednesday press conference that "the problems of Africa are not easy." As Sherlock Holmes was wont to say "that, my dear fellow, is elementary." Most of us are well aware of the seriousness of the African situation.

Mr. Kennedy also pointed out that "there are a good many conflicting forces that are loose in Africa as well as in all parts of the world."

If anything, this might be described as a classic understatement. The African fuse is burning dangerously short. At the moment, that is the trouble spot of all trouble spots on the cold war front.

Because the African situation is so precarious is precisely why Williams' statements were so inflammatory. As we always have contended, such a delicate international situation should be entrusted to a skilled, highly trained statesman. Our representative to Africa should not be an amateur diplomat being rewarded for his political influence in this own backyard.

Mr. Kennedy said he did not consider Williams' statement about "Africa for the Africans" to be very unreasonable.

It was not only unreasonable, but unnecessary and thoughtless. "Soapy" tried to repair the damage by later explaining that he was talking about all people who felt that they were Africans, whatever their color or race might be. However, if he had studied or read anything about Africa he would have realized that in Africa the term "African" generally refers to the original inhabitants of the continent, and that the very statement he used was the slogan of militant African nationalists.

As Michigan's ex-Governor he could express any opinion he might have about Africa, or any other part of the world. Few outside this State would have given two hoots what he thought about the situation. But as the representative of the United States on a special mission to Africa, his apparene off-the-top-of-his-head remarks was accepted as our country's official attitude.

Mr. Kennedy's statement that he is "wholly satisfied" with "Soapy's" conduct in Africa not only must be interpreted as an endorsement of making political plums out of such strategical important assignments, but could also indicate a determination to follow a go-it-ourselves policy in Africa.

That Williams should have put our President in a position where he was forced to take a stand in opposition to one of our Western allies is only a further indication that he is out of his element as a foreign diplomat.

The African situation is complicated enough without needlessly creating new friction. The mission of our representatives in any country, and especially in Africa, is not only to improve relations and instill confidence among neutrals and antagonists, but to maintain and strengthen ties with our allies.

To accomplish this it is as necessary to know, among other things, when to keep your mouth shut and be a good listener as it is to know when to speak out. This, as the people of Michigan long ago discovered, is not Williams' cup of tea. We hope it will not be too expensive a lesson for the President to learn.

Boston College Students Support Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1961

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in the RECORD the text of a petition which was sent to me by Miss Kathleen Lorden, secretary of the World Relations League of Boston College. Over 600 students at that college signed this petition. The petition follows:

The undersigned students of Boston College, recognizing the need for trained workers in the underdeveloped countries of the world, firmly believing that there is an untapped reservoir of American young people anxious to provide this assistance; strongly recommend the following provisions be included in a Peace Corps bill:

The U.S. Government shall form a corps of educators, professionals, and trades people in an independent agency under the International Cooperation Administration.

This corps shall be a voluntary program. Its members shall be a maximum of 5,000 in number.

This corps shall have a minimum service time of 3 years. Service in the corps shall be accepted in lieu of active military service.

Persons in the corps shall be at least 21 years of age. They shall be qualified to give constructive aid in underdeveloped countries. They shall have a sincere desire to help the people of underdeveloped countries help themselves.

Persons entering the corps shall participate in an intensive 4- to 6-month program studying the language and customs of the country in which they will serve. They will then serve a 6-month period for advanced training under supervision in the country to which they are assigned.

Salaries paid to members of the corps shall be equal to those paid to personnel of the Armed Forces.

Resolutions Adopted by Textile Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include resolutions adopted by the executive council of the Textile Workers Union of America at its recent meeting.

RESOLUTION ON UNEMPLOYMENT

The problem of unemployment has mushroomed into the No. 1 domestic issue facing the American people. In January 1961, unemployment jumped to a high of 5,385,000, or 6.6 percent of the labor force, on a seasonally adjusted basis. Forecasts are for an even higher rise in unemployment in the immediate future.

This Nation cannot tolerate the continuance of such a high rate of unemployment. As President Kennedy stated in his message to Congress on economic recovery and growth, "The Nation cannot—and will not—be satisfied with economic decline and slack. The United States cannot afford, in this time of national need and world crisis, to dissipate its opportunities for economic growth."

Employment in the textile industry has been severely hit by technological advances which have cut into jobs at an annual rate of 5 percent. Over the last 10 years, more than 400,000 production workers have lost their jobs, although the industry produces the same volume of cloth as it did then. Some 700 mills employing approximately 220,000 workers were completely closed down. Others were squeezed out by the reduced need for their products.

Large-scale textile unemployment has created depressed communities in the States along the Atlantic seaboard, running from New England to the South. Tens of thousands of former textile workers seek employment, but have been unable to find it in their own communities, and their search in other communities remains unrewarded.

A program of immediate relief to these workers must be matched with a plan for long-term revitalization of the total American economy and the textile industry: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the executive council of the Textile Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO, CLC, urges the President and Congress to adopt an adequate, immediate program of relief and aid to the unemployed to maintain and rehabilitate their competencies, well-being and morale and fit them for new jobs. Such a program should include:

1. The promotion of economic growth to assure full employment.

2. Provision for a 35-hour week with no reduction in pay.

3. The organization of a National Development Council to initiate a crash program for innovating new products and services.

RESOLUTION ON NLRB INVESTIGATION AND AMENDMENTS TO TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

In many parts of our country today, an unorganized worker must be cast in almost a heroic mold to carry out his desire to join a union. Despite the theoretical protection expressed in the language of the Taft-Hartley law, many prounion workers are virtually helpless before the intense and unlawful pressure anti-union employers exert upon them.

A wide variety of threats, as well as discharges and even plant shutdowns, are typical of the methods employers are using because the National Labor Relations Board and the Taft-Hartley Act are not performing the functions Congress intended them to. As the Textile Workers Union of America has pointed out in the past, the National Labor Relations Board has failed to meet its responsibility to protect workers in their right to organize.

Part of this failure is due to laxity. The Board moves with incredible slowness and its most serious dereliction is evidence in discharge cases involving lowly paid unorganized workers who cannot afford to be out of work for weeks, let alone years.

Another part of this failure is due to antilabor bias. The Board often grants the employer immediate relief by seeking injunctions against unfair practices by unions; it does not seek comparable action against employers when the situation is reversed. In fact, the Board has stretched and twisted many Taft-Hartley provisions to the utmost in order to avoid protecting workers in organizing situations.

Still another part of this failure is massive incompetence and indifference. The pertinent provisions of Taft-Hartley which are designed to protect workers have been in effect for more than 20 years and are derived from the original Wagner Act. Their principles are well known. Yet, through subtleties and trickery, antiunion employers can single out and fire prounion workers. Only vigorous and imaginative investigations can detect such violations; instead, we get routine National Labor Relations Board investigations which amount largely to going through the motions of enforcing the law.

Our union has outlined the changes that must be made if Taft-Hartley is to insure that its preamble, which guarantees the right to organize, has real meaning. These include revocation of the free speech immunity now enjoyed by employers; a change in the agency rule to make employers responsible for the conduct of union busters acting in their behalf; a restoration of prehearing elections to avoid the deadly toll of stalling and delay; adequate penalties for employers who chronically and deliberately commit unfair labor practices, and a return to the principle of uniformity in labor laws governing employers engaged in interstate commerce, so Federal law shall prevail over State laws.

TWUA has documented in a 77-page white paper entitled "Almost Unbelievable," what happens to workers who must rely upon the National Labor Relations Board and Taft-Hartley to protect their rights. The story this paper tells, coupled with the experiences of other unions, points up the urgent need for a remedy. That remedy lies in a sweeping investigation of the National Labor Relations Board and its administration of the Taft-Hartley Act.

The executive council of the Textile Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO, CLC, is gratified to learn that the House Labor and Education Committee has decided to launch such an investigation and that its chairman has already moved to have a subcommittee undertake this task. We are convinced that such an investigation will corroborate what we have charged, and we are hopeful that a thorough and exhaustive study will lead

to changes in the Taft-Hartley Act and eliminate the injustices of its administration.

To help achieve this end, we offer the House Labor Subcommittee our fullest cooperation, backed up by the documented record of our experiences in this area over the last 14 years.

RESOLUTION ON GATT COMMITTEE ON MARKET DISRUPTION

The newly formed GATT Committee on Market Disruption is charged with the responsibility of studying instances of market disruption caused by the rising volume of international trade. The textile industry has been chosen to be the first area of consideration.

This Committee representing all of the contracting countries of the General Agreement on Trade and Tariff was organized at the initiative of the U.S. Government represented in the person of Douglas Dillon, then Under Secretary of State and now Secretary of the Treasury.

The textile industries of many countries which enjoyed a sharp upturn in activities in 1959 and 1960 are beginning to suffer from economic setbacks. The United States and Canadian textile industries have been sharply affected by recessions.

Similarly, the Japanese, Hong Kong, and Taiwan textile industries report widespread unemployment, idle capacity and price cuts. This condition will spread if the current worldwide economic slowdown spreads through the non-Communist world.

Some of the difficulties confronted by these countries is the result of the haphazard growth of new textile capacity throughout the world. New plants have been built to export goods at a time when the world demand is unable to absorb them without concurrently causing injury to older textile industries. What is necessary above all else is a coordination of national programs for textile expansion to avoid such overexpansion and to control exports in such a manner as to permit newer countries to enjoy an increasing volume of world textile trade without injuring the established industries or interfering with the industry's progress and development: Therefore be it

Resolved, by the executive council of the Textile Workers Union of America, That we urge the U.S. Government to immediately petition the GATT Committee on Market Disruption for the development of a system of multilateral agreements on international textile trade and to guide in the development of textile producing capacity in the newer countries.

RESOLUTION ON TEXTILE DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

Although the textile industry has been advancing technologically, it has continued to lose markets to competitive materials such as paper and plastics, with the consequent closing of mills and displacement of workers.

New machines and methods of production have reduced labor requirements in the remaining mills, with the result that we have had an overall reduction in employment amounting to more than 400,000 in the last 10 years.

The textile industry has found enough money to finance the introduction of new machinery and methods which have reduced labor requirements, but its investments in research are among the lowest of all American industries.

Its failure to devote sufficient funds to research and development has limited its ability to find new uses for textiles and to open up new markets for its products, a practice which would offset market losses and create new employment for textile workers. Other industries have been able to do so. The textile industry should follow in their footsteps by using research and development to open up their markets: Therefore be it

Resolved, by the Textile Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO, CLC, That we urge the establishment of a permanent Federal Textile Development Agency, composed of representatives of labor, industry, and the public, which shall conduct or arrange for research designed to develop new uses, products, and markets for textiles.

RESOLUTION ON LEGISLATIVE OBJECTIVES

The executive council of the Textile Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO, CLC, herewith lists a set of high priority legislative targets in its efforts to help correct the ills of our economy and a variety of social inequities.

1. A $1.25 FEDERAL HOURLY MINIMUM WAGE WITH BROADENED COVERAGE

The proposals recently made to Congress by the Kennedy administration are so modest in scope that they should be enacted without delay. From the standpoint of social justice and economic necessity, however, we believe the coverage sections of this proposed legislation should include many more wage earners than are contemplated by the administration's recommendations. There is overwhelming evidence that the $1.25 hourly minimum for those workers already under the law should be made effective at once, instead of progressing to $1.15 now and arriving at the $1.25 figure 2 years hence. However, in view of the urgent necessity to stimulate our basic economy by whatever increased purchasing power that can be generated now, we support the administration's minimum wage bill in its present form, provided that no deletions in coverage or any other weakening provision are inserted.

2. SUPPLEMENTARY UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE BENEFITS

Because unemployment in the textile industry, since 1952 has been consistently at higher levels than the national average, we are more acutely aware than most other groups of thep rivations and suffering inflicted upon jobless workers because of the shocking inadequacy of unemployment insurance laws in most States of the Union. Every effort must be exerted to secure an interim measure along lines of the recommendations made by the Kennedy administration, which will provide immediate relief to workers whose benefits have been exhausted and who have no prospect of reemployment in the months ahead.

3. FEDERAL STANDARDS FOR UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

There is an urgent need to press once more for legislation requiring all States to improve their unemployment insurance standards to meet uniform and higher minimum Federal standards. The fact that stopgap or emergency legislation is also being introduced to help workers currently unemployed must not diminish our campaign to win enactment of a bill similar in scope and purpose to the measure introduced on several occasions by John F. Kennedy, when he was a Member of the Senate, and by Representatives Karsten and Machrowicz.

4. MEDICAL AID TO THE AGING AND IMPROVED SOCIAL SECURITY

Militant support is needed of legislation to provide medical aid to the aging under social security and along the lines laid down in the Forand bill of 1960. We can testify from firsthand knowledge and careful observation to the pressing necessity for speedy enactment of some type of Forand bill which will provide, as a matter of right, essential health protection for persons covered by the Social Security Act. At the same time, we endorse the enactment of increases in minimum social security benefits which have been recommended by President Kennedy.

5. AN EXPANDED HOUSING PROGRAM

A program of this type not only can help the Nation take a giant step forward in slum clearance and in meeting the housing shortage, but it can also help provide the economy with the strong stimulus needed to end the slump which grips our Nation.

6. FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Education is in trouble in this country for two reasons: Public school enrollment since 1946 has grown at twice the rate of the total population and will continue to grow; in addition, rapid scientific and technological advances demand a higher quality of education. Even the Eisenhower administration admitted a shortage of 130,000 classrooms 2 years ago and it is even more drastic today. Moreover, the average wage for all public school teachers stands at only $4,800 a year; thus, it is impossible to keep good teachers in our system. There should be no delay in securing enactment of a sound measure to provide Federal grants to the States for more classrooms, and to support teachers' salaries.

The above items head a list of legislative objectives which the executive council of the Textile Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO, CLC, considers basic to its objective of helping to strengthen the economy and eliminate social injustice.

We urge all of our affiliates to work energetically with us and the rest of the labor movement to make them a reality in this, the 1st session of the 87th Congress.

A Challenge in Civilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Worcester Telegram dated Friday, March 3, 1961, entitled "A Challenge in Civilization." I recommend this excellent editorial which sums up the legitimate arguments in favor of a Cape Cod National Park.

A CHALLENGE IN CIVILIZATION

Cape Cod's national seashore project will come up for hearing in Congress on Monday and Tuesday. The importance of these hearings and what Congress decides to do on the basis of the facts presented is so great that no description is really adequate.

If the plans are approved in the form presented by the National Park Service, the fine, wild beach which stretches along the full ocean forearm of the cape, can be saved for the public and for future generations.

If the public-be-damned group wins out, the developers will make quick profits and the spoilers will come in with their bulldozers, their asphalt paving, their trailer parks, and the cheap, dreary desolation that has already swallowed up so much of our New England ocean frontage.

If the park plan can be passed without being cut to pieces in the process, Massachusetts will enjoy just about the last stretches of virgin seashore on the Atlantic coast. If the commercial interests have their way, Massachusetts will lose its last and best natural resource.

The loss will be permanent. And the denial to our children and our grandchildren of what we have enjoyed in our own time will be just about complete.

Actually, it is to be expected that the park plan will require some compromises. Senators SALTONSTALL and SMITH have studied the requests for excepting certain areas. In fairness to communities where land takings might really involve public sacrifice now and where the project might not be seriously hurt, they have recommended changes.

But reductions in the proposed park simply for the convenience of individual interests are quite another thing. Our natural resources belong to all of us. They belong, also, to the Americans who will want to use them in decades and centuries to come. And there are moral as well as practical obligations for preserving and protecting the beauty of this seashore region while there is still time to do so.

Congress, we hope, will take into consideration that the conservationist is always at a disadvantage when he sets his arguments against commercial spokesmen. The commercial groups can bring more political pressure to bear. And political pressure is always apt to overwhelm the best pleas for saving what we have—saving is simply because its natural state is a delight to the eye and the spirit.

But the ability to weigh these values fairly is a measure of civilization. We hope Congress votes for civilization instead of commercialization.

H.R. 4510, Corn and Feed Grains Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA, JR.
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I realize that these remarks may be a little premature, but I offer them at this time in the hope that my colleagues may have an opportunity to read them before voting on H.R. 4510 which is scheduled for debate and vote tomorrow.

The Kennedy administration has made its farm move a la Orville Freeman and a disastrous move it is. H.R. 4510, corn and feed grains bill represents a broken campaign promise—not to attempt controls without farmer referendum. Not only does it break this promise but it flaunts the mandate of the farmer right back in his face. Farmers overwhelmingly voted corn allotments out in 1958 and now the administration is completely disregarding this mandate and forcing controls and allotments on the farmer when he has expressed his will to the contrary.

This is a complicated, dangerous proposal for a special 1-year program for feed grains. It is touted as a stopgap program. Actually, it is a topoff to plans for other farm products. As has been previously stated by Charles Shuman, it is an "entering wedge to take control of marketing all farm products." There is no better place to put that wedge than in feed grains since they have heavy influence on all livestock, dairy and poultry farming.

This is a move toward socialized agriculture. It is certain to cripple for all time the free enterprise system in the field of agriculture and further hamstring the farmer. This bill will put all of the grain dealers in the country out of business and the Government would take over the fundamental responsibility of buying and selling these items. The Government would be the market for these grain products. It would discriminate against the farmer who has been carrying out good soil management programs and reward the farmer who has abrused his farm by overplanting. It would provide an incentive to farmers to overproduce and increase per acre yield, thus adding to the surpluses rather than decreasing them.

This type of legislation provides a windfall for the large corporation farmer and deprives the family farmer of earning a decent livelihood.

If this law passes, it will be the first time one man has held in the palm of his hand the absolute right to control supply and price. It gives the Secretary of Agriculture, whoever he may be, the power to drive feed grain prices down to levels he chooses, simply by dumping CCC stocks—the dictatorial power to use surplus Government stocks to manipulate prices and force compliance.

The bill has been labeled as voluntary, but it is anything but—it is quite compulsory. A 1-year land-retirement program will be of no consequence. In order for a land-retirement program to function successfully, land must be retired from production for a number of years.

In my opinion, this measure will resolve into a complicated, expensive, surplus-producing blank check for the Secretary of Agriculture, depriving the farmer of more of his rights and freedoms, ending free enterprise in agriculture, and resulting in socialized farming.

I recognize the need for sound legislative action to deal with wheat and feed grains, but H.R. 4510 in its present form is not sound legislation and should be defeated.

The Vocabulary of Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to recommend to my colleagues a recent editorial which appeared in the Bloomfield Independent Press. This is one of the most eloquent statements on the meaning of brotherhood which has come to my attention:

THE VOCABULARY OF BROTHERHOOD

Brotherhood.

What is brotherhood? It is not a word to be used in glib, hackneyed phrases at public gatherings but forgotten in the real vocabulary of private life.

Brotherhood is a feeling, a personal emotion, an individual response to the hurt or the wound of another human. It is the anguish apparent in the horror and shock with which the Secretary General of the United Nations announced the murder of six Congolese prisoners. It is the feeling of personal responsibility that causes the hurrying shopper to pause to comfort a lost child.

It is the deep compassion that drew a dying Dr. Dooley "home" to Laos for Christmas. It is feeling on your own flesh the light lick of the whip that mutilates the flesh of another human in distant Africa. It is the stifled sob in your own throat, that echoes the keening anguish of an Asian mother cuddling the deathstilled form of her undernourished child.

It is the understanding of our own guilt with which we accept with a "meaculpa" the hate reflected in the angry young faces of Cuban Communists.

It is caring enough to try to understand our fellow humans, it is according to others the dignity we accept as our own natural right, it is attributing to men of all races and creeds the same nobility of purpose with which we try to guide our own actions.

Excise Tax on Automobiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying, indeed, to know that other municipalities in Michigan are joining the city of Flint in expressing support of H.R. 3647, the bill to eliminate the 10-percent discriminatory Federal excise tax on automobiles.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call my colleagues' attention to the resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Dearborn, Mich., on February 21, requesting, unanimously, that the tax be removed.

I believe that as more and more local officials become aware of the depressive effect of the tax on automobiles production and the stimulation that repeal of the tax would have, not only in automotive center but throughout the entire country, we will be hearing from many other municipal organizations urging that action be taken by the Congress in this matter as soon as possible:

FEBRUARY 21, 1961.

The council convened at 8 p.m., President of the Council Ralph B. Guy presiding. Upon rollcall, there were present: Councilmen Baja, Bondie, Dombrowski, Fordell, Hart, ImOberatag, and President of the Council Guy; absent, none. A quorum being present, the council was declared in session.

From Charles A. Mobley, mayor, city of Flint, Mich., submitting suggestion that House bill 3647, eliminating the 10-percent Federal excise tax on motor vehicles, be endorsed.

By Councilman Baja supported by Councilman Bondie.

Whereas House bill 3647, eliminating a 10-percent Federal excise tax on motor vehicles, has been introduced at the present session of Congress; and

Whereas it is believed that elimination of this Korean war nuisance tax, imposed then to brake car production, would stimulate the depressed automobile industry; and

Whereas the city of Dearborn, being home of the Ford Rouge plant, is vitally affected by the discouraging conditions in the industry as evidenced by unemployment rate of more than 10 percent: Be it

Resolved, That the mayor and council of the city of Dearborn do hereby endorse House bill 3647 and strongly urge its adoption; be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk is hereby instructed to transmit a true copy of this resolution to each member of the Michigan congressional delegation.

The resolution was unanimously adopted.

Don't Spoil the Peace Arch Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, again I wish to bring to the attention of the Members of this body the attempt that is being made to construct fences in the International Peace Arch at Blaine, Wash. It is the only place along the 3,000-mile boundary between Canada and the United States where a fence will exist if the Bureau of Public Roads continues to hold to its policy.

An editorial that appeared in the Bellingham (Wash.) Herald February 27, 1961, points out the problems involved. Safety, of course, is desirable, but the record shows that there has never been an accident to an automobile nor an injury suffered by a passenger or pedestrian since the park opened in 1921. Indications are this safety record will continue.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the Herald that the full beauty and usefulness of this distinctive and historical park should be preserved. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the editorial:

DON'T SPOIL BEAUTY OR FUNCTION OF PEACE ARCH PARK

If it's a question of safeguarding the lives of children, that's one thing. If it's simply an attempt to make a unique situation conform to a general pattern, that's another.

We're speaking about the international border at Blaine where unarmed rebellion is erupting against what the natives construe as an unreasonable bureaucratic ruling.

The problem is that Highway 99, in its long journey from Mexico to Canada, goes through Peace Arch Park at its northern extremity. Interstate Highway regulations call for fencing off freeways in populated areas to protect lives. Highway agencies of the various States also are on record for this access control provision.

State highway officials indicated they feel that some obstruction is necessary and promise attractive landscaping to preserve the park beauty. Which still leaves the problem of access between different parts of the park. Movable fence sections which could be folded back during the Peace Arch observance or other such large get-together were tossed out as a possibility.

Meanwhile, Congressman JACK WESTLAND has labeled the Federal regulation as "silly" and indicated that he will intervene in the National Capital.

For our part, we sympathize with any safety requirements which are based on the specific situation, but whether a fence is necessary for the short stretch from the southern park limit to the border stations seems questionable. Speed limits will be in force and drivers must slow down and stop to clear customs and immigration, so it is not a matter of needlessly slowing down through traffic.

Whether a satisfactory fenceless solution can be worked out is still to be determined. We earnestly hope the interested parties can come up with something which will preserve the full beauty and usefulness of a distinctive and historical beauty spot along the border.

No "Distress" Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. BATES
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in today's RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Haverhill Gazette of January 31, 1961, under the heading of "No 'Distress' Here." Haverhill, Queen of Shoe Cities, continues to maintain her leadership in shoe production and as indicated by the editorial writer "It is unfair to a city which is in good shape to have the word spread around that it is in trouble."

The editorial follows:

NO "DISTRESS" HERE

Inclusion of Haverhill in a U.S. Department of Commerce statistical grouping with Lawrence has resulted in an unfortunate impression being created in this State and throughout New England.

Lawrence, because of a high unemployment figure, is classified as a "distressed" area.

Haverhill, which does not have anywhere near the same unemployment percentage as Lawrence, comes under the same classification in all the statistics that are being compiled.

Proof of the incorrect impression that is being created has come to our attention twice in the past week. Last week Gov. John A. Volpe made it a point to mention Haverhill as one of the cities which could be considered a "distress" area. In a statement yesterday, our new U.S. Senator, BENJAMIN SMITH, of Gloucester, also specifically named Haverhill as a city that will benefit by proposed legislation affecting areas with substandard employment.

The only way in which Haverhill is distressed at the moment is through the concern some persons are expressing about this classification.

This city is in considerably better shape than some of its neighboring communities in Massachusetts. It should not be placed in the same category with those cities which are experiencing real employment problems.

It is unfair to those cities which need help badly to include communities which have only minor problems. It is also unfair to a city which is in good shape to have the word spread around that it is in trouble.

Haverhill is grouped with Lawrence in a metropolitan statistical district because Haverhill does not have the required 50,000 population to become the "core city" in a district of its own.

For this same reason, Haverhill cannot form its own regional planning group and under current regulations must be lumped with Lawrence to get Federal funds for regional planning, if it cares to engage in such activity.

Haverhill thus loses its identity and individuality as far as governmental statistics and classifications are concerned.

This is unfortunate, because detailed statistics and studies involving this area do not separate the two cities, and it is virtually impossible to tell what figures apply to Haverhill and which figures concern Lawrence.

It might even be that Haverhill will benefit from legislation designed to help "distressed areas." There may be many advantages to that classification, and certainly every avenue should be explored if and when the legislation is passed—and it now seems likely that it will be passed by Congress in the near future.

But it behooves every city official and every agency to make clear to all that Haverhill is not a "distressed" city, despite the classification in that category by the U.S. Government.

The Only True Deterrent to War Is Power Sufficient To Win if War Is Forced Upon Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address by Gen. S. E. Anderson, commander, air materiel command, to Holloman Squadron, Arnold Air Society, at North Carolina State College on February 7, 1961. I join with General Anderson in his tribute to the vision and foresight of Gen. "Hap" Arnold:

ADDRESS BY GEN. S. E. ANDERSON, COMMANDER, AIR MATERIEL COMMAND, TO HOLLOMAN SQUADRON, ARNOLD AIR SOCIETY, RALEIGH, N.C., JANUARY 7, 1961

It is a pleasure to visit the campus of North Carolina State College to share this evening with you. North Carolina, as you have been told, is my native State. I lived in the State until I was 18, when I left to enter West Point. North Carolina can well be proud of this institution, which has gained recognition throughout the country as a leader in scientific research and training, especially in the field of nuclear energy.

I take pleasure also in meeting the members of the George V. Holloman Squadron of the Arnold Air Society. You chose well in naming your squadron after the late Colonel Holloman, one of your distinguished graduates. His early research in guided missiles and automatic flight and landing of aircraft produced milestones in aviation history.

This society represents a fitting tribute to Gen. "Hap" Arnold and the part he played in building an aerospace force second to none. Much of the future leadership of the Air Force will come from the Air Force Reserve Officers Training Corps, and especially from those who are members of the Arnold Air Society.

Back in 1944 General Arnold recognized the Air Force's continuing need for the services of the best scientific brains in the country. He set up an organization of scientists known as the Army Air Forces Scientific Advisory Group.

"I told these scientists," General Arnold later wrote, "that I wanted them to think ahead 20 years. They were to forget the past; regard the equipment now available only as the basis for their boldest predictions. I wanted them to think about supersonic speed airplanes, airplanes that would move and operate without crews; improve-

ments in bombs; communication systems; television, weather, medical research; atomic energy and any other phase of aviation which might affect the development and employment of the airpower to come."

One of the descendants of this Scientific Advisory Group is the present Air Force Scientific Advisory Board, which reports directly to the Chief of Staff and provides a close link between the Air Force and the civilian scientific community of the Nation.

Today, almost 20 years later, the Air Force, together with the Scientific Advisory Board, is still looking out into the future. Living as we do, under the dread possibility of nuclear war and with a policy based on deterring such a war, the greatest assurance of our survival is our aerospace counterforce capability.

You will note that I specified aerospace counterforce capability. The word "aerospace" has come into common use to describe the continuous operational medium that extends outward from the surface of the earth. No one can pinpoint where air ends and space begins. Yet aerospace is the medium we must dominate in order to survive and to maintain our national integrity.

For years the Air Force has devoted most of its efforts, funds, and dedication to aerospace operations. This function dates back to the earliest flights beyond man's natural environment—when he first had to learn to live with an oxygen mask. The result has been the development of an aerospace force that deters war through its ability to destroy enemy forces that otherwise could destroy us.

Weapons systems beyond the wildest dreams of our ancestors are being added to our aerospace arsenal—we now have the Atlas, Titan, and Minuteman missile systems. Under development is the supersonic B–70. Experimental and research craft such as the X–15 and Dyna-Soar will furnish much valuable data for further development of advanced aerospace vehicles.

The world was given some striking demonstations of Air Force competence in aerospace during a short period in August of last year. Let me give you a brief rundown:

The experimental aerospacecraft, the X–15, set speed and altitude records near the outer fringe of the atmosphere. On August 4 it was flown at a speed of 2,196 miles an hour, and on August 12 it reached an altitude of 136,500 feet. It was given additional trials in November and December, preparatory to turning the rocket plane over the National Aeronautics and Space Administraion. NASA hopes the craft can be taken on the next step towards manned space flight early this spring.

The Atlas ICBM on August 9 was flown over 7,000 miles with an apogee of more than 1,000 miles.

On August 11 the first capsule was recovered from a satellite, Discoverer XIII, which had been sent into orbit from Vandenberg Air Force Base in California.

The first midair snatch of a capsule from space was accomplished on August 19 by a C–119 team. This had been ejected from Discoverer XIV. Incidentally, the feat was repeated in November and again in December.

The communications satellite, Echo I, was launched by the Air Force for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration on August 12.

In making tests of value to aerospace pilots, Capt. Joseph W. Kittinger, Jr., on August 16, ascended to an altitude of 102,800 feet—a record for balloons—and parachuted from the gondola.

This gives you an idea of the dividends accruing as the Air Force forges ahead in its search for improved vehicles and techniques. The drive is always for higher altitudes, faster speeds, and longer ranges.

The objective of the Air Force and the other services is, and has been, to build and maintain a deterrent to war. I want to go into this subject in some detail, because deterrence is a much misunderstood word. It is a term which should be understood by every American. Our survival almost certainly depends on this Nation possessing a true deterrent.

Real and effective deterrence is provided only by the ability and will to prevail.

This policy of true deterrence has forced the enemy into cold war tactics because he could not be sure of weapons superiority and ultimate victory. Any other strategy would degrade the enemy's belief in our capability. It would invite him to consider the advantages of unlimited military aggression as a means of attaining his goal of world domination.

There are some who contend that a lessening of our defenses would be viewed as a good-will gesture, a sort of proof of America's desire for peace. They are mistaken. One of the grim realities of the world in which we live is this: peace must be enforced; and weakness never enforced anything.

Now let's consider what sort of power is needed to provide a true deterrent. In general terms it is a carefully prepared and maintained blend of strategic weapons, both manned and unmanned.

There can be no doubt that missiles are playing an increasingly important role in our deterrent airpower. The ratio of manned to unmanned weapon systems is already shifting as we achieve reliable operational models of both guided and ballistic missiles and phase them into our active inventories.

We have solved many critical problems in this process. A notable example is the development of a space capsule which can survive the tremendous friction and temperatures of reentry into the earth's atmosphere. This is a significant step toward manned space flight.

All trends point to a situation in which the decisive weapons of the future will be aerospace weapons. We expect the B–70 to be a high performance aerospace weapon. Aptly described as a "manned missile," it is expected to fly at speeds of 2,000 miles an hour, at an altitude of about 80,000 feet, without sacrificing range.

The X–15 research craft, as I mentioned earlier, has so far successfully passed its tests. Beyond the X–15 is a craft known as Dyna-Soar, a name derived from the words "dynamic soaring." This piloted, boost-glide aerospacecraft is another step toward a manned strategic aerospace system.

As you know, we have operational intermediate range ballistic missiles, the Thor and Jupiter. We expect the Atlas intercontinental ballistic missile to be fully operational shortly.

Development of our Titan ICBM is progressing satisfactorily. It has greater range, a larger warhead and a more sophisticated guidance system which should give it greater accuracy and make it a more effective weapon.

The Minuteman will be a mass produced ICBM propelled by solid fuel. We expect to begin deployment of some Minuteman missiles on mobile missile trains next year. Others will be installed in widely separated hardened underground sites. This project is well ahead of schedule.

Other unmanned systems include certain satellites designed to add to our military capabilities. There is the Midas satellite which will be capable of detecting ballistic missiles shortly after they are launched. There are the Discoverer satellites, which the Air Force has launched in a polar orbit in a program to test the technique of recovery of satellite payloads and to conduct certain biomedical experiments.

These manned and unmanned systems of the future—and it is not a distant future—all play their part in assuring us of attaining predominance in areospace. And a nation which possesses that predominance possesses the means to survive.

I have dealt at some length with aerospace weapons of the present and future. Now I would like to speak about what is, in my opnion, the most important single element of our defense team—the supply of human talent available to it. Air Force officers, like all men, are subject to the workings of time—age catches up with them. Many of the present Air Force leaders will reach retirement age in the near future.

We are probing now toward the vehicles which will open the new frontier of space. The fruits of our research will be inherited by generations to whom the weapons which immediately concern us will seem as obsolete as the bow and arrow and—we hope—as unnecessary as the plague.

From this research will also come—indeed have already come—new sciences, new tools of research, whole new areas of investigation with infinite possibilities for both military and civilian application.

Ours is an era of corroding fears and tensions, of grim pressures generated by the massive struggle between free and slave ideologies.

Due to these pressures and the exploding technology of the space age, we have come to a sharp, new recognition of the importance of cultivating and using our mental resources. To sustain effective deterrent power for our own safety and for world peace we must have superior quality rather than sheer mass of weapons. To win the quickening sprint for space we must think our way over the scientific and technological hurdles.

The result is that a new premium has been placed upon the creative mind. There is, for example, a significant fact about numerous recent mergers in the missile industry. The primary incentive for many of these mergers was not the pooling of facilities or material resources, but rather the pooling of scientific and technological brains and skills.

During the years there has been much talk about the ultimate weapon. Some people applied the term to the atomic bomb, the hydrogen bomb and later to the intercontinental ballistic missile. They were in error. There is now and there will be in the future only one ultimate weapon upon which the Nation must depend to deter war or win it if it comes. That weapon is man.

The weapons of the future will be conceived by man and designed and built by man. And if the weapons have to be used to assure the safety of this Nation, it will be man who will use them.

There is no better sign of a nation's good health than a youthful generation that is forward looking and eager to cope with the tasks that face it. Without intending to belittle the great accomplishments of the past, I suggest that we are better off looking ahead than looking over our shoulders.

There are pessimists who view our times and the future through dark glasses. We are facing ruthless and powerful enemies in a cold war, the end of which no man can see.

We live under the constant menace of all-out nuclear war, threatening the end of civilization. Everywhere, say the pessimists, people are living in a condition of bewilderment, tension and fear—wondering if survival is possible, or even worth the effort.

Such gloomy comments don't tell the whole story. True, we face problems of enormous gravity and complexity. True, we are engaged in a deadly competition, a race with time, in which the prize may well be survival. But there has never been a time so spiced by challenge, so rich in promise. That challenge, that promise must have special meaning for groups such as this and

all who are helping to fulfill the mission of the Air Force.

In carrying out that mission, you may be sure, man will not be subordinated to the machine. During this decade the unmanned aerospace systems will continue to increase in importance. But as I indicated earlier, for as long as now can be foreseen a blend of the two will be necessary, each complementing the other and each contributing its peculiar characteristics to our total capability.

If the time ever comes when pushbutton warfare is a reality, two qualities will still have the highest priority—leadership and creative human thinking. Those are qualities no machine can provide.

The Air Force is going to need those qualities in full measure in the years ahead. Where is it going to obtain them? A large part of the answer lies with the AFROTC, which furnishes approximately 4,000 of the 9,500 new officers who come into the Air Force each year. That is, roughly, 42 percent of the total. Of these new officers, members of the Arnold Air Society should be uniquely qualified to become leaders of the Air Force during the next 10 or 15 years.

What are the qualities needed by potential leaders of the Air Force? I consider five of prime importance. They are, not necessarily in the order of their value: intelligence, motivation, health, education, and character.

Too often in this country intelligence is looked upon as an oddity rather than an asset. In some circles the bright boy is not a regular fellow, not one of the gang. He is a "longhair," an "egghead." As a result, he may tend to conceal intelligence in order to win acceptance. This is a tragic waste of human resources—a waste for which we could pay a high price in the race with Russia, where intelligence is venerated. Our young people must be encouraged to respect mental capacity, to develop it and to use it.

The value of motivation cannot be overestimated. The man who knows why he is doing a thing, what its significance is to him, his organization, and his country can survive trials that would destroy the man who lacks firm motivation.

Only the healthy can make the grade in today's Air Force. The requirements of effective aerospace power place heavy demands on the human body. There is an unrelenting race against time on the flight line, in the production plant, in the laboratory. This doesn't mean, for example, that a man who wears glasses is disqualified; but it does mean that general good health and stamina are essential.

The Air Force needs men who are completely competent in their particular fields of specialization. Rapidly evolving technology calls for the development of knowledge and skills to a higher degree than ever before. Yet the ivory-tower-type of specialist will not do. The real leader must have a broad general knowledge. He must know about the culture, institutions, and environments of all kinds of men in a world where the farthest country is only a few hours away.

All of this adds up to education and in the Air Force education doesn't end with a college degree. It is Air Force policy to provide continuing educational opportunity for personnel. This requires a heavy investment in time and money and the Air Force cannot afford to invest in men who have not made a sufficient investment in themselves.

The last requirement I listed was character, but it is one of the most important qualities we seek in a man. The word may be a little out of fashion in a day when phychological testers probe into such things as emotional resilience, sound adjustment, and self-confidence. These, along with such homely virtues as honesty, courage, wisdom, humanity, and a sense of justice, can be lumped together under the heading of "Character." It is an indispensable requirement for Air Force leadership.

Air Force standards for its personnel are high. They have to be. As never before in history, our need is for highly qualified men.

What does the Air Force have to offer those who can come up to its specifications? I could talk with you at length about the opportunity for growth and continued education. But I think there is a greater reward than any of these.

The reward I refer to is the opportunity to be a part of a twofold adventure. We are coming closer every day to manned exploration of space. Success in this endeavor—and it will come—will mark the fulfillment of one of man's oldest and greatest dreams. What a reward to have had a part in this achievement.

An even greater reward will come from having played a part in attaining the goal of world peace. For peace is the objective and the purpose of all that the Air Force is doing, of all that is being done by the other components of our Armed Forces.

I have been speaking about our urgent need for young men of talent and their importance to the present and future of air defense. But I would not like to give the impression that we in the Air Force are forgetful of the importance of women. Our WAF's—Women of the Air Force—are doing a fine job every day. In addition, we are fully aware that a great share of credit for all accomplishments by our men belongs to their wives who build the environment and create the climate for their achievements.

In closing, I want to reiterate one thought that I consider of the utmost importance: The only true deterrent to war is power sufficient to win if war is forced upon us. Such power has effectively deterred aggression and will continue to do so as long as it is maintained.

To maintain it will require the dedication of all Air Force members, the aid of all specially concerned groups such as this one and the support of an informed public.

The task is formidable; it is one of enormous complexity, but it can be done. In fact, if this Nation and the free world are to survive, it must be done.

Ladies and gentlemen, it has been a great privilege to have had this opportunity to visit with you tonight. Thank you.

Bulgarian Liberation Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, 83 years ago the czar of Russia concluded a pact with the Ottoman Empire resulting in the independent Bulgarian State after five long centuries of subjugation of the Bulgarian people. For nearly two-thirds of a century thereafter, the spirit of independence flourished and the Bulgarian people made many friends throughout the world particularly in the United States. The liberation of 1878 has been commemorated each year since then by Bulgarians of all political persuasions. Unfortunately, 66 years later the Russian Communist armies that invaded Bulgaria on September 8, 1944, snatched that freedom and commenced an era of indestructible oppression and suffering under it. Even today, the people are deprived of their freedom and liberty.

Today the Bulgarian National Front of America is the rallying point of free Bulgaria in the United States. This anti-Communist association has for its objective the establishment of a parliamentary government in Bulgaria. Its fifth annual convention is being held in New York City on March 4 and 5 and it is celebrating 10 years of work in the United States. The organization was formed abroad 5 years earlier. It publishes an organ called Borba of which Mr. Spas T. Raikin is the editor and which designates the democratic principles and aims of the free Bulgarian people.

We are happy to mark this occasion and to extend our felicitations to this worthwhile cause.

Project Hope—1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee 2 years ago to study the proposal to use ships to carry medical supplies, doctors, food, and technicians to needy or disaster-stricken peoples around the world, I became very much interested in the humanitarian, peace-promoting Project Hope.

Since I believe the story of the SS *Hope* the first, which is now touring the islands of Indonesia with some 100 dedicated Americans aboard, is of interest to all, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD an article from the January 1961, issue of Lather, the official organ of the Wood, Wire & Metal Lathers' International Union. I want to commend the union for printing this article about our fellow country men and women who are helping the less fortunate people of Indonesia by training and teaching them in the more up-to-date ways of the world of modern medicine and medical practice. I am only sorry that the pictures which accompany the story cannot also be printed in the RECORD.

I feel that Project Hope, which operates the SS *Hope*, is a true people-to-people program. The entire endeavor of the organization is carried through the generous contributions of individual Americans and groups who are convinced of its value. I hope that all Americans will continue their interest and their contributions to this most worthy cause.

The article follows:

PROJECT HOPE—1961

On October 19, 1960, a bright white ship from the United States, the SS *Hope I*, appeared in the harbor of Djakarta, Indonesia.

Greetings to the ship from the Indonesian press included this, from the Times of Indonesia: "We want to tell the Americans who are sending that good ship here how grateful we are to them for their interest in our wel-

fare. It will be a long time before this act of American generosity is forgotten by us."

Indonesia is one of the neutralist countries. Never before had such praise of America been seen in Indonesian papers.

This is the story behind that praise. It is a story which the American labor movement has helped to tell.

Project Hope (health, opportunity for people everywhere) began with the idea of one man, a Washington doctor who has, for more than 2 years, been holding down two full-time jobs—carrying on with his practice as an internist and heart specialist, and building Project Hope.

Dr. William B. Walsh realized the especially desperate need for advanced medical training in the newly developing nations of the world, and he believed that the American people could do the job best on a direct basis. His program would be direct personal contact between American medical specialists and doctors and nurses abroad, and it would not be financed through the third party of Government, but paid for by the American people out of pocket.

Specifically, Dr. Walsh saw the project embodied in a floating medical training center which could go to the areas where it was needed.

First needs were a ship, money to run the program, and personnel to staff it. Dr. Walsh spent weeks discussing the possibility of getting a mothballed hospital ship from the Navy and financing the program privately. Early 1959, he took his idea to the President who told him, "If you can raise the money, we'll see that you get the ship."

From then on, Project Hope existed.

Financing and support came from many directions. The labor movement was one of the first groups of Americans to endorse the project. In his speech at the ship's christening ceremonies in San Francisco last year, Peter McGavin, executive assistant to AFL–CIO President Meany, recalled "The AFL–CIO at its third national convention unanimously adopted a resolution endorsing Project Hope and has since pressed a campaign throughout our movement for financial support to the project."

Unqualified endorsement came quickly from both 1960 Presidential candidates, from Members of both Houses of Congress, from business and industry, and from individual Americans.

Staffing the ship presented no problem. During the first months of 1960, hundreds of applications piled onto Dr. Walsh's Washington desk from doctors, nurses, dentists, and medical technicians who wanted to serve aboard the SS *Hope I*. These were the people who brought to life the spirit of Project Hope. They were unselfish Americans, willing to leave familiar surroundings, security, families, homes, and in many cases, lucrative practices, for a chance to give to others.

Organized American labor is helping in a literal way to keep *Hope I* afloat. Affiliate unions represented aboard include: International Organization of Masters, Mates & Pilots, Inc., American Radio Association, Marine Cooks & Stewards, Marine Fireman's Union, Sailor's Union of the Pacific, Marine Engineer's Beneficial Association, 97, Inc., Marine Staff Officers, Office & Allied Personnel.

On March 16, 1960, the former Navy Hospital ship U.S.S. *Consolation* was turned over to Project Hope by the Navy for renovation.

In late September, the SS *Hope I* moved out of San Francisco Bay and into the service of humanity.

Dr. Walsh sums up the effect of the first months of *Hope I*'s voyage: "A total of 60 physicians, nurses, dentists, and medical technicians make up the permanent medical staff, and up to 35 medical people are aboard the vessel on a rotating basis for tours of 4 months. While some of the rotators remain aboard the vessel, others travel inland with mobile units and some work at onshore hospitals.

"The progress made by *Hope* in the first 2½ months in which it was in Indonesia during 1960 has been tremendous. We have received requests to visit Vietnam, Cambodia, Thailand, and Korea; to aid in staffing the School of Tropical Medicine, Dacca, East Pakistan; to help establish a cardiac clinic in Karachi, capital of Pakistan.

"The Indonesian Government has requested us to help staff a new 600-bed hospital, built by the people of that country; and, we have requests from the medical and public health authorities of Indonesia to develop a program to mail them used medical journals and technical books.

"Accomplishments of Project Hope during 1960 include aid to Pakistan flood victims with shipment of drugs and medical supplies, establishment of a manufacturing and training center for artificial limbs in Indonesia; and help in establishing and training the staff of a 50-bed orthopedic clinic at Djakarta."

Looking ahead, Dr. Walsh said, "There are many other areas of the world which could use a *Hope* vessel. We hope that through contributions in 1960, we can outfit another *Hope* vessel for South America and still another for Africa. There are millions upon millions of people throughout the world who are sick or maimed, and have not had the opportunity of the most up-to-date medical care.

"And, to aid these people, there are hundreds of thousands of doctors, nurses, dentists, and medical technicians who are starving to know what we, the dedicated men and women who would board another *Hope* vessel, can teach them."

Project Hope is today our finest example of Americans creating goodwill for our Nation and our system of government. It is proof that our democracy is made up of people working to help those less fortunate than ourselves.

Through the support of organized labor, as well as other facets of American life, Project Hope can and will continue to represent America and Americans at their best.

A Bill—H.R. 4455—For Extension of National Wool Act of 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARNOLD OLSEN
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, on the 16th day of February, 1961, I introduced H.R. 4455, a bill to extend the operation of the National Wool Act of 1954. Passage of this legislation is vital—it is absolutely necessary to prosperity of the wool growers of the Nation and of Montana. To some extent, the prosperity of the people of Montana generally is dependent upon the extension of the operation of the National Wool Act because the prosperity of Montana people generally is greatly affected by the prosperity of the wool growers.

Montana ranks fourth in sheep production among the 50 States of the Nation, with a January 1, 1961, stock sheep population of 1,643,000 head. This industry is extremely important to Montana in that it utilizes many land areas that would otherwise be wasted. It provides substantial taxes for roads, schools, and other needs of the State.

In 1954, the U.S. Tariff Commission, after investigation, recommended an increase of 10 cents per pound in the tariff on imported wool. President Eisenhower felt at that time that we could not jeopardize our relations with friendly countries such as Australia and South Africa and did not implement this tariff recommendation. The National Wool Act was then evolved and adopted to aid domestic growers in lieu of an increase in the tariff. Existing tariff duties on wool and wool manufacturers are used as the basis of payments made under the act. Payments are limited to 70 percent of these duties.

Since it has not been possible to raise our tariff on imported wool to levels which would reflect differences in costs of production here and abroad, this program is an extremely sound approach to the problem. In spite of drought conditions, during the early years of the Wool Act, shorn wool production has increased from 234 million pounds per year at the inception of the program to 265 million pounds in 1960. We are therefore moving toward the 300-million pound per year goal of shorn wool production set by Congress as the minimum necessary to our defense needs.

The Wool Act expires March 31, 1962, and should be extended in the present session of Congress so that growers can make their plans for next year's production and obtain from banks and other lending institutions the necessary financing to purchase replacement breeding stock this year. In other words, sheep production is a long range proposition and plans have to be made many months in advance of future production.

Extension of the act is especially vital due to the present competition from imported lambs and mutton as well as wool fabrics. In the case of the latter, the imported fabrics are coming from countries with low wage and production costs and are seriously affecting production of domestic mills, our only customers.

Also, the farm price of live lambs is presently only 65 percent of parity, which also points up further the need of extending the National Wool Act.

Impacts of Pollution on Fish and Wildlife, Recreation, and Esthetic Values

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD excerpts of an address by Mr. Seth Gordon, of Sacramento, Calif., distinguished national leader in the conservation movement, and a prominent member of the

Surgeon General's Water Pollution Control Advisory Board as well as former Director of the California Department of Fish and Game, to the National Conference on Water Pollution held at the Sheraton-Park Hotel on December 12–14, 1960.

The address, entitled "Impacts of Pollution on Fish and Wildlife, Recreation, and Esthetic Values," is a thoughtful commentary on the desperate problems of pollution and the danger of water pollution not only to our people but also to the recreational demands of this country which are increasing day by day:

IMPACTS OF POLLUTION ON FISH AND WILDLIFE, RECREATION, AND ESTHETIC VALUES

(An address by Seth Gordon, Sacramento, Calif.)

Leaders of public thought, especially conservationists, early in this century sought to arouse public opinion on the effects of water pollution and their broad long-term implications. The medical profession was concerned chiefly with waterborne disease.

* * * * *

Little was done about the problem, however, in an organized way until 1927 when the National Conference on Outdoor Recreation was organized by President Coolidge. It operated over a 4-year period under direction of a committee of Cabinet members who asked the Izaak Walton League of America to undertake the task of surveying pollution in the Nation's inland waters.

The results of that first survey were startling. They were reported in the May 1927 issue of Outdoor America, the league's official publication. Basic concepts underlying the survey are revealed in this one-sentence quote:

"A civilized community is morally bound to take care of its wastes in a decent and sanitary manner, and not throw its filth out the back door to incubate and spread disease."

The survey established that 85 percent of the Nation's inland waters were polluted, and that only 31 percent of the urban population of the United States then lived in sewered communities which boasted facilities, many of them very inadequate, for the treatment of their wastes.

A few months after the survey was made public, Vice President Charles G. Dawes, in a nationwide broadcast, commented:

"The fresh waters of young America are defiled beyond those of any other nation in the world whose civilization and development are comparable to our own. * * * Our problem is to purify our lakes and streams, not only for the contribution that clean streams make to the health and recreation of our people, but also for the economic value of the aquatic life they ought to support."

That organized campaign, launched some 35 years ago, and pursued unceasingly, brought about the Federal Government's current responsibilities in connection with the pollution menace.

The Federal Water Pollution Control Act specifies the development of comprehensive programs with due regard given to improvements which are necessary to conserve waters for public water supplies, propagation of fish and aquatic life and wildlife, recreational purposes, and agricultural, industrial and other legitimate uses.

* * * * *

According to recent Public Health Service reports, 21.5 percent of the 102 million people living in communities served by sewers still discharge their raw sewage into public waters. Nearly 2,900 new plants are required for the treatment of this raw sewage. Some 3,000 other communities need replacement or enlarged facilities to meet their obligations to downstream neighbors.

Industrial waste treatment construction also is still woefully short of current needs. Even the needs themselves are not accurately indexed. Roughly, an additional 6,000 industrial waste treatment projects should be in operation right now.

Since the turn of the century the volume of municipal wastes discharged into our watercourses has more than tripled and the volume of industrial pollution is said to be 10 times greater.

Obviously, these are some of the things Congressman HULL of Missouri had in mind last year when he told a convention of the National Wildlife Federation that:

"As the result of accumulated misuses of our water resources * * * we are faced today with a monumental water problem * * * which if not attacked aggressively today will overwhelm us tomorrow. * * * Polluted water can kill people, and it can kill industry."

Recent widespread usage of new chemicals and synthetics, including insecticides and herbicides, has dramatically changed the character of the Nation's wastes. Known methods of waste treatment won't remove these and other new organics being spewed into our watercourses. Some of them have been traced downstream for distances as great as 1,000 miles. Just how harmful are they? What can we do about them?

Someone has wisely said that this type of pollution is an ugly, creeping menace which does not make itself immediately evident. An unsuspecting public does not see it, and is therefore unaware of what is happening.

Biological changes resulting from pollution are like creeping paralysis. They may be a long time developing. But once a stream or other surface water dies, an equally long time may be required to restore the natural usefulness, productivity, and beauty of it, even after rehabilitation gets underway.

* * * * * *

Let's cite a few examples of what has happened to fish and wildlife, including aquatic resources not commonly classed as either.

On the Atlantic coast there are many. Oyster harvest from certain polluted waters has long been prohibited. In many badly polluted beds the oysters have actually disappeared.

Other commercial fisheries, as well as sport fishing, have likewise suffered severe setbacks at numerous points along the Atlantic coast.

Many hundreds of miles of fishing streams in the East were rendered worthless by combined municipal and industrial pollution. The latter includes acid water from hundreds of abandoned coal mines and culm banks, some of which have been remedied, but not enough.

And I suggest you take a look at what has happened to the production of aquatic resources right here on the Potomac. More of that later.

A serious decline of the Atlantic coast brant population some years ago was directly attributed to pollution. In large areas normally covered with eel grass, staple item in the brant's diet, this food was found to have been wiped out by pollution.

During the big duck decline of the midthirties, the diving ducks, especially the canvasbacks and redheads, became alarmingly scarce. Unfavorable breeding-ground conditions, plus destruction of their favorite feeding grounds by pollution, caused the decline, not overshooting.

These two favored species of the duck hunter are again in trouble. No shooting of canvasbacks and redheads is allowed this year. How much of the present decline is chargeable to polluted waters on winter feeding grounds?

* * * * *

There have been heavy losses of waterfowl to pollution on the Great Lakes and their connecting waters. One occurred last December, when some 10,000 ducks—mostly the scarce canvasbacks and redheads—were destroyed on the Detroit River by the release of untreated sewage.

In the great Midwest hundreds of miles of some of America's beautiful streams are still so badly polluted that fish productivity is far below its potential, and phenol taste has ruined market outlets. Recreational values in general have been ruined or badly impaired.

* * * * *

In the intermountain region many miles of choice fishing waters have suffered heavy losses from pollution, both municipal and industrial. Often implicated here are flows from both operating and abandoned mines and mine tailings dumps. Many of the latter are most costly to correct and frequently the owners cannot be located.

In the same region the Bear River National Waterfowl Refuge is not producing its maximum. The 500-mile long interstate streams for which the refuge is named is badly polluted. This river could produce wonderful fishing its entire length if cleaned up.

In the Far West pollution's impact on fish and wildlife, aquatic resources, recreation, and esthetic values has presented some unique problems. It has been most difficult to maintain salmon and steelhead runs in streams there. These anadromous fishes are of vast importance to both commercial and sport fishermen, as well as the many businesses of the region which depend solely upon them.

Salmon and steelhead must surmount high dams, rapids, and other obstacles to reach their freshwater spawning grounds. But worst of all is the fact that some of the major streams are so badly polluted in their lower reaches that the fish are blocked in their migration.

Experimentally, in California, young salmon raised in a big Federal hatchery are being hauled overland to brackish waters to bypass the dangers of known polluted areas.

Some of the western salmon and steelhead streams have the same abandoned mine and mine tailings dump drainage problems mentioned earlier. They are also bedeviled by large gravel dredging operations which not only destroy salmon spawning riffles and beds, but also cover the eggs downstream with silt.

Periodically these sources of pollution destroy many thousands—yes, millions—of young salmon, steelhead, and other fishes, both sport and commercial.

Thirty years ago (August 1930), Dr. W. A. Clemens, director of Canada's Pacific Biological Station, discussed problems inherent in the conservation of the famous sockeye salmon runs of the Pacific coast. Naming pollution and high dams as the two greatest obstacles, he said this with reference to pollution:

"The pouring into the water of substances injurious to plants and animals is inexcusable. In this age of science there should not be a single problem of industrial waste incapable of being satisfactorily and economically solved."

Dr. Clemens' contention has been proved correct in many of the situations of the West. But science and the willingness to apply it still lag in eliminating pollution. Annual losses to the commercial and sport fishing industry continue to run into the millions of dollars.

The Pacific coast no longer sustains its native oyster fishery. It was practically wiped out by pollution more than a quarter-century ago.

Today, thousands of cases of seed oysters, from parent stock far less desirable in flavor and quality, are imported each year from

Japan to sustain the industry. Since these exotics do not reproduce in west coast waters, the industry is being maintained as an annual put-and-take program, an enormously costly process.

The bays, estuaries, and lagoons along the Pacific coast play a tremendously important role in the production and maintenance of both commercial and sport fishes, and the aquatic food supply upon which the fishes depend. But many of these waters have deteriorated badly through pollution.

San Francisco Bay, for example, the scene of large occasional fish kills by careless industrial operators, is still badly befouled by pollution, including large volumes from Federal installations. The production of aquatic resources there is far below its potential. Public health authorities must issue annual warnings against eating any of the clams which reproduce abundantly in the South Bay. Swimming and other skin-contact sports are forbidden.

Along the beautiful southern California coast several large metropolitan areas pour enormously large volumes of sewage and industrial wastes into the Pacific. They are given primary treatment only, then widely dispersed through expensive diffusers.

These large outflows are believed to be seriously impairing the reproduction of both commercial and sport fishes, and the food organisms upon which they feed.

* * * * *

I predict that very soon public demand will compel the operators of all such sewerage systems, on the Atlantic, the Pacific, and the gulf to install secondary treatment plants.

Long outmoded is the contention that unlimited volumes of partially treated wastes can be dumped indefinitely into salt water with safety.

* * * * *

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service reports that nationally the area of fish and wildlife habitant rendered unproductive each year by pollution is greater than that created by all public agencies conducting fish and wildlife restoration programs.

* * * * *

More than 32 million Americans purchased hunting and fishing licenses last year. Additional millions, mostly youngsters, pursue these sports, but are license exempt. The Nation's fishermen and hunters spent an estimated $3.5 billion. By 1980 it is predicted that 60 million persons will be buying such licenses, and they will pour $6.3 billion into our economic stream.

* * * * *

In 1947 we had 2,440,000 pleasure boats in use on our rivers, lakes, and coastal waters. Ten years later, it was over 7 million, and today it is estimated to be 8 million. In 1959, recreational boating was a $2 billion industry, almost three times its size of 8 years earlier.

Skindiving, a sport which developed since World War II, has soared into a $100 million business.

These are but a few of the recreational pressures which are dependent upon clean water to survive and prosper. Additional millions of Americans enjoy picnicking, beachcombing, bird watching, and otherwise relaxing along our streams, lakes, and ocean fronts. To them, esthetic values are paramount. Who among us would want them to do their picnicking, and so forth, by the edge of unsightly, polluted waters?

* * * * *

Last year a New York City newspaper reported that only 36 miles of the city's 400 miles of waterfront were still fit for swimming.

On San Francisco Bay two additional important beaches were added to the long list of California's waterfront areas closed to public recreation uses.

Narrangansett Bay, long the playground of New Englanders, was invaded by algae induced by cesspool seepage.

Along the shores of the Great Lakes pollution is increasing faster than are efforts to control it. Milwaukee, one of the pioneers in city sewage treatment works, was forced last year to close seven beaches because of pollution in Lake Michigan. And Cleveland is losing its fight to keep beaches open for swimming along Lake Erie. Buffalo gave up long ago.

Sampling of water in the fall of 1960 at Great Falls, Md., showed that the Potomac River was more polluted than at any time in the past decade. No one will deny that we have made an open cesspool of George Washington's river, and that great recreational and esthetic values have been needlessly sacrificed right here at the Nation's Capital.

On the Oregon coast obnoxious odors and foamy liquid wastes turn tourists away from Newport Beach. Raw sewage flows into the beach through an open stream, and wastes from a nearby papermill are piped only 1,400 feet offshore.

Some months ago the speaker of the house headed a delegation appearing before a congressional committee to urge appropriations to help stop salt water from oil wells from downgrading the famous Lake Texoma, on the Texas-Oklahoma line, because "needed factories refuse to come into the neighborhood" due to lack of desirable recreational opportunities.

Our Nation's recreational facilities are woefully inadequate now. What will they be 40 years hence, unless we clean up our polluted waters without further delay?

The foregoing examples of pollution's impact on fish, wildlife, recreation and esthetic values should convince the most skeptical that we need some new philosophies, some bold, new approaches.

Immediately there are those who will say, "Yes, but what?"

1. First and foremost, the current philosophy of how much pollution can we add to our waters without public rebellion must be replaced with one of pollution removal and stream enhancement.

2. Those who are legally and technically responsible for cleaning up the pollution mess must join hands with the conservationist. Though their approaches may differ, both are working for the same objective—clean water.

3. Some States set maximum pollution loads for municipalities or new industries seeking approval for new waste outlets. In such situations are we allowing an ample cushion to accommodate future users of the same watercourse?

4. Sanitary engineers have been most efficient, but their training should be broadened to recognize social values. All water pollution elimination programs should include biologists, and probably recreation specialists as part of the working team.

5. The drive to stop publicly owned institutions and other installations from polluting our waters should be given top priority. President Eisenhower showed the way last spring with reference to Federal installations. Isn't it time that our Governors and mayors do likewise?

6. Why are we so slow in complying with repeated recommendations from conservation and other organizations that we stop dumping atomic wastes into our streams and ocean waters?

7. Finally, we must aim much higher in all of our pollution control efforts. Informed people are saying that water pollution is much bigger and much more important to this country than its present administrative level in the Public Health Service indicates. If this be true, and I believe it is, isn't it time we do something about it?

And what is true of our inadequate Federal effort is equally true at the State level.

We must aim much higher if we are to win the battle for clean waters. We must be much more aggressive if we would avoid a water crisis in America. Complacency won't get the job done.

An Eyewitness Testifies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, much is being said and many opinions freely expressed as to the student demonstrations during the hearings last May in San Francisco of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Some persons who never were there stoutly maintain the film "Operation Abolition" distorts what happened. Others who were not there, including myself, with equal fervor insist the film is fair and factual.

As for me, I do not join any defenders of the film who infer the critics of it are all soft on communism. To the contrary, it seems to me that fiercely patriotic and freedom loving individuals should be willing to defend, as a Congressman does his voting record, their positions on such an issue. Debate clarifies and strengthens and refines the truth. It is wholesome and prevents mass error and emotionalism.

In the case of the controversial issue of continuation of the Un-American Activities Committee, the Members of the House in all conscience studied the facts and heard both sides of the question. Then 412 to 6, they voted their support of the committee. The chairman was given a standing ovation such as seldom is given to a House Member by his colleagues. That tribute was the real expression of confidence.

Yet, like every supporter of a cause, I know there are intelligent, intellectual, and patriotic persons who disagree with the decision and with me. Their sincerity or honesty I for one would not question.

I subscribe to the Marquis of Queensbury rules, but one cannot be too squeamish against an enemy who is not using these rules.

Since the end of World War II, the Communist ideology has made significant gains as against the free world philosophy of freedom of choice because in devotion to individual rights and freedom the salient fact that we are engaged in all-out war for survival is ignored. By contrast, it must be recognized that the leaders of the Communist conspiracy are waging an all-out effort with no holds barred.

As to the student disorders, I believe, as the chief opponent of the Un-American Activities Committee in the House has conceded, they were instigated and abetted by Communists. Furthermore, no one can honestly justify such disregard of law and order or of a duly constituted congressional committee whose

rules of procedure have been approved, not only by Congress, but also by a committee of the American Bar Association.

However, as to what happened, the testimony of eyewitnesses should hold water as against hearsay. A letter from one such witness appeared in the Washington Star last week. This description points up that the students were dupes and makes one realize why after the riots, congratulations were sent by a Communist leader to his co-conspirators, for a job well done.

The letter of this eyewitness follows:

OPERATION ABOLITION

The city hall riots in San Francisco last May have boomeranged on the Reds with the wide-scale distribution and showing of the film "Operation Abolition." Since they have not been able to suppress this effective visual account of their activities, the Communists are attempting to discredit it by attacking its validity. By stimulating controversy regarding authenticity of the film, they hope at the very least to destroy its value in a fog of confusion. This is a typical Communist tactic.

Moving toward that objective, the Communist Party is ably assisted by the usual dupes and "front" organizations and a large segment of the metropolitan press.

Most of the individuals responsible for the issuance of official pronouncements by large organizations attacking the reliability of the film were not anywhere near the scene of the riots, hence in no better position for undertaking judgment than the general public.

Having been present at city hall during the 3 days of hearings and riots by virtue of the fact it was and is my place of employment, and having observed the film "Operation Abolition" at one of the churches here (where, incidentally, a number of the participants in the riots were also present and brought about another disturbance), I trust it is not altogether presumptuous on my part to also make a few observations and venture an opinion.

This was not just a peaceful student protest as has been loudly proclaimed by apologists for the mob. As the FBI stated, in publicly announcing the reports of its counter-agents in the Communist Party, preliminary to the hearings (that is, the reports were made to the FBI prior to the riots, and later published), the city hall disturbance was the result of a carefully engineered conspiracy of the Communist Party. The students involved were unwitting dupes of the Communist Party and were easily manipulated by trained agitators.

Anyone naive enough to expect a Communist riot to take place under the hammer and sickle while openly proclaiming its objective of overthrow of the Government of the United States, at this stage of the game, will wait in vain. The atmosphere surrounding city hall from beginning to end of the hearings was one of revolutionary anti-Americanism and as distinctively a Communist demonstration as anyone is likely to see in America for some time yet. The mob displayed blatant hostility to the proceedings from the outset of the hearings and long before there was any opportunity for provocation of any sort, unless the refusal to allow them to pack the committee room could be considered such.

The crowd was so wild and unruly that much of the normal business of the city hall was obstructed, to say nothing of the hearings of a duly constituted committee of Congress.

The film "Operation Abolition" may have a few shots out of sequence. This occurred in the haste and confusion of piecing together hundreds of feet of tape. But to say that this is a gross distortion or that it destroys the validity of the film is patently ridiculous. Aside from this insignificant feature, "Operation Abolition" accurately portrays the situation here in May 1960.

THOMAS R. WEBSTER.

SAN FRANCISCO.

A Patriot To Retire: A Tribute to the Honorable Francis E. Walter, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include, herewith, an editorial from the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier of March 3, 1961, lamenting the announcement of the decision of the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER not to offer for reelection in 1962.

The sentiments contained therein, receive my hearty approval, for indeed they reflect the mood of every citizen devoted to America today. The News and Courier expresses regard for Congressman WALTER as one of the outstanding patriots of his day. By those who know him personally, not only is Congressman WALTER regarded as one of the outstanding patriots of his day, but he is also regarded as one of the outstanding patriots of our great country throughout its entire history.

As chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, Congressman WALTER was quick to earn the confidence of the American people. By carrying out the American will in the interest of national security, against partisan criticism of astonishing magnitude, he has justified that confidence to the fullest extent imaginable.

In stepping down as chairman of one of the most vital committees in congressional history, Congressman WALTER is to leave behind a record his successors will find hard to equal, in brilliance, in zeal or in humble nobility. Seldom in the past have the American people been benefited by the work of so diligent a defender of the common cause, whose interest in the Nation overruled his personal interest at every turn. He has been a strenuous, persevering and absolutely indefatigable champion of a righteous cause. His efforts have been not only interminable but productive as well. In losing this distinguished lawmaker, the Nation will lose one of the ablest men who has ever served in the Congress of the United States.

I commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

PATRIOT TO RETIRE

The News and Courier notes with regret a decision by Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, Democrat, Pennsylvania, not to offer for reelection in 1962 for reasons of health.

Mr. WALTER is chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, which has been under fire of radicals, liberals and their dupes. He is confident their efforts to abolish the committee will fail.

Mr. WALTER has been reelected regularly since 1932 by his constituents around Easton. He has been advised by his doctors to seek a dryer climate than Washington affords on account of a chronic asthmatic condition. The Congressman, whom we regard as one of the outstanding patriots of his day, is 66 years old. He was coauthor with Senator Pat McCarran of an immigration bill that bears their names. He attributes attacks on him to this bill's exclusion of foreign-born Communists and setting of a quota system on national origins.

We sympathize with his health problem. The Washington climate is bad for more things than asthma.

A Positive Approach to Automation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Kansas City Star of Saturday, March 4, 1961, entitled "A Positive Approach to Automation." This subject—automation—is not something about which we can postpone our thinking and action, and I believe that this editorial presents some poignant observations in which my colleagues will be interested.

A POSITIVE APPROACH TO AUTOMATION

A Senate subcommittee has added to the administration's depressed areas bill a provision that strikes at the heart of one of the new frontier's chief problems. The amendment would provide $4½ million for the retraining of workers in depressed areas. The aim is to provide new skills that the individual could use either in his own community or elsewhere. We see here a hint of the strategy to deal with the growing force of automation.

The scope of this second industrial revolution was dramatically depicted by President Kennedy in his economic message. In broad outline, it is not unlike what happended during the first industrial revolution. Then, great benefits resulted, but at the cost of much job dislocation. There is, in the 1960's, a significant difference. It arises from the compression of time. Automation is relatively new. Yet just as we are already seeing the benefits in greater production, so, almost at once, the effects on employment begin to grow apparent.

Presumably Mr. Kennedy's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy will study the effects of automation. It is equipped with high-powered talent from industry, labor, government, and the public. But such a system moves slowly. And it is difficult to see how the Committee could recommend any other approach than that of retraining and, with a tactful nod to the deep roots that people have in their hometowns, of relocation.

For the fact is, we are confronted at once with a dual problem: Automated production has decreased the need for certain skills and certain types of workers. Moreover, in some areas longstanding industries have been eased out by changing demands or have

moved on to more favorable locations. Thus there is a backwash of unemployment, while, in other regions, certain skills are in short supply.

We do not suggest that the program proposed by the amendment to the depressed areas bill is necessarily the best. Indeed, State and local governments as well as industry and labor, have their responsibilities. This is a modern-day urgency that confronts the entire Nation, not just Washington. But at least the Senators have pinpointed the need. Americans have talked about automation's problems for some time. Now it seems advisable to start doing something about them.

The Great Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1961

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from Foster's Daily Democrat, Dover, N.H., on February 27, 1961, entitled, "The Great Challenge":

THE GREAT CHALLENGE

In our security-conscious, steam-heated society, boredom and a loss of real zest for life are rather common. People complain that there is no challenge in daily living, that everything moves along in a prearanged, or at least readily predictable fashion. Yet the challenges are there, all right.

It is true that a man can no longer get together a few household goods in a wagon and head west toward a frontier. It is not at all true that there are no longer any challenges that will test the mettle of a courageous man or woman.

We have in mind one challenge in particular. It can be simply stated: Try applying the precepts of your religion, without reservation or sail trimming, to daily life. Although this may sound rather simple, a challenge not to be compared with the hardships and hostile savages that tested the pioneers, it is actually the most demanding challenge of all.

Suppose that the concept of the brotherhood of all men—not merely those whose skin is the same color as ours, whose political and moral ideas are the same as ours, but literally all men—were to be applied unstintingly to our dealings with others? Suppose the admonition to sell all we have and give to the poor were to be followed to the letter? Suppose everyone accepted as a solemn obligation the demand to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, comfort the oppressed—without, be it noted, first taking precautions to assure personal comfort?

Those are only hints of the immeasurably great challenge that confronts us all. There is still plenty of pioneering to be done.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Capital Budget Makes Commonsense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an address delivered by Senator VANCE HARTKE before the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association at its annual meeting in Dallas, Tex., on February 16, 1961, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAPITAL BUDGET MAKES COMMONSENSE

You will excuse the play on words if I say at the outset that I come to Dallas to address this meeting from a city that is electric with excitement. Such has been the advent of the new Kennedy administration. These are, indeed, busy days in Washington for all of us.

A new mood appears to have taken hold of the city and the people in it. I hope these remarks are not misunderstood. I have the highest respect for President Eisenhower personally and I feel that America owes him a great debt for his long years of service. He is respected throughout the world. He is admired in this country for his sincerity, devotion, and honesty.

But now is a time to look ahead, glancing behind at history only to learn from the past as it affects the future.

The differences in views of the same situation are seen most graphically in the two state of the Union addresses. The outgoing President saw few problems. The incoming President saw many.

To many people in this country, a man who sees problems realistically is a "prophet of gloom and doom." It seems to me that a person can look realistically without rose-colored glasses and not be a pessimist.

I think of this as I would the doctor examining a patient. He cannot say: "Your symptoms seem to indicate cancer, but I do not want you to have cancer so I will treat you for a sore throat." Also the doctor cannot say: "Your symptoms indicate a sore throat, but you can have cancer so we had better operate."

It appears to me that too many symptoms of an unhealthy economy have been glossed over by the outgoing President. I do not need to call to the attention of this audience the fact that farm income as a whole has dropped 25 percent in the last 8 years. Employment today off the farm is in an even more dangerous position.

Now, I know it is possible to point to growth figures and say that all is well.

But all is not well.

The growth of this Nation's economy has not kept pace with inflation and the growth in population. In other words, inflation and more people should have forced us to grow faster than we have. The misery and hopelessness of unemployment is more widespread than ever since the great depression of the 1930's.

The warning for this state of affairs came in the persistent recession on America's farms. These conditions always foretell hard times in the cities. And unemployed workers cannot buy the abundance of America's farms or the abundance of her factories.

There is nothing so expensive in America as a man who does not produce. He adds nothing. Yet, he must be supported.

Recession is expensive. It is most expensive in the personal misery it causes. It is also expensive in the failure to produce what needs to be produced.

In 1958, this Nation ran up the largest deficit in history—$12 billion or $12,000 million. Was it because of some wild spending program? No, indeed.

We did not spend more that year; we earned less.

The recession produced less taxes than had been anticipated. It is that simple.

The threat of another recession such as that of 1958 faces us again today. But it is only one challenge faced by this Nation in 1961. Some are new; some are old.

There is a threat from Red China as well as Soviet Russia. Within 90 miles of our Florida shore lies another Communist threat—Cuba. In Laos, a SEATO ally fights for existence.

We find ourselves surpassed in many fields of science and technology. Yet one-third of our brightest youngsters cannot afford college.

Our farms produce such abundance that the abundance itself is regarded by some as a curse rather than a blessing. Yet millions in the world are starving and thousands of our own people in America subsist on meager handouts of food from relief offices in their communities.

Without knocking the old administration, we can look forward to new drive, new energy, and new ideas for the new decade, the new challenges, the new frontier.

If we set out to solve our problems, to make this a stronger and more prosperous nation, a safer and more peaceful world, we can meet the challenges and the problems of the new frontier of the 1960's. We can meet the challenge to the minds of men.

I think that the nation which unlocked the secrets of atomic energy can find the answers to heart disease and cancer. I think that the nation that has produced the world's highest standard of living can continue to do so. I think that the greatest system of public education in the world can provide the education for the minds of all its youngsters. I think the nation that has telephones and cars and refrigerators and television sets for nearly all its citizens can produce what is needed for the space age. I think that a country that can produce more food than it needs can lead the way in finding new uses for abundance and lead the way toward ending starvation in this country and in the world.

It will take daring. But it also took daring to open up America's West. It will take the best that America has.

But an America that is being led to greatness will once more rise to greatness.

When America once more puts its industrial production to work producing, when farm produce goes into use instead of into storage bins, when skilled workers go back to work, when our brainpower is harnessed both for shinier cars and for weapons and space ships, America will have met the challenge of the new frontier of the sixties. We will not have to worry about a challenge from Moscow or Peking or Havana.

When America does her best, she has no challengers. She will show the way to world peace and prosperity.

I know that all Americans know this. I hope all Americans will join with me in the prayer that the ideas, the drive, the brains of those who have begun the job of building a new America for the new frontier will be successful.

Our fear, if any, today is not of communism. Our choice of our system of Government was because we believed in freedom.

The aim of our representative democracy is not to destroy communism. Our aim is a full life in dignity and freedom and with individual initiative a valuable part in the operation of the whole.

Communism flourishes in a society where despair and hunger have become dominating forces.

A democratic form of government is basically one of a free society. There are no limits to a free society or of the people within it.

The REA is one of the Nation's greatest examples of people working together in freedom, with governmental help in a form of cooperative private enterprise. It is a great example of freedom, and benefit for people.

I do not need to tell you of how and why REA was started and of what it has accomplished. I do not need to tell you of the financial returns it has given the Federal Government.

Several cooperatives have paid out their loans; many are paying ahead.

The loans that were granted for rural electrification and which are being made are, in fact, investments in America's future. They have not alone lighted farms and small communities, they have produced markets for milking machines, washing machines, refrigerators, and hundreds of other electrical appliances. They have built a better America.

There are other such expenditures of the Federal Government which are literally paid back with interest in cold cash. And there are many others from which the benefits are paid back in other ways than in cash. There are conservation, reclamation, flood control, and development programs. There are loans to communities for waterlines and sewers, for schools, for college dormitories, and dozens of other things.

To consider these capital outlays, these investments, as expenses of government is a distortion. No private business does so. It would be as though a private power utility built a generating plant and carried the full value on its books as an expense all at one time. Instead, such companies amortize these capital investments over long periods.

It is much more sensible for the Federal Government to do likewise.

There have been over recent years several proposals for separating this kind of expense or outlay of funds. Generally, these plans provide for an operating budget—one in which all of the ordinary expenses of government are spelled out. In addition to this, the bills provide for a separate report on outlay for long-term projects which are investments in the country's future. This section, in turn, is broken down to show those capital expenditures which will be paid back. In this category belong REA loans.

Capital budgeting of this nature would reflect a true picture of expenses and investments. It would lead to a more intelligent understanding of what the Government is doing in the field of investments in America's future. It would show taxpayers what of their money is going for current operating expenses and what to capital expenditures.

This budgetary plan is endorsed by the platform of the 1960 Democratic National Convention. While this does not assure its passage, I am sure that the chances for this kind of legislation in the near future is good.

I think that this type of law will help create better understanding and greater acceptance of what we are trying to do in this field of investment in powerlines and dams and community improvement loans.

As we make our system work better, we shall no longer find those among us worried over whether we are being approached or overtaken by potential enemies. Our own successes will be enough to sustain us. As I said earlier, our aim is not to destroy communism or to best communism.

Our aim is a full life for all in freedom and dignity. When this system is working at its best, it need not aim to destroy any other. It need not worry about destruction at the hands of any other. Freedom will excell because freedom provides the environment which can bring out the best in men.

Myths Concerning Federal Spending Are Exposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, there is an increasing awareness everywhere of the fallacious assumption that has been fostered by those who spend our Federal revenues in the theory that what they send "back home" does not cost or does not add to the tax burdens of the local taxpayers. I for one am extremely happy to note this thoughtful resurgence of thought along more responsible fiscal lines.

The Mansfield News-Journal, one of the 17th district's outstanding newspapers, has published two thoughtful articles on its editorial page which contain a very concise appraisal of the subject of Federal spending and the dangers therein. I would respectfully commend the reading of these two succinct statements of fiscal responsibility to the entire membership of the House.

THE NEW SLAVERY

Stories about Abraham Lincoln are legion. This one has unusual significance in these times.

At the age of 24, Lincoln was named postmaster of New Salem, Ill. His annual salary was $55.70. The community was small and not a great deal of business was transacted.

In fact, New Salem dwindled instead of growing, and by 1836 the Government decided to abandon the post office there.

Lincoln turned to the practice of law.

Several years later a Federal agent showed up from Washington and announced that he had come to close the accounts of the New Salem post office. He checked Lincoln's records with his own reports and made a determination that $17 was due the Federal Government from the ex-postmaster.

Lincoln said he thought that was correct.

He went to an old trunk and took out a yellowed cotton bag. In it was exactly $17. He explained that he had put it away when he closed the office, adding: "I never use any man's money but my own."

In the century since Lincoln served as President and held the Union together at the cost of his own life, as well as the lives of thousands of young soldiers, the public concept about using someone else's money has changed.

This change has been brought about deliberately—first by the Socialists who preached economic equality achieved by the graduated income tax and public ownership, then by the economists who became fascinated with the idea of legal manipulation of money and business, and finally by politicians who saw vast opportunities for themselves in the public's gullibility. The politicians, in both Government and the unions, played skillfully on the old gambler's ruse of giving something for nothing. Business leaders joined in the game wherever it was to their advantage.

Our society is now fast approaching universal acceptance of the theory that whatever a man earns he is entitled to keep only what he needs with the balance distributed to individuals, groups, and areas which have the greatest political potential.

Lincoln, who found the enslaving of human beings repugnant, might well in this day consider that we have evolved a system of economic slavery of the individual.

We have, of course, no Lincoln to make this issue clear as the earlier slavery issue was defined in Lincoln's "House Divided" speech and his "Cooper Union" address.

But the issue is there and we are facing it even though it has not been crystallized in the words of a great leader.

It is the plain question of whether the Government shall serve the people or the people shall serve the Government.

A century ago when Lincoln saw the slave market in New Orleans he remarked, "Some day I'll hit that thing, and hit it hard."

Today he could see, if he were to return, all American workers and businessmen wearing the chains of Federal regulation and taxation and put up for auction at the ballot box.

IT'S QUITE A SYSTEM

If you are an average family skimping here and there to save money so your son or daughter can go to college, the educational program proposed by President Kennedy will give you an added burden. It will increase taxes by $5.6 billion and you, of course, will be expected to pay your share.

On the other hand, if you are in the "needy" catagory, you can relax. Your tax bill is probably very small so the increase will not be felt. You can't pay if you don't have it, obviously. And the new program would provide scholarships for 212,500. The thing to do is make sure your child gets one of those scholarships.

Similarly, if your community is paying high taxes to support its schools the new program will hike those taxes.

Mansfield is such a community. It will get Federal help, of course, under the proposal. But it won't get nearly all it pays in, because the communities which have not been doing such a good job will get more of the money. Again its the principle of helping the needy.

Once known as "soak the rich" this program has now been expanded—not only in education but in many other areas as well—to "soak everybody who has anything."

Total cost of the President's educational proposal is roughly $100 for each person employed in the United States. Probably most workingmen won't miss it. It's only a month's rent plus the cost necessary for gas for the family automobile for the same period.

It will mean giving the States an average of $15 per pupil for better teacher salaries and better buildings.

In Mansfield, through local and State taxes, residents are now providing about $395 per year per pupil for public education.

We do need more, it's true.

So the Kennedy program will take more away from us and give us back a part of it.

It's quite a system.

Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, Over Wisconsin Radio Stations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, our country, if it is to meet the great challenges of the times, needs, I believe, a revival of the adventurous, pioneering spirit, which has marked the history and progress of the United States.

For centuries the "rocking chair experts" at each stage of progress have said: "We have arrived. There is little left to be done."

By contrast, the enterprising spirit of current, and past, times, has found the heritage of history not a foundation to rest upon, but rather, to build upon!

The 1960's, I believe, offer such special challenges in almost all aspects of human life and world progress.

Recently, I was privileged to comment on what, in my judgment, is the need for revival of the spirit of pioneerism which has marked our history.

I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REVIVAL OF "PIONEERING SPIRIT" TO MEET CHALLENGES OF SPACE AGE

Today the Nation is attempting to find ways to more effectively resolve its economic problems; strengthen our defenses; reach further outward into space for new knowledge and control of the forces and elements of outer space; better meet fundamental human needs; withstand—and counter—the Communist threat to our survival; and create a climate in which social, economic, political differences among nations can be accommodated, or negotiated; and a greater percentage of the world's resources can be channeled into constructive—not destructive—programs.

Today, the world is spending about $14 million an hour on arms and armies. The United States alone spends about $46 billion a year on missiles, manpower, tanks, guns, ships, military explosives, and military aid to allies. This amounts to about 9.2 percent of our gross national product and requires a great concentration of resources and manpower. If we, and the world, could pool this great effort for peaceful purposes, living standards for all peo-

ple—particularly the less fortunate—could be increased substantially.

We recognize, of course, that the Communists, relentlessly, are attempting to gain control of the world. Consequently, we have no choice except to maintain deterrent power to thwart their goals. Until the Communist threat to freedom is defeated—or at least neutralized—it will be necessary to keep us the essential, though costly, defenses. Despite this burden, however, we can—and must—work creatively and confidently toward solution of the many problems that face us and the world in many areas.

Realistically, there are a great many frontiers confronting humanity. To adventurously explore them, we need a revival of the pioneering spirit. This is true, not just in space, but also in farming, industry, business, human welfare, and other fields of human endeavor.

To a large degree, progress is limited—or extended—by man's vision, imagination, adventurous spirit, and willingness to work to transform dreams into reality.

True, we live in fast-changing, complex—and sometimes perplexing—times. However, change is a law of life. Progress—based on the right kind of change—offers the great hope of humanity for attaining maximum physical, intellectual and spiritual maturity and progress.

With each generation, there are new dawns of understanding of the fundamental forces and values of the God-created universe. The great challenge is for man to learn to harness these forces to serve humanity.

In these challenging, through troublesome times, then, we must not lose heart. Rather, we—by optimism and confidence, well justified through experience—must revitalize the spirit of pioneerism. In this, lies the great hope of humanity: for success in solving its problems; for avoiding a world-annihilating war; and for the creation of a world in which the natural and human resources can bloom and bear fruit for better living of all people. * * *

WILEY AT WORK

Now, what has your Senior Senator been up to since he last reported to you?

As a member of the Judiciary, Foreign Relations, and Space Committees—and several subcommittees—I have been working with my colleagues on a variety of legislation, including: Strengthening our judicial system by the appointment of more judges to serve the overworked courts; consideration of nominees for important posts in the executive branch; consideration of treaties affecting the interests of the country at home and abroad; speeding up our space exploration program; and a variety of other challenges confronting the country.

I have also made recommendations in the following fields:

1. Establishment of a Manpower Commission. The purpose would be to (a) better determine manpower requirements for defense in the space age; and (b) to create a more efficient reservoir of experts, technicians, planners, leaders, and others essential to domestic life and progress for our country;

2. Legislation to provide stiffer penalties for violations of Federal laws on the distribution of obscene literature.

3. Urged a special study on nonvoting in the United States. In the 1960 election, about 35 million of our 104 million eligible voters did not—for one reason or another—exercise their voices at the polls.

4. Proposed a proclamation for a National Invest-in-America Week. The purpose would be to encourage more folks—whenever they can—to invest savings in our free-enterprise system. Currently, about 13 million Americans are shareowners in public corporations. Encouraging more people to invest would not only spur economic progress for the country, but would enable us to more effectively deal with our current economic problems.

5. Cosponsored legislation in the interest of the Menominee Indians. The purpose would be to equitably terminate Federal control; and better enable the tribe to hold responsibilities within our 72d county, created to accommodate the tribe's integration into the social, economic, political system of the State.

6. And urged action by the Departments of Labor, Agriculture, Commerce, and other Federal agencies, to help meet the serious economic problems of unemployment in hard-hit communities in northern Wisconsin and other areas of the State.

INTERNATIONAL

In a shrinking world, we are no longer isolated. Rather, peace or war may depend—in many cases—upon solution to crises in the far corners of the earth.

Now let's quickly scan the global horizons. In Africa, an explosive area of the world, conflicting internal interests in the Congo and other newly emerging countries are difficult to reconcile. Too, Mr. Khrushchev is doing everything possible to "brew up" trouble. The Reds' objective, of course, is to use the Congo as a steppingstone for taking over all of Africa. The non-Communist world must stop him. Looking ahead, we can expect Mr. K. and his troublemaking cohorts, as in the past, to continue to try to utilize the Congo or any other critical situation to promote the cause of communism—not peace. While we can expect that the Reds, if sane, will stop "short of total war," they are likely to push each crisis to the brink.

Turning to the economic picture, we are attempting to negotiate with West Germany and other Western European countries, as well as inaugurate domestic measures, to halt the outflow of gold; although the situation is complex, I believe we are making progress, and that we will be able to find a workable formula for correcting the imbalance of payments.

On March 7 also the General Assembly of the United Nations will reconvene. As of now, it appears that Mr. Khrushchev will not attend the session, although the Red leader is always unpredictable. We can expect, of course, that the Soviet delegation will make further attempts to control, neutralize, or destroy the United Nations. Why? Because experience has proven, time after time, that the U.N. acts as a bulwark against Soviet expansion. Global membership in the international agency brings world opinion to bear when the Communists attempt to flagrantly engage in interference in the affairs of other countries. In these times, when the balance of world power is being determined, even the hard-shelled Communists must consider, if not always heed, the will of other nations.

On the home front, Congress and President Kennedy are considering a number of pump-priming measures to give new economic life to the economy. As necessary, Uncle Sam needs to take action to help spur business and industrial activities, to create more jobs, and generally to improve our economic outlook. I am not one, however, who believes that Uncle Sam must do the whole job. On the contrary, I believe we are overlooking our greatest potential for economic progress if we ignore or attempt to usurp the responsibility of States and local communities to act effectively in promoting economic progress. Across the country we find that problems differ widely. Consequently, we need programs tailored to each specific situation. This requires constructive, creative efforts, not simply by the Federal Government, but also by States and local communities.

Message From the Adjutant General of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include the text of the address made by Maj. Gen. Thomas J. Donnelly to the troops of the Massachusetts National Guard at the assumption of command ceremony held January 15, 1961, at the Commonwealth Armory, Boston. The remarks were reprinted in the National Guardsman, official publication of the National Guard Association of the United States:

MESSAGE FROM THE ADJUTANT GENERAL

As I assume the duties of adjutant general, I do so not with a sense of personal elation, nor with a sense of personal success, but rather with a sense of humility—a humility born of the realization that to the degree of competence, of integrity, of dedication with which I execute the duties of this office I will affect, in direct proportion, the destinies, insofar as the military aspects are concerned, of over 17,000 National Guardsmen in Massachusetts.

I am appreciative of the distinctive position we occupy as the military forces of the home State of the President of the United States and the attendant added responsibility incumbent upon this position. Then, too, there is an acute awareness of the perilous times in which we live. No crises in our Nation's history is comparable to that with which we are presently faced. Not even 100 years ago, in January of 1861, when Governor Andrew called the Massachusetts militia to duty because the storm clouds of war were about to erupt between the North and the South, were the times as ominous as now.

The great crisis facing President Lincoln then is not comparable with that facing President Kennedy today. For not only is there the ever-present danger of either limited or thermonuclear war, but there is an even greater struggle being waged for the minds of men—a struggle in which there can be no compromise, and in which there can only be one victor.

Over 125 years ago, Alexis de Tocqueville correctly prophesied that there would some day be but two great powers on earth; one, he said, was Russia, the other, United States of America. One of these great powers, the Soviet, has spread its pernicious doctrines, based upon an erroneous dialectical materialism, throughout the surface of the globe, enslaving millions. While it is in error, it is positive and understandable. The free world looks to us for succor. They know what we are against, but as yet they do not know what we are for. Knowing this, and knowing that there must be a renaissance of spiritual and moral values that made this Nation great, our President Kennedy chose Massachusetts to proclaim his credo as guidelines for all of us to follow. We must prove to the world that we, as a nation under God, have the forces of history with us, and not with the Soviet.

We in the military in Massachusetts must not merely follow these guidelines, we must epitomize them.

This is not a time for meanness, for malice, for vindictiveness, for disunity. This is a time for courage, for integrity, for dedica-

tion. In short, this is a time for greatness in all of us. We must conduct ourselves in the military forces of this Commonwealth so that men of all walks of life will say once more, as they did long ago, both in whispered praise and loud acclaim, "Massachusetts, there she stands."

Help Sought for Senior Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN E. LONG
OF HAWAII
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, as I have pointed out in previous remarks, Hawaii faces a growing problem of care for the aged. As a member of the Special Senate Committee on the Aging, I am hopeful that steps can be taken to help solve some of these problems nationally. To point out one aspect of the problem in Hawaii, I ask unanimous consent that an article by Marcy Rosario in the Honolulu Sunday Advertiser of March 5, entitled "Help Sought for Senior Citizen," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HELP SOUGHT FOR SENIOR CITIZEN
(By Marcy Rosario)

There is a growing welfare problem among Hawaii's aging and aged Filipinos. It concerns the population characteristics of the race and the impact of a fast-changing island economy.

The Filipinos were the last major immigrant group to arrive in Hawaii to work on the plantations. They replace other ethnic groups whose parents came to the islands for the same purpose and whose children had moved or were moving in urban areas for employment.

Due to mechanization in the sugar and pineapple industries or the desire to obtain higher paying jobs, many Filipinos left the plantations. The result is obvious in the reduction of the labor force on the sugar plantations from 52,000 in 1932 to 17,600 in 1960.

During World War II Filipinos were able to get better paying jobs. A supplementary importation became necessary on plantations in July 1946, to ease the labor shortage.

In 1950 25,000 of the 43,000 Filipino males were 35 years and over. Of the 25,000 98 percent were born in the Philippines. Because of their age, their lack of education and skills, this group has had the most difficulty in obtaining jobs. These 25,000 male Filipinos are now in the age bracket of 45 years and over.

More and more of Hawaii's aged Filipinos are becoming, and will be recipients under our Old Age Welfare Assistance program for the needy, 65 years of age and over. Four percent of the old age assistance recipients in Hawaii in 1957 were Filipinos. In 1960 this percentage has increased to 33 percent.

Reasons for the increase: Most Filipino men employed on the plantations were not covered by social security. Therefore, they do not have any old age and survivors insurance to fall back on. A large majority of the older Filipino men are either single or widowed, and so have no families on which to depend.

Because at the time of mechanization on the plantations these men were in the upper age group as far as the labor market is concerned, and also because of their limited education, they were unable to get other types of employment.

A breakdown of the Filipino group of 65 years of age now receiving help from the Department of Social Services is:

Of a total 1,434 old age recipients, 460 are Filipinos—404 men and 56 women.

Of the 460, 212 are on Oahu, 106 on Hawaii, 64 on Maui and 78 on Kauai.

Three hundred and sixteen are either single or widowed; 300 are between 65 and 75, 140 between 75 and 85, and 20 are over 85.

WHAT IS BEING DONE?

Other ethnic groups (Chinese, Japanese, Korean) have assisted in the problem of caring for their aged by establishing homes. The Palolo and Kuakini old men's homes are examples. However, the recent trend is away from institutional care for the aged. The new concept is development of boarding homes and personal care homes.

The Department of Social Services can assist these older Filipino men with money to pay room and board and other essentials, but needs the help of community groups in locating homes that will provide care for them. Also, the Department Social Service Agency policy disqualifies single men under 65 years of age who are able-bodied from obtaining economic assistance.

Fabianism in America: Creeping Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, T. Coleman Andrews, former Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service under President Eisenhower, is an unabashed patriot and a supporter of things American. He is leading a fight against our present system of Federal taxation and against the present trend toward socialism in our Federal Government; he is doing his best to direct our Federal Government back to its original purposes, purposes so well outlined in both the Declaration of Independence and in the Federal Constitution.

In an article entitled "The Fabians," Mr. Andrews has outlined briefly the Fabian movement and has pointed out how the New Deal and the Fair Deal have contributed toward the socialization of our American form of government. The article is well worth reading and I offer it as a part of my remarks:

THE FABIANS
(By T. Coleman Andrews)

For however many hours each day a man wears shoes, that many hours he devotes to earning a living, warding off one bill collector or another.

It is too bad, really, for had a man more time to mull over what is going on something better might be in store for him.

At least I think so. I don't believe our people want to live under socialism. Certainly I don't know anybody—if you ask him right out, flatfooted—who will say he does.

Nevertheless, we are headed for a Socialist government sure as shooting, and this in the very near future. The Fabians have just about pulled us down.

That being so it is only right we have some understanding of the pack that has snapped so successfully at our heels.

The Fabians take their odd name from the Roman general, Quintis Fabius, who finally bested Hannibal. Fabius would not fight "fair." Rather, he nibbled away at the Carthaginian's flanks, pecking at his army in a thousand places until the great man fell.

Today's Fabian Socialists, like their idol, pursue sidling, deceptive methods to achieve their end, the obliteration of capitalism, your right to own things. The same end, it should be added, as that sought by their bullyboy brothers, the Communists. Only their methods differ; the Commies will shoot you full of lead while the Fabians shoot you full of bull.

Their organization was put together in England in 1884. Its purpose then, as now, was "to spread socialism, gradually."

F. D. Roosevelt, always a patsy for left-wingers, gave them their foothold in our Government and they have been flourishing there ever since.

Thus the "gradualism" we know. Thus comes the inspiration to change our laws, little by little, year by year, to make us all alike. Judy O'Grady is to be merged with the Colonel's Lady; there are to be no rich, only poor; no white, no black, only gray; you are to own no more than I and neither of us is to call our soul our own.

Never in the 80 years of their being have the Fabians formed a political party of their own. They do not work that way. Instead, they take on the coloration of whatever element of society they mean to defile and work from there, rotting the core of everything.

It makes no difference to the Fabians whether it is a political party to wreck, or a church, or a labor union, or a communication medium such as television, everything is grist for their mill.

Roger Baldwain (Harvard, 1905) is credited with being the man behind Fabianism in America. He is reported as having written in "an advisory to a Socialist agitator:

"Do steer away from making it look like a Socialist enterprise * * * We want also to look patriots in everything we do. We want to get a good lot of flags, talk a good deal about the Constitution and what our forefathers wanted to make of this country and to show that we are really the folks that really stand for the spirit of our institutions."

Thus they deny themselves, thus they acknowledge their conspiratorial nature. For they know, as I know, our people would rout them out if their true beings were disclosed. So they deceive, so they preach "the Constitution" and patriotism, while destroying one and defaming the other.

Thus have the Fabian spiders woven their web. And the rest of us, flylike, busy in search of each day's bread, have unwittingly, thoughtlessly become enmeshed in their trap.

A Tribute to Gerald J. O'Donnell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. HUMPRHEY. Mr. President, I wish to commend and bring to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate an outstanding, public-spirited citizen from the capital city of Minnesota—St. Paul.

Gerald J. O'Donnell has been a leader in both his State and his community, playing an active and vital role in all

phases of public life. No one can forget his many dynamic years as President of the St. Paul Trades and Labor Assembly, nor his constructive action as Chairman of the Ramsey County Democratic-Farmer Labor Party. But Mr. O'Donnell's interests are certainly not limited in scope. An example of his untiring service to the public is his 6 years of outstanding service on the St. Paul Board of Education. At a time when our educational system and standards have been under severe scrutiny and criticism, St. Paul's school system has moved ahead progressively. You can be assured that much of this progress can be attributed to the conscientious efforts of Mr. O'Donnell.

As stated in The Minnesota Union Advocate, "name almost any worthwhile activity of a community nature, and chances are ten to one that Gerald J. O'Donnell has played, and probably still is playing, an active part." At this time, upon Gerald J. O'Donnell's resignation from the St. Paul Board of Education, I wish to say "thank you" to this fine Minnesotan, and I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Minnesota Union Advocate be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRULY A LEADER

The recent decision by Gerald J. O'Donnell to resign as a member of the St. Paul Board of Education after some 6 years of outstanding service serves to focus attention upon an important function of the organized labor movement that is all too often taken for granted:

The distinguished services in public life and community affairs rendered by so many leaders, and rank-and-file members as well, of the trade union movement.

The story is a continuing one, but at this moment Gerald J. O'Donnell can be regarded as typical of all who have been true leaders, not only in labor activities, but in the State and community in which they live.

O'Donnell's service on the board of education is typical of the active interest he has taken for so many years in serving the entire area.

His many years as president of the trades and labor assembly are still fresh in the minds of most of us; his leadership and activity for constructive action as chairman of the Ramsey County DFL Party will not be soon forgotten.

Name almost any worthwhile activity of a community nature, and chances are 10 to 1 that Gerald J. O'Donnell has played, and probably still is playing, an active part.

The entire community as well as organized labor has reasons to be proud of Gerald J. O'Donnell as a good citizen.

The Annual Oscar Awards Show

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. CORMAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of my colleagues to an affair dear to the hearts of Californians—and to people the world over. I refer to the annual Oscar Awards Show, honoring outstanding film achievements, by the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences. The nominees for these awards were announced last week, and the selections promise another hallmark year for the motion picture industry's finest hour.

The industry long has been an important element in California's economy. Most of the studios are located in my own congressional district. The industry directly employs thousands of people and through its varied operations helps to employ thousands more in related industries throughout the country. More important, it brings untold enjoyment into the daily lives of millions, both at home and abroad, where it has won singularly warm acceptance as America's best-known export.

By encouraging higher cultural and technical standards of film making, the academy has helped make the American motion picture the finest in the world.

Oscar is 33 years old this year. He and the rest of the movie industry celebrate this birthday on Monday, April 17, and the "party," the awards show, will be seen and heard by millions on the combined radio and television facilities of the American Broadcasting Co. and the Canadian Broadcasting Co. As always, it will be an exciting and entertaining show and I urge all of you to watch it.

A Resolution by the Common Council of Oshkosh, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently I received a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Oshkosh, Wis. The resolution urges that cities be granted additional opportunities to acquire Federal surplus property.

In my judgment, it is extremely important that we find useful ways and means for utilizing such property. If we fail to do so, it would mean a further loss to the American taxpayer.

Believing the resolution to allow city governments the rights and privileges to acquire surplus property deserves the consideration of Congress as well as the appropriate administrative agencies, I ask unanimous consent to have this resolution printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Federal Government now possesses, and will continue to acquire, considerable quantities of property no longer needed for their original governmental purposes; and

Whereas much of this property, declared surplus, is stored and ultimately sold through the offices of the General Services Administration; and

Whereas certain rights and privileges to the acquisition of this surplus property are accorded to nonprofit organizations, and to school jurisdictions; and

Whereas the rights and privileges of cities to acquire such surplus property are severely restricted and are generally limited to purposes of civil defense; and

Whereas much surplus property is purchased by private individuals for speculative purposes; and

Whereas, in effect, municipal jurisdictions do not have the same rights and privileges now enjoyed by school districts and by certain nonprofit groups; and

Whereas all such surplus property has been purchased with public funds and paid for by the taxpayers; and

Whereas it is generally deemed equitable that city governments should enjoy the same rights and privileges, insofar as surplus property is concerned, now accorded to school districts and to nonprofit organizations; and

Whereas the rights and privileges of cities should in all justice take precedence over the rights and privileges of private speculators: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Oshkosh, That the Common Council of the City of Oshkosh hereby goes on record as favoring the adoption of legislation and administrative rules and regulations which will vest in cities the same rights and privileges now vested in school districts and other nonprofit organizations, with respect to the acquisition of Federal surplus property.

Cooperation Between the Races in the Alabama-Mississippi Flood Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an Associated Press article from the Mobile (Ala.) Register, with a Hattiesburg, Miss., dateline that will be very interesting to many of our friends all over this country.

I wish that I could put some of the pictures in, not only from Mississippi, but up from Demopolis, Ala., where one of our great friends, the head of civil defense, Jerome Levy, a great and good man, with the help of his organization evacuated over 800 people, white and colored, from these river bottoms that have overflowed. This has been the worst flood we have ever had. But it has done an awful lot to help keep the cordial relations we have had always with the white and Negro people. It has brought us close together and the Southerners are the ones who have helped in this great trouble, and it has always been a joy and a pleasure to do just that. We have no misunderstanding with our colored people down in our part of the country; it is just the outsiders meddling in their affairs and all of the right-thinking people, white and black, wish that they could be let alone where they have been so well for so long, where it is working and working well, and just the way both of them want it to work.

I also include an article by the Rambling Reporter appearing in the Demopolis (Ala.) Times, under date of March 2, 1961, in which she gives a graphic description of the flood conditions in the Demopolis area and of the wonderful cooperation between the races, the Coast Guard, the civil defense, the National Guard, the Salvation Army, and others, in alleviating distress and in evacuating the flood victims.

The articles follow:

NEGRO FLOOD VICTIMS LAUD WHITE HELP

HATTIESBURG, MISS.—Negroes lavished praise Wednesday on white citizens for what they called a tremendous job of helping the hundreds of Negro flood victims last week.

N. R. Burger, principal of Rowan Junior-Senior High School for Negroes, termed the work of white volunteers tremendous in aiding the 1,400 to 1,500 Negro evacuees housed in the school.

"There were young white women helping distribute diapers and mixing formulas for babies," he said. "Other whites aided in the distribution of clothing and food."

TELLS OF AID

Mattie Mullens, a Negro mother of five, said, "Whites of all ages came and sweated it out with us. I saw some of them helping with the babies. I can tell you this, it's something I won't forget."

The praise came in the wake of a Tuesday editorial in the Hattiesburg American on the teamwork of both races during the recent flood on the Leaf River.

The newspaper said such mutual help "ordinarily should not be singled out for any special comment. However, when our social order daily comes in for so much untrue and unfair criticism * * * we feel that the true nature of the white-Negro relationship is worthy of comment.

"We maintain that this basic compassion * * * can help us in time to solve any racial differences we face."

THE RAMBLING REPORTER

(By Elizabeth Cornish George)

If medals were presented for "Service Beyond the Line of Duty," they would have to make them by the carload to distribute to those who have given of themselves and their time in aiding the victims of the flood in this section the past week.

The organizations were here for handling the disaster, even though those participating in them had never had a similar experience. Men and women stopped what they were doing to save people and their possessions from the worst flood this section has ever known.

It was National Guards' "Muster Week." They mustered all right—day and night—wet, sleepy, and tired. When they could, they came into town for a meal at a restaurant, when they couldn't lunches were taken to them. Coffee, cookies, donuts, and sandwiches were furnished on the job by the Red Cross, the wives of the men and friends.

The civil defense organization, both from the local and State level, helped coordinate the rescue, feeding, transportation, and housing problems.

The Coast Guard was up and down the rivers way into the night working shoulder to shoulder with the National Guard and civil defense, bringing people to safety.

The Red Cross took care of financing the two meals a day which were prepared and served by Negro volunteer workers at U.S. Jones School. Certificates were issued from the Red Cross office for clothing, which was furnished at the Council of Church Women's clothing room, located in First Baptist Church.

The Salvation Army delivered food by helicopter and motorboat to those on dry land, but isolated from food supply. It also gave emergency food certificates to the flood victims.

People from all over brought clothes to the clothing room, all of which had to be assorted and put into some order by volunteer Red Cross workers.

Medical attention is also given by the Red Cross to the flood victims needing it. Fortunately, there have been very few to require this service at this point, but those who did had the service paid for by the Red Cross chapter. The Red Cross will also help to rehabilitate those in need of it.

Food will also be given to those who will need it when they return to their homes. This is food brought by civil defense from the surplus food program in Birmingham.

None of this, other than the clothing room supplies, is being done in the name of the religious groups of Demopolis.

Somewhere along the line, it seems, there should be mention of the fact that it is done because of the feeling of love and kindness toward our fellow man, as taught throughout the Bible. If there is a feeling of gratefulness in the hearts of these people who are being helped, that appreciation should be directed toward God, and not toward His servants who are doing His work.

The inspiration for the work comes from a tender heart, and a heart is made tender by the spirit who takes control of it.

The fact that the majority of people taken from the flooded areas were Negroes did not slow down the work of the white men and women who worked night and day for them.

Someone might ask why the Negroes were living in the low areas and the white people in the higher section of Demopolis. Thousands of Negroes do live in the higher sections. Across the river is farm land. Some land owners prefer living in town, while the Negroes seem to like the freedom of the country. The white people who lived in the low lands moved before someone had to go and move them, too.

Also, what was considered safe through the years, in this flood went under. Farmers lost cattle on what was thought to be "high ground".

No questions have been asked about their reasons for staying—except that it was home—nor about their race, beliefs or future plans.

The work for and with these people will be continued for many weeks. All through the years, things similar, though not so great as this, have taken place, and yet, in other sections of the world the white people of the South are pictured as hating Negroes.

Some of you who read this column are Negroes. Why don't you start a campaign to tell the people out of the South the real truth?

Youth Wants To Grow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by Miss Jonnie Flynn McCormac, of Dillon, S.C., the 1959 winner of the 4–H Club Electric Awards program. This address was delivered at the 19th annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association held in Dallas, Tex., on February 15, 1961.

The people of South Carolina are very proud of this young lady and the fine achievement which she has made.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUTH WANTS TO GROW

I pledge:

My head to clearer thinking; my heart to greater loyalty; my hands to larger service; and my health to better living for my club, my community, and my country.

This is the pledge that is carried in the mind and in the heart of every 4–H'er. From the very first day that he joins 4–H this pledge becomes an integral part of not only his 4–H work but also of his entire life. As he takes part in the many activities that 4–H offers, this pledge assumes a deeper meaning for him, and ultimately he becomes a living example of the very aim of 4–H—he becomes a strong and useful citizen of our great United States. This is what 4–H attempts to instill in its members—the necessity for honesty, integrity, character, and leadership in us, the leaders and citizens of tomorrow. It trains our heads, our hearts, our hands, and our health to face the responsibilities that you, the leaders of today, will leave for us. And we want to grow in all these ways—so we will be better prepared to defend the American way of life.

The 4–H offers so many ways in which to grow that I could never name them all. A part of the 4–H creed is: "I believe in the training of my hands for the strength it will give me to be helpful, skillful, and useful." This is where our projects come in—to train our girls in cooking, canning, sewing, and such domestic activities and to train our boys in farming, raising cattle and swine, and the other many activities of the farm. But contrary to the opinion of most persons, we girls are not limited to merely domestic projects. For instance, when I joined 4–H my first project was a pig. I had quite an experience caring for her, feeding her, and watching her grow. Maybell was her name and she and I had much fun together. We even entered the county fair and much to the surprise of us both we won first place.

From that first project I wandered on to a few of the domestic ones—house beautification, room improvement, cooking, and sewing. But I'm ashamed to admit that I was never fond of any of them; neither was I very good at any of them.

Finally, about 5 years after I joined 4–H, I found my project—the one that I liked from the first and the one that has continued to hold my interest. It is, of course, electricity. My brother is now an electrical engineer. Before he went off to school he was always wiring houses or tobacco barns and I tagged along to hold the pliers and get in his way. That began my interest in electricity; so, when I found that 4–H offered a project in electricity, I joined it—so I could learn to do the things that my brother did. Needless to say, I've never learned to do even a mere fraction of the things my brother does, but I have learned a great deal and I've had fun trying and doing the things I could do.

Almost more than anything else, I enjoyed giving my electrical demonstrations. There is one that I think I shall never forget. The Kiwanis Club of Dillon invited me to give one of my demonstrations at their meeting which was held at a local restaurant. The demonstration that I chose to give emphasized the danger of overloading circuits.

I feel quite sure that my point went over perfectly, too, for before I finished my demonstration, I blew the lights in the restaurant about a half dozen times.

More than any of my electrical jobs, I enjoyed and still am enjoying my hi-fi set. I assembled the speaker and amplifier for it myself and completed the set with a turntable. The entire outfit cost me less than $120 and I fancy that I saved approximately $50. I doubt I could be any prouder of an outfit engraved in gold.

Yet, I know that nothing that I have ever achieved could have been possible without the encouragement and help of our local electric co-op. They have been so wonderful to me, just as they have been to everyone in our electric project. Several of my trips were sponsored by our power suppliers and there have been many snags from which I could have never withdrawn had it not been for their help.

The rural electric system, Marlboro Electric Cooperative, in helping me and my club, helps us raise the standard of living of our area. By many other activities of the cooperative, they have made jobs available, created a market for many products, and given our families the advantage of modern-day living. Marlboro Electric Co-Op provides, where no one else would provide, the ways and means for our rural people to be first class citizens of our communities. Rural electrification all over the country means that our farm youth of today look to the rural areas as good places to work and to live, not as "distressed areas" to leave as quickly as possible.

Help from power suppliers, as I have already pointed out, has been no problem for my club, for any time my agents or I need, Marlboro Electric Co-Op has always been willing to lend their assistance. I truly hate to think that any electric club has to manage without the sponsorship of its local power suppliers. Yet, there are clubs without this help. I hope that some day this will no longer be true, for I hope that some day power suppliers all over America will see how much 4–H needs them and will give their aid, not only because 4–H needs the American power supplier, but also because America needs 4–H.

America needs 4–H? That's a pretty broad statement, isn't it? And yet, I am willing to defend it. America tomorrow depends upon her young people of today. And 4–H is youth—thousands of youths growing together toward the fulfillment of one common goal, to serve our country well. The sort of club 4–H is makes it even more important, for there are no ridiculous requirements for a person to meet before he can become a member. He doesn't have to possess a high degree of social prestige or money in order to become a member. All he is required to have is a sincere desire "to make the best better" (the 4–H motto). Therefore, thousands of boys and girls, who without 4–H would never have been given a chance, are given the opportunity to grow into strong and useful citizens.

Never before has America needed these strong citizens as she needs them now. And never before has the youth of our Nation been given the opportunity to work as citizens, participating in the activities of our communities and Nation. Rural electric systems, prime examples of our democratic way of life, offer youth many ways to serve, and give us the basis upon which we can build today to become solid citizens of tomorrow. 4–H helps us grow in mind, spirit, usefulness, and health. We must continue to grow stronger and more useful so we can help guide those weaker than ourselves to form a better, stronger, and more tolerant Nation. May God give us the strength as he gave us the opportunity.

Can We Adjust to Change?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEAL SMITH
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, Robert K. Buck, of Waukee, Iowa, was a member of the Agricultural Advisory Committee during the term of Ezra T. Benson as Secretary of Agriculture and has been an active participant in farm management conferences for many years. On March 2 he spoke to the National Pasture-Forage-Livestock Conference at Omaha, Nebr. Probably no farm commodity group, unless it is soybean growers, has had more Government protection in the past 2 years than the producers of feeder cattle. They secured this support through a program which set a low support price but no controls on corn production. The result has been diversion of acres to corn that otherwise would have produced millions of tons of soybeans and forage for livestock, at the same time there was increased demand for feeder cattle to eat the increased supply of corn. It amounted to the same thing as if soybean and forage acres had been put into a soil bank. Feed grain producers have lost heavily in terms of income and are now facing an emergency situation. The comments of Mr. Buck also deal with other problems involved and conclude that "we will close ranks behind a feed grain program very close to the one now before Congress."

At this time we are considering emergency farm legislation, and I think it would be worthwhile for others to read Mr. Buck's brief but potent remarks. I am therefore inserting them in the RECORD:

CAN WE ADJUST TO CHANGE?

(Address by Robert K. Buck before the National Pasture-Forage-Livestock Conference, Omaha, Nebr., March 2, 1961)

The theme of this 13th Annual National Pasture-Forage-Livestock Conference is "The Challenge of Change."

My subject is "Can We Adjust to Change?" My point of view is that of a Midwest commercial farmer concentrating on grain production and hog and cattle feeding.

In the 13 years this conference has operated new technology has given considerable economic advantage to grain production as contrasted with pasture and forage. This applies to a large acreage of Midwest land not subject to serious erosion or land that can be protected from erosion by such practices as terraces.

Among the new techniques important in this change are more and better fertilizers (especially nitrogen), improved insecticides, and developments in power and machinery for land preparation, planting, weed control, harvesting, and storing. Corn or sorghum silage has largely replaced hay as a roughage in many cattle feeding operations and the shift to confinement systems places much less emphasis on pasture for hogs. So, I would say that one of the major challenges faced by the Midwest farmers is (not can we but) how do we adjust to our exploding grain production?

Most of us agree on the basic facts of the situation. Grain yields have increased year after year. Year after year the Government removes several million tons of feed grain and wheat from commercial markets. In spite of very large disposal programs accumulated stocks are at an all time high, nearly $4 billion for feed grains alone. Even with this sizable takeover by the Government, enough grain has been fed in recent years to periodically depress livestock prices.

The hard fact staring us in the face is that we farmers are constantly and chronically overproducing our markets. Since 1952, 8 to 9 percent of each year's farm production has moved into Government hands rather than through commercial markets.

In a certain sense we livestock producers and feeders have been living in a fool's paradise. Surely it is obvious that we would have been in trouble much of the time in recent years if all our surplus grain production had been fed.

There is growing recognition that we have reached a time of decision—a crisis in farm policy. We cannot continue to pile up surplus stocks in Government bins over and above strategic reserve requirements. And we would not tolerate the lower prices and incomes that would result if all our excess production were fed to livestock and forced through commercial markets.

We are groping for an output balancing mechanism similar to that available in nonfarm industry. We must find a way to produce at something less than full potential capacity for the next few years and yet maintain the farm plant so as to meet the enlarged demand for food and fiber in the 1970's, the 1980's, and beyond.

There is growing conviction that farmers must retire enough land to keep grain production at needed levels so that (1) satisfactory grain and livestock prices can be maintained and (2) further accumulation of Government stocks will be stopped. In my opinion this is the most crucial change and adjustment facing Midwest grain and livestock producers. It isn't a matter of can we do it? Rather the question is how do we do it?

I believe we will close ranks behind a feed grain program very close to the one now before Congress.

* * * * *

Now, I would like to turn to the changes and adjustments being made on our individual farms. Here are some reactions that I get as a I talk with my neighbors.

I believe farmers get a bit impatient with the folks who seem to be clamoring for change for the sake of change. For a long, long time people have wrestled with two conflicting needs—(1) the need for change, for adjustment to new conditions and (2) the need for order and stability in their lives—change versus order. I believe farmers can be forgiven for having some of this same deep-seated need for order in their lives.

To hear some people talk, one would get the impression that farmers are very slow to change. The facts are just the opposite. What other major industry has made greater changes in the last two decades in terms of introduction of new technology, increased productivity per worker and the reduction of labor force?

Actually, to a large extent, our current problem of overproduction and downward pressure on farm prices and incomes is a result of overrapid introduction of new technology on American farms, of too rapid expansion of farm productive capacity, and of too fast expansion of nonfarm industry selling to farmers.

I believe it would only be fair for farmers to insist that greater attention be given

to the order side of this equation, change versus order. Changes for what purpose? What are our goals? What kind of farming society, what structure of farms do we seek? Certainly we do not want to create a new god—technology and efficiency at whose feet we bow down in worship. We are not pawns to be moved this way and that at the whim of every person or organization that has a new gadget or a new technology to sell us.

In my opinion, some farmers especially younger ones, are being confused and their faith in the future of farming undermined by a chorus of specialists crystal-ball gazing about the revolutionary changes ahead—the wave of the future—automation, ppshbutton feeding, eight-row equipment; bigger and bigger tractors; large scale, continuous, confinement hog systems, etc.

I'm not suggesting that a farmer turn his back on these and other developments. I'm sure, however, he must be hard-nosed about sinking his savings or borrowed money into major new developments. These are very major and very longrun decisions. A serious error can put a family out of business.

I like Bernard Collins' (Clarion, Iowa) rule—to pay very little attention to the articles about farmers who are planning a new setup or who are just starting a new program. He suggests that the "proof of the pudding is in the performance." One should analyze these new systems or new ideas after several years practical operation before judging their merit.

I'd like to add my voice to those who argue for the good future of the moderate sized, well organized family farm—the farm employing fully the labor equivalent of 1½ to 2 man-years.

Actually these farms are holding their own in numbers. They have sufficient volume to reap most of the economies of scale. They are tough competitors. In real rough going they would put the big operator out of business. Among their competitive advantages are close management, flexibility, high production per worker, and low costs of operation and overhead.

My advice to a young farmer would be to concentrate on getting moderate volume but keep his costs within reason. Big and fancy machinery and equipment, pushbutton feeding, etc., do add measurably to overhead costs, but do not insure necessary volume. I once heard an Iowa master swine producer observe that a farmer's success with hogs is usually in inverse relation to the elaborateness of his equipment.

* * * * *

I'm afraid what I have said sounds as if I'm constitutionally opposed to change. This is not true. Perhaps I am just baffled as are many other farmers with our conflicting beliefs and values.

A farmer observes a widespread enthusiasm and liberalism (among his friends on the farm, but especially among his friends in the colleges, the farm magazines, the farm organizations, and business' selling to farmers) for public and private measures to pump new technology, new power, new machinery, and new gadgets into farming—all in the name of progress and increased efficiency but all resulting in excess production.

The baffling thing is our deep-seated conservatism in developing new policies and programs to deal with the consequences—excess capacity for example—of this pell-mell drive to develop and disseminate new farm technology.

In closing I make two suggestions somewhat facetiously, but seriously too. Concerning public and private programs to expand productive capacity of farmers—through new technology, new machines, etc.—I suggest that we be a little more conservative. Concerning policies and programs to enable farmers to balance output with demand so that satisfactory prices and incomes result, I suggest that we be a little more liberal.

Tennessee and the Presidency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it has come to my attention that last week the very popular lecturer, Dr. Frederick Taylor Wilson, gave a most informative and interesting address to the Rotary Club of Charleston, W. Va., on the occasion of his 12th appearance before that splendid service organization.

Dr. Wilson has specialized for many years as a student of the lives of the Presidents of the United States, and in this instance he lectured on the contributions of the State of Tennessee to the Presidency, in the persons of Presidents Andrew Jackson, James K. Polk, and Andrew Johnson. His address contains information of interest, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TENNESSEE AND THE PRESIDENCY

Three citizens of Tennessee have served as President of the United States—Andrew Jackson, James K. Polk, and Andrew Johnson.

All were natives of North Carolina and all were Democrats.

The first two were born in the Charlotte area of North Carolina and Johnson, the third one, in Raleigh, the State capital. All were in the White House in a 41-year period (1829–69).

During that historic period, two other Tennesseans were voted on for President and carried Tennessee. The first one was Hugh Lawson White, of Knoxville, a native of North Carolina who carried Tennessee and Georgia in 1836. His running mate John Tyler of Virginia who 4 years later became President 30 days after becoming Vice President under William Henry Harrison. The second one was John Bell, a native Nashvillian, who in 1860 won the electoral votes of Tennessee, Kentucky, and Virginia. His running mate was Edward Everett, of Massachusetts, scholar and statesman.

Jackson, Polk, and Johnson all have a special place in American history.

Jackson, the only one to serve two terms, was our seventh President, a magic number, and his election as a war hero from Tennessee after 40 years of leadership by four great Virginians, Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe, and the two Harvard bred sons of Massachusetts, John Adams, and son, John Quincy Adams, represented a bloodless revolution in American politics.

Polk who was elected President 8 years after Jackson, our first dark-horse nominee for President, as fate would have it, defeated for the Presidency Clay the great Kentucky Whig leader who twice had opposed Jackson.

Johnson, our third President from Tennessee, and the only man from Tennessee ever to be Vice President, reached the Presidency by tragedy 42 days after he was sworn in as Vice President under the lamented Lincoln. He was the last southern citizen to become President. That was near 96 years ago.

Suppose we take a hasty look at the careers of this trio of Tennesseans.

The story of Jackson is largely the story of early Tennessee history.

He was born (1767) 2 years before the first cabin for whites was built in what became Tennessee.

He located in the far western North Carolina village of Nashville the year (1788) the Constitution of the United States was ratified and Washington became President. North Carolina had voted against ratification. Though never of the legal type, Jackson at 22, was a good prosecutor in Nashville's first court.

It fell to Jackson's lot to live under three flags in his remote western North Carolina home. First that of North Carolina then 2 years later under the flag of this newly ceded territory, and finally 6 years later under the flag of the new State of Tennessee, which Jackson helped establish and named.

Jackson had but limited experience as a lawmaker. He was chosen at 29 as Tennessee's first Congressman only to resign after 1 year to become again for 1 year only a member of the Senate. His major act as a Congressman was to unwisely oppose thanking the retiring President, George Washington, for his long services to the Nation.

Unhappy as a lawmaker far from his home and his faithful wife, Jackson left the Senate to accept a place on the highest court of Tennessee, a position ill suited to his taste and training.

After 6 years, Jackson quit his legal career forever and was thereafter Jackson the prosperous planter and merchant—and finally and unexpectedly a national war hero and President.

Strange as it may seem Jackson's military activities of a major nature took place after he was 45 years of age, and all within a period of less than 4 years. His fame as a soldier was won primarily in the battle of New Orleans (Jan. 8, 1815) and that 15 days after a treaty of peace with England had been signed in Paris.

Jackson lost in the free-for-all fight for the Presidency in 1824 though he led in popular and electoral votes. He was then again a Senator after a 26-year absence. The contest was decided by the House where Clay was Speaker and John Quincy Adams, who like Clay, had signed the Paris Peace Treaty was chosen President.

Four years later—Jackson easily routed Adams from the White House and then for a second term sent Clay his opponent into gloom and defeat.

Jackson as President carved out an era of his own. It was a mixture of success and failure. A domestic row all but broke up his first Cabinet. His acts once became so arbitrary as to win the censure of the Senate. But for the only time in our history the national debt was paid.

Despite that, a depression of great magnitude broke on the Nation soon after Jackson's Vice President Van Buren of New York became his handpicked successor. The Whig Party rose to power defeated Van Buren for reelection and in Tennessee was dominant for the next 20 years.

Jackson's last years were in quiet contrast to his earlier ones. The fiery fighting frontiersman now became the placid if not pious Presbyterian planter.

The Hermitage was a lonely place without his beloved Rachel, his wife for 37 years, whose death soon after his first election as President was hastened by campaign rumors of his early marital mistakes.

He died on June 8, 1845. His protege Polk was President, himself doomed to die 4 years later.

Devotees of Jackson now daily visit his Hermitage home and tomb. His human vices have long since been carried far out to sea by the tides of time. His great virtues shine on with ever increasing splendor.

James K. Polk became President March 4, 1845, a short time before Jackson's death.

He largely owed his unexpected nomination and election to Jackson's friends and followers.

Polk, born in 1795, had come to Tennessee as a 10-year-old lad with his prosperous and prominent North Carolina parents. His paternal grandfather also moved later to Tennessee. He was easily the best bred and best educated of our three Tennessee Presidents. An honor graduate of the University of North Carolina, he began life a prosperous and well-educated young gentleman.

Polk married Sarah Childress of Murfreesboro, herself educated in North Carolina who was his wise helpmate and secretary when President.

He served one term (1823) in the Tennessee Legislature which then met at Murfreesboro. His one big act there was to vote to send Jackson back to the Senate.

Two years later he became Congressman at 30 years of age. It was there he first won national fame.

He was Speaker of the House during the last 4 of his 14 years in Congress—a position now third in line for the Presidency. He was the only Speaker who ever became President. As Speaker at one time he had before him as fellow members, J. Q. Adams, a former President then a Congressman from Massachusetts and Millard Fillmore of New York, and Franklin Pierce of New Hampshire, both destined later to be President.

Polk reluctantly quit Congress in 1839 to rescue the Governorship of Tennessee from Whig hands. He was an able campaigner and his party needed him. He won for one term and was then twice in succession defeated for reelection by a wiry Whig named Jones, Tennessee's youngest and first native son to be Governor. Tennessee was a Whig stronghold, and elected Whigs as Governors in 12 out of 18 years (1835–53).

A sadder but a wiser man, Polk went back to his long neglected legal work. But the tide of failure became the flood of fame, and Polk through the influence of Jackson's men was made the democratic dark horse nominee for President when Van Buren now out of office for 4 years failed in this third effort to be nominated in 1844. By a close margin Polk won the Presidency over the popular Henry Clay in Clay's third and final fight to be President.

Polk was a success as President. He now rates as the greatest among the eight men in the White House between Jackson and Lincion. As President he saw the Oregon issue become a settled one, he saw Texas become a part of the Union, he saw a war with Mexico fought and won and a vaster area added to the United States than at any other period since the Louisiana purchase under Jefferson. He was not a candidate for reelection.

No President ever left office with his program more nearly completed than did Polk. But he wore himself out in doing it and came home a tired, gray-haired old man, died in 3 months and 11 days after leaving office (June 15, 1849) still under 54 years of age—the shortest life of any ex-President. His mother survived him.

He had just moved into his new Nashville home, once the home of Grundy, his law preceptor. He joined the Methodist Church in his last days.

Mrs. Polk lived on for 42 more years (1891), the longest life period of any ex-President's wife. For years her home was a shrine as the name and fame of Polk grew with the passing years. There were no Polk children.

The bodies of Polk and his wonderful wife rest in an impressive tomb on the grounds of the State capitol in Nashville.

Polk was neither gay nor glamorous but he served well and ably his day and generation.

Johnson, unlike Jackson, was never a soldier though he held the rank of brigadier general when military governor of Tennessee.

Unlike Polk the college trained scholar, and lawyer, Johnson was an illiterate at high school age (18) when he came to Tennessee, a tailor by profession.

He loved public office. Public speaking was his great delight. He ran for and was elected to more public positions than perhaps any other President during his less than 50 years of life in Tennessee.

A wise Tennessee wife, who aided him also in learning to read and write, managed well his earnings and he became prosperous where once he had been penniless.

Johnson served three terms in the Tennessee Legislature, twice in the house and once in the senate, all within 15 years after he had located in Greeneville, in upper east Tennessee. Polk was Governor during part of that time. For the next 10 years (1843–53) Johnson a Democrat represented in Congress what is now a Republican stronghold. Polk was President during 4 of those years.

Legislated out of Congress by a Whig Tennessee Legislature Johnson ran for Governor, took his cause to the people and routed a brilliant Whig opponent, a grandson of Patrick Henry. Sworn into office in the new State capitol he used a new broom and swept clean all traces of the Whig Party which had long held sway in Tennessee.

Himself unschooled, Johnson as Governor, championed Tennessee's first public school system.

It was easy for him after two terms as Governor to go to the Senate as the successor of James C. Jones (1851–57), who had twice defeated Polk for Governor years before.

The son of the Raleigh janitor, orphaned at 5 years of age had now traveled fast and famously in politics. The issue of secession which broke the careers of many southern men, indirectly made Johnson President of the United States. Alone of 22 southern Senators he stood firmly for the Union.

When the long pending war came, Lincoln as President who had known Johnson in Congress sent him back to Tennessee as its military governor. He was holding that position when chosen, as Lincoln's running mate in 1864. Tennessee now had its first and only Vice President, soon to become President.

No American President had more to overcome than did Johnson who tried unsuccessfully to carry out the pacific policies of the martyred Lincoln. The climax came 3 years after becoming President, when unfair impeachement charges were made against Johnson, a trial took place in the Senate and by a majority of only one vote he escaped removal from his high office.

Seven Republican Senators put patriotism above party and political pressure and saved the day for Johnson. The vote was 35 to 19 for conviction. One of that magic seven was Senator Willey of West Virginia.

It would seem that Johnson would have welcomed a return to private life, after his unhappy years as President. But politics was in his blood and twice he met defeat once for the Senate and once for the House until finally by a close margin, 6 years after being President he was again made a Senator from Tennessee—the only ex-President ever to be Senator. A few months later (July 31, 1875) Johnson died suddenly in his old congressional district, still under 68 years of age, honored and sung as a man of courage, character, and great ability.

He rests beside his wife, long an invalid,, who survived him for 6 months in Greeneville, Tenn. His burial place like that of Jackson is now a national park.

Polk declared an honest man the noblest work of God. Such were the three Tennesseans who became President..

Commercial Fisheries Rehabilitation and Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 17, 1961

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduced a bill designed to assist in the rehabilitation and development of the commercial fisheries of the United States. Properly managed and utilized our commercial fisheries constitute a self-perpetuating resource which may be cultivated and harvested on the perpetual yield principal. Only research plus rehabilitation and development projects can make possible large yields enabling maximum utilization by us and our children and our children's children.

With regard to my own State of Alaska, the situation is extremely serious because of the depletion of Alaska's once great salmon runs, now depleted to almost the vanishing point because of industry exploitation and Federal mismanagement during the years when Alaska was a Territory. Now that the State of Alaska has assumed jurisdiction and abolished the fish traps, underwater corrals, fishing is being intensly restricted to allow adequate escapement of the salmon to the spawning grounds and thus sow the seeds for large runs in the future. However, I have considered in my bill the situation as pertains to all the commercial fisheries in all of the States to formulate a widespread and consistent effort toward proper conservation and utilization in the entire field of fisheries.

Using Alaska as an example, a brief historical statement of background will illuminate the overall problem:

The history of fishing for salmon in Alaska on a commercial basis goes all the way back to 1878 when the first canneries were established. By 1928 Alaska had become the world's principal salmon producer and the Territory's largest single source of revenue. The salmon pack increased from about 2 million cases in 1905 to over 6 million cases in 1928 and then to over 8 million cases in 1936. However, these mounting returns were obtained by increasing the use of fish traps which eventually prevented enough escapment to the salmon spawning grounds. Warnings were given, but under Federal management by an absentee bureau no attention was paid. The runs began to decline. By 1941 the pack dropped to 6,906,503 cases.

The continuing decline brought the Alaska salmon pack to the low ebb of 1,600,000 cases in 1959.

Through these years Alaskans fought vigorously for abolition of the traps, which, combined with seine boat activities and the use of other floating gear, constituted serious overfishing and depletion. Incidentally, Oregon, Washington, and British Columbia, managing their own fisheries, abolished such traps in the 1930's. Alaska, as a Territory, however, lacked the political strength to prevail upon the successive Federal regulatory agencies to abolish the traps, which was accomplished only upon the advent of statehood. Accordingly, when Alaska took over the fisheries and abolished the traps on January 1, 1960, it inherited the wreckage of canned salmon industry avarice, and mismanagement by absentee bureaus.

Because of the serious situation in Alaska, the Alaska congressional delegation is taking a leading role in this matter. Analysis to date indicates that the most feasible approach would be legislation to amend the Kennedy-Saltonstall Act under which the Secretary of the Interior presently administers a fund made available each year for fisheries research. In addition to Federal Bureau of Fisheries research, the Secretary now allots money to State fisheries departments and other qualified institutions on a contract basis, for technological, biological, and related research programs. The money put in said fund each year has been an amount equivalent to 30 percent of the gross receipts from duties collected under the customs laws on imports of fishery products during the preceding year. Based on 1960 figures, the amount in the Kennedy-Saltonstall fund for 1961, already budgeted, will be $5,321,000.

My bill just introduced would create another fund, also composed of an amount equivalent to 30 percent of the gross receipts derived from duties imposed on imports of fishery products, which would also be administered by the Secretary of the Interior. Instead of allocating moneys in this second fund under contract arrangements, however, as is done with the existing fund, the Secretary would apportion the money to the States according to a formula based upon the proportion which the value of raw fish landed and the value of manufactured fishery products of each State bears to the total of such items attributable to all the participating States. The money so apportioned would be distributed only for carrying out projects approved by the Secretary of the Interior. Under this formula, for example, and postulating approval of the projects, Alaska would get about $600,000 per year from the second fund to use under its own management for fishery rehabilitation projects including stream clearance and spawning ground development. This would be in addition to the above mentioned allotments from the existing fund for technological, biological, and related research programs. This proposed new fund, applying to all States managing commercial fisheries, should attract the support of Members of Congress from all such States, and I would appreciate the interest and support of my colleagues. This legislation will be introduced by Senator ERNEST GRUENING, of Alaska, in the Senate.

Aid for Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, American small business occupies a very distinct place in our economy. Congress has recognized the importance of fostering and stimulating the growth of small business, and has made possible a fresh recognition of the contribution it can make to our economy.

Private firms have emulated the example set by the Congress, and I have a report here which details the example set by a New York bank in this field.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the Appendix of the RECORD the article by Harold F. Klein, an officer of the Manufacturers Trust Co., of New York, entitled, "How M. T. Co. Helps Small Business," which appeared in the magazine Emteeco for November 1960.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW M. T. CO. HELPS SMALL BUSINESS

(By Harold F. Klein)

In times when the demand for credit exceeds the supply and interest rates rise, the charge is often made by those who do not know the facts that "banks lend only to big business and small business can't get loans."

In October 1957, a time of so-called tight money, the Federal Reserve System surveyed all its 6,411 member banks, which account for over 86 percent of total loans of all commercial banks in the United States, and found that 78 percent of their 1,280,600 outstanding loans to business were to borrowers having total assets of $250,000 or less, the actual number of loans to businesses of this size bracket being approximately 1 million. Of course, there is no absolute boundary between small and large business, since both are relative terms, but it would seem reasonable to assume that no business with total assets of less than $250,000 could possibly be considered big. If one expands the definition of small business to enterprises having total assets of $1 million or less, the proportion of the total number of member bank loans to such businesses would rise to 90.3 percent.

Even less well understood is the fact that many businesses which are small today will be large within a few years—thanks to credit extended by banks, as well as the competence of their managements. Tucked away in the credit files of almost any bank, large or small, are case histories of businesses which started with limited capital a few years ago and which, with the help of bank credit, have since grown to be medium sized or large organizations today.

Every bank likes to render this kind of assistance to small business—whenever it can be done without undue risk of loss to the bank—because that is an almost certain way to build up good accounts which no competing bank is likely to take away. The proprietors of a business which was helped by a bank during the difficult days of early growth will seldom forget it, and the loyalty of depositors is the best kind of hidden asset a bank can have.

The voluminous credit files of M.T. Co., both at head office and the branches, contain enough case histories of loans to small and growing businesses to fill a thick book, but a few examples can be given to illustrate the point. Names of the businesses naturally are omitted because of the confidential character of all banking relationships. The following are typical:

Case No. 1: A manufacturer of women's foundation garments opened an account with the bank in January 1939. At that time the business had a net worth of $11,000 and working capital of $8,000. Eight months later this business borrowed $3,000 from the bank and repaid it when due. During the ensuing years, as the business grew, it became eligible for larger and larger loans. In 1959, 20 years later, the firm had a net worth of $1,654,000 and working capital of $1,900,000. It now has a credit line of $500,000 from the bank and similar lines from two other banks. Needless to say, it maintains a very substantial deposit balance with M.T. Co. today.

Case No. 2: A manufacturer of wooden butcher blocks had a net worth of $12,800 and working capital of $9,500 in 1936, when it obtained its first loan from the Bank in the amount of $1,000. Twenty-three years later its net worth had grown to $145,000 and its working capital to $118,000. During this period this customer has made and paid off loans of increasing amounts as the business grew, the maximum loan being $40,000.

Case No. 3: A jewelry manufacturer with working capital of only $3,500 opened an account in 1934 and borrowed $1,000. By 1942 his net worth had grown to $11,600 and he was borrowing $10,000. At present his net worth is $1,069,000 and his total credit line at the Bank is $475,000, of which $375,000 may be borrowed on his own notes and an additional $100,000 on his accounts receivable.

Case No. 4: A manufacturer of paper specialities began business in 1952 and started production in January 1953. At the end of March 1953, the business had a net worth of $54,000, representing the incorporators' investment, but nearly all of it was tied up in machinery, working capital being only $6,000. This business borrowed $10,000 from the Bank and paid it off within a year. Six years later the net worth of the corporation had grown to $73,000, and its sales volume had risen to $645,000 a year. During this period it borrowed frequently to meet seasonal requirements, always paying off the loans when due.

Case No. 5: A manufacturer of dolls, which began business in 1917, had gradually worked up to an annual sales volume of $192,000 and a net worth of $82,000 by 1939. The following year, this business was granted a loan of $30,000 and paid it off 6 months later. It has now grown to the point where annual sales volume exceeds $4,200,000 and net worth is $560,000. During the 20-year period it has borrowed up to a maximum of $280,000 from the bank.

Case No. 6: A manufacturer of quilted products, organized in 1949, had built up an annual sales volume of $300,000 by 1953. Purchases of new machinery had exhausted its working capital, and it borrowed from the bank June 15. In November of the same year it paid the loan off. Sales volume has since increased to $472,000 per annum.

Cases of the foregoing kind could be continued indefinitely. These histories do not imply, however, that any small business can apply for a bank loan and get it more or less automatically. The bank, in extending credit, must be ever mindful of the fact that

it is lending its depositors' money, and must have reasonable assurance that the loan will be repaid. It has been said that credit analysis is an art as well as a technique, and the credit man or loaning officer must consider many things outside the financial statements of businesses which borrow. As a part of the fundamentals of "character, capacity, and capital," he must appraise the ability and experience of the management, the market for the applicant's products and the outlook for the kind of business in which the would-be borrower is engaged. If the applicant shows up favorably in these respects, the chances are overwhelming that he will join the more than 1 million small businesses which are borrowing from banks today.

Response of Wellesley College Students to Peace Corps Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
Hon. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following report showing the response of the students of Wellesley College in Massachusetts to the current peace proposal. The response from this college is another proof of its continued adherence, as demonstrated through its 81-year history, to the challenge of the college motto: "Non ministrari, sed ministrare."

RESPONSE OF WELLESLEY COLLEGE STUDENTS TO PEACE CORPS PROPOSAL

INTRODUCTION

Since the beginning of the 1960–61 school year, Wellesley College students have been interested in proposals for the establishment of a Peace Corps. Representatives of the campus political organization attended a conference on the Peace Corps at Princeton University in November. Since that time, discussion groups and a speech by a representative of the Harvard Nigeria program have focused campus attention on the question of including women in the program.

Wellesley College Forum and the campus committee of the National Students' Association distributed a questionnaire to the entire student body February 14–15 in an effort to determine general attitudes toward the proposed Corps. The results of this poll are enclosed in the following report. We hope that our findings will be of use to individuals involved in the final stages of planning, as an indication of the degree of interest among college women, and as a concrete proposal for the role that liberal arts graduates could play in the program.

RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE

The total number of questionnaires received was 740, of a student body of 1,700 (44 percent). Ninety-nine percent of the returned questionnaires favored the inclusion of women in the program. Sixty-four percent indicated an interest in participating in the program (note: this group will be referred to as the interested group in future discussion). Twenty-six percent were not interested in participation, and 10 percent were undecided. The division by class of the positive and negative replies is as follows:

TABLE I.—*Breakdown by class*

A. INTERESTED GROUP

[492=100 percent]

	Percent	Number
Senior	22	108
Junior	23	115
Sophomore	26	127
Freshman	29	142

B. NONINTERESTED GROUP

[193=100 percent]

Senior	32	62
Junior	20	39
Sophomore	29	56
Freshman	19	36

The division of the interested group into major fields, desired employment, and preferred length of service may be seen from the following tables:

TABLE II.—*Breakdown by major fields (interested group equals 100 percent)*

	Percent
Social sciences [1]	29
English	25
Sciences [2]	18
Modern European languages	16
Other [3]	12

[1] History, sociology, economics, political science.

[2] Both physical and biological sciences, mathematics, psychology.

[3] Art, Biblical history, classics, music, philosophy.

Students who replied positively to the questionnaire indicated several types of employment in which they would like to serve. Of the total interested group, 69 percent chose teaching, 17 percent technical and agricultural projects, and 14 percent suggested other possible employment.

TABLE III.—*Tabulation of desired employment by major field*

Employment	Major field	Percentage of students interested in this employment, majoring in indicated fields
A. Teaching	Science	40
	Languages	21
	Other [1]	39
B. Technical and agricultural fields	Physical sciences	19
	Biological sciences	16
	Other [2]	65
C. Suggested employment:		
1. Social work	Sociology	54
	Political science	27
	Other [3]	19
2. Administration	Political science	60
	Mathematics, language, philosophy	40
3. Medical work	Zoology	62
	Chemistry	24
	Other (including some nonscience majors)	14
4. Interpreting	Language (Spanish, French)	100
5. Economic planning and research	Economics	100

[1] History, philosophy, music, economics, political science, art.

[2] Many of these were economics, political science, history, and sociology majors, who stressed an interest in planning and administration.

[3] History, Biblical history, philosophy, psychology.

TABLE IV.—*Preferred length of service of interested group*

[Interested group=100 percent]

	Percent
2 years	67
3 years	12
No preference indicated	21

The following table indicates the frequency with which students in the interested group listed specific geographical areas in which they would like to serve. (Note: students were allowed to indicate more than one area.)

TABLE V.—*Percentages of total area preferences (total preferences listed equals 100 percent)*

	Percent
Africa	28
Latin America	28
Asia	20
Middle East	18
No preference	6

Students in the interested group listed a number of reasons for wanting to participate in the program. Most frequently stated was the desire to improve international understanding through increased cultural contact. The needs of the underdeveloped countries themselves was also a strong motivating factor. To a lesser extent, students listed the desire to serve the United States by improving its image in the cold war rivalry, and to spread the ideals of democracy.

Many students mentioned personal considerations: the satisfaction of service; the challenge of a new situation and the excitement of travel; the further development of an interest in a particular region; the opportunity to gain useful experience in future vocational fields.

There was little indication that students felt strenuous conditions should prohibit the participation of women in the program. One student commented: "These [strenuous] conditions might lead to a greater sense of accomplishment than a less demanding situation." Of the 193 students who did not desire to participate in the program, only 11 gave strenous conditions as the reason.

TABLE. VI.—*Reasons listed by noninterested group for not wanting to participate*

	Percent
Personal objections [1]	32
Previous plans (marriage, graduate school)	24
No reason given	43
Opposed to program for women	1

[1] Personal objections included the following, in order of frequency: "Unwilling to leave United States for extended period of time;" "unsuitable temperament;" "physical conditions would be too strenuous;" "inadequate experience;" "health reasons;" "prefer to teach in United States;" reasons indicating lack of understanding of mechanics of proposed program.

EVALUATION OF QUESTIONNAIRE

It is difficult to assess the value of the results of the Wellesley questionnaire. In particular, we doubt that the large number of students who indicated an interest in participating (29 percent of the student body) represents the size of the group that would eventually apply. The wording on the questionnaire made it possible for students to check an interest without committing themselves to actual participation. However, the difference between the percentages by class of the interested group (see table I, A), seems to indicate that the program is as attractive to juniors and seniors, who are more realistically concerned with future employment, as it is to underclassmen.

Although the director of the college placement office concurs in a cautious interpretation of the degree of actual participation indicated, we as students feel that there are several new factors in the response to the Peace Corps that distinguish it from the reaction to extended volunteer service programs in the past. Among these factors are the following: The vigor and appeal to youth generated by the new administration; the increasingly accepted belief in the value of personal exchanges for furthering international understanding; [1] a greater awareness of the needs of underdeveloped countries, and a sense of responsibility toward them. We believe that the campus political organization and the committee of the National Students Association can help spread this awareness and with it the desire to express concern through action. We have already encountered an enthusiastic reaction to weekly study groups on Africa, inaugurated by International Relations Club with the aid of a UNESCO grant.

Student response to the questionnaire indicated several possible types of employment for women. Although students at liberal arts colleges such as Wellesley do not receive training in specific technical fields, we feel that they could be of benefit to the program. Teaching, the most favorable response on the questionnaire, is perhaps the type of employment most suited to liberal arts graduates. Preparation for teaching and other fields could occur in a variety of ways. If the Peace Corps in its final form includes a year of technical training in the field (as is true of the Columbia Teachers College program with Makerere College), students with liberal arts background would have an opportunity to develop special skills. A degree of initial preparedness in the field of future employment is suggested by the relationship between academic majors and type of employment preferred (see table III). Other possible sources of experience are summer jobs and work off campus during the academic year. (For example, the Wellesley Service Organization enables girls to work in mental clinics, neighborhood houses, etc.).

As indicated in table VI, most of the interested group expressed a preference for a 2-year rather than a 3-year term of service. This preference indicates a conflict for the liberal arts graduate between her lack of specific skills and her desire to serve. Several possible variations of the program might provide for the inclusion of less skilled applicants in the program for 2 years. Those students who present considerable experience in summer and extracurricular work or who start language study prior to their participation in the program might be able to eliminate much of the training period. Men or women with little training might be of use in positions of lower responsibility in areas where a trained person is available for supervision. The use of women especially for administrative positions in the United States offices of the Peace Corps is also a possibility.

THE ROLE OF WOMEN IN THE PEACE CORPS

We realize that there are certain inevitable difficulties in the inclusion of single young women in a project of this kind. With study, solutions could perhaps be found for some of these problems. For example, to alleviate the risks (imagined or otherwise) to the single woman, women might be sent as part of development teams to rural areas—though the groups should never be large enough to become enclaves of Americans—or they might be sent to urban areas. As indicated by the results of the questionnaire, strenuous conditions did not seem to be a deterrent to most students in the interested group. The experience of Crossroads Africa and American Friends Service Committee work camps is an example of the ability of women to adapt to difficult conditions.

The benefits of including women seem to us to outweigh the disadvantages. Women might make a unique contribution in certain areas. An example is India, where the Government's attempt to elevate the position of women through increased educational opportunities has encountered parental opposition because most of the teachers are men. American women could help teach Indian girls who could in turn become teachers, with additional training. Secondly, upon their return to American communities, women with the experience of a period of service in a foreign culture would be invaluable; hopefully they could develop the general level of tolerance and international understanding through their participation in parent-teacher and community organizations. The values they would inculcate into their own children would also be beneficial to society as a whole. Finally, the training of young women in the field would prepare greater numbers for employment in our foreign service, USIA and ICA.

CONCLUSIONS

We plan to send the results of this study to other women's and coeducational colleges throughout the country in hopes of encouraging increased interest in the participation of women in the Peace Corps. Once the plan has been approved, we intend to work actively on our own campus to encourage study of the relevant fields and to carry out the program in whatever form it appears. If the Peace Corps is to be organized under private auspices coordinated by a government agency, the student political organization, in consultation with the college administration, will explore means to initiate a program similar to the Harvard and Columbia plans with the other seven college conference colleges.

[1] Seen by the large number of young people participating in the Experiment in International Living and the American Field Service.

Bulgarian Liberation Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include in the Appendix of the RECORD text of a message sent by me to the Bulgarian National Front of America, Inc., on the occasion of the celebration of Bulgarian Liberation Day.

The text follows:

MARCH 1, 1961.

Dr. KALIN KOICHEFF,
Secretary, Bulgarian National Front of America, Inc., New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. KOICHEFF: May I extend my warm congratulations to the Bulgarian National Front of America on this memorable occasion. I deeply regret that my commitments in Washington will prevent me from joining you.

The celebration of Bulgarian Liberation Day has special significance to all people everywhere who cherish freedom. It is on this day that we recall the heroic Bulgarian effort of 1878, when Bulgaria was finally freed from the ruthless subjection of Turkish rule. It is on this day, too, that we tearfully remind ourselves that Bulgaria is once again ruled by a totalitarian regime not of their own choosing.

We are all very much aware that the Bulgarian people of today are just as determined to free themselves from Communist dictatorship as were their grandfathers in casting off the Ottoman Turkish yoke. Let each of us hope and pray that they will again meet with success and that freedom and liberty will soon reign once again in the Bulgarian nation.

Sincerely yours,

PETER W. RODINO, JR.,
Member of Congress.

Medical Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter under date of February 15, 1961, from F. E. Waterman, president of the Kansas Medical Society, Topeka, Kans., addressed to Frank Stanton, CBS, New York.

Since I have received considerable mail with reference to the manner in which this broadcast was presented, I think it would be well to have this letter printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of those who desire to read the RECORD concerning this type of broadcast.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE KANSAS MEDICAL SOCIETY,
Topeka, Kans., February 15, 1961.

Mr. FRANK STANTON,
President, the Columbia Broadcasting System, New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. STANTON: We presume the Columbia Broadcasting System has received a considerable number of letters protesting the manner in which you presented the problems of health care in your television show "The Business of Health: Medicine, Money, and Politics." The Kansas Medical Society experienced the same feeling of helplessness in the face of this inaccurate attack which, undoubtedly, has been expressed to you by other medical organizations.

A few days have elapsed since the occasion of your show to give us time to consider the problem objectively. A meeting

of the house of delegates of the Kansas Medical Society scheduled prior to your show and attended by more than 100 physicians of this State on February 12, 1961, was held to continue our efforts to provide people of all ages in this State with the finest possible health care.

It was quite natural that your show should come before this meeting in a discussion of some length. The following observations and questions reflect the dilemma experienced by the Kansas Medical Society. It is our opinion medicine is not alone in this situation and we would sincerely appreciate your expression upon the validity of your contention and we welcome your suggestions.

The physicians of this State will defend the right of free speech as one of the major premises to which our Nation adheres. We believe an individual should use any means to which he has access for prevailing his opinion upon others but the integrity of the medium through which he speaks should, I am sure you agree, force such individual to identify himself and those he represents.

It is not the fact that someone utilized the facilities of the Columbia Broadcasting System to advocate socialism for the United States that distresses us; it is the impression the program went to some effort to convey to the public that your network was bringing the people of this Nation an analysis of several views on a question of moment about which there are opposing opinions and then gave only one side of the argument. Of even greater concern to us is that medicine was invited to assist in developing the debate and during its presentation was credited with this fact but almost nothing of what medicine said appeared on the program.

We are sure the American Medical Association was of the opinion that this program was sponsored by the Columbia Broadcasting System as a public information service. If that is not correct, if this program was outside your organization, we believe the Columbia Broadcasting System would have made that fact known. It leaves us, for lack of other knowledge, therefore only with the opinion that your network is committed to the argument as presented and that you intend to press for public support of your contention. But the program did not say this. Instead, it told the people of the United States that the American Medical Association had assisted in its preparation.

Our dilemma is of course apparent. The medical profession did assist in the preparation but was excluded during the presentation.

We think ours is also rapidly becoming a dilemma for the information media of this Nation. Permit us a little philosophy in an effort to clarify our statement. The problem before medicine at this time may shortly become a crisis for the Columbia Broadcasting System which, when it is apparent, will have advanced beyond the point of redemption.

We recognize the economic hazard of extended illness perhaps more acutely than anyone else because we see the people to whom this happens. We know you are aware of this and that the reduction of morbidity in terms of time represents an economic gain to the individual today. You also are aware that medicine is doing many things to still further alleviate not only illness itself, but the economic distress this may bring.

You are familiar with the fact that in every State as in Kansas, the doctors of medicine have pledged to the public their professional services regardless of the individual's ability to pay. All this and a vast amount of other information is available to you but we think it represents only the periphery of the problem or its solution. It is a treatment of symptoms rather than the cause.

We believe historians of the future may well conclude the real revolution of this period is the consumer's emergence into control over the manner in which he will purchase commodities and services. Whether right or wrong, he is already dictating this in a great many instances and health care is the present frontier in the consumer's list of objectives. The producer of the services might know beyond all question, including any hint of aggrandizement, that the proposed choice is not in the consumer's best interest. Unless he can impart the knowledge of his experience to the consumer, the ultimate choice could well be disastrous.

Today medicine faces this crisis. We believe the outcome of the issue of socialized medicine is of only negligible concern to the practice of medicine but of momentous import to the people of this Nation as citizens. But we cannot adequately tell our story and find ourselves especially helpless in the face of situations such as the recent event involving the Columbia Broadcasting System.

When efforts such as yours influence public opinion to where the consumer dictates to the medical profession the conditions under which he will purchase his health care, he will move to a new frontier.

Eventually, this will strike the information services and when it does, freedom of speech as we enjoy it today will be denied.

In case you think our argument is distorted, may we summarize: We heartily endorse the idea of public debate upon controversial issues but we believe an agency of the influence of the Columbia Broadcasting System should exercise exceptional care in the fair presentation of both sides of such issues. Particularly is this true where items of essential services are concerned because the public will elect how these are to be purchased. If their choice is made on less than full knowledge, the result can affect much more than the service in question. Therefore, we have not only a crisis to face but, due in part to this program, a dilemma in addition to our previous concern. Both the problem and the dilemma will react not only upon us as physicians but, we sincerely believe, shortly upon other essential services as well.

Your consideration of this condition is solicited and any advice you might care to give the medical profession on what we might do will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

F. E. WRIGHTMAN, M.D.,
President.

Adm. Bartholomew Hogan

SPEECH
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, Adm. Bartholomew Hogan has served the U.S. Navy and our Government faithfully and well. He leaves active duty with the glow of satisfaction that comes to a man who knows he has successfully served his country intelligently, competently, and with honor.

Many of us are reluctant to see him go because we have been the beneficiaries of his wonderful talent in the field of medicine. He is not only highly skilled in his profession but he knows men. His deep knowledge of human nature with its frailties and weaknesses is one of the many assets that makes him a great doctor of medicine.

He took over the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Navy at a critical period in its history. He oriented its activities in the right direction. He leaves it knowing that he has builded well; that those who come after him will have an easier time.

I am glad to know Bart Hogan—to know his worth and to have his friendship. Verily here is a man who can "walk with kings nor lose the common touch."

Remarks of Col. Hubert F. Lee in Presenting the Man of the South for 1960 Award to Mr. Joseph T. Lykes in Tampa December 7, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, about the turn of the century, the Lykes family of steamship fame commenced its operations in the maritime industry. Mr. James Lykes, Sr., opened an office in my hometown of Galveston, Tex. The extent of their operations is too well known to require comment from me.

In 1910, one of the brothers, Mr. Joseph T. Lykes, Sr., began his individual career—also in Galveston. Subsequently with the passage of time, he has become the head of the Lykes family—a family which, in itself, is an American tradition.

Each year, an outstanding man of the South is elected to the South's Hall of Fame for the Living. On December 7, 1960, this honor was awarded to Mr. Lykes, known universally among his associates and his innumerable friends as "Mr. Joe." The award was made by the founder of the South's Hall of Fame for the Living, Mr. Hubert Lee, of Decatur, Ga. His tribute to "Mr. Joe" is something which should be recorded for posterity in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and it is my honor to place his words in the Appendix at this time:

REMARKS OF COL. HUBERT F. LEE IN PRESENTING THE MAN OF THE SOUTH FOR 1960 AWARD TO MR. JOSEPH T. LYKES IN TAMPA, DECEMBER 7, 1960

Mr. Chairman, Senator HOLLAND, Mr. Donald Comer, members of the Lykes family, distinguished friends:

I regard this as the South's greatest hour, as we signal out one man to honor as the man of the South of the year.

I am here in the capacity of a reporter who records the world as it happens and not as a modern version of a King Arthur knighting a Sir Galahad of the 20th century, although the man we honor would wear with becoming dignity such a knightly mantle.

Mr. Joseph T. Lykes, we honor you tonight for your fine character and Christian prin-

ciples that have followed you all the years of your life. We honor you, Mr. Lykes, for your leadership while a student of Washington and Lee University and for the contributions you have made to the field of education.

We honor you, Mr. Lykes, for your part in helping your brothers make the name of Lykes a badge of honor identifying a team of pioneers in the development of the South and its contribution to the Nation.

We honor you, Mr. Lykes, for your civic leadership at Galveston, Tex., where you began your life's career.

We honor you, Mr. Lykes, for your business acumen which has served so well in the guidance of the affairs of the Lykes Bros. of which you are titular head and for the way you have guided the family enterprises and such institutions as your own alma mater, Washington and Lee University.

We honor you, Mr. Lykes, because all your life the lines have fallen in pleasant places because of your own self and because of the fine heritage you have as a member of the family of Lykes.

We honor you, Mr. Lykes, because you are at heart a modest and humble man who knows that living a life of leadership and service comes more by the grace of God than our own doing, and with you we honor all men of good will who would rather give the credit for their own works to others.

We honor you, Mr. Lykes, as a husband and father who has passed along the same fine traits your own father passed on to you.

We honor you, Mr. Lykes, because your life's record has been such as to prompt Mr. Reuben B. Robertson, the Man of the South for 1950, and a great American who pioneered in the making of book papers and in employee and community relations as head of Champion Paper & Fibre Co. for more than a half century, to write:

"You have brought honor to me by association as the man of the South 10 years ago."

We honor you, Mr. Lykes, because your selection as the Man of the South for 1960 honors the past men of the South: Messrs. Thomas W. Martin, 1946; Donald Comer, 1947; C. Hamilton Moses, 1948; the late Ernest L. Kurth, 1949; Reuben B. Robertson, 1950; the late David Ovens, 1951; the late James C. Self, 1952; Bobby Jones, the all-time golf champion, 1953; Bishop Arthur Moore, 1954; my newspaper boss of 1925 and 1926, Senator Wilton E. Hall, 1955; the late Senator Walter George, 1956; A. Dee Simpson, 1957; Frank P. Sanford, 1958; and Norman A. Cocke, 1959.

We honor you, Mr. Lykes, because you stand unique among all the men of the South since 1946 in that you have received more votes from more countries around the world than anyone during the 15 years it has been my privilege to report the life's record of the men who have earned the distinction.

We honor you, Mr. Lykes, because this is the 50th anniversary as a member of the Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., and with you we honor all these who over the years have had a part in making this one of the world's great steamship companies.

We honor you, Mr. Lykes, because Americans anywhere in the world are stirred whenever one of the Lykes ships are seen. To me, the sight of the Lykes flag is second only to that of our beloved Stars and Stripes because the Lykes honor and prestige over the world is so fine and heartlifting.

We honor you, Mr. Lykes, because you have brought honor through association to all those on the "South's Hall of Fame for the Living," the honor group which is limited to 200 living leaders and from which each year the man of the South is elected. This honor group includes our esteemed friend, Mr. Carl Brerein who is a man much loved and honored because of his 40 years of leadership in these parts, a typical example of which is his presence here tonight as chairman of this wonderful testimonial to the man of the South.

We honor your Mr. Lykes for your leadership in Tampa and in Florida over the years. I lived in Arcadia in 1927, 1928, and part of 1929 before starting my magazine Dixie Business in November 1929, so know of my own personal knowledge of the love and esteem you and the Lykes family are held in Florida. I bring you greetings from Mr. A. C. Polk, Sr. My 80-year-old brother-in-law in Arcadia, who devoted many hours this year telling your friends how they could help pay tribute to you.

Mr. Lykes, you are truly a great pioneer of southern industry and you have contributed much to the greatness of our beloved South and Nation, both personally and as a member of the Lykes Brothers team.

It has been my privilege to read letters from over the world as well as our own country, telling why you should be honored as the man of the South. I regard the annual poll as the greatest democratic election ever devised to honor living men. Anyone in the world may vote for the candidate of his choice.

I could go on reporting on what I have heard and read and know about you, Mr. Lykes, but that would take days.

I can only say that I hope all future men named man of the South will be as worthy of the honor as you.

So, on behalf of the past men of the South, the South's Hall of Fame for the Living and the editors of Dixie Business, I am honored to present you this distinguished service award officially designating you the man of the South for 1960. I also present to you a volume containing many of the letters received in your behalf and I am sure that reading them will bring you many moments of pleasure.

Labor-Management Cooperation in the Clothing Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, last month, President Jacob S. Potofsky of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America addressed the members of the International Association of Clothing Designers on the status and accomplishments of the American clothing industry.

In his speech, Mr. Potofsky outlines the progress of the men's and boys' clothing industry, both in terms of the product which it offers to consumers and in terms of the conditions of work and wages of persons employed in this industry. He warmly praises management in the clothing industry for the spirit of cooperation and constructive action which they have consistently displayed.

Appropriate for a leader of the clothing industry, Mr. Potofsky said in his speech: "I want to take my hat off to you—leaders of the clothing industry—for your foresight and social mindedness, for your willingness to share the burden." Mr. President, I want to take my hat off to the clothing industry too. I am impressed by the spirit of cooperation in which labor and management work together. They may not always agree—but they have always managed to disagree in a pretty fine way.

Mr. President, I want also to call attention to the final paragraphs of Mr. Potofsky's speech in which he speaks of the problems confronting the clothing industry as a result of the importation of low-wage produced goods from overseas. I have been in close touch with Mr. Potofsky about this problem. This is a very serious matter.

I have introduced a bill in the Senate (S. 675) which I believe represents a sensible and sound position in this controversial area. While my bill may not be the final solution, it contains much which I believe should be done to provide more equitable and realistic procedures for relief in instances in which domestic industries and their workers are injured as a result of low-wage produced products coming into this country in huge quantities and over relatively short periods of time.

Mr. President, I am proud to call attention to Mr. Potofsky's address and the fine spirit of cooperation which it typifies. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE HAVE BECOME A FIRST-CLASS INDUSTRY

(By Jacob S. Potofsky)

I am honored by your invitation to address the members and guests of the International Association of Clothing Designers. Over the years, I have watched your fraternity of designers—dare I call you a union?—play an increasingly active role in the all-important job of selling our industry and our products to the American public. Your inspiration and artistry, and your ingenuity in creating more style-consciousness, have helped to give new importance to an old fact: that clothing is meant not merely to cover or protect, but also to adorn and enhance the human frame.

A NEW INDUSTRY REVOLUTION

In a way, what you are doing, along with the American Institute of Men's and Boys' Wear, is to fashion a revolution in our industry. It is not the first revolution our industry has seen. As a matter of fact, your accomplishments would not have been possible without earlier revolutions which laid the groundwork for you. You are building today on a foundation laid years ago—and I am proud that my organization, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, has played and will continue to play a major part in the changes that occur as our industry grows.

The first great revolution in our industry started in the opening decade of this century, and it brought about the decline and fall of the sweatshop era. Some of you may remember those days—and nights—of merciless labor and inhuman treatment, with uncertain rewards. For years our industry had the unpleasant distinction of being one of the worst on the industrial scene. The sweatshop was bad for the workers but it was equally bad for you and for the public. Chaos and uncertainty were the common condition of the market: chaos in production, in quality, in sales, in price. The average employer had little control over his own standards, and the consumer could not depend on uniform quality or even on delivery.

It took many years of struggle, but that revolution is over. The sweatshop and homework are dead.

Today we are proud that we enjoy stable and productive relationships with the employers. Today the worker is assured of a decent wage, some measure of job security, and a voice in settling legitimate grievances. Today an employer can look ahead and plan for the future, and the consumer can depend on uniform standards of quality in any price range. We are still a highly competitive industry—one of the most competitive in the land. As a matter of fact, sometimes I think you make it more competitive than conditions warrant. But at least the competition is not at the expense of labor. Today, we are an efficient, progressive, growing industry.

WORKERS AS HUMAN BEINGS

The second revolution was an extension of the first, and it is still being played out. For when we overcame the problem of the sweatshop, we turned our attention to the welfare of the workers not only as workers, but as human beings. It doesn't sound very novel now, but in 1923, when we initiated our unemployment insurance program in Chicago, it was unheard of. Until that time it was widely believed that unemployment, illness or old age, were no responsibility of the employer. That belief is as dead as the sweatshop.

We know now that a worker's ability on the job depends in part on his basic sense of security. And the industry has benefited from that sense of security. We have come to appreciate, too, that the community as a whole benefits when everyone has some kind of protection against misfortune.

Through the years, we have steadily expanded this concept of our responsibility to workers as human beings. When the Federal Government instituted national unemployment insurance, our plan was converted into a health and welfare program. Later we added a retirement program, supplementing social security.

Because our welfare program is jointly managed and industrywide, we have been able to render efficient services through our own insurance companies. During the past 10 years we have struck out in new directions with the building of medical and health centers, along with extensive recreation and educational facilities for retired workers.

SHARING THE BURDEN

The union provided the major impetus for this widening area of activity. But I want to take my hat off to you—leaders of the clothing industry—for your foresight and social mindedness, for your willingness to share the burden.

There is one thing to be said of our industry—it doesn't stand still. Today, we are in the midst of a third revolution: a unified industry effort to promote itself and its products to the consumer.

This is an important educational job. The products of our labor are being shortchanged by the American consumer. The American male was—and still is—the most neglected member of the family when it comes to clothing. The average wife maintains an up-to-date, well-fitting wardrobe. And that's as it should be. But when the good lady returns from her shopping, her husband takes another look at his last year's suit and decides it will last a year or two more. It may be out of style; it may be a little worn—no matter. The figures tell the story: The average male buys less than half a suit a year. What a sad commentary on this, the richest country in the world, where we pride ourselves on our high living standards.

A little more than 8 years ago, I addressed the 20th anniversary dinner of the Clothing Manufacturers Association and urged that the industry mount an intensive campaign, using all the modern tools of communication, to promote its own products. We applauded the subsequent creation of the American Institute for Men's and Boys' Wear and we gave it substantial support.

AN IMPORTANT LINK

The AIMBW, along with the work being done by your association, is an important link in the chain of our industry's growing strength. We know that today the American male is not adequately dressed to meet his business and social needs. The average American male still regards clothing as protection, not adornment. As a matter of fact, he is not even adequately dressed for protection—against changes of climate or weather.

Clothing may not make the man, but it certainly helps. A decently dressed boy is less likely to become a menace to society than a boy in blue jeans and black leather jacket. A well dressed man takes more pride in himself and in his work than a man in old slacks and a T-shirt.

Our job is to bring to the American public a consciousness of dress, a pride in appearance, an appreciation of new styles and fabrics. Brand-name advertising by individual companies is helpful, but it is not enough. Our goal can only be met by a massive, industrywise campaign shared in by every company making men's and boys' apparel. We must show ingenuity, vision and daring in promoting our industry, in obtaining a larger share of the consumer dollar.

A FIRST-CLASS INDUSTRY

The American clothing industry has distinguished itself in producing the best garments that money can buy in any price range. It has brought good clothes within the reach of every consumer. It has demonstrated that clothing can be mass produced and still assure the buyer a high level of style, quality and variety.

These are no mean achievements. In lifting ourselves out of the sweatshop-and-homework era, we have become a first-class industry, a basic and stable industry in the Nation and an example for the world.

We are only too familiar with the picture of the clothing industry in other nations. Since it requires less capital than heavy industry, the making of clothing is traditionally one of the first ventures of nations trying to promote industrialization. In most of these nations, the clothing industry is at the same stage we were 50 years ago; wages are substandard, homework is common, working conditions are shocking, quality is uncertain, and style is poor.

So today we face a new threat, and that is the swift spread of products made under sweatshop conditions—the same conditions we abolished here long ago. Just as bad money chases out good, so sweatship products can undermine and eventually destroy products made under decent working conditions. We hope that the newly industrialized nations will follow our example in abolishing the sweatshop, but until they do, we intend to guard our own conditions.

I can tell you now that we of the Amalgamated have no intention of allowing the products of sweatshop labor to destroy our achievements of the past 50 years. And we know that you of management share that intention 100 percent.

As has been true in the past, the Amalgamated will continue to cooperate with the industry in meeting even higher goals. We have taken pride in our association over the years—an association that has brought stability and much benefit to all segments of our industry and to the community as well. We will look forward to an equally close relationship in the years ahead, and I know that we will continue our mutual progress. I for one, am hopeful about the future of our industry.

The Red Cross

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, a number of areas in my congressional district have been hard hit within recent weeks because of rampaging floodwaters. Although great financial loss has occurred, much human misery has been averted because of prompt action by local, State, and national agencies which have unhesitatingly made available what facilities they had available during this crisis.

One such agency, the American Red Cross, performed yeoman service. An editorial in the March 2 edition of the Hattiesburg American, a daily newspaper published in Hattiesburg, Miss., the heart of the most damaged area, points up the magnificent contribution of the Red Cross to the well-being of the people affected by the flood. In order that the general public may be advised, I submit below this splendid tribute to the effectiveness of the American Red Cross.

The editorial follows:

THE RED CROSS

Volunteer Red Cross officials from throughout south Mississippi will take the story of the valiant work of rehabilitation of the Hattiesburg floor area back to their homes today. They came here Wednesday, toured part of the disaster area and heard explanations from national Red Cross personnel of what has been done already and what is planned for the future.

When they left, they carried with them the heartening word that should disaster strike their own areas, trained men and women of the American Red Cross will join them and direct the job that the American people expect.

The Red Cross comes in for much criticism—some of it no doubt justified because no organization or individual is perfect—but the work that is being done here should convince even the most skeptical of the greatness of this agency.

Hattiesburg area flood news now is leaving the front pages of the newspapers, the top spots on radio broadcasts, and the screens of television sets. The glamour is gone, but the major part of repairing what the waters damaged and destroyed has only begun.

The Red Cross estimates that more than 80 cents out of every dollar spent during a disaster is devoted to rehabilitation. Dozens of trained workers in every field are in the Hattiesburg area and will remain to help in the monumental task of returning life to some semblance of normalcy.

In the months to come, the Red Cross coffers will loose into Mississippi more money than has been collected in drives during the past 2 years. This will be spent on work with the people and their living problems. Federal funds that have been allocated for Mississippi are restricted to use for public facilities—schools, roads, bridges, etc.

The rehabilitation of the citizenry itself lies with the Red Cross and the volunteers it can recruit. Many workers will be needed for weeks to come.

In the 14 counties affected in the recent flood more than 2,500 families are expected to go to the Red Cross for help. An anticipated 1,700 will be in Hattiesburg alone.

None of these will be turned away. In the brief days since the crest of the flood we in Hattiesburg have seen what teamwork, coupled with the hearts of our own people, has done to restore morale and living conditions. It is up to us to pass that word, and our appreciation, on to others.

Golden Gateway to the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, this is centennial year in Kansas and many excellent articles have been written in regard to the observance of our centennial year.

A very excellent article entitled "Golden Gateway to the West," was written by Bob Considine and appeared in the New York Journal American, issue of February 13.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOLDEN GATEWAY TO THE WEST

(By Bob Considine)

Don't look now, but Kansas is 100 years old. Statehood came to it on January 29, 1861, and it's taking a year off to mark that happy day. All Americans should. Just suppose Kansas didn't join us. We'd be the shape of a doughnut.

It was there before. An elegant Spaniard named Francisco Vasquez Coronado sampled its delights, but found no gold, 79 years before the Mayflower threw a line on the Plymouth Rock. And where would TV be today without Kansas? It not only produced Jesse and Frank James, Coleman Younger and the Dalton gang, but the fearless Wyatt Earp and Bat Masterson to bring them to book. Dodge City wasn't named for the car. It was called that after the principal occupation of natives caught between salvos.

John Brown's body, long before it began a mouldering, was active in Kansas. He led a raid around Pottawatomie in which five proslavery settlers were killed in retaliation for the deaths of as many Abolitionists murdered shortly before. He should never have taken that trip to Harper's Ferry.

Kansas was the gateway through which poured the amazing Americans who opened the West. The ruts their wagon wheels bit still stand like proud scars here and there. A boy named Ike Eisenhower, part of a poor family in Abilene, used to sit by the hour listening to men tell tales of their cattle drives from Texas and the Oklahoma Panhandle, over the Chisholm Trail that ended in his little town.

Washington Irving gave the place a bad reputation by writing of it as if it were a desert. Actually, it once was under water, a couple hundred million years ago, as any fool who has seen the salt deposits in central Kansas will tell you. They are as deep down as 1,000 feet, and as much as 500 feet in thickness. Kansas also has 41 lakes and several Federal reservoirs, and water-skiing is a favorite sport. One of the industries of Leavenworth is tugboat building. It is the only State that has both tugboats and buffalo. And the only one which produced Walter Johnson.

Kansas had more trouble getting into the Union than either Hawaii or Alaska. During the 7 years it had the status of territory, three State constitutions were drawn up and scrapped. It couldn't make up its mind whether to permit slavery or not. The fourth constitution, drawn at Wyandotte—now part of Kansas City, Kans.—touched off calamitous fireworks in Congress. For 16 months it hung (and aroused) fire as Abolitionists wrangled with States Righters. The walkout of many southern Senators on the eve of the Civil War swung Kansas into the list of Free States. President Buchanan signed the bill that added another star to Old Glory, the 34th.

At the outbreak of the War Between the States, Kansas had 30,000 men between the ages of 18 and 45. Twenty thousand of them joined the Union forces, including two Negro infantry regiments and a Negro artillery battery. No other State could boast of the same response—two-thirds of Kansas' eligible men had joined up. Some 8,498 were killed, the highest mortality rate of any State.

Many forget that the Civil War spread as far inland as Kansas. Generals Pleasonton, Blunt, and Curtis defeated a Confederate army under Gen. Sterling Price at Mine Creek in October 1864, and General Lee gave up all hope of taking that remote State. One of the finest men American journalism ever produced, William Allen White, found the Emporia Gazette the perfect pulpit. Kansas, a tremendous aviation industrial complex now, also produced the first woman to fly the Atlantic, the first one to fly it solo and the first to fly from Hawaii to California—Amelia Earhart.

Drop in and visit Kansas on its 100th birthday. The natives are friendly, speak perfect English, and you won't be confined to $100 worth of purchases to bring back home.

The Race in Space and F–1 Rocket Engine Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, one of my specific assignments as a member of the House Science and Astronautics Committee during the 86th Congress was to study and recommend funds for the development of the powerful F–1 rocket engine.

The F–1 rocket engine is the 1,500,000-pound-thrust single chamber powerplant which will be used to thrust into outer space a 45-ton spaceship with sufficient energy and propulsion to orbit Mars.

As a result of the recommendation of the Subcommittee of the House Science and Astronautics Committee of which I was a member during the 86th Congress a contract was negotiated by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration with North American Aviation of Los Angeles, Calif., and through the capable and expert work of the North American Corp. at their Rocketdyne plant in southern California, they have developed the powerful F–1 rocket engine to a point of positive capability, and we are assured that it will be ready for actual firing in the near future.

With the F–1 rocket engine in operation, we will then have closed the gap between the United States and the Soviet Union for powerful rocket thrust engines capable of placing in orbit or into interplanetary exploration spaceships with the necessary equipment to return to us the vital information we are seeking.

Mr. Speaker, I am submitting herewith an up to the minute review of the progress made in the development of the powerful F–1 rocket engine which I am confident all Members of the House will be interested in reading:

F–1 ENGINE DEVELOPMENT: LOOMING LARGE IN THE U.S. SPACE PROGRAM, THE TREMENDOUS F–1 ENGINE HAS MOVED WITH SURPRISING SPEED TO THE TESTING STAGE

(By D. E. Aldrich and D. J. Sanchini)

A comparison of satellite weights announced by the Soviet Union with the weights of satellites launched by the United States demonstrates a significant difference in capabilities. The first two Soviet satellites weighed 184 and 1,120 pounds, respectively. Our first satellites weighed 31 and 3¼ pounds, respectfully. The gap in weight-lifting capability has continued. For example, our first artificial planet, Explorer IV, weighed about 13 pounds. The first Soviet artificial planet weighed about 3,100 pounds. Our Discoverer series of recovery vehicles weigh about 1,700 pounds. The recovery vehicles launched by the Soviet Union weighed about 10,000 pounds.

Thus, it became obvious that we should "leapfrog" the next step in rocket-booster technology and begin immediately the development of very-high-thrust booster engines to accomplish the ambitious space programs of the near future. Manned orbital flight and instrumented probes to the moon and nearby planets are planned for the early 1960's. Relatively large manned earth-orbiting laboratories, manned space vehicles to the moon, and manned orbital trajectories to the nearby planets are planned for the late 1960's. The spacecraft accomplishing these later missions, the "wagon trains" of the space age, will be Nova-class vehicles, using clusters of F-1 engines, the subject of this discussion.

We can illustrate the capabilities of Nova-type vehicles powered with high-energy upper stages by discussing several typical missions which could be accomplished with the same booster. For purposes of illustration, assume the use of a booster with six F–1 engines clustered for a takeoff thrust of 9 million pounds.

A vehicle of this type would be capable of lofting up to 400,000 pounds into a low-altitude orbit. For example, a mission could be to establish a manned laboratory for astronomical and earth observation, as well as other scientific and technical studies. Or large space platforms could be assembled in 400,000-pound increments by multiple-launch and rendezvous techniques. In addition, a large lunar vehicle, or vehicles for manned interplanetary flight, could be assembled and fueled while in a parking orbit. The use of the F–1 engine would considerably reduce the number of missions required to assemble very heavy, multiple-unit space platforms or large interplanetary vehicles.

Another typical vehicle would be capable of launching a 65-ton payload into a 24-hour orbit for such diverse functions as astronomical studies, weather observation, earth surveillance, navigational systems, and radio and television communications. Such capsules, capable of being repaired and maintained, could very well be an economical solution to the lofting of a variety of satellite systems.

A vehicle of this type would also be capable of placing up to 90,000 pounds into a Mars

orbit. With such a payload capability, a capsule could be well equipped with instrumentation and telemetering equipment. It could launch robot probes to the surface of the planet and relay the telemetered information back to earth stations. With the F–1 engine in the typical six-engine cluster, and with high energy upper stages, we would be capable of accomplishing a manned moon landing and return with an earth-landing weight of approximately 20,000 pounds.

The Rocketdyne F–1 engine, being developed under NASA contract for a Nova-type vehicle, is the direct result of such planning.

Although the contract for the development of the F–1 engine was signed in January 1959, the development of a single-chamber 1,500,000-pound-thrust engine was already well started. Under the Air Force rocket engine advancement program, studies of the feasibility of rocket engines up to 1-million-pound thrust were begun as early as 1955. These culminated in 1957 with a detailed analysis of a single-chamber million-pound-thrust engine with supporting model testing and full-scale thrust-chamber design. Later in the year, the program was realined to include three full-scale thrust-chamber firing attempts. These tests were concluded in March 1959, with a brief mainstage test at 1-million-pound thrust that demonstrated stable combustion.

F–1 CONTRACT BACKED BY STUDIES

Thus, with this preliminary work, the hardware, the facilities, and other necessary capabilities were being developed at the time of the NASA contract award for the development of the F–1 engine.

The principal objectives in the design of the F–1 engine are reliability, simplicity, and a degree of ruggedness required to provide a greater margin of safety for future manned applications. Advanced metallurgy, together with proper application of proven component designs, are the tools being used to achieve this goal.

The basic comonents of the F–1 engine are a tubular-wall thrust chamber, a direct-drive turbopump, a gas generator, and appropriate controls. The engine weighs approximately 15,000 pounds.

For simplicity and compactness, the turbopump is mounted directly on the thrust chamber. All other components are either mounted on these two assemblies or are in the plumbing system between them. When the engine is gimballed, the high-pressure ducting is not flexed. Thrust-vector control is achieved by gimballing the entire engine. The high-pressure fuel is used as the hydraulic actuating medium.

The thrust-chamber assembly consists of a tubular-wall, regeneratively cooled chamber with an uncooled extension, a double-inlet oxidizer dome, four integral fuel valves, and a flat-faced injector.

The cooled portion of the thrust chamber extends to a 10-to-1 expansion area ratio. Its approximate measurements are 40-inch combustion-chamber diameter, 9½-foot-nozzle-exit diameter, and 11-foot length. The chamber is designed for the attachment of segmented, uncooled nozzle extensions to facilitate transportation and to accommodate any expansion-area ratio required by the vehicle mission up to 16 to 1.

Two tons per second of liquid oxygen and nearly one ton per second of narrow-cut kerosene (RP–1) are burned in the combustion chamber. The oxygen usage rate is equivalent to that of 60 million people in normal breathing. In 3 seconds of mainstage operation, the F–1 uses as much fuel as the average automobile uses in 1 year.

The oxidizer is fed through dual inlets to the dome to assure even distribution to the injector. The oxidizer passes through feed holes, and is injected through a pattern of 2,600 orifices into the combustion chamber. The fuel is also fed through dual inlets to a chamber feed manifold. From here, it flows through alternate tubes the length of the chamber, and then returns to the fuel collector manifold. The flow then continues through four valves spaced at 90 degrees around the chamber into an injector feed manifold. This manifold distributes the fuel through 32 spokes into the injector, from which it passes through approximately 3,700 orifices into the combustion chamber. The location of the valves downstream of the chamber provides a greater degree of control in timing and sequencing the fuel for engine starting. It also provides a repeatable minimum cutoff impulse.

For simplicity and reliability, the turbopump is a direct-drive unit. The fuel and oxidizer pumps are driven by a velocity-compounded turbine. Operating at rated conditions, it will develop approximately 60,000 horsepower. It is 4 feet in diameter, 5 feet long, and weighs 2,500 pounds.

The oxidizer is supplied to the pump through a single inlet, in line with the main shaft, and is discharged radially through dual outlets. The dual-outlet design provides a balance of the centrifugal loads in the pump and minimizes the pump diameter. The fuel pump design also includes dual inlets and outlets for balanced load distribution and minimum size.

GAS-GENERATOR OPERATION

The gas generator operates fuel-rich, and burns about 2 percent of the total propellants used in the engine. The partial sphere is approximately 10 inches in diameter. The design makes use of a double-wall combustion chamber, through which the fuel flows to cool the body regeneratively. This feature adds to the safety of the engine by eliminating a hot outer surface which could ignite leaking propellants, and it reduces heat radiation to adjacent components.

The main controls are four fuel valves integral to the thrust-chamber assembly, two oxidizer valves mounted on the thrust-chamber dome, a gas-generator valve, a fuel- and oxidizer-flow regulator for the gas generator, and a four-way solenoid valve. This four-way solenoid valve is one of the only two components in the engine requiring electrical wiring or energy; the other is the spark exciter for gas-generator ignition. The oxidizer and fuel valves are of the poppet type. The poppet eliminates the turning moment associated with large butterfly and ball valves, simplifies sealing problems, and minimizes the package size.

The major F–1 engine test facilities consist of two engine stands and a thrust-chamber stand located at Edwards Air Force Base. An interim stand for thrust chambers and a turbopump stand are located at Rocketdyne's Santa Susana facility.

The thrust-chamber test facility capable of the full 1,500,000-pound thrust level that has been provided at Edwards Air Force Base requires huge, high-pressure, heavy-wall tanks to feed the propellants to the chamber. The tanks are constructed of stainless-steel plate approximately 5 inches thick, and have control valves that weigh more than 6 tons each. It was not economically practical to build these tanks large enough to supply the thrust chamber for durations of more than 20 seconds.

The engine-test facilities consist of a converted Atlas missile stand and a new two-position stand at Edwards. This new stand accommodates the side-by-side installation of two F–1 engines. This structure is an 11-story-high complex of heavily reinforced concrete with a girder framework anchored in granite. The stand construction permits the addition of concrete and anchoring structure to accommodate the testing of clusters of F–1 engines.

INJECTOR—A MAJOR HURDLE

Concerning development testing, experience has shown that the injector presents the first major hurdle. Stable combustion must be attained before injector cooling and other thrust-chamber development problems can be investigated. It seems logical to scale up designs which have proved successful in smaller engines. However, this did not prove to be an easy and quick solution for the 400,000-pound-thrust E–1 engine. It took 1½ years to evolve a stable injector configuration for the E–1.

The F–1 injector test program got underway within 2 months after the start of the NASA contract with the test of full-scale hardware. This was possible becuse of previous work which provided a test stand and some experimental hardware. Heavy-duty thrust-chamber hardware, which is inexpensive and easily fabricated, was used.

A series of water-flow and calibration tests was conducted to determine the start sequence which should be employed for the first hot-firing test. The initial series of hot tests consisted of ignition and transition tests. This is one of the most critical stages in an injector development program.

Unstable combustion explosions, and other destructive effects occurred in these tests, which ranged from 100 to 500 millisec in duration. However, a marginal degree of stability was achieved on the third test, and a stable injector configuration was then evolved 8 months after the start of the program. A large number of injector tests have now been conducted at or above the 1-million-pound thrust level.

The turbopump requires more design and fabrication time than any other component of the engine. To evaluate turbopump-design criteria, an intensive program of model testing was conducted. This model hardware has been successfully used to evaluate the fuel pump, oxidizer pump, inducers, and turbines from the standpoint of performance and durability. First tests of a full-scale turbopump began in November 1960. Calibration and development tests are underway.

Gas-generator tests were started on schedule in March 1960 with a successful short-duration test. Since that date, numerous successful tests have been conducted without failures associated with the combustion process.

The gas generator has been tested to the full facility capacity of 135 sec, and has performed satisfactorily over wide rages of mixture ratio, temperature, and pressure. Also included in the test series were simulated engine-start sequences, demonstrating suitability of gas generators for engine use.

The control components, including the oxidizer and fuel valves, the gas-generator valve, the four-way solenoid, and the gas-generator regulators, are all in development testing. These consist of flow, pressure, timing, and actuation tests. In the first phase of testing, water is normally used as the working fluid. However, the development program has progressed to the use of the actual propellant associated with each valve. Prior to installation in the engine, the components undergo tests in the subsystems in which they function. For example, the fuel and oxidizer valves are being tested in thrust-chamber assemblies simulating engine operation, and the valve-assembly regulators are being tested with the gas generator.

The first engine system is scheduled to be tested early in 1961. The components being assembled into this engine have completed hot-firing and bench tests. The first phase of the engine program will consist of short duration tests to perfect the engine-start and shutdown sequences. These tests will be followed by performance, durability, repeatability, and relia-

bility programs, all designed to prepare the engine for the start of a preliminary flight-rating test (PFRT) in late 1962. The engine, after approximately 18,000 sec of development testing, is scheduled to complete PFRT early in 1963.

Development of the F–1 engine is proceeding on schedule. With this high-thrust engine available in early 1963, and through the experience gained in engine clustering in the Saturn program, the way will be cleared for launching, in the mid-1960's, of advanced vehicles capable of establishing the first true outposts of man in space.

Mr. Speaker, I am also submitting herewith a summary of the comparison of space exploration by the United States and the Soviet Union which removes all doubt as to which of these nations has accomplished the most in specific and sophisticated scientific information. From the satellites launched by the two nations, the United States is far and away in the lead over the Soviet Union.

This should be interesting and valuable information to the American public and especially to the Members of Congress. Insofar as I am personally concerned as an original Member of the House Science and Astronautics Committee, and having heard expert testimony from all sources both civilian and military on the position of the United States in space exploration, I have never conceded that the Soviet Union was ahead of the United States in vital and important scientific information which we have been able to obtain from the satellites we have launched especially in reference to the United States superior position to Russia on weather reporting and photographing cloud masses, navigation aids, and communications progress of which there is no evidence that Russia has made any progress in these vital fields to date.

The following summary of a comparison between the United States and the Soviet Union on space exploration should prove interesting and valuable to those interested in the progress we are making in space exploration:

THE RACE IN SPACE: UNITED STATES VERSUS RUSSIA

A new air of confidence about U.S. progress in space is beginning to filter through official Washington.

Reasons are found in a report of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration that has had little public attention.

From a study of actual space achievements by the United States and Russia, NASA concluded this:

After a fast start, Russian space work slowed, missed many scientific opportunities.

After a slow start, the U.S. space program is paying off in a rush of discoveries.

The United States it appears, still lags in rocket power. But it leads in everything else.

A burst of speed in the U.S. effort to conquer space has brought this country closer to a par with Russia in fields where it has been lagging and far ahead in most branches of space science.

A report just made to Congress by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration gives a new appraisal of the race.

In this report, released February 27, NASA credits the U.S.S.R. with "great achievements of space technology." But the report's final conclusion is this:

"In summary, the U.S.S.R. space science program has dissipated some of its momentum after the initial successes of the sputnik launchings, while the U.S. program has picked up momentum from a standing start and now surpasses the U.S.S.R. effort in its breadth of interest, originality of concept, and volume of research."

A look at what both countries have actually done in space, as pictured in the chart on pages 42 and 43, shows what NASA is talking about. Through March 3, the United States had put 38 vehicles into space compared to Russia's 11. The U.S. total included several successful experiments in fields Russia had not even entered.

At the same time; Russia has kept its edge in rocket power, and that has given it the lead in "spectaculars" which attract world attention.

THE TIDE TURNS

Events in space itself within the past few weeks show how the tide has been turning in favor of the United States, as far as overall space experimenting goes.

Since January 31, the United States has done this:

Put a spacecraft designed for a man through a crucial test—a rocket trip from Cape Canaveral, Fla., at 12,850 miles an hour.

Started three astronauts on final warm-ups for the first man-in-space shot. Outlook is that a man will be sent on a short space trip in April, into orbit around the earth before the end of 1961.

Rocketed a 37-pound chimpanzee, named Ham, 155 miles into the sky over the Atlantic Ocean and recovered him without difficulty.

Launched a Transit satellite, carrying a piggyback vehicle named Lofti. This was registered a partial success as a navigation device.

Sent three satellites—Discoverers XX and XXI and Samos II—into orbit from Vandenberg Air Force Base, Calif., to help perfect systems for maneuvering vehicles in space and to develop sky spies that can photograph Russia and warn of missile launchings.

Put up, from Wallops Island, Va., the first satellite powered by a solid-fuel rocket—Explorer IX, now measuring air densities in nearby space.

In the same period of time, Russia produced one spectacular—an interplanetary rocket aimed at Venus on February 12. That shot, the Russians now say, will miss Venus by perhaps 100,000 miles. Radio contact with the rocket has been lost.

ROCKET-POWER GAP

The Venus shot, however, is a near miss considering the problem involved. It shows that Russia is far advanced in the mechanics of controlling spacecraft. It may be 3 to 5 years before the United States can close the booster gap—the difference to power between its most potent rockets and those that launched the Venus craft.

This lead in rocket power makes it likely that the Soviets will be first to get a man into space.

Brig. Gen. Don D. Flickinger, Air Force director of life sciences, on February 26 restated his personal belief that the Russians already have made several unsuccessful attemps and may have killed a number of astronauts.

If the Russians do get a man into space before the United States does, it will be another spectacular first. But the United States will be, at most, only a few months behind. And in the meantime it probably will be widening its lead in other experiments.

NASA, for example, will fire about a dozen satellites and five to eight deep-space probes before next January. Ranger, a spacecraft designed to make a rough landing on the moon, will be flight tested. The Army, Navy, Air Force, and NASA will be expanding experiments in weather forecasting, navigation, communications and reconnaissance. Three major programs to leapfrog the Soviets in rocket power will be pushed, including the effort to develop an atomic rocket. "Astounding successes" in ground tests of a nuclear rocket engine were announced by NASA February 27.

Why have the Soviets failed to keep up with the United States in basic space science, after their head start?

NASA's report notes that "the average quality of Soviet scientific research is the same as that of the United States." Yet, the report adds, "It is a striking fact that, in spite of equality of talent in U.S. and U.S.S.R. science, nearly all the highly original work has come out of the U.S program."

WHY RUSSIA IS SLOWER

Three reasons account for the Soviet lag, in NASA's opinion:

1. Russia "has concentrated on a small number of flights [in space], and has chosen its missions for these flights with close attention to their impact on world opinion and their effectiveness in reinforcing the public image of U.S.S.R. strength in science and technology."

2. It may be that "Soviet scientists are not in close contact with their program-planning authorities and have not been able to participate effectively in the formulation of their space program."

3. Where the United States has "a powerful base for scientific operations" with "many large laboratories with highly trained staffs," the base of research in Russia "is new and relatively thin. For this reason, the U.S.S.R. scientific effort is spotty. * * *"

The report warns that the Russians are training many scientists, and "it is entirely possible that the U.S.S.R. may strengthen the weak spots in its scientific structure and move ahead in an effort to overtake us."

As of now, however, the United States leads the world by a wide margin in basic scientific investigations into the mysteries of space. Soviet Russia has the edge in rocket power. Time will tell which advantage is the most important.

HOW EXPERTS APPRAISE THE SPACE RACE NOW

EARTH SATELLITES

Russia opened the space age with Sputnik I in October, 1957. Later, Sputnik II took up a dog, Sputnik III some instruments.

United States eventually got up three Vanguards, seven Explorers, yielding important new facts about radiation, Earth's shape, magnetism.

Russia's satellites were the first, and biggest. But United States has put up more, got back far more information of scientific value.

SUN ORBITS

Russia shot Lunik at the moon; it missed, went into silent orbit around the sun.

United States put two Pioneers around the sun, got back radioed data on sunspots, radiation.

Another first for Russia; another win, in solid information, for United States.

MOON PROBES

Russia planted Lunik II on the moon, with a Red-flag marker; took photos of moon's hidden side with Lunik III.

U.S. moon shots all have failed.

Russia is at least 2 years ahead.

WEATHER WATCHERS

Russia has no known experiments.

U.S. Tiros series photographed clouds, other weather signs helping to forecast storms.

United States is years ahead in a field that can be of immense practical value.

NAVIGATION AIDS

Russia has no known experiments.

U.S. transit series—artificial stars to guide ships and planes—foreshadows a precise navigation system.

Another field of great practical importance where United States stands alone.

COMMUNICATION AIDS

Russia has no known experiments.

United States put up first satellite to send recorded messages back from space. Then Courier sent and received photos; Echo bounced signals from one place on earth to another.

United States is well on the way to a vastly better system of communications, using space—a third field where Russia lags.

SKY SPIES

Russia may have secret tests, but there's no evidence.

United States put 15 Discoverers up to pave the way for the Samos "spy in the sky" satellite now orbiting the earth and presumably taking photos. A sister satellite, Midas, has been tested. It will detect missile launchings by heat indications.

A fourth field of enormous practical importance where United States leads.

EXPLORING THE PLANETS

Russia fired a rocket at Venus, now expects it to be a near miss. The shot, from an orbiting sputnik, showed advanced guidance and weight-lifting techniques.

United States has made no shot comparable to the Venus probe.

United States may be 2 or 3 years behind in the race to reach other planets.

MAN IN SPACE

Russia sent three spacecraft aloft in 1960, each weighing 5 tons. One took animals into space, sent them back safely—paving the way for similar trips by men soon.

United States named three candidates for a space flight within 2 or 3 months, after sending a chimpanzee 155 miles up, testing a man-in-space capsule.

Russia has appeared to be about a year ahead in manned space flight.

Citations for Brotherhood Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, we have recently participated in the observance of National Brotherhood Week. This annual event, originally initiated by the National Conference of Christians and Jews, has once again given all of us the opportunity to dedicate our activities to the promotion of mutual understanding and concern for people of all faiths. Two fine citizens of Williamsport, Pa., have already demonstrated their devotion to the advancement of ideals of brotherhood by countless daily efforts to defeat discrimination and prejudice in their community. These efforts received their deserved recognition this month when Mrs. Charles A. Lehman, Jr., and Mr. Alfred A. DiCenso were honored for distinguished service at the Lycoming County Chapter of the National Conference of Christians and Jews Citation Dinner.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the citations in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

Mrs. Charles A. Lehman, Jr.:

"For devoted and successful service in the interest of equal and fair opportunities in education for young people regardless of race, creed or national origin.

"For devotion in the welfare of all in the community in terms of service to the needy, the distressed, the aged and the sick without reference to faith and color.

"For unstinted giving of herself, her time and her strength to make this community a better place in which to live for all people and thus to broaden and strengthen the ideal of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

"For work in line with the high ideals of the National Conference of Christians and Jews that stresses the high dignity of every person regardless of race, creed, or national background."

Alfred A. DiCenso:

"For his interest in the cause of brotherhood between races, creeds and other groups on the basis of the fatherhood of God and the unity of humanity without regard to race, creed or national origin.

"For employment policies that are fair and based on merit only thus giving to every individual the right to work for a fair wage and the right to advancement regardless of racial or religious differences.

"For his deep concern in the interests of the aged, the needy and welfare of the sick and those who need guidance and wise direction, for the maimed whose handicap can be turned into fruitful living."

"For many works in line with high ideals of the National Conference of Christians and Jews that strives constantly to heal the wounds of prejudice and discrimination and holds high the truth that under the fatherhood of God men need to be brothers."

Communist Foe Succumbs at 77

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABNER W. SIBAL
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, on February 10, one of the most valiant American fighters against communism died at his home in New Canaan, Conn. He was Archibald Ewing Stevenson, brilliant attorney in New York City, geologist and civic leader in New York State and Connecticut.

Mr. Stevenson was one of the first to recognize the threat of Communist infiltration in the United States. I would like now to insert an article that appeared on Mr. Stevenson in the New Canaan Advertiser following his death:

COMMUNIST FOE SUCCUMBS AT 77

Archibald Ewing Stevenson of South Main Street, a New Canaan resident for nearly half a century and a former town official who achieved widespread fame as a stanch foe of communism, died Friday at the age of 77.

A New York City lawyer, he served as counsel for many metropolitan and New York State committees and spent much of his life fighting Communist and other groups he felt were trying to overthrow the Government of the United States.

Locally he was active in the revision of the town charter and served on the board of finance from 1934 until September 1939, when he resigned to accept the appointment of first selectmen for a few weeks between the resignation of the late George T. Smith and the town election in which Clinton M. Cruikshank was named to that office.

Born in Uniontown, Pa., Mr. Stevenson was graduated from New York University in 1904, received a degree in engineering there in 1905 and another from its law school in 1909.

As a law student he served as an instructor in mineralogy and later headed the geology department at NYU prior to his admission to the bar in 1910.

WAR ON COMMUNISM

His war on communism began in 1918 when he was named chairman of a special committee of the Union League Club of New York to study the Bolshevist movement.

The previous year he headed the committee on aliens of the [New York] Mayor's Committee on National Defense. He also served as special agent of the U.S. Department of Justice, studying propaganda, was a member of the Army's military intelligence staff and prepared a list of 62 "pacifist and radical intellectuals" alleged to have been part of the organizations that opposed the war.

In 1919 he was special counsel for the New York State Lusk Legislative Committee that looked into radical and seditious activities. In one move of this committee about 25 men were arrested in raids on Communist Party headquarters and charged with criminal anarchy.

The following year he served as counsel to a judiciary committee inquiring into the qualifications of five Socialist New York State assemblymen, for 2 years was general counsel to the National Civic Federation and later to the National Economic Council.

During the 1930's Mr. Stevenson sought to have Earl Browder, then Communist leader in this country, barred from radio and protested to the Secretary of State when the United States made a trade agreement with Russia. He warned that Communist unions had been organized to work discontent in labor, charging that academic freedom had sometimes been used to place a fifth column on America's public school payroll.

On several occasions in New Canaan, Mr. Stevenson was the moving force behind town meetings which protested such New Deal measures as President Franklin D. Roosevelt's Potato Control Act, the plan to enlarge the Supreme Court, and the governmental reorganization bill.

SPECIAL INTEREST

One of Mr. Stevenson's interests was constitutional law and he spent a great deal of time and money in research on the background history of various State constitutions, exploring their impact on the National Constitution.

He was the author of "States' Rights and National Prohibition" and "New England in Washington's Day," and was known for his letters to the editors of local and metropolitan newspapers. He also accumulated a comprehensive library on the American Revolutionary period which he donated to the New Canaan high school library.

At the time of his death he was working on a modern version of "The Vision of Piers Plowman," an allegorical poem written in middle English in about 1362, typifying the trials of the pious English laborer and Christ himself.

Surviving are three daughters, Mrs. Anice Mogabgab and Mrs. E. Stanley Glines of New Canaan, and Mrs. Thomas W. Richey of

St. Petersburg, Fla., and six grandchildren. His wife, Mrs. Katharine DeLaVargne Stevenson, died in 1956.

A memorial service was held Wednesday morning at the Franklin Hoyt Funeral Home with the Reverend Grant A. Morrill, rector of St. Mark's Church, officiating. Interment took place privately.

Dissatisfaction With Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, a penetrating analysis of the growing dissatisfaction with the Supreme Court's persistent attempts to exercise legislative powers is contained in the column of George E. Sokolsky featured in the March 4 issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald. Mr. Sokolsky emphasized that this dissatisfaction is national rather than sectional in scope as apologists for the Court contend. His presentation puts the issue in its true perspective and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPRESENTATIVE REPUBLIC
(By George E. Sokolsky)

This is a representative republic, controlled by a written Constitution and by acts of Congress as interpreted by the Supreme Court.

By a representative republic is meant a government chosen by the people at elections for specific terms of office and with limited responsibility. Under the American Constitution, these limitations are stated in very general terms, but as the economic and political life of the country has grown increasingly complex, laws have had to be passed which in 1787 would not have been thought necessary. The Constitution has been modified to meet these new conditions. This particularly applies to matters of interstate commerce, of public welfare and of the general defense.

When Theodore Roosevelt and Robert La Follette favored the referendum and recall, they were regarded as wild radicals. Today, both these ideas are recommended by men and women who regard themselves as conservatives. They agitate for direct action against the Congress, the Court and other Government officials with whose views and actions they disagree.

This would be the referendum and recall. It would bring us closer to a democracy than to a republic.

The dissatisfaction with the Court arises from the "Communist decisions" and from the Brown decision which dealt with the question of segregation. The principal objection to many of the recent decisions of the Court is that they are, in reality, acts of legislation, the Court assuming a function to which it is not designated.

This is a profound emotional response to a grave sense of injustice. There is too great a tendency to call everything crackpot which is not currently fashionable. The fact is that over the country groups are organizing themselves in opposition to what they regard as a negation of the American philosophy of government.

There are, for instance, about 100 conservative clubs on campuses and the number is increasing. Young Americans for Freedom is an exciting youth body, outspokenly conservative. The John Birch Society consists of adults, organized all over the country, to advocate special causes such as the impeachment of Chief Justice Earl Warren. They publish a magazine, "American Opinion."

The principal conservative publication is the National Review, the circulation of which increases although it does not receive much advertising from business firms. This weekly publication has gathered together a group of brilliant writers, mindful of the New Republic in the days of Walter Lippmann and Herbert Croly. Russell Kirk in Chicago, edits a quarterly, the University Bookman, which is conservative and intellectual.

For the Sake of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the speech delivered by Joseph Kajeckas, Chargé d'Affaires of Lithuania, to the American Lithuanian Society of Washington, D.C., at a commemoration of the 43d anniversary of Lithuania's declaration of independence.

The context of the speech follows:

FOR THE SAKE OF FREEDOM

February 16—how significant and full of memories is this day of Lithuania's resurrection: Before this day became a reality, a whole nation longed for it, suffered for it, fought for it, and sacrificed for it during 120 years. But with that day, the innumerable sorrows of so long a time paled before the reality of the act establishing Lithuania's independence.

Let us briefly recall that act and the circumstances of its proclamation. The unanimous declaration reads, as follows:

"The Lithuanian Council, sole representative of the Lithuanian people, in conformity with the recognized right to national self-determination, and in accordance with the resolution of the Lithuanian Conference held in Vilnius from September 18 to 23, 1917, hereby proclaims the reestablishment of the independent state of Lithuania, founded on democratic principles, with Vilnius as its capital, and declares the rupture of all ties which formerly bound this state to other nations.

"Likewise, the Lithuanian Council declares that in order to fix definitely the foundations of the state of Lithuania and its relations with other states, a constituent assembly, elected by the inhabitants in accordance with democratic principles, will be convoked as soon as possible."

In this act, there is solemnly underscored a whole list of principles, and these principles form the foundation of the Lithuanian state. They are very important, especially today, when enemies of Lithuanian freedom seek to call into question the repository of Lithuanian sovereignty.

We observe that the act proclaims the Lithuanian nation as the highest expression of sovereignty, and that the council is acting as the only representative of the nation.

The act is proclaimed according to the principle of self-determination of nations, and the conclusions of the Vilnius conference. The act makes very clear that the proclaimed Lithuanian state is to be one organized according to democratic processes, with its governmental form to be determined by a constituent assembly.

When the Red Army occupied Lithuania in the summer of 1940, bringing with it a Communist form of government, the Lithuanian nation's principle of sovereignty was broken and made sport of. Moscow doesn't recognize a nation's sovereignty: that right is absorbed by the Communist Party. In none of the countries now under Communist control was the then-existing order changed by the will of the country itself, but always by bald Communist lies or force.

There has never been a nation which would exchange natural human freedoms and liberty itself for chains and slavery. And the enslavement of Lithuania is Moscow's eternal shame, an ineradicable blot in history. It was gratifying to note that the President of the United States, in his state of the Union message, called for renewed respect of the human right of freedom, especially in regard to Eastern Europe. Only several days ago, the majority leader of the House of Representatives, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, made the point that "The Soviet Union would not dare permit the people of Lithuania to have a secret ballot, supervised internationally or by the United Nations to determine their own form of government." It knows that the free choice of the Eastern European peoples would overthrow even the minutest traces of communism. And truly, if Mr. Khrushchev and his cohorts in the Kremlin think otherwise, why don't they put their convictions to the test? That is to say, if they're so convinced, why should they be afraid of letting the people freely express their choice? Of course, our rhetorical question becomes, in addition, academic when we realize that, in the Soviet scheme, there is no such thing as people's free choice.

This is why the struggle for regained Lithuanian freedom is at the same time a struggle for man's right of free choice, a struggle for the essential freedom of the peoples of the free world and of all peoples.

It is noteworthy that the act of February 16 did not create a new state, as it occurs in Africa today. The new nations of Africa remember only colonialism. But when the Lithuanian nation experienced her rebirth, it was a rebirth that spanned the centuries and returned us to the time of Gediminas, back to the time when Lithuania extended its boundaries from the Baltic Sea to the Black Sea. Thus, the notion of Lithuanian statehood is nothing new; it refers back to a historical tradition of centuries. And this is admirably reflected in the Lithuanian national anthem, which conveys the fact that a Lithuanian is always born into a tradition of freedom. Moscow cries colonialism ad nauseam to those countries which are thousands of miles from Moscow, but with studied indifference turns her eyes from the suffering and enslaved nations on her very doorstep.

The act of February 16 also provided that Lithuania was free of all ties with other nations which may have been contracted in the past. This was done with an eye to the future, when it could be expected that there would arise pretenders to Lithuanian territory who would want to dictate the terms of Lithuanian relations with other countries.

The Soviet Union tried in the past and continues to try to justify, by every hypocritical means, the Lithuanian annexation. But the Soviets will never be successful; already the so-called incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union has come to be universally regarded by freedom-loving peoples as a classical example of aggression. But

in spite of this, the Soviets continue to try, by every devious means, to obtain recognition of the status quo from other nations. They even make such attempts in regard to Lithuanians in the free world, usually under the guise of cultural exchange and cooperation. Lithuanians in the homeland have not succumbed to this temptation, since less than 1 percent have joined the Communist ranks. And neither will free Lithuanians succumb to that insidious temptation.

Soviet efforts to speak for the Lithuanian nation is but an absurd parody of the free will of the people. This fact, as well as similar facts of Soviet shamelessness and hypocrisy, is reflected in the findings of the Select Committee on Communist Aggression.

It is a most happy circumstance that our commemoration today coincides with the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, who serves as a comforting example to all who struggle for human freedoms in the world today. The memory of Lincoln carries hope to the enslaved Lithuanian, and supports everyone who fights for a brighter tomorrow for Lithuania. Let us glance at just a few of his immortal ideas:

In the Declaration of Independence of the United States it is solemnly stated that "all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Speaking of this Declaration in Philadelphia on February 22, 1861, Lincoln emphasized that it "gave liberty not alone to the people of this country, but hope to all the world, for all future time. It was that which gave promise that in due time the weights would be lifted from the shoulders of all men." On other occasions he stated: "It is my desire that all people everywhere be free." "Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves; and, under a just God, cannot long retain it."

Thus, we may take hope in our fight for the liberation of enslaved Lithuania, not only from our past, but also from Lincoln, the hero of this day.

President Kennedy, in his inaugural address, expressed a similar concern for the rights of suffering peoples when he proposed, in the words of Isaiah, that we "undo the heavy burdens [and] let the oppressed go free." Was not this precisely Lincoln's greatest desire? I consider it more than a mere coincidence that, on February 8 at a White House reception for the chiefs of diplomatic missions, President Kennedy chanced to point out to me an impressive portrait of Abraham Lincoln hanging on the wall. I would like to express to him today, on behalf of enslaved Lithuanians in their homeland and Lithuanians abroad, deep public thanks for his encouragement of the oppressed Lithuanian people, and for the American Government's continued nonrecognition of the Kremlin's illegal occupation of Lithuania.

And while thanks are in order, I would like on behalf of the present gathering and on behalf of Lithuanians everywhere, to express the deepest gratitude to the Honorable Loy W. Henderson upon his retirement from the Department of State. At the very dawn of Lithuania's independence—on Easter morning of 1919, in fact—Mr. Henderson arrived in Lithuania to observe one of the most fascinating stories of modern democracy: the growth in freedom of Lithuania and her sister Baltic Republics. Mr. Henderson has always remained a good and true friend of the Baltic States, and on this occasion we express our deepest thanks and very best wishes for the future to his wife and himself.

We are heartened by this example of a non-Lithuanian's sympathy for our beloved homeland. But at the same time we are reminded that we must never grow lax ourselves in our support of the mother country in her very worst days. It is a fact of recent days that Bishop Julijonas Steponavicius was deported for refusing to ordain Communist agents as priests. And this is the fate of any man who defends basic freedoms under the Communists, especially religious freedoms.

Lithuania has suffered much for the sake of freedom. On this occasion, let us resolve to repay her as we can.

Let this commemoration be the day of rededication for us in our efforts to support the aspirations of the Lithuanian nation. Let us resolve to do everything in our power to hasten the dawn of a new birth of freedom and independence for Lithuania, and a surcease of her sorrows. In truth, let us "undo the heavy burdens [and] let the oppressed go free."

On Urban Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABNER W. SIBAL
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and very able colleague, BRAD MORSE, recently called upon the House to create a Select Committee on Urban Affairs to help unsnarl the tangle of problems besetting our Nation's burgeoning cities and towns.

Congressman MORSE's idea was met with enthusiasm by his home city of Lowell, Mass., as the following editorial from the Lowell Sun evidences:

ON URBAN AFFAIRS

A Select Committee on Urban Affairs has been proposed by Congressman BRAD MORSE of Lowell which may be the forerunner of a department within the Federal Government at Cabinet level.

The increasing problems of all American cities, large and small, have led to the Morse proposal.

"We must accept the need for fully coordinated programs of renewal, redevelopment, and other vital changes if our cities are to be rewarding places in which to live, work, and play," MORSE has stated in presenting the thought to his colleagues in Congress.

The older cities of the Nation are beset with complex problems which have primarily developed since World War II and made more perplexing by the general movement toward the suburbs.

As the situation now stands, each city faces its peculiar problems more or less alone. It has no recourse to a central office that would have the facts, figures, records of experience, and other data that could be so helpful in general guidance.

Mr. MORSE should get maximum support for his idea from all city fathers, especially in the East and Middle West. It comes at a time when most of these urban groups are going through a stage of insecurity, when they are not fully confident of what the future may have in store.

A pooling of all urban ideas with advice and information coming from a central agency that has the answers to the questions should be most helpful at this particular time.

Analyzing Republican Defeat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN E. LONG
OF HAWAII
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, Columnist Ralph McGill in the Washington Evening Star of March 6 points out that the Republican congressional leadership may be repeating an old mistake in its apparent policy of trying to downgrade President Kennedy. Mr. McGill states: "That this is not good politics is underscored by the latest poll figures which show that 72 percent of the people like the way the new President is conducting the Nation's business."

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. McGill's column, entitled "Analyzing Republican Defeat," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANALYZING REPUBLICAN DEFEAT—COMMITTEE BLAMES CITY VOTE, IS URGED TO SEEK NEW PARTY LOOK IN CONGRESS

(By Ralph McGill)

Since the obvious is not always true, the Republican National Committee wisely analyzed its defeat of last autumn and finds that it occurred, as suspected, in the larger cities.

Of 40 cities with populations of 300,000 and more, Mr. Kennedy carried 26 and Mr. Nixon 14. There are eight States in which the largest urban vote can be the balance of power in any close election. These are New York, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Maryland, Missouri, New Jersey, Illinois, and Minnesota. In 1942 Mr. Eisenhower won all but Missouri. Yet in 1960 all eight gave majorities to Mr. Kennedy.

Republican research broke down the vote in Philadelphia. Mr. Nixon, despite a very earnest effort to capture the minority groups, failed to do so. His visit to Warsaw, Poland, after the Russian journey in the summer of 1959, was expected to win the Polish vote, which is substantial in several cities. Yet the GOP breakdown disclosed that in Philadelphia Mr. Nixon received but 21 percent of the so-called Polish vote, 30 percent of the Irish vote and 18 percent of the Negro vote.

A GOP task force committee will seek to find out how its party may win support from the ethnic and minority groups in cities. It will not be easy.

The task force might make a start in Washington with Republican congressional leaders. These gentlemen already have done the party harm by their seeming reluctance to vote aid for the depressed areas and by their criticism of Mr. Kennedy for talking about a recession and unemployment.

This error was compounded by declaring the recession to be "a statistical one" and not a reality. The almost 6 million persons without jobs and the 2 million working part time do not consider themselves and their plights as statistical. They did not view the tour of the distressed cities and towns by Secretary of Labor Goldberg as politics, which the GOP declared it to be. The people visited said they were glad to have a Government with heart enough to take an interest in their misery.

Senator MUNDT's gross distortion of President Eisenhower's conversation into a denunciation of President Kennedy as too far to the left, a statement Mr. Eisenhower repudiated, is another case in point. If the Republicans and Southern Democrats join to defeat medical care for the aged under the social security program, they will thereby erect still another barrier to GOP hopes of capturing city votes.

The present Republican leadership as practiced by MUNDT, GOLDWATER, BRIDGES, DIRKSEN, et al. is repeating the errors of the party leadership of the 1930's. In that decade the partisan zeal to defend Mr. Hoover and the party's failure to anticipate or cope with the depression caused a great majority of Americans to see the Republican Party as cold and lacking in any sympathy for the problems of human beings caught up in the tornado of distress and suffering brought on by the economic crash.

The Republican Party was not lacking in humanity, but it permitted its extremely partisan leadership to make it appear devoid of any consideration for people in trouble. Farmers called their mule-drawn pickup trucks "Hoover carts." Smokers reduced to "the makings" spoke of the sack tobacco as "Hoover dust." A man who lacked food for his family and obtained it by going out and shooting a rabbit spoke of it wryly as "a Hoover dinner."

One may be sure the present Republican congressional leadership hasn't meant to repeat this error. But it is in the process of so doing because it apparently gives priority to trying to downgrade John F. Kennedy. That this is not good politics is underscored by the latest poll figures, which show that 72 percent of the people like the way in which the new President is conducting the Nation's business.

The most articulate Republicans are those who, in their bitterness, seemingly blame Mr. Nixon for defeat. In their desire to get back at Mr. Kennedy, they already have created the image of a Republican leadership which is reluctant to assist the distressed and the unemployed and which is even more unwilling to help old people who need medical care. If they also defeat the school bill, the GOP task force won't have much research to do. It will early know why the party won't win back city votes.

The Department's Soybean Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the House today to the Department's soybean program.

This program is to raise the support price for soybeans from $1.85 a bushel to $2.30 a bushel. The Secretary of Agriculture has the authority to increase the support without legislative action. He already has announced that he plans to do so.

Yet, this hoist in soybean supports is closely related to the pending legislation. It is an example of disregard for the farmer and of the overall program for a Government-controlled and dominated agriculture.

It is an example of complete bureaucratic disregard for the wishes and interests of farmers. It shows clearly that the professors and planners at the Department feel they know what is good for the farmers. They plan to force their views on the farmers, regardless, and today we are being asked to help them to do so.

Incredible as it may seem, the decision to raise soybean supports was made without consultation with the soybean producers.

Not only that. The producers do not want this increase, and have so informed the Department.

Nevertheless, the Department intends to go right ahead.

This situation is astounding. Let me repeat the circumstances so they can be fully understood.

The soybean growers, the farmers who make their livelihood from the crop, were not consulted when the Department made the decision to raise supports from $1.85 a bushel to $2.30 a bushel.

The growers, once they learned what was happening, informed the Department that they did not want the increase, and begged the Department not to raise the supports.

The Department holds their views in contempt, and will force the $2.30 on them.

What is the relationship to the proposed action on soybeans and the bill before us today, H.R. 4510?

Well, as I understand it, the excuse for the increase in soybean supports is to take land out of corn and other feed grains and to divert it into beans.

Apparently, the fact that the market price for beans is above the proposed support price does not count. If it is profitable to farmers to grow soybeans, they will do so. The Government, it would seem to me, does not have to point out the fact. Our producers have built the most marvelous agricultural plant the world has ever seen. They have done so by producing the most profitable crops, and products in the most efficient manner possible.

The bill before us is a part of the Government's scheme to get land out of feed grains.

Section 3 proposes to punish farmers who do not cooperate with the Government.

It would give the Government the authority to sell corn and grain sorghums at a comparatively low price so that noncooperators would not benefit from the higher support price—$1.20 or more for corn—to those who take part in the Government's program.

What this does is to give the Government control of the entire marketing machinery for corn and other feed grains.

On the one hand, the Government would raise the price to cooperators through higher supports.

To get this higher price, they would have to turn their corn and other feed grains over to the Government for the Government beats down the price by dumping on the market. The Government then establishes the ceiling and the floor for corn and feed grains.

We are told this is an emergency 1-year program, but how often have we heard this before? The emergency programs become permanent. They go on and on. We have with us today some so-called emergency programs which have been in effect since 1933.

Back to the soybean producers whose wishes the Government has disregarded. The question is: Who did the Department of Agriculture listen to? Who sold this program to the Department?

Apparently reliable reports say the architect of the soybean program was Roswell Garst, of Coon Rapids, Iowa.

Garst is a seed breeder and farm manager, whose chief claim to fame is that he is a good friend of the Soviet Dictator, Nikita Khrushchev. He was host to Khrushchev when the latter toured the United States in 1959. Garst, it is said, has sold a lot of hybrid seed to the Russians and has also been their adviser on ways to improve their agriculture. If he raises soybeans, this activity is overshadowed by his other operations. Most assuredly, he is not regarded by the soybean producers as their spokesman.

But the Department listens to him rather than to the soybean growers themselves.

Why do the soybean producers oppose the increase in their support price from $1.85 a bushel to $2.30 a bushel?

They are afraid that the hoist will get them into trouble and will put them in the unenviable position of the wheat, feed grain, and some other producers.

As is well known, the support prices on these products have been too high. The support dominates the market and tremendous surpluses have piled up in Government hands.

The Government owns about $10 billion in farm products which it has acquired through high supports.

The holdings of wheat alone amount to almost $3 billion and about $500 million is spent annually on subsidies.

The holdings of corn and other feed grains are more than $3 billion.

Let the fears of the soybean producers be expressed in the somewhat plaintive words of their president, Charles V. Simpson, of Waterville, Minn.:

Any moves by Government—

He said—

which will upset the equilibrium established within the soybean industry through the announcement of support price levels which will make it difficult or impossible to sell our products can only result in surplus stocks, Government ownership, storage costs, and the loss of years of work in the creation of markets. The transfer of the problems of feed grains to our commodity actually solves no problems, but merely transfers them from an already surplus crop to one which has made a determined effort to sell its products. Soybeans must be kept in their proper price relationship to crops such as corn, which compete for acreage, but they must also be kept competitive to other oilseed crops both domestic and foreign. Proposed support levels will, it is feared, stimulate production of competitive oilseed crops in other countries and cause loss of present exports as well as making it impossible to continue expansion of soybean product markets.

We will get needed acreage in 1961 without price supports established at too high levels. The proposed support levels might well make it impossible to continue building our markets at home and abroad, might turn our crop into just another surplus commodity in spite of the determined efforts of an industry which was not consulted in the establishment of the proposed price support levels.

But, as I have stated, the Government does not pay any attention to Mr. Simpson and the other men who raise the soybeans. They are listening to Roswell Garst, friend of Khrushchev.

We cannot do anything here today about the soybean program. We can do something about the companion scheme, H.R. 4510, the so-called feed grain program. We can defeat it and throw a real body block in the drive toward an agriculture controlled by bureaucrats and planners who pay no attention to the farmers themselves.

Municipal Government in Transition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on February 18, 1961, Commissioner Robert E. McLaughlin delivered a significant address at the Annual Meeting of the Greater Washington Association of the Unitarian Church in Washington, D.C., on the subject of "Municipal Government in Transition."

Commissioner McLaughlin served for several years as President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and before that was the chairman of the Public Utilities Commission of the District. In these posts he has had a unique opportunity to meet, and devise solutions to, a wide variety of the problems which beset the municipality of the District of Columbia. Within the past few months he also toured many of the great cities of Europe and the Middle East to study how they deal with their municipal problems.

In his speech of February 18, Commissioner McLaughlin surveys the problems of municipal governments in the modern world and how they affect the nation and the Nation's Capital City. He stressed the need to follow the principle stated by Franklin D. Roosevelt that a liberal government must use its power and resources to assure "to the average person the right to his own economic and political life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

I particularly commend Commission McLaughlin's comments on the importance of improving the processes of democracy and eliminating discrimination and bigotry. His speech is Lincolnesque in its perception and its felicity of expression. I believe his views on municipal government in transition will be of interest to every Member of Congress and also to other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I therefore, under unanimous consent, insert his speech in the RECORD:

MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT IN TRANSITION

When Dr. Howlett invited me to speak to you tonight, I was both elated and depressed—elated at the opportunity to cast my bread upon such rewarding waters, and depressed at the thought of following such able statesmen and orators as the pair of Douglases on this rostrum. When I thought of you in the audience I would be addressing, a group of liberals in politics as well as religion, I was reassured, with the conviction that if I be condemned for political reasons, I shall at least warrant your reprieve as a fellow-liberal in religion.

A very quotable American (whom I have had few occassions to quote) has said: "The liberal party is a party which believes that, as new conditions and problems arise beyond the power of men and women to meet as individuals, it becomes the duty of the Government itself to find new remedies with which to meet them. The liberal party insists that the Government has the definite duty to use all its power and resources to meet new social problems with new social controls—to insure to the average person the right to his own economic and political life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

These are the words of Franklin Delano Roosevelt; and if we substitute the word "policy" for "party" we have the basis for much that I am going to say tonight.

Mr. Webster defines "liberal" as "befitting, or worthy of, a man of free birth; free; not servile; not restricted; not bound by authority, orthodox tenets, or established forms in political or religious philosophy; independent in opinion; not conservative." And, as examples, he cites: liberal thinkers, liberal Christians and liberal ideas in politics.

While I am busy defining words, I might as well complete our own frame of reference by pointing out that Washington, D.C., does not even qualify as a "municipality," inasmuch as that word, derived from the latin "municipalis," meant a citizen of a city that had the privileges of Roman citizens.

We have vast new problems in government—international, national, and local. They must be solved, and not the least of them are our local problems. New concepts, new forms of government must be adopted to meet these needs; and liberal minds must conceive and effectuate them.

I should like to talk about transitions which are common to municipalities throughout our land, and to compare our problems and solutions with some cities in other lands. I may at the same time reflect a transition that has been taking place in my own views.

First of all we need a bit of review. We in America have become a highly mobile people. Over 20 percent of the Nation's population—some 35 million of people—change their residence each year. I have read that, of these 35 million, about 11 million move across county lines, and half of this group move across State lines.

People are moving from rural areas to urban centers, primarily in response to better job opportunities. We have become a predominantly urban society within the lifetime of most of us here this evening.

At the turn of the century, about 30 percent of the population lived in cities while about 70 percent lived in rural areas. Today the situation is reversed: about 70 percent of our people are now living in urban centers.

Paradoxically, while some people are moving from small towns and farms to the city, others are moving from cities to the surrounding countryside. They are seeking, primarily, what they think will be better environment for their children.

The flight to the suburbs during the past decade has resulted in a net loss in population for almost all of this Nation's larger cities, and the evacuees have been our most affluent taxpayers. The District has seen a 4.7-percent increase in population, while Boston and St. Louis have decreased 13 percent. As for the decrease in other cities of our population group Pittsburgh has lost 11.7 percent, Detroit has lost 10.6 percent, Buffalo has lost 8.7 percent, Minneapolis has lost 7.5 percent, San Francisco has lost 7 percent, and Cleveland and Philadelphia almost 5 percent.

We hear that cities like Houston, Los Angeles, and Milwaukee have had population increases during the decade. But people neglect to say that these cities have doubled their land areas; and that others have suffered losses despite territorial increases.

These changes present many problems for municipal governments—for us in the District as well as our large cities from coast to coast. We now face new and increased municipal functions and services, and more expensive local government than ever before. Moreover, our cities, which are, of course, creatures of State governments, are now being forced to look to the National Government for financial aid and assistance heretofore provided by their State governments.

Our problems are serious, but not insurmountable. We are concerned with the improvement of our transit facilities. We have got water supply and pollution problems, traffic congestion, inadequate housing and slum clearance. Urban renewal programs are essential and take up a large portion of our time, patience, and funds. We are concerned with improving our educational system and facilities.

We are charged with the development of adequate zoning, to combine the best features of residence, industry, business, recreation, and other essential and integrated community needs.

We are working to assure that the social welfare needs of our community are properly recognized and humanely met. To these add: crime prevention and detection, efficient, modern fire protection, alert and adequate public health services with ample hospital facilities; a highly ethical and conscientious judiciary, and a modern penal system.

But, our major problems are really minor ones compared to the problems some European cities have had to face. It is only by facing up to their problems that cities like West Berlin and Warsaw have been rebuilt.

Take Warsaw as an example: Despite its Communist rule, the people of Warsaw undertook, and did, what was necessary to rebuild that Nazi-demolished city. It was systematically dynamited, by special order of Hitler, but they had the spirit, the drive, to rebuild their capital city from mounds of ashes and rubble. They have duplicated their old historical buildings; and at the same time erected a 110,000 capacity stadium from the rubble not usable for other purposes. To rebuild this city for 1 million people required 15 years. This kind of result requires spirit in any community; but in communist lands, where the people are motivated by dictates rather than desires, evidence of this kind of spirit intrigues me.

De Toqueville said, "To labor in the direction of democracy is in my eyes a sainte occupation, and one in which one must spare neither one's money nor one's time, nor one's life."

Let's get back to Washington. Here we are in a beautiful city, our Nation's Capital, a world respected capital.

Where is our spirit? Where are the tens of thousands of people who should be standing ready to do their part to correct the conditions confronting us?

We live in a city in which our every act and our every omission occurs in a show window. This is true because of the tremendous concentration of power and responsibility located here.

We have over 100 excellencies, scores of Mr. Secretaries, hundreds of honorables, and if all the stars on the shoulders straps of our generals and admirals should be put alongside they would resemble the Milky Way. We have about 30 full-time protocol officers to keep the traffic of precedence and hospitality moving smoothly. In spite of this, we are expected to remain an unsophisticated country town in spirit, where Americans from all economic levels and geographic areas find their home.

It is a challenging task for us to be luxurious, yet economical; pompous, yet simple; ceremonious, yet democratic; impressive to our international friends, and at the same time, homelike to our simplest citizens, and correct, becoming, and appropriately formal with the simplicity consistent with democracy.

I am not among those who believe, either, that all wisdom and competence derive from long residence, or that those who have spent their lives, or their best years, in this community are so lacking in vision and enterprise that they must rely on others for direction and stimulation and forward motion.

Certainly the dramatic population changes of the past decade, and before, have intensified old problems and presented fresh challenges. But they have also brought new resources—of spirit, intellect, and energy—which mutual effort must discover, develop, and convert into assets for the total community, if progress is to be achieved.

In every group, old and new, there are workers and, let us say, nonworkers. Nineteen years ago Pearl Buck told the graduates of one of our local colleges that among those receiving degrees, that day, were those who would get in harness and help to push the wheels of progress, and those who simply would ride behind the efforts of others. She was not, she said, assigning blame; but merely stating the facts which must be faced.

We, likewise, must face the fact that in our total community, here in the Capital—and in our business community—there are those, old and new, who would rather ride than push, who have resigned themselves to a smug or fearful abstinence from effort, "playing it safe" on all fronts. This, as Miss Buck pointed out, 19 years ago, is true everywhere.

Many of our city's religious and privately endowed agencies, as well as those maintained by public subscription, are attempting to alleviate undesirable community conditions. Much constructive work remains to be done with these groups, to the end that duplication and overlapping of effort are eliminated. We can accomplish this by careful planning and by the coordination of our activities, so that no individual or problem area is overlooked or overemphasized.

In recent weeks, I have come across a passage from Washington's Farewell Address, which is a legacy of wise counsel.

I wish that more of our millions of citizens would, in this period celebrating his birthday, bear in mind what Washington reveals as his regard for the spiritual foundation on which our national life should be built:

"Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness—these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens.

The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume would not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, Where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason, and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

Observe good faith and justice toward all nations. Cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct. And can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened and at no distant period a great nation to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt that, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it? Can it be that providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue?

As we talk about the building of our great municipalities, realizing the greater the cities the greater the nation, there comes to mind a meditation on the lives of nations, as written by Franklin Roosevelt during a period of low ebb. The aptness and the timeliness of the Roosevelt statement come home today in February 1961.

"Lives of nations are determined, not by the count of years, but by the lifetime of the human spirit. The lifetime of man is threescore years and 10; a little more, a little less.

"The life of a nation is the fullness of the measure of its will to life. A nation, like a person, has a body—a body that must be fed and clothed and housed, invigorated and rested, in a manner that measures up to the standards of our time. A nation, like a person, has a mind—a mind that must be kept informed and alert, that must know itself, that understands the hopes and needs of its neighbors—all the other nations that live within the narrowing circle of the world. A nation, like a person, has something deeper, something more permanent, something larger than the sum of all its parts. It is that something which matters most to the future, which calls for the most sacred guarding of its present."

We Americans are now living in the most critical era of our Nation. We are at the point where previous civilizations have broken down through luxury, softness, and degeneration. We are now being brought to face—some perhaps are being forced to face—the real values of life. We are being forced by a powerful, false ideology to demonstrate that we can and will practice what we preach—and that it is good. We are forced to face up to the anachronism of a ruthless, feudal culture of the machine in this modern age, as it reveals the incongruities of our pursuits of selfish motives and interests.

In order to be strong enough—strong enough to win the struggle for free minds and the freedom of the world—we must be honest enough to recognize the need to utilize all of our resources. Like it or not, we, all of us, are the Americans who are pitted against subversion and communism. And we had better be wise enough to like it; because it is only by uniting in good fellowship, and accepting with total color blindness, the common cause, that we shall attain the necessary strength and worthiness to prevail.

As we plan our big buildings and new roads, we must plan far beyond the drawing board and blueprints. We must superimpose on our blueprints a plan that includes the human and the social aspects of all that is about us; because everything that we do involves people. Whether we are building a road, a bridge, or planning urban development, people are affected. And we must make certain that these people are always considered when we make our initial plans, rather than when we reach the final stages.

As you may know, I recently visited a number of countries in Africa and the Middle East, and I have been concerned, as your Commissioner, that some of our local problems reflect so badly on our community abroad.

It is disturbing that, on an international level, the integrity of the United States is measured by hundreds of millions of people on the basis of our racial practices. And it is good that it is disturbing.

The delegates and diplomatic missions of nonwhite countries have been encountering difficulties and embarassment as they seek appropriate places to live and work in our country—which is the seat of the United Nations.

Too many of us don't give a second thought—or even a first thought—to the fact that these difficulties will influence the personal and international attitudes of officials in other nations toward the United States. In this year of 1961, it is imperative that we in Washington—and our citizens throughout the land—reexamine their consciences.

Many a monument stands with an inscription: "Erected by the people—of whatever the place—in honor of the martyrs who fell and the heroes who fought in defense of liberty and union." This inscription is dated 1861–65.

We are now meeting nearly a full century after the close of the war which these monuments commemorate. Today we can, in honesty, say that the indissolvability of the Union is all but universally accepted.

If, however, we should speak to the fallen who have fought in freedom's cause at any time in the long history of man, tragically would we have to report that victory is not yet won.

The struggle for the rights of man is endless. Each past generation has witnessed, and each future generation may expect assaults on the dignity of the individual and onslaughts against liberty and justice. The annals of history disclose the discouraging difference between man's intended state and his reality. In the past, and even now, man has been relegated to second-class status, denied his liberty, or deprived of his life, because those in power and authority disagreed with his religious beliefs—or lack of them—his racial identification, his economic theories, his national allegiance, or his politics. Those who do not believe in, and those who do not trust, the democratic processes have been given aid and comfort by such indifference.

Abraham Lincoln once said: "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves."

There is an audible drumbeat in the halls of history that cannot be stilled. Men who value freedom march to its cadence. Today, the drummer increases the tempo, and no one, in the ranks of the free, dares stand at parade rest.

Those who have experienced freedom must give guidance to those who seek after it, lest they lose their way, marching to an undetermined destination is all but futile.

In some parts of the world, I have observed that the expulsion of colonialism,

and the growth of nationalism, are pale substitutes for the development of respect for individual liberty and social justice.

Lest it be forgotten, let the record show that despotic leadership—be it foreign-imposed or homegrown—is tyranny; and tyranny is the assassin of freedom and justice.

Fully convinced that a just and free society is the highest goal attainable by man on this earth, let us turn all our efforts in that direction and march with purpose to the drummer's beat.

Democracy is the most demanding form of society—demanding in that it calls for a balancing of individual liberty and community responsibility; demanding in that it calls for a citizenry which participates in decisionmaking; demanding in that it calls for an almost universal commitment to the sanctity of the individual; demanding in that it calls for a high degree of self-discipline.

Democracy is also the most rewarding form of society—rewarding in that it gives recognition to the dignity of each individual; rewarding in that it lends encouragement to each citizen to develop fully his potentialities; rewarding in that it grants equality of opportunity to each according to his merit; rewarding in that it grants no sanctions to bigotry.

If free men but use it, democracy, with these drumbeats, will set the pace, will win the pennants, and one day will free the world.

Again, thank you for the honor you have bestowed upon me this evening.

Resolution on Area Redevelopment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution adopted by the Textile Workers Union of America, AFL-CIO.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ON AREA REDEVELOPMENT

The need for a Federal program of action to assist people in economically distressed areas has been established so clearly and so many times that further delay in adopting such a program is unconscionable. The most recent study of this problem, by the Kennedy task force, found that "the social impact of chronic unemployment is staggering."

Textile workers are well acquainted with the social impact of chronic unemployment. The communities in the New England and Middle Atlantic States left stranded by mill managements after the people had built their entire economies around the operation of the mills know full well what it means to face the future without job opportunities and without hope. The communities in the Southern States dependent on the textile industry for employment suffer from the disabilities of an underdeveloped economy. Thousands of able-bodied persons are discouraged from looking for work where there are no jobs.

The efforts of these communities to help themselves have been strenuous but unavailing. The resources of State and local government are inadequate to the task of rebuilding the economies of the distressed areas. The problems transcend local and State boundaries. This is a national problem and it requires a national solution.

The solution will not be found along the lines of the business-as-usual techniques which promoters have employed to build up industrial sites in the past. We need an entirely different approach, one which will be based on a careful appraisal of the human, social, and physical resources of the affected areas. We must plan for the development of a well-rounded industrial base for these communities so that they may create the conditions for sustained long-term growth.

This is a task for a new, independent Federal agency. None of the existing departments of the Government is equipped to handle it. It requires an agency capable of calling on and coordinating the resources of all Federal, State, and local groups. The U.S. Department of Commerce has neither the experience nor the breadth of view and competence required for this significant undertaking: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Executive Council of the Textile Workers Union of America urges the Congress to adopt without further delay an area redevelopment program to assist in the rehabilitation of areas suffering from chronic economic distress and to place the responsibility for the planning and execution of this program in the hands of an independent agency.

Humanitarian Endeavors of Variety Clubs International

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, more than 10,000 members of our Nation's entertainment industry rededicate themselves, each year, to the task of curing the ills and soothing the pain of the Nation's handicapped children.

These men and women are members of Variety Clubs International. They have just celebrated Variety Clubs Week and during this period pledged their time and energy during the coming year—as they have for the past 33 years—to unselfish humanitarian endeavors.

Thus, these splendid Americans now embark on their 34th year of providing for underprivileged and unfortunate children of every race, every creed, every color. They will this year, as in years past, take time from their busy lives in the theatrical world and devote it to showing the handicapped how to repair their broken spirits and crippled limbs.

Most of us will agree, I am sure, that charity is never at its more glorious best than when it touches children. And those who quietly enlist in the fight against pain, hunger, and fear that shadow helpless children everywhere ennoble themselves and surely deserve a salute from their fellow Americans.

For that reason, I believe it more than appropriate to take notice today of the often unsung accomplishments of Variety Clubs International. To that end, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an inspiring review of the various projects undertaken by this humanitarian organization.

There being no objection, the résumé was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RÉSUMÉ OF PROJECTS: VARIETY CLUBS INTERNATIONAL

The charitable work of Variety Clubs International had its start 84 years ago, when an infant was abandoned in the lobby of Pittsburgh's Sheridan Square Theater.

Attached to the sleeping infant's blanket was a note expresing faith "in the goodness of show people." That faith was not misplaced, as 11 showmen adopted the baby and provided for his care and education.

Imbued with their success in caring for one child, the showmen determined to protect and care for others. Thus, Variety Clubs International was born.

Today, Variety Club activities include the sponsorship of children's hospitals and convalescent homes; of clinics for treatment and research of such diseases as cancer, cerebral palsy, polio, heart diseases and rheumatic fever; of orphanages, foundling homes and schools for handicapped children.

Thirty-four years ago, in 1928, the founders of Variety provided a name and a home for one child. Today, thousands of children in five lands receive security and solace from more than 10,000 members of Variety Clubs International.

From London to Los Angeles, from Mexico City to Minneapolis, Variety's show busines members raise more than $3 million each year to fight disease, pain and poverty in the United States, England, Ireland, Canada, and Mexico. And they raise this money not through public appeal but from revenue received from the various exhibitions, shows and other entertainments for which Variety has become justly famed.

In addition to its general charitable projects, every Variety chapter today is pledged to support one main charity. Down through the years, the Variety chapters known as "tents" have raised more than $80 million to crusade against pain and war on disease.

To call the role of Variety tents and their various projects is to understand the scope of the charitable activities sponsored by Variety and to realize, why Variety ranks today as one of the world's leading humanitarian organizations.

Variety's Tent No. 1, in Pittsburgh, has as one of its main charities the operation of Camp O'Connell, which offers to handicapped children of every race, creed, and color a summer camp retreat from the filth and heat of city slums. Not too long ago, this pioneer tent completed a new hospital building for the Roselia Foundling Home. Cost: approximately $1 million.

In Dayton, Variety sponsors the Variety Manor for Children—a place of new hope for emotionally disturbed children, through Variety-pledged support.

Variety's Boston chapter built what is recognized today as a world center for cancer-afflicted youngsters—the Jimmy Fund buildings. Here, in a center built at a cost of $4,500,000, more than 3,000 children not curable by surgery have been treated by new forms of chemical therapy under research in the Children's Cancer Research Foundation. At present more than 500 children are being cared for, under the direction of Dr. Sidney Farber. Also maintained here by Variety are diagnostic laboratories and clinics from which physicians all over the world receive free advice concerning the treatment and care of children suffering from cancer. The annual Jimmy Fund drive is familiar to all Americans, especially those residing in New England States.

Moving to Buffalo, you'll find that the children's rehabilitation center sponsored by the Variety Club of Buffalo is considered to be without peer. In Atlanta, Variety members maintain a school and clinic for children suffering from cerebral palsy.

In Las Vegas, Variety members support a day nursery and school for special education. Modeled after the vocational training school for crippled children which was designed, built, and equipped by the Variety Club of Toronto, Canada, the Las Vegas school is gaining nationwide recognition as "Variety Village."

Industrial rehabilitation of the mentally handicapped—often overlooked—receives the full attention of Variety's Cincinnati chapter. And hundreds of children are the better for it.

Worldwide praise has been the reward for the care and training of blind children conducted by the San Francisco chapter's Blind Babies Foundation.

Across the Atlantic, in London, Variety members have established the Heart of Variety, Ltd., to assist smaller charitable organizations—such as orphanages, hospitals, and playgrounds for children—in their work.

Here, in Washington, Variety members have contributed toward the construction of a new research building at Children's Hospital. The new building—known as the Variety Club Research Center of Children's Hospital—provides facilities for research in allergic diseases, antibiotics, cancer, cerebral palsy, and virus infections.

The most modern camp for handicapped children of its kind, in the world. That's the reputation earned by the camp operated in Philadelphia by Variety Club members. Their counterparts in Chicago sponsor La Rabida Sanitarium, an institution for children afflicted with rheumatic fever. The New York Variety Club joins in the fight against cancer by supporting the Cancer Control and Research Foundation.

Hospital care of 18,000 patients annually—that is the staggering responsibility assumed by Variety's Miami chapter. In addition to this care for handicapped children, much of the clinic work for doctors of the Florida Crippled Children's Commission is done at the Variety-sponsored Children's Hospital in Miami.

In Des Moines, Variety members have pledged support of the Cystic Fibrosis Association, while in Minneapolis the sponsorship of care and treatment of heart diseases is the special project of Variety.

The principal charity in Milwaukee is the highly regarded Variety Club Epilepsy Center. In Baltimore, Variety members have pledged to support numerous established charities—all of them for handicapped children.

Los Angeles, Variety members help more than 3,500 boys to become good citizens, each year, through their sponsorship of the Variety Boys' Club.

The Albany tent is small but the hearts of its members are big, as this chapter proves by financing of Camp Thacher, which provides under-privileged boys of the city with 2 weeks in the country. Mexico City's tent operates the successful Luis R. Montes Boys' Club. This camp provides a wholesome environment for youngsters whose families can provide them with nothing but the bare necessities of life.

In Charlotte, Variety members erected a children's clinic as part of the Charlotte Memorial Hospital. Two public health centers have not only been built but are being maintained by the Oklahoma City Variety Club. A day nursery care program receives the attention of St. Louis' Variety Club; blind children of Ireland benefit from the care provided by Dublin's chapter; Seattle's members work long and hard to comfort children at the Orthopedic Hospital's Children's Heart Clinic.

And so it goes, through the rollcall of Variety Club tents in five countries. And so it has gone, through the years, as Variety-sponsored charities have emptied thousands of wheelchairs, straightened hundreds of young bodies, replaced despair with hope and taught hundreds of thousands of unfortunate youngsters how to take their places—with heads raised—in society.

This week, all of this effort and good work is being honored as Variety Clubs International celebrates its 34th anniversary.

Most Variety members wear a cloak of anonymity that befits their humanitarian efforts. Their reward is a smile on a little girl's face, the crutches thrown away by a young boy thrilling to sturdy legs and the thousands and thousands of children all over the world who have benefited—in mind and body—from their humanitarian programs.

Through the hospitals they have built and the medical research they sponsor, Variety Club members have made it possible for handicapped children to laugh again, to walk again, to believe in the future again.

No pain or affliction is too small for the attention of Variety Clubs International and certainly no praise too high for their dedication to the cause of making the world a better place for children.

Their constant labor to rescue children from the twilight world of pain and suffering should be an inspiration to us all.

Jobs for the Handicapped: A Community Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JARMAN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include in the RECORD the winning essay of the statewide contest sponsored by the Oklahoma Governor's committee on employment of the handicapped. The winner of this year's contest is Miss Sharon Davis of Northwest Classen High School, Oklahoma City, Okla. The general theme of Miss Davis' composition deals with the community's responsibility toward those who are unfortunate enough to be handicapped. I feel that its message is a challenge to the Nation as a whole, and one to which we all should direct our attention and action:

JOBS FOR THE HANDICAPPED: A COMMUNITY CHALLENGE

You walk down the street, head high, eyes flashing, legs carrying you to your destination, and arms holding your packages easily. Then you see a man with the white cane of the blind guiding his way, or a woman in a wheelchair, legs helplessly resting on the supports, or a man clutching his bundle with one arm and a hook. You silently give thanks for your blessings and continue on your way as before. But stop. Is that all you're going to do—just count your blessings and continue on your way? No, they don't want your pity either. They only want your understanding and an opportunity. What can you do as a person or as part of a community? Listen a minute to the facts and make your own decision as an individual and a community.

Joe Smith is an average American—an average handicapped American, that is. He's one of the 17 million Americans who are working to make a life of their own. Joe Smith can't walk. He's among the 12 or 13 million Americans who have a disability involving limited motion. But Joe Smith could be blind or deaf and still be in the majority of handicapped Americans, for 960,000 people are blind and over 6 million people are deaf or have hearing impairments. Joe Smith has amazing hands, though. They can do any intricate job given them. But they weren't given the chance for a long time. He made the rounds of every employer in his community, and he received the same polite "No" each time. Why? Prejudice. Employers aren't informed, and people aren't informed. And then Joe Smith, average handicapped American, heard about the local division of the State vocational rehabilitation agency. He went to the agency, and now he has a job painting delicate designs on similarly delicate china. You ask how the agency can do this? Then you know nothing of its work? Most people don't.

Many services are offered to the disabled by the community agency. Joe Smith took advantage of those which especially suited him. Medical help is the first of the services offered. If any medical help would make it possible for the person to work again, it is given him. The agency pays part; the person works off the rest. So it is not all charity. If physical aids, like braces, hearing aids, etc., are needed, they are given; often the person can't pay for these, and the agency must. Remember, it's a State agency, and this money comes from your taxes.

Advice for the right job comes next. The person's interests and abilities are tested and considered first, and after the right job is found, training for it begins. Vocational rehabilitation usually pays costs. Often the disabled person needs room and board and travel while he's continuing his counseling, and again costs are either split or handled by the agency. The other services are both a help in finding jobs, securing tools, and obtaining licenses, if needed, and a help on the new job in working out any difficulties that might arise.

Joe Smith found the aid invaluable, and through the efforts of the Oklahoma State Employment Service and a special counselor for the handicapped, he is now employed. He is employed by a company whose officers are informed of the abilities—not the disabilities—of its workers. He is working to pay back the agency that helped him, and he is helping by participating in surveys and in the production of information to help overcome public prejudice. He knows the problems of the handicapped, and he wants to make it easier for the next guy.

So where does this leave you? Maybe you are now a bit informed as to what a man or woman must do, if he is physically handicapped, to earn his own way in the world. Perhaps you see where you can help. Understanding is your first concern. Knowing the facilities in your community is second, and most important, use them. Once the first is found, the second is easy. You'll find opportunities everywhere. That small businessman, who is your best friend, needs an assistant. The only requirement is a good brain. Your influence on him might mean the hiring of one or more handicapped persons. Opposition? Quote accurate facts. If 81,000 handicapped people add their job-hours to those of other workers, 121 million more hours of work would be contributed toward America's industrial future. Handicapped workers are just as reliable as, or more so, than any other worker. They know what a privilege it is to be able to work and earn a living. Handicapped workers are as skilled as, and usually harder working than, other workers. They have the desire to make up for any physical disability by mental capacity and work output.

There are not many physically perfect people who have the desire to make up for a mental or a personality disability. Still opposition? Quote history: Franklin Delano Roosevelt, a polio cripple; Lord Nelson, one eye, one arm; Beethoven, deaf; Steinmetz, the engineering wizard, a hunchback; Thomas Edison, deaf; Homer, blind; Lord Byron, clubfooted; John Keats, tubercular; Helen Keller, blind and deaf; Julius Caesar, an epileptic; John Milton, blind.

So you see, it isn't hard to convince others, if you're informed, and after you've talked to one person, others will be easier. But convincing isn't enough. You must work too. Work to promote the Goodwill Industries, the Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, and all other agencies of your community to help these wonderfully ambitious people. You aren't alone, either. You are part of the community, and it's the community's job to find the best solution to the problem. Every time one more person is added to the ranks of informed citizens, the community's work is strengthened and the cause of the physically handicapped is carried one step further.

You will walk down the street, head high, eyes flashing, legs carrying you to your destination, and arms holding packages easily. You will see a man moving with the white cane of the blind guiding his way, or a woman in a wheelchair, legs helplessly resting on the supports, or a man clutching his bundle with one arm and a hook. You will silently give thanks for your blessings and continue on your way—but not as before. For now you will add to your gratitude the knowledge, desire to help, and understanding that will make hiring of the handicapped successful. As a group of individuals and organizations, a community can plan programs to help the handicapped help themselves. It is your challenge, not only as an individual, but as a community.

A Farm Woman Speaks on Social Security Medical Care Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, it was my rare privilege last evening to listen to a very sound exposition of the social security medical care plan and I feel that I should share this fine statement with my colleagues. Mrs. David Holt, of Lincoln University, Chester County, Pa., delivered a masterful address before the Pennsylvania Farmers Association at its annual congressional dinner held yesterday at the Dodge House. Mrs. Holt is a constituent of our colleague, PAUL DAGUE, but Congressman DAGUE has kindly consented to accord me the honor of placing her fine statement in the Appendix of the RECORD. In commending her address to your attention particular emphasis is placed on the fantastic levels that must be anticipated in social security payments during the next 20 years if we continue to use this basic retirement system as a catchall for recurring socialistic proposals.

The address follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICAL CARE

The Constitution of the United States of America was conceived and purposely designed to make secure the God-given liberties of each individual against the domination of government. This provision was made by a division of authority among the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of our Federal Republic; the diffusion of government powers; and the retention by the people of those powers not specifically delegated to government.

America's unparalleled progress is based on the freedom and dignity of the individual initiative, and equal opportunity, sustained by our faith in God and our basic moral and ethical values.

The principles of our competitive enterprise system are consistent with our religious values and the highest goals of mankind. Through this system the American people have produced abundant goods and services and provided widespread educational advantages and religious opportunities.

The full realization of man's dreams as envisioned by our Founding Fathers can only be achieved if each individual assumes active responsibility for maintaining and strengthening the principles upon which our Republic was founded and vigorously opposes all programs and policies which erode the very foundation of our American system.

The present generation of oldsters are getting a handsome subsidy. We, in no sense, begrudge them this benefit. We only say that it should be understood for what it is. We not only are taxing present workers to support the oldsters, but we are creating liabilities for our children and grandchildren. If medical care is added to the present social security system, inevitably, taxes will be paid by many who can't afford them, to provide medical care for many individual elderly people who can afford to pay their own bills, or who have insurance that will cover them. Meanwhile the social security approach would leave out in the cold many people who have no resources at all. There are 4 million now not covered by social security.

Those who know the condition and capabilities of the social security system recommend that the whole structure not be endangered by placing upon it a new load that it was never designed to carry. Present social security reserves are about $20 billion, while obligations already incurred are more than $300 billion. In 1957, $128 million more was paid out than was taken in. In 1958, $528 million more was paid out than was taken in. In 1960, $1,724,000,000 more was paid out than was taken in. Each month there are 30,000 more persons added to the social security payment list.

Under Government payment for medical care, the Government would have control over services rendered and would be in position to regulate the doctor, the hospital and even the care involved. Why should the Government meddle with medical care when we already have the highest medical standards of any country in the world.

The United States is already one-third socialized. You can socialize just as surely by a steady increase in the burden of taxation as you can by outright Government seizure. The very imposition of heavy taxes is a limitation on a man's freedom. By past experience we know that the Government can change its contracts at will and how do we know that benefits will not gradually be extended to cover all ages or socialized medicine? That is something to think about before we wade in any deeper. There is a limit to how far we may safely go out on the social security limb.

Let's take a look at these charts. Chart No. 1 is a graph made from the statistics shown on chart No. 3. Here we see a maximum payment in 1937 of $60 or 2 percent of a man's salary, 1 percent paid by the employer and 1 percent by the employee. In 1960 we see a maximum payment of $288 or 6 percent of salary, 3 percent paid by each employer and employee. Next, under the present law, we notice the increase is such that by 1969 the amount will be $432 or 9 percent of salary 4½ percent paid by the employer and 4½ percent paid by the employee. And now we wonder what the future holds. At the present rate of increase, in the year 2001 only 32 years from now we would be paying $3,110 out of salary or wages.

Now let us check the figures for the self-employed and notice the increase there also. In 1951 when the self-employed person became eligible for social security he paid a maximum of $81 at the rate of 2¼ percent of his income. In 1960 his payment increased to $216 at the rate of 4½ percent of his income from self-employment. Now, under the present law he will pay in 1969, $324 or 6¾ percent of his income. What does the future hold for the farmer? Can he continue to pay these increases in social security taxes alone and can he afford to pay the increased levies to add medical benefits to the present benefits?

Companies offering financial medical protection policies for the individual have been forced to increase their premium payments, so how can social security offer more benefits without increasing the cost?

The social security approach to providing for and financing medical care for the aged would represent a real and distinct departure from the present mode of operation. It would represent a shift in emphasis from a voluntary to a compulsory contribution for health insurance. It would represent a shift from personal responsibility for our own health care to State responsibility for it. We question seriously whether the best interests of all are served by this shifting of responsibility for health and medical care from the citizen, the family, and established private organizations to the Federal Government.

The monthlong strikes, riots, and violence in Belgium, when the Government proposed very moderate reductions in the social security benefits which some groups had become used to, were ominous warnings to other nations of the political as well as economic dangers of over commitments. Social security benefits are easy to increase, but enormously difficult to reduce.

Will our children and our children's children and their employers be happy about paying social security taxes when they discover that the same money would buy substantially more retirement benefits for them if purchased voluntarily from a private insurance company?

Most people believe that social security is similar to private voluntary insurance and consider the taxes they pay equivalent to premiums bought and paid for. They have been led to believe that their contributions along with the similar amount paid by their employer is being held in an earmarked fund which will be ready and waiting for them upon their day of retirement.

This practice of erroneously comparing the social securtiy program to a voluntary private insurance plan has led to wide misunderstanding. There is no contractual relationship between the individual and the Government as there is between the insurance company and the individual policyholder. The individual rights under the social security program are statutory and are bestowed upon him by the Congress. Congress has the power to change the program and to alter these rights in the future if it so wishes.

The Farm Bureau's policy on this program is that it should be so designed to supplement rather than replace individual thrift and personal responsibility. The increasing costs of liberalized benefits are becoming a serious financial burden. We, therefore, recommend that existing programs be modified so that they will require no further tax increases.

Social security taxes should not be increased to pay medical costs for any portion of the population. The need for medical insurance should be met by expansion of existing private insurance programs without Federal subsidy.

Farmers should consider the degree of burden from increased social security tax rates. In many instances, the social security tax that a farmer pays is higher than his Federal income tax.

The generally accepted purpose of the social security system when it was first introduced was to provide a basic foundation of protection against want and destitution. It was expected that individuals and employers would construct additional security programs and retirement plans as inclination and capacity to finance would permit. This was and still is a sound basis for protection.

Lincoln once said that the Government should never do for an individual anything he can do for himself.

No one knows more at firsthand about the medical problems of older people than the doctors and no group cares more about the medical problems facing the country, yet they are against the social security approach. The average doctor already has more than adequately demonstrated his good will toward older citizens by treating many of them who could not afford to pay or who could pay little. In fact the doctor as an individual has made a greater contribution to the elderly than any other individual in our society.

With Government benefits there will be an increased demand for hospital care and this will flood the already overcrowded hospitals. There is a possibility of creating many hypochondriacs. In fact, 40 percent of the people using these benefits would not need to be hospitalized if they had someone to care for them.

One of the Ten Commandments is "Honor thy father and thy mother." How can our younger generation fulfill this commandment when they place this responsibility upon Government? With the shortening workweek, we have more time, more pleasure and accept less responsibilities.

And of further concern—young people today may never receive full benefits, if the social security system is not kept financially sound. Sweden, often displayed as the example of a perfect socialist state, has not met her social security obligations. Only 65 percent of the guaranteed payment is being made. We can profit by the costly lessons learned by other countries who have tried the road to socialism.

We must not let our sympathy and concern blind us to the facts and the long-range implications of medical care financed by the social security system. More than the physical welfare of our older citizens is at stake when this issue is finally decided. The very principles by which we live and are governed are being tested. May I repeat a statement that I made in the beginning. The full realization of man's dreams as envisioned by our Founding Fathers can only be achieved if each individual assumes active responsibility for maintaining and strengthening the principles upon which our Republic was founded and if each individual opposes all programs and policies which erode away the very foundation of our American system.

Tribute to a Good Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the House, without dissent, passed a most meritorious bill, H.R. 845, sponsored by our distinguished colleague from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. The bill provides for an amendment to an existing law raising the pension for holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor from $10 to $100.

I am sure that this will meet with the approval of all good, patriotic American citizens. It is something that should have been done long before now. The deeds of valor performed by the holders of this award have often left in their wake casualties other than physical.

I believe that my congressional district has furnished as many of these heroes as any congressional district in the United States. One of these was James D. Slayton, a man whose acquaintance and friendship I felt honored to have. Some 10 days ago James Slayton died, a victim of the hellish experiences which brought him the coveted Congressional Medal of Honor as surely as if he had died in the act which brought him this honor.

I regret that he never lived to enjoy the benefits extended by this bill.

A wonderful and deserving tribute was penned in the form of an editorial in his hometown paper, the Leader-Call of Laurel, Miss., on February 27. The author of the editorial is unknown to me, but I do know that whoever wrote this touching and true tribute felt what he wrote in a "Tribute to a Good Soldier."

This editorial follows:

TRIBUTE TO A GOOD SOLDIER

Tomorrow the warm, soft Mississippi loam takes home the frail, world-weary body of a good soldier who is safe at last from the wounds of war.

James D. Slayton, 48, decorated by four countries and winner of the highest honor the United States can convey for valor—the Congressional Medal of Honor—is dead.

He wore the medals of war quietly, and proudly, but he could not solve the problems of peace. So Saturday he folded his hands as if in prayer and went into a deep sleep. The verdict was carbon monoxide poisoning.

Death came as he lay in the seat of his automobile on a rutty road beside Lake Bogue Homo. Only inside his tortured mind was there darkness. Outside the fastened windows of his automobile the eternal mystery of spring began again. The weathered cypress stumps showed faintly green with new Spanish moss. Nearby the finches and orioles preened yellow and gold feathers in the Southern sun, readying themselves for the long flight northward. The first blush of redbud stained the woodland and the whited plum trees accented the green of the pines and live oaks.

If a man can select the scene of his passing no one would pick a more peaceful setting. Here were the aromatic piney woods of his boyhood. Here the loblolly and the cypress sing a requiem more fitting than the vested choir of any cathedral. This would be the music he loved to hear, the clean wind in the lacy tree limbs.

Born on April 2, 1912, he went to grammar school in Laurel but quit when he was 16. From 1927 to 1942 he was a truckdriver. He transported freight over long hauls on all types of roads. To some this sounds romantic but repairs on a wrecked truck on a lonesome road at night is a man's job.

Then came Pearl Harbor. He entered service on June 8, 1942, and after basic training became a rifleman. Every military man knows the rifleman has the toughest job in the Army. A rifleman depends upon himself for his own safety. He digs his own foxhole, hunts his own cover and concealment, and makes his own battlefield decisions.

Soon he was shipped overseas and assigned to Company K, 157th, U.S. Army, in Italy. He was promoted to corporal. Then, on September 23, 1943, near Oliveto, Corporal Slayton, while lead scout for an infantry squad, had an opportunity to take things into his own hands. Enemy resistance had succeeded in pinning down two attacking platoons. Working ahead of his squad, Corporal Slayton crept upon an enemy machinegun nest. He assaulted it with his bayonet and succeeded in killing the gunner. He detached his bayonet and killed the other gunner with rifle fire. At that time he was fired upon by a machinegun to his left. He then moved over the ground, under constant fire, to within throwing distance. Then, on his second try, he scored a direct hit by grenade on the enemy machinegun nest killing two gunners. At that time a third machinegun fired on him 100 yards to his front and he killed both of these gunners with rifle fire.

As a result of his heroic action, the two rifle platoons, which were receiving heavy casualties, were enabled to withdraw to covered positions and again take the initiative. Corporal Slayton withdrew, under mortar fire, under order of his platoon leader at dusk that evening.

This conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life brought him the United States greatest military award—the Congressional Medal of Honor—and also the British Military Medal, the Italian Cross of Military Valor, and the Russian Order of the Patriotic.

Although appreciative, he never wore the foreign decorations. But always on his breast, when in his suntans, was the blue and polished silver combat infantryman's badge and the red and white ribbon signifying the enlisted man's Good Conduct Medal. He had earned both.

When he was rotated to the States he was sent out on war bond rallies. Then he was assigned to Camp Shelby, near Hattiesburg, where he served, first, as a noncommissioned officer in the advanced infantry replacement training center and, later, as a truckdriver.

He told his buddies there he wanted to go to work for the post office in Laurel when he got out of service but somehow or other that ambition never materialized. He was working as a crew leader of a group stacking boards in the warehouse of Masonite Corp. at the time of his death.

Within recent years he is known to have become disturbed over his military role. He became deeply dedicated to religion. This happens often to those brave enough to look death in his face unafraid.

As he went by the spillway at Bogue Homo Lake he undoubtedly thought of the disillusionment still in the world. He must have mused that life was like a stream, rushing downward toward the eagerly awaited quiet pool beyond the troubled spillway's bottom. So may have seemed the problems of war and peace.

At first his family, knowing he was troubled by his military role, did not believe he would want a military burial. But that is settled now and he will be buried with all the military honors appropriate to a man who wore the blue ribbon with 13 white stars on it.

Those who knew him well say they believed in his final hours he bore no one malice; no more than the slight spring wind which now passes over the place where he will sleep.

They are confident his days of religious revelation told him the rebellious heart is but a human instrument that returns to the dust from whence it came; that man sleeps but a while in the redded Mississippi clay of his birth then goes to eternal peace and life everlasting, safe at last from the wounds of war and the arrows of peacetime adversity.

Remarks of Hon. John P. Saylor on Imporation of Residual Fuel Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I cannot comprehend the necessity of the order of Hon. Stewart Udall, Secretary of the Interior, in increasing the import quota on residual fuel oil from 530,000 to 630,000 barrels per day for the quarter ending March 31 and I have registered my strong protest thereto.

Oil importers have long made it a practice to exhaust their quota long before June 30 and then with anguished cries that critical users of residual oil are without fuel, attempt to use this as a basis of warranting an upward adjustment in the residual allotment for the period.

When residual supplies pile up in overseas refiners, the oil giants turn to the industrial market of the American eastern seaboard where utilities are large consumers of fuel.

Under the price-depressing effects of an oversupply of oil and with stocks of residual oil mounting rapidly, the disposal of residual oil becomes more important than the revenue it yields. Under these circumstances, prices are slashed ruthlessly to undersell coal to the utilities which can switch their boilers from fuel to fuel.

The mandatory control program on residual oil was adopted in order to give the coal producers, the consumers and the miners some basis with which to plan their operations. There must be some consistency in order to regulate production. The coal producers cannot operate blindly with the prospect of operating their mines full time for one quarter and suddenly because of an increase in import of oil, find that they will operate on a 2-day week schedule for the next quarter.

At recent open hearings conducted by the Secretary of the Interior, I was most impressed with the outstanding presentation of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. JOHN P. SAYLOR, and I ask consent to include among my remarks his most cogent statement in opposition to any further increase in the amount of residual fuel oil allowed to come into this country and respectfully refer the same to the Members of the House for their consideration:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE JOHN P. SAYLOR, REPUBLICAN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, FEBRUARY 20, 1961

Mr. Secretary, I appear at this time to make a brief statement for two reasons.

First, I want to add my voice to those who have disagreed with the order you issued last Friday in permitting an additional 9 million barrels of residual fuel oil to be imported into the United States during the next 6 weeks.

And, secondly, I want to urge you in the strongest terms possible to continue the import control program on residual oil and to take action to cut down the increasing amounts which are coming into this country, even under controls.

As for your order of Friday, Mr. Secretary, I simply cannot understand why you acted as you did, when you did, especially when you had arranged this hearing. It gives one the impression that you make the decisions and then in an effort to placate the coal industry you allow us to appear and testify after the order for more oil has been granted. I believe that in all good conscience you should have waited for a while to see if the alleged shortage of oil in New England is as serious as represented. The weather has been unusually cold, but would not unseasonably warm weather in the coming weeks make the additional allotment unnecessary? If the weather turns warm it will then be too late to do anything about the 9 million barrels of oil.

This latest increase is just one more bit of evidence to the effect that oil importers have found a way to get around the quotas. They constantly cry shortages of supplies, create a false sense of emergency on the part of a lot of well-meaning persons who bring pressure to bear at the highest level to force an increase in imports.

This has become standard operating procedure on the part of the oil importers. I hope you will constantly keep this in mind when you are being importuned by their pleas.

As for the import control program itself, Mr. Secretary, to me it would be unthinkable for you to recommend its removal. That would mean complete and utter chaos for the coal industry. Some people might think the coal industry is expendable—they have certainly indicated they feel so by permitting other fuel to enjoy consistent competitive advantages. But I contend that the coal industry is absolutely essential to this Nation's peacetime economy and to the Nation's security in time of emergency.

Believe me, Mr. Secretary, there is a limit to what the coal industry can bear and continue to operate. If we had to contend only with residual oil the situation would be serious enough. But in addition, we find the growing practice in the natural gas industry of dumping gas for boiler fuel in industrial plants at prices way below that paid by householders and oftentimes below actual costs to transmission companies. Also, because coal is produced so efficiently in this country, we find foreign nations have erected artificial trade barriers to keep it out.

On every hand, the coal industry is beset with serious problems. Residual fuel oil is probably the most serious right now because it can be sold at any price necessary to undercut coal. And the oil could be brought in in almost unlimited quantities if controls should be removed.

It does not take much imagination to picture what would happen along the east coast. All the international oil companies, holding oil concessions abroad, would use the east coast to dump their tremendous production of residual. Coal simply could not compete in a price war of this magnitude.

There could be only one result—and that is the complete elimination of coal from this market.

Is this what New England, which has opposed the import control program so violently, really wants? Do large industrial consumers of fuel want to be absolutely dependent upon imported oil as the sole source of fuel?

If that is what they want, they could certainly achieve their purpose by getting import controls taken off or by wrecking the present program through a series of extra allocations—such as the added 9 million barrels you, Mr. Secretary, approved last Friday.

I urge our New England friends to consider what will happen when and if residual fuel oil ever achieves a monopoly in their fuels market. Perhaps they believe that given monopoly conditions, the oil companies will continue to cut prices and make abundant supplies of cheap fuel available there. I do not share this faith in the oil industry's dedication to free competitive prices in a monopoly market.

The hope of New England in the future lies in a sound, expanding coal industry that will be able to maintain low, stable prices. But coal cannot maintain this stability in supply and price as a protection for New England if its markets are being constantly eroded by cheap residual fuel oil imports.

The coal industry is the most efficient in the Nation. But it is being forced to operate at little better than standby levels—producing only a little more than 400 million tons of coal a year. Employment is down to less than 180,000 from a figure just about three times larger than just a few years ago. Unemployment, economic stagnation, breadlines, hunger and despair—these are the heritage of the men who have labored in our coal mines and of the coal areas which have contributed to much to the Nation's progress.

Mr. Secretary, I can only say to you that the people in my congressional district were shocked by your recent order. They took heart that relief would be forthcoming if Senator Kennedy were elected President. He had stated in West Virginia—when he deployed the plight of the coal industry that a part of their problem was directly attributable to the importation of residual oil.

My people took increased hope when Mr. Kennedy was elected President of these United States. Their hopes were further raised when President Kennedy said that the first order of business of his administration would be relief for the distressed areas of this country. This promise seemed to be borne out with the announcement by the President that the Secretary of Agriculture was to increase the allocation of surplus foods.

They believed that it would be only a matter of weeks until relief was felt at home. Their spirits were reassured when your fellow Cabinet officer, the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Goldberg, was dispatched to these chronic depressed areas to bring to President Kennedy a firsthand account of present conditions.

They were jubilant when Secretary Goldberg reported that conditions were even worse than both he and President Kennedy had been informed.

And their feelings were reassured when President Kennedy issued the Executive or-

der that all decisions made by his administration would be made as a team and that they would all be consistent.

In view of the statements made in West Virginia last fall, and the recent actions by President Kennedy in increasing surplus food allotments and surveying the depressed areas, I cannot believe that he is in accord with your recent order to increase the amount of fuel oil to be imported into the United States.

When your order, increasing the import quota was announced, the thoughts of my constituents have been—"Well, it was too good to be true—relief is not in sight—our plight has not moved our Government in Washington."

Like the wards of our Government—also under your Department—our Indian brethren in olden days said "White man speak with forked tongue."

I plead with you, Mr. Secretary, to make it clear before this hearing adjourns that you have absolutely no intention of removing controls—that you will oppose efforts of any other Government agency to remove them—and that you are going to tighten up on imports and make sure they are held to reasonable levels.

America Recognizes Amerigo Vespucci

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1961

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution to commemorate on March 9 of each year the birthday of one of the world's greatest explorers, Amerigo Vespucci. America, which adopted the name of this explorer, has failed to do honor to the birthday of the man and I have therefore introduced this belated resolution to correct the omission.

The story of this great navigator teaches a lesson which we should learn very well. It is noteworthy that while this great country of ours was discovered by Christopher Columbus, an Italian, it is named after Amerigo Vespucci, another Italian. While Amerigo Vespucci's first voyage to America was 5 years after that of Columbus, his letters and reports were widely circulated in Europe. In one of these letters, he called this continent the mundus novus, New World, and in 1507 Martin Waldseemuller of Friberg, a professor of geography, drew up a new world map. In this map he used the printed word "America" for the first time. As a consequence, our continent was called America, after Amerigo Vespucci.

The anniversary of Amerigo Vespucci serves to remind us that the bridge of understanding and cooperation between Italy and America was not constructed recently. It is a process which has developed over many centuries, from the very beginnings of the discovery of this continent. First it was the early Italian explorers, such as Columbus, John Cabot—Giovanni Caboto—Amerigo Vespucci, Verrazano, and others. Then there were small groups of settlers from Italy who found their way to America. And during the past century there was the mass immigration of Italians who came here with a burning determination to improve their lot and to help build a free and a great America.

Thus, Italian immigrants have brought to this country the rich heritage of their wonderful culture, along with their passionate love for freedom. They have made lasting contributions to America in every sphere of activity, and the imprint of these contributions to American life and culture are visible all over this great land. They have become a vibrant and meaningful asset to American democracy. They constitute a hard-working and industrious group to whom American ideals and traditions are precious. The Italian immigrants and the children of these immigrants are loyal and devoted to the American democratic system.

The bonds of blood, understanding and friendship between the people of Italy and America continue to grow over the years. Not only are the two countries linked as allies diplomatically, economically and militarily, but there is also a growing link between the cultures of the two nations, an increasing interchange in education and the arts, and most of all there exists today a chain of understanding which is becoming stronger each day. Let us continue to strengthen that chain of friendship between Italy and America, and in this way we shall make both countries more secure in the future.

The Federation of the Italian-American Democratic Organizations of the State of New York, Inc., annually grants awards to outstanding Americans of Italian origin who demonstrate a pioneering spirit into new frontiers, called the Amerigo Vespucci Awards. The recipients of these awards for the year 1961 and in whose honor a testimonial dinner dance is being given, are as follows:

Joseph P. Addabbo, Member of Congress, New York State, fifth District.

Guy James Mangano, Brooklyn, assemblyman, New York State.

Michael J. Fusco, deputy commissioner, Department of Sanitation, New York City.

E. Howard Molisani, manager and secretary of the Italian Cloakmakers Union, Local 48, I.L.G.W.U.

Mrs. Angela L'Episcopo, civic and charitable worker.

I salute them.

Proposed Tax Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a fine article written by Mr. Paul Martin, chief of the Washington bureau, Gannett News Service.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, February 28.—President Kennedy is asking Congress to raise Federal payroll taxes on wage earners and businessmen by more than $6 billion in the next 2 years.

In addition, he is supporting former President Eisenhower's longstanding request for $843 million more in postal rates, including a new 5-cent stamp for personal letters.

Kennedy also wants to raise $300 million in new highway funds, either by higher user charges on truckers, or by a one-half-cent-a-gallon increase in the Federal gasoline tax on motorists.

All in all, the new Democratic administration wants to collect $7.2 billion in new taxes annually by January 1, 1963, to finance new or increased Government spending programs.

These taxes would hit primarily wage earners, consumers, and businessmen. They would amount to an additional 2 percent levy on gross income up to $5,000 a year per individual, without any deductions or exemptions, in all employment covered by social security.

The administration makes the point that taxes so collected would be paid back to the public in the form of higher social security, medical care, and unemployment benefits, thereby increasing consumer power and stimulating business.

But the revenue also would have to be collected from the paychecks of individuals and the payrolls of industry, thereby reducing consuming power of many workers, raising operating costs of business, and perhaps contributing to price increases.

The cost of doing business in America would go up at a time when domestic manufacturers in many lines are under increasingly severe competition from foreign producers who operate with labor costs one-half to two-thirds cheaper than union wage scales in the United States.

The proposed $6 billion boost in payroll taxes includes $3.9 billion to finance the administration's new social welfare bills, plus a $2.2 billion hike in social security taxes scheduled under existing law to take effect on January 1, 1963.

Of the total tax bill, wage earners would have to pay $2½ billion, while $3½ billion of the extra costs would fall on business. Here's what it would mean:

INDIVIDUALS

A cut of $56 a year in take-home pay for every worker making $5,000 a year in any endeavor covered by social security. The worker who has $144 deducted from his paycheck now would be paying $200 a year in 1963. He would then be taxed at a rate of 4 percent of his gross income up to $5,000. The rate would rise to 5 percent by 1969.

BUSINESS

An increase of $78 a year to the businessman for each $5,000 employee on his payroll. To a company with 1,000 employees, this would mean $78,000 a year in additional operating costs. By 1963 the businessman would be paying $375 a year for each wage earner on his payroll. The rate would rise to $425 a year by 1969.

SELF-EMPLOYED

A hike of $75 a year for the self-employed person coming under social security, or a 7½-percent earnings tax by 1963 amounting to payments of $375 a year. The payment would rise to $450 a year by 1969.

Under present or proposed tax law, the social security tax by 1969 will become in effect a 10-percent gross income tax, without any deductions or exemptions, divided equally between employer and employee.

Representative JOHN W. BYRNES, Republican, of Wisconsin, ranking minority member of the House Ways and Means Committee, says that the average worker in America, with a wife and three children, will then be paying more to the Government for social security than he does in income taxes.

Administration proposals for new health, social security, and unemployment benefits envision a "spend now-pay later" plan, by deferring the effective date of most new taxes until 1963.

However, the social security trust fund already is one-fourth of 1 percent "out of balance" according to actuarial studies. To keep the fund from getting further in the red, the administration must increase "current taxes" for every dollar of new benefits that Congress votes this year.

The Kennedy tax program would accelerate a 10-year trend toward higher Government spending. Tax Foundation, Inc., a nonprofit institution, says spending by Federal, State, and local governments has more than doubled in the last decade.

Government expenditures, which amounted to only $70 billion in 1950, jumped to $153 billion in 1960, or approximately 30 percent of the total gross national product, and 40 percent of all personal income in America.

The proposed tax boost of the Democratic administration is larger in amount than either the $4.8 billion income tax cut made by the Republican 80th Congress in 1948, or the $5.4 billion reduction in income and excise taxes made by the GOP 83d Congress in 1954.

In the last 46 years, or since the graduated income tax was adopted in 1914, there have been 33 major changes in the Internal Revenue Code; 23 tax changes were enacted by Democratic Congresses; all but 3 were tax hikes; 10 major changes were made by Republican Congresses; all but 1 were tax cuts.

Progress of School Construction in Peoria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, on two successive days, March 5 and March 6, there appeared in the Peoria Journal-Star, articles relating to education which to me are very timely and significant. The first article concerns the approval by the Richwoods Township voters of a school bond referendum and is self-explanatory. The Richwoods Township area is just outside the city of Peoria.

The second article by Art Andrews entitled "School Half-Day Sessions Just a Memory," gives a capsule account of what we have done locally in the Peoria area to meet our educational requirements. Both of these articles tell the story of what we are doing without the benefit of Federal aid, and it would seem to me that all other communities ought to be doing the same thing throughout the country.

One thing is for sure. We are getting more schools and classrooms built for our money by financing them locally and having the primary and secondary educational programs completely autonomous under the direction of locally elected school boards.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include both articles in their entirety in the RECORD:

RICHWOODS VOTERS OK $950,000 SCHOOL BOND ISSUE

In a big turnout, Richwoods voters passed Saturday a $950,000 high school expansion program by a margin of 453 votes.

The final vote was 3,361 "yes" and 2,927 "no."

The most talked about part of the bond issue was the proposal for a $198,000 swimming pool in the expansion plans. Classrooms and laboratories form the bulk of the bond issue.

Although high school swimming pools have been a part of some Illinois high schools for many years, Richwoods will become the first Peoria area high school to have such a facility.

The bond issue excited considerable interest. The Journal Star switchboard received hundreds of calls on the outcome beginning shortly after the polls closed at 7 p.m.

Here is the vote by polling place: Peoria Heights School, 505 yes, and 657 no; Hines School, 609 yes and 440 no; Woodrow Wilson School, 512 yes and 486 no; Art & Bob's Shell Service, 46 yes and 97 no; Sipp School, 1.041 yes and 800 no; Kellar School, 590 yes and 284 no, and Murray's garage, 66 yes and 152 no.

Dr. Fred C. Endres, board president, said: "I wish to say that the board and the administration of Richwoods Community High School is gratified and pleased with the positive vote on this issue.

The timing to bring this issue to vote was dictated by the need for the facilities because the children are here to receive a good education. But the timing was poor because of the recession.

"The confidence of the people in the board's policy expressed by the results of this ballot is appreciated by the board and the administration."

Superintendent Fred McDavid said that he was "very happy to have the issue passed * * * real pleased," he added.

Supporters of the bond issue point out that the pool will benefit students in teaching them swimming, water safety, and add to the physical education program. The pool was rejected in a 1958 special election.

It is also expected that grade school pupils in the Richwoods district will use the pool to learn to swim. Also, the pool will be open 1 night a week to adults during the school year and open in summer to families at a fee.

The school expansion program features 12 additional regular classrooms to meet enrollment growth increasing capacity by 500 students. The present enrollment of 1,489 is expected to grow to 2,265 by 1966–67.

Other special features of the expansion plans are a language laboratory, where students can hear recorded voices speaking foreign languages. Richwoods offers five foreign languages, one of which is Russian.

Additional science laboratories, including a combination physics and chemistry laboratory and general science and biology laboratory are a prominent part of the building program.

A reading laboratory intended to help students improve in their reading is a part of the addition, as well as a homemaking laboratory.

Other aspects of the construction program provide for a power mechanics shop, a typing room, and an addition to the guidance facilities.

An addition to the cafeteria is expected to meet the demand of feeding 1,200 to 1,300 students each day. The cafeteria was originally designed to feed 500. They now eat in four lunch-hour shifts.

ELEMENTARY BUILDING PROGRAM SOLVED CROWDING—SCHOOL HALF-DAY SESSIONS JUST A MEMORY

(By Art Andrews, staff writer)

Four years ago almost 1,000 Peoria children were attending school on half-day "split sessions."

Parents besieged the board of education with petitions to end the "inequality of education," one commenting that both home life and education were suffering.

The State department of public instruction threatened to withdraw accreditation of Peoria schools if steps were not taken to abolish crowded conditions.

Makeshift proposals for transporting pupils from school to school and remodeling basements, halls, and third floor gymnasiums into classrooms were studied and rejected in favor of seeking a more permanent solution to the problem.

But finally, after months of careful planning, in April 1958, the voters of Peoria approved a $5,800,000 bond issue for additions and rehabilitations affecting all 24 of the city's elementary schools.

Gradually, the number of schools with split sessions decreased from nine down to four—Loucks, McKinley, Irving, and Lincoln—and in the fall of 1959, for the first time in 6 years Peoria schools opened with a seat for every child.

Looking back on this elementary school building program, just how effective was it? Are school officials happy about the way it worked out?

The answer, schoolmen indicate, is an unqualified "Yes."

Charles M. Greeley, director of business for Peoria schools, points out that all unsatisfactory rooms—basement rooms, parts of two buildings (Franklin and Whittier) considered unsafe, third-floor gymnasiums and small rooms which were costly to operate—were eliminated by the new construction.

He totes up the other results as follows:

Elimination of split sessions by additional classrooms. Improvement of lighting. Improvement of heating and ventilation. Improvement of plumbing. General improvements such as new floor coverings, painting, tuckpointing, roof repairs or replacement, and some acoustical ceilings in aging buildings.

Major advantages were the addition of science rooms to the 14 kindergarten-through-eighth grade schools and addition of libraries.

Including interest on the bonds, the school board realized $5,916,084 on the bond sale, of which $5,760,778 was spent on the building program, leaving a balance of $155,306. The board has set aside $100,000 for construction of a new school on North Sterling Avenue, when needed.

Meanwhile, the money will draw interest.

At present all rooms are in use. But this does not mean the schools already are pinched for space. A few standard classrooms are being used as art, music or audio-visual rooms and these could easily be converted back to classroom use, if enrollments warranted.

Principal Ervin Zehr, of Glen Oak School put it this way:

"Frankly, when I compare the list of repairs and equipment which were needed during the summer months a few years ago with the list for this year I'm amazed. There used to be 50 or 60 items, some of them asked for every year. Now there are half a dozen."

As an example, he cited a new ceiling for the auditorium, which had been requested for 23 years.

"Spacewise, we're in good shape," commented David Pankake of Tying School.

"It's been wonderful," exclaims John Dunlop at Loucks School where parents once organized a protest on split sessions.

Principal Harlan Litchfield's dream of having a room for every teacher at the opening

of school came true at Lincoln School, formerly one of the most crowded schools.

Principal Ervin Koch, of Irving School has found, "Since we've been off split sessions, it's made the difference between day and night in our program."

The new addition is located across the street from the old school, which raises some administrative problems.

All in all, it appears that the elementary school building program, under leadership of Supt. Mark Bills and the school board building committee headed by Frederick M. Bourland, was remarkably well planned and executed.

Now the second phase of providing a sound, modern house for developing young minds to dwell in, the junior and senior high school building program, is about to begin.

True Picture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, because of the distorted picture that is too often painted about race relations in the South, I should like to submit for the RECORD an editorial from the Hattiesburg American, entitled "True Picture." The editorial, in fact, does present a true picture of what happens in my section of our great common country when the real and true interest of the Negro is involved. The editorial, of course, is based upon the relation between the races during the recent disastrous flood which visited this particular section of Mississippi. I have every reason to believe that similar situations were experienced in other sections of the South during this flood. This is nothing new and is as it should be.

As a matter of fact, I have witnessed many similar occurrences throughout my area when disaster struck. As far back as 1927, when the mighty Mississippi River flooded the rich delta lands of Mississippi and the adjoining States, and before governmental agencies were set up to meet such disasters, I was among a group of Mississippi coast men who went to the relief and rescue of many people, mostly Negroes, in that distant section of my State. We loaded boats and volunteer personnel upon freight cars and went to the relief our fellow men of both races. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the white people of the South are genuinely and sincerely interested in their black brethren.

The editorial follows:

TRUE PICTURE

The harmonious and heart-warming cooperation and mutual help among whites and Negroes during the flood disaster ordinarily should not be singled out for any special comment, being traditionally the natural order of things in the society of the South.

During times when our social order daily comes in for so much untrue and unfair criticism, however, from those outside the South who simply don't know what they are talking about, we feel that the true nature of the white-Negro relationship in the Hattiesburg area is worthy of comment.

So many throughout the Nation, having been fed lies and distortions for various reasons and therefore picturing us at at each others' throats, could have had their eyes opened by observing what happened during the flood.

Whites volunteered their services freely at Negro evacuation centers, caring for the sick and feeble, taking care of babies, pitching in at the most menial tasks that needed to be done, and wherever possible Negroes rendered assistance to whites. Lives were risked and major discomforts were endured.

We maintain, from having lived here and observed and having our roots here, that the disaster merely brought into focus the kind of fundamental white-Negro relationship that has always been in existence in Mississippi, despite the occasional violent and undesirable acts which occur in the normal course of any society. The ordinary acts of kindness and good will which are practiced in this area every day of every year go unpublicized except under unusual circumstances, which is as it should be.

No demonstrations of good will were staged or put on with any idea of proving some point to our detractors. This was not propaganda in action. It all developed quite naturally out of the basic human compassion that always has motivated a majority of southerners, white and Negro.

We maintain that this basic compassion, which is always ready to spring forth in time of mutual need can help us in time to solve any racial difficulties we face.

We also maintain that the sort of outside agitation and hate-mongering with which we have been bombarded in recent years can in time turn compassion and understanding into human tragedy.

The hearts and the pocketbooks of white individuals and white agencies were opened freely to Negro victims of the flood. It is our fondest hope that they always will be.

To the best of our knowledge, the NAACP did not set up any sort of flood relief headquarters during the emergency to come to the aid of anyone when the need was immediate, physical and very real.

"Election Emphasizes Freedom" Editorial by George A. Scott, Editor, the Progress, Clearfield, Pa., Wins George Washington Honor Medal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, Pa., has awarded a George Washington Honor Medal to Mr. George A. Scott, editor of the Clearfield (Pa.) Progress, for the editorial he wrote on October 28, 1960, titled "Election Emphasizes Freedom."

The award was 1 of more than 825 to individuals, organizations, and schools throughout the United States for their contributions in helping to bring about a greater appreciation and understanding of the American way of life during 1960.

Mr. Scott was 1 of 21 awarded honor medals for editorials. His editorial follows:

[From the Clearfield (Pa.) Progress, Oct. 28, 1960]

ELECTION EMPHASIZES FREEDOMS

Nothing like the current presidential election campaign which reaches the decision stage November 8, emphasizes more the basic freedoms that we enjoy as the keystone of the American way of life. However, such freedoms are too often obscured and overlooked by the heat of such a campaign and so it is well to call attention to them at this time.

There's the right to free speech and press. Certainly it can never be more clearly defined than during a presidential election campaign. Contrast the newspaper, radio, television and magazine opportunities given political candidates and their spokesman or followers in our United States with the suppression of both rights to the citizens of Cuba and the Iron Curtain countries including Soviet Russia. Where else, except in America and other free nations of the world, can you find the party in opposition permitted to criticize those in power and contend that they can do better? Where else can you find the newspapers and magazines divided on support of the opposing parties and with radio and television offering full space or facilities to both parties to present their views? Where else does the average citizen have a right to express his political views at his job, on the street, in the taverns and elsewhere without fear of reprisal from the government in control?

In the United States we enjoy these rights of free speech and free press, radio, magazine and television because our forefathers established such freedom as the American way of life and the generations that followed fought and died for these ideals.

Our same forefathers and their children over the years established our right to free elections and to a personal secret ballot. This right has not been completely achieved, but look back over the years and say we have not made progress toward such a goal. The right of women to vote, increasing prohibition of such voting deterrents as the poll tax, racial discrimination, etc., the increasing approval of absentee voting are signs of progress in the battle for free elections and secret ballot. And contrast our free election-secret ballot system with the Soviet Union's one-party, open-vote system that has been forced on its satellite and coexisent nations and ask yourself if the American way of life isn't better.

There are other freedoms that this important presidential and the less spectacular but equally important State and local election emphasizes. It emphasizes especially this year the all important freedom of religion in these United States, the right to worship God in one's own way; it emphasizes the right to assemble, whether the citizens be Republican, Democrat, or a minor party; it emphasizes our right to work in callings and localities of our choice or to go into business, compete and make a profit without fear of political or governmental reprisal. Less apparent but involved in the coming election are such political and economic rights guaranteed by our Constitution but ever in danger of loss through neglect of voting as the right of privacy in our homes, the right to trial by jury, the right to move about freely at home and abroad, the right to own private property, the right to bargain with our employers and employees, the right to government as a protector and referee and the right to freedom from arbitrary government regulation and control.

All these are basic human rights promised all of us in our American way of life and guaranteed to us if we will only take advantage of them by voting in each election and especially this coming election November

8. No matter how we vote, let us remember that it is essential that we vote. And let us vote with an appreciation of the freedoms we enjoy.

Civil Defense Program: Resolution Adopted by the Board of Supervisors, County of Los Angeles, Calif., on Tuesday, February 21, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the County Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County, in which my great 23d District is located, at their board meeting recently unanimously passed the following resolution in regard to civil defense program, resolution requesting President John F. Kennedy to exert leadership to stimulate construction of public and private facilities for civilian protection.

I think you and my distinguished colleagues will find the resolution interesting, pertinent, and timely:

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,
Los Angeles, Calif., February 21, 1961.

The board met in regular session. Present: Supervisors Ernest E. Debs, chairman (presiding), Frank G. Bonelli, Kenneth Hahn, Burton W. Chace, and Warren M. Dorn; and Gordon T. Nesvig, clerk.

IN RE CIVIL DEFENSE PROGRAM: RESOLUTION REQUESTING PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY TO EXERT LEADERSHIP TO STIMULATE CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE FACILITIES FOR CIVILIAN PROTECTION

On motion of Supervisor Hahn, unanimously carried, it is ordered that the following resolution be and it is hereby adopted:

"Whereas the Federal Government logically and historically has primary responsibility to provide for the common defense of the people of the United States as set forth in the preamble to the Constitution of the United States; and

"Whereas the tremendous difficulties and complexities of protecting the civilian population of the United States in this thermonuclear age when primary target areas are within 20 minutes of potential attack by unfriendly nations, has resulted in a general public spirit of apathy, indifference, and hopelessness; and

"Whereas unpreparedness at either the military or civilian level invites aggression and the civilian defense activities of the United States have not kept pace with that of our allies of Western Europe or that of our potential enemies—thus increasing the possibilities of a new Pearl Harbor type of attack against the people of the United States with thermonuclear weapons being used; and

"Whereas leading scientific opinion, including that of Dr. Edward Teller, the "father of the H-bomb," is that there is much that can be done to protect the people of the United States and that intelligent, positive action at all levels of government can save millions of civilian lives—which otherwise might be lost—in the event of a major disaster, provided that the people of the United States are educated to face up to the realities of the situation and trained as how best to protect themselves and strong dynamic leadership is exercised at the Federal, State, and local levels of government; and

"Whereas the American people have always met and overcome the great problems of each generation, but no problem in our history has approached the magnitude of the present threat of thermonuclear warfare, with our major civilian population centers as potential primary targets, and by meeting this challenge head on and realistically we will be strengthened as a nation and our economy will be stimulated as an incidental benefit; and

"Whereas the major steps which must be taken immediately to provide for effective civilian defense and protection are:

"1. The public must be made aware that there are practical means of protecting the civilian population from the effects of a thermonuclear attack through an education and information program stressing the steps which can be taken individually and collectively. The effectiveness of such a program will depend to a great extent on the quality of leadership exerted at the presidential level.

"2. There must be continuing dynamic leadership to direct and make effective a strong civilian defense program as an integral part of the Nation's total defense program.

"3. There must be an emphasis upon providing and adapting physical facilities for the protection of the public and incentives must be developed to stimulate construction of private facilities for civilian protection; and

"Whereas all levels of government must immediately exert positive leadership to accomplish these steps, with the Federal Government assuming the primary responsibility and leadership, strongly augmented where appropriate by State and local governments: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles respectfully requests President John F. Kennedy, as Chief Executive of the United States, to:

"1. Exert strong Executive leadership to establish and implement a more effective civilian defense program geared to meet today's needs and to strengthen the entire defense program.

"2. Promote an education and information program to inform every American that his only effective defense against thermonuclear warfare is to be informed and prepared in basic civil defense procedures.

"3. Take immediate steps to stimulate and provide incentives for construction of public and private facilities for civilian protection by:

"(a) Requiring that all new Federal buildings (including post offices, custom houses, office buildings, and military installations) be provided with adequate shelter facilities.

"(b) Requiring that all buildings constructed with Federal assistance or grants be provided with shelter facilities.

"(c) Providing Federal funds for both public and private schools to be used in construction of defense shelters.

"(d) Requiring that all private firms having defense contracts with the Federal Government must provide adequate shelters for their employees, just as local government requires businesses to provide off-street parking for the public good.

"(e) Providing a tax incentive for private enterprise to encourage construction of defense shelters at plants and factories by accelerating depreciation rates for privately built civil defense shelters or such other financial incentives as would be appropriate.

"(f) Providing a similar tax incentive program for private individuals building defense shelters at their homes.

"(g) Establishing matching funds on a dollar for dollar basis to be allocated to local governments to be used in building shelters at local public buildings; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That certified copies of this resolution be transmitted to President John F. Kennedy, to Senators Clair Engle and Thomas Kuchel, each Congressman from California, and the chairmen of the appropriate committees of the Congress concerned with civilian defense.

"I, Gordon T. Nesvig, clerk of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true and correct copy of a resolution which was adopted by the board of supervisors of said county on February 21, 1961, and entered in the minutes of said board.

"In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the board of supervisors this 27th day of February 1961.

GORDON T. NESVIG,
Clerk.

Prof. Edward D. Re, an Excellent Kennedy Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy recently named Prof. Edward D. Re, of Brooklyn, N.Y., as Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. This is a most excellent appointment which was well received in many circles throughout the country. I have known Professor Re for many years and consider him among my close personal friends.

Dr. Re is professor of law at St. John's University in Brooklyn. He received B.S. and LL.B. degrees from New York University. From 1943 to 1947 he served as legal officer and instructor at AAF Officer Candidate School. He was chairman of the committee of civil procedure and practice of the American Bar Association. He is a trustee of the Italian Board of Guardians, and for a number of years has been a member of the Board of Higher Education of the city of New York.

Professor Re has written extensively in various law journals and is also the author of several law studies, among them "Foreign Confiscations in Anglo-American Law" and "Brief Writing and Oral Argument." Several years ago he published a 46-page study in the Northwestern University Law Review dealing with jurisdiction over U.S. Armed Forces serving abroad. This study was based on a lecture he delivered in New York under the auspices of the Bar Association of New York City and the New York County Lawyers Association. A shorter version of this article was subsequently prepared, and this latter version I inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 12, 1956, page A231. That article was undoubtedly the most thorough and analytical treatment of the problem of the NATO status of forces agreement and international law.

Shortly thereafter, at hearings of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on the status of forces agreements, Congressman Stewart L. Udall, of Arizona, now the Secretary of Interior, testified before the committee and introduced Professor Re's article into the RECORD of the hearings. From part 2 of the committee hearings, held on February 1, 1956, page 503, I quote the following excerpt from Mr. Udall's testimony:

We have never had an alliance system like NATO—a peacetime military alliance where countries stand neither as conquered or conqueror, but on an equal basis, and the question arises, "We want to have a base in your country and bring in our troops and the troops of other countries."

The question arises, What shall the terms and conditions be under which they come in? I think this presents an entirely unprecedented situation. I don't think that what Caesar or Hannibal did is significant here, or that anywhere down through the pages of history you can point to a similar situation.

I might refer to this committee, and I think it should be made a part of the record—I would ask that it be made a part of the record—a review that was printed in the Northwestern Law Review magazine. Mr. Lavery has undoubtedly already seen it. Mr. Anfuso placed it in the RECORD. It appears in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page A-231. It is by Prof. Edward D. Re, professor of law at St. John's University.

He has made a study of this whole matter. It is a scholarly treatise, and is the best presentation I have seen.

He states that the principle laid down by Justice Marshall in the Exchange case is that where troops are permitted to enter with consent and to pass through a territory, once such consent is allowed and the troops enter, then they are subject to the discipline of their own forces. The key to the thing is the consent.

Obviously, with the NATO countries, they haven't granted any blanket consent; in fact we had to sit down with our allies and work out interim arrangements while the treaty was pending.

I would commend that article to you, and I would ask that it be placed in the record because it does throw a great deal of light on at least one point of view on this international law question.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to insert into the RECORD several recent articles and editorials lauding President Kennedy's appointment of Professor Re. These include an article from the Tablet, Brooklyn, N.Y., issue of March 4, 1961, "Dr. Re's New Post Tailor Made"; an editorial from the same newspaper, "Dr. Re's Appointment"; an editorial from the Brooklyn Spectator, issue of March 3, 1961, "Dr. Re Goes to Washington"; and an editorial from the Catholic News, New York City, issue of March 4, 1961, commenting on Dr. Re's appointment. They are as follows:

[From the Tablet, Mar. 4, 1961]

DR. RE'S NEW POST TAILOR MADE—FOREIGN CLAIMS OFFICIAL WROTE PAPER, BOOK ON THE SUBJECT

(By Frank DeRosa)

Dr. Edward D. Re's appointment as Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission by President Kennedy puts him in a post that "seems to be tailor made for me," according to the 40-year-old St. John's Law School professor.

Almost 20 years ago, while a student at St. John's Law School, Dr. Re wrote a paper on the subject of foreign confiscation of American property for the Law Review and in 1951 he published what is considered to be the first authoritative book on the matter of foreign confiscation.

Dr. Re's duties will entail determining claims of U.S. nationals against foreign governments for compensation for losses and injuries sustained by them.

The Commission possesses the powers and has the jurisdiction of the former War Claims Commission and the International Claims Commission.

A versatile teacher, writer, lecturer, and public official, Dr. Re has been a member of the board of higher education for the past 3 years.

Born in Santa Marina, nestled in the Aeolian Islands between Sicily and the Italian mainland, Dr. Re came to the United States at the age of 8.

Educated at Brooklyn's P.S. 176 and New Utrecht High School, Dr. Re began a long association with St. John's University when he enrolled in the school of commerce. After graduation he began the study of law at the Vincentian University and later became a member of the law school faculty. At the law school he organized and supervised the moot court system.

The educator earned a doctor of juridical science degree from New York University in 1950.

Divisional vice chairman on the section of international and comparative law of the American Bar Association, he was invited by the State Department to lecture in Mogadiscio, Somalia, 2 years ago.

FATHER OF EIGHT

Father of eight children, the Bay Ridge resident is married to Margaret Corcoran, who was a student in Dr. Re's classes at St. John's Law School. An attorney, she studied at Our Lady Queen of Martyrs School, Forest Hills, Maplehurst Convent of the Sacred Heart, Manhattan, and Manhattanville College of the Sacred Heart.

Three children attend Our Lady of Angels School: Mary Ann, 10; Anthony, 9; and Marina, 7. The others are Edward D., Jr., 5; Victor, 4; Margaret, 3; Matthew, 2; and Joseph, 1.

A 4° Knight of Columbus, Dr. Re is a member of Long Island General Assembly and John Hughes Council. A member of Our Lady of Angels' Holy Name Society, he is a governor of the Catholic Lawyers' Guild of the Brooklyn Diocese.

Last year Dr. Re was cited by the Italian Government and by Italy's University of Aquila. He received the Order of Merit of the Italian Republic for contributions to the cultural life of the Italian-American community and to legal literature of common law and civil law. The university bestowed on him the honorary degree of doctor of pedagogy.

[From the Tablet, Mar. 4, 1961]

DR. RE'S APPOINTMENT

The President's appointment of Dr. Edward D. Re as Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission (an independent agency of the State Department) has been well received both at home and abroad because of his eminent qualifications for the post.

Father of eight children, Dr. Re is a nationally recognized lawyer, lecturer and author, with extensive administrative experience. He has taught law at St. John's University for 14 years, has lectured in many parts of the United States, and has addressed bar associations, conferences, and universities in France, England, and Italy. He is an authority on international law and author of several texts used in the leading law schools of the country. During World War II, he served in the Air Force and is presently a major in the Active Reserve of the Judge Advocate General's department of the Air Force.

Besides his intellectual and professional qualifications, Dr. Re brings to his office a sense of equity and justice based on the moral law. His attitude in constantly keeping in mind the moral issue of any question can be gleaned from a talk that he delivered in 1954 in Monte Carlo while addressing a conference of the International Bar Association on the legal aspects of the confiscation of private property.

Taking sharp issue with previous speakers who had maintained that it is not within the province of lawyers to discuss moral issues, Dr. Re declared: "Although we are discussing property rights, we are also discussing human rights. Property rights are human rights because they relate to man's right to retain the fruits of his labor."

In carrying out his duties as a member of the Board of Higher Education of the City of New York, Dr. Re has manifested a like regard for moral principles. He has had the courage of his convictions and has persistently and fearlessly held to what he considered right notwithstanding the opinions of the other members of the board.

The presence on the board of a man of independent judgment is surely needed. For this reason, we are happy to learn that Dr. Re will retain his residence in Brooklyn and has not severed his connection with St. John's Law School, but rather has taken a leave of absence. This proves that he still maintains his interest in education and the civic affairs of the city. In the light of this, we can hope that he will remain on the board of higher education. A man of his moral courage, educational experience, knowledge, and ability will be valuable especially at this time when our municipal colleges are expanding in scope and entering on new fields of endeavor.

[From the Brooklyn Spectator, Mar. 3, 1961]

DR. RE GOES TO WASHINGTON

Congratulations are in order all around on President Kennedy's apopintment of Dr. Edward D. Re as Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

The President is to be commended for having made an excellent choice for this post, which is just below Cabinet level in importance. He has not only given well-deserved recognition to the fine legal talent possessed by Dr. Re, but has paid a high compliment to Bay Ridge and to the entire Italian-American community of which Dr. Re is such a shining exemplar.

Dr. Re's Commission meetings will keep him in Washington most of the time, but is good to know that he will be back home in Bay Ridge for weekends with his lovely wife and family, and among his many friends and neighbors.

We all wish him Godspeed in the important work ahead.

[From the Catholic News, Mar. 4, 1961]

A distinguished member of the board of higher education, Dr. Edward D. Re, has been named to a high post in Washington, as Chariman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. Dr. Re's appointment has been well received both in this country and abroad because of his outstanding qualifications and his high moral courage. In congratulating Dr. Re, it is pleasant to note also that he will retain his Brooklyn residence and has not severed his connection with St. John's University Law School where he has taught law for 14 years. Dr. Re thus evidences his continued interest in the educa-

tional and civic affairs of the city, and justifies the hope that he will continue on the board of higher education, where his term still has 6 years to run and where his knowledge, experience and fearless independence are assets of very special value.

Community Development and Agriculture in India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 17, 1961

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the Members an article by Mr. Don Shoemaker, editor of the editorial page of the Miami Herald, in which he outlines the problems involved in modernizing and diversifying community development and agriculture in India today:

Life is hard on the Indian farm—hard but, so the visitor is told, happy.

However, it does not seem to be as hard as life in town—in the great, cruel cities where poverty grinds very fine indeed.

Most of India's leaders regard the farm, and hence the Indian village, as the root structure of the country. S. K. Dey, Minister of Community Development, and a character with rare fire in his guts, says without blushing that the Indian village is "the greatest source of strength to democracy in the world."

Mr. Dey's department began 8 years ago, as the Community Projects Administration, with pilot projects to develop the life of the people.

What India has been trying to do, in other words, is to catch its Okies before they go upstream and spawn.

In this process, Mr. Dey is a controversial character. Even as he sits in the green garden of his comfortable villa and sips tea with you, his eyes flash in reflection of the plight of what might be called the Indian peasants, if there were peasants any more in this egalitarian country.

The minister thus is a subject of controversy. He says he is a whipping boy of the Nehru government. Whatever he is, he is lively.

India's villages of course can be described as the "source" of anything because they are the centers for nearly 80 percent of the population. Indians as aggressive as S. K. Dey, who is a graduate of Purdue, contend that the villages were sorely neglected by the British Raj, and that this is one of India's problems. Gandhi called the village, as a source of rural labor which must be transferred to industry, the "problem of problems."

The farm and the village as the repositories of population are also the main constituencies of the government. One object of the government of this teenage republic is to light a fire under the rural people who—like rural people everywhere—want no change and are suspicious of reform.

Morarji Desai, the finance minister and likely heir of Nehru, sat with folded hands at his desk and vowed that the rural people were not apathetic but contented, and that this contentment, while not intelligent, was inherited.

India must keep these people "happy"—content, that is—but anxious to work harder. One problem is how to create demands.

The visitor would think that the Indian countryman must be a chronic griper. Prime Minister Nehru believes that his lot has been improved; that often, for the first time, he has a bullock cart of his own. But he seems by our inflated standards to have very little—"nothing to get nothing with."

The village also reflects the caste system, which Mr. Desai believes has vanished in the cities. The city slums are like slums everywhere, only more and more and more so, but they are relatively sophisticated on caste. Though the government opposes caste and has "outlawed" it, the system remains in the countryside.

Like Mr. Dooley quoting Teddy Roosevelt on the trusts, Mr. Desai would stamp out caste—but not so fast. After all, as he points out, castes have been around for 2,000 years.

The chosen instrument of leveling, in any case, is the community development program. It builds on the "block" scheme, which is 100 villages (60,000 to 70,000 people) with a sort of farm agent and home demonstration worker for each six to seven villages.

The government's third 5-year plan sets forth that community development has been extended to 2,900 blocks and now "serves a population of 194 million." The target is to extend it over all the country by 1963 at a plan cost of around $750 million.

Community development is a complex of organizations which seeks a better rural life through education, marketing advice and formation of cooperatives for marketing, training, credit and actual farm management.

Credit co-ops have a membership of 17 million in some 200,000 rural societies. Co-op processing has less flashy statistics, but it extends to rice hulling, jute baling, fruit canning, oil crushing and so forth.

The fact is that Indians do not co-op very well. The candid administrator admits as much. Farmers everywhere are individualistic. They change their notions slowly.

As in industry, agriculture occupies both the public and the private sectors. Mr. Dey sees a certain cooperation between the two areas in that the state farms (for demonstration purposes) may influence or at least instruct the individual farmers in better methods of agriculture.

He thinks further that land pooled by marginal owners and the nearly landless who have principally their labor to contribute can produce a cooperative effort of great utility, part-time industry. This is a familiar U.S. pattern.

What Indian community development and agriculture really air at, in Dey's book, is "elimination of the middle man." This operator, he infers, makes Indian agriculture a poor man's pursuit.

Now, this sounds for all the world like farm collectivization.

Perhaps it is. There are no farms in India today of more than 500 acres, and even these are being eliminated.

The goal—the maximum—is 30 acres of irrigated land, with pastures generally held communally. The community development people figure that this is all a man can handle while feeding his family, contributing food to the national breadbasket, and keeping his land together.

The big tracts have been broken up. With adequate compensation, says the government. Nothing of the sort, say some "intervened" landowners. Who can be sure?

It is clear anyway that India for the present is an agricultural state even though it ranks eighth worldwide and second in Asia as an industrial power.

India in 1958–59 produced 75 million metric tons of food. The second plan target was 80.5 million tons. As the needlers of the India Merchants Chamber contend, there is a shortfall of 5.5 million tons.

Pointing to a Ford Foundation survey, they maintain the agricultural target should be 110 million tons of foodgrains, with 10 million held in reserve.

S. K. Patil, Minister of Food and Agriculture and enough of a character to be known as the "Jim Farley of India," is quite unworried by India's food problem. He thinks it just isn't.

For instance, Mr. Patil, who used to be Minister of Transport and Communications but who has pictures of fat cows and dairy farms around his sumptuous villa, think that India is at the marginal point in food self-sufficiency and is about to tip over to the sufficient side.

More for instance, he regards loans of foreign grain as unnecessary. India's basic planners, who figure grain loans as part of the deficit, don't agree.

Mr. Patil believes that India's food stockpile situation is the best in 10 years. But he really doesn't believe in food stockpiles. Maybe he has been reading of the trials of the United States of America.

He also believes that Indians set too much store by a diet of grains. He would diversify. You feel, also, that he might tip over—given enough time politically—and come out for beef.

India, he says, will move a pace into industrial farming. At present it has no farm tractors in domestic production. But four tractor companies are projected.

Mr. Patil is also a gentle rebel against another Indian custom. This, simply stated, is the "sacred cow."

Cow dung is widely collected, especially in the rural areas, for fuel. Thus it is lost as a natural fertilizer.

Otherwise, cows roam the strects in all rural areas and all but the main drags of the principal cities. An unlettered sector of Indian life considers these animals "sacred." But they are both a drag on the economy and a traffic hazard. The very fact that 70 percent of the heating and cooking fuel in rural India comes from pressed cow dung depresses India's agricultural leaders.

In good time this will be overcome. But the rural areas will be the last to succumb to modern ways. They will act as a halter on the cities.

In the long reach this may not be amiss. As in everything else, India must approach agricultural "progress" cautiously, lest it be not progress but retrogression. Few systems of agriculture are older or—come famine or high water—more successful.

India's problem is to improve on what it has, and not to replace it willy-nilly.

Our Wilderness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, as a Representative of the people of the Second District of Washington State, I am concerned about any legislation concerning the management of our forest resources. Others are concerned, too.

The Arlington, Wash., Times in an editorial March 2, 1961, expresses its thinking about certain aspects of the rugged, unsettled regions of the north Cascades. I believe what the publisher has to say is of interest to Members of this body, and, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this editorial:

OUR WILDERNESS

It is noted that Edward Park, author of "Washington Wilderness, the North Cascades," in this month's National Geographic, enthuses over the wonders of the Glacier Peak wilderness area. Mr. Park made the trip in company with members of the Sierra Club, and the influence of that club is noted in references to the ghost mining town of Holden, and reference to possible mining activities in the Suiattle Pass area, which would be discouraged if the Sierra Club could so dictate.

These conservation interests, living in other parts of the country, care little about the local economy.

An extensive exploration is being conducted by a mining company in the Suiattle Pass area, and it is understood that a townsite has been laid out all in preparation for the day when mining activities may commence there. To local people, and Darrington in particular, this would mean a great boost to the economy.

Would such an activity spoil the scenery for all time? Would a ghost town, after the mines are worked out, be a detriment?

Mother Nature seems to take care of these things. In Snohomish County, at this time, one of the greatest tourist and scenic attractions we have is the Monte Cristo district. Here at one time was heard the whistles of locomotives, the clanking of machinery, the roar of the ore bunkers, and the blasts in the mining operations. All this activity ceased many years ago. The railroad has disappeared, as have most of the mine buildings and the homes of those who resided there; the story of Monte Cristo adds to the interest of the tourists who visit the area; the same rugged mountains look down on the scene, and are as grand in their scenic beauty as they were before the miners arrived.

It has always been our contention that the Glacier Peak area is a potential tourist attraction that could have been developed to become of great economic value to the county. It is now locked up in a wilderness area, and will be visited each year by a few hundred people, where at least portions of it could have accommodated thousands without lowering the mountains or destroying the wilderness.

Three cross-State highways now penetrate the Cascade range and carry thousands of people a year, yet it is noted that a few minutes' hike from any of these highways takes the hiker into unspoiled wilderness.

H.R. 5153, a Bill To Increase the States' Share of Estate Tax Revenues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 17, 1961

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of our colleagues to legislation which the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN] and I have introduced, which would have the effect of making available to the States a greater share of the revenues from the combined Federal and State estate taxes.

This legislation, H.R. 5153, implements the recommendations of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, whose members and staff have devoted much time and thought to the need to simplify and make more equitable the operation and administration of estate, inheritance and gift taxes. This particular field of taxation has long been the source of confusion, trouble and frustration, for taxpayers and administrators alike. I believe this legislation can do much to help simplify estate tax administration, reduce the costs of collecting the tax, help stabilize States' revenues from this source and in general remove inequities and increase standardization in this important area of taxation.

As a member of the Commission, Mr. Speaker, I should remind our colleagues that the fact that the Commission is composed of members actively representing all levels of Government in our Federal system gives to this recommendation an unusually authoritative flavor. I hope the House will give it the consideration it deserves.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of a press release issued by the Commission which describes its recommendations in greater detail.

The release follows:

The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations today made public the Commission's report and recommendations for the coordination of State and Federal inheritance, estate, and gift taxes.

This report, the first to be made by the Commission to the President, the Congress, the Governors and the State legislatures, "contains a blueprint for coordinating State and Federal inheritance, estate, and gift taxes and for increasing the States' share of the revenues they produce," Commission Chairman Frank Bane said.

The Commission's recommendations were developed against the background of more than two decades of agitation for legislative remedy by Governors, legislators, tax practitioners, and various national organizations.

The Commission recommends to the Congress that it increase the Federal estate tax credit for taxes paid to States so as to reserve for the States a relatively large proportion of the estate tax in the low tax brackets and a small proportion in the middle and upper brackets. This will stabilize State collections from these taxes and improve their distribution among the States. The new credit would be available to taxpayers only after their respective States simplified their tax laws and adjusted their tax rates to avail themselves of the estate tax revenue to be relinquished by the Federal Government.

The Commission recommends to the States that they adopt estate taxes in lieu of inheritance taxes to reduce tax complexity, ease the compliance burdens of taxpayers and improve tax administration. It recommends against a Federal credit for State gift taxes because this would force gift taxes upon all the States. Instead, it urges the States to forgo gift taxation. The Commission's program could ultimately result in relinquishing several hundred million dollars of annual Federal revenue to the States, depending upon the level at which the Congress sets the new tax credit. The loss of Federal revenue, however, will not begin for several years because the States will have to be given time to bring their tax laws into conformity.

"Federal and State legislative implementation of the Commission's proposals," said Chairman Bane, "will make a major contribution to improving intergovernmental tax relations and tax simplification."

The Commission selected this group of taxes for priority attention, its report explains, because legislative developments since the mid-1930's have impaired the effectiveness of the Federal credit for inheritance and estate taxes paid to States. This credit provision was enacted by the Congress 35 years ago to safeguard the States' share of these revenues and to facilitate interstate tax uniformity. These objectives have not been realized.

The estate-inheritance tax area, the Commission found, is now characterized by tax overlapping and complexity, heavy tax compliance burdens for taxpayers, and relatively high administrative costs, out of all proportion to the small contribution these taxes make to most States' revenues. Property bequests at death are now taxed by the Federal Government and by 49 States (all States except Nevada). Gifts are taxed by the Federal Government and 12 States. This group of taxes now contributes annually about $400 million to State and $1.6 billion to Federal revenues.

The report represents the unanimous recommendation of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, a permanent bipartisan commission established in December 1959 under Federal legislation. Its 26 members include representation from the executive branch (3), the Senate (3), the House (3), Governors (4), State legislatures (3), mayors (4), counties (3), and the public (3).

The Interstate Highway System and Billboards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Harry O'Mealia, Jr., president, Outdoor Advertising Association of America, Inc.:

On reading President Kennedy's statement on the Interstate System and billboards, we feel that his advisers have given him a distorted picture.

Most of the Interstate System is, as yet, unbuilt. That which is built has not provided a "windfall" for a "handful of large advertisers."

Historically, highway advertising has been dominated by the thousands of small businesses which must reach the traveling public to survive. These include the motels, restaurants, hotels, gasoline stations, garages, food shops, novelty stores, scenic attractions, and others. Numerous studies have shown that highway advertising serving local businesses predominates by 8 to 1, and that advertising of so-called national products is very limited unless local gasoline stations, food stores, restaurants, and so forth, which attempt to identify their products, can be charged with advertising national products. Because highway advertising is the lifeblood of local business, we have always maintained that the rigid controls set up under the 1958 act would have its greatest effect on these small businesses. Our medium, standardized outdoor advertising, is mainly located in urban areas.

Recently, in Wisconsin, small businessmen along Interstate Highway 94 from Milwaukee to Kenosha filed suit to stop the State of Wisconsin from putting into effect rigid billboard controls. These businessmen reported extensive losses in business since the interstate highway in their area was built

and many contended they will have to go out of business if billboard controls are carried out. One, in fact, had lost 75 percent of his working force since the Interstate Highway was built and he was selling a local product—Wisconsin cheese. He said, "I must have advertising signs or close my doors."

Most of the other States have realized the hardship these controls would mean to small businessmen and have rejected the "bonus" or "bribe" set up under the 1958 act. They have also resented the extension of Federal controls into areas which traditionally come under State jurisdiction.

This Federal domination is quite evident in the case of Maryland, which recently became the first State to sign an agreement with the Federal Government. A careful reading of this complex, difficult to administer document shows that Maryland has sold its rights in perpetuity for a "bonus" which may or may not materialize.

We know of no highway where billboards "line the highways" and the charge that outdoor advertising is a traffic hazard has been refuted by laboratory and field studies at Iowa State College and in Michigan. These charges are echoes of a small but vocal minority which is exceedingly unvocal when asked to prove their charges.

This same minority has said the public doesn't like outdoor advertising. Yet, when the people were allowed to express their opinion in Oregon, they rejected billboard controls by nearly two to one. The measure was defeated in every county of the State.

The last paragraph of the President's statement says: "Should this measure still prove to be insufficient, it may be necessary to adopt more direct means of control." Does this mean the Federal Government is prepared to force the States to act in this area through measures contrary to the Constitution of the United States?

All in all, we're shocked at the atttempts to eliminate the advertising which permits so many small businesses to exist—at a time when "full employment" seems to be one of our national goals.

Higher Morals in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, more and more these days we hear a call for higher ethics and spotless propriety in government. This is a significant—and magnificent—indication that the apathetic and the unaware are being shaken awake to their responsibilities as citizens to assure clean, honest management of public affairs. An outstanding example of this kind of splendid drive for better government is outlined in the following editorial from my hometown newspaper, the Lowell Sun. Under leave to extend my remarks, I now insert it in the RECORD:

FOR HIGHER MORALS

A growing demand for higher ethical standards among men in public and political life is noted on all sides. Yesterday, for example, Governor Volpe addressed a joint session of the legislature, urging enactment of a moral code "that would restore and preserve confidence in our State government."

Last Sunday Richard Cardinal Cushing of Boston issued a strongly worded pastoral letter on politics, education, medicine and law, in which he pointed to "a dangerous decline" in the morality of America.

And the general court is considering various proposals for a constitutional convention, which, hopefully, would not only improve the machinery of government in Massachusetts, but would also remove some of the loose and lax conditions which frequently lead to corruption.

The Governor proposed a watchdog commission on conflicts of interest "to establish and enforce appropriate standards of conduct" and to advise officials if and when they may be faced with unusual situations calling for fine decisions.

Men in public life must give immediate and serious thought to the rising public demand for higher and better standards. In his broad and comprehensive consideration of the degeneration of public morals, Cardinal Cushing used his strongest language in discussing politics.

Declaring that no language can properly describe those who "poison politics with dishonesty and corruption," the Cardinal continued:

"When we hear murmurs of graft and bribery, or payoffs and grabs, we know that these charges are not the products of the imagination of fanciful people."

And one of the most significant comments by His Eminence explained that the present anxiety is "not so much that the present moral situation is alarming, but rather that too few people are really alarmed."

That apepars to be the crux of the situation as so many thinking people, concentrating on so many personal matters, maintain an indifferent and disinterested attitude to the performances of the men who run their government at Federal, State and local levels.

This is not a deliberate attitude, it is more one bred of carelessness.

It is therefore in the general public interest that men in high places, such as the Cardinal and the Governor, now call for the enforcement of higher ethical standards in government and in the American way of life.

The warnings of this week cannot be ignored—and we do not think they will be.

We expect that the legislature will take positive action on the Governor's proposal for a watchdog committee to help public officials do a better job with a higher appreciation of moral values. We likewise expect that the first steps toward the calling of a constitutional convention will be taken. This may come through the creation of a blue ribbon representative group that will make a thorough study of the matters that should be brought before the convention to improve efficiency, stability and morality in all State operations.

Stern calls for action have been issued; they must be heeded before corruption becomes so rampant as to start destroying the fundamentals and standards that have for so many years worked to make this Nation strong and great.

Depressed Areas Bill Robs Peter To Pay Paul

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. QUIE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Photo News newspaper of Owatonna, Minn., Mr. Pat Maloney, has effectively presented some serious questions about the advisability of passing the administration's depressed areas bill into law. Writing editorially, in the February 9, 1961, edition of the newspaper, Mr. Maloney stated that he had no dispute over the objectives of the proposed legislation. But he did point out the threat that some industries in areas not designated as distressed areas might be lured to reestablish in distressed areas. Since part of the attractiveness of relocating an industry would come from Federal funds, the question is raised as to whether this would not—in the final analysis—result in a case of robbing Peter to pay Paul. I recommend this thought-provoking editorial to my fellow Members:

REDEVELOPMENT BILL ENDANGERS CITY

Activated recently in Owatonna was a congressional action committee of the chamber of commerce designed to keep local businessmen informed of pending legislation coming before the U.S. Congress and State legislature, and how these bills, if passed, would directly affect the merchants on our main streets as well as local industries.

Being pushed hard in Congress now as the result of the current economic slump is S. 1, an area redevelopment bill that was introduced by Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois. The bill will undoubtedly draw much popular support, since its intentions are honorable—that of channeling industrial expansion into so-called depressed areas where unemployment figures are abnormally high.

But the means to the honest end are exceedingly controversial and, as far as Owatonna is concerned, are highly detrimental. What the bill proposes to do is actually relocate industry, or simply "rob Peter to pay Paul." When you happen to be "Peter"—as Owatonna is with its wealth of diversified industry—that becomes alarming, since it hits close to home.

Let's use a hypothetical example of what could conceivably happen if this legislation gets through Congress and is signed into law by President Kennedy. The iron range of northern Minnesota would surely be classed as a depressed area under this law and would become eligible for Federal subsidies. The inducements for industries to locate in that area would be considerable. It would be hard to resist the attraction of a free new factory building, complete with all necessary machinery and equipment, on a choice location, supplied with all necessary public facilities, and workers for the factory even trained for their jobs at Government expense.

Suppose then that one of our industries, say Josten's or Owatonna Tool Co., took this "bait," either by moving out entirely or deciding to expand its operation in the depressed area of northern Minnesota rather than here. Thus the Federal tax dollars of Owatonnans could be used to lure our industries away, which would be a substantial blow to the economy of Owatonna. In effect the area redevelopment bill as written might eliminate some depressed areas but couldn't help but create others. Putting it bluntly and focusing the impact of the bill on the local level as the congressional action committee is obliged to do, Owatonna would have nothing to gain and everything to lose by passage of such legislation.

Passage of the bill into law would also bring about Federal interference into the competitive field of attracting new industry. Most cities, proud of what they have to offer, have formed industrial development corporations designed to attract new industry, and Owatonna is one of them. If the Federal Government gets into this "game" with subsidies for one at the expense of another, it amounts to unfair competition.

There are still other major flaws. Merely building industrial plants in an area does not guarantee its economic revival since the

Government with all its funds cannot offset the deterrents to private investment in a bad business climate. The program as planned now would be terribly costly and there is an urgent need to avoid unnecessary Government spending in order to balance the budget and maintain a sound dollar.

DOUGLAS' S. 1 bill is not for us. Tell or write your Congressman.

Clichés of Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the Foundation for Economic Education, Inc., has rendered our private enterprise system a distinct service by publishing a series of articles exposing the fallacies of socialism and showing how those with little faith use many shopworn clichés to undermine our free way of life. I would like to include in the RECORD for your attention, the first of these "Clichés of Socialism."

CLICHÉS OF SOCIALISM

Argued a college president at a recent seminar: "Your free market, private property, limited government theories were all right under the simple conditions of a century or more ago, but surely they are unworkable in today's complex economy. The more complex the society, the greater is the need for governmental control; that seems axiomatic."

It is important to expose this oft-heard, plausible, and influential fallacy because it leads directly and logically to socialistic planning. This is how a member of the seminar team answered the college president:

"Let us take the simplest possible situation—just you and I. Next, let us assume that I am as wise as any President of the United States who has held office during your lifetime. With these qualifications in mind, do you honestly think I would be competent to coercively control what you shall invent, discover, or create, what the hours of your labor shall be, what wage you shall receive, what and with whom you shall associate and exchange? Is not my incompetence demonstrably apparent in this simplest of all societies?

"Now, let us shift from the simple situation to a more complex society—to all the people in this room. What would you think of my competence to coercively control their creative actions? Or, let us contemplate a really complex situation—the 177 million people of this Nation. If I were to suggest that I should take over the management of their lives and their billions of exchanges, you would think me the victim of hallucinations. Is it not obvious that the more complex an economy, the more certainly will governmental control of productive effort exert a retarding influence? Obviously, the more complex our economy, the more we should rely on the miraculous, self-adapting processes of men acting freely. No mind of man nor any combination of minds can even envision, let alone intelligently control, the countless human energy exchanges in a simple society, to say nothing of a complex one."

It is unlikely that the college president will raise that question again.

While exposing fallacies can be likened to beating out brush fires endlessly, the exercise is nonetheless self-improving as well as useful—in the sense that rear-guard actions are useful. Further, one's ability to expose fallacies—a negative tactic—appears to be a necessary preface to influentially accenting the positive. Unless a person can demonstrate competence at exploding socialistic error, he is not likely to gain wide audiences for his views about the wonders wrought by men who are free.

Of all the errors heard about the bargaining tables, or in classrooms, there is not one that cannot be simply explained away. We only need to put our minds to it. FEE seeks to help those who would expose fallacies and accent the merits of freedom. The more who outdo us in rendering this kind of help, the better.

Recognition of National Transportation Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, during the 86th Congress, legislation was enacted for a 1-year recognition of National Transportation Week. The recognition, I believe, was well merited and well deserved.

Currently, there are bills pending to make this a permanent observance.

We recognize, of course, the significance of transportation to our people individually as well as to the whole economy.

I hope, therefore, that the respective committees and subcommittees in the House and Senate may find it possible to give early consideration to the proposal now pending for permanent observance of National Transportation Week.

Recently I received some messages from a number of individuals deeply interested in this matter, urging such recognition. I ask unanimous consent to have these letters printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A. O. SMITH CORP.,
Milwaukee, Wis., March 2, 1961.
Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: As a sustaining member of the Associated Traffic Clubs of America, and being actively involved and interested in the furtherance of recognition of the importance of transportation, I would like to solicit your assistance in the following:

Senator MAGNUSON and Representative HARRIS have introduced resolutions to make National Transportation Week a permanent observance. Senator MAGNUSON'S resolution is Senate Joint Resolution 35 and the companion measure introduced by Representative HARRIS is House Joint Resolution 143. A similar bill was passed by Congress last year; the number of that bill was House Joint Resolution 602. Unfortunately at that time in order to get the bill on the floor of both Houses for a vote, the bill was made a 1-year bill only in place of one which would designate a permanent National Transportation Week.

I believe that recognizing the importance and significance of transportation to the everyday living of fellow Americans is a vital necessity, and the observance each year of a National Transportation Week would certainly help get the message across.

I earnestly solicit your help and favorable action on these resolutions.

Yours very truly,
R. H. HEILMAN,
Director of Transportation.

JOS. SCHLITZ BREWING CO.,
Milwaukee, Wis., March 2, 1961.
Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Judiciary Committee,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Your support of Senator MAGNUSON'S resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 35, in connection with establishing a permanent National Transportation Week will be appreciated.

This bill, House Joint Resolution 602, was passed by Congress last year.

Kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,
G. C. LOESER,
Assistant General Traffic Manager.

"Integrity," the First Word in Carl M. Saunders' Book

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1961

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Carl M. Saunders, one of the outstanding journalists of our times, has retired as editor of the Jackson Citizen Patriot, of Jackson, Mich.

Mr. Saunders has been a true patriot and a forward-looking leader in the promotion of good government and American principles of economic and political liberty.

Mr. Saunders won the Pulitzer Prize for distinguished editorial writing and is best known for his "Prayer for Peace," which pursuant to congressional resolution the President has included in his Memorial Day proclamations.

The Jackson Citizen Patriot of March 1, 1961, contains an excellent editorial on its former editor which I include at this point in my remarks:

"INTEGRITY," THE FIRST WORD IN CARL M. SAUNDERS' BOOK

With his retirement as editor of the Citizen Patriot, effective today, Carl M. Saunders, for the first time in nearly 27 years has not the power of veto over the content of this column.

And because that is true, we can talk freely about this remarkable newspaperman. He would say "No" if he could, for he is a modest individual.

Those who know him best, the men and women who have worked with him—no one worked for Carl Saunders—recall the thousands of times when he dodged the credit for an especially enterprising bit of newspaper work. He preferred to hand the

bouquets to the reporter, photographer, or subeditor.

And there are many other things about Carl Saunders that we can speak about for the first time—because he can't say "No."

Jackson knows him well, as does all of Michigan, for a career that has been remarkable for its service to the public; as an editor who never hesitated to speak out for what he believed for the public good.

The honors that have come to him through the years—and they have been many—have stemmed from this sense of service and the ability to make it a living thing.

He has fought for the preservation of Michigan's natural resources; for the betterment of the economy of the state; for legislation which would improve the government.

Health services, schools—you name it and Carl Saunders has had his part in improving it.

That is the public record, but not the story we set out to tell on this first day that Mr. Saunders turns to a life of community service independent of the newspaper, and enjoying his beloved out of doors and his garden.

What the public may not know is the impact that he has had on journalism throughout Michigan and the Nation. Wherever he went in professional gatherings his opinion was asked and respected.

Schools of journalism sought his counsel and will continue to do so. Due to his performance, the Citizen Patriot often has been cited as a model community newspaper with high ideals and a great standard of performance.

All this is true because Mr. Saunders has in addition to great talent as an editor, a set of principles by which he lives.

He often was called to speak before students, in high school and college, to discuss careers in journalism. That naturally involved listing the requirements which he believes a newspaperman should have.

He always places one qualification above all others: Integrity.

Without it, he will insist, ability to write or to do the other things required of the journalist are without meaning.

He lived that belief every day of his more than 50 years in the profession that he loved.

And he was proud to be a newspaperman. To him it is the noblest of all callings.

He never shrank from the great responsibility that goes with control of a medium of communication. He would lean over backward to make certain that the other side had its say.

Letters to the "Voice of the People" have to be screened for libel. But there always was one exception. Any writer could say almost anything he pleased about the editor.

The life of an editor often is one of hard and sometimes unpleasant decisions. He can consult with his associates, but must assume the final responsibility.

And it was in this area that the great character of Carl Saunders stood out. He called them according to principle, even though his opinion might be unpopular.

He has another sincere belief: That a newspaper, as such, cannot have friends—only principles. He believes that friendships belong in the social realm and that when the public trust is involved, the public interest must come first.

A man who adheres to such principles accumulates scars through the years. Carl Saunders carries his share into retirement. But there is no malice festering in the wounds. No more kindly or forgiving man ever lived. What is often mistaken for gruffness is a protective shell over a soft and warm heart.

He carries, also, the respect of a community and State on which he has placed his mark. And he takes the affection and admiration of all Citizen Patriot staffers of today and those who have passed this way through the years.

Our wish for him as he retires is a weedless garden that flourishes so as to shame Burbank; fish that cannot ignore his lures; and a further unlimited opportunity to utilize his great energy and wisdom in community service for the city and State that he loves so well.

State Peace Corps Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues a proposal from the Buffalo Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, University of Buffalo, Buffalo, N.Y. The proposal follows:

We of Sane at the University of Buffalo have studied the proposal of the U.S. Peace Corps and with some enthusiasm. We would like that States, specifically our own State of New York to be joined by others, should establish peace corps agencies as liaison between the National Peace Corps and the public. It might be sufficient, at this time, to say in a tentative way that the State peace corps agencies would, above all else, be alert and responsive to the needs and requests of the National Peace Corps; the pattern would be similar, perhaps, to that which now exists in civil defense. Specifically, it can be foreseen that the functions of a peace corps agency on the State level would be concentrated in the following areas:

(a) Recruitment, induction, and screening of young teachers and skilled workers of all kinds from the State;

(b) Explanation in schools and factories, and to the general public, of the ultimate aim of the program in furthering world peace; and

(c) Guaranteeing that the "veterans" of the Peace Corps on their return will have ample opportunity to tell the public about their experiences.

There is another kind of function the peace corps agencies could perform within the States. Arrangements have recently been made for 200 students from 6 major African countries to begin regular 4-year college courses in this country next fall; 85 colleges in 29 States are cooperating in the program. Travel expenses of the students will be met by their own governments; their tuition fees by the host colleges; their living expenses by the International Cooperation Administration; and administrative expenses by a Carnegie Corp. grant. The only expense not taken care of above is the extra small amount it would take to bring home to the American people the tremendous contribution such a program makes to international understanding and peace—a small amount compared with the terrible expense of the misunderstandings that might occur and of the wasted opportunity that might be forfeited. Peace corps agencies, concerned as they are with our own expeditionary forces, would be well able to prepare the public for such "invasions" from overseas, showing the great value of this two-way traffic. Peace corps agencies will concern themselves not only with the preparations to give of our own youth but also with our willingness to receive of others.

We ought to admit the proposal for State peace corps agencies is partly selfish. As quickly as possible we would like machinery created through which we ourselves can participate in the Peace Corps activity in our locality. We go further and suggest Buffalo as a pioneer induction and training station, the first divisional headquarters of the New York State Peace Corps Agency.

Good Old American Get-Up-and-Go Moves Dallas Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I am always grateful when I have the opportunity to point out to my colleagues the spirit which makes Texas, and particularly Dallas, the district I am privileged to represent, such an outstanding example of the philosophy which made our country great. We, in Dallas, have never waited for Federal handouts in order to move our city ahead. We have always found the initiative of our own people the most driving force in keeping our community alert, ready to seize its opportunities, and to keep pace with the progress of this day.

At this time, when there are some in the land who would have us believe that our country is on the verge of economic chaos, when some are ready to lose all faith in the private enterprise system, Dallas and its people once again meet the challenge by embarking on a program of new construction of homes, business enterprises and industry, creating jobs and offering better opportunity for all its people—not through Government subsidies, but through private initiative, individuals who are willing to invest time and money in the future and in our country.

The following editorial and news story from the Dallas Morning News of February 26, tells the world what is being done in Dallas and points out the only real solution for any recession, depression or business slowdown—progress through individual initiative:

DALLAS BUILDS AHEAD FOR FUTURE GROWTH

Despite President Kennedy's talk of a largely mythical recession, Dallas plans to build this year with unusual vigor. With January building permits here reaching a 3-year record, the city is off to a good start.

In addition to large residential construction under way or in planning stages, the year will see much downtown building in Dallas. Work has started on Cary Plaza at Ross and Akard and will begin soon on Southwestern Bell's tripling of its present quarters. In the blueprints, with sites bought, are new homes for the Southwestern Life Insurance Co. and the First National Bank.

Less certain in timing is the big Federal center which Washington has authorized and for which the site has been acquired on Commerce Street. An early appropriation by Congress for this structure would save rent money and add convenience by putting most Federal agencies under one roof.

HUGE CONSTRUCTION TOTAL IN PROSPECT—MULTIMILLION-DOLLAR JOBS WILL GET UNDERWAY IN 1961

(By Rudy Rochelle)

It looks as if Dallas might be off to a recordbreaking year in construction.

If the remainder of this year comes even close to January's booming total of more than $21,700,000 in building permits (the city's biggest building month in almost 3 years), there is a good chance 1961 will smash the alltime high of $172 million in 1955.

During 1960 there was a scarcity of multimillion-dollar construction jobs which would have easily pushed last year's total even with prior years. But this year it appears that at least a score of multimillion-dollar projects will come to fruition.

Some of these huge construction projects are still in the early planning stages, others are on architects' drawing boards, and many of them have been in the promotional mill for 2 or 3 years.

Despite talk of overbuilding downtown, at least four of five multistory office, apartment, and hotel buildings will start to take shape on the Dallas skyline this year.

Work recently got underway on Cary Plaza, the two-tower, $10 million hotel-apartment complex on the northwest corner of Ross and Akard. Completion of the project is expected in late 1962.

Southwestern Bell Telephone Co. revealed in late 1959 that it would triple the size of its downtown headquarters building at 308 South Akard, and the company recently announced that it will award the contract for the job next month.

The big Bell job involves razing a downtown Dallas landmark, because the 4-story brick building at the corner of Akard and Jackson Streets will be torn down to make way for a new 21-story structure.

Eight stories will be added atop Bell's adjacent 13-story structure, plus 2 levels below ground, and 4 penthouse floors on top. Estimated cost of the entire project is $9 million. Completion is planned in mid-1963.

In early December of last year Bell also began work on a new building for its Taylor exchange at Bryan and McKell. Cost of the multistory structure and its equipment is estimated at $8 million.

Southwestern Life Insurance Co. has hopes of breaking ground for its new home office building late this year. Plans for the building, to be located on the north side of Ross between Akard and St. Paul, should be completed by September.

BANK POSSIBLE

A new downtown building is being given serious consideration by officials of the National Bank of Commerce. If, as it has been rumored, the National Bank of Commerce merges with the Bank of Services and Trusts, a new building would be the next logical step.

The First National Bank in Dallas announced at yearend that it had acquired an entire block of property for a new building, which will probably be one of Dallas largest buildings, costing in the $25 million-plus range.

One of the key downtown projects, and perhaps the most controversial, is the Dallas Federal Building. This $26 million building has been a political football for 3 or 4 years.

Prospects for the building, which would be constructed next to the Santa Fe Building at 1114 Commerce, are pretty dim at present, particularly if the piecemeal movement of Federal offices to other cities continues.

If the building receives the approval of both the House and the Senate, plus the appropriation, it could get underway quickly, because the land has already been acquired and the architectural plans are complete.

Many Dallas leaders believe the approval of the Federal building would trigger off a number of other major buildings in the downtown area.

OUTLYING JOBS

Out of the downtown area there are also a number of multimillion-dollar projects which will probably be moving dirt this year.

Oak Cliff Bank & Trust Co. has acquired a block bounded by Zang, 12th Street, Beckley and Centre for its new home.

A decision concerning the development of a 21-acre site which is the present location of Jesuit High School should be forthcoming in the next few months.

Dr. Daniel Gevinson of Miami Beach, Fla., has an option on the land for more than $2 million. A court battle over the zoning of the land has raged for more than a year, but next month the final decision should be given by the court of civil appeals in Dallas. Construction will begin as soon as his plan is approved by the court.

He plans an apartment-office-hotel complex to contain three 18-story office buildings, three twin-tower apartments with 960 units, a 240-room hotel, facilities for retail outlets, and a huge underground parking lot.

Trammell Crow, developer of the Dallas Market Center, last fall reported that he plans two additional multimillion-dollar buildings for his center, both scheduled to start in the near future.

One is the Trade Show International, an "S"-shaped 252,000-square-foot structure, and the other is a Construction Materials Mart.

In East Dallas, a massive 3,500-acre development is being undertaken by Buckner Benevolences and the Carolyn Hunt Trust.

Work is progressing slowly on the projects because rainy weather has slowed dirt moving and clearing of the land.

The Buckner tract, about 2,200 acres, and the Carolyn Hunt Trust land, approximately 1,300 acres, will be developed into a 490-acre industrial district, 121 acres of commercial properties, two shopping centers, three schools, five churches, and more than 4,000 homesites.

In the shopping center category, a lot of activity is planned along Northwest Highway.

Early this month W. W. Caruth announced that he will build a shopping center, located at Northwest Highway, Abrams, and Skillman this year. First unit planed for the center is a new $3-million department store called the Medallion.

Almost 2 years ago, plans were announced for a $6-million mall-type shopping center on Northwest Highway overlooking Bachman Lake.

G. C. Ledyard, Jr., vice president of the developing firm, Bazaar Northwest, Inc., said last week that some action should be taken on the center in the next 90 days.

SHOPPING CENTERS

At least a dozen other shopping centers in other parts of the city are also scheduled for 1961.

Dallas' rapid population gain has prompted a big construction budget for new schools.

School officials report that two senior high schools, three junior high schools, two elementary schools, and major additions to existing schools are on the drawing boards or already under construction for completion after the end of this year, representing construction costs amounting to $14,200,000.

Other major projects include: A major hospital building permit of $5 million for the new St. Paul Hospital helped swell the January construction total.

Last week Sanger's broke ground at its Preston Center branch to double the size of the present store there. The expansion will cost more than $1,250,000.

The Methodist Church will build a $1,200,000 addition to the C. C. Young Memorial Home. Groundbreaking is planned in June.

Coleman Development Co. has announced plans for a 7-story, $1,650,000 office building on Irving Boulevard.

Luxury apartments, some requiring an investment of well in excess of $1 million, continue at the rate of three or four a month.

Homebuilding, the largest dollar volume category in local construction, also shows signs of perking up.

After a somewhat disappointing year in 1960, homebuilders are again optimistic, some forecast a 10-percent increase in business for 1961.

Even though home starts were restricted in January by bad weather, the month's home total was still above last year, and with the return of sunny weather activity will be accelerated.

The "Hope" Sails The Seas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, the whole world has been thrilled by work of the hospital ship *Hope*, which has been bringing needed medical training and care to underdeveloped areas of the world.

Recently the Bridgeport Telegram, a leading newspaper in my district, reprinted an editorial on the *Hope* that originally appeared in the Worcester (Mass.) Gazette. I would like to place that editorial in the RECORD:

THE "HOPE" SAILS THE SEAS

A year ago, the U.S. Navy set aside one of its hospital ships, the *Consolation*, to carry a message of medical hope to the underprivileged of the world. The vessel was rechristened *Hope* to honor her new sponsors, a group known as Health Opportunities for People Everywhere, which was launched by Dr. William B. Walsh of Washington.

The ship soon set sail on errands of mercy. It is now anchored at Sumbawa, one of the many islands comprising the Republic of Indonesia. Dr. Walsh says that the *"Hope's* reception in Indonesia has shown that this teaching and training idea, to which the ship is dedicated, fills a long-existing vacuum with a people-to-people action program."

So impressed have been other areas with the work of this vessel's staff that requests for visits have come from Vietnam, Cambodia, Thailand, and Korea. The ship has a permanent medical crew of 60, including doctors, dentists, nurses and other medical personnel. About 200 Indonesian medical workers are being trained in daily sessions on the *Hope*.

Hope plans to expand its activities next year by setting up a corps of medical minute men—volunteers who will respond to medical emergencies in all parts of the world.

The world is often at odds on political questions, but in the past 2 or 3 years there have been encouraging signs of global cooperation in medicine. Soviet Russia, for

example, has promised full cooperation in the forthcoming International Public Health and Research Year.

And a year ago, in his annual message, President Eisenhower urged a worldwide fight against malaria, heart disease, and cancer. He said this country would pool all of its knowledge of these subjects with Russia.

Proposed Solution to the Distressed Area Problem in West Virginia and Eastern Kentucky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, for a number of years, the Congress has been giving a great deal of consideration to the problems of the depressed areas of this Nation of ours. Many legislative proposals have been submitted, some of which have been cleared by the appropriate committees of both the House and Senate, and yes, even to the extent that the House and Senate have passed bills dealing primarily with the problem of distressed areas of our Nation. It should also be noted that the executive and legislative branches of our Government have heretofore disagreed as to what legislation should contain and, therefore, ultimate enactment into law has never been realized.

As a West Virginian coming from a State which has a higher percentage of distressed conditions than her sister States, I have been searching for the answer to this problem in my own mind both as an interested citizen and as a Member of this great body.

There has come to my attention an article by the Honorable David L. Francis, mayor of the city of Huntington, W. Va., which I should like at this time to include in the RECORD as it is a suggested and possible solution to the distressed area problem in West Virginia and eastern Kentucky. His proposal might well be applied to other depressed areas of our Nation:

PROPOSED SOLUTION TO THE DISTRESSED AREA PROBLEM IN WEST VIRGINIA AND EASTERN KENTUCKY

(By David L. Francis)

INTRODUCTION

There is no one single solution to the distressed area problem in our mountain States, and unfortunately, most of the solutions suggested by fact-finding committees and legislators are of a "pump priming" nature—such as road or other public works programs, extension of unemployment compensation, improvement of food distribution, etc. All of these are temporary shots in the arm which when turned off allow the area to drop back to its original distressed condition. Nor do they always reach down to the person who is unemployed and really needs the help. A second form of solution is the effort to bring new industries into a distressed area by such aids as special subsidies, moratoriums on depreciation rates and taxes, etc. At best, this has proven to be slow and an uncertain process. Now conditions are so critical that it is time for a new type program to be effected.

The only real wholesale solution that the writer has found to provide both an immediate and long-range cure for the unemployment problem in our distressed areas is through a crash program of vocational training which would annually teach in West Virginia 15,000 and in eastern Kentucky 10,000 unemployed workers a basic vocation that will train them to accept jobs either within their local community or in other parts of the country. These unemployed must be made mobile so that they can properly seek employment in areas where job opportunities are available.

Such training programs are already successfully in effect both in West Virginia and eastern Kentucky and, if expanded, they can provide just such a solution. However, they are not now of sufficient size or capacity to solve the problem. To date these schools have only proven that they can be a solution to the unemployment problem. Later in this report the writer will go into detail as to what has been accomplished to date and how vocational schools can be developed into a crash program to care for a large portion of our unemployed.

In summary, the vocational training program proposed herein involves four major steps, as follows:

1. In West Virginia, establish a series of major vocational training schools, such as the Huntington East High Training School, which can adequately process 1,600 unemployed students per year. We now have such schools in Parkersburg, Wheeling, Huntington, Charleston, and Welch. But additional schools or expansion of existing schools are needed in Bluefield, Beckley, Weirton, Fairmont, Martinsburg, Keyser, and Elkins.

West Virginia now has 25 satellite vocational training schools surrounding these large schools. These need expanding and still more are needed to operate in conjunction with the local high schools. These schools, because of their size, would not have the facilities and equipment of the central schools, but they would serve the purpose of providing the high school student with his first-year familiarization courses and the unemployed with orientation and the simpler courses not requiring specialized equipment.

In eastern Kentucky, the plan now in operation at the Mayo State Vocational School at Paintsville would be stepped up and this central school plant expanded to process 2,000 students annually. At the same time the program for the development of 10 new vocational training extension centers in strategic counties in eastern Kentucky would be implemented at a much more rapid rate. The parent schools in Hazard, Harlan, Somerset, and Ashland would, like Paintsville's, be enlarged.

Thus, to get this plan in full bloom, capital expenditures for land, buildings, and equipment would have to be appropriated immediately. The plans for this program have already been developed by the two States. This, in effect, would be a public works program but would be lasting because it would leave permanent facilities to carry on this very important training.

2. Provide sufficient funds for teachers' salaries and the operation and maintenance of this crash program.

3. Arrange the curriculum of the schools so that sessions are double shifted. During the first shift high school students would be trained as they are at present. On the evening shift, as a general practice, the older men and women would be rehabilitated and trained in the vocation they have selected. It has been proven that students are more rapidly and easily trained if they are grouped within their own age bracket. Presently the East Huntington High Trades School is training some 350 high school students on the day shift and an equal number of men and women who are at age 45 or over on the evening shift. Records show that these vocationally trained groups have a very high rate of employment. Even now there are several sectors of the labor market that are absorbing many of the graduates.

THE MAGNITUDE OF THE UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEM

There are 85,000 unemployed in West Virginia and 50,000 in eastern Kentucky as of the first of January 1961. This is an incease from 60,000 a year ago in West Virginia and 40,000 in eastern Kentucky of a year ago. In West Virginia 40,000 are receiving unemployment compensation as are 13,000 in eastern Kentucky. It is to be noted that there are several thousand persons on direct public assistance who are not included in the above unemployment totals. The number of people receiving surplus food on a regular basis totals 300,000 in West Virginia and 175,000 in eastern Kentucky.

IMMEDIATE ACTION BY LEGISLATORS IS IMPERATIVE

The program presented by the West Virginia Legislature in its current session is a long-range start toward a solution but will in no manner solve the unemployment problem as it exists today. A brief analysis will show the inadequacies of the current West Virginia program.

First, the legislature has passed a bill to increase the gross sales tax by 1 percent and this is designated to raise $7½ million for a 6-month period, after which the tax will be rescinded. This money is to be used for a public works program for the relief of unemployed. Actually this amount of money is at a rate of less than $100 per unemployed person in the State. If the plan is for public works, generally 50 percent of the cost of these programs goes into equipment, supplies, and overhead; so that actually only half of the total would be available. To express this another way, if $4 million were spent at $50 per employee per week for 25 weeks (the summer building season), it would gainfully employ about 3,000 men. Many of these would not come from the unemployed roles. This program might look good on paper, but it will reach only a few of the unemployed and is strictly temporary in nature.

Governor Barron has asked for $17½ million to be produced by personal income tax, and increases in the business and occupation tax and transportation privilege tax. An analysis of the proposed use of these moneys also reveals an inadequacy to solve the total problem. About half of this money is scheduled to be used for a north-south highway, another inadequate and temporary public works program. Three and one-half million is to be used for higher education and to increase teachers' salaries. Another 3 million is to be allocated to the newly formed Industrial Development Authority. This latter program may, over a period of years, bring in new industries to West Virginia but it may take this new department a year to get organized. Other States with similar departments have shown that the moving in of new industry to absorb unemployment is, at best, very slow. Likewise, other inducements by Federal and State which include free gifts of land, waiving of depreciation, or special tax benefits, etc., are slow to produce new plants.

Commendably, the West Virginia Governor has requested new funds of $500,000 for vocational retraining of the unemployed. This amount is 25 percent greater than the 1960 appropriation. Such action, although not nearly enough, is at least a start toward the enormous task of getting to the fundamentals of West Virginia's chronic job deficit.

Kentucky has also gotten underway with an enlargement of its vocational education program, although funds have not been specifically earmarked for the unemployed, as in West Virginia, the vocational education facilities have under Governor Combs' leadership received an increase of 168 percent over the funds of the previous biennium. Last year Governor Combs' bold new program was passed by the legislature, and has started many new plans to solve eastern Kentucky's problems. Those programs include better roads, schools, teachers' pay, recreational areas, etc.

No criticism is intended in the above remarks. All of these plans are good, but they are not enough to meet the tremendous immediate job of providing for and retraining tens of thousands of family men who are out of work. Unless these unemployed are vocationally fitted to find jobs most of them will remain unemployed for a long, long time.

THE FREE FLOW OF POPULATION

West Virginia has had a net drop in population of 145,131 and for eastern Kentucky 128,444 during the 1950 decade. However, this does not show the complete story. The net losses are increased to a total loss, due to birth-rate gains, of 459,000 in West Virginia and 265,000 in eastern Kentucky. If these large numbers of people had not been able to relocate themselves in other areas the distressed situation in West Virginia and eastern Kentucky would have been greatly compounded.

The citizens of these two areas have been solving their own problems by having the initiative to move to another area. Many of these workers saw the handwriting on the wall or found better job opportunities in booming areas. Many were young people who had to move because of lack of opportunities. But now jobs in other areas are more difficult to secure unless one has special qualifications. This movement of population from one area to another is as old as history and is constantly in progress. Many observers believe that the speeding up of this migration from the distressed areas is the only rapid solution to labor surpluses.

A careful but rapidly expanded vocational program for both high school students and retrainable unemployed will make larger segments of our population in these areas more mobile in their jobseeking and will also have the important effect of making them better trained citizens who can more easily adapt themselves into the living pattern of a new location.

WHAT THE TWO STATES ARE PRESENTLY ACCOMPLISHING

West Virginia is presently graduating from vocational schools some 10,000 high school students, 6,000 employed students who are upgrading themselves, and about 1,500 unemployed students per year.

Eastern Kentucky is presently graduating from vocational schools some 3,000 high school students, 2,000 employed students who are upgrading themselves, and about 800 unemployed students per year.

WHAT CAN BE ACCOMPLISHED IF THE CRASH PROGRAM IS IMPLEMENTED

Educators in West Virginia estimate that if the vocational education expansion program as outlined below is carried out, 15,000 unemployed can be trained annually. In Kentucky, if a similar program is carried out in expansion of vocational schools, 10,000 unemployed can be retrained annually for useful jobs in industry.

Analyses by educators reveal that nearly 50 percent of our unemployed are retrainable in vocational schools. The remainder are not eligible or interested because such factors as a lack of basic education, physical handicaps, health, or a lack of desire for self-improvment. Separate rehabilitation solutions for these people's problems must be found and are not a part of this report.

On the premise of nearly 50 percent of the unemployed there are 35,000 fairly good training prospects in West Virginia and 20,000 in eastern Kentucky to be planned for. Assuming that unemployment does not increase in either State, most of this group within 3 years could be retrained and qualified for relocation, if necessary, in other areas as useful citizens gainfully employed.

The school facilities that would be constructed to care for this expanded program would continue to be used when unemployment surpluses are eliminated. Normal growth in the number of high school students taking vocational education would easily take up the expanded facilities.

FUNDS REQUIRED TO IMPLEMENT PROGRAM

Inasmuch as West Virginia has more available present facilities than does eastern Kentucky to absorb additional student load, the capital costs are slightly more for eastern Kentucky.

Purpose	West Virginia	Eastern Kentucky
Land and buildings	$2,200,000	$2,800,000
Equipment for new shops	2,750,000	3,500,000
Total capital cost	4,950,000	6,300,000
Annual operating costs	8,250,000	5,500,000

These figures are over and above that already appropriated for normal growth requirements described below.

West Virginia has had no recent capital funds from State money for building construction. Some growth needs and new facilities have been paid for by the counties. Equipment has been provided by diverting a small percentage of operating funds. Kentucky has a program for the next 2 years to erect new buildings throughout the State at a cost of $4 to $5 million of State funds plus another half million dollars of county funds to be added to the program. The State will spend $2 million to equip these buildings. These expenditures are for normal growth requirements and do not provide in promptness or size the facilities which would be required to service large additional groups of unemployed now.

THE FINANCING OF THE UNEMPLOYED AS WELL AS NEEDY STUDENTS THROUGH VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS

Experience has proven in the past year in West Virginia that no large quantity of unemployed will take advantage of present vocational facilities unless adequate financing is provided for subsistence. It has also been brought to light that many high school students do not have sufficient funds to complete their educational program, whether vocational or high school, and these young people also require careful consideration. A procedure to provide for both of these groups is outlined below.

The unemployment offices within the area should expand their counseling program so that when a person becomes unemployed he immediately would be advised to go to these offices where a counselor would give him an aptitude test which would indicate the areas in which he could best be trained. The counselor would advise the unemployed of the nearest location of vocational schools and the courses available; then work out with him his financial situation. If the person is newly unemployed, a sufficient grant over and above the unemployment insurance would be provided for the duration of the course. He would also be advised of the source of surplus foods. In the case of those unemployed who are no longer drawing compensation, or who have not been eligible for compensation, a larger grant by necessity would have to be made.

The pattern of the original education plan for World War II veterans appears to be applicable. School costs are paid direct to the institution and the student receives a subsistence allowance.

In the case of the student of high school age who is without means to continue on with vocational training, a counseling service within the school system itself should be established and funds provided for these people to continue with their education.

Upon graduation from the vocational training schools counseling service both within the school system and the unemployment office should be available to advise the graduates of the availability of jobs in various parts of our country. If prospects of jobs can be located loans should be made where needed to those who do not have adequate finances for them to go and secure the job, and to transport their families to the new location. At least 1 month's subsistence should be made available in a loan form to these people so that they may become settled in the new area.

Almost every analysis of the Appalachian region's unemployed includes a statement of need for elevating the average level of education. Such an improvement, says the consensus, would help eradicate some of the region's unattractiveness to prospective industry and would improve the chances of the region's people to obtain employment.

Harvey S. Perloff in his article "Lagging Sectors and Regions of the American Economy" states: "I would put at the top of the list an intensive effort to improve education in the depressed areas, to prepare young persons for a lifetime of skilled, productive work. Compared to other governmental measures that have been proposed, public investment in education promises the greatest relative returns."

None of the previous studies, however, have come to grips with the specifics of this distressed area unemployment. Detailed plans for correction and statements of cost of what would be entailed to train these unemployed have not heretofore been presented. We submit that the current situation is sufficiently critical to demand detailed planning and action that can effectively bring this unemployment down to a minimum amount. It is with this intent that the foregoing is respectfully proposed.

Future of the New Federal Reserve Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very thoughtful column written by Mr. Arthur Krock in the New York Times of February 28:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FUTURE OF THE NEW FEDERAL RESERVE RULE

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, February 27.—The recent announcement by the Federal Reserve System that it has dropped its ban against the purchase of long-term Federal securities has come under heavy fire. The immediate objective—to push down long-term interest rates in the securities market while keeping short-term rates high—is being variously characterized by those who oppose it and are urging Congress to review the announcement critically.

Among the attacks are these: The Fed has surrendered its statutory independence to assist a purely political policy of the administration, being a soft alternative to holding down Government spending and cutting Government costs. The Fed has violated the concept on which it was established by Congress under the leadership of the late Senator Carter Glass by using Federal influence to "rig" the central Government's own security market—a criminal offense when engaged in by a private corporation. And the consequence will be to stimulate the inflation which Federal Reserve policies have done so much to bring to a halt.

The defenders of the Fed, and of Chairman Martin, who was a controlling factor in a decision on which his own group divided, deny these charges on the following grounds:

The relaxation of Fed policy is only an "experiment," for use only in the present abnormally mixed economic situation—a recession and a balance-of-payments deficit. Its limited employment thus far suggests it will not be a large market operation. If the experiment fails, it will be abandoned. And with recovery from the economic recessions the Fed will immediately return to its old policies of dealing only in short-term Government paper. As for the belief that Chairman Martin surrendered the independence of the Fed to the pressure of political power, to avoid a situation which might force him to resign, the fact is merely that he decided the Fed could safely assist the Treasury with this "nudge" against high interest rates without lasting commitment or loss of independence.

Since the attackers cannot instantly prove their charges, and the defenders cannot immediately establish their representations, the proofs of both will have to await the passage of time. But economic recovery and a return of the Fed to its former policy would be a demonstration almost unique in Government that the Fed can become "a little bit pregnant," as its critics now describe it, and limit the process at that point. However, if the "experiment" goes the way of all similar steps in recent American government, it will grow into a permanent, ever-expanding inflationary policy. In which event the critics will have proved their case to the utmost, and Chairman Martin will be obliged to confess error, and either resign or bear the onus of associating administration politics with the management of the Federal Reserve System.

The last time the Fed agreed to try to help the Treasury hold down the carrying charges (interest) on the public debt, the relaxation of policy did not subject it to comparable criticism. That was because the action was required to finance the war. When repeated postwar administration deficits sent long-term Government securities under par, the Truman administration sought an indefinite pegging of the securities market on both new and old issues. But Marriner Eccles, then Chairman, publicly asserted the Fed's independence by limiting its pegging of each new issue to the period necessary to float it. Then the System sold its holdings on the testimony of experience that cheap money for the Federal Government means cheap money for everybody.

But it was not until the late Senator Taft, also Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, threatened a full-scale investigation of the Fed-Treasury relationship that the Treasury concurred in the Fed's resolve to withdraw its peg entirely from the Government long-term securities market. The System had demonstrably been used as the engine of inflation it intended not to be, instead of as a salvage corps of the economic consequences of the many and large Treasury war bond issues. So to check the inflation to which it had unwillingly contributed, the System returned to its policy of investing almost wholly in Government short-term paper.

This time, because of the recession, not because of war, deficits, or rising inflation, the Fed is engaged in a retest of what opponents believe inevitably must fail, whatever its constructive purpose. It should not take more than a few months to find out.

Via Cuba: Communist Path to Conquest of Western Hemisphere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in U.S.A. of February 24. It is written by the Honorable Spruille Braden, who had a long and distinguished career in Latin America.

Mr. Braden knows these countries and speaks their language, and what he has to say in the article should wake us up a little.

Of course it is not very pleasant to realize that we have a thoroughgoing Communist apparatus working full time within about 90 miles of our shores. And it is equally unpleasant to realize that today Cuba under Castro has one prime mission, the destruction of the U.S. prestige and influence in Latin America.

Mr. Speaker, the day for brushing unpleasant facts under the rug and going off fishing are gone forever, if this Nation is to survive. We have got to face the facts in Latin America; we have to get some friends there, and then we have to back them loyally and completely. This is the only hope we have to defeat communism in this hemisphere.

The article follows:

VIA CUBA—COMMUNIST PATH TO CONQUEST OF WESTERN HEMISPHERE

(By Spruille Braden, delivered at the annual Founder's Day luncheon of the National Society of the New England Women, January 25, 1961)

For more than three decades, the Communists have been seizing the favorable opportunities afforded by peaceful coexistence for subversion, class struggle, and sabotage everywhere and for revolution wherever and whenever they could get away with it, as they now have in Cuba.

Endocio Ravines, former Peruvian Communist, tells of a Moscow meeting during 1934 of several Latin American and Russian Communist leaders. It was suggested that actual insurrection might be provoked in Brazil, but that any advances in the other American Republics should be made through popular front governments and subversion. Ravines objected that the United States of America quickly would suppress by force any attempted uprising in Brazil. Dmitri Manuilsky, who was presiding, sarcastically replied: "Our dear comrade * * * would be right if the United States were to dispatch its ships and troops to Brazil. Clearly, we could not ask the people to fight with clubs or orchids against cannons. But, happily for us and for the luck of the world proletariat, we have resolved the problem far in advance. Comrade, the international has concerned itself not with controlling cannons and warships, but by influencing and absolutely controlling the finger which would press the magic button, the one which makes the fleet sail."

Manuilsky then detailed the great Communist accomplishments in penetrating the highest, most important and powerful spheres in the United States of America—the fundamental positions of the high command of capitalism.

AMBASSADOR SOUNDS ALARM

Based on several personal experiences, I can attest to the existence of this penetration.

In 1954 I testified before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee that while serving as Ambassador to Argentina, in early July 1945, I sent two top secret cables for the President and the Secretary of State who were about to attend the Potsdam Conference. I referred to a long list of telegrams, dispatches, memorandums, and reports in person to the State Department made over a period of several years on Communist activities throughout this hemisphere. I told how Peron was playing hand-in-glove with the Communists. I urged in the strongest terms that Truman and Churchill at Potsdam lay it on the line with Stalin, that these machinations and subversions must stop immediately.

As I discovered years later, someone in the State Department or somewhere along the line so contrived that those extremely urgent messages never reached the President and Secretary of State. Who pressed that magic button? The question never has been answered.

Among the many alarms I repeated through the years, both in and out of Government, as to the Communist danger in this hemisphere, I specifically warned about the Communists' attempt to control Bolivia and Guatemala—but all to no avail.

CASTRO, CHAOS, AND COMMUNISM

I testified on July 17, 1959 before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee that on October 4, 1957, I went out of my way to warn the top echelons of the State Department that if they continued their present policies, they would bring Castro, chaos, and communism to Cuba. I was assured that my message had gone to the very top. Yet, 1 month later, on November 6, the Secretary of State, in a press interview, declared that the United States did not consider Communist activities in Latin America as dangerous [sic].

The time has come to find out who deceived and kept the truth from the Secretary of State. Was it only the result of stupidity, or did someone control the finger that presses the magic button?

The State Department and the Central Intelligence Agency should have had far better knowledge than I—as a private citizen—about Castro and his Communist background; what he had done and planned to do; what was happening and going to happen. If they did not, why not? Actually, we know they were informed. Why then did they fail to protect the United States? Why was aid and comfort given to Castro and the Communists?

This state of affairs is all the more shocking, because there never has been any secret about Fidel Castro and some of his government colleagues being all-out Communists.

CHRONOLOGY ON CASTRO

In early 1943, along with other Young Communist League members, Fidel was known to have been put through a course of instruction by Gumer W. Bashinov, of the Soviet legation, in Havana. In the university, Castro was recognized by both profes-

sors and fellow students as belonging to a Communist apparatus.

In 1948, he was sent by the party on a vitally important mission in Colombia. There he may have had a hand in the assassination on April 9, 1948, of Gaitan, a leading Colombian presidential candidate.

There is positive testimony by the Colombian chief of national police and others that Castro incited, and actively participated in, the rioting and looting, incendiarism, and murdering during the Bogotaza, which was planned and directed by international communism, and which destroyed that capital city. There are responsible accounts that Castro boasted of having killed three priests.

When, during 1955, Fidel, his brother Raul, Che Guevara, and others were being trained for guerrilla fighting by the notorious Spanish Communist, Colonel Bayo, in Mexico, our Embassy in Mexico City officially reported to the State Department that Castro was a Communist.

It appears that this report and often others from the CIA, the FBI, and the State Department's intelligence staff were not even read. The officer in charge of Mexican, Central American, and Caribbean affairs in August 1959 was unaware, or claimed to be unaware, of an analysis of Castro and other Cuban Communist governmental leaders which had been prepared by the State Department's research staff.

Castro's revolution, generally called the 26th of July movement, is the direct outspring of, and includes much of the same membership as, the Buro del Caribe (Bureau of the Caribbean) which was a section or branch of the Comintern. This bureau was in existence when I served as Ambassador to Cuba from 1942 to 1945. Its chief, Fabio Grobart (a Polish Red who traveled under 9 different nationalities and 11 aliases) directed all Communist activities throughout the hemisphere except for propaganda aimed at the colored people around the Caribbean which was directed from Harlem in New York City.

WRONG U.S. POLICIES

Fidel's conduct of the revolution from the Sierra Maestra was characteristically Communist—typified by his kidnaping of U.S. citizens and a group of marines from our Guantanamo Naval Base. After suffering from this indignity, we humiliated ourselves by sending two consular officers to negotiate with Raul Castro for the release of these U.S. citizens. Instead of demanding their release, we treated the Communist bandit as if he were the head of a sovereign power. This unprecedented self-abasement reinforced the conviction—already created by previous stupidities showing utter ignorance of Cuban psychology—that the United States was backing Castro against Batista.

Of course, many Cubans who had become fed up with long years of corruption, were desperately anxious to get rid of the old-type government. So, not unnaturally, they stumbled into supporting Castro. Even so, they primarily are responsible for their present desperate straits. But the U.S. Government must accept its share of the guilt. With a little commonsense diplomacy, Batista could have been eliminated and replaced by a reasonably honest, constitutionally elected, representative government. Instead, either we committed one of the most grievous and costly blunders of our history, or some finger pressed the magic button, and thus helped to bring the Communists to power in Cuba in what may turn out to be the worst catastrophe ever to strike this hemisphere.

COMMUNIST SCOURGE

The bloodthirsty Communists have scouraged and defiled Cuba, destroyed decency and obliterated every right and freedom. The extent of their property confiscations from Cubans is rivaled only in part by the more than $1 billion of U.S. investments they have seized. They have corrupted the young, set children to spy against and denounce their own parents, and condemned and punished the innocent. They have made thousands of Cubans homeless and jobless. Weeping mothers, wives, widows, children, and orphans testify to the imprisonments, and slow death in the Isle of Pines and in other prisons. Worse than all these barbarities has been the searing of Cuba's soul and the scorification of her spiritual values.

It would be inhuman of us to abandon our Cuban friends to Communist slavery and Soviet-Sino domination. Over 18 months ago, at a press conference in Chicago, I said I had been praying to God that the Cubans might rescue themselves. I am still praying, although the record shows that no people ever have been able to overthrow a Communist police state without strong assistance from abroad. The Communists, with an estimated 6,000 to 8,000 Russian, Czech, Polish, and Red Chinese advisers, instructors, and mercenaries, are entrenched so strongly in Cuba that liberation becomes more difficult with each day that passes.

The Cubans must have our all-out moral support, arms and money. To give them these things now would not be giving something for nothing; it would be self-defense.

We cannot tolerate a Communist satellite state on our very threshold, controlling the Caribbean and the approaches to the Panama Canal and the Mississippi Valley. The last bulwark in the defense of our territory and the Western Hemisphere is at stake.

WE MUST STAND FIRM

We must fight. Only by our vigorous and courageous stand can we attract other nations to our cause and induce them to make themselves strong in order to fight at our side. Such a stand will help to restore confidence in our loyalty to our friends. Too often the U.S. Government is distrusted because it turns against friends and allies and goes along with the enemy, as in the case of Suez. Finally, resolute and brave action now will show that all our vacillations, weaknesses, and faintheartedness in the United Nations and the Organization of American States were merely passing phases in our international conduct.

Castro and his accomplices frankly proclaim their intention to become the Mao Tse-tung's of the Western Hemisphere, including the United States. They are propagating communism among the Cuban workers in Florida and appealing for Negro sympathizers all over the United States. (Witness Castro's planned hocus-pocus in moving to a Harlem hotel during his last visit to New York City.)

In recent years, the Chinese Reds have become increasingly active in the subversion of this hemisphere. They seemingly inspire more confidence among intellectuals and students—even in the secondary schools—than do the Russians, Czechs or Poles, perhaps because the Red Chinese are not so well known.

Now the Cuban government is spreading its Red agents over the entire hemisphere; they are financed lavishly and are proving to be far more effective than agents of any other nationality, including the Chinese. They travel in the garb of diplomats, cultural, trade or labor delegations, or of simple tourists.

Cuban Communist attempts at subversion have induced Peru, Nicaragua, Guatemala, Paraguay and the Dominican Republic to break diplomatic relations with the Castro regime. Other nations, such as Uruguay and Panama have expelled the Cuban Ambassadors and other Communist diplomats.

CARIBBEAN UNDER ATTACK

The Caribbean is in danger of becoming a Red lake. The Communist, Cheddi Jagan, is top man in British Guiana. The French islands, such as Martinique, are represented in the Paris Parliament by Communists. Betancourt's government in Venezuela, while admittedly leftwing, has barely escaped from being upset by the Communists, and might fall at any time. Panama is weak, and the comrades are infiltrating there as they have been trying to do again and again throughout Central America. Trinidad grudgingly permits us to retain our military base at Chaguamaras; but other bases in the West Indies have been or will be, abandoned.

Of all the Caribbean republics, by instinct and experience the one which should be least influenced by totalitarianism is Colombia. Yet, since 1948 it has suffered continuously from Communist inspired and directed guerrilla bands operating in outlying districts. As a result, in these areas the national economy has been disrupted and agriculture paralyzed, thus raising the cost of living. The terrorized peasants have had to seek refuge in the cities where they can find no work. The ensuing chaos has broken down law and order and eased the way for communism. Two Red enclaves, Viota and Sumapaz, exist in the interior of Columbia. They collect their own taxes, run their own schools and fly the hammer and sickle as their flag. Colombian officials and troops must obtain permission from the Communist leaders to pass through these districts.

Two tons of Communist propaganda are flown daily from Havana to the Cuban Embassy in Mexico City. Former President Cardenas of Mexico, always an extreme leftist, recently returned from Moscow and Peiping and again is exercising an evil and powerful influence behind the scenes. He is organizing a Latin American Conference to condemn the United States as the despoiler of Cuban liberty, justice, and peace. In Mexico, and throughout the hemisphere, the Communists are poisoning public opinion and arousing hatred and demonstrations against the United States by every conceivable means. They have a receptive audience among the intellectuals. For instance, there are 55,000 students in the University of Mexico, and it is estimated that 90 percent of the professors are Communists. In contrast, our propaganda and defense are insignificant and inept, dated, and uninspired. Parenthetically, I am sorry to admit that one of the largest U.S. foundations presently is financing to the tune of several hundred thousand dollars a notorious European Communist professor in Latin America.

Were Mexico to fall under Communist control, the conditions would not be within the relatively mild limitations set by President Lopex Mateos, when he declared a few months ago that his Government was "of the extreme left, within the Constitution." The Mexican situation would be more serious than that in Cuba due to a population four times as large and a 2,000 miles frontier along the United States.

COMMUNIST CUBAN TACTICS

Presently, the Communists probably do not control, or even have the sympathy of, more than 15 to 25 percent of the Cuban people. However, the Communists always are a small minority. Even in the Soviet Union, they constitute not more than 4 percent of the population. They hide within other political parties and are hard to detect or expose.

Communists, to gain temporary benefits, will enter into a united front with anyone—with reactionary dictators, nationalists, or sworn anti-Communists. They try to create new conflicts and to deepen those already existing. They gladly reverse themselves, sacrifice and kill their own agents, and always will go back two steps in order to take three forward.

Fidel Castro could become expendable and be wiped out by his comrades overnight— just as was done to Beria in Russia.

Playing both ends against the middle, Communists often pretend to have intra-Party disputes with one group supporting and the other opposing a particular government. This situation developed for a time vis-a-vis Peron in Argentina. However, the Communists also have genuine and desperate schisms, such as that which arose between the Stalinists and the Trotskyites. Such a cleavage may be starting now in Cuba between the older and younger generations of Communists.

TWO TEAMS, ONE GOAL

In the terminology of American football, I call the present Cuban Government, led by Castro the "offensive team." But there are indications that the Kremlin might find it desirable to put in substitutes. Castro and his crowd would be sacrificed; if possible, he might be converted into a martyr of Yankee imperialism and travel around the Americas denouncing the United States. The new or defensive team would take over, shout for Fidelism without Fidel, agrarian reform and other so-called revolutionary principles. The new regime would pretend to want friendly coexistence with Washington.

Actually, it would be Communist, opposed to freedom and representative government, hating the United States, and, under its camouflage of coexistence, would be just as villainous as and more dangerous than the present first or offensive team.

Another dangerous alternative might arise if the Castro regime were to fall and be replaced by a Socialist one. This action would not bother Moscow and Peiping too greatly since they know that inevitably socialism leads to some form of totalitarianism. Socialism is a prep school for communism, and the latter would in this way eventually regain control of Cuba.

Certainly, it behooves the free Cubans, the other American republics, including the United States, to be on the lookout to prevent any such developments.

Based on the circumstances I have described, during the last 2 years I have urged, publicly and privately, the following course of action:

1. Inform the other American republics that:

We now expect them, belatedly though it may be, to fulfill their solemn commitments in cooperation with us "to take the necessary measures to protect their political independence against the intervention of international communism, acting in the interest of an alien despotism." These words, from the Declaration of the Organization of American States, exactly fit existing conditions in Cuba and the Caribbean.

If they fail to take collective action with us against this Communist attempt to seize the Western Hemisphere, then for its own security the United States will be forced into unilateral action. The other republics and not we will have destroyed the OAS and hemisphere solidarity. The responsibility will be theirs.

Fortunately, we still retain the "inherent right to collective and individual self-defense" under the U.N. and the OAS charters. But, far more imporatnt, it is our patriotic duty to save our Nation.

Action by the United States, strictly speaking, would not be unilateral. On the contrary, it would be at the earnest behest of all anti-Communist Cubans. It would not be intervention.

At long last, since October we have had as Assistant Secretary of State for American Republics a man of courage and intelligence, Mr. Thomas C. Mann. Given adequate authority, he may be able to lead us out of the Cuban morass. Already Mr. Mann has brought about the break in diplomatic relations with the Cuban Communist regime.

Our next steps must be:

2. Recognize a responsible Cuban government in exile, just as we recognized the Free French and other regimes in exile during World War II.

3. Give that government our full support, morally and materially, with arms and money.

4. Invoke a pacific blockade of Cuba, to halt trading by the Communist nations. Incidentally, some of our NATO allies and the other American republics who want to increase or at least continue business as usual with Cuba, should be induced to desist.

5. Continue U.S. cooperation and guidance after the Communists have been driven out of Cuba in order to rehabilitate it and bring it back to freedom and constitutional representative government.

If speedily enacted, such a program could succeed. Although several of my Cuban friends insist that, in addition, the United States will have to help with its Armed Forces, both to throw out the Communists and thereafter, as a simple humanitarian measure, to preserve order and save Cuba from a horrible blood bath. I pray they are wrong, but I fear they are right.

Forestry: The South's Pot of Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the March issue of the Progressive Farmer features an informative interview conducted by Mrs. Anne Haney, associate editor, with Dr. Richard E. McArdle, Chief of the U.S. Forest Service, and Regional Forester J. K. Vessey. Printed verbatim under the title "Forestry Can Be South's Pot of Gold," the answers of Dr. McArdle and Mr. Vessey point up forestry as the economic hope of the South. They predict that by the year 2000 the South will be raising more than half of the timber used in the United States and they see in that fact the salvation of the hard-pressed small farmers of the South. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of this interview be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORESTRY CAN BE SOUTH'S POT OF GOLD

What do you think will be timber possibilities for the South in 2000 A.D.?

Dr. MCARDLE. In the year 2000 the South will be raising more than half of the timber used in the United States. There will be bigger and more varied forest industries. We'll see far more managed forests. Forty years from now people traveling highways will see forest land that looks like wood factories. Forest products industries will be the backbone of the prosperity of the South.

Mr. VESSEY. The South must double its timber production by A.D. 2000. From this better forestry will come the added benefits of cleaner water, more and better fishing and hunting, and more commercial recreation in timberland

Where does the Nation stand in forestry? Where do we stand in the South?

Dr. MCARDLE. As is the case with the rest of the United States, the South is growing only about one-half the volume of timber that it should be growing. Annually, it is growing 24.1 billion board feet; it should grow 48.2 billion board feet.

Half of all U.S. forest land is in small forest properties. These are not producing the wood for the Nation or income for their owners which they should. They aren't managed with the same attention and skill their owners use in managing other crops.

What is the future of forest farming in the South as compared with timber farming in other sections of the country?

Dr. MCARDLE. It's good everywhere; it's especially good in the South. Most people think that the biggest part of forest land in the United States is in the Far West. Actually 80 percent of the land which will grow trees commercially is east of the Great Plains, and 50 percent of this is in the South.

Are we going to overproduce timber?

Dr. MCARDLE. No. We're going to need more timber because there are going to be more people. We have no surplus now. I see no chance of a surplus. The South must make up most of the deficit when remaining old-growth western woods will have been harvested.

Why do you think the South will make up most of the deficit for the future?

Mr. VESSEY. The South has several tremendous advantages—a long growing season, warm temperature, abundant rainfall, and soils especially adapted to timber.

We have a lot of mountain country suited for watershed and wildlife land. The average southern farm has all the advantages of being close to market and having good transportation. It takes 8 to 15 years to grow pulpwood thinnings here—30 to 45 in other sections. The South also has an advantage in the wealth of different kinds of trees that grow here naturally. If I were advising someone to go somewhere to make the most money growing trees, I'd advise the South.

What are some new and future uses of wood that may increase demand even further?

Dr. MCARDLE. We can look forward to ever-increasing use of wood in glued-up products—laminated beams, plywood, particle board, and composites of wood with metals and plastics. Already we are seeing a healthy growth in the uses of corrugated containers and food boards. We should see more structural uses of paper and other fiber products, such as paper honeycomb, paper-plastic facings, hardboard, and insulating board. The chemical industry doubles every 8 years; we are just crossing the threshold of possibilities in chemical utilization of wood.

Everywhere we go we see pulpwood trucks on the road, pulpwood loading yards, or pulpwood moving by freight. How important is pulpwood in the South today, and what about pulpwood's importance in the future?

Mr. VESSEY. Pulpwood has helped the South in many ways. Forward-looking pulp mills have contributed greatly to the South's growth. Growing pulpwood will always be a major activity in the South. Pulp and paper mills are moving South. Those already here are expanding. They are getting close to their source of raw material. Though many own a great deal of timberland, their primary supplier is still small private timberland owners.

And uses of pulpwood in paper products and in chemistry are constantly on the increase. Demand for lumber is expected to double in the next 40 years; demand for pulpwood is expected to triple.

What are we doing on better trees?

Mr. VESSEY. State forestry services are singling out patches of better trees and saving those as natural seed orchards. Industry is doing a good job of finding "superior trees" for use as parent trees. The

Forest Service is now doing the same thing. We are doing more and more research on superior trees that are better growers and more insect and disease resistant.

Dr. McARDLE. We are now developing superior pine hybrids that not only grow fast, but resist insects and diseases. We are developing better gum naval stores trees. In the nurseries we are eliminating tree root diseases, lowering cost of seedlings, increasing production, and providing healthier trees to the landowners. Also, we are reforesting thousands of acres each year in the South by direct seeding.

The South has been buying a lot of western wood in recent years. That disturbs a lot of our farmers. Will that continue?

Dr. McARDLE. Yes, because we haven't yet found out how to make use of certain southern woods. For example, we're using Douglas-fir doors because we haven't found a way of cutting rotary veneer from southern pine. The South does have an advantage over other parts of the country because half of southern timber is hardwood, some of the most beautifully figured hardwood in the world.

Competition now is in softwoods. The South has made prodigal use of its own quality woods and has to start over. The South can grow quality wood, but it will take time. The West still has a lot of big, fine-quality softwoods. But the South can produce quality hardwood. In high-quality hardwoods, the South has a gold mine and doesn't know it.

We continue to hear the desire expressed for wider uses of many of our hardwoods. What are the possibilities?

Mr. VESSEY. Half our Southern timberland is in hardwoods that have been neglected or overlooked. The opportunity for producing hardwoods is excellent for growing cash crops on small woodlands. They are used for flooring, furniture, interior trim, and panel boards. Our pulpmills are using some hardwood now and prospects are that they will expand the use of hardwood.

The oaks, poplars, gums, and many of our other better hardwood species have become the subject of much more research.

Before cutting weed trees, a farmer should get advice on what his land will handle best. He can get advice from the extension service, consulting foresters, State foresters, or U.S. Forest Service.

We understand that commercial woodlands and large private tracts sometimes get nearly double the yield of smaller woodlands. Why?

Mr. VESSEY. Difference is in technical knowledge and know-how. Large timber owners employ foresters. The farmer has know-how in producing other crops, but not so much about his timber and how to make it produce. Hundreds of thousands of acres of potential forest land are producing nothing. Many small woodlands—98 percent of which are less than 500 acres—are producing less than one-fourth what they could.

What is the remedy?

Mr. VESSEY. Better information to landowner so he realizes cash value * * * technical assistance * * * and added capital borrowed from banks or partial incentives from Federal and State Governments. And he can invest his own labor. Those who have had the foresight to make these investments in years past are reaping the profits today.

Do you see any opportunities for some of our smaller farmers to develop timber as their basic source of income?

Mr. VESSEY. It is possible for a small full-time farmer to have timber as his basic source of income. He should be able to make upward of $7 to $10 per acre per year from producing timber by harvesting all products to best advantage. If the farmer processes the trees from the stump to the market, he can increase net income materially. Products obtainable are pulpwood, veneer bolts, poles, posts, sawtimber, and, in some areas, naval stores. Number of acres he would need would depend upon standard of living he desires.

More than half the part-time farmers in the Nation are in the South. What do you think of forestry in this type of economy?

Mr. VESSEY. A tree crop is one of the best answers to the needs of the part-time farmer. Investment of capital, machinery, equipment, and labor is much lower for tree crops than for row crops. Tree harvesting can always be delayed from one season to another and from one year to another, unlike row crop harvest.

For young people, what opportunities does forestry offer?

Mr. VESSEY. As good as any scientific or professional endeavor. We have unlimited confidence in the future of wood. Every year, the forestry field broadens. We need more foresters than ever.

Opportunities in the research field are unlimited. Many new uses for timber are being developed each year.

If a youngster plants trees while he attends school, they will be producing when he graduates.

There are fields as yet untouched, such as effect of radiation on tree seed. Research in forest tree insect and disease problems needs to be stepped up. I am sure there are more fields that our young people of tomorrow will be conquering.

Los Angeles County Official on House Un-American Activities Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I wish to call to your attention a very significant newspaper article in the form of a letter to the editor, entitled "County Official on HUAC."

You will note the writer thereof is acting chief assistant, county counsel, Los Angeles.

The article follows:

COUNTY OFFICIAL ON HUAC

I have read with much interest your editorial "Attack From L.A.," with reference to the leftist-inspired campaign to kill the House Committee on Un-American Activities stemming largely from this area under the leadership of Frank Wilkinson, former Los Angeles Housing Authority publicity man.

You are to be strongly commended upon your editorial, as well as the later editorial entitled "No Time To Waste," which gave a list of the representatives and senators with whom we all should communicate.

You may recall that Jean Benson Wilkinson, the wife of Frank Wilkinson, was dismissed as a teacher in 1953 by the Los Angeles City Board of Education for refusing to testify before the Fact Finding Committee on Un-American Activities of the California State Senate, a committee similar to the House Un-American Activities Committee.

A board of education rule required employees summoned to appear before such committees to answer under oath questions propounded relating to present or past membership in any organization advocating the forceful overthrow of the Government of the United States or of any State.

Mrs. Wilkinson refused to answer questions.

Her dismissal was sustained by the superior court and by the district court of appeals, which opinion is reported in the case entitled *"Board of Education* v. *Wilkinson"* (125 Cal. App. 2d 100).

She was the first public employee in the State of California dismissed for refusal to testify before such a committee.

At the same time one other teacher was also dismissed for the same reason. Three others have since been dismissed for refusing to testify before the House Un-American Activities Committee.

More recently, two Los Angeles County employees were dismissed for refusing to testify before the House committee, their dismissals being upheld by the superior court, the district court of appeals, and the U.S. Supreme Court.

The above short history, it seems to me, fully justifies the House Un-American Activities Committee in its efforts to investigate and obtain information concerning subversive activities, and the committee should be retained with all its present powers.

I am sending a copy of this letter to each of our Representatives in this area and to our two U.S. Senators.

WILLIAM E. LAMOREAUX,
Acting Chief Assistant,
County Counsel, Los Angeles.

The Country Will Be Watching

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, legislation implementing the appointing of additional Federal judgeships has brought with it disturbing rumors and I submit for the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a discerning article by David Lawrence, which appeared in the March 6 issue of the Washington Evening Star:

POLITICS AND THE NEW JUDGESHIPS—ONE-PARTY DOMINANCE, HINTED BY CELLER, HIT AS IMPAIRING PUBLIC TRUST IN BENCH

(By David Lawrence)

Bad government is largely traceable either to the indifference or to the ignorance of the voters.

A conspicuous example of how the public interest may be injured by neglect has been given in the last few days.

What could be more important to the American people than the selection of qualified men and women as Federal judges to interpret and enforce Federal law? Yet the press has just reported indications that the 73 new judgeships being created by Congress may be filled by the President largely from one political party. Every little protest has been heard—even from the so-called liberal Democrats in Congress—over the implication that judgeships are to continue to be a matter of political patronage like postmasters. There has been a strange silence from "liberal" quarters about the gag rule imposed by the Democratic majority, which passed the bill in the Senate without even permitting hearings.

Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy gave to the House Judiciary Committee the usual promise that "the best qualified individuals" would be appointed. The United

Press International on March 1, however, reported, that the Attorney General declined to heed a Republican Congressman's plea for a "promise that the total number of Federal judges would be kept somewhat equally divided between Democrats and Republicans." The dispatch continued:

"Later Chairman CELLER, of the House Judiciary Committee, frankly told Representative MCCULLOCH that even though the bill to create new Federal judges was approved by the committee last year, House Democratic leaders bypassed it because they thought their party would soon take over the White House. 'The leadership gambled and won,' he said."

The figures presented to the House Judiciary Committee a few days ago showed that out of the 225 judges appointed by Franklin D. Roosevelt, there were 217 Democrats and 8 Republicans. President Truman appointed 118 Democrats and 12 Republicans. President Eisenhower appointed 175 Republicans and 11 Democrats. Mr. Eisenhower's supporters have insisted that he was merely "trying to restore the balance" which was impaired by 20 years of Democratic administrations in which the number of judges selected from one political party was overwhelming.

Last year, when a bill to create the new judgeships was recommended, the Eisenhower administration offered to divide the appointments evenly with the Democrats, but the measure was blocked.

The Nation has been led to believe that the Kennedy administration would introduce a new virtue in the matter of appointments. During the last campaign the Democratic presidential nominee said:

"All appointments, both high and low, will be made on the basis of ability, without regard to race, creed, national origin, sex or occupation and appointees shall be drawn from all segments of the community, wherever the best talent can be found."

This was widely construed as a new approach. The selection of the Federal judges now affords an opportunity for the campaign pledge to be fulfilled.

There can be no more effective way of destroying confidence in the impartiality of the Federal judiciary than to make it the tool of party politics. People in the community grow distrustful of politicians on the bench and, in litigation between prominent persons in politics and their adversaries, suspicion arises that a fair verdict will not be rendered.

There have, of course, been many judges of ability appointed who eschewed all previous political connections and discharged their duties fearlessly and objectively.

But how can the country be sure that the best qualified men and women are appointed to the Federal bench? One might assume that the local bar associations would step in and protest the appointment of incompetent judges. But this, too, is a course fraught with political embarrassments. The lawyers who are subsequently to appear before the same persons nominated for the bench would hesitate to oppose confirmation or to express themselves on the qualifications of such nominees.

It would be better, of course, if the bar associations in each district would select in advance at least five persons for a judgeship and, without expressing a preference, testify that each was qualified to serve. Failure to be selected by a local bar association need not always be conclusive, but at least in the vast majority of cases the country would have the assurance that the persons best qualified in the law were being selected for the Federal bench irrespective of their political background, political activity, or political influence, and solely on merit.

Continental Bald Eagle Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents in New York City is Mr. Carl W. Buchheister, the distinguished conservationist who serves as president of the National Audubon Society. I might lay claim to the whole society, since its national headquarters at 1130 Fifth Avenue, New York City, are in my district but, of course, its members are to be found in every district of the Nation.

Recently the National Audubon Society launched a continentwide survey and research program to determine the population trends and survival problems of the bald eagle. This great bird, which has been our national emblem since so designated by act of the Continental Congress in 1782, appears to be in trouble. Upon the findings of its study, the society hopes a conservation program can be devised that will make certain the eagle, as a species of wildlife, will, like the Nation it symbolizes, remain forever strong and free.

Mr. Buchheister explains the reasons for the Audubon Society's bald eagle project and it outlines in an editorial appearing in the January–February 1961 issue of Audubon magazine. Under unanimous consent I include excerpts from this editorial by Mr. Buchheister in the Appendix of the RECORD:

CONTINENTAL BALD EAGLE PROJECT

A study of the literature reveals that the bald eagle may have been declining in numbers a long time, perhaps for most of a century. Forbush speaks of it in his "Birds of Massachusetts and Other New England States," published 33 years ago. Many kinds of wildlife suffered drastic reductions from about 1890 to 1920, the period that prompted the birth of the Audubon movement and the growth to national prominence of the National Audubon Society. The passenger pigeon, we recall, disappeared as a wild bird between 1900 and 1907 and the last remaining representative of the species expired in the Cincinnati Zoo in 1914. The last wild heath hen disappeared in 1932.

Many species, both mammals and birds, skidded from abundance to scarcity as drainage blotted out great areas of now forgotten marshes in the East, Midwest, South, and as power machinery revolutionized agriculture while conservation lagged from 1920 through World War II.

There are alarming signs that the bald eagle, symbol of our Nation's majesty and might since it was so dedicated by act of the second Continental Congress in 1782, may be following the passenger pigeon and the heath hen toward the point of no return. It would be unthinkable, of course, to permit the bald eagle to become extinct. It would be unthinkable even to let it reach the state of crisis from which we are now trying to rescue the whooping crane.

Experience and commonsense dictate that the first task must be a thorough, scientific study of the bald eagle: to inventory its numbers throughout its North American range—this species does not occur elsewhere in the world except as accidentals—and, concurrently, to investigate its feeding, nesting, and migratory habits, its reproductive success, and other factors affecting its survival.

One cannot prescribe for a sick species until a careful diagnosis has been made of the malady. The general factor depressing the bald eagle is known: declining habitat due to changes wrought by man in the landscape. But while the general cause is known, the specific ways in which the eagle is affected by a changing ecology are not known. Once the biological and ecological facts are at hand, we are confident that methods will be devised to save the eagle, just as the wild turkey, the pronghorned antelope, the trumpeter swan, and other species thought doomed a few decades ago, have been brought back to comparative security. It was National Audubon Society research that laid the groundwork for a program that has arrested, at least, the decline of the whooping crane.

For these reasons the National Audubon Society has begun the Continental Bald Eagle project, a 5-year cooperative research program. A continentwide survey of the population and distribution of the species is now being organized under the direction of our research director, Alexander ("Sandy") Sprunt, IV, and we have solicited the cooperation of Federal, State, and provincial wildlife agencies, and local Audubon groups and ornithological societies, throughout the United States and Canada. We have no illusions about it. Without their assistance we cannot get the job done.

Why the Controversy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, when I was out in my district last fall, I presented the film "Operation Abolition" before many audiences. The reaction to this film was favorable. Since the Congress convened in January, I have received many letters concerning the film and the Committee on Un-American Activities. With very few exceptions, the comments have supported both the film and the committee.

The Bellingham Herald, a daily newspaper published in my district, carried an editorial about the film in its March 1, 1961, edition. It, too, found "Operation Abolition" a fair presentation of events that happened during the San Francisco hearings. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this editorial:

WHY THE CONTROVERSY ABOUT "OPERATION ABOLITION"?

We consider ourselves as zealous in support of basic individual liberties as anyone, but so far as the film "Operation Abolition" is concerned, we are at a loss to explain the hue and cry that has arisen about it.

We went to see the film with an open mind, ready to take note of any unjustified smear on innocent persons or groups. We saw none.

What we did see was a startling exhibition of disorderliness and rioting which disrupted the San Francisco hearings of the House Un-American Activities Commitee last May. The committee staff was subject to violent personal abuse, frenzied chanting and defiance of law officers. No city council or school board would have stood for such behavior.

The film was taken by newsreel photographers, not by committee employees. Several key figures were identified by name as Communists. Students who participated in the fracas were described as unwitting dupes, rather than sympathizers of communism.

A reasonable person would find little, if anything, to criticize in the presentation. Nor would a reasonable person approve of the tactics of the persons subpenaed who shouted insults at the committee, a duly constituted extension of the U.S. Congress which was attempting to proceed in orderly fashion under its congressional authority.

It would seem to us to be beyond any reasonable doubt that the San Francisco affair was planned and executed under Communist direction and that "Operation Abolition" is a fair presentation of what happened.

New Attack on Pocketbook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1961

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, legislation is being prepared dealing with Federal aid to education. There are many arguments well founded in opposition to the need for such legislation, therefore, I am inserting herewith an editorial from the Tablet. The Tablet has a very large circulation not only in Brooklyn and Long Island, but in Washington and many other places. It is highly respected because of the factual news it prints and it publishes excellent articles and editorials. I recommend the reading of this editorial to all the Members of Congress:

NEW ATTACK ON POCKETBOOK

The modest Federal aid program to expend $5,625 million on education during the next 3 years is discussed elsewhere in this issue by a number of our Bishops. We offer these additional considerations:

1. Where is there an honest, factual, accurate study which will show that the massive aid is needed? There is ample evidence to show that practically every State in the Union and the overwhelming number of school districts are properly supporting their schools, or at least are financially able to care for the situation if they really desired to. The shortage of both teachers and classrooms can easily be created, magnified and propagandized by professional educators and politicians who use education for selfish, personal designs. Roger Freeman in his classic "School Needs in the Decade Ahead" disproves the contentions of serious classrooms shortages and inadequate teachers' pay.

2. If the Federal Government believes that States, cities and towns are unable to find money to fulfill these obligations, then why should not police and fire departments and other local functions likewise be subsidized? Surely police and fire departments are complaining they have great difficulties meeting budgets and maintaining efficiency. Should they—as well as other agencies of State, city and town governments rush to Washington for handouts? Or perhaps the national government has those additional ideas in view.

3. It is said that the $5 billion to $6 billion outlay is only for 3 years. That should be one of the objections to the program. At the end of that time, it will likely double, and 10 years from now it will triple. Federal ventures usually start off with a reasonable outlay—although this one is described as modest—but the thirst for power, jobs, and appropriations represents a voracious and constantly growing appetite.

When the Federal income tax started, the sum fixed was 1 percent of a person's income over $1,000. The late Senator James Reed of Missouri sought to write a maximum in the bill, prohibiting any tax over 10 percent. He was laughed down by other Senators who maintained it was preposterous that any American's income would be taxed as much as 10 percent. Now most people pay from 20 to 90 percent.

4. The entire proposition is a classic answer of the nonsequitur in reasoning. The President and his advisers complain about the present woeful condition of education; a new standard of excellence is required. But further down in the message it is said: "We are educating a great proportion of our youth to a higher degree of competence than any other country on earth." One might presume that a system that has been so successful and satisfactory would be continued as such.

It is undoubtedly true that there are only a few school districts, out of tens of thousands, that need aid, but that, it appears, is no longer a guide for making appropriations. If some need educational relief, then all must have it; just as if there are some impoverished old people, then all must be helped by the Government, whether or not they need it, whether or not they want it. This is a ubiquitous nonsequitur, this habit of leaping over the center of the argument. It is encountered whenever there is a program put forward to have the Federal Government take over our medical care, move into our schools, spur growth in the economy, or whatever it may be. The fact that America has grown from a wilderness to the greatest industrial nation on earth is supposed to be rendered meaningless by the observation that we need more growth, and therefore we should supersede the successful market economy with a Government-managed economy. If you object you are opposed to more growth.

5. How and when will this increased appropriation be met? Nothing is said as to where the increased billions of dollars will be obtained for this new bureaucratic program. It is certain, however, the people will pay—with the result that the day may not be too far distant when the workers' salary envelope will be almost empty after all deductions are taken out—for the Government is considered by many to be the only trustworthy party for handling an individual's money.

New York State, under the new educational program, will receive $128,000,000 for school construction, teachers' salaries and scholarships, but New York's contribution to Federal educational aid, based on the percentage of total Federal taxes which the people of this State pay, will be $767 million. Connecticut and New Jersey are in the same proportional boat. They will also receive $15 per pupil, the lowest in the Nation. Texas will receive $27.19 per pupil, Alabama, $34.65, Tennessee, $33.19, etc.

Those States which now take care of the problem will be taxed to care for those who refuse to meet high standards.

6. This whole unfair situation is crowned by its bias directed against the parents of children—5 million children—who attend religious public schools. They will be doubly taxed for this wasteful program—and this in a day when racial and religious equality is preached as a Government ideal.

This injustice is based on what is called the unconstitutionality of granting Federal aid to private or church schools. The champions of discrimination talk of the "absolute wall of separation" between church and state demanded by the Constitution. But one can find no such thing in the Constitution—certainly not in the official wording of the document. They speak of a violation of time-honored traditions—but many can also think of time-honored traditions on the question of racial segregation that were blasted beyond recall by a second look at the Constitution and a persistent demand for a recognition of personal rights.

Perhaps the time has come for American parents, sick and tired of already bearing a double burden of taxation to support schools of their own choice, to demand a thorough study and recognition of their full civic rights, before a third burden be saddled upon them by unnecessary and extravagently massive spending for Federal aid to education. They have every right to question the civil righters, who glibly point to their own interpretation of the Constitution, and demand a hearing, asking full recognition of their fair share of the benefits of taxation, otherwise, sit back and suffer a new attack upon your pocketbook.

Hon. John J. Kane

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday morning the city of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County lost a distinguished public servant, the Honorable John J. Kane. Commissioner Kane was a fine and able leader in our community and served us well for many years. We shall regard his passing with a great sense of personal and public loss, for his devotion to the people and his duties stood as an inspiration to all of us.

An editorial, which appeared in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette and Sun-Telegraph on March 6, 1961, expresses the esteem with which he is regarded by all of the people of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County. Under unanimous consent, I include this editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD:

HON. JOHN J. KANE

Pittsburgh's political patriarch is with us no more. John J. Kane, former Allegheny County Commission chairman, died early Sunday morning. His long career, of vital importance to all who live in this area, ended 2½ months short of his 71st birthday.

Among the public servants born and raised in Pittsburgh, few have done as much, worked as hard, bossed as well or been as shrewdly realistic in the face of all problems—civic or political—as Mr. Kane.

From modest beginnings in the Hill District of the 1890's, John J. Kane rose to power in the classic American manner. Early an errand boy and newspaper carrier, the young man became a pressman's apprentice—which led to activity in the AFL Newspaper Pressmen's Union. In 1922, he was

elected president of local No. 9 and held the post 10 years. It was then that he became interested in politics.

Early in his political career, he was recognized as a natural and took to leadership with alacrity—and rose fast. Elected to the Pennsylvania House of Representatives in 1932, he backed a progressive Democratic program that put the Republican majority on the spot and helped win the State in the presidential election.

In 1935, Mr. Kane was elected county commissioner and maintained his hold over the board for 24 years until his retirement in 1959. His mark on the county was stupendous: greater economy in government, nearly total unionization of county employees, the launching of a county improvement program with a $34 million bond issue for bridge, highway and airport construction and the extension of the smoke control program; he strongly supported the Pittsburgh package introduced to the legislature in 1947 which led to this city's widely esteemed renaissance.

Mr. Kane's dream of a new county air facility was realized with the construction of the $33 million Greater Pittsburgh Airport. His interest in keeping North and South Parks in their natural and unspoiled state was instrumental in their current significance to all residents.

Mr. Kane was a lifelong opponent of higher taxes and unemployment, as well as militant against tolls for the Liberty Tunnels and area bridges.

The crowning mark of Mr. Kane's life, after years spent planning for a hospital designed expressly for the indigent and chronically sick, was the naming of that hospital, built in Scott Township, after him. It was recognition long deserved, for in his career he had constantly aimed at giving the people of Allegheny County good government—honest, efficient, forward-looking.

The Parkinson's disease that destroyed the Commissioner's health even as he held office was as severe as it was unrelenting. It plagued an able administrator and hastened his end.

In his days of service John J. Kane was more than the county's best vote getter or the politician who held office longer than any other in modern times. He has often been called one of the best Commissioners we ever had. That is how we will remember him.

Mennen Williams: The Storm Grows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article and editorial appeared in the Sunday Nation of Nairobi, Kenya, East Africa, on February 26. It is well the Members of this House, and the American people try to see themselves as others see them.

A friend of mine, now in Kenya, has this to say on the subject of the unfortunate Mr. Williams:

They—

Meaning some of the officials—

had not wanted Mr. Williams at this time, right in the middle of their elections, and had tried to put him off, but unsuccessfully. The situation in East Africa is tense enough, without any Americans shooting off their faces.

This wraps it up very completely, I think.

MENNEN WILLIAMS: THE STORM GROWS

The U.S. State Department yesterday intervened in the growing storm over the activities of Mr. Kennedy's special envoy on Africa, Mr. G. Mennen Williams, at present in Dar es Salaam. But this is considered unlikely to allay the anger of Kenya Europeans and a group of British Tory Members of Parliament who are proposing to take a House of Commons motion censuring his activities.

The State Department, after refusing to comment on reports that British Members of Parliament were critical of their envoy's published remarks, issued a "clarification" of his "Africa for the Africans" statement made in Nairobi last week.

The Department spokesman said: "The phrase was quoted out of context and did not mean support of Negro supremacy, but was only intended to reaffirm the U.S. support of the right of all peoples to self-determination.

"In the achievement of that goal the claims of all elements of a given society of whatever race, creed, or color should be resolved according to responsible, just, and democratic standards."

But, newspapermen, including those of the Nation group, deny that Mr. Williams was quoted out of context when he arrived in Nairobi last Tuesday.

At an airport press conference, Mr. Williams said: "The new American administration recommends self-determination for the countries of Africa, including South Africa and the Rhodesias—self-determination means Africa for the Africans."

Not until his departure on Thursday did Mr. Williams explain that "Africa for the Africans" included non-Africans.

Rightwing British Tory Members of Parliament will, it is understood, base their attack on Mr. Williams on the following points:

1. His original "Africa for the Africans" statement;

2. His behavior at a cocktail party given by the U.S. consul in Nairobi at which it is alleged white guests were "snubbed."

3. His remarks in Uganda to the effect that British "tyranny" might be replaced by another tyranny. Mr. Williams immediately withdrew this remark.

PLAYING TO THE GALLERY

From the inception of this newspaper nearly 1 year ago we have made no secret of our belief that the majority of the people of east Africa must as soon as possible rule their own countries.

And in our view the term "as soon as possible" means whenever it becomes apparent that the transfer of power from Her Majesty's Government will not be accompanied by disorder, but will entail the acceptance of responsibility by a government capable of ruling in a manner generally accepted as civilized.

However, the fact that we hold this view on uhuru, independence, self-determination—call it what you will—does not imply that we should hesitate in describing the sentiments uttered by Mr. G. Mennen Williams last week as downright irresponsible foolishness.

Mr. Williams, the Assistant Secretary for African Affairs in Mr. Kennedy's "new look" American Cabinet, during his brief visit to Kenya last week delivered himself of the trite "Africa for the Africans" as being the current American policy on Africa.

This sounded suspiciously like playing to the gallery, but if by this slogan Mr. Williams meant that colonial rule should vanish to be replaced by majority rule we would obviously have no quarrel with him.

But then Mr. Williams went on to say that the "people of Africa should set the pace and set their own objective."

This in a world aghast at the horror of the Congo wherein an unprepared people "set their own pace" in a headlong rush to a free state of bloody anarchy.

And by the same yardstick Mr. Williams would, presumably, have urged the British Government to agree to the recent secession declaration by the Buganda Lukiiko. That British assent to Buganda secession would be catastrophic for the whole of Uganda cannot be denied, but certainly the Buganda were setting their own pace.

That Mr. Williams, speaking on behalf of America's new President, should consider such remarks suitable for utterance in British-controlled territories of Africa is quite inexplicable. He must have been aware that Britain's policy is to remove the red from the map of the world as fast as possible.

There is no doubt that independence is very near for all of East Africa, but the path to that desirable political condition will not be smoothed by the remarks of Mr. Kennedy's representative which savour of an attitude to colonial problems we thought had died, even in America, when India and Pakistan were relieved of the weight of the British Raj 13 years ago.

California Assemblyman Attacks Narcotics Problem in the State of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, as you know, the narcotics problem continues to be one of the very serious ones facing our beloved Nation, particularly so where it relates to the young people of America. In my native State of California, the legislature is being very active in the premises.

Following is a copy of an assembly joint resolution introduced by Messrs. George A. Willson, Chapel, Bradley, Carrell, House, Munnell, Petris, Sumner, and Thelin, on February 6, 1961, relative to international traffic in narcotics:

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 14

Joint resolution relative to international traffic in narcotics

Whereas it has been reliably estimated that over 70 percent of the heroin that reaches our State is derived from opium poppy fields in Mexico; and

Whereas it has been reliably estimated that over 90 percent of the marijuana found in this State is illegally smuggled across the border from Mexico; and

Whereas the enforcement problem at the border is aggravated by the large amount of traffic that crosses the border, the annual traffic across the United States-Mexico border having been as high as in excess of 6 million vehicles and nearly 18 million passengers and in excess of 5 million pedestrians; and

Whereas the control of the smuggling of narcotics and the negotiating of cooperative agreements with friendly nations to eliminate the source of narcotics is a Federal responsibility; and

Whereas one of the acknowledged requirements for the solution of narcotics problems is drying up the source of narcotics; and

Whereas measures which would substantially reduce traffic across the border would also aid enforcement of the narcotics laws, and such measures can effectively be taken

only by the Government of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President of the States and the Congress of the United States to consider the negotiation and adoption of treaties with the purpose of controlling more effectively the import, export, manufacture, and use of heroin and marijuana, as between Mexico and the United States, with particular reference to California, and to consider the enactment of legislation, including, but not limited to legislation requiring visas or identification and legislation limiting the number of crossings of the border by any one person that shall be permitted, designed to reduce traffic across the border, in order that law-enforcement authorities can better cope with the narcotics problem, and to consider the appropriation of greater sums for patrol of the border; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

Also, I wish to call to your attention, and the attention of my other distinguished colleagues, assembly bill No. 1688, introduced by Assemblyman George A. Willson, a distinguished assemblyman from the great 23d District which I represent this my 15th year in this great legislative body. It is "An act to add chapter 8—commencing with section 11850—to division 10 of the health and safety code, relating to commitment of narcotic addicts, and making an appropriation." I also bring to your attention Assemblyman Willson's press release in the premises. It is informative and timely.

AN ACT TO ADD CHAPTER 8

Chapter 8 (commencing with sec. 11850) to division 10 of the health and safety code, relating to commitment of narcotic addicts, and making an appropriation

SECTION 1. Chapter 8 (commencing with sec. 11850) is added to division 10 of the health and safety code, to read:

"CHAPTER 8. STATE INSTITUTIONS FOR NARCOTIC ADDICTS

"Article 1. Administration

"11850. As used in this chapter, 'director' means the director of correction; 'State narcotic hospital' refers to the institution established under article 1 of this chapter; and 'narcotic addict' means a person who habitually uses, to the extent of having lost the power of self-control, heroin, morphine, opium, or any opium derivative.

"11851. The director shall establish and maintain an institution, to be known as the State narcotic hospital, for confinement and treatment of narcotic addicts committed to the custody of the director pursuant to this chapter.

"11852. The director may accept contributions from the United States or from any other governmental entity to be used for construction and equipping of the State narcotic hospital.

"11853. The director shall appoint, subject to civil service, a superintendent for the State narcotic hospital and such officers and employees as may be necessary.

"11854. The director shall adopt rules and regulations as necessary for administration of this chapter.

"11855. The director must accept any person committed to his custody pursuant to this chapter.

"11856. The director shall maintain, in the State narcotic hospital, a program designed to diagnose the causes of narcotic addiction in the inmates of the hospital and to rehabilitate such inmates, if possible, to the extent that they can be released with the probability, that, under parole supervision, they will not return to the use of narcotics.

"11857. At such time as he concludes that the conditions for release described in section 11856 have been met, the superintendent may release an inmate on parole, subject to such reasonable terms and conditions as the superintendent shall prescribe. Such parole shall continue for the duration of the life of the parolee, or until such time as he is returned to the State narcotic hospital pursuant to section 11859.

"11858. Parole pursuant to this article shall be administered by the division of adult paroles, department of corrections, under the supervision of the director of corrections.

"11859. The chief of the division of adult paroles shall advise the superintendent of the State narcotic hospital of any violation by a parolee of the terms and conditions of his parole. If the superintendent concludes that the violation is of such a nature as to necessitate resumption of confinement of the parolee, he shall issue an order requiring the return of the parolee to the State narcotic hospital. Such order shall be sufficient authority for any peace officer to take the parolee into custody and return him to the State narcotic hospital.

"Article 2. Commitment to State narcotic hospital

"11875. The district attorney of a county may file with the superior court a verified petition alleging that there is in the county a narcotic addict, and petitioning the court to commit such alleged narcotic addict to the State narcotic hospital. Supporting affidavits may be submitted with the petition and such affidavits and testimonial evidence may be required by the court before it takes action pursuant to section 11876.

"11876. If the court finds that there is no probable cause for believing the person who is the subject of the petition to be a narcotic addict, it shall dismiss the petition. If it concludes that there is probable cause for believing such person to be a narcotic it shall issue to a peace officer a warrant directing that the person be apprehended and brought before the court. Thereafter, proceedings shall be had in the same manner as if such person had been arrested on a warrant for a felony, and such person shall have the same rights as in a felony prosecution, but apprehension and commitment pursuant to this article shall not be deemed an arrest for and conviction of a crime.

"11877. If upon the trial, it is the verdict of the jury, or if the trial is without a jury, the court finds, that the person who is the subject of the petition is a narcotic addict, it shall order him committed for life to the custody of the director of corrections, for confinement in the State narcotic hospital, with the right of parole provided in article 1."

SEC. 2. The sum of ____ dollars ($____), or so much thereof as may be necessary, is appropriated from the general fund for the construction, equipping, and operation of the State narcotic hospital pursuant to chapter 8 (commencing with sec. 11850) of division 10 of the Health and Safety Code.

PRESS RELEASE

Assemblyman George A. Willson has introduced assembly bill No. 1688, calling for the creation of a State narcotics hospital for the confinement of narcotics addicts. The State hospital would be placed under the control and supervision of the department of corrections where, the assemblyman said, "the highest security from narcotics can be achieved."

"The object of the bill," said Assemblyman Willson, "is to take the narcotic addict off of our streets and confine him in a State hospital dedicated solely to the 'drying out' and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts." Persons charged with narcotic addiction would not be committed to the State narcotic hospital unless filed against by the district attorney and convicted under due process of law. A conviction under this new law would require the imposition of an indefinite sentence, placing the narcotic addict under an indefinite supervision of the department of corrections of the division of adult parole.

Assemblyman Willson further stated that he believes his bill would substantially reduce the public risk of further infection of others by narcotic addicts and will soon reduce the cost of crime where addiction is prevalent.

While the bill, in its present form, does not designate the amount of money to be appropriated for the creation of a narcotic hospital, Assemblyman Willson believes that a 600-unit narcotic hospital with provision for an addition of 600 units would constitute a capital outlay of some $7 million. Such a hospital should be located in southern California and properly in the Los Angeles area where it would be accessible to transportation, employment opportunities, doctors, and medical schools so that addicts on a rehabilitation program might be more effectively treated.

This program, said Assemblyman Willson, contemplates a compulsory treatment as distinct from our Federal narcotic institutions which are presently run mainly on a voluntary basis. The addict would be compelled to undertake a drying-out period and treatment for some 5 to 6 months during which time the physical dependency on the drug would be cured and the addict's rehabilitation encouraged by the treatment of proper food, exercise, and work. If, in the opinion of the department of corrections, such a person would be a good subject for the present narcotic treatment control program then he might be released on a daytime parole program which would permit early detection and immediate reconfinement.

The bill provides for a contribution toward the cost of creation of a hospital from both the county, State, and Federal Governments. Said Willson, this problem is not only State and countywide but involves the Federal Government and the assemblyman stated he would actively seek financial aid for this program from Congress and that he has already written a letter embodying the proposed program to Congressman CLYDE DOYLE of the 23d Congressional District.

In conclusion, Assemblyman Willson stated that all of the evidence at hand at the present time indicates that the narcotic addict first develops a dependence upon the drug followed by a tolerance and as the tolerance of the human body increases the victim is forced to increase the dosage to obtain his illicit pleasure. For this reason, the common addict cannot live on a maintenance dosage and hence must be forced to be hospitalized and treated in order to avoid danger both to himself and to others.

"The indeterminate sentence," said Willson, "will be a method of reducing costs to the taxpayer and the enforcement of our narcotic laws." The addict who violates his parole will be returned to the State hospital without the necessity of a new trial which would require the time of the district attorney's office and defense attorneys and the usual costs of litigation.

It is the prediction and hope of the assemblyman that this law will become an effective tool in reducing both narcotics addiction and the high cost of crime to the people of California.

Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to call this material on narcotics to the attention of yourself and the Members of this august body.

Appendix

Mission to Berlin: Summer of 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MILTON W. GLENN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, the following is a summary of a visit to four West German cities made by Rabbi Martin M. Weitz, DD., Ph. D., during the latter part of July 1960, upon invitation of the Ventnor Foundation, in New Jersey, interested in bringing hundreds of medical students from several countries of Europe for a year's internship in American hospitals and institutions. This foundation is chairmaned by Dr. Isadore Ravdin, of Philadelphia, Pa., and directed by Dr. and Mrs. Hilton S. Read, of Ventnor City, N.J., and has sponsored over 500 such interns from West Germany alone. Upon invitation of the foundation, Rabbi Weitz was invited to visit with individual doctors and with available groups who are graduates of its programs, and spotcheck current situations and surface exposures and report on the value—or lack of it—for continuation of such a program in West Germany, especially in view of recent swastika outbreaks in Cologne and elsewhere since December 1959. The summary of Rabbi Weitz follows:

After an invitation had been extended for a 17-day itinerary for a visit to the State of Israel, July of 1960, it was in the nature of a pleasant surprise, hesitant challenge and bold resolve, to have it followed by a different type of invitation, for an entirely different purpose. When an invitation was received, as a result of a casual conversation one day, from Dr. Hilton S. Read, it was indeed for a larger purpose beyond fugitive emotions regarding past tragedies and present tribulations. If faith has any sanctity and freedom has any validity, surely our reply must be affirmative, we thought, especially if it means finding a few more islands of stability in a sea of chaos, and even, in a small and limited way, helping to secure better foundations across whatever barriers there are—for none can deny deep barriers—on the very lives and labors of the Conrad Adenauers and Willi Brandts and countless others, including the hundreds of American-exposed interns brought last decade by the Ventnor Foundation, and now German physicians and surgeons who may be able to help keep West Germany free—free from any kind of tyranny and free for humanity. Shall we keep on hating, regardless of provocation, to the end of our days—or shall we attempt to discover those few or many Germans who were also victims of the same hate and who now are trying to rebuild their lives, the nation and the world, simultaneously free from hate?

The late great lamented rabbi of Berlin, Leo Baeck, answered this question for all of us of lesser stature, when, released from Thieresenstadt Concentration Camp near the end of the war, he restrained his fellow-inmates and victims from tearing apart their captured captors, as he confronted them, "Do not vent your hate, for hatred will not destroy our enemies—it will destroy us first."

My first stop was Cologne. Cologne is not only a cathedral city, graced as it is by its magnificent sky-searching cathedrals and many lesser shrines of Romanesque, Gothic, and also modern designs, but is a university city, home of the third oldest university of Europe. Cologne—or Koln—on the banks of the Rhine, was a port city in Roman days, a walled ramport in medieval days, and a metropolis of great size and stature in modern days.

"To appreciate its full historic significance, one need not glance upward to the spiral heights of its giant cathedral, but take a long walk and look under its new municipal townhouse and see four layers of history, vaulted in cement bridgework to preserve these ancient pre-Roman, Roman and medieval excavations and foundations and yet support the magnificent, adequate and thoroughly modern and modernistic city hall above these subterranean levels of history. Nearby, as an extension to this giant concrete grotto is recently uncovered "ghetto" area, especially Jewish mikveh or "ritualarium," which reminds us that Jews were on the banks of the Rhine long before Germans were, for ancient documents attest to the historic fact that Jews petitioned Constantine the Great, Emperor of Rome in the year 321 C.E., for permission to build a synagogue on the banks of the Rhine, near Cologne: This was the very setting—and in the near future it, too, will be encased and enshrined in glass above the excavation, with a new edifice atop this Roman-era Jewish life-arena. Cologne still has its three—ring ramparts of ancient, medieval, and modern—cities in one, and a vast parklike circumference, established by Konrad Adenauer when mayor of the city before he was taken into custody by Hitlerism. It helps filter industrial smoke, conserve land and provide scenic landscape.

Of general Jewish interest was a visit to the rebuilt Cologne synagogue, upon which was daubbed the first of the swastikas in the epidemic of last December; a conversation with the chief rabbi of North Rhine Westphalia who was present and attendance with him at a funeral he conducted for a returnee at the Jewish cemetery of Cologne, which has stones in its walls dating back to 11's.

In the heart of Cologne is the Museum of Cologne History, and a prominent and proud section on its second floor is a generous display of Torah covers. Torah mantels and pointers, Kiddush cups, Passover plates and scrolls, and other sacred objects, all of them presented to the museum by German citizens who hid them for their Jewish friends in their homes, churches, and cemeteries for many years. Not far away is a monument, subtle and sad, yet steadfast—"Mother and Child," in tribute to a Jewish family, all of whose seven members were martyred by Hitlerism on that very site.

Perhaps the most meaningful visit of all was an early morning conference with Dr. Theo Burauen, burgermeister, mayor of Cologne. I presented him with a golden key from the Honorable Joseph Altman, mayor of Atlantic City, and he presented me with several original works, "The Jews of Cologne," and "Cologne—Old and New in Sacred and Secural Art," inscribed and autographed.

We had a long conversation on things, ideas, and people. Indeed here was a man of destiny and decision. He told of his recent and forthcoming visits to Israel, his endless inspiration from it, his insistence—in higher policy levels of his own government—that West Germany forthwith recognize the State of Israel regardless of so-called Realpolitik and insist on pursuit of justice, which is, in reality, the highest politics, his constant encouragement of the many pilgramages by thousands of German youth to local shrines in memory of Anne Frank and her parallels, and beyond that, visits to distant Israel itself for an understanding of the Jews they never knew nor met throughout their young years, as expiation for a new generation. He helped over 1,000 youths participate in this new kind of Aliyah. We learned from him, also, in response to our inquiries, that two youths were responsible for the swastikas on the Cologne synagogue, that they are in custody and are under psychiatric treatment.

Some tentative, yet major, impressions and evaluations that followed us and fermented within us as we took air flight from West Germany, and saw an air view of the total life we experienced, the events we shared, the people we queried, the sights we beheld, the sounds—pleasant and unpleasant—we heard are as follows:

1. An exposure in cross section to approximately 50 alumni of the Ventnor Foundation in cities as Cologne and Berlin, of the 500 from West Germany this past decade, is a convincing commitment that each American intern—now a German doctor—has found his year in America, in the language of one, "a can-opening experience," with unquestionable dividends for democracy, freedom from medical paternalism at best, and authoritarianism at worst, willingness to learn from all sources and find in all peoples, emergent fraternity and fellowship. Some even had a great sense of guilt for all Germany and a need for expiation in helpful medical assignments in Jewish hospitals, homes for the aged, etc. Very few exceptions still have to struggle to overcome previous patterns of prejudice. Most are eager and anxious to free Jews and themselves from any leftover fears. We strongly commend the Ventnor Foundation and recommend its continuation, and that it widen its number by including more available medical personnel from smaller and newer countries, as Israel in the Near East, Ghana in Africa, Burma in Asia, and, newest of all, Cyprus in the Mediterranean, and also deepen its significance by quarterly or annual extension courses on not only medical but great human themes, to keep them all alive and alert, ever sensitive to human and humane issues as well as to personal medical advancement.

2. There seem to be several levels of psyche in the dynamism of culture, expansionism of commerce, and absorptionism of all manner of refugees that is West Germany today. In the muddy bottoms of this turbulent Rhine may be unknown primordial sediment of nazism, acquiescent currently, to be sure, and subdued generally, but which may reappear in chaos and crisis. This includes unregenerate Nazis, crackpots, swastika smearers, etc.

Above it, in the shallow flow of river bottom, moving sluggishly and in mystical moody shadows, living in a Nibelungenlied of their own, are those who go along with the stream because it is the best thing to do—now—who follow the new order as they did the old, who appreciate security (economic) more than liberty (political), who, as civil servants, teachers, government clerks, and others, want to serve their fatherland without necessarily liberating themselves. Their numbers are legion but not formidable; they may yet learn the truth, as it were, but when they do, it may teach them to be free—in the larger sense—free even from themselves. On the surface and at the cutting edges of shorelines is the full tide of the contemporary current. It has urgency, foam-crested energy, and full play of sunlight. It carries the real traffic today. In this tide are 13 millions of new refugees from the East Zone and its areas who have remade Germany within as well as without. Here, too, are the graduates of the Ventnor Foundation, over 500 of them, who have been touched by distant stars and find a way to a new day in an emergent brotherhood. Here, too, are the new leaders, as Konrad Adenauer in Bonn, Willi Brandt, and A. Albertz and Tiburtius in Berlin, and Theo. Brauer and Siegfried Ikenberg in Cologne, who have commitments to conscience as well as commerce.

Here, too, are the "new-old refugees" Jewish returnees, 30,000 of them, who dare to come back, after everything, and help West Germany become civilized as never before.

3. Why do so many Jews return?

Among the many reasons no doubt, these would be major: (1) the Federal Republic of Germany has deliberately attempted to make amends to the Jewish people for the suffering inflicted by the hated Nazi predecessors. This it has done throughout West Germany, by rebuilding Jewish synagogues, hospitals and other institutions, by encouraging growth of Jewish communities, by material compensation to all victims and their survivors wherever they be, by reparations to the State of Israel in helpful settlement of homeless Jews and, lest we forget Adenauer's Germany refused to clamp sanctions or end reparations to Israel when even the United States stopped the Sinai invasion. Then, too, Adenauer and Ben Gurion themselves created a new moral climate for West Germany, Israel, and the world at large, even as late as 1960 when they met at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel in New York City. (2) Anti-Semitism is not tolerated in West Germany. Its constitutions, Federal and State, its penal codes are vigorous safeguards for all minorities and individuals, and are in high lineage of Goethe and Lessing, not of Bismarck and Hitler.

The "basic law" is specific for "dignity of man" protection of individual and group against blasphemy (No. 166), slander (No. 185), desecration of holy places (No. 304), spreading nazism or anti-Semitism in action or utterance (Nos. 52, 58) even against the use of Hitler salute. Recent expressions by trade unions, Lutheran Church, German war invalids, and widespread solid reaction to anti-Semitic incidents December 1959, as well as many positive, new units as societies of Christians and Jews and rewriting all curricula for youth, are healthy barometers and as welcome mats in one, not only for German "refugees" from the East, but Jewish "returnees" from the West. As a Jewish judge in Cologne explained it: "We have no children. We knew no other home. We were tendered this unusual invitation to serve as judge in a high court and also to help our own people help themselves."

4. Since Jerusalem and Berlin were the highpoints of this exciting itinerary turned pilgrimage, because of these two cities primarily, we find that these two great cities, though deeply different, do indeed have much common ground (as we observed in our response at the luncheon by the Senate of Berlin):

(a) Jerusalem faces the East while New Jerusalem faces the West—so with Berlin;

(b) Old Jerusalem faces the East while New Jerusalem faces the West—so with Berlin;

(c) Jerusalem is almost surrounded by enemy territory—so is Berlin, completely so;

(d) Jerusalem lost its Hebrew University atop Mount Scopus, and is in process of completing a new Hebrew University in the Kiryah area of the West—so Berlin lost its university (now renamed Humboldt in East Berlin) and is in process of completing its Free University in West Berlin;

(e) Jerusalem is continuously welcoming refugees from many lands of the world during the last 15 years—so Berlin is welcoming refugees from many lands of the east during the last 15 years;

(f) Jerusalem has been sustained in great measure by a helping hand and understanding heart from America—so has Berlin.

(g) Jerusalem has its Mandelbaum Gate that makes it a city divided and keeps it an outpost of freedom—so Berlin has its Brandenburg Gate, is a city divided and an outpost of freedom.

(h) In Jerusalem, in Hebrew University, is a great fragment of immortality called the "theory of relativity"; in Berlin is the Wilhelm Institute where its author, Dr. Albert Einstein may first have written his theory while serving as its director. Perhaps it was in Berlin when he commented:

"If my theory works, the French will call me a Jew, while the Germans will call me a German; if it fails the French will call me a German, while the Germans will call me a Jew."

Perhaps the reverse is now true. Perhaps history has changed since France and Germany are such good friends, and the Rhine is no longer a barrier, but a bridge. Is it not all a matter of relativity?

Connecticut and New Federal Judgeships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRESCOTT BUSH
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the New Haven Register of March 6, 1961, entitled "Connecticut and New Federal Judgeships," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONNECTICUT AND NEW FEDERAL JUDGESHIPS

The just passed Senate bill creating 73 new Federal judgeships is particularly significant for Connecticut because of the heavy backlog of cases in our Federal district court. We must now hope that the House of Representatives will take equivalent action, and soon, on creating at least the 59 judgeships which have been recommended as essential by the Judicial Conference of the United States.

It is unfortunate that the judgeships have become involved in political maneuver between Democrats and Republicans. It is regrettable that the Democrats last year refused to act on the same measure, even when President Eisenhower guaranteed an equal sharing in the patronage involved. But at this point the overwhelming need is for judges themselves, and every week spent in further partisan pulling and hauling is a burden upon the whole body of Federal justice.

The fruits of delay are shown in striking terms here in the Federal district of Connecticut.

At the beginning of this year there were 100 criminal cases pending in our Federal court district, involving over 200 defendants. A year ago there were 44 cases, with 54 defendants. On the civil side—which must wait upon the criminal business of the court—there were 765 civil cases pending as 1961 opened. Last year the number was almost the same. But 10 years ago there were only 296 civil cases awaiting disposition, and 20 years ago—in 1940—the total civil backlog was 180 cases.

Since 1927 there have been two judges assigned to the Federal district of Connecticut—and in that time cases pending have increased by 400 percent.

Obviously the concept of justice begins to falter when the time element in court cases—which is in itself a significant factor in the provision of individual justice—stretches out into months and years. The median time from filing to disposition in our Federal district last year was 25.8 months. In 1952 a case could be filed, and heard, and disposed of within 8 months.

There are innumerable other evidences of how badly Connecticut needs the two Federal judgeships which the current legislation provides.

They have all been presented to the Judicial Conference, to the White House, and to the Congress.

Action in the House is the step needed now.

After that the issue will become hotly political as the judgeships themselves are filled. The Kennedy administration can meet its responsibilities only if it fills these judgeships with minimum concern for political acceptability and with maximum concern for legal capacity and personal integrity.

Act of Assassination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, facts concerning the Soviet attack on the American RB–47 reconnaissance plane are coming slowly to the public's attention. I feel that the editorial in the Chicago American of March 5, 1961, entitled "Act of Assassination," is a penetrating and thought-provoking analysis of the matter:

ACT OF ASSASSINATION

Now that the two captains who survived the shooting down of the American B–47 reconnaissance plane have told how it happened, the horrifying nature of the incident is clear: The attack was made simply for the purpose of keeping alive the propaganda uproar which Premier Khrushchev had raised over the U–2 flights.

To keep the hysterical campaign of accusation going, Khrushchev needed another American spy plane. Since there wasn't any, it was decided to destroy the RB–47, which was flying offshore from Russia over the Barents Sea on a perfectly legal mission, and then charge that the plane had been flying over Russian territory.

The Russians probably expected that all members of the RB–47's crew would be killed. However, Khrushchev did not let the fact that Capts. Freeman Olmstead and John McKone survived discourage him from launching his shameless lie anyway. Olmstead and McKone could not refute his charges of spying at the time because they were in prison in Moscow. But they have refuted them now.

In their press conference Friday, they said the Russian Mig fighter plane that attacked them July 1, 1960, came out over the sea and circled the American aircraft, trying to crowd it in toward the Russian shore. Failing in that, the Mig dropped behind the RB–47 and shot it down.

This was a cold and inhumanly cruel act of assassination. Only those Americans who have soft spots in their heads can feel that this country owes Khrushchev tearful gratitude for setting McKone and Olmstead free for propaganda purposes of his own after holding them prisoners illegally for 7 months.

But the United States does owe it to its national self-respect to demand that Russia apologize for the attack and pay reparations to the families of lost American airmen.

Highway Problems in Kentucky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Hon. Henry Ward, Commissioner of the Department of Highways for the Commonwealth of Kentucky. Mr. Ward has very comprehensively stated our problems in Kentucky and I think that the same situation prevails in some other States. I am sure that my colleagues will find Mr. Ward's observations of interest.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY,
DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS,
Frankfort, February 27, 1961.

Hon. THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORTON: Considerable public misunderstanding has been created in Kentucky by press reports which indicate that additional funds have been made available by the Federal Government for highway construction purposes in this State. I am sure you are aware of the fact that no extra Federal money has been allocated to Kentucky, either through any action by President Kennedy or by Congress.

The misunderstanding has arisen from a statement made in February by President Kennedy that he had authorized the States to proceed now to advertise highway construction contracts against the fourth quarter allotment of Federal funds. The allotment normally would not have been available until April 1. However, this did not represent any increase in available funds to Kentucky. We knew that the money would be available to us April 1, and we had already made plans to utilize it.

In fact, Kentucky had moved to expedite highway construction long before the President issued his statement. When the voters of the State last November approved a $90 million bond issue to provide State money to match Federal aid funds, we decided to speed up the roadbuilding program by advancing from bond money funds to pay the full cost of projects available for State-Federal financing, even though we knew that we would have to wait for reimbursement of the Federal share. Because of this decision, we made plans to award contracts for highway work that will total approximately $30 million more than the total would have been if we had not had the bond money available for this purpose and if we had not elected to "gamble" on the reimbursement of Federal funds.

I am sure that part of the public misunderstanding of this situation arises from the complicated procedures under which the Federal funds are made available for highway construction. As you know, Federal funds are apportioned among the States on a formula based on several factors. The States are notified annually of the amount of this apportionment. However, under the Byrd amendment to the Federal legislation, the States are not guaranteed that they will be reimbursed up to the full amount of the apportionment unless receipts from taxes which go into the Federal highway trust fund equal the amount of the apportionment. For the past several years, the amount which the Bureau of Public Roads has certified as being available each year for reimbursement has been less than the full amount of the apportionment. The difference was held in reserve for the States. Kentucky had accumulated approximately $30 million as the difference between the apportionment and the reimbursable amounts.

I was told last November by the Bureau of Public Roads that Kentucky could go ahead and let contracts against this balance, with the understanding that we would not be reimbursed the Federal share of the project until money was available in the Federal highway trust fund. A decision was made to proceed on this basis in order to expedite roadbuilding in Kentucky, and I referred to this above as our gamble. I am confident that the taxpayers of Kentucky approve what I regard as a sound financing decision.

The net effect of this situation is that we cannot provide for further expediting of the Federal aid highway program in Kentucky unless additional Federal funds are made available.

In fact, as a result of the 1960 census which showed that Kentucky did not keep pace with other States in population gains, we actually are receiving less Federal money. As you well know, Kentucky faces the loss of a congressional seat for the same reason.

Under the formula based on the 1950 census, Kentucky would have received a total of $15,632,887 in Federal funds for 1960–61 for the primary, urban, and Federal secondary programs. The same formula, applied to the 1960 census figures, will produce only $14,893,025 for Kentucky for the same programs.

Kentucky matches these Federal funds with State funds, on a 50 to 50 basis. This means that, for the 1960–61 fiscal year, we have a total of $29,786,050 for Federal aid primary, urban, and secondary highways in our State. These figures, of course, do not include allocations for the Interstate Highway System, since funds for this purpose are restricted to the highways on the limited Interstate System.

With only $29,786,050 of Federal and State funds available each year, the Kentucky-Federal primary, urban, and secondary highways cannot be improved to satisfactory standards within the lifetime of most of us. This is the critical problem that addresses itself to all of us who are concerned with this program which is so vital to the economic development of our State and to the welfare of our fellow citizens.

The Automotive Safety Foundation study of Kentucky highway needs, which was conducted over a period of 2 years and completed in 1955, estimated that $110 million would be required annually in Federal and State funds to bring the Federal primary, urban, and secondary highways up to desirable standards within 10 years. Since 1955, we have made some good progress toward the improvement of highways on the Federal aid systems. However, 1,937 miles of highways have been added to the State system since then, and many hundreds of miles need to be added to the Federal aid system.

Even a conservative estimate would indicate that it would take $100 million a year for 10 years to bring the Federal aid system up to standards which would serve the needs of Kentucky.

Under the present financing plan, we will have an estimated $29,786,050 a year to accomplish this task. At this rate, it would take 34 years to get the job done. By the end of that time, thousands of miles of roads that had been approved at the beginning of the program would have become outmoded and woefully inadequate.

This problem is not confined to what might be classified as the distressed or underdeveloped areas of Kentucky. It exists in every area of our State—in every county.

There are 19,091 miles of highways on the Federal aid system in Kentucky. Of this total, 3,852 are on the primary system, including urban extensions, and 15,239 are on the Federal secondary system. On the basis of the automotive safety study and reviews conducted by the department of highways since its completion, 9,210.2 miles of the total of 19,089.5 are classified as deficient when compared to the standards to which they should be built.

Kentucky cannot correct these deficiencies within the funds available to the department of highways in a period of time that would meet the needs of out State.

I am not suggesting that we are seeking to transfer this whole problem to Washington. It is one that all of us as Kentuckians need to know about, however, so that we may work together to seek it solution.

Yours very truly,

HENRY WARD,
Commissioner.

National Commander of AMVETS: Harold Russell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the national commander of AMVETS, Harold Russell, was presented to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs this morning by our distinguished majority leader, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK. Mr. Russell offered testimony which was of great significance and will be a real help to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Under unanimous con-

sent, I include it as a part of my remarks:

STATEMENT OF HAROLD RUSSELL, NATIONAL COMMANDER, AMVETS, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, ON AMVETS' 1961 LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM, MARCH 8, 1961

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I deeply appreciate your courtesy in granting me the opportunity to appear today for the purpose of presenting the highlights of AMVETS' legislative program for 1961. Having been engaged in the activities of organized veterans since the end of World War II, I am not entirely unfamiliar with the many accomplishments of this committee on behalf of the Nation's war veterans and their dependents. I can assure you that I am highly honored by this privilege today.

AMVETS have been in existence only 17 years, but in this short time have evolved an important philosophy—a philosophy that recognizes that the veteran has a vital stake in the economy of the Nation. He has an obligation as a citizen, as well as a veteran, and he is not entitled to burden the Nation's economy with unreasonable demands—demands that cannot be fully justified. We are interested in perfecting a sound, enduring structure of veterans' benefits that will discharge—adequately and properly—the Nation's responsibility to its veterans and, at the same time, earn the respect of the American people. In blunt language, we are not interested in milking the public treasury, and violently oppose those who are. Rather, we seek only a benefit structure that will enable the veterans to live self-sufficiently, with dignity, and contribute to his maximum ability to the welfare of the Nation.

Inherent in the responsibilities of this committee is the overriding problem of deciding how best and most equitably the moneys available for direct veterans' benefits can be distributed. If there were available an unlimited supply of funds to meet all the needs and all the demands of all veterans, this indeed would be no problem. In the absence of this Utopian concept, however, this committee must address itself to the problem of determining which proposals under its jurisdiction have merit and then, equally important, which proposals deserve priority of action.

We of AMVETS are mindful of the economic state of the Nation. We are mindful, too, of our obligations as citizens. Our legislative objectives have been formulated with these considerations in mind.

COMPENSATION

Any consideration of measures benefiting veterans and their survivors must necessarily include a discussion of the rates of compensation for service-connected disability and death. It is the carefully considered opinion of AMVETS that an increase in the rates of compensation for veterans and survivors is deserving of priority attention.

To keep pace with the rising cost of living, we recommend first a nominal increase in the basic rates of compensation. Even more important, however, are the needs of the seriously disabled veteran. Here much remains to be accomplished. It is the feeling of AMVETS that current needs dictate that less emphasis be placed on the so-called "scattergun" approach to compensation, and more emphasis on the "rifle shot." By that I mean that the greatest part of the compensation dollar should be distributed in a manner that recognizes factors other than the immediate degree of disability.

For example, the loss of life expectancy should be considered. It is not unlikely that two disabilities rated at 40 percent could have entirely differing effects. One could shorten the life expectancy of the person afflicted by 5 years, while the other would result in no similar effect. The "scattergun" approach would increase compensation payments to both in the same amount. The "rifle shot" approach would recognize the intangible factor of life expectancy and make compensation payments in differing amounts to the two classes of disabilities.

This committee, in the 86th Congress, gave some recognition to the special needs of the seriously disabled in the passage of Public Law 86–663, the so-called "housebound bill," establishing a new statutory rate of compensation of $265 monthly for those who are totally disabled and are permanently housebound. This proposal recognizes that there are differing degrees of incapacity even among the totally disabled.

Current studies being conducted by the Veterans' Administration have already established the fact that certain disabilities cause a loss in life expectancy. We urge your committee to utilize the results of these studies and to report a bill containing an increase in basic compensation rates as well as an increase in the rates for those disabling conditions that result in a shortening of the life span.

HOSPITALS AND MEDICAL SERVICES

The Veterans' Administration hospital system today operates under a ceiling of 125,000 beds. This appears to be adequate to meet present needs. The average age of World War I veterans is 66 years, while World War II veterans average nearly 42 years of age. As the veteran population ages and their medical needs grow, there will be increasing demands for hospital beds in Veterans' Administration facilities.

A particular problem in accommodating the aged veteran is the great need for facilities to provide intermediate or long term care for chronic disabilities. Persons in this category usually do not require the same degree of active medical care given the more acute cases, and yet they do not meet the requirements for domiciliary care. In short, the need for special facilities to accommodate the chronic long term patient will increase.

In spite of the growing need for facilities to accommodate the chronic, long term patient, the Veterans' Administration hospital system consistently has a substantial number of beds labeled "beds out of active service." At least 1,000 of these "out of service" beds have been retired because of "no patient demand, beds not required." It is patently ridiculous to say there is no patient demand, on the one hand, and then spend unlimited man-hours attempting to solve the health problems of the aging veteran, on the other. We respectfully urge this committee to use its great influence in having these unused beds immediately converted to the care and treatment of the long term chronic patient. Secondly, we recommend that long range plans be developed to permit the Veterans' Administration to more adequately discharge its responsibility to this class of veteran. Unless legislation is enacted creating special facilities for this rapidly growing class of patient, hospital facilities presently designed for active medical care will be greatly overtaxed.

PENSIONS

In August 1959, the 86th Congress enacted Public Law 86–211. This law for the first time incorporated a basically sound philosophy into the non-service-connected pension program—a philosophy that related the payment of pensions to realistic tests of financial need. It was estimated that the new law would benefit more than a million veterans and survivors. For the minority already on the pension rolls that might have suffered a reduction, the law contained a savings provision, a so-called "grandfather's" clause, that permitted them to continue receiving benefits under the old law. Thus, not one single pension payment was reduced by the new law, while the vast majority of pensioners would be entitled to increased payments.

Yet the ink was hardly dry on the President's signature of approval before proposals were being advanced to change the pension program so that greater pensions could be paid to persons with less need. These proposals have continued unabated in the present Congress.

We of AMVETS have studied these proposals in the light of the present system of pensions with its sliding scale of payments based on varying degrees of need. We have studied them with a view to the economic justification; their effect upon the Nation and their effect upon other benefits. Each of these views considered separately leave the impression that these pension proposals are unwise. Considered together, they leave the overpowering conviction that the proposals should be rejected by the Congress as ideas which appear on the surface to be beneficial but which by every yardstick are designed to defeat the very cause they purport to espouse.

Let me make it crystal clear that AMVETS do not oppose the non-service-connected pension program. On the contrary, we are proud of our supportive role in the enactment of Public Law 86–211. This is a sound measure reflecting the coordinated views of this committee, its able staff, the Veterans' Administration and the major veterans organization. It was designed to provide an equitable pension program for the veterans of all wars and their survivors. It does just that.

The single factor that predominates in any discussion of veterans benefits is the tremendous cost of the program. It is inevitable that as unwarranted expenditures for non-service-connected pensions arise, the entire structure of legitimate veterans' benefits will be placed in jeopardy. It will be increasingly difficult to obtain and maintain adequate rates of compensation for service-connected disability and death. A moment ago we mentioned the need for determining priority of legislative action. Certainly, on the theory that first things should be first, we must first take action to assure that the rates of compensation for service-connected disability and death are adequate. We must assure that the Veterans' Administration hospital system retains its "second to none" reputation both in the quality of care and the condition of its physical plant. These are matters that deserve priority attention before embracing additional pension programs that are actually in the nature of a service bonus.

Let those who advocate a new pension program first join in a concerted effort to obtain for pensioners the increased payments already made available through the enactment of Public Law 86–211. Estimates made at the time of enactment of this new pension law indicated that approximately 70 percent or 838,000 of those persons already on the pension rolls would receive an increase in monthly payments if they so elected. Yet, only 255,000 have thus far elected to receive payments under the new law. Studies conducted both in and outside the Veterans' Administration indicate that at least 500,000 to 600,000 additional pensioners would receive an increase if they elected to be paid under Public Law 86–211. We of AMVETS are confident that a vigorous public relations campaign launched by the Veterans' Administration and veterans organizations would result in more pensioners electing to receive the greater benefit awaiting them.

HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION

Undoubtedly, the Veterans' Administration hospital and medical program represents

the greatest single medical project undertaken by any government in the world. It has often been referred to as a "second to none" medical program. To continue enjoying that fine reputation, however, it is necessary that adequate funds be provided each year. This is particularly true in the case of the continuing program of replacement, repair and modernization. Hospitals that are outmoded or badly in need of repair or renovation cannot be operated economically or without unnecessary cost. We were pleased to note that the 1961 Veterans' Administration budget contained funds to permit the launching of a 12-year hospital construction and revitalization program. The budget request for fiscal year 1962 continues this program. Much of the credit for the increase in the tempo of this program rightfully belongs to this committee. We urge that you continue your vigilance and make every effort to see that sufficient funds are appropriated to complete this commendable program in even less time than the proposed 12-year span.

NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED HOSPITALIZATION

Considerable discussion in recent years has centered upon the subject of hospitalization for the treatment of non-service-connected disabilities. Those who oppose non-service-connected hospitalization point to abuses in the program by those seeking admission to a Veterans' Administration hospital when they can well afford to pay for the treatment.

They point to the length of stay in Veterans' Administration hospitals compared with the stay in private hospitals. Length of stay in Veterans' Administration hospitals will be reduced materially as the result of Public Law 86–639 which permits the prehospital workup and laboratory tests as well as treatment required during convalescence on an outpatient basis. AMVETS subscribe wholeheartedly to the theory that veterans should be treated in Veterans' Administration hospitals for non-service-connected disabilities provided they cannot assume the cost of hospitalization and a bed is available. Notwithstanding our support of non-service-connected hospitalization, however, I wish to make it clear that AMVETS will not condone abuses in this program. If a veteran can afford to pay for his non-service-connected hospitalization, he should not occupy a bed at the Federal Government's expense. We believe that abuses of this nature have been held to a minimum in recent years.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

A matter of great interest to AMVETS is the creation of an independent court or board outside the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration for the review of decisions of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs with respect to service-connected disability and death compensation claims. Under the present system of adjudication, the Board of Veterans' Appeals, acting for the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, renders a decision that is final in all respects and not subject to review by the judiciary. Meanwhile, the Veterans' Administration has acted as judge, jury, and counsel for one or both parties.

This situation gives cause for just criticism by veterans whose claims have been denied. It is the opinion of AMVETS that an agency completely independent of the agency that makes the original decision should be established. It is desirable in every program that safeguards be established to prevent unreasonable or arbitrary decisions in the interests of both the citizen and his Government. It is in keeping with the spirit of American political institutions that judicial review should be available to assure that executive action shall not be arbitrary, and that those with claims against the Government may, under prescribed conditions have their day in court.

PEACETIME READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

A problem of some consequence confronting this committee is the matter of benefits for persons who served in the military and naval forces of the Nation after January 31,, 1955.

In the past, the Congress, in providing benefits for former members of the Armed Forces, has been guided by one very important consideration—whether the military service was performed during time of war or in time of peace. Aside from the fact that the wartime serviceman was exposed to extra hazards not normally encountered in a regular tour of duty, it could be assumed that the greater portion of the wartime force was either drafted or volunteered because of the patriotic appeal and a sense of duty to country during a time of peril. In either event, it was clear that military service, in most instances, had interrupted the pursuit of a career in civil life. Thus it followed that special treatment, including benefits to assure their successful reintegration into civil life, was in order for the wartime veteran.

The straight peacetime ex-serviceman, on the other hand, was not exposed to the same hazards of service, nor was he motivated in the same manner in entering military service. In most cases, he voluntarily enlisted in the military because it offered him the career of his choice. The distinction, therefore, between war and peacetime service was crystal clear and the Congress proceeded to grant different benefits to each group.

The status of the group with service after January 31, 1955, is not so well defined. These men are not war veterans nor should they be placed in the straight peacetime service category. For the most part they are not men who analyzed the advantages and disadvantages of a military career and then enlisted through choice. These are men whose civilian pursuits were involuntarily interrupted. They were either drafted or served under the compulsion of the draft. In many instances the service was even more hazardous than that experienced by some war veterans. Yet, they are not entitled to non-service-connected pensions. They cannot be hospitalized for treatment of a non-service-connected disability unless there is also present a service-connected disability. They receive no mustering out pay. They have no entitlement to vocational rehabilitation, education, and training, housing loan guaranty, and other benefits. In short, this is an entirely different category of veteran for whom no precedent with respect to veterans benefits has ever been established.

It is the carefully considered opinion of AMVETS that the post-Korean conflict group is deserving of special consideration, and we urge this committee to address itself to this problem.

CONCLUSION

We have attempted this morning to touch briefly upon AMVETS program for the year. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I should like to submit at this time a digest of the resolutions adopted at AMVETS most recent national convention for inclusion in the record of this hearing.

We welcome the opportunity to appear before this committee from time to time to express our views on veterans' problems. As you embark upon your duties in this year of uncertainty, we wish you well. We pray that you may be blessed with the wisdom and foresight necessary to plot the best course for the millions of veterans and their dependents whom you serve. We pledge to you our cooperation and objective thinking in arriving at our mutual objectives.

Dr. George I. Sanchez, Noted University of Texas Professor, Writes Brilliant New Frontier Policy for the Americas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, because of our close historic and cultural connection with Mexico, my State of Texas has been blessed with a substantial number of leaders who are Americans of Spanish and Mexican descent. One of the most outstanding of these is Dr. George I. Sanchez, a native of New Mexico, who joined the faculty of the University of Texas 20 years ago, as the first professor of Latin American education in the Nation.

For a decade, Dr. Sanchez was chairman of the department of the history of philosophy of education at the University of Texas. During 1943–44 he served with Nelson Rockefeller in the Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, where his record was outstanding.

Because I have personally known Dr. George Sanchez for many years, and have had the high honor of his advice, confidence, and support, I was deeply pleased when President Kennedy named Dr. Sanchez to the extremely important Citizens Committee for a New Frontier Policy in the Americas. His complete understanding of the people of the Americas, his intellectual power and knowledge of the overall problem, his exceptional record of educative service, all serve to make him extremely well qualified for the Committee.

Mr. President, Dr. Sanchez recently wrote a brilliant report on our problems in the Americas and on some of the possible solutions to them. He has by far the finest grasp of our needs jointly with the needs of the people in the Americas, that I have ever read. His argument for more students from the other Americas in U.S. colleges is unanswerable. I strongly urge every member of the Congress to consider it carefully, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Appendix the report in the March 1961 issue of the Alcalde, the University of Texas alumni magazine, published at Austin, Tex., entitled, "A New Frontier Policy for the Americas," by Dr. George Sanchez.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NEW FRONTIER POLICY FOR THE AMERICAS

(By Dr. George I. Sanchez)

During the recent campaign, President John F. Kennedy expressed his conviction that the need was urgent to reestablish the bonds of the Americas, and that the peoples of the Americas join in an alliance for progress.

As an endorsement of that position, and as an organization to advise on its elabora-

tion, there was formed a Citizens Committee for a New Frontier Policy in the Americas. This committee is constituted of 50 individuals who, for many years, have been students of inter-American affairs and who are concerned over the deterioration of our country's status in the other Americas. Among the members of the committee are Adlai E. Stevenson, W. Averell Harriman, Dr. Henry Commager, Dr. Arturo Torres Rioseco, Dr. Frank Tannenbaum, Senator Dennis Chavez, Dr. Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., Senator Wayne Morse, and Judge E. D. Salinas.

Judge Salinas (111th District Court of Texas, a graduate of the School of Law of the University of Texas) and I are the only members from Texas. It is our hope that we can present to the committee views from the unique vantage point that our backgrounds in the Southwest and in Latin America have given us.

My thesis is a perfectly simple one, and one whose validity we are driven to accept by the inexorable trend of events the world over, but particularly in Latin America. That thesis is this: power lies with the masses of the people, and that power in Latin America can no longer be bought and sold over the counter. Further, the masses in Latin America are very seriously disadvantaged and, by fair means or foul, they will not be denied their heritage much longer. The calamity of Cuba, and reverberations elsewhere, testify eloquently to this. The United States, somehow, must find ways of joining hands with those masses in programs to alleviate their urgent needs—their hunger, their sickness, their lack of education. We need to inject ourselves into their situation in ways which do not infringe on their dignity and self-respect, and which leave no doubts as to our humanitarian motives and our desire for genuine, mutual good will.

WE MUST JOIN HANDS WITH THE LATIN AMERICAN MASSES

The big question is: How can this be done? It hardly needs mention that the methods of the recent past do not constitute the answer to this question. Our unilateral judgments of the past, or even our bilateral ones, are poor models upon which to base a new frontier policy in the Americas. We are dealing not with one nation, but with the sentiments of the peoples of all of the Americas and of the world. What we do about Cuba individually, or Argentina, or Venezula, and so on—what we do about one of our American neighbors will characterize us with the peoples of all of the others.

So, we can no longer think of foreign policy for Latin America as that which we can agree upon with the governments currently in power, or with the vested interests that may have put them in office. We are going to have to base our policy on the posture which brings us most closely to the masses of the people of Latin America, on that position which, if necessary, without reference even to the Organization of American States, tells the common man of Latin America that we are his friends de confianza, no matter what the political and economic maneuverings of the moment may seem to make us appear.

In thinking on how to attain this rapport with the Latin American masses I am convinced that in the recent past we have failed to make partners of those who do the most serious thinking in Latin America. We have either ignored these thinkers, the pensadores; or, worse still, we have taken a condescending, patronizing attitude toward them. Understandably, their followers—and, it is well to note that the poet, the university professor, the literary figure in Latin America is high in political stature—reflect the chagrin, the hurt feelings, and the bitterness of the intellectuals. It seems to me that it is time that we had a meeting of minds with such men as Romulo Gallegos (Venezuela), Germán Arciniegas (Colombia), Alfonso Reyes (Mexico), Gilberto Freyre (Brazil), and Luis Muñoz Marín (Puerto Rico). This meeting of minds on the formulation of principles for hemispheric development, on our mutual stake in progress and survival, and on the very bases for mutual understanding could well set the tone for political, economic, and spiritual collaboration.

I am suggesting that we consult with these pensadores, these thinkers of the Western Hemisphere, to determine how we—all of us—can join in the plans for helping the underdeveloped peoples and areas of the Americas. Let us ask the Latin American intellectuals to tell us how we can be of most value in helping the disadvantaged peoples of their countries—without offense to their dignity, without prejudice to our sincerity, and without any stigma of material gain or mean advantage. It is fatuous to think that we in the United States have the answers, and the only answers, to the questions raised in our hemisphere. The pensadores of Latin America have answers, too—and theirs have a firmer base of understanding of the Latin American masses than do ours.

Closely related to the above area in relationships with the rest of the hemisphere is the status of minority groups in the United States. I am thinking particularly of the Spanish-speaking minorities in this country. Our protestations of good faith and of good neighborliness towards Latin Americans are given a hollow ring when, for example, we look upon the plight of the American of Mexican descent in the United States. The fact that our "Latin Americans," almost 2 million of them in Texas alone, are the most disadvantaged minority group here—as measured by any criteria which depict health, wealth, education, and welfare objectively—is not lost upon Mexico, nor upon Latin America as a whole. We even use, cynically, cheap labor from Mexico to further depress the total situation of the Mexican-American, a U.S. citizen, here. It has not been long since many school systems in the Southwest segregated "Mexican" children in the public schools—and, even more recently, some counties systematically excluded U.S. citizens of Mexican descent from service on juries. Again, thees facts are not lost upon our southern neighbors, and we have much to make up, much to undo if we are to be truly convincing when we try to deal with their thinkers and with their masses as we profess good.

One of the most valuable undertakings which should be greatly expanded under a new policy for inter-American solidarity is that of the exchange of students and educators. Many, many more of our teachers and students need to go to Latin America to study there and to collaborate with their fellows in the educative processes there. Even more Latin American students and teachers should come here to study, to teach, to establish bonds of scholarship and of friendship with us. Our current programs to these ends are far from adequate, barely scratching the surface of need and opportunity. Subsidies in much larger amounts and on much more generous terms are sorely needed.

By way of illustration, I have suggested on several occasions through the years that the United States should establish a "student dollar" program to help equalize purchasing power in the field of inter-American education. At present, even well-to-do Latin Americans find it next to impossible to come here to study because of the differences in cost of living, because of prohibitive exchange rates, and the like. It seems to me that we would be making an exceedingly wise investment if we could work out a scheme by which the student from Latin America could be given the same purchasing power (for educational purposes) in the United States that his money would have in his own country. A scheme of this sort would drain no dollars out of the United States, as the visiting scholar would take back to his country only what he had learned here—and, undoubtedly, immense good will. I can think of nothing that would establish bonds of friendship among the Americas more quickly or more firmly than the subsidization of a community of scholars.

Closely allied to the "student dollar" idea is that of outright scholarships to worthy Latin Americans who otherwise could not come to study in this country. I am convinced that we would be very wise, indeed, if we made a special effort to bring here for education bright young men and women from the laboring classes, from the poor of Latin America. Again, the masses of Latin America are rapidly coming into their own—and they will generate leadership for the momentous changes that are surely in store for them. Let us hope that we in the United States have the good sense, the foresight to be wise and generous in participating in the development of that leadership.

We Americans of the north must identify with the Americans of the south. Heretofore, political cliques and economic vested interests could speak for most of those southern Americans. That will soon be a thing of the past for all, as it is already for some. Our new policy needs to be grounded on the fullest understanding of this new departure in hemispheric affairs, and we will need to get our heads together with the best minds of Latin America to see how the peoples of the Americas can form a friendly community, that strives for the common good by joining in an alliance for progress.

Representative Thomas B. Curtis, of Missouri, Looks at Federal Supply

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Honorable THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri, senior Republican representative of the Joint Economic Committee, and senior Republican member of the Subcommittee on Military Procurement, member of the Committee on Ways and Means, made a splendid address on various aspects of Federal supply before the Federal Supply Management Association in Washington, D.C., on February 7, 1961. I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from this speech printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CONGRESSMAN LOOKS AT FEDERAL SUPPLY

Commissioner Bean, I appreciate your generous introduction.

Mr. Eagle, members of the Federal Supply Management Association and guests, it is a pleasure for me to be here with you tonight at your first meeting and to discuss a subject which has been of vital interest to me during the 10 years I have been in Congress.

Before discussing the assigned subject "Congressman Looks at Federal Supply" in detail I should like to express my satisfaction and approval of the fact that the 50 or more members of your association have seen fit on their own initiative to organize a Federal Supply Management Association. I am sure that you have come to the same

conclusion as others who have studied this subject, namely, that there should be a specially trained group organized to raise the management of Federal supply to a high professional level. The broad field of supply management represents the single most important financial and physical element in the security of our country.

According to the Tax Foundation, Inc., in 1932, less than 30 years ago, the per capita tax for all levels of Government totaled $64. The Federal take was $15 or 22.7 percent, the State the same, and the local tax 53.6 percent. So the Federal Government took roughly 23 percent and the State and local governments 77 percent. By 1958 the per capita total tax was $639—almost 10 times that of 1932 and the Federal Government took 71 percent and the State and local governments 29 percent. This complete transposal, mind you, took place in less than 30 years.

SCOPE OF MILITARY SUPPLY OPERATIONS

While there have been some changes in the statistics on military supply operations from a year ago, they have not been great so I will quote a few paragraphs from the report of the Subcommittee on Defense Procurement:

"Military procurement has had a major impact upon the national economy and segments thereof during the past two decades. Procurement of supplies, materials, and weapons amount to $22 to $25 billion per year. From fiscal year 1950 to 1959, inclusive, there have been 38 million procurement transactions with a dollar volume of approximately $228.4 billion.

"Military transportation bills amount to several hundred million dollars annually.

"The inventories of supplies in the many duplicating military supply systems amount to some $44.4 billion and are stored in 585 million square feet of depot space throughout the world.

"The annual cost of maintaining the many military supply systems is conservatively estimated at $2 billion.

"The annual disposal of surpluses according to congressional testimony runs from $8 to $10 billion, with a net return on sales of less than 2 percent of cost. Many of the sales have a serious impact upon portions of the economy." (Report of Subcommittee on Defense Procurement to the Joint Economic Committee, pp. VII–VIII.)

Let us compare these figures with others which will give you a yardstick for measuring them.

General Services Administration

GSA was established after many years of study. It was endorsed by the first Hoover Commission, by the Congress and many outside interests.

The declaration of policy (sec., Public Law 152, 81st Cong.) states its intent: "It is the intent of the Congress in enacting this legislation to provide for the Government an economic and efficient system for procurement * * * utilization of available property * * * disposal of surplus property * * * records management * * *."

It was intended that GSA would act as the general manager in the common areas of property management for the Government.

After 11 years of operation GSA has barely scratched the surface of its intended possibilities.

It stocks 9,000 items compared to 3.4 million in the DOD.

The stores inventories are valued at $51.6 million compared to nearly $50 billion in the DOD.

It has 11 major depots and 2 annexes with a total of 5.7 million square feet of space or about 1 percent of the 585 million square feet in the DOD's numerous supply systems.

According to former Administrator Floete GSA purchases about 3 percent or $833 million in supplies and equipment from a total Government procurement of about $30 billion.

Evidence gathered by the Joint Economic Committee was that GSA is doing a better job than the DOD in the common supplies field.

GSA stocks turn approximately three times per year whereas military stocks are relatively slow turning with resultant deterioration and waste.

GSA buys much more on competitive bids than the military and is more helpful to small business.

I ask this question: "If the supply management functions of the Federal Government had been well organized and managed—I mean—if we had obtained the most from the means and available—how many billions of dollars could we have saved for better uses and what human and natural resources could have been made available for permanent, solid growth purposes?"

I will only say that $2 to $3 billion per year for at least 10 years could have been saved in my opinion. That I believe is a modest estimate.

CONCLUSION

Here is a challenge to the executive branch, the legislative branch and to the Federal Supply Management Association. I commend you for seeing the challenge and wish you the best of success in your efforts to meet it.

Career Employees in the Post Office Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following telegram was received by many members of the New York State delegation in Congress.

As I am in hearty agreement with Mr. Kiess and his associates I am asking that the telegram be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for future reference.

WILLIAMSPORT, PA., *March 6, 1961.*

Hon. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

In your capacity as a member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee I urgently request that you bring an immediate halt to the illegal retirement, downgrading and resignation demand presently being forced through coercion and intimidation upon civil service career employees in the Post Office Department. That these are definite political actions is well known throughout the Nation. We ask that you immediately take the following action for the prompt protection of these victims:

1. Direct the Civil Service Commission to investigate immediately the use of political coercion and intimidation to eliminate key civil service personnel in the Post Office Department, who were appointed or promoted during the last 8 years.

2. Direct the Post Office Department to halt these wholesale dismissals, forced resignations and retirements, and downgradings, which were maneuvered for political reasons, until conclusion of investigation by the Commission and your committee.

3. Direct the Postmaster General to provide you with a list of names of all persons on a departmental and regional level, who have been dismissed, retired, downgraded or forced to resign, or who have been threatened with any one of these actions since taking office. Everyone of the fifteen regional operational directors of the postal service is on that list and is now in the process of being liquidated. If immediate action is not taken they will be removed from office, together with other key civil service personnel who earned their position during the last 8 years. The Republican party provided full civil service protection for all Government personnel during the Eisenhower and Summerfield administrations. Now it is doing nothing to protect Government personnel, appointed or promoted during the aforesaid administration, from the ruthless sabotage of the civil service system in the Post Office Department. This is one of the blackest chapters in our Government's history. Your help is urgently needed. Please advise of any action on your part, giving details.

CLYDE G. KIESS.

(District chairman, Republican State Committee, for Lycoming County, Bradford County, Tioga County, Potter County, Cameron County, Columbia County, Montour County, Sullivan County, Union County, Snyder County, Northumberland County, Clinton County.)

Citation of Harry B. Haines as "Editor of Editors and Publisher of Publishers" in the State of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, a few days ago the Jersey Parade carried a tribute to Harry B. Haines, editor in chief of the Paterson Evening News of Paterson, N.J. Harry Haines has contributed richly to the community not only through his newspaper but in countless acts of civic devotion.

I ask unanimous consent that the column referred to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

HARRY B. HAINES PROCLAIMED "EDITOR OF EDITORS AND PUBLISHER OF PUBLISHERS" AS EDITOR IN CHIEF OF PATERSON EVENING NEWS, OF PATERSON, N.J.

(By M. Martin Turpanjian)

As president of the New Jersey League of Weekly Newspapers, Inc., I take great pride to proclaim Harry B. Haines, editor in chief of the Paterson Evening News, of Paterson, N.J., as the "Editor of editors and publisher of publishers in the State of New Jersey."

Individuality is the precious asset of Harry B. Haines as being the most progressive editor and publisher in the Garden State barring none. His newspaper is fast gaining the stature as being the very best daily newspaper in New Jersey. There is an extraordinary mark of distinction in his clear, coherently phrased editorials and I came to this happy conclusion after having before me New Jersey's 26 daily newspapers. The Paterson Evening News editorials are rich in sound rational philosophy and yet they are clothed in the crystaline garments of captivating simplicity.

Harry B. Haines does not editorialize with an academic pontifical air of dogmatic intellectualism. He does not parade a vast

wordy treatise teeming with vacuous verbosity. He is terse and the clarity of his diction is so impressively simple that his message can be understood by the elemental mass minds.

Harry B. Haines is indeed and in fact the supreme example of the "Editor of editors" as well as the "Publisher of Publishers" for his definitive commonplace phrases are so aptly coined and phrased with such dexterous verbal ability that they literally can penetrate the most elemental mind. It is a real thrill to read his richly phrased literary commentaries because they embody and penetrate the basic truth that in the final analysis the simplified approach to editorial writing never fails to strike the full target of public opinion.

Harry B. Haines stands out preeminently as a supreme editorial individualist. He is definitely incomparable. He is no hackneyed carbon copy imitator. He is no run-of-the-mill-mediocre editorialist. He is not only the living essence of originality but he is gifted inherently with the sheer genius for creative writing.

Harry B. Haines does not bore you with the grim monotony of verbose repetition. He has such an overpowering wealth of knowledge and his brilliancy of observation is so keenly acute that he can depict or picture the complete civic as well as social and educational problems with such a masterly array of sound logic and realistic facts that the general reasoning public can get the full moral impacts of his many editorialized sermons.

In a word Harry B. Haines is no commonplace expounder of the obvious. He is indeed the master of true educationalized editorialized editorials. He is indeed the pride and the outstanding editorial philosopher of the State of New Jersey. He is honored, respected, and loved by the vast majority of the city of Paterson as well as in all other parts of Passaic County and throughout the Garden State.

Harry B. Haines is one of the very few editors throughout the world who honors his late beloved father on the anniversary of his passing away since May 3, 1911.

His gentle dignity and his instinctive humility to his readers and his unselfish service for the promotion of all the civic projects for the general welfare of the citizens of the city of Paterson, the third largest municipality in New Jersey, has endeared Harry B. Haines as civic conscious editor and publisher as a public spirited executive who has become a part—a living dynamic promoter of every program that seeks as its objective a greater, a better, and a more progressive municipal government for the city of Paterson. The people of Paterson are fortunate to have such a personage of majestic moral aspirations molding the public sentiment and opinion of the civic area.

Harry B. Haines has proven to be a dedicated man of destiny for he has a radiant future. He cannot retreat. He is immune to failure. He wields something greater than the sword. His mighty pen can mold and shape human destiny with his editorial illumination.

Committee on Un-American Activities

SPEECH
OF
HON. HAROLD B. McSWEEN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. McSWEEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the full appropriation for the House Committee on Un-American Activities. This committee, under the chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, has done outstanding work. It must continue its vital functions. The committee is indispensable to the Congress and to the American people. Its functions must not be impaired. I strongly support the work of this committee and the appropriation requested in this resolution.

Crash of Air Force Tanker Aircraft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRESCOTT BUSH
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an article from the Hartford Courant of March 2, 1961, entitled "State Airman, Four Others Killed in Tanker Crash," printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE AIRMAN, FOUR OTHERS KILLED IN TANKER CRASH

MOUNT CLEMENS, MICH.—A loaded Air Force tanker plane smashed in a flaming smear across a busy highway here, destroying two buildings while narrowly missing a tavern and a tulip farm home.

Five crew members, one from Manchester, Conn., died in the flames.

The pilot, 1st Lt. John C. Bibble, 24, of Urbana, Ill., had just veered his stricken ship, loaded with 6,000 gallons of jet fuel and 3,500 gallons of her own fuel, away from a crowded housing project.

UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT GRADUATE

First Lt. Robert L. Lewis, 24, of Manchester, Conn., was the navigator aboard the stricken craft. Killed with Lewis and Bibble were Capt. Lydell M. Haygood, 29, of Hawthorne, Calif., aircraft commander; T. Sgt. Robert E. Derby, 38, of Tacoma, Wash., flight engineer; and S. Sgt. Ernest J. Lemoin III, 29, of Houston, boom operator.

Lieutenant Lewis, son of Mr. and Mrs. Felix E. Lewis, of 39 Turnbull Road, Manchester, was a graduate of the University of Connecticut. He was commissioned a second lieutenant upon graduation in 1958.

(He was a Courant carrier in Manchester from 1948 to 1952.

(Besides his parents he leaves a brother, Capt. Ronald Lewis, stationed in Japan; a sister, Mrs. Leonard Eurto, of Middletown; and his grandmother, Mrs. Lillian E. Rittstig, of Manchester.)

HIGHWAY CLOGGED

A housewife, Mrs. Ruth King, 32, said the four-engine, prop-driven KC–97 from nearby Selfridge Air Force Base struck "in a great big billow of flame and smoke" late Tuesday.

The big potbellied ship crashed moments after takeoff, leaving a wake of burning wreckage. Pieces hung from overhead powerlines and also clogged U.S. 25, the highway leading from nearby Detroit.

The ship smashed one home but the woman who lived there was away. Her dog was killed.

Spouting flames burned out a vacant real estate office. The barn, a tool shed, and a windmill at the tulip farm were damaged by flames and wreckage.

The plane, on a routine flight, suffered a power loss during takeoff. It veered away from a 380-unit housing project at Selfridge. It clipped a tree and knocked off part of its tail before crashing.

Migratory Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a number of bills designed to eliminate the disgraceful nationwide abuses against thousands of migratory laborers.

These workers are treated no better than peons. Their ranks are composed mainly of the historically exploited underprivileged groups, especially Negroes, Puerto Ricans, and imported Mexican Nationals. This is a national problem. Few States are blameless in their conduct of the treatment of these workers. Many of the States involved do not have any protective legislation, and a number of those that do have such laws show a general disinclination to enforce them properly.

The legislation covers housing, child and adult education, health, wages, and most important, the flushing out of racketeers, swindlers, and unscrupulous labor bosses who dominate the industry. The bills are:

H.R. 5284, to amend title V of the Housing Act of 1949 to assist in the provision of housing for domestic farm labor; H.R. 5285, to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants for improving domestic agricultural migratory workers' health services and conditions; H.R. 5286, to provide grants for adult education for migrant agricultural employees; H.R. 5287, to provide certain payments to assist in providing improved educational opportunities for children of migrant agricultural employees; H.R. 5288, to provide for the establishment of a Council to be known as the National Citizens Council on Migratory Labor; H R. 5289, to provide for the registration of contractors of migrant agricultural workers; H.R. 5290, to amend the act of June 6, 1933, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Labor to provide improved programs of recruitment, transportation, and distribution of agcultural workers in the United States; H.R. 5291, to amend section 13(c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 with respect to the exemption of agricultural employees from the child labor provisions of such act; H.R. 5292, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act, 1938, as amended, to provide for minimum wages for certain persons employed in agriculture; and H.R. 5293, to amend title V of the Social Security Act to further assist States in establishing and operating day-care facilities for the children of migrant agricultural workers.

These bills are similar to those introduced in the Senate by the Honorable HARRISON WILLIAMS, of New Jersey, and a number of his colleagues. Senator WILLIAMS has done magnificent work in this field and has been a leader in this crusade.

It is my hope that this vital legislation will be the subject of early hearings so that they may be enacted into law as promptly as possible.

Latin America's Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, unless we recognize that the political spasms of Cuba are born of deep-seated convulsions generated by hunger, illiteracy, and lack of opportunity in Latin America, we run the very real risk of a virulent communism spreading to other areas in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. A. N. Spanel, founder of International Latex Corp., a company that has spent great effort and time over the years in behalf of free world unity, accordingly gave widespread publication to an article first published in April 1956, and republished every year since then on the problems besetting the Western Hemisphere, and especially Latin America. Mr. Spanel's piece, in the wake of the events in Cuba today, is more timely than ever.

It is heartening and commendable that an American corporation can devote itself to the problems critical of our own hemisphere with such understanding.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement to which I refer be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LATIN AMERICA'S FUTURE

(By A. N. Spanel, chairman, International Latex Corp.)

Our time is destined to conflict. East versus the West in the war of ideas, if not of weapons.

One narrow segment of the globe from pole to pole is mankind's citadel of freedom in this struggle. This is the Western Hemisphere, itself the scene of evolution and change.

On the North American Continent the English-speaking peoples have developed mammoth industrialization while pursuing fruitful experiments in mass freedom with mass education. All this, with the great material wealth they have created spilling over into many lands, paints a bright, dynamic picture.

In middle America, South America, and the Caribbean island chain live over 170 million Latin American people who, in the main, produce agriculture and extract raw materials. And though the bright glow in North America partially obscures and masks it, a weakness in freedom's stronghold arises from poverty and disunity among the Latin American States.

Superindustrialization in the United States depends critically on foreign supplies of raw materials. World War II dramatically underlined this as one source after another fell to the enemy. The Paley Commission's report in 1951 officially publicized the fact that the tremendous expansion of the U.S. economy to meet freedom's needs has made this country a raw materials have-not nation.

As World War II also underscored, the Latin American countries control much of the mineral and other natural resources that the United States needs to supplement its own. This would appear to guarantee the stability of the Western Hemisphere.

The larger truth is far less happy, for the Latin American peoples are themselves have-nots of another kind. Though their countries possess enormous dormant wealth, underdevelopment deprives Latin Americans of almost everything that civilized human beings need and want.

HUNGRY PEOPLE TARGETS FOR COMMUNISTS

We are accustomed to think of underdeveloped areas as those lacking in big dams, modern highways, huge industries, a car in every garage, and a labor force with middle-class living standards. But Latin America's retardation means lack of all these and much, much more. United Nations reports reveal that the great majority of Latin Americans, in spite of their enormous natural resources, do not get enough good food. Their lot is malnutrition; they live on the edge of hunger. As in all great land areas, there are exceptions, but in the main, poverty, illiteracy, and lack of opportunity plague the people and their lands.

Within the high walls of the noisy xenophobia called nationalism, Latin America's 170 million people, divided into 20 national groups, have been for years fighting 20 separate battles to change their woeful standards of living.

These are uncoordinated, grim, diverse battles. The proud Latinos of many countries do not like to admit how desperate they are. Some progress has been made, to be sure. But it is pitiable in comparison to the need and shockingly inadequate in light of nature's rich endowment of this vast area.

Also, in many of these Latin American countries, dictatorships frustrate their peoples' hunger for democratic government; and for over a quarter of a century ultranationalist and leftwing partisans have been relentlessly spreading the lie to the masses that the giant Yanqui civilization of the north is their heartless exploiter and ruthless enemy.

Today the press exists in Latin America none too happily. Too often oppression, imprisonment, and exile threaten far too many who would speak the whole truth or wear the badge of democracy.

Thus endemic hunger, disease, illiteracy, stagnation, and the unholy twins of dictatorship and nationalism, grievously torment Latin America, while communism threatens from without.

RESTLESS MASSES

The weakness in freedom's arsenal, its Achilles' heel, is that: The region of the new world that is a critical raw materials reservoir for the West is itself a citadel of human misery.

Latin America is restless as its people hear of progress but do not themselves feel it. Yet the slogans and trick accusations against the United States employed by some Latin American politicians in order to justify their own glaring failures will solve precisely nothing. For while the entire Latin American situation in this atomic age is a highly complicated one, requiring full cooperation from the United States, this much is plain: If the Western Hemisphere is to remain the bulwark of freedom, Latin America's problems must be urgently reappraised. The hunger for democratic rule can be best met after hunger itself is satisfied. Above all, Latin Americans themselves must unite to forge solutions that are new, bold and workable.

In Latin America God and nature created an incredibly rich land. Long before the Spaniards discovered it, the Indian civilizations of the Incas and Mayans were well advanced in astronomy, architecture, military science, metallurgy, surgery, textiles, and art.

Even so, their society and their powerful military organization were destroyed when they encountered the unquenchable zeal of the Spaniards who understood so well the principle of "Divide and Conquer." In a comparatively short period of time a civilization of the Old World was superimposed on the new.

RIPE FOR ECONOMIC UNITY

Today, 18 of the 20 Latin American States are deeply rooted in the historic heritage of Spain. Brazil and Haiti also bear the stamp of strong colonizing nations—Portugal and France. Ironically enough, it would take but a fraction of that ancient zeal to unite these Latin American States economically. This could result in achieving the needed standard of living within the framework of a free, democratic society. In this process, the United States, with wisdom and statesmanship, could play the kind of role that would result in winning the lasting respect and enduring friendship of all these people.

Latin America from Mexico's northern border to the tip of South America possesses every natural resource for a living standard as high as technology and human effort can make it. It has minerals and petroleum in huge quantities, and the widest range of tropical and temperate agricultural products. With this there exists a vast hydroelectric potential to provide power for broad industrialization. As always, its people are its greatest asset: patient, peaceful, hardworking men and women, eager to improve their lot.

Yet from colonial times, Latin America has lived, for the most part, by exporting mined and grown raw materials to industrialized nations of the world while importing manufactured goods. Retarded and denied by this and other economic disparities, they have for a generation attempted to industrialize. But, unlike the United States, where no economic obstacles exist in commerce among the 48 States (now 50), we find in Latin America 20 national states, 20 separate countries representing 20 border barriers, 20 obstacles to commerce narrowing the markets and thereby impeding the industrial development of each one of them, and of all Latin America.

DIVIDED, THEREFORE WEAK

As Latin Americans struggle to build industry within 20 national areas, they condemn their factories to splintered fractional markets. This means their industries are chained to low production, low wages and high consumer prices—a pattern exactly the opposite of modern industry which grows because of growing living standards and the increased purchasing power of people. These restricted markets actually tend to restrict the standard of living for all of Latin America. The dead-hand parallel is to be found in Europe. But they have the remedy: the Common Market plan.

While the Latin American nations were still young colonies, imperial Spain actively discouraged interchange among them, to keep them manageably exploitable. Today, the Latinos themselves, with nationalistic barriers, are unconsciously preserving this devisive weakness.

There are those who say that Latin America needs a great flow of foreign capital such as developed the young United States. But it should be remembered that this capital was flowing into a young federation of States unhampered by economic barriers vis-a-vis each other. Their States being united, and not divided, the United States offered wide-open markets and growth potentials that Latin America will continue to lack so long as it remains carved up into 20 divided economic groups, with enormous dissimilarities and disparities among them.

Those who are critical of investors for neglecting investments in Latin America would do well to consider the facts revealed by recent United Nations studies:

1. Latin America is the only underdeveloped region where considerable U.S. private capital is gravitating into manufacturing, in spite of risks and barriers.

2. Over 90 percent of this capital has gone to the three nations having the largest market potentials: Argentina, Brazil, and Mexico. The other 17 countries are obliged to share less than 10 percent. (Is more proof needed?)

3. Very much larger sums for industry have flowed into industrialized Canada, not only because of its growing domestic purchasing power, but also because of tariff preferences, which encourage manufacturing in Canada for export to other British Commonwealth countries.

The lesson to us all is plain. Latin America, with all its enormous dormant wealth, suffers from the economic barriers of division. In contrast, the patriotic songs of the North American Revolution proclaimed, "United we stand, divided we fall." And so the young States become one federation, and in that bond they developed the strength to be and to become.

ABUNDANT HUMAN RESOURCES

Latin America today has its share of great men, creative, dedicated men of broad vision and leadership. They understand the complexities and the urgency of these problems. Also, in the United States as in Canada, there are men of dimension and horizons who realize their responsibilities in the vital interdependence that exists among the nations comprising the Western Hemisphere.

But this hard fact must be faced: The United States started on its road to abundance with a federation that abolished all internal economic barriers. Just as Simon Bolivar of old called for political emancipation for Latin America, so 20 modern "Simon Bolivars" have the opportunity today to lead 170 million Latin American people to an adequate and hopeful standard of living, through cooperation and unity, and ultimately economic federation itself.

In the Western Hemisphere, the Latin Americas are old in history, learning, and culture. They are young only in modern economic development as measured by the hemisphere standards of Canada and the United States. In their struggle to emerge as nations, political, economic, and military conflicts left their scars of oppression, violence, and war. In this process the United States played no small part—often good, frequently bad.

Prior to World War I, time stood still for the majority of people of Latin America. They suffered from an incredibly low standard of living. The underdevelopment was in glaring contrast to the vastness of their land area. The upheavals of two World Wars markedly changed the economic structures of most of the 20 nations comprising these fabulous lands; at last there was evidence of the beginnings of industry. Their cities had grown tremendously. Buenos Aires reached a population of 3 million; Rio de Janeiro, 2,500,000; Sao Paulo, 2,250,000; Santiago, 1,025,000; Havana, 825,000; Bogotá, 650,000. The great pride these republics take in their cities is well justified. For some of the most beautiful architecture in the entire Western Hemisphere is to be found there.

COMMUNISM THREATENS LATIN AMERICAN NATIONS

But these bright city lights should not blind us, for they mask the poverty, the struggle for existence, that is to be found in the hinterlands of many Latin republics. Indeed, in some of them the living standards and conditions of the burdened Indians have not changed in a century. Theirs is the treadmill struggle with want. And the Communists never fail to ply them with false promises and with conspiratorial cunning.

Nevertheless, economic progress was in the making. But it was a watered-down progress, grotesquely uneven and impeded by a lack of economic unity wherein 20 hemisphere nations erected trade barriers each against the other so that until this very day, with the possible exception of the coffee industry, there exists only economic disunity among the Latin American States.

The result was to be expected. After more than 40 years, we see in most of these countries living standards still so low as to border on hunger and want. Inevitably, democracy in Latin America is put on the defensive. Communism does not stand idly by; the Western Hemisphere is threatened.

Canada and the United States can no longer afford the luxuries of indifference or neglect toward the problem. For the alternatives are plain enough: Either we initiate economic development with cooperation among the nations of this hemisphere for the maintenance of their economic health, or, like Gulliver, be pinned down by Communist-Fascist chaos.

URGENT NEED FOR FOREIGN CAPITAL

Right now most Latin American countries desperately need foreign venture capital—the kind of capital that is willing to come with the knowledge that the Latin people want full employment and a growing standard of living. For it is a certainty that without these their countries will be condemned to creeping communism, fascism or socialism which feed on poverty, illiteracy and lack of opportunity—the chains which people everywhere want to lose.

The opportunities for industrialization and the development of resources in Latin America are enormous. For here live 170 million people (approximately the population of the United States) on lands that are indescribably rich in natural resources and potentials. Dr. Milton Eisenhower, in his Latin American tour, stated that the United States has its best markets and customers in these countries, not only now, but also in the foreseeable future.

With imaginative hemispheric planning, private venture capital, technology and initiative could be encouraged to flow into these lands.

As it is now, very real obstacles block the roads to an accelerated, privately financed economic development program for Latin America. For even the most enlightened investors point out that under the free enterprise system the basic reason for venture capital is the anticipated monetary reward; but that in the United States, taxation of corporations and individuals has grown to such burdensome dimensions as to encourage investors to play it safe with the blue-chip shares of the growing giants of North American industry.

Prospective investors, therefore, find three extremely difficult obstacles to hurdle: (1) the splintered fractional markets of the Latin countries themselves, born of outmoded border barriers; (2) increasing taxation in most of these countries; (3) the high taxation rate imposed by the U.S. Government on profits earned in Latin America—so high, in fact, as literally to penalize the pioneering investor for having the courage, the initiative and the money to venture into underdeveloped foreign fields.

These are the proportions of the dilemma. The responsibility for surmounting these obstacles falls on the shoulders of the industrial giants of North America no less than on the 20 Latin American countries. In this atomic age, in an age of idealogical pressure, it is certain that neither indifference, condescension, paternalism or the handouts of endless aid from the North—nor the false pride and the habitual unrealism that exists among the nations south of the United States, will solve the problems that demand solution now.

THE SOLUTION WE URGE

It is therefore our earnest recommendation that the U.S. Government take the initiative to call a meeting of all the Western Hemisphere nations (within the framework of the Organization of American States) to present the following reciprocal plan to the 20 countries of Latin America:

1. It is proposed that the 20 countries of Latin America enter into a mutual agreement to drop all existing trade barriers between them. In return for this agreement the United States will not only declare tax exempt all profits earned through new investments of its citizens in the aforesaid countries prior to the transfer of these profits to the United States (which is the usual procedure) but that when such profits are transferred they shall be taxed no higher than at capital gain rates. Furthermore, in order that the volume and scope of such investments may be realized, the United States will assume responsibility for effecting a minimum private investment of $1 billion a year for 5 years.

2. These U.S. commitments will hinge upon the Latin countries agreeing that, except for petroleum and minerals, the profits on such new private investments shall not be taxed more than 10 percent per annum, and that this maximum 10 percent rate shall apply either to corporations or to individuals, but not to both. In this way, North American investors would not have their incentives stifled by self-defeating, high Latin tax rates; at the same time, they would know in advance what to expect and thus act with confidence and promptness.

3. The 20 Latin American nations to agree to the free and unrestricted movement of both profits and capital from one country to another, in order to encourage the pioneering development, not just of some, but of all their countries.

Whatever costs the United States might incur as a consequence of reduced tax receipts would be inconsequential compared to the overwhelming financial burdens it would otherwise be forced to undertake in the future, in helping to snuff out the hemispheric fires of communism or fascism.

HUGE REWARDS FOR UNITED STATES AND DEMOCRACY

Collectively the proposal as a whole would provide a dynamic incentive for the populations of the 20 Latin American nations to commit their greatest exertions toward increasing the national product of their industrial economies and improving the social and political status of their separate societies. Democratic principles would take deeper root and flourish more luxuriantly.

Through providing the capital resources and technical assistance initially required, American industry would reap lasting material benefits which in turn would lead to a vast strengthening of mutual interest and respect between the United States and its great neighbors to the south.

But over and above these hemispheric considerations, there remains the overriding is-

sue of world freedom and democracy. The Western Hemisphere is the greatest reservoir of strength and nourishment for these principles. But the maintenance of this strength is contingent on the growing development, prosperity, and self-realization of the nations of Latin America, sparked by U.S. leadership. (This article first appeared in the press on April 15, 1956.)

(Presented as a public service by International Latex Corp., New York, N.Y.)

Statement of John E. Erickson, National Commander of Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the national commander of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A. this morning presented their program for the 87th Congress to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Under unanimous consent, I include it as a part of my remarks:

STATEMENT OF JOHN E. ERICKSON, NATIONAL COMMANDER, VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I OF THE U.S.A., INC., BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Congressman OLIN E. TEAGUE, chairman, and distinguished members of the committee, today I appear before you, as the national commander of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., speaking for over 170,000 members, the fastest-growing veterans organization today.

On behalf of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., I deeply appreciate this opportunity to appear before your distinguished committee for the purpose of presenting the 1961 program of the Veterans of World War I for legislation and economic welfare of World War I veterans and their dependents.

Mr. Chairman, to show you the sincerity and interest of our members in our program for the families of the veterans in World War I, as well as their beliefs of the entitlement of our program, at the last year's national convention at Miami, Fla., being a rather small organization compared with others, we expected approximately 5,600 registrations of members of our organization at the annual convention. However, to point out the sincerity of this veterans group, which is dedicated principally to veterans' affairs, we had over 8,600 registrations. It is our desire and purpose to be recognized as a veterans organization, dedicated to the welfare and to the benefits of veterans and their dependents everywhere. We are also willing to support programs for the welfare and security of the Nation. It is not our intention to be known as an organization that is spreading our activities to welfare progarms and money raising activities nor do we propose to tell the President, the distinguished Members of Congress, the official Cabinet members how they shall conduct the affairs of their respective offices for the good of the Nation.

Many members of our organization throughout the country would welcome an opportunity to come to Washington and appear with some of the national officers to present their legislative program. However, as we are an organization that discourages fund raising drives and with no financial assistance and foundations; regardless of the sincerity of the members, we felt it would work a hard financial burden on them, who are already suffering an economic hardship. With your kind permission, I would like to introduce my national officers and members of the interim legislative committee present, as well as members of the auxiliary.

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of this committee, I would like to tell you that the membership of the Veterans of World War I is composed of veterans who have served as national, department, and post officers in the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, as well as the rank and file members of these organizations. Thousands of these members have served with distinction overseas in the Armed Forces during time of war.

I respectfully call to the attention of this distinguished committee, at the close of World War I, no provision had been made to return these veterans to their normal civilian occupations. These men left their employment, their homes, and schools to serve their country. Upon their return, in many instances, they found their position had already been taken by others. In the absence of legislation comparable to the GI bill, these were then forced into the competitive field in their efforts to rehabilitate themselves. Today these men, who were boys in 1917 and 1918, are joined together to fulfill their obligation to the veterans and their dependents in working for benefits for the welfare, contentment, and security for the veteran.

As other patriotic groups, we are interested in the welfare of our Nation and the preservation of our democracy. Our organization certainly has proven its loyalty, devotion to country, as well as our continued interest in our preservation of democracy. If our advice is needed or solicited, we will be very cooperative to the proper authorities but, as a veterans organization, we feel that our principal purpose in this particular program is principally that of assistance to the veteran.

With your kind permission, I would like to tell you that I served overseas with the 82d All American Infantry Division, through three major offensives, liaison agent for brigade and regimental headquarters, and I was evacuated to the hospital in October 1918 and was discharged from the hospital and service in August 1919.

I have been a member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars for 37 years, serving through the chairs to and including department commander of Minnesota, two terms as a member of the national council of administration, and through my efforts, we organized the famous department rehabilitation welfare and service committee on which I was privileged to serve as chairman for 16 years. I am also a charter member of the American Legion and hold membership in post No. 62 in Minnesota. In the Veterans of World War I, I have served as commander of Mill City Barracks, commander of region No. 7 during which term of office I helped organize the departments of Iowa, North Dakota, and Nebraska. I am a past department commander of my State and a past member of the national legislative committee. In Springfield, Ill., I was elected national junior vice commander. Today, in the capacity of national commander, it is my proud privilege to present our program for 1961.

Moral strength and national willpowers are critical factors in the struggle to achieve a lasting world peace today, tomorrow, and especially the coming decade will demand the ultimate in determination and a new sense of national purpose to meet the challenges which do now and will continue to confront our free and open society.

As a nation, we now enjoy security, liberty, and the highest standards of living in the world. However, this efficient society of ours shows some indications of moral slackness and undue preoccupation with personal advancement. If we are to meet the problems and the challenges of the sixties, we must regenerate our sense of national purpose, rekindle our pride in national achievement. We, therefore, are eager and willing to accept the challenge which our President presented to the Nation. "Let the word go forth from this time and place, to friend and foe alike, that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans—born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage—and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this Nation has always been committed and to which we are committed today at home and around the world."

In presenting our program, we are in full accord with the thinking of this administration and that is to "boost the economy of this country." It is our honest and sincere belief that the enactment of a distinct and separate pension for the remaining veterans of World War I would do much to help solve part of the economic problems facing the Nation.

Our program is one pertaining to national security and other legislation to benefit the World War I veterans and their dependents.

I am happy to inform you that our organization has tried to follow the many suggestions that have been given by Members of Congress that have been visited by representatives of this organization during the current session.

H.R. 3745 was introduced on February 2, 1961 by Congressman WINFIELD K. DENTON from Indiana. We are confident that we have used and followed the adivce obtained from these well informed and most helpful sources, the Members of Congress, in having this bill referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. This bill asks for an increase over the old pension provision of $78.75 and it does contain income limitations, which we feel are in keeping with the economic condition confronting our country. It also includes the eligibility or period of service which must be performed for such payment. In defining or interpreting income for limitation purposes, earned income only should be computed. We believe it is contrary to sound economic doctrine in a free enterprise system to penalize a person who has, by sacrifice and thrift, managed to build up an annuity or retirement program.

H.R. 4611 introduced by Congressman ROLAND V. LIBONATI from Illinois, a distinguished member of this committee, asking for a 30-percent increase for the widow is in keeping with thinking of the present administration and has the full support of the Veterans of World War I.

H.R. 4918 introduced by Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN from Montana asks for a 10-percent increase for the disabled war service veteran. We realize that the distinguished chairman of this committee has introduced two bills, H.R. 4010 and H.R. 4011, asking for 5 and 7 percent increase; this, we feel, is not sufficient for these veterans who have given so much. In the past, the Veterans' Administration has not given or recommended less than 10 percent increase. We feel that this bill should receive your sincere and thoughtful consideration.

I would like to call your attention to the two bills, H.R. 4583 and H.R. 4584, introduced by a gracious member of this committee, Congresswoman JULIA BUTLER HANSEN from the State of Washington. These two bills ask that legislation be passed to provide medical treatment and outpatient medical services to all World War I veterans as granted to service connected veterans of World War I; also that the same considera-

tion be given the widow of deceased, honorably discharged veterans of World War I, providing they come under the provisions of the act. This legislation, we believe, is in keeping with the farewell address by the first President of the United States, George Washington. "It must also be a comfortless reflection to any man that he may have contributed to securing the rights of his country at the risk of his life and the ruin of his fortune, there would be no provision made to prevent himself from sinking into indigence and wretchedness in his old age."

H.R. 4685 introduced by Congressman GEORGE P. MILLER from California, a member of this organization, is a bill that should be given thoughtful consideration as similar language is mentioned in the Democratic Platform. "The Rights of Men—Under Health." "We shall provide medical care for the aged as part of the time tested Social Security Insurance System. We reject any proposal which would require such citizens to submit to the indignity of a means test—a paupers' oath." I am sure that you and I agree that no veteran or his widow should have to submit to the indignity of such a test.

Congressman FRED MARSHALL, from my State of Minnesota, has introduced H.R. 4450 which asks that sufficient appropriations be granted to the Veterans' Administration to allow for remodeling, installing of modern equipment, and supplying of personnel adequately to operate the Veterans' Administration hospitals, domiciliaries, outpatient, and dispensary facilities. I would be remiss this morning if I did not compliment this committee for instigating a program in which a huge sum of money is allocated over a 10-year period to carry out this program. It is certainly commendable that this committee would advocate such a constructive program; we are indeed proud of your foresight and activities in allocating these funds. However, we feel that this might be a good time to allocate more funds to step up the program at this particular time.

H.R. 4769, introduced by Congressman JAMES A. BURKE from Massachusetts, asks that the present ceiling of 125,000 beds be increased to commensurate with the veterans' population requirement of this country. As I stated previously, perhaps moneys could be allocated at this time for this purpose. I am sure you are aware that this condition increases daily and that you will give every consideration to Mr. BURKE's bill.

At this time I want to go on record as stating that it is our belief that the Veterans' Administration is doing a splendid job in carrying out the present law. We commend the present and past Veterans' Administrator and his staff and we recognize that they are doing the best possible job in operating with the funds, facilities, and staff under the present budgetary restrictions.

As a member of our organization, and especially myself who served with Alvin C. York, who received many decorations including the Congressional Medal of Honor, I hope that legislation will be passed by this Congress. This perhaps is just one example of one of the many hardships that are faced by our highest decorated heroes and I feel that this is regrettable and that certainly some legislation should be approved to compensate veterans who have won this highest award. You are to be complimented, Mr. Chairman, in asking in your bill that a pension of $100 a month be provede to all Congressional Medal of Honor veterans. On January 3, 1961, Congressman JOE L. EVINS from Tennessee introduced H.R. 1305 which asks that Alvin C. York should be relieved from all liability to the United States arising under the International Revenue Code of 1939 for the calendar year 1942 and 1943. We ask for your favorable consideration of this bill. We also feel that a bill should be introduced to take care of such a case as Mr. York's for medical treatment and nursing attendance at his home given in dire circumstances for these Medal of Honor heroes. It is always well to recognize the services of great military men.

A concurrent resolution has been introduced by a member of this organization by Congressman THOMAS J. LANE from Massachusetts and expressing the the sense of the Congress with respect to effective methods of combating the idealogical advances of world communism, which I am sure you will be interested in.

H.R. 5089, introduced by Congressman A. S. HERLONG, JR. from Florida, asks that a new subsection be inserted immediately below section 105(b), section 105(c). An injury or disease incurred during active military, naval, or air service will be presumed to have been incurred in line of duty and not the result of the veterans' own misconduct in the absence of a certification to the contrary by the service department concerned.

I believe that this statement of former President Herbert Hoover should be submitted in requesting your consideration for our legislative program for 1961: "We believe that military service is extraordinary service which transcends the normal duties of citizenship and consequently entitles veterans with honorable service to special consideration." I also believe that it is good to remind this committee that the Democratic platform, "the Right of Man," states: Veterans of World War I whose Federal benefits have not matched those of veterans of subsequent service, will receive the special attention of the Democratic Party looking toward equitable adjustments. As national commander of the Veterans of World War I, I endorse the policies of this administration and say to you I am sure that not one of you on this distinguished committee believe in the statement of General Bradley: "Military service in time of war or peace should be treated as discharging an obligation of citizenship and not in itself a basis for future Government benefits."

In closing, the figures that I am about to give are approximate. One hundred and five thousand veterans of World War I died last year. The average age of the veteran of World War I is 67.9. The limitations in H.R. 3745 will reduce the cost of a pension program for veterans of World War I. Veterans living away from the Veterans' Administration facilities will use their pension to pay for doctors and medical services. Indigent veterans, like all others, must be taken care of. Time and attrition will reduce the cost for a separate and distinct pension for the veteran of World War I. Not only will the veteran benefit, his community, his State, and the Nation will benefit by the added purchasing powers granted under this act and, ladies and gentlemen, I am sure this money will be spent in the United States of America. Thousands of the older veterans who have been forced to retire because of age and who are seeking employment again will find retirement a little better and it certainly will give him a little more security and livelihood, all in keeping with the policy of this administration to "boost the economy." May I remind you again that this organization is one dedicated to the veteran of World War I, his widow and children, always ready and willing to support a program for the welfare and security of the Nation.

At the hearing of our legislative program, which I understand will be in a very short time, we will try to be in a position to present to this honorable committee approximately the cost of the program and such data that you might request from us.

In behalf of the Veterans of World War I and myself, I want to express to you the sincere appreciation for the wonderful work this committee has done for the veterans of all wars.

In closing, Chairman OLIN E. TEAGUE and the distinguished members of this committee, may I again thank you for giving me this opportunity to present our veterans program for the Veterans of World War I for 1961. Thank you very much.

Wisconsin Courts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the question of timely justice is very important to the survival and success of our democratic system. For years our courts have been unable to cope with the increasing burden of cases coming before them.

Those suffering from the delay of justice are not only the people directly involved in the case—but the community at large.

The recent action of the Senate Judiciary Committee and the Senate to approve a large group of new judgeships is designed to help resolve the problem of court congestion. While I believe that the creation of 73 new judgeships was a worthwhile improvement—I fear that the hasty approval of this measure somehow smacks of political and partisan maneuvering.

I believe that partisan politics should be taken out of our judicial system. In this regard, I would like to emphasize here the fact that in my own State of Wisconsin—judicial appointments are completely nonpartisan.

In fact, I am proud to report that beginning with January 1, 1962, the State of Wisconsin will completely reorganize its court system.

This reform follows many years of intensive study and debate. It demonstrates that if the parties can rise above politics—they can provide the people with more effective justice. I should like to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a brief article describing the Wisconsin courts which appeared in the Milwaukee Reader, dated March 6–12, 1961.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN COURTS

(By Peter J. McCormick)

Following years of intensive study and debate, Wisconsin's court system will be substantially reorganized, effective January 1, 1962, in accordance with the Court Reorganization Act passed by the State legislature in 1959.

The major objectives of this reorganization are to eliminate unnecessary overlapping of jurisdictions, to clarify and simplify judicial procedures, and to more fully utilize judicial manpower and skills.

The Wisconsin constitution vests the State's judicial power in a supreme court, circuit courts, probate courts (county courts), and in justices of the peace. It

further authorizes the legislature to create municipal and other inferior courts, as well as to confer criminal and civil jurisdiction upon the county courts. Over the years, the legislature has created a large number of special courts to deal with specific matters. In a number of instances, these courts (while similar in name) vary considerably in their jurisdictions and procedures, e.g., municipal courts. The Reorganization Act abolishes these special courts and, for the most part, transfers their jurisdictions to the county courts. The need for specialization in large urban areas is recognized by establishing branch courts of special types, rather than by distinct and separate courts. If a branch court is created for certain types of cases, e.g., traffic, all cases of this type will be initially assigned to this branch but can be reassigned to another branch if the court calendar is overloaded, or for a number of other valid reasons. Each branch will be required, when necessary, to handle types of cases other than its particular specialty. In addition to this built-in flexibility, the act strengthens and streamlines judicial administration, both on the State and local level. It provides for and expedites the temporary reassignment of judges to meet special situations.

Under the Court Reorganization Act, Wisconsin's court system will consist of the following:

SUPREME COURT—CONSISTING OF SEVEN JUSTICES

The chief justice is the oldest in point of service on this bench. This court has original jurisdiction in a limited number of cases of statewide concern. It has appellate jurisdiction in all other cases. It is the final authority on the State constitution, and the highest court for any action begun in State courts, except when a Federal question is raised and on an appeal is accepted by the U.S. Supreme Court.

CIRCUIT COURTS

There are 25 judicial circuits in Wisconsin, each comprising one or more counties. The jurisdiction of these courts will not be substantially changed in the reorganization. As at present, they will have original jurisdiction in all cases—civil and criminal—including concurrent jurisdiction in cases which may be brought to inferior courts. The act does provide for additional branches of these courts in four urban counties. Milwaukee County will have 13—2 more than at present. These two will deal primarily with criminal matters, and to do this the two existing municipal courts will be transfered over and made branches of the circuit court.

COUNTY COURTS

County courts have had jurisdiction over all probate matters and, in most counties over juvenile matters. The Court Reorganization Act expands their jurisdiction to include matters now handled by a number of special courts. In Milwaukee County, the existing county, district, civil, and children's courts will become branches of a new county court with 11 branches. County courts will have concurrent jurisdiction with circuit courts in civil and criminal matters. However, the circuit court will retain exclusive jurisdiction over civil cases, involving damage suits of more than $25,000, and, over serious criminal cases. Appeals from the county court will go to the circuit court.

JUSTICE COURTS AND MUNICIPAL JUSTICE OF THE PEACE COURTS

Justice courts are presided over by justices of the peace. They are not courts of record, and their procedures are quite informal. The Court Reorganization Act limits their civil and criminal jurisdiction. Police justice courts are similar to justice courts, and exist in a number of cities and villages, and are presided over by municipal justices of the peace. They conduct preliminary examinations, have the same jurisdiction as other justice courts, and exclusive jurisdiction of violations of city or village ordinances. The Reorganization Act requires that all new municipal justices of the peace be attorneys and be paid a salary rather than fees.

All Wisconsin judges are elected on a nonpartisan basis in spring elections. Supreme Court justices are elected by statewide vote for 10-year terms; circuit and county court judges are elected for 6-year terms by the voters of their districts. Justices of the peace are elected for 2-year terms.

In the March 7 primary this year, voters will nominate the two candidates to run in the April 4 election for each of these positions: supreme court and the children's court branch and traffic and misdemeanor branch of Milwaukee's new county court.

The April 4 election will include the final vote for these three judgeships and, in addition, voters will choose judges for five other branches of Milwaukee's County Court; and for three branches of the Milwaukee County circuit court in which there are no primary contests.

Clichés of Socialism—No. 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 17, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert a second in the series, "Clichés of Socialism," published by the Foundation for Economic Education, Inc.

CLICHÉS OF SOCIALISM—No. 2

Of some 45 professors attending the dinner meeting at which I spoke, the 2 or 3 who might have agreed with the free exchange, private property, limited government philosophy kept discreetly silent. All of the questioning, particularly by one professor of economics, was deliberately antagonistic—not at all in the spirit of inquiry.

Following this meeting, I went to an auditorium to address the student forum. Some of the professors also attended.

Upon the conclusion of my address, one student said, "As I understand the extent to which you would limit government, there would be no place for social security." Then he asked, "Wouldn't that bring a great hardship to many people?"

"Let me answer your question," I replied, "by going back to October 1948," and I told him the following story:

"Just a month before the Truman-Dewey election, I asked a chance acquaintance if he thought the rapid trend toward socialism would abate, should the Republicans win.

"Rapid trend toward socialism? What do you mean by rapid trend toward socialism?"

I named a dozen items, including compulsory social security.

"Do you mean that you do not favor social security? What would you do, let 'em starve?"

"You are as old as I, are you not, Mr. G.?"

Being considerably older, he replied in the affirmative.

"Then you were around when Mr. Roosevelt took office?"

"Yes; I was."

"Did we have any compulsory social security previous to 1933?"

"No; I guess not."

"Tell me, did you ever know of anyone in America who starved prior to that date?"

Mr. G. acknowledged that he had never heard of anyone in America who had starved prior to F.D.R.

That was the end of my story to the student. But the professor of economics, who had led the antagonistic questioning at the dinner session, could not let this pass. Shouted he, "I have seen a dozen starve."

"Do you mean to tell me, professor, that you actually stood by and watched a human being starve to death?"

The professor, of course, had never witnessed a human being starve to death, and the students were well aware of the fact. Even a gangster, who would murder a competitor, could not stand by and watch a kitten, let alone a human being, starve to death.

Proposed Amendments to Fair Labor Standards Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Mr. Paul S. Hudgins, attorney at law, Bluefield, W. Va., during the hearings before the Senate Subcommittee on Labor with reference to proposed amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF BLUEFIELD SANITARIUM TO THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR WITH REFERENCE TO PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938 (S. 895)

Bluefield Sanitarium, a general hospital, of Bluefield, W. Va., located in a depressed area, requests consideration of the following facts in connection with the proposed amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (S. 895).

There are 890 proprietary hospitals in the United States. Of these, only approximately 30, including the Bluefield Sanitarium, will be affected by this bill.

It is respectfully submitted that unless hospitals are exempt from this bill, health and hospital services to the people served by these 30 hospitals will be seriously curtailed.

While figures for all of the 30 hospitals are not available, those for the Bluefield Sanitarium will serve to illustrate what the plight of those 30 hospitals will be.

The Bluefield Sanitarium is an unusual hospital for a city the size of Bluefield, W. Va. Having 211 beds and 26 bassinets, its gross income is more than $1 million annually. It is a proprietary hospital. Primarily due to the economic condition in this depressed area, the hospital suffered a loss of over $10,000 in 1960. Conditions causing this loss have worsened, so it is anticipated there will be a much larger loss in 1961.

Charts showing the effect of including hospitals in the proposed amendments are attached. Among other things, it will be seen from these charts that to include proprietary hospitals in the coverage would affect approximately only 30 hospitals in the United States. Bluefield Sanitarium has 257 employees, who will be affected. It is estimated that the maximum number of employees affected in each of these 30 hos-

pitals is 300. Thus, not more than 9,000 people throughout the United States would have forced increases in their wages through this legislation. In contrast to this number of affected employees throughout the entire United States, it will be seen that the Bluefield Sanitarium alone admitted over 9,000 patients to the hospital in 1960 and, in addition, had over 70,000 outpatient visits in its large, and well staffed department.

Unless hospitals are eliminated (as hotels and other facilities are eliminated) the direct wage cost increase to Bluefield Sanitarium the first year will be over $145,000. Even if the 1960 loss does not increase, the total loss in the first year under the amendment would be over $155,000.

Much more serious would be the loss after the full $1.25 per hour goes into effect. At that time the annual additional direct wage cost would be over $290,000. If the loss sustained in 1960 does not increase, this would mean that under the proposed amendment, Bluefield Sanitarium would be operating at an annual loss of over $300,000.

The above figures do not include the extra cost involved in paying premium overtime rates and obviously the overtime cost would increase these loss figures.

It is apparent that no hospital can continue to operate and serve the public under such a staggering annual loss. There would be several alternatives.

First, the hospital could attempt to continue its operations by making drastic reductions in its service, which means materially reducing the number of persons employed.

The second alternative is to close the hospital.

The third alternative is to attempt to find some public group that would purchase and operate the hospital. This appears unlikely, due to the previous year's loss, and the uncertain future of this depressed area.

A fourth alternative is so impractical that it deserves no real consideration. To increase charges to meet an annual loss of over $300,000, is out of the question. Even in boom times in a growing section, this would be difficult. Under present conditions, in this depressed area, it is impossible.

In view of these matters it is respectfully requested that the same exceptions which are properly applicable to hotels and restaurants, motion picture theaters and similar services should also apply to hospitals. It is assumed that Congress has carefully considered the economics involved in attempting to render services of the type supplied by hotels and restaurants and has determined that an exemption of such facilities is essential if the public is to have such services. More vital to the public is the need of a hospital of the type operated by Bluefield Sanitarium.

The concern of Congress with appropriate medical service has been demonstrated by other bills now before this Congress. To curtail or eliminate hospital service by imposing costs which are impossible to meet would be directly contrary to the need for added medical services.

It is believed that this committee and this Congress would not want to discriminate against patients in these 30 hospitals. In the Bluefield area alone (approximately 200,000 people) the bill, as presently drawn, might force the closing of a hospital that admits over 9,000 patients and has more than 70,000 outpatient visits annually.

The Secretary of Labor's position in presenting this bill indicates that it would exempt nonprofit organizations. On that basis the following facts are of interest:

According to the latest statistics there are 5,364 (short term stay) general hospitals in the United States, containing 619,877 beds. Eight hundred and ninety are proprietary or profit hospitals containing 36,210 beds, or 5.8 percent of the total. Assuming that each hospital with 200 or more beds would exceed $1 million a year in gross business, there are only 12 proprietary hospitals with 200 or more beds in the United States which would be affected. These 12 hospitals have 3,327 beds, or five-tenths of 1 percent of all beds in general hospitals. Bluefield Sanitarium is one of these 12 hospitals and the only one of this category in West Virginia.

In addition, there are a few proprietary hospitals of less than 200 beds which are presumed to gross more than $1 million a year. The total number of such proprietary hospitals in the United States grossing $1 million a year or more (regardless of the number of beds), according to the most careful estimate we can make, would not exceed 30.

Approximately 70 percent of Bluefield Sanitarium's total cost is in payroll expense, which is near the average for the United States. It remains open 24 hours a day. Under the proposed law, increases in salaries, additional cost for overtime and being on call, would increase Bluefield Sanitarium's total payroll expense more than 38 percent.

In the final 3 months of 1960 the Bluefield Sanitarium Hospital expenses exceeded the income by more than $25,000. If it had been able to collect all the charges made to patients during this period, it would have operated at a small profit. It is located in a distressed area where there is a great deal of unemployment which accounts for a sharp reduction in the percentage of collections.

Bluefield Sanitarium has never turned down an emergency case which required hospitalization, regardless of the patient's ability to pay.

The act would penalize and discriminate against approximately 30 hospitals throughout the United States, making them subject to forced wage increases while the remaining 5,334 hospitals continue to operate without wage increases.

Seventy percent of a hospital's total cost is payroll expense. This is, we believe, a larger percentage than any other business now covered by minimum wage or to be covered under the proposed amendment. Therefore, an overall increase in hospital wages would result in a larger percentage increase in total expenses than any other business now covered or to be covered under the act. This means that a hospital would have to raise its prices more than any other industry.

Hospitals are receiving criticism from the public, including many unions, on constantly increasing rates. Blue Cross plans are under fire in numerous States for their requests for permission to increase rates to their subscribers brought on by increasing hospital costs. Increasing wages would only add to these problems.

It is our opinion that hospitals should not be classed with other covered businesses when considering the extension of the wage-hour law, particularly since only one-half of 1 percent of the hospitals would be covered. Certainly, no other business would give a customer every available service it had to offer for an indefinite period, knowing the customer would never be able to pay anything on the bill.

This hospital is located in a depressed area with a large unemployed population. It seems that any law which would increase the cost to any patients, and particularly those in depressed areas, is unreasonable and discriminates against the very people the Federal Government is trying to help. The continued operation of Bluefield Sanitarium, which has provided care in the Bluefield area since 1902, would be extremely doubtful under the load of this increased cost, and it is assumed that the other 30 hospitals are faced with the same problem.

Surely the number of proprietary hospitals in the United States and their employees which will probably not exceed 9,000 newly covered employees, are not of sufficient number to justify including these few hospitals and employees in the proposed amendment to the wage-hour bill. It would be a terrible blow to the sick people who are affected and particularly to those who live in a depressed area such as now exists in southern West Virginia and southwest Virginia.

As suggested by the Secretary of Labor's statement, the exemption of nonprofit organizations, including hospitals, is essential. It is apparent that the same reasons exist for exempting proprietary hospitals. Exempting all hospitals, as has been seen, actually prevents discrimination against the 30 hospitals which would be affected by this bill. Putting them in the category of hotels, and other businesses serving the public, by exempting all hospitals, will permit these 30 hospitals to continue to serve the people in their areas at minimum medical costs.

It is urgently requested that hospitals be eliminated from the proposed amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (S. 895).

CHART 1

This chart is a part of a statement of Bluefield Sanitarium to the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

This chart shows the actual loss by Bluefield Sanitarium in 1960, due to depressed economic conditions in a depressed area, and the projected loss unless hospitals are exempted from the amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (S. 895).

Wages	Additional direct wage costs	Additional miscellaneous costs (social security, unemployment, gross sales, etc., taxes)	Annual loss
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1960			$10,547.27
At $1 per hour	$145,161.84	$11,146.44	166,855.55
At $1.25 per hour	290,867.28	22,251.36	323,665.91

I. The above loss figures include, in the projected losses, the same loss sustained in 1960 ($10,547.27). However, this basic loss will probably be greater because of declining economic conditions in this depressed area.

II. The additional costs (col. 3) are minimum because they do not include premium wages for overtime and the necessary increases to employees who are now paid $1.25 per hour and up.

CHART 2.—*1960 statistics of Bluefield Sanitarium*

Annual payroll	$936,356.64
Hospital admissions (does not include 1,084 births)	9,447
Hospital days	68,245
Outpatient visits	70,372
Estimated population in area served	200,000

CHART 3.—*Chart showing number of persons affected unless hospitals are exempted from the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (S. 895)*

1. Number of patients admitted to Bluefield Sanitarium in 1960	9,447
2. Number of outpatient visits to Bluefield Sanitarium in 1960	70,372
3. Proprietary hospitals in United States with gross income of $1 million (estimated)	30
4. Number of patients admitted annually to 30 proprietary hospitals (estimate based upon Bluefield Sanitarium experience)	173,000
5. Number of employees affected by wage-hour increase (average 300 per hospital, estimated—Bluefield Sanitarium with 211 beds has 257. Only 12 of the 30 hospitals have more than 200 beds)	9,000

NOTE.—The above figures (except for Bluefield Sanitarium) do not include outpatients treated by these hospitals.

Administrative Conservation Policy and Public Land Moratorium

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, for the information of Members and under leave to extend my remarks, I set forth below a new set of land conservation administrative policies in the Department of Interior with respect to land classifications and dispositions by the Bureau of Land Management which were announced recently by Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall. Immediately following this departmental administrative policy statement there is set forth the text of an 18-month moratorium that was simultaneously announced by Secretary Udall on most types of nonmineral applications and petitions for public lands.

I am in general agreement with the administrative policies enunciated and hope that the moratorium can be lifted before the expiration of the 18-month period that has been estimated by the Department of the Interior as the time within which pending applications may be acted upon. In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to advise the Members that the Secretary of the Interior has informed me that it is the Department's intention to lift the effect of the moratorium as opportunity permits in areas, one by one, as the problems are overcome or as remedial legislation may become available.

The documents referred to are:

LAND CONSERVATION POLICIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR WITH RESPECT TO LAND CLASSIFICATIONS AND DISPOSITIONS BY THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

1. The Government must receive a full return for its property in terms of money or other values. No party to a transaction with the Government should receive a windfall. To the extent that the law permits and in the absence of a binding contract, (a) no transaction will be entered into by the Bureau of Land Management where it is not clearly shown by competent evidence that the Government will receive full value and (b) no transaction will be consummated where, in the course of processing, evidence develops that the Government will not receive full value.

2. Private exchanges will not be entertained or consummated except where it is shown that there are compelling reasons to acquire the offered lands to augment long-range Federal resource management programs. Leases, sales or other dispositions of public lands will not be made unless the lease or disposition will serve a sound public purpose, including the satisfaction of bona fide needs of the general economy and improving the administration of the public lands. Leases, sales and other dispositions of public lands will not be made when they would encourage or promote speculation in public lands.

3. Public lands which are marginal for agriculture or which are more valuable for uses other than agriculture or which under national agriculture policy would not be found proper to be reduced to cultivation will not be classified for entry under the public land agricultural development laws.

4. Lands which cannot properly be developed under existing public land laws, taking into consideration such things as full return for the lands, requirements of State, county and other local agencies, and the needs of the local economy will, wherever feasible, be retained in Federal ownership, pending the enactment of appropriate legislation.

5. The Director, Bureau of Land Management, will establish procedures which will insure the full implementation of these anti-speculation policies. Among other things, he will institute procedures to determine, at the time or times just prior to the actions whereby commitments would be made, that positive and convincing evidence exists that the Government will receive full value from the transaction under consideration and that discretionary actions leading to disposition or lease of public lands made pursuant to the public land laws will meet the test of serving the public interest.

MORATORIUM ON APPLICATION AND PETITIONS FOR PUBLIC LANDS

Whereas the public lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management constitute an important segment of the economy of the West and of Alaska and their proper and efficient administration is important to the expansion of that economy; and

Whereas the privilege of filing of applications and petitions under the public land laws has been abused by unethical land locators and promoters at the cost of millions of dollars to the public; and

Whereas the unrestricted privilege of filing of applications has seriously impeded both the orderly and expeditious disposal of public lands suitable therefor to States, local governmental units, private organizations, and individuals and the orderly and efficient management of those lands best suited for continued Federal administration in the public interest; and

Whereas the processing applications and petitions under current procedure is wasteful of public funds; and

Whereas the Executive and the Congress are considering legislation to promote the efficient management of the public lands, therefore—

1. Pursuant to the authority granted to the Secretary of the Interior by sections 453 and 2478 of the Revised Statutes (43 U.S.C. 2 and 1201), as amended, and otherwise, it is hereby directed that, until September 1, 1962, all petitions for classification and applications for rights and privileges described in paragraph 2 hereof, submitted after the date this order is published in the Federal Register, except those submitted by or for States and local governments and by or for holders of scrip rights, will not be accepted, will not be considered as filed, and will be returned to the petitioner or applicant, together with all documents and remittance submitted therewith, unless or until the lands described in such petitions or applications have first been classified by the authorized officer and opened to such petitions or applications.

2. The petitions and applications referred to in paragraph 1 of this order are those which require for their allowance classification and opening or offer under or pursuant to sections 7, 8, or 14 of the act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1272; 43 U.S.C. 315f, 315g, and 1171), as amended, or the act of June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 609; 43 U.S.C. 682a–e), as amended, or the act of June 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 741; 43 U.S.C. 869 et seq.), as amended.

3. Pursuant to the authority cited in paragraph 1 of this order, it is further directed that all petitions and applications of the types referred to in paragraph 2 of this order and pending in the various land offices of the Bureau of Land Management as of the date this order is published in the Federal Register will, as promptly as possible, be considered on their merits by the appropriate land office manager. Where such manager approves such petition or application, the lands will be opened or offered at the earliest possible time. Where such manager rejects such petition or application for reasons involving the proper classification of lands, the decision of the manager will be sustained by the Director, Bureau of Land Management, on appeal if the appellant does not submit to the Director positive and substantial evidence that the classification is in error. Where the Director sustains decision of a manager on the grounds that the appellant had not submitted positive and substantial evidence that the classification is in error, the decision of the Director will be sustained by the Secretary of the Interior if he finds that the appellant had not submitted to the Director, in his appeal to that official, positive and substantial evidence that the classification is in error.

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

Strike of Flight Engineers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I recently noted in the February 22 edition of the Fort Lauderdale, Fla., News, an editorial written by editor and publisher Jack W. Gore regarding the recent flight engineers' strike.

I believe this article is worthy of widespread distribution; and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RIDICULOUS THAT 3,500 FLIGHT ENGINEERS COULD CRIPPLE AIRLINE INDUSTRY

Once again the people of this Nation are seeing a perfect example of how one small labor union can cripple our economy and exert influence far beyond the scope it should have.

As this is written virtually the entire airline industry in this country has ground to a halt because some 3,500 flight engineers don't like a decision that has been handed down by a Government agency and are refusing to work until they can have things more their own way.

As a result, 81,000 other airline employes have already been laid off, thousands of people are being seriously inconvenienced, and millions of dollars a day are being lost by businessmen and others who are dependent upon the maintenance of adequate air transportation service.

People might better understand this strike if it involved a dispute between the flight engineers and the airlines concerned. But the flight engineers are not at odds with the airlines to any great extent. Their primary objection seems to be they don't want to be forced into another, bigger union where they feel they might be swallowed up and lose their entity.

While this may be important to them, is it of great enough concern to deprive the whole Nation of vital air transportation at one of the busiest travel times of the year? Does it warrant depriving thousands of other innocent people of their jobs and causing untold financial loss and inconvenience to millions of others?

We don't think so. As badly aggrieved as the flight engineers might feel, we do not think this gives them any moral right to punish the public because they haven't yet been able to get what they want.

Here in Florida the effects of a prolonged airline shutdown can be disastrous at this particular time. Only in recent days has our seasonal business begun to hit a peak tempo and we are going to need all the business we can get in the remaining weeks of the season to have this year measure up to previous years.

Should this airline shutdown continue long enough to seriously affect travel to and from this area it will add up to an economic setback that will be felt for months to come.

We have never been one to argue for taking away from labor unions their right to strike when they have exhausted all other remedies. But the strike weapon, particularly in essential industries, is not a weapon that should be used indiscriminately or just for the sake of a union flaunting its power.

In this airline dispute it seems to us that the flight engineers are only hurting their own cause by forcing the public to become any unwilling party to their troubles. There is nothing that will antagonize people faster or more effectively than depriving them of an essential service when they need it the most and, in this particular instance, that antagonism is going to be aimed not at the airlines but at the flight engineers who have brought on this airline shutdown.

A long shutdown is certain to bring a renewed public clamor for legislation to outlaw strikes in essential industries such as transportation and public utilities. In the past few years there has been a definite upturn in public sentiment in favor of such legislation, and the more people are inconvenienced and victimized by such strikes the more pressure they are going to exert on the Congress to take action to ban such strikes.

Organized labor in this Nation has come a long way since the days when it had to fight long and bitterly for any kind of recognition. But with recognition and power also comes a certain amount of responsibility toward the public, and the best and the quickest way for labor unions to lose their power and their recognition is to ignore this responsibility.

People are seldom inclined to take sides in labor disputes until they happen to get caught right in the middle of one. Then their apathy and disinterest can vanish in quick order and they can be mighty demanding in their appeals to their elected officials to put an end to strikes that are against the public interest.

There is no question in this airline shutdown about who is being made the primary victim of the dispute. It is the traveling public and those who are dependent upon good airline service for their livelihood.

This includes millions of our people and it stands to reason that these millions of people are not going to be inconvenienced and hurt for very long without demanding a quick end to such nonsense.

It is ridiculous to think that in a nation this big some 3,500 individuals possess the power to bring a giant industry like our airline industry almost to a complete halt. If they persist in wielding this power they are going to lose it for sure and the mourners outside the ranks of organized labor are going to be few and far between.

Pro-Belgian Tag?—He'll Accept It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, with the spotlight of world attention now focused on the Congo and the abuse that has been heaped on the Belgians by Soviet Russia and all its stooges, I felt that the column by William S. White, which appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times on February 25, 1961, merits attention:

PRO-BELGIAN TAG?—HE'LL ACCEPT IT

(By William S. White)

WASHINGTON.—Sometimes a columnist who utters the smallest "yes, but" in all the current evangelical clamor against any and all forms of colonialism—even where the clear alternative may be Communist chaos—finds himself put down as pro something which he should not be.

This is the age not only of instant coffee but also of instant classification by label. There is a proper tag for everybody, and everybody properly falls under this proper tag.

One must be "for the Africans," whether these be honest patriots or merely murderous gunmen on hire to Kremlin agents. One must be against "the colonial powers," even in those not rare cases where "the colonial powers" have made decent and costly efforts to aid an orderly transition of Africa into the new independence.

If, for example, one doubts the total rightness and wisdom of all that has been going on in the Congo against its erstwhile Belgian rulers, one finds, pretty quickly, that he is "pro-Belgian" and "anti-independence."

Very well, then. This way of labeling at least has the advantage of ignoring all the awkward shadings in an immense problem. If a fellow has simply got to be one or the other—absolutely against the Belgians or absolutely in favor of all African "independence" movements, even the Communist ones—then this correspondent makes his choice.

In this sense he is "pro-Belgian." For, from years now long past, he remembers, in an intimately personal way, some things which others perhaps have forgotten. He remembers 1944, when this small country of Belgium was slowly and bitterly being liberated by the U.S. 3d Armored Division.

This was the forward, the breakthrough division in the thrust across Belgium and into Germany. Mons was the first Belgian city we entered, with the most-forward tanks of this most-forward division.

This is a mining area, and the countryside was not unlike that around Pittsburgh and Wheeling, W. Va. France had welcomed General Eisenhower's warriors with wine and flowers. Mons, in the gloomy half-light of a glowering day, was something else altogether.

Here, as our tanks and armored cars trundled along through the main street, stood the people of Mons in long, quiet lines. Many of them had faces black with the grime of the pits; on many of these faces tears cut paths down the cheeks of men as well as women. There was no shouting, no hurrah.

They were hungry people, desperately hungry and long driven like cattle. But, unlike cattle, they had never for an instant been broken. They crowded forward to hand us, still in almost unbroken silence, all that they had—little, doughy cakes whose name I never knew. We had far better food than this, even in our K rations. But we forced down the little cakes. "You'll eat the damn things," said a colonel, a break in his voice, "and that's an order."

From captured German officers themselves we learned that night in Mons something of what these Belgians had done during the far longer night of their Nazi captivity. We were to learn much more as the campaign for Belgium went on: The unbreakable spirit of the Belgiques. Their quiet, hopeless gallantry—and that of the Belgian white army partisans who fought with us. Their bleak, untalking, absolute, total, final faithfulness to their allies.

Among all the heroes of the last war, in simple truth, the indomitable Belgians need take no second place. For my own part, therefore, I think they have long since worked their passage with us—and more. I think they have earned the right—among their old friends, anyhow—even to be wrong.

Community Officials in Wisconsin Decry Pornography

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently I introduced a bill S. 1195, to provide stiffer penalties on distribution of obscene literature in violation of Federal laws.

Across the Nation, the traffic in obscene materials represents a serious threat to the moral standards of the country—particularly those of our youth. The battle against such trash, of course, cannot be solely by the enactment and enforcement of Federal laws. Rather, it will require vigilant efforts by parents, local officials, responsible dealers in publications and others, to cut off this flow of degenerative obscenity.

Recently, the Green Bay Press Gazette published an informative article entitled "Community Officials Decry Pornography," by Joan Schaupp.

Constructively, the article reveals the splendid way in which individuals in the community are cooperating to combat the distribution of obscene literature.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNITY OFFICIALS DECRY PORNOGRAPHY—PROBLEM EXISTS IN GREEN BAY, BUT IS UNDER CONTROL

(By Joan Schaupp)

What is the pornographic literature situation in Green Bay?

There is not any peddling of literature that has been defined as obscene by law—at least not to the knowledge of the police department.

Capt. W. R. Gilsdorf, head of the detective division, is rather proud of this.

He stated that about 5 years ago a man came into town with two suitcases of it.

"We intercepted the guy, locked him up, then handcuffed him and took him back to the distributor in Chicago."

TROUBLE REDUCED

"Since that time we haven't had too much trouble—they know we don't fool around in Green Bay," Gilsdorf added.

William Sinkler, postmaster, praised the work of local citizens in helping to squelch a rash of obscene literature that was being sent through the mails.

"The job of the citizen is to turn it in so the post office can report it to Washington. And the Green Bay citizen has been doing this," Sinkler said.

"Lately it seems to have quieted down," Sinkler remarked.

He also explained: "I sent clippings about COMBAT to the Post Office Department, Washington, so they know how we're handling it in Green Bay."

But what does Green Bay have?

BORDERLINE CASES

Currently borderline literature is being sold to anyone, including teenagers, on several area newsstands. Magazines examined are described as filled with nudes, or almost nudes, vulgarly displayed.

The Reverend H. H. Toonen, O. Praem., principal of Premontre High School, says that there isn't any question that the teenagers are getting this literature. "They just go down and buy it," he said.

"But we don't see it every day," he pointed out.

The schools handle this problem if and when the literature appears by confiscating it, calling the student to the office and calling in the parents.

This keeps the appearance in the schools at a minimum.

Does this literature affect the students?

STUDENTS CONCERNED

Father Toonen replied to a questionnaire sent by COMBAT to all area educators: "We have had good students come to us truly upset by the immoral pictures and articles that were shown them and I feel that our experience has been the same as that of other persons having to deal with students."

Walter Zahn, principal of Franklin Junior High School, replied to the questionnaire: "It is unquestionably true that much of the filth being dispensed to the youth of our community via immoral, indecent literature in various forms does much to warp and distort the sense of values and moral precepts of these immature minds."

Edward Blecha, guidance director, Preble High School, answered: "Indecent literature that is flooding the market is without question the greatest single problem that young people face today. This type of literature strongly suggests it is right and proper to do the things that have been contrary to acceptable moral standards, because times and standards have changed."

CALLED UNHEALTHY

Dr. Bernard Kalina, psychiatrist and director of the child guidance center, terms it "unhealthy."

"It just isn't healthy," he said emphatically.

"It's the children who have certain deficits who will be affected," Dr. Kalina pointed out.

James Hogan, an Apostolate social worker, is so concerned about the effects of this literature on the boys under his supervision that he became an active member of Combat.

He has been instrumental in organizing the public rally Monday at 8 p.m. at the Elks Club with Charles J. Keating as the main speaker.

Hogan states that about three-fourths of the boys he works with read the type of indecent literature now being sold on the newsstand. And he goes further to say that this has seriously contributed to the delinquency of a few of them.

INDIFFERENT PARENTS

Dr. Thomas Bassett, clinical psychologist at the reformatory, repeated a common theme. "It's not going to do the impressionable teenager any good. What is difficult to determine is how much harm it is doing."

Many educators feel that the greatest problem is parental indifference.

Francis L. Sundberg, vice principal of East High School, wrote in answer to the questionnaire:

"It seems to me that the most difficult thing to combat in this matter is apathy and parental indifference. The public tends to adopt a complacent attitude toward indecent and obscene books, magazines, and movies; and generally seems to feel that the situation isn't really too bad."

And Burton Rosefelt, former guidance director at East High School, wrote:

"I feel most wholeheartedly that the parents are the ones to act in behalf of their children. Educators have long been on the bandwagon and parents have continually assumed the school would take care of all their problems and discipline, which are rightfully theirs."

Should the New Haven Go Bankrupt Again?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRESCOTT BUSH
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Hartford Courant of Friday, March 3, 1961, entitled "Should the New Haven Go Bankrupt Again?"

The editorial refers to an emergency in which the New Haven Railroad finds itself, and rather supports the position I have taken, to wit, that the action of the New England Council suggesting receivership for the New Haven Railroad must now receive very serious consideration.

I make this conclusion with much reluctance, for various reasons; but I believe anyone who studies the situation closely and deeply must come to the conclusion that the things that need to be done simply will not be done without the intervention of court-appointed trustees.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOULD THE NEW HAVEN GO BANKRUPT AGAIN?

First came doubts in the general assembly over whether tax relief for the New Haven Railroad would do any good. Not that anyone saw anything wrong with the almost universally approved idea of keeping the trains running by means of such relief. Rather the question is whether, even granted such relief, the road can keep its head above the financial waters. Now comes the New England Council, which after a detailed and thoughtful study says that what is needed is both tax relief and bankruptcy.

Perhaps the council's most useful service is to put the question of bankruptcy into perspective. Bankruptcy is, of course, a last resort. It puts the burden of loss not on the enterprise that fails but on its creditors—which here include Uncle Sam. But as the council points out, bankruptcy would not mean that the trains would stop running. Rather it might hasten the day for rehabilitating them, and for returning the enterprise as nearly as may be possible to the ideal of a private enterprise that gives good service and make a profit. And bankruptcy's greatest service, once the hard decision has been taken, would be the regeneration that would come with it, the employee morale and public satisfaction.

An even more persuasive argument than the council's is the history of the New Haven's previous forced reorganization. On that day in 1947 when the trustees, after a 12-year effort, turned the road back to private management it was at its high point in its modern history. It had new equipment, it was safe, sure—and ran a lot more and cleaner trains than it does today. There followed the proxy fights, the battles for control over the descent into decay, that were a disgrace to private enterprise.

Surely one need, no matter what happens, is for qualified, professional management. And here the council's report points to testimony from Mr. Alpert himself that the presidency had been offered in vain to 18 professionals. Clearing away the burden of debt, adds the report, would give the railroad what it needs most—competent operating management, and working capital.

It may be that our society has grown so complex—and so motorized—that our railways can never again give good passenger service and make money too. Certainly all but a few of them aren't what they used to be. And they have before them the spectacle of the urban mass-transportation systems, many of whose ills the New Haven shares. Few of them, from the subways of New York to the buses of the Connecticut company, can make the grade without subsidy in one form or another. It may be that the tax relief agreed to by the four Governors, and the fact that only a 100-percent guarantee of loans by the Federal Government has kept the New Haven solvent thus far, are only samples of the artificial aid from the outside that will be needed to keep this essential public utility going. If so, then so be it. At the moment anything is better than today's gloomy prospect of mounting debt and decaying service.

Campaigns Should Be Clipped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, in further support of my campaign to limit the time of presidential elections, I append herewith a very pertinent editorial from the Waterbury Republican of December 15, 1960:

ABBREVIATION NEEDED; CAMPAIGN SHOULD BE CLIPPED

The weather, Mark Twain is supposed to have said, is something everybody talks about but nobody does anything about. So,

too, with the seemingly interminable election campaigns.

The memory of the stifling repetition and endless parade of political officeseekers throughout the land is still fresh in our minds, but 4 years hence we will probably suffer from the same overdoses of buncombe and pageantry as have only recently been concluded.

Believing that some relief is needed from the extended campaign period, however, and getting politicians to relinquish chances to sound off, shake hands, and kiss babies, are two very separate and distinct considerations. And yet, due probably to the vast and swift news coverage of the campaigns, there seems to be an increasing discontent with the surfeit of words and crowdmaking performances of the national candidates.

The weariness such prolonged campaigning produces was more than evident in the recent canvass and the imposition of a semiparalysis on the policymaking bodies of Government has been frequently lamented by our allies abroad. Is it all necessary?

"If crowds were votes," the late Al Smith said, "William Jennings Bryan would have been thrice President." Personal appearances are seldom little more than just that, and supporters of both candidates tire of hearing their man mouth the same catchphrases and shibboleths day in and day out until the national campaign staggers to a close.

A special House Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures is holding hearings in Washington, D.C., on whether the presidential campaign period should be shortened. We don't know who will defend the excessive duration of the campaigns, but we know of one man who will advocate their abridgment: Representative JOHN S. MONAGAN.

Representative MONAGAN has repeatedly pressed for a more sensible campaign time allotment and in May presented his arguments in an article in the magazine section of the New York Times; arguments which were seconded on this page at that time.

Representative CLIFFORD DAVIS, Democrat, of Tennessee, chairman of the Campaign Committee, has issued Representative MONAGAN a special invitation to testify before the committee today as one of the initial witnesses of the hearings.

We know and support what Representative MONAGAN will have to say. We can only hope the committee listens attentively.

The Pedestrian Point of View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the Pedestrian League of America, located in New York City, is working very hard to restore the right to walk. For those of us who are forced—or even at times deliberately choose—to exercise our once unchallenged right to perambulate, the hazards in these days of throughways and superhighways are immense.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD an account from Newsday, on the activities and objectives of the Pedestrian League of America.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WALKER OFFERS PEDESTRIAN POINT OF VIEW
(By Doris Herzig)

A small army of valiant foot soldiers is out to regain a lost kingdom for the American pedestrian.

Less than 200 strong, but armed with statistics and sharp verbal barbs, the Pedestrian League of America (Box 1308, Church Street Post Office, Manhattan), is fighting against overwhelming odds to restore the right to walk.

In defending the American pedestrian, the league inevitably finds itself attacking the American automobile. It charges the motorcar with gobbling up the countryside, poisoning the air we breathe and curtailing our civil liberties, besides killing and maiming our citizens.

"We are not antiautomobile. We're just propedestrian," said Leo Wilensky of Brooklyn, the nonmotorized director of the league. "We are dedicated to the interests, health, safety, and welfare, including the scenic welfare, of the American pedestrian.

"At one time," Mr. Wilensky pointed out, "the pedestrian was king of the road. Now the pedestrian is more and more deprived of space by the automobile. With the Federal highway construction program, roads will occupy an area equivalent to that of 8 or 10 States by 1965. At the rate we're going, America will be all road."

The dethroned king of the road is also being deprived of his civil liberties, the league believes. "He is told where and when and how to walk and how long it should take him to get across. As the city and State move in to control traffic and congestion, more and more police are required and our rights are curtailed."

The timing of traffic lights, he emphasized, works a special hardship on women, because of high heels and tight skirts. "We have found that women cross streets at a slower pace than male pedestrians. We have suggested to traffic engineers that lights be adjusted at shopping centers where there are large numbers of women walkers."

The league not only begrudges the automobile the land underfoot but also the money lavished on society's mechanized pet.

"Many authorities claim that building sidewalks is not economically justified. But they're always finding money for the motorists—roads, parking areas, lights, signs, and traffic police."

The league's spokesman reluctantly conceded that "in some areas" the automobile will always be needed. "We're not against the individual motorist, we're only concerned with the automobile where its massive, social, total effects adversely affect the pedestrian.

"In rural areas, we believe that sidewalks should be put up wherever possible. In fact, we go even further. We believe sidewalks should be put up before roads instead of vice versa."

The only group of its kind in the United States, the league was organized a year ago. Its formation was inspired by the British Pedestrian Association in London, which has 50,000 members.

Among the league's members, who are lightly scattered throughout 12 States, are a retired auto engineer from Detroit, a woman student from California who rides a bicycle to college, a nonmotorist from Hempstead, an architect from the Bronx, and a Manhattan physical culturist who believes cars are making people fat, lazy, and subject to heart ailments.

At first, the league advocated fingerprinting of motorists to prevent their getting licenses under false names from other States, but, Mr. Wilensky sadly recalled, public opposition forced the organization to abandon this policy temporarily at least.

The league favors stiffer license tests, stricter enforcement of traffic laws, and the banning of driving and parking near schools.

Its attitude toward small cars is almost benign. "The smaller the better," Mr. Wilensky said.

It likes lots of open space for strollers, preferably enriched with flowers and equipped with benches. It doesn't like parking lots or billboard advertising. The league's officials are not permitted to own cars, lest their purely pedestrian point of view take on a vehicular taint.

Railway Mail Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. QUENTIN N. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, the previous administration's policy of taking away mail service from the railroads has proved markedly unsuccessful in my State of North Dakota. Explaining this is a fine editorial in the Minot, N. Dak., Daily News of March 4, 1961. I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECHO OF MR. SUMMERFIELD

We have no idea of going into ecstasy with the final announcement of the Great Northern to take off passenger trains Nos. 9 and 10, Minot to Fargo. The company contends it has lost $20,000 a month on the operation west of Fargo since Postmaster General Summerfield discontinued mail contracts.

It was this eminent Republican official who gave birth to the idea that the way to move mail was on the highways. As a result contract after contract with railroads has been cancelled and following such action passenger train after passenger train has been withdrawn.

For the service he rendered the Democratic party, this man Summerfield should have been awarded the iron cross by President Kennedy.

Everyone knows that it is cheaper to operate a car or truck than a train and that savings could be effected.

But almost everyone knows that the winter weather in North Dakota is not conducive to scheduled operation on the highways. People desire and have a right to expect the regular movement of mail. For decades the railways have been employed. Now but a fraction of the mail goes over the rails.

A factor that probably never occurred to Mr. Summerfield is that people living on branch lines have learned to expect mail and express service daily from the railroad. The train has become a part of their life. In some respects it is their connection with the outside world.

Conceded the passenger patronage dwindled, but the service was important. It was there when the people needed it.

But with the loss of mail there is no question what is bound to happen on every branch. It has hit the main line and has also been felt in just about every corner of the State.

The News owns no stock in the railways. But we recognize the great job they did in the settlement of North Dakota, pioneering the movement of homesteaders.

Currently the pattern seems to be to subsidize competitors of the railways and take mail contracts from them as fast as possible,

leaving remote sections with no service when highways are blocked.

North Dakota has been rendered a disservice by Mr. Summerfield from which recovery may be all too slow.

Democracy Limited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the action in the House to enlarge the membership of our Rules Committee has attracted nationwide attention. The events which have followed this action by our body have also merited many comments. Following is an editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times of February 27, 1961, entitled "Democracy Limited" which I think is a most interesting commentary:

DEMOCRACY LIMITED

In the words of Alice, the goings on between Speaker SAM RAYBURN and the House Rules Committee are getting "curiouser and curiouser."

Not long ago, RAYBURN won his fight to enlarge the Rules Committee to prevent a conservative coalition from blocking legislation bound for the Chamber. As we understood it, the idea was for the full House to have the chance to vote measures up or down, rather than have the decision made by a handful of Congressmen on the committee.

Among other things, the Nation was told at the time, the Kennedy administration's entire legislative program was in danger as long as measures could be bottled up in the committee which controls the flow of bills to the House floor.

Nobody ever accused SAM RAYBURN of being a flaming liberal but he was clearly on the side of the angels as he led the drive to restore democratic procedures to House deliberations.

However, latest advices from the banks of the Potomac suggest the results were a bit more than Mr. SAM bargained for.

Committee Chairman HOWARD SMITH, Democrat of Virginia, who used to lead the roadblocking coalition, was seized with a sudden fervor to move legislation, all legislation, to the floor. The 217 to 212 vote by which control of the committee was wrested from him was a "mandate," said the 78-year-old Congressman dryly, not to hold up bills from House consideration.

Thus it was that RAYBURN spent the better part of last week lining up votes on the committee—to bottle up legislation he didn't want the House to have the chance to consider. And with the help of the members he added to the committee to prevent it from bottling up legislation, he succeeded.

Killed by the Rules Committee was a proposal to allow TV broadcasts of House proceedings, and a bill to curb Federal spending without direct appropriations, both opposed by RAYBURN. A third measure lacking the Speaker's approval was amended to meet his objections.

It appears that democracy, in SAM RAYBURN'S view, is a fine thing. It just shouldn't be carried too far.

Wisconsin Farmers Union 1961 Action Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in face of serious economic problems, the farmers of the Nation—individually and through their organizations—are vigorously attempting to find solutions which will brighten the economic outlook.

Recently, the Wisconsin Farmers Union News published the Union's 1961 Action program. The program outlines the views of this fine organization on a wide variety of problems confronting not only farmers but the people of the whole country.

In the past, I have differed from time to time with the policies of the Union. However, I have also had the gratifying experience of working shoulder-to-shoulder with it on many challenges confronting the American farmer and the country.

Believing the views of the Wisconsin Farmers Union warrant the consideration of the Members of Congress, I ask unanimous consent to have the Action program printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN FARMERS UNION PREAMBLE

Thirty years ago Wisconsin Farmers Union received its State charter and joined the National Farmers Union family. Born in the midst of a great depression, Wisconsin Farmers Union has survived to become a growing force for constructive action in agriculture as well as in other related fields.

During this span of three decades, revolutionary changes have taken place in farming and in the American standard of living. Agriculture progressed from the horse and buggy stage to an era of new technology. The United States moved to a position of world leadership and its expanding economy became both the wonder and envy of the world.

Wisconsin Farmers Union came into being at a time when agriculture's role in the national economy was being reassessed. The great depression convinced the country's leaders that the prosperity of farmers and the entire Nation were inseparable. A new policy was pursued to use the powers of the Federal Government to help maintain a sound and healthy agriculture in the public interest. This was a drastic departure from the past when the farmer was forced to shift for himself the best he could.

Under the leadership of Government and agriculture, our family farmers have become the most efficient in the world. Their great productive capacity has stood the test of two armed conflicts. The eyes of the hungry the world over have turned to these shores for hope and sustenance.

Now as the decade of the 1960's unfolds, our country's claim to world leadership is being challenged by a power whose beliefs are alien to ours. The Soviet Union has dedicated all its efforts to surpassing the United States as a world society. Significantly, Soviet regimentation has produced rockets to the moon but barely sufficient food to feed its masses.

The immediate years ahead are fateful ones for our Nation. Millions of the earth's peoples grow impatient under the specters of poverty and illiteracy, hunger, and disease. New nations, emerging from the disintegration of colonial empires, seek political and economic self-determination. Satisfaction of these human needs and aspirations can mean the difference between war and peace—the difference between freedom and slavery.

We as farmers must accept our responsibility to help keep America the bulwark of freedom and democracy in the world. The programs we support in these perilous times must not arise out of selfish interests or seek narrow goals. We believe that to strengthen the farm economy is to strengthen America. And a strong America, a compassionate America in the world community of nations, is man's greatest hope for peace and freedom.

WISCONSIN FARMERS UNION'S 1961 ACTION PROGRAM

We believe that family-type farming is fundamental and basic. It is the cradle of American freedom and democracy. American prosperity can never be secure without a prosperous agriculture.

We believe our economic system can and must be so adjusted to give farm families full opportunity to earn and receive a parity income equal on the average to the incomes of Americans in other walks of life.

We shall support adoption and use of workable combinations of farm commodity income improvement methods such as: loans, purchase agreements, market surplus diversion purchases, parity income deficiency payments direct to farmers limited to family-size operations, increased regulation of imports, export incentive payments, expanded development and use of marketing agreements and orders, marketing premium payments for sale of livestock at desirable weights designed to keep supplies in balance with demand, marketing standards and scheduling, cooperative storage and marketing practices, and a system of market supply management devices, subject to producer referendum, to help balance farm production to existing demand.

We urge the organization of a centralized and federated nationwide producer cooperative marketing organization for dairy products, and we favor State enabling legislation to develop cooperative marketing organizations which can fit into such federated nationwide cooperative marketing of agricultural commodities.

We favor the expansion of co-op processing, marketing, and storage facilities, including terminal markets, through REA-type loans and technical assistance to farmer-owned and controlled cooperatives.

We favor the elimination of interstate barriers to the free flow of quality dairy products between markets. For this purpose we favor Federal legislation for establishing uniform sanitation standards and practices in the production, processing, transportation and sale of fluid milk and milk products shipped in interstate commerce.

We urge consolidation of the conservation reserve with the ACP program and that the total program be expanded. Greater emphasis and attention should be given to the soil and water conservation aspects of the program. In any future land retirement program, we reaffirm our opposition to the placing of entire farms in reserve. Closer supervision and enforcement should be exercised by the Department and the farmer

committees to see to it that land conservation and care requirements are strictly carried out in the conservation reserve and ACP programs.

All possible measures to expand consumption of farm commodities should be undertaken, consistent with good soil conservation, before resorting to production restrictions. We recommend that the national food stamp plan as recently enacted be used to supplement the diets of underprivileged persons, and we favor a more aggressive export program to undernourished peoples of the world. We commend the University of Wisconsin and its extension service for its leadership in basic and applied farm research, and urge the State legislature to provide sufficient funds for an expanded program. We recognize that the University of Wisconsin College of Agriculture and its extension service have pioneered in spreading the results of farm research throughout the State, and the university has achieved great success in increasing efficient production on Wisconsin farms. These technological advances on the production side have now outstripped improvements in the distribution of farm commodities. The emphasis in such an expanded research program should be placed upon studies concerned with marketing and new uses of farm commodities.

We favor the enactment of a State food stamp plan in Wisconsin by which surplus food commodities would be made available to low-income families and the recipients of State and county welfare aids through the normal channels of trade. Such a plan should be supported by a Federal contribution equal to the value of the surplus commodities consumed through the plan's operation. A dairy food stamp plan would prevent the waste of surplus food commodities, insure a more adequate diet for needy persons, save on public storage and handling costs, and channel this trade through the local retail food merchant.

We favor an adequate school lunch and special milk program, and that it be continued on a Federal basis. We favor the use of more dairy products by our Armed Forces.

We recommend that the healthful benefits of milk be fully promoted, and that inconclusive research on the butterfat-cholesterol relationship to heart disease be withheld from the public until positive proof has been established and agreement between medical authorities has been reached.

We favor legislation to establish and maintain stockpiles of storable farm commodities as a safety reserve in the overall program of national defense.

We are opposed to the sale of Government-owned agricultural commodities on the market for less than market price plus 5 percent and carrying charges. We believe in rotating the commodities in storage, especially perishable commodities, with new crops or produce to avoid deterioration, but the commodities so marketed should be replaced with an amount equal to that taken out so as not to add to the amount normally marketed.

We demand representation of family-type farmers on all governmental boards and agencies involving agricultural programs.

We advocate a return to the democratic practices formerly used in the establishment and in the authority of farmer committees in the administration of the ASC program.

We favor the establishment of a comprehensive farm credit yardstick program built around the Farmers Home Administration to serve all family farmers, with minimum interest rates, increased size of allowable loans, and repayments geared to the borrower's ability to pay.

We continue to support the development and use of farmer-owned production credit and farm loan associations and the banks for cooperatives.

We endorse the methods being employed by soil conservation districts to help farmers across the Nation solve their soil and water problems. We recommend an acceleration in the planning and installation of watershed protection and flood-prevention projects under soil conservation district leadership. And we commend the U.S. Soil Conservation Service for its contribution of technical assistance to these activities.

We continue to favor the adequate program now operating in Wisconsin for the eradication of brucellosis (Bang's disease); and we support the tuberculosis program work being done by the Wisconsin State Department of Agriculture and the College of Agriculture in further improving the method used to identify tuberculin reactors and commend the use of the new diagnostic laboratories to find cures for new diseases.

We favor further development of the REA-financed electrical and telephone programs. We are opposed to legislation which would increase interest rates on REA loans. We protest any discrimination against co-op applicants in making loans for the telephone program.

We urge Farmers Union members to give all their patronage to Farmers Union cooperatives and their Farmers Union insurance program and to build more cooperatives in Farmers Union territory to provide services where they are needed, and to fight the rising tide of operating costs. Building the strength of cooperatives also requires the full support of cooperative patrons through membership in the Farmers Union, which carries on the educational and legislative program in their behalf.

We have always taken the position that taxes should be levied according to the ability to pay. We oppose any proposal for either State or Federal sales taxes.

We favor the present method of computing taxes on qualified farm cooperatives and are opposed to discriminatory double taxation of cooperative refunds.

We favor the taxing of excess profits in corporate income.

We favor the elimination of depletion allowances and accelerated tax amortization, where they are excessive, and other tax loopholes.

We favor an increase in State aid to provide additional funds for adequate schools serving the rural areas, such additional funds to come from taxation in accordance with the ability to pay.

We favor increased Federal aid for education. We oppose the proposal to withdraw Federal aid from vocational agriculture and domestic science.

We favor and recommend that bona fide, working farmers be represented on the governing bodies of the State university and colleges and on the Board of Vocational and Adult Education.

We are opposed to any plan which would destroy the segregation of highway tax income. We favor a more liberal policy in classifications of primary and secondary roads in the townships.

We favor a State and Federal program of investigation and regulation of monopolies and vigorous prosecution of all illegal practices.

We recognize and support labor's right to organize and bargain collectively for adequate wages and improved working conditions. We are opposed to the efforts to sabotage these fundamental rights of labor under the guise of so-called "right to work" legislation. Full employment in the cities at good wages is vital to the farmer's market.

We favor a medical aid to the aged program under social security.

We favor an immediate program to expand facilities for training more doctors and other medical personnel.

A Federal scholarship program should be made available to provide financial assistance to qualified students.

We favor realistic programs of aid for veterans.

We favor a reappraisal of our national defense needs in the light of recent development of new weapons and techniques of warfare, with particular reference to the need for trained manpower. Technological advances and training required for military personnel appear to require emphasis on longer enlistments of trained professional personnel with sufficient incentives for such, with more emphasis on quality than quantity.

We believe that in time of national emergency, industry and wealth should be drafted as well as manpower.

We favor greater participation in the present rural civil defense program in which every effort should be made to acquaint farm families with the necessary measures to be taken to protect themselves and their crops and livestock against radioactive fallout.

We favor new State legislation, governing the use of our water resources, which is adequate for the needs of our changing technology and population.

We support recently strengthened State legislation on eminent domain and urge farmers to avail themselves of all the protection the law provides when their rights or title to land are affected.

We endorse the principle of selective cutting and reforestation. We urge that public works in reforestation and cooperative logging and processing plants be established.

We believe that the use of State marketing orders and agreements should be encouraged and extended to all crops practical, and that wood products be included. We favor close cooperation with the Wisconsin State Department of Agriculture in implementing these orders and agreements.

Farm and highway safety is becoming increasingly important. We favor training programs and tightening of drivers' licensing to promote more safety.

We favor strengthening the United Nations and enlarging its functions for the purpose of peace. We support the Food and Agricultural Organization, the International Labor Office, U.N. Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization, and the World Health Organization and the establishment of a World Food Bank. We enthusiastically support the international exchange of farm trainees and urge the continuation and expansion of this program for better understanding among nations.

We favor economic aid to less developed nations of the world.

We favor a National Science Foundation to control all patents developed by public agencies to the general welfare of all people.

We are opposed to the control of atomic energy research falling into private hands or into the hands of the military.

The Wisconsin Farmers Union is opposed to all forms of totalitarian dictatorship, regardless of whether these dictatorships be political, economic, religious, or intellectual in character. We believe in political, economic, religious, and intellectual freedom with justice for all, and we shall oppose the efforts of any group to change this fundamental philosophy with the aim of subverting our program and organization to their ends.

Bolster Farm Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I

wish to include a resolution adopted by the Hamilton County Farmers Union, at Syracuse, Kans., on February 23, 1961;

RESOLUTION BY MEMBERS OF KANSAS FARMERS UNION

Farmers income has been declining for the last 8 to 10 years. By the same token cost of labor, machinery, and supplies have constantly increased since that time.

It should be pointed out that every dollar of declining farm income since that time has been that much less net profit for farmers. Business and farm purchasing power are measured in terms of net profit.

We, the members of Farmers Union, Hamilton County, meeting at Syracuse, Kans., this 23d day of February 1961 request the following resolution be sent to the Honorable Congressman J. FLOYD BREEDING and the Honorables Senator ANDREW SCHOEPPEL, and Senator FRANK CARLSON:

"Whereas the farmers net income has decreased to a disastrous low; and

"Whereas farmers are aware that excess production has contributed immeasurably to depressed farm commodity prices to farmers; and

"Whereas farmers in general, regardless of some farm organizations policies, do believe that agriculture must manage its supplies in order to receive an equitable income from the farm; and

"Whereas farmers do believe that referendums in regard to supply management and prices of various commodities should be held; and

"Whereas farmers have generally agreed that bargaining cannot be attained without control of supply by quotas or other methods; and

"Whereas this Nation's economy shall not remain healthy with a contagiously sick agricultuire in its midst; and

"Whereas farmers are being forced from the land not because of inefficiency but because of economic distress to join the jobless laborers in the city: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Congress and the Senate of the United States support this administration in its drive to bolster farm income during this session of the Congress by whatever legislative devices, tools, and mechanisms necessary to attain an income for farmers as the Congress so righteously has done for this Nation's industry and labor."

A. C. Westerman, Murlin Carter, Arthur E. Carter, Charles Van Eddy, Fred Westeman, Gene Schwerdfege, I. L. Wickerson, Marion Wickerly, Walter L. Westeman, E. L. Hatcher, L. J. Eddy, H. A. Forber, Mrs. Murlin Carter, Mrs. I. L. Nickerson, Roy H. Dunagan, Basin W. Crist, Legislative Committee of Hamilton County, Kans., Farmers Union.

The Dollar and Our National Purpose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following remarks of Alfred Hayes, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, before the 33d annual midwinter meeting of the New York State Bankers Association which was held at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel, New York City, on January 23, 1961:

THE DOLLAR AND OUR NATIONAL PURPOSE

When I spoke to you just 2 years ago, most of us were preoccupied with the difficult problem of checking pronounced inflationary tendencies, which were evident throughout our economy, without at the same time inhibiting desirable economic growth. By and large the efforts of monetary policy along these lines during 1959 were working not only in behalf of a healthy domestic economy but also in the direction of an improved balance of payments. While monetary policy can take only a part—perhaps a small part—of the credit, the objective of checking a dangerous inflationary psychology was very largely accomplished. Unfortunately the twin objective of full use of our resources was not achieved. To what extent this was due to the disrupting influence of the steel strike may never be measured accurately. In any case, full recovery was not attained before new recessionary tendencies began to appear, and therefore monetary policy began to swing over early in 1960 from restraint to ease.

As softness in business conditions persisted and became more accentuated, the resultant weakening of credit demands, together with a Federal Reserve policy of monetary ease, brought a substantial decline in short-term interest rates. And as this was reflected in a considerable flow of short-term capital from this country to Europe, reaching a peak in the summer and early autumn of 1960, it was demonstrated that monetary policies that were clearly helpful from a domestic point of view were having some effects that were not helpful to our international financial position. The result was that we were led to devise a policy that would assure ample availability of credit for as long as it was needed, but would at the same time hold the outflow of short-term capital from our shores to a tolerable limit. This is still the basic frame of reference for our current actions.

During the past few months the position of the dollar has been subject to more questioning and eyebrow raising, here and abroad, than at any time in the last quarter century. I shall try to show a little later on why I think these doubts on the dollar have been unwarranted. But the mere fact that they exist is of the utmost importance to us. After all, the dollar is the foundation on which all of our international economic relationships—and in fact many of those of the entire free world—have been based throughout the period of postwar reconstruction and development. We cannot allow any cloud on the dollar's reputation to persist.

In a sense this concern about the dollar has come at an appropriate time, for the Nation is apparently in a healthy mood of self-examination, of reappraisal of our broad objectives and our means to attain them. For lack of time and knowledge, I shall not dwell on the political and military aspects of this self-examination. But in the economic sphere the primary fact confronting us today is the urgent need of the underdeveloped areas of the world for sound advice and tangible assistance in achieving a better standard of life. I believe there is general recognition in this country that we cannot shirk this obligation—to ourselves as well as to the world we live in—and that the total economic assistance forthcoming from the industrialized nations must increase rather than decrease. The average man's commonsense tells him that a country rich enough to afford our standard of living is rich enough to do its part in this world task—and I am confident that the same feeling exists, and is in fact increasing, in the more prosperous countries of Western Europe. But where this popular understanding breaks down is in drawing the necessary conclusions as to the need for self-discipline—in the matter of costs and prices, and in fiscal and monetary policy—if we are to translate this inherent ability to create a better world into practical accomplishment.

We bankers and central bankers are often accused of placing too much stress on financial soundness, to the detriment of human objectives. Yet most of the bankers I know are no less mindful of these human needs than is the average citizen; they are, however, often better acquainted with the limitations set by our economic and financial structures—and with the choices to be faced if monetary stability, a basic requirement of sound growth, is to be preserved. They are aware that if the Nation wishes to do more in the public sphere, either at home or abroad, its citizens must be willing to pay for these outlays through taxation. And while it would be pleasant if this taxation could be made painless by having economic growth provide these additional resources automatically within our present tax structure—or better still within a lower tax structure—we must also recognize that in periods when needs outstrip growth there will have to be conscious choices and perhaps conscious, but purposeful, sacrifices to meet these needs. At such times, given the already steep rates of taxation on income, additional revenues might well have to come from taxes on some of the less essential types of spending that now compete for our resources. Furthermore, when the question involves provision of assistance abroad, we must recognize that theer is an additional hurdle—the hurdle of our international balance of payments—which must be overcome before resources available in this country can be made available abroad in a form that will not do violence to the dollar's stability.

So much has been said and written about the U.S. balance of payments that I shall try to be mercifully brief on this tortured but vital subject. For purposes of this discussion, I shall assume that in present circumstances the "hard-core" balance-of-payments deficit—exclusive of short-term capital movements—is in the neighborhood of $2 billion annually. As is inevitable when a large number of items of inflow are lined up against an equally large number of items of outflow, there is no mathematically valid way of attributing the difference between total inflow and total outflow to one or more specific causes. Thus, our balance-of-payments deficit could be ascribed to inadequate exports, excessive military outlays, too much foreign assistance, or excessive U.S. investments abroad, depending entirely on the analyst's point of view.

Just as there is no single cause, there is also no single or easy cure for the deficits of recent years. A solution must be pursued vigorously along many different paths, not only by ourselves but also by our major trading partners, for whom the preservation and strengthening of the international payments mechanism is no less vital than for ourselves.

As to our exports, we can at least point to a very healthy rate of expansion in the past year, with the favorable merchandise trade balance recently running at an annual rate of better than $5 billion. This is a high figure historically, even after allowing for the favorable effects of a European boom; but it is not high enough, in view of the continuing heavy demands on our resources. My own judgment is that our position in the world obliges us to strive for even larger exports, and this means above all a need to keep our costs and prices as competitive as we can make them. Fortunately, our effectiveness in attaining this goal should also contirbute importantly to achieving substantial economic growth with reasonable price stability.

The various measures announced by the President last November to reduce American military expenditures abroad, and to tie our aid to developing countries to our own exports, should have a salutary, if gradual, effect on the favorable balance for total trade and services. There are other measures which can help to achieve a better trade balance, such as removal of quantitative import restrictions abroad, lowering of excessive foreign tariffs, and removal of special unilateral incentives to American tourists to import duty-free foreign products (such incentives having been initiated largely as a conscious aid to closing the late-lamented "dollar gap"). In a parallel situation in the immediate postwar years, when the United States ran a stubborn payments surplus, we took the lead in reducing tariffs and extending aid to others, in order to bring about a better international balance. While I recognize that "tying" has no place in normal private international trade and lending, large-scale public assistance probably does justify "tying" for balance-of-payments reasons—and help "in kind" under such circumstances seems clearly preferable to a reduction in the amount of assistance.

There is no doubt in my mind that greater sharing of the burdens of foreign assistance and the defense of the free world offers one of the most promising possibilities for betterment in our balance of payments. Here we are up against the difficult problem of finding appropriate "yardsticks" for dividing such burdens. Granted that there will never be complete agreement as to the relative importance, for this purpose, of the various countries' domestic national income and of their ability to handle the burden from a balance-of-payments standpoint, I am sure that a reasonable compromise can be achieved among men of good will seeking a common objective. The very persistence of large surpluses in some countries' balance-of-payments positions could, in some circumstances, be taken as a rough indication that they might equitably undertake more of the burdens of defense and foreign aid. Already I have been impressed by the fact that many responsible leaders in Europe recognize that something along these lines can and must be done; and I believe that we shall see tangible progress on this front in the coming year, possibly centered around the coordinating activities of the new Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

Perhaps the most puzzling aspect of our whole balance of payments is the role played by private long-term investment. Many of you are probably familiar with the analysis wherein the U.S. payments deficit is equated with our outflow of funds on private long-term capital account, leading to the conclusion that the problem is not too serious, since we are acquiring productive investments which will ultimately provide a heavy return flow of interest and dividends. Recognizing the validity of this argument from the longer term standpoint, we must still face the problem of how to meet the balance-of-payments deficit here and now. One aspect of the matter that deserves study is the effect of existing United States and foreign tax laws on the flow of such investment and on the transfer of earnings to this country. There is the related question whether our tax laws should not differentiate between the less developed and the more industrialized countries, since special incentives are still appropriate for the former.

Another significant problem of our international private investment program is the growing tide of nationalism in countries which have been major recipients of long-term American capital. Granted that long-term private investment on a worldwide scale remains a most promising source of higher living standards everywhere—just as it played a major role at one time in developing our own country—we should be rethinking some of these related problems which seem to be diluting some of the great mutual benefits of international investment. Perhaps some vehicle for the internationalization of private equity investment might have fruitful possibilities, although direct investment by corporations will probably continue to be the mainstay of private investment.

Assuming as I do, that by various means we can soon eliminate our "hard core" deficit, two related questions may still remain unanswered: First, will we thereby remove a necessary source of world liquidity? Second, will the dollar still be in an unduly vulnerable position in the event that short-term capital outflows, and induced gold outflows, should threaten confidence in our currency?

On the first point, it has been argued that the United States should deliberately continue to run moderate deficits in its balance of payments—averaging, say, one-half a billion to a billion dollars annually—in order to add to total foreign reserves of gold and dollars over the long run. This would tend to follow from the fact that U.S. balance-of-payments deficits over the past decade have in fact been a major source of needed additional monetary reserves of European and other countries, and hence have helped to fill a need for world liquidity that could not have been wholly met from limited new gold production. There may be some force in this argument, if we take the long view, although I am persuaded that for the near future there is ample international liquidity and no need for us to incur deficits to meet such a need. Moreover, in the longer run, U.S. constributions to world liquidity should be the result of deliberate decisions made at our discretion, rather than the chance by-product of excessive spending and lending abroad in relation to our resources. The final answer to the tenability of such deficits depends on whether we can maintain sufficient faith in the dollar so that modestly higher aggregate short-term liabilities in relation to our gold holdings are supportable. This leads to consideration of the second question.

If our basic balance-of-payments deficit is virtually eliminated—except for cyclical fluctuations that might cause deficits in some years and offsetting surpluses in others—I can see little reason to fear periods of serious loss of confidence in the dollar, provided we are pursuing policies at home, both in Government and in the private economy, which are calculated to keep our costs and prices competitive. The balance-of-payments deficit having been corrected, our present gold holdings of about $17½ billion seem ample, both in relation to the world's total monetary gold stock and in relation to the $19 billion of our liquid foreign liabilities (excluding liabilities to international institutions, but including foreign countries' holdings of U.S. Government notes and bonds, which are of course readily convertible into cash). In a sense the situation is comparable with that of a bank, and a better than 90 percent ratio of cash to deposits should instill confidence in the minds of the banks' customers. By this crude yardstick, even a considerably lower ratio would probably be feasible. Two objections may be raised to this analogy, however. In the first place, the total of liabilities could be increased suddenly and substantially if large numbers of Americans sought to shift their funds abroad. Secondly, it might be contended that there is no readily accessible central bank, like the Federal Reserve System in the case of a domestic bank, to whom this Nation may turn automatically to replenish its reserves in the event of unusually heavy withdrawals. To meet the first objection I believe it will suffice to eliminate the balance-of-payments deficit and to pursue policies at home which guard against long-term erosion of the dollar's purchasing power. To meet the second, it may be pointed out that, besides holding such massive gold reserves, the U.S. Government is a very heavy creditor on long-term account and that some of these assets could become more quickly available through accelerated repayment by debtor governments; and furthermore it should be borne in mind that the liquid resources of the United States could be readily reinforced through sizable drawings on the International Monetary Fund.

Let me add at this point that, despite the existence of the 25 percent gold reserve requirement against Federal Reserve notes and liabilities (which requirement is subject to suspension in the event of emergency), there is no doubt at all in my mind that the primary purpose of our $17½ billion gold stock is to assure the international convertibility of gold and the dollar at the fixed price of $35 an ounce.

I have not yet spoken of ordinary international flows of short-term capital to take advantage of higher rates of return available in foreign centers. To a large extent I think we must look upon these as a fact of life—a natural concomitant of the restoration of external convertibility in most of the world's great trading countries. There is undoubtedly a place, however, for the kind of orderly policies already practiced by many leading central banks—both in framing their own monetary policies and in avoiding abrupt shifts in the proportion of their reserves held in the form of gold—with a view to minimizing heavy flows motivated solely by the attraction of a temporary rate of return. In any case, it seems to me that our present gold holdings provide an adequate cushion to absorb short-term flows of this kind without any appreciable disturbance; but in saying this, I am not unmindful of the desirability of our trying to prevent the spread between our short-term rates and those abroad from becoming unduly wide.

This leads us to a consideration of some of the criteria of domestic monetary policy. At a time such as the present, with large unemployment and unused productive resources in the economy, it is clearly incumbent on us to pursue a general policy of ease that will put the Nation's banks in a position to respond to all worthy credit applications, and in fact to seek out worthwhile investment opportunities. On the other hand, I can see no reason whatever, under current conditions, to flood the banks with reserves. For one thing, while this could conceivably have a beneficial influence on longer term market rates, it could do so only at the cost of driving short-term rates to much lower levels, needlessly accentuating the relative attractiveness of interest rates overseas. Furthermore, excessively "sloppy" credit might well discourage the desirable improvements in efficiency and adjustments in costs which tend to accompany any lull in economic activity. As I have said before, we should not expect monetary policy to do more than it can do; and it is very probably too much to expect it to create—all by itself—a new upward movement in business activity. If the inadequate use of our resources should long persist, the time might come when fiscal policy could perform a useful stimulating function. But we should certainly not forget the highly adverse effects on our whole credit mechanism of the unduly large and protracted Federal deficit of the fiscal year 1958–59—and especially the adverse effects of this deficit on foreign appraisals of the dollar's stability.

In closing, it seems to me essential to emphasize the need to avoid all remedies for our balance-of-payments deficit which would be inimical to the kind of world we have been trying to establish, with the aid of

our friends and allies abroad, ever since the war—a world of maximum freedom for international trade and international investment. This means that we should shun protectionism in all its forms, with all that it implies in the way of lower standards of living both here and abroad. Further, we should firmly resist any suggestion of exchange controls over the international flow of capital funds or other international payments. Such action would not only be futile but would also defeat the whole purpose of our international economic policy. But above all, as I am confident both the outgoing and the incoming administrations would agree, there must be no tampering with the present fixed relationship between gold and the dollar, at $35 per ounce, and the readiness of this country to deal freely in gold, at this price, with foreign central banks and governments. I am certain that only harm could come from any depreciation of the dollar in terms of gold; and I am equally certain that this country has the will and the necessary resources to maintain this firm foundation of our whole international financial structure.

The beginning of 1961 is appropriately a time for reexamination of our objectives and our national programs for attaining them. I hope that no conservative will be so unbending as to deny the need for a constructive approach toward the full use of our resources both at home and in the world at large; and I hope that no liberal will be so rigid as to deny the vital importance of conducting our affairs in a way that assures firm confidence in the dollar. If we can adopt such a constructive approach, I am sure we can avoid panicky or unwise actions—and we shall be able to look back at the international problems of these days as providing a useful discipline for the shaping of sound and imaginative programs.

Favor Health Care for Needy Only

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the current drive to provide a medical care for the aged program under social security even though we have a program on the books which has not had a chance to work is one of the typical approaches of the new frontier to provide something for everybody, regardless of need.

It was interesting to note the reaction to this proposal among the respondents to a recent Iowa poll conducted by the Des Moines Register. It is obvious from this poll that in Iowa, at least, there is no grassroots support for any approach which does not take into consideration the need factor.

I hasten to bring this poll to the attention of my colleagues by having it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The poll follows:

FAVOR HEALTH CARE FOR NEEDY ONLY

A majority of Iowans favor a medical-care-for-the-aged program based on need. They reject the idea that all aged persons should be covered regardless of their financial situation.

This is shown in a recent Statewide Iowa poll which reports that 68 percent of Iowans approve of some form of Government medical for the aged, but 74 percent feel that such a program should cover only those who cannot afford to buy their own health insurance.

This indicates a majority would not approve President Kennedy's proposal for medical aid through social security.

The survey shows that one out of five Iowans opposes any form of Government medical aid for the aged. About one out of five supports President Kennedy's idea that a Government program should cover all aged persons regardless of need.

Opinion does not vary much among city, town, or farm residents, although farmers generally show less interest in a Government aid program. Nor does opinion vary much according to age.

Among Iowans over 65 years of age, 71 percent think such a program should be based on need; 25 percent feel all aged persons should be covered and 4 percent express no opinion.

Sentiment remains about the same among the low- middle- and high-income groups—all strongly favoring a plan based on need.

Before Kennedy's medical bill was presented in Congress, Iowans in all age groups and from all parts of the State were asked the following question:

"Do you think the Federal Government in Washington should provide some form of hospital and medical care for persons over 65 years of age?"

[In percent]

	Total	City	Town	Farm
Yes	68	74	66	60
No	23	19	26	29
No opinion	9	7	8	11

All Iowans were then asked: "Suppose the Government decided to provide some form of medical care for the aged. Do you think this Government care should cover all persons over 65 years of age, or just those who can't afford to buy their own health insurance"?

[In percent]

	Total	City	Town	Farm
All persons	21	20	17	26
Only who can't afford	74	76	78	65
No opinion	5	4	5	9

Bulgarian Liberation Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, the tragic history of the Bulgarian people and especially the observance of their liberation day serve a significant reminder that freedom must always be guarded and strengthened, or it will always be in jeopardy. Otherwise sacrifices made in the name of national independence will be in vain. The gallant Bulgarian warriors of freedom, the best fighters in behalf of liberty, had vouchsafed all their worldly possessions and their lives for their freedom. And after centuries of struggle against their formidable Turkish foes, they finally succeeded in attaining their goal 83 years ago. Thenceforth they worked hard to safeguard their richly deserved prize, their independence. But unfortunately they were fated to suffer the worst consequences of the past two World Wars. In both they were on the losing side, but in the last one, they not only lost the war, but their freedom and independence.

Since 1945 Bulgaria has been drawn into the Soviet orbit, and has become practically a Soviet colony. Just as in the past the Bulgarian people fought the Turks for their freedom, now they are struggling in their homeland against Communist tyrants. March 3 was the 83d anniversary of their liberation day and I wish them fortitude and the courage to bear their trials which some day must assuredly pass away.

The Penalties of Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column from the February 27, 1960, issue of the Evening Press of Binghamton, N.Y., by Mr. Larry Hale, an able reporter who specializes in problems of county government:

U.S. WELFARE AID ISN'T EQUITABLE

(By Larry Hale)

Nearly 30 years ago, local governments in Broome County and throughout the State were rocked by the depression.

Not only did the local governments lack the tax resources to meet the vast problems caused by the economic rupture, but the governments of New York and other States found themselves in the same boat.

The Federal Government moved in.

What started out to be emergency aid from the Federal Government has become habitual. If anything, Federal controls over State and local affairs are being increased.

Last year, the total amount spent by the Federal Government in grants-in-aid to State and local governments was more than $7 billion.

In many instances this money is used wisely and for the best of purposes. Just as certainly, a lot of it is ladled out in a too casual manner and under circumstances which make little sense.

Take the manner in which the Federal Government hands out money to States for public welfare aid to the needy who are 65 years old or older.

Every welfare recipient in the old-age assistance class, in every State, is entitled to receive 80 percent of the first $30 of total aid from the Federal Government. In addition, the Federal Government pays 50 percent of the next $35, for a maximum Federal grant of $41.50 for each recipient each month.

But very wide—and expensive—differences exist between States in other aspects of Federal aid to the old-age assistance program.

New York State and Illinois, for instance, are among States which require children to support aged parents when such children are capable of doing so. New York and Illinois also provide recovery provisions against real estate owned by aged welfare recipients.

Under these circumstances, only 5.5 percent of New York's population of the 65-and-over age group received old age assistance during 1959. In Illinois, the ratio was 9.3 percent.

Not all States require that children support their parents, whenever possible. California is one of these, and in 1959 it provided old age assistance, with Federal help, to 21.5 percent of its senior citizens.

California has no provision for recoveries of real estate owned by old-age welfare recipients. It permits an old-age recipient to own a home assessed for $5,000, which in true value can go as high as $25,000 or more.

In 1958 Louisiana was providing old-age assistance to 58.6 percent of its aged population, Mississippi was taking care of 46.4 percent, and Texas 33.7 percent. The three southern States, just as California, do not require support by children, nor do they have lien or recovery provisions against real estate.

You can probably guess how the Federal Government spreads its grants-in-aid for old-age welfare recipients around. You're absolutely right.

During fiscal 1958, California received $132 million in Federal funds for old-age assistance. New York received $45 million.

During 1958, Federal funds paid 37.9 percent of all federally supported public assistance programs in New York State. In Illinois, the Federal Government contributed 40 percent. It contributed 78.6 percent in Mississippi, 69.7 percent in Texas, and 58.6 percent in Louisiana.

Raymond M. Hilliard, director of the Cook County Welfare Department in Chicago and a former New York City welfare commisisoner, contends that the Federal Government should require each State to adopt child-support and property recovery provisions in order to obtain Federal aid.

"The dollar which is saved in Illinois and New York by restricting the (old-age) program to the genuinely needy aged is dissipated in other States on the nonneedy aged and their defaulting children," Hilliard once said.

Hon. Joseph R. Grundy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLARD S. CURTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, last Friday saw the passing of a very prominent man who had long been a powerful figure in the Republican Party. I refer to the death of the Honorable Joseph R. Grundy. This former U.S. Senator and business and political leader was a resident of Bucks County in Pennsylvania. He was a power in both Pennsylvania and national politics for many years. His life was well exemplified by a statement he once made in which he said that his beliefs were rooted in his old-fashioned ideals of doing right, fearing no man, and loving my country.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Levittown Times, of Levittown, Pa., on March 7, 1961, about this illustrious man, which reads as follows:

A TOWERING FIGURE

Senator Joseph R. Grundy had become a legend even before death ended a full and remarkable life.

How greatly he influenced local, State, and National destiny may be a question for another generation, or even another, to determine.

His role during a crucial period of political, social, scientific, and technological change was that of an apostle of ultraconservatism, a role he played to the hilt and one of which he was proud "as a way of life."

Who can say, in retrospect, that such an unequivocal position of strength as opposed to dangerous trends toward socialism and governmental paternalism did not serve a purpose far above and beyond the vision of his critics of his day?

Senator Grundy was a controversial political figure. That Grundyism meant conservatism during those years when "isms" of every character flourished, including socialism, liberalism, and a lot of other flossy and foolish "isms," may in time to come represent one of the brightest commentaries on the career of Bucks County's most illustrious citizen.

Curiously, the caution and conservatism identified nearly a quarter of a century ago as the cornerstones of the Grundy political philosophy are again receiving sober consideration by more perceptive elements of both the Republican and Democratic Parties in this perilous day.

Be all of this as it may, Senator Grundy represented for nearly a half century a towering figure on the industrial and political scenes of the county, State, and Nation.

Yet he was inherently a humble man who personified in his own way of life the life of his forebears who helped fashion America into the great Nation that it is.

This way was one of hard work, thrift, simplicity, integrity, and love of neighbor, community, and country. Whether his causes were popular or not, he pursued them in the light of his own conviction of what was right.

We don't know that more can be expected of a man, whatever his estate.

Whatever his triumphs, however, through 98 years of living, and whatever his disappointments, we have an idea Senator Grundy was perfectly at peace with himself and with the world as he was cradled back into the arms of his Maker.

Red China and the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR WINSTEAD
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I wish to call your attention to a very significant newspaper article in the form of a letter to the editor of the Clarion-Ledger, Jackson, Miss. It is written by Mrs. Duke Thornton, of Jackson, Miss. Mr. and Mrs. Duke Thornton for many years owned and operated my hometown newspaper. Both are outstanding Christians and loyal Americans.

The letter follows:

RED CHINA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

DEAR EDITORS: Americans must think straight if we are to deal straight with the subject of Red China.

From the Supreme Court bench, from leaders in the new administration, from respected representatives of the press, one sees the American people being wooed and lured toward the recognition of Red China. The reasonable-sounding argument presented that "you cannot ignore 600 million people" and that their Communst leaders are a "fact of life."

There is twisted logic in these simple statements which is intended to advance world communism and to firmly establish the oppressive rule of China's tyrants. It is because we do not intend to ignore those 600 million people that we must not give official recognition to the regime which is holding them in slavery.

If Communist China were admitted to the United Nations, it would greatly strengthen all the Communists in the yet-free nations of southeast Asia. Japan, the Philippines, Malaya, Thailand, Burma, Indonesia, South Vietnam, and South Korea—these would be swept away like a deck of cards.

We must fight to secure true freedom for China's people so that they can be represented in the United Nations by honest leaders whom the Chinese people have chosen. If now we give our blessing to China's tyrants and oppressors by according them our official recognition in the councils of freemen, we shall certainly destroy the one last hope of the suffering millions.

We should rather turn our energies in the direction of finidng an ideology which can unite the free nations and answers the causes of communism in our free society. When freemen live a quality of life which demonstrates that freedom under God is a stronger force than slavery under man, then the tide will turn in the world. The millions who suffer are living, hoping, longing, and enduring for that hour. Surely we cannot murder the spirit which keeps them alive.

Peace is a coward's goal. Freedom is the goal for a man, as it always has been. As freemen we must stand and fight for what is right in the fact of whatever threats there are. Fear of annihilation must never make us play the coward's game, else all that America ever stood for will be lost. The issue in 1776 was freedom—not peace. This issue in 1961 is not peace or war—it is freedom or slavery.

We must choose aright for ourselves, for our Nation and for the world. That is America's destiny. Each of us is responsible for the clean living, straight thinking, and inspired action which will achieve that goal.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. DUKE THORNTON.

Pay Increases for Personnel in the Veterans' Administration Department of Medicine and Surgery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1961

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced two measures which seek to increase the pay of doctors, dentists, and nurses in the Veterans' Administration.

Both of these bills are based on a survey which the committee made of all Veterans' Administration hospitals—170 in number, plus 3 independent domiciliaries. These hospitals provide medical care for approximately 114,000 veterans each day, plus 17,000 in domiciliaries.

The managers of all the installations were asked for their suggestions as to the salaries which should be paid to the doctors, dentists, and nurses within this system. My first bill represents the recommendations of these managers and

the second proposal represents the thinking of the seven area medical directors.

It is essential, Mr. Speaker, that we give consideration to providing a salary structure and scale which will recruit and retain badly needed professional personnel in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration.

Cliches of Socialism—No. 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 17, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, following is the third of a series of published articles, "Cliches of Socialism," by the Foundation for Economic Education, Inc.:

CLICHES OF SOCIALISM—NO. 3

"The Government should do for the people what the people are unable to do for themselves."—Lincoln

If it be consistent with right principle to have a formal agency of society of delegated, limited and specified powers—government—it follows that there are principles, if we could but find them, which prescribe the appropriate limitations.

The search for these principles has proved elusive, as history seems to attest. Failure to find them has led some distinguished thinkers—sometimes called philosophical anarchists—to decide against any government at all. It has led others—sometimes called Socialists—to resolve in favor of the omnipotent State; let government control everything.

Other thinkers, who refuse to approve either anarchism or socialism, settle for what is more a plausibility than a principle: "The Government should do for the people what the people are unable to do for themselves." Thus, unwittingly, some avowed conservatives lend support to the Socialists. In practice, this plausibility works as follows:

The people express inability in that they will not voluntarily invest the fruits of their own labor in an enterprise that promises to deliver mail to those who choose to isolate themselves. So, let the Government deliver the mail—with rural free delivery.

The people, when organizing railroads, will not voluntarily extend their services to communities with few passengers and little freight. Therefore, have Government compel unprofitable operations on the private roads or, as in many other countries, form a Government road to perform such services.

The people will not willingly reclaim land for agriculture at a time when Government pays people to withdraw good farmland from production. Therefore, let the Government carry out uneconomic irrigation and reclamation projects.

The people will not willingly and with their own funds build huge hydroelectric projects to serve areas that can be served more economically by other forms of generated power. Hence, we have TVA and a growing socialism in the power and light industry.

The most up-to-date example of this system of determining governmental scope is in the field of astronautics. People simply will not, on their own, invest billions of dollars for astronautical weather reporting, for photographs of the moon's hind side, or for radio conversations—a century or more hence—with a people who might possibly exist in interstellar space. Ergo, let Government do these things the people are unable to do for themselves.

This formula for governmental action implies that the people lack the resources to perform such services for themselves. But, Government has no magic purchasing power, no resources other than those drawn from private purchasing power. What we have here is a rejection of the market, a substitution of pressure group political power for the voluntary choices of the individuals who vote with their own dollars. This criterion for the scope of the state leads away from private enterprise toward the omnipotent state, which is socialism.

The enormity of a project is no excuse for governmental interventionism. When the market votes "yes," capital is attracted, regardless of the amount required, to do the job. Witness our larger corporations, bigger than Hoover Dam or what have you?

Government has no right to use force or coercion for any purpose whatsoever that does not preexist as the moral right of each individual from whom the Government derives its power and authority.

LEONARD F. READ.

Postmasters and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Nyack Journal News of March 2, published in my district, is a very clear and factual study of what is going on in the Post Office Department.

Mr. Speaker, either we are to have a Civil Service or we should frankly revert to the old spoils system, always dear to the heart of the politician. We cannot have it both ways. The Post Office Department is a perfect example of what happens when we try to apply both systems. The Post Office should be under Civil Service, utterly and completely.

The editorial is as follows:

POSTMASTERS AND POLITICS

A continuing hazy political mystery is the status of postmasters under the appointment plan currently in vogue, an appointment further fogged by civil service regulations that purportedly apply yet that are somehow apparently sidetracked. The postmastership is supposedly a Presidential appointment with congressional approval but there's political fencework apparent when the two branches of Government have opposite party affiliations, seems as if. Patronage remains a great institution for the politicos, we know, and a postmastership is little more than a surviving remnant, but it's hardly in the interest of efficient operation.

Usually a postmaster appointment is of mysterious origin and most often an utter surprise to the community served. Normal procedure is to discover some fine morning there's a new man in charge when nobody had the least idea a change was pending. The party officials who handle such things with the greatest secrecy aren't surprised because they have pulled the strings while the general public remains completely ignorant. By the time the public is aware of what's in the wind, it's too late to do anything. It's only occasionally that the public gets into the act, even then without much success.

Maybe there's no mystery involved in the appointments and the political jockeying that goes into them but the public feels there is, just as it remains confused over the understanding Civil Service enters into the designation and how far it is effective. A better understanding of the whole process would help and after a full explanation has been absorbed we wouldn't be at all surprised to see some changes demanded and made. Maybe it's a last stand of the political plum orchard in operation of a Government function but it's not a particularly desirable condition.

The post office career employee has long been under civil service status, seldom getting beyond that next-to-last step, usually from lack of political activity such workers stay away from. No doubt the original thought when Civil Service took over the Post Office operation was that the top man was administrative in function and therefore should reflect the thinking of the Postmaster General, a place determined by the party to which the President belonged. It has become a practice, also, to have the successful candidate's campaign manager appointed Postmaster General.

Well, that's partially all right but, in passing years, local post office administration hasn't had to reflect the thinking of the top man in the Department. Instead, it's purely a business operation handled according to set rules and regulations that a career man who has worked up through the ranks can best handle from a wide background of practical experience. Frankly, we'd like to see the patronage plan thrown right out of the post office window, have the Department run from top to bottom on a business rather than a political basis. That might alter the Cabinet job but why would it retain the status it now has? It's not at all the same kind of operation it once was.

The only argument about Post Office Department policy is whether it's to be a Government service that's subsidized by taxes or a self-supporting operation in which the public pays according to the use it makes of the facilities. That can be determined easily enough by Congress without Cabinet direction, and it should be fixed as policy rather than fluid from one year to the next. We continue in the belief that it should be self-supporting rather than subject to all sorts of pressures for special privilege, as it would be under the Government service program. And maybe, if it were a business operation, politics would be removed from the process of appointing new postmasters as the need arises.

The Brotherhood Week Ideal Must Be Kept Alive All Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, during Brotherhood Week, many fine things were written and said in the interest of better understanding not only between the countries of the world but between the divergent factions in our own country. One of the most eloquent of these was written by a constituent and friend of mine, Mr. Paul Ryan, Davenport,

Iowa, who has served as Brotherhood Week chairman in his own community and is on the board of directors of the National Conference of Christians and Jews in Scott County, Iowa.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I consider it a privilege to bring Mr. Ryan's statement, which appeared as a guest editorial in the Davenport (Iowa) Times-Democrat on February 25, to the attention of the Members by having it appear in the Appendix of the RECORD. The editorial follows:

THE BROTHERHOOD WEEK IDEAL MUST BE KEPT ALIVE ALL YEAR

We are nearing the end of another Brotherhood Week.

The idea of having weeks dedicated to various causes is typically American, so it is right and indeed the natural thing to devote a week to considering the ideal that is encompassed by the word "brotherhood."

Thus brotherhood would seem to have attained a status equal to that achieved by hot dogs, the smile, national safe boating, insurance, better homes, and various other phases of modern life. Yes indeed. It has a whole week devoted to it.

In this, you might think, it is better off than mothers and fathers, who are only worth 1 day each to our special events calendar-makers. But many mothers and fathers, of course, go on for years and years, and it is quite difficult to forget about them even though it is not their "day."

Not so with brotherhood—that is easy to forget, and it is frequently forgotten.

But this is Brotherhood Week and it does us no harm to be reminded that we have an obligation to our neighbors, acquaintances—yes, and to strangers, too.

And brotherhood is not something to be observed on just a day or during a single week, anyway, it is something that we should have in our minds 365 days a year.

So as Brotherhood Week of 1961 draws to a close, let us consider seriously for a few minutes just what brotherhood is, and what it should mean to all of us.

In our U.S. democracy where every one of us enjoys so many freedoms that are denied to so many people throughout the world, it should not be necessary to make any special plea for brotherhood. Yet it's important that we should keep reminding ourselves not only of the great freedoms we enjoy, but of our need to share the brotherhood, man-to-man, that these freedoms permit.

Just what is brotherhood? It's something we hear from pulpits throughout the country; we're exhorted to practice it. But do we? Frankly, I think we have a long way to go before it is so ingrained in us, so inculcated in us that it becomes an outstanding national characteristic of the United States.

The National Conference of Christians and Jews continues to assert its great leadership throughout this country with the spotlight on this special week dedicated to brotherhood. Everywhere you have been made increasingly aware of this national dedication to brotherhood—the way keystone of real democracy.

And brotherhood should know no international borders either. It must become worldwide. Despotisms and tyrannies will disappear whenever any national group bradly accepts and practices it.

To those of us identified with business and industry, let us discover how, in practice, the ideal of brotherhood not only builds efficiency but even more, adds a joyous dimension to our daily lives. The regard for the other fellow—his welfare—induces an inner glow of deep happiness and satisfaction that is the priceless ingredient in any design for living.

Brotherhood: Say "Yes" and practice it. The Golden Rule is so simple, so sound, so worth while.

Racism in Reverse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR WINSTEAD
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I submit for the Appendix of the RECORD a most thought-provoking editorial "Racism in Reverse," by Mr. W. K. Prince, Newton, Miss. Mr. Prince is editor and publisher of the Newton County Record, an outstanding weekly newspaper in my congressional district. I strongly recommend that all Members of the Congress read this fine editorial:

RACISM IN REVERSE

Discrimination in 1961, if against the white race, is approved as legal, moral, and permissible by many colored peoples of the world. For example, under Liberia's Constitution no white man can own land.

It is considered all right for Negro groups to force their way into churches where they disrupt worship, into theaters where they see the same shows that are offered in their own theaters, into privately owned businesses where hard-working businessmen owe them nothing.

But—it is all wrong if a white man owns land in Africa, industries in Cuba, and belongs to associations where membership is limited and dues are required.

Fortunately, the Lord does not judge man as a race, a group, or a nation. He judges man by his individual motives and actions—with greater emphasis on motives, the Bible teaches.

Motives of the violent and the nonviolent differ widely. To the underprivileged, motive seems to be escape from exploitation, and hope of raised standard of living, often unearned and ill gotten. For peoples who have earned their freedom, motive is responsibility, economic justice, political security.

In international life, there are a great many questions that have no certain Christian significance. They represent conflicts of commercial interests and prestige. It must not matter greatly to God whether the African or the Belgian has greater prestige. It must matter to Him when Christian values are involved in such issues as human dignity, colonialism, the United Nations, atomic power.

In colonial problems, the colored people of the world assume that foreign rule is bad regardless of the purpose and method of the government. However, self-determination is not necessarily a Christian purpose. Modern colonialism seems to have outworn its historical necessity, in many areas, though by no means all. Africa was self-ruled for centuries while colonialism covered only a small era of her history. Yet Africa made more progress under colonialism than during all the preceding ages.

The demand for change by colonies may reflect a love of liberty, or it may reflect fierce hatred, undisciplined and irresponsible. Colonialism must be viewed with detachment and compassion for both sides. God's trust should not be abused by invoking His judgment on one or the other side.

In the competition of the United States with Russia, one cannot conclude that every measure of communism is bad, nor that every measure of capitalism is good. The world is not that simple. If the United States allows herself to copy Russia's methods as a means of combating them, she has lost the battle before she starts.

The totalitarian state in its nightmarish horror must be an abomination in the sight of God. Yet no American can say that his Government operates ideally. Everything the United States wants does not reflect God's purpose, nor does everything Russia wants reflect the purpose of the devil. There must be some areas of conflict in this cold war that cause a Divine Power to contemplate both sides with pity and disgust.

There is no particular Christian sanctity lent to decisions in the United Nations by the fact that they represent views of a majority of governments. Little countries are not necessarily more virtuous than big ones, colored people are not always more virtuous than white, and an international majority does not always reflect the Christian answer.

However the U.N. represents the germ of something necessary and hopeful for this endangered world; a sense of conscience higher than the national one. It should not be belittled nor desecrated, because of the idea it symbolizes. Desecration of the U.N. building 2 weeks ago may be termed un-American, un-Christian and subversive, and racism in reverse.

Long Island Firm To Build Research Station for Atomic Energy Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, it gives me sincere pleasure to report that the Atomic Energy Commission has chosen a nuclear design company in Garden City, Long Island, in the Second Congressional District of New York, to prepare plans for a new food irradiation experimental center to be built for the U.S. Army Quartermaster Corps.

The company is Associated Nucleonics, Inc., a division of Stone & Webster, Inc. As many of my colleagues know, both Associated Nucleonics and its parent company have been extremely active in designing and building atomic installations for civilian and military purposes.

Dr. Wilbur E. Kelley, president of Associated Nucleonics, is known to many of us in Congress as a highly respected pioneer in the new and exciting field of nuclear power. Among other accomplishments, Dr. Kelley was awarded the Legion of Merit for his outstanding work in the Manhattan project, which developed the atomic bomb that sealed the fate of freedom's aggressors in World War II.

Members of Congress, of course, recall that the food-irradiation studies conducted earlier by the Quartermaster Corps generated differences of opinion in the executive branch that resulted in temporary suspension of the program some months ago. I am pleased that the Army is resuming its experiments

to determine the effects of controlled radiation on various kinds of food. Obviously, the findings of the Army scientists could have extremely significant applications in our national defense effort and in the business community.

Under previous consent, I offer here the text of two news stories announcing the selection of Associated Nucleonics to design the new research station and providing additional details concerning the Quartermaster Corps unique studies:

NEWS FROM STONE & WEBSTER, FEBRUARY 8, 1961

Associated Nucleonics, Inc., of Garden City, Long Island, has been chosen by the Atomic Energy Commission to design a research station for U.S. Army Quartermaster Corps experiments in the preservation of food by atomic radiation.

Negotiations on final contract details will take several weeks, a company spokesman declared. In the meantime, the AEC has authorized the company to proceed with preliminary planning.

The research station will house the largest cobalt 60 radiation source in the United States. It will also be equipped with a large linear accelerator to irradiate foods with high velocity electrons.

Dr. Wilbur E. Kelley, president of Associated Nucleonics, a subsidiary of Stone & Webster Engineering Corp., New York, said the research post will be built at the Quartermaster Research and Engineering Center at Natick, Mass. It is expected to cost approximately $1.8 million.

Construction will begin this spring, and target date for completion is August 1962.

Army scientists at Natick will continue earlier pioneer studies to learn if controlled radiation can preserve all kinds of foods in safe and edible condition for indefinite periods. They also want to learn how, and to what extent, radiation affects the taste, color, and cooking requirements of different foods.

The experiments are expected to yield valuable data for evaluating the two methods of irradiation. In one process, food will be exposed to gamma radiation emitted by the cobalt 60 source, which will contain more than 1 million curies. In the other process, test foods will be bombarded by electrons shot from the linear accelerator, which will have a maximum energy of 24 million electron volts.

The cobalt 60 installation is being designed by Curtiss-Wright Corp. Varian Associates of California, specialists in accelerator design and production, is building the linear accelerator.

Associated Nucleonics has participated in many nuclear projects, both military and civilian. The company assisted in the mechanical and electrical designs for the newly completed Yankee atomic electric plant built in Rowe, Mass., by the parent firm, Stone & Webster Engineering, for 10 New England utilities.

Dr. Kelley said his staff has now undertaken a similar assignment for the Carolinas-Virginia nuclear powerplant to be constructed at Parr, S.C. The company has also conducted extensive design studies for the Nation's atomic-powered aircraft program. It designed a medical irradiator for the AEC and a radiation laboratory for Continental Oil Co.

Dr. Kelley, educated in engineering at the University of Louisville, holds the Legion of Merit for his work as a member of Gen. Leslie Groves' original team in the Manhattan project, top secret World War II program which developed the atomic bomb.

James J. Byrnes, a chemical engineer who has worked at the Oak Ridge and Brookhaven Atomic Laboratories, has been named project manager for design of the Natick station, Dr. Kelley announced. Mr. Byrnes educated at Columbia University and the University of Tennessee, joined Associated Nucleonics in 1952.

[From Newsday (Long Island), Feb. 9, 1961]

LONG ISLAND FIRM TO AID ARMY MAKE C-RATION STEAK LIKE STEAK

(By Leonard Baker)

WASHINGTON.—A Long Island firm will build a $1,800,000 research plant designed to replace the Army's C-rations with beefsteak.

The Atomic Energy Commission announced yesterday that a contract will shortly be signed with Associated Nucleonics, Inc., of 975 Steward Avenue, Garden City. The facility, to be built at Natick, Mass., is the first designed specifically for experimentation in the preservation of food by irradiation. The Garden City company was 1 of 28 which submitted bids on the project.

The food will be sterilized by irradiation from atomic or electronic waves. Once completely sterilized, it can be kept for indefinite periods of time without refrigeration or canning. It must only be wrapped in an airtight container such as a plastic bag. The rays used come from a different source from radiation generated in nuclear reactions which could contaminate the food. The waves will pass through the food leaving it uncontaminated.

This means, according to the Army Quartermaster Corps, that eventually the foot soldier will be able to reach into his knapsack and pull out a "fresh" steak or chicken leg rather than the canned rations which are now his lot. The plant will be built at the Quartermaster Corps Research and Engineering Center at Natick, and will be completed by late summer of 1962.

The facility represents a further step in a program the Quartermaster Corps has been conducting for 6 years. According to an Army spokesman, research has already demonstrated that "the system works" but, he added, "You can't eat the food."

In sterilizing the food, he explained, the irradiation process changes its texture and taste. The problem which will be tackled at the Natick plant, he said, is to discover what kind and what levels of irradiation and what treatment of the food are necessary to keep the steak tasting like steak.

Politics Foils Judiciary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Kansas City Kansan under date of March 5, 1961. Lest there be those who believe that the public is unaware of the situation, the very political situation, I must say, involved in the creation of new Federal judgeships, I want to call the editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

POLITICS FOILS JUDICIARY

No judicial bill was passed last year by Congress for political reasons, Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of New York, admits, saying that the Democratic leadership gambled on a change of administration and won.

It is clear to all that the judicial system has been fouled up by political maneuving as indicated by CELLER. Republicans have reason to cry "unfair."

The public, as usual, is the loser in the delaying tactics. Particularly in big city areas from coast to coast, the dockets of our U.S. courts (not to mention the State courts) are clogged with tens of thousands of untried, unheard cases.

The backlog goes on piling up despite much streamlining of court procedures. Every year 60,000 or more new cases are dumped in. In the most populous centers, it can take 3 to 4 years for a case to move from filing to final decision.

President Kennedy has now included among his "must" bills for 1961 a proposal to create 59 new Federal judgeships—9 at the appeals level.

No one interested in justice, in the sound functioning of our judiciary system, is likely to question the need for urgent action. Every month that passes aggravates the problem.

But it seems fair to say that should action now come, no great credit should reflect on the ruling Democrats in Congress. For in recent times their inaction has become as chronic as the delays in the courts. No new Federal judgeships have been created since 1954, and virtually all of that time the Democrats have controlled Congress.

Judgeships are, of course, rich political plums. The effect of inaction was to deny to the Eisenhower administration the opportunity to dispense these.

In a free society justice must be had with some speed. A fair disposition of all conflicts and other matters relating to citizens' rights and properties lies at the heart of democratic liberties.

Address by Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the National Education Association called a special legislative conference in Washington last Saturday night concerning the program of President Kennedy. It was the occasion for a report by the new Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Gov. Abraham A. Ribicoff, which sets forth many facts which we must keep in mind as we prepare to consider this program in the coming months.

Governor Ribicoff is no stranger to the problems of education. In his administration in Connecticut, he faced a rising school enrollment and dealt with a sharp rise in educational costs. Alert and imaginative, he spurred attention to these problems at the local level which was marked by progress all along the line. He supported a higher minimum for all teachers and signed into law a statewide tenure act.

His speech underlines the important fact that all Americans want an educational system adequate to our needs, but that differences among us arise over how best to attain it. And he makes clear what is often forgotten in this discussion—that Federal aid to education is as old as the republic itself.

There are many controversial aspects to the education program which has been presented to this House. We will all be undertaking close study of this measure in the days ahead, and I am hopeful that reasonable men will find a workable solution fair to all our citizens. Governor Ribicoff's speech offers some eloquent argument in support of the measure which is before us; I believe it deserves thorough consideration by the Members of the House:

President Kennedy has sent to Congress the most significant proposals in the field of education ever to have the support of a U.S. President. He has pledged his personal support of these proposals because of a basic faith that education is a key to the progress of all mankind.

It is a privilege for me to speak tonight on behalf of the President's program. I am proud to be enlisted in the cause to which he is so firmly dedicated. And I appreciate this opportunity to meet with distinguished representatives of an organization which so deeply shares the President's aspirations for the progress of American education.

Our total progress as a nation has always gone hand in hand with our progress in education. We cannot expect for long to have one without the other.

By the same token, if we move ahead in education, we will continue to move ahead as a nation. For education engenders progress in all aspects of our national life. This has been demonstrated from our beginning as a young nation to our emergence as a world power.

The National Education Association, the State Education Associations, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare share these dual goals—progress of American education and progress of America. And so do the American people.

The question is not whether we should have an educational system adequate to our needs but how we can attain it. And these needs must be considered not only in the light of today's problems but of tomorrow's as well. Tomorrow's problems must not be left for tomorrow. They must be dealt with today. For the lead time in all things concerned with education is long. And we cannot afford the price of delay.

Today's needs in education are well documented. And there has been ample forewarning of the potential crises of tomorrow.

What should demand our whole attention at this point is the solution.

During recent years and months—and especially in recent weeks—there has been a growing awareness that greater public support of education is essential. At the same time there has been a developing realization of what the Federal responsibility should be in this total effort.

But too often, it seems to me, the proponents of Federal aid have been off the real target.

At times the argument has been entirely negative, based solely on the obvious fact that Federal assistance has never meant Federal interference or control. I suggest that quite enough time and energy have been devoted to this point. Nobody, so far as I know, wants Federal control of education. Nobody, so far as I know, seeks it. You and I don't want it. The States don't want it. The Congress doesn't want it. Clearly, the President doesn't want it. So let's agree once and for all that we're not going to have Federal control of education.

At the other extreme, some advocates, in an excess of enthusiasm, seem to suggest that Federal aid is a bold new concept that all by itself can reshape the whole course of American education. This, of course, is also wide of the mark.

So the practice and principle of Federal aid to education needs to be protected not only from its enemies but sometimes also from its friends.

The simple fact is that the Federal role has been a legitimate and accepted part of the American educational experience since the founding of the Republic. It has neither subverted education nor produced the millennium. It is neither that bad—nor that good.

For 175 years, Federal aid has helped to serve the national interest. This, as I understand it, is what the Federal Government was set up for in the first place.

In proportion to other sources of support, the Federal share, of course, has always been modest. But the amount of dollars has been significant. The total of all Federal funds devoted to educational activities in fiscal year 1960 was $2.7 billion.

The point is, the Federal Government already is helping education in what can only be termed a big way.

This has not come about by accident or simply to demonstrate a theory. Congress has authorized Federal aid to meet certain specific needs, when other solutions were not deemed adequate in the national interest.

That is all the President is proposing be done today. That is all he was advocating in 1957 when, as a Senator, he told the Maryland State Teachers Association that "* * * the race for advantage in the cold war is * * * a race of education and research" as well as a race of armaments, production, and propaganda.

The situation confronting both American education and the Nation today is different in degree and kind than any that has confronted us before. The question of Federal aid to education, therefore, needs to be viewed in a modern context.

The basic ingredients of the American concept of education are, of course, unchanged. There are in education all the hallmarks of our Nation's progress. There is effort, imagination, and growth. There is a firm belief in the virtue of local control of public education. There is a sound and workable relationship between Federal and State Governments—backed up by a long record of solid achievement. All this and more remains the same.

The problems, however, are not the same. New challenges require more of American youth. National requirements, economic progress, the rapid advance of science and technology have combined to raise the sights of the present generation of students. The Nation expects much of them, and there is evidence throughout the Nation of an eagerness to live up to these expectations.

And they will live up to our expectations, given the opportunity. For the Federal Government to lend a measure of assistance in providing adequate educational opportunities for the coming generations of Americans is only a recognition of what we as a Nation expect of that generation.

The job, therefore, is up to the American people as a whole, working through the established instruments of government, to see that no American youth is denied the opportunity to realize his full potential.

More and more young Americans will be denied that opportunity—to their own and the Nation's loss—unless action is taken to supplement State and local efforts. There are a number of reasons why this is so.

Of prime importance, of course, is the uneven financial capacity of the various States. Despite increased efforts, many States simply do not have the tax resources to do what needs to be done for education. Nor will they be able to do in the foreseeable future. And those that are better off are confronted with a host of pressing demands on their resources.

While Federal tax dollars have doubled in the postwar years, State and local governments have had to increase their tax revenues by more than 300 percent. From 1946 to 1959, while the Federal debt increased by 9 percent, State and local debt soared by more than 350 percent. Property taxes, the traditional source of revenue for education, are in many areas rapidly approaching the limits of reasonableness.

In the meantime, the costs of education are going up and up and will continue to for some time. First there is the added expense of increased enrollments. Our public school enrollments have been increasing at the rate of more than 1 million a year for the last several years. Then there are the increasing costs of buildings, books, and salaries—all the goods and services that go into the operation of our school system. And finally, there is the drive toward better education. This involves more and better laboratory facilities, expanded libraries and all sorts of modern teaching aids.

All told, just in the past 10 years the cost-per-pupil in our public education system has jumped from $284 a year to $496—an increase of 75 percent.

Even where the situation is not yet desperate, efforts to raise real estate, personal, and business taxes still higher are meeting with more and more resistance.

This is not just a problem for the hard-pressed States. It is a problem that should concern us all. For when education is short changed anywhere it is an unseen drag on our national strength everywhere.

The uneven pattern of State and local tax capacity is aggravated by other factors which seriously affect our total progress in education. One is the uneven geographic distribution of our school-age population itself. As of 1957, no less than 44 percent of the Nation's children under the age of 18 were concentrated in seven States. And this concentration has probably increased since then.

Another problem confronting many a school district, is the rapid increase in the mobility of our population. Each year, more than 5 million people move from one State to another. In a decade, no less than a fourth of our people go to live in other States. Today's resident of a high-income State with a better-than-average school system may well find tomorrow that his children attend a less-than-average school in a low-income State.

Dominating all other factors is the momentum of the Nation's interest in education. This has taken the American people higher and higher up the educational ladder in larger and ever larger numbers. In the lifetime of many of us in this room, a grade school education was the norm, a high school education the exception. That rarity, a college education, was for the fortunate few.

As recently as 1920, only about 20 percent of our youngsters went on to high school. Today, more than 40 percent of our high school graduates go on to college.

This kind of momentum must not be denied. On the contrary, it is in the Nation's interest that it be encouraged.

I do not mean by this that the Federal-State relationship in education should be in any way modified or changed. No such change has been advocated. What is being advocated is a further application of old approaches to the problem of education in this country. Scholarship assistance is not new. The use of Federal funds for school construction is not new. Contribution to teacher salaries is not new. All of these

principles have been put into practice successfully in a long line of experience, going back to the Northwest Ordinance of 1785 and extending on through the land grant college program, the GI bill, aid to federally impacted areas, and the National Defense Education Act.

Those who came before us were ready and willing to use the instruments of government to promote the cause of education. They were not deterred by shibboleths or false fears.

Those stanch advocates of Federal interest in education—Washington and Jefferson—would agree, I think, that there is greater justification for Federal support of education today than ever before.

The Federal role in education is a proud one. Both its potential for good and its accepted limits derive from the firm tradition of mutual respect for true Federal-State cooperation. It draws strength from the deep sense of responsibility that the American people have for education.

The Federal Government can, and I believe must, play a significant role in the vital process by which the next generation of Americans prepares itself to meet the challenges of the 1960's, the 1970's, and beyond.

Political Gamesmanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, campaign trail promises loaded with political sex appeal are as important in winning elections as gapsmanship. But they have a noticeable capacity to turn up later as frightening haunts to winners gaining office with their lure. What seemed to November campaigners to be bold moves ahead often appear to January officeholders as enormous budget-busting millstones around extended political necks. This need not, however, prove catastrophic. All need not be lost. There is a way out. It involves combining political gamesmanship, the art of appearing to produce on campaign promises without actually doing so, with the old parliamentary axiom "kill it with controversy." The specific technique is to put a promise in bill form, making sure the bill also is loaded up with lots more items so unpalatable to large numbers of legislators they must vote against it. The skilled political gamesman can achieve an additional unpopularity bonus for the bill by leaving out numerous other items, the omission of which is wholly unpalatable to another bloc of legislators. Almost surely the bill will be defeated and the haunt exorcised. In the process the political gamesman has appeared to work with selfless devotion to produce on his promise. He remains glorious in defeat. He can sanctimoniously blame the outcome on evil, ignorant, selfish, corrupt, unhuman forces and/or including even the other political party. Unlike touch football, political gamesmanship is not a spectator sport. One of its basic rules is never to admit the game is being played. Only the players themselves are supposed to know. Sometimes bystanders can piece together enough impressions to form an opinion the sport is being indulged in, but they can never be sure. Persons and events hereinabove portrayed are entirely fictional and any similarity to actual persons, living or dead, is purely coincidental.

Praise for Patterson Army Hospital, Fort Monmouth, N.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have permission to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter dated March 5, 1961, which I have received from Mr. James E. McDonald, 53 Martin Drive, Red Bank, N.J., a constituent of mine.

Mr. McDonald's letter is in high praise of the excellent treatment which he received when he was a patient in the Patterson Army Hospital at Fort Monmouth. It is too often that citizens take for granted the excellence of work done by men in the Government service who are in responsible positions and so when outstanding work is recognized I believe it should be widely circulated. I think my colleagues are well aware of the fact that people frequently are given to criticism and that in many instances the criticism is based on inadequate knowledge of circumstances and insufficient information.

I am very proud of the accomplishment of Fort Monmouth, which is operated by the Signal Corps of the Army. In this age of new developments in the electronic world it has been in the forefront in the discovery of new methods and means of communication, and American citizens may be well satisfied with the way this Army post is conducted.

Mr. McDonald's letter is as follows:

RED BANK, N.J., *March 5, 1961.*

Mr. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Although I have visited with you in your House office on several occasions I doubt that you will be able to recall me. As a resident of Lincroft, I am one of your constituents and as such I would like to relate a recent experience of mine.

As a result of injuries sustained in an enemy air raid in Italy, I was retired from the Army in 1944. Recently I was confronted with the necessity of undergoing surgery. Despite the fact that I have full hospitalization coverage I decided to enter Patterson Army Hospital at Fort Monmouth. This decision was based solely on my profound belief that Army medicine is unexcelled and this conclusion was reached as a result of the excellent treatment I received during wartime confinement. I can assure you, sir, I made an extremely wise decision.

Starting with the first minute of my initial visit to Patterson Hospital and continuing through my entire stay, the treatment I received exceeded even my optimistic expectations. This statement can be applied to the medical, dietary, and morale routines. It is extended from the hospital commander down through the lowest ranked corpsman. I can assure you that the competency and efficiency that prevails at this facility is such that the Congressman representing this district should justifiably take pride. I would like to single out one man in particular but in such a situation this would not be wise.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, I wish to express my deepest gratitude to the Congress for having extended such privileges to retired personnel who held only temporary commissions.

I am positive that if the tenor of this letter was critical, you would take prompt action to correct the complaints. I trust that you will take similar action in passing along the feelings I have expressed. It should be very comforting to parents with children in the Army to know that they can be certain that they are protected by the most competent medical care when required.

With best wishes and kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely,

JAMES E. MCDONALD.

The Race in Space—A Communications Satellite in Orbit Proposed by the Bell Telephone System To Improve Our Communications System on Earth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1961

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, Project Echo which was used to bounce the voice of President Eisenhower across the Nation in a matter of seconds demonstrated the practical use of a communications satellite which could be placed in orbit and used as a relay for voice communication to all parts of the earth by radio bounce.

The proposal by the Bell System to finance the building of their own communications satellite and to obtain permission for its use through the Federal Communications Commission for voice transmission indicates the rapid progress we are making in the use of outer space for practical purposes.

In order to make this possible, it will require the cooperation of the Federal Government to fire the Bell System satellite into orbit and to grant them permission to use our tracking stations in order to prove that this system of voice communication is possible and may become an everyday operation for voice communication to all parts of the earth.

Public interest requires development of a satellite communications system as rapidly as possible.

Heavy use of present oversea cable and radio circuits reflects the rapidly growing need for an expanded and more flexible oversea communications system. Satellites are ideally suited to supplement existing facilities. They offer the most practical means of providing oversea television service and

would afford highly desirable alternate routes for other oversea services, many of which are extremely important to our national security.

Project Echo, one of our Nation's most dramatic space achievements, demonstrated our leadership in satellite communications. In an age when national prestige is so important, we should keep that leadership.

Privately owned common carrier industry should do this job.

The usefulness of any space communications system will depend upon the extent to which it can be integrated into existing domestic and international common carrier networks. The Bell System already has a vast domestic network with worldwide links to communications systems abroad. Placing a satellite system in operation would simply be adding another important group of international communications channels through what amounts to microwave towers in the sky.

Furthermore, the Bell System has an unmatched fund of experience in communications research, in systems engineering and in working agreements with other American international carriers and foreign telecommunications administrations.

The Bell System hopes to move forward with an active satellite trial in about a year.

Following the highly successful Echo experiment, the Bell System proceeded at its own expense with development and construction of experimental active satellites. These satellites are designed with repeaters to amplify and relay radio signals with power generated from solar energy. They utilize broadband microwave techniques and are of the type ultimately required to provide commercial telephone, television, data and global communications of all types. The Bell System has been assigned frequencies for experimental use. tI has also asked for launching facilities so the trial can get underway within a year.

It has offered to pay for satellite, for launching it, for building ground stations in the United States, and is confident that the communications agencies of other countries will cooperate by providing ground stations abroad.

It will make the satellite facilities available to NASA and U.S. international telegraph common carriers for experimental use.

Bell System space program is in line with national communications policy and with the aims and purposes of NASA.

Long-standing U.S. national policy places the responsibility for efficient public communication, both domestic and international, on the common carrier industry. Throughout its existence the Bell System has accepted this responsibility and has pioneered in all phases of communications research and development.

NASA has broad responsibilities to advance peaceful use of space, making most effective use of scientific and engineering resources of the United States to avoid unnecessary duplication of efforts. Its emphasis should be on research and development. Combination of Bell System communications experience and NASA space technology can avoid duplication of effort and result in fastest possible development.

Bell System efforts and plans are, in all major respects in accord with the views expressed in the December 4, 1960, staff report of the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

The Bell System is prepared to move rapidly, shortening the span between experiment and the goal of a fully operative commercial system of satellite communications.

In October, 1960, the Bell System applied to the FCC for an experimental grant for conduct of this trial. Frequencies were assigned in January 1961.

The Bell System has discussed with NASA the provision of launching facilities at Bell expense. Launching date of the first Bell satellite will be determined by the availability of suitable rocket vehicles.

NASA has taken the position that the Bell System satellite trial should wait until after experiments with a proposed new NASA active satellite.

It has called for bids on this satellite, expected to be launched as Project Relay in mid-1962. The first launching vehicles available to NASA for space communications tests will be used in this project.

The Bell System position is clear: We are ready to proceed with trial of an active satellite at our own expense at the earliest possible launching date.

Provision of satellite communications by common carriers is in line with U.S. national policy and does not conflict with the aims and responsibilities of NASA to foster rapid development.

Unnecessary delay could be harmful to our national security, to U.S. prestige and would postpone international television and other forms of communications not feasible today. Furthermore, the results of trials pointed as directly as possible toward a commercial satellite system are urgently needed to prepare the U.S. position for international space conferences in 1962 and 1963.

Only the cooperation of our Government—by making available launching and tracking services—is needed to get the trial underway.

Has the Farmer Been a Ward of the Government?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in today's Wall Street Journal attempts to place every American farmer in the "ward of the Government" category. Nothing could be further from the truth, and most farmers will resent the implication. To use the word "farmers" in connection with the fast-buck boys referred to in the article is doing a disservice to every responsible person in the profession. By and large, farmers are an honorable group, do their own thinking, want to do their own planning, and are willing to take their chances on results.

As a dirt farmer with 40 years' experience, I am certain I voice the sentiment of a large percentage of Pennsylvania farmers in suggesting the Government get out of this business of farming and allow those who know far more of the answers than any Government agency or any politician to conduct their own affairs. Thousands of Pennsylvania farmers have never received one penny in farm subsidies and want nothing more than to be let alone.

I personally resent being placed in the "ward" class, and I know my farmer friends do also.

The editorial follows:

SOIL BANKING

Several weeks ago, in his Economic Report, President Kennedy noted that "recession in agriculture has been chronic" over the past decade, and he sounded the familiar keynote of Federal farm policy:

"The American farmer should receive for his managerial skills, his labor, and his capital investment returns that are similar to those received for comparable human talents and resources in other types of enterprise."

At first blush, that sounds fair. Who, after all, begrudges the farmer the harvest of his honest toil? But, on second thought, the farmer has been a ward of the Government for a generation, and the cost of farm subsidies and surplus storage has grown fantastically. If agriculture has suffered chronic slump despite this lavish bounty, who, then, has been reaping the benefits of farm aid?

Senator WILLIAMS of Delaware shed some light on this mystery the other day. He disclosed that a group of Coloradans had turned the Federal soil bank into a veritable bonanza. It seems a 7,000-acre ranch was purchased for $139,200, then cut up into small units, leased to tenants, and put into the soil bank. Over a 10-year span, the Government was prepared to pay a subsidy of $271,000 on this deposit in the soil bank. So, Senator WILLIAMS notes, at the end of 10 years these operators stood to gain a $131,800 windfall and a debt-free ranch—all paid for by the American taxpayer.

What were the "managerial skills" and the "labor" to be thus rewarded? Only the instinct for a fast buck and the effort of signing a few papers, it would appear. And what other type of enterprise could conceivably give such a return on capital investment? None that we can think of offhand, unless it be bank robbery.

Tribute to Adm. Bartholomew W. Hogan

SPEECH
OF
HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to pay tribute to one of the finest gentleman I have ever known. A man who has dedicated his

life to the service of humanity through the proud traditions of the Navy.

Rear Adm. Bartholomew W. Hogan, Surgeon General of the Navy was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross by Secretary of the Navy, the Honorable John B. Connally, Jr., on February 28, 1961, at his retirement ceremony at the Naval Medical Center. A fitting tribute to climax a career that began on June 6, 1925, when Bartholomew W. Hogan was appointed lieutenant (j.g.) in the Medical Corp of the U.S. Navy. As Admiral Hogan stated, "on that occasion, the gold on my sleeves was bright. The fabric of my uniform was colored by the deep blue of the sea. It would only be human to admit that I was proud to be a doctor, and proud to be an individual unit as an officer in the U.S. Navy." I say to you today, Admiral Hogan has added new luster to the gold on the sleeves of all naval officers and his career is a symbol to guide all fledgling officers, in particular his son who has chosen to follow in the footsteps of his illustrious father.

The distinguished medical career of Bart Hogan spans 36 years, beginning with service as a junior medical officer at the U.S. Naval Hospital in Boston, Mass. Prior to World War II, he served as an instructor at the Naval Medical School in Washington; associate professor of psychiatry at Georgetown University Medical School and served as chief of medicine at the Naval Hospital, Annapolis, Md.

Early in World War II he was assigned as senior medical officer aboard the aircraft carrier, U.S.S. *Wasp*. While serving aboard the carrier in the South Pacific in 1942, a Japanese submarine torpedoed and sunk the *Wasp* on September 15, 1942. The record of Bart Hogan speaks for itself on this disastrous occasion. His citations read:

Silver Star Medal:

For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity * * * when the *Wasp* was torpedoed by enemy Japanese submarines * * * with his carrier swept by flaming gasoline and rocked by explosions, Commander Hogan, despite his own wounds, worked tirelessly, caring for the injured until forced to abandon the stricken ships.

Navy and Marine Corps Medal:

For outstanding heroism * * * on September 15, 1942. Rescued from the flaming oil-covered sea by personnel of the U.S.S. *Duncan*, (he), in spite of serious burns on both hands and several fractured ribs, immediately took active charge of caring for the many painfully injured carried aboard the *Duncan*.

Purple Heart Medal for wounds received in enemy action on September 15, 1942.

The dedication to duty, exemplified by Bart Hogan during this emergency period was typical of his devotion to his chosen profession of medicine, performed in the Navy blue and gold throughout his life. The many command posts he held in recent years reflected this esprit de corps.

I would like to take this opportunity to salute Adm. Bartholomew W. Hogan on the occasion of his retirement from the Navy, and extend my very best wishes for health and happiness to him and his family.

Magazine Writer Publishes Three Books

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD an article from the Washington Evening Star of March 7, 1961. The article is about Frances Spatz Leighton, Washington correspondent of the American Weekly, who has had three books published in recent weeks. Her three books are discussed in the article.

Mrs. Leighton is a very able and prolific writer. She devotes herself primarily to magazine writing, but has had considerable experience in news writing. I have always enjoyed reading her articles in the American Weekly and now look forward to reading her books. The article about her in the Star reads as follows:

WHITE HOUSE BAN BOOSTS NEW BOOK

(By Amelia Young)

The recent White House announcement that members of the domestic staff are pledged to silence on the subject of the First Family was—ironically—cause for rejoicing in a certain publishing house.

The Kennedys' new policy has made an overnight success of the latest keyhole report on life in the Executive Mansion, "My Thirty Years Backstairs at the White House."

The book, just published by Fleet, will be the last such report for at least 4 years.

Fleet's delight is shared by Lillian Rogers Parks, the former White House maid and seamstress who tells all in these 346 pages, and Frances Spatz Leighton, the as-told-to author who took down Mrs. Parks' memoirs.

Mrs. Leighton is becoming something of a genius at eliciting salable stories from other people. This is her sixth such as-told-to production, the first of which was "White House Chef."

TOO BAD, HISTORICALLY

An ebullient platinum blond, Mrs. Leighton assumed a serious look when she commented on the White House announcement:

"Historically speaking, I'm sorry," she said. "You know, these kinds of books are great source material for historians. But, selfishly speaking, the timing couldn't have been better."

The ban which is serving to promote "My Thirty Years Backstairs at the White House" is obliquely winning attention for two other Leighton books—"Bum Voyage," reminiscences of a European tour by a 10-year-old boy, and "I Married a Psychiatrist," the revelations of a one-time neighbor of Mrs. Leighton.

The three books, published within a week of each other, were written over a 3-year period. Mrs. Leighton turned them out in spare hours while holding down a full-time job as Washington correspondent for a magazine.

David Greer, the 10-year-old traveler of "Bum Voyage" (he's 13 now), stopped into the office last week to tell a few things on Mrs. Leighton.

BRIBED BY TOAST

He, too, was a neighbor of the journalist-author. When she invited him to write a book in collaboration with herself, David thought she was kidding. But he went along with the joke, chiefly, he explained, because "she used to feed me cinnamon toast."

Also, Mrs. Leighton promised him $20 spot cash on publication of the book, to go toward a track rabbit (miniature racer) which he dearly wanted.

David's unorthodox travelogue was produced in 3 months of afternoons at Mrs. Leighton's house. "I'd go over after school and mess around," he reported. "We might get an hour's work in every day. She'd ask me questions about the trip, what I liked the best, what I had most fun at, that sort of thing. It would be just like we were carrying on a conversation."

"I liked it," he added. "Well, I liked the cinnamon toast."

David has his track rabbit now and with returns from the book (he and Mrs. Leighton will split the 10 percent royalties) should be able to afford a few racer accessories.

He's a celebrity among his school chums and teachers (at Thomas Jefferson Junior High in Arlington) but takes it casually, has read only "some of" the finished work himself—"I'm no bookworm" he explained.

THINKS AT EASEL

Since the days of their collaboration, Mrs. Leighton has moved into an apartment at the Woodner, which is her office, as well as residence. There, she said, she does much of her literary thinking at an easel, while turning out abstract and primitive paintings that "actually sell." A week or so ago someone offered her $200 for one of her offhand abstracts and another painting, called the Blue Madonna, will be reproduced on a commercial Christmas card.

Brought up on a farm outside Cleveland, Mrs. Leighton entered journalism via the International News Service, where she worked for 2 years as a dictationist. "The desk got kind of sick of me," she said—"I gave a feature slant to every story and furthermore I was the world's worst typist." She left INS to go with the magazine about 15 years ago. She's been there ever since.

Life for a woman like Mrs. Leighton—who seems to run, not walk through it—is always pretty exciting. But no year has matched this one.

"This year," she bubbled, "it appears I can't do anything wrong. Everything's going right."

Hon. David J. Ward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS F. JOHNSON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, it is with great humility that I take the floor this afternoon to eulogize the late Honorable David J. Ward, of Salisbury, Md. The Honorable David J. Ward was formerly a Member of this august body.

In June 1939, he won election to the 76th Congress of the United States representing the First Congressional District of Maryland. He was reelected to the Congress for two additional terms in 1941 and 1943. He thus served our Nation during the crucial war years. Some 20 years earlier he served the State of Maryland with distinction, and I had the honor of serving with him at that time in the Senate of the State of Maryland.

David Ward left an indelible imprint on the First Congressional District. He sponsored legislation which enabled the city of Salisbury to obtain an excellent airport. Through his efforts, drainage

legislation was passed which reclaimed thousands of wasted acres on the lower Eastern Shore. His service to his constituents while a Member of Congress will always be cherished.

David Ward was active throughout his life in many phases of public and civic work in Wicomico County, the First Congressional District of Maryland, his State, and the Nation. His interest continued unabated until the time of his death, February 18, 1961.

To the devoted members of his family, I extend my deepest sympathy, and I share their great grief. A great American was called to immortality, February 18, 1961, at the age of 90 years.

I would like to have incorporated in the RECORD at this time the following resblution adopted by the State Senate of Maryland:

SENATE RESOLUTION 22

Senate resolution expressing deepest sympathy on the passing of David J. Ward, of Salisbury

David J. Ward passed away at the age of 90 years on Saturday, February 18, 1961, at his home in Salisbury.

He was born in Wicomico County on September 17, 1871. He received his education in the public schools of his native community. He engaged early in farming, and he also had interests in the mercantile and lumber business in which he was successful.

He has had an illustrious career in politics, spanning the period of two World Wars. He entered public life in 1915, when he was elected as a delegate from Wicomico County. During this term of office he served at the extraordinary war session of the general assembly. From 1918 until 1926, he was chairman of the Democratic State Central Committee of Wicomico County.

In 1926 he was elected to this honorable body representing Wicomico County, and he was reelected in 1930 for a second term of 4 years. He ran again for the senate seat in 1938 and was elected to an additional 4-year term.

In June of 1939, he won election to the 76th Congress of the United States representing the First Congressional District. He was reelected to Congress for two additional terms in 1941 and 1943. He thus served our country during the crucial wartime years as he had served the State some 20 years earlier.

David Ward was active throughout his life in many phases of public and civic work in the county. His interest continued unabated until the time of his death. He had the rare opportunity of serving his county, his State, and his country during important and stirring times of progress. The activity closest to his heart was in the care of the indigent aged and infirm. During the 1939 general assembly he sponsored a resolution asking for a study of the needs and care of the indigent. As a result of the study resulting from the resolution, funds were appropriated to build the first chronic disease hospital in the State. This was Deer's Head State Hospital, located in Salisbury, which was dedicated and opened in 1950. From this beginning the chronic disease hospital system has expanded to include two other hospitals, one in Baltimore and one in western Maryland. David Ward can rightfully be called the father of the chronic disease hospitals of Maryland.

David Ward was a modest and humble man. He had a great love and affection for his family and his fellow man. He was always the first to call when a friend was ill or in sorrow. No road was ever too long to the home of a friend. His work and his friends were his life.

He was married on November 22, 1897, to Edith Perdue, of Parsonsburg, who predeceased him. He leaves surviving him three sons and two daughters.

In his death we feel a sense of profound shock that an active and vigorous life has departed from us: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of Maryland, That we express our deepest sympathy on the passing of David J. Ward of Salisbury; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Stella L. Ward, David J. Ward, Jr., and Edward J. Ward, of Salisbury, and Albert W. Ward, of Baltimore; and be it further

Resolved, That when this body adjourns on Monday, February 20, 1961, it stand adjourned in memory of David J. Ward.

Admiral Merrill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to include the following editorial which appeared in the New Orleans Times-Picayune at the time of the passing of Vice Adm. A. S. Merrill, a brilliant naval officer, a great American, and a true patriot:

ADMIRAL MERRILL

Vice Adm. Aaron Stanton Merrill, of Natchez, New Orleans, and the seven seas, probably would like it recorded that he sailed away. During 35 years in the U.S. Navy he seldom missed a chance, off duty wtih shipmates, to sing "Old Sailors Never Die They Just Sail Away."

The retired officer's passing Tuesday in a Natchez hospital not far from the plantation where he was born closed a distinguished career. During its military phase it was the career of a brilliant fighting man. After his retirement, it was a career of continued fighting for educational opportunity for young men.

No task force had a beter record in World War II than did Task Force No. 39, commanded by then Rear Admiral Merril in the dark days when the Japanese enemy threatened to drive U.S. forces from the South Pacific.

Throughout his active service, from the time he won his first decoration for destroyer duty in World War I until his retirement, in 1947, after serving with distinction as commandant of the Eighth Naval District, he discharged large and small responsibilities in a way to win unqualified commendation by his superiors and the real devotion of his men.

The Deep South particularly and the cause of good will among men generally benefited when he returned to his old home, became president of Jefferson Military College and saved that 159-year-old school from death by neglect.

In all his good works, it seems to us, Admiral Merrill was at his best when odds against him were greatest. He was a reminder of an express by the British naval hero, Lord Nelson: "I am not come forth to find difficulties, but to remove them."

To use a sailor's language, "Tip" Merrill had a good trip.

This newspaper joins his many friends and admirers in expressing sympathy in their loss to his widow and to his colleagues at Jefferson College.

Area Redevelopment Bill, S. 1—Comments of Brice A. Eldridge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished citizen of Bergen County, N.J., Brice A. Eldridge, is now serving as executive vice president of the Bergen County Chamber of Commerce. Brice Eldridge is a citizen who has made a great contribution to the business, civic and cultural life of his State. I have a high regard for him as a friend and business leader.

While I do not agree with some of the statements which he makes in his letter to me regarding S. 1, the area redevelopment bill, his thoughts are clear and well expressed and should be available to all of us considering this subject matter. For that reason, under unanimous consent, I include his letter in the Appendix of the RECORD:

Hon. FRANK C. OSMERS, Jr.,
Representative from New Jersey,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRANK: We learn with a great deal of apprehension of the effort to push for fast Senate action, Senate S. 1, which deals with industry relocation.

It would seem to us that this is another step—and a big step—toward the socialistic state to which we have been riding hell bent since 1929. We don't believe that any amount of legislation short of complete domination by a central government can keep the economic index on a perfectly even keel. The economic pattern cannot be static; it must rise or fall; the most we can hope for is that the hills are not too high nor the valleys too deep.

It just so happens at this time, one of the normal recessions being in progress, that manmade laws are trotted out to correct the natural law of supply and demand.

There will always be depressed areas; certain groups of people either through circumstances, lack of initiative, poor planning, stupidity, laziness, change of style, or many other reasons, will be unable to keep up with the aggressive leadership of other groups. While certain consideration and assistance should be given to them, we see no reason why the successful areas should be penalized and forced to contribute, by sacrifice and money, in reestablishing better conditions in the areas which did not do so well, especially if it was their own lack of foresight which brought on their condition.

It is no news to anyone that the foreign competition with our manufacturing plants is a situation of grave concern. The President of the United States has given recognition to this by drawing attention to the drain on our gold reserves, aggravated particularly by the intense competition from Germany and Japan. It would seem to us that dictating the location of an operational unit certainly would not be conducive to efficient productivity and lower production costs.

As we study the reports on this contemplated legislation, the cost of carrying out the program would be fantastic, and it would also seem to us that the vast organization that would be necessary to carry out this program would certainly be a haven for many new employees on the Federal payroll.

This bill is a radical departure from the proper role of the Federal Government. The state should not proceed a step further than is necessary for the mutual security and protection against foreign enemies, for with no other object should it impose restrictions on freedom. Consideration should be given to solicitude for the welfare of its citizens, but not in such a way as to jeopardize the freedoms which have been so gloriously won and zealously guarded.

We beseech you to oppose any further restrictions on the liberties of our citizens.

Cordially yours,

BRICE A. ELDRIDGE,
Executive Vice President, Bergen County Chamber of Commerce, Hackensack, N.J.

The Race in Space—A Close Look at Mars Through a Telescope Satellite

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the possibility of a telescopic televised view of Mars from a telescope satellite shot into the vicinity of Mars and the telescope view televised back to earth is approaching rapidly in the U.S. race in space.

Here is a short item by Dr. Dan Q. Posin, professor of physics, De Paul University, in which he outlines how this can be accomplished.

As an original member of the House Science and Astronautics Committee, I have kept in close touch with the practical possibilities of space exploration as a means of bringing closer to people on earth the knowledge of what exists on our neighboring planets in the vast universe surrounding earth.

The following article by Dr. Posin will prove both interesting and informative:

AN EYE ON SPACE

(By Dr. Dan Q. Posin)

The canals and moons of Mars may be man made.

To solve the canal puzzle it is possible to put telescopes above the earth's atmosphere in an earth satellite. The telescopes would have to be of considerable power, and the satellites of a high degree of stabilization. Also needed is a sensitive alining system and a radio transmission installation.

However, to solve the problem of the Martian moons, a space device has to be fired to the vicinity of Mars—a Mars probe. This probe must contain a camera adapted to a telescope, and also a rather intricate TV transmitter. Needless to say, the televising of views from the region of Mars, some 40 or 50 million miles away, is not a simple task; but it can be done. The principal item of equipment on the probe would be a paraboloidal transmitting antenna (like an automobile headlight) which would be constantly pointing toward Earth. Such an antenna of aluminized plastic would go up folded, but would inflate in space to a diameter of about 40 feet. It would be able to form and transmit detailed views of Mars and its moons.

But a more breathtaking space device to Mars will be an actual spaceship carrying earthlings to Mars. An eight-man spaceship is within the capabilities of today's science and engineering. In fact, a design has been worked out by the Boeing engineer, Philip Bono, who showed that everything depends on the development of one engine type, a special 1½-million-pound thrust engine, using hydrogen and oxygen as propellant. A total of seven such engines would be needed for all three earth-escape stages. The spaceship would be 248 feet tall and 82 feet wide, with a launch weight of 8,300,000 pounds. This spaceship would contain a hugh 80,000-pound payload, including about 4 tons of exploratory equipment and a 2-ton land vehicle for touring Mars.

The spaceship could lift itself nonstop to Mars. There is no need for assembling the ship at an orbiting space station. With the coming of powerful fuels and engines, space stations are fast losing their appeal.

As the giant spaceship nears Mars, a cluster of four 20,000-pound reverse-thrust engines would fire to slow the ship down. These engines would also be needed on the return trip to earth.

The journey to Mars, mostly a coasting operation, would take 259 days. The time to launch a coasting spaceship to Mars is the first few days of May 1971. If this is done, the relative positions of Earth and Mars will permit a launch and coast to occur in such a way that 259 days later the spaceship will snuggle up to Mars, matching its speed in space with a few fuel-burning maneuvers. At landing time, moreover, in January 1972, Mars will be close to the Sun, and so its temperature will be fairly pleasant.

The explorers will have to remain on Mars 479 days until it again is in proper space relation to Earth for the economical launch-and-coast journey. Another 259 days would bring the travelers back to Earth. The spaceship would carry its own launching platform for leaving Mars, devised from the landing glider.

Millions of dollars, years of work, risk and suffering, are all part of the project. But think of the moment when the earthlings land on Mars and look upon its canals, then gaze upward and divine the nature of the Martian moons. Did someone put them there? What sort of being inhabit, or may once have inhabited, that world of Mars?

Statement by Charles W. Colson in Behalf of the New England Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very interesting statement by Charles W. Colson, counsel for the New England Council, on the subject of legislation to aid chronically depressed areas:

STATEMENT BY CHARLES W. COLSON, COUNSEL FOR THE NEW ENGLAND COUNCIL, BEFORE THE SENATE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1961

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much this opportunity to appear briefly before your subcommittee on behalf of The New England Council to discuss legislation to aid chronically depressed areas.

The New England Council was established in 1925 at the behest of the six New England Governors. It provides today a number of services to the New England States, including its function as secretariat for the New England Governors Conference. It is made up of representatives of industry, labor, the State governments, educational, and farm groups. The council is concerned solely with regional development and with improving the New England economy.

In recent months, a council committee made up of State, community, and private industrial development directors, conducted a detailed study of the various versions of area assistance legislation which have been offered in this and in past Congresses. Rather than to discuss in detail their analysis, I ask your permission to have the digest prepared by this committee printed at this point in the record of these hearings.

It would not be appropriate for The New England Council to suggest to this committee whether or not area assistance legislation should be enacted. This, of course, is a judgment to be rendered by the Congress and the President. We do feel, however, that certain conclusions which we reached as a result of our detailed study may be helpful to the committee at this point. While our study was concerned with the effect of this legislation upon the economy of New England, these comments, I might add, are relative not only to New England but to other well established industrialized areas of the country.

The council feels that S. 1, in common with most of the bills filed, contains one provision in particular which should be amended. The antipirating restriction as it now is written in section 6 beginning on page 9, line 5, we believe to be both inadequate and incapable of successful administration.

We in New England are particularly sensitive to the dangers of pirating by other regions. We have seen other areas in the past lure our industries away with tax concessions and low cost labor. In fact, most New England depressed areas can trace their recent economic ills to the exodus of a once prosperous textile industry.

Older industrialized regions like New England which have pioneered progressive social legislation and undertaken improved governmental services must of necessity impose heavy tax burdens upon industry. Moreover, wage rates are generally higher in these regions. It is both unsound and unfair to offer the inducement of Federal financing for the relocation of industries from these established areas to less well developed regions. To do so would clearly place the great industrial States of our Nation in a particularly disadvantageous competitive position.

It is the intent of depressed area legislation to stimulate America's economy and to create new employment opportunities for citizens in depressed areas. New industrial development is an essential goal to sustain America's economic growth. Without adequate antipirating protection, however, depressed area legislation could result in a mere transfer of jobs from one area to another with no net gain to the Nation's economy. Effective antipirating protection is thus essential if depressed area legislation is to realize its commendable objectives.

Moreover, the language of the present bill, Mr. Chairman, imposes an unreasonable burden upon the administrator. To determine what is or is not "substantial detriment" can only result in arbitrary determinations and in the exercise of this responsibility, the administrator would be subjected to unceasing pressure from all sides. Certainly in the eyes of any Member of Congress, the removal of any industry from his district would constitute "substantial detriment". The Congress should unequivocally spell out its intent and establish clear guidelines for the administration of this provision.

We feel that the amendment offered by Senator BUSH in the past Congress would

afford full protection against the removal of industry from one area to another while at the same time permitting the establishment of branch plants, subsidiaries, or the expansion of existing operations from the area of their original location. We are very hopeful that an amendment of this character, perhaps spelling out the precise prohibitions and permissible activities, will be enacted.

There is ample precedent for the inclusion of this kind of provision. Most of the States which have adopted redevelopment programs along similar lines to the program suggested by S. 1 have incorporated protection against the transfer of industries within their States. Certainly it is only logical that the Federal Government would take a similar attitude with respect to transfers between States.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, we believe that depressed area legislation without effective antipirating protection could undermine and devastate the economy of New England. I emphasize, however, that this is not exclusively a regional problem; rather it affects the very substance and purpose of this legislation. We are convinced that it is not the intent of Congress to encourage federally subsidized raiding of industries—nor is it the intent of Congress to make the Federal Government in the final analysis the "court of last resort" for industrial location. Rather we believe that distressed area legislation, to make its full and worthwhile contribution to a growing economy, must stimulate new job opportunities for our citizens and must encourage genuine economic growth.

Youth Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the Albuquerque Journal under the heading of Youth Peace Corps:

YOUTH PEACE CORPS

President Kennedy did not act upon his advice alone in initiating a peace corps of trained young men and women to help backward peoples by living and working with them.

Congress in 1960 authorized a study of such a project. It was undertaken by the University of Colorado's Research Foundation. The preliminary report recommended creation of the corps, and the President acted upon it on a temporary basis until Congress can by law create a permanent corps.

This country has been sending technicians abroad. But the basic difference between them and peace corps will be this: Peace corps members will get no salary—just subsistence wages. They will speak the language of the backward people and work side by side with them, helping to do what the technical advisers only suggest.

Kennedy ventured no guess as to the cost of the program for 500 persons he had in mind. But the Colorado researchers figured a 5,000-member Peace Corps might cost about 50 million a year.

It's an intriguing program. One that could build up goodwill for this country as well as benefiting the backward peoples. It well merits a modest trial.

The 58th Annual Savings Conference of the American Bankers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, March 6, I had the pleasure of addressing the 58th Annual Savings Conference of the American Bankers Association at the Roosevelt Hotel, New York City.

Following are excerpts from my remarks on that occasion:

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE 58TH ANNUAL SAVINGS CONFERENCE OF THE AMERICAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION AT THE ROOSEVELT HOTEL, MARCH 6, 1961

GOLD

Before touching upon several specific pieces of legislation that will be dealt with by the 87th Congress, I would like to discuss briefly a matter of more general interest and probably of even more importance. We have heard and read a great deal of late about gold and the possible devaluation of the dollar. Some of it has been irresponsible, some of it inaccurate and little of it more than half the story.

Let me put it as strongly as I can: No part of this administration, executive or legislative, has any intention of devaluing the dollar, by increasing the price of gold or otherwise.

There is no need to do so. Furthermore, doing so would accomplish no good.

We do not intend to succumb to the pressures of the gold miners, of the gold speculators, or of the Communists. The latter alone are said to own one-half of the world's supply, the value of which must be increased by every addition to the price of gold on the world market. We need no gold for our domestic economy. Americans cannot buy or hold gold except by license for manufacturing purposes. There is no need for a gold reserve for our currency. Nevertheless, the law requires a reserve of gold equal to 25 percent of the total of our outstanding Federal Reserve notes and liabilities.

We can repeal that law, and much respectable authority has urged that we do so, without in the slightest impairing our credit standing or our economic situation. The primary purpose of our gold stock is, and should be the international convertibility of gold and the dollar at the fixed price of $35 an ounce.

Please understand that I am not urging that we ignore our balance-of-payments problems. They probably will be with us always. Keeping prices competitive, increasing our exports, creating incentives to bring money into our country, removing the incentives that send or keep money abroad, and a readjustment of the contributions we and our allies make to world development and stabilization, are all matters of importance. They all enter into the volatility of the flow of gold on the international scene.

It seems to me that Mr. Average American Citizen has a great deal more confidence in the dollar than many alarmists who should know better. As proof of that statement, I direct your attention to the fact that for the first time in any month in 8 years, more U.S. savings bonds, E- and H-bonds, were sold during the month of January 1961, than were redeemed, with the Treasury reporting that this new trend apparently will continue.

With only one exception, I have yet to hear or see a single statement to the effect that the so-called outflow of gold from the United States has not been that at all. It has been merely an increase in the amount of the claims by foreign governments against that gold. The difference is important, if for no other reason than that there is no safer place to store gold than in the United States.

Let me emphasize that while foreign claims on our gold have increased, the gold has not left our shores. As a matter of fact, the total gold supply in our country has increased. During each of the years 1950, 1951, and 1952, our gold stock hovered around the $22 billion mark, and earmarked gold (that is, gold in the United States held for foreign and international accounts) did not exceed $5,600 million.

From 1953 to 1957, inclusive, the amount of the U.S. gold varied between $21 billion and $23 billion, and claims against that gold by foreign and international accounts ran from $6 billion to $7 billion. The last 3 years the gold we owned outright has dropped by about $5 billion, and the amount set aside for foreign and international accounts has increased by about the same amount.

The total gold on hand at the end of 1950 was $28,446 million, and 10 years later at the end of 1960, it was $29,648 million, a net gain of $1,202 million.

But says our alarmist friend: On demand, we may be required to pay out $11 billion of that gold.

That is theoretically correct, but just as absurd as saying that on demand every bank in the country may have to pay out all of its deposits in currency. Unlike the depositor who may stuff his pockets or his bag with the money and walk off with it, no foreign claimant would be willing to pay for the attendant cost of cartage, freight, insurance, security, and storage, assuming a safer place could be found for the gold.

Even that, however, is not the full story. Foreign claimants would just about have completed the transit of the gold when they would be compelled to reverse the process and pay the same costs all over again to get the gold back to us to pay their debts to us. What most of the theorists have overlooked apparently, is that foreign claimants owe the United States an aggregate sum equal to about the same amount of gold we hold for them.

Are the debtors and the creditors and the amounts identical? Of course not. But neither are they identical in any banking system.

I am sure that none of you would deign to call anyone a sound banker who suggested anything near a 100 percent reserve for any purpose.

Now for a few specifics. I will not discuss today any of the bills which soon will be law covering extended unemployment compensation, increased minimum wages, aid to depressed areas and housing. Although none of those bills will satisfy everyone, I am certain satisfactory legislation will be enacted which will improve our economy and assure our economic progress and our general welfare.

FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD

Some time ago Mr. Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, recommended that the term of office of the Chairman of that Board should coincide with that of the President of the United States.

This does not mean that the Chairman should be subservient to the President. But it does mean that he should be his spokesman, when he needs a spokesman.

It would have been destructive of public confidence in the system, to have sought to accomplish such a change while there was vigorous difference of opinion about fiscal and debt management policies between the Board, the President and/or the Legislature.

Today, for the first time in 10 years, we have substantial agreemeent between the Board, the President, the Treasury and the Legislature.

I suggest this is the time for Congress to amend the Federal Reserve Act accordingly.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

It is my hope that this Congress will consider and enact a bill to reconstitute the Board of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Without casting any reflection upon our good friend, Ray Gidney, the incumbent Comptroller, for whom I have the highest respect and regard, it is my firm conviction that no chartering and supervising authority should be a part of an insuring agency. The two functions are separate and distinct, and should be kept so.

A more basic objection is the double burden placed on the State banks, savings and commercial, that the national banks are free from under existing law. If we believe in a dual banking system, then we must make it work. Such a system can succeed only if there is true duality. I am sure that the national banks would rise up in arms against any proposal to amend the National Banking Act to provide that they must submit to the additional examinations, supervision and authority of the banking supervisors of the States in which they operate. Yet that is precisely what happens when the national banking supervisory authority serves as a member of the FDIC Board.

My bill seeks to eliminate the Comptroller of the Currency from that Board. I want to emphasize it is not directed against Mr. Gidney. It does not and cannot affect his term of office. It will apply, if enacted, only to his successors.

An alternative proposal that has been offered and will be considered by the Congress is that the Board be increased from three to five, with a provision that the savings banks and the commercial banks each be represented on that Board. The objection to that proposal—and there is some merit to it—is that a board of five is too cumbersome.

What I would like to see accomplished is the enactment of a bill which would combine FDIC and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation into one agency, with each of the segments of the banking industry represented on the new Board.

The objection that immediately appears is that there are many differences between the two funds as to assets, as to premiums paid, as to liability, both type and amount, and as to the basic difference of operation of the institutions whose accounts are insured.

To my mind, these are not differences in principle, but rather differences in technique of operation. All of this can be satisfactorily covered so as to assure maximum protection to all concerned—and I now include stockholders, shareholders, depositors, and the general public—in their individual capacity as well as in their aggregate capacity as the U.S. Government.

NATIONAL MUTUAL SAVINGS BANKS

As most of you know, for many years I have been introducing bills to extend the dual banking system to mutual savings banks. We have a dual system as to commercial banks. We have a dual system as to savings and loan associations, and we have a dual system as to credit unions. We even have a dual system as to regulation of the sale of stocks to the general public.

There is no sound reason why we should not have a dual system as to savings banks. If we read the legislative history of the various enactments on these subjects, we find in every instance the same objections were raised against the enactment of the Federal legislation, that are now being urged against this proposed legislation.

The trouble with most objectors is that they overlook the fact that when the law established a quasi-monopoly in the banking industry, it was done not for the purpose of throttling competition, but for the sole purpose of safeguarding, first the money of the public, and second the money of the stockholders. A sound banking system is more than vested with the public interest, it is identical therewith.

Those who oppose this bill by saying that it will weaken the State banking system, and that those States which have no mutual savings banks can enact legislation to establish them if they so desire, are begging the question. The dual banking system is either good principle or bad. If it is bad, then those who are objecting to this bill because it weakens the State systems, or will create undue or unfair competition to the State systems, should forthrightly launch a movement to eliminate the dual system. If the dual system is good in any area of banking, it is good in every area, and should be uniform throughout the country.

Other objections raised to the bill go not to the principle, but to the details thereof. To those who oppose this bill because they don't like one or more of its provisions, or think that those provisions should be improved, or that the author has overlooked some internal operational or management problems, I suggest to them that they quickly come forth with suggestions for the improvement of the bill.

Last year my bill had bipartisan sponsorship in the Senate as well as in the House. It will have such sponsorship again this year. I am now working on a new draft of the bill which I hope will be an improvement on prior drafts. After that bill is introduced, I am certain that we will proceed to hearings, and I hope bring out a good bill. This bill will not be defeated because some people think some of its provisions are bad, and it will be easier to eliminate those bad provisions and make corrections before the bill is enacted rather than after. I can assure you that if the principle of this bill is good, as I believe it is, a bill will be enacted.

TAXATION

The strongest objection urged against the bill is that the bill will enlarge and expand practically tax free mutual institutions, whereas the American Bankers Association has gone on record for eliminating such tax free advantages. The answer to that objection is the same answer I have been giving over the years to the ABA on that subject, and to all who have voiced their opinions to me with regard thereto.

The proponents of this tax legislation are barking up the wrong tree. The complaint is based primarily upon an alleged inequity. Assuming that the inequity exists, I do not intend to compound the inequity. I suggest that we eliminate it. There are two ways to accomplish that. Assuming that there is a different tax base for commercial banks than there is for mutual banks and associations, then if the commercial banks can make out a case, it should be to equalize the base. The only inequality that any commercial banker has thus far pointed out to me is that the amount of reserves a commercial bank may charge off before computing its tax liability, is less than that permitted to the mutuals. The simple way to remove that inequality is to permit the commercial bankers the larger reserve deduction if they are entitled to it. Mutual institutions, like every other individual or group of taxpayers will never be heard to complain about the reduction of taxes, if it is done fairly and without discrimination.

But the tax inequality or inequity that is basic in the financial systems of our country is precisely the same throughout our economy. Except in wartime, or dire emergency, there is no excuse for taxing earnings twice. Except under such circumstances, there is no excuse for a so-called surplus, or excess-profits tax. When an individual puts his money to work, he files a return and pays a tax on his earnings. When he puts his money to work through the instrumentality of a partnership or a joint venture, or a trust, he may file two returns, but he pays only one tax.

When he puts his money to work through a cooperative organization or a mutual institution, he again very properly is called upon to pay only one tax. The one place in our tax system where that does not apply, is when an individual or corporation invests money by the acquisition of corporate stock.

Only under those circumstances do we find the profits being taxed twice, first when they are earned by the corporation, and then when they are received by the owner of the corporation, that is the stockholder. Worse yet, if the corporation doesn't pay out its net earnings as required by law, a severe penalty is imposed and taken out of the earnings that were left after payment of taxes.

When the Congress granted a small tax deduction for a percentage of dividends, I hoped we were making a real start toward the eventual repeal of all taxes on dividends.

The project of the ABA and of all persons who are interested in corporate enterprises, both public and private, should be to fight the effort to repeal that dividend exemption. They should unify their forces in support of extending the exemption, until we see the eventual complete repeal of the dividend tax. What I have just said applies with equal force to those misguided souls who each year write me and urge the enactment of a tax upon cooperatives.

I have carefully analyzed the arguments pro and con advanced on this subject by the financial institutions. I am convinced that the inequities that the commercial bankers attempt to establish, add up to a strawman, which is blown away by the first slight breeze. If there should be a tax on the mutuals before they pay the net earnings to their shareholders and depositors, then the interest which commercial bankers pay on their thrift and time accounts should not be a deductible expense before arriving at the taxable income of the commercials. The fact of the matter is that the total amount of interest and dividends paid to savers and stockholders of commercials, is far less than the total amount paid as interest and dividends to depositors and shareholders in the mutuals. If the commercials are serious in their contention for equality—let's go all the way. Let's impose upon them the same requirements we impose upon the mutuals by requiring that time and savings accounts in the commercials may be invested only in the same investments permitted to the mutuals and let's require that for those funds the commercials must carry the same high reserves as are required of the mutuals. If this demand by the commercials for equity continues much longer, it would not surprise me to see the mutuals come forward and say that they too can render every service that a commercial bank can render, and seek the authority to do it. Let us not overlook the inequality that exists, that requires the mutuals to pay for the use of almost every dollar with which they operate (at least 93 percent thereof), while the commercials are permitted to use 70 percent of their resources (that is their demand deposits) free of cost.

My final word to you is that there is no need for businessmen, whether bankers or industrialists, small or big, to fight each other. They should stand together fighting to eliminate unfair and discriminatory practices in business and in government.

Resources: Top Rating

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from one of the leading daily newspapers in Oregon comments favorably on the President's recent message concerning natural resources. The plaudits of the Oregonian are particularly noteworthy in that it has not always editorially supported the Democratic Party and its nominees:

[From the Oregonian, Feb. 27, 1961]

RESOURCES: TOP RATING

President Kennedy's message to Congress on natural resources is the most comprehensive and knowledgeable statement of America's needs in this field and the responsibility of the Federal Government ever made by an American President. At least, the White House has caught up with the citizens who have been fighting a frustrating holding action to preserve and develop the Nation's natural wealth since Teddy Roosevelt left office a half century ago.

Whether or not one agrees, point by point, with all the proposals made by the President for the conservation and development of water, land, forest and minerals, one may not reasonably dispute the breadth of his understanding nor the critical need for intelligent action in each field. Mr. Kennedy's great contribution is his packaging of these resources and their needs in a master program recognizing their relationship and the critical necessity for a frontal attack on all the problems involved—right now, not 20 years from now.

Intelligent management of our resources has been hampered and hamstrung not only by economic and political conflicts amnog users but by conflicts among Federal agencies themselves. The President mentions some of these. It will be a test of his determination to see whether he can knock out the bureaucratic roadblocks.

In our own Columbia Basin, for example, there is a long standing conflict between the economic and recreational need to maintain a salmon fishery and the economic pressures for high dams. The President calls for a comprehensive study of each river basin. We have a reasonably comprehensive study by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for the Columbia Basin. It rules out a high dam at the Nez Perce site in the Snake River, blocking passage of anadromous fish into Idaho's Salmon River. But the Federal Power Commission has a hearing in progress on an application by Washington public utilities districts to build such a high dam at Nez Perce. Will the President intervene?

The President finds wholly inadequate the progress made in efforts to control pollution of water—use of which will double in the next 80 years—and of air, which is costing the Nation $7.5 billion annually. He proposes more Federal aid to communities for sewage plant construction, and asserts that industry has lagged in its responsibility. But in the Oregon Legislature, industry-sponsored amendments would cripple the State sanitary authority's power to clean up our water and air and keep them clean. We can only hope that our legislators read and ponder the President's message.

Mr. Kennedy, in the power field, not only favors reasonable multiple-purpose development of hydrosites but urges greater Federal-private cooperation to achieve economic, competitive nuclear power by 1970. But will he vigorously support the proposed plutonium-power, dual-purpose reactor at Hanford which would add 700,000 to 850,000 kilowatts to the Northwest power supply at low cost? Some utility spokesmen have lobbied backstage against this project, fearing Federal entrance into the nuclear power field.

The President approves continued financing of Tennessee Valley Authority power projects by sale of revenue bonds, as accomplished by Mr. Eisenhower. Will he also support a bill to allow the Federal power system in the Columbia Basin to finance power facilities, including nuclear plants, by revenue bonds instead of appropriations from a burdened Treasury? He has advanced programs to cost billions in tax revenues. Power facilities could be put on a self-liquidating basis.

The President's forest and range proposals will need detailed study but his recognition of the alltime values of these resources and the need to obtain maximum production under the best conservation practices is enlightened and stimulating. On the whole, we applaud the President's position. He will find great support for these policies in the Pacific Northwest.

Hoover Will Be Around

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALLEN SMITH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in today's RECORD, the text of an editorial written by Jack Carley of the Memphis Commercial Appeal which appeared on February 25, 1961.

HOOVER WILL BE AROUND

A flat FBI denial that J. Edgar Hoover intends to resign should put the quietus on all the rumors and gossip to that effect which have been going the rounds since President Kennedy was elected.

Mr. Hoover was the first official asked to serve under the present administration and "quitting" is not one of the words in his extensive and sometimes colorful vocabulary.

One so-called newsletter circulated recently throughout the country, in commenting on a prediction that the FBI's Director would "be out by summer," made the unequivocal statement that "He and his boss, Attorney General Robert Kennedy, disagree too much, particularly on the FBI's proper role."

That, we feel sure, will be "news" to both.

The FBI's role is defined by statute and by Executive orders based either on constitutional authority, or statute. Mr. Hoover's basic requirement for his agency is that it enforce the law. There has been no deviation from that precept in the more than 30 years he has headed the FBI. And vigorous law enforcement, his record shows, is an enthusiasm which Attorney General Kennedy shares.

Only the Nation's enemies and its criminal underworld will regret that Mr. Hoover is still going to be around officially to give them a hard way to go. We have an idea that the Attorney General and he intend that it shall be an even harder way.

Enslavement of Rumanians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter I received from Mihail Farcasanu, president of the League of Free Romanians, Liga Romanilor Liberi, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

March 6, 1961, marks the 16th year that Rumania and its citizens have been behind the Iron Curtain. Mr. Farcasanu calls to our attention the fact that the people of Rumania are enslaved and their human and political rights completely suppressed in their Sovietized country.

It is essential that we offer hope and encouragement to the Rumanian people in their enslavement so they will know that they have friends among the free nations of the world, and Mr. Farcasanu reminds us of the obligations we have in this regard.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LEAGUE OF FREE ROMANIANS,
New York, N.Y., March 2, 1961.

Hon. STYLES BRIDGES,
U.S. Senator From New Hampshire.

DEAR SENATOR: This 6th of March we Rumanians are mourning the loss of our country's freedom. Sixteen years ago, in 1945, the Soviet armies installed in Bucharest a puppet government obedient to the will of Moscow. This nonrepresentative government, agent of the Kremlin, has violated the peace treaty granted by the United States and completely suppressed human rights in Rumania.

On the 7th of March this same government takes its place in the United Nations along with the United States and Great Britain and will play its part in the Soviet campaign to unseat Mr. Hammarskjold.

This sort of incongruous situation passes almost unnoticed as do many others, because of the Soviet propaganda barrage of nuclear threats used to promote their political aims. It is necessary that such incongruities as that in the United Nations should be kept in sight if the right political answer is to be given to Russian maneuverings.

We will be profoundly grateful and appreciative if you could remind the Senate of the tragedy of an enslaved people and the farce of their being represented by the agents of Moscow. These circumstances could throw a certain light on some of the current issues. In the first place, it was a political error to accept the establishment of Russian domination in Eastern and Central Europe, but it was an even greater and more dangerous one to cooperate in the Russian scheme of presenting their puppets as sovereign and independent members of the international community.

The Rumanian stooge government as the other satellite governments, is acting under the false pretense of representing the people, which it does not, it is in fact representing exclusively the interests of the Soviet Union. Through this operation, all Eastern

European nations have been deprived of any voice in the international forums, whereas the Soviet Union has become a hydra, chanting through its many mouths the identical Russian tune. This has greatly contributed to falsify the character of the United Nations. It has been amply demonstrated—and is now again evident in the Congo issue—that these fake governments under Russian control will never abide by any international decision not furthering the Soviet interests.

To give an example, when the United States and Great Britain brought before the World Court a complaint of the nonimplementation of the peace treaties by the Governments of Rumania, Hungary, and Bulgaria, the said Governments refused even to appear before the Court, although they were obliged to do so by the treaties. The Court was impotent and unable to impose the law. So was the General Assembly of the United Nations with its resolution to investigate the circumstances of the Hungarian uprising. In the case of the World Court it is particularly obvious that the law-abiding free countries are at a great disadvantage as compared with the Communist countries.

Unfortunately the Rumanian puppet government, in spite of its crimes and unlawfulness, has been accepted in the United Nations and in international conferences and is the second government after its master, the Soviet Union, to enjoy cultural exchanges with the Government of the United States, despite the fact that Rumanian culture has been, like the people themselves, crushed in the Russian straitjacket. The liquidation of political opposition and of those considered not reliable goes on through imprisonment, forced labor, unemployment and extreme subalimentation.

Meanwhile the Rumanian Communist government is aiding North Vietnam with large credits for its industrial development and participates in other of the Communist bloc's "Council for Mutual Economic Aid" ventures. In the United Nations the Rumanian Government is working hard, hand in hand with Castro's Cuba and Guinea, assisted by Poland and Czechoslovakia, to obtain the resignation of the Secretary General. Czechoslovakia is at the present moment furnishing arms to the Communist supported groups in the Congo, to Castro, etc.

Having in view all these facts, the idea which is still cherished here, of using financial aid in Communist countries—aid which is to the benefit of no one except the Communists themselves—is hopelessly unrealistic. The real help for the peoples behind the Iron Curtain and which would also improve the position of the United States, would be a change in the present policy of the American Government toward the subjugated countries. This change should aim at weakening their oppressive puppet governments instead of strengthening them by economic aid.

After 16 years of slavery many Rumanians still put their hope in such a change.

Anything you can say on behalf of the aspirations for freedom and independence of our unfortunate people will meet with the gratitude of Rumanians everywhere.

I remain yours respectfully,

MIHAIL FARCASANU,
President.

Nonvoting Representative for Guam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, at this time when the national interest demands that we restore and rebrighten throughout the world the image of the United States as the champion of free government, truly representative of all the people, it seems to me most important that we should give to our fellow Americans in Guam nonvoting representation in the Congress.

Guam and the Virgin Islands are our two remaining unincorporated territories. They are not candidates for statehood. They are, however, part and parcel of our United States of America, and it is in the American tradition that the Americans who live in Guam and the Americans who live in the Virgin Islands should have nonvoting representation in the Congress. To withhold from them that representation would seem to me to be an abandonment of the fundamental principals of representative government.

Guam is our most far distant possession. In this small bit of American territory, far off in the Pacific, is a legislative body similar to that in the States on the mainland. It is fortunate for us that in recent years the distinguished speaker of the Guam Legislature, the Honorable A. B. Won Pat, has been commissioned by the Guam Legislature to visit us here in Washington. He has industriously spent his time in his mission of seeing that in the drafting of many laws, implementing the many activities of the American people, our fellow Americans in Guam should not be forgotten. He has rendered a great service to Guam and a great service for our country.

As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I feel strongly that our position in the eyes of the world, especially that part of it in the Pacific in the Far East area, would be immeasurably helped if we gave a nonvoting representation to Guam, and of course what is true as regards Guam is equally true as regards the Virgin Islands.

Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the statement of the speaker of the Guam Legislature, the Honorable A. B. Won Pat, before the House Subcommittee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and I trust that my colleagues will give to Speaker Won Pat's forceful presentment of his case the thoughtful reading that it deserves. Speaker Won Pat's statement follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, as speaker of the Guam Legislature, I am here pursuant to the authority of Resolutions Nos. 1 and 106 of the Sixth Guam Legislature which authorized and empowered me as such to present before congressional committees and/or Federal officials in Washington, D.C., the various problems relating to Guam, and also to represent the views and interest of the people of Guam on matters of vital concern to them before both Houses of Congress and various departments of the executive branch of the Federal Government. I ask, Mr. Chairman, that the text of resolutions 1 and 106 appear in the record at the conclusion of my testimony this morning.

In this capacity, I deeply appreciate the privilege and opportunity to appear before you today in support of the proposal to authorize Guam and the Virgin Islands to be reresented in the Congress through nonvoting deputies, or by whatever name you may decide to call them. Last year, as you will recall, I was privileged to appear before this same committee to urge enactment of similar legislation, and I would like to take this occasion to thank this committee for its favorable action upon that bill, H.R. 6791, by the distinguished chairman of the Territories Subcommittee, Hon. LEO O'BRIEN. Unfortunately, the 86th Congress adjourned without taking final action on the measure.

Today I am appearing before you categorically to reiterate the earnest desire and petition of the 41,000 American citizens of Guam to accord us this measure of self-government consistent with our democratic system and tradition. Your favorable action and active support on this important and vital legislation would not only be applauded and appreciated, but would demonstrate to the world our faith and conviction in the concept of our American democracy.

I am aware, of course, that this measure, despite its plausible merits will give rise to some objection: First, the question concerning the cost of the office looms in the minds of some Members of Congress as too high, but I understand that this cost will be less than 60 percent of the cost of the office of a Congressman which is figured to be approximately $75,000 a year. Further, the cost is insignificant compared to the intrinsic value that will inure to the benefit of our national posture before the eyes of the world. Are we not spending billions of dollars every year in order to protect and preserve our American way of life? And are we not spending also millions of dollars every year to propagate the ideals and worth of our American democracy?

Secondly, the question of statehood will be inevitably injected by opponents of the bill, namely, that if Guam and the Virgin Islands were authorized representation in Congress, it will follow that they will press next for statehood. Nothing could be further from the truth than this assumption. Guam and the Virgin Islands are unincorporated territories and the granting of representation by Congress as provided in the proposed legislation to these territories will not change their status as such. Historically, only organized incorporated territories have been admitted into the Union. I can neither believe no conceive that Guam and the Virgin Islands can possibly grow sufficiently, economically, or in population during our lifetime to a point where statehood could even be considered.

The third issue, and this is really the key one, is whether or not the people of Guam are ready to assume this greater responsibility, and whether they merit it. I firmly believe that the answer to both is an unequivocal "Yes." In support of this affirmation, I would like to review for you succintly our historical and political background.

Guam was discovered for Spain by Ferdinand Magellan, March 6, 1521, and remained a Spanish colony until the Spanish-American War in 1898 when it was ceded to the United States by the Treaty of Paris. It is the largest of the Marianas Islands, located in the western Pacific, on the edge of the continent of Asia, 3,000 miles west of Hawaii, 1,500 miles east of the Philippines and 1,100 miles south of Japan. It has been under American sovereignty for more than 60 years with the exception of the occupation by the Japanese during World War II. In 1950 the Congress of the United States passed the Organic Act which bestowed American citizenship to the people of Guam and provided for a limited degree of self-government. Because of its strategic location and the establishment of civil government, Guam has been a major defense base and at the same time a showcase of American democracy in the western Pacific.

Although it has been a little over 10 years since the people of Guam have enjoyed the blessings of American citizenship, they have been Americans at heart since 1898. During the past decade that they have exercised some measure of self-government, the

record will show that we have maintained a sound, stable, and progressive local self-government. This is further attested by the observations of some of our national leaders in Congress and the Executive Board who have a responsible interest in the development of our offshore areas.

The Honorable JOHN P. SAYLOR, a distinguished member of this committee, in his extension of remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 2, 1958, said in part:

"The people of Guam are not only assuming the responsibilities of citizenship in the American tradition but are displaying a notable degree of political maturity. During these few years they have made remarkable progress economically, socially, and politically within the framework of our American democratic system."

Senator GRUENING of Alaska, who visited Guam last November with Senator LONG of Hawaii, as members of the Senate Select Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, stated before the elected leaders of Guam in their conference:

"I am heartily in favor of having an elected representative of the people of Guam sit in the House of Representatives in Washington and I shall work to that end and cast my vote in that direction. We in the United States believe in the basic principle that was enunciated by our forefathers in the Declaration of Independence that government derived their just powers from the consent of the governed, and the United States has moved certainly in that direction. It is our hope and purpose to extend the maximum of self-government to the remaining areas that are under our flag, and I think the step of having an elected representative of the people of Guam sit in the House of Representatives to be able to voice the feelings and desires and aspirations of the people of this beautiful island is a step forward and a step that is now due."

Senator LONG of Hawaii stated on that occasion: "There must be voices that can speak with authority from a little greater firsthand information than a Senator from California or Maine or a Representate from the State of Washington or the State of Florida might have. So I think in addition to the possibilities of worthwhile contribution in relation to domestic affairs, national affairs, this proposal has a ready possibility in relation to the affairs of the Pacific in meeting successfully the problems that now exist and the problems that will come up at a future time."

President Eisenhower in his budget message to the 86th Congress last year recommended that Guam and the Virgin Islands be given nonvoting representation in the United States Congress. Again in this year's budget message to the 87th Congress he said:

"To promote further the development of democratic institutions and in keeping with the growth of local self-government, the Congress should authorize the representation of the Virgin Islands and Guam in the Congress through nonvoting territorial deputies."

It might be said on the other hand that Congress has not been remiss of its responsibility to Guam by the fact that a number of Federal laws have been extended to Guam to the great benefit of the people. These we gratefully acknowledge and we also want to thank especially this committee and other Members of Congress who have unselfishly given their valuable time and effort to promote the welfare of the people of Guam. We do recognize that Members of Congress do not get any votes from Guam nor can they afford to spend so much of their valuable time listening to a Delegate without portfolio or accreditation by Congress. It is apparent therefore that only a duly accredited representative as provided by the bills now before this committee can satisfactorily fulfill the services needed and desired by the people of Guam.

In urging you to support the passage of this legislation, we feel that we are not asking for something which we are not entitled to nor are we asking too much from our National Government. As citizens of this great Nation, the people of Guam wholeheartedly do agree with the principle enunciated by President Kennedy in his inaugural address when he said: "Do not ask what your country can do for you, but ask what you can do for your country." As Americans and as an integral part of the United States we recognize our obligations to support the American Government not only in military matters, but economically and morally. We have proved, during the war, that we are ready at any time to sacrifice our material possessions and lives if need be in defense of our democratic way of life. However, it should be borne in mind that the ability of the people of Guam to fulfill their economic responsibilities is conditioned upon a wide variety of factors beyond their power and control. I am convinced that this proposed legislation would be of inestimable help in these matters as well.

Again, I thank you on behalf of the people of Guam for your courtesy and kind attention, and on their behalf bespeak your favorable action.

David B. Sullivan, Winner of the George Washington Honor Medal Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, recently the Freedom Foundation at Valley Forge selected David B. Sullivan, 18, son of Mr. and Mrs. David L. Sullivan, of Ferndale, Md., to receive the George Washington Honor Medal Award and a $100 prize for his essay "Viewpoint." David graduated last June from the Glen Burnie High School and his essay appeared in the school's 1960 yearbook.

David's essay was termed "an outstanding achievement in helping to bring about a better understanding of the American way of life." At present David is a freshman at the University of Maryland where he is president of his class and a member of the freshman orientation board.

Because David's essay is a message which all of us need to receive frequently, I include the complete text of his award-winning essay at this point in the RECORD:

"Warning to Teenagers." Have you seen that notice lately? Certainly these words of admonition have been viewed variously in the recent years. High school students have smiled and said, "We are in for another lecture." Adults have nodded in affirmation: "Good idea to warn them before it's too late." The warnings can be applied to every topic imaginable, ranging from tastes in music, and dating customs to a demand for increased responsibility on the part of those who will in the near future exercise the privileges and responsibilities of citizens. As a high school senior, keenly aware of the many opportunities soon to be placed before us, I accept the warning.

My country stands today on the razor's edge of a precipice. At the bottom lie the crumpled empires of yesterday. The problem is double edged. Not only must the United States maintain amicable relationships with other countries, but she must also fight internally to check sliding standards and morals. Our blueprint for the future cannot ignore the records of the past. Too many nations have failed to recognize the need for brotherhood. Too many nations have confused prosperity and progress with corruption and decay. Early in our schooling we learned of the beauty that was Greece and the grandeur that was Rome. The parallel cannot be ignored.

By inheritance Americans are a proud race. We have come of a stock which fought valiantly to establish a nation conceived in liberty. These great ones became stronger as they accepted the challenges of life. Each obstacle faced and overcome strengthened the fabric of democracy.

Too many of us today feel that the race has been run, the goal has been reached. Too many of us are willing to be kept by the state; too many of us shrug off examples of intolerance we see about us.

Most young people enjoy pursuing an ideal. Let this be ours: save the American way of life before it is lost. We must be willing to give of ourselves and of our time. Through the benefits of education given us, we must raise our standards of living and our moral values. We must insure the American way of life for the future generations. Those born into a world of freedom must be taught to respect the price paid for it.

Initiation and Procedure for Public Works Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the World Ports publication for the month of February 1961, which was written by T. A. Young, industrial and governmental consultant here in Washington very ably presents the manner in which various ports, States, cities, and local groups must proceed in an order to obtain legislation for the development of an area. It is one of the few articles I have seen on this subject that I believe that serves a useful purpose to those planning on development of areas of the Nation:

INITIATION AND PROCEDURE FOR PUBLIC WORKS PROJECTS

(By T. A. Young)

Attracting industry to port and river areas has become a major undertaking in recent years. It is an understatement to say that competition is becoming very keen. Many areas employ full time industrial development managers in an effort to entice industry to their areas. To be considered by industry the areas must be able to offer ample water, electric power, rail and highway connections as well as a favorable tax situation, employment practices and living accommodations.

Helpful, indeed, to many progressive port and river areas has been the initiation of

projects for port expansion and for the development of river systems which ultimately bring the desired industrial growth to the community.

How are these projects born? They are started by individuals, community groups or progressive city, county, or State officials having industrial development foremost in their minds.

The initial step is to contact the Senators and Representatives of the area in an effort to obtain Federal consideration for assistance. The district engineer of the Corps of Engineers is in a position to furnish advice in this connection.

The preliminary step having been taken, it is necessary for the Members of Congress to request the Public Works Committees of the House and Senate to authorize the Chief of Engineers to make a survey of the area in question. In the event the area has been the subject of a previous report, the House and Senate committees may adopt a resolution authorizing a review of previous reports of the Chief of Engineers to determine whether any modification would be advisable. If no previous report has been made, a request can be made to include the authorization for a survey in either an omnibus river and harbor and flood control bill, or in a separate bill.

Once the Public Works Committees are convinced of the need for a review of a previous report (or the need for an original report), they either pass an appropriate resolution calling upon the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to make a review and refer it to the Chief of Engineers for action; or, when an original report is necessary, the requested project will, if approved by the committees, be included in either an omnibus river and harbor and flood control bill or a separate bill for action by the Congress.

Projects that have once received the approval of the Public Works Committees, as a general rule, are passed by the Congress with little or no opposition.

However, this is only a faltering first step toward the ultimate goal. The second is more difficult.

Before any further action can be taken, funds must be requested, either by the administration (Corps of Engineers) or by Members of Congress so the district engineers can make the necessary surveys. To obtain these funds not only must the administration be aware of the importance of the project, but Members of Congress as well must be informed.

Everyone will recognize that many areas of the country request, every year, projects that are considered vital to the development of the given area. However, the administration in the preparation of the annual budget, and the Congress, in an effort to keep the budget in line, must screen projects carefully. Resultingly, many requests for funds for surveys of projects are deferred. (This is where constant vigilance by local groups may be of assistance.)

When the Congress has authorized and appropriated funds for a survey of the project, the district engineer will undertake the necessary action. In many cases, it has proven valuable for the area to obtain a responsible engineering firm to make preliminary studies of the area and its potential. This information may be made available to the district engineer responsible for the survey. Further, such information, made available to the committees involved, can assist in a large measure during the course of the public hearings that must be held to obtain the views and the desires of the local people.

Local interests are afforded full opportunity to express their views on the proposed project.

The employment of a responsible engineering firm is most desirable during this preliminary step since the data furnished by the firm can be of considerable value to the district engineer, who must analyze all data received from local interests as well as devising a plan of improvement that will best suit the area in question.

The district engineer makes a report. If it is favorable (depending upon whether the benefits to be derived through the plan of improvement exceed the costs incurred), the report is submitted to the division engineer for review and transmittal to the Chief of Engineers for approval.

At the same time a proposed public notice is forwarded to the Chief of Engineers. This notice will be mailed to all interested parties detailing findings of the district and division engineers, their recommendations, and advising those concerned that they may appear before the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to present their views.

The steps mentioned above are a matter of routine once the Congress has authorized and appropriated moneys for the survey of the projects. As mentioned before, considerable assistance and the possibility of more favorable action by the engineers lies in assembling for the district engineer all possible information of a constructive nature. This is not easy for the average layman to do. For this reason, an engineering firm should be obtained by the local interests to furnish a plan of development.

Now, we arrive at the gateway to the accomplishment of the project that, let us say, has been 2 years in the making. We must now obtain the authorization and the appropriations from the Congress to commence actual development.

After the River and Harbor Board has approved the project the Chief of Engineers must recommend the inclusion of the project in a public works bill.

If this is not done immediately, the congressional Members or local interests may request a hearing before the committees of the Congress hoping, as a result, to obtain the necessary authorization. In this connection, the committees hold hearings for a relatively short period of time in the spring of each year to hear private-interest groups. At that time all interested parties appear, and possibly for the first time, the committees members other than the Members from the area in question learn about the project.

Therefore, it is essential that any locality seriously interested in a project have someone constantly making information available to all members of the committees and the committee staffs and to assist the local groups when they are in Washington to attend the hearings.

With persistent diligence and constant promotion, the project is finally authorized by the Public Works Committees and the Congress. Now, prior to the initiation of the project one faces the necessity of obtaining funds from the Appropriations Committees and Congress. If the project is a most favorable one, it is possible that it may appear in the budget submitted to Congress by the President. In this very fortunate event, the problem is somewhat easier. An indication of this possibility is, however, the budget for the fiscal year 1961 where the President recommended 42 new construction starts out of some 402 authorized projects. In this connection, it may be noted that some projects have been authorized for over 15 years and still funds have not been made available for development.

As you may see the authorization and appropriations for a project is not a routine procedure but one that must be constantly followed up by local interests. A once-a-year visit to the Nation's Capitol at the time of hearings before the committees of Congress is not enough. The wheels of Government move slowly and with the numerous projects which must be considered, not only by the Chief of Engineers and the administration but the Congress as well, a certain amount of push and constant followup must be exercised.

Not reflecting on any individual in Government nor in Congress, I should like to state those persons in a local area who visit Washington only a few times a year are at a disadvantage. I say this since persons in Government realize that they must meet with them only on rare occasions. This is not true, of course, with your elected representatives who are always endeavoring to obtain the funds necessary for development. However, they are only a few of many and have only a small voice.

This brings up an important, and an essential requirement for any area desiring to develop and obtain the industrial development resulting from the completion of a project in the area.

First, the area must have obtained, initially, an engineering firm that is able to construct a plan of development which proves the economic benefits exceed the cost. Secondly, the area must have a representative who can be in or make frequent trips to Washington. This representative's job is to keep the project uppermost in the minds of each of the agencies of Government having to pass upon the project, and to maintain constant contact with Congress and staff members of committees of Congress. Thus one can insure that the project will be given every possible consideration at every level and step in the process of development.

Okinawa Called Most Important Base in Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 17, 1961

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the situation in Laos reminds us of the need to keep our defenses in constant repair and alert in that part of the world. The recent Communist inspired riots in Japan for the sole purpose of preventing President Eisenhower's visit, and demanding that our bases be removed, illustrates that need graphically. I have recently read a news story by Robert N. Branson, of Federated Publications, which appeared in the Lansing (Mich.) State Journal on January 8, 1961, and which provides an interesting impression one of our bases made upon that reporter during his recent tour of the Far East.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to make available to my colleagues that story entitled "Okinawa Called Most Important Base in Pacific," which gives a rather comprehensive and vivid profile of the operation of that important installation:

OKINAWA CALLED MOST IMPORTANT BASE IN PACIFIC—IT'S BLUE CHIP FOR UNITED STATES IN FAR EAST, MORE VALUABLE THAN PEARL HARBOR, SAYS MILITARY OFFICIAL

(By Robert Branson)

OKINAWA.—The land of "Teahouse of the August Moon" has become the land of the Sunday punch, a billion-dollar U.S. fist rising from the green waters of the east China Sea.

Asia's shifting war clouds and political gusts have made Okinawa today America's most vital base beyond Pearl Harbor. For:

Japan's uncertain politics make our military future there doubtful at best.

Chiang Kai-shek's star has waned on Formosa.

The Philippines, beset with internal ills, would be a shaky U.S. springboard if war came.

South Korea has its hands full watching North Korea.

"That leaves Okinawa our best jumpoff point in Asia," a high U.S. military official said. "It's a blue chip worth all our other Far East positions put together—more valuable than Pearl Harbor itself, in my opinion."

MODERN LOOK

Many an air traveler reaches Okinawa expecting to find GI's and sailors in a Rodgers and Hammerstein setting of palm trees, ukuleles and teahouses. Word of our massive buildup here doesn't seem to have gotten through to U.S. newspapers and the public, our military people say.

Instead of tropical languor, the newcomer finds a military powerhouse spread farther than the eye can see with more concrete and steel pouring day by day into hard new shapes across the island.

Jet fighters and practice gunnery shake the air. Okinawa's night music is a mighty blend of engines, electricity, and steam—plus the jangle of slot machines at the biggest layout of military clubs this side of Honolulu. Some 60,000 Americans are based here, including dependents.

World War II left Okinawa a wasteland where 13,000 Americans had died in combat. For 5 years it remained a minor outpost manned by a temporary U.S. garrison.

Then Red thunderheads loomed. Chiang Kai-shek's forces were routed from the mainland. War broke in Korea. Our Far East allies started changing political complexion, all at once Okinawa's new importance dawned on defense planners.

CRITICAL SPOT ON MAP

Our Okinawan buildup began in 1950. At the Pentagon a new phrase sprang into use—"Keystone of the Pacific."

Okinawa's map location is almost equidistant from Japan, Korea, the Philippines and Red China. It is no more than 600 air miles from any of them and even closer to Formosa.

Okinawa is regarded as the best spot in the Far East from which to jump into any southeast Asian brushfire war. Better yet, the United States had inherited Okinawa as an orphan from World War II and held firmer political control than any place in the Far East.

Okinawa, part of the Ryukyu island chain below Japan, had belonged to Japan. Tokyo wanted it back, but John Foster Dulles put such skillful wording into the 1951 Japanese peace treaty that the United States won control of the islands indefinitely.

Our administration here has been gentle, but Washington made it plain we have no thought of being pushed off Okinawa and will resist anti-Yankee pressure of the sort that plagues us elsewhere.

Our hold is strengthened by power of veto over any action in the Ryukyuan parliament. The veto threat is rarely raised, however, since no serious political opposition exists.

Okinawans, by and large living higher than they dreamed of 10 years ago, appear contented with their generous Uncle Sugar.

Okinawa's growth into a billion dollar base (a tag fast growing obsolescent as more dollars gush) has brought a concentration of nuclear-age might that cannot be revealed in detail.

TROOPS AND VOICE

A partial catalog of units based here may help convey the idea:

The 2d Airborne Battle Group and 3d Marine Division, ready to leap anywhere from here to Burma.

Thirtieth Artillery Brigade with two Nike-Hercules battalions.

The Army's supersecret First Special Forces Group, airborne cloak and dagger specialists, headed by the legendary Col. Frank Mills of wartime Ranger fame.

Three Hundred Thirteenth Tactical Air Force, packing such supersonic hardware as F–100 super sabres, F–101 photo recons and F–102 Delta Daggers.

An Army psychological warfare unit whose fingers extend across Red China and Siberia, plus a million-watt Voice of America transmitter.

The high-flying U–2 plane of espionage fame is believed to be no stranger to Okinawa, though our Government has denied officially that any U–2's are based here now.

In case of war, our present punch could be multiplied fast by battle reinforcements from Hawaii and other points. Okinawa has lots more room, including naval anhcorages bigger than Pearl Harbor.

Lt. Gen. Donald Booth, top Okinawa commander who also serves as high commissioner, devotes as much time to Okinawan welfare as to military affairs because we must keep the local population content if we are to operate effectively.

Booth and his civil administrator, Brig. Gen. John G. Ondrick, have mixed benevolence so shrewdly with firmness that Okinawans kicked five Communists out of their legislature last November and elected the biggest pro-American majority ever.

FADING OPPOSITION

Communist-sponsored rallies drew 30,000 to 40,000 people 4 years ago, but Booth and Ondrick cut the ground from under them by promoting local labor movements instead of obstructing them, by seeing to it that no Okinawan lacked food or shelter or education, by spending heavily on disease control.

The opposition rallies that used to draw thousands attract around 300 today.

Okinawans who lived in caves at the end of the war are well housed now, many in pastel bungalows. They consume as much electricity in 4 weeks as they formerly used in a year.

Average income was $191 per Okinawan in 1960—which sounds miserable but is more than double the figure 10 years ago.

Ondrick keeps on the go by helicopter, visiting 48 inhabited Ryuku islands to see what he can do for villagers who need such things as pumps, generators, DDT, medicine, new roofing, and fences to keep wild boars out of the sweet potatoes.

Just Plain Jack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include three columns written by Art Hoppe which appeared in the San Francisco Chronicle of February 14, 15, and 16:

PRESENTING A NEW CULTURAL SERIES

(By Art Hoppe)

What this column needs is more drama. So I've made up a soap opera. It's about this lovable, rollicking, heart-warming Irish family. They've made good, see, and they now live in this big white house on Penn avenue in what could be any typical American town. Like Washington.

And it's got these wonderful characters. Like Father Joe, a crusty old gentleman with a heart of gold and a basement to match. And Mother Rose, who isn't happy unless she's bustling around the kitchen. And all the kids—Bobby and Teddy and Eunice and Pat and Jack. Jack's kind of the hero.

I was thinking of calling it "One Man's Family." Only that sounded familiar. And, anyway, I wanted a title that would more or less sum up both the hero himself and the story line. I think I've got it: "Just Plain Jack."

You'd think at first it wouldn't have much drama. Just Plain Jack's at the top and the family's happy. But they've got Problems. Jack, see, is married to this beautiful Society Girl. And you can always get a couple of episodes out of Will Dad Embarrass Just Plain Jack? Like in Stella Dallas.

And there's Brother Teddy. The family sent Teddy out West last fall as sort of sales manager for the family concern, which is Just Plain Jack. And Teddy lost every Western State but Nevada to the opposition. So now they've made him Assistant District Attorney up in Boston. Will Teddy make good on his own?

And there's a great flashback. Brother Bobby wants this job with Just Plain Jack. But the opposition is whispering: "Would you like a man who practices nepotism with his brother?" But Jack is fearless and he says: "I cannot discriminate against my own brother." Meaning when it comes to nepotism. So Bobby get the job and everybody's happy.

Then we have sister Pat, a wonderful girl. But she's married this sort of ne'er-do-much Englishman named Peter, who's very charming. But he lives in Hollywood and runs around with these strange characters—Frankie and Dean and Sammy in a clan or something. So when Jack gets this new job all Peter's friends come swarming in to have a ball. But Just Plain Jack sticks by them because he's loyal to the family.

Will the Clan Move into the Big White House? Tune in tomorrow, folks, for the first thrilling episode of Just Plain Jack, the story of a typical American boy's struggle to overcome the handicaps of brains, good looks and several million dollars.

Only I'm having a little trouble lining up a sponsor. The agencies say it's a great script. Except it isn't very believable.

JUST PLAIN JACK, VOLUME I, CHAPTER I

(By Art Hoppe)

Good morning, friends in radioland. It's time once again to visit with that rollicking, heartwarming Irish family in the big White House on Pennsylvania Avenue for another episode of Just Plain Jack—the story of how any typical American boy can reach the top with the guidance of a typical American father who has $100 million.

As our episode opens, we find Just Plain Jack and the society girl he married making their first visit to the rustic little 47-room week-end cabin in the Hunt Club district of Virginia, which Just Plain Jack bought so his children, Caroline and Jack Jr., can lead a normal life.

As we join them, Just Plain Jack and the beautiful society girl he married are just finishing breakfast in the rustic west wing. She is saying:

"BEAUTIFUL SOCIETY GIRL. Don't you just love it here, dearest? It's so wonderful for us to be alone again with only Caroline, Jack Jr., 32 servants, the Army Signal Corps, the Secret Service, and the helicopter pilots. And it will do you so much good to get away from the cares and worries of the family-owned business, United States of America.

JUST PLAIN JACK. Where are the photographers? You know, darling, that I don't like to eat breakfast without photographers.

"BEAUTIFUL SOCIETY GIRL. Dearest, I've kept out the photographers and I've can-

celed all your appointments. I want you to forget your business troubles and have fun with your family. You know, relax.

"JUST PLAIN JACK. That's a great idea, darling. I think I'll just curl up with a good book. Hand me that 1,472-page report on the gold crisis. We seem to be $16 billion on the shorts and the United States of America may fold up at any moment.

"BEAUTIFUL SOCIETY GIRL. No stuffy old reports for you, dearest. There, I've thrown it in the fireplace. Darling, why are you so green?"

(The telephone rings.)

"JUST PLAIN JACK. I'll get it. Hello? Oh, hi, Dad. Nothing much. Well, there is one little problem, $16 billion. You would? That's awfully good of you. No, I don't think I could sell you the whole thing. Just what's west of the Rockies? I don't know, Dad. How about a first mortgage instead? Great; and, Dad, thanks."

Will Jack last out the weekend? Will Caroline be mad there are no photographers? Will togetherness ruin this marriage? Join us again next week, friends, for another episode. And in the meantime, remember: As you go down the byways of life, there are no problems so insurmountable that they cannot be solved by Just Plain Jack.

JUST PLAIN JACK BUILDS UP PIERRE

(By Art Hoppe)

Good morning, friends in televisionland. It's time once again for another episode of Just Plain Jack, the typical success story of a typical American boy. With money.

As we join the rollicking heart-warming family in the big white house, Just Plain Jack is relaxing in the study doing one-handed pushups while writing Executive Order No. 10572 and dictating a speech. His aid and confidant, portly Pierre, enters puffing a cigar.

"JUST PLAIN JACK. Pierre, boy. How does this speech sound? 'We don't want a nation of spectators. We want a nation of participants in the vigorous life.'

"PIERRE (shuddering). Sounds great, Chief. Absolutely great.

"JUST PLAIN JACK. # 98, # 99, # 100." (He leaps to his feet and begins deep knee bends.) "Which reminds me, Pierre. I see Time describes you again as 'burly, belt straining.' Throw me the medicine ball.

"PIERRE. Could I roll it?

"JUST PLAIN JACK. Nonsense. We must move forward with vigor. Ready now. One-two-three-four * * *.

"PIERRE (panting). Chief. Look out the window. The cops have taken their ball away and are chasing them off the lawn again.

"JUST PLAIN JACK. Well, it's time they all got in here for the Cabinet meeting anyway. What's on the agenda today?

"PIERRE (sighing with relief as he puts the medicine ball away). Chin-ups, Laos, Indian wrestling, the Congo, 100-pound barbells, Berlin and handstands. And, oh yes, you've been invited to attend the opening game of baseball season.

"JUST PLAIN JACK (chinning himself on the mantel). Great. Do three laps around the grounds, Pierre. And about the game, which side am I playing on?"

Can Pierre do three laps? Will Washington win the opener? Is Adlai losing his paunch? Tune in next week, friends, for another episode. And in the meantime, as you go down the byways of life remember: nothing builds you up like Just Plain Jack.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

The 111th Anniversary of Birth of Thomas G. Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, Tuesday, March 7, marked the 111th anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk, the founder and the first President of Czechoslovakia, and a philosopher of world renown.

The interest of U.S. citizens in this historical figure arises from at least two sources: One is that he married an American girl. The second is that his life and his memory have a sustaining influence on the ideology of real democracy. This is proved by the fact that about a year ago there was issued a commemorative stamp in memory of Thomas G. Masaryk, as one of the champions of liberty. His influence in Czechoslovakia and elsewhere in central Europe is considered so detrimental to the cause of the U.S.S.R. that whenever letters bearing his likeness on the stamp attached thereto were mailed from this country to Russia, they were either turned back or were destroyed.

Mr. President, I have prepared a brief statement covering some of the things for which he stood and his biography. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HRUSKA

Tuesday, March 7, marked the 111th anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk, founder and first President of Czechoslovakia.

In this era of uncertain relations with an ideology bent on burying us, it is especially appropriate for us to pay honor to this champion of liberty and to heed the example of those, like him, who would not rest until the cause of freedom prevailed in their land.

Masaryk's name is linked with the cause of freedom, as once his country was. He remain, however, an inspiration to all freedom-seeking peoples, just as his country now is a tragic reminder that his work must be done again.

The life of Thomas Masaryk has been closely associated with our country. He married an American girl and took her family name, Garrigue, as his middle name. The democratic ideals he advocated were influenced by American concepts. During his years of exile and fight for independence for his homeland, he resided and taught here. In America he first obtained a formal declaration of sympathy with the cause of Czechoslovak independence. And with that sponsorship, the new Czech nation emerged in 1918 out of the ruins of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Within a few years, Czechoslovakia became a prosperous and respected country in the European Continent.

Today the principles he espoused have been uprooted in his country. This rejection was emphasized in recent days by the change in title of the government to include the word socialist, so as to identify the state even more closely with the Soviet sphere. In keeping with that program, even the name of Masaryk is to be expunged. American letters carrying a postage stamp issued in his honor have been denied entrance into the country. The historic words which embody the philosophy of Masaryk's life, "truth prevails," are now whispered and hardly heard in his homeland.

On the occasion of the anniversary of his birth it is exceedingly important that we pay honor to the memory of Thomas Masaryk and to renew our assurance to his oppressed countrymen that their cause of freedom continues to be the objective of liberty-loving peoples everywhere.

Feed Program for 1961

SPEECH
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 8, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4510) to provide a special program for feed grains for 1961.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the argument of the gentleman from North Carolina in opposition to the Harvey amendment, I simply want to say, that if the Secretary of Agriculture means what he said on many, many occasions covering his intention to fix the price support on corn at $1.20 per bushel, I cannot see any harm in spelling it out in the legislation so that there will be no misunderstanding and no misapprehension on the part of anyone, as to what the Secretary intends to do. The Secretary of Agriculture, has positively said that he would fix the price support on corn at $1.20 per bushel. That statement was made by him in the transmittal letter sent to the Speaker of the House and to the Vice President of the United States, urging feed grain legislation. His intention was again set forth in the Secretary's prepared statement before the Committee on Agriculture in which he specifically said that the price support on corn would be $1.20 per bushel; later, at a press conference held last week when the question was asked of the Secretary as to the price support on corn, he specifically said again that it was his intention to fix the price of corn at $1.20 per bushel.

Now what is wrong in adopting the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana? It fixes the support level at from 65 to 75 percent of parity. This in reality is $1.20 or approximately 74 percent of parity. In fact, the Harvey amendment provides for an additional point over and above the 74 percent of parity figure. Personally I have no fear about the Secretary of Agriculture not keeping his word, but the fact is that the present wording of the section dealing with price support on corn leaves the sky as the limit. This leaves it open for pressure groups and others to prevail upon the Secretary of Agriculture to raise price support to any figure he desires over and above 65 percent of parity. This could go to 110 percent of parity and even beyond. I do not think this will be done by the present Secretary but there is nothing to prevent another secretary tomorrow to do something else. Such uncertainty should not be permitted.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the committee is not in order, the gentlman from Iowa, the ranking Republican member of the committee is making a very important statement, and I think he is entitled to be heard.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Would the gentleman from Iowa agree with me that this in essence is simply not a matter of questioning the Secretary's word, but it is a matter of protecting him insofar as the views of the Congress are concerned on this issue.

Mr. HOEVEN. I agree with the gentleman. His amendment is a protective measure to protect the Secretary of Agriculture, and I think he would welcome it. I think this legislative body should protect him when he says that he wants a price support of $1.20 per bushel on corn.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I just want to remind the gentleman of the fact that the bill that the Secretary sent up here had these words in it, "the level of price support for the 1961 crop of corn shall be $1.20 per bushel." I think the gentleman objected, as I did, to that language and we put in the language which we now have before us. Further, I want to point out to the gentleman what the final report of the committee says. We are making legislative history at this moment.

The Secretary indicated in his memorandum to the President and in his testi-

mony before the committee that at the level of conservation payments recommended in his memorandum, which has been reduced by the committee, it was his intention to set the support price of $1.20 per bushel. There cannot be any misunderstanding about it. Why can we not have confidence in the gentleman who has just now taken office? This is the gentleman's first promise to this Congress, that he would fix it at $1.20 a bushel, or 74 percent of parity.

Mr. HOEVEN. I would advise the gentleman that on yesterday I gave the committee history of this particular amendment. The first figure presented to the committee in the bill sent up by the Secretary was $1.20 a bushel without relation to the parity formula.

Mr. COOLEY. Right.

Mr. HOEVEN. I objected to pegging the price as did the gentleman from North Carolina. Subsequently we considered fixing a support price from 65 to 90 percent of parity. That again was objected to because there was apprehension on the part of some members of the committee that the figure 90 might have some magnetic significance so as to weaken the bill. So we came up with the compromise provision now in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

(By unanimous consent Mr. HOEVEN was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. HOEVEN. I simply want to say that the Secretary, without equivocation, on many occasions said that he was going to fix the support price at $1.20 a bushel. What harm, therefore, can there be in writing the Harvey amendment into law so there will be no misapprehension and no question about the Secretary intentions? I am not questioning the honesty or integrity of the Secretary for one moment and am sure he would favor the amendment as a protective measure to himself.

This amendment, in fact, tests the honesty and sincerity of those who want to support their own Secretary of Agriculture in his announced intention of supporting corn at $1.20 a bushel, which is 74 percent of parity. I do not question the motives of anyone, and do not charge anyone with ulterior motives, but I cannot understand why anyone should object to writing into law the very thing the Secretary said he wants, in this regard.

The Harvey amendment should be adopted.

Useful Service of Mississippi National Guard During Recent Floods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Mississippi National Guard has always occupied a high place of useful service in the lives of all Mississippians.

The recent disastrous floods in south Mississippi, resulting from prolonged heavy rains that overran many rivers and streams, left widespread destruction in many areas, particularly in the Hattiesburg area.

Perhaps no single organization came to the aid and relief of flood-stricken Mississippians as did units of the Mississippi National Guard.

These citizen-soldiers, ready to act in peace and in war, in military and civilian distress, responded promptly and effectively with men and equipment to relieve suffering and hardship.

An editorial in the Jackson, Miss., Clarion-Ledger of Saturday, March 4, 1961, spells out in a commendable fashion the manner in which the National Guard performed its services.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Guard's Flood Relief Duties Are Timed Most Appropriately," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GUARD'S FLOOD RELIEF DUTIES ARE TIMED MOST APPROPRIATELY

Many organizations have helped in the relief of distress from the Mississippi floods, and we would not want to single out any one or any set of them for special distinction. But the fact remains that of all the contributing groups, the timing of the situation came most appropriately for our Mississippi National Guard.

February 22 was to have been a day of special observances for the Guard, as Washington's Birthday is traditionally "Muster Day" for the citizen-soldier organization.

But by that date last week, flood waters had already displaced hundreds of people from their homes, and the Guard was on duty in several areas, rescuing people and housekeeping for them, in concert with other agencies.

The presence of the Guard both men and equipment has been an invaluable asset to the people of areas devastated by floods, and these emergencies have afforded dramatic proof of the Guard's ability to react instantly and efficiently when the public interest demands it.

In this connection the Hattiesburg American has said editorially: "The National Guardsmen commanded by Col. John Fishel have worked above and beyond the call of duty to lessen the tragic impact of the invading waters. They have been cooperative and helpful, volunteering services not required of them in many cases, struggling against a powerful and unusual force almost to the point of exhaustion. * * *

"The guardsmen with their big trucks, boats, and amphibious vehicles evacuated the stranded, no doubt saving many of them from drowning. City police, firemen, and volunteer rescuers played big roles in this operation, but the job could not have been done without the National Guard's equipment and organization. The Hattiesburg area can be proud of and grateful to its citizen soldiers."

All Mississippians share this pride and gratitude. Our Mississippi National Guard ranks among the State's major assets. Organized and trained for Federal service in wartime, the guard in peacetime enjoys dual status as a State force. As such it is an organized and trained force immediately available in local emergencies—floods, fires, riots, explosions, and storms.

The Mississippi National Guard's present strength is approximately 11,500 members. Nationally, the force numbers 472,000 officers and men. Every guard member is trained to do his job and it is this training that makes all the difference in the world.

As citizen soldiers, guard members are motivated by a patriotic conviction that citizenship demands more than payment of taxes and obedience to the law. They believe that a good citizen must put into his country at least as much as he has taken from it.

Modern warfare requires the National Guard to be closer to battlefield readiness than ever before. It has become so coordinated with the active military establishment that it is instantly available—as proven by lightning-fast "Muster Day" exercises in the Nation during the recent observance of the Guard's 15th anniversary of reorganization after World War II.

The Clarion-Ledger gratefully again salutes all units and members of our Mississippi National Guard, and the entire Guard organization from coast to coast.

A Letter to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, a letter from Mr. W. S. Whitehead, president of Ives, Whitehead & Co., Inc., of Washington, to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation was brought to my attention recently. I believe this informative and interesting discussion of the problems involved in the operation of the Renegotiation Act of 1951 will be of interest to my colleagues, and therefore I commend it to you for inclusion in the RECORD:

IVES, WHITEHEAD & CO.,
Washington, D.C.,
December 21 and 28, 1960.

Mr. COLIN F. STAM,
Chief of Staff, Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Tax, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STAM: This is in response to press release dated November 23, 1960, inviting submission of views in connection with the renegotiation study which the Congress directed the joint committee to undertake pursuant to section 4(b) of Public Law 86–89. It is noted that the congressional directive provides for a "full and complete study of the Renegotiation Act of 1951, as amended, and of the policies and practices of the Renegotiation Board," and to report the findings with recommendations to the Congress not later than March 31, 1961.

In 1956, when your staff conducted a similar undertaking under congressional mandate you will recall, no doubt, that representatives from this firm met with your aids on more than one occasion. We offered what were believed to be worthwhile and realistic suggestions for change not only with regard to certain provisions of the act, but with respect to its administration, as well.

It is sincerely hoped that the sound comments and substantial suggestions for change included herein, and also those submitted from all other experienced sources, be given thorough consideration and impartial treatment and study by your group, prior to the submission of preliminary data with recommendations to the joint commit-

tee. We believe there should be public disclosure and wide dissemination of all pertinent statements, emanating from any source whatsoever, which your staff receives in response to the invitation referred to above. In this connection we plan to make known the contents of this communication to the members of the Senate Finance Committee, the House Ways and Means Committee, and to our many friends in private industry.

In forwarding our comments and observations they should be construed as having been developed from an impersonal and objective point of view. They represent some of our major findings based on nearly 10 years of assisting contractors with their renegotiation problems, and on over 18 years of experience in this area by Mr. Stephen B. Ives. You may remember that Mr. Ives was one of the prominent members of the War Department Price Adjustment Board (predecessor of the Renegotiation Board) for several years during World War II, and its first accounting adviser. He also was one of five select specialists who were drafted by the late Secretary of Defense Forrestal to promulgate the rules and regulations for use under the Renegotiation Act of 1948, and which furnish the basis for those used under the 1951 act.

I. CONSIDERATIONS REGARDING EXTENSION OF THE ACT

Among the 1956 recommendations which the joint committee made was one which stated, "Evaluation of renegotiation in its operation and results leads to the conclusion that renegotiation should not become a permanent part of the law. * * * The emphasis in the current defense program on rapid technological improvement in weapons makes pricing difficult. For these reasons it is believed that a temporary extension of renegotiation is necessary."

If the Joint Committee has any remote thought of encouraging Congress to enact permanent renegotiation legislation we wish to be most emphatic that such a move should not be favorably considered. Renegotiation is just as repugnant to honest contractors as are wage limitations to honest labor groups, and it should remain in the expediency category. We believe the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Procurement not only was presumptuous in recommending that the present act become permanent, but also exceeded the scope of its study on military procurement, as directed by the Congress in section 4(a) of Public Law 86–89. Therefore, its position on this point should be disregarded by the Joint Committee.

On the question of extension of the act we believe this to be prudent for a period not in excess of 2 years, providing the remedial suggestions to reflect improvements set out elsewhere herein, are adopted. It must be pointed up that the argument that renegotiation is required because "pricing is difficult" long since has become shopworn and certainly cannot be expected to reflect credence ad infinitum. In other words, temporary continuance of the act cannot be made to hinge on this observation, but rather it must rely on the premise that a "repricing" responsibility exists, if such be the case. That, in essence, is what the renegotiation process originally was intended to accomplish.

II. PROCEDURES, PRACTICES AND POLICIES

Before discussing each of the above subjects under this section we wish to quote from a report prepared by the five specialists chosen to implement the 1948 act. After one carefully comprehends these few lines of wisdom, it becomes abundantly clear that there is room for substantial improvement in the administrative responsibilities and duties of the Board and its regional operations. The quotation to which we refer states:

"No one has ever been able to devise a formula on precise measurement of excessive profits. Essentially renegotiation is a judgment matter and must remain so. Thus, the caliber and character of the renegotiation personnel is of the utmost importance—far more important than any formal rules and regulations. The Board should always maintain that flexibility of rule and procedure which is necessary to fair and equitable results in the wide variety of cases which will come before them. If renegotiation settlements are to be made palatable, they must be justified and explained in a satisfactory manner.

"Every effort should be made to negotiate with the contractor on all phases of his case including the allocation of sales, the allowance and allocations of costs and reasonableness of profits. Unilateral action should be taken only in those cases where fair and reasonable results can be obtained in no other way. Cooperation between the Government and contractor is essential to the success of the renegotiation process. The gears of renegotiation should be well lubricated with courtesy, patience and restraint on the part of the renegotiation personnel.

"Full and complete hearings, careful consideration of all pertinent facts and factors and adequate review before fresh minds are the safety valves of renegotiation. In every case the person making a decision on behalf of the Government should meet with the contractor, if the contractor so desires, and explain his decisions and the reasons therefor. Not only should all arbitrary and capricious action be avoided but cases should be conducted in such a manner that no appearance of such action can be created in the contractor's mind.

"In the review of any case great care should be exercised to eliminate grounds for any possible criticism that bias or prejudice at one level is being carried forward to the next. Fresh minds should examine the case de novo to guard against any such possibility and this procedure should be made clear to the contractor."

A. Procedures, practices, and policies of the Board

In the case of each of these subjects reference will be made to a major situation or condition which it is believed will support our contention that there is room for improvement in the administrative techniques of the Board.

1. Subsequent to the disastrous effects resulting from poor administrative direction during the first several years of operation under the 1951 act, both Mr. Ives and the writer strongly urged the Board to get a fresh start and engage a private management firm to review its entire operation. These overtures fell on deaf ears; and it appears that the Board has initiated few, if any, major improvements in its overall procedures since that time. For instance, in the five annual reports which the Board has issued since 1956 it is stated in each that there have been no significant changes in its operating procedures; the exception being that in the 1957 report slight changes were noted due to the passage of amendments to the Renegotiation Act.

Today there exists (as there has since inception of the act) a backlog of unfinalized cases awaiting renegotiation action on some contractor fiscal year reports dating back to 1956. There has been some improvement in this area over the past year or two, but drastic revision of the Board's entire procedural operation must be accomplished if a more positive current adjudication is to be realized in those instances where renegotiation action is required. In order to assure success in this direction it seems appropriate that the Congress should adopt legislation requiring the Bureau of the Budget to engage a nationally known management engineering firm to conduct such a survey. Similar action in the case of other executive agencies in the past has proved highly beneficial, both to the Government and to the public interest.

2. Over the past decade or two the Congress has ever increasingly encouraged, and in some instances directed, executive agencies to divulge more and more details of their practices to the public. In the case of the Renegotiation Board it appears to be the only important agency in the executive branch that fails to provide the public with current information on its practices and activities.

In March 1958 the Small Business Administration (SBA) requested our firm to proceed with the preparation of a manuscript entitled, "Suggestions for Contractors Subject to Renegotiation." The agency planned to publish the end result in the form of a management aid, to be widely distributed and made available to all businesses subject to renegotiation. This practice has been followed by SBA in the case of many other technical subjects of basic interest to business. Thus, no precedent was set in our instance.

In accordance with the agency's request we provide a complete and apparently acceptable manuscript, which dwelt for the most part on how to prepare a statement of contractors' performance in relation to the statutory factor. In turn SBA referred the document to the Renegotiation Board for review as is the required governmental procedure. In the following June, SBA informed our firm that the Board would object to publication of the manuscript concerned, and therefore SBA was not in a position to go ahead with the project. No objection was raised as to the contents of the presentation and SBA informed us that "the Board's action came as a complete surprise," and that it (SBA), "deeply regretted this development."

This instance is cited not for the purpose of pointing up the Board's refusal to permit another executive agency to assist contractors faced with renegotiation, but simply to note that since June 1958 the Board itself has failed to initiate any constructive suggestions for contractors subject to renegotiation. The Board has publicly released excerpts from opinions by its General Counsel from time to time, but to our knowledge it never has clearly pointed out how a contractor might come away from a division meeting with a "better break," had a succinct statement of performance in relation to the statutory factors been presented. This, we have found in the past, has been of substantial benefit to the contractor in some instances. And certainly we subscribe to the present Chairman's remark that such a statement of performance is the "omega" of renegotiation.

In view of the foregoing it appears highly desirable that positive action be taken to correct the Board's practice of failing to make disclosure of certain of its operations and policies which would be helpful to contractors. It is hoped that this can be accomplished in part, at least, by the Congress writing into any pertinent legislation, a requirement that the Board employ on its staff a highly competent public information officer, with qualified assistants. If this is not the proper approach then the Joint Committee should make a finding that when the 1962 budget request for the Board comes before the respective Appropriation Committees, that it be increased to provide for staffing such an office.

3. On file with the Tax Court at the present time are several renegotiation appeals which, simply put, pivot around a contentious policy of the Board of refusing to review the renegotiable profits of the several nonconstruction contractors on a completed contract basis, rather than on a fiscal year basis. The act directs the Board in section

105(a) therein, "to exercise its powers * * * during the fiscal year * * * except that the Board may exercise such powers separately * * * under any one or more separate contracts * * * at the request of the contractor or subcontractor."

Now comes the General Counsel to the Board and informs that body on March 30, 1959, that it "is without power to compress two or more fiscal years of a contractor into a single renegotiation." The Board in turn so informs the contractors and in one late instance arbitrarily directs that such action is "neither warranted nor appropriate and that, were it empowered to accede to your request, it would decline, in its discretion, to do so." On its face this position hardly seems to connote the maintenance of "flexibility or rule and procedure which is necessary to fair and equitable results * * *" in renegotiation.

The General Counsel seems to rely on certain points he considers sound and cogent in this matter. Basically, his position appears to rest on the absence of any legislative history which would permit the Board to take the action requested by the contractor. We are not versed in the law and, therefore, are not in a position to argue the issue. However, from privileged notes of the five renegotiation specialists which drew up the rules under the 1948 act, this whole matter was thoroughly studied historically by that group. They took the firm position that "if a loss or inadequate profit occurred at the end of a procurement program due to the discontinuance of renegotiable business, consideration should be given to methods to alleviate the hardship of the fiscal year basis." What, in effect, this appears to mean is that upon completion by the contractor of a contract for the production of, let us say, shell cases of a specific millimeter, and no further requirement thereafter exists, and the contractor has sustained a loss or subnormal profit from this particular production program, then consideration should be given by the Board to determining the company's renegotiable profits on other than a fiscal year basis. We believe that this is equitable and sound thinking, and we strongly urge that the Congress favorably consider legislation to spell out such accepted policy in unequivocal language.

B. Practices and procedures before the Tax Court

It is known by so few that the Tax Court is not a part of the judicial system of the country, but an independent executive agency. From long experience with the court we have found that its basic judgment and efficiency are not open to question. On the other hand, consternation is justified at the incredibly long delay contractors encounter in obtaining appellate action on renegotiation assessments. This, we appreciate, is due primarily to the exceptionally heavy docket, and a minimum of personnel to facilitate its handling. However, such condition discourages contractors from appealing levies made by the Board, which in turn, of course, defeats the objective of assuring the contractor of a de novo hearing.

Specifically, renegotiation is neither a tax matter, nor a legal matter, but is essentially a judgment matter, to be resolved by qualified specialists. Some interested parties (including former judges of the court) have regarded these de novo reviews of renegotiation determinations as foreign to the established purpose of the court. However, there appears to be no other central appellate group which appropriately could handle such type pleas, and we believe that this responsibility should remain where it has been since the inception of price adjustment action.

In subscribing to this conclusion we do, however, strongly feel that immediate action should be taken to assist the court in accelerating the disposal of all types of cases before it. Therefore, it is recommended that the Congress amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide for at least one additional judgeship. Such legislation should provide that this added division concentrate primarily on renegotiation appeals, and that the vacancy, if created, be filled by appointment from outside the present court, and by one qualified and fully cognizant of all major phases of the entire renegotiation process.

III. SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ACT

A. Exemptions to the act

Since the joint committee's first report on renegotiation in 1956, a considerable amount of experience has been gained by the principal procurement agencies in pricing and repricing techniques on technological improvements in weapons. Likewise, very strict standards on costing practices recently have been established by the military departments. Thus, it is not too much to expect that these agencies should now rely on their own talent to a great extent, in order to assure the elimination of real excessive profits from defense contracts.

In addition, since 96.5 percent of the refund determinations during fiscal year ended June 30, 1960, were derived from renegotiable sales volume of over $1 million, it appears appropriate to broaden the exemption applicable to comparatively small independent contractors. It is believed such action would be healthy for the national economy and would encourage many enterprises to utilize their talents and techniques in defense work. As it stands now the Government is deprived of the know-how of many businesses because of their fear of being unable to retain profits normal to their operation.

It is recommended, therefore, that the Congress affirmatively consider the following changes to the act in addition to those referred to hereinbefore:

1. Exempt from renegotiation, (a) fixed-price contracts which contain provisions for price revisions downward, and (b) contracts obtained from open competitive bidding;

2. Increase the floor beneath which contractor sales cannot be renegotiated from $1 million to $1,500,000, effective for fiscal years ending after June 30, 1961; and

3. Exempt all independent and nonaffiliated contractors and subcontractors from renegotiation which qualify as small business under criteria established by the Small Business Administration.

(B) ACCOUNTING MATTERS

No specific comments regarding this subject matter are offered at this time. However, it is strongly urged, in the event a management survey is conducted covering the Board's operation as recommended above in paragraph II A, that approval likewise will be given to having a firm of nationally known public accountants survey all accounting procedures of the Board.

In the event you or Mr. Wickham wish to discuss any part of this presentation, I will be glad to arrange a meeting at a mutually agreeable time.

Sincerely,

IVES, WHITEHEAD & CO., INC.,
W. S. WHITEHEAD, *President.*

Pact in Dress Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Record of February 28, 1961, which comments on the contract agreement reached recently between the International Ladies Garment Workers Union and five associations of employers, such agreement affecting some 9,000 workers in the Greater Wilkes-Barre area.

The editorial follows:

PACT IN DRESS INDUSTRY

Good news came to the Wyoming Valley garment industry last night.

The approximately 9,000 workers in the Greater Wilkes-Barre area will not strike as scheduled, but will receive a pay increase. This came about from a contract agreement reached between the International Ladies Garment Workers Union and five associations of employers who manufacture women's garments.

And the Wyoming Valley economy will receive a shot in the arm, for the workers will get an average increase of 5½ percent. Because of the piecework nature of the industry, and the variety of rates hinging upon the value of the garment being manufactured no definite figures can be given. Perhaps the best criteria is that operators for basic pay will go from $56 to $61 a week and pressers from $67.50 to $72.50 a week.

The increases will mean more money in the pockets of the 9,000 men and women who have become an important part of the Wyoming Valley economic picture. And the raises will filter into the businesses of the grocer, butcher and, if we have any, the candlemaker.

Coming at the time when Wyoming Valley is breaching into new plateaus of economic progress, the new contract for the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union is an important contribution.

Two Top-Ranking Texas Newspapers Laud Appointment of Ed Murrow as USIA Chief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, upon several occasions recently I have stated my views that it is mandatory that the Congress vastly strengthen America's overall information effort to carry the message of freedom to many troubled areas of the globe.

President Kennedy took a strong first step in this direction when he appointed Mr. Edward R. Murrow as head of the U.S. Information Agency.

Recently two of Texas' best daily newspapers have editorialized on Mr. Murrow's appointment. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Appendix the editorial entitled "Murrow and the USIA," from the February 1, 1961, issue of the Beaumont Journal; also an editorial entitled "Voice of America Should Carry Around the World," from the February 4 issue of the Corpus Christi Caller.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Beaumont Journal, Feb. 1, 1961]

MURROW AND USIA

An apt choice has been made in naming Edward R. Murrow to head the U.S. Information Agency. The television pundit is known to millions in this country and is said to be a popular commentator abroad.

Too, Murrow is an experienced newsman with an eye trained to differentiate between the important and the trivial. He is, in addition, highly articulate and his voice carries the sobering sound of conviction.

Having been on the outside of USIA for so long, and looking in, Murrow should know what makes it tick and should have some suggestions for making it more effective. And, since the information agency is so important to our defense effort and to our foreign relations, the better it ticks the more we benefit.

For this reason, we believe, everyone—even non-Murrow fans—wishes him well in his new job.

[From the Corpus Christi Caller, Feb. 4, 1961]

VOICE OF AMERICA SHOULD CARRY AROUND THE WORLD

Why has the Communist world, in the words of the late John Foster Dulles, been able to articulate a bad policy better than we have been able to articulate a good policy?

This question may have occurred to many Americans in recent years as they watch the rising propaganda tide of Red China and Soviet Russia. They cannot help but wonder how this Nation that produced advertising techniques which make it almost possible to sell ice boxes to Eskimos cannot make a better showing in the field of international propaganda.

The answer lies partly in our distaste for propaganda. The word has a devious, sleazy connotation for the average American. They were reluctant even to accept propaganda warfare in wartime. Hence the field of shaping international opinion has never apepaled to our best propagandists. They found a much more pleasant and financially rewarding life on Madison Avenue.

Another inhibiting factor is the congenital dislike of Americans for foreign policy and foreign affairs. They would much prefer to be left alone. The mantle of world leadership of the free world continues to sit uneasily and uncomfortably on their shoulders.

Then, too, the U.S. Information Agency, this country's foremost propaganda voice, has always been something of a stepchild. Congress has never had much confidence in the USIA and has kept its appropriations almost at the bare subsidence level. Even as serious, the Agency has never been represented in policy councils. It has had to be content to accept orders passed down from on high, while the field of agency policy has been left fuzzy and obscured. The many dedicated men and women who work for the USIA have fought disillusionment and frustration from the beginning.

Now the hopes of the Agency have been raised again by the appointment of a new head, Edward R. Murrow, one of the foremost and most eloquent reporters of his time. If, as James Reston of the New York Times suggests, Murrow is given a voice in policy matters then the transformation of the USIA into a strong instrument of Western public relations may be at hand.

It is about time. A unified voice of America, under flexible direction to take advantage of every break in the cold war, is essential to a successful propaganda offensive. Americans had better get over their squeamishness over the word propaganda and proceed with the task of portraying the free world in the best light possible.

John Ericsson Republicanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOFFMAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, recently much has been said as to what we can do for the country, not what the country can do for you. In our two-party system of Government it is well to reflect what the two major political parties can do for our country. The Republican Party offers opportunities for sound representation which are aptly set forth in an address by Illinois State Senator Joseph R. Peterson before the 87th annual State convention of the John Ericcson Republican League at Kewanee, Ill., on Saturday, March 4.

The address follows:

JOHN ERICSSON REPUBLICANISM

On this 87th annual convention of the John Ericsson Republican League of Illinois, it is not only appropriate, but mandatory that we consider for a few moments the great Swedish engineer, inventor, and patriot, John Ericsson. Much has been said about his keen interest, his indominable courage against adversities, his skillful draftsmanship of designs, his engineering sagacity, his epoch-making and history-changing inventions, and his patriotism to the cause of the North in the Civil War. Always the crowning achievement credited to him by historians, and wherein lies the immortality of the name of John Ericsson, is the rebel-crushing defeat in Hampton Roads of the *Merrimac* by his "cheese box on a raft" now enshrined in the hearts of Republicans—Lincoln Republicans—as Ericsson's ironclad *Monitor*.

Great men are the product of a great people. Born in Sweden in 1803, he lived there until 1827 when he went to England. Born under a monarchy, he learned of kingly ways. In these formative years he experienced social unrest, aggression, wars, and their resultant consequences. He left the land of his birth for England, the land of promise—the promise of the development of the steam engine and greater individual liberty. Here for 12 years his inventive mind flourished but the fruits of his efforts were rejected. The reform bills had placed the middle class in control, but a radical discontent was arising among the lower classes. He was becoming a respecter and admirer of individual liberty expressed through representative government. An American interested him in the United States arguing that his new and revolutionary ideas would appeal to the ever-aggressive Americans. On April 13, 1839, at the age of 36, he set sail for the United States, landing in New York 46 days later.

This causes us to pause and reflect—what are the political forces at work in our Nation today doing to John Ericsson's political descendants? Is the climate of liberty as warm, friendly and receptive today to his political descendants, as it was in 1839, when he arrived? Is the opportunity here now as it was then? Has the United States kept alive the forces that encouraged Ericsson?

These questions are soul-searching questions—not cheap bread-and-butter questions. The answers are not found in the sewers of political chicanery where selfish, self-perpetuating officeseekers promise to open the public treasury to fill the pockets of each selfish interest in exchange for the votes of the selfish interests to perpetuate that politician in public office. The answers must come from the plateau of honest statesmanship which values beyond all else the liberty of the individual citizen. The answer cannot be found among a people so enslaved by oppressive taxation and a resultant high cost of living that they have become no longer conscious of the dignity of the individual, or so numbed as to lose their spirit or initiative and industry, content to feed at the troughs of government doles. It must be found among a self-reliant people who regard government as the servant—and the people as its master. Neither can it be found in a political philosophy that none other than a Federal bureaucracy possesses the intellectual know-how to cope with the complexities of modern life, complexities either imposed by or made to seem so by the alarmists. It must be discovered in that brand of thinking, which orders the bureaucrats to do the will of the people. Nor will it come through deceit or class division. By that I mean selling the unfortunate on the idea of soaking heavy taxes upon the more prosperous; the employee on the idea of oppressing the employer, or by hidden taxes that increase the cost of living. Candor suggests that whatever taxes or oppression is laid upon the latter must be borne by the former. It must be conceived in the mind of Christian statesmen who practice truth, who honor honesty and who deal with all fairly. It will not be found in catch slogans such as "New Deal," "Fair Deal," or "New Frontiers," but in the everyday actions of honest, candid, truthful citizens who lay aside personal, competitive, selfish interests and look to the common good, not only of their own, but future generations.

As a citizen you must answer these questions in charting this Nation's course. You cannot avoid it, nor pass the buck. Are you willing?

Which of the major political parties of 1961, the Republicans or the Democrats, provides the encouragement for today's John Ericssons?

Do the John Ericssons of today find the same incentive and opportunity that John Ericsson found here 122 years ago? Are the fires of individual liberty glowing as brightly, or are they but ashes from a burnt-out fire?

What about the Democratic periods of war and its cost in human life and ensuing national debt? Was it a deceptive solution of the unemployment problem, or a necessary price to pay for the purchase of freedom? What then about the treaty of Versailles, or the betrayals at Potsdam and Yalta? What about the postwar period of high taxation and skyrocketing cost of living? Are these akin to those that drove Ericsson to leave Sweden?

What about our foreign policy—foreign aid—dabbling into the affairs of other nations—our stationing of military forces all over the world—our African policy—and our traveling soap man—our diplomatic espionage? Are they akin to the foreign intrigue that disgusted Ericsson with the Sweden of 1827?

Was the action of the dominant party in Sweden in calling a foreigner as crown prince related to the coddling of Communists in high places in our Government, and the persecution of a McCarthy who dared to expose it—and the defeat of a Nixon in 1960?

What about the progressive income tax in the New and Fair Deal eras, the rates which were raised and the exemptions which were lowered, and publicly designed for confiscation in the name of taxation? The Federal estate tax, if you survive to die with an estate? The gift tax, if you try to dispose of your estate before you die? Are they builders of individual incentive? Would they encourage an inventive genius such as Ericsson to produce, or would they prompt an-

other American to encourage an inventive genius to produce and market his product? Is there any American today who does not take inventory in November and December to determine whether he can afford to make any more income? Is this the proper atmosphere for a nation's growth, or does it earmark a nation's decline?

What about the national debt, and the annual interest loan of a billion dollars? Is this a millstone around the neck of our youth? Have we passed on to our sons and daughters a financial obligation we were strong enough to incur, but too puny to carry? Can a John Ericsson carry it and establish his home, family, and business in the pursuit of happiness?

What about social security? Which is right—that the old should assist the young in making their start in life—or that the young and active must carry the burden of our aged in retirement? Are our aged so weak as to require the imposition of that load upon our youth? If so, is that very weakness caused by too heavy taxation and too high a cost of living during our active years? Have the irons of tax bondage and skyrocketing prices brought us to our knees in submission and abject surrender by the time we reach the age of retirement? In the guise of the general welfare have we come to a general farewell? Are our youth strong enough to carry that burden? Would a John Ericsson of 18 years see a better future with 47 years of ever increasing deductions from his pay under public control, or with that sum privately saved under his own control? Does it destroy or create incentive in a young John Ericsson?

What about Federal aid to the States? Do we not lose freedom and pass into bondage when, through the power of Federal taxation, the moneys of Illinois citizens in the Federal Treasury are given away by the votes of Congressmen to other States?

What about State aid to local governments? Is it taxation without representation when the taxes raised in our local governing units are distributed to other local units by a general assembly of 235 senators and representatives, only 4 of which were elected by the people? How can 4 votes against 231 protect the people's money and assure its distribution to the place from which it was paid?

What about a proposed revenue article in Illinois? Is it to supplant or to be in addition to the property tax? Will it contain the safeguards built into the property tax; that every dime of it will be spent in the county, township, city or school district of its origin? Or will all or the larger part thereof be given to other counties, as now with the sales tax? That could happen under an income tax.

Is charity by government right? Is or is not charity a voluntary act resulting from the individual yielding to or resisting the goading of his or her conscience? Does it not depend on the decision of each individual to give or withhold? When government gives our money away, has it not taken that money from us in the form of taxes by compulsion? Under this system, does not the majority impose its will under threat of compulsion upon the minority? What has happened to the freedom of choice? Is not charity to others under compulsion of government akin to or actually socialism? Does this appeal to a freedomloving John Ericsson of today?

What about unemployment compensation? What right does any government have to require employers to compensate for idle time to those who are no longer identified with such employers? Is this conducive to growth or is it a sign of decay? Can the buying public afford to pay the skyrocketing price of the products as a result of this? Is this system, labeled as a boon to employees, actually not a boomerang which robs the buyers, mostly employees, of the added cost which such a system creates?

What about our greater dependence upon government? In our everyday contact with the Federal Government, through income tax, social security, unemployment compensation, military service, and presently envisioned medical assistance, are we the equal of the Federal Government in the courts to seek enforcement of our rights? What resources do we have to pit against the Nation's resources? Through that disparity, don't we accept the interpretation by bureaucrats of the maize of Federal laws and regulations, or do we stand up and fight for our rights? In that process have we strengthened or weakened the spirit of individual liberty? Do we become enslaved, or are we free?

These are the questions—the counterpart of which plagued John Ericsson in his day.

These are the questions of freedom, the dignity of the individual and equality through justice. Do these questions plague you? Can the John Ericssons of 1961 find that freedom, that equality under law and that dignity they ever seek? Is the political climate such as to encourage or disgust?

I challenge you—not as reactionaries or conservatives, but as true liberals. Search your hearts, minds, and consciences. Seek truthful, abiding answers to these questions and then give us the political climate that John Ericsson sought and found, and fought for, as a liberal Republican. That is the challenge of John Ericsson, a great early Republican, which echoes down the corridors of time to the Republicans of 1961.

The Space Generation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today the Nation is searching for ways to more effectively utilize the talents, energy, imagination, and ingenuity of our youth.

This is essential for the young folks themselves. As well, it is important to the progress of the country, particularly in providing the kind of leadership needed for tomorrow.

The scientific-technological revolution has had a dramatic impact upon our social-economic system. As a result, a need has arisen for adapting to these far-reaching changes. Problems, too, have arisen. Juvenile delinquency, for example, continues to be a blight on our society for which we need to find realistic antidotes.

Eleven years ago, there was formed the Junior Engineering Technical Society, better known as JETS. The organization, for high school students, aims at cultivating engineers and scientists needed for America's future.

Today, the society has grown to 762 chapters, including 19,000 members in 46 States and 7 countries.

The JET program represents a splendid example of the kind of activities which we need more of for channeling the energies and interests of youth in the space age.

Recently, the Superior Telegram, of Superior, Wis., published an article on the formation of a new chapter of JETS in that fine community. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JETS, FORMED BY EX-SUPERIORITE, NOW NUMBERS 19,000 MEMBERS

A space age high school program, keyed to promoting interest in science and engineering among students, which was initiated at Michigan State University by a former Superiorite, Harold P. Skamser, is the subject for an article in the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post. Skamser started the program, now known as the Junior Engineering Technical Society (JETS), while he was professor of the College of Engineering at MSU. Since then he has become dean of engineering at California State Polytechnic College.

The JET Society was started 11 years ago when college officials here and at other similar institutions, were worried about the manner in which high school students carefully avoid the tough, hard core subjects which are the foundation for the nuclear space conquering age." It began as a State program with the idea in mind of attracting high school students with talent in applied science.

Professor Skamser and Lorin G. Miller, who was at that time dean of engineering at MSU, developed the plan.

Citing the 4–H Club program as an example of successful youth clubs, Skamser and Miller unblushingly borrowed the 4–H pattern," the Post article states. The name, JETS, was though up to indicate speed and action.

"Sputnik," the Post writer reminds readers, "had not yet blazed through the skies, or the professors might have figured out an acrostic that would have added up to Rockets. The club emblem, however, turned out to be a rocket and a streak of lightning. Skamser's plan was that the students would "learn by doing" through school projects applied physics, chemistry, and math. He organized the first club in 1950 in "his own backyard in East Lansing, not far from Michigan State." During the next 2 years only nine clubs were chartered, the program moving slowly. Then as the program caught on through help from engineering and educational concerns, it spread fast into other States.

Skamser, as an MSU emissary, began visiting high schools throughout the country, and organized JET societies wherever possible. He visited Superior while his program was in its infancy and mapped plans for the JETS in our local high schools. JETS are also set up at Spooner.

He made it a point to be present at high school career days, and reported after these visits that he had found many students with excellent scholastic records who wanted to go into the engineering or science fields, but were unable to qualify.

"These young people had followed the course of least resistance," the Post story says, quoting Skamser. "Their realization that their training was useless for a career in applied science came too late for them to take corrective action."

"A club newsletter called the Jets-O-Gram was started," the Post points out. "New ideas came along. Michigan State set aside a few entrance scholarships especially for JETS. An official pin was adopted and Kuffel & Esser Co., of Hoboken, N.J., manufacturers of engineering instruments, agreed to provide these to all members. Companies such as General Electric made their educational literature available. The

Consumers Power Co. of Michigan assigned several of its engineers to work in their spare time in organizing and advising the clubs."

Although Professor Skamser is no longer at Michigan State, he has left a permanent mark at that college through the JET society which had mushroomed by 1958 to 365 chapters in 35 States and is today a national, nonprofit society with an impressive board of directors drawn from various parts of U.S. industry, education, and government. Dean J. D. Ryder of Michigan State College of Engineering is president with the national headquarters located at East Lansing.

Today, according to last count, there are 762 chapters made up of 19,000 members in 46 States and 7 countries.

FIT TOGETHER

According to Dean Ryder, "JETS has helped show students how science and engineering fit together. And we know that students from these clubs are better scholastic risks than the average. They've been preselected. This is highly important today because what we need in the coming age is not just engineers but good engineers."

Dean Skamser is the son of Peter Skamser, 2030 Baxter Avenue, and the late Mrs. Skamser. He has authorized and had published in leading professional journals as many as 45 articles on engineering and other subjects. He has done designing of V-8 engines and much research work.

Born in Superior, he attended the Cooper School, McCaskill Training School, graduated from Central High and Superior State College before earning his master's degree in mathematics at the University of Minnesota and a bachelor of science in electrical engineering at Michigan State where he was professor of engineering for about 16 years. He was appointed dean of engineering at the Kellogg Voorhis campus at CSPC in April of 1958.

Quick Buildup Forecast for Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news story from the Washington Evening Star of Saturday, March 4, 1961:

QUICK BUILDUP FORECAST FOR ARMED FORCES

An immediate buildup in this Nation's combat troops—involving three more Army divisions and 25,000 more marines—is being forecast by congressional sources.

Leaders familiar with a reappraisal of this country's defenses ordered by President Kennedy said they expected him to ask Congress for funds and authority for the expansion.

The manpower additions would lift the Army to 925,000 men and officers in 17 divisions and the Marine Corps to 200,000 for the 3 divisions and 3 air wings now required by law.

Both moves would involve strengthening U.S. ability to fight limited wars.

Both would require revisions and additions in the $42 billion defense budget sent to Congress by former President Eisenhower.

Mr. Eisenhower had asked an Army of 870,000, now fitted into 14 divisions, and a Marine Corps of 175,000.

Mr. Kennedy and Defense Secretary McNamara have delayed announcement of their new defense policies pending a detailed review of strategy and capability in both the nuclear weapons and conventional arms fields.

Earlier this week, Mr. Kennedy said he had received Mr. McNamara's recommendations for an increase in conventional forces.

Members of Congress familiar with this survey said the increase request they expected would win easy congressional approval.

Address by Hon. Elvis J. Stahr, Jr., Secretary of the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on Monday of this week the Honorable Elvis J. Stahr, Jr., Secretary of the Army, addressed the Army-Industry Liaison Seminar in New Orleans.

I find his speech to be most informative and interesting. The Secretary demonstrates a keen knowledge and understanding of the vital mission of the Army both in the event of so-called limited or brushfire wars and in the situation where our country may be faced with an all-out, global thermonuclear conflict.

It is very gratifying to note Mr. Stahr's remarks regarding the industrial-business community and the tremendous role it plays in partnership with the Army in keeping our country girded and prepared to meet any threat to the Nation's peace and security.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary's excellent address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE ELVIS J. STAHR, JR., SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, ARMY-INDUSTRY LIAISON SEMINAR, SHERATON-CHARLES HOTEL, NEW ORLEANS, LA., MARCH 6, 1961

I count it a special privilege to meet so many members of the Army-Industry defense team at a point this early in my service as Secretary of the Army. Our mutual dependence is such a real and dynamic thing that I know we shall be seeing a great deal of each other as time goes on, and there is no better way to make firm progress together than by getting to know one another at this early juncture.

Nothing is more encouraging to me as I contemplate my new responsibilities than to find a foundation of common understanding and cooperation, so evident in this seminar, existing in an important segment of the broad activity for which I am responsible. In a field where it is normal for one challenge to crowd in on the heels of another, it is reassuring to find a team already in harness and hardened to the task of plowing stony ground.

Though still relatively new to my present position, I bring to it not only the kind of acquaintance with the Army gained as an Infantry officer for more than 4 years during World War II, and later as a civilian Special Assistant to Secretary of the Army Frank Pace, but, above all, an unshakable faith and confidence in the men and women of the Army. In war and peace they have proved themselves worthy of the high trust the Nation has reposed in them, and I know that they will fully live up to their constantly broadening responsibilities. In simple terms, America can count on her Army, for it is made up of Americans who are among the finest and most loyal of all our citizens.

I know that the Nation can count with equal assurance upon the capability and dedication of its industrial leadership, which through the years has proved equal to the mighty tasks imposed upon it by the demands of national security in war and peace.

You gentlemen from industry have made personal sacrifices to be with us today. When I read the list of people attending this conference and considered the industries they represented, I was struck with the thought that few, if any, nations in the world could muster so much industrial talent and experience under one roof, and that no nation could call so many men of your caliber to a voluntary assembly for discussing common problems in open forum. On behalf of the entire Army, I thank you for coming, and thus affirming once again industry's appreciation of its heavy responsibilities for national security.

We are competing for survival with a nation that has demonstrated a will and a rapidly expanding ability to excel in all fields. Its leader has repeatedly pointed to all manner of achievements as evidence of the superiority of the Soviet system of strict regimentation. He has prophesied that the nations of the world will hasten to adopt his precepts because they offer the surest path to progress and prosperity. He has hurled numerous challenges at us to compete with him in any and all endeavors, so that the world may see the superiority of communism over capitalism.

The time has clearly come to demonstrate our faith in free and democratic enterprise with achievements surpassing anything we have done before. We fortunately have no reason to emulate the Soviet Union to the extent of applying so large a part of our industrial capacity to the creation of military might that our citizens are deprived of the comforts of life, but we can and must tighten our belts and gird ourselves with the determination to leave nothing undone to insure the basic safety of our Nation.

Industry plays a principal role in national defense all along the line. In addition to producing the necessary hardware for defense, our national leaders look to it more and more to contribute to our strategic planning. So deeply have the roots of technology sunk into the fundamentals of modern military activities that a presentday military planner without solid liaison with industry would be like a commander without a staff. This dependence on industry's finest minds will increase with the ever-ascending technological spiral, and it presents industry with a ringing challenge.

Industrial leaders must focus their attention not upon the factory alone, but upon the battlefield as well; not upon profit as the primary end, but upon the national interest as the transcendent consideration. They must have a thorough understanding of the entire range of factors which are involved in national security. It is the purpose of this seminar to contribute to that broad view.

A lot of people don't realize that the Army has a deep appreciation for both the problems and contributions of American busi-

ness because the Army is a major business itself. As a matter of fact, it is bigger both in annual budget and in the number of people it employs than United States Steel, General Motors, A.T. & T., and DuPont all put together—and you could add a few more without breaking even.

While it is true that the Army is a nonprofit organization, any notion that it doesn't appreciate the value of a dollar is completely unfounded. Given the missions which the Army is called upon to perform and the resources which are provided to it, it does one of the most remarkable jobs of sheer efficiency that you can find in our society.

One of the major programs of the Army is to place in the hands of our troops the results in cold steel of the brilliant and imaginative programs of research and development in which many of your companies have been involved which bring within practical reach the ability to equip our Army with better and more modern tools than those possessed by any army on earth today.

In my judgment we are much more likely to find ourselves in situations of so-called limited war in the years just ahead than in a situation of all out global thermonuclear war. The Army is much more likely to be called upon to put out what some people call "brush fires" than is the Nation to be faced with all-out conflict. If the brush fires are promptly and effectively dealt with, they will not mushroom. I am a firm believer in massive retaliation if the true occasion for it should unhappily develop but we must not permit ourselves to be maneuvered into a position in which our choice would be limited to all-out thermonuclear war on the one hand or piecemeal surrender on the other. We are rapidly approaching a nuclear stalemate but this does not mean that the world Communist conspiracy is changing or will change its objectives.

It is highly significant that while progressing with long-range nuclear weapons andn defenses against them, the Soviets also continue to push the modernization of their land, sea, and air units. The Soviet Army clearly intends to be able to fight with or without nuclear weapons, and, under the "umbrella" of the coming nuclear stalemate, to be prepared to foster and exploit weaknesses in the free world wherever they may sense they exist.

Soviet military modernization is making available large numbers of effective weapons for other Communist nations, including Communist China. Meanwhile, Communist China, with other bloc nations, is producing weapons of its own. Communist Chinese manpower equipped with modern weapons would constitute a formidable foe indeed. In the light of the emphasis which Red China has placed on the use of force to attain its ends, we would do well to recognize that we cannot wisely afford to ignore its steadily developing military posture.

When we consider, even thus briefly, the worldwide threat, the major actions our Nation must take to defend itself become relatively clear.

First, we must maintain the strong alliances we now have. Alone, we can expect to contain the Communist empire only at tremendous risk of global nuclear war. Our alliances contribute enormously to maintaining the frontiers of freedom in Europe, Asia, and Africa.

Secondly, we must maintain a balanced and diversified military posture which will enable us both to deter any enemy from initiating a general thermonuclear war and to confront him with powerful reason not to initiate other forms of war.

Thirdly, in the event of long-range nuclear attack on us, we must be able to endure, and to minimize its effects upon our homeland, and to deliver devastating long-range nuclear counterattacks on the enemy. We must also be able to carry on successfully the prolonged conflict which might follow such exchanges.

Fourthly, in the event of the outbreak of other forms of war, such, for example, as occurred in Korea and Indochina and could recur on smaller or larger scales, and in more than one place at once, we must be prepared to win—and the more quickly, the better from every standpoint. This means highly modern, dual, capable forces and the ability to move and support our forces in a hurry.

Fifthly, to achieve these ends, our posture should include modern land, sea, and air units which can fight quickly and effectively with or without nuclear weapons and sustain the fight as long as necessary; the best possible air defense and antimissile systems; an adequate command and control system; powerful, long-range nuclear delivery systems of minimum vulnerability; and truly ready military reserve forces—together with stockpiling programs which will provide the essential base both for our postattack recovery and for assisting in the military exploitation of the strategic opportunities resulting from a thermonuclear exchange.

The military posture I have just outlined will insure the capability to deal with concrete situations, against whose actual occurrence we have no guarantee whatever. I have the feeling that the need for the forces and systems I have described is becoming more generally recognized every day. I earnestly hope so.

Now I would like to examine very briefly the contributions of the Army, as a member of the all-services team, in fulfilling the needs I have described.

In an all-out war the Army will have a most significant role, which may not be as generally recognized as it needs to be. From what we know of the doctrine and the composition of Soviet forces, it is clear that while they place great emphasis and reliance on achieving a powerful, long-range nuclear system, they do not depend on any one element of military power to achieve final success. Our Army must have the capability in general war to meet and defeat Soviet forces in the wake of the damage caused by nuclear exchanges. It must then be prepared to exercise direct, full-time, and comprehensive control over the land, the resources, and the peoples of the enemy.

The Army will also play a key part in the defense of the United States from enemy attack through the air. In this connection, I submit that we must continue, as a matter of high priority, to develop an effective antimissile defense.

In preparing for any kind of war—all-out nuclear war or anything less—it seems obvious to me that we must maintain U.S. combat-ready forces overseas. The American serviceman on the ground is a living symbol of our readiness to contribute to the common defense—a symbol that allied peoples and the Communists can both see—a visible and effective deterrent against so-called limited aggression and an indispensable element in meeting it if it occurs.

A vital element of this forward deployment is the Army's contribution to cold war—a contribution made not only by Army units stationed overseas, but also by MAAG's and missions stationed in more than 40 countries of the free world. These activities range from civic actions aimed at increasing mutual understanding and the betterment of human relationships, to the critically important provision of training, advice, and equipment to improve the capabilities of various free world nations to deal with challenges to their security. Of particular importance now—and in my opinion, most likely of increasing importance in the years ahead—is the task the Army is doing to improve substantially the capabilities of selected countries to meet challenges to their internal security—challenges presented in the form of subversion and guerrilla action. This is primarily an Army job.

Another essential element in our forward strategy is the ability to reinforce rapidly our forces overseas. This capability would be required in all forms of war. Our Active Army maintains forces in the United States for this purpose, three divisions of which are in the Strategic Army Corps, the Army's fire brigade. Beyond that, we have the forces of our Army National Guard and Army Reserve. These Reserve forces, I am convinced, must be kept at a very high state of combat readiness to beef up our Active Army in an emergency. We must also have available sufficient airlift to get our combat reinforcements where they have to go with all possible speed.

I have sketched with a very broad brush the picture of the Army's role and requirements. It seems evident to me that the attainment of virtually every objective depends to a major extent upon the complete, perceptive, and sustained cooperation of American industry and the Army. If the phrase "the Army-industry team" is to have any meaning at all, it must express a fundamental relationship based on a thorough, mutual realization of the identity of interest which exists. The urgency of the missions with which the Army is charged in these perilous times more than ever requires that industry live up in all respects to its responsibilities as a member of the team. I would like to leave you with two thoughts concerning those responsibilities.

First, it is not enough merely to fill orders. It is imperative that industry play an active role in every phase of materiel development. As a full partner in defense, it should apply itself with foresight, initiative, and imagination to the evolution of new ideas which will contribute to the Army's effectiveness. It should, if possible, go forward even further and faster than the Army itself in anticipating demand by applying its own great resources, on its own volition, to the exploration of every field of science and technology in search of better methods and means for carrying out the Army's tasks.

Second, it would be impossible to overstress the importance of reducing to a minimum the time which elapses between the development of an idea and its translation into a useful piece of military hardware. In view of the scientific and technological "explosion" of our age, this time lag is the most critical factor in the maintenance of military capability adequate to dissuade any enemy from making war. No weapon or item of equipment—no matter how great a "breakthrough" it represents—no matter how much better it may be than what a potential enemy possesses—is of any value whatever on the drawing board. Only when it is actually placed in operational use, and in sufficient quantity, does it enhance the security of the Nation.

The level of understanding and cooperation between the Army and American industry which we enjoy today is the product of growth and experimentation, of lessons learned the hard way in three wars and years of strenuous efforts to preserve the peace in the face of the ominous threat of Communist aggression. I am confident that this seminar will help to increase the vigor of the Army-industry team, and to spark it with new enthusiasm. Let us go forward together with unselfish dedication to the well-being of our beloved country.

Admiral Hogan

SPEECH
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my valued colleague and good friend, Congressman BARRATT O'HARA, in his able and most gracious laudatory remarks touching upon the retirement of Rear Adm. Bartholomew W. Hogan, distinguished native of Massachusetts who has just completed 35 years of brilliant, outstanding professional medical service with the Navy.

Admiral Hogan has close and warm ties with the Commonwealth and his many friends in Massachusetts have noted with great pride the extraordinary honor which the Secretary of the Navy, the Honorable John B. Connally, conferred upon him at the February 28 retirement ceremony when he was awarded, in the name of the President, the Distinguished Service Medal.

Admiral Hogan, who was born in Quincy in 1901, received his medical degree from Tufts College in 1925. He interned at the U.S. Naval Hospital in Boston and St. Elizabeths Hospital in Washington, D.C.

He served with distinction during World War II as senior medical officer aboard the carrier U.S.S. *Wasp* and among his awards are the Silver Star, a decoration received for heroic duty in continuing to treat the wounded on the *Wasp* while suffering himself from badly burned hands and fractured ribs, the Purple Heart and the Navy and Marine Corps Medal. I earnestly hope that this great naval hero and his family may enjoy good health, success, and happiness for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include as part of my remarks the fine speech of Secretary Connally at the retirement ceremony for Admiral Hogan. The Secretary's remarks follow:

REMARKS BY THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY, THE HONORABLE JOHN B. CONNALLY, AT THE RETIREMENT CEREMONY FOR REAR ADMIRAL HOGAN ON FEBRUARY 28, 1961

Admiral and Mrs. Hogan, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, we are here today to observe the retirement of Adm. Bartholomew W. Hogan after a naval medical career of 35 years. It has been a most distinguished career, a career marked by professional achievement, high valor, and great service to the Nation and to the Navy.

Let us look back for a moment over Admiral Hogan's past 35 years.

When he was graduated in 1925 from the Tufts' Medical School in Boston he was awarded the Phi Lambda Kappa Medal for highest achievement during his term as a medical student.

Prior to World War II he served in various billets afloat and ashore including tours of duty as chief of neuropsychiatry at Philadelphia and Washington, D.C.

In World War II he was serving as senior medical officer aboard the aircraft carrier *Wasp* when she was sunk by a Japanese submarine. In this action Dr. Hogan sustained badly burned hands and several fractured ribs. Nevertheless he continued to treat the wounded of the *Wasp* until the order came to abandon ship.

For his courageous devotion to duty, Admiral Hogan was awarded the Silver Star and the Purple Heart for this action.

Once in the water after abandoning ship, Admiral Hogan was rescued by the destroyer *Duncan*, and there, in spite of his own painful injuries, he continued to treat the wounded until the small hours of the morning. For this he was recommended for, and received, the Navy and Marine Corps Medal.

After the war he was executive officer at the Naval Hospitals at Philadelphia and Bethesda, and later commanding officer of those at Mare Island and Bethesda. Subsequently he served as Fleet Medical Officer of the Pacific Fleet, and as Deputy and Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery.

For the last 6 years, as Surgeon General of the Navy and Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, he has been the Navy's senior medical officer.

His has been a distinguished career indeed. In the course of it he has been awarded honorary doctor of laws degrees from Mt. St. Mary's College and Villanova, and doctor of science degrees from Boston College, Tufts College, and Marquette University. His professional writings are well known in the literature of medicine.

In addition to the fine full professional life he has had as a physician and a naval officer, Admiral Hogan and his lovely wife are known to us all as a very pleasant couple and as fine friends.

This ceremony today marks the termination of Admiral Hogan's active naval career, but in another sense it is a beginning, a beginning for Admiral Hogan in new fields of achievement, and it is an opportunity to enjoy some well-earned rest and relaxation.

I know that we all join together in expressing to Admiral Hogan our own thanks and the thanks of the Navy for his distinguished service, and in expressing to both him and Mrs. Hogan our warm wishes for continued achievement and pleasure in retirement, and the satisfaction that they both deserve in looking back on their Navy years.

In recognition of his outstanding service as Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery it is my privilege to award to him in the name of the President the Distinguished Service Medal.

Gen. Casimir Pulaski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend remarks in the RECORD, I take pleasure in presenting an editorial that appeared in the Paterson Evening News, Paterson, N.J., on March 4, 1961:

A TRULY GREAT MAN

Today is the 214th anniversary of the birth of Gen. Casimir Pulaski, patriot and Revolutionary War hero.

The occasion is being observed and celebrated here and in many lands where the great deeds of really great men are cherished and appreciated.

Casimir Pulaski, when barely out of his teens, fought for liberty in his native Poland against Russian armies, which then, as today, and in World War II, overran his homeland. At 24, already a veteran of the unsuccessful uprising of the Confederation of Bar, he was famous throughout Europe for his gallantry, bravery, and military talent; for his character, humanness, and that romanticism which caused him to seek exile in France, and then to lead a small expedition of Poles to fight beside Turkey when that nation went to war against Russia. Failing in this venture, he returned to France, where he met Benjamin Franklin, and offered his services to the American Revolutionary cause.

He came to America when freedom was trampled in Poland by her powerful neighbors with Russia in the lead. He was at Valley Forge with Washington. He distinguished himself at Brandywine, Egg Harbor, and elsewhere, as leader of the first American cavalry units. Later he organized, and led, the famous Pulaski Legion. He died nobly in the Revolutionary cause at Savannah, Ga., while leading a charge of his legion, on October 11, 1779.

His was a great career and the life of a true idealist. Liberty and freedom were all important to him. He never compromised in his belief as to the importance of these ideals. He gave all that he possessed for them, his fortune, and his life.

America remembers Pulaski as a dauntless defender of liberty, and martyr to the cause of our independence. His memory lives on.

The Inescapability of History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. QUENTIN N. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, I am very proud of one of my young constituents, Dean Conrad, of Bismarck, N. Dak., a student at Lake Forest Academy at Lake Forest, Ill. On January 22, he gave a talk in the academy chapel that was considered one of the finest ever given there. This young man has an outstanding ability to articulate his convictions. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Dean Conrad's talk entitled "The Inescapibility of History."

The address follows:

THE INESCAPABILITY OF HISTORY

"Continuity with the past," Justice Holmes once wrote, "is not an obligation. It is a necessity." We are not free to choose our past. It is there and its influence on us is powerful and undeniable. To a large extent we are what we are today because our fathers were what they were. The past of any man or any nation contains inevitably both glory and shame, heroism and cowardice, truth and self-deception. We cannot change this mixed heritage even slightly. It remains what it has been, whatever we think or say; it is responsible for the circumstances and for both the hopes and the fears which are a part of our life today.

People beset by illusions and fears sometimes attempt to remake the past. Not long after the disappearance and death of the late and not generally lamented Lavrenty Beria, the chief of Soviet police, the Soviets published a new edition of their official encyclopedia. According to reports, the most significant change was the substitution of an extensive article on the Bering Sea, disposed of in a paragraph in previous issues, and the

disappearance of Beria's name from the book and thus from official history. His name and work are to be erased from memory. For all the future readers and students of Soviet history, he never existed. This trick, also described by George Orwell in his novel "Nineteen Eighty-Four," is so blatant, so wildly irrational that it is difficult for us to imagine how a government and a people can thus deceive themselves; however, it is not such an unusual practice. There is much in the past of any man or any nation which at some time or other it would be convenient to forget, to blot out as never having happened.

We cannot change the past. We are continuous with it, not by duty or choice, but by necessity. It works upon us for good and for evil; it shapes our ways of thought and life more than we care to admit. But still we have a measure of freedom and while we cannot change the past, there is always an area of choice in the present, within which we are free to decide whether our thoughts and ways shall be continuous with the best in our past, or with the mediocre and second-rate; whether we shall throw that strength and faith we possess on the side of fulfilling our fathers' noblest dreams or merely repeating their failures; whether we shall reaffirm in the present the highest meaning of our heritage or some lower meaning of it. We are continuous, unfortunately, with much in our past that we might wish to deny and expunge from our history, as the Soviets tried to expunge Beria. There is a history of narrow, arrogant nationalism in the United States as well as a history of the growing spirit of brotherhood, equality, and the sense of fellowship with all peoples and nations the world over. There is a history of demagogues and of low politics as well as a history of enlightened and far-sighted statesmanship. There is a history of bigotry as well as a history of expanding liberty and democracy. There is a history of the enslavement of the individual in mind and body as well as a history of the individual's steady liberation. There is a history of fear and hate and a history of hope and love. There is a history of adventurous change and experiment and a history of black reaction.

All these histories have gone into the ground we stand on and have played their part in producing our present strength and weakness, our hopes and anxieties, triumphs and failures. The past is never simple. It contains the entire range of man's spirit and all his attitudes and experiences, good, bad, and indifferent. Any man can prove any point from history; it is merely a question of which examples he wishes to emphasize.

This is not to say that history has no meaning and direction. Over the years the history of a people does reveal certain consistent, dominant themes, sometimes out of sight momentarily or forgotten, but continually reborn and reaffirmed from generation to generation. In spite of the golden calf, the priests of Baal, the false prophets, and the cowardly kings, Old Testament history remains the story of the triumph of one universal God, just, righteous, and loving in all His ways. The history reveals opposing forces, minor negative themes, and many failures, but there can be no question of its majestic major theme and of its long-range meaning and direction.

Likewise, one can discern in the American past, relatively short as it is, certain enduring meanings which are at once a source of hope and a summons to loyalty in the chaotic present. Indeed, the very fact that these major meanings of our tradition have been opposed bitterly, sometimes corrupted and frustrated, sometimes forgotten, sometimes even halted and defeated for a time, only to reappear with new strength and beauty, gives one reason to be confident today that they have not been lost or forsaken. The best meanings in our historic past are not bright, untarnished ideals, they are tough, battle-hardened ways of thought and life which have stood the tests of criticism, opposition, even occasional setback and failure, and are still alive and at work today.

One of the most important of these meanings is to be found in a document which may claim to be the first written constitution in the New World. When the Pilgrims anchored their vessel off the shores of Cape Cod, they drew up and signed a brief statement called the Mayflower Compact. Far from any source of authority they drew up an agreement among themselves on which they proposed to establish the life of their community. It was not in any sense a code of laws. It was simply an affirmation of the mutual respect, understanding, and trust which is the basic foundation of laws and government. They declared their intention to frame such laws as the good of the colony might require, and they pledged themselves to give "all due submission and obedience" to the demands of the general good. They made explicit a principle which is in danger of being forgotten today: that the strength and health of a free community rests upon the consent of its members. A free community is possible because people can count on one another, trust one another, and confidently expect from one another honesty and human consideration. The individual free conscience in cooperation and fellowship with other free consciences is the guarantee of freedom and order in a community. Laws, police, and the other ordinary methods of enforcement check the occasional transgressor, but the strength of the free community rests upon the fact that most people play fair and deserve the confident trust of their fellow men.

If this foundation of mutual trust and consent were to be destroyed, no amount of external force, no laws, no exhortations, or threats could prevent chaos. It is amazing to reflect that our complex, free society, with its innumerable checks and balances, its network of rights and obligations, has as its foundation the faith, the spiritual insight that on the whole we can and must trust one another. As long as this trust is present, the free community can stand almost any amount of argument and controversy as to how its common problems and challenges should be met and mastered. Not only can it stand argument and controversy, it is stronger and healthier for their presence. For out of honest, intellectual conflict, the clash of opposing opinions, the understanding of different doctrines, learning takes place and the collective wisdom and faith of the community is increased. But if we permit the existence of differing opinions among us to become an occasion for calling into question the basic integrity of those whose opinions differ from our own, then we are attacking the very foundation of a free community.

Hence, the real subversives today are those people who, willfully or not, have mistaken honest differences of opinion for basic disloyalty to the covenant of trust on which the free community rests. The real subversives are those who by gossip, slander, libel, publicity, spying, and even the misuse of the legal power of Congress to investigate and the executive power of high office are driving us toward an American conformity by insisting that difference from prevailing opinions or policies must be a sign of evil motives or basic disloyalty. The real subversives are the frightened people who dare not imagine that their opinions may be mistaken and so have tried to make it appear that criticism of their opinions is an attack on the American way of life.

These people are nothing new in American life. They have always been with us, and sometimes, though never for long, they have been highly successful in communicating their fears and hatreds to large numbers of others. In the 17th century they were afraid of the rebels, the French Revolution, and Napoleon; in the 19th century they feared Charles Darwin, the abolitionist movement, foreigners, and organized labor. Now, in the 20th century, they fear the Soviets, world organization, social and economic change, intellectuals, even ideas themselves.

These fearmongers cannot win in America today. They are without faith in themselves or in others, and hence they lack courage or any deep spiritual strength. Already there are signs that they are being swept away, as they have been swept away before, by the massive sanity and fairmindedness of most Americans. But it is time to revive our appreciation of and devotion to that tradition of our historic past which was first expressed in the Mayflower Compact and many times thereafter. The free society rests upon the continuous acts of mutual trust and confidence among men and women of good conscience.

It has always been understood in our society that neither personal liberty nor social order can be absolute in its claim. Each must be balanced by and adjusted to the other. Yet we have made the welfare and happiness of persons the test of the worth of social order. We have never hesitated to change our social order when the welfare and happiness of any significant group of persons seemed to require it. We have always cherished the faith that the social order or state exists to serve the person, not the person to serve the state.

Hence, we have loved our rebels and individualists with a fierce, proud affection. We have honored Jefferson, Paine, Washington, Adams, the little group of gentlemen who undertook the most ungentlemanly business of promoting a revolution against English crown and law. We admire Thoreau because he went his individualistic way without caring what society thought. We are proud of Theodore Parker for promoting disobedience to the Fugitive Slave Law even though it was the law of the land. And we all but worship the tall, uncouth man from Illinois who upset the respectable predictions and brought to a high office a rare combination of simple humanity and sorrowful greatness.

Always in Americans there has been a feeling that there is something in the spirit of man that is properly above all laws and institutions. Our national heroes are a curious group, and many of them would have little in common with one another except a certain rugged independence of mind and spirit, a boldness in thought and action, a willingness to stand up and be counted for what they believed in, no matter who said "yea" or "nay". This tradition of the nonconformist, the adventurer, the pioneer, the thinker of new thoughts has been very important in our history. Few American demagogs have been assassinated, most have been simply outgrown and cast aside when the people got tired of their antics.

In the same process we have given a free field and great encouragement to people of skill and ability who had some real contribution to make. From the penniless immigrant who found here a chance to build a new life, to the scientist with a new theory, the artist with a new form, the writer with a new thought, the businessman with a new product, we have actually practiced free enterprises, not only in economics but in all human activities, and it has been, on the whole, a magnificent success.

With this tradition behind us it is essential to our health and strength as a nation today that we do not go back on it, but honor it all through our common life. We could use some free enterprise in ideas and experiments today, not only in business but in foreign and domestic policy, in education, and even in religion. We have limited

free enterprise to a definition which is much too narrow. It means essentially the human mind alive, growing, thinking, experimenting, and transforming itself and the world around it. It means respect and opportunity for the individual man with a fresh idea in any field. It means that with open eyes we take the risks of freedom, because the creative possibilities of it are so great.

We have, in recent years, permitted ourselves to be pushed onto the defensive among the dynamic forces at work in the world today. We talk of security, counterattack, and retaliation. We wish to defend civilization against the new barbarians. But a civilization which is alive and both worthy and capable of survival does not retire behind prepared defenses, congratulating and admonishing itself and the world about its achievements to date. Rather, it seeks to offer the world hopes and possibilities long desired and yet to be realized. It does not retreat from its dreams. It restates them in terms clear enough for all humanity to understand. It meets the challenge of the new barbarians with a positive program. Do the new barbarians offer the poor and oppressed masses liberation from poverty, corrupt colonial government, and exploitation?

The great civilization sets out to prove that it can move toward these ends without the sacrifice of personal freedom and dignity of the individual. Do the new barbarians promise an end to racial and religious persecution? The great civilization dares call all the people of all the races and nations to an adventure in human brotherhood. Do the new barbarians summon men to a world enveloping conflict? The great civilization declares its faith that by patience, firmness, justice, and compassion, conflict can be avoided and the energies of men turned to the struggle against age old enemies of poverty, disease, and oppression wherever they are found.

These are the basic principles for which our great Nation stands, and their bases are found in the ideals our forefathers set decades ago. I urge you, my fellow students, to reaffirm these doctrines, so they will not be lost sight of for too great a time.

Let us give thanks. The great themes of our historic past, our trust in one another, our trust in the individual with all his variety and creativeness, our trust in the dream of justice, liberty and brotherhood as the safe and proper guide of a great, free people are not spent and lost today. They have survived many and severe challenges in the past. The men of mediocrity and fear will seek, as they always have, to persuade us that the situation is too dangerous, too complex, that the cost is too high for moral and spiritual greatness.

But we cannot renounce these meanings without renouncing the best in our past and the best in ourselves, and in spite of the frightened voices which plead and the strident voices which threaten, we will not do it. Rather, we will reaffirm the best that is in our past, add to it the skill and vision that is in our present, and move forward with renewed trust in ourselves, in one another, and in our God.

Youth Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the State of California, Department of the Youth Authority, for the interest of my colleagues:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
DEPARTMENT OF THE YOUTH AUTHORITY,
Sacramento, February 15, 1961.

Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT,
House of Representatives,
Washington D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am delighted to hear that you have introduced a bill in Congress to establish a Youth Conservation Corps. I am very much interested in this program as I have had to do with camps in California the last 30 years, having established the first youth camp in America in 1931 and later as an adviser to the CCC program in 1933.

If there is any information we can provide or any service we can be to you on this matter, please do not hesitate to call upon us.

I have discussed this matter with Governor Brown, and he is thoroughly in accord with the aims of your measure. Both of us believe that some such program is essential if we are to take a lot of young men who have dropped out of school off the streets. Certainly with the average crime age in America at 19½ years, a work program for this type of boy would hit at the heart of our national crime and delinquency problem. At the present time I have to do with operating 31 camps in California and could give you the benefit of our experience here.

Best personal regards.

Sincerely,

HERMAN G. STARK,
Director.

Columnist Sylvia Porter Reports Japanese Can Visit Russia Easier Than the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, as one of the cosponsors of S. 610, a proposal to establish an Office of International Travel which was introduced by the senior Senator from Washington, I was especially interested in the following statement:

It's tougher for an educated, desirable Japanese tourist with loads of cash to spend in hotels, restaurants, shops, etc., to get an entry visa for the United States than for Soviet Russia.

This statement was written by nationally known columnist Sylvia Porter and was published in the Sherman, Tex., Democrat. In the article she gives a number of specific examples of governmental policies which discourage tourists from visiting our country. Since one objective of the proposed Office of International Travel would be to cut redtape on the issuance of visas, this article should be of keen interest to the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent to have published in the RECORD Appendix the column from the March 1, 1961, issue of the Sherman Democrat entitled "Bars to Tourists Are Rigid," by Sylvia Porter.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BARS TO TOURISTS ARE RIGID
(By Sylvia Porter)

It's tougher for an educated, desirable Japanese tourist with loads of cash to spend in hotels, restaurants, shops, etc., to get an entry visa for the United States than for Soviet Russia.

We ask so many embarrassing questions of unmarried women who would like to visit our land as tourists for a couple of weeks (sample: "Have you engaged in, or will you engage in, immoral conduct?") that countless numbers decide they won't tolerate the ridiculously personal questions and they decide to take their vacations in Europe, Canada, South America—anywhere but here.

An Australian who wants to come here as a tourist must make three separate visits to the consulate at Sydney—one to get a visa application, a second to return the application, a third for a final appointment. The expense and delays repel many would-be visitors.

A citizen of Denmark often may not obtain his visa until just before his scheduled departure—no matter how long in advance he has requested the visa. The annoyance makes many give up their plans.

A naturalized citizen of Venezuela may have to wait 3 or 4 months for a visa, go through discouraging expense and redtape.

Wealthy Spanish and Greek tourists who place great emphasis on courtesy say frankly that they are revolted by the lack of hospitality at our consulates. The financial questionnaires, the long delays, the need for appearing in person at the consulates have slashed tourism from Madrid and Athens at least 25 percent below the present potential.

The President of the United States has called for a stepped up drive for tourism in our country. The foreign travel market, says Kennedy, is "virtually untapped" and a strong "promotion effort by this country can be expected to yield significant results."

The Senate only last week passed a bill to create a travel service in the Department of Commerce and to provide a system of American tourist offices abroad to stimulate travel to our country. Legislation along these lines is just about a certainty during this session.

But as Washington's Democratic Senator WARREN MAGNUSON said during discussion of the bill, "It's sometimes harder to get into the United States as a tourist than it is to break into jail." As a Department of Commerce committee appointed to investigate the situation reported a few weeks ago, "The tests involved in the issuance of visitor visas to the United States do much to discourage visitors from friendly countries."

We will get next to nowhere with our sound, timely, and potentially highly important drive for more tourists unless we simplify our visa practices and use our commonsense in differentiating between a person trying to immigrate here legally or illegally and a foreigner who just wants to see our country, spend money in it and go home.

We will continue not only to repel hundreds of thousands of visitors but also to make enemies out of those who want to be our friends unless we drastically amend our present procedures.

The plain fact is that in 1960 only 779,000 foreign nationals visited us and, excluding tourists from Canada and Mexico, only 450,000 of all the business and pleasure visitors in the world came here.

The shocking truth is that only 75,000 tourists came from all South America, only 198,000 from all of prosperous Europe.

The informed estimate is that a minimum of double last year's visitors here have the leisure and means to come to our shores, but lack the desire because of their objections to our visa practices.

The fault lies in our obsolete Government regulations and in our laws which subject a pleasure tourist to the same rigid requirements as an immigrant. The fault lies in our

State Department which pays lip service, but nothing more than that, to simplifying the rules.

The fault lies in our consultates abroad—all too often badly staffed, understaffed, deliberately inhospitable.

Conflict-of-Interest Crackdown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I have followed with great interest the efforts of Mr. Benjamin A. Javits in organizing America's 13 million shareholders. As president of the United Shareholders of America, Inc., Mr. Javits is seeking to unify this economic group as an effective voice in national affairs.

The millions of stockholders in our country represent diverse economic, cultural, and political views. In the words of Mr. Javits:

If the stockholders ever worked as a cohesive force, they could change the course of our history.

Mr. President, the success of the United Shareholders of America will represent a victory for the millions of Americans, in all walks of life, who by investing the fruits of their labors in American industry have affirmed their faith in our free enterprise system.

Mr. Javits, a noted attorney and author and the brother of the senior Senator from New York, will no doubt be successful in his efforts to organize an economic electorate in our country.

Last fall the Shareholders of America, Inc., conducted an inquiry with respect to conflict of interest in America's corporations.

I ask unanimous consent that an article published in the September 24, 1961, issue of Business Week relating to this inquiry be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONFLICT-OF-INTEREST CRACKDOWN: ALTHOUGH MOST COMPANIES SAY CONFLICTING INTERESTS IS NO PROBLEM, MANY, NEVERTHELESS, ARE RESTATING THEIR POLICIES OR REVISING PROCEDURES TO MAKE SURE IT DOESN'T OCCUR

The supplier tieins that cost Chrysler President William C. Newberg his job (Business Week, July 30, 1960, p. 30) are having repercussions far beyond Detroit.

"It couldn't happen here" is the typical reaction from top managements of other companies. But some are taking steps to make absolutely sure. And many would agree with Daniel F. Gerber, president of Gerber Products Co., who wrote in reply to a survey just conducted by the United Shareholders of America, "I believe that the affair * * * has had a very good effect on a lot of companies in making them a little more alert to the possibility of any remotely similar situations that might exist in their own organizations."

Hot subject: The U.S.A. survey provides plenty of evidence of management alertness. In fact, the volume of replies alone demonstrates that conflict of interest is a hot subject in executive suites today.

Benjamin A. Javits, the New York attorney who runs the 800-member stockholder group, sent a questionnaire about purchasing and conflict-of-interest policies to all of the some 1,500 companies listed on the New York and American Stock Exchanges. It went into the mail August 26. Within 3 weeks he had more than 500 answers, most of them from presidents or board chairmen.

All the executives assured Javits that they had no conflict-of-interest problems in their companies. But a number of them noted that they were rechecking anyway. And some said they were revising or restating their policies.

Varied policies: Under Securities and Exchange Commission regulations, if officers and directors have substantial interests in organizations doing business with their companies, these facts must be reported in proxy statements. Beyond that, company policies and practices vary widely.

Some ban any such interests except for minor stock investments in publicly owned corporations. ACF Industries, Inc., for example, prohibits any employees either directly or through family connections from having a financial or other interest in companies with which ACF does business.

Montgomery Ward & Co., Inc., bars all officers, managers and buyers who have a responsibility for our purchases from supplier interests.

Others, instead of flatly barring all potentially conflicting interests, require that they be reported. They have to be eliminated only if higher executives feel they might prejudice the company's interests.

Disclosure requirements: And there's plenty of variation in the levels to which such policies extend and in the kind of interests that are forbidden or must be reported. Columbia Gas System, Inc., insists on complete disclosures from all employees of any financial interest in any company or enterprise that might result in a conflict between their personal interests and their obligations to Columbia. Vanadium-Alloys Steel Co. has a disclosure requirement for officers, directors, and department heads; Douglas Aircraft Co., Inc., for supervisory employees; Westinghouse Electric Corp., for all employees. At Carrier Corp. every employee must report any large interest in publicly owned customers or suppliers; interests in privately owned customers and suppliers are banned.

Most companies rely on more informal procedures. Plenty of presidents, particularly in smaller companies, simply say they know their executives well enough to keep up with what they are doing.

Revised procedures: Since the Chrysler affair, however, there have been some second thoughts about the need for formal policies and procedures.

Some have felt the need to spell out policies for the first time. A. D. Dennis, secretary of Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co. reported his company has issued a statement of policy. Executives, managers, and employees involved in purchasing were told they could not own interests in a supplier, apart from listed stocks acquired as part of a normal investment program.

Others like May Department Stores Co., are reasserting their existing policies. And some are wondering whether policies—and enforcement procedures—need tightening.

The board of American Chicle Co. is considering a comprehensive review of policies and practices. Allied Chemical Corp. is studying its existing procedures. Cutter Laboratories is weighing a formal procedure of regular review, so is Consolidated Natural Gas Co.

Questionnaires: Ohio Edison Co. President Walter H. Sammis has written each of the company's officers, general office department heads, division managers, and division department heads, asking them about their interests in any corporation doing business with the company. H. L. Green Co., Inc., is now collecting such information from all key employees. Dorr-Oliver, Inc., is preparing a questionnaire for directors, officers, and employees. Allied Stores Corp. and American Radiator & Standard Corp. also have extended their reporting requirements to executives below the officer level.

Cerro de Pasco Corp. is questioning "all personnel whose positions are such as to give rise to transactions with other business entities." President Robert P. Koenig reported that "we have not and are not limiting ourselves to purchasing in our inquiry procedure."

In General Foods Corp., Chairman Charles G. Mortimer reported at the last annual meeting, officers, directors, and "a number of other selected executives have signed statements that they have held no material interest in any transaction with suppliers of goods or services."

Company declarations: A number of 1960 annual reports will contain declarations that the company "does its purchasing through a fully controlled and carefully checked system of competitive bidding wherever and whenever possible." This step was suggested by Javits, who (in preparation for a United Shareholders membership drive) wanted to show that a stockholder organization could influence management policy.

He thinks that point is proved by the fact that some 40 percent of the executives who replied said they "would be willing" to make such a statement in their annual reports or would consider it. A dozen or so definitely promised to publish the statement.

A number of chief executives, however, were strongly opposed to Javits' suggestion. Some said competitive bidding wasn't applicable to their businesses; other warned that it was "no panacea." Many felt, with Wisconsin Electric Power Co. President L. F. Sybold, that "any statement which in effect merely says that the officers are doing the job they were hired to do would be self-serving."

Many executives doubted the value—internal or external—of any sort of procedure embodying loyalty oaths. Lyle L. Shepard, president of Columbian Carbon Co., believes "our cost controls and the loyalty of our employees are such that to ask for a detailed statement would create a morale situation that would be detrimental to our shareholders for a long time to come."

Strawberries and Stories

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 17, 1961

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, we in the Eighth Congressional District of Tennessee are certainly happy with the wonderful success of Peter Taylor, formerly of Trenton, Tenn., and Jesse Hill Ford, of Humboldt, Tenn., as short story writers.

A fine article appeared in the Commercial Appeal of March 5, which tells of

their literary accomplishments. This article follows:

STRAWBERRIES AND STORIES

(By Paul Flowers)

For half a century or more, especially since strawberries became an important fruit crop, Gibson County, Tenn., has been known far and wide as one of the most prosperous agricultural counties in the United States.

Gibson County in more recent years has come into another realm of prominence, for the production of short story writers. It is of note that two of the dozen entries in "Prize Stories of 1961—the O. Henry Awards," were written by Gibson Countians.

Gibson County claims:

"Heads of Houses," by Peter Taylor, Trenton-born son of Mr. and Mrs. Hillsman Taylor of Memphis.

"How the Mountains Are," by Jesse Hill Ford, of Humboldt, who won the Atlantic first award in 1959 for his short story "The Surest Thing in Show Business," and a $2,500 grant which enabled him to complete a novel which will appear this year. One of Mr. Ford's plays was produced on the CBS Television Workshop.

His O. Henry award-winning story appeared first in Atlantic.

FREQUENTLY IN NEW YORKER

Mr. Taylor, frequently a visitor with his parents in Memphis, is a member of the faculty at Ohio State University now. His story appeared first in New Yorker.

It is of note that another of his stories, "Who Was Jesse's Friend and Protector," appearing first in the Kenyon Review, comes again in "The Best American Short Stories of 1960," edited by Martha Foley and David Burnett, from Ballentine Books, a paperback at 75 cents.

Peter Taylor is remembered also for his books, "The Long Fourth and Other Stories," "A Woman of Means," "The Widows of Thornton," "Tennessee Day in St. Louis," and "Happy Families Are All Alike."

Other Southern fiction writers included in the books are Reynolds Price of North Carolina, and Jackson Burgess, who has lived both in Georgia and Florida. Texas is represented by John Graves.

In the O. Henry collection are:

"Tell Me A Riddle," by Tillie Olsen.

"The Nickel Misery of George Washington Carver Brown," by Ivan Gold.

"One Sunday in Late July," by Reynolds Price.

"The Magician," by Jackson Burgess.

"O Lovely Appearance of Death," by Ellen Currie.

"The Quick and the Dead," by Ervin Krause.

"Thoreau in California," by Jack Ludwig.

"I Don't Need You Any More," by Arthur Miller.

"A Nous La Liberte," by David Shaber.

"Wife-Wooing," by John Updike.

ANOTHER COLLECTION

Contents of the "Best American Short Stories of 1960" include:

"The Santa Ana," by Sanora Rabb.

"The Day of the Bullet," by Stanley Ellin.

"Words Words Words," by George P. Elliott.

"The Man Who Looked Like Jesus," by Howard Fast.

"August," by Mavis Gallant.

"An Evening Performance," by George Garrett.

"The Last Running," by John Graves.

"The Ledge," by Lawrence Sargent Hall.

"The Purchase," by Elizabeth Hardwick.

"The Hunter," by Lachlan MacDonald.

"The Maid's Shoes," by Bernard Malamud.

"Unbelievable Characters," by Howard Nemerov.

"Hero," by Phyllis Roberts.

"Defender of the Faith," by Philip Roth.

"The Man Who Lost the Sea," by Theodore Sturgeon.

"A Glance in the Mirror," by Harvey Swados.

"Counterclockwise," by Elizabeth Larsh Young.

Medical Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House membership the following letter from Dr. J. A. Cosgriff, Jr., of Olivia, Minn., and the accompanying substantiating evidence which he produces concerning medical care in Renville County located in my congressional district. This comment and tabulation by Dr. Cosgriff is well worth a few minutes of the time of all Members of the House, in which to study a typical average American community's handling of medical care:

OLIVIA CLINIC,

OLIVIA, MINN., *February 24, 1961.*

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: I am enclosing for your information the report of a survey which outlines the costs of medical care to older people in our own community.

We believe that circumstances such as exist here are more typical of the average American community than are the extreme situations in poverty-stricken areas which are presented by some as justifying full Government financing of medical care costs. Most people, we find, can provide for themselves. This fact is borne out in our present study.

We have always been ready to help people who cannot provide their own necessities. Existing legislation adequately covers these people, who are a relatively small segment of the population. Adding now upon Government a social security financing of medical costs is completely unwarranted and unwise.

Sincerely yours,

J. A. COSGRIFF, Jr., M.D.

A COMMUNITY SURVEY OF HOSPITAL AND PHYSICIAN COSTS FOR MEDICAL CARE TO PATIENTS OVER 65 YEARS OF AGE

With the cooperation of members of the medical staff and the administrator of Renville County Hospital, Olivia, Minn., a study was made of the costs of medical care to those patients over the age of 65 years who were hospitalized in this typical community hospital during the year 1960. Ours is a general hospital of 41 beds and 10 bassinets, located in an agricultural community of west-central Minnesota. The majority of patients treated here are residents of Renville County.

This information is provided for consideration in the current discussions concerning financing the costs of medical care for the aged. We believe that our own data furnish sound basis for the conclusion that this particular problem is being well met under existing circumstances. Members of our medical staff know of no individual in this area who is not receiving proper medical care because of financial inability to pay for such care.

The data now presented summarize the findings of our study of those patients receiving care in the Renville County Hospital.

1. Patients over age 65 admitted to hospital during 1960: 256.

2. Total 1960 hospital admissions for patients over 65: 350 (21.5 percent of the total (1,630) admissions).

3. Patients having multiple 1960 hospital admissions: 63 (24.6 percent of the patients); 1 patient had 8 admissions, 2 patients had 5 admissions each, 5 patients had 4 admissions each, 9 patients had 3 admissions each, 46 patients had 2 admissions each.

4. Admission service division: 52, or 14.8 percent, were surgical admissions; 298, or 85.2 percent, were medical admissions; 47 patients had at least 1 surgical admission.

5. Patient's age: mode, 65 years; median, 74 years; mean, 75 years.

6. Patient's total 1960 hospital bill: mode, $36; median, $226; mean, $350.54.

Figures used here were the total hospital bills rendered a given patient in 1960, regardless of his number of hospital admissions.

The attached tabulation sheet shows that 75 percent of the patients used private resources to pay their bills, 25 percent being paid by Government agency; 84 patients, or 33 percent of the group, had some insurance coverage to aid payment; 21.4 percent, or 55 of the patients, had hospital bills larger than $500, 7.4 percent (19 patients) being over $1,000.

As of February 1, 1961, just 23, or 8.9 percent, of the patients had not paid their hospital bills in full. Yet, only seven of these (2.7 percent of the whole) had made no payment on account, the rest having made some payment.

7. Physician's bills; mode, $30; median, $56; mean, $105.69.

Here we contacted each patient's physician (seven physicians) and requested the total charges for illnesses treated in the hospital during 1960.

Only 1.6 percent, or 4 patients, had physicians' bills over $500; 9.1 percent, or 22 patients, had physicians' bills over $300.

As of February 1, 1961, 15.7 percent, or 38 patients, were known to have some of the physician's bill unpaid.

It was found that just 9.6 percent of the total hospital-physician bills rendered these patients for care during 1960 in these illnesses remained unpaid as of February 1, 1961.

8. A comparison can be drawn between our data and that previously published by the Tarrant County Medical Society of Texas, as contrasted with undocumented figures circulated by Senator CLINTON ANDERSON and others. The latter have stated that the average cost per illness to the elderly is $1,000—$450 hospital bill and $550 doctor bill.

	Hospital	Physician	Total
Compare:			
Senator Anderson's figures (per illness)	$450.00	$550.00	$1,000.00
Tarrant County, Tex. (per illness)	384.51	114.62	499.13
Renville County, Minn. (per 1960)	350.54	105.69	456.23

The data assembled in this survey warrant our agreeing with the members of the Tarrant County Medical Society that "Senator ANDERSON'S figures are fantastic." It is demonstrable that hospital costs far exceed physician costs. But more important, these data provide evidence that 75 percent of those patients over age 65 in our community are able to pay for their medical costs from private resources, and all the others are already adequately assisted by welfare agencies. There is no unmet need which requires the passage of new Federal legislation to pay for health care in our community. There is no warrant here to pass legislation which would compel the workers of America, through increased social security taxes, to

pay the medical costs for the 75 percent of those over 65 who are already able to pay their own costs adequately.

J. A. COSGRIFF, M.D.,
For the Medical Staff, Renville County Hospital.

Voters Tell Legislators What They Want Done in Olympia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I am pleased to include an editorial from the Wenatchee Daily World. While this editorial deals with voter reaction toward issues presently being considered by the Legislature of the State of Washington I do feel that it is of sufficient interest nationally to merit inclusion.

All of us in the Congress appreciate sound and serious thinking on the part of our constituents. It is necessary for healthy States who, together make up our great Nation.

The editorial follows:

VOTERS TELL LEGISLATORS WHAT THEY WANT DONE IN OLYMPIA

The votes are in and counted, and were we surprised.

Not at the outcome, but at the number.

Six-hundred and ninety-one replies to the Daily World's ballot on legislative issues were tabulated through last Saturday. Since then, 43 ballots have come in. That makes 734 people who took this easy way to tell your legislator how to vote.

Statistically, it's a terrific response. Many ballots contained a note of thanks for providing this way of expressing opinions to the legislature. It proves one contention: that most people would like to give their opinions to the legislators, but don't know quite how to go about it, or how to say it.

Legislators should give this ballot the same weight they'd give a personal letter. Almost every one of them is signed, and each one required special effort to fill out, unlike form letters.

The responses provide a good sampling of the entire north central Washington area. Four-hundred and ninety-nine of them were from Chelan County, 96 from Okanogan County, 74 from Douglas County, and 34 from Grant County. The rest were unsigned, or from out of the distrist. They will now be forwarded to the senator representing each county with the request that he pass them on to members of the house from his district.

You may find some surprises going through them—such things as the overwhelming support for making parents responsible for children's acts, the opposition to trading stamps and the support for raising the driver's age to 18.

Many people (and perhaps the legislators) will be surprised at the amount of opposition to a teachers' pay raise. The vote on extension of the sales tax to services may offer a big hint on how the people want taxes raised, and figures show the time ripe for installing a recovery clause and even for backing up on the welfare program.

Of course it's not a perfect poll. Some of these questions can't be answered on a straight yes or no basis. But it's an educated indication. Read the results for yourself.

1. Do you believe parents should be responsible for the malicious acts of their children? Yes, 603; no, 21.

2. Do you favor trading stamps? Yes, 95; no, 582. Do you want the stamps redeemable in cash 48; prizes 75?

3. Should the cities receive 5 percent of sales tax? Yes, 417; no, 221.

4. Do you favor capital punishment? Yes, 383; no, 258.

5. Do you favor increasing teacher salaries? No percentage, 287; 2½ percent, 110; 5 percent, 132; 10 percent, 89; 20 percent, 22.

6. Should minimum driving age be increased from 16 to 18? Yes, 380; no, 279.

7. Do you favor relaxing liquor regulations? Yes, 53; no, 632. Do you favor extension of Saturday night closing to 2 a.m.? Yes, 82; no, 594. Do you favor Sunday liquor? Yes, 43; no, 629. Do you favor relaxing liquor laws during century 21 only? Yes, 29; no, 547.

8. Should Washington State welfare laws be more conservative? 448. Stay as they are? 154; be more liberal? 48. Do you favor recovery clause? Yes, 398; no, 128. Do you favor family responsibility? Yes, 433; no, 147.

9. What is your opinion on the level of State spending? More money should be spent in: welfare, 61; schools, 341; institutions, 281; State departments, 13; highways, 162. Less money should be spent in: welfare, 357; schools, 108; institutions, 164; State departments, 381; highways, 73.

10. If the Governor's budget is approved, $60 million of new taxes will be necessary. Check the area of taxation which would be least objectionable to you if this budget is passed: Increase sales tax, 218; extend sales tax to services (doctors, lawyers, barbers, beauticians), 246; enact State income tax, 110; equalize and raise property tax, 137; tax on intangibles (stocks, bonds, bank accounts), 119.

Additional Judges for North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BASIL L. WHITENER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, on March 2, 1961, the members of the North Carolina delegation in Congress presented a joint statement before Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives. It was my privilege to speak in behalf of the delegation on the important subject of additional judicial manpower for our State.

We are convinced that the proposal advanced by us in this statement is absolutely essential to the proper administration of justice in our North Carolina Federal courts. We believe that the facts fully justify our request for an additional judge for each of the three Federal judicial districts in North Carolina.

It is my feeling that our colleagues will concur in our thinking if they are fully apprised of the difficult situation now confronting our Federal courts in our State. It is because of this feeling that I request that the joint statement of our delegation be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

JOINT STATEMENT OF THE NORTH CAROLINA CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION PRESENTED ON BEHALF OF THE DELEGATION BY REPRESENTATIVE BASIL L. WHITENER BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON MARCH 2, 1961

The undersigned members of the North Carolina delegation to the U.S. Congress respectfully request that Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Judiciary Committee amend H.R. 2226 entitled "a bill to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges and for other purposes." The bill presently provides for two additional circuit judges for the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and for one additional roving district judge for the State of North Carolina.

We heartily endorse the proposal for the two additional circuit judges. The record clearly shows that this increase is desirable and necessary.

With equal fervor we recommend that the bill be amended to provide for the appointment of three additional district judges to serve the State of North Carolina, with each of our present Federal districts in North Carolina being furnished an additional judge.

The Division of Procedural Studies and Statistics of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts recently made a very illuminating study of the Federal court conditions in the State of North Carolina. In this study it was pointed out that in 1960 the criminal caseload per judgeship in the middle district of North Carolina was the highest in 86 districts and that the criminal caseload during the past 5 years had been running 4 to 6 times higher than the national average per judgeship. It was further pointed out in this report that the criminal caseload in the western district of North Carolina for the past 5 years has exceeded the national average from two to four times.

Addressing itself to the situation in the eastern district of North Carolina during the past 5 years, the report pointed out that usually the criminal caseload per judgeship in this district is the highest in the 86 districts, although in 1960 the caseload was the second highest—the first place going to the middle district of North Carolina—and that this caseload in the middle district is from 4 to 6 times greater than the national average.

In the eastern district the civil caseload during the past 5 years has exceeded the national average. In the middle and western districts during the past 5 years the number of civil cases commenced per judgeship has been slightly lower than the national average, but it has been found that the heavy volume of criminal work confronting the judges in those two districts has presented a great problem in bringing civil and criminal cases to prompt trial.

In each of the three districts in North Carolina the records show a larger than normal number of trials begun. In the middle district during 1960, 167 trials were commenced, in the western district 119 trials were commenced, and in the eastern district 132 trials were commenced, as compared to a national average of 40 cases commenced per judge. These figures do not include the number of cases that were disposed of without trial. We would further point out that during 1960 the number of cases filed in our three North Carolina districts far exceeded the national average of 328 cases per judgeship. In the eastern district there were 772 cases, in the middle district 773 cases, and in the western district 567 cases. This gives a combined overload for the three districts of 1,128 cases more than the national average. When computed against the national average of 328 cases, we find that these 1960 statistics justify 3.44 additional judges in our State. Using the same approach to the 1959 experience in North Carolina Federal

courts as compared to the national average, we can justify 3.78 additional judges in our Federal courts of North Carolina.

Using the eastern district of North Carolina as an illustration of the critical situation existing in our State, we would point out to the committee certain interesting and illuminating facts. The eastern district consists of 44 counties having an area of 24,183 square miles. The area of this district is larger than that of either of the following States: Rhode Island, Delaware, Connecticut, New Jersey, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Vermont, Maryland, and West Virginia.

Furthermore, the population of the eastern district of North Carolina (1,791,880, according to the 1960 census) is nearly equivalent to the combined States of Delaware, New Hampshire, and Rhode Island, with a population of 1,912,701, which three States are served by five U.S. district judges.

The State of West Virginia with an area of 24,080 square miles and a population of 1,860,421 (1960 census) is substantially similar to the eastern district in both area and population. Yet, West Virginia has two districts served by three U.S. district judges.

It is also interesting to note that the States above mentioned, which are comparable in size to the eastern district, have the following available Federal judicial manpower: Rhode Island, one district judge; Delaware, three district judges; Connecticut, two district judges with three additional recommended in H.R. 2226; New Jersey, seven district judges with one additional recommended in H.R. 2226; Massachusetts, five district judges with one additional recommended in H.R. 2226; New Hampshire, one district judge; Vermont, one district judge; Maryland, two district judges with two additional recommended in H.R. 2226; and West Virginia, three district judges.

We would further point out to the subcommittee that the three Federal districts in North Carolina are comparable in the population being served by each of the district courts. In the 44-county eastern district the 1960 population was 1,791,880; in the 28-county middle district the 1960 population was 1,514,918; and in the 28-county western district the 1960 population was 1,249,357. Thus, it will be seen that the total 1960 population being served by these three districts in North Carolina is 4,556,155.

When we compare the judicial manpower available now and as proposed in H.R. 2226 with North Carolina's neighboring States of South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia, we see that a great disparity exists. We hasten to explain that in selecting these neighboring States for discussion we have no intention of intimating that they have an excess of district judges under the present law or under the proposals now being made in H.R. 2226. These States are mentioned merely to show the disparity which exists as far as our State is concerned.

In South Carolina, according to the 1960 census reports, there are 2,382,594 people. The State has two Federal districts with a total of three district judges under the present law. H.R. 2226 provides for an additional district judge for that State, which would mean that there would be four district judges to serve a population of slightly more than one-half of the total population of North Carolina.

In the State of Tennessee there are 3,567,089 people, according to the 1960 census. There are three Federal districts in that State with four district judges now serving. H.R. 2226 provides for three additional judges for the State of Tennessee. Thus it will be seen that enactment of H.R. 2226 would result in that State having 7 judges to serve 1 million fewer people than would be served by a total of 4 district judges which North Carolina would have if H.R. 2226 is passed as now written.

The State of Virginia with a population of 3,966,949 now has 5 Federal district judges. There would be no increase in Virginia's judicial manpower under H.R. 2226. Notwithstanding this, however, it will readily be seen that without any increase in judgeships in Virginia there will still be a great disparity in judicial manpower between North Carolina and Virginia even though H.R. 2226 may be enacted as presently written.

We would further call to the attention of the subcommittee that there has been no change in the Federal court structure in North Carolina since the creation of the middle district in 1927 at which time the latest census figures (1920) showed that North Carolina had a population of 2,559,123.

When the 1920 population is compared to the 1960 population it will readily be seen that North Carolina is a State in which there is little likelihood that there will be any reduction in demands upon the Federal judiciary.

The middle and western districts of North Carolina each serve the area known as the Piedmont. A cursory examination of population trends as reflected by the recent decennial census will indicate that it is one of the faster growing areas in our Nation. It must be recognized, therefore, that the caseload situation confronting the district courts in each of North Carolina's three districts will worsen rather than improve in the future.

We have the firm conviction that the three additional judges apportioned at the rate of one for each of our Federal districts are absolutely necessary to the proper administration of justice by the Federal district courts of North Carolina. Furthermore, we feel that even this relief will be only temporary in nature since all trends and statistics would indicate that in the not-too-distant future it will no doubt become necessary to create an additional district or districts in order to cope with the conditions confronting the Federal courts in our State. This will be particularly true of the eastern district of North Carolina.

We respectfully recommend, therefore, that this subcommittee approve an amendment to H.R. 2226 to provide an additional district judge for each of the three Federal districts in North Carolina.

SAM J. ERVIN, JR., U.S. Senator; B. EVERETT JORDAN, U.S. Senator; HERBERT C. BONNER, Member of Congress, 1st District; L. H. FOUNTAIN, Member of Congress, 2d District; DAVID N. HENDERSON, Member of Congress, 3d District; HAROLD D. COOLEY, Member of Congress, 4th District; RALPH J. SCOTT, Member of Congress, 5th District; HORACE R. KORNEGAY, Member of Congress, 6th District; ALTON LENNON, Member of Congress, 7th District; A. PAUL KITCHIN, Member of Congress, 8th District; HUGH ALEXANDER, Member of Congress, 9th District; CHARLES R. JONAS, Member of Congress, 10th District; BASIL L. WHITENER, Member of Congress, 11th District; ROY A. TAYLOR, Member of Congress, 12th District.

Award in International Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have just been informed that the Creole Petroleum Corp., of New York, has been given an award by the Institute for International Education for distinguished service in international education. The valuable contributions which Creole is making in the vital field of international cooperation can be a fine example to other American enterprises in South America and throughout the world. Free enterprise is especially meaningful in other lands when we can show, in such a concrete way, as Creole has done, that its blessings are not restricted to Americans or American businesses but are available also on a generous basis to help other nations and their citizens.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include the citation received by Creole Petroleum Corp. in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION AWARD FOR DISTINGUISHED SERVICE—CITATION FOR A CORPORATION

To the Creole Petroleum Corp., a U.S. business organization with headquarters in Caracas, Venezuela, the Institute of International Education present its award for distinguished service.

Nearly 25 years ago, in 1937, Creole Petroleum Corp. inaugurated a scholarship program reflecting an early philosophy of service which has guided the company to industrial greatness and to a widely recognized social awareness. By 1960, the corporation's scholarship program had provided a college education to 500 young people, both employees and persons not related to the company.

Creole Petroleum is bringing new dimensions to corporate philanthropy as an investment in human resources. Creole's technical and educational assistance projects in Venezuela, some supported solely by the Creole Foundation and others with private and public agencies, are vital and constructive. For example, the School of Agronomy of the Central University of Venezuela and the University of Florida cooperate in a joint program of agricultural development. The Ministry of Education and the American Broadcasting Foundation work together in pilot educational television programs. The Catholic University Andres Bellos, a private institution, has the help of St. Louis University in its administrative reorganization. Northwestern University and Universidad Central of Caracas pioneered an advanced management program for development of executive talent in Venezuela. The Fundacion La Salle established the first Marine Biology Station to which American and European scientists have come.

Believing that a nation's progress depends upon the availability of schools for its young people, Creole 2 years ago, in cooperation with the Ministry of Education and IIE, initiated a rural teacher training program which promises literacy and education for thousands of Venezuelan children.

The Creole Foundation also has its own scholarship program, not restricted to technical fields. Venezuelans are enrolled, for example, at Yale School of Music, Juilliard and the Ballet Theater School. The collateral Grant program, a unique feature of Creole scholarships, provides supplementary grants to universities in which the fellows are enrolled, to bridge the gap betwen tuition fees and the total cost of instruction.

The Institute believes that the Creole Petroleum Corp. exemplifies enlightened corporate citizenship at home and abroad. The corporation's awareness of the needs and

desires of the nation in which it principally operates, and its wisdom in providing the leadership and financial resources to meet them, merit this award.

More B–58's Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, in the Air Force's Operation Quick Step recently a B–58, running a closed-course race against time, set six official new world speed records. Two days later another B–58 broke three of these new records. Between them, these two B–58 crews set six new world speed records, five of which were previously held by the Russians.

In recognition of their achievement, Major Confer's crew received the coveted Thompson trophy on February 28 in Washington, D.C.

Americans everywhere are proud of the achievements of these young men and of the recognition they have received.

We in the Fort Worth area are particularly proud because both crews are part of the 43d Bomb Wing and are stationed at Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Tex.

While there is general knowledge that such records were set, I think few people know by what margins the new records were established. The new records are almost twice as fast as the old records, as shown by the following table:

The "Quick Step" story

	Payload (kilograms)	Miles per hour			
		Old official record		New B–58 record	
1,000 kilometers (USAF airplane No. 441).	None	USAF F–101	700.47	USAF	1,284.73
	1,000	U.S.S.R.	639.18	USAF	1,284.73
	2,000	U.S.S.R.	639.18	USAF	1,284.73
2,000 kilometers (USAF airplane No. 442).	None	U.S.S.R.	596.47	USAF	1,061.80
	1,000	U.S.S.R.	596.47	USAF	1,061.80
	2,000	U.S.S.R.	596.47	USAF	1,061.80

Yet these official figures do not tell the whole story, for the actual average ground speed on these recordmaking runs was 1,330 miles per hour for airplane No. 441 and 1,130 miles per hour for airplane No. 442.

No other strategic bomber we have can approach the speed of sound—yet the B–58 flies at more than twice the speed of sound.

Its ability to penetrate enemy defenses at these speeds is amazing. The difficulty of defending against it can be compared only with that of an ICBM.

General Power, Commander of SAC, was present at the Thompson Trophy award and commented on this penetration ability, and remarked that he was glad such a weapon was included in SAC.

Less than 5 months ago, at their annual convention, the American Legion adopted the following resolution:

AMERICAN LEGION, NATIONAL CONVENTION URGES STEPUP GROWTH

RESOLUTION NO. 595

Convention Aeronautics and Space Committee—"B–58 Program"

Whereas it is the expressed policy of the Nation to rely heavily for its defense posture on a mix of manned-bombers and missiles; and

Whereas the B–58 is the only supersonic bomber available now and will be our first-line bomber until the B–70 eventually replaces it; and

Whereas the B–58 is being produced at a minimum rate due to limitation of funds; and

Whereas greater numbers of this weapon could be produced at every decreasing individual cost: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the American Legion National Convention assembled in Miami Beach, Fla., October 17–20, 1960, That we urge the Department of Defense to continue production of B–58 Hustler bombers, to increase the number of B–58's in our defense inventory and to encourage the development of more advanced versions.

And in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert here a sound and thoughtful editorial which appeared in the Fort Worth press on February 26, 1961:

MORE B–58's NEEDED

For a decade the great Fort Worth-built B–36 was a mighty weapon and one of America's biggest sticks in helping keep the peace.

Then came the faster B–58, missiles were hurled into outer space. And before you could say "Senate Preparedness Investigation Subcommittee," the Hustler was classified as "an older supersonic bomber."

When the 1962 budget was prepared, no money was provided for making more B–58's. Money was included, however, for the projected B–70 program.

But what about the meantime, the lag between B–58 and B–70 production? It's a 5-year vacant spot.

Old and outmoded or not, the B–58 is the only supersonic bomber now in production for the Air Force. We know the B–58 is good. Two times in recent weeks it broke payload and speed records.

And who could compare the destruction caused by a bomb dropped from an "outmoded" jet with one dropped from a plane on a drawing board? Bombers must still be needed. Otherwise there would be no projected B–70 program.

Tooling, overhead and development costs of the B–58 have been paid for. They now can be built for a little more than $7 million each. That's chickenfeed compared to the cost of the first B–70's that will roll off the line.

We're proud of the fact that the B–58 is made here. But whether it's made here, in New York or Sleepy Eye, Minn., the B–58 still is a good buy.

Like the old B–36, it can help keep the peace.

Let's keep 'em flying.

Proposed Minimum Wage Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. THURMOND. Madam President, two outstanding afternoon newspapers, the Columbia Record, of Columbia S.C., and the Charleston Evening Post, of Charleston, S.C., have recently published editorials on the drive to enact additional minimum wage legislation, and I feel that these editorials should be called to the attention of the Members of this body. One is entitled "Minimum Wage and Compassion," and was published in the March 6, 1961, issue of the Columbia Record. The other, entitled "Behind Minimum-Wage Drive," appeared in the March 2, 1961, issue of the Charleston Evening Post. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorials printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Columbia Record, Mar. 6, 1961]

MINIMUM WAGE AND COMPASSION

A traditional liberal posture, so patently false that it should delude no one, is that conservatives have no compassion for their fellow human beings. Conservatives feel just as deeply about the individual well being of their fellow men as do liberals.

Conservatives realize and know the rich meaning of "inasmuch as ye have done it unto the least of these, my brethren, ye have done it unto me."

Indeed, conservative concern for the weekly paycheck producing the daily bread was shown in the rump session of Congress, and is being felt again now, over the loss of jobs that would be forced by the administration's minimum wage legislation.

Time and again, conservative Congressmen patiently explained to their liberal counterparts how the proposed bill would force curtailment of employment. Time and again, proponents of the measure refused to listen.

We suggest to our readers that they examine the honest statement of a distinguished Carolina businessman, Emert Rice, whose letter is printed on this page. Mr. Rice speaks for many businessmen in this State and elsewhere who, with most profound reluctance, would have to discharge marginal employees.

The alternative to the businessman is extinction. And when the business collapses, not only do marginal employee lose their jobs, but all workers.

Confronted with this situation, Senator Wayne Morse, of Oregon (who coauthored the recent bill with the then Senator Kennedy), was asked by Senator Barry Goldwater what he would do.

Senator MORSE's explanation was quick. The way out, he thinks, is for the Federal Government to subsidize with direct grants all businesses in the United States which could not meet the minimum wage.

No more blatant socialization of American business could be presented.

The Columbia Record believes that every South Carolina worker should be paid an honest day's wages for an honest day's work. But we do sincerely protest that no American engaged solely in intrastate business should want the amount of his paycheck to be determined by the Federal Government.

Nor should any South Carolina firm want to be subsidized, by the Federal Government, which would control, in time, its whole operation.

Freedom, we repeat, of the American worker and the American businessman is at stake in the commerce clause redefinition of the minimum wage bill.

Congress must determine at this fateful hour whether the Federal Government shall control the wages and hours of every laborer and the affairs of the individual business operating within the confines of a single State.

If Congress redefines interstate commerce, it will have transformed American democracy into a welfare state whose borders are marked: "No return."

[From the Charleston Evening Post, March 2, 1961]

BEHIND MINIMUM-WAGE DRIVE

A major objective of the drive to increase the minimum wage was revealed by Joel R. Jacobson, president of the New Jersey State CIO.

Betraying a lamentable ignorance of conditions in the South, he told a Senate subcommittee that the major cause of unemployment in New Jersey was the relocation of industries to "the low-wage, pauperized sections of the South."

To stop the flow of industry to this section, "Congress," he said, "should step up the minimum wage." The Federal Government should, as he sees it, legislate against the industrial development of the South.

There are conflicting figures as to comparative wages of southern and northern workers. We do not know how they actually compare, but we do know that new industries are welcomed in this section and that they have no trouble in attracting willing, efficient employees. And it is a fact, too, that in most southern localities the cost of living is lower than in New Jersey and most other Northern States.

What of unemployment in other northern areas? We presume Mr. Jacobson had in mind the impressive growth of the textile industry in the South. Unemployment is acute in the automobile, coal mining and steel industries, but there has been little or no migration in these lines to the South.

There are various factors which enter into industrial investment. One is the labor-management atmosphere. Virtually all of the Southern States have right-to-work legislation on their books. These are laws under which membership or nonmembership in a labor union may not be a condition of getting or holding a job. It is this protection to workers that accounts for much of the anti-South animus such as voiced by Mr. Jacobson.

The South has attracted only such industries as found conditions here attractive to them. Favorable labor-management relations, the climate, community cooperation, raw materials, power, nearness to markets, transportation, and advantageous sites are among the considerations that have prompted companies to locate here. Such wage differentials as may exist are but a minor factor.

The South, too, has, in some areas, the problem of unemployment, but it is significant that the most acute situations are in States where union membership is widely compulsory, and where labor costs have actually forced some concerns out of business. We cite Michigan, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey as examples. To blame the South for their troubles is as absurd as it is false.

An American Speaks Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, from all sides we hear that the Federal Government must do more in the field of education, to assist our older citizens, to help this segment and that of the economy. We are all sympathetic to these needs, but we must remember that we first take from the people all the money which is used to help them.

We must also remember the rich heritage we have received from the pioneers, the men and women who settled our frontier land, the people who dared to try the new and unknown. We must remember that individual incentive and reward are the cornerstones of our Republic. We must always allow and encourage the individual to provide for himself and his family, keeping the Government role limited to that of assisting those who due to circumstances beyond their control are unable to so provide.

We must never allow the Government through welfare programs or excessive taxation and interference to stifle the individual and his incentives and rewards.

I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a letter I received from Mr. R. W. Lowe of Omaha. Mr. Lowe is typical of the millions of Americans who do not look to Washington for their care and welfare. They want to be left alone, and they want to be left with enough to take care of their own education, medical care, and other problems.

OMAHA, NEBR.,
February 22, 1961.

Representative GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CUNNINGHAM: Frankly, I am fearful about the future. Not because of A-bombs or fallout or missile lags. But because of what the headlines keep telling us about the billions of dollars proposed for socialized medicine, for schools, for the unemployed, for foreign purposes; in fact for everything that can be conjured up that will take money from the taxpayers.

There is no one single thing that will weaken the country faster and more completely than irresponsible fiscal policies.

I have no axe to grind. I'm past 60 years. I am retiring late this year. I've been a public utility worker all my life; consequently, I'm not "well fixed." We have never received any big inheritance. But, we are not poor because we have saved as we went along. We did not ask what someone else—or the Government—should do for us.

Mrs. Lowe and I are both college graduates—by our own efforts and with no Government aid. Our two children are college graduates—by their and our own efforts, too, without Government aid. We have had average sickness and hospital bills and we paid them without Government aid. In fact, I am retiring some early because of a cancer operation about a year ago. We know something about education bills, hospital bills and the expense of operations.

But we saved to meet the requirements of living as we went along. We did not feel we were being punished when we did this. It was our duty as citizens to live so we could take care of ourselves. In fact, it was a privilege and a part of being an American citizen.

However, that privilege is about to be usurped by the great spenders. Why ask, "What you can do for your Government." What's going to be left to do with socialized medicine, federally dominated schools and taxes so outrageously high that the private individual has next to nothing left.

It's plain silly to talk about a strong Nation with prestige and then proceed to weaken it financially beyond recovery. I already know your feelings about this and they are correct. I hope your efforts are successful in keeping the country strong and sound and for the citizens.

Sincerely yours,

R. S. LOWE.

Judicial Patronage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the following editorial which appeared in the Newark, N.J., Evening News on Monday, March 6, 1961, on a very important subject to all American citizens.

JUDICIAL PATRONAGE

A Democratic Congress that for 5 years ignored President Eisenhower's annual plea for new Federal judgeships now, with the haste that only rich patronage can precipitate, is rushing to meet the judicial manpower crisis. And the Senate discovers that the country needs not merely 59 new judges, as President Eisenhower and President Kennedy recommended, but 73 of them.

Like Mr. Eisenhower, President Kennedy accepted the figure set by the Judicial Conference of the United States after a careful survey. The need for 59 new judges can be demonstrated by jammed calendars. But no evidence was offered of the need for 10 more places added by the Senate Judiciary Committee, or for another 4 added on the Senate floor. Indeed, informed opinion is that in most of the areas which will share the extra 14, the volume of business does not justify additional judges.

In his effort to get congressional cooperation in relieving court congestion, President Eisenhower last year offered to divide the nominations between the parties. This would have preserved the nearly equal distribution now existing. The Democrats declined. As House Judiciary Chairman CELLER now candidly admits, they gambled that they would take the Presidency and keep all the new judgeships for themselves, and no nonsense about a bipartisan bench.

President Kennedy has promised to appoint only the best qualified men, a promise reaffirmed last week by his brother, the Attorney General. But the President will be

under heavy party pressure to follow the tradition of victor and spoils, and it will be disappointing, but not surprising, if the best qualified all turn out to be Democrats.

Roosevelt and Fear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the current controversy over the film "Operation Abolition," which is a documentary of the riots on the House Committee on Un-American Activities, I think the Members of the House should read the lead editorial in the Indianapolis News of Wednesday, March 1, 1961:

ROOSEVELT AND FEAR

Congressman JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat, of California, whose attack on the film "Operation Abolition" and its sponsor, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, was televised in the Indianapolis area last week, recently sang the same song in New York. But there was a difference.

In a taped address beamed over WFBM–TV, ROOSEVELT argued that "Operation Abolition" was somehow sinister because it spread fear. It is wrong, he said, to make people afraid of communism—and, admit it, didn't this film make you just a little bit afraid? This argument is about like rebuking someone who tells you your house is on fire: Don't talk to me about it, I don't want to be frightened.

"Operation Abolition" does indeed make people afraid, or concerned, about the danger of communism in the United States, as well it should. Unless a lot more people become a lot more concerned, and soon, we may well lose our country.

ROOSEVELT topped off his argument by saying he did not call for abolition of HUAC—only for modification.

But in a subsequent speech to the New York Civil Liberties Union, ROOSEVELT did call for abolition, pure and simple—and then proceeded to spread a little fear of his own. HUAC and its counterpart in the Senate, he implied, were saddled with white supremacists, who could not perform their investigative duties fairly. He called the committees genuinely subversive.

The purpose of such a statement is clear: To shift attention from the issue of communism, and to frighten American Negroes and other minority groups with the specter of militant racism. Such fearmongering marks something of a milestone; previously it had been directed against the antisubversive committees only by outright Communists and avowed Marxists. Now we find it in the words of a U.S. Congressman.

ROOSEVELT'S allegation is not only untrue, but the very opposite of the truth. We need only to read the publications of the House committee hearings—which are available for the asking—to find that HUAC has repeatedly praised American Negroes as a group and as individuals for their record of resistance to Communist propaganda.

Only a year ago, Joseph Charles Jones, a Negro divinity student from Charleston, S.C., voluntarily appeared as a friendly witness before the committee to expose American Communist tactics used at the Vienna youth festival. And far from being a pawn of southern whites, Jones happens to be a leader of the student sit-in demonstrations in South Carolina.

By attempting to manufacture a phony racial scare in his attack on the House committee, JIMMY ROOSEVELT has done a disservice not only to the committee, but to his country. In this controversy, it would appear that American Negroes have nothing to fear but ROOSEVELT himself.

Captive Nations Week

SPEECH
OF
HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, the observance of Captive Nations Week by the people of these United States demands a renewal of our pledge to the cause of freedom for all peoples in the world. Today the millions behind the Iron Curtain live under the shackles of totalitarian governments. In fact, it is ironical that there are more people living in captive nations today than at any time in modern history. It is ironical because we engaged in two great world conflicts since the turn of the century to insure the freedom and dignity of men everywhere. And yet we who have enjoyed the heritage of freedom too often take it for granted.

The resolution which was presented before this House this week is a true reflection of the deep sentiments not only for freedom-loving Americans but those who detest oppression and its ruthless inconsiderations.

Can we, in our land of freedom, begin to realize how we would feel if we were suddenly to find ourselves a captive nation like Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Bulgaria, or the other nations that now stagger under the burden of the Soviet and Chinese Communist yoke? I submit that this would be difficult, but it is something about which we must think.

We must have definitions of the various types of tyrannies inflicted on these unfortunate peoples, who, like so many of us, must at one time have said to themselves, "It can't happen here." We must understand simple things like the fact that Socialist Russia preceded Soviet Russia; know that Socialist Italy preceded Fascist Italy, and that Socialist Germany preceded Nazi Germany. Then, too, we must recall that, for these nations, it was only one short step for them to take before they suddenly found themselves under the yoke of dictators at the best, or occupied and completely subjugated, at the worst. These socialized countries did not realize what was happening to their beloved lands until it was too late to take effective action and free themselves.

Although sad to recall, many of the presently captive nations once enjoyed freedom, and had civilizations of a high order. Czechoslovakia before World War II was regarded as the best-armed nation in Europe and one of the most prosperous and advanced in education, cultural activities, and industrial development. Yet today we face the fact that that great nation is wallowing in the dismal swamp of hopelessness; it cannot seem to figure out a way to extricate itself from this morass of utter discouragement. Yet some of the best brains in all Europe still live in Czechoslovakia.

Other countries too numerous to mention find themselves in the same frustrated situation. I cite the plight of the Czechs only because we seem to have known more about their country than about others and to have been completely shocked when we realized how rapidly the modern barbarians conquered and then occupied and subjugated them. No less have the other, smaller, and less well-known nations suffered than did Czechoslovakia. Our hearts go out to the Czechs in the long and unreasoning tortures they have suffered, and the personal indignities and regimentation which have all but destroyed their individual personalities and which has made them, to all practical purposes, puppets on the strings of their conquerors, leaving them no choice but to do as they are told.

One of the most effective objectives that Captive Nations Week should have is the teaching of other nations how to recognize and counteract the devious and diabolical schemes of those who would use these methods until they had succeeded in enslaving all of the known civilized world. Mere observance of Captive Nations Week in the future will not be enough; we must devise ways and means of halting the hordes of barbarians. The world has faced this same dilemma many times before. Let us not neglect this opportunity—the same kind of opportunity which other civilizations failed to grasp; their reward has been oblivion.

Celebration of Captive Nations Week, although as yet unofficial in the United States, has been a great source of irritation to the Kremlin; it therefore must be a sound proposal and one toward which all of us should bend our every effort to have enacted into law. The practice of freedom can well prove the Achilles heel for the enslavers of so large a part of the world that only recently enjoyed the same freedoms that we now enjoy in the United States.

It is significant that this Captive Nations Week proposal was adopted and we shall make it a cornerstone in our continuing fight for the freedom of all peoples. The stand that the United States has taken is crystal clear; it is written for all to see in our beloved Declaration of Independence; it is part and parcel of our national fabric; an inextricable part of our national morality; let us offer hope to enslaved nations through it.

Project Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 17, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, it was most gratifying to find tangible evidence that

the mercy ship *Hope* presently in Indonesia is not forgotten in America.

In the congressional district I have the honor to represent, the Seattle Advertising Club, mindful of this human mission of sharing our technological advances in medicine with other peoples of the world, recently contributed $175 to Project Hope. In thus aiding the work of this hospital training ship, the Ad Club passed the following resolution which I know will please the Members of Congress so many of whom have had a deep personal interest in the success of this privately sponsored people-to-people action program:

In recognition of the outstanding contribution of the *Hope* Ship to the betterment of man, to the fulfillment of world peace, and to the building of lasting friendships among the underdeveloped countries of the world, the Seattle Advertising Club and members extend their sincere appreciation and congratulations. It is hoped that this ship will be the forerunner of a "great white fleet" which will extend the hand of fellowship, the precious gift of knowledge, the priceless endowment of hygiene and health, wherever it is needed throughout the world.

Red Slant Reaches 10 Million U.S. Readers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the March 1961 issue of Nation's Business:

RED SLANT REACHES 10 MILLION U.S. READERS—COMMUNISTS PRINT AND IMPORT MANY TONS OF PROPAGANDA IN EFFORT TO GRAB MINDS

Communist publications are doing a booming business in the United States.

Freedom of the press, along with loopholes in our postal and antisubversion laws, allow Communists to print and import more than 10 million newspapers, magazines, pamphlets, and tracts here each year. This is in addition to the Reds' efforts to infiltrate legitimate U.S. publications.

President Kennedy has ordered a review of some aspects of the problem.

Efforts to stem the tide without violating traditional freedoms are underway in Congress. Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, has introduced legislation to tighten up on shipment of Red propaganda from foreign lands to this country. Other lawmakers have proposed denial of bulk mailing rates to Communist publications.

Businessmen can help stamp out the anti-American publications in several ways. The Federal Bureau of Investigation offers these tips:

Be informed. It's easy to identify the Worker as a Communist newspaper, but some Red magazines, for example, may mislead the casual reader. By learning to identify these publications you will be better able to guard against them.

Send them back. The Communists often mail publications at random, hoping to land a subscription. If you send them back, or write the publication demanding to be dropped from the mailing list, you won't get any more. You might also want to check whether such publications are coming to your company without your knowledge. Incidentally, receipt of Communist material does not necessarily mean you will be suspected of subversion. You might be if you encourage it.

Send no money. While the Communists are more interested in promoting their form of government than making money, they won't continue to send materials to noncontributors over a long period. Refusing to give anything to their publications or organizations is one of the best ways of stopping them.

Both foreign and domestic Communist materials cling closely to the international party's line which seeks to discredit the goals of the U.S. Government. But the two types present entirely different problems, each requiring a different remedy.

Communist publications printed in the United States represent only a tiny fraction of the material circulated here. Because they are tied more closely to American life, however, their impact may be greater than that of slicker materials prepared abroad.

HOW REDS TWIST THE TRUTH

Recent issues of the Worker, the party's weekly newspaper, provide some excellent examples of the Communist tactic of seizing on and distorting news events.

Even the weather is used to make the party's point. "A Good Snow Removal Job Requires City Hall Cleanup" was the headline on a story in the Worker. Here are excerpts:

"One full week after the storm, out on main sidewalks, at the front entrances of tenement houses, all the way from a half-dozen to a dozen garbage cans stood, filled to overflowing, uncollected.

"The only exceptions to this disgraceful and disgusting situation were the modern homes and apartments of the well-to-do."

After citing troubles with unheated apartments and transportation snarls, the Worker concluded:

"These problems will not be solved by dependence on the old parties, representing the vested interests. The city administration representing these interests, will only take steps in the people's interests under the organized pressure of the people. More substantial progress will be made to the degree that the common people act together in a new political coalition. The unions, the Negro people's political movement, the Puerto Ricans, the insurgents and liberals provide the ingredients for such a coalition."

This is the type of news the Worker supplies 14,365 subscribers, by its own count. Experts on communism in the United States warn, however, against judging its readership or influence by the relatively low circulation figure. It's known that copies are passed around among several party members and sympathizers. Moreover, it can be bought for 15 cents a copy at newsstands in some larger cities.

Known as the Daily Worker until 3 years ago, when lack of money and other problems forced the Communists to put it on a weekly basis, the Worker is published in New York.

A similar west coast paper, called the People's World, is published in San Francisco. In other major cities, some newspapers in Russian, Lithuanian, Polish and Croatian carry the party line.

New Horizons for Youth, a newspaper launched in 1960, is aimed at attracting young American readers. An editorial in the first issue proclaims: "We are independent of any group and rely on our own efforts."

However, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover in his year-end report to the Attorney General last December said: "Under the editorship of their national youth director, the Communists have begun issuing a special publication. New Horizons for Youth, aimed directly at America's young people."

Circulation figures for the chief Communist magazines produced in the United States seem negligible, but they, like the Worker, are usually shared by many persons. The slick, pocketsized Political Affairs claims only 1,028 paid subscriptions, while Mainstream, a cultural magazine, lists only 3,000. Both have been declared to be Communist publications in official statements of Federal authorities.

WHAT RED OFFICIALS WRITE

In the past year, Political Affairs has published articles by such Communist leaders as Gus Hall, chairman of the national party, on "Our Sights to the Future"; Hyman Lumer, its educational director, on "U.S. Imperialism and the Congo"; and Claude Lightfoot, a Chicago party official, on "The Negro Question Today."

Mainstream relies heavily on highbrow articles and poetry by foreigners, and twists selected passages from well-known authors to make the party's point.

Red printing presses also turn out an endless stream of pamphlets dealing with current events or party doctrine.

"The party wants mass readership," Mr. Hoover notes. "Communist literature is today being sold for 5, 10, 20, 25, and 35 cents. Even these prices are considered too high."

Unlike other publishers, the Communists are not interested in making a profit. Their aim is to influence readers and promote Red doctrine. None of the magazines carries advertising, and the Worker generally publishes only notices of meetings, tributes to comrades, and memorials to party leaders or deceased relatives. This ad is typical: "Dinner to help * * * win back his citizenship. Donation $1, musical program."

To make up the deficit in advertising revenue, the Worker conducts a constantly frantic fund-raising campaign. Last November and December, for example, it beseeched readers to send in $25,000 or "the voice of truth" would be stilled. Actually, authorities on communism say the party's general funds must carry most of the financial load of its publications. Just how much is involved is not disclosed, but Mr. Hoover calls the publishing activity a multihundred-thousand-dollar operation.

Government officials, in and out of Congress, concede little can be done to stem the publication of subversive material in this country. The First Amendment's guarantee of freedom of the press protects Communist as well as other publications. But some Congressmen contend that the Red propaganda should at least pay its way in the mails. So far, their efforts to deny such publications the right to use bulk rates provided for other newspapers and magazines have not been successful.

Some of the more arrogant leaflets sneer at the freedoms that permit their circulation here.

Things would be different if Communists gained control of the United States, according to a pamphlet entitled, "The Free Press, Portrait of a Monopoly."

In Russia, it claims, there is real freedom of the press—for "the organizations of the people, such as trade unions, cultural and scientific organizations, etc.

"There is, however, no freedom of the press for rent-collecting landlords, bankers, industrial monopolists. The Soviet press is frankly not a formally democratic press but a press of the working people."

Imported Communist publications present still other problems.

In volume, they far outweigh domestic Red materials. Irving Fishman, deputy collector of customs at the port of New York, reports that approximately 6 million packages containing about 10 million copies of Communist printed matter were imported in 1959.

That's an 18-percent increase over the year before, and about double the 1955 volume. Moreover, it does not include first-class mail, which can't be intercepted without permission of the recipient. Mr. Fishman estimates that 125,000 individual envelopes of this type of material are received each month at New York alone.

TARGET: YOUNG AMERICANS

Much of the foreign Communist material is directed at young people in the United States. In 1959, 380,000 packages, containing about 580,000 items, were addressed to students, schools or colleges. The volume has been increasing at the rate of almost 40 percent a year.

Shipments from Red China and through Latin America also have been increasing rapidly, officials say, while the volume from Europe has dropped. The Customs Bureau had to set up a screening unit in New Orleans to handle the flood of propaganda coming in from the south.

Representative WALTER'S legislation would close some of the loopholes in the present laws covering such imports. Each copy is supposed to be labeled as propaganda, so recipients will be aware of its origin. However, the law does not provide for this labeling before importation, and customs officials are unable to check every shipment, so many items undoubtedly slip through.

In addition, bulk shipments to foreign agents here need not be labeled, and it's believed most of them do not label the individual pieces when they mail them out. Finally, shipments made through friendly countries need not be labeled. The Communists are taking advantage of this loophole to send much of their material through Latin America, Canada, and non-Communist European countries.

Hon. W. F. Norrell

SPEECH
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1961

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, the sudden passing of our gentle colleague, Representative W. F. NORRELL, on February 15, came to me as a great shock. BILL NORRELL and I served together on the House Appropriations Committee for many years. During that time, I learned to know him not only as a friend, but as a good Christian and a man of conscience.

This country can little afford to lose a man so dedicated to the public interest as Congressman NORRELL. The years of our association has brought home to me the thought that of my many congressional associates, he was the man to be respected because of his wisdom, admired because of his strength, and loved because of his devotion to God and America.

To his family goes my heartfelt sympathy; to the Nation he so notably served, my prayers.

Amerigo Vespucci

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 17, 1961

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I think it safe to assume that when the name of Christopher Columbus is mentioned most of us have a fairly clear idea of the identity of the individual referred to. But I am bold enough to hazard the guess that when we refer to the official name of our country, the United States of America, some of us might be a little vague concerning the derivation of the last word, as applied to the two western continents. At any rate, I feel it will do no harm to refresh our memories as to why we are called the United States of America and hence are Americans and not Columbians.

Amerigo Vespucci was born, probably on March 9, 1451, or 1452, the son of a Florentine notary. A clerk in the commercial office of the Medici, the great banking family of Florence, Vespucci seems generally to have resided in Spain, especially in Cadiz and Seville, no doubt as an agent of the Medici. It is recorded that he acquired "an excellent practical knowledge of astronomy" and was the greatest expert of his day in the calculation of latitude and longitude, and made an avocation of geography and the collection of globes, charts, and maps. As contractor to the Spanish Crown for the fitting out of vessels, it is probable that Vespucci participated in the organization of Columbus' second voyage in 1493.

Our knowledge of Vespucci's voyages are based on his own letters, which are sketchy and generally believed to be unreliable, as they are in part contradictory. All the originals have been lost. Despite his reputation as the greatest expert of his day in the calculation of latitude and longitude, his accounts of all of his four voyages to the New World, beginning with the first one in 1497, are hopelessly confused and there is no telling just what landfalls he made. His letters, it should be added, are cursory and informal and not in the nature of official reports. In a letter written probably to one Pietro Soderini, chief magistrate of Florence, dated September 4, 1504, he gives an account of the four voyages he says he made; in the first, that of 1497, he says that after running to the Canaries, the expedition made land 1,000 leagues to the southwestward from those islands and then proceeded to coast for 870 leagues along a shore so extensive that it was though to be a continent; passed 37 days in a fine harbor and then returned to Spain. It has been surmised that Vespucci possibly might have sailed from Cape Honduras to a point not far from Cape Canaveral, Fla. If this is so, then he did indeed touch the continent which, however, like Columbus a year later, he thought to be that of Asia.

From this letter, supposedly to the Florentine magistrate, of which four printed copies exist, without place or date, but probably written before 1507, a French version was made, and from this one in Latin, printed in Lorraine in April 1507, which was immediately made use of by Martin Waldseemüller, professor of cosmography in St. Dié University. Because in some of the earlier reprints of Vespucci's letters the title, or introduction, bore the words "Mundus Novus"—New World. Waldseemüller made the first suggestion in a printed book that the newly discovered fourth part of the world "should be called America, because Americus discovered it."

But this is by no means certain, in fact, since Alexander von Humboldt, founder of the science of physical geography (for whom the Humboldt Current is named) published his great work in 1837, scientific and scholarly opinion has generally inclined to the belief, according to Sir Charles Raymond Beazley, contributor to the article on Vespucci in the Encyclopaedia Britannica, that the Florentine had no part at all in the discovery of the continents and the isthmus which now bear his name.

Be that as it may, our republic remains the United States of America—and may the name long figure on the maps and in the histories of this our world.

Employment and Unemployment in New England and Northeastern Labor Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following fact sheet compiled by the Area Employment Expansion Committee of New York City which is a complete recapitulation of unemployment rates by areas in New England and the northeastern labor markets, both large and small areas. These figures certainly support the need for early adoption of the depressed areas bill now before the Congress. The Senate is scheduled to turn its attention to this legislative program this week and it is my hope that the House will take action on this bill very soon. All supporters of the depressed areas bill can feel optimistic this year because the President has indicated he will sign the measure, unlike the past when we suffered two defeats by Presidential veto.

The fact sheet follows:

Fact sheet No. 38–G.—Employment and unemployment in New England and northeastern labor markets, 1960

Region, State, labor market	Month of report	Civilian labor force	Unemployment	Months of substantial labor surplus			Rates of unemployment [1] (1960)						Annual average rates of unemployment				
				1958	1959	1960	July	August	September	October	November	December	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960
NEW ENGLAND																	
Connecticut	December 1960	1,090,000	65,800	------	5	3	6.1	5.3	5.0	5.2	5.4	6.0	------	------	------	------	------
Major:																	
Bridgeport	do	146,500	10,300	12	8	12	7.7	6.3	6.3	6.8	6.4	7.0	2.2	3.9	10.8	7.9	6.8
Hartford	do	277,800	12,700	0	0	0	4.6	4.6	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.6	------	------	------	------	------
New Britain	do	47,300	4,400	12	11	12	8.2	8.5	7.0	8.2	8.1	9.3	2.3	3.9	11.3	7.5	7.3
New Haven	do	145,600	7,100	11	3	0	5.1	4.5	4.1	4.1	4.5	4.9	1.5	2.5	6.9	5.2	4.7
Stamford	do	75,700	2,100	0	0	0	2.6	2.3	2.2	2.4	2.5	2.8	------	------	------	------	------
Waterbury	do	79,200	6,600	12	5	11	8.5	8.3	6.4	6.8	7.5	8.3	3.1	5.3	10.9	6.4	7.2
Smaller:																	
Ansonia	do	14,700	1,500	12	12	12	10.9	8.8	8.8	9.5	9.5	10.2	4.5	5.5	12.3	9.3	------
Bristol	do	20,500	2,900	12	12	12	13.7	12.2	9.9	11.9	12.8	14.1	------	8.3	19.1	11.1	------
Danbury	do	32,600	2,100	10	4	7	6.6	4.6	5.0	5.3	6.2	6.4	------	------	------	------	------
Danielson	do	17,400	1,800	12	11	12	9.8	7.0	7.1	8.2	9.8	10.3	5.8	7.9	12.1	8.3	------
Meriden	do	40,900	3,400	12	8	12	9.8	7.0	6.3	6.6	7.4	8.3	------	5.2	12.0	7.2	------
Middletown	do	32,100	2,000	12	8	8	6.4	6.5	5.6	5.9	5.6	6.2	------	4.2	8.7	7.3	------
New London	do	43,200	1,700	0	0	0	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.5	3.7	3.9	------	------	------	------	------
Norwalk	do	35,000	1,600	0	0	0	4.3	3.1	3.4	3.4	3.7	4.6	------	7.2	11.1	8.3	------
Norwich	do	22,100	2,000	12	12	11	8.0	6.3	6.7	8.0	8.6	9.0	------	------	------	------	------
Thompsonville	May 1960	27,000	1,400	12	11	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
Torrington	December 1960	26,900	2,400	12	8	12	9.1	6.4	6.4	6.8	7.3	8.9	5.2	5.5	12.0	8.1	------
Willimantic	do	16,700	1,200	12	7	8	7.9	5.6	6.1	5.8	6.1	7.2	------	------	------	------	------
Maine	do	371,800	27,700	------	6	7	4.6	4.5	4.5	5.2	6.6	7.5	------	------	------	------	------
Major: Portland	do	62,700	3,900	10	7	5	4.8	4.8	4.4	4.6	5.9	6.2	4.4	4.8	7.9	6.7	6.0
Smaller:																	
Biddeford-Sanford	do	25,000	2,200	12	12	12	6.5	6.1	6.3	7.8	8.1	8.8	11.1	9.8	14.4	16.7	------
Lewiston-Auburn	do	33,100	2,500	12	8	12	6.1	6.1	6.4	8.8	9.3	7.6	------	6.6	10.5	8.3	------
Very small:																	
Calais	August 1960	2,800	160	------	------	------	------	5.6	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
Eastport	do	3,400	150	------	------	------	------	4.4	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
Massachusetts	December 1960	2,209,920	[2] 139,225	------	2	4	5.8	4.7	4.6	4.5	5.2	6.3	------	------	------	------	------
Major:																	
Boston	do	1,033,940	[2] 46,527	0	0	0	4.5	3.8	3.6	3.4	3.9	4.5	------	------	------	------	------
Brockton	do	58,100	[2] 4,183	12	8	8	8.5	4.9	5.3	4.9	5.5	7.2	4.4	5.8	8.6	7.1	7.6
Fall River, Mass.-R.I	do	58,460	[2] 6,431	12	11	12	11.4	7.5	7.7	7.1	8.5	11.0	6.3	10.6	12.3	8.3	9.5
Lawrence	do	61,250	[2] 5,084	12	9	8	8.3	4.9	4.8	5.2	6.4	8.3	10.1	9.0	10.4	7.3	6.9
Lowell	do	53,770	[2] 5,054	12	12	12	9.8	7.0	7.1	6.8	7.1	9.4	6.7	7.0	11.0	9.0	8.8
New Bedford	do	69,530	[2] 8,205	12	12	12	9.7	7.4	7.5	7.6	8.7	11.8	6.1	6.6	10.8	9.1	9.1
Springfield-Holyoke	do	201,310	[2] 15,098	12	7	12	7.1	6.3	6.3	6.1	6.8	7.5	8.4	4.8	8.1	6.8	7.2
Worcester	do	128,540	[2] 8,998	12	7	5	5.6	4.9	4.8	5.0	6.0	7.0	2.8	4.2	8.9	6.9	5.9
Smaller:																	
Newburyport	do	13,390	[2] 1,393	12	9	12	9.1	7.3	7.9	7.9	8.4	10.4	------	------	------	------	------
North Adams	do	16,690	[2] 2,086	12	12	12	11.0	9.8	10.4	10.1	11.9	12.5	6.1	7.6	16.2	13.4	------
Southbridge-Webster	do	22,680	[2] 2,767	12	9	11	7.3	7.2	8.1	9.5	10.7	12.2	4.6	7.6	10.7	7.5	------
Very small:																	
Athol	do	12,470	985	12	3	4	5.1	4.7	3.6	4.0	5.2	7.9	------	------	------	------	------
Attleboro	do	33,510	1,575	------	0	0	5.4	4.2	3.9	3.5	3.9	4.7	------	------	------	------	------
Very small																	
Fitchburg	do	43,910	23,162	11	3	2	6.2	4.9	4.7	4.5	5.2	7.2	------	------	------	------	------
Framingham	do	34,840	[2] 1,812	------	0	0	3.8	3.6	3.7	3.4	4.2	5.2	------	------	------	------	------
Gardner	do	12,290	[2] 971	12	3	2	6.6	4.0	3.7	3.4	5.8	7.9	------	------	------	------	------
Gloucester	do	11,320	[2] 2,196	9	10	11	8.0	5.5	6.0	7.9	12.1	19.4	------	------	------	------	------
Greenfield	do	16,180	[2] 1,197	12	6	6	6.1	5.4	5.1	4.3	5.9	7.4	------	------	------	------	------
Haverhill	do	22,130	[2] 1,284	12	7	5	6.5	4.7	5.9	5.6	5.6	5.8	------	------	------	------	------
Hyannis	do	15,340	[2] 1,703	6	6	6	1.4	1.3	1.5	3.5	6.4	11.1	------	------	------	------	------
Lynn	do	56,720	[2] 3,403	------	3	5	6.1	5.3	5.3	5.8	5.9	6.0	------	------	------	------	------
Marlboro	do	21,700	[2] 1,411	12	3	4	4.1	3.5	4.4	4.5	4.8	6.5	------	------	------	------	------
Milford	do	24,190	[2] 2,540	12	9	11	7.2	6.0	6.3	7.9	10.0	10.5	------	------	------	------	------
Norwood	do	33,650	[2] 1,683	------	0	0	3.7	3.3	3.1	3.0	3.8	5.0	------	------	------	------	------
Pittsfield	do	40,240	[2] 2,334	12	4	3	3.4	3.0	3.7	4.0	4.7	5.8	------	------	------	------	------
Plymouth	do	7,640	[2] 833	12	9	9	6.0	5.3	5.4	3.7	8.0	10.9	------	------	------	------	------
Salem	do	56,300	[2] 2,871	------	0	0	5.3	4.2	4.2	3.4	3.7	5.1	------	------	------	------	------
Taunton	do	27,700	[2] 1,717	12	4	5	7.7	4.4	4.1	3.7	4.8	6.2	------	------	------	------	------
Ware	do	15,130	[2] 1,316	12	4	12	7.7	7.4	7.6	7.2	7.3	8.7	------	------	------	------	------
Rhode Island:																	
Major: Providence	November 1960	333,500	24,900	12	11	12	7.6	7.2	7.1	7.0	7.5	------	8.0	9.8	12.9	9.0	7.6
Vermont	December 1960	[3] 147,308	9,575	6	0	1	3.4	3.2	3.5	4.1	4.7	6.5	------	------	------	------	------
Very small:																	
Barre-Montpelier	do	[2] 26,563	1,700	------	0	1	2.6	2.1	2.5	3.2	3.8	6.4	------	------	------	------	------
Bennington	do	[2] 9,890	900	------	0	4	3.5	3.0	3.0	4.0	5.6	9.1	------	------	------	------	------
Brattleboro	do	[2] 8,125	650	------	0	3	4.9	4.9	4.3	5.2	6.2	8.0	------	------	------	------	------
Burlington	do	[2] 26,917	1,550	------	0	1	3.7	3.8	4.3	4.3	4.4	6.0	------	------	------	------	------
Middlebury	do	[2] 7,353	500	------	1	4	2.7	2.0	2.0	2.0	4.1	6.8	------	------	------	------	------
Newport	do	[2] 8,125	650	------	5	6	4.9	5.6	5.6	6.2	7.4	8.0	------	------	------	------	------
Rutland	do	[2] 17,442	750	------	3	0	3.4	3.0	2.9	3.4	3.4	4.3	------	------	------	------	------
Springfield	do	[2] 15,789	600	------	0	0	1.9	2.2	2.6	2.7	2.9	3.8	------	------	------	------	------
St. Albans	do	[2] 11,111	700	------	0	1	3.2	3.2	4.1	4.5	5.0	6.3	------	------	------	------	------
St. Johnsbury	do	[2] 10,000	1,100	12	6	8	5.5	4.5	5.0	6.8	8.0	11.0	------	------	------	------	------
White River Junction	do	[2] 7,661	475	------	0	1	2.6	3.2	3.9	4.9	5.2	6.2	------	------	------	------	------
New Hampshire	do	[2] 243,750	11,700	------	0	------	3.6	3.5	3.6	3.7	4.0	4.8	------	------	------	------	------
Smaller:																	
Berlin	do	[2] 14,493	1,000	------	4	4	4.0	4.7	4.5	4.1	5.2	6.9	------	------	------	------	------
Claremont	do	[2] 19,355	1,200	------	2	1	3.3	3.5	3.8	4.2	4.7	6.2	------	------	------	------	------
Concord	do	[2] 26,470	900	------	0	0	2.4	2.2	2.0	2.4	2.6	3.4	------	------	------	------	------
Dover	do	[2] 25,000	900	------	0	0	3.6	2.6	2.4	2.6	3.0	3.6	------	------	------	------	------
Keene	do	[2] 18,750	750	------	0	0	3.5	3.5	3.7	3.7	4.0	4.0	------	------	------	------	------
Laconia	do	[2] 18,888	850	------	0	0	2.6	2.8	2.8	3.2	3.5	4.5	------	------	------	------	------
Littleton	do	[2] 9,375	600	------	3	1	2.6	2.6	3.2	3.7	5.3	6.4	------	------	------	------	------
Manchester	do	[2] 51,724	3,000	------	0	0	5.2	5.2	5.5	5.3	5.4	5.8	------	------	------	------	------
Nashua	do	[2] 31,250	1,500	------	0	0	3.6	3.2	3.1	3.2	3.7	4.8	------	------	------	------	------
Portsmouth	do	[2] 27,777	1,000	------	0	0	3.3	2.9	3.2	2.9	3.0	3.6	------	------	------	------	------

Footnotes at end of table.

Fact sheet No. 38–G.—Employment and unemployment in New England and northeastern labor markets, 1960—Continued

Region, State, labor market	Month of report	Civilian labor force	Unemployment	Months of substantial labor surplus			Rates of unemployment [1] (1960)						Annual average rates of unemployment				
				1958	1959	1960	July	August	September	October	November	December	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960
MIDDLE ATLANTIC STATES																	
New Jersey:	November 1960	2,458,000	159,200	------	7	9	6.8	6.4	5.7	5.7	6.5	7.5	------	------	------	------	------
Major:																	
Atlantic City	do	61,400	6,900	12	9	9	5.6	------	5.3	------	11.2	------	9.4	9.4	11.3	10.1	10.0
Jersey City	do	304,800	20,400	------	------	12	6.9	------	6.4	------	6.7	------	------	------	------	6.7	6.9
Newark	do	792,200	46,500	12	7	7	6.5	------	5.4	------	5.9	------	4.9	5.1	8.3	6.7	6.9
Paterson	do	442,600	27,300	12	7	11	7.6	------	5.6	------	6.2	------	5.2	5.5	9.0	6.9	6.7
Perth-Amboy-Somerville.[3]	do	208,200	11,900	12	4	4	6.2	------	5.0	------	5.7	------	4.1	4.3	8.4	6.1	5.9
Trenton	do	124,300	7,500	12	6	7	6.8	------	5.7	------	6.0	------	5.7	5.6	8.8	6.8	6.2
Smaller:																	
Bridgeton	do	45,600	3,450	12	10	11	7.1	------	5.2	5.7	7.6	------	8.8	8.7	9.7	10.1	------
Camden	do	240,400	16,600	12	5	7	6.1	------	5.7	------	6.9	------	------	------	------	------	------
Flemington	do	20,550	1,200	12	4	4	6.5	------	5.6	------	5.8	------	------	------	------	------	------
Long Branch	do	132,100	11,100	12	10	12	7.4	------	7.1	------	8.4	------	6.7	6.6	9.5	8.2	------
Morristown-Dover	May 1960	96,200	3,650	12	3	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
Phillipsburg	Nov. 1960	28,400	1,550	12	4	0	5.8	------	4.9	------	5.5	------	------	------	------	------	------
Salem	do	24,600	1,200	0	5	2	4.2	------	4.2	------	4.9	------	------	------	------	------	------
Sussex	do	16,100	1,100	------	------	------	7.1	------	6.0	------	6.8	------	------	------	------	------	------
Wildwood	do	16,800	2,450	12	11	12	6.4	------	7.3	------	14.6	------	------	------	------	------	------
New York State	do	7,700,000	457,000	------	------	------	6.1	5.4	5.2	5.3	5.9	------	------	------	------	------	------
Major:																	
Albany-Schenectady-Troy.	December 1960	271,500	19,000	12	9	10	7.0	6.4	5.7	5.5	6.7	7.0	3.6	3.9	6.9	7.1	6.9
Binghamton	do	95,200	4,300	8	3	3	4.4	4.1	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.5	3.3	2.8	6.0	5.1	5.0
Buffalo	do	527,300	52,000	12	12	12	8.3	8.8	7.5	7.5	8.5	9.9	4.0	4.5	11.0	9.5	8.1
New York-metropolitan.	do	5,516,100	341,600	12	7	3	6.0	5.0	4.9	5.0	5.4	6.2	5.1	5.2	7.4	6.2	5.7
Rochester	do	261,100	9,600	6	3	0	3.3	2.9	2.7	2.7	2.9	3.7	------	------	------	------	------
Syracuse	do	226,400	16,200	12	5	6	6.0	5.9	5.4	4.7	6.0	7.2	3.3	3.8	7.8	6.4	5.9
Utica-Rome	do	133,500	13,100	12	12	12	8.1	7.2	6.4	6.6	8.1	9.8	5.5	5.4	10.4	8.5	8.2
Smaller:																	
Amsterdam	do	22,900	3,300	12	12	12	------	8.7	------	------	13.1	14.1	8.8	8.7	9.7	10.1	------
Auburn	September 1960	25,400	2,300	12	12	12	10.5	------	9.1	------	------	------	6.7	6.6	9.5	8.2	------
Elmira	December 1960	40,900	2,800	12	10	6	4.8	4.2	4.1	4.7	6.0	6.8	------	6.8	11.7	8.3	------
Gloversville	May 1960	23,200	3,550	12	12	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	14.4	19.5	12.1	------
Jamestown-Dunkirk	September 1960	63,600	3,700	12	12	------	8.1	------	5.8	------	------	------	------	3.9	11.8	9.4	------
Newburg-Middletown Beacon.	May 1960	77,500	6,300	12	12	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	6.9	9.5	7.9	------
Ogdensburg-Massena-Malone.	June 1960	54,700	4,500	12	12	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	12.9	10.3	------
Plattsburgh	August 1960	21,400	1,800	10	12	12	10.8	8.4	------	------	------	------	------	------	10.4	10.6	------
Wellsville	October 1960	14,800	900	8	12	------	------	------	------	6.1	------	------	------	4.5	9.5	7.2	------
Pennsylvania	November 1960	4,604,200	381,000	------	------	------	7.7	7.2	7.4	------	8.3	------	------	------	------	------	------
Major:																	
Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton.	December 1960	219,300	18,300	12	4	5	5.3	4.7	4.9	5.1	6.2	8.3	2.7	3.5	7.9	6.7	5.8
Altoona	do	[3] 52,991	6,200	12	12	12	11.4	------	11.1	11.7	12.3	11.7	8.9	10.4	16.4	11.2	10.4
Erie	do	96,500	11,600	12	12	12	8.3	8.4	8.4	8.2	9.4	12.1	------	------	------	------	------
Harrisburg	do	166,400	9,900	5	1	0	4.3	4.0	4.7	4.3	4.7	5.9	5.3	6.6	12.8	10.8	9.1
Johnstown	do	[3] 94,048	15,800	12	12	12	11.6	------	12.6	13.7	15.3	16.8	8.6	6.6	15.5	15.1	11.9
Lancaster	do	119,500	6,000	------	0	0	3.3	3.1	3.1	3.3	3.9	5.0	------	------	------	------	------
Philadelphia	do	1,850,500	131,500	12	5	5	5.8	5.9	5.8	5.8	6.0	7.1	5.6	5.4	7.7	3.3	6.0
Pittsburgh	do	943,400	109,000	12	12	12	9.8	9.4	10.4	10.7	11.5	11.6	4.6	4.4	11.1	9.4	9.3
Reading	do	123,600	7,200	12	4	0	5.2	4.9	4.3	4.5	4.6	5.8	4.0	4.7	8.3	5.6	4.8
Scranton	do	96,100	11,900	12	12	12	11.9	11.6	10.3	11.0	11.9	12.4	11.0	11.2	16.2	14.6	12.0
Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton	do	133,500	18,700	12	12	12	13.7	12.7	11.8	12.5	13.2	14.0	12.7	11.4	16.2	15.5	14.6
York	do	105,800	7,100	12	8	6	6.4	5.6	5.4	5.3	5.9	6.7	4.6	5.9	7.4	6.8	6.0
Smaller:																	
Berwick-Bloomsburg	November 1960	22,000	2,200	12	12	12	10.0	------	7.3	8.6	10.0	------	8.7	9.3	14.7	10.5	------
Butler	do	34,300	4,000	12	12	9	7.1	------	9.0	------	11.7	------	------	3.2	12.9	10.4	------
Clearfield-DuBois	do	35,600	4,600	12	12	12	9.8	------	12.2	------	12.9	------	6.4	6.3	14.2	15.1	------
Indiana	do	21,500	2,200	------	12	12	9.6	------	8.3	------	10.2	------	5.3	------	9.9	9.2	------
Kittanning-Ford City	do	21,900	3,500	------	12	12	14.2	13.8	13.2	------	16.0	------	6.3	------	19.3	16.4	------
Lewistown	do	22,300	2,200	11	12	12	8.4	------	8.1	------	9.9	------	6.7	7.7	12.8	7.4	------
Lock Haven	do	------	------	12	10	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
Meadville	do	23,200	2,700	------	12	12	7.1	------	7.2	9.1	11.6	------	------	------	13.5	10.6	------
New Castle	do	38,500	5,500	12	12	12	12.4	------	12.0	------	14.3	------	------	4.8	15.2	11.0	------
Oil City-Franklin-Titusville.	do	29,600	2,700	12	12	12	6.7	------	7.5	------	9.1	------	------	4.3	11.4	9.5	------
Pottsville	do	76,100	13,900	12	12	12	18.9	------	16.4	------	18.3	------	15.9	14.6	18.1	15.4	------
St. Marys-Emporium	do	17,000	1,600	------	12	12	9.4	11.5	7.0	------	9.4	------	------	------	12.0	10.7	------
Sayre-Athens-Towanda	do	19,500	1,500	12	12	12	6.3	------	6.5	------	7.7	------	------	6.1	12.8	8.4	------
Sunbury-Shamokin-Mount Carmel.	do	61,600	6,400	11	12	12	10.6	9.1	8.8	------	10.4	------	------	------	------	8.7	------
Uniontown-Connellsville.	do	45,700	10,200	12	12	12	23.5	------	21.4	------	22.3	------	15.3	14.9	24.6	20.8	------
Smaller:																	
Williamsport	do	44,000	3,300	12	12	12	6.3	------	6.1	------	7.5	------	------	7.5	10.0	7.8	------
Youngstown (Ohio)-Sharon-Farrell, Pa.	do	48,600	4,700	12	4	10	9.1	------	8.1	------	9.7	------	8.3	7.6	11.8	11.4	------

[1] Percent of civilian labor force.
[2] Estimated.
[3] Includes New Brunswick and Plainfield.

Source: State employment security agencies.

Bulgarian Liberation Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, March 3 was Bulgarian Liberation Day. We in America are blessed with the privilege of commemorating this day in a land where freedom abounds. The greatest danger to this freedom, in fact, may be that we take the precious gifts of liberty and independence so much for granted. I feel confident, however, that Americans of Bulgarian descent will never make this mistake. They feel too deeply the loss of liberty suffered by their friends and relatives behind the Iron Curtain.

For them Bulgarian Liberation Day is more than a commemoration of the events of the past. It is also a symbol of dedication to the task of strengthening freedom in our own country and restoring it where it has been lost abroad. It is an expression of hope that someday all people everywhere will enjoy the material abundance, the human dignity, and the political freedom which are our privileges.

Let us review the events which brought about the day we commemorated. What was the course of history which brought liberation from one alien ruler, only to be later lost to the current Communist tyranny?

The Bulgarian people, let us not forget, enjoyed a large measure of freedom and independence in their own kingdom during the Middle Ages. Theirs was a formidable force to be reckoned with in southeast European affairs. They exerted their full weight in Balkan events. But the uneasy and precarious balance of power in the area changed late in the Middle Ages with the appearance of a new force in the Balkans. This new force was the entrance of the Ottoman Turks in the 14th century. It spelled disaster to all nationalities there. The Balkan countries were overrun and their inhabitants were brought under the yoke of autocratic Ottoman sultans. Bulgaria in its turn became a province of the Ottoman Empire late in the 14th century, and the Bulgarians the unwilling subjects of the Sultans.

Thenceforth for nearly five centuries, until the 1870's, Bulgarians endured the heavy and oppressive yoke of the Sultans. During all that time they were governed by callous and ruthless agents. They suffered hardships, indignities, inequities, insults, and even abject serfdom. The peasants were taxed to the point of bankruptcy, and many families were robbed of their dear male children because the obnoxious and inhuman method of child taxing, imposed on Christian families, seemed the only way of providing the Ottoman army with its elite corps—the Janissaries. From these harassments there seemed to be no escape for the Bulgarian people. They staged many rebellions, but each attempt was suppressed with increased fury, often with barbaric ferocity. It was, however, world reaction to one of these atrocious deeds of the Turks which finally brought liberation to the Bulgarian people.

In the 1870's the Balkan peoples took up arms against their overlords. In 1876 the Bulgarians rose in revolt. As before, Turkish soldiery fell upon the innocent, massacring thousands of youths, men, and women, indiscriminately. When the news of this bloodbath reached the outside world public opinion everywhere was shocked. Russians, under the lead of the czarist government, proposed drastic measures, even intervention, to prevent the recurrence of such terrible deeds. But the governments of other European powers were not prepared for such a step. In the end, Russia actively intervened. It declared war on the Turks early in 1877 and fought them with the help of the Balkan peoples. By early 1878 the Turkish forces were defeated on all fronts. The treaty of peace signed on March 3 provided for Bulgaria's liberation.

But that day did not bring complete independence. Sovereign independence was attained only in 1909. But March 3 of 1878 was a good beginning, and it is appropriate we should mark that day. Thenceforth Bulgarians worked for their full political independence.

Even after independence, however, the Bulgarians were fated to lead a rather stormy life. The Balkan Wars of 1912–13 and the two World Wars proved ruinous and tragic. In the first war they were victorious initially and extended Bulgarian territory. However, their allies turned against them and they lost to their partners more than they had gained. I need not recount how in both World Wars Bulgaria was on the losing side. Nevertheless, after 1918, even though their land was truncated, many Bulgarians were reconciled to their situation, hoping to make some gradual territorial adjustments with their neighbors through peaceful means.

Then came the Second World War, bringing with it more misery and misfortune and eventual enslavement under Communist totalitarian tyranny. Once drawn behind the ever-tightening Iron Curtain, Bulgaria became, for all practical purposes, part and parcel of the Soviet Union. The Bulgarian people were completely cut off from the outside and the free world, and were compelled to orient their government, their lives, even their thinking to that of the Soviet Union. Liberty has been denied to them by the Communists tyrants in their own homeland.

Here in America, Bulgarians of U.S. nationality enjoy a very different sort of life. We respect the contributions they have made and are making to our great country; and we know they will continue to join with all of us in building this great democracy. And we join them in looking forward to the day when Bulgaria will be master in her own house.

Wales, the Cradle of Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1961

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously obtained to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include herein an address entitled "Wales, the Cradle of Liberty," delivered by Benjamin Owen, a member of the Welsh Cambrian Society of Arizona.

March 1 is the day upon which persons of Welsh ancestry celebrate the birth of St. David, the patron saint of the Welsh. It is fitting at this time of the year that contributions of Wales and the Welsh people to our way of life and to the cause of freedom of the mind and body be recalled and properly appreciated. Since I am half Welsh and very proud to be, and since I am also a friend of Ben Owen, and proud to be, I am glad to share his work and his words with the Members of the House.

The address follows:

WALES, THE CRADLE OF LIBERTY

(By Benjamin Owen, member, Welsh Cambrian Society of Arizona)

The calendar tells us that it is February 28 in Phoenix, Ariz., but for the purpose of our gathering here this evening, it is March 1 in the land where you and I, our parents or ancestors first saw the light of day, and if I possessed a magic carpet, I would use its supernatural powers to transport everyone here to that land 3,000 miles away—"Wales, Mae Hen Wlad Fy Nhadau" where we would blend our voices with thousands of other Welsh sons and daughters, in singing some of the great Welsh hymns such as "Beth Syd Imi Yn Y Byd," "Delyn Aur," "Rachi," and others, and listen to the inspired oratory of our bards as they pay homage and tribute commemorating the life of our patron saint, "Dewi Sant" (St. David).

St. David was the greatest patriot and reformer that Wales ever produced, and, as history has proven, he established a pattern that has served to inspire other great leaders who came after him, and did much to make us the Bible-reading, liberty-loving and law-abiding people we are today.

St. David devoted his life in a militant leadership of his people from out of the foul darkness and superstition of paganism, and gave to us a newer concept of God as the Father of all men, and in whose holy light all men were equal, an equality they had never known, and a sublime and courageous faith in the love of God.

St. David displayed great courage when he proclaimed what he believed to be the "truth of God" in an age of darkness and superstition, condemning the evil deeds of kings and the evil ways of those who sought to govern the land. His course of action at all times was inspired as well as fortified by the old Druidic adage "Y Gwir Yn Y Byd" (the truth against the world) a pattern of faith that has stood the test of centuries, and is as immortal and eternal as the heavens.

It is not much we know of the life of St. David, as the making of such records was not the custom of that day, rather we must depend upon stories handed down from father to son, and which were often embel-

lished in order to glorify the subject, but that proves there was a worthy subject to glorify. We do know however, that St. David was born in Cardigan about the year A.D. 520. His mother's name was Nonnita or Better Non. She was an exceptionally devoted woman, and many churches were consecrated to her name not only in Wales, but in Cornwall, Devon and Brittany.

Dewi Sant's father was the King or Prince of Cardigan, something like a Governor of our State, but with no Federal power to overrule him. St. David was educated at Menevia in South Wales by Catholic monks, and at an early age went on a preaching tour of the peninsula. He was a great and inspiring preacher and soon became noted as a priest. He was later made a Bishop and virtually the head of the Catholic Church in Wales. He was canonized by Pope Calixtus in the year A.D. 1120 at the request of Henry the First.

There are 53 churches in Wales that claim him as founder. After his death about A.D. 588 he was buried at St. David's. There is a belief however that both St. Patrick and St. David were buried at Glastonbury Abbey, which during the life of St. David was the Mecca for Christians from all parts of the world.

In line with our subject it is appropriate to indulge in an historical survey, and in skeleton form, briefly sketch the contribution of Welshmen to America in statesmanship, education, industry, and religion—great and essential services on which, in the eyes of the civilized world a nation's reputation is built. For our purpose we will continue on our magic carpet and journey to the famed city of Aberystwyth, Cardiganshire, a most beautiful seaside resort, and where the College of Wales is situated.

From there we will take a hike up a nearby mountain, from the top of which—on a clear day, we can see the whole of Wales—12 counties in all. Six to the north and six to the south. This little section of country is referred to by Welsh historians as "The Cradle of Liberty," and some of us are egotistical enough to think that had there been no Wales, there possibly would have been no United States of America.

Over there in a northwest direction was born Howell Dda (Howell the Good), a Welsh king, the great law giver of the ninth century. Howell's laws, among other regulations, provided for the protection of life, liberty, and property from arbitrary spoliation; trial by jury, and the right of a wife not to be compelled to testify against her husband. They also redressed numerous grievances connected with laws then in force in the principality of Wales, and elsewhere.

Howell's law became a part of the Magna Carta, the great charter granted by King John at Runnymede, June 15, 1215, and the man who forced King John to sign his name on the dotted line was none other than William Marshall, of West Wales, Earl of Pembroke. As you know, the Magna Carta was written into, and became a part of, the Constitution of the United States of America.

Pointing in the direction of Snowdon, "In that farmhouse on our right was born Peter Jefferson, the father of Thomas Jefferson, the man who wrote the Declaration of Independence and who later became President. Over yonder is Tynton, where, on the 22d of February 1723, was born Richard Price, son of a dissenting minister. In 1766, Dr. Price published his 'Observations of Civil Liberty' and the 'Justice and Policy of the War With America'."

Dr. Price was a preacher of the gospel of human liberty and human rights. Benjamin Franklin held him in unbounded admiration, and said it was Richard Price who precipitated the American Revolution, by advising that if King George put that tax of a penny a pound on tea in Boston Harbor, the colonists should rise in their might and dump the cargoes into the sea. So, you will observe, the famous Boston Tea Party had its origin, not in a Massachusetts indignation meeting, as people were led to believe, but in the quiet precincts of a humble Welshman 3,000 miles away, and almost under the very nose of King George III, in London.

Tom Paine wrote "Common Sense," and the "Age of Reason," but it was Dr. Price's book on "Civil Liberty" that roused public opinion on both sides of the Atlantic and determined the Thirteen States to take issue with the then King of England, George III.

Jefferson said it was Price who convinced the world of the iniquity of George III.

That little booklet of Dr. Price's, "Civil Liberties," found its way across the Atlantic and was circulated throughout the length and breadth of America. It inflamed the whole people of our land, and in Britain transformed public opinion to an extent which divided Parliament. It was Richard Price who forced the issue. Price's little book was the most powerful deciding factor in determining America to declare its independence. He advised both Jefferson and Franklin to call Congress or Convention and announce to the world their position, their reasons, and their purposes. The result was the Declaration of Independence, the Fourth of July, and the birth of our great Nation.

Here is an extract from Dr. Price's book. I quote: "Every member of a free state, having his property secure, and knowing himself his own governor, possesses a consciousness of dignity in himself his own governor, and feels incitements to emulation and improvement, to which the miserable slaves of arbitrary power must be utter strangers. In such a state the springs have room to operate, and the mind is stimulated to the noblest exertions. But to be obliged, from our birth, to look up to a creature no better than ourselves as the master of our fortunes; and to receive his will as our law—what can be more humiliating? What elevated ideas can enter a mind so situated? Agreeably to this remark: the subjects of free states have, in all ages been most distinguished for genius and knowledge. Liberty is the soil where the arts and sciences have flourished; and the more free a state has been, the more have the powers of the human mind been drawn forth into action, and the greater number of freemen has it produced. These are reflections which should be constantly present to every mind in this country. As moral liberty is the prime blessing of man in his private capacity, so is civil liberty in his public capacity. There is nothing that requires more to be watched than power. There is nothing that ought to be opposed with more determined resolution than its encroachments. Sleep in state, as Montesquieu says, is always followed by slavery."

On October 6, 1778, the American Congress resolved as follows: "That the Honorable Benjamin Franklin, Arthur Lee, and John Adams be directed forthwith to apply to Dr. Price and inform him that it is the desire of Congress to consider him a citizen of the United States, and to receive his assistance in regulating their finances; that if he shall think it expedient to remove with his family to America and afford such assistance, a generous provision shall be made for requiting his services."

So you will see, this ancient and forgotten tale of America's greatest and best of friends puts a new phase on things. Franklin declared that the resolution I have just read to you was the very embodiment of the voice of wisdom, and was the call of the United States to the ablest man of the day to come to America and assist in the formation of a government which would establish the policies of equal justice and the fundamental rights of the people, together with a sound constructive yet conservative financial policy.

A little north of where Dr. Price was born, is the birthplace of Robert Morris, who financed the Revolution, and of whom General Washington said "he doubted if the Revolution would have been carried out had it not been for this same Morris."

South of us was born in 1559 Roger Williams, founder of Rhode Island, who gave America its first law on "The Liberty of Conscience," that law held the power of the civil magistrates only to the bodies, goods, and the outward state of man, and not so their souls or consciences.

Roger Williams founded the city of Providence in 1635, and established there a government of pure democracy. He actually set up a government which served as a model for the form of government which was ratified by the American Colonial fathers nearly 150 years after. It is not generally known, but Williams was aided by four other Welshmen, namely, Thomas Harries, Richard Williams, William Reynolds, and Thomas Hopkins. These men showed their inherited love of liberty all through the years which followed in Rhode Island's history. I used the word "inherited" advisedly, for I know with the Welsh people the love of liberty is born and bred in the bone.

From the same section of country which gave us Jefferson, came William Penn, who stands among the first as a lawgiver. William Penn was the founder of Pennsylvania, and a certain writer once said of both Roger Williams and William Penn: "If Welsh influence in New England and Pennsylvania had been that of Williams and Penn only, the Nation that gave them birth might well feel proud, and the Nation, the United States of America, whom they served with distinction, might well feel thankful."

The ancestors of Patrick Henry came from yonder little village. Patrick Henry is reputed to have been one of the most eloquent of American orators. One of the speeches Patrick Henry made in the year 1775 is on par with that of Caractacus, the great Welsh chief, given before the Roman Emperor Claudius, 55 B.C. Patrick Henry asked, "Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, almighty God, I know not what course other may take but, as for me, give me liberty, or give me death." Identical language used by Caractacus in defiance of Emperor Claudius.

Among the signers of the Declaration of Independence were 17 men who were of Welsh birth or origin. Let me mention a few: Stephen Hopkins, of Rhode Island; William Williams, of Connecticut; Francis Hopkinson, of New Jersey; John Morton, of Pennsylvania; John Penn, of Virginia; Arthur Middleton, of South Carolina; Button Gwinnett, a native of Swansea, South Wales and delegate from Georgia; Benjamin Harrison and Richard Henry Lee from Virginia; Francis Henry Lightfoot, another signer from Virginia was also of Welsh origin. Of the four delegates sent by New York to the Continental Congress in 1776, a native of Long Island, Francis Lewis, was born in South Wales, and the third was Lewis Morris, born of Welsh parents.

I might also mention that of the 34 Presidents of our United States, 8 of them were of Welsh ancestry: John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, John Quincy Adams, James Madison, James Monroe, William Henry Harrison, James A. Garfield, Benjamin Harrison, and Abraham Lincoln.

And in the field of education, let us look toward the north of Wales. One of the founders of one of our great American universities, Yale, bears the name of its founder, Elihu Yale of Plas Newydd, North Wales, and whose body now reposes in a churchyard at Wrexham. I could name other famous educators who had Welsh blood in their veins, such as John Harvard after whom

Harvard University is named; the Reverend Morgan Edwards and Dr. Samuel Jones who founded Brown University; Colonel Williams whose name lives in the institution at Williamstown. The Phillips Academy at Andover and the Phillips Academy at Exeter also attest the interest of Welsh blood in the cause of education.

We could spend profitable hours extolling the lives of many other illustrious Welshmen who have contributed much toward the industrial social, and cultural life of our adopted country, the United States of America, such as Charles Evan Hughes, Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court; Owen Roberts, Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court; Joseph Davies, author of the book "Mission to Moscow" and special Ambassador to Moscow; James J. Davis, U.S. Senator, Secretary of Labor and founder of "Mooseheart"; and many others, but time is of essence, so reluctantly, we bid farewell to Gwalia, and descending from our imaginary mountaintop, we take a last gulp of the free air of our beloved Wales, and climb aboard our imaginary carpet to return once again to the land where freedom is a reality, and with the profound and prideful belief, that the view we took from our imaginary mountaintop, provided us with enough facts to justify the title of our subject: "Wales, the Cradle of Liberty."

Nos Dach.

Alaska and New Federal Judgeships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 17, 1961

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement, which I submitted last week to Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives in support of H.R. 2226, the so-called omnibus judgeship bill, to provide for the appointment of 63 additional district court judges. This statement highlighted the need for an additional district court judge for the U.S. District Court for the District of Alaska. The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. RALPH J. RIVERS, OF ALASKA, ON MARCH 1, 1961, BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5 OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY ON H.R. 2226

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity of being heard on the matter of H.R. 2226, the so-called omnibus judgeship bill, to provide for the appointment of 9 additional circuit court judges and 63 additional district court judges. I speak in support of this measure, but shall confine my comments to the need for an additional district court judge for Alaska, as is provided for in this bill.

The U.S. District Court for the District of Alaska came into existence on February 20, 1960, pursuant to Alaska's becoming a State. Prior to that time, the District Court for the Territory of Alaska, which was composed of four divisions, served as the only judicial establishment in Alaska. According to a report prepared by the Division of Procedural Studies and Statistics of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Court, 3,048 civil cases were pending on the date that the district court for the territory ceased to exist. As might be expected, a large percentage of these cases were of a local nature and as a result were transferred to the new State courts. The remainder, totaling 214 civil cases, were transferred to the newly created U.S. district court. Between February 20, 1960, and December 31, 1960, a total of 101 cases were commenced and a total of 111 cases were terminated by the court. Therefore, at the start of 1961, a total of 204 civil cases were still pending before the court. To be sure, this figure is below the national average of backlogged cases pending before other U.S. district courts, and might not be considered impressive except for the unusual conditions prevailing in Alaska.

To vividly illustrate these unusual conditions I would like to quote several paragraphs from the statement of the Honorable Walter H. Hodge, U.S. District Judge for the District of Alaska, before the Committee on Court Administration of the Judicial Conference of the United States, at Seattle, Wash., August 16, 1960. At that time, Judge Hodge stated:

"First there was the problem of the very considerable backlog which faced the former U.S. district court at the time of the transition. At this time there was pending in the third division at Anchorage some 2,200 cases and in the fourth division at Fairbanks some 900 cases. The criminal cases had been kept fairly current but the civil cases were far behind, having been pending between the date of issue and possible date of trial for as long as 5 years and a great majority of them over 3 years."

"Facing this problem we attempted first to hold pretrial conferences in all civil cases throughout the circuit so far as we could reach them, covering the cases pending at Anchorage up through 1957 and those at Fairbanks through 1958. We were amazed to find that out of 54 such conferences held only two cases were immediately disposed of, one by confession of judgment and the other by order of the court, which of course is far below the national average."

"Travel involved is the next most serious problem. Alaska is by far the largest district in the Union, being approximately 2½ times the size of the State of Texas. The distance between Ketchikan, farthest point southeast where the judge is required to hold court, and Nome, the farthest point northwest, is slightly over 1,300 air miles. More appropriately, the distance from our headquarters at Anchorage to the four places where we are required to hold court, as given by the airlines, is as follows: Ketchikan, 768 miles; Juneau, 578 miles; Fairbanks, 263 miles; and Nome, 535 miles."

"The cost of travel is also significant, where we find that our cost as extending through September 30, 1960, is $10,839. These costs would not be eliminated by the addition of a second judge but would be substantially reduced. In this connection we find it necessary to take with us our clerk or deputy clerk as an in-court deputy for the reason that at the four places other than Anchorage we have the assistance of the State superior court clerks who also serve as deputy clerks of our court without compensation, and we find that we cannot justly require them to appear in court. We also need the services of a reporter, my secretary, and a law clerk, whose services I find invaluable in doing research work."

"It is my firm belief that the task cannot be adequately accomplished by one judge. I am not thinking so much of the burden upon the judge as the burden upon litigants who have been so long awaiting disposition of their cases."

By now, I have the latest figure showing that by December 31, 1960, the total cost for travel, including subsistence expenses, has risen to $18,859.13. Furthermore, the travel by air has frequently been delayed by bad weather, resulting in delays in court schedules, and increased travel expenses. It should also be mentioned that Alaska is growing rapidly so that the volume of business will increase apace.

Inasmuch as the U.S. District Court for the District of Alaska is not as yet a year old, no record of cases filed or terminated, or of the time required to dispose of cases covering a full year has been compiled. However, attached to this prepared statement is a copy of the statistical study and general information summary prepared by Judge Hodge covering the first three quarters of operation of the U.S. District Court for the District of Alaska. These statistics demonstrate the need for an additional district judge.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I would like to emphasize that the existence of the need for additional judgeships throughout the United States in the Federal courts, both district and appellate, has been amply proven and documented both in the records of previous congressional hearings and in the press of the Nation. We all know that the existence of court congestion and consequent delay in the disposition of cases causes serious hardship to the litigants. It also places heavy burdens on the judges so serious in nature as to impede the efficient performance of judicial functions. This is so in Alaska and in every other Federal district. Therefore, I respectfully urge that the committee report H.R. 2226.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of this committee.

February Monthly Change Indexes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, recently I inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Dr. John H. Hoagland, of the Graduate School of Business Administration at Michigan State University, relative to a prediction on the end of the present recession.

I am happy to insert now the latest prediction which includes the statistics for February which are even more encouraging than the January figures:

FEBRUARY MONTHLY CHANGE INDEXES

(By Dr. John H. Hoagland)

Purchasing business surveys now indicate that the business upturn will begin before mid-1961. A business cycle turning point must be near, for even the declining trends of February provide additional signs that the recession is abating.

Each passing month brings increasing evidence that this recession is similar to the recessions of 1953–54 and 1957–58, except this recession continues to be milder. As in previous months, the February declines in business have been less than those in comparable months of the two previous recessions.

Further improvement in the business climate should appear soon for as spring melts the heavy snows in industrial areas, so should the passing of time cause the pessimism in some quarters to blossom into optimism. The growth pattern of this optimism will determine, in part, the timing of the coming business recovery.

One dark cloud on the horizon causing concern is the approaching expiration of labor contracts in the automobile industries. As both sides prepare their positions, rumblings repeatedly reverberate in some

areas of business. Although this accumulating storm area foretells of possible dangers to a business recovery, there is a silver lining. Automobile strikes, though disruptive, have not inundated the total business scene the way the steel strikes did the years 1952, 1956, and 1959. A major business recession followed each of those steel strikes whereas, in 1958, the last major automobile strike did not retard, too much, the growth of that business recovery. Undoubtedly the business trends of 1961 are being influenced by developments in the automobile industries but it is hoped, and expected, that the results will not be too detrimental to the start of the 1961 recovery.

On the accompanying charts of Monthly Change Indices the comparative magnitudes of the current and preceeding recessions can be traced through February 1961. Those not accustomed to using Monthly Change Indices should recognize that these indices measure monthly rates of change and are based upon data from the business surveys of purchasing executives. A positive index signifies a rising trend and a negative index a declining trend, with the trend amplitude being indicated by the distance above or below the zero line—the point of no change from the preceeding month.

Almost all February Monthly Change Indices provide confirming evidence that the maximum rates of business decline occurred during the fourth quater of 1960. The diminishing declines of both January and February point toward better trends in the months ahead. Of 32 Monthly Change Indices charted here only the National and Cleveland employment indices reached new current lows in February, but these indices also should turn soon, as they did after February in the last recession.

In general the February trends show that the drops in order backlogs were significantly smaller than the declines of the preceeding 6 months. New order declines continued to be less than those of the last recession. Reductions in production were relatively mild. The greatest rates of decline in employment have been passed in most areas. The mild increases in industrial inventory liquidations were noticably less than those of the 1960 fourth quarter. Prices remained relatively stable, and vendors provided somewhat faster deliveries.

Although Purchase Policy Indices showed no appreciable lengthening of forward commitments there are growing signs that the reductions of 1960 have been terminated. This stabilization in purchasing policy is favorable, and future increases will strengthen business conditions further. The latter usually does not develop, however, until after the demand for goods increase and supplies are less readily available. The amount of expansion in purchasing policy will probably be moderate for long-term fundamental shifts have been developing as industrial capacities have increased and more electronic data processing equipment has been applied to purchasing and inventory control.

All five of the Monthly Change Indices from the National Business Survey showed greater declines in February than in January. With the exception of employment, the January and February declines were not as great as the average declines during the fourth quarter of 1960. In comparison with the last recession new orders, production, inventories and prices passed peak rates of decline 2 to 9 months earlier during this recession. The lack of a steel price increase in 1960 and the presence of one in 1957 probably caused some of this shift in timing.

As in the previous recessions, the declines in the New England areas have been relatively mild. New orders declined only moderately and production fluctuated between increase and decrease for the fifth month. Employment dropped slightly in February, after registering a minor rise in January and having passed a peak of decline in November. Raw material inventory liquidations increased a little in February, while work-in-process inventories registered minor accumulations. Prices increased slightly.

Detroit, an important area of automobile production, registered signs of improvement during February. The diminishing declines in both business conditions and employment showed that turning points occurred in those indexes during late 1960. Inventories were reduced further, but by lesser amounts, than the peak reductions of December 1960. Few changes were evident in prices.

In the Cleveland area the indexes for new orders, production, employment, and inventories all declined. This pattern is the same as for February 1958. In that year improving trends developed during the ensuing months. With so much similarity between the two recession patterns, further improvements should develop in the coming months of 1961.

February trends in the Pittsburgh area were also encouraging. Order backlogs declined less than any of the preceding 8 months, volume of business declines was less than the previous 4 months, and reduction in production was less than any month since September 1960. Employment declines in February were much less than the 4 prior months and inventory liquidations were greater than January, but less than the average for the fourth quarter of 1960. Vendors provided faster deliveries for the 15th consecutive month.

More encouraging trends also were registered for the Chicago area. Declines in order backlogs were less than during the preceding 7 months and reductions in production were less than the previous 6 months. Employment declines have not changed greatly during the past 7 months and inventory liquidations peaked 4 months ago. Vendors provided faster deliveries for the 14th consecutive month, after showing a peak rate of improvement in July. Prices were almost static.

PURCHASE POLICY INDEXES

Most of the purchase policy indexes show that forward commitments stabilized during the past 4 months, after declining during earlier months. The capital expenditures index indicated that reductions in this important area have ceased. In the Detroit area increases in purchasing policy were recorded for the second month.

Amerigo Vespucci: 1451–1512

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Amerigo Vespucci was the son of a notary in Florence, Italy, and he was fortunate to have been born in the classic age of exploration and discovery. True to his age, he was very much interested in navigation and exploration. He was also fortunate in his association with the famous Medici merchants of Italy, which offered him the best opportunity for sailing and seeing many parts of the then known world. Thus, at about 1500 when he entered the services of Don Manuel of Portugal, he had already seen and visited nearly all the famous cities in his day. He persuaded his patron to send him on expeditions beyond the seas, beyond the unknown. Soon he sailed away from European shores, crossed the Atlantic and is reported to have arrived at Cape Canaveral, Fla. He turned south and sailed as far down as the shores of Brazil. Having thus touched the shores of the two continents, he gave to both his name, Amerigo, soon to be known as America. Today on the 510th anniversary of his birth, we honor this daring and adventurous son of a Florentino notary, Amerigo Vespucci.

Our Republic: Bulwark Against the Tyranny of Majorities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following excellent statement on the difference between a democracy and a republic appeared in the recent newsletter, Spotlight, published and distributed by the Committee for Constitutional Government. It was written by the very able and distinguished senior Senator from the State of Maine, the Honorable MARGARET CHASE SMITH.

Mrs. SMITH has covered the subject briefly, clearly, and completely. Her statement of the difference between a republic and a democracy has never been more perfectly set forth even in the Federalist Papers, where the subject is gone into at more length. In fact, it was James Madison who wrote in these same Federalist Papers:

Hence, it is that such democracies have ever been spectacles of turbulence and contention; have ever been found incompatible with personal security or the rights of property; and have in general been as short in their lives as they have been violent in their deaths.

The statement follows:

OUR REPUBLIC: BULWARK AGAINST THE TYRANNY OF MAJORITIES

(By Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, of Maine)

We talk a great deal about our American Government being a democracy. It is said that we fought two World Wars within a generation to "make the world safe for democracy."

Yet, do we know what we are talking about?

You may be surprised to know that our Government is not a true democracy. It is a republic. If you doubt this, take a look at the Constitution. Try to find the word "democracy" or "democratic." Then take a look at article IV, section 4, which says, "The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government."

If you read the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, these amendments being more popularly recognized as the Bill of Rights, you will see that they directly flout the theory of democracy.

Now what is the difference between a democracy and republic—what are we instead of what some of us think we are?

A democracy is a truly representative government in which the supreme power is retained by the people and exercised by them. So is a republic. But a republic, such as ours, is a restricted and limited democracy.

The basic distinction between democracy and republic is in the degree of majority rule. Majority rule is unrestricted in a democracy while it is restricted in a republic.

The Bill of Rights part of our Constitution places definite limitations on the power of the representatives of the people. They are denied the power to abridge our freedom of speech, right of assembly, press, trial by jury, against unreasonable searches and seizures, and other individual rights—regardless of how much the majority might be opposed to such individual rights. Under a pure or true democracy, there is no protection of such individual rights against the rule of the majority.

Democracy actually means unrestricted majority rule that our Constitution so carefully prohibits. We are inclined to think of domocracy in the social sense rather than the political sense. We think of it as signifying equality among human beings. This ideal we do find expressed in the Declaration of Independence with the statement that "all men are created equal." But the ideal is even more basic than the Declaration of Independence. It is in reality the Christian concept of the Golden Rule.

So that there is good reason to distinguish between democracy and political democracy. By the sheer unrestricted rule of the majority of a political democracy, social democracy could be killed without any protection whatsoever to the minorities.

A republic is a truly representative government. It provides representation for the minority as well as the majority. It places individual freedom and rights above majority rule. If we were really a political democracy, instead of the republic we are, the will of the majority would habitually ride roughshod over the will of the minority. A republic creates and develops tolerance that acts as a bulwark against tyranny by the majority.

The U.S. Senate, in which I have the honor to serve, is striking proof that our Government is not a democracy but a republic. New York with a population of several million people has no more representation in the Senate than my State of Maine which has a population of less than a million people. Both States have two Senators each. This is a check against unlimited majority rule for the protection of the minority population states.

In short, a republic rather than a democracy is the American way simply because this country was settled and founded upon the love for liberty and individual freedom. Our republic protects our very rights to our beliefs even though we be in the minority. It protects differences of opinion.

India: Its Plans, Its Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 17, 1961

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the Members an article by Mr. Don Shoemaker, of the Miami Herald, dealing with what he feels are the major problems, or hurdles, facing India in the coming decade.

The article follows:

INDIA: ITS PLANS, ITS PROGRESS

(By Don Shoemaker)

In the dining room of New Delhi's giant Ashoka Hotel the Indian orchestra grinds out the overture to "Patience," proving how bad music can be when it is played literally.

Outside, a khaki-clad bearer, or porter, squats in the winter sun and contendedly chews his betelnut, thinking—like his father and grandfather before him—about nothing in particular.

Across town in a Government office where modern bureaucratese is already the rule but typewriters are absent, a smart young ministry officer drafts a memorandum on steel production at a plant more modern than anything in the United States.

These are the three sides of India in her crucial decade, the coming 10 years of the next two 5-year plans. These sides are the British legacy, which is fast disappearing; the old India that is sot in its ways and superstitious (and still very much alive), and finally the new India bristling with plans and dreams.

Which will come out on top, in peace and prosperity?

President-elect Kennedy, cosponsor in the Senate of the Kennedy-Cooper Indian aid resolution of 1958, has said that "how India goes, Asia will follow."

Needless to say, Mr. Kennedy is almost a trinity out here with Jefferson and Lincoln. On election night the U.S. Information Office in New Delhi got 4,000 telephone calls—a rare feat for this post-Victorian telephone system—while the USIS office in Calcutta got 8,000.

Almost without exception, the calls were pro-Kennedy. So Indians agree that the next American President correctly called the turn on India and Asia. Indeed, the new nations and nationalisms of Asia and Africa are looking to this subcontinent.

It seems to me that India's problems—or hurdles—stand up in this order:

1. Whether India can achieve true national unity and not break up into a confederacy of native language states.

2. Whether India can attain relative self-sufficiency in industry as it has done in food.

3. Whether India can establish itself in the 20th century without suffering its mild socialism to become something sinister.

4. Whether India can tame its restive Chinese neighbor or at least keep him in his own cage.

5. Whether Jawaharlal Nehru is followed by a man equally able to command the respect of the Indian people, for in regard to leadership Indians are living as Americans lived when George Washington was alive and President.

As for India's foreign affairs, they are complicated by the Red Dragon. When American newsmen on this tour did not meet up with expected polite taunts about the U–2 incident, Quemoy and Matsu, and U.S. military aid to rival Pakistan, there was one simple explanation:

China's rape of Tibet and invasion of disputed Indian border areas gave India a bad scare. At this moment Indian troops and Chinese troops look down one another's gun barrels at frontier barricades.

India would seem to be ill-equipped to meet the Red Dragon if he had on all his scales. The Indian defense budget is only $600 million a year, or less than the United States recently spent in producing a tank that never worked. The armed forces boast but 400,000 men and there are only 40,000 in the territorials, or home guard.

India and Pakistan are almost buddies again, but what is to be done about China is another matter. For once, India has had to take communism seriously.

The country's national unity is on every tongue but whether it is in every heart has yet to be proved.

Mr. Nehru, who uses words with Churchillian facility and exactness, framed the problem neatly in a speech at a Delhi school dedication the other day:

"We have always cared for the rich variety of India and we feel that a unity based on and recognizing that variety is far better than an attempt to produce some kind of enforced uniformity."

Nevertheless, India is striving for uniformity through promotion of a national language, Hindi, which is supposed to be used in lieu of English. But it is far from popular in South India, and its suggested exclusive use in the schools and colleges is being resisted.

Some Indians seriously fear the country may split up in native language states and that the wild Maharaja of Bastar may not be far off base when he says that "India will once again be the land of kings."

The maharaja is a kind of rich man's Huey Long who was relieved of his title and his lands 8 years ago. While he is wrong about every man a king, or at least every state a kingdom, he does reflect the parochialism which is visible in many of the states.

When these were reorganized 4 years ago to follow language patterns, some felt the government had made a mistake from which it might not recover. Hindi is "dandy," but millions of Indians are far more partial to Telugu, Tamil, Bengali, Kannada, Marathi, or Assamese, a partial rollcall of the regional languages.

At this moment, too, India would be unfortunate were it to lose the services of Mr. Nehru.

Like all strong men, he has not encouraged a succession—not deliberately, but simply because he is Nehru, the chosen instrument of Gandhi.

A Cabinet minister made a slip-up recently and appeared to liken Nehru to the banyan tree, which shelters everyone but under which nothing grows. He didn't mean it that way, and he is careful to explain his embarrassment. But he was right.

Khrishna Menon, the far-out Defense Minister, who has no political following save Nehru himself and who used to specialize in "cracks" at the United States (until Red China made noises at the border), is in no danger of becoming Prime Minister.

S. K. Patil, who "goofed" about the banyan tree, is Minister of Food and Agriculture and very smart political "cookie." He looks like a fair starter.

But if the mace had to be handed out by high noon, it might well go to Morarji Desai, the eloquent, astute, faintly puritanical, and hard-fisted Minister of Finance.

All these men are founding fathers of the Congress Party, which began in the last century not as a political party at all but as a sort of essay society. It is India's one-party system. Mr. Patil thinks it is good for about one more general election, or perhaps a decade, but what will come after?

The parties of the extreme left and right opposition can muster only about 6 percent of the vote and the Socialists lost their thunder to the planners. One of these wings, the Communist left, is suddenly unpopular because it roots for Red China.

The best guess is that a second party will spring from the Congress Party itself in good time, offering opposition but not immoderate government.

This could depend upon the state of the economy a few years hence.

Indians point out that their country has learned to produce enough food so that it is "beyond the famine threat forever."

They say that when the country has a steel surplus, perhaps 10 years from now, it will have much of what it needs indus-

trially and will be independent of foreign grants and loans.

These last have been abundant since the establishment of the Indian union 13 years ago.

Under the third Five Year Plan, the Indians hope to get at least $2 billion in aid from the United States. This is roughly what has come to them since 1947. Mr. Nehru also talks about a "massive" grant—a one-shot affair, and after that, nothing more.

But this is up to Congress. And to Indians themselves.

Their unique economic system is not wholly popular with their own people. Recently the government decided to begin the manufacture of diesel locomotives in the public sector, though there is precious little oil to fuel them while there is an abundance of coal for steam locomotives.

The Times of India gruffly called this a "strange decision," not only because there is little oil but also because private firms wanted the job if it had to be done. "What prompted the government to reject their offers?" asked The Times, answering: "It is difficult to resist the conclusion that the government has once again been swayed by narrow ideological considerations."

The future will depend, too, on the man who was little more than a pack animal under colonialism and who still seems to like it. Will his children get a technical education? Or will they, in the back villages and the city suburbs, continue to sunbake cow dung and sell it for fuel, thus depriving the land of fertilizer?

Whatever all the answers, this land of 400-million-plus—plus 8 million more a year—is the bellwether of the underdeveloped countries.

Its sympathies are undeniably democratic, despite a noisy and sometimes sinewy Communist minority.

Russia itself is in the third 5-year plan for a loan of $500 million. In the meantime the Russian Embassy floods the country with Communist literature and Marxist books, all translated into the regional languages, cheap, and fairly popular.

Using rupees from the Public Law 480 program, under which India got large quantities of U.S. wheat, we are going into the book business.

The U.S. Information Service, which maintains its largest unit in India, is publishing Kennedy's "Profiles in Courage" in Hindi and half a dozen other languages and is already circulating an account of American higher education. Next comes an anthology on American democracy. These books will be free.

One wonders whether this effort, which is worthy, is necessary. For Indians are very high on Uncle Sam at the moment and are likely to be higher as China glowers and the third plan nears.

The American in this part of the world definitely is among friends, many of them made so by President Eisenhower's triumphal visit last year but otherwise by circumstances. A decade may well seal the friendship as the meeting, at long last, of that twain from East and West.

Louis Ferini: An American of Distinction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and insert therein the most meaningful and eloquent remarks of my distinguished friend, Mr. Louis R. Perini, in accepting the national award of the National Conference of Christians and Jews on the occasion of the 33d anniversary dinner of that great American organization.

Mr. Perini has had an outstanding and most successful career in business, which is not only a credit to him but symbolic of the opportunities which exist in this great country.

He is not only head of the renowned, worldwide contracting firm bearing his name, which he has conducted so successfully for years with his brothers and members of his family, but he is also the owner of the famous Milwaukee Braves, another very successful business venture, as well as a most colorful contribution to American sport.

Notwithstanding his very busy life, Mr. Perini has invariably found the time to engage in civic, charitable, and social service activities, and has given unselfishly of his boundless energy and money in support of many meritorious causes.

It is a happy circumstance, indeed, that the Conference of Christians and Jews has so appropriately honored Louis Perini for his magnificent contributions, and I am happy and proud to add my heartiest congratulations to those which have been expressed to Mr. Perini and his family upon this signal event and great honor. I sincerely wish for this great American and his family many more years of good health, success, and happiness, and continued distinguished service to the Nation.

Mr. Perini's remarks follow:

CAN YOU FORESEE WHAT COMMUNITY BROTHERHOOD COULD DO FOR ALL?

(Remarks of Louis R. Perini in accepting national award of the National Conference of Christians and Jews from Roger P. Sonnabend, general chairman of the 33d anniversary dinner in the Somerset Hotel Ballroom, Boston, Mass., Thursday, Feb. 9, 1961)

Mom—I—our kids have been the recipients of many kindnesses from this community we love and call home.

Incidentally, since my memos were originated several weeks ago, some of this has become stale. Nevertheless, it still retains a current odor.

While still very young, I was subjected to tolerances associated with this inspiring Brotherhood of Protestant, Eastern Orthodox, Catholic, and Jewish movement of kindness toward neighbor and understanding of others' religious beliefs—languages—and our parents' inherited way of living, along with their old countries' cultural habits.

Since I am now dealing with the social, I must say it is nice to be here and still alive. It's been many years since I was last called—"Oh you Guinea—Oh you Wop—Oh you 2-cent lollypop." Brotherhood is a great healer. You people who years ago were called "Limeys, Sheenies, Micks, and Krauts" must remind our fellow citizens of darker pigmentation that time, patience and tolerance will reward them. For baseball is a classic example of the rewards that came with patience—for they are now our brightest stars, and highest paid players.

As we grew in height we came to believe and learn much about other peoples' rights, their feelings, their warmth, their human frailties, their bodies, their images, and these similarities of people could not possibly be a matter of coincidence for I truly believe there is but one Master who had a reason for giving us different tongues, habits and tints. He intended, when he fashioned our will, that we would live in a spirit of liberty and brotherhood; that we would adjust our differences, if any arose; that we would respect the habits and customs of others along with their social, political and religious beliefs.

The problems of integration will fade as surely as the predictions of latter year almanacs.

Brotherhood does not differentiate between white, black, red or yellow provided you covet liberty, peace, and freedom. If you have that, you will cherish your liberties and your rights to brotherhood. Dr. Levine has saved many—he hasn't given a hoot whose heart it was so long as it was beating. Neither has our humanitarian Arthur Rotch concerned himself as to whose parents gave birth to these hearts.

Nationwide much has been printed of liberties and the brotherhood principles of nations and their probabilities of social and political integration in our world's quest of peace.

Locally, we have been concerned with still other forms of liberties, such as the Boston tax rate, the Prudential and Government centers, our urban renewal program, the M.T.A. and the immediate building of the toll highway extension into Boston.

There is nothing less expert than one who pretends in matters much more foreign to him than to his listeners. Therefore, I will prove my inexpertness for I will both aim and fire.

Within the next 25 years we will see Massachusetts and Greater Boston restored and refashioned to the prestige and greatness that was once hers alone. Community brotherhood can do this—of that I am certain.

Because of social, community, and political conflicts, we have been guilty of sabotaging our past opportunities for growth. We are not, at the moment, traveling first class. Conversely, we have succeeded in developing men of outstanding rugged individualism, but in the process may have paid a very dear price of confining unity within community.

We have many capable and dedicated men in our public services. What we business and civic leaders have lacked is the gumption and determination to insist that these servants upon which so much of our cultural and business future depends are equitably rewarded.

Since everything is relative, their rewards have been shameful by present-day executive standards. If brotherhood recognizes one's civic needs and the respect of office, then let us pay the top price. Let's make our top administrative positions the most sought for in America. Not only will it reduce the cost of running our State and city government by the millions, it will further compound values in the form of progress. Let's restore prestige and eliminate the prime reasons for conflicts of interest. Let's, in the name of brotherhood and in a statewide spirit of understanding, do for qualified administrators of government those things that you or your shareholders would insist upon if you and they were running a State for prestige, profit and progress. Let the Massachusetts Association of Chambers of Commerce specifically recommend to the Governor and other leaders of both House and Senate, what these offices should receive as equitable in today's world.

I can see in the immediate horizon towering buildings and marketplaces of trade, spotted throughout this greater community. Cars will then be garaged and mass transportation will have been modernized and revitalized (attainable shortly with a little effort of community brotherhood).

Why strangle one's progress if community needs and logic dictate that we should fore-

see that commuter service as we used to know it has since served its purpose—it is gone—why not face it. And use these rights of way for modern methods of intercommunity transportation. Much growth has been lost in our stubborn adherence to the old. Let's think tomorrow—today—for we are living in the most dynamic period of human existence (3d quarter, 20th century).

He who has a mind, let him think—let's not flounder with the past.

The finest thing that could have happened nationwide, and perhaps to the entire world, was the election by you Protestants and Jews of America's first Catholic President. Twenty-five years of liberty and brotherhood is but a short time. It could well be that Cohen will be the next great President of these United States.

Locally we must unite as these great religions have united in a common objective of community brotherhood. Boston—its economy, its future—cannot afford, even for a moment, the dubious results of progressive stalling. We must build quickly—we must progress rapidly—we must administer wisely, but timely.

For this outstanding tribute and honor, my wife, my family, join me in a sincere "gratias, amici," "ich danka ear, mine a frinta," "thank you, my friends."

President Explains Philippines Fight Against Redism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, when we read in a sector of our American press some statements that would make us believe that we must soften our attitude toward the Communists and that judging by the trend of voting alignments in the United Nations, the admission of Red China is inevitable, it is encouraging to read a speech recently delivered by His Excellency, the President of the Philippines, Carlos P. Garcia. It is a voice of firmness and of courage, of uncompromising advocacy of freedom, a voice of strength and vigor that we need in America nowadays to straighten our backbones and make us face up to communism without shirking our responsibilities as free men.

President Garcia forthrightly tells the world that even if the United States recognizes Red China—God forbid it—the Philippines is determined not to follow in such a tragic decision. This is the decision of a true statesman and a proved friend of America. President Garcia emphatically said that "we should not permit an influx of hordes of spies, propagandists, and professional saboteurs, working from the protection of a diplomatic sanctuary in our very midst," and thus he is uncompromisingly against the recognition of Soviet Russia by his government or the admission of Red China in the United Nations.

There is in President Garcia's speech food for thought for the small nations. He says:

The question has been asked in some quarters, for example, why the Philippines, a small nation, has chosen to take an active part in this decisive world struggle. Our reasons in terms of political and religious belief, of morality and justice, already have been adequately stated. For the benefit of those who claim to be practical realists, however, I think it might be wise to add this further practical and realistic reason. The free world is fighting for a word community ruled by law, the Communists for rule imposed by force. As one of the small nations, a world of laws is our sole hope of stature and dignity. Under a world rule of force we can expect nothing better than national extinction and racial absorption.

The Members of Congress and the American peope should also know how President Garcia explains why his country is following American leadership. It is a tribute that deserves wide publicity. This is the kind of leaders that Asia needs. They are the words of a devoted friend of the United States who deserves and has earned the unstinted support of our government and people. Let me quote him:

There is little need to labor the obvious as to why we accept American leadership in this struggle. The American record for supporting freedom for all peoples is ample endorsement of their motivation and intent. In material resource and tenacity no other nation or combination of nations can claim the contribution already made to the fight, or match the strength and potential of America to sustain it. (In this connection, it is interesting to note that while some commentators go as far as to claim Soviet superiority over the United States, Mr. Khrushchev himself promises his people only that they will catch up with the United States in 7 to 10 years.)

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include President Garcia's address in the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

PRESIDENT EXPLAINS PHILIPPINE ISLANDS' FIGHT AGAINST REDISM

This annual meeting of the Chief Executive of the nation with the officers, members and guests of the Manila Overseas Press Club is by now a well-established tradition. I have welcomed your invitations in the past because they afford me an excellent opportunity to reach what is perhaps our best informed and most responsive audience on world affairs, the correspondents of the foreign press as well as those members of the local press most concerned with the preparation and dissemination of foreign news. This evening's opportunity is of particular interest for a number of reasons, among them the present state of world tensions and my recent return from a visit with our close neighbors and racial kin in Malaya.

Many of you will recall that a little over 2 years ago, speaking in this very room, I broached the idea of bringing about in this region an association of states which, mostly in the cultural and economic sectors, might explore common areas of interest, common problems and perhaps avenues of cooperative action for a common good. Shortly afterward we had the pleasure of welcoming among us the Premier of Malaya, Tunku Abdul Rahman, who likewise saw merit in the concept and became one of its most vigorous advocates.

This month a beginning was made, a limited one to be sure, but one holding great promise. In the agreement between the Governments of Thailand, Malaya, and the Philippines to confer on the mechanics of such regional association is the beginning of the kind of understanding and cooperation so essential to the free world in this time of trial.

Before discussing this development more fully, however, it might be useful to sketch briefly the background against which elements of our foreign policy should be viewed.

First let us examine the current international situation and the nature of the tensions which constitute the crises of our day.

A great scholar and observer of world affairs makes the significant observation that it is inaccurate to speak of the conflict between the free world and communism as a contest of two similar power blocs. He points out that whereas the Communist bloc is a monolithic organism held together by violence and intimidation, such as the Russian tanks in Hungary, the free world bloc is voluntary association impelled toward pooling its resources in the interests of collective security only by the threatening pressures of the Communist bloc itself. I think it is also useful to define more sharply the nature of the conflict.

It is a matter of Communist doctrine for all to read that the Communist revolution will not, indeed cannot, stop short of an all Communist world. No Communist of any stature has as yet repudiated this basic doctrine of international communism. In fact, careful study of their most recent literature establishes conclusively that even the concept of peaceful coexistence is seen by top Communists as a temporary lull in armed hostilities during which they may consolidate their gains and prepare for the next violent phase of Communist expansion. The present world crisis therefore derives from the Communist Party's continuing attack, by whatever means possible, on all non-Communist countries, since the continued existence of free societies, of free men, cannot be tolerated within the concept of an all-Communist world. Thus, unless we consider surrender to intimidation, the initiative for ending the cold war and averting a hot war rests with the Communists—and only the Communists.

I think it is also high time that we demolish the distortion heard from some quarters that small nations committed to the free world bloc are merely pawns fighting the war of the United States in a big power contest with the Soviet Union.

The question has been asked in some quarters, for example, why the Philippines, a small nation, has chosen to take an active part in this decisive world struggle. Our reasons in terms of political and religious belief, of morality and justice, already have been adequately stated. For the benefit of those who claim to be practical realists, however, I think it might be wise to add this further "practical and realistic" reason. The free world is fighting for a world community ruled by law, the Communists for rule imposed by force. As one of the small nations, a world of laws is our sole hope of stature and dignity. Under a world rule of force we can expect nothing better than national extinction and racial absorption.

There is little need to labor the obvious as to why we accept American leadership in this struggle. The American record for supporting freedom for all peoples is ample endorsement of their motivation and intent. In material resource and tenacity no other nation or combination of nations can claim the contribution already made to the fight, or match the strength and potential of America to sustain it. (In this connection, it is interesting to note that while some commentators go so far as to claim Soviet superiority over the United States, Mr. Khrushchev himself promises his people only that they will catch up with the United States in 7 to 10 years.)

To summarize up to this point, we may say that until the Communist bloc decides to abandon the world revolution, international tensions and conflict, regardless of temporary lulls of peaceful coexistence or peaceful competition, will continue. Further, by the Communists' own doctrine, every free society, committed or otherwise, will continue to be a target of whatever weapon is considered appropriate, whether armed aggression, assistance to internal rebellion, economic sabotage, or any of the many forms of subversion. It may also be assumed that America will continue to exercise the leadership and shoulder the major material burden of free world defense, while her allies gain the strength necessary to tip the balance so decisively that the Communists will be discouraged from further pursuing their aggressive expansion.

This brings us to the question of what may now be forecast as to the American posture of free world leadership under a new administration.

From President Kennedy's pronouncements to date, from those of his major appointees, and from the writings of those known to influence the thinking of the new administration, it is possible to derive at least a preliminary assessment. It now appears likely that there will be no alteration of basic policy and fundamental objectives. In executing policy and pursuing these objectives, however, it may be expected that full advantage will be taken of the opportunity afforded by change to secure a broader area of tactical maneuver, greater flexibility and variety in the instruments of policy brought to bear. Although for years the United States, almost alone, has carried the burden of military and economic assistance to the recovering and developing nations of the free world, and today is suffering in some measure from the economic consequences, it appears likely that neither of these programs will be abandoned or drastically reduced. There appears to be some inclination to lean more toward acceleration of economic growth, and it is predictable that because of economic pressures both military and economic, foreign aid programs will be more sharply scrutinized and more carefully weighed, so that each dollar of investment in free world strength delivers its maximum yield.

In his inaugural address, President Kennedy said: "My fellow citizens of the world: Ask not what America will do for you, but what together we can do for the freedom of man."

What can we do together for the freedom of man? What can a small nation such as ours do now?

It seems immediately obvious that maximum acceleration of economic growth and technical development serve not only the individual national interest, but also the objective of strengthening the free world alliance. It is toward this end that we are taking steps toward stimulating both foreign and domestic private investment, expanding and diversifying our pattern of trade and commerce, and developing new credit lines with appropriate nations of the free world.

Another contribution we can make to the free world effort, one wholly compatible with the national interest and aspiration, is in the political sector—not alone in terms of maintaining our own domestic stability but even more in terms of the posture and initiative we take in our regional and global international relationships. For example, the consultative conference held recently in Manila, I believe, established firmly for the information of all concerned the fact that the peoples and governments of this region see the situation in Laos not as a big power contest but as a serious threat to their own peace and security and a manifestation of renewed Communist expansionism.

Aside from the special and significant features of the free world bloc already mentioned, it should not be forgotten that the free world, precisely defined, includes the so-called uncommitted nations which nevertheless are as dedicated to the preservation of their own free societies and individual freedom as ours. With these nations, while we may differ on the measures taken to insure national integrity, we have much in common in terms of other problems and aspirations wherein mutual understanding and cooperation can be mutually beneficial.

For the most part, these common problems are characteristic of the developing new nations: Security against external aggressions, internal defense and protection of free institutions, and the acceleration of economic growth and technological development. It is no coincidence certainly that each of these areas is today included in the broadened front of Communist attack. As the arms race reaches a point of stalemate, the political and economic sectors grow in importance, and whatever can be done to increase the strength of these sectors in every free nation, regardless of military commitment, is a net gain in terms of free world security.

This has been the underlying purpose of our determination to broaden the base of our relationship, first with neighboring free societies and later with those geographically more remote. It would be utopian to think that in the free association I have described there could be complete agreement in all matters, but it is a characteristic of a democratic community such as the free world comprises that the individual and the community may seek benefits wherever agreement and cooperation can be achieved.

While on the subject of the small nation—committed, uncommitted or neutral—we might stop to consider a particular phenomenon of our times—a phenomenon, incidentally, which underscores my earlier emphasis on the fact that it is the small nation that has the greatest stake in realizing a world community accepting the rule of law.

Recently the General Assembly of the United Nations has been augmented by the admission of many new small nations. Small though each may be in resource and limited in experience, each enjoys numerical equality with the oldest and largest in that assembly of nations. The magnitude of the influence these nations acting in concert can wield has been demonstrated and commented upon. Some view the phenomenon with elation, others with concern. We of the Philippines, ourselves a small nation, experience both reactions. We are elated to have this confirmation of our most fundamental foreign policy outlook, but we are concerned that this power of small states, unique in mankind's history, not be lost or destroyed by abuse.

We must never lose sight of the fact that the power exists only by virtue of the organization in which it is exercised, the United Nations. This organization itself will exist only so long as it honestly and impartially reflects the intent of its Charter, only so long as each member feels that its decisions and judgments are the result of sober and honest deliberation. The intrusion of petty or sordid motives, of ancient grudges, or racial bias could bring about the destruction of what the world has so painfully tried to restore since the tragic collapse of the League of Nations.

Before concluding, there is one other aspect of this administration's foreign policy I should like to clarify. Our determination to withhold recognition from nations of the Communist bloc has been questioned as being more rigid than that of the United States. "More popish than the Pope," is one of the flippant criticisms.

In the first place it should be pointed out that the free world alliance by its very nature does not impose rigid conformity of policy upon each of its members. For its own reasons, the United States recognizes the Soviet Union and sits with its representatives in the United Nations. We have avoided such diplomatic relations without impairing our U.N. participation. Should Red China shoot its way into the United Nations, or even negotiate formal relations with the United States, we see no reason why either development need influence our own policy, which is based upon considerations of practical self-interest. In terms of trade, we certainly have not so thoroughly exhausted the markets of the free world as to turn in desperation to those of the Communist bloc. As for diplomatic convenience, we ask, "Whose?" All too vivid is the experience of many of our neighbors warning us of the tremendous burden that would be placed upon our security services should we permit an influx of hordes of spies, propagandists, and professional saboteurs, working from the protection of a diplomatic sanctuary in our very midst.

This, then, in summary, is our position. The clash between world communism and free societies is not of our choosing and not subject to our evasion. We believe that the only way to avert war, or win it if is forced upon us, is by a pooling of all free world strength in every sector, that weakness or disunity can serve only to invite aggression or piecemeal capture. For ourselves we choose active participation. In the case of those of our free world neighbors and friends who choose otherwise we are prepared to respect their freedom of choice, developing our relations with them in any or all of the other constructive categories of democratic activity mutually acceptable.

Contrary to Marxist dogma, we hold that tyranny—not the free society—carries within it the seeds of its own destruction. We believe, too, that the urge toward freedom is one of the strongest instincts, a divine endowment of all living things—including the people of Russia and Communist China. Therefore, the longer the free world can maintain and widen the margin of deterrence, the closer we come to peace with justice and freedom for all mankind.

I thank you.

Kansas: Symbol of U.S. Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, this year in Kansas we are celebrating our State's 100th birthday.

Among the many activities commemorating our State's first 100 years was an oratorical contest sponsored by the Native Sons and Daughters of Kansas.

The winner, Miss Marilyn Snell, of St. John, Kans., a freshman at Fort Hays Kansas State College, located in my district, gave her prize-winning oration at the centennial dinner of the Native Sons and Daughters in Topeka, January 28. She received the "Haucke Award" for her outstanding oratorical achievement.

It is with pride I submit Miss Snell's oratorical tribute and commend its reading to my colleagues:

KANSAS, SYMBOL OF U.S. PROGRESS

The following is the text used by Marilyn Snell, St. John freshman, in winning the Na-

tive Sons and Daughters' Award for the centennial year. Miss Snell gave this address before the centennial day dinner in Topeka, January 28. The Leader is printing this article in cooperation with the Kansas Centennia with other features to come in following weeks.

Today we stand as a favored generation. Those generations who have proceeded us and those who will follow us have not had and will not have the opportunity to see our State emerge from its first 100 years of growth.

This experience would both gratify and humble us because of the tremendous progress that must be made in the future. This progress that we cannot on our State's centennial birthday is most important when we can visualize it as being symbolic of the growth of the United States of America.

But, before we even start to think about the growth and expansion of Kansas, I wish you would shut your eyes, sit back in your chair and completely relax. Come back with me into history. No, not the history of Kansas; not even the history of our United States. But, back into your own personal history.

Perhaps it will take some of you back to the days of pigtails and long stockings, short breeches and double-breasted coats. But in any case, back to your gradeschool days.

Art class has been dismissed and you are now in your science room. Can you remember the miracle that occurred the first time you planted a bean seed?

Can you remember how delightful it was to watch that beanshoot nose its way out of the shell searching for the sunlight in its first experience of freedom? Then, as each hour, day, and week progressed, you watch it struggle in its new-found environment.

Finally the warmth of the bright, yellow sun touches the neophyte and its battle was won. It was almost as if the beanshoot had worked with conscious determination toward the warmth of the sun above the earth, until its primary battle was finished, until it was standing on its own two feet—or, roots, I should say.

Well, what is the purpose of this little piece of reminiscing? You've probably already guessed that the growth and struggle for light by the beanshoot is striking analogous to the growth and the struggle for that growth in Kansas.

The seed of progress was planted when the first white man set foot on Kansas soil back in 1541, some three centuries before our statehood was final. After many violent and hearty struggles, Kansas added her star to the blue field of the American flag, 100 years ago; then there was no holding Kansas back.

During her childhood and adolescence Kansas grew solid, deep roots * * * roots represented in balanced agriculture, diversified industry and the friendliest, most neighborly people in America.

If there is any area in the United States where agriculture can be called the "Kingpin of the Economy," it is in the vast stretches of farmland that constitute the high plains area of western Kansas.

Although manufacturing has surpassed agriculture as a wealth-producing factor, thus giving better balance to our economy, farm activities rank high and will continue to play a major role in the total picture.

Tops, of course, is the famous "Kansas King—Winter Wheat." The 1958 bumper crop was a jump of 59 percent over the previous year and served to put Kansas back in her traditional position as the Nation's No. 1 wheat-producing State. Kansas also supplies many other important crops and livestock that provide the basis for a substantial food-processing industry.

Yes, throughout the first 100 years of history, the first root, balanced agriculture, has played and will continue to play a major role in stabilizing and nourishing the growth of Kansas.

However, the rise of our economy from the depression era of the 1930's to the present level of prosperity was forged, and thus, another solid, nourishing root was established, in the small shops and large plants of our State's 3,450 manufacturing industries.

Since 1939 manufacturing has been contributing increasingly more to the welfare of the State. During recent years while agriculture has been zigzagging on the charts, manufacturing has been a stabilizing influence in our State's economy.

A milestone was reached in 1952 when, for the first time in Kansas history, manufacturing payrolls became the major contributing factor in the total personal incomes of Kansans.

During this jubilant year of centennial celebration, a practical eye can note that Kansas has made tremendous industrial growth in the past and offers virtually unlimited opportunity for future expansion.

The most outstanding assets that Kansas offers future industry are: (1) an available supply of manpower, (2) our location, as the crossroads of the Nation, (3) our transportation facilities, wherein we are ranked fifth in the Nation in railroad mileage and are served by five major transcontinental airlines, (4) Kansas offers an ever-increasing, prosperous consumer market.

The second root, diversified industry, has provided an expansion of wholesale and retail trade, transportation, construction, finance and many other related activities, to stabilize and nourish the growth of Kansas.

But our plant would still be only partially fulfilled without the third root, a root holding deep in the heart of America; a root for which I am especially proud. This root of nourishment is the most important—the Kansas pioneer.

If only we could have the same desires and abilities of our forefathers, those pioneers who had a spirit within their hearts and minds that they somehow managed to pass on to their children.

A spirit that lends itself to making great people, a people who can excel in culture and education, and yet retain a genuine humility in their religion. People who are interested in the ideals of improving one's self and in sharing the benefits of that improvement with his fellow man.

This is the type of person we think of when we hear the phrase, native Kansan. Our minds immediately recall our beloved William Allen White, Ben Hibbs, George Washington Carver, Glenn Miller, or perhaps our minds would immediately flash to our internationally known Drew Pearson.

But, it has been my experience that no matter where I start, past or present, my final picture of the people of Kansas, the picture to integrate and symbolize the great characteristics of all of these men is best expressed as when I drive down a bumpy Kansas road or a super Kansas highway, pass a dozen Kansans and have as many Kansans wave to me, a hearty wave of friendship and encouragement.

Nothing, absolutely nothing, makes me prouder to be a Kansan than the people I am naturally associated with when I say, "I was born and raised in Kansas."

Yes, from 1541 to 1861 we did progress rather slowly. But during these last 100 years, these years now so vivid in our minds, we Kansans have certainly made up for lost time.

From January 29, 1861, to January 29, 1961, Kansas grew sturdy roots, roots represented in balanced agriculture, diversified industry, and its native people. We have now reached our sunshine; and, as does the bean shoot, we will need great works coupled with God's blessings to continue upward.

There are many miracle mysteries in our world today, not the least of which is the growth of a bean shoot * * * or the growth of a nation.

Ladies and gentlemen, I, a native Kansan, am proud to stand before America today and declare that on our centennial birthday, there is not another State that can surpass Kansas, as the symbol of American progress.

Railroads: National Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to me, I am inserting in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a thought-provoking article entitled, "The Railroads: A National Challenge," writen by Ernest S. Marsh, president and chief executive, office of the Santa Fe Railway System, and carried in the January-February issue of Railway Materials and Equipment, published in Chicago for some thousands of railway executives in all parts of the country.

As a member of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, one of my continuing responsibilities is to keep up with transportation developments. All of us are extremely interested in the future of our railroads, and I feel that Mr. Marsh's thoughts about rail problems are well worth the consideration of my colleagues.

The article follows:

THE RAILROADS: A NATIONAL CHALLENGE

(By Ernest S. Marsh)

The railroads, with their ability to provide high-volume, low-cost, long-haul service remain the indispensable transportation link of the Nation. This industry, in spite of its difficulties due to the inroads made into its business by the newer carriers, still hauls nearly half of all the freight traffic moving between our cities.

However, in any appraisal of the present-day situation of the railroad industry there quickly comes to mind the paradox that on the one hand the railroads are presently in an excellent position to handle unprecedented transportation needs of the Nation and yet on the other hand numerous unsolved questions may well deter them in performing that service which is vital to the economy of our growing country.

The importance of the railroad industry to our national transportation system is unquestioned. Everyone agrees to that. The truth is that the standards of the American economy have been built around a marketing and distribution system almost totally dependent upon the reliability and efficiency of transportation.

The railroads have spent vast sums of money to be ready for their part in the development of our economy. New technologies have been adopted in every department of the railroad. Billions of dollars have been spent on equipment to provide better handling of lading, expedited service, improved communications, and all of the other things which go to make up the modern railroad.

However, within the past year we have had the railroads characterized in a Department of Commerce report as the "outstanding, unsubsidized, sick man of transportation."

Much has been written and said about the plight of the railroads. Many recommendations have been made and repeated by various boards, commissions, and committees over a quarter of a century. Still, few fundamental remedies have been adopted.

Nevertheless, there is optimism rather than pessimism about the future. But optimism alone is not enough. We cannot solve our problems by ignoring them. They will not disappear if we look in the other direction.

FIVE MAJOR PROBLEMS CONFRONT THE RAILROADS

There are confronting us today at least five major problems: (1) Excessive and inequitable regulation, (2) extensive direct and indirect subsidization of competitors, (3) excessive and discriminatory taxation, (4) excessive and unnecessary costs resulting from outmoded work rules and State laws, and (5) inflation so common to all industry but more serious for the railroads with their high labor cost ratio, their need for substantial capital expenditures on a regular basis, and where prices are not so easily or readily adjustable.

In the period since the end of World War II the total outlay of class I railroads for additions and improvements has been $15 billion, or an average of over $1 billion a year. At the same time the rate of return earned by class I railroads has declined from 3.92 percent average for the years 1951–55 to 2.72 percent for the year 1959.

Yet in what other industry has there been a greater technological advance than we have had in the railroad industry in the past two decades—the introduction of the diesel locomotive; centralized traffic control; microwave transmission of signals; traffic reversal on double track; electronic switching; greatly improved track maintenance machinery; electronic accounting devices; vastly improved train yards; shock control freight cars with safe loading devices; improved servicing facilities: piggyback and containerization; welded rail; curve and grade reductions; and many other less dramatic innovations have all contributed to tremendous increase in the efficiency of our operations.

Except for adoption of these progressive developments—in which the railroad suppliers played an important part—our industry would have had great difficulty surviving under private ownership. But further, as a result of these developments the railroads are in a position to give the shipping and traveling public the finest and most efficient and dependable transportation ever known—and at a reasonable cost.

We cannot, however, fulfill our maximum potential until we are given the opportunity to compete on something like an equal footing with other forms of transportation. Unless and until most of the problems I have outlined have been eliminated, the railroads will have great difficulty proving their enormous capacity and efficiency.

When I speak of resolving the problems of the railroads, let me emphasize that we are not looking for any special favors. All we want or need is a reasonable measure of freedom of genuine competition on equal terms in the transportation industry, coupled with relief from discriminatory, unrealistic and burdensome Federal and State taxation, and relief from unnecessary wage costs fixed on us by wholly obsolete work rules and State laws.

To illustrate one of our problems—under the so-called agricultural and bulk commodities exemptions of the Interstate Commerce Act great quantities of agricultural products move by motor carriers, and fuels, minerals and other such bulk commodities move by water carriers. These carriers, in transporting these commodities, are exempt from regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission. All the railroads have sought in this area is something approaching equality with the motor and water carriers. We would be happy with either of two alternative remedies—(1) elimination of the agricultural and bulk commodities exemptions in favor of motor and water carriers, or (2) extension of the same exemption to the railroads. I cannot see how any fairminded person could possibly oppose this suggestion. Yet, whenever we advance it, we are berated from some quarters as advocates of monopoly.

If the railroads had it within their power to solve all their own problems, they would do it. But they cannot eliminate restrictive and discriminatory regulations, or unrealistic and burdensome taxation. By themselves, the railroads are largely helpless in resolving these fundamental problems.

Relief ultimately must come from the cumulative efforts of railroad management, railroad employees, the public and the Congress and State legislatures. And because a healthy transportation industry is essential to our national economy, and the railroads in spite of their difficulties are the backbone of that transportation system, the overall problem is primarily one of national concern.

It would be inappropriate to outline here in extensive detail the precise remedies which might be applied. These are largely matters within the purview of Congress and the State legislatures because it is their work which has resulted in most of our problems and only they can set right a situation which they—in many cases entirely unintentionally—created or allowed to continue.

A broad evaluation of our transportation system reveals at once a national challenge, a challenge to bring, in the public interest, order out of a confusion of conflicting purposes, outdated laws, and unrealistic regulations.

The growth of competition is usually a healthy thing for the consumer—in transportation, a healthy thing for the shipping public. But the manner in which this was done through patchwork amendments to the Interstate Commerce Act and the Civil Aeronautics Act, while ostensibly beneficial, has actually been contrary in many respects to the long-term public interest and the well-being of the transportation industry.

A case in point is one in which the railroads fortunately were accorded some measure of relief by the Transportation Act of 1958. However, it provides a graphic example. For years we were denied the right to reduce our rates on certain commodities, even to levels that were admittedly compensatory, because the proposed rates would divert traffic from motor carrier competitors. This was economic foolishness. The shipper could have had lower rates but was denied them in order to sustain the traffic of motor carriers who could not economically meet those rates. As a result, the shipper paid an artificially high uneconomic rate whether his goods moved by rail or truck, and usually this added increment of cost was passed on to the public in the form of higher prices. This situation was met in part by the Transportation Act of 1958 which provided, in still another amendment to the Interstate Commerce Act, that the rates of a carrier shall not be held up to a particular level to protect the traffic of another mode of transportation. This clearly was a step in the right direction and may be a hopeful portent for the future.

The agricultural commodities exemption to which I previously referred is another example of utilization of regulation to frustrate the national purpose of fostering a sound transportation system. It was intended to aid farmers and fishermen in movement of thier products from farm or dock to market. But its most important result has been to develop a substantial segment of the motor carrier industry which, without regulation, moves a tremendous amount of traffic for large industrial producers and processors rather than for farmers or fishermen. Here let me emphasize that, if these carriers can move these products at compensatory rates lower than rates which the railroads could move them, we have no legitimate complaint. However, we can fairly complain about not being permitted to compete for this traffic on equal terms with the motor carriers. Resistance to our complaint would lead one to suspect that if our suggestion were adopted a considerable amount of this traffic would return to the rails.

COMPLETE OVERHAUL OF TRANSPORTATION REGULATIONS NEEDED

These examples point to the need for a complete overhaul of our laws and regulations governing transportation. Such is indeed long overdue. The objective of the railroads is not destructive competition and rate wars. Rather, we want to see an economically sound transportation system in which the various modes of transportation compete on as nearly an equal basis as possible, each promoting and capitalizing on its own inherent advantages while charging compensatory rates for its services, and none enjoying special advantages or favors.

Still another broad area in which relief is not only needed but clearly justified is that of taxes—Federal, State, and local taxes. This is not an objection of the railroads to paying their fair share of the expenses of Government. But it is an objection to a tax structure which severely handicaps us in our position in the transportation industry, and which, in some instances, is plainly discriminatory.

The railroads own and maintain their own rights-of-way, stations, yards, and other facilities. Every substantial railroad, by the very nature of its operations, owns many miles of right-of-way and other real estate and pays a myriad of local property taxes levied on these holdings. Contrast with this the trucker who merely runs through a town or city. The taxpayers provide and maintain his right-of-way and he, of course, pays no property taxes on it. The inequity of the situation is compounded when one considers that the dollars paid by the railroads in the form of property, income and other taxes, are devoted in part to direct and indirect subsidies for their competitors.

The remedy for this particular situation is twofold: elimination of the inequitable practice of assessing railroad property on a higher basis than other property and payment of adequate user charges by carriers employing publicly owned facilities. The trucks should pay their fair share of constructing and maintaining the highways. Water carriers should be charged on the same basis for waterway improvements and facilities provided by the taxpayers. And the airlines should pay adequate charges for their use of airports and navigational and weather facilities and services.

The area of taxes affords another potential source of very helpful relief. In order to continue to expand and improve their facilities, the railroads need capital, and at the rates of return outlined earlier—2.72 percent in 1959, and, perhaps, as low as 2.4 percent in 1960—it is difficult for them to find or accumulate that capital in present earnings. At least, it is very difficult under our present laws regarding deductibility for tax purposes of funds expended for capital acquisitions or improvements.

We have in the past and will continue in the future to seek legislation that would enable us to put aside funds from current income in a construction reserve and deduct them from taxable income of the year.

If not used for capital improvements within a period of years—for instance, 5 years—the funds could be made subject to taxes and perhaps certain penalties.

Such a construction reserve would enable management to plan ahead and undertake desirable improvements necessary to meet transportation demands adequately. With such a reserve, I am confident that the railroads would broaden and accelerate their modernization program.

There would be no subsidy involved in such an arrangement. At present, the cost of property less salvage value is deductible through depreciation. Under a "construction reserve" plan the actual cost of the property would simply be deducted sooner.

Nor would provisions for a "construction reserve" result in a long-term loss of revenue to the government, for the reason just stated that it does not involve tax forgiveness but merely temporary postponement. Indeed, it might even result in an immediate increase in tax receipts through a stimulation of capital expenditures which would put taxable income in the hands of builders and suppliers and their employees. It could have a very beneficial effect on those involved directly or indirectly with the railroad industry. It should level out the feast or famine experience of the past on orders for equipment and other facilities. Everyone is familiar with the billions of public exepnditures being devoted to waterways, highways and airways. They represent advance appropriations of taxpayers' money for improvements relating solely to transportation. All the railroads ask is some advance treatment of their own money, also for improvements relating to transportation.

A fairminded review of these objectives of the railroads which constitute a national challenge should make it evident that they are plainly reasonable and essential to a sound transportation system. The industry wants no favors, but, at the same time, we do not want to be discriminated against. We want the opportunity to compete fairly with other modes of transportation. We want to be relieved of inequitable and unrealistic tax burdens.

Service is all we have to sell, and it is only through a good brand of service at reasonable prices that we can attract and retain traffic while our country continues to grow and prosper. Over the years it has been demonstrated that the success of a railroad stems largely from the observance of sound operating principles, a policy of constant improvements, and a faith in the future of the industry. A policy of modernization and improvement has to be a continuing thing to keep abreast of new technologies—inventions and devices that will provide a better and more efficient way of doing what needs to be done. This is a job that is never fully completed, because what was modern yesterday may be obsolete tomorrow.

The U.S. railroads are the most streamlined in the world and more efficient now than at any time in their history. But more needs to be done and would be done if they are accorded the relief indicated by ordinary concepts of fair play. With ample resources they could capitalize to the fullest on technological innovations already developed. The horizons of the railroads, if they are given the chance, are virtually unlimited. Whether they will be permitted to move forward at a steady rate is the national challenge.

For the long term we have confidence in the continued growth and prosperity of our country. We have confidence too that a well-informed opinion will bring a sound and wise solution of problems in the competition transportation field and that the vitality of the railroads will be maintained in the interest of the public and our national security.

Foreign Trade Undertow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, there is no question but that foreign imports today are seriously and adversely affecting the economy of this Nation and adding to the unemployment problem. Much of the legislation that this Congress is going to be asked to pass upon will involve the consideration of the degree to which foreign imports should or should not be controlled. I am submitting for the consideration of the Members of the House an excellent address on this subject by O. R. Strackbein, chairman of the Nation-Wide Committee on Import-Export Policy, before the Society for Advancement of Management, delivered in my city of Cincinnati:

FOREIGN TRADE UNDERTOW

(Address of O. R. Strackbein, chairman, the Nation-Wide Committee on Import-Export Policy, before the Society for Advancement of Management)

The question of foreign trade has been debated throughout this country almost from the beginning of the Republic. Much of the debate, if not all of it, has issued from the base of interest or stake in the flow of imports and exports. Some interests have seen themselves as benefited by imports or exports while others have looked, particularly on imports, as a source of damage to themselves and the economy.

The elements involved include domestic producers, including labor, importers, exporters and consumers.

Domestic producers in turn may or may not be exporters or importers. Owners of manufacturing enterprises may indeed be both importers of raw materials, component parts and semifinished items, and exporters as well. They may sell abroad as well as at home. Usually their foreign sales are only a fraction of their domestc sales; but in some cases their exports may represent a substantial part of their total sales.

Attitude toward foreign trade may be determined in considerable degree by the extent to which the domestic producers export or import. It may vary also by the fact that they are merely importers of raw materials or parts rather than also being exporters.

If the producer neither imports nor exports he is a wholly domestic operator; and this fact will have a bearing on his outlook. This outlook will be further affected by his competitive status in relation to imports. If he has no competition from imports, his attitude may be quite objective. If, on the other hand, imports do compete with him, his attitude will be shaped by the seriousness of such competition. He may be little concerned about imports if they have gained little on him and if the outlook is that they will not be much of a threat in the future. He may, however, be greatly concerned or even frantic if imports are pressing him hard, cutting sharply into his market, gaining a rising share of it, breaking prices and generally disrupting his distribution and orderly marketing.

Another factor in attitude shaping is what is the prospective situation. The producer who does not now export may have hopes of engaging in foreign selling in the future. The producer who now feels no competitive onslaught from imports may see such competition looming on the horizon. The producer for exports may see his foreign market shrinking; or, on the contrary, possibly improving. He may, again, be nervous over political trends in some of his foreign markets. These are all factors that help to shape attitude toward foreign trade.

If the producer is not a manufacturer but a farmer, his attitude will be shaped by similar considerations. Is his product exported? What share of it? Is the foreign market attractive and important or is it uncertain and trivial?

If the farmer produces solely for the domestic market his feeling toward foreign trade will be one of relative indifference if in addition he faces little or no competition from imports and if there is little or no prospect of its arising. On the other hand, if imports are hurting him or threatening him, his response will be the same as that of the manufacturer. The degree of his interest will be determined by the volume and the sharpness of the import competition and by the trend and the prospects.

Sometimes the trend and the prospect are more upsetting than the actuality. This is only natural since the unknown often has power to induce more fear than what is in being and can be seen and evaluated. As an economic force the unknown but suspected, the unseen but feared, may be more powerful in shaping action than what is present and real, visible in broad daylight.

This is an important factor in foreign trade, even as it is in domestic production and trade—only more so if and when unknown factors play an important part in shaping profit and loss.

Foreign trends and developments are farther away and often more obscure than those at home. Up-to-date statistics on foreign movements and operations are often lacking or fragmentary. Therefore the unknown and the uncertain may play havoc with planning and foresight. Fear of rising imports may put a damper on business expansion for the domestic market because no sure answer can be had from abroad. The fear may not materialize; but the effect is the same; and, of course, the apprehended may indeed come to pass and sometimes may be exceeded. Then dismay and discouragement multiply; and there is no way of stopping the spread of gloom, unless, of course, there were some recourse.

What has been said of manufacturers and farmers is true also in the mining, lumbering and fishing industries. Any producer's outlook is determined or shaped by that which affects him or by what he thinks affects or will affect him.

The position of labor in this field is somewhat different. Workers who are directly in the front of import competition and who know what is or may be the impact on their employment, on their wages and on their hopes of promotion and their workweek, will react in much the same manner as the producers. They will regard imports as the enemy of their present welfare and future prospects. This similarity in reaction to that of their employers can and often does create a community of interest between the two.

If imports do not strike their own industry, the workers will be as indifferent as the manufacturer or farmer who is immune to import competition. If their industry is an exporter, the workers may become convinced that their interest lies in the freeing of trade barriers such as tariffs and quota restrictions. This will be a reflected conviction coming in the first instance from labor leaders, economists, commentators, publicists, etc. These workers would generally support the idea of free trade.

Then there are those who are employed in industries in which foreign competition produces only an indirect effect. Their attitude toward imports will be very similar to that of the industrialists themselves, i.e., one of complacence or indifference. "Perhaps," they think, "imports do hurt some people. That is too bad; but they help others; so, I guess the equation about balances. So, why get excited?" Such would be the workers in factories making parts and components or materials used in other industries that produce the final products, such as autmobiles, machinery, appliances, etc. The workers in paint factories, glue mills, paperboard plants, steel works, etc., may feel that since little or no paint is imported, little or no paperboard, or, until recent years, very little steel, they are free of import competition.

Only when they see foreign cars dotting the streets, foreign typewriters and calculating machines clicking in their offices, imported bicycles scooting along the sidewalks or foreign tableware rattling in the kitchen and the dining room, do they begin to reflect that the paint and the parts in the foreign cars are made outside of this country; the paper cartons in which these items are imported are supplied from abroad and the sprockets and chains, brakes and tires on the bicycles also come from overseas.

It will take some time for these workers to feel a kinship with those employed in the plants, factories and mills that turn out strictly domestic products that are hit directly by imports. It takes a while for those who are indirectly affected to see that imports are hitting at their own jobs, wages, workweek and working conditions just as surely as they strike at the workers employed in the domestic automobile companies, part manufacturers, etc., or in the bicycle or glass or pottery companies; or in the plants making screws, nuts and bolts, nails and other items that go into the finished product.

When finished shirts, blouses and pajamas are imported the workers in domestic button factories are bypassed. When readymade suits and sportswear are imported, not only are the workers in the button factories left to one side, but also the buttonholemakers, clothcutters and needleworkers. The textile workers already know that they themselves are under fire from imports, but it takes a while before their compatriots in the garment factories learn that they too have something at stake.

Even farther removed from the fray are the whitecollar workers, employees in doctors' offices, insurance agencies, banks; bookkeepers, salesmen, etc. They feel the effects more readily and believably if they are located in communities given principally to one or a few small industries, such as glassware, pottery, gloves, coal, lead, zinc, or the like. There the effects of an imported blight are more readily seen, even if they come by indirection. When the workers are unable to pay their doctors' and medical bills, the doctor's clerk, the pharmacist's helper and the lessor of the property soon learn the source of the trouble. Dried up or shrunken payrolls soon tell their tale.

While generally the interests of the workers and the manufacturers, i.e., their employers, are as one in the matter of imports and exports, there comes a parting of the ways under certain circumstances, some of which we see today and more of which are rapidly developing.

Before considering this aspect of the subject we should pay our respects to the other elements involved in the foreign trade sector of our economy. Mention at the outset was made of importers and exporters quite aside from the industries and other producers that import raw material or export some of their output. It should be enough to say that export and import houses, distributors, merchants, etc., will naturally be found arranged on the side of a maximum and free trade.

This, it should be noted, does not make them unselfish upholders of the national interest as opposed to the local, selfish interests of those who wish to see imports regulated, as they would like to have themselves considered, and as they never tire of asserting.

There remain the consumers—you and I, Democrats, Republicans, Catholics, Protestants, workers, industrialists, schoolchildren and teachers, salesmen and buyers, blacks and whites, men and women—that conglomerate mass known as the population.

The only comment necessary is to say that there is no such thing as a consumer interest as such. The interests of consumers are very diverse, as different as are people of different interests and pursuits and as unlike as the interests of the buyer and seller, farmer and processor, labor and management, landlord and renter, railroad and passenger, insured and insurer. The only common denominator is the human species and and the national interest. The latter is nearly as diverse as the number of those who comment on it. The consumer can have no spokesman because he has no coherence.

Back then to the interests of those whose welfare can be related directly or indirectly to the effects of imports and exports; more particularly, labor and the owners and managers of industries, farms, mines, fisheries, lumbering enterprises, etc.

With respect to reaction to imports, to repeat, the attitude of these various elements is much the same. The common denominator is injury or absence of injury. In the presence of injury, the degree of its infliction determines the tenor of the response. In the absence of injury there is indifference or adherence to what is considered the national interest. The only other determining factor then is the prospect of future injury.

With respect to exports, the common denominator is economic gain. If a good export market is assured, all is well. Workers will side with management in support of liberalizing trade. This has been the attitude over the years of the United Automobile Workers, the Steel and the Electrical Workers. If exports decline and the outlook for further shrinkage is compelling, both the producers and the workers begin to feel some disenchantment toward overseas markets.

If imports increase their pressure, as they have done in the past several years, attitudes of all the affected groups may be expected to undergo a modification. If the shift has been sharp, a complete turn-around may even occur. This was the case with the Amalgamated Clothing Workers and the garment-making unions. To a far degree this has also been true of the Textile Workers, and is finding an echo among the butchers and meat cutters.

Where the pressure, though felt, is not yet so great or perilous, some change in attitude may be expected, but no great swingabout. Witness the automobile and the steel industries and the unions in those industries. There have been expressions of alarm; there has been evident disenchantment toward exports, and the ideals of free trade have become tarnished. In the case of automobiles, imports reached about 10 percent of the market in 1959 and were met by the compact car and driven back slightly. Meantime, however, this country has lost completely its hegemony in the export field in automobiles. Our imports of cars now far exceed our exports and other countries have taken our long-held export lead away from us.

In the case of steel, imports surpassed our exports in the latter part of 1958 and continued until a few months ago. The outlook is for a long-term entrenchment of imports in this country.

Nevertheless neither management nor labor in these gigantic industries has yet turned around. They are taking stock and watching.

According to the preceding analysis, it would seem safe to say that if automobile imports reached 15 or 20 percent of the market and steel imports did the same, a turnaround quite swift and determined, would be executed, and without apology or regret.

Many examples could be cited, such as petroleum, an industry in which the independents came into conflict on this point with the great international oil producers. The latter, being themselves the importers, remained loyal to the principles of liberal trade. The former, finding themselves imperiled by the import impact, girded themselves for battle and 2 years ago succeeded in having an import quota placed on imports of crude oil, residual fuel oil and petroleum products. It would be more in point to say that the coal industry, not noted for its friendship otherwise toward the oil and gas interests, moved a strong hand in behalf of a restriction on residual fuel oil, a direct competitor. It may be noted that imports of petroleum had captured some 20 percent of the domestic market, when the quota cut them back to about 15 percent.

Here it may be added that imports in an increasing number of products have since 1950 captured a growing share of the market, often going from 5 or 10 percent, to 20 percent and on up to 30, 40 and even 50 percent or more. The New England fisheries, the tuna fisheries of the west coast, hardwood plywood, knit gloves, bicycles, smoking pipes, nails, typewriters, certain sporting goods, and other items have had this experience.

Once the tide of imports engulfs industry to an alarming degree, a divergence between the ownership, on the one hand, and labor and suppliers, on the other, begins to appear. Perhaps small business and most farmers should be placed in the latter camp.

When costs in this country rise to a point at which imported goods can readily undersell our producers and capture a progressively increasing share of the market, the manufacturer is confronted with a hard choice. He may fight against the imports as best he can by trimming costs, bringing out new products, if these can be found, or modifying existing lines and in general selling harder. If this does not meet his problem he may, if his finished product is an assembled one, undertake to import the parts and components rather than buying them from domestic producers. The bicycle industry has been forced into this defensive step. This means a loss of domestic sales to domestic manufacturers of brakes, handlebars, chains, tires, etc.; and, of course, employment suffers to that extent.

If this stratagem does not meet the challenge, the manufacturer may look overseas. He may shut down his plant here, as the White Sewing Machine Co. did some 2 years ago, and become an importer. In that event the domestic suppliers again find their market evaporating. The workers in the plant that made the final product may be dismissed in whole or in part but a substantial number may find employment in distribution or diversification. The transition may, however, be slow and painful.

If this gambit is not open, the manufacturer may send his agents overseas to explore the possibilities. Many have done so and are still doing so; and many have bought into going foreign concerns, notably Hamilton Watch Co. Others have made and continue to make licensing arrangements with foreign companies, under which a fee or royalty is paid to the American patent holder. In yet other cases actual branch plants may be opened overseas. Over $30

billion of American direct private investments, book value, are now in being in other countries, Canada leading, Latin America next and then Europe and Asia.

What happens now?

These companies, operating abroad, will supply foreign markets from within rather than from the United States. They may ship from bases in Europe to Latin America and elsewhere rather than from the home base in the United States. In other cases they may turn around and ship to the United States, as has been done by American automobile makers in England, Germany, and France, and by manufacturers of typewriters, other office equipment, tractors, etc.

All this adds up to a shrinkage in U.S. exports and lessened employment in the very industries that had been leading exporters from this country.

Labor cannot jump the boundaries as readily as capital and is left behind. The same is true of the suppliers or most of them; although some of them may follow their customers overseas. The chemical industry offers a possible example. The smaller manufacturers who lack adequate capital to take part in the exodus remain behind to face the withering import competition. Their main hope is to be absorbed by the larger companies. The trend toward mergers and monopolies may thus receive a considerable impetus.

The farmers, few of whom can emigrate, except to Mexico, Cuba and perhaps a few other areas, will find their domestic market shrunk even as do the suppliers, and the displacement of labor does not expand the market for agricultural products.

In the Midwest, an area long quite immune to import competition because of the overland freight charges, a deepening concern over the import problem is showing itself. The St. Lawrence Seaway leads not only outward but inward; and much of the competitive insulation of the past against imports is disappearing. The area that was free from import worry is now on the frontier of the low-wage competitive onslaught.

The machine tool industry, the foundries, the parts manufacturers and metalworking industries in general are now exposed on the new frontier. Their attitude toward import competition has given evidence of changing in accordance with the general experience.

The national trade policy of this country continues to support further reduction of the tariff and shunning of import quotas. Under present circumstances this represents a shocking failure to adjust to the new postwar competitive world. The competitive realities are against this country for reasons that are clear and simple: namely, low wages abroad, abetted by fast-rising productivity which in turn has been in considerable degree not only financed by this country but blue-printed to thousands of productivity teams hand-led through our factories. This is not said by way of complaint; but it is a fact that we ignore at our economic peril.

We are running successively in the red year after year in our international account and the outlook, considering our indefensible policy, is not good for a turnabout. The stimulation of our exports depends too much on our own Treasury to be anything much beyond a clumsy attempt to lift ourselves by our bootstraps. Witness the subsidy on our raw cotton and wheat exports, that between them cost the Treasury over $500 million a year. Witness the sales abroad of hundreds of millions of dollars of agricultural products for foreign currencies and shipments in the form of outright grants. Again, that is not a complaint; but we should begin most seriously to count our outgoing chickens. Many are coming to roost even now.

The recent speculative flurry in gold-buying abroad had only one possible meaning. Speculators who make a living by buying cheap and selling dear were betting that we will soon devalue the dollar. Why?

The outflow of gold has resumed. Beginning anew in recent months at an accelerated rate, the outflow has reached nearly $1 billion during 1960. The gold stock in Fort Knox is now slightly below $18.5 billion.

There is no likelihood that the varied gap that separates foreign wages from those in this country is about to close and little evidence that it is being significantly narrowed; and there is the rub. The installation of vast amounts of modern machinery and equipment abroad has greatly lifted productivity overseas and this confronts producers in this country with a problem never before contemplated. Yet we have thrown away most of our tariff defenses and even now we are in Geneva gnawing more of them away.

At the same time a mockery has been made of the remedy, i.e., the escape clause of the Trade Agreements Act, that has been so assiduously but falsely held up to the American people as a true source of relief against serious injury from imports.

What is needed in order to halt the growing exodus of manufacturing enterprise and so that economic expansion in this country may continue, is a competitive climate that will make investment in this country as attractive as abroad. In many lines this is no longer the case.

The reality and fear of import competition and the poor outlook for export expansion must be lifted. Otherwise the vigor and vitality in our economy to which we look for sustenance not only of our own population but for strength to ward off defeat from abroad, will be leeched away.

Thomas Garrigue Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the greatest Czechoslovak statesman of the 20th century, Thomas Garrigue Masaryk, was the son of a humble coachman, born 111 years ago today. At the time of his birth his country was ruled from Vienna and his people were suffering under Austro-Hungarian autocracy. By the time of his death 87 years later his country was liberated. It had become a stronghold of freedom and democracy, and his people were enjoying their richly deserved freedom in peace.

In bringing about such progressive and startling changes in the fortunes of his people Masaryk himself played a leading and very important role. Throughout his long mature life he was their leader, their teacher, their spokesman in the parliament in Vienna and in the capitals of Europe, and the tireless champion of their righteous cause for freedom.

As a man of exceptional ability and wide learning, Masaryk performed all his self-imposed tasks eminently well, and with consummate skill. He was the founding father and the first President of the Czechoslovak Republic. For nearly two decades he guided the destiny of his people, and at the time of his death he was venerated by his country and by all lovers of democracy and freedom.

Communist China Calls Peace Corps an "Expansionist" Move

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I have been heartened and encouraged by the enthusiastic response which the Peace Corps proposal has evoked both at home and abroad. It is unfortunate that this response has not been unanimous, and that our desires to help foreign countries meet their own urgent needs has been met with suspicion in part of the world. In a broadcast from Peiping on March 3 the New Chinese News Agency announced their belief that the Peace Corps was an arm of American "expansion" and "infiltration." While what the Communist Chinese say may be true of their own efforts to aid other countries, I think that the President's message made clear his determination that this would neither be the purpose nor the result of the Peace Corps. And he further made clear his hope that other nations would mobilize similar groups to "increase the welfare of all men and improve the understanding among nations." This will be the spirit of our Peace Corps and I hope that it will become the spirit of all countries sending aid in the form of materials or manpower to their neighbors.

In the thought that it might be of interest to the Members, the text of the Communist Chinese radio broadcast follows:

PEIPING, March 3.—According to a news report from Washington, President Kennedy issued an order on March 1 to establish within the U.S. State Department a large column of "trained American men and women." This column will display the billboard of the "Peace Corps" and resort to the pretext of "aiding" the new nations to intensify the infiltration and control of these countries.

As indicated in the order signed by Kennedy on forming a temporary "Peace Corps," this column will serve as a new tool with which the United States will carry out its foreign expansion under the "mutual security" plan. The order reads that the "Peace Corps" will train and dispatch American men and women to "serve overseas" according to the "Mutual Security Act" "as a new plan for offering assistance to certain countries and areas of the world." It will "coordinate or support" the "economic assistance plan" of the United States and the United Nations. The order also said that the director of the "Peace Corps" will discharge the "responsibility as delegated to the President under the Mutual Security Act and as assigned to the Secretary of State by the President, or the responsibility as

delegated to the Secretary of State under the Mutual Security Act."

On the same day Kennedy also presented to the U.S. Congress a special message proposing establishment of a "permanent Peace Corps." The message said that the United States is prepared to select and train at least several hundred persons for oversea service before the end of 1961. It expressed the hope for several thousand "Peace Corps members" to work overseas within a few years.

Just like the past infiltration of old China by the U.S. officials and "private" agencies of all description and their agents, this "Peace Corps" will "offer service" to the new nations "with initial emphasis in the field of education," especially in teaching English. It also plans to "offer contributions" on terms of medical service and public health, as well as in "rural development." The message indicates that the "Peace Corps members" will become "effective tools" to carry out the "development plans" as formulated by the U.S. "aid agencies" to help these countries.

With regard to selecting personnel for the "Peace Corps," the message said that all Americans "applying" to join the Corps "will be carefully screened" and "specially trained" for a period ranging between 6 weeks and 6 months. They will serve overseas from 2 to 6 years.

According to a Reuters dispatch from Washington on March 2, this U.S. "Peace Corps" will carry out its activities first in six Asian, African, and Latin American countries, including India, the Philippines, Nigeria, and Colombia.

Opposition to a Department of Housing and Urban Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, for several years the American people have been subjected to a barrage of propaganda from the mayors of our larger cities for a Department of Housing and Urban Affairs in the President's Cabinet.

Approval by the Congress of such a Cabinet department is fraught with dire implications for our constitutional system of Federal-State-local relations.

My attention has been called to the current issue of the legislative bulletin of the National Association of Real Estate Boards by Curtis E. Huber of Evansville, Ind., chairman of the association's realtors' Washington committee. Mr. Huber sets forth some very cogent arguments against such a Cabinet department. He analyzes some of the arguments of the advocates of such a department and his comments underscore the great confusion over the objectives of such a new Federal bureaucracy.

Mr. Huber puts to rest the argument that a Cabinet department is needed to coordinate the Nation's housing effort, and he views with great apprehension the demands of the mayors to deplete the Departments of Commerce and Health, Education, and Welfare of some of their functions.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD this bulletin by Mr. Huber.

The national legislative bulletin follows:

MARCH 3, 1961.

Department of Housing and Urban Affairs: This is the first of several bulletins which will be devoted to the subject of a proposed Department of Housing and Urban Affairs in the President's Cabinet. Within the next several weeks the President will propose such a Cabinet spot either through legislation or a reorganization plan.

The National Association of Real Estate Boards will oppose the creation of such a Cabinet department. These bulletins are to apprise you of the reasons why NAREB for the past 5 years has insisted that such a proposal is not in the best interest of the Nation. The bulletins will also develop the association's argument against such a Department as well as analyzing the arguments of those who spawned and who are now nurturing this most recent adventure in big Government.

The Kennedy administration will propose that the Congress create a Cabinet post for two reasons: (1) the adoption of such a plank by the 1960 Democratic convention and (2) the belief that such would be an adequate reward for the tremendous majorities returned for the Democratic Party in the recent national elections. The President feels that he owes this to the big city mayors.

Arguments: Let us first examine the arguments of the proponents of a Department of Housing and Urban Affairs. These arguments for Cabinet status are easily turned against such a proposal.

Will it coordinate the Nation's housing effort? The President's proposal will transfer the Housing and Home Finance Agency to the new Department: and, presumably the present Administrator, Dr. Robert C. Weaver, will become the Secretary. Two important housing agencies will be left out of the new Department. One is the Federal Home Loan Bank System which provides more home financing than all other financing institutions including FHA, VA, commercial banks, etc. President Kennedy in a letter dated February 6 to the Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board called upon the Board to cooperate in the President's effort "to secure a level of mortgage interest rates which will stimulate the construction of housing units, thereby aiding in our overall recovery program and in realizing this Nation's full potential for economic growth." Consider the recent implied warning of Secretary of the Treasury Dillon to savings and loan industry leaders that if dividend interest rates were not reduced the administration would be forced to ask Congress for authority to regulate such rates. Doesn't the omission of the Federal Home Loan Bank System from the proposed Department of Housing and Urban Affairs present convincing evidence that coordination of the Nation's housing programs is not the reason for creating the new Cabinet spot?

Yet the President will not request—initially, at least—that the FHLB system be part of the new Department. Why? Although logic demands it, the President has consented to the strategy that the opposition must be divided and confused. Once the Department is created, without the FHLBB, the illogicality of the situation can be cured by a simple maneuver. By then, NAREB—if such a Department is in being—would very probably support the adding of the FHLBB along with any other housing agency not yet trapped in the new bureaucracy. Certainly, there would be no longer a valid reason to oppose such a transfer.

The VA housing program, in its peak year, contributed to more home financing than the FHA. Current legislative measures indicate that the veterans' home loan program will be extended and expanded. The President will not include the VA program because opposition of the major veterans' organizations could prove decisive. Perhaps later, the veterans' program could be slipped in when only the veterans' organizations are opposed to it.

In any event, Cabinet status for a Department of Housing and Urban Affairs does not have as its objective the coordination of the Nation's housing effort.

Will it give housing a greater voice in Government? Representatives of the home building and home finance industries who view Cabinet status as giving housing a greater voice in the top levels of Government are whistling in the dark. Both the Federal Housing Administration and the Federal National Mortgage Association (and ultimately the FHLBB system) will be geared to accomplishing the social objectives of a monolithic Federal urban bureaucracy. This inevitable erosion of the economic soundness criterion underlying the operations of these agencies has dire implications for private enterprise.

Assuming that housing would play a major role, does not Cabinet status presuppose that Government's role in housing must be a permanent and expanding one? Yet the experience of the FHA, FNMA, and FHLBB, which have conducted their operations without cost to the taxpayers, points to the opposite conclusion. Instead of Cabinet status for housing, the Nation, and certainly private enterprise, should nurture the seeds of a lesser role of the Federal Government in the housing industry.

The erosion of our Federal system: To the big city mayors the State has become a relic of the 19th century. The cities want a direct pipeline into the Executive Branch and the Congress. The cities are impatient with the manner in which the State legislatures handle the demands of the urban areas. They prefer a more benevolent approach from the Federal level. A Secretary of Urban Affairs (we can forget about the minor role of housing) would, they think, hammer away at the cities' needs—see to it, they think, that the budget is loaded with what the cities need and demand. What are these things that the cities will want their Secretary to get for them in the Cabinet? The following urban interests were presented by the mayors before the 1960 Democratic Platform Committee (as reasons why a Department of Urban Affairs is necessary) and in hearings before the House Government Operations Committee (June–July 1959): Public health, immigration, highways and railroads, airports, water and air pollution, juvenile delinquency, slum clearance, housing, unemployment, civil defense, fire protection and prevention, location and relocation of industry, general public works planning.

Will the Secretary of Urban Affairs be the agent for the pirating of these many functions of Government, which affect urban areas, from the present Cabinet Departments?

The American Municipal Association contends that such a new Cabinet Department is necessary because soon we will be essentially a nation of urban dwellers. This is as good an argument against a Cabinet Department as we have ever heard. As a nation of urban dwellers we would have our Secretary in the person of the President of the United States.

Creation of a Department of Urban Affairs would complete the erosion of our Federal system, an erosion which first manifested itself in the early New Deal years. In essence it means that the cities would deal directly with the Federal Government, shunting the State aside as a sterile impediment to urban growth. The influence of the State legislature on the city would be inversely proportionate to the influence

wielded by the city's spokesman in the President's Cabinet.

County officials see danger in Department of Urban Affairs: On June 3, 1959, the Executive Director of the National Association of County Officials, representing 6,000 elected and appointed county officials, testified in opposition to the proposal. The policy statement read into the record is as follows:

"Whenever possible, dealings between county and other local governments and the Federal Government should be channeled through an appropriate State agency. We oppose the establishment of a Federal Department of Urban Affairs on the ground that it would further weaken the States and would tend to create an unwieldy bureaucracy of the type found in many foreign countries."

Coordination begins at home: Have State, county, and city officials made a sincere effort to solve the problem which they would have the Federal Government assume at the Cabinet level? The following colloquy in the hearings before the House Government Operations Committee (June–July, 1959) is of more than passing interest:

"Congressman FASCELL. Has the U.S. Conference of Mayors had any type of coordinating meeting with the American Municipal Association, the National Association of County Officials, the National Planning Association, and other national groups on related problems?

"Mr. GUNTHER [General Counsel, U.S. Conference of Mayors]. We at the staff level often coordinate our activities.

"Congressman FASCELL. But there has been no formalized action, to your knowledge?

"Mr. GUNTHER. No. There are no regularized channels through which discussion between city, county and State officials takes place."

Is housing only an urban problem? The FHA has two programs under section 203(i) (rural and farm) in addition to other programs which are available to small towns as well as urban areas. What happens to these interests when the FHA becomes a bureau of a Department of Urban Affairs?

AMA would deplete Commerce Department: On July 21, 1959, Philadelphia Mayor Dilworth, testifying for such a Department before the House Government Operations Committee, said:

"I think such a Department would certainly have a Division of Urban Transportation to which would be transferred those activities in the Commerce Department involving highways, transit, rails, airports, and other transportation activities affecting the cities. Air and water pollution is another activity which would fall under the jurisdiction of such a Department, and certainly virtually all of the functions of the Housing and Home Finance Agency would be transferred."

Perhaps housing should be shifted to the Commerce Department and public housing and urban renewal to the Health, Education, and Welfare Department if a Cabinet voice is so vital.

On the other hand, Dr. William L. C. Wheaton, director, Institute for Urban Studies, University of Pennsylvania, testifying on the same day, said:

"I do not think that it can or should be a Department of Urban Affairs. Water pollution and problems of transportation can't all be embraced in a department of cities, for many of these problems transcend urban boundaries and flow directly to peoples or to river valleys and so on."

He pleaded for a Department of Housing and Urban Development which would coordinate Federal aids and city planning. This is the present function of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator and his more than 10,000 Federal employees. Will the creation of another bureaucratic level over the present one improve coordination at the local level? The history of the growth of Federal bureaucracy attests to an opposite conclusion.

Where does this leave the small town? Federal programs will be geared to the metropolitan area, and the small town will participate only to the extent that it succeeds in becoming a satellite of the former. Significantly, during the 86th Congress, when department status for urban affairs first asserted itself as a major drive, legislation was introduced to create a National Commission on the Problems of Small Towns. Does this presage Cabinet status for small towns?

Let's not overlook the shortcomings of the cities before giving them a voice in the Cabinet. The Harvard Business Review (January–February 1961) in an article, "Is Business Abandoning the City?" reported the results of a survey of more than 2,000 businessmen. A highlight of the results is summed up in the statement: "The political image of the city is a major influence on business location and residence decisions. Right now, the big city image is bad."

Again, quoting the report:

"One of the chief inhibitors of more effective urban redevelopment efforts, and particularly the involvement of major corporations as entrepreneurs in these efforts, are the difficulties in the vagaries of local politics.

"We need stable, responsible municipal governments to clarify the rules of the game in undertaking major urban rebuilding."

Does the drive for a Department of Urban Affairs suggest that the cities want to surrender their responsibility "to clarify the rules of the game" to the Federal Government?

CURTIS E. HUBER,
Chairman, Realtors' Washington Committee.

Safety Belts for 1962 Automobiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, for several years, and especially from the time when I assumed in 1956 the chairmanship of the Special Subcommittee on Traffic Safety, I have been impressed with the value of certain devices which can be installed in passenger vehicles to curtail traffic injuries.

One of these devices, proven extremely beneficial, is the safety belt.

I was delighted recently when the major automobile manufacturers in this country announced that, starting with the 1962 models, they will install safety belt attachments for the front seats of all passenger vehicles.

By this commendable action, the automobile industry has forcefully called the attention of every automobile owner to the value of seat belts. To make seat belt attachment standard equipment will constitute a considerable financial investment by Ford Motor Co., General Motors, Chrysler Corp., American Motors, and Studebaker-Packard.

This will undoubtedly encourage the public to install and use safety belts. Expert testimony before the Subcommittee on Health and Safety, which I now chair, indicates that at least five or six thousands of lives could be saved each year if motorists used properly installed safety belts. In addition, thousands of serious injuries could be averted. This alone would more than pay the added cost.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I would call Members' attention to my bill, H.R. 134, introduced on the opening day of this session, which would establish standards for the manufacture of automobile safety belts. It is important, with the increasing acceptance of these belts, that the belts themselves be properly constructed so that they will be unfailingly strong and safe.

Under leave to extend, I wish to include a wire story on the safety belt announcement, as well as an editorial from the La Grange, Ga., Daily News, which points up the efficacy of seat belts.

The article follows:

THE 1962 CARS TO HAVE ATTACHMENTS FOR SAFETY SEAT BELTS

DETROIT, February 25.—The auto industry is going to make it easier for you to put seat belts in your car.

Starting with the 1962 models, all the major domestic manufacturers will install safety belt attachments in the front seats of all passenger autos. The anchors will be affixed to the auto frame or subframe.

The companies said yesterday that they will provide uniform attachments built to industrywide specifications to provide buyers with an easy, economical method of attaching seat belts. Previous costs have run as high as $20 per belt because of the drilling and other labor costs. Now the buyer will only have to pay additionally for the belt. Cost of the anchor is expected to be minor. Belts alone cost as little as $3.50.

Ford has been offering seat belts as optional equipment since 1955, but has had few takers.

General Motors, Ford, Chrysler, American Motors and Studebaker-Packard all said they will install the belt attachments as standard equipment.

WHAT PRICE LIVING?

More and more is being said about automobile seat belts. And there's no wonder, because it's a proven fact that the belts can save lives and are saving lives in the very limited group of users about the country.

Calculations, thorough and conservative, show from 9,000 to 18,000 persons would not be killed in the slaughter of the highways if seat belts were used by everybody.

Why do only 2 of every 100 cars have seat belts if the margin of life and death is so emphatically affected? There's public apathy to overcome, just like in other safety projects, and law enforcers like Col. Bill Trotter, Police Chief Troy McClung, and Sheriff L. W. Bailey know what this apathy can do.

There's a bright spot though. Manufacturers are taking the idea more seriously based on the minute percentage of patrons who ask for the seat belts. If as many as 7 percent of all automobile buyers demand seat belts, then auto executives believe the belts will become standard equipment, and, of course, that's the only way to get real good response.

There are several congressional crusaders now joining the campaign for greater safety through use of seat belts. Insurance companies have led in putting belts into company automobiles and medical men and safety councils are behind the movement.

"Seat belts are a lot of trouble," many drivers who take "very few dangerous trips" may say. Yet it takes more time to light a cigarette than it does to flick a seat belt buckle. And every engagement behind the wheel is a dangerous one nowadays.

Diplomacy by Terror

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call your attention to an important article appearing in the current issue—No. 57, winter 1960–61—of Prevent World War III, published by the Society for the Prevention of World War II, a nonprofit educational organization, located at 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. I refer to the article "Diplomacy by Terror," which is a factual analysis of U.A.R. President Nasser's policies toward his Arab neighbors.

There are many people who are under the impression that Nasser and his government speak for all the Arabs in the Middle East and have their welfare at heart. However, this is pure myth as can be seen by Nasser's efforts to subvert other Arab governments through terror, deceit, bullying, and even assassination. This article shows conclusive that Nasser does not represent the sentiments of other Arab States. On the contrary, a number of these countries fear and oppose Nasser as one who, under the slogan of Arab unity, is trying to absorb them to further Cairo's brand of imperialism. It is essential to understand what is really happening in the Middle East so that U.S. policy will not be guided by the groundless assumption that Nasser speaks for other Arab countries.

DIPLOMACY BY TERROR

President Nasser's capacity for aggravating tensions in the Middle East seems inexhaustible. Since his seizure of power in Egypt, practically every Middle Eastern state has, at one time or another, experienced Cairo's terrorism and poisonous propaganda. The targets may change from month to month and from year to year, but Nasser's overall objective is constant, i.e., to destroy the sovereignty of neighboring states and to append them to his orbit of empire. This article deals with the latest adventures of Mr. Nasser and his henchmen.

Having been sharply rebuffed by the Iraqi Government under General Kassem last year, Cairo has once more turned its guns on Jordan, the favorite whipping boy for Nasser's fiascos.

THE VICTIM

In the spring of this year, Egypt's controlled radio and press launched a vicious attack against the Jordanian Government with special emphasis on the Prime Minister, Hazza Majali. On March 8 radio Cairo warned, "If the people had its freedom it would not allow Majali to remain for a moment. * * * Majali is surprised that the lovers of freedom are dissatisfied with his slave policy. Hazza is surprised—but he is in for an even bigger surprise." The attacks grew in intensity as the summer approached. For example, on June 28, 1960, a Cairo broadcast described Majali as a spokesman of "treason and treachery." The fate of this "traitor" was "inevitable."

No man worth his salt will remain silent in the face of such direct threats to his physical person. Prime Minister Majali not only displayed courage, but spoke out in the sharpest terms. More than that, Majali rose above the question of personalities. He recognized that Nasser's attack upon himself was a clumsy camouflage and was really aimed at the sovereignty of Jordan. On July 7, 1960, Majali told newspaper correspondents that Nasser's policies were endangering peaceful relations in the Middle East. He noted that it was Nasser who initiated these assaults "which include wishes of death and streetdragging for the Jordanian officials."

The Prime Minister further observed that Nasser's incendiary talks took place at a time when Jordan and the U.A.R. had agreed that radio campaigns of mutual recriminations should be halted. He concluded his remarks with these words: "It was the U.A.R. authorities, headed by Jamal Abd an-Nasir, who caused the relations between the two countries to deteriorate. Although it is always Jordan's wish to see the Arab ranks united, we prefer a state of flagrant enmity to an artificial state of understanding which in fact shields intentions of treachery and plots."

Majali continued his exposé of Nasser's conspiracies. At a press conference on August 1, 1960, he outlined in detail Nasser's attempts to subvert and then dominate Jordan. The Prime Minister warned that Nasser's intrigues had far-reaching ramifications. Nevertheless, he assured his listeners that the Jordanian Government would stand firm and resist if necessary. Concluding his remarks, he said:

"Abdul Nasser realizes all this, but he is compelled to continue with his game of destruction from which he derives his continued existence, in order to conceal the corruption and ruin prevailing over his regime in Egypt and Syria * * * Nasser accuses us of being Western agents, because we obtain financial aid from certain Western powers. We do not deny that we obtain aid, but the aid is unconditional. We use this aid in promoting our economy and exploiting our resources. If obtaining aid proves one to be an agent, then Abdul Nasser is the master of agents, because he obtains aid from the East and the West in order to hide the corruption and to satisfy the growing need of his officers who are accumulating wealth, filling their pockets, implementing the plots of destruction, and shattering the Arab strength."

The growing tensions between Jordan and the Cairo government continued up to the Arab League meeting of August 22. The League met for 7 days and among the resolutions adopted was one which emphasized the importance that "accusations and all words and actions—especially through the press and over the radio—which might harm brotherly relations among the Arab countries, should be avoided."

On the day that the Arab League conference adjourned, Nasser's Foreign Minister Mahmoud Fawzi, announced that "the conference was held in a reasonable and realistic atmosphere. We did what we could to coordinate our moves in the direction of the aims in which we believe and for which we are working." On the very next day, August 20, 1960, Prime Minister Majali and 10 other high government officials fell victim to a coldblooded assassination. Could Mr. Fawzi ask for better "coordination"?

THE MAIN TARGET

Cairo's immediate reaction to this crime was one of self-satisfaction. Egyptian propagandists gloated and even warned that other agents of imperialism cannot live long if they oppose the overwhelming will of the people. However, even Cairo miscalculated the reaction of world public opinion. Indeed, almost automatically, commentaries in the Western press pointed to Cairo as the culprit. At that moment the Nasser regime changed its line. One of Egypt's foremost newspapers, Al-Jumhuriyah, ran a leading article entitled "We Accuse the King." It was King Hussein, according to this mouthpiece of the Nasser regime, who was behind the assassination of his Prime Minister. "We have proof to back up this accusation" the Cairo paper assured its readers. But to this day nothing has come out of Egypt that would follow through on this melodramatic accusation against King Hussein. Obviously, it was designed to throw sand into the eyes of those in the West who like to believe that Nasser is just a peace-loving, misunderstood Nationalist.

The criminal character of Nasser's regime was laid bare by the murder of Majali. Seldom have we seen such unanimity of reports in the Western press concerning responsibility for this outrage. King Hussein, himself, charged that the assassination plot was prepared with the full knowledge of those he termed the "responsible authorities in the United Arab Republic" (New York Times, Sept. 4, 1960.)

A couple of days later he publicly reiterated this accusation when he was asked if he thought Nasser had personally been aware of the plot. Hussein replied, "I am sure of it." (New York Times, Sept. 7, 1960.)

GANGSTER METHODS

Why did Nasser resort to this gangster method The fundamental answer lies in the nature of Nasser's goal which is to "integrate" the Middle East so as to provide a springboard for his empire building. This, of course, means that all states in the Middle East must be prepared to forgo their independence of action.

However, history does not record many instances where a state voluntarily consents to the yoke. Aware of this fact, President Nasser resorts to terror, subversion and murder. They have become an integral part of his foreign policy. It is perhaps no coincidence that Nasser is surrounded by German Nazis who helped Hitler to implement the same kind of operation when the Fuehrer was reaching for world domination.

This is the central fact of Nasser's foreign policy and the sooner it is recognized by all states, including the United States the better chance it will be to cope with this danger to peace.

Of course, there are immediate reasons why the Jordanian Prime Minister had to be liquidated. Certainly, one factor was his pro-Western views and his unconcealed contempt for Nasser's phoney nationalism and demagoguery. Nasser was discouraged over the fact that under Majali's leadership Jordan stood in the way of Cairo's plans to set up a so-called Palestinian government which would have inevitably been at the expense of Jordanian territory. Moreover, conditions in Jordan had been improved under Majali. As the London Economist of September 3, 1960, noted, since Majali took over in May 1959, he has brought a measure of calm in Jordan. He had "released a number of political prisoners and his plans for elections later in the year might have allowed more of the steam to escape."

Needless to say, the murder of Majali will not, in itself, satisfy Cairo. On the contrary, Egypt will never be appeased until it has completely swallowed up Jordan. This is impossible so long as King Hussein is on the throne. It is therefore, understandable that Cairo's conspiracies are above all conducted against the King who has been off and on a main target of Cairo's propaganda barrages.

THE TEMPO INCREASES

In the spring of this year, the tempo of the attacks increased with the ferocity which is the trademark of Cairo propaganda. Thus, on April 28, 1960, the Egyptian radio warned that Hussein would inevitably suffer the same fate as his grandfather (King Abdullah) who had been the victim of a terrorist assassination. On June 30, 1960, the Cairo radio declared that "the people have proven that they are capable of crushing their hangman (Hussein)." On July 8, Cairo Radio charged that "King Hussein is merely serving imperialist aims." On July 20 an Egyptian commentator called Hussein a traitor and warned that "the people are lying in wait for him." In this same commentary, it was said that Hussein "will not understand how poor his situation is until the day his people make him face the fate of all rulers who plot with imperialism against their people." Obviously, Nasser will spare no effort to destroy Hussein politically as well as physically.

It should be emphasized in this connection that Nasser's opposition to Hussein is not based on his aversion toward monarchism per se. We have no doubt that there are sincere people who might be misled into believing that this is purely a conflict between a popular dictator on the one hand and a monarch who wants to stay in power for selfish reasons. The issues are much deeper. Regardless of the nature of Hussein's rule, he has demonstrated friendship for the West and has, on the whole, pursued a peaceful foreign policy. Furthermore, Hussein has become a sort of symbol for those forces in the Middle East which stand for independence against Nasserism. It is this symbol which Nasser is striving to destroy.

AT THE U.N.

The contrasting positions of Nasser and Hussein were revealed at the recent session of the U.N. when Cairo announced that Nasser was going to New York to attend the General Assembly meeting. It was hoped that he would dominate the Arab bloc and give the impression that he was speaking for all Arabs. As a matter of fact, the propaganda buildup went even further. Here is the way Nasser's entrance into New York was described by Al Jumhuriyah (September 23, 1960): "Today New York will receive the hero who led the Arab peoples to freedom and peace and who paved the way for the peoples of Asia and Africa to achieve genuine freedom and cooperation among the peoples." Even Mr. Khrushchev could envy the imagination of Nasser's propagandists.

Nevertheless, Cairo showed much uneasiness and vexation over the fact that Hussein would also attend the General Assembly. Consequently, the Jordanian leader was subjected to a barrage of insults and accusations, obviously in the hope that they would intimidate and reduce Hussein's stature. One Egyptian newspaper, Al Ahram, charged that Hussein's trip was really "an imperialist plot" (September 22, 1960). This charge was echoed by another Cairo mouthpiece, Al Akhbar, which alleged that Hussein would be going because he was indebted to the "smile of Macmillan" and "the dollars of Eisenhower" (September 23, 1960).

But no matter how hard Egyptian propaganda tried to defame the Jordanian leader, the contrast was unmistakable when both Nasser and Hussein took their respective turns to address the General Assembly. While Nasser cast aspersions with regard to the U.N. role in the Congo which gladdened the heart of Mr. Khrushchev, the Jordanian leader gave unequivocal support to the U.N. in the "speedy and effective measures taken by the Secretary General and his staff in handling the tragedy of the Congo." Not only did the Jordanian leader expose the aims of communism in the Middle East, but he laid bare the conspiracies of the United Arab Republic, and warned the General Assembly that if they were not stopped they could "lead to the involvement of the major powers and thus produce a world conflict."

Describing Nasser's stepped-up campaign against Jordan, the King declared that it was the aim of Egypt to destroy the independence of his state. He recalled that on August 21, 1958, the U.A.R.'s warlike attitude became so menacing that the General Assembly of the U.N. endorsed an Arab League resolution by which even Nasser's government pledged to cease its anti-Jordanian campaign. "Unhappily," King Hussein remarked, "it (the U.A.R.) did not honor its pledge." These attacks continued and resulted in the assassination of Prime Minister Majali.

Hussein tried to restrain his emotion in referring to this brutal murder, but concluded with these words: "I should like only to add that I find considerable significance in the fact that our troubles with the U.A.R. date from the time that I denounced the growing menace of communism in the Arab world." Nasser was not present when Hussein spoke. He had already returned to Cairo where he received the usual hero's welcome. But Hussein's words are a challenge which, we can be sure, Mr. Nasser will not ignore.

ANOTHER TARGET

That Jordan's firm stand may be emulated by other Middle Eastern States is of prime consideration to Nasser. The recent break between Iran and the Cairo regime shows that the opposition to Egypt's strongman is gaining momentum. This last summer Iran roundly rebuffed Nasser's efforts to set himself up as the spokesman of the Islamic world. The conflict between Iran and Egypt burst upon the scene in July when, at the Shah's monthly press conference, a newspaperman asked if Iran was going to recognize Israel. The Shah's reply was not exactly clear and thus it was subject to misinterpretation. However, subsequent clarification by his spokesman indicated that there was no change in relations between Iran and Israel and that de facto recognition rather than de jure was the basis of Iran's recognition.

However, the Egyptian radio and press drowned out the calm explanations and the Shah was accused of being a tool of Western imperialism and an enemy of the Arabs. For days the Cairo propaganda machine poured out its venomous distortions. Thus on July 24, Radio Cairo said outright that Iran had formally announced establishment of full diplomatic relations with Israel. This was not true. Nevertheless, the lies poured forth in a continuous stream. The Shah was personally vilified and his Government slandered. Just as Cairo calls for the murder of Jordanian leaders, so has it appealed for the assassination of the Shah. On August 3, Radio Cairo declared that the Shah was protected by imperialism but this would not save him from the fate that awaits all traitors.

NASSER'S MANEUVERS

Having denounced the Iranian Government for something that it had not done, the Nasser regime had to follow through to keep up the pretense that what was false was really true. Diplomatic relations were severed. On July 28, the Egyptian Foreign Minister urged all Arab Governments to follow the lead of the U.A.R. and to break off all economic and cultural relations with Iran. Nasser's dominated Arab League was put into motion, and an unnamed spokesman for the League told the press that all Arab countries would blacklist Iranian companies and ships (New York Times, July 29, 1960).

The League spokesman expressed confidence that all other Arab countries would follow Cairo's lead. Nasser, himself, got into the act. In a fiery speech at Alexandria, he accused that Shah of having bowed to the will of the imperialists to receive a few more dollars of American aid. (Nasser receives tens of millions of dollars from American imperialists, i.e., taxpayers.)

Several days later, Nasser returned to the attack, sneering at the Shah for having allegedly recognized Israel to please America. He warned that breaking of relations with Iran would result in dire consequences for the Shah and his Government. "We are confident," Nasser shouted, "that the people or Iran will not let the Shah and other rulers in Iran to continue to march on this road." The road he was referring to, of course, was the path of friendship that had been maintained between Iran and the United States for years.

Actually, the screaming newspaper headlines, the blaring of the Cairo radio and Nasser's fulminations were all part of the psychological buildup which had been practiced in the past by German propagandists so as to pave the way for Hitler's aggressions.

Egypt's Foreign Minister Fawzi exuded confidence that this synthetic outcry would move other Arab States to take action against Iran and "all the Arabs will now say their word about the crime committed by the Shah and his government. Our statements will constitute the beginning of a flood" (July 28, 1960). Mr. Fawzi's optimism was based on nothing more than wishful thinking, for when other Arab governments were put to the test, they showed no enthusiasm. The Jordanian Government sought clarification from Iran regarding the Shah's position. The late Prime Minister Majali criticized Nasser for his "quick decision" and accused him of heaping "irresponsible" abuse on Iran (London Times, (Aug. 3, 1960).

REACTION

The Saudi Arabian Ambassador to Iran denied reports that his government would follow Nasser's line. Indeed, he reemphasized the point that friendly relations between Saudi Arabia and Iran would not be affected by "any kind of propaganda" (AP, Aug. 1, 1960). The Premier of Iraq was also cautious and unenthusiastic. He also refused to follow Mr. Nasser. "We should not allow rashness," he declared, "to make us lose our senses and thus lose our interest." In short, Nasser's trial balloon fizzled out. None of the Arab States went along.

Meanwhile the unequovical stand of Iran turned out to be another blow against Nasser. It unquestionably stiffened the resistance of other Arab States. The Iranian Foreign Minister described Nasser as "this lightheaded Pharaoh who is ruling by bloodshed."

At a press conference in Tehran on July 27, 1960, he delivered a slashing attack against Mr. Nasser: "The stupid, wil ful, and base declarations of Abdul Nasser, which are most unbecoming to the head of a friendly Moslem state, do not come as a surprise to the Imperial Iranian Government, because this man—whose illegal power derives from ambition, murder and bloodshed, incitement to riot, imperialism and the sowing of wrath and dissension among the Moslems—has always dreamed of leading and dominating the Moslem world * * * Gamal Abdul Nasser ought to know that Iran is an independent state and master of its fate, and that he is not the custodian of the Moslem states the states of the Middle East. He has no right to interfere in the affairs of other states."

Nasser's predicament was aptly described in a headline in the Christian Science Monitor, "Nasser Caught Out on a Limb."

The Egyptians were beside themselves with rage. Nasser's diplomats worked feverishly to recoup their master's loss of face.

They tried to do this by getting the Arab League to carry out an anti-Iranian boycott. On August 8, an emergency meeting of the League took place but no decision was reached. Consequently, the subject was deferred to the official meeting of the Arab Foreign Ministers on August 22.

On August 29, the Egyptian newspaper Al-Akhbar praised the results of this week-long meeting under the title "Arab Solidarity." This newspaper told its readers that resolutions on matters of great importance" had been adopted at the league meeting. Significantly, the paper did not go into details as to what these resolutions proposed to do, but it alleged that the conference had "established the primary element on which the strength of the Arabs depend—solidarity." The London Times correspondent reporting from Beirut put it this way: "The conference saved itself and the life of the league by avoiding the main issues in which agreement was not expected * * *" (Sept. 29, 1960). Obviously, Cairo propagandists could not be frank. As far as Iran was concerned, all of the maneuvers by Cairo went for naught. Indeed, the life of the league was saved.

OTHER TARGETS

Although Iran and Jordan have been the main targets of late, Nasser's aggressive activities are pointed toward other areas. On September 20, 1960, the Lebanese Ad-Dustur reported that members of a Syrian terrorist gang had been arrested. These agents of Nasser were also being interrogated in connection with recent bomb incidents in Beirut, Tripoli and other Lebanese towns. Another report from Jordan mentions that armed clashes had taken place between military units of Lebanon and the U.A.R. and that forces from the U.A.R. had crossed the Lebanon border and penetrated into Lebanese territory.

Turkey has also been the subject of Nasser's attacks. On July 11, Nasser's Minister of Interior in Syria, Colonel Serraj, called for the return of "Iskenderun" which is the Arab name for Alexandretta. This areas was incorporated into Turkey in 1939 following an election supervised by France and Turkey in which the pro-Turkish elements won. In reply to this revisionist speech by a key figure of the Nasser regime, the Turkish radio questioned why the U.A.R. had "chosen a way outside peaceful rapprochement." Several days before Serraj spoke, a member of the Iraqi air force, who had fled from Egypt, told a press conference in Jordan that Nasser was organizing a conspiracy to overthrow the Kassem regime (July 5, 1960).

NASSER'S TROUBLES

The enumeration of the plots and conspiracies engineered by Nasser and his associates pinpoints the main difficulties which block peace in the Middle East. So long as Western policymakers harbor illusions regarding the meaning of Nasserism, the Cairo regime will be able to continue its deadly game. Nasserism thrives on terror, subversion, and warlike acts. It is the age-old tactic of the demagog and dictator who has failed to cope with the real problems besetting his people. The roots of Nasser's crisis of leadership were described in succinct language by Iran's Deputy Foreign Minister as he explained Nasser's anti-Iranian policies:

"Nasser had been waiting for an opportunity to raise a furor, for the following reasons:

"1. According to reliable statistics in our possession, the economic position in Egypt is very grave.

"2. As a result, the standard of living has dropped by 35 percent during the last 6 months. The people are dissatisfied with the prevailing police regime, and the absence of freedom has caused a further deterioration of the situation. The condition of Egypt's farmers is worse than it was 5 years ago, and there is documentary evidence to prove this.

"3. The Egyptian Government nationalized the press, so that all the country's editors and correspondents have become the servants of the Government.

"4. The elections held there recently were modeled on the elections behind the Iron Curtain. No one may vote for any but the candidates placed on the list by order of the Government.

"5. Nasser promised his people to set up an Arab Empire and failed. In Syria there is strong opposition to Egyptian rule, and the Syrian people find themselves buckling under the economic strain and the lack of liberty.

"In order to conceal his internal difficulties, Nasser seeks to keep his people preoccupied with other matters and, with his campaign against the recognition of Israel, raises a furor in an attempt to force other states of the Middle East to follow in his wake. But he has failed miserably. The truth is that his tactics are well known to the Arab countries."

German Power Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call your attention to an important article which appears in the current issue—No. 57, winter 1960–61—of Prevent World War III, published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, a nonprofit educational organization located at 515 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N.Y. I refer to the article, "German Power Politics," which deals with the crucial issue of nuclear weapons for Germany. There is no doubt that NATO must be kept strong militarily in the face of the Soviet challenge. On the other hand, it is highly questionable, both from a military as well as a political point of view, whether nuclear arms for Germany would strengthen the Western cause. This article reveals some interesting facts on the problem which are little known. Because of the vital importance of understanding what might be involved in the nuclear rearmament of Germany, I believe this article merits attention and study by all security-minded Americans:

GERMAN POWER POLITICS

In matters of high politics there is no logic—only interests. A case in point is the current campaign of the West German Government to equip its armed forces with nuclear weapons. Needless to say, this has outraged no less than frightened millions of people. It is precisely this reaction which now compels the Germans to soften their blunt demand by proposing that NATO become an independent nuclear force. If this should come about, then the Germans will have achieved their objective. They will have killed two birds with one stone by outflanking the opposition to the nuclear rearmament of Germany and bypassing present prohibitions on the production of nuclear arms on German territory.

The German argument for nuclear weapons has been put forth by Chancellor Adenauer on a number of occasions. In a speech before the International Press Institute (October 31, 1960) Dr. Adenauer said that NATO (including Germany) should be equipped "with deterrent nuclear weapons." As matters now stand, he said, the Soviet atomic arsenal is so great that in comparison the weapons of NATO (including Germany) are equivalent to "bows and arrows." Then he went to the heart of his "reasoning" for equipping Germany with nuclear weapons, "I am convinced that the Soviet Union will agree to controlled disarmament only after we have achieved at least a balance in power."

Let us now analyze Dr. Adenauer's argument and see how much logic it contains. Judging from Dr. Adenauer's estimation of Soviet forces, Moscow now possesses superiority in power. Yet it was Chancellor Adenauer himself who made a most optimistic evaluation of Soviet policy when he was interviewed on the "Meet the Press" program in the United States (March 20, 1960). In reply to a question, he told his press interrogators: "I am convinced that Khrushchev does not want any war. He just has not any use for war. He needs the whole force of Soviet Russia for peaceful reconstruction for the next 7 years at least to carry through his 7-year plan."

Of course, it would be foolhardy for the Western powers to plan their defenses purely on Chancellor Adenauer's assurances of Russia's peaceful intentions. Indeed, Dr. Adenauer has been telling the West all along that a basic reason why the Soviet Union does not attack, is due to fear of the retaliatory blow of the U. S.'s deterrent nuclear forces. A few years ago, Chancellor Adenauer told a meeting of the Council of Foreign Relations in New York: "The United States has in a historically very short period of time become the strongest and the decisive world power" (April 16, 1953). Two days before he confided to an American audience in Chicago that the countries of Western Europe "are helpless in the face of the huge powers of the Soviets." Therefore, he declared, the strength of the United States must stand "behind us as long as any danger threatens."

The overwhelming power of the U.S. deterrent forces has been repeated up to the very present. Thus, in April of this year, the Chancellor, speaking before the German Press Club, said that the United States was the only power which could save the world (Christian Science Monitor, Apr. 13, 1960). According to the London Times (June 22, 1960) Dr. Adenauer told a meeting of his political party that only the power of the West based on the strength of the United States, had prevented West Germany from being "swept under by the Communist flood." The deterrent power of the U.S. nuclear forces has also been recognized by Chancellor Adenauer's arch political rival, Berlin's Willy Brandt. In a speech before the recent congress of the Social Democratic Party, Brandt warned his listeners to be "careful that the deterrent factor of the United States is not reduced." While no one, he admitted, could feel at ease in this "horrible" situation of nuclear balance we would feel less at ease if the West did not possess the (United States) deterrent (New York Times, Dec. 25, 1960).

Consequently, it would seem that the responsible leaders in West Germany including Chancellor Adenauer, do believe that the U.S. nuclear deterrent compels the Soviets to think twice before committing aggression in Europe. From the foregoing it would therefore follow that the balance of forces is not in favor of the Soviet Union—and if it is not, then why should the Germans be equipped with nuclear weapons? (If the Germans should receive nuclear weapons to remedy an alleged unbalance, is it not plausible that the Soviets would go ahead and provide nuclear weapons for its satellites and possibly Red China?)

Obviously, the answer to the question is not in the realm of logic, but in the sphere of power politics. In a little noticed speech delivered in Brussels in September 1956, Chancellor Adenauer declared that it was time for Western Europe to develop its own independent power. "The vital necessities of European countries need not always be identical with the vital necessities of the United States and vice versa; from this situation could ensue diverging political convictions which in turn could lead to independent political action." Chancellor Adenauer saw the countries of Western Europe in danger of being crushed between the two colossi, America and the Soviet Union.

As long as the countries of Western Europe were not united, Adenauer observed, they would be compelled to be dependent on one or the other of the superpowers. The Chancellor said that this was "deplorable from various points of view." One basic objection was related to the development of nuclear weapons. In the long run, Dr. Adenauer declared, the monopoly of these weapons by the two world powers is "bound to make the situation intolerable for the small powers." Implicit in this criticism was the idea of an independent nuclear force for Western Europe. Indeed, Dr. Adenauer was more than hinting when, toward the end of his talk, he declared outright: "The purpose of NATO is to protect certain interests of the Atlantic Community, not common European interests."

Thus, 4 years ago, Chancellor Adenauer revealed his true reason for wanting nuclear weapons for Germany. It is based on his pet scheme of a third power bloc in Western Europe dominated by German military might armed with nuclear weapons. For what purpose? "Without power there can be no policy." This is what Chancellor Adenauer told his generals and admirals on the occasion of his last birthday (London Daily Express, Jan. 9, 1960.) Dr. Adenauer's Defense Minister, Frank Josef Straus, spelled out the dictum in concrete terms.

Three years ago, Straus wrote a rather sensational piece on the nature and function of the new German Army in a weekly review which is closely associated with the Bonn Government. As noted by the New York Times correspondent (February 19, 1960) Straus' article outlined "the basic prerequisites for a return to the Bismarckian policy of strength and the use of this policy to force the western and eastern powers to reunify Germany" Straus emphasized that the West German Army should be used as a bargaining counter. He insisted that the West German Government conduct its diplomacy in such a way as to make Germany "so indispensable for the potential enemy that both sides would find it worthwhile to talk with Germany." The potential power of a German Army built along these lines, would, according to Mr. Straus, give the Germans a real opportunity to be heard.

There is nothing much that we could add. However, we do hope that our own policymakers will not allow themselves to take hasty decisions on so crucial a matter as the nuclear rearmament of Germany via NATO.

The 100th Anniversary of the Inaugural of Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, March 4, 1961, it was the will of Congress to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the first inaugural of President Abraham Lincoln. An appropriate ceremony for this occasion took place at 11 a.m. at the east front of the Capitol.

I was privileged to have a role in this ceremony and was pleased that we were blessed with good weather so that the some 20,000 who gathered there and those who saw and heard the program on radio and television could relive this great moment in history.

Those of you who shared in this rich experience can testify that what we heard and saw on that day will be one of the highlights of the Civil War Centennial observance, and that it, too, will take its place as one of the historic contributions to our heritage.

Unfortunately, many of the Members could not be present and thousands of others had to miss the event because of the travel distance involved and because of other commitments. It is appropriate, therefore, that we provide for the entire program, just as it took place, with the remarks of our beloved Speaker and the address of the distinguished American author, Carl Sandburg, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that it can be preserved for all time and made available to others who may be interested to have a copy of the program.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this commemoration ceremony in its entirety in the Appendix of the RECORD. The program follows:

THE LINCOLN INAUGURAL COMMEMORATION PROGRAM

(Music: the U.S. Marine Band; Lt. Col. Albert F. Schoepper, U.S. Marine Corps, conducting.)

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I present the Reverend Donald W. Mayberry of the St. John's Episcopal Church for the invocation.

Rev. Dr. MAYBERRY. Let us pray.

Oh, God, who moves among the centuries as author, and through faith in whom do we, living as in the chapters therein, find out our lives become rich. We honor this day, Thy servant Abraham Lincoln, who standing here admidst a people torn and anguished did lift his spirit above the false strength of malice to Thy spirit, and his will beyond factions and strive to Thy perfect will, and in Thee found his way and his Nation's way, so may we with his simplicity of heart find Thee in the complexities of our day. In the self-giving of ourselves to it, Thou hast set out happiness. Give us, we pray, the endurance to possess and to distribute Thy peace and may the blessing of God be amongst us and through us illumine the lives of others. We ask it in God's name. Amen.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, distinguished guests, my fellow countrymen, speaking for the Congress, whose servant I am, I extend a cordial welcome to each and all of you.

On a pillar to the entrance of the Archives Building here in the District of Columbia are inscribed these words:

"The heritage of the past is the seed that brings forth the harvest of the future."

There is no place in our heritage from which we can take more or better kernels of wisdom and examples to plant in the hearts of people now with better prospects for good results for the future than from the life and experience of our most American—American Abraham Lincoln.

I am glad to meet and greet all of you here and all of you in the radio and television audience who will share in this moving, meaningful, and momentous experience in our national life, which took place here 100 years ago today. This experience, if properly understood and commemorated, can do much in our day to help us along our difficult way as we prepare ourselves to contend with the struggles of our day.

It is fitting and proper, as a part of this experience, that we listen to an American statesman and to an American sage, poet, and historian whose respect and reputation has no peer in America.

Now, and first, it is a great honor and privilege for me to present a man who has had, just as the man we honor with this program, a tremendous influence for good in our country. A man who has served his people and his Nation extremely well, and longer as Speaker than any other man ever elected to the Congress.

All of America knows now that I speak of our beloved Mr. SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and now I yield to this great American for such remarks as he may care to make.

Speaker SAM RAYBURN.

SAM RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, distinguished guests and fellow Americans, I am happy to join the chairman in welcoming you today on Capitol Hill.

There are few occasions upon which the committees of the Senate and the House allow any sort of demonstration on this plaza. We inaugurate our Presidents here, and have for more than a century; but we meet here today for a special reason, and that is, to reenact the inauguration of one of the greatest Americans in all of our history and one of the greatest men of all time.

Prejudice, hate, agitation brought about the Civil War. I have always thought if it had not been for hotheads in the South and the inane and insane agitators of the North that Abraham Lincoln, by his justice, his fairness, his great statesmanship, would have prevented the Civil War which destroyed the flower of our young manhood in this country that at that time was so sorely needed.

As a son of a Confederate soldier, who did what he thought was right, I say for him and for myself after that was over, he was proud our great Union was preserved; and so, today I come upon this platform, with many distinguished people and many out in front of me, to say to you as I have said when I presented him to the House of Representatives a short while ago, that Carl Sandburg had studied Lincoln more and understood him better than any man who has ever written about him since his passing.

The saddest thing that ever happened to the border States and the Southland was for an insane man to assassinate Lincoln. Lincoln was strong enough in the hearts and minds of the people in the North that he could have prevented, and would have prevented, some terrible things happening in some parts of our beloved country. But north, south, east, and west, we have forgotten that prejudice, we have forgotten that hate, and today we are proud indeed, and I am happy to welcome you on this great occasion when we celebrate the inauguration of that great statesman, that man with a heart, that man with a heart of gold, and I am glad and I am happy, I am honored, to have the privilege of being a part of these ceremonies.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Thank you, Mr. SAM.

Our speaker is inseparably identified with the Lincoln story and its telling. He has devoted his life to it. He has lavished his genius upon it. He has quickened it and made it enduringly a part of ours. His "Abraham Lincoln: The Prairie Years and the War Years," are acknowledged throughout the world as constituting "a noble monument of American literature." It is with grateful pride and eager expectancy that I present the magnificent, the incomparable Carl Sandburg.

Mr. SANDBURG. Perhaps as an old reporter I could offer the point of information that Mr. SAM RAYBURN and myself are agreed that the crowd here today is nearly doubled that of 100 years ago when that was 10,000 listening to Lincoln.

Here 100 years ago to the day were 10,000 people who hung on the words of the speaker of the day. Beyond this immediate audience were 30 million people in 34 States who wanted to know what he was saying. Over in the countries of Europe were more millions of people wondering whether the American Union of States would hold together or be shattered into fragments. During the 4 months since his election Lincoln had kept silence on all such questions as, "What will be your policy?" "How will you act on this or that?" Six States had seceded from the Union. Big screaming black letters in Charleston, S.C., cried to the wide world. "The Union is dissolved." Scores of newspapers had asked in effect, "Mr. Lincoln, since you know you can't coax the seceded States back, will you go so far as to use force and start a bloody civil war?" The General of the Army, Winfield Scott, had arranged for riflemen in squads to be hiding on the roofs along Pennsylvania Avenue when the Presidential carriage passed. His orders were: "To watch the windows on the opposite side and fire on them in case any attempt should be made to fire on the Presidential carriage." Alongside the carriage rode a squadron of cavalry. In front of it marched a company of West Point cadets along with infantrymen and riflemen from the District of Columbia. On sidewalks were people who cheered and people with stony faces who refused to cheer.

Out over the country from the Atlantic to the Pacific was everyday question, "Will there be a war?" The new man, about to become the 16th President of the United States who, in minutes, would take the oath to be faithful to the Constitution, was drawing to the close his inaugural address, saying, "In your hands, my dissatisfied fellow countrymen, and not in mine, is the momentous issue of civil war. The Government will not assail you. You can have no conflict, without being yourselves the aggressors. We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection."

In this he was speaking as a President, majectic, kindly, understanding. However, he knew well that as President he was also Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy of the United States. He spoke, too, somewhat like a man with an iron hand in a thick velvet glove and almost like a solemn oath he declared, "I hold, that in contemplation of universal law, and of the Constitution, the Union of these States is perpetual. Continue to execute all the express provisions of our National Constitution, and the Union will endure forever."

There came from him little gnarled nuggets of wisdom which in the 100 years since he spoke them have been spoken and printed thousands of times, "Suppose you go to war, you cannot fight always; and when, after much loss on both sides, and no gain on either, you cease fighting, the identical old questions, as to terms of intercourse, are again upon you."

There were crimson shadows flowing from some of his sentences. "This country, with its institutions, belongs to the people who inhabit it. Whenever they shall grow weary of the existing government, they can exercise their constitutional right of amending it, or their revolutionary right to dismember, or overthrow it."

Like an elderly counselor he asked, "Why should there not be a patient confidence in the ultimate justice of the people? Is there any better, or equal hope in the world? My countrymen, one and all, think calmly and well upon this whole subject. Nothing valuable can be lost by taking time. Intelligence, patriotism, Christianity, and a firm reliance on Him, who has never yet forsaken this favored land, are still competent to adjust, in the best way, all our present difficulty."

From a Capitol doorway, standing with folded arms watching Lincoln and plainly wanting to be seen watching him was Senator Louis T. Wigfall, of Texas, who in his South Carolina years had killed a man in a duel. Plainly wearing contempt, defiance on his face, Wigfall was saying now in pantomime what he had said in the Senate, that the old United States of America, the Union, was a corpse and the question now was how "to give it a decent burial." He questioned the backbone of the President-elect and in Senate speeches laughed sometimes, this Wigfall, as though the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse were a quartet of fat merry clowns and war meant neither cadavers nor ashes.

In contrast, Representative Tom Corwin, of Lebanon, Ohio, spoke in the House a bitter grief:

"Better for us that the fruitful earth should be smitten and become dry dust; better that the heavens for a time becomes brass, and the ear of God deaf to our prayers; better than famine, with her cold and skinny fingers, lay hold upon the throats of our wives and children, than that we should prove faithless to our trust and all our bright hopes die out in that night which knows no coming dawn."

On January 16 of 1861 Corwin wrote to Lincoln a letter for Lincoln's eye only. "I have been for 30 days, in a Committee of 33." Members of Congress from nearly all States south and north served on this committee, of which Corwin was chairman and he gave to Lincoln this judgment:

"If the States are no more harmonious in their feelings and opinons than these 33 representative men then, appaling [sic] as the idea is, we must dissolve and a long and bloody civil war must follow. I cannot comprehend the madness of the times. Southern men are theoretically crazy. Extreme northern men are practical fools. The latter are really quite as mad as the former. Treason is in the air around us everywhere. It goes by the name of patriotism. Men in Congress boldly avow it and the public offices are full of acknowledged secessionists. God alone I fear can help us. Four or five States are gone, others are driving before the gale. I have looked on this horrid picture till I have been able to gaze on it with perfect calmness. I think if you live, you may take the oath."

The last two sentences were addedly profound coming from the best wit and story teller in Washington. When Lincoln was a Congressman in Washington he and Corwin often had fun together with their stories. Now Corwin felt himself a presence lingering on a threshold preparing his farewell.

This 16th President of the United States had a vision of his country being of service in the world leadership. It is told in an address in Illinois in 1858: "These representatives in old Independence Hall, said to the whole world of men: 'We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.' This was their lofty, and wise, and noble understanding of the justice of the Creator to His creatures. Yes, gentlemen, to all His creatures, to the whole great family of man. In their enlightened belief, nothing stamped with the divine image and likeness was sent into the world to be trodden on, and degraded, and imbruted by its fellows. They grasped not only the whole race of man then living, but they reached forward and seized upon the farthest posterity. They erected a beacon to guide their children and their children's children, and the countless myriads who should inhabit the earth in other ages. Wise statesmen as they were, they knew the tendency of prosperity to breed tyrants, and so they established these great self-evident truths, that when in the distant future some man, some faction, some interest should set up the doctrine that none but rich men or none but white men, were entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, their posterity might look up again to the Declaration of Independence and take courage to renew the battle which their fathers began."

A preacher in Auburn, N.Y., having sagacity and wisdom gave his listeners in the pews these long thoughts about Lincoln, the 1864 candiate for President of the National Union Party ticket:

"Such an epoch of perplexity, transition, change, is not often witnessed. In every such passage of a nation there ought to be a character like Samuel. Misunderstood and misrepresented at the time; attacked from both sides; charged with saying too much and saying too little, he slowly, conscientiously and honestly works out the mighty problem. He was not a founder of a new state of things like Moses; he was not a champion of the existing order of things like Elijah. He stood between the two; between the living and the dead; between the past and the present; between the old and the new; with that sympathy for each which at such a period is the best hope for any permanent solution of the questions which torment it. He has but little praise from partisans, but is the careful healer binding up the wounds of the age, in spite of itself; the good surgeon knitting together the dislocated bones of the disjointed times. The explanation of his every act is this: He executes the will of the people. His wisdom consists in carrying out the good sense of the Nation. His growth in political knowledge, his steady movement are but the growth and movement of the national mind. He stands before you a not perfect man and yet more precious than fine gold."

As Lincoln spoke on that day which we memorialize now a hundred years later he knew death was in the air and so was birth. What was dying men did not know. What was being born no one could say for sure. He knew well and deeply what he said 2 years later amid the smoke and blood of conflict: "The fiery trial through which we pass, will light us down, in honor or dishonor, to the latest generation."

He would have wanted us of the latest generation today to remember how he stood amid the terrific toils and turmoils he was under compulsion to face.

Lincoln came out of the pioneer time of America. He began his journey to the White House in a one-room log cabin with a floor of packed down dirt and one window and one door. Perhaps we can say now that there can be generations taking hold with the loneliness and genius to struggle that always dwelt in the hearts of pioneers, as though the restless and venturing human spirit shall perform again tomorrow with exploits today declared visionary and improbable. Tomorrow belongs to the children—yes. This means that they and their children will take their own peculiar directions dictated by events not now known to any well accepted prophets. The living might plan and blue-print a world for the unborn, who on becoming born and grown to man size would decide to forget the arrangements made for them while they were unborn. Starting in on their own they might shape something else. With respect and affectionate regard for the elders and ancestors they might do what they do in their time, acting under wills, theories and compulsions unknown to the Founding Fathers.

This has happened across history. More than once this has precisely happened. Tomorrow belongs to the children. They will mold that tomorrow with care and wisdom. Or they will muddle and while muddling some may look backward saying, "There are plenty of precedents."

There are careless generations who drift, dawdle, decay. Still others leave tall landmarks of liberty, of discovery, invention, and culture, setting targets of achievement at which no succeeding generation can take a horse laugh of derision and belittlement.

What the young people want and dream across the next 100 years will shape history more than any other motivation to be named.

Youth now living and youth as yet unborn hold the seeds and secrets of the folds to be unfolded in the shapes to come.

None shall look back on this hour and say we did not have hope and faith.

The mystery of justice between man and man, nation and nation, shall take on new phases.

Dreamers of deep sacred dreams, finders and welders, sons and daughters of burning quests, shall come.

In actions of courage and endurance lighted with inner humility, lighted sometimes with a fine balance of motives as between freedom and discipline, they shall clothe human dignity with wider meanings.

Youth when lighted and alive and given a sporting chance is strong for struggle and not afraid of any toils, punishments, dangers, or deaths. What shall be the course of society and civilization across the next 100 years? For the answers, read, if you can, the strange and baffling eyes of youth.

As the new President, 100 years ago, slept his first night in the White House, his inaugural address had gone by telegraph to St. Joseph, Mo., and Pony Express relays were rushing West with it. They would be 7 days and 17 hours reaching Sacramento, Calif., with his plan for the east and west coasts, the Great Lakes and the gulf, the Rio Grande and the Penobscot to belong to one common country.

It was a great day in American history, of which we might say it was sunset and dawn, moonrise and noon sun, dry leaves in an autumn wind, and springtime blossoms, dying time and birthing hour. It has been a privilege to face this magnificent audience, and I hope it has been worth your while. I thank you.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. My friends, to try to comment on a magnificent address like that is impossible but it must be said, Mr. Sandburg, that all of America and liberty-loving people everywhere are grateful for this eloquent, appropriate, meaningful, and moving experience that you have helped to create for us so magnificently today.

My fellow countrymen, what we emphasize today in this program is not the conflict, but the tragedy, that at frightful cost enriched and made clear the American tradition. The phrase, "Conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal," acquired a magnificent meaning during and since the war for all of us and for all time. With the result that our Nation under God was unified and made strong beyond any power again to separate and divide. What has emerged now is the last great hope of an imperiled mankind. The fragment of history we show so humbly today may furnish an insight into the tumult, the bitterness, that in the end cleared the air for the triumph forever of the American genius for justice and freedom.

From our early revolutionary beginnings and from this Lincoln heritage is forged our country's leadership in a world of this hour, a leadership that gives promise of freedom for all mankind everywhere.

And now the reenactment of the Lincoln inaugural in 1861:

LINCOLN INAUGURAL REENACTMENT, 1861

Narrator: Roger Mudd.

Abraham Lincoln, President-elect of the United States: John C. Collison.

Mary Todd Lincoln, wife of the President-elect: Mrs. Jane Gill.

Stephen A. Douglas, Senator from Illinois: Ralph Becker.

Roger B. Taney, Chief Justice of the United States: William Tredway.

Hannibal Hamlin, Vice Presdieat of the United States: Clarence B. Gill, Jr.

James Buchanan, President of the United States: Ray Moore.

Edward D. Baker, Senator from Oregon: H. P. Newson.

Henry Watterson, journalist: Al Carwil.

James A. Pearce, Senator from Maryland: Al Tyler.

"Mr. MUDD. Honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, you are about to witness the reenactment of the opening act in the greatest tragedy of Amercan history—the War Between the States.

"This platform and the scene about to be played before you, constitute not a precise, but a reasonable approximation of the properties and what happened in this very Capitol plaza, here, on the steps of the east front of the Capitol of the United States, just 100 years ago to the very day.

"The platform, the small table which you may see up front there, and the chairs taken from the U.S. Senate are a nearly authentic recovery of the scenic background on March 4, 1861.

"But on that occasion, extensions were attached to either side to hold the distinguished guests.

"The guests remained standing through out; the chairs were provided only for the central group under the simple wooden canopy made of rough boards and painted an offwhite, as now, to match the Capitol Building.

"The New York Herald reported that a crowd of 30,000 gathered where you are now; and they saw the spreading structure of the Capitol, with its unfinished dome surmounted by gaunt derricks, braced with ropes of steel.

"The model of the statue of Armed Freedom, destined for the dome's apex, stood back there in the grass, among a litter of marble blocks.

"Here is the Lincoln Presidential party—about the way it happened 100 years ago—beginning its slow and dignified walk to the platform for the ceremony of inauguration.

"Shortly before this entrance, the Senate was called to order and the oath of office was administered to Hannibal Hamlin, the incoming Vice President, by the outgoing Vice President, John C. Breckenridge.

"This, that you are now about to see—the inaugural—is the main event.

"Of course, this is a condensed reenactment of the hour, done almost in capsule form.

"Here is the President-elect, Abraham Lincoln, escorted by the President, James Buchanan, a former Minister to Russia and Senator from Pennsylvania.

"Immediately behind them are Mrs. Mary Todd Lincoln, flanked by Henry Watterson, on your right, the famous Kentucky journalist, and Senator Stephen Douglas, of Illinois.

"It was in the Illinois senatorial campaign of 1858 that Mr. Lincoln had forced the Senator to take a political position which wrecked Douglas' chances for the White House.

"Directly behind Senator Douglas on the left is Roger B. Taney, Chief Justice of the United States, participating in his ninth inaugural; and Mr. Lincoln's great friend from Oregon, Senator Edward D. Baker, who will introduce the President-elect for his inaugural address.

"And finally to the rear on your right, Vice President Hamlin, and Senator James A. Pearce, of Maryland, who is a member of the inaugural committee on arrangements.

"That's the party.

"March 4—100 years ago—began as a cloudy and raw day. But when Lincoln stepped forward to speak, Washington was beset by what one report called an unseasonably warm sunshine and the crowds were afflicted by what the reporter of the New York Herald called an overwhelming dust. Pennsylvania Avenue, from the White House to Capitol Hill, had been scraped of its dirt and debris just the day before and the city had no street sprinkling system.

"All reports say Mr. Lincoln's voice was 'clear and distinct' and that it was 'heard by thousands.'

"The crowds, too, participated actively and noisily in the inaugural.

"Not far from this platform and on the plaza grounds, one youngster fell out of a tree. A little man with red whiskers addressed part of the crowd with oratorical flourishes.

"Hecklers and well-meaning enthusiasts took small liberties with the ceremonies.

"One newspaper reported that Mr. Lincoln was greeted by cheers as he approached to deliver his inaugural.

" 'He then put down his manuscript,' said another journal, 'claps his hands in his pockets and pulls out a pair of steel-bowed spectacles. This is a signal for merriment in one portion of the crowd. A lusty, hawk-eyed fellow cries out: "Take off them spectacles, we want to see your eyes." "I didn't know he wore glasses," remarked another, "they ain't in the picture." '

"Now, the principals in today's tableau have ceased chatting with each other. Senator Baker is about to introduce the President-elect.

"You see Mr. Lincoln fumbling a little with his hat and Senator Douglas gracefully relieves him of it. This may or may not have happened. In any event, sometime later, Senator Douglas reportedly said: 'Well, if I can't be President, at least I can hold the President's hat.'

"Senator BAKER. Fellow citizens I introduce to you, Abraham Lincoln, the President-elect of the United States of America.

Mr. LINCOLN. Fellow citizens of the United States, in compliance with a custom as old as the Government itself, I appear before you to address you briefly, and to take, in your presence, the oath prescribed by the Constitution of the United States, to be taken by the President 'before he enters on the execution of his Office.'

"It is 72 years since the first inauguration of a President under our National Constitution. During that period 15 different and greatly distinguished citizens, have, in succession, administered the executive branch of the Government. They have conducted it through many perils; and, generally, with great success. Yet, with all this scope for precedent, I now enter upon the same task for the brief constitutional term of 4 years, under great and peculiar difficulty. A disruption of the Federal Union heretofore only menaced, is now formidably attempted.

"I hold, that in contemplation of universal law, and of the Constitution, the Union of these States is perpetual. I therefore consider that, in view of the Constitution and the laws, the Union is unbroken; and, to the extent of my ability, I shall take care as the Constitution itself expressly enjoins upon me, that the laws of the Union be faithfully executed in all the States. I trust this will not be regarded as a menace, but only as the declared purpose of the Union that it will constitutionally defend, and maintain itself.

"This country, with its institutions, belongs to the people who inhabit it.

"Why should there not be a patient confidence in the ultimate justice of the people? Is there any better, or equal hope, in the world? In our present differences, is either party without faith of being in the right? If the Almighty Ruler of nations, with His eternal truth and justice, be on your side of the North, or on yours of the South, that truth, and that justice, will surely prevail, by the judgment of this great tribunal, the American people.

"By the frame of the Government under which we live, this same people have wisely given their public servants but little power for mischief; and have, with equal wisdom, provided for the return of that little to their own hands at very short intervals.

"While the people retain their virtue, and vigilance, no administration, by any extreme of wickedness or folly, can very seriously injure the Government, in the short space of 4 years.

"My countrymen, one and all, think calmly and well, upon this whole subject. Nothing valuable can be lost by taking time. If it were admitted that you who are dissatisfied, hold the right side in the dispute, there still is no single good reason for precipitate action. Intelligence, patriotism, Christianity, and a firm reliance on Him, who has never yet forsaken this favored land, are still competent to adjust, in the best way, all our present difficulty.

"In your hands, my dissatisfied fellow countrymen, and not in mine, is the momentous issue of civil war. The Government will not assail you. You can have no conflict, without being yourselves the aggressors. You have no oath registered in Heaven to destroy the Government, while I shall have the most solemn one to 'preserve, protect, and defend' it.

"I am loth to close. We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection. The mystic chords of memory, stretching from every battlefield, and patriot grave, to every living heart and hearthstone, all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union, when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature.

"Mr. MUDD. It is at this point that Mr. Lincoln took the oath of office from 81-year-old Chief Justice Taney. Contemporary reports reveal that when the oath was given, all stood up and took off their hats. The journalists that day wrote that the new President repeated the oath after the Chief Justice in 'firm but modest voice.'

"(The oath of office):

"Chief Justice TANEY. Do you solemnly swear to faithfully execute the Office of President of the United States?

"ABRAHAM LINCOLN. I do solemnly swear to faithfully execute the Office of the President of the United States.

"Chief Justice TANEY. And will you, to the best of your ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States?

"ABRAHAM LINCOLN. And, I will, to the best of my ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States.

"Mr. MUDD. The great drama of the inaugural is now ended. A nation is teetering on the edge of the great abyss. The new President, the new First Lady, the ex-President, the Chief Justice, the Senators, and a great galaxy of notables—many of them not to be seen in this tableau—are preparing to depart in their horse-drawn carriages to the festivities at Willard's Hotel downtown.

"The gaiety, the elegance, and the grandeur of the inaugural and its subsequent events cannot be completely captured for this reenactment. Nor, by the same token, is it possible to reenact the tense and highly charged atmosphere of impending doom which, in this hour, hung like a pall over the Nation.

"But they were there.

"For this is the eve of disunion and tragedy.

"The inaugural party, then as now, returned to Willard's Hotel for the luncheon. The menu was mock turtle soup, special brisket of corned beef with green cabbage, parslied potato, and blackberry pie and demitasse.

"It is this same menu that will be served at the reenactment today in the same place.

"Other words that this President has spoken will be remembered more than the words he spoke today.

"Yet the words he spoke today: 'We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies' became, of course, the main theme of his Presidential life.

"Like all his words, they will serve to lift the moral tone of mankind through the ages."

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Ladies and gentlemen, the committee, the Congress, are grateful to all who have had a part in this program and we thank all of you good people for coming. We hope you feel it was a worthwhile effort. And now I present the Reverend George M. Docherty, pastor of the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church, for the benediction.

Rev. Dr. DOCHERTY. Let us pray.

Oh, God, of the nations, the wounds of the Nation have, indeed, been bound up and the scars have healed and in unity with live one nation, indivisible under God. In our day and generation grant us such courage and self-sacrifice as we do this day commemorate, that we may labor until across the whole world every child of the earth shall know a full life, enjoy liberty, and seek that happiness that is the blessing of all and the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ and the love of God, the fellowship of the Holy Spirit rest upon and abide with each one of us and all God's children everywhere, now and forevermore. Amen.

(Music: the U.S. Marine Band.)

Alabama Man's Gift Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, a friend and constituent, Mr. Edward H. Pearson, of Autaugaville, Ala., has come up with a unique idea for helping others and at the same time helping ourselves.

A story about his plan appeared recently in the magazine, America's Textile Reporter.

The Reporter comments:

We don't know whether every last detail of Mr. Pearson's plan could be put into effect, but we would like to see it tried. Here, at last, is a "giveaway" program that really makes sense.

I think Members will enjoy reading about Mr. Pearson's plan.

The article follows:

ALABAMA MAN'S GIFT PLAN WOULD AID NEEDY, BOOST U.S. TEXTILE TRADE

A little over a year ago, on December 3, 1959, the Reporter carried an article about Edward H. Pearson of Autaugaville, Ala., and his plan which would build new business for the textile industry, while at the same time providing good used clothing, gratis, to needy people at home and abroad.

Mr. Pearson's idea, which included the granting of tax deduction certificates to those who donated clothing, proved itself in a 1-day drive at Prattville, Ala., a town of less than 7,000 inhabitants, when more than $6,000 worth of garments was collected in just a few hours.

For the past 31 years, Mr. Pearson and his wife have made it a part of their Christmas holiday program to donate gifts of fruit, candy, and simple toys to children and grownups alike, within a 10-mile radius of Autaugaville. They annually carry the spirit of Santa Claus to as many as 1,200 people on the day after Christmas. So when Mr. Pearson, who owns a broom factory in Autaugaville, speaks of practical charity, he knows at first hand what he is talking about.

In a recent letter, Mr. Pearson said that more people than for many years in Autauga County were on the list for a visit from his party of Santa Claus' helpers, this past Christmas. He added:

"Our newspapers are making a big mistake when they publish stories that the world is consuming more cotton today than is being produced, and that we are gradually working down our cotton surplus. We all know that the 1961 cotton allotments to our cotton farmers will be increased some 10 to 15 percent in acres they will be allowed to plant. We, of course, are thankful for this increase, but it's not the textile mills in our United States who will receive most of the benefits, but it's the textile mills in other parts of the world, using American-raised cotton that was sold to them at a discount to encourage export shipments.

"It is hard for us to understand why we have to produce the raw cotton for export to foreign nations and have textile mills here in our United States needing orders to keep their workers employed. Why do we have to have mills such as West Boylston Manufacturing Co. and others closed down or running just part time, due to lack of orders for the goods they could be producing, when it would be such a simple matter to flood our textile mills with orders and put them on a 6-day full time operation round the clock?

"We know that distribution of any type of goods can be worked out so that the one who needs the goods will get them. It would be just as easy to work out the distribution of used clothing and bedding that was in good condition to the ones needing such goods here in our United States as well as foreign nations, as it is to set up the Christmas giving we do on a very small scale in our community. It takes us from 9 o'clock the morning of December 26 to 5 o'clock that afternoon to give to some 1,200 people. We do this with about four people helping my wife and myself.

"We also know, and you published this in your Texile Reporter, that if people are allowed a tax deducation certificate for the value of goods they donate to an organized charity, they will donate large quantities of their good used clothing, as they did in our one-day clothing drive in Prattville. Of course, the people throughout the county helped make this possible. The reason they did this was they were allowed to deduct the value of the donated goods up to 30 percent of their adjusted gross income for the year. It just shows what can be done if you can get the right setup operating.

"We also know when you have donated your own personal clothing and bedding, you and your family have to replace such donated goods with new goods, and this produces new business and jobs. * * * Right now, lack of orders is keeping good textile mill machinery idle, causing unemployment, and with the stockholders of the company receiving no returns on their invested capital.

"We have everything ready and set up to prove to the United States and the world that we can consume any amount, not only

of the cotton and wool our farmers are able to produce, but also all man-made fibers. We don't just "think" this can be done—we know it can be done. One real test of 30 to 60 days in any large trade area would prove we are right. We realize that just one man would be unable to do this. It would take a small group working together to get the job done.

"We have asked the Lord for the past 31 years to give us good weather at Christmas time, so we could make our rounds and bring a little Santa Claus to the people of our community, and for every Christmas He has given us the weather so large crowds would meet us. This Christmas we had the largest number we have had in many years.

"We are now praying, asking our Lord if he will help us get this set-up for donating used clothing and bedding to organized charity operating, and prove to our world that we can balance consumption of clothing and bedding with any volume of goods that our manufacturers are able to produce, with the donated goods caring for the needy here in the United States and other nations of the world. The Bible tells us that, if we have two coats and see a person who does not have a coat, we should give this person one of ours. We then have to buy a new coat, so when the next needy person comes along we will still have an extra coat to give to him.

"By giving away our old coat and keeping our new one, we will be raising our living standards, and also our new purchase will help provide jobs for the unemployed. And, as we have outlined, our Federal Government will have paid much of the cost of the new coat we buy through the tax saving we will have made. Yet, the government actually will make money on the deal, and will suffer no real loss of revenue, since the new business produced should more than offset, overall, the tax deductions—the new jobs produced for unemployed workers will also produce additional withholding taxes.

"Our State of Alabama Unemployment Agency has just informed us that during the tax year of 1961 all unemployment taxes against business will be advanced, due to the increase of unemployed workers. We think this is pretty general over our Nation."

Revaluation of the German Mark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives, I would like to take this opportunity to commend West Germany for the action taken in revaluing the mark.

Many of us have recognized for some time that the exchange value of the mark has been below its true value, particularly in view of the great economic recovery made by West Germany. This action in valuing the mark upward by 5 percent should have the effect of stopping inflation in that country and, at the same time, it will help the United States to improve its balance-of-payments position. I would have liked to see the mark valued upward by 10 percent, but this latest action is certainly a step in the right direction and I hope it is just a forerunner of other steps to be taken by the German Government to meet some of the realities of the international economic situation.

Increasing the value of the German mark by 5 percent means that those who hold them can get more dollars for the same marks and can buy more American goods cheaper than before.

It also means that anyone with American dollars will find German goods more expensive. This should discourage Americans from buying in Germany and stop some of the dollar outflow. It should also stimulate our exports and bring about a decrease in prices of German imports.

The Washington Star had a very timely, article on this subject last night, which I would like to include at this point in the RECORD:

CHIPPING AWAY AT DEFICIT

Weekend announcements in three free world capitals offer further encouragement of at least a modest near-term improvement in our unfavorable balance-of-payments position.

In Bonn, on Saturday, the West German Government announced a 5-percent increase in the exchange value of the deutschemark. In The Hague, on the following day, the Netherlands Government announced a similar revaluation of the Dutch guilder. In Washington, there was a series of moves—including a State Department order relaxing the barriers to foreign tourist travel to the United States, a Defense Department order ending transocean transportation at Government expense of foreign-made automobiles purchased by servicemen overseas, and a new call from the White House for a voluntary reduction in overseas spending by both military and civilian personnel of the Defense Establishment.

The West German move was not made expressly, or at least not exclusively, for the benefit of the dollar. It has been recognized for some time that the exchange value of the mark, fixed immediately after World War II, has been below its true value in the light of the spectacular economic recovery in West Germany. This undervaluation has, in itself, helped the booming West German export trade but has been inflationary at home and, partly because of the often-rumored upward revaluation, has contributed to the speculative interest in the mark. The mark's attraction has been a factor in the outflow of American gold that has accompanied our balance-of-payments deficit. While some authorities on international exchange already are expressing fear that the 5 percent change is not enough to correct the basic problem, theoretically it should bring a nominal rise in the price of German exports and a parallel decrease in prices of German imports. The Dutch action, taken primarily to keep that country in step with its biggest trading partner, should have similar effect—with both having some helpful impact on our own export-import trade.

As for the steps taken here, they promise only a limited chipping away at the payments problem. On the scale proposed, the voluntary reductions in overseas spending, for example, would amount to about $100 million yearly in a deficit record that has been running well over $3 billion. Even so, it is obvious that a cure for this problem will not be achieved through any single action here or abroad. Our own Government still is seeking other ways to act unilaterally and still more that might be done through negotiation with our allies. Meanwhile, even limited accomplishment and cooperation are helpful.

Legalities of Aid-to-Education Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRIS FAIRCLOTH BLITCH
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, to the credit of a large segment of our population, education is a priority item in their thinking. There have been many who have wanted to go completely overboard on the subject and to get Federal aid to education whatever the cost to our Constitution and to our traditions. Integration, up until recently, has been the bulwark of obstruction to the bill. We have used this tactic honestly and effectively. However, we did not wish to bring in the religious question for when one raises the question of religion in politics he or she is often accused of bigotry. I have no bigotry in my heart toward any religion that any individual in our great Nation wishes to embrace, but my deep concern is that of our forefathers who settled this country to escape the cruelties administered to them because of their religion. The largest denomination in the United States at the present time is the Roman Catholic Church. I, myself, am a Protestant, but I have never at any time failed to appreciate the fact that I could practice my Protestantism and the Catholics could practice catholicism without state interference. Now that the issue of Federal aid to education is before us again and we have a fine man as President who is a Catholic and who endorses a Federal aid to education bill that would exclude aid to parochial schools, his own church hierarchy has condemned him and is now making a valiant effort to have its schools included in the Federal aid bill.

To those of my colleagues who represent great Catholic majorities I have the greatest sympathy, for it means that their constituents will be doubly taxed by the Federal Government for public education if the President's bill should pass. On the other hand, if it should pass, with parochial and other denominational schools included, the basis upon which our freedom was established will have been destroyed. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this Congress has never treaded on more dangerous ground. For the information of my colleagues and the general public at large, I am including in the RECORD an article published in the Washington Post, March 7, 1961, which I think will give all of us reason to think. Even though we have the President's assurance of nonsupport of aid to parochial and other denominational schools, what assurance do we have in the future that this legislation will not overstep the bounds of the sacred Constitution? Any succeeding President or Congress could amend the bill to include the objectionable features.

Are there not minds keen enough and means great enough at the local and State level to take care of this very serious question? Or shall we, as Members

sworn to preserve it, betray the trust placed in us by our constituents who elected us to represent them even though some of them forget the principles upon which this Nation stands?

LEGALITIES OF AID-TO-EDUCATION PROGRAM

(By James Clayton)

("Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof"—amendment No. 1, Constitution of the United States.)

Last Wednesday, President Kennedy told his press conference: "Well, the Constitution clearly prohibits aid to the * * * parochial school. There is no doubt about that * * *. There isn't any room for debate on that subject."

A day later, American leaders of the Roman Catholic Church said: "In the event that there is Federal aid to education, we are deeply convinced that in justice Catholic schoolchildren should be given the right to participate."

These two statements and the administration's aid-to-education bill have brought up one of the most difficult and most decisive issues in American constitutional law: What kind of aid to religious schools and to students who attend them is constitutional?

WHAT BILL PROVIDES?

The administration's bill provides aid to public elementary schools but none to private and parochial elementary schools. It provides scholarships for college students which can be used at public or private colleges. And it provides loan funds for both public and private colleges and universities.

President Kennedy's statements imply that these things are constitutional and that it would be unconstitutional to go much beyond them. The Catholic leaders have implied that the Government can go far beyond them without acting unconstitutionally. Both sides are oversimplifying the problem. Here are some of the questions and answers both sides must face:

Question. What does the Constitution mean when it says there shall be no law "respecting an establishment of religion?"

COURT INTERPRETATION

Answer. The Supreme Court's basic interpretation of this language was in 1947, in the Everson case, when all nine Justices seemed to subscribe to what Justice Hugo L. Black said the phrase means:

"Neither a State nor the Federal Government may set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another. Neither can force nor influence a person to go to or remain away from church against his will or force him to profess a belief or disbelief in any religion * * *. No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion. Neither a State nor the Federal Government can, openly or secretly, participate in the affairs of any religious organizations or groups or vice versa."

Question. That sounds fine, but does it mean that Federal and State Governments can never do anything which aids a church or a religious school?

Answer. No, it does not mean that. Government has long provided aid of one kind or another to churches and religious schools. The basic such aid is exemption from most forms of taxation; these exemptions have been upheld as constitutional in States where they have been tested in court.

TO STUDENT, NOT SCHOOL

More than that, the Supreme Court has held that it is constitutional for a State to provide free bus transportation for students in parochial schools and to pay for secular textbooks in parochial schools. These two things, the Court has said, are aids to the student and not to the school.

Even this, however, is a close question. Four Justices of the Supreme Court said that free bus transportation to parochial schools was unconstitutional; five said it was all right.

Question. Does this mean that the scholarship part of the President's program is constitutional as an aid to students?

Answer. It probably does. Scholarships awarded on a merit basis for use in any college, public or private, would probably be considered as aids to students. That was the rationale behind the GI bill scholarships which could even be used at divinity schools.

Question. Did the Supreme Court ever say that the GI bill program was constitutional?

Answer. No, it did not. The Court only decides problems when they are carried to it in a disputed law suit. No such case ever arose under the GI bill.

In fact, this is one of the reasons for the constitutional argument now going on. It is extremely difficult to get a case involving aid to religious schools into the Federal Courts.

MIGHT NEVER RULE

Question. Do you mean that if Congress passed a bill granting direct aid to parochial schools, the Supreme Court might never have an opportunity to say whether it was constitutional or not?

Answer. That's right. Under the Federal Court rules, a taxpayer could not challenge the act as unconstitutional. The only ones who could would be persons who could show that the act damaged them personally. If carefully written and carefully administered, such an act would give lawyers a tough job in trying to find a way to protest it in court.

SEES A DIFFERENCE

Question. President Kennedy has indicated that there is a difference between aid granted to colleges and technical schools and aid granted to elementary schools. Is this a valid distinction?

Answer. Most constitutional experts think that it is not a constitutional difference. If aid to elementary schools is unconstitutional, the same aid to colleges and technical schools is probably also unconstitutional, they think. A few agree with Mr. Kennedy that there is a distinction. They justify it on two grounds: 1, that elementary schools teach religious dogma as well as academic subjects, while colleges and technical schools often do not, and 2, that compulsory education laws require youngsters to attend elementary schools but not college.

The one Supreme Court decision which may (or may not) be relevant came in 1899 when the Court said Congress could spend money on an addition to a Catholic hospital here as long as the hospital acted within the terms of a congressional charter.

Regardless of a constitutional difference, however, there is certainly a political one. The Federal Government has in the past aided colleges with loan funds for dormitories and other projects. These have never been tested in court and are accepted facts of life, whether or not they are constitutional.

Question. Is there a difference between direct grants of money to schools and loans to schools?

Answer. Again, most experts think that there is no difference. If government lends money to a school at advantageous rates, this is an aid as clearly as a direct grant of money, they argue. But in 1958, the New York Court of Appeals ruled that a sale by New York City to Fordham University (a Catholic school) of land in the Lincoln Square redevelopment area was not an aid to religion although the city sold the land at less than it paid for it.

Question. Some Catholics have complained that an aid to education bill which does not provide funds for private and parochial schools would discriminate against the students of those schools. Is that a valid argument?

Answer. Regardless of whether this is valid from moral or logical grounds, the argument is clearly invalid from a constitutional viewpoint. Students who go to private and parochial schools are free to attend public schools and thus gain the benefits of governmental help. That is all the Constitution requires.

Question. Can Congress make a distinction between private schools run by religious groups and other private schools in granting loans or aid?

Answer. No, it cannot do so without denying one group or the other "equal protection of the laws." Whether it can distinguish between profit and nonprofit schools is an undecided question.

Prize-Winning Editorial From the Yazooan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the Yazoo City, Miss., High School paper, the Yazooan, has again received an award from the Freedoms Foundation.

The editorial entitled "Nations Seek Truth; Must Fight Indolence," and which appeared in the October 6, 1959, issue won the George Washington Honor Medal.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this excellent prize-winning editorial which was written by Mr. Thomas Sewell Rand, now a student at Dartmouth College. The editorial follows:

AMERICA MUST LEAD—NATIONS SEEK TRUTH; MUST FIGHT INDOLENCE

Since the beginning of organized governments, man has been continuously engaged in a struggle to maintain fundamental God-given liberties. Among these rights is freedom of expression.

Americans are indeed fortunate among the peoples of the world because their right to say what they think is specifically guaranteed in the Constitution.

The average American has read about Khrushchev's recent visit in uncensored, American newspapers, heard reports over free air wires, and after forming an opinion on the merits of the exchange of visits, discussed it openly with anyone he pleased.

The average citizen in Russia, however, when he is asked about Khrushchev's trip to the United States, could not refer to the leader of his people as one noted American newspaper columnist did. He called Mr. Khrushchev "old Hawgjowls." If he valued his life he would be forced to agree that his brilliant master would eventually save the world with his sermons on communism, delivered from the pulpit of the free world's press.

When the American people give voice to their thoughts, then they no longer have to give vent to their emotions. A people blessed with legislation effectively guaranteeing each person the right to a free expression of opinion will never face the need to rise up in arms against an oppressive and

despotic government. Through united voices the people, the ultimate foundation on which any government rests, can shape the government under which they live to the mold of public opinion. No iron-fisted dictator can long clench a people in a tyrannical grip if they have the privilege of expressing their opinions without fear of reprisal.

Nevertheless, the American people must face with fear and apprehension a very real danger from within—the complacency and ingrained habit of appeasement that have become characteristic of a large segment of America's people. Americans have long excelled among the peoples of the world for their adamant stands for the right. Today, however, moderate points of view are becoming more and more a part of the American scene.

It is vitally necessary in a world where one false step by a world power could trigger a nuclear war that Americans and free people the world over continue to use their liberties to the fullest extent. Only through constant use, incessant vigilance, and a firm stand for the right can the American people retain their liberty and offer the oppressed peoples of the world credible assurance that they will continue to lead free nations in the never ending fight against tyranny with an unyielding dedication to and love for the American credo.

Resources Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, the recommendation of this administration under the leadership of President Kennedy to move forward in the development of the natural resources of our country is meeting with wide approval. Surely a standstill policy—a policy of no new starts—cannot be justified. There must be new starts. And the progress of such depends upon the dispatch with which we in the Congress develop the necessary legislation.

Our country is abundantly endowed with great natural resources. To harness and put them to use enhances the standard of living of all Americans.

The President's program should have the support of the Congress. Already it has the support of the people. As evidence of this I include as a part of my remarks an editorial which recently appeared in the Commercial Dispatch, a conservative grassroots newspaper published at Columbus, Miss., in my congressional district.

The editorial follows:

RESOURCES CHALLENGE

President Kennedy has placed before Congress and the American people a challenge to venture toward new frontiers in the conservation and development of the country's natural resources. His plan is sound in purpose, broad in scope.

There are bound to be some misgivings as to the wisdom of this or that aspect of Mr. Kennedy's proposals. But on the whole the program appears to be a well-conceived summation of what must be done if the Nation is to fulfill the greater responsibilities that will come as a swiftly rising population puts more and more of a strain on our resources.

The administration envisions the need of more water, more electric power, better forest conservation, expanded recreational facilities. Means of dealing with these needs are proposed. The President notes, for example, the frequently stated forecast that U.S. water consumption will about double in 20 years; he recommends spending twice as much to find economical ways of making ocean water suitable for home and industrial use. His plan also foresees much broader development of nuclear power. He asks for control of air and water pollution, flood control, expansion of national parks and wildlife refuges and water reservoirs, more effort to tap the oil, gas, minerals and food in and under the sea.

The economic and political impact of the administration proposals will be emphatic and enduring. Although no price tag has yet been on either the immediate or the long-range program, the matter of cost will soon be brought sharply into focus. Whatever comes of the debate, the President must be credited with having offered an imaginative plan for tackling one of the Nation's major tasks.

Control of Textile Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1961

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith a concurrent resolution passed by the New Hampshire Legislature, March 1, 1961, requesting its congressional delegation to support and work for all possible and necessary legislation and regulations to control textile imports which are adversely affecting the textile industry in this country.

The concurrent resolutions follows:

Whereas the textile industry is an important part in the economic life of New Hampshire; and

Whereas foreign competition is one of the factors adversely affecting this industry and the economy of this State; and

Whereas the U.S. Senate Textile Subcommittee has recently been holding hearings relative to this question; and

Whereas the Governor of New Hampshire, as chairman of the New England Governors' Conference, and all other New England Governors have been diligent in the effort to find a solution to this vital problem: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Court of the State of New Hampshire requests its congressional delegation to support and work for all possible and necessary legislation and regulations to control textile imports which are adversely affecting the textile industry in this country; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state transmit copies of this concurrent resolution to the President of the United States, Senators STYLES BRIDGES and NORRIS COTTON, of the Senate of the United States, and the Honorable PERKINS BASS and the Honorable CHESTER MERROW.

STEWART LAMPREY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SAMUEL GREEN,
President of the Senate.

Passed March 1, 1961.
Attest:

ROBERT L. STARK,
Secretary of State.

Fiftieth Anniversary of the Indianapolis Motor Speedway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD C. BRUCE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to congratulate the Indianapolis Motor Speedway on its 50th anniversary.

The first International 500 Mile Automobile Sweepstake was held in Indianapolis in 1911, and since then, auto enthusiasts from all over the world have traveled to Indianapolis for this annual racing classic. Besides being a thrilling spectator sport, the speedway has also been used as a testing ground for many safety features of our present day automobiles.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the following resolution adopted by the Indiana State Legislature on March 4, 1961:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 30

Whereas it is appropriate for the General Assembly of the State of Indiana to take notice of events which are of profound significance to our great State; and

Whereas one of the great events taking place in Indiana during the 20th century has been the founding of the Indianapolis Motor Speedway; and

Whereas this great attraction has brought fame and acclaim to Indianapolis and the State of Indiana from all corners of the globe; and its contributions to the development of the automobile as an aid to better living for all mankind are known the world over, and

Whereas the 50th anniversary of this spectacular event will be celebrated on May 30, 1961; and

Whereas the 92d General Assembly of the State of Indiana wishes to congratulate the Indianapolis Motor Speedway, its sponsors, friends, and automobile racing fans everywhere for their inspired interest in the greatest motor classic of the century: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the 92d session of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana hereby congratulates the Indianapolis Motor Speedway on its golden anniversary and hereby extends every good wish for a future filled with even greater fame to the claim of the world capital of auto racing; be it further

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the 92d General Assembly of the State of Indiana hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States to recognize the golden anniversary of the Indianapolis Motor Speedway by respectfully requesting the Postmaster General of the United States to take the necessary steps to cause to be issued at Indianapolis on May 30, 1961, a stamp commemorating the 50th anniversary of the founding of the Indianapolis Motor Speedway; be it further

Resolved, That the Postmaster General of the United States be respectfully requested to take any steps necessary to be caused to be issued at Indianapolis on May 30, 1961, a stamp commemorating the golden anniversary of the founding of the Indianapolis Motor Speedway claiming the title of "The World Capital of Auto Racing"; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to all Indiana Members of the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate, to the Postmaster General of the United States,

to Mr. Anton Hulman, president, and to Mr. Joe Quinn, Jr., safety director of the Indianapolis Motor Speedway.

E. BOOMLEY,
Representative.
EDWARD MADINGER,
Representative.

Attest:

FRANCES GAYLORD,
Clerk of the House.

Uncle Sam as Don Quixote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two articles from the editorial section of the March 6 and 7, 1961, issue of the Bangor Daily News:

[From the Bangor Daily News, Mar. 7, 1961]

UNCLE SAM AS DON QUIXOTE

Cervantes' classic novel of some 350 years ago told of the adventures of Don Quixote, a noble-minded man who sallied forth as a knight to right wrongs and to aid the downtrodden.

Today, Uncle Sam is preparing to sally forth in similar chivalrous manner. But Uncle Sam's exploit will be in fact, not fiction. And, of course, it is going to cost the taxpayers umpteen millions of dollars. We have in mind President Kennedy's Peace Corps—a brave band of young men and women already being formed to venture into the highways and byways of the world and set things to rights.

The Washington office of the Peace Corps reports that young people by the thousands are clamoring for enlistment. This is understandable. Young people are adventurous by nature. And good old Uncle Sam will pay the expense of their travels and their sojourns. It is a most appealing proposition.

There will be screening. If this is done properly, we suppose the majority of those accepted will be sincere in their desire to be helpful. But sincerity and idealism are not enough to remedy the woes of this sorely troubled world. It is too bad, for life would be much pleasanter and the millenium much nearer if they were.

The peace corpsmen are to receive up to 6 months' instruction in the language and customs of the lands to which they are assigned. But how much can a bright young man or woman from, say, Peoria, Ill., learn in 6 months about India, or Afghanistan, or Ethiopia? Enough to make him or her an effective helper?

We think not. Rather, we suspect, the corpsmen will find themselves groping about blindly in unfamiliar surroundings. And very likely being more trouble than their worth—however good their intent and however hard they strive. To reverse the picture for a moment: Would you expect a man from Afghanistan to come into a depressed area of the United States and show us how to lift it up by its bootstraps?

Modern travel and communication have brought the world's ills close to the view of Americans for the first time. But the ills are not new. They are ages old and deeply rooted in human nature. They are not going to be remedied quickly or easily.

The fictional Don Quixote "came a cropper" 350 years ago. Uncle Sam, we fear, is going to do the same with the Peace Corps.

The program strikes us as a bit of idealistic "boondoggling" which has been sold to President Kennedy and which his brother-in-law, Sargent Shriver, is going to direct.

[From the Bangor Daily News, Mar. 6, 1961]

WANTS MORE THRIFT

EDITOR, BANGOR DAILY NEWS: I note comments made by Frank W. Anderson in a recent issue of your paper, relative to thrift. I am 100 percent in agreement with his views and from talking with numerous voters, I know that a very large percentage of them are of the same opinion.

It seems to me that most of our elected officials, both National and State, have the feeling that the more ways they can think of to use money and increase taxation the better job they are doing.

I think we need more men in office that realize it was the taxpayer that put them in office; the taxpayers' money that they are spending, and the taxpayer is not interested in wasteful spending and higher taxation. In other words, a little more thrift would be a move in the right direction.

W. H. COMSTOCK.

Farmers Need a Press Agent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, Robert C. Liebenow, president of the of the Chicago Board of Trade, recently wrote a letter to the Burlington (Iowa) Hawk Eye in which he voiced some arguments which I have often made, to wit: the farm story needs to be better publicized. I am glad that Mr. Liebenow concurs and I hope that we can encourage others to join us in spreading the word about just how valuable this wonderful farm plant of ours is.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Liebenow's statement in the Appendix of the RECORD:

FARMERS NEED A PRESS AGENT

Reams have been written about the great wastes in the farm price support program—about the staggering piles of surplus crops lying idle, the enormous expense involved in Government loans for unused crops, etc. All of this is quite true, of course. (I might point out, incidentally, that it would be more economical, since we must aid the farmer, to do so by making direct payments to him where necessary, rather than advancing money on crops that cannot be consumed.)

Meanwhile, I think American agriculture needs a good press agent—to tell the public that the farmer is not the villain in this picture, but that he is playing a vital role in our economy. Consider the following, if you will:

1. Farming is one of our biggest industries, employing some 7.5 million people (more than are employed in the steel, automotive, transportation, and public utilities industries combined).

2. Farmers buy, annually, between $2.5 and $3 billion worth of farm machinery, some $3.5 billion worth of gasoline and other fuels, lubricants, maintenance products, etc. (Farmers use more petroleum than any other single industry.)

3. They buy millions of tires a year, and consume approximately 24 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity.

Yes; the truth is that agriculture is still big and important business, and I think the fact should be trumpeted throughout the country, along with clarifying facts and figures concerning the essential nature of the farm problem.

ROBERT C. LIEBENOW,
President, Chicago Board of Trade.

The Proposed Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the President's proposal that a Peace Corps be organized for the purpose of promoting American ideals both at home and abroad has left me with considerably less than the enthusiasm such a proposition should invite. First, I believe we are rushing headlong into a program that has not been thought through; second, I feel that this could become a haven for draftdodgers; and, third, judging by some of the mistakes our oversea emissaries have already committed I am reluctant to have a bunch of half-baked, ill-prepared amateurs represent us on foreign soil.

My thinking in this matter has been greatly strengthened by a letter received yesterday from a valued constituent of mine, Mr. William H. Kearns, Jr., of 109 Valley Forge Road, Wayne, Pa., a portion of which is included with these remarks as follows:

One particular program that distresses me deeply is the proposed Peace Corps of the President's brother-in-law. I urge you and plead that any appropriations bill for this wild-eyed and worldwide boondoggle be voted down, and that departmental appropriations be amended to preclude funds from such purposes.

My reasons for asking this are as follows:

1. For some years now, there has been a crying need to strengthen and support the professional Foreign Service of the United States. Yet when foreign aid and a host of related programs were instituted, without exception, the Foreign Service was circumvented, and in most cases, its officers were not called on to testify at hearings. Thus the prime function of the Foreign Service was ignored, and the opportunity to strengthen our professional diplomatic corps was drowned in a sea of bureaucracy. This sending abroad of inexperienced and impractical idealists cannot help but create more problems for the Foreign Service and at the same time further weaken its morale and hopes for the future.

2. Secondly, Mr. Shriver has again raised the specter of possible draft exemption for those otherwise-qualified males who would serve in the Peace Corps. It should be evident, even to the wildest-eye idealist, that this can have a profound effect on recruitment for the military services whose need for the more technically competent grows each hour of the day. This, combined with the ever-growing attitude that a military career is the last possible thing for a young person to undertake, is bound to sap our national strength.

3. Finally, the basic question must be met head on: What image of America will result from sending thousands of inexperienced youngsters to foreign lands? Isn't there a grave danger in this? Consider for a moment how our reputation suffered in many lands where more mature and allegedly experienced persons were sent under mutual security, mutual defense assistance, ICA, and other similar programs. Furthermore, will not this Peace Corps build a whole new cadre of persons who turn their faces to Washington for cradle-to-grave guidance who might otherwise prosper and develop better under private initiative?

The trap is there, waiting to be sprung, and the dangers are many.

Lest you think that I write as a crochety person whose peripheral vision is restricted by advancing age, let me add that I still have some time to go before reaching my 40th birthday. But having served as a World War II naval officer, who has seen more of the world than most, I believe that I can safely exclude myself from the "crank" category.

Again, I urge you and your colleagues to give this "innocents abroad" program your utmost consideration before granting it any funds.

Conservation of Salmon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, one of the largest industries of my district and the State of Washington is salmon fisheries. The fishermen who depend upon the salmon for their livelihood are confronted with the problem of conservation of the salmon run.

As population of the Pacific Northwest increases there are greater needs for power and land reclamation. Therefore, it has become necessary to construct many dams across the rivers and streams in which salmon spawn. One of the great rivers which contributes to the cycle of the salmon is the Salmon River. In order to help conserve our salmon reserves I have introduced H.R. 3589, which would prohibit construction of dams on the Salmon River.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution adopted by the Washington State House of Representatives which supports the objectives of my bill and also S. 323:

Be it resolved by the house of representatives in legislative session assembled:

Whereas the Governors of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho, in recognition of the serious depletion of the fishery resources of the Pacific Northwest, met jointly in Boise, Idaho, on February 6, 1961, and agreed to take steps to remedy this situation and to urge Congress to enact legislation to safeguard the fish runs on the Salmon River in Idaho, the most valuable fish producing stream in the entire Columbia River system, which can be accomplished by preventing any further obstacles to Salmon River fish in their migration to and from the Pacific Ocean, similar to the objectives of Senate bill 323 and House bill 3589 of the 87th Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the house of representatives, That we urge the Congress of the United States to enact legislation creating a fish sanctuary of the Salmon River by prohibiting the construction of dams thereon and restricting the height of dams below its mouth on the Snake River to a height no greater than the highest of those dams presently constructed or authorized in that stretch of river, that is, a dam having no more than 100 feet of hydraulic head; be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the house of representatives immeditely send copies of this resolution to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, each Senator and Representative in Congress from the States of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, California, and Alaska, and to the Governors of each of these States.

I hereby certify this to be a true and correct copy of resolution adopted by the house of representatives March 1, 1961.

S. R. HOLCOMB,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

Dr. John A. Clements Named the Federal Civil Servant of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, March 1, 1961, Dr. John A. Clements was awarded a certificate as the Federal Civil Servant of the Year 1960 by the Federal Business Association of Maryland. It was given him in recognition of his physiological research which led to development of the mouth to mouth resuscitation method which is now acknowledged as a great contribution in the saving of human lives.

Dr. Clements, who lives in the Greater Baltimore area, is a medical research specialist at the Army Chemical Center, Edgewood, Md. In addition to this work, Dr. Clements lectures at the Johns Hopkins Hospital on anesthesiology and also is a frequent participant in various medical research projects throughout the country.

It was my privilege and pleasure to have been a member of a committee consisting of the Right Reverend Noble C. Powell, Episcopal bishop of Maryland; Mr. Sterling Noel, managing editor of the Baltimore News-Post; and myself, which finally selected Dr. Clements for this well-deserved honor.

The purpose of the Federal Civil Servant of the Year awards is to recognize outstanding individuals and to draw public attention to the competence and devotion of Federal employees and to encourage improvement in managing and transacting Federal business. The organization presenting these awards was established in 1923 by the President of the United States for the coordination of Government business.

Miss Bertha D. Baldwin, of the Bureau of Narcotics is the president of the organization and Mr. Frank E. Quinn, director of the Maryland Regional Office of the Veterans' Administration, is chairman of its Civil Servant of the Year Committee.

The Federal Business Association of Maryland deserves commendation for its excellent work in bringing into closer relationship the representatives of the various Government departments and independent Government organizations located in Maryland in order to foster principles of economy and efficiency in the transaction of Government business. That is the reason I wish to bring this to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress of the United States and to the public in general.

Resources for All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, we all heard and subsequently have studied the outstanding special message presented to the Congress by President John F. Kennedy relative to the preservation, development, and use of the Nation's priceless natural resources. There is no question that these blessings which nature has bestowed on this country must be preserved if our future generations are to have the raw material with which to continue building our great Nation.

I would like at this time to insert in the RECORD an editorial published by the McClatchy newspapers of the great Central Valleys of California. This fine editorial points out the challenge of the times is to "raise the curtain on a new era in which the Nation's God-given resources will be used for the benefit of all rather than of a few":

J.F.K. SETS BOLD COURSE FOR USE OF RESOURCES

President John F. Kennedy submitted to Congress last Thursday a special message which may herald a radical change in U.S. policy on preservation, development, and use of the Nation's priceless natural resources.

It is perhaps the most comprehensive, the most imaginative, and most constructive blueprint on the subject ever laid out by a U.S. President. It stands in bold contrast to the restrictive, no-new-starts policy of the Eisenhower administration which the President not only deplored for its lack of vision but also blamed for loss of lives and property by floods.

Kennedy reiterated profound statements that the continued strength and prosperity of the Nation depend upon the wise and careful use of its natural resources. And he added the solemn warning that "If we fail to use these blessings prudently, we will be in trouble in a short time."

The President's broad program ranges the whole gamut from water and power, forests, minerals, recreation, commercial fisheries and recreation to cleaning up the Nation's rivers and air.

The Nation, he said, must prepare for doubled consumption of water, up to 600 billion gallons a day, and a tripling of power output by 1980.

The message leaves no room for doubt that he stands flatly for giving preference to public agencies in the purchase and distribution of publicly generated power to encourage widespread use and to prevent monopolization.

He pledged his administration to principles which "recognize the prior rights of the general public, consumer, and taxpayer who have financed the development of these great natural assets originally vested in them."

With Congress cooperation, the President's program will raise the curtain on a new era in which the Nation's God-given resources will be used for the benefit of all rather than of a few. And that is how it should be.

Don't Dilute It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, several days ago the President sent a special message to Congress, recommending the establishment of a permanent Peace Corps. As one who is in full accord with the President's idea, I would be very disappointed if it were diluted and volunteers in the Peace Corps were used in depressed areas at home in this country.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N.Y., on March 7, 1961, and which echoes my sentiments:

DON'T DILUTE IT

After wholeheartedly applauding President Kennedy's new Peace Corps, as unveiled last week, we must say we hope it isn't true that the administration is already considering diluting this worthwhile program into a diversionary campaign of domestic do-goodery, whereby its volunteers will be scattered over the depressed areas of this country as well as sending them abroad.

Nothing, in our opinion, could kill the Peace Corps idea faster than this. The corps can be just as great a success as careful administration can make it—by painstaking screening of its personnel and its missions. But the idea of using its volunteers in depressed areas at home—said to have been suggested to the President by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt—seems so laden with political and sundry other boobytraps that it would wreck the corps before it gets a fair start.

And so we trust that the President was merely being polite to Mrs. Roosevelt when he told her, without rejecting the use of the Peace Corps for the purpose, that the administration is "studying" how it can "use Americans who desire to serve in our own country—in slum areas, in education, retraining and all the rest."

The best answer to that last, of course, is that nobody in Washington needs to tell young Americans who want to serve in these capacities how best they can do it. The opportunities are lurking all about and fairly screaming at them: In every social service profession; in every church; in medicine; in schoolteaching; in United Fund agencies; in Federal, State, and local public welfare work.

To serve humanity abroad, there is need of governmental sponsorship and organization and supervision for the kind of worthwhile undertakings the Peace Corps can do. But when it comes to recruiting volunteers for social service work at home, let the administration just look around and take note of the countless public, quasi-public and private agencies already in the field that it would have to compete with. And then let it drop the idea of organizing a domestic corps of volunteer do-gooders at once, and concentrate on making the Peace Corps, as originally conceived for service abroad, the success that it can be if carefully administered.

Address by Hon. Robert E. Jones Before the Pacific Regional Road Conference of the International Road Federation at Sydney, Australia, on February 27, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I believe that other Members of the Congress would be interested in reading a speech made by Congressman ROBERT E. JONES, of Alabama, a member of the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives. Congressman JONES headed a delegation consisting of Congressman FRANK SMITH, of Mississippi, and Congressman FRANK CLARK, of Pennsylvania, to the Pacific Regional Road Conference of the International Road Federation at Sydney, Australia, on February 27, 1961. Congressman JONES made this address before delegates of 17 southeastern Pacific nations. The press of all these nations reported our colleague's speech in full, and praised it extravagantly. All said he had made a notable contribution to explaining American democracy in action, and I am sure it will be of interest to many:

On behalf of the delegation from the Congress of the United States, we wish to thank you for the cordial and warm reception we have had since being in your country.

We attend this conference to listen and to learn.

The profits of these discussions and deliberations will be carried back and reported to our committee and our Congress.

We are proud and pleased to participate in this international activity.

The United States of America is overlaid with a network of nearly 3½ million miles of roads and streets. The quality of the democratic form of government which we enjoy today in a large measure is attested by this hallmark. For freedom of the individual is the basic ingredient of our democracy. And this hallmark of roads insures one form of freedom—the freedom of movement for our citizens to all parts of our country.

Because of this freedom, ours has truly become a nation of movement. Last year, our citizens traveled over 720 billion vehicle miles in the 75 million passenger cars, trucks, and buses we have on our highways today.

Travel, they say, is broadening. I believe that this vast amount of travel over our roads and streets not only has broadened but also has unified our people to an ever increasing extent; they have developed a better mutual understanding of the people, the industry, the agriculture, the resources, and the problems which are characteristic of the various sections of this country. Through better understanding there has come greater unity.

Our citizens have developed an understanding of what highway transportation means to them—individually and as a free nation. I believe this because in 1956, through their representatives in Congress, the people of our country made a decision to implement the greatest public works program ever undertaken anywhere in the world. Passage of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 launched the greatly increased program of highway construction and improvement that is now underway in our country.

This Federal Aid Highway Act like its predecessors since the first one which was passed in 1916 authorized the appropriation of funds for Federal participation in the cost of constructing and improving roads on the Federal-aid highway systems. Of the 3.5 million miles of roads and streets we have, over 850,000 have been included in these Federal-aid systems. The remainder of the roads and streets are constructed and improved by State, county and local highway agencies and by the toll road authorities with funds available to them.

The Federal-aid program is carried out as a partnership between the States, represented by their highway departments, and the Federal Government, represented by the Bureau of Public Roads. Each partner has well-defined responsibilities. The State highway departments initiate programs, prepare plans, specifications and estimates, award contracts, supervise construction and maintain completed projects. The Bureau is responsible for approving the States proposals at each stage and for insuring that completed projects are adequately maintained.

This partnership has stood the test in our 40 years of Federal-aid highway programs in excellent fashion. The many problems encountered have been resolved mainly through the spirit of mutual respect and mutual cooperation that has developed. The seasoning over the years has qualified this partnership to carry out the present program efficiently, economically and expeditiously.

The expanded program was based upon an estimate of the cost of needed improvements in the light of the benefits to be derived from them. This is a sound business approach. These studies are made constantly by the Bureau of Public Roads with the cooperation of the State highway departments. They give us in Congress a basis for evaluating the highway needs of the Nation by comparison with the needs for other public works, for public health, for agriculture, for education, for defense and for the many other programs in which the Federal Government participates. Appropriate legislation is drafted largely on the basis of these evaluations so that the investment in highways will return a profit to the Nation in the benefits that will be received.

The construction and improvement of roads has been a profitable investment in our country. The late Commissioner of Public Roads, Thomas H. MacDonald, in discussing highway transportation and wealth, once stated, "We were not a wealthy Nation when we began improving our highways. But the roads themselves helped us create a new wealth, in business and industry, and land

values. So it was not our wealth that made our highways possible. Rather, it was our highways that made our wealth possible."

This relationship between highway transportation and our economy is well documented. Down through the years, curves showing the dollar value of the gross national product, and the motor vehicular miles of travel on our roads and streets, have paralleled each other to a remarkable degree. We anticipate that our gross national product, which in 1960 was about $500 billion, will reach nearly a trillion dollars in the next 15 years. During the same period we anticipate traffic to increase so that some 1.1 million motor vehicles will travel annually almost 1.2 billion miles over our highways.

We have implemented this tremendous highway program in part, therefore, so that our citizens will benefit from continued economic growth. The roads we are building now, not only will satisfy the pressing needs of today, but also will provide adequate highway transportation for the vehicles of the future. Since we have seen the interdependence of our economy and highway transportation, it is clear that the highway program of today is indeed a factor that is shaping the structure and magnitude of our future economy.

In providing highway improvements to insure future economic growth, many problems are encountered, particularly in urban areas. This is largely attributal to the profound influence which modern highways have upon such areas. But we have learned that problems more often that not, can be converted to opportunities by those of vision and vigor.

It takes both vision and vigor to find solutions to the complex problems involved in planning future highway systems that will adequately serve all the needs of our expanding urban areas. These needs are many. Growing populations, industrial expansion, residential developments, and other public works programs, are just a few of the traffic generating factors which must be considered. The closest cooperation between Federal, State, and local agencies which have related responsibilities is essential if the problems involved are to be converted to opportunities.

A coordinated, long-range plan for highway imporvements in an urban area is an important aid to restoring order to these congested communities. These improvements can help to channel facilities for industry, commerce, and business into locations planned for economic growth. They can also aid in channeling other community activities such as schools, residential developments, shopping centers, etc., into areas selected in the long-range plan for the orderly development of the metropolis and its suburbs.

Such a plan must be dynamic. It must be subject to continuing review and revision as changing conditions warrant. We are now beginning to get completed section of the network of expressways and their supporting new and improved roads and streets in many urban areas. The completion of these new and improved highway transportation facilities usually acts as a catalyst for other urban area development activities.

For instance, the taking of right-of-way for a new expressway may give impetus to the program for rehabilitating blighted sections of urban areas if there has been coordinated planning of these activities. As these programs progress, the need to relocate facilities, businesses, industries, and service facilities will stimulate the development of areas planned for these needs.

Growth trends develop during these activities. These must be studied for they may require adjustments in the planned highway network. As movement replaces congestion on the roads and streets in urban areas, the true benefits from safer and more efficient highway transportation begin to take size. Frequently, the new and improved roads and streets bring benefits that exceed estimates and require revisions in the overall plan to provide for greater growth than was anticipated.

We are beginning to get better information upon the economic impact of improved highway transportation. A report was recently submitted to Congress by the Secretary of Commerce. This was prepared by the Bureau of Public Roads with the cooperation of the State highway departments. It summarized the results of studies that have been made on the economic, social, and other impacts of highway improvements in both rural and urban areas.

It was found that highway improvements bring about changes in accessibility which in turn result in changes in land use and land values. In studies of changes inland values along major highway improvements in urban areas it was found that industrial property values increased 17.5 percent annually, commercial property increased 10.4 percent and residential property 8.5 percent. Unimproved land increased 12.5 percent per year. The average annual increase of all property values in these categories was 9.3 percent.

In many instances anticipated change in land use due to the greater accessibility is a contributing factor to the increase in land value. For example, the conversion of farm or unimproved land to an industrial property along a major highway improvement would normally be followed by a sharp increase in the value of the land since industry is considered to be a highly productive use for land. In the selection of new locations several factors are normally considered, most of which would relate to highways. These include the availability of a labor force, and since about 70 percent of our labor force travels to and from their place of work by automobile, the availability of highways would be an important criteria. Highways also would be important to the efficient transportation of raw materials to an industrial site and the movement of finished products to the market. Improved highways of modern design have played an important part in the relocation of industries to industrial parks in rural areas.

The single family residence is the largest consumer of land in urban areas. From 50 to 75 percent of land use in our cities is used for this purpose. Current trends increase the importance of residential development in planning long-range highway improvements. In my own State of Alabama, for example, not only is the population growing but it is also shifting. In 1950, 43.8 percent of the population of the State resided in urban areas while 56.2 was rural. The 1960 census shows that 54.8 percent of our people now reside in the urban areas and only 45.2 percent are in the rural areas. Highway improvements, therefore, can benefit the community by opening up new areas for needed residential developments in urban areas.

We have already mentioned the benefits of highway improvements in expediting the rehabilitation of blighted areas in our cities. Removal of undesirable structures and replacing them with highways of modern, clean design helps make this urban area a more attractive place in which to live and to do business.

Highway improvements bring similar benefits to rural areas. They increase the value of farm lands by making them more accessible to market and to sources of supply. They open up new areas of natural resources. They provide access to resorts and other places of recreation for all our people. They have been a means of bringing our children into consolidated schools where better educational facilities are available. They mean better mail, medical, and other services to our residents in rural areas.

All of our people will benefit from this highway improvement program upon which we are embarked for this is a balanced program. All classes of roads from the low traffic farm-to-market type to the multiland high speed expressways carrying large volumes of traffic will be constructed or improved for all are needed to develop the maximum benefit for our people in safety, welfare, and continued economic growth.

Within the Federal-aid highway systems that will be improved is a network of 41,000 miles of roads that comprises the trunkline system of the United States.

The Interstate System has been planned as the trunkline highway system of the United States. It will link together 90 percent of the cities having populations of 50,000 or more, as well as many smaller cities and towns. It will serve well over half of the urban and almost half of the rural population of the United States.

The system includes only 1.2 percent of the Nation's total mileage of roads and streets but, when it is improved to the high standards adopted, it is expected to carry 20 percent of all traffic. It will be of invaluable benefit to long-distance passenger-car, bus, and truck travel, and will serve equally well relatively short range travel along its lines, and important needs of suburban and urban traffic. It has been estimated that the reduction of traffic accidents through modernization of the system will save 3,500 lives a year.

The highways that now approximate the routes of the Interstate System have become an integral part of the Nation's industrial assembly line. Raw material, goods in process, and finished products move endlessly over these routes. So also, in and near the cities, move great streams of workers, driving from home to factories, mills, offices, and stores. The Department of Defense considers the system essential to the national defense. It will provide valuable escape routes in case of emergency evacuation of cities.

This Interstate System will be supported by concurrent improvements as needed on the remainder of the Federal-aid systems. The urgency of the need for completion of these improvements was recognized by Congress. We directed in Federal-aid highway legislation that the rate of construction including the Interstate System be accelerated. The other roads and streets in the country also are being improved as rapidly as funds are available.

We have seen the benefits of highway improvements not only at home but also abroad. Some of the countries which we have assisted in their road programs are represented here today. We have seen the improvements in the economy, the welfare, the health, and the social activities of people all over the world which come, in a large measure, where adequate systems of roads are provided to meet their highway transportation needs.

The dollars invested in highway construction and improvement have been shown to bring direct benefits to highway users on the order of 1 to 3. But the indirect benefits—the lives saved, the production cost reductions, the timesavings, and many others—have led most of us in Congress to support highway legislation to develop these benefits for our people.

A most important consideration is that good roads give our people that freedom of movement that is the hallmark of a free people.

The Milk Pricing System Under Federal and State Marketing Orders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial comment from the Cheese Reporter, Sheboygan Falls, Wis., on a letter written by Nick E. Fabricius in which he discussed the milk pricing system under Federal and State marketing orders.

The editorial, including the letter, follows:

FABRICIUS COMMENTS

Nick E. Fabricius, who is associated with the Dairy Maid Products Co., in Eau Claire, Wis., had a letter in a recent issue of a dairy magazine in which he discussed the milk pricing system under Federal and State marketing orders. His comments are quite interesting and we have taken the liberty of setting them forth here for our readers. Wrote Mr. Fabricius:

"From time to time we read articles by some of our profound economists stating that we cannot expect to ship milk to eastern milksheds for class I prices inasmuch as those areas only exceed our manufacturing milk prices by the difference in freight. This applies particularly to one of our midwestern economists whom I need not name. I assume the reason for these articles is the more or less general support by midwesterners for the Johnson bill that is designed to eliminate milk barriers. Occasionally a midwesterner has the temerity to object to the pricing mechanism under Federal and State orders that are obviously causing the production of excessive amounts of surplus.

"It would seem desirable for those of us in the Middle West to restate our case. We are not so stupid as to think we can ship milk or even cream to order markets with any degree of regularity. However, we do think it would be desirable if we could ship milk for 2 weeks or a month, and cream for a month or two, so some effort could be made to control surpluses in milkshed areas. If this were done it would seem that farmers in the sheds could expect better blend prices and our farmers could retain their market for manufactured milk products.

"Midwestern farmers and managers have a right to be concerned when they read order bulletin headlines such as: 'Production in January and February Sets New High,' 'Production Up Again in June; Receipts Top Billion Pounds.' But of even more concern are headlines such as: 'October Receipts Increase; Consumption Is Also Higher,' 'December Production Rises; Consumption Also Increases,' 'Production and Consumption Up in June.'

"To state that such headlines are misleading is to put it mildly. When we read the entire article we find production is up 6 to 7 percent, and consumption is up only one-tenth of 1 percent. In another area production was up approximately 9 million pounds above the same month the year previous, and consumption was up only 500-000 pounds. We could fill this entire publication with similar headlines. We admit our stupidity, but most of us have finished grade school arithmetic. With these increases in production, plus lower percentage utilization, plus low prices for surpluses for manufacture, we realize we are fighting a losing battle here in the Midwest. In most cases we are trying to pay our farmers 20 to 40 cents per hundredweight more for manufacturing milk than is paid for surplus milk under Federal and State orders. And that is the reason for the serious impairment of the capital structure of many of our plants.

"In a very practical way we have been reminded during the last year as to just what is happening to our markets. One distributor told us that he likes to handle our butter and powder but that for 5 to 7 months he can buy these products from surplus grade A sources at a much lower price. In another case a public official told us there was no use to look for distribution in his State for it now is making all of its butter, powder, and cheese needs from surplus grade A. He predicted that his State would be exporting cheese by fall. This is the case in two States where historically we have shipped milk and cream for short periods and manufactured products for 12 months. And it is no secret that we are being undersold in our midwestern cities by manufactured milk products from eastern markets for many months of the year.

"Many of us doubt we will ever have a shooting war with the Communists. But we are equally convinced that we will have an economic war with communism. We feel President Kennedy's statement that we should think about what we can do for our country rather than what our country can do for us, should be taken seriously by all of us. We assume we can ask ourselves if what we are doing in our dairy industry is in the public interest.

"Is subsidizing surplus milk production in milksheds with Mrs. Consumer's dollars in the public interest; particularly when it robs the efficient dairy farmer in the Middle West of his traditional market? We could, of course, argue about the relative efficiency of our milk producers. The fact that our farmer averages about $2 per hundredweight less for his milk should be argument enough. Despite this eastern producers are asking for an even higher price for class I milk. I suppose this move is in the interest of an adequate milk supply even though there is only a 60-percent fluid milk utilization during the best months. One result we are sure of is that we will be further undersold in our midwestern cities.

"We have all heard the argument advanced that the price of fluid sold as fluid can be raised without affecting consumption. In the language of the economist fluid milk has an inelastic demand curve. Some recent studies cast some doubt on this old chestnut. It has been indicated that a slightly lower price to Mrs. Consumer greatly affects milk sales, with a consequent better blend price to the farmer. If this study is sound it would seem we should reappraise many of our pricing programs under State and Federal orders. It would seem that to do so would be in the public interest."

The President's Message on Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, this is a copy of a letter received from the teachers of the Riley School of Richmond, Ind., in which they expressed their approval and support of the proposals in the latest Presidential message to Congress on education:

RILEY SCHOOL,
Richmond, Ind., March 2, 1961.

Hon. RALPH HARVEY,
House Office,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HARVEY: We, the undersigned teachers in Riley Elementary School, Wayne Township, Richmond, Ind., assure you of our strong approval and support of the proposals in the latest Presidential message to Congress on education.

We believe in local, State, and Federal support of schools, inasmuch as the strength of all democratic governments depends on a well-educated citizenship. We believe all supporting funds should be merged and expanded according to local needs, whether for construction or increased salaries, to draw the most capable young people into the educational profession.

We urge you to use all your influence to secure the prompt passage into law of these proposals.

Sincerely yours,

L. Dallas Albright, John C. Harvey, Helen Holder, Marie Kessler, Marjorie Miller, Joan Westendor, Edith Rothermel, Anna Marie Thurston, Ruth Harris, Marjorie Morehouse, Marie Alexander, Thelma Magee, M. Stewart, Juanita W. Cox, Robert S. Byrd, and Vivian L. Jones.

United Nations at the Crossroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call your attention to the leading article, entitled "The United Nations at the Crossroads," which appears in the current issue—No. 57, winter 1960–61—of Prevent World War III, published by the Society for the Prevention Of World War III, a nonprofit educational organization, located at 515 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N.Y. This is, in my opinion, a well thought out analysis of the U.N.'s problems in Africa. Obviously, the United Nations has a tremendous task in helping the African peoples to achieve progress in all fields. The opportunities are great, but so are the dangers. As the article points out, if the Soviet Union is intent on bringing the cold war to Africa, then the future of the United Nations may be jeopardized. On the other hand, if Moscow comes to the realization that the African peoples need concrete economic assistance and want no part of the big power struggles, then there is hope. In my opinion, the article is on sound ground when it states that the United States must do everything to strengthen the prestige and the authority of the U.N. in Africa, thereby removing the cold war from the crucial continent.

The article follows:

THE UNITED NATIONS AT THE CROSSROADS

The 15th year of the United Nations has been marked by international tensions and conflicts which may ultimately make or break the world organization. The turbulence in the Congo seems to be the climactic event which is taxing the courage, patience, and leadership of the United Nations far

beyond anything it has had to face since its inception. While U.N. Secretary General Dag Hammerskjold grapples with this unprecedented mission, Nikita Khrushchev strides to the rostrum of the General Assembly determined to turn the United Nations into a satellite of Soviet bloc policy or to tear it into shreds.

One should not be misled into believing that the Soviet Premier's unseemly behavior was a coverup for the lack of a carefully prepared program. Mr. Khrushchev is a dedicated dictator and his sense of purpose is not deflected by the extra drink, the pounding of a desk, or the waving of a shoe.

The Soviet Premier came to the General Assembly with at least three basic aims:

(1) To discredit and downgrade the world position of the United States.

(2) To pose as the champion of the newly created African States against what he calls the bloodsucking colonialists.

(3) To undermine the effective and independent functioning of the United Nations.

Mr. Khrushchev tried to employ the Congo crisis as a club to beat into submission those forces in the United Nations which stand in his way. Did he succeed? To rush forward at this time with a definitive answer would be premature and even dangerous. However, the immediate results of his labors were barren as indicated by the voting on key issues in the General Assembly. It is also noteworthy that many of the newly created African States showed little enthusiasm for his rantings and blandishments. Moreover, the Communist record in Tibet and Hungary as well as in other countries of Eastern Europe was laid bare by various speakers. This, too, helped to deflate the Soviet posture of anticolonialism.

These are indeed encouraging signs. They are, above all, a tribute to the good sense of the majority of United Nations' members who know how to distinguish between Soviet preachings and deeds. It is essential that the specious character of Communist sympathy for the victims of colonialism be unmasked at every opportunity. The very bypassing of the United Nations in the Congo reveals the real objectives of the Soviets; namely, to put across its own brand of imperialism under the guise of opposing colonial influence.

However, the short-term victory over Mr. Khrushchev's initial attack is only a breathing spell. Moods of complacency and overconfidence could be most damaging to the cause of freedom in Africa. Mr. Khrushchev's setback in the United Nations does not mean that the seeds of anti-Westernism which he boasts to have planted, will not sprout. The long-term prospects for freedom will be measured by the kind of positive program adopted by the West. To put it another way: anti-Communist action by itself is bound to degenerate into sterility and open the doors for further Soviet penetration.

The Soviet leader is a resourceful student of world politics. He is fully alive to the variety of opportunities available for fishing in the troubled waters of the Congo—Indeed, in all of Africa. We would be deluding ourselves, let alone the peoples of Africa, if we insisted on reducing their problems to a simple matter of combatting a Communist conspiracy. That the minions of Moscow are working around the clock needs no elaboration here. However, the gigantic problems of Africa would still be with us if there were not a single Communist agent on the entire continent.

Rampant poverty and disease, aggravated by political oppression and unrest, are at the bottom of the troubled waters. They inevitably attract Communist anglers. This is not to say that a number of progressive steps have not been achieved under the tutelage of the former colonialist powers. Nevertheless, it would be contrary to fact to allege that the situation in the Congo on the eve of independence, was exemplar—particularly when contrasted to the state of affairs in Nigeria or in the former French African colonies. As Walter Lippmann observed: "The tragedy of the Congo, as all the world now realizes, is that the Congolese themselves have so very few trained leaders, administrators, and technicians. Belgium granted them independence without having prepared them for it" (August 16, 1960).

Obviously, Mr. Khrushchev was well aware of these deplorable conditions. He has therefore made the Congo crisis a major point of concentration by distorting and slandering the Belgian record and by associating the United States with it. At the same time, he has endeavored to create bitterness between the United States and our Belgian ally. By such maneuvers Mr. Khrushchev apparently hoped that Africa will eventually open its arms to Moscow.

The next step in the Soviet strategy aims to turn the United Nations into a bedlam of discord so as to whittle down its power and prestige. This would jeopardize the independence of the small nations and throw them at the mercy of Moscow. Secretary General Hammerskjold put his finger on this central point when, in replying to one of Khrushchev's diatribes, he warned the General Assembly: "It is not the Soviet Union or, indeed, any other big powers who need the United Nations for their protection; it is all the others. In this sense, the organization is first of all their organization * * *" (October 3, 1960). In these words the Secretary General provided the key to the problem of thwarting the Soviet offensive.

Only by strengthening the United Nations in every way can the World Organization carry out the purposes of the U.N. Charter. Only a United Nations whose authority is respected, can foil those who would subvert the charter for self-seeking advantage. Whether it be in the political area, in the fields of economic and technical assistance or in such vital areas as health, physical rehabilitation, education, etc., the United Nations can and must play the leading role.

There is a direct relationship between the strength and authority of the United Nations and the support it receives from people all over the world. They feed on each other and this is the secret weapon which is far more potent than Mr. K.'s juggling with ICBM's. It was precisely world opinion, backing up the Secretary General on the Congo, which compelled the Soviets to pull in its horns during the recent sessions of the Secretary Council. This same force underpinning all of the United Nations actions, will enable the new African states to grow and develop without fear of becoming pawns of power hungry dictators, whether it be of the Khrushchev or of the Nasser varieties.

At this session of the United Nations General Assembly, the U.S. delegation showed its awareness of the great potential for good that can be derived from a further bolstering of the United Nations. It is certainly a realistic approach to the rapidly changing world picture. It will be welcomed by all peoples who are sick and tired of the power politics played by Mr. Khrushchev and his stooges. Mr. Khrushchev's stellar performance has also made it much easier for our policymakers to "sell" the United Nations to the American people. He has opened their eyes, we believe, to a fundamental truth, i.e., that a strong United Nations is man's best hope for world peace and security.

In this connection, it was interesting to note that a distinguished member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD publicly challenged the Russians to make an agreement with the United States whereby, in effect, both sides would refrain from extending the cold war to the African Continent. Senator MANSFIELD proposed that neither major power would maintain military bases in Africa. Finally, all military assistance and large scale economic aid would be channelled through and handled by the United Nations. Senator MANSFIELD's bold and imaginative proposals have put the Soviet Union on the spot. So far, Moscow has been silent, preferring to continue its undermining activities in the Congo and in other areas of Africa.

Commenting on Senator MANSFIELD's proposals, the New York Herald Tribune, September 1, 1960 wrote: "If and when the Russians renounce their designs in the Congo and genuinely accept the United Nations as an agency for keeping it free of the cold war and of conflict between the two major powers, they would then contribute to the kind of agreement envisaged by Senator MANSFIELD." This is indeed the nub of the question and Mr. Khrushchev cannot evade it by fulminations and threats.

If and when Mr. Khrushchev comes to the realization that the rights of the African peoples can best be safeguarded through the United Nations, then perhaps precedent will be established for extending United Nations authority to other hotspots of the world. On the other hand, if the Soviet Union is intent on emasculating the United Nations, the peace and security of the world will become more and more the plaything of power-hungry blocs. It is for the Soviets to decide. It is the job of the United States to make it clear before the whole world where the ultimate responsibility lies. The United States must now take up the fight and rally all forces of peace and freedom to prevent the United Nations from suffering the fate of the League of Nations.

Johan Ludvig Runeberg, 1804–77

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Johan Ludvig Runeberg, the distinguished son of a Swedish sea captain, was born in Finland, in 1804. In the mid-19th century, he became the national poet of Finland, and at the time of his death, in 1877, he was venerated both in Finland and in Sweden.

Runeberg was a gifted, well beloved poet, and he showed unusual interest in popular poetry and folklore. He cut short his college studies at the University of Abo, and traveled through various parts of the country, learning many popular songs by heart. Later when he began to compose his own verses, popular songs served him well as models.

In 1848 he achieved great popular success with the publication of his series of poems on the War of Independence of 1808. This series made him Finland's national poet, her poet laureate. All his poetry shows great originality and immense power, and his poems form an enduring link between the Finnish and Swedish people. Honor goes to the memory of this great national and international poet, immortal Runeberg of Finland.

Appendix

Proposed New Electric Power Generating Plant in West Virginia Would Augment "Coal by Wire" System, and Be Helpful to Appalachian Region and National Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I believe it is pertinent that a Senator from West Virginia invite the attention of his colleagues to two articles which appeared in today's issue of the Washington Post.

The first article I will discuss is that under the headline, "Long-Distance Power Transmission Studied," in which Staff Reporter Julius Duscha writes that:

> Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall yesterday (March 9, 1961) ordered a study of proposals to transmit electric power 1,000 miles or more. Now power is generally transmitted no further than from 250 to 300 miles.

Certainly, I see nothing wrong with such a study. In fact, I believe it is indicated in the light of what is reported to be extensive Soviet Russian achievements in the field of long-lines electric power transmission.

Whether or not it was a thought expressed or a suggestion introduced by Secretary Udall, I do not know, but the following paragraph from Mr. Duscha's Washington Post article invites attention and comment:

> If long-distance lines prove to be efficient, a housewife in Washington, D.C., might cook someday with electricity generated by water in a surplus power area such as Washington State.

Mr. President, the slogan "Coal by Wire," meaning electric energy generated from steam through the burning of coal in giant boilers, is really meaningful; and it is much more than a mere slogan. It is a fact—an accomplishment—and a very vital one to the coal industry of this country.

Now, apparently, the Secretary of the Interior is hopeful of expanding a "water by wire" program. Presently, according to Mr. Duscha's story in the Post, the Secretary's immediate objectives are to extend hydroelectric power capacities from the Pacific Northwest to southern California, and has has a task force examining these possibilities.

Perhaps this country is on the verge of another era of a developing power controversy. There are the proponents of hydroelectric energy and possibly atomic energy who may seek to apply pressure on other existing natural resource fuels utilized in the generation of electric power.

I must say, Mr. President, that we of the already-hard-pressed Appalachian coal-producing region will remain alert and aggressive. We will not oppose progress, but we will resist efforts of others to make of our region an island of permanent poverty and to deny us our fair share of the utilization of and markets for our rich heritage of natural resource fuels.

Our Appalachian region has made vast contributions to national defense posture and national security, as well as to industrial and general economic growth. We intend to continue to do so, and we will strive mightily to retain our equity in the Nation's defense requirements, as well as our country's equity in that which we have to offer for the maintenance of the national security and extension of national growth.

And now, Mr. Presdient, I refer to the other article in today's Washington Post, to which I made earlier reference. It is a story under the headline, "A $150-Million Plant Proposed in West Virginia By Virginia Power," and originated at Charleston, W. Va., by the Associated Press.

This article confirms earlier information I had acquired in personal conversations and correspondence with Mr. A. H. McDowell, Jr., president of the Virginia Electric and Power Co., that West Virginia's coal industry and tourist business could secure a shot in the arm if the West Virginia Public Service Commission approves an application filed by Virginia Electric and Power of Richmond, Va., to build a 1-million kilowatt steam electric generating station on Stony River in Grant County, W. Va.

This is the type of industrial development which admirably fits the needs of West Virginia and other States of the Appalachian region, and which plays a vital role in the economic growth of this country. It would be further augmentation of the vital "coal by wire" system.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the printing of the Washington Post article by the Associated Press, in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A $150 MILLION PLANT PROPOSED IN WEST VIRGINIA BY VIRGINIA POWER

CHARLESTON, W. VA., March 9.—The proposed construction of a $150 million electric generating plant in Grant County promises to open up a new coal producing area in eastern West Virginia, the Public Service Commission was told today.

The PSC conducted a formal hearing on an application by the Virginia Electric and Power Co. of Richmond, Va. for authority to build and operate on Stony River a steam generating facility with an ultimate capacity of about one million kilowatts.

Vice President R. M. Hutcheson of Vepco said: "initial construction is planned to be either a 250,000 kilowatt or a 300,000 kilowatt unit . . . We would expect to complete the proposed facility in about eight to 10 years."

The Virginia company now has about 762,000 electric customers in Virginia, North Carolina, and in five West Virginia counties.

Hutcheson said a desire to cut total fuel costs has been the primary reason in the company's decision to build a generating plant in West Virginia.

"About 48 percent of the total cost of coal at existing company steam electric stations is for transportation charges in moving the fuel from the mine to generating station," he said.

The coal in the Grant County area is high in ash content and has a high mining cost. Hutcheson said there has been little demand for it because "prospective users refuse to pay the present freight costs to haul this high ash, low quality coal."

The proposed Stony River facility ultimately is expected to use 2.5 to 3 million tons of coal per year and will create what Hutcheson called a substantial market for the fuel available in the Grant County area.

"The mining of these quantities of the coal in conjunction with the satellite industries and development which must result will be a substantial benefit to the area, and the State," Hutcheson said.

Hutcheson added that $24 million of the estimated construction cost will go for payroll. Annual operating and maintenance expenses, exclusive of the cost of coal, are expected to run $900,000 of which about $600,000 will be operational payroll.

Other potential economic benefits Hutcheson singled out included the creation of a 120,000-acre lake which he said should prove to be a great tourist attraction.

Water for cooling and other purposes will be obtained from the lake to be formed behind a dam about 143 feet high and 1,500 feet long a short distance south of Mount Storm. The dam would be of earth and rock fill construction.

"Medicare's" Ultimate Cost: $22.5 Billion a Year?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, some some of the legislation now facing this Congress has spurred more thought than perhaps at any other time. One of these subjects in the legislative mill is the medical care to the aged program.

I should like to share with my colleagues the following article from the

March 3, 1961, Human Events which deals with an important phase of this program:

"MEDICARE'S" ULTIMATE COST: $22.5 BILLION A YEAR?

Despite the denials of its proponents, the King bill is a foot-in-the-door move toward socialized medicine, and we do mean socialized medicine. If this bill should be passed, a drive will immediately begin to provide medical, dental, hospital and nursing home needs for all persons of retirement age.

At the same time, there will be a campaign to lower the age of eligibility by steps down to 60, 50, and then all the way. Ultimately, the program will cover the health needs of all, cradle to grave.

The cost of this introductory bill has been estimated at only $1 billion. Estimates made to get a new social program through Congress usually prove to be one-half or one-third of its actual cost. The cost of the British health program passed by the Labor Party immediately after World War II turned out to be three times the promised figures.

The British program now costs $2.5 billion and its supporters insistently argue it is grossly inadequate—as it certainly is. Brittain has less than one-third of our population, so its $2.5 billion cost would be in excess of $7.5 billion in the United States, if only to take care of 180 million people as against 50 million.

But an estimate of a $7.5 billion cost to the United States for a British-type full coverage plan would ignore the fact that wages and salaries in the United States of America are three times the British scale. If all persons being paid by a U.S. health care program—physicians, nurses, hospital attendants, and the rest—are to receive American-standard incomes, the $7.5 billion estimate must again be trebled—bringing the cost up to $22.5 billion.

Now let's see what a $22.5 billion program would cost in social security taxes.

The King bill calls for a payroll tax of one-half of 1 percent, which is to be collected one-half from employer and one-half from employee.

That one-half of 1 percent payroll tax will produce a yield of $1 billion. On that basis, the tax would have to be 11¼ percent if a $22.5 billion cost is to be met. This 11¼ percent is for health alone; it does not include the payroll taxes collected for old-age pensions, unemployment insurance, and other items that the "cradle-to-grave" advocates will eventually want to provide.

However, before bringing the $22.5 billion collective cost down to the level of the individual, let's establish right now that the tax, even when paid by the employer, is payment for the services of the employee. Liberals, interested always in deception, would like wage earners to believe that the employer's share is "no skin off his back." Let commonsense give the true answer.

Now that this foundation has been laid, let's see what a $22.5 billion program would cost in tax payments by and for an average wage earner.

For a $5,000 wage earner, the combined tax payment will be $567.50. If $5,000 should be his annual earnings from ages 20 to 65, the tax payments for and by him will total $25,537.50.

The average family today has two wage earners. If the second earner gets $3,000, the tax payment will be $337.50 per year. If that earner also works from 20 to 65 the tax payments for and by him will be $15,187.50.

For the two members of this family, the 45-year total will be $40,725.

Those tax payments go to Uncle Sam, who wants plenty of authority about how those sums are to be spent.

If the average wage earner knew now what medicare's full ultimate cost would be—to him and to his children when they grow up—the storm of protest would blow into a thousand pieces this great leap forward toward a socialist state.

Medical Care for Disabled Veterans—Address by William Q. Cooper, National Commander of Disabled American Veterans

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, all of us are keenly aware of the Nation's responsibilities to its disabled war veterans.

As chairman of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee, I feel a special responsibility in seeing that fair, reasonable veterans' legislation is enacted.

One of our principal concerns has been to help whenever we could to see that disabled veterans continue to have available medical service and hospital care of top quality at veterans hospitals.

Recently the national commander of the Disabled American Veterans, William Q. Cooper of Dallas, whom I have known for many years, made an outstanding address on this subject. Commander Cooper's address is a ringing declaration for veterans' medical care, and in opposition to opinions shaped by pocketbook prejudice.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix an excerpt from the speech delivered by National Commander Bill Cooper to the Disabled American Veterans in Amarillo, Tex., on March 4, 1961.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM A SPEECH BY WILLIAM O. COOPER, NATIONAL COMMANDER OF THE DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS, AT AMARILLO, TEX., MARCH 4, 1961

I come before you today to bring you a warning and to urge your closest attention to and deepest interest in a matter of grave concern to the DAV, to all disabled veterans and to the American people as a whole.

As most of you may know from previous reports, my recent appearance before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs was received most kindly and cordially by all members of the committee. I feel confident that they will be most receptive to our efforts in behalf of disabled veterans. But this is not the end of the fight by far. For, in spite of their inclination toward our cause, there are strong forces ranked against us, seeking at every turn to undo the work that we have done in behalf of the Nation's war disabled.

Perhaps most important and most basic to the present and continued welfare of disabled veterans throughout the Nation is a continuing high level of medical service and hospital care in veterans' hospitals of sufficient size to carry the patient load, equipped with the latest medical facilities and staffed by the finest doctors and by skilled and dedicated medical services personnel.

And it is in this very basic requirement for the future welfare of all disabled veterans that our program is threatened most gravely by forces who would—to gain their own selfish ends—obstruct the efforts of the Federal Government to meet the Nation's responsibilities to its war disabled.

In recent months the pages of the Nation's newspapers have been filled with an increasing number of statements from the American Medical Association and allied organizations, which I am forced to conclude can only be intended to undermine the very basis of the entire structure of Veterans' Administration medical services.

It is impossible to view a collection of public statements from this great granddaddy of all trade unions over any appreciable period of time without becoming immediately aware of the inconsistency and lack of objectivity in their stands on every issue which they feel might in any way intrude upon that wide area of vast public concern—the health of the Nation—which they have come to consider their private domain.

And here, let me pause briefly to emphasize that I, personally, and the organization which I represent have nothing but praise for the thousands and thousands of dedicated physicians and surgeons—many of whom were educated under the GI bill of rights—throughout the Nation who give so unstintingly of their time, effort, and lives to alleviate suffering and to maintain and improve the health of the Nation. It is only the pressure tactics of their association that we abhor.

Just look at the record of AMA opinion and action on hospital and medical benefits for disabled veterans, the operation of Veterans' Administration hospitals, the staffing of all hospitals over which the medical profession exercises sway, training, and standards for doctors, care for the aged and all other efforts to spread the benefits of better medical care to a wider segment of our society.

In each instance, this trade union in professional association clothing has been guilty of thinking through their wallets, of allowing their opinions to be shaped by pocketbook prejudice.

On the one hand—in spite of countless examples to the contrary—they cry out that any Government action in the medical field will do great harm to the level of medical care now enjoyed by the Nation. On the other, they set standards for the acceptance of doctors on hospital staffs and for admittance to medical schools which, to the layman, at least, can only appear arbitrary and designed more to limit competition than to improve the general level of medical care received by the vast majority of the American people.

They complain bitterly about the large number of non-service-connected disabled veterans receiving care in Veterans' Administration hospitals, claiming that the medical profession and local institutions can better and more efficiently provide this care. Yet, recent surveys of non-service-connected veterans in VA hospitals have shown dramatically that the vast majority of them had been admitted after exhausting their own funds for private medical care, and that by far the largest number of these had been admitted at the request of their private physicians.

The organization I represent is not advocating at this time that the Nation rush headlong into any program of greatly expanded medical care, supported by Federal funds.

I do insist, however, as an individual and as the spokesman for millions of war dis-

abled with a keen interest in the medical services provided by the Nation, that the matter be fully explored from every conceivable angle to determine what is best for America and what is best for the American people, regardless of its effect on the American Medical Association.

Let us judge all suggestions in this vitally important area without labels, name calling or other pressure tactics to determine the type of program that will do the most good for the most people.

Actually, it is extremely difficult to form objective judgments on these matters. It is impossible to draw any single line which would put all those things which can most efficiently be handled through private efforts on one side and the clear areas of Government responsibility on the other.

I remember a time, not so many years ago when the entire sewage system of a small Texas town not so very far from my home was owned and operated by a single individual. In the interests of bettering his profits he had resisted all efforts to improve services or to expand his facilities to meet the growing needs of his community.

Finally, the community was forced to take over the operation of this enterprise, with adequate recompense for the interests of the owner. I recall, as many of you may also, the terrific fuss this gentleman raised over the matter, shouting about the evils of socialism to all who would listen.

And, while it is a bit fanciful, I really don't think that the situations are without parallel. Sometimes the extreme reactions of the AMA toward every effort of the Federal Government to improve national medical standards are just about as ridiculous as a national association of plumbers and pipefitters crying "socialized sewers" because Federal, State, and local governments have assumed the responsibility for community-wide sanitation and sewage disposal.

In the brief period of our national existence under the Continental Congress, the Federal government didn't have the right to raise a standing Army.

At a time, hundreds of years before that, there was no government roads. Each individual built whatever he considered a suitable road across his property and, if he felt so inclined, put a tollgate across it and charged, quite literally "whatever the traffic would bear."

It is not impossible (although admittedly very improbable) that we might, hundreds of years from now, return to this theory of private enterprise in the extreme or that our States should again wring the right to maintain standing armies from the Federal Government.

For the present, however, our theories of government and philosophies of economics, tell us that this is absolutely ridiculous. The building and maintenance of roads, and the authority to maintain a standing army are clearly the prerogatives and responsibilities of the Government.

In short: it is just as impossible to guide our thinking on the health of the Nation by the theories of a generation ago, as it is to guide our transportation and defense policies by theories held to be reasonable in the extreme in other ages.

In this general field we view with some alarm the tactics of the AMA in its efforts to discredit these programs. We are willing to join with all competent Americans in a critical analysis of the programs and needs in the fields of veterans' care, but we will resist with all the strength at our command any effort to destroy these programs.

America knows these needs exist and we would say to the leader of AMA, "Unleash the hands, the minds, the genius of your members; open the staffs of our public hospitals to the talents of doctors outside seeking to reach their patients within. Unshackle the medical schools of the Nation and encourage more young men and women in the noble profession Hippocrates began 400 years before Christ."

Let us seek to discover the secrets of the diseases that plague us on earth with the same zeal and total mobilization as we seek to unravel the mysteries of outer space.

Let us, therefore, set aside all preconception and all prejudices in this vital area of public concern.

Let's look at increased Government participation in the improved health of the Nation, in the light—and only in the light—of finding a workable solution that will bring the highest possible standard of medical care to the largest number of people, at the lowest total cost to our entire economy.

For, whatever our theories of government and economics, it is unquestionably and undeniably true that millions of Americans today do not receive the medical care that they need and—as citizens of the richest Nation the world has ever known—that they deserve.

Rising costs for medical care, hospitalization and drugs are rapidly driving the price of sound health for the average American family into the luxury class, placing adequate private medical care beyond the means of the unemployed and partially employed, the retired, the disabled and all other on fixed and limited incomes.

Some solution must be found to insure for all Americans a necessary and proper level of medical care.

Whatever the solution, the time for action is now.

Party Responsibility on the New Frontier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, on March 1, 1961 Carl Shipley, chairman of the Republican State Committee for the District of Columbia, addressed the executives of the Washington Trade Association. In his remarks, he clearly defined the responsibility of President Kennedy to make the Capital City of Washington the Nation's pride and not its shame.

Mr. Shipley has emphasized the need for urban renewal, crime and traffic control, and has called upon the President to exercise the power he has over the congressional majority, the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and other executive agencies to effect necessary action.

Under unanimous consent, I include a summary of Mr. Shipley's remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

SUMMARY OF REMARKS BY DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REPUBLICAN CHAIRMAN CARL L. SHIPLEY TO WASHINGTON TRADE ASSOCIATON EXECUTIVES, MAYFLOWER HOTEL, MARCH 1, 1961

PARTY RESPONSIBILITY ON THE NEW FRONTIER

Party responsibility is vital to American government. The two-party system is the very pulse of the machine. We Republicans will be a responsible and loyal opposition—suggesting, criticising and examining President Kennedy's actions, in the Nation's interest. After November 8, he became everyone's President, regardless of party. As our President, we Republicans ask God's blessing to keep and guide him as Chief Magistrate.

As responsible citizens concerned with the Nation's Capital, we think he stands on the threshold of an opportunity to make Washington the splendid and beautiful central residence of this great Nation, as a congressional committee in 1915 hoped it might be, rather than the Nation's disgrace it is rapidly becoming.

For 8 years President Eisenhower, and the District's Republican Board of Commissioners, sent pleas to Democratic Congresses, without much response. The Nation's Capital has continued on the downgrade at an alarming rate—commonsense says we face a disaster unless President Kennedy lowers his sights from his lofty concern with Africa, Asia, and Latin America long enough to see the appalling realities in his own country's Capital City. Thus far, his many emergency messages to Congress have taken no proper account of the crime, poverty, and slums here in Washington, at the front door of the White House.

What shall history say of President Kennedy's stewardship of the City of the Nation? Shall his indifference let it become steadily worse? Shall he let it drift, or shall a Democratic President use his power with a Democratic Congress to turn the tide, and make Washington the Nation's pride and not its shame?

It is easy to contemplate the handsome facade and ignore the truth about Washington. But let's be fair with ourselves and face the facts—they are all written out in the District Commissioners' last four reports to Congress:

1. Street crimes of violence increased steadily year after year—Washington is one of the Nation's most lawless cities. And yet, Washington has more policemen per thousand population than any city but Boston.

2. The juvenile court is 2,200 cases behind, and losing the race daily against its backlog. The juvenile delinquency rate continues up and up—one of America's sorriest examples. What kind of a symbol for the world is this?

3. The population of Washington has decreased from 802,000 in 1950 to 764,000 in 1960. White people are leaving, nonwhites are coming in. The population was 65 percent white in 1950, but has fallen to only 45 percent white in 1960. As the first American city to become more than 50 percent Negro, Washington is rapidly developing into a Negro ghetto—80 percent of the children in our so-called integrated schools are Negroes, and there is very little integration. This is extremely unfair both to Negroes and other Americans throughout the whole Nation. The adjacent communities in Maryland and Virginia must welcome our Negro citizens and provide opportunities for housing and schools equal to those in Washington. It is not in the Nation's interest to have a dense concentration of Negroes, or any other racial group, restricted to any given part of the Washington metropolitan area. There can be no excuse for President Kennedy to fail to exercise positive leadership immediately in solving this problem.

4. Although our slums are as bad as any in the Nation, urban renewal lags and drifts. New slums develop faster than old slums are removed. President Kennedy virtually has direct control over all of the agencies responsible for urban renewal in the Nation's Capital.

5. Traffic congestion is abominable, yet funds for highways and bridges are not available. President Kennedy can hop over the traffic in his helicopter, but the rest of us are not so fortunate. The 7 million visitors who come to Washington each year from all over the world must get a melan-

choly impression from our failure to solve even the traffic problem.

What can President Kennedy do? He has appointed a new District Commissioner, Walter Tobriner, an able man. As Democrats, they should be able to get action now from the Democratic Congress on the following:

1. Two more judges for the juvenile court.
2. Amend Public Law 85–451 to increase the authorized annual Federal payment to the District by Congress from $32 million to $50 million.
3. Obtain legislation which clearly recognizes the President's responsibility for (1) preparing the District budget, and (2) requesting appropriations from Congress to provide financial support, over and above that which can be derived from taxing District residents and businesses at rates comparable to those of surrounding communities, to the extent necessary to make the District of Columbia what the Capital of the United States should be.

In addition, President Kennedy can exercise direct control over the Board of Commissioners and other executive agencies, to get urban renewal moving, crime under control, and traffic unsnarled.

The Nation's Capital is one challenge on the New Frontier President Kennedy has the power to do something about now. We Republicans, as a responsible opposition, urge him to get things moving in Washington.

Problems of the Open Spaces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have been extremely encouraged by the enthusiastic reaction to a bill I recently introduced, S. 858, the more so because of the newness of the subject, namely the preservation of open space to provide necessary recreation, conservation and scenic areas in and around our cities and towns, while at the same time using such land as a means of curbing urban sprawl and encouraging more economic and desirable urban development.

I wish to bring to the attention of those interested in this subject two editorials that have commented on the bill, one from the Washington Post and one from the Camden Courier-Post. I ask unanimous consent that these editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 11, 1961]

OPEN SPACES BILL

Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., of New Jersey, has come up with a bill that will have a wide appeal for urban and suburban dwellers throughout the country. He would create a $100 million fund that could be used over a period of 5 years on a matching basis to help State and local governments protect open spaces that ought to be devoted to parks or other recreational or conservation uses. It would set up a sort of "Capper-Cramton" program for the country as a whole.

The operations of the Capper-Cramton Act over a period of 30 years are responsible for saving many of the stream valleys in the Washigton area from the bulldozers. Millions of dollars have been saved by purchasing land suitable for parks before it has acquired real estate values. It was a grave mistake when Congress finally cut off funds for this purpose last year, and an effort is now being made to correct that error by providing $1.2 million in the new budget to match Virginia and Maryland funds for stream-valley purchases.

Congress has a special obligation to exercise foresight in the protection of open spaces near to the Nation's Capital, but the problems of other cities are not essentially different. Urban sprawl is spreading over the countryside at an alarming rate. Unless local governments act quickly to save scenic and historic spots, recreation areas and green belts to relieve the monotony of endless suburbs, many of the amenities of urban living will be lost for all time.

We are well aware of the fact that there are many demands upon the present Congress. In few instances, however, will a current outlay of funds hold greater promise of future return in terms of savings and conservation than that proposed by the Williams bill.

[From the Camden Courier-Post, Feb. 27, 1961]

CONSERVATION OF THE OPEN SPACES

As New Jersey, already the most urban State in the Nation, rapidly becomes more urbanized and open spaces dwindle, Senator WILLIAMS has appealed to constituents to "let me know if your valley is still green."

With housing development after housing development supplanting the once vast stretches of wooded areas and open lands, WILLIAMS is convinced that it is time to call attention to our dwindling natural resources for recreation.

The New Jersey Democrat wants direct word from the people on the subject because, as he puts it, "great social problems are most clearly understood only when we know what is happening to individuals."

WILLIAMS, who has introduced a bill to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System, and other farsighted individuals recognize that an increasing population, accompanied by an expanding settlement and growing mechanization, is destined to occupy and modify all areas within the United States except those that are designated for preservation and protection in their natural condition.

Alarmingly, there are some individuals who don't seem to care how or for what purpose the countryside is chopped.

There may be a better answer to the problem than WILLIAMS' bill, which would provide Federal assistance to State and local governments in preserving park and recreation space and controlling urban sprawl. But one thing is certain: The Government, the States and the public in general ought to pay more attention to conservation of these resources than they have.

The bill would provide $100 million a year for 5 years for planning and moderate grants for land acquisition. It comes at a time when there should be more national concern over the undesirable consequences of haphazard growth, controlled in many instances by nothing more than a profit motive.

It seems to fall within the framework of the massive conservation program President Kennedy has sent to Congress, a program that goes further than any previous Chief Executive has proposed.

Governor Meyner, too, has called attention to the problem by his proposal for a $60 million bond issue to meet the State's open space crisis. The money would be used to purchase land for future park, recreation, reservoir and water reserve needs. Of the total, $20 million is earmarked for reservoirs, $20 million for purchase of forest and park land, $5 million for extensions to existing park lands and the remaining $15 million to be devoted to land acquisition by counties and municipalities.

New Jersey's conservation department is charged with a dual function, the strengthening of the economy by industrial expansion and the conservation of resources. In the long pull, it cannot hope to attract economic development unless open space and recreation are provided for those people who will settle here and man the industries.

While it is not expected Governor Meyner's green acres program will get anywhere this year, it certainly is something the State ought to do something about soon. The governor emphasizes that "we have reached the now-or-never point," that the State's land resources "are disappearing at a startling rate while the price of those sites which remain continues to soar."

Examples of the dwindling open spaces can be found close at hand as one motors through what used to be the scenic countryside. Another is found in the seesaw battle of natural habitat versus jetport site in the Great Swamp area of Morris County.

A losing battle along that line was under way at Stone Harbor, where a third of one of the Nation's best known sanctuaries for exotic wading birds has been set aside for development by real estate operators. As a result, some bird lovers who have been struggling for years against encroachment by real estate men fear that ultimately the entire sanctuary may be chopped up for housing lots.

As time slips by, it will become more difficult to roll back such encroachment or even to find a primeval spot to preserve.

Dorothy E. Dickinson, Second-Place Winner for State of Ohio Prince of Peace Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA, JR.
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, recently the Ohio Council of Churches sponsored a contest known as the Prince of Peace Contest for high school students. This contest included essays written on appropriate subjects.

I am happy to announce that one of my constituents, a Miss Dorothy E. Dickinson, 38 Bortz Street, Ashville, Ohio, wrote an outstanding essay, and as a result of her fine work, she was awarded second place for the entire State of Ohio. Needless to say, I am extremely proud of this fine young American lady and consider it an honor to include the complete text of her work in the RECORD. Her subject, "Lasting Peace by Knowledge," certainly is apropos of the troubled times we are now experiencing and is worthy of the attention of my colleagues.

LASTING PEACE BY KNOWLEDGE

(By Dorothy E. Dickinson)

Peace is the greatest desire of mankind, for without peace there is no prosperity, security, or opportunity for progress.

Since the beginning of man's existence on this planet, he has lived by conquest; first, conquest over beasts for food and protection, second, by conquest of the land for food and security against the elements, and later by conquest against other men to acquire more food and security.

Later in man's history he went forth in conquest at another's bidding, the bidding itself a form of personal conquest by the leader. In doing this man believed that he was performing a mission that would benefit himself and his countrymen. The leader held up before his followers the wealth of others (to cause envy), the story of their neighbor's threats (to cause fear and hate), and the difference of color and religion (to create a feeling that the conquest was justified). In this way the leader proved that those they were to kill or maim would become a menace to all if they were allowed to thrive. Therefore, peace to an individual has come to mean peace to the group of people of which he is a part.

Problems of peace have occupied each moment of man's existence. The first beast harnessed by primitive man enabled him to proceed a little farther afield in harassing his neighbor than was possible before. Ships came to span the seas, and later planes and rockets placed any point on earth within a few hours' reach. Therefore, as man's ability to travel has progressed, war has evolved from when personal differences were settled individually, until today when peace or war depends on any nation's relations with the rest of the world.

Peace to an individual has come to mean peace to the nation in which he lives. The peace of subjugation, the uneasy peace of cold war, or the peace of an interval between hot wars, is far from the goal the world strives to attain.

National peace or war is the result of the desires of the majority of the people in the country involved.

War is always a gamble, not only to a nation but also to each individual. When a nation loses a war, it loses its national identity, but even though his country may be the victor in the conflict, the individual may lose his life and is certain to lose a portion of his personal resources in the national war effort.

Peace by law or peace by powerful weapons is not the answer to world peace. War makes its own laws as necessity arises, but humanity has not found peace in a long list of progressively destructive weapons ranging from thrown rocks to atom bombs.

The hungry man thinks of war for food, the fed man thinks of war to obtain luxury, and the man who has acquired both food and luxury thinks of war to obtain power. Consequently, man, as he is taught to provide for his physical needs, must also be taught faith, love, and compassion.

To obtain lasting peace, the individuals of the world must be able to pause, clothed and fed largely by their own initiative, and have the ability to realize that, even though they must render to their respective Caesars the things due him, it is not well for them to give their Caesars those things a good leader would not demand for his own benefit, such as, lives, money, and allegiance.

It will necessitate the combined efforts of all the nations to teach the people of the earth how to provide life's necessities for themselves. They must be taught to earn these things by their own hands. No man places a high value on those things for which he has not paid a price in effort. Giving him food, clothing, and shelter will provide him with no lasting desire for peace, for his surplus time and energy will beget envy and greed. He must be taught to provide for himself.

If the people of the world are educated sufficiently to provide for themselves, conscientiously instilled with knowledge that created the desire to peaceful coexistence and brotherly love, and taught to think for themselves, they will not be easily led by some pomopus leader who dangles wealth before their eyes in exchange for the conquest of others. Only through education and the ability to think for themselves, can people attain any stability and not be swayed by the promises of wealth or the incitement of envy, fear, or hate that leads them to do the bidding of their Caesar. Instead, the people will be able to determine the difference between their leader's lust for power and their own welfare.

In an effort to obtain world peace, we must make our goal one of lasting peace. The goal of lasting peace is often confused with the problems presented by some real or fancied menace to the peace of the day. These conflicts of ideals or struggles for power may, and often do, lead to a war. The easing of tensions between powers or nations, while desirable, does not in itself contribute to a lasting peace. Only the prevention of the desire for war among the people of the world will bring about any degree of lasting peaceful relationship. Desire for war can be stopped by the education of the people of all countries.

A program for the education of nations must be executed by the combined efforts of all the countries of the world. However, before people can be taught to think and reason for themselves, they must have the necessities of life. No hungry man nor one who is exhausted from eking a meager existence from the land is able or willing to give much time or thought to anything except his own physical welfare. He must first be adequately fed, clothed, sheltered, and have a few leisure hours to devote to his own betterment.

Peace is a problem of the population of the earth. A program for the education of the people of the earth, with the goal of lasting peace, will call for the accumulated knowledge of all humanity, regardless of race or creed. This will not be realized in a short period of time. However, with the peace-loving people of the world working diligently together toward a common goal, they themselves will find it necessary to forgo belligerent nationalistic or idealistic ideas and thereby, further their own understanding and knowledge.

The will to work for lasting peace must spring from the hearts of those who desire it. They must be willing to plan for and finance the cost of sending emissaries, accompanied by such tools or other equipment as necessary, to the parts of the world where their particular type of knowledge is needed; the weaver to the people who need cloth, the lumberman to the country that has timber but no houses, and to the people who have the necessities of life but wish more for their children, a college professor.

This program should be so well financed that it would cause men and women highly skilled in their trades to want to add to their already possessed abilities, dedication of purpose in foreign lands. However, this dedication must not be to their own personal financial disadvantage.

These emissaries must be people who have, in addition to their skill, embedded deep in their hearts the principle of Christ's teaching, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

Loyalty Day—Americanism in Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, during the 1960's, our country will face threats to security and survival greater than ever before in history. Every aspect of our way of life will be severely tested, including our ability to maintain a good, healthy lead over the Communists in the production of good things of peaceful life for better living, for more people; attain a pace of scientific-technological progress that will continue to surpass all competition; maintain a jet-nuclear-missile-space defense second to none in the world (a) to provide for our security, and (b) to deter would-be aggressors elsewhere in the world; and create a world climate and understanding of how the ideas and ideals of freedom can serve mankind. If this is done, nations, through self-determination, can have an opportunity to select those principles which best serve the interests of their people and progress.

Today, the challenge to freedom by a powerful and ever-growing totalitarian enemy—communism—offers a threat to our security so great as to question whether freedom, itself, can survive.

If we can adequately mobilize not only our own people and resources, but also capitalize upon the limitless reservoir of world sympathy with the principles and ideals of freedom, we can—in my judgment—win the battle against communism.

On May 1, the Nation will observe Loyalty Day. The observances offer each of us a new opportunity to become rededicated to freedom—and its great promise for the future of mankind.

In encouraging greater patriotism among our citizens, our veterans organizations have provided splendid leadership. The Veterans of Foreign Wars, for example, contributed immeasurably to encouraging support and approval and recognition of May 1 as Loyalty Day.

Recently, the Veterans of Foreign Wars magazine published a thought-provoking article by Thomas B. Dean, chairman, VFW National Loyalty Day Committee, entitled, "Loyalty Day—Americanism in Action." I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOYALTY DAY—AMERICANISM IN ACTION

(By Thomas B. Dean)

At this moment in history it would be well for all citizens of the United States to ponder the true importance of two major individual citizenship responsibilities.

These are (1) the need to practice the kind of human justice we say should pre-

vail in all freedom-loving countries and (2) the obligation to support America's efforts to assist our allies in the cold war against Communist Russia.

Today the United States and the free world are combating the mighty forces of Soviet communism. The basic objective of Red Russia is the ultimate military, political, and economic control of the world.

Ever since World War I the VFW has recognized the full implications of Communist plans for world conquest. When the Communists in the United States flaunted their anti-American beliefs with the visual aid of an annual May 1 parade in the heart of New York City, the VFW parried this strategy with the sponsorship of another parade—this one dedicated to the spirit of Americanism. New York City was treated to a demonstration in behalf of Americanism that stole the spotlight from the marching Reds. Subsequently the May 1 parade by Communists in New York became a memory. This is as it should be.

VFW leaders across the United States picked up this new weapon in the fight against the agents of Communist Russia and—following the pattern set in the East, developed Loyalty Day observances on a nationwide scale.

We are reminded how Congress acted in 1958, in response to the many Loyalty Day projects sponsored by the VFW. With little or no opposition, a bill was passed by Congress, and signed by President Eisenhower, proclaiming the establishment of May 1 as Loyalty Day in the United States.

Under this law, we—as individual citizens—are asked to publicly reaffirm our loyalty on that date. The display of the American flag on all Government buildings was ordered.

The duties and responsibilities of loyal citizens have increased greatly since World War II. Without our seeking it, or being ready for it, the United States was elevated to the position of world leadership. We are now charged with the task of preserving the concept of freedom in the world. To set the pattern on a global basis, it is mandatory that we should practice what we preach within our own boundaries. We have no moral right to ask other peoples to accept principles which we ourselves choose to ignore.

True Americanism means loyalty to God, loyalty to our country, and loyalty to the ideals upon which this country was founded. These are the deep tones of democracy in action. As Americans, we cannot minimize these ideals. When we fail to practice the kind of Americanism to which we are pledged, the leaders of Red Russia and Red China win another battle in the "cold war" against us.

Loyalty means liberty. If freemen stand by idly and allow Americanism to deteriorate, Communist slavery will move closer to its goal of triumph throughout the world.

There is no doubt the American people will do their best to expose and resist the spread of Communist thinking in this country. Most Americans also recognize the importance of giving aid to the freedom-loving nations of the world that are equally opposed to Communist infiltration.

Complete information on Communist party techniques must be made available to every American. The aims and purposes, unscrupulous methods and the ultimate goal of the Communist Party must be clearly understood by Americans—young and old.

Communist efforts to infiltrate various youth organizations, labor unions, college student groups and even some religious organizations must be recognized for the dangers they represent.

Loyalty Day comes each year as a dramatic reminder to all Americans that we must be vigilant against the evils of Communist Party propaganda activities.

An urgent note to post commanders—how will your post participate in the 1961 Loyalty Day program? Each post, no matter if it be large or small, can easily perform one of the many suggested Loyalty Day activities that will help accomplish the purpose of this observance.

Attractive window posters accenting the theme "America Is Your Heritage" are available from the national headquarters supply department. The display of these colorful posters in your community is a starter. From that point, any post can expand its program to promote Loyalty Day.

Let us not forget that Loyalty Day needs the active support of individual VFW members on the community level to give it the proper impact this day truly deserves.

Each post should plan an appropriate Loyalty Day project. Patriotic ceremonies at civic events are desirable. A parade is an ideal project. Proclamations by municipal leaders will help spotlight the purposes of Loyalty Day.

In any event, participation on the post level is essential. Post officers should examine the material supplied by the national Loyalty Day committee and then go into action.

Morris Morganstern: Mr. Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House one of my most distinguished constituents, Mr. Morris Morganstern—philanthropist, investment banker, and president of the Morganstern Foundation of New York City.

Last month Mr. Morganstern received the 10th annual Brotherhood Award of the New York Council of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States. Previout recipients of the award include Bishop James A. Pike and Dr. Buell Gallagher, president of City College of the City of New York.

Mr. Morganstern is a lifelong advocate of the tenets of brotherhood, a generous friend of all groups, regardless of race, creed, or color. He is the owner of the famous George Washington letter, valued at $250,000, written in 1790 to the congregation of the Touro Synagogue in Newport, R.I. It was written in reply to a letter of welcome from Moses Seixas, sexton of the Hebrew congregation in Newport, on the occasion of Washington's visit to the city and is considered to be a classic statement of the American ideal of freedom and religious harmony.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of the George Washington letter, a press release on the award to Mr. Morganstern, and some excerpts from an address by Dr. Lewis Webster Jones, president of the National Conference of Christians and Jews on the occasion of the award:

To the Hebrew Congregation in Newport, R.I.:

Gentlemen, while I receive, with much satisfaction, your address replete with expressions of affection and esteem, I rejoice in the opportunity of assuring you, that I shall always retain a grateful remembrance of the cordial welcome I experienced in my visit to Newport, from all classes of citizens.

The reflection on the days of difficulty and danger which are past is rendered the more sweet, from a consiousness that they are succeeded by days of uncommon prosperity and security. If we have wisdom to make the best use of the advantages with which we are now favored, we cannot fail, under the just administration of a good government, to become a great and a happy people.

The citizens of the United States of America have a right to applaud themselves for having given to mankind examples of an enlarged and liberal policy, a policy worthy of imitation. All possess alike liberty of conscience and immunities of citizenship. It is now no more that toleration is spoken of, as if it was by the indulgence of one class of peopel that another enjoyed the exercise, of their inherent natural rights. For happily the Government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to presecution no assistance requires only that they who live under its protection should demean themselves as good citizens, in giving it on all occasions their effectual support.

It would be inconsistent with the frankness of my character not to avow that I am pleased with your favorable opinion of my administration, and fervent wishes for my felicity. May the children of the stock of Abraham, who dwell in this land, continue to merit and enjoy the goodwill of the other inhabitants, while every one shall sit in safety under his own vine and fig tree, and there shall be none to make him afraid. May the Father of all mercies scatter light and not darkness in our paths, and make us all in our several vocations useful here, and in his own due time and way everlastingly happy.

G. WASHINGTON.

NEWS RELEASE FROM LOUIS WEINTRAUB ASSOCIATES, INC.

Morris Morgenstern, New York investment banker and philanthropist, tonight, February 21, called for a "united citizens drive" in support of President Kennedy's food for peace and youth corps programs.

Mr. Morgenstern, president of the Morris Morgenstern Foundation, received the 10th annual Brotherhood Award given by the New York Council of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States. Accepting the award, Mr. Morgenstern applauded the Kennedy programs as "plans which will help promote brotherhood in newly emerging nations and in underdeveloped areas."

He urged that "all our citizens, from all walks of life, give strong support to these constructive avenues toward peace and brotherhood."

The Brotherhood Award was presented to Mr. Morgenstern by Milton Rittow, commander of the New York Council of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, in ceremonies attended by more than 300 people in the board room of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 838 Fifth Avenue, New York.

Other speakers at the brotherhood ceremonies were Dr. Lewis Webster Jones, president of the National Conference of Christians and Jews; author Will Oursler; Paul Rutheiser, director of veterans' affairs, city of New York; and Irving Friedman, executive secretary, the Governor's committee to employ the handicapped.

Through his educational and philanthropic foundation, Mr. Morgenstern, last October cosponsored with the National Conference of Christians and Jews, the nationwide antibigotry drive. Mr. Morgenstern, who owns the famous George Washington letter on racial tolerance written to the Touro Synagogue, Newport, R.I., in 1790, received the award "in recognition and appreciation of his continuing efforts to advance the cause of understanding, toler-

ance and brotherhood among all races, creeds, and religions."

EXCERPTS FROM AN ADDRESS BY DR. LEWIS WEBSTER JONES

I am happy to join in the tributes being paid tonight to Morris Morgenstern. No man better deserves the award you are here conferring upon him.

Last fall, the Morris Morgenstern Foundation and the National Conference of Christians and Jews jointly sponsored a national celebration of the 170th anniversary of George Washington's celebrated declaration against religious intolerance—"To bigotry no sanction." It was a dramatic reaffirmation, in which millions of our citizens participated, of this Nation's dedication to the principles of brotherhood. And it was both fitting and typical that Morris Morgenstern should have been a sponsor of that occasion.

I have been told that Mr. Morgenstern is the first member of the Jewish faith to receive this award from the Jewish War Veterans. In seeking the first member of your faith for this award, you could not have made a better choice.

The observance of Brotherhood Week serves to remind us all the precepts and principles which should guide our lives throughout the year. I am pleased to pay tribute to the Jewish War Veterans for your many contributions toward bettering relations among members of various faiths, and to Mr. Morgenstern.

Wiretap Legislation Urgently Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the distinguished dean of Brooklyn Law School, Jerome Prince has recently written to me expressing approval of S. 1086, a bill which I introduced to help clear the confusion presently surrounding wiretapping, by court order on the State level. This bill was modeled after S. 3340 in the 86th Congress which was reported favorably by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

In view of Dean Prince's widespread acceptance as a leading scholar in the law of evidence, I know his comments will be read with a great deal of interest by many colleagues who share my feelings about the need for legislation to deal with this pressing problem. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from Dean Jerome Prince be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROOKLYN LAW SCHOOL,
Brooklyn, N.Y., March 3, 1961.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senator,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: Permit me to express my approval of your bill which would amend chapter 223 of title 18 of the United States Code.

The existing law concerning the use of wiretap evidence in a State court is in urgent need of correction. At present the unauthorized divulgence in a State trial of wiretap evidence violates section 605 of the Federal Communications Act and constitutes a crime under section 501 of the act, even if the tapping was done under a State court order. (See *Benanti* v. *U.S.* 355 U.S. 96 (1957).) Nevertheless, under *Schwartz* v. *Texas* (344 U.S. 199 (1952)), a State is free to adopt a policy admitting such evidence. The *Pugach* case (277 F. 2d 739 (2d Cir. 1960)), recently affirmed by the Supreme Court, leaves this situation unchanged. Thus, under the present law, a New York trial judge commits no error in admitting wiretap evidence in a criminal trial. (See *People* v. *Variano*, 5 N.Y. 2d 391 (1959).) But in allowing such evidence to be admitted he is tolerating, if not aiding in, the commission of a Federal crime. Recognition that the commission of a Federal crime is inherent in the admission of wiretap evidence has produced uncertainty in the State law and has adversely affected law enforcement. Thus, at least one New York trial judge has felt compelled to exclude wiretap evidence despite the general New York rule admitting competent evidence illegally obtained (*People* v. *O'Rourke*, 23 Misc. 2d 2 (Nassau County Ct. 1960)). And at least one State prosecutor has said that he cannot in good conscience offer wiretap evidence on a criminal trial. (See Prince, "Evidence," 35 N.Y.U.L. Rev. 1590, 1597, (1960).)

The present unsatisfactory State of affairs can be corrected only by legislation, and it is my opinion that your bill supplies a simple and satisfactory remedy. By exempting from the operation of the Federal Communications Act, the interception and divulgence of any wire or radio communication if such interception was made under the authority of a State court order issued after a court determination "that reasonable grounds existed for belief that such interception might disclose evidence of the commission of a crime," your bill, if enacted into law, will wisely free each State to formulate its own public policy with respect to legalized wiretapping and with respect to the use of such evidence on trial, and, of course, to do so in the light of its own experience and felt necessities.

I wish to make plain that I am no friend of indiscriminate wiretapping. The unnecessary invasion of another's privacy is abhorrent, whether accomplished by wiretapping, illegal search or by any other means. But whether wiretapping should be prohibited entirely within the State, or restricted to certain types of crimes, or allowed in all criminal investigations are questions which, I think, should be left to the State. For this reason I do not agree with the recommendation of the very able committee on Federal legislation of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York that Congress permit State wiretapping only in the more serious crimes, more specifically to crimes punishable by maximum sentences of 5 years or longer. Such a national rule would ignore the fact that problems of law enforcement vary from State to State, requiring different approaches as to the subject of wiretapping. Moreover, since punishments are not uniform throughout the United States, it is quite possible that the same offense, because of the different punishments prescribed, may justify wiretapping in one State but not in another. Finally, the proposed national rule overlooks the fact that certain offenses—certain conspiracies for example—may pose a truly serious threat to the welfare of the people of the State, even though not punishable by maximum sentences of 5 years or more.

Sincerely yours,

JEROME PRINCE,
Dean.

How To Hurt Both Religion and Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 10, 1961

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the most important measures to be considered by the Senate at this session is the Federal aid to education bill, S. 1021, of which I am a cosponsor. The bill has stimulated a great deal of debate across the Nation. Mr. James Reston, the distinguished columnist of the New York Times, has today written an excellent article concerning this issue, our Constitution, and religious-sponsored schools. I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "How To Hurt Both Religion and Education," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW TO HURT BOTH RELIGION AND EDUCATION

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, March 9.—In their statement on Federal aid to education, the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church has raised a serious issue.

They have said, in effect, that if they cannot get the Federal aid they want for their parochial schools, they will oppose the President's bill to provide Federal aid to public schools.

At no point in this or any other statement by the National Catholic Welfare Conference does anybody question the need for Federal aid to provide adequate standards for a rapidly growing population, but the fourth point of the official church statement by Archbishop Karl J. Alter, of Cincinnati, nevertheless declares:

"In the event that a Federal aid program is enacted which excludes children in private schools, these children will be the victims of discriminatory legislation. There will be no alternative but to oppose such discrimination."

There is, however, a very clear alternative. This is to do what most people and groups do all the time in a democratic society—namely, to fight hard for what they want for themselves and then, if they don't get what they want, go along with the best possible compromise for the whole Nation.

THE OTHER QUESTIONS

Once this principle of the primacy of the general welfare is accepted, much can be said on the merits of Federal aid to parochial and private schools.

The claims of the Catholic Church cannot be lightly brushed aside, as President Kennedy originally tried to push them aside, by saying that aid to parochial schools was "clearly unconstitutional" and by adding that "there isn't any room for debate on that subject." This merely envenoms the debate that is now obviously in progress.

The main reason for Federal aid in the first place was to see to it that the Nation develops all the brains it has, and if this reason is valid, it surely needs Catholic brains as well as Baptist or Presbyterian brains.

Also, Catholic schools have benefited in the past from the Federal funds in the National Defense Education Act; Federal funds have followed Catholic students to Catholic colleges; Federal funds have made

available scientific, foreign language, and other teaching facilities to Catholic schools; and even under the present Kennedy program, Federal funds would be granted to Notre Dame University, for example, to help defray the expenses of any student who won a Federal scholarship and chose to attend that university.

President Kennedy, however, has provided a way to argue out all these highly controversial religious and constitutional points. He has proposed that his bill be allowed to come to a vote to deal with the general welfare and that separate legislation be introduced providing for loans to the parochial and other private schools.

All he asks is that the people who have a special interest in parochial school education or racial integration do not insist on fighting out their religious, economic, or racial battles at the expense of progress in the field of general education.

It may be that, in the end, the officials of the church will agree to this procedure. When Rt. Rev. Msgr. Frederick G. Hochwait, education director of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, was asked on the air the other day whether his organization would rather see no education bill than one that didn't give his organization what it wanted, he replied, "not necessarily."

THE PRESSURES

Nevertheless, the mail flooding into Capitol Hill these days is not taking this line, but crying "discrimination" and charging "taxation without participation." In short, it is carrying out the threat to defeat implied in Archbishop Alter's official statement.

In some ways, of course, there is discrimination. There are almost as many Catholic children in the public schools as in the parochial schools, 4,447,600, at last count, to 5,088,000 and obviously, if all of these had to be educated in the public schools taxes would have to go up.

The decision not to participate in the public school system, however, was not the Government's, but the church's. They have chosen the separate way, and they have been given the opportunity to argue their case.

Accordingly, the first question is one of good faith: Whether they are prepared to put the progress of the Nation's education first, or risk wrecking the President's bill to serve their special interests.

Postal Subsidy for Moscow Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, very interesting and important studies of the methods by which Communist propaganda reaches America and how it is distributed are being made in the House and the Senate as well as in the General Counsel's Office of the U.S. Post Office. A brief article by Lawrence Sullivan in Christian Economics challenges every American. The article follows:

POSTAL SUBSIDY FOR MOSCOW PROPAGANDA

(By Lawrence Sullivan)

High school and college students throughout the United States are richly supplied with Communist youth literature which is delivered free of charge by the U.S. Post Office.

This report, from the House Committee on Un-American Activities, has alerted educators once more to the tide of ever more aggressive student leadership in pro-Communist demonstrations throughout the country.

When Moscow determines upon a new propaganda drive aimed at U.S. students it ships over its educational literature in ton lots to U.S. ports of entry, already addressed individually. Uncle Sam then distributes the Moscow periodicals free anywhere in the 50 States and the territories.

"Every school and college in the United States is directly or indirectly the recipient of some of these Communist propaganda publications," the committee's report said. ("Communist Training Operations, Part 2," GPO, Washington, Oct. 12, 1960, p. 1327.)

Our own Bureau of Customs made a 12-month spot check of Moscow's training literature through New Orleans. It counted at least 300,000 packages of Communist propaganda destined to schools and colleges in the United States.

Each package contained 5 to 15 different publications on youth leadership for communism.

"New Orleans is one of the lesser ports of entry from the standpoint of Communist propaganda. A heavier volume of this material is coming into the United States via approximately 40 other ports of entry."

The endless lists of U.S. students are compiled and addressed through the World Federation of Democratic Youth, a pro-Communist transmission-belt organization in London; and by the International Union of Students in Prague, Czechoslovakia.

"Both of these major international Communist-controlled youth organizations publish at least 40 periodicals, which are disseminated regularly in schools and colleges * * *.

None of these publications bears labelling as Communist propaganda, in accordance with requirements of the Foreign Agents Registration Act."

In one recent year 7 million pieces of such Communist literature were cleared through New York, and tons more through San Francisco, Seattle, Baltimore, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Boston, and New Orleans. Every Russian, Polish, or Czech ship touching a U.S. port brings its quota of Red "educational literature" for domestic free mailing. During one week last year the San Francisco Post Office cleared 17½ tons of postage-free Red propaganda to U.S. addresses.

"It is frustrating and disappointing to see the sanctity of the mails abused," said Chief Postal Inspector David H. Stephens, before the House Appropriations Committee. "In this country we are governed largely by the sanctity of the seal of mails, a tradition which has served us well, and I would hate to see it weakened."

Congressman FRANK T. BOW, Republican of Ohio, a ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, disagrees:

"No other country in the free world permits Moscow's propaganda to be delivered at the expense of its own taxpayers," said Congressman Bow. "Many countries refuse to let such subversive material in under any circumstances. Instead of increasing postage rates at home, why not start on budget-balancing in the Post Office by refusing to distribute this Communist propaganda free of charge?"

In a few cases, when non-Communist ships are available, foreign postage pays for fetching the Russian literature to our ports of entry. But at shipside, United States of America, the mail is handed over to the U.S. Post Office. The entire cost of distribution and delivery to any address in the United States, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, or Guam, is borne by the U.S. Post Office.

"This propaganda is unsolicited," Congressman Bow continued. "Much of it is addressed to colleges and student groups throughout the United States. Under the Foreign Agents Registration Act all of this stuff is supposed to be labeled 'political propaganda,' but none of it is.

"The only way to discover propaganda is to open the literature and study it for subversive content. Of course, if the Russian packets are never opened, there would be no way to determine the content to be 'political propaganda.'"

Not even first-class mail from the United States to Russia is delivered without being opened and examined in Moscow. Every piece of mail is read carefully for content. That which is approved is forwarded to the addressee. That which is not deemed in the Russian national interest is thrown into the trash. The U.S. mailer is not even notified that his mail will not be delivered. Much of the "pen pal" mail sent by American youths to Russian teen-agers under the Washington-Moscow cultural exchange agreement is never delivered in Russia, but all Russian letters are delivered here.

Our U.S. law extends to Communist countries free second-class mailing privileges anywhere in our national territory. Section 226, title 39, of the United States Code provides these preferential postage rates "* * * for the dissemination of information of a public character, or devoted to literature, the sciences, arts, or some special industry."

Never has any U.S. Government agency compiled for Congress a statement showing the total annual tonnage of incoming Communist propaganda distributed free, nor even an official guess of the total cost of this subsidy to the Kremlin's special industry mail.

"Does not commonsense dictate the complete elimination of all postal subsidies for Communist propaganda before American readers are taxed further for their own daily, weekly, or monthly publication?" Congressman Bow asks.

"I think the flow of propaganda material into this country is a very serious matter, indeed," said Chief Postal Inspector David H. Stephens before the Appropriations Committee (p. 162), "I am sure you know that the Government is limited as to what it can do to combat this influence with respect to denying use of the mails to the senders of his material * * *."

The Supreme Court has ruled in several controlling cases that the doctrine of clear and present danger from Red propaganda does not apply to mere advocacy of Communist principles, but applies only when specific over acts of sabotage, subversion, or revolution are at hand to offer a clear and present danger to the national security.

Songressman JOHN R. PILLION of Lackawanna, N.Y., pressed Inspector Stephens on the matter of incoming Red propaganda.

"Actually, if you had a great bundle of propaganda, no matter how vicious, coming from Red China or Moscow, and if I were to receive it in New York City or San Francisco and you attempted to investigate it, under the Supreme Court decision would you say you have the power to take that propaganda material away from me?"

Inspector Stephens answered: "I would say in this country, no" (p. 164).

"So when we talk about using our law enforcement machinery to stop Communist propaganda, you are helpless, and your hands are tied completely under the decisions of the Supreme Court today; is that correct?"

"That is correct," replied Chief Inspector Stephens, "and I might say that living with it from day to day is a very frustrating experience."

"Could this situation be corrected by legislation?" queried Congressman OTTO E. PASSMAN, of Monroe, La., "or would it require a constitutional amendment to offset these rulings of the Supreme Court in order to give you power to seize this Communist propaganda?"

This urgent question is now under crash study, both in the general counsel's office in the Post Office, and by constitutional experts in the House and Senate.

Meanwhile, the Kremlin's youth-training literature continues to flow inward daily by the ton.

At the same time the United States, through its U.S. Information Agency, is spending an average of $110 million a year the world around in news, radio, library, and TV operations calculated to defeat Moscow's unrelenting propaganda drive against freedom.

Participation by United States in Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development—Statement by National Foreign Trade Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement approved at a meeting of the National Foreign Trade Council Board of Directors on February 24, 1961, approving membership and active participation by the United States in the new Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. PARTICIPATION IN THE ORGANIZATION FOR ECONOMIC COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT

(Statement approved at a meeting of the National Foreign Trade Council Board of Directors Feb. 24, 1961)

Recognizing the need for a medium through which the closest contact may be maintained between the United States and the nations of Western Europe on matters of continuing mutual economic concern, the National Foreign Trade Council favors membership and active participation by the United States in the new Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. As successor to the OEEC, the OECD represents the responsive adaptation of an existing body to changing and challenging conditions. It can and should serve the same great constructive purposes of promoting international economic growth and development on a sound and lasting basis.

Despite the historic and steadily enlarging community of interest between the United States and Western Europe, there are also unfortunately recurrent points of difference and disagreement. In the economic and financial field, these differences as well as those which arise among the Western European countries themselves can best and most fruitfully be resolved through a forum for consultation such as OECD will provide. But beyond the mere exchange of views there is an increasing advantage to be gained from greater cooperation and coordination.

The council has had repeated occasion in the past to commend the OEEC for the leadership it has given during years of tension and strain, and for the contribution it has made toward the elimination of unduly burdensome and discriminatory restrictions and the restoration of a sense of fiscal and monetary responsibility. It is expected that the new OECD will be animated by the same spirit and will pursue the same realistic course. The United States, however, should impress on OECD and its members the vital role to be played by private enterprise in achieving the agreed aims and the desirability of according private enterprise the same recognition as it received from OEEC.

Finally, while there is much to be gained from the entry of Canada and the United States into common membership with the countries of Western Europe in OECD, there remain many distinctly European problems and issues. It is important that these not be neglected or subordinated by the new Organization and that OECD carry forward with equal vigor and dedication the essentially European work of the OEEC. One of the most important tasks the OECD can and should assume is to serve as a unifying and liberalizing economic force in Western Europe.

Colorado Water Projects Surveyed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of talk these days about the necessity for conservation of our water resources. In Colorado, where we have always lived with these problems, people are doing something about it. Under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to place in the RECORD an article which appeared recently in the Denver Post, outlining some water projects that are underway or planned throughout Colorado. The article was written by Mr. Bert Hanna of the Post, and it as follows:

COLORADO WATER PROJECTS SURVEYED

A statewide survey just completed by the Colorado Water Congress reveals an unprecedented number of civic and community water development projects are underway or planned throughout Colorado.

The programs range from expansion of existing municipal water systems to new methods and efforts to conserve water and improve sewage facilities. And an important consideration in the minds of all water experts this year is the critical water shortage in many areas created by the scant snowpack in most of the mountains.

The report on the statewide programs, prepared by Charles C. Fisk, Denver water supply engineer and newsletter editor for the Colorado Water Congress, contains these progress highlights:

The city of Boulder plans to expand its water system. The plan is to use space in the Public Service Co. Barker Reservoir at Nederland for water exchange. If that doesn't work out, a new $14 million mountain reservoir is indicated.

Boulder's water now comes from North Boulder Creek. The proposed expansion, financed by a bond issue, would develop Middle Boulder Creek supplies.

Pueblo residents expect to vote this year on a proposed $6 million bond issue for expansion of water facilities. The program includes main extensions, additional storage and pumping facilities, improvements to the treatment plant. This doesn't include planned purchase of new raw water supplies.

Arvada is seeking proposals for an engineering study on expansion of water facilities. The major facility will be a proposed filter plant near Denver Water Board's Ralston Reservoir. Arvada obtains most of its raw water from Denver.

Leadville recently dedicated its new Canterbury tunnel water supply project. It's a unique water defreezing scheme with a conduit under 7 feet of cover that will carry water to Leadville from a spring deep inside the old Canterbury mine, abandoned since 1923.

Thermostatically controlled heating cables will prevent freezing in Leadville fire hydrant laterals. Result will be elimination of most of the freezing problems that have plagued Leadville's water system for years.

Aurora and Colorado Springs received a $212,000 loan from the Federal Communities Facilities Administration for planning the proposed $40 million privately financed Homestake water project. Supply source is the Eagle River basin. Several projects on both slopes are seeking conditional decrees for Eagle River water rights which District Judge William H. Luby, of Eagle, denied on grounds water needs were speculative. The Colorado Supreme Court is expected to rule soon on appeals from Luby's decision.

Residents of southwest Weld County are considering a proposed $5.5 million domestic water project. Supply is the Colorado-Big Thompson project. Facilities are a filter plant at Carter Lake, clear water storage, 200 miles of pipeline. Service area includes some 3,500 rural and small town families in the Berthoud, Mead, Johnstown, Niwot, and possibly Windsor and Evans areas. Financing will come from a Federal loan, if possible, or a bond issue.

Farmers and ranchers in rural areas of the Grand Valley have decided the time has come to get domestic water piped to their homesites. The Ute water district proposes to divert water from Plateau Creek below Collbran project's Molina powerplant, construction of treatment facilities and delivery of potable water through 400 miles of pipeline. Service area includes potentialliy 64,000 farmers and ranches from Cameo to near the Utah line. Cost is estimated at $10 million, while financing will be by Federal loan or bond issue.

Grand Junction is expanding its water treatment plant, plans a $150,000 filter unit to serve outside the city area. But city officials are worried about this year's poor snowpack on Grand Mesa.

The Grand Mesa Water Users Association has proposed a cooperative cloud seeding project to increase the Grand Mesa snowpack. Delta and Grand Junction will join the project as contributors.

The Colorado River and Middle Park Water Conservation Districts are core drilling at Azure damsite between Little and Big Gore Canyons 10 miles downstream from Kremmling. The proposed reservoir probably will be about 20,000 acre-feet first-stage capacity, ultimately about 90,000 acre-feet. Financing probably will be through an REA loan.

This project will create hydroelectric power for REA sales and industrial water for the proposed Crown Zellerbach's paper pulpmill.

The Basalt project is slated for early U.S. Bureau of Reclamation studies. It's in the Fryingpan and Roaring Fork Valleys of Garfield, Pitkin and Eagle Counties. Objective is to find uses for water to be stored in Ruidi Reservoir, replacement feature for the proposed Fryingpan-Arkansas transmountain diversion project.

The Sweetwater project is a privately financed undertaking being planned by Rocky Mountain Power Co. of Denver. It will divert from the South Fork of the White River into Sweetwater Creek, Colorado River tributary above Dotsero. Major facilities will be a large reservoir and powerplant about 4 miles above Dotsero. It will utilize

power and municipal-industrial water for oil shale development area and eastern slope areas by exchange at an estimated cost of $21 million for first-stage development.

Westminster has received a $24,000 interest-free planning loan from the Community Facilities Administration to finance water studies. The town is considering the feasibility of enlarging Standley Reservoir.

Durango received a similar loan for planning water facilities to cost $575,000. Lafayette got a loan from the same source to plan improvements to its water system costing $388,000.

In the area of water sanitation, the survey notes that the Denver Metropolitan Sanitation Committee received a $270,000 Federal loan last month to finance planning for metropolitan sewage treatment facilities. Hurry-up studies will be made by three Denver engineering firms.

Objectives will be to determine what it will cost each participant to join the metropolitan district which each metropolitan community must approve by April 23.

Aurora is experimenting with an odorless, sludge-free sewage disposal process. Objective is a decentralized sewage treatment system that is less expensive, more flexible than conventional systems.

The deepest waste disposal well ever sunk is the 11,400-foot shaft under construction east of Denver at Rocky Mountain Arsenal, an Army Corps of Engineers project to treat chemical wastes and inject them into a deep, porous sandstone formation. Cost is $265,000 for the well, $375,000 for the treatment plant.

Code of Ethics for Legislators and Public Officials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Wisconsin Federation of Women's Clubs at its convention last May endorsed a Code of Ethics for Legislators and Public Officials. This code has also been endorsed by the auxiliary to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the County Board of Dane County, both candidates for President and Governor last year, and all the State officers.

Mr. President, the code is an excellent one. It bears a strong resemblance to the Code of Ethics for Government Service adopted by Congress in 1958. It is slanted slightly more in the direction of members of legislative bodies, which is perhaps a needed emphasis.

The resolution accompanying the code points to the same need which prompted me to support the Code of Ethics for Government Service in 1958, and to introduce in January of this year a bill to create a Commission on Ethics which could implement and apply the code. In her letter to me, the president of the Wisconsin Federation of Women's Clubs, Mrs. L. F. Motel, states her belief that such a Commission would render a valuable service in interpreting the code and deciding on violations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mrs. Motl's letter to me and the resolution endorsing the Code of Ethics for Legislators and Public Officials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN FEDERATION OF
WOMEN'S CLUBS,
February 27, 1961.

Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Enclosed you will find a copy of the resolution and code of ethics endorsed by the State Federation of Women's Clubs, at their convention last May. Since then it has been endorsed by the Auxiliary to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Dane County board, both candidates for President and for Governor, all the State officers and many others.

The code has received favorable action in the national resolutions committee of the Women's Club, and we hope it will be endorsed by the national federation at their convention in June. We also anticipate its introduction in our own legislature.

I have read with great interest the step you have taken to create a commission of ethics. I would appreciate very much a copy of the bill.

Endorsement of the code will be of little value if the officials do not adhere to its principles. I believe a Commission of Ethics will render a valuable service in interpretation and decisions on violations.

Wishing you success in your undertaking, which will surely tend to improve the ethical standard of our public officials, and which is extremely important, if the ideals of our country are to survive.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. L. F. MOTL,
Chairman of Legislation.

Whereas recent disclosures by legislative investigating committees and by the press reflect a serious deterioration in moral and ethical standards of many people generally; and

Whereas such an attitude is contributing to our political, legislative, and government officials adopting a course of action based on expediency and self-interest rather than on principle and statesmanship; and

Whereas we believe that unless our governmental leaders especially are made to act according to principle and high ethical standards the very foundations of our democracy and freedom are threatened; and

Whereas public opinion and votes reaction need to be stimulated by providing a simplified standard from which to judge our public officials: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this day, May 16, 1960, the Wisconsin Federation of Women's Clubs meeting in convention at Madison, Wis., endorses the following Code of Ethics for Legislators and Public Officials and urges its distribution and promulgation among all citizens of our State:

CODE OF ETHICS FOR LEGISLATORS AND PUBLIC OFFICIALS

1. He will put loyalty to the highest moral principles and to country above party and persons and uphold the honor and dignity of his office.

2. He will be a scrupulous trustee of all public funds, will not permit nor condone unjust enrichment of himself at the expense of the public, and will not accept expense money in excess of his actual expenses.

3. He will not promise his constituents improvements or public works that cannot reasonably be accomplished.

4. He will not take credit of any kind properly due someone else.

5. He will make no promises of any kind which compromise the duties of his office.

6. He will never accept for himself or his family favors or benefits that might influence the performance of his duties.

7. He will not make of his office a means for employment of his relatives.

8. He will be consecrated to the consideration of economy in the interest of economic stability.

9. He will endeavor in the performance of his duties to expedite good government and avoid delaying tactics.

10. He will avoid special concessions to lobbies detrimental to the public.

National Peace Agency—Letter to the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. MOELLER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to discuss an issue which disturbs many millions of people throughout the world. This is the lack of any effective means of controlling the explosive arms race we have been in for many years. Weapons of terrifying destructive power have been developed, technology seems to far outdistance man's ability to settle his differences, and now, advanced research and development by such powers as France and Israel appear to foreshadow a rapid spread of nuclear weapons among the community of nations. Experts tell us that it is only a matter of time until the Communist Chinese join the nuclear club. A recent scientific breakthrough in West Germany indicates that a cheap method may have been discovered to enable even small and relatively poor nations to have their own nuclear arms.

The nuclear test discussions scheduled to be resumed in Geneva later this month may or may not come up with any real progress. But it is essential that progress be made and one of the best ways we can assure progress is for the United States to initiate a vigorous and concentrated program of planning for peace. There is undoubtedly some work now being done in this field by the Federal Government, but so far, it has been a scattered and haphazard effort. There is no central direction or planning of this vital work. No one has gathered together all the diverse interests of the various governmental departments and agencies into a coherent whole, analyzed where we should be going, where we are lacking in information; and what we should be doing to energize and concentrate the national effort toward achievement of peace in our time.

I have recently introduced a bill, H.R. 2267, to establish a National Peace Agency. Over 30 other Members of this House have introduced similar legislation during the current session of Congress. The House Committee on Foreign Relations has yet to organize their subcommittees and therefore has been unable to take any action, schedule any

hearings, or request comments from the affected executive agencies. Thus, we have been in session over 2 months now and there is little prospect of action in this vital area in the near future.

In his last press conference, President Kennedy was asked what progress he had made in building up an adequate staff to deal with the question of disarmament and planning for negotiations. In his response, Mr. Kennedy stated that Mr. McCloy was working on the problem and he hoped to have recommendations to submit to Congress "in some days."

This week I sent a letter to President Kennedy outlining some of the problems and urging that quick action be taken on this matter. I would like to include the text of my letter to the President in the RECORD with the hope that it will act as a reminder that we have not yet done what we must, that we have not yet taken any concrete action to launch a genuine and sincere study of the problems of disarmament, control, inspection, and their many related problem areas.

Letter to the President:

MARCH 6, 1961.

The Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR PRESIDENT KENNEDY: One of the questions raised at your press conference the other day concerned the amount of effort currently being expended by the Federal Government in the field of disarmament planning.

Disarmament planning, or as it may more appropriately be called, planning for peace, has long been a concern of all thoughtful Americans—indeed of thoughtful men the world over. Your answer to this press conference question, as well as the many statements you have made on the subject, both during and since the campaign, indicate that this problem has been, and is, one of deep concern to you.

I will not soon forget the stirring words with which you characterized the task before us:

"But neither can two great and powerful groups of nations take comfort from our present course—both sides overburdened by the cost of modern weapons, both rightly alarmed by the steady spread of this deadly atom, yet both racing to alter that uncertain balance of terror that stays the hand of mankind's final war. * * * Let both sides, for the first time, formulate serious and precise proposals for the inspection and control of arms—and bring the absolute power to destroy other nations under the absolute control of all nations. Let both sides seek to invoke the wonders of science instead of its terrors. Together let us explore the stars, conquer the deserts, eradicate disease, tap the ocean depths, and encourage the arts and commerce. Let both sides unite to heed in all corners of the earth the command of Isaiah—to 'undo the heavy burdens * * * (and) let the oppressed go free.' And if a beachhead of cooperation may push back the jungle of suspicion, let both sides join in creating a new endeavor, not a new balance of power, but a new world of law, where the strong are just and the weak secure and the peace preserved."

Mr. President, the spontaneous and tremendous response you have received from the American people on your projected Peace Corps is proof enough of the wholehearted support you may expect to receive in your efforts to work out effective programs for arms limitation. This support will come from men of good will throughout the Nation and from the Congress.

As evidence of this support from the legislative branch of the Government I might cite the many bills to establish a National Peace Agency introduced during the current session of Congress. I have introduced such a bill, H.R. 2267, and believe this approach to the problem merits your most careful consideration.

Few will dispute the aims of this legislation: To promote arms limitation, to assure international control and inspection, and to assist in the elimination of the economic causes of war. Nor will many dispute the advisability of initiating research and study programs to seek and implement solutions to such problems as nuclear, missile and satellite test monitoring; the effect of disarmament on national economies; limiting the use of space for military purposes; the effects of radiation on men; population maldistribution; and problems of underdeveloped nations—to cite but a few contemplated by this bill.

There may well be some who feel that establishing a separate agency to carry out this vital mission would involve duplication of effort now being expended in several departments of the Government. I do not subscribe to this belief. I think, rather, that a single National Peace Agency could, and would, serve to focalize all Federal effort directed toward these goals. One agency, dedicated to these high purposes, would capture the imagination of the country, mobilize the creative power of American ideas, and concentrate the national effort toward the achievement of peace in our time. However, I respectfully submit that it is of overriding importance that no disagreement as to the location or agency structure of this effort be allowed to jeopardize its success. It is imperative that the task be initiated with vigor and without delay. I am confident that the Congress will respond to your call.

It is no small satisfaction to me and to many millions of Americans that we are able to rely on thoughtful and decisive executive action in these difficult times. I urge you, therefore, Mr. President, to give the problem of planning for peace your most careful and expeditious consideration so that your recommendations to the Congress may be made in the near future.

Respectfully,

WALTER H. MOELLER.

Mass Transportation Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on February 13 the Christian Science Monitor, one of the most respected newspapers in the country, devoted its lead editorial to S. 345, the mass transportation bill I recently introduced.

After describing the compelling reasons for Federal interest and assistance in this problem, the editorial describes some of the provisions of the bill and urges "that the Committee on Banking and Currency make sure the bill is not lost in inaction."

I must confess that I was flattered by the editorial's observation that the bill would make "good reading" for executives caught in a traffic jam or delayed on a commuter train. As we all know, a copy of a bill is not usually something one likes to curl up with either in bed or on a commuter train. But I did at least try to make the bill comprehensible on the face of it, so at least our poor commuters need not carry along a set of the United States Code with the bill, in addition to suffering the other usual indignities of commutation these days.

Mr. President, I ask that the editorial from the Christian Science Monitor, entitled "Out of the Traffic Jam," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 13, 1961]

OUT OF THE TRAFFIC JAM

If 7 out of 10 Americans live in cities, at least that many are on intimate terms with the traffic jam, the overcrowded streetcar, the subway strike, the late commuter train, and the perennial fare rise.

These are, alas, fixtures of city life, begot in one way or another by the wonderful automobile. And they are related to other uncomfortable urban problems—declining downtown shopping areas, higher in-town property taxes, spreading slums.

Political, educational, and social improvements obviously are needed. But these corrections alone will not save the cities from strangulation and loss of tax base. One big mechanical improvement must also be made: mass transportation needs to be rescued after decades of neglect.

The bluntest way of putting this is to say that it costs each taxpayer from 9 to 17 times as much to pay for auto expressways to move X-thousand people into town as it does to pay for a fine rapid transit system to move the same number of people.

Add to this staggering expense the added cost to the city from losses of taxable land eaten up by eight-lane expressways and downtown garages, and it is easy to see why mass transport plans are such an urgent pocketbook matter. (For instance, 68 percent of the downtown Los Angeles land area is already consumed for traffic and parking use.)

To Americans accustomed to taking care of such local matters locally it is hard to understand why Federal intervention in this crisis is needed. But unquestionably it is.

With the present system of tax revenues heavily weighted in favor of the Federal treasury, local and State aid are simply not forthcoming. Most big cities have been backed too near their statutory debt limits to be able to borrow at commercial rates the millions of dollars needed to make their mass transportation systems truly efficient. And local property taxpayers cannot provide such large chunks of capital.

In addition most metropolitan areas cut across city lines, and 53 of the 200 major urban areas cross State lines, making this clearly a job where Federal coordination can help.

It is for these reasons that the cautious urban mass transportation bill now in the Senate (S. 345) has such remarkably broad backing. Among its sponsors are both extreme liberals and extreme conservatives.

The bill provides for low-cost, long-term loans from the Federal Treasury to cities "to preserve and improve essential mass transportation facilities and equipment such as terminals, stations, adjacent parking lots, new commuter cars and buses."

It also provides for strictly safeguarded planning and pilot project grants to help metropolitan areas develop long-range plans for highways, rail service, rapid transit routes and industrial-residential zoning.

The bill would make available $100 million for loans the first year; $150 million in subsequent years.

It contains carefully constructed safeguards and incentives to insure that funds are not wasted or grabbed as a handout with which one city administration can patch up its finances at the expense of future mayors and taxpayers. Among the safeguards is a cutoff of Federal assistance after 3 years if progress does not measure up to strict tests.

We shall later analyze the provisions of S. 345 in more detail. For the present it is enough to urge that the Committee on Banking and Currency make sure the bill is not lost in inaction. And that city administrators and civic leaders familiarize themselves with its contents. It makes good reading for executives caught in a traffic jam or delayed on a commuter train.

Research in Oceanography

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, President Kennedy's references to research in oceanography in his inaugural address, his state of the Union message, and his February 23 message to Congress on natural resources development have received a most favorable response in the Pacific Northwest, as I am sure they have also in other parts of the country.

I have received letters from constituents in the State of Washington and from residents of Oregon who are enthusiastic about the President's advocacy of an expanded program. Many citizens have spoken to me personally to the same effect.

Indicative of the attitude in this area is an editorial entitled "Kennedy and Sea Resources," published in the February 24 issue of the Seattle Times, one of the Nation's leading newspapers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KENNEDY AND SEA RESOURCES

President Kennedy promised in his natural resources message yesterday that his administration would give "concerted attention" to unfolding the mysteries of the sea.

This pledge will be well received here. And the President's followup moves on his promise will be eagerly watched.

Mr. Kennedy made clear that his interest applied both to oceanography and to the narrower field of fisheries.

The administration's views on extending oceanographic research appear to parallel closely those of Senator MAGNUSON, who has been pushing legislation for a large, modern fleet of research vessels to match the vast ocean-study efforts of the Russians.

On the basis of Mr. Kennedy's somewhat generalized statements yesterday, we would expect the administration to support MAGNUSON's bill or at least the chief substance of it.

As for fisheries, the President pointed out that this country will need an additional 3 billion pounds of fish and shellfish annually by 1980, and many other countries also would benefit from more extensive use of sea life for food.

"All this wil require increased efforts," he said, "under Federal leadership, for rehabilitation of depleted stocks of salmon and sardines in the Pacific, ground fish and oysters in the Atlantic, lake trout and other desirable species in the Great Lakes, and many others, through biological research, development of methods for passing fish over dams and control of pollution."

The administration soon will discover, if it is not already aware of the fact, that the preservation and restoration of fish resources—at least as far as the north Pacific is concerned—are deeply involved in international affairs as well as in the type of domestic programs mentioned in the President's message.

The recent salmon-conservation conference called in Juneau by Alaska's Governor Egan gave rise to many expressions of serious concern on the part of American and Canadian fisheries officials over the extension of Japanese and Russian fishing in the north Pacific in disregard of conservation practices.

Pacific Northwest fishermen have not in the past found the Federal Government sympathetic enough or alert enough in regard to this problem.

Perhaps Mr. Kennedy's expressions will signal a change of attitude in the State Department and other concerned Federal agencies.

Certainly his interest in the ocean deeps—scientific, military, and commercial—is warmly welcomed in this north Pacific gateway city, and it is to be hoped that manifestations of that interest will not be slow in coming.

Address by Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover on Receiving Annual Patriotism Award at University of Notre Dame, February 22, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, on February 22, 1961, it was my pleasure to be present at the University of Notre Dame on the occasion of the presentation by the senior class during the annual Washington Day exercises of the annual patriotism award to Vice Adm. Hyman George Rickover, U.S. Navy.

At this point I should like to include the statement of the senior class concerning this award:

THE SENIOR CLASS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME TO VICE ADM. HYMAN GEORGE RICKOVER, U.S. NAVY—PATRIOTISM AWARD

Greetings, in his time Washington expressed the feeling that a kind of destiny had set him upon his service to our country and that more was expected of him than could really be performed. But history reveals the wonder of his achievement even as in our time. Sir, you have shown yourself to be a citizen of destiny, capable in the nuclear age of scientific and military performance more than marvelous. And you have not hesitated to tell our people of the perils of failing to use with full strength and unrelenting concentration the educational resources we richly possess.

Combining unusual genius and inventiveness with forceful character and courage, you have advanced our national cause of liberty and security. For such dedicated accomplishment, sir, we are proud and happy to honor you today as a patriotic inheritor of the spirit and purpose of Washington.

Mr. Speaker, following his introduction by the distinguished president of the University of Notre Dame, the Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., Admiral Rickover delivered an excellent address on "Democracy and Competence." I am pleased to include the text of this address at this point in the RECORD:

DEMOCRACY AND COMPETENCE

(Remarks by Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover, U.S. Navy, for delivery upon the acceptance of the Patriotism Award at the University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind., Wednesday, February 22, 1961)

Thank you for the great honor you have bestowed upon me and for the opportunity you have given me to speak here tonight.

We have just witnessed the impressive ceremony of the orderly transfer of the Presidency from one man to another, from one party to another. There has been favorable comment on the very thorough briefing that has taken place; the many consultations, the hours spent by new department heads and subheads, sitting beside their predecessors, notebook in hand, absorbing and recording the experience of the past so there will be no sharp break, no unnecessary gap in the continuity of managing the public affairs of this Nation. We have come to take it for granted that periodically such transfers of power take place. Yet relatively few nations manage this part of the democratic process as well as we do, and those few are all part of the civilization of the West which itself invented democracy and made the rule of law supreme in all human relationships.

As I look at this audience in which young people predominate I cannot help thinking about the private inaugurals that take place every day in all parts of this country when responsibility shifts from one generation to the next; we are not always as conscientious about briefing our private successors as we are about briefing incoming political administrations. The briefing I speak of is, of course, education: the educing or bringing forth of capacities locked in the child, the careful guidance of his growth to maturity by responsible adults in home, church, and school; the effort to develop his spiritual and intellectual resources so he will be prepared for the challenges the future may bring. Surely this too is part of the democratic process; a part, alas, we do not handle very well. The experiences of my life have given me a sense of deep personal distress at our failure—the failure of the generation currently in charge to help youth develop such competencies as they will need when they take over from us.

I thought it might perhaps be of interest to you if I devoted my remarks to the subject of competence in a democracy. We must face the fact that it is no longer sufficient for us to handle the political problems of democratic self-government to our own satisfaction. We are on trial; our way of life is on trial. We are being challenged by a rival system of government which claims to manage modern industrial societies more effi-

ciently than we and ought therefore be emulated throughout the world. We would like to go our own way but the world will not leave us alone. Science and technology have destroyed the geographic isolation which until recently allowed us to manage our affairs without giving thought how other nations manage theirs. Now we find ourselves captaining the free world and everything we do either strengthens or weakens the coalition fighting to preserve its right to remain free.

To remain free we must be immensely competent, and competent in a great variety of new ways. One of these has to do with science and technology, with the kind of creativity that produces scientific discoveries, and with the kind of organizational and social skill that puts these discoveries to practical use. That we cannot afford to fall behind in science and technology is self-evident. Of course there are other fields where we must likewise keep ahead and I do not for a moment wish to deprecate them. It is a fact, however, that unless we predominate in science and technology it will not matter how well we perform in other fields. The survival of our own, of everyone's freedom depends today on power anchored in scientific superiority.

I can illustrate my point best by citing an actual example of specific competencies needed to keep us in the forefront. You are perhaps aware that the Naval Reactors group I head has been part of a large-scale effort to launch a power revolution that will have as deep an effect—perhaps a deeper one—on living conditions as that of the earlier power revolutions that ushered in first the age of steam, then that of electricity. The nuclear power revolution is but one of several developmental projects of similar magnitude; all are concerned with the tremendous effort man is currently exerting to reshape nature. All have, in common, great potentialities for harm if they are not handled by people with the requisite competence.

There is first the requirement that only persons with a high degree of scientific and engineering ability be permitted to handle the powerful natural forces being harnessed by new development projects; if people who are, technically speaking, laymen, meddle with them there is grave danger these forces will escape man's control and go on the rampage, wreaking havoc. There is second the requirement that only persons with a high sense of social, ethical and political responsibility be allowed to decide how this new power is to be used; with it man can today do more evil than has ever been possible, barbarous though much of human history has been.

Our is a democracy where the ultimate decision in these matters rests upon each and every one of us; in final analysis the most important requirements is overall competence of the public to understand the forces with which we deal and to choose the right men to direct their development and use. This comes down to voting in the right kind of government. It means that, besides such considerations as whether candidate X has the kind of personality, the kind of looks, family, background, etc. we like, we give thought to whether he has the mental competence to deal with the tremendous decisions Government must now make. It means that, besides making certain he will get us our fair share of public funds to lubricate the local and State economy and keep us employed, we also weigh his readiness to put the national interest above local interest in matters that ultimately decide the fate of all of us.

Let me spell out several necessary competencies, with particular reference to the project set up to obtain energy from nuclear fission and apply it to ship propulsion and to generation of power for civilian use. The atom sets its own categorical imperatives; we have no choice but to accept them. Specifically, this means that the engineers in my reactor group must perform at higher levels of engineering competence; it also means that industry must perform at higher levels of managerial and production competence; that officers and men operating nuclear ships, and personnel who operate atomic power central stations must be far more competent technically than their counterparts in conventional ships and plants. What is adequate for routine manufacturing, construction, and naval jobs is wholly inadequate for the utilization of atomic power.

But this is not all. When nuclear reactors enter into domestic or international policies, those in government who have to decide how reactors may best be utilized to the advantage of the United States must be competent in new ways not required of politicians and statesmen before the advent of the atom: they must be thoroughly versed in the potentialities and limitations of this complex new source of power; above all, they must be fully aware of the need for special safety measures without which our use of this relatively untried new force of nature might prove disastrous.

As in the case whenever man attempts to pioneer beyond established techniques, we in the naval nuclear propulsion group had to learn about the atom even as we were working to develop it for human use. It seems to me this aspect is too often lost sight of when new developmental projects are set up. We talk of getting a strong man to head the project, we devote a lot of energy to setting up an imposing organization with layers upon layers of allegedly competent administrators to look over each others' shoulders so no mistake will be made; yet rarely do we make provision for self-education on the job. It should be obvious that when you develop something new you must simultaneously develop new human capacities. In our own reactor group we were driven to see this point because there simply were no engineers available who knew how to handle the project.

So, from the first, we set up a system whereby we kept transmitting what we were learning on the job to new members of our group, thus slowly building up a corps of nuclear engineers. I know of no other way to do this. There has to be a constant passing from practical experience to theoretical reasoning and back again; this sort of thing can nowhere be done better than in such a combination work-school program. The entire project was a bootstrap operation where work, study, and teaching went on simultaneously.

As important as this process of mutual education has been our choice of technical personnel. Since in a novel project everyone is by definition a novice, one essential task for those in charge of such an enterprise is to find people who have the innate potentialities to develop, to become active contributors; from the start we have been expending an immense amount of effort on a search for young people who show evidence that they may in time be capable of innovating, of applying basic principles to novel circumstances, of disregarding old, established routines, and taking chances on untried procedures. Selection of young people, usually straight from college or engineering school, takes up much of my own time and that of my leading engineers; we have found no shortcut; no sure-fire mechanical process that would pick out the winners. We do it laboriously through personal interviews, through trial periods; yet, though we have had a fair amount of success, we constantly find our prognostications confounded by various unpredictable human factors.

These interviews with hundreds and hundreds of young men from the top of their graduating classes have brought home to me how poorly our public school system prepares American youth for the problems of tomorrow. These bright young people are, for the most part, badly deficient in basic knowledge, in a truly scientific spirit, in readiness to apply themselves with all their strength to a task that is vital to our future. The core group that has emerged from a long selection and trial process have, of course, performed superbly. Yet our work has been delayed by the need of these young men to make up their educational deficiencies through study at night; many have had to be taken off work and sent to school. We are presently operating our own school system which not only trains people specifically in nuclear engineering but provides remedial courses in fundamentals they should have learned in school and college.

The specter of Russia's giant scientific strides lent urgency to our work. We decided to save time by telescoping the procedures usually followed in new engineering projects. The sequence normally runs from basic research to applied research, to the laboratory or breadboard model, finally to the full-scale working model. We skipped the stage when theory is tried out on laboratory or breadboard models, and designed our reactors to fit directly into ships and power stations. This was a gamble we could not have taken had we not been fortunate enough to receive the backing of Congress. With their support we were able to cut construction time for the first atomic submarine by several years. The *Nautilus* was designed and built within the time usually required for the building of a conventional submarine. Omitting the laboratory model stage did increase our difficulties, however.

To most laymen—and alas even more so to public relations men—a laboratory model always seems to be equivalent to the finished, working product. But this is not so. There are many laboratory reactors; reactors that produce a little electricity under ideal laboratory conditions, and much is to be learned from them. There is a world of difference, however, between a research or experimental reactor and one that must actually produce useful power for a naval ship or a utility system. Whereas laboratory conditions favor the new project, reality is troublesome.

It is troublesome because as soon as you move from the laboratory to the practical world you deal with people outside your own group, over whose qualifications you exercise no control. I use the utmost care in choosing the engineers—naval and civilian—for my own reactor group. I can, therefore, influence the quality of their design work. But for construction of our reactors and of the ships and power stations into which these are installed, we depend on governmental and industrial organizations that do not specialize in atomic energy. Most of their work is with conventional types of ships and powerplants. Their managers, as a rule, lack familiarity with the pecularities of the atom. Therefore, they tend to go about building reactors and nuclear ships in the old and tried ways that were appropriate for conventional jobs. It has taken time and effort to convince them that nuclear power is a more exacting kind of energy than steam or diesel power.

Old, established organizations develop undue veneration for routines and protocol and it is extremely difficult for their managers to realize that what suffices for conventional work is quite inadequate when you undertake new engineering projects. We still have trouble getting the idea across that technological breakthroughs can never be brought about by routine methods and protocol. The essence of all progress is a shedding of preconceived ideas and accustomed ways of doing things, a venturing into the unknown where one is necessarily

guided more by intuition and imagination than by established rules and regulations. How else can anything new be created?

Every attempt to develop something new is hampered not only by technical but also by administrative problems, and sometimes by lack of understanding on the part of the general public. Advancement is hampered unless all who directly or indirectly exert influence on new projects learn to think on a higher intellectual plane. At the present stage of development only extremely competent, technically trained persons can design, build and operate reactors or devise appropriate safety regulations for their use. This is unfortunately not understood by many persons occupying key positions in the organizational set up. Among nontechnical administrators in particular, few realize that to deal efficiently and safely with these new and increasingly complex technical developments they themselves must achieve greater technical knowledge and attain a higher level of human competence. I do not exaggerate when I say that a major part of my own time and that of my top engineers must be diverted from our regular job and devoted to a never-ending battle for higher levels of performance by people outside my own group who make decisions about the building or use of nuclear powerplants. Having ourselves gone through the laborious process of self-education on the job, it is self-evident to us that higher standards of performance are a necessity dictated by the nature of atomic energy; there is nothing personal about it.

Personalities should never intrude into decisions concerned with technical problems. Unfortunately they often do, when people without scientific training make decisions concerning development or use of nuclear energy. In this country we place extraordinary emphasis on getting along with people, on conforming to accepted ways of doing things, and on maintaining pleasant social relationships in our business contacts. People with a nonscientific outlook carry this attitude into technical fields. They regard as impolite, even rude, our insistence on high standards of performance, despite the fact that these high standards are dictated by laws of nature. We were forced to choose between letting technical standards slide and so failing in the job assigned to us, or of incurring personal unpopularity. Faced with this choice, the reactor group put the primary task first. Of course, if it were generally understood that no new project can be pushed through without exacting higher standards of performance, our demand for these standards would not be resented. It is sheer ignorance of the complexities of nuclear fission that generates friction and a hostile attitude toward the rigorous specifications we are compelled to exact.

The climb upward to higher technologies is always difficult and painful. It is rendered still more onerous when one must periodically stop and convince reluctant climbers that it is really necessary to reach a higher plateau. Time thus lost in argument shows up in lengthening lead times, that is in prolongation of the period which elapses between conception of a new idea and its utilization in a useful object; as for example, between Einstein's formulation of the equation $E=Mc^2$ and completion of the first atomic bomb or nuclear reactor.

The imaginative creativity of the theoretical scientist who deals with abstract concepts is always ahead of the technical and administrative competence of those who translate the abstract into the concrete. How fast we progress technologically depends largely on the time it takes us to put new scientific ideas to practical use. Since World War II, leadtimes have been lengthening alarmingly in this country—from 2½ years during the war to 10 years today. In Russia, meanwhile, leadtime on military items is said to have been reduced to but 5 years. This is so serious a matter that we ought not allow obsolete organizational routines and preference for pleasant personal relationships to prevent us from reversing this ominous state of affairs. With the world situation as it is today, our country must advance rapidly if it is to retain its present power position. Delay in utilizing new ideas could spell disaster. Anyone familiar with history knows that a slight advantage, grasped and exploited by one side, has often totally altered power relationships. Today changes occur faster than ever before. No longer can we afford to indulge in the luxury of ignorance of scientific and technical matters which delays vital enterprise and lengthens our leadtimes. Leaders in industry and government must acquire a better understanding of science and its inexorable laws so they will find it less repugnant to consult technical experts, even those who are their subordinates.

The man of the future on whom we shall depend more and more is the professional expert. Today he is still being bossed by administrators thinking at prescientific levels; his work is hampered and sometimes destroyed by men in whom is vested great power but who are unable to understand the realities of the new, artificial world which the scientific revolution has created almost overnight. In the future, both a great deal more technical knowledge and a better understanding of the world we live in will be required of all who manage large organizations. Administrators whose sole talent is to manipulate men, money, and words will be of little use to us in the future; professionals who can handle the intricate mysteries of complex scientific and engineering projects are on the way in. This applies all along the line to the skilled workman on whose judgment, concentrated attention, and sense of responsibility may depend the functioning of some new gigantic piece of engineering. To put this in military terms, we shall need more technical sergeants and fewer martinets. In our naval nuclear program we have taken cognizance of this demand for a different kind of man, and we have set up schools to train the officers and men who will operate the new atomic Navy.

But the need for higher competence is not limited to leaders who supervise and direct large organizations, or to the professional people who run our complex society, or to the scientists and engineers who move us ahead technologically—this higher competence is required of all of us. This is so because ours is a democracy and no democracy can function properly if the majority does not understand what the minority does. In a thoughtful editorial introducing a series of articles entitled "Adventures of the Mind," the Saturday Evening Post said, "The fact is that what the scholar thinks, the artist creates, the scientist discovers, cannot achieve full reality without the rest of us. Without us no idea or institution can flourish."

Democracy is in serious danger if the mass of our citizens, whose beliefs and attitudes shape national policy and determine national mores, are out of touch with the talented minority who push us ahead technologically and from whose ranks come all the trained professionals who run our complex society. Life on a high level of technology cannot be lived democratically unless all the people raise their human stature so that they may be competent to judge and direct the new forces that our creative brainworkers are bringing under man's control. More is needed today than the marvelous practicality for which Americans have long been famous. In the past this practicality served us well, for our principal task was the taming of this continent; the exploitation of the natural wealth of this new land. To do this all we needed was ability to adapt and apply scientific techniques developed elsewhere.

But this practical ability no longer suffices; we must now make over the world in order to offset shrinkage of space and natural resources; we must develop scientific substitutes for disappearing natural materials—artificial sweet water, for instance; artificial power through hydrogen fusion; substitutes for metals which, at present rates of use will be exhausted before too long. We must, in other words, turn more and more to science to solve our problems. Yet we cannot hand over management of our affairs to scientists; the people themselves will have to acquire sufficient understanding of science and scientists to be able to direct scientific work toward socially desirable ends. Should they shirk the effort to acquire this understanding of science, the American people will not, in the long run, obtain maximum social benefits from scientific work and preserve the right of self-government as well.

Just as important as popular comprehension of science is popular understanding of the humanities; these too are becoming more and more important, for in this overfull world where people and nations impinge ever closer upon one another, it is the humanities that teach us how to preserve human dignity and decent interpersonal and international relationshisp even when we are crowded together with people we would not choose for close neighbors. To keep democracy viable, to sustain a free technological society today, the American people must be well versed in the fundamentals of the sciences and the humanities. No better foundation for a modern democracy can be built than an educational system open to all children that helps them to acquire civilized minds through a liberal education.

Democracy is the only government worthy of free men; it is also the most difficult. It will not run well unless all the people, or at least a majority, possess those qualities of mind and character that in other forms of government are needed by none but a small governing group. We are not born with these qualities. We must acquire them through effort; we must be carefully guided and taught by home, church, and school. Hence the overriding importance of education in a democracy; education that enhances the human personality, that "brings the mind into form" to quote John Henry Newman's definition of a liberal education.

Much of our educational thinking is built on the erroneous belief that science, which has so greatly eased man's physical labors, similarly can ease his mental labors—a totally false conclusion; the very opposite is true. Periodically magazines break out in fanciful descriptions of the world of tomorrow when kitchen walls move up and down at the touch of a button, roasts cook themselves, everyone operates his own helicopter, and life is one long round of vacation fun and refreshing pauses for togetherness around tables laden with food which nobody has had to prepare. Never a word will you find in these rosy pictures of things to come about people having to be wiser, more knowledgeable, better educated, more actively involved in public affairs. Life without effort appears to be our national goal.

But when machines take over manual labor and routine mental chores, the complexity of life increases; efficient management of one's private and the Nation's public affairs makes much higher demands on the human mind. Today most fathers work fewer hours than their children ought to devote to studies if they would develop their innate abilities to the fullest and be best prepared for the problems of tomorrow. It is nonsense to say that new scientific methods can make learning painless and fun; that it

matters not whether a child chooses to become "educated" via typewriting or the study of calculus; by fudgemaking or learning to speak French. Only an uneducated person with no concept of what the future will be can blind himself to the necessity for education to center upon developing the mind, upon making it a useful tool. Only work requiring skills in which the intellect plays an important part has any real future. Jobs that are purely routine and can be learned in a few days are bound in time to be taken over by machines, but automation will never be a threat to those who have a mind that can think for itself and reason logically.

Another misconception widespread in our educational thinking is the notion that higher education is a democratic right—as is the right to vote or to equality before the law; that it is part and parcel of the American standard of living and should therefore be universal; that it is something you need not earn by effort but which is yours by virtue of living in a country that occupies a privileged, as it were, an upper-class position in the society of nations. Such thinking does not differ much from the notion that special rights accrue to persons by virtue of belonging to an upper class within a given nation. In education the only valid right is the right to equality of opportunity. When we attempt to use a public agency—the school—to level down inherent inequalities of talent and motivation we destroy equality of opportunity. Children of educated or well-to-do parents will simply attend private schools if the public schools lower their standards; it is not possible in a free society to undo inequalities of intellectual power conferred on us by God.

In order to preserve a narrow and mistaken concept of democratic education we are currently depriving many of our talented, and almost all our average children of a carefully planned sequential program of studies in the liberal arts that will genuinely educate them. Because we cannot impart this general education to all children simultaneously, we have downgraded curricula in the direction of what are termed, "common needs of youth"—vocational training, the teaching of manners, leisure time skills, and the like. These do not equip youth with competencies needed in the twentieth century, either to be successful in their private lives or to discharge their responsibilities as democratic citizens. Maudlin sentimentality and an unrealistic notion of the child's democratic right to choose only subjects that interest him keep many of our children from obtaining the solid advantages of a broad general or liberal education.

Something on the order of 300 courses are offered in our public schools; I doubt whether more than 10 percent have anything to do with developing the child's mental capacities. We are the only civilized nation where children are not protected at school against pursuing educational programs unsuited to their abilities and needs. In contrast to the law which takes account of the limited judgment of minors and erects safeguards to prevent them from making decisions that will harm them, our schools do not protect minor children against their immature desire to avoid hard subjects and choose courses that require no effort on their part and little or no homework. These easy courses have the so-called advantages that they do not show up mental inequalities as do those of the liberal arts curriculum (also, they are easier to teach).

We make a mockery of the noble concept of universal free education when we eliminate from education everything that spurs the child to effort. It is official educationist dogma that "there is no aristocracy of 'subjects' * * * mathematics and mechanics, art and agriculture, history and homemaking are peers." All win for the pupil the same credit toward his final diploma or degree; all are open to every pupil regardless of his ability. Thus do we eliminate competition and reward from the child's most important business—growing up to be a worthwhile adult. In every other human activity we recognize that people do their best when they are challenged by competition; we know that effort brings reward. Not so in education. Here we actually pride ourselves on sparing the lazy and the stupid child the disappointment of failure. To save the sensibilities of the incompetent, we neglect the talented. And even the average child with sufficient motivation to absorb at least part of a liberal education all too often misses out because he has not been properly guided and spurred on to exert himself.

Today's effort to wrap children in cotton wool and protect them against every risk of school life contrasts with the way children were raised in pioneer days. No parent would then have dreamed of sparing his son the risk of possible accident by not teaching him to shoot a rifle. Survival in pioneer days depended on being a handy shot; the risk of a child hurting himself had to be taken. Survival today depends on ability to raise intellectual capacities to higher levels than were ever before needed; yet, though ability to think is as important today as ability to shoot was yesterday, many American parents will not accept the risk of their child hurting himself by failing in a tough curriculum. Our folklore has little admiration for the pampered child of rich parents, but now that most of us are rich beyond the dreams of people elsewhere in this world; richer by far than most ruling classes were a few generations ago—now we engage in that very pampering we once scorned.

A peculiar sense of logic permits us to award the star athlete all sorts of honors, thereby motivating him to practice hard and continuously; while to do the same for children of superior intelligence and scholastic achievement is supposed to "undemocratic." It is odd that we who think we are an exceptionally practical and realistic people should admire the kind of competence which has no great personal or social value in later life, while we deprecate intellectual prowess of which we have far too little and need a great deal.

We want our children to lead a happy and rich life. But instead of teaching them to develop their inner resources we waste their best learning years on training them how to be socially popular and how to find a mate. Much of the "entertainment" type education given in our schools could well be given after school hours and at the expense of the interested families. I am old fashioned enough to feel that taxes ought to be invested in educating children for real life and not for having a good time.

In setting educational objectives, one may take the view that they must achieve what is best for the individual, or one may take the view that they must aim at what is best for society. In democracies, fortunately, that education which enables the individual to make full use of every one of his abilities because all have been developed to their maximum potential—that education also best prepares him for democratic citizenship.

When we substitute vocational training for general education in our schools, we treat human beings as breadwinners pure and simple. We leave out of consideration their needs as persons and as citizens. This is an attitude often found in authoritarian societies but it has no place in a democracy, particularly one as rich as our country which can well afford to provide all its children with a good liberal education. Though it is not highly regarded by authoritarian governments, the independence of mind which such an education develops is indispensable in a democracy.

Substituting vocationalism for general education cheats a child of his right to become a well-educated person. Let us, by all means, provide for all sorts of extracurricular activities which may be pleasant or marginally useful to children; we can use the school buildings for this after hours. But let us not substitute typewriting, metal shop, or driver training for history, languages, mathematics, and sciences. Vocational skills were deemed sufficient for the hewers of wood and the carriers of water in times gone past; they are not sufficient for future democratic citizens.

How better can we use the wealth and the leisure which technological advances give us than by investing them in a concerted campaign to provide our children with the best schools and the best educated teachers in the world so that all future American citizens may absorb as much education as is humanly possible. Is there a worthier goal we can set for ourselves than to help America's youth become the most intelligent, the most competent, the most patriotic, and the wisest of rulers of this land of ours?

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by reading an extract from the bull of Pius II in 1459 upon the establishment of the University of Basle, Switzerland:

Among the joys which mortal man in this transient life can obtain by God's gift, this does not deserve to be reckoned among the least, namely, that through constant study he can gain the pearl of knowledge. This points out to him the way to live well and in happiness and by its great value enables one who possesses it to far surpass him who does not. Furthermore, it makes him like unto God and brings him to a clear knowledge of the world's secrets. It brings its favors to the untaught and raises to the heights men born in the lowliest circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, I should also like to insert in the RECORD a fine editorial from the South Bend, Ind., Tribune in praise of Admiral Rickover's address:

[From the South Bend Tribune, Mar. 2, 1961]

SOUNDING THE ALERT

Two men who spoke last week at the University of Notre Dame emphasized the pressing need for quality education in the United States, but for two entirely different reasons.

One, Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, a sharp critic of the Nations' public school crisis, looked at the problem from the patriotic point of view of survival of freedom as we know it in the United States.

The other, Louis F. Buckley, regional director in New York City for the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, viewed the matter from the standpoint of how a solid education will benefit the individual in the competition for jobs in the future.

Both men made their points clear. Both made it plain that quality education is essential to the well-being of the Nation as a whole and to the individuals who hope to fare well in the United States of tomorrow.

"To remain free," said Admiral Rickover, "we must be immensely competent, and competent in a great variety of new ways. One of these has to do with science and technology, with the kind of creativity that produces scientfic discoveries, and with the kind of organizational and social skill that puts these discoveries to practical use."

Estimating that 26 million new, young workers will enter the labor force in the current decade, Buckley warned that only the skilled will find the path smooth in tomorrow's automated world.

"The untrained or uneducated," said Buckley, "will not be able to design, produce, install, service, or operate the machinery of the future."

At a time when fresh attention is being given to the quality of education at all levels in the United States, the words of Admiral Rickover and Buckley are timely and meaningful.

Noting that in pioneer days no parent would have dreamed of exposing a son to possible accident by not teaching him to shoot a rifle, Admiral Rickover added:

"Yet though ability to think is as important today as ability to shoot was yesterday, many Americans will not accept the risk of their child hurting himself by falling on a tough curriculum."

What both men are saying is that the educational system must do better and the young people themselves must do better in preparing themselves for the future or the Nation and its individual citizens will be in deep trouble.

What Liberty Is

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, our country is faced with one of the severest tests of its ideological history.

Communism—a global social-economic-military system antithetical to freedom—has mobilized almost a billion people and vast resources in its attempt to conquer the world.

As adherents to the belief that government of, by, and for the people—not a totalitarian system—can best serve mankind, we now must shoulder the responsibility of warding off this threat to liberty, and of creating a climate in which the ideals of freedom can flourish.

However, this can be done effectively only if we understand the meaning of liberty—its opportunities, responsibilities, and ultimate goals.

We can effectively insure the survival of liberty only if we have a good understanding (a) of its meaning for ourselves and our country; and (b) of its potential for establishing the climate in which the world, too, can best progress to its ultimate destiny.

Recently, the American Bar Association Journal published an informative article by Wendell J. Brown. In this analytical article, Mr. Brown traces the origin of our concept of liberty as set forth in the Declaration of Independence, embodied in the Constitution, and reflected in the life and progress of our Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT LIBERTY IS

(By Wendell J. Brown)

Culturally we have reached a stage in America in which we assume that we know what liberty is, could we but say or could we but take time to say. We take liberty for granted in the same way that we take electricity for granted. Each are common and useful to us. No one really knows or has to know what electricity is, for it to be and to continue to be a common and useful product.

But liberty, different from electricity, must come from within ourselves and to produce it we must know what it is—its spirit and its structure. This short article is the result of my unwillingness to assume that I know what the full import of liberty is.

SOURCE OF LIBERTY

An understanding of the full import of the concept of liberty requires that we examine its source. The words of our Declaration of Independence to the effect that man is "endowed" by his "Creator" with certain "unalienable rights" among which are "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" were not entirely the words of Thomas Jefferson, but were built from the words of John Locke and other philosophers. Specifically, the phrase "endowed by his Creator" was inserted from the floor of Congress after Jefferson's draft came before it for debate and adoption.

In early America the acceptance of the thought behind the words "endowed by his Creator" was much broader in its base than either the acceptance of Jefferson or the acceptance of the Continental Congress. Its acceptance came from the individual convictions of the bulk of the 3 millions of people in the then American colonies.

Most of these early Americans, our forefathers, had never heard of John Locke. But an unusual number of them had read their Bibles. In them they had read that men should "render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; unto God the things that are God's". The basic idea that each individual has the God-given right to an inner life was not new to them. Thomas Paine merely put their basic thought into words. This basic thought was and still is that political sovereignty derives from our Creator and resides essentially in the people. This idea, even then more than 1,700 years of age and still alive, is that each man, be he a Caesar or a George III, is equally bound to acknowledge that he must render unto God "the things that are God's."

Also, our forefathers knew that they couldn't sit around on stools, or even sit in pews, and wait for God to bring liberty to them. With respect to that basic right, they knew that God acts discernibly through a responsible people. They had learned that fact the hard way. The great paradox in the concept of liberty is that man is endowed by his Creator with the right to liberty and yet to have it he must earn it. This paradox, elusive to some, did not bother our forefathers. Overwhelmingly they understood and accepted the paradox contained in Paul's comment, "I labored more abundantly than they all, yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me." At the end of that first year at Plymouth in 1620 only 50 of the original 102 survived. What the survivors attained thereafter they knew would have to be earned by them, even though they knew that they could not earn anything save by the grace of their Creator.

Why did our forefathers ascribe this unalienable right to liberty to their Creator? They acknowledged that they were endowed by their Creator with the unalienable right to liberty because they knew they had it, and it was their faith, a hard faith that they were willing to fight and die for, that there was no other source for it.

And I venture to think that we cannot escape the fact that such hard faith furnishes us with the emotional catalytic element in the concept of liberty which is required to make it an equally hard political fact. Emotionally we have to get outside ourselves to attain a rational perspective of liberty which shows us what it is. Once we have done that, we cannot help but know that there is a Creator who has endowed us with these individual inner lives which we ourselves could not have created and yet which we have.

Paradoxically, egoism and humility have a place in the concept of liberty. Egoism stems from the knowledge that each individual has the power of choice. Humility stems from (1) the knowledge that such power of choice must be God-given and (2) the faith that it is a part and parcel of a divine purpose. Under the aegis of liberty, ego and humility complement each other. They walk hand in hand.

When Lincoln said that ours is a nation "conceived in liberty" he understood and his audience understood that our Nation was born of the idea (1) that there is in each individual a God-given inner life which is worthy of preservation and protection and (2) that governments should be instituted among men to preserve and protect such individual inner lives. Hence our Federal Constitution declares that it, our Constitution, is ordained and established "to secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity."

It is thus that we in America have philosophically and politically immersed our individual lives in a stream of life which may have continuity and which at least makes sense.

Liberty, then, is the acceptance of the idea (1) that there is in each person a God-given inner life which is worthy of preservation and protection and (2) that a primary job of government is to preserve and protect such individual inner lives.

If all of the "bigs" of our day—big business, big distribution, big agriculture, big labor, big government, big foreign powers, big religion—must continue to pay homage to the idea that each individual has a God-given inner life and a right to that God-given inner life we shall continue to have liberty—otherwise not.

ITS UNIQUE QUALITY

Liberty has a unique quality which enables it to avoid the historical graveyard in which many dogmas are buried, dogmas for which men would once have died. Its unique quality is that it seeks to accomplish no fixed end, but only seeks to provide a process of living by which each man can work out for himself his own life and his own conception of his own destiny, provided he stays within an area which will allow others to have such right equally with him. Inasmuch as its primary object is to furnish a fertile field for reason to function, reason will never destroy it. It is bound to survive rational advances in science and philosophy. Dogmas die because all human knowledge is imperfect and yet man is a rational being. Liberty lives because reason cannot do without it.

Yet reason is not placed on a pedestal by liberty. Rather, liberty takes man as he is, an emotional, volitional, physical, and rational entity. It is never embarrassed by man's imperfection, but, like a patient and understanding friend, is tolerant of those whose thoughts reach beyond their grasp and is just to those whose actions encroach upon the rights of others.

ITS HEROES

It has no heroes save men of commonplace caliber, men who in a greater degree than others have commonplace virtues, men who are decent, free, and God fearing. In the concept of liberty, a great man of Napoleonic stature is a public calamity and must be dealt with on that basis whether he be a too aggressive foreign dictator or a too aggressive labor leader or a too aggressive person or group of persons of any sort.

The torch of liberty throws its own light and they who would purport to act in its

name immediately have the burden of persuasion thrust upon them by those who understand what liberty is. To sustain this burden they must prove more than pureness of motive. They must never put down the light of liberty under a promise to pick up again in futuro.

ITS DUAL CHARACTER

Liberty is a requirement of a complete and functional living which is an inescapable fact where human beings live, want to live, and have to live in relationship with each other. Yet it must be earned by a people who would possess it. It must be earned in the same way that the graceful and awe-inspiring freedom of movement of a skillful ice skater is earned, by a self-discipline as sharp and as keen as the steel upon which the skater relies. Man cannot have liberty unless he accepts the moral task it imposes. It is a combination of self-assertion and self-denial, of independence and responsibility. Inherently it cannot be a gift which has no mutuality. When a man thinks that he alone can make a gift of liberty, he has lost his sense of liberty and should not be allowed to carry its torch. Men cannot have liberty by the grace of one person alone.

LIBERTY AND EVOLUTION

Liberty recognizes that Darwin was a man and, therefore, had within himself "the spark of liberty" which is common "to the mind and spirit of man." Liberty does not accept or reject the theory of evolution. Rather it observes that each man is endowed with a spark of willfulness which makes him individually different from any other person. It observes the ever-living process of change and hence knows that it must never cease its fight to preserve that "spark of liberty in the mind and spirit of man." The quotations are the words of Herbert Hoover, our oldest living ex-President, a man who has an unusually high degree of understanding of what liberty is.

POLITICAL LIBERTY

Liberty presupposes an individual who has more than an embryonic sense of independence and more than an embryonic sense of responsibility. In fact, liberty in its totality presupposes a nation made up of a sufficient number of people who have an individual sense of independence and sense of responsibility to make it work. There must be enough of these individuals to make liberty the dominant characteristic of a particular group's way of life. In practice the idea of liberty must always have this dual aspect of independence and responsibility. To attain independence there is always the responsibility to fight for it and to know what we are fighting for.

THE AMERICAN IDEAL

In the search for a firm understanding of what liberty is, time and again I have returned to the thought that whenever men have dared to think in terms of a free nation for themselves and their posterity they have thought in terms of a just and righteous God. We know that there is a force greater than our own which created the world in which we live and that this world includes human beings endowed with a power of choice. We cannot understand the concept of liberty without this objective viewpoint of that which is within ourselves. If we are "endowed" with the "unalienable" rights which are the essence of liberty then there must be a Creator who thus endowed us. Once we see ourselves from the perspective of our Creator we see moral values within ourselves which include the cultural idea of liberty.

At age 78, Kerensky smiles at Khrushchev's reference to God because he recalls Karl Marx's saying that "religion is the opium of the people" and that Lenin has declared "God is a complex of ideas engendered by the ignorance of mankind * * * religion is a kind of spiritual vodka in which the slaves of capital drown their human shape and their claims to any decent life". Yet historical time, as distinguished from research laboratory time, has proved that if we would have liberty—a chance for an individual decent life—we must appreciate that an individual sense of dignity is best attained and only attained by a mature faith that we have been thus endowed by our Creator.

STRUCTURAL LIBERTY

We are not hypocrites because we do not always live up to the American ideal of liberty. There are limitations inherent in all human endeavor, and the practical premise of structural liberty is that human beings are both good and bad. Otherwise there would be no need for structural liberty which consists of governmental restraints and governmentally enforced absence of restraints. In the words of Carl Schurz, a Senator in Lincoln's day:

"Ideals are like stars; you will not succeed in touching them with your hands. But like the seafaring man on the desert of waters, you will choose them as your guides and following them you will reach your destiny."

John Adams, in his eventide correspondence with his friend, Thomas Jefferson, referred to the fact that the preservation of liberty by government is a complicated administrative task. Each of them had been at the helm of our ship of state and each of them knew the tribulations which a state "conceived in liberty" must perforce undergo.

CONSTITUTIONAL BACKGROUND

Under the American ideal of liberty, we are immediately beyond the question of whether any government is necessary for the preservation of liberty. By the time our Constitution was adopted, effective in 1788, by a process of trial and error extending from the days of John Smith to the Articles of Confederation, we had found that the preservation of liberty requires a form of government which has coercive power, one that can deal effectively to protect individuals or groups of individuals within its jurisdiction from each other and one which can effectively protect the legal entity of the Nation from outsiders. We found that even by fleeing to a new country we could not escape that fact. Nor could we escape that inexorable fact by casting off all ties with all government.

We did not reach this stage in our thinking until we had to and we were reluctant to reach it at all. The hard thinking, practical, disputatious, idealistic and differently constituted delegates who met in Philadelphia from May to September of 1787 and there formulated our Federal Constitution were confronted with the fact that the only alternative to the granting of power was dissolution and loss of their liberty.

These 55 men at Philadelphia had no use for any form of government except to preserve their individual liberties. The federation wasn't working. Accordingly they had to "form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense * * *" all to secure the blessings of liberty for themselves and for their posterity.

Individual liberty, and there is no other, insists upon the right of each individual to seek his own answers. It combats the idea of either a government which would create a mass hypnosis or one which would stifle criticism of the Government. Many years ago Jefferson stated the ideal of liberty in these words:

"This institution will be based on the illimitable freedom of the human mind. For here we are not afraid to follow truth wherever it may lead, nor to tolerate error so long as reason is left free to combat it."

More than 100 years later Justice Holmes reiterated the same thought when he wrote from the bench that our concept of liberty is an inspiration to endeavor that encourages the free trade of ideas and which is based on the rational faith: "that the best test of truth is the power of the thought to get itself accepted in the competition of the market, and that truth is the only ground upon which their wishes safely can be carried out. That, at any rate, is the theory of our Constitution."

Without these individual inner lives and the right to them there is no market in which truth can be tested. There is only oblivion.

OUR CONSTITUTIONAL HERITAGE

With the premise that liberty is only for a people of whom the majority are individually independent and responsible, our forefathers have (1) adopted a Federal Constitution; (2) provided therein that it "shall be the supreme law of the land" and a Supreme Court to enforce it; (3) provided for the reposing of legislative, executive, and judicial powers in separate governmental bodies; (4) provided for a system of checks and balances between these separate powers; (5) provided for the preservation of the idea of federalism or State's rights; and (6) provided a Bill of Rights. This instrument our forefathers conceived and made a living document for themselves and, insofar as they could, for us.

A CONSTITUTION IS NOT THE COMPLETE ANSWER

But the effective promise of liberty is not contained in our Constitution but in the indwelling spirit of each of those who cherish it. Each generation must remake the promises contained in a constitution or it loses its vitalty.

In the process of lving, each day is a new day and liberty must be found there. A constitution which in unequivocal language guarantees individual liberty is not enough to assure its preservaton. No matter how a constitution is worded, history proves that it can be lost or become meaningless. Even the three sturdy rules of construction, which provide that to know any part of a constitution's meaning it must be read (1) in its entirety, (2) giving common speech and common understanding meanings to the words used and (3) with the circumstances under which it was made in mind—are not enough to preserve a constitution.

Nor can we rely solely on an independent judiciary because the Supreme Court must have a justiciable controversy on its docket before it can act and its actions may become a colossal futility. The executive and the legislative branches are equally the custodians of liberty. They are equally the active bailees of its owners, the people.

OTHER CONSTITUTIONS

In the desert of time there are strewn many constitutions whose skeletons remain to tell us that if we, the people, would be free we cannot merely enact a constitution and then rest.

Many sovereignties, now dead, started with glorious words of liberty in their organic laws. In 1860 the Argentine nation adopted a constitution for the stated purpose of "securing the benefits of liberty to ourselves, our posterity, and to all persons who may desire to inhabit the Argentine soil." The Italian Constitution of 1848 provided in article 26 that "Individual liberty is guaranteed." The Constitution of Mexico, adopted in 1857, provided that "In the Republic all are born free." The fundamental laws of the Russian Empire, adopted May 6, 1906, provided, after several bows to the sacred and inviolable character of the person of the Emperor, that "The domicile of everyone is inviolable" and that "property is inviolable." The Constitution of the Spanish monarchy of 1876 provided that "no one shall be deprived of his property except by the competent authority, and for a proved cause of public utility, always after due compensation." All of these

sovereignties have been replaced. Words even in organic laws are not sufficient to preserve the liberty which the words espouse.

LIBERTY ANALYTICALLY RESOLVED

There are they who say they believe there is no God. There are they who believe there is a God, a Creator, who has no time for man. There are they who believe there is a God, and, like Socrates, say and believe "I move not without Thy knowledge." Man is free because he has a God-given power of choice. With that power of choice he is also given a moral sense. Inasmuch as we have learned that government must be by consent of the governed, the majority must determine what the laws of that government shall be. Inasmuch as the majority has a God-given moral sense, liberty has a chance to succeed. Inasmuch as the majority also has a God-given choice, liberty has a chance to fail. Choice and moral sense by the majority are inseparable if we would have liberty.

Analytically thus resolved, liberty has no secrets. It is neither myth nor magic. It is not supernatural because to have it we must earn it. It becomes a dynamic political fact for a particular nation whenever and wherever there are a sufficient number of individuals within that nation with the required strength, courage, and intelligence to make it an ethical imperative for each of them in the conduct of their individual lives.

The basic and grand concept of liberty does not change. The same idea which conveyed itself into the minds of our forefathers is still there, a universal idea, available to all, and yet peculiarly our American heritage.

Children are playing in front of my house. One of them has a piece of chalk and is drawing a circle on the sidewalk. After their game has been played, rains will come and wash the circle away. Yet the geometrical concept of a circle will remain, and cannot be destroyed. However, even a nation blessed with a constitution which guarantees liberty may lose it. Yet liberty is immutable. Even after it is gone and only the hunger for it remains, there will be the concept of liberty which can never be destroyed.

On How Not To Grow Old

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, the other day I received a letter from a fine lady, Mrs. B. F. Stewart, of Cambridge, Nebr., who lives in the Frst Congressional District. Mrs. Stewart recently celebrated her 93d birthday. Her letter to me contains a few words by an unknown author which I feel are good advice, not only for my colleagues but for all Americans.

I would like to incorporate Mrs. Stewart's very fine letter at this point in the RECORD.

Congressman PHIL WEAVER,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I was pleased to receive the nice note extending best wishes on the occasion of my 93d birthday. That seems a long time to live.

I quote some lines from an unknown writer:

"Age is a quality of the mind
If we have left our dreams behind
If hope grows cold
If we no longer look ahead
If ambition's fires are dead
Then we are old.

"But if from life we take the best,
And if in life we keep our zest,
If love we hold,
No matter how the years roll by
No matter how the birthdays fly
We are not old."

Federal Crime Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. MOELLER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received from Lt. Comdr. Helen G. Williams, of Lancaster, Ohio, Secretary of the Ohio Department of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, a copy of a resolution enacted on January 22, 1961, by that organization. This resolution opposes the creation of a Federal crime commission on the ground that crime can be fought most effectively on the local or State level, that the FBI is now adequately performing the functions that such a Federal Commission would perform, and that establishment of any such superagency would constitute a step toward development of a national police state. I would like to include this resolution in the RECORD as well as the remarks made on this subject by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in a speech last October. Mr. Hoover is of the opinion that nothing could be more dangerous to our democratic ideals than the establishment of an all-powerful police agency on the Federal scene.

It is my understanding that Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy is currently giving his attention to the problem of effectively combating national and international crime syndicates. Mr. Kennedy has his work cut out for him in this field and any reasonable proposal he may offer that does not conflict with or endanger our traditional constitutional rights should be given the careful consideration of all citizens.

The Reserve Officers Association resolution and Mr. Hoover's speech are as follows:

Whereas certain groups and individuals in the United States advocate creation of a Federal Crime Commission or national clearinghouse for criminal information; and

Whereas establishment of such a superagency on the Federal scene would constitute a step toward a national police state which is repugnant to American freedom and throught; and

Whereas crime constitutionally is a local matter which can be handled most effectively by law enforcement at the State and local level; and

Whereas the Federal Bureau of Investigation, under the leadership of its dedicated Director, J. Edgar Hoover, is already effectively performing the very functions which are being proposed by advocates of a Federal Crime Commission through its cooperation with all other law enforcement agencies in the dissemination and exchange of criminal intelligence information: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Ohio Department, Reserve Officers Association of the United States, assembled in council this 22d day of January 1961 at Columbus, Ohio, does hereby oppose any movement to establish a Federal Crime Commission in the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Attorney General of the United States, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Ohio Senators and Representatives to the 87th Congress, for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Enacted at Columbus, Ohio, the 22d day of January 1961, and approved.

H. KERNY BURCH,
President.
HELEN WILLIAMS,
Secretary.

REMARKS OF J. EDGAR HOOVER

No profession in our country has been so beset by outside theorists and pressure groups as law enforcement. This is true to such an extent today that we members of the law enforcement profession are well advised to be extremely skeptical of many alleged friends. I refer particularly to those persons—some in an earnest desire for a remedy to the crime problem, and others blinded by the urge of empire building—who have advanced such potentially dangerous so-called solutions as Federal crime commissions, national clearinghouses, and special prosecuting teams to cover the United States.

Typical of the ignorance of a self-appointed Pied Piper of crime is his statement that "fingerprints, criminal records, and rogue's gallery photographs are the tools of a bygone era." Such statements reflect the total immaturity of a theoretician in the field of law enforcement. It is remarks like these that indict the maker for his stupidity.

The persons who endorse these grandiose schemes have lost sight of some very basic facts. America's compact network of State and local law enforcement agencies traditionally has been the Nation's first line of defense against crime. Nothing could be more dangerous to our democratic ideals than the establishment of an all-powerful police agency on the Federal scene. The truth of these words is clearly demonstrated in the experience of nations ruled by ruthless tyrants both here in the Western Hemisphere and abroad.

Blanche Lange Hall Dedicated at Hardin-Simmons University, Abilene, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OMAR BURLESON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, an outstanding Texas woman, Mrs. Fred M. Lange, of Dallas, was honored recently when Hardin-Simmons University in Abilene named a dormitory for her.

Mrs. Lange, well known in Texas for her activities in educational, church, and civic work, is the wife of Fred M. Lange, executive vice president of the Dallas Community Chest Fund, a man who has devoted his life to raising money for welfare purposes.

Mr. Speaker, it may be said simply and truthfully that this couple works for mankind.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit a story from the Abilene Reporter-News about the dedication of Blanche Lange Hall, an editorial tribute to Mrs. Lange by the Dallas Times Herald, and the text of Mrs. Lange's brief address at the dedication, and ask that they be printed in the RECORD:

[From the Abilene Reporter-News, Feb. 19, 1961]

"ALL DEDICATED WOMEN" HONORED, MRS. LANGE SAYS

(By Lane Talburt)

Mrs. Fred M. Lange of Dallas accepted the honor Saturday of having a dormitory on the Hardin-Simmons University campus named in her honor in behalf of "all the dedicated women of the Southwest who labor in the interests of our youth."

Blanche Lange Hall was formally dedicated with the unveiling of a plaque at the dorm entrance by Mrs. Rosemary Gordon Smith of Dallas, niece of the honoree, and the unveiling of a portrait of Mrs. Lange in the reception room by her sister, Mrs. Mary Swanzy Woodward of Dallas.

The painting had been presented to the university by Frank Heller, head of the Remington Rand Corp. in Dallas.

Facilities of the women's dormitory will be open to the public from 2 to 4 p.m. Sunday. Guests will also be able to tour the new chapel-auditorium now under construction and the newly renovated Caldwell Hall.

Dr. Evan Allard Reiff, Hardin-Simmons University president, said the newly decorated dormitory was being named for the Dallas civic and church leader because of "her interest in our young women."

"We're so happy in this occasion to say in our own hearts that Mrs. Lange has consented to have this dormitory named after her," the president told the crowd.

A group of about 100 friends of the Langes who accompanied the honoree from Dallas to Abilene in 2 chartered planes were among approximately 250 persons in the reception room who heard Mrs. Lange express her gratitude for the honor.

"I am most appreciative for this generous recognition and I am proud to become more closely identified with this outstanding center of Christian education," Mrs. Lange said.

"At the same time, I am humbled by the realization that I shall need to live up to this great honor.

"There are many women throughout Texas and the Southwest who are deeply devoted to this fine university who could have been chosen. Being conscious of this fact, I do not accept this recognition for myself.

"I accept it on behalf of all those devoted women who work in the interest of culture and education based on high Christian principles, as exemplified so well in this institution of higher learning.

"I feel that through me you honor all the dedicated women of the Southwest who labor in the interests of our youth. You honor the young women who will live in this dormitory and the families they will rear in the future. They will be the recipients of the rich religious spirit which pervades this campus."

Dr. W. B. Irvin of Dallas, vice president of the H-SU Board of Trustees, presided at the ceremonies, Dr. Lee Hemphill, vice president in charge of development at the university, gave the dedicatory prayer.

Audrey Rasco, a student in the school of music, sang a solo, "Bless This House."

Reception and open house followed, with dormitory hostesses taking visitors on tours of the building and other campus structures. Hall Council members, headed by Gail Smith of Haskell, were official hostesses.

Honorary hostesses for the reception were Mrs. David Proctor and Mrs. W. P. Wright, cochairmen, Mrs. Guy Caldwell, Mrs. H. A. Pender, Mrs. Marvin Lewis, Mrs. E. L. Farnsworth, Mrs. Ernest Yeatts and Mrs. Will Minter. Ex-officio hostesses were Alice Berkshire, dean of women at H-SU, and Mrs. W. M. Rayburn.

Members of the university administrative staff and H-SU trustees, were in the reception line honoring the Langes.

A noon luncheon in the Windsor Hotel preceeding the dedication ceremony was attended by trustees, administrative officers and their wives and the Dallas delegation.

Host committee for the luncheon included Mr. and Mrs. W. P. Wright, Dr. and Mrs. Elwin Skiles, Mr. and Mrs. J. D. Sandefer, Dr. and Mrs. Irvin and C. M. Caldwell.

The Reverend W. H. (Dub) Jackson, Southern Baptist missionary to Japan who is currently in Abilene on a furlough, presented Mrs. Lange a picture of the Tokyo Baptist Church at the luncheon. The Reverend Jackson said Mr. and Mrs. Lange inspired construction of the church while visiting in Japan several years ago.

The H-SU girls trio sang "Be Still My Soul."

Invocation was given by the Reverend Merle Weaver, pastor of Lovers Lane Methodist Church in Dallas of which Mrs. Lange is a member.

The honoree has been active in the Dallas Women's Forum, Women of Rotary, Women's Group of the Dallas Council on World Affairs, Dallas Civic Opera Women's Board, League of Women Voters, Dallas Symphony Orchestra Women's Guild and Friday Forum.

Mr. Lange has served as public trustee representing H-SU in the Texas Foundation of Voluntarily Supported Colleges and Universities for several years.

[From the Dallas Times Herald, Jan. 11, 1961]

HONOR WHERE DUE

The Dallasite for whom a women's dormitory is to be named at Hardin-Simmons University wears two civic hats. She is both Mrs. Fred M. Lange—"the woman behind the man in public life"—and Blanche Lange, a leader in her own right.

Her fellow citizens revere her in both roles. Hundreds of them will be voicing their approval of the honor bestowed by Hardin-Simmons' executive committee.

As wife, Mrs. Lange has backed her husband's outstanding career as former executive leader of the Community Chest and now head of the Chest Trust Fund as well as in other key roles he has played. As citizen with a special interest in Christian education, Blanche Lange has been active in such varied organizations as the Women's Forum, Women of Rotary, Women's Group of the Dallas Council on World Affairs, Dallas Civic Opera Women's Board, League of Women Voters, the Friday Forum and others.

The naming of Blanche Lange Hall honors notable achievements. It should inspire future students at the Abilene institution.

MRS FRED M. LANGE'S RESPONSE TO THE NAMING OF THE BUILDING, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1961, AT HARDIN-SIMMONS UNIVERSITY, ABILENE, TEXAS

Dr. Reiff, members of the board of trustees, members of the faculty, and beloved friends who so kindly have come from near and far to be with us on this wonderful occasion.

This is a thrilling experience for me personally. I am most appreciative for this generous recognition, and I am proud to become more closely identified with this outstanding center of Christian Education. At the same time, I am humbled by the realization that I shall need to live up to this great honor.

There are many women throughout Texas and the Southwest who are deeply devoted to this fine university who could have been chosen. Being conscious of this fact, I do not accept this recognition for myself. I accept it on behalf of all those devoted women who work in the interest of culture and education based on high Christian principles, as exemplified so well in this institution of higher learning.

I feel that through me you honor all the dedicated women of the Southwest who labor in the interests of our youth. You honor the young women who will live in this dormitory and the families they will rear in the future. They will be the recipients of the rich religious spirit which pervades this campus.

Because of this religious atmosphere and heritage, the Kingdom of our Lord and Saviour will be made more real to those who live here, and our State and Nation will be a better place in which to live.

It is my prayer that during the remaining years which are mine, I shall be privileged to take a personal interest in the young women who reside here. I pray that God's love will be so manifest that those who live within these walls will learn to live together so well that they will become shining examples in a world that needs women of highest ideals and Christian devotion.

Captive Nations

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM W. SCRANTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. SCRANTON. Mr. Speaker, one aspect of the age in which we live which has often been criticized by commentators is the fact that too often, the cause of world peace and the preservation of human freedom and dignity seems such a complex task that the average citizen finds himself unable to make a contribution.

Americans from every walk of life dearly love peace and liberty, but it is difficult for them to understand always what they can do to make the world safe for their children.

May I submit that the resolution calling for the establishment of a Captive Nations Committee in the House presents an unusual and precious opportunity for the Congress to provide leadership in a field where the American people, wherever they live, can make a real and substantial contribution.

Because I come from northeastern Pennsylvania, a part of this Nation particularly blessed with the richness of the varied cultures that were carried there from every corner of the world, I am very well aware of the tremendous emotional, intellectual, religious, and family ties that bind so many of our people to enslaved nations across the world. These northeastern Pennsylvanians, and

thousands more like them across America, have a very deep appreciation of the facts which have led to the enslavement of the nations from which their ancestors came. These people know that Soviet unity is a myth. They know that it is only an Iron Curtain which manages to keep their blood relatives within the Soviet orbit.

Congress, by establishing a special Captive Nations Committee in the House, will be in effect encouraging not only Americans whose ancestors have come from the captive nations, but all Americans, to take a very deep and personal interest in the fate of the enslaved peoples. If we are able to enkindle a spark, a feeling of personal obligation, a sense of mission among the American people in regard to the Communist menace, and if through this committee we can maintain a constant spotlight of public opinion on the problem, then I would predict that before too long, this spark could very well spread across the world.

I know I speak for every one in northeastern Pennsylvania when I say that all of us hope that this committee will be established, and that Congress and the entire U.S. Government will lend their great moral leadership to the cause of the captive nations—a cause which our people want to serve and are able to serve.

Residual Oil Problem a Factor Relating to Fuels and Energy Resources Requiring Study in Depth—Senate Resolution 105 Has 63 Cosponsors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, there appeared in today's issue of the Washington Post under the headline "United States Revises Residual Oil Import Curb," an article which points out that Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall yesterday issued an order which "increased slightly the amount of residual oil that can be brought into the United States and changed the regulations to permit more importers to enter the residual oil business."

The article noted that "importers will be able to bring residual oil into the United States at the rate of 461,427 barrels a day," and indicated that this represents only "an increase of about 10 percent over the current rate of about 422,000 barrels."

A thorough analysis reveals that the Interior Secretary's order considerably more than "increased slightly" the amount of residual oil that can be brought into the United States.

At this point in my remarks, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD extracts from a statement issued by the National Coal Policy Conference through its president, Joseph E. Moody, in rebuttal to Secretary Udall's announcement.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF STATEMENT BY JOSEPH E. MOODY, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL COAL POLICY CONFERENCE, INC., MARCH 9, 1961

The import total permitted for the next year is 13 million barrels more than the import quotas for calendar year 1960, and amounts to 40 million barrels more than were imported in these controlled categories in 1957—the original base year which the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization found to be a maximum level which should not be exceeded in the interests of national security. Permitting imports of 20 percent of this annual total during the next quarter means that the quarter total will equal 370,000 barrels per day, compared to 332,000 per day brought in during the second quarter of 1960.

This does not take account of the more than 30 million barrels per year increase over 1957 which is going into the general market through greatly increased use of bonded oil for ships' bunkering, freeing domestic residual for other markets, and the residual oil which is now being brought in at an annual rate of 18 million barrels from Mexico under bond and then shipped across the border and returned overland as unbonded but quota free imports, in flagrant evasion of the intent of the control program.

With permitted quotas of 168 million barrels for the next year, total imports of 261 million are thus indicated, and this is the equivalent of 62 million tons of coal. That means that, even under a control program which was established in the interests of national security, and should be administered to prevent further damage to the domestic fuel and transportation industries, the announced level projects an increase in imports since 1957 of annual residual oil imports which is the equivalent of 21 million tons of coal.

Demand forecasts can only be made by making certain assumptions as to the price for which residual will be sold. The high levels announced today obviously indicate Bureau of Mines' anticipation that residual will be sold at dump prices to make further inroads into coal markets.

In addition, such a level of anticipated demand can only reflect the Bureau's willingness to meet all requests from oil importers, even including those to permit frantic search for new markets, rather than to fulfill the legitimate needs of U.S. consumers.

We are completely unable to understand the published statement by Secretary Udall that the new procedures "will not change demand levels, and therefore, will not be detrimental to the interests of other energy-supplying industries in the United States."

On the contrary, they can only trigger a frantic scramble for existing coal markets by oil importers, and contain within themselves an automatic demand escalator which will be disastrous to the domestic producers of heavy crude oil, to the coal producing regions of the United States, and to the railroads which derive a substantial portion of their freight revenue from hauling coal.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, today's Washington Post article also contains this paragraph:

Udall's decision followed an all-day hearing 2 weeks ago at which representatives of New England industrial interests argued for the abandonment of the import quotas while representatives of West Virginia and other coal-producing States called for an embargo on all residual imports.

I cannot speak for others from West Virginia "and other coal-producing States" who testified before Secretary Udall, but I state unequivocally that I did not on that occasion, or at any other time, call for "an embargo on all residual imports." I have consistently supported a system of established import quotas on foreign residual oil—preferably based upon the 1957 import rate of this cheaply produced byproduct of oil from foreign sources.

Frankly, Mr. President, I am much disturbed by what seem to be distortions of facts, exaggerations, and caustic comments growing out of the controversy over the residual oil import problem. This is only one—but a very important—factor relating to the fuels and energy resources situation in this country demanding study in depth.

In this connection, it is satisfying to report that Senate Resolution 105, to create a Special Committee on a National Fuels Study, which I submitted March 2, 1961, will be referred today to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with 62 of my colleagues from both parties and from all sections of the country as cosponsors. We all hope it will have early and favorable committee consideration and that it will be adopted with dispatch by the Senate.

Joe Vaccarella: From Marine to Mayor To Master of His Mounts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, one of the most dedicated public officials I ever met was the energetic mayor of Mount Vernon, Joseph Vaccarella. His popularity was enhanced by the daily kindnesses that he showed and the good he constantly performed. Many times a bereaved family would be heartened by a surprise visit from the ubiquitous "Mayor Joe." Some may erroneously have thought that he was doing these good deeds for political reasons, others know that it was his nature to be considerate. How good Joe Vaccarella was few people could fully realize until a story was written about him by Dan Parker, feature writer of the New York Mirror on December 22, 1960.

Joe Vaccarella won election as a Democrat in the city of Mount Vernon, N.Y., in a traditional Republican area. His qualities as mayor inspired the young lawyer, and his well wishers and friends are legion. After serving for two full terms as mayor, Joe Vaccarella demonstrated that he could adjure power and declined to run. As expected, he was succeeded in office by a Republican, an outstanding former legislator and judge. The courage that Mayor Vaccarella demonstrated in the ring, in the Marines, and in politics he will never lose. Like

Cincinnatus of ancient days, Joe Vaccarella has renounced government power and returned to his first love, sports. If his State of community needs him once again, I am confident that he will answer the call.

A beautiful tribute was paid Mayor Joe by one of the discerning sports writers, Dan Parker. The details so poignantly portrayed reveal the soul and the heart of the man and depict his ever youthful spirit. I feel that a reading of this capsule life story would stir his many friends throughout this Nation. I salute Joe Vaccarella and wish him complete relaxation and joy in his new pastime.

The article by Dan Parker follows:

EX-MAYOR SHEDS TROUBLES IN SULKY SEAT AT TROTS

(By Dan Parker)

From the mayor's office to the mare's stable is where the paths of glory have led Joe Vaccarella, ex-marine, ex-boxer, ex-referee, ex-mayor of Mount Vernon, N.Y., and now extraordinary harness racing driver, presently at Seminole Park Raceway, Casselberry, Fla., training his stable of five harness racers for next season.

Joe Vaccarella is an unusual person. At an age when most youngsters have no thought for anything but having fun with the other kids, Joe was the sole support of his parents and two blind sisters, developing a sense of responsibility seldom encountered in one so young. This early contact with life's harshness gave him a special understanding of other people's troubles that was to serve him in good stead when he became one of the most popular and efficient mayors the city of Mount Vernon ever had.

The road to political success was a long, hard, uphill pull for Joe but when he made the grade he wondered if it was worth the headaches. There were years of back-breaking toil on the New York City docks as a longshoreman, with professional boxing as a sideline to swell his income, in order that his sisters and parents might not be neglected, but he found out that all this was child's play compared with politics.

This modern Horatio Alger type youth enlisted in the Marines in the First World War. Returning from overseas, he worked as a supervisor on the docks and then opened a travel bureau in Mount Vernon, continuing his interest in boxing, meanwhile, as a referee and judge on the staff of the New York State Athletic Commission. The term "man of the people" is much abused when applied to politicians. But it is an honest description of Joe Vaccarella. His dreary childhood and sympathetic nature give him a deep insight into the short and simple annals of the poor. During most of his younger days he was skating on the edge of poverty himself, burdened as he was by the load of responsibilities that were his since he was able to work. The problems that assailed common folk troubled him as much as if they were his own and he decided that he would seek election to office as a means of doing something to help. His first goal was Mount Vernon's board of aldermen but, through lack of experience in this devious game, he was beaten. However, with the persistence that has carried him so far, he tried again at the next city election and was successful. One term as an alderman gave him a fine knowledge of municipal affairs and put him in a position to help so many Mount Vernon people, that, unwittingly, he built a political machine.

The outbreak of World War II fanned into flame the spark of patriotism in Marine Vaccarella's breast and he offered his services to his country. It wasn't easy for a man in his late thirties to get into the service but he found a way, by enlisting in the Seabees branch of the Navy which all but the hardiest were ducking. Commanding a regiment of Negro stevedores, Joe rose to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in New Guinea where his friend and fellow boxer, Steve Belloise, was also stationed with a naval unit. They saw that the ships were unloaded and that the supplies were kept moving, in that malaria-ridden jungle. Joe worked night and day but the anopheles mosquitoes finally caught up with him and sent him back home, ridden with malaria.

Mount Vernon was so proud of its native son who, despite family burdens, had performed so valiantly in both major wars and served his hometown so well that he was put up for mayor by his host of friends and elected. Four years later, he was returned to office, first Democratic mayor ever re-elected in the Westchester County community.

The reason for his great popularity as a public servant as quoted by Julius Wickler, high in the councils of the Westchester County Democratic Party, is simple: "He understood the common man, anticipated his needs and saw that they were filled." No contract was too small for him to follow through to completion. When it snowed heavily, Mayor Vaccarella worked 18 hours a day, visiting the street department crews and participating in their chores just as if he were one of them, even to driving snowplows himself. Four years ago, Mayor Vaccarella took a brief respite from city hall to visit his friend, Anthony Abbatiello, a harness racing man who keeps his stock at Five Point Farms, Freehold, N.J. This visit proved to be the turning point in his life.

Joe had passed the half century mark without ever learning to play. It wasn't that that he didn't want to; he just couldn't afford to take time out, with responsibility always tagging after him. Now, the brisk country air at his friend's training farm awakened in him a sudden interest in the horses he saw jogging around the track and he asked if he could hitch one of the trotters to a buggy and go for a ride. That did it. The mayor resolved then and there to go into the harness racing game after his term expired so he could whistle while he worked. The mayor had finally learned how to play and the beneficial effects on his health from his first real hobby convinced him he wasn't making a mistake.

As an amateur driver last year Joe participated in 14 races and won six before qualifying at Monticello with Larry Scott in 2:10. Relieved of the responsibility that went with being Mount Vernon's chief executive, Joe launched his new career last New Year's Day. The first horse he acquired was Scot Honor, a 5-year-old pacer which he drove to a 2:03 mile at Saratoga last August. There are now five standard breds in his stable and Joe expects some of them will be heard from during the 1961 campaign. Until his wife joins him at Seminole Park in January, the ex-mayor, who is childless, has his nephew, Jimmy Vaccarella, to keep him company.

"Do I miss politics?" he asked the other day, repeating a question put to him. "No, I don't. I like the harness racing game better. Why? Because horses don't talk back to you."

One of Joe's keenest regrets is that his two sisters who are excited over his new career can never enjoy the thrill of watching a horse race or even visualizing animals they have never seen, through that extra keen sense of perception with which the blind are partially compensated for being doomed to live in a world of darkness. Did I say "doomed"? There's no such word in their vocabulary as they everlastingly thank the good Lord for blessing them with a brother like Joe.

Toronto's Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, in matters of foreign policy we have been turning increasing attention of late to our neighbors of the South. In matters of metropolitan affairs, however, increasing attention has been turning to the North, to Toronto, Canada, in particular. Toronto offers many interesting insights into ways of solving metropolitan or regional problems, and one of the most interesting activities going on there is in the area of mass transportation.

The February issue of Metropolitan Transportation carries an informative article no Toronto's rapid transit program, describing not only the costs involved, but the beneficial effects of the present 4½-mile system on traffic congestion and adjacent real estate values. I would only like to emphasize the wisdom displayed in Toronto's decision to undertake its future expansion program on a regular annual basis over a 10-year period, with adequate governmental support.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article on "What Rapid Transit Has Done for Toronto" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT RAPID TRANSIT HAS DONE FOR TORONTO—LESS TRAFFIC CONGESTION, MORE TRANSIT RIDERS AND INCREASED REAL ESTATE VALUES RESULTED WHEN TORONTO OPENED ITS FIRST SUBWAY. NOW A SECOND IS UNDER CONSTRUCTION

(Toronto is the only important city on the North American Continent which appears to be finding a rational solution to its transportation problem.)

These words, spoken recently by famed City Planner Walter Blucher, are a tribute to the people of Metropolitan Toronto and to the Toronto Transit Commission for the courage and foresight both displayed not only in building Canada's first subway but also in moving quickly to extend the system when the first line proved its worth. It was just 20 years ago that preliminary studies on a possible Toronto subway were begun. Studies continued and plans were drawn during World War II and on January 1, 1946, the citizens of Toronto voted overwhelmingly in favor of building the Yonge Street Subway—to be financed largely out of TTC funds.

TTC Chairman W. C. McBrien glowed with pride as work was begun on December 8, 1949, and on March 30, 1954, Canada's first subway was opened by the Toronto Transit Commission.

The Yonge Street Subway starts adjacent to the Union Station at Front and York Streets, runs under Front Street to Yonge Street, which is the main north and south thoroughfare, and under Yonge Street to College. At this point the route curves about 200 feet east onto a private right-of-way parallel to Yonge Street, coming out into an open cut between Bloor Street and

St. Clair Avenue. Near the latter point, it crosses under Yonge Street to the west side and continues in open cut to an underground terminal at Eglinton Avenue. There are 12 stations on the line which is 4½ miles long, approximately 3 miles being underground and 1½ miles in open cut.

TWENTY YEARS AND $67 MILLION LATER

The total cost of the structure, including right-of-way, rails, electrical distribution system, signal system, ventilating and control, was approximately $55 million. This is equivalent to $12 million per mile and, as the ultimate capacity is 40,000 people per hour, it works out to a capital expenditure of $300 per passenger accommodated at the maximum hour. The rolling stock cost about $12 million additional. This covered the purchase of 140 rapid transit cars built in England by the Gloucester Railway Carriage & Wagon Co., Ltd. The entire cost of building and equipping the subway was borne by Toronto Transit Commission. About $18 million of the cost was met from surplus funds accumulated during the war years. The remainder was raised through debentures issued by Metro, but repayable by the Toronto Transit Commisison out of current revenues, as provided in the Commission Governing Act.

While this line is only 4½ miles long, it is probably the most successful postwar rapid transit installation on the continent in terms of benefits carried in the first 5 years of operation. Approximately 250,000 passengers are now being transported every business day. Thirty-two thousand passengers are carried in the peak hour and direction, and for 15-minute periods passengers have been carried at a rate of 39,000 per hour.

Next month the Yonge Street subway will mark its seventh anniversary. Certainly 7 years constitutes a sufficient span of experience to assay what this first 4½-mile taste of high-speed rapid transit has done for Toronto. And three marked areas of improvement do present themselves—most forcefully.

TRAFFIC CONGESTION HAS BEEN RELIEVED

First, the subway has eased surface traffic congestion. Opening of the subway made it possible to remove streetcars from Yonge Street and Avenue Road. Overnight the capacity of these two thoroughfares was increased for automative traffic—at no expense to the motorist or to the community.

Traffic experts agree that a highway 20 lanes wide would be required to transport in automobiles the number of passagers carried by the Yonge subway. To duplicate subway capacity on the surface, the community would have to build at least three major streets, and carving new streets through a great city can only be done at incredible cost.

AUTO DRIVERS CONVERTED INTO SUBWAY RIDERS

Second, the subway has attracted new customers. One of the toughest jobs of a transit system is to convert automobile drivers into transit riders. Yet this is a major factor in the solution of traffic congestion. The only way drivers can be converted into riders is to make transit faster and more convenient than automobiles. This has been done on the Yonge Street subway. In a survey of subway riders using Eglinton Station, 13 percent reported that they formerly drove their cars to work. From these figures it is estimated that the subway is keeping 10,000 automobiles off the streets every business day.

REAL ESTATE VALUES HAVE INCREASED

And third—and most important—the subway has encouraged redevelopment and new development along the entire route. Dozens of attractive commercial and office buildings have been built in the past 5 years, many of them replacing substandard housing that was a burden on the taxpayers. These fine new buildings have added millions of dollars to the assessment rolls. Assessed values in the 14 subdivisions through which the rapid transit system passes increased 37 percent in the 5 years, while assessed values in the remainder of the city showed an increase of 20 percent.

It is interesting to note, incidentally, that if the 14 subway subdivisions had increased only 20 percent—the same as the rest of the city—the total increase in assessment would have been $88 million, less than it was. With a 48-mill tax rate this could have meant a difference in tax revenue of over $4 million a year, which is more than enough annually to liquidate the cost of the Yonge subway.

Public acceptance of the subway has exceeded all expectations. It has proved to be the anchor of the community. It has assured the permanence and stability of the downtown area, which is the foundation for growth and prosperity of any city. In view of this success, it is not surprising that the 10-mile Bloor-Danforth-University subway is now under construction.

SECOND SUBWAY SECTION NOW BEING BUILT

The conditions which existed on Yonge Street before the Yonge subway was built are now being encountered on Bloor Street. In rush hours, a total of about 12,000 people an hour are using Bloor at its heaviest point and about 9,000 of these people are streetcar riders. There is often serious congestion indicating that the capacity of the street has just about been reached.

Conscious of the steady increase in Bloor Street transit and other traffic over the last 15 or 20 years, and faced with the prospect of tremendous population growth during the next 20 years in suburban areas tributary to the Bloor carline, the Toronto Transit Commission began to urge the construction of an east-west subway on or near Bloor Street, an important business street throughout its length.

In 1956, the Metropolitan Council (formed in 1953 to put Toronto and its suburbs under a single unified government) authorized investigation and study of the proposal and the preparation of functional plans and estimates. These were presented by the Toronto Transit Commission to council in January 1958 and called for a subway on or adjacent to Bloor and Danforth from Keele Street to Woodbine Avenue, with an extension of the present Yonge subway up University Avenue to Bloor Street to provide additional capacity into and coverage of the downtown area and the whole central business district.

METRO AND TTC SHARE COST

On April 7, 1959, Metropolitan Council approved the financing program for the $200 million project with Metro to assume about 55 percent and the Toronto Transit Commission to assume the remainder. Over $80 million of Metro's share will be raised on a pay-as-you-go basis through taxation by a 2-mill capital levey over a 10-year period. This special levy must be used for subway construction. The remainder of Metro's share (about $22 million) is being covered by the issue of debentures and sale of surplus right-of-way land. The Toronto Transit Commission share is being met through debentures issued by Metro with the Toronto Transit Commission being responsible for repayment and interest. These arrangements were approved by the Ontario Municipal Board. Under this program, the Metropolitan Corporation is purchasing and will retain ownership of the right-of-way. All other costs are divided equally between Metro and the Toronto Transit Commission. The bylaw to permit the expropriation of the land needed for the right-of-way was passed on April 21, 1959.

CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULED IN THREE STAGES

Construction work began officially on November 16, 1959, when Prime Minister Leslie M. Frost broke the ground for the first stage, the 2-mile University line which will extend from the present Union subway station west on Front Street, north on University Avenue and west on Bloor Street to Huron Street.

The second construction stage will be started early in 1963. It extends along Danforth Avenue and Bloor Street from Greenwood Avenue to University line and includes construction of Greenwood yard and shops. Completion date is set for 1966.

The third stage of the subway is the west leg of the route, along Bloor Street from University to Keele Street and also the easterly portion from Greenwood to Woodbine Avenue. These will be started in January 1967 and should be completed by the end of 1969.

USE TUNNEL SHIELD AND MILAN METHOD

Tunneling is being done with a tunneling shield. Each shield is equipped with hydraulic jacks that move the shield forward along the tunnel route. The earth in front of the shield is cut up with a pneumatic hand spader passed through ports in the shield, loaded on a conveyor and taken to the surface. As the shield is pressed forward, heavy cast iron tunnel liners are inserted behind it, and these form the outside wall of the tunnel. The small space outside the tunnel linings is filled with a cement grout and the lining joints are caulked to make them watertight.

The men working in the tunnel are all medically examined, and they must be certified as fit for work under air pressure. They are reexamined every 2 months. A typical shift is 8 hours. The men go through the air lock with their work gang, and in the lock the air pressure is gradually taken up to the pressure in the tunnel. For the meal break, they again come through the air lock to the surface.

One of the most interesting construction phases of the new subway is the 162-foot Milan method test section which was started on August 14 and completed before the end of the year. The construction method employed was a variation of cut and cover which eliminates the need for temporary piles, timber decking, and forms for the subway walls and roof. The test was considered successful and this method will be considered for subsequent construction stages.

Unlike the Yonge subway, the entire Bloor-Danforth-University line, with the exception of ravine crossings, will be underground—43,223 feet in concrete box, 8,226 feet in cast iron tunnel, and 3,710 feet in open ravine crossings.

When the entire 10-year project is completed, Toronto's new subway will be 10.45 miles long, will have 25 stations, and will carry about 345,000 riders a day. A total of 280 additional subway cars will be required and orders were placed last month for the first 36, Montreal Locomotive Works (assisted by Pullman-Standard) being the lucky bidder. See box for a recap of the bidding.

Present TTC Chairman W. E. P. Duncan probably finds the 10-year piecemeal construction program frustratingly slow. Certainly savings could have been effected, for example, by ordering all 280 cars at once. But TTC can't move any faster than the metropolitan council can go, and the city can't move any faster without endangering either its credit rating or other public-works programs.

COMMERCIAL INTERESTS WANT AIR RIGHTS

The Toronto Transit Commission has been encouraged by a desire of commercial interests to obtain air rights to build over their open-cut sections of the rapid transit rights-of-way. Air rights have been sold and structures built over sections of the right-of-way

of the Yonge Street line. The original plan for the Greenwood yard called for an open area. Certain commercial interests have indicated a desire to cover the yard and build a shopping area on top. Similar interests are now being expressed in the Davisville yard air rights for development of commercial purposes. The TTC hopes to exploit these interests to the maximum extent.

AIM FOR 37-MILE RAPID TRANSIT NETWORK

The Bloor-Danforth-University subway is a 10-mile extension in the development of rapid transit for Toronto. Plans are being studied for extension to the present Yonge Street line, for another crosstown route, and for an extension in the northwest section of the city which might include operation in the center mall of an expressway similar to the Congress Expressway in Chicago. It is hoped that by 1980 the present and proposed rapid transit lines will total 37 miles.

Metropolitan Toronto and the Toronto Transit Commission have joined hands in the construction of the Bloor-Danforth-University subway, which will put Toronto even further out in front of most of the American metropolitan area counterparts.

This giant undertaking should benefit every resident of the Toronto area. Traffic congestion will be reduced on Toronto's main crosstown artery. Thousands of daily transit riders will enjoy substantial savings in time. And newly created property values will produce greatly increased tax revenue.

Medical Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK R. MILLER
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a short but thought-provoking editorial relating to the problem of medical care for the aged, and published in the Mason City, Iowa, Globe-Gazette of January 11, 1961.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PROBLEM THAT IS BEING SOLVED

In the drive about to get underway to place widescale medical care for the aged under social security, there should be a realistic look at the problem. What has been done and what is being done to solve it should figure in the congressional approach.

Here are some statistics that should not be passed over lightly:

There are 120 million persons covered by surgical insurance, 86 million have policies designed to help pay for doctor calls and other nonsurgical care, 25 million have major medical insurance and 43 million have some form of loss-of-income insurance.

Voluntary health insurance has had a phenomenal growth in the past 15 years. More than a thousand organizations in the health insurance field (737 of them insurance companies) have focused their attention on solving this problem in the free enterprise way.

To the claim that those already in retirement are not helped by this program, it can be pointed out that numerous policies for persons 65 or older are available at moderate cost.

Many companies now offer coverage designed specifically for senior citizens. Home nursing care and less expensive residence in nursing homes rather than in hospitals are covered in the protection.

A blind spot in the social security approach is that it would do nothing for the several million older men and women who never qualified for social security. They're the forgotten people.

To remedy this would entail a drastic departure from social security's original intent—one that could wreck both the present retirement program and the voluntary insurance already procured by millions from private companies.

Compton College Student Body President Sends Congressman Doyle Resolution of California Junior College Student Government Conference Supporting and Emphasizing Foreign Student Exchange Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to include for the attention of your distinguished self and all the other Members of this great legislative body to following: to-wit, a letter to me dated March 2, 1961, signed by Gary Boyd, student body president of Compton College, Compton, Calif., situated in the great 23d district, identifying to my attention a resolution by the California Junior College Student Government Conference.

I am pleased to furnish a copy of that resolution as sent to me by student body president Gary Boyd.

This resolution, I believe, is very, very pertinent and timely.

THE ASSOCIATED STUDENT BODY,
COMPTON COLLEGE,
Compton, Calif., March 2, 1961.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DOYLE: Each year officers from the 2-year colleges in the State of California meet in conference to discuss issues relative to the welfare of the student group.

Last year, as student body president of Compton College, I attended this conference of the California Junior College Student Government Association. The enclosed resolution which pertains to the necessity of the further exchange of students with foreign countries was discussed. This resolution was passed unanimously.

I write this letter to encourage your support as we, as students, believe this issue to be timely and necessary.

Sincerely yours,

GARY BOYD,
Student Body President, Compton College.

RESOLUTION 4

Whereas inasmuch as the peace of the world is being threatened by Communist elements and in view of assistance needed in less-developed countries to combat the menace of communism, it is our firm conviction that the adoption of the following program would not only serve as a bulwark against aggressive elements, but would also help host countries to raise their standards of living and ultimately take over the duties and responsibilities currently initiated by internatonal experts; and

Whereas foreign aid in the nature of technical assistance can prove beneficial only if it enables the recipient countries to train its own nationals and to take over the activities attached to international experts; and

Whereas the lack of financial resources for training more students may prove an obstacle to the implementation of a number of worthwhile projects; and

Whereas the objective of the international technical assistance or foreign aid is to help a country to help itself; and

Whereas if sufficient care is not paid (1) to make available competent exchange of foreign students, (2) to maintain a continuity of such students for a long enough time, and (3) to insure either on-the-job training or college education of such personnel, the less-developed countries would not be able to make themselves independent of the outside technical or foreign aid for many years to come; and

Whereas in the interest of economy as well as efficiency, we recommend an early approval of the following: Therefore be it

Resolved, To recommend that the California Junior College Association, the California State Department of Education, the Congress of the United States, and the Department of State of the United States of America, have more exchange and competent foreign students be brought to the United States and that they be educated in the fields in which their host countries are in need; that equipment and machinery relating to the students' major fields be sent with the students on their return home; that the host goverments, in conjunction with the State Department of the United States be asked to strongly recommend that students coming to the United States under such a program should return to their respective countries and serve their governments for a given number of years; and be it further

Resolved, That above all, the U.S. Government be asked to sponsor a special fund from the current foreign aid for the implementation of such a program.

Flood Conditions in Indiana—Federal Grants-in-Aid to State of Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the 92d General Assembly of the State of Indiana adjourned at midnight last Monday. It enacted two significant measures which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

One memoralizes and petitions Congress to enact effective legislation which will provide relief from the flood conditions along Indiana's rivers and streams, provide port facilities for Indiana on Lake Michigan, and improve navigation in the Ohio River.

The other authorizes the Governor of Indiana to accept on behalf of the State any and all Federal grants-in-aid available.

These two enactments by the 92d General Assembly of the State of Indiana are important ones and I am pleased to inform my colleagues in Congress of the full cooperation of the general assembly in our efforts to provide full development of Indiana's water resources and the willingness of the State of Indiana to participate in programs set up by the Federal Government.

I continue to feel that Indiana taxpayers should receive a fair return on their tax dollars and I commend the members of the general assembly for their action on these two measures.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution and excerpts from the acts of the 92d general assembly were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE ENROLLED CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 2

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to enact effective legislation which will provide relief from the flood conditions along the rivers and streams in the State of Indiana, provide for port facilities within the State of Indiana on Lake Michigan, and improve navigation in the Ohio River

Whereas each year the overflow of the various rivers and streams of the State of Indiana creates flood condtions, damaging crops, decreasing the fertility of the soil and damaging highways and other property within the State; and

Whereas such flood conditions are increasing in frequency and intensity because of the increasingly rapid runoff of surface water; and

Whereas the completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway has made feasible and necessary the construction of additional port facilities within the State of Indiana on Lake Michigan; and

Whereas certain improvements in aid of navigation on the Ohio River along the southern boundary of the State of Indiana are necessary in order to improve water transportation and more adequately serve various industries which desire to locate in the area: Now therefore

Be it resolved by the house of representatives, the senate, concurring—

SECTION 1. The 92d General Assembly of the State of Indiana does hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to enact effective legislation for the control of floods and the prevention of soil erosion along the rivers and streams within the State of Indiana, to preserve natural resources, protect and promote the health, safety and general welfare of the people, and to appropriate sufficient funds for the execution of such legislation.

SEC. 2. The 92d General Assembly of the State of Indiana further memorializes and petitions the Congress of the United States to enact effective legislation for the purpose of building and improving port facilities within the State of Indiana on Lake Michigan, and to appropriate sufficient funds for the execution of such legislation.

SEC. 3. The 92d General Assembly of the State of Indiana further memorializes and petitions the Congress of the United States to enact effective legislation for the purpose of improving navigation in the Ohio River along the entire southern boundary of the State of Indiana, and elsewhere where such improvements are necessary, and to appropriate sufficient funds for the execution of such legislation.

SEC. 4. The principal clerk of the house of representatives is directed to forward copies of this resolution to the Secretary of the U.S. Senate, to the Clerk of the National House of Representatives, the Director of the Budget, and to each U.S. Senator and Congressman from Indiana.

STATE OF INDIANA—EXCERPTS FROM THE ACTS OF THE 92D GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Indiana:

The Governor is hereby authorized to accept on behalf of the State of Indiana any and all Federal grants-in-aid available to the State of Indiana, and such grants-in-aid so received are hereby appropriated for their purposes.

"Provided, further, That the appropriations herein made are inclusive of the appropriations heretofore provided by law for the division of industrial hygiene, and for the division of health and preventive medicine, and are for the purposes of matching funds, made available by the U.S. Government under the several acts of the general assembly providing for, and authorizing, such cooperation as provided in said acts, and to enable the State through said several agencies, to avail itself of the provisions of the several acts of Congress of the United States making allotments and grants to the States for such purposes.

"Provided, that in addition to the above appropriation, any Federal funds received for mental health purposes as a grant or allowance, are hereby appropriated for the uses and purposes for which such funds or moneys were paid to the State."

The appropriations for current obligations are for the purpose of enabling said department to carry out all services as provided in chapter 3, of the acts of special session of the 79th general assembly, and all acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto. In addition to the above appropriations, all money received from the Federal Government and paid into the State treasury as a grant, or allowance, is hereby appropriated, and shall be expended by the State department of public welfare for the respective purposes for which such money was allocated and paid to this State. If the sums herein made for the department of public welfare are not sufficient to enable the State department of public welfare to meet its current obligations, there is hereby appropriated such further sum as may be necessary for such purposes, the amount, however, to be subject to the approval of the State budget agency.

"Provided, further, That the trustees of Indiana University, the trustees of Purdue University and the Boards of Trustees of the Indiana State College and of the Ball State Teachers College are hereby authorized to accept Federal grants.

"FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

"Current obligations..... $487,500

"In addition to the above appropriation, any Federal funds received for the above purposes as a grant or allowance are hereby appropriated for the uses and purposes for which such fund or money was paid to the State."

In addition to the foregoing appropriations, any funds received for the above title III administration as a matching grant or allowance from the Federal Government are hereby appropriated for the uses and purposes said moneys were paid to the State.

In the event any Federal funds are distributed to the State of Indiana for the support of education, including building construction and the payment of teachers, such funds shall be distributed to the respective school corporations on the basis of the school distribution formula as though such Federal funds had been herein appropriated.

SEC. 4. The amount appropriated in this section shall be payable out of any sums received from the Federal Government pursuant to the Employment Security Administrative Financing Act of 1954, for the administration of the unemployment compensation provisions of chapter 208 of the acts of 1947, and all acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto:

"SEC. 5. The trustees of Indiana University, the trustees of Purdue University, the trustees of the Indiana State College, and the trustees of the Ball State Teachers College are hereby authorized to accept Federal grants for new construction, repair and rehabilitation."

Review of First Actions of the Kennedy Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD my weekly newsletter, Capitol Comments, which reviews the early record of the Kennedy administration. The newsletter follows:

REVIEW OF FIRST ACTIONS OF THE KENNEDY ADMINISTRATION

President Kennedy, although in office as the Chief Executive for only 6 weeks, has shown remarkable insight into the needs of the Nation and extraordinary skill in setting forth programs that will fulfill these needs.

He has moved rapidly in presenting programs to the Congress for restoring vigor to the economy and for improving our international position. He has moved with even more speed in initiating programs, which fall completely within the authority of the Executive, to assure that the Government assume its full responsibility to the people of this Nation and to the world.

A review of some of the important actions of the President during this brief period of the new administration demonstrates this insight and vigor.

The President in his first two Executive orders moved to provide food for the hungry—first, at home by ordering the Secretary of Agriculture "to expand and improve" the program for food distribution to the needy in areas of chronic unemployment, and secondly, by establishing a food-for-peace program to use the Nation's agriculture abundance to help provide food for needy people around the world. President Kennedy has directed also that the school lunch program be expanded and strengthened.

On the military scene during the first 10 days the President ordered $125 million in additional cargo planes to increase America's airlift capacity and $724 million for additional Polaris submarines—one of our Nation's most effective weapons—and also launched the most comprehensive disarmament study in the Nation's history.

To stimulate the economy and help bring the recession to a halt the President lowered interest rates on FHA insured loans; liberalized the loan program to local governments for construction of public facilities; expanded the U.S. Employment service; ordered $257 million in 1961 GI insurance dividends paid ahead of schedule; stepped up payments of $4 billion in income tax refunds; made $724 million in Federal highway funds avail-

able to States ahead of schedule; speeded up processing of urban renewal loans and established the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy among other Executive actions.

The President has sent a number of messages to the Congress urging legislation in a variety of fields including assistance for distressed areas; a health insurance program for the aged; a revised and expanded social security program; a national health program; an increase in the minimum wage; a national housing program; a plan to keep the interstate highway program on schedule; and a comprehensive program for Federal aid to public schools—all being considered in Congress.

The President also asked the Congress to extend unemployment benefits and to pass an emergency feed-grain program—both of which have passed the House.

In another very significant action, the President has established a Peace Corps, which will enlist American men and women for voluntary service in promoting understanding and good will in the countries of the world. The Peace Corps will serve as a pool of trained talent which will be sent to foreign countries to help other governments meet their needs for skilled manpower as a gesture of a good neighbor promoting peace.

The President in his inaugural address said the problems of the Nation and the world could not be solved in 100 days nor 1,000 days "but let us begin." The first weeks of his administration indicate early dedication and decisiveness of action determined to serve our country and to make improvements in our relations with other nations of the world.

Success Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, on February 17, our colleague, TOM CURTIS, of the great State of Missouri, presented us here in the House with an outstanding analysis of the economic situation. The strength and force of his ideas have reached out across half the continent and have found response in the editorial page of the Iola (Kans.) Register, one of the really outstanding editorial pages in my own district in Kansas, if not in the entire midcontinent United States. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the lead editorial from Angelo Scott's Iola Register of March 7:

SUCCESS PROBLEMS

Has it ever occurred to you that some of the greatest problems in this country are due to the successes of our free enterprise system rather than its failures?

Take the farm problem. Actually it isn't an agricultural problem at all. It is a marketing and technological unemployment problem resulting from a dramatic agricultural success.

Agricultural advancement has been so great and so rapid that millions of people who had skills in agricultural work a short time ago now are glutting the labor markets of the cities while machines do their work on the farms.

This is success, not failure. The problem is how to make use of the surplus products and labor created by the agricultural success.

Take the field of health.

So rapid has been our progress in this area that people are living 10 years longer than they did a bare generation ago. There has been no greater success story in the growth of America's free professions and institutions.

So what? So we now have an old-age assistance and medical care problem. People live so long past their earning years that the job of caring for them has doubled in recent years and could well double again in another 2 or 3 decades.

But this again is success, not failure. And Representative THOMAS CURTIS of Missouri, discussing the matter in a speech in Congress the other day, made the pertinent suggestion that in trying to solve the problem, we should be careful "not to undermine the system which produced the progress."

Take the field of manufacturing, mining, and production generally and you find that our major problem—unemployment—is due to our most brilliant successes in devising machines which speed up production faster than displaced workers can be trained for new jobs.

But here again, it seems to me, the clear warning should be raised that the way to cure unemployment is not to undermine the system which has boosted production of the good things of life to the highest level of any spot in the world.

There is no farm surplus problem in India. There is no old-age medicare problem in the Congo. There is no unemployment problem in Russia.

But would you rather live there than here?

Migrant Farmworkers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Michael Coleman, Jr., is the national president of the Young Christian Workers, an international organization of Catholic youth dedicated to the mission of a better understanding among the young people of the world of the great social issues of our times. Mr. Coleman for 2 years was a flyer in the Air Force of our country in Korea. On his return to civilian life he became a pilot for the Eastern Airlines. Wishing to devote his life to social service, he persued a course of studies leading to a master's degree in industrial relations. By unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include his statement on H.R. 2010 before the Subcommittee on Equipment, Supplies, and Manpower of the Committee on Agriculture:

STATEMENT OF MICHAEL J. COLEMAN, JR., NATIONAL PRESIDENT, OF THE YOUNG CHRISTIAN WORKERS

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Michael J. Coleman, Jr., national president of the Young Christian Workers. I wish to express appreciation for the opportunity to appear before this distinguished committee, and to present testimony on the House of Representatives bill 2010, concerning Public Law 78. I would also like to pay a compliment to the various religious groups for the testimony which they are presenting at these hearings. Having cooperated with several of these groups locally and nationally in the past, we believe they are contributing substantially toward social justice for a large group of American citizens, that is, the migrant worker and his family.

Our organization is an international movement of young workers, which is established in 92 countries and territories, with a membership approximating 2½ million.

Our purpose as a youth movement is to inquire into the problems and situations which affect working youth throughout the world, and in each country. Further, we attempt to bring solutions to the social, economic, and moral problems which confront all young workers, and, wherever possible, to present the facts and situation of working youth to various civic, labor, business, Government and legislative bodies on local, national and international levels.

The Young Christian Workers has consultative status in the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, and is the only worker organization outside of labor unions to have this position. We also have consultative status in UNESCO, and in a less official way, with the International Labor Organization.

Here in the United States the YCW consists of 250 active groups in 26 States. Our membership comprises a typical cross section of young working adults in the United States: factory workers, apprentices, skilled tradesmen and technicians, office workers, professionals, young farmers, union organizers and representatives, local and State political leaders and scores of others who are exercising leadership in their local communities. The Young Christian Workers is proud to count among its membership young workers of varied racial backgrounds, including Negroes, Puerto Ricans, and those of Mexican ancestry. Most important for the purpose of testimony before this committee, our membership also includes those who have been migrant workers or whose families at one time were part of the migrant worker stream.

Since we are the only organization in this country which deals specifically with the problems of young workers, our role in appearing before this committee is to present a situation which seriously affects the lives of a large group of young workers.

We appear before this committee today because of many disturbing facts brought to our attention by our own members. These facts were obtained from surveys and from eyewitness reports of YCW leaders and members in the east, midwest, north central, northwest, and southwest regions of our country. From these results it is apparent to us that serious problems are common to migrant workers in all parts of the country.

For the young workers themselves we found an incredible lack of opportunities; either for an education which goes beyond the elementary level; for employment which pays an adequate wage; or even for the normal opportunities of human development necessary for young adults, that is, if they are going to realize their complete development as human persons.

One example which typifies this situation came to us from Wisconsin. Here young fellows and girls, 12 to 15 years of age were working long hours in the fields and in factories; where, for example, 15 cents was paid for each basket of tomatoes picked, with an entire family picking about 67 baskets a day for an approximate income of $10. Here, too, several 16-year-old fellows told us of the great loneliness which they face as migrants and how they purposely would get drunk in order to combat this problem.

Our results showed us, too, that migrant workers throughout the United States face many basic family problems in common, problems which weaken the very existence of the family itself. In New Jersey, for example, a migrant worker related to us that in his search for work he had to leave his

wife and six children in Florida. He said he missed his family very much and wished he could settle down to a permanent job and home. From Oregon, we noted an observation of migrant family life which was typical of several others we received. That is, the migrant father must often look upon his young children as sources of income. For example, a father with six children may only be able to do without the earnings of three of them. The other three children miss school. This, of course, puts children of migrant families behind in what little formal education they receive as it is. The YCW in Minnesota reports great concern among migrant parents, who realize more and more that formal education is about the only solution to a better economic life.

Particularly disturbing to us were the many comments relating to the spiritual needs of migrant workers. When it becomes necessary to work 10 hours a day, 7 days a week, little opportunity exists for the migrant, who traditionally has a deep religious faith, to even think about his obligations to God. As was pointed out to us by a YCW leader from California, "the only people who show them attention as far as their spiritual and moral life is concerned are some priests and the migrant ministry. Others who show them attention are hustlers, prostitutes, and gamblers."

I would like to point out to this distinguished committee that in each of the areas where an inquiry was made, we discovered similar social, economic, family and moral problems. It was true in housing which could consist, we found, in a barn with 30 men living inside, or 5 men quartered in a cinder block building next to a pig tank. Whether we speak of his wages, his power to bargain collectively, his working and living environment, his health conditions, or his benefits under social legislation, the migrant worker is at the bottom of the ladder. Credit is due, however, to those farm employers, who have in some instances provided such things as accident insurance or fairly decent housing for the migrant and his family. These, we found, were exceptional.

Further, we have seen the direct and adverse effects which the entry of braceros into our country under Public Law 78 has had upon our own domestic workers. First, the availability of 400,000 foreign workers last year forced domestic workers and their families to seek work in other States. We have learned that for the most part migrant farmworkers in the North Central States are U.S. citizens of Mexican ancestry whose residence is in Texas. With the presence of thousands of braceros in Texas, wage rates were lowered to a level which forced the migrant worker and his family to seek work elsewhere.

Second, we find that while he is in the United States serious difficulties exist for the bracero himself. In one California county our groups, seeing this situation firsthand, tell us that, "as far as the bracero or Mexican national is concerned he is segregated from society, with the community in general shunning these people as if they were lepers. Disillusioned with the United States he returns to Mexico with only a small fraction of the money which he had intended to make in order to start a new life. The braceros have no mediator for their grievances. The dignity of the work is brought down wherever nationals are brought in because our own people will not do the work." It was related that in this particular county there were enough people to do the work which the braceros were brought in to do, but, because of low wages and the low dignity and status attached to this work our own people did not do the work. The dignity of the bracero was thereby lowered almost to that of a slave.

Since our national organization is part of an international movement, we have frequent opportunities for personal contact with young workers in many parts of the world. In October of this year, for example, YCW delegates from the United States will go to Brazil for a council meeeting of the International Young Christian Workers. Over 400 YCW leaders from approximately 90 countries will participate in this council. From our international contacts we have come to a profound realization of the high hopes which young political and trade union leaders in the less developed countries have placed in our country for the future of the entire free world. On the other hand we know, too, that many of these same key leaders have serious doubts concerning America's national policies and practices.

It was with this in mind that our movement decided to broaden the scope of its international program last year. In the hopes of allaying some of these suspicions and doubts about our country, we invited a group of key Latin American political and trade union leaders (all former YCW leaders in their countries) for an intensive study tour of the United States. It was our hope to create new bonds of international understanding between us. (One member of this group had recently returned from an all-expense-paid tour behind the Iron Curtain.) On the whole our tour was quite successful. However, in viewing the bracero situation in Texas firsthand, our international visitors came away amazed and even horrified at the treatment accorded to Mexican nationals while they are employed in the United States.

Because of their severe limitations of movement, their life in labor camps, separation from their families, and their inability to change jobs, it appeared to our group that their fellow Latin Americans lost most of their rights and freedom after they arrived here. It was their unalterable judgment that while we spoke to the world about the rights and freedom of workers, in this instance we said one thing and practiced another. We could not justify this situation to them.

In arriving at a policy decision from these and other facts related to this issue, our organization has come to certain conclusions which seem to coincide with other national reports, particularly the recommendations as specified by the distinguished consultants to the Secretary of Labor on the Mexican farm program.

We conclude that if H.R. 2010 which extends Public Law 78 in its present form for 4 more years is passed, serious social injustices are thereby extended another 4 years as well.

We recommend that this bill not be passed in its present form, but should include certain changes.

1. That Public Law 78 be continued on a temporary basis only.

2. The authority of the Secretary of Labor should be increased in order to insure that in the active competition for workers, no adverse effects are brought upon our own domestic workers.

3. The test of adverse effect upon wages and employment should be more specific and such criteria should be clearly established by the Secretary of Labor.

4. The number of Mexicans employed by each employer should be limited so as to insure active competition in the farm labor market.

5. Employment of Mexican nationals should be refused to employers who fail to offer domestic workers comparable wages and conditions of employment.

6. Authorization of Mexican nationals should be limited for the most part to unskilled jobs.

7. Farm wages should be increased at least to the minimum set by the Fair Labor Standards Act.

8. The Secretary of Labor should arrive at a national formula for farm wages so as to prevent unfair wage competition between regions.

9. The present administrative procedure of this program should be improved so as to insure justice for all who are involved—employers, domestic workers, foreign workers, and the public.

Thank you very much, gentlemen.

Federal Emergency Gas Tax Must Be Allowed To Expire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, the continuing problems of financing the Federal highway program are ample evidence of the validity of the objections raised by a number of us when the program was proposed a number of years ago. Even before the program was launched, there was considerable doubt that the gigantic expenses could be assumed by the Federal Government without additional taxes. Now that the difficulties are more than predictions, many of those who once supported the highway program are losing their enthusiasm.

In my district there is one person, among many others, who, from the beginning, has raised many questions concerning where all of this is leading. He is Mr. A. Robbins, Jr., editor of the Hopewell News, of Hopewell, Va.

I wish to include with my remarks an editorial which appeared in this newspaper on March 3, calling attention to the emergency gas tax. I commend this to the reading of Members of the House.

The editorial follows:

FEDERAL EMERGENCY GAS TAX MUST BE ALLOWED TO EXPIRE

We certainly agree with President Kennedy that the huge trucks should pay a larger share of the cost of construction of the Federal Interstate Highway System, but we certainly disagree with him that the emergency 1-cent increase in the Federal gasoline tax, which will expire on June 30, should be continued.

Because of the insistence of the Democratic Congress that the Federal Interstate Highway program be speeded up, funds were advanced out of the general fund.

Then it looked as if a lot of work would not be contracted, because the day of reckoning had arrived. So the Democratic Congress imposed the additional penny per gallon tax, making the Federal tax on gasoline 4 cents per gallon.

It was stated that this was an emergency measure and that when it expired on June 30, 1961, it would not be reimposed. It was implied by the Democratic leadership in the Congress that they would not try to extend it, as they knew the States needed all the revenue they could get from the gasoline tax to maintain and improve our highways.

STATE INCREASES

On that implied promise several State legislatures raised the State gasoline tax 1 cent. The Virginia General Assembly did this, raising the tax from 6 to 7 cents. That made a total of 11 cents per gallon tax on gasoline. However, we all thought that the Congress would keep the implied promise and let the extra Federal penny tax expire, thus reducing our gasoline tax to 10 cents per gallon.

The point of diminishing returns has already been reached on the gasoline tax. First it was the popular wave of small foreign cars, now it is the compacts. People just got tired of paying so much for gasoline to run big, heavy cars. They might go back to larger cars if the gasoline were reduced.

Anyway, the Congress even looked forward to the day the extra penny Federal gasoline tax would expire. For on July 1, 1961, the Congress decreed that one-half of the excise tax on automobiles, and all the tax on auto parts, should go into the highway trust fund, instead of into the general fund. With the extra taxes on big trucks that the President proposed to the Congress, this should produce enough to keep the program going.

Even if it will not, the program should be stretched out, rather than break faith with the people by continuing the Federal gasoline tax at 4 cents per gallon.

Now as to the big trucks. After a 3-year study a report has just been made to the Congress that they should be paying considerably more taxes.

Some big trucks, the report says, have annual benefits from our highway system of $1,084 to $3,143 but are taxed only $820. The big intercity buses do well, also. The report shows annual benefits of $705 to $1,370, in return for taxes of $540.

MORE FIGURES

More figures are to come later out of statistical analysis of tests recently completed at Ottawa, Ill. In this test 200 variations in highway construction were built and tested by 17 million miles of operation of trucks of several sizes.

Passenger automobiles, delivery trucks, and farm trucks could be served well by less expensive pavements than are being built. The heaviest trucks, about 5 percent of all motor vehicles, require stronger surfaces.

This additional cost for big trucks is apparently paid in large measure by all of us. We make the railroads own, build and maintain their own right-of-way (and pay taxes on it) so we should find a way to make the heavy trucks pay for the additional cost of construction to serve them, as well as their full share of the cost of maintaining these expensive highways.

While the Congress decreed that the Federal Government would bear 90 percent of the cost of the Federal Interstate System, regulations of the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads actually cut this percentage to about 85. So the States actuallly pay some 15 percent and let us not forget that the States must maintain them.

The States need and must have all the gasoline tax they can get. We have always felt that the Federal Government should have laid off the gasoline tax entirely. It could, too, if all the Federal taxes on all motor vehicles, tires, parts, oil, etc., went into the highway trust fund. A lot of these taxes still go into the general fund.

If you are against the Federal Government continuing the emergency 1-cent tax, write today to:

Senator HARRY F. BYRD, and Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, both Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., and to Representative W. M. ABBITT, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Cattleman's Viewpoint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the following guest editorial in the Oregon Cattleman magazine gives the cattleman's viewpoint on the issue of range conservation. Mr. Oliver has served as mayor of the town of John Day in my district.

[From the Oregon Cattleman, Prineville, Oreg., February 1961]

CATTLEMAN'S VIEWPOINT

(By Herman Oliver)

(NOTE.—The text of Herman Oliver's talk marking the issuance of the first commemorative stamp honoring range conservation has been selected as a guest editorial for the February issue of the Oregon Cattleman. The stamp acceptance ceremony was conducted February 3, in Portland's main post office. Mr. Oliver, veteran retired cattleman and civic leader is an early pioneer in range conservation practices. Presented at Range Conservation Stamp Ceremony, Portland, Oreg., Feb. 3, 1961)

Every cattle rancher worthy of the name is a conservationist at heart, partly because he has to be and partly because he wants to be. Ever since soil conservation came to be a popular theme; with Federal, State, and private money backing the concept, our experiment stations all over America have been working diligently to figure out ways and means for keeping the soil in place. Boiled down, the best way to conserve soil is to have a protective covering on it. Of all the kinds of covering, grass works best. Grass roots not only hold the soil in place, but facilitate getting water into the soil by acting as a storage reservoir; holding the water back has untold value by its more gradual release of the moisture from the soil with no damage, as compared to heavy runoff which does endless damage.

Now what does the stockman want? His ambition is to produce beef and lamb for a profit and grass is the means of reaching his objective. Essentially all he has to sell is grass. His cows, steers, and sheep eat the grass. The grass puts on growth and weight and he sells the weight. Therefore, the only income he has comes from grass. To a stockman grass is most important. It can be damaged or destroyed in different ways such as drought, erosion or overgrazing. There are three things involved in overgrazing. (1) By grazing too early in the spring before grass gets a good start; (2) grazing too heavy during the critical part of the growing season; (3) grazing too heavy and too long toward the end of the grazing season, leaving no forage plant food or ground covering.

If these abuses are repeated year after year the grass disappears, the land production goes down and down and the operator has less to sell, so he gets punished right where it hurts most—in the pocketbook. In the livestock industry, we are in the unique position of profiting most when we treat our grass and soil best.

Every stockman then is in league with every conservationist. Their aims are identical; they want more grass on more acres; they want better grass; and they want the grass managed so its root system will not be destroyed.

There is no stockman in Oregon who does not want to leave his ranch better than he found it. If he doesn't achieve that ambition, it is because of lack of knowledge, not lack of desire. However, knowledge of better grasses and better ways of managing them is fairly new. In other words, conservation is a new art and all hasn't been learned about it yet. One only needs to travel through ranch and range countries to see who is practicing land conservation and who is not.

Along these lines, the Federal Government is something like a rancher, because over half of Oregon rangeland area is federally owned, much of which is adaptable to no other purpose than that of growing grass, which can only be harvested by livestock.

About 1870, when the stockmen began the utilization of grass in most parts of Oregon, they were more concerned with hay and water. The grass was already there, ready to use, the hay was for winter feed, while water was one of the means of controlling ranges by acquiring water rights. Then followed a 40-year period of unregulated use that ruined a good part of the range. Wild horses, the flocks of itinerant sheepmen, and large herds of unmanaged cattle were contributing factors. They all crowded the ranges too early in the spring, killing the good grass. Sagebrush increased and cheatgrass came in, so the ranges were reduced to only a fraction of their possible production.

This all happened before 1910, and for many years no one paid much attention to range conditions. However, during more recent years, rangeland has become more important to stockmen and they are more grass and conservation conscious today than ever before.

Oregon cattlemen bow down to no one in their efforts to grow good cattle. Buyers come form the Midwest, from California, the Hawaiian Islands, and even from foreign countries—such as Texas—to buy our cattle. Why? Because they are good and getting better. It costs lots of money to buy good bulls, weed out the inferior cows and all the dozens of things necessary to improve quality in cattle.

But the curious thing is that money spent to develop more grass would result in more pounds of beef or lamb per acre. For example, in Bear Valley (Grant County) the ranchers are making their rangelands produce 10 times more than they formerly did by removing the sage, plowing and reseeding the ground, and that means 10 times as much beef to the acre, and more profit for the ranchers. Maybe our financial institutions should be looking into this and helping the progress of the State by encouraging their ranch customers to devote part of their yearly budget to grassland improvement. It would surely be very helpful in assisting the repayment of their loan, and at the same time improve their financial position materially.

Federal and State agencies should be commended for their farsighted views and activities in this line and should be urged to step up the program to improve the production and usefulness of our national grasslands, by using more of the grazing fees for that purpose. I am sure they will find the livestock permittee willing and eager to work cooperatively with Federal and State agencies to reseed those lands over which they have well established tenacy. The Government is in an advantageous position to do this; its stewardship is virtually perpetual, whereas the rancher may hold title for an average of about 40 years. Conservation does

not only affect the stockman or tiller of the soil, but it also affects more than is generally conceded, "the man on the street," because it does affect the entire Nation.

As my father did before me, I have devoted my ranching life to just such things. If my life has meant anything, it has taught me that the constructive way is the best. I wanted to leave that philosophy in some sort of permanent record, so recently I have put these ideas down in book form, bolstered and enlivened by hundreds of little experiences—many of them humorous. The book will be out in the spring. It will be called "Gold and Cattle Country" and maybe some of you will get something out of it.

Anyhow, like the old prophet Isaiah, I will remind you—"all flesh is grass."

Purim—Loveliest Holiday of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this is the month of the 105th anniversary of the birth of my mother and my father. I have never failed to observe these natal anniversaries by opening the tide of sweet memories and in my mind reliving the days of my childhood and of my young manhood.

It was especially in keeping with this sentiment that at this time my good friend and constituent, A. J. Glickson, should have sent me a copy of his poem on Purim, his mother's birthday anniversary. By unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include Mr. Glickson's poem:

PURIM—LOVELIEST HOLIDAY OF THE YEAR
(By A. J. Glickson)

In remembrance's splenderous most sacred sanctuary
Emblazoned deep in heartfelt loving memories
Reposes sweet in heaven's radiant repertory
Purim, my mother's birthday anniversary.

In the treasure trove of precious yesterdays
Reflecting the benevolence of her earthly days
Like a diamond with a thousand lustrous rays
Is the beloved memory of her selfless ways.

Her's the majesty of Queen Esther's dedication
The staunch pride of Mordecai's heroic consecration
The fulsome faith in truth's unequivocal vindication
And the eternal justice of His consummate approbation.

From out of time's labyrinth of memories' recesses
Rising sky high with affectionate blessed caresses
I send this paen of tender greeting on Purim day
"With love to mother on the anniversary of your birthday."

Of all the holidays I esteem and hold most dear
Purim is the loveliest holiday of the year
And so it shall always, forever and ever be
Because Purim is my mother's birthday anniversary.

You sons and daughters of time and clime where'er you be
Your mother's birthday alive or in tender reminiscent memory
The loveliest, dearest and most glorious anniversary
The sweetest song, of all God's melodies, eternally.

Ode to a New Assignment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have received a most entertaining communication from one of the new members of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, of which I am chairman. Representative JUDY WEIS, of New York, is the first woman to be named to this major standing committee of the House of Representatives. She has attended faithfully session after session of the committee and apparently listened intently to everything that has been said and watched everything that has been done. In other words, she has been an excellent committee member.

Only yesterday I received in the mail from this Congresswoman a delightful piece of poetry entitled "Ode to a New Assignment," with apologies to the chairman of the committee. It is delightfully done and refreshing to read. With the idea of giving this House the full opportunity to understand the attitude of a new Member, especially a female member of the Science and Astronautics Committee of the House, I present to you a poem of her origin entitled "Ode to a New Assignment." It is as follows:

ODE TO A NEW ASSIGNMENT

Listen to the plaintive case
Of a female put on space.
Glad she is, but quite confused—
SACed in, Moon struck, and BMEWSed.

NASA—ARPA—R. & D.,
Conus—Spasur, and Mach 3;
Advent—Scouts, both sea and blue,
What, oh, what, do they all do?

Gantrys, pads, and solid fuels,
Booster, thrust, and molecules;
My, but what a chump I am—
More stupid than a chimp named Ham.

Samos, Midas, Atlas, Thor,
Minuteman, and Transit IV,
Roam in the ionosphere—
Van Allen's Belt is also here.

Echo twinkles in the sky,
Open to the naked eye.
Here's a puzzler—boy, oh, boy!
What's a "carbon cloud decoy"?

Astronauts will soon be found
Up in orbit going round.
Heroes all, we will agree,
Still the earth's the place for me.

Saturn—Nova—Dynasoar,
Each day brings a whole lot more.
With all this hardware up in space,
We should win this awesome race.

This is tough for me, gosh durn it!
But I'll work until I learn it.
I'll not yield my treasured place—
The first female to serve on space.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, Federal aid to education will occupy the attention of committees in both House and Senate this week.

The Senate hopes to begin debate on a bill within 30 days, and the House may do the same.

Most of the mail I receive is opposed to Federal aid to education. A few letters, usually from school officials and some teachers, support it. Many letters state opposition, go on to say that the writers believe all schools should receive aid if aid is given.

I have, over the years, been giving the issue a great deal of attention, and it seems to me that there are several factors people should think seriously about before they make up their minds.

One is the amount of money the President proposes to distribute, and the manner of its distribution.

The education bill proposes a payment of $666 million the first year, growing to $866 million in the third year.

Each State would be guaranteed a minimum of $15 for every child in daily attendance at a public school.

Some States would receive considerably more than $15. Mississippi, for example, would receive about $29 for each public school child. Ohio's payment would be $16.30.

Now that seems like a considerable sum to many people, and their letters to me indicate that they believe the money would be parceled out so that each school district would receive $16.30 for each child in school.

But this is not the way that the bill proposes to split the pie. Instead, the State educational agency, which means the Ohio Department of Education, would determine which local school districts were most in need. Then they would divide all of Ohio's share among those local school districts.

The Federal Office of Education in Washington would have to approve the State's decision as to what constitutes need. And the law provides that every school district in each State would have a right to appeal if the State decided it did not meet the qualifications for help.

Now, consider for a moment what that would mean in practical operation. Officials in the department of education at Columbus would have $28 million to divide among needy districts. Applications would flock in from all over the State. Political and other pressures would be brought to bear. Someone would make a decision, someone would

be left out, there would be appeals. Presumably a district that did not receive a share could go to court to stop any distribution of funds until its appeal was heard. The possibilities of graft, favoritism, political deals are staggering, and all for a sum that is less than one-half of 1 percent of what Ohio and Ohio school districts already are spending on education.

I mentioned that Ohio's share of the education fund would be $28 million the first year.

Ohio's share of the taxes for the education fund would be $38 million.

It would cost us $10 million in new taxes more than we would receive in new benefits.

Furthermore, there are built in escalators in this law that require our State to spend more for education every year if we want to continue to get our share of the Federal funds. A State is penalized if it does not increase its efforts, which means increase the amount it spends on schools. If a State's effort fails to meet the national average, it is penalized. And Ohio, being a State of high income, would have to increase its educational spending many, many times to avoid this kind of penalty. Of course, our share of the taxes to support the program would not decrease.

These penalty provisions are another form of Federal control. By the use of penalties, with the reward of money, the Federal Government tries to force us to spend more than we may think is necessary for our schools. It gives the Federal Government the power to decide to a large extent what the States and localities must spend on education.

There is still another consideration involved in this matter of effort—the willingness of the State and local communities to build their own schools and finance them.

Assume, for example, that a bond issue is pending in one of our school districts. The local people have been declared ineligible because they appear to have adequate finances, and they do. But right next door is a school district that defeated its bond issue the year before. And that school district is eligible for aid because in the eyes of the State, it is not able to provide the buildings it needs. What incentive remains, then, for any district to go ahead and take care of its needs. Why not slow down, wait a bit, see whether or not we might be able to get part of the Federal money next year or the year after. And so this proposal might very well reduce local incentive to take care of its own problems.

Another serious question rises as to the duration and probable cost of the program after the public finds out how small are the amounts to be distributed under the initial bill. A clue to what lies ahead was given by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in a recent television interview. Admitting that this bill is for only 3 years, and that it is supposed to be necessary because of an emergency, the Secretary went on to say that he thought large doses of Federal aid were necessary on a permament basis.

How large a dose? Perhaps there is a clue in the report of President Kennedy's task force on education. That group recommended spending $9½ billion in the next 4 years—or about twice the amounts now proposed in Congress.

It becomes clear, then, that what is planned is massive Federal expenditures for an indefinite period of years, even though we start out with only $15 per child on a 3-year basis.

Federal control of education is another consideration.

I have mentioned two matters in which Federal control is already obvious in the bill—even though the bill itself denies the Government any right to control or interfere. The Supreme Court once said that "it is hardly lack of due process for the Government to regulate that which it subsidizes."

In short, the Government has a right to supervise how its money is spent.

As a taxpayer, I think the Government has a duty to control how my dollars are spent. How else can we know that they are spent wisely or properly.

An editorial in a magazine published for teachers—the Nation's Schools—had this to say:

> Federal direction is inherent in any Federal law or any Federal court decision pertaining to education. This is true even if Congress delegates to the States the administration of a Federal grant.

And now let me quote to you what happens in a country where the central government does control schools. We know about the school systems of Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia—but this concerns France, supposedly the citadel of liberty. A recent report on French education reads, as follows:

> Some criticisms come from the teachers' organizations who would like to have more freedom for the teachers and less control from Paris.
>
> The system is criticized because of the inevitable delay and inefficiency which arises from the need to refer any question of importance to Paris for decision. It is criticized by local communities because by the time the bureaucrats in the ministry, in the academy, and in the department have worked out the details of every matter of administration, there is nothing left for the local school boards to do. Some of them refuse to go through the motions.
>
> Some attempt has been made to offer a little adaption of the work of the schools to local needs and conditions. But it is difficult to read much meaning into offers of freedom to the classroom teachers when such important factors as the course of study, the textbooks, examinations, the preparation of teachers, and the inspection of classrooms are controlled centrally and operated in such a way as to secure uniformity throughout the nation.

That is France.

And I am certain that would be the situation in the United States if Federal aid to education becomes the law.

Let me cite another example. The Federal highway program is supposed to be one in which the States have almost all jurisdiction over the roads—the Federal Government only approves what States propose. But since early last summer a committee of Congress has been investigating the Federal aid program as it is administered in each State. There have been hearings in Massachusetts, Florida, and other places. The committee has exposed terrific graft and corruption in some of these States, and the result has been a shakeup in State governments and State highway programs. That is Federal control, exercised by Congress as part of its duty to supervise the expenditure of Federal funds.

It has happened in the highway program. It has happened in every other Federal aid program. It will happen in Federal aid to education.

These are some of the things I hope everyone will consider—consider thoughtfully in the next few weeks.

Citizens of Ohio are being asked to give up a great deal of freedom, responsibility and control of the kind of education their children get, in exchange for a pittance—and worse than that, a pittance which will cost them in actual tax dollars $10 million more than they receive.

You might consider also a few facts about the need for this kind of program.

Nonetheless, the demand for Federal spending in this area has increased so rapidly that it appears almost inevitable. Facing this fact, and hoping to avoid Federal control, I have proposed a substitute and have discussed it on this program before.

My substitute is based on the reasoning that any inability of the State to meet its expenses is due, at least in part, to the fact that the Federal Government imposes so heavy a tax burden. There is little left for States to tax. What we need is to return sources of tax revenue to the States or—failing that—to return some of the money the Federal Government collects, but without the usual fee for collection and administration.

My principal suggestion is to return 25 percent of the money collected from the Federal cigarette tax—based upon the number of packs of cigarettes sold in each State. My bill would give almost every State as much or more than it would have received under the bills in the House in 1960. It is not as generous as the 1961 Kennedy bill. However, it would provide substantial sums, free of extra tax burdens on the State, free of the taint of deficit spending, and with no possibility of Federal interference or control.

I intend to offer my bill as a substitute for the administration proposal. I hope it may win the approval of all who truly want to give more money to education without control, and that even those who believe added funds are not needed will recognize it as a desirable alternative to the control-type measure.

Admiral Hogan

SPEECH

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, upon the retirement as Surgeon General of the Navy, Adm. Bartholomew Hogan, I wish

to join with his legion of friends in extending to him my good wishes.

Admiral Hogan's naval service has been a dedicated one. He had already embarked upon a noble career—the medical profession, when he entered naval service 36 years ago. His record of bravery during combat, under fire, is an inspiring one, and his devotion to the wounded is heartwarming.

It is men like Admiral Hogan who have given our Navy an enviable record. The strict discipline inculcated in all service men, did not derogate the warmth of his personality. His understanding, compassion, and sympathy to those who sought his medical care gained for him the respect and friendship of all who knew him. His record is one of valor. The gold on his sleeves and the blue of his uniform he wore with grace and pride. Most recently the unique responsibilities of his high office, Surgeon General of the U.S. Navy, have brought him abundant acclaim. His leadership, his brilliance of mind, and the decisive role he has carried as Surgeon General of the Navy will long be remembered with gratitude by all patriotic Americans.

German Exchange Student Trains at Encinal Terminals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, as part of the people-to-people program and to further a better understanding between the maritime practices of our country of those of friendly nations, a German exchange student is training at Encinal Terminals at Alameda, Calif., according to an article in the Times-Star of that city.

Don Dullum, president of Encinal Terminals, conscious of the position of the American merchant marine, arranged for this student to come to this county through conferences with Hamburg-American Line officials.

In my opinion, this type of activity not only improves understanding but also contributes to the flow of goods in international trade.

There follows an article appearing in the Alameda Times-Star for February 27, 1961:

GERMAN EXCHANGE STUDENT TRAINS AT ENCINAL TERMINALS

A young, future ship's officer from Hamburg, Germany, is learning how an American waterfront terminal operates. An "exchange student," he is a guest at Encinal Terminals, Donald L. Dullum, president, announced today.

Dieter Mueffelmann, 25, an officer trainee with Hamburg-American Lines, has spent 3 months at Balfour-Guthrie & Co., Ltd. (Hamburg-American agents), San Francisco, and will study at Encinal 6 months. He acquired the equivalent of a junior college education prior to joining the steamship company. He will study ashore 2 more years, spend 2 years at sea, then return ashore for additional study.

Dieter is Hamburg-American's first ship's officer offshore trainee to study abroad and he's at Encinal through a set of fortuitous circumstances. Although Hamburg-American regularly sends its shoreside trainees to various ports around the world for indoctrination, ship's officers-to-be, in the past, studied at home—or at sea.

Dullum, in Hamburg last year to confer with Hamburg-American officials, casually remarked that Encinal would be happy to host one of its young trainees. Soon after, Dieter suggested to his superiors that the offshore trainees might also benefit from oversea study. Dieter became the first student.

Dieter, who already speaks knowledgeably about cargo movement and stowage, said, "Because the loading and carrying of cargo is the main function of a vessel, I thought relations between the ship and the dock might be improved if ship's officers knew the problems and procedures in moving cargo onto the ship."

And that's exactly what he's learning. Although Encinal officials are insuring a pleasant visit for the young German, they're also making sure he returns to Germany thoroughly indoctrinated in terminal and stevedore operations.

His curriculum includes the shipping, billing, and operating departments. He'll personally handle work in servicing accounts, complete a biweekly progress report, and at the end of his visit, seminar with each department head to evaluate the training experience.

Dullum, who feels that such training programs work to the mutual benefit of terminals and shipping lines, said other trainees probably would be invited to study at Encinal in the near future.

A Washout

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Ottawa (Kans.) Herald of Tuesday, March 7, 1961, and respectfully call it to the attention of my colleagues for their thoughtful consideration:

A WASHOUT

The recent, much-awaited interview with the two Topeka fliers shot down by the Russians nearly a year ago was a disappointment.

After elaborate preparations the Air Force held a press conference for the two captains, John McKone and Bruce Olmstead. It was widely attended, drawing newspaper, radio, and television men from across the Nation.

Most of what these newsmen heard was contained in two phrases—"That is classified information" and "for security reasons we can't divulge that."

Even the spot where the Air Force RB–47 was shot down remains a mystery. The fliers were allowed to identify the location no closer than "50 miles from the Russian coast."

The two were allowed to say their plane was equipped with two cannons which "fired to the rear" and this was about the extent of any new information newsmen were able to get out of them.

What transpired at the Topeka press conference could have been told as easily 6 weeks ago when the two men were first released.

In all probability the powers that be who put the original silence order on the freed fliers felt that the press conference was a necessity.

About all they accomplished was lip service to the odd belief that the people have a right to know what's going on in the world.

Legislative Program of Young Women's Christian Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1961

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, the Young Women's Christian Association of Springfield, Ill., was kind enough to inform me of their legislative program before the 87th Congress convened.

Their organization for years has been very active and has given detailed study to the problems confronting our Nation.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I wish to include the following letter from Mrs. J. P. Murphy, chairman of the Public Affairs Committee of the Springfield YWCA:

YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION,
Springfield, Ill., December 13, 1960.

Hon. PETER MACK, Jr.,
House of Representatives Office Building, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. MACK: The recent election has again reminded us of the legal barriers that keep millions of persons from voting each Presidential election.

The Public Affairs Committee of the Young Women Christian Association of Springfield, Ill., has been studying this problem and would like to share with you our convictions.

1. We favor granting the franchise to residents of District of Columbia.

2. We believe there should be a uniform residence requirement for voters who move from State to State, and we favor 6 months within the State and 30 days within the precinct as a reasonable residence requirement. In this age of instant mass communication and of great mobility of population, national uniformity of residence is essential.

3. We concur with our constitution that the State should retain the right to prescribe the method of registration and the regulations for voting procedures so long as the State makes it possible for every citizen over 21 years of age who is of sound mind and not a criminal, the right to cast a ballot. This would include absentee ballots for members of armed forces, college students and civilians who cannot be in their home precinct on election day.

4. We favor electing the President by direct popular vote.

We realize that hundreds of thousands are prevented from voting through literacy tests (such as Puerto Ricans in New York), but we feel reform of this nature should occur within the State.

We feel sure you have given much thought to election reform and would be interested in knowing that the board of directors of the Springfield YWCA has authorized the Public Affairs Committee to write this letter to you.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. J. P. MURPHY,
Chairman, Public Affairs Committee.

Secretary Dillon Gives Views on the Bearing Which Foreign Aid Costs Have on Our Imbalance of International Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD copies of correspondence between the Honorable Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury, and myself regarding the costs of our foreign aid programs with particular reference to their bearing on our currently unfavorable balance of international payments.

Texts of the letters follow:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 18, 1961.

Hon. DOUGLAS DILLON,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY DILLON: It seems to me that we need an emphasis on reduction of our foreign aid costs which we are not getting.

American spending for foreign aid during the postwar years in which we have extended this form of international assistance has reached a staggering total in excess of $80 billions.

As you know, our national economy has been adversely affected in recent years by an increasingly unfavorable balance of international payments—an annual deficit roughly equivalent to the amount we spend each year for foreign aid. We were asked by the previous administration for $4 billion in foreign-aid appropriations for the fiscal year 1962.

The Congress and the country want to cut and reduce but President Eisenhower insisted and urged more spending and increased foreign-aid appropriations. Obviously, a dangerous gap exists which must be closed at the earliest possible moment. The money we are sending abroad for foreign aid is needed at home to help quickly restore a favorable balance of payments, stop the flight of gold, and serve our own economy and country.

If we were getting the desired beneficial results from our foreign-aid expenditures, more might be said in favor of continuing these outlays at present levels. However, the evidence seems overwhelming that a large part of our foreign-aid money is not being spent wisely or effectively and with bad results for our country.

We are all too familiar with the shocking evidence of misdirection, mismanagement, and waste in our foreign-aid programs. The situation is one which calls for a complete review of these programs, with a view to a substantial reduction in American expenditures.

Such a review is required further by the fact that for quite some time our country has been bearing a grossly disproportionate share of the costs of international assistance.

In view of all these facts, it is puzzling and disturbing to read statements attributed to you in the press indicating that you are opposed to reduction of our foreign aid spending at this time. I find it even more disconcerting to read that you regard this Nation's economic problems as no reason to reduce our foreign aid expenditures. And that is followed by a statement dismissing the size and importance of our formidable foreign aid bill as a mere three-fourths of 1 percent of total output.

It needs to be underlined, Mr. Secretary, that "mere three-fourths of 1 percent of total output" is a vital factor in our national security at this time.

I had hoped, along with many others, that you, in your new post as our Secretary of the Treasury, would be in a position to give somewhat different consideration of the economic and financial aspects of foreign aid than was perhaps possible in your former office as our Under Secretary of State. I must confess to a disappointment caused by statements credited to you in the press indicating that you hold to the view that we can make no rational reductions in our foreign aid outlays.

We are all working for the same end, a stronger and more secure Nation, and I would appreciate a further expression of your views on this subject, toward the reaching of a fuller understanding of what we can do and must do to strengthen our own economy while effectively cooperating with our allies in constructive programs.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

JOE L. EVINS,
Member of Congress.

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, March 8, 1961.

Hon. JOE L. EVINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. EVINS: Thank you for your letter of February 18, 1961. I am glad to have your thoughts concerning the relationship of our foreign aid program to our balance of payments.

The President in his message to the Congress of February 6, 1961, dealt with this question which concerns us all. As there indicated, the sharp increase in our balance-of-payments deficit in 1958 and 1959 resulted principally from lagging exports and rising imports. Our deficit last year was largely the result of significant movements abroad of short-term capital.

Under our foreign aid programs, primary emphasis is now being placed on the procurement of U.S. goods and services. As I am sure you understand the purchase of American goods from our factories here at home and the shipment abroad of these goods as part of our foreign aid program to countries that could not have purchased these goods does not in any way affect our balance of payments or the flow of gold. With this procedure, as the President stated, our economic aid programs no longer have a significantly adverse effect on our balance of payments. In addition, a much broader approach to international imbalance of payments within the free world is being undertaken. Under this approach larger economic assistance programs are being sought from other industrialized countries who are in a position to make increased contributions on behalf of the less developed countries. Success in this effort should help our balance-of-payments position.

On the military aid side, the gross payments impact on our balance-of-payments position has been roughly one quarter billion dollars, representing expenditures we make abroad for military offshore procurement and for NATO infrastructure. We are expecting to obtain some reduction in this figure. We are also engaged in trying to achieve an actual increase in our international cash receipts by transferring a portion of military equipment deliveries to some of our allies from an aid to a sales basis.

We intend to pursue with all vigor our efforts to expand our international receipts and to achieve a reasonable equilibrium in our balance of payments, while meeting our national and international commitments and while expanding free world exchanges of goods, services, and investments.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

Mr. Speaker, the case for a complete review of our foreign aid programs "with a view to a substantial reduction in American expenditures," requires a more specific answer than here given by Secretary Dillon.

Deep Concern Expressed Over Reports of Change in Defense Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1961

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, a letter written by Mr. Philip V. Brennan, Sr., of Deerfield Beach, Fla., has come to my attention.

Mr. Brennan, a veteran of World War I who sacrificed his hearing for his country, expresses deep concern over reports of a change in our defense policies. I believe that his letter accurately reflects the views of many thinking Americans.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD excerpts from Mr. Brennan's letter:

I just read this article by David Lawrence entitled "Limited War Fear Disturbs Washington," appearing in Fort Lauderdale News, March 6, 1961 and thought I would write you about my own thoughts on what seems to be the trouble with all this talk about fighting limited wars.

When Eisenhower took office in January 1953 he immediately let it be known that we would never fight another limited war like Korea. If the Communists started any more wars we would use all our weapons, including atomic, and we would go to the source of the trouble. Result: No more Koreas.

During Kennedy's campaign, he repeatedly stressed the fact that he would change all this and be ready to fight limited wars all over the globe. That's right up the Communist's alley. Just what they want.

Now is the time for responsible Members of Congress to come right out and fight this trend before it is too late. If they do not take a public stand right now so that the Communists know there will be opposition to any such idea by the administration we will shortly be engaged in limited wars all over Africa, etc.

I may be wrong but that's what it looks like to me and it has me worried. We can't beat the Communists in limited wars. They have too many slaves that they are perfectly willing to sacrifice.

Salute to General Eisenhower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD, the following editorial from the Nashville Banner, on the move to restore the rank of five-star general to Dwight D. Eisenhower:

[From the Nashville Banner, Mar. 3, 1961]

SALUTE TO GENERAL EISENHOWER

An overwhelming number of Americans, regardless of party affiliation, are in accord with President Kennedy's announcement that he will urge Congress to restore to the immediate past Chief Executive, Dwight D. Eisenhower, the rank of five-star general.

Mr. Kennedy stated—and the Banner concurs—that this move is appropriate because of Mr. Eisenhower's outstanding military record and his long public service to the country in peace and war.

Mr. Eisenhower, when advised of the President's views, said he was "highly pleased and complimented" and that it would be a great honor to again be a five-star general.

Except for a relatively short period as a private citizen—when he served as president of Columbia University—Mr. Eisenhower, now 70, has served this Nation since early manhood; first as a soldier and ultimately as President, twice elected by large majorities.

He was the architect of victory in Europe; the man who charted the invasion of the continent which led to disintegration of the Nazi Germany war machine.

And later as President, he exemplified dedication to peace—not peace at any price, but a peace with honor, completely devoid of any hint of appeasement.

Thus, it truly is appropriate that the former President, who still stands ready and able to be of service to his country, be known again as General Eisenhower; the title fits the man.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Wheeling, W. Va., Celebrates Its 125th Anniversary—Govs. J. Lindsay Almond, Jr., and W. W. Barron Extend Greetings—Hundreds Join in Colorful Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 13, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on March 11, it was my pleasure and privilege to participate in a notable community celebration of the 125th anniversary of the granting of the charter to the city of Wheeling, W. Va.

The ceremonies were presided over by the Honorable Charles L. Ihlenfeld, vice mayor of Wheeling, and attended by hundreds of the citizens of Wheeling, ranging in age from young toddlers linked in hand with their parents to one of the city's elders, Mr. William Bye, who carries his 89 years with vigor and alertness.

The economic, social, and cultural accomplishments of the citizens of Wheeling have shed luster not only upon the State of West Virginia, but also upon the Commonwealth of Virginia, from whence the original settlers came—as attested to by the congratulatory messages sent by the Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia, and by the Governor of the State of West Virginia. As the Honorable J. Lindsay Almond, Jr., stated in his message, "Virginians are proud that they had a part in its birth." Congratulatory messages were also received from the West Virginia delegation in Congress, including Senator ROBERT C. BYRD and Representative ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

The colorful observance of March 11, which was enlivened by the Wheeling High School Band and the drill team of the Benevolent and Protective Order of the Elks, is but the first of the festivities which will mark the 125th anniversary year proclaimed by the Honorable John J. Gast, mayor of Wheeling. The active cooperation of the city council and of business, service, and civic groups is being given to the planning in order to make this a memorable year in the history of Wheeling.

In order to give wider acknowledgment to this event in the life of one of the cities which played a significant role in the early development of our Nation, and which continues to occupy an important place in the economic and cultural life of America, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the mayor's proclamation, the original incorporating act of 1836, and my remarks at the 125th anniversary commemoration, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE MAYOR OF THE CITY OF WHEELING, W. VA.:
A PROCLAMATION

Whereas on March 11, 1836, the general assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia passed an act organizing the inhabitants of the town of Wheeling, in the county of Ohio, into a body corporate under the name of "the city of Wheeling," thus giving the town of Wheeling, established December 25, 1795, corporate status; and

Whereas on this 11th day of March, 1961, we gather to celebrate the 125th anniversary of the incorporation of the city of Wheeling, W. Va., with appropriate ceremonies; and

Whereas the 125th anniversary committee of the city of Wheeling has planned observances of the city's anniversary during the coming year;

Now, therefore, I, John J. Gast, mayor of the city of Wheeling, do hereby proclaim the year beginning with this, the 11th day of March, 1961, as the 125th Anniversary Year of the city of Wheeling; and I invite the people of this city and surrounding communities to observe this day and the coming year as a landmark in the history of Wheeling, keeping in mind the great accomplishments of the citizens of this city during the years of its existence and the bright promise of the future growth and attainments of this community;

And I urge the citizens during this coming year to take part in all activities planned by the 125th Anniversary Committee of this city.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the city of Wheeling to be affixed this 11th day of March, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred sixty-one.

JOHN J. GAST,
Mayor.

ACTS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA, PASSED AT THE SESSION OF 1835–36, IN THE 60TH YEAR OF THE COMMONWEALTH

"CHAP. 235.—AN ACT TO INCORPORATE THE CITY OF WHEELING IN OHIO COUNTY (PASSED MARCH 11, 1836)

"1. Be it enacted by the general assembly of Virginia, That the inhabitants of so much of the county of Ohio as is within the bounds prescribed by the act of the general assembly, entitled, 'an act to enlarge, define and establish the corporate bounds and limits of the town of Wheeling in the county of Ohio,' passed January 6, 1836, as the bounds and limits thereof, and their successors, shall be, and they are hereby made a body politic and corporate, by the name and style of 'the city of Wheeling,' * * *."

REMARKS BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, OF WEST VIRGINIA, AT THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CHARTER OF THE CITY OF WHEELING, W. VA., MARCH 11, 1961

MAYOR GAST. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I am most grateful for the invitation to participate in the celebration of your 125th anniversary as an incorporated city. I anticipate the fulfillment of your plans for a more formal and ambitious observance, hopefully with the President in attendance at a later date, and I shall assist in every way to bring that to fruition.

We speak often these days of the New Frontiers. No city in the country has been more closely identified with the adventurous and explorative frontier spirit of America—both past and present—than has Wheeling.

At every phase in our Nation's history, the town of Zanesburg, later the town and now the city of Wheeling, has been in the vanguard of development. Whether as one of the westernmost outposts of the frontier during the Indian wars and the Revolutionary War, or as the chief port of entry and exit in the commercial traffic of East and West, or as one of the leading centers of the industrial revolution of the 19th century, Wheeling has always cast its eyes to the future. So be it now, as we approach the even more exciting frontiers of tomorrow, bringing with you the confidence borne of your vigorous and creative tradition from the past.

Perhaps this tradition is no longer quite as stern as that expressed during the siege of Fort Henry in 1782, when Betty Zane—volunteering to run under Indian fire to replenish the dwindling powder supplies of the fort—declared "Tis better a maid than a man should die." But this tradition—in your men and women alike—lives on in the citizens of Wheeling, and I have every confidence that it will carry your city and its people to notable achievement.

Dear Sis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VERNON W. THOMSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1961

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Reedsburg Times-Press, Reedsburg, Wis., of March 9, 1961, and respectfully call it to the attention of my colleagues:

DEAR SIS: We have news for J.F.K.

There is no depression in Sauk County.

The hard-working farmers, businessmen, employees and laborers just keep plugging along at their jobs, paying no attention to the scare headlines emitting from our Nation's Capital and the office of President J.F.K.

Tax payments were completed as of last Tuesday and Reedsburg property owners put their money on the line. Only 1.55 percent of the amount required to run our city, county, and State was put in the delinquent list by Alice Brunhoefer, city treasurer. That's a small percentage on a total of $479,771.32.

Over at Loganville the villagers paid up 100 percent, as they have done for a number of years. Other townships and villages also paid nearly 100 percent.

Federal tax payment time is coming close, and we'll bet that Sauk County folk will again have their checks in the mail by the deadline.

Of course paying the Federal bite is a little more unpleasant and for a good reason.

We just can't comprehend where all the money goes and why. Every year some branch of the Government comes up with a new way to spend our money, and that's getting to be a bit discouraging.

But if we keep on expecting Washington to take over and manage our requirements—do things which, with a little guts, we could do ourselves, we've got to pay the piper.

YOUR BROTHER.

We Teach Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1961

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, John Crosby has made an eloquent play for public action to cut down the volume of programs stressing physical violence on our television today.

The continuation of these programs will have an unfortunate influence on the children of this country and I append Mr. Crosby's column herewith in the hope that it may help to bring about concerted action to eliminate these programs.

WE TEACH JUVENILE DELINQUENCY
(By John Crosby)

After a 7-year vacation, Mickey Spillane is writing another of his Mike Hammer books. But Mr. Spillane declares that his hero, who popularized the shooting of naked women in fiction, will probably be considered mild stuff. Now even women writers, said Spillane, purvey more tough talk and violence than he did.

That is the truth. The other day, Police Commissioner Kennedy said that New York City's crime was up for the seventh straight year, which, in a city whose population is declining, is depressing. The steepest climb is again in the ranks of the young. The arrests of those under 16 years of age are up almost 7 percent; the arrests of those 16 to 20 went up almost 9 percent in 1 year. Does this surprise you? It shouldn't. It should alarm you but it shouldn't surprise you. These are the children who have been conditioned since birth to violence—to commit, to acquiesce in it, to consider it normal.

On my television program, Alfred Knopf, the publisher, said that it's out of date to complain about sex in fiction; it's been replaced, he said, by sadism. Not only in fiction either, everywhere. In TV Guide Dr. Frederic Wertham, the psychiatrist, says: "We have been conditioned to an acceptance of violence as no civilized nation has ever been before. How? That is very simple. You crowd the minds of the people with violent images—continuously, relentlessly, in every context and costume * * *. We have silently passed an amendment to the sixth commandment. Thou shalt not kill but it is perfectly all right for you to enjoy watching other people do it, the more the merrier and as brutally as possible."

You are surprised at the rise of juvenile delinquency? We teach juvenile delinquency on television and in books and in the movies. No other civilized country in the world permits the horrors we allow on our television screens. In Washington we have a sublimely blind, hopelessly inefficient and frequently corrupt Federal Communications Commission which has permitted the abominations of "The Untouchables" and of all other TV felons to continue without taking a single step to enforce its powers.

No other country allows this, not even uncivilized ones. The Wall Street Journal reports that the sale of American TV abroad is booming but adds: "Excessive violence on some U.S. video programs has already raised difficulties abroad. Australia's censorship board barred 42 U.S. (TV) films and demanded cuts in 1,594 additional films. Sweden and Japan and other countries have also voiced objections to brawling and shooting in American programs. Says Mr. McCarthy of the TV export group: 'There's no doubt about it. We're going to have to tone down our violence, if we want to get the most out of the foreign market.'"

The last time I was in France, a country notoriously openminded, a representative there of Ziv TV films told me the French simply would have nothing to do with our violent TV films. He added: "The French agree that the violence would probably be just as popular in France as it is in America but they say simply that it isn't good for the little ones or for the big ones."

Is this censorship? Hell, no. It's plain commonsense, which is conspicuously lacking in our treatment of the subject. When those who are making a fortune out of making juvenile delinquents out of our children start pointing out (as they do) that "Hamlet" has lots of violence, too, the answer should simply be: "Oh, come off it, Charlie. Behave yourself or I'll yank your license." With perhaps a good swift kick. There is no decent rationalization for this mayhem being committed on television. No other civilized country permits it except us.

The Federal Communications Commission, by simply flexing its muscles at the networks and at the stations who show the tripe, could do much toward abolishing violence on television tomorrow. The "public interest, convenience and necessity" clause of the Communications Act is plenty of authorization. It wouldn't even take any official reprisals much more serious than a telephone call or a public reprimand.

The public itself ought to raise the roof over the misuse of violence—not only on television, but in comics and movies and books. The ordinary citizen has at his disposal vast powers of social disapproval—and this, used against the corner drugstore which sells and displays sadistic pocket books, or against the TV station, or against any store selling those awful sadistic comics, should accomplish much.

A $13,500 Home Would Cost $33,437 With 40-Year Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is impossible for a mere Member of Congress to match the torrent of words that is pouring forth from the White House these days, but this brief comment on one of the aspects of the proposed housing legislation is extremely appropriate:

A $13,500 HOME WOULD COST $33,437 WITH 40-YEAR LOAN

WASHINGTON.—Monthly payments under President Kennedy's proposed new program for 40-year no-down payment mortgage insurance on low-cost homes would be lower than under the present system; but home buyers would pay more for the house because of the extra 10 years of interest outlays.

Under the Federal Housing Administration's present program, the buyer of a $13,500 home can obtain an insured 30-year mortgage at the maximum 5½ percent rate. The required downpayment is $450, and the monthly payments thereafter total $74.12 for principal and interest. At the end of 30 years, the buyer will have paid $27,133, including the down payment—or about twice the price of the house.

Under the proposed program, the buyer of a $13,500 home could get an insured 40-year mortgage at the maximum 5½ percent rate. With no downpayment, the monthly interest and principal payments on the full $13,500 loan would be $69.66. After 40 years, the total cost would amount to $33,437—or about 2½ times the original price.

Time To Take a Second Look

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 13, 1961

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I believe we need to take a second look at our quotas on importation. I have been reading with considerable regret that some unions intend to boycott Japanese goods. The long-range effects of such an action must be considered.

I recall that the matter of Japanese plywood imports played far too great a role during the recent congressional campaigns in my State. The percentage of importation of the Japanese hardwood plywood was minute. Yet men were out of work and men who are out of work and men who are hungry and unable to feed their wives and children instinctively strike out to protect their special interests.

We need education at home and abroad to increase world trade in order to improve balance of payments.

The editorial entitled "Unwise Boycotts" which appeared in the New York Times, notes:

The purpose of protection should not be to protect indefinitely—at the expense of the American consumer—those who refuse to meet this competition on its own ground of cost, price, and quality.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the March 11, 1961, New York Times editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNWISE BOYCOTTS

Both President Kennedy and Secretary of State Rusk have spoken out vigorously and properly this week against the boycotts of Japanese goods planned by some unions. As the President pointed out, such unilateral action by private groups seeking to serve their own interests conflicts with the national interest, and in any case point the road to chaos. If a private group in this country boycotts one type of Japanese goods, the Japanese would be only human if they re-

taliated with counterboycotts. The result could only be the growth of bad feeling between the two nations, disruption of the orderly flow of international trade and political gains for Communist China and the Soviet Union.

The proposed boycotts, of course, are only one aspect of a more general problem. Demands for protection against foreign competition come not only from unions but also from businessmen, and the competitive goods against which one or another interest would like protection cover a wide range of commodities from many nations. With almost 6 million unemployed in this country arguments for greater protection tend to receive more sympathetic attention than in times of fuller employment.

A balanced view of the general problem must take into account at least three factors that are too often ignored. First we must import, if we wish to export. In 1959, for example, Japan bought almost $1 billion worth of our goods, providing a large number of jobs here which would not exist if Japan did not have the resources, derived from our purchases, to pay for these goods. Second, the only real long-range protection against effective foreign competition is increased productivity and lower costs of production here. Third, the purpose of such protection as is given by tariffs or other measures should be to ease the transition while one or another interest makes appropriate adjustment to a sudden sharp increase in foreign competition. The purpose of protection should not be to protect indefinitely—at the expense of the American consumer—those who refuse to meet this competition on its own ground of cost, price, and quality.

Mineral Developments in Southern Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD (DICK) ICHORD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1961

Mr. ICHORD of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, southern Missouri is experiencing a mineral exploration and development boon which promises to be of great importance to the future of the area and our Nation. This development has been aided substantially by the cooperative services provided by the State geologist, the U.S. Bureau of Mines, the U.S. Geological Survey, and the Missouri School of Mines located at Rolla, Mo. An excellent editorial written by Mr. Edward W. Sowers, publisher of the Rolla Daily News, points up the need for continuing support of these agencies and the services they offer. Under unanimous consent, I include the editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD:

NEW STATUS FOR SURVEYS, BUREAUS HERE
(By Edward W. Sowers)

The terrific, almost fantastic, iron and lead strikes, and some copper, in the area not far south and east of Rolla have given new status to Rolla and its surveys and bureaus pertaining to minerals and other resources.

The other day when State Geologist Tom Beveridge asked the Missouri Legislature for $550,000 for a new Missouri geological survey building here, our first through—as a taxpayer—was: "What's this, another half-million-dollar building for the survey, when the building it now occupies looks pretty good to us?"

On second thought, however, one doesn't have to be a geologist, or a miner, to realize that the new impact of mining discoveries in Missouri—and within a 40-mile perimeter of Rolla—has forced the need for better facilities for the State's own survey. Authoritative sources picture this area of mining development as one of the three hottest spots in the entire United States of America.

A kindred activity, also influenced by the new importance of our mineral and forest resources, is likewise seen here in the announcement by the Missouri National Forests to build a new headquartesrs building here this spring. Much of the activity in mining, and forest resources, development, is within the lands serviced by Missouri national forests.

There is also the U.S. Bureau of Mines station here, working constantly with ores and their application to industry. And, of course, the University of Missouri School of Mines and Metallurgy is important in this picture, as emphasized recently by its International Symposium on Mining Research. No little help comes, too, from the U.S. Geological Survey at Rolla, providing maps for the ever-changing and increasingly important area.

Another factor in this scene is the growing importance of the Eighth Congressional District of Missouri, which blankets the entire mining and forest-products development. Our Congressman, DICK ICHORD, recognizes this vast potential in his (and our) district, and has, in fact, legislation before Congress now to help realize more from the vast resources within the new eighth district.

While there is talk of "recession" in parts of the United States it should not apply to this part of the Eighth Congressional District of Missouri. We must not let it. We must back up our bureaus and agencies (which happily for our economy and for their strategic location in Rolla) and our governmental representatives with positive action as a community and as individuals each and every time we have the opportunity.

Need for Greater Education on Anti-U.S. Activities by Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 13, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, across the Nation there are an estimated 25,000—and in all likelihood many more unaccounted for—Communists working against the best interests of this country.

The Red strategy ranges from agitation for social unrest and strikes to sabotage, espionage and ultimately the overthrow of the Government.

According to FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, for example, the Communists played a prominent role in the riots in San Francisco during the 1960 hearings of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Currently, too, there is increasing evidence that the U.S. Communist Party—an arm of the international conspiracy headed by Moscow—is engaging in stepped up activities against the best interests of our people and the country.

As a people, I believe we need to be more alertly attuned to the great dangers of these cancerous cells in the heart of America.

Recently the Milwaukee Sentinel published an informative article by Jack Lotto, entitled "Reds Push 1961 U.S. Hunger Marches." The article reflects some of the ways in which Communists currently are attempting to stir up unrest because of our economic problems. I request unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REDS PUSH 1961 U.S. HUNGER MARCHES
(By Jack Lotto)

The Communists are drumming up nationwide "hunger marches."

Thirty-one years after they led the big March 1930 demonstrations, the Reds are working to spark new mass struggles.

The plans to sharply increase agitation among the Nation's unemployed were OK'd in a recent secret meeting of the party hierarchy.

A letter-directive to all district and State Communist locals ordered immediate concentration on the task.

A special "depression issue" of 100,000 copies of the party's newspaper was printed and is being distributed in key unemployment areas across the country.

Every article had one theme: The mass demonstrations and battles of the depression days have "lessons for today's struggle." Meaning: Get such marches going again in major cities and State capitals—with one march toward Washington.

"Prepare for sharper struggles" was the word sent to the comrades by Gus Hall, national secretary of the Communist Party.

Indications are the Reds will begin setting upon local, State and national levels so-called "unemployment councils," as they did in the 1930's. Where such groups are already organized by legitimate labor unions, the Reds will attempt to infiltrate or guide them.

Said an editorial in the Worker, official party paper:

"Only struggles like those waged by the unemployed and many unions during the 1930's can force new urgent advances on the welfare front * * * conferences of a few public figures along with union officials will not impress anybody * * * we need grassroots action and conferences of many thousands, if the country is to be really aroused * * *."

Thus, the Reds belittle the efforts of the anti-Communist AFL–CIO on the jobless problem. They claimed that only the Communists truly represent the needs of the unemployed.

The Communists see wonderful trouble-making opportunities in the real unemployment problem. Discontent is the breeding ground for the Reds to find recruits among those who have nothing to lose, and to push their divide and conquer strategy.

Among the proposals being peddled by the party supposedly to aid the jobless was one for a big increase in trade with Red China and Russia. Shipping strategic goods to the Communists to build up their war potential—now banned by law—would make plenty of work, the local Reds claimed.

Another demand in the peddling of Utopian ideas to pose as the friend of the needy and unemployed: The U.S. Government should pay two-thirds of every jobless worker's wages indefinitely.

Work Ahead in Mental Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include remarks entitled "Work Ahead in Mental Health," made by William P. McCahill, executive secretary of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, and made at the Workshop on Social Action, National Council of Catholic Women, 13th National Convention, at Las Vegas, Nev., on November 3, 1960.

The views of Mr. McCahill in this important field of human thought and action are worthy of deep consideration. Mr. McCahill is dedicated to improving the conditions and the outlook on life of the handicapped.

The remarks follow:

WORK AHEAD IN MENTAL HEALTH

Last May the executive committee of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped voted to take steps to aid the employment of the mentally restored and the mentally retarded—two very different groups of people indeed. For the past 13 years, the committee and cooperating Governors' committees have concerned themselves almost completely with the physically handicapped. In these 13 years we have seen a decided change for the better in the acceptance of employers and fellow workers of the qualified physically handicapped worker in the labor market. It is our sincere belief and great hope that the next 13 years will see an even greater accptance of the mentally restored and mentally retarded as responsible employees in a great variety of jobs in this country. The restored are people like you and I who have suffered severe mental illness. The retarded are persons, generally, with lower IQ's than most of us.

Groups like the National Council of Catholic Women and its parent body, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, can aid materially in speeding the day when mental disability will be better understood in America. There is plenty of work ahead for all of us in the field of mental health. This is the first major speech on the subject that I or any committee staff member have made since it was formally accepted as part of our promotional program. So we are pioneering here together, you and I, the committee and the Council, and perhaps this may be used as a bench mark in the future from which to measure employment progress.

Your social action committee assistant, Irma Piepho, advised me in September that your social action national chairman, Mrs. Bayard Kurth, would deal with the mentally ill in your monthly message. Then she said something which I hope will be prophetic. She said: "So much can be done in this field by the lay person, particularly in helping people back on their feet." I can say "Amen" to that.

Today, I should like to discuss a vital part of the mental health field. I am concerned primarily with attitudes toward the proper utilization of all the available manpower resources of the mentally handicapped, a term which includes those we have chosen to call the mentally restored and those we all know as the mentally retarded.

In our Program Guide for 1960, the President's Committee has a page on those with mental handicaps. It reads in part: "In America, there are more than the lame, the halt, and the blind who need our assistance. Our country's No. 1 medical problem, the problem that is responsible for filling more than half of all the hospital beds in the United States, is mental illness.

"Obviously, a hospital bed is not the end of the line for a person suffering from mental illness. We have long since emerged from the dark ages when we would throw the mentally ill into poorly kept overcrowded, dank asylums—and purge them from our thoughts.

"Today, the mental hospital is a way point on the road back to the community and to a useful and productive life. Modern techniques, modern drugs, modern research have enabled the mental hospital to work miracles. But—What happens to the patient when he leaves the hospital? When the hospital staff breaks the good news: 'You can go home now; we think you're ready.'"

It is obvious that if we are to get ahead faster, the community must better learn to accept and properly use the mentally restored and the mentally retarded. Catholic women and all persons of good faith have a responsibility to learn more about opportunities for additional opportunities for the mentally restored and the mentally retarded. You women who wish to be modern pioneers have only to consult local lay and medical authorities to learn, to know, to understand, and to appreciate the nature of individual differences and specific ways you can be or help.

A panel of distinguished physicians have advised us that discrimination in fact does exist in employment and reemployment of persons with histories of mental disabilities. They have advised deliberate speed in better educating the public to the shape of the problem and have recommended education be undertaken at all levels of management, including the unions and the doctors themselves. Motivation of the mentally restored employee was considered vital and in this area, groups such as yours certainly can play a very large part.

Illustrations of what has been done may be helpful to our consideration. You who have been closely associated with the Veterans' Administration during these past years, already know the work ahead in mental health will be made easier as a result of VA planning.

The VA is undertaking a study of jobs now held by veterans with histories of mental illness, some 200,000. Regional offices have identified the veterans and are obtaining a good-sized sample of what they are doing, whether they are working to the best of their abilities and what employers think. The study will be completed and in pamphlet form by next spring and will be distributed jointly by the Veterans' Administration and the President's Committee. Another pamphlet, "Jobs Held by Veterans With Epilepsy," was released last spring and 15,000 copies distributed the first month. The VA for the first time is now attempting to sell benefits to a particular class of veterans. All those with 100-percent disabilities or those with 70 percent or more for mental conditions are now being contacted by VA training officers and encouraged to take vocational rehabilitation training if it appears to be necessary.

The Office of Vocational Rehabilitation is doing more and more research and special project work with the mentally retarded. Many State divisions of vocational rehabilitation have full-time counselors working in mental health hospitals jointly with patients and doctors, helping to prepare the way for return to work of the mentally restored. More is also being done with the mentally retarded in discovering the kinds of work they can do best.

A number of State employment service agencies have entered into formal agreements with State and Veterans' Administration mental hospitals to provide counseling and placement assistance to emerging patients. Others cooperate with mental hospitals and other agencies on an informal basis to help discharged patients find suitable employment. Both formal and informal arrangements between State employment service agencies and mentral treatment facilities, public and private, for counseling and placement services to the mentally restored are steadily increasing and employment service agencies, generally, have for many years been providing specialized service to mentally retarded persons as a recognized disability group. Many State agencies have developed interviewing guides to assist their personnel in serving this group.

My purpose in mentioning some of these things is not to paint a rosy picture, but to keep faith with my assigned topic and to point out that if you are willing to move into an area where it might have been said that angels have feared to tread, you will have available new tools, new techniques, and new allies as the Nation makes a concerted attack on increasing job opportunities for the mentally handicapped. The President's Committee with its small staff and cooperating Governors' committees can't by any stretch of the imagination be expected to win the battle. All we can do is raise the issue, sound the battle cry and possibly point the way, as I am trying to do here today, and hope that the real troops, the vast army of volunteers in organizations such as the NCCW will form ranks, establish committees and get on with the work ahead.

Whenever I mention formation of committees I wince a bit, for I heard a statement at the first meeting of the Richmond Diocesan Council of Catholic Men this September which paraphrased a quotation from the Scriptures. The phrase was: "I was hungry and you formed a committee, I was thirsty and you formed a committee, I was naked and you formed a committee." Well, you already have a committee.

I have assembled some opinions from laymen and experts in the field, however, and this may help us. Perhaps you would do well to consider the words of a prominent Methodist layman, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, who said at a news conference last year: "It is apparent that some progress is being made to facilitate the return to employment of patents discharged from mental hospitals and to help the mentally retarded to lead normal, self-sufficient lives. It should be emphasized, however, that considering its scope, far too little effort is being expended to deal with this problem, particularly by most of the individual States."

My background is that of a newspaperman turned bureaucrat. Newspapermen ask questions and we have been asking questions of doctors, laypeople, former mental patients, association executives, and parents of the retarded. I'd like to share with you some of the reactions and some of the thoughts which have come to us.

A prominent psychiatrist for a large insurance firm told us: "At this juncture, more is to be lost by going too slowly on the problem of employing the mentally handicapped than on possibly going too fast. Initially, there is the semantic problem to overcome since we do not usually associate the concept of handicappedness with individuals who have or have had emotional problems." He said we should keep in mind

that there are all sorts and degrees of emotional illness, and that above all, no stereotype of the emotionally ill should be allowed to crystallize. After several years with industry and in occupational psychiatry, he has found more and more willingness to go at the subject of the emotionally ill "objectively and scientifically," even though he conceded there are still many pockets of resistance, both individual and involving the outlook even of some very large organizations. But, our expert witness advised: "All in all, however, I think the mistake to be avoided is overcaution."

An amateur, but one whose interest is just as intense as a housewife and mother, wrote us recently: "I think it is time right now that something definite be done for these poor forsaken retarded adults. Why should they be neglected and cast aside? Something must be done and right now. Why can't there be more workshops—or a workshop where they could do packaging, circular work, assorting and things like that, which would hire physically handicapped, mentally restored, and mentally retarded adults? The mentally retarded would be willing to work for less, just so they would be occupied and be a part of this world. I certainly do not want to spend the next year like I spent the past 4 years, seeking employment for my daughter with deadends all around, closed doors, and despair looking at you from all sides." The capital letters in her letter are hers, not mine. They were the words now and right now this, too, is part of the work ahead. Of course, we do not recommend that anyone work for less than a fair wage but rather, that people be paid equal pay for equal work.

The consultant on vocational rehabilitation and sheltered workshops on the staff of the National Association for Retarded Children said that during field trips around the country he urged special educators to dovetail their programs with that of vocational rehabilitation for the mentally retarded. The way he put it was to the effect that it goes like the song "Love and Marriage," which says "You can't have one without the other."

I brought some background material along with me for tucking in your purses for sober reflection when you get back to places like Milwaukee, Dayton, Fort Wayne, Minneapolis, and Pittsburgh. I select these five not to slight the other places from which you good women come, but because I have lived in all these cities and know something of the work that can be and has been accomplished by groups such as yours when they decided to tackle a community problem. For, in the final analysis, this is a community problem, for it is at the community level where these people live, are hospitalized, are cared for and to which they return seeking employment.

The National Association for Retarded Children which places incidence of retardation at 3 percent or 5 million Americans, has just last month released a general information booklet titled, "The Retarded Can Be Helped," and this certainly is part of the story of the work ahead. The booklet emphasizes that 25 out of 30 metally retarded can aspire to "marginal independence." It says, "with special schooling these educable retarded can learn the three R's. Special programs emphasizing social development and occupational training enable most of them to become self-supporting, contributing citizens. Able to manage their own affairs under normal circumstances, their need for help will be reduced to times of crisis or undue stress."

Another 4 of this 30 will become semidependent adults. Most may never learn to read or write but they can learn to take care of personal needs and help with tasks at home. Many will be able to work at simple jobs, in sheltered workshops or under supervision, some will be happiest and safest carrying on their lives in an institution with others like themselves. One child in thirty will always require nursing care.

Writing in our magazine, Performance, the former executive vice president of the National Association for Mental Health, said last May:

"Last year 165,000 people were discharged from public mental hospitals in the United States. At the very same time that these ex-patients were being discharged, another 80,000 were being readmitted. Many of these people, we know from experience, had to be readmitted because on their discharge they were thrown into an intolerable situation—a situation in which they were met with outright rejection, or were unable to find suitable living arrangements, or adequate followup medical care, or a suitable occupational situation.

"Rejection cuts deeply, whether it comes from a friend, a relative, or an employer. And when rejection is coupled with denial of the opportunity to earn a gainful living, and to enjoy the fulfillment of achievement, then it can be utterly devastating.

"Unfortunately, the former mental patient has an additional handicap to overcome, and that is the age-old stigma and prejudice which still attaches to mental illness, despite the almost miraculous changes in public attitudes during the past half dozen years. He may be fully recovered—retain no impairment whatever in his ability to perform adequately in his chosen occupation or profession. Yet, he will, in most instances, be denied his old job—or one of equal technical or professional level—because of persistent misconceptions about the permanence of mental illness.

"Yet, from experience we know that this unfortunate stereotype is unfounded and that the very great majority of recovered mental patients are as good as new, or at least as good as they were during the 10, 20, or 30 years they performed satisfactorily on the jobs they held before their breakdown, and the ones which are being denied to them on their return."

In a foreword to the excellent 1959 NAMH annual report, its president, Mrs. A. Felix DuPont, Jr., said:

"We are concerned not only with the sick, but with the well—not only with the relief and recovery of the 17 million Americans who suffer in varying degrees from mental and emotional illnesses, but also with the preservation of the mental health of the 150 million others.

"To carry out our task, we are relying on the American volunteer spirit—the spirit which already has drawn hundreds of thousands of dedicated men and women and thousands of membership organizations into mental health activity, and contributed so much toward alleviating the plight of the mentally ill. And as we face the future in this golden anniversary year, we share a philosophy of faith—faith in ourselves and in others; faith in the capacity of each person to improve and grow; faith in the essential decency of mankind."

Mental Health in America is 50 years old this year. We stand on a bridge halfway across a century, behind is much progress, ahead is a great challenge. I am sure that the Catholic women of America are equal to this challenge and that they will help do the things that need to be done in their States and communities.

There has been much on this subject in the Catholic press of late and both the Catholic Digest and the Family Digest have had feature stories. Lay people can do a great deal to help the professionals, as Mrs. DuPont so well said, both with children and adults. This is a heartland where women have raised magnificent monuments before and this certainly comes within the social-action field. You've done it before, you can do it again.

May I close with a prayer for the handicapped written by the Right Reverend Monsignor Paul A. Tanner, general secretary of the National Catholic Welfare Conference:

"God of mercy and compassion, make us understand that every man whom misfortune has touched is our neighbor. Help us by Thy grace to see that by ministering unto them, we really are serving Thee. In a materialistic age when men are infatuated by the cult of the body, restore in us a right mind which acknowledges in human personality absolute spiritual values far transcending mere physical integrity. Bless our efforts to persuade America to accord justice and equity to those souls among us who have been signed with the seal of calvary. As they courageously serve Thee, may we honor and assist them: All of us together working in redemptive charity toward the glorious advent of Thy eternal kingdom, wherein, as Isaias has said, 'The eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped; then shall the lame man leap as the hart, and the tongue of the dumb shall be free and the redeemed of the Lord shall return and shall come into Sion with praise, and everlasting joy shall be upon their heads.' Amen." (IS: 35; 5, 6, 10)

The Fight Against Obscene Literature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 13, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have recently introduced a bill, S. 1195, which would stiffen the penalties for dealers in obscene literature. I believe that this filthy business poses a very serious threat to the morality of our youth and population generally.

I have, in recent days, received many communications from my own State, and from other States, urging Federal action to combat this danger.

I hope the Senate will take speedy action on the bill I recently introduced. Yet, it is obvious that the solution to the problem is not only through Federal legislation: There is a need for community action; there is a need for action on the part of church groups. Most important of all, there is a need for greater responsibility on the part of parents.

In this connection, I would like to have placed in the RECORD an article which recently appeared in the Catholic Herald Citizen of February 18, 1961.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARENTS CAN TACKLE PROBLEM OF YOUTH AND SMUT AT MANY POINTS

(By Fr. John L. Thomas, S.J., assistant professor of sociology at St. Louis University)

"I have lately found that our 17-year-old son has been reading and exchanging sex magazines with his schoolmates. This has left us at a loss as to what has gone wrong and what should be done about it. Our son has a good Catholic education. How can

we best fight this in our home? These magazines are so easily accessible that it is impossible to keep our children from coming in contact with them in one way or another."

Your letter raises a problem that many modern parents will have to face up to realistically. I suppose there has always been a limited amount of obscene pictures and suggestive literature surreptitiously circulated among youth. But, at present such material is flooding the newstands and pouring through the mails in ever increasing volume.

Although we need not assume that young people are the principal consumers of this product, they are freely exposed to it at every turn. Granted the normal curiosity of youth in such matters, it is not surprising that some of them are tempted to become users.

What can parents do about it? The problem is highly complex, involving both social and individual, negative and positive aspects.

Yet, it can be dealt with effectively only if it is tackled at many different points. Let us consider them separately though they all must be included in an adequate program of action.

First, young people must be prepared to face this challenge as individuals. Such preparation requires that both parents and teachers take a positive approach in training youth for chastity. What does this mean?

Since chastity consists in following the order of right reason in the use of one's procreative faculties, young people must be helped to understand and appreciate the nature, function and purposes of sex, together with what might be called its mechanism of arousal or excitation.

This is to say that educators must have two major aims in training youth for chastity. Young people must be taught to regard sex as essentially lifegiving or precreative. The personal, social, and spiritual significance of sex is based on its relationship to the transmission of life.

The traditional negative approach to chastity, consisting of a series of don'ts, is so inadequate because it does not help people make sense of their sexual drives and powers.

The proper use of sex can be defined only in terms of its lifegiving purpose.

Training for chastity primarily involves an understanding and appreciation of sex as a procreative privilege, for this is the positive value that gives meaning and significance to the norms regulating proper use.

Further, educators must help youth acquire some understanding of the mechanisms of sexual arousal. Like all human faculties, sex responds to a definite set of stimuli.

The process is relatively simple; if the proper stimulus is received, the faculty responds by preparing for action.

Young people must be taught to recognize the usual sources of sexual stimulation. They must see the connection between what they think, see, hear, or do and sexual arousal.

This understanding is so important because one avoids sexual arousal by controlling the stimuli. Young people need careful instructions on this point, since lack of experience, curiosity, and the normal desire to manifest or receive affection frequently disguises the sexual nature of some stimuli.

Second, although your children are being adequately trained for chastity, they are still immature. Hence you must carefully guide their reading by providing good material and rejecting trash.

When your son brings home sex magazines, use this occasion to explain the connection between such material and sexual arousal. Speak plainly.

Explain that you understand youth's normal curiosity in such matters but point out that he is filling his mind with thoughts and images that are designed to cause sexual arousal.

That is their purpose. Why should he try to fool himself?

Remind him that he will be a man only when he has learned self-mastery in sex. If he continues to stimulate himself by such magazines, he cannot hope to control his sexual drives, for God has designed them to respond to such stimuli.

This is his problem and he must learn to face it honestly before God. You have only limited control over what he does outside the home.

Either he himself resolves to avoid such sources of temptation, or he is not sincere in his desire to serve Christ.

The third approach to the problem consists in an attempt to control the production and circulation of such magazines.

This must be a community effort in which all men of good will cooperate for the common good.

Current laws and court decisions render legal action quite ineffective, but community pressure can be a powerful force at the local level, and a concerted, intelligent long-range program supported by earnest citizens can bring the force of public opinion to bear on State and Federal legislatures.

As I have indicated the problem has many aspects. We need more adequate training for chastity, more vigilance on the part of parents, and an aroused public opinion that will support legal action.

Bear Creek Dam Prevents Serious Flooding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Hazleton, Pa., Plain Speaker of February 28, 1961, which reports the very gratifying and thankful news that the Bear Creek Dam has prevented serious flooding in Allentown and Bethlehem, Pa., as well as in other communities along the Lehigh River.

The article follows:

CREDIT BEAR CREEK DAM WITH PREVENTING FLOODS IN ALLENTOWN AND BETHLEHEM AREA

Allentown and Bethlehem and other communities along Lehigh River were saved from flooding yesterday because of the giant $11,700,000 dam at Bear Creek.

Efficacy of the mammoth reservoir as an impounding basis for rampaging flood waters of Lehigh River and its tributaries was put to a good test over the weekend for the first time since its completion. It came through with flying colors because it kept approximately 20 communities along 75 miles of the river from serious flooding.

Army Engineers, who built the huge 234-foot-high earthen dam over a 5-year period, reported the downstream industrial and population centers were spared flooding Sunday and yesterday because of the dam.

Sluice gates, at the intake end of the outlet tunnel, automatically went into operation last week, with the result that flow of murky water through the 16-foot tunnel was reduced to a minimum so floodstage downstream was minimized.

Spokesman for Army Engineers reported two of the 5-foot 8-inch by 10-foot gates were closed and a third was kept about one third closed to impound the water draining from a 288-square-mile area. Gates will remain closed until water passage below the dam returns to normal flow.

Water in the reservoir rose slowly until it leveled around 11 a.m. yesterday at an elevation of 1,353 feet above sea level—97 feet below the spillway crest of 1,450 feet.

Water was reported to have backed several miles from the dam, but it still had a long way to go to reach the reservoir's estimated 35-billion-gallon capacity. Army Engineers estimated the reservoir at 11 a.m. contained approximately 5,200 million gallons of water, slightly more than one-seventh of capacity.

Inasmuch as the dam was designed to cope with a 7-inch runoff of rain and melting snow, Army Engineers spokesman was quick to point out yesterday the reservoir could have taken a much greater deluge and still come through the test nicely.

Questioned as to how long the floodgates will be kept closed, he said it will depend upon the behavior of the river and its tributaries downstream from the dam. It is expected several days will elapse before the river will return to normal.

When the danger of flood has passed and the river stages have returned to normal, the floodwaters will be released gradually from behind the dam until the river resumes normal flow. The dam is designed to create a 90-acre conservation pool for recreation purposes at elevation 1,300 feet, but for the present the reservoir will be kept empty.

Item Veto for President Is One Method of Halting Waste and Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1961

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I have three resolutions pending in committee which would authorize the item veto authority for the President. No action has been taken on these resolutions, but I find growing support for the item veto as a method of controlling government spending and curbing the inflationary spiral.

Another case in point is a recent editorial in the Muscatine (Iowa) Journal entitled "Item Veto for President Is One Method of Halting Waste and Inflation." Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that this editorial appear in the Appendix of the RECORD:

ITEM VETO FOR PRESIDENT IS ONE METHOD OF HALTING WASTE AND INFLATION

Waste and inflation have no declared friends, but many of their alleged enemies back policies that actually aid these evils.

One way to reduce wasteful expenditure has been suggested for many years without getting anywhere, the latest attempt being by President Eisenhower.

This is a permission for the President to veto single items in appropriation bills in-

stead of, as now, having to take the whole bill or veto it all.

This is no new power to American Government. Some State governors have it. It was contained in the constitution of the Confederacy, whose draughtsmen had had long observation of the operations of Congress.

Congress has even included it in drawing up the framework of government of our territories and insular possessions.

It is to his credit that Representative FRED SCHWENGEL of the First Iowa Congressional District has renewed his efforts in the present session of Congress to obtain item veto for the President.

Opinions differ as to whether giving the President this power would require a constitutional amendment, or whether a mere new law would suffice. SCHWENGEL has introduced resolutions leading to a constitutional amendment.

However, the sufficiency of an ordinary statute was strongly maintained a quarter of a century ago by Michigan's noted Senator, Arthur Vandenberg.

But there is one huge obstacle: This would involve getting through a measure which would reduce "pork barrel" items.

This is a mighty undertaking.

Appeasement in Canal Zone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, as the result of personal experience over a period of years, I have noted two types of sources of information as to matters affecting the Canal Zone, especially relations with the Republic of Panama.

One of these is the body of United States citizens resident on the isthmus, who also know what they report. A second group consists of our diplomats accredited to Panama and certain other officials who either act under instructions or seem bent on currying favor.

The latter never lose an opportunity to wine and dine official delegations of our country, thus contributing toward denying the Congress and the Nation an accurate picture of the situation. With rare exceptions, our controlled press and other news media have likewise served to propagandize policies inimical to the best interests of the United States and to make our career employees objects of contempt.

As evidence of what has been, and still is, going on on the isthmus, I quote a letter to the editor published in the March 8, 1961, issue of the Panama American, the leading afternoon newspaper on the isthmus:

APPEASEMENT IN CANAL ZONE REACHES THE LIMIT

SIR: There is an opinion abroad that the United States is losing the Panama Canal Zone. If that should occur, it will be a loss by default—by the failure of those who are charged with protecting U.S. interests to exercise the authority which has been vested in them and thus comply with their duty.

I do not suggest that this is the only reason. There is one, equally as convincing, which is the determination of the commies, pinkos, and others of the Alger Hiss vintage in the State Department, who appear determined to dismember the United States completely and make a gift of its rights to other countries and persons.

Let me cite one example of what I have in mind. Some years ago, it was the custom of the Canal Zone Police to maintain a patrolman on duty at "the Limit." What could be more natural and proper than that? "The Limit" is a most sensitive point where the U.S. jurisdiction ends and the jurisdiction of the sovereign Republic of Panama begins.

During the past few weeks, it has become painfully apparent that there is no Canal Zone policeman at "the Limit." That area now is overrun by howling, insulting, rock-throwing, and club wielding youngsters who appear to have taken complete charge of the Canal Zone at that point.

These shrieking urchins and others run in front of automobiles and navigate around on skates creating a menace to traffic and to themselves. One of their favorite tricks is to stop in front of an automobile and prevents its progress. Their attitude is eloquent of the new position, "Yes, white man, you run me down and see what Lumumba will do to you."

You will never be able to prove this, but I venture to suggest that the Canal Zone Police no longer are stationed at that point because they wish to avoid trouble by the ostrich method of burying their heads in the sand and saying, "Breach of the peace? Disturbance of the public order? Can't see none nohow."

I did not see this myself but a most reliable person told me of having observed a gang of youths shouting insults at a Canal Zone policeman in a patrol car on the road which leads to the new bridge. When nothing happened, they became bolder and threw rocks at the police vehicle.

Frankly, I never thought I'd live to see the day.

While it is pretty obvious that the State Department Reds, do-gooders and one-worlders are conspiring to give the Canal Zone to Panama, it seems to me that while the United States still retains technical jurisdiction over that area, such authority should be exercised in furtherance of the interests and in the upholding of the dignity of the United States.

This is not being done. Now the Canal Zone Police appear to be reluctant to arrest a Panamanian in the Canal Zone, no matter what he has done. They are still eager and willing, however, to produce a grim curl of lip and a harsh word for their fellow Americans who may have incurred some breach of the traffic regulations.

Not only that, let some of our American youngsters begin to play around on Canal Zone streets like those Panamanians do in the U.S. jurisdiction at "the Limit" and rapid action would be taken.

With all that, I find it difficult to be critical of the zone police. They have been publicly chided in court for doing their duty where Panamanians were involved, and without official backing they become the accused and not the accusers, even where they are unquestionably in the right.

All of this appeasement, of course, is in accordance with the current U.S. policy as dictated by the State Department. "Whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn unto him the other also."

This, comrades, is our meat.

MICHAEL MUNICH.

Our Incredible Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 13, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the American farmer—through greater efficiency—including the advantages of the technological revolution—has written the greatest food production success story in the history of the world.

Over the years, the volume of production has increased tremendously, while the farm population has reduced substantially. In 1916, for example, there were 32 million persons on U.S. farms. By contrast, in 1959, there were only about 15.6 million persons on the farms, including about 5.8 million production workers. Yet, these fewer farmers produced an abundance—yes, and a surplus—of food for consumers of this country, now totaling 180 million—as well as feeding hungry mouths elsewhere in the world.

In comparison with agriculture in the Soviet Union, also, the U.S. farmer is doing a tremendous job in greater efficiency and volume of output.

Regrettably, success, in far too many instances, has meant hardship rather than reward. Why? Because a small margin of surplus over consumption levels unfortunately creates a supply—demand imbalance that results in a depression of farm prices—and thus, ultimately, the income of the American farmer.

I am hopeful that soon a realistic solution can be found.

The outstanding record of the American farmer—particularly in national emergencies—in producing its most vital resource—food—warrants, I believe, are favorable—not an unfavorable—reaction of the people of the Nation.

Recently, the Milwaukee Journal published an informative article, putting the production picture of U.S. agriculture in better perspective.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article entitled "Our Incredible Farmers," printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR INCREDIBLE FARMERS

Government figures show that the Nation's total farm population as of last April was only 15,635,000—a little more than 8 percent of our 180 million people.

On this farm population only 5,800,000 are actually engaged as production workers. This relatively small group is producing so much food and fiber that it results in surpluses such as the world has never seen.

Soviet Russia, by comparison, has half of its population on farms—and does not meet its needs in food and fiber. This results in a national standard of living much below that which Premier Khrushchev says is needed.

Our greatest agricultural population was reported in 1916, when there were 32 million persons on farms. The figure today is just about what it was at the time of the Civil war—when the total population was 31,440,000. In other words, just 100 years ago it took half of our people to produce food and fiber for a much lower standard of living than we have today. We were in the position Russia is now.

It all makes Khrushchev's boast that Russia will overtake us in standard of living by 1965 sound a bit hollow.

The Confectionery Industry in Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the manufacture of confectionery products occupies an important place in the economy of my State of Massachusetts. In fact, this industry is 1 of the 10 leading manufacturing industries on the Bay State, employing about 10,000 of our population. I believe the following facts may be pertinent in demonstrating the importance of maintaining this industry in a sound economic position, not only so far as it concerns Massachusetts, but the economy of the Nation as a whole:

FACTS ABOUT THE CONFECTIONERY INDUSTRY IN MASSACHUSETTS—REVISED TO DECEMBER 1958

Confectionery manufacturing is one of the 10 leading manufacturing industries in Massachusetts.

There are 155 manufacturing confectioners in Massachusetts including 30 manufacturing wholesalers and 125 manufacturing retailers.

For many years Massachusetts ranked first in the manufacturing of candy and still is the leading center for packaged chocolate candies.

The candy produced in Massachusetts has a retail value in excess of $200 million.

Massachusetts produces about 12 percent of all candy made in the United States with only Illinois, Pennsylvania and New York exceeding that percentage.

Capital invested in real estate, machinery, inventory and other assets is in excess of $50 million (not including rented property which is quite substantial.)

There are approximately 10,000 employed in the industry of whom 3,500 are men and 6,500 women.

The total payroll is in excess of $25 million. Wages are in line with prevailing rates of other industries.

Massachusetts candy manufacturers use millions of dollars of dairy and agricultural products produced or processed in part at least in Massachusetts: 13,500,000 pounds of milk, butter, eggs; 143 million pounds of sugar; 79 million pounds of corn syrup; 18 million pounds of peanuts; and 5 million pounds of tree nuts.

Massachusetts candy manufacturers also use vast quantities of fruits, flavoring materials from domestic sources and cocoa beans, coconut and other products grown in other parts of the world.

On the candy consuming side of this picture, 83 million pounds with a retail sales value of $60 million are eaten annually in Massachusetts.

Communism? A "New" Continent Wants To Look at It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1961

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, Judd Arnett, one of the top reporters of the Detroit Free Press, was sent to Africa by the Free Press to cover the trip of G. Mennen Williams, Assistant Secretary of State for Africa. In my judgment, his views as expressed in a recent column should be of interest to everyone:

(By Judd Arnett)

LEOPOLDVILLE, THE CONGO.—I have just returned from a walk to the American Embassy and en route a thought recurred that has haunted me in other cities:

This must have been the way our South looked, sounded, and "felt" immediately after the Civil War.

For, all at once, the African has been swept up in an enormous tide of independence. In most instances, he is no more prepared for it than the American Negro was in 1865, but there is this difference:

For better or worse, the white man is finished on this continent.

Oh, some will stay here in subordinate official capacities or as merchants or technicians, but from now on "Africa for Africans" will be just what the British suspect—the black man will be calling the tune.

I do not argue against the justice of this. After all, of the estimated 200,000,000 inhabitants of Africa, fewer than 6,000,000 are European or Asian. This continent belongs to the natives and, at long, long last, they are coming into their heritage.

But there is also this for an American to consider:

Will the self-determination now evolving be to our liking? For the product of our genius and toil—dollars—will we receive any guarantee that the emergency governments will stand with us in the moral and political conflicts yet to be waged on behalf of freedom?

Frankly, with a few exceptions I am pessimistic to the point of depression.

AND HERE'S WHY

African leaders are the next thing to brazen in their demands for aid without obligation.

Surely, most of them understand that their countries are already involved in the cold war. But they pretend that this is not true and in the process pit one side against the other, saying:

"If the United States does not help us, Russia will."

Generally speaking, Africans have little understanding of the ideologies separating the free world from communism. This is unfortunate. But far worse, and of far more danger to the ultimate triumph of freedom, is the fact that many African leaders are determined to discover for themselves what communism is all about.

They are perfectly willing to run the horrible risks of such contamination.

This is not the hasty observation of a reporter who has been exposed to too much African sun. To the contrary, it is the studied opinion of one of the few great men of this continent—Julius Nyerere, the political and spiritual leader of Tanganyika, who has been acclaimed in the United Nations for his wisdom and courage.

Before leaving Dar es Salaam a few days ago, I had the opportunity to talk at length with Mr. Nyerere. He told me this: "The leaders of Africa will demand a definition of communism before they will be willing to agree that it is dangerous."

Other quotations from the same conversation:

"Many African leaders will ultimately agree that they cannot accept the position that the Russians must be locked out of Africa. * * *

"This will be their conclusion even though they have some realization of the fate of other nations—Poland and Hungary included—that fell within the Red orbit. * * *

"African leaders know that only 40 years ago the Soviet Union was a primitive country. They realize that within this span two great wars have been fought on Russian soil. Yet, despite its late start and the conflicts that ravaged it, Russia is now challenging for world leadership.

"For these reasons, Africans refuse to accept the statement that they have nothing to learn from communism. They are convinced the Russians must have something in their philosophy beyond ruthlessness."

Julius Nyerere is not a communist—his country is the least inclined in that direction. But he is a realist and better than most men, he knows the African mind.

A CITY SLEEPS

At night, Leopoldville is a ghost city. The brilliantly lighted streets of the downtown area are deserted. The restaurants languish from lack of trade. The white man, entrenched in the lovely homes of the residential districts or packing the hotels to absolute capacity, keeps to himself. The African retires to his own devices, too.

But with the coming of a new day, the African emerges to dominate the city. Scores take station in front of the hotel entrances and offer "services" of every conceivable nature. Sitting at a sidewalk cafe, you are approached by children begging alms, by men with cheap trinkets to sell, by persistent newsboys, by countless others on the make. On my walk to the Embassy this morning, I was confronted with a dozen implorations.

The African is everywhere, doing the best he can for the nonce—and waiting. For what? Why, for the "fruits of independence" to show themselves.

And unlettered as he is, he, too, will accept the best deal he can get and the sooner the better.

The Communists know this and that is why they are practically everywhere. I have been in Africa. They are in Ethiopia, Somalia, Kenya, Uganda, Zanzibar—now they are in Zanzibar—and here in the Congo, although underground in this immediate area for the moment.

This society—at loose ends, disillusioned with "freedom," unemployed, restless, frustrated, angry, jealous of the possessions of the race it greatly outnumbers—well, it seems made to order for the anarchy of communism.

Hon. William F. Norrell

SPEECH
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1961

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most respected Members of this body has been called to his reward. BILL NORRELL was a man of principle who could always be counted upon to act with courage and wisdom. He disdained the petty things, and always voted and acted in terms of what was best for the country. The country needs more men of that caliber today.

This great American will be missed. His wise counsel and his sober judgment will no longer be available. But his principles and his philosophy will be remembered, and they will continue for a long time to inspire many of us.

I join with BILL NORRELL's many friends in extending to the family my deepest sympathy.

Lifting Ban on Russian Canned Crab

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 17, 1961

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, the Russian political offensive to spread its Communist ideology and control throughout the world is being matched by its economic offensive which is becoming of increasing concern to all of us. From its rapid construction of vast hydroelectric projects and reportedly accelerated gold mining to increase the monetary impact of the ruble, to intensive exploration and exploitation of the resources of the seven seas, the Russians are forging ahead.

In speaking of the resources of the ocean I refer to a subject which has come uncomfortably close to home. Because the Russians have for 2 years now operated a massive trawling fleet in the Bering Sea, capturing bottom fish on a large scale, which they have a right to do in the international waters involved, those of us interested in the great wealth of the North Pacific fisheries have developed a mounting and frustrating concern. This concern became enhanced when the Russians last year expanded their activities to the taking of king crab from the Bering Sea and processing the crabmeat on mother ships. Russian ocean exploration was also expanded. The Russians have now stated that their next move will be exploration of the Gulf of Alaska, the site of halibut banks long fished almost exclusively by United States and Canadian fishermen.

It has been bad enough to watch these developments backed by the Russian Government as against the feeble efforts of privately owned and operated fishing vessels of the United States, but the worst recent development is the declared intention of the Department of the Treasury to lift the ban on Russian canned crabmeat. This ban was effectuated 10 years ago because Russian caught crab was being canned by convict labor. Now that this practice has been reportedly discontinued, the Treasury Department is all set to lift the ban. Presumably, of course, the consideration for such a step was weighed against the impact upon our own crabmeat industry which produces about 29 percent of crabmeat consumed in the United States. Perhaps also our own producers, who are expanding their crabmeat enterprises, can be protected by realistic quotas, but on this score I have been given no assurance whatsoever. Even if such assurance were given, I feel that this latest concession to Russia is not warranted, if only for the following reason: The North Pacific Fisheries Convention between the United States, Canada, and Japan will expire in 2 years. Under this convention the Japanese have limited their high seas salmon fishery to an area of the North Pacific west of a provisional line set at 175 degrees west longitude. Through tagging and other research, it has been determined that many salmon caught by the Japanese in their presently prescribed area are spawned in Alaskan streams. It has also been established that many are spawned in Russian streams and that the Japanese North Pacific fishery has a considerable impact upon the Russian coastal salmon fishery as great, if not greater, than the impact of such Japanese fishing upon Alaska's Bristol Bay red salmon runs. It is my considered opinion that about 2 years hence, when United States negotiators will be working with the Japanese toward revision and extension of the North Pacific Fishery Convention, they will have to reckon with the Russians one way or the other and that a reappraisal of the whole subject will have to be brought to bear. Therefore, I strongly oppose the Treasury Department's proposal to lift the ban on Russian caught crabmeat at this time, which will not only encourage Russian exploitation of the great king crab resource of the Bering Sea off the coast of Alaska, but weaken the bargaining position of the United States in the approaching clash of interests with the Russians in regard to the utilization and conservation of the fisheries of the North Pacific.

Miguel Ydigoras Fuentes: President of Guatemala

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the course of my studies of the countries of the Caribbean and other nations of Latin America, I have become increasingly conscious of the statesman-like stature of their leaders and the parts that they are playing in resisting conquest of the Americas through subversion by the world revolutionary force known as the international communistic conspiracy.

Outstanding among these statesmen is President Miguel Ydigoras Fuentes of Guatemala, whose grasp of the current crisis and capacity to surmount its dangers have been proved by his effective handling of an attempted invasion of his country.

On the weekly broadcast of the Manion Forum Network on February 26, 1961, in an exclusive interview with Marilyn Manion, distinguished daughter of Dean Clarence Manion, President Ydigoras Fuentes emphasized that intervention by Communists in Cuba in the internal affairs of other countries of the Western Hemisphere must be stopped.

In order to give the stirring message of President Ydigoras Fuentes wider circulation, I quote it as part of these remarks:

THE MENACE OF COMMUNISM IN CUBA

Dean MANION. When we are considering the grave danger of Communist footholds in the Western Hemisphere, it is important to remember that Cuba is not the first Latin American country to be victimized by a Communist government. The first direct hit by the big guns of the Communist conspiracy in the Western Hemisphere was made upon the Republic of Guatemala.

The Red penetration of Guatemala began when Juan Jose Arevalo assumed power in that country in 1944. When Arevalo was succeeded as President by Moscow-trained Jacobo Arbenz Guzman in 1950, the Communist conquistadores came out into the open in Guatemala and instituted a typical Red reign of terror.

Like his Communist prototypes in Russia, China, and Cuba, Arbenz posed as an "agrarian reformer." In his ruthless execution of the Communist blueprint, private property was confiscated, while Guatemalan patriots were being jailed, persecuted, tortured, and killed. As is now the case in Communist Cuba, all of the resulting trouble and confusion was blamed by the Communist government upon the greed of the rich and the imperialistic exploitation of the United States.

In 1954 the 10th conference of pan-American governments assembled in Caracas, Venezuela. This convention declared officially that communism is incompatible with American freedom and that the domination or control of any American state by the internationalist Communist movement would require strong counter measures.

As expected, the delegation representing the Arbenz government of Guatemala strenuously objected to this resolution and recorded the only vote cast against it. Shortly thereafter Arbenz received a big shipment of arms directly from the Communist government of Poland (May 17, 1954). Our then Secretary of State, Mr. John Foster Dulles, declared publicly that these Polish weapons would enable the already heavily armed Communist government of Guatemala "to dominate the Central American area" and "to threaten the Panama Canal" (London Economist, May 29, 1954).

Nevertheless, it soon became evident that the oppressed patriotic people of Guatemala were ready and anxious to risk everything in a desperate effort to free themselves from the Kremlin-directed apparatus that had taken possession of their incomparably beautiful country.

Significantly, on May 19, 1954, Guatemala's next door neighbor, Nicaragua, severed diplomatic relations with the Arbenz government. Alarmed by the signs and portents of revolution that were becoming evident in and around Guatemala, Arbenz appealed to to the United Nations for intervention and protection.

At the U.N. the Kremlin's stooges promptly echoed the hue and cry against "imperialist aggression" that was threatening the "peaceful" government of Guatemala. Fortunately, before the U.N. could act, Guatemalan patriots, led by the distinguished Col. Castillo Armas, penetrated Guatemala from Honduras on June 18, 1954, and began their historic march toward the capital of their country.

From all sides the people of Guatemala rose up to join and support the anti-Communist revolutionary army. The entrenched Communists fought bitterly, but the valor and determination of the patriotic tide was too much for them.

SUCCESSFUL ANTI-COMMUNIST REVOLUTION STAGED IN GUATEMALA

When Arbenz saw that his Red jig was up, he took all the money remaining in the Guatemalan treasury that he could lay his hands on and fled to the protection of Communist Czechoslovakia. In a few weeks Castillo Armas became the new President of Guatemala and thus the first, and to date, the only successful anti-Communist revolution staged anywhere since the end of World War II became history.

In officially acclaiming the success of the Guatemalan revolution, Secretary of State Dulles bitterly castigated the Soviet Government for its sustained attempt to establish the Arbenz government as a Communist foothold in the Western Hemisphere. A few years later the Kremlin got its revenge for this public humiliation. On July 26, 1957, Guatemalan President Castillo Armas, the hero of the anti-Communist revolution, was assassinated by a Communist agent.

But in spite of the death of its revolutionary hero, the anti-Communist determination of Guatemala has remained firm to this day. Because of this determination and because of its distinctive history as the one country on earth to break the chains of Communist tyranny, Guatemala is an indispensable key point in the delineation of strategy for the destruction of Communist control in Cuba.

We, the people of the United States, need to know a great deal more than we do about the freedom-loving people of Guatemala who have suffered terribly from the disease of Communism and want no more of the same.

What about the present government of Guatemala? Is it operating in the militant anti-Communist spirit of Castillo Armas? Is it duly apprehensive about the Kremlin's menacing penetration of Cuba?

I switch you now to the capital city of Guatemala where my daughter, Marilyn Manion, is transcribing an exclusive interview with the President of the Republic of Guatemala. Here is Marilyn Manion.

MARILYN MANION. I am here in Guatemala City with the distinguished President of Guatemala, President Miguel Ydigoras Fuentes. Preisdent Ydigoras has graciously consented to say a few words to the people of the United States, through the radio facilities of the Manion Forum, about the threat of communism in Latin America. Your Excellency, what is your opinion regarding the danger posed to the Americas by the Communist forces in Cuba?

SOVIET BLOC IN CUBA DANGER TO PRESERVATION OF PEACE

President YDIGORAS. The presence of civilian and military forces of the Soviet bloc on the island of Cuba signifies not only an imminent danger to the preservation of peace for the American hemisphere, but also constitutes a flagrant assault on Inter-American solidarity. There is no doubt that the treacherous designs of the Communists go beyond the protection of their satellite in the Caribbean. It is urgent, therefore, to take prophylactic measures to prevent the spread of this terrible disease.

MARILYN MANION. Mr. President, would your government back the necessary measures to reestablish a free government in Cuba—for instance, would you recognize and support a responsible Cuban Government in exile? Would you favor a "pacific" blockade of Cuba to prevent free countries trading with this Communist government?

President YDIGORAS. My government respects the principle of nonintervention in the internal affairs of other nations. But it is no longer a secret that for communism and its Soviet directors this principle has no meaning. There insolence has carried them to the extreme of pentrating our American Continent, where they have taken over control of the destiny of the island of Cuba.

But they are not content with that. They continue to attempt to invade new territories. Panama and Nicaragua, for example. And they wished to do the same in Guatemala. But here we were—and shall be, always—prepared to receive them as they deserve and throw them back into the ocean. Our democracy will know how to defend itself from Communist aggression at any time and under any conditions.

INTERVENTION BY CUBAN COMMUNISTS MUST BE STOPPED

Peru, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, and Brazil, among other countries in South America; Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Panama, and recently El Salvador, in Central America, have accused Cuba of trying to intervene in their internal affairs. Nonintervention, then, is respected only by the democracies. Urgent measures must be taken by our side to stop the attempts at intervention of the Cuban Communists.

Perhaps the most adequate and proper would be that an inter-American congress face up to the problem. Or, considering the nature of the problem, charge the Inter-American Defense Board with its solution.

MARILYN MANION. Mr. President, I am sure that the millions who hear this broadcast would appreciate your frank recommendations as to how my country, the United States, could help the people of Guatemala and of other Central American countries to resist the attempt by the Communists to conquer and enslave such free republics as Guatemala. What are your opinions?

President YDIGORAS. The best way in which the United States could help the people of Guatemala and of other countries of Central America would be:

(a) Paying good prices for our raw materials and products, such as coffee, bananas, sugar, meat, citronella, lumber, seafood, and so forth.;

(b) Make available long-term loans to encourage the development of agriculture, light industry, transportation and culture. Our peoples, through their governments, need sufficient funds for the development of programs of social justice, health, better nourishment, sources of employment, social welfare, social security, education, housing, land reform, and so forth.

All this would help our peoples to resolve their most immediate problems, thereby destroying the false and demagogic approach of the Communists, who would offer anything in their attempt to enslave humanity.

We have a great deal of hope in the administrative program of the new President of the United States of North America, Mr. John F. Kennedy. We trust that he will understand us better and comprehend that the responsibility for the struggle against the Communist danger is not ours alone, and that his great Nation must help our developing countries, because the seed of communism flourishes in poverty, whereas democracy prevails when standards of living reach a higher level for our peoples.

We are anti-Communists by conviction, because we know the evil of that doctrine and the effects of the tyranny of the dictatorship of the proletariat. But in order to fight communism we need better means to enable us to extend the advantages of democracy throughout our land.

MARILYN MANION. For the Manion Forum and for all of my fellow citizens of the United States, I wish to thank you sincerely, President Miguel Ydigoras Fuentes, of of Guatemala, for this frank and helpful contribution to the cause of continued freedom for Guatemala and for the U.S.A. I now return you to my father, Dean Manion, in South Bend, Ind., U.S.A.

Dean MANION. Thank you, Marilyn Manion. We are deeply obliged to you, Mr. President Miguel Ydigoras Fuentes, of Guatemala, for this message to the American people. The whole world has reason to be proud of your wonderful country for its spirited and singularly successful resistance to what you have so aptly described as the terrible disease of communism.

You may be sure that this direct message from you will strengthen our resolution strongly to support our Government in its every proper effort to remove this deadly plague from your doorstep and our own, where it now ravishes and despoils the neighboring island of Cuba. Beyond that, rest assured that we will all work and pray to prevent the reappearance of this disease in your own lovely country.

Our hearty congratulations once more upon Guatemala's patriotic deliverance from this scourge of tyranny that now grips more than a third of the world.

From my observations here, Mr. President, I know that the people of the United States are united with your own people of Guatemala in firm determination that this menace to God-given freedom will not be tolerated in this hemisphere.

J.F.K. and Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, to a very large extent this Nation's basic wealth and progress has stemmed from its natural resources.

The San Francisco Examiner, in a recent editorial, has succinctly expressed the sentiments of many Californians regarding President Kennedy's natural resources message and I believe that it is pertinent to have this sentiment brought to the attention of the Congress:

J.F.K. AND CONSERVATION

The program proposed by President Kennedy for the conservation of national resources embodies a great volume of good news for California, and the entire West. The bulk of the remaining undeveloped resources of the Nation are in the West. The time is short for effective conservation. The President's grasp of the problem is remarkably complete, considering his brief period of responsibility and the sparse opportunities for study and appraisal.

The endorsement of the Point Reyes National Seashore project is particularly pleasing to northern California, where a 30-year fight at last has the scent of victory. With the subdivision bulldozers already moving in, the air of last chance hangs heavily over the project.

The larger wilderness program, preserving the Nation's dwindling resources of wild lands, is the heart of western aspirations to keep the American heritage of scenic and natural beauty intact.

In the fields of air and water pollution, flood control, and desalination, where the Federal Government is already heavily committed, the President's message offers the prospect of even more Federal action.

An especially important prospect that emerges from his brisk rejection of the old Federal policy of "no new starts" in

water conservation is that California may expect with new hope and confidence that the Feather River project will be given additional Federal financial support.

President Kennedy has moved forward swiftly and earnestly and with exceptional vision in all these matters. He is obviously impressed with their urgency. Delay in the fulfillment of his purpose inflates the ultimate costs of conservation, but even more than that it means the loss of opportunities that will never come again. The Congress should act with the same sense of urgency on these matters that the President has displayed in reporting on them.

Coordinated Water Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the most vital problems facing my great State of California is the adequate and timely development of our vast water resources. The people of California have voted to bond themselves in the amount of $1,750 million to initiate a statewide water development program.

All elements of our economy including local, State and Federal Government and private enterprise must work closely together in order to achieve our goals. To convey to this Congress the position of our State legislators, I would like to insert herewith two statements on water policy presented to the Governor by the following five State Senators: Hon. Stanley Arnold, Hon. Carl L. Christensen, Hon. George Miller, Jr., Hon. Virgil O'Sullivan, and Hon. Stephen P. Teale:

STATEMENT ON WATER POLICY

California voters have agreed, under proposition No. 1, to bond themselves for a series of water projects. These projects, they were assured, would add up to a balanced statewide plan.

But, the $1.75 billion in bonds is not enough to complete all the works that were promised. The State's consultants have confirmed this. So, this program for the vital future development of California is in trouble.

We face two choices:

1. Either our State water policy is to remain singular and static. We can continue to hold to "go it alone" concepts.

2. Or California, as the fastest growing State in the Nation, can join the New Frontier. We can play a dynamic role in supplementing a Federal water development plan for all the Western States.

This is not a hard choice.

Obviously, we should avail ourselves of the assistance of the Federal Government, as Western States have in the development of water resources throughout this century. This is the right choice. This is the historical choice. The current state of our national economy demands it.

This choice means that the keystone of the State water plan, No. 1 project in proposition No. 1—Oroville Dam—can and must be built. It can be built without delay and it must be built as a true multipurpose project. It should be built as a Federal reclamation project.

We point out there is precedent for Federal-State cooperation in California for the construction of Federal multipurpose projects. Black Butte Dam on Stony Creek and New Hogan Dam on the Calaveras River were initiated with funds advanced by our State and are being constructed by the Federal Government. The San Luis project is on a combined Federal-State basis.

Let Oroville Dam be the first of a new series of needed cooperative Federal-State projects to develop our natural resources.

In addition to Oroville Dam, there are a host of eligible fresh Federal starts. Within the system proposed by the State there are a number of works in which there is high Federal interest. Federal agencies are studying problems in the San Francisco Bay and the delta area. Surveys have been made by government agencies of virtually every stream and water course in California.

STATE FUNDS INADEQUATE

We point out that our State government simply does not have the money, in any available bond fund, tax revenues, or other financial resources, to complete the program promised to the people of California.

Furthermore, our State needs a dynamic program of development. We need an expanded industrial, agricultural, and commercial base to accommodate our exploding population. Without water, our economy faces stagnation.

Right now, California is caught in the throes of a nationwide business recession. Five great areas in our State already have been classified as distressed. Throughout the State more than 5 percent of our working force—1 man out of each 20—cannot find a job. An accelerated construction program for needed water development would help close this employment gap.

HISTORIC PARALLEL

There was a parallel situation in the 1930's, when the State of California, by itself, planned with a $170 million bond issue approved by the voters to undertake a basic water program. But funds were short and the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation constructed the Central Valley project.

To date, more than $1.3 billion of Federal money have been invested in California water development. The State's central valley project bonds are still held in reserve.

BROAD COOPERATION

We believe our State government should cooperate with intensified Federal efforts in the whole field of water and other resources development.

SALINE CONVERSION BREAKTHROUGH

This would include a crash program for a breakthrough in the conversion of saline and brackish waters. Scientists tell us that while such a breakthrough may be 10 or more years away, intensified work would bring that date closer. The timing of this breakthrough could very well have important international significance.

A successful, economic conversion process would mean a source of water supplies for our population which faces the Pacific Ocean, especially to meet the demands for more industrial and domestic water use. Any surpluses that result from present sources could be diverted to the interior areas, particularly for agricultural use.

RESEARCH, WATER DEVELOPMENT, AND NEW SOURCES OF POWER

This kind of water development is tied in with the creation of new sources of power. We commend to Federal interest the research talent available in California in our State and private institutions for the coming breakthrough in the fields of solar and nuclear energy and their application to water development and conservation.

IMPORTANCE OF OROVILLE DAM

Oroville Dam fits precisely the standards for a Federal project. Its construction by the Government would mean reasonable rates for water users, and the low-cost power the dam would produce could be taken by the State, as a preference customer, for use in the remainder of the State system.

The Oroville project, however, should supplement, not replace other Federal projects in California on which advanced planning has gone forward.

WATER CONSERVATION PROJECTS AND THE DELTA

For example, we commend to Federal authorities, the Auburn Dam project on the American River, the Folsom-South Canal project, Nashville and New Melones Dams in the proposed Eastside development, and Bullard's Bar Dam on the Yuba River. We look forward to Federal activity on California's north coastal streams.

These are water conservation projects—and only by building upstream water conservation projects can we provide enough water to maintain the great Sacramento-San Joaquin delta's economy. To rob water from the delta before additional water supplies are added would be an engineering and political mistake of immeasurable consequence.

END THE ARIZONA DISPUTE

A go-it-alone philosophy has for too long been the rule in California water policies. A "good neighbor" water development program must be inaugurated in the West. This means, for instance, an end to disputes that led to costly litigation such as that between California and Arizona. Experience has shown that lawsuits, expensive to the taxpayer, do not develop one additional drop of water. Cooperation will.

THE GOAL: A COORDINATED PROGRAM

We repeat that our immediate goal is the welding of a combined Federal-State water conservation program. We point out that California should join other States in the great western region to accomplish this. We believe that our California plans should be carefully fitted into an integrated program of development for all the West.

The new Democratic administration in Washington has promised to sweep away stand-pat policies of the previous administration. For 8 years a ban has been enforced on the initiation of wealth-producing and job-creating resource projects in the Western United States. This ban will now be lifted.

We therefore call upon the Governor of California and other State officials, as well as our U.S. Senators and Congressmen, to put before the new administration in Washington, a proposal to bring the Federal Government into a coordinated program with California and its neighbor States for full development of our western water resources.

STATEMENT ON WATER POLICY—II

Since our December 22 statement on water policy which called for California to take the lead in proposing a Federal-State coordinated program for full development of our water resources, these events have cast their consequences westward toward Sacramento:

1. A new Chief Executive, committed to strong national purpose, has taken office.

2. In his state of the Union message, President Kennedy pointed out the problem of our dwindling clean water supply, as well as our neglect of saline water conversion—a field where we stated a crash program should become a vital part of any Federal-State cooperation effort in water development.

3. A Presidential task force recommended:

(a) Earliest possible action to authorize Federal flood control projects.

(b) Easier requirements for localities to qualify for flood control, power, and reclamation projects built under Federal authorization.

(c) Development of long-range research programs for conversion of saline and brackish waters.

(d) Establishment of a Council of Resource and Conservation Advisers in the President's Office.

4. The U.S. Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources issued a report urging Federal and State cooperation for the full development of river basins.

5. The House of Representatives Science Committee warned the Nation must start new stepped-up research programs on converting salt water into fresh water. (Previously, we commended "to Federal interest the research talent available in California in our State and private institutions for the coming breakthrough in the fields of solar and nuclear energy and their applications to water development and conservation".)

6. Also, in his state of the Union message, President Kennedy promised a separate message to the Congress outlining a program to increase the development of our natural resources.

7. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers put an end to stripping trees along the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta channels and levees.

8. The U.S. Bureau of Reclamation instituted an engineering review of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta.

9. Congressional bills to meet the Federal-State commitments for Black Butte Dam and New Hogan Dam are in the hopper.

10. California Senators and Congressmen are busy with additional Federal flood control legislation.

All this has happened on the Federal side.

What signs of cooperation do we see from the State side?

Will the State administration and the Department of Water Resources move in the direction of a Federal-State coordinated water development program?

If a request for Federal assistance can be made in the field of metropolitan transit problems, why not for statewide water development?

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

Our earlier Statement on Water Policy dealt with the timely opportunity of availing ourselves of the assistance of Federal Government financial and technical resources, the reasons why Oroville Dam—No. 1 project in proposition No. 1—should be built as a multipurpose project on a combined Federal-State basis. It gave proof why upstream water conservation projects for full basic development policy, as antirecession measures, are needed to maintain the industrial and agricultural economy of the upstream and the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta areas.

Two parallel problems in the field of water conservation deserve special emphasis. They are flood damage and water pollution, both prime areas for Federal-State cooperation.

FLOOD CONTOL

State support of the present flood control system is essential to help protect us until such time as upstream water conservation projects are constructed.

Present flood control measures are merely stopgaps. These measures must be augmented by additional storage dams for flood control and multipurpose dams with full flood control features. State participation in a larger program, promised in proposition No. 1 is essential now.

Nationally known authorities find that flood damage is at its highest level in history, despite the billions of dollars spent throughout the Nation in past years.

The potential is accentuated in California. Our population growth rate is one factor, but we are also vulnerable because our residential and industrial expansion in the State is greatest into the areas subject to flooding.

In 1955, flood waters doomed the lives of 64 Californians. The Feather, the Yuba, the Klamath, and the Eel Rivers, raging out of control caused an estimated $167 million in property damage, not counting the large destruction of fish and wildlife.

To show California is not ahead of the flood menace, let everyone understand that while the Federal Government has spent more than a half billion dollars on going flood control projects in our State, since 1937 property damages from floods have approached the half billion dollar mark.

Though these figures look about even, they aren't. Another flood season like 1955—for which we still remain ill-prepared—would take a cruel and calamitous toll. Therefore, we feel compelled to warn, as sure as human lives are in danger, responsibility for such a calamity must inevitably fall at the feet of policymakers.

WATER POLLUTION

The present water supply of California must not be further polluted.

Immediate steps should be taken to reduce the pollution of the waters of California.

This should take the form of (1) assurance that existing pollution control measures be enforced, (2) establishment of a water quality base line" on a stream-by-stream basis.

In this field our greatest need is in the area of research. An expanded program is required on a nationwide basis.

We do not know, for instance, what the so-called natural quality is of many of our streams and other water sources. Without such a base line, it cannot be told whether or not such sources are being polluted.

The causes and agents of water pollution are multiplying rapidly. New materials for use in the homes have raised new problems of detection and elimination.

On the farm, weed and insect killers of increasing diversity are being used in growing quantities. Expanding irrigation use intensifies the problem of disposal of seepage and drainage waters.

New industrial processes add their quota of pollutants. Meanwhile, far too little is known of the effect on plants, fish and wildlife of new substances in water.

All these developments have prompted a new use for water to compete with the traditional uses for domestic, agricultural, industrial and other purposes. In the future, greater quantities of water are going to have to be used to flush away waste water no longer fit for use, or to dilute it to usable quality.

Where neither process is possible, a host of new techniques are needed to detect and remove impurities.

We believe that the control and regulation of water pollution should remain in State and local hands. But we urge that the U.S. Public Health Service and other Federal agencies take the lead in basic research in the detection and removal of water pollutants.

Careful consideration should be given in the engineering plans for the San Joaquin Valley Drainage Canal, proposed in proposition No. 1, to prevent any further aggravation of water pollution in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta.

We see in the problems of flood damage and water pollution a broad new vista for Federal-State cooperation.

Peace Corps Idea Praised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD a letter which appeared in the New York Times on March 12. This letter should be of interest to the House in considering President Kennedy's Peace Corps proposal. This is particularly true because the writer, Mr. Kenneth Holland, has a wealth of experience in this field. He has had extensive experience as a participant in work camp activities, and more recently he has made an extensive study of these camps. His studies, "Youth in European Labor Camps" and "Youth in the CCC," have been published by the American Council on Education. Since 1950 Mr. Holland has been president of the Institute of International Education.

I also include an article which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of March 10, 1961.

The letter and the article follow:

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The proposal for a Peace Corps made by President Kennedy during his campaign has appealed to the imagination of both young and old Americans. Those who remember the successful Civilian Conservation Corps camps established in the early days of the Roosevelt administration and various other youth service projects conducted at that time by both Governmental and private organizations do not find the President's proposal impractical or visionary.

The idea of providing an opportunity for American youth to serve and to gain experience in real life situations probably grows out of our belief in the constructive effect of frontier experience on previous generations of young American men and women. George Washington, the surveyor, Abraham Lincoln, the rail splitter, and Daniel Boone, the scout and explorer, are all part of our heritage from days when we were extending our frontiers.

As the physical frontier in the United States disappeared, some of our best minds proposed substitute experiences for our youth. In 1912 Willian James in his essay "The Moral Equivalent of War" proposed a type of Peace Corps.

YOUTH SERVICE

He suggested "a conscription of the whole youthful population to form for a certain number of years a part of the army enlisted against nature. No one would remain blind, as the luxurious classes now are blind, to man's relations to the globe he lives on * * * our gilded youths would be drafted off, according to their choice, to get the childishness knocked out of them, and to come back into society with healthier sympathies and more sober ideas." This proposal and others resulted in many projects and experiences with youth services.

Immediately following the First World War a Swiss Quaker, Pierre Ceresole, organized a group of young men, some of whom had fought on opposite sides during the war, to help in the rebuilding of the devastated area of northern France. This voluntary

service for peace spread to other countries.

In 1919 Bulgaria developed a compulsory labor service that required every young man upon reaching the age of 20 to give 8 months to "compulsory community labor." In the period between the two World Wars most governments of Europe developed some kind of a labor service for their young people, and there were also many privately financed projects.

Most of the governmental projects were designed to provide real and satisfying work for the unemployed. Most of the privately sponsored camps were established to give college and university students from many other countries an opportunity to work together improving underdeveloped areas, while becoming acquainted with the peoples, their problems, hopes, and aspirations.

MINING EXPERIENCE

In 1932 I worked in a camp in a depressed coal mining village of Wales, sponsored by the National Union of British Students. This camp was building parks and recreation facilities. We had some 15 different nationalities in the camp.

We slept on straw mattresses on the floor of a school. We had our meals in the rectory of a little Church of England. We started working with pick and shovel at 6 a.m. leveling talus slides and piles of debris from coal mines.

I worked in another camp sponsored by the National Union of Swiss Students at Auserberg in the Swiss Alps. There we constructed a "studentweg," or studentway, from the village of Ausserberg to the village of Luerig. Some of the students in these camps, especially the girls, also did some teaching, directed discussion groups and recreation projects for children.

I also worked in camps during the summer of 1932 administered by the Bruening Government of Republican Germany which brought together unemployed workers, peasants, and students to attempt to overcome the violent antagonisms of Nazis and Communists.

As these few examples indicate, there is a wealth of experience with voluntary services, civilian conservation corps, work camps, and other projects that demonstrates the feasibility of the President's recommendation of a Peace Corps.

Universities and other nongovernmental organizations should be encouraged to utilize corps members in connection with their projects overseas. Agreements with governments that welcome the corps should be developed in writing, setting forth the project's administrative plan.

The Peace Corps is basically a sound idea. If care is used in its planning and administration it will contribute greatly to the practical education of our young people, to better understanding of the motives of the United States and at the same time assist the developing countries of the world.

KENNETH HOLLAND.

NEW YORK, *March 9, 1961.*

PEACE CORPS PITFALLS

(By Josephine Ripley)

If the President's Peace Corps program touches off half as much enthusiasm abroad as here, it is assured of success. But experienced officials who head voluntary agencies operating similar programs abroad warn of pitfalls.

The prospect of giving a more human touch to foreign aid has wide public appeal, to judge by the thousands of expressions of interest and offers of service which have been pouring into the White House.

Yet the very sweep and momentum of this enthusiasm is causing some concern among those experienced in such programs.

"If we don't go too far, too fast, I feel confident the program will be a success," says Representative HENRY S. REUSS, Democrat, of Wisconsin, author of the bill which started the ball rolling about a year ago.

"You have to do it right or not at all," warns Warren E. Schmidt, who heads the international youth farm exchange program for the national 4-H Club. "It is a wonderful thing if it is handled properly. But you have to go about it cautiously."

Another expert in this field of work, J. F. Noffsinger, executive director of the International Voluntary Service, also cautions against "starting too large." The important thing is not to "go, go, go, as many Americans are prone to do; it is how you go that counts."

There is every indication that the administration plans to go about it just that way. Officials welcome the public enthusiasm; they need it to put the program on the road, to get the best possible candidates for the job, to win public and congressional support.

They also need to know that these teams of young people—teachers, public health workers, farmhands, and sanitation experts—will be welcomed. No team will budge a foot except on invitation of the recipient government.

The prospect of such a program has its critics abroad among the anti-American elements who are suggesting that the project is a method of spy infiltration.

This sort of charge is to be expected and will be recognized for what it is. But it does give warning that Peace Corps members must be prepared to combat this type of reception.

Their orientation training will prepare them for this. Social workers in this country often have to overcome similar hostility among those who resent their benefactors. It is not an uncommon attitude, and indeed the problem of breaking it down is part of the very job itself.

Recognition of this and other problems that a youth corps might encounter in putting technical assistance on a personal level has already prompted a number of decisions. One of these is that the youth corps should be made up of college graduates.

Another is the plan to feel the way along by means of a pilot program. Moreover, the pilot group will be one primarily made up of teachers. This is an area of greatest need of many of the newly developing countries.

Much fieldwork has already been done in this area by organizations such as those previously mentioned who have been sending Peace Corps teams abroad for many years. The administration is working closely with the heads of these organizations, and in fact will carry out some of its projects through them.

This will be done by means of Peace Corps grants to these groups of the expansion of programs already in operation. Some colleges and universities, fired by the idea of Peace Corps service, have developed their own programs.

Experience indicates the importance of having a program extend over a period of time. Two years, in general, is considered the minimum for good results. Some may go over into a 3-year term of service.

Those who have worked in the field put great emphasis on the desirability of heading up each team with a mature leader. They have found that his leadership is important to the morale and good work of the group.

The American Friends Service Committee trains its workers for both domestic and oversea assignments. Most of those sent abroad have had experience in at least one project in this country.

Some 10 or 12 countries, according to Sargent Shriver, head of the corps, have already expressed interest in the project. They were not named specifically but described as in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

The program adds a new, human dimension to American foreign policy, a kind of grassroots approach seen as one of the most wholesome and encouraging developments of the day.

Resolutions by the Dodge County Constitutional Conservatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1961

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, because of a widespread belief in sound, conservative government within my native State of Nebraska, there is a current move there to organize persons of this belief in units.

One of these units has been formed in Dodge County, Nebr., with Mr. Robert C. Lambourn as chairman. Mr. Lambourn's group considers questions of national importance. Just recently, one question concerned the House Committee on Un-American Activities. After considerable discussion, the Dodge County Constitutional Conservatives adopted the following resolutions which I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Whereas the filmstrip "Communism on the Map" shows how serious errors in U.S. foreign policy have contributed to the spread of communism and shows further how some leading U.S. publications have contributed to these disasters by articles they have printed; and

Whereas the U.S. Department of Defense has ordered that this filmstrip not be shown by the Department of Defense to public gatherings; and

Whereas members of the Dodge County Constitutional Conservatives have seen the filmstrip "Communism on the Map" and from information available to the members have observed nothing untrue or unfair in it, and believe that the only thing controversial about the filmstrip is that it presents the truth and the truth is embarrassing to certain individuals and organizations; and

Whereas the best way to avoid future mistakes in our fight against communism is for the public to be fully informed as to past errors; and

Whereas it is contrary to American principles and would be disastrous in our fight against communism to hide from the public errors committed by Government officials: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Dodge County Constitutional Conservatives—

1. That the Dodge County Constitutional Conservatives urges the Department of Defense to withdraw its order against showing of the filmstrip "Communism on the Map"; and

2. That the Department of Defense be urged instead to encourage the showing of the filmstrip "Communism on the Map" wherever possible; and

3. That a copy of this resolution be sent to Robert McNamara, Secretary of Defense.

Adopted March 5, 1961, at Fremont, Nebr.

DODGE COUNTY CONSTITUTIONAL CONSERVATIVES,

By ROBERT C. LAMBOURN, *Chairman,*

DORIS MARKLAND, *Secretary.*

Whereas the House Un-American Activities Committee has been attacked by some organizations and individuals as having engaged in unfair tactics and an effort has been made to abolish this Committee; and

Whereas from information available to members of the Dodge County Constitutional Conservatives it appears that the vague charges against the Committee have been unsubstantiated; and

Whereas from information available to members of the Dodge County Constitutional Conservatives it appears the House Un-American Activities Committee has done an excellent job of leading in the fight against Communist subversion and deserves the confidence and support of all citizens: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Dodge County Constitutional Conservatives—

1. That the Dodge County Constitutional Conservatives organization expresses its utmost confidence in and support of the House Un-American Activities Committee and urges that other Nebraska organizations pass similar resolutions; and

2. That a copy of this resolution be sent to the legislature of the State of Nebraska and that the legislature is hereby urged to pass a resolution expressing support of the House Un-American Activities Committee; and

3. That copies of this resolution be sent to the Nebraska Constitutional Conservatives and the Americans for Constitutional Action, urging their enactment of similar resolutions.

Adopted March 5, 1961, at Fremont, Nebr.

DODGE COUNTY CONSTITUTIONAL CONSERVATIVES,
By ROBERT C. LAMBOURN, *Chairman.*
DORIS MARKLAND, *Secretary.*

Plight of the Captive Nations

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that the U.S. House of Representatives should devote this time to recognition of the plight of the oppressed peoples of the so-called captive nations. These are the little countries which have lost their independence and liberty through the forcible seizure of their governments by international communism. These unfortunate and tragic people are kept in subjection by ruthless military power—the gun and the tank. No thoughtful person can doubt that if these little nations had a choice, if their Communist rulers would permit a plebicite in which they could vote as free men and women for a government of their own, they would throw off the rule of their oppressors in overwhelming numbers.

The real importance of this observance is the message which will be carried back beyond the Iron Curtain to these people who exist under the yoke of Communist slavery that the Congress of the United States, the leader of the free world, continues to recognize their tragic situation and is ever mindful of their desire for freedom and independence. This may reassure them that the people of this Nation and of the free world have the deepest sympathy for their aspirations and that there is among us a unity of hope and determination that they will eventually regain their freedom.

Government whose power is derived from the sword and the secret police rests upon a thin reed indeed. Such governments cannot endure indefinitely. It is the universal desire of mankind to be free. Hope for the deliverance of these nations has a solid basis in the conviction that while they have captive governments they are not really captive peoples, as long as the torch of liberty still burns in their souls.

May God speed the day of their liberation.

Children Have Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1961

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the International Peace Arch at Blaine, Wash., has existed since its dedication in 1921 without fences and without guards, both in the area administered by the State of Washington and the Province of British Columbia. Now, the Bureau of Public Roads is requiring that fences be constructed along the proposed interstate highway that will terminate at the United States-Canadian border in the middle of the park.

Hundreds of my constituents, including more than 500 schoolchildren, have written to me or have signed petitions protesting these fences. Among these letters are about 100 from grade school pupils at Blaine. Their arguments, it appears to me, are better than the arguments presented by bureaucrats in the Federal Government.

A number of letters pointed out that more than 660,000 person visited the park last year. Other letters document the fact that there has never been an automobile accident nor a person injured in the park during its 40-year existence.

The fifth and sixth graders who wrote me also pointed out that in 1929 the children in the Blaine Elementary School contributed pennies and nickels toward making the park what it is today. They say the park belongs to the children of America and Canada as much as anyone else. Therefore, they should have as much say about building a fence as the Bureau of Public Roads or others.

Mr. Speaker, I agree that these children should be heard and further agree with their statements that it is silly to fence off the highway on the American side when there will be no fences on the Canadian side. It appears that the children of Blaine have more sense than the Bureau of Public Roads.

Youth to the Rescue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1961

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I commend the following editorial from the Jamesville (Wis.) Gazette of March 7, 1961, to the membership of this House. The idealistic reasons which have inspired such a tremendous interest and response to the proposed Peace Corps impose a tremendous responsibility upon its administrators and directors to screen out potential "ugly Americans" or misfits.

YOUTH TO THE RESCUE

If misgivings come to mind in connection with the administration's plans for a worldwide Peace Corps, good reasons for them can be cited. Over the years efforts to build improved relations with foreign nations have been less than a success, even with the expenditure of billions in foreign aid, missionary work under the point 4 program and gifts of food and supplies.

The poor results up to now might be advanced as an argument for a new approach. But certainly the assignment of inexperienced youth to problems which have stumped the experts will raise doubts in the minds of many citizens. If the fresh young viewpoint is to prevail and have a chance of success, it would seemingly be necessary to cut it loose from the supervision of systems and individuals which have a record of substantial failure.

But the activities of a youthful Peace Corps unrestrained by a background of policy and experience certainly contains some elements of dangerous international complications.

One of the questions which seem to have been overlooked completely in the Peace Corps enthusiasm is the effect of such service upon young Americans. It is assumed, of course, that the young people will patriotically carry the American message to foreign populations, and wage a counterpropaganda war against the Communists. With the awareness of the frequent gullibility of youth and the known cunning of the Communist masters of propaganda, we ought at least give thought to the possibility that our boys and girls might be outgeneraled, or worse yet, made tools of the opposition.

These doubts, of course, are not the only ones which are bound to arise in the minds of some citizens. The word that a Peace Corps may be utilized not only overseas, but also on the home scene, provides one of them. While the system is touted as a high-minded adventure in improved foreign relations (and domestic improvement too) it certainly holds the seeds of a mass Democratic political organization aimed at the youthful sector of the population. The employment of thousands as Peace Corpsmen, both here and abroad, could make some of the old-fashioned patronage systems look—well, old-fashioned.

If young men and women can succeed where others have failed, steering populations in various parts of the world away from communism and toward close relations with the United States, they should be encouraged to do so. But there are various existing youth programs aimed at this very purpose, and which could be expanded with suitable encouragement. From the Washington viewpoint, of course, this would be

a disadvantage because they would not be added to the public payroll, or beholden for their appointments to Federal bureaucracy.

Sell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1961

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include an editorial by J. Worth Bernard, editor and publisher of the Orange County News. This editorial is very timely as it is written to stimulate business and sales activity in southern California. All industrial indices are higher today than they were 1 year ago in my congressional district. This includes employment, construction of new homes, and retail sales. By positive thinking, instead of gloom and doom, America can move forward:

SELL

Now is the time for salesmen to sell.

Now is the time for salesmen to prove that they are more than order takers, that they are really salesmen.

Now is the time for company sales and advertising programs to be stepped up.

Careful study of economic conditions shows that production has outrun sales, but has not exceeded the capacity of consumers to buy.

No product is ever finished until it is sold to the final user. Goods may be sold (?) by factory to distributor or dealer, but the production-distribution jobmaking process is not complete until the items have moved into the hands, homes, garages, stomach or onto the backs of the ultimate consumers.

Boiled down to their essence, the actual facts of the present "economic transition" prove that nothing is wrong except that consumers (including corporations) have been saving more money and buying less of durable goods.

The saving-more, buying-less action of consumers (you and me and our friends and neighbors across the country) has clogged the production-and-sales pipelines of certain important items across the Nation and thrown millions of Americans out of work.

Here's why we say "Now is the time for salesmen to sell"—

If all salesmen will get out and sell their own products to the millions of their fellow Americans who are at work and saving more, buying less—the production distribution process will be complete and millions of unemployed can be returned to work. Then everyone will have more money and the salesmen will have an even greater market.

Here are the facts on the year 1960:

The total value of all goods and services produced (gross national products) reached a new alltime high at more than $500 billion.

Personal income topped all previous years at more than $400 billion.

Disposable income (income after taxes) exceeded all former peaks at more than $350 billion.

Retail sales reached a higher total than in 1959; $215 billion in 1959 and over $220 billion in 1960.

More American civilians were at work in active jobs than ever before in history—a total of 67½ million (6¼ million of them in California).

Construction put in place topped $55 billion.

Installment loans were being paid off faster than new loans were being taken out.

The amount of money spent on soft goods, travel, recreation, and education topped all previous records.

The sale of so-called durable goods, including homes, furnishings, appliances, autos, and new plant construction and equipment dropped off from previous peaks.

Personal savings reached a new alltime high.

There were more unemployed by year-end than at any time in recent years.

What does it all add up to?

More sales are possible.

The money is in the hands and pockets of consumers. Better selling will help the employed to enjoy life more and will help put the unemployed back to work.

If you are an auto salesman are you sitting in the showroom idly twidling your thumbs, bemoaning the fact that so many are unemployed, while waiting for customers to walk in to take a new car away from you, or are you investing every available minute phoning owners of your make of car, inviting them to come in for real service at your shop and meet you; then, when the come in, are you showing them the new cars (or better used cars) and offering a good trade-in deal?

If you are selling new homes are you siting on your haunches greeting home shoppers with a smile as they walk into your model home inviting them to "look through," shaking hands as they leave and inviting them to "come back anytime," or are you taking them through pointing out the features of your home—its construction, low down payment, possibility of tradein, good location, fine climate, proximity of schools and shopping, advantages of suburban living, etc., getting their names and addresses as they leave, following up the next day or so with a reminder that you are offering a good value?

If you are selling furniture or appliances or carpets are you "gassing" all day with your fellow salesmen about "how bad times are," or are you busy phoning families who are building new homes, buying in subdivisions near you or now moving in, offering to to show them what you have that will make their new homes complete and comfortable, inviting them to come in and get acquainted, or, better yet, making a date to visit them "after hours"? (You or your sales manager or your "boss" can get the names and addresses.) Are you working or just waiting?

If you are the owner of a small production plant are you becoming a nervous wreck as you review your reduced income and steady "outgo" for payroll, rent, and payments while waiting for the phone to ring with new orders, or are you leaving the "phone answering" to someone else while you use this rare opportunity to get out and meet your customers, learn their problems and show them how you can help them? (This is the time, because they are probably not too busy to visit with you now.)

If you are a sales manager are you laying off salesmen and trimming expense accounts, or are you fighting for budget, spending more time with your salesmen and customers, helping to perfect new products and services?

If you are an advertising manager, are you cutting the budget as sales drop off, or are you fighting for a budget based on a higher percentage of present sales to finance a hard-hitting, smart-sell advertising campaign that will bring your company more than its share of the so-called reduced market to build sales back up to where your advertising budget will become a smaller percentage of sales?

Let us all realize that the facts show that the market is here, that in most lines of business we can speed fully prosperity by selling but we are going through the post-war adjustment which brings us to a new, longtime period in which competitive conditions will bring success only to those companies that keep ahead with new products and services, reasonable prices, smart advertising and real selling.

Salesmen must realize that selling is the best paying hard work, the poorest paying easy work in the world.

Papa Knows Best

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL FINDLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1961

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Carroll P. Streeter, editor of the Farm Journal, is the author of this cogent analysis of the administration feed grain bill, H.R. 4510. It presents clearly the danger and weakness in this bill, and deserves the thoughtful consideration of all Americans.

The article follows:

PAPA KNOWS BEST

The feed grains bill may be law or it may be dead by the time you read this, but it is very much worth your attention anyway. For it puts in clear view for all to see just what the farm philosophy and program of the Kennedy administration really is. It tells you what you can expect from here on.

On this page last month we said we were in favor of the land-retirement purpose of the bill. But now that the whole plan has been unrolled we oppose it (whether it's dead or alive) with all the vigor we can summon. Urgent as the feed grains problem is we might better solve it right than make another major mistake. Here are some of the things wrong with the administration's plan:

1. The office of the Secretary of Agriculture would become the feed grain market of the United States. One man, the Secretary, would determine what the cash grain farmers would get for their crop, and what the livestock, dairy and poultry farmers who buy feed would pay. The plan puts no ceiling on the prices the Secretary could set. It allows him to take grain out of Government bins and sell it as much as 17 percent below support levels. That's a great deal too much power to give any one man. A very great deal too much.

2. The program gives the Secretary a whip to use on reluctant farmers. You don't have to join his program, but if you don't he can make it cost you—up to 17 percent of the support price. He has a persuader to make you crawl into the Government tent—unless you want to pay. How typical this is of the big Government crowd, the planners, and how revealing of their philosophy. "Papa knows best," and can remind you of it if necessary.

3. Wheat can be a feed grain, a big one, but wheat is ignored in the bill. We can't do anything about the wheat now in the ground but we could provide for what we're going to do when seeding time comes around again.

If there's anything we should have learned after 20 years or more of sad experience it's this: You can't legislate soundly for just one segment of farming at a time. Anytime we try it we only rotate the problem to another segment and wind up with a worse muddle than before. Yet here we are trying it once more.

4. The bill makes no provision for retiring whole farms, which in some instances is best for all concerned.

5. The bill introduces the Brannan plan by the back door. Farmers who comply would get the support price but the Government could sell the grain at 17 percent less—a direct payment without name.

6. Fruit and vegetable growers would get new competition—you could put the idled feed-grain land into fruit or vegetables if you want to forgo a Government payment.

7. Soybean farmers are about to see their markets hurt by an increase (that they don't want) in their support price from $1.85 to $2.30. The bean farmers have been doing fine. They've increased production of beans from 180 million bushels at the close of World War II to 550 million in 1960. They've taken 12 million acres a year out of other crops. They've exported a fourth of their beans—for dollars. In short, they've been a problem to nobody, and everybody's happy.

So what happens? Without consulting the bean farmers the planners up the price support by 45 cents. Why? Because they first decided it would be good to raise corn supports to $1.20. When one went up the other had to for we already have too much corn and too few beans.

Actually we need about 2½ million more acres of beans but we were going to get them anyway with prices the way they are. What's likely to happen now is that we could wind up with about as much corn as ever and one more surplus crop—beans.

Isn't it wonderful when the planners get going?

Preserving Our Wilderness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in both the 86th and the 87th Congresses I have sponsored legislation which would establish a national wilderness preservation system. With our rapidly growing and expanding population I believe that it is important to preserve a portion of our wilderness heritage for both present and future generations of Americans.

A recent editorial in the Washington Post has urged prompt enactment of a wilderness bill. I commend this article to my colleagues:

Each year more people, more houses, and more industry encroach on the remaining open land in the United States. Only diligent conservation will preserve for future generations the wilderness areas which were the mark of frontier America and which are an important part of the Nation's patrimony. Once again Congress has a chance, at very little cost to the taxpayer, to secure this heritage of forest, river, and wildlife by a speedy enactment of the national wilderness protection bill now reintroduced by Senator ANDERSON.

As Mr. ANDERSON noted in presenting the measure, it has been 5 years since the first wilderness bill was introduced by Senator HUMPHREY; through two Congresses and four printed volumes of testimony the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has considered such a bill. "Objections, eliminations * * * and the inclusion of various special provisions." There should be no responsible opposition to the Senator's new bill.

The measure is not a sweeping change. It envisages no reorganization of present land agencies; no new bureaus would be created. It merely sets aside certain wilderness areas, unspoiled by manmade changes, in perpetuity. There are ample safeguards for cattle grazing and industrial interests and provision for periodic review of the wilderness tracts.

Indeed, all the lands that could be dedicated to wilderness use and protection are already within established national forests, parks, or refuges. They make up only 5 percent of the Federal lands. This bill is, in reality, only the beginning of what is needed for the future, but it is the necessary first step. Unless lawmakers act soon much of the opportunity for preservation of these natural havens and retreats will be forever lost.

Stringent Farm Controls or What?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK MacGREGOR
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1961

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the Minneapolis Star serves the upper Midwest, and particularly the people of my district. It make a great contribution to the understanding of farm problems. Before the feed-grains legislation receives final consideration by the Congress, I should like my colleagues to have the opportunity to read the following excellent article taken from the editorial page of the Minneapolis Star of March 8, 1961:

STRINGENT FARM CONTROLS OR WHAT?—NONE OF THE ALTERNATIVES IS COSTLESS OR EASY, AND NONE BY ITSELF OFFERS A READY SOLUTION

(By Dale E. Hathaway)

The present problem of commercial agriculture is not that of temporary surpluses in one or two commodities, which, if removed, would solve the price and income problem. If this were the situation, stringent Government controls on one or two crops would be the most effective solution.

The problem, however, is one of too many total resources in agriculture to allow good earnings, not just too much wheat and corn. We have been chasing resources from one crop to another via acreage allotments long enough. It is now time to look at the total problem and do something about it.

There are several alternatives to stringent controls as a solution to the over capacity currently existing in agriculture. Some alternatives deal with the problem and others merely tidy up the symptoms of the problem enough to make them bearable—at least for a time.

Many of the alternatives would appear preferable to what we have now, and to most farmers would be preferable to really effective direct Government controls. Furthermore, the alternative may be appealing to urban Congressmen who must be getting tired of spending $3 or $4 billion per year to help farmers only to find out that situation is worse than before.

What are the alternatives to stringent controls? One is to continue the present program. This seems unlikely. Despite the current slackness in our economy, our major problem is to find enough resources to meet our defense and foreign policy commitments without reducing our standard of living. The current farm program uses resources to produce farm products that have very low value both at home and abroad. We are using valuable manpower, and machinery, gasoline, and chemicals to produce crops; more manpower to buy them, and manpower, steel, and concrete to store them.

The argument that, as long as we have urban workers unemployed, it's all right to use resources to produce surplus farm products, doesn't impress me. Most Americans would prefer to see schools, churches, homes, roads, and defense items produced if the Government has to pay someone to use excess resources.

A second popular alternative to stringent controls is an expansion of demand, at home and abroad, sufficient to insure satisfactory earnings for all of the present resources in agriculture. Great hope for such a program is fondly held by the operators of smalltown businesses who sell feed, seed, machinery, and supplies to farmers, and who understandably take a dim view of production reducing schemes which will shrink their sales appreciably—even if farmers' incomes thereby could be maintained.

Such hopes also are held by the operators of big businesses who produce steel and other supplies and who buy, sell, store, or process farm products and thus have a stake in continued high farm outputs.

The recently announced expanded domestic distribution program and food stamp plan are useful examples of this alternative. These are useful because we have excessive resources trapped in agriculture, and it is desirable to use as many of these resources as possible to improve the well-being of deserving persons.

But, as a recent study at the University of Minnesota pointed out, even if all American consumers had an adequate diet, domestic demand would fall far short of absorbing all of the current excessive capacity in agriculture.

Expanded use of our farm surpluses abroad is even more appealing, for the needs are obvious, and we may be saving our hides in the process. However, even here, there are practical limits to such disposals, and many acute observers believe we have reached, or in some cases, exceeded, these limits. Many agree that the food for peace program can be more helpful and every effort should be made to develop and implement it wisely. This may mean that we have to set it up and operate it through the United Nations. If not, we may create more international problems than we solve.

A third alternative which would make the symptoms more bearable is the use of direct Government payments to farmers to provide income protection while market prices are allowed to seek their levels. This is a program dear to the hearts of many economists, but apparently to few others. Direct payments would encourage consumption, allow market prices to influence resource allocations in agriculture, and end Government stock accumulations.

However, a recent study shows that direct payments sufficient to maintain farm income at present levels would cost the taxpayers about $5 billion annually. Since this would be in addition to some other program expense, it appears unlikely that nonfarm people would allow such a program to operate for very long.

For the remaining alternatives, we turn from programs which may make the symptoms bearable to programs which attack the basic problem of excessive resources in

agriculture. The solution requires temporarily reducing resources in agriculture and preventing future excessive resource commitments. Direct Government controls is one such program. Other favorites are free prices, land retirement, and voluntary farmer bargaining groups.

Free prices are especially appealing to those not subject to their income-reducing effects, and to those who mistakenly assume that the adjustments would be quick and easy and rewarding for all concerned.

Moreover, they must assume that free prices can maintain stability and satisfactory earnings in agriculture.

Increasingly, the evidence suggests that free prices in agriculture would result in serious price declines, that the adjustment period would be an extended one, and the results might not achieve the desired goals.

Land retirement, or the soil bank, is another method for removing some of the resources from agriculture. Of course, land is only one element in producing farm products, and a great deal of it must be taken out to achieve a given cut in production. Sometimes an effective land retirement program will induce the retirement of other inputs, including farm operators. This is good, for there is too much labor in agriculture as well as too much land.

I recognize the serious community problems of concentrated land retirement programs, yet the realities must be faced that certain areas are marginal for some kinds of farming. A good land program would alter and improve land use—not just remove it completely from use.

It has been estimated that a land retirement program sufficient to end surplus stock accumulation and maintain farm incomes at present levels would require the retirement of 15 to 25 percent of our present cropland, the exact amount depending on the location of the land retired. To end wheat surpluses, it would have to be concentrated in the Great Plains, with severe impact on communities as a consequence.

Land retirement would not be an inexpensive program. Initially the cost might be $2 billion annually and costs would rise rather than decline over time. Even so, this probably is less than our present program will cost under the same conditions.

Land retirement programs have many merits, although in recent years they have not been used effectively. I think they are a program accepted by farmers. Actually, much of the protest over the whole-farm soil bank has been from the nonfarm areas affected, not from the farm people. However, the nonfarm economy, too, must decide sooner or later whether it really wants to reduce the excessive resources in agriculture, or whether it merely wishes to talk about it.

Every program we have discussed thus far fails to deal directly with the most important resource in American agriculture—its people. There still are too many people in agriculture, just as there still is too much land currently under cultivation. None of the programs that we have now or that have been discussed deal positively with reducing the excess labor in agriculture.

Direct Government controls would force people out of agriculture, "free" and low farm prices would force people out of agriculture, and land retirement would encourage people to quit farming. But nothing is proposed that would really help, in a positive way, those people who want to leave agriculture for other occupations. The excess of human resources in agriculture is the really important national waste in our present farm program.

The alternatives to direct and stringent Government controls for agriculture are neither costless nor easy. All of the alternatives I have discussed should be used to achieve the best possible solution. None, by itself, offers a ready solution, yet the proper combination could improve farm incomes, reduce public expenditures, and move toward more permanent solutions.

I do not envy those who will have the responsibility for these programs, for the criticisms will be great and the compliments few. Even so, the national gain will be great from any permanent improvement in our major farm problem.

Aid to Education or Dixie Dole?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, some newspaper columnists attempt to mold public opinion by means of their nationwide syndicated columns. I have always felt that nothing is equal to the native wisdom of a homegrown product. I respectfully include the March 8 Chicago American column by Jack Mabley in the hopes that it will receive the attention of the Members of the House:

JACK: IS IT AID TO EDUCATION OR DIXIE DOLE?
(By Jack Mabley)

There's nothing complicated about Federal aid to education if you understand one fact.

Every dollar in taxes has to come from our pocketbooks, no matter who extracts it—the mosquito control district or the Government of the United States.

Walter Lippmann, a senior thinker in the Washington press, says of Federal aid to public schools:

"Those who oppose the program in principle have almost certainly not understood the problem."

He sounds like a petulant professor lecturing a class of not too bright freshmen. "If you do not agree with me, you simply do not understand what it's all about."

Lippmann says giving Federal money to public schools does not mean Federal control of education will follow. The Kennedy administration insists States will retain control.

Fine. Now does anyone believe that once this aid is started, it will ever end, that it will not be renewed in 4 years.

What about the administration that succeeds Kennedy? Or the administration 20 years from now? Sooner or later a government handing out billions for education is going to want a say in how it's used. Like on an approved curriculum.

Lippmann and backers of the plan say some States can afford to educate their young properly but some do not have adequate resources.

This means nothing else, then, but the Federal Government will extract money from the taxpayers of Illinois and will give part of it to the taxpayers of Mississippi for their schools.

I don't like the way they run the school system in Mississippi, but the Federal Government still is asking that I help support it, at the expense of my own schools.

Again, no matter how you slice it, every tax dollar has to come from your pocket or mine. If we pay our dollar locally, thru the real estate tax, it goes almost wholly to the schools.

But the Federal Government wants to help us with that dollar, extract it from us, take out a handling charge, skim off a little more for Mississippi, and give us back the rest—about 66 cents for every dollar we send to Washington.

Tipoff for this plan is found in Lippmann quoting Beardsley Ruml that "State and local taxes are encountering stiffer resistance."

This is true. At the State and local level, we know what we're paying. Voters in my town last week turned down an $800,000 bond issue for parks which would have raised taxes slightly.

It's hard to hide taxes at this level. There is resistance.

The Federal aid to education plan makes nice reading down in Louisiana and Mississippi.

To an Illinoisan or a Californian, it means they are taking our school money, charging us for taking it, using part of it to support school systems which are run in a way many of us vigorously oppose, and are giving the remainder of the money back to us.

Mr. Lippmann, I guess I just don't understand the problem.

Good Housing Plan With Dubious Gimmick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Kansas City Star, under date of March 11. This very stimulating, perhaps it would be better to say provocative, editorial calls attention to some points about the President's housing program that deserve thorough scrutiny. I respectfully call the editorial to the attention of all of my colleagues, especially those who will have the opportunity in committee to study the points raised by the editorial:

GOOD HOUSING PLAN WITH DUBIOUS GIMMICK

The major proposal of President Kennedy's housing program would step up urban renewal grants to more than 600 million dollars a year, virtually double the present spending rate. The purpose is to encourage replacement of blighted city areas with new construction. This is the feature of the program of special interest to American cities and to their lower income populations. The proposed increase in spending might be opposed for budgetary reasons but the purpose is good.

The strangest part of the program is the proposal that would experiment with 40-year FHA mortgages on small homes with no down payment. It appears to assume that people of lower incomes should necessarily buy new homes instead of renting or buying older homes.

In spite of the political pressures, so far, the FHA has managed to operate successfully on business principles. This nothing down lending plan is at least a move in the direction of using the FHA for welfare purposes. And it isn't necessary.

Of course the soundness of FHA loans depends on more than downpayments and the number of years to pay. Even now many loans on small houses are made with down payments as low as $500. The chief protec-

tion for the loans is in rules which require the borrower to show his financial ability to keep up the payments. The future character of the FHA will depend on its overall policies. If the 40-year loan plan indicates a general relaxation, the FHA could soon lose its business character.

There is nothing in the national record to show the need for a radical departure from business principles in home purchases. This country has been building more than a million homes a year for 12 successive years, a fantastic record. In the history of American home construction, there is nothing remotely comparable to this 12-year record.

There is some slackening in the current market which may cause a reduction in building this year. One reason for it is the past unprecedented construction that has been catching up with demand. Another is the cautious attitude brought on by the recession. The easy-money proposals might stimulate some additional buying but they are superficial palliatives that could have little effect on the causes of reduced demand.

The President's urban renewal proposal should offer a more direct benefit to people of lower than average incomes. Building of apartments under urban renewal offers good places to live without the necessity of taking on a lifetime mortgage. And urban renewal is having a profound effect on the future of American cities. By this means the cities are battling the old disease of slums. Congress could carry out the main and good purposes of the Kennedy program without getting involved in any easy mortgage gimmicks.

Feed-Grains Program Will Aid Taxpayers

SPEECH
OF
HON. DON MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4510) to provide a special program for feed grains for 1961.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I supported H.R. 4510, a measure designed to introduce a 1-year program of emergency legislation in the feed-grains area. At present the Government has $4,255 millions invested in feed grains, which each year cost the Government millions in tax dollars, and to which, each year, additional surpluses are being added. By the program proposed in H.R. 4510, it is hoped that the taxpayer will be saved $500 million during the next year.

The present bill is intended to alleviate the conditions of oversupply and low prices which have added additional burdens to one of the most troubled and unstable segments of our domestic economy. It is hoped that this will produce an amelioration of market conditions by allowing the Secretary of Agriculture to dispose of quantities of feed grains now held by the Commodity Credit Corporation, at any price not less than 17 percent below the 1961 support price for such grains. Further, it is hoped that through the expedient of acreage retirement—with the marketing of grains presently in storage—our surpluses will be depleted, thus reducing the public tax burden. This measure should present greater security to the feed-grain producers, reduce surpluses with a concomitant reduction in storage costs, and stimulate rural buying power.

The allotments allowed for acreage retirement are to be calculated on a basis of 60 percent of normal annual production. This, however, does not prevent the producer from marketing increased production per acre over the normal yield. Thus there would be no deterrent to the producer's incentive to increase the efficiency of his operation through the use of improved farming practices, fertilization and irrigation. Any bill which would tend, however inadvertently, to decrease the producer's incentive to agricultural efficiency, in the name of preventing surpluses, could only result in a form of agricultural featherbedding, would have a generally deleterious effect upon the agricultural industry, and ultimately would result in higher prices to the consumer.

The incentives offered in section 3 appear as a vital portion of this program. It would be unthinkable to expect certain producers to submit voluntarily to a land-retirement program with production cutbacks, from which noncompliers would be free to benefit. The bill cannot be expected to work unless there is a high percentage of compliance.

To be sure, we must make every effort to reduce our agricultural surpluses, most logically, perhaps, through a program of food for the hungry peoples of the world—as the administration has assured us will be done—of course, without injuring other nations whose production surpluses are in the same areas.

H.R. 4510 is not to be considered a final solution to the feed-grain problem, but rather as emergency legislation for a 1-year period. The Secretary of Agriculture can work out a more comprehensive program after further study.

A Solution for "Soapy"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the following comment from the March 7 issue of the Chicago American should be especially interesting to the officials of the State Department and USIA who are attempting to upgrade the language requirements of our oversea personnel:

A SOLUTION FOR "SOAPY"

We're relieved to see that "Soapy" Williams, now touring Africa as Under Secretary of State for African Affairs, has been learning Lingala. This is a Congolese native dialect, and "Soapy" has been doing better with it than he did with English; at least, he hasn't set off any new international crises recently, and the Congolese seem to get a kick out of his accent.

Maybe "Soapy" had better stick to Lingala. He might pull some more diplomatic boners like his famous "Africa for the Africans" statement, but at least he'd be able to claim he was misquoted.

Hope Increases for Cape Cod National Seashore Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1961

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, as one who, back in the 85th Congress, introduced one of the first bills to authorize a national seashore park on Cape Cod, I wish to express my gratitude to my colleagues in this 87th Congress, and particularly to the members of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, for the sense of urgency as well as the earnestness with which they are considering this nationally important conservation measure.

The National Parks Subcommittee last week held hearings on the Cape Cod National Seashore legislation, which has the full support of President Kennedy. It is clear that we all agree with the President, with Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, with other sponsors of this legislation and with the committee members who have heard testimony in the past, that Cape Cod has top priority among conservation measures now before the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, when I introduced my first Cape Cod National Seashore bill in 1958, basing it upon the findings of the National Park Service studies of the cape and of the Atlantic coast, I was deeply impressed by two things. One was the truly terrifying speed at which our superb natural shorelines were being preempted for developments of all kinds which would destroy their beauty and remove forever the opportunities which future generations might have to know and enjoy this aspect of their national heritage. Within the past 20 years whole stretches of natural seashore have vanished completely under developments or have become priced out of the reach even of Government.

But an equally impressive fact, and one which fills us all with a great hope, is that one of the finest seashore areas of the entire Atlantic seaboard yet remains largely unspoiled and constitutes a major conservation opportunity.

This is Cape Cod, an area so close to the country's largest centers of population that one marvels at how its unspoiled character has survived for so long. Here is not only a spectacular shoreline, beloved and written about for generations, but also inland areas of surpassing charm, scientific values of extraordinary significance, and evidences and traditions of an inspiring history.

Since establishment of a Cape Cod National Seashore Park will affect the lives and interests of many private citizens and their town and State governments, it is evident that great care must be taken to reconcile national and local interest in this conservation legislation. The recommendations of the National Park Service already had done much in this direction. However, more was

needed, and we of the Massachusetts delegation in Congress are proud to sponsor legislation, unique and unprecedented in its scope and purpose, which we believe will be successful in protecting individual rights and interests within the larger framework of the national purpose.

But working out such complex protective and reconciling provisions, based on further studies of the economic and other consequences of park establishment on the cape, have taken time, and time is running out. Since I introduced my first Cape Cod Park bill, new roads have been cleared, new subdivisions staked out, and the blight of honky-tonk development has crept further up the peninsula.

And the delay is costly in dollars as well as beauty. Seashore land prices have in some places risen as much as a thousand percent in the last 20 years. Each passing year sees conservation of Cape Cod growing more costly, with less and less to conserve.

I recommend to the Congress that prompt and effective action in conservation matters carry through all the legislative process, reconciling remaining differences with dispatch so that a nationally significant Cape Cod national seashore can become a reality.

Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted, I include with my remarks an editorial from the Springfield, Mass., Union of March 11, 1961, concerning the proposed Cape Cod National Seashore Park:

HOPE INCREASES FOR CAPE COD PARK

Chairman ALAN BIBLE of the Senate Public Lands Subcommittee, said Thursday that he sensed an atmosphere of give and take between Cape Cod town officials and the National Park Service on the reduction of boundaries in the proposed Cape Cod National Seashore. The chief stumbling block to establishment of the great park is the reluctance of towns in the area to relinquish taxable property for the project in the face of the National Park Service's decision that it can reduce the acreage no further.

The Park Service already has substantially cut its original request for land in order to placate local objectors. But the objections still continue, though an adjustment at last appears hopeful. Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL holds that Cape Cod officials are unduly upset over the boundary problem and that they serve "only to frustrate both national and local interests in an irresponsible manner."

They also appear to be using their piecemeal demands for excluding more land from the park to mask their aim of killing the whole idea. Great areas of the proposed park have lain undeveloped through all the years of Massachusetts history and have produced little tax revenue for the towns in which they are located. The fact that the developers now have their eyes on these areas and, in fact, are eating away at them, accounts for the immediate crisis. Underlying the whole plan for the park is the desire to conserve the tract in its natural state for posterity and to stem the tide of commercial development before it engulfs the land. In view of the park's importance as a magnificent tourist attraction and an asset to the whole state, the objectors appear woefully shortsighted in their efforts to discourage the plan and, in effect, kill it by shrinking the land available for it to an acreage so small as to force the National Park Service to abandon the project.

Secretary of the Interior Udall, whose appearances at the hearing he admits indicate President Kennedy's deep interest in the proposal, tersely and accurately analyzed the issue recently when he said:

"Unless action is taken in the near or immediate future to acquire and preserve lands at Cape Cod for public enjoyment, it seems quite evident that the Cape's traditional atmosphere and character will vanish under construction activity now under way there."

Housing: New Frontier Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, two excellent editorials appeared in the Wall Street Journal this morning that every Member of Congress should read and think over:

TWO FRONTIERS

About a century ago, a young man on the eastern seaboard gathered together a few personal effects and started walking. In time, he reached the home of a relative, 1,000 miles to the west. Five years later he had saved enough as a farm laborer to buy land of his own. He hacked down trees and blasted out stumps to make arable land; he cut up trees and build himself a house. In time two sons went forth from this farm home, put themselves through college and made productive lives, and good homes for their families.

This is not an unfamiliar story; there were, once, many such men. But all that was on the old frontier.

Now, on the New Frontier, the President's housing message makes it clear that individuals are to be freed from the responsibility for caring for their own housing needs. In the phrases of this era of groupthink, would-think and dollar-think, Mr. Kennedy has pretty well washed out whatever attachment his frontier ever had with that other one.

"A nation that is partly ill-housed is not as strong as a nation with adequate homes for every family," he said. And he left no doubt that an "adequate home" derives not from the strength of the individuals in it, but from how much money, especially Federal money, is spent on building the floor and walls and roof.

"A nation with ugly, crime-infested cities and haphazard suburbs does not present the same image to the world as a nation characterized by bright and orderly urban development," the President added. And so the "brightness" and "orderliness" of our cities is somehow to become a weapon in the cold war.

There are many things wrong with the President's program. But it is not so much that there is no discernible ceiling on the spending entailed. Nor that the program is a patent effort to single out a lagging basic industry—construction—and spur it with massive Federal assistance. Nor even that the program contains the seeds of almost certain inflation, as bad as that would be for all the people.

What is most disturbing is that this Housing and Community Development message is of a piece with other proposals by Mr. Kennedy. He has told us that the responsibility for medical care in old age is not the individual's concern but Government's. He has told us, that the responsibility for educating the young is not an individual or local one but the Government's. And now, "we as a nation have before us the opportunity—and the responsibility—to remold our cities, to improve our patterns of community development, and to provide for the housing needs of all segments of our population."

The old people, the young people, the farm population, the city dwellers, the suburbanites, the citizens with middle incomes, low incomes and even high incomes are to be the beneficiaries of a benign and all-knowing Federal Government. All are embraced in the housing message, and there is something for each.

For people with moderate incomes, there are to be federally insured mortgages—temporary and experimental—with no money down and 40 years to pay. For old people and others with low incomes, there are to be 100,000 additional units of public housing.

Someone has also decided that "almost a fifth of the occupied houses in rural areas of America are so dilapidated that they must be replaced" so the Government will see to it, in the form of insuring "adequate credit." Furthermore, "we must do more than concern ourselves with bad housing * * * our urban renewal efforts must be substantially reoriented from slum clearance and slum prevention into positive programs for economic and social regeneration." There is even to be a Federal "long-range program and policy for dealing with open space."

And so it goes. Here is the welfare state in one of its central aspects—provision of homes for all, homes that the planners consider "decent." And if there must be public absorption of the cost of housing rehabilitation that cannot succeed on a voluntary basis, we have it on the administration's word that it must be done, because it is "socially desirable."

To be sure, Congress has yet to have its say. But whatever Congress may say, the administration has plainly stated its philosophy. Housing is to join medicine and education and other areas of national life in which the Government thinks that "socially desirable" goals cannot be achieved by the individual.

On numerous occasions Mr. Kennedy has spoken movingly about "meeting our responsibilities." In this message to the Congress he said it again "* * * to achieve our Nation's housing goals, to meet our appropriate Federal responsibilities * * *."

We would not claim that the old frontiersman led other than a hard life; probably the house he hacked out of the woods was not decent by Federal standards. But at least he met the responsibility of housing himself.

It is a measure of the difference between the two frontiers that responsibility is now defined as the responsibility to accept what Government says is best.

HOUSING INTEREST

It has been calculated that a $13,500 home, bought under President Kennedy's 40-year mortgage plan, would cost the buyer $33,437 by the time the place was paid off.

This may strike some people as high, but then again that $33,437 may be worth only $13,500 by the time A.D. 2001 rolls around.

A Journey to Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following: Mr. Speak-

er, on Friday of this week St. Patrick's Day will be observed. I think it a most appropriate time to insert in the RECORD another in a highly informative and often humorous series of articles written by Mr. Thomas Heffernan, editor, Sunday Independent, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., on the experiences he had on an extended trip through Ireland last fall. Today's article appeared in that newspaper on March 5, 1961. Mr. Heffernan's article follows:

A JOURNEY TO IRELAND—IRISH FOX HUNTING IS NATURAL; CUSTOMS ARE CENTURIES OLD

(By Tom Heffernan)

It appears we left some confusion last week when we wrote that in hunting as it is known in Ireland, the rest of Britain and Europe, no guns are used, so some wondered just how the hunt was completed—also if trapped foxes were released to assure a chase.

The answer to the first is that guns could not be used and furthermore none is necessary since the hounds kill the fox.

He is killed in an instant when these 40 or 50 big foxhounds catch up to him.

As for whether foxes are released to be chased, the answer is in the negative since fox hunting in Ireland is completely natural, which is one reason we picked it to try the sport.

As for results, we got up to four foxes a day.

The fox is classed as vermin, the farmers want them kept down and but for the hunts chasing them for sport they probably would have been eliminated by poison long since.

FOX IS A KILLER

You see, when a fox manages to reach a chicken yard or gets into a coop at night, he does not run off with a chicken to make a meal.

While he does that in the end, he first kills every chicken he can reach and leaves them lying where they fall.

We have an idea that to keep the farmers from complaining, the hunts pay a little fox damage, just as in Pennsylvania the game commission, for the same reason, pays farmers for damage done by deer and bear.

As for being cruel, we have to feel that no one who does any kind of killing either of game or vermin for sport should call the sport or any other person cruel.

The rabbit in Luzerne County does not exactly enjoy being chased by a beagle or shot by the beagle's owner, with the same applying to all other hunted animals and fowl.

It can be said, however, there are no wounded foxes, crawling off to a lingering death after the kind of fox hunt we joined in Ireland.

Those foxes either are killed with the flick of a big hound's head—as a cat kills a rat—or they get away.

There is nothing in between.

OLD TRADITIONS IN CUSTOMS, CLOTHES

Traditions and customs are ancient, honorable and extremely strong in fox hunting—riding to the hounds—though we were assured, when we knew part of our attire was wrong to be concerned not at all since "anything goes in Ireland."

While that isn't exactly true, they were anxious to help an ignorant stranger.

Perhaps it might be mentioned at this point that since they have done a pretty good job of preserving their sport for all these hundreds of years, it may well be that the traditions and customs have served well.

At any rate, if one doesn't care to abide by their customs, one does not have to go hunting with them.

We wore the plain black Melton coat of rather heavy cloth to meet the chill of December, two well-used pairs of breeches, one buff and one fawn, and the black bowler—derby to you.

GOOD PROTECTION

It is a specially reinforced derby to fend off the wallops you get when smashing into heavy branches of trees jumping over a bank. A soft hat would have resulted in at least painful injuries.

Our boots were black, with a tan cuff at the top and these were wrong, as we knew.

The tan cuffs are worn only with the jacket of scarlet (red) or the special color a particular hunt may adopt.

With these jackets, which are of different and slightly longer cut than the Melton, white breeches as well as those of fawn or buff may be worn, also the high silk hat.

The hunting cap, which also is hard and serves as a protection, is worn only by the master, the huntsmen and whips, and women.

They say that, at one time, everyone wore caps but eventually its use was restricted to distinguish these leaders of the hunt.

WE HAVE CUSTOMS, TOO

However, a chap who knew America as well as the British Isles, said "The foolishness of a custom depends on the viewpoint.

"For instance," he said, "in your country, straw hats are not worn before May 15 nor after September 15—regardless of the weather or climate.

"The custom is quite general to wear a black tie with a tuxedo and a white tie with tails (full dress suit), which also is purely a matter of custom and tradition, too.

"Men who wear a morning coat for their wedding—though they might never have worn such a coat before and never will again—wouldn't think of wearing a pair of blue serge or tweed trousers with it, would they?

"No, indeed, only striped trousers.

"So. * * * You see. * * *"

We do.

One more item.

At the back of the hunting cap is a black bow of ribon, which, we had read, always is worn with the ribbon's ends pointing up.

That of Lord Daresbury, master of the County Limerick Hounds—and those of everyone we saw—hung down.

He said he had never seen anything else.

USE LITTLE TERRIERS TO FLUSH FOXES

Every so often, when a hunted fox goes to ground—deep in a hole from which he cannot otherwise be flushed—a terrier is sent in after him.

Frequently the terrier succeeds and often the result is really worth while.

There was one day, for instance, while hunting with the Scarteen Black and Tans of Thaddeus Ryan, MFH, that a terrier was used with complete success.

Furthermore, as it happened, the terrier had the fox out of the hole and well under way before the hounds recognized the situation or could be put on the trail in chase.

RIGHT AFTER THE FOX

So the picture produced was that of a good-sized fox running full speed across the field with the spunky little terrier, its short legs pumping like mad in its wild effort, racing right behind Sir Reynard.

Yipping like a dandy at every stride, the pint-sized terrier was full of courage as he—all alone—went after the fox that was bigger than he.

The two of them were almost across the big field and gone before the hound pack got underway.

The terriers, these in charge of 83-year-old Jack Dargan, are carried about in a jeep as the hunt goes on, seeking to keep as close to the hunt as the roads will permit.

When needed, the terriers are seldom far away and soon can be put to work.

STEERS AND CARTS ARE ROAD HAZARDS

There are more hazards on Ireland's roads, for an American visitor, than having to drive on the left.

There are steers—and carts without lights.

Every day, no matter where, you meet from 5 to 50 steers coming down the road as the owner brings home some to be fattened or takes a bunch to market.

Try and get by them.

Then, at night—and the lonelier or more remote the road the more likely—you can round a sharp curve in inky darkness and see, we hope in time, the dim outline of a horse-drawn cart.

There were a couple we haven't yet figured out how we missed.

A GOOD HUNTER HAS LOTS OF LEP

Instead of using the word "jump" in connection with the prime requisite of the horse used for hunting, the Irish horseman will say "lep."

When we climbed on a big chestnut for our first try at foxhunting we made some remark about hoping he would do well for us.

"Ah, he's a grand lepper," we were told.

"Sure an' he's got a lot o' lep in him," said Paddy O'Toole.

BEAGLE PACKS ARE FOLLOWED ON FOOT

There is another sport in Ireland, akin to hunting, which would be beyond most of us.

The packs are of beagles, their quarry is the hare.

And the followers go on foot. Running.

The men—young, naturally—with the harrier pack we saw near Limerick wore jackets much like those of the foxhunters but shorter and, we believe, lighter, and of green.

They wore green caps like hunting caps and long green stockings.

In between were white track pants.

Distinguished Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1961

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, a few men receive all the credit due them in this life. And while our colleague from Ohio MIKE KIRWAN, is no exception to the rule, he has received more awards, honorary degrees, citations, medals, diplomas and other notable honors than any other Member of Congress in either body.

The latest came just last Thursday when at the 12th annual banquet of his industrial area, sponsored by the Industrial Commission of Ohio, he was awarded the coveted medallion which for 12 years has been conferred on captains of industry, community builders, and outstanding benefactors of State and Nation, including the executives of United States Steel, Youngstown Alloy, Ajax Magnethermic, Hutch Manufacturing, Concrete Steel, Frandee Corp., Johnson Lumber, Super Laundry, Carbon Limestone, Frank Sherman Co., China Craft, Youngstown Lamp, Ward Baking, Coca-Cola, and Republic Steel.

The beautiful medallion which is a work of art in itself is engraved: "To honor MICHAEL JOSEPH KIRWAN, 1961."

The citation given at the close of the speech in recognition of his exceptional career of public service reads:

IN TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE MICHAEL JOSEPH KIRWAN

As a self-made man who is recognized among men for his great capacity for understanding and accomplishment. Coming from a humble, austere beginning, he fought his way to the top by sheer force of his own character and determination. His life is a symbol of success and light of hope to the people of the world—the American success story.

As a dedicated public servant, believing and practicing that public office is a public trust, he has served his congressional district, State, and country with distinction as the Representative to the U.S. Congress from the Youngstown, Ohio, area for 25 years. A steadfast defender of the rights of the individual, a leader in the development of our natural resources, a spokesman for conservation and reclamation, a respected and admired subcommittee chairman on the important Appropriations Committee for 18 years. He has been elected to the high post as chairman of the Democratic National Congressional Committee for 8 consecutive Congresses.

As a Christian gentleman whose devotion to his family and country exemplify the high traits of character possessed of a man who lives his religion. If one trait must be paramount in a life so full and complete, it must be his devotion to his church, which is an inspiration to all who know him.

As a husband and father ever mindful of the great rewards derived from his devoted wife and family. Ever responsive to those benefits reserved to fatherhood and an inspiration to his family of children and grandchildren.

How Urgent Is Study of the Color of Pork?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, serving on the Agricultural Subcommittee of the full House Committee on Appropriations and coming from the heart of the Corn Belt in Illinois, I was more than amused to note the editorial appearing in the Columbus Dispatch of February 18 and entitled "How Urgent Is the Study of the Color of Pork?" For the edification of my colleagues, I ask, Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent that the editorial be reprinted at this point:

HOW URGENT IS STUDY OF THE COLOR OF PORK?

At his most recent press conference, President Kennedy said every possible step would be taken to bring about economy in the Federal Government. With an annual budget of $80 billion, he said, undoubtedly there are unnecessary expenditures.

We suggest one place for a small beginning. A recent news item from Washington revealed that the Agriculture Department has hired a scientific institute in Communist Poland to find out more about the color of pork.

The Department announced the grant, amounting to nearly $43,000, would go to the Institute of Animal Physiology and Nutrition of the Polish Academy of Sciences in Warsaw.

The very same day the grant was announced a New Jersey Congressman introduced legislation which would permit the United States to make loans to Communist-dominated countries.

He explained that the proposal was an administration measure intended to implement President Kennedy's suggestion for improving relations with Poland and other satellite countries.

Frankly, we doubt whether many Americans are very much concerned about the color of Polish pork, and, furthermore, it is unlikely they approve of their hard-earned tax dollars being used to further communism.

In light of the current unemployment problem and the national economic slump, the Federal Government would do well to concentrate on helping its own citizens and pay less attention to wooing Communist nations.

The $43,000 assigned to study the color of pork in Poland would feed quite a few unfortunate people in the United States.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of March 11, 1961:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

MARCH 11, 1961.

The Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1961, passed handily without a record vote. Seldom is there opposition to these catchall spending bills because of the unique congressional system of authorization and appropriation. After all, we must pay for the programs we authorize. What I once thought a blessing, namely, Congress' double consideration of each legislative matter involving expenditure, I now see as weakness hiding behind procedure. Here's how it goes. When a new program is thought of, the cost is shrugged away with a "this doesn't cost anything; it's only the authorization; we'll consider the cost under the appropriation bill later." When the appropriation bill comes up later, we're reminded, "You must spend this money because you've already authorized it." The result too frequently is reduced discipline in the spending of money. While this may reflect the House's will on any specific occasion, yet the procedures unduly abet the natural inclination to spend someone else's money.

Within this framework, I made a mistake, a vote cast I wish could be changed, the first in 7 years. During debate, an amendment was proposed adding approximately $30 million to the already large sums of Federal aid given to impacted school areas where Federal Government workers cause a hardship on local school facilities requiring financial aid. I voted for this amendment thinking of the relative merits of aiding impacted areas only or Federal aid to all school districts, without knowing of an important procedural omission. This additional sum had not been studied by the appropriation subcommittee but was added on the House floor, a violation of our own sensible, committee procedures, which at the least assure some knowledgeable consideration of the how much and why of our spending. After further thought, I am even dubious of the merits of continually increasing aid to impacted areas and shall study the possibilities of our gradually retrenching in this area as communities become adjusted to the increased Federal population. We must remember that tax rolls increase as Federal workers buy property and settle permanently in the various communities. Even in error I am reminded of some important lessons. (1) A vote should be based on a knowledge of all the salient facts. (2) Correct procedure must never be forgotten since this is the bulwark of good government (reemphasizing the importance of our earlier squabble over the Rules Committee).

The feed program for 1961, involving corn, grain sorghums, soybeans or other feed grain and oil seed crops, is almost unbelievable. The administration's further effort to strangle the farmers with Federal concern and attention is impossible to define or describe, except for repeating the words of the bill. Few agree on what it means. I will send a copy to anyone interested in attempting to understand it. Most agree it means more Federal control and less freedom for the farmer. All agree that we're almost buried in surpluses. All agree it will cost the taxpayer much more. One grave danger recognized by many is the potential destruction of the free market by permitting the Government to sell its holdings below the market level. Yet this is only one of many of the dangers of bureaucratic control of the farming industry. As one Member summarized the bill, "I can foresee the year ahead as a time when a farmer's skill at farming will not depend so much on his knowledge of soil and crops as it will on his skill at interpreting regulations."

The Peace Corps finally got a comeuppance when a Congresswoman flatly called it a terrifying prospect. She felt that the thought of sending too-little trained young people overseas in the name of building good-will belied and contradicted the smooth-sounding designation of Peace Corps. Perhaps our younger citizens can give us some light on the subject.

The Ways and Means Committee has some busy times ahead. (1) A bill to exempt from income tax foreign banks' holdings of U.S. obligations will give foreigners a tax break not extended our own citizens. (2) Five changes in social security will cost at least $1 billion more per year and will cost all employees another ¼ percent and employers ¼ percent, and self-employed ⅜ percent. I predict that when taxpayers start to really examine social security and its cost, there will be public indignation beyond anything heard to date. Thus far the political handout aspect of something-for-nothing has overshadowed the cost and actuarial unsoundness which must someday be recognized by all. The field of taxation is confounding at best. Recent Kennedy administration admissions of the benefit of tax reduction to stimulate business and expand purchasing power contradicts everything otherwise championed by the administration. Simultaneously, many tax increases are being recommended—unemployment compensation, social security, highway users, and others. As to the logic of cutting taxes to stimulate business, with which I agree, then why wait? Further, why simultaneously recommend increased spending hand-over-fist that requires higher taxes? On the contrary, the logic suggests that less Federal spending and more money left in the hands of our people will continue to accelerate prosperity. The hitch, of course, is that the Federal programs would be trimmed and eliminated and less power reside in Washington. Unless the public demands it, the Federal Government will never turn back money to the taxpayers, despite the recent administration statements, because with money goes power. Power, the liberals believe, must stay in Washington and Federal hands.

Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HORACE R. KORNEGAY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1961

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech made by our colleague, the Honorable BASIL L. WHITENER, of the 11th District of North Carolina, to the Lower Catawba River Soil Conservation District, March 10, 1961, on the very timely subject of soil conservation. This is such an excellent and well-documented presentation that I thought it would be of great interest to the Members of the House, as well as to the public generally:

ADDRESS BY BASIL L. WHITENER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 11TH DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA, ANNUAL LADIES NIGHT DINNER, LOWER CATAWBA RIVER SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT, GASTON COUNTY AGRICULTURAL CENTER, DALLAS, N.C., MARCH 10, 1961—7 P.M.

I am very happy to be here tonight to discuss for a few minutes with so many of my friends soil conservation and what it means to the survival of our Nation.

Land, its proper use and care, is basic to our survival.

The history of agriculture is the story of man's use and misuse of land and the natural resources from land. In fact, we can trace the rise and fall of great civilizations and nations that existed in the past through a study of the use they made of the land in their possession.

The history of agriculture goes back approximately 7,000 years ago to the Biblical lands of the Middle East. In the fertile valleys of the Tigris, Euphrates, and Jordan Rivers it is said that man had his beginning.

From the Bible we know that it was a land of milk and honey and an area of great natural forests and verdant valleys. The great cedars of Lebanon were used to build King Solomon's temple, and every variety of agricultural product was cultivated in what was to be known in history as the Fertile Crescent.

Mankind, however, has never been able for some strange and unexplainable reason to learn how to use, protect, and enrich the land with which he has been so richly blessed. Only during the past 50 years have we come to realize the need for conserving land. Only in recent times has come the knowledge that unless land can be preserved our civilization in the end will perish.

Although agriculture began in the Holy Land 7,000 years ago, the people who lived in that area did not know how to conserve what God had given them. In time the great Cedars of Lebanon were laid waste. The fertile soil washed away to the Red Sea and to the Mediterranean. The land that flowed with milk and honey became a desert, and the rose of Sharon failed to bloom.

In the place of plenty there was famine. Instead of wealth there was poverty, and today as we fly over the birthplace of agriculture we see only a wasteland and a monument to man's inability to conserve the basic gift so necessary to his survival.

This story has been repeated a hundred times during the course of history. Egypt, the birthplace of cotton, became in a large part a desert. The fertile soil of Italy was washed away, and the collapse of the Roman Empire was inevitable.

Four thousand years ago China was one of the richest and most productive nations on earth. Today its vast interior is a wasteland of gullies, arid mountains, and unproductive deserts.

Everyone in the world, therefore, has a very vital stake in soil conservation.

Our forefathers followed the historic pattern and in the beginning paid very little attention to soil conservation.

It has been said that they hacked, chopped, and burned their way across America, leaving in their wake ruined and abandoned fields and gullied hillsides. Certain sections of our country to this day bear the mark left by our forefathers. The land is still unfit for cultivation and defies even modern attempts to bring it into use. Such sections exist up and down our eastern seaboard and in many areas of our Midwest.

I think it is interesting to note that the first man to become interested in soil conservation in the United States was a New Englander by the name of Jared Eliot. Eliot, a native of Connecticut, lived from 1685 to 1763. At an early age he realized that New England was literally washing away due to the lack of conservation practices on the part of his neighbors.

He devoted his life to the study of conservation and wrote a book which became the "conservation bible" of his day and time. Unfortunately Eliot's teaching of conservation and the great work done by his successors in the field had little effect on our forefathers.

Only within the past 50 years has the lack of good land, a growing population, the need for increased timber, and the destruction wrought by great floods brought home to the American people the realization that conservation must be removed from the realm of discussion and placed into practice.

The United States has over 600 million acres of land with characteristics favorable to crop production. About 400 million acres of this land is used every year. We have a population of 180 million people at the present time, and it is expected that by the year 2,000 we will have a population of approximately 300 million people.

It does not take the vision of a prophet for us to realize that this vast population must make intensive use of natural resources gathered from the soil if our Nation is to survive. We have great surpluses of food at the present time, but experts tell us that the day will surely arrive when it will take every acre of land capable of being cultivated to supply the wants of our people.

Soil conservation, therefore, is not just a question for persons engaged in agriculture. It is a matter of grave concern to everyone.

I am particularly pleased, therefore, to be here tonight with the leaders of one of the outstanding soil conservation districts in the United States. The work you are doing will insure that a dynamic and growing North Carolina will continue to have the natural resources that come from the soil for the uncertain days that lie ahead.

I think we can all be proud of the the fact that the first soil conservation district in the United States was created in North Carolina. Organized in Anson and Union Counties on August 4, 1937, it was the forerunner of over 2,860 soil conservation districts we have in our land today. The original 120,000 acres in the first North Carolina soil conservation district has expanded to over 1,665,256,000 acres in every one of our 50 States, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

More than 4,538,000 farms in the United States are in soil conservation districts. In fact, approximately 91 percent of the land in farms and 95 percent of the farms in our Nation are now in soil conservation districts administered and controlled by you and other outstanding citizens.

When we speak of the need to conserve the natural resources of our Nation we are dealing with a question vital to the security of our freedom and that of the world. The Soviet Union has a far greater land mass than does the United States and is capable in the future of placing into cultivation hundreds of thousands more acres than can the United States.

Russia is engaged in a deadly race with the United States on all fronts, including that of agriculture. One of the great objectives of the Soviet Union is to surpass our Nation in the production of foodstuffs.

Russia is still, to a great extent, a have-not nation when it comes to adequate clothing and food for her people. Thus, she is striving to overtake us, and when that day arrives we are in serious difficulty.

At the present moment 50 million people—more than 40 percent of the labor force of the Soviet Union—are engaged in agriculture. When we compare this with the 7½ million Americans engaged in agriculture, we can visualize the magnitude of the effort that Russia is making.

The underdeveloped nations of the world have a tremendous need for food, proper shelter, clothing, and the other gifts of land. Many of them are countries carved out of the dead and arid empires which I mentioned a few moments ago as having perished from the lack of proper conservation practices in the past.

The Communists know that if the day arrives when the Soviet Union can supply food and the other products of a rich agricultural economy to the ill-fed, poorly housed, and half-clothed peoples of the world, the battle for world domination by communism will be won.

We in North Carolina can be proud of the progress that our soil conservation districts are making to aid our farm economy and conserve our national resources. I am particularly proud of the very fine work that is being done by the Lower Catawba District.

As you know, your district was formed in 1940 and was the 11th created in our State. Today we have 43 soil conservation districts.

The people in the Piedmont area of North Carolina have always been interested in soil and water conservation. You will recall that the Civilian Conservation Corps had camps at Gastonia and Cherryville between 1935 and 1942. The work which the young men of that organization did has had a tremendous effect in the improvement of our land and timber resources.

President Kennedy has said, in promising his support of an expanded soil and water conservation program, "We in America enjoy a situation that is rare in human history. We have enough to eat." He also reminded us that: "There is too little public recognition of how much we all depend upon farmers as stewards of our soil, water, and wildlife resources."

The lower Catawba district has an outstanding record among the soil conservation districts of North Carolina and the Nation. I noted recently that as of June 30, 1960, the district had nearly 3,300 cooperators with basic soil surveys completed on more than half a million acres and with basic conservation plans on more than 230,500 of their 283,500 acres.

You are to be commended on the wide range of conservation measures you have used successfully, such as conservation cropping systems, contour farming, cover cropping, pasture planning, tree planting, and farm ponds, to mention some your fine practices which I have observed.

Your magnificient record has been indicative of the work performed in North Carolina by the other 42 soil conservation districts. I have been pleased to note that for the State as a whole more than 92,000 district cooperators, operating 9⅓ million acres, have

nearly 67,000 basic conservation plans on 6¾ million of those acres and that soil surveys have been completed on 16¼ million acres. This certainly is an impressive record.

I have always been interested in soil conservation, and during my service in the Congress I have kept advised as to the progress of all legislation on the subject. I think that all of us in the State of North Carolina, and for that matter in the Nation, can be proud of the fact that President Kennedy has realized the position of leadership that our State has in agriculture.

He has seen fit to name three distinguished North Carolinians as members of his administration. These men, all dedicated to a better farm economy, are Charles S. Murphy, our Under Secretary of Agriculture; Horace Godfrey, the Administrator of the Commodity Stabilization Service; and Harry B. Caldwell, who has been named Chairman of the Secretary's Agricultural Advisory Committee.

I feel sure that with these able men in the President's administration we can look forward to a new era in our agricultural economy. While it is too early to predict what sort of farm and soil conservation legislation we can expect at this session of the Congress, I am confident that the steady progress that has been made during the years will be accelerated.

Secretary of Agriculture Freeman said recently: "One of our major objectives in agriculture is to turn America's abundance into a blessing. Another is to insure the production of enough food and fibers to supply high standards for all Americans now and in the years ahead." With the great team of North Carolinians working with him I am sure that the Secretary's objectives will be realized.

The members of the lower Catawba soil conservation district can also take pride in the caliber of leadership which the district has on the local level. Chairman Dane Rhyne, who has long been active in agriculture and who has served with distinction as past president of the State Association of Soil Conservation Districts, together with R. B. Watterson, R. A. Jackson, and Hugh Helms of Gaston County, as well as supervisors like A. H. Beam of Lincoln County and Neal Craig of Mecklenburg County, exemplify the high caliber of people who are working to preserve our soil, our wildlife, and our timber resources. I commend them and every member of the Lower Catawba River District for the splendid efforts that are being accomplished.

In conclusion, I want to say that I am happy to see so many of the ladies out for this occasion. You know conservation is not only a man's job. It is also a job for all of us. I feel that it can be truthfully said that much of the fine work being done in the lower Catawba district can be attributed to the inspiration and interest on the part of the ladies present here tonight.

I want to assure you of my continued interest in the fine work you are doing. I hope you will continue to keep me informed as to your activities. At any time that I can be of possible service or help to you in the great work you are doing I hope you will call upon me.

As one final word, I would like to point out that there is nothing wrong with the land that our Lord has given us. It has been mankind who has wasted his precious resource. Our charge and responsibility is to give our full efforts in avoiding future dissipation of this great and vital resource which is a great legacy given to us by Almighty God.

May 1961 prove to be a very fruitful year in all of your endeavors.

New Frontier Disagrees With Webster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. John Crosby was an avid supporter of the New Frontier's candidate for the Presidency. This is what he said about slum clearance and blighted areas in the New York Herald Tribune this morning:

WHO SAYS WHAT IS A SLUM?

(By John Crosby)

I suppose Russia must be like this. You never know when they are coming to order you out of your house. President Kennedy has just packed off to Congress a plan for huge Federal assistance to provide more and better housing. New York is already loaded with the stuff, so let me tell you what to expect when it hits your area.

First, the press will be full of stories from housing officials with such phrases as "urban renewal," "blighted areas," and "substandard dwellings" and all that. The next thing you know a man will show up and, to your stunned surprise, you will discover that your house is in a blighted area, is substandard. You consider your house rather nice. High ceilings, fireplaces, handsome cornices, beautifully designed and built. Nonsense, the man will tell you briskly. Those are the hallmarks of slums.

What he want to build there is a modern building with ceilings just barely high enough to stand in, rooms 9 feet square, paper-thin walls, badly ventilated, noisy, crowded, and charge you $100 a room for it. This is urban renewal. It will be built and financed by people who wouldn't dream of living in the awful thing themselves or even in the neighborhood. They live in Westchester on the profits they make from urban renewal.

This is what's happening in West Village in Greenwich Village. The city's Housing and Relocation Board announced on a Tuesday that they would propose a plan for Thursday with Washington's Birthday in between. Villagers call it 24-hour democracy. Walter Fried, one of the commissioners of the board, who appeared before a group of angry villagers to explain this, said "We have learned from experience in other neighborhoods that it is best to try for the fastest possible action in order to avoid unnecessary local disturbances."

Translated, that means: Hit them with the bulldozers before they have a chance to organize and protest the destruction of their homes. "Unnecessary local disturbance" is the very essence of democracy. I had lunch the other day with Eric Sevareid of CBS, who's been living in England, and Eric was talking about how long it took in England to inflict progress on the English because every last individual right was scrupulously observed. But this is what a democracy is.

Mr. Fried was asked—and provided no real answers—who decides what is a slum? And why should any neighborhood look forward to the prospect of public housing when the concrete pillboxes being erected in the name of public housing have created the most dangerous and depressing slums yet?

I am not arguing that all public and semi-public—that is private housing with Federal and State assistance—is unwise. It's got to be done. But this is the worst possible way to go about it. The first consideration in any of these urban renewal (ugly phrase which fits the houses) programs should be the psychological values of the neighborhood. The psychological beauties of a neighborhood, where people live together in their own harmonies, is far more precious than the paint job on the houses. (Let the Government redo the houses, not demolish them and build substandard—aah, there—anthills in place of them.) The psychology of cities and of people is being absolutely ignored in these brick monstrosities of appalling conformity and ugliness called urban renewal. A neighborhood is a viable community of people who have learned to live together. West Village is an example of complete integration of races and income groups, for instance.

While the Federal Government is fighting racial segregation, it is building a whole new kind of economic segregation, erecting these anthills for people of similar incomes. There is also a very bad smell about this whole plan. A group called Mi-Cove (Middle Income Cooperators of Greenwich Village) who are not villagers seems intent on throwing people out of their homes with the assistance of city officials and making a fancy profit out of what is erected in place of the lovely 18th century homes that are there now.

But the village keeps its sense of humor. One of the coffee houses, called Phase 2, has a number called "Please, Mr. Tishman, leave me alone." It tells about a girl looking for an apartment for 3 years, finally finding a hole in the wall—but it's home. Then she finds they're painting X's on her windows. No spot on earth can put its problems into a song or a skit faster than a villager. Well, now it can. But if the bulldozers arrive, they will bulldoze not only the buildings but the spirit of the place—and that would be a loss beyond price.

H.R. 2798, a Bill to Repeal the Commodities Clause in Part I of the Interstate Commerce Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on January 16, 1961, I introduced H.R. 2798, a bill to repeal the commodities clause in part I of the Interstate Commerce Act.

Under the so-called commodities clause a railroad company is prohibited from transporting in interstate commerce any article or commodity other than timber and the manufactured products thereof which it may own in whole or in part, or in which it may have any interest, direct or indirect, except such commodities as may be used in its business as a common carrier.

The commodities clause, Mr. Speaker, was enacted in an era when the railroads occupied a monopoly position in transportation. Its enactment reflected a governmental policy to separate the production and manufacture of commodities from their transportation. Today,

the railroads carry only about 45 percent of the Nation's traffic and are confronted with fierce competition by other forms of transportation, but they continue to be the only transport agency to which the prohibitions of the commodities clause apply. Thus, as to over half of today's transport there is no governmental policy separating it from production and manufacture.

The fact that a tremendous growth of competition in the transportation industry has not led to repeal of the commodities clause, or to the extension of its prohibitions to other forms of transportation, offers a striking example of the failure of regulatory policy to keep pace with changing conditions. This failure to adjust regulation to today's facts has resulted in inconsistent treatment among the several forms of transport that has been almost invariably discriminatory against the railroads as the transport form that was first regulated in point of time and as the one that has been, as a matter of degree, most intensely regulated.

This discriminatory treatment cannot be justified by any claim that the railroads possess a superior economic power. The fact is that, measured by dollars, the position of the railroads today is secondary to the motor carriers, and the rail share continues to decline. Furthermore the waterways and the highways are traveled by many of the largest and most prosperous corporations in America carrying their own commodities in their own barges, ships, and trucks. Two-thirds of the trucks on the road today are either private or exempt carriers. Only an estimated 10 percent of domestic water transportation is regulated by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

So the commodities clause should, in fairness and in the interest of equality of regulatory treatment, be repealed. Since it first became effective in 1906 the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission has been greatly increased. The ICC now has full power to correct and prevent every conceivable kind of undue discrimination and prejudice. These other provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act are entirely sufficient to prevent any reappearance of the alleged abuses that the commodities clause was long ago intended to prevent.

I urge, Mr. Speaker, that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce favorably report, and that the Congress enact, H.R. 2798.

H.R. 3647: Bill To Repeal the Auto Excise Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, as many attempts as there have been to repeal the auto excise tax, as many times as I have raised my voice in that demand, and despite much discouragement and inaction in the past, there still exists a large, persistent, and I believe, growing body of public opinion that strongly declares this tax reform to be both desirable and important, economically, and unqualifiedly necessary in terms of tax justice. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to inform my colleagues of another instant of this public feeling which is contained in a letter from the Honorable Ralph W. Crego, mayor of the city of Lansing, Mich., expressing the city council's endorsement of my bill H.R. 3647. I believe that able statements such as this one indicate the degree of sincerity and reasonableness that characterizes the thinking of those who advocate this repeal:

CITY OF LANSING, MICH.,
March 7, 1961.

Hon. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAMBERLAIN: This is to advise you that I, and the City Council of the City of Lansing, and all civic groups who are aware of the problem are strongly in favor of H.R. 3647 relative excise tax on automobiles and trucks.

Your similar proposals, in years gone by, have been a recognition on your part of the discriminatory burden carried by the major industry in our State. The repeal of this tax is long overdue.

Since the war, the excise tax has either been removed or reduced with respect to most articles upon which it had been placed. It is impossible for us to comprehend why an article upon which so many Americans are dependent and which contributes so greatly to our prosperity should continue to be taxed in this manner.

The automobile industry should not be asked to assume this unfair burden in ordinary times. It is doubly important that your colleagues should appreciate its effect upon our economy at the present time, when so many areas, dependent upon the manufacture of automobiles, have been declared depressed areas, and when at the same time this industry must meet the very real competition of the foreign-made car.

The workers in our community are proud American citizens; they prefer jobs to a dole. The removal of this tax would, in our opinion, provide a direct stimulus to the automotive industry upon which we are so dependent and would result in many of our workers being recalled and production being increased in our factories.

May I, at this time, commend your efforts on behalf of the people of the city of Lansing and of the State of Michigan who are so dependent upon the production of automobiles and urge you to vigorously press your attempt to remove a tax which has, in the last few years, had a deplorably depressing effect upon a key industry.

Sincerely,

RALPH W. CREGO, *Mayor.*

Red China by the Back Door

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1961

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted to extend my remarks, I wish to insert an article written by Ralph de Toledano entitled "Red China by the Back Door."

It is frightening to me to read of pronouncements by our Ambassador to the U.N., and by others, adopting a defeatist attitude toward keeping predatory Red China from the U.N. Such pronouncements cause our friends to doubt our will to win this fight.

Let it not be forgotten that this House has voted overwhelmingly several times to the effect that Red China should be kept from the U.N. Neither let it be forgotten that Red China is the same unrepentant monster which, 10 years ago at this very time, was making war on the United Nations and inflicting casualties on the sons of the United States. Neither let it be forgotten that appeasement has never sated a Communist, and never will. Most of all, let it not be forgotten that if we act with resolution, we can keep the U.N. free of Red China.

The article follows:

RED CHINA BY THE BACK DOOR

(By Ralph de Toledano)

Very quietly, where Foggy Bottom and 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue meet, a persistent whisper can be heard that we must be realistic and face the inevitable on the Red China question. The inevitable stands for admission of the Red Chinese into the United Nations and eventual recognition of the brigand state by the United States. Why it is inevitable is never fully explained and all the arguments for this disastrous course of action seem to peter out into mumbled statements that "you can't ignore the Chinese mainland."

Propaganda for a sellout to the Chinese Reds has very skillfully hidden the fact that the United States can very simply and effectively keep Red China out of the United Nations. If the Soviets, the Afro-Asians and part of the Latin American bloc join forces in the General Assembly, they need a two-thirds vote to succeed. And even this is not enough. The Security Council must approve, and there both the United States and the Chinese Nationalists have the veto. The Soviet Union has employed her veto freely to keep other nations out, when it suited Communist purposes, but we are being told constantly that it wolud be bad for the United States to make use of this prerogative.

It is forgotten that our Ambassador to the United Nations warned last autumn that the United States might withdraw if Red China were admitted to the world body. This shocked some of the more sensative souls in the State Department, but it had considerable impact in the halls of the United Nations. Among diplomats, there is a substantial body of agreement that should the United States unequivocally announce that it would use the veto, the effect would be very salutary.

It used to be said that we must show our flexibility by going along with admission and recognition of Red China. The new argument, which the State Department has encouraged the British Government to stress, concerns disarmament. How, it is asked, can the Soviet Union and the Western Powers discuss disarmament without including Red China. The quick answer, of coourse is that we can if we wish discuss anything with the Red Chinese, and have been doing it for many weary months in Geneva. The second answer is one which the British, despite their hopes that we will cease to block admission, were honest enough almost to admit. In debate before the House of Lords, the British Foreign Secretary Lord Home really let the cat out of the bag when he said:

"We can make no progress with disarmament unless China is there. I do not know whether we can make very much progress if China is there, but that remains to be seen."

In short, the British are telling us, while the State Department softly applauds, that in exchange for the admittedly paper-thin hope of getting the Chinese Reds to act civilized, we should increase Communist strength at the United Nations, make the U.N. Charter a dead letter by giving moral sanction to a series of belligerent acts, and authorize the establishment of one or more Communist espionage center in New York City.

Neither the Soviets nor the Chinese Reds want disarmament—except for the West. To the point of utter boredom they have made it clear that disarmament to them means a scrapping of Western nuclear weapons without any check on their reciprocation. Since 1945, America's experience has been that negotiation of any kind with the Communists ends up in one of two ways: either in a stalemate or in an agreement violated even before the ink is dry. President Roosevelt learned that at Yalta, President Truman at Potsdam, President Eisenhower in Paris. President Kennedy must learn it too, but I hope the price he pays will not be so high for himself and the Nation.

Along with the disarmament argument, the proponents of Red Chinese recognition have come up with something else—a kind of sleeping pill for the Nation. You hear it over and over in Washington. "There's no need to fear admission of Red China to the United Nations," it is said. "The Chinese Communists won't come in unless we kick out the Republic of China and put the mainland regime in the Security Council." Just last week, the State Department made public a statement by Red Chinese Premier Chou En-lai: "The United Nations must expel the Chiang Kai-shek clique, otherwise it will be impossible for China to have anything to do with the United Nations."

Experts on Communist strategy and tactics are convinced that this is nonsense. Let the U.N. General Assembly seat the Red Chinese and Chou En-lai will leap to it. It will give him the forum he wants in the West, enhance his prestige in Asia, and provide a base of operations for ousting the legitimate Government of China. Like all good Communists, Premier Chou knows that infiltration and the flank attack are often far more successful than the frontal assault. To him, anything we offer will be an opening wedge.

So far, Secretary of State Dean Rusk continues to speak out in support of our commitments to the Chinese on Formosa. But the whisper down in Foggy Bottom is that he will gradually edge away from this stand. It may be a rumor, spread to weaken anti-admission forces. Or it may be fact.

This Will Be Something New

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fort Scott (Kans.) Tribune of March 8, 1961. I believe this editorial makes a reasonable request of labor, management, and government in behalf of the consumers and general public. I hope that the editorial, along with other things being spoken in the same vein, will be met with good response, and that it admonitions will not be lightly taken:

THIS WILL BE SOMETHING NEW

President Kennedy's announced intention to encourage both business and labor to hold the line on costs will receive loud and widespread support. How people in business and labor organizations perform when faced with their own decisions that determine whether costs must continue upward or be held in restraint, however, will speak far more impressively than present words of commendation.

How the Kennedy administration big spending plans designed to stimulate business and employment recovery could be reconciled with promises to prevent inflation has not been clearly explained. At present, the expressed hopes that costs will be held are somewhat less strong than expectations for greater spending and more inflation.

At least it is something to have a goal, and there is no doubt but that pressure, if applied intelligently from Washington offices, can encourage both business and labor organizations to restrain prices to some extent.

The lack of such pressures in the past has tended to give free rein to boosting costs both of goods and services. Increased labor costs used as the excuse for high prices of manufactures, and vice versa, have accounted for the inflation spiral.

It will be a bright new day if planned prosperity can be purchased without the price of more inflation. Here indeed, a new, albeit foggy, frontier is being faced.

Open Wide the Doors to Foreign Visitors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1961

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I have been gratified by the favorable response to my remarks in the House on March 2 on the problems of attracting foreign visitors to the United States. Comments by both the press and private individuals indicate widespread support for legislation to establish a new Office of International Travel and to liberalize substantially our rigorous visa and entry requirements.

I was also gratified that on March 5 the State Department announced it was making substantial revisions in the application processes for visas. The Department has had the option of asking foreign visitors to fill out short-form or long-form application blanks. The long-form blank has been too often used and it contains many unnecessary and sometimes offensive questions. This revision of administrative practices is welcome.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to insert in the RECORD an editorial on the subject of the legislative approach to the visa question which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on March 10, 1961, under the title "Open Wide the Doors to Foreign Visitors":

OPEN WIDE THE DOORS TO FOREIGN VISITORS

If you invite a guest to your home, both courtesy and commonsense dictate that you not harass him at the door. Yet this is what the tourist-hungry United States too often does, and—equally damaging—what it has a reputation for doing.

This is partly, though by no means entirely, because of restrictive provisions of the law governing visas. It contains, for example, a clause specifying that "every alien [applicant] shall be presumed to be an immigrant" until he proves otherwise. With very limited exceptions, it bars reciprocal agreements with other countries providing for the waiver of visas. It denies the Secretary of State authority to overrule a consular officer's refusal of a visa.

New York's Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY has introduced a bill to change all this, and also to simplify entry procedures by stationing immigration and health officials overseas as a convenience for the would-be visitors.

Probably the most controversial aspect of the bill will be the one he considers its key provision—authorizing the Secretary of State to waive nonimmigrant visas for nationals of any country which grants reciprocal privileges to U.S. citizens. A lot of Americans are still haunted by a distrust of anything foreign, and are readily susceptible to visions of undesirable hordes slipping in unless alert consular officers are there to bar their way.

But the point is that the United States now needs visitors more than it needs protection against them. In a selfishly economic sense, it needs their money. A 1960 gap of $1,150 million between what foreign visitors spent here and what American travelers spent abroad made a hefty contribution to the balance of payments deficit. But more fundamentally important, this country has everything to gain from encouraging the widest possible spread of firsthand information about what the United States is really like. Those intent on spreading lies will spread them anyway, whether they come here or not. But those seeking the truth (and this, after all, means practically every one in those countries with which reciprocity is likely) ought to be welcomed with enthusiasm.

One of the best evidences of the sincerity of that welcome would be such a reciprocal waiving of visas.

It's time the Federal Government overhauled its whole approach to the encouragement (which sometimes has seemed discouragement) of travel to the United States. An active and well-financed tourist promotion program, which Mr. LINDSAY also espouses, seems like elemental commonsense. But we ought to remember, as he has told the House of Representatives, that "if our tourist program is to succeed, we must first encourage people to come—and we must then let them in."

Udall's Excellent Suggestion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1961

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I heartily endorse the suggestion of our former colleague, Interior Secretary Stewart Udall, that a wait of 50 years be made mandatory before allowing erection in Washington of a statue or memorial honoring an individual or event.

An editorial supporting this view appeared on March 11 in the Herald-News, published in Passaic, N.J. It

very ably represents my feelings in the matter, and, under unanimous consent, I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

MR. UDALL'S EXCELLENT SUGGESTION

The suggestion of Interior Secretary Udall to make a wait of 50 years mandatory before permitting the erection in Washington of a statue or memorial honoring an individual or event has great merit. It should receive sympathetic consideration from the Congress.

The plan to erect a jumble of monstrous concrete headstones to honor Franklin D. Roosevelt shows the necessity for preventing hasty action. The modernistic memorial could conceivably look ridiculous a half-century hence and become an eyesore in the Nation's Capital. The passage of time tends to show up fads for what they are and, on the other hand, to deepen appreciation for that which has genuine artistic merit.

The passage of time also tends to put individuals and events into their proper place in history. Washington has numerous statues and memorials to persons who were merely near great and others who have been long forgotten. These statues were the products of momentary enthusiasms and of the mistaken notion that the erection of a monument guarantees immortality.

Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln, whose memorials are the most impressive and moving in Washington, received these evidences of reverence and appreciation from posterity, not from their contemporaries.

The Forestry Situation in the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1961

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a statement presented to the House Appropriations Committee and Subcommittees on the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies by two of this Nation's outstanding foresters, Mr. Frank A. Albert of Jacksonville, Fla., and Mr. J. Walter Myers, Jr., executive director of the Forest Farmers Association. Every tree farmer in this Nation or anywhere else will be very much interested in the wonderful information contained in these two statements which were given to our House Appropriations subcommittee today:

STATEMENT PRESENTED TO THE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES, MARCH 13, 1961

(By J. Walter Myers, Jr., Executive Director, Forest Farmers Association)

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is J. Walter Myers, Jr., and I am executive director of the Forest Farmers Association. It is a pleasure to appear before this committee again as a representative of our association. As you may recall, the Forest Farmers Association is an organization of timberland owners—primarily small owners—in 15 Southern States. Our association headquarters is in Atlanta, Ga.

The Forest Farmers Association is, naturally, very interested in the forestry situation in the South, and in the progress the area is making in developing its forest resources. Our association feels that the Federal Government is a partner in the development of our forests, especially since it receives 52 percent of all the profits of the wood processing business in the form of taxes. For these reasons we feel that the Federal Government has a tremendous stake in the continued development of our forests and the markets for wood products.

The wood-using industries in the South have shown tremendous growth, due primarily to the fact that we have had and are continuing to maintain an abundance of raw material which is readily available. A well-guided program of sustained research is, however, essential if we are to maintain and further develop our forest resources to keep pace with the expanding economy.

The benefits from this research will accrue to the Federal Government and all segments of our population, in addition to the timberland owners and wood-processing enterprises. This committee has repeatedly demonstrated its interest and support in maintaining a strong program of Federal research in forestry, and this has been most gratifying. The committee, I am sure, is well aware of the outstanding manner in which the private timberland owners, wood-using industries and the States are cooperating with the Federal Government in promoting forest reesarch activities, and particularly at the local level. These groups logically, however, continue to look to the Federal Government for leadership in these activities.

In recent months, representatives of the Forest Farmers Association have carefully reviewed the status of forest research activities in the South with various key individuals and groups, including the U.S. Forest Service. We have also reviewed the 1962 fiscal year budget estimate as prepared by the previous administration. We were happy to note that it contained an increase of $1,500,000 for forest research activities, along with certain increases for cooperative programs, including $1 million for cooperative fire control. We endorse this original budget estimate and hope these important increases may be maintained, and possibly further increased.

It is our understanding that the original budget estimate may currently be undergoing further revision by the Secretary of Agriculture, as regards the Forest Service items particularly; and also that Senator STENNIS of Mississippi has indicated that he will ask an additional $6,500,000 for increased research activities under the important program to step up development of the national forests. We concur in the desirability of the additional $6,500,000 for research included in Senator STENNIS proposed amendment; and should such an amendment be approved by the Senate, we hope that it will be carefully considered by this committee with a view to concurring in that increase.

In reviewing the original 1962 budget estimate, so far as I can determine, any increases for programs in the South are relatively small. Under the propoesd amendment by Senator STENNIS; however, I believe most, if not all, of the minimum needs for the South, as we see them, would be included to a generally satisfactory degree.

As the Forest Farmers Association sees the situation, an increase of $1 million in Federal funds, above the original 1962 fiscal year budget estimate, is clearly indicated, if essential forest research needs in the South are to be maintained. Included in this increase would be forest research programs in eight Southern States, as follows:

INSECT AND DISEASE INVESTIGATION CONTROL RESEARCH

A minimum of $400,000 is urgently needed to step up this work centered primarily in the States of North Carolina, South Carolina, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Georgia. We believe that $300,000 of this amount should be for investigations on two serious southern forest diseases—fomes annosus and cronartium fusiforme.. The remaining $100,000 is urgently needed to strengthen existing investigations of southern forest insects.

HARDWOOD MANAGEMENT

Two hundred thousand dollars is needed for strengthening hardwood management research in the South. What is known about hardwood management in the South is pitifully small compared to what is needed. These additional funds are needed to maintain and expand programs in Mississippi, North Carolina, and Texas.

WILDLIFE HABITAT STUDIES

One hundred thousand dollars is needed for research on wildlife habitat and forest recreation so that increasing pressures can be met in an orderly manner. Work centered in North Carolina and Texas.

WATER PRODUCTION AND CONTROL RESEARCH

It is highly desirable that forest owners learn how to manage their lands for water production and flood control as well as for timber and other purposes; and $100,000 is needed this year for strengthening programs in Mississippi and North Carolina.

SPECIES IMPROVEMENT STUDIES

Tree improvement studies indicate outstanding opportunities exist for tree species improvement. Much has been done with corn and other agricultural crops. An additional $200,000 is urgently needed to maintain and expand this work in Mississippi, Georgia, and Florida. The total increase needed to maintain satisfactory progress in these important programs is $100,000.

I hope this committee may give consideration to recommending sufficient additional funds to meet these minimum research needs in the South. I thank the committee for its courtesy in hearing me.

STATEMENT PRESENTED TO THE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES, MARCH 13, 1961

(By Frank A. Albert, Jacksonville, Fla.)

Mr. Chairman and members of the commitee, my name is Frank A. Albert. I have had the pleasure of appearing before this committee before, when I was director of the Georgia Forest Research Council, and it is a pleasure to appear before you again. I am now the manager of lands and forests for the southern woodlands division of St. Regis Paper Co. with headquarters at Jacksonville, Fla.

I wish to concur in the comments made by Mr. Myers on minimum research needs in the South as prepared by the Forest Farmers Association. I want to endorse his statement and also to speak briefly in special support of the insect and disease item which he mentioned.

Forest products are major elements in the southern economy, but the present investment in research on forest pests is exceedingly small in comparison to what is being spent on the control of other crop pests. This is exceedingly significant when we consider that insects and disease are reducing timber growth by 4 billion cubic feet annually, or by nearly 40 percent of the South's potential net growth.

Research can help meet the Nation's expanding need for timber by finding ways to reduce the volume of wood destroyed by such agencies as annosus root rot, fusiform

rust, bark beetles, hardwood borers, tip moths, and sawflies.

Fomes annosus or annosus root rot and cronartium fusiforme are two diseases which are currently causing great concern among foresters and timberland owners. Millions of dollars in timber are currently being lost as a result of these two diseases. Actually, more timber is lost from insect and disease attacks than from forest fires.

While these are old diseases, they have become increasingly serious problems in the management of our vast slash and loblolly forests in the South. Annual losses, or growth impact, due to fusiform rust is estimated at over $10,600,000 worth of sawtimber and 97 million cubic feet of growing stock, according to the Timber Resource Review prepared by the U.S. Forest Service. I imagine the committee is quite familiar with this report.

Loss figures from annosus root rot in this country are not yet available since the disease is just now beginning to work on our southern pine plantations. In the older forests of Europe, however, annosus root rot is generally considered the most serious forest disease, and in Denmark, a country half the size of South Carolina, the annual losses are figured at $1,200,000.

These two diseases have become so important in forest management that a group of professional foresters working for various forest industries in the South recently formed the Southern Forest Industries' Committee on Forest Diseases, which assembled a summary of the threat from these two diseases and published a booklet, "Twin Disease Enemies of Southern Pine." I would like at this time to give each member of this committee a copy of this report, so that you will have it for your review and consideration.

A major expansion in research is urgently needed on these two serious threats to southern pine management. Very little investigation work has been done on either one of these two important diseases. Even today there is no direct control measure suggested by forest pathologists for fusiform rust. Our leading books on forest pathology note under control measures for fomes annosus: "No direct control; plant disease-free seedlings." If the situation were not so serious, these control measures could be considered quite humorous. Just don't plant diseased trees.

A small scale program on control measures for annosus root rot has been started at the Southeastern Forest Experiment Station on stump treatments similar to those used in Europe. I hasten to point out that such treatments do not prevent the occurence of root rot, but merely control its spread.

An enormous planting and thinning program is currently underway in the southern forests. The resulting stands will provide the bulk of our Nation's future timber supply. Too much is at stake, however, to gamble in going much further with this program without knowing what to expect and how to deal with these twin enemies of southern forests—fusiform rust and annosus root rot.

Our goal of healthy, profitable stands of timber can be reached only by better unified research efforts. The forest industries in the South stand ready to cooperate fully with the Federal Government in expanding such a program, which is urgently needed.

The problem of insect damage prevention and control is also tremendously important. I believe that the additional funds requested by the Forest Farmers Association will allow satisfactory progress to be made in both our insect and disease research programs; and I hope that this committee will give consideration to approving these requests.

In addition, I am familiar with the other requests of the Forest Farmers Association for strentghening existing research programs in the South and wish to endorse them as being well-conceived and sound.

I appreciate the committee's courtesy in hearing my views. Thank you.

"Freedom Insurance" Theme of Address by J. J. Davidson, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1961

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I have been much impressed by an address delivered before the Louisiana Association of Mutual Insurance Agents by Mr. J. J. Davidson, Jr., of Lafayette, La., a distinguished attorney and a leader in his profession, on the theme "Freedom Insurance."

Referring to the Constitution of the United States as the greatest insurance policy of all times, Mr. Davidson asked:

Where else can we find better and more comprehensive coverage providing insurance for all our freedoms?

Member of the law firm of Davidson, Meaux, Onebane & Donohoe, Mr. Davidson is a former president of the Louisiana State Bar Association. He is a member of the Order of the Coif, Council of the Louisiana State Law Institute, American Law Institute, American Counsel Association, American Judicature Society, American College of Trial Lawyers, Association of the Bar of the City of New York, American Bar Association, 15th judicial district and Lafayette Bar Associations, and International Association of Insurance Counsel. A larger part of his practice is in the field of insurance and he is particularly recognized for his ability in that connection.

The address to which I refer, delivered at Baton Rouge, La., follows:

FREEDOM INSURANCE

(By J. J. Davidson, Jr.)

It is indeed an honor to be invited to speak to this distinguished gathering of men who are experts in the field of insurance. I feel confident that most of you are now reviewing in your mind the entire history of insurance and thinking to yourselves that in this modern day, one can get insurance against almost everything except having to listen to after-dinner speeches. The insurance world today has become so complex that it includes lawyers and adjusters who try to economize with the company's assets, agents who desire that every claim be paid in full so as to stimulate sales, actuaries who think in terms which are so abstruse as to be understood by no one except other actuaries, liberals who would be happy if the courts would go even further than they do in deciding that everyone is liable to someone for almost everything that can be insured against, solid citizens who worry about where the money is coming from, and many who view with alarm everything relating to the field of insurance. In such a situation, it is with great fear and trepidation that I attempt to address you, who have made the cause of insurance your life work.

Insurance being an agreement to guard against disaster and loss in its many forms, is closely regulated to prevent possible abuse. I believe the Babylonians are given credit for thinking up the idea of insurance, some 4,000 years ago. Thereafter, regulation of that concept came into play in the 13th century when the Pope prohibited bottomry loans which avoided the application of the law of usury. Apparently the first legislation having to do with insurance was enacted in the Italian City State of Genoa in the last quarter of the 14th century. The first insurance commissioner was appointed in Florence pursuant to a statute of 1523, and the first commissioner in the United States was appointed in Massachusetts in 1827. The early laws dealt primarily with taxation of insurance companies and regulations to insure their solvency. However, as the business grew, the laws were expanded to take charge of almost every facet of insurance enterprise, and today, as we all know, insurance is one of our most completely regulated businesses, and this regulation is becoming more and come complex. Investment laws are changing. Policy forms are being altered. Rating formulas are becoming more involved. Judicial decisions and legislative enactments are limiting the scope of operation and causing us to realize that this is in truth a business affected with a public interest. Freedom to contract is definitely circumscribed by the State under the overall declaration that such action is necessary in order to protect the public.

It is essential that the public be protected against insecurity, sharp practice or abuse, but, at the same time, it is likewise essental to our American way of life that the public and the individual citizen be kept secure in the exercise of those fundamental freedoms guaranteed by the greatest insurance policy of all times, the Constitution of the United States. Where else can we find better and more comprehensive coverage providing insurance for all our freedoms?

From the earliest moment of our history, we have believed that every human being has an essential dignity and integrity which must be respected and safeguarded. We believe that the welfare of the individual is the final goal of government, and in order to be secure in the rights one wishes for himself, he must be willing to respect the rights of other men. The Bill of Rights found in the first 10 amendments to the Constitution of the United States were not intended to set forth any novel or new principle of government, but the purpose was simply to clearly and unmistakably declare certain guarantees and immunities which had become fundamental in the American concepton of government. The fundamental principle is that government must be kept within bounds, denying to it the right to exercise any powers except those that the people have specifically granted to it.

The Constitution stands as the policy insuring the protection of all our freedoms, including our freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of press, freedom of the right to make contracts and prevent their impairment by government, freedom to exercise private property rights without encroachment by government or private citizen, but the continuance of that protection depends upon us. And, what are we doing? It would appear that we are all seeking security at the expense of the state. We are gradually allowing our Federal Government at Washington to take over in the fields of finance, agriculture, business and commerce, social welfare, and now perhaps education. We stand by and watch our courts interpret the provisions of our policy of freedom insurance so as to take from the State and vest in the Central Government authority and power which gradually but surely is destructive of fundamental rights.

We watch the "welfare state" gradually emerge, and we foster its growth in our desire to get free security at the expense of the state. In the Book of Genesis, we are told that Joseph as the agent of Pharoah benevolently fed the Egyptians and in a few short years, all the land of Egypt belonged to the Government. In their eagerness for free security at the expense of the state, the Romans became so insecure that they lost everything, and a few thousand barbarians were able to overthrow the mighty Roman Empire.

Are we in America moving along the same highway? Are we losing the rugged individualism which has been the strength of our national life? Are we so engrossed in our everyday affairs, so busy practicing law, selling insurance, adjusting claims, selling soap and razor blades, that we are losing sight of our duties and obligations as citizens in a democracy? Are we, by our indifference and preoccupation, permitting theories and philosophies which seek to undermine our entire democratic system to grow and flourish? Our situation may be rather aptly paraphrased by the Mother Goose rhyme:

"The American men are in the counting-house, counting out their money.
The women are playing bridge, and eating bread and honey.
The laboring classes are in the garden, hanging out their clothes,
Easy prey for communism to lead them by the nose."

In the present day, far more than in any former period in history, ideas govern mankind. Not individuals, nor societies, nor kings, nor emperors, nor fleets, nor armies, but ideas; ideas which overturn established systems, subvert and reorganize governments, revolutionize society, and change the course of history.

Ideas combined with foresight, ingenuity, and initiative have built America, and the insidious spread among our citizens of ideas based on communistic doctrine can destroy those fundamental freedoms on which our Nation stands. Not only do we face serious internal and domestic problems which endanger our fundamental freedoms, but they are also subject to severe and repeated attack throughout the world.

We live in a world which is filled with turmoil and strife, and find outselves confronted by dangers on every hand which carry with them the threat of the destruction of liberty itself. No nation can live to itself in this modern day. The economic developments of the 20th century have produced a solidarity of humanity which no international hatred can destroy. Each nation is its brother's keeper, and the greater the power, the greater is the responsibility. If this be true, no nation owes a greater duty to civilization than does the United States. Regardless of how we should like to view our world, we cannot escape the fact that America holds the key position in world affairs. There is no donger of overrating the importance of the part we are now playing in the affairs of mankind the world over. This knowledge should inspire us with a deeper and more solemn sense of our privileges and our obligations to mankind. We stand at the crossroads with the privilege of voluntarily choosing the road we wish to follow. But, unless we make our choice promptly; unless we step forward with a firm resolve, the decision will be made for us, and we will be literally pushed along the road chosen by the masses of mankind.

Four-fifths of the people of the world are illiterate. Two-thirds of the people of the world are hungry and on the verge of starvation. With a total of 2,200 million people in the world, when 1,700 million who have been in want, hungry, and unhappy all their lives grasp the determination to change their status in life, the surge will be so overwhelming that nothing can stem the tide.

Our Government has spent billions in various forms of aid to other countries. However, along with some gratitude, we have won a large measure of distrust and ill will. Somehow, our foreign policy has not been able to overcome certain human reactions. With the masses of the world hungry, when, through our magazines, movies, and radio, we tell these masses of our overabundance, our wealth and our ease of living, they do not react with love and respect—they only pull their belts a little tighter and hate us a little more. It would seem that we have made a pretty poor job of trying to manage our world and its resources. A little poem seems to quite effectively express our plight:

"MONKEYS

"Three monkeys sat in a cocoanut tree,
Discussing things as they're to be;
Said one to the other, 'Now listen, you two,
There's a certain rumor that can't be true

'That man descended from our noble race;
The very idea is a disgrace!
No monkey ever deserted his wife,
Starved her babies and ruined her life;

'And you've never known a mother monk
To leave her babies with others to bunk,
Or pass them on from one to another
Till they scarcely know who is their mother.

'And another thing, you will never see;
A monk build a fence 'round a cocoanut tree,
And let the cocoanuts go to waste,
Forbidding all other monks to taste.

'Why, if I'd put a fence around a tree,
Starvation would force you to steal from me!
Here's another thing a monk won't do,
Go out at night and get in a stew;

'Or use a gun, a club or knife,
To take some other monkey's life;
Yes, man descended, the ornery cuss.
But, brother, he didn't descend from us!' "

However, apparently the people of America are coming to realize that there is another way to help the people of the world, insure their friendship, and thereby protect our own liberty and freedom. Through technical aid programs we are helping the people to help themselves. The new foreign policy places emphasis on the individual citizen. Such private organizations as CARE, agricultural missions, various church groups, are sending to these foreign people the aid they really wish, which does not carry with it the suspicion which they always felt for a foreign government. Through these programs of direct assistance, the villagers of India, as an example, are being taught to use steel plows instead of crooked sticks, to dig wells, to put chimneys on their stoves, instead of suffering from smoky huts, to control flies, insects, and disease. The person-to-person idea is the keystone of the new process. As we destroy ignorance, poverty, hunger, and suffering, which are truly the causes of strife and war, we can build understanding, and thus effectively combat the Communist propaganda which thrives on the misery and unhappiness of people, and further underwrite freedom insurance for ourselves.

After all, on the success or failure of America and the American way of life depends the future of all the unborn races of mankind. If the example we set, if the part we play in world affairs, fails to demonstrate that individual rights and liberties can be maintained in a peaceful and cooperative society, where else may the world look for models of freedom? This great and overwhelming responsibility brings us face to face with the obligation of each individual as a citizen to protect our freedoms at home, to get back to the fundamentals of constitutional government, recognizing the importance of the individual and the dangers of the "welfare state," in order that those freedoms may likewise be protected from the destructive forces of foreign ideology. Men may be protected against murder, but they cannot be guarded against suicide; so government may be shielded from assaults from external foes, but when it disintegrates from within, when it chooses to lay violent hands upon itself, nothing can save it. We must have "men to match our missiles," so that we can enforce the provisions of our policy of freedom insurance, through dynamic action consistent with the idealism of America.

The need is obvious, and the responsibility of America and individual Americans is overwhelming. But we ask, "Where does this group fit into the picture?"

This is an election year—and now as never before the attention of the entire world is focused upon us. What we do and what we say will determine not only our own future, but that of the entire world. The principles for which America stands are being, and will be, discussed throughout our country, and those voices will resound throughout the world. In the final analysis, the people of America will determine the course to be followed.

At this time in our history, when America needs more than ever before the constructive thinking and dynamic action of men and women who are dedicated to the cause of individual freedom at home and abroad, the influence of those connected with the vast insurance industry is immeasurable. The very principle of insurance is one of service to others. By means of contracts freely made, in a free society, the individual is able to make himself secure in certain of his fundamental freedoms—freedom from fear—from worry—which is found in the freedom which insurance brings, enabling the individual to carry on his everyday affairs with the confidence that in the event of unexpected losses, or of disaster, he will nevertheless have that financial security which will enable him, or his family, to carry on despite those difficulties. Freedom from want, made certain by the contract of insurance. Insurance brings these guarantees of independence, based on full freedom of contract, through which the individual establishes his own security and welfare—protecting himself—with his own money and initiative in the tradition of the American system.

Men and women engaged in the field of insurance must realize better than anyone else, the vast importance of insuring those things of great value, and this group, and groups of similar character throughout America, have the opportunity and the obligation of seeing to it that America insures its own freedom and that of its individual citizens.

Here then is the challenge to the insurance men of America.

The prophetic story is told that Nero once ordered a procession to pass before him, depicting all of the nations of the earth, with typical women taking the part of the lands dominated by his empire, which Nero fondly believed would last forever. One by one the representatives of many lands passed before him, and one by one passed the women representing the conquered nations. First came Gaul, subjugated and impoverished by the military might of the Caesars. She passed before the emperor and bowed low in submission. Then came Greece, the home of immortal learning—hungry and despondent. One after another they came—all victims of tyranny.

Last came a woman clothed in purest white—beautiful beyond the boast of any Roman maiden, who failed to bow in submission as had the others.

The emperor, indignant that she should not follow his command and bow down to him, demanded her name. Slowly she answered: "I am the land of liberty and freedom—the realm of service to mankind. Thy power shall pass, but I am the hope of a world on the brink of destruction by the errors of tyranny."

And so, in our world, torn by the errors of greed and tyranny, where governments and philosophies and ideas strike at the fundamental freedoms of the individual, may we refuse to bow to those adverse forces, and firmly establish in our land those principles which constitute our freedom insurance.

Peace Corps, Private Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. BARRY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1961

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, it is very heartening to me to see the spark that has been struck in youth across the land by the proposals for furthering mutual understanding with peoples of other countries. The Peace Corps idea has aroused enthusiasm on every college campus. But not content with programs led by the Government, a resident of my hometown, Yonkers, N.Y., with a group of five young friends, is setting off on a private good will tour of South America. Their object: to bring better understanding of America and especially American youth to college students the length of Central and South America. Since in Latin America it is the students who are often the most easily misled by agitators, these young men from the United States will be doing a very worthwhile job. They plan to visit about 80 Latin American colleges, using as transport an Army surplus duck.

La Pata Valiente, whose English name is *The Brave Duck,* is a 7-ton Army amphibious landing craft, and it will carry William Hayes, of Yonkers, and Walter Kutrieb, of Tarrytown, on an approximately 27,000-mile journey.

The mission, which will take them by land and water on a 6-month jaunt, has been dubbed "Operation Americanas." It gets underway this summer after well over a year in the planning stage.

The ambassadors will get rolling July 1 at the campus of Cobleskill College. The whole plan had its beginnings there while Robert Hinds of Gloversville, was studying at the Agricultural and Technical Institute and where he met Walter. The idea was carried by Bob to Drew University, where he and Bill Hayes are fellow students now.

YONKERS MECHANIC

Bob is president of Operation Americanas, which has gained support from communities, industry, college groups, and individuals. He will serve as skipper and chief linquist on the venture, and Bill, son of Mr. and Mrs. William R. Hayes of 75 Rossmore Avenue, has been signed on as mechanic.

The Yonkers man, newest addition to the crew, also is equipped with a repertoire of folk songs and a command of the Spanish language, which he studied at Roosevelt High School. Bill and brother Howard formerly delivered the Herald Statesman in their neighborhood and a third brother, John, is a carrier now.

Walter, son of Mr. and Mrs. Otto Kutrieb of 85 North Washington Street, Tarrytown, was in on the early plans at Cobleskill. He has postponed further studies at Cornell University to join the duck's crew as navigator and cook.

The rest of the crew are: Daniel Twomey, of Worcester, N.Y., another Cobleskill graduate and student now at Albany State, who will be the radioman; his twin brother, Tom, Cobleskill alumnus now at Cornell, who will be the quartermaster, and Edwin Naylor of Mayfield, N.Y., and Middlebury College, the duck's medic.

INSPIRED BY MISUNDERSTANDING

Unknowingly, Pedro Recio, of Barranquilla, Colombia, while an agricultural major at Cobleskill, instigated the good will project through his own misconceptions about North American people, according to President Bob:

> Pedro was antagonistic. He didn't understand American ways or our philosophy, but, after many months of working at it, we became fast friends.

It was at this point, some 14 months ago, that Bob began thinking about promoting friendship between North American students and their neighboring counterparts. His idea caught fire as he found the right men around the upstate campus and later at Drew to carry out his plan.

The first step was acquiring the amphibious vehicle from an Akron, Ohio, war surplus dealer, and then came a gift of $250 worth of plastic paint to transform the 31-foot duck into a gleaming white dove of peace. Four weeks of sandblasting prepared it for eight coats of paint.

The young men have written letters to prospective backers and have made speeches appealing for interest in their undertaking and, incidentally, for funds and equipment. Bob Hinds' hometown, Gloversville, has contributed $2,000.

> The success of our project depends on people and organizations giving their time, work, or donations,

He said.

Already they have received a nylon folding cabin for the duck, which will be their home on rivers, in jungles, and mountains as they travel through Mexico into Colombia and on southward.

Stories about the forthcoming adventure have preceded them and paved the way for Operation Americanas. Bob visited his former schoolmate at Barranquilla last summer to lay the groundwork at that end. Colombian papers have told their plans.

The students are writing to South American colleges in the hope that some sort of a schedule for classroom visiting and meetings will be arranged. They plan to show films of American life to village people.

They also will be making a study of road conditions in Latin America; will represent the motorists of the United States, and will send back monthly reports of their mission, all at the request of the American Automobile Association, the skipper said.

Next step? Washington, D.C., where they expect to visit their Congressmen, Pan American Union officials, and President Kennedy on the continuing rounds of seeking support and sanction.

"Mutual Understanding" is their motto, and *La Pata Valiente,* which itself is bound to attract interest because it has a real personality, will be a little moving America.

> But we're not going to stand on top of it and wave the flag,

Bob hastened to add.

In the meantime, the crew applies itself to a public relations whirl hoping to arouse community interest throughout the East and to raise money wherever they can.

Immediate needs: Outboard motors, depth finder, liferaft, radio transmitter, cameras, and film.

This sort of enterprise on the part of young Americans is really inspiring. It is the stuff of which U.S. greatness is made. I am sure we in the Congress all join in wishing these six young New Yorkers Godspeed and good luck.

Tax Reforms and Federal Aid to Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. QUIE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the March 3 edition of Life magazine expressed itself editorially on its concern for the ever-increasing amount of tax money collected by our Federal Government, compared to the amounts collected by other levels of Government. The editorial points out several hopelessly complex and inequitable features of Federal tax collection.

Since I believe this editorial is thought provoking and on sound ground, I recommend its reading to my fellow Members:

TAX REFORMS AND FEDERAL AID TO SCHOOLS

President Kennedy's program for Federal aid to schools and colleges ($5.6 billion in 5 years) reminds us of nothing so much as the need for Federal tax reform. We are really not trying to change the subject; there's a connection. For, once the Federal tax structure is reformed, States and municipalities can have more ample tax sources of their own; and the chief excuse for massive Federal school aid would vanish.

In contrast with 20 years ago, when the ratio was about 50–50, the Federal Government now collects about twice as much in taxes as all State and local governments together. It does this through a patchwork tax system that has become hopelessly complex and inequitable and requires drastic rewriting. This system has also preempted or crowded all tax sources except real estate, now virtually the sole source of local school taxes.

Despite their cramped resources, States and localities (as well as private institutions) have done a heroic job of keeping abreast of the need for more and better schools. Total expenditures on U.S. education have more than doubled since 1952. This was done with practically no Federal aid or stimulus. After sputnik, the people of the United States did not need to be told by Washington that their educational system was in trouble.

The unceasing strain on local money, and the need for still further school improvement in the decade ahead, have steamed up the lobbies for massive Federal aid. More steam came from the unevenness of our recent progress—the fact that Alabama, for example, spends only $217 per pupil on public schooling, while New York spends $585. This gross inequality of educational opportunity is undemocratic and there is plenty

of precedent for steps by the Federal Government to correct it.

The simplest way would be by such a formula as the Committee for Economic Development proposed last year which confines Federal aid to the poorer States. But the Kennedy plan subsidizes everybody—$30 extra per child in Alabama, but $15 extra in New York and California too.

By moving massively into education, however, the Federal Government would compound the very problem—i.e., Federal taxes—that keeps the chief and proper sources of school funds under such strain. The school boards would become increasingly dependent on Federal aid, as have the farmers, veterans, the aged, etc., before them. This is too bad because if Kennedy would shift his legislative priorities, the traditional supports of American education could still prove strong enough to meet all foreseeable requirements. His administration is studded with experts who realize that the basic reform of our tax laws is an absolute must for the health of the whole U.S. economy. This reform is on Kennedy's agenda, but not for this year. His immediate "musts" are some 16 other bills, including school aid, most of which cost money and therefore tend to make the tax mess even worse. If tax reform came first, the problems behind these bills would be a lot easier to handle.

Tool Bank Plan Arouses Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1961

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I offer the text of a statement I made recently outlining a proposal for the establishment of a tool bank.

As a result of press reports about this proposal, inquiries have come in from all parts of the country. In view of this great expression of interest, which has also been reflected in business, industry, and labor publications, I believe it appropriate to present the text of this statement, as follows:

THE DEVELOPMENTAL MACHINERY AND TOOL BANK

(A proposal by Hon. FRANK KOWALSKI, of Connecticut.)

THE PROPOSAL: A DOUBLE-BARREL APPROACH

A. To stimulate, by appropriate incentives, U.S. business activity and employment, through stepped-up modernization of the machine park currently used by U.S. Government, industry, and agriculture.

B. To help equip the developing nations with machinery and tools, suited to their particular needs, environment and stage of development, and thus to accelerate their productive capacity and economic growth.

(A and B add up to the developmental machinery and tool bank, hereinafter called the tool bank.)

The tool bank would derive its assets from deposits consisting of machinery, tools and equipment transferred to it by industry, agriculture or the government, because of obsolescence in terms of age and/or design, or excess capacity.

The developing nations would be enabled to draw on the tool bank, in accordance with clearly defined objectives and regulations, without any charge to them for the tools.

U.S. voluntary agencies, engaged in overseas development work, would equally be able to draw on the tool bank to carry on and/or expand their programs.

THE RATIONALE

A. The current recession in the United States as the administration has indicated, requires immediate remedial action. The tool bank proposal is designed to meet this requirement in a number of ways:

1. Modernization, through replacement, of America's machine park would stimulate an important sector of our industry and thus help to create more employment opportunities.

Such a program would affect not only the machine tool industry, but steel and related industries supplying machine toolmakers.

2. Modernization of America's machine park would put U.S. manufacturers in a better competitive position, especially vis-a-vis such up-to-date competitors as Japan and Germany, in international markets. It would, therefore, be a contributing factor in the expansion of U.S. export markets, especially in areas where price considerations have proved a deterrent to the acceptance of U.S. products.

3. The importance of early introduction of U.S. machine tools to secure future markets canont be overestimated. A worker accustomed to working on machines with the metric system, for instance, is difficult to break of his working habit. Familiarity with U.S. tools is likely to stimulate demand for better and newer ones later.

The tool bank proposal, therefore, holds out two promises of direct and immediate benefit to the United States—stimulation of the domestic economy, and expansion of export trade with all the attendant benefits.

B. There is a demonstrated need for a multitude of different tools in the developing nations. They may used to:

1. Equip vocational schools which train nationals in the much needed skills the country requires.

2. To further, or help establish, small businesses (the bulwark of democracy) such as a one-man repair and machine shop, for instance, which otherwise could not afford to purchase machine tools.

3. Machines considered obsolete by U.S. standards may well be better suited to the current needs and state of development of a developing nation, than the most modern presently available. The so-called hand-me-down machinery, therefore, can assume an important function in filling the intermediary needs of a developing nation.

To combine efforts to stimulate modernization of America's machine park, while at the same time helping the developing nations, would multiply the effect of U.S. development assistance programs. While preventing an inundation of the U.S. market with secondhand equipment, the tool bank would actively increase the training and productive capacity of developing nations.

Since amortization and tax writeoffs have fully paid for most of the machine tools discussed in this proposal, the development assistance aspects of this program can, in effect, be carried out with little or no cost to the taxpayer and private enterprise. The tool bank, therefore, is a proposal which meets President Kennedy's criterion "ask what you can do for your country." Here is one answer.

DEMAND POTENTIAL FOR U.S. TOOL BANK SERVICES

At this time there exists no international inventory of tools. However, that there is a pressing demand, worldwide, for tools is well documented by a series of uncoordinated, individual transactions:

The Government of India availed itself of GSA declaration of excess tools to the tune of $16.9 million.

Yugoslavia was the recipient of such tools valued at $2 million.

Mexico received $500,000 worth of excess Government tools.

Technico, a private voluntary organization with no paid employees, has recently collected, from private industry, 150,000 pounds of small machine tools. So far, without much organization and strictly in the spare time of the individuals involved, 14 shipments of tools have been made, to almost as many countries. Eight more are about to be dispatched. Without solicitation Technico, for lack of organizational facilities, has some 35 requests on its books which it has not yet been able to process.

Individual citizen and private corporations are currently working with and through CARE to provide self-help throughout the world.

CARE itself is engaged in operations in developing countries to which it sends tool kits of all sorts.

The Journal of Commerce reports from Japan a heavy flow of inquiries from the developing African nations for machine tools.

A spot check of embassies, representing developing nations in Washington, reveals a keen interest in the tool bank.

ORT (Organization for Rehabilitation Through Training) has equipped and is operating 663 training units in 19 countries. All are vocational training schools.

DEPOSIT POTENTIAL FOR THE TOOL BANK

Industry studies indicate that there are currently some 3 million machine tools distributed over the United States. Out of this total, some 60 percent are 10 years and older, nearly 20 percent are 20 years and older.

There are more than 100,000 machine tools in storage or surplus.

The U.S. Government holds millions of dollars' worth of standby tools, and annually disposes of large quantities of "excess" equipment. (See General Service Administration's excess declarations.)

Considering tools in a broader sense, there are untold quantities of obsolete farm implements, hospital equipment (including U.S. Army hospitals in moth balls) and similar items scattered throughout the United States.

While the degree of obsolescence naturally varies from industry to industry, the historical trend shows a constant proportional increase in obsolescence of the U.S. machine park.

Obsolescence in age and design go hand in hand, since continuous development and improvement increase machine productivity.

For the sake of national security and international competition, the United States cannot afford to continue the historical obsolescence trend.

Understandably, the percentage of obsolescence is higher among older, less complicated tools than it is among the more modern, complex tools. In that lies the significance of a tool bank for the developing nations.

Obsolescence need not be equated with uselessness. On the contrary, the less complicated machines are more likely to find widespread application in the developing countries than some of the more complex machinery. Here are some examples of potential availability of machine tools (10 years and over):

	Percent
Lathes	64
Milling machines	61
Drilling machines	59
Grinding machines	60

A large percentage of these tools is in excess of 20 years, and of the type which would lend itself more readily to adaptation for use by the workers of the developing countries.

Similar percentages pertain to metal farming machines, and other tools.

TO MAKE A TOOL BANK A REALITY

The author has no illusion about the number of complex problems which will have to be resolved to initiate the proposed program. They include:

1. To provide incentives for U.S. industry and agriculture to replace and modernize their machine park. A number of solutions, possibly in combination with each other, come to mind. Accelerated depreciation, and/or tax allowances and credits for the purchase of new machine tools. Facilitating of new purchases through a system of low interest credits. Financial aid to machine tool manufacturers, where necessary, to permit them to sell their products on easy credit terms.

2. Arrangements for warehousing, and where necessary, rebuilding of these machines. Possibly, an arrangement could be worked out where the original owner stores the replaced machinery himself, but provides the necessary information to a central clearing house (the tool bank) describing the machine's pertinent data. This system would avoid the necessity for large storage depots, but would ultimately lead to a national surplus inventory.

3. Crating, shipping, insurance costs will have to be worked out in such a manner that the recipient nation which is to pay for it, will still find it advantageous to draw on the surplus machine stocks.

4. The bank itself can be established as part of a Government agency, or possibly be administered by a private organization (i.e., the machine tool industry's trade association) with Government assistance.

Solutions to these questions might well fall within the realm of a special task force composed of representatives of private enterprise, trade unions, Government, and Congress.

OVERCOMING PITFALLS

There are, as in any daring program, inherent dangers attached to sending used machinery abroad. Proper controls and execution of the program can, however, overcome such dangers.

1. Proper matching of requests and available stocks is imperative. Here the service of the tool bank is of tremendous value, since a large, varied inventory will permit an easier matching of demand and supply, reduce notorious time lags between the two.

2. Malfunction of machinery is a distinct possibility. To avoid the repercussions that this might bring about, technical advisers supplied by the trade unions, the Youth Corps, etc., would be stationed in recipient countries. Their function would be to supervise installation of machinery, help with repairs, where necessary, and assist in training nationals where this is required.

The possible pitfalls of this program are negligible compared to the possible benefits, especially when adequate safeguards are taken to avoid such pitfalls.

IN SUMMARY

The tremendous inventory of surplus machinery in the United States—overage, obsolete excess—can either be an important national asset or a tremendous liability.

It will remain a liability if it is continued to be used in our productive effort, where we need the most modern equipment to improve our competitive international standing. It might also be a liability if it were disposed of in such a manner as to flood our domestic market with second-hand machinery.

On the other hand, this surplus machinery can become a national asset if we stimulate its replacement and make it available to those countries which are in dire need of it, and can put it to good use. In this manner, we can help stimulate our economy and turn a potential liability into an asset by making it work as part of our national development assistance to the developing nations.

As outlined, this program can be expected to command the support of a large segment of the manufacturing industries and trade unions. Some, who have been sounded out so far, have expressed a most favorable reaction.

Needy Nations To Get More of U.S. Surplus Machinery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1961

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, an exciting new proposal for the establishment of a tool bank for the dual purpose of stimulating production and employment in the United States, through the replacement of obsolescent machines and of aiding underdeveloped countries, was recently made by our colleague the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. KOWALSKI].

An excellent article on this proposal and related subjects was printed recently in the Chicago Sun-Times under the byline of the distinguished correspondent, Frederick Kuh.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I offer the text of this article on the Kowalski plan from the March 5 issue of the Chicago Sun-Times:

NEEDY NATIONS TO GET MORE OF U.S. SURPLUS MACHINERY

(By Frederick Kuh)

WASHINGTON.—The Kennedy administration is preparing to enlarge the supply of American used machinery for underdeveloped countries. Plans are being studied for turning into an asset the tremendous accumulation of overage surplus U.S. machines.

The program was launched in 1956. It began modestly. In the first year only $2,416,313 worth of secondhand machinery was shipped to economically backward nations from America and from U.S. oversea military centers.

The flow gradually grew until in 1960 it reached a value of $31,205,259. Over the past 5 years—1956 till the end of 1960—the total equipment thus provided amounted to $92,804,648.

U.S. officials, perhaps a little optimistic, now estimate that in 1961 alone the figure will approach $100 million.

THIRTY-ONE COUNTRIES GET SURPLUS

All this material was Government surplus, almost wholly from military stores. Its most important component was machine tools and of these some 75 percent went to India. The rest was allotted to 31 countries scattered through south Asia, the Far East, Latin America, south Europe, the Caribbean and a trickle to the Sudan in Africa.

What is new in the discussion now proceeding in Washington is possible extension of the enterprise from Government-owned equipment to obsolescent machines belonging to U.S. private industries.

It is estimated that more than 100,000 machine tools are now in storage or are surplus in American private industries. And another assessment says some 25,000 U.S. Government-owned machine tools become surplus each year.

MACHINERY AND TOOL BANK

A Democratic Congressman, FRANK KOWALSKI, of Connecticut, is active as a one-man ginger group working for a machinery and tool bank on which laggard regions of the world can draw.

To enlist private industries in this important project, KOWALSKI suggests tax incentives. He also mentions Government credits to private companies to help them buy new machine tools and Federal financial aid to machinery manufacturers to enable them to sell their products on easy terms.

U.S. officials emphasize the dual purpose of the scheme:

First, it tends to substitute new, modern machinery for outworn equipment used by the American Government, industry and agriculture.

Secondly, it provides machinery and tools to speed the economic growth of less developed countries.

ANTIRECESSION MEASURE

KOWALSKI met during the week with State Department and foreign aid officials and with other Congressmen. He presented his plan for a machinery and tool bank as an antirecession measure, arguing it would create more employment and stimulate a significant sector of industry. By increasing the demand for new machinery it would promote not only the machine tool but also the steel industry.

KOWALSKI made the further point that modernization of America's manufacturing plant would improve U.S. competitive ability on the world market, especially against rivals like Germany and Japan. It would therefore help expand U.S. exports, he said, especially where American high prices have hampered acceptance of U.S. products.

He also underscored the advantage of introducing American-made machinery into countries which are important potential customers for the years ahead. Familiarity with U.S. equipment, he explained, is likely to stimulate demand for better and newer ones later, especially if the workers become accustomed to using American appliances.

He concluded that the machine bank proposal holds out the triple promise of immediate benefit to the U.S. domestic economy, promotion of exports and assistance to the have-not regions.

Under the Kennedy administration, new vigor is being applied to reviewing the whole excess machinery policy. The aim is to find more practical uses for such equipment within the foreign aid program.

During the past 5 years only a minor part of such material went to the underdeveloped nations from U.S. military depots abroad. The ratio of such machinery drawn from the United States to that taken from oversea installations has been about 1 to 4.

U.S. officials estimate that some $300 million worth of surplus machines belonging to the American Government become available overseas each year. In recent years, however, only $3,700,000 to $7,300,000 worth have come from those sources.

NO DUMPING GROUND

One object of the reappraisal now being made is to discover whether considerably more of this aging U.S. equipment lying abroad could be funneled to needy countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

The project is by no means just a method of dumping wornout machinery on unsuspecting nations.

For instance: A mission from Pakistan came to the United States, inspected and selected some Defense Department surplus equipment produced in 1941 and gladly acquired it.

India has derived great advantage from this program in the past few years and is pressing for an increased flow of used U.S. machinery. It has gone into India's railroad workshops, small industries, and coal mining. Altogether India received between 2,500 and 3,000 pieces of American secondhand machines.

SURPLUS MACHINERY LISTS

The U.S. Foreign Aid Administration circulates lists of available used machinery to South American, Asian, and other potential recipients. Interested countries then express their wishes. To obtain the equipment, it must become part of their development projects.

Who pays for it?

The recipient government foots the bill for packing, inspecting, and transporting the machinery. In the past, some have paid up to 5 percent of the amount the machines originally cost the Government to acquire. Now even this 5-percent system has been dropped.

U.S. officials stress that by unloading overage plants and getting modern machinery, it is not only peacetime American factories, farms, and mines which gain but also those actually or potentially fitted for military production.

Luring the European Tourist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, considerable discussion and some action has been taken in the area of reducing our international spending deficit. One small aspect, tourism, has received penetrating comment in the March 6 issue of the Chicago Daily News:

LURING THE EUROPEAN TOURIST

Americans traveling abroad spend $1 billion a year more than foreign tourists do in the United States. The Kennedy administration has a program for reducing this spending gap.

First steps include establishment of a travel promotion agency and the appropriation of $5 million for advertising to tell foreigners that they can, too, afford to visit America. While practically every major country has such an agency here, it might be smarter for the United States to begin at this end and, so to speak, prepare the product for the sales campaign.

For one thing, we are so security conscious that our visa restrictions are laughable to Europeans—when they are not infuriating. For another, American institutions, from hotels down, have a reputation abroad for being both expensive and unaccommodating.

For the same reason that Americans revel in the courteous and extensive service they receive in Europe, Europeans find the typical American reception rude and ungracious. An American abroad can quickly find someone to speak his language in shops, hotels, or bus stations. There are good reasons why Americans are poor linguists, but that doesn't help the hapless visitor to these shores who knows no English.

Beyond all these considerations is the hard fact of prices that often seem prohibitive by European standards. J. J. Horan, chairman of an association of travel agents, told an audience in Copenhagen the other day that a desperate tourist could live in the United States on a dollar a day.

Just possibly a man who knew his way around skid row might subsist on a dollar a day in Chicago, but a bus trip to the museum of science and industry would sure cut into his allowance for souvenirs that day.

Europeans aren't dopes, despite Mr. Horan's apparent opinion, which is one reason why, on incomes half the average prevailing here, they have not been swarming to see the sights of America. A successful effort to attract them had better start with some accurate information about what it costs. Any who really tried to do it on $1 a day would most likely wind up in jail or a hospital.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Shall State Be Master or Servant of the People?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 14, 1961

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, it gives me great pleasure to include an editorial written by my esteemed friend, the editor of the Council Bluffs Nonpareil Council Bluffs, Iowa, Mr. A. M. Piper.

The Freedom Foundation at Valley Forge awarded the top National George Washington Honor Medal in the editorial category to A. M. Piper, which appear in the Nonpareil December 4, 1959.

Having known Mr. Piper for a quarter century or more, and having read most of his editorials during that long period, I was not the least bit surprised when I learned he had won this coveted honor from the Freedom Foundation, whose members are known far and wide for their unexcelled patriotism and love of the freedoms we all enjoy. Let every American strive mightily every day of our lives to keep the blessing of our American freedom so plainly and ably expressed by a dedicated American patriot, Mr. A. M. Piper.

The winning editorial follows:

SHALL STATE BE MASTER OR SERVANT OF THE PEOPLE?

The supreme issue of this century is whether the state is to be the master or the servant of its citizens.

Freedom of speech nearly always goes hand in hand with economic freedom. Those who try to set human rights against property rights are making a great mistake.

Where there is no security for property, such human rights as freedom of speech and of the press and guarantees against arbitrary arrest, execution, and slave labor are invariably absent.

When the state goes beyond its proper functions of maintaining law and order at home and providing protection against foreign aggression, there is no place to stop. One power after another is seized until no freedom is left.

The importance of liberty was proved during the century between the end of the Napoleonic Wars and the outbreak of World War I. During that century there were great gains in political and economic freedom. Old fetters which absolute monarchy and fuedalism placed on individual initiative and enterprise were broken in some countries and loosened in others.

There was not a country in the Western World where people were not better fed, better clothed, better schooled, better cared for medically in 1914 than in 1814.

Political institutions varied from country to country, but the trend everywhere was toward more freedom. The century following the fall of Napoleon was the most progressive in human history.

It brought an end to slavery in the United States and of serfdom in Russia, and a wide spread of education.

World War I ended these trends in many countries. In addition to the toll of human lives and the enormous destruction of property, World War I unloosed a revolt against liberty which took two forms.

It paved the way for outright dictatorship in Russia. In Nazi Germany a dictator outlawed all poltical parties except the one composed of his own followers. Other European nations were influenced by these developments.

In the United States the change took a different form—in the creation of the so-called welfare state. The Government has undertaken functions designed to help individuals and groups but in the process controls have been established which have dulled initiative. Enormous taxes have been imposed which have increased the burdens of all groups, under the guise of helping them solve their problems.

Reckless spending is the rule rather than the exception, with the results the purchasing power of the dollar has shrunk more than half in the last two decades.

We are continually being flooded with propaganda for bigger spending and more controls.

At the present time we are being warned that we must spend more and submit to more controls to keep Russia from getting ahead of us, and perhaps destroy us either with new weapons or economic measures, or both.

The basic strength of the United States lies in being as different from Russia as possible. Our future depends upon adhering to the principles of the free market, consumer free choice, complete opportunity for the individual. But powerful forces in this country use the mistaken fear of Russian competition to drive us along the path of economic statism.

Aside from military attack, the only thing we need fear from the Soviet economic pattern, is that we should imitate or adopt it.

Only if we maintain the historic American principles of individual economic opportunity can we continue to prosper as we have in the past.

The United States will be a great and prosperous nation only so long as the State is the servant of its citizens, not the master of its subjects.

The Military-Industrial Complex—Farewell Address by President Eisenhower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 14, 1961

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "On Independence," published in the March 1961 issue of the Officer magazine of the Reserve Officers' Association of the United States, containing an excerpt from the farewell address by President Eisenhower, dealing with the military-industrial complex.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON INDEPENDENCE

In his farewell speech, President Eisenhower dealt frankly with a problem relating to a development which largely had arisen during his administration—the military-industrial complex.

So that you may comprehend the danger to which reference is made, and in order not to distort the statement by removing it from context, we reproduce in whole this part of his message to the Nation:

"Our military organization today bears little relation to that known by any of my predecessors in peacetime, or indeed the fighting men of World War II or Korea.

"Until the latest of our world conflicts, the United States had no armaments industry. American makers of plowshares could, with time and as required, make swords as well. But now we can no longer risk emergency improvisation of national defense; we have been compelled to create a permanent armaments industry of vast proportions. Added to this, 3½ million men and women are directly engaged in the Defense Establishment. We annually spend on military security more than the net income of all U.S. corporations.

"This conjunction of an immense Military Establishment and a large arms industry is new in American experience. The total influence—economic, political, even spiritual—is felt in every city, every statehouse, every office of the Federal Government. We recognize the imperative need for this development. Yet we must not fail to comprehend its grave implications. Our toil, resources, and livelihood are all involved; so is the very structure of our society.

"In the councils of Government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military industrial complex. The two potentials for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist.

"We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes. We should take nothing for granted. Only an alert and knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of the huge industrial and military machinery of defense with our peaceful methods and goals, so that security and liberty may prosper together."

Perhaps as at no other time, our association is put to the test when measuring its goals against this requiem to the Eisenhower administration.

For well more than 38 years now ROA has sought to support programs adequate to deliver complete national security.

Yet, in so doing, we have never surrendered our independence.

ROA is supported by dues paid by its individual members. The association's constitution wisely requires approval of the national executive committee for any gift

or revenue outside the pale of the membership dues.

So far as the editorial board of the officer can ascertain, the occasion for action by the executive committee has never arisen.

Against all pressures, ROA has declined to enter the contest for military-industrial subsidization, whether it be in the form of funds spent in entertainment at our conferences, in the guise of advertising in our publications, or in any other form.

Occasionally, an individual member will express disappointment that we are outstripped in these fields—that we are not taking advantage of opportunities which are apparent.

Yet, we all need reminding that what ROA possesses is of a value far beyond that which can be expressed in gold. When our association becomes willing to sell its character, which is built on precious independence, then we should yield our charter, for there would no longer be a primary reason for our existence. We do not believe that time will ever come.

Address by District of Columbia Commissioner Tobriner at His Swearing-In Ceremonies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALAN BIBLE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 14, 1961

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, it is an invigorating experience to chart revitalized and realistic goals in government whether such be international, national or more localized in scope.

Hon. Walter N. Tobriner, the new president of the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners and President Kennedy's choice for that position, in his first official public expression about the Nation's Capital, set forth succinctly, yet illuminatingly, his goals for this great Capital City. In his address at his swearing-in ceremonies on March 3, Commissioner Tobriner capsuled the tempo of what he hopes may be achievements under this new administration in the District of Columbia.

I commend to the Senate the reading of his brief address wherein he sees President Kennedy's New Frontier as a concept which has captured the imagination of the country and kindled the spark of new effort for people everywhere.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Commissioner Tobriner's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Judge Edgerton, colleagues on the Board of Commissioners, distinguished guests, and friends, the years ahead are a challenge and an opportunity. I hope that I shall be equal to this privileged honor of helping to govern my beloved city with wisdom and with the strength to do the right as is given me to see it. I would hope to bring to the city, with the aid of my fellow Commissioners, the concept of the New Frontier, the New Frontier which has so captured the imagination of the country and kindled the spark of new effort. The New Frontier is not just a campaign slogan. It is not a shibboleth appropriated and copyrighted by the Democratic Party. To me, it is a revitalization of American life on all levels. It involves, once again, a holding high of our heads and a reaffirmance of the destiny of our country to lead the world to a new freedom. It is a rediscovery of what has made us great and will continue to sustain us in the struggle ahead. It is a realization of the "Promised Land" of Mary Antin and the moving words of Thomas Wolfe, who said: "To every man regardless of his birth, his shining golden opportunity, to every man the right to live, to work, to be himself and to become whatever his manhood and his vision can combine to make."

I would wish, among many other things, that it come to pass as part of this revivifying concept that the citizens of our city shall feel free to walk the streets in any part of it, night or day, without molestation or fear; that we should have a more direct voice in the control of our local affairs; that we provide for our young citizens the same post-high-school education at public cost as that provided by every State in the Union; that there shall rise within the core of the city a new and beautiful residential area where people of good character and good will may live in harmony; that every citizen shall be secure in person and in reputation against unwarranted arrest or detention; that job opportunities shall be available for those with skills, and the opportunity to achieve skills shall be open to everyone. I should like to see a city where life will be so full of constructive opportunity, where the standards of living can be so elevated that frustration will be lessened and the old answers found only in drugs, alcohol, and gambling will tend to diminish; a city where new highways will feed the growing activities of the community and where the young with children, as well as the old, will return from the suburbs attracted by our city's parks, its fine schools, and its cultural opportunities.

All this, ladies and gentlemen, may seem like Utopia. But no worthwhile advance, however small, has ever been made without sight of Utopia in the distance. These things will not come to pass during my term of office, nor during the term or terms of my successors; but, keeping in mind the vision of the New Frontier, let us so act within the years immediately ahead that no historian can say we have not at least made a good beginning.

Admiral Rickover Donates to Charity Fees for Talks and Writings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 14, 1961

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, in fairness to Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, whose contributions to our national security have been of immeasurable value, I bring to the attention of the House a brief newspaper article pointing out that he donates to charitable and educational causes the fees he receives from his speeches and writings.

Here is the article, from the New York Times of March 9, 1961:

RICKOVER AIDS CHARITY—ALWAYS DONATES FEES FROM SPEECHES AND WRITINGS

WASHINGTON, March 8.—United Press International, in a dispatch on March 6, listed Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover among those who would face reduced incomes under a White House order that administration officials must donate to charity the fees received for speeches, articles, and books.

Actually, Admiral Rickover has always donated such fees, and also cash awards, to charitable and educational purposes.

"This will reduce my income by zero," he said after having read the dispatch.

Chesterfield County Was First To Secede

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 14, 1961

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from the Pageland Journal, Pageland, S.C., of March 9, 1961:

A MATTER OF HISTORY: CHESTERFIELD COUNTY WAS FIRST TO SECEDE

(NOTE.—The Journal is indebted to W. B. Burch of Killarney, Fla., a great-grandson of Col. Stephen Jackson, secessionist leader, for the following account of a meeting held at Chesterfield Court House as reported to the Charleston Mercury by one of its correspondents, which establishes the fact that Chesterfield County was the first county in the State to adopt a secession resolution.)

THE STATE OF PUBLIC FEELING IN CHESTERFIELD

CHERAW, S.C., *November 19, 1860.*

Knowing the deep solicitude you and many of your readers feel in the movements of the people of the State at this momentous period, I have to inform you and them of the events in Chesterfield in the last few days. Last Thursday there was a parade for the upper battalion, there was quite a large turnout. After the parade the people were addressed by the Honorable J. W. Blakeney, our Senator, and Representatives, Colonels McFarlan and Prince, and also by Col. Stephen Jackson.

At the close of Colonel Jackson's speech he submitted the question of submission, or resistance by immediate seccession to a vote of the battalion, and requested all in favor of the latter to advance four paces, the whole battalion advanced four paces, leaving not a solitary man for submission. The course of our Senator and Representatives was unanimously and most enthusiastically endorsed.

Saturday last was parade day for the lower battalion. I had the pleasure of being present. The same speakers with Maj. A. McQueen and F. M. McIver, addressed the people. The addresses were received with enthusiastic applause. After the speaking the military spectators were requested, if they approved the action of the legislature in calling a convention, to make their approbation known by advancing four paces to the front, a unanimous forward movement was the response. Immediate separate secession, and a Southern Confederacy were vociferously demanded. At both the upper and lower battalion the lone star flag graced the fields.

I, this evening, returned from our courthouse where one of the largest meetings ever assembled in the district was held today. The object of the meeting was to nominate candidates for delegate to the convention. The meeting was organized by the appointment of Hon. J. W. Blakeney, chairman.

A committee of 24, 3 from each beat, were appointed to nominate a ticket. The committee retired, and after due deliberation returned having unanimously agreed upon a

ticket, and reported the following ticket: Hon. John A. Inglis, Col. Stephen Jackson, Henry McIver, Esq. During the absence of the committee the meeting was most ably addressed by Colonels Prince and Macfarlan. At the conclusion of Colonel Macfarlan's remarks, the committee made their report, whereupon the nominees were severally called out in the following order: Colonel Jackson, H. McIver, and Chancellor Inglis.

All the nominees in the most emphatic language declared themselves in favor of immediate separate secession. The whole question was fully discussed in a clear and forcible manner, and with a fervence and eloquence that could only have been inspired by a due sense of its vast importance. At the conclusion of the speeches of the nominees, the nominations were submitted to a vote of the meeting, and it was unanimously concurred in.

The Honorable J. W. Blakeney, Col. Alfred M. Lowry, and Gen. E. B. C. Cash were then called upon to address the meeting. Their remarks though brief were to the point. They fully endorsed the action of the legislature in calling a convention, believing the immediate separate secession was the only remedy, and that nothing short of that could save the honor, and protect the rights and interests of the State. The meeting was not only the largest and most enthusiastic, but also one of the most harmonious ever held in the district.

The people including beardless youths and grayheaded grandfathers, were eager and interested listeners from an early hour in the day 'till a late hour in the evening and for the first time in my recollection, a goodly number of the fair sex graced with their interesting presence, and encouraging smiles, a political meeting in Chesterfield district.

The ticket nominated will certainly be elected without opposition. For talent, integrity, and firmness of purpose it will not be surpassed by that of any other district. Our delegates will represent a district that is a unit in opposition to black Republican domination, and in favor of immediate State secession. Indeed, we have but one party in the district.

A neatly gotten up flag of medium size, having on it a Palmetto tree with a rattlesnake curled around it, with its rattles sprung and in the attitude of striking, a lone star in one corner, and the inscription, "Immediate State Action," floated over the public square.

After the adjournment of the meeting the whole concourse of ladies and gentlemen assembled under it and saluted it with three deafening cheers. Altogether it was one of Chesterfield's most glorious days, her citizens a unit in their stern resolve to resist to the death the domination of black Republican fanaticism—to die free rather than to live slaves.

"South Carolina Secedes," by John Amassa May and Joan Reynolds Faunt, published by University of South Carolina, Columbia, and printed in December 1960, carries biographies and pictures of Chesterfield's delegates—Chancellor Inglis, Stephen Jackson, and Henry McIver.

An Administrative Conference Procedure for a Quasi-Judicial Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 14, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Stuart Rothman, General Counsel for the National Labor Relations Board. The article was published in the February 1961 issue of the American Bar Association Journal.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE PROCEDURE FOR A QUASI-JUDICIAL AGENCY

(By Stuart Rothman, General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board)

Borrowing a leaf from the book of the Federal judiciary, the Office of the General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board has had a Regional Advisory Conference on Administration convened in each of the agency's more than 20 regions.[1] Just as each Federal judicial circuit has a judicial conference "for the purpose of considering the business of the courts and advising means of improving the administration of justice within such circuit," [2] so each regional office of the Board will have an advisory conference for analogous purposes.

Judicial conferences, or councils as they are sometimes called in State judicial systems, are normally provided for by statute. Since their inception in the Federal system, they have proved to be an invaluable adjunct in developing improvements in the operation of the courts within the circuits. The system has worked so well in fact that it seems appropriate and desirable to apply a similar technique in the administrative field. A multitude of conferences, councils and committees exist to advise the heads of Federal and State administrative agencies on many types of questions, but so far as is known, however, this is the first time an independent Federal administrative agency has established advisory groups at the regional level for the consideration of techniques for handling the business of the local regional offices.

This new development is only one phase, but an extremely significant one, of a comprehensive program which has been undertaken by the Office of the General Counsel for the improvement of its function in the administration and enforcement of the National Labor Relations Act. Improvement is necessary for a number of reasons, not the least of which is the fact that the number of cases filed with the agency has been steadily increasing, and the passage of the Landrum-Griffin amendments [3] in 1959 is expected to bring further increases. Since 1947, when the act was extensively revised for the first time since its enactment, over 185,000 cases have been filed in the regional offices. Of these, between 80 and 90 percent were disposed of at the regional level. Thus it becomes self-evident that the efficient, effective handling of the business of the regional offices is a key factor in the ability of the agency to fulfill successfully its responsibilities to the public interest it was created to serve.

An advisory conference has been established on a permanent basis by the regional director of each of the Board's regional offices, with the regional director serving as moderator. While a limited number of regional office staff members have attended the conferences to contribute background information, the membership of each conference has been drawn from the ranks of those in the regional area particularly interested in the law of labor-management relations—practicing attorneys representing labor and management, and teachers of labor law and industrial relations.

RESPONSE IS ENTHUSIASTIC

The response of those invited to participate in the conferences has been enthusiastic. This is encouraging. But perhaps more significant, it is a positive reiteration of a truth demonstrated by the response of the bar to the Federal judicial conferences. The members of the profession are vitally interested in improving the procedures of the bodies they practice before, whether those bodies be judicial or administrative. The members of the regional conferences contribute their thoughts, imagination, and time. They also pay their own expenses, for the agency has no funds for this purpose. It would, therefore, be difficult to imagine a more positive affirmation of legal professionalism, and for this the members of the labor bar deserve sincere commendation.[4]

Students of labor law, whether in the academic world or in private practice, have long been fascinated with theory. If the number of published papers, books, and articles is any criterion, primary attention has been focused on legal theory and the impact of cases on the development of labor-management relations law. The Office of the General Counsel is no less interested in this subject. But the advisory conferences do not concern themselves with the interpretation of the National Labor Relations Act, for that is solely the province of the agency and the Federal courts. Rather, the attention of each local group has been devoted to the consideration and recommendation of techniques for improving the administrative operations and procedures of the regional office so as to eliminate unnecessary delay and wasteful or ineffective practices in the handling of cases at the regional level.[5] These matters, though local in nature since they are found within the framework of the particular regional office, are national in scope.

And improvements developed in one region may appropriately be considered for general application throughout the regional office system. Indeed, one change for the better has already been instituted nationally as a result of the initial meeting of these conferences. Heretofore, regional directors had not uniformly been in the habit of fully informing charging parties of the reasons for the dismissal of charges which were found to be lacking in sufficient merit to warrant the issuance of an unfair labor practice complaint. The discussion at several of the conferences made it evident that this had resulted at times in dissatisfaction, confusion and even misunderstanding of the law or the motivations of the regional offices or the Office of the General Counsel. As a result, all the regional offices were instructed to insure against such results in the future by making explicit the reasons for the dismissal of an unfair labor practice charge.

NEW PROCEDURES AND TECHNIQUES

Prior to the meeting of the advisory conference, agenda developed by the regional director were, insofar as possible, circulated among the members in advance in order to obtain their suggestions about other matters which might be covered and to enable them to consider and develop any comments they wished to contribute at the meeting. Since the primary objective of these gatherings is to devise new procedures and techniques by which the regional office may better serve the public, initial agenda included a brief description by the regional director of the handling of cases by the regional office as a springboard to discussion. Further agenda items included such matters as the question of cooperation in obtaining expeditious handling of cases, methods for locating and interviewing potential witnesses, timing of and responsibility for settlement of cases, the use of pretrial conferences, and the desirability of making pleadings more informative and effective. But these were by no means all the matters which were discussed, for, as was expected, agenda for the various conferences differed because the problems the regional offices encounter are diverse rather than uniform.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Since the concept of the conferences is in its infancy, a complete or fixed program seems undesirable at this point. Only with the passage of time, permitting the development of refinements based on evaluated experience, will they mature as an institution.

By means of discussions stimulating the interplay of ideas, regional office personnel, attorneys practicing before the agency, and members of the academic world will have the opportunity to become better acquainted and reach levels of understanding and cooperation heretofore unattained for the lack of an appropriate forum. Any group with a general common interest may profit from a mutual exchange of ideas and experiences, and these new advisory conferences can be of real value to their members, the agency, and the public by providing a vehicle for eliciting, examining, and testing suggestions for new or improved techniques and procedures in handling the business of the regional offices. If this proves to be true in the case of the National Labor Relations Board, the concept of regional advisory conferences may well recommend itself to administrators in other agencies. Certainly they will bear observation as a creative experiment in improving the practical operating procedures of a quasi-judicial agency in the dispensation of administrative justice.

---

[1] Two series of these Regional Advisory Conferences have now been held, the first in February 1960, and the last having been concluded in January 1961.

[2] 28 U.S.C. § 333 (1959 ed.).

[3] Public Law 86–257, title VII, 73 Stat. 341–546 (86th Cong., 2d sess.).

[4] Morris D. Forkosch, Regional Advisory Conferences on Administration, Labor Law Journal (September 1960), page 857. Professor Forkosch says "on procedures it was remarkable how many areas of agreement were found, how many excellent suggestions came forth and how splendidly the conference tree bore fruit."

[5] There is, however, an increasing interest on the part of conferees in discussion of the more complex passages of the act, as amended by the Landrum-Griffin Act.

An Industry That Is Expanding in North Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 14, 1961

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, last week, the House spent a large portion of three sessions considering the feed grain bill which was designed to stop the buildup of surpluses of feed grains in the feed grain producing areas of the Nation.

This is a somewhat frustrating problem, with no easy answer, as was evidenced by the lengthy debate on this bill and the narrow magin by which the bill passed the House. The real answer to this problem is to move feed grains into their proper use; namely, that of feeding and fattening livestock and poultry.

My State of North Dakota is apparently doing its best to put together the livestock we raise and the grain we produce, with the end objective in view of increasing the agricultural income of our State. The Bismarck Tribune, North Dakota's oldest newspaper on March 8 carried an interesting story on the subject of the expansion of livestock feeding in North Dakota. I believe the information contained in this editorial should be of interest to all Members of Congress, and under unanimous consent, include it with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

NORTH DAKOTA CATTLE FEEDING GROWS

Throughout North Dakota, more farmers are putting more cattle in feedlots. Not only big farmers are doing this but also smaller farmers, who are feeding 10, 15, or 25 steers and heifers while wintering their foundation herd.

Thus economists think the agricultural stability and economic security of the State is developing a broader foundation which means that North Dakota will be better able to weather the vicissitudes of drought and recession.

The Federal Reserve bank at Minneapolis has just issued a report which discloses that North Dakota has increased both its beef cattle numbers and the number of cattle on feed for market by more than any other State in the Ninth Federal Reserve District.

According to this report, there are 40 percent more cattle on feed in this State than there were a year ago. This compares with the district increase of 21 percent. Beef cattle numbers have grown by 8 percent compared with the district growth of 3 percent. Meanwhile, Iowa, one of the very biggest feeder States, showed a decline in the number of cattle on feed for market.

One of the big reasons for this development in North Dakota, of course, is the growing utilization of rolled barley for livestock feeding. It provides a relatively cheap feed, easy to handle, and North Dakota has a relative abundance of it. One Sheridan County livestock producer said the other day that he fed absolutely nothing but rolled barley in the latter weeks of their fattening to his 30 steers, recently marketed, and they prospered on it. This appears to have been the experience of all livestock men using rolled barley, which they can raise themselves if they want to.

If the number of cattle on feed in North Dakota continues to grow anywhere near the rate of recent years, it won't be long before fat cattle are a major source of North Dakota farm income with vast effects upon the State's entire economy.

How To Save a Billion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 14, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speakers, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor:

HOW TO SAVE A BILLION—AN INTIMATE MESSAGE FROM WASHINGTON

(By Neal Sanford)

There is a new twist to that old maxim: "A penny saved is a penny earned." The twister is that Member of Congress, economist-professor Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat of Illinois, who has come up with the modern version: "A billion dollars saved is a billion dollars earned."

He has passed this on to his former Senate colleague, now President Kennedy, as the latter begins looking around for new money to pay for some of the new defense costs he is planning.

The President does not have to go outside of the Pentagon itself, asserts Senator DOUGLAS, to find the money he wants for paying new Pentagon bills, for starting on a Zeus antimissile missile program, for modernizing the Army, for more Polaris and Minutemen missiles.

There are $2 to $3 billion to be saved each year, insists the Senator, by squeezing "scandalous and appalling" military waste out of the Pentagon. And the Senator is not alone in this conviction. A joint congressional committee last year, chairmanned by the Senator, reached the same conclusion. It spelled out in some detailed examples of what is called mismanagement, waste, duplication.

That there is going to be some slippage in an operation the size of the national defense program (between $45 billion and $50 billion) is obvious. But when it gets into the billions of dollars it takes on the aspects of a national scandal. Senator DOUGLAS, however, is finding it hard to dramatize it. He can't understand how people whose money is being thrown away can be so disinterested.

Here, for example, are a few instances of this waste, duplication, mismanagement—which he says could be duplicated ad infinitum:

Inventory showed the Department of Defense with 1,082,740 yards of cotton duck cloth above its needs. The Post Office Department (which wanted cotton duck cloth for patching its mail bags) asked for some. It offered to take the total amount off the Defense Department's hands, but it refused to pay the Pentagon the market value for the cloth. As as result the Defense was stuck with this yardage, and the Post Office went out and had a new lot made up.

The Air Force contracted for a shipment of 4-foot cables with a plug at each end. It paid $10.67 for each one. The identical article, meanwhile, was selling in retail supply stores in the Washington area for $1.50, which means the Air Force was charged at least six times the value of the item.

The Navy contracted for a small socket for a lamp, at $21.10 each. A box of 500 acquired by the Navy came to $10,550. Identical items were located in a Maryland electronics retail store selling at 25 cents apiece, or $125 for a box of 500.

The Army's inventory listed 5,739 small wrenches priced at $1.84 apiece, or $10,559.76 for them all. Similar wrenches were available at not more than 25 cents each in District of Columbia hardware stores.

The Marine Corps supply center at Albany, Ga., reported 49,514 feet of 3-inch iron pipe in new condition and excess to its needs. Fort Jackson, S.C., said it could use 10,000 feet, but the offer was refused. Fort Jackson then bought what it wanted new.

Estimates indicate that there are some $14 billion worth of supplies in stock that are surplus to the armed services. Defense Department surplus sales run to about $10 billion annually. But it gets only a return of about 2 percent on the original cost. So the argument goes: why not let other branches of the Government use surplus items, even for nothing, instead of having to buy them new?

Another problem is lack of standardization of even the commonest items the Pentagon buys. There are, for example, some 3,400,000 items in the various military supply systems alone. The Pentagon admits that every time it can eliminate a thousand items by standardization it saves over a million dollars. Annual savings of about $450 million could be made by completing the standardization program.

There are signs that the President is impressed with the charges of waste, duplication, overbuying, by the Pentagon. His Budget Director David Bell has called on the Illinois Senator to learn more about the possible "gold in them thar' Pentagon hills."

Mr. DOUGLAS says the vein runs to $2 or $3 billion, which, as it just happens, is about what the President wants to cover the added costs of his increased defense program.

The question now is: Can he mine it?

Development of the Creative Arts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 14, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, citizens and legislators of New Jersey are expressing a growing interest in proposals to increase State encouragement of creative arts. A cultural center has already been authorized; a cultural council has been proposed. This interest is shared in many other States. A national realization is growing: The vitality of a nation is expressed not only through its industry and its principles, but also in the abilities of its citizens to express themselves clearly and meaningfully.

State activity is encouraging and overdue. Interest at the Federal level: Thanks to the efforts of such legislators as Representative FRANK THOMPSON of New Jersey and Senators HUMPHREY and CLARK, we are finally considering proposals to demonstrate Federal interest without imposing any form of Federal control.

Mr. President, an editorial in the Camden (N.J.) Courier Post of March 9 discusses one of those proposals, and it expresses the growing realization I mentioned earlier. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Development of the Creative Arts" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

New Jersey's Senator WILLIAMS is hoping for action this year on legislation which would speed development of the creative arts throughout the Nation.

Cosponsor of bills which would help define the Federal role in this area, the Democratic Senator wants a clearer statement of Federal intentions on plans to encourage performance and practice of the arts. A Federal Advisory Council would be established under terms of one of the bills.

In recent years, a step forward was taken with the founding of a National Cultural Center in Washington. At the State level, New Jersey has authorized the establishment of a cultural center, and a proposal for a State art commission has been made.

But WILLIAMS feels such efforts will yield the greatest return if, from national to local level, the citizens prove to themselves and the rest of the world that their interest in creative activity and widespread appreciation of the arts is deep and growing.

The Federal Advisory Council would recommend ways to maintain and increase the cultural resources of the United States, propose methods to encourage private initiative in the arts, and strive to stimulate greater appreciation of the arts by our citizens.

The council would have 21 members widely recognized for profound interest in one or more of the arts. They would represent the major art fields including music, drama, dance, literature, architecture and allied arts, painting, sculpture, photography, graphic and craft arts, motion pictures, radio and TV.

The Government certainly has a role to play in support of cultural activities. It should do a lot more than it does. Of all the civilized nations, our Government probably does less to promote the arts than any of them.

The proposed council could give national perspective on the development of a basic national resource—our own fine arts.

It looks, too, like the time is ripe for the effort by WILLIAMS and others to promote this. President Kennedy has already made it clear that he will take a deep interest in the arts.

Congress should do all within its power to offer programs to achieve that purpose and related purposes.

The Economics of Medical Care for the Aged—Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 14, 1961

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in all of the buildup by the American Medical Association against S. 909, the legislation recently introduced by me and other Senators to include health care insurance within the social security system, little attention was given by newspapers and magazines to the quiet but significant decision of a positive nature by the general board of the National Council of the Churches of Christ. On February 22, the council of churches general board, consisting of 250 members, unanimously adopted a resolution approving wholeheartedly the principle of using the system of old-age, survivors', and disability insurance for financing basic health care for America's growing population of older citizens.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the resolution into the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ECONOMICS OF MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

(A resolution adopted by the General Board of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America, February 22, 1961)

The good news of God's redeeming love and saving power, declared in the teaching of Jesus Christ was proclaimed in His concern for suffering and His ministry of healing. From the beginning, Jesus went directly to the sick and suffering. To all who came or were brought to him, he expressed his loving concern for the health of body, mind, and spirit. This divine concern has received repeated emphasis in Christian life and teaching. The Apostle Paul wrote that the strong should bear the burdens of the weak.

Through the generations Christians have turned to the victims of disease with increasing concern and at the same time have sought resources which might bring healing power to the sick. Consciously or unconsciously sharing God's purpose that mankind should have health, a ministry of healing has become an inherent aspect of a civilized and humane society.

As new health needs have appeared, new resources have been discovered for meeting them. In our day, as the number of aged persons have increased, there are among them many men and women who require financial assistance if they are to have physical and mental health and that spiritual health which may be dependent thereon. On their behalf today ways should be sought and found to further the will of God once so clearly made manifest by Jesus Christ that men and women should be enabled to enjoy health.[1]

For the Christian, means are as important as are ends; but no more so. In our endeavor to achieve Christian ends we must choose those methods best calculated to develop and maintain Christian character and relationships.

No method is better suited to do this than sharing the unpredictable incidence of the cost of medical care through the various mechanisms of mutual aid that have been developed. The most widely accepted of these is the mechanism of insurance—both private and public.

To the extent that Christian duty can be discharged by the assumption of individual, family, and group responsibility and without resort to governmental action, this is to be preferred.

On the other hand, where needs of people can be met only by united, socially planned action, the Christian will choose such action rather than the neglect of basic human need.

Therefore, we should seek to bring the blessings of modern medical care within reach of all by nongovernmental action to the extent that such methods can accomplish this. But we should not fail to support governmental action in circumstances where other methods are clearly inadequate or impossible.

On the average, American families spend nearly $300 a year for health purposes. Most of this money is spent to secure hospital and physician services, medicines, and prosthetic and other appliances after illness has already become serious. Comparatively little of it is spent for the maintenance of optimum

[1] The general board of the national council has already made clear its concern for the provision of adequate standards of health care for all and for the cooperation of both private and public agencies in their maintenance as follows:

1. "Christians should work for a situation wherein all have access at least to a minimum standard of living. Such a minimum should be sufficient to permit care of the health of all and for suitable protection of the weaker members of society, such as the aged. (Pronouncement on basic Christian principles and assumptions for economic life, adopted September 15, 1954.)

2. "The churches' concept of man imposes a more fundamental obligation for the furtherance of health. Therefore, the availability and financing of medical care of high quality is of deep concern to the churches. If voluntary prepayment plans cannot accomplish the desired ends, government should protect the health of the people by making possible the prepayment of health service." (Pronouncement on the churches' concern for health services, February 25, 1960.)

health. This contributes substantially to demands on hospital facilities and to a lower level of general health and well-being than could be had by a wiser and more orderly expenditure of the same amount of money for preventive care. The rapidly rising cost of modern medical care puts it beyond the ability of most retired persons and low-income families to purchase such care on an emergency fee-for-service basis.

A very wise variety of nongovernmental efforts have been and are being made to meet this problem of medical economics. They range from indemnity health insurance provided by commercial insurance companies to prepayment, group practice health plans providing comprehensive, including preventive, care for nearly all the health needs of their subscribers through teams of physicians which include specialists and general practitioners.

The voluntary sharing among groups of people of the risks and hazards of illness, and the voluntary pooling of some of their funds to meet the cost of care for any in their group who may need it is indeed a Christian approach to this problem, whether this method is utilized by churches, labor unions, industrial managements, paternal organizations, cooperatives, community groups, or by subscribers for health insurance. The National Council of Churches commends it and urges its widest possible application.

It is noteworthy, however, that the cost of health care and consequently of health insurance is rising so rapidly as to make it difficult for the average family to afford adequate coverage for its comprehensive health needs. While some 73 percent of the American people have some form of health insurance, nonetheless, only 25 percent of the total private medical expenditures are paid from such insurance.

About 4 million Americans who are today obtaining comprehensive medical care from group practice or other direct service health care prepayment plans pay for it by monthly subscription premiums amounting to less per year than the average $300 per family annual expenditure. It appears that one method of making the best of modern medical available to more and more people lies in a rapid growth and expansion of voluntary health plans of this character.

There are, however, certain groups in the population for whom even their ordinary medical needs cannot be met by voluntary prepayment plans, namely, low-income families and most people 65 years of age or older. Eighty percent of persons with family income of $5,000 or more have some form of health insurance, but only 33 percent of those with family income under $3,000. Only 35 percent of persons 65 or more years of age have any health insurance.

Voluntary health plans are unable to offer coverage for even a fraction of health care needs at charges either of these groups can possibly afford. Eighty percent of people 65 years of age or older have annual incomes of less than $2,000; about 60 percent incomes less than $1,000. At least 7.6 million older people have liquid assets of less than $500. Yet 77 percent of people 65 years of age and older have chronic ailments, and the percentage increases to 83 percent for those 75 and older. The group 65 and older now requires, for less than optimum health care, more than twice as much hospitalization per person as is needed by the rest of the population, and they spend on the average twice as much for health care as does the population as a whole.

Full advantage should be taken of recent amendment to title I of the Social Security Act which offers Federal funds to improve State medical care programs for aged persons on public assistance rolls and also provides matching funds for States desiring to aid medically needy older people not now on relief rolls but able to pass a means test as a condition of eligibility. This program offers the States opportunity to provide help for older persons at the bottom of the economic scale. However, it does not offer aged persons of moderate means and many of low income any solution to their problem.

About three out of every four policyholders in voluntary group prepayment plans are completely excluded from coverage upon retirement, and studies indicate that less than 5 percent can convert to individual policies without reduction in benefits. The voluntary prepayment plans, necessarily based upon experience rating, discriminate against high-risk groups and are not geared to the problems of chronic illness characteristic of old age. Policies commercially written for older people are not only beyond the means of most, but they are not based upon a philosophy of preventive medicine and optimum health, nor do they include provisions for diagnosis, followup, and restorative medicine.

As previously noted, the general board has stated, "If voluntary prepayment plans cannot accomplish the desired ends, Government should protect the health of people by making possible the prepayment of health services." This is precisely what the social security system would be able to provide efficiently through the mechanism of old age, survivors' and disability insurance. Therefore, the National Council of Churches supports in principle legislation which will extend the benefits of old age, survivors' and disability insurance to include adequate health care for retired aged persons.[2]

There are human values that are inseparable from the economics of medical care. Two call for special consideration:

1. Quality of care. While high quality medical care has been achieved under a number of different methods of payment, it is unrealistic to think that quality is ever completely separable from the economics of medical care. The National Council urges that in the development of prepayment and insurance plans—under both private and public auspices—careful attention be given to arrangements which give maximum encouragement to the highest quality of care and the enhancement of the best relationship between physician and patient.

2. Individual dignity and freedom. Government participation in any welfare program does not necessarily involve loss of individual freedom or affront to personal dignity. In some circumstances, indeed, individual freedom is enhanced by the utilization of government to achieve a social goal, though it is obvious that such enhancement does not come about automatically. As the instrument of government is employed by a free people, they must be ever vigilant to guard their freedom. In planning and developing any government insurance program to help older people meet the cost of their medical care, there is a Christian obligation to include provisions for its administration that will adequately safeguard freedom, dignity, and self-respect.

The counsel, cooperation, and active participation of the medical profession and other health workers in both planning and execution of a government health program are essential. The values to be realized from an improved level of health for America's older citizens are so great that we are confident that cooperation will be forthcoming from all who in our day are custodians of the almost miraculous capacity to maintain the health and cure the diseases of their fellow human beings.

In the light of the above concerns the general board authorizes representatives of the National Council to testify at public hearings along the lines herein indicated.

[2] In its pronouncement on the churches' concern for public assistance, adopted June 4, 1958, the General Board stated: "The National Council of Churches affirms that the use of social insurance as exemplified by old age, survivors' and disability insurance is to be preferred to economic dependence upon the public assistance programs."

The Political Situation in Colombia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 14, 1961

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the complexity of Latin American politics leads most Americans to despair of trying to really understand what forces are at work in each of the nations south of our border. It is much easier to generalize and stereotype, to think of all Latin American leaders as strutting caudillos or Communist sympathizers, to overlook the hard struggle being fought by honest and dedicated political leaders in each country to preserve and strengthen their democratic institutions.

Recently I received a letter from Mr. Richard H. Naber who teaches in the high school at Portage, Wis. Mr. Naber has had many years experience as a teacher in Colombia at their major universities. I was so impressed by the careful and perceptive discussion his letter contained on the present political situation in Colombia that I thought it should be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Naber's letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTAGE PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL,
February 28, 1961.

The Honorable WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
Senator From Wisconsin,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: On April 9, 1948, one of Colombia's leading leftist politicians, Jorge Eliecer Gaitán, was brutally slain in downtown Bogotá. In the subsequent investigations it was brought out that international communism had taken an active role in both the wanton assassinations and later uprisings in various cities of the country. In fact, one very well-known figure in world events of today, Fidel Castro, was expelled from Colombia because there were implications of his complicity in the events which took place during the inter-American meeting of Bogotá. From this infamous day when the Reds released prisoners from the principal jails of the country, managed to burn the greater part of police documents against them, destroyed many business establishments through arson and looting, attacked churches and important political leaders, etc., Colombia has been attempting to establish peace in its territory and put a stop to the senseless slaughter of countless innocent people in the farming communities and the backwoods areas of the country. Having lived in Colombia from 1950 to 1959, having taught in their two principal universities and having traveled widely during my residence there, I can testify to the efforts

made to end the chaotic situation that exists in certain Communist infected regions of Colombia.

Previous to my departure from this potentially wealthy country, Colombians of both parties joined together and made a political pact which would rotate the presidency between the two traditional parties—namely liberal and conservative—and divide positions in government between the two. The pact originally called for the conservatives to occupy the presidency during the first period after the fall of the dictator, Gustavo Rojas. When Dr. Hernando Goméz Tanco (one of my former private English students) turned down the offer by both political parties to be the one and only candidate of both parties, the pact was changed to permit a liberal to become president during the years—1958–62. In the elections Dr. Alberto Lleras Gamargo, one of Latin America's leading statesmen—a firm ally of the United States—a true democrat and believer in inter-American unity—was chosen to become president. Since his inception as president the Communists have left no stone unturned to foment unrest, disorder, and chaos so that Dr. Lleras would find it difficult if not impossible to restore civil liberties, peace, and economic stability to his country. The United States has aided Colombia through loans to stabilize their economy but every day from friends and former students both university and private comes the news that the situation is very dangerous and grows graver and more serious.

The day is fast approaching when Colombians must choose a new candidate for the Presidency from among the conservatives. If for some reason there is no choice agreeable to the liberals, civil war with all its horrible aftermath is a distinct possibility. Among the conservatives there is a man, Dr. Jorge Gutierrez Anzola, who was governor of one of the departments of Colombia and who has shown himself to be conscientious, incorruptible and just to both liberals and conservatives. He has friends among both parties but is little known abroad. So far there are indications that the liberals would look favorably on his postulation as candidate to the Presidency some time this year. As far as I know no other candidate has the approval of the liberal leaders. The other potential conservative candidates all have enemies in their own party which is a much more serious matter in Colombia than it would be in the United States. The Communists know that should someone with integrity like Dr. Gutierrez be found among the conservatives then their possibilities of destroying democracy in Colombia would be diminished. Hence, it comes as no surprise that the Red appointed killers of the 20th century have attempted to assassinate him seven times this year. They know that if he is eliminated, then they are just that much closer to power. The liberals would then have the choice of either continuing in power (pact would be broken) or accepting a candidate who is no guarantee to either liberals or conservatives in continuing the program of the pact. In either case it would bring on a period of great internal strain.

If this were not enough there is increasing indication that agents of Fidel Castro are introducing arms and ammunition to the Communist guerrillas in Colombia through Venezuela. Just the other day we were given an indication of Fidel's popularity among the masses when over 3,000 fellow travelers paraded in downtown Bogotá shouting anti-American slogans. Some 1,000 made a demonstration in front of the Belgium Embassy crying, "Down with the murderers." When Vice President Nixon visited Bogotá, he was protected by Colombia's presidential guard and not more than 300 paraded in demonstrations against him. In the short span of a few years they have increased their strength tenfold. Unless positive action is taken to counteract this rising tide of anti-Americanism, Mr. PROXMIRE, I am afraid we may lose one of our stanchest friends in Latin America. While Mr. "K" from Moscow rants and raves his innocence before the world, his agents murder, slay, and endeavor (under his orders) to disrupt the progress toward true democracy in the underdeveloped regions of the world. I send this report your way in the hope that now that you are aware of a potentially dangerous situation you may do something for our friends to the south before it is too late.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD H. NABER.

Politics and Postal Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 14, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as the concept of the New Frontier is applied to the operations of the postal service, it is sometimes well to review recent political history to help understand the present situation. The following editorial from the Chicago Tribune does just that:

POLITICS AND POSTAL RATES

Postmaster General Day says the Kennedy administration is going to ask Congress to raise the basic first-class letter rate to 5 cents and the airmail rate to 8 cents. This is precisely what Mr. Eisenhower recommended to Congress on January 13, 1958, and again on March 11, 1960. On both occasions the Democrats rebuffed him.

They tried in vain to block Senate approval of the bill in 1958. A committee approved the bill over the objection of its chairman, Senator JOHNSTON, of South Carolina. Senator MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, tried to scuttle the 5-cent rate by an amendment, and among the Senators who voted against the 5-cent rate were Mr. Kennedy and Mr. JOHNSON, now President and Vice President.

Although the Senate approved the bill, House Democrats led by Representative MCCORMACK refused to go along with the 5- and 8-cent rates, and the present rates of 4 and 7 cents were adopted in joint conference.

In 1960, Mr. Eisenhower's request never got beyond the House committee headed by a Democrat, TOM MURRAY, of Tennessee.

Now the Democrats are asking for themselves what they denied to Mr. Eisenhower. As far as the justification for higher rates goes, it is hard to see that anything has changed in the last 3 years. There is still a post office deficit. There is still the threat of an overall budget deficit.

One objection which the Democrats raised in 1958 was that rates should not be raised in time of recession. Today another recession is in progress and the administration tells us it is a serious one.

We are reminded of the hit tune, "Anything Goes," which goes, in part, "Day's night today and wrong's right today." But of course it isn't really that confusing. In 1958 and 1960, the Republicans were trying to balance a budget and the Democrats were trying to embarrass them. Today the Democrats are in office.

Whether 5-cent postage is right or wrong has depended, in the eyes of Democrats, simply on who is asking for it.

Milwaukee Foremen's Safety School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 14, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the never-ending challenge of life conservation is a responsibility which every citizen of a community must accept. This is a basic premise of the safety program conducted by the Association of Commerce, of Milwaukee, Wis.

Last year, the tragic accident toll in America included 92,000 persons killed—1 life lost every 5½ minutes—and 2 million crippled.

In the face of such factors, safety education becomes, not an extracurricular activity, but an essential saver of life and limb.

For 40 years, the Milwaukee Association of Commerce has conducted an annual Foremen's Safety School, dedicated to the training of thousands of employees in the fundamentals of accident control. The school has played an important leadership role in the reduction of occupational injuries and fatalities in this fine community.

The association—now celebrating its centennial anniversary—can be extremely proud of its splendid record in the field of safety.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief résumé of purposes and objectives of the association's safety program, and also a list of officers serving the association to promote safety.

There being no objection, the statement and the list were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INFORMATION

PURPOSE OF SCHOOL

An employee safety training school providing practical instruction in the fundamentals of plant and manpower protection against accidents—causes and control of injuries "on" and "off-the-job."

WHO CAN ENROLL?

Open to all interested employees of business firms in metropolitan Milwaukee. No registration fee. The school is conducted in the community interest as a membership service of the Milwaukee Association of Commerce.

FEATURES

Sectional programs—addresses by outstanding safety authorities, films, discussions, demonstrations. General assembly sessions featuring America's finest inspirational speakers, musical programs by industrial bands.

HOW TO ENROLL

Registrations should be sent in advance by your company to the Milwaukee Association of Commerce. Each employee should be registered in one of the eight sections of the school closest allied to his occupation. Attendance cards and programs will be provided for all enrollees. Individuals not previously enrolled before opening of school may register on meeting nights at the Milwaukee Auditorium.

CERTIFICATES

Will be awarded at close of school only to those enrollees who attend a minimum of

two of the three monthly sessions of school—including both sectional and general assembly meetings. All attendance cards will be collected at closing session.

MILWAUKEE ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE

President: Harry G. Hoffman, president, Hoffman, York, Paulson & Gerlach, Inc.

Executive vice president: Lester W. Brann, Jr.

INDUSTRIAL SAFETY DIVISION OPERATING COMMITTEE

Chairman of division: Robert G. Allen, Bucyrus-Erie Co.

Chairman of school: James G. Reilly, Cutler-Hammer, Inc.

Allen W. Bathke, Chain Belt Co.

Charles A. Baumann, Heil Co.

Philip W. Behling, Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co.

Michael F. Biancardi, Allis-Chalmers Mfg. Co.

Lester C. Bloedorn, Evinrude Motors.

Erwin C. Brenner, Milwaukee Gas Light Co.

J. Lloyd Cantrell, Miller Brewing Co.

Joseph E. Carone, Pressed Steel Tank Co.

Peter M. Cartwright, Wisconsin Electric Power Co.

Jean G. Dapp, International Harvester Co.

James G. Dickinson, Wisconsin Electric Power Co.

Donald J. Diederich, Wehr Steel Co.

George P. Dunn, Ladish Co.

Warren E. Fuhrman, Milwaukee Gas Light Co.

Edward G. Goldbeck, Milwaukee Solvay Coke Co.

Edward Haverberg, American Motors Corp.

Thomas F. Hedglin, General Electric X-Ray Dept.

Myron E. Jolidon, Standard Oil Division of American Oil Co.

Herbert H. Koepke, Johnson Service Co.

John H. Kopmeier, Wisconsin Ice & Coal Co.

Cyril V. McDonald, Froedtert Malt Co.

Franklin A. McVety, Borden Co.

S. Lloyd Nemeyer, Milwaukee Gas Light Co.

Howard H. Perlick, Perlick Co.

Donald F. Possell, Nordberg Mfg. Co.

Murdoch G. Pryor, Allen-Bradley Co.

Robert G. Reeve, Allis-Chalmers Mfg. Co.

Ray W. Rodgers, North Western-Hanna Fuel Co.

Dorr C. Snoyenbos, AC Spark Plug, General Motors Corp.

Russell E. Sorensen, Motor Castings Co.

Carl Usinger, Fred Usinger, Inc.

E. Clark Woodward, A. O. Smith Corp.

Mount Vernon Kiwanis Club Plans Community Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to a community project planned by the Kiwanis Club of Mount Vernon, Va.

With your permission, I shall read the announcement of this event which has been sent me by the club president, Mr. Thomas Androus:

KIWANIS CLUB OF MOUNT VERNON, VA.,
March 9, 1961.

Hon. JOEL T. BROYHILL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROYHILL: Please be advised the Kiwanis Club of Mount Vernon intends to hold a Sunrise Service on Easter Sunday morning, April 2, 1961, at historical Mount Vernon, as one of its commuity projects.

This project is being sponsored on behalf of our club by the chairman and the committee for support of churches. We have invited all of the Kiwanis Clubs comprising the 10th division to participate in this service, and an invitation has been extended to all citizens in Alexandria, Arlington, Fairfax County and northern Virginia to attend. In addition, an invitation has been extended to all public officials in this area, and it is expected that a large number will be in attendance.

Our guest speaker will be Dr. George M. Docherty of the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church, and a very elaborate program has been arranged, complete with a beautiful choral group; and it is anticipated that some 2,000 citizens will be present for this service. Special arrangements have been made with the National Park Commission, who have been most cooperative in assisting us with our community project.

May I, on behalf of the Mount Vernon Kiwanis Club, extend a personal invitation to you, Mr. Speaker, and to all the Members of both House and Senate who will be in the Washington area during the Easter recess, to participate in this beautiful and memorable ceremony.

Special Postage Stamps Commemorating Flags of Particular Significance in the History of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1961

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article which appeared in the May 9, 1960, issue of Linn's Weekly Stamp News entitled "U.S. Notes," by Carl P. Reuth:

A recurring suggestion is to the effect that our Post Office Department should continue the issuance of the flag stamps in full color. We've had them now with the 48 and 49 stars, with a 50 coming in July. However, the flags for future appearance, and what would be more appropriate than on July 4 each year, are those which have been used since the beginning of our Nation.

This would include famous ones such as the several versions of the pine tree and the rattlesnake ones (don't tread on me), as well as colorful banners as the Bedford flag, the Philadelphia Light Horse and the Rhode Island. Presenting a different one each year would in time provide an excellent educational and pictorial presentation.

Of course, the ultimate would be to have 50 different in one pane of stamps. Making another full pane of 50, in color, would be the flags of the 50 States.

Subsequent to this article, I introduced a bill in the 86th Congress to provide for the issuance of a series of special postage stamps in commemoration of flags of particular significance in the history of the United States of America. The Citizens Advisory Committee in existence at the time did not adopt the recommendations contained in the bill.

Today I am reintroducing this bill, which would provide for the continued issuance of the American flag series stamps on each July 4, subsequent to the 1960 flag issue—50-star, by the Post Office Department.

Since it appears that no more States will be added within the foreseeable future, I feel that this stamp series should be continued by honoring flags used since the beginning of our Nation, such as the following: National flag, 1777; Bennington flag, 1777; Navy jack, 1775—Don't Tread On Me; Cambridge flag, 1775; Continental flag, 1775; Bunker Hill flag; Pine Tree flag, 1775; Taunton flag, 1774; Gadsen flag, 1775; Fort Moultrie flag.

Stamps subsequent to July 4, 1970, would be issued as determined appropriate by the Postmaster General with the advice of the Citizens Advisory Committee.

A "Brief" for the Public Defender

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 14, 1961

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the district attorney of New York County, Hon. Frank Hogan, who has held this high position for 18 years, recently spoke before the National Legal Aid and Defender Association on the need for assistance to indigent defendants. This speech, which was reprinted in the February 1961 issue of the Journal of the American Judicature Society, is one which deserves the attention of all Members of the Congress.

Legislation is now pending before the Senate Judiciary Committee sponsored by myself and Senator KEFAUVER, Senator WILEY, and other Members, which would establish a system of public defenders on the Federal level. I hope that the strong sentiments for such legislation indicated in Mr. Hogan's presentation will secure additional support for the enactment of this legislation which has passed the Senate in the last two Congresses.

I am particularly impressed by the support which Mr. Hogan gives to existing legal aid society efforts, as my bill, S. 854, would permit the provision of such assistance through grants to existing legal aid societies, and not only for the establishment of new legal defender positions, which are, of course, also vitally needed.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech by District Attorney Hogan be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BRIEF FOR THE INDIGENT DEFENDANT

(By Frank S. Hogan)

I suppose it is rather unusual for a district attorney to file a notice of appearance in behalf of those he prosecutes. But I am here to enter a brief for the defense—for the type of defendant whom you represent, the impoverished defendant.

I am encouraged in my advocacy by the happy recollection that those persons who were most instrumental in the formation of the criminal courts branch of the New York Legal Aid Society in 1917 were former members of the prosecutor's staff in New York

County. Charged with the enforcement of the criminal law, they had become acutely conscious of the problem of the needy defendant.

Supreme Court Justice Frankfurter has said that a defendant's best protection is a fair, honest and competent prosecutor. That is a precept we have tried to live by in my office.

Curious what notions some people have about district attorneys. I suspect they are largely induced by an excessively rich and steady diet of crime movies, television and radio shows. Some time ago, after I had spoken at a dinner, a gentleman sent me a gracious letter in which he said, "After all I have read in the newspapers about prosecutors, I wasn't quite sure what to expect. Well, after listening to you, I decided, in spite of my fears that you are a very human fellow."

Now, wasn't that kind and generous. We district attorneys must try to spread that impression. It will be a great service to law enforcement.

I hope that some of you, during your stay in New York, can visit us in the Criminal Courts Building and see our office in operation. We try to be very courteous to guests, and we get a great many of them. Over 1,000 persons come to see us daily. Only a few are invited to stay, and for them we have special quarters—a bit confining—in the north end of the building. The others—lawyers, policemen, complainants, witnesses—come and go and marvel, I hope, at our efficiency.

The jurisdiction of our office is limited to New York County. That constitutes only a little more than 7 percent of the total area of the city, but nearly 2 million people live in our county. We are joined every day by an additional million who come from a 50-mile radius to work, shop, and to seek recreation.

Such a concentration of people, wealth, and activity attracts criminals. The racketeer, the grafter, the swindler, the killer—those are the sensational cases. To them are added the daily harvest of frauds, thefts, assaults. Upward of 50,000 separate criminal matters are presented to our office for consideration each year.

In spite of this saturnalia of crime, I should like you to believe, with my kindly correspondent, that a prosecutor is not a bloodthirsty fellow who stays awake nights scheming how to get more people into our already crowded jails.

Not at all. Ours is a quasi-judicial function. Our sworn duty is to prosecute the guilty, but it is equally our obligation to protect the innocent and to safeguard the rights of those accused of crime. The most vital and precious of these, of course, are the rights to life and liberty.

PROTECTION OF THE COMMUNITY IS THE PRIMARY TASK

The Office of the District Attorney is not a mere prosecuting machine. We are engaged not in a search for guilt but in a search for truth. Our primary task is to protect the community with all the skill and vigor at our command. But we must proceed fairly and with a scrupulous regard for hard-won civil rights. Their preservation is surely as vital to a free society as is the punishment of the malefactor.

In our office there is a careful scrutiny of each case at every step of the legal process. There is additional investigation, if it be necessary, and a reevaluation of the evidence, both as to the facts and the law, by each of the several assistant district attorneys to whom the case is assigned at successive stages.

In spite of every possible precaution, mistakes are made, usually as the result of honest but erroneous identification by well-meaning witnesses. It is the conscientious endeavor of those entrusted with the administration of justice to eliminate even this minute fraction of error.

EXTENSIVE INVESTIGATIONS ARE UNDERTAKEN

Lengthy investigations are often and enthusiastically undertaken to determine the truth with respect to a defendant's claim of innocence, even where the circumstances of the case seemingly foreclose the possibility of a vindication.

And may I say, parenthetically, that if a lawyer of the legal aid society tells one of my assistants that he believes an injustice is being done—so great is our confidence in the integrity and good faith of that organization—we will turn the office upside down and devote our every resource to make absolutely certain that we have all of the facts.

Every year we have been able to point to cases in which we were able, after careful investigation, to bring about the exoneration of persons unjustly accused of crime. Naturally, there is a very deep satisfaction in this aspect of our work.

Perhaps these are not very modest statements I make about the administration of our office but, then, it is difficult to be modest and proud at the same time. I am like the French friar who was describing his monastic order to a Columbia professor. He said "We are not so famous as the Jesuits for scholarship, or the Trappists for silence and good works, but, when it comes to humility, we're the tops."

Notwithstanding the prosecutor's fairness, his concern for the rights of the accused, his concept of his function as a quasi-judicial one, he is, after all, an advocate in an adversary proceeding. The adversary system is contentious by its very nature. In the courtroom, it may not be possible for the district attorney to present his case vigorously and, at the same time, be giving his concentrated attention to all that might be said in the defendant's behalf.

The judge, too, is ever mindful of the rights of the defendant and will do all that is proper to sustain them. But he cannot abandon his impartial role to sit at the counsel table, consult with the accused, advise him, and direct his defense.

We recognize, therefore, the wisdom of that constitutional right which is embedded in the judicial process—the right to counsel.

Fundamental in our American system is the presumption of innocence. Every accused person has the right to submit the question of his guilt to a court of law. However unworthy he may be, he must be presumed innocent until the contrary is proved.

He has a right to his day in court. He may not be convicted of a crime except by due process of law. This means that he has a right to a fair trial. How can he be assured of that right unless he is adequately represented by counsel? This right to honest and competent representation certainly should not be forfeit simply because he is a poor person.

The practical need of legal assistance for the defendant is obvious. Even the intelligent layman may well be baffled by the complexities and mysteries of legal procedure. To the ignorant, the very language of the indictment is a bewildering foreign tongue. If he is impoverished and jailed, he can do nothing for himself. He doesn't know how to prepare his defense. He has no means to secure such witnesses as might testify in his behalf. He knows nothing of the rules of evidence. He does not know his legal rights, nor how to assert them. He may well be convicted simply because he does not know how to establish his innocence.

All will concede that every person accused of crime is entitled to honest legal advice and competent defense in a trial which involves his liberty.

Yet well over half the defendants indicted for serious crimes here and throughout the country have no money for a lawyer.

All good citizens give lipservice to the principle of equal justice for all. It is a truism that every man has his day in court. We all like to believe that justice is even-handed and knows neither rich nor poor. But can there be equal justice if it is not accessible to all?

THE PRINCIPLE OF EQUAL JUSTICE TO ALL MUST APPLY TO THE INDIGENT DEFENDANT

The good citizen will readily accord every legal safeguard of the accused to a bank president or an archbishop, or to his friends and neighbors. Indeed, he is quite ready to give the affluent racketeer, well represented by counsel, a sporting chance to beat the rap. But he is inclined to be impatient of the law's delays in the case of the less fortunate criminal. All too often, he tries and convicts him with the appearance of the first headlines announcing the arrest and accusation. Now he wants him put away and kept behind bars. He might do it again. And it is not unlikely that the good citizen will find his opinions as to the guilt of such a defendant ready made for him in the editorial columns.

Sometimes there seems to be a feeling that legal assistance for those charged with heinous crimes serves only to hamper the administration of justice and aid the guilty to escape the consequences of their misdeeds.

Even legal aid societies—and I say this in no critical spirit—devote the greater part of their invaluable services to the defense of the needy against civil wrongs. They have been concerned primarily with the problems and heartaches incident to controversies arising over unpaid wages, installment payments, evictions and such domestic problems as alimony and abandonment.

The society in New York has been engaged in its splendid work for the poor for 40 years before it began to represent indigent defendants in the criminal courts. And even today, nationally, the societies perform these vital services for defendants in criminal cases in only a handful of communities.

We are all sympathetic with a worthy cause. But how about the cause of the less worthy, the illiterate, the friendless, the "undeserving poor," in the words of George Bernard Shaw, the defendants who, in all probability, are guilty, at least of the crimes charged against them.

Each is still presumed to be innocent. Each is entitled to test the people's case and to have the evidence and argument in his own behalf fully presented. If this right is denied to the least, it is denied to all.

Once we assume that the accusation is tantamount to conviction, we have abandoned our concept of equal justice. We might as well abandon our free society. For we are on the threshold of the police state where even the accusation may be dispensed with.

The right of counsel exists not merely for the innocent and the unjustly accused. The test is whether it is accorded to the least deserving. And it is further the privilege of every indigent defendant not as a kind of charitable handout, but as a matter of right. It is a fundamental right that can be denied to no one, however unfortunate his circumstances, however unpopular his cause, however abhorrent the charge he is held to answer.

How then are we to meet our obligation to the indigent defendant? The earliest approach, and still the most prevalent, has been assignment by the court of counsel to serve without compensation, either at random or, in the more refined versions of the system, from a panel.

I need not review before this association the inadequacies of this method. With all due honor to the many lawyers who have

unselfishly and conscientiously devoted legal services of a high order to indigent defendants, I think it can fairly be stated that most students of the problem agree that the need is best met by the voluntary or the public defender.

THE PUBLIC AND VOLUNTARY DEFENDER MOVEMENTS

The public defender movement is growing steadily and public defenders are now serving in some 50 jurisdictions. Many distinguished members of your association have been in the forefront in urging Federal legislation to establish the public defender system in the Federal courts.

I have had no experience with the public defender plan so that I am unable to argue its merits.

I find myself partial to the voluntary defender. I confess to a prejudice in favor of the Legal Aid Society. It has been a gratifying experience to work with the able and dedicated lawyers of that society for almost a quarter century in the criminal courts of New York County.

The Legal Aid Society of New York was the pioneer voluntary group that sought to cope with the problem of the indigent defendant. Its record is most impressive and the quality of the service which its capable attorneys have given to the needy defendant has been uniformly excellent.

The society is now in its 85th year. It was organized in 1876 to help poor immigrants collect wages and enforce other legal rights. Consider how the society has grown. In its first year it represented 212 persons. Last year, there were 75,984 applications for legal assistance of all kinds. Originating in the various criminal courts were 35,506 of these matters.

In our own court of general sessions, the Legal Aid Society received 80 percent of all assignments of counsel. In the same year, 1959, the lawyers of the society represented 1,808 felony defendants, a figure constituting 44 percent of all dispositions in that court. This year, to date, the Legal Aid Society attorneys have appeared in 1,784 cases, almost 50 percent of all dispositions.

During the past 10 years the criminal courts branch of the Legal Aid Society, under the dynamic direction of Justice Florence M. Kelley and her able successor, Mr. Anthony F. Marra, has expanded its services impressively.

Today, 26 able, experienced lawyers constitute the staff of the criminal courts branch. Of these, 14 are assigned to the various courts in New York County alone.

One would like to be able to say that the problem of the indigent defendant in New York County has been solved. Insofar as we are concerned with the quality of service which the lawyers of the society give to their clients and to the community, we can say enthusiastically that it has been solved. But when we consider that, for a second successive year, the society has sustained a deficit, although contributions for its support have never been more generous, we may well ask if something further can't be done.

BOTH PRIVATE CONTRIBUTIONS AND PUBLIC FUNDS ARE NEEDED

Must the financial burden be borne entirely by a relatively small group of public-spirited citizens? Does not the community as a whole have a stake in the preservation of fundamental legal rights?

We provide our voluntary hospitals with supplementary funds for ambulance service and ward cases. We appropriate public moneys to assist our libraries and museums. We find money for our zoos.

Does not the work of the Legal Aid Society, in defending a basic right of the poorest of our citizens, partake of the public interest? Does it not merit supplementary assistance from public funds? Does not the community have an obligation to recognize its share of the responsibility and assume it?

A program of public aid, supplementing voluntary contributions within the framework of a privately administered organization operating under its own board of directors, would provide trained specialists in criminal law as attorneys for the society. It would permit expansion of its experienced, on the spot, competent and zealous representation of the needy defendant. It would allow for the employment of additional full-time investigators. It would make possible an expanded training program for less experienced lawyers. It would encourage the development of a wholly independent, nonpolitical career service in this most important area of the administration of justice.

There have already been some promising experiments, along these lines, in Rochester and Buffalo in this State and in Puerto Rico.

THE LAWYER FOR THE POOR

With some hope that you will think it pertinent, I would like to say a few words about a man who lived 700 years ago. He was called Ives of Brittany. He was born in the year 1252. He belonged to a noble family and from childhood was given every educational advantage.

In his 14th year, his parents sent him to Paris where for 7 years he studied theology and canon law. At the university, his habits were consistently unselfish. He slept on a pallet of straw, wore the humblest garments, gave away such money as came to him, shared his meals with the poor.

From Paris he went to Orleans to study Roman law. At the age of 23 he concluded his studies. From that time, it is said of him that "he spent his life in the cause of justice and fair dealing among the common people—assisting without compensation the orphans, the poor, all who had the greatest need of such a ministry of justice."

Although later he was ordained a priest, he continued to serve the poor as a lawyer. His sympathy for the oppressed made him famous throughout the country and he was known as advocatus pauperum—"the lawyer for the poor."

After his death in 1303 there was a widespread movement to declare him a saint. This finally came about. He was canonized as St. Ives in 1347 and is recognized all over the world as the patron saint of lawyers.

I suggest that he deserves another title—patron saint of legal aid—for does not this description of him serve likewise to identify our Legal Aid Societies: He is the lawyer of the poor; he defends the children, the widows, and all friendless people. Not only does he accept their defense, but he seeks them as his clients and offers his good services; he gives them good counsel and pleads for them. And for all of this he receives his reward from God.

Even if I had not consulted St. Ives, I would have been certain that there is a special blessing in store for every one of you who aids in this most charitable work and, of greater importance, there is the warm approval of your own conscience as your continuing efforts make increasingly possible—equal justice for all.

Editorial Analysis of Proposal To Establish Tool Bank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK KOWALSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1961

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, a detailed analysis of my proposal for the establishment of a tool bank was carried recently in the editorial columns of the Meriden Journal, in my home State of Connecticut.

The comments made in this editorial reflect a keen perception of the plan's twin goals of helping American industry modernize its equipment to increase production and create job opportunities and of aiding underdeveloped countries.

Here is the editorial, printed in the Meriden Journal, March 6:

TOOL BANK PROPOSED

The tool bank proposal set before the administration by Representative FRANK KOWALSKI of Meriden makes good sense. Reduced to its simplest terms, it is a method for removing obsolete machinery from American plants and transferring it to where it is most needed abroad, thus opening the way for U.S. industry to become more productive and more efficient through the installation of modern machinery. Farm machinery, also, would be included under the plan, so foreign agricultural economies would have a chance to benefit along with the American farmer who decided to go along and purchase new equipment on the favorable terms which could be arranged.

The Department of State, the International Cooperation Administration, and the Department of Commerce have discussed the proposal with Representative KOWALSKI, and all these agencies are giving it their serious attention.

In essence, the plan is simple. The tool bank would derive its assets from deposits of machinery, tools and equipment by manufacturers, agriculture or the Government. The developing nations would be able to draw on the bank, under a carefully drawn set of rules, without any charge to them for the tools. U.S. voluntary agencies engaged in overseas development work would also be able to draw on the bank to carry on or expand their programs.

Much equipment in American plants is obsolescent, yet far from being worn out. In some respects, it would be better for the purposes for which it might be used in underdeveloped nations than brandnew machinery. It has also been pointed out, by the originator of the plan, that these nations might well become later customers for new U.S. tools.

The immediate effect in this country would be to stimulate the tool industry and create a large number of jobs. This looked-for effect should be of special interest in Connecticut, which is the seat of many plants, large and small, making tools and other machinery. But many other sections would benefit also, and the general economy of the country would be the principal benefactor.

Of course, incentives would have to be provided by the Government to induce manufacturers and farmers to contribute to the tool bank. However, since amortization and tax writeoffs have fully paid for most of the machine tools which would be sought for the bank, this part of the plan should not be costly to the taxpayer or private enterprise. As Representative KOWALSKI has expressed it, "The tool bank * * * is a proposal which meets President Kennedy's criterion, 'Ask what you can do for your country.'"

The Connecticut Congressman also points out that certainly foreign governments have drawn largely upon the United States for excess tools, a fact which serves to indicate the latent demand which must exist. India, Yugoslavia, and Mexico have imported a considerable volume of excess tools, and a private voluntary organization known as Technico, with no paid employees, has collected from private industry 150,000 pounds of small machine tools for shipment abroad. CARE is also shipping many tool kits to underdeveloped countries.

There are about 3 million machine tools in the entire American industrial plant, and it has been estimated that more than 100,000 machine tools are in storage or surplus. Of the tools now in use, about 60 percent are 10 years old or older, and nearly 20 percent are 20 years old or older. Similar percentages apply to farm machinery and other tools.

Representative KOWALSKI sees the possibility of a number of incentives for inducing toolowners to part with their present tools and buy new tools. Accelerated depreciation and/or tax allowances and credits for the purchase of new tools are among them. Low interest credits might be arranged. Financial aid to machine tool manufacturers, where necessary, to permit them to sell their products on easy credit terms is another possibility.

Of course objections will be found to the plan in some quarters, but it seems to us that Representative KOWALSKI was right in stating that "the possible pitfalls of this program are negligible compared to the possible benefits, especially when adequate safeguards are taken to avoid such pitfalls."

World Federation of Neurology

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 14, 1961

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, Dr. Ludo van Bogaert, director of the Institut Bunge, Antwerp, Belgium, and president of the World Federation of Neurology, is an internationally recognized physician in the field of neurology and neuropathology and the personal physician to His Majesty, Baudouin I, King of Belgium. Dr. van Bogaert has been a fellow of the Rockefeller Foundation. Recently he completed a lecture series at the National Institutes of Health and at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore.

In an address presented this year in Louisiana, Illinois, and California, Dr. van Bogaert described the developments that led to the establishment of the World Federation of Neurology which now has a membership of 9,500 scientists from 46 countries. This organization has as its objective the exchange of scientific information in the field of neurology and the stimulation of neurologic research through international collaborative research projects.

I ask unanimous consent to have the address of Dr. van Bogaert printed in the Appendix in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

With the great expansion in neurology and the allied sciences which contributed to its development during the past 40 years, came the need for a world federation of neurology. The international congresses demonstrated the necessity for such an organization.

There have been six international Congresses—three before and three after the Second World War. I have been closely associated with the preliminary organization of all of them since the first congress held in Bern in 1931. Without going into great detail, I would like to touch on some of the problem areas encountered during my association with the congresses.

The Bern Congress, organized by Charles Dubois, had the support of some of the most eminent neurologists and psychiatrists. During the 3 days of discussion, physiology was represented by Pavlov himself; anatomy was taken into consideration in an attempt to rebuild the "brain commission," which, as you know, was a nomenclature commission established in 1910 but which had seen little activity since the First World War. I worked with eminent neurologists such as Winkler, Monakow, and Economo, but in spite of our efforts, there were no practical results.

These international congresses, and I mention the ones held in London in 1935 and in Copenhagen in 1939, were, in my opinion, only extensions in topics, chairman, and participants, of the usual national congresses or the ones for one linguistic or cultural group. The remote participating countries such as the United States, Japan, and Russia, were represented by well known, but very few, neurologists. During preliminary meetings, the choice of reports and chairmen were settled. The most famous elder neurologists decided this according to their personal knowledge of the problems and investigators. The neuropathologist was not taken into consideration unless he had some clinical standing or was associated with a clinician. The bacteriologists could not present papers unless in collaboration with a clinical neurologist; this also applied to the few biologists then studying problems of the cerebrospinal fluid. Outstanding physiologists or anatomists from neighboring countries may have been allowed to lecture before a limited audience. There were no reports on electroencephalography, epileptology, and radiology. No one ever thought of neurochemistry.

The meeting of the Third International Neurological Congress in Copenhagen in August of 1939 was abruptly terminated in the middle of the program due to the massing of Hitler's Wehrmacht along the Polish border. There was then a moratorium of these congresses for 10 years because of the war.

These prewar congresses stand out due to the high quality of their scientific and social programs; to the high professional standing and authority of the program executive committees who planned and conducted the scientific sessions in their own way. They comprised a small, elite group of senior rank neurologists who had organized excellent scientific meetings in a club-like setting. The ground rules of the congresses, then as now, were based on precedent and tradition.

The first postwar International Neurologic Congress was the fourth, held in Paris in 1949, under President Alajouanine and Secretary General Garcin. Transportation was faster and less expensive and the Paris congress took on an entirely different look from the previous ones. The number of participants had increased. Topics were more varied; neurophysiology was introduced as an essential topic; electroencephalography became an important clinical adjunct; the problem of epilepsy was considered from various viewpoints; neurosurgery had become a challenge and neurologists for the first time realized the importance of keeping the neurological sciences in contact with the mother discipline. Many of us appreciated the importance of the contributions from countries which in the past had not been active participants in our congresses. The outstanding exhibition on the history of neurology displayed in the lobby of the Faculte de Medicine concluded a period of neurological thinking and living.

However, the Paris congress was also the first in which rumblings of discontent about the organization and conduct of the congress was detected. The discontent followed two main streams: the first directed to the organization of the scientific programs and the second to an alleged lack of recognition given to the ancillary disciplines of neurology.

The dissensions expressed by the disciplines related to neurology were most conspicuous among the neurosurgeons followed by the electroencephalographers, the neuropathologists and the epilepsy group. All these groups either had or were considering plans to establish independent international congresses.

This, then, was the eventual background for the Lisbon congress in the fall of 1953. For the first time, at its preliminary meeting, the scientific rank of the designated topic directors was considered to be more important than their friendly relation to our congress or diplomatic and geographic necessities. At the end of the preliminary meeting, the necessity of keeping contact with the other disciplines was again considered and an ad hoc commission was established. After the Lisbon congress, there were individuals who were dissatisfied with the course it had taken, which had not been resolved, in spite of the excellent efforts and generous hospitality of the Portuguese.

The overt failure after the Lisbon congress to keep the allied disciplines bound within the framework of clinical neurology at international congresses resulted in furthering ideas for the organization of a combined congress of neurological sciences which would be an affiliated meeting of several independent congresses attached to the central axis of clinical neurology.

When the national delegates at Lisbon had selected Brussels as the site for the next neurological congress, these needs were studied and in 1955 the Belgian national committee proposed at the meeting of the program executive committee to group all specialized neurologic disciplines along a central axis of neurology by investing them in a coordinated program which would allocate 2 days to major topics of common interest to all constituent groups and 2 days for independent sessions of each participating discipline.

It was further proposed to reduce to a minimum the time allocated for free communications.

The Belgian national committee faced another serious problem: costs of the congress. Increasing attendance and size of the programs at international congresses, inflation of currencies and prices, particularly those concerned with publication, and the introduction of simultaneous translations through electronic hearing devices called for an enormous increase in expenditures. These congresses could no longer be financed on the basis of registration fees which had not increased and on the contributions from constituent national neurological societies. At the end of the Lisbon congress, the secretary general was faced with unpaid bills in the amount of $15,000. Moreover, international neurological congresses, not having a constitution and not being officially registered, did not have the permanency and financial responsibility needed for procuring grants-in-aid from international scientific government bodies or foundations.

The executive program committee for the Sixth International Neurologic Congress convened in a preliminary reunion in Brussels to structure a tentative program for the congress to be held in Brussels 2 years later.

Good or bad, we felt that the best approach would be the interweaving of different disciplines in the given time and space, choosing common topics, recruiting chairmen among representatives of their own disciplines, entrusting the joint meeting to topic directors and the responsibility for the administration to a small number of general local secretaries.

You may realize that an organization of this expanse needs numerous human contracts and large financial means. It would be a waste of energy to establish this for one session only and repeat the entire procedure each time a similar congress was to be held.

Between the preliminary meeting and the First International Congress of Neurological Sciences, we realized that a permanent world organization would have to be established, which would coordinate and supply information during the intervals between the congresses. This organization would be of invaluable help in organizing committees of future congresses. Before the Brussels congress, we asked the different countries to send delegates to discuss the question of a federation and to grant the delegates authority to join in the adoption of any resolutions. Happily, this agreement was obtained, and during the ICNS, the World Federation of Neurology was founded.

We have been asked, "What is the World Federation of Neurology?"

We say that it is an international professional body of delegates from the national neurological societies of 46 countries with 48 societies. Our objectives are the dissemination and exchange of neurologic news and scientific knowledge, the organization of symposia and multidisciplinary congresses and stimulation of neurologic research through international collaborative research projects. The dissemination and exchange of neurologic news and scientific knowledge is promoted through the organization of colloquies. The World Federation does not take on the role of organizations which give substantial help to investigators to accomplish their projects. These organizations remain responsible for bestowing grants to investigators selected by them. The WFN does not give financial help to these investigators, but as many of you know, it is often difficult and sometimes impossible to obtain information on research situations in a determined field; on places where documents and material are available; the names of investigators studying the same problem; the knowledge and application of new techniques to be taken into consideration in a determined part of research; and work already performed by other schools on the same subject.

Our idea was to find a solution to these problems, as there were no such organizations in existence. The WFN took steps to a solution. There would be one general federation of all national neurological societies, each represented by a delegate, an alternate delegate and a secretary. The assembly of the national delegates would constitute the executive committee of the WFN and elect the officers. The present officers were elected in 1957 at Brussels and the committees were also established at this time. Also, the constitution was drafted, submitted, and approved by all members of the committee.

One problem came to our direct attention. Most members of neurological societies are clinicians. Very few who belong to other sciences but who are interested in neurologic problems, are members of a neurological society. Close contact between clinical neurologists and researchers in the basic sciences has been one of the main goals of the WFN.

Early in its planning, the WFN conceived of the concept of creating problem commissions (groupes de travail) of experts to review and evaluate the status of research and research opportunities in specialized areas. The task of these commissions would be to detect and call attention to promising research even when appearing in some obscure laboratory or clinic. In addition, these commissions study whether or not a more effective attack may be made on a given research problem by pooling scientific talent and facilities of several countries into a single collaborative operation. Each problem commission consists of between 8 and 12 members and its secretary is the point or contact between the commission and the WFN. It is essential that each commission be active in its own field and envisage the possibility of establishing a system of replacement of its members periodically. These changes in the composition of the commission are naturally subordinate to the desires of the commission depending upon its orientation or the request of the federation.

Two of the problem areas in which the WFN utilizes the commissions are to ascertain the advisability of including on the agenda of international congresses or neurology, neurosurgery, neuroradiology, and so forth, programs devoted to subspecialties represented by the commission and the advisability of sponsoring symposia suggested by representatives of some subspecialties or allied disciplines.

The commissions may refer to the WFN, problems raised within their own areas, such as organization of congresses and symposia in conjunction with other disciplines; the organization of registries and repositories of research materials; the exchange of technical help and personnel; WFN assistance in obtaining financial support from Governmental or nongovernmental agencies for research; WFN assistance in establishing specialized libraries and publication of special reports and documents. Should a commission represent a specialty which has already formed an international organization, this commission serves as liaison between the WFN and the other federation. The commission has no authority to interfere in the activities of the federation, but acts as a coordinating agency by transmitting information and giving assistance to both federations in every way possible.

The secretary of the problem commission may advised different governments of problems under consideration, available techniques, trained technicians, and existing available material.

Allow me to give you some examples:

The problem commission of neurochemistry organized, in collaboration with a Portuguese committee appointed by the Portuguese Government, for a study of paramyloidosis, a colloquium on paramyloidosis of the central and peripheral nervous system. The Portuguese committee, along with some 10 interested American and European scientists, were invited. The purpose of this meeting was to establish a research plan for the study of this disorder, which is exceedingly rare except in certain parts of Portugal.

A roundtable discussion with the Portuguese investigators was held at the WFN secretariat. They brought with them clinical histories and anatomical pathological material which was made available to clinicians, neuropathologists, geneticists, and biochemists.

Another example was the symposium on cerebral localization held after the inaugural meeting of the liaison committee of the World Federation of Neurology and the World Federation of Neurosurgical Societies in Lisbon.

Most of these colloquia are organized with financial assistance from the scientific organization of the host country and from the WFN. In this way, problem commissions stimulate the exchange of material for human and comparative neuropathological and neurochemical investigations, for research in genetic and rare hereditary diseases.

Along with the organization of commissions and symposia, the permanent secretariat has conducted a survey on the status of neurological training throughout the world.

When national delegates of all countries have submitted their surveys on the training of neurologists, a synthesis will be published in World Neurology. This pool of information will relate to the development of neurology as a science and to the practice of neurology. The permanent secretariat is also collecting theses and periodic scientific publications for the WFN archives. This collection will contain, in particular, books and papers difficult to obtain such as manuscripts, nonserial numbers of journals published for centenaries, transcriptions of the proceedings of colloquia and symposia, governmental documents and annual reports of research institutes. Many medical faculties do not seem to understand the importance of collecting rare documents which are often valuable and often lost. In certain countries, these theses are not published in their entirety, and only an abstract is inserted in a national journal or other periodical. Although only a small number have any real value, the cataloging is being continued to preserve those documents that are valuable. As they are classified, they are forwarded to World Neurology for publication.

An essential prerequisite for concerted world planning and programing of medical research, whether general or specialized, is a greater flow and exchange of scientific information and news than exists today. In this respect, the WFN was fortunate in having a well-known medical publisher in the United States launch an official monthly publication, World Neurology, the first number of which appeared last July. The articles of World Neurology, as you may know, are published in four languages. The editorial board and consulting editors represent 26 countries, many different language areas and a wide interest in neurologic and allied medical sciences. The scientific section contains review articles on invitation, unsolicited original papers, translations of important papers not readily accessible and reviews of important books. The information section contains reports on research activities in various countries, exchange information on the availability or need for research or teaching materials, and material needed for research. The journal also provides a complete calendar of all national and international meetings of interest to neurologists and neurologic scientists as well as the newsletter by Pearce Bailey.

In summary, the WFN has accomplished this:

The total number of countries now represented in the WFN are 46, with 48 societies with an individual membership of 9,500 neurologists and neurologic scientists. We now include the U.S.S.R. and the East German Republic.

We have developed official affiliations with the World Health Organization, the World Federation of Mental Health, and the International Brain Research Organization. Under the auspices of the Association for the Aid of Crippled Children, with Mr. Leonard Mayo, we are affiliated with interested groups in the United States and elsewhere.

In July we launched our official journal. Paid subscriptions already exceed 2,300 and the distribution is mounting rapidly. In addition, mechanisms are underway for the exchange of rare papers, volumes, scientific specimens, and motion pictures. We have eight problem commissions and in March we are activating two more—on neuroophthalmology and neurogenetics in Geneva. In December we founded the Problem Commission of Tropical Neurology in Buenos Aires. We have dispatched members of our staff, consultants, and liaison officers to evaluate research and training potential in key areas in Western Europe, behind the Iron Curtain, the Far East and Latin America. We have sponsored or participated in important international meetings, such as the Milan symposium on medications affecting lipid metabolism; in Varenna on regional

neurochemistry, physiology, and pharmacology of the nervous system; in Hamburg on cerebrospinal fluid; and in Rio de Janeiro on parasitoses of the nervous system.

This may give you some idea of the WFN—the necessity for its existence, the circumstances of its foundation, its achievements and its future goals. In the pursuit of these objectives, whenever possible, the WFN has sought to enroll financial aid, either in kind or in hard currency, from governments, foundations and institutions outside the United States. So far, only a few inroads have been made into this problem. The Danish Multiple Sclerosis Society, for example, following the meeting of the problem commission of biometry and genetics in Copenhagen, supports a project on the epidemiology of multiple sclerosis. The German Federal Republic, with the WFN, contributed to the cost of investigation of multiple sclerosis in South America. The Gulbenkian Foundation contributed to our symposium in Lisbon. The city of Buenos Aires, with the National University of Public Health, the University of Buenos Aires and the Argentine Neurological Society, will give financial assistance to the WFN Commission on Tropical Neurology.

So, you can see that a scientific organization as the WFN can largely contribute to the realization of the unity needed today. We must consider countries who are at the beginning of their technical and scientific development. The WFN is morally in a position which allows it to help them without any political or economic intent. The prosperity and comfort of these peoples are certainly essential since their absence makes them subjects of cold wars—of which there have been too many. But there is even more. By helping them to respect and dignity and independence, we will promote a civilization to which we are deeply attached. Born of the scientific achievements of the Old World, and your New World, the WFN, and this is my sincere feeling—must, according to the ideals which founded it, turn to the countries of Asia and Africa, to the South and Central Americas, where under the ashes of civilizations long gone, burns the same need for knowledge and service.

National Purpose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 14, 1961

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from the Pageland Journal, Pageland, S.C., of March 9, 1961:

STRAIGHT TALK

(By Tom Anderson)

"Better be Red than dead." That's the new national purpose of the appeasers. Appeasers are people who feed a crocodile hoping it'll eat them last. Coexistence is immoral. A gutless, impossible delusion and fraud. Our national purpose, if we are to survive as a free people, must be to free the enslaved peoples of the world and destroy that organized religion of hate, communism. In the coexistence compromise between right and wrong, evil wins. In a compromise between food and poison, death wins. To win the war against the Communists, we must abandon containment, renounce peaceful coexistence and reject a status quo based on millions now enslaved by the Communists. We can coexist with the Communists just like the lion and the lamb coexist. All that is necessary is to pitch a fresh lamb into the cage each morning.

Attack us? The Communists are not insane enough to attack us. They are winning without it. And they want our cities, our industries, our youth intact. They can win without changing their tactics. We cannot win without changing ours.

TERMITES ON OUR PAYROLL

It was at the multimillion-dollar U.S. Embassy building in Stockholm, Sweden. They were having a small cocktail party for our little group accompanying Secretary of Agriculture Benson on a trade development tour. As I joined a group of a dozen or so standing in a circle, one of our Embassy employees glibly expounded: "This ain't bad duty now that McCarthy is dead." Quick as you could say Alger Hiss or Phillip Jessup, I politely inquired: "How've all you pinks, and punks, and perverts been getting along since the Senator passed away?" Uninsulted, he answered: "There are just as many of us and we're getting along better than ever."

I don't see how any red-blooded American could mix with our Foreign Service and State Department people without thinking more of Joe McCarthy. Our oversea employees, like State Department people here, and like groups anywhere, can't accurately be lumped into one category. Some are dedicated patriots. Some are one-worlders, international Socialists, people who've long since lost their patriotism, if they ever had any. Some are people who like to live abroad because they can live better than they ever lived before and can enjoy all the privileges and few of the responsibilities of their American citizenship. Some are dupes and do-gooders who are serving the Communist cause unwittingly by following the Communist line. Some are undoubtedly Communists. Some are merely gutless traitors who'd "rather be Red than dead." Many of these people, deliberately or not, are delivering us to the enemy.

A news service recently carried the story that the United States had just made a grant of $350,000 to Yugoslavia "to aid that country's development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes." That's like giving a supply of hunting knives to Jack the Ripper on his promise to use them only at his dinner table.

I think it would be near treason to sell our surpluses to Poland and other enemies. But we don't do that. We give it to Tito who sells it to his people, who never know where it came from.

In Poland, guess who's one of the men in charge of giving away your farm surpluses to the enemy? An old New Dealer who's been listed on more Communist fronts of the House Un-American Activities Committee so our Communists and fellow-travelers can be made to feel more at home here.

THEY ARE BURYING US

We are in a war for the world, and we are losing. The Communists have taken half the world. Berlin is precarious. Formosa (Nationalist China) may be sacrificed. Japan is moving toward the Communist camp. Laos is on the brink. Cuba is now being fortified by the enemy. Central and South America are Communist infiltrated. Africa may be lost. England and other European allies are talking neutralism more and more. And more of the American people, a survey shows, knows who said "Give me liberty or give me death." More are interested in losing 5 pounds than in losing Quemoy. Finding a parking place is more important than who promoted Peress or who's on the World Court.

Who—we or the Communists—have the necessary courage, the dedication, the fanatical zeal necessary to win? We will soon know. It depends on you. What can one person do? One man, Nathan Hale, brought chills to the spies of generations of patriots with his statement just before he was put to death: "I only regret I have but one life to lose for my country." (Is U–2 spy Powers the modern Nathan Hale? Powers claimed he did not know what he was doing, though he got $30,000 a year for it, and wouldn't have done it if he had.)

YOU ARE THE ANSWER

What can one person do? One man, Adolph Hitler, cast the deciding vote in a beer hall putsch that set the world on fire. One man's vote kept us from killing compulsory military training—3 weeks before Pearl Harbor. One man's influence led to giving China to the agrarian reformers. That man was not a foreigner, but an American.

What can one person do? One person, unknown today, fired the shot heard around the world. He didn't worry about it hurting his business. He didn't check to see if the leaders approved. He was neither paid cash nor guaranteed any benefits by his government. He just did what his conscience told him to do—for his country. You are but one. So were Carrie Nation, and Joan of Arc, and Patrick Henry.

What can one person do? One man, Karl Marx, was a ne'er-do-well. But his religion, communism, has enslaved half the world. What can one person do? St. Paul was an emaciated epileptic. Hitler was a psychiatric paperhanger. Are we inferior to them—or even to Christ's disciples—before they became dedicated men? It is up to you.

Federal Health Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 14, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, President Kennedy has given Congress his proposals for Federal action to imporve health and fight needless illness in our Nation. His recommendations have already stirred wide discussion and much praise; it is evident that growing numbers of citizens realize that the need for well-considered programs is critical.

An editorial in the February 10 issue of the Daily Journal in Elizabeth, N.J., offers a constructive commentary on the President's recommendations. It warns, for instance, that "Unreasonable opposition to the President's plan could well produce a thrust catapulting us into truly regimented health planning."

Mr. President, the editorial is a thoughtful and valuable addition to our thinking about an essential goal for the United States. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Our Prime Resource," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR PRIME RESOURCE

Health is the Nation's No. 1 natural resource and as such its conservation and preservation are appropriate subjects for Presidential recommendations to the Congress.

The program which President Kennedy sent to the Capitol yesterday envisions Gov-

ernment involvement in the field to an unprecedented degree, and it will be assailed as socialization of medicine. But nowhere in the long list of projects outlined by the President is there a hint that bureaucrats would dictate to doctors, that patients would be restricted in their choice of treatment, or that hospitals would be subject to Federal regulation and control.

Indeed, the program may be the last bulwark against socialized medicine. Skyrocketing medical costs and some disenchantment with the profession have pushed that prospect nearer to reality. Unreasonable opposition to the President's plan could well produce a thrust catapulting us into truly regimented health planning.

The Kennedy proposals appear to be a rational attempt to expand the Nation's abilities, public and private, to meet its expanding health needs. They would provide hospital insurance for the elderly and at the same time stimulate the growth of medical education and research.

The White House plan also would set in motion programs to improve the health of children and youth, encourage and aid construction of nursing homes and hospitals, accelerate rehabilitation efforts for disabled Americans and spur improvement of nursing and home care services for all age groups.

In each of the areas covered by the program improvement and expansion are dictated. In some, notably health problems among the elderly, this need is critical.

Last March the Journal published a series of articles examining the medical care crisis facing senior citizens. Various authorities quoted advocated some form of health insurance, help for the chronically ill among the aged and more nursing homes.

Senator PAT MCNAMARA, Michigan Democrat, speaking as head of a Senate subcommittee on problems of the aged and the aging, was quoted in one of the articles as saying that America's senior citizens have been "neglected and literally cast aside by the Nation which they themselves spent the greater part of their lives helping make strong." President Kennedy's message yesterday outlined a remedy for that situation.

"The health of our Nation," said the President, "is a key to its future. It is to the unfinished business in health, which affects every person and community in this land, that we must now direct our best efforts."

Fulfillment of the goal that the President describes will depend ultimately on the citizen's willingness to participate; the whole heavy cost falls on him. The thinking American will not hesitate to accept the burden.

Employers' Group Supports Improvements in Federal Fair Labor Standards Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 14, 1961

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, during the past few weeks my office has received many communications from businessmen who oppose any amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act which would further expand coverage of the law to their employees.

It came as a surprise to me then one day when I received from the St. Paul, Minn., chapter of the National Electrical Contractors Association a letter not only strongly supporting the philosophy of the Fair Labor Standards Act but urging an immediate raise in the minimum wage rate.

The gentleman who sent me the views of this chapter is Dan M. Gephart, its manager. When I asked him for permission to reproduce his letter in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD he further explained his views:

I am sincerely of the belief that America's continuing progress will depend to a large degree on a constantly improving income for its citizens, and particularly for those who are intended to be covered under the amendments to the present outdated minimum wage law.

For over 15 years I have worked as a representative of employers who employ thousands of employees in both production and construction in 18 of our States, and it is my desire to continue to serve not only these employers but our country as well in encouraging an increase in the minimum wage law.

I am indeed thankful that there are Representatives in Congress like yourself who place the overall good of our country and all its citizens above the interests of those who would exploit that group for whom the proposed legislation is intended.

Because I believe his public-spirited views would be appreciated by other Members, I ask that his original letter to me as well as other material be reprinted herewith:

MINNESOTA (ST. PAUL)
CHAPTER, NATIONAL ELECTRICAL
CONTRACTORS ASSOCIATION, INC.
St. Paul, Minn., February 17, 1961.

Hon. JOSEPH E. KARTH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE KARTH: I am enclosing herewith copy of a letter received from the St. Paul Area Chamber of Commerce in which I am urged to write to you and express my opinion on the minimum wage law now being considered, the effect of which would increase minimum wages from $1 to $1.25 over a period of time. Also enclosed is a copy of an excerpt from "Leader's Digest of Views on Congressional Issues."

I am both shocked and confused as to why any intelligent group purporting to represent the best interests of St. Paul merchants and industries should champion a continuation of the rights of Southern merchants or industries to pay their employees less than a bare minimum required for bare subsistence—which results in severe injury to the employers of this area, practically all of whom pay at least the minimum proposed or in excess of it.

I am quite familiar with conditions in the New England States and many of the Southern States where I have traveled extensively and have found that in most instances employees paid rates less than the proposed minimum are subsidized by either local relief agencies or Federal moneys in order to survive.

This matter, therefore, resolves itself into whether or not the employers involved in the employment of employees at ridiculously substandard wages will be supported in their present program of making it necessary for their employes to rely on tax moneys provided by employers like ourselves who pay a living wage to their employees without being compelled to do so by the Federal Government.

I am, therefore, responding to the plea of the St. Paul Area Chamber of Commerce to write to you regarding this matter, except that contrary to their wishes, I urge you to vote in favor of an increase to the minimum wage rate—not over a period of 3 years but effective immediately.

Contrary to the belief, expressed in this bulletin, of injury resulting to our country from this action, I believe it will do more to strengthen our economy than any single act Congress could undertake. I suggest you not be disturbed over claims that employers of employees with substandard wages will be injured by an increase in the minimum wage law because I assure you that an employer who cannot make a profit except through the exploitation of his employees will not be injured but will, through the increase in the purchasing power of the citizens of his community, be aided.

Yours sincerely,
DAN M. GEPHART,
Manager.

ST. PAUL AREA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
St. Paul, Minn., February 16, 1961

DEAR SIR:

You are listed as a member of the Committee of 300 Good Citizens (letter writing). I must now ask you to go to work.

Enclosed you will find a copy of Leader's Digest on the minimum wage issue, which will give you some background on this subject. Expression of your personal views on minimum wage proposals to your Congressman and Senators at this time will be especially meaningful to them.

Will you please write to your Congressman and Senators today expressing your views on the minimum wage issue? You will be performing your rightful duty as a good citizen.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,
WILBUR M. BENNETT,
Chairman, Committee of
300 Good Citizens.

Impact of Television Debate on Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 14, 1961

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Freedom of Communications Subcommittee, I have been especially interested in various reports concerning television's role in the 1960 presidential election.

One of the most interesting articles on this subject which have come to my attention, was written by Mr. Lawrence Laurent of the Washington Post. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Appendix Mr. Laurent's column, entitled, "TV's Election Role Polled," from the January 22, 1961, issue of the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TV'S ELECTION ROLE POLLED
(By Lawrence Laurent)

Now that President Kennedy has taken the oath of office, a more calm atmosphere permits calm discussion of television's role in the 1960 national elections.

President Kennedy has acknowledged that he couldn't have been elected without television, but this acknowledgement settles nothing. With the smallest margin of votes in the 20th century, it can be argued with equal force that he couldn't have been elected without the city vote, the Negro vote, the southern vote, the Catholic vote or the labor vote.

The most impressive effort to settle the TV question came from CBS President Frank Stanton. He quoted a survey, conducted by Elmo Roper for CBS, which concluded that 4 million voters made their choice after watching and listening to the TV-radio debates betwen Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Nixon.

Of this 4 million, Stanton quoted Roper, 26 percent voted for Nixon and 78 percent voted for Kennedy.

The first argument that ought to be dropped is the one that begins, "Nixon never should have agreed to the debates * * *." From May 16, when Adlai Stevenson appeared before a Senate committee and advocated changes in the Communications Act to permit the debates, Nixon had no choice.

To have refused would have made him a kind of coward. It would have given the Democratic candidate a chance to use the "empty chair" technique.

The argument also presumes that Senator Kennedy would not have had access to the electronics media, except for the debates. When victory is possible, the money for broadcast time can be accumulated.

The rules of the debates were, for Nixon, most unfortunate. He is one of those speakers who depends, greatly, on the feedback from an audience. He needs group and individual reaction to indicate the strength and weaknesses of his argument.

Without audience feedback, Mr. Nixon has a tendency to lapse into apple pie platitudes.

If we have learned anything about the persuasive qualities of the electronics media, it is that they can be most effectively harnessed to create brand preferences. That is, where no real differences exist on a particular product field, radio and TV are most effective in creating a preference. This is why radio and TV do well for the makers of soap, cigarettes, toothpaste, chewing gum and beer.

The electronics media have conditioned the audience to what Madison Avenue likes to call the positive sell. Here, Mr. Kennedy had a clear advantage: The most popular word in advertising is "new" and Mr. Kennedy was ready with a "New Frontier."

In the harshest commercial terms, Mr. Kennedy was able to pitch for a trial of a new product. Mr. Nixon, defensively, was forced to argue that the old product is still good.

It was to Mr. Kennedy's advantage that he happens to fit, in appearance, the stereotype of the television hero: He is tall and slender, fair haired and pale eyed. This has been TV's most popular hero, the guy in the white hat.

Mr. Nixon, no matter how many references he made to Americanism and no matter how crisp his logic, was still the stereotype of the bady guy—heavy of beard and defending what had gone before.

Technically, Nixon has almost no faults as a public speaker. Much of his effectiveness, however, is lost when he engages in give-and-take and, as noted earlier, when he lacks an audience.

That television is better suited to the attacker than to the defender was recognized by President Kennedy's closest associates. Shortly after the results of the election became known, the President's brother, Robert F. Kennedy, told reporters that he doubted a President would agree to debate one who wished to become President.

Thus, the suspicion grows that we shall not see another series of confrontations until two nonincumbents are nominated.

Like Stanton, I am distressed by those who chose to wail that a George Washington, a Thomas Jefferson, or an Abraham Lincoln could not be elected President in this television age. The arguments are intellectually dishonest, for each man of greatness speaks to his own generation in a unique way, in terms his own generation can understand.

Mr. Jefferson—no orator—harnessed the written word and struck fire in men's souls. (He was the first President to give reporters printed copies of his inaugural address.)

The spoken word, unaided by electrical amplification, helped push Mr. Lincoln to his greatness.

In our time, the electron and the atom shape a candidate's future. At best, however, 1960 furnished some valuable clues, but did not provide enough information to allow general conclusions.

Open Letter to the Postmaster General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1961

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, since the new administration took office on January 20, a number of statements and reports regarding personnel and other matters pertaining to the Post Office Department have emanated from—or been publicly attributed to—the Postmaster General.

I made a brief reference on this floor early last month to disturbing indications of "shenanigans" with respect to civil service laws and regulations.

The subsequent public statement by the Postmaster General in response to my comment has increased, rather than diminished, my concern as to what is going on.

Meanwhile there have been other public statements and reports relative to other operational matters in the Post Office Department.

In an effort to secure for this House and for the American people a disclaimer of these statements and reports—or a more adequate explanation thereof—I have today addressed a letter of inquiry to the Honorable J. Edward Day, the Postmaster General.

Under permission to extend and revise my remarks, I include the text of this letter:

MARCH 14, 1961.

Hon. J. EDWARD DAY,
Postmaster General,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. POSTMASTER GENERAL: This letter is written to you in advance of the initial appearance of you and your top associates in the Post Office Department before an executive session of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service tomorrow, Wednesday, March 15, 1961.

I anticipate that many, if not all, of the questions I list herein may be raised during tomorrow's committee meeting.

Since this is an executive session, and the proceedings, therefore, are not properly subject to public disclosure, I am taking this means of publicly requesting a public response to the questions entirely apart from the executive session.

I do so particularly because most of the items herein mentioned have already been the subject of public comment by the Postmaster General and therefore, in my judgment, the answers to my questions should be equally public.

1. You have been quoted in the past as saying that more than 4,000 persons were picked to staff the 15 regional offices following creation of the regional setup; that "most of these—certainly all in the higher paying positions—were chosen on a purely political basis." You have further been quoted as stating that "the top people in these regional offices have far-reaching responsibilities" and that "just as in private business, persons in such positions of authority must be responsive to the new management."

These statements, if accurate, suggest certain important questions to which I respectfully request your answers:

How many of these 4,000 persons held career civil service status as of January 20, 1961?

How many of these appointees have been replaced—and how many is it contemplated will be replaced—by appointees of the new administration?

What provision, if any, is being made to comply with civil service laws and regulations with respect to the career status employees thus removed from these positions?

Will you please provide me with a complete list of all persons among these 4,000 employees who have been asked to resign, asked to retire, relieved of duties, or demoted, together with the up-to-date civil service records of these employees.

2. There have been numerous reports both in the press and from other sources of career status personnel in the Washington offices of the Post Office Department who have been—or are to be—subject to removal, retirement, or demotion by the new administration.

What are the facts as to such removals, retirements, or demotions?

Will you please provide me with a complete list of all of the persons employed in the Washington offices of the Post Office Department who have been asked to resign, asked to retire, relieved of duties, or demoted, together with the up-to-date civil service records of these employees.

3. I have in my possession the copy of an order issued to postmasters under date of January 25, 1961, reading as follows:

"If all or any part of your supply of the January and February 1961 issues of the Postal Service News has not been distributed to employees of your office, you are directed to withhold distribution and destroy the supply. Please give this your personal and prompt attention."

I would appreciate a statement from the Postmaster General explaining the basis and alleged justification of this order and particularly the alleged basis and justification of the portion of the order applying to the January 1961, issue of the Department's Postal Service News.

4. I have seen published statements attributed to the Postmaster General to the effect that the project Operation Turnkey is not working.

At the same time, I have seen a statement attributed to an official of the corporation which designed, constructed, equipped and is maintaining this operation to the effect that "Operation Turnkey is consistently performing."

I would appreciate a report from the Postmaster General as to the exact situation and the alleged basis for these charges.

5. I have been advised by several colleagues that in connection with post office deducations since January 20, 1961, either the official plaque in the post office or a sign posted outside the building, attributes the project to the Kennedy-Day administration. I have been advised that this is the case even in instances of post offices which were completed and placed in operation prior to January 20, 1961.

Will you please advise me as to whether there is any basis for such reports, if so the exact wording of such plaque or sign, and on what grounds claims of credit for the

new post office are made by the new administration.

6. Finally, I am advised that the Department is giving consideration to a change by administrative order of the procedures under which letter carriers are to receive the $100 per year uniform allowance.

It is my understanding that the proposed new procedure contemplates payment of the $100 a year allowance in cash, rather than the letter carrier receiving an authorization for purchase of such uniforms with the Post Office Department billed by the vendor for the uniforms.

I would appreciate being advised as to the facts in this matter if the reported change is indeed contemplated, the basis for the proposed change.

Respectfully yours,

AUGUST E. JOHANSEN.

Menominee Termination Amendments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 14, 1961

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, termination of the Federal status of the Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin is scheduled to take effect on April 30. In the past few weeks the tribal delegation, consisting of Mr. Jerome Grignon and Mr. Al Dodge, has been in Washington to discuss the many problems, mainly financial, facing the tribe in connection with termination. The delegates are convinced that termination cannot work successfully unless a substantial financial underpinning is put under the tribe's affairs. The recent history of their enterprise and business operations gives little hope that such a financial basis will be available.

At the request of the delegation, acting on behalf of the tribe, I introduced two bills, S. 869 and S. 870, to amend their Termination Act. I was joined in sponsorship of this legislation by my senior colleague, Mr. WILEY. The tribe believes that the proposals contained in these bills will help achieve a successful transition from their present Federal status.

On March 9 Mr. Grignon was sent a memorandum from Mr. George Kenote, the Bureau of Indian Affairs representative on the reservation and himself a member of the tribe. The memorandum presents the tribe's latest thinking on the need to amend their Termination Act.

Mr. Kenote points out that there are "lacks and gaps" in the legislation as introduced, and hopes that his memo will make the objectives of the tribe somewhat clearer. He suggests to Mr. Grignon: "I think you should stress that this effort is not trying to defeat termination, but it is rather trying to program it under reasonably sound procedures."

I think Mr. Kenote's memorandum is an important supplement to previous testimony on the Menominee situation, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 9, 1961.

Re Menominee legislation now in Congress.

Mr. JEROME GRIGNON,
Chairman, Menominee Advisory Council:

Because of the obvious lacks and gaps in the legislation as introduced, the urgency of which I thoroughly understand, I asked Mr. Sammond to make a hard, impartial, and critical review of bills S. 869, and 870, and H.R. 4130 and 4444, to see what their practical and legal effect would be upon the community services provisions incorporated in chapter 259, laws of 1959 (the Menominee County bill), and the termination plan. The review by Mr. Sammond should help immeasurably to resolve the lacks and gaps, so that the objective of the tribe can be made more clear, and particularly so that provisions for continued community services are not left in suspense.

The general council resolution of January 9, 1961, calls for a trial and error period of not less than 8 years—practically the same period during which the State legislature put local government on a trial and error basis. The April 30, 1969, date now proposed in S. 870 and H.R. 4444 would fulfill the tribal request. This date would no doubt precede the closure of the 1969 session of the State legislature by 3 to 4 months, as evidenced by recent experience where the legislature has been running into June and beyond. By that time, this community and the business affairs of the tribe should be well enough measured under the new scheme of things, so that the legislature could make an informed judgement on the strength of the community, and on its ability to continue as a full fledged county.

The idea of a Federal chartered corporation is not new. In 1928 the Merriam report on the administration of Indian affairs proposed a somewhat similar corporation for Menominee and Klamath. It would have used Government officials as nontribal members of the board of directors. Our proposal is to use trained and experienced men from the business world. Obviously, the Merriam proposal would have entailed general Federal review authority over actions of the corporation to some extent, and fuller authority to supervise and/or conduct community services, using Federal funds where tribal funds were insufficient.

In 1947, the report to Congress made by Acting Commissioner William Zimmerman (see H. Rept. 2503, 82d Cong., 2d sess., pp. 162–177) proposed a 16-section bill which would have established a Federal chartered corporation specifically for the Menominee Tribe. It would have provided general Federal supervisory authority over the corporation. The corporation or tribe, under this plan, would have contracted with State and local agencies for community services, such as education, health and welfare, law enforcement, roads, etc. Obviously, corporate or tribal funds would have been involved in payment for such services, as they should be as far as they will go. Federal assistance would still be available to fill the gaps and voids. No doubt the corporation would have been freed up to operate the business affairs of the tribe with more flexibility than prevailed under direct Federal management and control.

The general council resolution of January 9, 1961, does not pretend to dissolve the corporate structure developed in the termination plan, instead it proposes to place the management and control of business affairs and property in the corporate organization. It proposes to give this organization a chance to improve upon the organization and to work out of any Federal supervision or control. The end result hoped for is that the business and governmental affairs of this community can be better stabilized before total Federal aids are cut off. As it is, this community will start out under very marginal conditions, both in business and community service affairs. The impact of health and welfare (particularly direct relief at this time, extra medical services to the needy, and institutional charge backs) and educational services is the most worrisome to the community until the economic situation is better established. The water and sewerage systems will also be a heavy drain upon both Keshena and Neopit, and must have further Federal assistance if they are to be feasibly programed into State regulation.

Under the general counsel resolution, the corporation would be exempted from Federal and State income and direct property taxes. The stumpage account would be segregated and from it an equivalent of direct property taxes would derive to support local government and community services. In effect, what is now termed our stumpage profit will be used to pay the local tax levy if Menominee County is fully established under State law. We have explained to our people that either way we go, to full countyhood or continued tribal operations of local government (through the provisional town and county board), we will have to forego stumpage payments, or its equivalent in interest on the income bonds, in order to pay local taxes until the corporation is earning at least $1 million net. The corporation needs some time to get on its feet and in a financial position to meet taxes, other new costs, and interest payments. The deficit spending enforced by full payout of stumpage since 1955 has been disastrous and we need time to recover.

The January 9 resolution also proposes that governmental affairs be conducted according to the forms of State law, without being a fully integral part of State government. This is intended to give our people experience in governing according to State forms before they actually have to function as full fledged officers of a legal community of the State. In effect, the elected town and county board would replace the advisory council to the extent the latter now acts in respect to community services and general government. The provisional town and county board would take over and program for education, health, and welfare, law enforcement, roads, extension and home demonstration agents, public health, and water and sanitation operations. In all of which fields there remains a tremendous reorganizational problem which cannot be oversimplified. Here is one area where we need organizational time and some continued Federal assistance to prevent further distress to this community. The provisional town and county board would have no responsibility in the business affairs of the corporation.

During this trial and error period, the corporation and the individual people would have an opportunity to work out the deeding or leasing of private land holdings, on which the corporation would now have to pay nearly all local taxes in full if termination takes place April 30, 1961. The platting of individual land holdings has just more or less been completed. We do not know whether or not current holders or users of land will take all of the areas platted to them, and will not until they take a title or lease. If the deeding or leasing of land could be more or less completed before the corporation is made subject to real property taxation it would relieve it of a sizable financial burden in the first instance. The county records and tracts could be perfected and ready to begin normal operations without fear of chaotic conditions that will prevail to a large extent under present hurried operations. This is what is meant by "putting the cart back behind the horse," in the termination program.

I think you should stress that this effort is not trying to defeat termination but, it is rather trying to program it under reasonably sound procedures. The success of the total program should not be measured by the carrying out of the mechanics of the termination act, rather its success should depend upon and be measured by what it does to a community of simple people. The general objective of the general council resolution of January 9 is not unreasonable and I believe it is feasible and proper. Mr. Sammond's memorandum will help immeasurably to fill in the gaps. As discussed by telephone, I am sending you sufficient copies to distribute in the Department and in Congress, particularly to Senators WILEY and PROXMIRE, Congressman LAIRD, and committee chairmen, with a copy of this memorandum.

GEORGE W. KENOTE.

Address of O. G. Powell, President of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, Jackson, Miss.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, on March 9, 1961, the President of the United States submitted to the Congress a special message on housing and community development. In this message the President outlined a far-reaching multibillion-dollar program suggesting that the Federal Government is going to help practically everybody to obtain a home at less than cost.

My attention has been called to an address by O. G. "Bill" Powell, president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, in Jackson, Miss., on Tuesday, March 7. While Mr. Powell's address was delivered before the President's multibillion-dollar housing message, he predicted the salient points of the message and answered them in a most exemplary manner from his point of view. His was a blueprint for strengthening the role of private enterprise with a minimum of interference from the Federal Government and at no cost to the taxpayers.

Under unanimous consent, I include the adress by President O. G. "Bill" Powell, of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, in the Appendix of the RECORD.

ADDRESS OF O. G. POWELL, DES MOINES, IOWA, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REAL ESTATE BOARDS BEFORE THE JACKSON, MISS., REAL ESTATE BOARD, MARCH 7, 1961

Not too long ago, a young man stood on the steps of the Capitol in Washington and said, in part:

"And so, my fellow Americans, ask not what your country will do for you—ask what you can do for your country; ask not what America will do for you, but what together we can do for the freedom of man."

Regardless of political affiliation, all Americans—all realtors—will give the President unqualified support in his ringing call for the assumption of personal responsibility.

In fact, when I became NAREB's president for 1961 at approximately the same time that Mr. Kennedy took office, I said just about the same thing; namely, "I see in my election as president of NAREB a step toward the philosophy of the responsibility of the individual for the preservation of society rather than the responsibility of society for the control of the individual."

And the conclusion of my inaugural speech was the reminder that "We have no greater duty than the maintenance of an environment in which freedom of man is paramount to all things."

However, some of the programs and policies proposed by Mr. Kennedy since his inaugural speech contain strong elements of the welfare state and an apparent acceptance of the responsibility of the Federal Government for the welfare of large groups of citizens. They seem at variance with this enunciation of personal responsibility. To the extent that this proves to be the case, we must exercise our critical faculties.

But here today I prefer to stress the positive—to make my humble contribution to national unity on the basis of a great patriotic appeal by our President. Yes, Mr. Kennedy, the realtors of America are with you all the way—as they always have been—in seeking to determine what we can do for our country. Here are some specifics:

1. Realtors believe in a dynamic and growing society in which each man, responsible to law and imbued with a deep sense of man's responsibility to man, is free to use his initiative, talents, and skills in the conduct of his own business. This is what we call the free enterprise system, and nowhere in the land will you find a more ardent group of practitioners of that system than in the ranks of realtors. To say that it is through this system that our country has flourished is to state a truism. But to rededicate ourselves to the exercise of this free enterprise responsibility with full vigor is the first duty of the patriot in an era in which free enterprise is menaced by statism as never before.

A rough measure of the extent to which realtors—more than just real estate brokers—have discharged their vital free enterprise function of bringing together the buyers and sellers of real property is supplied by the fact that today more than 6 out of 10 families own their own homes. We do not say that realtors alone are responsible for this commendable record of ownership. But we do say that realtors—all 69,000 of them distinguished for demonstrated competence and observance of ethical standards beyond the levels required by State license laws—have led the way in this exercise of person-to-person negotiations made possible by a free market.

2. Realtors have always opposed governmental interferences in the activities of the free market.

A prime example of this, of course, is federally subsidized public housing. Today we have approximately 522,000 public housing units in operation, and another 98,000 in various stages of processing. The Federal taxpayers are obligated for the next 40 years to pay annual subsidies which, for the fiscal year 1962, are estimated at $170 million. Of course, this annual price tag will continue to increase during the coming years.

There will be an attempt to expand this program. There will also be an attempt to amend the basic public housing law to permit overincome tenants to remain in public housing provided they pay a so-called economic rent. We are opposing these attempts because we believe that the Government ownership of family shelter is inherently bad for a free people. This does not mean that we do not believe it is a valid function of Government to assist the needy in obtaining the necessities of life. There are means of doing this without making low-income families wards of the Government in the realm of shelter—or clothing, or transportation.

Other examples of the Government's interference with the free market are found in the several Federal direct lending programs having but one thing in common—the direct lending of the taxpayers' money for housing, generally at interest rates less than those prevailing in the free market. Incidentally, it is noteworthy that such direct lending programs generally are approved by the Congress without going through the appropriations process. These back-door raids on the Treasury involve authorizations to withdraw money from the Treasury which, by the magic of some bookkeeping entry, are noted as "public debt transactions."

Today our direct lending programs include programs for veterans, elderly persons, and colleges. Tomorrow, unless we are vigilant, direct lending may be extended to housing for middle-income families. This is no idle warning.

Legislation to accomplish this was actually approved by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee in the spring of 1960, and a similar proposal has been recommended in the recently completed report of the President's task force on housing.

3. Realtors believe in a strong America, and one way to build strength is to conserve it. As a nation, as a people, our sustenance is represented by tax revenues. Any time any group of our people seeks to tap these Federal funds to accomplish goals which they might realize with their own resources and initiative, they are, in effect, asking what their government can do for them rather than what they can do for their government. The current proposal to establish a department of housing and urban affairs in the President's Cabinet is such a request.

Chief proponents of this plan are the mayors of large cities, who, in an apparent desire to get the Government to do something for them, are cutting loose from the traditional patterns of State-local relations. In testifying in favor of this plan last year, many of these mayors defined urban affairs as encompassing everything from metropolitan planning to mass transportation. Realtors will oppose such a department because we do not believe that government's role in the housing industry must necessarily be a permanent and expanding one. In other words, realtors are eager to continue to do their part in making ever-better housing available to the public within the free enterprise system. This is something we can do for our country—and, it should be recorded, it is something that we have been doing for the country for decades without Federal subsidy.

All that we ask is the continuation of something that already has been well established to the great benefit of the country—the creation of a favorable atmosphere for private enterprise on the part of the Government. This is the proper role of government. It is represented by the Federal Housing Administration, the Federal National Mortgage Association, and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. Under FHA, the borrower pays a premium for his mortgage insurance. In its 26 years of life, FHA has not cost the taxpayers one cent. FNMA, through its secondary market operations, borrows money by issuing fully taxable obligations to the investing public and using the funds to buy mortgages in times of seasonal scarcity in the mortgage market. The FHLBB serves to regulate and stabilize the Federal savings and loan associations of the Nation which have played such a notable part in sound credit expansion—again without Federal subsidy.

The realtors' desire to contribute to, rather than take from, national resources is even more clearly shown in the position of NAREB on urban renewal.

We have supported and will continue to support the system of Federal grants for

urban renewal with some qualifications—important qualifications. The Federal taxpayers pay two-thirds of the net cost of an urban renewal project. To date, almost $2 billion has been obligated, and pressures for continuing such obligations at the rate of $500 million a year are increasing. Our association insists that there is no justification for providing all the money sought by city urban renewal planners who think in terms of clearing vast areas and rebuilding them from the ground up by the "bulldozer" approach.

We believe that more attention should be directed at conserving our communities and rehabilitating structures and areas that lend themselves to rehabilitation. Only in this way will we get a maximum of urban renewal with a minimum drain on our resources.

We are convinced also that much of the money spent on urban renewal will be wasted unless local government makes a greater contribution to preventing the spread of slums. Our association has urged Congress repeatedly to amend the basic urban renewal law to require that before a community can receive financial assistance it must submit evidence that it has an adequate housing code and that it is enforcing such a code. Unless cities take such concrete steps to check the mushrooming of blight, slums will grow faster than they can be eliminated.

An example of the willingness of realtors to participate in this local rehabilitation effort without remuneration and with the devotion of their time is supplied by the Build America Better program of our association. On the invitation of local real estate boards and municipal officials, no less than 10 teams of experienced realtors have been dispatched to as many cities to make on-the-spot surveys and draw up programs to fight blight and the spread of neighborhood decay. Again, realtors have seen an opportunity to be of service to the country, and they have accepted it to the expressed pleasure of all concerned. Several more visits of a team are scheduled this year.

4. Realtors seek to add to the strength of the country by making possible the widest diffusion of landownership and the highest and best use of land.

The preamble to NAREB's code of ethics—which every realtor is pledged to uphold—states our position clearly when it says:

"Under all is the land. Upon its wise utilization and widespread ownership depend the advancement of well-being and the perpetuation of the free institutions that go to make the American way of life. The realtor has husbanded and developed the land resources of the Nation and, with his help, ownership has attained its widest distribution—a distinguishing mark that differentiates this from other civilizations and provides the real safeguard against radical impenetrations."

It is, I submit, in the discharge of this function—effecting the transfer of land by bringing buyer and seller together on mutually advantageous terms and with the greatest competence and integrity—that realtors can continue to serve their country. Ours is a proud function—a basic function—and one deeply invested with the future freedom of men here in America and throughout the world.

5. As another contribution to the strength of the country, realtors have always sought to hold to a minimum the taxation of our people. This attitude springs from a fact and a conviction. The fact: Government produces nothing; it provides services. The conviction: our resources should, to the maximum extent possible, be left in the hands of our people to be used productively in their personal and business undertakings—and Government services should be confined to those of an essential nature that people cannot provide for themselves.

Having made this general statement, let me now be specific.

To begin with, I think it would be a gross understatement to say that our income tax laws were enacted and are administered for the purpose of raising revenue to meet the cost of Government.

In fact, our tax laws today are powerful political weapons which have as their primary objective the redistribution of income. This is the essence of our progressive taxing system.

It is the philosophy underlying our Federal tax laws which makes me uneasy over the plans of our tax writers in Congress and the Treasury to reduce the tax rates but only after broadening the base of our tax laws.

It is said that of the total of $410 billion in personal income only $182 billion is taxable. The $228 billion of income that supposedly escapes taxation makes up the many exclusions and deductions including personal exemptions, interest on real estate mortgages, real property taxes, and the like. We are told that if all these exemptions and all capital gains tax were eliminated, the rates could be reduced to 9 to 42 percent instead of the present 20 to 91 percent. If the $600 personal exemption were retained, then the rates could be reduced to 12 to 55 percent.

Now this sounds very good, but there is one thing that worries me very much.

Many of these exclusions and deductions were placed in the tax code by a Congress whose conscience was troubled over the high tax rates. Most of these deductions came into existence over the past 25 years when it began to be apparent to the American people that the purpose of the Nation's tax laws had shifted from the raising of revenue to run the Government to redistributing income by creating a welfare state. Others such as real property and personal interest go back to the first Federal individual income tax during the War Between the States.

Let us suppose for a moment that the people agree to give up these exclusions and deductions and accept the reward of a simple income tax on gross income at a lesser rate, and suppose that this results in less taxes for everyone. This would indeed make many Americans happier. However, there is one thing wrong with this.

What assurances would the American people have that, once they had given up all these deductions, the next Congress wouldn't start pushing up the rates to meet the cost of expanding the welfare state?

You can be sure of this—as sure as night follows day—that it will be easier to push that 55 percent rate to 65 percent and then to 75 percent than it will be to put back into the law a deduction for real property taxes and mortgage interest and capital gains on investment, to mention but a few of the deductions from taxable income that would be no more.

The promoters of the welfare state could always point to the 91 percent limit as a target to provide the means of raising more money for expanded social welfare programs.

I have a suggestion to make.

If the sponsors of these proposals for broadening the tax base are serious, let them first sponsor legislation which would restore fiscal responsibility to the operations of our Federal Government.

I have in mind these:

1. Adopt House Resolution 125 which would stop backdoor raids on the Treasury by reaffirming the provision in the Constitution that money may not be drawn from the Treasury except pursuant to an appropriation made by law.

During the 86th Congress, 2d session, the Congress enacted legislation authorizing more than $1 billion to be drawn from the Treasury without appropriations. Yet on August 12, 1958, in a letter to Congressman GARY of Virginia, the Secretary of the Treasury agreed that "any legislative enactment permitting money to be drawn from the Treasury is an appropriation." Thus money is drawn every year in violation of the Federal Constitution.

2. Enact legislation which would provide for subsequent income tax reductions out of part of the increased revenue resulting from economic growth.

3. Enact legislation earmarking a certain portion of revenue to retire annually part of our public debt instead of consigning it completely to future generations.

Only by the enactment of these three proposals would the American people be assured that broadening the tax base will mean something more than an invitation for the Federal Government to embark on more and more financial adventures until private enterprize is completely smothered.

This is the challenge which will measure the sincerity of the tax planners of the New Frontier.

This would indeed be a New Frontier which would raise the hopes and aspirations of the American people.

In concluding this review of what realtors can do to help their country, let me sketch for you the current status of the real estate market.

The components of a healthy and active real estate market in 1961 are present in plenty. Right now mortgage funds are in ample supply and are destined to become more so. Population is expanding, and population is moving, east to west, north to south, city to suburb and, to a degree, from suburb to city.

A healthy real estate market, responsive to the stimuli of intelligent and industrious salesmanship, need not be a boom market nor do sales have to depend upon the promise of higher prices and cheaper dollars.

While residential activity may establish no record in units or dollars, either minimal or maximal, the realtor with imagination, energy, and determination, stimulated by competition, will find in 1961 a satisfactory and productive field for his labor.

His threat and his challenge come primarily not from the pressures of the economy, but rather from the misguided, if sincere, ministrations of the politician who would substitute for private ownership of real estate a mammoth public utility controlled and possibly owned by the State.

Every time another unit of State-owned real estate is created, every time another enterprise is removed from tax collection, every time an unsound mortgage is financed by Government funds, every time multiple ownership of a tract of land and buildings is extinguished by a single ownership—at each of these steps we build a barrier not only to the future of the real estate practitioner but to the well being of the Nation and the independence of our people.

If realtors are to continue to seek to serve their country, rather than asking the country to help them, the real estate business must survive and prosper. It can do so only in a land where men are free in mind, in spirit, in the ownership and use of property. To the degree that leaders of real estate are able to preserve that freedom, to the degree that they are able to enhance that freedom—to those degrees does real estate truly prosper and continue to be able to contribute to the national strength.

First Showing of American Men's Fashions in Rome

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting to note that under our new national leadership American initiative and imagination in private enterprise is once again coming to the fore. People in every economic activity of the Nation are coming up with new ideas and suggestions, some of which are beginning to take root to the benefit of the entire country.

One of the major problems facing the new administration—a problem which has received much attention in the press and has aroused considerable discussion in Government and business circles—is the problem how to stabilize the flow of dollars from this country, and yet maintain a more equitable balance of trade. The Kennedy administration now has under advisement various plans to deal with this important matter in our economic life, which at times has taken on threatening and critical proportions.

As has frequently occurred in the past, in times of peace and in war, American business ingenuity has come forward with worthwhile proposals and ideas in the effort to obtain a solution of critical problems of the period. This time it is no different. Our problems of the present day are being tackled with new ideas and renewed vigor.

Let me cite one such example which has come to my attention. On May 13 of this year an interesting event will take place in Rome, Italy, which has much significance for us. For the first time in the history of the men's clothing industry, an American men's clothing manufacturer will present in Rome a collection of men's fashions before an audience of European businessmen, government officials, social leaders, and others.

Aware of the urgent need to increase American exports and the sale of U.S. products abroad, Petrocelli Clothes, Inc., of New York, a leading manufacturer of men's clothing, will display a collection of such clothing at the Grand Hotel, in Rome. It is hoped that this showing will create and stimulate a new trend in the men's clothing industry.

In the past decide, the fashionable look for men had gone abroad to Italy and to England for its design stimuli. Thus, we had the Italian look, the continental look, and more recently the English look, which have all had their influence on the styling of men's clothing in America. To these fashion forces, the American men's clothing industry has added the know-how of mass production. Until now, however, this was done solely for the American male and the American market.

In order to meet the need for increasing American know-how and business throughout the world, Petrocelli Clothes has decided to reverse the trend and has accepted the invitation of leading Italian business firms to present the international merger collection of American fashions for men. These fashions will now be shown in Italy on May 13.

This common experience of interest in fashion can be a productive force—

Say Mr. Sam Eisenberg and Mr. Tony Petrocelli, executives of the firm—

by showing European retailers and manufacturers how American manufacturers have learned to coordinate Italy's fashion influence with the know-how of American productive techniques, in order to make available clothes of high quality at a price below the cost of custom tailoring. We have here an international merging of ideas which should bring America's famous garment center, with its highly skilled craftsmen, designers, and business executives, closer to their European counterparts.

The American and European press have shown great interest in this international event.

One important phase of this event should not be overlooked. As an added gesture of friendship between our two nations, the receipts of the fashion presentation in Rome will be donated to a very worthy charitable cause; namely, to Monsignor Carroll-Abbing for his work in the world-renowned Boys Town of Italy. Thus, we have here a fine example of combined business and charitable efforts which in itself is a heartwarming relationship.

It is to be hoped that this leadership in international business relations will stimulate other American business firms and executives, even in areas until now devoted almost exclusively to the American market, to broaden their interests and create new ideas. It should serve to increase business throughout the world, as well as create a level of interchange of ideas, methods, and techniques which will undoubtedly prove to be beneficial for all concerned.

Home Builders Support President's Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEM MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 14, 1961

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call attention to a statement by Mr. E. J. Burke, Jr., president of the National Association of Home Builders. It is indeed heartening to see this expression of support for the legislative objectives of President Kennedy in the home building industry. This statement epitomizes the concern of the industry for its own future and the need for effective, concerted action to make it the catalytic agent for the upturn of our economy. The keystone for this effort must be to tap the great middle and low income market by appropriate legislative action:

Our association welcomes the general objectives enunciated in the President's special message on housing and community development.

The fact that the President recognizes the need for a prosperous construction industry as an essential component of general economic prosperity and growth is greatly encouraging to us as we formulate our own plans for this year.

We must reserve opinion on some of the specific proposals until they take actual legislative form and we have had a chance to study them in full detail.

As to the broad tenor of the President's message we certainly concur with the three basic national objectives: urban renewal and sound urban growth; decent housing for all of our people; the encouragement of sound construction industry to promote the general economic welfare.

We are particularly pleased that these basic goals so closely coincide with those of the program the NAHB has just worked out for 1961.

We are particularly interested in those proposals in the message which would make it possible for the private home building industry to broaden its markets and provide more homes for moderate income families.

We hope as the President's program is spelled out in more detail that it will include a Central Mortgage Facility—a proposal we have long advocated—to insure greater stability in the flow of mortgage money. We hope also that it will include proposals for assistance in the proper development of community facilities such as water and sewers, items which could help immeasurably in lowering the price of homes.

We are rather disturbed at the continuing emphasis on public housing, a problem which we hope soon, on the basis of current studies, will be eliminated.

We have long advocated the establishment of a cabinet post for Housing, provided housing was given priority in such a department, and we welcome the President's statement that he will shortly offer such a proposal.

Paging Mr. Goldberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 14, 1961

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lancaster News, Lancaster, S.C., of March 9, 1961:

PAGING MR. GOLDBERG

The administration's reaction to a threatened boycott of imported textiles and manufactured garments has been one of mixed indignation and confusion.

The indignation was expressed mildly by President Kennedy during his recent news conference when he said the Government could not have its trade and diplomatic policies blocked by the action of minority groups.

The Department of Justice is investigating the boycott movement with vague promises to take action against those manufacturers' organizations found acting in restraint of trade.

But the real problem, and one that must be solved quickly, is what to do about the announced intention of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers to stop cutting imported fabrics from Japan on May 1.

It is settled law that when labor and management join together in imposing restraints on trade they have no immunity from prosecution under the antitrust laws. But a union, acting on its own, does have a legal immunity from antitrust action.

No collusion between the ACW and manufacturers was needed to throw a monkey wrench into the import machinery. As soon as the union's intention was announced, manufacturers were compelled to make preparation for May 1.

If the union would not handle imported fabrics, obviously manufacturers could not import them and the boycott would spread, not because of any agreement or collusion, but through simple fear of being stuck with useless bales of Japanese fabrics.

The ACW is a tough union. If its members are determined not to handle Jap fabrics administration leaders may find themselves in the difficult position of the British in meeting the passive resistance program of the late Mahatma Ghandi in India. Neither injunctions nor bayonets will cut cloth. A real problem for Arthur Goldberg and Brother Bobby Kennedy.

Decision Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very timely editorial on the subject of Government aid to private schools, which was in a recent issue of the Pilot, published in Boston, Mass.:

DECISION NOW

Just what does the U.S. Constitution have to say about Government aid to private schools? This is the multimillion-dollar question to which we do not in fact have any final answer at the moment and are not likely to have for a long time. The Congress, it appears, will have to come up with some sort of a judgment on the matter before we can get any kind of Federal aid bill as recommended by the President.

It has been maintained for a long time—with dissents here and there—that direct Federal funds for private and religious schools are in conflict with the Constitution. Such funds, it is generally argued, constitute an aid to religion and so are forbidden by the establishment clause of the first amendment. This argument was clearly expressed in the Everson case and ran like a thread through some others. As a result of all of this, successful Federal programs were directed to the child, not the school, as in the school lunch program, and the constitutional question was avoided.

This arrangement—help the child not the institution—was the kind of formula that was embodied in the eminently successful GI bill that educated a generation of Americans in schools of all kinds. It still offers the quickest and most acceptable way of getting the education job done; as an added advantage it does not discriminate between citizens on religious and other grounds. No one has ever raised any serious constitutional objections to this kind of program, as long as the distinction between the child and the institution has been clearly drawn.

At the same time this sidesteps the present issue of loans and grants to private and religious schools, and eventually this issue must be faced. On the matter of loans—already provided to sectarian colleges and hospitals—there is very little to be argued; such action is surely constitutional. Grants, even though we have good precedent here also, are in a different category and the court decisions in related cases leave room for some doubt in their regard. This is the question which the Congress now must discuss and decide, with the best advice they can get from the constitutional experts.

Professor Sutherland, of the Harvard Law School, no mean constitutional authority, has given his view in the last few days that Federal aid to private schools faces no constitutional problems. While far from being the common position, his arguments nonetheless must be considered and his conclusion examined. Plainly, we have been moving on the edge of this large question for many years but we have never probed it. Now is the time for the Congress to take the initiative and seek a definitive answer. The President has indicated the national need for a new education bill; the only kind worth having is a just one. Congress should see that we get it.

The Late Herman A. Lowe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 14, 1961

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure I express the shock and deep regret of many Members of Congress who knew him as a newspaperman upon learning of the death in Philadelphia of Herman A. Lowe, director of development and public relations for the Albert Einstein Memorial Medical Center in Philadelphia. Mr. Lowe was only 55 when he died Sunday of a heart attack, just as he was preparing to expand his activities by opening a public relations office here in Washington.

As a long-time friend of Mr. Lowe, and of his very fine and capable wife, Florence, I find it almost impossible to realize that Herman has been taken from us in the prime of an active and useful life. My deepest sympathy goes to Mrs. Lowe and to their son and daughter, Roger and Mrs. Fred Israel.

Mr. Lowe spent many years as a newspaperman in Philadelphia before joining the Washington Bureau of the Philadelphia Inquirer in 1942. Several years later, he opened his own news bureau here, the Penn-Federal News Bureau, writing for a number of Pennsylvania papers and serving also, in partnership with Mrs. Lowe, in covering Washington for Variety, the entertainment industry's trade journal. He closed his Washington office 3 years ago to join the staff of the world-famous Einstein Medical Center.

Long associated in various capacities with the Republican Party in Pennsylvania, Mr. Lowe never allowed partisanship to interfere with his objectivity in covering news stories involving me, or my husband before me. We were personal friends regardless of politics.

Memorial Favoring the Establishment of a Great Plains Soil-Moisture Research Laboratory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER H. DOMINICK
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 14, 1961

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Speaker, the Colorado State house of representatives has enacted House Joint Memorial 9, memorializing the Congress of the United States to establish a Great Plains Soil-Moisture Research Laboratory. The management and conservation of water resources is one of the most vital problems facing the Great Plains area which encompasses a large portion of 10 Western States: Montana, Wyoming, North Dakota, South Dakota, Kansas, Nebraska, Colorado, Oklahoma, Texas, and New Mexico.

The proposal for this laboratory is a worthy one and has strong bipartisan support from the Colorado legislature.

Under unanimous consent, I include House Joint Memorial 9 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 9

(By Representatives Poe, Burns, Anderson, Bain, Black, Boyden, Braden, Burch, Burk, Byrne, Calabrese, Clark, Compton, Dameron, Dines, Douglass, Eberhardt, Evans, Farr, Fenwick, French, Gallegos, Gilbert, Gossard, Johns, Johnson, Kane, Kelley, Klein, Knox, Lamb, Lamm, Lennox, Littler, Lorton, Love, Lucas, Mackie, Magnuson, P. Massari, V. Massari, McCormick, McNeil, Morgan, Myrick, Nichols, O'Donnell, Ohlson, Pellett, Propst, Quinlan, Romer, Rubin, Schafer, Simpson, Stalker, Stockton, Streitzer, Thomson, Tomsic, Vanderhoof, Wade, Wertz, West, and Wyatt)

Whereas the Great Plains area of the United States encompasses a large portion of the States of Montana, Wyoming, North Dakota, South Dakota, Kansas, Nebraska, Colorado, Oklahoma, Texas, and New Mexico and is a vital part of the agricultural and livestock production of the Nation; and

Whereas the major portion of the nonirrigated acres in these 10 States experience frequent periods of extensive drought and are subject to severe wind and water erosion; and

Whereas there is an urgent need for intensive research on the conservation and maximum use of available moisture, on soil moisture-plant relationships, and systems of managing highly erodible soils in periods of drought; and

Whereas such need having been recognized by the Congress of the United States by enactment of legislation authorizing the establishment of facilities for such research; and

Whereas the eastern one-half of Colorado is situated in that portion of the Great Plains where a high percentage of the days are cloudless, the light intensity is high and the relative humidity is adequately low to minimize daily operating costs of growth chambers, the wind tunnel and greenhouse facilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 43d General Assembly of the State of Colorado, the Senate concurring herein, That it respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of

Agriculture to act favorably upon the establishment of additional facilities to conduct soil moisture research studies for the Great Plains, that funds needed for the construction of a laboratory be appropriated in the immediate future and the facility be located at Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colo., which we believe to be the site most logically situated to meet the required climatic, physical, and other geographic conditions essential to the conduct of research in the Great Plains area; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this joint memorial be forwarded to the U.S. Senators and Representatives from Colorado, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President of the Senate, the President of the United States, the chairman of the subcommittee on agricultural appropriations for the House and the chairman of the subcommittee on agricultural appropriations for the Senate, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Director of the Agricultural Research Service.

ALBERT J. TOMSIC,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
ROBERT L. KNOUS,
President of the Senate.
GENE MANZANARES,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.
LUCILE L. SHUSTER,
Secretary of the Senate.

Nine Promises of a Patriotic Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 14, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently the chamber of commerce of the community of South Chicago in the Fourth Congressional District of Illinois, printed a pamphlet entitled "How You Can Help Combat Communism." This pamphlet draws up nine promises of a patriotic citizen. I believe that the distribution of this publication by this local group reflects the normal American concept which is best exemplified by the grassroots spirit indicated here:

HOW YOU CAN HELP COMBAT COMMUNISM

NINE PROMISES OF A PATRIOTIC CITIZEN

1. I will value our American heritage of freedom by knowing how and why a free economy works and compare communism, its history, its philosophy, especially its tactics of infiltration and subversion—then tell my friends to do the same.

2. I will oppose Communist conquest by making my convictions known and by writing to Government officials, legislators, newspapers, etc., and encourage others to do likewise, that a combined effort may best neutralize Communist strategy and subversion.

3. I will learn the names of all possible Communists, also sympathizers and front organizations and study the publications of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

4. I will unite with other loyal citizens in all community betterment projects and take an active interest in public affairs; I always will vote in elections—and will get others out to vote.

5. I will never participate in mob action evolved around group prejudices and will not join uninvestigated groups who use such appealing words as "peace," "freedom," "youth," and "mother" because of the Communist perversion of these terms.

6. I will teach our children to have a firm moral and spiritual basis of life as the Word of God is the weapon most feared by the Communists.

7. I will earnestly withhold support from advertisers, all magazines, movies, organizations, etc., whenever they sanction or foster communism and will not buy products imported from Socialist or Communist countries—I will also protest to the seller.

8. I will endeavor to know what public school books contain, know the teachers of the local schools and take a vital interest in the education of our children.

9. I will read all possible reports on the capabilities and activities of our elected officials and strongly support the candidates who understand the scope and seriousness of communism and who agree to work for its defeat.

(NOTE.—Your answer being yes to the above nine anticommunistic musts—merely aline the first letter of each key word for your title in this ultra important task.)

Program Launched To Send Young Ambassadors Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT RAINS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 14, 1961

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, recently some enterprising Alabamians have launched a program to send a young ambassador to a foreign country for the summer. Two cities, Gadsden, my home town, and Tuscaloosa, have indicated participation in this project which, I understand, some 85 U.S. communities now sponsor.

While abroad the young person who is selected as ambassador from each community would spend 1 month in the home of a native family and the remainder of his time traveling about the country, getting to know and understand the people and bringing messages of friendship from the folks back home.

The young persons selected by our communities must be of excellent caliber, for their selection is based on the highest standards of conduct and character. Gadsden is fortunate to have the interest and help of an outstanding young man, Mr. Douglas Lanford, who is well traveled and highly educated and dedicated to this grassroots friendship program. Mr. Lanford is director of the continuing legal education program of the University of Alabama.

Already the press and many radio and television stations have expressed interest in the reports which our community ambassadors will bring home in the fall. The success of this venture for each community which participates depends on the interest and energies of various civic and business and professional groups. Their support is vital to the success of the mission.

I am confident that the two Alabama ambassadors who go forth this year will be a credit to our State and will do much toward bringing a true concept of young Americans to peoples in distant lands. I only wish it were possible for each community in our State to engage in this program.

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply impressed that such a program is conceived and executed at the local level, and that so many of our citizens are anxious to participate in this endeavor. I believe that our young ambassadors and the communities which back them should be an inspiration to the Congress.

House Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN KYL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 14, 1961

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, many of our citizens are aware of the danger posed by the Communist teams operating in our country. The following communication was from one of these citizens who has had personal contact with the problem:

Hon. JOHN KYL,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Reading in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I noted comments of a Congressman concerning the House Un-American Activities Committee.

This individual severely critized HUAC's activities, expenditures, area of operation, and publications. This disturbed me. Perhaps there have been times when HUAC has made errors; but let us not destroy it for errors that are common in all human undertakings.

If Congress does not investigate and inform the American people, who will? Will we wait until the Reds have created the same chaos in the minds of our youth as they have already have in Europe and Asia? No thank you, I saw too much of the San Francisco type Red action in Europe.

Instead of attacking HUAC let us get at the problem's roots—educating uninformed students and adults concerning Red doctrine and modus operandi. Reveal the fallacies of communism—bring out into the open this vague identity which upon examination is found to be the product of sick minds.

Fortunately, here in the Creston school system we have administrators and a school board which have supported me in presenting the high school student with a 4-day unit on communism. What I offer is largely based on J. Edgar Hoover's "Masters of Deceit," my experiences as a counterintelligence agent serving in Europe, and the publications of HUAC.

My students have been very receptive to this unit. Many found themselves clearing away false and exaggerated ideas concerning this force that seeks to twist their minds. Mystic communism took the form of a well-defined and visible enemy, who can best be defeated by knowing him, his plans, tactics, and aspirations.

Knowing communism as I do I feel that the Red enemies of HUAC are not concerned with the number of their agents brought into the light as much as they are concerned about the committee's strength as

an educating force against communism. HUAC is causing potential dupes to be on their guard—the Reds cannot afford this, for they cannot exist without blind mass support, especially when the time comes to seize power.

JOHN G. BITZES,
Instructor, U.S. History, Creston Senior High.

Policy Statement of National Consumers League

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 14, 1961

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, recently I had the honor of addressing the annual meeting of the National Consumers League. This organization is now beginning its 62d year of existence. Throughout its long history, it has made tremendous contributions to many of the major social reforms of the 20th century.

It was founded in 1899 in the belief that consumers have a responsibility to help improve the working and living conditions and standards of those who produce the goods we all consume. The league introduced the idea of minimum wage legislation to the United States in the early years of the century, gave valuable support to the great social insurance programs, and was an early supporter of the concept of pure food and drug legislation.

The list of National Consumers League officers, directors, and members of both the past and the present reads like a "who's who" of important Americans. They include Felix Frankfurter and the late Louis D. Brandeis, U.S. Supreme Court Justices; Arthur Goldberg, Secretary of Labor, and Frances Perkins, former Secretary of Labor; Esther Peterson, Director of the Women's Bureau, and Mary Anderson, former Director of the Women's Bureau; Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt; Arthur Schlesinger, historian; Paul Douglas, U.S. Senator; the late Sumner Slichter, economist; Benjamin V. Cohen, New Deal adviser; J. Douglas Brown, dean of Princeton University; Mary Gibson Blanding, president of Vassar College.

Present officers include president Dr. John Howland Lathrop, Berkeley, Calif.; vice presidents, Elizabeth Brandeis Raushenbush, Madison, Wis.; Mary Dewson, Penobscot, Maine; Mrs. Thomas Fleming, Pasadena, Calif.; Pauline Goldmark, Hartsdale, N.Y.; Alice Hamilton, M.D., Hadlyme, Conn.; John Haynes Holmes, New York, N.Y.; Alice W. Hunt, Providence, R.I.; Archbishop Robert E. Lucey, San Antonio, Tex.; Frances Perkins, New York, N.Y.; Josephine Roche, Washington, D.C.; Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Hyde Park, N.Y.; Bishop William Scarlett, Castine, Maine; and Robert Szold, New York, N.Y.; treasurer, Hyman Schroeder, New York, N.Y.; board chairman, John W. Edelman, Washington, D.C.; board vice chairmen, Walter Frank, New York, N.Y.; Eleanor Hadley, Northampton, Mass.; Mrs. R. Gordon Arneson, Arlington, Va.; general secretary, Vera Waltman Mayer, Washington, D.C.

The league's long history of service and idealism commands respect. Further, the modernity of the league's ideas and its sensitivity to the important social problems which confront us today is impressive. This is not an organization content to rest on the many laurels of its past achievements. Rather, this is an organization which is continually reaching out for solutions to problems both old and new.

For this reason, I believe the league's statement of policy, adopted last week, will be of interest to the Senate. I ask unanimous consent to have that statement printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLICY STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL CONSUMERS LEAGUE

A wave of hope seems to be sweeping over our Nation. Although the problems we face are many and grave, the will to confront and solve them is shared by us all. We in the National Consumers League, along with our fellow citizens, face the year ahead with a sense of real expectation.

In the 62 years since the founding of the Consumers League, the nature of the problems we must cope with has changed but the object of the league remains the same—improvements in the working and living conditions of our countrymen. Today, as in 1899, our members believe that, as consumers, we have an active responsibility for the establishment of humane standards of employment and for the protection of the standard of living of our people. Because of these beliefs, the National Consumers League was responsible for introducing the concept of the legal minimum wage in the United States, gave significant support to the social insurance programs, and was among the early advocates of pure food and drug protection.

AREAS OF CONCERN TODAY

The sweatshops of yesterday have given way in many industries to varying degrees of industrial democracy. Yet problems remain—problems about which much must be done and about which we feel great concern. Even today the following conditions exist:

Food and fiber still are produced under conditions which often amount to peonage. "Harvest of Shame" is an appropriate title for many of America's agricultural products.

Minimum wage and maximum hours protection is still denied to millions of wage earners who need it the most.

Thousands of our aged are still without the financial means of living in dignity and health in their declining years.

Unemployment, with its corroding and degenerating consequences, is chronic in some of our regions and recurs periodically in virtually all of them.

The consumer is still too often compelled to buy at his own risk in a marketplace which becomes increasingly more complex.

Legal and social prejudice still robs millions of Americans of their rights as citizens to equal participation in the political, economic, and social life of our country.

These are some of the problems which affect our social health, our national self-confidence and our leadership in a rapidly changing world. In the solution of these problems, the National Consumers League will continue to offer its full support and assistance.

NEW FRONTIER'S FIVE-POINT PROGRAM

Specifically, the Consumers League will support the legislation designed to carry out the already announced five-point program of the New Frontier—legislation we have long called for and have worked to secure. This five-point program would provide for:

1. increasing the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour and extending the Fair Labor Standards Act coverage to additional millions of Americans;
2. providing health insurance for the aged under social security;
3. enacting Federal aid to public education for school construction and teachers salaries, leaving the choice to each State;
4. assisting chronically depressed areas;
5. instituting an omnibus program for housing construction, including especially slum clearance, urban renewal, and housing for the elderly.

FARM LABOR IMPROVEMENTS

The Consumers League would add a sixth point to the program outlined above. The league's goals include extensive improvements in the conditions of the 2 million and more farm workers in the United States. Too many men, women, and children engaged in agricultural work in this country toil and live under shamefully depressed conditions. They are denied the protection of much of the reform legislation enacted during and following the 1930's.

Farm workers currently earn an average of only $829 a year. They are employed an average of only 138 days a year. They suffer from so many privations it is difficult to decide which evil to attack first. The basic problem, however, is their deplorably low wages. Their miserable housing, poor health, illiteracy and the use of their children in the fields, all grow out of their great poverty.

A major cause of low wages in this occupation is an oversupply of labor due to the importation of foreign workers. Half a million Mexican farm workers enter the country annually under the provisions of Public Law 78—originally an emergency war measure.

Therefore, the league's legislative priorities for improving the conditions of farm workers are the reform of Public Law 78, the enactment of a Federal minimum wage for farm workers, and the protection of their right to bargain collectively.

We will also request legislation (1) establishing employment guarantees for domestic farm workers—a protection now accorded to foreign workers; (2) establishing employment referral centers in areas of employment to aid farm workers and employers; and (3) controlling and regulating crew leaders to prevent their exploitation of the migrant workers whom they recruit. We also advocate education, health services, and the regulation of the employment of their children, and the removal of State and local residence requirements for eligibility to health and welfare funds.

CONSUMER PROTECTION AND INFLUENCE

The Consumers League is well aware that an individual's economic well-being is not completely assured by the payment of an adequate minimum wage or the protection of a comprehensive social security system. We know that his standard of living is materially affected by such other things as the purity of the food available for his consumption, the rates he is charged for credit extended him, and the efficacious or harmful qualities and price of the drugs he buys. Much is needed to protect the consumer's interests in such matters, which are largely beyond his individual control, irrespective of his economic status.

Therefore, the National Consumers League will encourage and support legislation that:

1. Provides protection for the consumer in the production and marketing of food and drugs.

2. Safeguards consumer interests through the regulatory agencies and executive departments which control the price and the furnishing of gas, electricity, transportation, communications, etc.

3. Requires the disclosure of the actual interest rates charged on installment purchases and loans.

4. Establishes a consumer department in the executive branch of the Federal Government to represent the interests of consumers, as the Department of Agriculture, Department of Commerce, and Department of Labor represent the interests of particular economic groups.

5. Initiates committees in Congress to study and consider legislation to deal with the problems of consumers as other committees now act on other economic problems.

PROTECTION AGAINST THE DANGERS OF RADIATION

Closely allied to consumer problems is the rapid rate at which radiation is increasing throughout the world and the serious and insidious dangers which accompany it. Uncontrolled radiation kills, maims, and endangers, whether it comes from nuclear warheads or peacetime industrial pursuits. There are no easy means of avoiding the dangers of radiation. But solutions of the problems must be sought, found, and applied. The health of future generations, as well as that of our own, depends upon man's search for means of counteracting the evil effects of radiation at the same time he develops the great potentials of atomic energy for man's advancement.

We will, therefore, continue to follow with care the course of atomic energy development, and support such measures as we believe should be taken to protect the health and life of men.

RECESSION PREVENTION

As a Nation, we can ill-afford the economic waste and human suffering caused by periodic unemployment and business recessions. The new administration has promised a constructive program for economic recovery and the expansion of national production. Parts of that program have long been on the Consumers League list of must legislation. Therefore, we shall continue to support a bill providing for the redevelopment of depressed areas, Federal standards for unemployment compensation laws, and the attainment of full employment.

CONCLUSION

The National Consumers League regards these proposals as a means of meeting desperate human problems facing America in an ever more complex world. America has the ability, the capacity, and the strength to meet these problems.

Captive Nations Week Resolution

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join in support of the resolution to establish a House Committee on Captive Nations and to commend the gentlemen from Pennsylvania for his action and comment on the subject. The United States certainly should pursue every peaceful means to help the people of those nations achieve their desire to regain their national and individual freedoms.

In addition to the establishment of the Committee on Captive Nations, I believe we should enact a formal program, such as proposed in my bill H.R. 1012, to assist the captive nations, once they have thrown off the yoke of Soviet oppression, in establishing free governments. I realize, of course, that the President and the Department of State do have a certain amount of latitude in that respect, but I believe we should have a statute on the books designed specifically for the captive nations. It would be concrete evidence to the enslaved people that we are interested in their fate and are prepared to help them at the appropriate moment.

Under my bill the President would be given specific authority to furnish technical assistance and services, agricultural and other commodities, and other assistance to strengthen the newly formed, free government and to promote the continuation and growth of freedom and security within the nation, after it was demonstrated that the nation had freed itself from Soviet domination.

I believe it is imperative to have this law enacted now, so that whenever these captive nations do cast off their bonds of tyranny, there will be no delay in rendering them the help in stabilizing a free government.

Petition From Businessmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 14, 1961

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to a petition from a group of businessmen in southwestern Kansas. The petition follows:

It has become increasingly evident that the farm situation pricewise has worsened to the point where farmers purchasing power is practically gone.

Businessmen are aware that farmers have never asked for Government handouts, and they do not intend to now. Many of us recognize the fact that the farmers status in the national economy is far below par.

We, the following businessmen, do not profess to be economists, but we believe that the cause of the present recession and the two previous ones can be traced to declining farm income. The agriculture problem is complex and a touchy issue politically, because of that fact, it is believed that many people in Government friendly to agriculture hesitate to voice their opinion. We hope this petition will give you, who represent us, moral and political support. We petition you to speak out for agriculture so that the farmers incomes may reach that point to where their purchasing power will help alleviate the present recession. The ills of our economy and the Nation's economy, we believe, can be cured by a healthy prosperous agriculture.

Frederick Finnup, the Finnup Land Co.; L. G. Perry, President, Garden National Bank.; B. J. R. N. Downie, President, the Fidelity State Bank, Garden City, Kans.; W. E. Rutherford, Manager, Sears, Roebuck & Co.; O. R. Nanningar, Western Motor Co.; Harry Fansler, Fansler Tires, Inc.; Ellsworth Sherman; Preston Burtis, Burtis Motor Co.; Nolan Motor Co.; Southwestern Equipment Co.; Oswalt Industries; Pilands, Garden City, Kans.; J. Hayes Baldwin, Implement Co.; Richard W. Evans, Kalvesta, Kans.; A. N. Hanna, Cashier, First National Bank; Wayne Beery, Hardward Co.; Clark Pharmacy, Fisher, I.G.A., Grocery and Meat; Anawalt-Campbelle Lumber Co.; Koehn Motors, Ford Agency; Walker Sales Co.; Nicolets Men's Wear; Harold Hoskinson, Recreation Parlor; Ralph Herron, Ferguson Radio and TV; Wilson Lumber Co., Inc.; Magouird Chevrolet Co.; Menzie Implement Co., Cimarron, Kans.; Farmers State Bank, George Johnson, Cashier, Ingalls, Kans.; Montezuma Hardward Co.; H. A. Hedlund, Montezuma State Bank, Montezuma, Kans.

Mexico Isn't Just Like the United States or Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Kansas City Star of Sunday, March 12. This penetrating and comprehensive editorial presents some extremely important thoughts and considerations about our neighbor to the South. Latin America, and Mexico in particular, are of great interest to midcontinent United States, and we certainly wish for nothing but the best of relations with our Latin friends. This editorial may help to open the eyes of each one of us, and to further those relations. It is for this reason that I hope all of my colleagues will take the opportunity to read the following:

MEXICO ISN'T JUST LIKE THE UNITED STATES OR RUSSIA

For the foreseeable future Latin America is likely to be an ideological battleground of the cold war. There the United States and Russia are engaged in a continuing contest for the minds of great populations. In such a vital struggle they might be expected to employ shrewd psychological moves. But at this stage a traveler south of the Rio Grande is likely to be impressed with the fact that the Latin American psychology is not too well understood in either big country.

So far, at least, the one advantage of the United States is in the major psychological blunders of Nikita Khrushchev.

This last week the Star carried a report on the evidence that Fidel Castro's effort to stir Latin American revolutionary fervor had bogged down in Mexico. Because Mexico has been regarded as one of the countries

friendliest to Castro, it should provide a fair test at least for the Communists. In fact, Mexico is the one major Latin American country that has actually been invaded by the United States (in the last century). Yet for the present the United States seems to be coming off better than Russia.

Fortunately the representatives of the United States in Mexico and in Washington are much more familiar with Mexican psychology than the Americans who swarm across the border for business or fun.

There is the illustrative story of a troubled American businessman who was deeply disturbed by the printed report of a speech by his friend, a recognized leader in Mexican politics.

The speech reeked with inflammatory and revolutionary phrases—denunciation of capitalist exploitation, resistance to imperialistic intervention, praise for past expropriation of foreign investments and revolutionary flag-waving in general.

This American laid the report before his friend with caustic comments. The politician scanned the story, smiled broadly and said, "You have made the mistake of reading it in English. You should read it in Spanish."

By this the Mexican meant that the old phrases are the accepted cliches of Mexican politics. They are rooted in the revolutions of 50, 100 and 150 years ago. A traditional part of political oratory, they can be compared to American political cliches. The U.S. orator lauds individual opportunity, freedom and free enterprise in a way that implies the old virtues are the sole possession of the United States. Few people bother to consider the meaning.

The dominant party of Mexico bears the name of Party of Revolutionary Institutions. A half-century after the start of the last great revolution the party's leaders live in beautiful haciendas or fine city homes and conduct large business operations. They can speak in the political language of revolution without a passing thought to the meaning of the words.

These are the people with a big stake in the status quo and in that sense they may be regarded as conservative. The cliches of revolution are the catch phrases of Mexico's new conservatism. Of course this doesn't mean conservative by U.S. definitions.

The highly regarded Government of President Adolfo Lopez Mateos clings to a soft and fuzzy line on Castro and his Russian alliance—even when conspicuously troublesome Mexican Communists may be held in jail. Mexican Communists are divided according to the hard-line group that follows Red China and the soft-line followers of Khrushchev. The soft-line Communists make a point of supporting the Government and appear to be socially accepted. They could be dangerous.

The big Mexican Federation of Labor Unions has supported the ruling party and therefore the status quo although its leaders have recently engaged in an open spat with President Lopez Mateos. Labor leadership generally can now be regarded as conservative by Mexican definition.

The ominous development in Mexican labor is the strong Communist influence in the huge teachers' union. The Communists always choose their spots and in this case they grabbed control of the editorial board that publishes the magazine delivered to every elementary and secondary schoolteacher of the country. The issues of last July and August were loaded with unabashed Communist-line articles on such subjects as American imperialists, bleeding Cuba and the wonders of Russian education written by Russians.

On the encouraging side, some influential leaders in the teacher union have become alarmed by the excessive display of Communist infiltration. Since the decline of Castro's influence in Mexico, the magazine has been toned down. The last issue, at least, carried nothing that could be identified as outright Communist propaganda. But the Communists hold to their strategic posts.

To a lesser degree, Americans in Mexico are troubled by the continuing socialistic trend. In the last year the Mexican Government bought control of nearly all the privately owned electric power distributing companies. The Government is expanding ownership in the Mexican airlines. But this is far different from the expropriation policies of the 1930's. The Government has paid a fairly negotiated price for its purchases. Mexican socialism appears to be less extreme than the socialism of Sweden.

There is probably no way for U.S. free enterprises to comprehend the Mexican association with the adroit soft-line Communists. Neither could Mexicans understand our intense feeling on the issue. Up to this point, at least, the Communist influence appears to be on the decline. The Castro vogue of last summer has definitely passed. Except for the old leftist, Lazaro Cardenas, the party leaders are intent on keeping the status quo. And Cardenas is a millionaire.

Any country of low living standards must be regarded as exposed to Communist infiltration. The day laborers you see working on Mexican highways, outside the capital area, receive a wage of around a dollar a day. Considering the difference in purchasing power this dollar might be stretched to the equivalent of $2 a day in the United States. Of course this is the country's minimum wage, a depressing minimum.

But here again, a Missourian or Kansan is not equipped to judge Mexican wage standards. As in the case of the political speeches, perhaps the wage figures should be read in Spanish, not English.

It is easy to see how Nikita Khrushchev could have been misled by the political cliches and leftist conventions in Mexico. Last summer Americans were alarmed by the ominous similarity of Fidel Castro's fulminations to the standard political oratory of Mexico. It appeared natural for the Mexicans and other peoples with revolutionary histories to identify themselves with Castro.

All travelers in Mexico, American or Russian, have been confronted time and again with the bitter mural art of Mexico. The walls of Mexico pour pictorial hate on fiendish Spanish invaders, bloated priests and scheming capitalists. The unabashed Communist, Diego Rivera, set a pattern of Communist-line art that has been widely imitated by less famous artists. From the walls the beaten and lacerated Indians have cried out as a symbol of the persecuted proletariat, goaded to revolution.

Americans look uneasily on Mexico's great and ominous murals. Khrushchev's agents could report that Mexico seems to be dominated by Communist ideological art.

Communist agents in other Latin American countries could see good prospects in populations with varying histories of revolution. Throughout Latin America politicians in one way or another had taken verbal shots at interventionists which plainly were directed at wicked Yankee imperialists.

Given plausible reasons to support him, Khrushchev made what now appears to have been a major miscalculation. Without a nod to the Monroe Doctrine, he moved arrogantly to support Fidel Castro in the Western Hemisphere. In theory he should thereby have proved himself the friend of the persecuted workers. In theory, his show of strength should have given intimidated peoples the courage to defy the capitalists.

In Mexico, certainly, the rather plausible power play didn't come off. And, so far, we have heard nothing to indicate better results in other countries. Perhaps Khrushchev should have read the Mexican political speeches in Spanish instead of Russian. And his agents might take another look at Mexico's Communist murals. It seems that the average Mexican views the murals as art and historical drama, much as a Missourian looks at Tom Benton's traders, Indians, politicians and tick-bitten mules.

Both Americans and Russians can now see that the relationship between the almost identical revolutionary phases of Cuba and Mexico is rather remote—separated by a half century, to be specific. Castro is whirling around in the midst of revolution. Mexico's last revolution started in 1910.

And in their character the two revolutions are as far apart as Mexico City and Moscow. Mexico grew and imported its own Communists. It never turned for support to an aggressive foreign power. Mexicans are sensitive on any foreign power plays. Their revolution of a century ago was directed against the agent of France, the Emperor Maximilian.

A representative of the Star traveling in Mexico found various reasons for the people's reaction against Castro. None has seemed more important than resentment over the reckless interference in the hemisphere by Soviet Russia. This reason is not acknowledged officially by the Mexican Government. It is not unusual for governments to lag behind public opinion.

At this stage, it appears that failure to understand the Latin American psychology caused Nikita Khrushchev to overplay his hand as he has also done in Asia and Africa.

For a Latin American, Fidel Castro has been surprisingly insensitive to the psychology of Mexico. His appeal to the people over the heads of the governments hardly made friends among the ruling groups anywhere in Latin America. And his selp-appointed role of the hemisphere's revolutionary leader now looks much too ambitious for the bearded zealot of a small island.

In Mexico, Castro's grand claim to being the inventor of the model revolution has appeared childishly arrogant. Every literate Mexican child has grown up on stories of Father Miguel Hidalgo and other leaders of the war for independence 150 years ago. Benito Juarez who overthrew the Emperor Maximilian is a household name. Fidel Castor has not rated a place in Mexico's extensive and revered hall of fame.

For the present, certainly, the American people can breathe easier over the threatened impact of the imperialist Communist invasion of the hemisphere. But it would be a serious error to regard the respite as more than an opportunity to understand the Latin American psychology and to act for a united hemisphere. We can't always count on Khrushchev's blunders.

Regardless of the reaction to Castro and his Communist alliance, Soviet Russia is conducting its own long-range campaign for the minds of Latin America. According to current reports, this year the Russians are offering 600 scholarships for Mexican youth to study at Friendship University in Moscow. The U.S. Government has no remotely comparable program. The possibility of a large U.S. scholarship program for Latin Americans deserves consideration.

For a continuing campaign the Russians have the support of a solid corps of Mexican Communists who can be regarded as a beachhead—not in Cuba but in Mexico itself.

We can take encouragement from the fact that the trend of recent years and months has favored the United States. To keep it turning our way we will have to count on a thorough public relations job.

Transportation Education Fund To Begin April 1 With Committee of 200

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 14, 1961

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, in my service on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, it has been my privilege to meet and work with many professional transportation management men—from industry, from the common carriers representing all forms of transportation and from our Federal regulatory agencies. Their tasks are exceedingly complex and difficult, and they perform them with a strong sense of responsibility for the development of a national transportation policy which embraces the public interest and the economy and defense of our country.

The American Society of Traffic and Transportation, which is the qualifying professional organization of transportation management men, will, on April 1, inaugurate its transportation education fund. Its purpose will be to improve and coordinate college and graduate level instruction in the theory and technology of transportation through grants-in-aid, qualifying examinations and sponsorship of needed research projects.

I call this to the attention of my colleagues because I think it typifies the manner in which professional societies, supported by dedicated men and women, contribute through technological advancement to our progress as a nation. The American Society of Traffic and Transportation, its members and the forward-looking businesses which are supporting its transportation education fund, are to be commended for the important work they are doing.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a short article concerning the fund that appeared in the "Annals," the society's publication:

A $100,000 GOAL—TRANSPORTATION EDUCATION FUND TO BEGIN APRIL 1 WITH COMMITTEE OF 200

In a recent letter, addressed to over 50 society members who will serve as State and regional chairmen of the transportation education fund, E. F. Hamm, Jr., president, Traffic Service Corp., Washington, D.C., and fund chairman, announced that the board of directors had "decided to get the nationwide drive underway April 1."

Continuing in his letter, Mr. Hamm pointed out that the board of directors "realized that business may not be as good as it might be in some areas, but we felt that we have an excellent program that should be supported and that nothing would be gained by temporizing, for there probably never is a truly proper time to undertake fund raising."

ONE-HUNDRED-THOUSAND-DOLLAR GOAL

The transportation education fund and its 1961 goal of $100,000 was approved by the board of directors, prior to the society's 15th annual meeting held in Cleveland last September. Since this initial announcement, the members of the committee have already contacted 50 corporations throughout the country on a trial basis. Based on the favorable results of these contacts and personal interviews, Chairman Hamm recommended the program be undertaken on a national scale and as soon as possible.

In reporting to the board of directors at their meeting in Chicago on January 27, Chairman Hamm detailed the results of the initial contacts; pointing out that in addition to receiving unanimous favorable reaction to the program from all of the firms contacted, a number of actual contributions had also been collected, and an additional number of companies had pledged specific amounts to be paid during the national campaign.

CAMPAIGN COMMITTEES

It is estimate that over 200 members will participate in the campaign. Each State chairman has been asked to appoint a committee of at least five members, who will contact the corporations in their area. These State committees will be given the names of the companies in their area whose employees are also members of the society. These companies will be the initial source of contact. In the case of a company who has branches or divisions located in different sections of the country, the solicitation will be made through the concern's home office.

Using the names of member-affiliated companies as a starting point, the local committees will then contact other transportation and industrial concerns in their areas. Chairman Hamm pointed out that while "we are after company contributions first, we have already had a number of contributions from individuals." Work is now underway in the preparation of kits which will contain information concerning the fund, and suggestions on how the committee members might best proceed.

PROGRAM SCOPE

Two of the six specific programs which will be made possible through the establishment of the transportation education fund, have already been started. The first is the authorization for the publication of the Transportation Journal (see story p. 6). The second program will be the financing of the attendance of society educator members to the G. Lloyd Wilson Memorial Seminar. This program of enabling the educational members of the society to attend and participate in the biannual seminar of the society was first established in conjunction with the Michigan State Seminar held at East Lansing, Mich., in 1959. Invitations for those qualified educational members will be extended shortly by President Frank J. Ryan.

The remaining four specific programs which will be activated in the near future are as follows:

Provision of regional study group instructors;

Employment of a full-time, paid educational director and staff;

Scholarships to cover cost of examinations for needy applicants and to encourage study at the college and graduate level;

Grants-in-aid to universities and colleges to encourage establishment of additional courses in transportation and traffic management.

Who Would Benefit?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 14, 1961

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Gaffney Ledger, Gaffney, S.C., of March 7, 1961:

WHO WOULD BENEFIT?

A total of 4,333,000 workers will be brought under the Fair Labor Standards Act for the first time if President Kennedy's minimum wage proposals are adopted, according to Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg. Of this number, 2.9 millions would be employes in retail and service enterprises whose wages tend to be lower than the earnings of presently covered workers.

About 804,000 of the 4.3 million proposed to be covered workers are paid less than $1 an hour, Goldberg said. About 200,000 of these now receive 75 cents per hour.

Other groups of employees that would be brought under the act's coverage for the first time include:

About 800,000 construction workers, 40,000 of whom are now being paid less than $1 an hour.

About 130,000 laundry workers in enterprises engaged in commerce or production for commerce which do $1 million or more in business annually. Of these, 32,000 are now paid under $1 an hour.

About 110,000 employees in interurban and metropolitan transit systems, some 5,000 of whom now receive less than $1 an hour.

About 86,000 employees in gasoline service establishments doing an annual business of at least $250,000. Some 19,000 of these workers are being paid less than $1 an hour.

About 100,000 seamen on American vessels.

No one can tell the Ledger that raising the pay of these workers as proposed under President Kennedy's program is going to ruin the economy of the United States. Instead, the country's business will be benefited by the increased purchasing power.

Africa and Mr. Williams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the dilemma confronting the United States in formulating its African policy has been succinctly pointed out in a recent article by Joseph Evans in the Wall Street Journal.

With so much of the world's attention today focused on Africa, I believe that this article deserves the thoughtful attention of my colleagues:

AFRICA AND MR. WILLIAMS

(By Joseph Evans)

NAIROBI.—Whatever sins of excessive talk and deficient thought U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs Williams may be guilty of on his get acquainted tour of Africa, there is more to the story than that. The hot water he is in also points up the basic dilemma of the United States' foreign policy in Africa.

Since Mr. Williams arrived in Nairobi about a week ago and left a couple of days later, local papers have been having a terrific time with him and they show no sign of letting up. Articles, editorials and letters to the editor, all lambaste him. One G. C. Dockeray writes to the editor of the East African Standard: "The sayings of Mr. G. Mennen Williams lend support to the view that Christopher Columbus went too far." No conversation with Briton or British settlers here can avoid discussion of Williams' brash remarks.

Such an outcry can scarcely be explained wholly on the basis of alleged diplomatic

malapropisms. Though charged with various other transgressions, Mr. Williams is chiefly accused of advocating Africa for Africans, which was interpreted as dumping Kenya colony's small but important European—mainly British stock—minority into the ash can. Yet the best available evidence is that Williams was not adequately quoted on this in the local press, especially on his arrival at the airport when he was talking to the tune of a warming-up jet engine.

The fact is that Williams' observations became an excuse here to give vent to what is a large amount of anti-Americanism among the European community. Anti-Americanism is perhaps too vague a term; it is more a suspicion that Washington is meddling deep in Kenya's affairs via London.

To begin with, feeling among these British people in Kenya—mostly farmers and estate owners who are the mainstay of Kenya's economy but also including some of the civil servants in the Kenya government—is that their own government in London has broken faith with them by pushing a policy providing a Black African majority in the legislature—just certified in the elections concluded this week—and by leaving up in the air the whole future of settlers' property rights and indeed any other rights in an eventually independent Kenya dominated by Black Africans.

LEERY OF UNITED STATES

Especially since the Suez war of late 1956, these white settlers have been leery of the influence of the U.S. Government on British policy; they figure the United States stopped that war by talking tough to Britain. When London started moving a year ago toward Kenyan independence at what they regarded as an unbelievably rapid and irresponsible pace, they saw the United States as the villain pushing a weak British Government into abject surrender to black nationalist demands in order to win influence in an Africa bursting into independence and turmoil all over the continent.

So Williams' observations, some ill-advised and some perhaps ill-reported, seemed absolute confirmation of Kenya's British settlers' worst fears.

Now this picture of U.S. pressure on Britain regarding Kenya is almost certainly untrue or grossly exaggerated. Nobody knows what President Kennedy has in mind as a new American policy for Africa, if any. But the British Government has ample reasons of its own for proceeding with Kenyan independence at the fastest pace consistent, it hopes, with safety. The simplest reason is, what else can it do?

A likelier explanation of the U.S. purpose, in the view of diplomats here, is that the Kennedy administration did want to use the Williams trip as an indication that the United States intends to take a greater interest in Black Africa's nationalist and independence aspirations, an interest freer than heretofore from America's alleged domination by policies of its colonialist partners.

For here is the other horn of the dilemma of U.S. policy in Africa. Throughout much of the area—Guinea, Ghana, Nigeria and here—you encounter complaint among African nationalists that the United States refuses to take a positive position in favor of African self-determination because of fear of offending its colonialist allies in Europe. This is often bitterly linked with America's own anti-colonial struggle against Britain. So mush was expected of the United States, it is almost tearfully said, and so little received.

Why didn't the United States help Guinea's Sekou Toure, it is asked, when France left him flat after he broke with France? Why hasn't the United States laid down the law to Belgium about its continued interference in the Congo? And so on.

IDENTIFICATION

The point is not the validity of these questions for they have little point indeed; they are not concerned with logic but with emotions and primitive ones at that. The point is the existence of these feelings on the part of numerous educated Africans, including political leaders.

Naturally any U.S. administration would like to identify itself with African aspirations if for no other reason than to try to stem Communist influence in Africa, for the Communists have no inhibitions about what they say. That is, the United States would like to make such identification if it could be done without alienating its European allies. For the European alliance is, and in logic must be, even more important than a massive attempt to court Africa's nationalists and so try to save them from communism.

But here in Kenya a small beginning at disengagement from America's colonial allies, if that is what Williams was up to, brought on a storm among British settlers already angry at the government to which they owe allegiance. Obviously if the United States were seriously to spite its European friends to gain new African ones, it would find itself in dire difficulties in capitals of Europe. The continued existence of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization would be in question. And seeming to abandon allies would hardly win the resepct of African leaders.

The most objective observers here, acknowledging this dilemma, do not excuse Williams. They consider that his loquaciousness, however misquoted or unquoted, was sensationally ill-timed in view of Kenya's delicate political condition. One of the kinder remarks is that he violated the two rules of a diplomat—first know thoroughly what you are talking about before you talk, and second, don't talk anyway.

The trouble is that the problem is a good deal larger than Mr. Williams. If the Kennedy administration is searching for a new pro-African policy more independent of Europe, it may find itself damned if it does and damned if it doesn't

The Spirit of March 15 Lives On in Hungary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, in an age when slavery and tyranny stalk the earth in the name of revolution the 15th of March, like the Fourth of July, recalls for us that "revolution" once meant the end of tyranny and the triumph of individual freedom. For it was on the 15th of March, 1848, that the Hungarian people, under the leadership of the famed Louis Kossuth, won freedom from Hapsburg rule and obtained their charter of freedom. This revolution brought freedom for the serfs, enlarged public representation in political affairs, and the right to create their own Hungarian national government.

Americans of all national origins proudly honor Kossuth on March 15, although the freedom which he obtained for his country does not exist there today. We have faith that the Hungarian people will some day be free again, and that when they are it will be the spirit of Kossuth that leads them.

We know firsthand of the greatness of the Hungarian people for many of them have come to this country and enriched its heritage. They help us to keep alive the spirit of freedom which sparked the Hungarian patriots of 1848 just as it sparked our own patriots in 1776.

Filling Empty Mills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very fine article that appeared in the newspaper publication the Christian Science Monitor on March 13, 1961, which should give us food for thought:

FILLING EMPTY MILLS—AN INTIMATE MESSAGE FROM NEW ENGLAND

(By George B. Merry)

BOSTON.—Dozens of vacant or partially tenanted, multistory mills from Maine to Rhode Island and from the Berkshires to the Atlantic coast, are silent reminders of New England's changing economic scene.

Shrinkage of the cotton, woolen, and synthetic textile industry has not only dealt a severe economic blow to individual cities and towns but also has tended to funnel off some of the important leadership elements in these communities.

That most of the cities and towns were ill-prepared to grapple with problems of this magnitude is now abundantly clear. Among the most heavily depressed areas in this region are several long-established textile manufacturing centers, hard hit by mill closings over the past three decades.

Within the last 10 years alone hundreds of production jobs in this industry have been wiped out through plant liquidations.

And except for the more highly skilled who in the main are easily placed with other textile firms or industries, men and women idled by shutdowns have had a hard time finding steady full-time jobs.

These displaced workers constitute a lingering hard core of unemployment in several areas long associated with textile weaving, spinning, and finishing operations.

Fall River, Lowell, New Bedford, and North Adams, Mass., Pawtucket, R.I., and Biddeford and Saco, Maine, are consistently on the U.S. Labor Department's substantial labor surplus list.

And each recession only serves to accentuate the lingering job deficit for a growing band of older and middle-aged workers who are often passed up by new industries which move into former textile communities.

For more than a century these virtually single-industry towns had leaned heavily on "king textile" for jobs, taxes, civic improvements, and even community leadership.

People were generally content to let the other fellow take the initiative, and, as long as the local mill prospered, things kept humming.

"We thought we were well off," a Sanford, Maine, merchant recalls in discussing local attitudes on the eve of the closing of the Goodall-Sanford Mill, in August 1954.

"As long as people needed clothes we felt sure we would be all set. Our mill produced the finest of fabrics and operations were near capacity."

Mill liquidations in other New England towns had little impact in the small southern Maine community where one textile firm provided more than half the local employment.

"It couldn't happen here."

Then almost overnight it happened. The long established Goodall-Sanford empire was acquired by another firm, closing the local plant, idling some 3,600 persons.

But this economic tragedy taught Sanford an important lesson it will not soon forget.

"Never again will we depend on one company or even a single industry," a civic leader emphasizes in outlining steps already taken to rebuild a strong economy through industrial diversification.

And with equal determination other former single-industry communities with similar experiences have come to the same conclusion.

"I would rather have 10 new firms each employing 150 workers than one company with 1,500 workers," the mayor of one industry-hungry northern New England city said.

Some communities have been slower than others to woo new firms but in recent years significant strides have been taken.

While some cities and towns have concentrated on filling old textile plants, others with more capital and long-range plans have built up-to-date plants often on prime land sites away from the congested industrial areas.

With industrial parks ranging from 600 acres to single plots dozens of New England communities are vying for new and growing firms to ease employment slack.

Older mill properties are not being neglected. Unfortunately, however, they are generally less attractive than modern one-story buildings. And in the haste to find new tenants large areas of otherwise valuable manufacturing space are turned over to warehousing which adds few jobs. With few exceptions space on upper floors is hard to dispose of.

But these brick, or wooden, multistory giants are especially suited to smaller firms, which cannot afford the rents of newer plant facilities; certain types of industries where employment may fluctuate widely with the seasons, such as the needle trades, and some marginal manufacturers.

In any event long-time New England textile centers are on the move. They are meeting at least to some extent the challenge of finding jobs for idled workers by attracting new firms and are reshaping their industrial patterns.

Army Includes Kaman in Pioneering on Helicopter Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 14, 1961

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, in my district is located the Kaman Aircraft Corp., one of the fine industries of our State, with additional facilities in other parts of Connecticut in addition to my district.

Not only is employment provided for a substantial number of skilled workers, but the company is alert in research and planning so that there are bright prospects for even greater employment, which will be particularly gratifying in an area that sometimes has been officially listed as "depressed."

There is nothing "depressed" about this industry, however, and as a demonstration of that is information that has just come to me about a revolutionary new power transmission system for possible application as a helicopter transmission, and which will be studied by the Kaman Aircraft Corp. under contract with the U.S. Army Transportation Research Command at Fort Eustis, Va.

Because of the interest in this project, the Kaman Aircraft Corp. has issued a news release, which I include herewith as part of my remarks:

A revolutionary power transmission system called Harmonic Drive will be studied by the Kaman Aircraft Corp. for possible application as a helicopter transmission under contract with the U.S. Army Transportation Research Command, Fort Eustis, Va.

Originally conceived and developed by the United Shoe Machinery Co., Harmonic Drive departs radically from conventional gearbox design. Inherent in the Harmonic Drive system is extremely high efficiency and weight reductions of up to 50 percent from existing transmissions. Very high ratios—as much as 200,000 to 1—are attainable.

Kaman Aircraft is entering into the Army contract under a working agreement with the United Shoe Machinery Co.

Work to be done by Kaman Aircraft will look to the possible use of Harmonic Drive under the high-power input, heavy loading conditions, and high reduction ratios imposed by helicopter operations, especially with gas turbine installations. To date the Harmonic Drive has been used only in relatively low-power and torque input levels in such applications as nuclear reactor control rod drives, antenna drives, power take-offs and servomechanisms.

The typical Harmonic Drive departs from conventional drives in that it makes use of one or more of the flexible mechanical elements. A typical unit of a single stage contains only two moving parts, the input and output elements.

Transmission of power is accomplished not with gears as in existing systems but through the combination of two splines, one rigid and one flexible.

The typical unit consists of three parts: a circular spline with the teeth cut on the inner circumference which is rigidly fixed and is normally a part of the transmission case; a flexible spline with teeth cut on its outer circumference and which is concentrically mounted in the circular splines; and a wave generator which rotates within the flexible spline and which deflects the spline from its normal circular shape into a generally elliptical or oval shape.

With the wave generator mounted within it the flexible spline, or flexspline, attains two definite axes, one longer than the other as in an oval shape with the longer axis occurring at the point of contact of the wave generator. Spline teeth are firmly engaged at the points of the long axis and totally disengaged at the short axis.

The flexspline is designed with two fewer teeth than the rigid circular spline. As the wave generator is rotated by the power input the point of contact of the flexspline rotates with respect to the fixed circular spline. The net effect is the creation of a wave action in the flexspline.

As a point of contact between the two splines moves, the spline teeth continually engage and disengage. Since there are two fewer teeth in the flexspline, this element literally walks around the fixed circular spline imparting rotation to the flexspline in a direction opposite the rotation of the driven wave generator. Rotation of the flexspline is the power output of the drive system.

The difference in the number of teeth between the flexspline and rigid spline determines the reduction ratio. In this example the flexspline has 198 teeth and the rigid circular spline 200, resulting in a 100:1 ratio. Combining two or more stages can produce extremely high reduction ratios.

The Sea: Practical Source of Fresh Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 14, 1961

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, an adequate supply of fresh water will soon become our Nation's No. 1 resource problem. Already serious water shortages exist in some areas. It is estimated that by 1980 demand for water will exceed the developed available supply by 85 billion gallons per day. By the year 2000 demand will exceed supply by an estimated 300 billion gallons per day.

Two things become immediately obvious when considering these facts. First, the water available for use will have to be used and reused many times over. The greater degree of reuse the greater becomes the pollutional load in the water supply. Thus, in order to permit repeated water reuse we will need strong pollution prevention and control programs at all levels of government and in industry.

Second, we must increase, if possible, the available supply of fresh water. Through presently known methods the Nation's supply of water will reach about 600 billion gallons per day by the year 2000—far short of needs even with repeated reuse. Thus, in addition to pollution prevention and control necessary for reuse we must develop entirely new sources of water. To do so we must turn to the oceans through an extensive program of desalinization.

The winter issue of the magazine Quest contains an excellent article by Arthur M. Brandel entitled "The Sea: Practical Source of Fresh Water." Under leave to extend my remarks I include Mr. Brandel's article:

THE SEA: PRACTICAL SOURCE OF FRESH WATER
(By Arthur M. Brandel)

The sea becomes a practical source of fresh water for the home, for agriculture, for industry. This is one of man's basic quests. Indeed, water is the lifeblood of civilization. With it, civilizations have flourished. For it, wars have been fought. Without it, nations and cultures have perished.

It is bitter irony indeed that the undrinkable seas about us make up 71 percent of the earth's surface. Water, water, everywhere, nor any drop to drink—the ancient mariner's anguished cry has been all too apt.

From the start of recorded history, the search for ways to convert salt water to fresh has intrigued man. And he will take a big

step forward when a $1¼ million complex of pipes and plumbing in a plant on the bogs and salt marshes of the Texas gulf coast goes into operation in mid-March.

The maze of plumbing, at Freeport, 60 miles south of Houston, has been designed to produce 1 million gallons of fresh water a day from the sea. It is not, of course, the first plant to make drinkable water in this manner. But it is the first to make it at a cost as low as $1 per thousand gallons—half the cheapest at any other operating plant. And engineers hope to reduce this to 50 cents or less.

This plant is the result of many years of study—and many years of history. For man's search for ways to produce fresh water from salt dates back well over 2,000 years. Our first written record of this comes from Aristotle, who reported such experiments in 350 B.C. Julius Caesar utilized a primitive sun-powered evaporator to produce fresh water for his troops at the siege of Alexandria, Egypt, in 49 B.C.

Sir Francis Bacon discussed the problem in detail in 1567, for Queen Elizabeth I wanted to be able to produce fresh water on shipboard, so that the crews of her navy would not have to come in to port so often. The queen made a standing offer of a sum equal to $20,000 to the inventor of a machine for making sea water potable.

One record of a solution appears—200 years too late—in the annals of the Second Congress of the United States of America. On November 21, 1791, Thomas Jefferson, then Secreary of State, wrote of witnessing a demonstration of a process developed by Jacob Isaacks of Newport, R.I.

"Mr. Isaacks," Jefferson wrote, "fixed the pot of a small caboose with a tin cap and straight tube of tin passing obliquely through a cask of cold water; he made use of a mixture, the composition of which he did not explain, and from 24 pints of sea water he distilled 22 pints of fresh water in 4 hours." A second experiment involved a furnace and a 5-gallon still. From 32 pints of sea water, Isaacks produced 31 pints of fresh in 7 hours and 24 minutes.

But Jefferson was an intellectually curious man, and the next day, he tried the experiment without Mr. Isaack's secret ingredient. Jefferson produced the same amount of fresh water in 11 minutes more time, but with one-fifth less wood. This process was a rudimentary form of distillation. Today, that 1791 still would be termed wholly inadequate. The skills and energies of many scientists and engineers have been devoted to increasing the efficiency of distillation.

At the end of 1960, fresh water was being produced from salt in at least 17 plants, each having a capacity to make 100,000 gallons or more per day. These are scattered throughout the world—on islands in the Persian Gulf, Aruba, Bermuda, and Greenland, in Italy, Latin America, and the United States. The cost is high—usually upward of $2 per 1,000 gallons.

Most residents of the United States think of water as free, or anyway, inexpensive. And usually, it has been. But our increasing consumption has pushed close enough to the virtually constant daily supply of 515 billion gallons to eliminate much of the margin of safety we have had in the past.

During the 1957 drought, for example, people in nearly 1,000 communities across the Nation, had to cut down on their use of water, one way or another. One of every seven persons in the United States suffered some kind of water shortage. In Dallas, water was sold for half a dollar per gallon, with the populace queueing up for their purchases. In Orange, N.J., people were subjected to fines for leaky faucets.

These are not indications that we now face emergency. But with our increasing population and expanding economy, the United States will indeed face a national water shortage within the next 10 years—unless we plan ahead.

One area for planning is in control of water pollution. We use and reuse water many times as a river sweeps from its source to the sea. By further control of pollution, we are using the same water more often. But this, by itself, can't increase our water supplies enough.

A further answer is to investigate ways to make salty water into fresh. And the Freeport plant is the first to be built as a result of the first comprehensive study of the problem—the saline water program of the U.S. Government.

This program was established in the Department of the Interior in 1952, upon the urging of President Harry S. Truman.

Truman suggested that $25 million be appropriated for a 5-year research and development program. Congress authorized $2 million. In 1955, under the Eisenhower administration, this amount was increased to $10 million, and the duration of the program extended to 14 years. In 1958, an additional $10 million was authorized for demonstration units.

We have had 8 years of coordinated research through contracts with universities, research organizations and industry. This work has indicated that at least five methods can produce fresh water at a cost that we can afford to pay. Demonstration plants are now being built to test out three of them; plants to try out the other processes are being designed:

The plant being built at Freeport will test a method known as multiple-effect long-tube-vertical distillation. This plant, with a capacity of 1 million gallons per day, is being built on land made available by the Dow Chemical Co. Dow is supplying steam and utilities at cost, and will buy half of the output. The other half will be bought by the city of Freeport. The process (explained in detail on page 16) involves several techniques not now used in similar distillation units. Their use should bring the cost of producing 1,000 gallons of water to the $1 figure. The plant is designed for eventual expansion to produce 17 million gallons per day. The cost should then be reduced to 50 cents per 1,000 gallons or less.

A second million-gallon-per-day plant is also under construction near San Diego, Calif. This will use what is known as the multistage flash distillation technique. Cost of this plant will be shared by Federal, State, and city governments. Cost of the water per 1,000 gallons is estimated at about $1.

A third plant, designed to de-salt brackish water, is being built at Webster, S. Dak., and should be in operation late this year. This plant will use the electrodialysis process, producing 250,000 gallons of fresh water per day for somewhat less than $1—perhaps 80 cents—per 1,000 gallons. This process uses a combination of thin membranes and an electric current to remove salt from water. It is not economic for treating sea water (which contains 35,000 parts per million of salt). But it is ideal for use with the less salty brackish water found in many arid areas throughout the world.

The fourth plant, also to be used to purify brackish water, will be built at Roswell, N. Mex. This will use the forced circulation vapor compression process.

The fifth plant will probably demonstrate a "freeze-out" process, a relatively new technique. This may well turn out to be the most economical technique for treating sea water, since it takes far less energy to freeze water than to boil it. In this process, salt water is frozen into a slush, and the salt (which has not frozen) is washed away from the ice crystals. Present costs are about $1 per 1,000 gallons, but these can probably be lowered to under 50 cents.

Other techniques are also promising. Perhaps the most obvious one is solar distillation, using the sun's heat to evaporate water. Solar stills normally involve a shallow basin with a transparent cover. The sun heats the water and causes it to evaporate; the vapor condenses on the underside of the cover, and runs down into a trough for collection. Initial cost of such equipment is still quite high.

Numerous other processes are also being investigated. Many of them involve other variations on distillation, freezing, or electrical techniques that could reduce costs. But in addition, some entirely different methods are being tested. Certain types of algae absorb salt from water. They may be used in these separations. It may be possible to find liquids that will "dissolve" pure water, thus separating it from its salt.

Undoubtedly, some of the techniques that are still in the research laboratory will show enough promise to receive large-scale tests. Some may be more economical than current methods.

As a result, people are now looking beyond the specifics of plant and process, to come up with some kind of an estimate of potential use throughout the world. For indeed, manufacture of fresh water from salt in the United States—substantial though it will be—will represent only a small part of the ultimate total. A 1959 Senate report put it this way: "If we can develop low-cost means of bringing water to the thirsty lands and peoples of the world, we shall bring a boon to mankind that is even more meaningful than the conquest of space [something to] greatly enhance the prestige of the United States."

And spokesmen for the United Nations Special Fund have reported that at least 60 of the 100 underdeveloped nations and territories associated with the U.N. face water shortages that will require installation of plants and equipment to desalt brackish and sea water.

Four thousand years ago, Hammurabi, King of Babylon, introduced irrigation to the fertile area between the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers, and proclaimed: "I brought the waters and made the desert bloom."

Today we again stand on a threshold, ready to make more desert bloom.

An Inspiring Husband-and-Wife Team

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 14, 1961

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, many Members of the Congress and many others in public life in Washington and throughout the land have come to know a most extraordinary man by the name of Joe Capsin who writes to us from Honolulu. A very eloquent article concerning this man appeared recently in the Honolulu Advertiser in the column "In One Ear," by Bob Krauss. I shall include this article in its entirety; and I commend it to you as a story of great courage and accomplishment under difficult circumstances.

I shall not add any words of mine concerning Joe, but I do desire to point out a factor in his amazing career which would never escape the knowledge of those who know him personally but which might not be known to the casual

reader. Behind Joe, or perhaps it is more appropriate to say "beside him," watching over him, cheering him on if he needs it, mothering him, bullying him, and loving him devotedly is his wife, Louise. She is, herself, a most retiring individual and one who will probably be intensely embarrassed, but I hope pleased, by this humble tribute of mine. In Honolulu, across the Pacific, and in many places of the United States, there are people who have been helped by Joe's intercession in their particular needs. Let everyone of them realize that without Louise it could not have been accomplished and let those of us who are blessed by being on Joe's correspondence list ourselves recall Louise—the other member of an inspiring husband-and-wife team.

Mr. Krauss' article follows:

IN ONE EAR

(By Bob Krauss)

About 16 years ago during the Roosevelt administration, before Hawaii had seen a jet airplane, a man in a little white house in Waikiki went to bed.

And until last Sunday, he hadn't gotten up.

His name is Joe Capsin and he has acute arthritis. Since 1945 Joe has been on his back. He can sit up long enough to get a haircut, about 20 minutes.

But don't get the idea that Joe has nothing to do.

Ask any newspaper editor in Honolulu and he'll tell you that Joe Capsin has more letter writing energy than 10 newspaper readers combined.

Ask syndicated Columnist Drew Pearson and he'll tell you that Joe is his closest Hawaii contact. Half a dozen important Congressmen know Joe Capsin, through letters he writes on an electric typewriter.

Most of these letters deal with legal matters involving veterans (Joe is a disabled veteran) who don't know how to work their way out of mazes of redtape.

Through the grapevine they hear about Joe.

He thumbs through the law books on the shelves by his bed. Then he begins writing letters. Often he's able to save his client a lot of money.

Joe never takes pay. "Give something to the Salvation Army," he'll insist, "or to somebody who needs it."

So Joe is seldom idle even though he's in bed. In fact, most of the people he writes to don't know he's an invalid.

His friends in the Disabled American Veterans Club didn't know what to give him for his birthday this year. It was last Sunday.

A few days before, Bill Oshiro, who's principal at Kalihi-uka School, went to see Joe at 426 Namanaha Street. "The boys want to know what they can do for you, Joe," he said. "Is there anything you really want?"

"Well, yes, there is," Joe answered. "I haven't been around the island since I went to bed 15 years ago. That's what I really want to do."

Oshiro called the Hawaii Ambulance Service, hoping it wouldn't cost a small fortune to rent an ambulance for all day.

He discovered that Vernon Vogan, president, is a disabled veteran, a former Navy hospital corpsman who served with the Marines in World War II. He donated the use of an ambulance.

The DAV's chipped in to pay the salaries of two attendants for the day, Robert Naauao and Martin Kaninau.

At 8:30 a.m. last Sunday, the ambulance pulled up in front of Joe's house. He and his wife rode in back. Two cars completed the convoy.

In one car was Representative Philip Minn, his wife, Momi, and their family. In the other car rode Bill Yamamoto and Mitsuo Okinaga, U.S. Government workers, and Bill Beers, Jr., who works for the State. They are all DAV members.

First they drove around Waikiki where, 15 years before, the only hotels on Kalakaua Avenue had been the Royal Hawaiian and the Moana.

They took Joe to Kuhio and Kaiulani Avenues in Waikiki where Joe and his bride had lived in a house "in the jungle."

Now the same spot is a jungle of apartment hotels.

Unlike a lot of people, Joe doesn't feel sad about it. "Those new buildings are beautiful," he said. "The colors, the architecture."

They drove down Ala Wai Boulevard, across the bridge on Kalakaua, then backtracked to the Club 100 and 442d clubhouses. Joe said frankly he got lost.

Honolulu has changed so completely in 15 years that he didn't recognize it.

They made a stop at Punchbowl National Cemetery, then took a spin through the Wilson Tunnel. They swung around on Kaneohoe Bay Drive and back to Honolulu.

Everybody had lunch at Pearl City Tavern. It was the first time since President Roosevent died that Joe had eaten in a restaurant. He had jumbo shrimps, as "good as I had in New Orleans."

By that time he was getting tired. So, after one last stop at the home of Judge Delbert Metzger, they took Joe home. It was 3 p.m.

"You can't realize what that trip meant to me," said Joe. "I wouldn't trade that ride for anything. Not anything. There's nothing I would have rather done. It was wonderful."

When the new Royal Prince co-op apartments are finished, Joe and his wife will move his office-bedroom to their new home on the top floor. "Once I get up there," he said, "I don't expect to ever come down again. Unless it's for another trip around the Island."

Memorandum on Stevenson Plan To Drop Hungary and Tibet From the United Nations Agenda as "Cold War Issues" in Exchange for Soviet Agreement To Postpone Disarmament Debate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1961

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following memorandum by Mr. Christopher Emmet, chairman of the American Friends of the Captive Nations, of which I am proud to be a member, expresses the fears of this organization of the unfortunate suggestion to drop the Hungarian and Tibetan problems from the United Nations agenda.

Mr. Emmet's memorandum is forcefully presented and while I do not agree with his calling the countries of Eastern Europe Soviet colonies—they are conquered people, nothing more and nothing less—I agree with his overall presentation of the case for the captive nations. I also would like to include after the memorandum the proposed advertisement that summarizes the whole question very forcefully indeed:

MEMORANDUM BY CHRISTOPHER EMMET

The cause of the captive nations in the United States and the United Nations has obviously reached a crisis. It is up to our committee either to undertake energentic and even desperate measures, or to virtually go into hibernation until new events in European Europe, or a new crisis between the United States and the Soviet Union changes the present trend of U.S. Government policy and of public opinion. Since we are a bipartisan committee with several Senators and Congressmen, as well as others, who are active in the Democratic Party, there are obviously risks that in attacking any important policy decision of the Kennedy administration we will lose some of those members. Nevertheless, we took that risk with our Republican members when we attacked Eisenhower's handling of the Hungarian revolution, and to justify our existence we must take it now.

Good as President Kennedy's appointments and general policy pronouncements have been, his statements and policies during the campaign and since have not been very helpful to the particular cause we serve—the cause of keeping alive the memory of Soviet aggression and persecution in Eastern Europe and raising the issue of Soviet treaty violations and colonialism in the captive nations to a leading place in U.S. diplomacy and propaganda.

During the campaign and since, the President has talked about amending the Battle Act, which restricts aid and credits to the Communist countries of Eastern Europe, as if that were the sole policy choice available for him to advocate. There has been no similar reference to the possible need to increase the trade restrictions—though all diplomatic bargaining power depends on the stick as well as the carrot. The President's approach clearly suggests an attempt at improving relations with the satellite puppet governments step by step in the hope that this may wean them away from Moscow. His approach seems to exclude the use of economic and propaganda pressure which would increase the peoples' passive resistance in Eastern Europe as well as inspire criticism of Soviet colonialism abroad. This latter policy would increase the political and economic costs of Soviet colonialism and augment Western bargaining power in negotiating for a relaxation of Communist oppression. In our view, since the stability of the puppet governments is totally dependent on Moscow's support, the idea of bribing the Communist officials with concessions in trade or aid is naive. We should rather offer these economic concessions to the Soviet Union itself if it will permit more freedom in Eastern Europe; and conversely, we should threaten to increase propaganda and economic pressure against the puppet governments if the Soviet Union refuses to do so.

The so-called Titoist solution, which the President seems to favor, may be justified in the special geographic and political circumstances in Yugoslavia and Poland; it cannot possibly apply to the other countries of Eastern Europe where the governments are still totally subservient to Moscow. The approach our committee has always advocated is to weaken such governments rather than to help them by economic trade or aid, and to encourage the passive resistance of the captive peoples against these puppet governments and their Soviet masters. I need not recall all the arguments for our policy here, but I enclose a copy of our appeal to the Democratic and Republican platform committees, which is the most recent expression of our views.

The President has sensibly wanted to gain time to formulate his new policies, organize his administration and buttress our defenses before resuming negotiations with the Soviet Union. But in order to do this, Kennedy must persuade Khrushchev to agree to the postponement both of summit conferences and disarmament conferences (except for atomic tests). Evidently, part of the price Khrushchev wants the President to pay for such a postponement (aside from

our 2 months' toleration of the Soviet arms buildup in Laos) is to sacrifice the Hungarian and Tibetan items on the agenda of the present session of the U.N. General Assembly.

Although we sympathize with the President's motives, we believe that this price is too high. I enclose the text of a telegram which was sent to Ambassador Stevenson on behalf of our Executive Committee, which explains our views.

The Hungarian issue has already been partially evaded by the General Assembly for the last 3 years by the device of appointing a U.N. Commissioner, first Prince Wan Waithayaken and then Sir Leslie Munro, to negotiate for compliance with its resolutions, while the Communists have refused to even speak or write to these commissioners. This year, the Hungarian item was even omitted from the original agenda. It was only restored, together with the item on Tibet, in response to Khrushchev's resolution denouncing the United States over the U–2 incident. Therefore, unless Hungary is debated now, there are no grounds for confidence that it will ever be debated again.

Even if the Kennedy administration later wished to revive the Hungary issue, after abortive negotiations with the Soviets, or after new Soviet pressures on Berlin, it might be difficult to carry enough of the new nations with us in the U.N. In any case, it would damage the integrity of our cause if we abandon the Hungarian issue now for reasons of expediency, and treat Hungary as a source of weakness and a sore spot in our efforts to seek peace with the Soviet Union, instead of recognizing Hungary as a source of moral and political strength which increases the bargaining power of the West. Moreover, if our protests against aggression and injustice are cynically turned on and off according to our convenience, we will destroy all faith in our sincerity.

Nor can we count on the continued resistance of the captive peoples if we treat them as pawns in American foreign policy, to be remembered or not according to our interest of the moment. Yet Gen. Maxwell Taylor, whom the President admires, has described the passive resistance of these peoples now, and their potential active resistance in time of war, as one of the greatest deterrents against Soviet aggression.

The peoples' resistance depends on keeping their hope of eventual freedom alive. To do this, we must convince them, first, that we will never acquiesce in their present subjugation or make a deal with the Soviet Union at their expense; and second, that we are strong enough militarily, politically, economically and morally, to outcompete and out-last the Soviet Union in the struggle between our two systems for the future of the world.

The captive peoples know the weaknesses as well as the wickedness of communism. Nothing discourages them so much as signs of Western diplomatic retreats under Communist pressure, or Western gullibility toward Communist motives. They know of America's good will, but fear that we are naive, and any acts of ours which even appear to be acts of appeasement fulfill their fears on both these points.

In addition to all this, the ostensible grounds on which Ambassador Stevenson proposed to omit Hungary and Tibet from the agenda seem to me as dangerous as the omission itself. The theory is that we can negotiate better with the Soviet Union on disarmament or other matters if we are silent on the question of Hungary. Yet to attempt to negotiate with the Soviet Union without using the tremendous moral and propaganda weapons which her betrayal in Hungary, and her colonialism in Eastern Europe, represent, is to abandon the whole theory of negotiations from strength. It implies the adoption of Mr. Macmillan's thesis that we can hope for concessions from the Soviet Union on Berlin only by "relaxing tensions" and creating a "better atmosphere," instead of by increasing our own bargaining power by taking the propaganda offensive on Soviet colonialism, or even threatening to do so in order to get concessions from the Soviets. Yet Stevenson is doing it only to get a postponement of these negotiations.

Surely this is the apotheosis of the philosophy of appeasement which was so conscientiously carried out by Neville Chamberlin at Munich. Its adoption as official U.S. policy will put the American Friends of the Captive Nations, and all other organizations interested in the captive peoples, in the position of a shrill and irresponsible minority whose "warmongering" threatens the smooth course of negotiations.

The only hope is to dramatize the abyss into which we are imperceptibly sliding by such warnings as the enclosed advertisement. Certainly the American people as a whole, and the majority of the Catholic and other anti-Communist Democrats who voted for President Kennedy, had no realization that they were voting for this. This is especially true because Kennedy's many appeals for Polish freedom in the campaign were far better understood than his references to the Battle Act.

The policy of relaxing tensions to create a better atmosphere, without first removing the cause of the tension was clearly associated with the candidacy of Adlai Stevenson and not with that of President Kennedy. It was Kennedy who repeatedly promised negotiations from strength. Later the opposition from within the Democratic Party against the expected appointment of Stevenson as Secretary of State also indicated the strength of anti-Communist sentiment; yet it is the Stevenson policy which now seems to prevail in the case of Hungary and Tibet.

The President has just made an eloquent appeal for the Free Europe Committee at his last press conference on March 8, and we are sure that he will return again to the firmer line of pressure and propaganda to promote an eventual Soviet withdrawal, after he has had further experience with Khrushchev. He has never wavered in his position that we should never recognize the enslavement of Eastern Europe and it is only in connection with the methods of pressing for such freedom that he has shown any ambiguity. However, as mentioned above, if we cut Hungary and Tibet from the U.N. agenda now, the effects will haunt and hamper us in the future. This explains the urgency of our telegram and our proposed advertisement. The final decision will probably be made before our advertisement can appear, but paradoxically, if Hungary is cut from the agenda, we believe this warning of ours will be all the more necessary.

DRAFT FOR HUNGARY ADVERTISEMENT: CAN WE FORGET THE COLD WAR BY PRETENDING IT ISN'T THERE?

We are now being told that we must omit Hungary and Tibet from the U.N. agenda because they are cold war issues.

Everybody would like to forget about the cold war.

Nobody wants a war, cold or hot. Everybody longs for peace.

But we can't get rid of tensions by shoving their causes under the rug. We can only do it by removing those causes.

What is the cold war, anyhow?

The cold war started when the Soviet Union, after the triumph in World War II, made promises which it did not keep—

Remember Korea? Czechoslovakia? Vietnam? Hungary? Tibet?

The Soviet Union promised to respect the territorial integrity of the countries of Eastern Europe; the Red Army occupied them instead.

It promised the peoples of Eastern Europe that they could choose their own governments through free elections. The last free election in any of these countries was held in Czechoslovakia in 1946.

It promised that Germany would be allowed to unite in peace and freedom. Now, 15 years later, 20 Soviet divisions police East Germany; and the once great city of Berlin is split, its small area of freedom constantly menaced by Soviet tanks.

It promised to stop interfering in the internal affairs of other countries, and dissolved the Communist International, but subversion continues throughout the world, from Laos to the Congo.

Why is Hungary still on the U.N. agenda? Because in 1956, when the unarmed Hungarian people rose up against their Communist oppressors, the U.N. by an overwhelming majority called on the Soviet Union to withdraw its troops and permit Hungary to hold free elections. The Soviets are still in Budapest. The U.N. resolutions have been ignored.

Why is Tibet still on the U.N. agenda? Because in 1958 the Chinese Communists, disregarding all their promises, invaded Tibet, annexed it, and maintain themselves there by systematically murdering the Tibetan people.

Greece and Turkey are free today because the free world acted.

South Korea and South Vietnam are free today because the free world acted.

We did nothing when the Soviets took over Czechoslovakia in 1948.

We did nothing when Soviet tanks reentered Budapest in 1956.

We did nothing when the Chinese Communists overran Tibet in 1958.

Can we march toward a new frontier of peace and freedom while surrendering once-free peoples to aggression?

Can the U.N. expect to enforce its rule in the Congo if it does nothing about Hungary and Tibet?

Can we achieve a world of law if we enforce it in the free world only?

What do you think? Can we forget the cold war by pretending it isn't there?

AMERICAN FRIENDS OF THE CAPTIVE NATIONS.

Flaming Moderates: Harvard's GOP Advance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, a brilliant new magazine, called Advance, has burst upon the politico-literary horizon. The work of a bright, knowledgable group of Harvard Republican students, Advance is remarkable in its realistic grasp of the opportunities before the Republican Party, and of the problems facing the entire Nation. I had the pleasure of meeting the young publisher, Bruce Chapman, when he was in Washington recently, and I was tremendously impressed. Roscoe Drummond, the noted columnist, confirmed my views in a column which appeared in yesterday's Washington Post. Under leave to extend my remarks, I now insert this article:

FLAMING MODERATES: A HARVARD GOP MAGAZINE

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Harvard College does not have to be satisfied with manning the Kennedy administration with Democratic professors.

It is also manning a new magazine with

Republican students and giving the party the stimulus of vigorous, youthful, intellectual leadership which it has been needing for a long time.

When three young men from Cambridge, Mass., came to Washington a few days ago, they did not go to the White House to see Professor Schlesinger or Mr. Galbraith. They did not seek out President Kennedy's very own Massachusetts Senator, BENJAMIN A. SMITH II. They went directly to the office of an authentic New England Republican, Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, whom Massachusetts voters seem to prefer, 4 to 1, over any other brand.

These three Harvard students, who were in search of nothing except a chance to be heard, conferred with Republican Hill leaders, including Senator THURSTON MORTON, chairman of th Republican National Committee, and held a press conference without tripping over a missile gap.

The purpose of the new Harvard student magazine, Advance, is to espouse the politics of "Progressive Republicanism." The three most active in its creation are Publisher Bruce Chapman, of Illinois; Editor George Gilder and Business Manager Robert Beal, both of Massachusetts.

They made it clear that they are just as Republican as they are progressive. The practical initiative they are taking to provide a new forum for their ideas suggests no state of shock over the election and no preoccupation with "might have beens."

The editors of "Advance" are not connected with any formal Republican organization. The initial money came from some 200 Republican leaders in different parts of the country. The editors retain total control of the magazine's policy and their hope is to stimulate the Republican Party in the 1960's to find positive answers to political and social problems.

"It is imperative," they contend, "that the Republican Party help direct the future of America with programs that are both progressive and consistent with the best Republican traditions, that the party be a leader in its own right, instead of reluctantly being dragged down the path of history in the trail of some New Deal or New Frontier.

"While we eschew the doctrines of the New Frontier, we emphatically deny the tired 19th century formulas of arch conservatism. We are, if anything, 'flaming moderates' avoiding both the welfare state and primitive state."

When the editors of "Advance," as shown by the first issue, apply their broad principles to practical affairs, they support the progressive wing of the Republican Party in Congress—CASE, SALTONSTALL, COOPER, etc. They look with favor upon the nomination of either Richard Nixon or Gov. Nelson Rockefeller in 1964. They are critical of what they consider the overly dogmatic views of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, but argue that one of the virtues of the Republican Party is that it is not "committed to rigid ideologies," while the Democratic Party "is closely wed to the narrow point of view of unadulterated liberalism."

These young Republicans think—and hope—that the Nixon and Rockefeller forces will not split. They figure it would be a great mistake for either to do anything which would enable the extreme right to acquire control of the party.

The editors show every promise of getting out a zestful, provocative, and broadly interesting publication. On the political side there is a penetrating analysis of the election in New York State, a good profile of Representative JOHN LINDSAY, and an outline of the course which Senator CLIFFORD CASE charts for the Republican Party—a course of progress and preservation." But the magazine is not limited to politics. There are articles on the stakes in Germany and on arms control.

It has recently become fashionable to argue that there is a great rise of rightist opinion among students. Maybe there is a move from the extreme left. But the new Harvard Republican magazine hews strongly to center. It bespeaks the cause of the positive moderate.

Eulogy to Dr. Arthur H. Ruggles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1961

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, on January 2, Rhode Island lost one of its most beloved citizens with the death of Dr. Arthur Hiler Ruggles in his 80th year. His passing was a profound loss to the profession of psychiatry, and a personal bereavement to his many colleagues, students, friends, and patients. To us in Rhode Island his death brought a sharper sting of sadness for he had become almost a legendary figure after 40 years as superintendent of Butler Hospital. Although he was a native of New Hampshire, Rhode Island had been his home for the past 55 years.

In the sunset of life, Dr. Ruggles could look back over a career of more than half a century in the healing sciences of medicine and psychiatry. Wherever there is knowledge of mental health research, training, and high-level treatment, the achievements of this beloved physician are known and will be remembered. He was equally as well known for his pioneer participation in the synthesis of the first citizens' mental hygiene movement—so closely was he identified that his long and productive career parallels the history of the national mental health program from its first halting steps.

As a trailblazer in child guidance and college mental health, as the venerated superintendent of Butler Hospital, as forerunner in the citizens' mental health movement in this country, as consultant to the Secretary of War in time of crisis, as president of the American Psychiatric Association, as scientist, author, scholar, gentleman, and kindly mentor to all who sought his help and guidance—all of these suggest but do not adequately convey the full scope of his contributions to the psychiatric profession and to his country. In the words of Dr. Robert H. Felix, president of the American Psychiatric Association, "The profession of psychiatry has suffered the loss of one of the greatest among its leaders for more than a century since the founding of the American Psychiatric Association."

I have a special pride in eulogizing this grand old man of psychiatry for we shared a mutual tie as friends, as fellow Rhode Islanders, and a lively interest in the progress of mental health affairs. But only Dr. Ruggles, from his vantage of fourscore years, could clearly view the cavalcade of mental health in its progress over the years since 1909 when, as a young psychiatrist, he pledged himself to Butler State Hospital. The concern that we Rhode Islanders have today for the mental health of our felow citizens is a heritage nurtured by Dr. Ruggles in a half century of tireless toil at the hospital that he made famous. Here it was that this humane healer learned to sense intimately the plight of the mentally ill. To him, his patients were people first and always, and he used every forum to propagate the doctrine of humaneness in the care and treatment of the mentally ill. This was a novel philosophy two generations ago, and it is a measure of the herculean task that lay ahead of this pioneering humanitarian—for he had to unchain prejudiced minds before he could help to unshackle the mentally burdened.

The first citizens' mental hygiene movement materialized from the efforts of Dr. Ruggles and his colleagues to enlist volunteer truth squads to refute the canards and misconceptions that largely prevailed about insanity. His perseverance quickened the early trickle of public interest into a stream and justified the formation of the National Committee for Mental Hygiene of which Dr. Ruggles was president for some years. When the public's quest for enlightenment and hope swelled into a torrent, Dr. Ruggles and other volunteer groups fused their efforts into a mighty clearinghouse of mental health education and information that we know today as the National Association for Mental Health. This voluntary army of devoted lay citizens serves as the most substantial auxiliary to the profession of psychiatry in acquainting the American public with its No. 1 public health problem. This was one fond dream that Dr. Ruggles was privileged to see come true.

In World War I, Dr. Ruggles served as psychiatric adviser to the Secretary of War and as chief psychiatrist of the 2d Infantry Division of the AEF. Perhaps it was at this period that Dr. Ruggles and other caretakers of the Nation's mental health realized that nothing less than a federally mounted program of research, training, and prevention, could ever hope to turn back the mounting flood of emotional and mental illnesses.

Tragically, the lessons taught by that war were forgotten in the complacency of peace. Not until World War II revealed an even more disheartening picture was the public alerted to the need for a national mental health program. When the Congress of the United States approved the National Mental Health Act in 1946, Dr. Ruggles was in his 65th year. Another of his visionary ideas of long ago was now the law of the land. But this sage of psychiatry had no time to rest on his laurels. The enormous job that lay ahead was a challenge that he accepted—there was even more to do. He labored on—to share his judgment and wisdom as a consultant to the National Institute of Mental Health that had been established by the Federal Government to implement the National Mental Health Act—to occupy the most honored position in psychiatry as president of the American Psychiatric Association. Yet he still found time in his crowded hours to minister to the needs of his charges at Butler Hospital and at the Emma Pendleton Bradley Home which has such a distinguished record in the treatment of children.

What a great man he was and yet,

withal, a modest kindly man who sought no accolades but only the enduring satisfaction of a lifetime dedicated to illuminating the dark night of mental illness. And it can truly be said that Dr. Ruggles trod the footsteps of St. Luke the Great Physician. How else can one account for the reverence in which he was held by his brother psychiatrists, the veneration that we in Rhode Island had for the "grand old man" at Butler, and the warmth and humanity that pervaded every gathering when he was present. He won distinction for himself yet all that he accomplished for his fellow men flowed from a philosophy that was based on an inner conviction that he was his brother's keeper.

Background on Project HOPE

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1961

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, Include therein an article from the Fond du Lac Commonwealth Reporter, under date of February 23, 1961, and another article from the Oshkosh Daily Northwestern, of February 23, 1961, covering the activities of Miss Elizabeth Ahern, of Fond du Lac, Wis., who is presently serving aboard the SS *Hope*.

Project HOPE is a privately sponsored program to share this country's modern medical knowledge and skills with the newly developing countries. The SS *Hope I* is a floating medical training center for Southeast Asia in its first year of operation. The SS *Hope I* was formerly a Navy hospital ship, and is being loaned by the U.S. Government. It has the most modern medical equipment and supplies, and training aids. The ship, formerly the U.S.S. *Consolation*, is a 15,000-ton vessel, with 230 beds. It was constructed during World War II.

The permanent medical staff of the SS *Hope I* includes 15 physicians, two dentists, 25 nurses and 30 auxiliary personnel. Volunteer teams of up to 35 physicians will be flown to the ship on a rotating basis for tours of 4 months. The medical staff includes top specialists in the key fields of medicine. More than 2,000 medical people have applied for assignments on the SS *Hope I*.

HOPE is essentially a teaching program, although necessarily there will be treatment involved. American members of the medical staff will be assigned to work in small teams with their local counterparts. This will enable the American staffers to pass along modern techniques and the latest medical knowledge under working conditions.

Part of the medical staff will work on shipboard, part will form mobile, inland teams. They will work with physicians, surgeons, dentists, health officers, sanitation officials, nurses, midwives, and technicians.

The SS *Hope I* will visit only those countries to which it has been invited by the local medical professions. Indonesia is the first stop. The ship will remain there for about 6 months. Vietnam will be next, for a 4-month stay before its return to the United States. Invitations have also been received from Korea, Okinawa, and Pakistan. The ship left for Indonesia on September 22.

HOPE's program is geared to the specific needs of the countries visited. Activties are worked out in advance with local doctors. This will enable HOPE to concentrate on the most serious and pressing problems of each country.

This is the type of foreign aid that every American can take heart in. It is designed to help peoples to help themselves. HOPE is a gleaming symbol of the good will of Americans for the people of Asia.

The above-mentioned articles follow:

[From the Fond du Lac, (Wis.) Commonwealth Reporter, Feb. 23, 1961]

ELIZABETH AHERN, "HOPE" SHIP NURSE LAUDS HERITAGE

A local girl has gone halfway around the world to find out the farther she travels, the prouder she is to be an American.

"I feel as if we've really accomplished something," says Elizabeth Ahern, a nurse aboard the good ship *Hope*, currently waging the peace in southeast Asia. Miss Ahern wrote her experiences in a special report to Dr. William B. Walsh, president of Project HOPE, Washington, D.C.

Miss Ahern, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. T. L. Ahern, 229 East Division Street, is a graduate of the University of Wisconsin School of Nursing.

She has just completed serving her first 4 months aboard the American teaching and training ship *Hope*, currently anchored off the Indonesian island of Ambon, giving intensive short courses to local medical personnel. On March 6, the ship moves on to Kupang, another Indonesian island.

Working in the *Hope's* wards, Miss Ahern has cared for hundreds of patients who have been treated aboard the ship in connection with teaching seminars helds for local medical people.

PATIENTS GRATEFUL

"These patients are totally uncomplaining," reports Miss Ahern. "They are extremely grateful for anything that is done for them. One patient, who could speak only a few words of English, clasped my hand as she was discharged from the ship, and said slowly, 'I will not forget you.' "

The *Hope*, whose initials stand for "health opportunity for people everywhere," is supported by contributions from Americans in all walks of life.

One of the most gratifying moments of the entire journey, Miss Ahern wrote, was watching a 12-year-old Sudanese child feel the spot on his neck from which an ugly tumor had been removed.

"When the child was told the spot was gone forever, the expression on his face was enough to more than repay us for the long hours of work on that ward," the Wisconsin nurse wrote.

During the ship's stop at the island of Bali, Miss Ahern visited some of the Government-run leproseries and made recommendations for the distribution of bandages, vitamins, and medicines from the *Hope*.

At Sumbawa, in eastern Indonesia, she was a member of an inland medical team that set up an outpatient clinic in a warehouse.

FOUR HUNDRED ARE TREATED

"I had just finished writing a manual on the setting up of a shore clinic, and surprisingly enough, we were able to follow much of the manual right through to the finish," she said. American and Indonesian doctors treated more than 400 patients at the clinic during the 2 weeks the ship stopped at Sumbawa.

"Those we considered to be in need of further treatment we sent out to the ship," Miss Ahern reported. "By the time I finished work in the clinic, my Indonesian had improved considerably, having had to instruct the patients to take medicine three times a day, or to go out to the ship for further treatment, or to return to the clinic."

Miss Ahern has been aboard the *Hope* since it sailed from San Francisco late last September.

[From the Oshkosh, Wis., Daily Northwestern, Feb. 23, 1961]

NURSE WRITES OF WORK DONE BY PROJECT HOPE

A Fond du Lac nurse, who is well known in Oshkosh, has gone halfway around the world to find out the farther she travels, the prouder she is to be an American.

"I feel as if we've really accomplished something," says Elizabeth Ahern, a nurse aboard the good ship *Hope*, currently waging the peace in southeast Asia. Miss Ahern wrote her experiences in a special report to Dr. William B. Walsh, president of Project Hope, Washington, D.C.

Miss Ahern, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. T. L. Ahern, 229 East Division Street, Fond du Lac, is a graduate of the University of Wisconsin School of Nursing.

She has just completed her first 4 months aboard the American teaching and training ship *Hope*, currently anchored off the Indonesian island of Ambon, giving intensive short courses to local medical personnel. On March 6, the ship moves on to Kupang, another Indonesian island.

Working in the *Hope's* wards, Miss Ahern has cared for hundreds of patients who have been treated aboard the ship in connection with teaching seminars held for local medical people.

"These patients are totally uncomplaining," reports Miss Ahern. "They are extremely grateful for anything that is done for them. One patient, who could speak only a few words of English, clasped my hand as she was discharged from the ship, and said slowly, 'I will not forget you.' "

The *Hope*, whose initials stand for "health, opportunity for people everywhere," is supported by contributions from Americans in all walks of life.

One of the most gratifying moments of the entire journey, Miss Ahern wrote, was watching a 12-year-old Sudanese child feel the spot on his neck from which an ugly tumor had been removed.

"When the child was told the spot was gone forever, the expression on his face was enough to more than repay us for the long hours of work in that ward," the Wisconsin nurse wrote.

During the ship's stop at the island of Bali, Miss Ahern visited some of the Government-run leproseries and made recommendations for the distribution of bandages, vitamins and medicines from the *Hope*.

At Sumbawa, in eastern Indonesia, she was a member of an inland medical team that set up an outpatient clinic in a warehouse.

"I had just finished writing a manual on the setting up of a shore clinic, and surprisingly enough, we were able to follow much of the manual right through to the finish," she said. "American and Indonesian doctors treated more than 400 patients at the clinic during the 2 weeks the ship stopped at Sumbawa.

"Those we considered to be in need of further treatment we sent out to the ship," Miss Ahern reported. "By the time I finished work in the clinic, my Indonesian had improved considerably, having had to instruct the patients to take medicine three times a day, or to go out to the ship for further treatment, or to return to the clinic."

Miss Ahern has been aboard the *Hope* since it sailed from San Francisco late last September.

Peace Corps Typifies Great U.S. Tradition of Adventure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy's Peace Corps proposal has quickened the spirit of adventure which has been responsible for the growth and development of America. This aspect of the proposal was well discussed in an article by Frank Conniff, which recently appeared in the Milwaukee Sentinel:

PEACE CORPS TYPIFIES GREAT U.S. TRADITION OF ADVENTURE

(By Frank Conniff)

There is a certain irony in the objectives raised by so-called conservatives to President Kennedy's Peace Corps, an enterprise which even its most ardent protagonists admit contains elements of risk.

The demurrers for the most part seem to be coming from the very people who in recent years have been most vociferous in demanding that the United States "seize the initiative," "carry the fight to the enemy," and, in general take command of the cold war raging between two diametrically different systems.

Well, President Kennedy has answered their calls for action with the Peace Corps. It could well be that events will prove the move a disaster of the first order, but our President appears willing to assume the gamble.

PREFER OWN DEMANDS

Why, then, are the objectors unwilling to take the risk? On the surface it would seem they prefer to get their kicks from mere demands that action be taken to blunt communism's worldwide offensive rather than from approval or concrete anti-Kremlin steps launched by our chief executive.

What they all seem to have forgotten is that President Kennedy has more to lose from a failure of the Peace Corps than any of the conservatives who are inveighing so heavily against it.

DIRE PROPHECIES MADE

If the project blows up completely or even takes a bad bounce, the fingers of failure will be pointed directly at the White House and not at the objectors—mostly Republican sympathizers in the first place—who are presently muttering such dire prophecies about its future.

Two or three years hence, should the Peace Corps eventuate into a boo-boo of embarrassing proportions, it will be President Kennedy who will be hard hit to explain its disintegration, not the long-faced pundits who now are predicting its doom.

Conservative commentators claim there are many bugs in the Peace Corps proposal. They are undoubtedly right. But there are many bugs, too, in the various gambits unleashed by the Kremlin in its attempts to take over the world.

KHRUSHCHEV DARES

The fear of snafus does not seem to stymie N. S. Khrushchev, however, when he decides to tee off on free people. The old man appears willing to buck the wheel despite obvious risks, while Uncle Sam sometimes waits until every possible contingency is foreseen. By then, of course, it is often too late.

In the opinion of this reporter, the Peace Corps contains those elements of imagination, adventure, and hope that once caught the fancy of our wonderful country.

Would any citizen in his right mind have ventured across the plains in the old days when every mile teemed with possible death or destruction? Would our forebears have sailed around South America to reach the promised land of California if they had been deterred by lurking dangers?

These questions answer themselves.

DARING AIDED COUNTRY

We have become the great Nation that we are precisely because our people were willing to dare, to gamble, to go forward in the obstinate belief that the future belonged to them and that they could mold it to their own purposes.

In undertaking the Peace Corps, this same deeply held belief should motivate the young men and women we send into the world with the passionate hope that the future again can be shaped in their own idealistic image.

In fact, the opposition of their elders should encourage them in the same way that the fears of the skeptics in the old days goaded the adventurers to supreme efforts.

WORLD AT STAKE

For that is what is at stake in the world we live in today: the great globe itself. Not that we intend to force our own customs or beliefs on the millions who lag behind in material blessings. We simply must hold fast to the faith that the American concept is indeed something that can capture the imagination and the devotion of those aspiring billions who are even now looking for an ideal to follow.

My own belief is that the tide will turn in our favor as soon as enough people through the world are equipped by education and improved environment to read American history.

FINAL PAGES UNWRITTEN

We all tend to forget, in our occasional bouts of despair, that the American story remains one of the most glowing chapters in all recorded history and that its final pages are not yet in sight of being written.

Perhaps the Peace Corps will prepare the ground for millions of people who some day will read the American story with delight and wonder, sensing our grandeur without any misgivings about our might.

The conservatives should stop looking under the bed. Our young people are not afraid, and that's what counts. Blessings on the Peace Corps.

"Old Hickory" Was Tough, Forceful, Adventuresome

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 14, 1961

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following story from the Lancaster News, Lancaster, S.C., of March 9, 1961:

On the 15th day of March in the year 1767, a baby was born in the home of James Crawford and his wife Jane, located about 10 miles north of Lancaster, who was destined to become the 7th President of the United States.

A few days after the death of her husband, Elizabeth Hutchinson Jackson, sister of Jane Crawford, journeyed from their home at Twelve Mile Creek to the Crawford home where she was given refuge and there on the eve of the Revolution she gave birth to her third son. The baby was named Andrew.

History relates that as a specimen of the young manhood which was beginning to dominate the country as the rule of the aristocracy was waning and the control of government was beginning to pass to frontiersmen, no better example could be found than Jackson. He was described as uneducated, crude, and fond of fighting, but energetic self-confident, honest and straightforward. His friends loved him ardently and his foes hated him just as ardently. He is reported to have abundantly returned the hatred.

The call for soldiers to resist the British invasion appealed to the spirit of young Andrew and he interrupted his few years of formal education to enter the Army. On August 1, 1780, at the age of 13, he participated in the Battle of Hanging Rock. In 1781, he and his older brother were taken prisoners when an attempt to capture a body of British troops near Waxhaw Church failed. According to history, the sabre blow which was to mark Jackson for life was inflicted when he refused to black the boots of a British officer while he was being held prisoner.

Andrew's brother, Robert, was also wounded in the fray and their mother made repeated attempts to have the two wounded boys released from the British prison camp at Camden in an exchange of prisoners. She finally succeeded and the boys returned home where Robert died 2 days after his return. Elizabeth Jackson went to Charleston to nurse the sick and wounded American soldiers and she herself died there.

OLD HICKORY

Andrew Jackson did not remain long in Waxhaw County following the close of the war. In 1784, he began reading law in Salisbury, N.C., and 3 years later was admitted to the bar. In 1788, he was appointed prosecuting attorney of the Western District of North Carolina, now Tennessee, and moved to Nashville. In 1791, he married Mrs. Rachel Donelson Rolards, a daughter of John Donelson, a pioneer settler of Tennessee.

Jackson served as a Member of Congress, U.S. Senator and judge of the Supreme Court of Tennessee.

As a soldier, he become major general of the militia, Indian fighter and conqueror of the British forces at New Orleans. His high-handed and independent manner of conducting military successes made him the hero of the West and earned him the title of "Old Hickory."

PRESIDENT JACKSON

In 1828, he overcame John Quincy Adams to become the seventh President of the United States. With his inauguration, the control of Government passed from the "Virginia dynasty" and the Adams family to the rule of the frontiersman.

During his term as President, Jackson strengthened his party, and left them enthusiastic on his platform of low expenditure, payment of debt, and no taxes.

Throughout the remainder of his life, his name still remained a "spell to conjure with," but in general he refused political alliances and his last years were quiet and uneventful.

Death came to Jackson on June 8, 1845, at his residence "the Hermitage," near Nashville, Tenn.

BIRTHDAY CELEBRATION

On March 15, 1961, a group of patriotic Americans will again gather at Jackson State Park near Lancaster to pay homage to this native-born son whose heritage has so enriched the American way of life.

With words and with music, he will be honored as the 194th anniversary of his birth is celebrated.

The public is invited to join the celebration which will begin at 3 p.m. Donald Russell of Spartanburg will deliver the key address, and a number of out-of-town dignitaries will be here for the ceremonies, which are being sponsored this year by the South Carolina Daughters of 1812, the South Carolina State Commission of Forestry, and the Lancaster County Historical Commission.

Appendix

Faith in Our Scientists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, Dr. William Baker, in an article appearing in the Berkeley Review, has made an interesting and perceptive analysis of C. P. Snow's recent speech before the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Dr. Baker has explored the question of how scientists can best labor in the macrocosmos of the world outside their laboratories and libraries. He concludes that because of the large role scientists must play in human affairs that they must be trusted mightily.

This is a thoughtfully written article and I urge my colleagues to read it:

I am honored to respond, on behalf of the community of scientists, to the compelling issues drawn up so deftly in Sir Charles' address.

I should say, first that few, if any, scientists in the free world would be against his contentions about moral values and responsibilities. Therefore, I can most gainfully remark on a rather practical aspect of the matter, as becomes an industrialist—that is, the old query of what to do and how to do it, concerning public morally, since the matter of doing it or not is so convincingly treated by Sir Charles.

Thus, how can the scientists best labor in the macrocomos of the world outside their laboratories and libraries? This is what I shall try to answer.

First, above all, they must gain public trust and understanding, even though, because of its inner qualities, political, and social judgments derived from science may be less perfect than expected. Second, scientists must carry forth to all the world the bright hope, the good fortune, that science does betoken for mankind. We can indeed negate the spreading cynicism and nihilism of our time. Both are alien to science and to research. Science gainsays the words of a present-day anthropologist: "America is the only culture which has passed from barbarism to decline without going through a stage of civilization."

Science and its fruits do indeed confer that joy and sense of beauty—the esthetic content, as Sir Charles says—that can give our times social strength and buoyancy and liveliness. A society caught up in the great adventure of an Echo satellite, a reconstructed biological gene, a niobium-tin compound superconductor operating far above absolute zero—this will not lapse into Huxley's "Brave New World." Free people of today are ready to take up Wordsworth's offer:

"Come forth into the light of things,
Let Nature be your teacher.
She has a world of ready wealth,
Our minds and hearts to bless—
Spontaneous wisdom breathed by health,
Truth breathed by cheerfulness."

So, over all, scientists must learn to express just those human virtues which Sir Charles said so kindly in his opening words were theirs.

PUBLIC FAITH AND FOLLOWING

But now we have to go back to the first urgency for scientists—public faith and public following. The simple fact now is that scientists do not have the trust of people and of nations in dealing with the issues that Sir Charles raises—the issues of peace and war, of feast and famine, of life and death in their temporal forms. This is not a complaint; it is a realization. I could support this assertion by many grevious examples. Following Sir Charles theme, I shall, however, refer to only two. The first is the action that followed the scientific communities' plea of 1945–46 to achieve immediately nuclear disarmament and agreement on nuclear weapons between all nations of the world. Some statesmen in our own government indeed cared deeply about this issue. Some scientists worked hard with them to awaken the world and its politics to the nuclear terror shortly to come. These scientists enlisted others in an effort to see whether what looked to many like a monopoly of nuclear weapons would soon be a worldwide nuclear arms race.

I happened to be one of a task force that was gathered officially, with State Department sanction, at the very beginning of 1946 to prepare a detailed scientific estimate of just what Sir Charles now speaks of as an "engineering truth." We found, of course, the engineering truth that another country, explicitly the Soviet Union, would have nuclear weapons in a certain number of years after 1946—a number which we carefully estimated. Our estimate, which is a matter of record, was off by little more than a year, and it was, indeed, too conservative an estimate. But it was by no means trusted, and —an equally sorry circumstance—we lacked the skill to make people believe and heed it.

A somewhat similar but rather more complex situation besets us now in regard to the nuclear test ban. You remember that, following the technical agreement of the summer of 1958 for a test detection network, scientists working on the subject were obliged drastically to revise their estimate of the known efficiency of detection of nuclear events. This necessity and subsequent studies of the subject have aroused a widespread mistrust among national leaders, and perhaps among the populace at large, concerning the reliability of scientific judgments and decisions.

LIMITATIONS OF SCIENTIFIC CERTAINTY

So I would like, in the space available for comment, to say something about the inner nature of science and technology and of scientists and engineers—something which must be understood by all the world if we are to operate practically in the condition of moral unneutrality that has been invoked. These inner qualities really turn out to be special limits on science and technology. To state it baldly, scientifically there are limits on truth, there are limits on certainty, and there are limits on discovery itself. Maybe the limit on certainty is the most important to explore here. Scientific findings, scientific facts, are usually thought of as symbols of certainty. But people must realize that these findings are certain only with respect to a particular frame of reference. That frame of reference is, broadly, the present state of knowledge or the present position of scientific thought. Richard Feynman put this eloquently in a lecture on the value of science, delivered in 1955. He said, "We have found it of paramount importance that in order to progress we must recognize the ignorance and leave room for doubt. Scientific knowledge is a body of statements of varying degrees of certainty—some most unsure, some nearly sure, none absolutely certain. * * * Now we scientists are used to this, and we take it for granted that it is perfectly consistent to be unsure—that it is possible to live and not know." And so the world, facing the possibility of an era blessed by the fruits of science, as Sir Charles points out, must learn to accept the uncertainties of science.

Correspondingly, the truth is also subject to drastic revision in the light of discovery. Note carefully the difference between this kind of revision of truth and that in which the truth is compared to falsehood, deceit, or clumsy human error. Indeed, since wave mechanics has supplemented classical mechanics in the description of material events, the scientists' own concepts of truth and certainty have dramatically changed. But much of the popular view of science is still related to the deterministic description of the state of a physical system. Technically, this reached its climax in Newton's revelation of the basis of Kepler's laws governing the motion of the heavenly bodies. However, in atomic physics this causal deterministic account has been vigorously displaced by the quantum theory, involving a universal quantum of action. Thus, for nearly 60 years the physicist, and later the chemist, have had to make experimental conditions such that they could describe universally their findings without being dependent upon a particular quantum which was being observed at that particular time. In other words, to make these experiments anything like a truthful description we have had to work with such heavyhanded measurements that the individual quanta of action were completely disregarded. However in doing this we threw away the oldtime goal of certainty of position in time or in space, and thus a certainty of movement, too.

Hence, in a quite technical way, but with an abiding philosophical meaning, the scientists of our age and also the engineers who work with nuclear physics and with the tools of solid-state electronics, like transistors and magnets, have already come to terms with the kind of uncetrainty and incomplete truth with which they must live. But, along with this, of course, there is a quantization of truth. Never can the scientist deal with a half truth even though it may resemble that fragment of Irish confetti called a "half brick" in that both are said sometimes to carry further than the whole. The scientist has to tell the whole truth as he knows it in that moment in time, and nothing less or different can be expected. The situation relative to detection of underground nuclear explosions vividly illustrates this.

SCIENCE AND COMPROMISE

This brings us to some other large limitations in the tactics of science with respect to their harmonious integration in human affairs. For instance, that esteemed virtue of

some of the noblest leaders of societies and of nations, the ability to compromise, is painfully, utterly lacking in the scientist producing new science. My late colleague Karl Jansky had powerful reasons for regarding the sibiliant murmurs of his sibilian radio research antennas as some earthborn interference. This would have been just the sensible thing to decide on and allow for in the decisions on power and frequency then shaping up for long-distance radio usage. But the refusal of any researcher to compromise the posibilities led Jansky to the discovery of radio astronomy through radiation from the stars. Likewise, we cannot say that we will make an international agreement defining the correct amino acid sequence in the helix of a protein-nuclear acid molecule, convenient as that might be. In constrast, of course, we do make just such agreements about the gold value of the dollar, about international law, even about the time of day. Is it not well that science warns that all cannot be compromised? George Orwell, in 1884, warns grimly about such deep danger to human freedom: "For it is only by reconciling contradictions that power can be retained infinitely."

DISCOVERY AND INDIVIDUALITY

Finally, concerning the limitations on discovery, here we must respond to the popular queries, Why don't the scientists do the things we need to have done—why isn't there a cure for cancer now, why don't we have a defense against nuclear weapons, why cannot we make more reliable moon rockets, why don't we understand the forecasting of weather? Thus, on and on, the infinity of unanswered questions flows, and as long as the human race advances, so will it ever flow. The point is that the scientist does not really know how to multiply—or perhaps one might better say to distribute—his efforts. It is not useful for a team of 100 scientists each to have one one-hundredth of a good idea. No one ever synthesized an important new idea in science that way. The ideas of scientific discovery come one at a time from one person and one mind at a time. Sometimes two or three can aid each other. But scientific discovery cannot be collectivized, and does not flourish in collectivized structures. As Sir Charles has said, individuality, independence, scientific nonconformity are the requisites for discovery.

Even then, how hard and slow it is. Take the case of light—the mystery and adornment of the universe since the Creation: "Let there be light." Thousands of scientists have studied it, in tens of thousands of ways. But only this year was the concept of coherent light—light whose waves start and go from a source in unison—realized in the optical maser. Thus, Schawlow and Townes envisioned, and there have been achieved, light never before beheld. This is past the halfway point of the 20th century—what else, indeed, have scientists not beheld? All these things too, I hope, the people will understand and will have sympathy for, when science has the operational role for which Sir Charles Snow petitions.

Altogether then I ask that scientists be trusted mightily in view of the changes, the revisions, the alterations that they will constantly have to make in their role in large human affairs. In the small, they do almost universally trust each other, as Sir Charles has brought out so eloquently in his novels, even by dramatizing the rare cases of mistrust. The experiences of many decades now have shown that this trust is merited and does good.

Can Kennedy Meet the Test?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I recently read a most provocative column written by Mr. Constantine Brown entitled "Can Kennedy Meet the Test?"

This excellent commentary by Mr. Brown is most interesting and informative and, in my estimation, is worthy of widespread attention. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAN KENNEDY MEET THE TEST?
(By Constantine Brown)

Will President Kennedy be able to fulfill the Herculean task ahead of him? All Americans, regardless of party, hope he will, because they realize we are approaching a "quarter to twelve" situation.

Domestic problems are serious, but they can be improved with discipline and intelligent and honest administration. We still are potentially the richest country in the world with our ingenious and imaginative population. It is in the foreign field, however, that all the administration since 1945 have failed us. The enormous wealth-draining budgets; the ideological confusion which prevails in this usually well-balanced and patriotic Nation. The intellectual segment which is siding with our enemies at the expense of our friends, has its roots in the mishandling of international affairs.

OUR PRESIDENTIAL FAUX PAS

President Roosevelt created Russia's great might at the end of the war when he sacrificed the Eastern Europe and border states to Stalin's thirst for territorial aggrandizement. President Truman increased the power of international communism when he presided over the taking of China by the Communists. Finally, under the administration of President Eisenhower, we witnessed the emergence of militant communism in the Caribbean and Latin America. The spearhead is Fidel Castro and his fellow conspirators, whom we actually helped take over Cuba and thus establish a beachhead of international communism on our doorsteps.

Authoritarian governments have been historically repugnant to the American way of thinking. This repugnance has been injected into our international relations. In our struggle to contain communism, it became essential for us to accept the assistance of nations which, in order to ward off the Red menace, were compelled to maintain nondemocratic forms of governments. We overlooked for the last 15 years the fact that we "can't have the cake and eat it, too." To counter the threat of world domination by those who vowed to destroy freedom, we supported, on a quid pro quo basis, nations which were not following our political image. Thus, after accepting the regimes of managed democracy such as in Portugal and Spain, we are now creating the impression that we would be glad to support those who want to overthrow them.

The recent incident of the Portuguese luxury ship Santa Maria is an example. According to all precedents of maritime and admiralty law, Henrique Galvao, who hijacked the liner with a motley crew of Spaniards in exile and Argentine, Italian and French Communists besides a sprinkling of Portuguese opponents of Dictator Salazar, is guilty of piracy on the high seas. This was the first admission of our own Government as soon as the news reached Washington.

Yet within less than 48 hours we changed our attitude, not only because the administration was concerned over the safety of the American tourists aboard the Santa Maria, but also because it was thought by some administration advisers that it would be wise to play it cozy with the men who might conceivably replace the Salazar regime. We have treated Galvao with the courtesy to be extended the head of a revolutionary junta instead of dealing with him as a pirate.

THE SPANISH FREEZE

Similarly, the new administration has given indications of coolness toward Spain, where civil rights, as we understood them, do not exist. While Mr. Kennedy, after his victory, replied instantly to Premier Khrushchev's congratulations, he waited for nearly a month to answer Generalissimo Franco's felicitations. Last week, when a Pentagon official gave a briefing to a number of Congressmen about our bases abroad, Spain was represented by a white blotch on the map. When asked about our five bases in that country, the official replied, "This is now a political matter which cannot be discussed in my briefing."

A high-ranking American diplomat in Madrid suggested informally to Spanish officials that Generalissimo Franco would be wise to announce that he needs no further economic and military aid from us. He intimated that this would spare him the humiliation of having them cut off when the next foreign aid bill is presented in April to Congress.

Yet the Iberian Peninsula is immensely important to the common defense against Communist imperialism, of which President Kennedy is keenly aware. We have vital airbases in the Azores and even more important bases in Spain. Both will have to be renegotiated next year.

In his state of the Union message, the President emphasized the importance of NATO and complained that "in Europe our alliances are unfulfilled and in some disarray." Western Europe, however, does not have a parochial approach to the forms of governments of even its allies. Hence even the liberal-minded British wonder where our present attitude might take the coalition of free nations.

Interconnection of Electric Power Transmission Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I am happy to note that Secretary Udall is acting expeditiously to improve the marketing facilities for the electric

power produced by Federal water projects.

I refer to the program that he proposed last week for transmission line construction—particularly an extra high voltage common carrier intertie between the Pacific Northwest and the Pacific Southwest. The Secretary has appointed a task force to study the feasibility of interconnecting the Bonneville and Central Valley project systems, and possibly also the Colorado River system. He wisely has directed that any such program must show mutual economic benefits to all the regions involved, and that any area of hydro surplus—such as the Northwest for the present—must have legal safeguards to assure it a permanent priority in the use of power generated in its own region.

I believe such a development can provide benefits to the electric consumers of all agencies, both public and private. A common carrier intertie would be available to anyone willing to pay the transmission fee. Public agencies and private companies both could take advantage of the hydro surpluses that occur in different months in different river basins. This kind of interregional integration can make two plus two equal five.

Closely linked with Secretary Udall's intertie study is his announcement of a program to complete the Trinity project transmission system by the construction of all-Federal lines to Tracy which is the CVP load center. These too can be common carrier lines.

The companion announcements—one on the intertie task force and the other on Trinity—are described in more detail in two Department of the Interior press releases which I would like to submit for inclusion in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the announcements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TASK FORCE ON WEST COAST POWER INTERTIE

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall today named a five-man departmental task force, headed by Charles F. Luce, Bonneville Power Administrator, to study feasibility of an extra high-voltage common carrier electric transmission line between the Pacific Northwest and the Pacific Southwest.

Secretary Udall emphasized that any interconnection must be mutually advantageous to economic growth and conservation of energy in both regions involved. He charged the task force with recommending legal safeguards to assure that each power producing region will have a permanent priority in the use of electricity generated on its rivers and streams.

Udall declared this action was in keeping with President John F. Kennedy's recent message on natural resources and that immediate action is being taken because of developments in the Pacific Northwest which involve the Canadian Treaty, the proposed dual-purpose reactor at the Hanford Atomic Plant, and the need for maintaining the Pacific Northwest's low power rate.

Udall revealed that the Bonneville Power Administration's surplus has been reduced from $78,800,000 to $53 million in the past 4 years and the Administration will operate with an additional $13 million deficit this year because of the lack of markets for secondary energy. The Secretary said some $30 million worth of electric energy would waste over the spillways of Columbia River Federal dams this coming year because of inadequate transmission lines to market areas. "If this situation persists there will be heavy pressure to raise power rates in Bonneville Power Administration's service area—a step that seems unnecessary, and one we must take every means to prevent."

Udall emphasized that the proposed treaty with Canada would intensify the need for bold plans to market the Canadian and the Northwest power. Udall's directive said: "The possibility of integrating Canadian power supplies with the Pacific northwest-southwest intertie should be fully explored, and the plans of the British Columbia power agencies ascertained in this regard."

The Secretary further stated: "I am specifically requesting that in making this preliminary report the task force consult with the public and private power agencies in the areas affected, industrial customers of Federal power systems, and the Governors of the affected States, and other interested groups."

Secretary Udall asked that the task force studies consider the effect of the proposed intertie on existing energy resources and uses—oil, gas, and coal.

Other members of the task force who will submit a preliminary report to Assistant Secretary for Water and Power, Kenneth Holum, are: Morgan Dubrow, Washington Office Manager of the Bonneville Power Administration; Bernard Goldhammer, Bonneville Power Administration Commercial Operations Officer, Portland, Oreg.; Hugh P. Dugan, Regional Director of the Bureau of Reclamation, Sacramento, Calif.; and Milton A. Chase, General Engineer in the Assistant Secretary's office in Washington, D.C.

SURVEY WORK TO BEGIN ON ALL-FEDERAL TRANSMISSION FACILITIES FROM TRINITY

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall today approved recommendations to proceed with surveys and design work looking toward construction of all-Federal transmission facilities to distribute electric power from the Trinity Division of California's Central Valley project.

No rights-of-way will be purchased until surveys are complete. The Congress will have to approve the necessary construction funds.

The recommendations followed several months of study by the Bureau of Reclamation which showed this course of action would yield considerable financial gain to the Government over a period of years.

The recommendations approved by Secretary Udall are:

1. Construction of all Federal common carrier transmission facilities for Trinity power.

2. Utilization of 1961 appropriations of $320,000, already made by the Congress, for surveys and design work south of Keswick, Calif.

3. Consideration of construction of Trinity lines so they could be converted to a 500-kilovolt transmission line from near Keswick to Tracy, Calif., these considerations to be based on the possible future use of these facilities, if future strides show feasibility, as a section of the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest intertie which is under study.

4. Authorizing the Bureau of Reclamation to contract for engineering work, location and design of Federal transmission facilities and to obtain data for necessary right-of-way acquisition so as to speed up the program.

"Our decision was purely a matter of economics," the Secretary declared.

He said Bureau of Reclamation comparisons indicate that 50 years after the San Luis unit goes into operation the Central Valley project would produce a surplus $12 million larger than if the Government entered into an alternative wheeling contract. This assures repayment of all reimbursable costs including those of the Trinity division. The $12 million advantage to the United States includes an estimated salvage value of at least $10 million at the end of the 50-year period.

The all-Federal system would consist of 230-kilovolt transmission lines to transmit energy from Trinity powerplants to Cottonwood and on to Elverta, as well as facilities for 230-kilovolt lines from Elverta to a point called East Sacramento to Tracy, together with powerplant transformers, switchyards, and terminal equipment.

Cost of these facilities is estimated at $28,800,000.

Discrimination in Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, recently in a television interview I was asked about a so-called civil rights gap in President Kennedy's administration. My immediate response was that this gap has been closed by the moral leadership the President has already demonstrated. He has associated himself with the morality of the Supreme Court integration decision; he sent a telegram to Williamsburg applauding the brave people who are beginning integration in the South. The voice from the White House has been heard; our citizens know where the President stands on civil rights.

The most direct action taken by the President was the recent opening of a campaign to eliminate discrimination in employment. He intends to take every possible action to combat bias at its economic base; I am sure that we can expect lasting and significant progress in this effort.

The President's actions have already caused much editorial comment. I would like to have reprinted in the RECORD a few of them: from the AFL–CIO News of March 11, the Christian Science Monitor of March 8, the Daily Home News, New Brunswick, N.J., of February 24, and the Newark, N.J., Evening News of March 8.

I ask unanimous consent to have the above editorials printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Daily Home News, New Brunswick, N.J., Feb. 24]

JOB EQUALITY FOR THE NEGRO

One of the areas in which President Kennedy seems to be moving forward swiftly is in opening up the Federal services to members of hitherto discriminated against minorities.

A striking case in point is his selection of Clifton R. Wharton, a career diplomat, to be Ambassador to Norway.

Wharton is a Negro. He is not the first Negro to hold an ambassadorial post, for some Negroes have attained that status as political appointees. But he is the first Negro to ascend this high in the diplomatic service as a career man, winning his job on merit.

It will be recalled, too, that Kennedy, when his Cabinet was still in the formative stage, offered a Cabinet post to a Negro Congressman, who declined the appointment.

We anticipate in the years immediately ahead that Kennedy will be registering many more "firsts" in giving the Negro the place to which he is entitled in the Federal service. And we think that this example at the Federal level will be instrumental in leading other governments at lower levels along the road toward complete equality of job opportunity for the Negro.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 8, 1961]

CIVIL RIGHTS AND JOBS

Franklin Roosevelt initiated the use of Federal contracts to combat racial discrimination in work performed for the Government. Dwight Eisenhower expanded the effort under a committee headed by Vice President Nixon. Now John Kennedy has set up his own machinery for the same purpose. Its utility will depend very much on the spirit in which it is operated.

Civil rights advocates should not assume that vigor will be lacking because the new Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity is to be headed by Vice President JOHNSON. The Texas has a record of practical steps to advance civil rights, legislatively and by his own acts. Yet the record of these Presidential committees indicates that this one faces real problems.

Contracts pledging employers not to discriminate in their hiring have been written before. Now contractors will be asked to take active measures against discrimination, under threat of cancellation and blacklisting. But there are no visible sanctions against labor unions which discriminate, and in the past unions have been among the most stubborn discriminators. The Secretary of Labor is to be a member of the committee and much will depend on how his agents police Federal contracts.

The Executive order setting up this committee is the first action of the Kennedy administration to carry out strong promises on civil rights in the Democratic platform. It had been expected that the President would find it more feasible to move in this way than through new legislation which would meet entrenched congressional opposition. If this is the administration's main early move on civil rights the need to make it effective is doubly sharp.

[From the AFL–CIO News, Washington, D.C., Mar. 11, 1961]

A MAJOR ANTIBIAS STEP

President Kennedy's first Executive order in the civil rights field is a major step in the campaign to eliminate discrimination in employment.

The strengthening and expansion of the antidiscrimination machinery through the creation of a new President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity holds out real promise that "Americans of all colors and beliefs will have equal access to employment within the Government and with those who do business with the Government."

The President's action came a few days after the AFL–CIO Executive Council adopted a resolution at its mid-winter meeting welcoming indications that proposals to strengthen the committee were under consideration. The council declared that "even without statutory authority the President can—and should—strengthen the Government contract nondiscrimination policy."

The AFL–CIO hopes that the new Committee will look into the federation's proposals that its authority be extended to cover all grant-in-aid programs, that it require nondiscrimination throughout a contractor's labor force and that it will in fact disqualify violators of the nondiscrimination pledge until cause is removed and cancel existing contracts.

As the executive council declared: "Prejudices and century-long practices cannot be wiped out overnight by decree. But the work of extending the frontiers of equality must go on. The AFL–CIO pledges to do whatever it can to cooperate with the newly created Committee in the furtherance of this goal."

[From the Newark Evening News, Mar. 8, 1961]

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

In no area of American life is group discrimination more apparent or seemingly more stubbornly rooted than in the occupations by which men earn their bread and butter. Thus it is fitting that the President now creates a Committee well armed to set the rules for achieving equal opportunity in employment by the Government or its contractors.

By assuring the Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity the use of the Labor Department offices to supervise the program and investigate complaints, Mr. Kennedy corrects a handicap of previous committees. And by attmpting the job through Executive order rather than legislation, he skirts the controversy civil rights proposals invariably evoke in Congress.

The new Committee's membership gives promise of a cohesive effort to eliminate discrimination from Federal hiring practices. Its Chairman is Vice President JOHNSON and includes Labor Secretary Goldberg, who as Vice Chairman, will undoubtedly be its sparkplug, the Attorney General, Defense Secretary, Army, Navy and Air Force Secretaries, the General Services Administrator, and the chairmen of the Civil Service Commission, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Atomic Energy Commission.

That is as formidable a team as has ever been fielded in the fight to make Government practice what it preaches. Holders of Federal contacts are drafted to press the fight at the front—where the jobs are assigned. Where they fail to comply with this very proper Government employment policy, they will, barring a good explanation, find their contracts terminated.

Labor unions, too, will be pressed to abandon archaic discrimination habits, something that the AFL–CIO has not been able to accomplish by itself. President Kennedy should find many allies in his effort to eradicate discrimination in employment. For discrimination in this part of our national life, together with discrimination in voting and education, constitutes a national disgrace that neither our economy nor our conscience can longer tolerate.

Views on the Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, it is conspicuously apparent that today confusion hangs like a heavy cloud over United States-Russian relationships. And the American citizen's vision is dimmed by smoke rising from fires built by international pyromaniacs and from steam generated by the hot and cold antics of front men of certain unfriendly countries.

A letter submitted to the Bangor Daily News under date of January 27, 1961, by my good friend, Harold Walden, of Greenville, Maine, serves as a sweep of fresh air, for it clears away the mists that enshroud the causative factors of the cold war and extends each one of us the warm comfort of viewing a highly practical and promising solution.

I would like to share this unique optical experience with my colleagues; hence, I submit Mr. Walden's letter to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

GREENVILLE, MAINE, *January 27, 1961.*

EDITOR, BANGOR DAILY NEWS:

In your leading editorial of January 21 you speak of the cold war as being between "two dominant powers built upon contrasting ideologies arrayed against each other." Is not this popular concept the very basis of our failure to find a solution to the problem?

To be sure capitalism and communism, carried to extremes, are opposed in ideology; but today this Nation is no longer capitalistic in the Marxian sense nor is Russia steeped in extreme communism. The problem lies in the fact that the peoples of Russian and of her so-called satellites are dominated by ruthless minorities which, hiding behind a false front of communism to which they give lip service only, seek to dominate the globe. Our great mistake is in treating these minorities and their top henchmen of the moment as though they represented the peoples involved.

How naively gullible can we be? A recent pronouncement by Khrushchev is being hailed in certain quarters as the most important since World War II. Actually this harangue and others from the same source have importance comparable to that of cheese to a mouse trap. But are we mice or are we men? No attempt at negotiation between the free nations and these self-appointed dictators, from Hitler down to Castro has ever produced anything but frustration, humilitation, and lost prestige. It is a major tactic of their craftiness to take us in these traps, tempted thereto by wishful thinking. When the widow of a late and great President invites this Khrushchev into her very home; when a President, a man of unquestioned integrity, naively says to this glibly lying butcher, "call me friend," is it surprising that we win the distrust, even the contempt, of freedom-seeking peoples?

What then is the solution to this problem which confronts the entire world and concerning which the world looks to us for the answer? It would appear that we should, insofar as possible and as peaceably as possible, bypass these ruthless, self-appointed, and nonrepresentative dictators and make every effort, both officially and unofficially, to reach the peoples involved with the message that we stand and shall stand ready to go much more than halfway in negotiating and cooperating with their true representatives to the end of peace, freedom, and human progress.

HAROLD WALDEN.

Tribute to E. J. Haslerud

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, North Dakota agriculture is losing one of its best and devoted friends

in the retirement of Mr. E. J. Haslerud, Director of the North Dakota Extension Service. Mr. Haslerud has for 34 years been associated with the extension work in North Dakota and is very widely known among our farmers for the good work he has done.

I am sure Mr. Haslerud is remembered, too, by many members of the Senate Appropriations Committee for his many able appearances before that committee in behalf of appropriations for the Extension Service.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Minot Daily News, published at Minot, N. Dak., on Saturday, March 11, paying a well-deserved tribute to this fine gentleman and public servant.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIS CONTRIBUTION WAS GREAT

It's a pleasure to note that several organizations recently have paid public honor to a mild-mannered man at Fargo by the name of Ed Haslerud.

These honors come as it becomes public knowledge that Mr. Haslerud will be retiring this year as director of the North Dakota Extension Service. A month ago the Northwest Farm Managers handed him an accolade when they recognized him as "Pioneer of the Year." This week the North Dakota Council of Homemakers presented a gift.

The term "pioneer" fits Mr. Haslerud's career in agricultural extension work quite well. He has been a worker in agricultural education since 1917, and has been associated with the extension service in our State for 34 years. In that period farm extension work in North Dakota has grown up with the country. It was still a new and struggling agency, feeling its way to the confidence of practical farmers, when Mr. Haslerud became one of its able advocates. Extension work has burgeoned into a farflung and considerably specialized organization, gaining general acceptance through the service it has rendered, in the 30 years in which he has been on the North Dakota staff.

In no small degree the acceptance that extension work has gained during Mr. Haslerud's directorship is due to his even-tempered, fairminded view of North Dakota and its agricultural problems. To the best of our knowledge, all farm groups and factions in the State have agreed that Mr. Haslerud has been motivated by a sense of fairness to all, and by a spirit of public service.

In Ward County we have benefited from the fact that we had opportunity to become well acquainted with Mr. Haslerud early in his career, while he worked here as county agent.

Italy Today and Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABNER W. SIBAL
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, this year Italy is celebrating her 100th year as a unified, modern nation. The following editorial from the Saturday Review gives an excellent picture of the strength and progress of this valued partner in the free world. It was written by James D. Zellerbach, former U.S. Ambassador to Italy:

ITALY TODAY AND TOMORROW

(EDITOR'S NOTE: The following guest editorial is by James D. Zellerbach, who retired last month as Ambassador to Italy after having served in that post since 1957. Mr. Zellerbach, president of the Crown Zellerbach Corp., succeeded Clare Boothe Luce as Ambassador.)

Within the century since the establishment of modern Italy, no single period of development has produced more dramatic changes on this endlessly fascinating peninsula than the past 15 years. From the most destructive war in its history, Italy is not only emerging as an industrial nation of the first rank; it is also enjoying a major cultural renaissance whose impact extends far beyond its frontiers.

The Italian economy, stimulated after the war by American aid, has been expanding at the rate of 6 percent a year, well ahead of the rate of population growth. Due to the classic economic disparities between different regions of Italy, this expansion has been largely concentrated in the north, especially Piedmont and the Po Valley. It is the north that has provided much of the impressive statistical evidence and tempo of Italian economic growth, such as the doubling of Italy's national income in the last 10 years, the favorable blanace of payments, and the soundness of the lira.

But the south, the Mezzogiorno, the object of countless official investigations and false starts, is beginning to shake off its past of impoverishment and neglect. The Cassa per il Mezzogiorno, or Fund for the South, is providing a broad range of incentives to stimulate agricultural production and industrialization in Sicily, Sardinia, Apulia, Calabria, and the other southern provinces. New highways, railway lines, and electric power systems, including nuclear power stations, have been built or are under construction. Petro-chemical plants are rising at Brindisi, Gela, and Syracuse. Taranto will soon be producing steel.

The Cassa also performs the unique function of financing archeological excavations, in some cases combining slum clearance with the resurrection of Roman provincial cities—a novel form of urban renewal. This is not as farfetched as it sounds. The Italian Government is vigorously promoting tourism, now a $500 million industry in Italy. If the south is poor in natural resources, its wealth in antiquities is a major attraction to visitors from other countries.

Up to now, however, the Cassa has not appreciably narrowed the economic gap between southern and northern Italy. The northern industrial centers have benefited from its investments along with the south, since they have been busy manufacturing the tools for southern industrial expansion. But there is at least the possibility now that the cumulative effect of development in the Mezzogiorno will generate the spark of regional economic self-propulsion.

Because of its depressed areas, Italy continues its long struggle with unemployment and underemployment. The high rate of growth has absorbed new people coming into the labor market, and unemployment in recent years has dropped from 10 to 6 percent of the labor force. But the economic misery of the nearly 2 million Italians who cannot find work is tragic reality of contemporary Italian life. There was a time, however, when Italians despaired of ever finding a decent living for their whole population within the limitations of their economy. Now, almost for the first time in history, no Italian need regard himself as permanently surplus to the needs and resources of his country.

The confusions of Italian political life continue to baffle the foreigner, and I suspect not a few Italians. The Italian political spectrum has not been substantially altered by the country's economic expansion and rising living standards. Of the democratic forces, the Christian Democrats form by far the largest single party. However, they do not constitute a majority in Parliament and are themselves a coalition of various factions. Unless the situation changes, the Christian Democrats cannot govern without outside support, and none of the smaller democratic parties can form a government without them.

The Italian Communists are still the largest Communist party in the free world, and have the second largest representation in Parliament. To keep their electorate today, however, the Communists have to follow, not lead it. Both in politics and the labor movement, where they are deeply entrenched, the Communists now try to present themselves as the advocates of mild reform rather than of violent revolution.

The Nenni Socialists have indicated that they intend to break away from the Communists and follow an independent line. But much remains obscure about their real intentions and the ability to implement them. On the extreme right, the Neo-Fascist Party is impotent and isolated.

The persistence of the large Communist and pro-Communist vote in Italy is a source of concern and puzzlement to many observers of the Italian scene familiar with the goals of leftwing totalitarianism. There are many theories to explain it, but the roots of the problem go fairly deep and are primarily historical: the reaction to Fascism, past disunion and misgovernment, anticlericalism, the traditional influence of Marxist concepts, especially the idea of class struggle. If all this seems vaguely irrational or anachronistic in light of present-day realities, let us be broadminded enough to lament outworn prejudices in our own country which strike Italians in much the same way.

We should remember, too, that throughout the 100 years of modern Italian history, Italians have never known a period of prolonged political stability. It is probable, therefore, that the historical factors and current tensions underlying political extremism in Italy will be softened by time, the continued improvement in living conditions, and the practice of political democracy itself.

The United States can contribute much to political democracy and economic progress in Italy by its firm support of Italy's determination to remain free, and by continuing to merit Italian confidence in our own Government and people. By mutual understanding arising from deep historical associations, as well as by formal treaty obligations, we are permanent partners and allies. It is clearly in our interests that a free Italy develop its own path as a member of the European Community and the Atlantic Alliance.

No sober study of the total Italian situation would minimize the problems still to be solved. What is important is that the Italian people, through their own hard work, irrepressible originality, and individuality, have now achieved a forward momentum toward greater social and economic progress that justifies high hopes for the future of their country.

In Italy, with its infinite variety of people and landscape, its ability to renew itself out of a past of incredible richness, its creative genius and humanity, the visitor finds the world in microcosm. The country, as always, draws the stranger from a distant land as though to his own home, which in a larger sense is what Italy represents for millions of non-Italians. With the creative energies of Italy fully utilized in freedom,

there are no limits to what the Italian nation and people can accomplish. The United States has joined with Italians and other free peoples to protect their right to have this great opportunity.

Girl Scouts of America Observe 49th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the future offers great promise and challenge. Our best hope for effectively fulfilling our potential for the future of our youth.

The Nation—if it is to benefit to the maximum from our youth potential—needs to design more effective programs to channel the talents, energies, imagination and ingenuity into creative, not destructive, activities.

Unfortunately, there is a minority of juveniles who, by their antics, reflect unfavorably upon the character and moral fiber of all of the Nation's young folks. This is a tragedy.

The Nation cannot afford to waste its most precious asset—youth. To the contrary, constructive programs are needed, not only for dealing more effectively with delinquency, but also for broadening youth development programs for our fast-expanding population.

Over the years, a number of organizations have been created to channel the talents and energies of our young people. Outstanding among these is the Girl Scout movement. Organized in 1912, the Scout movement—founded upon the theme, "Honor the Past—Serve the Future"—continues to be one of the outstanding youth programs in the country.

Recently, the La Crosse Tribune published an informative article on the progress and programs of this fine organization.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE 49TH ANNIVERSARY OF GIRL SCOUTS OBSERVED

The Girl Scouts of the Riverland Council this week are celebrating the 49th anniversary of the founding of the Girl Scouts of the United States with the theme "Honor the Past—Serve the Future."

Local Girl Scouts will join 3.5 million girls and adults across the country in commemorating the organization of the first troop in Savannah, Ga., by Juliette Low on March 12, 1912.

Mrs. Donald Hansen, president of the Riverland Council which is a Red Feather agency, in explaining the theme for the anniversary said, "We not only encourage girls to become familiar with their own heritage and the origins of Girl Scouting but we help them to prepare for future roles as homemakers, citizens, and professional workers."

Each day of Girl Scout Week has been given a special designation. These will be marked by activities within the troops and displays in various store windows in the area.

Sunday will be devoted to duty to God; Monday, homemaking; Tuesday, citizenship; Wednesday, health and safety; Thursday, international friendship; Friday, arts and crafts; and Saturday, out-of-doors.

The 49th anniversary is a part of a larger observance of the birthday years which began March 12, 1960, and will culminate in 1962 with the observance of the 50th anniversary of Girl Scouting.

The birthday years have been divided into five areas of emphasis. In 1960 founders of the National Girl Scout movement were honored as well as early adult workers locally. October 31, 1960, was the 100th anniversary of Mrs. Low's birth.

The second area of emphasis is "Yesterday's Girl Scouts—Today's Career Women." Through a girl's experiences in scouting and from vocational counseling during her senior Scout years she will be better prepared to serve her community as an adult in the future.

"Heritage Hikes" is the area in which a Scout honors the past by exploring the history and culture of her community. Troops of the Riverland Council are planning trips to various homes and spots of historic interest in the region.

Parks and recreational areas throughout the council will be ablossom with golden flowers through the efforts of Scouts to mark their golden anniversary in late summer 1961 and in 1962.

The last area of emphasis "Serve the Future," will be centered on community service. Projects in this phase are in the planning stages but will probably be centered on service to children of the community.

Americanism Preferred

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Mr. Allston Calhoun, a descendant of the great John C. Calhoun, presents a weekly radio program to a number of listeners throughout the southeastern part of the United States. On his program recorded for delivery the first week in March 1961, Mr. Calhoun has presented a very interesting program on an outstanding American, Mr. H. L. Hunt, of Dallas, Tex. I ask unanimous consent that this radio script be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the script was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICANISM PREFERRED

(Script of radio show, delivered by Allston Calhoun over radio stations in the Southeast, Mar. 4, 5, 7, and 8, 1961)

Hello, folks, this is your "working man's friend" speaking with you on "Americanism preferred."

With the birth of every child in America another potential President of the United States comes into being. If this child does not wish to become President but instead wants to become a doctor, a lawyer, a teacher, a preacher, a businessman, a scientist, or take part in any other walk of life, it is his election to do so. In fact, the American-born child can choose the course of his future, even in his primary school days, as many of them do; or else, having once chosen a career or profession and even after having embarked on same, he may choose to follow a different career or profession, which he may decide is better suited to his God-given capabilities and energies.

This equality and independence of opportunity is by far the leading factor which, up to now, has made of America the greatest nation the world has ever known and also the most pleasant in which to live.

As concrete proof of the statements we have just made, we need only cite the lives of such men as Abraham Lincoln, who was born and lived in the utmost poverty, and yet became one of the greatest Presidents our country ever produced. By far the larger percentage of our great business and professional people were born to the humblest of circumstances and through their own God-given abilities and willingness to go the extra mile in the way of industry and work, achieved top ranking prominence and position in their chosen profession or business. More than this, many of our present day most outstanding professional and businessmen changed careers in midstream, so to speak, thus achieving what is fabled to be impossible, in bringing about the complete fruition of their lives in this land of opportunity and independence. Of a truth, America is indeed a land in which the seemingly impossible can be transformed into the possible. This freedom and independence of operation enables man to hitch his spirit and his soul to the divine power, which is often referred to as "hitching one's ladder to a star."

These facts are something that every young American, even every very young American should keep uppermost in his mind. In helping to impress this on our youngsters, your "working man's friend" is going to tell you today something about the life and career of an American, born in the ordinary circumstances of the average American home, even as you and I, and who, in this land of opportunity, has achieved great wealth in the business world and real greatness in his ideal of service to his fellowman which he carries along as a joint and companion career of perhaps equal importance to his business career in which he has achieved such distinction. In the true American tradition, this great American actually did achieve the fabled impossible by changing careers in midstream, when, through no fault of his own, he found that the career on which he had originally embarked was not giving him the complete expression in life that he longed to achieve. I am referring to H. L. Hunt of Dallas, former large-scale planter of the Southwest, who in the midstream of his career changed his interest and activities to petroleum to bring in a flood of wealth which has made him, reportedly, one of the richest men in the world today.

But don't think for 1 minute that achieving this position was easy by any means. Far from it. In fact, had it not been for Mr. Hunt's willingness to face adversity and go the extra mile in learning everything he possibly could about his business and doing everything he could to put it across he never would have achieved the position he has today in spite of the fact that he is endowed by God with one of the keenest minds in the entire business world.

Interestingly enough, after achieving his position of wealth in the oil industry Mr. Hunt has returned in part to his first interest—agriculture—and has become one of the most outstanding planters both of row crops and trees as well to be found on the North American continent.

But what has made this man distinctive from the major portion of the business world

and the factor that has lifted him far and above the ordinary walks of life is the interest he shows in his fellowmen and his active participation along these lines, which, as we said before, is carried along on an equal footing with his business activities. In fact, his interest and activities in behalf of his fellowmen take a considerably larger portion of his time and thought than do his business activities which, to a great extent, he has now turned over to his sons and to an excellent business structure known generally as the Hunt Oil Co.

It is this interest in the welfare of his fellowmen and in the future security of his country that has transformed Mr. Hunt from simply another man of vast wealth to the great man which he is today.

On this point, your "working man's friend" wants to give you a quote from the Houston Chronicle written by Sigman Byrd, entitled, "Ex-Poorboy's More Realistic Utopia Has Low Tax Ceiling." In this as the "ex-poorboy" he is referring to Mr. Hunt and the book written by this "ex-poorboy" outlining some of his own ideas and principles upon which he, himself has lived and which would certainly be conducive toward making more of a Utopia out of our own United States of America. Or rather still, in his books Mr. Hunt would help his fellowmen to find their Utopia by outlining to them some of the principles and ideas upon which he has lived. We quote Sigman Byrd:

"H. L. Hunt, of big Dallas, was the richest man in the world until the news magazines and the Yankee press bumped him to second place and named George Getty top dog. Hunt was supposed to have started out as a broke cotton farmer in 1921 with barely $50 to his name. His present income is said to be about a million clams a week.

"Ever since the news columns announced late last year the publication of a book written by Hunt, I have been waiting for a review. Here it is almost Washington's birthday, and I still haven't seen a review.

"Wondering why, I checked the file on Hunt. There wasn't much. A shy man, for all his billions, the reports said. Further, most of the stories from the news magazines and the Yankee press were slyly uncomplimentary. Too rich, they suggested. And worse.

"Then a man I know who works for a Hunt enterprise, and happens to be a member of one of the minority groups that Hunt is supposed to hate, gave me a copy of his boss' new book, 'Alpaca.' He laughed at the notion that H. L. Hunt was a minority hater, declaring that he, at least, had certainly enjoyed a happy association.

"So I read the book.

"Alpaca is a fictional country with a new and unique constitution that in many ways resembles the U.S. Constitution. Here are some of the ways in which it differs:

"1. In Alpaca, voting power is based on age, experience, previous year's taxes and interest and investment in Government.

"Thus, because of age, I would get two votes where H. L. Hunt would get only one. But he would get additional 'bonus' votes because of his higher tax bracket. Other bonus votes are given for waiving payments due from the Government.

"2. Candidates for public office are chosen by petition, not convention, and must renounce any party affiliation. Every election has a primary and a runoff.

"3. The legislative branch consists of a single house and a three-member veto board. All legislation expires automatically after 12 years unless re-enacted.

"4. There is a 25-percent ceiling on income taxes, and payroll taxes are forbidden.

"5. The monetary unit, the pack, is based on and redeemable in rice or wheat.

"6. The right to work is guaranteed.

"7. The government must not compete with private industry.

"8. The executive authority is vested in a triumvirate (reminiscent of the theory of an influential vice president plus a powerful house speaker.)

"9. Supreme court judges are elected.

"10. The death penalty is provided for treason.

"11. Each citizen at age 66 gets a monthly seniority payment from the government based on his highest previous earnings. He may waive this benefit and earn bonus votes.

"12. Politics is barred from radio, television, moving pictures and all other media except the press. The press must make 2 percent of its space available for propaganda from two opposing 'thought groups', which in Alpaca are called Liberal and Constructive.

"That's just about the briefest possible digest of the Hunt book. I doubt that many Americans have read it closely, and I suspect that many who have read it are inclined to agree with Hunt's critics—that the man's ideas ought to be discarded because he's too rich.

"I disagree. When a poor boy who has made a fabulous fortune by his wits, despite a predatory environment, stops to think and write about government, and when he does it as serenely and intelligently as poor, rich H. L. Hunt has done in this inadequate vehicle, he deserves to be read and thought about and answered by us American Alpacans."

But writing books expressing his ideas and principles for the better existence of his fellow men is only a portion of that phase of the activities of H. L. Hunt. His other activities in this same direction have extended throughout the nation, finding such expressions with the people such as through radio, television, and nationally known publications. He was founder and sponsor of "Facts Forum," heard and seen nationally over radio and TV and with a monthly journal published in Dallas and appearing nationally with sound articles and stories edited and written by America's foremost pro-American writers and thinkers.

Mr. Hunt now sponsors Life Lines, conservative weekly journal published in Washington and issued nationally and with a companion radio program expressing the wisdom of both Mr. Hunt and his commentator, Wayne Poucher, and with a background of the greatest of all wisdom from the most conservative of all publications, the Bible. One recent undertaking of Life Lines, which project is still in progress, is the sponsoring of a nationwide essay contest offering great encouragement for the expression of conservative America-first thoughts and ideas from the people throughout the nation, with valuable prizes for the best essays on some 300 or more topics related to the promotion and preservation of our American way of life. As to the content and nature of Life Lines both over the air and through the newspaper, no better comment could be heard than that expressed by several leaders of the John Birch Society who told your "workingman's friend." "It is the finest ever."

So long, folks. Thus we have the picture of a man who, through his own God-given ability and his individual application and capacity for hard work, has reached the tops in this land of opportunity which is America, and who, instead of resting on his laurels and enjoying his hard-won wealth, as most of us would do, finds his own joy and real expression in working to preserve and even improve this American utopia for you and for me and for our children.

Chain Reaction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVE MARTIN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial from the Omaha World Herald of March 6, 1961. I consider it to be an excellent comment on our foreign policy:

CHAIN REACTION

Adlai Stevenson's words sounded tough when he said that America means something "definite and practical" in its support of "the end of all outside interventions" in the Congo. He added:

"War follows when new empires thrust into the collapsing ruins of the old. So stay your ambitions."

John Foster Dulles might have used the tone of those remarks. But the content would have been something else.

What Mr. Stevenson really was saying is that the United States is helping, insistently, to kick this Nation's allies out of Africa, where they have been the one civilizing and stabilizing influence.

Mr. Stevenson said he hopes the Russians won't move in, but he is helping to create a power vacuum which invites them in. Thus once again America is helping to shape the tragic conditions by which the established power is held in check or weakened or destroyed while revolutionary communism comes charging down like a wolf on an unguarded fold.

That is what happened in Chiang's China. It happened in Korea. It happened in Vietnam. It happened in Cuba. And right now, at this very hour, it is happening in Laos.

In the 6 weeks the Kennedy administration has been in power a major change in American foreign policy has taken place. Laos is the evidence.

While Mr. Kennedy and his advisers were making up their minds whether to defend that far-off Asian country, the Russians openly piled in military supplies by air. Last week the American effort to maintain a pro-Western Government in Laos was abandoned in favor of neutralism. This is another retreat, another defeat for the United States and a corresponding strengthening of the Communist position in Asia.

To describe it by any other names would obscure what has happened there and what is about to happen, we very much fear, in the Congo, in much of the rest of Africa, in the Middle East, and perhaps elsewhere.

One who speaks plainly on this subject is America's ally, the Shah of Iran. In an interview in U.S. News & World Report he said bitterly:

"We certainly do not want any deal made between the United States and the Soviet Union whereby our country would be 'neutralized.'"

The United States, he said, always accepts the accomplished fact of Communist penetration, "and never goes all the way to try to save anyone. This was the case in Korea. It was the case in Indochina. It is the case today in Laos.

The Shah, like a good many Americans, foresees the inevitable result of neutralism.

He concluded:

"If all the countries that border the Soviet Union become neutral, then pretty

soon, all the countries bordering those countries will be neutral, and the United States will eventually find itself in a 'fortress America' with all the world's other countries neutral. Then the Communists will be able to take them over one by one. You wouldn't have time to go to their help—in fact, if all the countries were neutral, they would not have asked for your help."

As for the Shah, his Prime Minister is going to Moscow next month to hear what kind of a deal Khrushchev will make. Iran doesn't trust Khrushchev, but the momentous and truly tragic fact is that if the United States indorses neutralism and new power vacuums, nobody will be inclined to trust the United States either.

The Most Disadvantaged Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor has, in its visits to eight States, seen direct evidence of earnest, effective action by private groups and by Government agencies to overcome handicaps and hardships faced by men, women, and children in the migratory worker stream.

In my own State of New Jersey, we heard directly from those who are trying to help provide educational opportunities to these youngsters who may spend only a few weeks with us while their parents harvest our crops. An excellent example of this help is the summer school program for migrant children, started in 1947 by the New Jersey Bureau of Migrant Labor.

An article by Mrs. Lefferts A. Loetcher in the December 1960 issue of School Board Notes—published by the New Jersey State Federation of District Boards of Education—describes these efforts, the difficulties faced by migrant children, and also records a favorable attitude toward proposed Federal legislation for migrant education.

I ask unanimous consent that this very informative article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MOST DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN
(Mrs. Lefferts A. Loetcher)

In 1959 some 25,000 migrant workers helped to plant, weed, and harvest New Jersey crops worth $122 million. For more than 40 years these seasonal workers have been essential to the agricultural economy of the State and will continue to be needed in the foreseeable future. Since the 1920's, when children of Italian families migrating seasonally from Philadelphia to New Jersey would lose spring and fall schooling, efforts have been made to insure the education of migrant children while in New Jersey.

The first summer school, sponsored in 1947 by the Bureau of Migrant Labor, was held at the Court Street School in Freehold. Every year but one since then at least one summer school has been operated by the Bureau in collaboration with the State Department of Education. Each year the Bureau looks hopefully for more school boards willing to rent classrooms in the 8 out of 21 counties where children are living with their families in migrant camps.

The U.S. Office of Education has declared that the children of migratory farm workers suffer greater disadvantage educationally than any other group. Agreeing with this statement, the migrant labor board, through its subcommittee on education, in 1959 set up a citizens' advisory committee. Representation on this committee came from 19 educational (including the New Jersey State Federation of District Boards of Education), grower, labor, religious, social welfare, civic, and governmental groups. To this committee the national child labor committee, a nonprofit social welfare agency, loaned Curtis Gatlin, one of its staff members, to serve as a consultant. The migrant education demonstration project subsequently set up included four aims: (1) stimulation of public interest and support through State and local citizens' committees; (2) surveys by volunteers in spring and fall of potential and actual enrollment of migrant children in local schools; (3) location and financing of additional summer schools; (4) development of a long-range program. It is hoped that this pilot project, when proved successful in New Jersey, will stimulate other States to similar efforts.

At the request of the Advisory Committee and by action of the Governor and his cabinet, $25,000 spent on the 1960 summer school program (twice the amount spent in 1959) doubled the number of children reached in 14 classrooms divided among schools in Cranbury, Freehold, Fairton, and Woodstown. Because classrooms were available in too few areas it was necessary to use bus transportation for children living as far as 35 miles from their school. Some pupils rode as much as 45 minutes each way.

SUMMER AID

Boards of education were paid $100 for each classroom used in the 5-week session. The Bureau of Migrant Labor also assumed the cost of utilities and guaranteed the repair of any damage to rooms or equipment. Fear on the part of school board members and parents that these summer scholars would deface property and bring dirt and disease into the school were ill founded. In 14 years of the summer program only once has a school failed to invite the Labor Board to use its facilities the next year. Yet in spite of the fact that no other State has matched the efforts of New Jersey, last summer fewer than one child in three got a chance at a small amount of schooling. More summer schools are needed: in Stowe Creek, Greenwich, and Hopewell Townships in Cumberland County; in Logan, East Greenwich, Woolwich, and South Harrison Townships, in Gloucester County; in West Windsor Township in Mercer County; in Upper Penns Neck, Oldsman, Pilesgrove, and Mannington Townships in Salem County.

OVERLAP PROBLEM

Perhaps an even greater problem is trying to meet the needs of those children who arrive in New Jersey in April or May and of those who are still here through November. In the spring of 1959 about 55 school districts were affected by migrant enrollment, with 3 months the longest period any pupil attended. Furthermore, it is practically impossible to anticipate exactly how many children will be in the area in any given year. Hesitancy on the part of school boards to seek out these children, to provide bus transportation, to find space, teachers, and textbooks for limited periods is understandable. But these migrant children who are in the State part of the time while the regular public schools are in session are entitled by law (should be required) to attend school. Actually, schooling for the children is advantageous to the farmer. The better, more stable crews return year after year to areas where their children can go to school, either during the regular sessions or to the special summer schools or both.

If local communities are unable to finance education for children of parents who work in New Jersey only part of the year, funds need to be provided from some other source. Perhaps part of the answer may lie in Federal aid, such as the bill (S. 2864) introduced by Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS, chairman of the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor. Then, perhaps, there wouldn't be a family in New Jersey who had 5 school-age children who didn't go to school for 4 years. Perhaps more than 1 out of 50 children would get to high school.

Instead there would be more cases like the 14-year-old girl in Cranbury who had never been in a classroom before and couldn't read who was taught to write her name and thrilled to learn to read it during the brief summer session. And there might be an adult program for the 25-year-old farmworker at Freehold whose plea to be admitted to summer school to learn to read was rejected because he was too old to sit with the children.

We can't go on permitting children to grow up without even a decent elementary education. In testimony presented at hearings before the Subcommittee on General Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor on May 5, 1960, Eli E. Cohen, Executive Secretary of the National Child Labor Committee, said, "The United States can no longer afford to have large groups of underdeveloped and undereducated citizens. The moment has come when destiny will not permit our civilization to dissipate its human resources and survive."

Kennedy and the Economy—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, a gifted editorial writer of the Winston-Salem (N.C.) Journal has written three thought-provoking editorials on the subject of President Kennedy and the economy. These editorials are incisive and penetrative and therefore deserve wide circulation. It is for that reason that as a part of my remarks I include the first of the series published on March 6, 1961. The second and third editorials of the series will be inserted later:

KENNEDY AND THE ECONOMY, I—THE BURDEN OF THE UNEMPLOYED

Unemployment, the dollar and growth—those words sum up the basic economic problems of the country that will be with us after the current recession has vanished. President Kennedy has recognized the relationship between the three in his emphasis on the need for economic growth: Unemployment keeps spiraling upward, and the dollar keeps suffering from inflation and weakened international stability, all because the national economy has not been growing fast enough.

That sounds like such a sweeping generalization that it could not possibly be accurate. But even though it fails to cover every force at work in our complicated economy, it is

essentially a correct summary of the fundamentals. President Kennedy's whole economic policy centers around these factors of unemployment, the dollar and growth. All the economic legislation he has proposed so far, or is likely to ask for in the future, deals with one or more of those factors. To get a picture of what he is trying to do, and why, each of the three should be examined.

The unemployment problem which gives real cause for concern is not the thousands of people thrown out of work because of the recession, but the number who will remain unable to find jobs as the recession moves to a close (which it is now showing some signs of doing). All during the 1950's, unemployment kept increasing both in numbers and in percentage of the total civilian work force. This trend could, in fact, be carried back to World War II, when very few people were without work, but conditions then were too abnormal to have much bearing today.

If the trend of the 1950's continues, the number and percentage of the jobless when this recession is over will be as high as at the very bottom of the 1954 slump. We have, therefore, been building up a recession-sized burden of nonproductive manpower for even our most prosperous times. Today perhaps 7 of every 100 workers are out of jobs; if we have the usual sort of recovery, 5 out of 100 will still be unemployed next year at this time. During the boom years of 1952–53, the count went as low as 2½ out of 100.

To a great extent, lack of economic expansion can be blamed for this growing burden, but actually, nonagricultural employment during the 1950's grew just enough to keep pace with the growth of the total labor force. Each increased about 5½ million. But the revolution in agriculture during the decade dumped well over 2 million former farmhands on the labor market. That is the source of the load the economy has not grown swiftly enough to absorb.

The source of the surplus workers suggests that slow economic growth was not the only difficulty. A great mass of these people, coming from rural to urban surroundings, lacked the flexibility of training or experience to qualify for the jobs that have been open. Unemployment is therefore an educational problem, at least in part.

What happened to farm employment through mechanization can now happen to industrial and white-collar employment through automation. Automatic factories and business machines can have a far more drastic influence than they have so far. The resistance of organized labor can only retard this revolution, not stop it. And the big boom in industrial and governmental paperwork, which has helped support white-collar employment despite automatic office equipment, has to reach a limit somewhere. During the coming years, what might be called technological unemployment might thus come in bigger floods from the office and shop while continuing to come from the farm. There is ample reason to expect the jobless uptrend of the 1950's to continue or even sharpen during the Kennedy administration, if no answer is found.

Does Mr. Kennedy have an answer? To say that growth is the answer is being so vague as to beg the question. What, specifically, has the President proposed that would ease the unemployment burden?

The depressed areas bill is part of his answer. Not only would it seek new productive activities for those localities where old industries have faded away, it would tackle the problem of retraining workers for presently useful occupations and would expand Government employment services to help them locate jobs.

Mr. Kennedy has also proposed an income tax break to encourage private industrial expansion, plant improvement and new product development. This would tend to boost growth while keeping it on a sound business basis. It should prove helpful in creating more productive jobs.

There is also the tempting but hazardous recourse of putting a large segment of the unemployed to work for the Government. The President has not committeed himself to any such step, but a number of his advisers like the idea. They accept the thesis of John Kenneth Galbraith that the public sector of our affluent society has lagged far behind the private sector, which they see as a foolishly lavish world characterized by tailfins. So far, the President has shown no more sign that he will follow the advice of this element than that he would go along with those who want the Government to keep its hands completely off business.

The big danger of wholesale Government employment is that it would not be productive in either the short or long run—that is, it would neither produce a salable product nor add substantially to the chances of future production of such products. Up to a point, however, Federal highway projects, rural electrification schemes and recreation area developments actually can enhance future economic growth. The more immediate hazard of increased Government employment, even for projects that would pay off in years to come, is that this might require huge Federal deficits and thus take strength away from the dollar. The problem of the dollar will be dealt with in the next editorial in this series.

Aside from whatever can be done to speed the sound growth of the economy, the best hope of reversing the uptrend of unemployment seems to lie in increased flexibility of the work force. As has been noted, revolutionary changes are taking place in our economy, and the worker who cannot change with the times is apt to wind up a part of our nonproductive burden—either out of work or temporarily sheltered from the revolution in a union-made featherbed.

The Kennedy administration has made some proposals which would aid workers in adapting to new job requirements, but its aims here are modest in comparison to its other economic plans. The depressed areas bill allots only $10 million for retraining and relocation of jobless workers. Perhaps this program should be increased, but the Government alone cannot produce a flexible work force. Much of the task must be undertaken by private business and industry, and must have the cooperation of labor. The urgent necessity for this flexibility must be recognized by all parties concerned.

American Legion Marks 42d Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, during March 15–17 the American Legion observes its 42d anniversary.

During its lifetime, the Legion has grown to some 17,000 posts, numbering millions of members. United in a common bond of war experience, Legionnaires, through this fine organization, have not only given support for a strong national defense, but also have engaged in splendid efforts to meet the civic and domestic needs of our people.

Recently, the La Crosse Tribune published an excellent editorial relating to the 42d anniversary of the Legion.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN LEGION MARKS 42D ANNIVERSARY

The American Legion is observing its 42d anniversary, March 15–17.

The Legion has come a long way since that historic caucus of delegates from the first American Expeditionary Force in 1919 in Paris. Today, the American Legion numbers in the millions its members, all of whom are united in a grim bond forged in the horrors of war and dedicated to the preservation of the American way of life through unhesitant service to community, State, and Nation.

The influence for good on the American scene of the American Legion is immeasurable. It has been an important factor in the defense of our free institutions, in keeping love of country at a high premium, in the great increase in homeownership, in the enlightened streamlining of child welfare concepts, in pioneering in the modern care of the disabled and the physically handicapped, and in the Nation's preparedness against aggression.

Thousands of American communities are better places in which to live today because of the civic responsibilities assumed by some 17,000 American Legion posts.

On this 42d anniversary of the American Legion, we salute the Roy L. Vingers Post No. 52 and the millions of Legionnaires everywhere in their continuing endeavors dedicated to God and country.

Gray Hairs a Liability?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABNER W. SIBAL
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, in all the talk these days about the situation of our older citizens, too little attention is being paid to those who reach their later years and are forced to retire, although fully able to continue working. In fact, many of these people in their sixties are at the peak of their experience and intellectual capacity and their enforced retirement under arbitrary rules is a great loss to American society.

This point was made very well in an editorial in the Ridgefield Press of Ridgefield, Conn., on March 2. I would like to have this reprinted in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

GRAY HAIRS A LIABILITY?

"Compulsory retirement of employees at the age of 65 is on the decline," says an editorial in a recent Journal of the American Medical Association.

It cites as one reason for the change in public opinion the fact that more employees are in good health at 65 nowadays, so they may continue to use their experience and skill for the benefit of society.

We certainly agree with this thinking and chorus with former AMA President Louis Orr, "There is no scientific rhyme or reason for selecting 65 as the magic number separating the productive from the nonproductive. * * *"

As a case in point we think of Konrad Adenauer, Chancellor of the West German

Republic, now working on his second decade after 65. We think of Sir Winston Churchill, who retired as Prime Minister of England when he was past 80. We wonder who would be better off if Dr. Albert Schweitzer were forced to retire from his care of South African natives just because he is closer to 90 than 65. Here in Connecticut we think of the late Wilbur L. Cross, who retired as dean of the Yale Graduate School at 68 and then served four terms as Governor of Connecticut, being defeated in his try for a fifth term when he was 76 years old. Ridgefield's beloved cleric, the late William B. Lusk, preached his 20th century sermons until his retirement at age 80.

In another field we have the case of Charles Dillon Stengel, late of Yankee Stadium, now of Glendale, Calif., who lost his job in the autumn of 1960, primarily because his former employers think that 70 is the compulsory retirement age for baseball managers. The fact that Mr. Stengel's teams had won 10 pennants and 7 world's championships in the 12 years he was in New York and that his 1960 team would have added another world's championship to the record if the pitcher had covered first base on a play in the eighth inning of the seventh game, seemed to have little weight in their considerations.

Our feeling is that employers should base their calculations on the way a man is doing his job rather than on the number of years that have gone by since he was born.

Commendation of Movement to Strengthen Sense of Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the virtue of patriotism is so often taken for granted that it is well to remind ourselves periodically that true love of country is, by its nature, an active, not a passive condition of mind and heart. Unless patriotism is dynamic and positive, it withers away into a slogan, or it makes itself evident only in specific occasions, like flags that appear on the Fourth of July. In the light of this fact, it is heartening to note that a number of leading Americans have united in the common cause of breathing new life and meaning into the word patriotism. It is, therefore, a pleasure for me to draw attention to a most timely and cogent editorial on this subject, entitled "Restoring Patriotism," published in the Fulton Patriot, Fulton, N.Y., on March 2, 1961. Because of the importance of this message, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESTORING PATRIOTISM

A number of editors, statesmen, and military leaders are joining in an effort to restore patriotism to its proper place in the American way of life. This newspaper is more than willing to lend a hand in the campaign.

The greatest single piece of evidence showing what has happened in this country, what has happened to the burning patriotism and dedication to the American way of life, came during the Korean conflict. In that war many U.S. soldiers who returned obviously lacked an enthusiasm and an understanding of the government and the country.

Some fell prey to Communist propaganda because they did not know enough about the United States and its history and Government to refute clever Communist arguments. Others simply lacked patriotism and conviction when it came to the United States and the democratic system it represents.

This, many statemen, military leaders, and scholars have concluded, is the result of a period of deterioration in the homes, schools, movies, television, etc., which began in the 1930's, when it became popular to be cynical and to criticize the American system. And, of course, there is room for criticism of the American system. It is not perfect.

But it is possessed of many admirable qualities and features and is the best system of freedom and independence man has yet devised on the democratic level. The system has brought more things, materially, to more people, than any other system on earth, giving the American people the highest standard of living in the world.

The words of Commodore Perry, "Don't give up the ship," should stir a feeling of patriotism in every young heart. John Paul Jones' immortal words: "I have just begun to fight," are of the same vein. This is the spirit we need in the sixties. This is the spirit of devotion and dedication which will assure survival as a nation.

An Important Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include in the CONGRESIONAL RECORD Appendix the following editorial entitled "An Important Decision," which appeared in Advertising Age of March 6, 1961:

AN IMPORTANT DECISION

The reversal by the U.S. Supreme Court of the judgments against Carl Byoir & Associates and 24 eastern railroads in the Pennsylvania trucking case is of major importance, not only to the public relations segment of business, but to advertising people as well.

The court reached its decision unanimously, and as Advertising Age's reporter said, it wrapped lobbying in a "public interest" cloak of unprecedented grandeur, even though it sharply criticized the ethics of public relations operators on both sides of the railroad-truckers dispute.

The important point for our purposes is that the court advanced in the strongest terms the opinion that representative government can't operate unless citizens can express their views freely, and that the Sherman Antitrust Act cannot be so construed as to act as a brake upon that freedom of expression.

Among other things, the court's decision said:

"The right of the people to inform their representatives in government of their desires with respect to the passage or enforcement of laws cannot properly be made to depend upon their intent in doing so. It is neither unusual nor illegal for people to seek action on laws in the hope that they may bring about an advantage to themselves and a disadvantage to their competitors."

In the light of this and other language of the decision, it would appear difficult for the Internal Revenue Service or others to argue about the legality of advertising devoted to public interest messages, even though the point at issue in the recent advertising cases has not been action under the antitrust laws but in terms of allowances for taxes, determination of utility rates, etc. When the Supreme Court ruled on advertising cases not too long ago, it held that lobbying was not to be encouraged; now it seems to have changed its mind.

It is narrow legalism to argue that lobbying and discussing public issues are essential to the operation of our kind of society, and then, to restrain or hobble such discussion by penalizing it in terms of tax reprisals.

President Kennedy To Address Italian Centennial Celebration, Thursday, March 16

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of all Members of Congress that President Kennedy will be the guest speaker at the formal observance of the 100th anniversary of the unification of Italy, which is taking place tomorrow, Thursday, March 16, at 10:30 in the morning, in the new auditorium of the Department of State.

Invitations have been sent to all Members of both Houses of Congress, and I hope they will all be able to attend. Among our honored guests will also be the Vice President and the Speaker. We plan to adjourn shortly before noon, in order to give the Members an opportunity to get back to the House for the session.

The centennial celebration is being held under the joint sponsorship of the Italian Embassy and the American Honorary Committee for the Italian Centennial. Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, of Rhode Island, is the honorary chairman of the committee. I have the great honor of being the chairman, and Representative PAUL A. FINO, of New York, is the secretary. Other members of the committee are: Representatives Peter W. Rodino, of New Jersey; George P. Miller of California; Hugh J. Addonizio, of New Jersey; Dante B. Fascell, of Florida; John H. Dent, of Pennsylvania; Roland V. Libonati, of Illinois; Alfred E. Santangelo, of New York; Silvio O. Conte, of Massachusetts; Emilio Q. Daddario, of Connecticut; Dominick V. Daniels, of New Jersey; Robert N. Giaimo, of Connecticut; and Joseph P. Addabbo, of New York; also the Governors of the following four States: John A. Volpe of Massachusetts, John A. Notte of Rhode Island, Michael V. Di Salle of Ohio, and Albert D. Rosellini of Washington.

In addition to our distinguished national leaders and the Members of Congress, invitations have also been extended to the members of the Cabinet, the Supreme Court, the diplomatic corps, leading Government officials, heads of Italian-American societies, and others.

I should like to request all of our colleagues to be in their seats by 10:15. The President is expected to arrive a few minutes later and we shall start the observance promptly at 10:30. The Most Reverend Patrick O'Boyle, archbishop of Washington, will give the invocation. As chairman, I shall then make brief welcoming remarks. The Italian Ambassador Manlio Brosio will read a message from President Giovanni Gronchi of Italy. Prof. Gaetano Martino, head of the Italian delegation to the U.N. Assembly, will deliver an address. President Kennedy will then make his address, which will conclude the formal part of the observance.

A recital of Italian operatic music will then be presented by Metropolitan Opera stars Miss Renata Tebaldi, soprano, and Mr. Franco Corelli, tenor. Prior to the official opening of the observance, the U.S. Marine Band, under the direction of Lt. Col. Albert Schoepper, will present a musical program.

May I also call to the attention of the House the fact that Congress last year passed unanimously a resolution calling for official particiaption by the United States in the Italian centennial celebration in March 1961. This is the event which we had in mind at that time.

On March 8, 1961, President Kennedy issued a proclamation pertaining to this centennial anniversary. I am pleased to insert into the RECORD at this point the text of the President's proclamation, which reads as follows:

CENTENNIAL OF THE UNIFICATION OF ITALY—BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, A PROCLAMATION

Whereas the centennial of the unification of Italy, which occurs in 1961, commemorates a great event in the history of nations; and

Whereas in observance of the centennial there will be many celebrations in Italy, in the United States, and in many other countries as events of a century ago are relived; and

Whereas we in America are confident that the people of Italy, in the celebrations reenacting the events and experiences associated with the struggle for unification a century ago, will find renewed strength to further their vital contributions to the cause of freedom; and

Whereas it is the sense of the Congress, expressed by House Concurrent Resolution 225, agreed to July 2, 1960, that the President extend official greetings from the United States to the people of Italy on the occasion of the centennial of the unification of Italy:

Now, therefore, I, John F. Kennedy, President of the United States of America, do hereby extend greetings and felicitations from the people of the United States to the people of Italy on the occasion of the centennial of the unification of Italy, in recognition of the progress and achievements of the Italian people during the past century and the bonds of friendship between our two nations.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 8th day of March in the year of our Lord 1961, and of the Independence of the United States of America the 185th.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

By the President:

DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State.

North Platte, Nebr., Shrine to Buffalo Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVE MARTIN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House an accomplishment registered by North Platte, Nebr., one of the many fine cities in the Fourth District of Nebraska.

North Platte is the hometown of William F. Cody, better known to millions throughout the world as "Buffalo Bill" Cody. It was at North Platte that he founded his historic Scouts' Rest Ranch, and here chose to live for more than 30 years. Here Buffalo Bill was host to many celebrities ranging from Indian chiefs to European noblemen, entertaining them in the big, ornate house that still stands at the entrance to the ranch.

Here in the huge red barn with gunstock-carved rafters was wintered his famed wild west show, with purebred Arabian stallions sheltered under the same roof that covered Argentine llamas and longhorn steers.

Here on the tree-shaded grounds bisected by Scout Creek camped Sioux and Pawnee Indian warriors who traveled with the wild west show; here sharpshooters Annie Oakley and Frank Butler practiced and developed their skill. Scouts' Rest Ranch at North Platte, Nebr., is truly a historic spot.

Aware of this, the citizens of that community are making the ranch into a State park, which they know will soon become a national shrine to one of our Nation's most colorful showmen. And they are doing this with a local effort which is a fine example to individuals and communities who still feel they can solve their own problems.

I am happy to note today that North Platte, numbering fewer than 18,000 people in west central Nebraska, has passed the halfway mark in its local drive to raise $37,500 toward its share of financing such a State park.

To a huge Federal Government accustomed to spending billions of dollars at the drop of a hat, the sum of $37,000 may sound pitifully small. But to the citizens of North Platte and the State of Nebraska, it is a sizable amount to raise. And it is to their everlasting credit that they have elected to do this on their own initiative, without coming to the Federal Government with outstretched palm, as is popular nowadays.

After the $37,500 goal is reached, the State of Nebraska will match that amount and complete purchase of the ranch, now privately owned by a leading Nebraska beef cattle producer. Thereafter, the State of Nebraska will spend nearly a quarter of a million dollars in renovation, maintenance, and operation during the next 10 years.

Some day, Mr. Speaker, I hope all Members of Congress will visit, as I have visited, this unique and beautiful historic site in Nebraska. I am sure they will feel, as I feel, a sense of satisfaction and pride in the country which has produced such men as William F. Cody and still produces such people as the citizens of North Platte.

And, like me, perhaps they will reflect that here is a perfect example of community effort in our free enterprise system—with the initiative coming from the people on the local level, and with the control resting there.

I congratulate the progressive citizens of North Platte and their surrounding communities—and I have faith that they will continue their drive and bring it to a successful conclusion.

W. D. Harrigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a section of a great newspaper down in the First Congressional District of Alabama, the Clarke County Democrat, of Grove Hill, Ala., in the Thursday, March 9, 1961, issue. Grove Hill is the county seat of the great county of Clarke. Mr. Speaker, this is a great story which the editor of the Clarke County Democrat has published about a wonderful man, a fabulous man who has gone to his reward, W. D. Harrigan. He was founder of the great Scotch Lumber Co., one of the great companies of south Alabama. They have been in business for over 65 years and nobody but their own people there who work for them and the merchants know what this has meant to all the people in that county and several other adjoining counties. W. D. Harrigan certainly laid the foundation for a vast timber industry, one of the greatest not only in the South, but in the Nation.

I remember when he and his wonderful wife were there at Fulton, Ala., and I remember when Billy Harrigan—W. D. Harrigan, Jr.—was born. Now he and his sister, Virginia Harrigan, who is now Mrs. Thomas H. O'Melia, are there. What a great group they are. And if we could only get this picture which is on the front page of the Clarke County Democrat of W. D. Harrigan, it would be great. I remember when he put me through the Shrine at Mobile there at the old Abba Temple. Well, he and I were just as close as brothers. I had

places down at McIntosh and Calvert and Malcolm and all through that country, and I remember when he and Mrs. Harrigan used to drive down there to see us long before I was married. We did a lot of courting at Fulton, Ala., in the home of the Harrigans, and I do wish they would put a picture of that wonderful, marvelous, fabulous woman, Mrs. W. D. Harrigan, in with the rest of this great family.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, this story in the Clarke County Democrat will interest many, many people. How I wish we could not only put the picture of my beloved departed friend, W. D. Harrigan, Sr., where everybody could see him, but the pictures of the great timber he left there—some of the largest timber that we have anywhere in this country. I see this article says that one tree cut 3,600 feet—almost enough to build a house.

Well, not only did W. D. Harrigan, the founder of this great Scotch Lumber Co., do a great job, but his son and his daughter and his son-in-law, have certainly carried on. Now he has a son and a daughter who are coming along and they, too, will do just like their father and their grandfather and their grandmother did, and then, Mr. Speaker, you will remember the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. W. D. Harrigan, Jr., Kay. She was Cherry Blossom Queen here, where, as she drove down Pennsylvania Avenue, there were over a half million people who had the joy and pleasure of seeing this beautiful young lady.

Then there is Mrs. W. D. Harrigan, Jr.—what a great and fine woman she is. They are just all fine. They are good people and they are great people. I wish just all of you knew this great family group there at the Scotch Lumber Co. at Fulton, Ala., down between the Tombigbee and the Alabama Rivers, where they have about 200,000 acres of the finest timber-growing land on earth and where they have some of the finest people, the very finest on earth, there, who have helped and are just the same as partners with the Harrigans and the O'Melias. It is a great organization, and I predict, Mr. Speaker, that it will be going and going good for another 100 years, because Mr. Harrigan, the great W. D. Harrigan, Sr., had it all worked out where the cut would be perpetual and they do selective cutting, and I believe W. D. Harrigan, Jr. has even improved on what his father did, and that's the way it should be.

This is a great story, and I am so glad that this story will get to go to every library in this Nation and will be read in every meeting that there is in this Nation. They will read about a great country, a great company and a great family.

May God bless, help and keep them and give them strength to keep on keeping on.

An Expression of Appreciation to an Old Business Institution

This section of the Democrat, which salutes Scotch Lumber Co. upon its long years of successful operation and recent modernization and expansion, is sponsored and made possible by the business houses of Grove Hill. It is an expression by them of what this big company has meant to them, to their town, and to the county as a whole throughout its long years of operation.

The fact that this mill has been operating in the county since 1896 means that for the past 65 years jobs have been available in considerable numbers to people of this county all of that time. Not only has it afforded work to those directly employed at the mill, but it has made work for those who have cut and sold timber to the company and in many other ways it has helped to boost the economy of the county.

The company has recently completed a modernization and expansion of its plant and it is highly appropriate that at this time the town of Grove Hill should extend an expression of its appreciation for what the company means to her people.

Harrigan Laid Foundation for Vast Timber Industry

The story of W. D. Harrigan, founder and for many years operator of Scotch Lumber Co., is very similar to that of thousands of other successful businessmen. He started at the bottom of the sawmill business, but his ability, his business judgment, and his powers of organization, management, and the other factors necessary to the operation of a big business, speedily carried him forward in his chosen profession.

Although comparatively a young man when he moved to Alabama from Wisconsin, he had already proven his ability as a sawmill man to such an extent that his associates were ready to give him the financial backing he needed to establish a big and going business.

The Scotch Lumber Co. was organized along big lines and it has been constantly expanding and modernizing with the passing years until today it is not only one of the largest, but one of the most modern plants of its kind to be found in the South.

Mr. Harrigan was among the first operators in this section to recognize the wisdom of providing recreation and entertainment for his employees. A motion picture theater—one of the first, if not the first, built in the county—was built by him in Fulton; swimming pools were built near the mill; annual picnics and barbecues were given the employees, and once a year, the school children were carried out into the woods on the log train for a picnic; he built a nine-hole golf course and hired an instructor; and he not only saw that his employees had a place to dance but he also brought up a dancing teacher once a week to instruct them in the art of terpsichore.

When the county first undertook to build good roads, he provided teams and machinery and built several miles at company expense; the company also donated the structural steel which went into the building of the bridge which now spans Bassetts Creek in Fulton; he was the first to inaugurate tree farming and he also conducted a demonstration farm on the tract of land between Fulton and Thomasville known as the Hayes Field. Here he planted a variety of orchard trees, including peach, Japanese persimmon, Satsuma, and other types. Mr. Harrigan was more of a sawmill man than an orchardist, however, and the demonstration farm was abandoned after a few years of operation.

He also brought a number of registered Hereford bulls to the county, thereby demonstrating that he not only was interested in improving the lot of those who worked for him, but of their relatives and other citizens of the county, as well.

Mr. Harrigan died in February, 1919, but so well was the business organized and so thoroughly and efficiently had those been trained who worked with him and under him that the business continued to grow and expand after his death.

Up until the death of Mrs. Harrigan in 1943 it was operated as a family enterprise. Following her death, the business was reorganized with Mr. John Gray, one of the stockholders in the company, disposing of his share of stock. Today the mill is owned and operated by the two living heirs of Mr. Harrigan, W. D. Harrigan, Jr. and Mrs. Virginia Harrigan O'Melia. Mrs. O'Melia is assisted in the operation by her husband, Thomas H. O'Melia.

Scotch Lumber Co. Timber Acreage Sufficient To Insure a Perpetual Cut

Around the turn of the century, or even a decade before this time, northern lumbermen and investors had turned their faces toward the South. The magnificent forests of northern white pine and other timbers had been ravished by the wasteful timbering practices of that day and the timberlands had been laid bare for many years to come. The fast growing regions of the North and East were using large quantities of lumber and the timber areas of that section were no longer able to meet these demands.

Down South, conditions were exactly the reverse. Untold thousands of acres of land here were covered with a magnificent growth of long leaf pine timber, one of the finest grades of timber the world has ever known. There was practically no local demand for this timber, as the South had been ravaged following the War Between the States and no capital was available for starting a redevelopment program.

The best pine timber was found on a type of soil that was unfit for cultivation unless fertilized and the rank and file of farmers and landowners had no money to buy commercial fertilizers nor did they understand the science of using them.

These were the conditions that northern investors found when they invaded this region. Many farmers and landowners had found themselves in possession of land which brought them no returns, was unfit for farming, but on which taxes had to be paid each year. The taxes were not much but neither was there much money with which to pay them, so when the southerners were offered a chance to sell these lands, they were ready to accept any offer made them.

In a setting like this, the Russell Sage interests of New York came in and bought thousands of acres of this country's best timber lands. The most of it was bought for as little as 50 cents per acre.

The Sage interests did not cut any of the timber, but were content to resell the lands at prices that netted them a fortune.

Among the timbermen who were attracted to this region during the above period were W. D. Harrigan of Rhinelander, Wis., and Fred Herrick, of that same region. Harrigan came as the active representative, bringing with him the financial backing of Herrick.

At Fulton they found a small mill being operated by two Scotchmen, Alexander McTaggart and Norman Spencer. They bought the mill, renamed it the Scotch Lumber Co., and thus was born the industry which has endured and prospered to this day. This was in 1896.

One of the first moves of this company was to buy a big block of timber acreage from the Russell Sage interests. To this was added many more thousands of acres, bought from local farmers who had gone broke trying to farm the thin, sandy land. Once ample acreage had been secured, Mr. Harrigan went ahead with his ambitious plans.

In the years immediately following 1896, he enlarged the sawmill of the two Scotchmen until he had a big plant ready to go into production.

Operating a sawmill in those days was a vastly different undertaking to that of today. There were no roads, not even the main highways, that were worthy of the name. Timber had to be moved to the mill by the high-wheeled oxcarts or by timber wagons pulled by horses and mules.

It was but a short time before the Scotch had built log roads, or dummy lines, out into the more distant timber holdings, and this greatly simplified the hauling of logs to the mill. The short hauls from the woods to the dummy line were still made by ox-cart or mule team, but from there on in, the logs were hauled by rail.

The long leaf pine timber produced lumber of the highest quality and the mill was soon converting it into grades of rough and planed products that found ready sale everywhere.

One of the early orders which this company handled, and one which was always a source of much pride to the owners, was for a quantity of rift pine flooring with which the Senate Chamber of the Capitol in Washington was floored.

Wages back in those days were extremely low, judged by today's standards, but jobs then were very scarce and workers were usually glad to get jobs at any rate. In the early 1900's the daily wage paid common labor was $1.50 for an 11-hour day, but there appeared to be an abundance of labor available at all times.

The aristocracy among the laborers then, as always, was found among the more skilled workers—the sawyers, the saw filer, the foreman and subforeman, and those who held the easy jobs, such as work in the commissary and the office. One of the aristocrats of that day was the company doctor, a Dr. Hanks, who drove a matched team of horses to his buggy.

Another employee usually envied by the rank and file of the laborers, was Tom Holloway, engineer on the log train. He was generally regarded as the daredevil. There, of course, were other engineers, but when the average person spoke of the dummy engineer, he had Holloway in mind.

The mill is located on the banks of Bassetts Creek and this creek has proved a blessing throughout most of the 65 years the mill has operated, but on one or two occasions, it grew unruly and spread devastation. In 1928 continued excessive rains along the upper reaches of this creek forced it into the highest flood stage it had attained since the mill had been there. The flood which swept through the channel inflicted losses to homes, lumber yards and other installations that mounted into the thousands of dollars.

At other times the flow of the stream has been so reduced by prolonged droughts that it did not afford the needed water for mill operations. The company has corrected this condition by building a reservoir above the mill which is kept pumped full of water.

In 1929 the sawmill was destroyed by fire but the planer mill and other portions of the plant were saved. The sawmill was not rebuilt until 1940, but as it was rebuilt it was modernized and today is completely electrified.

The electrifying of the sawmill was but one of the moves that have been made in recent years to make the plant more modern and more versatile in its handling of the timber of this area. One other innovation, which has now developed into a big operation, is the installation of a hardwood flooring mill. This mill manufactures the "Heather" brand of flooring. Distributors throughout the United States are now handling this brand and it is becoming nationally known.

The most recent installation, and the pride and joy of the millowners, is its German type sawmill. This mill, which handles the smaller sizes of sawlog, averages from 80 to 100 logs per hour.

Clyde Bradford, who is the night foreman at the mill, stated that one night recently, the mill cut 812 logs during an 8-hour work period and was shut down for 25 minutes of this time.

Logs for this mill, as well as for the other mill, are debarked before being brought to the carriage. The conveyor belt then brings them into the mill, where they pass to two separate sets of saws. The first saw merely cuts slabs off each of two sides. It then goes to the second carriage, where a gang of saws converts it into lumber at one trip.

The slabs go into the chipper and the chips and the sawdust are conveyed by belt to a railroad car on a nearby siding. The bark of the log is the only thing that isn't used. It is consumed in a nearby burner.

In the old days, when the boards left the saw carriage, they were loaded on two-wheeled carts or dollies and pushed by hand to the dry kilns or the lumber yards. Today practically all of these things are done by automation. Power-driven rollers convey the lumber out of the mill. It is then loaded on special type stackers or conveyors, hauled to the lumber yards by these conveyors and deposited there with a minimum of handling.

Policies of the Scotch Co. Help Restore Game

Clarke County's magnificent stock of game—deer, wild turkeys, and the smaller varieties—is largely attributable to the wise policies of conservation which the Scotch Lumber Co. has adopted and enforced over a lengthy period.

Many of their tracts have been opened to public hunting, a nominal permit fee being charged to provide supervision in an effort to assure that the game laws are observed.

A tract of 20,000 acres in the Chilton-Tallahatta Springs area has been set aside as a game preserve under provisions of the Pittman-Robinson Act, and this preserve is now opened for limited periods each season for public hunting. At such times hunters flock into the county from all parts of the State and from other States as well.

The hunts held on this preserve last fall resulted in good kills of both deer and turkeys. Another hunt will be held on the preserve during the gobbling season this spring.

In the Silver Creek region of east Clarke County and in a few other areas, as well, the company has maintained its private preserve, where only those it elects to give permits are allowed to hunt. Even this is a benefit to the hunting in adjoining areas, as wild life is not confined to any one locality and much of that on the Scotch private preserve wanders into adjacent lands.

Scotch Among First To Use Scientific Forestry Program

(By H. T. Reynolds)

The large trees of Clarke County found by the settlers provided them with timbers to build their homes and fuel to heat the home and also to cook their food. In about 1770 Dr. Mohor visited the area for the British Crown and set aside certain tracts containing cedar and oak. In 1815 John Landreth made a survey of oak, cedar, and yellow pine for the U.S. Navy Commissioner for use in the construction of ships. The big trees were cut and hewn into square timber, were rafted and floated down the Alabama or Tombigbee River to Mobile where they were exported to Europe and used in ship construction. After the Civil War the sawmill industry bloomed in the South.

The Scotch Lumber Co., one of the oldest sawmill companies of Clarke County, at Fulton, near the turn of the century set up their mill. Their first operation was by railroad as the main means of transporting the logs to the mill.

Their first operation was with log camps out on the east and west sides of the county with the railroad providing transportation from the camp to the mill. The early industry was welcomed by the people as it provided work for the local people, felling and snaking or hauling the logs to the railroad, and also provided income to the land owners in the way of stumpage.

During this time it was the custom to burn the woods at least once a year. Although most of the leaders of the company were very much against this practice, and spent time and effort trying to prevent the woodburning engines from setting fire, as well as encouraging the general public to help prevent fires, the woods continued to burn.

Then the depression years came on and the old mill burned, but the company would not be defeated; they set up a portable mill. They did away with the big steam skidder and trains and began to log with tractors and trucks, continuing to provide lumber for buyers and jobs for the people of this area. In 1938, one of the largest, if not the largest, pine log ever cut in Clarke County was cut on the Silver Creek area. It squared 26 by 26 inches by 63 feet long.

Then in the late thirties they began construction of a new modern mill at Fulton, Ala., near the old millsite. The company ran day and night along with other mills during the war years to turn out timbers and lumber products needed by the Armed Forces to defend this country.

Due to the heavy drain on our forests during World War II and in view of the expanding population, the company became very concerned about uncontrolled forest fires that destroyed seedlings and saplings and damaged mature trees on thousands of acres each year. They joined forces with the State division of forestry, donating the Sand Hill Tower site; furnished a plane with a pilot during fire weather to detect fires in 1947 and 1948 before there were enough towers in Clarke County to give fair detection.

They were among the large companies that asked for a severence tax to be passed to support the fire control program. They, along with other companies and landowners continue to make regular contributions each year to provide funds needed to purchase and operate forest fire control equipment. In addition they have a fire crew equipped with hand tools, also a truck-tractor-plow unit for use on fires on or near their property, when needed.

The Scotch Lumber Co. was among the first in Clarke County of any company to go all out constructing good wide gravel and clay surfaced roads that were to be used as access roads as well as firebreaks. They were also the first to do timber stand improvement work of controlling undesirable hardwoods and brush, by griding and/or chemical treatment to release the young pine seedlings that had come up under the hardwoods.

They transplanted loblolly pine seedlings in the old fields to bring them into production sooner than if they reseeded naturally. They also planted about 1,500 acres of scrub oak woodland to pine because past burning and cutting practices had left too few pines to reseed the area naturally. They continue to employ a forestry crew that does timber stand improvement work where needed; site preparation for seed catch by natural seeding or where necessary they seed mostly loblolly pine direct to the prepared seedbed area. Much of this work is being done in the area populated by the larger so-called virgin yellow pine near the site where early explorers such as Landreth and others noted the pine in 1815 south of Thomasville.

The company has recently cut timbers that squared 17 by 18 inches by 36 feet long

from trees estimated to be from 300 to 500 years old.

Their forest practices, under the supervision of Mr. R. M. Campbell, chief forester, is geared to produce a continuous crop of timber, encouraging pine on upland pine sites and promoting practices that will keep good hardwoods growing on good bottom lands, to provide raw materials for their modern electric sawmill, planer, and flooring mills; to provide poles, piling, and wood chips that are needed to provide forest products for an ever expanding population.

Just as the fire tower stands as a guardian of our forests against wild wood fires and for the conservation of our forests, the Scotch Lumber Co. stands as a symbol of economic stability in this area where it has worked with the people and has kept pace with progress and provided leadership to produce our only renewable resources, our forests; providing timber and forest products for an expanding population and jobs for our people.

Many large sawmills like Scotch Lumber Co. have gone out of business or merged with some other company in recent years. But we need these concerns to keep a balance in our economy, with the sawmill industry and tree farming to provide the raw materials for them and the pulp and paper industry with some row crops and livestock farming along with the sewing industries we now have we are among the most blessed people of any period in history.

During the next few weeks the weather will be changeable with high variable winds that can cause a spark to kindle into a roaring demon that could destroy thousands of little trees in a few minutes. The forest, with its beauty, game, and wildlife, is our heritage to use and enjoy and to pass on to future generations. Let us be very careful and prevent forest fires.

Feed Grains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the South Dakota Stock Growers Association, opposing the pending feed grain bill. The views of this organization are, I believe, representative of livestock interests throughout the Nation.

The resolution is as follows:

FEED GRAINS

Whereas national legislation is being requested to require producers of feed grains to reduce acreage by 20 percent, and

Whereas corn support level would be increased from $1.06 to $1.20 per bushel, and supports for other feed grains would be raised to keep them in line with corn, and

Whereas such legislation would create a severe price penalty on stocker and feeder animals: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the South Dakota Stock Growers Association, at their quarterly meeting in Philip, S. Dak., March 9, 1961, emphatically oppose such legislation or any other legislation pertaining to the control of feed grains which would disrupt the natural law of supply and demand.

What Makes a Leader Great

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent address delivered by the Honorable Arthur B. Van Buskirk, of Pittsburgh, Pa., entitled, "What Makes a Leader Great."

Mr. Van Buskirk is Chairman of the Board of the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT MAKES A LEADER GREAT

(Address by Arthur B. Van Buskirk, Western Pennsylvania Engineers Society annual banquet, February 6, 1961)

Gentlemen, I have agreed to talk this evening on one of the most intriguing subjects I know: "What Makes a Leader Great." How and why through the ages have men and women of uncommon mold risen to lead their fellow citizens in hours of crisis? Whence did such people come and what was their secret?

Since this is to be a relatively brief address, time will not permit us to cover the whole gamut of leaders, and hence we must begin by laying aside certain groups which it would be most interesting to talk about. Among these are the God-inspired prophets of old: Moses, Buddha, Mohammed, Confucius, and Christ. Also the great religious leaders: St. Paul, Luther, Loyola, Knox, Wesley, and we might add, Gandhi. We Christians believe that Christ was divine, but let us not forget that to even greater masses of the world's population Buddha, Mohammed, and Confucius also had a divine aura. And whereas the impact of the life of Alexander the Great on the modern world is relatively small, the souls of such men as St. Paul, Martin Luther, and John Wesley go marching on. Although referring only briefly to these prophets and religious leaders in tonight's address, I do want to emphasize one basic trait they all had, which runs through the lives of most great men: the considered habit of periodically withdrawing from the world—onto the mountain top or into the wilderness perhaps—for personal enlightenment, after which they returned to the task of uplifting their fellow men. There is a lesson here for every leader at every level—for our statesmen, our business executives, and all of us who under the pressure of modern life are apt to forget the significance of occasional quiet and solitude.

Another group we must pass by are men preeminent in literature, art, or music. Shakespeare, Michelangelo, Wagner, and Beethoven would be good examples. Here again we see the touch of the Almighty. Otherwise how can we explain their genius: Mozart composing minuets before he was 4 years of age, or Beethoven playing in public at 8, and at 10 writing compositions for publication. It seems safe to say that the impact of the life of Shakespeare or of Wagner upon Western civilization has been far greater than that of Napoleon. The same thing would be true, I suspect, of the genius Thomas Edison.

Sometimes the hand of the Divinity comes like a flash of lightning out of the heavens as in the case of Jeanne d'Arc. Who can match the sheer heroism of this young maid of Orleans—a simple peasant girl hearing a call in the nightwatches and rising to lead the French Forces to victory over England. When she was brought to trial at the instance of the church, she answered her interrogator, "Everything I have done is at God's command." You know the rest of her thrilling story—and how fearlessly she faced death as she was burned at the stake. Her executioner was instructed to reduce her entire body to ashes so that no part should escape, but it is recorded that notwithstanding the charcoal and sulphur which were applied to her heart, it remained unconsumed and was finally thrown into the Seine. Is it any wonder she stands sainted today in church history?

The more meaningful leadership so far as you and I are concerned, and which I want particularly to talk about this evening, is that which arises in Western democracy and on which its survival in the crucial years ahead must depend. We may not assume the America we know will survive. In his famous history, Arnold Toynbee deals with 26 civilizations, of which he identifies 16 as dead, 9 broken down, and only ours in the West remaining vital.

Let us take four of our greatest Americans: Franklin, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Woodrow Wilson. What characteristics did they have in common? Do we find the same traits in the best of our military leaders, such as George Washington and Robert E. Lee?

Good old Ben Franklin—often referred to as the first civilized American, and certainly the wisest man of his age. At any time, in any place, Franklin would have been great. He had a commonsense, an earthiness, as though he sprang from the very soil itself, and in a sense he did, because he came from a long line of English blacksmiths. From penniless obscurity as a boy of 17, a printer's apprentice, he stepped off a packet onto the cobblestones of Philadelphia, with 1 Dutch dollar and a copper shilling in his pocket. As the years passed, he displayed his eminence as printer, educator, inventor, philosopher, and statesman. Being much older than Washington and Jefferson, and greatly revered by them and the other young Revolutionaries, his wise counsel left an indelible mark upon our early history from the Declaration of Independence, through the days of the Continental Congress, and on into the Constitutional Convention. Perhaps the only genius of his age that could rival Franklin was Thomas Jefferson.

An anecdote on Franklin may not be amiss. It's the story of the teacher who had been instructing her class of children in the virtue of brevity and called on a little lad to tell the high points of Franklin's life in a few words. Said the boy, "Benjamin Franklin was born in Boston in 1706, landed in Philadelphia in 1723, walked up the cobblestone street and saw a girl in a doorway, married her and discovered electricity." His life is a matchless example of democratic leadership—he spent 42 years of his life in active business in order that he might be free to spend the last 42 years of his life promoting the welfare of mankind.

Thomas Jefferson was born when Ben Franklin was 37 years of age. These two, with Abraham Lincoln, constitute the great triumvirate of American leadership and the personification of all that is finest in our history. Each of them possessed to a striking degree the most fundamental trait of all great leaders of men; namely, a sympathetic insight into the motives and

aspirations of the people of their times—a knowledge of what is in their hearts and minds—coupled with the ability to articulate these aspirations with clarity and force. This trait, says Woodrow Wilson,[1] distinguishes all the real leaders, the builders, irrespective of the time, the place, and the society that produced them. Thomas Jefferson more than any other man in our history voiced the aspirations of the colonists and their fierce spirit of liberty. Inscribed over the Jefferson Memorial in Washington are his famous words written to Dr. Benjamin Rush, a fellow signer of the Delcaration of Independence: "I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man." This was the motivating force of Jefferson's life and of the times in which he lived. The three greatest Americans—Franklin, Jefferson, and Lincoln—also embodied the additional traits which students of leadership in democracies pretty much agree are displayed by the truly great leaders: integrity, courage, determination, good judgment, and a flexibility of mind.[2]

As a byproduct of these dynamic virtues, Franklin, Jefferson, and Lincoln had a tolerance without which the whole history of America would have been different. They were devoted to the things that united rather than those which divided their countrymen. The Constitution could not have been agreed upon without the willingness of Franklin and Jefferson to join in great compromises so that the nation might be formed.

And where in all our history is this attitude of tolerance and devotion to the whole Nation so strikingly shown as in these immortal words of Abraham Lincoln's second inaugural:

"With malice towards none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphans; to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and a lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

No discussion of American leadership would be complete without some mention of Woodrow Wilson, George Washington, and Robert E. Lee. Wilson had the kind of prophetic vision of the people's aspirations to which I have referred. Undoubtedly one of our most eminent presidents, he studied the art of leadership and was our best modern authority in the whole field of political science. In a stimulating commencement address on "Leaders of Men" he wisely observed: "If you would be a leader of men, you must lead your own generation, not the next."[3] Ironically, Wilson proved this in his own life when he could not lead the country to accept the League of Nations. It was a cause born before its time, to which Franklin Roosevelt a generation later was able to win the support of the American people in establishing the United Nations. History will certainly accord F.D.R. a high place in the annals of American leadership.

George Washington and Robert E. Lee likewise displayed the marks of leadership I have mentioned, along with a perfection of character unexcelled in our national history. These two military leaders in their days of trial showed the faith, the devotion, and the personal sacrifice which bring the everlasting remembrance of their fellow men. Each gave his all to the time in which he lived and to the cause in which he believed. Perhaps the most fateful hour in the life of Lee was not his surrender at Appomattox, but the moments that followed as he mounted his faithful horse Traveller and with a broken heart rode back to his campfire amid the tears and demonstrated affection of all his soldiers and officers. Lee, a man so great that both the North and the South wished him for its military leader, and now a century later, like Abraham Lincoln, he belongs to both the North and the South.

Magnetism and eloquence can be powerful traits in democratic leadership. A striking example is Daniel Webster. Or listen to John Bright, who defeated Lord Randolph Churchill for Parliament in England, speaking to his constituents:

"Palaces, baronial castles, great halls, stately mansions do not make a nation. The nation in every country dwells in the cottage; and unless the light of your constitution can shine there, unless the beauty of your legislation and the excellence of your statesmanship are impressed there on the feelings and conditions of the people, rely upon it, you have yet to learn the duties of government."

On the other hand, however right may be his theme, the statesman whose ability is literary rather than forensic may lose his cause. Picture Edmund Burke speaking on conciliation with America in words that might have avoided the Revolution and changed the whole course of British and American history. "Wise beyond precedent in the annals of debate," yet his words emptied the audience in the House of Commons.[4]

Sometimes it is robust enthusiasm rather than eloquence, along with courage and integrity that shapes a leader. Such was Theodore Roosevelt. No doubt many of you were young men when Teddy was President, and perhaps you belonged, as I did, to that vast group of boys who got their first taste of hero worship from Theodore Roosevelt. In many ways he was greater as a leader than he was as a President. In other times he might have been an immortal.

Curiously, history effaces the antagonisms of the moment that often surge about illustrious leaders in their day. Just as Lincoln and Lee belong to the whole Nation, so Jeanne d'Arc and George Washington are admired in England; and we Americans take pride in the noblest leaders of British history. I would like to mention two of them: First, Horatio Viscount Nelson, who in leading the attack of the British fleet against Spain at Santa Cruz de Tenerife had his right elbow shattered by a musket ball. His arm was amputated at the shoulder without an anesthetic, and within a half-hour his flag captain was receiving orders as though nothing had happened. Let me add parenthetically, that if you have not visited Santa Cruz de Tenerife in the Canary Islands, put it on your travel list; it is one of the most majestic spots in the most heavenly climate in all the world. But let's get on with Nelson. During the Napoleonic wars Nelson was given the Mediterranean command. As he led his fleet into battle at Trafalgar, he signaled to each of his ships those memorable words: "England expects that every man will do his duty." During that battle Nelson lost his life because he refused to let the fighting *Téméraire* pass his flagship and take the first shock of the French guns. Little wonder that he was trusted and venerated as much by his seamen as by his officers and that history regards him as the most famous of all seamen and one of the immortals of all time.

My second British immortal is the greatest democratic statesman of this century, whose name will live as long as our way of life shall endure: Winston Churchill, Britain's man of destiny in our time. Hear his words in Parliament after France had fallen and Britain stood alone in 1940:

"The whole fury and might of the enemy must very soon be turned on us. Hitler knows that he will have to break us in this island or lose the war. If we can stand up to him, all Europe may be free and the life of the world may move forward into broad sunlit uplands. But if we fail, then the whole world, including the United States, including all that we have known and cared for, will sink into the abyss of a new Dark Age, made more sinister, and perhaps more protracted, by the lights of perverted science. Let us, therefore, brace ourselves to our duties, and so bear ourselves that, if the British Empire and its Commonwealth last for a thousand years, men will say, 'This was their finest hour.'"

On hearing these words would you not have been proud to be a British subject?

One cannot give even cursory study to the world's greatest leaders without being impressed with another general attribute, not of their characters but of their lives. I refer to the virtue of adversity—the demonstration that for the individual as well as the Nation the road to the heights is built by hard work and sacrifice, and those who travel it are bathed in blood, sweat, and tears. Indeed, Toynbee tells us that it is difficult rather than easy environmental conditions that produce the advance not only of nations but of civilizations. I wonder whether our American society today with its so-called prosperity and it ever easier mode of life, infiltrated by the search for security instead of opportunity, is conducive to the production of great leaders. Our new young President in his inaugural struck the right note when he said, "And so, my fellow Americans, ask not what America can do for you; ask what you can do for your country."

Now the real significance of all that I have said about the qualities of leadership is that today more than ever before America needs to develop her leadership at all levels of government. Part of the problem is that a free society requires more leaders than other kinds of society. With us the heads of state lead; they do not rule. Hence, in each new generation we must develop statesmen, young and old, men of broad vision with an understanding of our Nation's traditions and a sense of her destiny.

Our technological advance in this century has moved with lightning rapidity. Within a single lifespan many of us have seen the development and mass production of the automobile, the piston and later the jet airplane, the radio and television, and now automation, atomic energy and the space age. True, these scientific advances have contributed to our high standard of living, but in spite of such material progress America will have failed in the truest sense unless our advance in the art of government and in the realm of human and spiritual values keeps pace with our physical progress. From the standpoint of wise leadership, it is not enough that you able and imaginative engineers should expand the frontiers of our technical knowledge. You and the scientists who come after you must, either through formal education or private study, expand your horizons and knowledge in the field of the social sciences and acquire a better understanding of the motivations of human beings. The situation is similar in the profession of medicine, where our notable progress has failed to expand adequately in the field of psychiatry to cope with the mental ills of our population. Our admiration of technological and material gains caused Nehru on leaving our shores a few months ago to warn us in these words, "Of all countries, the United States and the Soviet Union are nearer to each other than any two countries in the world—both take their stand on technology and what I call the machine civilization." Is this the kind

---

[1] Woodrow Wilson, "Leaders of Men," Princeton University Press, 1952.

[2] L. F. Urwick, "Leadership in the 20th Century," Pitman Publishing Co., 1957. Emory S. Bogardus, "Leaders and Leadership," Appleton-Century, 1934.

[3] See "Leaders of Men," supra, p. 29.

[4] See "Leaders of Men," supra, p. 27.

of image of America that we are building for the underdeveloped and uncommitted nations to look upon? Or are we going to build something far beyond a machine civilization? The answer will depend upon whether the hero worship of the new generation is directed merely to the development of ever more intricate machines, tools, and gadgets, or whether along with this there goes deep respect for the heritage of America and emulation of the traits of character which our greatest men displayed.

Have no feeling that these qualities of leadership are most likely to be found in our best schools or colleges. The environment of our humblest homes is perhaps better able to nurture them. Alas, many of these potentially great young men and women go through life and never receive the call to lead their fellow countrymen, but their qualities of heart and mind are there nevertheless. These are the people Thomas Gray spoke of in his famous Elegy written in a country graveyard:

"Perhaps, in this neglected spot, is laid,
Some heart, once pregnant with celestial fire;
Hands that the rod of empire might have sway'd,
Or waked to ectasy the living lyre.

Some village Hampden, that, with dauntless breast,
The little tyrant of his fields withstood;
Some mute, inglorious Milton here may rest;
Some Cromwell, guiltless of his country's blood."

Perhaps in your home or in your office there are young men or women in whom you can kindle the spark which will make them aspire to give their lives as leaders in the service of America. It was when Thomas Jefferson, at the age of 22, heard the stirring words of Patrick Henry that he resolved to dedicate himself to the cause of freedom and independence.

Remember, too, that the same qualities which made the great statesmen I have mentioned are what make the leaders of American industry. This is especially true today when a sense of public responsibility becomes a prerequisite to wise leadership in the top echelons of our corporations. First consideration for the public interest must exist, not only at the executive level, but in the councils of labor and all along the firing lines of industry, if our system is to remain strong and we are to avoid the welfare state.

Upon you and me, who spend our lives in the learned professions or in positions of importance in industry, there rests a special responsibility for the development of the right kind of future leaders. We must be sure that as managers of business we do not spend too much of our time on the merry-go-round grabbing for brass rings. Titles and material gains will not bring lasting satisfaction to most of us. Fortunate is the man who learns in younger years with Thomas Jefferson the relative value of life's goals. When Jefferson came to write his epitaph, he never mentioned having been President of the United States. He wished to be remembered as the founder of the University of Virginia and author of the Declaration of Independence.

Our American heritage is very great. The American dream is still a reality. But I wonder as future historians record the progress of our age whether they will find that we have measured up to the challenge we received from our forefathers. When at the sunset of life we pass the torch of freedom to our children, will it burn as brightly as it did or us in our youth? Even though men grow old, the Nation still is young; and in each succeeding generation there must be awakened the intense spirit of liberty that gave our country birth. **America is only beginning to fulfill her larger destiny, and she yearns for leaders to match her greatness. The grave question is, Will these leaders rise? The long sweep of our history answers that such leaders will not arise if we are worshipers of technology and the material, but if on the other hand we as a people follow in the footsteps of our ancestors and walk with our Maker "beside the still waters," finding our inspiration in the noblest leaders we have ever known, then surely a wise Providence will bless us in the future as He has in the past.**

A Move in the Wrong Direction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "A Move in the Wrong Direction" which appeared on February 17, 1961, in the Monitor, the official Catholic newspaper of the diocese of Trenton, N.J.

A MOVE IN THE WRONG DIRECTION

The House Committee on Un-American Activities has been functioning for the past 20 years. It was created as an agency for the protection of the Nation's security against subversion. Like other congressional committees with broad powers of investigation, it serves the purpose of disclosing conditions that justify legislative action. In the course of its work, which is necessarily along unpleasant lines, it has aroused enmities and opposition. This antagonism again has taken the form of a petition to Congress calling for the abolition of the committee.

This movement has been initiated by citizens of a number of States who have signed a petition which cites five charges against the committee, all presented in general terms and without documentation. The committee, it is charged, has perverted and imperiled the proper and necessary powers of Congress, helped to discourage free study and inquiry in working for peace, harassed Americans who work for racial equality and justice, increased bitterness between racial and religious groups, discouraged social and cultural contacts with neighbors.

Citizens are asked to write to Congress in support of the petition. The appeal is made on the basis of a complaint which is not specific in any instance, which cites no supporting evidence and which makes no pretense at being a presentation of facts. But its most indefensible aspect is its disregard of the affirmative side of the record—the disclosures of disloyalty and subversion which, if they had not been brought into the full light of day, might have been seriously damaging to the Nation's security.

The nature of the task which the House Committee on Un-American Activities has been required to fulfill and the character of many of the people with whom it has to deal have made stern measures a necessity. Many of those involved have been conspirators against the Nation's security, agents of potential enemies. They have employed every available device to protect their secrets and escape involvement. They have been determined to thwart the committee at every turn.

In view of the failure of the sponsors of this movement to support in any tangible way the collection of loose charges directed against the House Committee on Un-American Activities, is not the demand for its abolition presumptuous and arrogant? And is not the failure even to refer to the committee's many constructive accomplishments during the 20 years of its history a reflection of unreasoning prejudice and unfairness?

It is possible that many tender feelings would be spared if the purpose of this movement were accomplished. And it is possible also that a green light would be given Communist agents and their allies and disloyal Americans whose main business is subversion. The committee serves a necessary purpose and the dangers of its abolition should not be risked.

Peace Corps Recruiting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the recent Executive order creating the nucleus of a Peace Corps has captured the imagination of students, church groups, and everyone else who is concerned about the great numbers of people who still live limited lives in so many nations of the world.

The reaction to the Peace Corps proposal is indicative of the great potential for good in this program. As one New Jersey editorial writer recently expressed it:

President John F. Kennedy's establishment of a Peace Corps may well mark the passing of another milestone on the road to world peace. His program promises * * * a golden opportunity for the people of the United States, through dedicated, interested, and able young people to acquire the intimate understanding of our neighbors which is so essential to our national emergence as a strong, more respected, and better equipped leader of the free nations of the world in their search for world peace, with freedom.

The enthusiasm for the proposal in New Jersey has been expressed in a United Press International story of March 8 and in the following editorials: from the Courier-Post, Camden, N.J., March 13 edition; Jersey Journal, Jersey City, N.J., March 11 edition; the Daily Journal, Elizabeth, N.J., March 7, edition; the Sunday Home News, New Brunswick, N.J., March 5 edition.

I ask unanimous consent to have the above editorials printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACE CORPS AS MISSION ACTIVITY

President Kennedy has created the Peace Corps about which he talked during his campaign and has asked Congress to make it permanent.

The President may have an excellent idea here, but its success will depend on the temperament and training of the volunteers sent abroad and the kind of support they get.

They will go only to countries where "their services and skills are genuinely needed and desired," the President promised. By the

end of the year he hopes to have 500 to 1,000 members around the world, building peace by helping underprivileged nations toward what might be called new horizons of productivity, health, and hope.

The program would appear to complement the program of mission activity in which churches of every denomination are engaging, with people of many special skills sought to promote Christian advancement through technical aid designed for the areas in which it is given.

The wording of Mark 16: 15 is almost identical in either Douay or the King James version of the Bible, and the last seven words are the same: "* * * and preach the Gospel to every creature."

There are many ways to preach the Gospel. Some men preach it with a surgeon's scapel, some with a plow, some with a book, some with a bar of soap.

Whatever the means, they scatter good seed and some of it falls where it can take root.

Many years of religious work in the darkest corners where daring men and women have been permitted to go have built a great body of experience. The Peace Corps volunteers will find much spadework done when they begin their task.

The plan should work as long as it and the people engaged in it stick to the simple principle of teaching men the way to walk in dignity toward their goals and not trying to pick them up and carry them.

It's a slower and harder process than it might appear on the surface.

PEACE CORPS RECRUITING

President Kennedy's Peace Corps plan is stirring the imaginations of the Nation's college students. The initial response is so strong that the pool of prospective corpsmen is even larger than the most optimistic planning originally had supposed.

The enthusiasm should be gratifying to an older generation which at times has wondered just where the Nation's youth is headed. But at the same time, it should caution corps leaders in Washington to give considerable thought to selection processes they may set up.

The good intentions of the thousands who will apply cannot be questioned seriously, although there may be some diplomatic dilettantes included. Maturity and understanding should be considered carefully in each applicant.

Our foreign dealings have been criticized severely in recent years for introducing the ugly American to the world. The sometimes inadequate image we have presented overseas has cost us dearly in prestige and friendships.

As we work to erase the ugly American and his effect, care should be taken to prevent a new caricature from assuming his place. Irresponsibility among members of the Peace Corps could bring about just such a situation.

The same psychological factor would be involved in the plan to expand the Peace Corps functions to include work in depressed areas of this country. Preventing economic depression from spreading to the human heart requires tact and discretion that are not always present in college-age men and women.

If these risks can be eliminated from the program, its potential for America, the deprived areas and nations and participating youth is unlimited. It not only will give the United States a new image and the depressed areas and nations new hope, but it will provide an unparalleled opportunity for growth and learning for the young corpsmen themselves.

FRONTIER FOR YOUTH

There is a promise of adventure in the President's Peace Corps that is catching the fancy of young Americans. It truly contains the allure of New Frontiers—not only the sort promised by Mr. Kennedy during the campaign, but also frontiers such as beckoned pioneers westward during our early history.

The new project will give Americans an opportunity to serve their country abroad in ways intended to promote mutual understanding and benefit. Peace Corps members of both sexes will be teachers, field technicians and the like, trained and eager for their jobs and carefully screened. They will work in education, farming, public health, homecrafts and the English language. They will operate largely under native authorities and at the invitation of host countries.

Recruits will spend 2 to 3 years overseas, according to present State Department plans. They will not have plush living; the Peace Corps worker will get a basic allowance sufficient only to match local living standards and maintain health.

But the program will provide the Peace Corps member, in payment for the sacrifice the assignment entails, his chance to make a tangible contribution to better world understanding and to his country's stature in the community of nations. We were among the first to applaud this idea when it was suggested last summer. We are confident that enthusiasm for the program will endure.

YOUTH SHAPING WORLD FUTURE

President John F. Kennedy's establishment of a Peace Corps may well mark the passing of another milestone on the road to lasting world peace.

His program promises not only direct and invaluable benefits to the countries where Peace Corps members will live and work but also a golden opportunity for the people of the United States, through dedicated, interested and able young people, to acquire the intimate understanding of our neighbors overseas which is so essential to our national emergence as a stronger, more respected and better equipped leader of the free nations of the world in their search for world peace, with freedom.

President Kennedy's Peace Corps appears to be a carefully planned and well thought out program. He seems to have anticipated objections that might be raised to the program, and eliminated the points of conflict.

Peace Corps members will serve without pay, receiving only living allowances. They will be carefully screened by the FBI for security clearance. They will not get draft exemptions. They will be forbidden to engage in religious missionary pursuits. They will not in any way serve the Central Intelligence Agency.

That takes care of most of the objections that might be raised.

What will the Peace Corps do? Its members will be young people specially skilled in teaching, in agriculture, in health. They will have 3 to 6 months' special training here in language, culture and work skills needed in the nations to which they are assigned.

In the foreign field, the Peace Corps members will live and work with the ordinary people of the land they are assigned to. In many cases the work will be arduous in the developing nations and living conditions will be most primitive.

President Kennedy hopes that this new American Peace Corps will find favor not only in the nations which need its services but in the leading free nations which stand shoulder to shoulder with us in the cause of world peace. He says, "Let us hope that other nations will mobilize the spirit and energies and skill of their people in some form of Peace Corps—making our own effort only one step in a major international effort to increase the welfare of all men and improve understanding among nations."

We think the Peace Corps will achieve this aim. And we find ourselves extremely well pleased with this offer to our young people of a chance to help shape the future of the world.

NEW JERSEY COLLEGE STUDENTS RALLY TO PEACE CORPS PROPOSAL

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—President Kennedy's Peace Corps program is winning the backing of college students throughout the country. The following story gives the reactions of New Jersey students.)

(By Walter K. Lindenmann)

New Jersey college students are rallying to President Kennedy's Peace Corps program.

A United Press International survey indicated that many of the State's upperclassmen were interested in the program, and even those who said they couldn't join thought it was a good idea.

Additionally, the proposal to send volunteers overseas as missionaries of peace for the United States has earned the official approval of at least one institute of higher learning—Fairleigh-Dickinson University.

Dr. Peter Sammartino, president of the Rutherford School, announced during the weekend that each student who gives 1 year of service to the program will receive 6 academic credits on the graduate level or 12 on the undergraduate level.

LEADING ENTHUSIASTS

But most of the enthusiasm has come from the students.

Typical of the reaction was the comment of Hugh McDaid, of Harrison, a prelaw student at Fairleigh-Dickinson who found the plane "one of the finest expressions of American foreign policy in years."

Don Emmerson, a 20-year-old Princeton senior, called the plan "a concrete step toward national and personal understanding and development.

"It gives American youths a chance to prove they are not self-satisfied, as they are so often portrayed," he added.

Ted Pontius, 20, another Princeton senior, said he sees in the Peace Corps "a chance to serve my country and at the same time pick up valuable knowledge about people. I don't think it will be fun, but I think it will be challenging and rewarding."

WILL DESTROY CONCEPT

Upsala student John C. Schmeelk, 19, of Dumont, put it this way: "It's a program which is long overdue and one that will get the enthusiastic support of most college students.

"I can see the unlimited possibilities of a Peace Corps in destroying the ugly American concept in underdeveloped nations as well as in improving the living and educational standards of those areas," was the reaction of David Cote, 25, of Willimantic, Conn., an Upsala student.

At Fairleigh-Dickinson, about 250 upperclassmen were said to be leaning toward the corps. At Rutgers University, New Brunswick, both the Targum and the Caelian, undergraduate newspapers of Rutgers and Douglass College, respectively, endorsed the plan.

An official of Rider College, Trenton, said it was too early to evaluate reaction.

Have You Heard About the Hard Times?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, we so often overlook the fact that we live in a country that maintains the best standard of living in the world. This is a dis-

tinct compliment to our historic free enterprise system as contrasted with the Communist systems which today threaten our very existence.

Recently a very interesting editorial appeared in the editorial column of the Sleepy Eye Herald-Dispatch. The point that is so well put across by the editor I think should be brought to the attention of my colleagues and I ask that it be included with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

HAVE YOU HEARD ABOUT THE HARD TIMES?

Have you heard about the hard times we're experiencing? About the ill-housed, ill-clothed, ill-fed? About the farmers and small businessmen who are going broke? It's really tough. As a result of the shortage of food on the table, some of us are now only 20 instead of 30 pounds overweight.

Seriously, a small segment of the population is having financial difficulty. Those who have lost jobs are worried and have reason to worry. They comprise from 5 to 7 percent of those who ever had jobs, including part-time workers and those who want only part-time work.

The other 93 to 95 percent is getting along reasonably well. Most of them are living on a scale they would have thought fantastic 30 years ago.

Maybe we should back away from the wailing wall for a while and compare our lot with that of men, women and children in other lands.

A Missouri school superintendent has done this. He says that if the world's population—2,750 million—were compressed into a single town of 1,000 population, the following contrasts would be seen:

Sixty persons would represent the U.S.A., 940 would represent all others, 60 Americans would receive one-half the income of the town, 940 other people would share the other one-half, 36 Americans would be church members, 24 would belong to no church, 300 of the town's population would be Christians, 700 would have other beliefs, 80 of the town's population would be card-carrying Communists, 370 would be under Communist domination, 303 would be white, 697 would be non-white.

The 60 Americans would have a life expectancy of 70.

The expectancy of all others would average under 40.

Of the town's total supply, the average American would have 15½ times as much as the average other person.

The Americans would produce 16½ percent of the town's food supply and would consume 15 percent, storing the 1½ percent. Most of the 940 non-Americans would be hungry most of the time.

The 60 Americans would have: 12 times as much electricity, 22 times as much coal, 21 times as much oil, 50 times as much steel, 50 times as much general equipment—as the 940 remaining in the town.

The lowest income group of Americans would be better off than the average of the other 940.

Corraling Policy Statements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I believe the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor for March 11, 1961, entitled "Corraling Policy Statements," is worthy of the attention of all Members of the Congress and of the administration:

Within limits there is much to be said for President Kennedy's desire to have his administration speak with one voice. Responsible government can be damaged by careless or confusing policy statements. But obviously the art of shaping a clean-cut impact on public opinion has not yet been perfected.

One clear problem comes in reconciling campaign positions with the responsibilities of office. This was shown in the missile-gap gap. But the latest incidents requiring amplification ("correction" in less diplomatic language) have concerned foreign affairs. Secretary of State Rusk could well be wishing certain roving envoys would rove more and talk less for publication.

The White House had to explain the Mennen Williams remark about "Africa for the Africans." Now Mr. Rusk has had to clear policy from questions raised by Ambassador Harriman's statement in West Germany that policies of the Eisenhower administration would not necessarily bind the new President. This was said in answer to a question whether Mr. Kennedy would continue to regard East Germans controlling West Berlin's communications as agents of the Soviet Union.

The answer evolved doubts about American firmness on Berlin. Mr. Rusk had to say in effect that nothing has changed and many foreign policy positions must necessarily remain the same. He had the difficult chore of trying at the same time to leave himself some freedom for maneuver by linking Berlin with a broad German settlement.

Both at home and abroad the campaign led people to expect greater (or different) changes. This opens even careful statements to misunderstanding. It leaves even less than normal room for careless or conflicting ones.

Dwight David Eisenhower

SPEECH
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 14, 1961

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, this is a happy occasion when Members on both sides of the aisle join together with the President of the United States in honoring a great former President, a great soldier and a great American unanimously. It is fitting that this tribute should be unanimous because President, and before him General, Eisenhower did more to guide the peoples of the world and the people of the United States than any President we ever had. It is also gratifying that his successor, although he comes from the opposite party, was the first one to see the necessity of giving this honor to former President Eisenhower.

It has been well said that the Presidency is the highest honor in gift of the American people. This is true. But in President Eisenhower's case he has a special place in the hearts of all of our people because it was as a general that he conducted a great and victorious campaign. It was he who was there on the beach at Normandy on D-day and, therefore, he occupies a rather unique position in our entire history. We do want him to carry the title of "General," a five-star General of the Army.

For this reason, today is a great and historic occasion. This honor that is being conferred upon him can only be conferred on a very few. There are only four men in our country today who have it. It is not an honor that can be passed on. It is an honor that has to be earned. No man in our history has earned it more completely or deserves it more absolutely than does Dwight David Eisenhower.

The Disclaimer Affidavit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Prof. Howard E. Dean, secretary of the American Association of University Professors, University of Oregon Chapter, Eugene, Oreg., has written to me concerning the association's opposition to the disclaimer affidavit requirement of the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

I ask unanimous consent that Professor Dean's letter be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF
UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS,
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON CHAPTER,
Eugene, Oreg.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am sure you will be interested in the following letter concerning the disclaimer affidavit requirement of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 which this chapter is sending to American Association of University Professors chapters in State universities and colleges throughout the country:

"On behalf of the University of Oregon Chapter, American Association of University Professors, I enclose for your information copies of official statements expressing vigorous opposition to the disclaimer affidavit requirement of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 which have been made by the Oregon State Board of Higher Education, the faculty of the University of Oregon, and by this chapter.

"More recently, the Pacific Northwest Assembly, a regional meeting of the American Assembly established in 1950 by Dwight D. Eisenhower, while President of Columbia University, has expressed its opposition to this requirement. At its meeting in Cottage Grove, Oreg., December 1–4, 1960, the assembly adopted a recommendation that the National Defense Education Act be amended to remove the requirement of the disclaimer affidavit. Participants in the Pacific Northwest Assembly included community leaders from business, labor, agriculture, Government, and the professions in five Western States.

"We are encouraged by these affirmations of steadfast support for American traditions of free inquiry and fair play. We feel strongly the faculties, governing boards, and AAUP chapters must act now, as the 87th

Congress begins, to make plain their opposition to the unjustly discriminatory disclaimer affidavit requirement and to work for its immediate repeal.

"We believe that our opinions will be more effective if we act in concert, and if we express them at strategic moments when they will be relevant to proposed congressional action. To accomplish this, our faculties ought to have some ready and continuing channel of communication. We believe that the AAUP chapters can serve that role.

"We respectfully request that you keep us informed of the actions taken in this direction by your faculty, governing board, AAUP chapter, and your Representatives in Congress."

Sincerely yours,

HOWARD E. DEAN,
Secretary.

Resid Controls: Is the Game Worth the Candle?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include an editorial that appeared in the February 27, 1961, issue of the Oil and Gas Journal entitled "Resid Controls: Is the Game Worth the Candle?" This publication is one of the most objective in the industry, and its views are worthy of profound consideration.

The editorial follows:

RESID CONTROLS: IS THE GAME WORTH THE CANDLE?

Perhaps it would be smart politics for the domestic oil industry to interpose no opposition to current proposals to remove quota controls from imports of residual fuel oil.

At first blush this suggestion may be alarming to those who look on any oil imports as injurious, or who fear that a weakening of controls on resid would be used by the international companies or others as an entering wedge to gut the rest of the imports-control plan.

But study would demonstrate that the overall economic loss to the domestic producing and refining industry would be quite small, while the political gains could be very substantial.

Resid import controls are the subject of a lot of political rhubarb—have been since they were imposed and will be as long as they continue. Domestic oil is an innocent bystander caught in the crossfire between coal producers and New England consumers.

Consumers' spokesmen don't distinguish between industrial fuel oil and other petroleum products. Their squawks against resid controls tend to become attacks on the whole control system.

So if the domestic industry would favor ending Government interference in the resid business it would have much firmer ground to support the much more important—and much more defensible—limitations on imports of crude and of other refined products.

Foreign resid has impact only on the North Atlantic seaboard. Its low price has some, but not a huge, effect on the total product realization of the relatively few gulf and east coast refineries competing with foreign resid. And this reflects back on the market for only an extremely small volume of low-gravity gulf coast crude.

Resid sells for less than the price of U.S. crude oil used to make it, and a price attractive to U.S. refiners would price resid out of the market. Therefore most refiners consider resid an unwanted byproduct and make as little as their equipment permits, regardless of the import volume.

Two years of resid controls have not had appreciable effects on demand, prices, import volume, or domestic output of resid. The only tangible results are an unsolvable administrative headache and an eternal squabble among importers, dealers, consumers, and coal men.

There should be safeguards if controls are lifted. Resid should be imported only for boiler fuel and not for reprocessing as crude. Resid imports should be excluded from the demand base in calculating crude imports, and deducted, at least in part, from crude-import quotas.

In short, resid imports are a very special situation, with little bearing on the rest of the oil business. If the domestic industry would keep aloof from that hassle it might gain support for the rest—the really vital parts—of the import-controls system.

A Proposal for the Dollar Gap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Constantine Brown as it appeared in the Washington Evening Star of March 9, 1961. Mr. Brown's idea appears to be a very good one:

A PROPOSAL FOR THE DOLLAR GAP: AMERICAN COUNTERPART FUNDS FOR TOURISTS URGED TO EASE OUTFLOW OF GOLD

Why has nobody in the administration considered the use of counterpart funds available to the American Government almost everywhere in the world to offset the outflow of dollars spent by American tourists abroad? This question is being asked by those connected with the highly developed tourist industry here and abroad.

The American people have spent over the last 15 years through their Government upward of $80 billion all over the globe, either in the form of economic assistance under what is generally known as the Marshall plan or through the sale of surplus goods, especially food.

In all these transactions it was provided that the recipient countries would set aside in their own depreciated currencies substantial sums representing interest or repayment for the money and goods received from the United States. According to the existing agreements, the United States is entitled to spend for its own needs in the debtor countries between 15 and 20 percent of the counterpart moneys. The balance is being plowed back into the economy of that country, itself.

It is difficult for outsiders to determine how great an equivalent of dollars is available to the United States. But according to some responsible sources in Washington an "informed guess" is that some $7 billion is at the disposal of the Treasury to be spent within the various foreign countries.

The greatest number of American tourists travel to England, France, Germany, Italy, etc. In all these countries we have substantial counterpart funds. Before the dollar yielded its place of honor in the international money markets to the mark and guilder the administration used a small percentage of these funds to purchase palaces for its embassies, cultural centers, and also to pay for the many and ever-increasing congressional junkets abroad. But these expenditures represented a drop in the bucket.

Until recently Americans were encouraged to travel and spend dollars abroad as a means to strengthen the sick European currencies. The situation has changed now. We are in the midst of a dollar crisis. The outflow of our currency is one of the main causes. In order to meet this difficulty and without interfering with tourism it is being suggested that the U.S. Government use its counterpart funds on a larger scale than heretofore.

A tourist going abroad would buy his francs, pounds, lira or marks from the Treasury Department. He would deposit the amount of dollars he intends to spend abroad with an agency of the Treasury or other department of the Government and would receive in exchange drafts in foreign currency to be drawn at the national banks of the countries he intends to visit. In this manner the outflow of dollars spent by tourists would be halted and at the same time the countries visited by more than 2 million American tourists would lose nothing.

In the past, when there were black markets everywhere in the world, the American tourist might have balked at such an idea, since he would have lost the substantial difference between the official rate of exchange and what was being paid for dollars by the black marketeers. But in the last 18 months this has disappeared and there is only one rate of excharge. As a matter of fact the purchaser of drafts on foreign countries would make a small profit since all banks abroad charge a commission when they purchase American currency or travelers checks.

The foreign governments where we have counterpart funds would welcome such a measure since it would encourage rather than discourage tourism. So long as that money is kept in circulation they don't care any longer whether it represents actual dollars or their own currencies owned by the American Government. Such a step would make it unnecessary for Congress to pass any legislation reducing the value of goods imported by tourists abroad from $500 to $100. The foreign markets would no longer be glutted with dollars when the American traveler is given foreign exchange from counterpart funds, which are lying idle, for dollars which remain at home.

Thus the concern of the British, French, Italian and German Governments over the reduction of sales to the 2 million American tourists would be offset and might strengthen the much-needed feeling of good will from the man in the street toward Americans.

Where's the Money Coming From?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the

March 12 issue of the New York Sunday News. Since I believe this editorial makes good sense, I urge its reading to the Members of this Congress:

WHERE'S THE MONEY COMING FROM?

Whatever else you may say of President John F. Kennedy, you have to admit that he isn't one to feel any reluctance about spending the taxpayers' money in ways he thinks it should be spent.

He wants a big, inclusive, and hugely expensive system of medical care for the aged set up in a hurry.

His heart yearns to help schools and colleges with several billions of dollars in the next few years, and to shoot $2.5 billion on urban renewal.

The new Chief Executive has set one of his pet schemes—the Peace Corps—in motion by Executive order, without waiting for Congress to act on it. Nobody seems to know how much this will cost, but it doesn't look cheap from any angle.

Current talk has it that Mr. Kennedy hopes to increase our defense spending by some $2 billion this year over the approximately $40 billion at which ex-President Eisenhower felt it should be pegged.

It looks as if the President has forgotten his inaugural advice to us all to ask, not what our country can do for us, but what we can do for our country.

His main object up to now seems to be to have the Government do more and more for increasing numbers of Americans and foreigners.

WHERE'S THAT SELF-SACRIFICE?

But maybe it's unkind of us to bring that up—and maybe the President feels that Americans' golden opportunity to do something for their country will come when and if Congress passes all his proposed welfare legislation and then has to jack up taxes to pay for it.

We can't say we relish that prospect, what with Federal, State, and local taxes already sky high. And it would not be necessary, anyway, to hear Representative PAUL A. FINO tell it, to finance all of the proposed Kennedy welfare projects by boosting taxes still higher.

In an impressive speech in the House the other day, the Bronx Republican lawmaker reminded his listeners that there are 24 States in this country in which betting on horse races is lawful.

The National Association of State Racing Commissioners, Mr. FINO pointed out, reports that in the year 1960 a total of $3,310,712,316 was bet on horse races in those 24 States. From this $3.3 billion handle, the 24 States took $254,046,278 all told in tax revenues.

New York State alone got $97 million from this source, despite the fact that its up-State bluenoses, spoilsports, and leftover Puritans have thus far kept legal betting confined to the tracks.

FINO used these dramatic statistics as an argument for the national lottery—which he has long tried to persuade Congress to set up.

Such a lottery presumably would be along the line of the Irish Sweepstakes, with tickets sold at low prices through post offices or banks, with prizes numerous and generous, and with the Government taking what was left after payment of awards and overhead expenses.

PAINLESS REVENUES

FINO is convinced that a U.S. national lottery would bring in at least $10 billion a year to the U.S. Treasury. He bases his belief on the estimate of most experts on this subject that the gambling turnover in the United States adds up to about $30 billion—repeat billion—every year.

The $10 billion would go a long way toward financing President Kennedy's welfare legislation; and it would be collected without pain to any taxpayer. People, on the contrary, would enjoy it.

True, Representative FINO is a Republican and President Kennedy is a Democrat. But J.F.K. must know that an occasional Republican can have an occasional good idea.

We're convinced that FINO has a good idea in his advocacy of a national lottery. We further think that the new President would be exceedingly well-advised to look in FINO's idea, satisfy himself as to its practicality, and then do his powerful best to sell it to Congress.

Golden Anniversary of the Indianapolis Motor Speedway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD C. BRUCE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to present for insertion in the RECORD, a copy of the Indiana State Senate resolution on the golden anniversary of the Indianapolis Motor Speedway. Many friends and supporters of this great racing classic, are hoping that the Postmaster General will honor the "world capital of auto racing" with a special commemorative stamp on its 50th anniversary, May 30, 1961.

The resolution follows:

Whereas it is appropriate for the General Assembly of the State Indiana to take notice of events which are of profound significance to our great State; and

Whereas one of the great events taking place in Indiana during the 20th century has been the founding of the Indianapolis Motor Speedway; and

Whereas this great attraction has brought fame and acclaim to Indianapolis and the State of Indiana from all corners of the globe; and its contributions to the development of the automobile as an aid to better living for all mankind are known the world over; and

Whereas the 50th anniversary of this spectacular event will be celebrated on May 30, 1961;

Whereas the 92d General Assembly of the State of Indiana wishes to congratulate the Indianapolis Motor Speedway, its sponsors, friends, and automobile racing fans everywhere for their inspired interest in the greatest motor classic of the century: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the 92d session of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana hereby congratulates the Indianapolis Motor Speedway on its golden anniversary and hereby extends every good wish for a future filled with even greater fame to the claim of "the world capitol of auto racing"; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senate of the 92d General Assembly of the State of Indiana hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States to recognize the golden anniversary of the Indianapolis Motor Speedway by respectfully requesting the Postmaster General of the United States to take the necessary steps to cause to be issued at Indianapolis on May 30, 1961, a stamp commemorating the 50th anniversary of the founding of the Indianapolis Motor Speedway; and be it further

Resolved, That the Postmaster General of the United States be respectfully requested to take any steps necessary to cause to be issued at Indianapolis on May 30, 1961, a stamp commemorating the golden anniversary of the founding of the Indianapolis Motor Speedway claiming the title of "the world capitol of auto racing"; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to all Indiana Members of the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate, to the Postmaster General of the United States, to Mr. Anton Hulman, president, and to Mr. Joe Quinn, Jr., safety director of the Indianapolis Motor Speedway.

J. RUSSELL TOWNSEND, Jr.,
Senator.

MARTHA Y. BURNETT,
Senator.

Will Appeasement Be Our New Foreign Policy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, William Henry Chamberlin evinces the false promise of appeasement in his powerful article on the question of the recognition of Red China, which appeared March 14 in the Wall Street Journal. This is especially appropriate on this—Hungarian Freedom Day.

FAR EAST MUNICH?—BRITISH PRESSURE FOR U.S. ACCOMMODATION OF RED CHINA MAY FIND SYMPATHETIC EARS IN NEW ADMINISTRATION

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

It is usually enemy threats and pressure that lead to appeasement. But an ally can also give a push in this direction.

Ever since the election last November there has been mounting pressure from London, partly in the form of public statements of British officials, partly of quite off-the-record hints, in favor of U.S. retreat from its policy of not establishing diplomatic relations with Communist China and opposing the admission of this regime to the United Nations.

This issue may come to a head when Prime Minister Macmillan meets President Kennedy early next month. It is time for American public opinion to give this matter of our far eastern military, political, and diplomatic stance serious considerations. For pressure is usually aimed at a point that looks soft and responsive. No one, it is safe to say, ever tried to convince John Foster Dulles that appeasement and retreat represent a hopeful formula for meeting the Communist threat in Asia, or in Europe. But some of the published statements of men who have been appointed to high positions in the Kennedy administration indicate willingness to consider substantial modifications of U.S. far eastern policy.

For example, before the election the present Under Secretary of State, Mr. Chester Bowles, in the quarterly magazine, Foreign Affairs, urged that the United States "move off dead center in East Asia, beginning with the creation and implementation of imaginative policies based on the realities of two Chinas." These would include "the neutralization of the offshore islands imme-

diately adjacent to the China coast" and increased freedom of travel and trade.

Mr. Adlai Stevenson, writing in Foreign Affairs for January 1960, advocates these American "concessions" as part of a "negotiated" settlement:

"An end to American embargo on China's admission to the United Nations (not to be confused with diplomatic recognition), the evacuation of Quemoy and Matsu and the inclusion of Korea and Japan in the atom-free zone and area of controlled disarmament."

OMINOUS FOR STABILITY

To be sure, these are to be balanced by Communist concessions, including acceptance of international inspection of disarmament, ending the threat of force against Formosa and subversion in Indo-China, a peaceful frontier settlement with India, free elections under U.N. supervision in Korea and, rather curiously, "acceptance of the right of the inhabitants of Formosa to determine their own destiny by plebiscite supervised by the United Nations."

But what is ominous for the stability of our Far Eastern policy is the tendency of both Mr. Bowles and Mr. Stevenson to write as if we had no treaty of alliance with the Chinese Nationalist Government on Formosa. Quemoy and Matsu are not ours to give away; they are under the sovereignty and military occupation of the Chinese Nationalists. And it is bizarre, to say the least, to propose a plebiscite for an area under the control of a government which is a recognized ally. Another figure in the Kennedy Administration, Mr. Thomas Finletter, ambassador to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, has also been attracted by the idea of a plebiscite and a U.N. trusteeship for Formosa. The problem of what, in such a case, would happen to Chiang Kai-shek's government and army is airly treated as nonexistent.

What are the arguments for a Far Eastern Munich? (This is what the admission of Red China and the expulsion of the Chinese Nationalist Government from the U.N. would be.)

Certainly there has been no visible change of heart in Peiping which would entitle Red China to be considered a "peace-loving state," which is a condition of membership according to the Charter of the U.N. Red China is still technically at war with the U.N. because of its invasion of Korea, which ended in an armistice, not in a peace. It is in occupation of patches of Indian territory along the Himalayas. One of its causes of doctrinal difference with the Soviet Union has been its dogmatic insistence on the inevitability of war with "imperialist," i.e., non-Communist states.

THE BRITISH CASE

The British seem to be basing their case for a drastic change in American policy on a series of most speculative and debatable propositions. That the Soviet Union is ready for meaningful disarmament. That it can be trusted to keep any paper agreement on this subject it may sign. That it has both the power and the will to keep Red China from developing nuclear weapons. That international inspection and control can be effective in the nearly closed society of Russia and the totally closed society of China. Not one of these propositions can be accepted without question, and pretty serious question.

Then there is the hoary chestnut that withholding diplomatic recognition from Red China is equivalent to refusing to admit that Red China exists. Americans, including especially relatives and friends of Korean war casualties and prisoners, know to their sorrow that Red China exists. The point of declining to establish diplomatic relations (and neither Great Britain nor any other country which recognized Red China has derived any tangible benefit from this act) is that a choice is necessary between our allies, the Nationalists, and our enemies, the Communists. A "two Chinas" solution is equally unacceptable to Peiping and to Taipei.

It is a grave miscalculation to contend that there would be no serious unfavorable consequences if the United States should spurn the Nationalists and extend the welcome mat in the U.N. to the Red Chinese, who are so avowedly and violently hostile to this country. The whole balance of power in the Far East would be shaken to its foundations. Such a move would hearten our enemies and discourage our friends, not only in Formosa, but in Japan, Korea, Vietnam, Thailand.

Twice in recent history the experiment has been made of trying to buy off an implacable enemy by sacrificing a weaker ally. Czechoslovakia was the victim at Munich; Poland at Yalta. With the sorry results of these two trials of appeasement in mind, do we want to let ourselves in for a third flier in the same discredited philosophy in the Far East?

Some Information About Feed Grain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written to me about the feed grain program:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., March 1, 1961.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letter of February 17, asking questions about the emergency feed grain program recommended by the administration.

The administration is recommending this emergency program for two major reasons. These are: (1) the vital importance of the feed-livestock complex to our whole agricultural economy; and (2) the pressing need to bring to a halt the continuing increase in surplus stocks of feed grains which are already at very high levels, and, under existing programs, threaten to continue to increase.

The administration's recommendations constitute an emergency program for 1961. Early action is necessary if the program is to have the desired effect of reducing feed grain production this year. The short length of time available has prevented our giving the serious consideration that we think necessary before we could make a recommendation regarding marketing quotas for feed grains. Marketing quotas for commodities like feed grains where more than half of the production is used on the farm where it is produced present a number of serious problems. We intend to study a number of alternative ideas, including marketing quotas, in developing a longer range program for feed grains to be submitted later.

The number, the quantity, and the dollar amount of loans made on the 1959 crops of corn, grain sorghums, barley, oats, rye, and soybeans are as follows:

Commodity	Number of loans	Unit	Quantity	Amount
Corn	263,042	Bushel	470,377,031	$511,156,415.05
Grain sorghum	49,165	Hundredweight	59,263,436	93,181,912.29
Barley	16,140	Bushel	33,756,600	24,201,013.21
Oats	4,786	do	7,892,478	3,714,630.40
Rye	817	do	913,699	796,146.71
Soybeans	51,473	do	43,390,584	78,629,462.45

The dollar amount of loans made on 1959 crops of feed grains represents the initial outlay on price support for these commodities. Some of these loans were redeemed and the quantity of the commodities acquired by CCC was less than the amounts on which loans were made.

During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, the CCC disposed of feed grains and soybeans acquired in previous years price support operations. The realized losses on price support operations and the costs of the commodity export program that were incurred on the feed grains and soybeans disposed of in the fiscal year 1960 were as follows:

[In thousands]

Commodity	Realized loss, price support program, fiscal year 1960	Cost of commodity export program, fiscal year 1960
Corn and cornmeal	$181,982	$8,088
Grain sorghums	17,988	3,773
Barley	20,938	3,742
Oats	10	2,303
Rye	925	1,056
Soybeans	10,344	

In addition to the realized losses on commodities disposed of during fiscal year 1960, the Commodity Credit Corporation still had on hand at that time substantial stocks of several of these commodities. It may well be several years before disposition of these stocks is complete. In the meantime, additional charges such as storage and interest will continue to accumulate. Hence, it is quite likely that there will be additional losses incurred when these stocks are disposed of.

According to preliminary reports of the 1959 Census of Agriculture, 1,989,411 farms reported corn harvested for grain; 223,263 reported soghum harvested for grain; 1,028,847 reported oats harvested; 290,160 reported barley harvested; and 499,143 reported soybeans harvested for beans. Many farms, of course, grow more than one of these commodities, and there is no information available on the extent of the duplication. The information given above on the number of loans made provides the information that is available on the number of farms obtaining price support. Here, again, a farm may obtain price support on more than one commodity, and there is no information available on the extent of the duplication.

We are enclosing a table which will provide you with preliminary information from the 1959 Census of Agriculture on the number of farms producing the various feed grains and soybeans by States. Just as with the U.S. figures, there is a certain amount of duplication here since some farms produce more than one of the commodities in question.

World supplies of high protein meals and vegetable oils are short, and the higher support price for soybeans will encourage increased production that can be used to meet current and future world needs. In addition, the higher support price for soybeans will encourage diversion of part of the feed grain acreage to soybeans.

The support price for cottonseed is required by law to be at a competitive relationship with soybeans. As in the past, price supports on cottonseed will be available to those producers who wish to take advantage of them.

As we stated in the announcement, the price support level for the 1961 crop of Upland cotton was set after long and painstaking study and consultation with all parties concerned. Although the result is not wholly satisfactory to any single group involved, it is, in our judgment, the best decision that could be made in the light of the current legislative and economic conditions and alternatives.

Sincerely yours,

WILLARD W. COCHRANE,
Assistant to the Secretary.

Number of farms reporting harvested acres of specified commodities, by States, 1959

State	Harvested for grain		Harvested				State	Harvested for grain		Harvested			
	Corn	Grain sorghum	Oats	Barley	Rye	Soybeans for beans		Corn	Grain sorghum	Oats	Barley	Rye	Soybean for beans
Maine	57	----------	2,483	46	42	----------	West Virginia	19,922	----------	4,342	992	127	48
New Hampshire	69	----------	75	----------	14	----------	North Carolina	142,678	6,074	29,130	7,074	2,680	25,665
Vermont	138	----------	1,112	----------	12	----------	South Carolina	55,187	825	17,228	2,310	1,069	7,745
Massachusetts	373	----------	91	----------	78	----------	Georgia	71,043	1,127	9,461	574	1,123	1,552
Rhode Island	42	----------	9	----------	21	----------	Florida	9,064	----------	373	----------	----------	414
Connecticut	365	----------	96	----------	84	----------	Kentucky	99,195	2,311	4,528	4,850	1,214	4,286
New York	18,623	----------	38,159	2,640	1,178	158	Tennessee	94,608	3,266	9,840	3,269	951	7,056
New Jersey	4,940	----------	1,555	1,385	699	1,018	Alabama	83,756	1,173	31182	----------	----------	2,048
Pennsylvania	64,127	----------	53,354	15,335	2,845	773	Mississippi	90,762	585	4,088	----------	----------	9,634
Ohio	104,975	----------	68,619	6,452	2,772	42,489	Arkansas	33,048	1,661	3,362	402	----------	21,479
Indiana	99,253	773	48,685	4,909	5,991	60,526	Louisiana	32,686	232	1,714	----------	----------	3,651
Illinois	131,295	1,200	73,182	5,400	4,323	88,268	Oklahoma	11,601	17,074	15,092	13,850	2,372	1,652
Michigan	68,700	----------	54,149	7,828	5,218	8,924	Texas	64,861	59,349	17,853	6,194	462	----------
Wisconsin	90,101	----------	106,844	3,216	2,199	4,066	Montana	124	----------	7,756	15,497	332	----------
Minnesota	103,995	----------	107,204	16,990	2,854	57,855	Idaho	1,761	----------	6,486	9,171	195	----------
Iowa	155,167	3,051	127,849	1,325	841	64,374	Wyoming	694	10	2,982	2,800	111	----------
Missouri	94,973	19,242	32,832	12,885	3,064	42,757	Colorado	7,242	3,886	5,143	10,688	1,234	----------
North Dakota	5,423	25	32,601	38,665	3,648	2,958	New Mexico	2,261	1,697	475	937	112	----------
South Dakota	30,261	4,138	33,006	9,907	2,364	3,913	Arizona	176	802	67	1,021	8	----------
Nebraska	70,120	31,338	38,367	10,937	5,004	5,232	Utah	401	----------	2,460	7,579	73	----------
Kansas	39,223	59,661	31,560	26,676	5,251	11,927	Nevada	32	----------	101	380	10	----------
Delaware	3,660	----------	522	762	879	2,959	Washington	1,957	----------	5,289	6,700	772	----------
Maryland	16,067	----------	5,081	5,055	1,835	4,417	Oregon	1,483	----------	5,782	8,560	616	----------
Virginia	60,636	585	11,543	9,170	2,319	9,800	California	2,286	2,516	1,135	7,638	----------	----------

Source: Agricultural Marketing Service. Compiled from Bureau of the Census preliminary State summaries of 1959 Census of Agriculture.

Cleve Bailey: Children's Champion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following citation given to the Honorable CLEVELAND M. BAILEY when he received the 1960 Parents' Magazine Award for Outstanding Service to Children:

PARENTS' MAGAZINE AWARDS ITS 1960 MEDAL FOR OUTSTANDING SERVICE TO CHILDREN TO CONGRESSMAN CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

Congressman BAILEY (Democrat, West Virginia), a former school principal and school superintendent, has fought valiantly for Federal aid for education legislation during the 12 years he has served on the Education and Labor Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives. He led an unsuccessful battle in the House for the Federal aid to education bill sponsored by the late Senator Robert A. Taft a decade ago. He authored and introduced the aid for federally impacted areas bill which now provides money for school construction and school maintenance in localities that have big military establishments and other large Federal installations. He was the cosponsor of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, which authorized $887 million of Federal funds for student loans and aid to schools to support science, mathematics, and language teaching.

During the 86th Congress, as chairman of the General Education Subcommittee of the House, he made a vigorous bipartisan effort to get a Federal aid for school construction bill enacted. For the first time in American history, a bill for general Federal aid to public elementary and high schools was passed in the spring of 1960 by the House of Representatives. Unfortunately, the House and Senate passed different bills and failed to reach agreement on a single measure. Congressman BAILEY fought courageously for a bill until the adjournment gavel fell. He richly deserves the gratitude of all American parents and children. The West Virginia Representative can be counted on to continue his fight for what he believes—Federal aid for the schools our youngsters need.

Kennedy and the Economy—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the third in a series of editorials recently appearing in the Winston-Salem (N.C.) Journal. The following editorial appeared in the issue of March 8, 1961:

KENNEDY AND THE ECONOMY, III—HOW TO ACHIEVE GROWTH

As noted in the first two editorials of this series, President Kennedy's stated economic policy can be boiled down to one central equation: Fast economic growth equals full employment plus a sound dollar. The equation seems correct in what it claims growth would do. The problem is to produce that growth on a solid, sustainable basis.

Consideration of the unemployment and dollar problems has indicated some of the factors that need to be included in the definition of the growth we require. It should be growth in the number of jobs available, and thus in the size of the market for the goods produced. It should be growth in productivity; that is, goods should be made more efficiently, with less expenditure of manhours and paycheck dollars per item. It should not be growth in the price of goods.

The most obvious point to make about these requirements is that they cannot be met by actions of the Federal Government. At the most, the Kennedy administration can only aid and encourage the processes that must take place if such growth is achieved. The brunt of the burden must fall on the private citizen. Given the proper business environment, the proven vitality of our private enterprise system should be equal to the task.

There is also the evident conflict between the requirements for increasing the number of jobs while at the same time producing more goods with less manpower. Resolving this conflict calls for pure creativity in all areas of the national economy. This creativity must improve the quality of products and services to make them worth more. It must conceive and develop entirely new products and services. It must bring the costs of things which only a few people can now afford down to a point where they will have mass markets.

That kind of growth by creativity has been one of this country's traditional strong points. It has come through the medium of individual initiative, and can be expected to flourish best when that initiative is untrammeled. It has never been produced by governmental pump-priming to any effective extent.

The optimum role of the Federal government in assisting this sort of growth process would be different from its role in pulling the country out of a temporary recession. Unemployment relief speedups in the awarding of government contracts, juggling of the dollar supply—all these can be considered pump-priming measures that are effective in speeding a momentarily sluggish economy. But only by sheer chance could they give the economy a new supply of vitality. They are not creative measures. The government simply is not creative in that sense.

What, then, can the Kennedy administration do to provide the right atmosphere for increased economic innovation?

One clear-cut possibly is the President's proposed tax break on private capital improvements—money spent for new plans—and for product research and development. This country's tax laws now treat such expenditures much more harshly than do the laws of most free nations. To name two, Canada and West Germany take far more liberal views of such industrial expenditures.

In a way, the depressed areas measure favored by the President seeks to produce the sort of background needed for long-range growth. Its purpose is to put unused sources of manpower and production facilities back to work. It would do this primarily by extending $300 million in government loans and $75 million in grants to finance the public and private improvements considered necessary to rejuvenate the areas involved. It would authorize $10 million for retraining workers. Out of the whole amount, only the last-mentioned and by far the smallest figure offers real assurance of being well-spent. Retraining of the unemployed on a nonselective scale is beyond the scope of private business and needs Government sponsorship.

Big loan funds, however, are open to logical criticism. Unless it is carefully administered, the Federal loan program is all too likely to waste money on areas where lack of cash is not the problem.

The Johnstown, Pa., area is a prime example. It is a steel town—where the United Steelworkers Union is strong. The decline in the need for workers in basic steel production there has thrown many out of work. Money has been raised locally to finance plants for new industries. At first glance, the town would look ideal for various metal-fabricating operations. The rub is that any such plant would almost certainly be organized quickly by the Steelworkers, at a rigid average pay rate of $2.90 an hour, and collective bargaining to bring that rate down would be a practically hopeless cause. Labor conditions have, in effect, priced Johnstown out of the national economy, so far as its most likely sources of new income are concerned. Federal loans would do nothing to solve the town's problem. Only a saner approach to the community's needs by labor and management can really help.

For depressed areas and the Nation as a whole to increase the rate of creative growth, such debilitating and unjustifiable restrictions as the one which has Johnstown hogtied must be cleared up. All such faults cannot be laid on labor's doorstep, either. Insular industrial leadership or a socially retarded population can put a community in an equally bad economic position. All these things are what prospective builders of new plants lump together under the term, "a bad business climate."

The Kennedy administration can, through legislation and through using its influence with labor and management, do much to give private enterprise the climate and the elbow room it needs for creative growth. Some big Federal spending programs may be helpful, but they are probably not essential to the process. Given a reasonably clear path and a little encouragement, the people surely have the ingenuity and ambition to assure the economy of the growth it needs.

Repeal of Auto Excise Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the repeal of the auto excise tax constitutes for many people a constructive and continually effective means of stimulating the economy while at the same time correcting an inequity in our tax system that has been allowed to exist far too long. The City Council of the City of Grosse Pointe Farms, Mich., has recently passed a resolution endorsing my bill (H.R. 3647), which, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues as another expression of opinion favoring such tax reform:

CITY OF GROSSE POINTE FARMS,
Grosse Pointe Farms, Mich., March 7, 1961.
The Honorable CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Please be advised that the Council of the City of Grosse Pointe Farms, at its meeting of February 27, 1961, adopted the following resolution relative to H.R. 3647: 3647:

"Whereas there is presently before the U.S. Congress a bill (H.R. 3647) which would abolish the 10 percent Federal excise tax levied against motor vehicles manufactured in this country, and

"Whereas, it is the opinion of the Council of the City of Grosse Pointe Farms that passage of the bill will spur the local as well as the national economy by supplying the necessary stimulus to increase production: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Council of the City of Grosse Pointe Farms endorse passage of H.R. 3647.

Very truly yours,
DAWSON F. NACY,
City clerk.

Hotel in the Old West Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Northwest Ruralite, a publication of cooperative and consumer-owned electric utilities in the Pacific Northwest, has in its current issue an interesting article entitled "Hotel in the Old West Style." It describes the Frenchglen Hotel located on the Malheur National wildlife refuge in southeastern Oregon.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOTEL IN THE OLD WEST STYLE—FRENCHGLEN, OREG., INN GOES FOR QUALITY—TAKES DUCK ON QUANTITY

(By Ken Metzler)

This is an open letter to all motorists who might be casting eyes toward the tiny hamlet of Frenchglen, way out in the middle of nowhere, so to speak, in eastern Oregon.

First of all, I have been specifically requested by Mr. Ken Pruitt, operator of the Frenchglen Hotel, to take a realistic approach to travel in the Frenchglen vicinity.

Mosquitoes: Terrible, especially during June and July. They will literally eat you up.

Heat: Terrible in summer, especially in late summer after the mosquitoes have gone away. If the mosquitoes don't get you, the heat surely will.

Dust: Ditto.

Horseflies: They'll drive you crazy.

Roads: Long and tortuous; seldom paved. It's 105 miles to Lakeview, 70 to Denio, 65 to Burns.

Rattlesnakes: No denying they're around.

Accommodations: The Frenchglen Hotel with eight rooms is it. There's a sign in the lobby which says: "You don't have to be crazy to vacation here, but it helps."

Ken Prutt's commentary may be a bit tongue-in-cheek, though one may suspect there is a kernel of truth here, too. A paved road is due in the Frenchglen area soon, and as Eleanor Pruitt, Ken's wife, puts it, "We're just a little bit afraid of it.

"There has never been a key to the front door here; never has been locked up. There never has been any need to lock it. We have accepted every check that's ever been offered to us and in the 9 years we've been here, only one check has come back, and then only a $3-check. I'd say that's a good record and we'd like to keep it that way."

"To put it more bluntly," says Ken, "when the quantity of clientele goes up the quality goes down."

Safely positioned in the backwaters of Oregon's current tourist boom, Frenchglen has changed little and has suffered none of the blight that accompanies the fast-buck type of tourist commercialism. In sequence it remains delightfully quaint. The Frenchglen Hotel is undoubtedly one of the few, if not the only, places, to offer a free cup of coffee—served, incidentally, in a double-sized cup.

It is rumored that when a motorist asked the price of changing a tire in Frenchglen, he was told "50 cents for a lady, $5 for a man," presumably on the theory that any man who couldn't change his own tire deserved to pay $5.

Most of the visitors to Frenchglen are a pretty self-sufficient lot. They include hunters, fishermen (the fishing in the Blitzen River is pretty good, if you can stand the mosquitoes), birdwatchers, photographers, and a few curious souls who seem to have strayed off the main highways and can't find their way back.

"We really don't have a whole lot to offer around here," says Ken Pruitt. "The country isn't big enough for a Cadillac.

Those who now venture as far off the highways as Frenchglen come with fairly serious intent. The Malheur National Wildlife Refuge (which owns the hotel, leasing it to the Pruitts) attracts many eminent ornithologists as well as wildlife photographers and people simply interested in birds. The rugged grandeur of nearby Steens Mountain, best reached from Frenchglen, attracts many others.

"We welcome these people," says Pruitt. "It's the mobs that we fear.

It is obvious that progress in the form of a paved road would not be welcomed in any quarters around Frenchglen. Progress of another type, in a form little more acceptable, arrived but 3 years ago when Harney Electric Cooperative piped electricity into Frenchglen for the first time.

"It was wonderful," says Eleanor Pruitt, recalling the days of the light plant when "if you wanted to wash you had to disconnect the deep freeze."

The history of the Frenchglen hotel goes back to the establishment of the bird refuge in 1908. There was a cabin there then, and the first portion of the present building was built in 1917.

The present operators have been on the job for the past 9 years, coming originally from the Rogue River Valley. It was the hunting and fishing, indeed the "way of life," that attracted them to Frenchglen, Ken says. They hope that the coming of "progress" will not appreciably change that way of life. Otherwise they may have to remove that sign—the one that says it helps to be crazy when you vacation here. The coffee and information are free.

Relationship of Reclamation Crop Production to Agricultural Crop Surpluses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the most misunderstood problem we have today in connection with the Federal reclamation program is the relationship of crop production on reclamation projects to the agricultural surplus problem. As I have pointed out to Members of this body on several occasions and to the Appropriations Committee, irrigation farming in the West complements rather than competes with the whole of the Nation's agriculture. It tends to alleviate rather than add to our existing agricultural problems. The placing of water on land being used for nonirrigated grain crops usually results in a shift to more diversified farming. Very little of the Nation's crop surplus is attributable to the irrigated areas of the West.

In addition, we are advised by agricultural authorities that our present crop imbalances are only temporary and that continued efforts are needed in research and the conservation and development of soil and water resources. In my opinion, the continued development of our water supplies for expanding irrigation is entirely consistent with sound, long-term agricultural objectives.

The Bureau of Reclamation has prepared an excellent evaluation of the relationship of reclamation crop production to agricultural surpluses. I believe that this evaluation will give Members of the House a better understanding of this problem, and I am therefore including it as a part of these remarks.

RELATIONSHIP OF RECLAMATION CROP PRODUCTION TO AGRICULTURAL SURPLUSES

Irrigation farming in the West enjoys a complementary rather than a competitive relationship with the whole of the country's agriculture. Little, if any, of the Nation's crop surplus is attributable to irrigated areas of the West. The principal sources of surplus crops are nonirrigated areas where one-crop farming predominates. Reclamation farms produce abundantly of the protective and body-building fruits, vegetables, and meats needed for healthful diets. Sweeping generalization that the development of additional lands under the Reclamation program adds to the crop surplus are misleading. An understanding of the problem requires the thoughtful consideration of: (1) what crops make up the surplus problem; (2) what part of these surplus crops are grown on Reclamation project farms; (3) what do Reclamation farms produce; (4) how is this production used; and (5) the long-term needs for the products of western irrigated agriculture.

For a full understanding of the situation, the term "crop surplus" needs to be explained. The prices of about 20 crops are supported by the Government. However, the majority of these crops sell in the open market at levels equal to or above the support price. Thus, the fact that the price of a commodity is supported does not necessarily mean that the crop is in oversupply. In like manner, the fact that the Commodity Credit Corporation has a quantity of a farm commodity under loan or in its inventory does not of itself mean that the commodity is in surplus supply. In order to meet the distribution demands of the market, it is normal and customary that a carryover of some commodities exists at the beginning of a new marketing year. For example, the 1960 carryover of cotton totaled about 7.5 million bales which is considered normal for present conditions. Of this carryover, approximately 5 million bales of Upland cotton were under loan or held in inventories of the CCC as of September 30, 1960. Indications are that acreage allotments will be increased for 1961. Notwithstanding these conditions, much can be learned of the crop surplus situation from a look at stocks of each commodity in CCC loans and inventories.

Five crops constitute the bulk of farm commodities under loan or in the inventories of the CCC. These and their relationship to the total holdings as of September 30, 1960, were as follows:

Total CCC loans and inventories, $8,964,116,741 (100 percent)

Item	Amount	Value	Percent
Wheat	[1] 1,536,897,409	$3,665,651,179	40.89
Corn	[1] 1,702,205,744	2,688,007,218	29.99
Upland cotton	[2] 5,097,014	891,427,266	9.94
Grain sorghums	[3] 326,896,898	861,464,495	9.61
Tobacco	[4] 631,956,875	394,706,802	4.40
Total		8,501,256,960	94.83

[1] Bushels.
[2] Bales.
[3] Hundredweight.
[4] Pounds.

WHEAT

This grain crop is the No. 1 surplus commodity. The existing overproduction would have been even greater had not the introduction of irrigation in commercial one-crop wheatgrowing areas enabled farmers to shift from wheatgrowing to a diversified cropping and livestock economy. About 2 percent of the total U.S. wheat crop is grown on reclamation farms. If this were placed in the support program in the same proportion as is the total wheat crop of the States in the reclamation West, the supported quantity would equal only two-thirds of 1 percent of the U.S. wheat crop. It is reasonably certain, however, that not even this small amount of irrigated wheat goes into surplus holdings.

For the first few years that formerly dryland farmers commence irrigating, they tend to adhere to old methods and old crops—this most frequently means wheat. As they accumulate know-how and capital, and develop their land, they diversify and adopt other crops. With considerable new land coming into the reclamation program each year, there is always some of this transitory acreage of irrigated wheat.

On the established irrigation farms, other crops are preferred because they offer greater opportunities for profitable use of land and capital. A small amount of wheat is planted for the purpose of a nurse crop—protection for newly seeded alfalfa and clover fields. Wheat grown on these limited acreages is sometimes mixed with other grains and hence will not qualify for price support. The quantity of wheat grown per irrigated farm is small. In some project areas formerly dry farmed it has been demonstrated that the actual production of wheat is reduced about 60 percent. Because reclamation farms are predominantly livestock farms, there is ample outlet for these small quantities of wheat via the farm livestock. Wheat is equal or greater in feed value than corn and, when available, may constitute a significant share of the ration of poultry, hogs, and cattle. It is estimated that most of the reclamation-grown wheat is utilized in this manner.

CORN

Corn constitutes about 30 percent of the total value of commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation, but only a negligible proportion is produced on reclamation farms. Corn grown on reclamation farms is utilized for livestock feed, rather than for cash income. But even if reclamation farmers were to put the same proportion of their corn under support as the rest of the farmers (who produced 99 percent of the corn crop) the quantity would amount to less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the total amount of corn produced in the United States.

The production of corn on these irrigated farms, though limited, has a strategic role in the scheme of farm livestock feeding since it is a key or pivotal feed around which rations of other concentrates and forages can be built. Any extensive shipment of corn from the commercial corn areas of the Midwest would be impractical because of the cost of transportation. In the absence of reclamation-grown corn, therefore, little if any greater use of midwestern corn in the westernmost States would be realized. For these reasons, the corn grown on the western irrigated lands is not considered to be in competition with that grown in the commercial corn areas, and does not comprise a significant portion of the Nation's corn surplus.

COTTON

Due to recently improved market conditions, both domestically and abroad, the surplus cotton situation has been markedly improved. Less than 10 percent of the commodity holdings of the Commodity Credit Corporation is represented by upland cotton. This is about one-third less than a year ago. Due to the reduction of cotton stocks to approximately the level of a normal year's carryover, the U.S. Department of Agriculture has stated that an increase in the plantings of cotton will be allowed in 1961. Thus it appears that the necessary adjustments in cotton production have been pretty well realized and that a favorable period lies ahead for U.S. cottongrowers in which our improved technologies will be given opportunity to operate at greatest effectiveness.

Irrigation farming permits cultural efficiencies which, with a favorable climate and one variety plantings, enable western farmers to produce cotton of uniform staple length and higher grade than in much of the dry-farm Cotton Belt and to do it at a lower cost.

Further improvement in the competitive status of this country in the world cotton market, where we have to compete with cheap labor and cheap land, demands more of the sort of advancement in cropping technologies that cottongrowers on western irrigated farms have been able to demonstrate.

Assuming that reclamation farmers put the same proportion of their cotton crop in the price-support program as do other western growers, the quantity they thus committed would amount to only 2½ percent of the total U.S. cotton crop. This is such a relatively small proportion of the total that it can be said to be but a negligible share and consequently, the production of cotton under irrigation on reclamation farms does not significantly affect and is not the root of the surplus problem.

GRAIN SORGHUM

Reclamation farms produce just slightly over 1 percent of the U.S. sorghum crop. The quantity estimated to be placed in the support program by reclamation farmers amounts to one one-hundredth of 1 percent

of the Nation's entire grain sorghum crop. While grain sorghum stocks at this time make up about 10 percent of the total Commodity Credit Corporation inventory, the buildup of these stocks has not stemmed from reclamation farms.

WHAT CROPS THEN DO RECLAMATION FARMS GROW?

For the most part, reclamation farms produce the crops that can't be grown successfully in the West without irrigation. The grain and other feed crops are needed for the livestock that is raised on the farflung rangelands. These feeds are utilized right in the project vicinity. Thus they do not add to the grain which is marketed for cash sale and which, when in oversupply, is the basis for the price-support program.

From the value standpoint, reclamation's biggest contribution is in the category of fruit, vegetable, and other specialty crops, most of which are outside the price-support program. The environment of the irrigated western areas is especially favorable for these crops. For example, 100 percent of the commercial production of apricots, artichokes, honeydew melons, hops, lemons, olives, dates, figs, garlic, nectarines, prunes, English walnuts, almonds, and filberts come from the irrigated Western States. During late fall, winter, and early spring, the warm irrigated valleys of the Far West and Southwest grow most of the Nation's supply of fresh spinach, peas, onions, lettuce, asparagus, broccoli, cantaloups, carrots, cauliflower, and celery. The off-season production of the fresh vegetables and fruits add variety and balance to the Nation's diet.

While imbalances have built up in a few agricultural commodities, so that attention is focused upon these crops, little recognition has been given the subject of nutritional deficiencies. In this country we may be relatively well off when considered in light of the rest of the world, two-thirds of which is said to be undernourished. But the latest survey of dietary levels (USDA Circular ARS 62–6, 1957) shows that more of the protective foods—fresh vegetables, fruits, meats, and dairy products are required to meet adequate diet standards. Ten percent of our families have diets classed as poor. Twenty-nine percent needed greater allowances of calcium, 25 percent needed more vitamin C, from 15 to 20 percent were below recommended levels of vitamin A, thiamine, and riboflavin. Diets of individuals are even less adequate, according to the dietary survey. The foods needed to alleviate these deficiencies are the fresh fruits and vegetables and the meat and livestock products that irrigated farms provide so well. Irrigated farms in the Southwest furnish us large supplies of these body-building winter fruits and vegetables which we would otherwise do without. Expansion in these crops must take place if we are to maintain even the present standard of diet while the population continues to increase.

Efficiency and responsiveness are necessary for success in farming today. Given these, farmers can overcome most of the problems that face agriculture. Through research, through education, through extension of the advantages of irrigation, the factors of success can be built into agriculture, and the necessary adjustments effected. Reclamation has played a large role in facilitating these adjustments and in enhancing the efficiency of the agriculture of the West as a whole. The misapprehension that any extension of irrigation will compound the Nation's agriculture difficulties is not borne out by the facts either past or present, and this false notion should be quickly dispelled.

Broadside analysis of national issues is often misleading. Close scrutiny of the intricacies of the country's agricultural makeup, and of the vital part that irrigation plays in the arid and semiarid western half of our land, will lead to the true conclusions that the whole Nation, as well as the West itself, stands to gain from further reclamation development.

Never was the urgency so intense for seeking ways to modernize, improve, and balance our agricultural economy. Never has the westward tide of population movement been so great. Never will the time be more propitious for wise and timely action in developing the water resources of the West.

A report prepared by the U.S. Department of Agriculture for the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources discloses that the rapid population growth will soon place this country in a position of farmland shortage unless timely offsetting actions are taken. In this report the Department of Agriculture appraised the food and fiber needs, export and import requirements, and farm production potentials for the United States in 1980 and 2000. Consideration was given to possible crop yield increases and to shifts in land use.

Population growth to 330 million persons, plus a 12-percent increase in per capita consumption, will boost the total requirement for farm products to a level double that of the present. The report concluded that land use shifts in the 1.9-billion-acre land base of the United States can provide a net addition of 63 million acres of cropland by the end of the century. Limited land use capabilities will preclude converting as much land as will be needed, and per-acre crop yield increases of 76 percent will be necessary to meet the expanded food and fiber demands in year 2000.

Breaking out of grassland in the order of 31 million acres and clearing of 74 million acres of timberland will bring vast new areas under the plow. These shifts to cropland use are offset in part by shifts of cropland to other uses. The conversion of timberland to crops represent a loss of one-fourth of our present and future timber-growing capacity. However, the Assistant Secretary of Agricultures states this is not recommended.

Of more immediate concern is the short-range projection cited by the report. By 1980 the present 177 million population will have grown to 244 million, with commensurate requirements for additional agricultural products. To meet these needs, the Department of Agriculture projected crop yields 41 percent above the present, and a net addition of 20 million acres of cropland.

None of the charted conversions and the assumed productivity increases are presumed to be automatic, but all will require well-directed effort and considerable financial support. Research and education will have to be intensified in order to realize the yield increases required.

Supplemental irrigation in the East as well as in the moisture-deficient West is counted on for a share of the increased productivity of the Nation's agricultural plant. The report assumes an increase in irrigation in the Western States from 1954 to 1980 of about 5.4 million acres and from 1980 to 2000 of about 7.5 million acres. During the 58-year history of Reclamation, facilities have been constructed for irrigation service for 8.1 million acres. About one-half of this area is furnished supplemental water. To attain a goal of 5.4 million and 7.5 million additional irrigated acres in the Western States in each of the next 20-year periods will require a sustained strong effort beginning now.

In terms of the short range, the period right now, or for a few years ahead, there is no question but what we have enough food and fiber to accommodate our present population. There are some crops, however, that even now are in short supply. A comparison of production with demand discloses that abundance exists in a number of our basic crops and surplus exists in a relatively few. Most significantly, deficiencies according to our nutritionists still plague us in many of the protective foods. Many of these foods grow best in the irrigated West, and supply our needs during winter months when many other producing areas are blanketed with snow.

We are, however, not considering agricultural research or Federal Reclamation in terms of what they will do to production right now or tomorrow, or even 5 or more years from now. We live better today because of the investment made in agricultural research 10, 15, and even 50 years ago.

Similarly, some of the benefits of agricultural research now being conducted may first become apparent to our grandchildren in some indefinite period ahead. In like manner, the Reclamation projects we are now investigating or building will not reach their full productive potential for many years, and the question we should logically now ask is what should be our position in terms of the long-range point of view. One thing is abundantly sure—we cannot wait until dire need is upon us before we do our research or our planning or our building of these projects from which our Nation has gained so much.

Only People Pay Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial that appeared in the March 3 issue of Life Lines entitled "Only People Pay Taxes."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONLY PEOPLE PAY TAXES

There is nobody in the world to pay taxes except people. A heavy income tax is levied against corporate profits and many heavy taxes are levied on all business concerns. Business collects the taxes. But you pay them. You have to pay them. Business—from the giant corporation to the corner grocery store—could not continue to operate long if they had to pay all these taxes themselves. Taxes are a cost of doing business and are taken into account when prices are set.

Approximately one-third of the average American family's income is siphoned off by direct and hidden taxes. The average salaried person or wage earner works for government 1 day in 3.

The alarming truth is that this average American spends more of his working day earning money to pay his taxes than he does to pay for any other major item in the family's budget.

Here is how tax accountants figure this American's working day is divided:

He works 1 hour and 39 minutes to earn money for his family's food; 1 hour and 25 minutes to meet the mortgage payment on his home or to pay the rent; 37 minutes for clothing; 42 minutes for transportation; 24 minutes for medical care; 20 minutes for recreation; 24 minutes to pay for other purchases.

And he works 2 hours and 29 minutes of each day to pay his taxes.

Do you see how directly and how vitally you are affected by excessive governmental spending?

In the months ahead you will be hearing and reading a great deal about the Federal Government's budget. Just remember it is a budget that you, along with all other Americans, have to pay. If Government is wasteful, if Government is extravagant, if Government ships billions of dollars annually to countries all over the world, if Government throws money into activities that do not belong in the proper functions of Government—you, Mr. American; you, Mrs. American, pay the bill.

There are two important points to be made in this connection.

One is that the tax load now being borne by you, the people, is too heavy.

The other point is that nothing is so bad for a government as to give it too much money. There is ample evidence today that our Government is indeed being given too much money. Government has too many people on its payroll. Government has entered too many fields where it has no business being. Government—our U.S. Government—is undertaking too much at home and abroad.

The result is not merely a flattening of our pocketbooks. The result is also a flattening of our individual liberties, a steady erosion of American freedom, a sickening decline in adherence to the principles of common decency and basic morality on the part of government.

There has been a great outpouring of words here of late about something called our national purpose. Some say we have lost it; others counter that this national purpose was never in better shape.

Both sides seem to want to commit the United States to greater centralization of government, to further scattering of our resources all over the globe, and to letting the United Nations handle our foreign affairs.

In this great country of ours, the one national purpose to which we should be committed is that of saving freedom. If we can do that, we shall be able to handle our other problems. After all, it was under a system of freedom that the United States grew big enough for its national purpose to be of concern to all the world.

Twenty-second Anniversary of Slovak Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 17, 1961

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, approximately 2 million Americans of Slovak origin are deeply and rightly interested in the fate of the more than 4 million Slovaks who are presently living under the domination of Communist despots in their native land.

The Congress of the United States, too, is interested in their fate, as in the fate of all other victims of Communist tyranny throughout the world. It is fitting and proper that the House of Representatives, which speaks and acts for all the people of our country, in their diversity of origin and in their unity of spirit and purpose, should take public notice of the 22d anniversary of Slovak independence, today, March 15, 1961.

The history of the Slovak people has been a singularly difficult one for many hundreds of years. Victims of persecution, of big power politics, of Fascist and Communist dictatorship, the people of Slovakia have tenaciously held to their goals of personal freedom and national independence. Their continued devotion to these great ideals should inspire us and freedom-loving people everywhere to renewed efforts to help bring closer the day when freedom and justice and peace will reign throughout the world.

The Peace Corps Takes Shape

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 17, 1961

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial of the WDSU Broadcasting Corp., of New Orleans, La., entitled, "The Peace Corps Takes Shape."

The editorial follows:

THE PEACE CORPS TAKES SHAPE

(The following editorial was broadcast on WDSU–TV and WDSU–Radio on March 10, 1961.)

Reports from Washington indicate that there's one office in the Nation's Capital that's feverishly busy these days, telephones ringing constantly and telegrams and letters arriving by the basketful. That's the office where something brand new called the Peace Corps is beginning to take shape.

President Kennedy, by Executive order, has established the Peace Corps on a small scale, temporary basis. He has asked Congress to follow up by making it permanent.

The President has described it as a pool of trained American men and women, volunteers working without pay, who will go overseas to help work on development projects of foreign countries.

He expects them to serve in such fields as teaching, malaria eradication, public health and sanitation projects, school construction, and improvement of agricultural techniques. They will be paid only enough to live on. They will work and live inconspicuously among the people of the countries they go to—if necessary, in thatched huts.

There already have been some legitimate criticisms and questions directed at this idea. What's to prevent it from being filled up by young people more interested in a free trip abroad than in doing a job of hard work? Suppose the peace corpsmen decide after they get overseas that they don't like the work and don't like the country they're in. Would that lose friends for this country?

The people putting together the Peace Corps say they're emphasizing sacrifice and hard work. That all applicants will be screened carefully and trained for 6 months in this country. That the Peace Corps will begin on a small, experimental basis in order to iron out the kinks.

In the view of this station, nobody knows whether the Peace Corps will work. It could go wrong in many ways.

But we believe it deserves a chance to show what it can do. Maybe American idealism channeled into down-to-earth projects can help other countries and make friends for us. Here is a chance to take the initiative in selling America, not with American dollars but with unselfish American men and women. A chance to identify the United States with the goals of peace and progress. This station says, Let's try it.

Legislative Program of the Independent Retail Grocers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the February 1961, issue of the Oregon Independent Grocer carries the statement and recommendation of the Oregon Independent Grocers Association on the proposed food stamp plan.

I ask unanimous consent that the article appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASSOCIATION LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE OUTLINES PROGRAM

PORTLAND, February 15.—Many measures of importance to the retail grocery industry were reported on and discussed at the special meeting of the legislative committee of the Oregon Independent Retail Grocers Association held in Portland today.

One of the most important matters under consideration was the report on the proposed distribution of surplus foods in Oregon to welfare recipients. The Oregon State Welfare Commission and local county welfare agencies have been urged to establish their own warehouses for distribution of surplus foods. However, the U.S. Department of Agriculture has been considering the establishment of a food stamp distribution program whereby food stamps would be distributed to welfare recipients which would be redeemable for designated surplus foods at retail food markets. This same manner of distribution of surplus foods was carried on throughout the country by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and welfare agencies in 1939, 1940, and 1941.

"Retail food markets, both chain and independents, can render a more efficient and economical distribution service of surplus foods than can any governmental agency," stated Harvey Curry, association director.

More than $15 million a year in surplus foods would be distributed in Oregon based on the present allotment allocated for this purpose. This would represent average sales of $15,000 per year for 1,000 food markets in Oregon.

FOOD STAMP DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM OF SURPLUS FOODS RECOMMENDED

It was also emphasized that the many food markets in Oregon with adequate personnel, are equipped to distribute surplus foods without the necessity of requiring investments for refrigeration, and warehouse facilities by county or State welfare agencies.

A resolution endorsing and recommending the immediate establishment of a Federal surplus distribution program with the use of a food stamp plan was adopted at the grocers' meeting. Copies of the resolution were ordered sent to the members of the Oregon congressional delegation and to the Oregon State Welfare Commission.

The Veterans' Direct Loan Housing Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on January 3, 1961, I introduced H.R. 797, to provide for direct housing loans to veterans.

The House Veterans' Affairs Committee is presently conducting hearings on the subject and the following is my testimony in support of H.R. 797:

STATEMENT OF ABRAHAM J. MULTER, DEMOCRAT OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE HOUSE VETERANS' AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, THE VETERANS' DIRECT LOAN HOUSING PROGRAM, H.R. 797, MARCH 14, 1961

Mr. Chairman, I am most appreciative of the opportunity to appear before this committee today in behalf of my bill, H.R. 797.

I agree with the President's statement made in his special message to the Congress on housing and community development—that we must make more funds available to the American veteran who is seeking to own his home. I believe the Congress will agree that the cost of these loans should not be prohibitive.

There are many thousands of veterans now on the waiting list for both direct loans and for loans of private capital at the 5¼ interest rate. The program of direct loans has never been as large as needed to meet the needs of veterans who are otherwise unable to secure credit. In view of the need to stimulate the activities of the housing industry and out of consideration for the many veterans' families who are not living in the comfortable, standard housing which is their due, we must try to:

1. Encourage the private capital market to make mortgage funds available at the 5¼ interest rate;

2. Liberalize veterans' mortgage terms to allow as many veterans as possible to benefit from the housing loan program, including those in metropolitan areas as well as those in the smaller communities, and

3. Provide a sufficient amount of direct loan funds to meet the urgent needs of veterans to whom normal credit channels are not open.

There is no legitimate reason why the cost of housing loans to veterans must be raised; to do so is to penalize the veterans and to increase the income of the lenders. Let us hope that we will be able, generally, to lower the cost of money to the many American families who are seeking to better themselves.

Building costs have been steadily climbing in recent years, so much so that in most areas you cannot think in terms of a $12,000 or $13,000 house. In fact, in many areas you cannot find a house for less than $17,000 to $20,000. Therefore, I believe that it is necessary and right that the loan entitlement of veterans be raised to meet the higher cost of housing.

My bill, H.R. 797, is concerned with the direct loan program under section 512 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended. By it, I seek to make available more direct loan funds. I also propose to increase the amounts of loans to create broader eligibility.

Over the years I have consistently sought to have these proposals written into the law. This year I feel particularly confident that this goal may be achieved. There is a pressing need to put the country's more than 5 million unemployed back on the payrolls. A portion of this need could be met if more veterans were placed in a position to buy their own homes.

You are all fully familiar with the basic importance of the activities of the construction industry to the Nation's economy. However, I do want to emphasize these facts: The more homes we can build and sell, the more furniture we can make and sell; the more electric appliances, other consumer durables, lumber, bricks, mortar, building hardware and numerous other products will be demanded, thereby creating employment opportunities for almost every segment of industry.

I disagree with those who say that the building industry cannot serve as a stimulant to the economy as it has in the past. The major reason advanced by those who take this pessimistic view is that housing demand has been substantially achieved. Higher priced housing demand has been largely met, but there is a tremendous market for homes for the moderate income families and individuals.

The cooperative efforts of builders, lenders, and the Federal Government can assist in meeting the needs of veterans and other moderate income groups, and the building industry can again assist in buoying up the economy. Still another worthwhile purpose could be served—the elimination of substandard living quarters for many thousands of families.

The record of payment by veterans who have secured loans, under the direct loan program as well as the loan guarantee program, has been an excellent one—few losses have been recorded. The entire GI housing loan program has been successful, and it has not been costly.

I hope that this committee will find it possible to include my proposals in the bill it sends to the floor this session. To do so will be to help the families of many deserving men and women who have served this country well. At the same time, some impetus will be given to the lagging housing industry, and thereby to the economy as a whole.

It is essential that the GI home loan program be extended and expanded. Again, I want to thank you for permitting me to appear before this committee to state my views on this important piece of legislation.

Resolutions Memorializing Congress on the Questions of Federal Quotas on Imports of Residual Fuel Oil and End-Use Control of the Various Fuels Serving the Commonwealth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include resolution of the General Court of Massachusetts:

RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS ON THE QUESTION OF FEDERAL QUOTAS ON IMPORTS OF RESIDUAL FUEL OIL AND END-USE CONTROL OF THE VARIOUS FUELS SERVING THE COMMONWEALTH

Whereas the current Federal quotas on the imports of residual fuel oil discriminate greatly against the New England area, including the Commonwealth; and

Whereas such restriction on fuel oil imports poses an economic hardship on both the consumers of fuel oil in the Commonwealth and on the industrial community, already being responsible for higher fuel oil costs in the New England area; and

Whereas a continuation of the current trend to limit fuel oil imports further augurs even higher fuel oil prices; and

Whereas any study of the various fuels used in Massachusetts markets which has as its objective the promotion of the end-use control of such fuels would be contrary to the basic economic law of supply and demand and not in consonance with the operation of a free competitive economy, thereby causing higher prices to consumers of such fuels: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby requests the Members of the U.S. Congress from the Commonwealth to use their prestige and influence to terminate said quotas on the imports of residual fuel oil; and be it further

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby requests the Massachusetts congressional delegation to make its voice heard against any attempt to promote the end-use control of the various fuels used in the Commonwealth; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to each Member of the U.S. Congress serving from Massachusetts.

Senate, adopted, February 28, 1961.
IRVING N. HAYDEN,
Clerk.

House of representatives, adopted in concurrence, March 3, 1961.
LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

The Future of the Private College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANCHER NELSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, March 2, 1961, I boarded the crowded plane in Washington and a gentleman approached me asking if the companion seat was taken, which was not. Soon we were engaged in a very pleasant visit dealing with many of the domestic issues of the day.

I found my companion very well versed on what was going on in Washington, with very sensible, sound ideas on the issues of the day.

Gradually the conversation shifted to the topic of Federal aid to education. My companion expressed some concern as to the proposals that were being considered and I commented that I had introduced a bill that would provide a tax deduction for a parent that sent a son or a daughter on to an institution of higher learning. My premise was that rather than tax the parent to send the money to Washington to be returned in part, the parent could use his own dollar sending his child to the school of his choice. My observation drew a quick enthusiastic response from my companion. I later learned that I had been privileged to visit with one of the Nation's leading educators, the Reverend Virgil C. Blum, S.J., and it was my privilege also to read an article prepared by Father Blum.

I believe this article merits attention in the Congress of the United States and it is along the lines of the bill that I have introduced with about 40 Members of Congress and I, therefore, wish to insert the article with my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The article is appended in full, as follows:

THE FUTURE OF THE PRIVATE COLLEGE—IN THIS TIME OF CRISIS NEW METHODS OF FINANCING MUST BE DEVELOPED

(By Virgil C. Blum, S.J.)

You may be planning to send your son or daughter to a private college or university. There are strong indications, however, that you may not have the opportunity. In the years ahead many private institutions of higher education are likely to collapse financially; others will, as experts predict, boost their tuition by more than 100 percent and thus price themselves beyond your financial reach.

But the demise of our private college is not inevitable. Nor is a tuition level beyond your reach inevitable. Private institutions can be saved. But it is a task to which every citizen who believes in diversity in education, academic freedom in the pursuit of truth, free enterprise in education, and the best interests of the taxpayer must take a personal interest. In this time of crisis for education, new methods of financing private education must be found.

The rapid increase in the cost of classroom buildings, laboratories, and operations is at the heart of the problem of financing private education. The problem cannot be solved simply by raising tuition. Such an approach might well aggravate the problem.

The private college, however, cannot fix the price of the product it is selling—education—on the basis of production costs. It does not operate in a free market. It operates in the context of a State-subsidized educational system. Under present conditions of high-cost education, the high public institutional discount rate of 80 to 90 percent on the full cost of education spells destruction for most private institutions.

This fact was underscored by Dr. Lawrence A. Kimpton, former chancellor of the University of Chicago, when he spoke of this destructive situation. "To put it in the crassest terms possible," he said, "it is hard to market a product at a fair price when down the street someone is giving it away."

Private colleges are like private grocery stores which, even while selling their products at a substantial loss, would be forced out of business by State-owned and operated supermarkets that sell their products at an 80- to 80-percent discount.

In such a competitive situation the private college cannot raise its tuition to meet necessary costs. If it does, it simply prices itself out of the education market. Some students, to be sure, will continue to attend private schools, even if they must borrow money to pay tuition.

But the typical student (and his parents) will not incur large debts to pay tuition when he can get a college education at the taxpayer's expense. The typical student will not borrow $1,000 or $1,500 a year to pay tuition when he can get an education free.

The impact of the growing gap between tuition in public and private institutions is clearly demonstrated by the rapid shift of students from private to public institutions. As recently as 1950 more than 50 percent of our college students attended private institutions. Today it is less than 40 percent.

Experts predict that, if present trends continue, 80 percent of our students will be in tax-supported colleges and universities by 1970. The tuition-imbalance is one big reason why there are thousands of vacancies in private colleges while tax-supported institutions are asking for hundreds of millions of dollars to expand facilities.

It costs a minimum of $3,600 to supply classroom facilities for a student. Hence, it is in the taxpayer's interest that existing private school facilities be used to the fullest extent possible. This is not being done. A year ago there were 709 private colleges with fewer than 500 students each. Their average enrollment was only 226. It is a fair estimate that these colleges have available many hundreds of millions of dollars of unused facilities. In Wisconsin alone the private colleges have $17 million worth of unused space.

Why do students bypass small private colleges for large State institutions? Dean Martin Quanbeck, of Minnesota's Augsburg College, says that this preference "can be explained largely in terms of differences in quality, prestige, and tuition costs." Relatively high tuition costs are a deterrent to attendance at private colleges. Yet, it is precisely because tuition cannot begin to cover the full cost of quality education that many of our small colleges are short on quality and prestige.

Under present conditions the facilities of most private colleges are terribly underpaid and overworked. "What all this amounts to," said Dr. Barnaby Keeney, president of Brown University, "is that every student at almost every private college in the country is on a scholarship from the faculty, whether he needs one or not, indeed whether he wants one or not. This scholarship is paid by the faculty of the institution, out of their hides."

But it is true, nevertheless, that most parents cannot afford to pay a tuition that covers a greater portion of the full cost of education. For one thing, taxes are too high. And the larger the proportion of students in tax-supported institutions, the higher the taxes.

How then can private colleges and universities be saved and enabled to render a valuable service to American society? A number of proposals are now receiving serious consideration.

Direct Federal matching grants to public and private institutions for classroom buildings and laboratories are being proposed. Such direct grants would, however, be of little help to the vast majority of the Nation's 1,300 private institutions. Since additional students increase the operating deficit, private schools are reluctant to spend meager resources to match Federal funds to expand their facilities.

Some way must be found to increase the income of private schools for operating purposes. "Otherwise," predicts Dr. Louis T. Benezet, president of Colorado College, "we may expect to see the monumental construction of State university metropolises on the one hand and on the other the disappearance of most of the private colleges."

A Federal tax credit against tuition or fees deserves serious consideration. It would enable parents to pay a greater portion of the full cost of education, thus making higher tuition feasible. A 40-percent tax credit on a tuition of $1,000 would enable the taxpayer, parent or other, to claim a credit of $400 against his Federal income tax. If his income tax is $900, he pays only $500. If a parent sends his son to a State university where tuition is $200, he could claim a credit of $80.

There is nothing revolutionary about the tax credit. The Federal Government makes innumerable tax concessions to business and the professions to promote some particular aspects of the public interest.

If the tax credit would induce student attendance at private schools, it would result in substantial savings for the taxpayers. Since it costs the taxpayers from $1,600 to $2,000 a year per student in a State university (less in a State college), a tax credit of $400 to a parent who sends his son or daughter to a private institution would constitute a large saving in tax dollars.

It is sometimes objected that a tax credit would not greatly aid low-income families. This is true. But it must be emphasized that with or without a tax credit these families cannot send their children to private colleges. They need scholarship help. The adoption of the tax credit plan would enable private colleges to give more scholarships to needy students. This would aid low-income families. Moreover, an increasing number of States are adopting extensive scholarship programs, and the U.S. Office of Education has proposed an extensive Federal scholarship program.

In early December representatives of the major educational associations, meeting in Washington, adopted a package recommendation in support of Federal scholarships, Federal matching grants for classroom buildings and laboratories, and a tax credit plan. There was a feeling, however, that support of the tax credit plan would be controversial.

Although the major educational associations have repeatedly adopted resolutions supporting the tax credit plan, State universities and land-grant colleges have in recent years publicly opposed the plan. The reason is not difficult to discover. Since all their instate students enjoy a hidden tax-provided scholarship that covers most of the cost of their education, tuition is nominal. Hence, the dollar value of a 40-percent tax credit to these students is not high. Consequently, public institutions, if they desired to absorb the tax credit benefit by raising tuition by 40 percent, would receive less in increased tuition income than private institutions.

Public institutions want direct Federal matching grants for capital construction, rather than tax credit. It seems to me, however, that the best interest of America, as well as the best interest of both public and private higher education, would be served by the adoption of both the matching grant proposal and the tax credit proposal, together with a scholarship program with grants weighted in favor of the low-income group.

Academic freedom, the need for diversity in education, equity, and economy strongly urge the adoption of the 40-percent tax credit plan. Such a Federal program would enable parents to pay a greater portion of the full cost of education. This would enable private schools to raise their tuition substantially without pricing themselves out of business.

Whether Congress will adopt the tax credit plan during the present session depends largely on you, the citizen. You will decide whether the private college will survive in America. Because of open opposition to the plan, private education will need your support before Congress. If you have an interest in the preservation of private higher education (and every American should have), write to your elected representatives in Washington.

Extending Loan Guarantee Authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1163) to amend section 510 of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to extend for 1 year the loan guarantee authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, the discussion on the floor this afternoon, in my opinion, reaffirms my belief in the good judgment of the chairman of the Committee on Rules of the House. When I observed that we had a rule providing for 2 hours of debate on this bill, I could not conceive how we could possibly consume 2 hours discussing a noncontroversial bill or at least what I presumed was a noncontroversial bill. But here we have consumed half of the time already, and we have not even yet directed our remarks to the bill before us.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AVERY. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Reluctantly, I must make this comment. Referring to the second point the gentleman just made, I did take some 15 minutes discussing the bill itself and I thought I had quite thoroughly explained it and I did try to analyze it. In the second place, and I suppose that modesty would keep me, not necessarily from wanting to say this, but without trying to take anything away from the chairman of the great Committee on Rules, I would like the gentleman to know that as chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I asked him for 2 hours.

Mr. AVERY. Well, of course, I presume I should have included the gentleman from Arkansas in my observation in support of the prevailing usual wisdom of the gentleman from Virginia, the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to consume 30 more seconds in respect to the matter we have been discussing in the last 30 minutes, and that is whether or not there was any intention on the part of the executive to exercise any influence over the agencies that we normally allude to as the independent regulatory agencies. I am convinced there will be less influence anyhow in view of the discussion that has taken place here on the floor this afternoon, and the further concern that will undoubtedly be expressed by the sequel to the legislative oversight committee. I do not believe that particular subcommittee has been officially named as yet, but I am sure its presence and its worth will be well known and will become very familiar to the Members of the House in the weeks to follow.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1163, a bill to extend the loan guaranty authority authorized in the Transportation Act of 1958. I do not view this proposal as special legislation to benefit any one individual railroad. If I thought it was special legislation in that context, I would not have supported it when it originally passed Congress in 1958 nor would I support the extension of the same program today.

The benefits of this program fall in two general categories. In the first instance, the benefits obviously accrue to the particular railroads that have already secured loans under this program. I will list those carriers in an extension of my remarks. The second category is perhaps more far reaching and more important than the first. The very knowledge and availability of this program makes credit available at a reasonable rate to other carriers that are not identified in the hearings or in the reports of the Interstate Commerce Commission. It is in somewhat the same context as mortgage credit for home building. Because there is a guaranteed loan program available to potential homebuilders, there also becomes available certain commercial credit. I firmly believe that the benefits falling into these separate categories clearly establishes that an extension of this program is in the public interest.

Most of the criticism of this program during the hearings was directed at loans made to the New Haven Railroad. There is probably not another railroad in the United States that has less to do with the transportation problems of Kansas than does the New Haven. Nevertheless, I feel that there is a public need served by this railroad and at the moment the Federal Government appears to be the only entity that is capable of providing the necessary emergency assistance to the New Haven Railroad for it to continue in operation. It is somewhat out of character for me to walk down the aisle in support of Federal assistance to a facility that is regional in nature. I would not be in support of further possible assistance to this particular carrier if the metropolitan areas directly benefiting from its service had not indicated an increasing sense of financial responsibility to this carrier.

When the president of the New Haven Railroad, Mr. George Alpert, testified before our committee in response to a question he stated for the record that the New Jersey Legislature has provided $6 million to railroads that serve metropolitan areas in that State. In New York the legislature, he stated, at the request of Governor Rockefeller in 1958, passed a law which tied the railroad taxes to net income rather than to assessment.

In addition to these specific actions the four States served by this line, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and New York, joined to establish an interstate committee appointed by the respective Governors. This interstate committee was to recommend back to the several State legislatures a program that they considered would reflect the individual State responsibility to preserve the service and operation of this particular carrier. In brief this recommendation suggests a possible $13 million annual subsidy program, half of which would be the modification or elimination of local and State taxes. I wanted the record to be abundantly clear that Congress is not creating a loan fund that is to be available for loans to insolvent carriers merely to permit them to continue paying inequitable and disproportionately high local and State ad valorem taxes.

At this point I think it is desirable to make the record clear in respect to a loan approved by the Commission for another carrier. In his statement to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, Commission Chairman Everett Hutchinson stated that the proceeds of one of these loans was used primarily to pay overdue State taxes. Taken out of context this loan might appear to be beyond the loan authority contained in the original act. When read in context, however, and in connection with a subsequent explanation of this loan in the hearings, it is abundantly clear that this loan was approved by the Commission in keeping with the authority in the original act. The act provides that loans may be made for financing or refinancing (1) of additions and betterments or other capital expenditures made after January 1, 1957, or to reimburse the carrier for expenditures made from its own funds for such additions and betterments or other capital expenditures. The proceeds of this particular loan were used to restore operating capital to the carrier that it had committed to the purchase of certain needed equipment after January 1, 1957.

I think the Committee should know that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee did not liberalize the act in keeping with several requests that were presented during the course of the hearings. Mr. William P. Johnson, president of the Railway Express Agency presented a very persuasive statement requesting that that enterprise also be made eligible for a loan under the program the same as the railroad. There were other suggestions as to what should be considered as acceptable collateral by the Commission in approving a loan. Our Committee did not see fit to make any changes in the program as it was originally authorized in 1958 and the bill before you today merely provides for a simple 15 month extension of the act.

Wilderness Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARNOLD OLSEN
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Robert C. Sykes, president of the Montana Wildlife Federation.

He made that statement before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in testifying in support of the wilderness bill, S. 174.

As Mr. Sykes says, he speaks for the Montana Wildlife Federation, and I think that his position is a moderate one; that is, in supporting the creation of wilderness recreation areas, he leaves room for other people to make a living at their pursuits in the several industries that are dependent upon our natural resources, such as mining, lumbering, ranching, and farming.

I have not resolved exactly what position I will take with respect to the several parts of the wilderness bill, but I thought it well to publish this statement of the president of the wildlife

federation and to circulate it so that I might stimulate interest in my district and, finally, stir my constituents into writing me and expressing their opinions.

Mr. Speaker, after I have heard from my constituents concerning the bill, I will resolve my decision.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF ROBERT C. SYKES, PRESIDENT OF THE MONTANA WILDLIFE FEDERATION SUPPORTING WILDERNESS BILL

My name is Robert C. Sykes. I am an attorney by profession, living in Kalispell, Mont., a small town that is in the middle of a green valley surrounded by mountains. Within a 60-mile radius of Kalispell, there are more than 500 lakes. I appear here today on behalf of the Montana Wildlife Federation, of which I am the president. I wish to thank this committee for the privilege of making this appearance in support of the wilderness bill, and giving me this opportunity to state the view of the members of my organization.

I think it might be interesting to consider that the four largest industries of the State of Montana are mining, agriculture, logging and tourist trade. These are the same industries that are here today expressing their opinions on the wilderness bill. As a small-town attorney, my livelihood is dependent upon the economy of Kalispell; and my clients, naturally, are my neighbors and friends who are the loggers, mill operators, the ranchers, and farmers, as well as those who serve the many tourists that visit our beautiful country each year. These are the same people who make up the membership of the Montana Wildlife Federation throughout the State of Montana. Now it would be extremely unwise for me, from a selfish standpoint, as well as from an economical standpoint, to jeopardize the existing economy of those who make up the membership of the Federation. In other words, I ship of the Federation. In other words, I would not be here before you today, if I thought that this wilderness bill would adversely affect Montana's economy or any segment of that economy.

I would not purport to be an expert on the uses of natural resources. However, I am a user of those natural resources, and I live with and represent people who make other uses of those natural resources. My hobby is horses and amateur style pack trips. Because I have had the actual privilege of enjoying and using these resources, and because I live with and work for other different users of these natural resources, I believe I understand the meaning of multiple use of national forests.

As I understand it, multiple use means that use or management of the forest lands which achieves the maximum benefits for all the various users of such lands. I further understand and assume that such management for multiple use requires application of this principle to the national forests as a whole rather than attempting to apply multiple use to each and every foot of ground that exists. If this is a reasonable definition of multiple use, then by all means, the wilderness bill is necessary so that wilderness use can have value or recognition, whatsoever, in the multiple use of national forests.

I have been quite impressed with the viewpoint expressed by Senator ANDERSON when he compares a wilderness area to a museum. He quotes Dr. Luna B. Leopold, Chief of the Water Resource Division of the U.S. Geological Survey, who said "We take for granted that there is some social gain in the erection and maintenance of a museum of fine arts, a museum of natural history, or even a historical museum. Sooner or later, we ought to be mature enough to extend this concept to another kind of museum, one which you might call the museum of land types, consisting of samples as uninfluenced as possible by man." I think we must take for granted that he also includes the fish and wildlife that inhabit such a living museum.

The wilderness areas of Montana are a vital segment of our tourist trade. Should Montana ever lose its wilderness areas, the adverse effects to Montana, economically, would be disastrous.

I sincerely believe the opponents of the wilderness bill are opposed to wilderness use of public lands. They profess stanch support for the multiple use of public lands; however, I earnestly submit that the only multiple use they will ever support on public lands are to those lands which do not in any way contribute to the type of resource which their industry is dependent on. I further submit that they probably are speaking for a segment of the industry they represent, but that segment is either misinformed or does not know the purpose of the wording of Senator ANDERSON's bill. I do know this that the opponents who have appeared here today do not speak for many of the members they claim they represent. Without qualification, I know that I speak for every conservationist, not only in the State of Montana but everywhere else, when I ask that this Committee support Senator ANDERSON's bill.

In considering Senator ANDERSON's bill, I fail to see how it will, in any way, adversely effect the economy of any of the members of my federation, regardless of what vocation, business, or industry their livelihood is dependent on. For instance, this bill does not in any affect the present establishment of the working circle or the annual sustained yield cut, as established by the National Forest Service for logging. The reason for this is that wilderness areas have never been used in establishing such working circles or sustained yield cuts. The provisions in the bill itself under section 6, paragraph (c) and more particularly the subparagraphs (1) through (7), thereof, clearly permits existing users to continue to do so, and goes further than that, and permits the President to authorize prospecting, including exploration for oil and gas, as well as the establishment and maintenance of reservoirs and other facilities needed in the public interest. Also, the Secretary may permit grazing of livestock, where this has been done prior to the passage of Senator ANDERSON's bill. I do not know what more could be expected in giving reasonable protection to grazing and mining interests than this.

I request favorable consideration of Senator ANDERSON's bill for the following reasons:

1. To protect and preserve the last reservoir of natural resources for the use of future generations.

2. To establish and protect the economy derived through wilderness recreation and education.

3. To afford greater opportunity to those living adjacent to wilderness, in having the right to speak relative to any boundary changes of such wilderness area.

4. To prevent exploitation of what few wildernesses remain.

I believe that if we look back to the hearings on the establishment of the national forests and the national parks that the same opponents of the wilderness bill made the same objections then that they are making now, and they must concede that they were wrong then; and in the future they will concede they are wrong now.

In closing, I would like to invite the committee's attention to the fact that once a wilderness area has been invaded and exploited and as a result destroyed, it is gone forever. A wilderness area is as fragile as the most priceless piece of porcelain or china. Should that porcelain or china be broken, it can never be replaced nor restored to its original condition. The same thing applies to a wilderness area. Restoration of a destroyed area would be impossible because of the tremendous cost it would entail.

The Kennedy Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I enclose a splendid editorial entitled "The Kennedy Plan" appearing in the New York Times of March 15, 1961. The comparison of the Kennedy plan with the Marshall plan of the latter 1940's is logical and sound. Legislation to carry out the President's recommendations should be enacted into law as quickly as possible after legislation to effectuate the Kennedy plan is introduced in Congress.

The editorial follows:

THE KENNEDY PLAN

Ever since 1948 Latin Americans have been reproaching the United States because they received no benefit from the Marshall plan. Now they have a Kennedy plan, as broad in scope, as important and potentially costly in what it seeks to do, and like the Marshall plan it is a response to a desperate need whose satisfaction will benefit the United States as well as the recipients and partners. Another striking parallel is that just as the Marshall plan was the U.S. answer to Joseph Stalin, so the Kennedy plan is the U.S. answer to Fidel Castro.

The address by President Kennedy to the Latin American diplomatic corps on Monday and the message to Congress yesterday will be historic documents of the first order. They are the result of long and expert study; they cover a great deal of ground and dig deeply into the needs and aspirations of the 20 countries of Latin America. There probably have never been in hemispheric history two American documents in which so many vital and hitherto ignored truths have been set forth.

Here is one, from the speech to Congress, that goes to the very heart of Latin America's problem: "Economic growth without social progress lets the great majority of the people remain in poverty, while a privileged few reap the benefits of rising abundance." It has taken us many years, a frightening revolution in Cuba, and the entrance of the cold war into the Western Hemisphere to accept that basic truth of modern times.

Obviously, one can only barely touch on the significant points of the new American policy in a first comment. It is new in its emphasis on social change and progress, its acceptance of the need for a long-range program of towering dimensions, and its recognition of the importance of helping to stabilize commodity prices.

The special stress put upon the necessity for the Latin American ruling classes to improve their own institutions, make land reforms, and give up some of their wealth and privileges might also be considered new. Our policies for 150 years have been with these ruling classes and not for the people of Latin America. However, the pressures

we apply must be made with understanding and patience, or the United States plan will fail.

The challenge that we North Americans face—and it is one of the gravest and most significant in our history—was best summed up in this sentence from Mr. Kennedy's speech to the diplomats: "Our unfulfilled task is to demonstrate to the entire world that man's unsatisfied aspiration for economic progress and social justice can best be achieved by freemen working within a framework of democratic institutions."

As Mr. Kennedy implies, we have not yet demonstrated this. His challenge, whatever we call it—the Kennedy plan, "Alliance for Progress," or, perhaps best of all, "Operation Pan America"—is the challenge of our times. We can lose the cold war in Latin America, but we will not lose it if the policies put forward by President Kennedy yesterday and Monday are carried out.

Kennedy and the Economy—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the second in a series of editorials recently appearing in the Winston-Salem (N.C.) Journal. The following editorial appeared in the issue of March 7, 1961:

KENNEDY AND THE ECONOMY, II—DEALING WITH THE DOLLAR

If the United States had no dollar problem, the chances are we would also have no big unemployment problem. Such goals as increased economic growth could be achieved far more easily if the dollar were gaining in strength and prestige rather than losing.

Moreover, if the dollar's difficulties get worse, our other economic problems will become proportionately harder to solve. President Kennedy, in his various references to the national economy, has shown some recognition of the need for a strong dollar.

In a nutshell, the dollar problem is that the United States, taken as a unit, has not been making ends meet. It has been spending and giving away more than it has been taking in. We have been losing several billions annually in dollars and gold to foreign businesses and governments. This leaves us a poorer country financially, and that lessens faith in our financial soundness and the soundness of our dollar. So far, the dollar has kept its international buying power. But if the country keeps going in the hole, we cannot expect faith in our currency to continue indefinitely. If it falls, that is, if it is devalued, the least calamities that might result would be (1) loss of ability to buy and import the raw materials we need, and (2) lack of financial power to carry on our oversea spending programs which have political and military significance. Such results would be disastrous for the United States in more ways than one.

Like mounting unemployment, which was discussed here yesterday, the dollar loss has become a well-developed trend that has causes more lasting than the current recession. As long as the causative conditions remain, the outflow of our national wealth cannot be permanently halted by stopgaps, such as those ordered by Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy.

What are those causes?

One is the rapid development of oversea industrialization. In itself, this is not bad. However, the countries that have made rapid industrial strides have not raised their popular standards of living accordingly. In none of them does the average worker's income even approach what we have. While this disparity exists, the United States will have tough competition indeed. So far, we have managed to stay in the black in our export-import balance—we are selling goods of more value than we buy. The drain on our wealth has come from sources other than our spending for imports.

But even though this international trade is not the cause of the dollar problem, it may be the most promising place to look for a cure, because trade will respond favorably to improvements in our national economy over which we have ample control. Oversea military and aid spending, on the other hand, must depend largely on international circumstances over which U.S. control is most limited.

How can the needed economic improvements be made?

The answer to that is a bitter pill to many. It requires the reversal of those causitive trends which have weakened the U.S. dollar position, and there are large vested interests behind the preservation of those trends.

Briefly, the wage-price spiral must be halted, and the Government must follow noninflationary economic policies. There seems no other dependable way for the United States to make the drastic improvement it needs in world trade to balance the costs of its nontrade operations overseas.

Industrial management must, through plant modernization and other means of improving efficiency, increase our productivity, so that U.S. goods can be sold abroad at more competitive prices. In those areas of employment where standards of living are now acceptable, labor must be content with its earnings, or at the most with wage increases that are less than the gains in productivity.

The Government must recognize that, so far as the country as a whole is concerned, it has a lot to do with the total cost in man-hours of the goods produced. Manufacturers, after all, must count the expense of running the Government as part of their cost of doing business. When that overhead goes up, particularly when it does so by increasing the Federal debt, the cost of goods must go up, too. That is inflation.

The Kennedy administration is in the fortunate position of being on good terms, thus far, with both labor and management. It may be able to win their cooperation in checking the wage-price spiral.

However, the administration's own plans are definitely inflationary. They call for a sizable expansion of the Federal Government's activities and expenditures, and budget deficits in the billions are already counted upon for the next 3 years. The hope that growth would pay for the New Frontiers' program seems to be in the more distant future.

Which should have the priority—the President's spending plans or the restoration of a strong dollar?

Much of his program is for Government services that would, in the final analysis, help to improve the public's standard of living—less unemployment, more old-age security, more heavily financed education and so on. Parts of this program, for humanitarian reasons alone, are thoroughly justified. Other parts may be needed to retain our position in the world. But a basic cause of our dollar problem is that the average American standard of living is already high in comparison with that of the world as a whole. The danger is that it is insupportably high.

Under the circumstances, black rather than red Federal budgets are preferable, and if the Government must go deeper in debt it should be by the smallest reasonable amount.

In the long run, of course, income must grow along with the growth in production—otherwise there would be no market for our goods. But the Government and private enterprise alike should make more production, not more cost, their immediate target.

Is Nation's Capital Safe From Enemy Air Attack?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the March 25, 1961, issue of the Army-Navy-Air Force Register and Defense Times contains an article which should be of interest to all Members of the Congress. It is entitled "Is Nation's Capital Safe From Enemy Air Attack?" and was written by Mr. Robert E. Schweitz. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS NATION'S CAPITAL SAFE FROM ENEMY AIR ATTACK?

Any enemy air attack on Washington will be met by a nuclear one-two punch that will turn the aggressor to dust.

The Nation's Capital is defended by an interservice force, armed with a variety of nuclear warheads, on 24-hour duty and a 2- to 5-minute reaction time.

Since a ground attack on the continental United States is unlikely, main attention, fiscal and strategic, has been turned toward defending the seat of Government from air and space attacks.

We can destroy any known aircraft or air-breathing missile coming our way. If the enemy launches ballistic missiles at us all we can do is fire ours at them and duck. But if Nike-Zeus tests are successful we may be able to defend the Capital from ICBM's by 1965.

If a bomber attack comes, the first atomic explosion most Americans will see will be that of our own weapons killing the attackers.

Genie missiles: The main carriers for our nuclear air defense weapons in the Washington area are the ugly MB-1 Genie missiles (fired from planes) and ground-fired Bomarc and Nike-Hercules interceptor missiles.

The central battle station for the defense of the Washington area is a four-story windowless concrete SAGE building surrounded by a high chain link fence at Fort Lee near Petersburg, Va. This is the headquarters of the Washington Air Defense Sector of the North American Air Defense Command's 26th Region.

Commander of the sector is Brig. Gen. Earnest H. Beverly whose trigger finger could save millions of American lives.

In a red alert the general sits at the rim of a C-shaped desk with his key operational officers.

Ships: To them, from picket ships at sea, early warning aircraft aloft and radar sites all over their sector, comes information about aircraft flying their way. In a month's time more than 4,000 planes were sighted and tracked. Each plane is identified within 2 minutes.

The general's order to go could put into action the tremendous air defense force which guards Washington.

Included are 24 Nike fire units, 3 fighter-interceptor squadrons, and a Bomarc squadron. Navy and Marine Corps planes and antiaircraft missiles can be alerted too.

The fighter-interceptor squadrons are the 95th at Andrews AFB which has the F–106 planes (single place Mach 2 craft made by Convair); the 48th Squadron at Langley AFB, also with 106's, and the 98th Fighter-Interceptor Squadron at Dover AFB. The Dover outfit uses the two-place F–101–B. The McDonnell F–101–B Voodoo can clip along at better than 1,200 miles an hour.

Nuclear tipped: The Bomarc squadron, the 22d Air Defense Missile Squadron, is also near Langley. Under its nearly two score steel sheds are nuclear-tipped Bomarc missiles which can be raised and fired through the automatically opened shed roofs in 2 minutes. The Bomarcs are the shorter range A models. The newer model will be able to kill attackers more than 400 miles away at ranges above 60,000 feet. The new Bomarcs will be operational in about a year and the first copies will go to the Washington Air Defense Sector.

The Bomarcs can be controlled directly from the SAGE building. Also from this operational headquarters General Beverly can order the interceptors into the air.

If an unidentified plane enters the sector and remains unidentified for longer than 2 minutes. Beverly's people flash a signal to the fighter-interceptor squadron which can make the earliest intercept.

Some pilots are on an alert status, fully dressed and waiting for the signal in the alert hangar at all times.

When they get the signal they race to their planes which are next to the end of the runway. They roar into action within 2 minutes after receiving a red alert.

Let us suppose an unidentified plane is tracked heading for Washington. The F–106 Delta Darts, at speeds over 1,400 miles an hour, streak for the possibly hostile aircraft.

UNKNOWN

They reach the unknown just minutes later. Generally, the Dart pilots travel in pairs. Upon sighting the craft, one of the interceptor pilots will approach the unknown from behind. The other pilot hangs back.

The first pilot comes up beside the unidentified plane to read its markings. If it's a commercial, private or military aircraft which has strayed from its flight path that information is sent back to headquarters and contact is made with the wayward one to set him on the right path.

If the unknown turns out to be a hostile plane, it is quite likely he will try to destroy the first Dart. If he does the pilot of the other plane will knock him down.

The U.S. defense philosophy is to let the enemy take the first hostile action. What creates a hostile action is in a gray and highly classified area. But certainly the launching of an air to surface missile, the opening of a bomb bay door or an attack on a U.S. plane are hostile.

In an actual war situation there are likely to be quite a few bombers heading this way. As their intent becomes clear it would be up to General Beverly to contact the North American Air Defense Command in Colorado Springs. NORAD, in wartime, controls all of Canada's and the United States' air defense forces.

RETALIATE

The Joint Chiefs, the President and all the higher echelons take part in the decisions to retaliate and defend.

All the air defense forces would be immediately put on alert, all the radar scopes manned, all the intercept pilots would be aloft and the Bomarcs and Nikes would lock on their targets.

The area and far out defensive first line would be manned by the Air Force units assigned.

If any of the raiders get through they will be met by the mighty striking force of the Army's 35th Artillery Brigade whose Nike units ring the Capital.

Of the 24 Nike firing units in the Washington area, 9 are manned by National Guardsmen. The rest are Regular Army. The Guard sites are now all Ajax (nonnuclear 25-mile range).

The Regular Army mans seven Nike-Hercules sites. The rest are Ajax. These Hercules rockets all are nuclear-tipped weapons that can hit targets more than 80 miles away.

KNOCKED OUT

Commander of the 35th at Fort Meade, Md., is Col. Howard E. Michelet. The brigade is in the second region of the U.S. Army Air Defense Command headed by Brig. Gen. George S. Eckhardt. Eckhardt would be in complete charge of the sector if for some reason the Fort Lee operation were knocked out.

The entire air defense system depends on a network of radar installations which range from the Navy picket ships which roam the seas in the sector searching the skies for approaching aircraft to the simple height-approaching aircraft to the simple height finding radars at the Nike sites.

Texas Tower No. 4, which toppled January 15 killing 28 men aboard her, was part of the system.

The surveillance mission has been partially filled by the picket ship.

INTRUDERS

In addition to the picket ship the Air Force has radar-equipped aircraft in the air at all times attempting to detect intruders.

There are huge radar towers in other spots around Washington. One of these, the Manassas site, is actually on the Quantico Marine Corps installation. It has a new high-powered rig atop its five-story tower.

The most seaward site is at Cape Charles. It is getting high-powered equipment too.

There's a site at Roanoke Rapids in North Carolina. This setup will not get the newer equipment for 2 more years.

Four thousand feet up, at a Blue Ridge Mountain peak, 26 miles from Bedford, is another radar search unit.

All the information gathered by these radars is fed into the air defense sector headquarters at Fort Lee.

The data goes into a 275-ton computer which occupies a space at Lee large enough to accommodate 24 average-size ranch-style homes.

This 1,000-mile mass of wires and 50,000 vacuum tubes accepts and stores the information.

PUSH BUTTONS

Air Force and Army men studying 100 radar scopes at steel consoles push buttons and flash ray guns at the scopes which signal the computer to bring up the data needed instantly.

The path of each airplane seen on the scope appears as a small maggot wiggling its way across a black field punctuated with flashing yellow lights.

As the little worm moves across the screen, the interceptors blip can be seen speeding toward it. The computer even flashes to the radar operator the exact point in the vast airspace where the intercept will be made.

This is the kind of information General Beverly can see on his scope at his battle station. From his chair he can watch hundreds of miles of sky; he can see the raiders getting closer and closer to Washington and he can see our forces flash into the sky to kill them.

Like the British who watched the air battle of Britain over the hills of England 20 years ago, the men in the blue lighted room at Fort Lee can watch the battle for Washington, if it ever comes. But unlike the Britons, the Air Force, Army and Navy men sitting at the radar consoles can do something about it.

Frederick C. McKee, Outstanding Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, Fred McKee of Pittsburgh has been a fine example of civic-minded and patriotic citizenship. He was selfless in his patriotic devotion to our good country and the American people. He was an ardent leader, working for freedom and justice everywhere.

I have received a thoughtful letter from my good friends Louis and Florence Reizenstein, close friends and coworkers with Fred McKee in many good causes. The letter of March 14, 1961, summarizes for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the excellent career and public service of Fred McKee, which should be here recorded for future generations to know of his spirit and patriotism.

MARCH 14, 1961.

Hon. JAMES G. FULTON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FULTON: You know of the death of our good friend Frederick C. McKee. Pittsburgh and the Nation has lost a great and good man.

Until the year 1937 when Japan invaded China, Fred McKee led the life of a business executive. As president of West Penn Cement Co., president of Winfield Railroad Co., treasurer and later president of the National Casket Co., he made his contribution to the business life of the Nation and the civic life of our community of Pittsburgh. The act of aggression by Japan moved him so deeply that his life from then until his illness was one constant battle against the authoritarian dictator wherever he might be—in Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy, Communist Russia, or Communist China.

He was a man moved to action by his deep convictions. In 1938 he became national director of the Committee for Boycott Against Japanese Aggression. When Hitler began his conquest of Europe, he understood the great need to sustain Great Britain and as an organizer and national treasurer of the Committee To Defend America by Aiding the Allies, traveled throughout the country helping Americans understand how our freedom and safety were being protected by Britain's stand against the Nazi onslaught.

Long before Pearl Harbor, Frederick C. McKee personally financed the first foreign language broadcasts from WRUL Boston to France, Italy, Yugoslavia, and Arabic countries.

He understood the great need for the United States assuming positive world leadership. Before the war, he was interested in the National Committee To Study the Organization of Peace which made a significant contribution to the United Nations Charter. And all during the war he spent his time and resources in a nationwide educational effort to assure public approval of the United States joining a world organization for the preservation of the peace. He became national chairman of Citizens for Victory which had headquarters in Pittsburgh and other large cities and mobilized public opinion in favor of the United States' participation in the United Nations. This group later became the American Association for the United Nations and Fred McKee its national treasurer.

He was one of the first Americans to understand the danger of Russian expansion in Eastern Europe. He believed deeply in our country's responsibility for strengthening the free world and gave support to the Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan, formation of NATO and aid to underdeveloped countries. He was chairman of the Committee to Defend America by Aiding Anti-Communist China and was Pittsburgh chairman of American Relief for Korea.

Fred McKee became known throughout the country as an expert on foreign affairs. Ex-Governor of Vermont, Ernest Gibson remarked: "I am glad to be in Pittsburgh because it is the home of Fred McKee. If he's not well known in Pittsburgh, you can believe me his name rings through the halls of Washington and Downing Street." Great Britain recognized his great assistance in the war effort and awarded him the King's Medal of Britain.

Frederick McKee's great concern for his country and its position in the world made him conscious of the need to correct here at home the iniquities, the undemocratic practices toward our own minorities. He was a stanch advocate of equality of opportunity for all our citizens. When the Pittsburgh Fair Employment Practice Commission was established in 1953, Mr. McKee became its chairman and when this commission later became the Commission on Human Relations and was empowered to administer all of Pennsylvania's equal rights laws, he was elected one of its cochairmen. His rich background in national and international affairs, his sensitivity to man's deepest needs and his modest unassuming manner made Frederick C. McKee one of America's great human beings.

Very sincerely yours,
LOUIS J. AND FLORENCE REIZENSTEIN.

Veterans of Massachusetts and the Medical Assistance to the Aged Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement submitted to me by John T. Connor, chairman, Committee for Massachusetts Veterans' Services Association:

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF MAKING AVAILABLE TO THE OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF VETERANS' SERVICES, COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, CERTAIN FUNDS UNDER THE PROGRAM OF MEDICAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE AGED

Massachusetts enjoys a unique position among the 50 States in that its concern for its veteran population prompted it, just 100 years ago, to enact special legislation providing for a separate program of assistance for these special people. In doing so Massachusetts patterned its treatment of veterans after the Federal Government, which for a longer period has maintained an agency to deal exclusively with the problems of the disabled, sick, and needy veterans. In Massachusetts the Commonwealth and each city and town maintain a department for the administration of veterans' benefits that is entirely separate from that administering public welfare. This is similar to the Federal Government maintaining the Veterans' Administration as a separate and distinct agency from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare even though the aims of both relative to the alleviation of financial hardship consequent on old age and illness are similar.

The last session of Congress enacted, under its amendments to the Social Security Act, a program of medical assistance for the aged to provide funds to the several States and through them to the cities and towns thereof, for the purpose of shouldering, to a great degree, the burden of the cost of frequent illness among the elderly, both as it affects the cost of other relief programs and the financial drain on the individual beneficiaries themselves. As of the date of preparation of this memorandum, 5 of the 50 States have accepted some version of the medical assistance for the aged program. One of the States so accepting is Massachusetts. Chapter 781 of the "Acts of the General Court of 1960," which incorporates within it several sections taken from a model act supplied by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare establishes the Department of Public Welfare within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts as the administering agency for medical assistance for the aged. Under the provisions of the program as adopted by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the Federal Government pays half of the cost of eligible cases, the Commonwealth two-thirds of the balance and the local community the remaining one-third of the balance. Under the Massachusetts program of veterans' benefits there is no Federal participation and the Commonwealth and the local community share equally the cost of each eligible case. Assuming a $300 per month chronic hospital case the following comparison is illustrative:

	Medical assistance for the aged	Massachusetts veterans' benefits
Total cost	$300	$300
Federal share	150	None
State share	100	150
Local share	50	150

It will be observed that in cases equally eligible, each costing in care the amount of the illustration, the State would save $50 per month and the local community $100 per month under medical assistance for the aged. The present Massachusetts laws provide that persons equally eligible for several categories of assistance may exercise free choice as to which they will accept. It is not difficult to envision, however, that with such substantial reimbursement available to the Commonwealth and the local community under medical assistance for the aged, pressure will shortly be brought to bear to force the transfer of many veterans' benefits cases to medical assistance for the aged or for the repeal of the statute permitting free choice.

It is not suggested that Congress intended, by its act of last year, to cripple a Massachusetts program which parallels in so many ways the treatment accorded by the Federal Government itself to veterans. It is felt rather that the designation of the department of public welfare as the State administering agency was the result of a too diligent effort to achieve uniformity within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

It is hoped that by bringing this matter to the attention of the Massachusetts congressional delegates and to the Secretary for Health, Education and Welfare, steps can be taken to make available Federal funds provided in medical assistance for the aged, to the Commissioner of Veterans' Services, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, with the result that our historic consideration of veterans as a special class may be continued and the Commonwealth and its communities may receive the benefits of this additional Federal aid.

Extending Loan Guarantee Authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission

SPEECH
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 14, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1163) to amend section 510 of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to extend for 1 year the loan guarantee authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce brings to the House of Representatives today the bill H.R. 1163 and urges its adoption. The committee held hearings on the legislation at which time interested parties were given the opportunity to appear, and a number of witnesses did appear and testified on the legislation. I believe, without execption, every witness who appeared before the committee recommended the extension of this authority.

The purpose of the bill is to extend for 15 months the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission to guarantee loans to railroads which was provided for in the passage of the Transportation Act of 1958 which, unless extended, would terminate March 31. In the 1958 act the Congress added a new part V to the Interstate Commerce Act which provided that the Interstate Commerce Commission could guarantee loans to railroads made by public and private institutions for the purpose of capital and maintenance expenditures. Under the economic conditions which existed in 1958 we were informed that some railroads had been forced by reason of their cash position to defer certain construction and maintenance programs and that with provision for this guarantee they would be able to secure loans enabling them to reinstate such programs, employing labor and purchasing materials and supplies.

It seemed to us that such programs were certainly desirable and apparently the Congress felt they were desirable, and the matter was approved. Under the guaranty loan authority the Com-

mission has granted some 14 applications totaling a little more than $85 million.

I wish to emphasize that this is not a loan by the Government. It is a guarantee of a loan obtained from the regular market. A substantial portion of this amount was authorized in capital improvements and in the purchase of equipment. Unfortunately the economic conditions today in the railroad industry are similar to those which existed 3 years ago. Our committee has been informed that it is extremely desirable that this guarantee loan authority be continued. There is pending before the Commission at this time an application for $15 million, the proceeds of which are to be used for capital improvements involving among other things the construction of a new electronic freight yard, which will take half of the amount. It is the belief of the committee that it is desirable to extend part V until next year so that projects such as this may immediately go forward.

It is not alone in the number or amount of the applications which have been approved by the Commission that this authority has been effective in providing for railroad construction, maintenance, and purchases. Testimony before the committee has been to the effect that it is unmistakable that the mere existence of this authority has enabled the carriers to secure financing through regular money markets even though they do not have to avail themselves of this guarantee.

It is our belief that the tests and limitations provided for by part V give as full protection to the Government as is reasonable under all of the circumstances. As stated in section 504, the Commission must find that the carrier cannot elsewhere procure funds on reasonable terms, that the rate of interest must not be too high, and that the prospective earning power of the carrier, together with the character and value of the security pledged, furnish reasonable assurance of the carrier's ability to repay the loan. You will observe further explanation of the statute in the report to which I direct your attention.

In the bill as reported from the committee almost unanimously you will observe there are additional views on the report filed by certain members of our committee. I direct your attention to the views of our colleagues at the hearing, at which time these matters were thoroughly discussed and searching questions were addressed by members of the committee particularly to the Interstate Commerce Commission. There were some questions raised with reference to some of the problems of administration and some of the policies, but nevertheless the members who filed these views state that in their view they recommend that the authority be extended. Therefore, I think you will find that in the course of the debate on this legislation the committee was practically unanimous in its recommendation that this authority be extended, but there will be some debate, and appropriately so, as to the administration of the law by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and questions raised thereon.

I think you will find that this is a reasonable request. It is needed. For many years we have had a transportation policy that we thought was a sound one. It is imperative that we do provide the American people with a sound transportation system under which all modes of transportation may be able to serve the American people. We feel that this is a step in that direction, and it is needed. Therefore, we urge the approval of this extension in this legislation.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MONAGAN. Do I understand correctly that this is simply a guaranty and not an appropriation of funds?

Mr. HARRIS. There is no appropriation of funds. There is no Government loan. Application is made to the Interstate Commerce Commission, and under the act passed in 1958, there are certain criteria required. The Interstate Commerce Commission considers whether or not the application meets the criteria, that is, these requirements, and if so, through the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Government guarantees the loan or the repayment of the loan, and the loan is obtained through the regular, established money market.

Mr. MONAGAN. I understood one of the previous speakers to say that in spite of the authority, which was extended, there had been appropriations of only $80 million.

Mr. HARRIS. No, there have been no appropriations whatsoever. There has been a guaranty of loans to the extent of a little more than $85 million in some 14 applications, I believe.

Mr. MONAGAN. So that the appropriation would come only if the guaranteed obligation was not finally met at maturity?

Mr. HARRIS. In that case, the Government would be called upon to carry out this obligation and, obviously, there would have to be made appropriations for that purpose.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. I might say in connection with the inquiry of the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut that one of the criteria for an application for a loan under this provision is that the borrower cannot get the money in the open market. In other words, if an application is made and the commission feels that the borrower can get the loan through some private source without the necessity of a guarantee, the commission will refuse to give such a loan. Not everybody who comes to the commission gets a loan automatically. The borrower must comply with the criteria set up by this law, and the commission itself.

Mr. HARRIS. As a matter of fact, one loan was turned down completely, in toto.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. It is also true, is it not, that a fee is charged in connection with the guarantee?

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. YOUNGER. That point was not mentioned so far in the discussion.

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ROBERTS. I ask the distinguished gentleman if it is not true that the existence of this loan authority makes it somewhat easier for the railroads to obtain funds from other sources.

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, it makes it easier for the industry to go to the regular money market and obtain funds through the regular channels. That is true, as I tried to explain in my statement.

Mr. ROBERTS. I might further ask the gentleman, if it is not true that at the time we were considering this bill, there was quite a bit of pressure put on by various railroads about the matter of freight car shortages, and that since the approval of this legislation, we have not had any demands that we enact any legislation to relieve that situation.

Mr. HARRIS. We have had remarkable progress in that particular field.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. I would be most reluctant to let the comment of the gentleman from Alabama stand without some modification anyhow because, certainly, for the railroads that serve the Middle West, there is a considerable demand for adjustment in the per diem fee charged on freight cars. So there is a continuing request, part of a segment of the industry, to improve the freight car situation.

Mr. HARRIS. Of course that is for the purpose of keeping the cars rolling; utilizing them and not having them stand idle.

Mr. ROBERTS. My reference was to the fact that some of these laws have been for the purpose of building freight cars.

Mr. HARRIS. Maintenance, construction, employment—all of those things were part of the consideration of this program in 1958.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. I think one point ought to be made which has not been made thus far. At one time the railroads appeared before our subcommittee on Transportation and Civil Aeronautics, and wanted the Federal Government to form a corporation with a valuation of around $500 million, from which they could borrow. It was the feeling of the subcommittee, and I am sure the feeling of the full committee, that such action was not justified. We felt it was not wise to enter into that kind of arrangement, but we felt that a Federal guarantee program was much more in

line with the kind of program which we had begun back in the thirties extending on down to 1959.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman is correct.

Now I should like to comment briefly on the statement made by my distinguished colleague from Kansas [Mr. AVERY] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER], members of the committee.

First I should like to make it clear, and I will say to my distinguished colleagues that my views have not changed at all as to whether or not the Congress intended the major regulatory agencies to be independent in character and an arm of the Congress. I have the same interest in this problem now as I had last year and the year before and the years prior to that. It is my intention to continue that interest in the future.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Just as it has been in the past, we should endeavor to find out if there are inadequacies in the laws, and if so, what; also whether or not under the responsibility of our committee, the laws are being properly administered accordingly.

Now, I come to the Landis report. I had some feeling or reaction to the report when I was advised of it, and after I had read the suggestions, I thought it stated the problem exceptionally well. It was actually in three major divisions; the first part points up the problem as fine as I have ever seen it anywhere. As to the second part of the report, the critical analysis, I had some questions about some of it. The third part of the report contained recommendations. I have some grave concern about some of them and some aversion to some of the recommendations. I did not hesitate to state my concern. But since then I have gained a great deal of insight in discussions with Dean Landis and with the President as to what actually was intended. I think it will be clarified.

The report the gentleman gave from the article in the Wall Street Journal was called to my attention just a few minutes ago. In my judgment I do not believe the President has any intention of attempting to gain unprecedented powers as the Chief Executive over these independent agencies of the Government. I hope I am right in this statement.

The President has stated that he was concerned about some of the things that our committee was concerned with and which many other people of the country are concerned about, and that is interminable delays, delays, delays. The American people are entitled to their business being expedited insofar as possible before these agencies.

The Constitution charges the President with seeing that the laws are faithfully executed and I am sure this was what the President had in mind in connection with his expressed intention in that field.

After my conversation with him, as you well know of from published reports, I came away with the feeling he was not concerned with anything except the administration of the acts establishing the agencies and laws connected therewith and wanted to cooperate with the Congress to that end.

Something was said about the memorandum. I learned of this memorandum, I might say to my distinguished colleagues and this did not come as a surprise to me. I learned about it, I assume, in just a few days after it had been sent to the Chairman of each Commission. I was concerned about it at first and I took it upon myself to make an inquiry. In doing so I obtained a copy of the memorandum which went from the White House to these agencies, and when we get back in the House I will ask consent to include it at this point in the RECORD for the benefit of the Members.

It is as follows:

MEMORANDUM TO CHAIRMAN, INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION—FEBRUARY 7, 1961

The President will appreciate receiving for informational purposes on the third Tuesday of each month, a brief, informal, written summary from the chief officer of the agency on its principal activities during the preceding month and pending for the period immediately ahead.

The President is most interested in being kept closely informed on important policy and administrative action taken or proposed, and of concern to him as Chief Executive or in his other constitutional responsibilities. He is particularly interested in having major problems of the agency flagged for his attention.

The reports should be kept as specific, incisive, and brief as possible—preferably but not necessarily under two pages. Matters highlighted in these summaries and of particular interest to the President can later be more extensively developed at his request. Decisions pending before independent boards or commissions should not be included; nor should these reports be only generalized progress reports, statistical compilations, or personnel lists. If nothing of significant note for the President's personal attention has occurred, please merely report that fact. These reports will supplement, not in any way displace, existing means of communication and consultation with the President. The reports will be used only by this office.

Please send duplicate copies of the monthly report to the President, attention: the undersigned.

FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Special Assistant to the President.

I also have a copy of some of the reports, and I will include one in order that you may have the benefit of it and to help clarify any question anyone might have, as I did at the time. Also to show the nature of the report as typical of what is desired.

It is as follows:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION—SUMMARY STATEMENT OF PRINCIPAL ACTIVITIES, JANUARY 20–FEBRUARY 20, 1961

Several major reorganization steps were taken in an effort to speed disposition of cases, improve quality of decisions in major cases, and generally develop greater efficiency in the agency's operations. Further steps were planned.

The position of Chairman was strengthened, a Vice Chairman (Commissioner Rupert L. Murphy) was named to oversee the major regulatory functions beginning March 1, 1961, additional delegations of work were made to staff employees, and the right of appeal to the entire Commission was limited thereby freeing the commissioners for action upon cases of general transportation importance.

Rulemaking proceedings were instituted to curb certain practices of household goods movers, particularly the one complained of most: low and misleading estimates.

A guarantee was approved for an additional loan of $3,500,000 to the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad, for a total to date of $21,659,400, on a showing that officials of the four States concerned will make new efforts to help the railroad over its serious financial troubles.

The Great Northern, Northern Pacific, and Burlington railroads filed application to merge. The combined mileage would be about 24,700, largest railroad system in the country.

The Comission set in motion a broad investigation of grade crossing accidents involving trains and tank trucks.

The agency's 74th annual report to Congress, transmitted February 8, 1961, contained 14 legislative recommendations.

It is made very clear that no information concerning investigational processes is requested. Under the law these agencies of the Government are to issue annual reports. After looking over the report I came to the conclusion that this was merely a request to see if such report could not be provided, not necessarily on a confidential basis to the White House, but as a public report that we might get the benefit of it. I think it is a pretty good thing to have a status report on a general basis each month. The President did not ask any information, and neither did he in this memorandum indicate to any of the agencies that he wanted any information on any particular case. That is the difference in this memorandum from the cases referred to by my distinguished colleagues who are equally interested in this problem.

Mr. Chairman, I am participating in a panel discussion tonight with the District Bar Association on the subject of who should oversee these regulatory agencies. I have very carefully worked up what I believe to be a pretty good statement, certainly of my own views on this, and I shall ask to have the statement included in the RECORD at this point, as follows:

OPENING REMARKS OF HON. OREN HARRIS ON PANEL PROGRAM, ADMINISTRATIVE LAW SECTION, BAR ASSOCIATION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 14, 1961

It is always a pleasure to participate in the activities of the administrative law section of the Bar Association of the District of Columbia. It is particularly rewarding to me to be asked to join the chairmen of the major independent regulatory commissions in discussing the age-old, but always topical, subject before us tonight. Mr. von Baur has asked me to present congressional view of our topic, "Who Should Regulate the Regulators: Congress or the White House?" While, of course, I can speak only for myself, I think it is fair to say that the views I will advance are widely held among Members of Congress.

I want to compliment your administrative law section for sponsoring this program tonight to consider a topic of such pressing importance and wide concern.

I might say at the outset that I suspect the statement of our topic is a bit loaded. Taken literally, it seems to force us to side wholly with one branch or the other, a position that is a little too "pat" in so complex a system as ours. Even the slightest

acquaintance with the problems of these agencies teaches us that here is no place for the doctrinaire or the fanatic, for the man who would have one branch of our Government lord it over all the others. We might also acknowledge that the courts have had something to say about the course of administration. With those qualifications in mind, I shall try to outline briefly my views.

Let us first put this question in its true perspective.

We might as well begin with the Constitution, the foundation of our Government. Article I of the Constitution vests all legislative powers in the Congress and charges that body "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States."

Article II, dealing with the executive branch, enjoins the President to "take care that the laws be faithfully executed."

These regulatory agencies were established by Congress pursuant to its constitutional mandate to regulate commerce. Of necessity, Congress has chosen to delegate to the agencies the detailed, technical, day-to-day work of regulation.

They are the administrative agents of specified legislative policies. They are in a very real sense trustees of these congressional powers, and their primary accountability is accordingly to the Congress. This is what we mean when we say that the independent agency is an "arm" of Congress.

The President is charged by the Constitution with taking care that the laws be faithfully executed. How, we hear it asked, can the President fulfill that responsibility if he is prevented from exerting control over powerful agencies of Government dealing with vital segments of the economy? I think the answer is that he is not constitutionally to be held responsible for the exercise of any authority beyond limits imposed by Congress pursuant to its own constitutional responsibilities. No one has put the point better than Mr. Justice Holmes, who said that "the duty of the President to see that the laws be executed is a duty that does not go beyond the laws or require him to achieve more than Congress sees fit to leave within his power."

The President is granted by Congress the power to appoint and in some instances to remove members of independent agencies. Congress provided that he may appoint the chairman of most of them. Likewise, it provided that the advice and consent of the Senate be required for confirmation of agency members.

But the power to appoint is in the case of each commission limited by a requirement that no more than a simple majority may be of the same political party. The power to remove, where it exists at all, may be exercised only on grounds of inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office. Typicall, the terms for which commissioners are appointed are staggered and overlap the administration of any given Executive. Thus the commission members are in and of the commission; they are not in and of the administration of any particular President.

Congress fully recognizes the Presidential duty to see to the faithful execution of the laws. In addition to the powers of appointment and removal, the executive branch has been granted by the Congress considerable power over agency budgets. Not only does the Bureau of the Budget have vast powers over the preparation and presentation to Congress of commission budget requests, it also screens all their proposals for legislation. These powers have been lodged in the Budget Bureau in recognition of the fact that centralized budgetary control is necessary for the efficient management of our huge Federal Government. Even so, as I'm sure you are aware, many Members of Congress feel we have vested too much control over independent agencies in the Budget Bureau. Some attention is being given to this problem now.

What all of this adds up to, I think, is this: Congress, for a number of reasons, one of which is the wisdom of having a spirit of comity among the major branches of Government, has conferred on the executive branch specific but limited powers with respect to the independent agencies. It has occasionally conferred extraordinary powers where special circumstances warranted. An example is the President's unreviewable authority to override the CAB's assignment of international commercial air routes.

But while Congress recognizes that the job of "regulating the regulators" is one that requires teamwork with the Executive, it has necessarily reserved to itself the basic responsibility for oversight of agency operations. In the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Congress expressly entrusted each standing committee of both Houses with exercising "continuous watchfulness of the execution by the administrative agencies concerned of any laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of such committee."

This statutory provision simply recognizes that congressional responsibility does not end with the enactment of legislation and the establishment of the regulatory commissions. Congress must keep itself advised of inadequacies in the substantive and procedural laws as they may appear in the course of administration by the agencies. It must also ascertain whether the laws are being administered in accordance with the intent of Congress. These basic responsibilities could not, in any event, be abdicated by the Congress, and it would appear only practical that in this connection Congress should concern itself with the interrelated problems of delay, agency organization, standards of conduct, and so forth. Division of these responsibilities would result in considerable duplication of effort by the executive and the Congress, dissension, and a number of thoroughly harassed commissions.

In addition, I doubt the wisdom of lodging both the appointment power and the oversight power in the Executive. It is axiomatic that for persons in positions of public trust the appearance of improper conduct can be as destructive to effective government as the disclosure of actual impropriety. It would not be in the public interest for the Executive to be placed in a position of vulnerability in this respect.

Before closing, I should like to invoke the authority of President Woodrow Wilson, who earlier recognized that congressional responsibility was not solely that of enacting legislation. He stated that he considered vigilant oversight by Congress of administration of the laws quite as important as the legislative function, and stated further that "even more important than legislation is the instruction and guidance in political affairs which the people might receive from a body which kept all national concerns suffused in a broad daylight of discussion."

I don't think anyone—in the agencies, in the executive, or in the Congress—wants to see the agencies become a battleground where the other branches are engaged in a struggle for control. The only beneficiaries of such a struggle would be those persons with a short-run interest in trying to evade effective regulation by keeping government demoralized. Surely the public interest would be the loser.

And while I would be the last to pretend that Congress may not share some of the responsibility for many agency deficiencies, I see no reason for challenging the soundness of the basic framework for agency oversight that I have just outlined.

I want it made indelibly clear to everyone what my views are with respect to these agencies. They are an arm of the Congress, they have only such authority as the Congress has given them, and it is going to be my purpose to see that that situation is maintained. It is going to be my purpose in working with our committee to assist to the best of my ability these agencies and everyone else interested, members of the bar, the practitioners, the agencies of the Government, the Chief Executive, everybody, in order to see that the efficient administration of the laws of these agencies may be carried out as fully as possible.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. I want to make the record abundantly clear that not for 1 minute do I feel the gentleman from Arkansas is going to recede from his position of responsibility he has taken. As chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of course, that automatically makes him an ex-officio member of the Oversight Subcommittee. I am fully aware he will pursue those things in the same fairminded way he always has. Obviously I do not agree with some of the gentleman's conclusions, but I have never questioned his motives.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. AVERY. The gentleman made one statement I want to have underscored here this afternoon. Did I understand the gentleman to say that he was going to exert all the influence within his power to make these so-called monthly reports back to the White House a public document, or will he be content for them to remain purely confidential memoranda to the Chief Executive?

Mr. HARRIS. Let me say to the gentleman in the first place that I do not claim to exert any influence at all. As a matter of fact, that is what we are talking about now in reference to these agencies. I do not want to indicate that I am going to try to influence anyone. In my judgment we can, and I am sure our committee will, get a copy of these monthly reports as they come out in order that we may have the information.

Mr. AVERY. I think that is an extremely important statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the chairman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, this statement about the agencies comes up, of course, as a part of the problem we have here, because this is a bill in which the administration feature is going to be discussed, as I have discussed it here briefly. Secondly, I think the discussion of our colleagues in the minority views on this problem is important. So far as I am concerned I believe we are all working together with what the President has in mind, our committee and everyone, so that we can see better administration of these laws by the major agencies.

I want to take this opportunity now to say that when extension of the authority for the submission of reorganization programs of the Government comes before this House I for one am going to raise the question as to the appropriate time that we will have to carefully review any kind of a reorganization plan that affects the regulatory agencies and the action of these major regulatory agencies. We have to give proper consideration to any such reorganization plans that might be submitted affecting these agencies, and I for one am going to be watching that very closely.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

A Trade Union Approach to Foreign Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Solomon Barkin, director of research, Textile Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO:

A TRADE UNION APPROACH TO FOREIGN TRADE

(By Solomon Barkin)

A trade unionist's view on foreign trade originates from the same fount of values as those which govern his determination of policies on national domestic issues and collective bargaining. There is a consistent core of values which guide him, for these are the very rationale of the movement itself.

BASIC APPROACH

As for his approach to foreign trade, he is neither a free trader nor a protectionist. Having rejected the belief in the benevolence of the price system in the domestic free market, he can hardly be expected deliberately to accept it as the basis for sound international trade policy. Nor can he possibly look with favor on steps designed to protect domestic producers to enrich themselves by price protection. His international position, like that developed for domestic issues, seeks essentially to protect union members and the people at large from special property interests and from injury in the course of technological and economic change, and to assure constant improvement in the lot of the common man as well as equitable treatment and democratic participation in the conduct of the economy. Whatever his momentary formulations may be, he will tend to return to the basic value system on which his whole philosophical outlook is founded.

At the domestic level, the trade unionist has long realized that the price system operates impersonally and inexorably, and often inhumanely, inequitably and uneconomically. Guided basically by the profit goals of the entrepreneur, the system itself does not discriminate as to the methods used. Good and foul means may be employed to affect the price, to the extent that the law or the business code permits. Monopolies or quasi-monopolies may be formed and political power used to gain these ends.

The worker as an individual has felt helpless before this concentrated aggressive power, and has formed unions. By means of collective bargaining and legislation he has sought to provide countervailing power to right the balance. The objective has been to eliminate economic exploitation, improve working conditions, secure an equitable distribution of income, share in the benefits of productivity, protect workers from the ravages of business and economic change, and from arbitrary management rule, and promote management and government policies favorable to an expanding and full employment economy.

SOCIAL COSTS OF PRODUCTION

Most important for the present discussion, the American trade unionist endeavors to shift the personal and social costs of production on to the enterprise itself. The price of goods and services should include the costs of unemployment, sickness, retirement, conservation of natural resources, and the economic and social redevelopment of people and regions. The decisions based on comparative costs and gains would therefore be made in the light of the full range of benefits and sacrifices involved, and more reasonable decisions would therefore be made. This correction of the price mechanism is being gradually fully realized in economically advanced nations.

The liberal trader in the trade union ranks has to date not perceived the precise manner by which to integrate the above value system into his thinking on foreign trade. As a result many have merely adopted the logic and argumentation of the free trade movement with which the trade unionist will have to part company as the domestic impact of foreign trade becomes more and more evident.

COMPLACENCY SHAKEN

Until very recently the liberal trader among unionists has been protected from this step by two considerations. First, the number and importance of the industries in the United States affected by imports had been limited and did not include strongly unionized sectors. But as significant union groups are affected, racial changes in attitudes have occurred even temporarily catapulting individual unionists into the protectionists ranks. Second, many are so overwhelmed by the primary American responsibility for aiding developing nations and strengthening the non-Communist alliance that they are disposed to overlook the personal and national costs of foreign trade. This acceptance of sacrifice on behalf of international strength appeared quite tolerable while national unemployment was low and a feeling of economic optimism pervaded the Nation. In the face of current economic reverses, however, this complacency is being converted into real concern, demands for action and finally a reevaluation of the very propriety of yielding so generously to international obligations.

SOME FREE TRADE FLAWS

Until now the liberal trade position has been defended with arguments which are inconsistent with the basic trade union value system. As a result this outlook on international trade is not likely to survive for long and is in fact currently undergoing radical change. First these unionists have tended to discount the effect of imports upon domestic employment. They have borrowed the free trade argument that more people are dependent upon export than import trade, forgetting that the issue is primarily what will be the employment effects of new measures of liberalization of international trade. In connection with the evaluation of the latter issue, they have used outdated estimates derived from 1951 calculations on the effect of lower rates on imports and domestic employment. Actual imports now exceed the volume projected by the aforementioned estimates despite the maintenance of substantially the same structure and level of import duties. The analysis is likely to neglect the problems of employee economic adjustment and the finding of new employment. In face of the nigh national and local rates of unemployment, the chronic distress in many affected areas, the specialized skills and experience of the displaced, and the absence of provisions for retraining, income maintenance and redevelopment, the plight of the displaced in the United States has been most discouraging.

No trade unionist directly concerned with a particular group of industries or occupations can stand by idly and play down his concern for his own members or for employees generally in the present period of high unemployment. In the face of the current difficulties of finding new jobs and adjusting workers to them, even the national trade union organization, however much it is disposed to a liberal trade position, is under compulsion to insist on controls of trade which limit the growth of imports so as not seriously to injure domestic industries.

Second, the acceptance of the price system as being a beneficent arbiter of the flow of international trade flies in the face of the unionist's rejection on the domestic level of this system as the sole basis for economic determination. As a minimum to gain such acceptance, total domestic costs and effects of international trade must be taken account of in the determination of comparative advantage. And as the present price system does not allow for them, they must be added through direct imposition upon the producers or at least as calculations for the determination of real advantage and cost in the formulation of policy and attitude. A program of international trade which lays waste a region in the United States, which is itself underdeveloped, and where unemployment and underdevelopment are widespread (as would result from wholesale imports of textiles and apparel at the present time) would not square with a rational trade unionist estimate of national interest.

FACING REALITIES

Third, no trade unionist can dismiss the problem posed by competition from low labor rates and labor costs from abroad. Even though the use of this argument by employers in specific contract negotiations as in the case of steel, is for the most part specious, the accuracy of the argument in other instances cannot be dismissed. The rebuilding of industry in Europe and Japan has resulted in the construction of modern factories with advanced equipment managed by people thoroughly acquainted with and tutored in American management arts and skills. Benefiting from a lower hourly labor cost, they have become formidable international competitors in many industrial lines and are able to hurdle existing American tariff walls to capture substantial American markets. The reality cannot be dismissed.

There is, however, an appropriate debate on how best to meet the issue. Certainly, a crash program of research, modernization and new product development would be most constructive to meet this new competition. Such activities have already helped several domestic industries such as automobiles. But the issue is what other course should be taken pending these developments, particularly in the field of international trade regulation.

AN OUTDATED ARGUMENT

Fourth, the defense of liberal trade as a means of providing foreign markets for American exports is, of course, somewhat dated. The present concern is with the means of stopping the outflow of gold which is challenging our monetary liquidity. A decline in imports and an expansion of exports would contribute toward this end. One approach, as indicated above, would be to improve the competitive position of American products through improvements in quality, lower cost effected through greater efficiency, better merchandizing and marketing pro-

cedures and credit facilities. Sacrificing American industry as the means of providing dollars abroad for purchasing American exports is therfore no longer economically wise, if it was ever reasonable and justified.

Fifth, the trade unionist disposed to liberal trade has been further embarrassed by the impressive volume of imports originating from American subsidiaries abroad. Inclined to accept the full liberal trade position including the free flow of capital and even labor, he has tolerated this situation. The recent rise in American investments in advanced European nations with their lower hourly labor costs, however, has caused many brows to knit. Union members have resented this new form of "foreign competition." Already, the American trade union movement has begun to object to further tax concessions to American investments in developed countries. There is a definite inclination to eliminate all differential benefits to these investments in order immediately to tap the profits earned abroad to finance the American Government and, incidentally also to reduce the attractiveness of such investments.

A similar problem is being experienced with the immigration of farm labor. These workers have been brought in to overcome labor shortages. But with the growth of national and local unemployment, these temporary immigrants have challenged Americans for jobs, hampered the rise of wages for this type of labor and impeded union organizing campaigns. There is a growing union demand to abolish the statutory authority for such immigration. The position supporting the liberal flow of the factors of production is being weakened by recent economic events.

TRADE OR AID?

Sixth, the enthusiasm for helping foreign countries has inclined some trade unionists to overstress the importance of trade. Aid has been vital in the growth of many developing countries. Trade is not always a proper substitute, for it may mean great local sacrifice and encourage the growth of industries whose long term survival is not certain. Therefore, the relation and proportion of trade and aid must be carefully evaluated for the advancing countries.

The inconsistencies outlined above in the position of liberal trade unionists are of course matched by the unionist who has taken a strong protectionist position. His thinking is quite apparent. His following is being hurt by imports. Recognizing no immediate alternative possibility of any growth of job opportunities in the industry, he is impelled to insulate existing employment from outside competition. Many such industries are already contracting. Moreover many have a high labor content so that the capital employed per operative is low and new jobs are likely to require two or three or even more times this sum. The possibilities for new employment for the displaced are further minimized by their specialized skills and limited training, and their location. To this unionist the only ready defense is a higher tariff wall, as neither the Government nor the community provides other solutions.

PROTECTIONIST INCONSISTENCIES

However, in taking this position, the unionist has often failed to examine the roots of the difficulty. If administered high prices, or conservatism in management, backwardness in research or lags in product and technical innovation are the real troubles, he cannot unconditionally endorse management's demands for protection. He must balance his appeal for aid with a concurrent demand for action by management. Otherwise he would be betraying his responsibility to the trade union movement as a whole which is looking for overall economic growth and improvements in living standards for the American people.

In like manner, the trade unionist in such industries has to reconcile himself to the high priority which the United States must assign to its international obligations. This country and the national trade union movement cannot be, and has not been, oblivious to these requirements. The realities will therefore demand that the protestations against imports should be balanced with proposals for aiding in the adjustment of individuals, since some diminution of American industry will occur. His responsibility is to help the public and the union movement as a whole evaluate the soundness of a particular tariff decision in meeting the objectives of international trade policy.

In seeking to apply the basic trade union system of values to the field of international trade, one common bond among all trade unionists is their belief in adequate labor standards. In the United States, most unionists accept the principle of prescribing such standards to insure fair competition. The experience with the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act reinforces this position. The issue is how to implement this objective.

It is assumed that the technique of international conventions provided by the International Labor Office will continue to press to reduce hours, raise minimum wages, and otherwise bring international pressure to bear toward humanizing working conditions and relations and promoting free trade unions. But some more immediate leverage is being sought to correct the low labor standard of workers producing wares or services entering into foreign trade.

ACTION THROUGH GATT

The contracting parties of the GATT have, under the prompting of countries such as the United States, established permanent machinery for examining cases of market disruption so as to moderate the effect of a sudden rush of imports into a country. One basic cause of such disruption is the growth of exports from the low wage and low labor cost areas. Common ground has been found in that products made under working conditions and wages which are below the national standard of the exporting country for that industry should be barred from trade. A second area of consensus is that labor standards should be formulated in setting prices under international commodity agreements. Competition between workers enjoying high standards in factories and home workers is considered unfair. Similarly, there is considerable agreement that products made at lower rates than are prescribed, or would be prescribed, by a national minimum standard, are also causing unfair competition.

SOME DIFFICULTIES

Unions are now seeking a formula for effecting improvements in labor standards in exporting countries operating advanced technical production systems with low total costs, and hourly labor costs in line with or better than existing national standards but well below those of other world competitors. Illustrations of this may be found in the clothing, chemical, metal and textile industries. The difficulties in finding an answer to this problem is both substantive and administrative. Ordinarily lower labor costs are considered one of the comparative advantages which both developed and developing nations may employ to earn foreign currencies. It is particularly important if the nation enjoys few other advantages. Lower labor standards are often deliberately used for the purposes of building up the nation's capital. Unions in some countries have cooperated at different periods with management and government in policies of wage restraint to achieve these ends. On the other hand, the international trade union movement is aware that the rising expectations of peoples must be satisfied to maintain their allegiance to the free world. Moreover, these low wage and benefit policies can create real difficulties for other countries.

Little agreement exists on how and when to effect wage increases and higher living standards in countries in which productivity has been rising and where objective circumstances might possibly permit such boosts. As indicated, in some instances the various parties concerned are in agreement to withhold improvements pending the accumulation of capital at much higher levels. In other instances, the Government or the economic power of employers enforce such policies. These countries tend often to minimize the stimulating effect which wage advances could have on productivity itself. Illustrations are available where wage adjustments have been voluntarily agreed upon as part of trade treaties, as in the case of the Netherlands at the time of the effective application of the Benelux agreement. But newer procedures have to be designed for this purpose.

Unionists are therefore hoping that the discussion of individual cases of market disruption will provide a means of impressing on all nations the need for higher labor standards. Another suggestion is that the requirement of annual reports from governments on advances being made in labor standards could exercise the same moral suasion. There is also a proposal to associate capital grants or loans with understandings on labor standards. New procedures will have to be devised in this area to achieve these goals of improving labor standards.

A POLICY FOR CLOTHING AND TEXTILES

In view of the limited developments which may be expected in the near future in the field of labor standards, each nation and the unions within it must consider the likely impact which foreign competition may have. One industry group which will be seriously affected is clothing and textiles. Its peculiarity is that the technology is enjoyed almost universally, since advanced machinery and management methods are shared throughout the world. Moreover, at least each large nation and community of nations produces textiles for some or all of its needs and many of its items are indigenous to its way of life.

As for the textile industry, the large national major producers have in the past generally been exporters. With the growth of industries in newer countries, not only have they lost major parts of their foreign markets, but these newer producers have further aggravated national problems of adjustment by increasing or threatening to increase their exports to the former countries. In many of these countries the textile industry, and in the United States also the clothing industry, constitutes a significant base for the national or at least regional economies. The threat of their disruption presents a truly serious issue to the nation.

PROBLEMS OF ADJUSTMENT

The affected national trade union centers must therefore really face up to the formidable problems of adjustment and evolve policies which seek to reconcile the diverse national and international interests. Considering particularly the United States, higher textile imports at present will have distressing effects. National unemployment is high. The rates of unemployment in the textile regions and communities tend to be even higher. Several such communities have suffered from chronic distress for several years. The southern textile region is underdeveloped, with large labor surpluses and widespread underemployment. Further closings of mills and elimination of jobs would aggravate the already distressingly serious plight of the people in the area. The economic redevelopment of New England, and the textile areas of New York and Pennsylvania and the South, has not yet been mapped nor taken hold. The personal and social costs of displacement and redevelopment are so high that if included in the calculations of comparative costs they would

definitely make such imports disadvantageous to the national economy.

SEARCH FOR A FORMULA

In view of the above considerations, but yet recognizing that the United States does have international obligations to allow a moderate level of imports to enter, the major issue for trade unionists in these areas is to find a method of control which would reconcile union, domestic, and international commitments. The program which has been offered as most adequately achieving this end is one which starts with a definition of a safeguarded level of national production. In calculating this level, a historical period such as 1954–57 or 1957–59 has often been chosen. This absolute domestic level of production would be safeguarded for American manufacturers. Others have proposed that the historical level of the per capita volume of production should be safeguarded from foreign competition to allow for expansion of population. A much wider consensus supports the first formula. Domestic consumption beyond this level would be more freely shared in open competition with foreign goods imported into this country. Of course, tariff duties would be much lower for these imports than those promulgated to safeguard the level of national production. One qualification added to this proposal is that no domestic industry should be granted this benefit if the prices for its products have consistently risen at a relatively higher rate than the rise in the general level of prices of products in the same group.

The development of the above formula would help maintain the American clothing and textile industries and would allow for the continued stimulation coming from competition from other industries and clothing and textile imports, minimize the processes of adjustment and allow for the introduction of wholesale plans of economic redevelopment. The formal adoption of this program would mean an open policy commitment by all concerned that private enterprise within the industry must be more innovating in its products and methods of operation and merchandising. The national commitments would involve no guarantees of monopolistic rights and privileges and would help minimize the human, social, and economic costs. At the same time this policy would allow the world to benefit from a progressive American clothing and textile industry. The economic growth of the United States itself would allow for an expanding area of direct competition in the American market by foreign producers.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Recreational Development a Big Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT S. KERR
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, on March 11 in Tulsa, Okla., my assistant, Mr. Don McBride, made a very important and enlightened speech on "Recreational Development a Big Business." I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECREATIONAL DEVELOPMENT A BIG BUSINESS

(By Don McBride, assistant to Senator ROBERT S. KERR, of Oklahoma, at the annual meeting of the Arkansas Basin Development Association, Tulsa, Okla., March 11, 1961)

Regular readers of Life magazine recently ran across a new word—or maybe a new way of life—in a feature article called "Aqua-Maniac." Now most of us have been on speaking terms with the word "aqua" for a long time. We know that it's just a high-falutin term for water. Likewise, we know what a "maniac" is. So we come up with a definition that means a "water fool," but Life used a bit more finesse. They said it meant "one who had an excessive urge for water based recreation." That is the general theme of my remarks today, with a slight leaning toward the dollar and sense aspect.

I have had some conversations recently with fishermen who would vow that "water fool" was the appropriate term to apply to some of the hoards of individuals who have taken up water skiing and skin diving as a recreational pursuit, and declare emphatically that these guys should not be allowed on the same lake with those who have succumbed to the lure of angling.

It just goes to show that you can get an argument about water-based recreation.

Some of the most cherished boyhood recollections are the old swimming hole—or a can of worms and a cane pole. How we pity those who missed such experience.

Then in the process of maturing, I recall when I had a deep conviction that wildlife and recreation were inseparable—not necessarily water recreation—you understand.

But now I've reached a point where I can think of recreational development as a serious business and one that should demand hardheaded thinking—lest we err and fall short of the mark.

Your presence here today is a testimony of your belief in the comprehensive development of our river basins. Each of us is aware of what conservation and development have already done for this great Arkansas Valley. We have faith to believe that greater things are in store for us by 1970. We believe we have found the secret that unlocks the future.

This great project has for its major purposes navigation and flood control, but who would discount its potential for sound recreational development? It must be an integral part of the whole.

We, in the Arkansas Basin, have been sobered by the census announcements. The national growth in population from 1950 to 1960 was 18½ percent—but Kansas gained only 14$^{3}/_{10}$ percent, Oklahoma only 4⅓ percent, and Arkansas lost by 6½ percent. These three States will lose three Congressmen and we narrowly escaped losing four. What do you suppose the loss would have been without the water resource projects we already have? How important was recreation in preventing further population loss?

While we lost ground populationwise, we were gaining in another area. The U.S. per capita income gain was 45$^{3}/_{10}$ percent in the 10-year period. Arkansas per capita income increased 64⅓ percent, Oklahoma 57⅗ percent, and Kansas 45$^{1}/_{10}$ percent. Can anyone deny that our resource development program has been at least partially responsible? How much more will water development pay off for us in the future?

What part will recreational benefits incidental to our water project development play in our future growth and economy? How much can we depend on recreation as a business?

The national economy on the whole is rapidly shifting from an overwhelmingly productive-based structure to one where service aspects are increasingly important. This reflects many complex and interwoven happenings which we need not concern ourselves with, but it does indicate two patterns. They are most important to the people of the Arkansas River Basin. No. 1, the standard of living is high enough that people have more money to devote to what once were the nonessentials of life. No. 2, the people have more leisure time to enjoy these nonessentials or intangibles of life.

A smaller percentage of the family budget is rigidly earmarked for the necessities and more for enjoyment, education, and better medical care. Did you know that from 5 to 8 percent of the family budget is now spent for recreation?

I am convinced that the chief beneficiaries of the relaxation revolution are those areas rich in scenic splendor and recreational facilities, where people can get back to nature. For example, the U.S. population rate of increase from 1948 to 1958 was 18.7 percent, while the sales of fishing licenses rose 43.3 percent during the same period and hunting license sales rose 29.6 percent. In 1955, the $3 billion spent by the anglers and nimrods equaled the total electric bill for all households of the United States. The automobile miles traveled by these sportsmen equaled 120,000 trips around the world. These same fellows spent 567 million play days in the woods and on the water. This is no small group of people engaging in these two sports. One in five persons over 12 hunted or fished in 1955, and one family out of three numbered either a hunter or fisherman in its ranks. These tension-easing sports are just a facet of our recreation economy which accounted for an expenditure of $40 billion and 8 percent of the gross national product in 1959. The cost of boats for sports and pleasure in 1959 was $2.5 billion, as compared to $905 million in 1947. Meanwhile the number of boats on the water increased 300 percent during the same period. Right here in Oklahoma there are over 80,000 outboard motors in use. This means that 1 of each 30 Oklahomans owns an outboard motor. In the Tulsa area, which by the way is one of the leading marketplaces for outboard motors, there are 25,000 outboard motors in use. By 1970, there will be 8 million boats in use and the industry will gross $4 billion. As you can see, water-based recreation is big business, if we merely look at the equipment purchased, used, and repaired each year alone. It is a field that is not limited to the rich. Sixty-five percent of the boats purchased during the recent years have gone to people in the semi and skilled labor and white collar groups—the middle income brackets.

In Oklahoma, a half million fishing licenses are sold each year, and 20 percent of these go to nonresidents. They must travel across our State, and probably your State, to get to our lakes and rivers. Incidentally, Oklahoma ranks fifth in the number of nonresident licenses sold in 1960.

These visitors to our borders spend freely. When you add their expenditures to the $40 million per year spent by our fishermen and the thousands by our sportsmen, you begin to see how vital recreation is to the State's economy. There were 14 million tourists in Arkansas in 1959, and in Kansas your fishing license sales have risen over 100,000 during the last decade.

We have just started to reap the harvest from our neighbors who come to enjoy the scenic beauties within our borders and to hunt and fish in our reservoir areas. Senator KERR's Select Committee on National Water Resources, which has just published its completed study, estimates that there will be over 70 million hunters and fishermen in 1980, and almost 100 million by the year 2000. They are expected to spend about $8 billion in 1980, as compared to the $2¾ billion they spent in 1954.

The Corps of Engineers reservoirs, the Bureau of Reclamation projects and the soil conservation structures of our area are tremendous drawing cards to the recreation-hungry of this basin. For example, visitor days at our eight Oklahoma corps reservoirs rose 280 percent from 1951 to 1960. For the future, it is estimated that visitor activity at corps projects will increase 400 percent by 1980 to 34 million visitor days. The W. C. Austin reclamation project at Altus, Okla., registers more than 200,000 visitor days each year. These visitors and their expenditures provide a tremendous boost to the local and State economy. The average Kansas tourist spent $4 per day in 1952, and today probably spends $6. An average hunter spends $6 per day, and a fisherman $8. An unofficial 1959 study revealed that the average benefit to the Lake Tenkiller area was $4.58 per fisherman day.

Some of you probably are thinking that all this is fine, but since we are building so many lakes and parks, won't we soon reach the saturation point? Won't we soon begin to lose rather than gain? Just the opposite is true. If you will permit me to quote from a letter Senator KERR received from the Tulsa district engineer on January 20, 1961, I think you will see my point:

"There does not yet seem to be a point of saturation in the Oklahoma area (and I

would assume the same to be true of your area) of the Arkansas and Red River Basins. The existing reservoirs complement each other rather than being competitive in the sense of penalizing the use of another reservoir. The additions of major water areas to the region have had the effect of extending the zone of influence. More people desire to travel a greater distance to enjoy the varied opportunity of several lakes whereas they would not do this to visit one project.

"Keystone, Eufaula, and Oologah are expected to materially strengthen eastern Oklahoma as a recreational area for Oklahoma and adjoining States. It is expected that these projects with those of the Arkansas River will establish a tourist and recreational area comparable to that of the TVA or the Kentucky River Basin."

In spite of this barrage of statistics that I have thrown at you, I have not, and shall not, advocate construction of reservoirs by the Federal Government for recreation alone. Such a proposal could in some instances be fully justifiable. The corps should continue to concentrate on flood control and navigation work, the Bureau on reclamation, the S.C.S. on flood prevention and soil conservation. But these branches of the Federal Government must not be blind to the economic impact of recreational benefits, nor should the present beneficiaries be charged with costs that more properly belong to recreation.

As we attend this very meeting, dedicated to the promotion of sane and fiscally sound water resources development, Government employees charged by law with evaluation of project benefits are out working with blinders on, compelled to be legally oblivious to the great benefits that recreation brings to our Nation. I am not advocating the justification of a massive project building plan where values are puffed up to justify the spending of our tax dollars, but who can deny that the creation of adequate recreational facilities is in the national interest?

Those who oppose making the evaluation of recreational benefits an integral part of project planning do so on the cotton candy argument that no accurate measure of such work is available. The present evaluable benefits for flood control, hydropower, and navigation are not sacred nor divinely ordained, and themselves were only inserted in some cases after long and bitter legislative struggles. In the case of reclamation benefits, the pitched battle lasted over 20 years until in 1902 a farsighted President, who had come to the West to regain his health, persuaded a reluctant Congress to pass the Reclamation Act of 1902—the basic law under which all Federal reclamation projects are constructed. I feel that action to require inclusion of recreational benefits is equally justified by the available information which has been compiled in survey after survey and published in one report after another. Even rabid opponents of such inclusion have been forced to alter their position in light of the facts. Testimony taken before Senator KERR's Public Works Subcommittee on Rivers, Harbors and Flood Control has revealed that failure to properly evaluate the recreational potentials of reservoir projects has led to dangerous overcrowding of recreational facilities in many cases as early as the first year of normal operation. It has also shown that many projects which have been rejected on the basis of presently evaluated benefits might easily have been justified if only reasonable dollar allowance had been made in the benefit-cost computations for potential recreational use.

Legislation which Senator KERR introduced during the last three Congresses has provided for value per visitor day use at rates which are very conservative, and with a 15-percent limit on project costs to be allocated to recreational benefits.

During this session of Congress, we hope to realize the end of a long and tiring legislative battle to amend basic water project legislation. We want it to reflect the great value to the Nation that recreational benefits, incident to multipurpose project development, bring. We are grateful to those of you who expressed your support for S. 159 of the 86th Congress, which passed the Senate as a part of the rivers and harbors bill, but was rejected by the House conferees. We appreciate the actions of those of you who steadfastly supported Senator KERR's S. 1164 of the 85th Congress, which was reported out of committee but died on the floor when the Congress adjourned. As I have said before, new statistics pour in each day to strengthen our case. We have a new administration determined to push rather than impede a realistic evaluation of all water project benefits.

Encouraged by these factors, Senator KERR has reintroduced the recreation bill this session, and its number is S. 121. It is essentially the same as the earlier bills which I have mentioned. It simply provides for the inclusion of recreational benefits in project planning as long as the recreational program does not conflict with the major purposes of the project, such as flood control or irrigation. The general result would be to speed authorization and construction of projects with recreational opportunities and to improve such facilities at projects already in operation. For example, two sorely needed projects in Oklahoma could meet authorization requirements if S. 121 were to become law—the Optima project on the Canadian near Guymon, Okla., and the Kaw project on the Arkansas near Ponca City.

This would be accomplished by improving the benefit-cost ratio by counting potential recreational benefits up to 15 percent of the total cost of the project. This portion would not have to be repaid to the Federal Government by the users. Such benefits would be computed on the basis of 50 cents per person on the estimated number of visitors annually. This figure is a very conservative one for experience has shown that a much greater sum is fed into the local and national economy by a booming tourist industry.

We are hopeful that S. 121 will become law, and your expressions of support for it to members of your congressional delegation would be most helpful.

Today the question of providing recreation at federally constructed projects is not one of fiction, but one of fact. Coupled with the population explosion, increasing leisure time, and a rising standard of living, the problem of providing adequate recreational facilities on the lakes and rivers of the United States will be of mounting concern—and we must be prepared for it. The inclusion of recreational benefits in project planning will be a sound and forward step in meeting a problem that is with us today, and one that will become truly critical in just a few short years.

I think it is cheaper and better to recreationalize our population than "to tranquilize or institutionalize them." What we do, we must do adequately to meet the needs of tomorrow. Development should be on the basis of forecasts of use for an ever-expanding population.

In developing recreational facilities at our reservoirs, we should be aware that we could wreck-create if our plans are too small and our vision too short.

Now is the time to exploit our potential. Now is the time to call attention to the advantages of our area over the teeming population centers where a parking place is dear and a fishing hole nonexistent. Industry, too, likes to locate in places where employees will be happy and relaxed, and in places where their children can enjoy the great outdoors at its finest. Our region, with the help of men and women like you, has the leadership and enterprise to match its resources. Opportunity is knocking here—opportunity for everyone who has a hand in the planning, design, and construction of our projects; projects which enable us to do our share to make up for the destruction of much of our most beautiful and productive fish and wildlife and recreation habitats since 1492. But most important, we have an opportunity to build for a greater Arkansas River Basin area and a truly more prosperous, beautiful, and enjoyable America.

The Good Will With Which Election Results Are Accepted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, one of the noteworthy characteristics of our American political system is the good will with which election results are accepted. Even when the results are as close as they were in last year's Presidential race, when there was less than 112,000 difference in the number of votes cast for the two major candidates out of a total popular vote of 68 million, the winner takes office with the best wishes of the entire Nation, including the losing party and its defeated candidate.

A number of newspaper editorials have come to my attention bringing out this important point. One fine example, which only recently came to my attention, was published in the Newburgh-Beacon (N.Y.) News. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Newburgh-Beacon (N.Y.) News, Jan. 13, 1961]

A GOOD LOSER

Even those who campaigned most vigorously against Richard M. Nixon's bid for the Presidency would agree that in defeat he has been impeccably gracious and dignified.

The irony of proclaiming the election of his opponent, John F. Kennedy, fell to the Vice President. He not only lifted the routine of certifying the electoral college vote from a dull ceremony to a historic event; he did so with good humor and without rancor. He was, in a sense, presiding over his political demise.

The Vice President, in an unprecedented act, said that it was the first time in 100 years that a candidate for President thus had announced the victory of his opponent.

"There is no more striking and eloquent example of the stability of our constitutional system and of the proud tradition of the American people of developing, respecting, and honoring institutions of self-government," Nixon pointed out.

In the spirit of a good loser the Vice President extended best wishes to his successor as he "works in a cause that is bigger than any man's ambition, greater than any party."

As Senator KENNETH B. KEATING said at a dinner this week honoring the retiring Vice President: "He revealed to us an example of the kind of man whose heart and mind and spirit form a timeless, precious, indispensable part of the national grandeur."

For what he believed in, Nixon fought with bulldog determination and lost like a thoroughbred.

Most important of all, when party leaders advised him of voting irregularities in Illinois and Texas which, if verified, might disprove the election of Senator Kennedy and put Nixon in office, the Vice President refused to make any protest or to challenge the outcome.

He is reported to have said that, even if he were to prove his case, the result would be to hurt the United States and the election of candidates by popular will in the eyes of the rest of the world. It would tend to show that, even here, election frauds had been proved.

In essence, what Mr. Nixon did was to show he would rather see his country right than be President himself.

Legislation To Give Foremen a Voice and a Vote in Affairs Affecting Their Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, because I feel that the foremen in American industry are presently captives in the "no man's land" of collective bargaining in American industry due to definitions and restrictions contained in the Taft-Hartley Act, I am today introducing legislation which is designed to once more restore to the foremen class of people the status of first-class citizens, or an equal status, with all the rights and privileges of the rank and file worker, with all the protection of the laws of the land, and will be able to take their rightful place at the bargaining table, and have a voice and a vote in affairs affecting their welfare.

In modern industry today, we have strong representation for management at the top level—at the bottom level we have strong representation for the rank and file worker. In the middle, we find a vast number of people called foremen with no representation whatsoever operating in a vacuum as a buffer, and sometimes a whipping boy, between management and union in the economic struggle for survival.

I contend that these people, the foremen of America, have a natural right of association which should not and cannot be taken away from them by administrative definition and interpretation of legal verbiage. I contend that the foremen of America have a natural right to band together to process grievances, protect their job security, safeguard their working conditions, and be human beings—the same as any other group of workers. At the present time, neither the law nor company policy provides proper protection for the foremen class of people, although a foreman in American industry speaks for and acts for management. At the same time, in his personal capacity, he is an employee subject to terms and conditions of employment imposed upon him from above—a matter over which he has no control or no voice.

I find no basis for the argument that foremen, through enjoyment of the benefits and fruits of the collective bargaining process, would impair the effective performance of their duties in behalf of management.

On the claim of divided loyalties, we cannot assume that self-organization for collective bargaining would prove incompatible with the foreman's faithful performance of his duties. Such an assumption has never been proved.

Many foremen groups throughout the Nation have been organized, but not recognized, without detriment to their loyalty or efficiency to management goals. Management's disciplinary powers are adequate to insure faithful and efficient job performance by all of its employees, regardless of title.

The basic argument of the foremen concerns the denial by their employers of the right to participate in the decisions which affect their welfare as employees.

A foreman does not lose his right to serve himself in matters fixing his own wages, hours, seniority rights, or working conditions because he serves his master in others. The foreman is caught in the squeeze between a gigantic mechanized system that can turn the human element, including foremen, into robots—unless the fundamental and basic human principles, one of which is the right of association, are completely respected and tolerated.

My bill proposes to free the shackles that bind the foremen of America in managerial bondage and restore to them their natural rights and privileges to which they are entitled as a matter of plain, simple, common justice.

At this point I wish to include one of many letters that I have received concerning the foremen's situation:

Realizing your interest in the welfare of the working people of your district and being aware of your previous attempts to assist us through legislative channels, we are again bringing our case to your attention.

We are an organization of foremen, employed by a local industry, nameless for our protection, unable to bargain collectively with our firm's management because of the Taft-Hartley Act. We are hourly paid foremen, not salaried, and are raised in pay only when the rank and file local union negotiates a pay increase, for their members, through collective bargaining. A percentage differential separates us from the top represented employee. Yet management insists that we are supervisors and a part of management.

The following quotes from our company's supervisory training and development manual are illuminating:

"The timing of pay adjustments for supervisory employees has been a subject of discussion by management in our company for many years and there are many different opinions and practices in the industry. Fundamentally, pay increases for supervisory personnel are considered as merit increases, whereas pay increases for represented personnel are negotiated in the light of any and all other benefits that are granted. In order to disassociate the two, it has been the policy at * * * to grant pay adjustments at different times during the year. This should not be construed as meaning that the increases for represented people are not deserved or merited but rather that the cost to the company of other benefits that are granted, must be considered in determining the amount of any general wage increase for the organized force. It should be understood that wage adjustments for the two groups are unrelated and are not dependent on one another."

Clearly management has drawn a sharp line between the hourly represented employees and the salaried supervisors. No mention has been made of the foremen, who are in between the two groups herein discussed, being a part of neither one.

The Taft-Hartley Act bars foremen from collective bargaining, but our employers have put us in the van with the represented or rank and file union worker as far as wage increases and other benefits are concerned. On the other hand they refuse to allow us to bargain collectively, claiming that we are supervisors and thus a part of management.

Therefore, our only hope of ever attaining collective bargaining lies in amending the Taft-Hartley Act to permit the first line of supervision to organize and bargain collectively. We are firmly convinced that our best interest will be served by a separate and distinct organization of foremen, not connected to, or a part of any rank-and-file union.

I trust that early action will be taken on this legislation.

Bernard G. Segal, Esq., Reports on Work of American Bar Association Federal Judiciary Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, Bernard G. Segal, Esq., the chairman of the American Bar Association's Standing Committee on Federal Judiciary, has done an outstanding job in screening proposed nominees for Federal judicial office. He has performed a public service of the highest order for which all Americans owe him their gratitude.

Mr. Segal recently reported to the American Bar Association's house of delegates on the work of his committee. In his remarks he reviewed the history of cooperation which his committee has enjoyed from the Department of Justice in the past and expressed his expectation that such cooperation would continue.

Mr. Segal's excellent statement on the problems of judicial selection should be of interest to many Senators, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRANSCRIPT OF ORAL REPORT BY BERNARD G. SEGAL, OF PHILADELPHIA, PA., CHAIRMAN OF THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION'S STANDING COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL JUDICIARY FOR THE ABA HOUSE OF DELEGATES IN CHICAGO ON FEBRUARY 20, 1961

Mr. Chairman, Members of the House, the beginning of the year 1961 may well be regarded, in the future, as the start of a new era in the history of the Federal judiciary. For certain events, occurring simultaneously, have created an unprecedented situation—one full of hope for the progress of our Federal court system.

In the first place, the method of consultation with your committee before an appointment is made, with a view to assuring that no unqualified person shall be appointed a judge, has, after 9 years under two Presidents of the United States and three Attorneys General, been developed to a point of efficient processes, mutual respect and trust, and constant cooperation.

At the end of the last administration, it could be said with complete assurance that no person would be given consideration by the President for judicial nomination without first a preliminary screening, later a formal report to the Attorney General, by this committee; that the President would not nominate to any Federal court, including the Supreme Court, any person whom your committee, for valid reasons stated to the Attorney General, reported as unqualified; and that two out of every three appointees to the U.S. courts during the preceding 2 years had been rated by your committee not merely as qualified, but as well qualified or as exceptionally well qualified.

In the second place, for the first time in 40 years, the judges sitting in the Federal courts throughout the Nation are just about evenly divided as to their preappointment political party affiliation, half of them Democratic, half Republican.

In the third place, there are likely to be a greater number of appointments of new judges to the U.S. courts this year than ever before in the history of the country.

It appears almost certain that in recognition of the desperate and mounting need for additional judgeships in certain of the U.S. courts and the critical conditions of congestion which exist in these courts, and under the urging of the President and the Attorney General, the Congress will very shortly effectuate the recommendations of the Judicial Conference of the United States, endorsed by this House this morning, calling for the immediate creation of 59 new judgeships in the Federal courts, 9 in the courts of appeals, and 50 in the district courts. Almost certainly, the Judicial Conference, at its meeting next month, will recommend even more judges in courts where they are greatly needed. In addition, there are 13 vacancies in existing judgeships—4 in the courts of appeals and 9 in the district courts. Three recess appointments await action. So that, with the normal number of vacancies, created by retirements and other causes, the number of new appointments to be made by President Kennedy during the coming year is likely to reach the staggering and completely unprecedented total of more than 100 judges.

All the emphasis which our association has given in recent years to the goal that appointments of only the most qualified lawyers and judges shall be made to the Federal bench, without regard to political party, seems to be bearing some fruit. Thus, within the past 2 months, editorials and articles by columnists have been appearing in newspapers throughout the country, spotlighting the issue and in numerous cases urging that the time has come for a "new look"—adopting the President's words, some have said, a "New Frontier"—in the matter of appointment of judges in the U.S. courts.

Against the background of this unique combination of events, a new national administration has come to Washington.

The very first week after the Kennedy administration took office, President Seymour and I visited Attorney General Kennedy and Deputy Attorney General White to discuss the subject of Federal judicial appointments, to offer the services of the American Bar Association, through this committee, and to urge upon them the resolution passed by this House last August urging the incoming President, whoever he might be, to nominate as judges only the best qualified persons available, without regard to their political affiliation. The discussion was most cordial.

I am happy to report to this House that both Attorney General Kennedy and Deputy Attorney General White stated then, and since that date the Attorney General has reiterated to the Senate Judiciary Committee, that the Kennedy administration plans to continue the policy of submitting to your committee both for preliminary screening and for later formal report, names of individuals under consideration for Federal judicial appointment, and of appointing only individuals who are clearly qualified.

Two weeks ago, when in San Francisco, I received a telephone call from Deputy Attorney General White making his first request for a preliminary screening—an informal opinion—on the qualifications of an individual under consideration for judicial appointment. So that the system is continuing without interruption.

Finally, I refer to the statement by Senator Kennedy in his letter of August 30, 1960, to our then President John Randall, which was adverted to in the Board of Governors' resolution passed by the House this morning. You will recall that after expressing his full agreement with the concept of a qualified and independent judiciary as promulgated by this association, Senator Kennedy said:

"I would hope that the paramount consideration in the appointment of a judge would not be his political party, but his qualifications for the office."

We have every confidence that as President, Mr. Kennedy will carry out this lofty pledge.

The importance of this sequence of events to the courts and to the Nation cannot be overstated. This combination of circumstances holds bright promise for the years ahead.

We have gone far toward the establishment and maintenance of a qualified judiciary. The undoubted ideal, long a major objective of this association and of the organized bar of the country, is the nonpartisan selection of judges on the basis of merit alone. Bipartisanship in appointments would not achieve this goal. But if nonpartisanship is not yet attainable, then bipartisanship would certainly create a wholesome atmosphere around the whole issue of judicial appointments and would be a long step in the direction of establishing what a former great official of the Department of Justice who did much in the cause of a qualified judiciary, called "the difference between a Federal judgeship and Federal patronage." President Kennedy has the best opportunity of any President of this century to break important new ground by introducing real bipartisanship into judicial appointments.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, our committee should like to convey to you our high hopes for the future. In view of the notable statement of purpose of President Kennedy, and the unequivocal assurances of Attorney General Kennedy and Deputy Attorney General White, against the background of the significant factors I have outlined, this should be a year of great accomplishment and progress in the critical field of judicial appointments. With the continued help and guidance of the Members of this House, your committee will exert its efforts toward the achievement of this goal.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have a pleasant assignment. One of the major reasons for the optimism of your committee rests in the person of the new Deputy Attorney General. He attended the meeting of our committee which lasted all of yesterday afternoon, during which he asked us searching questions and made sage observations. It was apparent to all of us that Deputy Attorney General White is completely dedicated to the goal of having only highly qualified lawyers and judges appointed to the U.S. courts.

Our committee believes that its relationship with Mr. White will be fully as cordial and as effective as it was with his predecessor, Judge Walsh, when it reached its all-time high.

Hungarian Independence Day

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we are commemorating a sad and important occasion today—the 153d anniversary of Hungarian Independence Day. Today when many formerly backward nations are gaining their independence it is a great tragedy that a nation with a history of a thousand years of freedom is now under a brutal domination which practices such violations of basic human rights as foreign troops, secret trials, and collectivization of agriculture. To most persons the successful effort of the Hungarians to gain freedom on March 15, 1848, is not nearly as well known as their heartbreaking attempt to throw off the iron hand of communism in 1956.

Thinking of the history of Hungary and its battles to hold freedom and to regain it, we realize that the new nations gaining freedom for the first time do not face an easy road. In fact, there seems to be no easy road for anyone or any nation in the world today. With the wicked power of modern weapons and the diametrical split between political systems based on personal freedom and those based on complete domination of the individual, the chances of utter chaos are considerable.

We feel that the key to peace lies in ideas rather than weapons. Somehow we must give to those caught up in powerful ideologies the knowledge of what freedom is—what it really means. Perhaps this is the role which the Hungarians and other captive nations are to play, because they have known the world of freedom and now live under the stultifying ideology behind the Iron Curtain. Perhaps, through Hungary, and other captive nations, we—a nation with nearly 200 years of freedom—can reach the millions who have no real knowledge or concept of freedom.

Voice of Democracy Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the Voice of Democracy essay contest, which has just been concluded for the 14th time, and which has the endorsement of the U.S. Office of Education, is a most commendable means of stimulating the youth of America to investigate and appraise the American form of government and to realize the values of our form of life.

A few weeks ago I had the honor of meeting the winners from the 50 States of the American Union in the Voice of America contest. I was particularly interested in speaking to a young lady from my own State, who appeared as the representative of California.

The wide participation of students in high schools throughout the Nation will pay substantial dividends in the way of better-informed citizens. Doubtless, the leaders in community affairs, and possibly those in State and National governmental activity, in future years will include award winners whose appreciation of the meaning of democracy stems from the study and the thought required for preparation of essays for this competition.

The California winner in this year's contest was Miss Kathleen Bodeen, of San Anselmo. Her essay is a moving expression which I believe will inspire Americans in all walks of life. I believe many will be reassured about the mental attitudes of our youth by reading Miss Bodeen's essay. Therefore, I request that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY

I speak for Democracy. I move my heart, my lips, and my tongue in utterance of an ideal which is the highest that humanity ever developed. An ideal which enables the man of mediocrity to share in the pipedreams of justice, freedom, and human dignity. To resound a cry of equality which states either "I'm just as good as you are—and a darned sight better" or, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal."

For, in the words of Montescuieu: "The love of democracy is that of equality." It's an ideal which finds its roots in the fertile soil of belief that if men are equal in any respect, they are equal in all respects. It is an American aspiration which personifies itself in the poignant story of a 6-year-old Alabama lad who had been given permission by his mother to bring home to dinner both a white and a colored schoolmate. The next day, the boy shot through the door, both his friends in tow. Then, he drew his mother over to a corner, stood on tiptoe, and whispered, with an air of beautiful childlike simplicity, "In case you're wondering, Mom, the one with the checkered shirt on is the colored boy."

It is this central concept of democracy, equality, for which I speak—that which gives it its energy, its overwhelming vitality—a concept which cries democracy. A concept holding aloft the banner emblazoned with the eternal phrase "It is the person as a person who counts." Not the individual as a landowner, not as a member of a white- or blue-collar working class, not as a child of advantageous wealth or prestige, not as belonging to this or that religion, race or creed—but the person as an individual * * * a being of human dignity who can lift his voice with mine in saying, "I speak for democracy."

I speak for kids and ticker-tape parades and freedom of education; for the timeclock, the sweat of the workingman's brow—for life, for liberty, for the pursuit of happiness. I speak in behalf of Jews, Catholics, Protestants. The Swedish, the Irish, the Spanish, the Hungarian.

I speak for those who have realized that democracy is the feeling of privacy in the voting booth—a feeling of communion in one's place of worship. It's the score at the bottom of the ninth. It's a small hand placed over the heart and the utterance of the words "I pledge allegiance * * *."

It is a form of government. It's a way of life. It's the ground upon which we walk. It's the air we breathe. It is this for which I speak. I speak for democracy.

Increased Appropriation for Forest Service Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. MOELLER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, several official and unofficial statements have recently been made on the subject of this Nation's vital natural resources. These statements—The Final Report of the Kennedy-Johnson Natural Resources Advisory Committee, the President's Special Message to Congress on Natural Resources and the President's Message to Congress on the American Economy, among others—have all acknowledged the urgency of revitalizing our national forestry programs.

I agree wholeheartedly with these statements. To emphasize the necessity for prompt action in this field, I would like to insert in the RECORD a statement I made before the Appropriations Subcommittee this past Monday in support of additional appropriations for Forest Service Research.

My statement follows:

INCREASED APPROPRIATION FOR FOREST SERVICE RESEARCH

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am WALTER MOELLER, of Ohio's 10th District. More than three-fourths of my district lies in the hilly southeastern part of Ohio. My appearance here is to discuss briefly my interest in Senator STENNIS' statement before the Senate on January 31, 1961, regarding the "Program for National Forests," as approved by Congress 2 years ago. According to my information, and to Senator STENNIS, some $8 million will be needed to bring the research part of the program up to the goal set for next fiscal year. This extra financing certainly is needed nationwide to place the management of our forest resources on a sounder basis through application of research results.

The situation in my district well illustrates the need for a really adequate national forestry research program. Many of the leading citizens of my district and I have a special interest in the development of our forests because they are the chief renewable resource in some 20 counties of southeastern Ohio's sharply rolling country. Forest improvement is moving ahead as a result of increasing protection against destructive agents and application of cultural practices developed by Forest Service Research. But a depressed economy exists and needs immediate attention. I believe that an investment in a research program designed to increase the output of timber and other forest resources, in perpetuity, is one of the best assurances against a recurrence of present economic conditions.

Early settlers found southeastern Ohio fully covered with some of the finest hardwoods. Now only some 50 to 60 percent of the land remains in forest cover; mostly it is of generally low quality. Much of the land cleared for farm crops has deteriorated and no longer has such value. Progress in the forestation of idle land with pines has been rapid; but the problem of successfully planting deteriorated soils to a valuable hardwood such as walnut is still troublesome.

Other major problems, in the rebuilding of the forests, involve both the establishment of timber stands and the management of them for increased volume and quality. For example, we must have better knowledge of soil characteristics and their relation to the occurrence and growth of our best tree species. This is the very heart of maximum forest use of land, as it is for the best use of farm cropland. When relations between soils and the distribution and growth of different kinds of our best native trees are determined, guidelines will have been established for planting trees in the proper places and managing forests to assure maximum yield and regeneration of new stands.

A further immediate problem is related to production of pulpwood. The hardwood pulp industry is rapidly expanding in the Midwest and increasing its drain on timber stands. There are 19 woodpulp plants in the Midwest; 6 of them are in Ohio. This drain is mostly on good quality trees that are too small for sawtimber. If continued without the guidance that can come from research, pulpwood cutting can be a hazard to our future sawtimber stands. Research is needed to determine suitable methods of managing our forests for production of pulpwood alone, as a special product, and for production of both pulpwood and sawtimber in the same stand. And we need to find the costs and returns available from growing hardwoods for pulp and sawtimber.

The Forest Service is conducting research in my district and in other parts of southeastern Ohio. This work has already made many fine contributions, such as improved forest management methods, better ways to plant trees on old fields, and tree planting methods for coal stripped land. But the program is entirely too small. It ought to be enlarged immediately just as this work should be strengthened in many other parts of our Nation.

I appreciate the time you have given me to review forestry research needs in my district as an example of national needs. Funds appropriated for forestry research are investments that will help, in a constructive way, the economy of depressed areas

and assure a more abundant supply of forest resources for the Nation's people and economy. Finally, I want to approve the statements of Senator STENNIS and recommend that we in the House equal his leadership by appropriating an $8 million increase for Forest Service research in fiscal year 1962.

Why U.S. Farmers Are Tops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, since 1914 when the Smith-Level Act became law cooperative extension work has been a vital part of the Department of Agriculture activities and through the years the farmers of America have been the beneficiaries of the results of research conducted by the Department of Agriculture and our land-grant colleges who have worked in concert with the Federal Extension Service in an effort to give our farmers and their families the opportunity for a greater share of the benefits and blessings of American prosperity.

Basic to the success of the general educational programs of the Extension Service is the county extension agent. It is through his dedicated efforts that our farmers, farm homemakers, and rural youth are apprised firsthand and almost immediately of the latest agricultural research findings of the Department of Agriculture and our land-grant institutions. Certainly the structure of American agriculture does not have a more important or vital link than the work of the county extension agent.

In the December 1960 issue of Better Farming Methods a most deserving tribute was paid the joint Federal-State program of the Extension Service and our land-grant colleges in an editorial entitled "Why U.S. Farmers Are Tops." I strongly commend the editorial and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY U.S. FARMERS ARE TOPS

(By Frank Waddle)

Every once in a while a person is fortunate enough to have an experience which helps him to see what is fundamental and what isn't.

Recently I have had such an experience. It has given me such a new appreciation of the fundamental role of our land-grant college system and our agricultural extension system that I would like to share it with you.

Between October 20 and November 3 it was my good fortune to visit five South American countries with Secretary of Agriculture Ezra T. Benson and a group of other farm newsmen. During the 2 weeks, we visited Brazil, Uruguay, Argentina, Chile, and Peru.

We visited with farmers (wealthy and poor), presidents, ministers of agriculture, educators, business people, the agricultural staff members of our own Embassies, and many others.

All of this does not make one an expert on Latin America or its agriculture. It does enable one, however, to make certain observations and reach a few conclusions.

My most important conclusion is that everyone in the United States—and especially anyone related in any way to agriculture—ought to thank God every day of his life for the wisdom of our forbears which led to the establishment of our land-grant college system and our Federal-State extension service.

These Latin American countries (as well as others throughout the world) have a tremendous potential for the production of food and fiber.

They are handicapped by a shortage of capital, but that is not the greatest handicap.

By far the most important shortage is in technical knowledge—simple know-how. Why?

My conclusion was that the difference is due primarily to our research and educational institutions.

Our land-grant colleges have sought earnestly to determine the best methods of using the many types of soils which we have. They have worked hard on the development of better varieies of seeds and improving our livestock and poultry. This research was not done privately for the selfish advantage of a few but was done for the welfare and use of all who would apply it.

Our Extension Service was established to bring this information to the individual farm. (Of course, I would in no way belittle the other communications media which also have helped to spread the information available.)

It is easy to say, "Why don't the farmers in these countries adopt our methods?" To help illustrate why this is difficult, let us imagine for a moment that all of the agricultural research in the United States had been done at Cornell University for the farmers of New York State. How generally could this have been applied by the farmers of Iowa, or Georgia, or New Mexico, or California?

It is even less practical to simply send our information to these other lands, helpful as that may be.

There are agricultural schools in South America, but very little research as we know it. There is no extension system or method of disseminating the information. Half of the people who should have this information cannot read or write.

This is not said to belittle the people or the potentials of these countries. They have great potential and in the years to come will be tremendously productive lands. Furthermore, they will develop much faster than we have.

This is being said simply that we might appreciate the background of research and education which has enabled approximately 10 percent of our workers in the United States to produce all the food and fiber that we need—and then some.

While we are giving credit, perhaps we ought to go back still further. We can be thankful that the pioneers who settled our land built homes, churches, schools, and colleges almost at the same time. They believed in the dignity and value of the individual. They believed that each individual should have an opportunity for the best education which he was capable of achieving. They believed that only when people were eductaed could they progress fully and live together democratically. Thus, from the beginning we developed a middle class of people rather than the great extremes of wealth and poverty which exists in many other parts of the world.

I believe that it was that attitude which, when applied to agriculture, resulted in our land-grant colleges and in our extension system and our agricultural education.

Our agricultural economy today is undergoing considerable stress and strain. We are prone to criticize our researchers and educators and our extenison leaders for not having answers to our problems.

But for now, I would like to suggest that we do not overlook their fundamental values and that we do not cease to be grateful for them. They are the envy of the rest of the world.

A Journey to Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow being St. Patrick's Day. I think it a most appropriate time to submit for the RECORD another in a series of articles, which I have found to be most informative and often highly amusing, on Ireland, written by Mr. Thomas Heffernan, editor, Sunday Independent, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., which appeared in that newspaper on March 12, 1961. Mr. Heffernan wrote this series of articles for his newspaper following an extended trip through Ireland last fall.

The article follows:

A JOURNEY TO IRELAND—IRISH NAMES WITH SCARTEEN HUNT—A VARIETY OF OBSTACLES TO JUMP

(By Tom Heffernan)

The other hunt with which we rode in the region about Adare in County Limerick was that of the Scarteen Black and Tans—with the name coming from the markings on the fine big pack of hounds and which pack we were told had been in the Ryan family for generations.

One contrast here was that while the nucleus of the County Limerick Hunt were people from England come over for a season of hunting, there seemed more Irish—at least Irish names—among the followers of the Scarteens.

Thaddeus (Thaddy) Ryan, tall and handsome, was master and the dashing young Pat Hogan was field master, acting as master in the field since the master served as his own huntsman.

There were also the O'Briens, Raffertys, and others while on two of the days we were with the Scarteens we met Catholic priests riding in the field.

FATHER FOLEY FALLS

One was Father Denis (one N) Foley, a young man Paddy O'Toole informed us "was just after being ordained."

The other was Father Kennedy and when we asked his first name he smiled as he said, "John."

Father Foley was riding a young and green hunter which give him both difficulties and spills.

"I fell into and over everything," he said.

That was understandable, because the country hunted by the Scarteens seemed to us to have nothing but double banks and jumps over walls that took you down into precipitous slopes.

They seemed that way, anyway.

And with the hunt one day was a young man who had lost one leg from about the middle of the shin, and he wore a straight wooden peg leg.

This he fitted into a black leather boot which replaced the stirrup.

Later that day we were just behind this young man and somewhat apart from the rest.

FOLLOWED WRONG MAN

We were in a narrow country road bordered by a stone wall which led into a field which sloped steeply down, when the hounds chasing a fox, came suddenly into view way down in the field below.

Without hestitation he put his horse, from a standstill, right over that wall into the field below and took off at full speed down that steep incline.

With considerable hesitation we followed him and when asked later about it said we felt that if a one-legged man could get over we thought it safe to follow.

"That one-legged man," we were told, "is Ferguson Sutherland, one of England's finest horsemen and a trainer of hunters, jumpers and steeplechasers at Newmarket"— which is famed for just that.

With the Scarteens we met an Englishman named John Shedden.

Quite by accident, in a restaurant we met him again later in Dublin.

At that time we found out that he had been in Harrisburg on business last summer.

CHURCH COLLECTION TAKEN AT ENTRANCE

The collection for the church at Adare was not taken up by passing the plate.

Instead, two men from the congregation stood at either side of the main entrance, holding the collection plates into which those attending dropped their offerings on their way into the church.

In Dublin, the big city ways reverted to what we know, with the plate passed through the congregation.

WHO CAN JOIN IN THE HUNT

Members of a hunt pay a yearly subscription to help defray the costs.

Visitors pay a daily fee called the cap—coming from the same root, as per capita.

Residents of the area pay a smaller and nominal fee.

Farmers and members of their families are welcome at all times and often there are a couple farm boys or perhaps a girl and they usually make no effort to wear hunting clothes, but often are well mounted.

At other times they are quite young and bouncing right along on ponies.

And we still can see one chap, in his thirties, wearing rubber boots, an old army overcoat and ancient cloth cap—his long haired little horse trying hard—flying at his best for a while.

Hunting they love.

FEW FLY FENCES BUT QUITE A VARIETY

Hunting in Ireland you don't get to jump many straight up and down obstacles like wooden fences, similar gates or even, in the part where we hunted, stone walls, all of which are like the obstacles seen in horse shows.

By hunting people these are called fly fences because you can fly at them and over them.

When going into ditches, banks, and other overgrown affairs you don't fly—you go in slowly because the horse must have a chance to see where he is jumping and it is well for both of you to get a view of what is on the other side, where you hope to land.

With good luck finding us well mounted every day, we had a good chance to find out why Irish hunters are so famous and so highly prized. They are wonderful and some of the affairs we got over leave us still wondering how it was done.

OVER HUGE STONE WALL

Keeping in mind that it was approached slowly and not cleared but taken a bit at a time, with the horse jumping first up on top and then jumping off, we met quite an example the first day.

Later, John Gouriet told us, in case we were interested, that the big stone wall we had negotiated was 6 feet high, 9 feet wide, and with a drop on the far side.

Then, on the last day, we were taken over another that still baffles us as to how it was negotiated by the horse—and let us stress there was no danger whatever involved.

However, it was an ancient brick or stone affair, between 5 and 6 feet high, perhaps only 18 inches wide. It separated us from the field we were in from the road we had to get to and we approached it at a walk.

Somehow, that big horse got his front feet on top and scrambled up one side and down the other almost in one motion—and practically in slow motion.

GETTING PHEASANTS THE HARDEST WAY

Talk about doing it the hard way.

They still tell the story of a Mr. Toomer, an English sportsman of the 18th century.

He is said to have ridden a trained bull to shoot pheasants while using a pointing pig to find his game for him.

The 1961 Resolution in Opposition to the Federal Income Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial entitled "1961 Resolution Opposing Federal Income Tax 48 Years Too Late," which appeared in the Mandan Daily News of Mandan, N. Dak., in the March 7, 1961, issue.

This is one of the most factual and documented editorials that has come to my attention on this subject. I am sure the Members of the Senate, as well as others greatly interested in this proposal will appreciate reading this editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 7, 1961 RESOLUTION OPPOSING FEDERAL INCOME TAX 48 YEARS TOO LATE

The proposal, during the last week of the legislature, to pass a resolution abolishing all Federal income taxes served one purpose only, and that was to call the attention of the voters to just how much money is being used, and the number of agencies that are now apparently fully dependent on the Federal income tax.

Another purpose, too, that prognosticators could visualize was that it gave Fay Brown an opportunity to get into the State, as well as national limelight, thus laying the groundwork for any future political ambitions he might have. To eliminate the Federal income tax at this time would create chaos throughout the Nation. It should have been stopped before it became law in 1913. Certainly many changes could, and should be made in the law, particularly the confiscatory rates, and the varied and many degrees of interpretations of the law. Each year the forms are said to have been simplified but as we make out our taxes we find this is not so and the only safe way to make out the tax is turn it over to a specialist. Even he is apt to be confused.

Going back to the North Dakota resolution. It all started apparently at the instigation of a certain Willis Stone of California, called the Mystery Man by the North Dakota Union Farmer. Mr. Stone claims to be chairman of the "National Committee for Economic Freedom" claiming the far-to-the-right politicians as supporters.

We can and do agree with numerous points in Mr. Stone's program, but we resent an out-of-State man moving in and using our State legislature as a sounding board, even though we may agree with many of his aims.

This takes us back to the early days of the Nonpartisan League. When the farmers revolted about 1915, they had many supporters among the businessmen of the towns and cities, but they allowed a gang of out-of-State socialistically inclined ideologists to take over the leadership and North Dakota was soon headed down the road to State socialism, with which many of the farm revolt supporters could not agree. In time these agitators left the State, but the results of their bitter antibusiness campaign hung on for years. Today there is little of the farm versus city "feller" resentment left.

No matter what the cause, when they have a family quarrel, most States resent outside interference, even from Uncle Sam. Witness the segregation troubles down South. Many southerners agree with integration but they don't like to be pushed around by outsiders and thus negate a program that probably could have been adopted much sooner if they had been let alone.

Certainly we would like to be rid of the Federal income tax but in order to do so we must first eliminate about 700 Government functions, millions of jobholders, and numerous little and big bureaucrats. And what sort of tax could be used to raise money for the absolutely necessary Government functions.

Here is where the Federal tax money now comes from: individual income tax, 55 cents; corporation income tax, 25 cents; excise tax, 12 cents; and other receipts, 8 cents.

Here is where the tax dollar goes: major national security, military, and stockpiling, 57 cents; interest, 11 cents; agriculture, 6 cents; veterans, 6 cents; debt retirement, 2 cents; other, 18 cents.

We cannot eliminate the Federal income tax, but the rates certainly can be better equalized and adjusted to give business and earners more incentive to expand and advance.

The Finnish Journey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, at a recent meeting in Geneva, Switzerland, Finland was granted associate membership in the European Free Trade Association. This was a significant step in the direction of strengthening Western relationships and a heartening one to all of us who believe in expanded world trade, when such trade does not act as a detriment to our domestic industries.

In this connection, I noted a most informative article, entitled "The Finnish Journey," that appeared in Fortune magazine during the congressional recess. It provides an interesting explanation of current commercial and political

realtionships between Finland and the Soviet Union. It also outlines the significant strides that Finland has been making in an increasing orientation of her trade with the West.

Under previous permission, I include this excellent article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE FINNISH STORY

This month Finland's President, Urho Kekkonen, will travel the 550 miles that separate Helsinki from Moscow on a crucial and unusual mission. His aim is to discover what terms the Soviet Union will require before giving its blessing to Finnish membership in the Western-oriented Outer Seven, the European Free Trade Association. Kekkonen's task, a grave one, symbolizes the perilous position in which his country finds itself. Tied by tradition and trade to the West, its entry into EFTA should be a matter of course. Yet this tiny nation of 4,400,000 must always take into consideration its huge Soviet neighbor.

In practice, Finland usually plays its role of rabbit in the bear's den with considerable spunk and independence. This fall, for example, President Kekkonen, who is not as ready as most Finns to stand up to Russia, told Khruschev face to face: "I am convinced that even if the whole of the rest of Europe becomes Communist, Finland will remain a traditional Scandinavian democracy." To the chagrin of Finnish Communists who were at the meeting, Khrushchev agreed.

Yet the U.S.S.R. obviously can have considerable influence over the tiny neighbor with which it shares an 800-mile border. This Soviet leverage on the Finns goes back to the Finnish military defeats in 1940 and 1944. Under the terms of the Finno-Russian peace treaty, the arctic port of Petsamo, along with its nickel mines and the Karelian Isthmus and its forest industry, were surrendered to the Soviets. The government was forced to resettle some 400,000 people, mostly refugees from Karelia, on small tracts of land. And Finland had to agree to pay the U.S.S.R. a war indemnity in goods that eventually cost about $570 million. Further while forest products constituted practically the entire base for the prewar economy, some 72 percent of the reparations had to be supplied by the country's metal industry.

To meet Russian demands, Finland had to create new industries dependent on imports for equipment, raw materials, and fuel (the country has no coal or oil). But by 1952 the last of the reparations were delivered. The country was then left with inflation (the cost of living rose 400 percent from 1944 to 1952), debts, and a metal industry that had to import its raw materials and export its output. In 1955, partly to keep this industry alive. Finland extended its 1948 Treaty of Friendship with the Soviets for 20 years and negotiated a long-term trade agreement.

As a result of this and subsequent trade agreements, the U.S.S.R., which accounted for less than 1 percent of Finnish trade in 1938, has continued to be an important factor in the economic wealth of the country. Finland still relies on the Soviet Union for much of its iron, cotton, and grain, and has gradually given ground to Soviet requests to supply the bulk of their crude oil. At the same time, Finnish shipbuilders and machinery manufacturers have had to continue to rely on the Soviet Union for much of their trade. At the present time, for example, Finland is, among other things, building 11 cargo vessels, 15 tankers, a woodpulp plant, and a cardboard plant for the U.S.S.R.

Despite all this, trade with the Soviets remains surprisingly low. Last year Finnish sales to the U.S.S.R. were valued at $140 million, about 13 percent of Finland's total exports, while imports from Russia totaled $147,300,000, about 16 percent of the total. This year Russian imports and exports will represent an even smaller portion of Finnish trade.

HAIL BRITANNICA

The chief reason for this decreasing dependence on the U.S.S.R. is the fact that Finland has been able to capture Western market for 95 percent of its wood and paper, which in turn account for 78 percent of its exports. Especially since the 1957 devaluation of the Finnish mark, the nation's textile and machinery industries have also begun to find Western customers.

As a result, Britain, not Russia, is the country's principal trading partner. Last year Finland exported $188,600,000 worth of goods (mostly pulp, paper, and wood) to the United Kingdom, imported $111 million worth of such items as automobiles, machinery, and raw materials. West Germany is also a major customer and supplier. In 1959 it accounted for $91,200,000 in Finnish exports and sold Finland $149,900,000 worth of goods. In fact, in the first half of 1960, total trade between Finland and West Germany exceeded total Finno-Soviet trade.

The United States remains a minor factor in Finnish trade and last year accounted for only 5 percent of the total. This is slowly increasing; U.S. exports to the country will amount to about $60 million this year as compared with $43 million in 1959. Meanwhile, the Finnish forest-products industry is beginning to recover part of its prewar U.S. market. In 1959 the United States, which bought 163,000 tons of Finnish paper and 112,000 tons of newsprint, was Finland's most important paper customer.

SESSION IN SAUNA

By increasing exports (and keeping the Soviet Union at arm's length), Finland has slowly begun to recover internally. It is by no means so prosperous as neighboring Sweden (per capita incomes: around $650 versus $1,150), but is far better off than most of Eastern Europe. This year alone, the gross national product is expected to rise 7 to 9 percent and industrial production will probably increase by 14 percent. However, to maintain the growth in trade on which it depends, Finland must become part of EFTA, whose members absorb about 30 percent of Finnish exports. Already, tariff reductions between EFTA members have forced Finnish exporters of cardboard and paper to reduce their prices in order to stay competitive with Sweden in the British market. EFTA members have indicated they would be pleased to accept Finland. And Finnish industrialists have backed such a move.

Yet until this September the Kekkonen government has feared U.S.S.R. reprisals. Then Nikita Khrushchev arrived in Helsinki uninvited and ostensibly to bring greetings to Kekkonen on this 60th birthday. After a session in Kekkonen's sauna (steam bath) that lasted until early morning, the two men announced that they had agreed to open negotiations that would permit Finland to "remain competitive in Western markets."

At the present time there is considerable speculation in Finland as to just what terms the Russians will require. Obviously the Russian negotiators know the importance of EFTA as well as the Finns. It would thus seem that all the bargaining power lies in the East and that the Soviets will insist on such conditions as an increase in Finno-Soviet trade to 25 percent of the Finnish total.

Despite this, many Finnish businessmen are convinced that few concessions will be required. These men point out that Finland's position is not necessarily so weak as it seems. If Finland refuses to meet harsh Russian demands and stands up to economic sanctions, the U.S.S.R. would probably still hesitate to use force of any sort if only because Sweden might become alarmed and modify its present neutrality. For the time being, the Russians obviously prefer a Scandinavian buffer zone to NATO troops on Swedish soil.

So the probability is that Finland will gets its EFTA membership and will continue to build and strengthen its ties with the West, the segment of the world in which a great many Finns are passionately convinced they belong. Recently in Tampere, Finland's leading industrial city, a young, Stanford-educated Finnish textile executive expressed this widely held Finnish conviction. While showing a line of sweaters and knit goods with which his firm hoped to break into the U.S. markets, he suddenly interrupted his description of design and price, turned to a group of U.S. visitors, and passionately stated: "We are of the West. This is where we are. We belong here. And we intend to stay here."

Legend of St. Patrick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article on St. Patrick that was featured in the Pittston (Pa.) Sunday Dispatch of March 12, 1961, which I found very interesting and historically informative. Today being the eve of St. Patrick's Day, I take this occasion to wish all my friends and associates a happy and enjoyable St. Patrick's Day on the morrow.

The article from the Dispatch follows:

INTERESTING LEGEND OF ST. PATRICK AND THE CHASING OF SNAKES FROM IRELAND

This year marks the 1500th anniversary of the death of St. Patrick—historical authorities have set A.D. 461 as the year of his death.

Through the centuries, many legends and controversies have arisen surrounding the life of St. Patrick.

Almost as many countries claim the honor of having been the natal soil of St. Patrick, for example, as made a similar claim with respect to Homer. Scotland, England, France, and Wales have each furnished their respective pretentions.

Whatever doubts may obscure his birthplace, however, he came from a patrician family, as his name implies.

When St. Patrick was 16 years old, he was carried off by pirates, who later sold him into slavery in Ireland. His master worked him as a swineherd on the well-known mountain of Sleamish, in the county of Antrim. Here St. Patrick lived for 7 years, acquiring a knowledge of the Irish language, as well as their manners, habits and customs.

St. Patrick eventually escaped from captivity and after many adventures reached the Continent, where he was successfully ordained deacon, priest and bishop. With the authority of Pope Celestine, St. Patrick, once more returned to Ireland, to preach the gospel to its then heathen inhabitants.

The history of St. Patrick's Day is mostly legendary history. Probably the most famous feat associated with St. Patrick was his driving the snakes out of Ireland.

However, a little known but cute legend is associated with this event.

It is said, that when banishing the snakes and toads from Ireland, in the Gaultie Mountains situated between the counties of

Cork and Tipperary, St. Patrick chained a monster serpent in a lake called Lough Dilueen, telling him that he would remain there until Monday. However, St. Patrick never returned to free the serpent and on every Monday morning, it is said, the serpent calls out in Irish: "It is a long Monday, Patrick!"

That St. Patrick chained the serpent and that the serpent calls out to him every Monday morning, is still firmly believed by those who live in the neighborhood of the lough.

One of the better known of all the legends dealing with St. Patrick, is how he was responsible for the shamrock becoming the familiar Irish emblem.

The legend, which has been recounted in the famous Rust Craft "legend series" of greeting cards, reads: "Long ago, when Ireland was the land of the Druids, there was a great bishop, Patrick, by name, who came to teach the word of God throughout the country.

"This saint, for he was indeed a saint, was well-loved everywhere he went. One day, however, a group of his followers came to him and admitted that it was difficult for them to believe in the doctrine of the Holy Trinity.

"St. Patrick reflected a moment and then stooping down he plucked a leaf from the Shamrock and held it before them, bidding them to behold the living example of this 'three in one.'

"The simple beauty of this explanation convinced these skeptics and from that day the shamrock has been revered throughout Ireland."

Today, on the 17th of March, wherever true sons of Erin gather, the shamrock is proudly worn as a symbol of the faith that is Ireland.

The McMahon Frontier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRESCOTT BUSH
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I was elected to the Senate in November 1952, to fill the unexpired term of former Senator Brien McMahon, of Connecticut. Senator McMahon was one of the most widely respected politicians and statesmen in the State of Connecticut.

A very interesting and eloquent tribute was paid to former Senator McMahon in the Bridgeport Post on Monday, March 13, under the title "The McMahon Frontier," and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MCMAHON FRONTIER

In the field of international relations, the late Senator Brien McMahon was generally recognized as one who was well ahead of his time. The highly esteemed Norwalker approached world problems with a zeal that transcended political advantage. Even today, 7 years after his death, one associates his name with efforts to strengthen the bonds of brotherhood the world over.

Evidence of the Senator's prophetic views recently was uncovered in a speech he delivered in February 1952, a few months before he died. In this address, he anticipated the need for a Peace Corps of the type which has evoked so much enthusiasm in the process of organization under President Kennedy.

Speaking before the National Conference of Christians and Jews, Senator McMahon proposed a point 5 program of "compassion, understanding and brotherhood" to fight communism in backward areas. He recognized then the Kremlin's concerted effort to win over the peoples of underdeveloped lands. The Russians, he warned, had "enlisted tens of thousands who are working full time at advancing the cause of tyranny."

It is interesting to note that Senator McMahon even used the word "frontier," in urging a new kind of army to combat disease and poverty abroad. "Here," he declared, "is the great answer to those who lament the passing of the American frontier. Here is the challenge to those who declare that life has grown soft and flabby."

"We of the West," he said, "must now enlist tens of thousands who will become full time missionaries for decency. In place of 2,000 technicians now engaged in point 4 we need 50 times this number for services on the lonely lands of Tunisia, the endless stretches of the Arabian desert, the steaming jungles of Africa who will journey and show the downtrodden of the world their fate is not a matter of indifference to us."

He reached the New Frontier ahead of us.

Hungarian Freedom Day

SPEECH
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, today, March 15, commemorates the 113th anniversary of the Hungarian revolution, a day which will be celebrated by Hungarians all over the world as a national holiday, commemorating their freedom fight against the autocratic rule of the Austrian monarchs which they suffered for many years. On this day in 1848, the Hungarian people, after more than 200 years of enduring hardships and sufferings under an alien yoke, revolted. Hungarian patriots, taking full advantage of this situation, staged demonstrations against the existing government. They presented a list of their just grievances and demanded freedom. On March 1 the Hungarians were granted the concessions and freedom they demanded. This should be a day of glad rejoicing rather than a day of sad recollection as it has been made to be by the action of the Soviets in 1956.

Today, as we commemorate an earlier era of Hungarian freedom, we honor all Hungarians for their gallant and tenacious longing for liberty and we pray that the day soon will come when the light of freedom and independence again will be burning brightly in their beloved homeland.

In closing, I quote that great statesman, Dwight D. Eisenhower, in saying that, "Budapest is no longer merely the name of a city: henceforth it is a new and shining symbol of man's yearning to be free."

The Urban Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, within recent years, we have developed a new vocabulary to describe growing problems caused by urban population increases and extensive suburban development. We have heard about "urban sprawl," "high-density and low-density development," the "steadily worsening commuter crisis," and "a Marshall plan for cities."

The gradual acceptance and understanding of these terms indicate, I believe, that we in highly urbanized areas realize that the chips are down. Either we make our cities and suburbs livable now, or we can look forward only to deterioration, confusion and much greater expense later on to correct mistakes that could have been prevented.

Newspaper editors, in particular, have an important role to fulfill if we are to educate ourselves about specific metropolitan area problems. If they understand the problems facing their communities and regions, their readers will, too. If they can show that the urban problem has direct impact on each homeowner and each apartment dweller, they perform a valuable service for their readers.

I am particularly pleased, therefore, that many newspapers in New Jersey—the most urbanized State in the Union—are effectively featuring news and comment about the many problems that all go under the one general heading. In a relatively small State divided into almost 600 individual communities, these reporters and editorial writers are often able to detect and describe joint problems that call for joint action.

Mr. President, I would like to give a sampling of some of the recent commentary from New Jersey papers. I ask unanimous consent to have the following editorials and article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Elizabeth (N.J.) Daily Journal, Mar. 9, 1961]

STRUGGLE AGAINST BLIGHT AND DECAY

President Kennedy's estimate that in the world's richest country as many as 14 million people live in slums or in substandard housing adds a note of urgency to his housing program given to the Congress yesterday.

The President makes another telling point which his prediction that by 1970 two million more housing units will be needed just to keep pace with the expanding national population. This is over and above any replacement of current substandard dwelling units.

America seems to be headed for a crisis in housing, both in deterioration of the old and in a scarcity of the new. This is part of the general picture of decline in urban areas. The White House program would extend remedial operations in all directions, with the emphasis or reviving cities.

Needed assistance in individual rehabilitation projects would be given, as well as added help in renewing whole city neighborhoods. At the same time, the President's recommendations would make it easier for middle income families—who feel the pinch the most—to obtain new housing.

Veterans, most of whom have family responsibilities, and the elderly, most of whom have financial limitations, are singled out for aid in the Kennedy housing proposals. These are among the immediate measures; there are others of long-range importance.

The most vital is the recommendation for creation of a cabinet post dealing with urban affairs and housing. U.S. Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., of Westfield was among the originators of this idea, which the President discussed often during his election campaign.

This proposal gives depth to the housing program, suggesting that there would be permanence in the Government's concern. The strength of America rests largely in its cities, according to economists, historians and sociologists. The decline of these population centers that has marked recent years must be stopped, they say.

Brightening up, cleaning up and refurbishing cities will eradicate crime-breeding and disease-laden slums, revive community pride and restore the home to its place as the center of family life.

Included in the plans to put cities back on their feet is a grant program underwriting the purchase of green acreage for recreation and conservation purposes.

This seems to symbolize the aims of all the housing recommendations which are to provide healthful, attractive and comfortable surroundings in which all Americans can live and raise their families. It is a challenging goal.

[From the Camden (N.J.) Courier-Post, Mar. 2, 1961]

GREATER CAMDEN MOVEMENT HAILED

An optimistic movement to assist in the redevelopment, rehabilitation and growth programs for Camden and surrounding municipalities has been boosted off the ground with formation of the Greater Camden movement (GCM).

Talked about for many years and more sorely needed as time went on, this new nonprofit organization was brought into being by leading industrialists, professional and businessmen in the area to work in complete cooperation with governmental agencies.

Supplanting many widely diversified little study committees, which sometimes appeared not to know what either they or their counterparts were doing, the GCM should prove to be a great coordinating effort.

Patterned after similar organizations which have been successful elsewhere, GCM could indeed put all interests on the right track toward real progress and serve as a timely catalyst.

For a number of years, various groups like the Camden County Chamber of Commerce have been discussing the physical deterioration of Camden and how they could help in the rehabilitation or redevelopment which is required.

Emerging from these discussions and many others, the GCM plans first to tackle the redevelopment problems in the city and subsequently the greater Camden area, hence the name.

Already hailing the formation of the organization are Mayor Pierce and other city and county officials who have pledged full cooperation with GCM's policies and goals.

The mayor sees the organization as destined to be successful because "it has the right product." And it is his conviction that "in order to create a healthy urban atmosphere you must have a willingness for change of attitude on the part of the people."

Setting forth its purposes for development and community planning for the entire area, the GCM prefaces its goals with such words as to encourage, to stimulate, to facilitate, to promote and to help. In summary, it wants to do "all and everything necessary, suitable, convenient or proper" for accomplishment and attainment of this very worthwhile project.

The movement is fortunate, too, in having as its executive vice president someone who is familiar with this area and has gone through a similar sort of group activity in Trenton. Appointment of Hal H. Holker to that post, which he also held with the Greater Trenton Council, brings to Camden a director with an excellent reputation, and gives the launching of the Camden movement a fine sendoff.

Holker, who before joining the Trenton group was assistant regional director for the Urban Renewal Administration offices in Philadelphia, is a man of wide professional experience in planning, housing and urban renewal fields.

The Courier-Post, with its editor among the many incorporators representative of area interests, enthusiastically pledges its support to the movement and warmly welcomes the creation of the organization. This newspaper, too, urges all citizens of the Greater Camden area, whether in public or private life, to join in this effort to encourage the development of greater economic opportunity, cultural advancement and recreational facilities.

[From the New Brunswick (N.J.) Sunday Home News, Feb. 26, 1961]

URBAN AFFAIRS IN THE CABINET

President Kennedy is moving rapidly to fulfill the Democratic platform pledge to establish a Department of Housing and Urban Affairs as the 11th agency in the Federal Government with cabinet rank.

This is a sound move in many ways. First, platform pledges should be kept. Second, the cities of the Nation are confronted today with so many problems that, to survive and flourish, they need all the help they can get. Third, Kennedy's slim margin of victory in November was found in the city precincts, and establishing the new department is very good politics indeed.

The new Department would be a large and busy one. At the outset it would take over all programs of existing housing and home finance agencies of the Federal Government. They include the Federal Housing Administration, the Urban Renewal Administration, the Federal National Mortgage Association, the Public Housing Administration and the Communities Facilities Administration. Other urban programs administered by other Departments and Agencies would move into the new Cabinet rank department as the need became apparent.

Who would run the new Department and enter the Cabinet as its representative? The presumptive new Secretary is Robert C. Weaver who has been confirmed as administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Weaver is a Negro, able, energetic, widely respected, and he now holds the highest executive position ever attained in our Government by a member of his race. He would be the first Cabinet member of his race.

Two other names prominently mentioned for the position are men of urban political experience. They are Gov. David Lawrence, of Pennsylvania and Mayor Richardson Dilworth, of Philadelphia.

It has been clear that the Federal Government's increasing activity at the urban level has been in so many hands that red tape has multipled, leading to both delay and inefficiency.

A new Department of Urban Affairs would place ultimate responsibility for myriad Federal functions in urban affairs in one agency. And, perhaps as important as administrative functions, is the planning function. Here, again, a central agency can do the job more quickly, more efficiency, more economically.

We are confident that a new Department of Urban Affairs will become a mighty factor in clearing out slums, in hastening redevelopment, in making housing available, in preserving and improving today's cities to meet the growing challenge of tomorrow.

[From the Elizabeth (N.J.) Daily Journal, Feb. 14, 1961]

CONSERVATION AND INDUSTRY

The several plans advocated to increase New Jersey's green acres have more than aesthetic value, says State Conservation Commissioner Salvatore A. Bontempo.

Beautification of the State's landscape and expansion of its recreational facilities can mean economic growth, according to Mr. Bontempo, who also is commissioner for economic development in the State.

Reports from the Federal Labor Department indicate that development could use some stimulation. The Department has added three of the State's industrial complexes—Newark with Union County included—to its growing list of areas in which unemployment is above the national average.

Just how much of the spreading joblessness in New Jersey arises from a scarcity of nearby picnic grounds or swimming holes is hard to say. But incongruous as it seems, there may be a connection.

The concept of New Jersey as a smoke-begrimed tract of factories between New York City and Philadelphia is all too common outside the Garden State. And it may be just enough to persuade a prospective industrial settler to look elsewhere if he has the morale of his executives and workmen in mind.

Conservation has more practical arguments in its favor. There is the issue of water supply. All the green acres plans advanced thus far advocate broadening of the State's water resources and storage facilities for recreational as well as industrial reasons. Most plants must have adequate drainage to operate and if New Jersey can't supply it, it will lose more prospective settlers.

In advocating development of open land and natural resources to attract industry, however, we must be careful to avoid the latent paradox: If the large remaining tracts of land in the State are to be preserved, where will the new industry be located?

There must be coordination of effort in Mr. Bontempo's dual office so that conservation and economic development proceed hand in hand and not head over heels.

[From the Passaic (N.J.) Herald News, Feb. 18, 1961]

THE CHANGE THREATENING THE SUBURBS

U.S. Senator WILLIAMS, of New Jersey, is trying to arouse interest in the Congress and country in his open space proposals. They are an effort to avoid the fate which planners predict is in store for us by 1975. Every available bit of land in suburban areas, they say, will have a home or other building on it, and the suburbs will become cities.

The subject has already attracted the attention of certain groups, such as our New Jersey farmers. They are being squeezed out of one community after another by home developments. They and agricultural experts fret because, they say, some of the Nation's best agricultural land is being taken for building. The Rutgers farm policy forum, held recently, was devoted to this problem.

Architects are tackling it from another direction. One proposal, which Senator WILLIAMS has mentioned favorably, is a

modern version of the old row housing. Instead of placing homes on individual plots, the homes would be clustered. The balance of the land which would be required if they were built in the conventional manner would be used to provide open space around them. One such row housing development already in existence concentrates 74 homes on 8 percent of the land, leaving the rest of the land as woodland and meadows for the families to share. Substantial saving in cost is another advantage claimed by the proponents.

The discussion and new ideas are welcome. Senator WILLIAMS is to be commended for looking ahead. The subjects of home and the preservation of the suburbs are of great importance to a great many Americans.

[From the Newark Star-Ledger, Feb. 17, 1961]

ROOM FOR BOTH

Senator WILLIAMS has introduced a bill to help preserve park, recreation, conservation and scenic areas and he points out that this bill would encourage proper development of the Jersey meadowlands.

The meadowlands, however, do not need preservation. They have been preserved too long. Instead they need development.

The geography of the meadowlands makes them potentially some of the most valuable property in the metropolitan area. They are not likely to be reclaimed, however, until there is a definite plan for their usage.

From an engineering standpoint, there is nothing standing in the way of developing the meadowlands. The stumbling block is the development of a sound financial plan and a firm decision on what to do with the area.

The Williams bill, if it is passed, will be added pressure toward the area's development for recreation purposes. And that prospect may spur to greater effort those interested in its development for industrial uses.

In the meadowlands, happily, there is room for both types of development.

[From the Jersey Journal, Jan. 16, 1961]

HUDSON TUBES ARE A VITAL FACTOR

The ferry strike is turning out to be a boon to the Hudson & Manhattan Railroad because of the extra customers forced to use tubes. While commuters may complain about the packed cars, the fact is that there have been almost no delays and all those who usually ride the ferries are getting into New York.

Thirty extra trains a day are carrying about 25,000 of the 30,000 commuters whom the ferry strike has stranded. It means several thousand extra dollars in the tube's tills but that is not the important point. This is a good demonstration, abeit a forced one, that the Hudson & Manhattan Railroad can handle many more commuters and therefore should be a central factor in any plan for turning the States present rail routes into a rapid transit system.

This is a point that Mr. Stichman, the tube's referee in bankruptcy, has made repeatedly but which seems to have made little impression. The latest slight handed him was by the Port of New York Authority, which wanted to take over the railroad for the value of its real estate in Manhattan, paying nothing for the railroad itself. The tube's proved ability to handle all the commuters tossed its way indicates that it is a vital transportation link that should not be dismissed as of little value.

In connection with this is the bill that U.S. Senator WILLIAMS has introduced, calling for various loans and planning aids at a cost of $100 million to "improve essential mass transportation services." He says that "what we really need is a new outlook, a concern with how best to meet our total urban transportation needs in the most economical manner possible."

This is an important concept and one which seems to have eluded transportation studies so far made in New Jersey. People get to work, shop and visit by means of private autos, buses and trains. What is needed is a total solution to the problem rather than piecemeal props to support lagging elements of first one and then another transportation element. Senator WILLIAMS' bill may prove to be the stimulus to taking a new look at New Jersey's transportation problem.

[From the Record, Jan. 23, 1961]

SIMEON STYLITES: COLLISION WITH A WALL OF IGNORANCE

(By William A. Caldwell)

If a man empty his purse into his head, said Franklin, then no one can pilfer his wealth, and so much for research. "An investment in knowledge," the old gentleman added, "always pays the best interest." Look around you. Coal gave up on research. It's dead. Oil plows into research hundreds of millions. One hesitates to press Franklin's 302d law so far as to force any conclusions about the electronic media's gusto for research and the newspaper industry's lordly distastes, but Senator WILLIAMS, Democrat, of New Jersey, was talking the other day about the railroads.

They've come down with a bad attack of death wish, and nowhere does this show so clearly, even in their eager acquiescence to the harbor strikers, as it does in their numb incuriosity about themselves and the future.

Highway people, airplane people, chemistry and drug and electricity people talk about what they'll be doing 10 years from now, atomic energy people about 50 years from now, space people about 100 years from now.

It's a rash and radical young railroad man whose thinking ranges farther than the end of the week.

KNOW-HOW GOES ELSEWHERE

That's the U.S. railroad man. The French have evolved a railroad train that'll do 205 miles an hour over conventional standard-gauge track. They run a train, the Mistral, at a top speed of 100 miles an hour and an average of 80 over the 318 miles between Paris and Lyon. Their research has developed a method of electrifying rail lines at a fraction of the old cost and feeding them off the public utility power grid. In Portugal, Soviet Russia, Turkey, Japan, Communist China railroad research is speeding trains and lowering expenses. Brussels and Madrid have brought their railroads even with the century by wiping out their clutter of stub-end terminals and connecting their rails in cross-city networks. And Americans know what's going on; for these data we are indebted to an American, Stanley Berge, professor of transportation at the Northwestern University School of Business, writing in the May 1960 Harper's. We know research could save the railroads, at least the commuter railroads; but the railroads don't want to be saved.

It was in recognition of this pathetic fact that Senator WILLIAMS introduced his bill to set up a $75 million program of Federal grants for big research in metropolitan transportation.

"The truly unfortunate fact," he said, "is that we have no clear idea what should be done."

It is one thing for Professor Berge to recall the attention of the Port of New York Authority to its ancient vows:

"The New Jersey railroads, with the exception of the Pennsylvania, all terminate in stub-end stations west of the Hudson River. * * * Why should the Long Island Railroad continue to struggle with the obvious inefficiency of dead end terminal movements in the heart of Manhattan when its service could be made much better and less costly by swinging its trains under the Hudson and terminating their runs at various points on New Jersey railroads? Consider also the advantages that would be gained by extending the Grand Central tracks of the New York Central and the New Haven through a tunnel connection with through rail operations between Long Island and New Jersey. Such a terminal-unification project would finally consummate one of the major unrealized objectives of the Port of New York Authority's comprehensive plan of 1921."

IN DEFAULT OF ENTERPRISE

But, as a Washington transportation consultant named William B. Saunders told the Senate Commerce Committee January 18, in the absence of an industrywide research program the question is whether any existing agency is capable of phrasing the first question for researchers to tackle.

"Thus even the farflung port authority is not equipped to solve all the New York area's problems—even if it wanted to," said Mr. Saunders. Things have changed since 1921. The port authority could take over the railroads' passenger operations and finance them out of bridge and tunnel receipts, but to what end unless it could tell the States where and why to build highways and feeder roads? How could it keep people in cars out of the central city? How could it induce them to drive only as far as the railroad station parking lot? How could it apportion costs fairly among the big and little beneficiaries of reducing congestion?

Mr. WILLIAMS is right. Someone has a lot of thinking to do. In default of free enterprise, here in his white smock is your old friend Sam.

[From the Paterson (N.J.) News, Jan. 13, 1961]

SENATOR WILLIAMS TAKES A GOOD BITE AT TRANSPORTATION PROBLEM

Recognizing the urgency of the mass transportation crisis which, in spite of many solicitous intercessions, continues to deteriorate, New Jersey's junior Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS has introduced new legislation which could be the catalyst to bring the problem into proper focus.

The Senate last year passed Senator WILLIAMS' measure to provide $100 million for mass transportation loans. His latest bill is a supplement to the other, providing for low-cost, long-term loans up to $100 million the first year and up to $150 million in subsequent years.

We are always suspicious of the these governmental money-spending operations because they inevitably result in waste, if not corruptive spending. In the distribution of the largesse involved in such an extensive operation, substantial sums do a disappearing act while the sore remains only partially healed and continues painful.

Senator WILLIAMS, however, is thinking in terms of mass transportation and a thorough study. He won't be satisfied, he says, with providing funds for a sick railroad which will feel it has served its purpose if it adds a few pretty coaches to a train and then feels the problem has been solved.

The Williams thinking, and we like it, is to tie transportation into urban-suburban planning which is a No. 1 problem facing all growing areas, New Jersey especially.

It could be, Senator WILLIAMS feels, that railroads aren't the only medium that need attention,—it could be buses, it could be highways. Exploration and study could determine the truth.

Certainly the transportation problem is an A–1 headache. The railroads don't help themselves—they maintain disordered equipment, their relations with the traveling public are at bottom, no effort is made

to sell the benefits of rail travel in competition with, for instance, the aviation industry which spends fortunes for equipment and in dressing up its sales presence.

Nonetheless, railroads are essential to the transportation life of the country. They have their rights-of-way, their preservation as freight carriers is vital, they do not add to the congestion on the highway, and increased use of the rails might lead to easing of the burden on the roads.

Senator WILLIAMS' bill is aimed at finding a solution. If its enactment and execution could be achieved without it developing into a pork barrel in which, for support of it, millions are diverted to wayside stations, it could be a boon to the country.

Address by Vice Adm. Elton W. Grenfell, U.S. Navy, Commander, Submarine Force, U.S. Atlantic Fleet, at the Commissioning of the Submarine, U.S.S. "Abraham Lincoln" (SSB(N)602), at U.S. Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, N.H., on Saturday, March 11, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, March 11, I had the privilege of participating in the commissioning of the nuclear submarine, U.S.S. *Abraham Lincoln*, at the U.S. Naval Shipyard at Portsmouth, N.H.

It was an impressive event and I took renewed pride in the security which is on our side each time one of these great arms of our defense is put into service.

Naturally, I am pleased that one of these superior craft now carries the name of the most American American, Abraham Lincoln. The officers and men can take just pride in serving on the first major Navy ship ever to bear his name. I know that this craft will take its place in history, too.

At the commissioning, I listened to the address by Vice Adm. Elton W. Grenfell, and was impressed by his sincere and inspiring remarks. I think they deserve the attention of this body, so under leave to extend my remarks, I include Vice Admiral Grenfell's address in the Appendix of the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY VICE ADM. ELTON W. GRENFELL, U.S. NAVY, COMMANDER, SUBMARINE FORCE, U.S. ATLANTIC FLEET, AT THE COMMISSIONING OF U.S.S. "ABRAHAM LINCOLN" (SSB(N)602) AT U.S. NAVAL SHIPYARD, PORTSMOUTH, N.H., ON MARCH 11, 1961

One hundred years and seven days ago today, the man for whom this mighty ship is named stood on a temporary platform on the east front of the Capitol in Washington, and faced a Nation in crisis. The people who stood before him were anxious, because loosed within our land at that time were the elements of war which soon would test the strength of America to maintain herself, when confronted by forces which sought to tear her asunder. They were anxious to hear this man, this Abraham Lincoln, who had been chosen by them in this period of uncertainty and need; anxious to hear what he would say on that March day in 1861, to furnish them hope and guidance for the dark days which surely lay ahead.

Abraham Lincoln faced squarely the challenge of our anxious Nation, and the challenge of the awesome responsibilities which he was about to assume. He spoke, not in favor of one cause or another which would divide the Union; he spoke rather of the perfect identity of interests among the States which originally brought these States together. He cautioned calmness and courage, he asked for reason and patience, and in closing he professed the friendship and strength inherent in this Union of States, and held aloft to them the hope, that at the end of the troublesome days ahead America would prove to the world her right to harbor freemen. He closed this, his first inaugural address, with these words:

"We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection. The mystic cords of memory, stretching from every battlefield and patriot grave to every living heart and hearthstone, all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union, when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature."

It was thus that this 16th President of our country embarked on his great challenge, which would decide our country's ability to maintain a form of government which it had proved could be established and administered.

Today, this ship of peace which bears his name, the first major Navy ship ever to bear it, embarks on a challenge which seeks to perpetuate the heritage passed on to her by this great man.

As was his, hers is a quiet power. As did he reserve his immense strength and powerful conviction for those moments when it had to be used, so will she reserve her awesome strength forever; unless some unwise and miscalculating aggressor decides for her that she must do otherwise in order to preserve the ideals willed to her by this great man.

t would be presumptuous of me to try and capture for you today the poignant relationships which exist between this man, and this ship which bears his name.

They are many; and they differ only in that the knowledge of their existence is the stronger today as we commission the ship, *Abraham Lincoln*, because they have been expressed and imbedded into our culture so clearly by the man, Abraham Lincoln.

They both seek peace through power.

They both accept the challenge of troubled times unflinchingly.

They both demand the greatest exertion of talent and effort available in their respective times.

They both understand the sacrifices required sometimes if freemen are to remain free.

They both depend on people, expert people, to put into operation and to make work the principles which they inspire.

This man; this Abraham Lincoln was a man of the people. He understood them, and he derived his power from them. He felt it necessary to explain to them why things must be done; and he was not afraid to use words, and use ideas which coming from many men might sound emotional and even trite.

He lost no opportunity to talk, informally, to groups of soldiers passing through Washington, explaining to them the cause on which they were embarked, and the reason they must endure.

He said to the 166th Ohio Regiment in 1864, as it passed through Washington, that he wanted to impress on them the importance of success in this contest in which they were engaged; and he used these words:

"It is not merely for today but for all time to come, that we should perpetuate for our children's children, that great and free Government which we have enjoyed all our lives. I beg you to remember this, not merely for my sake, but for yours. I happen, temporarily, to occupy this White House. I am a living witness that any one of your children may look to come here as my father's child has. It is in order that each of you may have, through this free Government which we have enjoyed, an open field and a fair chance for your industry, enterprise, and intelligence; that you all may have equal privileges in the race of life, with all its desirable human aspirations. It is for this the struggle should be maintained, that we may not lose our berthright."

Yes, Abraham Lincoln was a man of the people; and this ship named for him understands its people too.

Working together in organizations dedicated to the same principle are the blue and gold crews which will man this ship on alternate patrols, as she carries out her duties for peace.

Welded together in a closely knit organization; sure of their knowledge, proud of their heritage, aware of their purpose, and fierce in their determination to uphold their part of this challenge for freedom passed onto them, these people who will comprise the blue and gold crews are indeed fortunate, that in the life of the man for whom their ship is named they find so many examples of the purpose for which their ship was built.

For those of you here at this fine naval shipyard who had a hand in bringing to fruition this moment when *Abraham Lincoln* joins the fleet; for those in the industrial and scientific pursuits of our country who are responsible for the concept and design which results in this fine ship; for Miss Mary Lincoln Beckworth, her sponsor and great-granddaughter of the immortal man whose name she bears, and for you Captain Erb and Captain Miller, your officers and men; your heritage is of the quiet, humble strength of a mighty American, and you are fortunate that this is so.

Often in the days ahead I am certain that you will draw on this inexhaustible source of enduring power, and like the invisible energy which forms the heart of the reliable system which moves you beneath the seas, it will never fail you.

Your ship is well named and your mission well defined; and in the words of him whose name and honor she bears, it remains only, for us here today, rather to be dedicated to the unfinished work which he, thus far, has so nobly advanced.

Captain Erb, Captain Miller, your officers and men, I congratulate you and I welcome you into the fleet. God bless you.

It Is the Eye Which Makes the Horizon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include the keynote address of Dr. Lewis H. Rohrbaugh, Boston University's vice president for academic affairs, delivered during founders' day ceremonies on March 13 at Boston University:

IT IS THE EYE WHICH MAKES THE HORIZON

(Founders' day convocation, Boston University, Mar. 13, 1961, by Lewis H. Rohrbaugh)

It was Emerson who said, "It is the eye which makes the horizon." I have chosen this phrase on which to base my thesis today because these founders' day comments are addressed to Boston University's future, and I am convinced that Boston University's eye will make its horizon. In other words, Boston University will become what we are agreed and determined it shall become.

With my statement of goals and of further steps toward them, not all will agree. This is to the good. On the one hand, agreement too often can spell lethargy and complacence. Disagreement, or even controversy, on the other hand, at the least means a dynamic situation, and at the most, when fairminded and objective persons are involved, can result in dynamic, constructive action.

Before looking to the future, it is fitting, this founders' day, to judge how well our present position meets the ideals of a great university as the founders envisioned them.

For this how useful it would be had we an educational long focal-length, wide-angle camera such as that used for other purposes by the unfortunate U–2 airplane. That U–2 camera, incidentally, initially was developed under a postwar Boston University optical research program under contract with the Air Force. The aim was to produce an aerial camera large enough to have a wide field, yet avoid the defect of all such cameras whose photos were in clear focus only in the center of the film.

Lacking a device of comparable breadth and depth, my assessment of how far and how well we in 1961 are warranted in feeling that we have implemented our founders' mandates, can be achieved, in this brief time, only by selected educational flashbacks.

I find it inspiring to know that these ideas, willed to us almost a hundred years ago today, have either been realized or are now guiding our thinking about the future of Boston University.

First, on institutional structure, our forebears wrote that "Boston University ought neither to generalize education merely, nor to specialize it merely, but do both at one and the same time." Their plan of organization was to have colleges which would prepare students for the "higher industries and arts of civilization and for the study of the professions"; professional schools which would qualify students theoretically and practically for professional life; and a graduate school, in those early days called a school of all sciences, which would focus on the universal or nonprofessional aspects of postgraduate studies.

From the beginning, this structural pattern was carried out faithfully. In 1878 Boston University was the only U.S. university to offer to theology, law, and medical students graded uniform courses covering 3 scholastic years and requiring for graduation 3 full years of study. Even the adequacy of this worried the founders, and the following year they added another year's study to the period required for a medical degree. Their insistence on separating into distinct schools but in the same university, their stressing the need to carry the general education of each pupil as high as possible before giving him the special, and this institutional pattern, by and large came to be that followed in most American universities.

The second objective of the founders was that Boston University should become an institution of many schools and colleges, and of many students. That objective has been reached: 14 schools and colleges, and numerous other institutes and bureaus and centers, 11,000 full-time and over 20,000 part-time students, and an annual budget above $20 million; surely these prove this. May I say parenthetically: it is no secret that the president and I, particularly at budgetmaking time, not infrequently are afflicted with an old-lady-in-the-shoe feeling. And remember, please, that one of every three New England school teachers has studied at Boston University, that similar large proportions of this region's doctors and nurses and lawyers and business chiefs have sat in one of these classrooms. This university's contribution? About its dimensions there is no question.

The founders laid great stress on standards of excellence. Let's consider their ideas about admissions requirements. I reckon that few entering freshmen at Boston University today could have qualified in those early years. I know that the vice president for academic affairs would have been denied admission.

Their admission requirements must seem ludicrous, or frightening, to us. What did they, and what do we, ask a student to show that he is ready for college work? Admission requirements then included sight translation of Caesar's first four Gallic War books, Cicero's Orations; from the Greek the first three books of Homer's "Iliad" and four books of Xenophon's "Anabasis," and translations from English into Latin. I am not sure that we in higher education today, relying increasingly on the intellectual thermometer of test scores, know any more of potential than in those earlier days. I do not mean to denigrate testing. I do object to overreliance on quantification, on numerical comparisons and competitions, and on the resultant tendency, whether in grades, athletic contests, bathtubs, or sputniks, to overstress on quantity and the "more-than" factor.

The fourth principle of the founders was that of proposing the impartial advantage of every class, nationality, and sex. From the outset they made clear their conviction, a lonely one then, that women could and should be educated. And they acted on this conviction. Boston University was the first institution in the world to open the entire circle of postgraduate schools to women, and, I believe, the first to award the doctorate degree to a woman, Helen Magill who in 1877 received the Ph. D. degree in classics and whose dissertation was "The Greek Drama."

The general principle of nondiscrimination has been followed zealously by Boston University. For example, today's 900 students from 80 foreign countries. Witness the President's visit last year to Africa where in every country to which his itinerary took him he found Boston University graduates in strategic educational and developmental posts. We all know how broadly our student body is representative of all faiths. To me, the best current illustration of how Boston University carries forward the flag first raised by the founders is the spontaneous faculty and student movement last year to bring to Boston University qualified Negro students who, because of participation in the sit-in demonstrations in the South, were expelled from their colleges.

Another early Boston University injunction was that the University shall not hesitate to experiment, to explore new and promising ventures in education. And our institution has never hesitated to explore, to pioneer, to extend and sometimes even to overextend. The record on the whole has been distinguished, and certainly lively. In those early days it was characterized by agreements with the universities of Athens and Rome under which our graduate students could take course work in those institutions and then, after examination, apply the work for Boston University degrees. The tide of pioneering still runs strong today. Mere reference to our internationally-known African Studies Center, to our pioneering 2-year-old Law-Medicine Research Institute, and to our new and nationally known 6-year liberal arts-medical education program which begins next fall, only illustrate this fact that we are still pioneering.

The last flashback and current assessment I should like you to consider has to do with liberal education. Today, of course, liberal arts education is a stock in trade for most colleges. But liberal education has had a cyclical history, and in many a college its emphasis today has a Johnny-come-lately look. It is the more remarkable then, that in those early days our founders were so convinced of the need of liberal education. Let me read from the first annual report of the university: "All persons proposing to study law (and other programs) are earnestly recommended to first complete a course of liberal studies in some college." Here, the record has been consistently a distinguished one, and today for that emphasis Boston University has no peer among the larger American universities.

All in all, we may feel fairly well satisfied with the extent to which the principles set forth by the founders have been carried out. But enough of the past. Let us address ourselves to the future.

The problems of higher education rapidly are taking on dimensions and intensities unthinkable even a generation ago. That we as a people have the resources and the abilities to solve these problems effectively there can be no slightest doubt.

Though by nature an optimist, I should be less than candid were I to view the future mission of the private, independent institution in general, and of Boston University in particular, with other than deep concern.

It is not the goals of higher education that concern me, for here there really is little controversy. We all want to help develop in the individual, creativity which is at once questioning and responsible. My concerns can be put more specifically. To a degree they represent the case history and prognosis of any privately supported independent university with inadequate endowment. But many aspects are unique to Boston University. As in looking at the past and present, in commenting on our future mission I shall select specific issues and highlights which appear to me to have great portent.

Our major need is to place in agreed and always clear focus the overall concept of the institution we are determined Boston University shall be. To my mind this concept is abundantly clear and wholly in keeping with the founders' objectives. Boston University must continue to be an urban institution, in an urban setting. An institution with always increasing standards of excellence, oriented particularly to the educational needs of the New England region, whence 76 percent of our undergraduates now come, with an extensive residential student body but a larger complement of commuting students. And with the strongest emphasis on meeting the educational needs and problems of those whose families are at neither end of the economic scale and who themselves, in potentiality, and, by and large, fall into the center part of the bell curve into which too many of us mentally cast all students.

This means many things. It means a pride in the label "streetcar" university. It means we hold as peculiarly applicable to our institution Henry Heald's definition of a city university as "one of the new immovable islands in a sea of urban change." We need to accept and rejoice in urbanization, to exploit to the fullest the advantages and unique offerings of a city setting, of this city of Boston. Accept that assumption, and what may we infer?

First, we must banish any lingering thoughts that a campus demands pfeitzer junipers and water fountains and rolling greensward. It means we must resist what

Henry Steele Commanger calls the inclination to fix the pastoral image of the American college, as versus its European antecedents and contemporaries, as a place where young men and women saunter over sweeping lawns or study in pennant-arranged rooms. This is is a persuasive stereotype. I can well remember when year by year the debate raged at my own University of Pennsylvania on the pros and cons of a move to Valley Forge.

Boston University cannot return to the institutional pattern of 19th century America. And if it tried to, it would be opposing all the trends of present-day America, with urbanization the order of the day. Boston University is, and will be, and should be, an urban university. The fundamental decision Boston University took on capital plant in the fall of 1959, to have a high-rise campus, to go up instead of out, has basic implications which we must now follow through, in all directions.

We believe that education is learning how to use knowledge. We realize that learning does not stop at the classroom door but encompasses the whole campus experience. And if we want to have younger people under the influence of a family of scholars, we must direct attention to conditions which produce and nurture such a family. To this end we must avoid, as someone has put it, turning a community of scholars into a collection of commuting scholars. For a substantial proportion of our faculty, we need to provide adequate housing on or near the campus.

Faculty concerns have many other facets. None is more important than salary. Despite significant improvements in the past 5 years, Boston University, and most other institutions, must make more progress. For college teachers and staff not only are underpaid in contrast to many other occupations, they have lost ground in terms of real income as prices have continued to spiral. This problem affects urban institutions perhaps more than others. One of the alternatives to which some teachers have had to turn, "academic moonlighting," can be lessened only as higher salaries are provided.

Faculties are at once the greatest resource and the most sensitive factors in university development. They are the university. The universities, Boston University, must attract and retain able men and women to meet the students of tomorrow, and—let's face it—only adequate salaries will achieve this.

Boston University needs to do much more, with other institutions and agencies, in the regeneration of the city and the region—pointed not only to the workshop role the city serves but to improving a cultural and intellectual center in which an academic community can flourish. We must avoid academic insulation and isolation. There is no question that Boston University, both on the Charles River and Medical campuses, could do much more, in company with other institutions and agencies, on urban renewal and general urban regeneration.

As an urban center of leadership, the university needs to rise above local prejudices and political fragmentations. To fulfill its role, it needs to set standards, to be a constructive critic, to speak out boldly on matters of principle. We need to make more contributions such as that of Professor Levin's publication on the alienated voter. We need to get our roots down further and our branches out. We are part of the city and region and not just by happenstance housed here.

Another question looking for an answer: How many students should Boston University have? We must turn even before that to know how many we could have, and how many we can effectively accommodate. And well ahead of either of these we must place the absolute imperative that before any major increase we must use more effectively, and where it counts, the resources we have, give better support to and strengthen our present programs.

A study made last winter, a study which concerned only the six New England States, indicates that, if the ratio of college-age young people coming to Boston University were to continue at the same rate, our full-time student body would by 1965 increase 30 percent from today's 11,000 to some 14,000. And by 1970 it would increase by 50 percent to some 16,000.

Should Boston University accommodate these additional students? I think our only answer must be an unqualified yes. But to make it, we must assume that we have the facilities, the physical plant, and the operating funds to do the job.

Another study made in December 1960 asked this question: How many students could the university, given adequate faculty and operating funds, accommodate in its present or firmly planned facilities; i.e., including the first of the new high-rise buildings, and the biological and physical science facilities being made ready across Commonwealth Avenue? The study gave us this answer: That on these bases we could accommodate, altogether, only 1,500 to 3,000 additional students; and with this important qualification: that where we can accommodate them, in our present organizational pattern, may not correspond to the schools where they would enroll.

If we assume that as part of our social responsibility we should attempt to accommodate larger numbers, provided we secure adequate resources first to strengthen properly our present program and then to meet expanding needs, we face the Scylla and Charybdis which confronts most other institutions, particularly those not publicly supported. Someone has said this means there is a ditch on both sides of the road. How to keep out of the ditches and yet move forward successfully requires that Boston University take stock of its resources, estimate closely what will be needed to arrive at its objectives, realize what gaps exist, and then fill the gaps. Here is an apt quotation from Alfred North Whitehead: "Where attainable knowledge could have changed the issue, ignorance has the guilt of vice."

Let's take a quick look at the comparable higher education picture nationally. It is generally reckoned that the 3.6 million students in higher education today will have doubled by 1970, and that the $3 billion spent annually today on higher education will have to be expanded three or four times by 1970 to an annual $11 billion. Taking publicly and privately supported institutions together, this would mean that for the Nation to meet an $11 billion bill, 22 percent (2.4) of income would need to come from tuition, 14 percent (1.6) from endowment and gifts and contracts and grants, and 8 percent (.9) from auxiliaries (dorms, food service, etc.), leaving an unmet gap of 52 percent ($6.1 billion).

How does this compare to Boston University's income pattern today? Though the correlation is not necessarily close, since the estimates I cited cover both private and public schools, the major difference is the part tuition plays. In the national picture, with an unmet gap of 52 percent, tuition income is reckoned at 22 percent. Last year tuition at Boston University already represented 60.2 percent of income while nationally tuition income constituted about 33 percent of the income of private institutions. The gap to come, between prospective dollar resources and costs, is a warning loud and clear.

What implications has this prognosis for Boston University. It means for us, as for every private and for that matter every public institution, that we must first examine and strengthen our own institutional resources. We need to test the adequacy of our institutional framework. In other words, and this cannot be said too often, we must make sure that we are using present resources where they are needed most and count the most. Having examined critically our needs and resources, both human and physical (and I am happy to say that vigorous work on this is currently going on), we need, I repeat, to mark our gaps and plan how to meet them.

When this is all done and toted up, I am reluctantly sure that we shall have to conclude that between income and outgo we have a gap which from presently foreseeable resources we cannot fill.

Higher tuition? Yes, tuition at Boston University will certainly go higher. But how much higher? And do we want the change in Boston University personality which "Too far up" could bring? An example of this change is seen in medical education. The abnormally high costs of a medical education, according to our medical dean, have lessened the number of applicants, decreased the ability of those applying, and in the end have meant that 40 percent of them come from the 3 percent of the Nation's families that earn above $10,000 per year. Do we want that to happen to the Boston University personality generally?

The prospect is a gloomy one. Indeed, in looking in the same vein at many a private college, one can only marvel at how year by year they have recently been able fiscally to defy the law of gravity. Many private colleges certainly will not be able to defy fiscal gravity much longer.

The only answer, and I would remind you that this is in addition to the university's having examined critically and where appropriate acted on the need for optimum use of its present resources, the only answer is to look to the American people to come to the conclusion that having used pennies where dollars are needed, we can afford to and will spend more on higher education, all higher education. The 1 percent of gross national product now spent on higher education is mute testimony. It may come to deciding whether to spend on higher education, the medium for our survival, or on other things.

Even if we can expand our current income sources, tuition, alumni and graduate aid, the gifts of philanthropic foundations and of business and industry, we will still have to be supported more by public funds. And this is not our problem only: realize that out sister institution across the Charles, one of the most heavily endowed, and having but last year successfully completed a campaign for 82.5 million, has already reached this same conclusion about its own future.

If substantial support were to go to privately supported institutions, why not convert all so-called private universities to public institutions? Because the strength of American higher education stems from the coexistence of strong public and strong private institutions. Privately supported colleges and universities enroll about 45 percent of the students. They will continue to provide the education and the educational flexibility which have marked their history.

Would public support not introduce a new element into privately supported institutions? Not at all, if the forms of support were wisely wrought. There is now no publicly supported institution which does not get aid from private sources. And there is no privately supported university which gets no public support, both direct and indirect. No institution is strictly private, none is strictly public.

Then privately controlled institutions are in the public interest? Decidedly so. Would this answer shock our Boston Uni-

versity forebears? Listen to these words of our first president, William Fairfield Warren: "For the (university) property belongs not to private citizens but to representatives of the State. It once belonged to private individuals but in their unselfish public spirit they have expropriated it and set it apart forever to public uses, approved by the State and honored by the State. The State by incorporating appropriate bodies of managers for it and prescribing laws for its administration, have ratified the donors' action and have accepted the custody and perpetual defense of the gift."

To sum up, every university, public and private, will find that between its present and foreseeable resources and the need society expects it to meet, there will be a gap of monumental dimensions. With Boston University as our case in point, the dilemmas we face are grave. The steps to meet the chosen solutions are absolute imperatives.

Some of the steps open to us are internal, and under our direct control. They include first the need to retrench, reasonably, criticially to assess every present activity of the university and discontinue or reduce those activities not constituting a significant part of the educational program or of its support and servicing. They include the need to examine and where possible improve the use of faculty and staff and present space and time arrangements.

But even with optimum progress toward improved use of these internal resources in closing the gap, these internal steps will be insufficient. Our commitment to capital plant now and to come, and our rising operating costs, will make of these efforts only a shoring-up process.

We must look for substantial aid elsewhere. We must reinforce and redouble our efforts to make clear the case for more alumni support. We have a right to expect that business and industrial support will rise far above the 1 percent of income before taxes it now approximates, particularly with the broad tax provisions on this score. And we have a right to expect that the tax-exempt foundations, whose grants to universities have meant so much, will swing gradually to a rhythm of general institutional support to be expended in ways judged best by the institutions, and away from grants for projects which the foundations prefer to have explored and implemented.

But most of all we need to look to public sources for massive help in meeting the gap between income and outgo. In the public domain there are three logical sources, the city, the State, and the Federal Government. There are many logical and compelling reasons why the city of Boston should contribute. They range all the way from the interest of society to the services we render to the city, such as the vast medical services provided in the South End by the home care program of our School of Medicine. Nonetheless, realistically I cannot envision in the years immediately ahead when we will need it most, any prospect of direct financial support from the city.

State aid, however, is quite a different matter. We have a right, all of us as taxpayers, to expect the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the other five New England States first to make the higher education dollar stretch as far as possible and at the same time to be multiplied. This means many things. It means, for example, that jointly through our New England Board of Higher Education, a more searching look ought to be taken at what we do now, what we might do differently through our public institutions. In the most heavily and increasingly industrialized and urbanized region in the Nation, do we still need six agricultural colleges, for example?

And beyond the optimum use of present State institutions and dollars, it is no new thing to conceive of the State as contributing to the support of private institutions functioning clearly in the public interest. Since 1785 my own alma mater, the University of Pennsylvania, has received aid annually from the Commonwealth, with no trace ever of interference with university policy. There is another less direct form of State support which, accepting the premise of a private institution in the public service, to my mind is logical. It is that of tuition aid, paid directly by the State to students admitted to college and with the student entering the college of his own choice. This would not be an innovation. And it would be on the basis of the well-being of society both in terms of helping to provide the personnel needs of our modern society and of the fact that the added tax return to the State from these young people would more than meet the added costs of their education.

But most of all it is to our Federal Government we must look for help to close the gap. First of all, the Federal Government can help by correcting the freeloading in which it now indulges at the expense of the universities. Examples are numerous. ROTC programs conducted in cooperation with the Armed Forces for years have represented another plate at the table for which the costs exceed the board bill. And this year's laudable trend to substitute university-taught for ROTC-taught courses lightens further the Government load and transfers it to the universities. So, too, with many programs in which, to strengthen secondary education rather than higher education, universities including our own participate under the National Defense Education Act. A third well-known example is the Federal contracts and grants research representing in so many instances services purchased for which the Government should bear the total costs.

Over and above these situations needing adjustment is the urgent need for massive aid to higher education on the simple but fundamental ground that higher education is in the national interest, is indeed the main medium for the survival of our American and Western civilization. The variety of forms of assistance are many. I am highly in favor of the recent higher education proposals of the Federal administration, modest and overcautious and conservative as they are. Especially significant for institutions such as ours are the programs of long-term, low-interest loans for the construction or renovation of academic facilities, and the extension and supplementation, with operating grants to the institutions, of Federal scholarship programs. And essential, of course, is the discontinuance of the inappropriate and unnecessary disclaimer affidavit.

On the matter of separation and distinction between public and private institutions, the effective British and Canadian programs of public support to both are evidence of what can be done. It is likely that the Federal Government will serve as the chief source of the public costs of higher education. There is every reason why State and local governments should bear significant fiscal responsibilities also. For it is the whole community which has a basic concern for and benefits from higher education.

These founders' day thought have had many implications for the future of Boston University. The options are here. "Babylon had its opportunity and built the Tower of Babel. The University of Paris had its opportunity and in many ways set the thinking of the Middle Ages. American higher education has its opportunity at a most critical time in the history of civilization." And Boston University has its share of this opportunity and challenge. For over 90 years Boston University has met challenges thoughtfully and successfully. The years immediately ahead hold crossroads more significant than any the university has faced. It is our eye which will make our horizon.

Tribute to New York State Commissioner of Commerce: Keith McHugh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it can well be said that the dynamism of our economy derives from the dynamism of our people. It is the mind of man, his imagination, his energy which are the prime movers in lifting our individual communities, our States, our Nation to higher levels of economic growth and achievement. In this vital role of the individual citizen in promoting the advancement of progress, Mr. Keith McHugh, New York State Commissioner of Commerce represents an excellent example of what one able and dedicated public servant can accomplish.

Since his appointment to his present post by Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller in 1959, Keith McHugh has committed his great vigor and distinguished talents to such a degree that the State of New York has experienced a tremendous forward thrust in its economic development. In tribute to the success of Mr. McHugh's work as New York State Commissioner of Commerce, the General Electric Schenectady News of March 3, 1961, published an article entitled "McHugh's Job (and Yours): Building State's Economy." In view of the pertinence of this article in terms of the current national emphasis on economic growth, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MCHUGH'S JOB (AND YOURS): BUILDING STATE ECONOMY

(By Bob Dixson)

Ask New York State's commissioner of commerce what the average citizen can do to help spur the State's economic growth and he'll say—"That's easy. Become a booster, not a knocker."

Although Keith McHugh says it with a smile he means it with sincerity. He feels quite strongly about this point. In fact, he believes that citizens and government officials being "boosters" rather than "knockers" was one of the main factors in some other States—such as California—attracting so much new business in the past few years.

DEEP CONCERN

McHugh, who gave up the presidency of the New York Telephone Co. to become commissioner of commerce at probably a fraction of his former pay, loves his job. Seated at his desk in a downtown Albany office building, he'll talk for hours on a subject of deep concern to New Yorkers in recent years—the State's economic growth.

McHugh is a Coloradoan by birth, a New Yorker by adoption, and an "incurable optimist" by admission. Despite New York's age and trends in population in recent years toward the south and west, he believes the State can—and will—continue its economic growth and maintain its position as America's leading industrial State.

EVERYBODY'S RESPONSIBILITY

However, Commissioner McHugh believes that economic growth is not something to be done solely by the Department of Com-

'merce. It is something a State, a community, business and labor groups and every individual can—and should—take a part in.

What can individuals do? Well, first of all, "they should make sure they are doing their own job the best they know how," says McHugh. Then, they can take a good look at their own community to make certain it has the right type of environment to promote economic growth. After this, they can become boosters and not knockers.

McHugh also believes that individuals, including businessmen, can make important contributions toward improving their State and community and promoting economic growth by becoming more aware of what government is doing and by taking an active interest in governmental affairs.

TAKE POSITIVE APPROACH

The commissioner will admit that there are still problems to be overcome in order to maintain New York's position of industrial leadership. However, as an "incurable optimist" he prefers to take a positive approach rather than a negative one.

McHugh believes New York has taken significant steps in recent years to become more attractive to new and expanding industries. But, he also believes that continuing efforts are necessary, both on the State and local level. For example, he likes to see communities taking a good hard look at their assets and liabilities for attracting industries and then taking steps to correct the liabilities.

NEED FOR DEVELOPMENT GROUPS

McHugh is a strong believer in industrial development groups, such as the Schenectady Industrial Development Council. New York now has 65 such groups which, in many cases, the Department of Commerce has helped form, but, "we ought to have probably 250 or 300 such corporations instead of just 65."

Why did McHugh accept a considerable personal sacrifice? "Well, because Governor Rockefeller said to me, 'Mr. McHugh, I believe two things about our free enterprise system quite strongly. First of all, I believe the reason our country is the greatest nation in the world is that we believe not only in the freedom of the individual, but the freedom of businesses to grow with a minimum of interference from outside sources. And secondly, I believe that Russia won't attack us with arms until they beat us at our own economic game, using their controlled economy rather than our free enterprise system. I want to do everything I can to show the Russians they can't beat us.' "

It didn't take McHugh long to decide that "by golly, I want to help." He has yet to regret his decision.

Commissioner McHugh has several personal objectives for New York State. He wants: The highest possible income for our people, the highest standard of living possible, as stable as possible an economy, and maximum employment consistent with a high level of economic activity.

He believes that hand in hand with these objectives will be the maintenance "of the highest standards of education and culture."

WHAT HAS BEEN DONE?

What has Commissioner McHugh done in the last 2 years to promote these objectives?

"Well, the first thing I thought important to do was to find out the facts about our business climate." Representatives of the commerce department made over 1,400 depth interviews with various businessmen and groups. It invited their gripes, not their comments on the good things in New York.

His chief caution in forming such groups is that communities in the same general area should not get involved in competing with each other for industry. The problem can be solved in many instances by an area-wide industrial group, rather than a strictly local one.

Who should be a part of these organizations? Representatives of every segment of the community, according to McHugh. And this includes labor because "labor, in the long run, has the biggest stake of anybody" in economic growth.

McHugh had only a speaking acquaintance with Governor Rockefeller when the State's new chief executive invited him to lunch one day in the spring of 1959 and asked him to accept the job as commissioner of commerce.

Surveyors found that businessmen interested in expanding their businesses were first of all concerned with the administration of certain State services, "particularly unemployment insurance and workmen's compensation." They also had some general complaints on tax levels and, to McHugh's surprise, a number of complaints that dealt with local government problems rather than State government.

The department then went to work to correct some of these deficiencies and to let local communities know what businessmen were saying.

The results?

McHugh points out that in the past 2 years business has invested more than $4 billion for new plants and equipment and research establishments in the State.

TWENTY NEW PLANTS

In 1960, the department of commerce, in cooperation with local groups, brought 20 major plants into New York. These plants will have an initial employment of 2,300 and an expected employment of about 4,500 "within a reasonable length of time."

Additionally, McHugh says the department, acting in a "trouble shooting" role, "saved" for New York State communities "scores of firms that threatened for local or other reasons, to leave the State." One was a firm with more than 5,000 employees which McHugh personally had a leading part in saving.

TWENTY-SEVEN RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS

In the last 18 months, 27 new research and development institutions have been announced in New York, including General Electric's materials and processes and manufacturing laboratories in Schenectady and the company's new electronics laboratory at Syracuse.

The Commerce Department has been giving a great deal of attention to encouraging new research and development institutions, McHugh says, because they not only develop the new products which in turn result in jobs, but also provide a significant attraction to new industries.

NEW YORK LEADS

He points out that a recent survey has shown that New York is now the leading State in research and development with more than 1,000 laboratories.

Governor Rockefeller last year appointed an Advisory Council for the Advancement of Industrial Research and Development that includes, among others, General Electric vice presidents George L. Haller, of Syracuse and C. Guy Suits of the research laboratory in Schenectady, and B. H. Caldwell, general manager of KAPL.

McHugh believes that research and development facilities along with an atmosphere of "boosting California" have been the chief ingredients in that State's ability to land so much of the missile business in recent years.

KEEP PLANTS HERE

Although attracting new industry is usually considered to be the most important part of the commerce department's activities, McHugh believes that maintaining the industries the State already has is equally important. Thus, he points to the decisions of the Remington-Rand typewriter plant to remain at Elmira and Endicott-Johnson at Endicott. The latter, he adds, is an example of what local groups can accomplish.

Commissioner McHugh won't necessarily subscribe to the theory that there has been a "lag" in economic growth in New York in the past few years, but he would be the first to agree that changes and innovations are constantly needed in order to promote growth.

New York's Temporary Commission on Economic Expansion recently submitted to Governor Rockefeller what Commissioner McHugh terms "an exceedingly fine" report containing 27 recommendations for promoting economic growth. And McHugh believes the report will be "useful to all persons interested in the State's development and improvement."

PROMOTES NEW YORK

As for the recommendations that pertain to his own department, they are either already in effect or well on the road to being in effect. He points specifically to increased efforts to promote New York State as a good place for expanding businesses. The department recently opened new offices in Chicago and Los Angeles to aid these efforts, Mr. McHugh says.

BELIEVER IN DIPLOMACY

Commissioner McHugh could perhaps be described as a believer in personal diplomacy. He maintains offices and residences both in Albany and New York City. He shuttles between the two each week in a small airplane.

He also uses the plane to travel around the State as much as possible, discussing the State's economic problems with various groups and attending dedication ceremonies for new expansion projects. The plane allows him to make a speaking engagement that night.

His hobbies include fishing, shooting, and golf in that order, but his chief hobby is work, as his associates will testify. And he particularly likes his work in aiding New York's economic growth.

New Frontier for American Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, a substantial number of Members of Congress cheered Tuesday night as the Honorable W. W. Keeler, chairman of a task force studying American Indian problems, outlined plans for the most intensive survey of Indian problems in a generation.

Speaking to the executive council of the National Congress of American Indians and their congressional guests, Mr. Keeler outlined plans of the task force group named by Interior Secretary Stewart Udall, and emphasized his belief that the final answer to Indian problems must be found among the Indian people themselves.

Earlier Tuesday, Mr. Keeler and Acting Indian Commissioner John Crow, had told members of the Oklahoma congressional delegation of their intention to visit and hold meetings with Indian groups all over the country, beginning on

March 20, in order to receive grassroots recommendations and suggestions for ways to bring an imaginative, New Frontier approach to the field of Indian problems.

Leaders of the task force have emphasized their conviction that no Indian program will work effectively without the understanding and approval of the Indian people, and this represents a decisive step forward in this field.

At Tuesday's meeting, the Honorable Earl Boyd Pierce, of Muskogee, Okla., presented to Mr. Keeler a letter representing views of the executive meeting of the National Congress of American Indians, and Mr. Keeler also received a letter expressing appreciation of the group for the designation of NCAI President Clarence Wesley as a consultant to the task force.

The letter read to the NCAI's meeting by Mr. Pierce highlights some of the important American Indian viewpoints which must be considered and dealt with by the task force, and these viewpoints are worthy of study by everyone interested in the American Indian.

The text of the NCAI letter to Mr. Keeler follows:

MARCH 14, 1961.

Hon. W. W. KEELER,
Chairman, Indian Study Task Force,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KEELER: As you know, the executive council of the National Congress of American Indians has been in regular, convened session in Washington, D.C., for the past 2 days. It is the belief of the council that your task force will welcome a brief expression of the views of the members of the council concerning the mission of the task force before it visits the different reservations and Indian communities in our Nation.

We trust that your task force, in its work which lies immediately ahead, will give earnest consideration to the deep concern of Indians everywhere, that your investigation in the field will touch the crux of every problem that has vexed the Indian leaders and other sympathetic, interested groups in this Nation in the areas of bureau administration, health, education, welfare, the restoration, consolidation, and conservation of land resources, heirship difficulties, suppression of Indian freedom of expression, Indian credit, depressed areas, relocation, termination, unemployment, housing and other serious problems, to the end that both the American Indian and the American taxpayer can be satisfied that at last a serious effort is being made to solve perplexing American Indian problems.

It is our hope and our belief that your honorable body has entered upon an undertaking willed by a sympathetic administration of our Nation's affairs and that the American people, including our Indian citizens, will expect a report from your hands that will speedily bring to fruition the fondest hopes and aspirations of our Indian people. It is our firm belief that the constituted authorities of the several Indian tribes of this Nation will gladly give to your task force the highest degree of cooperation and that Indian tribal leaders are anxious for the opportunity to assist your body at any time or place.

For a fuller expression of our views we most respectfully submit to you and your associates a copy of the resolutions of the National Congress of American Indians adopted in convention in Denver, Colo., on November 14 through 18, 1960. We earnestly solicit your thoughtful consideration of Resolutions 1, 2, 24, and 25 thereof, in particular.

We are most grateful to President Kennedy and to Secretary Udall for their wisdom in launching the investigation which your task force is now undertaking.

We are, sir,

Most respectfully yours,

NATIONAL CONGRESS OF AMERICAN INDIANS,
CLARENCE WESLEY, *President.*

The Constructive Opposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, there has been much discussion in recent weeks of the role of Republican Members of Congress as the "loyal opposition." I believe a more descriptive phrase is "constructive opposition." All of us, I am sure, feel a strong responsibility as minority Members of the National Legislature to find the most effective means of presenting the views of the constituents who elected us to office. We seek to present those views in a positive manner, in the best interest of our constitutents, and the country as a whole. Despite charges to the contrary, this represents no form of obstructionism but rather is a presentation of what we believe to be the convictions of the majority of the people of our part of the country in the way of Federal programs.

The February issue of the Kiwanis magazine, the publication of Kiwanis International and one of the finest of all service organization periodicals, contains an editorial setting forth this point in thought-provoking and forthright language. It is written by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [KARL MUNDT]. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONGRESS WILL RESPOND

(By Hon. KARL E. MUNDT, U.S. Senator from South Dakota, past governor, Minnesota-Dakotas District of Kiwanis International)

The 87th Congress is the first in many years to begin operations with a so-called undivided Government. It finds the Democratic Party enjoying control over both legislative Houses and the White House. This fact brings to mind a number of significant questions, not the least of which are: Will this bring about more responsible government? Will it reduce the role of the Republican Party to that of a negative, nagging, antagonistic opposition, and thereby subvert the direction of our national purpose to petty squabbles along party lines?

In attempting to answer these questions, one must, it seems to me, appeal to history. In our own history, the history of America, we find that both systems of government—divided and undivided—have been made to work effectively. Then, too, there have been instances where each has failed. In my own experience of 22 years in the U.S. Congress, I have found that successful government has been attained because of—and not in spite of—sound, responsible party politics.

There can be no doubt that both parties want a better America, a prosperous America, one that continues to move ahead. The differences between the two parties do not really concern goals, but how best to attain these goals; it is a difference not of ends but of means. And, more often than not, much of our National legislation is the result of working out these differences through debate and compromise to achieve good government and a productive, free America.

The key to disagreement in majority-and-minority government is responsibility. When accepted and practiced, responsibility brings to the Nation united effort working for the national good. And responsibility in Government has a peculiar way of making itself felt. It is for this reason that, as the 87th Congress opens with a new President in the White House, I am not seriously alarmed at the prospect of congressional divisiveness along party lines. For when the chips are down on issues of major significance, responsibility will, as it always has in the past, emerge. And it is my conviction that, as usual, it will cross party lines.

This is not to say that there will be no major differences over the role Government is to play in the future. But, at the same time, these differences do not stand in the way of progressive programs, for responsibility rests with the President as well as with Congress. A President cannot afford to launch programs that are not, so to speak, "in tune with the times." This has, of course, happened, and it has usually been accompanied with a resultant change in the White House. It has also happened in Congress. But here, too, the American voter asserted his responsibility—when the politician has not asserted his—by stepping into the polling booth and removing from public office those officials who trifled with the national interest by playing politics in the legislature.

And here is the main reason why I expect the 87th Congress to be a typical Congress, a Congress that will be responsible. I refer to the voter. Responsibility begins and ends with the voter. It is still the greatest system devised for successful and productive government. For in our renowned check system of government, the voter is the final check. If responsibility is not exercised where laws are made, then it will surely be exercised by private citizens on the homefront where lawmakers are made.

Hungarian Freedom Day

SPEECH
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, all peoples throughout history have aspired and struggled for their freedom, but no people have fought for so long in modern times and have staked so much for their freedom as have the people of Central and Eastern Europe. And nowhere has national freedom been in such constant jeopardy as in that part of the world. This is true in the case of many peoples there, and certainly it characterizes the modern history of the Hungarian people.

For centuries these sturdy peasants of Hungary maintained their national independence, fighting their enemies on the east and in the southwest. Early in modern times a part of Hungary was overrun by the Turks, but they still maintained their independence until late in the 17th century when they were brought under the Austrian monarchy. Then for about 200 years they lived as unruly subjects of the government in Vienna, and strove to regain their freedom. In this they were not successful until 1848. In that year the European revolution offered them the chance to free themselves. Disturbances and uprisings in many parts of the Austrian empire weakened the government in Vienna, and the Hungarian patriots in Budapest were ready to take advantage of the situation. Early in March they petitioned the government and demand freedom. On the 15th they were granted freedom and autonomy, and that day of victory and jubilation became a Hungarian national holiday, their Freedom Day. Though the freedom thus regained was lost in the following year, to this day the Hungarian people celebrate the anniversary of March 15, the date that marked their freedom 113 years ago.

Statement on Supreme Court Decisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by the American Civil Liberties Union Board of Directors on the Supreme Court decisions in the Wilkinson and Braden cases, and the House Un-American Activities Committee:

STATEMENT BY ACLU BOARD OF DIRECTORS ON SUPREME COURT DECISIONS IN WILKINSON AND BRADEN CASES, AND THE HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE

The February 27 decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court affirming by a 5-to-4 vote the contempt of Congress conviction of Frank Wilkinson and Carl Braden for refusing to answer the questions of the House Un-American Activities Committee are a deep disappointment to the American Civil Liberties Union.

While the narrow vote and the penetrating dissenting opinions make clear that the first amendment has its strong defenders, this does not greatly lessen our dejection that in the area of legislative investigatory committees the Court once again has assigned the constitutional rights of the individual to a secondary position.

The first breach of the vital first amendment principle that citizens are free of government compulsion to bare their political beliefs and associations came in the 1959 Barenblatt case, for which the ACLU provided legal defense. The Court held then that the compelling need for national security outweighed first amendment guarantees, and that Congressional investigating committees in this area have wide and pervasive power. We disagreed with that decision because of our belief that the HUAC's mandate, to investigate "un-American propaganda," directly violated the first amendment. However, we were somewhat encouraged that the Court recognized the danger to our free society of incursions on the first amendment by its statement that it would examine carefully other cases in this area brought before it so that the decision could not be used as a blanket to smother unpopular expression.

Evidently this caution has been discarded, for in the Wilkinson case, for which the ACLU also assumed legal defense, the majority, after once more upholding the HUAC's authority, flatly says that critics of the HUAC are not immune from investigation merely because they are "opposed to the existence of the Un-American Activities Committee." This point was not argued in the Wilkinson case but the practical effect of the majority's statement is to silence all critics not prepared to testify about their motivations.

Thus the wheel turns full circle, from validating the authority of a congressional committee to investigate "un-American propaganda" to compelling political disclosure by persons who dare use their first amendment guarantee of free speech to criticize such investigation. This gross attack on the first amendment is sharply illustrated by the fact that Wilkinson was not subpenaed until after the HUAC had learned he had arrived in Atlanta to "develop a hostile sentiment to the Committee for the purpose of undertaking to bring pressure upon the United States Congress to preclude these particular hearings."

The impact of such governmental pressure on individual opinion was incisively and eloquently stated in the minority opinions of Justices Black and Douglas, which the ACLU heartily endorses and commends to all for reading:

Justice Black said: "In my view, the majority by its decision today places the stamp of constitutional approval upon a practice as clearly inconsistent with the Constitution, and indeed with every ideal of individual freedom for which this country has long stood, as any that has ever come before this Court. I think it is clear that this case involves nothing more or less than an attempt by the Un-American Activities Committee to use the contempt power of the House of Representatives as a weapon against those who dare to criticize it. The majority does not and, in reason, could not deny this for the conclusion is all but inescapable for anyone who will take the time to read the record. They say instead that it makes no difference whether the committee was harassing the petitioner solely by reason of his opposition to it or not because it is not for us to speculate as to the motivations that may have prompted the decision of individual members of the subcommittee to summon the petitioner. The clear thrust of this sweeping abdication of judicial power is that the committee may continue to harass its opponents with absolute impunity so long as the 'protections' of Barenblatt are observed."

Justice Douglas said: "Criticism of government finds sanctuary in several portions of the first amendment. It is part of the right of free speech. It embraces freedom of the press. Can editors be summoned before the committee and be made to account for their editorials denouncing the committee, its tactics, its practices, its policies? If petitioner can be questioned concerning his opposition to the committee, then I see no reason why editors are immune. The list of editors will be long as evident from the editorial protests against the committee's activities, including its recent film 'Operation Abolition'."

To state that the Wilkinson decision (and the decision in the companion Braden case) is a serious defeat for free speech in our country is to state the obvious. Unless new legal challenges can be developed, and we certainly will explore this possibility, it seems, as Justice Black says, "The only real limitation upon the committee's power to harass its opponents is the committee's own self-restraint," but, as he gloomily adds, this is a "characteristic which probably has not been predominant in the committee's work over the past 5 years." Justice Black's doubts unhappily seem true as witness the remarks of the present committee chairman in attacking the HUAC's major critic, Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, that the latter did not believe that communism was evil and un-American.

But there is one other approach: For the people themselves, and their representatives in Congress, to recognize their responsibilities to maintain the freedoms of the Bill of Rights. It is true that the HUAC has just received an overwhelming endorsement by approval of its $331,000 budget—the largest in its history (and we salute the gallant handful of Congressmen who recorded their opposition, Representatives ASHLEY, GREEN, KASTENMEIR, O'HARA, ROOSEVELT, and RYAN). But the ACLU does not believe the campaign is ended; only one battle has been lost.

We sense a new vitality in many parts of the country, a deep conviction that the HUAC's depredations must be ended. People, organizations, newspapers and magazines, who are not Communists or Communist dupes and fully understand the evil of all totalitarianism, are simply concerned that freedom prevail in our country, especially at this time of history when our principles are being tested in the fires of international conflict. They are utilizing their first amendment right to express opposition to the HUAC. We urge them, and others, to join with the AGLU—despite the setback in the Wilkinson and Braden cases—to press our effort even harder. We ask them to renew their hope and courage through these words of Justice Black's:

"This country was not built by men who were afraid and it cannot be preserved by such men. Our Constitution, in unequivocal terms, gives the right to each of us to say what we think without fear of the power of Government. That principle has served us so well for so long that I cannot believe it is necessary to allow any governmental group to reject it in order to preserve its own existence. Least of all do I believe that such a privilege should be accorded the House Un-American Activities Committee. For I believe that true Americanism is to be protected, not by committee that persecute unorthodox minorities, but by strict adherence to basic principles of freedom that are responsible for this Nation's greatness."

H.R. 5637 Would Protect the General Public and the Transportation Companies in the Event of Accidents Resulting From the Transportation of Nuclear or Other Unusually Hazardous Products and Materials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on March 15 I introduced a bill (H.R. 5637) that would authorize the Department of

Defense to extend protection to the public by indemnifying transportation companies against public liability arising from the risks involved in the transportation of nuclear or other unusually hazardous products and materials and to limit the liability of transportation companies so indemnified. Before commenting on the provisions of my bill, it seems to me that it is worthwile to address myself to some prior legislation dealing with the general subject of indemnification with respect to unusually hazardous risks. Such indemnification is in some instances already provided by law with respect to some governmental agencies and in others has been suggested for governmental agencies.

In an act of July 16, 1952 (66 Stat. 726), a bill was enacted to facilitate the performance of research and development work by and on behalf of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. One section of that statute provided that contractors who entered into agreements for research, development or test facilities could be indemnified, first, against liability on account of claims by third persons, including employees of the contractor, for death, bodily injury, or loss of or damage to property arising as the result of a risk defined in the contract to be unusually hazardous or, second, for loss of or damage to property of the contractor arising as the result of a risk defined in the contract to be unusually hazardous. The act of July 16, 1953, was slightly amended by an act of August 10, 1956 (70A Stat. 134), but the general principles contained in the 1952 act are still applicable.

By an act of September 2, 1957 (71 Stat. 576), the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, was amended to provide protection to the public by providing that the Atomic Energy Commission could indemnify its contractors and licensees to the extent of $500 million in order to indemnify such licensees and contractors against public liability arising out of a nuclear incident. A nuclear incident was defined in the statute as meaning any occurrence within the United States causing bodily injury, sickness, disease or death, loss of or damage to property or for loss of use of property arising out of or resulting from the radioactive, toxic, explosive or other hazardous properties of source, special nuclear or byproduct materials. The persons indemnified under the amendment to the Atomic Energy Act were to be those with whom an indemnification agreement had been executed and any other person who might be liable for public liability.

In the last Congress the Secretary of Defense submitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives a bill which would broaden the scope of the indemnification authority contained in the 1952 act to which I have already referred. In submitting that bill to the Speaker, the Secretary of Defense accompanied it with a memorandum in which he stated that the items and materials which in 1952 were in a research or developmental status have now advanced beyond that status. He added that nevertheless the unusually hazardous risks remain, and the Department of Defense would be unable to enter into many supply or construction contracts involving atomic energy systems or weapons, missiles, special propellants and other projects involving unusually hazardous risks unless it could provide indemnification to its contractors where such unusually hazardous risks were involved. He said that contractors in extra hazardous fields were hesitant about contracting with the Government because of the risk that unexpected accidents in this type of activity might cause them enormous liability and loss and only by assumption of this extra risk, that is, indemnification of such contractors, could Government assure itself of a continuing willingness of defense contractors to participate in such projects. The bill submitted to the Speaker was introduced and carried the number H.R. 4103. It provided that the Secretary of Defense and the secretaries of the military departments would be authorized to enter into agreements of indemnification with contractors and subcontractors of the Department of Defense up to an aggregate obligation of $500 million with respect to any one accident. Indemnification could be provided against liability to third persons including employees of the contractor for death, bodily harm or loss of or damage to property and loss of or damage to property of the contractor arising from risks which the agreement defines as nuclear or other unusually hazardous risks. Congress took no action with respect to H.R. 4103 and the Defense Department has this year again asked for favorable consideration of such a bill.

I, of course, do not know whether Congress will see fit to pass a bill such as has been suggested by the Department of Defense but I do know that there is at least one area in which prompt action should be taken by Congress. Congress should see to it that the general public and the transportation companies are protected in the event of an accident arising out of the transportation by such carriers of nuclear and other materials which can result in unusually hazardous risks. Obviously, a contractor manufacturing nuclear and other unusually hazardous materials will be doing such manufacturing at a fixed site. That contractor will have full knowledge of the materials he is manufacturing but a transportation company that carries similar materials will, in the normal course of events, have no specific information as to what it is carrying. Further, a manufacturing process carried on at a fixed site obviously permits, to an extent not possible in the area of transportation, establishment of safety practices and precautions designed to reduce the degree of hazard and the possibility of accident. In addition, it is obvious that the general public will be less exposed to an accident involving nuclear or other unusually hazardous materials if those materials are at a fixed site rather than being transported by a carrier. What I mean by that is this: a contractor manufacturing hazardous materials is at one location and the only portion of the public that could possibly be injured or damaged by an accident involving those materials is that group of people immediately adjacent to the manufacturing plant. On the other hand, when carriers, whether they be trucks, railroads, water carriers, or airlines, transport such hazardous materials, they may carry them for thousands of miles and through many communities, towns, and cities thereby making a much larger portion of the general public exposed to an accident involving such materials. These are the reasons I have introduced a bill that would protect the general public and the transportation companies in the event of accidents resulting from the transportation of such hazardous materials.

I am sure it is well known that transportation companies are now and will in the future be expected to carry nuclear and other materials which involve unusually hazardous risks. It seems clear to me that in order to protect the public and to permit the orderly development, production and deployment of defense weapons in the interest of the general welfare and the common defense and security the Department of Defense should be given the authority to idemnify the transportation companies in order to limit their liability and to make funds available for the damages suffered by the public as the result of any accident arising out of the dangerous properties of nuclear or other unusually hazardous products or materials. That is precisely what my bill would do. It would define the term "public incident" as meaning any occurrence causing bodily injury, sickness, disease, or death, or loss or damage of property or for loss of use of property arising out of or resulting from the radioactive, toxic, explosive, or other dangerous properties of nuclear or other unusually hazardous products or materials. The Secretary of Defense would define and designate the meaning of the term "nuclear or other unusually hazardous products or materials." The bill would give the Secretary the authority to enter into agreements of indemnification with transportation companies, such indemnification protecting those companies against public liability arising out of or resulting from the occurrence of a "public incident" during the transportation of nuclear or other hazardous materials for the Department of Defense or contractor thereof. The limit of the Government's liability would be in the amount of $500 million for each public incident.

As I have said, the transportation companies of this country are going to transport for the Department of Defense nuclear and other dangerous materials. We are all aware of the so-called Minuteman mobile missile program. It is my firm view that in the event of an accident the public should be protected and the transportation company should be indemnified by the United States. It is my hope that the Committee on Armed Services, to which my bill is being referred, will consider the measure at an early date and take favorable action with respect to it.

Church and State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. MOELLER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, there is an ever-present danger of intermingling the spheres of legitimate concern of church and state. This danger often results from zealous efforts to meet the social responsibilities shared by both.

Thus, I believe it important and very timely for a proper appreciation of our time-honored acceptance of strict separation of church and state, that the National Lutheran Council of 50 Madison Avenue, New York 10, N.Y., has recently issued two very enlightening statements. One deals with religious faith as a factor in American elections and the other with church hospitals and the use of Hill-Burton Act funds.

Since these two areas of mutual church-state interest and responsibility are among the most sensitive and difficult of judicious resolution, I would like to insert in the RECORD and submit for the serious consideration of my colleagues, these two excellent resolutions of the National Lutheran Council as examples of the sound guidelines we must use in this dangerous area.

The resolutions are as follows:

RELIGIOUS FAITH AS A FACTOR IN AMERICAN ELECTIONS

Whereas during the recent presidential election the so-called religious issue received a great deal of attention despite the avowed intention of the political parties and candidates to say as little as possible on the subject; and

Whereas responsible political analysts have affirmed that the religious affiliation of candidates and of voters was among a number of major factors in the election; and

Whereas following the presidential election much confusion and sharp difference of opinion regarding the religious issue exist within the Christian community; and

Whereas the religious affiliation of candidates will continue to be a factor affecting the voting of many citizens in future elections in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the following statement on "Religious Faith as a Factor in American Elections" be made available to members of the participating church bodies of the National Lutheran Council and to other interested persons as worthy of serious study and deliberate discussion:

"The religious affiliation of a candidate for political office is a valid concern of the voter, but in a democratic order a candidate ought not be opposed merely on the grounds of his religious affiliation without regard to his record or to his other qualifications.

"Unless we are prepared to grant that religion, and in particular, the Christian faith, is irrelevant to public life in the United States—a proposition which would hardly stand the test of objective examination—it will have to be admitted that the religious faith of any person will influence his private and public conduct to some extent. It is regrettable that the effort is sometimes made to disclaim completely all relevancy of religious convictions to political life. Such disclaimers are a danger sign since they reveal that the "image" of the Church in the American mind is such as to make religion essentially irrelevant in those areas where the important decisions of our time are made.

"The conduct of public affairs is subject to a multitude of pressures. Since even private conduct, where these pressures are far less complex, is rarely determined exclusively by a person's loyalty to a religious denomination, it is naive to assume that a public officer's conduct of his public office would be exclusively determined by such religious loyalties. Obviously people of varying religious loyalties are constantly required to compromise these loyalties in order to avoid a breakdown in our pluralistic society. There is a great deal of difference between the theoretical claims of absolute loyalty which a religious community may be prepared to make and the actual loyalty which it can command. This appears to be true of all religious groups though in varying degrees.

"The fitness of a candidate for public office depends upon many qualifications. Such personal qualities as integrity, courage, wisdom, and understanding are essential for a candidate to deserve the support of church people. The past record of the candidate is a legitimate basis for evaluating his future performance. Although a basic change may not be impossible, it would be unwise to anticipate a fundamental reversal of an established pattern as a result of an election. The record of a candidate's party and the avowed policies of his supporters also must be taken into account. Among all these considerations the candidate's religious affiliation is one factor.

"It is regrettable that some church people begin to show concern about the qualifications of candidates only when high Federal office is involved, neglecting State and local elections and primaries which often are just as important as national elections in deciding policies and leadership in our representative form of government.

"To reiterate: the religious affiliation of a candidate for any office is a valid concern of the voter. But it has to be balanced against all the qualifications of this candidate and other candidates, and should not be taken out of the context of the total political situation in which the voter has to make his decision."

CHURCH HOSPITALS AND THE HILL-BURTON ACT

The Holy Scriptures teach that church and state alike have been instituted by God and are subject to His will. Each has its specific functions and scope of activity in serving as an instrument of God in society. They are to be separate and yet allied in making their contribution toward the fulfillment of His purposes in the world.

The church, corporately and through its individual members, bears witness to the redemptive activity of God in Christ and to the centrality of this fact in the Christian life and in history. It fulfills its divinely ordained mission to the whole of man and of society through its ministry in which preaching, teaching and serving are fundamental and primary.

Under God's law and subject to His authority, the state's necessary and appropriate role is to support good and curb evil. To this end, it establishes and maintains structures to achieve justice and order and to promote the general welfare.

Since both church and state are involved with human welfare, they find many common concerns in areas of public life, even though their basic responsibilities and motivations are different. This fact must not lead to conflict or antagonism but rather should serve to emphasize the necessity for wholesome and intelligent cooperation or coordination. In such situations the church is not the agent of the state, nor vice versa; each must retain freedom of action and proceed in a way consistent with its divinely designated nature. However, great care must be taken lest, deliberately or unwittingly, the one step out of character to hamper or control the other in its distinctive sphere of responsibility.

In some instances of overlapping interests, the best solution may be that of coordination; in others wisdom may require cooperation. Both patterns are legitimate, and properly planned and conducted need not compromise either party. However this assertion should not be used to conceal the fact that, because of the differing motivations, the lines of demarcation and "proper" procedures in particular situations may be far from clear.

The Hill-Burton Act, enacted by the U.S. Congress in 1946, deals with an area of service in which the concerns of church and state have much in common and thereby provides an example of the church-state cooperation which under the principle as stated above is permissible. At a period in U.S. history when Government is becoming more active in the field of public welfare, this development of Federal encouragement of community hospital construction merits careful examination by the church in order to ascertain from its standpoint the extent to which the provisions of the Hill-Burton Act meet criteria regarded as necessary to maintain proper church-state relationships in our pluralistic society. The state also should proceed with care. Reference to church-state relationships in the U.S. Constitution is made in quite general terms; applicable criteria for guidance in specific cases have not as yet been defined for general acceptance.

As a contribution toward further examination of the implications of the Hill-Burton Act for proper church-state relations, the following propositions are posed for consideration:

1. There is a place in society for private, voluntary, and public hospital programs. The allocation of public tax funds for voluntary hospitals under special conditions does not commit either church or state to a policy giving such joint projects a first priority in its approach to this field. Each normally should act in the context of its proper functions: the church using its resources sacrificially and in love to witness to the compassion of Christ; the state providing hospital facilities in support of the public welfare whenever the need clearly exists, as the Hill-Burton Act stipulates.

2. Where voluntary hospital facilities do not exist or are inadequate, and local authorities with community concurrence judge it impractical or impossible to establish a hospital under public auspices, it is proper that supplementary public tax funds be granted to qualified voluntary groups, including churches, for the provision of such facilities (private hospitals operated for profit do not qualify). The purpose of the state in making such capital grants from public tax funds should be solely that of meeting a clearly recognized public need not otherwise served. Where churches are party to the transaction, sectarian objectives which are inevitably furthered thereby must be of incidental consideration. No facilities planned for sectarian objectives may be subsidized by means of these capital grants under the current legislation; this provision must be honored in letter and in spirit.

3. In accepting a grant of public tax funds, a church hospital must weigh carefully the implications of such acceptance, namely that some flexibility in services in order to respect the convictions and practices of patients coming from other religious traditions will be called for to a degree beyond that required if only denomination funds were used. To some degree, the use of public funds makes it a quasi-public institution. There may at times be a conflict between the convictions of a patient or member of the medical staff and the doctrines of a church operating a hospital. In such cases

the fact that the church has accepted public tax funds for the construction of hospital facilities should prohibit it legally and morally from imposing sectarian policies or any form of sectarian pressure upon persons of another faith. (The practice of conducting sectarian religious programs throughout a hospital via a public address system should be reviewed in this connection.) Cooperation between church and state in this instance would necessitate a procedural pattern often followed today whereby local pastors, priests, or rabbis, etc., are encouraged to meet patients' needs in harmony with their faith under a church's administrative "umbrella" without thereby compromising that church's objectives, ethical standards, or spiritual ideals. Where such a workable pattern is not found, a church hospital should not accept public tax funds.

4. The acceptance of capital grants from public tax funds should not be construed in any way as excluding the religious testimony which churches make by means of the health and welfare institutions involved. However, when conducting direct evangelistic activities the churches should be especially sensitive to the ambiguities of the situation. They should not take advantage of extensive facilities made possible only by supplementary tax grants, to imply a witness of their faith beyond that which their own gifts and services justify. Not only would an abuse of this nature violate the U.S. Constitution by using public tax funds to advance the interests of a particular church, but also it would compromise the character and integrity of that church itself.

The extent of the cooperation received through capital grants from public tax funds should be acknowledged as a matter of candor and appreciation by permanent records conspicuously placed in public view.

5. The requirement that voluntary hospitals receiving capital grants from public tax funds shall offer services to the entire community, without discrimination as to race, creed, or color must be strictly enforced.

In view of the complexity of this problem which contains greater pitfalls for the church than for the state, religious groups would do well to observe the following procedures: (a) Make every effort to finance their hospitals completely with their own resources and other voluntary contributions; (b) accept public tax funds for their hospitals only when the possibility of providing much-needed facilities under community auspices has been thoroughly explored and found not feasible; (c) if public tax funds are accepted, be scrupulous at all times in acknowledging the use of such resources in the construction of the buildings and in observing the ethical requirement of this fact with respect to the manner and extent of furthering religious objectives in a welfare institution thus financed.

The success of a church-state relationship so delicate and complex will stand or fall upon the alertness and integrity of the citizens and churches concerned.

The Problem of Open Spaces in Urban Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, it is difficult for a person who has never lived on a budget to start living up to one. The freehanded way of life lingers with us until we take stern, self-disciplinary action to overcome it.

As far as land is concerned, this Nation has never really relied on a budget. We have used up our acres as we needed them, and we have moved on when we had to. We have missed many opportunities for well-planned, intensive development; we have been profligate and heedless, particularly in our metropolitan areas, where unplanned development eats up our precious open land near big cities and within those cities. Each year we must move farther from downtown; we find our life more complicated by new distances to travel, new expenses to maintain our suburbs.

A bill I introduced recently would establish Federal responsibility to participate in a general effort to commit communities to continuous, comprehensive areawide planning. Open spaces would be preserved or developed; entire regions could chart intelligent development. This bill, I believe, could do much if it is applied vigorously, but it will not really be effective unless we have growing public understanding of the metropolitan area crisis.

I was particularly pleased, therefore, to read about a new proposal in Bergen County, N.J. There, the Home Builders Association of Northern New Jersey has proposed a broad-based campaign to pool the knowledge and interest of many persons and groups concerned about the effects of countrywide population boom.

As a State planning official said at the first meeting of the new group:

> We should remember on the other hand that we are wasting the most important commodity we have—something not even found in a bank—land.

Mr. President, I believe that the Bergen experiment is worthy of close study by others faced with similar problems. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Record, Hackensak, N.J., of March 1 and an article by Real Estate Editor Dillon Karsian of the same newspaper on March 8. The article and the editorial clearly indicate the extent of the problem and the imaginative response already underway in Bergen. I might add, too, that the Record has, over the years, performed a valuable service to its readers and to the communities it serves by consistently warning about the serious growth problems in such a highly populated county. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed an earlier editorial that deals specifically with the open spaces bill.

There being no objection, the article and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOME BUILDERS' PLEDGE TO HELP TOWNS ACCEPTED

(By Dillon Karsian, real estate editor)

Officials of 59 of Bergen's 70 municipalities accepted with veiled optimism the pledge last night of the Home Builders Association of Northern New Jersey to cooperate in helping solve the myriad local problems produced by the county's population boom.

Bergen County's municipalities now have, in effect, a powerful new force to call on in seeking common solutions to mutual problems facing the architects of good community development—the home-building industry and local governments.

But, as it was acknowledged by the experts last night, successful community development is a continuing effort and only time can measure the real results of such a cooperative undertaking.

The meeting at the Casa Mana in Teaneck, the first of its type in county history, drew nearly 300 persons, including approximately 125 Bergen mayors, planning and zoning board members, and building inspectors.

Renewed endorsement of the builders' program came from the Bergen County Chamber of Commerce, the Bergen County Building Trades Council, the Architects League of Northern New Jersey, the American Institute of Planners, the New Jersey Society of Professional Engineers, and the New Jersey Association of Real Estate Boards.

Herbert A. Chary, head of the association's special committee on municipal affairs, explained the necessity of industry-government cooperation in order to derive the greatest benefits of building codes, planning, and zoning actions for Bergen's towns and their present and future residents.

This can be accomplished successfully, Chary said, if both builders and local officials recognize each other's problems and seek solutions producing mutual benefits in an atmosphere of cooperation, rather than antagonism.

The association, Chary said, will work with local officials to help prevent the placing of unnecessary burdens upon builders and at the same time uphold the town's safeguards to protect its residents. These burdens, he said, ultimately result in higher home costs and maintenance charges for the towns themselves.

State planner Alvin E. Gershen, introduced by builder president Paul Losick, gave his emphatic endorsement to the builders' program.

"It's about time," he said, "that people interested in community development sat down to discuss community development."

The action has been long overdue, and only the marriage of industry and government can solve New Jersey's population woes, he said, pointing out that while the State grew 24.7 percent in the past decade, Bergen's population gained by 44 percent.

"Don't we know that large-acre zoning really solves nothing?" Gershen asked. "I don't say that we shouldn't have large lots, but we should remember on the other hand that we are wasting the most important commodity we have—something not even found in a bank—land."

He asked the builders and local officials to explore the advantages of density zoning in order to preserve open space.

Density zoning permits a builder to develop on smaller plots a certain portion of a subdivision, leaving the remainder of the land as open space or as a park area.

Gershen is chief of technical operations of the division of planning and development of the State department of conservation and economic development. He also heads the Meadowlands Regional Development Agency.

THE REGIONALIZATION OF A COMMON CAUSE

When the Home Builders Association of Northern New Jersey meets with officials of Bergen County's 70 towns next week, the occasion may inaugurate a new and welcome relationship. If the major barrier which has traditionally separated these two groups, mutual distrust, can be whittled away even slightly (and there's no reason why it shouldn't be), the ultimate beneficiaries will be Bergen County residents present and future, by hundreds of thousands.

What the homebuilders propose through their new committee on municipal affairs is simply to inculcate in builders and municipal officials alike a livelier appreciation and understanding of each other's problems. The good will and cooperation that would flow out of such understanding would supplant the current ritualistic clashes which

so often produce costly litigation and bitterness.

It is hoped the time will come when towns preparing legislation will call on experienced homebuilders to present their views on technical points—not to subvert the town's intent but to avoid creating unnecessary and often costly obstacles for the builder. These costs ultimately are borne by the home buyer and the town.

The venture has the endorsement of the Bergen County Chamber of Commerce, the Bergen County Building Trades Council, the Architects League of Northern New Jersey, the American Institute of Planners, the New Jersey Society of Professional Engineers, and the New Jersey Association of Real Estate Boards.

It is abundantly clear to these groups that government and industry must work together to derive the greatest benefits from construction codes and zoning and planning decisions. No program of this kind has been even attempted elsewhere, but there's no better place to begin than here in one of the fastest growing areas in the Nation. The effort has yielded a limited success in at least three Bergen County towns. There's no reason to let it stop there.

CAN YOU PROPOSE BETTER SOLUTIONS?

New Jersey's experience with Federal aid is far from heartening. The State pays out almost $2.50 for every $1 in Federal aid it gets back. And there is something like $7 billion of Federal aid in the 1961 budget. Senator WILLIAMS, Democrat of New Jersey, wants to add $100 million more, for open area. Reluctant as many Jerseymen are to espouse more Federal aid for a State that has to come out on the small end, some of the points Senator WILLIAMS makes are all but unanswerable.

Consider, for instance, this excerpt from his latest "Report Home," the Senator's semi-monthly newsletter.

"We are now urbanizing at the rate of more than a billion acres a year. In the last 15 years we have put almost two-thirds as much new land to urban uses as we did in all the previous years in the history of our country. We all want this growth to continue. But there is a difference between growth and sprawl. The question is whether we wish to continue with our haphazard, wasteful, and often deeply unsatisfying pattern of development or whether we wish to create something of lasting value to marshal our resources and revitalize our entire urban environment, both at the fringes and at the center."

If this is not all microscopically germane to Bergen County's growth pattern, what Senator WILLIAMS has to say next certainly is:

"Out in the sprawling suburbs, for instance, communities find themselves building five small schoolhouses to serve the same number of children that attend one larger school in the higher-density centers, because there is just so far that children can travel to school. Since there is hardly a one-family house that yields sufficient tax revenue to pay the costs of educating a child living in it, little wonder that homeowners are feeling the pinch on their property taxes and the communities and the States are looking to the Federal Government to share the burden."

Yet, with all this talk about open area and the scarcity and cost of land, we continue to employ conventional methods of development which methods are perhaps the most inefficient and wasteful we could design. Mr. WILLIAMS has an idea there too:

"To cite just one of the many ways in which open space can be related to urban development, the architect Victor Gruen proposed that the 516-acre Whitney estate in Old Westbury be developed as a cluster development (of the kind) which was first made famous in Radburn. If one were to build 247 houses on conventional 2-acre plots, the entire tract would be covered. Instead Gruen proposed that 96 percent of the land to be kept open for golf courses, tennis courts, and wooded areas and that the same 247 dwellings be clustered in the remaining 4 percent of the land in attractive town-house style."

Mr. Gruen is sometimes regarded as fanciful. Mr. WILLIAMS has proposed a big Federal grant. And perhaps New Jersey is not ready fully to accept either.

But if we are to avoid the sprawl that Mr. WILLIAMS mentions; if we are to keep open areas; if we are to provide education and still not have confiscatory real-property taxation, then we shall have to do a good many things we do not relish and have not done before. We shall have to update our thinking. There are hopeful signs. The proposal by Mr. WILLIAMS is one. Governor Meyner's Green Acres plan is another. But until people demonstrate that this or something like it is what they want, government is not likely to make them take it.

Taxation Eye-Opener

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shelbyville News of March 13, 1961:

TAXATION EYE-OPENER

In a column some time back from Washington, Lyle Wilson of United Press International, made this observation.

"Tax withholding by the employer so dulls the tax bite as to foster the belief among citizens that they are getting something for nothing in the way of services and benefits when the Federal Government pays the bill.

"This state of public mind is well known to politicians. The politicians take advantage of it when confronted with a crisis of almost any kind almost anywhere."

Truer words were never spoken.

And perhaps no one has realized these facts more poignantly through the years than Publisher Don R. Peterson of the Truman (Minn.) Tribune, whose experiment in fostering employee awareness of Federal surgery on his earnings we have previously applauded. This, as you may recall, consisted of leaving the full pay in the envelope for 3 successive paydays, and then taking the full withholding out of the 4th week's remuneration. Thus, the single man who got $100 a week for 3 weeks found only $14 in his envelope the 4th week. With one dependent, the 4th week pay of $23.60 would still seem pretty skimpy.

We would now like to quote from a letter from Publisher Peterson to Editor Bob Taylor of Washington Exclusive, and passed on to us. He says:

"Said (brain) child is now 2 months old, and our employees are still with us. Our shop foreman, Les Wiborg, has not let up in his earthy descriptions of the Federal tax program. 'Tis music to my ears to hear someone else describe the never-to-be-sufficiently-damned Federal tax bite, as my voice is weary and my typewriter a worn-out piece of junk as a result of fruitless efforts in that direction during the past 16 years.

"For the first time, our employees comprehend when I tell them they are working 3 months on up for the Federal Government each year."

We are happy to pass along this report, especially since we said earlier this year that this would jolt a few people, at least, into awareness of some of the fiscal facts of life. We also said, and we would like to repeat it now, that wide adoption of the "Peterson Plan for Eye-Opening" would bring effective tax reform—and quickly.

In fact, as Bob Taylor says, it is likely that such needed tax reform could be accomplished by a similar demonstration by a single large national manufacturer.

Hungarian Freedom Day

SPEECH
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join in paying tribute to the heroic Hungarian people on the 113th anniversary of the Hungarian revolution of 1848. This memorable occasion is celebrated by Hungarians throughout the world as a national holiday.

The revolution of 1848 in Europe constituted a landmark in the history of many nationalities there, for it was that stirring mid-century event which roused and revived the idea of nationalism and the desire of subject peoples to free themselves from the oppressive yoke of alien rulers. This was true in many parts of Europe, but particularly so in the Austrian Empire. The autocratic government in Vienna was successful in holding down a number of nationalities through the ruthlessly efficient despotism in Vienna headed by that sworn enemy of liberalism, Count Metternich.

For more than 200 years Hungarians had been living under Austrian rule, subject to an alien regime in their homeland. Their past attempts to free themselves had not been successful, but the revolutionary events weakened the government in Vienna, and thus assured the Hungarians certain success in 1848. In March of that year they drew up a list of their grievances, presented it to the Austrian authorities in Budapest and demanded freedom. On March 15 the government granted these demands, thus allowing freedom and autonomy to the Hungarian people. That date became a turning point in their struggle for freedom, and to this day it remains as their national holiday, their Freedom Day.

On the 113th anniversary celebration of that event we recall also the Hungarian revolution of October 1956 and its ruthless suppression by the Reds. But neither the loss of Hungarian freedom in 1849, nor their subsequent sacrifices in the October revolution of 1956, have dimmed the Hungarian spirit for freedom and independence. In that spirit

they and their friends celebrate their Freedom Day.

It is fitting that on this glorious date in Hungarian history Americans express their sympathy and concern for the brave Hungarian people.

Basin Work Sped on the Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT S. KERR
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, on Monday, March 13, 1961, a very timely and informative article describing the Arkansas River navigation and development program appeared in the New York Times. I ask unanimous consent that this article may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BASIN WORK SPED ON THE ARKANSAS—DEVELOPMENT GROUP IS TOLD OF ADVANCES IN OPENING RIVER TO BARGE TRAFFIC

(By Donald Janson)

TULSA, Okla., March 11—An imagination that could sail a fleet of barges into landlocked Oklahoma was a prerequisite for a 2-day meeting of the Arkansas Basin Development Association here this weekend.

What is more, there was little doubt among the 400 engineers, industrialists and planners at the annual gathering that the dream would come true.

Nor was there much doubt that even such unlikely places as nearby Catoosa, a town of 500 persons on the shallow Verdigris River, would become thriving ports in the wake of the introduction of barge traffic to Oklahoma.

Catoosa, 450 miles from the Mississippi, is the western terminus for a $1,200 million Federal project to open the meandering Arkansas River and the Verdigris, a tributary, to navigation.

A SLUGGISH STREAM

Just a look at the silty, listless Arkansas is enough to convince the layman that the sluggish stream is no seaway for a prairie fleet of towboats and barges. Most of the time it displays far more dry bed than water.

But Lieut. Gen. E. C. Itschner, Chief of the Army Engineers, and a battery of subordinates were on hand to assure the association that the project not only was no pipe dream but would also be finished well ahead of its 1975 completion date.

With the completion of a nine-foot channel to Catoosa, Senator Robert S. Kerr of Oklahoma said at the meeting, "there will be an industrial run into this valley just like the run for land into the Cherokee Strip in 1889."

The Arkansas will be the last of the major Mississippi River tributaries to be made navigable. The plan calls for 19 locks and dams between Catoosa and the Mississippi. This engineering feat will turn the lower Arkansas and Verdigris into a slack-water channel similar to the upper Mississippi.

Four of the dams, already under construction, will be large ones, creating reservoirs and producing power. Seven more upstream reservoirs on the main stem and tributaries in eastern Oklahoma will store water for use in the navigation channel when it gets low, to prevent flooding and to generate power. Some of these have been completed.

Dikes will restrict and further control the channel and dredging will help keep it deep.

Besides navigation, flood control and power, the Arkansas Basin development plan will create recreation possibilities in Oklahoma, which has no natural lakes.

Industry is already moving in, Senator KERR said, in anticipation of cheap water transportation, hydroelectric power, and a plentiful labor supply.

Rogers and Fort Smith, Ark., and Muskogee, Okla., have acquired new plants. Other big concerns are surveying the possibilities.

PLAN PORT AUTHORITIES

Oklahoma and Arkansas have passed laws permitting cities to set up port authorities. Little Rock and Pine Bluff, Ark., recently organized authorities. Tulsa and Muskogee are planning them.

Industrial diversification is widely desired in the valley, whose oil-and-agriculture economy has sagged significantly.

"This plan will provide a cradle in which an industrial complex equal to that of the Ohio Valley can be born and reared," Senator KERR said. "With low-cost water transportation, the Arkansas Valley can give birth to a petro-chemical industry equal to that on the Gulf of Mexico."

Gov. J. Howard Edmondson of Oklahoma agreed. Gov. Orval E. Faubus of Arkansas said that the navigation channel presaged great gains for his hard-pressed State. Gov. John Anderson, Jr. of Kansas, noted that since the 1,400-mile-long river crosses his State, too, any future extension could benefit Kansans.

Senator KERR was a prime mover in developing the multipurpose plan when he was Governor of Oklahoma in World War II. The project was authorized by Congress in 1946 but little was done for a decade. Now the pace of construction is being stepped up in an effort to make navigation to Catoosa a reality by 1970, the weekend meeting was told.

The speedup fits in with President Kennedy's call for action in developing river basins throughout the country.

In his message on natural resources 2 weeks ago, the President called on Congress to authorize the establishment of study commissions for all major basins that lack adequate development plans. Representatives of three basins already have begun investigating the comprehensive Arkansas Valley plan as a possible model.

A big benefit of the slackwater system to Oklahoma and Arkansas will be savings in water transportation rates over present rail rates. Heavy traffic is also expected to open the valley to exploitation of hitherto largely untapped reserves of natural resources, including coal and bauxite. Natural gas and crude oil are also plentiful for petrochemical operations or low-cost fuel.

Exercising Our Freedoms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. CAHILL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an outstanding essay written by Miss Anna St. Petry, a student at Paulsboro High School, Gloucester County, N.J. This essay was adjudged the winner in a "Voice of Democracy" contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of Gloucester County.

I have read the essay with a great deal of interest and satisfaction because it once again demonstrates not only the insight into the meaning of democracy but the deep appreciation that the youth of our Nation have for the privileges they enjoy under our system of government.

I commend the Veterans of Foreign Wars for sponsoring such a project and personally congratulate Miss St. Petry on her winning entry. The principal and teaching staff of Paulsboro High School can well be proud of this outstanding young lady.

I am happy to insert Miss St. Petry's essay in its entirety:

EXERCISING OUR FREEDOMS

Democracy is an important part of our lives, every day and every year. It is the very basis of our way of living.

Have you ever paused to realize how fortunate we are to have a voice in our Government? How we are free to voice our opinions, favorable or unfavorable, about our country?

Democracy, as we know it, is many things—but most of all, it is the freedoms we have—the freedoms of choice, religion, press, and speech.

We realize and recognize these privileges all too seldom, but in an election year such as this, they are brought to our minds as matters of great importance.

We saw two men chosen as presidential candidates by representatives of the people. These men were chosen by the people, not by a superior authority and forced upon the people.

Each candidate had the liberty to campaign in his own behalf—trying to win the majority of the public to support the ideals and principles which he had set forth. To accomplish this goal, he and his supporters took full advantage of their freedoms.

Freedom of the press was recognized at that time probably more than at any other. The newspapers and magazines printed what they felt were the true facts about each candidate, regardless of how many copies would be sold. They felt that the public should have the opportunity to be well informed if they chose to take advantage of it. Many, many people did, and therefore, they were able to cast a more intelligent vote.

Perhaps, more now than ever before, our Nation can fully realize the vast importance of freedom of religion. For the first time in the history of our country we will have a President of the Catholic faith. He was chosen, not because of his religion, but because the individuals of our Nation felt he could best fulfill the duties of the Executive Office and best safeguard our heritage of democracy and freedom.

Each party was given as much time on the air as they felt necessary to sway public opinion. Individuals could exercise their rights for the benefit of their favorite candidate. Although we exercise this right every day, we don't realize how important it can be until an election year. Other governments of the world have candidates just as we do, but they can't voice their criticisms as we do.

After listening to and reading the pros and cons of each candidate, the Nation went to the polls to exercise perhaps its most important privilege—voting. Each voter chose for himself the candidate he felt best suited for leading our country for the next 4 years. This choice was made freely and according to each individual's own way of thinking.

Only here, in our country, which is more often than not referred to as the melting pot of nations, can we find what we might call a melting pot of freedoms—a place where not one or two, but all may enjoy many freedoms.

Here in the United States we truly enjoy all freedoms and only here can we freely enjoy liberty to its full extent.

Here, when we attend the church of our choice, vote for the candidate of our choice, read the newspaper we choose to read, and speak freely at any time to anyone we choose—then we are saying, loudly enough for all nations to hear, we speak for democracy.

Housing, Long-Term

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON

OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the much-publicized and stirring challenge that the people of the country "ask not what the Government can do for them," this body has received from the author of that challenge a message on housing which contained far-reaching provisions designed to provide something for all segments of our population.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from one of Wyoming's leading daily newspapers, the Casper Tribune-Herald, under date of March 12, 1961, which offers some considerations Members will find pertinent in their deliberations on the housing program:

HOUSING, LONG-TERM

The President has sent to Congress a housing program carrying a price tag estimated at $3.25 billion. He referred to it in terms of urgency as an antirecession measure, noting that the housing industry—one of the largest employers of labor—"has been depressed and housing output has lagged," with one out of every six construction workers jobless by the end of 1960.

The beetfields and fruit orchards offered little opportunity for productive effort at that time, either.

And if housing output has lagged, it could easily be that construction has pretty well caught up with demand. Even so, there were 1.26 million starts in 1960, which is not far below the peak construction year. Officialdom rarely notes that lags are lags from peak and that production remains at a very high level.

But Mr. Kennedy's program is oriented in another direction. Of the $3.25 billion total, $2.5 billion is earmarked for grants and loans for the elimination of urban blight. Most of the housing items are designed to finance more housing in the lower price ranges to meet the unfulfilled demands of moderate income families, along with those of still lower incomes who must rely on low-rent public housing.

For the latter, perhaps the most controversial of all housing items, the President asked authorization of 100,000 additional units.

He told Congress the Nation has both the responsibility and the opportunity to "remold our cities, to improve our patterns of community development, and to provide for the housing needs of all segments of our population."

Which is pretty easy acceptance of a misplaced responsibility.

Still, Congress is apt to go along with much of the program. Of the voiced criticism, one complained that more was not asked for communtiy facilities, another that so little attention was paid to veterans' housing.

As if to underscore his purpose, Mr. Kennedy proposed that the housing agency be raised to Cabinet status, which would put a stamp of permanency on the whole program, with stress on urban affairs.

So far as that goes, it is seriously argued that if farmers are represented by a governmental department, so should urban dwellers be represented.

There is about as much need for a new department at Cabinet level as there is for a hole in the head. In that way does Government constantly grow, and federalization expand. Urban assistance, it might be noted, is not limited to blight; it is spoken also in terms of transportation, even with the suggestion that this might be made a Federal responsibility.

In such things, the first step taken, there is no end.

We might hopt that in considering the housing program, Congress will look beyond the humanitarian values which are given such great stress, and probe the long-term political implications.

Address by Hon. A. S. Herlong, Jr., of Florida, at the 16th Annual Convention of the National Limestone Institute, Washington, D.C., January 18, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOWARD H. BAKER

OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by my colleague, Congressman A. S. HERLONG, JR., of Florida, at the 16th annual convention of the National Limestone Institute, Inc., January 18, 1961, Washington D.C.:

As a member of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives it is our responsibility to provide the revenue to meet the spending needs of the U.S. Government. Not only must we do this, but we must do it in such a manner as will be as fair as possible to the greatest number of taxpayers, and without following tax policies that will stifle incentive or hold back economic growth.

Too frequently in the past when the need for money arose, Congress simply took the easy way and raised tax rates.

Because of the fact that there are fewer people in the upper brackets it has been the natural tendency of the man in politics to shift the burden to these few because in so doing there is less fear of political reprisal from great numbers of the people.

It has been pointed out by the chairman of our committee that of all the money presently raised in taxes by the Federal Government, only $4½ billion is raised by surtaxes—that is, personal income taxes on taxable income over $2,000 for a single person and $4,000 for a married couple. Yet the present rates are so steeply progressive that the tax rate on taxable income in the $16,000 to $18,000 bracket is 50 percent and it climbs rapidly from there to 91 percent.

Our country is in the midst of a tremendous population growth. It is estimated that by 1975 the population will be in excess of 225 milion. This means that there will necessarily have to be some 20 million additional jobs provided for these new people. It is further estimated that it costs between $14,000 and $17,000 of investment capital to provide one job. If we are to provide jobs for these new people, we must make more capital available for investment.

The avenue of bond issues and extensive borrowing, or the issuing of stock, is open to the very large business in order that that business might expand. Unfortunately, these same avenues are not open to the small- and medium-size businessman who would like, and who is entitled to, the privilege of expanding his enterprise. There is no justifiable reason why a person whose business is relatively small should be prevented from getting larger.

In my judgment, the only sound and fair way we can provide this capital for people and businesses all up and down the income tax scale is to permit them to retain a larger portion of their earnings. To do this, it would necessarily mean a reduction in our income tax rates from top to bottom.

Your natural question in this regard is: How can we who are so concerned about our national budget being balanced afford to reduce taxes when we have before us an $80-plus-billion spending budget?

Of course, the first answer to this question is that our spending budget doesn't have to be $80-billion-plus. I earnestly hope we will be able to hold it below that figure. In this connection I don't need to remind you that the revenue demands of the U.S. Government are gaged by the amount of money we in the Congress spend. How much we spend is triggered by the demands of you, the people, for Government services, and of course by the requirements of the national defense establishment. Until these demands and needs are appreciably reduced, it would be unrealistic to say that we were not going to have to continue to take large sums from our people in taxes.

The answer to the question, then, as to how we can afford to reduce tax rates when we are confronted with this situation is, in my judgment, that the expansion of our economy which would be brought about by the making of additional capital available for investment and creation of more jobs would more than make up the difference in net revenue to the Government. The point I mean to make is that we have reached the point of diminishing returns taxwise. It is an historical fact that in the past when tax rates have been reduced, net income to the Federal Government in succeeding years increased, rather than decreased. It's the old story of the merchant who needs to raise cash. He doesn't raise his prices. He has a sale and lowers them and takes in more money—and, of course, in the process, more net profit. He has created incentive for people to want to buy. The Government can likewise create an incentive for people to want to invest, and can also through reduction in tax rates help provide them with the money to invest.

If this incentive for expansion and the growth which it generates isn't enough to "take up the slack," there is also this fact: Our gross national product normally increases about 3 percent a year. It has been shown that every percentage point increase in our gross national product brings in about a billion dollars in internal revenue. We could, therefore, feel safe in reducing tax rates to a point which would equal $3 billion a year and still, because of our natural growth, not have a deficit. This single factor, however, is contingent, and the contingency is a pretty big if. We would not have a deficit with such a tax cut if Congress held down expenditures. We cannot

continue to spend in the same lavish way we have been spending—increasing our spending budget each year even more than the increase in our revenue—and expect to have a balanced budget. It is important that Congress exercise some restraint. For Congress to exercise this restraint, it will be necessary to the people back home, to lower their demands of the Federal Government.

The next question that arises is—is there a comprehensive plan for the accomplishment of this reduction in income tax rates which will result in a rebirth of incentive to invest and expand, and which will promote the growth of our economy without inflation? The answer is in a bill which Representative HOWARD H. BAKER, of Tennessee, and I introduced the other day. I understand we have since that time been joined by a number of other Members of Congress who have also introduced identical legislation.

The basic principle involved in this legislation is a gradual reduction in tax rates over a period of 5 years. Individual income tax rates would be brought down, by the end of the 5th year, from a top rate of 91 percent to 47 percent. The first bracket would be reduced from 20 percent to 15 percent, and there would be a corresponding reduction in all the rates in between.

The top corporate of 52 percent would be reduced from 52 percent to 47 percent by an annual reduction of 1 percent over the 5 years. Almost 85 percent of our total business population, as you well know, is composed of unincorporated firms, and surely they should not be taxed at higher rates than corporations.

There are predictions that by tax rate reform we can raise the annual average family income of the American people from $6,500 annually to $11,500 annually in the next decade and without inflation.

It is my conviction that these steps can be taken without creating deficit spending or a net loss in revenue, even if we are to be saddled with Federal spending at the current level—but no higher—in the foreseeable future. But we must, as I have said, hold down our spending.

I am convinced that we need not continue to spend what we are spending; but even if circumstances compel us to do so, the proposed legislation has a built-in safety valve to protect us against deficit spending, which is so highly inflationary, by the simple formula of postponing rate reductions in any year when an unbalanced budget is threatened. This could stretch out the 5-year reduction period by not more than 4 additional years.

The revenue effect of the Herlong-Baker bill would average less than 3½ billion annually, or the equivalent of a 3.5 percent rate of economic growth.

With new funds for investment and job creating, in this country, we can foresee as much as 5 percent average rate of growth over the next 5 years, with a revenue increase rather than decrease of more than $1 billion annually, above the direct effect of the scheduled reductions and reforms in our legislation.

I believe also that our bill has a built-in virtue that will help convince the American people that tax reform is essential to their future.

Many of you undoubtedly participate in incentive and profit-sharing plans in your plants. Some of you may use a bonus system in creating stable labor forces and loyal workers. I hope that you have found that such plans also reduce waste and costs, for this is one of the pillars on which our tax reform legislation is based.

By promising our 60 million income taxpayers a forward-scheduled tax reduction—where they have a clear choice between a tax reduction or no tax cuts because of increased Federal spending—we will enlist them as individual participants in the war against excess spending and waste.

We offer them a partnership in economy and saving on a national level. If they exercise their right of petition and insist on Federal spending only for those services which are essential at the moment, they will profit during the 5 years in which we propose to establish tax reform. If not, an annual tax saving will not accrue.

This will, as a byproduct, in my judgment have a salutary effect on appropriations, for it will take a brave man in the legislative branch to deny a tax reduction to an anticipating constituency by a last-minute, budget-upsetting spending spree.

We must not lose sight of the fact that tax reduction proposals short of thorough tax rate reform will fail to provide the competitive forces we need in the Nation today to put the brakes on Federal spending.

There is a critical urgency about this business of tax reform. Capital-destroying tax rates are a luxury we can no longer afford. Our excesses in spending and in taxing are producing wrinkles in our economy, just as the excesses of individuals produce their telltale signs on those individuals.

Moderation is good for all of us. It is good in the field of tax reform, which provides for both individual and corporate tax relief.

Our potential for growth is nurtured by the spirit which created our freedom in the first place.

Our pioneer with his wooden plow ventured into the unknown forests and left his monument to courage.

We have improved the tools of our progress vastly since then. The means to build them still better, for the future of the land, must not be denied the bold and adventurous today.

Our failure to free the means whereby any one of you can build on your dream of a better missile, a bigger steamshovel, a more tamed atom, could well be catastrophic.

Let us not make that mistake, or allow our Government to make it for us, as we march together toward a new realism in America and the highly competitive world in which we live.

Foreign Invasion of U.S. Sheet Glass Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the principal points of a statement by Robinson F. Barker, vice president, glass division, Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., before the U.S. Tariff Commission on March 14, 1961.

Mr. Barker has made a distinguished presentation of a problem that is acute not only in the glass industry of Pennsylvania, but is a matter of diminishing returns if not complete oblivion to many segments of our economy.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF ROBINSON F. BARKER, VICE PRESIDENT, GLASS DIVISION, PITTSBURGH PLATE GLASS CO., AT THE U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION HEARING ON SHEET GLASS, MARCH 14, 1961

My name is Robinson F. Barker. I am vice president and general manager of the glass division of Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. and have been in the glass business for over 25 years.

My company—Pittsburgh Plate Glass—manufactures glass, paints, chemicals, fiber glass, plastics, brushes, and other products. The principal glass products we manufacture include sheet glass, plate glass, laminated glass, tempered glass, structural glass, and optical glass. We believe that Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. produces about one-third of the sheet glass manufactured in this country. It is my understanding that sheet glass is the only product involved in this hearing.

I appreciate the opportunity to appear here today to present facts concerning the serious injury our sheet glass business has suffered as a result of the foreign invasion of the U.S. sheet glass market. The injury—already severe—threatens to assume even greater proportions in the years immediately ahead.

The extent of the injury already suffered and whether the domestic industry can continue to survive the ever-increasing onslaught of foreign imports, it seems to me, are the very serious questions which are now before this commission in the pending investigation.

Before addressing myself to these and other questions, I invite your attention to the fact that prior to the August 1960 hearings my company filed with you a detailed memorandum in opposition to further reductions in the existing tariff rates applicable to sheet glass. That memorandum was supplemented by my appearance before you on August 17, 1960. Other representatives of the domestic industry, labor and members of Congress also appeared on that occasion.

Subsequently, on November 17, 1960, the Commission issued notice of this investigation under the escape clause provisions of the tariff act. Thereafter we were visited by members of the Commission staff and have received various requests from them for additional information, all of which we have supplied to the best of our ability. Of course, we have also answered and filed the detailed questionnaire we received from the Commission in connection with this investigation.

You now have the Pittsburgh Plate Glass sheet glass story in detail. However, in the event you have need for any further information, we shall be pleased to be of whatever assistance we can in that regard.

With your permission, I plan today to give you facts concerning the competitive problems confronting us in our sheet glass operations and also to speak candidly to certain questions which you may have in mind.

First, I would like to dispel two notions about the company-owned distribution branches which are operated by Pittsburgh Plate Glass merchandising division. On the one hand, those unfamiliar with our company sometimes contend that our merchandising division branches utilize most of the glass produced by our factories. That is not the fact. During the 1955–60 period, the amount of sheet glass shipped to our company-owned outlets ranged from 19.8 to 24.8 percent of our total domestic sheet glass shipments. From this it is obvious that Pittsburgh Plate Glass is much more dependent on the sheet glass business it obtains from its nonowned customers than it is from its own branches.

The other notion which conceivably might arise from Pittsburgh Plate Glass ownership of company-owned branches would stem

from the fact that these branches actively compete with independent distributors whom our factories are endeavoring to sell.

Since the late 1930's our merchandising division has opened a number of new branches in order to give better service to our customers. That fact has been alluded to in some quarters as an act which is inimical to the best interests of our factories' independent distributor customers. Such a contention would assume that whenever Pittsburgh Plate Glass opens additional branches, the activities of these branches will so dilute the business of competing glass dealers that the dealers' volume will be reduced. In such a case presumably the business of their distributor suppliers would be similarly affected. Were this the fact, it would seem to follow that with its additional company outlets Pittsburgh Plate Glass would distribute more of its own sheet glass through them than it formerly did. Such is not the case. Thus, in 1950, 26.7 percent of our total domestic shipments of sheet glass were made to 171 company-owned branches. In 1960, shipments to 294 company-owned branches represented 23.4 percent of our total domestic shipments—a reduction of 3.3 percentage points. In terms of the quantity shipped to company-owned outlets in those 2 years, it should be noted that the 1960 shipments represented 450,000 actual boxes less than the quantity shipped in 1950. Also relevant to this notion, it seems to me, is the fact that in 1950 Pittsburgh Plate Glass shipped sheet glass to 466 independently owned factory customer establishments. In 1960, this number had increased to 612—an increase of 31.3 percent.

To summarize this point, in 1960 we shipped 23.4 percent of our total domestic shipments of sheet glass to our 294 company-owned branches. In the same year we shipped 76.6 percent of our total domestic sheet glass shipments to wholly independent companies.

The fact that the U.S. sheet glass industry is losing the domestic market is readily apparent from the statistics your staff has developed during this investigation. As you know, the ratio of imports to total domestic shipments in 1955 was 15.4 percent. Three years later—1958—this figure had increased to 27.2 percent and last year reached an all-time high of 32.5 percent.

During the same period U.S. exports of sheet glass declined substantially and now amount to less than 1 percent of total domestic shipments.

In my appearance before you on August 17, 1960, I discussed in some detail the reasons which have contributed to the loss of a substantial part of our domestic market to the foreigners. It is not my purpose today to repeat what I said on that occasion. However, I do believe it would serve a worthwhile purpose if I were to summarize those reasons and as to those where there have been additional developments I shall endeavor to bring you up to date.

The principal reasons which have contributed to the successful penetration of our market by the foreign producers are as follows:

1. There is equality of technology, labor skills and productivity among foreign and domestic producers of sheet glass.

2. Ocean freight rates constitute no barrier to imports into the United States.

3. The foreigners have an overwhelming cost advantage over the domestic producers. This is true not only with respect to labor costs but also with respect to raw materials cost. In addition, replacement and repair costs and research and development expenses are appreciably lower abroad, primarily because of the lower labor costs they enjoy.

4. Our tariffs have been completely ineffectual in equalizing or offsetting the overwhelming cost advantage held by the foreign producers. The tariff on sheet glass in recent years has declined sharply—from an equivalent ad valorem of 60 percent in 1939 to an equivalent ad valorem of 14.8 percent in 1959. The cumulative effect of the series of tariff reductions made over the years necessarily has assisted the foreign producers in capturing a substantial share of our market. The latest in that series of reductions took place in 1958, the year in which the ratio of imports to total domestic shipments jumped dramatically to 27.2 percent from 17.1 percent in 1957.

5. With their tremendous cost advantage, the foreign producers can and do undersell us consistently in this market.

The summer and fall of 1960 witnessed a number of price gyrations. Although the amounts of the differentials between the prices of the foreign producers and Pittsburgh Plate Glass varied from time to time during that period, the cold, hard fact of the matter is that foreign sheet glass continues to be sold at considerable price differentials below our domestic prices. Thus, today the amounts of those differentials range from 8.1 percent to 12.2 percent in the case of the prices of western European producers and from 13.3 percent to 18.9 percent in the case of Japanese producers.

There was considerable testimony before the Commission yesterday regarding the impact of the 18-ounce and 24-ounce products in the American market. There was also considerable discussion whether the indicated discounts at which such glass was sold below the prices for the standard 19-ounce single strength and standard 26-ounce double strength products were justified. From time to time Pittsburgh Plate Glass has given study to the possibility of producing glass in these thicknesses in the United States.

Our decision up to this time has been that it would not be economical for us to do so. Simply stated, our reasons are that the standard thicknesses which have prevailed in this country for many years have been the 19-ounce glass, or so-called single strength product, and 26-ounce, or the so-called double strength product. As indicated this is traceable, at least in part, to Government specifications. You have already been informed that the total market represented by sales under Government-prescribed specifications is quite small. The expression was even used, I believe on yesterday, why did we American manufacturers allow a so-called tail—representing this small percentage of the market based on 19-ounce and 26-ounce specifications—to wag the dog of a very much larger market which could apparently be adequately and satisfactorily filled by 18-ounce and 24-ounce products?

So far as Pittsburgh Plate Glass is concerned, we have felt a real obligation to continue to supply glass responding to the precise specification DD–G–451a established by our Government. Our studies have also established to our satisfaction that consistent with this sense of obligation, if we were to attempt to undertake manufacture at the same time of 18-ounce and 24-ounce products, the possible savings in cost which have been suggested would be largely illusionary, if they exist at all. Specifically, we feel that to attempt to produce the small quantities of 19-ounce and 26-ounce single and double strength specification glass and at the same time and in our same plants and with the same equipment also attempt to produce 18-ounce and 24-ounce glass to supply the very much greater nonspecification market would involve so many additional production scheduling and inventory problems as to wholly defeat the possibility of effecting cost savings on the mix of thicknesses involved in such a program.

On the contrary, based upon our studies, it is our belief that our costs on such an undertaking would be increased for all four thicknesses. It is entirely possible that we may be driven to the abandonment of the 19-ounce and 26-ounce standard products conforming to Government specifications and to confine our production to the 18-ounce and 24-ounce products exclusively.

However, the prospect of the voluntary abandonment of any segment of our domestic market, which has already been riddled by low cost, foreign competition is repugnant to us. Even if we should take this drastic action, the heavy losses which we have suffered as a consequence of low-cost, low-price foreign glass in our markets in recent years have afforded convincing proof that any lower level of prices we might thereby hope to establish would be wholly insufficient to meet the demonstrated ability of foreign competitors to reduce their prices to whatever extent necessary to take the business.

The essential thing which I desire to impress upon the Commission in connection with this whole situation is that foreign manufacturers—at least in the case of those competitors located in Western Europe—supply to the American market these four types of glass; namely, 18 ounce and 19 ounce in single strength category, and 24 ounce and 26 ounce in double strength category, and that the prices they quote on 18- and 24-ounce glass are even lower than the already low prices they quote on 19- and 26-ounce glass. The Japanese, on the other hand, do not even publish quotations in the United States on 19- and 26-ounce glass; they quote only 18 ounce and 26 ounce for single and double strength.

We say to you simply this: That with the exception of the very small portion of the American market which is controlled by the Government specifications requiring 19-ounce and 26-ounce products, the Western European producers are offering and supplying throughout the United States single strength glass in both 18-ounce and 19-ounce thicknesses, and double strength glass in both 24-ounce and 26-ounce thicknesses. Concerning the single strength product in 18- and 19-ounce thicknesses, the products are commercially interchangeable; the physical differences are hardly discernible, and can be determined only by precise testing; the products are bought and sold, and applied for the same uses and purposes, and are in every sense directly competitive. The same conclusions are equally applicable to the 24-ounce and 26-ounce products.

We would also invite the Commission's attention to the fact that thicknesses tolerances for 18-ounce glass, which are contained in the specifications of the foreign producers, permit the foreigners to sell as 18-ounce glass a product which is slightly thicker than our minimum tolerances for 19-ounce glass and the minimum tolerances set forth in the Federal specifications for single strength thickness. The same situation applies in the case of the foreign producers' thickness tolerances for 24-ounce sheet glass as compared with our 26-ounce double strength glass and the Federal specifications applicable to that thickness.

Although we know of no governmental statistics which disclose the relative proportions of 18-ounce and 19-ounce for single strength glass or 24-ounce and 26-ounce for double strength sheet glass imported in these categories into the United States from Europe, we believe that on the basis of all the trade information received by us that a very high percentage of the so-called single strength and double strength sheet glass imported into this country is in 18-ounce and 24-ounce glass respectively. For your information, single and double strength

sheet glass represent the largest volume items in our sheet glass line.

Turning now to questions which might be raised by those who would attempt to minimize the injury which has been sustained by us as a result of the successful foreign penetration of this market, the first question might involve the assertion that the impetus for the high volume of foreign imports was provided by the fact that in some past periods of time the domestic producers had inadequate capacity to serve the U.S. demand. It is true that during 1955 and 1956 sheet glass was often in short supply. This phenomenon, of course, was not confined to the sheet glass industry. Rather, it also occurred in many of the major industries in this country, e.g., steel, aluminum, cement, heavy chemicals, to name a few. The reason why this occurred in many American industries is explained by the fact that the economy was literally bursting at the seams in those years and also operating at its alltime highest levels.

Interestingly, many of the industries which experienced temporary shortages of supply during those years were industries having heavy capital requirements. I will have more to say about this latter point further in my statement. I would point out here, however, that during most of 1954 the domestic sheet glass industry operated at levels far below its capacity. Thus, when the economic boom of 1955 suddenly emerged, our domestic industry, like the others I have mentioned, was not fully prepared for it. The fact remains, however, that even if we had decided in 1954 to add additional capacity at a time when business was off, it would have taken a minimum of two years' time to design, engineer and construct the new capacity needed to meet the boom which, by the end of 1956 at least, so far as sheet glass is concerned, had already run its course.

The last shortage of sheet glass in this country ended in 1956. Ever since then we have had substantial unused, idle capacity, more than sufficient to take care of any increased demand. I will emphasize here that increased demand has accrued since 1956, but we have gotten little benefit out of it because most of the benefit has gone abroad.

It so happens that prior to 1955 our company had been giving consideration to the question of whether we should build another Sheet Glass plant which necessarily would have the effect of increasing our capacity. I actively worked on that project over a period of many months. On September 30, 1955, we publicly disclosed our plans for the construction of a multimillion dollar sheet glass plant in the vicinity of Decatur, Ill. The construction contract was awarded in the early fall of 1957 and the plant went on stream in April 1959.

The decision to carry through the building of our Mount Zion, Illinois plant—Mount Zion is located near Decatur—at a time when we were operating well below the level of the 1955 and 1956 period, took courage. I say that because of the heavy fixed capital requirements needed to produce sheet glass. Implicit in our decision to build that new plant was a recognition of the absolute necessity that the plant contain the most modern technology to obtain high quality at low cost. Nearly 2 years' operating experience with that plant shows that those needs were met—high quality, low cost. I wish to emphasize here the fact that the Mount Zion plant required a very heavy investment in fixed assets on the part of our company. It goes without saying that an investment of this magnitude, with the attendant risks of obsolescence from technological changes and intense competition, can only attract the necessary capital if the profits derived from the investment are commensurate with the risks.

The decision to build our Mount Zion plant did not carry with it any idea that we would abandon our investment in our existing sheet glass plants. Rather that decision was made to place ourselves in a position to satisfy a growing market which we felt would develop. At the same time we carried forward our continuing program for process improvement in our existing sheet glass plants.

In retrospect, it is now quite clear that even before our Mount Zion plant commenced operations, substantial unused capacity was present in the domestic sheet glass industry. Since then Mount Zion, of course, has created additional idle capacity.

While all economic indications point in the years ahead to a period of steady growth in the American economy, clearly the domestic sheet glass industry is not sharing in that growth, such as it exists today, and every indication is that it will not share in any future growth. If the recent past is indicative of the future, the foreign producers will reap the benefits of the projected growth of our economy because of their cost and price advantages. This is the dismal picture which presently confronts the domestic sheet glass industry.

I would also invite your attention to the recent address of the President of the United States before the National Industrial Conference Board on February 13, 1961. On that occasion, President Kennedy had this to say with regard to economic growth:

"The economic program which I have set before the Congress is essentially a program for recovery—and I do not equate recovery with growth. But it is an essential first step. Only by putting millions of unemployed back to work can we expand purchasing power and markets. Only by higher income and profits can we provide the incentive and the means for increased investment. And only when we are using our plant at or near capacity can we expect any solid expansion. Capacity operation is the key. No matter what other arguments or stimulants are used, the incentives for investing new capital to expand manufacturing plant and equipment are weak so long as manufacturers are operating at less than 80 percent of capacity."

We emphatically agree with these statements of the President of the United States. It is imperative that we obtain profits that are commensurate with the risks if we are to continue to have the incentive for increased investment. Too often the degree of profit of a given business is superficially determined by looking only at the profit as a percent of sales. To measure all industries by that single standard is unrealistic. Certainly industries having heavy fixed capital requirements must earn a substantially higher rate of return on sales to provide a satisfactory rate of return on investment. It is equally important that heavy industry, in order to obtain a satisfactory rate of return on investment, must operate at a higher level of capacity—as President Kennedy stated: "Capacity operation is the key."

In sharp contrast with the President's minimum goal of operations at not less than 80 percent of capacity, I can tell you that we have not met that goal in any year since 1956. Indeed during the last 4 years and down to the present we have fallen considerably short of that goal.

Today we are operating only at about 60 percent of our capacity. The number of our unemployed sheet glass factory workers represents approximately 25 percent of our normal factory worker complement. Our inventories last summer were then at an alltime high but our inventories are even higher today than they were then. This, of course, means that while we are operating at only 60 percent capacity, we are by no means able to sell all the glass we are producing at that rate.

We firmly believe that a substantial part of the difficulties we have been experiencing in our sheet glass operations are the direct result of the large volume of low cost, low price foreign glass coming into this country. We believe further that this large influx of foreign glass and the appropriation by foreign manufacturers of an ever-increasing portion of the American market are the result, in whole or in part, of the successive reductions which have been made in the tariff duties applicable to sheet glass.

We see no real hope of reestablishing ourselves in the American market and, particularly, in sharing in any growth in this market, unless effective tariff relief be granted. Accordingly, on behalf of Pittsburgh Plate Glass, I fervently urge that the Commission complete this investigation at the earliest practicable date and recommend to the President the maximum relief possible under the law.

Cornell University Petition Against HUAC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following petition signed by 528 members of the Cornell University community which was sent to the Congress urging abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Among the petitioners were 52 professors, 93 graduate students, and 312 undergraduates:

CORNELL PETITION TO ABOLISH THE HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE (HUAC)

Last week 528 members of the Cornell University community signed a petition to the Congress urging the abolition of the HUAC. Among the petitioners were 52 professors, 93 graduate students, and 312 undergraduates. (The text of the petition and the complete list of signatures is attached.)

The petition marks a period of intensive student activity on civil liberties at Cornell. Students were goaded into action by the showing in downtown Ithaca of the HUAC-supported film "Operation Abolition," a distorted version of the anti-HUAC demonstrations in San Francisco last May, and they took their cue from a nationwide anti-HUAC petition that appeared as an advertisement in the New York Times on February 9.

About 30 students participated in the drive for signatures and the concurrent campaign to enlighten the campus on the dealings of the HUAC. Some of the students canvassed faculty members for signatures. The main student effort was concentrated on mounting a huge display in the lobby of the student activities building on the Cornell campus, Willard Straight Hall. Relays of students manned a desk for 5 days to collect signatures for the petition. The literature displayed included San Francisco Chronicle reports of the May demonstrations, the text of the film "Operation Abolition," a California student analysis of the film, reprints of anti-HUAC editorials and articles, resolutions and petitions from across the Nation (including the New York Times and the Washington Post).

The sentiment that all is not well with the state of civil liberties was seen to be so strong on the Cornell campus that the

students have decided to form a permanent organization to plan further action in support of civil liberties. Already 70 students have signed up. One of the immediate aims of this student organization is to raise the funds to place the anti-HUAC petition in the campus newspaper as an ad.

Dr. Willard Uphaus, who was on the Cornell campus last week to give an invited talk on the first amendment, sat at the desk in the Straight lobby with the students for a time. In his lecture he urged everyone to sign the petition, and signed it himself.

Both the two new Cornell student journals, Controversy (edited by four graduate students) and Dialogue (edited by two freshmen), featured editorials and articles on the HUAC in their current issues.

Other recent related student activities were the picketing of Sigma Chi fraternity in protest over its overt discriminatory clause, a demonstration mourning the death of Patrice Lumumba in which Americans joined Cornell students from Africa, a rally last December at which about 300 students and faculty signed a telegram to President Kennedy urging him to come to a speedy agreement on a nuclear weapons test ban, picketing of the local Ithaca bomb shelter exhibit last December, etc.

PETITION TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE 87TH CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

We, the undersigned students and faculty of Cornell University and friends, petition the 87th Congress to eliminate the House Committe on Un-American Activities as a standing committee.

We are confident that only a return to constitutional procedures can protect us against subversion without at the same time subverting the very liberties we seek to protect.

For two decades the committee has condemned individual Americans, has wrecked the lives of some, and has denied them the due process of law that English and American courts have toilsomely evolved over centuries.

The committee has habitually misused its mandate in unconstitutional ways for political purposes; it has become an agency for repression; it has usurped the functions of the executive and judicial branches of our Government.

1. The committee has perverted, and thereby imperiled, the proper and necessary powers of the Congress to conduct investigations.

2. The committee has helped discourage free study and inquiry in working for peace while the world is threatened with destruction.

3. It has harassed Americans who work for racial equality and justice.

4. It has increased bitterness between racial and religious groups of our citizens, which in turn has imperiled our good relations with the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin Amercia.

5. It has discouraged social and cultural contacts with our neighbors on this shrinking planet. It has discouraged U.S. students and scholars from studying in countries which we Americans desperately need to understand.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities has in these ways weakened America. At no time in our history have we needed to be stronger. At no time have we needed to be wiser. Let us rid ourselves of this agent of weakness and folly.

FACULTY

H. A. Bethe, Max Black, G. R. Blakley, Dalai Brenes, Stuart M. Brown, Edward L. Christie, Morris A. Copeland, David B. Davis, A. G. DeCapua, Douglas F. Dowd, Keith S. Donnellan, R. H. Farrell, E. G. Fogel, Edward W. Fox, Paul W. Gates, Andrew Hacker, Hugh G. Hansen, Baxter Hathaway, Hollis Hayward, David Hertzig, C. S. Herz, Judith Herz, George H. Hildebrand, L. Paul Jaquith, Mark Kac, Alfred E. Kahn, H. Peter Kahn, Jack E. Kiefer, M. Kinsolving, G. R. Livesay, Gerald C. MacCallum, Jr., Royal E. Montgomery, Philip Morrison, Chandler Morse, Benjamin Nichols, E. C. Nuttall, Paul Olum, Jay Orear, J. J. Price, John L. Ragle, David Ray, Ewell J. Reagin, Jerome Sacks, M. J. Sienko, Allan E. Snyder, George Staller, Francis R. Walton, Stephen E. Whicher, H. A. Wichelns, H. Widom, Bertram F. Willcox, Robin M. Williams, Jr.

GRADUATE STUDENTS

Howard A. Abrahams, Dean Alfange, Jr., B. Ro't Anderson, Phil Assimakis, K. M. Baker, Bruce Barnes, William W. Bernhardt, Richard G. Briggs, Frederick Bunnel, Alan N. Bunner, L. Aldrich Cass, M. Kevin Concedine, Billy Crowder, Arthur E. Curtis, Edward Dolan, Howard Elford, James Farganis, James E. Felten, Allen Franklin, Peter L. Gale, William R. Gavin, Julien Gendell, Ed Gelerinter, Edward T. Gerry, Sean D. Gervasi, David L. C. Gilmore, Avrama Gingold, Margaret Gordon, Paul Green, Del Greenblatt, Michael T. Gregoric, Joan Haavie, Sandor Halebsky, Brian Hansen, Thomas More Harrington, Charles A. Haynie, Henry Heller, Robert R. Hett, Alfred Bacon Hudson, A. Imohiosen, Bruce Justh, Richard A. Johnson, J. C. Judd, Stephen Kaplan, Keith P. Kerney, Charles J. Keyes, George E. Keyes, Alan F. Klein, David Kotelchuck, Peter Jay Kushner, Patricia Laugharne, George A. Lear, Jr., Mal Liggett, Anne C. Loveland, H. M. Mann, Eugene McGuire, Geo. Medawar, R. T. Micklem, James R. Millar, Harolyn King Perkins, Lewis Curtis Perry, Ruth Pfanner, Dan Phillips, Al Pinkney, Judith Puchner, Evan R. Pugh, Louis Rader, R. Raja Raman, Margaret P. Rhoads, Robert C. Rodnick, Emilee de Roca, Joseph E. Rogers, Jr., David Sanford, Kent Schellinger, Terry Siegel, Harvey G. Simmons, Malcolm H. Skolnick, Jesse Smith, Jerome Sohn, A. Soyer, Melvin Standig, A. R. Sugg, Don Sullenger, John S. Steachman, Emanuel Wachsler, Marilyn Watson, Ralph A. Westwig, Paul Weller, Joel H. Wiener, John A. Winters, John Worlock, Louis Yucht, Harold S. Zapolsky.

UNDERGRADUATES

Richard Wayne Abel, Gerald S. Abrams, Michael D. Abrams, Beverly Album, Martin Alpert, Jon Amsden, Joel Anderson, Paul Anderson, L. Victor Asch, Roger Avery, Gerald Baker, Wayne Alan Baker, Bob Baron, Jill Beckoff, Paul Beiley, Margaret S. Benson, Thomas W. Benson, Arthur Bergen, Alan Berkeley, Carol Berkman, Betty Berman, Truman E. Bewley, David Birnbaum, Arthur Birnkraut, Elliot Blackman, Arthur M. Block, Donald Bluestone, James A. Blyler, Mary Ellen Bollinger, Edmund C. Bradley, Linda Brandt, Barbara Braun, Dave Brown, Don Brown, Harley A. Brown, H. K. Brueckner, David R. Bruning, Robert C. Buckle, Elizabeth Buff, Jeffry M. Burman, C. Allen Bush, Charles P. Bush, Daniel Camejo, Terence M. Cannon, Jill Careton, Edward M. Chait, Stephen Chamides, William Chandler, Edward D. Child, Helen Chuckrow, Joyce Chuckrow, Marion M. Chute, Elena Citkowitz, Stephen A. Cole, David A. Cobin, Donald S. Coburn, Barbara Cohen, Adina Grace Cohen, Randall K. Cole, Jr., Phillip J. Colle, Kenneth A. Collins, Philip Corn, Eric Craven, Chris Creal, Michael Davidson, C. S. Davis, Claire Davison, Harold G. Diamond, Vincent Di Pasquale, Margery Donk, David Brucker, Steve Eckroad, Bob Eisner, Richard W. Ely, Therese L. Elzas, S. Engleman, Dan Evett.

William J. Fabrey, Florence Ira Faerstein, Eliot Feldman, Richard Feuer, Robert Filner, Edmond S. Fine, Ira J. Firestone, Judy Fleiss, Margot Joan Fox, Michael Allen Fox, Donald A. Foss, Richard L. Friedberg, Herb Friedman, Paula Friedman, Jennifer Froistad, Steven Fruh, Diana Frumkes, Thomas E. Frumkes, Robert Gabriner, Albert Galves, Joseph Geller, Donna Gellis, Nina Gershon, Phil Ginsburg, Bob Di Giovanni, Nona Glazer, Donald De Glopper, Feffrey Gluckman, Stephen Godoff, Allan Goldberg, Marcia Goldberg, Edward E. Goldman, Edwin D. Goldwasser, Billie May Goldwyn, Mike Goodwin, Robert Goren, George Gorman, William Gorn, Stephen Gottlieb, William B. Gould, Jr., Kenna Grant, Mitchell Grayson, David Green, Daniel Grossbard, Joseph Grossman, Lucy Guerlac, Kenneth Hagood, Judith Halpern, Richard Hampton, Jay Harris, Robert Hashell, Madelon Helfer, Bari S. Heller, Gregory Herzog, Richard D. Heyman, Robert Heyman, Alan S. Hirshberg, Anthony F. Hitchcock, Alice M. Hoffenberg, Francis M. Hugo, Steve Isaacson, Jonathan Jacoby, Michael Jaffe, Marion Janel, T. Todd Jesdal, W. F. Jordan.

Stephen Kagle, Jeffrey L. Kahn, Thomas Kahn, Stephen Kaplan, Richard L. Kaufman, Jeffrey Kessel, Carol S. Kestler, Kenneth King, Lawrence Kirsch, Richard J. Kline, J. Kline, Norman Knopf, Terrell E. Koken, A. Koloseike, Albert J. Kopec, William Kornblum, Marc C. Kornfeld, David M. Kurn, Everett C. Ladd, Jr., John F. Laffey, Alan Larris, N. Lawrence, Judy Lazarus, Lawrence B. Lesser, Madeleine Leston, Robert E. Levine, Richard Levy, Michael Lichtig, David B. Lipsky, David S. Litwin, Edwin D. Lorsch, Marcia Anne Luther, Dirk M. Luykx, Mieke Maas, Cynthia MacLane, Ron Maduro, Stephen Mainster, Michael J. Malby, Eric Mann, Paul Joseph Marantz, F. Landis Markley, Andrea Martin, Phoebe J. Mason, Alan McConnell, Dennis F. McCulloch, Richard Keller McKee, S. E. McKee, Lawrie Medini, Helen L. Menges, Steve Merritt, Peter S. Mitchell, George Mohn, Peggy R. Monkmeyer, Bernard Moss, Art Myers, Steven R. Nelson, David de Neufville, David B. B. Neumann, R. V. Nieburgs, Shelia O'Connell, Joe Oppenheimer, Ruth Opler, Fred Pass, Marian Pearlman, Paul J. Peckar, Lewis J. Perl, Rachel Perl, Robert J. Perrin, Nancy Phillips, Nathaniel W. Pierce, Martin Platzner, Carol Polinsky, Donald H. Pond, Gary Evan Poser, Leigh Power, Robert Putz, Paul Quenean.

Jonathan Radin, Mark Ramras, Jon A. Rantzman, D. Rattner, Warren Reier, Steve Rempell, Jack Reubens, Tom Rich, Andrew Carl Rogrod, Judith Robinson, Stephen E. Rochow, C. B. Roeder, Bruce Rogers, Joan Romm, Fred Rosen, Frederick P. Rothamn, Michael Rubenstein, Alan Ruskin, Judy Ruskin, Roger E. Sack, Michael Sanders, E. Savage, Bill Schaap, David Schaefer, Daniel Schecter, William E. Schleicher, Helen Schoonmaker, Alan Schwartz, Ralph Scott, George M. Sebsow, Gail Seeley, Eugene V. Seidel, Alexandra M. Shapiro, Nina Shapiro, Rochelle Shaw, James H. Shawvan, Dick Sherman, Wayne Sherman, R. M. Siegel, Martin E. Silverman, Su Silverstein, Stephen B. Sirkin, Hillel I. Swiller, Robert J. Sklarew, Stephen Skwire, Michael S. Slade, Donald O. Smith, Peter B. Smith, Matthew C. Sonfield, M. L. Stahl, Elsa Starobin, Robert Starobin, Evelyn Stein, Michael Steinberg, Bruce Steinhardt, Peter Sterling, Nancy Sterns, Chris Stuhr, Nina Swersie, Emily Tall, Terry J. Tondro, Janet Trampler, Ellen Tremper, Anne Tropp (plus 28 more).

FRIENDS

Kathryn H. Buyoucos, Shirley A. Cass, Donna M. Drummond, Nancy Gendell, Norman Greenberg, Joy Hadden, Thomas Hanna, Roena L. Haynie, Sydney A. Kneebone, Ella S. Laffey, Ellen Metzner, Carolyn Micklem, Althea Pearlman, Elihu Pearlman, Kehnroth Schramm, M.D., Florence Schwartz, P. Silverman, Linda J. Standig, David Stieglitz, Willard Uphaus, Doris Wachsler, Carol E. Wolf (plus 50 more).

Italy: Old Yet Young

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, March 17 marks the 100th anniversary of the unification of Italy. I am taking the pleasure today of calling to the attention of my colleagues an excellent editorial which appeared this morning in the Chicago Daily Tribune commemorating this anniversary.

I am very happy to join today in this tribute to Italy, a nation that has given the world great scholars, artists, composers, and philosophers. It would indeed be a most difficult task to attempt a complete analysis of the great contribution Italy has made toward enriching the cultural standards of the world. Suffice it to say that the entire world is rightfully grateful to this magnificent nation for its many contributions.

We in America have a particularly close relationship with Italy because Italian immigrants, from the very birth of our Nation, have been prominent in our Nation's cultural, spiritual, and industrial development.

I am sure that all Americans will join tomorrow in paying tribute to Italy and wishing this great nation every best hope for its second century as a unified country. Let the cynics and the skeptics, who so frequently have maligned this distinguished race with distorted television productions, ponder the real contribution to America and the world by the people of Italian heritage.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial follows:

ITALY: OLD YET YOUNG

One hundred years ago tomorrow, a legislature convened in Turin, at the foot of the Alps, proclaimed the kingdom of Italy. Though the dream of a united Italy is very old, the ancient city of Rome is today the capital of a national government now just completing its first century.

In 476 a Barbarian army revolted against its exclusion from the rich peninsula of which Rome was the principal city, and the foreign legions with which imperial Rome had overawed much of the known world finally roosted on the seven hills of the capital. The center of gravity moved north; Charlemagne's principal capital was Aix, now the German city of Aachen. Through dark ages and renaissance, princelings contended with each other in Italy. Out of generations of conflict, no unified government of and in the Italian peninsula emerged. Cities such as Florence and Venice had their golden periods, but there was no Italian nation.

At one time or another, the French, the Spaniards, and the Austrians were ascendant. Napoleon Bonaparte for a few years played a commanding role, and dominated all Italy except for the islands of Sardinia and Sicily. With his fall, power again splintered. From the unlikely source of Sardinia the process of unification began from scratch.

A reasonably flexible King of Sardinia, Victor Emmanuel II, presided over the effective consolidation of a realm reaching from Sardinia as far north as Geneva. In a Parliament of growing strength, the future architect of Italian unity appeared in Count Camillo Cavour. Exiles and rebels who in an earlier time would have left Italy altogether began to gather in Turin.

In 1859, Sardinia and France in alliance struck successfully against Austrian power south of the mountains, but France pulled back before Sardinia could annex more than Lombardy. The tide was running for the revolutionaries, though, and one small area after another declared for union with Sardinia. At this crucial point, by ceding to France its provinces of Nice and Savoy, Sardinia purchased French acquiescence to its expansion in Italy.

In Sicily, an uprising against the unpopular government at Naples was reinforced by Garibaldi and a thousand men from Genoa. Garibaldi moved on against Naples, which he occupied in September 1860. On the excuse that if he did not move against the papal states Garibaldi would, Cavour sent troops through those territories. When they made contact with Garibaldi, one regime at last had authority the entire length of the boot. The way was prepared for the proclamation in Turin the next spring of a kingdom of Italy; soon after, Cavour died.

Venetia, previously ruled from Vienna, was incorporated in 1866. In 1870, when the destruction of Napoleon III's Empire in the Franco-Prussian War deprived the Pope of his strong support from Paris, the new Italy gained temporal power in what had been left of the Papal States. In a sense, the unification of Italy had finally been achieved.

Of course, every nation is perpetually redefining its character. For a time it looked as if the unification of Italy would flower in nothing more admirable than the strutting nationalism of Mussolini. Fortunately for Italy and the world, the country has made a magnificent recovery from World War II, a recovery accompanied by marked economic advances and more particularly by a rebirth of the Italian genius in the arts, sciences, and letters.

Contemporary Italy, for both better and worse, lacks the degree of uniformity and unity which characterizes many nation states. The various regions have deep roots in different subsoils, watered and fed by different degrees of development and prosperity. Only against the background of its tumultuous centuries and the brevity of its national experience can present day Italy be understood.

Creeping Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARLETON J. KING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1961

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following editorial published March 11, 1961, in the Saratogian, Saratoga Springs, N.Y.:

CREEPING SOCIALISM

Near the shores of the Potomac in the massive agriculture building, a new group of state planners is cooking up a program of farm controls that makes the New Deal look like an exercise in free farming.

The American people—farmers and nonfarmers—ought to realize what's coming. And they ought to understand that they can't depend on just Congress to block it.

Already, Kennedy's new Secretary of Agriculture, Orville L. Freeman, has given a foretaste of what's to come by upping cotton support prices and sponsoring a bill to impose tighter controls on feed grains.

This legislation has a gimmick in it which permits the Federal Government to sell surplus grains and knock the bottom out of the market, just to punish farmers who don't want to cut back their acreage. It's having rough sledding in Congress, but the Freeman crew won't give up easily.

This is nothing, however, compared to what's coming later. There's a Minnesota professor named Willard W. Cochrane in the Agriculture Department now and he's working overtime dreaming up new control ideas.

One approach involves "the conscious adjustment of supply to demand, commodity by commodity, year after year, to yield prices in the market that have already been determined fair by some responsible agency," in Cochrane's words.

From that program, it's not a very long step to Government controls over the marketing process and perhaps even to Government regulation of what kind of food Americans will eat, all in the spirit of conscious adjustment of supply to demand.

This will mean higher taxes and a vast bureaucracy if the farmer is to be made to comply and if his income is to be protected, as the New Frontiersmen seem determined to do.

These are the reports from Washington, undenied, almost incredible to hear. Call it socialism, call it state planning, call it anything you like. It all adds up, in our view, to a frightening extension of Government control in prospect unless somebody blows the whistle, and quickly.

The City of Davenport, Iowa, Adopts a Resolution Urging Approval for Right of Municipalities To Buy Surplus Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I understand that many municipalities have gone on record favoring approval of the right to purchase surplus Government property on the same basis as school districts and civil defense units.

The city of Davenport, Iowa, recently adopted a resolution to that effect. I take this opportunity to bring it to the attention of the Members of Congress.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION RELATIVE TO THE PURCHASE OF SURPLUS U.S. GOVERNMENT PROPERTY

Whereas the Federal Government of the United States now possesses, and will acquire in the future, surplus property; and

Whereas the surplus property is stored and sold at various points in the United States; and

Whereas it has been, and is sold, to school districts, civil defense and like organizations on a preferred basis; and

Whereas much surplus property still remains unsold that is purchased by private parties for speculation; and

Whereas the Government property was purchased with the taxpayers funds; and

Whereas a municipality is a tax body that should be afforded the same preferences afforded other taxing bodies, such as,

school districts and civil defense: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Davenport, Iowa, That we hereby urge the President and Vice President of the United States, and the U.S. Congress, to take the necessary steps to accord the same privilege to municipalities as now enjoyed by school districts and civil defense in purchasing surplus Government property: Be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the United States Senators and Representatives from the State of Iowa.

Passed and approved this 1st day of March, 1961.

DON A. PETRUCCELLI,
Mayor.

A Menace to Our Freedoms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. CORMAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the following editorial from the Los Angeles Times in the Appendix of the RECORD. It is a most inspiring and forthright exposure of a deadly menace to our freedoms, and one I would commend to all my colleagues. The articles which preceded this editorial provide a shocking but accurate picture of the blind philosophy and treacherous activity of the John Birch Society and its leader, Mr. Robert Welch. The articles are on file in the Library of Congress, and I would also commend those to my colleagues as required reading.

The editorial follows:

PERIL TO CONSERVATIVES

The Times published last week a heavily documented series of articles which defined the nature and methods of the John Birch Society in the words of its absolute master.

The quotations from Robert Welch, and from some of his lieutenants, nail down the treacherous fallacy that an honorable or noble objective justifies any means to achieve it.

Our fear of the John Birch Society is based on our own findings, on the meticulously researched articles written by Gene Blake. In them it can be read, within quotation marks, that Communists must be fought with their own weapons, smear for smear. Even—and the quotations are brutal—with sedition.

Every conservative must adhere to the general purpose of the society as it is stated by Robert Welch: "to promote less government, more responsibility, and a better world."

Every loyal American must agree devoutly with the society's immediate intention of stopping the Communists and destroying their conspiracy, or at least breaking its grip on our Government and shattering its power within the United States.

And every informed American must agree with the society's tenet that the United States is actually now engaged with Soviet Russia in a struggle for the survival of our system.

With all honorable Americans, this newspaper looks with disgust and dream upon the godless materialism and blood-soaked tyranny of the Communist conspiracy. It is because of our people's disgust and dread that the Communists must seek their ends by secret subversion, by seducing officials, by discrediting our institutions, sowing distrust among us, aggravating union and racial disputes, entering without conscience into any course that will serve the purpose of Moscow.

Then what is likely to happen to the member of the John Birch Society who abandons all the rules by which he has lived his decent life, and adopts instead the techniques and the rules of conspiracy to fight Communists in Communist fashion?

If the John Birchers follow the program of their leader, they will bring our institutions into question exactly as the Communists try to do. They will sow distrust, and aggravate disputes, and they will weaken the very strong case for conservatism.

What are we to think when our last three Presidents—Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower—are accused either of being Communists or Communist dupes?

What are we think when these charges are leveled against Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, against his brother Allen who heads our vital Central Intelligence Agency, against the Chief Justice of our Supreme Court?

What are we to think when the honor and integrity of the Vice President of the United States, the Republican Party's nominee for President, are questioned?

What are we to think when we are told that our Nation's press almost without exception is Communist infiltrated and inspired?

What are we to think when we are told that our churches almost without exception are corroded with active agents of Moscow?

What is happening to us when all loyal Americans are accused of being Communist dupes unless they subscribe to the radical and dictatorial direction of one self-chosen man?

All sincere conservatives must ask themselves these questions. And they must answer them.

The Times believes implicitly in the conservative philosophy. It has challenged all these men and most of these institutions on the soundness of one or more issues. But the Times does not believe that the argument for conservatism can be won—and we do believe it can be won—by smearing as enemies and traitors those with whom we sometimes disagree.

Subversion, whether of the left or the right, is still subversion.

Finnish-American Trade Amity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, it was reassuring to learn of the recent offer made to Finland by the Ministerial Council of the European Free Trade Association for that democratic country to become an associate member of the organization. Finland, with its vigorous private enterprise system, offers expanded trade opportunities, not only to the seven countries that make up this important trading bloc but with the United States as well.

Two-way commerce between Finland and this country is on the increase and I consider this a very healthy development. I understand that in 1960 U.S. exports to Finland nearly doubled the total of the previous year and our imports to Finland were about 12 percent higher than in 1959.

These cordial relationships are greatly desirable and gratifying because they do much to preserve the historic and cherished amity between our Nation and the great Finish nation and its devoted people.

To me, this valuable program has a more intimate significance because of the large number of people of Finish descent who live in my district. These good people are constituents of mine, of whom I am very proud. The magnificent contributions of Americans of Finish descent to this Nation in war and in peace are second to none.

An interesting and factual account of diversification within the Finish economy, and an indication of some of the export activities engaged in by this small but enterprising nation which is accelerating its industrialization, can be noted from an article that appeared in a McGraw-Hill publication "International Management Digest." I request unanimous consent to have this report printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From International Management Digest, October 1960]

LETTER FROM HELSINKI

Prior to World War I, Finland's famed distance runner, Hannes Kolehmainen, literally ran his country onto the map of the world. The map has changed considerably since then. But until recently, the Finns have not bothered much about telling their story to the world—and especially to the business world.

Now the Finns are coming out of their Nordic hibernation. They are excited about the growing diversification of their economy; they are proudly pointing to new export successes in Western markets. You could see a changed Finland at last month's Finnish Industries Fair, in Helsinki. One-third of the space was reserved—not for the traditional forest industries—but for the metalworking industries. (Finland's wood, pulp, paper, and board still add up to nearly 80 percent of total exports, and when bad times hit the forests, the whole nation suffers.)

Look at the progress in metalworking. Capacity has been expanding at a healthy 7 percent annually, providing today 17 percent of total exports. Mining, too, is assuming greater importance (note the new undersea iron mine off the southern coast, to be producing 300,000 tons of ore by 1962; a joint Finish-Swedish venture will process the ore). Nor is the forest industry standing still—it is in the midst of a $340 million expansion, to be completed in 1962.

Growing production—in a nation of only 4.4 million—is making the Finns export hungry. And they are getting results by following two business principles and an unusual marketing effort.

The first principle lies in specialization. The Finnish metalworking industry concentrates on offering paper and sawmilling machines, cables, electric motors, transformers, icebreakers and refrigerator ships, and materials-handling and earth-moving equipment. (Finns believe their rugged terrain has inspired some especially well-engineered heavy equipment.)

How successful? Kone of Finland supplies 50 percent of Sweden's harbor cranes. Valmet is building a tractor works in Brazil.

The second principle is to concentrate on the potentially good markets, in the industrial and semi-industrial nations, not so much the underdeveloped lands (the Finns have real difficulty granting extended credit terms). In the process, Finland is breaking

its trade dependence on the Russians. For one thing, the Finns are tired of the caprice of the purchasing agents in the Kremlin; for another, they are meeting much stiffer competition from other westerners in the Communist market. One big Finnish company, which once sold 60 percent of its exports behind the Iron Curtain, now reports the total is only 7 percent. By 1965, Finns believe that 50 percent of their metalworking exports will go west, compared to 35 percent now.

To market its machinery exports, the Finns set up Metex Corp., a private company linking 42 member firms with 87 factories and an annual turnover of $250 million. The roving salesmen of Metex have made contacts in about 100 foreign markets, and won contracts to build factories or supply major machinery components in 23 nations, from India to South America.

The Finns also hope their European trade may improve, now that Mr. Khrushchev has given his tentative blessing to Finnish membership in the European Free Trade Association. The price: a guarantee providing the Russians with the same trade privileges that the Finns would grant to EFTA members. Next month, President Kekkonen will journey to [illegible]w to start negotiations.

Our First Line of Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, there are altogether too many folks who do not appreciate or understand our immigration program and its effect.

It is always encouraging to find leadership that is helping to get an understanding of such important legislation as the McCarran-Walter Act. I recently read an editorial entitled "Our First Line of Defense" in a recent issue of Life Lines published in Washington, D.C., which I believe my colleagues and readers of the RECORD will be interested in.

The editorial follows:

OUR FIRST LINE OF DEFENSE

The Immigration Act of 1952, known also as the McCarran-Walter Act, was under consideration in Congress for 5 years prior to its passage. It codified earlier laws on this important subject, and liberalized them considerably. It established an annual quota for each country of one-sixth of 1 percent of the number of U.S. citizens lately derived from that country. We admit to our shores well over 150,000 immigrants each year, together with special cases which almost double the number.

Preference is given to skilled workers, who can support themselves and their families and contribute to the arts and crafts needed in this country, while relatives of persons already absorbed into our population are accorded welcome up to the very limits of practicality. In addition to formal entrants, we have within our borders nearly 1 million nonquota, displaced persons and refugees, plus an unestimated number of foreign visitors, who have overstayed their temporary permits, plus 3 to 5 million of outright aliens who have arrived illegally.

The United States has been generous in admitting those who knock at our gates. Our immigration laws are adequate when weighed on honest, realistic scales. Although we are accused in some quarters of being cold and selfish because we do not admit aliens indiscriminately and without restriction, there exist a few good reasons for maintaining our carefully evolved immigration policies. It is not selfish to assess and safeguard our national interests. For if the United States falls to invasion of one type or another, then, all over the world, freedom will perish. The immigration front is our first line of defense.

Well-organized forces of the mistaken are solidly entrenched, urging repeal of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, or at least a drastic revision thereof, to lower our immigration barriers. According to a recognized authority on immigration, Congressman FRANCIS E. WALTER, the mistaken "have advertised the brazen lie all over the world that, under present immigration laws, access to this country has been curtailed if not wellnigh closed." On the contrary, our quota and above-quota admissions are humane and not at all narrow, as witness the figures cited above.

Higher rates of entry would soon result in a state of supersaturation which, far from being humane, would be suicidal. Would that be commonsense? A sensible nation is like a sensible individual, in that either must be governed by the head as well as by the heart.

There are those who think we should invite all the poor, the hungry, the inept, and the afflicted from across the seas to come and share our bounty; some even advocate our paying their passage over—with American taxes adjusted, naturally, to meet the extra strain. But this is not a workable program because our bounty would not last very long in such circumstances. At best, this attitude is unrealistic and sentimental and needs to be analyzed in the light of economic facts and figures.

Our own population, thanks to a high birth rate and enlightened health care, is growing at the rate of 2.5 million or more each year. Therefore, the United States does not need new immigrants beyond the fixed quotas.

It may cause you some dismay to know that powerful forces are urging that the volume of our immigration be increased in the ratio of approximately 3 to 1. And you will be properly alarmed to realize that repeal of the Connally amendment would take control of our immigration entirely out of the U.S.'s hands and would place it with the World Court—an agency of the United Nations. There would be no appeal from decisions of the World Court. If we are not very alert—and cautious—our immigration problems will be settled for us, once and for all, in ways not to our liking.

INFILTRATORS IN OUR MIDST

The eminent Patrick Jay Hurley once observed that America's passion for liberty began with our Declaration of Independence in 1776 and ended with the disgraceful Conference at Yalta in 1945. He explained that, in the first instance, the American people cared; in the second, they had quit caring.

Is this indeed a just statement? If so, we die-hards, who do care, had better get busy and alert the quitters, who won't, for we are living in times more dangerous than our forefathers experienced in 1775 and the decade which followed. "Dangerous to what?" you may ask. The answer is: Dangerous to our lives and our sacred honor; dangerous to our freedom as opposed to a condition of abject slavery, such as that forced upon all peoples behind the Iron Curtain.

Abraham Lincoln's famed remark that "You can't fool all the people all the time" is being challenged by the Soviet Union's intensive efforts to do precisely that. The Reds are spending $2 billion a year to prove Lincoln wrong. A lot of that money is our money—funds which the Soviet Union owes the United States but refuses to acknowledge as indebtedness; also, funds which have been paid out by us in our worldwide program of foreign aid, much of which has gone to build up countries before they fell victims to Red takeover, much as pigs and poultry are fattened for holiday slaughter.

The doctrines of Karl Marx form the Soviet gospel. Marx assumed that the Western World would be too gullible, too idle, and too indifferent, to rise up and fight his sordid socialist principles, until Marxism should have been solidly established and the time would be too late. And it is true that Marxist socialism, which is identical with police-statism, has succeeded almost entirely because of the don't-care attitudes on the part of those marked next for enslavement. A recent Senate document says: "Totalitarianism moves ahead less on the conviction of its members than on the confusion of its opponents."

Let us take a quick look at some of the methods used by the mistaken to deceive and demoralize free peoples, and to condition them for tyranny. These methods must be worth examining, if they merit $2 billion annual expenditure by the Communists, who are the world's tightest guardians of the purse. Their own paid agitators are held in line by blackmail and other threats, because the fierce dictators long ago learned that intimidation costs less than regular salaries, and gets more effective results.

First of all, the mistaken go directly after the minds of a target people. They secure agents who, kept under strict control, will zealously, blindly carry out orders no matter if those orders call for murder, rape, or terrorization.

Here is another economy they cultivate: In every land today the Reds maintain only a relatively small, hard core of active and dedicated party agents; but here is the catch—each agent can count on the help, sympathy, and cooperation of ten or a dozen unpaid pro-mistaken fellow-travelers, who have become infected with the poison of selling out their native country to the enemy. In some cases, they are mere dupes, of limited mentality to begin with, happy to be associated with subversives they admire as being clever and influential. In other cases, they are so-called intellectuals and idealists, often heirs to vast fortunes piled up by their grandfathers, but afflicted with a terrible blind spot which prevents them from seeing that they are headed for a crash landing with no rescuer anywhere.

Such are the prime movers of mistaken propaganda and infiltration. Such are the advance guard scattered all over the world today, numerous enough for mass action and for taking over the vital machinery of public life when so directed.

In the second place, the communists make a specialty of manufacturing crises. Any kind of crisis will permit the mistaken to bore a little deeper into the vital spots of a target nation. After having deliberately caused a crisis, they shout from the housetops—and they fool a lot of people: "World tensions must be eased."

The ability of our enemies to stage a revolution makes the Communist Party highly dangerous even though its visible membership be small (with the main part undersurface, like an iceberg). An example of this was Guatemala, where the Reds seized power through third parties when their own membership was 1,000. Another example is Cuba, where Castro was able to unseat the existing government, constantly denying communist affiliation, until the day came when he openly stated what informed observers had known all along—that any enemy of communism was also an enemy of Castro.

Mistaken propagandists think of everything. They overlook no area—social, political, religious, or educational. The United

States is learning to look with dismay on the current products of progressive education, which would better be called regressive education. We can only hope that young people, as they grow older, will come to realize that the philosophy of the mistaken is bound to rob them of all they hold dear. It is our duty to help them see how erroneous subversive activities are for themselves and their fellow citizens. It is our duty to urge removal of the root cause—the presence of Communist infiltrators in our midst.

A Strange View of the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Wall Street Journal of March 15.

This editorial says something that I have longed to have said for many a long day. Why should the United States of America assume the guilt and responsibility for every sin, misfortune, cruelty, and stupidity on this plan. Why, oh, why, assume to play God Almighty to the whole of mankind.

Mr. Speaker, this cannot be done. It never has been done and it never should be done.

A STRANGE VIEW OF THE WORLD

Is it not strange that whenever we Americans look at the woes of the world—be they in Asia, Africa, or Latin America—we must adopt all faults as our own, and announce to the world that we were born to set them right?

This strange view of the world, and of ourselves, is met again in the program for Latin America outlined the other day by President Kennedy. It is not that the President misstates the troubles that beset the Latin American countries. Latin America is an area, taken by and large, that has not accomplished its potentials. There are, in many places, much poverty, a lack of decent shelter, a want of education, and a needless blight of disease. It is also a land of discontent, as its many revolutions testify, and this discontent, as no one will deny, is a source of new troubles.

But there runs through the President's speech the thought that all these troubles in Latin America are somehow the fault of the people of the United States. Our revolution of 1776 is not yet finished; our hemisphere's mission not yet complete. The ignorance, poverty and the political instability of Latin America are a part of our unfilled task. They must, so we are told, lie heavily—that is, guiltily—upon our conscience.

Ours is the attitude of the rich man who feels he must apologize for his affluence. He has taken the envious comments of his neighbors at face value and ascribes it all to a fortunate Providence. And we say: Our riches are a poor and slightly soiled thing—but let us make you rich, too. And if your poverty is greater than our riches can assuage, we must share some of your poverty.

And so it is the duty of the United States to embark on a vast sort of Marshall plan for the New World. We must provide Latin America with capital, send them teachers and school lunches, provide money for their universities, help them recast their social and political patterns, fill their gaps in trained manpower, wipe out disease and in general help provide "resources of a scope and magnitude sufficient to make this bold program a success."

Of course, there is a touch of the ridiculous in talk of sending teachers abroad at a time when we complain ourselves of a shortage of teachers, of subsidizing foreign welfare projects when we are hard put to pay for projects promised here at home. And more than a touch of the ridiculous in a new vast plan for pouring out dollars when this country is already wrestling with a deficit in its present balance of payments.

But the strangest part is the view of history here reflected. The Latin American continent is as rich in resources as the northern continent, richer in some. The United States has done nothing to prevent the Latin Americans from developing their continent and has done much that would have helped them. If Latin America has failed to reach its potentials, it is for many and complex reasons, but there is no reason why this country should bear the burden of guilt.

Yet this assumption of guilt about Latin America is part of a view we assume toward many parts of the world we describe as backward or underdeveloped. Ignorance in Africa or poverty in Asia is somehow also our fault and therefore our responsibility to cure.

No one ever specifies what it was exactly that we did to impede civilization in Africa, uncivilized for centuries before a European ever set foot upon it; or to block economic progress in Asia, a continent civilized before Europe was born. We just accept without question the charge that it was all due to colonialism or exploitation. The fault never lies in the economic systems or in the political institutions of those lands themselves.

But if we thus misread history in taking upon ourselves all these guilts, we misread the world around us when we begin to think that this country can, out of its own resources, uplift all these peoples, dissolve their ignorance, banish their poverty and remake their societies and institutions. The basic troubles in these backward countries are not entirely to be solved by an infusion of dollars, and even if they were, we overpride ourselves in thinking that we are sufficiently strong to carry all these lands upon our own shoulders.

There is nothing particularly remarkable about the proposed new program envisioned for Latin America. It is of a piece with our grand design all over the world, and in its way more modest and therefore more promising than some.

Yet in its assumptions of guilt and in its vaunting of our own powers of redemption, it reflects, once again, our strange view of ourselves and of the world around us.

Charles Silver: A Man With a Heart of Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, one of the great humanitarians in America is Charles H. Silver. His contributions to charity are legion. His efforts on behalf of the Alfred E. Smith Fund are perennial and his devotion to the daily kindness to his fellow man is well known. Mr. Silver is president of the Board of Education of the City of New York, president of the Beth Israel Hospital, and president of B'nai Jeshurun, the second largest temple in the city of New York.

Because of his deep concern for the educational system of our city of New York and the impact that proposed Federal legislation would have upon a large segment of our youth, Mr. Silver testified before the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor on March 15, 1961, in Washington, D.C. His viewpoints are worthy of serious consideration and I take the privilege of inserting them for the readers to peruse. His testimony follows:

STATEMENT BY CHARLES H. SILVER ON FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION AT THE HEARING HELD BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, MARCH 15, 1961, WASHINGTON, D.C.

I wish to express my gratitude to the committee for inviting me to make a statement of my views at these hearings on the proposed legislation regarding Federal aid to education. I am honored that they should be sought and I am pleased to give them.

In addition to my duties as president of the Board of Education of the City of New York, I am also president of one of our city's hospitals, Beth Israel, and president of B'nai Jeshurun, the second largest temple in the city of New York which has been in existence for 135 years. I mention this to point out the extent of my involvement in matters of education and welfare.

Intimate experience in the field of education during the past 10 years has made me aware of the many and complex problems facing our young people and those responsible for their education. I have more than a passing or casual interest in the proposals being made. Any effort to help our boys and girls during the important and formative school years is a vital matter to me. Anything done to assist and reinforce the work of our teachers and all others involved in the educational process enlists my interest and cooperation.

The President deserves our gratitude for the concern he has shown, and for the practical and aggressive spirit with which he has so quickly and forcefully addressed himself to the problems of education on all levels. I do not know of anything more important for the present and future welfare of America than improving and advancing our standards for the education of all our young people.

I am justly proud of our New York public school system, the largest in the world. Staffed by 40,000 teachers and educating close to a million boys and girls in almost a thousand buildings, our system is entrusted with the serious obligation of providing the best education possible for the children of our great metropolis. It is our duty to give them the training they need for the fuller development of their own lives and for the greater progress of our country and all mankind.

For these reasons, I welcome and endorse the proposals made to assist our children and our schools. Such a program will do much to help us accomplish more fully the challenging task with which we have been entrusted.

It is quite obvious that the staggering problems and complexities involved in organizing, financing, and operating the largest school system in the world would indeed be greatly increased, if it were not for the

private and church-related schools, which provide the education for such a large segment of elementary and high school youth in New York City. They are, and have been for generations, partners of the public schools in this great work of education. These nonpublic schools presently enroll approximately 450,000 boys and girls—a total slightly less than one-half the number of 960,000 enrolled in public schools. Thus, one out of every three children in New York City of elementary and high school age attends a nonpublic school. All will admit that if these schools did not exist it would be extremely difficult for New York City to finance adequate and proper school programs and facilities for this army of children.

Most of the parents who send their children to nonpublic schools have accepted the heavy burden, not only of building these schools, but of meeting the costs of their maintenance and operation. Speaking from a financial point of view, may I ask you to consider the following basic and important facts:

If New York City were confronted with the situation, whereby 450,000 additional children came into the public school system, this would entail a capital outlay of $1 billion for the construction of school buildings.

If New York City were responsible for the maintenance and operation costs of educating an additional 450,000 pupils, it would increase the cost to the city by approximately $200 million each year.

Aside from this staggering sum of money which would have to come from public taxes, the public school system would have the problem of obtaining the services of additional properly qualified teachers in the face of a present national shortage. A total of 18,000 new teachers would have to be employed. This represents approximately one-half of the total teachers presently employed in our New York City school system.

This staggering financial burden would be multiplied scores and scores of times, if local and State governments throughout the Nation had the responsibility of providing educational programs and facilities for all children now enrolled in nonpublic elementary and high schools.

It is estimated that these institutions, with a total enrollment of 7 million pupils, save local and State governments an expenditure of more than $3 billion annually in operational and maintenance costs. An expenditure of approximately $16 billion would have to be made from public funds to provide buildings to house this student population.

Personally, I am seriously disturbed that the President's proposals for Federal aid make no provision for assisting the children in attendance at our private and church-related schools. It is disappointing that no assistance of any type is proposed for the parents who, by their free choice, elect to send their children to nonpublic schools. This exclusion of children in nonpublic schools does an injustice to the objectives we are trying to achieve.

The total educational picture in this country includes both public and nonpublic sectors. Unquestionably, our goal is improvement in education. No matter how much aid is given to the public schools, it is not possible to ignore so large a segment as that which exists outside the public domain, without falling short of our objective.

It seems to me that there are only two alternatives.

We can provide aid only to the public schools—thereby limiting our objectives, at the expense of our national well-being. To me, this is unthinkable.

On the other hand, we might seek to apply Federal aid to all schools, by a method consistent with our national principles. A diligent search for such a method seems to me to be the soundest approach to a solution of our total educational problem.

Federal aid will be a New Frontier for educational expansion and improvement. It is important to remember, however, that public and nonpublic schools have both played a vital role, and each has a valid function in the traditional educational structure of this Nation.

In the course of our history, the contributions of public and nonpublic schools have created a balanced effort that has enriched American education.

Any plan of Federal aid that excludes nonpublic schools would tend to destroy this balance and do a disservice to our country.

What I am trying to say, in capsule, is that the relationship and the relative positions of the nonpublic and public schools are firmly established in the social and educational fabric of our society.

If the Federal Government enters directly into the field of education, it should maintain the status quo in this area. The balance is a very delicate one. Unless it is maintained, all of education may suffer, and Federal aid, instead of a blessing, may become a divisive influence.

At this very time, we find differences of opinion about the principle and the method of Federal aid to education. Speaking as a Jewish layman, I would like to point out that Jewish opinion is by no means unanimous. I will read, if I may, some excerpts from a translation of an article by Solomon Dingol, editor of the Day and Jewish Journal, the largest Jewish newspaper in the country. I submit the original article, which appeared on January 28, 1961.

"As it can readily be seen, there are valid arguments on both sides, and different opinions prevail in different Jewish circles.

"Orthodox Jewry is for Federal aid to religious schools. At a recent convention of the Union of Orthodox Congregations, Prof. William Brickman, head of the School of Education of New York University, asked for Federal aid for the religious Hebrew schools, which would be merely an extension of the aid which some schools receive now.

"The American Jewish Congress, a civil Jewish organization, is opposed to Federal aid to parochial schools.

"As for myself, I am opposed to the introduction of religion in public schools, but I can see some benefits to education in Government aid for the teaching of general subjects in the religious schools."

The President himself has repeatedly emphasized the importance of developing, conserving and protecting our natural resources. Moreover, he has stressed the urgency of going to great lengths to keep and preserve our forests with their material potential, our waterways with their power potential, our farms with their food potential, our mines with their mineral potential.

But what of our greatest natural resource—our children? For they are all our children, no matter what school they attend. How can we honestly say we are interested in all children and in the welfare of our Nation, if we disregard or overlook the physical, cultural, intellectual, and social needs of approximately 450,000 boys and girls in New York City, attending nonpublic schools, and the 7 million who attend these institutions throughout the United States? After all, the money needed to improve our educational standards is not, in its ultimate purpose, being given to any school as such—public, private or parochial, but to our children.

The battle against ignorance and intellectual inadequacy, at a time when knowledge was never more vital for the preservation of our way of life, must be fought at every desk, in every classroom, library, and laboratory of every school in our land, regardless of religious or nonreligious affiliation, regardless of the race, color or creed of its students.

Maine's 100th Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, on May 31, 1820, the first State of Maine Legislature convened to commence formulating laws for the new State which had gained its sovereignty from Massachusetts on March 15, 1820, via the famed Missouri compromise.

It took Maine's first legislative body 4 weeks to act on the pressing problems of that era, a task that today requires 5 or 6 months.

Maine is proud of its State legislature and of the many distinguished legislators who went on to gain national prominence in the past. To mention only a few—Hon. Hannibal Hamlin, Member of Congress and Vice President of the United States under Lincoln; Hon. James G. Blaine, U.S. Congressman, Senator, and Republican candidate for President; Hon. William Pitt Fessenden, U.S. Congressman and Secretary of the Treasury; Hon. Nelson Dingley, Member of Congress; and Hon. Thomas B. Reed, former speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Yesterday, March 15, ceremonies commemorating Maine's 100th legislature were held at the State house in Augusta, Maine. I wish, as a former member of the Maine Legislature, to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues this momentous occasion, and know you will all join me in wishing the Maine Legislature and the people of Maine another 100 years of successful legislation.

I would like to have the following remarks by the Governor of the State of Maine, John H. Reed, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE JOHN H. REED, GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF MAINE

The annals of Maine history will note this memorable occasion made possible through the efforts of a great many individuals. Those responsible for this fitting tribute to the Maine Legislature, past and present, deserve credit and recognition. We are assembled this morning to commemorate all the legislatures which have served our State and great has been that service. I believe the 100th Maine Legislature is setting a record which assures its place in the history of State government.

Although the State of Maine separated from her parent Commonwealth 141 years ago today, the ties which binds Massachusetts to the State of Maine are strong. Ours is a friendship and a close relationship of which there is no equal in the nation.

The members of the 100th Maine Legislature can look back upon a proud heritage of 99 legislatures composed of dedicated citizens who have been called to serve this great State. The members of the 100th Maine Legislature may also look forward with confidence to a future filled with accomplishment, to a future of their own creation, and to a record which I am confident will go down in Maine history as a truly great act of service to the people of the State of Maine.

The Power To Tax Is the Power To Destroy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL WILSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the House Committee on Ways and Means on March 15, 1961:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Congressman EARL WILSON, of the Ninth Indiana District.

First, I would like to thank the members of this committee for the opportunity to appear here today. I am happy to appear here on behalf of the Cummins Engine Co., of Columbus, Ind. This industry is vital to our Nation's progress and safety, essential for the forward movement of our transportation industry and a fundamental factor in the economic progress of my district.

I hope to be able to acquaint this committee with many of the facts pertinent to this proposal which tends to discriminate against an industry through the raising of tax on diesel fuel.

I am sure you gentlemen have heard this quotation by Chief Justice John Marshall many times in the past—"The power to tax is the power to destroy."

Tax proposals contained in the President's highway message would, if enacted, verify the truth of that statement. A vibrant, growing, efficient American industry stands to be seriously harmed if not destroyed once the proposed diesel fuel tax increase is approved.

A very unjust economic hardship will be imposed on the diesel engine industry if the tax raise of 75 percent is enacted. This industry has prospered; not through government favoritism; but, through its own enterprise and ingenuity. To tax the efficiency and economy achieved by this industry's product, is a direct contradiction of our American principles and is, in fact, an attack against a fundamental idea of American life.

This proposed tax poses the threat of crushing the diesel engine industry if enacted. Furthermore, by placing a penalty on the success of private enterprise we will stifle further diesel development and serve notice that the future success of private enterprise will always be in danger of tax penalties. Actually, diesel motored trucks represent only 2 percent of the entire trucking industry.

This Nation's progress depends upon preservation of historic principles of freedom and private enterprise which have made our country the "land of the free." Any other course is another step toward discouragement of individual initiative, toward socialism and communism.

This proposed tax is a proposal to tax efficiency, industry, and initiative, and discourage development of new and better products, as well as work a hardship on a vital American industry.

For your consideration I summarize below my findings on the subject of the proposed discriminatory fuel differential tax.

1. Taxing diesel fuel at a higher rate than gasoline would result in taxing only 15 percent of the heavy duty trucks, i.e., 26,000 pounds registered gross vehicle weight and above.

2. Differential tax on diesel fuel in effect is a tax on the efficiency of the diesel engine and therefore discriminates solely against the diesel engine industry as compared to its major competitor the gasoline engine industry.

3. The proposed diesel fuel tax increase from 4 cents per gallon to 7 cents per gallon amounts to a 75-percent increase, yet the Bureau of Public Roads, in its own exhaustive studies (table 5, p. 14, H. Doc. 91, third progress report of the highway cost allocation study), found only a 5-percent to 18-percent advantage of diesel trucks over gasoline trucks, making this proposed tax clearly discriminatory.

4. Development of the diesel engine to its present state of superior efficiency has been accomplished by private industry, without Government subsidy in any form.

5. Diesel-powered truck owners already pay substantially higher Federal taxes in the form of excise taxes on new trucks and on engines and repair parts than do the owners of gasoline-powered trucks of equivalent carrying capacity.

6. Federal differential taxation on diesel fuel would encourage every State to apply similar taxation with the inevitable result that diesel engines could be taxed off the highways.

7. Our military defense vehicle dieselization program would be adversely affected through restricting the ability of the diesel engine industry to continue its privately financed research and development programs. (Department of the Army 1960 policy calls for dieselization of all vehicles over 150 horsepower.)

8. The proposed diesel fuel tax would have a primary effect on one company—Cummins Engine Co., in my home district of Indiana, which produces 60 percent of all highway truck diesel engines. Cummins' average employment in 1960 was approximately 4,100, with a total payroll of $29,866,796. In addition raw material and finished products of $27,720,100 were obtained from Indiana suppliers in 1960.

In addition to presenting to this committee the preceding eight major arguments against the proposed diesel differential tax, I wish to comment upon an important point that was raised during the first day's hearing on this subject. You will recall that the Department of Commerce was asked if any studies had been made to determine what effect the proposed tax program would have upon the trucking industry. Their answers indicated that studies of the effect of the taxes on the profits of the industry had not been analyzed.

It was quite surprising to learn that this fundamental question had not been studied prior to recommending this tax program to the Congress. Had the Commerce witnesses been prepared to answer this question, I believe this committee would have been amazed at the unjust discrimination contained therein.

The success of many manufacturers and businesses depends upon efficient and economical truck freight transportation. To continue to provide such services to its many customers the trucking industry must be able to carry out its operations in a profitable manner. American Trucking Association figures indicate the proposed tax program would add $44.1 million per year to the total operating costs of the 1,076 class I and class II common carriers of general freight. Had the proposed tax increases been in effect in 1960, the added cost would have entirely eliminated the $43.7 million before tax net income of these carriers.

This significant fact demonstrates quite clearly that the trucking industry will be unable to absorb any portion of the proposed tax increases. This readily available information answers, at least in part, the earlier question raised by this committee.

Supposedly, the proposed taxes are aimed at the heavy duty trucks (26,000 pounds registered gross vehicle weight and over). Yet when we look into the makeup of this vehicle classification we find that only 135,000 (or 15 percent) of these 900,000 heavy duty trucks are powered with diesel engines. Since the proposed diesel differential tax affects such a small portion of the heavy duty trucks, this tax feature discriminates against a minority of those trucks. This fact is even more clearly emphasized when you consider that diesel trucks use between 13,000 and 18,000 gallons of fuel per year. Under the proposed tax increase their annual fuel costs will be increased by $390 to $540 per truck, with no corresponding increase in the costs of operating competitive gasoline engine powered trucks.

Another key point is that over 43 percent of the 135,000 heavy-duty diesel trucks are located in the mountain and Pacific regions. Yet, only 26 percent of the 40,943 miles of Federal highways will be located in these two regions—and an even smaller percentage of the total program dollars are to be expended in this western area. One can only conclude that the geographical distribution of this tax burden is unequal and does not follow the fair-share concept.

I am even more concerned about the effect the proposed tax increase program will have upon the suppliers of major components to the trucking industry. In this category, the Cummins Engine Co., the world's largest independent manufacturer of high-speed diesel truck engines, produces 60 percent of all highway truck diesel engines built in the United States. This company, through its own resources, inventiveness, and initiative, has been a leading pioneer in developing the diesel engine to its present state of operating efficiency.

During the past year Cummins has spent about $5 million on research to improve the efficiency of its engines about 4 percent. An additional $7 million is currently being spent for facilities to produce this improved engine. Each 1 cent increase in the differential price of diesel fuel over gasoline decreases the efficiency of the diesel nearly 5 percent. The total proposed tax increase on diesel fuel will have the same effect as decreasing the efficiency of the diesel engine by 14 percent—or nullifying almost fourfold the latest research efforts of this company. Taxing this type of ingenuity and inventiveness is about as logical as placing a penalty tax on the compact car for its superior fuel economy.

In conclusion, I am firmly convinced from my study of this matter that had the justification and effects of the proposed diesel differential tax been adequately studied beforehand, you would not find this feature in the tax program now before this committee. We are not opposed to taxes on motor fuels but we propose that all such taxes be placed across the board. The unjust, discriminatory aspects of this specific tax proposal will be most detrimental to the trucking industry, selected areas of our country, the consumer public and the diesel engine industry.

Expensive Low Cost Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, since the flood of messages we have received from the White House are of the nature of political editorials more than normal reports to Congress, occasional valid

newspaper comments make good reading in comparison. The editorial entitled "Expensive Low Cost Housing," which appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times of March 12 merits our attention.

EXPENSIVE LOW COST HOUSING

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat of Illinois, is of the opinion that anyone who buys on credit or makes a loan ought to know exactly how much the carrying charges or interest amounts to over the years. He wants Federal legislation providing that credit costs must be spelled out to buyers.

Let us apply the Douglas proposals to President Kennedy's formula for giving a shot in the arm to the housing industry.

Mr. Kennedy wants more credit extended to persons in lower brackets to encourage them to build homes. As Senator DOUGLAS asks, how much will such credit cost them?

At present, the Federal Housing Authority insures mortgages for 30 years and requires downpayments. Mr. Kennedy proposes that it be permitted to approve 40-year mortgages with no downpayments on new houses of $13,500 or less.

Perhaps this would stimulate some housing and permit some wage earners who cannot now afford to do so to undertake the construction of a house. Many persons do not have cash for downpayment. Stringing out monthly charges over a longer period would reduce them.

Under the present FHA regulations, a $13,500 house requires a $450 downpayment. At the maximum 5½-percent interest rate, monthly payments on principal and interest come to $74.12. After 30 years, a total of $27,133 will have been paid.

Under the 40-year, no downpayment arrangement, the same deal would require payments of $69.66 a month. At the end of 40 years, $33,437 would have been paid.

These figures serve to underline the old adages about thrift: A penny saved is a penny earned, many a little makes a mickle, take care of the pennies and the dollars will take care of themselves, etc.

The family that can save up $450 before it buys a house saves, on that item alone, $900 in interest over 40 years. The difference in monthly payments of only $4.46 makes most of the difference of $6,304 between the total cost of the mortgages described above.

After applying the Douglas test to the Kennedy mortgage idea, it may occur to many families that the President is not offering them a great boon. It may also occur to them that the Democratic idea that a nation can become prosperous by spending more money and going deeper into debt may not necessarily work when adopted by individuals.

The Reds Talk, but United States Pays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Union of March 14, 1961:

THE REDS TALK, BUT UNITED STATES PAYS

The United States has poured $3 billion plus into the United Nations and its related functions since 1946 and the U.N. today is unofficially bankrupt. Why?

This question was raised the other day by William Fulton of the Chicago Tribune Press Service. Mr. Fulton did not have to dig deep to get the answer. Soviet Russia and its Communist satellites refuse to pay their share of U.N. costs.

At the same time Russia and the balance of the Red bloc bellow arrogantly on the floor of the U.N. in a somewhat successful effort to lure more "neutrals" into the Communist voting camp.

Most flagrant example of Russia's ignoring the tab is the Congo. The Kremlin has refused to pay its assessed share in the tremendous cost of maintaining a U.N. force there. The United States is footing half the bill. And it is but one of 99 countries having equal voting powers in the U.N.

The free-riding Communist U.N. members have performed similarly in the case of the emergency force deployed around the Middle East to police the cease-fire between Israel and the United Arab Republic. Once again, the United States is paying nearly half the bill.

Khrushchev and his colleagues have refused to contribute toward dozens of other U.N. projects, including the refugee program. The Congo "no-payment" stand, however, is the most offensive denial Russia has yet tossed at the U.N.

Mr. Fulton wrote: "* * * it (Russia's refusal to pay) is in a sense crude blackmail * * * Khrushchev is demanding the U.N. force be withdrawn, a policy obviously aimed at giving the Red army a foothold and ultimate domination over mineral-rich equatorial Africa. By refusing to share in the Congo expenses, the Russians are weakening the effectiveness of the polyglot peace force, making its downfall a serious possibility."

Apart from the Congo, the Soviet is $10,225,627 in arrears for support of the U.N. force in the Middle East. Russia's Communist leaders have said flatly they will "not pay a single kopek" toward this international peace brigade because Britain, France and Israel—"the aggressors" in the 1956 Suez affair—should foot the bill.

The Communists aren't paying their dues in an international club that wields world influence. Yet the U.N. itself permits Khrushchev and his ilk to continue their shoebanging on a platform for all the world to see. It's time free world members of the U.N. told the Communists: "Put up or shut up."

The American Legion's 42d Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial on the American Legion's 42d birthday appeared in the Evening News of Newburgh, N.Y., of March 14.

Newburgh, the largest and most historical city in my district is justifiably proud of its close ties with the American Legion: First, through the fact that our former Congressman, Hamilton Fish, was one of the three-man committee that wrote the truly magnificent Legion preamble; and also, last but by no means least, when one of Newburgh's most distinguished sons, Martin J. McKneally became national commander for the term ending in 1960. His term was one of outstanding accomplishment for one of our greatest patriotic organizations, the American Legion.

The editorial follows:

AMERICAN LEGION 42

This week the American Legion celebrates its 42d anniversary. Formed at the close of World War I (with its famous preamble written by a three-man committee which included former Representative Hamilton Fish), the American Legion appeared to be a dying organization in the 1930's as it saw its prospective membership dwindle each year. World War I veterans were decreasing in number and there were no new veterans eligible for membership from peacetime military forces.

Then came World War II and the deluge. Instead of restricting its membership to World War I veterans and leaving the younger men to create their own organization, the American Legion revised its constitution. The number of prospective members became almost unlimited (although still restricted to those who served their country in time of war).

With 17,000 posts and 3 million members the American Legion is a potent force, one that fortunately has been dedicated to God and country.

Orange County, and Newburgh in particular, have been honored notably in work of the biggest veterans' group ever formed One of the first State commanders was Arthur E. Brundage, of Newburgh, later an assemblyman and then postmaster.

Within the last decade Newburgh has gained even greater distinction. After becoming the community's second State commander, unique recognition for a city of its size, Martin B. McKneally was named national commander, a post he served with distinction until he yielded the reins last October to William Burke, of California.

As the American Legion celebrates its anniversary, Newburgh's Judson P. Galloway post is staging its own ceremonies under Commander Donald Leamy, culminating in a corned beef and cabbage dinner on St. Patrick's Day.

The community has good reason to be proud of its American Legion and Galloway post.

Economic System Basically Sound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, with the emphasis of the New Frontiersmen directed to curing our economic ills which they have adversely described and greatly exaggerated, I feel a nonpartisan column discussion of our economic system might be in order. The article entitled "Economic System Basically Sound," by Milburn P. Akers, which appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times on March 10 is appropriate reading at this time:

ECONOMIC SYSTEM BASICALLY SOUND

Unemployment in February reached 5,705,000, the highest since 1941. Simultaneously, the number of employed persons totaled 64,655,000, an increase in February 1961, over February 1960, of 207,000.

More unemployment and, coincidentally, more employment.

Labor Secretary Arthur J. Goldberg says this anomalous situation results from the fact that the labor force has grown faster than the economy. That seems to be a logical explanation. At least, it will do until a better one comes along.

The Secretary said the new unemployment figures demonstrate the pressing need for speedy congressional passage of President Kennedy's antirecession measures, including the depressed areas bill and the extension of unemployment compensation benefits.

Obviously, there is a pressing need; 5,705,000 unemployed persons, plus their dependents, should not be left in want, even partial want. The Nation has the resources to make certain that they are not.

Measures designed to make such provision should be speedily enacted, if existing ones are inadequate.

There is a vast difference, however, in meeting the temporary needs of the unemployed—which should, of course, be done—and in seeking, under the guise of doing so, fundamental changes in the economic structure. Those who would make America over according to their own textbooks on economics usually seek to do so in times such as the present.

Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon told Congress only this week that Kennedy administration economic experts now expect an upturn in the economy sometime during the quarter which starts April 1.

A similar forecast was made as early as January 22 by Prof. Ezra Solomon of the University of Chicago. He said at that time the current business recession would reach its trough in the present quarter, that the upturn would be underway in the second quarter and that, by yearend, the gross national product rate would have risen about $25 billion to $585 billion. He also predicted 1962 would be a boom year.

Professor Solomon's economic forecasts have been remarkably accurate in the past. His January forecast, made at a time when some of the President's advisers were seeking major overhauls in the economic structure, are now being borne out.

The President himself seems to have had doubts as to the validity of the advice given him by some of his economic planners and dreamers. For he stated on several recent occasions he would wait until April before advocating fundamental changes.

February's unemployment figure, the highest in 20 years, has its origin in at least four factors: (1) The general business slump; (2) seasonal curtailment of outside work; (3) a growing emphasis on highly skilled workmen; and (4) competition of U.S. industry with foreign production. Each reacts on the other.

Foreign competition with U.S. industry in the domestic market could be quickly ended. But that would create more problems than it would solve. Perhaps little can be done collectively about the growing emphasis on highly skilled workers. But individually that emphasis contains a lesson for the youngsters who are, according to many an analysis, so large a part of the currently unemployed. Trade schools and colleges should be their goals.

Seasonal unemployment has long been the lot of many—and it is apt to remain so for such workers.

Maintaining full employment is, of course, a desirable goal. But it can be done only by maintaining full production. And a certain way to do that has yet to be found. For every economic planner and dreamer who think he has found the way there is another who is certain he hasn't.

There is little urgency in seeking a way to do so in times of prosperity. But that is the time when such plans should be undertaken. The present needs of the unemployed should be met, of course.

But let's not undertake major and fundamental reform, so called, at times when crackpots and charlatans easily get attentive audiences.

The American economic system has provided Americans with the world's highest standard of living. The system itself doesn't require major overhaul. A way might be found, perhaps, to level out its peaks and valleys. And a way should be found to distribute its benefits somewhat more equitably, and some of the restrictions which have been placed on it might well be lifted. But the system itself is sound.

Some Views on Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include the following editorial comment on foreign aid from the publication Life Lines, issue of March 10, 1961:

HOW LONG THE GIVEAWAY?

Money taken from American taxpayers has been given away, is still being given away, to foreign nations. Call it foreign aid, call it the Marshall plan, call it the Economic Cooperation Administration, or any of the other pseudonyms under which the program has masqueraded—it makes no difference, the money still comes from American citizens.

More than 15 years have passed since World War II ended and the first of this series of aid programs was instituted—programs which have increased everybody's taxes and raised the price of every purchase. After 15 years, and more—when will these programs be ended?

The State Department has given away money abroad for the construction of foreign-owned factories in low-wage areas. In some cases the wages are no more than one-tenth the wages paid Americans for comparable work.

The foreign aid program has caused a steady increase in imports. In the last few years many large American companies, as a protective measure, have built or bought plants abroad. Now their products are entering the United States in an ever-growing flood. The result is a loss of American jobs and lower American payrolls.

The equivalent of approximately $2,000 from every family in the United States has been poured down the foreign aid rathole. This farce has brought us neither security nor friends, nor has it stopped the spread of communism.

How long will the giveaway continue?

NEW FOREIGN AID GIMMICK

Thrifty Americans should note that the big spenders have come up with a new idea for foreign aid. A school of thought is developing in Washington which advocates the entrance of the United States into the home-building business in several foreign nations.

The general idea of the advocates of foreign aid has been to use American taxpayers' money to build factories or to provide airports, roads, and hospitals. Their argument has been that if we assist the underdeveloped nations in providing these essentials in a few years they will be self-supporting. There is no indication at all that things generally are working out this way. In fact, most of the underdeveloped nations are further from being self-supporting and self-reliant than when we started giving them money.

So now the big brains among the big spenders are saying that of course the folks in those countries are not classical economists and cannot be expected to understand everything about building a stable economy. What Uncle Sam must do, therefore, is to build homes for them. This would be done under mortgage financing—provided, naturally, by American taxpayers.

If private lenders were putting up the money, they might be concerned with such questions as these:

Will the borrower in a South American country, for example, actually maintain his property within the requirements of difficult climatic conditions to justify a loan extending more than 18 months.

Assuming that interest will be charged for the loans, might this fact not tend to bring forth the mistaken claims that Uncle Shylock is greedily exploiting unskilled and untutored natives in scores of faraway places?

In the event of default will the U.S. Marines move in to collect back payments, or will the United Nations bail the lender out? If the local government is supposed to do the bailing out, will foreign aid be increased in order to enable them to pay up?

The big spenders cannot be expected to answer such questions as these, and no doubt they will feel such questions should never be asked. How do you feel?

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have received a wonderful letter from a young constituent of mine, Pamela Mattes. Pamela attends the South Baker School in my hometown of Baker, Oreg. Pamela realizes the need for Federal aid to education and is planning to be a Congresswoman when she grows up so that she can work for better schools. It is refreshing to see such a keen awareness of the needs of our country among our young people. I know Pamela will not mind my sharing her letter with the other Members of the House:

SOUTH BAKER SCHOOL,
Baker, Oreg., March 9, 1961.

DEAR MR. ULLMAN: We are writing letters in our language class, and I decided to write to our Congressman from Baker.

We are studying about our schools and how they are financed. We also know we need many new schoolbuildings all over our Nation.

I know you are doing all you can for our schools. We are hoping President Kennedy's bill on Federal aid to education passes as we need much help for our schools.

I would like to be a Congresswoman when I grow up, so I can help work for better schools for America.

Sincerely yours,

PAMELA MATTES.

P.S.—My teacher's name is Mrs. Brown.

State Help Versus Self-Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. William Henry Chamberlin, in an article that appeared today in the Wall Street Journal, has put his finger on the great flaw in the basic structure of the philosophy of the wing of the Democratic Party.

SAVINGS AND SECURITY—INDIVIDUALS COULD MORE EASILY MEET MEDICAL, HOUSING NEEDS IF THE TAX COLLECTOR LEFT THEM MORE INCOME

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

It would be neither good sense nor good morals to leave a stretch of sidewalk dangerously slippery with glazed ice while preparing ambulances for the passersby who might be expected to break arms or legs.

This same kind of reasoning should apply to the prevention or maximum alleviation of poverty in old age. President Kennedy's health bill notwithstanding, State help is never a satisfactory substitute for self-help.

The most effective and truly humanitarian means of helping an individual in his years of diminished or lost earnings capacity is to give him more chance to provide for his own future by not taking away so much from him during his most productive period. Many of the indigent aged can take paper and pencil and calculate acurately how much more opportunities for comfortable living and recreation they could have enjoyed, if so much of what they had earned had not been siphoned off to satisfy the demands of Federal, State, and local tax collectors.

Or consider the young man, newly married. By President Kennedy's housing plan, he would be "taken care of," if he wants a middle income house, by a 40-year, no-down-payment mortgage plan. But if he were not taxed so high on his income, he might well have saved a conventional down payment and have enough of his paycheck left to pay off his mortgage on a 20-year basis.

Yet the policy of imposing heavier and heavier levies, calculated to make the individual less and less capable of looking out for his own future, advanced steadily under a relatively conservative administration and is plainly gaining momentum with the change of power and psychology in Washington. Individual saving is the best kind of social security. Yet the opportunities for individual saving, for the large number of Americans who lack inherited wealth and earn incomes in the median range, are being steadily curtailed.

STATE AND CONSTITUTION

The State in America has assumed the role of an omnicompetent provider, for which there is no warrant in the American Constitution—it is mainly concerned with telling the Government what it may not do in abridging the freedom of the individual citizen. This role is radically at variance with American principles and practice during the 19th century, which witnessed the impressive pioneering of this continent. The Government has become a price and wage fixer, a purveyor of housing, a regulator and, if the "liberals" in Washington have their way, a large-scale financier of a public school system that was formerly left to local management and local resources.

The whole trend recalls the definition of the state by Frederic Bastiat, a 19th century French classical liberal economist: "That great fiction, by means of which everyone hopes to live at the expense of everyone else."

For the central fallacy in the philosophy of Government spending as a painless form of social progress is that government, by its nature, creates no wealth. A foundation deriving funds from a large private fortune can extend benefactions to various projects and causes without taking the money out of any source except the private fortune. Government can acquire funds in only two ways, by taxation or by borrowing, which, when pushed too far, leads to the most deadly and insidious kind of taxation, inflation by debasing the value of the currency.

It may, of course, be argued that state social spending programs achieve the purpose of transferring money from the pockets of the rich to those of the poor. But, at a time when the maximum rate of Federal income tax is 91 percent, this contention loses most of its force. Taxes designed to hit high incomes have reached the point of small and diminishing returns. Most of the money for additional spending projects will be extracted from taxpayers in medium and low brackets, whose ability to provide for their own social security will be correspondingly diminished.

THE END PROCESS

It has been the general experience of financing the welfare state in Great Britain and in other countries where it has developed even farther than in the United States that the end of the process is for the government to take out of one pocket what it puts into another, with the inevitable overhead costs of bureaucracy as an extra charge.

Perhaps some day, when the futility of this process becomes quite evident, there will be more recognition for the simple truth that one of the best services government could render to the peace of mind and the real social security of its citizens is not to pile on new exactions, but to get off their backs to the extent of making it a little easier for them to save for their ultimate retirement.

One widespread form of saving in America, in contrast to Europe, where stocks are held rather narrowly, is investment in common stocks. A handicap here is the double taxation involved in the fact that corporation income is first taxed at a rate of 52 percent and then taxed again at progressive rates, insofar as it is distributed in dividends. A very slight concession, designed to alleviate this injustice, was the introduction, under the Eisenhower administration, of a 4-percent credit for dividend income. Yet there is a strong drive to do away with this credit.

The Government could offer a number of positive inducements to saving for retirement purposes. There could be tax exemption for funds set aside for this purpose and invested in Government bonds or annuities, which should be, up to a limit of perhaps $50,000, free from taxation. But here, of course, there is little role for a Federal bureaucracy.

A national population permitted and even encouraged to save for their own maintenance on a not too pinched standard of living would be happier and economically much healthier than one forced to depend on State handouts and State-provided services.

The ideal society is one in which people are allowed to retain enough of what they earn to pay for their homes, medical services and other needs without Government assistance. There was a time when we actually had such a society in the United States.

The Great St. Patrick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, on St. Patrick's Day, the heart of every Irishman quickens with pride and the whole world pauses in its busy life to hail the magnificent Irish saint, whose blessed memory throughout the centuries has fired a great race and given inspiration and strength to peoples everywhere.

St. Patrick is more alive, more famous, more celebrated and more honored today than most of the historical figures who lived long after him, while his contemporaries are almost entirely forgotten in the ruthless surge of the centuries.

St. Patrick still lives in the hearts and souls of Irishmen and many other people of every race, religion, and station.

He was not only great in heart, mind and spirit, but he was endowed with a boundless energy, a fierce determination and a loyalty and devotion to his cause that compelled very many people to follow him into the sacred precincts of Christianity.

Patrick was one great figure of history who seemed more than most others to thrive on adversity and in spite of many disappointments and obstacles he steadfastly pursued his high goals until he had triumphed over the bitter opposition, brutality, and cruelty of early barbarians and had founded a new civilization in Ireland based on the exalted precepts and sound moral values of the Christian faith.

A gifted organizer, Patrick had a way of attracting to his banner thousands and thousands of people, who at first had savagely opposed him with powerful zeal and feverish activity, he and his influence covered practically all of Ireland and from that time forward, the Irish people have loyally kept his teachings, influence, and inspiration deeply enshrined in their hearts.

The troubled world in which we live today would be blessed indeed if we had another St. Patrick of the 20th century and the space age to take up the torch of morality and freedom and inspire our people to work militantly and unitedly against the insidious evils which surround us.

It is for us, not only those who boast of their Irish blood, but those of every nationalistic, racial, and religious strain, to be inspired anew on St. Patrick's Day by the example, the perseverance, the strength, the determination, the supreme faith of the great patron saint of Ireland to the end that the verity and the dignity of the individual soul shall be recognized in the world, and that all men and all peoples who believe in freedom shall band together more united than ever in one great human union actuated by divine faith to renounce and defeat the barbarian hordes

of this age who are seeking to enslave mankind, and thus to install and perpetuate peace, security, prosperity, and freedom in the world.

I ask to include as part of my remarks a very brilliant article by Mr. Hugh A. Mulligan, recently printed in the distinguished Worcester (Mass.) Telegram entitled "Time Hasn't Diminished St. Patrick's Glory":

TIME HASN'T DIMINISHED ST. PATRICK'S GLORY—LEGENDS DRAMATIZE HIS CLOSENESS TO THE IRISH HEART

(By Hugh A. Mulligan)

(Some folks wearing of the green next Friday may just be wondering who St. Patrick was, after all. Well, the easiest way to find out is to go to Ireland and follow the trail of the ancient saint. He is as alive today as he was 1,500 years ago and if you don't believe it, just ask an Irishman who stole St. Paddy's goat. Then duck.)

CROAGHPATRICK, COUNTY MAYO, EIRE.—Fifteen centuries have passed since an Englishman or maybe a Scotsman named Patrick waved his shamrock over Ireland, drove out her snakes and had his goat stolen by some unconscionable blatherskite.

Yet the good saint who died in 461 A.D., exactly 1,500 years ago this March 17, is more alive today than Charlemagne, William the Conqueror, Catherine the Great and most of the other famous historical figures who came centuries after him.

To listen to the talk at any Irish crossroads and around the turf fire in any pub, you'd think it was only last week, or a month ago at best, that he came over, shirt flapping in the breeze, to put the fear of God into the druid high priests and convert this lovely jewel of an island to Christianity.

An AP reporter and photographer, following St. Patrick's route for more than 1,000 miles through Ireland, seldom suffered for lack of directions, despite the long lapse of centuries.

"It's St. Patrick you're after?" demanded a grizzled farmer, pausing with his donkey and a cartload of potatoes in the shadow of Slieve Gullion, a haunted mountain in County Armagh.

"By God, you've come to the right man. Patrick and his whole retinue came up that wee lane to the left there, just over yon hillock."

An authoritative wave of his stick, an essential item in every Irishman's haberdashery, pointed out the very route, as if a good squint of the eyes would reveal a few stragglers in Patrick's party just emerging out of the mists of history.

HOW KNOWN

How does he know it was that particular path and not the one on the right or maybe the left?

"Me great-grandmother told me. Sure it would take me 2 days and 2 nights to tell you all she told me about St. Patrick. His horse had dropped a shoe, but the blacksmith in town here was heading over the mountain to bury his daughter and didn't have time to do the job. Patrick blessed a new graveyard there and then for the smith and got him to shoe his horse. Go up to the field beyond there and you'll see the stone marking the little girl's grave."

What does it matter that St. Patrick was already 14 centuries dead when his great-grandmother was a girl?

TIME LOST, TOO

Time has never gotten the upper hand over Patrick, any more than the high kings of Ireland could have when they matched wits with him on the ancient hill of Tara.

Like the slender, thousand-year-old round towers rising up out of the bogs, like the gray tumbled ruins of the abbeys and monasteries hunched every few miles in the fields, like the crumbling castles of the Normans and the Danes, Patrick endures in a land where time and eternity can meet in a field.

Everywhere you go in Ireland, from Ulster to Munster, from Leinster to Connacht, you hear of his exploits in the most extraordinary detail. Here he left a footprint. There he built a church. He baptized a king at this well. He knelt in prayer on that rock. Without his ageless presence Irish conversation might be in a near famine state.

The slow, silent trickle of the years may have eroded the thin line between historical certainty and fireside legend, but the fact of his coming is indisputable.

Patrick came without troops or arms, without crown or colonists. Yet his conquest endured, a glimmer of learning to light the hopes of Europe in the dark ages of the barbarian invasions, a conquest that outlasted the Normans, the Danes, the Cromwellians, the Tudors, the Stuarts and all the others who swarmed over Ireland in the centuries after him and left only the ruins to speak for them.

From his confession, now regarded as authentic by most scholars, we know that he was born at Bonnavem, which may have been at the estuary of the Severn River in England, or the esuary of the Clyde in Scotland.

Like the other great missionary, Paul, he was a Roman citizen, the son of Calphyrnius, a platoon leader stationed in Britain. The Roman legions never got to Ireland, but Patrick did.

At the age of 16 he was kidnaped by Irish pirates and taken to the Slemish mountains in County Antrim, where he tended flocks for 6 years as a slave of Milchu, a Druid high priest. Patrick finally escaped to his home in Britain, only to find his sleep troubled by the cries of children, somewhere in the west of Ireland, who kept calling: "O pious youth, come back to Erin."

TOO INCESSANT

The dream was too incessant to be ignored. With the blessing of Pope Celestine I, Patrick returned to Ireland in 432 as a missionary. He attempted to land at Wicklow Head on the east coast but was driven off by the same hostile chieftain who had turned back another missionary, named Palladius, several years before.

Skirting Dublin, which wouldn't be founded for another 400 years, Patrick and his party put in at Skerries for supplies. It was an unfortunate choice. By morning the goat he had trained to carry his water jars was gone and one of history's longest feuds was launched.

After 1,500 years the question of who stole St. Patrick's goat still smoulders. The Skerries men insist the heist was made by the men from Rush, 2 miles to the south. The Rush men hold an opposite opinion. Either will defend their innocence at the drop of a hurling stick.

At a British officers' club in India during World War II, someone made the mistake of calling an Irish volunteer from Skerries a "goat eater." The ensuing riot reduced the club to rubble. Only recently sculptor Albert Power affixed a goat to a statue of St. Patrick commissioned by the church in Skerries. In the interests of preserving the peace, the parish priest made him chisel it off.

BOTH GUILTY

Eighty-year-old John McNally, a Skerries man who has witnessed many a brawl over St. Patrick's goat, thinks both towns equally guilty. "It was the Rush men stole and the Skerries men ate it," he told us, judiciously smacking the foam of a dark glass of stout from his lips.

Like other oldtimers, McNally claims to have cured many a toothache by drinking the brackish water accumulating in "St. Patrick's footprint," a scooped-out crevice in a rock down on the beach. Local legend has it that this and an identical footprint on an island 1 mile out in the bay mark the spot where Patrick came ashore with his goat in one mightly leap.

"I could tell you more only the wife was expecting me an hour ago," McNally apologized. "It's the cold shoulder and tongue I'll be getting when I go home, Patrick or no Patrick."

So it fell to Terry Ferguson, a fisherman with a boat named *Padraic*, and Henry Boylan, the local lighthouse keeper, to show us the footprint on the beach and point out its mate on the island.

"An Englishman saw it last summer," Boylan recalled, "and his only comment was: 'Patrick must have had some pair of britches to make that step.' So you see the likes of the visitors we get in these parts."

Bereft of his goat, Patrick continued north and made his first real landing at Saul in County Down. He baptized Dichu, the local chieftain, after miraculously silencing his dogs, said mass in a barn and founded his first church. Next he headed to the Slemish Mountains to pay off his ransom to his old slavemaster, Milchu, who at his coming set fire to his house and hurled himself into the flames. Pride would not permit him to bow down to a former slave.

The heavens were spilling rain, in the words of a local constable, as we drove down the lovely valley of the Boyne to the hill of Slane, overlooking Tara, the scene of St. Patrick's greatest triumph. Summoned by High King Leoghaire, the kings of Ireland had gathered at Tara to cope with Patrick's assault on the pagan beliefs of the Druid priests.

Protocol decreed that no fire should be lit until the lamps went on in the great hall of kings at Tara. Patrick defied the Druid law on Easter Eve, 433, by lighting a huge bonfire on the opposite hill of Slane. The King dispatched a dozen charioteers to extinguish the alien blaze, but the oxen ran wild and the flames would not die. Conceding defeat, Leoghaire gave Patrick permission to preach the gospel throughout Ireland. His lighting of the pascal fire is believed to have established the date for our modern Easter observance.

WANDERED 20 YEARS

For the next 20 years Patrick wandered about Ireland, preaching the gospel, baptizing the faithful at wells once worshiped by the Druids, praying and fasting on lonely mountaintops, like Croaghpatrick in Mayo and on remote islands, like Lough Derg in Donegal, where thousands of pilgrims now come barefoot each year to pray and fast in his footsteps. The origin of both pilgrimages is lost in the mists of the Middle Ages.

An ascetic who slept on a rock, ate little and preached mostly by example, Patrick knew the secret of all great missionaries. He gently blanketed the old pagan beliefs without stamping too hard on the customs of the people. Which is why the old, secret, mysterious, mystical Ireland still exists in vanishing lakes, haunted mountains and eerie creatures who cry of death with the dogs in the night.

The headquarters he established at Armagh is still the ecclesiastical capital of Ireland where two cathedrals face each other on opposite hills and silently proclaim that Patrick is everybody's saint.

JUST IN CASE

On the way into this charming cathedral town, we encountered a caravan of tinkers, Irish gypsies, who travel the countryside in colorfully painted wagons, mending pots, selling horses and telling fortunes. No one really believes that the tinkers can cast spells and make the cows go dry, but most people

slip them a couple of coppers for the baby, just in case.

It's like the priest who saw an old woman tossing salt over her shoulder after dropping a fork on the floor.

"Molly," he exclaimed, "you don't really believe in leprechauns, do you?"

"Of course not," she assured him. "But they're there."

Similarly, the legends that have grown up around Patrick through the centuries have not harmed his stature as a saint and missionary, and, if anything, have dramatized his closeness to the minds and hearts of the Irish people.

EXIT SNAKES

At Croaghpatrick, the Devil tried to disturb his prayers by blackening the sky with screaming crows and ravens. Patrick dispersed the flocks by flinging his bell down the mountain, crashing against the rocks, and further retaliated by driving the snakes "and every evil thing" out of Ireland into Clew Bay.

On the tiny island of Inchagill (which means "Island of the Devout Stranger") in Lough Corrib, Patrick buried Lugnadon, his nephew and favorite navigator, under a headstone that may be the oldest in Europe.

On the Rock of Cashel in Tipperary, Europe's most impressive religious ruins, Patrick plucked a shamrock to explain the mystery of the Trinity and inadvertently drove his staff through the foot of King Aengus of Munster. The king, thinking it part of the baptismal ceremony, did not cry out.

Patrick is believed to be buried under a huge rock in the graveyard of the Church of Ireland Cathedral in Downpatrick, County Down, not far from where he first came ashore at Saul.

SPOT IN DISPUTE

The exact burial spot may be in dispute, just as many of the footprints and knee prints are, but there is no doubt that a man named Patrick came to Ireland in the fifth century and left his indelible mark on the island and on all of Europe. The exploits that legend has credited to him are not nearly as impressive as his real accomplishments.

In the centuries after Patrick, Irish monks trained by him and his followers "walked the world for God," founding universities from Gaul to Kiev, bringing the light of the fire lit on Slane into the chaos of darkness left by the collapse of the Roman Empire and the barbarian invasions.

After 1,500 years, Patrick endures. His name is on a thousand churches. They parade for him in New York, Dublin, Baltimore, Montreal, Baton Rouge, and San Juan, Puerto Rico, and this Friday, as it has for countless years, the shamrock will bloom again in thousands of lapels in his honor.

Address by the Honorable Herbert H. Lehman at 77th Annual Meeting of United HIAS Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. HART

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. HART. Mr. President, former Senator Herbert Lehman has been one of the leaders in the United States for many years. Last February 5, for the annual meeting of the United HIAS Service in New York City, he reviewed some of the history of the efforts to bring about revision of our present immigration and citizenship laws.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from his remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE HERBERT H. LEHMAN AT 77TH ANNUAL MEETING OF UNITED HIAS SERVICE, HOTEL ROOSEVELT, NEW YORK CITY, FEBRUARY 5, 1961

To me, coming here to address this gathering is almost like a homecoming. One of the main threads running through the fabric of my lifelong interests has been immigration.

A few years ago, in clearing out some old effects, I came across a box of compositions I had written in college. One of them was on immigration. I read it over. I was surprised to find out how sound my views had been 60 years ago. In fact, they haven't changed much since. It is a little startling to realize that the issue itself hasn't changed basically over the years. The need is still there—our country's need for immigrants and the immigrant's need of asylum, freedom and opportunity. And the same type of opposition to immigration which we confront today was active and vocal 60 years ago. * * *

Yes, I have been interested in the immigration question as far back as my memory runs. I began to rub elbows with the voluntary organizations concerned with immigrants and immigration soon after I left college, first through the old Henry Street Settlement House, of whose board of directors I am still a member; then in the early 1920's, when I was chairman of the reconstruction committee of the joint distribution committee.

As the years went by, I retained my deep interest in immigration. It accompanied me into my political and public life. In 1942, migration and immigration became one of my chief official concerns, when UNRRA was created to confront the tragic problems arising from the cataclysmic population shifts, flights and displacements which occurred during and toward the end of World War II.

During my brief period as a private citizen after 1946, one of my major public activities was with the Citizens Committee for Displaced Persons Legislation. And then in 1949, after my election to the U.S. Senate, my first experience in major legislative battle in the U.S. Senate was over the liberalizing amendments to the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 * * *

The 1950 fight over the Displaced Persons Act was followed during the next 2 years by our desperate efforts to stop the McCarran-Walter Act from becoming law. It became law. And then the long undertaking to amend the McCarran-Walter Act—to humanize and liberalize it—began. That effort, punctuated by intermittent pauses for emergency measures to meet special crises, such as the Hungarian upheaval of 1956 and its aftermath of terror—is still going on. For the past 8 years we have maintained what has often seemed like a lonely and almost hopeless vigil on this important issue.

But now, a new day in this, as in other matters, may be dawning. But before discussing this possible new day, let me complete my references to the old days—to the past—and specifically to my past associations with our host organization here, United HIAS Service.

I came to know the old HIAS during my Henry Street Settlement House days, almost 60 years ago.

As for the second parent organization of United Hias, United Service for New Americans, I had contact with it too, from the first days of its constitution. Yes, I have long been privileged to work frequently and intimately with both HIAS and USNA, and with the merged organization since the merger. We have fought and worked side by side, under a common banner, for the same good cause and for the same high and noble purpose—to enact just and humane laws and to succor and assist those who need succor and assistance, here and across the seas.

So much for the past. These are days of the present. These are times when one can begin to feel the long-absent surge of the national spirit of action. The beat of the national pulse has begun to quicken, and an air of excitement, emanating from Washington, has begun to spread throughout the land.

Whether the early promise of a dynamic national resurgence will be wholly or largely realized remains, of course, to be seen. But I do believe that in the months and years immediately ahead, much will be achieved for our country, and our countrymen, and for the cause of peace, understanding, justice and freedom abroad.

Now we must ask ourselves, what are the prospects for immigration and naturalization reform in the period ahead?

While during recent years Congress has enacted a number of bills for special or general refugee relief, and has approved some few fringe changes in the McCarran-Walter Act, it has persistently refused to deal with the central structure of our immigration and naturalization laws, and the hundreds of basic discriminations—and cruelties—imbedded in that structure.

In 1953 I introduced into the Congress a substitute omnibus immigration and citizenship bill which was the result of 8 months of study, formulation and drafting by teams of experts in the field, including those of your organization—notably, as I recall, Carlos Israels, Ann Petluck and William Males.

The provisions of that substitute omnibus bill and their underlying principles are still sound, desirable, and necessary today.

That omnibus bill provided a uniform immigrant selection system, based on the worth and need of the immigrant—and the need of the Nation—in place of the present national origins quota system which discriminates on the basis of national origin in the case of Europeans, and on the basis of race in the case of Asiatics.

That omnibus bill humanized deportation law, and, among other things, eliminated the deportation penalty for long-past acts which were perfectly legal when committed.

That bill abolished the status of second-class citizenship for naturalized citizens.

All these improvements, and many more, need to be made in present law. They must be made.

I understand that our old omnibus bill, updated and with some changes—has again been introduced into the House by a number of Members, including Representative CELLER, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee. But if we are realistic, we must recognize that the prospects for the consideration and passage of that bill are quite remote.

This was true also last year, and the year before, and the year before that. There is no need to review the obstacles to this legislation. We all know them. * * *

But in my judgment the situation today is radically different from that of last year, and the years before. We now have a new President and a new spirit in the White House and in Washington.

I believe that during this administration we can get major changes in our basic immigration and naturalization laws—changes which will move substantially in the direc-

tion of the omnibus bill which we formulated in 1953.

It is a notable fact that in 1960 the platforms of both major political parties strongly supported the kind of changes in the McCarran-Walter Act which we have long been advocating. And during the campaign both presidential candidates vied with each other in promising action on this front.

I believe that President Kennedy is wholly committed to the proposition that the discrimination and bigotry must be taken out of our immigration and naturalization laws, and these laws must be humanized.

But we are realistic enough to know that party platform planks, and even campaign pledges by candidates, no matter how sincerely meant, are a long way from performance. The political word usually precedes the deed by a long, long time.

I am deeply convinced that President Kennedy intends to perform on his promises in regard to immigration and citizenship. After all, he has been an advocate of immigration reform throughout his political career. He supported President Truman's veto of the McCarren-Walter Act in 1952 while he was still a Member of the House, and joined with me as a sponsor of my omnibus bill in the Senate of 1953. He has introduced one piece of immigration reform legislation after another; and some of them have passed.

In legislative matters he is, above all, a practical-minded man. He knows the legislative process and the compromises which are entailed. He is inclined to go along with a solution that is less than ideal, if it represents some forward progress. This was his approach while he was in the Senate. I suspect it will be his approach from the White House.

We must be ready to suggest, and to consider suggestions from the White House for new formulas in immigration legislation. It is also a Kennedy inclination, as I have perceived it, to make detours, wherever possible, from legislative roads which have been too much traveled in emotional controversy. I would judge that this might be the President's inclination with regard to immigration legislation.

Speaking for myself, I am ready to accept and embrace any hope for substantial progress on this front, and to acclaim any real progress which is actually made. But let me warn my friends in this and other organizations not to make their compromises too soon. Making legislative compromises is the business of the Congress and, up to a practical point, of the President. It is still up to us who want immigration reform, to supply the pressure from below which will facilitate, encourage, and support bold leadership in this matter from above.

We must ask for what we believe to be sound and right. We must take a fresh look and, where desirable, make a fresh start in our thinking and rethinking of legislative formulas. But it would be foolish, in my judgment, for us to depart from our principles and offer compromises to the opponents of immigration reform, before the legislative battle has even been joined.

I hope we can all stand reasonably united, together with all the organizations of all sects and creeds which are concerned with immigration legislation—for the achievement of our common purposes: to erase discrimination and bigotry from the laws, to eliminate discriminations against naturalized citizens, to humanize and rationalize our deportation laws, and, in general, to open our gates in gracious welcome to the number of immigrants we can afford to receive and absorb, and to make much more welcome than in the past the visitor, the student, and the scholar. Thus we will make the name of America ring out again throughout the world as the synonym of freedom, hospitality, and opportunity.

The greater glory will be ours in the fulfillment of our traditions and in the realization of our national potentialities.

Could Build Million-Pound Booster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, many of the projects and programs being carried on in space research depend for their ultimate utilization, both commercially and militarily, upon the development of giant new space boosters with millions of pounds of thrust. Recently, witnesses before the Committee on Science and Astronautics expressed the belief that these giant boosters could be constructed now, in much less time than many had thought possible.

For the benefit of the Members and the public, I insert in the RECORD a news account of this testimony which appeared recently in Aviation Daily, authoritative publication on aviation, space, and missile activities:

THIOKOL, UAC SAY THEY COULD BUILD MILLION-POUND BOOSTERS SOONER THAN 1964

Two defense manufacturers yesterday told the House Space Committee they could deliver million-pound-plus thrust solid fuel rockets for space flight experiments sooner than 1964. If carried out successfully, their proposals would cut time and costs from the current schedule for clustering either the liquid fueled Saturn or single chamber F-1 to achieve thrust ratios above the 1.5 million pound level. Neither witness directly advocated slackened effort to develop the liquid boosters.

Chairman OVERTON BROOKS, Democrat, of Louisiana, and other members expressed surprise at testimony by Thiokol Chemical Corp. and United Aircraft Corp. that solid fuel thrust boosters of that range could be produced so quickly. BROOKS recalled that NASA testimony indicated the 1.5 million pound thrust Saturn probably won't fly until 1965.

Dr. Harold W. Ritchie, vice president of Thiokol, testified that his plant could produce and deliver within 18 months a solid booster capable of generating 3 million pounds thrust at costs comparable to liquid fuel rockets. Though some NASA officials are interested, he said, there has been no official go-ahead. Ritchie outlined another Thiokol proposal for a multistage heavy duty space flight rocket capable of 21 million pounds of thrust. He said it could be produced within 2 years, but since no payload worthy of its giant power will be available then, it is probably best to think of it as a long-range project. A cluster of seven such units would provide an orbit capacity of 2.1 million pounds and push a 600,000-pound payload into gravity-free space. "This booster, in combination with selected nuclear and electric propulsion stages, will permit cargo flights and transport flights to all planets of our solar system in the 1970 time period," he said. "The lead time to achieve this capability requires thorough planning and an early decision to proceed."

Dr. Barnet R. Adelman, vice president-general manager of UAC's United Technology Corp., Sunnyvale, Calif., said the firm is developing with its own funds a family of reliable low-cost first-stage solid boosters that will permit the "firing of the world's largest flight-weight solid propellant rocket engine (500,000 lbs. for 60 secs.) in the fall of 1961. With what he called its "unique conical segmented" design, the engine will be able to deliver over 2 million pounds of thrust by 1964.

"Use of these engines as first stage boosters for large launch vehicles should permit a reduction in the cost per pound of payload in orbit—or escape—by a factor of 2 to 10 under those estimated for presently planned launch vehicles," he said. United could deliver seven of these boosters by 1964 to provide 14 million pounds of thrust required to put a 150,000-pound payload on the moon. Estimated cost through preliminary flight testing would be $150 million to $200 million for a Nova class (15 million to 20 million pounds of thrust) first stage. "These figures are substantially less than the estimated cost of developing liquid propellant stages of comparable performance," he said.

Hard-Headed Plan for Americas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy has presented to the Congress and to the Nation a challenging, far-reaching, and realistic program for strengthening hemispheric unity and aiding all American countries to promote their own economic growth and to raise the living standards and the education of their peoples. The 10-year plan is not a giveaway program—it asks much of the Latin American leaders and the people themselves. It will provide direction for these nations which help themselves to improve their living standards, their educational level, and their economic growth.

The President's program is a challenge to us and to all the Americas—in his words—"to demonstrate to the entire world that man's unsatisfied aspiration for economic progress and social justice can best be achieved by freemen working within a framework of democratic institutions." He said that only in an atmosphere of political freedom throughout the Western Hemisphere can we attain the economic growth and social stability which will provide higher living standards and greater education for all our peoples.

In his plan he reaffirmed the Monroe Doctrine and called for strengthening the Organization of American States as the center of "the collective security system." Tyranny must be eliminated from this hemisphere in order to achieve these goals, he said.

Never once in his address before the ambassadors of 18 Latin American nations and other leaders did the President say that his plan was designed to halt communism in this hemisphere. But certainly, if all the American nations join together willingly and fully, in President Kennedy's long-range program, and thus bring greater freedom, education, and living standards to all in an atmosphere of liberty, then communism will not be long with us. It cannot—it will not survive.

With these thoughts in mind, Mr. Speaker, I include in the Appendix of

the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following column by William White, which presents a salient feature of the President's plan for the Americas. The column, entitled "Hard-Headed Plan for Americas," appeared in the Evening Star of Wednesday, March 15, 1961, and is as follows:

HARD-HEADED PLAN FOR AMERICAS—KENNEDY PROGRAM IS LAUDED FOR LINKS TO NATIONS' SELF-HELP AND REFORM

(By William S. White)

Like the old Marshall plan for Europe, the Kennedy plan for Latin America has a tough and profoundly realistic anti-Communist political motive beneath the generous economic aid it offers this hemisphere.

What President Kennedy really intends to do is to halt communism in Latin America just as the Marshall plan largely halted it in Western Europe in the period immediately after the war. This is to be done by making communism politically as well as economically unprofitable. If all goes well, communism or procommunism will become unprofitable, even among those of our hemisphere neighbors who are, at this moment, far from good neighbors and very far from procapitalist democracy.

This is no ribbon-wrapped package of Christmas in the springtime for the Latinos. This is no social worker's scheme for a "a quart of milk for every Hottentot." This is, at bottom, a hard-headed plan for an economic revival of Latin America under "strings" that are very real, indeed.

For in political terms the very core of the Kennedy plan is this: It is simply not going to be possible for any Latin American nation to obtain any real benefits unless it joins in truth and loyalty into a far larger pattern of collective strength and collective Western-style security for this hemisphere.

Any Latin American president who excludes his country from aid by his unwillingness to go along with this security pattern will surely have a good deal of explaining to do to the home folks. He will, indeed, be shooting Santa Claus; except that in this case Santa will be a muscular old boy carrying more in his bag than toys for the kiddies.

True, the President's outline of his policy to Latin American diplomats put a good deal more emphasis on what we intend to give the Latins than on what we intend to ask of them. But this was the traditional rhetorical politeness, the frosting on the real cake below.

No nation will receive help unless it lives up to the principles of self-help and domestic reform. This is the bluntest requirement ever put on any American-aid program. And, parenthetically, it may well foreshadow a tougher line toward all other recipients of American aid under the old and familiar programs.

But what is far more significant is the nature of the political strings, more bluntly they might be called strong ropes, which will attach to Kennedy aid. These strings will lead in the end to one place and one alone, the Organization of American States. No nation can really get anywhere under this aid plan without operating under the OAS.

The OAS, in consequence, is bound to be greatly strengthened. And the OAS is the sole instrumentality through which the United States can really get at the most dangerous example of Communist intrusion in this hemisphere, Castroism in Cuba.

The Kennedy administration—no less than the Eisenhower administration before it—knows it dare not act alone against Castro, short of some assault on our naval base in Cuba. A howl about "Yankee imperialism" would go up from the Rio Grande to the bottom tip of South America.

Fidel Castro, himself, clearly gathers what the Kennedy plan means. Within hours of its announcement, he was screaming in angry pain in Havana. The White House and State Department were not made exactly unhappy. For every assault he makes on the plan will help it in Congress, just as the Soviet Union's violent denunciations, plus its invasion of Czechoslovakia, put the then new Marshall plan over the top in Congress a decade and more ago.

Port Program, City of Philadelphia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, one of the projects dear to the heart of Philadelphians is the development and promotion of our port. The distinguished president of our city council, the Honorable James H. J. Tate, spoke on this subject recently, and his remarks, which were carried over the Philadelphia radio stations during the weekend of February 25, may be of interest to other Members of Congress. Therefore, I include them below:

REPORT TO THE PEOPLE

The most important single project in our entire urban renewal movement in Philadelphia is the development and promotion of our port. I do not exaggerate when I say that the future prosperity and progress of Philadelphia, and the metropolitan complex extending throughout the Delaware Valley, depend to a large extent upon success in our port expansion program.

More than 96,000 employees in this area, with an aggregate annual income of about $516 million, derive their earnings directly or indirectly from our port. It offers services and inducements to all forms of industry, those which we now have and others we seek to attract. It is our gateway of commerce to all the world.

I am glad to report on this broadcast that a comprehensive program of port development is now being planned and carried out in Philadelphia. This ambitious project is being implemented by various local government and private agencies, spearheaded by our administration, the city council, and the Delaware River Port Authority.

For example, preliminary plans have been started on the construction of a major marine terminal at Packer Avenue, which will have six berths and will provide facilities for handling all types of cargoes. The cost of this terminal will be about $15 million, to be supplied jointly by city and State funds. It should be able to handle about 1 million tons of cargo annually.

Encouraging progress is being made in the city's negotiations to purchase piers, 96, 98, and 100, located below Oregon Avenue, now owned by the U.S. Army, which handle 25 percent of the general cargo entering this port. We have offered a half million dollars to the Government for these piers. We have also promised to spend $3,500,000 in rehabilitating them over a period of 10 years. Private interests sought to buy these same piers for their own use, but this was halted by Philadelphia Congressman WILLIAM J. GREEN, Jr., at the last session of the Federal Congress.

Already in the planning stage is a proposal to construct a marina or marine recreation center on the Delaware waterfront from Market to Catherine Streets, by acquiring outmoded piers in that area. This would not only serve as an excellent tourist attraction, but would also be visited by many of our own citizens and help them become more port conscious.

In addition to these major projects, we are now improving truck handling facilities at all of our piers. There is today a growing trend toward the delivery of seaborne cargoes by truck rather than by rail. This movement will be greatly accelerated with the completion of the Delaware Expressway. We will thus be prepared for that development.

Nor have we neglected the expansion of tourist facilities at the port. Seven cruises to the Caribbean on luxurious passenger ships are scheduled this year, and with the substantial economy and convenience our port offers in comparison with New York, I am sure this phase of our port business will continue to grow.

Two recent developments have been most favorable to our port promotion program:

The Federal Interstate Commerce Commission ruled that Philadelphia should have a rate differential under New York of 2 cents on each 100 pounds of freight moved by rail car between Philadelphia and the Midwest. This differential, which was opposed by New York and other eastern port interests, but defended by counsel for the Delaware River Port Authority and our city, will continue to help us in our promotion of waterborne commerce here.

A compact between Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York and Delaware for the development and allotment of the water resources of the Delaware River Basin was approved this month by the Governors of the four States, and is now being submitted for approvel by the Federal Congress and the respective State legislatures. If effective, this agreement will insure the protection of the water supply required for the development of our port.

But with all of these advances, we still must do a selling job. The competition for waterborne commerce is unusually keen among the big seaports of the Nation.

The Delaware River Port Authority is developing a comprehensive program to meet this competition. It is now maintaining freight solicitation offices in Philadelphia, New York, Pittsburgh, and Chicago, and is establishing an office in London, England, so that we can solicit more commerce for our port from European and Scandanavian countries. It is also studying a proposal to establish foreign offices or send trade missions to South America and the Far East.

We are well on our way to making Philadelphia the Nation's greatest seaport. It is one of the most challenging and interesting phases of our plans to bring ever more progress to Philadelphia.

The 4–H Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the 4–H Club members throughout the Nation recently celebrated National 4–H Club Week and again reminded everyone of the wide range of their interests. The celebra-

tion was particularly significant this year, at a time when we are discussing the Peace Corps proposal and other suggestions to make greater use of our youth to meet national and international needs.

An editorial in the Daily Home News of New Brunswick, N.J., on March 8 described some of the activities that keep 4–H Club members busy. An article by Newark Evening News Washington correspondent William May on March 12 gave us some other facts on 4–H work abroad.

Mr. President, both articles give us helpful information about one of the great youth movement in this Nation. I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Daily Home News, Mar. 8, 1961]

THE 4–H PROGRAM SERVES ALL YOUTH

More than 2 million 4–H Club members across the face of the Nation are celebrating National 4–H Club Week this week, and the theme of the observance is "Learn, Live, Serve, Through 4–H."

Here in New Jersey we have over 11,000 members enrolled in 850 clubs. And, which may be surprising to many people, a tremendous amount of the emphasis is on town and city projects rather than country projects.

We tend to think of 4–H as a rural program, but over the years as our population has become more and more urban and suburban, 4–H has adapted to meet changing needs. The most popular 4–H projects here in the Garden State are clothing, meal planning and preparation, garden, beautification of home grounds, in that order.

The 4–H movement today, stronger than ever before, serves all young people, offering them a broad field to learn and work in. This broad field opens up interesting and worthwhile vocations and avocations, in such diverse pursuits as auto mechanics, dairy farming, forestry, fashions, teaching, cookery.

We recommend 4–H as one of the great youth movements creating the better America of tomorrow.

[From the Newark Evening News, Mar. 12, 1961]

4–H'ERS DOING PEACE CORPS WORK: MENDHAM YOUTH IN NEPAL AMONG INTERNATIONAL SERVICE ENTHUSIASTS

(By William May)

WASHINGTON.—Without attempting to take any of the glory away from the Peace Corps proposed by President Kennedy, the National 4–H Club Foundation is politely calling attention to a people-to-people program of its own, now entering its 14th year.

The program is known as the International Farm Youth Exchange (IFYE) and its leaders say that the officials who are studying the possibilities of the Peace Corps have found the IFYE has pioneered in many of the basic objectives.

"While IFYE is primarily a cultural exchange, delegates have made a lot of important contributions to improved rural living in many of the less developed countries around the world," Ted Hutchcroft, information director for the National 4–H Club Foundation, said. "Working with like groups in some 60 countries, IFYE's have lived and worked with rural people and become familiar with their problems."

JERSEYMAN IN NEPAL

One of the IFYE's who has made national headquarters proud is Denis Dalton of Pitney Road, Mendham, who is celebrating his 23d birthday today in Nepal, where he has volunteered to stay an additional 4 months.

Mr. Dalton was due to return to the United States March 1, but he and Sharron Scheline of Donnelly, Idaho, have offered to stay on as English teachers in a new binational center just opened in Katmandu.

"Dennis and Sharron have done remarkably well in learning the language, and Nepalese is quite difficult," Hutchcroft said. "They have really been out in the boondocks living with the people. Their term of service may be shorter than those proposed by the Peace Corps, but they are participating in the kind of work suggested for members of the Corps."

In his letters back to 4–H headquarters, Mr. Dalton has stressed his enthusiasm for working at the new school in Katmandu. He told of farmers who barely make a living coming out of the forest to contribute a few rupees to the school.

NATIVE SUPPORT

The farmers cannot read or write and their signatures are a thumbprint on a document, he said, but their spirit is amazing.

"We have worked in the villages and found our contact with the rural people most satisfying," Mr. Dalton said in a recent letter to Washington. "Now we are looking forward to a stimulating and equally rewarding association with the people of Katmandu. The center intends to lay emphasis upon youth projects, such as discussion groups, lectures, and recreational projects. The principle of the binational center appeals to me; the exchange of ideas and cultural activities to promote better understanding between the United States and Nepal."

Mr. Dalton, who graduated from Rutgers University with a B.A. in political science, wants to return home and go to graduate school with the idea of becoming a college instructor. But meantime he is happy in his work.

LIKES THE PEOPLE

"I like it here in Nepal," he wrote 4–H authorities recently. "I like the people, the culture and the idea of contributing something toward the nation's development. I find many great qualities in the Nepalese people. I see first enormous energy and then mental perseverence and physical stamina."

The 4–H headquarters here has come to look forward to Mr. Dalton's letters because he has a zest for experience and a knack for describing the lighter side of his life in Nepal. A favorite report of the Mendham man, according to Hutchcroft, is the one dealing with his first ride on an elephant.

"I always wanted to ride one and suddenly this big elephant appeared and the villagers gathered around and 100 hands pointed for me to get aboard," Mr. Dalton wrote.

The attendant on the elephant made it kneel and Mr. Dalton backed away 100 yards, got a running start and headed for the beast. His mistake, he said was in closing his eyes.

"I missed the main target, landed on the rear end and slid to the ground while the crowd cheered," he said. He backed away, made a second start and finally got safely aboard the elephant.

RIDING AN ELEPHANT

His first reaction as the ride started, he said, was sheer panic.

"The rise and fall was awesome," he said. "There was a special Elvis Presley swing and sway sensation as we moved along. I imagine the feeling was something like shooting Niagara in a canoe."

Finally the jaunt was over and it was time for Mr. Dalton to descend.

"Getting off the elephant was like falling three stories in a fast elevator," he said, "but I made it. I had ridden an elephant, what more can be expected of an IFYE?"

The Decatur, Ill., Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, this week Look magazine in conjunction with the National Municipal League announced the selection of 10 cities and one county as recipients of this year's All-America Cities awards. The story of the awards, with pictures, will appear in the next issue of Look magazine, to reach the newsstands March 28. The city of Decatur, Macon County, Ill., was awarded the honor of being known as an "All-America City" for 1961. I am proud of Decatur, in the heart of the congressional district I represent. America has grown great and will continue to remain great through individual ingenuity and initiative, self-reliance, and determination, and devotion to community and country. I can think of nowhere where these attributes have been more clearly demonstrated than in the city of Decatur, and I am sure the editors and publishers of Look magazine, and the jury that decided upon the 11 awards from over 100 U.S. cities considered, realized this in making the award to Decatur.

The story of Decatur, the "All-America City" nestled in the Land of Lincoln, is the story of America. It is not only the story of America past and present, but the story of America tomorrow and in all the tomorrows which lie ahead. It is the story of agriculture, of industry, of education, of religious freedom, of culture. It is the story of God-fearing industrious men and women adhering to the high ideals of the past to serve their community in carrying out constructive plans for the physical, spiritual, and cultural advancement of themselves, in their day, and those who have followed after them. And it is the story of the people and leaders of Decatur today following in the same great purposes that those who follow—their children and their children's children and their children—continue to live and work and prosper, in peace.

Perhaps Decatur is a shade more imbued with the high principles that have led America from a hodgpodge of 13 Colonies to the world's greatest Nation of 50 States. I say this because the early history of Decatur is intimately a part of the early history of the immortal Lincoln, more than any other man responsible for the might and right of our country, and the spirit of the Great Emancipator has ever been part and parcel of living in this community near the geographic center of Illinois, and today but 100 miles from the center of U.S. population. When one walks the streets of this busy yet friendly city today, one cannot help but feel the impact of its history, the aura of dignity, of majesty humble but real, that is the heritage left by Lincoln.

A tall, gangling young man of 21 brought his ox team to a halt in a muddy clearing surrounded by log cabins, in central Illinois, in March of 1830. This was Lincoln, and the hamlet he had entered was that which has grown into today's city of Decatur, with a population now exceeding 78,000. The spot where Abe then halted is now called Lincoln Square. During the next 30 years, Lincoln became a familiar figure in the area as he and the town grew. And it was in Decatur, in 1860, with Republicans meeting in a tent called the Wigwam, where the city's Millikin Bank now stands, that the railsplitter was first proposed for the Presidency.

But Decatur is not just Abraham Lincoln. Like Abe, the community saw hard times and good times; and like Abe, from the crucible of the changing years, Decatur has emerged strong, resolute, thriving, one whose great purposes augur well for the future not only of itself, its county, its State, but its Nation.

Incorporated as a town in 1836, it now ranks 8th among the cities of Illinois, and 176th in the United States. It ranks 80th in per capita income in the United States and 161st in retail sales. It is a great farm center, the heart of Macon County where farming is big business. Crop production in Macon County is bountiful. Average yields for corn, soybeans, wheat, and oats are above the State averages. Livestock inventories are high and dairy production compares with the best. This is all reflected in the economic pattern of Decatur, the county's chief trade center.

Decatur has its industry, too. While grain milling provides the largest employment, there is heavy employment in metal working and in the railroad industry. Five railroads serve the city, with a network of over 25,000 miles of track which connect the community with all parts of the country, with division shops where locomotives and freight cars are repaired and rebuilt. The railroads have enabled Decatur manufacturers to develop trade with all parts of the world. Significantly, this has contributed to the growth of the milling and processing plants which depend on the surrounding farmland for soybeans and corn which they turn into hundreds of valuable products, shipped to every corner of the free world's trade, bringing to Decatur the deserved title of "soybean capital of the world."

While Decatur has been growing rapidly during much of its life, it has never forsaken cultural interests. The growth of those things which make life worth while has kept pace. Schools, churches, libraries, recreation facilities, art, drama and music facilities, all these continue to contribute toward making Decatur a more pleasant city in which to live.

Mr. Speaker, too many individuals, too many communities today have forgotten how to think and to act for themselves. Rather do they look toward a paternal Federal Government to think and to act for them. They have lost somewhere the knowledge that the "do-it-yourself" principle is that which has made and will keep America great. Decatur has never been in this category. The history of this progressive and truly American city speaks for itself, and I submit that history for the Congress and all the country to know.

Before that, however, I want to reiterate that Decatur's citizens of today have not departed from the ways of their forebearers. Today's sons follow the example of their forefathers, giving expression to their ambitions and ideals that Decatur remain a busy, livable city and an example to all of America. While adhering to the tried traditions of the past, Decatur does not stand on past accomplishments. It knows that the future, the "great purposes" of tomorrow, can only be one of progress, peace and prosperity through the meeting and solving of the problems of today.

Today Decatur, as all America, is on the threshold of a new era. There are new industrial and agricultural developments. With these new developments come new responsibilities. I am happy to say that Decatur is facing, and meeting, every responsibility that has come with the past years of its growth, with those of today and those it can foresee in the coming years. Homes are being built, new schools are being built, churches and hospital facilities are being enlarged and new ones built, new factories are going up and additions are being made to many of those that have been long established, improvements are being made in public services, and community and civic problems such as those of water supply, traffic safety, sewage, and others are being met.

Mr. Speaker, we are facing one of the most critical times in our national history. That we may meet the crisis, that we may in solving it maintain our American system of government and our American way of life. I feel sure that all of our people must reaffirm their faith, rededicate themselves to truly American principles. That this can be accomplished, millions of Americans must be shown the way; they must be told over and over again. And the best way to tell the American story is by example, by the example of Decatur, and her sister cities, who have never strayed, whose community integrity and devotion, through trial and tribulation, through the long hard pull, have led us from a noble past and, if followed, into an even nobler future.

The path to the fulfillment of "great purposes" and a world at peace is that which Decatur treads and on which in the days ahead must be heard the footsteps of all America.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, Decatur is truly an "All-America City," not just for 1961, for it has been in the past and will continue to be for long years to come.

Mr. Speaker, as quoted in the issue of Look magazine which will carry the All-America Cities awards, Dr. George H. Gallup, foreman of the All-America Cities jury, states:

> The citations are not given for good government or efficient municipal administration, but rather on the basis of energetic, purposeful citizen effort.

Within this concept, Look magazine says of Decatur, in naming it an All-America City:

> Middle age came early to Decatur. The city's downtown section was traffic-clogged. Parking space was scarce. Slums choked the city's choicest sections. Industry grew, but outside city limits. Even worse, water reserves were low.
>
> In 1958, a citizen group campaigned for and won a council-manager government. Later, the reformers elected a mayor and five out of six councilmen. Meanwhile, a $2.5 million street program had been adopted, augmented by State and Federal funds, along with a $5 million plan to raise the reservoir level. Merchants purchased parking sites, and urban-renewal funds were obtained to clear a blighted area of 50 acres. Today, Decatur is a rejuvenated city.

Liberalizing Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing in the House of Representatives a bill liberalizing the Social Security Act and providing an essential package break for our older citizens.

The bill provides for three major changes in the act: First, removal of the present limitation on outside income that can be earned by recipients of social security benefits; Second, lowering of the retirement age for men to 60 and women to 55 years of age; Third, continued payments to dependent children after age 18 provided the dependent child is actually attending full-time school.

The first revision is the removal of the present limitation on outside income that can be earned by individuals who are receiving social security benefits. We are all well aware of the fact that the cost of living has continued to spiral upwards, and it is almost impossible for the majority of our older citizens to live on savings, small pensions or their social security. Pensions and social security are not that generous, and whatever savings might have been accumulated over the years have been for the most part dispersed for various reasons. In many instances the older folks are forced to become dependent to some degree on relatives or friends, or on the various welfare agencies for the additional help they need. To remove this restriction on the amount of income which they can earn would correct a great inequity in the law and would most assuredly make it easier for them and their families. Wage earners, for whom the act was originally intended, would then be on a par with those who have trust funds, real estate, and other investments, against whom there is no limitation whatsoever.

The second provision would give full benefits to men and women at age 60 and 55 respectively. Early retirement of our older workers has been advocated and encouraged to make way for young-

er employees who are coming on the labor market in greater numbers each year. After working for a period of 30 to 40 years an individual is certainly entitled to some rest and a relaxation of pace. The fact that he has retired from active full-time employment would not necessarily mean that the benefit of his qualifications and years of experience would be lost and unused. However, his responsibility would be lessened and his burden lightened; yet he would be free to continue to contribute his ideas and know-how, but on a more limited basis.

With regard to provision three, for many years we have been mindful of a great deficiency in our approach to the educational needs of our people. Literally thousands of young men and women are obliged to forego a full education because of the need to contribute to the maintenance of their home. This provision, if enacted into law, will be a real step forward, not only from the viewpoint of our educational needs, but also from the viewpoint of a parent who has only an average income and wants to provide his child with additional schooling.

The Congress has a substantial responsibility for the welfare of all our citizens. If we are to be practical and realistic we must at this time revise this program to meet the challenge of the times.

Reasons for Locating Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor Customhouse at the Harbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Government proposes to locate one of its customhouse 22 miles from the harbor it is intended to serve. This is the Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor. Although it would seem ridiculous to have to explain why a customs house should be located at the harbor, rather than 22 miles away, nonetheless Bob Wells of the editorial department of the Long Beach Independent Press Telegram did a good job of it in a letter to Assemblyman Vincent Thomas of the California Legislature, who has introduced two resolutions in that legislature requesting the customhouse be placed where it should be. The letter is as follows:

MARCH 8, 1961.

The Honorable VINCENT THOMAS,
Assemblyman, 68th District,
State Capitol, Sacramento, Calif.

DEAR ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Needless to say, we are very pleased by your action in introducing two resolutions requesting that customs headquarters be located in the harbor area. Would you please send two copies of each resolution to me here at the newspaper?

I am sending along some of the material we have collected or prepared on the customhouse problem in the hope it may be useful.

The main justification made by Customs Collector Carl White and some GSA officials for a downtown customhouse seems to be that business interests who deal with customs—brokers, banks, shiplines—are located in downtown Los Angeles and only in downtown Los Angeles. This reasoning is erroneous as you well know:

The main justification made by the customs service and the GSA seems to be that business interests who deal with customs—brokers, banks, ship lines—are located in downtown Los Angeles and only in downtown Los Angeles. This reasoning is erroneous on two counts.

First, many of the businesses mentioned are present in the harbor area. The shipping lines all have offices in the harbor. Our banking facilities are adequate. There are 27 customs brokers in Los Angeles; there are 7 in the harbor area; there are a similar number near International Airport in Inglewood. The harbor area is closer transportationwise to the airport than is downtown Los Angeles.

Second, customs brokers are located in downtown Los Angeles because the customs headquarters is there, not the other way around. If the customhouse were located in the harbor, all brokers would have offices there. The brokers are concentrated at Sixth and Spring Streets in Los Angeles, the present site of customs offices. If the customs headquarters is moved to the proposed new building in the civic center, the brokers will have to run special messengers. This will pose a problem because there are no provisions for off-street parking at the proposed new Federal building. Lack of civic center parking has already reached crisis proportions.

I am enclosing a Verifax copy of a copy of a letter sent to the GSA by Carmichael Freight Forwarders and Customhouse Brokers. This firm is located in downtown Los Angeles, but the reasons for a harbor customs center and against a downtown customhouse are very well summarized.

D. B. Strubinger, acting commissioner of customs, in a report prepared for Senator WILLIS ROBERTSON, has acknowledged that there is a transportation time of 1 hour between the downtown Los Angeles headquarters and the harbor branch customs. He shrugs it off, but let me tell you what it means.

First, every day the appraiser of customs has to send eight men to the harbor to appraise merchandise on the docks. By Strubinger's own figures, it takes these eight appraisers 1 hour to reach the area where they work. It takes them 1 hour to return to the appraiser's headquarters in downtown Los Angeles. That is 16 hours a day lost in transportation—or the equivalent of two more appraisers per day.

Second, imported merchandise that cannot be accurately appraised on the docks has to be sent to the Appraiser's Stores in downtown Los Angeles. Samples—or, as in the case of antiques, sometimes the entire shipment—are picked up and trucked at Government expense from the docks to downtown Los Angeles. The fee for this cartage is 85 cents per package. The bill to the Government runs between $3,500 and $4,000 a month, or between $40,000 and $50,000 yearly.

Third. The customs service has one messenger a day that makes the trip between downtown Los Angeles and the harbor. He carries entries—customs forms—between the customs headquarters and the merchandise. Thus an entry that is sent up one day will not be sent back until the next. That is a delay of at least 1 day for entries, which at other ports (with customs near the harbor) are handled in less than an hour. Sometimes, the messenger misdirects the entry, or there is an error on it. In this case it must go back to Los Angeles and be sent down all over again. This can cause a minimum delay of 3 days.

I received this information from customs employees, who, contrary to their Los Angeles-oriented bosses, favor a harbor customhouse for efficiency.

The Bureau of Customs and GSA say the decision to locate customs headquarters in Los Angeles was reached only after extensive surveys. Port officials in both Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors would like to know what surveys. As far as I can determine, no one in the harbor area was consulted. We learned about the surveys only after it was announced that customs headquarters would be located in downtown Los Angeles.

GSA Public Buildings Service Commissioner Karl E. Wallace states in a letter to a Long Beach businessman—a copy of which I am enclosing—that customs has to go into the new building because the Department of the Treasury is the principal tenant and, after all, the Bureau of Customs is a part of the Treasury. This, again, is contrary to practice at other ports in the United States.

In other ports, the following agencies, all of which are concerned with maritime commerce, are located in a customhouse: Federal Communications Commission; Coast Guard Search and Rescue, Coast Guard Steamship Inspection and Shipping Commissioner and other Coast Guard bureaus; Public Health Service; Immigration Service; Maritime Commission.

The Internal Revenue Service will take a large share of the space in the proposed new Federal building in Los Angeles. The IRS gets lots of business from taxpayers, as you know, and it is going to cause a parking problem under present plans, which do not provide for parking areas.

Proponents of the downtown customhouse are trying to make it appear that Long Beach is demanding the customs headquarters be located in Long Beach. This is untrue. What Long Beach has asked is that customs be located at a site mutually convenient to the two ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach. There are excellent sites available in Los Angeles. Reeves Field on Terminal Island, which is within the city limits of Los Angeles, would be ideal.

I am sending copies of this letter to Assemblymen Kennick and Grant, to Senator Engle and to Congressmen Hosmer and King.

Sincerely,

BOB WELLS,
Editorial Department, Independent Press-Telegram.

A Dignified and Well-Informed President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, John S. Knight, editor and publisher of the Miami Herald, observes in his weekly column "The Editor's Notebook," which appeared in the March 5 Miami Herald, that President Kennedy was "dignified, surefooted, and remarkably well in-

formed" in his preceding press conference.

Mr. Knight is one of the Nation's foremost editors and his remarks in this regard bear great significance. He notes that in his time six Presidents have faced the Nation's press in these Washington news conferences.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Knight's editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Miami Herald, Mar. 5, 1961]

THE EDITOR'S NOTEBOOK—KENNEDY'S SURE-FOOTED WORDS FAR FROM NAIVE, IMMATURE

VIEWS ON THE NEWS

The President's press conferences are disclosing some unsuspected qualities in our Chief Executive.

Or so is must seem to those who charged in the campaign that Jack Kennedy was "naive, immature, and inexperienced."

As I watched the President on television last Wednesday morning, he was dignified, surefooted, and remarkably well informed.

The anouncements which preceded the questioning were made without flourish. A lesser politician might have waved the flag in urging the restoration of Eisenhower's former rank, but Kennedy stated quite simply what he thought ought to be done and that was that.

Nor did the President attempt to claim credit for the halt in the net outflow of gold from the United States to foreign countries. He conceded that "this complete halt is only temporary" but expressed the belief that confidence in the dollar is being restored.

Kennedy made no extravagant claims for the new Peace Corps, but voiced the hope that it may be a contribution to world peace.

He conceded that the task of dedicated people, receiving no salary and living at the same economic level as the people of the countries to which they are assigned, will not be easy.

PRESS PRECEDENTS

In my time, six Presidents have faced the Nation's press in these Washington news conferences.

Two of them, Calvin Coolidge and Herbert Hoover, insisted upon written questions in advance. They answered only the ones they cared to answer.

Franklin D. Roosevelt used the press conference as a device to help accomplish whatever purpose he had in mind. Mainly FDR specialized in selling the Roosevelt programs. An arranged question was often the launching pad for a lengthy dissertation on what Roosevelt thought the country should know.

The question and answer period enabled FDR to send up trial political balloons, clout his enemies and convey as little or as much information as he wished.

Harry S. Truman, though humble at the start, was a new man after his surprising victory in 1948.

He thoroughly enjoyed his encounters with the press and never ducked any of the tough questions. When the meetings were on the dull side, HST would try to liven things up.

He was testy at times, often cocky, and generally well liked by the reporters.

Dwight D. Eisenhower's press conferences were always illuminating, though seldom inspiring. The general, unpracticed in the art of deception, gave honest if involved answers.

I have seen him flush with anger when asked prying questions about personal matters, and give the short rebuke to windy interrogation.

Ike never mastered the simple direct answer. A grave problem was always "this thing of which you speak" and the dangling participles came in endless flow.

Nevertheless, the Eisenhower conferences were productive of news. Although Ike disliked these meetings with the press, he dutifully gave his best without artifice or evasion.

ALL'S DIFFERENT NOW

The Kennedy technique is quite different from the methods used by his predecessors.

He has dispensed with the requirement that his questioner identify himself and the newspaper represented.

This has come as a sharp disappointment to some Washington correspondents who (a) have a tendency to ham it up and (b) to others intent upon displaying their perspicacity to editors back home.

To date, the cool, confident, and reserved President has won the respectful attention of the Washington press corps.

There is no banter, nor any wisecracks. Kennedy's opening announcements sound like the chairman of the board reporting to the directors.

As one of our correspondents wrote me this week: "The blandness, the tedious excellence of the Kennedys must seem like dull copy. Hence the aridity of the bureau's report."

CHALLENGES AHEAD

In time, as the newsmen grow restive over this unaccustomed efficiency, they will become bolder and pose the shrewd, penetrating questions which give no comfort to the gentleman who must answer them.

It will be interesting to see how the President handles the little lady who has parlayed a funny hat and a vinegar voice into a national television reputation.

Or the pompous chief of bureau who always makes a speech before getting to the question.

And the needling prosecutors of the press who, in the past, have caused Presidents to feel as uneasy as a corporation officer charged with price fixing by the Department of Justice.

A MATCH IS MET

I have a hunch, however, that the Washington press corps has met its match in J. F. K.

This knowledgeable young man will not easily be thrown off stride. He gives the impression that he has done his homework, is fully conversant with all aspects of his job, and understands the magnitude of the problems he faces now and in the future.

A few editors are complaining that Kennedy's televised press conferences disadvantage the newspapers in terms of publication time.

Even so, it seems to me that the greater exposure a President has, the better informed are the people he leads.

Our Fear of Nuclear War Kremlin's Greatest Asset

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Capt. J. H. Morse, Jr., U.S. Navy, retired, has for long been an outstanding authority on nuclear problems. On the eve of the resumption of the Geneva nuclear test ban talks it is well to remember his words on November 27, 1960, on the Manion Forum. Pertinent extracts from Captain Morse's broadcast are as follows:

"The only thing we have to fear is fear itself." These cogent words of Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1933 state as well as any words can the situation as I see it today. They form the essence of the thought I shall express today in the few minutes at my disposal. I shall make the following basic points:

1. America today seems a fearful nation lacking in self-confidence and determination.

2. The Communists are, to a large extent, responsible. They have fought for years to erode deliberately our individual and national courage, in recent years through nuclear lies and half-truths.

3. They have done so in order to weaken their strongest opponent and achieve their goal of world domination through surrender by installment, won from irresolute and frightened opponents.

4. We can thwart their aim by recognizing what they have done and what they mean to do, by reviving the individual and national courage required for life in the dangerous world today. We are physically stronger than the Soviets and can retain this lead. But, there is no substitute for courage as the indispensable supplement to physical strength.

The nature of today's crisis is clear, but our national response to this crisis is still in doubt. Neither we nor our anxiously watching allies can be sure how we will react. This doubt is natural under the circumstances.

There is good reason to believe that we as individuals, and hence our Government, are dangerously inhibited by fears that assume two basic forms:

1. We fear the possibility and the consequences of nuclear war if we take the kind of positive action and initiative which history and commonsense call for today.

2. We fear what other people, including our enemies would think or say if we took such positive action. The latter fear shows unhealthy lack of confidence in ourselves and in our country. Both fears are greatly inflated beyond justification by the facts. And this inflation has not come about by chance.

It would be only natural if Khrushchev thinks us fearful. After all, the Communists have deliberately sought to erode our national courage for many years. It would be most surprising, particularly to them, if they had failed completely. Let me be specific.

In their short 40 years of history, the Communists have demonstrated astounding skill in psychological warfare. They got their start that way. The founders of the Communist movement had no physical power—only ideas, lies, and a basic understanding of psychological warfare against men and nations.

By such warfare against the mind, backed judiciously by threat of force, they have come in only 40 years or so from nowhere to control directly now one-third of all the people on this earth. Indirectly, and again by psychological warfare, they largely control millions more. What would be more natural than to concentrate this devastating form of warfare upon Americans who for years have been the No. 1 Soviet target?

From the very beginning of this assault the Soviets have recognized that any nation's power consists of two main elements: First, its physical power, such as military and economic strength; and, second, its moral courage and determination to use that physical power where required for survival and to attain the other national ends.

The Soviets have also recognized that until recently they could do little directly about America's physical strength. They could not appreciably influence the size of our Armed Forces or our weapons, for example. Nor could they affect our economic policies appreciably. Our individual and national courage, however, they early recognized as

another matter, an essential element of our national strength which is peculiarly vulnerable to their particular skill in psychological warfare.

Even before nuclear weapons, they made some progress though not too much; however, the nuclear weapon in their skilled hands has now changed the picture drastically and provided a perfect tool for them to destroy our national courage. Now our courage is being really tested. You may be sure that the Soviets are making the most of this opportunity.

How have they gone about it? As you might expect—by deliberately stressing nuclear half-truths and outright lies to inflate and distort the possibility and the very real dangers of nuclear war. There is no field of progress more encumbered with misunderstandings than that of nuclear weapons. Much of this misunderstanding is deliberate. Much is the result of our own inept handling of the problem. Whatever the causes, the results are clear. Nuclear weapons have acquired a no hope connotation in the eyes of most Americans. And the end result, if this situation continues, is likely to be fatal, by installments.

Two nuclear half-truths among the many implanted by the Soviets have been particularly devastating in this regard. For example, you have heard many times over that major nuclear war means the end of everything for you as an individual, and for your children and your Nation—all that you hold dear. You have heard that major nuclear war will probably destroy all life on earth. Who wants most for you to believe this? Khrushchev. Of course.

You have also heard that the use of any nuclear weapon anywhere, no matter how small the weapon or how remote the area, or how unimportant the occasion, must inevitably expand into all-out nuclear war. Who want most for you to believe this? Khrushchev. Of course.

Why? The answer, it seems to me, is very simple. If you really believe with certainty these two concepts: That major nuclear war means the end of everything; if you really believe with certainty that any use of any nuclear weapon must surely bring on a major nuclear war; then the use of nuclear weapons must mean to you no hope. Think about the implications of these words for a moment. No hope. These are terrifying words.

They mean that you know there is no hope if anyone ever uses nuclear weapons under any circumstances. Thus, the very essence of our national military strength, our absolutely indispensable nuclear elements are useless for your defense, or for achieving your national objectives. They will remain unavailable until and unless you face an equally hopeless situation with little to choose between the two.

It is difficult for many Americans today to imagine any equal or more hopeless situation than one which calls for using any nuclear weapons. Certainly Khrushchev will not present us with such apparently hopeless alternatives which might lead us to choose that of nuclear weapons until he is certain he can win no matter what we do. Then it will be too late. This is what he hopes and plans. There are more ways than one to skin a cat.

So it is easy to see why he wants you to believe these two ideas so carefully implanted into our national thinking. If we are sufficiently fearful of nuclear war, the Soviets can thus avoid the one inhibiting restraint which has so far curbed their growing power.

Whenever we have shown that we mean business, with nuclear weapons in our arsenal and the credible will be to use them to stop the Soviets, they have drawn back. Whenever we have shown indecision and willingness to compromise, we have fared badly. I am aware of no exception.

I am not concerned about our physical strength. Despite the current debate about our physical strength which rages in many circles, I am confident that America still is many times stronger than the Soviet Union and can remain so if we, the people, so determine. And we will, if we keep our courage. If we were not stronger than the Soviets, do you think that America as a Nation would be alive today? I don't.

No, our physical strength does not concern me at the moment. I believe that we can and will provide the military and economic strength required to stay ahead if we do not completely lose our courage. We will, I believe, make the financial sacrifices required to assure sufficient missiles of modern vintage and the military forces required in other fields of military strength.

Our appalling decision to stop improving our nuclear weapons argues against this optimism about our continued physical strength. I would hope, however, that our blindness here is temporary. It may disappear if the Khrushchev tactics call for continued bullying as at the United Nations recently, and if our courage gradually recovers as Khrushchev again shows us the facts of modern life.

Please do not assume that I favor nuclear war of any kind, or that I criticize the Republicans and not the Democrats for lack of courage. I am calling only for a rebirth of national and individual courage by which this Nation can face the facts of modern life in realistic fashion clear of wishful thinking; by which Khrushchev will know that America courageously faces any risk he can impose, including that of nuclear war on any scale that may be necessary to stop him. He must know that Americans do, indeed, regard some things that he would do to us and to the world as worse than death. This, I believe, is the most effective way to avoid a nuclear war, and yet retain a free world for our children.

The courage, I believe, must come from you, the people, demonstrated to your Government leaders so clearly that they also find courage within themselves. After all, they get it from you. This is a democracy. Your opinion is important. Make it known to your friends and to your leaders on any level accessible to you.

We can thwart Khrushchev only by showing traditional American courage and determination of the sort that made this Nation. We must recognize that just being alive today takes courage—but, it is also fun.

Between implacable Soviet hostility and the threat of nuclear weapons there is no way that we can positively assure a favorable outcome for us. Let us accept that fact and stop looking for easy ways like trusting Khrushchev, or the threat of the Red Chinese, or early changes inside Russia.

We must recognize the cold hard facts of modern life, its inevitable risks, as well as its rewards, and shun the kind of wishful thinking which blinds our Government to such simple facts as how to treat a bully, and what happens when one tries appeasement, no matter how cleverly disguised.

The Chains of the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include therein an address by Willis E. Stone, chairman of the National Committee for Economic Freedom, 6413 Franklin Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif. Due to the expanding and continuing interest in my bill, House Joint Resolution 23, which I reintroduced in the 87th Congress, I believe the contents of this speech will supply valuable information in support of this measure:

THE CHAINS OF THE CONSTITUTION

(By Willis E. Stone)

Power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely. Lord Acton's dictum is not a cliché; it is a tragic truth. And unfortunately the lust for power is an innate vice of men. The pages of history run red with the blood of those who have lived in misery and died in agony under the absolute power of tyrants. And the instrument of every tyrant's power has been a corps of satellites who yielded him unquestioning obedience in return for the privilege of dominating over and terrorizing his subjects.

To protect the new Nation from this fatal vice of mankind, the founders of our Republic acted on the maxim enunciated by Thomas Jefferson: "Let no more be heard of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution.

But we have neglected our Constitution, relaxing the vigilance with which we should have enforced it, and permitting gradual and systematic encroachment on our liberties. And even now, when a vast and greedy bureaucracy has almost openly become our master, we try to reassure ourselves with the hope that it can't happen here.

Unfortunately, it not only can happen here, but it is happening to us, and our plight grows progressively worse day by day. Incredible as it would have seemed to the authors of the Constitution, our Government is little by little wresting from the people the right to own and operate the productive enterprises that the people have created. And we can no longer avoid the unhappy realization that our income taxes pay for the destruction of our property rights.

In our dismal plight, however, one hope for the revival of our institutions of economic freedom is growing brighter and stronger. The proposed 23d amendment is constantly gaining momentum as it becomes increasingly apparent that this measure, which would undoubtedly control the bureaucracy's lust for power and restore economic justice to our troubled land, can command enthusiastic popular support.

The proposed 23d amendment will free the American people from the crushing burden of financing socialism at home and abroad in direct violation of the spirit of the Constitution.

II

It is an appalling fact that Americans, who have never known military defeat, have been forced by their Government, under the pretext of economic aid, to pay more tribute to foreign Socialist and Communist governments than all the vanquished peoples of the earth have paid to their conquerors. And these vast sums, when not simply wasted, are used to give to foreigners industries which, if successfully operated, necessarily deprive Americans of foreign, or even of domestic, markets.

At home, our whole economy is being overgrown by a jungle of bureaucratic agencies with strange names and often incomprehensible activities, which operate without the slightest pretense of constitutional authority, and whose very existence is unknown to most of the taxpayers from whom they suck nourishment. The first clear picture of this jungle is provided by the series of fact sheets available from Post Office Box 2948, Los Angeles, Calif.

Fact sheet No. 1 listed more than 700 Federal agencies which compete with private

enterprise on a cost-free, interest-free, dividend-free, rent-free, and tax-free basis—and even so usually produce admitted or concealed deficits. Subsequent issues report on single agencies and projects, of which the following are typical examples.

The Cuba Nickel Co. (fact sheet No. 3) involved us deeply in the troubles of Cuba, which it possibly helped to generate. More than $90 million of our taxes were poured into the economically unsound mining of extremely low-grade nickel. Even without Castro, the hope of salvaging any part of our "investment" would have been extremely remote.

Eskimo dwellings (No. 4) is one of the eight projects included in the single budget entry titled "Independent Offices Appropriations Act of 1955," and in which a total of $2,500 million was invested. Of this original capital, about 25 percent has been recovered, 60 percent has been lost, and most of the remaining 15 percent will probably have to be written off. But the admitted loss to date of more than $1½ billion in this mad-cap enterprise seems to embarrass no one, nor does it discourage the promotion of similar schemes.

Passamaquoddy (No. 5) was a scandalous New Deal project abandoned in 1936 as obviously impractical and notoriously corrupt. But it has been revived, and a new preliminary survey has already cost us $3 million.

The Alaska Railroad (No. 10) has the distinction of possessing the world's only steam-heated railroad tunnel. As a political effort, the tunnel is a great success, requiring a large staff to keep it warm 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. But unfortunately it was necessary to open the doors to let the occasional trains go through, and this produced difficulties of such magnitude that, according to a recent report, the railroad has been rerouted around the tunnel.

These are but samples of the bizarre misuse of political power and our money. The detailed studies made by the Hoover Commission report, among other things, that the Federal Government taxes us to operate no less than 104 money-lending institutions.

The Rural Electrification Administration (No. 17), for example, takes money borrowed by the U.S. Treasury at the current rate of 4 percent and lends it to tax-exempt cooperatives at 2 percent. Of course, the differential is so obvious that the cooperatives are taking more and more of this 2-percent money and investing it in the Government bonds which yield 4 percent. And no one—except the taxpayers who pay for this folly—can complain because the cooperatives recognize an opportunity to make a sure profit on no investment.

Another one of the 104 lending agencies was the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (No. 14), which, according to page A–10 of the U.S. Budget of 1950, dissipated more than $10 billion during the single year of 1948. Exposure of such facts forced the abolition of the RFC—but it vanished only in name, since its powers were transferred to the Small Business Administration (No. 15) and General Services Administration (No. 21), which squander money by the same methods, although currently on a somewhat reduced scale.

The Federal programs to usurp the business of producing electrical power were all labelled "economically unsound" in the Hoover reports. The best known of these are the Tennessee Valley Authority (Nos. 11 and 28) and Bonneville (No. 34). It is interesting to note that the TVA, which has already inflicted on American taxpayers a direct loss of more than $2 billion, was recently made independent of all restraints when it was granted the fantastic power to issue its own bonds against the credit of the United States, without reference to the budget or the national debt limit, and without review or control by the Congress or the Treasury Department.

The list of Federal agencies which, in violation of the Constitution, tax us to invade and corrupt every area of our national life, is long—and tragic in its implications. It is estimated they have grabbed more than 20 percent of our industrial capacity.

III

The invasion of our business community is matched by the spectacular capture of land empires by other Federal agencies.

The Department of the Interior proclaims on page 229 of the U.S. Government Organization Manual for 1959–60 that it has "custody of 750 million acres of land." The sheer magnitude of this domain has somehow escaped notice. We assume that this must be all right because the Department is part of our Government, and we further assume that it has observed its obligations under the Constitution. We forget that the Federal Government has no right or power to have or to hold land in any State except within strict limits specified by the Constitution—limits which the Department of the Interior has patently transgressed. Without the slightest constitutional authority, it has invaded the States and taken control of 750 million acres, which are 32.3 percent of the total land and water area of the United States and all of its territories and possessions.

The Department of Agriculture does not itself claim ownership of vast tracts of land, but it does hold the power of life and death over the agriculture of the Nation. The threat of seizure of private farms is very real. The farm acquisition plan devised by Henry Wallace, Henry Abt, Lee Pressman, Rexford Guy Tugwell, and others of their kind, provides for the confiscation of farms, crops, and livestock if the farmers fail to obey the commands of the Department. And who knows when the bureaucrats will decide to exercise their tyranny on a national scale?

While the Department merely threatens its subjects, agencies within it are building great feudal baronies. Although the Forest Service has no constitutional authority for being the proprietor of any land in any State, it now, according to page 261 of the manual cited above, "administers approximately 150 national forests, together with land utilization project lands, experimental forests, and other lands, aggregating about 188 million acres." This domain equals 8.1 percent of the total land and water area of the United States and all its territories and possessions.

The Founding Fathers of this Nation well knew that, as was shown by all history and emphasized by the experience of the English people, the ownership or control of large or economically important tracts of land by a central government was an infallible incitment to despotism—that the theory of the "divine right of kings" had been in fact less baneful to human liberty than the powers of political corruption and arbitrary control inherent in the monarch's possession of great areas. For this reason they stringently limited in the Constitution the territory that could be under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government, restricting it to an area of not more than 10 miles square (the present District of Columbia), military and naval establishments, and buildings for the conduct of Federal business. And they provided with equal clarity a single procedure whereby the Central Government might acquire even these restricted areas, making the decision in all cases rest exclusively with the State concerned.

It is true that the new Federal Government also had jurisdiction over the western territory that had been ceded to the Confederation by New York, Virginia, and other States, but this jurisdiction was merely provisional and temporary, since the cessions had been made with the express proviso that this territory was to become, as soon as it was sufficiently settled, a number of new States equal in all respects to the Original Thirteen. This equality included, of course, complete sovereignty over all land within the State's boundaries except Army posts, naval bases, and Federal buildings. The terms of cession were confirmed by the first Congress under the Constitution, and carried into effect when the first new States, Kentucky and Tennessee, were admitted in 1792 and 1796.

It is quite clear, therefore, that the Constitution did not contemplate, and does not permit, permanent possession or occupation by the Federal Government of even 1 acre of land outside the District of Columbia, except as provided in article I, section 8, paragraph 17, of the Constitution:

"The Congress shall have the power * * * to exercise exclusive legislation * * * over all places purchased by the consent of the legislature of the State in which the same shall be, for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards, and other needful buildings."

The stringency of this limitation is emphasized in "The Federalist," No. 43, and it was assumed that the States would be vigilant to prevent trangression of the carefully prescribed limits. This assumption, implicit in the Constitution itself, is reiterated throughout "The Federalist"; for example, in No. 85: "We may safely rely on the disposition of the State legislatures to erect barriers against the encroachments of the national authority."

But where are those barriers? Under the spell of unprecedented prosperity and a wild optimism we not only relaxed the vigilance of freemen, but seem now almost to have forgotten what a State really is.

When Alaska was recently admitted as a State, it was permitted jurisdiction over only a small part of its total area, and even this part was made subject to permanent restrictions as to occupancy and use. The people of Alaska obviously do not have authority over their own territory, and therefore do not enjoy equality with the inhabitants of the older States, for they have been made subject to the sovereignty of a multitude of bureaucrats in Washington. Alaska is not a State in the meaning of that word in the Constitution; it is a monstrous hybrid and, in effect, a disguised colony of the Federal Government.

In the meantime, the bureaucracy is assiduously eroding the States by legal usurpation and, most fantastic of all, by buying them up with money obtained by taxing them.

The bureaucracy has become so arrogant that it now challenges even a State's jurisdiction over land owned by the State government, as, for example, in Ohio, where the State has been sued by the U.S. Department of Agriculture for daring to plant wheat on its prison farms.

Today, 48 percent of the State of California is federally owned, so that the legislature and people of California have sovereignty over only half their State—and even the part that has been left to them is being steadily diminished. The plight of Arizona is worse; there Federal agencies own and control 75 percent of the entire State. In Nevada, Federal agencies hold 87 percent of the land, and three new programs of acquisition will increase this to 88.8 percent, thus leaving but 11.2 percent of Nevada under the control of its Governor, legislature, and people. These monstrous and ever growing domains are strangling the States and threaten to extinguish the whole concept of individual property rights.

Just two Federal agencies—the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service—have between them attained jurisdiction over nearly 1 billion acres of American land—a land mass equal in extent to the combined areas of England, Ireland, Scotland, Wales, Portugal, Spain, France, Belgium, Holland, Luxembourg, Switzerland, East and West

Germany, Iceland, Denmark, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Austria, Hungary, Italy, Albania, Greece, Yugoslavia, Rumania, and Bulgaria.

This incredible usurpation has been effected and is maintained by wringing from American taxpayers money to violate and subvert the Constitution. While we were unaware of what was happening and heedless of our own safety, the bureaucracy took our own money to conquer us from within; but we, the people, still have the power under our Constitution to reestablish economic freedom, private property, and self-determination.

IV

The procedure is clear. The provisions and intent of the Constitution can be reinstated by an amendment to clarify and define the terms and purposes that have become vague through abuse and quasi-judicial distortion. A single amendment, enacted as provided in article V of the Constitution, can take from the bureaucrats the enormous powers they have usurped.

The proposed 23d amendment, introduced as House Joint Resolution 23, by Congressman JAMES B. UTT, of California, provides:

"SECTION 1. The Government of the United States shall not engage in any business, professional, commercial, financial, or industrial enterprise except as specified in the Constitution.

"SEC. 2. The constitution or laws of any State or the laws of the United States shall not be subject to the terms of any foreign or domestic agreement which would abrogate this amendment.

"SEC. 3. The activities of the U.S. Government which violate the intent and purposes of this amendment shall, within a period of 3 years from the date of ratification of this amendment, be liquidated and the properties and facilities affected shall be sold.

"SEC. 4. Three years after the ratification of this amendment the 16th article of amendments to the Constitution of the United States shall stand repealed and thereafter Congress shall not levy taxes on personal income, estates, and/or gifts."

This amendment will erase the privileges and immunities claimed by Federal agencies, cause the lands and facilities held without constitutional authority to be sold back to the people or transferred to the States, and free us from an oppressive taxation that has become virtual serfdom. * * * This will be obvious from a simple calculation.

The value of the lands and facilities now held by the Federal Government has been appraised by the Government Operations Committee at $262 billion. This appraisal is undoubtedly conservative, for the Federal Government recently sold barge lines, synthetic rubber plants, and various parcels of land at nearly three times the appraised value. It may safely be assumed, therefore, that the lands and facilities affected by the "23d amendment" would find a market, even at forced sale, which would yield far more than one-fourth of the 1959 appraisal for all Federal properties. But if only one-fourth were realized, this would reduce the national debt more than $65 billion. And on this modest estimate we can readily compute that, in terms of the 1960 budget, the proposed measure would at least—

	Million
Save interest on this portion of the debt (at 3 percent)	$1,950
Save amortization ($65 billion in 40 years) per year	1,625
Save losses of agencies affected (1959 level)	19,000
Save payroll paid by general fund for free services to Federal corporate activities (estimate 1959)	4,300
Save costs of goods, services, and facilities required to make above payroll operative (three times payroll)	$12,900
Domestic savings	39,775
And also save foreign grants and credits (estimate 1959)	5,000
Total savings	44,775
Therefore we can repeal personal income taxes, which yielded in 1959	—36,900
Leaving a surplus of	7,875
And also repeal estate and gift taxes, which yielded in 1959	—1,393
Leaving the Federal Government a net surplus of	6,482

Furthermore, the purchasing power that will be released, and the economic activity that will be stimulated when the American people are liberated from the serfdom of income taxes will increase the revenue from other taxes by approximately $9 billion per year.

This great financial gain is merely a by-product of the multiple benefactions that the proposed 23d amendment will bring to the American people. Freedom yields rich rewards, and no one can set a price on the gain in human dignity, personal integrity, individual enterprise, and faith in our national future.

V

The campaign for enactment of the 23d amendment is being conducted by local groups which federate to form State committees, whose efforts are coordinated by the National Committee for Economic Freedom, 6413 Franklin Avenue, Los Angeles 28, Calif. This unified activity is producing remarkable results.

The first success was reported by Mr. Dan Hanson, chairman of the Wyoming Committee for Economic Freedom. The proposed 23d amendment, introduced in the Wyoming Legislature as a joint resolution, was approved by a voice vote in the Democratic house, with which the Republican senate concurred without a single dissent, and was approved by Governor Hickey, a Democrat, on February 26, 1959.

Texas was the second State. Dr. Ernest E. Anthony, Jr., of Fort Worth, and Mr. Robert E. Nesmith, of Houston, cochairmen of the Texas Committee for Economic Freedom, reported that a resolution identical to the one approved in Wyoming had been adopted by the Texas house by a vote of 80 to 55, and on the following day, May 6, 1959, by a voice vote in the senate.

Nevada has a senate of 17 members, 13 of whom (9 Republicans and 4 Democrats) cosponsored the 23d amendment and approved it on March 1, 1960. The house then voted 31 to 10 for it on March 11, 1960, and Governor Sawyer, a Democrat, signed it. Mr. George E. Shaner, chairman of the Nevada Committee for Economic Freedom, has since reported unanimous endorsement of the amendment by the Nevada Republican Convention.

Louisiana became the fourth State to approve the 23d amendment. Introduced as a concurrent resolution, it was adopted almost unanimously by the house, and by a vote of 28 to 9 in the senate on June 20, 1960.

There are good prospects for early action in a number of other States, and what has thus far been accomplished is proof that Americans are developing a cumulative determination to regain their economic freedom.

We need no longer submit to the lust for power. We have been shown by our dolorous experience that liberty can be preserved only by perpetual vigilance, and that we must, as Jefferson warned us, "bind down those whom we are obliged to trust with power"—bind them down from mischief "by the chains of the Constitution."

Cuba's New Rebels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter to the editor which was published in this morning's edition of the Washington Post and Times Herald entitled, "Cuba's New Rebels," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CUBA'S NEW REBELS

I wish to commend you on your March 2 editorial, "Cuba's New Rebels," which so accurately grasps the tragic and ironic situation in my country.

I share the view of the editorial that the same historic tendencies which worked against Batista may now be working against Castro, and that the long survival of the anti-Castro defectors in the Escambray Mountains suggests that an armed internal rebellion is possible.

Unfortunately, however, he is still strong, not only because he has the best weapons, equipment and military personnel from the Communist bloc of nations, but because he has the fanatical support of a small minority of the people of Cuba—mainly the well organized and disciplined apparatus of the Communist Party. Also the bulk of his indoctrinated militia mistakenly believe that the movement against the Cuban revolutionary government is actually a reactionary counterrevolution hatched by the U.S. Government, and that both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations stand for the support of dictatorships of the right, dollar diplomacy, and opposition to the agrarian reform because it confiscates the property of U.S. citizens.

For this reason I believe it most important to accelerate the overthrow of the Castro regime, not only by giving military assistance to the freedom fighters within Cuba such as those in the Escambray Mountains, but also by using every means of communication to let the Cuban peasant and militiaman know that the anti-Castro movement is not a counterrevolutionary one, and that its leaders are not "stooges of American imperialism" as they have been told.

Finally, and perhaps most important for the Kennedy administration not only in Cuba but in all of Latin America, all media of communication should emphasize that the U.S. Government is not against the Castro government because it is carrying out a social revolution, but because it has become a brutal tyranny and an instrument of subversion of the Sino-Soviet bloc throughout the Western Hemisphere.

NICOLAS RIVERO,
Former Cuban Diplomat.

WASHINGTON.

Appendix

This May Be the Answer to the Problem of Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, on March 16, 1961, I introduced two bills, H.R. 5672 and H.R. 5673 which offer an eminently sound and fair solution to the growing controversy over loans to private education. These bills would: First, establish $1,000 a year scholarships in all fields for needy students winning a national competition; second, grant taxpayers an additional deduction from taxable income for expenses incurred by him, his spouse, or his dependent or dependents, while attending college; and third, provide an optional tax credit for contributions to education which may be chosen by the taxpayer in place of the deductions now allowed. This feature extends to all taxpayers the tax advantages now available only to taxpayers in the top-income brackets who make contributions to education.

H.R. 5672 and 5673 include many of the ideas and recommendations of the country's leading educational organizations. Increased private giving to education is supported by leaders in both public and private educational fields. Such powerful and respected organizations as the Association of American Colleges, which represents over 1,000 public and private colleges, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the Council for Financial Aid to Education, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce support private giving to education. Loans to private education may be the issue which defeats the administration's Federal aid-to-education proposals. But no one can honestly object to steps to encourage private giving to education.

A resolution adopted by the Association of American Colleges declares:

> The American people must give consideration to the more adequate support of higher education from both public and private funds. The traditional friendliness of government to education in America through its tax structures needs to be continued through the modernization of that tax structure.

H.R. 5673 would update and modernize the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

The administration's program for American education ignores the fact that the Congress has taken a number of concrete steps in recent years with the support of all segments of American education to encourage private giving to education. It is remarkable that the Democratic administration has made no recommendations regarding the updating of the tax structure to encourage private giving to both public and private education, though its leaders surely know very well that such a step would have overwhelming support in the Congress, and throughout the country.

For many years I have been advocating—as have many others—that the tax dollar be kept at home where it does the most good. Many people are surprised when they learn what a large share of the tax dollar is required to administer it in Washington. My theory is that if private giving to education were increased, the pressure for huge appropriations by the Federal Government would be correspondingly reduced. Thus, the $6 billion Federal aid-to-education programs of this administration could easily be reduced by as much as 2 to 3 billions of dollars if private gifts of that amount were forthcoming.

The Congress obviously intended to encourage private giving to education when, in 1952, it raised allowable deductions of adjusted gross income from 15 to 20 percent, and in 1954 raised the allowable deductions to 30 percent for such purposes. These steps had bipartisan support in the Congress and were taken while President John F. Kennedy was a Member of the Congress. They had the support of leading Members of both parties in both Houses of the Congress at that time.

H.R. 5673 is based on the sound theory that private giving to education would greatly increase if the tax deductions for philanthropy now allowed persons in the top-income bracket were extended to all taxpayers. At the present time the taxpayer with a moderate income pays $80 out of his own pocket for each $100 he gives to education. At the same time, the wealthy taxpayer in the 91 percent bracket pays only $9 out of his pocket for each $100 gift he makes to education. The bill, H.R. 5673, ends this unfair treatment of the American taxpayer and makes it possible for everyone to make gifts to education.

Members of the House and Senate who believe in private giving to education, both public and private, and who are seriously interested in a sound legislative solution to the problems facing American education, may find the Kearns' proposals worthy of sponsorship and support. I would be pleased to hear from you.

John Day Jackson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRESCOTT BUSH
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, on Friday last, March 17, there died in New Haven, Conn., Mr. John Day Jackson, retired publisher of the New Haven Register and the New Haven Journal-Courier, at the age of 92.

He was one of the most distinguished newspapermen in the United States during his active years, a man of wide acquaintance and influence, and an expert in many fields, particularly the field of taxation and fiscal affairs of Government.

He was indeed a rugged individualist, and one who was respected as such not only throughout Connecticut but most of the United States, where he was very well known.

He was a friend of Cabinet officers and Presidents of the United States. He was one of the most remarkable men I have ever known.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, following these remarks, an editorial which appeared in the New Haven Register of Saturday, March 18, 1961, entitled "John Day Jackson," followed by a newspaper account giving a brief biography of this distinguished gentleman.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHN DAY JACKSON

It is difficult for anyone not connected with the Register to realize fully the void created by the death of John Day Jackson, the paper's guiding spirit for 62 years and its owner and publisher since 1905. He was its editor and publisher in the fullest sense. To replace him is impossible.

To a man of conscience and integrity, such as John Day Jackson was in a measure far above the ordinary, a position such as his carried with it a responsibility as heavy as man can bear. To say that he bore it worthily is to appeal to the history of this newspaper under his direction.

The great newspaper which the Register is today was not John Day Jackson's by inheritance or gift. Rather was it the result of a lifetime of hard work, of devotion to a cause, and of directness of purpose.

John Day Jackson, of course, made mistakes like the rest of mankind; he had his prejudices and his predelictions. But he was seldom wholly wrong; and never, it can confidently be said, did he err purposely. No unworthy motive led him astray.

He served to illumine public issues with a mind of wide grasp and fine culture. By nature he was bound to the pursuit of high and serious purpose. His shrewd judgment, sensitive conscience, vast experience and innate conservatism were combined with an integrity of purpose as inflexible as it was fearless.

The world is apt to think that organizations like the Register live and move, and even prosper, of themselves. So they do, perhaps, in a certain sense and measure. There have been other forces and personalities at work, besides those of John Day Jackson, to make this newspaper what it is today. But no one who knows the delicacy of such an operation, the vigilance, the judgment, the forethought and the sincerity of purpose that are incessantly needed for its successful conduct will be tempted to under-

rate the value of John Day Jackson's share in the work to which his life was devoted.

There would be much more to say if this were the place and the occasion to say it. John Day Jackson's influence has been powerful wherever it has been applied. We may confidently appeal to the history of the Register under his management as a measure of his real influence on the affairs of men, and as an index of the spirit in which that influence was exercised.

Of such a record we are unashamedly proud. And though we have no desire to pronounce final judgment on the conduct of this newspaper under Mr. Jackson's management, we do render what no one unconnected with the Register is qualified to give—a faithful appreciation of his public services and a sorrowful tribute to his private worthiness.

JOHN DAY JACKSON DIES; EX-NEW HAVEN PUBLISHER

NEW HAVEN.—John Day Jackson, retired publisher of the New Haven Register and the New Haven Journal-Courier, died Friday after a long illness at the age of 92.

Jackson died in Grace-New Haven Hospital, where he had been a patient for some time. Death was attributed to pneumonia.

Funeral services will be conducted at 10 a.m. Monday at Christ Church (Episcopal), Broadway. The rector, the Reverend Mr. William G. Kibitz, will officiate. Burial will be in the family plot at Cedar Hill Cemetery, Hartford. Interment services will be private.

The publisher was a charter member of the Associated Press when it was organized in its present form in 1900.

CAME IN 1896

He worked as a newspaperman in New York and Washington before he came to New Haven in 1896 as managing editor of the Register.

A few years later, Jackson and Samuel A. York of New Haven purchased the newspaper from York's father. In 1905, Jackson bought out York's interest and became sole owner.

Under Jackson's management, the Register climbed from a circulation of 4,000 to more than 100,000.

In 1899, he and the late George F. Booth, then a cashier at the Register, purchased the Worcester Gazette. Their partnership continued for 20 years, with Jackson remaining in New Haven and Booth going to Worcester. They sold the newspaper in 1920, but a few years later Booth purchased the Worcester Telegram and the Gazette and was publisher of those newspapers until his death in 1955.

BECAME SOLE PUBLISHER

Jackson purchased the New Haven Journal-Courier in 1925. Three other dailies in the city subsequently went out of business and Jackson became the sole newspaper publisher in New Haven.

A native of Hartford, Jackson spent most of his boyhood in New York City. His father, Gen. Joseph Cooke Jackson, was an attorney and one time assistant U.S. attorney there.

Jackson was educated at Yale University, the University of Berlin, and the Ecole Libre Des Sciences Politiques and the Sorbonne in Paris. He attended Harvard University Law School for a year, but decided to give up law for journalism.

WORKED FOR MANY PAPERS

He worked for the New York Herald, the Washington News, and the Washington Times. He was also Washington correspondent at various times for the New York Evening Post, the Newark Evening World, the New York Journal of Commerce, and other newspapers.

Jackson was particularly interested in the fields of public finance and taxation and won attention for his knowledge of estate and inheritance taxes. He was known in Connecticut for his strong positions on State and municipal finances.

In his youth, the publisher was a track enthusiast, a mountain climber, and an ardent horseman and golfer. He traveled widely, making more than 30 trips to Europe.

He was an accomplished linguist, speaking German, French, and Italian, and reading Spanish, Latin, and Greek.

JOINED MANY GROUPS

Jackson was a member of many organizations, including the American Society of Newspaper Editors, the National Tax Association, the Political Science Association, and the Society of the Cincinnati, Sons of the Revolution.

He is survived by his widow, the former Rose Marie Herrick, of Elgin, Ill., and six children: Richard S. Jackson and Lionel S. Jackson, of North Haven, copublishers of the Register; Henry Jackson, of Phoenix, Ariz.; Mrs. John W. Sheppard, of Greenwich; Mrs. John I. Ely, of New Haven; and Mrs. William B. Reese, of Havre de Grace, Md. He leaves 28 surviving grandchildren.

One of his sons, John H. Jackson, died in 1951 at the age of 39. His youngest son, William B. Jackson, a staff sergeant in the Army Air Force, was killed in action in China during World War II.

Hungarian Freedom Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, today, March 15, 1961, marks the 113th anniversary of the victorious Hungarian Revolution of 1848.

The recent history of the brave Hungarian people is full of trials and tribulations. They have certainly had their share of cruelty and misfortune. Notwithstanding the pressure of the Soviet tyrants the people of Hungary expressed their denuciation of the Communist Party and its interference in the nation's affairs in the revolution of October 23, 1956. Unfortunately, their efforts to regain freedom were crushed after great bloodshed. One of the injustices of this century is that these people with their record of many years of independence are forced to languish in the bondage of the Soviet despots.

This is a most appropriate time to raise the Hungarian issue as the observance of this national holiday will precede United Nations debate on the problem of Hungary.

I sincerely hope that something may be accomplished toward withdrawal of Soviet troops and that the human rights and the privilege of self-determination may be restored to the Hungarian people so that they may decide the form of government they want through the establishment of free elections.

I join with other freedom-loving people throughout the world in a prayer that they will soon regain their treasured freedom and liberty.

The Soviet Squeeze on U.S. Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent analysis of the economic aggression conducted by the Soviet Union, entitled "The Soviet Squeeze on U.S. Trade," prepared by Maj. Gen. Julius Klein, retired.

In my judgment, the observations contained in this statement warrant careful study by the American public.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SOVIET SQUEEZE ON U.S. TRADE

(Prepared by Maj. Gen. Julius Klein, AUS, retired)

Soviet economic activity in individual raw material markets and in certain countries is characterized by sudden, coordinated measures which, according to Western concepts, frequently appear to make little economic sense. The considerations usual in a free competitive economy are completely alien to the Soviet system of a planned state economy. The line of thought which takes costs and profitability into consideration is foreign to it. A state-controlled economy can concentrate on and try to achieve political aims by means of economic measures.

In addition to the psychological successes which can thus be gained in some countries, such measures can directly and indirectly result in damage to the economy of the free world in several respects, which the U.S. economy in spite of its relatively small degree of dependence on foreign countries cannot escape.

In the case of a number of raw and basic materials, the United States is dependent on imports, such as mineral oil, natural rubber, various nonferrous metals, wool, and sugar, as well as luxuries such as tea and coffee. By carefully coordinated purchases, particularly in the form of long-term commitments of supplying countries, with the Soviets, the Soviet Union can cause shortages and send prices soaring.

Such commitments by countries economically beholden to the Soviet Union automatically reduce the export opportunities of the United States. The Soviet contracts always provide for compensatory transactions, i. e., they compel the supplying countries to accept Soviet goods in payment instead of purchasing them from the Western World.

The close economic interrelationship of the United States with countries all over the world not only covers its foreign trade but also penetrates to a large extent into the financial sphere. The extraordinarily large American investments abroad are given to numerous countries—their value and stability stands or falls according to the intensity of the trade relations these countries have with the United States.

The danger of Soviet harassing operations often lies therefore not so much in the individual measures carried out as in the tendency to cause long-term destruction of the equilibrium in world trade relations with the United States, both in the exchange of goods and in monetary and capital transactions.

Should the Soviet Union receive any substantial reinforcement through intensification of her economic relations with West-

ern Europe, it is obvious that the disturbance of the equilibrium in world economy by coordinated Soviet measures would have an intensified effect on the U.S. economy.

It can, therefore, only be in the interests of America to prevent the European economy from being geared to the eastern bloc. By closely knit European-American economic connections the effects of the Soviet economic offensive could be substantially mitigated.

THE SHRINKING U.S. ADVANTAGE

If we take the economic potentials of the United States of America and Western Europe as a whole, their joint achievement in the world economy at present is still second to none in spite of the precipitate advance of the eastern bloc economy. The net value of industrial production at 1950 prices reached the level of $136 billion in the United States, in 1957, i.e., roughly 39 percent of world production and in Western Europe approximately $87 billion; i.e., 25 percent of world production, so that together they accounted for almost two-thirds of total world industrial production. The eastern bloc accounted for $69 billion; i.e., about 20 percent of world production. Current political conditions permit of such an approach, but if they were to change it would mean the end of the industrial superiority of the United States of America.

Already, the superiority which the United States still has over the eastern bloc in the economic sphere is diminishing year by year; owing to the large and as yet unexhausted raw material and labor reserves at Communist disposal and because the Communists can utilize a far larger part of their national product for new investments that can free countries, thus enhancing their economic and political objectives. The economic expansion of the eastern bloc is advancing much more rapidly than that of the United States at present relative growth rates. But if the Communist economic area were extended to Western Europe, the percentage of world industry accounted for by the United States would, on the basis of present production, be 39 percent compared with a Communist-controlled share of 45 percent.

Similar conclusions are reached when we consider the production of individual products essential for economic efficiency. Taking international standard values as a basis, 28 percent of world mineral production is covered at present by the United States, another 10 percent by Western Europe, while the eastern bloc share including Red China, amounts to 24 percent. The superiority of the free world over the eastern bloc which is shown in a ratio of 38 to 24 would shift to a ratio of 28 to 34, if the mining production of Western Europe were added to that of the eastern bloc. Even if mining production of the other great mining countries connected with the United States in the Western World, especially Canada, were to be added, this would only insure a slight superiority and probably only for a short time, as the eastern bloc countries are known to be pushing their raw material production with particular drive.

As regards hard-coal alone, on the basis of the share of world production as of 1957, the present ratio between the United States, plus Western Europe and the Eastern bloc, viz, 56:34 would switch to a ratio of 27.61, if Western European production were combined with that of the Eastern bloc. Similar ratios would result for steel, in which the United States today still dominates world production with 35 percent and, taken together with Western Europe, accounts for no less than 65 percent of world production. As against this, the Eastern bloc only reached 25 percent of world production in 1957. For 1958, a recession year in the United States, the ratio for the West was less satisfactory, whereas 1959 again saw a certain degree of recovery. At any rate, the ratio of 65:25 in steel production would change to 35:55 if the steel capacity of the United States were to be faced by the combined steel capacity of the Eastern bloc and Western Europe. Finally, the production of electricity should be cited. In this field, the United States today accounts for 41 percent, Western Europe for 24 percent, and the Eastern bloc for 20 percent of world production. In spite of the tremendous capacity of the United States, even its present production figures would be inferior to the combined achievements of Western Europe and those of the Soviet Union.

In view of the extraordinary importance of this type of production, not only for economic development but also for political and cultural achievements in the countries concerned, it can be seen what an abrupt change the role of the United States would undergo in world events should its present close relations with the countries of Western Europe be disrupted and those countries come under Communist influence.

More important, any such shift in the East-West economic balance would have a telling impact on the domestic U.S. economy. Actually America's economic turnover is much more closely geared to the home market than that of the smaller Western European countries. In 1957, the United States contributed to world trade to the extent of 13 percent. The European Economic Community alone accounted for 23 percent of world imports and 22 percent of world exports. Even today the United States is to a very considerable extent self-sufficient, that is, we ourselves mainly produce the raw materials, food, and manufactures, that we require. Nevertheless, for many branches of the American economy, especially the processing industry, the foreign markets are of considerable importance, and Western Europe is by far our most important customer in these branches of industry. Western Europe imported 26 percent of the total exports of the United States, which in 1957 reached the level of $21 billion; among the Western European countries, Great Britain, followed by the Federal Republic of Germany, and finally Italy, are the best purchasers of American goods; machines and transport equipment, metal goods and chemicals being the categories of goods most in demand.

It is obvious that these marketing outlets, in many cases of vital importance for American exporters, would at once be jeopardized if the present economic structure of Western Europe were changed. Furthermore, we must keep in mind the ability and tendency of the Soviet economy to manipulate exports in accordance with political aspects and regardless of prices and costs; accordingly the Soviet economy is in a position seriously to disrupt world markets at any time by calculated cheap exports. In view of the generally poorer quality of Soviet goods, this possibility has been so far confined mainly to raw materials, e.g., aluminum and tin. The dangers arising here would, of course, be multiplied if the factories of Western Europe, which are so efficient as regards both quality and quantity, were also available for these purposes.

Naturally imports are less important for the United States. Our raw material requirements are covered almost exclusively from countries outside Western Europe, and, moreover, the goods imported from Western Europe are scarcely of vital importance for the United States. Nevertheless, for reasons connected with economic transportation, inter alia, the supplies of iron ores from Scandinavia and Spain are not unimportant for the blast furnaces situated along the American east coast, and of fertilizers for poor soils in our Atlantic States; interruptions in these supplies would at an rate result in certain disadvantages for the overall economic development of the United States.

On the whole, it must be realized that the hypothesis of Western Europe's inclusion in the Communist power bloc, no matter how improbable it may seem in view of actual military conditions and the atmosphere in the countries concerned, would mean a disastrous change in the present position of the United States with regard to world economy. The rapid increase in raw material and industrial production in the eastern bloc states being alarming enough, any extension of their political influence to the Western European countries which are for the most part economically very efficient, would completely reverse the present ratio potentials, expose the United States to a possibly overpowering pressure, and most decisively weaken the position of all the other countries still belonging to the free world.

Operation Fearmongering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER L. McVEY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, fearmongering causes an alarm reaction in a nation's people. Sometimes, this apprehension of fear is sudden and hysterical, as was the case back in October of 1938 when a radio network carried the report that a meteor containing strange creatures from Mars, armed with death rays, had landed near Princeton, N.J. The broadcast, a fantasy production of Orson Welles, based on "The War of the Worlds," by H. G. Wells, created national havoc as panic gripped thousands of Americans across our land. This, of course, is an extreme example of how gullibly we Americans accept the oral or written word. Whether the fearmongering is trumpet voiced, or voiced through a gloomy news forecast, the effect of scare tactics is felt.

Mr. Rex Woods, editor of the Arkansas City Traveler, from my Third District of Kansas, protests the economic fear campaign being conducted by the administration, and though he points out that there are many areas in the South and Midwest where business and industry are "rolling with the punches" and looking confidently to future expansion and growth, he is fully aware that if our people believe these mouthings, their fear becomes a prophetic reality.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the Appendix of the RECORD, the editoral "Demand Equal Time," from the Arkansas City Traveler.

DEMAND EQUAL TIME

Business and industry in this Midwest region and parts of the South should band together now and protest the fear campaign being conducted by the administration in Washington.

This isn't the job to tackle through the chamber of commerce. It is something that should be done by petition. Washington should know how we feel out here.

Last week Secretary of Labor Goldberg talked to men in the unemployment line back East. He led them to believe these

conditions existed across the Nation. That is not true. Such will happen if the talk continues and it is apparent the administration is setting the stage for a depression.

The psychology of the scare tactics are being felt by some merchants. Consumers everywhere are beginning to believe the country is hard pressed. Industries in these healthier areas as well as businesses, have plans for expansion on the drawing board. Talk could eliminate expansion and progress.

We believe businessmen and industrialists in the unblemished regions should insist the administration give equal time and conversation to the areas that stand on their own two feet and look to the future with enthusiasm.

Seoul's Fire of Discontent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, daily the struggle between communism and freedom in countries around the world continues.

By its nature, freedom finds itself at a disadvantage in this competition. Why? Because inherently freedom implies respect for the rights of other people to determine their own destinies. By contrast, communism—by military, economic, cultural, ideological, and all other means—attempts to spread its ideology; more than that, to gain control of more people and resources around the world. The struggle continues at almost all levels of human life.

The free nations, if they are to win the battle against communism; if they are to preserve the integrity of lands where freedom now exists; if they are to prevent the extension of Red control to more lands and people—need a greater effort not only to block the many-pronged efforts of the Communists at expansion but to aggressively educate them for and convert them to the ideas and ideals of freedom. The conversion to freedom, however, cannot be an abstract thing in terms of just dedication to high ideals. Rather, the free countries must show the way in which freedom itself can bring more of the good things of life to the millions of people now undecided about which way they shall go in the future.

Freedom without bread is an abstract thing which cannot satisfy nor meet the needs of the people. As the leader of the free world, then, we must learn not only how to more effectively preach the gospel of freedom but also to create the kinds of practical life-giving programs that can serve the needs of humanity.

Recently, the New York Times published a thought-provoking article by A. M. Rosenthal entitled "Seoul's Fire of Discontent." The article reveals the way in which problems of disenchantment and discontent may arise for people, such as those in South Korea—with the opportunity for freedom, but without adequate tools and know-how to make it work to effectively serve their country.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEOUL'S FIRE OF DISCONTENT—DISENCHANTMENT OF SOUTH KOREANS GROWS AS SEASON OF REVOLT SEES LITTLE CHANGE

(By A. M. Rosenthal)

SEOUL, KOREA, March 17.—Mong Yong, the handsome, brave yound lord, comes charging to the rescue of his beloved Choon Hyang just as the wicked old lord is about to chop her pretty little head off.

The good guys then lead the wicked old lord and other bad guys off to meet their just and terrible doom and everybody on the screen and in the theatre cheers as the Korean epic movie, "Fragrance of Spring," fades away and ends. The movie is South Korea's smash hit and the people seem grateful for 2 hours of wide-screen forgetfulness spent in a medieval world where everything turns out for the best, and virtue triumphs and the wicked perish.

But outside, in a city lying in a saucer-bowl with mountains all about, there is not much smiling and no cheering. The fragrance of spring in Seoul this year is soured with discontent and grievance, complaint and cynicism, and yesterday's heroes are mocked and weary.

"They give us freedom without bread," an unshaven, ragged orator shouts hoarsely in a park. "They only care about feeding themselves, not us."

"Our people had 50 years of Japanese occupation and war and Rhee's dictatorship, and now they expect the Government to change everything and work miracles in 8 months," a politician says angrily.

Foreigners who spend a few days in Seoul become so wrapped in gloom that they seem convinced another spring of revolution is coming to Korea like last year's spring, which saw the overthrow of President Syngman Rhee—only this time without a goal.

In Seoul itself, however, Korean politicians and most foreign diplomats say, no, it won't be that way. They say that people are unhappy and that there may be demonstrations, but that the mood is not of revolution but of restlessness and unfulfillment.

Everybody talks about the problems. They are a heritage of decades and built so deeply into the cement of society that nobody really knows how to dig them out. Everybody simply lists them, in frustration—a divided country, wars, devastation, too many people on too little land, not enough jobs and not enough resources to create enough industry to sop up the unemployed, inefficiency and graft as traditions and the "spring hunger," those lean months before the June crop can be harvested.

But the special discontent of this spring is an offshoot of last year's revolution. Last spring, for the first time in the memory of most men, the Koreans found themselves free from dictatorship, foreign or domestic, free to talk and shout and hope and say what they hoped for.

Their hopes of sudden, blessed change have not come true and they search for scapegoats. There are men who work hard and plan, but there are others to whom cynicism has become the answer.

Ideas that were once forbidden fruit—neutralism, economic democracy, the right to march and protest and hang up signs saying down with this or that—were plucked and tasted. Sometimes in Seoul men say things loudly just because they have the right to say them and want to remind the people they have the right.

Opposition leaders complain that the new government is just as bad as the old. But when they are asked what they would do if they were in power, they do not have much to say.

Newspaper writers and students talk about the need for increasing ties with neutral nations—partly because they believe it and partly because this was a swiftly punished heresy in Dr. Rhee's time. They snap angrily at the United States out of their own sense of humiliation for national dependence on the American dollar, but then demand that the United States contribute more and more.

There is an education fever in the city. An elevator boy keeps a hand on the controls and an eye on an English-Korean dictionary. Older people act a bit frightened of the students, who led the rioting of 1960 and tasted the power of rule by agitation.

The students are not always sure of what they want, but they want it quickly.

In Pagoda Park, a dusty place where recreation-starved Koreans go to spend a few hours, snake-medicine men in snappy bow ties put on magic shows to draw crowds. But for every crowd around the medicine man there is a crowd around a man denouncing the government or a man saying, "Give them a chance."

But there are times when even the young Koreans are weary of it all and search for relief from the triphammer of political talk.

They go then to large halls, dimly and flickeringly lit by neon, and sit closely packed in soft chairs. They lean back with their eyes closed and listen to recorded music—Beethoven, Verdi, Mozart. They have to pay an "appreciation fee" of about 20 cents, but it is worth it to them, for the right to listen to music and sit silent for a quiet hour.

Farm Bureau Philosophy—An Address by Mrs. J. S. Van Wert, of Hampton, Iowa, State Women's Chairman, Iowa Farm Bureau Federation, at Banquet for Iowa Congressional Delegation in Washington, D.C., March 7, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 7, the members of the Iowa congressional delegation were the guests of 96 members of the Women's Division of the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation during this organization's biennial trip to Washington, D.C.

At this banquet, we heard three outstanding addresses: "Farm Bureau Philosophy," by Mrs. J. S. Van Wert, of Hampton, Iowa, who is State women's chairman of the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation; "Federal Aid to Education," by Mrs. Walter Heuer, of Princeton, Iowa; and "Trade and Cropland Adjustment," by Mrs. Gene Murphy, of Reinbeck, Iowa.

Because of the sound thinking represented in these addresses, I have asked that they appear in the Appendix of the RECORD so that they can have the attention of the Members. The following is

Mrs. Van Wert's address on "Farm Bureau Philosophy":

FARM BUREAU PHILOSOPHY

The two speakers following me will be discussing current issues which you are considering and our thinking on these issues.

So that you can better understand the reasons for our recommendations, I would like to spend a little time on the general philosophy of Farm Bureau.

We all know that an individual must have a rather definite moral philosophy which goes beyond his own interests. If he is to make a contribution to his community—in fact, if he is to survive, he needs a definite economic and political philosophy, too. We think such well established philosophies are almost as important for organizations.

The purpose of Farm Bureau is to represent farmers—to fight for farmers. However, we believe firmly that the welfare of the Nation and the people as a whole must come first. Any other policy would be shortsighted on our part. The Nation is facing some crucial problems. Survival of America as we know and love it is not an absolute certainty. We will survive and improve our welfare only if we make intelligent decisions concerning international affairs, monetary and fiscal policies at home—maintain in our own people a strong sense of personal responsibility and initiative.

For farmers to recommend policies that would put money in their own pockets and weaken the Nation as a whole would be uter foolishness. To quote: Mark 8: 36 "For what shall it profit a man if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?" To paraphrase this—what would it profit farmers, or any other group, to gain for themselves, if they weaken our Nation economically, politically, or morally and lose the cold war to Russia and Red China.

In addition, we believe that recommendations that are purely selfish will cause an organization to lose its influence and its prestige.

We believe:

"In our constitutional form of Government and its division of powers."

"That self-government is a precious heritage which can be preserved only by active, intelligent assumption of basic citizenship responsibilities by everyone of us. We urge all of our members to participate."

We believe:

"In the American competitive enterprise system, in which property is privately owned, privately managed, and operated for profit and individual satisfaction, and in which supply and demand are the ultimate determinants of market price."

"That efficiency of production and maximum per capital production are primary elements in determining standards of living." People should be paid according to their ability and how well they do their jobs.

"That property rights cannot be separated from human rights and are essential to the preservation of individual rights guaranteed by the Constitution."

"That the exercise of free will, rather than force, is consistent with the maintenance of liberty."

"That the desire for 'security' must not lead to the curtailment of individual freedom and opportunity." Security doled out through governmental programs leads to inefficiency and loss of individual incentive.

We believe:

"That monopoly in any form—whether by government, industry, labor, or agriculture—jeopardizes freedom and self-government."

"In strong and responsible State and local units of government and in protection of State laws against Federal preemption."

We believe:

"That farm people have the right and the responsibility to speak for themselves through organizations of their choice without coercion or Government intervention."

"That the centralization of power and authority in the Federal Government, the movement to socialize America, the apathy of the American people toward this trend, and the apparent lack of responsibility on the part of individual citizens are among the greatest dangers threatening our republic and our system of competitive enterprise."

Our women have been studying the isms and are aware of governmental programs which lead us in the direction of socialism. That is not what we want for our generation nor for future generations.

Of course, we believe in intelligent use of our Government—at all levels—to provide an economic and political climate in which individuals can solve their own problems. However, as I have just indicated, we are very much concerned about the amount of responsibility the Federal Government is taking for individual affairs. A nation is no stronger than its people. I can think of no more pitiful object than a young man in his 20's whose parents, through love for him, have made all of his decisions, satisfied all of his wants, and taken on their own shoulders all of his responsibilities. Such a young man—or woman—starts life with the greatest of handicaps even though the parents had wished him to have every advantage. When my two sons were young and started their 4–H livestock projects, it was their father who insisted that it was their full responsibility to care for the animals. It was their responsibility to build the temporary fences around the portable housing. I must confess that I felt a bit sorry for them at the time and if I hadn't been so busy with the younger members, I might have gone out to help. It was after the sudden death of their father that I realized how fortunate my sons were to have been surrounded by this philosophy in their formative years—for they had learned to be self-sufficient and could stand on their own feet. Don't we owe this same type of training to our individual citizens in relation to our governmental policies for a continued strong Nation?

I would like to quote some of the Nation's religious leaders to further clarify this point.

R. W. Lindberg, Secretary, Des Moines, YMCA said:

"One of the great dangers of social services these days is the tendency by Government, churches, and agencies to help take care of the needs of people to their own injury. In spite of the high motives which prompts these services, the results sometimes create within the individual lack of personal initiative and responsibility."

"After 37 years of working with young people, I am well aware of this danger. If you are not careful you can help youth so much that it leads to pauperism."

Rev. E. W. Mueller, a national church leader, and a former Iowa Luthern pastor says, "There is danger if we plan too much for too many people. We could destroy initiative."

From a recent statement by the Catholic Bishops of the United States:

"If our future is to be worthy of our past, if the fruit of America's promise is not to wither before it has reached full maturity, our present preeminent need is to reaffirm the sense of individual obligation, to place clearly before ourselves the foundation on which personal responsibility rests, to determine the causes of its decay and to seek the means by which it can be revised."

"Although personal responsibility and initiative have been our national characteristics, explaining in large measure our country's progress in human welfare, yet pressures are growing for a constantly greater reliance on the collectivity rather than on the individual. An inordinate demand for benefits, most easily secured by the pressures with a further infringement on personal freedom and responsibility."

"Intensive socialization can achieve mass benefits, but man and morality can be seriously hurt in the process."

Recently we had a group of our young members assembled for a program on American heritage. The films and the discussions were fine, but it was the young farm wife, formerly of England, who expressed most impressively the disadvantages of socialism. She had seen the Labor Party execute many governmental control programs at the end of World War II when people were more receptive, thinking that was the atmosphere for rebuilding their country. She has seen how her farming parents must have governmental permission to sell their produce and be told where to sell and then let the government take a big bite of the check. The English, she said, now under the Conservative Party are trying to rid themselves of some of these controls—a very difficult thing to do, once controls have been established. May our foresight be vivid enough and our cooperation strong enough for us to maintain our freedoms so basic to our Christian Nation. As Iowans we have inherited the motto, "Our liberties we prize and our rights we maintain." Let's be able to bequeath it to our children and future generations.

Public Land Policy May Get First Real Review in 25 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GALE W. McGEE
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, in the Washington Post of yesterday, I noted an interesting summary and digest of the public land policy of the United States. The article was written by a staff reporter of the Post. Because of the excellence of the summary and because it brings into focus some of the intricate problems of a question that is very keenly in the hearts and in the interests of the people in our State—and I say "our State," Mr. President, because the present occupant of the chair [Mr. HICKEY], my colleague from Wyoming, and I have been close to this matter for many years—I believe it will be helpful to the Members of this body to have access to the article, especially in view of the fact that under the new Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Stewart Udall, our public land policy will get its first real review in 25 years. Therefore, I ask that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC LAND POLICY MAY GET FIRST REAL REVIEW IN 25 YEARS

(By Julius Duscha)

The trouble all started way out West a few years ago when the Government land office began doing a land-office business.

Meanwhile, back East, the boys in the Interior Department got so stirred up they decided that land claims ought to be checked at the door awhile like six-shooters.

But to some in the West a land claim is as precious—and as profitable—as water, and therein lies the rub, pardner.

By establishing an 18-month prohibition on the purchase of public lands last month Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall called attention to a Western land problem that few persons had been aware of in the East.

Although fewer than 100,000 of the 770 million acres of land that the Government owns are involved in the controversy, Udall's action may lead to the first comprehensive review of public land policies in 25 years.

The problem is the large number of claims that have been filed in the last 5 to 10 years for desert land and sites in the mountains near Los Angeles, Tucson, Phoenix, and other fast-growing Western cities.

The claims are encouraged by land locators, who are as familiar in the West as cowboys are on television.

For a fee of perhaps $25 an acre, a land locator will file a claim to a 5-acre tract of the public domain for a person who wants a weekend retreat on the desert or in the mountains.

LONG LINES FORM

Difficulties arise, however, when scores of claims are filed by land locators on one piece of property.

The Bureau of Land Management of the Interior Department maintains that land locators deliberately pile up applications in the Bureau's western offices because every application means profits for the locators.

When the Bureau turns down an applicant because the tract he is seeking has already been sold or, for other reasons, the land locator blames the Government. Frequently, the locator will encourage the applicant to try for another tract, even though it, too, may have been sold.

It was to stop practices of this sort and to clear up the backlog of applications resulting from the indiscriminate encouragement of land claims that Udall put the 18-month prohibition on new claims.

FILED UNDER OLD ACT

The applications have been filed under the Small Tract Act of 1938, which permits purchase of sites up to 5 acres for recreational use.

Many of the tracts are sold at regular Bureau of Land Management auctions in Los Angeles and other western cities. The more desirable sites frequently are sold for high prices.

Not only is the procedure for filing claims on public lands about the same as it was when the first Western land boom began almost 100 years ago, but both the Homestead Act of 1862 and the Desert Land Act of 1877 are still on the books.

And out of the 770 million acres of public land—about one-third of the original public domain of 1.8 billion acres—an estimated 177 million acres conceivably could be turned into farmland.

A homesteader, however, who got 160 acres of free land from among the 177 million dry and arid public land acres of the West would have to spend from $20,000 to $60,000 to irrigate and equip his land for modern farming.

Mineral leases, most of which are for oil and gas rights, and grazing permits are granted to persons who want to use the public domain for these purposes. Government revenue from such leases and permits amounts to more than $100 million a year.

HOW MUCH IS THERE?

Of the remaining 600 million acres of public lands, half are inaccessible mountainous areas of Alaska. More than half of the 300 million remaining acres in the United States are in national forests.

The rest of the public domain is used for national parks, wildlife refuges, defense and atomic energy projects and other governmental activities.

As the Interior Department—and Congress—try to decide how all of this land can best be used in the public interest, the General Services Administration continues to try to make an accurate count of the Government's vast landholdings.

It's a job as big as all the West. The GSA has been at it for 6 years now and is still not sure exactly how vast the public domain is—a century after the great American land boom.

Brethren Service Commission Endorses Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, for two decades the Brethren Service Commission, which has many strong supporters in my district, has been very effectively operating a voluntary program very similar to the Peace Corps plan now being organized by the administration.

Because of this dedicated group's experience in this field, I think it would be immensely valuable to consider its counsel in establishing the Peace Corps. It is reassuring, I might add, that the Brethren Service Commission, looking at the Peace Corps in light of its own experience, endorses the concept. The commission predicts that the Peace Corps, if soundly developed, will make a valuable contribution to the world's needs.

The views of the Brethren Service Commission are contained in the following statement which it recently issued:

The Brethren Service Commission enthusiastically commends the Congress and the administration for the studies underway to establish a Peace Youth Corps for service abroad. We feel the general concept of the corps is sound, especially in helping meet the felt needs in the less developed areas of the world, in creatively using the mounting interest of American youth in constructive service overseas, and in enhancing the sensitivity of Americans to the problems of the world community.

The long-time conviction of the Brethren Service Commission, confirmed by 20 years of experience in utilizing the voluntary services of youth in oversea projects, has been that a corps of carefully selected and properly oriented American youth could render a most significant and needed service abroad. Particularly in the developing programs of health, education, agriculture, and small industries at the village level, such youth could provide the missing link between highly specialized technical knowledge and the need for bringing this know-how into actual practice by villagers. Moreover, these youth could become the most effective carriers of our best American image abroad.

Without attempting a definitive, comprehensively structured proposal, our interest and experience leads us to suggest the following considerations:

1. GENERAL POINT OF VIEW

The Peace Youth Corps should be guided by the spirit of mutuality rather than the spirit of assistance. Superiority and condescension must be avoided. The program should reflect the attitude that America has much to learn from contacts with other people. A growing understanding among Americans of the problems of the world community would increase America's effectiveness as she participates in mankind's efforts toward peace with justice.

The Peace Youth Corps should be noncreedal and devoid of dogma whether it be religious, economic, political, or technological. The character of the youth involved is of more importance even than technical training, for the sharing of life is of more significance than the offering of material or ideological advances. Emphasis in the selection of corpsmen should be placed on sensitivity and human relations skills because the program will succeed in terms of the mutual trust and respect found in the human relationships established at the grassroots level.

In the more primitive and needy situations, often the immediate need for highly specialized knowledge and precise technical skills is not great. To work among those with no pure water supply, a degree as a plumbing engineer is often more training than can be utilized properly. A graduate agriculturalist has training and methods which may be beyond the realistic next steps in the development of people who till the soil with hand-forged hoes. Instead, a corpsman with adequate farm background and sufficient creativity to help plan and direct the next steps will be of immense help in such a situation, providing he has sensitivity for the people and a willingness to share in their experience and to earn the right to add to their experiences from his own. Whatever expert knowledge he or his village associates require can be secured through specialists in the country or from specialized international agencies.

True mutuality is to be achieved best in two-way or even multilateral exchanges of young people. Consideration ought to be given to receiving young people for service in our country as well as sending our youth overseas, and to provide for increasing international participation in the program. Aspects of exploitation and self-interest, often inherent in our very acts of helpfulness, can be reduced by bringing youth from other countries to America to participate in social service projects.

The spirit of mutuality, likewise, needs to be expressed in the negotiations establishing projects. The oversea projects of the Peace Youth Corps should grow out of genuine requests of host governments. Preliminary discussions with governments should be made in an atmosphere free from coercion or necessity and should explore the possibilities of mutual cooperation and exchange. No program should be undertaken except as it grows out of clearly defined agreements between the host government and the management of the Youth Corps.

Programs overseas should have practical continuity. The cessation of the activities of the corps must not be the end of project activities. To insure continuity, the projects should be integral to existing institutions and programs. The role of the Peace Youth Corps should be to help people achieve their own objectives rather than to impose new goals on them or to create new institutions which may be too complex or too burdensome for the people to carry on their own. The goal of the Youth Corps should be to help people help themselves in terms of their own aspirations, institutions, and developing resources.

2. ORIENTATION AND TRAINING

Training should emphasize proper motives of service so as to remove attitudes of condescension and superiority in the approach of the corpsman. The corpsman must possess or develop a genuine desire to be helpful and a willingness to build mutual trust rather than any desire to dominate or pressure for change.

Practical language study should be a part of the training. Appreciation should be developed for the culture, beliefs and way of life of the people to be served.

Whenever practicable, training should be carried on within a physical context similar to that of the project, rather than exclusively in academic institutions or in American establishments abroad.

Few potential corpsmen know how the other half of the world lives. The cultural shock that will be experienced initially by some corpsmen might be sufficient to make them permanently ineffective. Therefore, training should include not only orientation in this country but also an early introduction to a different culture in order to provide opportunity for any possible cultural shock before going to the permanent project overseas.

The fields of service into which corpsmen will go are often so alien to anything in their own experience that opportunity ought to be given for firsthand observation and practice in a nearby but foreign culture before final acceptance for service overseas. Existing health, education, and welfare projects within continental United States as well as in Mexico, Puerto Rico, or Jamaica might well serve as training locations for periods of 1 or 2 months. This intern experience in an unfamiliar culture would provide a selection and screening device not available in other forms of testing used in the program.

3. INITIAL PROJECTS

The initial projects of the Peace Youth Corps should be situated in places of generally recognized human need in order to more readily sell the American public on the purpose and value of the corps. The corps will undoubtedly be attacked by many who now oppose foreign aid, but these critics will find it harder to criticize the program if it is at work alleviating pronounced human suffering.

The initial projects should be carefully selected and organized with the possibility of making early, tangible accomplishments in relieving human suffering or solving immediate basic problems. To insure some early successes, the first units should be under the supervision of leaders who have had comparable and successful experiences in oversea programs. Several American voluntary service agencies with service programs overseas have personnel resources that could provide tested leadership for early units of the corps. Likewise, early units might include in each one or two corpsmen who have had comparable experience in oversea service programs. The proposed Youth Corps will be able to expand in direct proportion to its concrete accomplishments.

The formation of early projects should be aimed primarily at intensive programs of depth rather than at extensive programs which may be superficial. The success of the Peace Youth Corps will depend not as much on the number of projects nor on the number of American youth involved, as on the solid achievements of the program. Growth of the corps should come through experience and achievement rather than through popular recruitment programs and propaganda media.

4. MOBILE SERVICE TEAMS

In addition to the more normative projects in the fields of health, education, agriculture and welfare, the Peace Youth Corps might include a well formulated network of mobile service teams, composed both of mature technicians and younger volunteers, which could move with dispatch to any point on the globe to give immediate assistance in disaster situations. Such a plan might require stockpiling of emergency supplies in regional warehouses, and a quick reference for immediately available personnel for emergency service where needed.

5. REMUNERATION OF CORPSMEN

Mutuality will be increased in the program to the extent that youth live with the people, and will be decreased to the extent that they are set apart from the people. One determinant of the social distance created will be the salary received by the youth. The sincerity and effectiveness of the program can be increased by providing only maintenance for members of the Youth Corps. Maintenance might include transportation, room, board, clothing, medical care, and a small personal allowance. The cash allowance should not be enough to encourage the corpsman to participate in leisure activities beyond the reach of those with whom he lives and serves. Any additional financial remuneration, if provided, should be retained for the corpsman and paid when he returns home following his service overseas. This additional remuneration might be in the form of scholarship aid for additional professional or technical training.

6. RELATIONSHIP TO SELECTIVE SERVICE

Service in the Youth Corps should not be the basis for automatic exemption from the draft. However, acceptance for service in the Youth Corps should provide local draft boards with sufficient reason for temporary draft deferment, and upon completion of 2 or more years of Youth Corps service such service might be considered as fulfillment of Selective Service obligation. These matters, however, depend on a coordination of the Peace Youth Corps and the Selective Service System which can be better achieved through administrative directives than through legislative policy. The Youth Corps should be recognized as an alternative service program for properly certified conscientious objectors.

7. OPERATIONS AND ADMINISTRATION

In the early stages of the corps, there should be provided a full complement of very able supervisory personnel, in residence at projects, between project and host country, and between project and the corps agency in the United States.

The administration and fiscal policies of the Peace Youth Corps should be freed as far as possible from government bureaucracy in order to work creatively and flexibly. If it is not possible to provide sufficient freedom of operation within government, then a civilian agency might well be created to administer the program under general directives and financing established by the Government.

In conclusion, it is the considered judgment of the Brethren Service Commission that the proposal for a Peace Youth Corps is basically sound and that it will render a significant service abroad in assisting community development programs in health, education, agriculture, and welfare. Motifs of the program must include full recognition of the basic interests of the little people of the world as well as the wholesome desires of American youth for service overseas. Careful planning and adequate support can make this program a helpful instrument for peaceful change in many parts of the world. A corps of well-trained and properly motivated American youth serving hand-in-hand with village people, who themselves welcome additional help on their most pressing problems, might well bring a new climate of international goodwill and cooperation. The program should reflect at every level of involvement such basic concepts as mutual trust, human dignity, shared leadership, and helping people to help themselves. In short, the Youth Corps should reflect the best of our American traditions in community building without the intention of imposing any of our values or institutions upon others. The true measure of success for the Peace Youth Corps will be the degree of its effectiveness in helping people in other lands to achieve their own best values in community development.

The Brethren Service Commission expresses its willingness and desire to participate as fully as possible in the proposed Peace Youth Corps and offers its support and facilities as needed in the program.

W. HAROLD ROW,
Executive Secretary,
Brethren Service Commission.

ELGIN, ILL.
(Revised February 22, 1961.)

Mercy Ship "Hope"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRESCOTT BUSH
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, a Connecticut eye surgeon, Dr. Paul Tisher, of New Britain, recently returned from 7 weeks' service aboard the hospital ship *Hope* off the Republic of Indonesia. An interesting account of his experiences aboard this mercy ship, which Dr. Tisher describes as an instrument for generating good will for this country, has been published in the New Britain Herald, under the headline "Dr. Paul Tisher Sees Mercy Ship *Hope* As Effective Weapon Against Communism."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RETURNS AFTER 7 WEEKS' SERVICE—DR. PAUL TISHER SEES MERCY SHIP "HOPE" AS EFFECTIVE WEAPON AGAINST COMMUNISM

(By Sigmund Kramnick)

Dr. Paul W. Tisher of 389 Shuttle Meadow Avenue, an eye surgeon, returned yesterday after a 2½-month trip that brought him to such exotic-sounding places as Cairo, Calcutta, Bangkok, Borneo, Java, and Singapore, among others.

Despite his predeparture statement, "Call it a love of adventure or an attempt to get away from a humdrum existence that seems to trap a man when he becomes too settled," the trip was no pleasure cruise.

For 7 weeks, Dr. Tisher served on the famed hospital ship, *Hope* (Health Opportunities for People Everywhere), off the Republic of Indonesia. He was the first Connecticut volunteer to be accepted for duty on the ship.

He considers the *Hope* an effective weapon in the fight against international communism. There is an "excellent possibility" that a second such hospital ship may be established, he said. He claimed there is a long waiting list of doctors who are willing to serve.

A highlight of the trip occurred on February 24 when he had a formal audience with President Achmed Sukarno of that new nation. He bore a letter of introduction from

Abraham A. Ribicoff (written while he was Governor), containing greetings from the State of Connecticut.

Dr. Tisher described Sukarno as "pleasant and cooperative." "He spoke on medical subjects with remarkable knowledge for a doctor of engineering," he added.

Reviewing the trip, the local physician was obviously proud of his participation in the mercy ship project sponsored by the People-to-People Health Foundation of Washington, D.C.

"The *Hope* has been a tremendous success from the standpoint of good will," he said. While he was aboard, a letter was received from President Kennedy commending all on the ship for the fine job they were doing, he disclosed.

Joining the *Hope* on January 10, Dr. Tisher remained until February 23. During that time the ship anchored off several Indonesian islands including Borneo and Java. The *Hope* goes wherever it is asked, according to the doctor. It will be off Indonesia until June and will then be in drydock in Singapore for awhile before proceeding to South Vietnam, he said.

The ship is staffed, ideally, by 25 American doctors (the number is usually lower because of transportation and arrangement difficulties). Of these, 10 are permanent staff members and 15 are rotating volunteers. In addition, there are 10 Indonesian doctors. Aiding them are 25 American nurses and 27 Indonesian nurses, permanent staff members.

Before the ship arrives at a port of call, a committee composed of doctors in the area decides which patients will be treated on board. The ship has medical facilities not available to many natives and by the same token helps to relieve the workload on the too few native doctors.

While medical treatment and surgery are important functions of the ship, with its two operating rooms, the primary interest, says Dr. Tisher, is in training native doctors. More precisely, the intent is to teach them the medical advances. The doctor, who instructed approximately half a dozen himself, said this was no reflection on the abilities of the native doctors.

"Some are actually better than our doctors because they have more patients," he said, "but they get out of touch with modern techniques." He estimated that between 25 and 30 native doctors received valuable training on the ship while he was aboard.

At one stop, he learned that native doctors had studied English for 6 months before the ship's arrival so that they could converse with American doctors. After the ship arrived, meetings were held every day for 3 weeks, alternating between the ship and shore.

Dr. Tisher reiterated that it was not a case of "doing something for them, but a case of doing something with them." He called it "an international medical exchange" and in his enthusiasm described it as being "way ahead of Kennedy's program of workers for peace."

During most of his visit, the temperature was in the 90's, he said. He described the soil in the moist, tropical Indonesian climate as being "so lush you could plant a pencil and get fountain pens."

Besides its rich soil and the abundance it reaps from the sea, Indonesia is rich in other natural resources such as oil and tin, he said. He described its problems as "poor dietary and sanitary knowledge." The Dutch, he said, kept them suppressed but "they have tremendous potentialities and should do well. It should take a generation."

He recalled an experience which occurred just before an operation in an Indonesian hospital. He asked a native doctor where he might wash his hands, standard operating procedure for an American doctor. The reply was "nowhere." He asked why and was answered, "no water."

Despite the absence of running water, Dr. Tisher claims everything went along just fine. They used carbolic acid to sterilize their rubber gloves: standard operating procedure in this particular hospital.

Before he joined the hospital ship, Dr. Tisher stopped off for conferences with medical authorities in Cairo, Egypt; Calcutta, India; Bangkok, Thailand, and Djakarta, Indonesian. He spent 5 days working at the University of Djakarta where he met a Dr. Isaac Salim who will be visiting him here next month.

After leaving the ship, Dr. Tisher flew to Singapore where he met his wife. Mrs. Tisher does radio publicity work for the foundation which sponsors the *Hope*. Mrs. Robert P. Brown, of 550 Shuttle Meadow Avenue, accompanied her from London. The three were joined by Mr. Brown in Hong Kong. The Tishers returned via the Pacific, completing round-the-world journeys. Mr. and Mrs. Brown are expected this weekend.

Project Mohole

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, in these days of interest in the prospects of penetrating the mysteries of outer space, we may overlook another step that is being taken to penetrate the mysteries of yet another dimension—the challenging vastness of the depths of the earth. This step—known as Project Mohole, a joint venture of the National Science Academy and the National Academy of Sciences—has as its ultimate goal the drilling through of the earth's crust under the ocean to determine the composition and physical properties of the crust and of the underlying rock known as the mantle. Scientists have called the project "one of the most important scientific undertakings of modern times, for it will probe into new and totally unknown regions of the earth. Knowledge gained from ocean sediments alone will greatly enhance our understanding of the history of the oceans, climatic changes and the evolution of life."

The New York Times of Sunday, March 5, contains a graphic description of this first attempt to gain knowledge of the earth's mantle, and I wish to bring it to the attention of my colleagues.

The article follows:

TEST DRILL IS READY TO PIERCE SEA FLOOR

(By Walter Sullivan)

In about a week, barring equipment failures, a strange-looking craft is to take station 40 miles east of Guadalupe Island in the Pacific Ocean and begin the first attempt to bore through the ocean floor to the mysterious second layer.

With a rig originally designed for drilling oil wells in a few hundred feet of water, a drill pipe is to be extended downward 2¼ miles until it touches bottom. It will then bore a succession of holes that, it is hoped, will penetrate into the so-called second layer, some 1,000 feet below the ocean floor.

The nature of this layer is unknown, except that shock waves from explosions or earthquakes travel through it faster than they do through the soft sediments that lie above. Some believe the second layer consists of solidified sediments that may extend our knowledge of evolution and of past climates.

The project, sponsored by the National Academy of Sciences and financed largely by the National Science Foundation, is a rehearsal for the drilling of the "manhole," which would pierce the ocean floor and bring up a sample of the earth's manhole.

EIGHTY-FOUR PERCENT OF VOLUME

The latter is a massive shell enclosing the earth's liquid core and constituting, in volume, about 84 percent of the planet. Yet, as with the second layer, its composition is a mystery. It is only known that it transmits shock waves much faster than the rock layers above it.

The point of the sudden increase in these travel times, as waves descend into the mantle, is known as the Mohorovicic discontinuity, or "Moho," named for Andrija Mohorovicic, the Yugoslav geologist.

Above it is the crust, many of whose rocks have been brought within reach of the geologists' hammer by the upthrust that has built the mountains.

Some believe that we actually have a few fragments of the mantle in hand. Dr. Harry H. Hess, chairman of the geology department at Princeton University and a scientific adviser to the project, suspects that the peridotite of St. Paul's Rocks, a wave-swept outcrop midway between Brazil and Africa, is an erupted bit of mantle. Others hold contrary views. The Mohole should settle the matter.

TESTED IN PACIFIC

On Friday the drill rig, known as Cuss I, had its first experience with Pacific Ocean weather since its modification for this job.

In heavy seas off San Diego one of its derrick guy wires carried away and the rig is now in that port for repairs. On Tuesday it is hoped to take it out again to test the rig in the San Diego Trough 18 miles off La Jolla in about 3,000 feet of water.

Last Wednesday the drill site there was marked with two taut-wire buoys of the type that are to ring the site off Guadalupe. The buoys are about 100 feet below the surface, their locations marked by surface floats and sonic transponders. When the drill rig pings, each buoy pings back. When the answering pings arrive simultaneously, the barge is on station, equidistant from the buoys.

At the four corners of the barge four huge outboard motors of 200 horsepower each have been mounted to keep the rig on station.

The Cuss I does not have any means of finding the hole again after the drill has been hoisted out to replace a bit or make other adjustments.

Hence every time a bit wears out, a new hole will be dug. The experience gained will be used to design a special rig for the far deeper Mohole.

It is hoped that the cores brought up from off Guadelupe may greatly extend present archives of the earth's history. For millions of years the debris of oceanic life has been raining downward. Climate changes and catastrophes such as volcanic eruptions, have added additional layers of silt or ash in some areas.

The resulting sediments are 1,000 or more feet deep over much of the oceanic basins. The portion of the oceans that is more than 2 miles deep covers roughly half the earth's surface.

How peaceful has been the history of these depths? Some believe the sediments have largely lain undisturbed since the evolution of life first began. If the earliest fossils

remained intact in this record, they would fill in the missing first half of the history of life.

Other scientists fear that landslides and mud torrents knowns at turbidity currents, periodically sweep away the record at any one point. Dr. Hess, for example, believes this sedimentary record will have many gaps.

HOPEFUL FOR DATA

Nevertheless, he and the other scientific sponsors of the Mohole project believe light will be thrown on a multitude of scientific problems.

Under the second layer there is a region that seems to scatter shock waves and that some think is the earth's primordial surface. They say it is littered with meteorites and dust that fell during a weatherless, waterless period when the earth looked more like the moon than its present-day self.

Even such questions as continental drift and polar wandering may be resolved from complete cross sections of the deep sediments. They might show whether or not continents once ploughed across the oceanic basins. The orientation of metallic filaments would point to the ancient locations of the magnetic poles.

The Cuss I is named for the initial letters of the four oil companies that have used in shallow water: Continental, Union, Shell, and Superior. If the tests off La Jolla go smoothly the rig is to be towed by a Navy tug to the site off Guadalupe about March 12.

Smithsonian Institution Numismatic Display

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, we read in the Bible that the love of money is the root of all evil. That statement illustrates a historic fact as well as a grave human weakness. The historic fact is that more than 2,000 years ago money was used as a medium of exchange throughout the Roman Empire. The human weakness is the fact that even since King Midas struck off gold coins men have loved money, and some have loved it to the extent of losing their souls in its acquisition.

In a sense, the history of money is the history of civilization. Savages did not have money, and even today savage tribes of north Africa have no coinage of their own. The Romans were the first to mint coins with milled edges, which would easily indicates whether or not they had been defaced, because all money prior to that period represented so much in weight of gold, silver, copper, or iron, and ignorant people would be cheated by the moneychangers who would take a small portion of gold or silver from a coin before passing it on. Consequently, before the milled coin of the Romans, money was weighed by those who wished to be sure they were getting full value.

Even in our own country, money can tell us a lot about the history of a given period. One complaint of the colonists against the mother country was that the mother country would not permit the colonists to coin their own money, so in order to supplement an inadequate supply of British coins, tobacco was used for money in Virginia and beads and wampum in Massachusetts.

Mr. President, on last Saturday, the Smithsonian Institution opened to the public its new Hall of Monetary History and put on public display the most extensive and most historic display of ancient and modern coins and paper money the world has ever known. Not only is this exhibit of the greatest interest to those interested in numismatics, but it should be of interest to every citizen in our country, because whether we love money or not a certain amount of it is a necessity in our modern way of living. Indeed, if we seek the secluded happiness of the desert, boldly proclaimed by Omar Khayyam, we still must have the money with which to buy the loaf of bread and the jug of wine to be taken with us into our desert retreat.

In order that my Senate colleagues and all who read the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD may have a better understanding of the numismatic collection now on display at the Smithsonian Institution, I ask unanimous consent to publish in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief description of the principal displays prepared for me by Dr. Vladimir Clain-Stefanelli, Curator of Numismatics of the Smithsonian Institution.

There being no objection, the description was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Smithsonian Institution's new Hall of Monetary History and Medallic Art opened to the public on Saturday, March 18, 1961, in the Arts and Industries Building.

The main display in the new hall is dedicated to monetary history and illustrates in a sequence of 19 specially designed cases the major aspects of the development of the units used in economic systems employing money from the beginning of primitive barter to the establishment of our modern monetary systems. The exhibits have been arranged to show the evolution of money as related to a sequence of significant historical events, and thus as an integral part of the cultural development of human society. The development of the various forms of currencies in Colonial North America is traced and especial emphasis is given to the evolution of U.S. coins and paper money.

This new exhibit illustrating monetary history forms an important step in the Smithsonian's long-range program of exhibition modernization. Displays of coins, tokens, and paper currencies have been arranged in their historical and cultural contexts, rather than by conventional classifications. These exhibits are thus intended to give a new dimension to the visual record of history on display at the Smithsonian.

Several topical displays complete the basic monetary history exhibit. The themes of these displays are: "The Origin of Coin Names," "The Reformation," "Confederate Currencies," and "State Bank Notes." A reconstruction of a coin-stamper designed by the renowned Italian artist and inventor Leonardo da Vinci—1452–1519—is also on view. It marks the introduction of mechanization in coining techniques.

"The New World" is the title of a special panel, recalling the first coins struck in the Western Hemisphere, in the Mexico City Mint at the beginning of the reign of Charles and Johanna of Spain—1536–56. It is followed by a display of the monetary history of North America which starts with "Barter on the Frontier," an illustration of the trade of the primitive Indians and the hardships of the white man on the advancing frontier, when only a few hundred years ago Dentalium and Mercenaria shells, wampum, skins of animals and many other articles were used in lieu of money.

"Colonial Money, 1607–1754" is an exhibit showing examples of English, Dutch, and French coins brought by the early settlers, and the first coins struck in Massachusetts in 1652 as well as early paper currency issues.

Other displays show paper bills issued by the States and by the Continental Congress, coins of the States struck after the Declaration of Independence, and the first national currency in relation to the organization of the national banks.

"Economic Adjustments, 1812–60" is the title of an exhibit reflecting a period marked by a series of financial crises and the institution of various banking systems intended to guarantee financial stability. The gold discoveries in Georgia, North Carolina and California resulting in a variety of private gold issues are also featured.

Another is "War and Reconstruction, 1860–73," depicting the different currencies and monetary intermediates, from cardboard money and encased postage stamps to the first U.S. "greenbacks," as well as some of the Confederate issues of this troubled period.

A significant section of the hall is dedicated to the U.S. mint collection. This exhibit is of unusual importance since it represents the oldest collection of coins owned by the Government. In fact, it had its inception in 1792 at the U.S. Mint in Philadelphia. That year and during the rest of his career the chief coiner, Adam Eckfeldt, set aside a specimen of each type and date of coin minted. The mint's collection was increased systematically through purchases made possible by Congress since 1839. This original collection was transferred to the Smithsonian after World War I and is known for the unique or extremely rare pieces it contains. One of its sections is devoted to the pattern or experimental pieces which were made at the mint as early as 1792 and continued until fairly recent years. Many of these designs were never adopted, but they served a useful purpose in helping our coin engravers arrive at designs that would be attractive as well as resistant to wear. The artistic merit of some of these patterns is indeed unusual. Others are notable for their historical import, particularly the $50 gold pieces dated 1877, designed by William Barber, and the so-called metric issues of 1879 and 1880.

The hall features also the world's largest collection of gold coins on public display, given to the Smithsonian by the late Paul A. Straub. It is a "type" collection consisting of 1850 gold coins of Europe and the Americas. Almost 4,000 silver coins of the world complete this series. Remarkable, among others, is the group of oversize multiple talers of the Brunswick duchies issued mainly during the 17th century. A study of the elaborately detailed mining landscapes on some of these coins led to new contributions to the knowledge of early mine-pumping devices.

On view also are outstanding specimens from the Willis H. du Pont donation of Russian coins and medals. It is an authoritative collection paralleled only by that of the Hermitage in Leningrad. The selections are displayed in two cases; one of them illustrates coinages issued between 1700 and 1740 by the Czars Peter the Great, Peter II, and Anna; the other one depicts the life and political aims of Peter the Great as shown on medals.

Another outstanding exhibit is the collection of rare Japanese gold coins presented

in 1880 to General Grant, by the Japanese Government, on the occasion when a thoroughbred stallion was given by the general to the Emperor.

The completion of this hall would not have been possible without the assistance of many public and private institutions and organizations as well as most generous gifts from numerous private citizens of the United States. Notable contributors have been: The American Antiquarian Society, Mrs. Frederick C. C. Boyd, Mrs. Catherine E. Bullowa-Moore, Philip H. Chase, Willis H. du Pont, Eric P. Newman Numismatic Education Society, First New Haven Bank, Mrs. Ulysses S. Grant, International Business Machines Corp., Hon. and Mrs. R. Henry Norweb, Mrs. Wayte L. Raymond, Joseph B. Stack, Morton Stack, Paul A. Straub, U.S. Mint, William H. Vanderbilt, and many others.

The Curator of the Division of Numismatics, Dr. Vladimir Clain-Stefanelli of the Smithsonian, reports that the total number of coins, medals, and paper currencies has nearly doubled since 1957 and amounts today to approximately 120,000 catalogued items, not a few of which are unique.

Army Makes a Comeback: What It Will Get and Why

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article that appeared in the U.S. News & World Report of March 20, 1961, that I found to be most satisfying and gratifying because it supports what I have been urging for a number of years by the introduction of the necessary amendments in the Department of Defense Subcommittee as well as in the full Appropriations Committee and on the floor of the House when the defense appropriations bill was before the membership. After reading this article, I feel it is better late than never and it is my hope that it is not too late.

The article follows:

ARMY MAKES A COMEBACK: WHAT IT WILL GET AND WHY

Overhaul of U.S. defenses, now in the works, signals a bigger role for the Army—which has felt neglected for years.

More troops for "brush fire" wars—a billion dollars for new weapons—greater strength and mobility on the ground and in the air—these are only part of what's being planned.

Result: The U.S. Army is on its way back.

It is the U.S. Army—after a period of lean years—that suddenly stands to gain most from shifts now being made or planned in defense strategy. The Army, you are told by officials in Washington, is making a comeback.

This is to be the shape of the new Army, if plans now being proposed are carried out.

More manpower. The Army's troop strength, cut sharply since 1955, will grow by stages to 925,000 men—up 55,000 from present levels. This in turn means higher draft calls in sight. Some of the new manpower will go to form a fifteenth combat division, this new unit earmarked for the Strategic Army Corps. STRAC is the Army's emergency force for "brush fire" wars, now totaling 3 divisions of paratroopers and infantrymen based in the United States.

Other new troops would be sent to revitalize 5 understrength divisions in Germany and 2 others in Korea. Urgent need is seen for sharper combat efficiency for U.S. troops in potential trouble spots overseas. Already, 5,000 more soldiers have just been ordered to Central Europe and the Pacific.

More, newer weapons. Swift modernization of arms, costing at least $1 billion overall, is to be started almost immediately. Whole families of World War II weapons must be replaced by newly designed rifles, tanks, combat cargo carriers, faster vehicles, disposable flame throwers. An example of what the Army has developed and needs money for: A mobile radar that can pinpoint hidden mortar emplacements 6 miles away.

Additional funds are to be sought, also, for longer range development of itmes such as combat planes that can take off and land like helicopters on rugged airstrips, and new tactical missiles light enough to be flown to any battle area in a hurry.

More mobility. On the ground and in the air, there is to be more mobility. The Army's present fleet of 5,000 light planes, small troop carriers, and helicopters is to be increased and modernized.

Mobile "fire brigades" of about 4,000 men are wanted and may be created. They would be based overseas, always ready to move in Asia, the Middle East, or Africa. More guerrilla-warfare experts are to be trained to support and lead native insurgents behind enemy lines.

More for home defense. The Army's traditional role in antiaircraft defense is being expanded to include defense against enemy missiles. A plan is now before President Kennedy to start limited production of Nike-Zeus antimissile missiles without waiting for a series of full-scale tests to be completed. The speedup would save 2 years and is expected to win approval.

The price tag on such actions over the years is put at more than $15 billion above current budgeting. A complete Nike-Zeus system alone will cost from $8 to $13 billion, depending on how many U.S. cities are to be protected. In practice, these costs would be spread out. The Army budget, now running at just under $10 billion a year, would go up to $12 billion as programs move into high gear.

Why the beefing up? A broad shift in U.S. defense policy is behind the Army's comeback. Decision has been made to end this country's concentration on massive nuclear weapons alone. Balance is being sought between the old doctrine of massive retaliation and a new policy of meeting Red aggression with nonnuclear means, if that is the choice. This is where a stronger Army comes in—an Army ready for big or little wars in any situation.

A report just given to Congress by Pentagon intelligence is another reason for the new concern over the relative state of U.S. conventional forces. In the report, the Soviet Army was pictured as having 100 combat divisions in the line and 50 in reserve. In the hands of these Russian troops, in quantity, were said to be weapons completely modernized since World War II—heavy field missiles, new tanks, self-propelled artillery, helicopters and planes.

Such weapons have been developed in this country but not purchased in quantity because of budget restrictions since the Korean War. Spending on nonnuclear hardware slid from 3.7 billions in 1954 to 600 millions last year.

Criticisms of such economy were made by a parade of high Army officials, some of whom resigned in protest during the administration of President Eisenhower. Charges were made by these officers that the Army had been completely subordinated to a new look in military affairs in which the greater emphasis was on nuclear weapons. During that period—from the end of the Korean war in 1953 through 1960—the Army was chopped in size from 1.5 million men to 870,000. Six divisions were retired as a result, and the size of existing divisions was reduced.

An urgent need. A swing back to greater dependence on the Army actually started during the last session of Congress, when legislators increased the Army budget over the amount asked by President Eisenhower's fiscal planners. The action followed a study of Army deficiencies by the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee.

That report, drawn up by Committee Chairman LYNDON B. JOHNSON saw the Army "in urgent need of modernization." It found that only one-sixth of the Army's needs for modern rifles and only one-tenth of the new tanks needed were on order, and in other cases hundreds of new weapons and vehicles were being purchased when thousands were needed.

Any overnight build-up of the Army even now is not seen as possible. After a long series of reduced budgets—some running $4 billion below the Army's formal requests—new weapons and manpower must be absorbed slowly. Time needed to produce new weapons is another factor. And Congress, by controlling the purse strings, also controls the timetable.

Before the end of March, the President will officially ask Congress for specific changes in military spending. He will request more money for projects to be started before June 30, and recommend major amendments to the defense budget for the next fiscal year. That budget was left by President Eisenhower.

Outlook is that the Eisenhower budget, pegged at $42.9 billion, will be increased by more than 2 billion for all services if President Kennedy's revisions are adopted. This new total would exceed the peak spending of the Korean war years.

More money for all? There is to be more money, as plans now stand, for all services. The Army buildup is not to be at the expense of others. Biggest share of the first increase will go for Air Force speedups of costly missile systems and new preparations for the Strategic Air Command. There is also to be a speedup in the Navy's Polaris submarine fleet. The Marine Corps is in line for an eventual increase of 25,000 men to bolster its limited-war capability.

But in the longer run, as a shift in strategy takes hold and more time and money are made available, officials say it is the Army that stands the best chance of making the biggest relative gains among this country's armed services.

World's Fairs Contribute to Science and Technology

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in the March 12 edition of This Week magazine, Mr. Joseph Gies has written an excellent article outlining the chronology of World's Fairs for the past 100 years

and describing their contributions to science and technology.

Mr. Gies shows how each World's Fair has generated a spirit of scientific exploration and discovery.

In Philadelphia in 1876, it was the telephone. In Paris in 1889, it was the automobile; in Chicago in 1893, the electric light; and as recent as the Brussels Fair of 1958, it was the spirit of the space satellite that inspired and challenged man's imagination.

Mr. President, the most exciting thing about this chronology is that it makes us wonder in a spirit of anticipation what will be the great contribution and great technological advances that will inspire the New York World's Fair to be held in 1964 and 1965.

A World's Fair is not only an opportunity for entertainment and enlightenment, it truly transcends the fair grounds and speaks out to all nations of scientific progress and technological advances to better the world we live in.

Mr. President, as one who has long been interested in the New York 1964–65 World's Fair, I am delighted to see that already there is building up a great enthusiasm for this event. The article by Mr. Gies certainly illustrates this enthusiasm. It is an excellent and worthwhile article, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOWS THAT MAKE DREAMS COME TRUE

(By Joseph Gies)

The unusual version of the world shown on our cover is the first official color picture of a major symbol of the sixties—the unisphere.

The unisphere is the theme symbol of the 1964–65 New York World's Fair, now in the planning stage on drawing boards. This fair will be held in Flushing Meadows, scene of the 1939 New York World's Fair. On our cover is an artist's representation of the stainless steel giant (120 feet in diameter) that the United States Steel Corp. will construct and present to the fair for installation at Flushing Meadows Park. At night flashing lights will pinpoint the capitals of the world while satellites zip around in orbit.

"The unisphere," says Robert Moses, president of the New York World's Fair 1964–65 Corp., "represents man's achievements on a shrinking globe in an expanding universe, and the necessity of achieving peace through understanding."

The unisphere will be the biggest armillary sphere ever constructed. An armillary sphere, just in case you didn't know, is a model of the world formed on concentric rings—a sort of global skeleton. The Unisphere, which will be mounted over a 350-foot pool, will not be taken down after the fair, but left as a permanent embellishment of the park.

Meantime, on the opposite coast, Seattle has picked a symbol for its own World's Fair, the "Century 21 Exposition," due to open in April 1962. Seattle's fair planners have possibly even outsymboled New York's, with a 550-foot-high tower called the space needle. It will house a 220-seat restaurant which will revolve as you eat. You'll get a view of the Cascade Range with your soup, Puget Sound with your entree and snow-capped Mount Rainier with your ice cream. The bar, luckily, will be in the hub and won't revolve.

The space needle too will outlast the fair it symbolizes, and become a permanent feature of downtown Seattle (the Century 21 will be located close to the business district).

Leaving enduring landmarks behind is an old World's Fair custom—but often what survives isn't what the people in charge intended. Whether it turns out to be an engineer's dream shape in structural steel or the memory of every man's dream shape behind a couple of fans is something nobody knows till the fair's over, and sometimes not then. The first fair on record was when King Ahasuerus staged his big 180-day fair in Shushan, Persia. He never figured it would get him a new wife, but Queen Vashti refused to put in an appearance for the fair's closing ceremony, and lost her royal job to Esther, according to the Bible.

There were a lot of local fairs after that, including some pretty big ones during the Middle Ages. In the 18th century London and Paris launched industrial fairs, showing the latest wrinkles in Sheffield cutlery, liquor distilling, etc. But it wasn't until the middle of the 18th century that the first World's Fair opened.

Here's a short rundown of some unforgettable World's Fairs—and what made them unforgettable:

London 1851: The First World's Fair, with exhibits from all the leading nations, was dreamed up by Prince Albert. The Great Exhibition, as it was called, gave the world its first World's Fair symbol—and a magnificient one it was. The committee in charge had rejected 245 straight blueprints from leading British and European architects, when an ex-gardener named Joseph Paxton submitted a design based on a greenhouse. The idea of a glass building left the committee speechless, but Paxton, a man far ahead of his time, sent his idea to the new Illustrated London News, the world's first picture magazine. With the London public it was love at first sight. Despite dire predictions from experts (the Astronomer Royal said the thing couldn't stand up) Paxton's towering greenhouse, enclosing several Hyde Park elms, was built. Punch called it the Crystal Palace, and overnight it became one of the world's most famous buildings. After the exhibition it was taken down piece by piece and moved to the outskirts, where it served as a glittery exhibition and amusement hall for eight decades, before a fire destroyed it in 1936.

But Prince Albert's Great Exhibition left more behind than the Crystal Palace. Out of its handsome profits were eventually built the Victoria and Albert Museum, several other museums and a cluster of schools and colleges. And since 1891 the estate left by the exhibition has financed thousands of scholarships to British universities. Known as 1851 scholars, the recipients have numbered seven Nobel Prize winners and many scientists.

The exhibition left at least one other souvenir—Antoine Sax's new instrument, the saxophone.

Paris 1867: Two miraculous new chemicals, gasoline and aluminum, were introduced to the royalty-studded throngs who flocked to the "Exposition Universal." And a more raffish survival: a picturesque maze of booths, restaurants, minarets, aquariums, sideshows, concert halls, captive balloons and games of chance—the first midway. Today, who can imagine a fair without one?

Philadelphia 1876: The Emperor of Brazil tried out the funny little gadget Alexander Bell had invented an exclaimed, "My God, it talks." That lasted. So did another talking novelty brought to the fair by a young fellow named Thomas Edison—the first phonograph. And Philadelphia contributed an important fair idea: that a World's Fair should commemorate something. This one, of course, was the 100th birthday of the United States.

Paris 1889: Like the Crystal Palace, Engineer Gustave Eiffel's giant steel tower stirred bitter controversy. But like the Crystal Palace the Eiffel Tower was built anyway, 984 feet high, taller than any building in Europe then or now.

But the exposition in 1889, marking the centenary of the French Revolution, left two other things behind for good measure: (1) the automobile, the first of which was exhibited by Karl Benz, and (2) a muscle dance, performed by a sinuous lady named Little Egypt. History does not record which drew the most bug-eyed stares—the Eiffel Tower, the automobile, or Little Egypt.

Chicago 1893: The Columbian Exposition, the 400th anniversary of Columbus' landing, got going a year late, but made up for its tardiness with three new wonders: (1) the electric light, powered by George Westinghouse's new generator, which flooded the fair, creating a dazzling "white city;" (2) the present-day Museum of Science and Industry, a limestone-built 1893 original building, and (3) the first ferris wheel—Chicago's answer to the Eiffel Tower, not as tall but more fun to go up in.

Paris 1900: Not content with leaving two famous Paris buildings, the Grand Palais and the Petit Palais, this exposition left the escalator. In fact the very "moving sidewalk" that was a hit of the fair later carried thousands of Christmas shoppers onward and upward in Gimbel's, Philadelphia.

St. Louis 1904: Atop the dome of the main auditorium at the Louisiana Purchase Exhibition stood a heroic-sized statue: the Victorious Athlete, by Evelyn Longman—a salute to the Olympic games, held in St. Louis. Today the statue is in trophy rooms all over the Nation, because manufacturers of athletic trophies have copied it ever since.

Less prominently displayed was the exhibit of a young genius named Lee De Forest, whose audion tube shortly led to the development of radio.

San Francisco 1915: A 435-foot "tower of jewels," made of thousands of glittering glass prisms, symbolized this celebration of the digging of the Panama Canal. That's long gone, but the fair-built Palace of Fine Arts still is standing on Baker Street.

Philadelphia 1926: The Sesquicentennial Exhibition was a patriotic pageant—so it figures that the huge stadium it left behind is the scene of every fall's Army-Navy football game.

Chicago 1933: "A Century of Progress" exhibition, marking Chicago's 100th birthday, was officially symbolized by the impressive hall of science. But its unofficial symbol was a fan, for despite science, Fan Dancer Sally Rand was the thing whose name became a household word.

New York 1939: Remember the trylon and perisphere? The unisphere will be mounted on the perisphere's old pedestal in 1964. The symbols of "The World of Tomorrow" are long gone, but three items unveiled at the fair have definitely lingered: Nylon, home air conditioning—and television.

San Francisco 1939: The Golden Gate Exposition left an unusual legacy—an island. Treasure Island, scraped together out of shoals in the bay, was originally designed as an airport, and fair buildings were constructed for easy conversion to an air administration center and two hangars. Today it's an important Navy base.

Brussels 1958: Most of the buildings of the last World's Fair have vanished, but the fair's great symbol, the atomium, remains in Brussels to remind of man's determination to mold the atomic age to the benefit of hu-

manity. Two other Brussels exhibits left enduring memories: Russia's first sputnik, whose pioneer orbit has been followed by dozens of U.S. and Russian satellites since; and the beautiful U.S. pavilion, designed by Edward Stone, which will inspire architects for years.

What will remain of "Seattle 1962" and "New York 1964." The space needle and the unisphere, parks and gardens, sports arenas, and concert halls.

But that's far from all. Out of the fabulous scientific exhibits, which at this moment are still perhaps only gleams in researchers' eyes, will come new advances, new ways of doing things, new ways of thinking even, that will influence the life of every human being on this planet far beyond the reaches of this century.

Our Vanishing National Seashores—Subdividers Threaten Proposed Point Reyes Seashore Park

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLEM MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Speaker, in both the 86th and 87th Congress, I have sponsored legislation to provide for establishment of the Point Reyes National Seashore in California as a unit of the national park system.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has scheduled a hearing on this legislation—H.R. 2775—for March 24.

Mr. Speaker, I consider our ocean seashores a uniquely national natural resource.

I, coming here from the north coast of California, recognize that our Pacific Ocean shoreline in California—as in Oregon and Washington—is also the Pacific shoreline for the people of our neighboring States of Arizona, Nevada, and Idaho and of the States further inland.

I believe that the people of all the States are entitled to access and enjoyment of some of the limited seashores of our continent.

Therefore I also believe that the people of all the States are entitled to help insure protection and development—for public access and benefit—of certain segments of this irreplaceable and fast-vanishing national resource. Such national seashores properly should be those few remaining natural segments which possess exceptionally high public recreational values.

The National Park Service has identified several such superlative seashores. They include portions of Cape Cod, Mass.; Padre Island, Tex.; Oregon Dunes, Oreg., and Point Reyes Peninsula, Calif. Legislation has been introduced to establish national seashores at each of these areas.

Increasing population pressures have added new dimensions of urgency to congressional consideration of this legislation at this session.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include portions of recent newspaper articles which report certain of these developments at Point Reyes. The articles are from the San Francisco Chronicle of February 11, 1961, and from a series in the San Francisco News-Call Bulletin beginning March 6, 1961.

The articles referred to follow:

SUBDIVIDERS VERSUS NEW U.S. PARK—LOTS AT POINT REYES READIED FOR HOMES

(By James Benet)

Subdivision seemed to be winning the race against park use for the magnificent Point Reyes Peninsula yesterday.

"The lot owners will be able to start building as soon as we finish putting in these roads and the water system," said Walter G. Moore.

He is a salesman for David S. Adams of San Anselmo, who has already brought bulldozers, power shovels and roadscrapers into the heart of the proposed national seashore park in Marin County.

Adams is advertising that 1,000 acres will be devoted to his "Drake's Beach Estates" in the area that, the National Park Service has said, "provides a combination of scenic, recreation and biologic interests which can be found nowhere else in this country as near to a large center of population."

"We already have commitments for more than half of the first 80 half-acre lots that we are preparing," Moore said.

"We are asking—and getting—$4,250 each."

The lots are on a south-facing slope overlooking the long white beach along Drake's Bay, a beach the U.S. Congress is being asked to set aside for public use.

The subdivision plan shows a beach club to which lot owners will belong, adjacent commercial development and large beachside parking lots, but no public access.

"Of course the beach below high water line is public," said Moore. "If people can get access to it they couldn't be kicked off."

And what of the proposed park, which Congress last year appropriated $15,000 to study, and for which bills have been introduced into the new Congress by both California Senators, Republican THOMAS H. KUCHEL and Democrat CLAIR ENGLE, as well as by Representative CLEM MILLER, Democrat, Corte Madera.

"I doubt if it will go through, myself," said Moore.

"They are talking about $8 million, but I doubt if they could buy up this peninsula for less than $80 million."

James Cole of the National Park Service confirmed that it will cost far more to create the proposed park if subdivisions are built in the area, since the cost of improvements must then be paid for by the Government if it still goes forward with the park.

"And," he added, "it would create a situation that would take many years to get rid of."

However, Cole said, the National Park Service cannot prevent Adams from proceeding on private land.

"We plan a good development," Moore said. "We will have the right to disapprove architectural plans. The houses, on half-acre lots, won't be jammed together."

The developer has built a road of about eight miles south along a ridge and there, stark against the skyline on the ridgetop, stand two water tanks that are the first structures of the new development.

The Park Service's present proposal, backed by Governor Edmund G. Brown, State park authorities and others, is for a seashore reserve of about 53,000 acres. Of these, 21,000 acres would be designated as a pastoral zone.

Park authorities said the park can serve wide recreational use, including camping, picnicking, hiking and beach activities, as well as enabling preservation of the historical area where Sir Francis Drake is believed to have landed in the 16th century.

POINT REYES: PARADISE LOST?—SUBDIVISIONS HAVE STARTED

(By George Dusheck)

It is now possible to live in view of the white Marin cliffs beneath which Sir Francis Drake careened the *Golden Hind* in June 1579.

The subdivisions which have threatened Drakes Bay ever since the National Park Service proposed, 2 years ago, to make Point Reyes a national seashore recreational area, have arrived.

The bulldozers are at work making roads and streets. The ditchdiggers are furrowing the rolling moor for drainpipes.

The stakes are up, with fluttering blue and red ribbons attached, on the half-acre homesites.

Architects and engineers are at work on plans to dredge a small boat harbor, lay out a golf course, erect a "Carmel-type" commercial development.

Salesmen are ready now to sell you a site, on a hill overlooking Drakes Bay or on Limantour Spit below the hill, for a fancy price—$4,250 to $10,000, depending on size and location.

There is a bill now before Congress, supported by the Kennedy administration and members of the California congressional delegation, to make 53,000 acres of Point Reyes Peninsula a great national park, a seagirt, forest-crowned playground and pastoral reserve.

But unless Congress acts quickly, it may find the National Park Service will have to buy up and destroy a residential and commercial development.

When Point Reyes dairymen appeared before a Senate committee at San Rafael last spring to protest the proposed national park, they said they wanted to be left in peace to graze their cows and milk them on the rolling green hills of western Marin.

They were warned then that being left in peace was not in the cards—that they must choose between a national park and residential and commercial development of the peninsula.

In the hope of winning them over, the National Park Service has gone so far as to offer to let them continue their cattle and dairy operations within the boundaries of the proposed national park.

Now a group of Marin real estate men and developers have tightened the screw. They have set up Drakes Beach Estates, subdivision No. 1, and Drakes Bay unit No. 1 on Limantour Spit.

They have roughly surfaced an old fire road to within a mile of the subdivision and bulldozed an extension to the homesites.

Drakes Beach Estates was incorporated a year ago, with Benjamin P. Bonelli, a San Rafael attorney, as president, and David S. Adams, a San Rafael real estate man, as the principal—25 percent—stockholder.

This was, of course, after the announcement of the National Park Service's intention to make Point Reyes a national seashore recreational area.

The first subdivision is on a sloping ridge above the sand spit. It is roughly 50 acres, with 81 homesites marked off. About half of these are marked "sold" on the subdivision map in the Inverness office.

But a salesman told a customer last week: "Some of the sites marked 'sold may still become available. People's dreams are sometimes bigger than their pocketbooks."

The second subdivision is on the spit itself. This is about 25 acres, divided into 88 homesites.

The hill sites are less expensive—$4,250 and up—than the Limantour Spit sites—$10,000 for the tip of the spit.

"Some press statements about our development have been misleading. This is not just a lot of tract homes. In fact, we're not building any homes at all.

"This is a recreational development. We're going to put in a small boat harbor and, later, a golf course. There will be a beach club, to which all lotholders may belong. There will be a small, Carmel-type commercial development—to sell boat sails, gasoline, food, and so on."

It is also possible, he conceded, that Pacific Bridge Co., whose engineers are laying out the master plan, and Campbell & Wong, the San Francisco architects who are drawing the plans, may include such things as:

A motel (or yachtel), a restaurant, a gift shop, and a clothing shop.

"We don't know yet what the commercial development will be," says Bonelli.

But there will be one. One paragraph in "declaration of conditions, covenants, and agreements" which lot-buyers sign contains this language:

"The purchasers of lots in this subdivision agree * * * not to oppose any commercial, residential, or recreational development whatsoever by Drakes Beach Estates, Inc. * * *."

This could presumably include such things as hot dog stands and a drive-in movie on the beaches of Drake's Nova Albion. The corporation owns about a thousand acres in all, once part of the great 10,000-acre Murphy Ranch on Point Reyes.

POINT REYES BUILDERS ENJOY EXEMPTIONS; BYPASS RESTRICTION, SUPERVISION

(By George Dusheck)

Some conservationists are complaining that Drakes Beach Estates, the developers who are subdividing a thousand acres of grassy hills and sandy beaches on Drake's Bay, are cutting corners and putting in substandard work.

This is not true. Everything being done there is perfectly legal—the Marin County supervisors and planning commission have granted the company exemption from much of the restrictions and supervision that bind other subdividers.

Here are some examples:

1. Ordinarily subdividers are required to build county-standard roads and streets, dedicate them to public use and turn them over to the county.

Drakes Beach Estates, Inc., asked for and got an exemption from this requirement. Their roads and streets will be private and purchasers of homesites are warned by the California Division of Real Estate that owners may be forced to maintain them at their own expense.

The roads would not be accepted by the county in their present condition, even if offered; they are too narrow, their roadbed is substandard, their tar topping is too thin. They have already begun to wash out and gully at the shoulders here and there.

2. Ordinarily, subdividers are required to file a complete set of plans for development with the planning commission and with the county road commissioner, who thereupon inspects such installations as roads, streets, gutters, sidewalks, storm drains, sewage pipes and utility lines.

Drakes Beach Estates, Inc., asked for and got an exemption from this requirement. The only part of the subdivision which County Road Commissioner Marvin Brigham is permitted to inspect is the water system.

The water will come from nearby wells owned by the Limantour Mutual Water Co. A mutual water company is not a public utility, is not regulated by the California Public Utilities Commission, and the California Division of Real Estate warns buyers:

"No public agency (other than the health department) has any supervision over the management, rates, assessments, charges, or conduct of business of a mutual water company.

"In some instances, a subdivider or some other person may own the majority of the stock and thus control the mutual water company. If this is so, the stockholders may find it difficult or impossible to get improvement if the service is unsatisfactory."

3. Ordinarily, a subdivider must file with the planning commission a map showing any parts of the subdivision that conceivably could be flooded by rain run-off, high tides, high waves or any combination of these.

Drakes Beach Estates, Inc., asked for and got an exemption from this requirement. It is a fact that Limantour Spit has not been inundated by the sea in recent years, but the Marin County Planning Commission staff believes it was so washed over many years ago.

The subdivider also asked exemption from the legal requirements that such areas (subject to flooding or wave washing) be filled to a level 7 feet above mean sea level.

Benjamil P. Bonelli, president of Drakes Beach Estates, Inc., says this part of the subdivision code will be strictly adhered to—but the records show he is legally exempt from this requirement at his own request.

How were Bonelli and the other corporate subdividers able to escape application of these parts of the law?

Very simple—they asked the supervisors for exemption and got it. The vote, last June 28, was 4 to 1.

It is well known that a majority of Marin County supervisors are opposed to creation of a national seashore recreation area on the Point Reyes Peninsula. On two occasions they have formally taken this position, in response to entreaties from Point Reyes dairymen, and from Capt. Adolph Oko and other peninsula real estate men.

The California Division of Real Estate's "Final Subdivision Public Report" on the Drakes Beach estates project also makes these points:

There is no gas except bottled gas. There will be electricity and phone service. Sewage will go into septic tanks, to be built by and maintained by the homeowners. Fire protection will come from the county; the nearest fire truck is at Inverness Park, 6 miles distant over a substandard private road. It is 12 miles to the high school, 6 miles to the grammar school, 6 miles to the nearest store. There is once-a-day Greyhound service on Highway 1 at Inverness Park, 5.6 miles from the tract.

Foreign Aid Where It Counts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the Peace Corps, I would also like to bring attention to a lucid and discerning editorial which appeared March 6 in the Indianapolis Times. The editorial, I believe, makes a valuable contribution to the current discussions about the spirit that should underlie the Peace Corps:

FOREIGN AID WHERE IT COUNTS

The Peace Corps idea, now officially launched by President Kennedy, has a chance to revolutionize the American attitude toward foreign aid—and the attitude of many foreigners toward America.

The billions of dollars loaned and given away since the last World War have served a necessary purpose, even though a lot of the money has been wasted on grandiose, hurry-up projects of doubtful benefit to anyone.

These expenditures have preserved order when civil chaos invited communism. Undoubtedly they made possible the recovery of Europe and Japan.

But there has been little warmth in them, either for the American taxpayer, putting up the money, or for foreign peoples who were benefiting, at least in theory.

For this there are several reasons, including the uncomfortable feeling in America that we were trying to buy friends and military support—the widespread instinct abroad that this was the case.

The dozens of private American organizations which have been in the foreign aid business for years have made an entirely different impression.

They have furnished shovels and hoes to farmers, plus cattle and chickens for breeding stock.

Sewing machines have been accompanied by sewing lessons.

Building tradesmen have helped erect houses and schools.

Doctors and nurses have tended the ailing at posts deep in the jungles or across wide deserts.

Food packets by the millions have been furnished directly to the hungry.

In all this there is the feeling of direct, friendly contact between the world's unfortunates and their better-off fellow human beings in America.

The type of aid being furnished by American universities, church and nonsectarian groups more nearly fills the needs of underdeveloped countries anyhow.

Industrialization is the fad but benefits from this lie in the distant future, if ever.

What these countries need first is a sound basis in agriculture, which will enable them to feed themselves, in the mechanical trades which will permit them to house themselves, and in basic education which will enable them to understand the new kind of world they are entering.

There is so vast a void for these things, in Asia and Africa and even in Latin America, that no amount of American effort can fill it. But American Peace Corps men and women can establish small islands of instruction and aid, setting an example for neighboring communities to imitate.

The Peace Corps idea thus starts at the bottom, with food and medicine, plows, seed and fertilizer, instead of showy buildings of little present use to primitive people whose routine is hunger and disease, millions of whom never heard of democracy, or communism, or the United Nations.

The Peace Corps idea appeals to the American missionary spirit—particularly so since the wages will provide a bare existence, hence emphasize personal sacrifice in a good cause.

If our missionaries are carefully chosen for dedication and special skills, if they are carefully placed where they obviously are wanted, this Peace Corps idea can work wonders.

Temporary Unemployment Compensation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4806 is a bill to provide a temporary program of extended unemployment compensation and to increase the Federal unemployment taxes imposed on the employers in the respective States to finance

that program. At the time this legislation was before the House of Representatives I opposed its passage and joined in minority views to that effect. These minority views expressed opposition on the grounds that the bill first, did violence to the insurance principle of unemployment compensation; second, purported to impose $1 billion in additional taxes to meet a problem that had not been adequately defined; and, third, posed a threat to economic recovery by imposing higher costs on employment. These views pointed out how this legislation represented a backdoor approach to the imposition of Federal standards on the States and threatened the experience rating system which operates so successfully in the States to encourage employers to stability in employment opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, since expressing those views the legislation has passed the House of Representatives and has received approval in the other body. It now comes back to the House improved in some minor respects but still containing the basic defects that I criticized in the House version with respect to financing.

It is in regard to the financing features that I would like to comment further at this time.

In 1958 when the Eisenhower administration and the Congress considered that the economic situation required the enactment of a temporary unemployment compensation extension, legislation was then approved dealing with the situation. That legislation provided for a system of repayable advances to the States on a voluntary basis with the borrowing States having responsibility for the repayment of their respective advances.

The bill before the Congress today is markedly different. The benefit payments are voluntary with the States, but the Federal tax increase imposed on the employers in the States is mandatory and will be assessed against the employers in a particular State regardless of whether or not benefits are made available to the unemployed in the State. The anticipated consequence is that all States will make benefits available even though the responsible State officials may not consider that the economic situation in a particular State makes such an extended benefit program necessary. But the mere fact that benefit payments are to be made available in every State does not mean that the benefit payments in the State will equal tax collections in a State; it does not mean that the employers in a particular State will be taxed only to the extent that benefits are paid in the State. On this point we said the following in our minority views on this legislation:

Those States that have responsibly administered their unemployment compensation programs today have the financial ability to deal effectively with existing unemployment conditions. However, the approach set forth in H.R. 4806 would tax the employers in those States to pay for the benefit needs in other States where perhaps less satisfactory administration of unemployment compensation programs has occurred.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate Finance Committee report contains a table setting forth on a State-by-State basis the estimated additional tax collections and the estimated benefit payments under H.R. 4806. I will include that table as a part of my remarks and urge my colleagues to examine this table for the purpose of ascertaining the patent inequity in the financing arrangement of this proposal.

Estimated additional tax collections compared with expected benefit payments by States under H.R. 4806

[Amounts in millions]

State	Tax collections	Benefit payments[1]
Total	$964.0	$928.2
Alabama	12.2	10.0
Alaska	1.2	2.2
Arizona	5.7	2.1
Arkansas	5.3	4.7
California	99.4	80.0
Colorado	8.3	2.0
Connecticut	18.5	18.2
Delaware	3.2	2.0
District of Columbia	5.5	2.2
Florida	21.4	9.5
Georgia	16.7	12.0
Hawaii	3.1	.7
Idaho	2.5	1.6
Illinois	68.6	40.0
Indiana	28.0	26.0
Iowa	10.8	3.5
Kansas	8.5	3.5
Kentucky	10.6	15.0
Louisiana	13.1	12.9
Maine	4.5	2.0
Maryland	15.8	10.0
Massachusetts	34.2	30.0
Michigan	46.6	93.0
Minnesota	16.0	14.4
Mississippi	5.7	2.2
Missouri	23.6	11.0
Montana	2.6	1.1
Nebraska	5.2	.5
Nevada	2.0	2.0
New Hampshire	3.4	.4
New Jersey	39.7	51.2
New Mexico	3.9	2.3
New York	119.9	170.0
North Carolina	19.9	7.9
North Dakota	1.6	.9
Ohio	62.4	85.0
Oklahoma	8.9	5.8
Oregon	9.6	10.6
Pennsylvania	70.7	82.0
Puerto Rico	3.2	3.2
Rhode Island	5.5	5.5
South Carolina	9.1	7.3
South Dakota	1.6	.2
Tennessee	15.0	8.0
Texas	42.1	30.0
Utah	4.1	2.0
Vermont	1.7	.6
Virginia	16.1	5.5
Washington	15.4	8.9
West Virginia	8.4	9.5
Wisconsin	21.5	16.0
Wyoming	1.5	1.1

[1] Includes about $100,000,000 in benefit payments in excess of 26 weeks made under State law, and excludes payments to Federal civilian employees and ex-servicemen.

Source: Estimates of tax collections furnished by Department of Labor and estimates of benefit payments furnished by State employment security agencies.

Mr. Speaker, that table reveals that there are 40 surplus States with tax collections exceeding benefit payments, 3 break-even States with the tax collection and benefit payments equal, and 9 deficit States in which the tax collections in the respective States will not equal their estimated benefit payments. A table showing a recapitulation of the three categories of States follows:

[Figures in millions of dollars]

	Tax collections	Benefit payments	Surplus or deficit
Surplus States (40)	604.2	399.0	+205.2
Break-even States (3)	10.7	10.7	
Deficit States (9)	369.1	518.5	−149.4
Total	984.0	928.2	+55.8

The employers in the 40 surplus States would pay in taxes $205.2 million more than would be paid in benefits in their respective States. The 9 deficit States would have $149.4 million more in benefit payments than the employers in these States paid in increased unemployment compensation taxes. There would be a net surplus of tax collections over benefit payments for all 52 States under this temporary program amounting to $55.8 million, and I will comment on the disposition of that surplus later.

Five of the deficit States—Michigan, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania—would account for $141.9 million of the $149.4 million total deficit incurred by the 9 deficit States. Mr. Speaker, this fact raises the obvious question: Are the employers in Michigan, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania so impoverished that they are unable to pay their respective State's own way in regard to their State unemployment compensation programs? And the second question follows: Are the employers in the other States so wealthy that they can afford to pay their State program costs and contribute to paying the way of the deficit States?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on the disposition of the $55.8 million surplus under the bill. The formula for distributing this surplus under the legislation provides that it should be allocated to each State in proportion to the taxable wages as defined under State law. This means that the deficit States would be participating in the distribution of this surplus and it is inevitable that the five States contributing the most in the way of deficits will be among the leaders in the amount of the surplus they will receive. In other words Michigan, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania, which created the lion's share of the deficit-State-total, will have a lion's share of the surplus created by the surplus States.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that if unemployment compensation is to be a State responsibility, it should be kept exactly that. I believe that the States have demonstrated their ability to manage their unemployment compensation programs responsibly and adequately. Therefore, I am opposed to this legislation.

Some of my colleagues who want to preserve State preeminence in regard to unemployment compensation do believe that a temporary program of extended unemployment compensation is necessary in view of the present eco-

nomic conditions. I respect their viewpoint; however, I cannot understand how anyone can support the method of financing provided in this bill. Even those individuals who come from deficit States should be concerned that this financing pattern contains a strong inducement to loose administration which threatens the future of the unemployment compensation program. Those individuals who come from surplus States must determine whether or not the employers in their respective States should be called on to pay for an unemployment compensation program in other States where the employers have no vote and no influence as to the character of the program in those other States.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation in its present form should not proceed one step further in the legislative process. If legislation is necessary, then we should start all over again to develop legislation that is equitable and proper in its conception and which does not endanger the continued existence of our State unemployment compensation programs.

Russians Run Show for Castro in Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article that appeared in the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., Tuesday, March 14, 1961, written by Mr. William L. Ryan, Associated Press news analyst, which is very indicative of the direction that Castro's Cuban Government is going.

The article follows:

RUSSIANS RUN THE SHOW FOR CASTRO IN MEXICO

(By William L. Ryan)

MEXICO CITY, March 14.—One of the first things Fidel Castro's current Ambassador did when he arrived in Mexico—even before presenting his credentials to the government—was to call on the Soviet Ambassador.

From that time a year ago until today there has been a steady stream of traffic between the embassies of Moscow's Vladimir Bazykin and Cuba's Jose Antonio Portuondo Valdor.

There is every evidence that activities of the two embassies, less than two blocks apart on the Calzada Tacubaya, are carefully coordinated, and that the Russians are the unquestioned bosses of their common efforts.

Mr. Portuondo now is the leading spokesman for Fidel Castro and Castroism in Latin America. He attacks the job with enormous energy, lecturing frequently throughout the country.

ONCE TAUGHT IN UNITED STATES

Mr. Portuondo was a member of the Young Communist League and later of the Popular Socialist (Communist) Party of Cuba. He once taught in several U.S. universities but left 10 years ago when the heat was on him for his Communist connections.

Able, intelligent, and fluent in English, he now is in full charge of Castro intelligence operations in Mexico. Aiding him are members of a top-heavy embassy staff and about a half dozen employees of Prensa Latina, the Castro news service which is devoted strictly to propaganda.

The Cuban Ambassador seems to have plenty of money. His agents are highly paid. His propaganda output is expensive. There is one report that he brought from Havana $200,000 to help finance last week's Latin American conference sponsored by the Communists in Mexico City. The Russian sare reported to have put up more than twice that and to have pledged to foot any additional expenses.

Mr. Portuondo works hand in glove with Mr. Bazykin, who speaks English and Spanish fluently. Mr. Bazykin is in constant touch with the Soviet Embassy in Havana and the suspicion has been raised that the Embassy in Mexico is in charge of all Communist activities in the Caribbean and Central America.

Mr. Bazykin's Embassy has been stepped up in size recently and now has about 140 staff members, none of them Mexicans and all of them carefully shielded from unauthorized contact with the outside.

The U.S. Embassy has a staff of about 430. Half are Mexicans. But the U.S. Embassy must deal with issuing tens of thousands of visas, with the influx of 700,000 U.S. tourists annually, with a multiplicity of common United States-Mexican trade and border questions. The Russians have no such obligations.

The Russians and the Castro Cubans concentrate much of their energies on recruiting among Mexico's students and teachers and the intellectual class in general. They obviously are making significant progress in building a dangerous fifth column for Mexico.

ECONOMY IS SOUND

Mexico is one of the bright spots of Latin America in many respects. The capital has a bright, hopeful look and hums with an energy seldom encountered elsewhere in Latin America. Mexico's economy is sound, its currency strong, its prospects encouraging.

Most Mexican labor unions are headed by strongly anti-Communist leadership. The Confederation of Labor itself is a stabilizing influence in Mexican politics. The Communists have practically no strength in trade union leadership—with one exception. This is the National Union of Education Workers, embracing all Education Ministry workers outside the university, both in the state and federal school systems.

The Mexican Confederation of Labor leadership disagrees with the charge that the teachers' union is Communist-dominated. But at least 6 members of its 18-member national executive are known Communists. It is the only Mexican union affiliated with the Communist World Federation of Trade Unions.

Working for Democracy in the United States, and in Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a remarkably discerning and historical address on the issue of democracy in the United States, and in Africa. The address was made by Prof. John Hope Franklin, formerly of Howard University, and now chairman of the department of history, Brooklyn College, New York, and was delivered in Detroit at a testimonial honoring one of our State's most distinguished citizens, Dr. DeWitt T. Burton. It was an extraordinarily fitting address for the occasion, because it points up the contribution American Negroes have made, and are challenged to make, toward the fulfillment of the African dream for self-realization, and it focuses the vital point that democracy in Africa is forwarded as Africans see democratic institutions working effectively in wholesome environment.

Dr. Burton, first Negro elected member of the board of governors of Wayne State University, is one who gives unstintingly of his mental, spiritual, and material resources to causes which foster and actualize democracy's highest ideals of human dignity, liberty, and justice. He spearheads a private and increasingly successful endeavor which provides scholarships for African students. One could list among other of his working memberships that of national board director of the United Negro College Fund; board member of the United Foundation-World Medical Relief Organization, of the Detroit Urban League, the NAACP, the Boy Scouts of America, and member of the Citizens Advisory Committee on School Needs in Detroit. Dr. Burton brings honor to the 13th Congressional District, and it is for me a distinct privilege to count him among my constituency and to work with him as fellow colleague in Michigan, national, and international affairs.

The address follows:

WORKING FOR DEMOCRACY IN THE UNITED STATES AND IN AFRICA

(Address delivered by Prof. John Hope Franklin, chairman of the Department of History, Brooklyn College, at the testimonial honoring Dr. D. T. Burton, Detroit, Mich., February 18, 1961.)

One measures the growth of a city not merely by population, its economic and industrial strength, its educational achievements, and its social development, but also by that city's own understanding of the forces and personalities that have contributed substantially to that growth. This occasion clearly demonstrates that the city of Detroit, by paying tribute to one of its great citizens—one who has done so much for it in so many ways—is not only a great metropolis, it is also a most civilized and cultivated community. It would be highly presumptuous for me to come among you this evening and speak at length about Dr. Burton and his many highly meritorious activities. Your presence here signifies your deep appreciation of them and, without doubt, as much greater firsthand knowledge of them than I could ever hope to have. I am nevertheless honored to be present and to make public acknowledgment of my own appreciation of his great works and to say a word in behalf of those beyond this community who feel the warmth of his passion for humanity and the sensitivity that he shows for the importance of human values whether they be found in Paradise Valley or on the banks of Lake Victoria in East Africa.

I propose to say a very few words about something that I know is near to Dr. Burton's heart and mind and to dedicate these remarks to him. For a number of years he has been interested in establishing the proper educational and cultural communication between this country and the emerging

African states, in stimulating the growth of important educational and social institutions in that great sister continent, and in assisting in other ways their proper assumption of responsibility in the complex world into which they are emerging. In doing so, Dr. Burton is standing in a great tradition that is a part of this country's attempt to extend the area of democracy; and he is also standing in a great tradition that belongs to the Negro citizens of this country in attempting to establish and maintain ties with the continent from which their ancestors came.

For more than a century and a half this country assumed the responsibility for keeping the torch of democracy burning in the Western World and for extending the light into the darker recesses of other worlds. If the light has at times flickered rather falteringly and if it has not always burned brightly here, the hope that the light has held out to underprivileged persons here and around the world has never dimmed. It has been one of the great inspirations to all peoples from the time that it first appeared on the horizon. In 1776 Thomas Jefferson held out the torch to what he called "a candid world." James Monroe declared in 1823 that he would guard the torch as it was being kindled in the nations to the south of us. Abraham Lincoln said in 1865 that it would be the basis of a just and lasting peace not only in the United States but among all the peoples of the world.

We need to remind ourselves, moreover, that the interest of American Negroes in Africa has seldom flagged. In our own burst of enthusiasm about events that are transpiring in the African nations today, we tend to forget that Negroes in this country extended the hand of fellowship to Africans shortly after emancipation almost a century ago. Since that time they have shared their meager resources with their black brothers of the dark continent. Negro missionaries in Africa back in the 1870's and 1880's recruited African students for Negro college and university training in the United States. The story of the work of the Lott Cary Missionary Society is a most inspiring and dramatic story of efforts in this regard. One of my earliest recollections is hearing my father tell of his proud, intelligent African classmates at Morehouse College in Atlanta, Ga., 60 years ago. When one reads of the herculean efforts of Dr. Hastings Banda to secure independence for his beloved Nyasaland, one is reminded of an earlier fellow countryman of his, John Chilembwe. As a result of the influence of missionaries in Nyasaland, Chilembwe came to this country, studied diligently, and caught the inspiration to carry forward the struggle against tyranny from his Negro associates at the little Baptist school in Lynchburg, Va. When he returned to Africa, he knew what he wanted. He wanted freedom and independence for his people. The uprising he led in Nyasaland in 1915 ended in his own death, but it kindled the torch of freedom and independence that has burned ever since. It is this torch that Dr. Banda and his fellows are holding up today as they carry on the fight for independence. It was in this spirit that Aggrey, Nkrumah, Azikewe, and literally hundreds of other Africans trained in this country, sharing the fortunes and misfortunes of American Negroes, returned to their countries to build societies and governments based on human dignity and freedom. It is in this spirit that Tom Mboya, though not educated in the States, looks to his friends here to give him strength and support in his fight for freedom.

What has happened in Africa during the past decade is a result, in part, of the work of dedicated men and women like those African leaders who got much of their training and inspiration in this country. What is happening in Africa at the present time must be viewed in the perspective of history as well as in the context of current complex developments. This is as true of the Congo with all its tragic bloodshed and chaos as is of Nigeria with all its sophistication and obvious preparation for the responsibilities of citizenship. In Australia last summer I heard the Commonwealth Attorney General, Sir George Barwick, deplore conditions in the Congo and describe them as being at variance with independence movements in the Western World. In an address before the Australian Association for the United Nations I reminded Sir George and the Australian people that the United States fought 6 long, bloody years for its independence and even after that time neither an Englishman's life nor his property was worth much in New York, Boston, or Philadelphia. When one remembers the centuries of darkness and oppression that characterized European rule in Africa, one can deplore bloodshed, but one must understand it in the light of what had happened in Africa. And what has happened to Africa under European rule never happened to the United States under British rule. One is greatly distressed over events in some parts of Africa, but one must be greatly encouraged by other events that are, unhappily, obscured by the chaos in some places.

I was present in Nigeria in October when the Union Jack of Britain was lowered and the green and white flag of independent Nigeria was raised. It was an inspiring sight. Even more inspiring, however, was the countenance of the Nigerian people who could, at long last, hold up their heads in dignity. Whether it was a Hausa from the north riding a camel through the streets of Lagos or a Moslem medical student at the University at Ibadan, they had one thing in common: they were proud to be regarded as people worthy of their own land and traditions and ready to become forces in the modern world. If, however, one was impressed with what they were and what they had, one was more deeply impressed with what they could become and what they needed for that purpose. They, like their less privileged fellows in the Congo, in Nyasaland, and Kenya, need greater opportunities for their intellectual and economic development. They need technical assistance and training in order to master their own environments and promote their own general welfare. They need a healthy world environment in which to fulfill their own destinies.

They look across the Atlantic today as they have for a century in the hope that they will secure the assistance and inspiration that the people of the United States are capable of giving them. They want and need your help and mine. But we must be careful in defining the kind of assistance that they need. To be sure, they need the kind of substantive aid to which I have referred. But they also need the inspiration that we can give them. And it is about this that we must be most careful. The inspiration cannot be given by our merely sitting on the sidelines and cheering them on. They can look to the East of them and get this kind of encouragement. The inspiration they need and that we too seldom provide for them is the inspiration that comes from their seeing democratic institutions work effectively in a wholesome environment.

We have had every advantage in the effort to win the peoples of Africa over to our side. Long before Moscow had any interest in Africa, long before Moscow thought of establishing an International Friendship University, Africans looked to the West, traveled to the United States by the thousands to secure an education, and assimilated Western culture in a variety of ways. But they had their doubts, sometimes lingering, always present. They entertained serious doubts and they continue to entertain serious doubts about the good faith of the people of the United States. They continue to have doubts about the real interest of this country in their welfare or their future. The acceleration of solicitude in this country on their behalf is interpreted by many of them as merely a selfish gesture on our part to save our own necks by keeping the Russians out of Africa. When we come bearing gifts today, Africans are extremely suspicious of the contents of the package. One well-educated Nigerian, and one with sympathies for the West, told me that he remains unconvinced that the United States is interested in anything in Africa but keeping the continent in the orbit of the Western Powers. He doubted that there was any basic respect for the dignity of the African personality or for the Africans as a human being.

One's perception does not need to be very keen to understand what this week's demonstrations at the United Nations meant to the African people. To the African, it did not mean—as so many people in this country insist—that this was a Communist inspired demonstration in which American Negroes were given the cue to lash out against the United Nations and the U.S. delegation there. It did not mean to the African merely that a group of African Nationalists seized on this as on other opportunities to embarrass the United States and to promote their own peculiar and selfish interests here and abroad. To many Africans it meant, as James Reston said, that young Negroes were identifying with the larger struggle for freedom in which the Nation's ideals are proclaimed to the world but denied to many Negroes at home. It reminded the African that despite the great progress that Negroes have made in many areas, they still live under the most appalling condition in many cities and suffer many indignities which their rising knowledge of the world will not permit them to accept.

Regardless of what interpretations Africans themselves might have put on the unfortunate demonstrations in New York on Thursday, these demonstrations should serve as a warning to us that as long as our own house is not in order, we lend ourselves to attacks at home and lack of faith abroad. The inspiration that Africans need from us today is the inspiration of knowing and seeing that democracy works here, that people of African descent are not victims of the blind and unconscionable racism that has characterized too much of our history. They need to be certain that as they look about them and examine the conflicting ideologies, ours is indeed the best hope on earth. If they do not find this to be so, they will desert us; and we shall be left to work out our salvation without the support and endorsement that would come to us if we were a real democracy, practicing what we preached.

There were times when we could enjoy the luxury of inch-by-inch evolution in the progression toward decency in human relations. In 1865 the whites who had enslaved Negroes for more than 2 centuries asked this Nation to give it time to get accustomed to the idea of Negroes as free people. Not only did this Nation and the world give them time, but the Negro in his remarkable patience, also gave time—plenty of time. When any step forward was made or attempted, there was the cry that things are moving too fast, radicals and subversives are infiltrating, and we must take our own good time. A century has elapsed and, indeed, time has run out. In the middle of the 20th century, the luxury of snail's pace improvement has yielded some good returns but not enough; and it has also yielded some bitter fruits.

A minister of finance from the Republic of Ghana is denied service in a Delaware

restaurant. An African delegate to the United Nations is insulted when he goes to Georgia to observe the workings of democracy in a national election. A South Carolina Negro is chased at the point of a shotgun from a gasoline station by a white proprietor who shouts that desegregation is a Communist plot and that he wants no Negro in his place of business. A white Methodist minister escorts his 6-year-old daughter to a desegregated school in New Orleans and is spat upon by hissing hysterical white mothers. A white nursing supervisor in Florida is caught having lunch with her Negro colleague and is dismissed for the "crime." An Illinois town condemns property to be occupied by Negroes and declares that the town needs the land for a public park. Members of the U.S. Senate oppose the confirmation of one of the Nation's most distinguished housing authorities as housing administrator because his skin happens to be a shade or two darker than lily-white. When our heart goes out to Africa in its so-called backwardness, save some heart for the medicine men, headhunters, and cannibals of the United States. They deserve the pity of all men here and in Africa who live on a civilized plane.

But if they deserve our pity, they do not deserve our indulgence. For they, in their folly, would wreck our civilization and would, at the same time, destroy every chance for us to join hands with our brothers in other parts of the world to erect on this earth a social order in which all men can live in peace and dignity. Bigots and bigotry must be destroyed, not by violence but by the quiet, impatient, dignified destruction of every vestige of power wielded by these purveyors of hate. This house of ours must become a place in which all can live peacefully together, respecting each other, conceding to each other all the rights that any of us enjoy. As we look to our brothers across the seas, whether they be in Europe, Africa, or Asia, or Australia, we in America must be conscious of the ways we can help them. The extended hand must come from one whose heart is committed to equality. If the heart is not committed to equality the hand will be rejected. And as surely as we are standing in this place honoring this great and good man who has done so much with such a good heart, we shall live out our lives in misery and chaos. We deserve a better fate than that only if we work for it with all our hearts, souls, and minds.

Railroaders Seek No Favors or Special Privileges—Only Equality of Treatment for All Forms of Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, recently the board of directors of the Association of American Railroads, representing railroads that account for the great bulk of the industry's 800,000 employees adopted a Magna Carta for transportation appealing for equal Government treatment for all forms of carriage.

A copy of the association's declaration follows:

MAGNA CARTA FOR TRANSPORTATION

(Declaration adopted by the board of directors of the Association of American Railroads, made public on March 20, 1961, by AAR President Daniel P. Loomis)

The railroaders of America, responsible for meeting our country's transportation needs in war and peace, solemnly declare that their industry is in jeopardy to the detriment of the national interest.

A major cause of this condition lies in unequal Government treatment compared with other forms of transportation—in overregulation, subsidization of competition, and inequitable tax policies which discriminate against railroads.

As a result of these conditions, thousands of jobs in the railroad and related industies have been lost and more thousands are in jeopardy, the public has been denied the kind of fast, low-cost transportation a dynamic economy demands, and the Nation's defense capability has been weakened to an alarming degree.

The national interest cries for an end to such distressful conditions. These are matters of legislative determination and can be corrected only by legislative action.

We, the railroaders of America, therefore respectfully petition the Congress of the United States and the governing authorities for the following four freedoms: Freedom from discriminatory regulation, freedom from discriminatory taxation, freedom from subsidized competition, and freedom to provide a diversified transportation service.

Railroaders seek no favors or special privileges. They seek only equality of treatment for all forms of transportation—the traditional American concept of fairplay.

Reelfoot Lake History and Tradition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor of representing the Eighth Congressional District of Tennessee. In this district is Reelfoot Lake. It is such an outstanding body of water that I feel I should bring this to the attention of the Congress. The history and tradition of this fine lake follow:

REELFOOT LAKE HISTORY AND TRADITION

The northwestern corner of Tennessee where Reelfoot Lake lies, although the youngest section of the State in regard to settlement and development, is nevertheless very rich in history and tradition.

If we begin with history, we find that it was not until 1785 that the white man spent any time in west Tennessee. Henry Rutherford, a surveyor from North Carolina, and two companions were early travelers in this territory. A survey called the I.C. Line was made which now marks the main street of Tiptonville.

Tennessee became a State in 1796; but west Tennessee was not then a part of the State, being still Indian country. It was not until 1818 that Andrew Jackson and Isaac Shelby inveigled the Chickasaws into signing a treaty by which this beautiful country was added to the domain of Tennessee.

Reelfoot Lake came into existence between the time of the surveyors' entrance to the section and that of the Jackson purchase. Rutherford and his companions came into northwest Tennessee on the Reelfoot River, which is now included in the lake where it can clearly be seen because of the fact that no trees nor stumps lie in its channel.

According to Indian legend, Reelfoot, a chieftain of the Chickasaws, in the course of his wanderings, met and fell violently in love with Starlight, princess of the Choctaws. Forbidden by her father to marry her, Reelfoot and his braves stole her. After the return home, as they celebrated the success of the venture, the earth opened up and swallowed the whole tribe as an indication of the wrath of the gods.

History is more reliable than this legend. It states that Reelfoot Lake was formed during the earthquakes of 1811–12, when the whole Mississippi Valley north of Louisiana was virgin forest and when only a few settlements of white men existed in this region.

Today, Reelfoot Lake is a magnet which draws tourists from every section of the Nation to Lake County—a county different from all others in Tennessee in that there cannot be found within its borders a native rock, a hill, nor a running rill. Here lies the beauty spot, Reelfoot Lake, having nationwide admiration—a land of delight for the naturalist, the angler, and the hunter.

The House Rebukes James Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, I am asking unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Santa Monica Evening Outlook of March 6, 1961, forwarded to me by Mr. Donald Jackson, former ranking Republican of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. This editorial speaks for itself:

THE HOUSE REBUKES JAMES ROOSEVELT

If any further proof were needed of the widespread public support of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the overwhelming vote in the House on the annual appropriation for the committee should be sufficient. In unmistakable terms, by a tally of 412 to 6, the House told Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT and his five supporters that it wanted no part of his plan to make America safe for traitors by abolishing the committee.

Even Mr. ROOSEVELT should get the point now.

The House went further and rendered an unusual tribute to the committee and its chairman, Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER of Pennsylvania. Members rose to their feet in a standing ovation when Representative WALTER addressed the House, taking Mr. ROOSEVELT to task for his continuing efforts to emasculate HUAC.

Far more responsive to the grassroots sentiment than the Senate is the House of Representatives. Its Members must stand for reelection every 2 years, so it is incumbent on them to keep their fingers on the public pulse at all times. Their vote of confidence in HUAC, denying any cut in its appropriations, undoubtedly reflected the sentiments of the great majority of their

constituents—meaning the great majority of Americans.

Let the strange assortment of Communists, fellow travelers, Soviet apologists and liberal dupes of Moscow take note of what can happen when an aroused people indicate their wishes in no uncertain terms through those who represent them in Congress.

Address by Hon. Jessica McC. Weis, of New York, Before the Federation of Citizens Associations of the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech of the Honorable JESSICA MCC. WEIS, of New York, before the annual dinner of the Federation of Citizens Associations of the District of Columbia, Saturday, March 11, 1961, at the Mayflower Hotel:

TEXT OF SPEECH OF HON. JESSICA MCC. WEIS, OF NEW YORK, A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMITTEE, BEFORE THE ANNUAL DINNER OF THE FEDERATION OF CITIZENS ASSOCIATIONS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, SATURDAY, MARCH 11, MAYFLOWER HOTEL

The District of Columbia is today confronted with a large variety of serious problems, some typical of all major metropolitan areas and some quite unique. These problems have been aired and studied and analyzed by House and Senate District committees, joint committees, congressional hearings, advisory committees, private study groups, car pool riders, businessmen at lunch, women at bridge parties—everybody discusses the District's problems, but it sometimes seems as Mark Twain once observed about the weather, "Everybody talks about it but nobody does anything about it."

In thinking about the District, I have found it useful to think in terms of the problems which are common to all large metropolitan areas in this country on the one hand, and those which seem unique to the District on the other. It is easy to forget, sometimes, that other areas are suffering the same stresses and strains with which we ourselves are confronted, but I can assure you that many of your civic vexations here are also being experienced and grappled with in my own home city of Rochester, N.Y., as well as in every urban center in the United States. Among these I would list at least the following:

The shift in population, which has produced a decline in total population within the District and an even greater relative decline in the productive, wage-earning portion of the population between ages 21 and 64. This has produced in the District the seeming paradox of declining population and rising welfare costs.

The increase in juvenile delinquency and in crimes of almost every kind. Washington has increased the size of its police force regularly—a force recognized for its dedication and efficiency—and still the crime rate moves upward at an alarming rate.

Then there is the traffic problem—enough to try the patience of a saint which I certainly am not as I fight my way back and forth to work every day. The crush of traffic has become insupportable, and I am convinced that the longer we wait the more it is going to cost to solve this Chinese puzzle. Some form of rapid transit, be it monorail, subway, freeway, or a combination of all of them would seem to be an absolute must. You are all familiar with the transit survey which was undertaken jointly by the National Capital Planning Commission and the National Capital Regional Planning Commission. In some ways the survey is startling, both in its scope and in its projected cost. Largely this is true because in recent decades not a single solitary step has been taken toward development of a mass transportation system for the metropolitan area, and as a result, the problem has become acute. No doubt the costs will be high, no one denies this, but the alternatives are equally unpleasant to contemplate. In my opinion, either we manage to pay the cost or we resign ourselves to further decay of many portions of the central city and the complete strangulation of traffic throughout the entire area.

Likewise common to metropolitan areas everywhere are the slum areas, the question of urban renewal, pollution control, which in Washington with the historic Potomac has esthetic as well as sanitary implications. Also, the problem of education, of adequate school facilities, of competent administrators and of adequately paid teachers. These matters are in the papers daily. We know the problems and in many cases we know the answers. Further than that, I am convinced that real progress is being made in some areas. These are among the metropolitan difficulties shared by all our cities. But, as I mentioned earlier, Washington has some unique situations which are extremely serious. At least three matters come to mind which fall into this category: the race question, the difficulties of dealing with an extremely unwieldy governmental structure, and the problem of a wholly inadequate tax base from which to generate the revenues needed to keep the city going. One could easily devote a doctor's thesis to any one of these, but tonight I can only comment on each of them briefly.

The race question in the District is one of serious proportion and its ramifications, both direct and indirect, are numerous. The white population has dropped 20 percent in 10 years, and while I am the first to admit that I am no expert on this subject, I do not believe it would be in the national interest, or in the best interests of the residents of the District, of whatever race or nationality they may be, for this trend to continue. In this connection, I might say that the adjacent neighborhoods and communities in the suburbs of Maryland and Virginia have an obligation to welcome Negro citizens and provide opportunities for housing and education comparable to those in the District, for the great bulk of the Negro population of the Washington metropolitan area is, in effect, now quarantined within the boundaries of the District. This is not, I know, a subject which it is popular to discuss, but it is with us and it must be not only discussed, but solved.

Another situation which I find extremely disturbing is that of the hopelessly confusing assortment of local governmental agencies through which the affairs of the District are handled. After 2 full years on the District Committee, I have yet to solve the mysteries of the labyrinth known collectively as the District Government. Four separate congressional committees exercise jurisdiction over District matters, a situation which is tailor-made to produce snafus and bottlenecks of all types, and if the organization of the Congress for dealing with District matters is less than desirable, and ineffective, the structure within the District Government is equally bad. Ever since 1874 the District has been administered by Commissioners, but their administrative function is often questioned and interfered with by the Congress—the result being that over the years a patchwork of legislation has created about 20 Federal agencies and local boards to operate independently of the Commissioners. Regardless of one's position on the question of complete home rule, surely the present situation could stand considerable improvement.

An incidental matter which concerns me is the fact that a high percentage of top jobs in the District government are held, not by District residents, but by residents of nearby States. This raises the question of whether their interest in the District is as great as actual residents might be presumed to have. I have not checked recently, but in March of 1959 all three assistants to the engineer commissioner were from outside the District, as were the chiefs of the Employment and Training Division and the Classification and Wage Administration Division in the Personnel Office. Other high ratios were noted in the Fire Department, in which only 9 of 20 battalion chiefs were local residents, the Department of Licenses and Inspections, with only 6 or 19 executives living in the District and the Motor Vehicles Department, in which 1 officer in 8 was a District resident. Is it too much to ask, I wonder, that high-ranking District employees make their homes in the District?

Finally, there is the toughest one of all—an inadequate tax base from which to generate the revenues to do the things which need to be done in the District. With 52 percent of the real estate in the District off the tax rolls, and with productive, income tax paying citizens migrating to the suburbs in increasing numbers, the burden is constantly being shifted to that property and those people who do remain. It is only a question of time before demand for tax dollars completely outdistances the sources of revenue available. The competition of neighboring jurisdiction places an economic ceiling on tax measures, and as a result District budget planners have found themselves virtually impaled on the horns of this dilemma of rising costs and dwindling revenue—and may I add that to date the Congress has contented itself on many occasions with watching them bleed.

But it's time to leave the wailing wall. Washington is a beautiful city and we all love it. But it seems to be the fashion to bemoan the plight of the District and to criticize the effort—or lack of it—which has been made to lift the District to a new plateau. I have perhaps been guilty myself, for it is extremely easy to be critical, but if so I want to balance the scales by referring to the encouraging trends which are clearly visible within the District, for certainly substantial progress has been made in the face of heavy odds.

And let me say, in this connection, that the activities of the citizens associations and the civic associations within the District have made a real contribution to finding solutions to the District's problems. In its magnitude and enthusiasm, the citizens movement in the District is to my knowledge absolutely unique. I am certain that there must be more citizens associations per square mile in the District than in any other place in the world and this is good. Your citizens associations meetings resemble the town meetings of our forefathers, at which residents of the community came together periodically to consider, discuss and make decisions on a tremendous variety of local problems. The citizens association movement presents an attempt to make democracy work at the lowest grassroots level, and I commend you for what you have done and wish for you a long period of even greater service in the years ahead. I hope and trust that you will continue to maintain effective liaison with all civic-minded associations,

and that all groups can work closely together in effecting solutions to all of the many problems of mutual concern to white and Negro alike, for it would be a great loss if the two groups served to drive a wedge between the two races rather than to build a bridge between them.

With reference to specific improvements which I have observed in the District, I am convinced that substantial progress is being made with the District school system, despite what some of my colleagues may say to the contrary, most of which is for home consumption. The important teacher-pupil ratio has been decreased, and Washington ranks with any of the major cities in this respect. Building of new schools is keeping pace with demand and slowly overcoming the schoolroom shortage. Salaries have achieved comparability with other metropolitan areas—though they are all a bit low. Advances are being made in scholastic attainment among children in the public schools, even though median achievements are still below national norms.

In the area of slum clearance and urban renewal, much remains to be done, but I made an extensive visit through the southwest redevelopment area on Thursday of this week and I was much impressed with what I could see there now and what I was assured would be there in the years immediately ahead. Solid progress has been made there, and I share with you the hope that the entire project can go forward to completion as quickly as possible. I can see the distinct possibility that completion of the southwest redevelopment could trigger off and serve as a magnet for a return from the suburbs, which is something that is drastically needed.

Despite its promise, however, I am distressed by the plight of some of the people whose homes have been literally torn out from under them in the southwest and for whom apparently inadequate provisions have been made elsewhere. Individual cases which have been discussed with me are nothing short of tragic, and I hope that every effort will be made to correct all of the injustices which exist in this regard.

Other accomplishments of potentially major significance are the establishment of the Washington Metropolitan Regional Conference, and the activities of local businessmen, typified by the organizations such as Downtown Progress, Inc., to revitalize the downtown shopping area.

The Washington Metropolitan Regional Conference, envisioning as it does close cooperation among an assortment of governmental units in the metropolitan area—including two States, six counties, two independent cities, and several Federal agencies—gives promise of developing into a most effective vehicle for coordinated multijurisdictional action. Downtown Progress, Inc., in a like manner gives promise of serving as a most productive self-help organization for attracting more trade to the downtown area.

I have discussed the problems of the District and some of the efforts which are being made to solve them. Let me look now for just a few minutes at what still needs to be done, and let me preface these final remarks by saying that adequate solutions to the District's problems are going to take the combined efforts—and the best efforts—of everyone concerned, including the citizens of the District themselves, the District Government and the Federal Government, both the Congress and the executive. To make the District what it should be, and could be—we are going to have to roll up our sleeves and do the job ourselves, and it will require a maximum amount of patience, tolerance, good will and plain hard work—and, I might add, a great deal of money—for rebuilding and breathing new life into a city cannot be done on a shoestring.

There are two items which seem of particular importance to me. One of these is the need for a concerted program to retain the well-educated productive citizens who still make their homes in the District, as well as a program specifically designed to bring similar type people back from the suburbs or into the District for the first time. Such a program will serve two important purposes: It will broaden the tax base, and it will provide the District with a valuable reservoir of new talent with which to cope with future problems. In the same way, more should be done to promote the location in Washington of the national headquarters of more of our trade associations, more stimulus for reserach and engineering firms to locate here, more encouragement for industry to set up offices in Washington. All of these things could be done without changing the character of the District appreciably, and all would, in my opinion, add to the economic vitality of the District.

A second item, which I have also touched on lightly, is the need for enlightened cooperation between Negroes and whites in the District. For many of us, and I do not exclude myself, the roots of racial prejudice are difficult to weed out. Many of you can remember a time when Washington was, at least as race relations go, a part of the Deep South, and memories linger long, but we have come to a different age, and unless we develop the tolerance and good sense to deal with this problem realistically, it will surely defeat us.

Finally, I come to what some of you will call the main course, those things which I think the Congress should be doing for the District, and may I say that not only as a Member of Congress, but as an American citizen with a deep and abiding interest in the American Government and in the Capital City in which that Government is situated, I am deeply concerned with the obligation of Congress to provide for the needs of the District of Columbia. I am only one Member among a very large number, but it seems to me that this responsibility is so clear and so plain that no reasonable and well-intentioned person could deny it.

Because Washington is our Capital City, it draws people here on business and also brings vast numbers of tourists as well, not only from this country, but from all over the world. It is, in a sense, a showcase of America for all the world to see. As such, it should be a model city, employing all the knowledge and professional skills of our civilization to make it beautiful, attractive, clean, and safe. This is important, not only to you and me who live here and work here, but to all Americans now and for all the years to come. And because it is the Nation's Capital, established specifically and solely for that purpose, and because the Constitution contains a specific mandate to the Congress to provide for its needs, it seems to me that the responsibility of the Congress is inescapable. Inescapable, too, is the fact that the Congress has not effectively discharged this responsibility to the District.

What is past is finished, but for the immediate future, it is my belief that the Congress must do at least the following things:

First, it should bear a more realistic portion of the costs of operating the District. A larger Federal payment can be justified on several grounds. It is my belief that the Congress has a responsibility to provide financial support over and above the moneys that can be collected from taxes comparable to those of surrounding communities, in the amount necessary to care adequately for the District's needs. For many years the Federal payment was 50 percent of District needs; today it is little over 10 percent and if the authorized payment were raised to $56 million, as requested by the Commissioners, the Federal Government would be contributing less than 15 percent of the estimated needs for 1962. An authorized Federal payment of $50 million would still be less than 20 percent of the District's overall budget for next year. With a total budget of $290 million, $50 million does not seem to me to be an unreasonable amount for the Federal Government to make available to the Nation's Capital when I consider the amounts which are being spent on other items.

Secondly, I think we should move quickly to provide the two additional juvenile court judges who are so desperately needed. The juvenile court is now 2,200 cases behind and the backlog is growing daily, while in the meantime the delinquency rate grows steadily worse. There is no excuse for this situation to continue.

Finally, I would hope that the new administration will take a long look at its responsibilities and that the President will move to exercise the positive leadership which he has talked so much about. His interest in District affairs might go a long way toward getting more sympathetic action in the Congress. With his Democratic Party in control of both the Congress and the White House, the responsibility for action is clear cut—and I might add that blame for lack of action is equally easy to assess. I sincerely hope and pray that the President will take an active interest in the District and that we can move ahead now with the steps which must be taken if we are to make of the District the splendid and beautiful central city of the Nation that it ought to be.

I pledge to you that as one member of the Congress, I shall do all that I can by my vote and through whatever influence I may possess, to see that this great national objective, so close to the minds and hearts of all of you, is realized.

The College Social Fraternity—Cradle of Future Public Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Dr. Brendan F. Brown, professor of law, Loyola University of the South, New Orleans, La., at the annual national convention of Alpha Delta Gamma on August 24, 1960, at New Orleans, La.:

THE COLLEGE SOCIAL FRATERNITY—CRADLE OF FUTURE PUBLIC LEADERSHIP

I

Mr. Chairman, Your Excellency Archbishop Rummel, Acting Mayor Schiro, officers and brothers of Alpha Delta Gamma in national convention assembled, it was with a very deep sense of appreciation and gratitude that I accepted the cordial invitation to address you today tendered on your behalf by Brother Fritz Veters, the dynamic national steward of Alpha Delta Gamma. After 5 years Epsilon Chapter is again your host in beautiful New Orleans.

The objectives of Alpha Delta Gamma are necessarily coordinated with the aims of the Catholic tradition. Though membership is not restricted to Catholics, yours is the only national Catholic social fraternity, which exists exclusively in Catholic colleges and

universities. It is wholly dedicated to the task of uniting intellectual, moral, and social living together with the ideals of Catholic learning. The founders of Alpha Delta Gamma in 1924 extracted the best and most constructive elements from the system of the American Greek letter fraternity, as it then existed, and combined them with the truths of Christianity, even as Thomas Aquinas in the 13th century utilized the wisdom of the Greeks in his famous synthesis.

Hence, as members of Alpha Delta Gamma, you have a very special responsibility to understand the unique character of Catholic education. This was the obligation you assumed, when, as an elite corp of select men, gathered from far flung campuses which span the continent, you became united in the fraternal ties of eternal friendship, comradeship, and mutual support in the cause of Catholic action. You have a living stake in the knowledge of the total implications of the history and philosophy of Catholic higher education, and of its ceaseless struggle against the forces of secularism.

Catholic higher education has been inspired by an intellectual and spiritual culture which is founded on the wisdom of divine revelation and the profound insights of a philosophical tradition built by such masters as Aristotle and Aquinas, Suarez and Bellarmine, Chesterton, and Maritain. This concept of the nature of Catholic education was expressed by Cardinal Newman when he wrote: "I wish the intelect to range with the utmost freedom, and religion to enjoy an equal freedom; but what I am stipulating for is, that they should be found in one and the same place, exemplified in the same persons" (Newman, "Intellect, the Instrument of Religious Training," in "Sermons Preached on Various Occasions," first sermon). Hence, Catholic colleges and universities are needed for adequacy of knowledge. The product of a sound education is the person, who, in the words of Pius XI, "thinks, judges, and acts constantly and consistently in accordance with right reason illumined by the supernatural light of the example and teaching of Christ" ("Encyclical on Christian Education of Youth, Five Great Encyclicals," p. 37 at 65, Paulist Press, New York, 1940).

Historically, the chief problem of Catholic education was to discover a proper balance between the study of the supernatural law and the investigation of the rational, social and physical sciences as integrated under natural law. Trial and error were required to find that balance from the time of Isidore of Seville in the 7th century down through the time of Alcuin and Charlemagne, later through the period of the rise of the great medieval European universities of Bologna, Paris, and Oxford, and eventually in the stages of the Renaissance, the Protestant Reformation, and the modern era of materialism. During this historical progression, the true ideal of a Catholic university remained constant, namely, the seeking of perfection in the discovery and communication of knowledge, and the cultivation of the intellect, but always by way of vital relationship with the most luminous of the sciences, i.e., that of the divine positive law.

The chief inadequacy of the modern secular college or university results from its incapacity to teach that the immutable and eternal truths of the natural and supernatural laws constitute the bedrock foundation of our civilization, and that the survival and propagation of these truths are essential for the happiness of men on earth, and for their salvation in the hereafter. The adoption of relativistic attitudes toward the educational processes by secular institutions of higher learning has opened the door to conflicting philosophies, ranging from the obviously pragmatic and antimetaphysical theories of John Dewey to the more acceptable but inadequate views of Alfred Whitehead, who believed in the need of sensitivity to beauty and human feeling, yet maintained that a principle was only a habit of thought. Conflicting philosophies, often in the same institutions, destroy each other, create intellectual confusion and moral doubt, and lead to belief in a power concept of human existence.

The overall objective of supporting the principles of the Catholic tradition is the most fundamental justification for the existence of our fraternity. It looms large when a student is pledged to Alpha Delta Gamma. But in every human society, there is a tendency for ideals to suffer in the mundane routine of daily living. Truly it has been said that great ideals never fail men, but men often fail great ideals. Hence, a word of caution may here be in order lest the spirit of the group, as expressed in its actual conduct, its typical conversations, and its habitual policies, deviate from the ideals which have been formally expressed with the resulting disillusionment of neophyte members.

It is evident that the principal purpose of joining a social fraternity varies somewhat with each individual. That purpose may be to facilitate companionship with congenial friends, or to obtain the recognition and support of an organized group by coming within one of the standardized corporate structures of undergraduate college life. Again, secrecy may have been the chief attraction to the fraternity, or the opportunity to associate closely with the best men on the campus, men who have achieved honor and prestige, and who have won the good will and friendship of the faculties of their respective schools.

These are all legitimate purposes as long as they are subordinated to the promotion of the dominant social ideal. The justice and effectiveness of the adjustment of the individual and social interests in this regard are the measure of the success of any chapter. The record of the activities of the various chapters, as contained in your excellent official publication "Alphadelity," gives assurance that not only does our fraternity use social life to stimulate congeniality, but combines social activities with Catholic practice in such a way as to leave no doubt that the ideals of Catholic education do control the subultimate aims of convivial living and good fellowship.

II

The fraternal life in college or university is for the final purpose of acquiring experience and training for leadership in the national and international communities. The activities in which you are now engaged are symbolic of your future contributions to church, state, and society. Today, as members of Alpha Delta Gamma, you act as leaders in the activities of your school and the promoters of its spirit. You engage in several extracurricular activities, and financially and physically support all the functions of your school. Your policy is to promote the good of the fraternity by advancing that of the university in question. Tomorrow, you will be expected to act as leaders in the maintenance and extension of that cultural tradition which made possible our most cherished institutions by lifting mankind from the abyss of barbarism. That tradition alone provides the cohesive force which holds the civilization of the free world together as it courageously awaits its greatest crisis in the impending final showdown with communism. Tomorrow, you will participate in professional, social, civic, charitable, political, and religious activities which will redound to the credit of your fraternity, your alma mater, and the system of education in which you have been nourished.

The fraternal activities, in which you now engaged as members of an organization transcending the limitations of an isolated campus, develop a national point of view and afford a comparative approach cutting across geographical variations. You have been trained to measure and evaluate your own conduct and social contributions by an external standard which has been created for Alpha Delta Gamma. A test of leadership is ever before your eyes. This constitutes the indispensable measure of an extracurricular training and experience which will aid you in assuming an effective initiative in the beneficial service of the larger fraternity of the Nation.

You are the bearers of the values which form the basic postulates of our national way of thought and action. The preservation of these values, insofar as they relate to the nature of man, law, the family, the state, and God, will be the most important part of the mission which awaits your leadership. All else must be considered as final means toward this aspect of your mission in afterlife.

While your fraternity has trained you for action by providing practice in the techniques and methods of group living and cooperative action for the achievement of praiseworthy goals, the schedules of studies offered by your respective alma maters have taught you to recognize the existence of a divine plan in the drama of the cosmos. From this plan, it becomes evident that there is a natural law, which may be described as that objective, immutable, and eternal hierarchy of moral values, which are sources of obligation with regard to men because they have been so ordained by the Creator of nature. The philosophy of an objective natural law drew the pattern for our American political, social, and legal institutions. This philosophy wrote the Magna Carta in 1215, dictated the Declaration of Independence in 1776, inspired the American Bill of Rights in 1789, and chartered the course of constitutional law in the United States from the days of John Marshall. It alone provides the authority, implemented by the Federal Constitution, by which the Supreme Court of the United States dares to strike down a legislative enactment as unconstitutional, under the uniquely American doctrine of judicial supremacy.

Your contribution to American life and culture will include the most compelling justification ever proclaimed for the existence of human rights and their protection. For you, these rights are not the creation of physical force, however necessary that may be for their effectuation. You are convinced that human rights are not derived from compacts or human will. Man was never without these rights, for the so-called state of nature is a historical fiction. These rights are the inescapable consequences of human nature and the dictates of the natural law. Yet your faith in the inestimable value of man exceeds even that which springs from the natural law, for you believe that man has been exalted to the status of an adopted son of Almighty God. This is the maximum appraisal of the dignity of human nature. It provides the firmest possible basis for the inviolability of human rights.

The attitude toward teamwork, brotherhood, and the requisite balance between the individual and the group, which you have learned in the association with your fraternity brothers, will be valuable regardless of your particular future calling or life work. Some of you will enter the business, professional, and scientific worlds. Others will undertake the service of the state, while some will respond to the call of a religious vocation. Some will have greater opportunities than others to influence and mold public opinion for the common good, and to direct trends toward the formation of sound policies resulting in justice and peace. But regardless of the diversity of your careers, your present fraternal experience gives promise that each of you will make an

indispensable contribution whether it be in the national or international community, commensurate with the unusual opportunities which you have been privileged to enjoy.

The crises of our times challenge your leadership by forcing the issue whether the American people are able to remain faithful generally speaking, to the truths of a natural law, or whether they will surrender that philosophy, which historically has made them great, as the result of pressures from false and often malicious modes and habits of thought. These have created destructive interpretations of what is good for man and society. The people of this country have never been quite sure whether or not their concept of natural law rested on an immutable and extrinsic foundation. They have not been able to decide definitively whether the will of a majority of the people, or the basic principles of the natural law, should prevail as the final source of moral authority in case of an ultimate and final conflict between the two in an important matter. It will be your responsibility, as scholastic thinkers in the rational and social sciences, to convince your fellow countrymen that any withdrawal from the reality of the natural law can lead only to national schizophrenia or split national personality.

III

Ever increasing opportunities are being made available to promising college graduates for education, training, and experience, as a preparation for world leadership. These opportunities include fellowships, scholarships, and financial grants which will assist you to realize your ambition of intelligent public service. Other opportunities include the availability of participation in projects fostering such service, which are now being undertaken by certain institutions of higher learning, and also by a few national organizations. Fortnightly discussions of the great books of the past are sponsored by the Great Books Foundation throughout the land.

The purpose of all these systematic programs is to make you aware, generally speaking, of the goals of true democracy, as well as the experience of history, and the success or failure of preceding generations to solve problems which are at least analogous to our own, because they spring from the very nature of man himself and his complex drives. I exhort you to make an inventory of all possible educational opportunities with the assistance of your school advisers and friends, at least upon the completion of your undergraduate education. It is your duty to cooperate in every possible way with those who have created these opportunities at the cost of great effort and expenditure of money.

The knowledge and experience which you will accumulate by following a continuous program of adult education in after life must be galvanized into social action by a dynamic motivation to serve the common good rather than the individual interest of monetary acquisition and gain. The need for such service by the most talented and intellectually gifted is being ever more widely recognized. It was long ago emphasized, for example, by two men of widely different backgrounds, personalities and mentalities, who have done much to influence the American scene. I refer to my old professor, Felix Frankfurter, and my good friend Father James G. Keller, founder of the Christopher movement, which calls upon each individual to do his utmost, as an individual, in advancing the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God. Professor Frankfurter, decades ago, substituted the ideal of public service in Washington for that of a lucrative career as a Wall Street lawyer as most worthy of the mettle of a Harvard Law Review man. For many years, Father Keller has preached the Gospel of leadership through careers in government, teaching, mass media of communication, labor organizations and the like, despite personal financial sacrifice. These are the areas which Communists have been directed to infiltrate and exploit as channels for their subversive propaganda. It would indeed be ironical if the profit motive, which has played such a praiseworthy role in generating psychological power for the capitalistic system, should lure our best brains from careers of public leadership, and thus aid the cause of communism.

Men of Alpha Delta Gamma, educate yourselves progressively all through life in order that you may transmit the benefits of your educational experience to others. Acquire maturity in the art and techniques of administration so that you may apply the resulting wisdom to the preservation of the freedom of man, within the framework of right reason, as a spiritual being, endowed with the power of making free moral choices. It is true that the need of leadership in the field of the physical sciences is essential to cope successfully, for example, with the still unsolved problems of certain types of diseases which shorten human life. It is also true that such leadership is essential to maintain our supremacy in the invention and perfection of superior weapons of defense in the disarmament race with the slave world in order to deter unjust aggression. The experience of the Nation during the past few years in the face of Soviet achievement in the missile and rocket fields has resulted in an adequate emphasis upon the imperative demand for better and more extensive training and education to produce scientific leadership. But it must never be forgotten that leadership in the physical sciences depends for its success, and for the establishment of the goals to be reached through such success, by leadership which influences public opinion and controls the policymaking power of the State, in the sense of politically organized society.

IV

I know that the advantages of this convention will be many. The annual convention has become an integral part of the life of almost every national organization, because there is no substitute, in the realm of intellectual growth and understanding, for the living exchange of ideas between persons, meeting face to face. Such a convention is particularly required in the instances of those associations and groups which are engaged in the advancement of cultural, educational, professional and scientific projects, because the subject matter of intercommunication with regard to such projects is more abstract, complex, technical, and ideational. The objectives of our fraternity come within this classification.

Many benefits will accrue during the numerous instructive and pleasurable hours which you will spend together at this convention. Like its predecessors, it symbolizes the realization of the objectives of our common brotherhood. It will afford a formal occasion for rededication in national assembly to the aims and purposes of our fraternity. It will enable men of high caliber and broad outlook from many schools to compare views. It will engender a spirit of camaraderie among the representatives of the member chapters, which will tend to weld them more together than in the past. It will afford an opportunity for the delegates to meet, in a socially intimate atmosphere, many whom they had hitherto known only by name or correspondence.

In conclusion, I congratulate Mr. Veters for his efficient handling of the overall work of preparing for this convention. I commend Father Louis Hiegel, the popular and beloved moderator of Epsilon chapter, and the officers of that chapter, as well as all others who have been responsible for launching this magnificent meeting. I praise your enthusiam, imagination, and lightness of heart as you spend yourselves unselfishly in the service of a God-given cause. Those who direct the destinies of church and State are proud of you.

And now, brothers in Alpha Delta Gamma, I bid you farewell. May your days be many and full of joy and happiness. May you carry away fond memories of Loyola University of the South and of her loyal sons. May you come again ere long to this quaint and historic Crescent City, the pride of the Southland. May God bless you and keep you and smile upon you.

Grants-in-Aid for Public Health Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. H. FOUNTAIN
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced, for appropriate reference, a bill to implement recommendations made recently by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations for the purpose of simplifying and improving the administration of Federal grants-in-aid for public health services. The gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER], who represents the House so ably as my colleague on the Advisory Commission, joins me in this action.

The Advisory Commission was created by Congress in September 1958 as an instrument for bringing together public officials from all levels of government for the consideration of common problems, including feasible methods for achieving greater coordination and simplification in programs requiring intergovernmental cooperation. Earlier this month I introduced H.R. 5155 relating to the first of the Commission's legislative recommendations seeking to increase the coordination and effectiveness of Federal-State programs. That bill deals with Federal and State taxation of estates and inheritances.

The bill which I have introduced today is intended to accomplish two objectives. First, it would amend the Public Health Service Act of 1944 to permit States, at the discretion of the Governor concerned, to transfer up to one-third of the Federal funds granted in any one category to one or more of four other public health categories. It is proposed that this flexibility apply to the following five categorical grants: general health assistance, cancer control, heart disease control, tuberculosis control, and venereal disease control. The bill would not affect the remaining health categories of mental health, maternal and child health, and crippled children's services.

It is believed that the transfer provision would allow the States sufficient flexibility to apply the Federal funds to the categories of the greatest need within the particular State, while at the same time providing assurance to the Congress that in terms of the Nation as a whole

the categorical areas would receive the relative emphasis placed upon them by the Congress in annual appropriations.

Second, the bill would establish a uniform allotment and matching formula for Federal grants to States in the special categories listed above. A number of differing formulas are now applicable to these five categories. The Advisory Commission believes this diversity is of doubtful value and causes unnecessary complexity at both the National and State levels. It is the Commission's view that a combination of population, as a general indicator of relative program need among the States, and per capita income, as an indicator of financial ability, would be fair to all the States.

The Commission has not yet been able to study the general question of the extent to which Federal grants should be used to equalize variations in State fiscal resources. However, since the Hill-Burton formula has come into general use in other Public Health Service grant programs, such as the hospital construction program, the Commission recommends that a formula patterned generally along the lines of that formula be applied to the disease-control grants in place of the present diverse requirements.

Chief Justice Earl Warren

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a native Californian and a great American, Earl Warren, celebrated his 70th birthday.

In his 11 years as Governor of the State of California Mr. Warren served with a distinction clearly evidenced by the widespread support he received from California's voters.

He is a distinguished graduate of the University of California and its school of law, which recently honored him by naming the impressive new law building on the Berkeley campus Earl Warren Hall.

As holder of the highest judicial office in the land for the last 8 years, Mr. Warren has been a steadfast and unrelenting guardian of the rights of individual citizens. The Washington Post yesterday recognized his outstanding contribution and the major role he played in the momentous 1954 Supreme Court ruling that "segregation amounted to a denial of the equal protection of the laws." I include this editorial for its clear commendation of Mr. Warren's position:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 19, 1961]

When Earl Warren quit the governorship of California in 1953 to become Chief Justice of the United States, he left behind him every vestige of political partisanship and political ambition. But he brought with him, as the product of nearly a quarter century of robust participation in the lively politics of this State, an intimate knowledge of American political institutions and a ripened understanding of human nature, human needs, and the patterns of human adjustment.

He came to the Supreme Court at a moment when it had peculiar need of his harmonizing skills and his political wisdom. Divided internally, the Court faced one of the most dramatic decisions in its history—a recognition that contemporary sociological and psychological insights forbade further reliance on the fiction of half a century that racially segregated public schools can be said to offer equal educational opportunity. The time had come when the Court had to rule that such segregation amounted to a denial of the equal protection of the laws.

Manifestly, the decision demanded a major social readjustment in the United States. That readjustment was fostered by the fact that the Supreme Court was unanimous. The new Chief Justice spoke for the Court in an opinion as simple and comprehensible in language as it was firm and resolute in meaning. Surely the Court's unanimity was a product, at least in part, of his judicial statesmanship; surely his leadership has had much to do with maintaining that unanimity.

On many other matters that come before it, the Court is sharply divided—composed, as it is, of men with strong convictions. The Chief Justice has alined himself for the most part with those of his colleagues who think that the Court should serve as an active champion of individual liberty against the sometimes overbearing power of the state. A tough and vigorous public prosecutor in his younger years, the Chief Justice has always recognized that strict adherence to the rules of fair procedure is an indispensable condition of a free society. His concern for individuals reflects not sentimentality but a conviction that freedom affords the key alike to public welfare and to national security.

Today marks Mr. Chief Justice Warren's 70th birthday. We congratulate him warmly on the occasion and on the vigor with which he faces the useful years that lie ahead. And we congratulate the country on the blend of commonsense, compassion, and ardor which he brings to its highest judicial office.

Mr. Speaker, Americans throughout our country have joined in congratulating the Chief Justice on his birthday. As a Representative from Alameda County in California where Mr. Warren began his career as district attorney, I would like to express a special note of congratulation from people who remember him with deep fondness and respect.

Happy birthday, Mr. Chief Justice, and may you have many more years of productive service.

Immigration Quotas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, the bill I have introduced today has a twofold purpose. It is designed to facilitate the reunion of separated families and, at the same time, to benefit a considerable number of skilled immigrants whose services have been determined by the Attorney General to be urgently needed in the United States, but who cannot be issued a first preference visa solely because a quota number is unavailable. In recent years the Congress has attacked the problem of backlogged immigration quotas by enacting special legislation which afforded only nominal relief and provided no real remedy for the problem. Quotas of many countries continue to be heavily oversubscribed, while other countries, notably Great Britain, and Ireland, fail to use their allotted quotas year after year to a very substantial degree. It is estimated that approximately one-third of all authorized quota numbers remain unsued at the end of each fiscal year, and are consequently discarded. One of the underlying principles of our immigration laws is the preservation of the family unit. The instant bill is intended to give meaning and reality to that principle.

The problem of backlogged quotas is attributable in large part to the great disparity between the size of quotas proclaimed for certain northern European countries and the size of quotas proclaimed for all other countries throughout the world. For example, three countries of northern Europe are assigned 70 percent of the overall annual quota of 155,000 and the other quota countries, about 100 in number, variously divide the remaining 30 percent of the overall quota. These quotas were computed under the national origins formula which Congress wrote into the Immigration Act of 1924 and carried forward in the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. They range from the minimum quota of 100 per annum to the maximum quota of 65,361 proclaimed for Great Britain and Northern Islands.

In addition to bringing families together and hastening the entry of hundreds of skilled aliens, this bill will tend to alleviate the hopeless predicament which faces many prospective immigrants whose chances of ever being reached on the waiting list are extremely remote, particularly the nonpreference immigrant. To the extent that the quota numbers now unused are made available for the issuance of visas to aliens within the preference classes, more numbers will become available for the issuance of visas to aliens in the nonpreference class. The vast majority of refugees fall in the nonpreference category.

The redistribution of unused quota numbers on a regional basis is not a new idea. It was first broached by President Eisenhower in his message of February 8, 1956, to the Congress and repeated on other occasions. This proposal does not increase the overall quota of 155,000 established for all quota countries nor does it relax in the slightest degree any of the substantive conditions which every alien must meet before he is issued an immigrant visa and admitted into the United States. The bill simply authorizes the use of the present quotas to the fullest extent possible within the framework of existing law except for the national origins concept.

Specifically, this bill authorizes the Secretary of State to create four regional quotas representing Europe, Africa, Asia, and Oceania, and to assign quota

numbers unused at the end of each fiscal year to the appropriate regional quota. For example, unused numbers attributable to the quota for Great Britain and Northern Ireland would be assigned to the regional quota for Europe, while unused numbers attributable to the quota of Vietnam would be assigned to the regional quota for Asia. The Secretary of State would then make these numbers available for the issuance of immigrant visas to qualified immigrants to whom a first, second, third or fourth preference status had been granted on the basis of a petition approved by the Attorney General. The first preference class consists of skilled aliens so classified because of their high education, technical training, specialized experience or exceptional ability, and because of the urgent need for their services in the United States. The second-preference class consists of the parents and the unmarried sons or daughters of citizens of the United States. The third-preference class consists of the spouses and the unmarried sons or daughters of aliens admitted to the United States for permanent residence. The fourth-preference class consists of the brothers, sisters, and married sons or daughters of U.S. citizens, including their accompanying spouses and children. The assigned numbers in each regional quota would be made available for the issuance of visas to these preference immigrants who were born within the respective region, regardless of their country of birth, and in the same chronological order in which quota numbers are now allotted and charged against the national quotas. Any regional quota not fully used within the period specified for allotment of quota numbers would expire automatically at the end of such period.

Addresses of Mrs. Gene Murphy, Reinbeck, Iowa, and Mrs. Walter Heuer, Princeton, Iowa, Members of the Women's Division, Iowa Farm Bureau Federation, Before the Iowa Congressional Delegation, March 7, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, elsewhere in the Appendix of the RECORD, appears the address of Mrs. J. S. Van Wert of Hampton, Iowa, State women's chairman, Iowa Farm Bureau Federation, at the banquet for the Iowa congressional delegation on March 7.

Two other addresses were made at that banquet, one by Mrs. Gene Murphy of Reinbeck, Iowa, on "Trade and Cropland Adjustment"; the other by Mrs. Walter Heuer of Princeton, Iowa, on "Federal Aid to Education."

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include two other addresses at this point:

TRADE AND CROPLAND ADJUSTMENT

Farmers have always been involved in the process of adjustment—to weather, to prices, to new technology, to yields, to economic growth, and changing conditions. But in no period in American history have they been subject to such a rapid and radical period of change as during the past decade. And the forseeable future continues to point to an era of even greater adjustment.

The highly productive agricultural segment of our economy has been responsible, at least in part, for the high standard of living enjoyed by the people of the United States. Yet this same productive ability in which the resources of land, labor, management, and capital have been invested have resulted in an imbalance between level of total output and consumer demand for farm products. Because of this imbalance many farmers are not receiving a return over and above their cost of production that is comparable to the income received for similar labor effort and management ability by the other segments of our economy.

The acute nature of the agricultural problem is indicated by the continuing rise in the cost of production, the mounting supply of farm commodities in storage, and the low real income of many farmers.

Traditionally the farmer has always been a free and independent maker of decisions in regard to his own enterprise. The role of Government in his behalf should be along the lines that assist without tampering with his freedom. The control of inflation would be a big help in the cost price squeeze. The prevention of Government held surpluses being placed in competition through regular domestic and foreign markets, the stabilization of farm prices through minimum price supports, stopping of all Government payments which result in increased production, and a 60- to 80-million acre land adjustment program are ways in which Government could play this role of assistance.

To rectify the imbalance efforts may be taken in two directions—to increase the demand or reduce the supply. Some programs, in which food is distributed to the needy, are desirable from the humane standpoint, but as real aids in reducing surpluses or increasing consumption their value is negligible. When this given away food program is broadened to include food for peace projects, while the motive is compassion for hungry humanity, many complexities arise in implementation and effect. We may be perpetuating corrupt governments, limiting the orderly development of agriculture in underdeveloped countries, making it more difficult for the people of these countries to learn how to support themselves and injuring trade relations of some of our friendly allies.

The high rate of population growth in the United States would seem to warrant an increasing domestic demand for more food. But a comparison of the current rate of U.S. population increase with the rate of increase in agricultural production shows that production will outrun population for some time. The capacity of the human stomach is no greater than it was 50 years ago—the annual per capita consumption of food, close to 1,500 pounds has remained about the same since World War I. The increased consumer expenditures have been in the quality not quantity of food, and in payment for greater marketing services which does not necessarily mean increased demand at the farm levels.

Since the expansion of domestic demand for food products seems somewhat inelastic, except through upgrading diets, maybe greater emphasis should be placed on research to find new industrial uses for some of our farm products. Even though it isn't likely such a program would have much immediate effect on farm incomes, in the long run there is a chance for improvement. It may even be quite necessary to carry on such a program to maintain the status quo incomewise and prevent more of our farm markets being researched away by other industries.

The expansion of foreign demand through trade seems to be the program that offers the most possibility in the sphere of increasing demand for our farm products in the immediate future. First, let us take a very brief look at the general advantages of international trade. A higher standard of living is maintained through the theory of relative advantage. Even though the United States could produce all commodities more efficiently than any other country, it's an economic factor in our prosperity that, in concentrating on producing those products with other countries for those that they produce at the greatest relative advantage, we raise their standard of living as well as our own. International trade also provides us with a powerful weapon in the cold war—as the old adage states, "When goods cannot cross borders, soldiers will." And trade imports perform many important functions for our economy—make domestic monopoly price fixing more difficult, keep labor unions demands for wage increases more reasonable, fill supply gaps in case of strikes (steel), make possible the use of very specialized equipment, increase the types of models available for use, and furnish an opportunity for market testing sometimes followed by domestic production (small foreign cars).

The special advantages of international trade to agriculture lie in the $2 billion net gain in markets through trade, since we have quite consistently exported approximately twice as much as we import of competitive farm products. Also, the importing of many items duty free or at low tariff rates, such as agricultural machinery and parts, fertilizers, twine, petroleum products, automobiles, nails, rubber tires, have helped hold farm costs down. To bring the trade advantage even more closely to home, will you please bear with a few statistics on percentage of 1959 Iowa farm products exported—soybeans 42 percent, inedible tallow 42 percent, nonfat dry milk solids 38 percent, wheat and wheat flour 30 percent, calf and kid skins 29 percent, dry whole milk 27 percent, lard 26 percent, barley 25 percent, cattle hides 18 percent, rye 17 percent, sorghum grains 17 percent, corn 6.4 percent evaporated milk 3.7 percent, meat products of beef and veal 7.5 percent, pork 1.7 percent, live cattle 1.7 percent, and oats 1 percent.

Europe is our principal unsubsidized commercial market and takes almost half of our $4 billion agricultural exports. So we are vitally interested in the economic union of West Germany, France, Italy, Holland, Belgium, Luxembourg, known as the Common Market. The Outer Seven, England, Norway, Denmark, Switzerland, Portugal, Austria, and Sweden, form another rather loosely organized union. Proposals are also underway for the formation of the Latin American Free Trade Association, and also a Central American Customs Union.

These economic unions comprise both a threat and a promise to our expanded agricultural trade. A threat as is presently proposed that trade barriers around the unions be established and the unions become self sufficient in the production of most agricultural products. The promise lies in the fact that these unions may actually bring about a greater industrial growth than it will agricultural expansion. If such a growth occurs

there should be an even greater market for our farm products.

The United States has even greater stakes in all this development that our economic concerns, important as they are. We can apply ourselves to the difficult problems which agricultural trade poses. We can take active leadership in moving toward relaxation of trade restrictions and use our influence as a rich, powerful trading Nation to encourage progress toward trade based on comparative advantage. This greater flow of trade should benefit all and contribute indirectly to our national security.

These few facts give us only an inkling into the complexities of our agricultural and international trade problems, but should encourage us in our efforts to become informed on the ramifications of international trade. Only as we become more aware of how good trading policies aid our international relations will we be able to influence public attitude in this most important phase of our national policy development.

You remember we said there was another approach to this problem of imbalance besides expanding demand and that was reducing the supply. Total agricultural production can be curtailed by retiring land from cultivation through voluntary agreements. To bring about a satisfactory adjustmentment studies made at the Iowa State University's Center for Agricultural and Economic Adjustment indicate that between 60 to 80 million acres of the 450 million acres of cropland would have to be retired. This would be between 13 and 18 percent—a rather high percentage shift but we must realize the less productive land would be taken out—there might be some slack in administration of program and that some production comes from the 965 million acres of permanent pasture program—hay land. At this level a 2 percent adjustment in land is allowed for each 1 percent change in supply desired. We feel sufficient acreages can be taken out on the voluntary basis if payments are high enough. Such an approach can result in the most efficient agriculture and the least monetary cost to society. We fell that such a voluntary land retirement program properly conceived and administered can aid in bringing about needed adjustments while protecting farm income.

Senators, Representatives, Farm Bureau leaders, and guests, those of you who are in Washington regularly may have forgotten the thrill it is to come here for the first time. This is a new experience for me and one which I am enjoying very much. It is also a new experience for me to find myself addressing our congressional delegation. Until now I have usually been a listener while they did the talking. In the period just prior to November 8, I believe we all did quite a bit of listening. I hope you gentlemen will not think that we have invited you here this evening with retaliation in mind.

During the time that I have been a farm bureau member, and I imagine for many years before that, it has been our custom to keep in fairly close contact with our legislators, both State and National. We feel this is the best possible way to gain mutual understanding on our problems. The good relationship we have usually enjoyed with our Congressmen must be due to the fact that we send such dedicated statesmen to represent Iowa.

This evening we would like to visit with you for a few moments about the great task of educating our young people. This is an area of great interest to Farm Bureau members, and for many years we have been working for improvements in this field. I doubt if any organization has done more to educate its members regarding school taxes and school reorganization. We believe our whole school program can be improved by increased State aid, and the Iowa Farm Bureau is leading the fight to get such measures adopted in our State legislature. Recognizing the fact that the schools are only as good as their teachers, our own Iowa Farm Bureau women have tried to encourage worthy young people to become teachers by offering a number of scholarships for this purpose.

Certainly it is self-evident that free public education has been a major reason for our astounding advancement to the position we now hold in the world. We believe that the whole future of our Nation lies in a well educated population. George Peabody once said, "Education is a debt due from the present to future generations." We have no intention of shirking the responsibility for this debt.

I have always been especially proud to be a Farm Bureau member because this organization is constantly working for the betterment of our country, as well as the individual farmer. This requires that we try to assess the dangers to our form of government. Where does the greater danger lie today? We believe sincerely that we are threatened most from within, and that we need to be on guard against those things which insidiously weaken us as a Nation. Those of us who are determined to keep our country free must speak up in opposition to programs which encourage greater centralization of government and greater dependency on Washington. Farm Bureau people must put Federal aid to education in this category.

We find Federal aid not only a danger but also unnecessary. Rapid progress is being made by States and local districts. In the last 10 years, teachers' salaries have increased dramatically compared with other salaries and wages. Today there are teacher shortages in only a few specific fields. Since 1930, the number of teachers has increased 65 percent while pupils increased only 42 percent. School construction has also been rapid, with 81 percent of bond issues in 1959 and 1960 being approved. Five hundred fifty thousand classrooms have been built since World War II. Three hundred sixty-five thousand would have been enough to provide for the increased enrollment.

Strangely enough, it is not lack of finances that prevent some States from providing adequate education for their pupils. As in Iowa, some States need to change their tax structures so that more money can be channeled to the schools. States can levy sales, excise, and income taxes just as easily as the Federal Government can. Nothing is gained by sending the money to Washington and having only a percentage of it returned. Federal money is not free.

Today Federal aid might be only indirect, but as time goes on, it can only lead to Federal control. Farm Bureau's position was stated clearly in its 1961 policy. I quote: "The financing of public elementary and secondary education is quite properly a State and local responsibility. We oppose expanded Federal aid to education, because it would be a 'foot in the door' toward a federally controlled system of education. It is unrealistic to contend that the mere insertion in a legislative proposal of a clause disavowing any intention of authorizing Federal controls would prevent Federal encroachment. The Supreme Court has ruled that the Federal Government can regulate that which it subsidizes. The greatest control available to the Federal Government is its power to allocate funds."

Coincidentally, the evening before I was asked to make this presentation, I attended a local meeting called by a citizens' committee to discuss school problems. We are in one of Iowa's largest school districts, areawise, and although we have a new junior-senior high school, we are greatly in need of elementary schools. I was much surprised to hear people saying we should only plan for the schools now, but be ready to build when Federal aid becomes a reality. These are people whom I am sure would be opposed to a Federal aid bill being enacted if they had a choice, but if it is available they want their share. Once again we are willing to turn over to the Federal Government a function which belongs to the people. Once again we are willing to give up just a little freedom for added security.

Ours is not the only community in which this is happening. Picture this situation multiplied by the number of school districts in the United States. The complaint is often voiced that people today are not interested enough in our schools—that school elections and bond issues are decided by a small percentage of the population. Will people's concern for their schools increase as local control gives way more and more to Federal dictation?

We do not mean to imply that there are no problems in education. There are many, but we can work them out ourselves. Today the trend seems to be that everything must come from Washington. This is not the American way. We cannot fight ideologies foreign to our own by becoming more like them. People must have confidence in their Government, but Government must also have confidence in the people.

When legislators and individual citizens, thinking clearly, cooperate to set the proper climate, then our country can continue to progress in the spirit of our beloved Iowa motto: "Our liberties we prize and our rights we will maintain."

The 113th Anniversary of the Revolutionary Movement in Hungary

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, Europe has been witness to countless revolutions throughout her long history, but no year saw a greater revolutionary fervor than did 1848. Nationalist ferment kindled by the examples of the American and French Revolutions swept the continent awakening the long-dormant aspirations of the oppressed and shaking to its foundations the long tradition of autocratic tyranny.

On March 15, we commemorate the 113th anniversary of this revolutionary movement in Hungary. On this day in 1848, the Austrian Empire acceded to the Hungarian people's long cherished demand for freedom. That freedom was short lived, however. Russian troops soon moved to help crush the infant state, but the people's love of liberty and their desire for national independence remained unmoved. Their aspirations were again realized after World War I when an independent state with its own constitution was established. Under the heel of Nazi Germany, Hungary once again lost her independence. The Nazi armies were defeated only to be replaced by Soviet troops.

This tragic turn of history did not kill the spirit and courage of the Hungarian

people. In 1956, these brave people sought to realize their aspirations for freedom in a revolt so courageous and fervent that the Soviet Union resorted to the cruelest of military suppression. Against overwhelming odds, the immediate battle was lost, but the sacrifices of countless men, women, and children were not in vain. The year 1956, as does 1848, stands in solemn testimony to the Hungarian people's indominable spirit and their irradicable desire for freedom and independence.

Since 1956, the United Nations General Assembly has adopted 12 resolutions which call for the full restoration of Hungarian independence and speak the conscience of the world in condemnation of Soviet brutality in crushing the 1956 revolution. Today I am happy to join with my Hungarian friends both here and abroad in the firm hope that the time will not be long before the aims of these resolutions are realized and all Hungarians can freely join in an open and joyous celebration of the anniversary of their freedom. Until this happier day, let us look to the record of the Hungarian people as a constant source of inspiration, and let all of us who now enjoy the blessings of liberty mark this day as a time of rededication to the cause of human dignity and freedom.

Our People Are Looking to Congress To Carry Out the Promises Echoed by Fervent Candidates for Office Within Those Valleys of Depressed Economy Only a Few Short Months Ago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, over the past 5 years volumes of evidence have been presented to Congress and relevant committees thereof on the need for depressed area legislation. Any long explanation of conditions in a specific surplus labor region would be superfluous. Time and again I have outlined the problem and its implications with respect to Pennsylvania's 20th District.

I need only assert at this time that conditions are worse than they were when a Senate subcommittee visited Pennsylvania several years ago; they are worse than when I reported to the House in subsequent years; they are worse than they were when spokesmen for the present administration were promising quick action in the windup of the general election campaigns.

Congress is a deliberate body which should and usually does study carefully all matters of consequence before setting the finishing legislative machinery into operation. For this reason it is on rare occasions that bills of major significance are finalized on short notice.

While the new Congress has been in session for less than 3 months, it would seem that there is a sufficient accumulation of testimony and statistics on the matter before us today to permit passage without further procrastination. Data assimilated and distributed by the Department of Labor provides ample substantiation of the need for expeditious action. Many thousands of residents of surplus labor areas have been subjected to the many misfortunes that walk with unemployment since the early 1950's. Our people are looking to this legislative body to carry out the promises echoed by fervent candidates for office within those valleys of depressed economy only a few short months ago.

I have introduced legislation to provide an avenue of quick relief to communities of chronic unemployment. I have indicated my willingness to support other measures which have not concurred precisely with my own ideas as respects the method of approach, the size of appropriations necessary on the part of the Federal Government, and the administration of the legislative product. I was highly optimistic about prospects in the 85th Congress. Failure of the 86th Congress to enact responsible legislation was even more alarming. Now the new Congress is faced with a dual responsibility. While we cannot compensate for what amounts to nothing less than a delinquency of responsibility that occurred during preceding sessions, we must nevertheless act promptly not only to make it possible for those citizens long deprived of employment opportunities to get back to work; we must preclude additional hardships that would come with further delay.

Unemployment nurtures unemployment. Families without income cannot purchase commodities whose sales provide work for other segments of the population. The incidence of poverty increases daily in a recessed economy. In my particular constituency, and I know that I speak for members of both parties from coal-producing States in the Appalachian range, a further impediment to recovery was cast here in Washington earlier this month with the remolding of the concept of the residual oil import control program. The revision added emphasis to the urgency for enactment of a distressed area bill.

Mr. Speaker, our district has experienced mine closings—one after another—since the tide of residual oil imports began to take its toll of coal markets on the east coast more than 10 years ago. Mine workers waited anxiously for Congress or the executive branch to correct what they assumed would be only a temporary situation. As American citizens, they felt confident that the Federal Government would not permit their sources of livelihood to be destroyed through the contemptuous machinations of an international business entente.

As shipments of bituminous coal to seaboard industry declined, railroad workers took their place alongside displaced miners seeking new jobs. General economic inertia set in. In ensuing years, those affected areas have been given top billing on the Department of Labor's listing of areas of chronic unemployment.

The recent order by the Department of Interior was another cruel blow. The administration has succumbed to the pressures of shipping companies determined to unload their surplus product anywhere, at any price, without regard to the welfare of America's citizenry. The impact of the increase in residual oil import quotas will be felt simultaneously with delivery of the alien product. Mines whose product will be preempted by that increase will be forced to cut work days accordingly. There will be less money for our mine workers and our railroaders. The mine workers' welfare fund will suffer proportionately.

To give precedence to the international oil crowd over our own working men is shortsighted and costly. I hope that the Department of Interior will reconsider its hasty decision and revise its order in keeping with the principle of the purposes of the program. Meanwhile we must be realistic. The economy of coal and railroad communities is faced with a turn for the worse. Distressed area legislation becomes even more necessary than it has been throughout the years of suffering to which our people have been subjected. I appeal to my colleagues to act quickly.

A Cloud That Shouldn't Be on Federal Aid to Education Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, the Cincinnati Enquirer in its lead editorial of its Sunday, March 19, 1961, issue puts its finger on the real issue confronting the Congress on the matter of Federal aid to education.

All Members should carefully consider what the Enquirer says in this exceptionally well-written and well-reasoned editorial which follows:

A CLOUD THAT SHOULD NOT BE

It is nothing less than tragic that the debate both inside and outside Congress on the Kennedy administration's program for Federal aid to education has been beclouded by the wholly extraneous question of whether private and parochial schools should be among the institutions allotted Federal aid.

This subsidiary question has aroused such intensity of feeling that many Americans are likely to forget the central issue—the soundness of Federal aid for any of our elementary and secondary schools.

We are against Federal aid to private and parochial schools.

We are also against Federal aid to public schools.

And the reasons for our opposition are the same: Both are a direct violation of the

10th amendment to the Constitution, which reserves to the States all of the powers and responsibilities not specifically assigned to the Federal Government. Education clearly is one of these.

Nonetheless, Washington today is seeing one of the most massive pressure campaigns in history in behalf of Federal aid to education.

The campaign's purpose is to paint a picture of desperate need on the part of school districts in every corner of America. Congressmen are told of crowded classrooms, harried teachers, inadequate equipment, deficient curricula.

The implication is that money from Washington can solve all these problems. But we believe that whatever shortcomings do exist in the Nation's educational machinery are shortcomings that cannot be corrected with money. They are, in reality, shortcomings introduced by the same professional educationists who are campaigning today for Federal control to education.

In one State after another, these educationists have turned our schools away from such rudimentary courses as reading, writing, and arithmetic; they have substituted in their place the notion that the primary mission of our schools is equipping young people for life. The products of this life-adjustment approach to education are the young people who find themselves in college unable to read.

The educationists, in addition, have set up teaching requirements that would bar a Nobel Prize winning scientist from teaching a junior high school course in elementary science for lack of enough credit hours in teaching methods. The same system entrusts the training of tomorrow's scientists to experts in teaching techniques who have never studied science at the college level.

The day will never come when our schools cannot be better. But their betterment will come from where it has always come—from the communities they serve, from the parents, the teachers, the students themselves.

It would be nothing less than a calamity if the church-State debate were to becloud one of the basic constitutional issues of our day and destroy one of the American people's most precious possessions—the local control of their schools.

His Eminence Archbishop Iakovas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, yesterday it was my privilege to attend a function in connection with the dedication of the Greek Church of the Annunciation in York, Pa.

During this portion of the service, Archbishop Iakovas, of New York City, who serves both North and South America, delivered a brief, soul-searching and inspiring message. In it every denomination of every race, creed, or color might well find inspiration to help further the primary function of the church—that of directing people to a better way of life.

I commend this message to every Member of the Congress:

I am still absorbing the sacred moments of the consecration of your church, which we celebrated in the most impressive and colorful liturgical tradition, this morning.

I can easily imagine how deeply moved and happy you are for, after all, it was your industrious piety and your dedication to God and His church, which made today's ceremonies possible.

Such an occasion will never cease to serve as a source of inspiration and strength for me. For it is in the life of the church that I find the meaning and the purpose of my ministry.

Today's consecration of your church is, on the other hand, one more most profound and convincing testimony to the fact that our Orthodox faith, in this blessed and beloved country of ours, is experiencing a growth unprecedented in its recent history.

These very thoughts compel me to make a new appraisal and evaluation of the potentialities which our church has—not only to make new and greater strides on its divinely assigned path of development and evolution, but also to meet the challenge which the tragically declining spiritual and moral values in our society, present for us today.

It is hightime that churches and temples of all faiths realize that they have a new mission and a new task to perform. So-called religious needs cannot fully justify the existence of our many beautiful and imposing church buildings.

Churches are not monuments; churches are not institutions; churches must never be considered like rest stations or milestones, or landmarks. Churches are like living organisms; organisms that grow, that develop, that produce life—the much needed and moral life for all believers as well as non-believers.

I cannot conceive of the church in a different way. Either it is the house of God, a place where man meets God and where God condescends to meet man—uplifting our souls—or, it is a soulless, a spiritless building, where people meet each other on various occasions to celebrate the kind of feasts that God despiseth. The churches must snap out of their state of self-righteousness and arm themselves with a militant spirit and a moral courage, adequate to challenge and prevail over organized atheism in all its various forms. Christians, who care for nothing more than their own comfort, are absolutely unworthy of Christ. In like manner the churches, which care only for economic stability and for their numerical strength of membership, are also unworthy of Christ.

Tragic and disheartening as it may be, Christian churches have lost both the proper insight and the true scope of the purpose for which they exist. One needs not look far in order to verify the fearful truth of this grave statement. Look into your own hearts. Are you aglow with the love of God? Are you ready to dedicate your very life to Him? Are you willing to confront and combat, along with Christ, organized evil—lying, covetousness, crime, corruption?

God is not mocked, my friends. He is not satisfied with lipservice and shallow and meaningless "hosannas" and "allelouiahs." He cannot be pleased with the formal acts of dedications or consecrations of simple or magnificant temples of worship. He can be pleased only when we dedicate or consecrate ourselves.

Believe me, my dear brethren and friends: There is no greater need, than the need for dedicated and consecrated men and women; for believing and practicing men and women; for followers and soldiers of the cause of God. Insincere and faithless to God and to ourselves, we shamelessly speak about truth and faithfulness, about God and religion, about our tenets and our beliefs, about ideals and principles, while we do nothing in order to implant them and make them active, first in our own life, and then into the life of our family and of our society.

Never before was the distance so great between that which we claim to be and what we really are, as proclaimed by our Christian action; never before in history has our religious faith meant so little; never before in history have our churches and our places of worship, in general, failed both man and God, as much as in our days.

Let us, therefore, gain a new insight into the dedication which we celebrated this morning, and let us supplement it—or rather, give meaning to it—by a personal dedication, each of us, so that the church may become a driving force which will raise us from lowliness to exaltation, from pettiness to greatness, from weakness to moral and spiritual strength and fortitude. May the all-merciful God sanctify our souls with His saving grace, and may His spirit inspire and animate and create within us a new life for each of us and for our church.

A Tribute to Ireland and the Irish People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1961

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, to those who admire the characteristics of faith, of home, and of courage, the story of Ireland shall forever stand among the fascinating sagas of history. Never have a people been known to fight so long and so heroically in the name of freedom, for themselves and for the sake of the principle, itself.

Beginning with the Norse invasions of the eighth century A.D., the Irish revealed a fiery spirit against which the invader was powerless to triumph. This was the era of the Vikings, then the most powerful warlike force in the Western World, accustomed to sweeping the enemy aside at a single thrust. They came in fleets, sometimes large, sometimes small, landed suddenly in a bay or creek, despoiled the countryside and retired with booty to the safety of their ships. So long as that remained the pattern, the Irish were virtually powerless to resist. But in the year A.D. 837 the Norsemen sought permanent settlement on Irish soil and in so doing, sealed their own fate. Aroused to action, the Irish determined to resist the invader and waged relentless war against him, building up an army that in time would alter Irish history. In the end, so strong did the army become that it not only subdued the foreigners, but also secured for its commander the kingship of the Irish State of Munster. The hero of the occasion was Brian Boramha, who, in the Battle of Clontarf, in the year A.D. 1014, smashed the Norse army and drove it from the field. The victory, won at the cost of Brian's life, was the first of many in which the Irish were to show their determination to live in freedom, or die in the attempt. The Battle of Clontarf broke forever the power of the Norsemen in Ireland. In the next century, those who remained were to accept the Christian faith and submit to Irish laws.

Yet so inviting a prize was Ireland, so small her population and so greedy her neighbors, that the people no sooner overcame one enemy than another inevitably appeared.

In the 12th century it was the Norman knights, clad in armor from head to foot, armed with lances, mounted on horseback, and aided by rank upon rank of archers. Incomparably superior to the Irish in the matter of military might, the Normans swept to victory in a clattering wave of steel, and settled down to live as permanent lords of the land. But by the year 1300 their power had passed its peak and Irish recovery had begun. At the battle of Dundalk, in 1318, the Irish were again defeated in the field. But so fierce was their assault that from that point forward, the Norman power was to wane and in short order would disappear entirely.

Next, it was England with whom the Irish had to cope; the same England that was to extend her power to every corner of the earth and rise to dominance in every continent but one. Yet while all this was going on, the Irish were putting up a battle for independence wholly out of keeping with their political strength, and winning the admiration of the world.

From that day to this, the Irish have persistently fought for the right to self-government, in the fact of awe-inspiring odds. Nor has their struggle been limited to their own shores. In 1776, the American patriot cause was promoted by many an Irish immigrant, to the benefit of every American alive today. And as recently as the past decade, Irish volunteers could be found in the ranks of the gallant little army of Israel, fighting, as always, for the right of smaller nations to determine their own destinies.

The battle for Irish freedom is not yet over, and shall not be until the day when Ireland—all of Ireland—is free to rule itself in the manner of free men everywhere.

But even then, I doubt that the battle will be entirely over. For the Irish spirit requires, and the Irish conscience demands, that freedom encompass every inhabitable portion of the earth. And until that goal is reached, there will be no rest for the Irish.

Campfire Girls Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, the week of March 19 to 25 has been designated as "Campfire Girls Birthday Week." Campfire Girls are to be congratulated on the observance of their golden jubilee celebration started last November. They are to be especially praised for their 2½ year golden jubilee conservation project which has been of inestimable value all across the Nation, not only to people living today, but to generations who will follow us in populating this great country.

Only recently President Kennedy appealed to Americans to develop and preserve the Nation's natural resources, as he dedicated the new building of the National Wildlife Federation, and only last month he outlined in a message to Congress his plans for protecting our natural resources. It is stimulating to know that we have a President who is vitally aware that "we draw our strength and sustenance from our earth." It is equally inspiring to know that 2½ years before these great addresses were delivered by President Kennedy, the Campfire Girls had launched a grassroots program which answered his appeal for help in protecting and developing the Nation's resources of water, power, forests, and wildlife.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture printed "Soil and Water Conservation Activities, a Guide for Leaders of Campfire Girls." And to guide the girls in their work, the Campfire Girls national headquarters published a beautifully illustrated book "Conservation," suggesting a program so flexible that each member could select an activity which appealed to her, while meeting the needs of her community. As a result, more than a million trees have been planted in the past 2 years, many raised from seeds by the girls themselves. Vast acres of burned over or abandoned areas have been reforested, with Campfire Girls working together in small teams to do the planting. A census of trees has been taken throughout entire cities, and diseased or dead trees replaced.

Recreational areas have been improved by the addition of many new parks and children's forests. In some cases, Camp Fire Girls raised money to purchase the land which they developed into parks and then turned over to the community. In other instances, the Government gave them land from which they created the parks. Tremendous clean-up campaigns have been undertaken to improve both rural and urban areas.

Conservation of wild life has been achieved by participation in many activities which affect the soil, improve the quality of water, and foster better planning for land use. Ponds have been freed of choking vegetation. Cold water for trout has been supplied by a new deflector dam. Pheasant eggs have been hatched by chickens and raised by members for restocking. All forms of new wildlife housing have gone up, including 15,000 bluebird houses built by the Blue Birds, youngest members of the Camp Fire Girls family.

Camp Fire Girls have made speeches, conducted dedication ceremonies, designed display posters, and enacted plays to inform communities of the need for wise use of natural and human resources. In some States Camp Fire Girls restored historical monuments and sites as a part of the conservation program.

Significant as these facts are, they form only a partial picture of the Camp Fire Girls conservation program for the past 2½ years. The completed report will be made to the Nation at an early date following the close of the golden jubilee celebration.

Conservation, however, is not new to Camp Fire Girls who have made notable contributions in other years, including the planting of 700,000 trees throughout the Nation 34 years ago. It is a fine example of the law of the Camp Fire Girls in action, and has called into play all eight tenets of their law, which is: "Worship God, seek beauty, give service, pursue knowledge, be trustworthy, hold on to health, glorify work, be happy." Our hats are off to the Camp Fire Girls.

Donald Comer, Avondale Mills Chairman, Cites Injury from Cotton Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding manufacturers of textile goods and a leading citizen of Alabama has written the following letter to the New York Times. The writer, Mr. Donald Comer, is the chairman of the executive committee of Avondale Mills. His letter, and he is an expert, details some of the shortcomings in our present trade policies. I am hopeful that the Congress will shortly heed the advice and counsel of men like Donald Comer and come to a more realistic position in our foreign trade policy.

The letter follows:

MARCH 13, 1961.

The EDITOR, THE NEW YORK TIMES,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: I am in New York once a month in connection with sales problems in our business. Last month when I was here your paper of February 12 carried a news item written by Mr. B. M. Jones against Government protective measures against foreign imports. I wrote two letters, dated February 13 and 15, but had no acknowledgment.

This morning I am more concerned by your own editorial position in your Saturday's paper, headed, "Unwise Boycotts." You quote the administration as having spoken out vigorously against this procedure; you fail to quote Secretary of Commerce Hodges' statement in the Daily News Record of March 1, "Mills Need Government Aid to Survive: Hodges." You refer to the fact that Japan bought a billion dollars' worth of our goods in 1 year, 1959; you fail to mention that the two largest items were our pulpwood and our cotton—both raw products which the Japanese want to return in a larger measure to us as manufactured synthetics and cotton goods. I am not quite sure of the terms of our Government's trade regarding the sale of our pulpwood; our cotton is sold to her at 6 cents a pound less than our American spinners pay for it. The Government has just increased this differential to 8½ cents. We take our pay in local currencies, and I am enclosing a statement made by Mr. Charles Cannon regarding the further advantages that this gives our foreign competitors.

Our foreign trade operates under a renewal of the Hull miscalled reciprocal trade program. We know that there can be no foreign trade except on a two-way basis.

Secretary Hull describes this as nations swapping what each has in overabundance that the other needs, with some three-way trading. When this legislation was up for renewal President Eisenhower wrote Congressman JOE MARTIN of Massachusetts that it would be administered without injury to a single American industry. Senator SPARKMAN of Alabama told the Congress that neither Hull's original intention nor the President's promise had been carried out.

Included in this overall and continued injury to our American industry, I'd like to cite just two particular cases in our own experience. A garment manufacturer in Tennessee bought 12 million yards of cloth from a mill in Korea, which put one of our mills on short time. A knitter began supplying his needs of yarn from Portugal at 10 cents a pound under our price, which put our million half time.

The immediate cause of your editorial comes from a protest of union plumbers asked to use imported material. This clearly indicates that this problem is broadening. The trouble may have begun because of textile imports from Japan but is now spreading to everything America makes, and supplying sources are now from all Europe and Asia—in fact, all over the world.

Our American income and wages provide the most lush purchasing power in the world and we are the target of every foreign manufacturer.

I know of no farmer who provides a clover pasture for his cattle who doesn't put a fence around it. In our desire to live and help live we have suggested limited quotas of imports of which our country is already oversupplied and the market sharply competitive. We could welcome imports which were new or improvements on our own; our objection is to imports of imitations of ours coming in only because they are cheaper, and cheaper only because they are made under cheaper foreign wages and standards. You quote the Government as saying, "Please, no boycotts," but the Secretary of Commerce adds, "The Government must take steps to protect home industry."

Your offer "the only real long-range protection against effective foreign competition is increased productivity and lower costs of production here."

In the past we had the machines and the know-how. Even so, our industrial might was built and protected from Europe by a tariff. No protection was needed then from the teeming millions of Asia who had only their hands.

Your suggested program would only invite a lowering of our standards to a world level. The same machines are available to all the world today and no nation has any corner on their efficient use. In connection with textiles let me remind you that the late Secretary Knox said that textiles were second only to steel for our defense needs. You admit that some protective measures might be desirable for some particular industry during its adjustment to the world standard. We are looking for no temporary adjustment; therefore we want a permanent protection, whether by tariff or quota or both, that will maintain our American standards today, tomorrow, and forever.

Please, whether you use my letter or your words, let your readers see this side of the question. Industry needs your help right now.

Very truly yours,

_____,

Chairman of the Executive Committee.

The Honorable Victor L. Anfuso, Member of Congress from New York, Chairman of the American Honorary Committee for the Italian Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, March 16, it was my pleasure to be present at a very impressive and significant ceremony at the Department of State on the occasion of the centennial celebration of the unification of Italy. An important part of the proceedings was the opening address by my respected colleague from New York [Mr. ANFUSO]. In his eloquent remarks he took note of the strong and lasting bonds of friendship between the people of Italy and the people of the United States.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of his address:

REMARKS BY HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO, ITALIAN CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION, MARCH 16, 1961

It is a great honor for me to have been singled out by my colleagues on the American Honorary Committee to be the chairman of this historic event. It is my pleasure to welcome you.

It is of particular significance for me, since I came to this country as an immigrant from Italy at the tender age of 9. Little did I dream then that some day this immigrant boy would preside at a celebration of this sort in Washington, where the President and other great leaders of this Nation would gather to pay tribute to my ancestral homeland on the centennial anniversary of its unification as a single strong nation.

I am deeply grateful this morning, as never before, to this wonderful country of ours for the unlimited opportunities which I and millions of other Americans of Italian extraction have received. This is a feeling which only immigrants and the children of immigrants can fully appreciate.

The President of the United States has played a significant role in these celebrations. I have had the honor and the privilege to know the President ever since I first came to Congress in January 1951, when I served with him in the House of Representatives. I remember the kindly guidance he gave me then—and I shall never forget his encouraging assistance on several projects which I proposed to the Congress in those days.

This association continued also after he had moved over to the U.S. Senate, and it is best exemplified by the fact that after I had introduced the resolution on the centennial observance of Italian unification and brought it to the attention of Mr. Kennedy, he immediately introduced it in the Senate. May I quote just a brief remark by Mr. Kennedy at the time he introduced the resolution on July 13, 1959, when he said:

"The concurrent resolution expresses our pleasure in receiving the invitation (to participate in the observance) and testifies to our admiration for the contributions this great Nation has made to our common ideals of freedom and independence. It is fitting and proper that we recognize in this fashion the progress and achievements of the people of Italy during the past century."

During this entire decade that I have been privileged to know Mr. Kennedy, I have always found him to be an admirer of Italy and of its achievements in the annals of culture and civilization. Likewise, he has a keen appreciation of the contributions of Americans of Italian descent toward the upbuilding of America and its way of life.

It is to a certain extent an irony of history that, as Italy was reborn as a united nation, the United States was on the threshhold of facing its greatest test for survival. As the guns were stilled in Italy, and Garibaldi was going back to his beloved island of Caprera with a bag of bean seeds on his shoulder, the guns of Fort Sumter on this side of the Atlantic were rumbling. Italy's Risorgimento, which means rebirth as a nation, was being accomplished.

And speaking of Garibaldi, I take particular pleasure in greeting here this morning the grandson of that great patriot, General Ezio Garibaldi, and also his granddaughter, Mrs. Giuseppina Ziluca. May I ask them to take a bow.

Today there exist strong bonds of friendship between the United States and Italy. The bonds joining our two nations are, in my estimation, stronger and deeper than those resulting from a military pact or an economic program. They are the bonds of faith and confidence in one another, of mutual respect and understanding between two great peoples, of genuine friendship and reciprocal contributions.

The bridge of understanding between the people of the United States and the people of Italy was not constructed overnight. It is a process which is at least as old as the United States, and in fact goes back to our earliest days when small but significant numbers of Italians joined the waves of early explorers and settlers who came to these shores. They and succeeding generations of Italian immigrants, who settled in this land, have made lasting contributions to our American heritage over the long centuries. The imprint of their contributions on American life and civilization is visible all around us.

We live in a crucial time in the annals of human affairs which requires utmost unity in the ranks of the free nations. The future survival of democratic America and of the whole free world depends, in large measure, on reinforcing our bonds of cooperation with nations like Italy, and on the creation of working partnerships with such nations in every endeavor which could serve the best interests of mankind.

It is not for me to spell out in detail how this partnership between our two nations is to be created, nor is this the time and the place to do so. Suffice it merely to indicate that we have the beginnings of it in several ways: the fact that Italy has been willing to give as much as she receives; the fact that Italy has made available to us areas for the establishment of military bases; Italy's significant role in NATO; Italy's strategic position in the Mediterranean in relation to Europe, Africa, and the Middle East; and Italy's ancestral ties in Latin America.

Our partnership can be extended and deepened in other ways through many new ideas and bold action. Instead of working alone in certain areas, where our help has been misunderstood, let us invite the participation of partnership—nations like Italy—if such participation will bring about better understanding and more fruitful re-

sults. The possibilities are unlimited. This, too, may in time prove to be a New Frontier in our international relations.

It is, therefore, only fitting and proper that we choose this occasion to rededicate ourselves to the same ideals which triumphed over a hundred years ago. In this era of the New Frontier, let us, in the words of our beloved President, pray that the future years will prove to be the years when the tide came in—when America, together with a strong and united Italy and a free world, moved forward again.

National Wildlife Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, this week, March 19 to 25 is National Wildlife Week. Yesterday, the Governor of Oregon, officers of the Washington State Sportsmen's Council, representatives of both Washington State and Oregon Fish and Game Departments, officials of the U.S. Forest Service, members of the Fish and Wildlife Service and representatives of the Bureau of Land Management opened the week with a joint ceremony on the Columbia River.

I believe it is fitting that the Members of Congress take special note of National Wildlife Week because its theme "Multiple Use: Balanced Conservation Planning for the Future," expresses the intent of the Congress which passed the Multiple Use bill last year. I am proud that I introduced this legislation and am pleased that the National Wildlife Council and the various State sportmen's councils have shown their support of the multiple use concept by choosing the theme they did for National Wildlife Week.

Mr. Speaker, the National Wildlife Federation has prepared a booklet concerning multiple use which is interesting and constructive. One part I found particularly well worth reading and under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include it in the RECORD.

BALANCED CONSERVATION PLANNING FOR THE FUTURE

Multiple use of land and water resources is a product of a modern industrial civilization or society. To survive as a civilization it is important that none of the natural resources be despoiled or wasted.

Multiple use applied to the many different purposes man has found for the land and water resources over which he was given dominion. The application of improved technology and scientific know-how has brought the present generation the highest degree of civilization the world has ever known.

The objective of mutiple use is to conserve and wisely use the Nation's lands and waters in such manners that the greatest benefits in enjoyable living will result for the greatest numbers of people. The study of ancient history teaches that 19 of 21 civilizations perished from the face of the earth because of an inability to learn an existence cannot be maintained without the conservation of soil and water. To the end that this civilization will not become the 20th to so perish, each citizen should fully inform himself on the needs for conserving renewable natural resources.

Grass Is Green, Like Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I have said on the floor of this House that the way out of the present farm dilemma does not lie in the way of more complex controls with fewer crops, but rather in a return to a system under which a farmer is free to plan his operation in line with what he can use and sell. In line with that view I want to offer an article written by a warm friend, Mr. Jim Wilson, of Polk, Nebr. Mr. Wilson to my knowledge, is no Harvard doctor of philosophy, but rather a man of practical approach. His knowledge of what is right for the farm comes from living and working on one. I submit his views for general consideration.

GRASS IS GREEN, LIKE MONEY

(By Jim Wilson, Wilson Seed Farm, Polk, Nebr.)

Twenty years ago, before mechanization, almost any small farmer could increase his income by feeding a few head of cattle. But how can a man with a pitchfork and a bushel basket compete today with the big commercial feedlots where one man pushes a button to feed 1,000 head, pushes another to dispose of the manure?

It's hard for small farmers with only a few head to mechanize. The profit per head is too small. If, as can happen, the profit margin is only $1 per head, a 70,000-head feedlot can still clear $70,000. The 30-head feeder can clear only $30.

Think it over. Maybe you're in the wrong end of the business to make money.

The profit's too small in cash grain farming, too, unless you have enough land to use big machinery efficiently. Let the big operator raise cash grain. You can't compete with him. You can't afford big machinery, and you're behind the eight ball with small.

Get into a line where mechanization isn't so important and big and small operators compete on more even terms. Produce meat on grass.

THE CHEAPEST MACHINE

In a North Carolina experiment, the cost of producing 100 pounds of total digestible nutrients (TDN) for livestock in the form of shelled corn was $1.77, alfalfa hay $1.35, improved pasture only 58 cents.

About all you need to start with is the grass, fence, the stock, and a rocking chair, whether you have 160 acres or 200,000. Dry or irrigated, it doesn't matter. Profit is roughly proportional in either case. Even the biggest ranches don't have much machinery compared to cash grain outfits. The animal itself is the machine—the cheapest machine in the world.

"But my land is worth $350 an acre," you say. "Can I compete with western ranchers on cheap land?"

DOLLARS AND SENSE

It takes 8 to 15 acres to support one animal unit for 150 days in the Nebraska sandhills, one of the most prosperous ranching areas in the world. Land currently costs $40 to $60 an acre there. Therefore it takes an investment of about $400 to $500 in land per animal unit in the sandhills.

A new University of Nebraska bulletin states, "An acre of well-managed irrigated pasture in Nebraska should support two to three animal units during a 150-day grazing season." At $350 an acre, therefore, it takes about $115 to $175 in land per animal unit on irrigated pasture. The savings on interest, taxes, etc., more than cover the cost of fertilizer and water. On crop-type dry land the investment in real estate per animal unit is somewhat higher, but many expenses are less.

And you're probably closer to market than most western ranchers.

CAN YOU AFFORD TO RAISE CORN?

How much money can you make per acre on grass? The 1959 University of Nebraska bulletin, Irrigated Pastures, states, "Good irrigated pastures in Nebraska should produce 500 to 800 pounds of beef (or 5,000 to 8,000 pounds of milk) per acre." Even at 22 cents a pound for beef, that's a gross of $110 to $175 per acre—equal to a 110 to 175 bushel corn crop at 1960 prices—with less expense.

A careful, talented, scientific operator with top-grade land can beat this. Bill Pierce, of Kearney, has had a grain-on-grass operation on 18 acres of improved irrigated pasture for the last 5 years. He turns 80 head of 400-pound calves onto grass late in April, with free-choice rolled corn and a little alfalfa to eat, and takes them off in November with an average gain of 400 to 500 pounds per head—32,000 pounds plus, or 1,800 pounds per acre, including the gain from the corn.

HOW NOT TO GO BROKE

At 22 cents a pound for the grain, including that from the corn, that's a gross of $7,040 plus, or $390 per acre. Since the corn is not measured, there is no way of figuring either the gross or net profit from the pasture separately, but obviously Pierce is not going broke very fast. And obviously, he doesn't just let his pasture and cattle take care of themselves.

As for dry land, the 1958 University of Nebraska bulletin, "Does it pay to improve your pastures?" says, "In the drouth years of 1954–55, an improved dryland warm-season-grass pasture near Lincoln under rotational grazing averaged 163 pounds of gain per acre." At 22 cents a pound, that's a gross of $35.86. How much did you dryland farmers gross on corn in 1954 and 1955? In 1959—admittedly a very good year—a Polk County farmer grazed one and one-half animal units per acre on a dryland intermediate wheatgrass pasture all summer.

Of course, you have your investment in livestock. But it's usually easier to get financing on livestock than on farm machinery.

HIGH COSTS AND HEADACHES

What does it cost to raise corn? About $50 to $60 an acre on irrigated land, experts say.

After your grass is established, about your only big operating expense is fertilizer—and water, if you irrigate. Few insect pests, no worry about hot winds or hail destroying an entire year's crop, no anxiety about flood damage, perhaps one-third to one-fourth the investment in machinery, and, if your land is rolling, no more poor crops raised with blood, sweat, and tears. In 5 years after starting the changeover, you should be doing all right.

Most of the foregoing figures are for pastures planted several years ago. Still better strains of grasses are available today. And better ones yet are coming. Keep up with the times. Plant the very best grass you can get. Don't just assume brome is best be-

cause you never heard of the others. Ask your SCS man about the best adapted varieties and strains for your area.

You don't plant squaw corn—don't plant "squaw" grass.

IT'S UP TO YOU

What kind of grass operation is best for small farmers? I don't know. I'm a seed producer, not a livestock man. But I have some ideas. If you're in milk, and making money, modernize, plant more and better pasture with the newest and best strains of grass, and stay in milk.

Whatever kind of operation you are in—milk, hogs, sheep, beef—improved grass and modern methods of pasture management will make you more money. But pasture management is a science—learn it. Don't just "monkey along."

Beef producers should consider two points:

1. The calf brings the highest price per pound of any beef animal. On a steady market, the price per pound goes down every time it changes hands after the first time. Each successive buyer has to make back that loss before he can start to make money. And each successive buyer usually has a higher cash investment per head in proportion to his profit. A comparatively small drop in the market won't hurt a producer of calves very much, but it can wipe out a small feeder.

2. Every time an animal changes hands, it costs money. The trucker gets some, the commission house or auctioneer gets some, and some evaporates in extra labor cost, shipping shrink, loss of appetite, etc. The longer you're able to keep an animal, all other things being equal, the more of these expenses you can convert into profit.

"GRAIN-ON-GRASS" BEEF

The man who is in position to produce beef from calf to finished product ready for slaughter, in a "grain-on-grass" operation, is in an enviable position.

I should think such a vertically integrated program, with a variety of grasses, now available, to produce green pasture up to 8 months of the year in this climate, would make a good, solid year-in-year-out business, after one got it going. The profit differential per acre between well-managed grass, and grain crops, is enough so that if a man was short on land he could well afford to buy all his grain for such an operation.

The important thing is to start making the changeover from cash grain to grass before you go broke on cash grain. It will take a few years. While you're getting a start, you may be harder up than you are now, so don't wait till your reserve of credit and cash is all gone.

Some of the best permanent grasses take a full year—maybe 2—to make pasture. (Plant with a grass drill—get a stand quick.) Start with a few acres and stock them, instead of buying new cash-grain machinery as your old wears out. Add more acres each year.

HOW MUCH DOES IT COST?

"The seed costs so much," you object.

Did you know that you can seed cropland to the finest permanent grass available for about $3 an acre with Government help?

See your ASC office. It will pay up to 80 percent of the cost of the seed, and $1 an acre for drilling.

But there's one kind of help that you need more than cash—technical help. If you try to get along without it, you'll be sorry from now on.

Go to your soil conservation office for the best free advice you can get on pasture planning, varieties and strains, seedbeds, planting, care and management. When it comes time to stock, your county agent can help you.

As with any good business, there's a lot to learn if you want to succeed. But won't you feel like more of a man to strike out for yourself and learn something new, than to keep on hiding behind an unworkable system of price supports for cash grain till it breaks down completely? Our great-grandfathers had the courage to learn a lot of new things when they left Sweden, or Poland, or Pennsylvania, to homestead in Nebraska.

Remember this: There has never been a chronic surplus of meat. A temporary surplus can always be marked down and sold to make way for next year's production. The demand for meat, unlike bread, depends on the price. And the cheapest way to produce meat is on grass.

The Dilemma To Come

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL FINDLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Pike County (Ill.) Republican paper on March 8, and I would like to recommend it for the reading of all Members of Congress:

Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country.

These words from President Kennedy's inaugural address were surely the most inspiring in it. They have been praised by editorial writers and others as the most direct challenge to America in a long time. The ironic fact is, however, that one can hardly pick up a daily newspaper without reading of a new proposal from some branch of the new administration in Washington that will lay the hand of centralized government more heavily upon the people under the guise of "doing something" for the people—a direct contradiction of President Kennedy's noble challenge.

The time will come when the issue will be resolved and the words put to their true test. As John J. Lacey told a Farm Bureau audience last week in Pittsfield, the administration must face the dilemma of meeting its many promises of something for everybody while making good on President Kennedy's promise to protect the value of the dollar. Or will the tempting lure of inflation again seem more comforting than the stern alternative inherent in President Kennedy's stirring words?

Meanwhile, it is interesting to review the answers Gallup poll interviewers received to the question, "Can you yourself, at this time think of anything you could do for your country?"

A total of 63 percent of those interviewed were able to think of some way in which they could help the country.

The kinds of things people volunteered were many and varied. They included writing to their Congressman to let him know their views on issues they cared about. For others, it meant informing themselves better about the state of the Nation and the world. To a few, it meant being scrupulously honest in making out their Federal income tax return.

For many, it meant simply being a better citizen—being active in local affairs, obeying all laws, being honest in dealing with their fellow citizens.

According to the Gallup poll directors, since the founding of the public opinion survey institution in 1935, it has often found the public ready to make greater sacrifices than Government leaders have asked them to make.

It might be a good time to ask if the many welfare state proposals now coming out daily from Washington are truly in keeping with the desires of a people more aware than their leaders that a something-for-nothing philosophy of Government flowing unending from Washington may not be precisely what they want or are willing to pay for with dollars that will buy less and less.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

MARCH 18, 1961.

Committee work exceeded House floor action this week. Legislation moves through committee hearings, executive sessions, amendment and redrafting before going to the Rules Committee for a place on the House Calendar.

A resolution was steamrollered through by a voice vote (Members not desiring a record vote) to increase each Member's staff by one person and the base pay of $3,000 per year (equals approximately $6,700). This should enable each Member to do a more thorough job. Here is tangible evidence of the growth of the Federal Government, and as it grows, so grows the workload of the Members of Congress. The office of the Fifth District of Texas (Dallas County) this week received 2,000 letters from within the district and more than twice that from other areas of Texas. One thousand to one thousand five hundred letters per week involve "casework," that is, Federal problems confronting citizens who then appeal to their Congressman. These require special attention and Government agency help before response. All letters must be answered. This workload is the nonpolitical daily effort, mostly unknown to the general public in appraising Congressional routine. Of course, the inaction of Texas in the past to redistrict doubles the Fifth District's volume of work.

Federal highways are in trouble again. The problem—not enough money to finish the program by 1972 as planned and $200 million more needed per year. How to solve this problem is the current subject of hearings by the Ways and Means Committee. At this time, the issue is in doubt. Possible solutions include: (1) stretch out the time period for completion of the 41,000-mile Interstate Highway System; (2) cut back various building programs; (3) raise the Federal gasoline tax; (4) raise the truckers' tax 75 percent; (5) take the money from the General Treasury (thus cutting the money available for other Federal Government costs).

Here's a bird's-eye view of the testimony thus far, President Kennedy:

"Our Federal pay-as-you-go highway program is in peril. It is a peril that justifies a special message because of the vital contribution this program makes to our security, our safety, and our economic growth. Revised cost estimates require additional authorization of $11.56 billion or $900 million per year. I am wholly opposed to either stretching out or cutting back our highway program." The President then outlined two

alternatives through the year 1972 of (1) a 1½-cent per gallon Federal gas tax on all motorists (adding one-half cent to the extension of the 1 cent due to expire July 1, making the total Federal taxes 4½ cents per gallon instead of 3 cents); or (2) continuation of the additional 1-cent gas tax plus an increase of the tax on trucks by upping diesel fuel 4 to 7 cents per gallon, trucks over 26,000 pounds use tax raised $1.50 per 1,000 pounds to $5, tires 8 to 10 cents per pound, inner tubes 9 to 10 cents per pound, retread rubber 3 to 10 cents per pound. Commerce Secretary Hodges, Treasury Department Head Dillon, and Budget Bureau Chief Bell then testified in support of the second alternative, which is President Kennedy's preference.

The American Association of State Highway Officials (AASHO) emphasized the need for the highways, but said, "we will not attempt to tell you how you should raise highway money at the Federal level." The diesel truck industry was strongly defended by Congressman WILSON of Indiana against the tax increase as an unequal distribution of the tax, putting diesels in an unfair competitive position, in short, a penalty on efficiency. The strongest protests came from the trucking industry as witness after witness vowed that such tax increase would force him out of business. At the least, employees would be laid off and reduced business produce less tax revenue to the Government. Further, that this cost could not be absorbed or passed on in higher prices but that other forms of transportation (railroads) would get the business. The Teamsters Union joined with management solidly to denounce the taxes as unfair and a death blow to the trucking industry.

So the outcome is still in doubt. Further hearings, executive sessions and redrafting of compromises must be accomplished. Problems troubling me include: (1) Why was there a $12 billion increase in highway cost, culminating in our present lack of revenue to finish the job? (2) Why do we not await the findings of the Illinois road tests before seeking a permanent solution? (3) Should we live beyond our means in Government spending? (4) Do the people want taxes raised on all motorists, either 1 cent or 1½ cents per gallon of gas, to finish the program by 1972? (5) How much of the expense should come from the General Treasury as a defense measure? (6) Hasn't "pay as we go" for motorists and truckers actually become "pay before we go" since taxes are in effect well before the highways are built? These and others, * * * one thing is sure, we're a long way from the answer.

Other important legislation pending in committees or waiting action in the Senate, or House includes a proposed increase in the minimum wage and extension of coverage of the act; a depressed areas bill, new farm legislation, Federal aid to education, establishing a Peace Corps, plus the regular appropriation bills. All of which points up the importance of my questionnaire this year. It is now being prepared and will be in the mail early next month. I hope you will make a special effort this session to let me know your thinking on the questions on which I am seeking your advice.

America Loses a Distinguished Gentleman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES F. BATTIN
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, Zales Nelson Ecton, a former U.S. Senator from Montana from 1946 to 1953, passed away in Bozeman, Mont., in early March 1961.

Senator Ecton was born in Iowa and moved to Gallatin County, Mont., as a boy where he attended public schools, as well as Montana State College. He later attended the University of Chicago Law School.

During World War I he served as a private in the infantry, and from 1921 to 1946 he was a successful rancher in the Treasure State.

He had a useful and worthwhile career in public life, having served in the Montana House of Representatives from 1933 to 1937 and in the State senate from 1937 to 1946.

Senator Ecton was well liked by the people of Montana and by the Republican Party, for he served as chairman of the Republican Central Committee from 1940 to 1944.

Zales was a good father, a good husband, and a good American. He believed in the rights and dignity of man and during his career in public life he fought to preserve our American system.

Though I did not know him well personally, I did know him by reputation, and I am sure that his wife and family will have pleasure in knowing in the years to come that he was revered, not only by the people of Montana, but by his colleagues and friends in the Congress of the United States.

My wife and I join in extending our deep sympathy to his wife, Vera, and to his daughter and grandchildren.

Put to the Test

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

PUT TO THE TEST

The Federal Government, as we all know, has waded hip-deep into activities which used to be undertaken, when needed, by State and local governments.

This has had two inevitable consequences. First, it has made a substantial contribution to the gargantuan size of Federal spending, Federal budgets, and Federal taxes.

Second, and even more important, it has woefully weakened local independence, local responsibility, local pride in achievement. The general attitude becomes one of "Uncle Sam will take care of it—why should we worry?"

It is argued, of course, that only the Federal Government has the resources that are needed these days to cope with all kinds of local problems. But that argument fails, more often than not, when put to a test.

For instance, last year President Eisenhower vetoed a bill calling for expansion of Federal grants-in-aid for construction of sewage-treatment facilities, as a means of meeting the water pollution problem. He then called a National Conference on Water Pollution which was attended by 1,145 people. A poll was taken—and 70 percent of the delegates agreed that " we have no pollution problems that require any additional Federal controls. Enforcement is the primary concern of the State."

One of the burning needs of the time is to turn back to State and local governments the rights, responsibilities and obligations which belong to state and local governments. We'd save barrels of tax money. And beyond that we'd make huge savings in the precious coin of character and principle.

HUAC Upheld

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, I am herewith inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent and thought-provoking article by Forrest Davis, the able Washington columnist for the Cincinnati Enquirer, with reference to the recent Supreme Court decisions in the Braden and Wilkinson cases.

The article follows:

SUPREME COURT AND CONGRESS UPHOLD HUAC

(By Forrest Davis)

WASHINGTON.—If one strings along with Alan Barth, Supreme Court Justice Hugo L. Black, Congressman James A. Roosevelt (Democrat, California), Carl Braden, and Frank Wilkinson, the House Un-American Activities Committee is a sorry and dangerous institution.

Mr. Barth is an editorialist on the Washington Post who lectures around the country against the HUAC and once wrote a book expressing similar misgivings about the FBI's smelling out of Soviet spies and domestic seditionists.

Mr. Justice Black, who learned about political conspiracy as an Alabama Kluxer, lapsed into a species of hysteria the other day when dissenting from the Court's 5-to-4 opinion (written and delivered by Cincinnati's Justice Potter Stewart) upholding the HUAC's privilege in citing Mr. Braden and Mr. Wilkinson for contempt of Congress. Said Mr. Justice Black, who reasoned that the committee was vindictively punishing the Messrs. Braden and Wilkinson for criticizing its activities:

"There are not many people * * * who will have the courage to speak out against such a formidable opponent. If the present trend continues, this already small number will necessarily dwindle as their ranks are thinned by the jails. Government by consent will disappear to be replaced by intimidation."

To which Justice Stewart, youngest on the bench as Justice Black is the oldest, coolly replied that he found no warrant for holding that critics of the committee were thereby immunized from asking questions authorized by a proper legislative intent.

The late President's son, JIMMY, leads the tiny cell in the House of Representatives disapproving of the Un-American Activities Committee. When, 2 days after the Supreme Court ruled favorably on the committee's findings against Braden and Wilkinson, the House adopted the HUAC's budget for the year, ROOSEVELT was joined by only five other Members. The pro-HUAC vote, recorded by rollcall on motion of Congressman CLARENCE J. BROWN, veteran Representative and eminent Cincinnati suburbanite, was 412 to 6.

This massive majority was a vote of confidence in the committee itself, of which Cincinnati Congressman GORDON F. SCHERER is the ranking minority member, as well as a notice to the active and vocal claque seeking

its abolition that the House of Representatives remains aroused to the dangers of the Communist fifth column in our midst. If the Congress is so convinced, can the mass opinion of the country be far behind?

Braden and Wilkinson were in Atlanta before and during a HUAC inquiry for the acknowledged purpose of arousing public sentiment against the committee and inducing witnesses to stand mute. Since both Braden, a former Cincinnati and Louisville newspaperman convicted of complicity in a phony, political bombing of a Negro's home in the latter city, and Wilkinson had been identified under oath as Communists by witnesses before congressional hearings, the committee quite reasonably asked if they had been sent to Atlanta by a Communist agency.

The court and the House have spoken but that will not persuade the progressive bourgeoisie who, detesting any exposure of the Communist conspiracy in the United States, affect to believe that congressional committees thus acting do so in violation of civil rights. An alert reading of the country's press will find more attention given the dissents of Justices Warren, Black, Douglas, and Brennan than Justice Stewart's cogent vindication of the historic right of Congress to inquire.

The heat of the dissents may be explained by the circumstance that, since 1959 and the addition of Justices Stewart and Whittaker to the bench, the Jacobin justices have lost their majority. For the time being the majority takes a temperate view of the court's power to enfeeble the other coordinate branches of the Government through an extreme reading of the rights of the citizen under the first amendment against Congress, the Executive and the society's preservation itself. The former majority's absolutist interpretation of the first amendment frequently served to safeguard certified Communist agents. Perhaps that was coincidental.

The Court's present tenor could, of course, be reversed by the appointments which in the exigencies of nature are likely to fall to President Kennedy. We may be certain that if, as, and when the elderly Justices Black and Frankfurter retire, the President will be under extreme pressure to replace them with justices sympathetic with the old majority.

As one reliably hears it, the campaign to relieve Communists from official scrutiny calls for abolition of the HUAC and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and the shelving of J. Edgar Hoover in that order as well as a redress of the Supreme Court's balance.

Five-Year Census

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, may I call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to the following editorial which appeared in the Santa Paula (Calif.) Daily Chronicle of March 7, 1961:

FIVE-YEAR CENSUS

The many surprises of the 1960 census have stimulated a movement to have the census taken every 5 years instead of every 10. The main reason behind this plan is the practice of giving Federal aid to States and cities on a population basis. Representative JOHN LESINSKI, of Michigan, is a leading advocate of the change.

Allotments are made for public health, employment services, unemployment compensation, child welfare, some education programs, roads, agricultural extension, and other purposes. The States make grants to local communities for streets, highways, hospitals, libraries, and sewer, and waterworks, to name only a few.

The amount of each distribution depends on the last census figures for the community involved. A city such as Houston, Tex., which jumped from 596,000 in 1950 to 938,000 in 1960, or Phoenix, which showed 106,000 inhabitants in 1950 and 10 years later hit 430,000, has obviously been getting less than what it would have received had the last previous census been in 1955 instead of 1950. Many California cities have an interest in more frequent census surveys.

Private business also is vitally affected by out-of-date population figures. Marketing and advertising firms want recent population data in their attempts to locate new business outlets.

A 1965 census would not need to be as elaborate as the regular 10-year article. Its main purpose would be fulfilled if it simply gave more recent population figures. Despite its costs, a 5-year census seems to be worthwhile.

Millions Will Benefit From Project HOPE

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAGE BELCHER
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following feature story from the Tulsa, Okla., Junior Chamber of Commerce magazine Future, January 1961, entitled "Millions Will Benefit From Project HOPE":

Project HOPE—Health Opportunities for People Everywhere—becomes a part of the United States' people-to-people diplomacy as America shares its modern medical knowledge and skills with the newly developing countries. After dedication ceremonies in September, at which Legal Counsel Vic Levit represented the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce, the SS *Hope I*, the first of a fleet of hospital ships, sailed from the United States for 6- and 4-month stops in Indonesia and Vietnam.

The need for such a project is overwhelming. In much of southeast Asia there aren't nearly enough doctors. Indonesia, for example, has 1 doctor for every 71,000 people compared to 1 for 750 in this country. The available doctors are so busy they have no time to keep posted on latest information and techniques.

Because there are millions who need treatment the limited staff could help only a few. For these reasons HOPE is essentially a teaching program, although some treatment will be involved. The American members of the medical staff, which includes 15 physicians, 2 dentists, 25 nurses, and 30 auxiliary personnel, will work with groups of their local counterparts. Training will also be conducted through classroom lectures and discussions, movies and film strips. By concentrating on training, HOPE will upgrade the local medical people who can in turn teach others, thus spreading the impact of HOPE.

HOPE is a privately sponsored program supported by contributions from business and industry, labor unions, civic groups, and individuals. Estimated cost is about $3.5 million for a year's operation. At present, Propect HOPE is establishing local area committees in many States. The U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce member chapters can play a vital role in acting as a stimulant for this organizational program. Further information can be obtained by writing the People to People Health Foundation, Inc., 1818 M Street NW., Washington 6, D.C.

Taxing Freedom of Expression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have recently introduced a bill (H.R. 5573) in which I join many of my colleagues in the House, which proposes a much-needed clarification of congressional policy on the right of freedom of expression without undue tax restraints. These tax restraints have arisen as a result of arbitrary administrative rulings interpreting our tax laws so as to impose a prior restraint on the right of our constituents to present their views on legislative matters at any level of the Government. The administrative interpretations to which I refer are embodied in Internal Revenue Service regulations which attempt to deny a tax deduction for lawful business expenditures which relate to lobbying, the promotion or defeat of legislation, or "propaganda relating thereto."

These sweeping terms are not defined in these administrative rules which places business taxpayers in the position of proceeding at their peril in exercising their right of petition to their Government and in determining whether or not their expenditures for activities on expressing their views may not be deemed proper deductions for Federal income tax purposes. This rule applies even though the legislation to which the business taxpayer may express his views and reactions can have a substantial economic impact on his business or his right to stay in business.

The Supreme Court of the United States, in my opinion, has compounded the confusion in this area in a series of cases in which the Court contends that in denying tax deductions to a taxpayer for expressing his views on matters which would have seriously affected or destroyed his business are not allowable as a tax deduction because of a sharply defined national policy against such deductions. However, upon reading the cases which set forth this purported rule of law one finds that the basis for this so-called national policy is predicated upon administrative interpretations rather than upon duly considered congressional enactments. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, this is a highly questionable rule of law which is predicated

upon an erroneous concept of what our national policy is and should be with respect to the tax status of business expenses for full expression of views on matters of vital economic importance.

To further demonstrate the confusion that exists in this area we find that for tax purposes there is a sharply defined national policy against the deduction for business purposes of such expenses. However, in a case decided by the U.S. Supreme Court just last month in connection with a determination of a violation of the Sherman Act, the Supreme Court noted:

> The right of petition is one of the freedoms protected by the Bill of Rights, and we cannot, of course, lightly impute to Congress an intent to invade these freedoms.

With this statement I would heartily concur and I would believe that my colleagues in the House would also heartily concur. The Supreme Court also noted in this same decision:

> The right of the people to inform their representatives in government of their desires with respect to the passage or enforcement of laws cannot properly be made to depend upon their intent in doing so. It is neither unusual nor illegal for people to seek action on law in the hope that they may bring about an advantage to themselves and a disadvantage to their competitors.

Thus our Supreme Court has created what to my mind is a double standard. For tax purposes the right of petition and presentation of views on matters governmental is restricted and impaired because of a purported sharply defined national policy. Yet the same Supreme Court with respect to an alleged violation of a punitive statute expressing the antitrust policy of the United States considers it the preservation of a basic freedom that under our system of government there is a right of the people to inform their representatives of their views on matters governmental. I cannot reconcile this double standard. I would doubt that my colleagues in the Congress of the United States could justify or reconcile such a double standard.

This then is the nature of the problem. The law demands an immediate clarification and the burden—the duty of clarification—is one of those responsibilities we accepted upon undertaking the solemn duty of representing those who chose to elect us to the high offices we now hold.

The bill which I have sponsored and which has been referred to the Committee on Ways and Means is an effective, realistic solution to the difficult legal dilemma now facing our taxpayers. I have no pride of authorship in this proposed legislation. I only heartily subscribe to the principles embodied in this bill. Who are the authors of this proposed legislation? Mr. Speaker, this bill to which I have put my name is very similar to the bill which was favorably reported and recommended by my distinguished colleagues on the Committee on Ways and Means during the second session of the last Congress, House Report 2077. At the time the Committee on Ways and Means favorably reported on this legislation during the last session of the Congress, the committee noted:

> It seemed to your committee that if an expenditure is ordinary and necessary to the conduct of a taxpayer's trade or business and is lawful, it is unfair for the deduction to be disallowed just because the expense is incurred to influence legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that taxing the freedom of expression is to effectively impair one of the tenets of our form of government. With the ever-expanding scope of government—at all levels of government—it is more important than ever that we reconcile the effective impediments created by this legal situation and that we forthwith undertake to pass remedial legislation.

As I previously indicated, there are several proposals on this subject which have been introduced by many of my colleagues in the House from both sides of the aisle. This is not a partisan issue, it is a nonpartisan problem of fundamental importance and I urge that we undertake an immediate disposition. I earnestly solicit the support and cooperation of other Members of the House of Representatives and respectfully request that my colleagues on the Committee on Ways and Means immediately schedule this problem for discussion.

Mr. Speaker, an editorial which appeared in Advertising Age on March 6, 1961, points up the important issues involved in clarification by Congress of proper business expense for tax purposes. Under unanimous consent I include the editorial at this point:

AN IMPORTANT DECISION

The reversal by the U.S. Supreme Court of the judgments against Carl Byoir & Associates and 24 eastern railroads in the Pennsylvania trucking case is of major importance, not only to the public relations segment of business, but to advertising people as well.

The Court reached its decision unanimously, and as Advertising Age's reporter said, it wrapped lobbying in a "public interest" cloak of unprecedented grandeur, even though it sharply criticized the ethics of public relations operators on both sides of the railroad-truckers dispute.

The important point for our purposes is that the Court advanced in the strongest terms the opinion that representative government can't operate unless citizens can express their views freely, and that the Sherman antitrust act cannot be so construed as to act as a brake upon that freedom of expression.

Among other things, the Court's decision said:

"The right of the people to inform their representatives in government of their desires with respect to the passage or enforcement of laws cannot properly be made to depend upon their intent in doing so. It is neither unusual nor illegal for people to seek action on laws in the hope that they may bring about an advantage to themselves and a disadvantage to their competitors."

In the light of this and other language of the decision, it would appear difficult for the Internal Revenue Service or others to argue about the legality of advertising devoted to public interest messages, even though the point at issue in the recent advertising cases has not been action under the antitrust laws but in terms of allowances for taxes, determination of utility rates, etc. When the Supreme Court ruled on advertising cases not too long ago, it held that lobbying was not to be encouraged; now it seems to have changed its mind.

It is narrow legalism to argue that lobbying and discussing public issues are essential to the operation of our kind of society, and then, to restrain or hobble such discussion by penalizing it in terms of tax reprisals.

A Thorough Search Would Surely Find Negro Musicians Capable of Playing in the National Symphony Orchestra

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, the manager of the National Symphony Orchestra, Mr. Raymond F. Kohn, was quoted in the Washington, D.C., Afro-American on March 4, 1961 as follows:

> There cannot conceivably be a color line in the National Symphony.

Mr. Kohn then outlined to the reporter of the newspaper, Don Harewood, the procedure used for auditioning new talent. He said:

> We hold two types of auditions annually. First we notify the union (Local No. 161 of the American Federation of Musicians) that a vacancy or vacancies exist.
>
> If we are unable to find talent locally then our personnel director sends out a call to music schools, colleges. They are requested to recommend persons who it is felt can meet our qualifications.
>
> Sometimes even the orchestra members recommend people whom they know.
>
> There is one primary requisite for an applicant who desires an audition. He must have a repertoire.
>
> This means that the applicant must have some knowledge of the symphonic standards, i.e., Bach; Beethoven; Tschaikovsky, etc.

He added:

> Why, we even have a contest every year, the Merriweather-Post Contest, which is open to all.

If it is simply a matter of not being able to find a competent Negro musician, and not a matter of bias reinforced by hiring only through a Jim Crow local of the American Federation of Musicians, then there is a simple solution. That solution is to make a more thorough search.

Because I am confident that competent Negro musicians can be found who will add luster to the National Symphony Orchestra I hereby offer my own services in an effort to find a Negro instrumentalist for the orchestra.

The National Symphony Orchestra should represent to all the world our high standards and aspirations as a nation and as a people, and our part in and contribution to Western civilization.

The National Symphony Orchestra has represented this Nation on its tours abroad under the sponsorship of the Department of State and as part of the President's program for cultural exchange which is financed by taxes which are paid on a nonsegregated basis.

That the National Symphony Orchestra does not have a single Negro instrumentalist in its ranks despite the vast

contribution of the American Negro to our Nation's musical culture, a contribution which is universally acknowledged by people of all nations, is a matter to be deplored.

Top Government officials have shown deep concern in the case of the nonreferral of Negroes to employers and contractors working on Federal buildings or holding Federal contracts.

Surely, the fact that there has never, in the entire time that the National Symphony Orchestra has been in existence, been even one Negro employed by this musical organization should also be a matter of public concern.

The National Symphony Orchestra has been included in the budget for the first time, and Members of Congress will soon be asked to appropriate funds to it. These funds are small in amount, and far from what a city the size of Washington should be contributing to its orchestra if we are to judge by what other American cities contribute.

But, in any event, the National Symphony Orchestra and the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia should come to the Congress with clean hands and, especially, in view of the worldwide interest in what we as a people do about solving our own problems of bias and prejudice, they should make an honest attempt to end the longstanding bias of the National Symphony Orchestra against Negro musicians.

I include, as part of my remarks, the article from the Washington Afro-American to which I have referred:

NATIONAL SYMPHONY PLAYS WAY OUT OF TUNE ON HIRING POLICIES SAYS REPRESENTATIVE POWELL

(By Don Harewood)

The National Symphony Orchestra of Washington, D.C., has been accused of racial discrimination in its hiring policies by Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL.

Calling attention to the "undemocratic and employment policies persisted in by the orchestra," Representative POWELL introduced a bill, H.R. 4348 to establish a Commission on the Cultural Resources in the Nation's Capital, and to provide a comprehensive plan for the effective utilization of such resources without regard to race or color.

Exactly 8 days later, the Young Democratic Club of the District of Columbia likewise called for an end to the "whites only" hiring policy of the National Symphony Orchestra.

The National Symphony, however, has strongly denied any discrimination in its hiring policy.

In an interview with an AFRO reporter Mr. Raymond F. Kohn, manager of the National Symphony, was asked, "Is there any discrimination in your hiring or employment policies?"

Mr. Kohn declared, "There cannot conceivably be a color line in the National Symphony."

Mr. Kohn was also asked, "Have you ever hired personnel through Local No. 710 of the American Federation of Musicians?" (This is the segregated musicians' union for colored musicians in the District.)

Mr. Kohn exclaimed, "Do you know that I have never heard of local 710 until recently."

Mr. Kohn then outlined the procedure used for auditioning new talent. He said, "we hold two types of auditions annually. First, we notify the union (Local No. 161 of the American Federation of Musicians) that a vacancy or vacancies exist.

"If we are unable to find talent locally then our personnel director sends out a call to music schools, colleges. They are requested to recommend persons who it is felt can meet our qualifications.

"Sometimes even the orchestra members recommend people whom they know.

"There is one primary requisite for an applicant who desires an audition," he continued. "He must have a repertoire.

"This means that the applicant must have some knowledge of the symphonic standards, i.e., Bach; Beethoven; Tschaikovsky, etc."

He stated, "Why, we even have a contest every year, the Merriweather-Post contest, which is open to all."

Then, with a puzzled expression he asked, "Why hasn't local No. 710 made an inquiry of the National Symphony? Why have they not come forth?"

The Afro also contacted the president of local No. 161 of the American Federation of Musicians, a Mr. Kaufman.

This local, along with local No. 710, was mentioned in the resolution passed by the Young Democratic Club of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Kaufman said flatly that certain sections of the resolution had no basis in fact. "If a qualified colored musician came up he would be accepted," he told the Afro.

"We do have a contract with the National Symphony Orchestra which is not exclusive, and it is not restrictive since all hiring is done on the basis of qualification of the applicant," he said.

When asked whether or not a nonunion musician who applied for an audition would be allowed to join the union, Mr. Kaufman said "No."

Later, the question was put to him in this manner: "if a man who through his own initiative and aggressiveness, though not a union member, managed to secure employment with the National Symphony, would he then be permitted to join the union?

Mr. Kaufman said, "under those conditions we would accept him. But in the last 6 years not one colored person has made application for an audition."

This last statement, however, would appear to contradict information supplied by Howard Mitchell, music director and conductor of the National Symphony Orchestra.

Mr. Mitchell informed Mr. Kohn that he had auditioned a colored cellist in New York last year, but that he did not have a repertoire at that time and failed to qualify.

District residents remember Mr. Mitchell as the man who led the fight against the DAR which opened the way for colored performers to appear on the stage of Constitution Hall.

Mr. Mitchell also invited Dr. Warner Lawson to direct the National Symphony Orchestra in January 1955 and several times since.

In addition, he has appeared with the National Symphony Orchestra and the Howard University Choir on numerous occasions.

The Unification of Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1961

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the liberation of Italy from the yoke of alien rulers and its unification in 1861 is one of the great events of 19th-century European history. It marked the culmination of the fight for freedom which the people of Italy had carried on for centuries against their foes. Until the historic and memorable year 1861, Italy was divided among her conquerors and lay prostrate at their feet. In the 1850's most of the country was under the Austrian monarchy, and all earlier efforts on the part of the people of Italy to free themselves from foreign domination had been unsuccessful. But when they renewed their war for freedom in 1859, they had France as their ally, and they were most ably led by three great Italians Victor Emmanuel, Cavour, and Garibaldi.

In the war Italy was victorious, and in the subsequent peace her freedom assured and independence recognized. By early 1861 all liberated provinces had joined hands, and by proclaiming Victor Emmanuel as their king they founded the Kingdom of Italy. That was exactly 100 years ago, the centenary of which is being celebrated throughout Italy and in all parts of the free world. I am indeed happy in joining this great centenary celebration on the 100th anniversary of the unification of Italy.

District 102 Raises Teachers' Pay; Denounces Federal Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, with all the controversy over pending legislation to provide Federal aid to education, I cannot help but take special note of an ordinary news item in the Pekin Times covering the activities of one of our local school boards in my district. School Board District No. 102 embodies the North Pekin and Marquette Heights area in Tazewell County, Ill.:

DISTRICT 102 RAISES TEACHERS' PAY; DENOUNCES FEDERAL AID

(By Edith Ladick)

MARQUETTE HEIGHTS.—School Board District 102 of North Pekin and Marquette Heights, at its meeting Thursday night, passed motions granting the superintendent of district 102, whose salary is for 12 months, a $500 increase in pay; the principal at Georgetowne Junior High School, whose salary is for 11 months, a $200 increase; and the principal at Marquette School, whose salary is for 10 months, a $400 increase. Jack O'Hara, education chairman, pointed out that the difference in the two principals' salary was due to an increase in the classroom load at Georgetowne, plus an intensification of the curriculum at Georgetowne.

A motion was also passed granting degree teachers a $15 increase; nondegree teachers, a $75 increase; and adding 3 more years' increments pay to degree teachers, who previously received increments only up to 11 years' service. Four teachers in the present school system will benefit from this extension.

The maximum pay for a degree teacher will be $5,850 and master degree teacher, $6,075.

Previous to the decision, Charles Kitchell and Mrs. Gebhardt, speaking in behalf of the teachers, stated that the general opinion of the teachers was that the increase in pay should be $200 across the board. They commented that the beginning salaries of the teachers in district 102 compared favorably with other school districts but the salaries of teachers with degrees fell behind. O'Hara stated that he would resist any more across the board increases.

He recommended encouraging the requirement that teachers not holding a degrees and who were under 60 years of age, continue their education toward a degree by attending summer school for one 6-week session each 3 years, or an extension course for 1 semester each 3 years in order to qualify for scheduled salary increases.

The board also answered two questionnaires from the Illinois Association of School Boards. One on State revenues which sought the board's opinion on various taxes. In summary of the answers, the board felt that the Retailers' Occupation and Use Tax is a proper method for supplementing the common school distributive fund in conjunction with present property taxes and that the property tax provides for State contributions and the State distributive fund provides for State contributions. The board members said they believed emphatically that the School Board Association had no business talking about the State of Illinois business and how it gets its revenue, but should confine itself to school business.

The second questionnaire dealt with Federal aid available, joint State and federally financed claims, and opinions on Federal aid. The board took a stand against any form of Federal aid, felt it led to Federal control, and felt no school in Illinois needed Federal aid. However, even though they disapproved of Federal aid for the hot lunch program, the board had to answer the question in the affirmative that they do receive this aid now.

Loans for Nonpublic Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1961

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to me this date to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include by request the text of a resolution adopted by the Board of Chosen Freeholders of Union County, N.J., at a regular meeting held on March 16, 1961, which expresses the support of the Board for legislation authorizing a program of Federal loans to private and parochial schools.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the parochial schools of Union County, representing all major religious faiths, and private schools, contribute vastly to the educational welfare, cultural and financial betterment of the county; and

Whereas the parochial and private educational systems of the county are finding it increasingly difficult to finance its operations without assistance from sources other than those already contributing; and

Whereas there are before the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, proposals that would, if enacted into law, allow for governmental loans to parochial and private school systems, that would permit new construction, expansion, and improvement to said school systems: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this board of freeholders go on record favoring such loans, and be it further

Resolved, That forthwith Senators CASE and WILLIAMS, and Representative DWYER, be informed of the sentiments of this board.

Farm Bureau's Golden Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, due to the unfortunate death of my distinguished and respected colleague, the Honorable B. CARROLL REECE, of Tennessee, it has been necessary to cancel a special order that I had for today for the purpose of bringing to the attention of this body the fact that today, March 20, 1961, marks the 50th anniversary of the founding of the American Frm Bureau Federation. Under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith include the address that I had prepared to mark this occasion:

This is a momentous day in the history of agriculture in the United States.

On this day, 50 years ago, in Broome County, N.Y.—one of the four counties in the district I have the honor to represent—the idea that brought forth the great American Farm Bureau Federation was conceived.

Not a single Member of this Chamber today is unaware of the activities of this vast organization, the largest and the only nationwide federation of farmers in the United States. Its membership today is more than 1,600,000 farm families in all States of the Union except Alaska and, in addition, in Puerto Rico.

A half a century ago today, on March 20, 1911, a pioneer, John H. Barron, one of the first county agents in northern United States, went to work in Binghamton in Broome County to open an office for what then was the farm bureau of the Binghamton Chamber of Commerce. The word "bureau" had its inception in the fact that the Binghamton Chamber of Commerce had other bureaus—a traffic bureau, a manufacturers bureau, and several other subdivisions similarly named. Thus, the farm bureau.

Back of this activity by the Binghamton Chamber of Commerce was the interest of its secretary of that day, Byers H. Gitchell, who had become convinced his organization should have a department or division devoted to the promotion of the interests of agriculture in surrounding areas.

Mr. Gitchell was motivated by a belief that farming is basic and very closely interrelated with urban and suburban areas. His vision and his agitation bore fruit.

He was joined by, among others, George A. Cullen, who then was traffic manager and industrial agent for the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad, now the Erie Railroad.

The original operation of farm bureau was sponsored jointly by the chamber, the railroad, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture. At the time the New York State College of Agriculture was unable to contribute financially, but gave freely of advice and encouragement.

These were the horse-and-buggy days and Mr. Barron wheeled up and down the muddy roads of his district, acquainting himself with problems of farmers, helping, coordinating their interests and activities, giving farm demonstrations. When farmers began coming to his office, he appointed community leaders who then organized meetings in local farming communities. He organized study clubs.

From this sprung the largest farm organization in the Nation—representing three out of four organized farmers in the country.

Not long after Broome County became organized, other counties followed. Five more farm bureaus were organized in New York State in 1912. Thirteen more followed in 1913. Growth continued. By 1918, a total of 55 New York counties had farm bureaus.

Meanwhile, other areas of the county had become active. In middle 1912, Pettis County, Mo., organized a county group of farmers that was the forerunner there of the Missouri Farm Bureau Federation. In Illinois, the DeKalb County Soil Improvement Association was formed at about the same time.

By 1913, the Broome County Farm Improvement Association had been formed, taking over all of the farm activities previously centered within the chamber of commerce. The new organization took on the working name of the Broome County Farm Bureau. Friendly relations with the chamber continued, but henceforth farmers took over complete control of their affairs.

This pattern of greater local farm responsibility spread rapidly. The emergency of World War I, with its message of, "Food Will Win the War" echoed throughout the land, and agriculture took on a renewed importance. The farm bureaus of the day responded magnificently.

As the county farm bureau evolved, the question of control received much thought and attention. So long as State and Federal funds made up a large portion of financial support, there remained a question of control by the state college of agriculture.

The aim was to advance farm bureau to the point that county appropriations and farm bureau membership dues would make up a larger and larger share of the expenses involved.

It is a tribute to the men and women of a half a century ago that they had the vision, the spirit of freedom and the will to recognize that only an organization free from government could indeed be a true representative of the farmer.

It is interesting to note that by 1917—only 6 short years after an idea had been born in Broome County—a State federation of farm bureaus was born in New York State. By 1918, the State Federation of the New York Farm Bureau had four standing committees—one on legislation, one on organization, another on education, and a fourth on markets and transportation. Problems of that year were the sale of wool, labor, power ditchers, the shipment of wheat, and liberty loans.

In 1919 the New York State Farm Bureau Federation took the initiative and called together farm bureau representatives of 12 States to meet at Ithaca, the home of Cornell University. The purpose of that conference was to advance a proposal that a National Farm Bureau Federation be organized.

The stated purpose of that first 12-State meeting is interesting:

"1. To provide the Nation with a strong Farm Bureau organization thoroughly representative of agriculture which might speak for the farmers of the entire country.

"(2) To develop and carry forward a program which would reach the entire country and which would bring into action the strongest farmers of the country."

An outgrowth of that Ithaca meeting was the appointment of a committee of five to

push forward the idea of a national federation.

On November 13 and 14, in 1919, at Chicago, representatives of 31 States formed a temporary American Federation of Farm Bureaus. The original problems of a nationwide federation were obvious. Never before had all of the diverse elements of agriculture attempted to unite under one mantle.

Very properly, questions were deep and searching, but overshadowing all else was the real possibility of creating a great, new national farmers' organization on a basis different from anything which had been before. Here in their grasp delegates saw a degree of strength and solidarity never before possible. Here was a sleeping giant that might be awakened.

There were about 500 delegates at that first meeting in the Red Room of the LaSalle Hotel in Chicago. The atmosphere was tense, expectant.

After much discussion and not little argument, the delegates decided to form a nationwide organization to be called the American Farm Bureau Federation. The first president was James R. Howard, of Marshall County, Iowa, a tall, angular man who knew well the problems of agriculture. He had been born on the same farm he then operated.

Nothing better illustrates the vision of American farm families than the membership report of the first annual meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation at Indianapolis in 1920. At that meeting, the secretary reported a paid-up, voluntary membership of more than 800,000.

Since those early days, there has been a tremendous growth in this great federation, all of it under the leadership of the illustrious presidents who followed Mr. Howard: Oscar E. Bradfute, of Ohio; Sam H. Thompson, of Illinois; Ed. O'Neal, of Alabama; Allan B. Kline, of Iowa; and the current president, the sixth president, Charles B. Shuman, of Illinois.

All of these men played vigorous roles in leading agriculture, in giving it a voice that must be heard even as the number of farmers declines.

Along the line there have been many outstanding State Farm Bureau presidents, among them the present president of my own New York State Farm Bureau, Donald F. Green, fruitgrower of Chazy, N.Y. Much of the progress of the entire Farm Bureau effort can be traced to State leaders like Mr. Green. I am sure other Members of this Chamber can point with equal pride to their own State farm bureau presidents as men who represent the good and the solid in agriculture of these United States.

Over the last half century, a great organization has come to life and has developed as an independent, voluntary—and I stress the word "voluntary"—federation of farm and ranch families associated to safeguard and promote their enlightened self-interest in a manner consistent with the general welfare.

It is an organization that is typically American. Members join and pay dues voluntarily to finance the Farm Bureau program. Members develop the policies and program through democratic process and majority decisions. Members have equal rights to make proposals, discuss, debate, and vote on issues. Members elect leaders from their own group.

Farm Bureau is local, national, and international in its scope and influence, and is nonpartisan, nonsectarian, and nonsecret in character. Its main offices are in Chicago and it has a Washington office. In addition, a foreign trade office has been opened in Rotterdam, the Netherlands, to promote the sale of American farm products overseas. This office is totally supported by membership dues.

Recently, the American Farm Bureau Federation has organized the Farm Bureau Trade Development Corporation to strengthen its private trade efforts. The Farm Bureau also has recently organized the American Agricultural Marketing Association, an organization designed to help farmers market their products.

Most of us here are familiar, I am sure, with the booklet of annual Farm Bureau policy resolutions. This booklet is the work of thousands upon thousands of farm families from nearly 2,700 counties in this Nation. Annually, these farm families start policy development at the county level. From there it moves up to the respective States and, finally, to the annual meeting in December of the American Farm Bureau Federation which regularly attracts more than 5,000 farm men, women, and young people. At this convention, the delegates, elected by farmers of their own States, thrash out issues, argue, give and take, much as we do here.

Finally, the policies emerge, hammered out in the most democratic way.

Perhaps the most succinct statement of the Farm Bureau position can be stated in the words of Mr. Shuman, the Illinois farmer who now heads this great organization:

"Our goal," he says, "is to serve the best interests of agriculture from an overall standpoint and to do so on a basis consistent with the national interest.

"A major objective of Farm Bureau policy is to create conditions which will make it possible for farmers to earn and get high per-family real incomes in a manner which will preserve freedom."

If we listen carefully to Mr. Shuman's words we easily will see that he doesn't mean to try to make farmers prosperous by the use of tax money. He believes, and strongly, that the way to real prosperity for agriculture is not the control route, but the avenue of decisions freely made in a free atmosphere without the shackles and chains of a Federal bureaucracy.

I have, with pride, traced the history of a great organization whose birth was in Broome County, N.Y. It was a noble idea. It is being well executed.

During next November, the New York State Farm Bureau will observe the 50th anniversary year by holding its annual meeting in Binghamton, in Broome County. This will bring together many farm leaders to observe a half century of solid progress. It is an event to which I am looking forward with great pleasure and pride.

Farm Plan Adds to Confusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last week the President sent a farm message to the Congress. It was another example of this administration's attempts to persuade the Congress that it should abdicate its constitutional role as one of the coordinate branches of our Federal Government whose responsibility it is to legislate. The type of thinking that has produced this fantastic proposal that farm legislation is no longer within the province of the Congress is not far removed from the thinking of those who would like to see a Chief Executive rule by decree. Under the leave that was given to include extraneous matter I wish to insert at this point an editorial from the Rockford Morning Star of March 17, 1961. I think that it provides an excellent, short analysis of the compounded chaos that would result from the adoption of such a program. It also points up the fact that it would place the Congress in a purely negative and subservient role. The farm problem is our No. 1 domestic problem, and we should get on with the job of providing a solution. The President's farm message is not a solution but a demand that the Congress surrender its rightful responsibility.

The editorial follows:

FARM PLAN ADDS TO CONFUSION

President Kennedy's latest farm plan would greatly multiply the confusion and problems that government meddling has heaped on agriculture. The President, whose efforts to try to deal with the farm problem have been a series of starts and stops and jumps this way and that, has sent Congress a complicated program which could send segments of agriculture moving off in all directions and stumbling over each other.

On the surface, it may appear that the President would have the farmers write their own ticket and that would be it. But there is a good deal more to his proposal than that. Congress would step out of its management role in the Government farm program and delegate to the President and Secretary of Agriculture broad powers to deal directly with farmers in drawing up and putting into effect programs designed to raise farm income through more Federal subsidy and indenture the farm economy with more controls.

Under the Kennedy plan, farmer advisory committees would be created to work with Secretary of Agriculture Freeman in formulating separate programs for individual crops and for livestock. Once a program involving controls was drafted, it would be submitted to affected producers in a referendum. If approved by a two-thirds vote of those balloting, the program would be submitted to Congress. Unless rejected by either House within 60 days, the program would become effective for that segment of agriculture.

Congress could no longer write farm legislation. Its role would be merely to let stand or reject programs put together and approved by the adminstration and farm groups. The programs would include marketing quotas based on bushels, tons, or units of production; Government-financed price supports; deficiency payments; incentive payments; Government purchases of surpluses; and export subsidies. It can be assumed that the administration would see to it that all of these Government props were applied in large measure. President Kennedy and Secretary Freeman have made it clear that they aim to increase rather than decrease Federal controls, even though the President's task force on agriculture has advised curtailment of Government programs that tend to increase production of farm products.

The President's program would fractionalize farm production, breaking it down into groups which inevitably would be working against each other if the plan were made fully effective. The plan would reverse Government policy of trying to encourage diversification and rotation of crops and would benefit primarily the one-crop grower. A farmer producing several commodities might find himself enmeshed in a number of con-

flicting alliances under the various programs for individual segments of agriculture.

President Kennedy apparently doesn't believe the farmers meant it when they rejected the Democratic farm philosophy at the polls last November. He is telling Congress to leave the problem to him and he'll straighten it out—with a Secretary of Agriculture who admits that he knows little about farming or the farm problem.

The Will To Win Pays Dividends—Pollution Can Be Controlled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, everyone vitally interested in the conservation of our natural resources agrees pure water may well be one of the limiting factors in future economic growth. The annual lowering of the water table in many areas is causing serious concern among scientists.

It is becoming increasingly important that every available means of controlling pollution be employed. Unfortunately, not all segments of our economy cooperate to the fullest extent possible.

In my district of Pennsylvania the P. H. Glatfelter Paper Co. is one of the old established companies in the papermaking industry. Few industries require the amount of water that papermaking does and, by the same token, water used is left in a highly polluted stage. I have personal knowledge that over the years this company has expended huge sums to find an efficient and satisfactory method of controlling, not only water, but air pollution, as well.

In addition to that, the company has been responsible for the planting of millions of seedlings which not only assure a continuing wood supply but also serve as one of the better methods of conserving water.

Industry in general, and the papermaking industry in particular, should be interested in a news item which appeared in the Harrisburg, Pa., Sunday-Patriot-News, of March 19. It once again proves no barrier is unsurmountable if the will to win is the guiding factor. The Glatfelter Co. is to be commended for its contribution to the advancement of pollution control.

The article follows:

GLATFELTER OPERATING WASTE PLANT

SPRING GROVE.—The P. H. Glatfelter Co. has placed into operation a waste treatment plant to provide complete treatment of the mill's waste water, P. H. Glatfelter 3d, company president, revealed last night.

The new facilities, costing more than $1.5 million, will meet the requirements of the clean streams program.

According to Glatfelter, the company is a pioneer in the treatment of pulp and paper mill waste, having had in 1958 a plant to provide complete treatment for one-fourth of its mill waste.

Based on data obtained from the 1958 study, the company received from the State sanitary water board a permit to proceed with the expansion to complete treatment of the entire mill effluent.

The treatment processes resulting from these studies represent improvements over conventional methods and have proved to be of great interest to mills throughout the country that are faced with stream pollution problems, Glatfelter explained.

"The problem has been both gigantic and difficult. The plant discharges 10 million gallons of waste-containing waters daily, each daily discharge containing from 15 to 25 tons of solids," he said. Moreover, it is "oxygen-demanding" or organic waste, comparable in type and quantity to that which might come from the entire city of York.

The Jewish Memorial Hospital and Its New Development Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, in the district which I have the honor to represent is located the Jewish Memorial Hospital. This great institution dedicated to healing has never turned away anyone who has been ill or injured. It is a voluntary hospital supported by devoted humanitarians.

A long-treasured Jewish Memorial Hospital dream was brought several steps nearer to realization when Jesse H. Barkin, president of the hospital's board of trustees, released a public announcement on January 23, 1961 that Milton S. Heller has been named general chairman of a new development fund program that is already in action. The public announcement released to the press and to community, professional, and hospital publications and circularized to the medical staff, read as follows: Milton S. Heller, a director of the McCrory Corp. and Landers, Frary & Clark Co., and a partner in Heller Bros., has been named chairman of a $2 million development fund campaign to expand the bed facilities and other services of Jewish Memorial Hospital, a nonsectarian, voluntarily supported institution located at Broadway and 196th Street. Announcement of this appointment was made by Jesse H. Barkin, president of the hospital's board of trustees.

Mr. Heller, a trustee and vice president of the hospital, heads up a development fund campaign committee consisting of David Schwartz, chairman of the board of Jonathan Logan; Henry Kalman, of the R. & K. Dress Co.; Henry L. Schenk, president of the Trade Bank & Trust Co.; Marvin Kratter, of the Kratter Corp.; David Dawn, of Alice Stuart; and Drs. Walter Levy and Harry Wallerstein, of the hospital's medical board. Julius Israel, of Regal Knitwear Co., is chairman of special gifts.

Behind this announcement is the story of the earnest efforts by the board of trustees, the medical board, and the administration to evolve the ways and means that would enable the hospital, which has by now grown to the point where additional building is absolutely essential, to provide still more services and facilities for the use of the community. The founders of the hospital, back in 1905, and even those who later planned and brought to realization the present building, understandably could not foresee the growth of the institution that they had established. Nor could they forecast accurately the enormous expansion of the population of the areas that Jewish Memorial Hospital serves: Washington Heights, Inwood, Riverdale, and the Bronx. In terms of numbers, the estimated population of these communities totals approximately 300,000 people.

The result of this growth has been such that the hospital has for years had the recurring problem of how to enlarge its facilities to provide the necessary services called for by its growing importance in the community. After the research laboratory building was completed and other structural modifications made to keep up with the growing needs, there still remained the increasing need for more beds, more facilities, more hospital services.

For years, the board of trustees have been studying this problem. One plan after another was evolved, with each having to yield either because the requirements continued to grow or the costs seemed prohibitive. With every major step, approval was needed from city and State agencies. Consultations were held with architects and builders.

As a background to all of this effort, there was the ever-present phenomenon of steadily rising building and maintenance costs. In past years, a portion of the funds raised from the annual dinner and from the souvenir dinner journal could be set aside to be applied at a later date toward new construction. Today the steeply rising costs are such that the moneys now raised by the hospital barely cover the annual maintenance deficit.

During 1960 the board of trustees took the serious step of approving a building program that would take care of the hospital needs for the reasonable foreseeable future. Present plans, while not complete or definite, are designed to provide for: Forty-eight additional beds, four major operating rooms, anesthesia induction rooms, plaster and fracture operating room, cystoscopic X-ray operating suite, central supply and sterilization unit, new medical library and conference room, and an entire new intergrated maternity unit. Also four new nursery suites of 10 basinets each, a new suspect nursery, a 4-bed isolation nursery, a new formula preparation room, and a new circumcision room.

In addition there will be two patient-guest lounges, a doctor's rest and locker room, a doctor's conference lounge, two nurses' rest and locker rooms, and three

new treatment and examining rooms. The plans provide for new and enlarged clinics in rehabilitation medicine and mental health. Also included is an obstetrician's lounge and sleeping quarters and many other auxiliary service units.

The cost of these additions is now estimated to be in the $2 million range.

To raise these funds, the board thought it desirable to approach first its own trustees and medical staff. From these sources there was pledged a total of close to $300,000. However, the anticipated costs are such that it now becomes absolutely indispensable to go beyond the confines of the Jewish Memorial Hospital family. It becomes imperative to appeal to the communities for their philanthropic support.

The development fund will be used to increase the inpatient facilities of the hospital by 45 beds, enlarge and integrate its maternity unit, add operating rooms, expand the rehabilitation department, provide additional library space and increase the hospital's community and outpatient services particularly in its growing mental health and geriatric departments.

The development fund campaign is enlisting the community leadership of Washington Heights, Inwood, Riverdale, and the Bronx. These, among the most rapidly growing areas of New York City, are all served by Jewish Memorial Hospital as a community hospital.

Louis Miller is the hospital director. Seymour Ardam, formerly with the Albert Einstein College of Medicine, Yeshiva University, has been named as coordinator of the development fund campaign.

With this in mind, the development fund committee under the leadership of Milton S. Heller engaged a fundraiser and program coordinator. Seymour Ardam, the man selected for this important post, brings with him many years of experience with the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies, The United Jewish Appeal, and the Albert Einstein College of Medicine of Yeshiva University.

Along with the development fund committee of the board of trustees, a medical staff division of the development fund committee has been set up under the chairmanship of Drs. Harry Wallerstein and Walter Levy. Drs. Herman Cohen and Meyer Karsh of Riverdale; Drs. Milton Klein and Sol Schifrin of the Bronx; and Dr. Herbert Zerner of Washington Heights, will serve as cochairmen of their respective communities.

Also a general community division is being organized under the chairmanship of C. William Borchers, president of the North Side Savings Bank. Functional committees are now being set up in the Bronx, Riverdale and Washington Heights. Through the efforts of Mr. Borchers, chairmen for these communities have been appointed. They are: for the Bronx, District Attorney Isidore Dollinger; for Riverdale, Commissioner Francis J. Bloustein, vice chairman of the New York City Planning Commission; and for Washington Heights, Floyd Cramer, president of the Washington Heights Savings & Federal Loan Association.

Many prominent civic and industrial leaders have indicated their interest and support of the program by enlisting as members of the development fund committee. The manner in which these civic-minded leaders have responded to Mr. Borchers' request indicates that the public realizes the need for the development and growth of the hospital as an absolute necessity. The campaign promises to be hard and demanding, but its goals are also challenging and inspiring.

How Many Judges?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, shortly the House will be asked to pass legislation creating additional Federal judgships. I would like to call to the attention of the House an excellent editorial in the March 3 issue of the Cincinnati Enquirer, entitled "How Many Judges?"

Respect for the Federal judiciary must be one of the bedrocks of our National Government. We have seen in Cuba dictator Fidel Castro make laws to suit himself, and then displace judges until he found men willing to do his bidding.

The first real fracture of public confidence in the New Deal as administered by the late Franklin D. Roosevelt developed when he attempted, unsuccessfully, to "pack" the Supreme Court.

And in later years, various neopolitical decisions of the Federal judiciary have done much to erode general respect for the Nation's courts. The Democrats were in power for 20 years—virtually a generation—and during that time there was a sizable turnover in Federal judgeships. Democrats were not invariably chosen to fill vacancies, of course, but it was the exception when they were not. And in some conspicuous instances, the appointments went to individuals who were patently Democrats in their thinking, whatever political label they may have worn superficially.

This was not good for the country. It was a disservice to our scheme of balanced government.

And now it appears that the harm will be compounded, because the need for more judges to handle the increased workload of the Federal judiciary became acute during the Eisenhower administration—and a Democrat controlled Congress turned its back on the need until a member of the party could be installed in the White House to make the selections.

Originally, President Eisenhower asked for 40 additional judges. He even offered to name 20 Democrats and 20 Republicans. But Congress, in hopes of a Democratic victory last November, simply kicked the request around until adjournment.

Now President Kennedy has asked for 59 more judges. The Senate Judiciary Committee—which had trimmed the Eisenhower request to 25—said, "No, let's make it 69." The Senate itself said, "Let's make it 73." Meanwhile, an influential Member of the House predicts that by the time that body gets through with the bill, it will call for at least 100 more judges.

We hope the public shames these patronage grabbers, for that is what they are.

The need for additional judges is unquestioned. Yet each appointment represents a lifetime job paying $22,500 to $25,500, and in many States, if not most, the influential politicians—Members of Congress, Governors, or whatnot—will insist upon dictating the choices for the bench. President Kennedy may wish to be fair, as he was fair in the selection of his Cabinet, but he respects the ordinary rules of politics, and a President is scarcely in position to pick and choose the entire Federal judiciary personally. He can, however, hold down the number of appointments to reasonable—not political—proportions.

Pesticides, Chemicals, and Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address given by Mr. Clarence Cottam, director, Welder Wildlife Foundation, Sinton, Tex., on December 13, 1960, entitled "Pesticides, Chemicals, and Pollution:"

PESTICIDES, CHEMICALS, AND POLLUTION

(Address by Clarence Cottam, director, Welder Wildlife Foundation, Sinton, Tex.,[1] national conference on water pollution, Washington, D.C., December 13, 1960)

Water, soil, air, and sunlight are the four basic ingredients that make life on earth possible. Accordingly, life is curtailed or handicapped to the extent that any of these basic requirements or substances are made unuseable or unavailable. Because useable water is now in short supply and the demands increasing pollution abatement and clean waters are public necessities. In the past, water conservation and development mainly have been concerned with water volume. Dams, flood control, irrigation, and diversion structures have been installed to transport precious water from areas of abundance to areas of need. With our exploding population increases and constantly expanding industry, it becomes abundantly clear that more consideration must be given to water quality. Water needs can be met only by using the available supply over and over again. We must practice use without abuse. Pollution must be stopped.

CHEMICAL POLLUTANTS AND THE PESTICIDE INDUSTRY

More than half a million organic chemicals have been made and described [2] and new compounds are being developed almost daily. Most surface waters receive a large, variable and anonymous load of organic chemicals whose composition and probable effects are poorly known. Pollutants of soil, water and air are adversely affecting the environment in which our people must live. Pesticides, used with little concern for other values, for an ever increasing part of this complex chemical picture.

[1] Contribution No. 57, Welder Wildlife Foundation.

[2] To save space the 40 reference citations have been deleted.

The introduction of DDT and 2,4–D, in about 1943 to 1945, marked the beginning of a tremendous upsurge in the development of a bewildering array of chemical pesticides. More than 90,000 pesticide products and formulations are now registered under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act, and a fourfold increase is expected in the next dozen years. Furthermore, and contrary to the public interest and to most advertisements, most new pesticides are decidedly more toxic, generally more stable and less specific in effect than those of but a few years back.

We do not know the total production or consumption of all pesticides. The Stabilization Service of USDA shows that 574,213,000 pounds of technical material of just 15 major chemical pesticides of the 200+ basic control compounds now in use were produced or imported into the United States in 1958. A few other pesticides not listed above include: 2,801,572 pounds of synthetic pesticides; 2,545,565 pounds of organic phosphorus; 5+ million pounds of pryethrum products; 1,816,300 pounds of ryonia; $729,189 worth of rotenone; 93,160,000 pounds of fungicide, 28,346,000 pounds of pentachlorophenol wood preservative; 150,000,000 pounds of herbicides and other millions of pounds of rodenticides.

Well over 100 million acres in the United States are sprayed, dusted or otherwise treated with highly poisonous pesticides annually and at a consumer cost of well over $2 billion per year. Currently, nearly one-fifth of our croplands and millions of acres of forest and rangelands are treated from once to seven or eight times each year with the same or different pesticides in quantities of technical material of a few ounces to more than 20 pounds at each application. Pesticides usually are applied year after year to essentially the same farmland. It seems logical to assume that the potential hazard to wildlife, as well as to people, increases with the pesticide volume applied and the toxicity of the poisons used.

DO THESE CHEMICALS BECOME POLLUTANTS?

There is abundant proof that often there are immediate ill effects upon wildlife resulting from many of the eradication and control programs and that the soil is polluted with some of these toxicants for many years. There also is considerable evidence of serious side effects that are generally overlooked because of the delayed action when highly toxic, stable, and broad spectrum poisons are used in quantity. It should be obvious that the only reason for using any pesticide is that it is toxic to something. There is much evidence that some of these chemical poisons are getting into our water systems and causing considerable loss of wildlife resources. The more subtle, indirect, and long-range effects of these toxicants upon man and his wildlife resources are little known. They could be profoundly important. It is well known that trace elements in infinitesimal amounts can and often do exercise extraordinary influence on life, which seem out of all proportion to their size. "No one at this time can tell how much or how little of a carcinogen would be required to produce cancer in any human being, or how long it would take the cancer to develop." In general these chemicals are undesirable additions to food and water.

PESTICIDES AND WATER PROBLEMS

Pesticide compounds may enter our water supply through direct application to the water surface, by drifting onto the water surface from adjoining treated areas, or by being washed in from the watershed. Detergents, domestic and industrial pollutants have entered water courses and ground water aquifers by being washed into our streams from seepage, cesspools, absorption fields, oxidation ponds used in treating municipal sewage, ponds holding industrial or commercial wastes or by natural and induced infiltration from streams or channels receiving sewage and other waste products.

When large amounts of stable chemical poisons are broadcast over extensive acreages, it is virtually certain that some will get into our public water supplies. They are not readily detected in water. Detergents, known commonly as ABS (alkyl benzene sulfonate) have been found in ground water in concentrations even exceeding those found in surface waters. Studies are needed to determine the presence of pesticides in ground and surface water. More practical, economical and effective means of removing them are needed. Dangerous pesticides already have been found in the major U.S. rivers.

FISH KILLS

Highly toxic pollutants have been found in many smaller streams in nearly all parts of the country, which have resulted in extensive fish kills. Fish and their food organisms have been killed over considerable stretches of streams, and fish flesh has been tainted and made unusable by different pesticides. In the return to a questionnaire from 28 States, covering the 4 months from June through September of 1960, more than 200 reports of individual fish kills were recorded. The number of fish lost varied tremendously in the different instances of poisoning from "a few" to "5 million."

Agricultural poisons (pesticides) accounted for 38 percent of the cases of die off. Another 13.9 percent, undetermined, may largely have been caused by these poisons. Industrial pollution caused 27.7 percent of the loss, domestic sewage followed with 7.7 percent, mining wastes with 3 percent, miscellaneous or other causes 9.7 percent.

The severity or extent of die off was high in most cases of industrial and pesticide losses. In the agricultural or pesticide kills, 8 percent of the cases were not appraised as to severity. The kills of fish in local areas up to 19 miles of stream were listed as complete in 34.7 percent of the cases.[3] Heavy losses were recorded in 33.3 percent, moderate kills in 13.3 percent, and light kills in the remaining 10.7 percent of the cases.

PESTICIDE TOXICITY

While many chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides were listed as being the cause of the fish kills, endrin is one of those most commonly listed. This is not surprising in view of the fact it is the most lethal pesticide to fish yet developed. Because of its high toxicity, it also is commonly used as a rodenticide and surprisingly too as a pesticide on vegetables and in orchards. Like most chlorinated hydrocarbons, it is a broad spectrum, stable, highly toxic poison. The infinitesimal amount of 0.6 p.p.b. or only 0.005 of a pound of endrin in 3 acres of water 1 foot deep (or 1 acre, 3 feet deep) is sufficient to kill 50 percent of the bluegills in a 96-hour period. Toxicity of the 10 most commonly used chlorinated hydrocarbons to fish tested to date, in descending order of potency, is as follows: Endrin, toxaphene, dieldrin, aldrin, DDT, heptachlor, chlordane, methoxychlor, lindane and BHC. There is some variation in the order of the effects these chemicals have upon birds and rodents, but BHC and methoxychlor are generally the least toxic to terrestrial warm-blooded vertebrates. Shrimp and other related invertebrates are highly susceptible to pesticides.

Runoff from treated areas often is highly toxic to fish. A sample of a domestic water from an orchard area in Pennsylvania was found to be lethal to fish in 4 hours. One pound of dieldrin per acre on a 20,000-acre tract in St. Lucia County, Fla., used to control sand flies, killed some 20 to 30 tons of fish. In New York State sevin, at 1¼ pounds per acre, was found to be devastating to all insect life, but it produced no noticeable direct ill effects upon fish or wildlife. Young and Nicholson found that there was a serious valleywide (TVA) fish kill in 15 streams in 8 counties of northern Alabama, caused by heavy use of toxaphene, DDT, BHC and aldrin to control the cotton boll weevil.

FOREST SPRAYS AND FISH

Spraying an extensive forest area against spruce budworm in the watershed of the Miramichi River in New Brunswick in 1956, at the rate of one-half pound of DDT per acre, produced a 91-percent kill of young salmon. Aquatic insects also were largely wiped out and some of these were not reestablished 16 months later. As expected, an alarmingly reduced adult Atlantic salmon run was noted in 1960 when the 1956 hatch returned to spawn in the Miramichi River system.

In June 1958, some 302,000 acres of northern Maine forest were sprayed with DDT at the rate of 1 pound per acre to control spruce budworms. Loss of trout was moderately heavy. Trout collected 3 months after spraying contained from 2.9 to 198 parts per million DDT. A significant growth decrease was noted in trout in sprayed areas a year following spraying. The population of brook trout was reduced considerably. The most serious effect was on the young of the year.

During mid-June 1957, some 155,000 acres of forest in Vancouver Island, British Columbia, were sprayed with 1 pound of DDT in 1 gallon of solvent per acre to control the blackheaded budworm. Steelhead salmon and trout were almost eliminated. The aquatic insect loss was extreme. Based on this study, it is evident that the safe concentration of this formulation is below 0.05 parts per million.

Spraying of 8,000 acres of forest area in Montana in the summers of 1956 and 1957 with 1 pound of DDT per acre against the spruce budworm showed variable results. In the early winter, 4 months after the area had been sprayed, fish in large numbers were found dying in Yellowstone River 90 miles downstream below the area treated. Some 600 dead and dying whitefish, brown trout, and suckers were noted in 300 yards of stream. DDT was found in these fish. It is interesting that this delayed mortality was most severe with the fall spawners—brown and brook trout and whitefish. The sucker mortality occurred just after spawning. It is apparent that the major loss occurred when the fish were in poor condition and under physiological stress.

THE CLEAR LAKE PROBLEM

That various organisms can store chlorinated hydrocarbons has been demonstrated at Clear Lake, northern California, where DDD was used to control pest midges. Large scale treatment started in the summer of 1949 and was repeated in 1954. In December 1954, about 100 western grebes were found dead and still more succumbed in March of 1955. In 1957, another DDD treatment was made to control the gnats. More grebes died in 1957. Chemical analysis revealed these contained 1,600 parts per million of DDD. Various fish were collected and chemically analyzed and their stored fat showed DDD ranging from 40 to 2,500 parts per million.

In 1958, a further loss of birds occurred. In the summer of 1960, a composite fat sample of 12 California gulls and 5 western grebes contained 2,134 and 1,465 parts per million, respectively, of DDD. These samples were collected 29 months after the last pesticide treatment at Clear Lake, again indicating the high levels of accumulation and the long residual life of this poison in birds. These birds were shot and appeared normal.

[3] A recent pesticide kill eliminated fish for some 200 miles downstream in a Texas river.

An interesting, and I believe profoundly important sidelight, is that although there were at least 30 pairs of summer breeding western grebes at Clear Lake in 1960, no young were produced and none are known to have been produced there since 1957. It is to be remembered that this lake, since the beginning of its recorded history, has been a favored nesting and production area for western grebes. Another note of interest is that plankton collected showed DDD at the rate of 5.3 parts per million.

That the pesticide poison tended to accumulate and concentrate over a considerable period of time, was shown by the fact that almost invariably the older fish contained much more DDD than did the younger individuals, and much more than was in the water. High mortality and reduced reproduction are evidenced from other studies in various States.

GROUND WATER CONTAMINATION

With the amount of chemicals being used, including pesticides and detergents, it seems inevitable that some of these materials ultimately would enter our water courses and even penetrate into the underground aquifers. A number of startling examples already are on record.

Montebello, Calif.: In June 1945, a small plant in Alhambra, Calif., began manufacturing 2,4-D. A batch of the raw material failed to react properly and the chemicals were dumped inadvertently into a sewer. Thence, this waste entered the Alhambra pumping station, passed through the tricities activated sludge sewage treatment plant and was discharged into a mile-long ditch. From here the contaminant traveled some 3 to 5 miles above ground, then seeped into the underground strata from which Montebello, a city of about 25,000 population, obtained its water supply. Within 17 days after the manufacture of the weedkiller started, taste and odor of a chemical used in the manufacture of 2,4-D, dichlorophenol, were noticed in the 11 wells supplying the city. The operation of the plant was stopped within 30 days, yet the taste and odor of dichlorophenol persisted for 4 to 5 years. This case shows the possible longtime effects from wastes even though they were unwisely discharged over a relatively short period.

South Platte River Basin near Henderson, Colo.: This represents another significant case in the serious pollution of underground water. In 1943, the Rocky Mountain Arsenal of the Chemical Corps started to manufacture warfare agents. It appears that sludge from the pond used at the arsenal between 1943 and 1955, to hold chemical waste effluents, is the source of the contamination. Phytotoxic substances in this waste included chlorates and phosphonates. It also appears that other waste substances in the discharge in the presence of air, water, and sunlight caused these waste materials to combine and form 2,4-D as none had been purposely manufactured. The 2,4-D obviously was synthesized in the waste mixture from precursors introduced from the plant operation. There may also be other contaminants.

The first farm crops to be affected were in 1951, indicating that it took 7 to 8 years for the contaminated underground water to travel approximately 3 miles. By 1958, contaminated water extended in an area of several square miles and seriously affected crop production, industry, and the people who had relied on the water for their own culinary purposes and for livestock. The 60-square mile area within this aquifer basin is yet only partly affected. How long this pollution of poisons will last and what total damage yet will result is unknown, but obviously it will be many years before the damage is corrected.

WELLS

The common frothing household detergent, ABS, gives convincing evidence that pollution in shallow ground water is common. Because ABS is not found in any natural substance, its presence in water is evidence of contamination. Frothing is said to occur in concentrations as low as sixtenths milligram per liter.

Housing developments wherein each dwelling is serviced by its individual well and sewage disposal system often invite pollution. Walton, of the Public Health Service, points out that 35 percent of 600 well waters analyzed from Suffolk County, Long Island, N.Y., contained ABS, and it is estimated that there are, or soon will be, some 17,000 ABS contaminated wells in that county. A survey of 54,000 private well waters in the vicinity of Minneapolis and St. Paul showed about 50 percent pollution. Studies from 976 well waters in 13 States showed that 36.6 percent of these contained ABS. There is reason to believe that similar pollution situations are developing in localized areas where stable and highly toxic pesticides have had heavy and extended use and where the soil is comparatively porous and the ground water table is shallow.

CONCLUSION

The enormous and ever growing quantity and kinds of extremely toxic, broad spectrum, stable chemicals used as pesticides throughout America give warning that an objective forward look is necessary. If our people are to receive protection as well as benefit from the mature and safe use of these needed pesticides, there must be more advanced planning and better coordination in the management and use of chemical controls. Dangerous and costly pollution of both surface and ground water with these poisons is inevitable unless effective steps are promptly taken. Because of the nature of the problem, more effective controls must be placed on the distribution and use of dangerous toxicants at the source. This, I believe should include more effective testing, registration, labeling, and distribution of poisons. I am convinced that we need a clearer declaration of national policy by the Congress and by many States regulating the use of pesticides in the broad public interest. More effective coordination must be obtained between agencies and interests directing control and those groups and agencies of State and Federal Government, as well as national and local interests, that are vitally affected by operational programs.

There is critical need for more adequate support of basic research. Many costly mistakes and controversies of the past have been kindled through a painful lack of facts on which to act. Sound research should precede an operational program of control and eradication. Safe limits of toxicants in water is an involved and long-term undertaking, and yet safe and clearly defined standards for water quality are needed. It is essential that public and private forces unite to support a coordinated program of research.

A few additional "needs" include: (1) To the extent possible, use toxicants that are selective that will give reasonable control of a particular pest and do the least damage to desirable forms of life. (2) Rely more on biological and cultural controls. (3) When chemical controls are necessary, use formulations, methods of application, time of treatment, and dosage that will be the least damaging to the biota. (4) Use toxicants that hydrolize promptly and those that can be utilized or broken down by organisms in the soil. (5) Use spot and not broadcast treatment wherever possible. (6) Determine toxicity of runoff and seepage water for different materials, dosages, and modes of pesticide application. (7) Determine the toxicity of the poisons to the various organisms in the environment. (8) Direct research toward side or indirect effects of various pesticides. (9) Develop more specific controls. (10) Study the total environment and its management so that control can be carried on more wisely.

Life Tenure of the Judges of the Court of Military Appeals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, the grant of life tenure to the judges of the Court of Military Appeals will accord that tribunal the judicial position demanded by its important functions and its many and heavy responsibilities.

When the Uniform Code of Military Justice was approved by the House of Representatives in 1950, section 67 thereof provided that the judges of the Court of Military Appeals should hold office during good behavior. As it originally passed the House, the bill also contained a further provision to the effect that the court's judges were entitled to enjoy the same powers, privileges, and rights of retirement possessed by the judges of the several U.S. Courts of Appeals. By subsequent action of the Senate, the House's life tenure provision was removed and a term of 15 years was substituted therefor. This term scheme, originating in the Senate, ultimately found its way into the legislation signed by the President.

Title 28, section 451, United States Code, defines "a court of the United States" as "any court created by act of Congress the judges of which are entitled to hold office during good behavior." A similar definition of "a judge of the United States" is contained in this legislation. It would seem to follow, therefore, that a judge of the Court of Military Appeals is not "a judge of the United States," and that the tribunal itself is not "a court of the United States." Thus it will be seen that the Senate's alterations exercised a far-reaching effect on the nature and position of the Court of Military Appeals. Reference to some of the results of this action will be made at subsequent points in this memorandum.

The U.S. Court of Military Appeals heads a judicial system which currently administers approximately one-ninth of the criminal trials of the entire Nation. On the basis of prior experience, it may be predicted with certainty that under total mobilization the military system will administer approximately one-third of such trials. The jurisdiction of the Court of Military Appeals is concerned not with mere property rights, but with the lives and liberties of Americans—principally young Americans—from all walks of life, all segments of society, and

all sections of the land. It was the clear intent of Congress in enacting the Uniform Code to assimilate the administration of military justice as nearly as possible to that of the civilian community. All these factors argue strongly for a Court of Military Appeals which is firmly integrated into the Federal judicial system and which enjoys the authority and position of "a court of the United States."

Life tenure for the Court of Military Appeals will set at rest present doubts concerning the court's powers—and will enable it to perform all of the functions of a judicial tribunal.

As a result of changes in the Uniform Code of Military Justice effected after its initial adoption by the House, it is probable—as has been seen—that the Court of Military Appeals is not "a court of the United States." As a result, genuine doubt exists with respect to the body's power to punish for contempt, if necessary to subpena witnesses, to issue the several prerogative writs, and to perform other necessary judicial functions.

All these powers are enjoyed by "a court of the United States," and their exercise in proper cases by the Court of Military appeals is essential to its status as a Federal judicial tribunal with substantially final authority over the lives and liberties of literally hundreds of thousands of young men and women in the Armed Forces. It will be recalled that the Uniform Code provides for no appeal from the determinations of this court, with the result that—save as to jurisdictional questions—its dispositions are final. It is in every substantial sense a court of last resort in criminal cases, and should possess all of the authority of such a court.

The grant of life tenure to the judges of the Court of Military Appeals will free them from the danger of political and other pressures, regarded by many thoughtful persons as an inescapable peril under a term system.

This reason for a modification in the present tenure provision requires little elaboration. All Federal judges laboring under responsibilities even remotely comparable to those resting on members of the court under scrutiny hold office during good behavior. If, as has been said, a principal reason for this phenomenon lies in a desire to protect against clamor and the attempted use of influence—direct or the reverse—then it is applicable equally to the military system's highest judicial tribunal. In truth, it should be deemed to apply with even greater force—for in no other Federal court is the danger of pressure from organized blocs so great. Potential sources of this special danger are numerous and easily recognizable.

Nothing less than life tenure for the judges of the Court of Military Appeals is consistent with the overall intent of Congress as expressed in the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

It is manifest that, in enacting the Uniform Code, Congress intended to bring the administration of military criminal law into as complete accord as practicable with that obtaining in Federal civilian courts. Inescapable differences were recognized, of course—but it seems certain that the Congress was moved by no slightest purpose to approve their existence in the areas of quality and objectives. In other words, there can have been no wish to relegate to second-class citizenship the members of what is now predominantly a civilian—that is, a nonprofessional—Army, Navy, or Air Force.

The Federal criminal law applicable to nonmilitary people is, of course, administered and supervised by courts whose members enjoy life tenure—and thus have been placed in a climate favorable to the development of a proper independence and the highest sort of judicial integrity. Although the presence of minor differences cannot be denied, nothing in the nature of ultimate protections which are available to Mr. A can with safety be denied to Private B, Seaman C, or Airman D—if the basic objective of Congress in enacting the Uniform Code is to be supported and preserved.

This aim is demonstrated more specifically by the code's provision to the effect that the judges of the Court of Military Appeals shall enjoy the compensation of judges of the several U.S. courts of appeals. And the same legislation provides that if a judge of the former court is temporarily disabled, the vacancy thus created shall be filled by designation of a judge of one of the latter. These determinations would seem to indicate with force that Congress chose to assimilate the bench of the Court of Military Appeals to that of a U.S. court of appeals—the members of which, of course, hold office during good behavior.

Life tenure to judges of the Court of Military Appeals will provide for them retirement and survival-of-dependents benefits like those enjoyed by other judges of the Federal judiciary.

At present the judges of this bench are regarded as members of the Federal civil service, so far as retirement is concerned. Thus they are required personally to contribute toward such benefits—to the substantial reduction of their statutory compensation. If the court is to secure for the future personnel equal in professional capacity and standing to that from which other Federal judges are recruited, it is essential that the members of its bench enjoy similar treatment in this particular. This result would be accomplished by assuring to the Court of Military Appeals recognition as a court of the United States.

Sufficient time has elapsed since establishment of the U.S. Court of Military Appeals to permit reliable evaluation of its contributions to the administration of military law.

Oaths of office were taken by the court's judges in June 1951, and thus the tribunal has been in existence for almost 10 years. During this period it has processed more than 15,000 records of trial by court-martial—and its three members have published written opinions in approximately 1,700 cases. The court has now completed the 11th bound volume of its reported decisions.

In addition, numerous articles dealing with the court and its work have appeared in professional journals, and many of its opinions have been the subject of comment and scholarly evaluation in recent case sections of these same periodicals. In short, there is every reason to suppose that sufficient data are now available to enable the Congress to reach a sound conclusion concerning the quality of the court's personnel and product, and in general the value of its contribution to the military justice scene.

There can be no doubt that the Court of Military Appeals has justified its existence. And if it is worthy of continuation at all as a judicial tribunal of the United States, it fully merits the protections, the powers, and the position enjoyed by comparable Federal courts. It is certain that, insofar as clarification of its powers is desirable, this critical need should be met without delay—and the most effective and economical means for accomplishing this result lie in action according to the body status as a court of the United States. This, in turn, may be accomplished readily by granting life tenure to its judges.

Civilian Conservation Corps—Resolution of Legislature of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the House to the following resolution by the Pennsylvania State Senate. It was introduced by Senator John J. Haluska, who has served better than a generation in that legislative body. His experience and knowledge of the economy of our State and our Nation qualifies him as both a sponsor and author of this important resolution.

This resolution will give each Member of this Congress food for thought and although we have been toying a great deal with related problems of unemployment, juvenile delinquency, camps, and training centers, it might be a good time for the Ways and Means Committee of this House to give serious consideration to the provisions contained in Senator Haluska's resolution:

Pennsylvania is proud of the many beautiful forests that dot our countryside. No other State can boast of such preserves, but without conservation some day our beautiful woodlands will be a barren area.

The same is true of our water supply. Today it is abundant but without care and conservation we might find ourselves faced with a shortage of water in the future.

A way to solve these problems would be to reestablish the Civilian Conservation Corps which worked so well during the thirties. The creation of this force would not only help our forests and water supply, but it would also aid in the curbing of juvenile delinquency, and the problems of unemployment which we face today; therefore be it

Resolved (the house concurring), That the General Assembly of Pennsylvania memorialize Congress to establish a Civilian Conservation Corps; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Presiding Officers of each House of the Congress of the United States and to each Senator and Representative from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States.

Elton B. Stephens Tells Story of How Birmingham Got Its First Big Hotel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following account of the building of Birmingham's first big hotel. Mr. Elton B. Stephens, a civic leader in Birmingham, gave the account on his retirement as president of the Birmingham Downtown Improvement Association. The article appeared in the Birmingham News on March 13, 1961:

HOW BIRMINGHAM GOT ITS FIRST BIG HOTEL

This very hotel in which we are gathered is constructed not so much of brick and mortar as it is of vision and courage. Substance most needed today if we of this generation are to make the prefix "magic" once more valid as a descriptive adjective of Birmingham.

Let me briefly tell the story of this building, the Tutwiler, because it is significant. It strikes at the innate desire within us all to build, to create, and to perform something in our day and time worthy to be remembered.

This is, after all, our purpose, and perhaps this meeting which will see the election of new officers and board members is the proper time to reaffirm it.

We can draw inspiration from the past and from the Tutwiler because the situation faced by aggressive-minded citizens of the early 1900's is much the same as we face today. The erection of a million-dollar hotel then, is as big as our multimillion dollar plans of today.

NEEDED—A HOTEL TO DIRECT BOTH CAPITAL AND COMMERCE

George Gordon Crawford, then president of the Tennessee Coal, Iron & Railroad Co., realized that a city without adequate hotel facilities was a city not likely to encourage commerce and the influx of investment capital. He dreamed of a magnificent hotel for Birmingham—the best the South would have to offer. He visualized Birmingham, abundantly endowed by nature, as an industrial metropolis, giant among the cities of the Nation and the world.

The old adage "out of sight, out of mind" is a truism of long standing and it is not irregular that Birmingham's growth was to start with a hotel. Crawford wanted speculators, financiers, and the like to take a long hard look at Birmingham's potential during the day, and to enjoy a comfortable night's rest so they could look some more the following day.

First, Crawford contacted Harvey Woodward who had already built the Woodward office building on First Avenue. It was not difficult to sell Woodward on the hotel project. He, being a practical man, envisioned heavy traffic between his office and the new hotel. He also informed Crawford that he was willing to subscribe to second mortgage bonds.

Thus, with this optimistic start Crawford and Woodward enlisted the imaginative genius of our own Mr. Bob Jemison. Actually, I should say Bob volunteered, because in fact that's what he did. Moreover he took over the hardest job—that of raising money. How and where to get it apparently held no fright for him.

MAJOR TUTWILER HAD $1,850,000 AFTER HIS COMPANY'S SALE

Jemison quickly enrolled W. G. Harding, the president of the First National Bank, on the hotel project team, and learned from him that a great Birmingham pioneer, Maj. E. M. Tutwiler, had $1,850,000 in ready cash after selling his interest in the Tutwiler Coal, Iron & Coke Co.

Jemison caught the good major just before leaving for a South American vacation and got his verbal pledge to support the hotel project. On his return from South America, Bob met the major at a New Orleans dock, with affidavits and blue prints in hand, and convinced him on the spot to underwrite $500,000 in first mortgage bonds.

With first and second mortgage bonds secured, Jemison, Crawford, Harding, and Tutwiler turned their attention to the people of Birmingham, and began a street walking marathon unequaled to this day. Citizens were stopped in their tracks on street corners, and trolley stops. Business associates and merchants were taken to lunch. Before they were through, most responsible citizens of Birmingham had contributed something to the hotel project. Over $350,000 in preferred stock was sold by the happy, but footsore hotel promoters.

So construction was begun, and soon the Birmingham skyline was silhouetted by a magnificent new building.

(Would it be hard to conceive of ourselves going about a task with such drive, energy, and enthusiasm today?)

The Tutwiler story should have ended here for local gentry had accomplished a tremendous job, and had exemplified great community spirit. But it didn't, cruel fate intervened not once, but many times, and in many ways.

BUSINESS CONDITIONS GAVE THE LESSEE COLD FEET

Some of the trials and difficulties the hotel promoters and community endured before the hotel settled into solvency I will enumerate. As I go along, perhaps you may compare in your own mind the dogged courage of this generation with that of our own.

First, after an investment of $1 million the lessee withdrew his commitments. As originally agreed, he was to furnish the building, but economic conditions across the country were worsening and the $400,000 required to equip the building gave him a case of cold feet. Finally, after an exhaustive search a New York hotel chain agreed to operate the Tutwiler, but only on the condition that three upper floors be completed, a powerplant and laundry installed, and other details attended to. All these were to be completed after the hotel began making profits.

Now it was necessary to raise an additional $250,000, a problem as perplexing if it had been $2 million for, let me remind you, these were the days when the expression: "Buy a bale of cotton, 10 cents," was common.

Fortunately, a young attorney, Bew White, Sr., had just arrived from 6 years of experience with a New York law firm. He rallied to the aid of the hotel directors by outlining a plan that called for the underwriting of third mortgage bonds, with installment payments, which could serve as sound collateral if signed by responsible subscribers.

Needless to say this was a rather new idea back in 1913.

So once again the great street walking marathon started anew, and once again the people of Birmingham responded and absorbed the third mortgage bonds.

FIRST THE WAR, THEN ICE CREAM PARLOR DAYS

In June 1914, the hotel was opened to the public and the dream of its originators seemed fulfilled, but also in that year, the world was plunged into a world war making the operation of the hotel as originally anticipated, impossible. Then on January 29, 1919, prohibition struck, and the Tutwiler's elaborate bar which had realized most of the hotel's profit was, overnight, changed by law, into the world's fanciest milk and ice cream parlor.

The Nation's teetotalers had, it seemed, finally toppled the Tutwiler.

The New York hotel chain also developed cold feet and disposed of its lease rather unethically to Mr. Louis J. Dinkler of Atlanta.

Fortunately, Mr. Dinkler was a stouthearted person. He weathered a threatened $1 million foreclosure to the Metropolitan Life Isurance Co., and for a while sustained heavy financial loss.

This was, at last, the end of a seemingly endless succession of troubles.

Excuse my being poetic, but the Tutwiler stands today, as a monument to the pioneer citizens of our metropolitan community.

Hated Colonialist Termed Africa's Best Friend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1961

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, as Judd Arnett, of the Detroit Free Press, continued his tour of Africa with G. Mennen Williams, Assistant Secretary of State for Africa, his articles reflected an acute understanding of the problems, incidents, and people he was observing at firsthand. His dispatches displayed not only his ability to report facts, but also the ability to cut beneath the surface of the problems:

HATED COLONIALIST TERMED AFRICA'S BEST FRIEND

(By Judd Arnett)

DOULA, REPUBLIC OF CAMEROUN.—This is being written from the patio of a rather posh hotel. It would be easy to mistake this oasis for a tender tourist trap in Miami Beach or San Diego were it not for a few distinctive African touches.

For one thing, it is oppressively hot and muggy. At 9:30 a.m., the white man's lingering death has set in; clothes stained, and feel like wet burlap.

A few hundred yards away there is a swath of jungle, and yellow fever is brewed there. No place for Bwana, this.

Then, too, a large, dun-colored lizard just slithered up. Now he is flattened against a wedge of concrete, awaiting the unwary fly. He will eat the fly. Eventually something will eat the lizard. Then something will eat the something. Living off itself, Africa marches on.

How far it will march in the years ahead is anybody's guess, and opinions vary from the pessimistic (me) to the optimistic (the Honorable "Soapy" Williams).

Incidentally, at the moment the Governor is out shaking the hands of 600 students at College Joss. If they ever arrange things so he can run for public office out here, he will sweep all precincts.

Basically, my pessimism extends from the fact that I have taken a look at the remnants of African colonialism and find them good. In large part, I agree with what the British have done in east Africa and the French here.

This will set the dogooders clamoring for my pelt. But there is one highly important facet of this argument that stumps those who pant in favor of the rather tinny nationalism now prevalent; who, or what, fills the void left by the departing colonialists?

Yesterday we took to the bush, driving the jungle-bordered road that leads from Douala to Edea, an inland port served by a serpentine river straight out of the pages of "The African Queen."

In Edea, we toured the largest industrial complex in the Republic of Cameroun, an aluminum plant built 4 years ago with French capital. It has enjoyed financial success, partly, no doubt, because of cheap hydroelectric power and low-priced labor.

So—you may be saying—a sweatshop within the hotbox of equatorial Africa. True, by American standards, for the average wage is only about 30 cents an hour.

But by African standards, this was one of the brightest spots in what has otherwise seemed a grim economic picture, for the workers are well housed, well attended, and well schooled and the company (called ALUCAM) picks up the tabs.

Moreover, an effort is being made to upgrade African labor through training programs, and each year approximately 10 more natives advance to the management class, replacing Europeans.

As they go up the ladder, their pay and accommodations improve. This is capitalism at work—colonialism at its best. Africa could use a good deal more of it.

Later we visited the "Exploitation du Cameroun," a rubber plantation developed with painstaking skill with French capital. Again we found the Africans living far above the average level, with better housing and opportunities for education and advancement.

The question as this country joins the rest of Africa in the great, pulsating experiment of nationalism: How long will it be before the creators of the aluminum plant and the growers of rubber trees are sent packing, victims of this superb nonsense called Africa for Africans? Already, there are pressures against ALUCAM.

Throughout the Africa I have seen, many capital investments encouraged by colonialism have been withdrawn in the face of the wave of fervor against the white man.

Moreover, little new capital is coming in. In the Republic of Cameroun, for example, there has been no new American private investment of consequence this past year.

The departure of civil service workers, professional people, technicians is causing problems.

Some of us look upon Tanganyika as one of the more hopeful spots. If that sweet little country does not make out in the years to come, there is small hope for its less advanced neighbors.

Yet, Tanganyika has only one African lawyer, who does not practice. It has no qualified native doctors. It needs skilled help in every conceivable category. Yet despite its plight it is in better shape than its sister republics.

The trouble with Africa is that it is regressing as the colonialists retreat. It will take years for this continent to recover the economic footing it had when there was a welcome place for the whites.

Since private capital is understandably, discouraged, what is to take its place?

The answer is obvious. That's where you fit into the picture, dear American taxpayer. Your money must fill the void. You must run the risks of investment under the cloud of nationalism, with no assurance that your gifts, or loans, will earn you political fidelity in return.

You don't like the odds? Well, there are always the Russians. That's the fix we are in these days as the tempo of the cold war picks up on the Dark Continent.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (JAN. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Wiley-Dodd Interview on Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, communism continues to be the No. 1 threat to our security. For the future, we can expect that the growing power, economically, as well as militarily, of the Soviet bloc, will present an even greater threat, not only to the security of the United States, but to the survival of freedom in the world.

To cope with such broad-scope dangers, we need realistic policies at home and abroad.

Recently, I was privileged to discuss highlights of the Communist challenge—particularly as these relate to our internal security—with the distinguished vice chairman of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, the Honorable THOMAS J. DODD, in a radio-television program. I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of the interview printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were order to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILEY-DODD URGE GREATER CITIZEN ACTION PROGRAM TO COMBAT COMMUNISM

Senator WILEY. The Nation—now and in the future—must keep alert to guard against threats to its security at home and abroad. On global and domestic fronts the Communists—deadly enemies of freedom—pursue their goal of world conquest. How? By aggression, subversion, sabotage, infiltration. What tactics do they use? All kinds: Open and secret, legal and illegal, ethical and unethical, humanitarian and geneocidal.

Confronted by this great, and growing, threat to our survival, we need a strong security system, internally and externally, to parry, and counter, the deadly thrusts of this enemy at the heart of America. In the face of a Red enemy, constantly probing for weak spots in our system, however, we need to further strengthen our internal security efforts, as well as to be better educated about, and armed against, overall Communist threats to our security.

At this time, we are privileged to welcome to the program the Honorable THOMAS DODD, vice chairman of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the U.S. Senate. Welcome, TOM.

Senator DODD. Thank you, Senator WILEY. I consider it a privilege to join you in a discussion of threats to our internal security. Only if the public is aware of, and alert to, these dangers, can we take the necessary steps to protect our Nation and way of life.

Senator WILEY. Is there any doubt in your mind that communism, at home and abroad, is the No. 1 threat to our security?

Senator DODD. None at all.

Senator WILEY. What about the U.S. Communist Party? According to estimates, it has a membership of about 25,000 members.

Senator DODD. In my judgment, that's an extremely rough estimate. The Reds, as you well know, operate in spy-like fashion. Consequently, it is extremely difficult to get a clear picture of the party and its activities. Organized in 1919, the Reds, working openly and secretly, have agitated for strikes, riots, social unrest, and demonstrations, such as the riots last year against the House Un-American Activities Committee hearings in San Francisco. In addition, they have engaged in espionage, sabotage, subversion, and other acts that threaten our security.

Senator WILEY. In your judgment, are U.S. Communists closely tied to the apron strings of Moscow?

Senator DODD. In any sound assessment, the Communist Party U.S.A. must be considered an arm of world communism. Allied with this increasingly powerful international ocnspiracy, it is especially dangerous.

Senator WILEY. You feel, then, that the U.S. Reds, ready to take orders from Moscow, would rise up against the United States, if they might be successful?

Senator DODD. Yes. The evidence was best presented by Gus Hall, the No. 1 U.S. Communist. When asked the question: "And are you willing to take up arms and overthrow the constituted authorities?" he answered: "When the time comes, yes."

In these five simple words lie the deadly promise of communism.

Senator WILEY. Recognizing this grave threat, we, naturally, need to keep our laws up to date for greater security.

Senator DODD. As a member and former chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Senator, you have long exhibited a deep concern about the Red dangers; and have forthrightly supported efforts to strengthen our laws, law enforcement agencies and judicial system.

You well recall, of course, the acts of Congress dealing with the Communist menace? These include:

1. The Voorhis Act of 1940, requiring that any organization in the United States engaged in political activity and subject to foreign control would be required to register with the Attorney General of the United States.

2. The Smith Act of 1940, prohibiting the teaching and advocacy of overthrowing the Government by force or violence, and also membership in such an organization with knowledge of this purpose; and

3. The Internal Security Act of 1950, requiring that any Communist organization or front register its members, disclose its finances, and label its propaganda as Communist.

Senator WILEY. Through the years, also several States—and rightly so—have established special committees to investigate subversive activities and recommend necessary legislation. This helps, I believe, to focus public attention on—and more effectively deal with—the dangers of communism at home.

Senator DODD. I am seriously concerned, however, with a serious shortcoming in our efforts to deal legally with this danger to our security. For the most part, laws relating to internal security are based on past experience, rather than on anticipation of future problems. The Communists—on the other hand—are long-range conspirators, planning far into the future. Consequently, we cannot always be sure that legislation, in itself, will guarantee the internal security of the Nation.

Senator WILEY. That is true. Recognizing this situation, we must make greater efforts to gear our laws—including the updating of existing statutes, and the writing of new ones—to the future, not the past.

Senator DODD. In addition to Federal and State action, there is also a real need for alertness, and a willingness to act, at the local community level. The private citizen—individually, and through his civic, labor, religious, education, business, cultural, and other organizations can do much to thwart the aims of communism and strengthen our free system.

Senator WILEY. I agree. The expulsion from the CIO in 1949 and 1950, of 11 Communist-dominated unions, for example, represents one of the worst setbacks ever inflicted on the United States Communist Party.

YOUTH—MAJOR TARGET OF REDS

We must be alerted to the great effort of communism, also, to reach, and convert the youth—not only of the United States, but of the world.

Senator DODD. Very definitely, Senator WILEY. The successful Communist exploitation and manipulation of youth and student groups throughout the world today is a major challenge which free world forces must meet and defeat. Recent events clearly reveal that world communism has launched a massive campaign to capture and maneuver youth and student groups.

The vigor and vitality of such groups constitutes an explosive force. Channeled into proper outlets, it can accomplish immeasurable good for a peace-and-progress world. Maniulated into destructive channels, however, this force can create chaos. Overall, the capture of the youth of the world is a major goal of Communist strategy. We must therefore, take more effective measures to prevent our youth from being taken in by innocent-looking, but often dangerous, lures thrown out by the Reds.

Senator WILEY. Overall, an effective security system requires teamwork—and dedicated cooperation efforts—between citizens and their local, State, and Federal law-enforcement agencies.

Let me say, however, that I don't believe in witch hunts; or in creating a climate of fear in which people jump at shadows. To the contrary: I am confident that by effective, vigilant law enforcement—and maximum cooperation of our citizens—we can minimize the Communist threat to our internal security, and catch and punish violators of laws.

Now, TOM, do you have any recommendations for more effective "citizen action" to combat the menace of communism?

Senator DODD. As an individualist—like yourself, Senator WILEY—I naturally respect the rights of each citizen to interpret his civic, patriotic responsibility according to his own conscience.

Nevertheless, I believe there are definite steps which would, if taken, better enable us to cope with the Red menace. These include greater efforts to (1) educate our citizens to the true nature, dangers, and tactics of United States and international communism; (2) dedicate ourselves more completely to the ideas and ideals of freedom; (3) support efforts to further improve our free society; (4) exercise the right to vote—electing representatives who would enable us to progress in the right direction,

but also effectively fight against our enemies; (5) imbue in our citizens a great realization that we are in a battle of survival against communism; apathy could be fatal; and (6) strengthen our efforts to eliminate bigotry, prejudice, hate—all blights on our national integrity.

Senator WILEY. I concur wholeheartedly. As vice chairman of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, you are doing a vigorous, splendid job.

Now, as we discussed earlier, communism in this country cannot be isolated from the world conspiracy. Would you give us a brief look—from your vantage point—at the global horizons on which communism threatens the survival of freedom.

Senator DODD. Currently, there are an estimated 36 million Communists working in 86 countries around the world. Overall, they control about 1 billion people, and vast land and natural resources. Witness the activity of the Communists in Cuba, Laos, Africa, South America, and elsewhere on this globe. Day by day, the Reds are attempting to further expand and mobilize this empire into a machine to take over the world.

As a ranking minority member on both the Judiciary and Foreign Relations Committees, you, Senator WILEY, have had long experience in fighting this menace to freedom at home and abroad. How do you evaluate the situation?

Senator WILEY. From experience—and the facts of life in the 1960's—I can say this: Winning the battle against communism will not be easy. The challenge will require a total effort by our own people—and those of our allies. The actions will involve further strengthening our jet-missile-nuclear-space defense—to serve as a deterrent against would-be aggressors; bolstering the free world alliances—economically and politically, as well as militarily; stepping up our offensive on the ideological battlefront; finding realistic solutions to our economic problems to better enable our free enterprise system to meet the production-line challenge of the Communist system; and, above all, revitalizing in our citizens the patriotic, moral, and spiritual dedication to the cause of freedom.

Even with an all-out effort to combat communism, however, we can expect a long, difficult struggle.

Senator DODD. You're right, Senator WILEY. Failing to alert our people and dedicate the necessary resources to protecting freedom would spell grave dangers for our future. If we mobilize—in effort, spirit, and resources—however, I am confident that we can, and will, win the battle.

Senator WILEY. Now, TOM, I want to express my gratitude for your taking time out of your busy schedule to join me in a discussion of a topic of deep interest to my home folks in Wisconsin. Thank you very much.

Sugar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, in pointing out some of the difficulties of our domestic sugar industry, I think the following facts and figures might be of interest. For example, the latest information available with regard to new producer data shows that in 1960 some 5,338 farmers requested 189,442 acres to grow sugar beets. However, only 1,243 participated in the allotted new acreage of 17,282. In other words, 23 percent of the applicants received 10 percent of the requested acreage. Even these figures do not show the true picture. Many farmers who would have liked to get into production did not ask for any acreage because from past experience only a small amount has been made available.

New producer data, 1960

State	Number of requests	Acres requested	Shares established	Acres established
California	794	41,609	51	1,279
Colorado	282	6,408	147	1,828
Idaho	845	14,896	147	798
Illinois	7	168	7	168
Iowa	4	220	4	165
Kansas	63	2,930	3	90
Michigan	257	3,607	257	3,607
Minnesota	887	54,780	39	1,372
Montana	113	2,846	54	809
Nebraska	218	6,172	103	1,368
Nevada	7	383	6	110
New Mexico	4	300	4	100
North Dakota	251	13,928	7	230
Ohio	116	1,873	116	1,773
Oregon	59	1,212	31	248
South Dakota	11	322	7	190
Texas	155	10,780	6	18
Utah	103	1,191	103	734
Washington	911	20,563	46	368
Wisconsin	83	1,821	83	1,821
Wyoming	168	3,433	22	206
Total	5,338	189,442	1,243	17,282

In contrast to the above where the domestic industry has been prevented from increasing their production, below are some figures which point out how our Government has encouraged the expansion of sugar producing areas outside of this country. I do not want to imply that I am opposed to some of the investments that are being made to improve production in these countries, but I do feel that our domestic producers should have at least an equal right to expand and grow in this important commodity.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

In 26 years they have issued 45 credits in the amount of $50,753, 192 to sugar production and processing.

PHILIPPINES

Nov. 22, 1957	$70,000
Feb. 17, 1959	42,948
Apr. 30, 1959	202,144
Apr. 8, 1960	12,142
Aug. 25, 1960	110,736
Jan. 27, 1961	167,000

ECUADOR

Feb. 17, 1959	62,000
Feb. 2, 1960	58,000
Nov. 18, 1960	32,500
Dec. 13, 1960	14,500
Dec. 20, 1960	110,000
Dec. 29, 1960	118,000
Dec. 29, 1960	96,000

MEXICO

June 14, 1956	32,000
Feb. 14, 1957	33,400
Apr. 3, 1958	3,000,000
Mar. 4, 1960	22,000

ARGENTINA

Feb. 23, 1956	310,000
May 9, 1957	97,000
Mar. 31, 1960	1,787,000
Aug. 12, 1960	110,000

BRAZIL

Oct. 9, 1957	32,100
Jan. 31, 1958	33,500
Jan. 15, 1958	33,600

HONDURAS

Aug. 1, 1957	1,000,000

PERU

Mar. 28, 1957	$731,000

DEVELOPMENT LOAN FUND

Bolivia:

1959	2,500,000
1961	1,750,000

Haiti: Applications were considered and approved in 1960 for $3,000,000, however, this was canceled in 1961. Another application has been received in February of this year for $3,000,000.

Guatemala: An application has been received for $5,592,000. This has been referred to the Export-Import Bank.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION

A large number of their loans are for general agriculture developments, and actual figures of support for sugar programs were not supplied. However, the following countries have had sugar developments of some sort involved in their programs.

Vietnam: Various training programs from 1955 to 1959.

Tunisia: 1959.

Indonesia: Technical production, experimental plots 1959.

Iran: June 1952 until March 1957—$635,000 to expand a plant. February 1953 until March 1956 $931,000 two plants.

Sudan: Survey in 1959.

Taiwan: Support to improve refining equipment 1952-1953, 1954, 1955.

INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

Bolivia in a $10 million global credit received $1,800,000 to increase by 50 percent a sugar processing plant.

Argentina has applied for a global credit of $800,000 to be used in sugar development.

Haiti has requested a global credit of $4 million and if approved, part of the money would go to double the production of an existing sugar plant.

Honduras has presented an application, part of which is to increase a sugar plant daily capacity by 40 percent.

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

They have been making agriculture loans for several years, some of which have gone into sugar production. However, figures were not available showing actual support of sugar.

INTERNATIONAL FINANCE CORPORATION

Tanganyika: June 2, 1960, $2,800,000 for sugar development.

Maritime Transportation Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
OF ALASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has been conducting extensive hearings regarding maritime transportation to and from the so-called offshore areas—Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, and Puerto Rico. The committee has heard from local government representatives that high freight rates imperil economic development.

In his column printed in the Washington Evening Star for March 14, Mr. Constantine Brown called attention to the committee's hearings, and I ask unani-

mous consent to have the column printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHIPPING COSTS, FOREIGN IMPORTS—RATES BY U.S. LINES TERMED DAMAGING TO HAWAII, ALASKA, AND PUERTO RICO

(By Constantine Brown)

There are times when a seemingly dry subject presents some fascinating aspects.

The Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has begun hearings on freight rates between the mainland United States and the States of Alaska and Hawaii, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. The hearings are the result of a series of understandably anguished protests from our two newest States and the Commonwealth.

The testimony has been startling, to say the least. Ocean freight rates between American mainland ports and Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico have skyrocketed in the last 10 years to a point where they approach the prohibitive.

With such zooming, stratospheric rates in effect, it is now as cheap to ship an automobile from London, Hamburg, or Le Havre to Honolulu as it is to ship an American-made car from San Francisco to Honolulu.

It is cheaper to ship canned seafood such as tuna, crab, oysters, and other fisheries products from Yokohama to New York than from Maine to New York.

Pineapples from Formosa can be shipped by freighter to San Francisco or Seattle or Los Angeles cheaper than from Honolulu to the same cities, or even to east coast ports; and pineapples happen to be a major Hawaiian crop.

The results of such a curious situation are, quite naturally, not encouraging to American industry. European automobiles are taking the lead over American, for example, in all three areas involved. Why buy an American car and pay half its value just to get it shipped? And this situation becomes all the more ironic when it is a case of shipping from one American port to another American port.

In Alaska, haircuts cost about $3, a quart of milk about 45 cents. No, haircuts are not shipped, but the barber has, like his customers, the soaring cost of living to contend with. There is a popular story, once considered an exaggerated joke, that the smallest coin in regular use in Alaska is the quarter-dollar. This is a joke no longer.

The challenge of imports, seriously considered at the present time by the new Kennedy administration, is most certainly affected by this business of prohibitive freight rates. If it remains cheaper by far to import from foreign countries, then people in Hawaii and Alaska and Puerto Rico will import foreign goods, and so, to a surprisingly great extent, will people in the mainland States.

Witnesses at the hearings have stressed that the low cost of labor in Japan or France or Germany has little to do with the great advantage enjoyed by exporters in those nations. A major factor is shipping. American-flag lines simply have jacked their rates to a point where there is no comparison with rates charged for oversea (European and Asiatic) voyages.

Of course, the American shipping companies will have their innings, too. They will certainly testify to the vastly higher labor costs they are required to bear under United States maritime laws and union labor demands. They also have to provide much more in the way of creature comforts, safety precautions, facilities for recreation and similar amenities than are required by foreign-flag vessels and shipping companies.

But the Alaskans and Hawaiians and Puerto Ricans insist with facts and figures to back them up that this factor does not nearly begin to justify the soaring freight rates between American ports.

A weekly English-language newspaper in Puerto Rico, the tabloid Island Times, publishes regularly a comparison list of prices for staple groceries, fruits, and vegetables, meats and similar foodstuffs. Price tags in San Juan and Ponce supermarkets are listed side by side with prices in effect the same day in New York, Boston, Miami. The difference is startling, particularly when one considers the average income of Puerto Ricans.

Minimum Wage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, in the past few weeks, I have received hundreds of letters and telegrams in connection with the pending bill to increase the minimum wage and to extend the coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very informative letter from Mr. Charles A. Miller, Jr., of Thomas & Miller Lumber Co., of Linden, Ala., in which letter he sets forth facts and figures on his present operating costs and on his costs which would result from increasing the minimum wage in his plant. You will note Mr. Miller's conclusion that the only alternative his company would have to reduce the cost of lumber would be to decrease the stumpage price; that inasmuch as a great majority of timber is still in the hands of small landowners, this would decrease the landowner's income at a time when most everyone else is receiving an increase; and that it is doubtful that the timber owner would sell his timber cheaper if wages were increased. Mr. Miller's conclusion is that they will not be able to absorb either the $4.19 or the $6.98 per thousand increase in the cost of lumber, and that if the minimum wage is increased and business conditions do not improve materially, they will be forced to curtail their operations and add to unemployment.

I also include a statement by Mr. Price Paschal, president of the Price Paschal Lumber Co. of Brandon, Miss., before the Subcommittee on Labor Standards of the House Education and Labor Committee. Mr. Paschal represented the Forest Industries Committee of the Mississippi Manufacturers Association.

THOMAS & MILLER LUMBER CO.,
Linden, Ala., February 24, 1961.

Hon. FRANK BOYKIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BOYKIN: I am familiar with your opinion that you do not favor the principle of Federal wage legislation and that you also oppose an increase in the minimum wage.

However, you may not fully realize the effect an increase would have on our particular business. It is urgent that the increase be defeated if our business is to remain solvent and to contribute to the economic well-being of our employees, the community, and also the owners.

Our company is engaged in all phases relative to the manufacture of lumber—logging, manufacturing, sales, and trucking of finished product to consumers. We employ an average of 80 men including salaried and skilled personnel. (This group would also be entitled to the minimum increase or more in order to be fair.) Due to present conditions our operation is marginal, but we have not laid off any men.

Using our 1959 operating and cost report the following would be the results of increasing the minimum wage in our plant.

Payroll increase: 15 cents per hour would cost $24,960 per year; 25 cents per hour would cost $41,600 per year.

Increased cost expressed as percentage of sales—$606,960: 15 cents per hour, equivalent to 4.1 percent of sales; 25 cents per hour, equivalent to 6.9 percent of sales.

In the lumber industry it is generally agreed that in an operation of our size, a minimum profit of 10 percent of sales (before Federal taxes) is necessary in order to stay in business. At present our profit is not equal to the 6.9 percent of sales that a 25-cent per hour increase will cost.

INCREASED COST CONVERTED INTO COST PER THOUSAND FEET OF LUMBER

Direct labor cost in our operation is $27.92 per thousand feet lumber manufactured. Of this $11.37 is logging and hauling and $16.55 is manufacturing.

	Per thousand
15 cents per hour would increase logging cost	$1.71
15 cents per hour would increase manufacturing cost	2.48
Total	4.19
25 cents per hour would increase logging cost	2.84
25 cents per hour would increase manufacturing cost	4.14
Total	6.98

COMPARISON WITH INCREASE IN 1956

In 1956 when wages were increased, lumber prices did not advance to take care of cost. Consequently the mills were forced to absorb the difference. To help offset labor costs, most mills have added labor saving machinery and reworked their plants to increase efficiency. At the present time, further installation of labor saving machinery and improvements would be approaching the law of diminishing returns and would not be profitable.

In 1961, prices are below the 1956 level. Lumber prices are controlled by law of supply and demand and the price of competitive materials. We cannot increase the price of lumber and be assured of selling it. If and when conditions improve, it is my opinion that lumber prices will not advance much above 1959 price level.

DECREASE STUMPAGE PRICES ONLY ALTERNATIVE—SMALL LAND OWNERS HURT

As I see it the only alternative we have to reduce cost of lumber would be to decrease the stumpage price. Inasmuch as a great majority of timber is still in the hands of small land owners, this would decrease his income at a time when most everyone else is receiving an increase.

In my opinion, it is doubtful that the owner would sell his timber cheaper if wages were increased.

Conclusion

We will not be able to absorb either the $4.19 or $6.98 per thousand increase in cost

of lumber. If minimum wages is increased and conditions did not improve materially, we would be forced to curtail our operation and add to unemployment.

We know that in the past you have always helped the lumber industry with their problems and we know we can count on you to do all possible to help defeat any increase in minimum wage.

Yours very truly,

THOMAS & MILLER LUMBER CO.,
By CHAS. A. MILLER, Jr.

STATEMENT OF FOREST INDUSTRIES COMMITTEE, OF THE MISSISSIPPI MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION, BY PRICE PASCHAL, PRESIDENT, PRICE PASCHAL LUMBER CO., BRANDON, MISS., TO THE HOUSE EDUCATION AND WELFARE COMMITTEE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR STANDARDS

My major objective in this statement is to point out to the committee and to the Members of Congress some of the harmful effects an increase in the minimum hourly wage would have on our industry and on the economy of our State and Nation.

I am considered a medium-sized operator in the manufacturing of southern pine lumber. We buy logs from independent loggers; also, we buy small tracts of timber and have this timber cut and logged to our mill by contract loggers.

During the past 5 years we have completely rebuilt and modernized our plant and we had to borrow $150,000 to do it. We did this so we can produce lumber at the lowest possible direct cost. Even with this modernization accomplished, my company showed a net loss last year of $900 on a sales volume of approximately $1 million. It is easy to see what any increase in our direct labor costs would do to us. Multiply this effect by the many hundreds of lumber mills similar to ours in the South and you have a picture of what will happen to our economy.

The lumber industry cannot absorb an increase in direct labor costs at this time or at any time in the foreseeable future. Instead of increasing, the average price of lumber has declined from $78.40 in January of 1960, to $69.23 in January of 1961. These figures were arrived at by an average of the selling prices of several of our neighboring lumber mills.

I would like to establish a few economic facts about our situation to bear out my claim that any increase in the minimum wage would actually put many of these mills out of business and create an alarming addition to the already acute unemployment situation.

1. We cannot pass on to the consumer this additional cost because of the many substitute building materials, both foreign and domestic. We point out as evidence of this what has happened in the steel industry.

2. We provide direct employment for 155 persons in our small community. If we were to go out of business it is easy to see that these people would be added to the unemployment rolls since there is no other industry to absorb them.

3. New claims of unemployment compensation in our State for the 6-month period of August 1960 to January 1961, were up 42.1 percent from the same period of the year before.

One further point I wish to mention regards the 12-man exemption on logging and pulpwood harvesting.

If an effort is made to eliminate the 12-man exemption on logging and pulpwood harvesting, our problem will be magnified even more.

The elimination of the 12-man exemption would work a hardship on the small logging contractor, pulpwood contractor, and the men they employ. If it rains, the woods are too wet to log and harvest pulpwood, so they lay off or only make a few hours some weeks. During the weeks they can log, they may work more than 40 hours, thus stabilizing their total annual earnings. To keep the records necessary to comply with the rules of this law would be practically impossible.

I point out to you gentlemen that the lumber and forest products industry is the major contributor to the economy of this State.

I urge you, therefore, to postpone any action on the minimum wage because of the serious effect it would have on our economy and industry.

Albert Schweitzer: Man and Prophet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, on the 15th of January 1961, at the National Episcopal Cathedral in Washington, D.C., there was celebrated, in most impressive manner, the 86th anniversary of the birthday of one of the greatest humanitarians of this age, Dr. Albert Schweitzer. His great talents as a musician, physician, author, missionary, and humanist have been dedicated to, and brought into play for, the betterment of mankind. In the far country of French Africa his services in establishing and operating a hospital for the natives, and in his Christian leadership there, his energies have been brought into a most helpful and efficient focus.

The principal feature of the ceremonies at the cathedral was the address given by Dr. Hermann Hagedorn, well-known author and biographer of Dr. Schweitzer, Theodore Roosevelt, and other notable characters. In November 1958, in my capacity as chairman of the Panama Canal Subcommittee—of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee—I spent several days on the isthmus. This was during a week-long celebration—in the Canal Zone—of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt who, as President, did so much to bring about the construction of the Panama Canal. The commemorative programs put on there were of an outstanding character, and of varied character. The principal addresses delivered were those of Dr. Hagedorn—an intimate friend of the Theodore Roosevelt family—and Maurice H. Thatcher, former Member of this body, and the sole surviving member of the Isthmian Canal Commission.

Under leave accorded I include, as a part of these remarks, the splendidly interpretive address of Dr. Hagedorn on Dr. Schweitzer:

ALBERT SCHWEITZER: MAN AND PROPHET

(Address by Hermann Hagedorn, at the National Episcopal Cathedral, on Mount St. Albans, Washington, D.C., Jan. 15, 1961)

In his poem, "The Man Against the Sky," Edwin Arlington Robinson paints a bare hill, at sunset, with a solitary figure, mysteriously looming "Against the glory of a world on fire."

The picture has meaning for us on this 86th anniversary of Albert Schweitzer's birth.

How large he looms against the sunset, this doctor in the African jungle; this man of faith, rooted in renunciation; this carpenter and handyman, in whom scholarship, music and a powerful and original mind are joined to abounding love and prophetic vision.

What does he say to us, this benign sage, with the rumpled hair and walrus moustache, too human to be a saint, too saintly to be measurable in purely human terms? What does he say, this benevolent despot of a kingdom of healing in a sick and turbulent continuent; this friend of man, who suffers with his patients, and, to a degree, dies with any who die; this philosopher—in thought, so poised between earth and heaven; in expression, so direct, so lucid; this child of fortune, rich in divers gifts, in whom the wisdom of this world and the next have combined to create, not a man in conflict with himself, but one of those rare, integrated personalities that are among the chief graces of any culture, any age? To us in our complacency, our idolatry; our money-centered and life-heedless living; to us in our morally cancerous and spiritually illiterate society—what is it that he says?

He speaks of the struggle for truth, of the dignity of the individual; and of the glory of the self, lost and found in selfless giving; of the use of the philosophic mind not to build speculative skyscrapers in the empyrean, but foursquare houses to live in, richly, on the solid earth. He speaks of Jesus, "who comes to us," he says, "as One unknown," and reveals himself to those, be they "wise or simple," who obey Him. Most persistently, through the years, he speaks of the decay of civilization, and of that which alone can restore it, the human spirit.

A single purpose runs through all Albert Schweitzer's thinking and living—to lay a foundation for a change of heart in the individual and in society, in government and in the relations of nations; a change from self-serving to self-giving, from the expedient to the God guided; from life bruising and life destroying to life renewing, life upbuilding; from a civilization, dying, because it has lost its moral standards, to a civilization that can blossom and bear fruit because it faces and avows the inhumanity and corruption of its past, and is prepared to make such restitution as may be possible.

Mark well that purpose—change in the individual and in society—for it is implicit in all that Albert Schweitzer has uttered, in all that he has done.

The decay of world civilization has haunted him for 60 years. It began, he says, on the day, almost a century and a half ago, when the German philosopher, Hegel, wrote the words, "What is reasonable is real, and what is real is reasonable." The world translated the phrase into the philosophy and public policy of expediency, out of which have come two World Wars and the rejection of that humanitarian liberalism which, to Dr. Schweitzer, is the very essence of what to him spells civilization. Did the 18th century first recognize, on a wide scale, compassion as the essence of the civilized mind? The 19th extended this recognition into ever new areas, blind though that century was in the industrial field. What of the century in which our lives are set? Torture, practiced again as not in centuries, with new, hitherto undreamed of devices added, not only to torment the body but to poison or destroy the personality and the mind. Everywhere, callousness to injustice and brutality which, 40 or 50 years ago, would have brought cries

of protest from every civilized throat; glorification of moneygetting, exploitation of sex for profit; corruption in government, corruption in private life; immorality and even perversion in high places; weapons of warfare, infinite in horror; slaughter a commonplace of the day's news; slaughter on the highways; slaughter in war; slaughter in building a new social order. Albert Schweitzer's answer is reverence for life; each living creature sacred; reverence for life which recognizes as evil that which "annihilates, hampers or hinders life"; and as good that which saves life and helps it attain its highest development in body and spirit.

"If I am a thinking being," Albert Schweitzer tells us, "I must regard other life than my own with equal reverence." But the contempt for life that he sees on every side decries thinking. He is appalled by the tendency to conformity, the subjection to slogans, the readiness even of the scholarly mind to accept the idea that thinking is unavailing in the complexity of the modern world.

"Renunciation of thinking," he cries, "is an admission of spiritual bankruptcy." There are forces in the world, moreover, he warns, deliberately cultivating the skeptical attitude of mind, convinced that "when men renounce the hope at arriving at truth by themselves, they will end by accepting as truth that which is forced upon them by authority and propaganda."

If you want to keep the flame of freedom burning in the world, Dr. Schweitzer tells us, revitalize in men the willingness to suffer the lonely vigil and the hardship of independent thinking; thinking infused with love, he adds; love that is made real in service to another. "Love," he declares, "is reason at its highest." It is in reverence for life that love and reason join.

Love and reason have combined in Albert Schweitzer to release forces which have entered deep into the spiritual fabric of the free world.

Love and reason joined to make a hospital, in the "heart of darkness," a beacon light, for an even darker world.

Love and reason stood with the watchman on the ramparts, crying, night and day, his warning of a crumbling civilization. They rode with the knight of the grail, as he sought the sacred cup, in the faith that he might find sustenance for mankind, sweeter and more lifegiving than the wine turned vinegar of materialism and expediency. Love, from one side, and reason from the other, built the bridge, intellectually acceptable, from man's affirmation of life and will to live to his recognition, hitherto merely intuitive, that civilizaton, to survive, demands an ethical foundation. The term resounds like organ music in a church. What it means, in terms of Mr. Everyman, is less ethereal. The foundation of civilization is honesty, it is purity; it is—and we use the word hesitatingly, since it has been so misused—it is love of each for all.

Without these, developed to a high degree in each individual, Dr. Schweitzer tells us, there is no civilization; only a shell, ready, at a touch, to crumble to dust.

Thinker and man of action, fused and made one by compassion; physician, humanitarian, philosopher, prophet, Albert Schweitzer stands, at 86, tireless in thought and service against the flaming background of a world politically and morally in chaos.

Here is greatness, by any standard. But, behold, a paradox. The greatness is visible to millions today where it might not have been visible, on so wide a scale, for decades or generations, except for an act of renunciation on his part of every prospect of the world's acclaim.

Let us, in this great cathedral, on this wintry Sunday in 1961, turn the clock back, 65 years, to another Sunday in an Alsatian parsonage, and recall the familiar story of Spring and bird song and church bells, ringing in the Whitsuntide. The pastor's son, stretched out in bed, tells himself that life is unbelievably good. He has a happy home; a study body and a vigorous mind; studies that excite him; and a future, obviously. A wave of gratitude sweeps through him. But a voice, deeper than conscience, sobers in exultation. "Such happiness," it whispers, "is not a free gift. It must be paid for."

The thought is not new to him. It has lain on his heart for months, but he has evaded asking the crucial question. He asks it now. "How shall I pay?"

The answer is clear. Let him give himself to his philosophical and theological studies until he is thirty; to the teaching and preaching for which he is preparing himself, and to the music that is the deepest expression of his spirit; but, thereafter, he shall give himself to the immediate service of mankind.

It is a heavy price, a hard summons?

He will pay the price, he says to himself; he will respond to the summons.

It is a noble resolve, but it is not unique. Hundreds of young men and women, in those middle Eighteen Nineties, made no less selfless, no less earnest, resolves, when they were 21. Hundreds of us here, in this cathedral, in high moments, made such resolves; and let their brightness fade into the light of common day.

Albert Schweitzer does not let his resolve languish. Nine years pass, happily and too quickly. The young man is a professor of philosophy, assistant pastor in one of Strasbourg's leading churches, an organist with a growing reputation, the outstanding biographer of Johann Sebastian Bach, a theologian whose views of the Jesus of history have set a worldwide controversy raging. He is, by common consent, one of the coming men of Europe.

But success has not dimmed the brightness of his resolve, or led him to question the validity of the summons that came to him. He asks only what form the "immediate service," to which he has committed himself, shall take.

Simply, and yet mysteriously, he receives his answer. The most neglected and primitive of African tribes needs a physician. A physician? He is a philosopher, a teacher, a preacher, a historian, a musician. Must he then go back to school—not for 1 year or 2 or 3, but for 7?

The summons is clear. It is a physician that is needed.

So be it.

We stand here in a cloud of mystery, the mystery of God and man, when man lays his life without reserve in God's hand. That Whitsuntide decision, that summons, heard and responded to, with no taint of self-conscious sacrifice; that unwavering resolve, that acceptance of unanticipated implications, what was the fruitage, what the consequences?

We recall the pain of the renunciation when the dedicated teacher faces the fact that he shall teach no more, the impassioned musician recognizes that he shall play the organ no more; the individualist, who, for years—even through his period of medical study—has paid his own way, teaching and preaching, proud of his dependence on no man, knows that he shall be financially independent no more; rather a mendicant, begging, hat in hand, for 10 marks here, a hundred marks there, for his hospital, and his own and his wife's subsistence.

Twenty years pass. The doctor has built his hospital, built it by back-breaking labor and tireless self-giving. He has won over the shy, mistrustful, superstitious natives, established himself as a growing factor of hope and healing in an unhappy, suffering land. He has won friends in Europe and America, and recognition in everwidening circles of humanitarian concern.

It is the early 1930's. The doctor is back in Europe on a visit. The man who, with a heavy heart, gave up teaching in a single university, is called to lecture in a dozen of the world's most venerable institutions of learning. The musician who, in agony of spirit, gave up the organ, is asked to give recitals all over Europe; the man who gave up his financial independence to become a mendicant, finds himself earning, by lectures and concerts, enough money to cover not only his own needs and his family's, but a large part of his hospital's.

Yet this is only a part—and not the most evocative or mysterious—of the story of one who lost his life only to find it in a new dimension. What was the deeper and the wider fruitage?

His jungle hospital is part of it, obviously, though, indeed, not the most significant. The range of consequences goes beyond the thousands of jungle-lives, experiencing the life-giving touch of a man with God in his heart and healing in his finger-tips. In the great world beyond the seas, dimly, yet with ever-deepening clarity and power, appears, through the mist of the commonplace, that rare and precious thing, the image of a life that lifts men's hearts, kindles their imaginations and gives their lives new depths of meaning, new horizons, a compelling challenge; perhaps, by God's grace, a new direction. The picture of the doctor of philosophy, the doctor of theology, the doctor of music, putting aside the prospect of fame and honors and wealth and ease to serve the most neglected of Africa's peoples, becomes a part of the imperishable folklore of the western world. A new force has entered into the thinking and living of civilized mankind as the legend of Albert Schweitzer enters into men's consciousness.

We catch our breath, seeing the ripples going out in everwidening circles from this life, thrown, without reserve, into the seas of God. Wherever men read, they read the story; they hear it from a thousand pulpits, they see it on the screen. Who shall number those who have been touched by it to new perceptivity; perhaps, new vision, new hope, new levels of resolve? Were they to gather in one place, how vast would have to be the plain on which they met, how limitless the horizon. And how diverse would be the character of that multitude.

Among them would be not only the eager young idealists, with torches lifted, moving in review before the venerable Nobel prize winner in Oslo, but hard-headed American businessmen, sending shiploads of medicines and medical supplies as their gift to an African hospital; not only men of vision and action creating "little Lambarénes" in remote Caribbean and Southeast Asian valleys, but cynical newspapermen, greeting a celebrity on his arrival in New York and feeling his unpretentious greatness piercing the veneer of their sophistication.

The abundance of the fruitage of this man's life that we can see, and have seen, is only a token of an immeasurable harvest. Who shall say what powers this great creative example has awakened in men's hearts, what powers it may awaken as his story is told, his words are read, down the years, the generations, the centuries; what "adventurers of self-sacrifice," his spirit may enlist, men and women, boys and girls, "for whom"—in his words—"there is no quenching of the irrational fire?"

We stand in awe not before a man but before the consequences of one man's high-hearted resolve and unremitting fulfillment; before the miracle of the life, lost to itself, and found alive and at work in the hearts of millions.

What shall we say of the power of a single life so to shake mankind? "Give me the right place on which to rest a lever," cried

Archimedes, "and I will move the world." Is the life, lost and found, the fulcrum on which the lever rests?

We ask the question, conscious that it may cast a light into the darkness of the struggle in which mankind seems condemned, for generations, perhaps, to live.

Cold war, hot war, submission, defiance, mutual annihilation?

In the face of the appalling alternatives, there come moments when we recognize that our antiphonal strivings with our opponents forever the new weapon, ever the answering defense, are childish and irrelevant, and that the assurance which we so feverishly seek is not to be found in terms of destruction, agony and death.

Happy, in such dark hours, are they who, like the prophet Elisha, see shining armies covering the mountainsides—men and women, wholly committed to God, and united in a force, inspired and impelled by the ideology which Washington and Franklin, Hamilton and Jefferson built a nation on—acceptance of moral standards that have no escape clauses, and obedience to the guidance of God in the struggle for true freedom. William Penn's words have a shattering significance today: "Men must choose to be governed by God or they condemn themselves to be ruled by tyrants."

"A moral renascence is our only hope," says Albert Schweitzer, and a distinguished Washington scientist pinpoints the instant need: not only guided missiles but "God-guided men."

For dedicated and God-committed fighters are needed in the warfare that is rocking the world. Again and again, the doctor has stated the issue of the struggle. It is moral standards against expediency. It is reverence for life against contempt for life. It is man as a child of God against man as a cog in a machine.

A quarter century ago, the philosopher of Reverence for Life could still feel that he could let his creative conception make its own way; but not today. Through the philosophic exposition of his Nobel Peace Prize address strides the embattled prophet, calling to the spirit of man, as Isaiah called to it, calling to each individual; calling to each one of us, here in this cathedral.

He calls to us to see the realities of the world in which we are privileged—or condemned—to live: the realities of our national life, the realities of our personal living—the dishonesty, the impurity and the irresponsibility; the sentimentalism and, with it, the inhumanity—the ambition, the bitterness, the jealousy, the hate; many of them, perhaps, in my own heart; many of them, perhaps, in yours. He calls to us to achieve the cleansed world we pray for, by achieving, in our own lives, that honesty in seeing ourselves as we are, that change of direction and motivation, that about-face in purpose and action, which is basic to the survival of freedom, the survival, even perhaps, of mankind.

It is in this perspective that we see Albert Schweitzer's conception of reverence for life in its ultimate dimensions: Reverence for the soul of man, the soul of the community, the soul of the Nation. As such it stands in eternal opposition to everybody and everything seeking to decry faith in God, to decry the sacredness of the individual; stands in opposition to those who deny those absolute moral standards which bind human society into a cohesive and healthy body so that all its members may function at their highest potential; stands in opposition to every effort to break down those standards in the individual and in society; against every effort, finally, to frustrate the transformation, in Dr. Schweitzer's words, of the "modern state" into the "civilized state."

We know that civilization may be destroyed in a day. We know, too, that, even if the world be spared the catastrophe of war, our civilization will not, in a day, be cleansed and made whole. But, in the confusion and the perils of our time.

"One truth stands firm," Albert Schweitzer tells us. "All that happens in world history depends on the human spirit. If that spirit is strong, it creates world history; if it is weak, it suffers world history. The question is, Shall we make world history, or shall we merely passively suffer it?"

The query is addressed to you, and to me.

We have celebrated the birthday of a great man, rejoiced in his commitment to God, and his service to his fellow men. But, in the world in which we are living, admiration for even so great and good a man is not enough. Awe of his image in sculpture and stained glass here in this cathedral is not enough. Goodness in you and me, seeking to imitate his, is not enough. There was a time when I myself lived under the illusion that I was a good man and by my imagined goodness paid my debt to society. I have learned that, in this world of ideas in conflict, this was invisible, it is not enough to be what men call "good." A good man without a philosophy, a passion and a plan, will, in his sentimentalism, his woolly-headedness, his blurred vision of moral realities, be taken into camp by the enemy, and betray his county.

The world today is a world of battlefields between the forces of Christ and the forces of anti-Christ. One of these battlefields is Washington. One may be even Mount St. Albans. Each of us will know where the battleline crosses his own heart.

May each of us be sure on which side he is fighting. I speak it as a prayer. Amen.

A White Elephant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter to the editor of the Salt Lake Tribune of March 18, 1961, signed by Harry Magnus, president, District 22, United Mine Workers, Price, Utah, entitled "A White Elephant."

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A WHITE ELEPHANT

EDITOR, TRIBUNE:

E. C. Schlender, secretary, Snake River Power Association, Burley, Idaho, is critical of the position contained in a brochure sent out by the Utah Power and Light Co.

It might surprise Mr. Schlender to know that there are many citizens who agree and who are of the opinion that the Burns Creek project is certainly a white elephant, a $50-million white elephant. All the people in America are required to pay taxes to give a privileged few certain benefits. We can understand Representative HARDING'S criticism of this brochure as the privileged few are the constituents that Representative HARDING of Idaho represents.

There is far too much government in competition with private enterprises today, and in reading the Utah Power and Light Co.'s brochure it can be noted that this company is not in opposition with sound reclamation programs.

Burns Creek is a Federal project whose primary function is to generate electric power. Insistence on passage of such legislation will certainly jeopardize true reclamation projects.

It is not a storage project as E. C. Schlender attempts to have readers believe. Previous storage facilities already exist that were constructed as hold-over storage on the upper Snake River and hold 4 million acre-feet of water.

The thing that the people of Idaho should think about is that projects such as Burns Creek should not be contemplated or constructed as they endanger true reclamation projects.

HARRY MAGNUS,
President, District 22,
United Mine Workers, Price, Utah.

Welcome to Archbishop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader of Thursday, March 16, 1961, which welcomes to Wilkes-Barre His Grace—Vladiko—Archbishop Dmitri, bishop of Philadelphia and the eastern Pennsylvania area of the Russian Orthodox Church, who recently transferred his seat to the Holy Resurrection Russian Orthodox Cathedral in the north end section of Wilkes-Barre. I, too, welcome the archbishop to Wilkes-Barre and trust that he will have a long and most satisfying tenure at his new station.

The aforementioned editorial follows:

[From the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader, March 16, 1961]

WELCOME TO ARCHBISHOP

It is a privilege to welcome to Wilkes-Barre His Grace—(Vladiko)—Archbishop Dmitri, bishop of Philadelphia and the eastern Pennsylvania area of the Russian Orthodox Church, who has transferred his seat to the Holy Resurrection Russian Orthodox Cathedral in the North End and established permanent residence in one of the two rectories the parish maintains. Wilkes-Barre has been singularly honored.

Holy Resurrection Cathedral is regarded as the mother of orthodoxy in the Eastern United States and when the status of the edifice was changed in 1950 this newspaper said editorially:

"It would not be surprising in a short time if the local cathedral becomes the seat of a bishop, thus adding to the city's prestige."

That has come to pass after a decade. Thus Wilkes-Barre not only took its place with New York, Pittsburgh, San Francisco, Chicago, and Cleveland when Holy Resurrection was singled out from 340 parishes in America, but it has come into new distinction as a focal point for this denomination.

The presence of His Grace will make possible special services at the cathedral weekly, as well as on special occasions when he will pontificate at divine liturgy and other cere-

monies. The pastor, the Reverend George Pawlush, will continue in charge of the parish and perform his own functions as well.

Archbishop Dmitri, a distinguished churchman, was consecrated in 1942 and installed as bishop of Rovno in western Russia. Later, he was transferred to the diocese of Dniepropetrovsk, consisting of more than 400 parishes and a variety of institutions. He also was abbot of the monastery at Zhirovski and an instructor in the theological seminary at Chenyakhovsk.

Coming to America in 1948, he was assigned to New England and 7 years ago was advanced to Philadelphia, one of the most important dioceses in America. He maintained residence in Cassville, N.J., until yesterday.

A dedicated spiritual leader, an outstanding preacher, a noted scholar, Archbishop Dmitri will enhance the local scene with his presence as he administers to the needs of the 52 parishes under his jurisdiction.

Mrs. Clara B. Gonzales: A Dedicated Public Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in his inaugural address, President Kennedy sounded a call to duty to the entire Nation. "Ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country," was the challenge to all of us.

The story of Mrs. Clara B. Gonzales should serve as a bright example of a dedicated public servant who has for the past 37 years been "doing" for her country. She is the resident principal on the Zuni Indian Reservation in western New Mexico. Tonight she will be one of the 10 recipients of the National Civil Service League's prized Career Service Awards at a dinner in Washington. She is the first woman in the Department of the Interior to receive this award and the first person in the Bureau of Indian Affairs to do so.

As a master teacher and an able administrator, Mrs. Gonzales has served the Nation in the field of education for more than 37 years. Responsible for the overall administration and supervision of the educational activities of the Zuni Indian Agency, she works unselfishly to provide the educational ingredients which will develop each child to his utmost potential.

She has been highly successful in inspiring Zuni devotion to education. When Mrs. Gonzales came to the Zuni Pueblo, very few of its members were in school. Now, largely because of her efforts, the percentage in schools and institutions of higher learning exceeds that of non-Indian communities on the periphery of the village.

The Indian people do not hesitate to bring their problems to Mrs. Gonzales, so confident are they of her understanding and help. She has taken every opportunity to help them broaden their horizons. The Zuni people, as well as her coworkers, have a deep regard for Mrs. Gonzales because throughout her career the Zuni Pueblo has been her classroom; and the understanding, love, and affection for the Zuni people have been her basic textbook.

Born in Paulina, La., Mrs. Gonzales was educated at Southwest Louisiana Institute, Louisiana State University, Peabody College, Loyola University, and the University of Southern California. She lives in Zuni, N. Mex., and is active in many civic affairs. She has cooperated in organizing and sponsoring 4–H Clubs, is local chairman for the American Red Cross, president of Epsilon Sigma Alpha, and is a member of the New Mexico Education Association and the American Association of School Administrators.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "For Service to Government," published in the Washington Post of today, March 21, 1961, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR SERVICE TO GOVERNMENT

"Human talent," said Senator HENRY M. JACKSON recently, "is our most precious resource." The remark is especially applicable to the presentation of the National Civil Service League's Career Service Awards tonight. The 10 recipients of these awards have been chosen from a large group of nominees on the basis of their competence, efficiency, character, and continuity of service. They are especially outstanding among the thousands of men and women who devote their lives to the service of the Government.

The award winners are John D. Jernegan, Ambassador to Iraq; Sherman Kent, Assistant Director for National Estimates in the Central Intelligence Agency; Robert M. Macy, Chief of the Budget Bureau's International Division; Ralph S. Roberts, Departmental Management Officer for the State Department; Ralph G. H. Siu, Technical Director of Research and Development in the Department of the Army; Harry Wexler, Director of the Weather Bureau's Office of Meteorological Research; Manuel F. Cohen, Director of the Division of Corporation Finance of the Securities and Exchange Commission; Max Golden, General Counsel of the U.S. Air Force; Clara B. Gonzales, Reservation Principal, Bureau of Indian Affairs; and Fay W. Hunter, Regional Director in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

To these nine men and one woman Government has been a passion as well as a career. They exemplify the best tradition of public service. We join with Secretary of Commerce Hodges and the National Civil Service League in saluting them both for their achievements and for the inspiration they offer to the new crop of civil service employees who plan to make Government a career.

B. Carroll Reece of Tennessee

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and grieved on Sunday evening when I learned of the death of my good friend, B. CARROLL REECE.

Years ago when I was commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States it was my privilege to meet and become acquainted with the gentleman from Tennessee, whom I learned to know as a quiet, kindly man but at the same time a dedicated individual and a very capable legislator.

CARROLL REECE was not only a great American but an outstanding soldier, having served his country in the U.S. Army during World War I. As a young lieutenant, he commanded the 3d Battalion of the 122d Infantry Regiment in France and was decorated with the Distinguished Service Cross and the Distinguished Service Medal for bravery in action against the enemy. In addition, he was awarded a Purple Heart, having been wounded in action, and finally the French Government decorated him with the Croix de Guerre.

In 1920 our late colleague was first elected to the House of Representatives and from that time until his death he could always be found among those striving to make America a better place to live, as well as protecting his country against our enemies without and within.

As a Member of the House of Representatives, he authored much important legislation, including the resolution creating the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs as well as the bill which helped to establish the Army Air Corps.

CARROLL, as he was commonly known, loved his favorite game of politics and many of us recall when he resigned his seat in the House of Representatives to serve the Republican Party as its national chairman for the period from 1946 to 1949. Under his keen and able direction, the Republican Party captured control of the Congress in 1946. From the time of his reelection to the House until his death, his interest in his party was always a subject of conversation with his many friends.

I mourn his great loss and offer my heartfelt condolences to Mrs. Reece and their daughter, as I pray to God for His blessing and deliverance to everlasting life.

Agriculture in Wonderland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Salt Lake Deseret News of March 17, 1961, entitled "Agriculture in Wonderland."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGRICULTURE IN WONDERLAND

Any similarity between President Kennedy's new write-it-yourself agriculture program and what some critics have termed the "Alice-in-Wonderland" approach to solving the farm problem is far from coincidental.

The first hint that something is amiss with the Kennedy farm plan comes with the President's admission that "We cannot expect to solve the farm problem in a day or in a year, or perhaps even in this administration." This amounts to a frank confession that now he has come up against the harsh realities of the farm problem—and what appears simple when you're on the outside looking in, may turn out to be much more complex once you become more fully acquainted with the problem and have direct responsibility for solving it.

The second indication of weakness in the President's farm plan is its failure to provide specific suggestions for reducing wheat and feed grain surpluses, which constitute $7.8 billion of the Government's $9.4 billion farm surplus stockpile.

The salient features of the Kennedy farm plan include:

It would authorize Brannan-plan-type income payments to farmers who sell crops at free market prices. This makes the Kennedy plan subject to the same criticisms applied to the Brannan plan—namely, that it would be either costly to the taxpayers since farmers might greatly increase their outputs to get maximum payments, or would involve strict production controls that might amount to regimentation.

It would authorize farmers themselves to draft and adopt, subject to congressional veto, a sweeping new series of crop-by-crop farm marketing control programs.

Here's how this aspect of the Kennedy plan, which is its central feature, would work, in theory at least. Taking cotton as an example, the Secretary of Agriculture would arrange the election of a grower committee which would then propose a plan under which each grower would get a quota entitling him to market a fixed number of bales of cotton. The grower would sell his crop at open market prices, with a Government compensatory payment covering the difference between the market price and whatever support level the committee recommended. Congress could veto the growers' recommendations but not revise them.

The defects of this proposal become apparent when one tries to apply it to another segment of the economy. Suppose the same marketing arrangement were applied to the homebuilding industry. The homebuilders would get together and recommend their own prices. Conceivably they might decide the "support level price" for a home that previously sold for $25,000 ought to be advanced to $45,000. But the market price of the home, determined by supply and demand, probably would remain at $25,000. So the Government would make up the difference—with taxpayers' money.

This example, of course, is farfetched. But that's just the point. The laws of economics aren't repealed simply by switching from building to farming, and what would result in higher prices and higher taxes in one instance would surely produce the same results in another.

Furthermore, the Kennedy plan assumes that a grower committee would be able to agree on a marketing plan. But farmers are not all of one mind—the prime example being the American Farm Bureau Federation, which opposes price supports, and the National Farmers Union, which favors high rigid price supports. The Kennedy plan also would deprive Congress of its responsibility for drafting legislation dealing with each commodity. And if that isn't enough, a similar proposal was defeated by Congress last year.

By proposing that farmers write their own program, President Kennedy evidently realizes that the long-range solution to the farm problem is to get the Government out of agriculture. But he's going about it the wrong way.

Communications and Medicine—Address by Gen. David Sarnoff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the 1961 National Health Forum was held at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York on March 14–16 and its theme was "Better Communications for Better Health." On March 16 the forum was address by Gen. David Sarnoff, chairman of the board, Radio Corp. of America, on "Communications and Medicine."

There is no person who speaks from greater experience or with greater authority on the development, the use, and the tremendous potentialities of electronics than General Sarnoff. Last year he served as a member of the Committee of Consultants on Medical Research set up by the Senate Committee on Appropriations and made many fine contributions to the devoted and outstanding work of the Committee of Consultants.

As we know, General Sarnoff is a man of great accomplishments and of great vision. His address to the National Health Forum is not only most informative but it is a challenge to all who would advance the cause of medicine, protect and strengthen the health of our people and help build the peace of the world and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNICATIONS AND MEDICINE

(Address by David Sarnoff, chairman of the board, Radio Corp. of America, at National Health Forum, New York, March 16, 1961)

It is a novel and challenging experience to attempt a layman's diagnosis of a subject relating to medicine, and to do so before a group of medical experts. In approaching it, I recall the comment of a British nobleman, Lord Rochester. "Before I got married," he said, "I had six theories about bringing up children. Now I have six children and no theories."

Well, I have advanced from three children to eight grandchildren, and, being a less prudent man than Lord Rochester, I still have several theories left. Primarily, the relate to electronics, where the main function is the communication of information, and some bear on the subject assigned to me this morning—"Communications and Medicine."

I believe that electronics offers as many avenues for advance in medical communications as it has, over the years, for communications in other fields. The very theme of your National Health Forum, "Better Communication for Better Health," suggests that you, too, sense this need for rapport between your ancient art and science of medicine and our young one of electronics.

COMMUNICATIONS: THE BROAD PROBLEM

How do we meet this need?

First, I think, by an understanding of a problem that has become basic to almost every area of human endeavor. It is the problem of progress—the accelerated, diversified, omnibus type of 20th-century progress.

Since 1900, there has been more scientific and technological progress than in all the previous centuries of recorded history. The present tempo of that progress is accelerating daily. Discoveries of science that once would have required several lifetimes to develop are now compressed into a few years—sometimes even months. It took half a century to move from mechanical office machines to modern computers; but it took less than a decade to increase the speed of these computers a thousandfold. It took 40 years—from the Wright Brothers to the Second World War—to push flying speeds up to 500 miles an hour; but less than 15 years to go from 500 miles to the 18,000 miles an hour at which mademade satellites now circle the globe.

How profoundly the world has altered in these 15 years. A hermit emerging today from a 1946 refuge would never have heard of earth and solar satellites or atomic reactors. Automation would be an alien word. He would never have flown in a jet plane, had his laundry washed with a synthetic detergent, or seen the inside of a glass-walled building. He would never have watched color television, or listened to stereophonic music.

This vast spawning of new products and services, and new information about them, has created a classic dilemma. Is a great quantity of new information truly useful if it does not reach those who are trained to use it? There was more than levity in the recent comment of a Harvard librarian that if new books continued to arrive at the present rate, it will not be long before the books crowd the students off the campus.

Even the weatherman suffers from an information surplus. The RCA-built Tiros weather satellite was designed to provide information that could lead to greater precision in the much maligned art of forecasting. It did just that. In the 3 months between its orbiting and the end of its operating life, Tiros I produced over 22,000 pictures of the earth's cloud cover. But the Weather Bureau—submerged in these informational riches—had to hire four new specialists just to index and classify the pictures.

Before the war, when anyone talked about electronics, he was talking about a single product, radio. With a good background in radio, a man could do his job with reasonable competence. Today, electronics encompasses a dozen different businesses, and the executive must have a working knowledge of each. It is not unusual at RCA to start the day with a meeting about space vehicles, shift to a study of the market potential for new automation devices, then move to a discussion of electroluminescent lighting for the home—and finally wind up with a chart report on the decibels of teenage sound that greeted the latest Elvis Presley recording.

COMMUNICATIONS IN MEDICINE

The thrust of invention and development has placed us all in an informational pressure cooker, and nowhere is this fact more clinically apparent than in the field of medicine. I am told by a doctor friend that 7 out of 10 prescriptions written today are for items unknown to medicine before World War II. The communications problems that result are more serious here than in any other area, since human health and life itself are involved.

Viewed statistically, information covering new medical developments is contained in an estimated 8,000 medical journals and bulletins that appear annually, about half of them in the United States alone. Stretched end-to-end, their 11 million pages would extend from New York to Denver.

To keep up with developments published in these journals, a physician would have to read the equivalent of one book every hour. If Harvard is threatened with a loss of students, you doctors are threatened with a loss of patients. Soon, you will be too busy reading to see them.

This is a fundamental problem in the logistics of communications. On the one side, a mounting flow of fresh material on methods, techniques, and drugs; on the other, the harried physician to whom this information must be funneled over and around the obstacle of his rapidly diminishing time.

The communications methods standard in the world of medicine—journal articles, conventions and symposiums, medical newspapers, and house organs, and detailing—have served well in the past. But the past is not always an infallible guide to the future. Today, I find widespread agreement among my medical friends that your science moves ahead too rapidly for the older communications techniques to cope with its advances.

This was a key point in the report of the U.S. Senate's Special Committee of Consultants on Medical Research, on which I was privileged to serve during the last session of Congress. The committee's report said in part: "The enormous problems of handling the rapidly increasing flow of new information in the literature, of codifying it, and making it readily accessible, urgently cry out for solution * * *."

My theories on the solution of this formidable problem relate to the application of new electronic techniques in three broad areas.

THROUGH RADIO: A MEDICAL JOURNAL OF THE AIR

The first is medical radio.

As some of you know, RCA has done exploratory work in this area. We are convinced, on the basis of intensive studies, that radio can be an effective method of keeping the doctor better informed about significant developments in medicine.

It is possible to set up a closed-circuit radio network that would link 100,000 to 200,000 doctors' offices, hospitals, and medical schools in the principal metropolitan centers of the United States. At specified times during the day, this network could carry medical news, reports of scientific assemblies, discussions of medical economics, and medico-legal topics, and reports on research activities.

In short, it could be a comprehensive medical journal of the air, with the scientific integrity of its program content insured by an Editorial Advisory Council serving as both a source of material and a critic of scripts.

Such a private network is possible through the imaginative use of what is known as FM multiplexing. This is a relatively new form of communications permitting two or more programs to be sent by the same transmitter along the same frequency. In principle, a multiplex system is not dissimilar to the message-carrying complex within the human being where trillions of interconnected cells coordinate messages traveling from one part of the body to another.

The multiplex signal could be heard only by those receivers designed for and tuned to the frequency of the network station. It is thus possible to crossbreed a mass communications technique with the privacy of a telephone line.

For the doctor, such a system would: Sharply reduce lag time between the scientist's laboratory discovery and its bedside application; provide postgraduate medical courses by a faculty of the Nation's foremost specialists; provide up-to-the-minute news on significant developments across the entire spectrum of medical science; remove the specialist from the isolation to which the pressures of current medical practice drive him, and give him awareness of developments in all medical fields.

Above all, the radio network would give the doctor more information more quickly and more conveniently than any other means. In his own office, with no more than 50 or 60 minutes of daily listening, he could stay abreast of the unending march of medical advance.

THROUGH TV: A MEDICAL SCHOOL OF THE WORLD

A second way to enlist electronics in medicine is through television, particularly color television.

Since the first "on camera" surgery at Johns Hopkins in 1947, television has proven effective in training physicians, surgeons, dentists, and specialists in many other fields. Today, more than 25 medical schools find television indispensable for various aspects of their teaching programs.

As for the future, you can preview it today at the Walter Reed Army Medical Center in Washington. The most extensive color television system of its kind ever devised—a system comparable to that of a major commercial network—is in regular use.

A color TV microscope camera system allows for enlarged color reproduction on a television screen of minute biological material. It enables many doctors to observe simultaneously micro-organisms or tissue sections, it obsoletes the stand-in-line wait for the microscope.

At Walter Reed, a surgeon can send from the operating room to the pathology laboratory, through a pneumatic tube, tissues removed during surgery. The pathologist can examine and analyze the tissue and determine whether a malignancy exists. Then, through closed-circuit television, he can transmit to the operating room a microscopic view of the tissue, in natural color, and discuss it with the surgeon.

This is a clinical and diagnostic use of television. A broader informational application comes through films made of live color programs and furnished to Army doctors stationed at remote posts around the world. Any military installation with a standard motion picture projector can take advantage of lectures, demonstrations and courses given by specialists at Walter Reed.

Eventually, lectures and demonstrations by front-rank specialists will be available to every physician in his own office. A compact, inexpensive television-tape player, now under development, will reproduce television pictures and sound from magnetic tape over any television receiver. When the player reaches the market, taped versions of refresher courses will be mailed the physician to play through his own television set at his convenience.

In terms of international communications, electronic hardware is already available for manmade satellites that will serve as relays for worldwide medical television. Ultimately, such a system will permit round-table discussions between medical experts anywhere on the globe. It can bring together scientists, teachers, demonstrators and students into one vast audience—truly a medical school of the world.

Worldwide television will permit thousands of physicians to sit in on diagnosis and consultation sessions among specialists of many nationalities. Heart specialists in London will be able to examine a patient, display on the television screen his X-rays and cardiograms, and discuss a diagnosis with specialists in New York, Berlin, Paris, Rome, Tokyo, or other parts of the world.

And through instantaneous electronic translation techniques, which are now in development, the barrier of language difference—as real to the doctor as to the statesman—will be finally surmounted.

THROUGH COMPUTERS: A MEDICAL CLEARINGHOUSE

A third way electronics can move against medical communications problems is with computing techniques.

Every physician, every medical researcher, every hospital struggles today with mountains of data requiring classification, analysis, and storage for immediate retrieval. More and more of that burden can be shifted to modern electronic data processing equipment, with tremendous economies in time and gains in precision. Electronic performance provides in seconds the kind of statistical and probability findings that, with conventional methods, take days or even weeks of onerous work.

No more requirement is more fundamental to the research scientist than knowing what has been done in his immediate area and in related areas. Lacking this knowledge, he can grope aimlessly, duplicating the work of others to a wasteful extent. In industry, such duplication costs an estimated billion dollars a year, and the toll is comparable in other fields.

Medical knowledge is increasing so rapidly that it has far outstripped the storage capacity of any single human brain. But computers enable us to store accumulated knowledge compactly, update it continuously, recall it instantly.

Through a blend of electronic computation and communication techniques, it would be possible to establish a national medical clearinghouse which could serve as a central repository for all the latest medical information. By a combination of communications circuits, every major hospital and medical school in the country could be tied into this clearinghouse.

If a doctor in a San Francisco hospital sought the source of information on a particular subject, he would simply dial a number. Instantly, a relevant bibliography would flash on a televisionlike screen before him. Then, when he made his choice of a particular article, he could dial again and get a microfilm version of the article on his screen.

Another service of great value to the physician would be rapid access to the medical history of any person seeking treatment. Now, the relevant data are so scattered in doctors' offices, hospitals, insurance company files and elsewhere that an individual's medical background has to be reestablished on every occasion through time-consuming questioning and examination. With a centralized electronic file of health records, the physician could simply dial the identifying code number of his patient and obtain an up-to-date report.

In the presence of so many leaders of the medical profession, I should like to offer this suggestion: That the American Medical Association, in concert with representatives of the electronics industry, create a joint group to consider the feasibility of a National medical clearinghouse; and if it is deemed feasible, to decide the soundest way of bringing it to fruition. In such a venture, I am certain that the electronics industry would cooperate wholeheartedly. Speaking for my own organization, I assure you that our experts,' experienced in many fields of communications, would be pleased to assist such a group in its studies.

I realize, of course, that there are numerous details to be analyzed in any proposal of such magnitude. But I trust that the concept itself has sufficient promise to justify its careful pursuit. There is no technical reason why a medical clearinghouse, once established on a national scale, could not be expanded gradually to embrace the entire world.

MEDICAL KNOWLEDGE FOR DEVELOPING NATIONS

At various times, centers like Rome, Berlin, Vienna, Edinburgh, and London have claimed the distinction of being the "Medi-

cal Capital of the World." Today, few question that the center of medical learning has shifted from Europe to the United States.

To insure our continued preeminence, we must ceaselessly strive to increase our medical knowledge and to improve its dissemination. I believe that electronics can aid immeasurably by permitting the doctor to hear more—through radio; to see more—through television; to find information more quickly—through computing techniques.

It can also, as it has in the past, offer medical science a wide range of new tools for research, diagnosis and treatment. As an example, one of the newest developments is a transistorized low-frequency amplifier, sensitive enough to detect skin potentials due to cardiac action. The unit, developed by a research team under Dr. V. K. Zworykin, occupies less than one-half cubic inch of space. By variation of the light intensities, it can reproduce and electrocardiogram containing far more information than is provided today by conventional methods.

But in medicine, to a unique degree, your place on history's canvas is likely to be fixed primarily by your success in meeting the needs of other peoples. As Arnold Toynbee has said: "Our age will be well remembered * * * because it is the first generation since the dawn of history in which mankind dared to believe it practical to make the benefits of civilization available to the whole human race."

What high marks history would accord our two professions if we were to combine our medical knowledge and communications skills for the mastery of disease among the developing areas of Asia and Africa—and wherever such assistance may be needed. You in medicine have the necessary information; we in electronics have the necessary means for conveying it.

The more closely we work together, the more effectively we can contribute to better health for all mankind. This is our common objective, and its achievement would make this world a happier place in which to live.

Tribute to Carroll Reece

SPEECH
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, all of us are saddened today as we pay tribute to our departed colleague, CARROLL REECE. I cannot help but recall my days in school when I first heard and read about CARROLL REECE as a most distinguished Member of this House and as a former chairman of our Republican National Committee.

It was a memorable day for me when I came to Washington for the first time and had the privilege of meeting CARROLL. I remember so distinctly how disarming he was and how much time he was willing to give me in conversation on the occasion of our first meeting. Subsequently, after I was elected to Congress, there were many more opportunities for me to talk with CARROLL and counsel with him. His was always a wise and considered judgment, and I know of no one who was so gifted with the ability to see the good in people rather than their faults. He was always quick with a quip or an anecdote if the occasion called for it, and likewise he could be so forceful and stirring if need be.

I will never forget one of my first public appearances here in Washington after being elected to Congress and sharing the speaking honors with CARROLL. My remarks for the occasion were so inadequate, while his were so profound and appropriate. Nevertheless, he asked me to come to Tennessee to make several speeches there, and regardless of where it may have been in the State of Tennessee everyone knew and spoke most highly of CARROLL. While I respected him from the very first meeting, I learned to love him as well. He had such a vast reservoir of experience and I learned much from him.

We will miss CARROLL so much on the floor of this House, and I would want his wife and family to know this heavy burden of sorrow is being borne and shared by a host of us who have come to know CARROLL REECE as a dear friend. This House loses one of its most fearless and yet gentle Members, and the country suffers the loss of a great soldier and patriot.

Needs of the Nation and of the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, one of the most fruitful results of President Kennedy's inaugural address has been a great stirring of public discussion concerning the needs of the Nation and of the world and how they might be met.

In an eloquent, imaginative, and hopeful article, Mr. Edward J. Meeman, the distinguished editor of the Memphis Press-Scimitar, identifies many of these needs and exhorts all manner of men to rise to the challenges of our critical times.

I ask unanimous consent that his article, published in the Press-Scimitar on March 9, appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOOK AT ALL THESE JOBS THAT HAVE TO BE DONE—THE POWER TO DO THEM IS IN US

(By Edward J. Meeman)

President Kennedy's inaugural address gave hope to the world. One of its many challenging, inspiring, and encouraging statements was this:

"Let us begin anew."

In using those words he was specifically making a request "to those nations who would make themselves our adversary" to "begin anew the quest for peace before the dark powers of destruction unleashed by science engulf all humanity in planned or accidental self-destruction."

We need to "begin anew" in negotiation.

We need to begin anew in more than negotiations.

We need to begin anew in building the unity and strength of the free world; beginning anew by taking measures which are positive and good in themselves and not a mere negative reaction to the threat of communism, as have been most of the measures we have taken in the past.

We need not only to strengthen the economic and cultural aspects of NATO through the coming Atlantic Conventon.

We need also to study the great possibilities in the recently formed Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). This embraces not only the United States and Canada but free nations of Europe not included in NATO. Freer trade could come through this organization which is wider than NATO, more inclusive than the "Inner Six" or the "Outer Seven" groups of European nations from which the United States is shut out. It holds the hope that the burden of aid to developing countries which is now largely borne by the United States will be spread among other free nations, our allies, who have now become prosperous.

We need a new attitude in, if not a complete reorganization of, the United Nations. The U.N. was formed under the wartime psychology and illusion that the future threat to peace would come from a possible resurgence of fascism. The fact was that fascism was only a reaction to, and an imitation of, communism, and when we destroyed fascism, there still stood communism, our original and relentless enemy, determined now, as always, to "bury us" (as they keep telling us, in plain words), a more formidable foe than ever.

We should recognize that our economic system, capitalism or private ownership, is not decadent, as Marxists say, but it is suffering from arrested development. The logic of capitalism always required that all members of society directly benefit from profits. To have a unified society all capitalists should also be workers and all workers should be capitalists. We should end the class conflict now by the universal adoption of profit sharing.

It will require a new kind of man to do all this that must be done. The people we see around us, functioning as we see them functioning, are not equal to this. But we do not need to import supermen from other planets. Man as we know him, if he develops his higher nature and lives in that nature, can do it. He needs only to awaken to what he really is, the child of God, perfect expression of His very being.

In our time man has unlocked the powers of the universe, awful powers that President Kennedy could only describe as "the dark powers of destruction unleashed by science" because mankind has done only half the job of scientific discovery. There are matching powers of control in the divinity which is in man. God offers us the key to them in the quiet of meditation.

It is certain that man can become as reliable, as unerring, as perfect in performance, as the machines and devices which he has made. It is as certain that he can as that he must.

This orderly universe is so constituted that the existence of a need is balanced by the existence of what will supply that need.

This great crisis requires an answer as great as the crisis.

The call comes to every man to give that answer.

It comes to the president of the corporation and to the janitor who sweeps out his office.

It comes to high official and to the workingman whose vote put him there.

It comes to the housewife. It comes to the student.

The call is to the greedy to become generous. The self-indulgent to become sacrificial. The unreliable to become reliable. The lazy, the useless to go to work. The shiftless to become self-supporting. The waster to become thrifty. The drunk to become sober.

The fanatic to become tolerant. The jealous, the envious, the hating, to become loving. The unfaithful to become loyal. The weak to become strong.

The doubter to believe—"Be not afraid, only believe." "All things are possible to him that believeth."

"Every day is a new beginning,
Every morn is the world made new
Yesterday's errors and yesterday's sinning
Are gone with the sunshine and gone with the dew."

The new beginning is imperative for the human race and every member of it. It is as possible as it is imperative.

The new beginning begins with you. It begins with me.

Atomic hell on earth? Or heaven?
Choose ye this day.

Bulgarian Liberation Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 3, 1961

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, on March 3, 1961, a tribute was paid to Bulgarian Liberation Day. At this time I was inadvertently prevented from participating. But in view of the importance of this commemoration I would like to include in this RECORD my statement on this subject.

For the past 83 years March 3 has been commemorated by the the entire Bulgarian people, irrespective of political persuasion, as the Bulgarian Liberation Day. The Act of San Stefano, signed on this day by the imperial Russian Government and the Ottoman Empire, restored the independent Bulgarian State and ended a 500-year foreign oppression of the Bulgarian people.

The liberation of Bulgaria followed a long self-sacrificing struggle for freedom led by such gallant patriots like George Rakovski, Vasil Levski, and Christo Botev, and was immediately preceded by a national uprising which won the sympathy of the world and the indignation of all humanity, led by William Gladston, against the outrageous atrocities committed by the much stronger oppressors. Yet this uprising made European intervention unavoidable and Bulgaria was liberated.

In their long history the Bulgarians have made a humble but important contribution to European civilization and have withstood their right to independence and freedom against powerful empires and foreign cultural influences. The Byzantine Empire, with illustrious culture and military might, failed to subdue and assimilate the Bulgarian nation. The Ottoman Empire crumbled after a five-century rule in the Balkans, but the Bulgarian people survived. March 3 opened the way for the Bulgarian people to join again the community of European nations.

The first Bulgarian Empire, which lasted from 861 to 1018 A.D., became the cradle of the Slavic civilization. It was here that the work of the apostles of the Slavs, Sts. Cyril and Methodius, the first Slavic alphabet, found a fertile soil and developed into a powerful literary tradition continuing up to this day in Russia, Bulgaria, Ukraine, Serbia and Byelorussia. This literary tradition began in Bulgaria in the ninth century, was originally based on the Old-Bulgarian language, and subsequently spread throughout the eastern Slavic world to form the basis of the national cultures of the Slavic nations.

It was in Bulgaria that the ancient Christian civilization, represented by Byzantium, was converted into a Slavic-Byzantine civilization, a kind of cultural revolution which reflected the spirit of freedom and independence manifested many a time by the Bulgarians.

The Bulgarian exiles abroad, loyal to the national tradition of freedom and independence, joined in various groups to support the struggle of the Bulgarian people for freedom from communism and independence from Soviet domination. The Bulgarian National Front of America, representing the patriotic younger generations in Bulgarian politics, is on the forefront of this struggle.

In 1954 the Bulgarian National Front of America organized the first solemn celebration of the Bulgarian Liberation Day in New York. Ever since this day became the national holiday of American Bulgarians and a uninterrupted tradition in commemoration of those who have given their lives for the liberation of Bulgaria from Ottoman subjugation, those who have fallen in the struggle against Communist oppression and in salutation to those who continue their struggle for freedom in Bulgaria.

Inflation and Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Wall Street Journal of March 16, 1961, entitled "Inflation and Trade."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INFLATION AND TRADE

The resurgence of West European industry is by this time an old story. But the competitive impact on the United States may be entering a new and more difficult stage.

As our Mr. Malabre wrote from London the other day, the Europeans are driving harder than ever for increased exports. They are tailoring their products more to foreign tastes; they are boosting advertising. But beyond that, more of them are raising capacity of their already new and efficient plants beyond levels sufficient to satisfy home markets, so they have to export more. There is also mutual lowering of tariff barriers within the six-nation Common Market and the seven-nation European Free Trade Area. And the prospect that there will be some sort of reciprocity between the two groups.

Certainly for the United States, already suffering balance of payments troubles and a gold outflow, the situation is not one to be passed over lightly. U.S. exports have been a relatively strong point in the payments situation. But already the Europeans can often underprice us, both at home and abroad. Here are all the ingredients for trade war.

It is often easier to say what must not be done, than what is to be done. But if higher U.S. tariffs are ever the answer, this is plainly not the time, however persistent the protectionist chant. We already suffer price disadvantages, and are likely to suffer worse ones as the Europeans lower tariffs to each other. Raising tariffs here would almost certainly bring retaliatory action abroad, worsening our competitive price situation.

Nor will the exhortations from Washington to "get out and sell" prove much of an answer. U.S. companies that are in a competitive position to sell will certainly do so without being told. And the less they are interferred with the more successfully they will sell abroad. No master plan to boost exports is likely to help unless it is grants of dollars abroad and that not only would aggravate the balance of payments, it also would spur domestic inflation. And inflation has been a main cause of our competitive price disadvantage.

By the signs up to now we are headed for still more inflation. The administration has put forth plans which call for spending, unestimated but surely massive, for social welfare, housing, and education. It has called for spending for aid to Latin America. And if anything is certain it is certain that there will be calls for more such spending to meet our responsibilities.

Yet all of this increases inflationary pressures. The prospects are for a truly serious unbalancing of the Federal budget, the creation of more credit, and an upward push on prices and wages. To be sure, the individual U.S. businessman will battle higher costs; he has to or cut his own throat. But can either business or labor hold back on price and wage increases when deficit financing makes the wheel of inflation spin faster?

So, as European factories push harder, U.S. factories will face more of a disadvantage—unless inflation is stopped.

If it is stopped, there are factors then working in our favor. U.S. made goods still are the criterion of quality and status in most parts of the globe. There are inflationary factors at work in Europe, and a push for higher wages, which tend to raise their costs. As wages and costs in the United States stabilized under prudent monetary policy, our relative disadvantages would shrink and could in time become advantages.

But that is only if inflation is brought to a halt at home. And so long as we think our responsibilities require us to spend more than we have, inflation is what we will have, and a weakening stance in this new and difficult era of competition.

National Watch Inspection Month

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. McFALL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1961

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like

to include in the RECORD a resolution recognizing that March is National Watch Inspection Month.

Following is the text of the resolution submitted by the National Watchmakers Association:

Whereas the master watchmaker has dedicated himself to such science and renders untold benefit to his fellow citizens in the practice of such craft; and

Whereas the unique skill of the master watchmaker plays so vital a role in the highly complex field of mechanical instrumentation which now is of utmost importance to the security of our Nation and our free world; and

Whereas the American Watchmakers Institute has designated, throughout our Nation, the month of March 1961 as a time to emphasize the highly technical accomplishments achieved in its chosen field of service:

Now, therefore, March 1961 is proclaimed as National Watch Inspection Month and all are urged to join in congratulations to the master watchmakers for continued achievement and outstanding service.

Eighteen Years Late but Blimp Pilot Cited for Attack on German Sub—Rosendahl States Act Is Unparalleled in History of Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the permission granted me to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article reporting the recognition of valiant service rendered by a blimp pilot and his crew in an attack on a German submarine 18 years after it had happened. The citation was given to Comdr. John Jan, of 6 years' service in the Navy and a resident of Toms River, N.J. He was pilot and navigator of the airship, K–74, and the incident took place on January 18, 1943. This outstanding feat was dug out of the records by Rear Adm. Charles E. Rosendahl, retired, a brave and most distinguished Navy man whom I think we all recognize as an authority on blimps and the essential part they play in the defense of our country.

I am particularly pleased to have this matter included in the RECORD at this time because of the recent plan on the part of some in the Navy Department to eliminate blimps from our line of defense and seriously curtail the activities at the Lakehurst Naval Air Station, in Ocean County, N.J. This proposed action is vigorously opposed by Admiral Rosendahl and others and I hope that before anything is decided on that a thorough and careful investigation about the whole problem may be made by the appropriate committee in Congress.

I am pleased to include with these brief remarks an article appearing in the New Jersey Courier of Toms River, N.J., on February 23, 1961, telling about the recognition of these brave men and the circumstances connected with their achievement:

EIGHTEEN YEARS LATE BUT BLIMP PILOT CITED FOR ATTACK ON GERMAN SUB—ROSENDAHL STATES ACT IS UNPARALLELED IN HISTORY OF NAVY

LAKEHURST.—Recognition of a blimp's attack on a surfaced German submarine has come. But the citation to Lt. Comdr. John Jan, 41, of Toms River, was presented last Friday, 18 years after the event, by Rear Adm. Charles E. Rosendahl (retired), of Toms River.

It was signed by Secretary of the Navy William B. Frank, who served under President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Commander Jan, then 22 years old, was pilot and navigator of the airship, the K–74, of nonrigid design. Jan had been in the Navy 6 years when the incident took place on the evening of July 18, 1943, and the following day, July 19.

The efforts of the crew, two officers and eight enlisted men, may have gone unrecognized forever if Rosendahl hadn't discovered a record of the incident while reading captured German logs of submarine operations.

TO RECEIVE DISTINGUISHED FLYING CROSS

The feat almost brought about a general court martial for the skipper of the blimp, Nelson G. Grills, now an Indianapolis lawyer, then a Navy lieutenant. Separated from the service with the rank of commander, Grills will be presented with the Distinguished Flying Cross in the near future.

Said Rosendahl at ceremonies February 17: "It proves that airships can render outstanding service and the acts of the men aboard the K–74 against U–boat 134 is unparalleled in naval history.

"It also proves that American servicemen will never run from the enemy under any circumstances, that our servicemen stand ready to defend the country at any time," he added.

The citation to Jan pointed out "courage, skill and devotion to duty in the face of hostile gunfire were in keeping with the highest tradition of the U.S. Naval Service."

The fight with the surfaced sub was the first in history. And how much damage the lighter than air ship inflicted on the sub was not known until Rosendahl checked the log last year.

Records were found in Germany but the submarine itself was sunk by British aircraft 2 weeks after the fight with the blimp.

The sub was located off the Florida coast after operation reports listed no enemy ships in the area. Radar discovered the sub as a blip on its screen. The U-boat was located on the surface but its crew did not detect the blimp until it was 250 yards away and was visable to the eye on the clear moonlit night.

The crew of the sub opened fire with deckguns, sending shells through the helium filled envelope of the airship. When the blimp was 100 yards overhead shells from a larger deckgun found their target.

ON TARGET

But crewmen on the blimp threw round after round of machinegun shells at the sub damaging its ballast tank and conning tower. Bombs straddled the sub as she pulled away in an effort to submerged.

Losing helium, the blimp plunged into the water, and was abandoned by the 10 men who were clad in life jackets. An inflatable boat could not be salvaged as men went into the water.

Grills, however, returned to the partially submerged car of the blimp to destroy classified gear and records.

Nine of the ten men were rescued the following day, July 19, 1943. One, Isador F. Stassel was lost as rescue planes approached the men. He was presumed to have been the victim of a shark.

After the skirmish with the blimp the sub's skipper sent a message to Berlin. In it he told of the surprise of the attack and damage inflicted to his craft. It was forced to head back to Germany instead of reaching Havana, its destination. Two weeks later the U–134 was the victim of English bombers.

When reports of the actions of the officers and crew of the blimp hit Washington, it created a furor. Criticism was thrown at Grills for what Navy brass called the loss of equipment through unnecessary actions. They said Grills should have averted contact with the sub.

But Rosendahl, at Lakehurst in charge of the base, knew differently. Somehow, he had a feeling no Navy man would run away from a fight.

And so it required 18 years for this to be proved true. Navy officers here said Rosendahl was responsible for bringing out true facts and proof that the sub had been damaged.

Even though the admiral is retired, he hasn't lost his love for airships. And talk of them brings a smile to his face.

They piped him aboard the station last Friday as officers and men stood at attention. The complement of men were at parade rest as he spoke in a clear voice despite a cold that had him weakened somewhat.

He left in the same fashion he entered the auditorium. His stature was erect, his steps firm, his eyes straight ahead. He returned each salute from officers, noncoms and enlisted men.

He dined with Capt. Marion H. Eppes, station commander, and other officers at the Officers Club.

He talked about airships. He'll continue to talk airships.

"We still don't have as good an antisub defense as we need. The Navy knows it and is giving it major consideration," Rosendahl pointed out as he drank milk.

He declared airships still have their place in defensive tactics despite subs powered by atomic energy. Sonar, a sound detecting device, keeps the subs under water and can detect atomic-powered ones.

Aid to Education—Contribution of a Fair and Enlightened Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH L. CAREY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extent my remarks in the RECORD and to add extraneous matter, I commend the chairman and the members of the Committee on Education and Labor for the manner in which hearings are being conducted on H.R. 4970, the Federal aid to education bill. The atmosphere of full and frank discussion on a question which has provoked widespread controversy among the public and the press should prove measurably helpful in reaching a fair solution to this question. I submit that it is beyond contradiction that a child's hunger for knowledge in our times merits our charitable consideration on an equal basis with his need for bread. To satisfy that hunger on the basis of the need, regardless of creed, to provide the aids to wisdom with which to build new hori-

zons disdaining considerations of color or geographical location may well be the challenge that decides the place in history of the 87th Congress. It is my opinion that this great body possesses all the ingenuity and skill required to open the doors of opportunity for optimum education to every American child. Parents and children alike look to us in this hour.

I believe the gentlemen of the press are rendering a service of the highest order beyond partisanship and employing clear perspective in discussing all facets of this problem. I submit for the consideration of my colleagues two pertinent discussions of this question which appeared in our New York City newspapers. While I am in substantial agreement with certain major conclusions of both writers below, I differ on some others and present them only as exemplary indications of the unbiased treatment which our journalists are according the merits of this controversy. I trust it will serve as an inspiration to us in the final deliberations of this bill.

The two articles follow:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of Mar. 21, 1961]

TODAY IN NATIONAL AFFAIRS—FALLACIES REVEALED IN RIFT OVER U.S. SCHOOL AID BILL

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, March 20.—Some fallacies are being spread around in connection with the program of Federal aid to education now pending in Congress.

Fallacy No. 1 is that, if the main bill were to include any loans for construction of parochial schools at the elementary or secondary level, this could jeopardize the operation of the whole law, when passed, because of doubt about constitutionality.

The fact is, however, that Congress for many years has inserted in various laws a section, usually at the end, which says that if any provision is held unconstitutional by the courts, this does not affect the validity of any other provision. It is known as a "separability clause."

Fallacy No. 2 is that Federal funds are not being loaned to any church schools today for construction purposes because it would be unconstitutional to do so. Here, however, is an excerpt from a news dispatch which appeared a few days ago in "The Catholic Week," the diocese newspaper in Alabama, under the dateline of Cullman, Ala.:

U.S. HOUSING LOAN CITED

"A $400,000 loan has been issued to Sacred Heart College in Cullman, Ala., for construction and expansion, according to Mother Mary Susan Sevier, president of the college. The Housing and Home Finance Agency of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare approved the loan in February.

"Founded in 1940 by the Benedictine Sisters of Cullman, Sacred Heart College was the natural outgrowth of the educational institution founded in 1904 by the sisters. Sacred Heart College is the only Catholic women's college in the three-State area of Alabama-Mississippi-Georgia. The college has trained faculty members who staff 14 elementary schools, 3 high schools, and 1 college. All are Catholic schools in the Mobile-Birmingham diocese.

"Sacred Heart College has also educated a large number of teachers in public schools in the State, especially in Cullman County."

SCHOOL LEVEL DIFFERENCES

Fallacy No. 3 is that there is a constitutional difference between aid at the elementary and secondary level, as distinguished from the college level, the argument being that attendance at elementary and secondary schools is compulsory, while attendance at sectarian institutions at the college level is voluntary.

Actually, there is no law anywhere that compels any child's attendance at a public school, either at the elementary or the secondary level. What is set forth in State laws is that children shall get an education for a stated period at an accredited school. Parochial schools are accredited—that is, they satisfy the education standards set by a State school board—and this is all that is required of any Protestant or Catholic school or of any other private school. Most States send an inspector at least once a year to each parochial and private school to make sure that the State standards are being met.

The Federal Government, on the other hand, does not participate in any way in so-called compulsory education at the elementary or secondary school level.

BILL BARS U.S. CONTROL

In the bill introduced in behalf of the Kennedy administration by Representative THOMPSON of New Jersey, Democrat, dealing with funds for construction and teachers' salaries, there is this provision:

"In the administration of this title, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, or the administration or operation of any school or school system."

This makes it plainly a bill by which the Federal Government is to provide educational facilities but is not to take any part itself in what is taught.

STATES RETAIN CONTROL

If the parochial schools at the elementary and secondary levels should receive funds for construction of physical facilities from the Federal Government, the schools would be under no obligation to alter their courses of study in any manner whatsoever. They would continue to look to State authorities for recognition of their graduation certificates and diplomas as fulfilling the requirements of a standard educational program.

There may be good reasons why the Federal Government should let the States take care of all school problems, including funds for construction and any other educational facilities, but the moment the Congress begins appropriating money for education, the argument is made that, under the Constitution, it cannot permit any discrimination as between different kinds of religious schools or colleges, or impose any handicap on those parochial or private schools which satisfy State requirements in the field of general education.

[From the New York Daily News of Mar. 20, 1961]

U.S. AID TO EDUCATION

President Kennedy unquestionably opened a king-size can of worms when he sent his message to Congress urging billions' worth of Federal aid to education.

The President's program falls into two parts: (1) about $3.3 billion to be dealt out over a 5-year period for undergraduate scholarships and college building operations; and (2) some $2.3 billion to go in a 3-year period as gifts to States for building public schools and/or fattening teachers' salaries.

Shortly after the President made these proposals, the executive board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference served public notice that the Roman Catholic Church in the United States (though assertedly without trying to pressure Members of Congress) would oppose the Kennedy program unless it were amended to provide for long-term, low-interest construction and repair loans to private schools.

That means schools and colleges run by religious groups, mainly. The Catholic Church operates most of these.

The President, a Catholic, finds himself in opposition to the Catholic clergy, to the embarrassment of many Catholics and the delight of numerous anti-Catholics.

What's the best way out of this affair, which obviously is worrying the President as well as a lot of other people?

For one thing, many Americans doubt that there is any need for Federal aid to school and college construction, and are convinced that classroom shortages on both levels have been greatly exaggerated.

For another, it seems a safe bet that, should the Government begin helping to pay teachers' salaries, Federal bureaucrats sooner or later (probably sooner) would move in and take to telling the teachers what and what not to teach. Who pays the piper calls the tune.

SCHOLARSHIPS OR DEDUCTIONS

Maybe the best way out is to forget about all the Federal aid the President proposes, except the scholarships.

Government scholarships might safely be awarded, in large numbers and generous amounts, so long as the Government refrained from telling the winners what to study on their Federal money. Should the Government prescribe the courses to be taken, it would be aping the Soviet Government.

These scholarships ought to go, we believe, to youngsters of promise and proved ability, regardless of creed, race, politics or other considerations of that nature.

Or wouldn't it be still better just to forget all about U.S. Government handouts of the taxpayers' money, and amend the Federal income tax laws so that parents could deduct the costs of educating their children at any and all schools and colleges?

That way, the cash could be spent directly on education, without a horde of Government bureaucrats taking a cut as they passed the money from the taxpayers to schools, colleges or students.

Anyhow, let's have plenty more debate on this complex subject before Congress does anything about Federal aid to education.

The Story of the White House China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the world-famous fine china used in the White House by all Presidents since 1917 is manufactured in Trenton, N.J.

In a letter dated March 6, 1961, Robert J. Sullivan, vice president of Lenox, Inc., points out that—

Lenox china is not only the top American fine china, it has a worldwide reputation. In these days of intense discussions about foreign products, it is heartening to realize that no American, including the President, who wants the finest available china, has to go beyond our shores.

Mr. Sullivan goes on to say that—

There is another reason why we feel your colleagues should know the Lenox story at this time. Our Nation is undergoing an economic recession and as we well know,

the Trenton area in particular has been hard hit. But our company plants continue to operate at full capacity, maintaining regular employment and serving as an anchor to the economic stability of their communities. We are able to do this, we believe, because we continue the same high level of quality established by our founder, Walter Scott Lenox, a native of Trenton, who entered business in 1889. The business growth of Lenox is the story of a great American functioning in the finest American tradition. We hear talk these days that Americans have lowered their standards. Yet the present success of Lenox is accounted for because the quality of the product appeals to the American families who purchase our fine china.

I include, as part of my remarks, the letter from Mr. Sullivan together with a short account of the china used by our Presidents:

LENNOX, INC.,
Trenton, N.J., March 6, 1961.

The Honorable FRANK THOMPSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: Because of the great interest of the American people in President and Mrs. Kennedy's move into the White House, it occurs to me that you might want to remind your colleagues about the fine china service which has been a particular pride of the White House since 1917. As you know, the fine china used by our Presidents since that time is a product of Lenox, manufactured here in Trenton.

Lenox china is not only the top American fine china, it has a worldwide reputation. In these days of intense discussions about foreign products, it is heartening to realize that no American, including the President, who wants the finest available china has to go beyond our shores.

There is another reason why we feel your colleagues should know the Lenox story at this time. Our Nation is undergoing an economic recession and as we well know, the Trenton area in particular has been hard hit. But our company plants continue to operate at full capacity, maintaining regular employment and serving as an anchor to the economic stability of their communities. We are able to do this, we believe, because we continue the same high level of quality established by our founder, Walter Scott Lenox, a native of Trenton, who entered business in 1889. The business growth of Lenox is the story of a great American functioning in the finest American tradition. We hear talk these days that Americans have lowered their standards. Yet the present success of Lenox is accounted for because the quality of the products appeals to the American families who purchase our fine china.

I am enclosing some background material on the presidential china which I believe will be of interest to your colleagues.

Sincerely,

ROBERT J. SULLIVAN,
Vice President.

THE STORY OF THE WHITE HOUSE CHINA

Because of a Presidential command, the American public was awakened to the fact that fine china need not cross an ocean to grace the finest American dinner tables.

The President, Woodrow Wilson. The command, commission American artisans to fashion a fine china service suitable for the tables of the White House. The result, President and Mrs. Kennedy have a china service second to none in the world.

The commission went to Walter Scott Lenox in 1917, a Trenton, N.J. potter who had a lifelong dream of producing fine china that would rival that of European manufacturers. He had been creating fine china of a high quality for a number of years, but the Presidential commission gave his art the recognition needed to place his ware in the front ranks of American products.

Lenox's first Presidential china amazed Washington society. In 1826, Congress passed a statute requiring that, wherever possible, all the furnishings and equipment for the President's home be American made, yet from 1826 until 1917, European china was used in the White House. The service Lenox created for the White House was decorated in cobalt blue with an outer border of etched gold, an inner gold rim with 48 stars surrounded the Presidential seal. Washingtonians were delighted that an American potter was able to meet the stringent specifications of the White House, thus demonstrating American creativity. Although thousands of meals were served in the White House in the first 8 years of its use, only four pieces of the Wilson service were broken.

The service now in use by President Kennedy was originally made under the Truman administration; it is etched with gold and teal green to match the then newly decorated White House official State Dining Room. The White House still uses another Lenox service. The service bears the gold Tudor rose and plume design of the Roosevelt family coat of arms encircling the Presidential seal. This dinnerware is used for an especially large party when the First Family of the country finds it needs additional pieces to complement its dinnerware.

The Presidential Mansion was not the limit of Lenox's command performances. The Royal Family of Saudi Arabia commissioned the company to create a service befitting the regal furnishings of an Arabian palace. The result was a service fashioned of embossed 24-karat gold bordered by rich maroon, a sumptuous, truly royal dinner set.

Over the years the Presidents of Mexico, Venezuela, Cuba, and Ecuador commissioned magnificent Lenox services which bore the seals of their countries. When their Majesties King George VI and Queen Elizabeth visited the United States in 1939, they dined on china created by Lenox especially for this historic occasion.

State Governors have been one of the largest groups requesting special services by Lenox china. New Jersey is so proud of the international respect earned by the Trenton firm, that it has sent Lenox services as gifts to the Governors of every State.

Lenox china has been used in our American embassies throughout the world.

It is important to note that not in every case has a command performance been ordered by the head of a state or the internationally famous. Museums too have paid tribute to the company. One of the fabulous command performance services was commissioned for special exhibit in the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City. Since they wanted the finest example of the potter's art they called on Lenox to create breathtakingly beautiful service plates—$18,000 a dozen—which still amaze connoisseurs everywhere.

In another country, rich in the tradition of fine china, Lenox occupies an honored and unique place. The famed ceramic museum in Sevres, France, exhibits a lovely coffee set by Lenox, the only American china so honored.

The experience of Lenox shows that Americans are still interested in high quality, and that American business is not lowering its standards. The success of Lenox is based on American principles. There is only one grade of china manufactured, whether it is for the American President, or the American housewife. Differences in price are dependent only on the amount and type of decoration on the plate. The fine china itself is the same that graces famous tables the world over.

The Rule of Law in Outer Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a splendid article entitled "The Rule of Law in Outer Space," written by Prof. John Cobb Cooper, legal adviser, International Air Transport Association, which appeared in the American Bar Association Journal of January 1961. The important subject and field of law in outer space is one of a most challenging nature, and which is addressing itself to keen and objective minds in all parts of the world, and particularly in the legal profession. The expression of the views of men like Professor Cooper on this important subject is a marked contribution toward discussion and the ultimate establishment of an International Code of Law in the field of outer space.

Prof. John Cobb Cooper practiced law in Jacksonville, Fla.—1911–34—except service on active duty as U.S. Naval Reserve officer 1917–19; president, Florida State Bar Association, 1931; chairman U.S. delegation International Civil Aviation Law Conference, Rome 1933; vice president, Pan American Airways 1934–45; one of the legal advisers to U.S. delegation Chicago Conference on International Civil Aviation 1944; chairman of one of drafting committees; member Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, 1945–51; first director Institute International Air Law, McGill University, 1951–55; first administrator American Bar Foundation, 1955; legal adviser International Air Transport Association since 1946; Annual Award Fellows American Bar Foundation for Research in Law and Government, 1959; member Organizing Committees International Academy of Astronautics and International Institute of Space Law, 1959; fellow American Bar Foundation, American Academy of Arts and Sciences; member Phi Beta Kappa; American Institute Aerospace Sciences; American Rocket Society; American Law Institute, et cetera. Princeton A.B. 1909; McGill University LL.M. 1951; Princeton LL.D. 1960; Author "The Right To Fly," 1947; and many magazine articles; coeditor "Sources of Our Liberties" 1959.

THE RULE OF LAW IN OUTER SPACE

(By John C. Cooper, legal adviser, International Air Transport Association)

(NOTE.—Professor Cooper discusses four problems that will have to be solved if the rule of law between states is to be extended to outer space. He warns that failure to solve these problems may mean disaster.)

The rule of law between states must be extended to outer space. Otherwise the world faces chaos and disaster. Peace may be at stake.

As Past President Rhyne of the American Bar Association said in his address on "World Peace Through Law" at the 1958 annual meeting:

"We live at the turning point in the history of civilization * * * As we listen to the roar of current history it is absolutely clear that mankind—men and nations and races—must learn to live together or else see civilization as we know it perish in the senseless devastation of war. The atomic and hydrogen bombs, the ICBM's, the sputniks, the Explorers, and Vanguards, have attuned the world to an overwhelming desire for peace * * *."

The United Nations, as recently as December 1959, declared that the "use of outer space should be only for the betterment of mankind and to the benefit of states irrespective of their economic or scientific development." But little action has followed.

President Eisenhower, in his address to the General Assembly of the United Nations in September 1960 warned the world, saying:

"Another problem confronting us involves outer space. The emergence of this new world poses a vital issue: Will outer space be preserved for peaceful use and developed for the benefit of all mankind? Or will it become another focus for the arms race—and thus an area of dangerous and sterile competition? The choice is urgent. It is ours to make * * *.

"National vested interests have not yet been developed in space or in celestial bodies. Barriers to agreement are now lower than they will ever be again.

"The opportunity may be fleeting. Before many years have passed, the point of no return may be behind us * * *.

"We must not lose the chance we still have to control the future of outer space.

"I propose that:

"1. We agree that celestial bodies are not subject to national appropriation by any claims of sovereignty.

"2. We agree that the nations of the world shall not engage in warlike activities on these bodies.

"3. We agree, subject to appropriate verification, that no nation will put into orbit or station in outer space weapons of mass destruction. All launchings of spacecraft should be verified in advance by the United Nations.

"4. We press forward with a program of international cooperation for constructive peaceful uses of outer space under the United Nations. Better weather forecasting, improved worldwide communications, and more effective exploration not only of outer space but of our own earth—these are but a few of the benefits of such cooperation."

Law, as a rule of human conduct, and international law, as a rule of the conduct of states, require certainty of application and clarity of subject matter. If President Eisenhower's proposals as to outer space are to be made effective, and if also the rule of law is to be there fully enforced, certain basic problems must be resolved. What is the area termed "outer space"? What is its legal status; that is, may a powerful state seize and control it, or is it free for the use of all states equally? What is the legal status of the satellites of other spacecraft used in outer space, particularly is the launching state responsible for their international good conduct as the state of the flag is for its ships and aircraft? Has the state over which such a spacecraft is put in orbit or is stationed any effective rights of self-protection and self-defense? These are fundamental questions. Until they are answered by international agreement President Eisenhower's detailed proposals may not fully protect our future.

1. WHAT IS MEANT BY THE TERM "OUTER SPACE"?

The term "outer space," when used in a legal or political sense, is comparatively new. The term "airspace" has long been used. But unfortunately neither term has been legally defined.

The term "airspace" appears in article I of the Paris Convention of 1919. This provides that the "high contracting parties recognize that every power has complete and exclusive sovereignty over the airspace above its territory." The United States assisted actively in drafting this convention during the Paris Peace Conference and later signed but did not ratify it. We did, however, ratify the similar Havana Convention of 1928, and the Chicago Convention of 1944, which is now in effect. The latter provides that the contracting states recognize that every state has complete and exclusive sovereignty over the airspace above its territory. This treaty provision is therefore part of our law of the land. It can only mean that we have acknowledged the sovereignty of every other state—whether a party to the convention or not—as to the airspace over its lands and waters. This carries with it the right of exclusion of foreign aircraft, as the Aeronautical Commission of the Paris Conference agreed in 1919 on the motion of the U.S. delegate, Admiral Knapp.

Should the airspace referred to in the Chicago Convention be construed to extend as far upward as the slightest traces of atmospheric gases are found, then any state may arbitrarily veto the flight of satellites above it, no matter how peaceful may be their use. But this I do not believe to be sound.

The most recent data generally available indicate that at least one or two satellites have been as close to the earth as 100 miles, or a little less, at the perigee (lower limit) of orbit. A well-known astronomer has stated that studies of meteors entering the earth's atmosphere show that the atmosphere below 70 miles, approximately, is too dense for a satellite to pursue an orbit. It would, therefore, appear that it may be possible for a satellite to be put in orbit at least once around the earth at some minimum altitude between 70 and 100 miles above us.

Distinguished scientists have expressed the following views:

a. At the surface of the earth the air consists of about 78 percent molecular nitrogen, 20 percent molecular oxygen, and small quantities of argon, carbon dioxide, and water vapor.

b. At 50 miles altitude the temperature has dropped sharply, the atmospheric density is only about one one-millionth of the surface density, and not sufficient to contribute in any appreciable degree to the aerodynamic lift of aircraft.

c. At 100 miles or less, the temperature has increased up to 2,000° F. or more, the atmosphereic density has further decreased to one one-billionth of the surface density, the oxygen molecules have already broken down into separate oxygen atoms.

This extremely thin gaseous combination of a few nitrogen molecules, oxygen atoms, and perhaps particles of other gases, has little if any resemblance to the substance, ordinarily called air, which we breathe and which is needed to support the flight of aircraft as envisaged when the Paris and Chicago Conventions accepted the principle of airspace sovereignty.

If the lower boundary of outer space is fixed by international agreement as the lowest altitude above the earth's surface at which an artificial satellite may be put in orbit around the earth, we should then have much more than a mere theoretical boundary. Below this boundary most objects moving from outer space toward the earth would be destroyed by heat from atmospheric friction. Above the boundary satellite flight would be practical.

Before Sputnik I was launched, I suggested to the American Society of International Law a new convention: First, reaffirming absolute sovereignty of the subjacent state up to the height at which aircraft could be operated; then further extending limited sovereignty upward to 300 miles above the earth's surface; then accepting the principle that all space above should be free for passage.

In 1957, a few weeks after Sputnik I was launched, I published a memorandum in which I pointed out that my 1956 suggestion was based on earlier and widely accepted scientific opinion to the effect that somewhere not far below 300 miles the atmosphere had sufficient density to prevent free satellite flight, but that Sputnik I had proved this premise to be unsound. My primary view has always been that the airspace does not extend to the area in which a satellite may be put in orbit around the earth.

Any careful analysis of President Eisenhower's proposals to the United Nations will disclose that he dealt with outer space as an area in which satellites might be put in orbit. If international agreement is reached so as to define outer space as the area whose lower or inner boundary is the lowest altitude above the earth's surface at which an artificial satellite may be put in orbit at least once around the earth, the rule of law could then be applied without difficulty in a reasonably definite geographic area. As President Eisenhower said, "Barriers to agreement are now lower than they will ever be again." The Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S. Senate, in its June 25, 1960, report on "Events Relating to the Summit Conference," has joined in urging speedy action. It said:

"Finally, the U–2 incident has pointed up the need for international agreement on the question of how high sovereignty extends skyward. This question is certain to become more acute in the future as aircraft fly at higher altitudes and as space satellites, many of them equipped with cameras or other devices, become more common. It is a question full of difficulties and one which demands the full attention and consideration of the United Nations as well as of the individual nations themselves."

2. WHAT IS OR SHOULD BE THE LEGAL STATUS OF OUTER SPACE?

It is quite impossible to apply international legal principles in a satisfactory manner in any geographic area whose legal status is unknown. Today the legal status of outer space is as vague and uncertain as was the legal status of the high seas in the centuries before Grotius, in the Mare Liberum, focused attention on the need of the world to accept the doctrine of the freedom of the seas. Years after that historic event, a great American jurist, Mr. Justice Story, said in the case of the *Marianna Flora*—1826:

"Upon the ocean, then, in time of peace, all possess an entire equality. It is the common highway of all, appropriated to the use of all; and no one can vindicate to himself a superior prerogative there. Every ship sails there with the unquestionable right of pursuing her own lawful business without interruption; but whatever may be that business, she is bound to pursue it in such a manner as not to violate the rights of others."

The legal status of outer space should be fixed along these lines by international agreement. Certain jurists have argued that the failure of States to protest present satellite flights indicates an acceptance of this status of outer space without further agreement. Others have insisted that it is not possible logically to consider the extension of sovereignty into outer space. The Ad Hoc Committee of the United Nations on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, appointed under a 1958 resolution, stated in its 1959 report that the launching and flights of space vehicles, on the premises of the permissibility of such flights, may have initiated "the recognition or establishment of a generally accepted rule to the effect that, in principle, outer space is, on conditions of equality, freely available

for exploration and use by all in accordance with existing or future international law or agreements".

But we must deal with hard facts. A well-known American lawyer and air law lecturer, the late Arnold W. Knauth, pointed out in an address in Buenos Aires on August 24, 1960, that only about 35 months had then passed since sputnik I was launched, and since that time there had been, perhaps, less than 50 launchings of other satellites and perhaps a hundred attempts, but that these launchings and attempts at launchings are not adequate to formulate and create any customary law in space.

My own view has also long been that no general customary international law exists covering the legal status of outer space. It must never be forgotten that the Chicago Convention goes no further than declaring that each state has sovereignty in the airspace over its lands and waters. Nowhere does that convention, nor any other international agreement of which I am aware, state that claims of sovereignty of a state must be limited to its airspace. Jurists may urge doubts as to the right of states to claim sovereignty in areas beyond the airspace, but there is no international agreement to that effect, nor am I aware of any formal and binding declaration of any state waiving any rights to claim sovereignty beyond the airspace, even to the far reaches of outer space.

The situation can be rectified only by a new international agreement. This might declare that no state has, or can have, sovereignty over outer space, or any part thereof, or any celestial bodies therein, and could at the same time make unlawful, as recommended by President Eisenhower, the orbiting or stationing in outer space of weapons of mass destruction, and that all launchings of spacecraft should be verified in advance by the United Nations. Thus the rule of law could be made effective in a reasonably definite area whose legal status has been determined.

3. WHAT IS THE LEGAL STATUS OF SATELLITES AND FUTURE SPACE CRAFT?

In the law of the sea the legal status of the waters used and the vessels employed has long been settled. The high seas are free for the use of all. Territorial waters, bays, harbors, and rivers have certain varying national characteristics. Vessels employed are said to have the "nationality" of the state of the flag. Under the law of the air, as exemplified in the Chicago convention, the legal status of the airspace has been fixed, and it was agreed, as in the precedessor Paris convention of 1919, that aircraft should have nationality.

The meaning of this term "nationality," as applied to ships and to aircraft, is quite well known. It symbolizes the acceptance of a rule of international law which states that a special relationship exists between a particular state and the transport instrumentality which has the "nationality" of that state. The effect of this special relationship is that the state of the flag is responsible for the international good conduct of its vessels and its aircraft when in use beyond national territory. And reciprocally, that state has the right, as against other states to see to it that its national vessels and aircraft are accorded the privileges and rights to which they are legally entitled when away from home. This is a rule of public law and not of private law. It does not make the state of the flag responsible for such things as debts incurred in the operation of the vessel or the aircraft, but it does make the state of the flag responsible if such vessel or aircraft violates a rule of international law affecting the rights of other states. International law writers have often pointed out that on the high seas, uncontrolled by any national sovereignty, chaos would be the rule but for the fact that the principle of nationality of vessels has for centuries been accepted into maritime law, and that with this concept international order may be maintained.

It is interesting historically to note that the necessity of balloons having this quality of "nationality" was suggested in one of the earliest air law discussions. Fauchille's major thesis in 1902 and 1903 was that the air was free. But as a very able international lawyer, he accepted the fact that chaos might result if the instrumentalities in flight did not have the nationality of some particular state.

A few years later the problem was discussed at length at the 1910 conference called by the French Government. While the conference did not, for very different reasons, conclude a convention to regulate flight, no serious contention was ever made later against the application to aircraft of the maritime principle of "nationality." In fact this principle was widely recognized in the conduct of states between 1910 and the signature of the Paris Convention of 1919. For example, neutral states, such as the Netherlands, Switzerland and the Scandinavian countries enacted and enforced rules during World War I which outlawed the flight of foreign aircraft over their territories. At the close of the war the nationality of aircraft was recognized in the Paris Convention, as it has been in every subsequent convention regulating air navigation, including the Chicago Convention of 1944. But the gravest doubt exists as to whether satellites and other flight instrumentalities, which can operate freely only in outer space, are "aircraft" within the present rules of international law dealing with required "nationality." If outer space is to be free for the use of all, the logic of Fauchille must again be applied. Every type of flight instrumentality usable in outer space must have the nationality of a state of the international community. Normally, this would be the launching state, which would thereby become responsible for the behavior of the satellite, or other space craft, so far as rules of international law are concerned.

The complicated functions which satellites are already performing illustrate this need. If the rule of law is to be effective in outer space, international regulations must be recognized and enforced, dealing, for example, with frequencies permitted to be used by radio equipment on a satellite. If it is admitted that a satellite has the "nationality" of the launching state, then that state can be held responsible without question if the satellite used unauthorized frequencies and thereby creates jamming or other types of international radio interference. This is but one example. Also reciprocally, when future control of outer space flight internationally has become effective, as it must, each state will have the right to protest against the interference with the flight of its satellites or other space craft, provided they are following authorized and internationally agreed patterns.

In the absence of the application of the requirement of flight instrumentality nationality, chaos and conflict will be inevitable in outer space.

4. WHAT ARE OR SHOULD BE THE RIGHTS OF SELF-PROTECTION?

This question poses a most serious problem. Whether the legal status of outer space be left undetermined as at present, or whether it be fixed by international agreement as an area in which no state may claim sovereignty, the right of every state in the international community to act for its individual self-protection or self-defense must be fully acknowledged and carefully preserved. This is part of the rule of law between states.

As early as 1804 Chief Justice Marshall said in the celebrated case of *Church* v. *Hubbart:* "The authority of a nation within its own territory is absolute and exclusive. But its power to secure itself from injury may certainly be exercised beyond the limits of its territory." This statement still stands in our jurisprudence. It would be directly applicable to the right of a subjacent state to "secure itself from injury" in outer space beyond its territorial airspace.

In 1837, Daniel Webster, as Secretary of State, said during consideration of the celebrated Caroline case, that the necessity which justifies acts of self-defense outside national territory is "confined to cases in which the necessity of that self-defense is instant, overwhelming, and leaving no choice of means, and no moment for deliberation". This statement was cited with approval in the Nuremberg cases after World War II. However, I would point out that no emergency could leave less chance for deliberation than a threat from outer space.

Perhaps the most important analysis of the problem made in the United States is found in an address delivered in 1914 by the late Elihu Root speaking as president of the American Society of International Law. In discussing the "right of self-protection" as "a right recognized by international law" he said (8 A.J.I.L.–6): "The right is a necessary corollary of independent sovereignty. It is well understood that the exercise of the right of self-protection may and frequently does extend in its effect beyond the limits of the territorial jurisdiction of the state exercising it." Later, in the same address, in a much-quoted phrase he insisted upon "the right of every sovereign state to protect itself by preventing a condition of affairs in which it will be too late to protect itself."

May I point out that this principle of the right of a state to act for its self-protection outside its national territory has already been applied in connection with aircraft flight. In 1950 the United States and Canada established air defense identification zones around parts of their respective shores. Admittedly the airspace over the high seas is not territorial space and enjoys the same international status as the high seas themselves. Yet the United States and Canada did not hesitate to establish regulations to prevent unidentified aircraft approaching their shores from the seas. The U.S. regulation, for example, requires that foreign aircraft approaching our shores must report their presence and identification when not less than 1 hour or more than 2 hours average cruising distance via the most direct route to the shore. This is a clear application of the right of self-preservation and self-defense applicable outside national territory and within international flight space. It would seem that the same right exists for subjacent states to act in outer space above national territorial airspace to the extent deemed necessary for the protection and defense of the lands below.

Certainly any future agreement for international regulation of outer space flight, or control of outer space, must preserve such national rights of self-protection and self-defense. It is submitted that nothing in the United Nations Charter is opposed to this view. While article 51 deals solely with the right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations, it is my firm belief that this does not take away already-existing international law rights of self-protection which have long been supported as part of the international law applicable to all states. In any event, as suggested earlier, such rights should be specifically preserved in any convention dealing with the legal status of outer space.

CONCLUSION

Four fundamental problems have been stated and tentative answers suggested.

First, that the boundaries of outer space must be fixed and that the important lower boundary should be at a point above the surface of the earth where it is possible to put a satellite in orbit at least once round the earth.

Second, that the legal status of outer space must be fixed and that this could best be done by accepting a status similar to that of the high seas, thus permitting its equal use by all and denying to any state the right to assert sovereignty over outer space or any celestial bodies therein.

Third, that the legal status of satellites and of other spacecraft used in outer space must be determined, and that this status should be that of "nationality" of the launching state, or other agreed state, otherwise chaos will result.

Fourth, that the international law right of a state to take action in outer space for its self-protection and self-defense must be preserved and acknowledged, even though no state has a right to claim sovereignty therein.

It is suggested that these four fundamental questions of outer space law stated demand urgent international settlement. It is also suggested that the solutions here put forward, when taken together, would provide a reasonable and practical foundation for the future application of the rule of law in outer space.

Hon. B. Carroll Reece

SPEECH
OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly shocked and very deeply grieved by the passing of our dear friend, beloved and esteemed colleague, Congressman CARROLL REECE, of Tennessee.

Few, if any, of the men I have met in or out of the public service, in my journey through life, could compare with him, and none could excell, this noble son of Tennessee.

In his basic integrity, he was as rugged and solid as the hills of his beloved, native State, and in his broad, active mind, only noble thoughts found lodgement. In his alert brain, great ability moved this proud Tennessan into many orbits of constructive interest and action for his district, State and country.

In his great heart, there abided feelings of brotherhood, tolerance and compassion for all men, especially for those who were less favored and less fortunate in coping with the vicissitudes of life.

A man of vital and sterling patriotism, who demonstrated on the battlefields in one of the Nation's greatest wars, his superb courage, his personal bravery, his complete fearlessness of danger, and his consuming love of country. CARROLL REECE was truly in the vanguard of great fighting heroes.

While he was a most highly decorated soldier and received many plaudits and honors throughout his career that might have changed the outlook of one less rugged and real.

CARROLL REECE was known for his humility, his modesty and his down-to-earth personality a man who never lost the common touch.

A successful businessman of genius and foresight, he well understood the financial business and economic problems of the Nation, and was greatly concerned about them. But he never swerved from his fundamental purpose of serving his country in the broadest sense with all his heart. When he passed on, this House lost one of its greatest, most distinguished, most famous Members, and those of us who knew and loved him lost one of our dearest, most loyal friends.

Obviously, it will not be possible to fill the great void which has been left by the untimely passing of this great American. The memory of his beaming personality, genial nature, high exploits and splendid contributions to the Nation and people of America will long be remembered here and wherever the name of CARROLL REECE is known.

He was truly one of God's noble men, one of America's first citizens, and his name will go down in history honored and revered for his heroism, his magnificent, unselfish service, his noble character and his greatness of heart.

I express my deepest and most heartfelt sympathy to his devoted, gracious wife, his loving daughter and all of his family, his friends and constituents for the irreparable loss which they have sustained. With a sad heart, indeed, I join them in mourning his passing and extend to them from the very bottom of my heart sincerest condolences and prayers that the Good Lord may lighten their heavy burden of sorrow and out of the consciousness of his great life, good works, and generous heart, bring them assuaging comfort and resignation.

The memory of CARROLL REECE will long live in these halls and in this Nation. It is my devout prayer that he may find peace, rest and eternal reward in his heavenly home.

A Kentuckian Writes About America's Folk Heritage in 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, in Berea, Ky., there is published a quarterly magazine, Mountain Life and Work, which is the official voice of the Council of the Southern Mountains, Inc. Reflecting the cultural patterns of the region, the magazine frequently carries articles on the folk traditions of the southern Appalachian area. In the winter quarterly, out this month, a most significant article goes beyond the regional sphere to explore the preservation of our folk heritage as a movement of national importance. The article, "Folk Songs and Dances, U.S.A.: The Changing Scene," is written by Sarah Gertrude Knott, a Kentuckian, who founded the National Folk Festival and who will direct the Silver Anniversary National Folk Festival in Washington this coming May.

Miss Knott, national director of the National Folk Festival Association, is recognized nationally and internationally for her great contribution toward the preservation of our cultural heritage. On many occasions, Miss Knott has been invited by folklore specialists and festival societies of other nations, as well as the governments themselves, to visit them and to bring the story of America's awakening to its rich cultural heritage.

I am also happy to know that the board of directors of the National Folk Festival Association, the producer and sponsor of the National Folk Festival here in Washington, has elected as its president, Dr. Lawrence G. Derthick of the National Education Association and until recently the Commissioner of Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The educational significance of the work to which Miss Knott has dedicated her career is indelibly underscored in the selection of Dr. Derthick to this position of honor.

I am sure that Members of the Senate will want to read this article from Mountain Life and Work for the great information it provides about the status of folk traditions in the United States. For that purpose, I ask unanimous consent to have Miss Knott's article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOLK SONGS AND DANCES, U.S.A.: THE CHANGING SCENE

(By Sarah Gertrude Knott, director, National Folk Festival Association)

John Henry, the legendary steel drivin' man, struggling against the on-marching civilization heralded by the new-fangled steam engine, had nothing on our folk festival leaders of today. They too are faced with the problems of transition and change, and these problems are intensified because there are diversities of views among the leaders themselves. Some feel that the newer groups are introducing alien patterns which dilute the purity of traditional American folk expression; others welcome the infusion of the new with the old in the belief that folklore, in its authentic aspect, is a manifestation of the contemporary scene, a reflection of the life of a people, never static, ever developing, and embracing an admixture of the modern with the traditional.

There are two special divisions of those interested in folklore today: The scholar, whose interest is academic and related to the fields of anthropology, history or literature, and the folk festival leader, who may be termed the "practitioner," using folk expression in folk festivals and other form of active presentation for artistic and recreational purposes. There should be no sharp line of demarcation between the two. They should go hand in hand, but under present conditions it is not always possible for them to have complete unity of thought and action because many scholars are impatient with the trend of some leaders toward modernization, deploring what they look upon as a lack of authenticity, while there are not a few practitioners who have little under-

standing of the cultural implications of their medium, presenting it merely as a means of recreation without attention to its value as recognized folklore.

Presentation of folk festivals is not the sole function of the practitioner. In communities all over the country there are informal gatherings of folksingers and dancers who get together under the inspiration of a leader for the pure joy of participation. They need no spectator audiences.

Up to about 25 years ago, when the National Folk Festival was established as an annual event, the scholar dominated the field of folklore. A few scattered folk festivals existed, but their scope was limited and they exerted little influence outside their own narrow areas. Seldom did they present folksongs, music or dances which were not indigenous to the communities where the events were held.

The National Folk Festival, instituted in St. Louis in 1934, was the first effort to demonstrate folksong, music, and dance as they existed all over the country. It drew from 14 States for its participants. No attempt was made to exemplify the folk expressions of the late immigrant groups, for in the concept of most scholars and festival leaders they had not attained the status of American folklore. However, the national was a significant step in the presentation of a broad cross section of our lively folk arts.

The folklore of most countries passes through three stages. There is the early stage when it is in its purest form, untouched and unchanged by any outside influences. Then there is the intermediate stage when it has been weakened by outside influences but retains sufficient vitality that it can be be revived. In its final stage it has lost so much of its fundamental content and substance that the roots are dead and revival is impossible.

We are in the late part of the second stage today, as far as most of our folk music and dances are concerned. Many of the folk legacies known to our pioneer forefathers have already been lost. There is left, however, enough that is still vital among both old and new American groups that with proper planning and coordinated effort on the part of those concerned with the scholarly aspects of folk expression and those whose interest is in its actual use, our democratic country might well become one of the richest folklore reservoirs left in a world of rapid and accelerating change.

Among the scholars who collect, record and classify folk material and the festival leaders, as well as teachers, recreational directors and other popularizers, three distinct lines of thought may be found today. First, there is the purist who believes that any presentation of folk expression should be rigidly limited to its traditional form. Seldom does a folk festival measure up to the standard of the purist but he exerts a powerful influence in setting a goal toward which the festival leader should aspire. The folk music and dance movement is the better for his existence. He gives purpose and helps to avoid the danger that the folk festival might degenerate into a mere popular show.

Second, there is the for-fun-only practitioner whose singers and dancers have no regard for tradition and seek only recreation. This leader has no qualms about changing and adapting folk songs and dances and often does not hesitate to introduce new elements which change their original character. His is not usually an inherited art; he is likely not to have any appreciation of the history of folk music and dance or of the cultural and educational values of his media. Nevertheless, if this leader does no more than lighten the load and relieve the tension of modern life, he has served a very real purpose and may incidentally awaken interest in authentic folklore. Who can say whether these innovations may not to some degree take root to become a part of the accepted folklore of tomorrow?

The third type of leader is the middle grounder who finds most satisfaction in the traditional forms, who appreciatively understands their substance and spirit, but accepts the inevitability of change and development. He knows that the folk expressions of a people are not static, but are the living, pulsing outpourings of the life of a nation, growing with it. Still, he realizes that unless songs, dances, and music have certain indefinable characteristics—perhaps "legitimate descent" would be descriptive—which link them with the established culture of a people; unless they genuinely reflect the spirit and background of the race or nation which created them, they cannot last, and cannot truly be classified as folklore. Thus, the aim of the middle grounder is to preserve the traditional while accepting the inevitability of growth.

The folk festival movement in the United States, as represented by the majority of the groups which bring dancers and singers to the National Folk Festival each spring, has adopted the middle ground philosophy. The National, itself, has bent and bowed to the changing times because it is felt that it would be shortsighted and unrealistic to ignore what is going on today. Nevertheless, effort is made to hold as nearly as possible to the authentic in basic folk expression and to avoid hasty acceptance of what may prove to be mere fads of the moment.

Up to the end of World War II, the development of folk festivals and the teaching of folk songs and dances for artistic and recreational purposes was gradual. Local, and even State and regional festivals were small. Objectives seemed clear, but when peace came and the long tension was lifted, widespread enthusiasm and popularization burst into unparalleled activity in many States.

For the last 10 years, especially, it has been more difficult to keep emphasis where it belongs; to make folk music and dance reflect the history of this country and the heartthrobs of our own people; it has been more difficult to avoid having folk festivals become an indiscriminate hodgepodge, reflective of many nations but not genuinely expressive of our own. Standardization has been consciously encouraged by many groups; recordings of music have pushed "live" musicians further into the background; country music floods television and radio, often replacing the traditional and confusing the picture, even in some of the areas where some of the richest treasures of inherited song and dance are still available and ready for use.

Time is running out for much of our indigenous and early American folk song and dance. A great deal of our American Indian music and dance along with early customs, are now known only to a rapidly dying older generation. Yet, there still remains enough upon which revival can be built, and there is some current adaptation of older songs and dances in newer versions which retain the old patterns. The same is true of the Spanish-American legacies of the Southwest which reach back over 400 years. These colorful songs and dances are now seldom heard or seen except at fiestatime. The rich cultural treasures of Old Spain are being stamped out in the rush toward industrialization and unless a determined effort is made to revive them as a part of the everyday life of younger Spanish-Americans they will soon become no more than a legend. What a pity to allow these ties with our Latin neighbors to the south to wither away at a time when communism is making every effort to separate us.

The gay French dances of the Acadians of Louisiana are almost gone, and the singers of the Acadian patois or standard French, grow fewer. The younger Acadian does not seem to cherish the lore of his bloodline as did his fathers but there are still enough of the elders left, remembering the songs and dances of their people, and still speaking the language, to restore the old cultural wealth, if only interest can be aroused.

The southern Appalachians were once the treasure house of Anglo-Saxon folklore. When Cecil Sharp, the English musician and student of English folk music and dance, roamed the area between 1914 and 1918, he collected hundreds of British ballads and folk songs handed down through the generations since covered-wagon days, some of them forgotten in his native land, from whence they came. However, country music flourishes in that region today, influenced largely by the Grand Old Opry which originally featured genuine folk music. When the National Folk Festival was held in Nashville in 1959 George Boswell, of Clarksville, Tenn., had recently completed his collection of 700 songs made during the preceding 10 years in Tennessee and Kentucky, with the blessing of the Tennessee Folklore Society. This society did not approve of country music, yet it did nothing to encourage of the folk songs and music which Mr. Boswell had collected.

Even in the national, held in the heart of the area where Boswell did his research, few native singers came to the surface. The Ozark Jubilee in Springfield, Mo., has encouraged the newer music—and songmaking, but there has been little comparable stimulation given the continuation of the inherited songs, the indigenous dances or the musical instruments long known in the Ozarks.

Among the traditional singers, British ballads and folk songs and our indigenous music which, in the main, sprang from them, have been the most popular, but they are gradually and surely passing. Many of the country singers and instrumentalists know and like this music but find so little general encouragement that it would be almost an innovation which they hesitate to venture. Here we encounter an anomaly: the use of folk music is waning in rural areas where it first sank its roots in American soil, whereas in New York, Philadelphia, Washington, D.C., and other urban centers up and down the Eastern Seaboard there is a strong and growing interest. Younger singers are learning authentic folk music and are making creditable attempts to present it with genuine strength and beauty to audiences who become more and more appreciative. So vital is this reawakening that when the 24th annual national was held in Washington in 1960, there were more of these singers from the cities, anxious to present such music, than could be used.

Emphasis has not, however, entirely shifted, for many pockets of genuine folk tradition can be found today in the still somewhat isolated sections where there is a continued need for community participation. In such states as Tennessee, Kentucky, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, the Carolinas, and even in Texas, there are thousands of sacred harp singers who use the "shape note" style, singing the notes first, and then the words. Groups still meet each week for the "singing school" which is, for many, their chief recreational and religious outlet. There are many other evidences of surviving folk heritages of the Negro, the German, the Irish, Scottish, and other groups, in much their original form, but there are also many indications of change. To an increasing degree they are starting to reflect the spirit of today, as the older folk traditions told the story of yesterday.

The most widespread folk activity in the United States today is the American square dance, the distinctively national dance of our country. Up to about 15 or 20 years or the

front room, or in small halls with neighbors only. Often this was to the tune of a lone fiddler. The caller usually gave his directions from within the square; his calls were spontaneous; the dancers followed in informal style, with their individual steps, and with leeway in interpreting the calls, which differed in various regions. Today, do-si-do and other figures used in the large State, area, or national square dance gatherings, are standardized. Californians can dance with New Yorkers, Floridians, or Minnesotans at the giant square dance festivals, and the calls are familiar to all. The participants are often married couples who cross the country at the slightest excuse, simply for the joy of dancing together.

Square dance records have been distributed nationally and many callers have, as a consequence, become famous from coast to coast. Their individual styles and distinctive calls become known to dancers all over the country, and when they call at national dances, the participants follow easily. These men have become important men in their field, and they command high fees as they travel about, serving the needs of an estimated 4 million square dancers the country over.

One of the most profound changes in the folklore scene results from the influence of the newer immigrants. The earlier programs of the National Folk Festival centered upon the traditional songs, dances, music and customs of the American Indian, the English, Spanish, Irish, Scottish, French, German, and Negro, representing the early cultures, and the song and music of such indigenous occupational groups as the lumberjack, miner, cowboy, canalman, and sailor. Today there is, perhaps, more emphasis placed upon the folk dances of newer Americans than upon those of the older settlers. These newer groups are keenly aware of the value of folk activity in binding themselves together, in maintaining esprit de corps and national identity and spirit. The National Folk Festival recognizes this as a situation in being, and, perforce, stresses the folk expressions of these late immigrant groups almost to the same extent as those of the earlier ones. This is also true of the State and regional festivals the country over.

No longer does the National present merely the folk music, song and dance of the early ethnic groups. A typical festival would now also include those of the Hungarian, the Yugo-Slav, the Lithuanian, Pole, Italian, Greek, Norwegian and many others. However, emphasis is still centered upon the earlier groups.

The influx of new ethnic groups following World War I awakened us to new and rich cultures. First recognition of these new values was given just prior and after World War I, by International Institutes, whose festivals in New York, St. Paul, Buffalo, and other large cities initiated their presentation in the form of songs, dances, and music of our newer immigrants, making our newcomers feel at home, and incorporating their cultures with ours. Further recognition of the newer groups was given by the State folk dance federation festivals which followed the lead of California, the first State federation. Today in festivals all over the country, folk dancers swing and sway to the rhythms of many lands.

The extent to which these newer transplantations will affect our existing folk expression is not yet clear. It is evident that our general cultural pattern was established before the emergence of the newest immigrants from overseas, and that it is perhaps too soon to claim some of these cultural imports as a definite part of American folklore. What will happen to the wealth of folk treasures recently brought here; whether they will persist in their present form; whether they will take on new characteristics under the pressure toward Americanization; whether they will be frozen into a standardized formality as a result of the sudden increase in the number of professional dance instructors who teach them; these are anyone's guess. One thing is certain: as of this moment the indigenous and early folk expressions and the creations based upon them, predominate in every State.

Few bonds unite a people as does a common appreciation of its folklore. The United States is one of the few countries which has failed to recognize this fact. In one country after another we find a ministry of culture or some equivalent authority. One of Hitler's potent unifying was the attention to folk music and folk festivals which gave the Germans a vivid reminder of their national heritage. Today, Soviet Russia does the same. In our struggle to maintain military and economic superiority in a divided world we spare no effort or expense to defend our position against outside attack. Should we not give thought to the fostering of pride in our cultural heritage as a bulwark against propaganda attack? We need not encourage a Chauvinistic nationalism, but we may strengthen our belief in the ideals of our country through the unifying influence of a common culture understood and beloved by all our people.

There is no agency of our Government which provides material aid in the advancement of the folk activity movement, nor has any appreciable aid been given by any private agency or foundation. It is hoped that this situation will soon change. It is to be admitted that there has been lack of coordination among the many folk festival associations scattered across the country and that there has not been a national organization qualified to speak and act for folk festival groups on a national basis. The hesitancy of the Government or private agencies to subsidize or otherwise assist the movement may be understood in the light of that fact.

The National Folk Festival Association is now preparing to campaign for national recognition of the importance of folk expression in the life of our people, and to attempt to enlist the aid of government and private sources in welding together our varied cultural groups through a common understanding and appreciation of our rich folk heritage. If this movement succeeds it will do much to give the folk activity movement the position of dignity and respect similar movements enjoy in other countries.

Commonsense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. BROMWELL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, citizens weary of seeking to discover some public benefit in every bill passed here will be refreshed by the note of commonsense expressed in the Cedar Rapids, Iowa, Gazette on March 15 in an editorial entitled, "Round and Round We Go," which I herewith submit in full:

ROUND AND ROUND WE GO

The government giveth and the government taketh away, if we may be allowed to paraphrase a far more elevated quotation with no intention of irreverence.

The administration is all set to increase farm income by $1 to $1½ billion through higher price supports and payments on diverted acreage. At the same time it is pushing for higher wages, which will be passed along through greater labor costs in the form of higher prices for things needed for production and living on the farm.

The net result is likely to be that farmers may handle more dollars, but their net income will not be improved nearly as much as they hope. As a primary producer at the end of the line, both selling and buying, the farmer is very likely to end up lowman again.

High costs probably have as much to do with the farmers' unsatisfactory economic situation as low prices. Since 1947 gross farm sales have gone up $3.5 billion. But in the same period farm costs have increased $9.2 billion, resulting in a $5.7 billion decrease in net farm income.

Labor Department figures show that factory worker productivity has gone up 35 percent since 1947, while factory wages have increased 77 percent. Labor costs of manufactured items have increased about 42 percent in the period.

Meanwhile productivity of farmworkers has increased 50 percent, but net income per worker has gone up only 5 percent. That increase is in dollars, not purchasing power. The farmer's purchasing power has decreased 20 percent in the 14 years.

Government payments, then, are likely to be largely offset by increased costs as the result of nonfarm Government programs. If the farm program is successful in actually cutting total production, higher prices in the market may result in some gains. But higher prices will bring pressure for wage increases, which will again absorb the farmers' gains.

What's that story about the dog chasing its tail?

Maj. Gen. Winston P. Wilson, Commander of the Air Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on Sunday, March 12, 1961, there appeared in the Arkansas Democrat an article by Maurice Moore, the Democrat State editor, about one of Arkansas' outstanding citizens, Maj. Gen. Winston P. Wilson, the commander of the Air National Guard.

I have known "Wimpy" Wilson for many years, and have followed his distinguished career with justifiable pride. General Wilson's service to the Nation has been in the finest tradition of those who serve our Armed Forces. Through dedication and complete devotion to duty he has risen through the ranks to the position of chief of the Nation's Air National Guard. He has served in this high post since 1953. His career is an outstanding example to the people of the Nation, to the men of our armed services, and particularly to the youth of the country.

I wish to take this opportunity to commend General Wilson for his outstanding service to the country.

I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAJ. GEN. WINSTON P. WILSON, COMMANDER OF THE AIR GUARD

(By Maurice Moore)

Once upon a time a 15-year-old Arkansas boy played hookey from Sunday School, took $5 he had earned working in a grocery store and used it to pay for a 3-minute airplane ride over Little Rock.

His father called him foolish.

His mother was too stunned to say anything.

This was his first time in the air.

Today 49-year-old Maj. Gen. Winston P. Wilson is deputy commander of the National Guard Bureau and head of the Air National Guard.

Under his command he has 72,000 airmen, 134 bases and 2,600 aircraft, including 2,100 jets.

He has 11,000 hours of flying time, including 5,000 in military service.

He travels hundreds of thousands of miles each year—mostly by air—to check on the Air Guard's farflung operations.

His father, W. P. Wilson, now 80, no longer thinks he's foolish. His mother, now 78, is no longer stunned. They are proud of his accomplishments in the air age.

His associates call him a born executive. They substantiate this by pointing to the fact that for 13 of his 16 years of active duty he has been attached to the Pentagon in various capacities.

Winston P. Wilson was born in Arkadelphia November 11, 1911. His background is all Arkansas. He was reared in Little Rock and played high school football under Earl Quigley as a substitute guard and center. He was a regular at Hendrix College in Conway.

To his Arkansas friends and his higher echelon associates in the military, he is known as Wimpy. But the nickname didn't come because of any resemblance to the hamburger-eating chum of Popeye of cartoon fame.

In high school he was called Win—the shortened version of his first name. One day on the football practice field, Coach Quigley yelled for Win P. Wilson. His schoolmates followed through. They called him Wimpy.

Now Wimpy Wilson's name is synonymous with the Air Guard. He has been its commanding officer since January 1954, when he succeeded a fellow Arkansan, the late Maj. Gen. Earl T. Ricks of Hot Springs. He had served as acting chief since July 1953, when Ricks became ill.

In recognition of his service, Wilson was renamed to a second 4-year term as Air Guard chief in 1959. It expires in May 1963 and he's hoping he'll be reappointed again. He isn't thinking about retirement.

When he does decide to call it quits, he's coming home to Arkansas. Take it from him, "There's no better place."

In fact, he's still an Arkansas businessman—a silent partner in the Eldridge hardware and plumbing firm in Forrest City.

But right now, his main concern is seeing that America keeps its Guard up.

He started his military career in 1929 by enlisting as an airplane mechanic in the 154th Observation Squadron of the Arkansas National Guard. He attended Little Rock Junior College and graduated from Hendrix College in 1934.

Wilson joined the Soil Conservation Service and drew assignments in Conway and Forrest City. While he studied how to improve terra firma, his heart was in the air. He received his CAA pilot's license in 1936 and earned his commercial pilot's license in 1940. The same year he was commissioned a second lieutenant and received the rating of junior aircraft observer after finishing a 9-month cadet observer training course offered by the 154th Observation Squadron.

The 154th Squadron was ordered to active duty in September 1940, and a year later Wilson was promoted to first lieutenant in the Army Air Corps.

When Pearl Harbor came he and the 154th went to Eglin Field, Fla. He flew antisubmarine patrols as an aircraft observer until February 1942. And in May 1943 he was rated as a pilot.

He had a varied wartime career. His duties included assignments as chief of the Tactical Reconnaissance Branch of the Army Air Force; commanding officer of the 16th Photo Squadron, which concentrated on photographic mapping and charting missions in the continental United States, Alaska, and South America.

Wilson also served in Hollandia, New Guinea, the Philippines and Tokyo. In 1945 he was promoted to lieutenant colonel. Upon separation from active duty, he rejoined the Arkansas Air National Guard and commanded the 154th Fighter Squadron based at Adams Field in Little Rock.

When the Korean war broke out, he was ordered back to active duty and assigned to the National Guard Bureau in September 1950.

His promotion to full colonel came the following year while he was chief of staff under General Ricks. When he assumed command of the Air Guard, he was made a brigadier general.

Wilson takes a great amount of pride in the guard's combat readiness.

"We are training under the same standards as our active duty counterparts," he declared in an interview recently in Stuttgart. He had interrupted preinaugural activities to fly there to make a chamber of commerce address.

"Guard planes are standing at the ready; they can be airborne within 5 minutes. It is a great satisfaction to see the efficiency and professionalism of these men. They are dedicated volunteers.

"We are not allowing ourselves to become missilebound," he declared. "Since we are involved in a number of mutual security agreements around the globe, we must be prepared to step in at any trouble spot to stop an aggressor.

"Further, we must possess the capability of fighting and winning in such cases, so that a local war will not automatically become a general war. Here is where the National Guard plays a vital role."

Wilson explained:

"We (the guard) have atomic capable missiles to be sure—in both the Army and the Air Guard—but we are also flying supersonic jet fighters and big, 4-engine transports; and we maintain 21 infantry divisions and 6 armored divisions which, while capable of waging atomic war, are prepared to slug it out on the beaches and in the mud, the way they have always done.

"It is a heavy burden of responsibility, maintaining such a military force at the peak of readiness. It requires a considerable sum of money, unrelenting effort, and perhaps most important of all, a sense of patience and dedication unparalleled in our history."

Wimpy Wilson has come a long way since that 3-minute plane ride over Little Rock in 1926, but he admits "It was one of the biggest thrills of my life."

A Tribute to St. Patrick

SPEECH

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the story of St. Patrick is the story of captive peoples everywhere, throughout the history of mankind. Moreover, it stands as a symbol of hope to all the captive peoples of the present day. For Patrick was not simply a local hero with the ability to cope with local problems. Indeed, his problems were those of civilization, itself, and his solutions applicable not only to Ireland, but to nations of every description, in every time and place.

Carried into slavery in his youth, Patrick was transported to Ireland around 400 A.D., and was not to retain his liberty for 6 long years. In the time that elapsed this saintly man gave no though to revenge, for that was far from being his nature. Instead, as a Christian, he came to understand the heathen weakness of his Irish captors, and determined that some day he would come among them as a Christian teacher, to spread the Gospel to those so sorely in need.

Escaping his bonds, he fled to France, where he entered upon the study of missionary work, and in the year 432 he returned to Ireland in the role of a bishop.

History and tradition record many wondrous acts by St. Patrick during his service in Ireland. Three hundred and sixty churches are said to have been built under his auspices, and 12,000 people baptised at his own hand. As an able administrator he knew no peer, and in the time that he stayed in Ireland he was to ordain so many priests and convert so many heathen that the Druid religion—the religion of his persecutors—was shocked out of existence in the land.

Through fables and folk tales we are told that he did many wondrous things to win the confidence of the people. It is said that he drove the snakes and toads from Ireland, for instance; that in contests with the Druid priests he was known to have performed many miracles; that he was able to confound his enemies by bringing darkness upon them, and that at his death, the sun shone steadily for 12 days.

Be that as it may, there is no denying the persevering and noble qualities of the man, who entered the land of his captivity to bring the love of Christ to those who knew it not; to spread the light of Christianity among those that had dwelt for years in veritable darkness.

Nor can anyone with knowledge of the Irish people fail to consider the fact that they radiate a Christian spirit unsurpassed by any other nation on earth today.

In the period embracing Patrick's lifetime, Ireland was but a conglomeration of municipalities ruled over by a score of self-designated kings. By singling them out, one by one, Patrick managed to win over most of the kings to the Christian cause. His knowledge of the Irish language was of course a great benefit to him in all his undertakings among the Irish people; and his experience of 6 years in the country had given him an insight into the character of the people that he could probably not have learned as well in any other way.

In such a manner did Patrick profit by his captivity and in time was able to turn against his captors the forces of righteousness. So it has ever been in the case of captive peoples, and so it is again today.

The spirit of Patrick radiates today beyond the confines of Ireland and beyond the Irish in other lands, to serve as a promise of truth and justice to all who are denied those rights in their own country.

As a symbolic enemy of slavery, St. Patrick looms larger today than ever before; and, as always, the slave master trembles at the sound of his name.

Truly, St. Patrick will stand as a hero of mankind, so long as Christianity prevails.

Proposed Merger of the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad and Seaboard Air Line Railroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution passed by the House of Representatives of the Georgia State Legislature, "opposing the merger of the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad and the Seaboard Air Line Railroad, and for other purposes."

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A RESOLUTION BY THE GEORGIA LEGISLATURE OPPOSING THE MERGER OF THE ATLANTIC COAST LINE RAILROAD AND THE SEABOARD AIR LINE RAILROAD; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Whereas there is now pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission, Finance Docket No. 21215, relative to the proposed merger of the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad and the Seaboard Air Line Railroad; and

Whereas such a merger would tend to create a monopoly and greatly lessen competition, thereby having a disastrous effect on the small railroads which are now operating at a loss; and

Whereas such a merger would have a direct effect on 2,770 miles of railroad lines, and would indirectly involve an additional 1,400 miles; and

Whereas such a merger would deprive many communities of this State of any rail service whatsoever, since it is the avowed purpose to abandon many miles of track within the State of Georgia; and

Whereas if lines were abolished it would seriously affect the counties and municipalities involved, since it would remove a large source of taxation therefrom, upon which political subdivisions are now dependent to a large degree; and

Whereas it would create a loss of approximately $20 million in payrolls by virtue of workers' jobs being abolished or workers being transferred to out of State positions; and

Whereas innumerable municipal, county, civic, and other organizations have opposed this merger: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives, That this body hereby goes on record as opposing the merger of the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad and the Seaboard Air Line Railroad, and respectfully requests that the application for such merger be denied; be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the house is hereby instructed to transmit a copy of this resolution to each member of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and to each Member of the Georgia congressional delegation.

Proposed Resolution of Student Council, Lafayette College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

PROPOSED RESOLUTION OF THE STUDENT COUNCIL COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING "METHODS USED BY THE HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE"

We urge the Lafayette student council to reaffirm and support the resolution and mandate passed by the National Student Congress of the U.S. National Student Association concerning the investigations of the House Un-American Activities Committee. That resolution condemned the Committee's method of investigation of alleged subversive activities in the teaching profession and in other areas of our society. We urge Council to likewise condemn the Committee's methods. The abrogation of individual freedoms under the Constitution, the consequent disintegration of national integrity, are reasons why we support the revision or subsequent abolition of the House Committee through means available to the judicial and legislative portions of the Federal Government.

The committee, since its inception in 1938, has existed through a congressional mandate which, at best, is ambiguous in its definition of the term "un-American." We acknowledge the right and necessity of Congress to obtain information from various areas for the purposes of regulatory or remedial legislation. The House Un-American Activities Committee, however, has led to very little actual legislation through its information-gathering hearings, despite voluminous reports to the contrary. The vagueness of the term "un-American" has made difficult any precise definition of the committee's powers or areas of investigation. In the past decade their investigations have mainly sought to discover and expose individuals and organizations whose words or activities may be labeled "subversive."

If the efforts of the committee were directed solely toward obtaining information, we might have no cause for condemnation. However, the information obtained and the legislation enacted scarcely warrant the expenditures which make the committee one of the most expensive subsidized by the House of Representatives (last year receiving $327,000).

Therefore, we feel that, for the following reasons, the House Un-American Activities Committee should be condemned:

1. Its stated purpose to investigate subversive activities has led, in an atmosphere inspiring "guilt by association," to the attachment of suspicion to any witness called before the committee, in other words, has led to the idea of "guilt by subpena" which has often resulted in economic or social sanctions being applied to the witness. This, when article I of the Constitution prohibits such infliction of punishment by legislative acts without judicial trial, i.e., bills of attainder.

2. The committee attracts undue publicity to its hearings. Chances of any significant information being brought to light are reduced in a hearing atmosphere more like that of a courtroom, in which the purpose of examination seems more like exposure than information. Often the committee rehears in public hearings what it has already discovered in closed session. We feel the public hearings serve no legislative purpose, not when they attach the stigma of guilt to the guiltless and guilty alike. In the words of Congressman JAMES ROOSEVELT, the committee judges, yet "is not subject to the restraints of fairness and impartiality which we impose upon our judiciary."

3. If the committee shall continue to interpret its mandate as a directive to expose subversive activities for the purpose of national security, then, we feel, it has outlived its usefulness. National security can be maintained more effectively and efficiently by the existing agencies whose employees are specially trained for police and counterespionage work. We have some reason to believe that the committee actually weakens the national security when its inquisitorial methods undermine faith in freedom, the basis of our democratic society, by transforming government by consent to government by intimidation.

4. The committee has interpreted its mandate, we feel, so that it may exercise moral judgment on the witnesses it calls. Furthermore, it employs a logic which does not permit any shadings of human opinion or behavior. One is either for the committee or against it; if one is against the committee, he is a Communist or a Communist dupe and, as such, should be exposed and persecuted. The committee has created an atmosphere of fear which endangers the progress of intellectual inquiry and exchange of those ideas which are made available only through personal associations with individuals of diverse and sometimes unpopular opinions. The future freedom of our free society depends ultimately, we feel, upon the exchange of such adverse and diverse opinions.

We urge that student council condemn the House Un-American Activities Committee for the above-mentioned reasons and support proposals for its revision (to avoid further violations of intellectual and constitutional freedoms) or abolition.

Press Release From Gov. John B. Swainson, of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into

the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a release from the office of the distinguished and able Governor of the State of Michigan, the Honorable John B. Swainson.

The release dated March 2, 1961, sets forth how another industry is being located in Michigan and the reason therefor.

I think that reading this statement may do much to calm the fears of the carybabies who constantly bemoan the industrial fate of Michigan and the opportunities in that great and wonderful State of which I am so proud.

I hope this will help in some way to dissolve the pall of gloom which has surrounded some of those in and outside of our great State.

The release follows:

Governor Swainson today announced that the Chamberlain Metal Products Co., of Chicago, manufacturer of golf carts, will be moved to Benzie County and will be in production by April 1.

The Illinois firm was purchased by George Petritz, of Beulah; Don Parker, of Frankfort; and Joseph Zarish, of Deerfield, Ill. The company makes Ko-Lap-Si Karts and Kaddie Karts.

The Governor said:

"This is one of the dramatic chapters in Michigan's industrial development. Petritz and Parker wanted a new industry for Benzie County so, together with Zarish, they bought one and will move it to Michigan. Their confidence in Michigan's industrial potential and their deep love for northern Michigan is a real inspiration to all the people of our State.

"It was through the efforts of Ray Weigle, Cadillac industrialist and one of our fine Michigan industrial ambassadors, that the Chamberlain plant was brought to the attention of Petritz and Parker. Throughout the campaign to obtain a new industry for Benzie County, there has been outstanding cooperation."

In informing Governor Swainson of the new industry, Petritz said:

"We are happy to bring in an industry affiliated with the rapidly expanding leisure field. We expect it will make an important contribution to employment in the area within the next 3 years. There is no place in the world I would rather live than in northern Michigan. That's a big reason why we are sincerely interested in the industrial development of this area.

"I am convinced that fairly treated personnel in Michigan reflects the healthy attitude that means so much to an industry's balance sheet. Personnel attitudes in our part of Michigan are so healthy as to more than offset the logistics of our location. Michigan has an outstanding highway system that means much to the economy of the north country.

"There is great ingenuity and interest in the service industries in the north country and light industry presents a great opportunity for that area. If more management people knew what can be done there, we would have an inundation of industry.

"We have never been let down by other industries in our area. Whenever we needed some assistance, we were able to get it. The Michigan Economic Development Department, the industrial ambassadors, Benzie County Industrial Commission, the State savings bank at Frankfort and others have been most helpful to us."

Petritz told the Governor he and his associates are pursuing an aggressive policy to seek employment for the Chicago workers who will be displaced by the removal of the Chamberlain plant to Michigan. Initial employment at the Frankfort plant will be from 15 to 20 with an increase to near 40 by the first of next year expected.

Petritz, who came to Michigan in 1947, started the Petritz frozen pie company which is now subsidiary of the Pet Milk Co. and the largest manufacturing industry in Benzie County. He was a Michigan Week regional chairman in 1958. Parker came to Michigan last year.

Petritz is president of the new company, Parker is vice president and general manager, and Zarish is vice president of marketing, and treasurer.

In a letter to the president of the company, Governor Swainson wrote:

"DEAR MR. PETRITZ: Please accept for yourself, Don Parker, and Joseph Zarish my sincere congratulations on the purchase of the Chamberlain Metal Products Co. and its removal to Michigan. This is a wonderful expression of confidence in Michigan's industrial future. The people of your community will benefit directly from this decision and all the people of Michigan will gain inspiration.

"Your action is particularly gratifying in that you have put into action your deep interest in northern Michigan, and have set an example which all of us could follow with great advantage to our State.

"In this new undertaking I wish you great success.

"With sincere best wishes."

The Plight of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, at the conclusion of these remarks about the situation confronting the New Haven Railroad, two editorials, one from the Hartford Courant of March 19, entitled "Relief, Yes—Bankruptcy, Yes," and the second from the Deep River New Era of March 16, entitled "Bankruptcy Is Best."

Mr. President, the New Haven Railroad is vital to the economic life of Connecticut and all New England and the New York metropolitan area. It can and must be saved in order that the essential services it provides to commuters and to business and industry in the area may continue.

The State of Connecticut has granted tax relief estimated at $1.2 million a year as its contribution to preserving railroad services. Similar action is being considered by New York, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island.

The Subcommittee on Housing of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency currently is considering S. 345, introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] and cosponsored by myself and 16 other Senators. If enacted, this bill would enable the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to assist States and local governments in planning and providing for necessary community facilities to preserve and improve essential mass transportation services. The bill would authorize a $250 million revolving loan fund, through which States and localities could finance purchases of new equipment and facilities for use in mass transportation service, and provides $75 million in grants for planning improvements in such service.

Such governmental aid is essential for the future of the New Haven Railroad, and other hard-pressed commuter roads, but the question arises whether such aid alone can insure successful operations.

In the case of the New Haven, I have reluctantly come to the conclusion that a change in management and a reduction in heavy fixed charges such as can be brought about only by court-appointed trustees in Federal receivership proceedings, must be made if tax relief and other governmental assistance are to be effective.

Mr. President, the New Haven Railroad is bleeding to death. There now appears to be only one chance of saving its life, and that is to apply the tourniquet of bankruptcy.

After many months of worrying and studying over the New Haven situation, I conclude that the only way credit can ever be restored is through drastic reorganization. Without new sources of credit, this railroad will soon collapse.

If the other three States—New York, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island—follow Connecticut's lead in giving tax relief; if the Federal Government provides assistance such as is contemplated in S. 345; if competent operating management can be provided, and fixed charges reduced by the appointment of trustees in bankruptcy, the New Haven Railroad can be saved. Governmental assistance alone will not do it, I am convinced.

The New Haven must be relieved at once of its heavy fixed charges, over $6 million a year. This relief, added to what the States and the Federal Government may provide, will make possible an operating profit and a restoration of credit to buy or lease some new equipment, renovate old equipment and work toward efficient and safe operations which are essential in the public interest.

The New Haven, I repeat, must be saved. But, Mr. President, I conclude it cannot be saved without the discipline that only trustees in bankruptcy can provide.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hartford Courant, Mar. 19, 1961]

RELIEF, YES—BANKRUPTCY, YES

There is nothing wrong with the tax relief for the New Haven Railroad voted last week by both parties in both houses of the general assembly. There is everything wrong with thinking that such relief is enough to nurse the railroad back to health.

Governor Dempsey has notified New York, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island of Connecticut's action. We must hope that they will take like action. But necessary as tax relief is, it does not get to the root of the New Haven's troubles. It is, indeed, a pity that two amendments to the relief measure offered in the house were voted down over-

whelmingly. They should have been passed overwhelmingly.

First was the proposal of Representative Nicholas B. Eddy, of New Hartford, who would have conditioned tax relief upon bankruptcy and reorganization under new management. Less important but equally to the point was the amendment by Richard W. Sheehan, of West Hartford. He wanted to see to it that no official of the railroad got any salary increase as long as the line was living off State relief. As it is, the only assurance the State has under the measure passed is a proviso that the road must meet service and maintenance standards yet to be established by the public utilities commission.

Mr. Eddy believes that, even with tax relief, the road will still go broke. It probably will. For while it is possible that tax relief will enable the New Haven to go on as now, half alive and giving half service, the picture is not good. Connecticut's relief is estimated at $1.2 million a year. But in hardly more than 5 years the railroad has already borrowed $31 million that had to be guaranteed by the ICC. A while back Massachusetts gave the road almost $1 million to keep the old Colony Railroad to Cape Cod running. And New York has already cut the road's New York property tax from $1.7 million to less than half a million, with more to come. Is all this going to be enough, when each time the road has been given help it has had to come back for more?

This thing cannot get better without reorganization. For the present fiscal and management structure is unsound. President Alpert, who has presided over more of the decay begun under his predecessors, will be still left in charge after all four States have extended more relief. He now argues that if the road goes bankrupt "Nobody is going to get paid for anything," including the tax gatherers. Others warn that if there is bankruptcy the trains will stop running. All this is nonsense. It didn't happen the last time there was bankruptcy. That time service got better, maintenance was improved, and new equipment was bought.

Apart from its overall disadvantages in the automobile age, which the New Haven shares with other American railroads, the basic trouble is this: neither management nor common stockholders nor preferred stockholders have a personal interest in the health of the railroad as such. To them it is just a source of money; or potential money. The only ones who have an incentive to build the road back into modernity and health are the first-mortgage holders. As long as nothing is done but apply the poultices of tax relief to the railroad sores running, these bondholders are powerless.

If the road can benefit from the fresh start that can come only through bankruptcy, the normal procedure will be for the first mortgage holders to form a protective committee. They can then work with the court, to do again much as was done the last time the New Haven went through bankruptcy. A professionally competent and dedicated management can get to work on a program of revival, instead of merely trying to beg help to hold an ailing fiscal structure together.

We have had just the opposite of this kind of dedicated professional management since 1947, when a healthy railroad came out of bankruptcy to be turned over to the managements that have ridden it downhill ever since. It seems to have been considered by stockholders and by management as a goose that, if squeezed hard enough, would lay golden eggs. None of them have had a personal interest in maintaining and modernizing and improving the road as a vital member of the State's economy, as the livelihood of its employees, and as a necessity for Connecticut citizens and Connecticut industry.

It is true that the railroad has had hard luck in recent years. It has never recovered from the blow of the 1955 floods. It also is up against that revolutionary change in our way of life that has come with the automobile, a change whose economic impact we have been slow to understand and slower to do anything about. The American railroads' need for subsidy like that long since given to their competitors is now receiving a partial answer in the relief being granted by the States. But the New Haven's greatest need is to be put under the control of those who have a personal stake in its success as a railroad.

If there is bankruptcy, if the first-mortgage bondholders form their committee, there will be prominent in the picture those who have something to conserve and to build up. The success of the railroad, its recovery and improvement, will mean something to them. Private enterprise is not something in which you make a killing from an enterprise, or get a fat living from while it is bleeding to death. Private enterprise requires making something, or doing something, that is useful, in hope of reward. And that is just what the New Haven doesn't have now, and will not have until in one way or another it is forced into reorganization.

[From the Deep River New Era, Mar. 16, 1961]

BANKRUPTCY IS BEST

Is bankruptcy the best—perhaps the only—way to save the New Haven Railroad?

President George Alpert of the railroad says "No." The New Haven can cure itself, he holds, if it gets the tax relief, Federal loans, and other aid it seeks. Gov. John Dempsey, a Democrat, and Edwin H. May, Republican State chairman, seem to agree.

But both the New England Council and a study committee of the Interstate Commerce Commission see bankruptcy as the only hope. And such distinguished Republicans as U.S. Senator PRESCOTT BUSH and John Alsop have concurred.

Who is right? The editor of the New Era, after carefully weighing the pros and cons, must side with the New England Council and those who now look upon bankruptcy as the best solution to a sorry mess.

Many of us here in the Lower Connecticut Valley tend to shrug off the railroad problem, because we do not see it as a problem that bears importantly on our everyday lives. True, we have a passenger station at Old Saybrook that serves as our rail link with the outside world and many of our people would be inconvenienced, at least, if the trains stopped running tomorrow.

Moreover, many of the necessities of life—from furnishings for our homes to the clothes we wear and the food we eat—come to us by train. But ours are not basically "bedroom towns" for New York or any other large city, and because of this we look upon the railroad problem mainly as a commuter problem which in our State means a Fairfield County problem.

The real problem, however, goes far deeper than that. The railroads, in our case the New Haven, have been pleading poverty for years, a plea that has now resulted in a bill before our general assembly to repeal the gross earnings tax. The bill has wide bipartisan support, and if it is successful, the railroad's tax in Connecticut will be reduced by more than a million dollars a year.

At the same time, however, our State budget is expected to be up sharply as demands for more State aid to education, more highway funds, more facilitits for higher education and the mentally ill, more pay for State employees, etc., increase. Obviously, with State spending to be higher and State income, from the railroad at least, to be lower, someone is going to have to make up the difference, and you know who it will be—John Q. Taxpayer.

So, you see, the railroad problem is our problem after all, even though we don't live in Fairfield County and don't use the train daily to commute.

Who is to blame for the present plight of the railroads? Government? Yes, to some extent. It seems to the editor of the New Era that the railroads have a legitimate complaint against government when their officials point out that the industry is required to carry an unfair load of the tax burden, as compared to their competitive transportation industries, such as the airlines and the bus and trucking companies.

In most cases, local, State and Federal tax funds are spent to build airport facilities, which are then leased or rented to the airlines at a fraction of what it would cost the airlines to build their own facilities privately and pay taxes on them.

Bus and truck lines have largely the same advantages. They roll over highways built with taxpayers' money and pay a comparatively small amount for the use of those highways in license fees and tolls. Even American shipping firms receive large subsidies from the Federal Government on the theory that the Government may someday need to employ these ships as troop carriers in case of another war or threat of war.

Railroads, on the other hand, must buy their own land, build their own terminals, lay their own track—and pay heavy taxes on all their property every year.

From this viewpoint, it can readily be seen that the railroads are forced to carry a far heavier taxload than the competing industries. But the present plight of the railroads is not entirely the Government's doing; far from it. Management and the labor unions are not helping the situation.

Not only has the management of the railroads shifted, to a large extent, from born and bred railroadmen into the hands of lawyers, financiers, and stock manipulators, but the salaries, expenses and other extras that many of these men take out of the railroads are completely unjustified in view of current economic conditions in the industry.

For instance, the Associated Press in Boston last week reported that records show the New Haven paid more than $500,000 during the last three years to President Alpert and members of his family. Previously, PUC records had shown that more than 30 New Haven executives were in the $15,000 a year and over salary bracket.

Salaries such as these might be justified if the New Haven were a booming industry, reporting healthy annual earnings and showing a respectable net profit from operations. But such salaries are indeed difficult to reconcile with the pleas of poverty that come almost daily from these same well-fed officials.

Would it really be fair to ask taxpayers earning perhaps $4,000 or $6,000 a year to pay a higher State tax in order to provide tax relief to a utility that, despite all its cries of woe, can still afford to pay so much to so many?

As for the railroad labor unions, they are equally guilty of greasing the rails on which the industry is rapidly plunging to economic ruin.

Instead of facing up to the problem, recognizing the difficult competitive position the railroads are in, and liberalizing work rules so that the industry might have a fighting chance of scrambling back onto its economic feet, the unions have continued to insist on their costly work practices and seniority rules that have added considerably to the miseries the industry finds itself in today. And they have been responsible for adding a new word—"featherbedding"—to the American vocabulary.

Just one example of how work rules help to strangle the railroads: Too many of the conductors on our trains today are sarcastic old codgers who act as though they're doing you a big favor by telling you in which direction the dining car is located. The editor of the New Era doesn't have occasion to travel by rail too often, but he had the misfortune of running into two such characters on one short train trip to Boston.

On the other hand, in many thousands of miles of air travel in the last few years, your editor has yet to encounter a single discourteous stewardess. The airline stewardesses are trained to be polite, helpful and completely charming at all times and they seldom, if ever, forget their training.

Your editor does not see how a million dollars of tax relief—or $10 million, for that matter—can save the New Haven Railroad under the present management and with present labor practices. Such funds, at best, would only serve to perpetuate the present wasteful, inefficient system a little while longer—until this money also vanishes down the drain.

Bankruptcy, to be sure, would not be a cure-all. But it would at least be the first step toward a complete top to bottom reorganization of the railroad. At this point, nothing less will do.

Fifteenth Anniversary of the Three Combat Arms of the U.S. Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, this is a significant anniversary for our defense forces. Fifteen years ago today the three combat arms of the U.S. Air Force were created—the Strategic Air Command, Tactical Air Command, and Air Defense Command.

These mighty air forces constitute the striking arms of the Air Force. They have done their job for these 15 years. They have kept the peace for America.

I am proud to represent the men and women at the Headquarters of the Strategic Air Command, located in Offutt Air Force Base, near Omaha. This highly mobile organization has recently put into effect the latest of a long series of operational steps designed to keep the striking power of SAC at its peak. I refer to the Airborne Command Post, a specially equipped KC–135 jet plane in which there is at all times a group of SAC officers and airmen capable of directing SAC's worldwide striking force should enemy attack ever destroy ground headquarters.

The airborne command post has now been in operation for over a month. There is always a general officer on board in addition to other staff officers and airmen. There is instant communications with SAC bases, higher Air Force headquarters, the joint war room in Washington, and the North American Air Defense Command in Colorado.

I include two articles in connection with this 15th anniversary. First there are excerpts from an article which appeared last week in Air Pulse, the weekly paper for personnel at Offutt Air Force Base. This describes the Airborne Command Post. Also I include an article prepared by SAC headquarters in connection with this 15th anniversary of SAC, TAC and ADC.

[From Air Pulse]

COMMAND POST: FIRST 30 DAYS

An airborne command post—complete with communications equipment and manned by an experienced team of controllers—is now in the air at all times to assume direction of the SAC force in the event the underground command post and its alternates are lost.

Five KC–135 jet Stratotankers from the 34th Air Refueling Squadron at Offutt have been specially modified to serve as aerial "headquarters" for the command in wartime. Though these planes retain their refueling capability, their force control assignment would take top priority if SAC is required to counter an attack on the United States.

One of the five aircraft is kept in the air around the clock, and it does not land until its replacement is airborne with its replacement staff of controllers.

General officers from throughout the command come to Offutt to serve their turn as airborne emergency actions officer. His staff includes a senior controller (colonel), duty controller (major), communications duty officer (usually a captain), an airman controller (tech sergeant or above) and two radio operators.

While airborne, ultra high frequency and single side band radio gear is used to establish and maintain contact with the SAC underground, alternate SAC command posts, the U.S. Air Force Command Post at Washington, D.C., the joint war room, also in Washington, and the North American Air Defense Command in Colorado.

With the loss of the SAC underground and its alternate control centers, the airborne command post can immediately assume direction of the SAC bomber-missile force and execution of the command's emergency war orders under authority of the President.

FIFTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF SAC, TAC, AND ADC

Tuesday, March 21, 1961, will come and go as just another day for SAC, TAC, and ADC.

Crews of long-range jet bombers will be on 24-hour alert, ready to give a lethal reply to Communist attack on this country. Giant Atlas intercontinental ballistic missiles and their launch crews will stand by to deal their own pulverizing blows to the Red heartland.

Sleek jet fighter bombers, bristling with firepower, will be geared for action. Massive air transport planes will be prepared to carry troops to the front, wherever it may be.

Rocket-armed jet interceptors will patrol the skies over the North American Continent, waiting to repel Soviet bombers. At lonely outposts along the Arctic rim and far at sea, radar observers will watch their scopes for the "blips" that may signal danger.

And support personnel, whose essential jobs lack the glamor of their combat companions, will keep the machinery running at a smooth, steady hum. They will make sure that the Air Force can go to war, and win, under any terms the Communists dictate.

Despite the look of routine, Tuesday, March 21, 1961, will be an anniversary. It will be the 15th for deterrence—the military concept of keeping the peace by letting your enemy know every day that attack on this Nation or its allies will result in his own destruction.

The greatest portion of America's counterforce wallop—and, consequently, its deterrent strength—rests with three Air Force combat arms, Strategic, Tactical, and Air Defense Commands. Their creation on March 21, 1946, marked the beginning of this country's best guarantee of peace. The fact that the Communists have not attacked during the last 15 years points to the success of SAC, TAC, and ADC.

Separately, the commands have been groomed to handle any type of conflict. Together, their power and readiness for war pose the greatest obstacle now facing the Red military planners.

SAC is the long-range force. Its fleet of 2,000 bombers and rapidly growing missile inventory comprise 90 percent of the free world's total striking power, as measured in TNT equivalents. From more than 70 bases across the world, SAC B–47, B–52, and B–58 jet bombers are keyed for immediate nuclear counterattack. About one-third of the SAC force is on 15-minute ground alert at all times, with aircraft fueled and loaded and crews within scant yards of their planes.

SAC missile crews pull alert duty, too, at bases in the United States. Their nuclear-armed weapons can be trigged under Presidential order and reach targets half a world away in 30 minutes or less.

TAC's limited war force can deter aggression or cut down an enemy at any spot in the world. Composite Air Strike Forces, composed of fighter bomber, reconnaissance, refueling and transport aircraft, can move within a few hours to any hot spot on the globe. The effectiveness of these strike units as a deterrent was proved in 1958 when they were used to contain Communist moves in Lebanon and Quemoy. Composite Air Strike Forces can assist ground forces by airlifting crack troops to the heart of a conflict.

ADC—as the Air Force component in the joint United States-Canadian North American Air Defense Command, operates a fleet of deadly fighters and interceptor missiles from a network of bases across the country. The command's SAGE (semiautomatic ground environment) computers can direct fighters and missiles against invading aircraft quickly and accurately.

ADC personnel also man defense radar systems spread along the Far North perimeter and points in both the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. These systems would give the first notice of imminent attack on North America, providing the vital time needed to launch SAC's alert force and ADC's defensive units.

The three Air Force combat commands have a staggering job. There is no relaxaction, no time to catch up in a modern nuclear war. That's why March 21, 1961, must be a business-as-usual day in the Air Force—with no time off for celebration of a very special anniversary.

National Defense Scholarships for Higher Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on January 3, 1961, I introduced H.R. 805, to provide for a college scholarship program.

Last week the Special Subcommittee on Education of the House Education and Labor Committee held hearings on the subject.

The following is my statement before that subcommittee:

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, CONGRESSMAN OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION OF THE HOUSE EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE, MARCH 17, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to have this opportunity to present a statement on behalf of my bill, H.R. 805, to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to provide for national defense scholarships for college and university study. In my opinion, the enactment of this bill and the establishment of scholarships would provide the very much needed measure of assistance for many thousands of our capable young people who desire to go on to college or university study but for whom the cost of attending college is beyond their family income possibilities.

You are undoubtedly familar with the various reports indicating the cost of attending college. More recent information such as that reported by the U.S. Office of Education indicates that the mean total current expenditure for publicly controlled institutions—1960–61—is $1,300; for privately controlled institutions the estimate is $2,100. These estimates include expenditures for tuition and required fees, room rent and board, clothing and other current needs. If we consider the tuition costs alone of colleges and universities, we may observe that the increase for publicly controlled institutions since 1949–50 is around 86 percent while for privately controlled institutions the percentage increase is 91 percent. The estimated expenditures in 1960–61 for students in public colleges for room rent and board alone totals about $434 with tuition and fees totaling $225. This leaves the average student very limited funds for clothing, books, transportation and other expenditures. I would like to insert a table showing college costs based upon the U.S. Office of Education information. [See charts.]

There are many persons who argue against a program of Federal scholarships for assistance to capable and deserving high school graduates. They argue that if a student has motivation toward college he will be able to make it somehow. Others speak of the possibility of students working their way through college. I would agree with the fact that there are certainly rewarding benefits to the student who is able to work his way through college. I would agree also that a large number of capable students lack adequate motivation from home and school which would direct them toward college or university study. It is interesting to note, however, the following comment in a report by the U.S. Office of Education on the retention and withdrawal of college students:

"* * * No single reason for discontinuance could be identified as most important, although the inference that the financial factor predominated is supported by its high rating importance in combination with other high ranking factors having financial implications such as enlisting for military service by men and taking a full-time job by women. Significantly greater importance was assigned to the financial factor by students who transferred to less expensive institutions or dropped out after the first year than by dropouts from the institution of first registration during the first year." [1]

This study also gives some attention to the general income range of families of students who continue their studies to graduate. It reported:

"* * * The median annual income of parents of nongraduating students was $437 less than that of parents whose children graduated. * * * the chances are 97 to 100 that the dropouts during or at the end of the first registration period would have a during the remainder or at the end of the first school year." [2]

I would like to call attention to table 3 which presents a breakdown of major sources of student incomes for higher education, 1952–53. Scholarships were reported to contribute only 4.8 percent of the total student income. The mean amount of scholarships received by students totaled about $310. Other sources of student income such as family financial support, and the term-time and summer earnings of the students themselves contributed significantly larger percentage totals to the source of income. Yet when we give close attention to the matter, we are able to see that there are few families within the income range which can contribute substantially to the college education of more than one child. Moreover, the summer earnings and term-time earnings of students are seriously curtailed by the ability of the student to find employment in off-campus businesses which usually pay considerably higher wages than most on-campus employment affords.

Let us consider the question of student earnings more closely. The Office of Education reported that in 1952–53 the mean amount earned by students in term-time earnings and summer employment was $413 and $395 respectively. The earnings of women students was considerably below those of the male students and totaled about one-half the amount of the male students' earnings. W. Bradford Craig, in his book "How to Finance a College Education" has reported:

"Students, as a group, financed from their own earnings over one-fourth of their budgets during a recent year. Most of the moneys lower median family income than dropouts came from earnings during the school year, the remainder from summer employment. More than a third of all students who attend college earned some money during vacations; the average amount of such earnings was $395. A still larger proportion worked part time while attending college. Three-fifths of all students—two-thirds of the men and one-half of the women—earned money during the school year. Their average earnings were $468 and $265 respectively." [3]

Indeed, resourcefulness and willingness to work to meet the cost of attending college reflects the high value which many of our young people place upon a college education. On the other hand, I would raise several questions: (1) How many of our institutions of higher education are located in communities which offer off-campus employment to young men and women in terms sufficient to enable them to meet the majority of their costs of attending college? (2) How many of our best students pursuing studies such as the exact sciences are able to meet the physical and mental demands of a full schedule with lecture and laboratory courses while, at the same time, working a sufficient number of hours to make significant earnings? In this time of the history of our Nation, when we are stressing the value of an education and emphasizing excellence in all endeavor I would question seriously those who maintain that student scholarship aid is not needed to help individuals in the plight such as I have just pointed out.

We know, of course, that the National Defense Education Act of 1958, which my bill, H.R. 805, would amend to include scholarships, established under title II, a national student loan program. This program has been enthusiastically hailed by students, parents, and administrators of institutions of higher education as a positive step forward in meeting student financial needs. I join with those who praise the success of the student loan program. I fully acknowledge that for a large number of students a college loan adequately meets their needs. For an equally large number of students, however, the possibility of a loan debt to be repaid upon completion of college studies is forbidding.

In some instances, students are pursuing a course of study which will continue into graduate study before they are adequately prepared to make a significant contribution to the field. We well know that the specialization of today requires college and graduate study in many fields, but especially in areas such as mathematics, science, and modern foreign language. Moreover, many students have elected areas of study which require considerable preparation but which afford very small returns upon this educational investment. Teaching, unfortunately, is still one of the professional areas which pays low salaries in comparison with the required preparation and study. Since the NDEA contains a forgiveness clause for individuals teaching in public elementary or secondary schools, I should perhaps have used some other professional area for my example, but I think the point is clearly made. There are other circumstances, of course, such as an individual's obligation in many instances to contribute a substantial part to the family support upon completion of college studies, or the responsibilities he may wish to take for a family of his own—all of which remove the use of a loan for higher education from the realm of possibility of many capable students.

I have mentioned the value of an education in these times of modern technology and complications in human relationships both within and without our Nation. Also, I have spoken of the need for emphasis upon excellence in all endeavor. Both of these factors, in my opinion figure very highly in the total consideration of the need for scholarship assistance to larger members of our young people.

The value of an education cannot, of course, be evaluated in terms of dollars and cents. Yet, we know that there is abundant evidence to support the fact that the well-educated worker enjoys measurable advantages over the worker with little formal education. He earns more; he suffers less from unemployment; he is more likely to find work in high prestige occupations and he returns a greater proportion of his earnings to those things which afford a cultural uplift for the total community. Everyone familiar with the direction and trends of the Nation's manpower needs is well aware of the shift toward the employment of those persons with greater levels of formal education and training. A recent study showing incomes according to years of school completed by persons 14 years or more of age indicates that men and women with college training are enjoying a substantially higher median income than those with lesser education. It has been pointed out, for example that in 1959, professional and technical workers had completed an average of 16.2 school years and had an average family income of $7,788. Proprietors and managers, exclusive of farmers, had completed 12.4 school years and the family income for this group was $7,012. Clerical and sales workers had completed 12.5 years of school: the median family income of clerical workers was $5,692; that of sales workers was $6,268. Skilled workers had completed 11 years of school and had a median family income of $6,018. Semiskilled workers had completed 9.9 years of school and had a median family income of $5,157. Unskilled workers had completed 8.6 years of school, and the median family income of this group was $4,089.

Education increases the personal income of the individual. Increases in our national income and product register the collective impact of the producing and earning ability of a better educated people.[4]

Moreover, in these times when we are very much concerned with unemployment we must give serious attention to the relation-

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

ships between education and unemployment. As one report indicates: Unemployment of workers is closely related to the amount of education the workers have had. The relationship is, of course, inverse. In March 1959, 8.5 percent of the workers in the labor force with less than high-school-graduation were unemployed, compared with 4.8 percent of the high-school-graduates and 2.4 percent of workers with some college experience.[5]

President Kennedy has recently called attention to the need for the reeducation of many individuals who are now contributing to the total unemployment scene of the Nation.

But the value of an education and the demands of the day which call for greater numbers of persons with high degrees of skills, training, and education cannot be understood in terms of the financial picture alone. We must, of course, consider the needs within the Nation for an increasingly more educated populace if we would continue to provide in America, an example for the free world as to how an educated people move freedom forward. Speaking of education as our ultimate weapon, Mr. Neil McElroy has said:

"Our recognition of the university as a major source of our national vitality affirms a dependence that has long characterized free societies. From the days of the Greek philosophers, democracies have known that their effectiveness depended on citizen knowledge. Representative government in its own interest has built or has encouraged the building of educational institutions to spur the individual to test his own capacities—and to help him understand his responsibilities to the community as a whole.

"So we come to this inescapable conclusion: that education is and will be—the key to success or failure for each of [the] competing ideologies.

"If our educational system functions at or near its optimum, our Nation will thrive and grow. If we allow that system to fail to achieve its potential, we must expect to decline as a free society."[6]

Higher education in America will suffer a serious blow if we do not act now to provide financial assistance in the form of national scholarships to the many capable students who need such aid for college and university study. Moreover, without an adequate Federal scholarship program to meet the needs of large numbers of our high-school graduates, such as I propose in H.R. 805, we will be failing to live up to the goal of providing for every individual, regardless of economic condition, the maximum opportunity to study and to develop to his maximum potential.

I have taken time to comment in great detail upon many of the phases of the present-day demand for higher education for larger numbers of capable persons. I consider such considerations to be essential if we would realistically evaluate the national need for a scholarship program, and if we would enact such a scholarship proposal which will accomplish a meaningful mission. I certainly do not consider that the proposed bill, H.R. 805, will suddenly transform all uninspired students into eager applicants for college or university study. What I do propose is the establishment of national defense scholarships for persons determined by State commissions to be in need of financial assistance to continue education at an institution of higher education.

H.R. 805 is not a complicated bill. There is no barrage of mumbo-jumbo. It would establish national defense scholarships through an amendment to the already established and enthusiastically received National Defense Education Act. In the main the bill would provide for scholarships of $500 to students during each academic year for 4 years. There is a provision which allows students in special need, as reviewed by the State commissions, to receive an additional amount not to exceed $500 per academic year.

As I have indicated, persons receiving scholarships would be selected by State commissions on the basis of objective tests and other measures of aptitude and ability to pursue study leading to a bachelor's degree successfully. In keeping with the specialized national needs for individuals in science, mathematics, or modern foreign languages, which is the general frame of reference of the NDEA, the bill would provide for special consideration of those with superior capacity or preparation in these areas.

The proposal is not overpowering in its appropriations of allotments. It would authorize that there be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for each of the 2 succeeding fiscal years the sum of $17,500,000. Allotments to the States are to be in the ratio of the State's population between the ages of 18 and 21 and the total population of all the States between such ages. What I am proposing is assistance to individuals which leads ultimately to the total welfare of the Nation. In view of the many ramifications of problems in costs and expenses of higher education today, and the need for a more highly educated citizenry, I hope that this committee will favorably report H.R. 805.

I hope the committee will amend my bill so as to have it cover students in colleges which require 5 years instead of 4 years of attendance for certain of the sciences and engineering courses, as well as medical and dental students who have successfully completed their premedical or predental collegiate work.

TABLE 1.—*Major items of students' mean current expenditures: 1952–53 actual and 1960–61 estimated expenditures*[7]

Major item	Publicly controlled institutions		Privately controlled institutions	
	1952–53[1]	1960–61	1952–53[1]	1960–61
Mean total current expenditure	$1,120	$1,300	$1,674	$2,100
Tuition and required fees	151	225	546	863
Room rent	102	116	146	165
Board (regular meals)	270	318	301	354
Clothing (including footwear)	130	135	149	155
All other current expenditures	467	506	532	563

[1] Data for 1952–53 are computed from tables 3 and 4 of "Costs of Attending College" by Ernest V. Hollis and Associates: Bulletin 1957, No. 9, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Estimates for 1960–61 are based on the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, consumer price indexes and the increase in mean institutional fees since 1953.

TABLE 2.—*Comparison of the mean annual tuition and required fees of 196 representative colleges and universities: 1949–50 and 1959–60*[8]

Type of institutions	Number of institutions	Mean tuition and required fees		Increase	
		1949–50[1]	1959–60[2]	Amount	Percent
All institutions	196	$249	$464	$215	86
Publicly controlled	120	112	194	82	73
Privately controlled	76	465	890	425	91
Publicly controlled:					
Universities	69	138	240	102	74
Liberal arts colleges	19	80	129	49	61
Teachers colleges	17	89	171	82	92
Technological institutes	5	142	221	79	56
Junior colleges	10	18	30	12	67
Privately controlled:					
Universities	57	457	885	428	94
Liberal arts colleges	14	439	810	371	85
Technological institutes	5	626	1,148	522	83

[1] Conrad, Herbert S., and Hollis, E. V., Trends in Tuition Charges and Fees. In Annals of the Academy of Political and Social Sciences, vol. 301: 148–64, September 1955.
[2] Preliminary report, Division of Higher Education, Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, May 1960.

TABLE 3.—*Major sources of student income, 1952–53*[9]

Source of funds	Percent of total income	Mean amount received by all students
Family (parents and other relatives)	40.5	$647
Long-term savings	20.0	695
Term-time earnings	17.0	413
Summer earnings	9.3	395
Scholarships	4.8	310
Veterans and vocational rehabilitation benefits	4.3	894
Loans	1.5	400
Other sources	2.6	133
Total	100.0	1,462

[1] U.S. Office of Education. Retention and withdrawal of college students. U.S. Government Printing Office, 1957. Various pages.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Craig, W. Bradford. "How To Finance a College Education." New York, Henry Holt & Co., 1959. P. 17.
[4] "It Pays To Go to School." Research Division, National Education Association, December 1960. Pp. 114–116.
[5] Ibid.
[6] McElroy, Neil. "Education—Our Ultimate Weapon." In an address delivered at the 32d Annual Conference on Educational Administration at Harvard University, July 14, 1960.
[7] Goldthorpe, J. Harold. "Outlook for the Costs of Attending College." Nov. 16, 1960. In a paper before the Agricultural Outlook Conference, Washington, D.C. November 1960.
[8] Ibid.
[9] Goldthorpe, J. Harold. Ibid. P. 4.

Centennial Anniversary of the Unity of Italy, 1861–1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago this month the Italian Risorgimento—the dream of Dante and Garibaldi—was at long last accomplished.

Last Thursday I was honored to be one of those present at the stirring observance of this momentous event which took place in the State Department auditorium.

Gathered to honor the state of Italy, as well as to pay tribute to Italian-American friendship, were the President of the United States, the Vice President, the Speaker, and numerous other Members of Congress and prominent U.S. officials. Among those representing Italy were the Italian Ambassador, H. E. Manlio Brosio, and Prof. Gaetano Martino, the chief of the Italian mission to the United States.

Keynote of this centennial ceremony was the great and indestructible bond which exists between the United States and the State of Italy. On this historic occasion we saw a rededication to our traditional ties, to our mutual respect for each other's culture and civilization, and to our united effort for the survival of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to insert at this point in the RECORD the speech of the President of the United States; the messages sent by the Honorable Giovanni Gronchi, the President of the Republic of Italy, and the Honorable Amintore Fanfani, President of the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Italy; the address of the Honorable Gaetano Martino; and the opening remarks of Representative Anfuso, chairman of the American Honorary Committee for the Centennial Celebration:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES AT THE CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF ITALIAN UNIFICATION, NEW STATE DEPARTMENT AUDITORIUM, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 16, 1961

Congressman Anfuso, Your Excellency, the Vice President, Mr. Speaker, Ambassador Dr. Gaetano, Mr. Secretary, Senator Pastore, distinguished Members of Congress, ambassadors, and ladies and gentlemen, many of us who are here today are not Italian by blood or by birth, but I think that we all have a more than passing interest in this anniversary. All of us, in a large sense, are beneficiaries of the Italian experience.

It is an extraordinary fact in history that so much of what we are, and so much of what we believe had its origin in this rather small spear of land stretching into the Mediterranean. All in a great sense that we fight to preserve today had its origins in Italy, and earlier than that in Greece. So that it is an honor as President of the United States to participate in this most important occasion in the life of a friendly country, the Republic of Italy.

In addition, it is one of the strange facts of history, that this country of ours, which is important to Western civilization, was opened up first by a daring feat of navigation of an Italian, Christopher Columbus. And yet this country was nearly a century old when modern Italy began.

So we have the old and the new bound together and inextricably linked—Italy and the United States, past, present, and we believe, future.

The Risorgimento which gave birth to modern Italy, like the American Revolution which led to the birth of our country, was the reawakening of the most deeply held ideals of Western civilization: The desire for freedom, for protection of the rights of the individual.

As the doctor said, the state exists for the protection of those rights, and those rights do not come to us because of the generosity of the state. This concept which originated in Greece and in Italy I think has been a most important factor in the development of our own country here in the United States.

And it is a source of satisfaction to us that those who built modern Italy, received part of their inspiration from our experience here in the United States—as we had earlier received part of our inspiration from an older Italy. For although modern Italy is only a century old, the culture and the history of the Italian Peninsula stretches back over two milleniums. From the banks of the Tiber rose Western civilization as we know it, a civilization whose traditions and spiritual values gave great significance to Western life as we find it in Western Europe and in the Atlantic Community.

And to this historic role of Italian civilization has been added the strengthening in the life of this country of millions of Italians who came here to build their homes and who have been valued citizens—and many of their most distinguished citizens sit on this platform today.

These ancient ties between the people of Italy and the people of the United States have never been stronger than they are today, and have never been in greater peril. The story of postwar Italy is a story of determination and of courage in the face of a huge and difficult task. The Italian people have rebuilt a war-torn economy and nation, and played a vital part in developing the economic integration of western Europe.

Surely, the most inspiring experience of the postwar era: Italy has advanced the welfare of her own people, bringing them hope for a better life, and she has played a significant role in the defense of the West.

As we come to this great anniversary in 1961, we realize that once again new and powerful forces have arisen which challenge the concepts upon which Italy and the United States have been founded. If we are to meet this new challenge, we—Italy and the United States—must demonstrate to our own people and to a watching world, as we sit on a most conspicuous stage, that men acting in the tradition of Massini and Cavour and Garibaldi and Lincoln and Washington, can best bring man a richer and fuller life.

This is the task of the new Risorgimento, a new reawakening of man's ancient aspirations for freedom and for progress, until the torch lit in ancient Torino one century ago guides the struggle of men everywhere—in Italy, in the United States, in the world around us.

MESSAGE BY THE HONORABLE GIOVANNI GRONCHI, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF ITALY

To the CHAIRMAN,
American Honorary Committee for the Italian Centennial, Washington, D.C.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am happy to address, through your courtesy, the good wishes and greetings of the Italian people, as well as my own, to the American Committee for the Italian Centennial and to all those—Americans and Italians—who have participated with such spontaneous enthusiasm in the celebration on American soil of this day which has such lofty significance for the history of my country.

I address my gratitude particularly to the President of the United States, who has consented to attend these ceremonies, as well as to the Members of Congress, the Governors, the mayors, the educational and cultural institutions, the public and private officials, to the numerous committees from all over America who joined in commemorating our anniversary.

The great American Nation, which has such a high sense of liberty, recognized in the events that 100 years ago led to the unity of the Italian people the selfsame yearning for independence which led to the birth of the United States.

Thus, the tribute being paid in America to our Risorgimento, whose anniversary is being celebrated throughout Italy with great solomnity, is a new expression of the spirit which increasingly binds the peoples of our two countries in their determination to enhance, both now and in the future, the values of a free civilization. At the same time, these observances which unit Americans and Italians underscore those sentiments of confident friendship which opened the doors many years ago in the constructive contributions of Italians to life in the United States.

Please accept, Mr. Chairman, the gratitude of the Italian people and of myself and kindly convey it to all those who in response to the committee's appeal are today celebrating this joyful anniversary of our national unity.

GRONCHI.

MESSAGE BY THE HONORABLE AMINTORE FANFANI, PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS OF THE REPUBLIC OF ITALY

To the CHAIRMAN,
American Honorary Committee for the Italian Centennial, Washington, D.C.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We, in Italy, are deeply moved by the thought that on March 16 the centennial of the unification of Italy will be observed in the city of Washington for the first time in a foreign country.

It is highly significant that the United States, whose own history is based upon the respect of freedom and a sense of independence, so promptly realized the import of that long and hard struggle which led to Italian unity 100 years ago, through strife and suffering, through the deep beliefs of our people, the sacrifice and martyrdom of the brave, the able and patient efforts of our leaders.

I believe the reason for this understanding lies in the similarity of historic events, in the common struggle for the same goals and in the active participation of Americans and Italians in the development of both countries. All this stirred in the hearts of the people of the United States the memory of the years when the new Italy was born and a friendship was started, which never died.

The warm American participation in the observance of our centennial adds to the many ties already existing between our two countries a new bond which strengthens their determination to persist in the defense of the common ideals of the two nations.

I am therefore extremely happy to convey the greetings and the appreciation of the Italian Government, as well as my personal thanks, to you, Mr. Chairman, to the American Committee for the Italian Centennial and to all those—Americans and Italians—who joined in the observance of this solemn anniversary in your country.

I wish particularly to extend my grateful respects to the President of the United States, who graciously consented to honor

the ceremony with his presence, to the diplomatic corps, the Members of Congress, the Governors, the mayors, the various institutions, committees, and personalities that in Washington and all over America are celebrating our centennial.

I am happy to express my heartfelt thanks and those of the Italian Government to them all.

A. FANFANI.

ADDRESS OF PROF. GAETANO MARTINO, CHIEF OF THE ITALIAN MISSION TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. President, Mr. Chairman, honored guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I am greatly honored to speak of the political birth of my country as a modern nation in a ceremony made so solemn by the participation of the President of the United States of America. I wish to assure you, Mr. President, that your presence here will be profoundly felt by all Italians and will increase their love for your country. They admire the United States as the country where human endeavor has brought its most important contribution to the civil and moral progress of the peoples and where the greatest effort is being made to guarantee the continuity of that progress in the uncertain and perilous present. No doubt, Mr. President, this ceremony—attended by the highest representatives of the American Nation—will contribute to the deepening and strengthening of friendly relations between the United States and Italy.

One hundred years ago in Turin the Kingdom of Italy was proclaimed in the first Parliament elected by the majority of the Italians. That proclamation marked the birth of the Italian state which included in its political structure, shaped on democratic patterns, all Italians, living on the soil of Italy.

It is true that the Venetian region was still under Austrian domination, and that the new nation was born without its capital which could only be Rome. But already in 1861 the liberation of the Venetian region and the annexation of Rome appeared inevitable as events were soon to show. The first occurred in 1866 and Rome was annexed in 1870. Our final war of independence in 1915–18, which was part of the First World War, made it possible at last to restore to the Italian family the peoples of Italian language, culture and spirit still remaining under Austrian domination.

What we call "Risorgimento" is the political movement which through revolutions and wars led Italy to the conquest of its national freedom and independence. It cannot be understood historically without recalling that it stemmed from that great fountainhead of ideals, sentiments and moral values which were the substance of the "age of enlightenment" of the 18th century.

The moral and political forces which emerged from the enlightenment stimulated the fundamental historical events of the American and French Revolutions, and of the Italian and European Risorgimento. After a silence of more than a century, Italy once again took its place in the cultural life of the 18th century Europe and celebrated its spiritual resurgence which was to become a political rebirth as Napoleon's victories brought to our land the wind of liberty. The immediate comparison with the more modern and civilized forms of life adopted by the French and partially introduced into Italy made the Italians feel the full impact of their centuries-old ills. They were the ills of poverty, ignorance, fear, the servility of the weak, the corruption and abuse of power of the rulers.

The problem of national independence could then be stated in terms that were no longer theoretical but which held a promise of solution since the old refractory and absolutist nations had demonstrated their complete backwardness and inefficiency in the face of the French conquests.

On the concrete political ground there were two ways to free and unify our nation: through a popular uprising which, following the American and French examples could have ousted the princes from their creaking thrones and defeat Austria; or through an action undertaken by one of the states of the peninsula having sufficient power and prestige to enable it to achieve the same results. Only the state of Piedmont could do this.

The first path was chosen by Mazzini, the second by Cavour.

Giusseppe Mazzini maintained that independence must be the fruit of revolt—not a gift from above—and that therefore Italian unity must be achieved exclusively by popular revolutionary forces. Inspired by the same ideals as your Founding Fathers. Mazzini held that national states can be founded only on the people, by the people and for the people. He affirmed the preeminence of the duty of human solidarity in domestic affairs as well as in the international life of the peoples. He thus intimately linked the destiny of resurgent Italy with that of a resurgent Europe by founding the two associations known as young Italy and young Europe. Mazzini conceived the Italian problem as one aspect of the general European problem. Old Europe and old Italy were to die together. In their place the new Europe and the new Italy were to rise together. The constitutional formula of "United States of Europe" which, like your own, at that time was disseminated throughout Europe in the works of the French Victor Hugo and Michel Chevalier, the German Johannes Sartorious, the English Richard Cobden, found in Mazzini the staunchest supporter. The European ideal was transformed into political action.

With the crushing of the European revolution, a new political situation developed in Italy. In it Camillo Benso di Cavour directed the movement of the Risorgimento toward final achievement, with his genius and daring. After having accomplished a widespread reform of political, social, and administrative life of the Piedmont, and after having placed it in vanguard of civil progress which attracted the surprise and admiration of Europe, Cavour distinguished himself by engaging in the liveliest of diplomatic activity. Dealing with the great powers with skill he succeeded in securing for Piedmont a leading role on the European scene, by forming alliances now with France, now with England. If he was able to bring an end to Austrian domination of Lombardy by securing the aid of France, it was with tacit English solidarity that the "Piemonte" and the "Lombardo"—the two ships carrying the thousand from Scoglio di Quarto to the Sicilian coast—could slip quietly through Mediterranean waters.

However, despite the fact that he worked with the instruments of crude politics which do not admit sentimentalism, he remained steadily loyal to those moral values and principles of the enlightenment redeveloped and reinvigorated in the new century. It was his firm conviction that the unity of his country must benefit not only Italians but all of humanity. His conscience was the conscience of the most cultured and civilized Europe and he looked upon its unity as the inevitable future of a Christian Europe. Few political leaders possessed his conception of rational freedom: only Jefferson, Lincoln, Gladstone could be cited as supporters of the same liberal ideals. These ideals inspired also his suggested solution of the problem of the church-state relations through the ingenious formula of "a free church in a free state." It gave Italy a long period of religious peace while it enhanced the spiritual force of the church.

I cannot refrain from mentioning two other outstanding leaders to whom Italy owes its unity: Giuseppe Garibaldi and Victor Emmanuel the Second. The name of Garibaldi has been always celebrated not only in Italy, but in the Americas where he lived and fought for many years. It was mainly Garibaldi's daring that evoked the sympathy and support of public opinion in Europe and America for our national cause. He fought for all the oppressed against all oppressors. The generosity of his actions earned him a place among the champions of human ideals. Your poets and ours unanimously greeted him as the new Washington and glorified his name. It gives us pleasure to think of him at the moment when, concluding his victorious campaign, he handed over to Victor Emmanuel the Second the half of Italy he had liberated. Refusing to accept honor and gains he returned with his poncho and red shirt to his native island to cultivate the bleak earth. He had presented the King with a generous gift; the hands receiving it were equally generous. Victor Emmanuel the II had also given fully of himself and his kingdom to Italy. He had kept his selfless pledge in the darkest and most difficult hours.

The ideals of the apostles of our national unity are now once more, lighting our path after the tragedy of a war brought on by a minority which had seized power by violence and deceit.

We have perfected the institutions that guarantee freedom. We have increased the opportunities and means to give everyone security. We have rebuilt everything that was destroyed: we have created an atmosphere of industriousness in our country. Nevertheless, we are more sensitive to what remains to be done than to what we have accomplished.

The unification of Italy, as I said, is only a phase of the broader historical and political cycle whose philosophy centered on the enlightenment and on its unshakable faith in the rights of man. These rights—as you, Mr. President, wisely said in your inaugural address—do not derive from the State, but from God's hands, and the State can and must only guarantee them against all attempts of subversion.

That historical cycle is now far from being concluded. We have precise duties in the process of its completion. Italy's duties can be outlined both in the domestic and the international field. In the area of domestic policy we are pledged to restore confidence and hope in the millions of our fellow citizens who still believe that justice should be sought outside the democratic system. We must win them back to democracy and eliminate the reasons which can explain—though not justify—their present attitude, a cause of concern for us all. These reasons are connected with certain conditions of poverty which time thus far has not permitted us to remove, as well as with the survival of habits acquired during the many centuries of our painful serfdom. To discharge this duty of redemption and civil education the model used by Cavour is still valid. It suggests application of the policy of the juste milieu, the right middle of the road, which proved so fruitful not only in our country, but in yours as well.

On the international scene, it is our duty to move ahead, with renewed vigor along the path pointed out by Mazzini. In the last 15 years Italy, not only participated in all organizations dedicated to the pursuit of world peace, but kept itself in the forefront of the struggle for the unification of Europe. As Foreign Minister of my country, I had myself the privilege of playing a role, which was not minor, in the creation of the two new European communities: The Economic Community and Euratom. But we are still far from our goal. It is therefore urgent and vital to speed up our movement for unity, closely coordinating our efforts with those aimed at the achievement of the Atlantic unity. A unified Europe is

only a part of that broader unity of the Atlantic world which started taking shape in the fields of culture and ideals three centuries ago and which substantiated our common conception of the world centered on conscience and ethics. This unity took political shape in 1949, when the Atlantic Alliance was built. Thence a new Risorgimento started: We all have a leading role in this rebirth, you Americans and we Europeans, as keepers and bearers of the message of the "Age of Enlightenment."

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, we must further strengthen the ties of our unity. This is necessary not only to face the challenge of our common enemies, but principally to enrich and guard the spiritual and moral patrimony handed down to us by our forefathers, which we want to pass on to our children. Only by tightening our bonds we will be able to make our future worthy of our past. Only by uniting more closely can we secure the triumph of our ideals and allow our peoples to dedicate themselves in full serenity to deeds of peace: only thus can we fulfill the wish expressed by your poet, John Whittier, in some of his verses addressed to our reborn Italy:

"Fold the flags of war, and lay its sword and spear to rust away, and sow its ghastly fields with flowers."

REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN VICTOR L. ANFUSO, ITALIAN CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION, MARCH 16, 1961

It is a great honor for me to have been singled out by my colleagues on the American Honorary Committee to be the chairman of this historic event. It is my pleasure to welcome you.

It is of particular significance for me, since I came to this country as an immigrant from Italy at the tender age of 9. Little did I dream then that some day this immigrant boy would preside at a celebration of this sort in Washington, where the President and other great leaders of this Nation would gather to pay tribute to my ancestral homeland on the centennial anniversary of its unification as a single, strong nation.

I am deeply grateful this morning, as never before, to this wonderful country of ours for the unlimited opportunities which I and millions of other Americans of Italian extraction have received. This is a feeling which only immigrants and the children of immigrants can fully appreciate.

The President of the United States has played a significant role in these celebrations. I have had the honor and the privilege to know the President ever since I first came to Congress in January 1951, when I served with him in the House of Representatives. I remember the kindly guidance he gave me then—and I shall never forget his encouraging assistance on several projects which I proposed to the Congress in those days.

This association continued also after he had moved over to the U.S. Senate, and it is best exemplified by the fact that after I had introduced the resolution on the centennial observance of Italian unification and brought it to the attention of Mr. Kennedy, he immediately introduced it in the Senate. May I quote just a brief remark made by Mr. Kennedy at the time he introduced the resolution on July 13, 1959, when he said:

"The concurrent resolution expresses our pleasure in receiving the invitation (to participate in the observance) and testifies to our admiration for the contributions this great nation has made to our common ideals of freedom and independence. It is fitting and proper that we recognize in this fashion the progress and achievements of the people of Italy during the past century."

During this entire decade that I have been privileged to know Mr. Kennedy, I have always found him to be an admirer of Italy and of its achievements in the annals of culture and civilization. Likewise, he has a keen appreciation of the contributions of Americans of Italian descent toward the upbuilding of America and its way of life.

It is to a certain extent an irony of history that, as Italy was reborn as a united nation, the United States was on the threshhold of facing its greatest test for survival. As the guns were stilled in Italy, and Garibaldi was going back to his beloved island of Caprera with a bag of bean seeds on his shoulder, the guns of Fort Sumter on this side of the Atlantic were rumbling. Italy's Risorgimento, which means rebirth as a nation, was being accomplished.

And speaking of Garibaldi, I take particular pleasure in greeting here this morning the grandson of that great patriot, Gen. Ezio Garibaldi, and also his granddaughter, Mrs. Giuseppina Ziluca. May I ask them to take a bow.

Today there exist strong bonds of friendship between the United States and Italy. The bonds joining our two nations are, in my estimation, stronger and deeper than those resulting from a military pact or an economic program. They are the bonds of faith and confidence in one another, of mutual respect and understanding between two great peoples, of genuine friendship and reciprocal contributions.

The bridge of understanding between the people of the United States and the people of Italy was not constructed overnight. It is a process which is at least as old as the United States, and in fact goes back to our earliest days when small but significant numbers of Italians joined the waves of early explorers and settlers who came to these shores. They and succeeding generations of Italian immigrants, who settled in this land, have made lasting contributions to our American heritage over the long centuries. The imprint of their contributions on American life and civilization is visible all around us.

We live in a crucial time in the annals of human affairs which requires utmost unity in the ranks of the free nations. The future survival of democratic America and of the whole free world depends, in large measure, on reinforcing our bonds of cooperation with nations like Italy, and on the creation of working partnerships with such nations in every endeavor which could serve the best interests of mankind.

It is not for me to spell out in detail how this partnership between our two nations is to be created, nor is this the time and the place to do so. Suffice it merely to indicate that we have the beginnings of it in several ways: the fact that Italy has been willing to give as much as she receives; the fact that Italy has made available to us areas for the establishment of military bases; Italy's significant role in NATO; Italy's strategic position in the Mediterranean in relation to Europe, Africa, and the Middle East; and Italy's ancestral ties in Latin America.

Our partnership can be extended and deepened in other ways through many new ideas and bold action. Instead of working alone in certain areas, where our help has been misunderstood, let us invite the participation of partnership nations like Italy—if such participation will bring about better understanding and more fruitful results. The possibilities are unlimited. This, too, may in time prove to be a "new frontier" in our international relations.

It is, therefore, only fitting and proper that we choose this occasion to rededicate ourselves to the same ideals which triumphed over a hundred years ago. In this era of the "New Frontier," let us, in the words of our beloved President, pray that the future years will prove to be the years when the tide came in—when America, together with a strong and united Italy and a free world, moved forward again.

The Cooperative in Our Free-Enterprise System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following remarks of John C. Satterfield before the 32d annual meeting of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives at New Orleans, La., on January 10, 1961.

Mr. Satterfield is president-elect of the American Bar Association and is senior member of the firm of Satterfield, Shell, Williams & Buford, Jackson and Yazoo City, Miss.

The remarks of Mr. Satterfield follow:

THE COOPERATIVE IN OUR FREE-ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

In the free enterprise economy which is ours in the United States of America today, the cooperative is a potent factor in retarding the rapid march of this country toward socialism and a Government-manipulated economy. It is both surprising and alarming to observe the criticism of cooperatives by businessmen and business organizations who are blinded to the service which is now being rendered by cooperatives to the free-enterprise system. This service has been a material factor in support of capitalistic free enterprise in the United States for more than 50 years.

This discussion will be limited to farmer cooperatives, except insofar as a broad picture of the cooperative field in its widest sense is necessary to understand the basic principles and issues involved in the consideration of the place of cooperatives in the free enterprise system of today. A brief history of the development of cooperative effort will aid in recognizing that from the very first cooperatives have been an essential part of our economy.

HISTORICAL OUTLINE

Although cooperative enterprise has been called unique in recent hearings before congressional committees, the actual practice of cooperative enterprise by agricultural and industrial workers goes back for many centuries. This type of enterprise originated with the guilds of the Middle Ages which were cooperative efforts of the early industrial employees to alleviate the conditions under which they worked.[1] Thereafter, cooperative enterprise continued on the Continent and in Great Britain in many forms until the birth of the modern cooperative business organization through the Rochdale Equitable Pioneers' Society in Rochdale, England, in 1844. In the meanwhile, there was a parallel but entirely separate development of cooperative enterprise in America dating back to the earliest colonial days.[2] Pioneers cooperated in clearing land, building homes, constructing roads. There were community husking bees, log rollings, threshing rings, beef and cheese rings, and many other cooperative activities. These were informal, but gradually definite organizations developed. As early as 1780 farmers organized societies to purchase purebred cattle and to make community drives of livestock to distant markets.

Gradually as the farmers' production expanded and the farmers' markets increased and became more distant, co-operative tech-

---

Footnote at end of speech.

niques were developed both in the marketing of agricultural products and the purchase of supplies. Formal organization developed, one of the first being the associated or cooperative dairying at Goshen, Conn. about 1810. These gradually spread to the Midwest as illustrated by the organization of dairying cooperatives by Wisconsin farmers in 1841. During the next 50 years various types of cooperative enterprise spread throughout the entire United States, the principles of cooperative organization and operation gradually emerging by trial and error. Similar movements developed separately in Europe led by the Scandinavian countries. By 1860, cooperative organizations existed in most of the agricultural areas of this country, and in 1865 Michigan passed, what is regarded, as the first statute recognizing the cooperative method of selling farm products and purchasing farm supplies.

When we search for the first formal organization embodying the modern district cooperative features, we find that the modern cooperative probably had its origin in the group of 28 weavers who banded together in Rochdale, England, in 1844, to overcome the desperate straits they were in as a result of a combination of high prices and low wages in their industry. It is said these weavers pooled about $140 as their initial capital and formed the first consumer cooperative. When the Rochdale weavers formed the Rochdale Equitable Pioneers' Society, they formulated seven basic principles of cooperative endeavor; open membership; democratic control on the principle of "one member—one vote," limited interest on capital; trading on the basis of cash; patronage refunds; political and religious neutrality, and promotion of education.[3] However, it has long been recognized that all seven of the Rochdale principles need not be present for an organization to be properly considered a cooperative.

The National Grange, officially known as "The Order of Patrons of Husbandry," was founded in 1867, and in 1874 the Grange sent one of its officers to Europe to study the cooperative enterprises which had developed there. An early writer on cooperation says, "The great contribution of the National Grange was the formulation and distribution in 1875 of a set of rules for the organization of cooperative stores. These rules were based on those of the 28 weavers of Rochdale." By 1876 the National Grange had established more than 20,000 local Granges and in 26 states local Granges practiced selling and buying for members on a cooperative basis.

The Federal Government and all of the States repeatedly have recognized the value of farmer cooperatives to our free-enterprise economic system. Basic Federal legislative recognition of the desirability of encouraging farmer cooperatives includes the exemption from Federal income tax in 1913,[4] the protection of such cooperatives from the provisions of the Clayton Act in 1914,[5] the authorization of organization of cooperatives as against certain provisions of the antitrust laws by the Capper-Volstead Act in 1922,[6] and the creation of the Federal Farm Board, predecessor to the Farm Credit Administration, in 1929.[7] Each of our 50 States has authorized the organization of cooperatives under special statutes, most of which contain features designed to encourage agricultural producers to form cooperatives.

Since the turn of the century the importance of farmer cooperatives to the agricultural economy of the United States has increased rapidly. The number of farmer cooperatives has increased from 3,099 in 1915 to the alltime high of 12,000 in 1930 with a gradual decline, following the reduction in the number of farms and farmers, to 9,731 in 1957–58, the latest year for which figures are available.[8] The number of memberships in farmer cooperatives has increased from 651,186 in 1915 to 7,485,779 in 1957–58.[9] In the year 1915 the business done by farmer cooperatives amounted to $310,313,000. During the 1957–58 season, the gross value of farm products marketed, farm supplies handled, and receipts for services performed by cooperatives amounted to approximately $14 billion, and the total net volume, after eliminating duplication resulting from interassociation business, amounted to almost $10.7 billion.

Although farmer cooperatives are of vital importance to the farmers of the United States, their effect upon the national business picture is often grossly exaggerated by critics. While directly comparative figures are not available, when the total net volume of farmer cooperative business for the crop season ending in 1958, which amounted to $10.7 billion, is compared with the gross national product for the year 1958, which amounted to $450 billion, farmer cooperatives accounted for less than 2½ percent of the total business done.

COOPERATIVE DEFINED

Having covered the development of the cooperative movement from colonial times to this date, we should define the word "cooperative," differentiate between the various types of cooperatives, and consider the place of the farmer cooperative in our free-enterprise capitalistic economy.

Throughout the years cooperatives have been variously defined.[10] Many Federal and State statutes limit their application to organizations which meet the particular criteria set up in such statutes. These statutes have tended to complicate the definition of the term. It seems to me that a simple and proper definition of a cooperative under the decisions of our courts may be the following:

A cooperative is a legal entity organized and operated for the purpose of furnishing at cost goods or services to its patrons or to its patron members (or patron stockholders).

With reference to the type of legal entity utilized for the doing of business, cooperatives may be classified as follows:

1. Cooperatives organized under special statutes enacted for that purpose.

2. Cooperatives organized under general corporate laws which embody the above cooperative principle in their charter, bylaws, or patron contracts.

3. Partnerships, unincorporated associations or other recognized legal entities which embody the above cooperative principle in their articles or basic contracts and agreements.

COOPERATIVES IN THE FREE-ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

In considering the place of cooperatives in our present economy we must keep in mind use of the cooperative principle by many varied types of business. With reference to the nature or type of services or goods furnished, cooperatives may be classified as follows:

1. Cooperatives organized for the purpose of providing financial aid to their members at cost, such as credit unions; mutual building and loan associations; health, accident, medical care and compensation companies; and mutual life insurance companies.

2. Cooperatives organized for the purpose of furnishing services at cost, such as the marketing and processing of agricultural products; the rendition of public utility functions such as electric, water and telephone service; and the rendition of various types of service to members such as the services furnished to about 1,000 newspapers by the Associated Press and to 74 railroads by the Railway Express Agency; services of trade associations and the like.

3. Cooperatives organized for the furnishing of goods at cost such as manufacturing, purchasing, and consumer cooperatives, and wholesale buying groups.

We are not interested in the many forms of urban and general business cooperatives included in this enumeration. Farmer cooperatives are faced with enough problems of their own without our attempting to discuss the problems of other types of cooperatives. So long as human nature is human, problems will arise along the edges of legitimate enterprise. Misuse will exist. Undue advantages will be taken. We are here concerned only with farmer cooperatives, and those farmer cooperatives which are organized and operated in accordance with law and within the scope of proper cooperative principles.

Under our constitutional form of government the unalienable rights of life, liberty and pursuit of happiness necessarily carry with them the rights of individuals to do business as they see fit within the framework of our Federal and State constitutions and statutes. An individual, a parnership, an association, a conventional corporation and a cooperative fit into our free-enterprise system, one as well as the other. During 31 years of the practice of law, which has included meeting annually for many years with lawyers from every State in the Union, I have never heard advanced any legal basis of criticism of persons who choose to do business in the form of a cooperative whether organized under special State laws, under the general corporate law or in any other legally permissible form.

The position of the farmer cooperatives in our free enterprise was well stated by the National Association of Manufacturers[11] as follows:

"A 'cooperative' is a form of business enterprise that enables a group of individuals, partnerships, or corporations, to combine together for the purpose of producing or buying or selling a commodity or service. City consumers have gotten together to buy goods and sell them. Businessmen have formed mutual fire insurance companies. Individuals join together to buy life insurance through a mutual insurance company or merchandise through a mutual wholesale purchasing association. People who save money put their funds in a mutual savings banks. Farmers join together to buy goods they use in production or to sell the things they grow. All of these are 'cooperatives.' They are also legitimate forms of private enterprise."

Recent hearings before congressional committees point up the fact that the cooperative movement is frequently and vehemently attacked by industrialists, wholesalers and retailers alike. These persons lose sight of the fact that the formation and operation of cooperatives represent the only logical manner in which the farmer can deal with the soaring costs of his operations as compared to the slight increase in his gross income over the years. The only other solution to this problem would draw the Federal Government into greater control of every element of farming operations until agriculture would constitute a wholly Government-manipulated phase of our economic system. This solution is certainly not consistent with free enterprise.

One of the most powerful tools which the farmer may use to free himself of the economic pressures now being brought to bear upon him is the proper use of his farmer cooperatives. In this way, the farmer is able to fight the impending possibility of closer Government control of his operations by managing his own business affairs, and theregy increasing his profits.

This is the free-enterprise system in action. It is a true manifestation of the principle that business will flourish toward proper ends, within a fully legitimate economic framework. The farmer cooperative is not only an example of the free-enterprise sys-

Footnotes at end of speech.

tem in action; it is a necessary barrier to the flowing tide of governmental domination and possible eventual elimination of the free-enterprise system altogether.

TAXABILITY AND THE PATRONAGE REFUND

When the attacks upon farmer cooperatives are analyzed, it is found in almost every instance that the actual reason motivating the attacker is the competition which is given to the business of such person by cooperatives. These attacks are concentrated upon what the attackers believe to be the Achilles' heel of cooperatives—the payment of patronage refunds at the end of the fiscal year as a means of adjusting to actual cost the consideration received for goods or services furnished by the cooperative.

The so-called tax advantage which permits cooperatives to exclude patronage refunds from their income is available to every business man in the United States. This was pointed out by Joseph G. Knapp in "Are Cooperatives Good Business?", which appeared in the Harvard Business Review for January-February 1957, as follows:

"The cooperative operation does not result in the formation of net income by the cooperative subject to tax. Should any firm elect to forgo the making of income and operate according to cooperative principles on a cost-of-service basis, it likewise would have little or no net income subject to tax. Any business can enter into a contractual agreement with those that it serves to return to them savings resulting from their patronage and free itself from income tax on those amounts. In other words, our tax laws at the present time provide no general advantages to cooperatives that are not available to any other organization which elects to operate so as not to accumulate income."

The criticism of the taxation of cooperatives must be considered in the light of the recognized principles of law applicable to the payment of patronage refunds and the exclusion thereof from the income of nonexempt cooperatives legally obligated to pay them.

(a) A taxpayer is free to choose the type of organization or form in which he will cast his business activities to achieve a desired business or tax result. He is not required to adopt or continue with that form of organization which results in the maximum tax upon business income.

(b) When a legally enforcible obligation exists to refund to stockholder-patrons (sometimes referred to as member-patrons) the margin between the cost of the goods or services furnished and the amount received by the cooperative, it does not constitute income to the cooperative. Such margins properly calculated, allocated and paid to such patrons are excludable from the taxable income of the cooperative as a matter of constitutional and legal right regardless of any statute or Treasury regulation.

(c) This exclusion is enforced by the courts on the grounds that: (1) under the preexisting legal obligation, the margins never become the property of the cooperative and are not a part of its income, (2) money received by one in a business transaction which he has no right to retain cannot be said to be a gain or profit to him, (3) patronage refunds are distributions of money belonging to the patrons rather than distributions of income of the cooperative, (4) while held by the cooperative the funds are in its hands as agent or trustee for its patrons to whom it is legally obligated to repay the same, and (5) patronage refunds are in reality discounts or rebates paid under a preexisting legal obligation and are just as allowable as any other discount upon the purchase price of any commodity.

(d) It is immaterial whether the cooperative is organized under a special cooperative statute or under the general corporation statutes; the test is the existence of a legally enforcible obligation to pay patronage refunds which existed during the period such refunds were earned. The obligation may be created by the charter, bylaws, or separate contract.

(e) If the board of directors of such a nonexempt cooperative has the discretion under the contract to utilize a limited portion of such margins for the payment of common stock dividends, the amount which may be thus diverted within the fixed limits will not be excluded. It is held that the legally enforcible obligation to pay patronage refunds is destroyed to the extent that such discretion to divert exists.

(f) Such a corporation is required to pay regular corporate income taxes upon net margins or profits derived from nonstockholder patrons when such persons are not entitled to patronage refunds upon their purchases.

The whole argument against cooperatives overlooks the fact that under our constitutional form of government the unalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness necessarily carry with them the right of individuals to do business as they see fit within the framework of our Federal and State constitutions and statutes. An individual proprietorship, a partnership, a conventional corporation, or a cooperative fits into our free-enterprise system, one as well as another. The courts repeatedly have rejected the criticism of corporate forms and corporate contracts which minimize taxes. The burden of the argument is that cooperatives should be condemned because they choose to do business in a manner which prevents the patron's savings from becoming part of the corporate funds and corporate income so that such funds are not taxable to the corporation.

One of the recent cases decided by the court of appeals of the fifth circuit which reiterates this rule is that of *Friedlander Corp.* v. *Commissioner* (216 F. 2d 757 (5th Cir. 1954)), in which the court held as follows:

"A taxpayer is free to choose the type of organization or form in which he will cast his business activities to achieve a desired business or tax result. He is not required to adopt or continue with that form of organization which results in the maximum tax upon business income. *Meldrum & Fewsmith, Inc.* (20 T.C. 790), *Moline Properties, Inc.* v. *Commissioner* (319 U.S. 436, 63 S. Ct. 1132, 87 L. Ed. 1499). Furthermore, if a taxpayer actually carries on business in the form chosen, the tax collector may not deprive him of the incidental tax benefits flowing therefrom, unless it first be found to be a fiction or a sham * * * *Polak's Frutal Works, Inc.* (21 T.C. 973)."

The Court of Appeals for the 7th Circuit cited cases from the Supreme Court of the United States and the Courts of Appeal for the 3d Circuit, the 5th Circuit, the 6th Circuit, the 7th Circuit, the 9th Circuit and the 10th Circuit in announcing the same rule in the case of *Stearns Magnetic Mfg. Co.* v. *Commissioner*, 208 F. 2d. 849 (7th Cir. 1954).[12]

The basic fallacy of the argument against the exclusion of patronage refunds is illustrated by the statement in a recent article appearing in the Harvard Business Review, November-December 1960 issue in which the author, Prof. Harry G. Guthmann, stated his basic premise as follows:

"Like other businesses, cooperatives have had varying prosperity. If successful, cooperatives may choose to distribute a part or all of their net income as patronage dividends rather than as stockholders' dividends. That is their right. But if this patronage distribution is from net income of the same economic nature as that on which their competitors are taxed where is the equity here? Tax treatment should be similar and business survival should not be determined by tax favoritism."

The fact is that the profits of the conventional business corporation belong to the corporation and not to its individual stockholders, may be retained or distributed in the discretion of the directors and are properly a part of the corporation's taxable income. Exactly the opposite is true of the margins between the amount received by a cooperative from its patrons and the cost of the goods or services furnished to its patrons or patron-stockholders. These margins belong to the patrons (or patron-stockholders), do not become the property of the cooperative and as a matter of constitutional and legal right, cannot be taxed to the cooperative as a part of its income. They are of an entirely different nature from the profits of a conventional business corporation. As statements to this effect have been challenged in recent congressional hearings and the country has been flooded by propaganda to the contrary, I shall quote some of the court decisions which establish the fact beyond successful contradiction.

The most complete discussion of all of the various phases of the exclusion of patronage refunds by cooperatives and corporations in the nature of cooperatives by any court is found in *Farmers Cooperative Co.* v. *Birmingham*, 86 F. Supp. 201 (ND Iowa 1949).[13] This case contains 37 pages and is a more detailed discussion than we have found in any law journal article or any legal source other than a complete text. Several of the basic principles involved here are announced by that court as follows:

"In the case of *Saenger* v. *Commissioner* (5 Cir. 1934, 69 F. 2d 613, 633), the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit stated, 'If compensation paid to one is paid to him as the agent or servant in fact, not in fiction, of another, that income is taxable, not to the servant or agent as earner, but to its real earner, the principal (Cit.).' The court cites in support of that statement cases dealing with community property or family partnership relations. The Mississippi Supreme Court in *State* v. *Morgan Gin Co.* (1939, 186 Miss. 66, 189 So. 817), used the theory advanced in the Saenger case to uphold a cooperative's exclusion of patronage dividends from its income subject to State income tax. Though no patronage dividends were involved, the U.S. Supreme Court in *Commissioner of Internal Revenue* v. *Wilcox* (1946, 327 U.S. 404, 66 S. Ct. 546, 90 L. Ed. 752, 166 A.R.L. 884), stated that in order for receipts to constitute taxable income to a taxpayer there must be (1) the presence of a claim or right to such receipts, and (2) the absence of a definite, unconditional obligation to pay the same to another.

"In *Johnson* v. *Staple Cotton Cooperative Association* (1926, 142 Miss. 312, 107 So. 2), it was held that the cooperative marketing contract between the association and a member created the relation of principal and agent, the association being a sales agency operating for the benefit of the members.

"The exclusion of patronage dividends for Federal income tax purposes has not been placed upon the ground that cooperatives are special creatures of statute under the tax laws, but is justified rather upon the theory that patronage dividends are in reality rebates on purchases or deferred payments on sale, allocated or distributed pursuant to a preexisting obligation of the cooperative, and thus do not constitute taxable income to the cooperative. *Cooperative Oil Assn.* v. *Commissioner* (9 Cir. 1940, 115 F. 2d 666), *Midland Cooperative Wholesale* v. *Commissioner* (1941, 44 B.T.A. 824)."

A recent case decided by the Tax Court is that of *Producers Gin, Inc.* v. *Commissioner*

Footnotes at end of speech.

(18 TCM 369 (1959)), in which that court held as follows:

"So construed, the agreement would meet the requirements for a nontaxable cooperative to the extent of member sales of cottonseed. *Pomeroy Cooperative Grain Co.*, 31 T.C. 684 (Dec. 31, 1958) Dec. 23, 302. There was a preexisting legal obligation: the members' cotton never became the property of the cooperative, and no nonmember business accrued to the advantage of the members. And that the corporation was not organized as a cooperative is not fatal. *Eugene Fruit Growers Association, supra; United Cooperatives, Inc.*, 4 T.C. 93 (Dec. 14, 145). The profits in question never belonged to petitioner and did not become a part of its income. *Clover Farm Stores Corporation*, 17 T.C. 1265 (Dec. 20, 977)."

A case decided by the Supreme Court of Mississippi in 1939 has been cited as authority by the Tax Court and several courts of appeal in connection with the exclusion of patronage refunds. This is the case of *State of Mississippi* v. *Morgan Gin Co.* (189 So. 187 (Miss. 1939)), in which the court held as follows:

"Money received by one in a business transaction which he has no right to retain, but, under the stipulations of the transaction, must return to the one from whom it was received could hardly be said to be a gain or profit to him. The word "income" is broad enough to include all that comes in, but its specific meaning must be determined by the intent of the party or parties employing it to be determined by the context, the subject being dealt with, and the character of the person or persons employing it (31 C.J. 397). In taxing statutes, as usually construed, it 'imports an actual gain; * * * indicates increase of wealth in hand.' *Bingham* v. *Long* (249 Mass. 79, 144 N.E. 77, 33 A.L.R. 809). When so interpreted, it must here be held not to include things received by the taxpayer in a business transaction which he has no right to retain, but must return to the one from whom it was received. When one receives money in a business transaction which he has no right to retain but must return, his income from the business is neither increased nor diminished thereby; it remains as it would have been had he not received the money at all."

The final case we shall take from the Tax Court on this issue is that of *Colony Farms Cooperative Dairy Inc.* v. *Commissioner*, 17 T.C. 688 (1951), in which the court held as follows:

"This problem is not new, and has often been before the courts. The accepted rule is that if the cooperative receives these earnings under an existing legal obligation to distribute them to its members, such earnings are not income of the cooperative and consequently are to be excluded in the computation of its gross income."

Finally the true nature of patronage refunds is clearly discussed by the Court of Appeals of the Seventh Circuit in the case of *Uniform Printing & Supply Co.* v. *Commissioner* (88 F. 2d 75, 109 A.L.R. 966), which was decided on February 4, 1937, as follows:

"Had the taxpayer given a customer (whether stockholder or outsider) a discount promptly after filling the order, no one would call it a dividend. If a rebate were given promptly upon the customer's business reaching a certain volume, the same conclusion as to its character would follow. To make cost estimates and adjust them at or near the end of year returning the excess payment to the customer should not change the reasoning which leads to this conclusion. Nor should the fact that the customer is a stockholder materially affect the result.

"Perhaps a single refund coming at the end of each year would lessen the irresistibility of the inferences, but the conclusion would still fit the facts better than one founded on a dividend assumption. It is true the taxpayer is not a nonprofit corporation in a legal sense. It is subject to a tax upon the profits by it made. Nevertheless, net profits in its case must depend upon the facts. Payment to the customers, who are also taxpayers, of sums called refunds upon the volume of business transacted and in no way dependent upon stock ownership, is the determinative factor.

"Considering all the facts we conclude that the payments in issue were made as refunds rather than as dividends to stockholding customers."

Tax favoritism, tax advantage, or tax discrimination in favor of cooperatives does not exist. Every individual proprietor, every partnership, every corporation in the United States may enter into patronage contracts under which patronage refunds (or delayed discounts) are deductible or excludable from taxable income of the business. Two wrongs do not make a right. It is a weak and fallacious argument to say that because there is double taxation of corporate income and corporate dividends, there should be double taxation of patronage refunds.

It appears to me that the attacks made upon the exclusion of patronage refunds from cooperative taxable income are actually a tempest in a teapot. The reason is simply that, if Congress should enact and the courts should uphold a statute preventing the exclusion of true patronage refunds from the income of cooperatives, all cooperatives would simply proceed to do business at cost by reduction of the original price charged for their services or goods. This is, of course, an over-simplification for I recognize the resulting inconveniences and difficulties in obtaining sufficient working capital, in obtaining funds for capital reserves in the use of assessments or compulsory capital contributions. For most cooperatives, these difficulties would not be insurmountable. In fact, many cooperatives, particularly those which furnish services, those of an industrial nature and those dealing with commodities were the prices do not fluctuate rapidly, would need only to cease to follow their policy of following the market and actually sell goods or render services at or at about cost. Frequently, the results would be far more objectionable to competitors than the exclusion of patronage refunds.

THE COOPERATIVE IN THE FORM OF A GENERAL BUSINESS CORPORATION

Turning to some of the problems within the cooperative field, a basic difficulty of cooperatives has been that of attracting capital to finance organization and operations. One of the manifestations of the cooperative movement that well may appear in increasing proportions during the coming years is the cooperative set up in the form of a general business corporation. In many instances this type of cooperative is much preferable to the ones set up according to the State statutes for the establishment of cooperatives. As we approach this new era of the cooperative's place in the free-enterprise system, it would be well for us to give careful consideration to the cooperative in the nature of a general business corporation and its importance to the cooperative movement.

Great flexibility is provided by the use of the general corporate form in organizing a cooperative. I have formed cooperatives under the general laws of several States. It is my understanding that there are many States in which the general corporate organization has never been used for the formation of a cooperative. Nevertheless, I see no legal reason why the general corporate form could not be utilized for the organization and operation of a cooperative in any State in the Union.

Harking back to the Rochdale principles of 1844, one of these was that of "one member—one vote." This has been followed in most of the special statutes authorizing the organization of cooperatives, although it is sometimes varied to permit limited multiple voting, or voting power related to amount of patronage as to some or all corporate matters. Some of the Federal and State statutes providing special benefits to cooperatives embody the "one member—one vote" principle as one of the tests of statutory qualification. Nevertheless, this is not one of the tests set up by the courts in determining the cooperative nature of a business. This element has proved to be one of the inhibiting factors in the attraction of substantial investments to provide working capital and other proper reserves.

Laying aside historical significance and theory, consideration of the hard facts of present-day financing and business reveal the following advantages arising from the flexibility of use of general corporation laws for the organization of cooperatives:

1. Under the general corporate form, the cooperative would not have the status of an exempt cooperative under the Federal income tax law. Nevertheless its charter and bylaws may carry a legally enforceable obligation to handle its business at cost and to refund its patron stockholders the difference between the amount received and the actual cost of doing business. This will entitle the corporation to exclude from its gross income all patronage refunds paid or payable under the rules similar to those applicable to cooperatives organized as nonexempt cooperatives under special State statutes. However, under the general corporate form there is no maximum upon the amount of fixed dividends which may be payable upon the different forms of stock. On the other hand, as is true of all entities of a cooperative nature which are not exempt cooperatives, the dividends upon capital stock may be paid only with tax paid money and hence should be held to as low a percentage as possible. Nevertheless, it may be necessary to provide for a higher percentage of return in the form of dividends in order to obtain working capital.

2. The use of this form results in the ability to authorize the issuance of all forms of corporate stock permissible under the general statutes. This may include preferred stock of all kinds, with limited dividends cumulative or non-cumulative as desired. Dividends may be limited to any percentage of par value which may be desired, with or without a callable feature. Such preferred stock may have no voting power (under most State statutes) or may have noting power equal to that of the common stock. Payment of dividends may be given preference over the payment of patronage refunds in order to make the investment more attractive.

3. The extent of the participation in the management of the corporation by various classifications of stockholders may be varied. This is sometimes material in maintaining compliance with special definitions contained in Federal or State statutes. As an illustration, common voting stock may be divided into classes such as class A common stock with a par value of $5 per share (20 votes for each $100 invested), class B common stock with a par value of $100 per share (1 vote for each $100 invested) and class C common stock with a par value of 10 cents per share (1,000 votes for each $100 invested). Again we are dealing with the hard facts of modern business as distinguished from the theory of "democratic control, one member—one vote."

4. Under this form of organization different classes of common stock may perform different functions in the allocation to its stockholders of the services or goods furnished to the corporation. The charter or bylaws may provide preferred patronage rights with each class of stock whereby each is permitted to

purchase a named quantity of the products of the corporation or a fixed amount measured by the market price thereof. Thus, the extent of a stockholder's right to receive goods or services furnished by the corporation would be proportionate to his investment in stock. This also may be varied as to particular products. For instance, if a manufacturing cooperative manufactures anhydrous ammonia, ammonium nitrate and mixed fertilizer, it may have three classes of stock. Class A stock would carry with it preferred patronage rights for the purchase of anhydrous ammonia only. Class B stock would carry with it preferred patronage rights for the purchase of ammonium nitrate only. Class C stock would carry with it preferred patronage rights for the purchase of mixed fertilizer only. Thus, in one corporate organization, the stockholder may in effect invest in the different manufacturing enterprises carried on by such corporation.

5. In addition to the issuance of varied forms of capital stock the cooperative organized under general corporate statutes may issue bonds or certificates of indebtedness with any preferential features desired, with or without security but, of course, subject to Federal and State regulation when sold on an interstate basis and subject to State regulation when sold on an intrastate basis. These certificates of indebtedness or bonds are unlimited as to form and content as are similar obligations of general corporations formed under general laws. Under proper charter or bylaw provisions, payment of such certificates or bonds may be given preference over payment of patronage refunds in cash.

6. In addition to ordinary certificates of indebtedness, charter or bylaws may authorize the issuance of what are sometimes caled "certificates of participation." These are actually certificates of indebtedness carrying with them preferred patronage rights to purchase fixed amounts of the products of the corporation. They differ from stock in every particular that certificates of indebtedness differ therefrom, the interest payable upon the certificates of participation are deductible as a part of the cost of doing business, and yet the certificates may carry with them preferred patronage rights to the same extent as stock. This means that holders of certificates of participation will have no vote in the business of the company but will be patrons on the same basis as stockholders, will have preferred patronage rights and will receive patronage refunds at the end of the fiscal accounting period. This carries with it the advantage to the investor of an agreed contractual payment of interest, with all the rights of stock ownership except voting, and carries the advantage to the corporation that the return in the form of interest paid upon these certificates is deductible as a cost of doing business.

7. Another illustration of the flexibility of the use of the general corporate form is that the preferred stock, the certificates of participation and certificates of indebtedness may be callable or not as provided in charter or bylaws or as provided in the trust indenture under which the certificates are issued.

8. Another flexible feature of the use of the general corporate form is the ability of the corporation to enter into contracts with nonmembers or nonstockholders whereby such persons will receive patronage refunds. There is no requirement that the corporation pay patronage refunds to nonstockholder patrons on the same basis as stockholder-patrons, nor is there any requirement that nonstockholder patrons be treated with complete uniformity. The freedom of contract inherent in general corporate entities is present.

9. By the use of general corporate form the charter or bylaws may contain restrictions upon the purchase or transfer of stock. In most States, it may be provided that stock may be transferred to or held only by agricultural producers or some other class of persons. The provisions setting up preferred patronage rights also may restrict the use of such rights in such a way as to prevent the effective transfer of the stock contrary to the policy of the company. For instance, it may be provided that all preferred patronage rights will cease when the stockholder ceases to be an actual agricultural producer or that the preferred patronage rights will be no greater than the amount of the production of the company actually used by the stockholder on his own property. Through these means the agricultural integrity of the corporation may be preserved, for, if the common stock dividend rate is low, the major advantage of ownership is the use of the right to purchase the products or services of the corporation through the preferred patronage rights.

10. Under the general corporate form the original corporation in its charter may permit the organization of any number or type of subsidiaries. These may be wholly or partially owned and controlled by the parent corporation. They may be used as adjuncts to the business of the parent corporation or for an entirely separate purpose.

There are a number of disadvantages to the general corporate form which are readily discernible and which should be taken into consideration prior to making the determination to set up a cooperative in the form of a general business corporation. These include, of course, the fact that the entity is subject to all of the regulatory statutes affecting general corporations such as blue sky laws, the Federal security acts, the antitrust laws without limitation, and certain relatively small corporate taxes from which cooperatives in some States are exempt such as franchise taxes, privilege taxes, fees paid in connection with compliance with blue sky laws, etc.

CONCLUSION

Now, more than ever before, the farmer is faced with the choice between protecting himself by way of his farmer cooperative or by giving in to complete Government control. The situation grows more serious daily. Now is the time for a new farmer cooperative movement, one much more vast than has ever before been contemplated. Now is the time that the choice must be made as to whether the farmer can take care of himself or whether he must be protected, and thereby regulated, directed, and restrained by an all-powerful Federal Government.

Now is the time for the farmer and for his farm cooperative to take inventory of their present situation. Now is the time for new ideas. Now is the time for a new cooperative movement—a sound business program which will allow the farmer to both benefit and protect himself in the years ahead.

---

[1] 27 Indiana Law Journal 353 (1952).

[2] For a complete history of cooperative effort in the United States see Bulletin 1, Farmers Cooperative Service of U.S. Department of Agriculture.

[3] See Blankertz, Marketing Cooperatives 45 (1940); Holyoake, "The History of the Rochdale Pioneers (1907)"; 1 and 2 Holyoake. "The History of Cooperation."

[4] Revenue Act of 1913, sec. II, G, 38 Stat. 172 (1913).

[5] 38 Stat. 730, 731, 15 U.S.C., sec. 12 (1946).

[6] 42 Stat. 388 (1922) 7 U.S.C., sec. 291 (1946).

[7] 46 Stat. 11 (1929), 12 U.S.C., sec. 1141(a) (1945).

[8] "News for Farmer Cooperatives," Reprint 185 (April 1960).

[9] Ibid.

[10] "An agricultural cooperative association is a business organization, usually incorporated, owned and controlled by member agricultural producers, which operates for the mutual benefit of its members or stockholders, as producers or patrons on a cost basis after allowing for the expenses of the operation and maintenance and any other authorized deductions for expansion and necessary reserves." Hulbert, L. S., "Legal Phases of Cooperative Associations." Farm Credit Administration. Bulletin 50, p. 1 (1942).

"A cooperative enterprise is one which belongs to the people who use its services, the control of which rests equally with all the members, and the gains of which are distributed to the members in proportion to the use they make of its services." Report of the Inquiry on Cooperative Enterprise in Europe." U.S. Government Printing Office (1937).

"Cooperation is organized working together for mutual benefits. Economic cooperation is a form of business with democratic ownership and control by member patrons having common needs, serving themselves on a nonprofit basis, and receiving benefits proportional to participation." Fetrow, W. W., and Elsworth, R. H., "Agricultural Cooperation in the United States." Farm Credit Administration Bulletin 54, p. 4 (1947).

[11] "National Association of Manufacturers, "NAM and Cooperatives" (privately published in New York, 1946), p. 7.

[12] The following is a quotation from the case of *Stearns Magnetic Mfg. Co.* v. *Commissioner*, 208 F. 2d 849 (7th Cir. 1954):

"Individuals who own all the capital stock of a corporation are not by reason of that relationship disqualified from contracting with the corporate entity. An agreement between a corporation and its sole stockholder is valid and enforceable, if the arrangement is fair and reasonable, judged by the standards of a transaction entered into by parties dealing at arm's length. This is recognized by the Bureau of Internal Revenue in official rulings, O.D. 440 C. B. Webb Press Co., Ltd., 3 B.T.A. 247, and by the courts of review. *Comm. of Internal Revenue* v. *Thomas Flexible Coupling Co.*, 3 Cir., 198 F. 2d 350; *A. & A. Tool & Supply Co.* v. *Comm. of Internal Revenue*, 10 Cir., 182 F. 2d 300; *J. H. Robinson Truck Lines* v. *Comm. of Internal Revenue*, 5 Cir., 183 F. 2d 730. * * *

"* * * A taxpayer is free to adopt any form of legal organization for the conduct of his financial affairs he may choose; he may convert from the corporate setup to that of a partnership or vice versa. Though his motive in so doing is to reduce taxes, the conversion must be accorded recognition unless it is such a sham, such a change in form only, without substance, as to require that it be disregarded for tax purposes. *Gregory* v. *Helvering*, 293 U.S. 465, 55 S. Ct. 266, 79 L. Ed. 596; *Comm. of Internal Revenue* v. *Tower*, 327 U.S. 280, 66 S. Ct. 532, 90 L. Ed. 670; *Twin Oaks Co.* v. *Comm. of Internal Revenue*, 9 Cir., 183 F. 2d 385. If the parties deal fairly with one another, it matters not whether their aim be, as the second circuit said, 'to avoid taxes or to regenerate the world.' *Chisholm* v. *Comm. of Internal Revenue*, 2 Cir., 79 F. 2d 14, 15. To quote again from that circuit, from *Helevring* v. *Gregory*, 2 Cir., 69 F. 2d 809, 810, a transaction does not lose its immunity 'because it is actuated by a desire to avoid, or, if one choose, to evade, taxation. Anyone may so arrange his affairs that his taxes shall be as low as possible; he is not bound to choose that pattern which will best pay the Treasury; there is not even a patriotic duty to increase one's taxes.' See also *Tilden Inc.* v. *Comm. of Internal Revenue*, 5 Cir., 19 F. 2d 704; *Comm. of Internal Revenue* v. *Clark*, 7 Cir., 202 F. 2d 94; *Chamberlin* v. *Comm. of Internal Revenue*, 6 Cir., 207 F. 2d 463 at page 468."

[1] The following is an additional quotation from the case of *Farmers Cooperative Co.* v. *Birmingham*, 86 F. Supp. 201 (ND Iowa 1949):

"In a number of cases the Tax Court has recognized that a 'liability' may exist by virtue of State statutes, articles of incorporation, bylaws, or other agreements, on the part of the cooperative to its patrons for that amount of its net earnings over which the directors have no discretionary powers of appropriation. Exclusion of such amounts from the gross income of the cooperative organizations concerned has been consistently allowed on the theory that this 'liability' is a contractual obligation on the part of the cooperative to its members and the declaration or payment of the patronage dividends is a mere recognition of this obligation. In *United Cooperatives, Inc.* v. *Commissioner*, 1944, 4 T.C. 93, the bylaws of petitioner provided that all net income other than certain reserves and an 8 percent stock dividend (in the directors' discretion) should be distributed to patrons. The Tax Court allowed an exclusion for that amount of the net earnings remaining after deduction of those sums which the directors were either obligated or had the discretion to distribute. In holding that a legal obligation existed only to the extent of those amounts over which the directors had no discretion the Court stated, 4 T.C., page 106, 'However, this practice of excluding patronage dividends from gross income has been limited to those cases in which the right of patrons to such dividends arises by reason of the corporation charter, or bylaws, or some other contract, and does not depend upon some corporate action taken subsequent to its receipt of the money later so distributed, such as the action of the corporation's officers or directors.' See also, *Midland Cooperative Wholesale* v. *Commissioner, supra; Valparaiso Grain & Lumber Co.* v. *Commissioner*, 1941, 44 B.T.A. 125; *Farmers' Union Cooperative Association* v. *Commissioner*, 1928, 13 B.T.A.; *969 Anamosa Farmers Creamery Co.* v. *Commissioner*, 1928, 13 B.T.A. 907; *Home Builders Shipping Association* v. *Commissioner*, 1927, 8 B.T.A. 903; *Western Colo. Producers Cooperative* v. *Commissioner*, 1943, T.C.M. P.H. par. 43, 107; *Farmers Union Coop. Exchange* v. *Commissioner*, (1944) T.C.M. P.H. par. 44, 384. To the same effect see Hulbert, Legal Phases of Cooperative Associations; supra at p. 266 and House Report 1888, supra at p. 16. * * *

"A strong case supporting the theory that where an obligation to distribute net earnings to patrons exists the cooperative does not own its net proceeds but only holds them as agent or trustee for its members is *San Joaquin Valley Poultry Producers' Association* v. *Commissioner*, 9 Cir., 1943, 136 F. 2d 382. Petitioner was organized as a nonprofit cooperative association incorporated under the Agricultural Code of California. Its bylaws provided (136 F. 2d page 384 footnote 11) that 'The "net proceeds" shall be such funds as are derived from overcharges on sales and as are left after all expenses shall have been paid, or provided for, all at the discretion of the directors. The "net proceeds" resulting from the operation of the business, if any, shall belong to the members . . . and shall be prorated to them in proportion to the amount of business each member has transacted with (petitioner). . . .' The directors had established three reserve funds with part of the net proceeds of the business and in holding that these reserve funds were not the property of the petitioner and thus were excludable from its gross income the Court stated, 136 F. 2d page 385, that, 'The sums so placed in these reserves . . . never became the property of petitioner, but were and are the property of the members (cit.). . . . The fact that the sums were not payable to the members on demand, or at any fixed time, does not alter the fact that they were their property and not petitioner's. Petitioner held them, not as owner, but as agent or trustee for the members (cit.). Since none of the sums ever belonged to petitioner, they could not be, and were not, income of petitioner.'"

Opinions on Domestic and International Situations as They Confront Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. A. THOMPSON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, it is seldom that a Member of Congress receives a communication from a constituent so well phrased and displaying such fundamental thought as one I received from Mr. Blair F. Reed, of Lake Charles, La. The problems that today confront us, as well as the great minds of the executive department, will be hard to surmount; however, I do hope that the thinking of our constituents everywhere will be spurred on to the point that all of our people will have an insight as to the potential dangers with which we are faced because of foreign ideologists.

I address to you the comments of Mr. Reed, who has spent considerable time overseas and, no doubt, many, many hours cogitating the dramatic changes over the world. It can very well be that our future course of action will possibly not follow exactly along the lines suggested by Mr. Reed; however, his views are fundamental and worthy of the perusal of the Members of this body:

LAKE CHARLES, LA., *March 15, 1961.*

Hon. T. A. THOMPSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I deem it my duty to express my opinions of a few domestic and international situations as they confront us at this time.

Peace Corps: President Kennedy and all concerned with the Peace Corps should be aided as much as possible in the development of their idea. I should like to bring out the point that the youths sent abroad will not be dealing with amateurs from the Communist schools. There exists a host of imponderables in dealing with the economic and ideological development of underdeveloped nations. Taking into account the dedication and training of the competition, caution is in order. A liberal sprinkling of adult (mature) partcipation should be encouraged until the difficulties can be envisioned and a proper training program instigated to counter the obstacles. Do not think that our youths will not be harassed and intimidated by imported and local Communists. One minor error can be broadened into an international propaganda tool for the opposition. The stakes are very high and our very survival hinges on the small nations either accepting or rejecting our efforts.

I was in India for about 19 months during World War II and I worked in the civilian personnel office at Kalukunda, India, both hiring natives and making up a payroll. The people may be uneducated, but they are gifted with an innate sense to take advantage of every opportunity for betterment and exploit it to the limit of yours and their endurance. Excruciating circumstances can be limited in accordance with your foresight and adaptability to quick change, if in order. The civilian owner of the labor pool was an out-and-out hard-shelled Communist and if you didn't watch him, you'd be "had." I witnessed a whole village being burned by Communits agitators near Dacca. All brought about by their fanning the flames of hatred between the Moslems and Hindus. Religious views are very important when dealing with most African and Asian peoples. If not taken into account, you can be stymied. In India, and Africa, also, I would imagine, when a person presents you with a problem you can be sure he got his advice from somewhere else. He either paid for his advice or got it from some religious source. Your immediate problem is to probe the individual and locate the source of his utterances. To deal with the individual is a long and tedious proposition and with some tact, you and the intermediate can get together. I enclose a letter from a professional "intermediate." Would you please return the letter to me; it has sentimental significance.

Limited aggression: Now that massive retaliation has reached proportions where use of the force means suicide for both sides, limited local aggressions must be taken into consideration. If not, we could be nibbled to death. But, to allow the retaliatory forces to deteriorate would be the end for us, also. The U.S.S.R. could be tempted to make a first strike blow to accomplish their purpose. Even though they may not succeed, it would be our stupidity that allowed the temptation to develop. Taking into consideration that we will be unable to accurately pinpoint the source of Soviet missiles, I believe, we should develop a manned reconnaissance or bomber force to get in and locate the hardened installations. They will have to be of the supersonic variety, though. When missiles approach mobile feasibility that will have to be a must. We can only approach the problem of resisting local aggressive operations when we have a reliable deterrent facing the Sino-Soviet conspiracy. They may decide to resort to limited war as a means of weakening our resistance to their world domination ideology. Even to wage war in a free nation, destroying personal property, cities and human lives all will contribute to a weakening of our position along the Communist periphery. If they pull out completely or we negotiate for a peaceful settlement, allowing them to occupy even part of their gains, they've scored a point in resisting future intents by the helpless smaller nations.

As I mentioned before, we could be nibbled to death. The period from 1962 to 1967 will probably exhibit to the world just how much we want to protect our constitutional ideals. I fear that if we must stick to strictly budgetary limits, our cause will be lost. Russia intends to rule the world in space as Britain ruled the seas in past decades. If they accomplish their objective, it will be no laughing matter for the world. Not too far in the future, China will develop atomic weapons, aided by the U.S.S.R., then we are in for trouble. Don't bet any money that a serious rift will develop between Peking and Moscow, to our advantage. It amounts to no more than discussions between Democrats and Republicans. Their discussions are about the size of the club to clout us with. You'll never live to see the day that China invades Russian territory; that myth was dreamed up by American journalists and aided by astute persons who hope someone else will solve our dilemma.

I suggest that you members of our Government get together and decide what to do when China is admitted to the U.N. Just as sure as I am about the sun rising tomorrow, China will get into the U.N. We could tie in a deal with Communists over Berlin. Something is better than nothing.

You better develop a program to enlighten the American public when the full impact of Russian industrial development is felt. If not, the whole thing will spread confusion like Sputnik I. I leave you with thoughts of the effects of mutual massive retaliation, Communist ground forces, air power, and industrial potential. Something's going to pop soon.

Yours very truly,

BLAIR E. REED.

Major League Baseball for San Juan, P.R.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, last week, I sent a letter to Commissioner of Baseball Ford C. Frick proposing that organized baseball give consideration to the establishment of a major league baseball franchise in San Juan, P.R.

I proposed that San Juan either be added as one of the new franchises in the two major leagues or that it be part of a new third major league. Aside from the advantage this would create for baseball in general, I know of no better way to enhance Latin American cordial relations than to establish firmly in one of our neighboring countries to the south of us a new baseball team embraced within either of our big leagues. This may be difficult of achievement but it is not impossible.

I also mentioned some of the many talented baseball players in our present major league teams who have come from Puerto Rico and indicated that the distance between Puerto Rico and many of the existing cities in the major leagues is no longer a serious factor in view of this jet-propelled age.

The text of my letter is as follows:

MARCH 16, 1961.

DEAR COMMISSIONER FRICK: A most interesting proposal has been suggested to me recently that I wish to call to your attention. This proposal has my heartiest endorsement.

The proposal is to accord a major league baseball franchise to the Latin American city of San Juan, P.R. Aside from the advantage this would create for baseball in general, I know of no better way to enhance Latin American cordial relations than to establish firmly in one of our neighboring countries to the south of us a new baseball team embraced within either of our big leagues. This may be difficult of achievement but it is not impossible. Baseball in Puerto Rico is a most popular sport. Evidence of the intense joy that Puerto Ricans derive from baseball may be seen any weekend at the Yankee Stadium, where great numbers of Puerto Ricans, residents of the city of New York, are cheering on their favorites.

Puerto Rico has supplied many talented baseball players to our present league teams. To mention some outstanding in the sport, we have: Hi Bithorn, Chicago Cubs; Luis Rodriquez Olmo, Dodgers; Luis Canena Marquez, Pirates; Carlos Bernier, Pirates; Ruben Gomez, Giants; Roberto Clemente, Pirates; Vic Power, Cleveland; Nino Escalera, Cincinnati; Orlando Cepeda, Giants; Jose A. Pagan, Giants; Terin Pizarro, Milwaukee. Luis Tite Arroyo is probably one of the mainstays of the Yankee pitching staff.

The distance between Puerto Rico and many of the larger cities may no longer be deemed a factor in this jet propelled age. Puerto Rico has a huge baseball-hungry population. It is also a warm weather city where baseball may be played the year round.

I am informed that a number of public spirited Puerto Ricans would be willing to join a group of Americans to finance such a team in Puerto Rico and I am advised that the Puerto Rican Government has been approached on this matter, and its Administrator of Parks, Senor Monagas, made the following statement:

"This Department (Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Public Parks and Recreation Administration) will provide, (if assurances by either major league is given that a franchise will issue to a San Juan club) for the use by the new major league San Juan Club, a stadium with a seating capacity of not less than 50,000 persons.

Each of the two major baseball leagues has already expanded as a result of public pressure from 8 to 10 teams in as many cities. These four new cities are all in the continental U.S.A. I am also informed that telegraphic advices were given to you and Messrs. Giles and Cronin, National and American League baseball presidents, under date of November 29, 1960, that San Juan would welcome officially a franchise in either league.

I would even heighten my baseball sights. I would envisage the possibility of a team in Tokyo, Japan, or in Mexico City, Mexico. Baseball has inspired the youth of Japan and Mexico and teams have been organized all over those countries. I also refer to Panama, Venezuela, Nicaragua—all of which have many baseball teams. I omit Cuba because of persent conditions there, though there is great reservoir of baseball talent in Cuba. It is interesting to note that even Dictator Castro realizes the importance of baseball by expressing his willingness to grant exit permits to Cuban major league players to enable them to participate in organized baseball in the United States during the coming season.

One of the best ways to create amity and accord and understanding between the countries is by mutual sport contests.

If, for any reason, a new San Juan team could not be fitted into the regular playing schedule of the big leagues, it might be well to ponder a third league of cities partly in and partly out of continental United States.

As was stated to me in a memorandum submitted to me by Mr. M. A. Krisel to show the interplay of sports in general and baseball in particular and their influences upon the various languages of the world, I quote Prof. Mario Pei, in his "The Story of Language," page 165:

"Sports and games penetrate the language to the same extent that they are penetrated by it. The English tongue is replete with sporting terminology which has overrun its bank ('hit-and-run drivers,' 'to pinch hit for someone,' 'to hit below the belt,' 'to jump the gun,' 'to be on the inside track,' 'to be in the chips,' 'to be behind the eight-ball,' 'it isn't cricket,' 'according to Hoyle'), 'Trump' and 'ten-ace,' 'pawn' and 'checkmate' have international figurative currency. Baseball and its terminology have probably done more to bring the meaning of the American way of life home to the Europeans, Latin Americans and Japanese than any form of direct cultural propaganda. Beisbol and jonron ('home run') are as familiar to the Mexicans as their native corrida and matador, and Latin American crowds have learned to cry 'Maten al arbitro' with the same gusto with which Yankee Stadium fans shout, 'Kill the umpire'."

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman.

"Whenever a Nation Values Anything More Than Its Freedom, It Will Lose Its Freedom—If It Is Comfort and Money That the Nation Values More Than Its Freedom, It Will Lose Them Also"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, on February 27 of this year, in Pittsburgh, Pa., the vice commander of the Air Materiel Command, Lt. Gen. William F. McKee, addressed the Association of Stock Exchange Firms, and under leave to extend my remarks, in the RECORD, I include General McKee's speech, which contains much valuable information concerning the progress of our efforts to gain and maintain general air supremacy:

I am honored to speak to a group like this, composed, as it is, of men of wide and various business and industrial interests.

Representing one of our military services, I am here—in a sense—as a member of a great partnership speaking with a large number of his partners. The partnership I refer to is a partnership in the most important enterprise of our time—the preservation of our way of life by the deterrence of war. It is a partnership between our Armed Forces and the great industrial arsenal of free enterprise.

My experience since 1953 as vice commander of the U.S. Air Force Air Materiel Command has brought home to me many lessons. One of the most important has been how greatly the military and industry depend upon each other and how successful both are when they work together as a team.

Under the National Security Act of 1947, the Army Air Forces became a separate service—the U.S. Air Force. The functions assigned to the Air Force are many and varied. The principal job assignment in time of war would be—and I quote—"to gain and maintain general air supremacy."

This is a large order when you take into account the potential space involved and the rapid progress of science and technology, resulting in constantly changing weapon systems.

The space involved is all the area extending outward from the surface of the earth—the indivisible operational medium which the Air Force refers to as aerospace. This term is used because no one can say—except arbitrarily—where air ends and space begins.

In discussing our aerospace achievements, let me take you back to a remarkable 24-hour period on January 31 and February 1 of this year. It happens that January 31 was the third anniversary of the launching by the Army of the United States first earth

satellite. The great strides that have been made in 2 years are illustrated by the events in this 24-hour period.

On January 31, a research and development satellite was placed into orbit by the Air Force from the Navy's Point Arguello Base in California. On the same day there were two successful firings by the Air Force of a Bomarc-B interceptor missile from Eglin Air Force Base in Florida. And the world's most highly publicized chimpanzee—a little fellow named "Ham"—took a 420-mile ride through space and was picked up at sea little the worse for his adventure. "Ham" was propelled by the Army-developed Redstone rocket fired by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration from Cape Canaveral. This is a preliminary to placing a man into orbit.

The next day another event occurred that is sure of a place in our history books. This was the first free launching of a Minuteman missile. The launching was a spectacular success. I think that here the Minuteman program deserves a little discussion.

The Minuteman is an intercontinental ballistic missile propelled by solid fuel. It is capable of instant readiness and does not require the maze of complicated equipment that is necessary with its predecessors.

The Minuteman also has the advantage of economy; it costs 75 percent less than the ICBM's that came before it. It can be placed in hardened sites underground or deployed around the Nation's railway network on missile trains. And it will be ready to go if and when the alarm sounds. The Minuteman is a most significant addition to our aerospace capability, our power to deter war or to win war should it be forced upon us.

I would like at this point to discuss briefly the Air Force ballistic missile program. Development of the intercontintental range Atlas, Titan and Minuteman and the intermediate range Thor called for the greatest marshalling of men, money, materials, and scientific endeavor in the history of our Nation.

A fact that many do not realize is that the larger proportion of the national investment and effort in these programs is not in the missiles themselves, but in the ground environment—the construction of sites as well as the maintenance and test equipment which support the missiles.

Incidentally, the job of managing the activation of missile sites happens to be the responsibility of the Air Materiel Command. I am happy to report that a great deal of progress is being made.

These sites involve an enormous construction job. It is estimated that currently approved programs will use enough structural steel to build 26 Empire State buildings; enough concrete for seven Pentagons; enough air conditioning for 29,000 six-room homes; enough paving material for 400 miles of two-lane highways; and enough power to supply a city of 250,000 people.

Progress in the development of unmanned vehicles such as ballistic missiles and earth satellites has been great; but we should not overlook the significant advances being made also in manned aircraft. Performance which literally will take man out of this world has been made possible by greatly increased thrust, improved metals and new techniques in airplane design and construction.

A striking example is the X-15 research rocketcraft, which on the 7th day of this month attained a speed of 2,275 miles an hour. Last year it reached an altitude of more than 25 miles. This is faster and higher than man has ever gone before in controlled flight.

The X-15 is not intended to achieve space orbit, but the program has produced a vast amount of useful data, qualifying it as a significant step toward manned space operations. The next step, the first Air Force development program aimed directly at a manned space system, is the Dyna-Soar.

Eventually, if we are successful, the Dyna-Soar will be fired over the Atlantic from Florida to land in California, covering a distance of 22,000 miles in some 90 minutes. It will also have the capability to go into orbit and to return.

The advantages of manned aircraft and missiles will be combined for the first time in the Dyna-Soar. It will make use of the boost-glide principle, attaining its initial high speeds and altitudes from a large rocket booster. Then, operating on aerodynamic principles, the pilot will control it to a normal landing at a speed less than that of some of our current combat aircraft.

And speaking of combat aircraft, the Air Force is working on the next big advance in this field—the B-70—which we consider an essential rung in the ladder to the future. This aircraft will have a normal cruise speed of three times the speed of sound—about 2,000 miles an hour.

Such a speed is hard to comprehend; it is just a number until translated. An Air Force project officer in the B-70 program recently translated it something like this:

He prepared a flight plan for a hypothetical B-70 bomber and crew returning from London to their home base at March Air Force Base in California. The plan called for takeoff at London at 7:30 a.m. At that hour, the sun would be about 20° above the horizon. The bomber climbs to cruising altitude, which changes the sky picture. The horizon drops away and the sun appears to climb rapidly to the zenith.

But here a strange thing happens—relative to the aircraft, the sun stands still, and then begins to set. If the crew looks backward as they fly their great circle route, they witness the amazing spectacle of the sun setting in the east. Four hours after takeoff the B-70 touches down at March Air Force Base. After debriefing and another breakfast, each crew member arrives home in ample time to enjoy the second sunrise of that day with his family. The time of the flight is 4 hours; the time of the sun's transit is 8 hours.

Perhaps at this point you are thinking that we really don't need the B-70, now that we have intercontinental and intermediate range ballistic missiles. Maybe missiles can do it all and this is an attractive thought if you're not too interested in the facts. But the fact is that machines do not fight wars.

Wars are fought by men using machines; and the application of human intelligence will always be necessary in combat. We must have systems with men in them for what pilots call "eyeball contact." Only human intelligence can find hardened and concealed targets or find and destroy mobile forces that can be used against us. Manned aircraft will have its place in aerospace military operations, I think, for a long time to come.

When, more than 3 years ago, the Russians launched the first earth satellite, Sputnik I, the propaganda effect was terrific. The United States, so it was said, had suddenly become a second rate power; the Russians had taken the lead in science. The picture has changed since then—or, rather, it has come into better perspective.

Let's look at the record. The Russians launched the first satellite, but since that event the United States has launched many more than they have and we have a long lead in the number of satellites still in orbit.

And there is more to this than superiority in numbers. Our satellites are more varied in scope, have longer lives, and more importantly, send back critical information.

We have learned the most about conditions in space—cosmic radiation, cloud formations, the earth's shape and heat balance. We are the first to experiment with the use of space for weather forecasting, global communications and precise marine navigation.

Following a somewhat limited path of scientific investigation, the Russians developed a big booster quite early. This gave them a leg up and they have exploited it to the utmost. Their ability to launch heavier payloads has given them an edge in so-called spectaculars, the more dramatic exploits.

Please do not misunderstand me. I am not trying to discount or belittle the Russians' space achievements. For example, there is their recent firing of a space vehicle from an orbiting sputnik with Venus as its goal. This accomplishment certainly has the utmost scientific significance.

It is easy to understand the importance to scientific progress of the knowledge we are gaining from our ventures into space. But some may wonder about the military application. How can earth satellites add to our own military capability?

Let me give you a somewhat simplified answer. By our policy and by our historic record, we are a nonaggressor nation. We have no intention of making use of the ancient art of leaping upon an enemy from ambush. Our Communist adversaries aren't bothered by any such scruples. And they know quite well the advantage that surprise gives to an aggressor.

Consequently, we have the problem—which the Communists do not have—of finding and using every means available to obtain the earliest possible warning of an attack. We must speed up our decision-making and command procedures. We must secure our own counterforce systems against destruction and be able to launch them without delay. Timing is all important.

Satellite systems are capable of giving us the immediate warning and the rapid communications needed. By stationing these sentinels in space—the natural environment of missiles—we can attain the speed, range and freedom of action which are characteristic of the weapons that may be sent to destroy us.

The Air Force is already well advanced in this program. There are, for example, the Midas satellites which are being developed to constitute an early warning system. The name comes from the initial letters of Missile Detection Alarm System. Circling the globe at great height, Midas would detect flights of hostile ICBM's shortly after launching. Thus, we would have up to the maximum of about a half an hour to prepare for the attack.

The Air Force placed the first experimental Midas satellite into orbit in May of last year. As the system is perfected, others will go into orbit in the months ahead.

The subject of space exploration and investigation is one about which many volumes can be—and have been—written. I have tried merely to give you a broad outline of what the Air Force is doing in this field and why. The significance of these efforts from the standpoint of our security cannot be overemphasized.

At the beginning of these remarks, I made the statement that the most important enterprise of our time is the preservation of our way of life by the deterrence of war. A most vital part of war deterrence is the aerospace capability the Air Force has built—is maintaining—and will continue to build.

In his inaugural address, President Kennedy said, and I quote: "Only when our arms are sufficient beyond doubt can we be certain beyond doubt that they will never be employed."

The President repeated that statement in his state of the Union address, in which he also asserted, and I quote: "* * * If we are to keep the peace, we need an invulnerable missile force powerful enough to deter any

aggressor from even threatening an attack that he would know could not destroy enough of our forces to prevent his own destruction."

Thus, the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces has made it clear that we must possess a true deterrent to war.

It happens that "deterrence" is a word about which there is a great deal of misunderstanding.

However, it is a term whose interpretation by the Air Force should be understood by every American. It should be understood that to possess a true deterrent we must have the ability and the will to prevail.

Some may wonder why I emphasize the world prevail. If deterrence succeeds and there is no war, why do we need the strength to win?

The true meaning of deterrence gives the answer. Deterrence is the effect produced in the minds of potential enemies when they understand the enormous striking power of our military forces and when they understand that it is our national will and intention to use this striking force swiftly and decisively if the need should arise.

The conclusion is obvious: power that cannot prevail will not deter. The Air Force concept is that a true deterrent requires forces capable of destroying an aggressor's military power to the point that he no longer has the ability to wage war.

This is what is meant by "counterforce"—a force that can win. The purpose of military power remains what it has always been—to destroy the military power of the enemy if that becomes necessary.

There are some who contend that a lessening of our defenses would be viewed as a good-will gesture, a sort of proof of America's desire for peace. I think they are mistaken. One of the hard lessons that history teaches is this: peace must be enforced; and weakness never enforced anything.

There is another hard lesson that history teaches and I would like to leave this with you as a closing thought. It is also a lesson in irony and comes in two parts. First, whenever a nation values anything more than its freedom, it will lose its freedom. The second and ironical part of the lesson is this: if it is comfort and money that the Nation values more than its freedom, it will lose them also.

President's Podium: To the Student Body of Compton High School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I call to your attention and the attention of all of my distinguished colleagues the following article which appeared in the Compton Chimes for February 10, 1961, this being the official publication of the students of Compton High School, which splendid high school is located in Compton, Los Angeles County, which is in the great 23d Congressional District which I represent. This article is written by the associated student body president, Wilbert Wade, and I am sure that all who read it will be inspired. The article follows:

PRESIDENT'S PODIUM: TO THE STUDENT BODY OF COMPTON HIGH SCHOOL

(By Wilbert Wade)

Today I am starting out on my long journey as your student body president. This journey will not be as easy as we would think. But I knew this before I ran for this highest of honors which was given to me by you, the student body.

This will not be a lonesome journey because I have all of you to walk it with me. With your cooperation we can go on to greater heights together. To do this we must work together and not against one another. Cooperate and this will be the most historical, outstanding and rewarding semester in the history of Compton High School.

We have what it takes to make our school a workshop of democracy. I want you to understand that I am not trying to wave the flag in your face, but we all have our responsibility to our school and Nation.

We are in grave times, whether we want to accept it or not. What we do in high school will determine whether there will be a United States for our children to live in. We are not too young to start thinking about this. If we want our country and our posterity to survive, we must start applying ourselves to the task.

We are born in a world of blood, sweat and tears. We must not let the efforts of our parents be in vain. Too many have died so that our generation might live under a free democracy for us to fail.

Let's do our school work and support every activity. I'm not perfect myself and I have resolved to do my part too. If I can do it, certainly you can. The days of the "goof off" are over. Let's shed our blood, sweat and tears (participation, responsibility and cooperation), to finish this journey together.

Congressman Kirwan's St. Patrick's Day Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, one of the gaiest and outstanding social fetes held in Washington during the congressional session is the annual tribute to the Irish under the auspices of our beloved colleagues, the gentleman from Ohio, the Honorable MICHAEL J. KIRWAN.

The congressional St. Patrick's Day party was held last week at the National Press Club and I am sure my colleagues will enjoy reading the following account of the event, written by the correspondent of the Baltimore Sun for last Sunday's editions:

THAT'S WASHINGTON

WASHINGTON.—Representative MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Democrat, of Ohio, threw his annual St. Paddy's Day stag soiree at the National Press Club Wednesday night. The honored guest was President Kennedy, whose ties with the Old Sod are only three generations and 3,000 miles removed.

It may be said on no great authority that KIRWAN'S party had all the earmarks of a good old Irish bash. The band was loud and brassy, and the participants and the room were filled to overflowing.

AT BALCONY TABLE

It was so full, in fact, that they put the President at a table on a balcony overlooking the dance floor and stage where the latterday Irish thrush, Carmel Quinn, regaled one and all with the likes of "Mick McGilligan's Ball," and "Danny Boy."

Mr. Kennedy told Miss Quinn that "Danny Boy" is his favorite Irish song. It is also the theme song of that Armenian comedian Danny Thomas.

Some of the words to "Mick McGilligan's, etc." seemed downright apt in view of the number of "Irish" jammed into the Press Club ballroom. Part of it goes, "And they had to peel the paper off the wall" to get all the Irishmen into Mick McGilligan's ball. Unqualified experts estimated the crowd at between 400 and 500. It might have been.

The President strode into the ballroom to be confronted by an old friend, House Speaker RAYBURN.

"Good evening, Mr. O'Kennedy," he said. My name is O'Rayburn."

With that cordial beginning, Mr. Kennedy made his way through the crowd shaking hands like the election was yet to come. He stayed about half an hour, leaving his seat while Miss Quinn was still ringing the rafters with raucous and sentimental Irish ballads. Ah, 'twas a grand night, as the program said, "we have come a long way in the span of a single lifetime."

The KIRWAN affair is an annual event held by Members of Congress and their guests. Mr. Kennedy was described to the partygoers as an "Irishman of note." But unlike the other Irishmen gathered there, he refused to don the green paper hat, though he did stick a proffered green carnation in his lapel.

Hanging over the entry was the traditional sign in Gaelic: Cead mile failte—"a hundred thousand welcomes."

KIRWAN started giving these parties 8 years ago. The first was for a group of about 15 people. This one, he declared happily, "got way out of bound."

French Government Honors New Jersey Merchant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, one of the leading merchants in the New York metropolitan area is Frank W. Packard, who heads the Packard-Bamberger retail complex in northern New Jersey. It has been a privilege to have him as my personal friend for many years.

During his career, Mr. Packard has established a wide reputation for originality, competence, and great success in retailing. Some years ago, he began merchandising French wines in New Jersey in a modest way, based on the quality of the wines he offered.

At the present time, through his eleven Packard-Bamberger liquor stores, more than $5 million worth of French wines are sold annually. As a result of this amazing achievement, the French Government recently awarded him the Ordre du Merite Agricole at a very impressive ceremony here in Washington.

Recognition such as this to an outstanding American businessman is very helpful in furthering international goodwill, both abroad and here at home. The Newark Evening News of February

17 has a brief description of the award presentation to my good friend, Frank Packard. Under unanimous consent, I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

FRENCH HONOR FOR NEW JERSEY WINE MERCHANT

WASHINGTON.—The French, as everyone knows, regard wine as a dietary staple. So does Frank W. Packard, of New York and Hackensack, and as a result he wears today the Ordre du Merite Agricole of the French Government.

"You all know the importance we French attach to the fermented juice of the grape," said Olivier Manet, counselor of the French Embassy here in presenting the medal.

"We regard it with a reverence that approaches veneration."

Then he told why Packard, who sells $5 million worth of French wines annually in his 11 Packard Bamberger liquor stores in northern New Jersey, was getting the medal.

Because Packard introduced French wines to New Jersey 25 years ago; because of the work he did during World War II in the distribution of military rations to Europe and to Africa; because he was a friend to France whose work had benefited French winegrowers and the French economy.

Packard, who is in his fifties, said he was very humble in accepting the award, the only way he could express his great love for France, he said, was to quote the English poet who stood on the shores of Calais and expressed the lines that begin:

"Dearest ally, let us be true to one another * * *."

According to French authorities present at the award luncheon yesterday at the Fairfax Hotel, the Ordre du Merite Agricole is not commonly awarded to other than French agriculturists. It is given to people who have done much for French agriculture—"anything to do with the soil, or the products of the soil."

After the medal presentation, the small party repaired to a luncheon—four courses and four wines.

Teaching Slovak in Our Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM W. SCRANTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. SCRANTON. Mr. Speaker, part of the recent general increase in interest in education has been reflected in growing concern over the teaching of foreign languages. One of my constituents, Mr. William D. Gombar, Throop, Pa., presently connected with the Pennsylvania Department of Public Instruction as a secondary education specialist and world cultures consultant, has written an article which presents a new viewpoint on foreign language instruction which is worthy of consideration wherever it applies in the United States.

This article appeared in the Slovak Catholic Sokol, Passaic, N.J., the Slovenska Obrana, Scranton, Pa., and other Slovak newspapers and publications across the country, as follows:

EDUCATOR ADVOCATES STUDY OF SLOVAK IN HIGH SCHOOLS

(By William D. Gombar)

"Each school system may determine the number of class hours, the number of years, as well as the language or languages to be included in the curriculum." This extract comes from the graduation requirements as outlined in the official school code in Pennsylvania.

The chief purpose of studying a foreign language is the mastery of the language as a means of communication. In the past our traditional language courses—French and Spanish—have proved in many cases to be sterile. The grammar approach, if it didn't sour a majority of students on the language and those it represented, produced very little in the way of communication skill. Wasted motion, misspent time and money were the products of the foreign language offerings in many of our high schools.

Now with the modern foreign language lab replacing the old-fashioned way of language learning, competency in a language is being reached. And with World Cultures, a mandated Pennsylvania course with its implication of insight into the people, their beliefs, traditions, and aspirations, we should reevaluate the language situation in our high schools and in addition seriously consider the objectives inherent in the World Cultures mission.

The Slovaks have a heritage of which the present generation has been unfortunately deprived. A generation ago the picture was different. There was a greater awareness of and a deeper respect for the enviable culture from which our parents developed. This was manifested in the activities in the family, in the church, in the community, indeed in the state that fired the spirit of Slovaks all over. It was manifested in the sound of the language.

Today this is lost. Today our young generation knows very little of the language of their parents. This tool of communication, that helps one understand a culture more thoroughly, has been denied the Slovak-American youth. When you recall that our forefathers suffered and shed blood for principles that included, most emphatically, a recognition of the Slovak language, then we must face the fact we owe our martyr ancestors a lot more than we're giving them. For generations the Slovaks have fought for the right to keep the language alive, to sustain the language by various means including instituting its study in the schools of their country, establishing chairs in Slovak at universities. These were inherent rights petitioned for by our ancestors as far back as 100 years ago and for which they were willing to lay down their lives.

They subjected themselves to intolerable abuses, political humiliation, perpetual depression because they believed, among other things, their mother tongue should be recognized, should be used. The denial of those rights and the futility of the plight during the 50 years that preceded World War I, sent nearly ¾ of a million emigrants to the United States, emigrants whose offspring today are inhabiting our public and private schools. These public schools have the legal right to offer Slovak as a course of study. We have denied our young people this right because we are willing to deny the Slovaks their rightful cultural heritage. We've let down a whole generation.

School districts abide by the will of the public that supports them. A public that has an opportunity to institute the study of a modern foreign language for communication skills and for understanding the culture of a peoples must take advantage of that opportunity. Not doing so implies a disregard for the responsibilities of adulthood and parenthood. We owe this generation the inheritance that is rightfully theirs.

Communities in Pennsylvania where Slovaks are living should petition the authorities. Learning competency in a language pays dividends a hundredfold. If the traditional Spanish or French has little meaning in the school system, then other languages approved by the legal code of the State should be considered, adopted, and taught. Slovak is among these.

Statement by Arthur S. Flemming Before the Subcommittee on General Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, Tuesday, March 21, 1961, 10 a.m.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD a statement by former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Arthur S. Flemming before the Subcommittee on General Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Tuesday, March 21, 1961:

STATEMENT BY ARTHUR S. FLEMMING BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON GENERAL EDUCATION, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, TUESDAY, MARCH 21, 1961, 10 A.M.

Just prior to leaving the position of Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, I released a study prepared at my request by the Office of Education entitled, "Ten Year Aims in Education—Staffing and Constructing Public Elementary and Secondary Schools."

This study identified the following two objectives:

1. To have a professionally qualified and competent teacher in each classroom in America's public elementary and secondary schools—(a) by providing staff salaries that are competitive with those in other occupations requiring equivalent training and experience, and (b) by significantly improving selection procedures and preservice and in-service programs in teacher education.

2. To complete a construction program during the 5 school years after 1958–59 that will supply satisfactory schoolhousing for every public schoolchild by the fall of 1964; and a construction program during the second 5 years of the 10-year period through 1968–69 that will maintain the status of a satisfactory classroom for every child.

In order to achieve these 10-year objectives, the study stated that the following action would be required:

1. To provide teaching staff salaries in keeping with these aims will require, by 1963–64, average salaries 50 percent higher in purchasing power than those prevailing in 1958–59. To preserve this level of achievement for the remainder of the decade (1959–60 through 1968–69) will call for further upward adjustment of instructional salaries over the second 5 years, as necessary to maintain the new comparative position of

teaching among other competing occupations—an increase which, on the basis of present projections, may be tentatively assumed to be 2 percent per year. In some communities the salary levels need to be doubled or more than doubled by 1963–64, while a great many other school districts will need to effect increases of lesser magnitude.

The increase, in terms of the resultant national average salary level, is roughly equivalent to compressing into a 5-year period the amount of salary increase which would be achieved in 12 years according to the present trend. If instructional salaries were maintained at their 1958–59 level over the 10-year period, the total cost would be $82.6 billion. But with the salary increases proposed the 10-year cost would be $120.5 billion. Thus the increases over the period would total $37.9 billion, and the average annual cost of the salary increase would be $3.8 billion.

The task of accelerating the improvement in teacher selection, preparation, and in-service education that must accompany the salary increase if the staffing aim is to be achieved is primarily one of leadership in mobilizing resources, developing constructive public concern, and expanding cooperative professional action at the occupational level. Although the challenge is not, therefore, chiefly a financial one, it will call for outlays which are considerable, though not of the magnitude of the salary aim. It may be ventured that an expenditure of $1 billion over the 10-year period will be required on the part of the many institutions, professional groups, and governmental and other agencies to be included in this crucial partnership.

2. To achieve the stated aim for school facilities will require construction of an estimated 607,600 classrooms during the decade 1959–60 through 1968–69; 416,600 of these are required during the first 5 years, 1959–60 through 1963–64. The total capital outlay expenditure required to build these classrooms may be estimated at $25.5 billion in dollars of 1959 purchasing power. Capital outlay expenditures for schools are traditionally financed by issuing long-term obligations. If these same methods are used to finance the schools needed in the decade ahead, the total revenue that must be raised to provide these schools and to service the debt already existing may be estimated at $26.8 billion over the decade. Of this $26.8 billion, about one-half is needed for debt service on classrooms that had been constructed by 1958–59.

These conclusions were arrived at with the assistance of educational leaders representing all levels of public education and were subsequently discussed with representatives of national educational and community organizations in conference or by letter.

I believe that these conclusions constitute the best presentation to date of the magnitude of the task that confronts our Nation in the public elementary and secondary educational fields. They are not the last word on the nature and size of the task that lies ahead. They do, however, constitute a sound professional appraisal of that task.

It is clear from this appraisal that Government at all levels is going to find it necessary to obtain—over a 10-year period—at least $50 billion more in revenues for public elementary and secondary schools than is now available. I arrive at this figure by adding to the additional $37.9 billion that will be needed for teachers' salaries the $13.4 billion that will be needed for debt service on the classrooms that must be added to those constructed through the year 1958–59.

Our Nation must obtain—over this 10-year period—this additional $50 billion, or an average of $5 billion per year, over and above what we are now spending for public elementary and secondary education. In order to obtain it taxpayers, at all levels of Government, are going to be called upon to make genuine sacrifices. These sacrifices must be made, however, if our Nation is going to remain true to one of its most solemn commitments, namely, to provide every young person with the opportunity for a superior—not a mediocre—elementary and secondary education in public schools. As has always been the case, not all young people will take advantage of the opportunity. Some will attend private schools. But for those who take advantage of the opportunity, the commitment must be kept.

With this as background, it is my purpose first of all this morning to address myself to the issue of whether, in addition to providing Federal assistance to public elementary and secondary schools, we should also provide Federal assistance to private elementary and secondary schools. In doing so I will also consider the issue of whether we should provide Federal assistance to both public and private colleges and universities.

In considering these issues I believe it is important to recognize that, up to now, the Nation has followed one policy in the field of elementary and secondary education, and an entirely different policy in the field of higher education.

In the field of elementary and secondary education, as above noted, the Nation has been committed to a policy of providing our young people with the opportunity for a public elementary and secondary education. In harmony with this commitment we have used, with a few minor exceptions, our public funds to strengthen public elementary and secondary education.

In the field of higher education we have been committed to a policy of maintaining a dual system of both private and public colleges and universities. In harmony with this commitment whenever the Federal Government has made funds available in the field of higher education, it has made the assistance available to both public and private colleges.

I believe that at this point in the development of our total system of education we should continue to follow these two different policies.

Here are my reasons for believing that we should not depart from our present policy in the field of elementary and secondary education:

1. We must live up to our commitment to provide our young people with the opportunity for a superior—not a mediocre—public elementary and secondary education.

2. In order to live up to this commitment we must obtain over a period of the next 10 years at least $50 billion in additional revenues from taxpayers at all levels of government.

3. There is no question but that a substantial portion of the $50 billion must come from the Federal Government.

4. Until the Federal Government has played its part in underwriting the policy of providing our young people with the opportunity for a superior elementary and secondary education, it should continue to adhere to the policy of restricting its financial grants to the public schools. Any other policy would constitute a breach of faith with the young people of the Nation.

Here are my reasons for believing that we should not depart from our present policy in the field of higher education:

1. The Nation has never made a commitment in the field of higher education to provide all young people with the opportunity of attending a public college or university. As a result public colleges and universities do not have a prior and overriding claim on Federal funds.

2. Any deviation from the policy of providing Federal assistance to both private and public colleges and universities would seriously undermine our system of higher education, would impair our ability to meet the manpower demands of the future, and would, as a result, pose a substantial threat to the welfare and security of the Nation.

In summary:

1. I believe that continuing to restrict Federal grants to public elementary and secondary schools is in accordance with sound public policy. Any other policy would seriously impair the Nation's ability to fulfill its commitment to provide our young people with the opportunity of obtaining a superior elementary and secondary education in public schools.

2. I believe that continuing to make Federal grants available to both private and public colleges and universities is in accordance with sound public policy. Any policy that fails to recognize our commitment as a nation to the maintenance of a dual system of public and private colleges would make it impossible to meet the manpower requirements of the future and would seriously undermine, therefore, our welfare and security.

It is in the light of these beliefs that I would like now to discuss the two issues pending before this subcommittee, namely, whether Federal loans should be made available to private elementary and secondary schools, and whether Federal aid should be granted to public elementary and secondary schools in the manner proposed by the administration.

It is clear that it would not constitute sound public policy to operate a Federal loan program for private elementary and secondary schools in such a manner, for example, that the Federal Government would be borrowing money at a higher rate of interest than it could charge the private schools to which it made loans. Such a program would in reality be a program of Federal grants to private schools.

On the other hand, a program of Federal loans to private schools under which the Federal Government received interest payments at least comparable to the interest it paid in connection with its own borrowing operations and, at the same time, was compensated for all expenses incurred in connection with the program would not be in conflict with the policy of restricting Federal grants to public elementary and secondary schools.

I believe, therefore, that it would be wise for the Congress to give careful consideration to the possibility of inaugurating a genuine loan program. In doing so, the Congress will have available the experiences that the Office of Education has had in administering a comparable provision under title III of the National Defense Education Act—the title dealing with the purchase of equipment for the teaching of science, mathematics, and the languages. As far as I was able to observe during the time I served as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the administration of this provision did not give rise to any serious policy issues, particularly issues involving the traditional separation between church and state in this Nation.

It is true that a rather small percentage of the funds made available for loan purposes has been used up to the present time. The Congress will undoubtedly want to obtain testimony on this point from representatives of potential borrowers.

It is true also that some have questioned the constitutionality of such a program. I would hope, therefore, if such a program should be enacted that the law would be drafted in such a manner as to permit a prompt consideration of its constitutionality in the Federal courts.

I will not presume to make recommendations as to whether the issue of establishing a Federal loan program for private schools should be considered in a bill making grants to public schools or should be considered

separately. I do, however, want to state my conviction that whatever procedure will insure favorable and expeditious action on a program of Federal grants to public schools is the one that should be followed.

It is in light of this same conviction relative to the necessity for action in the area of Federal aid to public elementary and secondary schools that I now desire to comment on the proposals for strengthening elementary and secondary public education that have been placed before you by President Kennedy and Secretary Ribicoff.

I concur in the recommendation that Federal grants should be made to the States of approximately $2.3 billion for their public elementary and secondary schools.

I do not concur, however, in the recommendation that the grants should be available for use by the States for both school construction and teachers' salaries.

Rather I believe that the Federal funds should be earmarked for servicing debts already incurred for school construction, for servicing debts that may be incurred for new construction, and for the construction of new buildings on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Here are my reasons for this recommendation:

1. It would release funds for urgent increases in teachers' pay by taking up a substantial share of the heavy burden of construction costs.

I am convinced that it would make a substantial contribution in the direction of achieving the objectives in the areas of teachers' salaries that I discussed at the beginning of my testimony.

2. It would help materially in closing the gap between the existing number of classrooms and the number that will be required in the years that lie immediately ahead.

3. It would make possible the introduction of a requirement that the States must match the Federal funds that would be made available on a 50–50 basis.

This in turn will insure making available State funds in amounts comparable to the Federal funds thus expediting the action that must take place in the areas of teachers' salaries and classroom construction if our system of elementary and secondary education is to be strengthened.

4. It would attract the support of those citizens who are genuinely fearful of the Federal Government making grants that become a part of current operating budgets at the local school district level.

Some argue that there is no basis for such fears. The fact remains that they exist. There are many persons who will support a school construction program but who will not support a program that also calls for Federal grants for current operating budgets even though these grants are to be used for such a desirable objective as teachers' salaries. They believe that such grants afford too great a temptation for Federal controls.

It is difficult for me to express adequately in words my own convictions that nothing must be permitted to stand in the way of action in this area of Federal assistance to public elementary and secondary education. It is long overdue. It would be tragic if another session of Congress adjourned without significant steps having been taken in the direction of providing public elementary and secondary education with the financial underpinning that the Federal Government alone can provide.

I am confident that the representatives of some of the Nation's private schools that have appeared before this subcommittee recognize and respect the commitment that the Nation has made to provide our young people with the opportunity for a superior public elementary and secondary education. They know that additional resources are required in order to make it possible for the Nation to fulfill this commitment. They know that a substantial portion of these resources must come from the Federal Government. I believe, therefore, that because of their dedication to the task of making and keeping America strong, they will help to make it possible for our public elementary and secondary schools to receive financial help from the Federal Government.

I am also confident that the Congress will take steps to insure that the proposal advanced by these same representatives of some of the Nation's private schools for a Federal loan program for private elementary and secondary schools is given careful and thoughtful consideration.

Likewise, I am confident that some who believe that Federal grants should be available for use by the States for both school construction and teachers' salaries will yield on the question of teachers' salaries, knowing that by so doing they will help to insure favorable action and, at the same time, will be putting local school districts in a far more favorable position to increase teachers' salaries than will be the case if once again Congress fails to provide any Federal help to public elementary and secondary schools.

In brief, I am confident that we are going to close ranks and take action designed to strengthen the welfare and security of our Nation.

Tax Reform Is a Must

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the need for tax reform in this country was never more urgent than it is today. The present hodgepodge system of patchwork in our tax concepts, filled with loopholes and contradictions, must be repaired.

Joseph A. Pechman, Brookings Institution economist, told the House Ways and Means Committee back in 1959 that "if all the eroding features of the tax law had been eliminated, the tax base would have been $59 billion larger than it actually was in 1957, and the revenues that were collected on 1957 incomes could have been raised with rates that were one-third lower in every taxable income bracket."

President Kennedy has pointed to the imperative need for tax reform. That need was recognized by former President Eisenhower. It was repeatedly referred to during the last presidential campaign. The necessity being self-evident, it is up to the Congress to do something about it.

Many proposals have been offered. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER] have both introduced tax reform bills. They did so in the last Congress. Other Members have done likewise. In 1959 I introduced a companion bill, H.R. 4584. This year I have reintroduced that bill as H.R. 5529. These bills, I am sure, are not foolproof but they are steps in the right direction. They propose positive relief from unrealistic rates and they contain the elements of incentive-producing reforms.

Our system is so out of kelter with realities that it has been cited by Soviet Premier Khrushchev as evidence that we fail to use incentives to increase production to the extent that they are used in Soviet Russia. I would not concede that, but it does give us something to think about.

There are other areas of needed tax reform, including effective taxation of cooperatives and mutual finance companies to insure more substantial equity with ordinary taxable enterprise. Something needs to be done in the field of estate taxation to remove the present inducement to leave property in trust extending over many years, together with a reduction in rates. And there are loopholes that need to be closed.

PENDING BILLS

Under the pending reform bills to which I have referred, over a 5-year period individual rates would be compressed downward with reductions of over 50 percent in the middle brackets and the top rate coming down from 91 to 47 percent to coincide with the new top rate of corporate tax under the legislation. The first-bracket rate, applied to the lower income people, would be reduced from 20 to 15 percent, giving all individual taxpayers a minimum tax reduction of 25 percent.

This proposal has received substantial support from all over the country. It is not just a tax relief bill. It has a goal to achieve—that of permitting the more rapid accumulation of new capital out of current income, and moderating the tax destruction of capital already accumulated. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. WILBUR MILLS, has been quoted as saying: "Taxes are too high, and at present rates have a strong tendency to blunt incentives and stifle economic growth."

We hear a lot these days of the New Frontier and the need to encourage economic growth. It is said we are suffering from economic roadblocks that strifle and retard our capabilities. If so, then let us treat the disease and not the symptoms. It is believed that the pending legislation would undoubtedly bring about the achievement of higher economic growth, improvements of jobs and creation of better jobs. This will encourage new businesses to start. It will help control inflation through greater production and productivity. It will serve to strengthen our economic system and our position of leadership, prestige, and influence in the free world.

In fact, at this time when our foreign trade balance is unfavorable, when we are finding it increasingly difficult to compete in the world markets in areas which we have dominated for generations, it becomes increasingly necessary that we get our economic house in better order. And a genuine reform of our income tax structure is, in my judgment, a prime requirement.

WOULD BENEFIT LOW INCOME GROUP

From the standpoint of our own citizens, those now in the lower income levels have perhaps the most to gain from increase in the flow of capital into the expansion of industry and the resultant

improvement of old jobs and creation of better jobs.

I am convinced that under the present law income taxe rates climb too steeply and are much too high for the good of our economy and the well-being of our citizens.

Moreover, the proposed reform will inevitably pave the way to greater and more consistent reduction in the Federal debt. And it can be expected to ease the pressures that cause inflation. The inflation of this era essentially reflects a greater demand from all sources for the combined product of economic activity than can be provided by capital formation under present tax rates. The constant upward pressure on interest rates which we have witnessed in recent years is simply a reflection of the inadequacy of new savings to do all of the things which all of our citizens want done to enhance their economic well-being. Stated differently, a greater rate of new savings is the only route to greater rates of increased production and productivity, which in turn are the means to better satisfaction of competing demands on the economy while dampening inflationary pressures. This is the view of competent economists.

After all, the bulk of income taxes in this country are paid by the great middle class who earn from $4,000 to $25,000 a year. And the tax burden is very heavy for many of them to carry. A family man earning $4,500 a year now works 22 days a month, on an average. Taxes, visible and invisible, take one-third of what he produces. Of course, every citizen has an obligation to contribute his own fair share to pay for the legitimate functions of Government. But when it goes beyond the range of being a fair share, that taxpayer finds his money which he earned being used by others who do not earn it.

It must have been that thought which prompted the late Senator Bob Taft to say: "You can socialize just as well by a steady increase in the burden of taxation beyond the 30 percent we have already reached as you can by Government seizure. The very imposition of heavy taxes is a limit on a man's freedom."

Let us hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress will face up to this problem. Just doing something about exemptions will not suffice. Doing something about loopholes, although important, will not suffice. The entire structure must be overhauled. There must be an increase in depreciation—tailored to those industries considered essential to national survival. They must be able to modernize their equipment. It is said that one-third of the Nation's plant and equipment is obsolete. Some $6 to $8 billion is drained off each year from industry which is actually needed for survival and to make the Nation grow.

As one man put it—taking this money is like harvesting corn or wheat before it is mature.

Industry should be able to deduct for basic research. Incentive capital should not be siphoned off by taxation. Such capital could be made to earn more revenue for the country than it provides in taxes, if it is invested in growth under favorable conditions.

TAX REDUCTION CALLS FOR REDUCED SPENDING

Mr. Speaker, tax reform such as I have outlined will be possible only if we can reduce Federal expenditure. More than just a balanced budget is needed if this reform is to be fully meaningful. It has been said, and I think correctly, that balancing the budget at too high a level will not by itself solve our inflation problem nor our growth problem. Taxes would have to remain high to finance that budget, even though reduced taxes might result in more income. The simple fact is that it is not necessary to reduce essential spending—such as that for defense which at all costs must be maintained, water and soil conservation, flood control, veterans' benefits, and things of that kind—but it is necessary to reduce nonessential spending and waste.

In the long run we will be able to reduce the debt only if we have a flourishing and growing economy. For that purpose tax rate reform is essential and the sooner we get it the better our chances will be for sustained long-term debt reduction.

REDUCED RATES AND MORE INCOME

The fact is that every time we have reduced rates in the past our economy has been stimulated to produce more revenue than before. That was true back in the 1920's and it was true after the 1947 reduction. Take West Germany for example. In that country the economic growth has been so rapid under moderate incentive-producing tax levels, that not long ago it became necessary to raise taxes so as to apply the brakes and siphon off more of the earnings and take the edge off their boom. A year ago it was reported that investment capital gains in West Germany had increased 12 percent in 1 year.

Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that the Congress reexamine this tax problem. We are operating today with an outmoded tax philosophy. It will be recalled that the "Communist Manifesto" by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, lists the No. 2 objective of communism for overthrowing capitalism: "A heavy progressive or graduated income tax." If we are to retain the income tax system, then let us make it realistic and fair. Let us remove the inequities that restrict growth. Let us tailor our income tax structure and make it consistent with the incentives that contribute to economic growth under the free enterprise system.

The Late Honorable Walter Mann Mumma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the passing of our friend and colleague, the Honorable Walter Mann Mumma, was met with profound shock and heartfelt sympathy by all the Members of this body. His unselfish motivation, integrity of ideas and principles, and the deep sincerity with which he approached the responsibilities of this Chamber are missed by those of us who remain in this body. In all his work, Walter was a man of his word, ability, and resourcefulness, and one who always remained true to the dictates of his conscience.

As a congressional neighbor and personal friend of Mr. Mumma it was with deep regret that I heard of his untimely death. I have known Walter for many years and I know that he will be a great loss to the many constitutents, Republicans and Democrats, which he represented. I wish at this time to express my sympathy to his family and friends in Harrisburg, and hope that it may afford them some measure of solace to know that his many friends in the House of Representatives share in their sorrow.

Tribute to Robert Vahan, Editor, Armenian Mirror-Spectator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, the contributions made by Americans of Armenian origin are well know throughout the land. In a recent issue of the Hudson Gazette, of North Bergen, N.J., there appeared a tribute to Robert Vahan, editor in chief of the Armenian Mirror-Spectator of Boston, Mass.

Mr. Martin Turpanjian, president of the New Jersey League of Weekly Newspapers and publisher of the Hudson Gazette, has informed me that a plaque for distinguished service will be presented to Robert Vahan in the near future by the league. This plaque will be presented to Mr. Vahan because of the fine influence which the Armenian Mirror-Spectator exerts wherever it is circulated. It is my understanding that the Armenian Mirror-Spectator is distributed to people in many foreign countries.

In order that my colleagues may know of this fine tribute, I, under unanimous consent, place it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

Robert Vahan, editor-in-chief of the Armenian Mirror-Spectator, of Boston, has been elected an honorary member of the New Jersey League of Weekly Newspapers, Inc., it was announced last night by President M. Martin Turpanjian and Col. Mrs. Arthur A. Lyons, chairman of the board of directors, who is also the editor and publisher of Spotlight, coast-to-coast picture news weekly.

A plaque for distinguished services will be presented to Editor Bob Vahan soon. The executives of the league had glanced over hundreds of weekly and daily newspapers concerning the testimonial banquet tendered to President M. Martin Turpanjian on November 20, 1960, for having served as its

chief administrator for a period of 7 years and for being a member of the fourth estate more than 40 years. He is the editor of the Waldwick Jersey Parade and North Bergen Hudson Gazette. The article written by Bob Vahan in the Armenian Mirror-Spectator of Boston, a weekly newspaper, circulating in all parts of the world, was considered as being the best of all.

Appreciation in this age of haste and scramble has almost disappeared from our brash undisciplined civilization of the 20th century. But thank God there still remain certain personages who cling to the tradition pioneer ideals of commendable accolades that were so conspicuously glorified by the Founding Fathers in our colonial era.

And because we feel a deep religious conviction that appreciation in all its phases of commendation and its routine meritorious awards should be maintained as an integral and permanent part of our modern American society that we feel inspired to extoll and render the full measure of appraisal with its justifiable commendation to that stalwart energetic humane pioneer journalist, Robert Vahan, the dynamic editor of Armenian Mirror-Spectator of Boston.

Bob Vahan embodies in his character the precious asset of true humanitarianism. His cosmic consciousness is universal in its editorial philosophy. He is no narrow sectarian apologist. He has no clannish symptoms of self-provincialism. He accepts as his basic moral credo the Golden Rule of the Eternal Moralist of Nazareth. His editorial opinion is characterized by a sound basic sense of rationalized intelligence. He is no trite hackneyed sensational journalist. He is a stickler for the normal facts and the sheer truthful interpretation of all newspaper stories.

Bob Vahan is essentially an honest candid forthright realist. He does not slant, enlarge or distort the news to arouse and trigger by hysterical public clamor and civic anxiety. His editorial policy of the Armenian Mirror-Spectator has been consistently progressive and sagacious in its presentation of the realities of the routine incidents that embody the copy news material of his militant Armenian Mirror-Spectator. He does not stress or place an overemphasis of Armenian nationalism. He has always stressed the vital import and value of loyal Americanism.

Bob Vahan's personality is radiant with the true democratic affable characteristics that reflects an impelling magnetism. He has a warm, generous approach that is truly magnetic in its personal appeal. To know him is to admire him because he has that rare psychological mental gift to say the right thing at the right time and in the right place.

It can be truly said without profuse adulation or national bias that Bob Vahan is born with a tryst for destiny. And we take great pride in proclaiming him as the Editor of the Year.

The following represents the biography of Robert Vahan, who resides at 13 Appleton Terrace, Watertown, Mass. He was born June 28, 1921, in Constantinople. He is the son of Vahan Churgents Vahan and Minerva Eknayan Vahan. He is the husband of Maritza Bazarian Vahan. He has been editor of Armenian Mirror-Spectator of 296 Shawmut Avenue, Boston, Mass., for the past 10 years. He has attended Suffolk University and Boston University.

Work: public relations: Industrial and personal with American Taxicab Association, Bob Hope, Herminone Gingold, Irene Manning, Victor Jory, Cape Cod Conservatory, Rocky Marciano, Boys' Town, lobbying before Massachusetts Senate and U.S. regulatory agencies. Public opinion surveys.

Editorial: Publisher The Logan International weekly public service magazine at Boston's airport. General manager the Greater Boston Shopper weekly shopping newspaper.

Parent's birthplaces: Father, Kessab (now Syria) Cilicia; mother: Cairo (her parents from Tiflis and Istanbul).

Service: Combat veteran of World War II, European theater, decorated in action. Same outfit which met Russians in Leipsig area at Torgau.

Published in Boston Chamber of Commerce monthly and have been member of chamber, also member of St. James Armenian Church of Watertown, Armenian Democratic Liberal organization, National Association for Armenian Studies and Research, etc.

Have three children, two boys and a girl.

A Proposed National Highway Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. FALLON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, we in America are especially well pleased in the number of freedoms we enjoy in a world from which too many freedoms have disappeared in recent years. One of the greatest freedoms our people have is their freedom of mobility, made possible by the development of the Nation's highways.

A national system of highways in America has made it possible for us to move about with ease. Because of our highways, our people are granted greater choice in where they shall live, where they shall work, and where their businesses and industries shall be established.

Indeed, the importance of what has already been done in building the Nation's highways is readily translatable in terms of increased gross national product.

Forty-five years ago, in 1916, this Congress enacted our first Federal Aid Highway Act. Periodically we have reviewed the matter of Federal responsibility in coordinating highway construction programs across the land. As the highways made possible by the Federal-State roadbuilding partnership unfolded, linking North to South and East to West, new opportunities were brought to our people for traveling. The residents of the central portions of these United States are separated from the Atlantic or Pacific Ocean by little if any more than 2 days' travel over good highways. Only 50 years ago, their forebears lived out their lives without seeing either of these great bodies of water, because travel was too expensive or travel time too great. The Rocky Mountains, our magnificent national parks, the Grand Canyon, the Great Lakes—all the wonders of America—have all been brought closer to our families by the roads we have built.

Because of better roads, our national resources are more accessible. The output of our factories, and the products of our farms are more easily moved to the consumer, and in better condition, because of highways. Our national defense has been made more secure by the roads we already have.

But, Mr. Speaker, with all that has been done, roadbuilding has not kept up with America's needs for more and better highways. The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 provides for construction and improvements on our interstate defense highways, and roadways subsidiary to that system to meet our traffic needs 14 years from now. The benefits of the roads already built extend to all our people. The need for an orderly continuation of the road building program is urgent.

In view of the tremendous contributions good roads make to our better living standards and to the prosperity of our Nation, I propose, through the introduction of House Concurrent Resolution 198, to call the public's attention to the importance of highways through the establishment of National Highway Week this year from May 21 to May 27.

Mr. Speaker, I urge every Member of this body to support favorable action on this resolution.

Salute to National Council of Jewish Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1961

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Pittsburgh Post Gazette, March 19, 1961:

FIFTY YEARS OF SERVICE

The biennial convention of the National Council of Jewish Women in Pittsburgh, Sunday through Thursday, will salute a half century of action in behalf of social progress by the council, the oldest Jewish women's organization in the Nation.

Measures which the council has backed over the years include aid to immigrants (NCJW had its own immigrant aid station on Ellis Island, at the request of the Government, for many years), Federal regulation of child labor, adequate housing and low-income groups, food and drug regulation, uniform marriage and divorce laws, wage and hour laws, social security, antilynching and civil rights legislation.

This public affairs program is particularly notable in that it has been attempted not by a political organization, but by a service and educational organization—with political action growing out of 900-odd community service projects across the country.

As the Jewish women meet in this city, they should feel proud of the myriad projects they early championed that have proved, on fruition, of benefit to all Americans. Above all, the council has striven to encourage women to participate in challenging tasks for social betterment. What it has helped to achieve has elevated the American standard—as well as the position of the American woman.

The Nation Magazine and the Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the March 18 issue of the Nation magazine contained an editorial entitled "The Issue, Mr. Speaker," which commented on the Supreme Court decisions in the Wilkinson and the Braden cases, and on the House vote on the appropriations for the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD the text of that editorial, as well as the text of my letter to the Nation, replying to some statements contained in it. I believe that these two articles will prove of interest to the membership of this body:

[From the Nation, Mar. 18, 1961]

THE ISSUE, MR. SPEAKER

A day before the House of Representatives voted, 412 to 6, an increased appropriation for the Committee on Un-American Activities, the Supreme Court divided 5 to 4 in the Braden and Wilkinson cases. If the eloquent dissent of Justice Black had been the majority opinion, the Court would in effect have abolished the HUAC. Yet the impression prevails that since the HUAC received the nearly unanimous approval of the Congress, it must enjoy the nearly unanimous approval of the Nation. The Supreme Court is not, of course, an elected body, and divisions in it do not necessarily reflect national divisions; nevertheless, the San Francisco Chronicle hazards the opinion that this time the Court seems to mirror the split in the country.

By any reckoning, the Court's division on the issue is a more accurate mirror of national opinion than the vote in Congress. Reports from close observers confirm the view that a hundred or more votes would have been registered against the appropriation if a secret ballot had been used. It is a matter of serious concern when Members of Congress fail to vote their convictions on an issue of this importance. The remedy, of course, is for citizens who favor abolition to concentrate their attention on Congressmen who might have been expected to vote against the appropriation, but did not. "What is it about public office," inquires the Madison Capital Times, "that makes men so timid? Where were Representatives REUSS, JOHNSON and ZABLOCKI?" (liberal members of the Wisconsin delegation who failed to join their colleague, Representative ROBERT KASTENMEIER, in opposition to the appropriation). This is the right question to ask. The time has come to call the roll on those Members of Congress who, in conversation and correspondence, over teacups and cocktail glasses, agree that the HUAC should be abolished and then fail to vote their convictions. This year's best speech in the HUAC debate was delivered by Representative THOMAS ASHLEY, Democrat of Ohio:

"All of us are keenly aware that the forces of communism are unswervingly dedicated to the destruction of this and other free nations. But surely we are aware, too, that communism is not the only threat to our liberty. The individual freedoms guaranteed in the Bill of Rights can be lost or diluted through our own action or inaction, and if this is allowed to happen by our own hand, the loss of liberty is no less than if imposed by an alien adversary.

"Are we ready and willing to defend our individual freedoms in the House of Representatives as we are on the battlefield? I believe this is the issue, Mr. Speaker."

MARCH 20, 1961.

Mr. CAREY MCWILLIAMS,
Editor, the Nation,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. MCWILLIAMS: I was surprised to read your editorial of March 18, entitled "The Issue, Mr. Speaker." It is outstanding not only for its poor logic, but also for its disregard for the laws of mathematics. Inasmuch as my name appears in it, I feel compelled to comment on it.

First, the Supreme Court and the U.S. House of Representatives acted on two entirely separate and distinct issues.

To review the issues involved:

The Supreme Court, on the one hand, ruled on the issue whether Wilkinson unlawfully refused to answer a question pertinent to a matter under inquiry before a subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities. The question involved was, "Are you now a member of the Communist Party?" The majority of the Supreme Court held that the question was pertinent and that the refusal to answer it was unlawful. A similar issue was involved in the Braden case.

Teh House of Representatives, on the other hand, was deciding, in effect, whether the Committee on Un-American Activities should continue its operations within budgetary limitations recommended by the House Administration Committee. The decision was overwhelmingly in the affirmative.

In my opinion, you cannot in logic compare the two decisions, and further, as you have done in your editorial, try to infer from that comparison the public sentiment with respect to the Committee on Un-American Activities. Your conclusion is pure poppycock.

Second, in asserting that "a hundred or more" Representatives voted against their convictions in supporting the appropriation for the Committee on Un-American Activities, you have, in a reckless fashion, impugned the honesty and the motives of almost every Member of the House of Representatives. In doing this, you have resorted to the very same tactic which you find objectionable when used by others.

Third, even if your allegations were true, and if in a secret ballot a hundred or more Representatives would have voted against the appropriation of funds for the Committee on Un-American Activities, the vote in the House still would have been 3 to 1 in support of the committee' work. While the two—as I have already mentioned—are not comparable, I believe that even such a 3 to 1 House vote would indicate a more accurate mirror of national opinion than the 5 to 4 vote of the Supreme Court on the above-mentioned cases.

Fourth, since you saw fit to include my name—at leaast by placement—within the group of Congressmen who, in your opinion, failed to vote their convictions, I would like to set the record straight: I did vote my conscience and conviction and I believe that my vote is in harmony with the opinion of the majority of the people whom I have the privilege to represent.

I have, in the past, criticized some of the methods used by the Committee on Un-American Activities, and I intend to speak against any abuse of legislative power. At the same time, I believe that the committee's legislative accomplishments, and its work in exposing the methods and the true aims of the Communist movement, warrants its continuation. I intend, therefore, to continue to support the legitimate work of that committee.

Your cooperation in printing this reply will be appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
Member of Congress.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES HARVEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call to the attention of the House the following resolution by the Saginaw Board of Education of March 14, 1961, and two newspaper editorials, all touching on the subject of "Federal Aid To Education."

In particular, the Saginaw Board of Education's resolution, as so ably supported by the Saginaw News editorial, "School Board's Stand Merits Commendation," of March 16, 1961, deserves close reading.

The second editorial, "The Federal Aid Mirage," which appeared in the March 14, 1961, edition of the Owosso Argus-Press, rates equal attention.

There being no objection, the resolution and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAGINAW BOARD OF EDUCATION STATEMENT OF POSITION ON FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

To help crystallize public opinion and inform the citizens of the Saginaw School District, we, the members of the Saginaw Board of Education, wish to express our opinions concerning Federal aid to education.

We are opposed in principle to Federal aid in the field of education. We take this position because of many valid reasons, some of which are listed following:

1. This is not a new source of revenue. Any funds furnished additionally to those presently received would come at the expense of the same taxpayers who are now carrying the load, namely the citizens of this district and every other district.

2. Financial dependence on the Federal Government would weaken local control and option. We feel sure that it would eventually lead to Federal control of the educational system. Once the local control is lost, so is the flexibility and responsiveness to community desires that we now have.

3. We feel that the freedom of education is fundamental to our American way of life. If we surrender this freedom, we also surrender our freedom of choice to shape the future of our children and young adults. The way is then open for Federal regimentation of their thought, action and future. This could happen so gradually that its progress would be fairly imperceptible, but nonetheless irrevocable. Once we start down such a path, there is no return.

It is irrelevant to argue that the above would not happen. Since each generation is entrusted with the guardianship of our liberty, let us make sure that none of these things can possibly happen. Let us keep our present system. Imperfect as it may be, it is better than any other in the world, and

has brought us to our present high station among the nations of the world.

4. Federal aid to education would create a financially impossible mess. It is a pie-in-the-sky absurdly impractical Robin Hood scheme which would take money from the States (such as Michigan) which do an efficient job of educating their youngsters and give this money to those States which are too penurious or improvident to do a good job. This, claim the liberals and do-gooders, would establish equality of opportunity for all children. It would do no such thing. It would only serve to further magnify the inequities which already exist.

5. Federal aid to education would create a new bureau, and a new bureaucracy for its implementation. It would lead to a grouping of Federal "experts," the like of which we have not ever seen. Untold thousands of executives, administrators, examiners, inspectors, clerks, typists, and minor functionaries would be superimposed on our existing structures. And who would pay the bill? You and I, the taxpayer, and at the expense of education.

6. With Federal aid to education we can perceive only diminishing quality and flexibility as the Federal experts attempt to equate the needs of this community with the total concept. We can also perceive a greater burden for the taxpayer when he is forced to shoulder the burden of Federal Bureaucracy as well as the educational system he is already supporting.

The foregoing should not be interpreted to mean that all Federal aid to education is bad. Certain statistical gathering and reporting services of the U.S. Government are very worthwhile and could not be accomplished any other way.

It is when the Federal Government collects our own funds and then returns to us only a portion after deducting the expenses of administering and the shares going to States that don't raise sufficient funds themselves that we fail to see the logic of the program. Is there some magic in a Federal program that we fail to see—that we cannot accomplish ourselves otherwise? If we can send these tax dollars to Washington, then surely we can send them to Lansing or Saginaw and with greater effect. The closer to home we spend our tax dollars, the more we get for our money and the more control we have over how the money is spent. If we don't like what happens, we can change a local situation. Just try to change Washington.

This board of education has enough experience being dependent on a governmental source for funds to realize that we don't want any more of it. Roughly half of Saginaw's present school revenue comes from the State government. Each year in Michigan State aid becomes a political football and legislators try to make political hay with the education of our youngsters. Each year the situation becomes a little more complicated, a little less workable, a little more impossible.

Multiply this confusion by 50 States to get some idea of what Federal aid would bring. Imagine 50 partners with unequal interests trying to divide up the pie evenly. Such a prospect would be laughable if the consequences weren't so deadly serious.

In the final analysis the solution depends on us as citizens who will accept our responsibilities. We can have any kind of educational system that we desire without Federal aid. We need only to be wise enough, mature enough and responsible enough to realize that, one way or another, we must pay for what we get. And if we try to abdicate this responsibility of ours, we shall find out that we cannot, that the burden of payment will be imposed on us by higher authority anyway and without any hope of recourse.

To simply reject Federal aid to education is not enough. We must decide what level of educational achievement we desire, that we are willing and able to support such a program, and then follow up our decisions with appropriate action.

If the spectre of Federal aid to education does nothing but spur us on to a fuller realization and acceptance of our responsibilities as citizens, it will have served a useful purpose.

We wish to commend the people of Saginaw for their splendid support of our schools. Whenever any need has been fully demonstrated, they have risen to the occasion. We are confident that they will do so again in the future, as the need may arise.

Adopted March 14, 1961, by board of education.

SCHOOL BOARD'S STAND MERITS COMMENDATION

While Governor Swainson and State Superintendent of Public Instruction Lynn Bartlett were in Washington busily trying to paint a portrait of Michigan's solid support for the Federal aid-to-education bill, the Saginaw Board of Education was just as aggressively adopting a resolution of opposition.

The Governor and Bartlett first made the rounds of Michigan Democratic Congressmen, then put in an appearance before the House Education and Labor Committee conducting hearings on the measure. The Saginaw board communicated its resolution of opposition to Congressman JAMES HARVEY and a telegram informing the House committee that Michigan's two State officials did not speak for it.

Boards of education willing to state publicly their convictions on the issue of Federal versus State-local school aid have been conspicuous by their silence. The Saginaw board should be commended for taking a stand.

It is not the easy way and, as Board President Eugene P. Stansbury acknowledged, it could be misinterpreted as meaning that Saginaw schools do not need more money. But Mr. Stansbury touched on the very heart of the school aid issue when he said, "We may not need as much as some, but we need more than others. I have confidence the public will understand our position, and if we ever have to ask for money they will vote it."

This is putting the local school position right where it belongs—among the people of the community, to judge for themselves the need as represented by their own school board, then to decide whether or not they want it badly enough to pay for it.

The board's resolution is distinctive in still another direction. It does not stop short with mere opposition to the philosophy of Federal aid, as do many opponents of nationally centralized financing. This, it says, is not enough. "We must decide what level of educational achievement we desire, that we are willing and able to support such a program, and then follow up our decisions with appropriate action."

This constitutes both an invitation and a challenge to the community to develop the means for appropriate action. This is and always has been the other side of the coin confronting local citizens if they are to oppose successfully Federal encroachment in local affairs.

In Michigan, as in most other States, the easy appeal of Federal assistance has stemmed more from the denial of adequate taxing powers to local units of government than from any genuine belief that Federal aid is for free. The cities have turned to the Federal Government just as the schools have turned to their State governments because taxes on local property were about the only sources of revenue allowed to them. State legislatures could help local governments resist movements for Federal aid by granting broader local taxing powers.

Those who subscribe to Federal aid to education as a socially desirable means of insuring at least minimum opportunities for every child in every part of the land view arguments for local responsibility as narrow, even selfish. The answer to that is that wealthier States do contribute more in revenues to the Federal Government—and would not object to the Federal Government's granting direct assistance to any school districts suffering proven economic distress.

But States that have advanced their educational standards because of the people's enlightened desire to do so should not be herded and fleeced indiscriminately to make up for lackadaisical efforts in other States whose educational impoverishment is more of the spirit and will to do than of the pocketbook.

THE FEDERAL AID MIRAGE

Federal aid for local programs has considerable appeal to many people. They think that such Federal aid is giving help to programs of local importance and thus in some manner the people receiving such aid are saving money. Of course, that is not true but it is increasingly difficult to show the public otherwise.

The theory of Federal aid started in a small way as all such ideas start. There was need for help in certain areas to pursue some program recognized as a public necessity. So what was more natural than to first try to tap the State treasury for help and then when such burdens become hard for both State and local sources to finance, the appeal follows for Federal help.

Over the years, therefore, the Federal Government is being tapped for more and more money to turn back to States and local communities to finance various types of programs. There seems to be a feeling that money coming from either State or Federal sources means that someone else is paying the bigger part of the load.

That may be true in some sections of the Nation. But it does not hold true for Michigan. The taxpayers of this State are definitely helping to pay the load for other States when such programs of Federal aid are established. But the majority of the taxpayers either do not realize this or are mesmerized by the lure of money from Washington.

Take the argument for Federal aid for education, which is now before Congress. The increasing emphasis on the need for more educational facilities for the youth of the Nation gives impetus to programs of trying to get help from the Federal Government. The legislation now before Congress will provide Federal aid for both construction and also for the payment of teachers' salaries.

So those advocates of more education, regardless of cost, are getting vocal about this Federal aid bill for education. They are pulling out all stops in the campaign to get Congress to vote this measure. There probably will be some form of Federal aid to education passed in this session of Congress, but it can be hoped that it will be tempered.

The Federal aid provided under this bill sets up a measure of need related to local and State capacity to finance it as to the basis of the aid granted. In other words, the more prosperous States will have to pay part of their Federal taxes to help the more undeveloped sections in their educational requirements.

The State of Michigan will receive benefits of somewhat more than $17 per school pupil under this procedure. Some southern States would receive considerably more per pupil, because of the difference in financial rating. Perhaps the basis of need and financial ability must be the basis of the dividing of the levy, but the difference should be noted by the Michigan taxpayers.

Especially so since some of the States who would benefit by the proposed education levy are doing their best to wreck the economic strength of this State. It is in those States, which cannot afford to carry their educational load, that today through local and State tax and other concessions are doing all they can to attract industry from Michigan and other more prosperous areas.

Justice With Charity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks I include an interesting and informative editorial entitled "Justice With Charity," appearing in the March 10, 1961, issue of the Catholic Standard, the weekly newspaper of the Archdiocese of Washington.

JUSTICE WITH CHARITY

Is there any reason why the Washington Post cannot discuss a constitutional question, admittedly debatable, without imputing false motives to those who disagree, using smear-tactics employing inuendoes about the loyalty of Catholics to the Constitution and prejudging apodictically a specific question before it is submitted to the Supreme Court? Other newspapers can disagree with the position of Catholics and carry on a dialogue of reason, respecting the motives and rights of their opponents.

Many authorities, including professor Arthur Sutherland of Harvard University, an authority on constitutional law, support the position of Catholics, thus disproving the contention that our position is indefensible and obstructionist. We feel that the importance of a constitutional question and the demands of justice and charity, as we have said before, demand a discussion in a spirit of studious inquiry and respect for the views of others. Even a reasonable respect for freedom of expression demands such an attitude.

We also feel strongly that a constitutional question, as Federal aid to education, must consider all the amendments to the Constitution, especially the 14th as well as the 1st. The 14th amendment forbids any impairment of rights because of one's religion; the 1st amendment forbids Congress to establish a religion or to prohibit the free exercise thereof.

The judicious balancing of these provisions, which are complementary and not contradictory, is admittedly difficult. Catholics contend that by the first amendment their youth should receive equal treatment with other youthful citizens in educational benefits at the school of their choice. Catholics do not consider that such aid (by a loan or by a tuition grant) constitutes an infringement of the 1st or 14th amendments; obviously, many citizens do consider it an infringement. Wherefore the discussion.

Many opposing Federal aid to private schools quote the famous Everson case (the Washington Post quoted only the Everson case). The Everson case, which relates to both the 1st and the 14th amendments, contains a strong reason why loans with interest would be constitutional: "It is much too late to argue that legislation intended to facilitate the opportunity of children to get a secular education serves no public purpose." Catholics contend that a loan with interest for school construction (or tuition grants) certainly serves a public purpose. In fact, the only reason why public schools are constructed and conducted is that they serve a public purpose, the education of the children. Catholic schools perform the same function, with the addition of religious instruction.

The Everson case also states that "subsidies and loans to individuals" have long been commonplace practices in our national history.

Besides the Everson case, there are several well-established precedents for making loans bearing interest to private schools: loans are made for the construction of college dormitories, social centers, and related facilities; loans are made to elementary and secondary schools for securing scientific and foreign language equipment; grants are made to educational institutions to maintain a program of testing and guidance. Note that these grants and loans are made to the schools, not to the students or to their parents.

Despite all these precedents, the Post can dismiss the statement of the House majority leader that loans with interest are constitutional with this: "It is difficult to believe that he has ever read the opinions in the Everson case."

Well, fortunately the Supreme Court is still judging such matters and we believe in conducting any discussion as if that will still be the procedure.

The difference in the viewpoint toward aid to private schools—by loans bearing interest or by tuition grants—resolves itself to this: Are the private schools to be viewed as serving essentially a public purpose or just a church purpose? Catholics contend that parochial schools, all private schools, do serve a public purpose because their students receive the same education as that provided in a public school; Catholics also acknowledge that in addition, their students receive religious instruction. The opponents to aid to private schools contend that these schools serve essentially a church purpose, not a public purpose. The Supreme Court decisions acknowledge that the Catholic schools serve a public purpose but they also, naturally and necessarily, insist that no church, "religious activities or institutions" can be supported by tax moneys.

Curiously, predominantly Protestant countries, as England and The Netherlands, agree with the viewpoint of Catholics and consider Catholic schools, as other private schools, as serving a public purpose. In fact, in England and Netherlands, the government makes very large grants of money (not loans) for the construction of Catholic schools as it does for all private schools because they serve a public purpose. Despite the wave of sentiment and charity that wells up in us as the Feast of St. Patrick approaches, we cannot state that England and the Orange State are partial toward Catholics.

We realize that every country is entitled to have its own system, developed according to its constitutional history. We have always believed deeply in preserving reverence and respect for the Constitution and constitutional procedure. But the practice of other democracies which aid the public welfare should not be cavalierly disregarded. There is no grounds for dire warning of the Post that, "The only safe course is to keep Federal aid to education within the public schools." Where is the proof? There is overwhelming proof to the contrary.

May we repeat that discussion on constitutional matters should be carried out with respect for the beliefs of others and the authority of the Supreme Court? We are all fellow citizens and we all acknowledge the demands of justice and charity as well as the authority of the Supreme Court as the supreme arbiter.

Five Challenges to American Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by a leading scientist who pinpoints and analyzes five dangers the United States faces today. Edward Teller is a noted nuclear physicist whose work has earned him the title of "Father of the H-bomb." The article follows:

FIVE CHALLENGES TO AMERICAN DEMOCRACY
(By Edward Teller)

The Communist Party of the United States is small. It would be a mistake, however, to believe that it is insignificant. For many years it has pursued the goal of weakening our Government, of aiding the Soviet Union and of discrediting democracy. It has done so with skill and with some success.

The lifeblood of democracy is criticism and free discussion. For this criticism to be constructive, it must be objective and free of rancor. But it is inherent in human nature that discussions should become heated and bitter. One of the great challenges of the democratic way of life is to find methods by which our discussion can be kept moderate and helpful.

Communist Party members participate in public discussions with the aim of exacerbating evry conflict. They endeavor to show that problems cannot be solved in the context of our form of government; in fact, they do not aim at practical solutions, but try to use every imperfection in democracy to prove that democracy itself is not viable. By introducing into the discussion an all-too-human element they attack democracy at one of its sensitive points. And thus they induce doubts in many who are discontented or who are looking for a better way of life. Every Communist Party member has found frequent occasions to undermine faith in the process of gradual improvement. Communists often act in the name of a good cause rather than in the name of their party, but they have used each of these causes to make converts to their way of thinking, or at least to sow disunity among the democratic majority.

Communist Party activities have brought about countermeasures, some of which are ill-considered and aggravate the ill they want to cure. These are the countermeasures employed by the House Un-American Activities Committee and known to the whole world today as McCarthyism.

McCarthyism commits two basic mistakes: It strikes indiscriminately at real and imagined foes, and it limits freedom of discussion. The investigation of "un-American activities" has impugned the good faith of many who are completely without blame; it has leveled hurtful accusations at waverers; it has driven many into the camp of the enemy. "Witch hunting" has become the most effective target of anti-American propaganda, and has allowed Communists to masquerade under faked flags of freedom and democracy. What is worse, investigations of un-American activities have limited freedom of discussion. They have fostered an atmosphere where knowledge of Russia is suspect and acknowledgement of any Communist strength almost equal to treason.

Our best answer to Communist infiltration is not self-righteous investigation which presumes everything to be good only if it is American and everything to be evil if it is

not. Our answer must be full and free discussion. We can and should be convinced that our democracy will emerge stronger from such a discussion.

The world has become too complicated and we need specialists to make decisions for us. This is, in part, proper, but our reliance on specialists has become too great and there is a real danger that decisions will be made by a select few. Decision by the people is endangered. It is correct to say, of course, that the common man cannot hope to follow the complexities of political events in every country of the globe, but it is equally correct to maintain that in our shrinking world we are affected by the fate of every country. True, no layman can be familiar with all the intricacies of our modern technology. Few are familiar with the basic ideas on which our technical progress rests. At the same time, the future of our technical development depends on an intelligent appraisal of its foundations and its capabilities. Today, unfortunately, all this is left to the expert.

These conditions need not continue to be fully valid. Mass communication media could be used to acquaint our people with the history, habits and daily vicissitudes of our partners on this globe. Though science and technology have developed many ideas not readily accessible to every citizen, a great feat of integration has also been accomplished in science. Science thereby has become less complex and more systematic and can more easily be mastered by a student who has the determination to do so.

Detailed decision never has been appropriately made by complete discussion carried to the public. Much must be taken on faith by the voter. But it is dangerous if the last word on important issues is spoken by a group of specialists who are invested by popular belief with almost superhuman knowledge. The average man may safely turn to his neighbor for counsel on political questions. He knows the character of his neighbor and can judge to what extent he should follow the advice he gets. The specialist is invested with an aura of wisdom and impartiality which he actually possesses to no greater extent than his fellow beings.

Many specialists have accepted the responsibility thrust upon them with some reluctance. The real fault lies with the common man who shrinks from the heavy responsibilities he must undertake if democracy is to function.

It is generally believed that secrecy is necessary to limit the knowledge of the modern dangerous weapons. Yet there can be no quetsion that secrecy is not consonant with the full functioning of the democratic process. Secrecy can be used by those in power to hide their mistakes and it would be unrealistic to believe that this is never done. Democratic safeguards and checks have been established, but it is doubtful that these can ever become as effective as full and free discussion.

Secrecy has been adopted by the majority of nations as an aid to some phases of their government. The example of the United States has helped to strengthen this trend. At the same time secrecy inhibits communication between free nations and has erected a barrier which impedes the unity of the democratic countries. Our present policy of secrecy makes it difficult for us to present a completely convincing case against the Iron Curtain and the police measures of the Communist countries. We might press for an international agreement outlawing measures which restrict freedom of information and which would make the world safer and establish entry of genuine democratic ideas into the Soviet empire. Obviously, Russia will be slow to yield its reliance on secrecy, but the pressure of world opinion is a factor in Russian policy, too. So far, we have done little to apply such pressures.

We have, in fact, proceeded in the opposite direction. We have sought our safety in secrecy which is officially designated "security." What is the present value of this security? It has failed to prevent our worst enemies from acquiring every one of our major technical secrets. It has not delayed any country with fissionable materials from detonating an atomic bomb. To restrict the full functioning of the democratic process in order to buy this kind of "security" seems to indicate a diminished interest in democracy itself.

There is a further and deeper aspect of this question. Public interest in our secrets is not great. The average citizen is willing to leave the question of dangerous weapons to the specialist who is cleared. Many citizens seem averse to giving thought to the distasteful problem of these weapons. They would rather abolish the weapons themselves than learn about them. They do not even stop to inquire carefully how the question of secrets and weapons affect their fully justified and paramount desire for peace.

Secrecy and trust in the expert are twin dangers which tend to transform our democracy into a platonic government by the fully informed philosophers.

The dangers of the nuclear age require split-second decisions. These decisions can be submitted to the voter only after the fact. This is unavoidable. In principle, the delegation of authority for urgent decisions is not new and is in full agreement with a well-considered democratic philosophy. But the speed of the new age has affected us in still another manner. It calls for a faster change in our mental patterns than has been practicable in the past. We have turned away from isolationism with impressive determination, but we are already challenged to go further and to consider political and economic problems abroad on an equal footing with our domestic issues.

The basic challenge to democracy is whether or not we can adapt ourselves to our new environment with an unprecedented speed. It is clear that the world will not continue to exist half-slave and half-free. If all of it is to be free, we must be prepared for an exceptional and enduring effort which will require sacrifice, courage, and an unusually imaginative application of the principles of democracy.

The New Leader.

The New York Forum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a special television program scheduled for presentation on April 20.

This 1-hour program is designed to brief Air Force Reserve officers on the changing role and the effectiveness of Government and the news media in focusing public attention on public affairs.

The participants in the program will include Dr. Arnold Toynbee, A. J. Liebling, of the New Yorker magazine, and Douglass Cater, of the Reporter magazine.

In the thought that it will prove of interest to my colleagues in the House, I am enclosing a copy of the letter containing further details which I received from Mr. Paul Melton, of WCBS–TV, the producer of this program, "The New York Forum":

WCBS-TV,
New York, N.Y., March 7, 1961.

Hon. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I should like you to know, as a fellow Air Force reservist, about an event scheduled for April 20 here in New York. The Air Force Reserve has asked me to produce at that time a keynote presentation for its sixth annual New York information seminar. This 1-hour session will brief Air Force officers on the shifting roles of Government and news media in giving public facts public attention in a mass society.

The idea is to take a hard look at basic beliefs regarding the theory and practice of public information. Dr. Arnold Toynbee will explore just why data on public issues is essential to a free society. He will also examine how the public earned its right to know and how that right has been guarded.

Having established why and how freedom demands facts, we will attempt to demonstrate that the responsibility of making these facts available is inherent now not only in Government but in news media. A. J. Liebling of the New Yorker will examine how effectively newsmen inform us about our Government today.

Finally, another speaker, probably Douglass Cater, will examine how well Government itself is going about the job of informing people about public affairs. In other words, we will examine whether censorship, handouts, regulation of news coverage, press agentry and political reprisals have dammed or polluted the stream of public information.

Charles Collingwood will narrate.

Do you agree that this presentation may deserve to be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

Yours very truly,

PAUL MELTON,
Producer, the "New York Forum."

Greater Wilkes-Barre Industrial Fund Drive Goes Over Top

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of Thursday, March 16, 1961, which reports and comments upon the truly amazing results of the Greater Wilkes-Barre industrial fund drive. The goal was $1,500,000 and as of last Wednesday this figure was topped by some $202,000, with still more to be pledged in the near future. This is a classic example of the full meaning of the often used term "Operation Bootstrap," and all of the people in my congressional district of Luzerne County who worked so hard and long and fully supported this badly needed fund drive are to be warmly congratulated for their faith in

the future of our area. I am sure the happy results of this drive bodes well for the economic advancement of our depressed area where unemployment at the present time runs some 17 percent of the work force.

The aforementioned editorial follows:

GREATER WILKES-BARRE HAS WON, BUT THERE IS A BIG JOB AHEAD

Greater Wilkes-Barre entered a new era last night when the 1961 Industrial Fund campaign to raise $1,500,000 for industrial development was oversubscribed by $202,076 with considerably more expected to come in the weeks and months ahead. Although the victory dinner and meeting in Irem Temple marked the close of the formal solicitation, actually the campaign is due to continue for 3 years—the period for which the pledges were made. This month and next especially, hundreds of unreported pledges are anticipated and until 1964 when payments will conclude new workers will sign for payroll deductions to match the contributions of fellow employees whose generosity helped to make their jobs possible.

Frankly, the outcome of the campaign exceeded the fondest expectations of the most optimistic boosters of the community. The response was overwhelming, as labor joined capital in an all-out effort in the public interest.

It was a happy coincidence that at the very moment cheers were ringing through Irem Temple, the Senate in Washington was enacting legislation to aid distressed areas in America, of which Greater Wilkes-Barre had the dubious distinction of being No. 1 on the list so many years. While the community will welcome a helping hand from Washington and Harrisburg and can put every dollar that is made available to good use, it is justifiably proud of the success of its efforts to help itself in the finest American tradition. It has not been content to sit back, bemoaning its fate and waiting for the Federal and State Governments to come to the rescue.

Perhaps no area has been hit so hard as Greater Wilkes-Barre. It has been knocked down, but never out, for it always has managed to get up from the floor and resume the battle with matchless courage and stamina. Britain, in its darkest hour, gave no more moving demonstration of pluck, for the trial by fire during the war lasted only a few short years, whereas Greater Wilkes-Barre has been lashed by disaster for more than a quarter century.

From all sides, its people and its communities have been battered. The anthracite industry, to which its economy was pegged, practically folded up and even today it's only a shadow of its former self. Nature struck blows that were as savage as any H-bomb, adding to the problems, but the brave men and women who stayed and carried on never faltered, never lost faith. Today, their service beyond the call of duty, for which thousands who earned them will receive no Medals of Honor on the homefront, is about to be rewarded.

With unparalleled generosity, unselfishness and sacrifice, they not only shared their limited means in outright gifts with no strings attached and no return on their money other than the benefits that accrue to the community, but they pledged their futures to the common cause.

During the past few weeks, the scent of victory has been in the air. Without being able to put our fingers on it or to explain it, we could sense a vast change, as barriers, erected in the community in years gone by, were swept away and all segments of the population marched forward together, shoulder to shoulder, with heads erect and confidence exuding. We invariably refrain from making predictions, but yesterday we could not resist the temptation to express the opinion editorially that there was a guarded optimism the campaign would go over the top and the minimum goal of $1,500,000 would be surpassed.

Let us not only take pride in this achievement, but let us tackle the future with the same solidarity in the ranks and unity of purpose that were the foundations of this triumph. We have won. With this spirit and with God's help, nothing can stop us now. We need only to consolidate our gains and reap the harvest.

To Andrew Hourigan, campaign chairman, to members of his organization, to contributors and solicitors, to those who offered their prayers and good wishes, as well as a helping hand in divers ways, our compliments not only for a magnificent performance, but for giving Greater Wilkes-Barre a new lease on life, for keeping faith with those who have gone before us and for meeting this major challenge, so future generations will have a stirring example to guide them if they are called on to keep a date with destiny.

The 153d Anniversary of the Hungarian Revolution

SPEECH
OF
HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, in these days of world chaos and tribulation, when the struggle between freemen and the forces of tyranny is at its height, it is heartening to rise today to pay tribute to the brave Hungarian people in commemoration of the 153d anniversary of the Hungarian Revolution of March 15, 1848. This date is a national holiday to Hungarians throughout the world. It commemorates the valiant fight of the Hungarians against another form of tyranny that then existed—the oppressive Hapsburg dynasty. It is ironic that this revolution was finally crushed by the forces of the Austrian and Russian Armies. I say this is indeed ironic for there is still fresh in our minds the terrible cruelties imposed upon the Hungarian people by another Russian Army the forces of Red communism when they destroyed the October revolution of 1956.

The Russian Government itself has conceded that armed forces were used in 1956 to put down the free expression of the Hungarian people because they were determined to keep Hungary behind the Iron Curtain and because they knew of the extreme bitterness and despair of the Hungarian people under the puppet regime of terror than in power in Hungary. Since that date the United Nation General Assembly has successfully adopted 12 political resolutions on Hungary, demanding the withdrawal of Soviet troops and free elections under international control, while condemning the Soivet Union for the brutal crushing of the victorious Hungarian revolution.

Once again at the 15th session of the United Nations the Hungarian question is on the agenda. Once again I am certain that the sentiment of the free peoples of the world will be vigorously expressed in support of self-determination for the Hungarian people.

It is particularly tragic that in these days when free nations throughout the world are entering the community of the United Nations and increasing it daily—as witness the rapid development of freedom in the African Continent—that a nation such as Hungary which has had such a long tradition of liberty is still forced to live under a tyrannical yoke. However, in the inexorable movement of history I feel certain that liberty, freedom, and peace will once again come to the Hungarian nation.

Until that day arrives the spirit of these people shines forth both as an inspiration to us to continue on our democratic course and as a warning to be eternally vigilant against the forces that would deprive mankind of its fundamental rights.

I salute the people of Hungary and the Hungarian nation and I trust that in the not too distant future the true representatives of the Hungarian people will raise their voice in the free councils of the nations of the world.

An American Prize for Music and Art

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, the newspapers reported that Pierre Salinger, White House press secretary, at a luncheon of the National Symphony Orchestra, suggested the establishment of an American music or art prize.

Great interest is being shown in this significant and worthy proposal, and it is being hailed as an historic step by civic and cultural leaders throughout our Nation.

National prizes are well known abroad where they have made major contributions to the discovery, encouragement, and advancement of young artists and thus have served important national purposes.

Young American artists should be similarly encouraged and it is to the credit of this administration that steps are at last being taken along these lines.

I am certain that my colleagues, from both parties, are ready to welcome this long overdue step and to assist this plan to become a reality without undue delay.

I include as part of my remarks articles from the Star, and the Post of Washington, D.C.:

[From the Evening Star, Mar. 20, 1961]

MOVE FOR ART, MUSIC PRIZES

President Kennedy is very interested in establishing an American music and art prize according to his press secretary, Pierre Salinger.

Mr. Salinger, said the President had asked him to explore the possibilities of such a prize

and had put him in charge of preliminary plans.

In a taped interview over WGMS yesterday, Mr. Salinger said that within the next 2 weeks a forming committee will be organized. He said the prize idea had received an overwhelming reaction and pledges of large amounts of money for the project have been received at the White House.

Mr. Salinger first suggested such a prize during a national Symphony Orchestra sustaining fund luncheon earlier this month, together with an idea borrowed from Violinist Isaac Stern for a national youth orchestra.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 20, 1961]

MUSIC-ART PRIZE GETTING BIG SUPPORT, SALINGER SAYS

Presidential Press Secretary Pierre Salinger said yesterday there has been overwhelming response to the idea of a White House-sponsored American music-and-arts prize and the project is going forward.

Salinger said pledges of large amounts of money have been among the many communications received and within 2 weeks a forming committee will be organized. He said President Kennedy is very interested.

Salinger said also in a radio interview (WGMS) that there will be White House representation at the National Symphony Orchestra concerts, including the President and Mrs. Kennedy when their schedules permit.

The idea for such a national prize was first suggested by Salinger at a National Symphony fund luncheon early this month. The press secretary is an accomplished pianist and has played many concerts.

[From the Evening Star, Mar. 8, 1961]

PIERRE SALINGER SUGGESTS U.S. MUSIC OR ART PRIZE

(By Daisy Cleland)

Mr. Pierre Salinger, press secretary to the President, made a plea for music and the arts yesterday when he spoke at the National Symphony Orchestra's fund raising report luncheon.

The speaker called for two means in which he felt the youth of this country would benefit in the field of culture and in turn benefit the country.

The first he mentioned was "regional youth orchestras" which as "farm teams" would eventually "feed our national orchestras."

FOREIGN ASPECTS

Mr. Salinger said that a program of this kind could even reach abroad. This could be done with European tours of the youth orchestras which could stimulate interest among the youths in the countries visited.

The other suggestion Mr. Salinger had was the establishment of an American music or art prize.

However, he added, "I think for it to be effective it would have to be under the auspices of the White House."

Mr. Salinger foresaw in this latter suggestion that because the winners would come to Washington for proper recognition "there could focus a great deal (worldwide) of attention on this."

The speaker stressed, "I don't think America should be on the defensive about its music and its culture."

Mr. Salinger, who is a pianist in his own right, talked of "music and what it meant to me in my own life."

He started to study the piano when he was 5 years old, and said that he came from "a very musical family."

The personal experiences of meeting and hearing Rachmaninoff ("every time he came to San Francisco he was requested to play the 'Prelude in C Sharp Minor' and he hated it"), Stern, Yehudi Menuhin and Rubinstein made the speaker "remember as a boy the vista of music open up to me."

He added that after listening to Brahms, "Mindemith, and Ravel," "a kind of world opened to me, which I hope would be opened to others."

CHILDREN AND MUSIC

In stressing that he felt music was an important part in growing up, Mr. Salinger said, "They (children) should at least have the opportunity of hearing music as a child."

The press secretary added, "So many people go through life with a plug in their ear."

A surprise for the luncheon guests came when Mr. Salinger sat down at the piano after speaking, and played one of his own compositions. The piece is nameless, he said, and was composed when he was 15.

An interesting note is that Mr. Salinger first started to study in Toronto, Canada, when his family moved there.

His teacher was then Clement Hambourg at the Toronto Conservatory of Music. Mr. Hambourg has now gone into compositional jazz, and is running a gaslight club, according to Mr. Salinger.

A reunion will take place shortly between the teacher and student. Mr. Salinger said that he is going to Toronto on April 8 to speak at the Canadian National Newspaper Awards dinner, and that Mr. Hambourg had planned a concert for him.

Mrs. Dean Rusk, wife of the Secretary of State, was the guest of honor at the luncheon, and although not scheduled to speak, did ask to say a few words at the end of the reports.

She said that "it is exciting to come back to Washington after 10 years, and I am very moved to see your program."

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 8, 1961]

SALINGER NOTES NEED IN U.S. MUSIC

(By Marie McNair)

Presidential Press Secretary Pierre Salinger, who could get a job with the National Symphony Orchestra any time, thinks, the White House should establish an American music or art prize that would be sought by artists on a worldwide scale.

Before sitting down to demonstrate his own keyboard talents which once made him a child prodigy at the piano, the versatile Salinger told a luncheon meeting of National Symphony fund raisers yesterday that his proposed award would "be an affirmative step in the cultural field." Financing would come from private sources.

Salinger stressed that his award proposal is still in the idea stage, and he did not indicate whether the project has been discussed with President Kennedy. The prize should not be any ordinary prize, he said, but one with prestige enough to be sought by artists throughout the world.

He laments the fact that so many Americans never have the opportunity to know music, and he feels education in both music and art should begin with children. "It is sad that in this country, in spite of the great opportunities, such a small percentage of the people know and understand music, compared to the people of Europe," he said, adding: "So many people go through life with a plug in one ear."

Salinger's own performance at the piano was a composition he wrote at the age of 15. It was a moody, Gershwin-sounding piece of music he never gave a name.

Salinger was the speaker for the occasion. Mrs. Dean Rusk, wife of the Secretary of State, was a special guest, and had been told she didn't have to speak. But she became so enthusiastic that she couldn't restrain herself. She got up and told the workers what a privilege it was to be there and to represent the Secretary of State and his coworkers. "It's very exciting to be back here after 10 years," she said, to "find how magnificently the symphony's program has developed."

The President's press secretary began studying music when he was 5 and for a time it was thought he might become a concert pianist. He gave it up, however, when he was 12 years old.

Music has continued to play a part in his life and he told his audience yesterday that he's in favor of establishing a national student orchestra with teams throughout the country. They would tour the United States playing on college campuses and later possibly visit colleges in Europe.

U.S. Troubles Called Internal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, in this troubled era, when we are engaged in a struggle for men's minds with the Communist bloc nations, it is indeed encouraging to see American clergymen taking the lead in the spiritual struggle.

On November 13, Rev. Eugene D. Dolloff, pastor of the First Baptist Church in New Bedford, Mass., preached an inspiring sermon pointing out that communism can be conquered on a spiritual level.

In order that my colleagues and others who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD may have the benefit of Dr. Dolloff's message, I am inserting in the Appendix excerpts from his sermon, as reported in the New Bedford Standard Times:

U.S. TROUBLES CALLED INTERNAL—REV. DR. DOLLOFF WARNS OF SPIRITUAL LAXITY

"America hates everything for which communism stands, yet unwittingly the United States is probably communism's greatest ally," declared the Rev. Eugene Dinsmore Dolloff in a sermon on "Communism's Greatest Ally," at the First Baptist Church yesterday.

"This is due to internal weakness resulting from moral and spiritual deterioration," he continued.

"Communism is clever, far-sighted, optimistic. Russia does not seek, will do everything possible to prevent a 'hot war' with the United States. They believe, as things now exist, that America will become so weakened as to destroy herself, or make her ultimate overthrow easily possible a decade or two in the future. Poison is equally lethal taken by design or through accident."

EMPHASIS IN WRONG PLACES

"A thoughtful person, who is realistic, must observe evidence to validate this communistic belief. In our country today it appears that greater emphasis is placed upon beer than bread; Cadillacs and Chevrolets than Christ, cosmetics than the church; the dollar sign than the sign of the Star of Judaism or the sign of the Cross of Christianity; gambling than God; hormones than the home; liquor business than the business of the Lord; salacious literature than the Scriptures; saloons than salvation, stomach than the soul; Sunday as a gala holiday than a holy day; taxes than truth; victuals than virtue.

"America leads the world in motor cars, telephones, radios, schools, missiles. We also lead the world in murders, suicides, broken homes, and divorces. Church membership and attendance have reached an alltime high; so also has crime—far ahead

of population increase and increase in church membership and attendance.

"But have the moral and spiritual supports—the inner braces—been crumbling? Material prosperity is of small consequence if there is 'something lacking on the inside.'

"History offers eloquent witness to this assertion. Look upon ancient Israel. Behold mighty Babylon. Consider Rome—'Eternal Rome.' When corruption gnawed away their inward integrity they all collapsed."

URGED TO READ

"There is a cure available, there is 'a balm in Gilead.' However, even the most potent medicine cannot avail unless it is taken. Our own Nation must face up to the need, and then take its medicine. And let it be known beyond all peradventure that communism can be conquered only on a spiritual level.

"I suggest that we take three principles from the Communists' own book—'fight fire with fire.'

"Read the Book. All members of the party are required to read the writings of Marx, Engels, and Lenin. This must be done. By the same token the first challenge to Americans is to read God's Book—read it faithfully.

"Study the Book—daily. Adherents of the party must study their 'textbooks' every day. No exception to this rule. So every patriotic American is challenged to study God's Book—daily. Never are we to regard it as an outmoded antique, of value at best only to innocent children.

"Apply the principles of the Book to daily living. That is the only reason why party members read and study their 'textbooks.' So every American should adapt and become adept in the application of God's teachings to every phase of life. Whatever He says we should do.

"Communism is a merciless, heartless, horrible, godless reality. But, freedom-loving, God-fearing people have an all-sufficient serum by which its terrible venom can be conquered. This is the limitless potency of the Judaic-Christian religion—God's power working through stouthearted men."

"Operation Abolition"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, a great many charges have been raised against the film "Operation Abolition," and many of my constituents have expressed deep interest in knowing the facts behind this film. I have, therefore, prepared a study which I believe is a straightforward answer to these charges. Under unanimous consent, I include this study in the Appendix of the RECORD:

CHARGES AND FACTUAL ANSWERS CONCERNING THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES FILM "OPERATION ABOLITION"

1. Charge: The demonstrators were not Communist inspired and Communist led.

Fact: (a) George Christopher, mayor of San Francisco, quoted from the San Francisco Examiner, May 18, 1960: "The mayor said that in his opinion last Friday's riot was Communist directed and that for the most part, unknowing and misguided students were innocent pawns of trained Communist agitators skilled in crowd control tactics."

(b) J. Edgar Hoover, quoted from Communist Target, Youth: "It is vitally important to set the record straight on the extent to which Communists were responsible for the disgraceful and riotous conditions which prevailed during the House Committee on Un-American Activities hearings. It is vitally important that not only the students involved in that incident, but also students throughout the Nation whom Communists hope to exploit in similar situations, recognize the Communist tactics which resulted in what experienced west coast observers familiar with Communist strategy and tactics have termed the most successful Communist coup to occur in the San Francisco area in 25 years.

(c) Judge Albert A. Axelrod, presiding judge at the San Francisco municipal court where those arrested at the riots appeared, made the following statement quoted on page A2 of the Washington Post, December 25, 1960: "I very definitely agree with the view of FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover that the city hall riot of last May 13 was instigated by Communist subversives."

(d) To clarify his position, which had been distorted in some quarters, Mayor Christopher made the following statement in his office on January 18, 1961: "Known Communists, and I repeat this emphatically, known Communists were in the lead of this demonstration. The students were dupes who joined some of these causers of agitation, believing it is an innocent and harmless expression of civil liberties, not realizing that while they are doing this they are at the same time violating every precept of the liberties they profess to cherish."

2. Charge: The San Francisco police were brutal in their handling of the students. No witnesses have been produced who can verify that the rioters provocated the physical conflict.

Fact: (a) J. Edgar Hoover, as quoted from "Communist Target, Youth": "One of the judges in a municipal courtroom in the city hall ordered the mob dispersed because the noise made it impossible for him to hold court. When an attempt was made to carry out the order, the crowd responded by throwing shoes and jostling the officers. An officer warned that fire hoses would have to be used if the crowd did not disperse, but the crowd, instigated by Communists who had maneuvered themselves into strategic positions, became more unruly. One of the demonstrators provided the spark that touched off the flame of violence. Leaping a barricade that had been erected, he grabbed an officer's night stick and began beating the officer over the head. The mob surged forward as if to storm the doors, and a police inspector ordered the fire hose turned on. At a party meeting on the night of May 20, 1960, Archie Brown (Editor's note: Archie Brown is second in command of the Communist Party in California) disclosed how the party intended to use a followup campaign with campus students as the target. He stated that the party planned to emphasize police brutality as a rallying cry to attract sympathy of student groups."

(b) Dave Hope, reporter, stated in an article on January 25, 1961, in the Oakland Tribune: "I was there. I was in the committee room, in the hallway, on the rotunda. I mingled with the demonstrators, watched the picket lines." On the following day in the Oakland Tribune in another riot article, he said, "I didn't hear any orders, but I did hear the police ask, even beg, the students to be quiet and to leave the city hall. All through the morning the police were polite and courteous. Even when the mob's mood turned ugly after the noon recess, and the hose was brought out, the students were warned repeatedly for a period of at least 10 minutes before the water was turned on. That didn't happen until one student grabbed an officer's night stick and slugged him with it." It has been claimed that no one was ever charged for this, however, that is dead wrong. Hope went on to say, "Robert J. Meisenbach, a University of California student who was then living in Berkeley, was arrested and charged with assault. His trial is still pending, now set for March 6."

(c) In the January 25 article, Hope went on to say, "Police were careful not to use excessive force. When two or three officers carry out one person, they're being gentle. The party never gets rough until it's man for man. So there was no chance for martyrdom and this was disappointing. Martyrs must above all else be dignified. You can't be a martyr when soaking wet you're skidded unceremoniously down a flight of stairs on the part of your anatomy that should have been spanked more frequently in your childhood."

(d) The San Francisco Chronicle, Saturday, May 14, 1960, in a lead article on page 1, reported that eight policemen and four students were injured. By the ratio of injuries it would appear that the so-called brutality was felt more by the police than the students.

3. Charge: The film is edited, distorted, out of sequence and deliberately slants the facts.

Fact: (a) Obviously, the film is edited, as is every film ever made. Three days of hearings, including the interviews of 46 witnesses cannot be shown in a 45-minute film without editing and ommission of most of the material. One thing is certain—the film does not show anything which in fact did not occur during the period of the hearings.

(b) If, as has been claimed, there had been religious students present who wore armbands to distinguish them from the other protestors, the bands would have been visible in the film. For certainly, the films scanned the crowd in a most comprehensive way and any armbands present could not have been deleted from the film.

(c) There are two errors in the film: One, Harry Bridges is shown leaving the city hall and the accompanying editorial comment says this was shortly before the riots. In fact, he arrived shortly after the rioters had been cleared by the use of fire hoses. The important fact is that Harry Bridges was there. Two, a sequence taken on Saturday was included in the Thursday sequence. David Hope stated in the Oakland Tribune, January 25, 1961, ". . . It is astonishing that no more serious mistakes were made in putting the film together and drafting the commentary."

(d) Mayor Christopher, in his statement of January 18, 1961, summed up by saying, "The pictures I believe speak for themselves. They are true. They are authentic. They tell the real story and, of course, at the same time, they are most unfortunate, to say the least."

4. Charge: The hearing room was unfairly "stacked" with those sympathetic to the Committee.

Fact: (a) J. Edgar Hoover, in "Communist Target, Youth," stated, "Approximately 25 percent of the spectators in the room were individuals under subpena and their friends, relatives, attorneys, and sympathizers. This group applauded and cheered the antics of Brown and Brodsky and booed, hissed, and ridiculed the committee at every opportunity."

(b) Seven Baptist ministers from the San Francisco Bay area, who were in attendance at the hearings, issued a joint statement which was printed on May 17, 1960, in the publication of the Foothill Baptist Church, 1530 Foothill Boulevard, Oakland, Calif., which stated, in part: "We sat in the rear of the room (hearing room) on a raised platform where we could easily observe the

proceedings, right in the midst of the student demonstrators. We studied the crowd carefully for hours and could easily discern which were the masterminds of the mob riots. It is our certain conviction that this indefensible demonstration against law and order was conceived, planned and directed by a few hard-core Communist agitators who were carrying out their textbook orders on insurrection with classic success."

These statements, as well as the film sequences taken within the hearing room, make it all to plain that, if anything, too many persons actively opposed to the Committee on Un-American Activities were inside the hearing room.

5. Charge: Sheriff Carberry of San Francisco stated, "There was no act of physical aggression on the part of the students."

Fact: The above quotation was attributed to Sheriff Carberry by Paul Jacobs in his article attacking the film which was published in the November 24, 1960 issue of the Reporter magazine. On December 6, 1960, Sheriff Carberry issued the following statement concerning the above quote:

"I did not make that statement. I do not know the author of the article, Paul Jacobs, and have never spoken to him and have never been interviewed by him.

"I was on the scene on Thursday and Friday (May 12 and 13) up to luncheon time when I went for a luncheon conference with the chairman of the committee, Mr. Willis. The disorders took place during the luncheon and I was in no position to know anything about them.

"I did not make that statement."

6. Charge: The film fails to name non-Communist groups by whom the protest against the committee was endorsed.

Fact: No one disputes that assertion. The important fact here is that those who were part of the rioting responded to the orders and directions of known, identifiable Communists. Furthermore, the HCUA might have been subject to justifiable criticism, if in the course of naming and identifying the known Communists who are shown in the film, the names of other, non-Commuist groups and persons were mentioned. The HCUA showed admirable and patriotic restraint in not identifying those groups so that the groups could not be subjected to "guilt by association."

7. Charge: Judge Axelrod, presiding judge of the San Francisco municipal court where the rioters were brought, stated: "I am convinced that they (the rioters) are not engaged in subversive activities nor in spreading subversive propaganda."

Fact: In a news article in the December 25, 1960 Washington Post, dateline San Francisco, December 24, 1960 (AP), Judge Axelrod is quoted as saying, "At no time did I condone their conduct. A single sentence (ed: the one quoted above in the charge) from my decision, quoted out of context, created that false impression. . ." After the sentence quoted above, the Judge went on to say, "However, they chose the wrong means to accomplish their purpose and let themselves become victims of those who profit by creating unrest, riots and the type of conduct which is outlawed by the penal code section I have quoted. As the result, they were arrested, fingerprinted, and photographed, and their efforts achieved a directly opposite result."

8. Charge: The film used to make "Operation Abolition" was obtained by the HCUA improperly and before the private TV stations which took the film could view it. Also, no credit lines are given. Furthermore, the sale of this film by a private firm is in violation of the copyrights of the stations which took the films.

Fact: (a) The film was obtained by subpoena, which is the normal legal way that evidence is obtained by any investigatory body or court of law. The TV people who took the film made no objections to this procedure. A copy of the film was made by Video Productions, Inc., Washington, at the request of the HCUA and quickly returned to the stations.

(b) No credit lines were placed on the film because the film was presented as an official document of the HCUA to be submitted to the Congress. In such cases, credit lines are not normally included, for the document is officially authenticated by the presenting committee and not by a private individual or firm.

(c) No copyright infringement suits have been filed against Video Productions, Inc., nor are any planned, so far as is known.

9. Charge: The film must be inaccurate because of all the furor and controversy that it has created.

Fact: Dave Hope, writing in the Oakland Tribune of January 25, 1961, sums it up: "From the audience reaction (to the film) I would say it is extremely effective and that is why extraordinary effort is made to discredit it. Few people have seen Communists in action. Here they are shown when called before the hearing, screaming imprecations, insults, and contempt at a committee of the U.S. Congress. Almost maniacal in their challenge to law and order, they present an ugly picture that cannot be adequately described in words but becomes all too vivid in the film. For those who took part in the riot and their apologists, the film is just too accurate, too revealing. That's why it is so bitterly attacked."

Pacific Northwest Being Threatened With a Loss of Its Low-Cost Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Interior on March 9, 1961, appointed a five-man departmental task force to study the feasibility of a high-voltage transmission line between the Pacific Northwest and California. On the same day in another press release he said he has approved recommendations to proceed with surveys and design work on an all-Federal transmission line to distribute electricity from northern California to southern California.

The recommendation as approved would allow construction now of lines from the Trinity River project in northern California so they could be converted to a 500-kilovolt transmission line to Tracy, Calif., with the possible future use as a section of the proposed Pacific Northwest-California intertie to be studied by the task force.

Mr. Speaker, it appears to me the Pacific Northwest again is being threatened with a loss of its low-cost power. Back in April 1959, I warned that a clever move to rob the Pacific Northwest and the State of Washington of low-cost power was underway. I again repeat this warning with the added emphasis that the California interests now apparently have a champion in the Nation's Capital.

A task force made up of persons in the Department of Interior, it seems to me, would be subservient to the Secretary who appointed them. The term "task force" has the connotation of being a group especially selected to promote an interest or to get a particular job done. Members of this task force include Charles L. Luce, Bonneville Power Administrator; Morgan Dubrow, Washington office manager of the Bonneville Power Administration; Bernard Goldhammer, BPA commercial operations officer; Hugh P. Dugan, regional director of the Bureau of Reclamation; and Milton A. Case, general engineer in the assistant secretary's Washington office. A study group consisting of disinterested persons outside the Department, on the other hand, is a different proposition.

But, Mr. Speaker, is a study of this kind necessary? It would be surprising if it is needed in light of the fact that Mr. Luce has stated the Pacific Northwest will have a power shortage by 1965. Also, since March 1953 there have been studies of one sort or another. The Federal Power Commission reported the feasibility of 230-kilovolt intertie between Oregon and its neighbor to the south. Later Bonneville found that a 230-kilovolt line was feasible and advisable, but a larger line was not. Only one study, authorized by the Governor of California and paid for by California taxpayers, supported a high-voltage intertie, and its recommendation was based on numerous hypotheses.

The Secretary of the Interior said on March 9 that the estimated cost of federally constructed Trinity lines would be $28,800,000. I cannot understand the need for this huge outlay of taxpayers' money when the Bureau of Reclamation has been offered a contract for wheeling power over existing lines at one-half mill a kilowatt-hour.

Advocates of such an intertie between the Pacific Northwest and California first talked about dump power. But they knew and still know that if they can get a federally owned line into California, they will get firm power. Once the foot is in the door, there wil be no way to close it. Also, it is conceivable that the principle of a nationwide grid could be established, whereby, this Chamber could be lighted by electricity from the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to the possible sale of surplus seasonal power to California or other States if the sale would result in lower power costs for the Pacific Northwest, but I believe a high-load federally constructed line would inevitably lead to the transmission of firm power from Bonneville to California. Full integration, ideal as it might seem in terms of engineering principles, could result economically to the detriment of the Pacific Northwest in terms of increased regional power costs, retarded industrial growth and fewer new payrolls.

We in the Pacific Northwest need our Bonneville power for future growth. We need our present industries and we want to expand them. We want new industries to come to our great Pacific Northwest. Mr. Speaker, I intend to fight to keep our power from being turned over to California and other regions.

The Older Person and the Family in the Perspective of Jewish Tradition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

THE OLDER PERSON AND THE FAMILY IN THE PERSPECTIVE OF JEWISH TRADITION

(Paper by Dr. Abraham J. Heschel, professor of Jewish ethics and mysticism of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, at White House Conference on Aging, Jan. 9, 1961, Washington, D.C.)

I see the sick and the despised, the defeated and the bitter, the rejected and the lonely. I see them clustered together and alone. I hear them pray for the release that comes with death or clinging to a hope for somebody's affection that does not come to pass. I see them deprived and forgotten, masters yesterday, outcasts today.

What we owe the old is reverence, but all they ask for is consideration, attention, not to be discarded and forgotten. What they deserve is preference, yet we do not even grant them equality. One father finds it possible to sustain a dozen children, yet a dozen children find it impossible to sustain one father.

Perhaps this is the most embarrassing aspect of the situation. The care for the old is regarded as an act of charity rather than as the highest privilege. In the never dying utterance of the Ten Commandments, the God of Israel did not proclaim: Honor Me, revere Me. He proclaimed instead: Revere your father and your mother. There is no reverence for God without reverence for father and mother.

Father and mother are always older, more advanced in years. But is being advanced in years to be considered an advance or a retreat?

Ours is a twin problem: The attitude of society to the old and old age as well as the attitude of the old to being old.

The typical attitude to old age is characterized by fear, confusion, absurdity, self-deception, and dishonesty. It is painful and bizarre. Old age is something we are all anxious to attain. However, once attained we consider it a defeat, a form of capital punishment. Enabling us to reach old age, medical science may think, it gave us a blessing; however, we continue to act as if it were a disease.

More money and time are spent on the art of concealing the signs of old age than on the art of dealing with heart disease or cancer. You find more patients in the beauty parlors than in the hospitals. We would rather be bald than gray. A white hair is an abomination. Being old is a defeat, something to be ashamed of. Authenticity and honesty of existence are readily exchanged for false luster, for camouflage, sham, and deception.

A gray hair may destroy the chance for promotion, may cost a salesman his job and inwardly alienate a son from his father. The fear of being considered old has become a traumatic obsession. Only very few people are endowed with the rare and supreme courage to admit their true age without embarrassment. With the rest of us, courage and honesty go underground when the question of age is discussed. The most delightful resolution this Conference could pass would be to eliminate from now on any mention of the date of birth from the birth certificate.

A vast amount of human misery, as well as enormous cultural and spiritual damage, are due to these twin phenomena of our civilization: the contempt for the old and the traumatic fear of getting old. Monotheism has acquired a new meaning: the one and only thing that counts is being young. Youth is our god, and being young is divine. To be sure, youth is a very marvelous thing. However, the cult of youth is idolatry. Abraham is the grand old man, but the legend of Faust is pagan.

What is necessary is a revision of attitudes and conceptions. Old age is not a defeat but a victory, not a punishment but a privilege. In education we stress the importance of the adjustment of the young to society. Our task is to call for the adjustment of society to the old.

By what standards do we measure culture? It is customary to evaluate a nation by the magnitude of its scientific contributions or the quality of its artistic achievements. However, the true standard by which to gage a culture is the extent to which reverence, compassion, justice are to be found in the daily lives of a whole people, not only individuals.

The test of a people is how it behaves toward the old. It is easy to love children. Even tyrants and dictators make a point of being fond of children. But the affection and care for the old, the incurable, the helpless, are the true gold mines of a culture.

In our own days, a new type of fear has evolved in the hearts of men; the fear of medical bills. In the spirit of the principle that reverence for the old takes precedence over reverence for God, we are compelled to confess that a nation should be ready to sell, if necessary, the treasures from its art collections and the sacred objects from its houses of worship in order to help one sick man.

Is there anything as holy, as urgent, as noble, as the effort of the whole nation to provide medical care for the old?

This is one of the great Biblical insights: The needs of suffering humanity are a matter of personal as well as public responsibility. The representatives of the community are held responsible for the neglect of human life, if they have failed to provide properly for those in need. The ancient sages realized that it was not enough to trust to individual benevolence, and that care for the sick was a responsibility of the community.

It is in accord with this tradition that all major religious organizations have endorsed the principle of government responsibility and the use of the social security mechanism as the most effective medium for dealing with the problem of medical care for the aged.

It is marvelous indeed that for the first time in history, our society is ready and able to provide for the material needs of its senior citizens. Yet in addition to the problem of material security we must face the problem of psychological and spiritual security.

How to save the old from despondency, despair? How to lend beauty to being old? How to regain the authenticity of old age?

Old age is a major challenge to the inner life; it takes both wisdom and strength not to succumb to it. According to all the standards we employ socially as well as privately, the aged person is condemned as inferior. In terms of manpower he is a liability, a burden, a drain on our resources. Conditioned to operate as a machine for making and spending money, with all other relationships dependent upon its efficiency, the moment the machine is out of order and beyond repair, one begins to feel like a ghost without a sense of reality. The aged may be described as a person who does not dream anymore, devoid of ambition, and living in fear of losing his status. Regarding himself as a person who has outlived his usefulness, he feels as if he had to apologize for being alive.

The tragedy is that old age comes upon us as a shock for which we are unprepared. If life is defined exclusively in terms of functions and activities, is it still worth living when these functions and activities are sharply curtailed?

The tragedy, I repeat, is that most of us are unprepared for old age. We know a great deal about what to do with things, even what to do with people; we hardly know what to do with ourselves. We know how to act in public; we do not know what to do in privacy. Old age involves the problem of what to do with privacy.

While we do not officially define old age as a second childhood, some of the programs we devise are highly effective in helping the aged to become children. The preoccupation with games and hobbies, the over emphasis upon recreation, while certainly conducive to eliminating boredom temporarily, hardly contribute to inner strength. The effect is rather a pickled existence, preserved in brine with spices.

What is the role of recreation in the life of the aged? Is it merely to serve as a substitute for work one has done in earlier years? It seems to me that recreation is serving a different purpose, and that an over indulgence in recreational activities aggrevates, rather than ameliorates, a condition it is trying to deal with, namely, the trivialization of existence. In the past it was ritual and prayer that staved off that danger.

For thousands of years human existence was not simply confined to the satisfaction of trivial needs. Through prayer and ritual man was able to remain open to the wonder and mystery of existence, to lend a tinge of glory to daily deeds.

Modern man has discarded ritual, failed to learn the art of prayer, but found a substitute for both in occupational routine. He severed relations to God, to the cosmos, or even to his people, but became engrossed in the search for success. The excitement of success took the place of inspiration. Upon his retirement from labor or business, games and hobbies, the country club or golf take the place of church, synagogue, ritual, and prayer. This, then, is the fact: hobbies have become a substitute for ritual, not only for work. Should we not clearly distinguish between recreation as a substitution and recreation as a solution?

Authentic human existence includes both work and worship, utilization and celebration. We have a right to consume because we have the power to celebrate. The man of our time is losing the power to celebrate, instead of participating in spiritual celebration, he seeks to be amused or entertained. It is upon reaching the summit of his years, that man discovers that entertainment is no substitute for celebration.

What are the basic spiritual ills of old age?

1. The sense of being useless to, and rejected by, family and society;
2. The sense of inner emptiness and boredom;
3. Loneliness and the fear of time.

Let us analyze the root as well as the cure of these three ills.

I. THE SENSE OF BEING USELESS TO SOCIETY

While it is vitally important to see man in his relation to society, we must not forget that society is not man's only and ultimate referent. In spite of the fact that our ideologies and institutions continue to imply that the worth of a person is equivalent to his usefulness to society, every one of us entertains the keen expectation that other people will not regard him merely because of what he is worth to them, because he

serves to satisfy other people's needs, but as a being significant and valuable in himself. Just as the grandeur of the sun or an oak tree is not reducible to the functions it fulfills, so the grandeur of a human life is not reducible to the needs it is capable of satisfying. Even he who does not regard himself as an absolute end, rebels against being treated as a means to an end, as subservient to other men. The rich, the men of the world, want to be loved for their own sake, for their essence, whatever it may mean, not for their achievements or possessions. Nor do the old and sick expect help because of what they may give us in return. Who needs the handicapped, the incurably sick, the maintenance of whom is a drain on the treasury of the State? It is, moreover, obvious that such service does not claim all of one's life and can therefore not be the ultimate answer to his quest of meaning for life as a whole. Man has more to give than what other men are able or willing to accept. To say that life could consist of care for others, of incessant service to the world, would be a vulgar boast. What we are able to bestow upon others is usually less and rarely more than a tithe.

There are alleys in the soul where man walks alone, ways that do not lead to society, a world of privacy that shrinks from the public eye. Life comprises not only arable, productive land, but also mountains of dreams, an underground of sorrow, towers of yearning, which can hardly be utilized to the last for the good of society, unless man be converted into a machine in which every screw must serve a function or be removed. It is a profiteering state which, trying to exploit the individual, asks all of man for itself.

Human existence cannot derive its ultimate meaning from society, because society itself is in need of meaning. It is as legitimate to ask: Is mankind needed?—as it is to ask: Am I needed?

Humanity begins in the individual man, just as history takes its rise from a singular event. It is always one man at a time whom we keep in mind when we pledge: "With malice toward none, with charity for all," or when trying to fulfill: "Love thy neighbor as thyself." The term "mankind," which in biology denotes the human species, has an entirely different meaning in the realm of ethics and religion. Here mankind is not conceived as a species, as an abstract concept, stripped from its concrete reality, but as an abundance of specific individuals; as a community of persons rather than as a herd or a multitude of nondescripts.

While it is true that the good of all counts more than the good of one, it is the concrete individual who lends meaning to the human race. We do not think that a human being is valuable because he is a member of the race; it is rather the opposite: the human race is valuable because it is composed of human beings.

II. SENSE OF INNER EMPTINESS AND BOREDOM

Old age is an age of anguish and boredom. The only answer to such anguish is a sense of significant being.

The sense of significant being is a thing of the spirit. Stunts, buffers, games, hobbies, slogans are all evasions. What is necessary is an approach, a getting close to the sources of the spirit. Not the suppression of the sense of futility, but its solution; not reading material to while away one's time, but learning to exalt one's faculties is the answer; not entertainment but celebration.

To attain a sense of significant being we must learn to be involved in thoughts that are ahead of what we already comprehend, to be involved in deeds that will generate higher motivations.

There is a level of existence where one cannot think anymore in terms of self-centered needs and satisfactions, where the problem that cannot be silenced is: who needs me Who needs mankind? How does one relate himself to a source of ultimate meaning? The cry for such relatedness which gains intensity with old age is a cry for a referent that transcends personal existence. It is not experienced as a need from within but as a situation of being exposed to a demand from without.

Significant being is not measured by the amount of needs that agitate a person but by the intensity and depth of the response to a wisdom in relation to which my mind is an afterthought, by the discovery that the moment to come is an anticipation, an expectation, waiting to receive my existence. Significant being means experiencing moments of time as a comprehension which embraces me.

What a person lives by is not only a sense of belonging but also a sense of indebtedness. The need to be needed corresponds to a fact: something is asked of many, of every man. Getting older must not be taken to mean a process of suspending the requirements and commitments under which a person lives. To be is to obey. A person must never cease to be.

Our work for the aged is handicapped by our clinging to the dogmatic belief in the immutability of man. We conceive of his inner life as a closed system, as an automatic, unilinear, irreversible process which cannot be altered, and of old age as a stage of stagnation into which a person enters with his habits, follies, and prejudices. To be good to the old is to cater to their prejudices and eccentricities.

May I suggest that man's potential for change and growth is much greater than we are willing to admit and that old age be regarded not as the age of stagnation but as the age of opportunities for inner growth?

The years of old age may enable us to attain the high values we failed to sense, the insights we have missed, the wisdom we ignored. They are indeed formative years, rich in possibilities to unlearn the follies of a lifetime, to see through inbred self-deceptions, to deepen understanding and compassion, to widen the horizon of honesty, to refine the sense of fairness.

One ought to enter old age the way one enters the senior year at a university, in exciting anticipation of consummation. Rich in perspective and experienced in failure, the old person is capable of shedding prejudices and the fever of vested interests. He does not see anymore in every fellow man a person who stands in his way, and competitiveness may cease to be his way of thinking.

What the Nation needs is senior universities, universities for the aged where wise men should teach the potentially wise, where the purpose of learning is not a career, but where the purpose of learning is learning itself.

The goal is not to keep the old man busy, but to remind him that every moment is an opportunity for greatness. Inner purification is at least as important as hobbies and recreation. The elimination of resentments, of residues of bitterness, of jealousies and wrangling, is certainly a goal for which one must strive.

Only very few people realize that it is the days of our youth that we prepare ourselves for old age.

This is an imperative we must be conscious of even in youth. Prepare spiritually for old age and learn how to cultivate it. The ancient equation of old age and wisdom is far from being a misconception. However, age is no guarantee for wisdom. A Hebrew proverb maintains: "A wise old man, the older he gets, the wiser he becomes; a vulgar old man, the older he gets, the less wise he becomes." People are anxious to save up financial means for old age; they should also be anxious to prepare a spiritual income for old age. That ancient principle—listen to the voice of the old—becomes meaningless when the old have nothing meaningful to say. Wisdom, maturity, tranquillity do not come all of a sudden when we retire from business. We must begin teaching in public schools about the virtues that come to fruition, about the wisdom and peace that arrive in old age. Reverence for the old must be an essential part of elementary education at school, and particularly at home.

III. LONELINESS AND THE FEAR OF TIME

One of the major ills of old age as well as one of the roots of the general fear of old age is the fear of time. It is like living on a craggy ridge over a wide abyss. Time is the only aspect of existence which is completely beyond man's control. He may succeed in conquering space, in sending satellites around the moon, but time remains immune to his power; not even General Motors can bring back a moment gone by. Being used to dealing with things he can manage, the encounter with time is the most stunning shock that comes to man. In his younger years, he is too busy to react to it; it is in old age that time may become a nightmare.

Indeed, we know what to do with space but do not know what to do about time, except to make it subservient to space, or to while it away to kill time. However, time is life, and to kill time is to murder. Most of us seem to labor for the sake of things of space. As a result we suffer from a deeply rooted dread of time and stand aghast when compelled to look into its face. Time to us is sarcasm, a slick treacherous monster with a jaw like a furnace incinerating every moment of our lives. Shrinking, therefore, from facing time, we escape for shelter to things of space. The intentions we are unable to carry out we deposit in space; possessions become symbols of our repressions, jubilees of frustrations. But things of space are not fireproof; they only add fuel to the flames.

Most of us do not live in time but run away from it; we do not see its face, but its makeup. The past is either forgotten or preserved as a cliche, and the present moment is either bartered for a silly trinket or beclouded by false anticipations. The present moment is a zero, and so is the next moment, and a vast stretch of life turns out to be a series of zeros, with no real number in front.

Blind to the marvel of the present moment, we live with memories of moments missed, in anxiety about an emptiness that lies ahead. We are totally unprepared when the problem strikes us in unmitigated form.

It is impossible for man to shirk the problem of time. The more we think the more we realize; we cannot conquer time through space. We can only master time in time.

Time is man's most important frontier, the advance region of our age, a region where man's true freedom lies. Space divides us, time unites us. We wage wars over things of space; the treasures of time lie open to every man.

Time has independent ultimate significance; it is of more majesty and more provocative of awe than even a sky studded with stars.

Time is the process of creation, and things of space are results of creation. When looking at space we see the products of creation; when intuiting time we hear the process of creation. Things of space exhibit a deceptive independence. They show off a veneer of limited permanence. Things created conceal the Creator. It is the dimension of time wherein man meets God, wherein man becomes aware that every instant is an act of creation, a Beginning, opening up new roads for ultimate realizations. Time is the presence of God is the world of space, and it is within time that we are able to sense the unity of all beings.

Time is perpetual presence, perpetual novelty. Every moment is a new arrival, a new bestowal. Just to be is a blessing; just to live is holy. The moment is the marvel; it is in evading it that boredom begins that ends in despair.

Old age has the vicious tendency of depriving a person of the present. The aged thinks of himself as belonging to the past. But it is precisely the openness to the present that he must strive for.

He who lives with a sense for the presence knows that to get older does not mean to lose time but rather to gain time. And, he also knows that in all his deeds, the chief task of man is to sanctify time. All it takes to sanctify time is God, a soul, and a moment. And the three are always here.

It is still considered proper to expect that the first responsibility in planning for the senior citizen rests with the family. Such expectation presupposes the concept of a family which is not only an economic unit but also an interplay of profoundly personal relations. It thinks of the family not only as a process of living together but also of a series of decisive acts and events in which all members are involved and by which they are inwardly affected.

What is characteristic of the modern family is that on the level of profound personal experience—parents and children live apart. The experiences shared at home are perfunctory rather than creative. In the past, it was the role of the father to lead the children through moments of exaltation. Whatever stood out as venerable and lofty was associated with the father. Now we are entering a social structure in which the father is becoming obsolete, and in which there are only three ages: childhood, adolescence and old age. The husband of the mother is not a father, he is a regular guy, a playmate for the boys, engaged in the same foibles and subject to similar impulses. Since he neither represents the legacy of the past nor capable of keeping pace with the boys in the pursuit of the future, his status is rather precarious.

Children today experience their highest moments of exaltation in a children's world, in which there is no room for parents. But unless a fellowship of spiritual experience is reestablished the parent will remain an outsider to the child's soul. This is one of the beauties of the human spirit. We appreciate what we share, we do not appreciate what we receive. Friendship, affection is not acquired by giving presents. Friendship, affection comes about by two people sharing significant moment, by having an experience in common. You do not attain the affection of your teenage son by giving him an expensive car.

It is not necessary for man to submit to the constant corrosion of his finest sensibilities and to accept as inevitable the liquidation of the inner man. It is within the power of man to save the secret substance that holds the world of man together.

The real bond between two generations is the insights they share, the appreciation they have in common, the moments of inner experience in which they meet. A parent is not only an economic provider, playmate, shelter, and affection. A human being is in need of security, he is also in need of inspiration, of exaltation and a transcendent meaning of existence. And to a child, the parent represents the inspiration, the exaltation and the meaning. To my child, I am either the embodiment or the distortion of the spirit. No book, no image, no symbol can replace my role in the imagination and the recesses of my child's soul.

It is easy to speak about the things we are committed to; it is hard to communicate the commitment itself. It is easy to convey the resentments we harbor; it is hard to communicate the praise, the worship, the sense of the ineffable.

We have nearly lost the art of conveying to our children our ability to cherish the things that cannot be quantified.

This, then, is a most urgent problem: How to convey the inexpressible legacy, the moments of insight, how to invoke unconditional commitment to justice and compassion, a sensitivity to the stillness of the holy, attachment to sacred words?

There is no human being who does not carry a treasure in his soul; a moment of insight, a memory of love, a dream of excellence, a call to worship.

We must seek ways to overcome the traumatic fear of being old, prejudice, discrimination against those advanced in years. All men are created equal, including those advanced in years. Being old is not necessarily the same as being stale. The effort to restore the dignity of old age will depend upon our ability to revive the equation of old age and wisdom. Wisdom is the substance upon which the inner security of the old will forever depend. But the attainment of wisdom is the work of a life time.

Old men need a vision, not only recreation.

Old men need a dream, not only a memory.

It takes three things to attain a sense of significant being: God, a soul, and a moment. And the three are always here.

Just to be is a blessing. Just to live is holy.

Nationwide Traffic in Obscene Materials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM W. SCRANTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. SCRANTON. Mr. Speaker, a number of Representatives and Senators have introduced legislation in both Houses calling for the establishment of a Presidential Commission to deal with the nationwide traffic in obscene materials. Similar legislation was also introduced last year. It passed in the Senate, but failed to get out of committee in the House.

There is growing concern over this problem among America's parents. Since children and adolescents are the prime targets of the smut peddlers, this concern is understandable. And since it has been estimated that the traffic in obscene materials in the United States has now reached a volume of $1 billion a year, it is evident that their concern is most timely.

It would seem that Members of Congress can be no less concerned with this problem. For those Members who may not have had the opportunity to give serious consideration to the proposals calling for a Presidential commission to look into this problem, I am inserting here excerpts of letters from representative clergymen from my home district. It is clear that their views reflect the thinking of clergymen and concerned citizens in general across the Nation, and it would seem clear that the Congress has a definite obligation to respond to this concern.

The excerpts follow:

Father Karl Luther Memford, St. John's Lutheran Church, Scranton, Pa.: "* * * Let me commend you on proposing an indispensable foundation for a truly needed attack on a real evil. From my experience both in newspaper work and as an Air Force chaplain in two wars, I can verify the insidious and pervasive nature of obscene literature. Perhaps printed matter would be a more accurate description than 'literature' * * *."

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Thomas J. Cawley, editor in chief, the Catholic Light, Scranton, Pa.: "The February 23 issue of the Catholic Light which I enclose will advise you of my own concern with the traffic in smut and of my feeling that House bill 3686 which you sponsored will go a long way toward eliminating this threat to the moral health of all American citizens, regardless of their age or station in life.

"I note with gratitude and pleasure that you recognize the need for cooperation on every level, if any dent whatsoever is to be made in this nefarious business. For years the Light has been insisting that neither laws, nor parents, nor churches, nor committees will ever succeed by themselves. Each needs all the others; all need the help of each.

"Even then the battle will be fierce, for evil, greedy men do not easily surrender millions of dollars however tainted they may be.

"Accordingly, you may expect a fight at every step of the way."

Rev. Dr. William D. Golightly, Immanuel Baptist Church, Scranton, Pa.: "* * * I am of the opinion that you are on the right track. If this bill is passed it ought to accomplish the things many of us have hoped for through the years. It is my personal opinion that much can be done to prevent the transmission of such material by the combined efforts of Federal, State, and local governments. I sincerely hope your bill will be passed. Your bill seems to lay the responsibility where it belongs for it calls upon all of us to perform a duty.

"I am personally pleased that some decided step has been taken to combat the traffic in obscene literature and hope and pray for the success of your bill."

Rev. Dr. Mark R. Thompson, Westminster Presbyterian Church, Scranton, Pa.: "* * * My impression is that this bill provides for a channel at the Federal level to deal with this traffic which is as much a national as a local problem. Very few people are ever against anything that can be done to ferret out the kind of materials that apparently are being made easily available to our youth. As I understand it most of the criticism and the danger of such legislation and action springs from those who administer it. At this point the makeup of the Commission should be helpful.

"In my mind the last agency that should ever have expediting powers in the matter of dealing with such materials or in matters pertaining to censorship is the police department. In some cities a temporary enthusiasm without much in the way of a thoughtful, definitive policy has created a kind of gestapo attitude which in turn takes away from the effort the support of the very people that you need.

"When I was closely involved in the Navy's concern for the protection of moral standards, I became aware of the degree to which our Nation's moral health has been threatened by the professional promoters of pornography. I certainly think that anything that can be done, without violating the freedoms in which we believe to bring about a healthier community in which to raise our families, will be a great service to our Nation."

Rev. Dr. Richard K. White, St. Luke's Church, Scranton, Pa.: "* * * For many years I have felt that there should be some general law shaping and controlling much of our printed matter of the noxious and obscene type and especially the media by which it is circulated (in many cases through our postal department in rather devious

methods of disposal). Much of the material you refer to in your bill is just plain filth and no real excuse for its publication or traffic, except by those who profit upon the curiosity of the youth and mentally unbalanced. We could certainly live without it. The youthful minds could profit by using this time to better advantage.

"The problem is how to get to the grassroots and stunt its growth. Your bill seems to be the logical approach in this direction and the cross section of representation on the Commission should prove valuable in that they will be a nonpartisan group interested in general welfare rather than political in nature, which sometimes kills a good moral approach to the question. Your bill takes these things into consideration with the hope of overcoming the sleeper element, which causes most bills like this to die in committee."

Mr. Goldberg Speaks Firmly on Union Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Kansas City Star under date of March 16, 1961.

I believe that it will be of interest to the entire membership of the Congress, and I respectfully commend it to their reading:

MR. GOLDBERG SPEAKS FIRMLY ON UNION RESPONSIBILITY

Arthur J. Goldberg, Secretary of Labor, has proved himself to be a man who can shake a stern finger at either management or labor. Indeed, we have the impression that he has of late been shaking his finger most sternly at labor. More precisely, we have the impression that Secretary Goldberg is speaking now from the perspective of a public servant who represents not only labor, from whence he came, but capital and the public.

The Secretary is to be congratulated on his apparent recognition of the responsibility that he now has to the entire Nation. There were some in the business community who had their doubts about the special counsel for the AFL–CIO who received the Kennedy call. But Arthur Goldberg clearly was speaking in the public interest in Philadelphia recently when he said that "labor organizations and labor leaders who abide by the letter of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 are observing only the minimum standards of conduct expected of them."

We may note, for the record, that Goldberg has not always spoken thus. Last year, in the Northwestern University Law Review, he wrote of a Landrum-Griffin law weighted against labor. Then—and understandably so—he voiced the labor viewpoint.

But in Philadelphia, the Secretary spoke from another point of view, and it is to his credit that he did. Thus, it seems to us, there is a persuasive answer to the chief question raised by the Goldberg appointment: Could this man of great talents once known as labor's idea man accept fully his new responsibilities to the entire public?

Obviously the Goldberg record in the Cabinet cannot yet be assessed. We may note, however, that labor which he once represented so assiduously has become big business. The test of labor's maturity lies in a willingness to acknowledge its proper place as only one part of the economy. In a sense, the test applies to Goldberg, too.

Thus it is doubly significant that he should, at a union convention, stress that "the problems of society, and programs to solve them, are the problems of each member of society, not somebody else's entirely." We see in this new Arthur Goldberg a strong hope for the future of labor-management relations in the United States.

United Nations Activities in Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I have recently had the privilege of listening to a uniquely farsighted and penetrating statement by Mr. Paul G. Hoffman entitled "United Nations Activities in Africa." Mr. Hoffman, the Managing Director of the United Nations Special Fund, delivered these remarks on March 13 to the delegates of more than 100 national organizations meeting at the Statler-Hilton Hotel in Washington, D.C., in the annual meeting of the American Association for the United Nations. The general theme of the conference was "The United Nations in Crisis."

Mr. Hoffman's current position as Managing Director of the United Nations Special Fund is his most recent contribution in a long and distinguished career, largely in the public service. Mr. Hoffman began his business career as a salesman for the Studebaker Corp. in Los Angeles in 1911, becoming vice president of the corporation in 1925, and president in 1933. From 1942 to 1948 he served with distinction as chairman of the board of trustees of the Committee for Economic Development and as Administrator of the U.S. Economic Cooperation Administration. In 1950 Mr. Hoffman was appointed president and trustee of the Ford Foundation, a position from which he resigned in 1953 to become chairman of the board of the Studebaker Corp. and then of the merged Studebaker-Packard Corp.

During the 11th regular session of the General Assembly, Mr. Hoffman was a member of the U.S. delegation, serving principally as delegate to the Economic and Financial Committee of the Assembly. He is the author of "Seven Roads to Safety" and "Peace Can Be Won," and was awarded the Freedom House Award in 1951.

Paul Hoffman is a distinguished American and an outstanding international public servant. As a dynamic Managing Director of the United Nations Special Fund for economic development, he has contributed new strength and effectiveness to the world organization.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that Paul Hoffman's recent speech on "United Nations Activities in Africa" will be of real interest and instructiveness to the Congress and I, therefore, have asked unanimous consent that these remarks be inserted in the RECORD:

UNITED NATIONS ACTIVITIES IN AFRICA

No matter what any Texan present may think, the eyes of the world are not on Texas—they are on Africa. Hardly a day goes by without some new crisis in the Congo and these, together with eruptions in other countries, have kept Africa in the headlines. The news of Africa has been of conflicting but a great deal of quiet work has been going on to assist the African nations inspeeding their economic development. I have been asked to tell you the part the United Nations is playing in this effort.

I shall first try to give you an idea of the dimensions and character of the developmental problem in Africa. The continent is larger than all of North America and Western Europe combined. It comprises one-fifth of the world's total land area. There are some thirty countries, colonies and territories for which the U.N. has some measure of responsibility. The population of these countries is presently estimated at 240 million.

Africa is a continent of contrasts. Most of its countries are rich in natural resources—some have virtually none. Most of the countries are under-populated, but Egypt and several other countries are faced with serious problems of overpopulation. Near Lake Chad is a land area with the world's heaviest rainfall—386 inches per year—while in the nearby Sahara Desert only an occasional raindrop falls. Africa has two of the world's largest rivers, the Nile and the Congo, but they are the only two with unimpeded access to the sea. In Egypt we have the world's oldest civilization, while in Central Africa there are large areas untouched by civilization, where natives live much as did the Neanderthal Man.

Not only is there a diversity of conditions among the countries of Africa but oftentimes within a country one finds land that is lush and land that is sterile, swamp lands and deserts, to say nothing of peoples, some sophisticated and some primitive. Clearly, talk of an overall program for the development of Africa is utterly unrealistic. Every country requires a program hand tailored to its condition.

And yet, with all the diversity in Africa there are certain characteristics shared by almost all countries in a marked degree:

1. The leaders of these countries are faced with a demand for the immediate conquest of poverty, illiteracy and chronic ill health. In the case of the newly emerging countries, the demand for a better life is particularly insistent because the people of these countries were too often led to believe that independence would automatically bring prosperity.

2. All countries lack comprehensive knowledge of their physical or natural resources.

3. All of them are desperately short of trained government administrators, professional men, business leaders and skilled workers.

Assisting the African countries in acquiring a comprehensive knowledge of their physical or natural resources presents no insurmountable obstacles. The techniques for analyzing soils, charting river flows, investigating minerals resources, appraising forests, analyzing potentials for commercial fishing, are known. The U.N. and the Specialized Agencies have had a rich experience in this type of work. They have also had a decade of experience in other fields of technical assistance. Thousands of experts have taught new methods, new skills to the nationals in more than 100 countries and territories. And almost 10,000 nationals of the less developed countries have been given

fellowships for training in institutions in the more advanced countries.

The technical assistance program of the U.N. for Africa has been sharply stepped up from 1960 to 1961. In 1960, something over $4 million was devoted to such activities. In 1961, more than $10 million.

The Special Fund is assisting in the financing of some 15 surveys calling for total expenditures of $18.5 million, to which the Special Fund contribution is approximately $10 million.

I have recently returned from a trip to Africa where I inspected a number of our Special Fund projects. As a specific example of a rich but little used resource I cite the Niger River. A study for the development of that river has been underway and is, in fact, just about completed. There is every evidence that, with the construction of a 150-foot dam, the waters of that river will be available for the irrigation of thousands and thousands of acres of potentially rich land, for the generation of millions of kilowatts of cheap power, and navigation on the river will be greatly improved.

Let me give another specific example from another country—Ethiopia. One of its principal rivers is the Awash. Here again, its waters have been used but little and yet preliminary studies indicate that, with control of the waters of that river, the Awash Valley can become one of the most fertile valleys in all Africa. In fact, the prospects of this are so bright that a British syndicate signed an agreement with the Ethiopian Government to supply $35 million of capital for a settlement project in the valley, provided the intensive survey, now underway with United Nations assistance, measures up to the preliminary findings.

And now I would like to talk about the problems of assisting the African countries in making better use of their human resources. There is plenty of evidence that the people of these African countries can be trained to be good administrators, good engineers, good doctors, good technicians and good farmers. The size of the task, however, is staggering. Of the 240 million people in Africa, I do not believe that 80 percent can read or write, and I would be surprised if as much as 30 percent of the children of school age are currently attending school. It would be good if all Africans at or over school age could read and write, but that would be far from enough. Millions upon millions of these people must be given secondary education as well. There are also immense needs for vocational training. And finally, as a critical factor in economic development, we have the necessity to train vast numbers of higher and middle level administrative, scientific and technical personnel.

How many of these are required over the coming decade? Global figures for Africa are simply not available, but a clue is given in the case of Nigeria, whose needs for skilled manpower have been estimated rather carefully. Nigeria will need to train over the next 10 years 20,000 top-level administrators, professional technicians, managers and business executives. It will also need some 40,000 middle-level technicians—for building and industrial programs, for health services, teaching, and for supervisory positions in government and business. Now these are the requirements for people trained for highly skilled occupations and for only one country in Africa. And they represent the top of the educational and training pyramid. Think of what this implies in terms of the broader lower part of the pyramid that will also be necessary—of the enrollment in grade schools and high schools, and of the number of teachers, school buildings, libraries, and laboratories required.

Here indeed is a staggering job, one that is impossible with the resources currently available for it. But there is no time to lose in getting on with the task, for education and technical training must go in advance of significant economic development. Happily, as I said, the people have the capacity to learn.

The U.N. hopes to make a most significant contribution in the educational field. Both UNESCO and ILO have quite substantial programs financed from their own funds and by the United Nations Expanded Program of Technical Assistance. In addition, the special fund is assisting in the financing of a total of 24 educational and training projects calling for expenditure of more than $50 million, to which the special fund will contribute approximately $20 million. An idea of the emphasis we in the Fund are putting on training is disclosed by the fact that in our May 1961 program eight of our thirteen recommended projects for the African countries are in the training field.

In furtherance of the work of the United Nations, the Specialized Agencies and the special fund, the United Nations is rapidly developing a chain of permanent offices throughout Africa. Resident representatives are now actively at work in Ghana, Nigeria, Somalia, Togo, and the Congo, and are in the process of appointment to Madagascar, Senegal, Tanganyika, and the countries of the former French community in Africa south of the Sahara.

A report on U.N. activities in Africa would not be complete without special mention of its civilian operations in the Congo. Over 175 U.N. advisers and experts, plus some 65 dedicated Red Cross personnel working under the U.N. banner have labored selflessly over the past 6 months striving to restore the economic level of the Congo and to carry on essential public services. Since the crises of July 1960, U.N. emergency programs have helped in the reactivation of the port and railway systems of the country, the distribution of huge quantities of food and milk to the needy, a start on public works programs for employment relief, and protection of the water supply in major centers. The telecommunication system of the country has been kept running largely through U.N. efforts, as have the major airports, through the uphill efforts of air traffic control, air radio maintenance, and meteorological teams. With the departure of hundreds of doctors, the hospitals of the country have been kept in operation by WHO and Red Cross teams, working often under the most difficult conditions. May I cite just one isolated but illustrative activity, the organization by the U.N. Public Health Adviser in Luluabourg of a "refuse" week, during which 3 months accumulation of garbage was removed in this important city, thus preventing the obvious and serious consequences which might have ensued. More recently, the U.N. has undertaken a herculean program of relief—both food and medical assistance—to the 300,000 destitute refugees in Kasai Province. Within the past few weeks, a daily death toll of 200 in this region has been cut by over 75 percent.

Less spectacular but constructive progress has been made through U.N. assistance in preventing financial collapse, in preventive medical programs, in training of civil servants, in the revision of the social security scheme, in the arrangement of training abroad for Congolese in the fields of medicine, meteorology, labor instruction, etc.

Admittedly, this unprecedented effort of the U.N. in a single country has suffered from the political events and governmental instability, but it is a record of marked accomplishment, with the groundwork laid for long term economic improvement once the political situation has improved materially.

In conclusion I would like to offer certain suggestions which would, I believe add to the effectiveness of our aid programs not only in Africa but in all parts of the world. I suggest:

First, that we must put an end to all talk that implies that assistance from one nation to another is an act of charity. Such an approach is paternalism and paternalism has no place in relations among sovereign nations. There is only one relationship that is sound—and that is one of partnership. All nations must in their own self-interest accept proportionate responsibility for the achievement of a rapidly expanding world economy. The first responsibility of each country is to speed its own development. Its second responsibility is to assist other nations in accordance with its means. No nation is so rich that it cannot profit from an expanding world economy and no nation is so poor that it cannot help other nations.

Second, that helping low-income countries speed their development should be accepted as an objective worthy to be pursued for its own sake. Economic aid should not be thought of as an instrumentality of the cold war nor for obtaining a preferred commercial position for a donor country. There are practical as well as ethical reasons for concentrating on the one goal of economic development. The practical reason is that without such concentration the chance for success is remote. We all know that speeding development is much more difficult than promoting recovery. Nevertheless, I do not believe that the Marshall program would have been successful if it had not been for our concentration on the one goal of recovery. We refuse to become involved in the cold war and never sought a commercial advantage for the United States. We adhered strictly to the guidelines laid down by General Marshall in his commencement address at Harvard University in June 1947 when he stated:

"Our policy is directed not against any country or doctrine but against hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos. Its purpose should be the revival of a working economy in the world so as to permit the emergence of political and social conditions in which free institutions can exist."

Third, that much greater emphasis should be placed on preinvestment activities. Included in preinvestment activities are sending experts into a country under technical assistance programs; bringing nationals out of countries on fellowships for training in the more advanced countries; making surveys of natural resources; and assisting in the establishment of indigenous educational and training institutes. Billions of dollars of investment have been lost because millions were not spent in adequate preparatory activities.

Fourth, that a very pragmatic approach be employed in determining whether aid should be given through the United Nations, through regional organizations or on a bilateral basis, namely, which channel will yield the most development per dollar. I would be less than frank if I did not say that if this test is applied the result is certain to be a substantially increased use of the U.N. There are several reasons. First, as I said earlier because in the U.N. and its 13 specialized agencies reposes the richest experience that can be found anywhere in virtually every field of development activity. The U.N. draws on the whole world for its technicians. Second, assistance through the U.N. guarantees that there is no paternalism. U.N. assistance is a completely cooperative endeavor with a voice given to countries whatever their size or wealth and with all countries contributing to the cost. Third, because the low-income countries prefer assistance through the U.N., it is possible for the U.N. to insist upon the recipient countries putting forth a maximum of self-help. As proof that this can be done, I cite the fact that the Special Fund's contribution to the 115 projects thus far approved by the Governing Council is $96 million, that of the recipient countries $131 million, for a total of $227 million.

Fifth, that new emphasis be given to adjusting the educational program of the less-developed countries so that they will make a maximum contribution to the achievement of their economic goals. This means that primary, secondary, vocational, technical, and university education must have their appropriate share of whatever educational funds are available. In most of the less-developed countries of which I have knowledge, far too little attention has been given to secondary school education. The need is for a balanced program.

Sixth, that the advanced countries give careful thought to finding means to increase the supply of experts which have so important a part to play in the developmental process. At the present time there is an appalling shortage of fisheries, forestry, and soil experts, to say nothing about engineers and qualified teachers.

I am sure that out of this conference will come suggestions which are much more valuable than those I have offered. I am sure also that we are all of one mind that we must approach our task of assisting the less-developed countries with boldness, imagination, and new vigor. This decade of the 1960's is a crucial period in human history. If no answer is forthcoming to the yearnings of these hundreds of millions of desperately poor people for better living conditions, we will be faced with a world of dangerously explosive unrest. On the other hand, if in this period momentum is built up which will insure in time the conquest of poverty, illiteracy, and chronic ill health, we will have a better world than any of us have dared dream of.

The Fryingpan-Arkansas Reclamation Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include in the RECORD an article reviewing one of Colorado's major proposed reclamation projects, the Fryingpan-Arkansas. The article was written by Mr. Bert Hanna and appeared recently as a series in the Denver Post. Mr. Hanna has done an excellent job of summing up what is involved in this project and what its construction would mean to the development of the West.

THE FRYINGPAN DREAM

(By Bert Hanna)

"And not by eastern windows only,
When daylight comes, comes in the light;
In front, the sun climbs slow, how slowly,
But westward, look, the land is bright."

This quotation from Arthur Hugh Clough was used by John F. Kennedy in a speech at the Western Democratic Conference in Albuquerque last spring.

He used to dramatize his expressed determination to push for western development—to make the western land brighter—if nominated and elected president.

Colorado Congressmen are counting on this promise to aid them in their unremitting efforts to obtain authorization at long last for the huge Fryingpan-Arkansas reclamation project in the 87th Congress.

This is the major immediate goal of this State as a part of the New Frontier of the new administration, as it has been a goal in past administrations.

Kennedy has pledged that he will support this undertaking of such tremendous importance to the future economy and the water and power needs of both the Arkansas River Valley and the Colorado River Valley of this State.

President Eisenhower supported it.

This year, a fresh, dynamic approach seems to be needed in the view of most western Congressmen.

The Fryingpan-Arkansas plan stands as a symbol of political frustrations of the past and of hopes for the future.

It is hard to find romance or poetry in just plain water, particularly at this season of the year.

But when you try to translate water development in terms of people and their needs for ecnomic survival and security, there is heart interest not confined to dull engineering reports, statistics, studies, maps.

Many people, despite all that has been written about the Fryingpan, probably think of it as a cooking utensil, just as they probably vision the potential Savery-Pot project in northwestern Colorado as culinary art.

What is the Fryingpan?

Briefly, it is a multiple-purpose development designed as a major step in maximum utilization of water and related resources in the upper Arkansas River Basin in Colorado.

It is estimated to cost some $170 million at present prices.

By multiple purpose is meant domestic and irrigation water, reservoirs of power for industrial development, flood and sediment control, antipollution, fish and wildlife conservation and recreation.

The project involves the annual transmountain diversion of 69,000 acre-feet of water from the Colorado River Basin to the Arkansas River Basin, along with protection of western slope water users.

The project, despite its cost, is designed as an independent, self-sustaining unit.

It would readily integrate into a comprehensive plan for resource development in the broad, fertile plains of the Arkansas.

MORE WATER VITAL FOR REGION

Water is what the thousands of people in this area must have—more and more water. Without it, their economy will become stagnant, their future limited. There would be no place here for the population explosions from the teeming cities.

The development would provide:

1. About 190,000 acre-feet of water annually to supplement the present inadequate irrigation supply in the Arkansas Valley.

Only part of this would come from the diversion.

The rest would be supplied by adequate storage facilities for Arkansas River water now going to waste, particularly in the winter, and the trapping floodflows and their conversion to beneficial use.

In case you didn't know it, an acre-foot is the amount of water it takes to cover an acre of ground 1 foot deep.

It equals 326,000 gallons of water, and 190,000 acre-feet equal 62 billion gallons.

2. About 15,000 acre-feet of municipal and domestic water to improve the quality and supplement the supplies of Pueblo, Colorado Springs, and the valley towns of Manzanola, Rocky Ford, La Junta, Las Animas, Lamar, Wiley, and Eads.

Domestic water also would be made available to the farm population of the Arkansas Valley.

3. About 505 million kilowatt-hours of electrical energy annually. That's a lot of energy. It is enough to supply municipal consumption for a city of 250,000 annually.

4. Flood protection to the Arkansas Valley between the proposed Pueblo Reservoir and the existing John Martin Reservoir.

Diversion of water from the Fryingpan River watershed would be accomplished through a system of collection tunnels and conduits to tap tributary streams.

The water would be carried to a central point on the Fryingpan River, thence under the Continental Divide through the 5-mile Fryingpan-Arkansas tunnel, below Leadville.

Eastern and western slope agreement on project operations provides various measures for protection of rights and interests on both slopes of Colorado.

The plan now calls for construction of Ruedi Reservoir near Basalt to store 100,000 acre-feet of water for western slope use, in place of an originally planned dam near Aspen.

This dam and reservoir is designed to meet replacement requirements of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project and provide an additional regulated water supply for other uses on the western slope.

The amount of water to be imported through the Fryingpan diversion is declared well within Colorado's share of the waters of the Colorado River Basin, as allocated by the Colorado River and upper Colorado River compacts.

Storage of imported water, reregulation of native waters and storage of flood flows would be accomplished by enlargment of the existing Sugar Loaf and Twin Lakes Reservoirs on the eastern slope and construction of a reservoir near Pueblo.

The Fryingpan has been under consideration for over 30 years.

A tremendous engineering effort has been put forth to investigate all its phases.

The project has been ready for authorization for 8 years.

However, it was not until recently that all interested parties in Colorado were able to agree on the extent of the development.

STATE UNITED IN BACKING PROJECT

Felix L. Sparks, director of the Colorado Water Conservation Board, told the Upper Colorado River Commission recently:

"All segments of Colorado have dedicated themselves to solving the Fryingpan-Arkansas problem.

"It can now be stated without reservation that the people of this State are now determinedly united to secure the construction of this important project.

"To date, the people of Colorado have spent more than $500,000 in preparing the necessary plans and agreements to make this project become a reality.

"The Federal Government has spent over $1 million for the same purpose.

"There is no reason in equity or commonsense why this project should be delayed any further."

NEW LIFE

Picture if you will a great and formidable mountain bastion extending across a State.

On the western side of this rugged fortress is a beautiful, clear, rushing stream fed by rivulets from snow banks, winding through high, green mountain meadows.

That is the Fryingpan.

On the other, eastern side is a vast plain with a river that as it flows through large and small cities and farming communities gradually fades away into a sorrowful little trickle, soon lost and gone in the shimmering heat of what looks like a dry arroyo.

That often is the Arkansas.

This contrast affords the motivation for the renewed effort to make these streams work together to bring new life and beauty and hope for people.

A sort of wedding of two streams to create the long-sought Fryingpan-Arkansas project, which again will come before the Congress for authorization this year.

RUSHING WATERS

The Fryingpan as it flows into the Roaring Fort River to help create the western upper

basin supply for the Colorado River often has a roaring, tumultous head of water.

And that water often flows, wasted, unchecked and unused, into the great Gulf of California.

The vision of Colorado water people and the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation is to trap some of that water and convert it to beneficial use in the State where it originates. And to benefit both east and west slopes in the process.

Colorado is legally entitled to a substantial share of that water.

Let's explore some of the economic benefits that would accrue from the Fryingpan-Arkansas project to bring some of that water over to the Eastern Plains.

1. The undertaking, in part, is a rescue mission, a plan to make the most out of available water supplies

It is not a cure-all for the tremendous water problems of southeastern Colorado.

The latest reevaluation studies of the Bureau of Reclamation show that without the project the Arkansas Valley lands were short of water in 46 of the last 47 years studied.

The project would eliminate these shortages in 20 out of the 46 years and greatly reduce the shortages in other years.

Often the shortages have been critical.

Effects of shortages include:

Marginal operations of many farms.

Migration from farms during series of bad water years.

Inclination toward consolidation of farms.

Lack of adequate domestic water supplies to keep pace with population growth; hence, a population shift from some portions of the valley into other more promising areas.

Supply Varies

It should be pointed out that there is a wide variation in effects of water shortage.

Dependent on water rights, some farms will always have an ample supply.

Some characteristically will have a partial supply and some will get enough water only in the best years.

A reclamation table shows that the total project water is 192,600 acre-feet, although the transmountain importation is only about 70,000 acre-feet as an annual average.

Evaluations of benefits to the project area of 280,600 acres has placed the annual benefits, direct and indirect, at more than $5 million.

But you cannot place all the actual benefits under a dollar sign.

You have to think of the housewife turning on a water tap in her home; the happiness of a farmer able to have enough water to irrigate his fields, the security that only adequate water can bring to a home.

In addition to benefits to project acreage, it is estimated that some 20,500 acre feet of water could be obtained for municipal and industrial use through the diversion tunnel under the Continental Divide.

There are nine cities, including Pueblo and Colorado Springs, that would receive additional supplies, with total annual benefits placed at about $1 million.

2. Water quality

A U.S. Public Health study in 1957 showed that of all the Nation's major rivers the Arkansas is one of the worst from the standpoint of pollution, from the standpoint of chloride content, alkalinity, hardness and turbidity.

The fresh supply from the Fryingpan would go a long way toward improving these conditions, in improving water quality.

Most of the valley towns below Pueblo obtain municipal water from pumped wells. Other valley communities use water from streams and springs. In general, the quality is poor because of excessive hardness.

While Colorado Springs obtains excellent water from the slopes of Pikes Peak, the city has indicated an urgent need for a supplemental supply which the Fryingpan would provide.

Pueblo obtains its municipal water from the Arkansas River. During periods of low flow, the water is of poor quality—relatively hard and unpalatable.

The towns of Manzanola, Rocky Ford, La Junta, Las Animas, and Lamar and the offstream towns of Crowley, Wiley and Eads have requested treated municipal water from the project to replace entirely their present supplies.

3. Power

Meeting powerload growth for preference customers is a problem east of the Rockies. The Reclamation Bureau has specified contract dates which inform the customers of the times when it will no longer be able to meet their growths.

The power generated by the Fryingpan-Arkansas project will bolster not only the project area but also the interconnected power system.

The western division power network of the Missouri River Basin project serves preference customers in Colorado, Wyoming, and western Nebraska with power from 16 reclamation bureau plants in Colorado and Wyoming.

The Fryingpan will be connected with this network and also with the great Colorado River storage project.

4. Benefits to valley economy from project work

From the moment of authorization of such projects, there is a psychological uplifting in the project area.

This later is augmented by direct spending for field studies and then construction expenditures which would go a long way toward relieving employment in southeastern cities.

Finally, there are the benefits to the economy from project operation.

Present plans envision a 13-year construction period, during which a large portion of the total project cost will be expended directly in the project area for labor, materials and equipment.

5. Valley support

Innumerable valley residents have poured their efforts and personal funds into project support through the frustrating years.

The personal burden is eased since formation of the Southeastern Colorado Water Conservancy District in 1958 and its resultant tax revenues.

The district, with State water conservation board support, is actively at work on projects that anticipate the ultimate construction of the Fryingpan.

Existing water rights and priorities will be fully respected in the new development. The Fryingpan supplements, does not superimpose or conflict.

6. Western slope benefits

Original plans for construction of a replacement reservoir at Aspen have been abandoned through local opposition. Now the plan calls for construction of a reservoir at Ruedi near Basalt, to store 100,000 acre-feet of water.

The Aspen Reservoir capacity was placed at 28,000 acre-feet—more than adequate to replace the amount of diversion involved.

Hence, the project is building for the future as yet undetermined uses on the western slope, possibly including oil shale development.

The Fryingpan will underwrite the additional cost of the Ruedi Reservoir but expects to be repaid when the western uses develop.

Thus, a bigger Colorado natural resources asset is being created.

WESTERN CHALLENGE

"There are some who say that the challenge is gone out of the West that the pioneer died along with the buffalo and the open range.

"I say to you that it simply isn't so. A new challenge is developing before our very eyes.

"Its wellspring is the amazing population growth our country is experiencing. The challenge is to coordinate resource development with this population explosion."

These observations by Floyd E. Dominy, U.S. Commissioner of Reclamation, highlighted the recent meeting of the National Reclamation Association at Bakersfield, Calif.

Dominy stressed in his talk the tremendous need for more development and conservation of water resources to keep pace with population growth through such great undertakings as the Fryingpan-Arkansas project in Colorado.

ABOUT THE COST

Inevitably, however, such discussions come around to money—to the question of justification of costs.

Testimony and documentation before the Select Committee on National Water Resources of the U.S. Senate indicates that between now and 1980 the Nation will have to invest more than $200 billion in the development of water resources.

But foes of developments in the 17 Western reclamation States have traditionally adopted the attitude that these undertakings are pork-barrel raids on the U.S. Treasury.

They overlook the salient fact that these multiple-purpose power and water projects pay their way.

That they make returns on the investments in actual earnings.

And that they make incalculable returns by creating new wealth, new industry, new hope and opportunity for people of ambition.

Summarizing its most recent reevaluation statement on the Fryingpan-Arkansas, the Reclamation Bureau said:

"As demonstrated by benefit-cost analysis, the Fryingpan-Arkansas is a highly productive development.

WHERE IT'S SPENT

"About 90 percent of the total project cost is reimbursable and over one-half of the repayable cost bears interest."

And Felix L. Sparks, director of the Colorado Water Conservation Board, discussing the estimated cost of $170 million for the Fryingpan, said:

"Long before the project cost is scheduled to be repaid, the direct and indirect benefits from its operation will run into hundreds of millions of dollars."

Let's explore the benefit-cost analysis.

The estimated $170 million cost would be distributed among the following principal features:

A system of about 70 miles of canals and tunnels on the western slope for collecting and transporting water from Hunter Creek and tributaries to the Fryingpan River.

Ruedi Dam and Reservoir with a capacity of about 100,000 acre-feet of water on the Fryingpan River 14 miles above Basalt, to provide replacement water and water for other beneficial western slope uses.

The 5.3-mile Fryingpan-Arkansas transmountain diversion tunnel below Leadville.

Enlargement of the existing Sugar Loaf and Twin Lakes Reservoirs on the eastern slope and construction of Pueblo Reservoir for a total eastern slope storage capacity of 777,000 acre-feet.

A power system consisting of about 52 miles of canals, seven powerplants with a total installed capacity of 123,900 kilowatts, seven switchyards, seven substations, and a primary transmission network to assure distribution of power to load centers.

(This power system by itself could take care of a city of 250,000, the Reclamation Bureau estimates.)

The $170 million estimated project cost includes the full estimated cost of Ruedi Dam and Reservoir ($12,831,000), of which $7,600,000 is assignable to the Fryingpan-Arkansas.

PLUS FIGURES

The Bureau's new economic justification study translates benefits in terms of dollars as follows:

First, annual irrigation benefits to the 280,600 acres in the project area.

Direct benefits to project service area, $2,471,100; to lands below existing John Martin Reservoir, $446,900; total, $2,918,000.

Indirect and public benefits to project service area, $1,768,550; to lands below John Martin Reservoir, $319,850; total, $2,088,000.

Total annual irrigation benefits, $5,006,400.

Annual benefits from construction costs of $13,761,000 for municipal water facilities, $1,116,900.

Annual benefits from marketing of power, $3,606,500, plus taxes of $531,000.

Annual benefits from flood and sediment control, $849,000.

Total all annual benefits, $10,578,000.

To understand the Reclamation Bureau's benefit-cost analysis, it is necessary to point out that for the purpose of this study, the net project costs was reduced to $164,674,000.

That is because construction of the Ruedi Dam and Reservoir on the west slope will cost $12,831,000 as compared with an estimate of $7,600,000 for building the originally planned dam at Aspen.

Thus, some $5,231,000 of the Ruedi Dam costs was not considered an actual obligation of the Fryingpan.

Of the additional costs assessed to the Ruedi development, some $3,300,000 is applied to future western slope use of the big new water supply and the remainder for nonreimbursable purposes.

THE BREAKDOWN

Taking those factors into account, the Reclamation Bureau has come up with this allocation summary:

Net project cost	$164,674,000
Payable interest during construction	2,696,000
Total investment	167,370,000
Nonreimbursable allocations:	
Flood control	15,226,000
Fish and wildlife	2,081,000
Balance: Reimbursable	150,063,000

Two and five-tenths percent interest bearing allocations:

Commercial power project costs	$59,342,000
Interest during construction	1,962,000
Total	61,304,000
Municipal water project costs	8,438,000
Interest during construction	279,000
Total	8,717,000
Delivery system project costs	13,671,000
Interest during construction	455,000
Total	14,216,000
Irrigation (non-interest-bearing allocation)	65,826,000
Total reimbursable	150,063,000

Revenues for repayment of project costs will be derived from conservancy district ad valorem taxes, water and power sales and payments to amortize the costs of the municipal water delivery system.

Federal construction of this delivery system is to be undertaken only if it is not feasible for communities involved in construct the works themselves.

Taxes from the newly formed Southeastern Colorado Water Conservancy District will provide a major source of revenue. The assessed value of all taxable property in that district amounts to upward of a half-billion dollars.

With the Fryingpan project in operation, a 1-mill tax would be levied by the district.

FLOOD CONTROL

Flood control is a very important aspect of the Fryingpan-Arkansas multiple-purpose development.

Along with that will come other benefits such as sediment control, fish and wildlife conservation, recreation.

Damaging floods of record have occurred in the western slope diversion area and in the Arkansas Valley extending down to Cannon City.

From there extending eastward, damaging floods increase in frequency to the mouth of the Purgatoire River in the extreme southeast.

The largest flood to ever occur in the project area struck Pueblo and environs with devastating force in June 1921.

RAINS TO BLAME

Intense rains caused enormous flows at Pueblo, reaching 103,000 second-feet.

Downstream tributaries contributed to the flood until the peak of 200,000 second-feet was reached at La Junta.

A second-foot is a cubic foot of water flowing in 1 second past a given point.

That's a lot of water roaring down a river in a period of minutes, tearing up the countryside and cities, then lost to beneficial use.

The 1921 flood killed at least 78 persons. Property damage exceeded $19 million, including $10 million in Pueblo.

As a result of the disaster, a barrier dam was built across the Arkansas 6 miles west of Pueblo and an improved floodway channel through the city was completed in 1926.

Another flood control structure, the John Martin Reservoir, located on the Arkansas near Lamar, Colo., was completed in 1949 by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

This is a multiple-purpose project, with 281,000 acre-feet of its 701,000 acre-foot capacity allocated to flood control.

However, U.S. Reclamation Bureau studies show that a flood danger still exists from Pubelo downstream to the John Martin Reservoir.

BIG BENEFITS

The Corps of Engineers has estimated that the annual damages along that reach of the river averages nearly $1 million.

The Fryingpan project, it is concluded, would eliminate the big percentage of that damage, besides conserving water.

The corps has reevaluated the flood control benefits attributable to the project at $708,000 annually.

Much of the flood control would be achieved through construction of a new reservoir at Pueblo. It would impound 93,000 acre-feet of flood control storage and contribute greatly to increased municipal water supplies.

There are the associated needs.

Take sediment control.

An evaluation has been made of sediment control benefits of $141,000 annually from the proposed Pueblo Reservoir.

These benefits consist of:

Prolonging the useful life of John Martin Reservoir.

Reduction of annual operation and maintenance expenses at existing diversion works and canals between the two reservoirs.

An acute sedimentation problem long has affected irrigation in the main Arkansas Valley.

At Pueblo, the river annually transports a vast sea of sediment.

Much of it is deposited in reservoirs, canals, and laterals and more than a third of it becomes undesired deposits on irrigated lands.

Modification of the river channel by the deposits has made some diversion structures inoperative; other diversion structures have necessarily been raised.

DISPOSAL COSTLY

Removed sediment now lines some canal banks and further disposal has become very expensive.

"The only apparent immediate solution is provision of reservoir space specifically for the disposition of sediment," says the Reclamation Bureau study.

Fishing and hunting are sports of much financial significance in the diversion area and the Arkansas Valley.

The project has been so planned and operating rules have been formulated to prevent diversions of water beyond a minimum for preservation of fish life.

Provisions also have been made to minimize interference with wildlife habitat.

The mountainous portions of both slopes of the project area are important recreational areas at all seasons.

They combine such qualities as scenic beauty, wilderness character, remoteness, water for fishing, and skiing facilities.

All agencies concerned with the project are pledged to protect and improve the recreational advantages through operation of the project and to abide by recommendations of the National Park Service in this regard.

HOPES RAISED

"Look to the green within the mountain cup;
Look to the prairie parched for water's lack.
Look to the sun that pulls the oceans up;
Look to the cloud that gives the oceans back.
Look to your heart and may your wisdom grow
To power of lightning and to peace of snow."

This poem by Denver's Thomas Hornsby Ferrill illustrates murals by the late Allen True in the rotunda of the Colorado Capitol.

The art and poetry point up the tremendous importance of water to the growth and economy of this State.

They might very well serve to show the need for the wise conservation and development of water supplies through construction of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project and other similar undertakings.

The Fryingpan, which is again before Congress for authorization, is vital to the lifeblood of a vast area of southeastern Colorado, as well as the whole State's economy.

That is agreed by all water resources experts.

Felix L. Sparks, director of the Colorado Water Conservation Board, put the State's need for the Fryingpan and other multiple-purpose projects in simple terms in a statement before the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources.

The committee held hearings here and elsewhere to come up with some answers for what has become one of the greatest national problems—water. It is due to report to the Congress in late January.

"I believe it is highly appropriate that this committee should meet here in Colorado," Sparks said.

"In this State are found the headwaters of four of the major rivers of the West—the Platte, the Arkansas, the Rio Grande, and the Colorado.

"These rivers are the life arteries of our State.

"These rivers or their tributaries are of similar importance to the majority of the States west of the Mississippi River.

"Geographically, Colorado occupies a unique position within the continental boundaries.

"Waters originating in other States are in nature not available for use in Colorado.

"On the other hand, all of the surface waters of the State, excepting natural losses, are available by gravity to 18 other States.

"This in itself would not be significant if it were not for the fact that by court decision and interstate compact we are compelled to deliver about 50 percent of our available surface water to other States.

"Within the next 50 years the water resources of the Colorado River Basin will have become almost entirely exhausted. Our major problem today lies in developing our remaining water resources at a pace commensurate with our population increase."

And Sparks pointed out that of the four major river basins of Colorado, the Arkansas has 24 percent of the State's total population but only 6.9 percent of the State's surface water production.

The Arkansas Basin occupies second place in population total and includes two of Colorado's major cities, Pueblo and Colorado Springs.

A significant portion of the flow of the Arkansas River must be shared with Kansas.

Thus, Sparks pointed out to the Senate Select Committee:

"Any appreciable population growth in the future will not be possible in the Arkansas Valley unless additional water resources are made available.

"One of the State's major reclamation projects, the Fryingpan-Arkansas, has long been planned to augment the already exhausted water supply of this area.

"No Federal reclamation project has as yet been constructed for the benefit of the Arkansas Valley, although the John Martin Reservoir, constructed by the Corps of Engineers, has contributed to the economy of the area."

The Fryingpan project to divert water from sources of headwaters of the Colorado River into the Arkansas to augment supplies for irrigation, power and municipal use has had rough sledding.

In its several outings in Congress, it encountered some of its most severe opposition from California.

That State long has been jealous of any water developments in the upper Colorado River Basin States on the theory that its own tremendous needs for Colorado River water will be jeopardized.

But water experts now suggest that California's position may soften somewhat in the realization that the Fryingpan development won't mean a thing to that State.

In the first place, it will take no water away from Californnia that it is entitled to.

The Fryingpan diversion is in accordance with water allotments under Colorado River compacts.

And what California is entitled to was carefully spelled out in the recent decision of a special master of the U.S. Supreme Court involving a long California-Arizona water suit.

The special master, Simon H. Rifkind, gave Arizona a clear-cut victory in its feud over water rights in the lower Colorado River Basin.

To understand what the decision is about, you have to know that the basic charter of Colorado River development apportions 7½ million acre-feet of water to the upper basin States of Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, and New Mexico.

It allows the lower basin States of California, Arizona and Nevada the same amount. California claimed a greater share of the river than Arizona contended she was entitled to.

LOST ON POINTS

California lost on two key points under Rifkind's findings.

First, Rifkind held that none of the more than 1 million acre-feet used by Arizona from the tributary Gila River can be charged against Arizona's 2 million acre-feet apportionment from the Colorado River.

Rifkind declared that Arizona's share of Colorado River water should come from the main stream.

Arizona's second major victory was in Rifkind's decision that the historic "first in use, first in right" doctrine does not apply to water apportioned btween States under the 1922 Colorado compact and 1929 Boulder Canyon Project Act.

This gives Arizona a priceless stake in almost 1 million acre-feet of water a year. While the decree must still be approved by the U.S. Supreme Court, it is extremely doubtful that the findings of the special master will be upset.

The decision has no bearing on Upper Colorado River Basin States providing they abide by compacts. But it does place a definite limitation on how far California can go in use of Colorado River water.

In other words, it simply means:

If the Fryingpan project is defeated, this won't create a single extra drop of water for California. California is already using more than her apportioned share of the river.

The great and growing water problem of the West, as well as the entire country, is brought into sharp focus in the work the Senate select committee is doing.

A recent report to that committee from a privately endowed research foundation, Resources for the Future, Inc., said the United States can meet its soaring water demands in most areas in the next 20 years.

But at best, this will cost from $54 to $74 billion for new dams, reservoirs and waste-treatment facilities.

A Report on "Operation Abolition"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report of a special study subcommittee unanimously adopted by the Santa Clara County Democratic Central Committee on February 16, 1961. Because of the widespread interest shown in the film, this central committee report has been made available to all interested parties:

A REPORT ON "OPERATION ABOLITION"

(By the Santa Clara County Democratic Central Committee)

In June 1959, a week before hearings of the House Un-American Activities Committee in San Francisco were scheduled to begin, they were postponed until September. In the meantime, names of over 40 northern California schoolteachers (plus 70 from southern California) subpenaed for the hearings were made public. Typifying protest over the delay, the San Francisco Chronicle editorialized: The teachers "* * * stand accused with no opportunity to clear themselves. This * * * procedure is hardly in accord with the best American practice, though it is not new with the House Un-American Activities Committee."

After another postponement (from September to October) the hearings were canceled. The House Un-American Activities Committee then, as the San Francisco Chronicle put it, "* * * unceremoniously dumped its files on 93 California teachers into the * * * office of superintendent of public instruction * * * Many of the files found their way to the local school boards. Some teachers * * * lost their jobs * * * although at least one * * * board * * * announced that the files * * * revealed information of no consequence." The Chronicle commented: "Is anyone really surprised * * * that the files used by this reckless committee are worthless, containing unverified charges and rumors from unnamed sources? Pressing an unfair advantage is standard operating procedure with the Un-American Committee."

In April 1960, House Un-American Activities Committee issued subpenas for hearings to be held in May. Student protests began to take shape informally with announcement of the House Un-American Activities Committee's plans. The student leaders in this connection came from organizations already established on the University of California campus. They have emphatically denied that Douglas Wachter, credited by House Un-American Activities Committee with organizing the demonstration, took any part in the mobilization of protest. At a meeting 2 weeks before the House Un-American Activities Committee's arrival, the students formed an ad hoc committee called Students for Civil Liberties (SCL) and drew up a petition for cancellation of the hearings and abolition of House Un-American Activities Committee. In a 4-day circulation the petition received 2,000 signatures.

Subsequently, the SCL scheduled a mass meeting at Union Square in San Francisco to coincide with the start of the hearings on May 12. The mass meeting was to be followed by a march to city hall where a picket line was to be formed. Throughout the bay area, protests against HUAC were endorsed by various religious, labor, and educational groups and individuals. Some 1,000 people attended the meeting in Union Square the day the hearings began.

The film "Operation Abolition," focuses primarily on events of May 13, the so-called riot. According to the HUAC version, as represented by the film, Communists planned the demonstrations, planned the riot itself, and converted the students into unwitting dupes. The film's narrator declares that the Communist Party activated trained agitators in the bay area months before the hearings and that professional Communist agitators in the halls led the crowds in chants and songs.

The HUAC also asserts that the riot was sparked by student violence. Both the film's commentary and the Hoover report flatly state that the riot started when a demonstrator leaped a barricade, grabbed an officer's night stick, and beat the officer over the head. Both further assert that the students then surged forward as if to storm the doors, and that Police Inspector Michael McGuire, at that point, ordered fire hoses into play. Police reports also blame the riot on student violence.

Our investigation, which included interviews of witnesses, news photos, tape recordings, a great many reports, and a careful analysis of the film itself, led to the following conclusions:

1. The known Communists referred to by HUAC did not participate in the organization of the student demonstrations.

2. The students inside City Hall were noisy, but not violent. The noise was in protest of HUAC's arbitrary admission policy giving preference to those with white-card passes issued by HUAC to members of certain HUAC-approved organizations. Our findings show that the police inspector's decision to use fire hoses in an attempt to disperse students then seated on the rotunda floor in

front of the barricades actually touched off the incident.

3. HUAC's claim that the hoses were turned on after a student jumped a barricade and allegedly assaulted a police officer is not true. The San Francisco district attorney's office in its prosecution of the student in question will maintain that the hoses were turned on before the alleged assault occured. Other evidence examined by this subcommittee is consistent with this finding.

On the morning after the riot, the HUAC altered its announced agenda to receive testimony from Chief of Police Cahill, Sheriff Carberry, and friendly witness Karl Prussion. While admittedly not a witness to any of the events, Chief Cahill built the case for the official version by citing hearsay evidence—the reports of officers in his department. Although Police Inspector McGuire was questioned, Committee Counsel Richard Arens carefully avoided examining him on the facts immediately prior to the hosing. Prussion warned the committee that the Communist press would charge police brutality. While he was speaking, readers of the San Francisco Chronicle and other bay area newspapers were reading accounts such as that of Mel Wax, Chronicle reporter, to the effect that "* * * never in 20 years as a reporter have I seen such brutality."

The committee staff rapidly subpenaed all available photographs, newsreel and TV camera footage, and tape records of the preceding day's events. Subsequently, the Washington Video Production, Inc., a commercial film company in Washington, D.C., issued the film "Operation Abolition." By lifting film strips out of context by rearranging the sequence of events, and by a grossly inaccurate narration, the producers of the film have rendered an extremely distorted version of the demonstration. A summary of some of the distortions follows this report.

The presentation of the movie usually attributes its filming and distribution to an organization known as Coalition of Patriotic Organizations. Our subcommittee has been unable to determine the present official position of HUAC regarding the controversy over the film. Two committee staff members were responsible for acquiring the newsreel films; Fulton Lewis III, a staff member, prepared the narration; and three members of the Committee appear in the movie. It was submitted by HUAC as part of its annual report to Congress.

Throughout the Nation, the movie has found a ready market. Large corporations have bought a great many copies. The Defense Department reportedly purchased 75 copies. Service clubs, fraternal organizations, government agencies, civil clubs, PTAs, and school departments have also purchased the film.

Having interviewed people who saw the film on the job, in service clubs, or elsewhere, this subcommittee discovered that, almost without exception, it was exhibited either with no additional commentary or with a one-sided commentary supporting the film's version of the events.

This subcommittee regretfully reports that the movie "Operation Abolition" has been successful in suppressing free discussion and in intimidating those opposed to practices of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

This subcommittee unanimously approves the findings of this report and recommends:

1. Formation of a speakers' panel to be made available to exhibitors of the film so that the truth may be presented along with the movie.

2. Wide distribution of the pamphlet "In Search of Truth," prepared by the Bay Area Student Committee for the Abolition of the HUAC, wherever the film is shown.

3. Distribution of this report and the pamphlet "In Search of Truth" to members of the Democratic clubs of this county, Members of Congress, members of the State legislature, press representatives, and other interested parties.

Joseph F. Lewis, attorney; Edith S. Freidenrich, housewife; Arthur F. Ronz, steel company executive; Mervyn L. Cadwallader, college professor; William Stanton, attorney and college professor; Jacob M. Stone, M.D., physician; Harry Branch, insurance company executive.

The folowing summarizes some of the more flagrant distortions in the movie "Operation Abolition." The pamphlet "In Search of Truth" provides a more detailed analysis.

1. The film narrator states that a directive was issued by the students' civil liberties group to laugh out loud.

The truth: A student suggested this at a public meeting, but it was not adopted as policy by any organization involved.

2. The film narrator states that Harry Bridges is shown being escorted out of the city hall moments before the rioting broke out.

The truth: The J. Edgar Hoover report states that order had been restored when Bridges appeared.

3. The film shows a demonstration by known Communists in the hearing room and, by switching promptly to a scene of the hosing, seeks to establish a causal connection between these two incidents.

The truth: The first demonstration occurred on Thursday; none of the participants in it are shown or said to be present during the student demonistration in the rotunda during the noon recess on Friday. The so-called riot occurred Friday at 1:20 p.m.

4. The film narrator states that on Friday 200 members of the general public were admitted to the hearing room.

The truth: On Friday morning, highest estimates place 30 members of the public in the room and on Friday afternoon only 15. The narrator's figures can be supported only by considering the white-card holders as members of the general public. These passholders were permitted to go ahead of the long line of waiting students.

5. The film narrator says that the songs sung by the students were taken from the old Communist "People's Song Book."

The truth: They were heard to sing "The Star-Spangled Banner," "God Bless America," "Battle Hymn of the Republic," and "We Shall Not Be Moved" (a folk hymn revived during the sit-ins in the South).

6. The film narrator states that the students were warned to clear the building.

The truth: The students claim, with a tape recording for support, that Sheriff Carberry told them thay could stay in the rotunda and that they would be admitted on a first-come, first-served basis. They deny that McGuire warned them of the hosing. Some admit seeing the hose and sitting down in passive resistance. The AP photographer declares that while there was a warning, it could only have been heard, if at all, by students immediately in front of the barricade.

7. The film narrator states that one of the Communist professional agitators arrested was Vernon Bown, one of the notorious Louisville Seven and charged with sedition in 1954.

The truth: He does not state that Bown was identified on Friday morning as not being a member of the Communist Party. Further, his charge of attempting to overthrow a Southern State (i.e., defending a Negro family from segregationists) was dismissed by the U.S. Supreme Court.

Proposed Wilderness System Will Not Damage Commercial Interests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources on the Wilderness System legislation, of which I am a sponsor:

PROPOSED WILDERNESS SYSTEM WILL NOT DAMAGE COMMERCIAL INTERESTS

Attacks on the pending wilderness bill by livestock, timber, and other commercial interests are labeled false and misleading by Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, chairman of the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, because the proposed program will not damage these interests and will affect only a very small part of the Federal lands.

The opposition stirred up against the wilderness bill "by commercial interests with covetous eyes on even our last remaining areas of wilderness," the Citizens Committee described as "completely without justification."

Existing grazing privileges in the national forests are continued by a provision of the bill. No areas open to lumbering are affected. Mining on the national forest lands involved may be permitted if needed in the national interest. A special provision in the bill safeguards State water laws.

The wilderness bill, it was explained, has been carefully designed to avoid damage to existing interests and to fit into the land-use programs already established.

LESS THAN 2.2 PERCENT OF THE NATION

Only in 10 Western States where there are large acreages of Federal land are there considerable percentages of the land involved in programs to be established by the wilderness bill, according to the citizens committee. Even in these 10 States the maximum wilderness involved would vary from only 1 percent to only 7½ percent, or an average of about 4 percent of the so-called Western public land States.

The 10 Western States and the percentages of their areas involved are Idaho, 5.7 percent; Utah, less than 1 percent; Wyoming, less than 7½ percent; Oregon, 1½ percent; Montana, 4 percent; California, 5/10 percent; Colorado, less than 2 percent; Arizona, 5 percent; New Mexico, 1½ percent; and Washington, less than 6 percent.

Other States in which wilderness areas could be established by the proposed program are Nevada, North Dakota, South Dakota, Oklahoma, Texas, Minnesota, Michigan, Louisiana, Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Tennessee, Kentucky, Virginia, Maine, Alaska, and Hawaii.

The total area of the United States involved would be less than 2.2 percent at the most, the citizens committee estimated.

National forest areas were estimated to be about 14,500,000 acres at the most and national park system areas to total less than 20 million acres. Within the national wildlife refuges and ranges the areas that could be designated have not been predicted in any detail, it was pointed out, and it is estimated that they would not in the extreme exceed 15 million acres.

A national total of 50 million acres was thus estimated to be considered an outside

maximum, out of the Nation's total of more than 2,300 million acres.

ONLY 5.7 PERCENT OF IDAHO

Only five areas in Idaho are involved, the Citizens Committee points out, and they comprise 5.7 percent of the state. More than 94 percent of the state is not affected at all by the bill.

Out of Idaho's total of 83,557 square miles, only 4,835 would be preserved as wilderness under this measure. Two of the areas in Idaho to be given protection are already in the national park system, and are not available for commercial use.

The other three areas are all within national forests, and have been for a long time set aside by the Forest Service for special protection. The wilderness bill would make all three of these subject to further studies before they can become permanent units of the wilderness system.

LESS THAN 1 PERCENT OF UTAH

Only six areas in Utah will be involved. These include 845 square miles, or less than 1 percent of the State's 84,916 square miles. Five of the areas are already in the national park system, two parks and three monuments. These are already unavailable for commercil use or exploitation.

Just one Utah area remains to be considered, the high Uintas primitive area. The wilderness bill will require further study of this area before its inclusion in the permanent wilderness system.

LESS THAN 7½ PERCENT OF WYOMING

Two of the areas in Wyoming to be given protection by the wildeness bill are already in the national park system and not available for any commercial use.

Of the other areas, eight are within national forests, and have for a long time been set aside by the Forest Service for special protection. The wilderness bill would make four of these subject to further studies before they become permanent units of the wilderness system.

Ten areas in Wyoming are involved, the Citizens Committee points out. More than 92 percent of Wyoming is not affected by the bill at all.

Out of Wyoming's total of 97,914 square miles, less than 7,262 would be preserved as wilderness under this measure. The bill does not withdraw any additional units or acreage.

ONLY 1½ PERCENT OF OREGON

Only 1½ per cent of Oregon, the Citizens Committee points out, is involved in the 11 areas of the State included in the proposed system. This means that more than 98½ percent of Oregon is not affected by the bill.

Out of Oregon's total of 96,981 square miles, only 1,508 would be preserved as wilderness under this measure. One of the areas in Oregon to be given protection by the wilderness bill is already in the national park system and not available for any commercial use.

The other 10 areas are all within national forests and have for a long time been set aside by the Forest Service for special protection. The wilderness bill makes one of these subject to further studies before it becomes a permanent unit of the wilderness system.

FOUR PERCENT OF MONTANA

Two of the units in Montana to be given protection by the wilderness bill are already in the national park system and not available for any commercial use. Of the other units, nine are all within national forests and have for a long time been set aside by the Forest Service for special protection. The wilderness bill would make seven of these subject to further studies before they become permanent units of the wilderness system. Three areas are now protected by the Fish and Wildlife Service. In all, 14 areas in Montana are involved, the Citizens Committee points out.

Out of Montana's total of 147,138 square miles, only 6,397 would be preserved as wilderness under this measure. More than 95 percent of Montana is not affected by the bill at all.

LESS THAN 5.1 PERCENT OF CALIFORNIA

Californial has more units and more acreage affected than any other State. Its 27 units include 5,775,053 acres. Californians are proud of the parks, monuments, and national forests. Yet these occupy only 9,023 square miles, or less than 5/10 percent of the State's total of 158,297. Of these units, nine are national parks or monuments, already removed from commercial exploitation.

The remaining 18 units are all in national forests and have for years been set aside by the Forest Service for special protection. The wilderness bill would make 16 of these subjects to further study, to make certain that only areas predominantly of wilderness value will be included.

LESS THAN 2 PERCENT OF COLORADO

Less than 2 percent of Colorado, the Citizens Committee points out, is involved in the 16 areas of the State included in the proposed system. This means that more than 98 percent of Colorado is not affected by the bill.

Out of Colorado's total of 104,247 square miles, ony 2,044 would be preserved as wilderness under this measure.

Five of the areas in Colorado to be protected by the wilderness bill are already in the national park system and not available for commercial use. The other 11 areas, all within national forests, have for a long time been set aside by the Forest Service for special protection. The bill makes nine of these subject to further studies before becoming permanent units of the system.

ONLY 5 PERCENT OF ARIZONA

Seventeen areas in Arizona are involved, the Citizens Committee points out, and they comprise only 5 percent of the State. This means that 95 percent of Arizona is not affected by the bill at all.

Out of the Arizona's total of 113,909 square miles, only 5,631 would be preserved as wilderness under this measure.

Six of the areas in Arizona to be given protection by the wilderness bill are already in the national park system and not available for any commercial use.

Of the other areas, nine are all within national forests and have for a long time been set aside by the Forest Service for special protection. The wilderness bill would require further studies of four of these before they become permanent units of the wilderness system. Two of the areas are game ranges protected by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

LESS THAN 1.5 PERCENT OF NEW MEXICO

Only eight areas in New Mexico are involved, the Citizens Committee points out, and they comprise less than 1.5 percent of the State. This means that more than 98.5 perecnt of New Mexico is not affected by the bill at all.

Out of New Mexico's total of 121,666 square mile, only 1,795 would be preserved as wilderness under this measure.

Two of the areas in New Mexico to be given protection by the wilderness bill are already in the national park system and not available for any commercial use.

The other six areas are all within national forests and have for a long time been set aside by the forest service for special protection. The wilderness bill even makes three of these subject to further studies before they become permanent units of the wilderness system.

LESS THAN 6 PERCENT OF WASHINGTON

Only 6 areas in Washington are involved, the Citizens Committee points out, and they comprise less than 6 percent of the State. This means that more than 94 percent of Washington is not affected by the bill.

Out of Washington's total of 68,192 square miles, only 3,942 would be preserved as wilderness under this measure.

Two of the areas in Washington to be given protection by the Wilderness Bill are already in the national park system and not available for any commercial use.

The other 4 areas are all within national forests and have long been set aside by the Forest Service for special protection. The bill requires that the largest of these—the 801,000-acre North Cascade primitive area—must be studied further before becoming a permanent unit of the wilderness system. The other national forest units are the 458,505-acre Glacier Peak wilderness area, the 82,680-acre Goat Rocks wild area, and the 42,411-acre Mount Adams wild area.

CONSERVATIONIST'S TASK FORCE HAS MAPS

The Citizens Committee on Natural Resources describes itself as a conservationists' task force for representing the public interest in legislation. Incorporated to advance conservation, restoration, and sound management of natural resources in the public interest, the committee, with a nationwide memership of 43 conservation leaders, maintains its headquarters at 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Outline maps of each of the 10 Western States with potential wilderness system areas of significant acreage, showing to scale these areas, are available from the committee.

In Tribute to Carroll Reece

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MILLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the immense personal loss I feel at the passing of our beloved colleague from Tennessee, CARROLL REECE, is shared not only by the Members of the House and those who, in the past, were privileged to serve with him, but by all Americans who are concerned with the welfare of our Nation to which he was so dedicated.

For more than 40 years, Mr. REECE served his country—on the battlefields of France in World War I, as a Member of Congress and as leader of the Republican Party. Although he was the most decorated Member of Congress, CARROLL REECE's wartime awards are more than matched by the accolades from literally thousands of persons whom he helped personally or as a Member of the House of Representatives. His generosity, kind understanding, personal courage, and willingness to give his immense personal energies and thought to the problems of all men, both great and small, made him unique in this age of cynicism and self-interest.

For he was more than just a soldier and a statesman. CARROLL REECE was a humanitarian, a gracious and courteous gentleman whose kindness was extended

in many forms to all who required it. His wisdom was as freely imparted as it was sought and his generosity was unbounded. But even more important, he was a friend whose loyalty brought him the reverence of all with whom he came into contact. Those of us who have had the arduous political task of campaigning for Republican candidates for Congress can appreciate fully his magnificent accomplishments as chairman of the Republican National Committee from 1946 to 1949 when he did perhaps more than anyone else to gain for his party the majority in this House.

The void he leaves in the Congress and on the American scene cannot be filled through the simple application of the electoral process, but will remain for years to come as a reminder to us all of the true qualities of Christian charity and kindness.

I am sure I am joined by everyone here and all other Americans in saying to the bereaved family of our beloved colleague: "Your loss is shared and your grief is, in part, our grief. Although we cannot return that which has been taken by the Almighty, our heartfelt sympathy is given you as freely as your husband and father gave of himself to others. The stature he attained in life cannot but become greater in death, as the humane acts he so long shielded in anonyomity at last come to light.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, March 25 will be a day of deep significance and importance to Byelorussians and their friends everywhere. On that day, 43 years ago, Byelorussia was proclaimed an independent state.

Byleorussia's existence as an independent state unfortunately was short lived. However, the strong spirit of its people which won that independence goes on. This spirit has existed over the course of many centuries and it is still strong and firm today.

Byelorussians can proudly boast of their long and glorious history, which antedates the history of Russia. Though that country early in modern times became a part of Russia and many attempts were made to eradicate all Byelorussian tradition and distinctive national traits, the Byelorussian people have never been willing to forgo and forget their national and individual identity. They have always wanted to regain their freedom and independence, and for centuries set political independence for their national goal. They obtained that goal in 1918.

In that year, when the decrepit czarist regime in Russia was no more, and the new Communist regime there was still in its infancy, the Byelorussians regained their freedom and proclaimed their independence by establishing the Byelorussian National Republic. At the time it was hoped that some 10 million Byelorussians, having become sovereign in their historic homeland and masters of their own destiny, would be allowed to enjoy the fruits of freedom in peace. Their subsequent history however took a sad and tragic turn.

Early in 1921, before the Byelorussians had sufficient time to consolidate and strengthen their government, Communists attacked and overran the country, thus putting an end to the independent Byelorussian National Republic. Since that time little is heard of the country or of its people. Today, and for more than four decades, these sturdy and stouthearted Byelorussians have been suffering under the ruthless regime of Communist totalitarian tyranny maintained by the Kremlin. These people, even the worst of tyrannies, have not given up their hope for freedom and independence. They still ever fervently cherish that noble ideal, and at this 43d anniversary of the independence day, all of us in the free world wish them strength and fortitude in their struggle against Communist tyranny.

Can We Afford Such Housing?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appearing in the March 18 edition of the Record, published in Hackensack in the Seventh New Jersey District, spotlights just one of the areas suggested in the new administration's housing message.

Since we will be considering housing legislation in this session, I would like to bring this editorial to the attention of my colleagues. It is entitled "Can We Afford Such Housing?" It could well be "All Is Not Gold That Glitters."

The editorial follows:

[From the Hackensack (N.J.) Record, Mar. 18, 1961]

CAN WE AFFORD SUCH HOUSING?

Generally speaking, Mr. Kennedy's programs are attractive and appealing, and his housing program—suggested slogan: a nation of homeowners—sounds well, as musicians say cautiously of a piece of new music. That's generally speaking. But we shall have to get down to the details of his Government insurance on 40-year mortgages at 5½ percent on homes up to $13,500, no downpayment. And the more deeply one gets into details, the more dismaying is this aspects of the New Frontier.

To the little guy earning $100 a week or so, unable to scare up in one piece the $2,500 he'd need for conventional financing and unable to qualify for subsidized low-rent housing, the President's planning must seem inspired. Mr. Kennedy, for his part, appears to be of at least two minds about the ultimate effect; recommending a 12- to 18-month test run for the program, he mused:

"A nation with ugly, crime-infested cities and haphazard suburbs does not present the same image to the world as a nation characterized by bright and orderly development."

What kind of bright and orderly development could be carried out under this program? In the first place, it does not meet the need, either for housing or for business stimulation, nationwide; where except in Florida and the Southwest can $13,500 these days put a habitable house on a habitable lot? In the second place, even if through some miracle of automation, prefabrication, and assistance such as Mr. Kennedy suggested from nonprofit church, fraternal, union, and municipal co-ops—even if some miracle made $13,500 houses economically possible, what would be the effect of such housing on land waste, suburban sprawl, urban blight? Would the community get housing it could tolerate? And, though his monthly payments totaled less than rental plus taxes and insurance, what kind of a buy would this be for the little guy? Purchasing at age 25, he'd pay two or three times the face value of the loan before he retired his debt at age 65, and what would today's $13,500 (or $10,000) house look like by that time? Bright and orderly development and this kind of housing just aren't compatible. A nation of homeowners is a high ideal. It is trusted Congress will look carefully at what we'd be acquiring along with the house.

Man of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of Thursday, March 16, 1961, which comments upon the selection by the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick of Wilkes-Barre of Mr. Tom Hart as its Man of the Year. It was my privilege to extend this honor and recognition to Mr. Hart at last Friday's banquet held by the Friendly Sons and I received a great deal of personal pleasure and satisfaction in doing so because Mr. Hart is truly one of the most outstanding citizens in my Congressional District. I wish him continued good health and success in all of his future endeavors.

The aforementioned editorial follows:

MAN OF THE YEAR

The Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, at the annual dinner in Hotel Sterling on March 17, will add the name of Tom Hart, Wilkes-Barre realtor and Sugar Notch native, to the list of outstanding citizens who have been honored as Men of the Year at this gathering of Americans of Irish extraction. The recognition is no small distinction, for it is based on public service. The fact that a dozen men were considered and he was the choice is no small compliment in itself.

Tom Hart easily measures up to the exacting standards as a good citizen, neighbor and businessman. He is a credit to his Irish forebears and, incidentally, to the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, one of a number of organizations in which he has played a leading role in the half century he has been active on the local scene.

Now heading for 76, he sets a stiff pace, with no diminution of zeal or enthusiasm as he makes the appointed rounds. He is

impervious to the passage of time and his appearance belies his years.

From Sugar Notch to Wilkes-Barre is a journey of 5 miles, but to Tom Hart the distance was not important. For him, it has been a march of triumph in the pattern of Ireland's famed patron whose day he shares in 1961.

U.S. District Court—Southern District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following material:

U.S. DISTRICT COURT, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

(Leslie Taylor and Kevin Taylor, minors, by Wilbert Taylor and Hallie Taylor, their parents and next friends, and Marjorie Williams and Rosylyn Williams, minors by Rudolph Williams and Marjorie Williams, their parents and next friends, and Cheryl Ann Williams, a minor, by Ula Williams, her mother and next friend, and Lynn Garland, a minor, by Thomas Garland, her father and next friend, and Benjamin Hall, Lonnie Hall, Michelee Hall and Velma Hall, minors, by Barbara Hall, their mother and next friend, and Marilene Murphy, a minor, by Walter Murphy and Willene Murphy, her parents and next friends, and for these and all others similarly situated and who may become parties to this action, Plaintiffs, against the Board of Education of the City School District of the city of New Rochelle, and Herbert C. Clish, as superintendent of schools of the city school district of the city of New Rochelle, Defendants—60 Civ. 4098.)

AMICUS CURIAE

Irving R. Kaufman, D.J.: Planitiffs in this class action, proceeding through their parents, are 11 Negro infants who were formerly enrolled in the Lincoln School, a public elementary school operated by the defendants, the Board of Education of the city of New Rochelle, and Dr. Herbert C. Clish, that city's superintendent of schools.[1] It is admitted by the defendant that approximately 94 percent of the pupils at Lincoln are Negroes. Plaintiffs contend that the board has deliberately and intentionally created and maintained Lincoln School as a racially segregated school, and thus has violated the 14th amendment and the principles enunciated in *Brown* v. *Board of Education*, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).

The board operates the elementary school system in New Rochelle by means of the neighborhood school plan. Under this plan, as it functions in New Rochelle, the city is divided into 12 districts, each of which is served by a centrally located school. Pupils residing within a particular district are required to attend the school within that district, and permission to transfer to other schools is granted by the school authorities only in exceptional circumstances. Thus, as a result of this policy, the plaintiffs have been compelled to attend the Lincoln School. At the start of the 1960 school term, they sought to register in other elementary schools in the city having a more heterogeneous racial composition; permission to so register was uniformly denied, and this action then followed. During the pendency of this action, plaintiffs have withdrawn from the Lincoln School, and are receiving private tutoring.

In the fall of 1959, after much public agitation against the racial imbalance in the Lincoln School, the board proposed to replace the present Lincoln School building, admittedly antiquated, with a modern facility on the same site to serve the same neighborhood.[2] Financing for this proposal was approved in a referendum held on May 24, 1960. The plaintiffs view this decision by the board as the culmination of a course of conduct designed to maintain Lincoln as a racially segregated school. They thus seek an injunction restraining the defendant from proceeding with the construction of the new school. They also seek to enjoin the board from refusing to allow them to register in schools other than Lincoln which are not racially segregated, and from requiring them to register in the Lincoln School.

The defendant board vigorously contends that the charge of racial segregation is absurd. Its position is that no child is compelled to attend any school in the city of New Rochelle solely on the basis of race or color. It points out that two-thirds of the Negro elementary school children in New Rochelle attend public schools other than Lincoln, and that the city's two junior high schools and one senior high school are attended by all children regardless of race. It urges that the high proportion of Negroes in the Lincoln School is a result solely of residential patterns, rather than any desire on its part to maintain Lincoln as a segregated school. With respect to its decision to rebuild Lincoln School, the board contends that it was made only after an exhaustive study undertaken in good faith, which led it to conclude that the course chosen was the only feasible alternative. Thus, the defendant maintains that no constitutional rights of the plaintiffs have been infringed in any way.

After hearing and observing the witnesses, and carefully examining the large amount of documentary evidence submitted, I conclude that the defendant's conduct has violated the Constitution, denying the plaintiffs the right to the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the 14th amendment. I find (1) that the Board of Education of New Rochelle, prior to 1949, intentionally created Lincoln School as a racially segregated school, and has not, since then, acted in good faith to implement desegregation as required by the 14th amendment;[3] and (2) that the conduct of the board of education even since 1949 has been motivated by the purposeful desire of maintaining the Lincoln School as a racially segregated school.[4]

I am mindful of the recent admonition of Mr. Justice Frankfurter, in *Gomillion* v. *Lightfoot* (29 U.S. Law Week 4024, U.S. Supreme Court, Nov. 14, 1960), as to the dangers of an undiscerning application of broad generalizations in a delicate area such as this, when important rights of individuals are so directly affected. Justice Frankfurter reemphasized what should always have been obvious: that it is the particular facts in each case which are determinative, and thus that it is incumbent upon the Court to examine these facts with scrupulous care. He said:

"Particularly in dealing with claims under broad provisions of the Constitution, which derive content by an interpretive process of inclusion and exclusion, it is imperative that generalizations, based on and qualified by the concrete situations that gave rise to them, must not be applied out of context in disregard of variant controlling facts."

In light of this admonition, before discussing what I conceive to be the controlling principles of law applicable to this case, and the legal import of the respective contentions raised by the parties, I will fully elaborate the facts which have impelled me to the conclusion that defendant's conduct has violated the Constitution.

THE FACTS

In order to comprehend the Lincoln problem, as it has evolved, familiarity with the geographic and racial character of the city of New Rochelle is necessary. The city has an elongated shape, its length from north to south being almost four times its average width. The settling of population started in the southern half of the town; in relatively recent years the northern end of the city has developed. That area, however, is now in the midst of a housing boom, and in the past 10 years two new elementary schools—Ward and Davis—have been built to accommodate north end students. There are virtually no Negroes in this area. The north-central part of town is served by two schools, Roosevelt in the west and Barnard in the east, with only the latter having a sizable Negro enrollment. The southern end of the city is also predominantly white in population and is served by two elementary schools—Trinity and Jefferson—which have 5 percent and 7 percent Negro enrollment, respectively. If a line were drawn east to west across the middle of New Rochelle, the area of predominantly Negro population would be found immediately south of that line, in the south-central portion of the city. The Lincoln School District lies in the center of this Negro area. Bordering Lincoln are five other elementary school districts—Mayflower, Stevenson, Washington, Columbus, and Webster—all of which contain a substantial Negro population. Washington School has a Negro enrollment of greater than 50 percent, while the Negro enrollment of the other four schools varies from approximately 17 percent to approximately 30 percent.

Lincoln School was built in 1898; there is no evidence as to the Negro population, if any, at that time. Marylynn G. Pierce, a member of the board of education, testified that there has been a tradition of a Negro school in New Rochelle for approximately 100 years, but she did not indicate how this tradition had been inherited by the Lincoln School. Events occurring subsequent to 1930 indicate that by that time the majority of the Negro population of the city was being served by the Lincoln School. In 1930, according to the uncontradicted testimony of Bertha O. White, corroborated in part by the testimony of Mrs. Pierce, and also by official school maps, a policy of gerrymandering was instituted which led to the confining of Negroes within the Lincoln School District by redrawing the district lines to coincide with Negro population movements. (See, e.g., record, pp. 131–134, 236–237). The testimony as to the gerrymandering revealed the following:

1. In 1930, the Webster School was built, to the northwest of Lincoln, and thus district lines in the area were redrawn. The boundary lines between Webster and Lincoln were so drawn that, in one section, they were extended to a point directly across the street from the Lincoln School. By this arrangement, an irregular corridor, which was of white population was carved out from Lincoln and placed in the Webster district. The result was that an area containing white students, directly adjoining the Lincoln School, was districted into the Webster School, despite the fact that this area was far closer to the Lincoln School than to Webster. It was testified that the purpose of this gerrymandering was to confine Negro pupils within the Lincoln district, while allowing whites living in the same area to attend a school which was not predominantly Negro in composition.

2. In the ensuing years, as the Negro population increased, expanding westward from the Lincoln district, the borders of Lincoln

Footnotes at end of speech.

were extended in this direction so as to contain the Negroes within them.

(3) During the same period in which the boundaries between Webster and Lincoln were being adjusted, other alterations were being made between the Lincoln district and the Mayflower district to the north, although these changes were never noted in board minutes, nor were they reflected on official school maps for many years. By means of these boundary changes, children living in a predominantly white area known as Rochelle Park, then located in the northeast corner of the Lincoln district, were assigned to the Mayflower School.

It is highly significant that the board has offered no evidence to refute the testimony indicating that this gerrymandering took place. Nor, did it proffer any explanation for this conduct to negate the obvious inference of a desire to segregate. In addition, board minutes for the period subsequent to 1930 indicate that Lincoln was considered in the community as the Negro school, and that the board intended it to be utilized after school hours as a meeting place for the Negro community (see joint exhibit VII supplemented by defendants; see also superintendent's report, February 2, 1937, submitted on consent of the parties).

In addition to this gerrymandering, the board instituted further policies to assure that the Lincoln School District would remain Negro, and to relieve white children of the burden of attending a predominantly Negro school. Thus, up until 1949, white children remaining in the Lincoln district were allowed to transfer to other elementary schools. For example, in the year 1949, board minutes indicate that 106 children residing in the Lincoln district were allowed by the board to attend other schools (defendants' exhibit SS). The board admitted, in a resolution of November 30, 1959, that "There was a time when the transfer of children to schools outside the school district of their residence was permitted and this operated unfairly in the Lincoln School district from which white parents were allowed to transfer their children, resulting in a high percentage of Negro children in Lincoln School" (defendants' exhibit I). This policy produced the anomaly, testified to by Mrs. White, of children living in adjoining houses attending different schools solely on the basis of their race (record, pp. 141–142). Further, it appears, for example, that white children living south of the Lincoln School were assigned to Mayflower School, approximately one-half a mile north of Lincoln. Thus, they apparently had to pass Lincoln each day on their way to school. (See plaintiffs' exhibit 6.) The inevitable result of this transfer policy, when combined with the earlier gerrymandering, was that by January of 1949, Lincoln had become a 100-percent Negro school. (See, e.g., plaintiffs' exhibit 24.)

The defendant's failure to rebut this evidence of gerrymandering and racially motivated transfers gains even greater significance from the fact that Mr. Sim Joe Smith, assistant superintendent of schools in New Rochelle since 1930, was present in the courtroom throughout the trial. It was testified that Mr. Smith approved transfers made during this period. When called to the stand by plaintiffs' attorney, Mr. Smith's testimony as to the operation of the transfer policy was vague and evasive, and evinced a conveniently faulty memory.

In examining the board's conduct subsequent to 1949, it must be remembered that this conduct must be viewed against its historical background and context. It must be examined and evaluated in its totality. Intent, purpose, and motivation, while unclear or uncertain if only isolated acts are considered, become defined and recognizable when a total course of conduct is carefully scrutinized.

By 1949, the segregated condition at Lincoln had come to public attention, and numerous civic groups exerted pressure on the board to alleviate it. As a result of this agitation, the board passed a resolution, on January 11, 1949, ending the policy of transferring white children out of the Lincoln School and indicating that readjustment of district lines would be considered.[5] At that time, however, the board did not redistrict in any way, nor has it done so until the present day. Thus, it has done nothing to eliminate the effects of the gerrymandering undertaken previously. Rather, it has chosen to maintain the status quo, imposing, in effect, a freeze on the artificially created boundaries of the Lincoln District. When it determined to maintain the status quo, the board could hardly have been unaware that this would necessarily perpetuate Lincoln as a predominantly Negro school. For example, on June 17, 1949, a letter written to the board by Kenneth B. Low, then president of the Council for Unity of New Rochelle (and later a member of the board) was reprinted in the New Rochelle Standard Star.

Low wrote:

"By the redistricting which was made at the time Webster School was built in 1930 the board participated in creating an overbalance of Negro pupils in Lincoln School which steadily increased with the development of the neighborhood until, by virtue of the board's transfer policy, it became an all-Negro school.

"To now enforce district lines, without changing the present Lincoln School District, is to create a situation in which the white pupils will be in a small minority and this appears to be completely unrealistic and undesirable. In our opinion it will result not only in bitter opposition by the parents of the white children in the district but eventually in the removal of these parents from the district and a consequent accentuation of the all-Negro character of the neighborhood and school.

"[S]ound educational policy calls for the integration of children of all races, creeds and national backgrounds in the public schools, which are the cradle of democracy to permit the separation of Negro children from white children throughout their primary school education is indefensible in this community.

"Any plan which will not freeze Lincoln School as an overwhelmingly Negro school would, in our opinion, be preferable to the present plan of action which we feel certain will seriously increase the tensions in this area.

"The board has seemingly overlooked the basic issue of the existence of an all-Negro school in New Rochelle. Similar conditions have been changed in other communities either by closing the Negro school or by redistricting to create a proper balance of white and Negro pupils" (plaintiffs' exhibit 23).

But no action on the part of the board was forthcoming. The board has steadfastly refused to alter the rigid neighborhood school policy with the result that the Lincoln School has continued to be a predominantly Negro school. Today it contains approximately 94 percent Negroes.

The years between 1949 and 1960 have been 11 years of agitation for New Rochelle. For 11 years, responsible civic-minded organizations and groups have urged that something be done to correct the Lincoln situation; for 11 years the board has discussed the problem, hired experts, made surveys, and constantly reiterated its belief in racial equality and the necessity for equal opportunities. But, in these 11 years, it has taken no action whatsoever to alter the racial imbalance in the Lincoln School. It has met the problem with mere words, barren of meaning, for they were never followed by deeds.

In 1954, the Supreme Court rendered its opinion in *Brown* v. *Board of Education, supra*. This decision heralded a new epoch in the quest for equality of the individual. it called for responsible public officials throughout the country to reappraise their thinking and policies, and to make every effort to afford Negroes the more meaningful equality guaranteed to them by the Constitution. The Brown decision, in short, was a lesson in democracy, directed to the public at large and more particularly to those responsible for the operation of the schools. It imposed a legal and moral obligation upon officials who had created or maintained segregated schools to undo the damage which they had fostered. And, compliance with the Supreme Court's edict was not to be less forthright in the North than in the South; no double standard was to be tolerated.

The Brown decision also increased the public agitation for change in New Rochelle. But the board paid little heed to the Brown doctrine, finding nothing in its conduct repugnant to Brown. In 1955 a survey of the physical facilities of the New Rochelle schools, conducted by the engineering firm of Englehardt, Englehardt, and Leggett, revealed that the Lincoln building was obsolete and thus would have to be retired. This conclusion reinforced the findings of a 1948 engineering survey conducted by Leland Hubbell Lyon. The report recommended that both the Lincoln and Washington schools be closed, and a combined school be built on the present Lincoln site.[6] With the necessity for making some change thus forced upon the board, it was thereby given an additional opportunity to eliminate segregation. Once again, no action was taken in this direction.

In December of 1956, a committee representing 14 civic groups interested in ameliorating the Lincoln situation requested the board to have a study of the problem made by the New York State Department of Education. As a result, at the board's request, Mr. Theron Johnson, an experienced, high-ranking administrator in the department, came to New Rochelle, conducted interviews and discussions, and surveyed the Lincoln problem. At the same time, the board proposed for the first time to rebuild Lincoln on the same site. This proposal was included in a comprehensive school referendum to be submitted to the voters in the spring of 1957. Mr. Johnson submitted his final report to the board on March 25, 1957, at which time the date for the referendum was approaching.[7] Johnson pointed out that "[t]he actions of previous boards running back over the years contributed to your present de facto segregation."

He said: "[a]lthough the board of education has frequently expresed its dissatisfaction with the existence of a predominantly Negro elementary school in New Rochelle, it has not fully taken the responsibility to implement its policy of integration. Although the board of education cannot be blamed for a residential pattern which facilitates segregation, it does have the responsibility to take the leadership in finding a way out. The impact is strongest on the schools and affects educational achievement and psychological development. If the board does not take the leadership no one else will. In studying the existing school attendance lines there were many instances where the boundary seemed to be neither reasonable nor consistent. It could only appear that special interests had been permitted to effect the assignment of children to schools. When this situation exists doubt will remain in the minds of many residents as to the board's intent."

Johnson's report concluded with a challenge to the board: a challenge to meet its

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

obligations, and to take the leadership in ending segregation.

He wrote: "In summary, then, we can say there have been no 'solutions' achieved. The search must continue but in a fashion which is productive and in a way which can draw the community together. The opportunities lie before the board of education and its administrative officials. You have the decision in your own hands" (plaintiffs' exhibit 15).

The board's response to this challenge was somewhat less than edifying. The board's president, Mr. Frederic Davidson, wrote immediately to the commissioner of education, asking that the report, which the board itself had initially requested, be recalled and repressed. The commissioner of education acceded to the board's request and the report was withdrawn. Meanwhile, undoubtedly due in large part to the publicity which the report had received, the portion of the referendum calling for a replacement of the Lincoln School was defeated by the voters.

Johnson's report had recommended, inter alia, that a comprehensive community study of the problem be undertaken. Accordingly, the board hired a distinguished group of educators, psychologists, and sociologists, headed by Dr. Dan Dodson, one of the country's foremost experts on the problems of integration. In December of 1957, this group after an exhaustive study, delivered its report, entitled "Racial Imbalance in Public Education in New Rochelle, N.Y." (popularly known as the Dodson Report). This report, like that of Mr. Johnson, concluded that the board had been derelict in its duties, and remiss in its attitudes. Moreover, Dr. Dodson testified that his initial proposed report had been even more severe in its criticism of the board, but that the final report submitted had been toned down so as to make it more acceptable. The Dodson Report framed the essential issue involved as follows:

"Specifically, if the board of education in the past, operating in a different social setting, encouraged or permitted the present situation to develop, does the present board of education have the obligation to undo any damages which may have accrued under previous decisions of its predecessors? Does the present board have an obligation to eradicate the imbalance of races in the Lincoln School which was permitted to develop under previous boards?" (p. 9).

The report pointed out that "it is basically through the mechanism of the public school that members of a group occupying an inferior position in our society can achieve equal opportunities. Help in breaking down economic, social, and cultural barriers should begin with the public schools" (p. 16).

Comparing the situation to that involved in the Brown case, the report said:

"It seems that morally the situation is little different than the situation which the U.S. Supreme Court in 1954 found to generate 'a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone' " (p. 18).

Dodson pointed out that change in New Rochelle was necessary; new facilities were required. Thus, the board was faced with the necessity of dealing with the racial problem at once. Procrastination had to give way to action.

"The board must realize that any building or utilization plan it adopts will implicitly make this decision. It is not possible to avoid the question of whether racial imbalance is going to be alleviated or encouraged. To do nothing about it is to encourage racial imbalance. To do nothing about it is a decision just as powerful and as important as a decision to try to do something about the imbalance" (p. 19).

The report pointed out that the board alone was in a position to immediately alleviate segregation:

"At this time the board of education is in a position to eliminate de facto segregation in schools by its decision on a matter which has to be resolved; namely, how to accommodate the increasing numbers of students in the public schools of New Rochelle. Obviously the racial imbalance in the schools is related to the housing patterns. The housing patterns, however, cannot be changed overnight. The school district boundaries can" (pp. 19–20).

The Dodson report discussed the concern for "status" of various schools which has apparently been a strong motivating factor in the board's conduct through the years.

"The panel was puzzled that in a city as dynamic as New Rochelle, in a decade with insignificant exceptions, few children from the outside have ever been sent into the three schools located in the low socioeconomic status neighborhoods" (p. 34).

Dodson commented on "what seems to be a lack of willingness on the part of the board to move district lines," and found that "acquiescence has heightened concern as to the 'status' of one school as against another with the result that there is almost a 'phobia' about the district lines in several of the schools surrounding Washington, Lincoln, and Columbus" (pp. 34–35).

The experts found, as a result of the survey, that the board had been largely responsible for the situation.

"The panel believes the board of education has adhered too rigidly to established district lines for elementary schools. It has tended to make underuse of some facilities at the expense of over-crowding in others. This policy has reinforced the 'status appeal' of some schools and depreciated others. It has helped fragment the community into neighborhoods identified by school attended and made more provincial the experience of all children" (p. 41).

With respect to the rebuilding of Lincoln School, Dodson said: "To do so would further reinforce the segregation of Negroes. It would leave two schools in the same neighborhood (Washington and Columbus) only partially used, and it would reinforce community fragmentation" (p. 43).

The Dodson report concluded with two comprehensive proposals designed to eliminate segregation in Lincoln School, and to provide a more balanced educational experience throughout the community. The first, and favored, alternative provided for (1) the rebuilding of a larger Lincoln School on the same site; (2) the discontinuance of Washington School; (3) extensive redistricting; and (4) the more flexible use of the neighborhood school policy in the future.

Dodson's second proposal involved the use of K–3 schools (kindergarten through third grade) so as to allow for greater flexibility in districting. Dodson made it clear that each of these two recommendations was submitted "as an integrated whole, rather than a series of separable proposals" (p. 3).

The Dodson report, in short, indicated clearly to the board that it alone had the responsibility of determining whether segregation in New Rochelle would continue. But, once again, the board took no action whatsoever to implement the Dodson recommendations, or any of the other proposals submitted to it by interested persons and groups, such as permissive zoning and dispersal of Lincoln pupils (see defendants' exhibit G). Of significance in interpreting this inaction is Dr. Dodson's testimony that during the course of the survey, he lost faith in the board's sincerity and willingness to come to grips with the racial problem (record, pp. 413–414).

One reason persisted in by the Board as an excuse for its failure to act was the administrative difficulties and costs involved in making any changes. However, it is noteworthy that no comprehensive survey of costs was ever undertaken (Record, page 589). Moreover, the difficulties allegedly envisioned in allowing Lincoln pupils to travel to other schools do not seem overly substantial. Although, in the north end, some children live as much as a mile from the school which they attend (Record, page 725), the radius of the Lincoln District is only a quarter of a mile. In addition, several of the schools in districts adjoining Lincoln are within half a mile of the Lincoln School (defendants' exhibit RR). Thus, even if Lincoln pupils were allowed to attend other elementary schools, their journey would still not be as great as that of many of these north-end children.

In November of 1959, the Board decided again to propose only the rebuilding of Lincoln School on its present site, despite the admonition of the Dodson Report that this course of action inevitably would lead to the furthering of segregation. Although both Dodson and Johnson had indicated that, unless the Board assumed positive responsibility, segregation would inevitably continue, the Board stated, in a resolution dated November 30, 1959:

"The solution to the problem of racial, religious or other concentrations of children does not lie with the schools, but rather with the community and its living patterns" (defendants' exhibit I).

This proposal was to be put to the voters by way of a referendum in May of 1960. The board's activities in an attempt to gain public support for the proposal give strong indication of the absence of good faith in meeting its obligations. It permitted the issue of segregation to be insinuated into the referendum campaign, to the extent that persons in the districts bordering Lincoln were fostered.[8]

Thus, principals in schools in these districts sent letters to parents urging support of the Lincoln proposal, indicating that integration was the primary issue and intimating that if Lincoln were not replaced, Negroes might be transferred in large numbers to the schools which their children were presently attending. (See plaintiffs exhibits 20 and 21; see also record, pp. 153, 161–162, 547, 606, 611–612.) Although the board had disciplinary authority over these school officials when acting in their official capacity, it took no action to censure them, or suppress the letters in any way. It insisted instead that the principals were merely exercising freedom of expression. Surely this is not the conduct of a public body seeking in good faith to reach a legitimate solution to a racial problem.

The board itself participated more directly in similar acts. In an advertisement, which Superintendent of Schools Herbert C. Clish admitted was prepared by the board's referendum committee (record, pp. 615–616, 619–620), opponents of the Lincoln proposal were branded as extremists and propagandists (plaintiffs' exhibit 9), despite the fact that numerous reputable civic organizations had publicly announced their opposition to it. In the same advertisement, the taxpayers of New Rochelle were warned of harsh financial consequences if the Lincoln proposal were defeated. The taxpayers were reminded that if the proposal failed, the new school could be built with 5-year bonds, a procedure which would greatly increase taxes in the city. Thus the board made it clear that it saw only one course of action: rebuild the Lincoln School on its present site. This, as Dodson made clear, could mean only the continuing of segregation at Lincoln.[9]

In addition, there was testimony as to pressure applied by Dr. Clish on PTA officials who were reluctant to support the Lincoln

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

proposal and the advertisement to be placed by the board's referendum committee (record, pp. 172–174). And, in the advertisement, it was stated that the Lincoln PTA had endorsed the proposal, when in fact it had never met to consider the matter (record, pp. 77–78, 534). At any rate, these pressures were successful, and the voters passed the Lincoln proposal by an overwhelming 3-to-1 majority. It is significant that although the board constantly reiterated that the new school was being built to benefit Lincoln district, this was the only district in which the proposal was defeated.

This, then, completes the picture of board intransigence and refusal to act through the years. The freeze placed by the board in 1949 on the already gerrymandered boundaries of the Lincoln district remained unchanged, despite 11 years of public agitation, pleas and advice from distinguished educators and sociologists. And, what is more, the board has not evidenced any intention to change its policies in the future.

THE LAW

I

Any discussion of the applicable law must begin with the case of *Brown* v. *Board of Education, supra*. Principles long accepted by psychologists and sociologists were given the stature of the law of the land. The Supreme Court made it clear that in the field of public education, separate but equal was inherently unequal, and hence violative of the Constitution. Thus, the operation of separate schools for whites and Negroes was proscribed. Those school authorities throughout the country which had operated such separate schools were instructed to implement desegregation, in good faith, "with all deliberate speed" (see *Brown* v. *Board of Education*, 349 U.S. 294, 301 (1955)).

I hold that the Board of Education of New Rochelle, by its conduct in the years prior to 1949, created and established the Lincoln School as a segregated, Negro school. Thus formulated, the present case falls squarely within the plain meaning of the Brown decision.

The board contends that since Lincoln School is not in form a component of a dual system of education for whites and Negroes such as was invalidated by Brown, and since the school contains 94 percent Negroes rather than 100 percent Negroes, there can be no violation of the 14th amendment or of the Brown principles. But, this contention misconstrues the underlying premise of the Brown rationale. That opinion, while dealing with a State-maintained dual system of education, was premised on the factual conclusion that a segregated education created and maintained by official acts had a detrimental and deleterious effect on the educational and mental development of the minority group children. The unanimous Court, speaking through Chief Justice Warren, declared that segregation of Negro children, especially in their formative years "generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone" (347 U.S. at 494). The court further emphasized the necessity of giving these minority-group children the opportunity for extensive contact with other children at an early stage in their educational experience, finding such contact to be indispensable if children of all races and creeds were to become inculcated with a meaningful understanding of the essentials of our democratic way of life. That the benefits inherent in an integrated education are essential to the proper development of all children has been reiterated time and again by the many witnesses in the present case, including those called by the defendant.

With these principles clear in mind, I see no basis to draw a distinction, legal or moral, between segregation established by the formality of a dual system of education, as in Brown, and that created by gerrymandering of school district lines and transferring of white children as in the instant case (cf. *Gomillion* v. *Lightfoot, supra*). The result is the same in each case: The conduct of responsible school officials has operated to deny to Negro children the opportunities for a full and meaningful educational experience guaranteed to them by the 14th amendment. Further, the fact that the Lincoln School contains approximately 6 percent whites, surely cannot divest Lincoln of its segregated character. In a community such as New Rochelle, the presence of some 29 white children certainly does not afford the 454 Negro children in the school the educational and social contacts and interaction envisioned by Brown.[10]

Having created a segregated school, the Constitution imposed upon the board the duty to end segregation, in good faith, and with all deliberate speed. It is patently clear that this obligation has not been fulfilled.

The board argues that the study which it has given to the problem, and the surveys which it has requested, conclusively indicate its good faith. But, history is made, and constitutional rights vindicated, by deeds, not by talk, resolutions, and fine phrases. As already indicated, the board has discussed the problem, hired experts, made surveys, and constantly reiterated verbally its belief in racial equality and the necessity for equal oportunities. But the fact remains that, in 11 years, not one single act was taken to implement these expressed principles. And, the board's attitude, as indicated by its overt conduct, has been one of negation; it has publicly disclaimed all responsibility for the Lincoln problem.

The board urges, however, that its decision to rebuild the Lincoln School on the same site constitutes a start in the right direction, since it is the first step outlined in the Dodson proposals.[11] But, the board has indicated that it has no intention of implementing the remainder of these proposals, which Dr. Dodson stated must be considered as an integrated whole. Dr. Dodson testified at the trial that the board's decision did violence to the spirit of his report (record, p. 439). Thus, it is most difficult to conceive of the rebuilding of the Lincoln School as good-faith compliance with an obligation to desegregate. In fact, this seems the one sure way to render certain continued segregation at Lincoln.

The board attempts to excuse its inaction on the ground that admittedly there is no "ideal" solution to the Lincoln problem. But, inability to find a perfect answer is hardly justification for refusal to do anything. Alternatives have been proposed by experts and prominent civic organizations. While not perfect, they contained much merit and offered a decided improvement over the board's policy of inertia. It hardly need be stated that there is never an ideal solution when the question of desegregation is faced squarely. Experience in the South has made clear, that the problems to be met in this area are most difficult and delicate. They involve the most intense, deep-seated aspirations and prejudices of persons and groups. Therefore, there can never be a solution which could conceivably please everyone. But, if this alone were sufficient to excuse inaction, progress in this vital area of human rights would be nonexistent. I cannot accept the proposition that in his relatively small community in the North, men of good will, wisdom and ingenuity could not have devised a plan for the orderly desegregation of the Lincoln School.

Footnotes at end of speech.

If school boards could satisfy their obligations under the 14th amendment merely by waiting complacently until an ideal solution presented itself, the Brown decision, and the advances in the area of individual equality which it represents, would be a virtual nullity. Brown, if it meant anything, meant much more than this. Necessarily implied in its proscription of segregation was the positive obligation of eliminating it. This obligation requires both good faith, and action with dispatch, and I am compelled to the conclusion that the Board of Education of New Rochelle has complied with neither of these requirements in the present case.

II

I also conclude that if a board of education enters into a course of conduct motivated by a purposeful desire to perpetuate and maintain a segregated school, the constitutional rights of those confined within this segregated establishment have been violated.

This principle has already been recognized by the courts. In *Henry* v. *Godsell*, 165 F. Supp. 87 (E.D. Mich. 1958), the Negro plaintiffs moved to enjoin the construction of a new school in an area predominantly populated by Negroes. The court denied the injunction, finding that the plaintiffs' constitutional rights had not been violated, but only after a specific finding that the school board had acted in good faith, and that its policies "were not motivated by racial considerations" (165 F. Supp. at 91). The court clearly considered the issue of intent and purpose to be controlling.

In *Sealy* v. *Department of Public Instruction of Penn.*, 159 F. Supp. 561 (E.D. Pa., 1957), aff'd. 252 F. 2d 898 (C.A. 3), cert. denied 356 U.S. 975 (1958), Negro children attacked the proposed location of a new junior high school as racially discriminatory. The court denied the injunction sought, but once again only after a specific finding of lack of intent to discriminate. The court found that "the record discloses in no instance a single iota of testimony that the consideration of the Darby Township School District Board, in the selection of the site for the proposed new junior high school and its construction thereon, was motivated by any racial discrimination whatsoever * * *" (159 F. Supp. at 563).

And its principal conclusion of law was that "None of the defendants herein named was in any way racially motivated, nor was any discrimination whatsoever regarding race exercised by any or all of them in the selection of the site or the approval given for the construction of a proposed junior high school in the upper section of Darby Township" (159 F. Supp. at 566).

These cases clearly imply their converse: If a board of education selects a school site, or otherwise operates its schools, with a purposeful desire to segregate, or to maintain segregation, the Constitution has been violated. See also *Clemons* v. *Board of Education of Hillsboro*, 228 F. 2d 853 (C.A. 6), cert. denied, 350 U.S. 1006 (1956); *Holland* v. *Board of Public Instruction*, 258 F. 2d 730 (C.A. 5, 1958). If such motivation is present, it makes no meaningful difference whether the segregation involved is maintained directly through formal separation, or indirectly through overrigid adherence to artifically created boundary lines, as in the present case. Similarly, it is of no moment whether the segregation is labeled by the defendant as "de jure" or "de facto", as long as the board, by its conduct, is responsible for it maintenance.[12]

Constitutional rights are determined by realities, not by labels or semantics. The Supreme Court has affirmed that courts must look through the guise in which school officials seek to clothe their unconstitutional

conduct. The court said, in *Cooper* v. *Aaron*, 358 U.S. 1, 19 (1958):

"It is, of course, quite true that the responsibility for public education is primarily the concern of the States, but it is equally true that such responsibilities, like all other State activity, must be exercised consistently with Federal constitutional requirements as they apply to State action. The Constitution created a Government dedicated to equal justice under law. The 14th amendment embodied and emphasized that ideal. State support of segregated schools through any arrangement, management, funds, or property cannot be squared with the amendment's command that no State shall deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. The right of a student not to be segregated on racial grounds in schools so maintained is indeed so fundamental and pervasive that it is embraced in the concept of due process of law."

Turning to the realities of the instant case, the inference is inescapable that the board's deliberate intransigence and inflexibility for the last 11 years in the face of public pressures and expert advice were motivated by a desire to continue Lincoln School as a racially segregated school, and thus not to alter the racial balance in the city's other elementary schools. This becomes especially clear when the board's conduct subsequent to 1949 is examined against the background of the pre-1949 gerrymandering and transfer of white children. No other rational purpose can be attributed to the board's almost fanatically rigid adherence to district lines which were established in the first instance out of a desire to separate whites and Negroes. This utter inflexibility has been sharply criticized by Mr. Johnson and Dr. Dodson, both of whom came to New Rochelle at the board's invitation, and both of whom were led to seriously question the board's good faith. Not one proposal which would alleviate segregation, submitted by these experts and others, has ever been instituted by the board, even on an experimental basis. When this course of conduct is viewed in its totality, the desire to maintain segregation is clear. This does not necessarily mean that individual members of the board are segregationists or racists. But it is apparent that they have failed to accept or recognize their moral and legal responsibilities and have chosen instead to yield to pressures of certain groups who wish to avoid an influx of Negro children into the schools in their districts.

The defendant argues, however, that the neighborhood school policy is a reasonable and educationally sound one, and thus that it is not violating the Constitution in adhering to it. But, this argument ignores the essential nature of the plaintiffs' position. They are not attacking the concept of the neighborhood school as an abstract proposition. They are, rather, attacking its application so as to deny opportunities guaranteed to them by the Constitution. It is a legal truism that "acts generally lawful may become unlawful when done to accomplish an unlawful end." *Western Union Telegraph Co.* v. *Foster*, 247 U.S. 105, 114 (1918) (Holmes, J.). Moreover, as Justice Frankfurter succinctly noted in his concurring opinion in *Cooper* v. *Aaron*, 358 U.S. 1, 25 (1958): "Local customs, however hardened by time, are not decreed in heaven."

The neighborhood school policy certainly is not sacrosanct. It is valid only insofar as it is operated within the confines established by the Constitution. It cannot be used as an instrument to confine Negroes within an area artificially delineated in the first instance by official acts. If it is so used, the Constitution has been violated and the courts must intervene.

This principle is well illustrated by the litigation involving desegregation of schools in Delaware. In *Evans* v. *Buchanan*, 172 F. Supp. 508 (D. Del. 1959), the court was required to pass upon the constitutionality of a desegregation plan submitted by State officials. The court approved a large portion of the plan, but disapproved a section providing "whenever possible, every pupil in the grades affected * * * shall have the choice of (a) attending the nearest school within the district in which he resides or (b) attending the school he would have attended prior to the effective date of this order."

In effect, therefore, the authorities were attempting to institute a neighborhood school policy. The court ordered this provision stricken from the plan, commenting "now, it is a fact that in Georgetown, for example, the majority of the Negroes live in a community know as The Hill. The colored school is close by. The white school is at a much greater distance. Interpreting the language * * * in the light of these facts, it would seem to result that no Negro student whose family resides on The Hill may ever enter the white school. Whatever may have been the reasons for this provision, it strikes me as unfair and is ordered to be stricken" (172 F. Supp. at 516).

When later asked to restore this provision to the plan, the court refused, and pointed out:

"Read against a background of geographical facts of which judicial knowledge may be taken, it provided that in many localities no colored student could ever attend a white school unless his parents thereafter changed their residence to a point closer to the white school than the colored school" *Evans* v. *Buchanan*, 173 F. Supp. 891, 892 (D. Del. 1959).

The court thus indicated that it would not permit the school authorities to confine integration to a bare token under the guise of a neighborhood school plan. The Evans dicision clearly answers the board's contention that since Negroes are free to move to other districts, they are not being required to attend a segregated school. Moreover, the board indicates a naivete in not recognizing the difficulties inherent in changing long established residential patterns.

The board raises several other contentions in an attempt to justify its conduct. With respect to its refusal to institute permissive zoning, or to allow the Negro children to register at other schools at the start of the 1960 school year, the board argues that it would be violative of the law to accord Negroes special privileges not allowed to other minority groups. It points to the fact that several other elementary schools in New Rochelle have student compositions which are primarily of one religious or national origin group, and argues that if permissive zoning privileges were afforded to the Lincoln pupils, the same privileges would have to be given to these other minorities. This, it says, would produce chaos throughout the school system. But, the Constitution is not this colorblind. The Brown decision dealt only with Negroes; it was based on factual findings which may not be applicable to other minority groups. Furthermore, the chaos envisioned by the board seems more fanciful than real, since no other groups or persons in New Rochelle have requested permission to attend schools outside the district in which they reside. Nor, is there evidence that any other school district was gerrymandered or deliberately set up to embrace an ethnic group. In addition, there are instances where it is not only justified, but necessary, to provide for such allegedly unequal treatment in order to achieve the equality guaranteed by the Constitution.[12]

The board also contends, with respect to its decision to rebuild Lincoln School on its present site, that it is empowered by State law with the authority and duty to select locations for schools. The existence of this authority, however, is not questioned by the plaintiffs. But this power, like any other, must be exercised in accordance with the demands of the Constitution. See *Cooper* v. *Aaron*, 358 U.S. 1, 19 (1958); cf. *Henry* v. *Godsell, supra; Sealy* v. *Department of Public Instruction of Penn., supra.* Similarly, the fact that the people of New Rochelle overwhelmingly approved this proposal by referendum is of no legal significance. Constitutional rights can certainly never be made dependent upon public choice; the consequences if they were, need hardly be labored.

Finally, the board's principal contention, which it has asserted throughout these proceedings, is that the existence of an all-Negro or a predominantly Negro school is not, in and of itself, a violation of the Constitution. The constant reiteration of this argument indicates the board's preoccupation with semantics at the expense of realities. This is not a case where the existence of an all-Negro school is an unfortunate fortuity. The Lincoln School was established as an all-Negro school by the gerrymandering of district lines, and by the transfer of white children residing in the district to schools outside the district. The Board of Education of the City of New Rochelle was responsible for both of these policies. Subsequent to 1949, the board by its arbitrary rejection of all proposals for change has purposefully maintained Lincoln as a segregated school. This decision is rendered on the facts in this case and holds that, in the instant situation, constitutional rights have been violated.

In conclusion, the words of Justice Frankfurter in *Cooper* v. *Aaron, supra,* indicating the attitude with which responsible public officials must necessarily approach these problems, bear repetition: "That the responsibility of those who exercise power in a democratic government is not to reflect inflamed public feeling but to help form its understand, is especially true when they are confronted with a problem like a racially discriminating public school system. This is the lesson to be drawn from the heartening experience in ending enforced racial segregation in the public schools in cities with Negro populations of large proportions. Compliance with decisions of this Court, as the constitutional organ of the supreme law of the land, has often, throughout our history, depended on active support by State and local authorities. It presupposes such support. To withhold it, and indeed to use political power to try to paralyze the supreme law, precludes the maintenance of our Federal system as we have known and cherished it for 170 years" (358 U.S. at 26).

Litigation is an unsatisfactory way to resolve issues such as have been presented here. It is costly, time consuming—causing further delays in the implementation of constitutional rights—and further inflames the emotions of the partisans. Men of goodwill, such as the individual members of the board submit they are, could have solved, and still can solve, the problem by exercising the judgment and understanding for which they presumably were chosen. The school board is a public body charged with a public responsibility. This responsibility must be exercised solely in the best interests of the children attending the schools. The board cannot relieve itself of this responsibility by giving the community whatever result might gratify the impulse of the moment. Nothing can be permitted to conflict with the board's moral and legal obligation.

THE DECREE

In determining the manner in which the Negro children residing within the Lincoln district are to be afforded the opportunities guaranteed by the Constitution, I will follow the procedure authorized by the Supreme Court in *Brown* v. *Board of Education*, 349 U.S. 294 (1955), and utilized by many district courts in implementing the

Footnotes at end of speech.

Brown principles. Thus, I deem it unnecessary at this time to determine the extent to which each of the items of relief requested by plaintiffs will be afforded. Instead, the board is hereby ordered to present to this court, on or before April 14, 1961, a plan for desegregation in accordance with this opinion, said desegregation to begin no later than the start of the 1961–62 school year. This court will retain jurisdiction of this action until such plan has been presented, approved by the court, and then implemented.

The foregoing opinion will constitute the court's finding of fact and conclusions of law.

---

[1] Hereinafter, any reference to the defendant will be to the board of education, since it is the party primarily involved in this litigation.

[2] Although Lincoln School presently has a maximum capacity of 622 and an enrollment of 483 children, the proposed new school will accommodate only 400. Thus, almost 100 children will be dispersed, presumably to neighboring schools, after construction of the new building is completed.

[3] It should be noted that under section 2502 of the New York State education law, the board of education is a corporate body, and as such bears a continuous responsibility for the operation of the New Rochelle public schools. This responsibility is not terminated or altered by the inevitable turnover in individual membership, which has occurred from 1930 to date. Otherwise, illegal ocnduct of a public body could rarely be challenged. Thus, the conduct of the board is, in law, viewed similarly to the conduct of any corporation; individual changes in membership have no legal significance in the context of this case. In addition, nothing in this opinion criticizing conduct of the board of education is meant to apply to those members who have urged that the present course of conduct in relation to the Lincoln School be altered.

[4] The plaintiffs also contended that the quality of education afforded at the Lincoln School was inferior and that the educational achievement of the Negro children at Lincoln had thus been curtailed. Much evidence as to teacher qualifications, teacher turnover, and various student test scores was introduced by both sides in this connection. But, in the view which I take of the case, it is not necessary to consider these claims. *Brown* v. *Board of Education, supra,* has determined that segregated schools established and maintained by official acts are inherently unequal as a matter of law.

[5] The resolution provided as follows:

"*Resolved,* That the board of education study present district lines with a view to setting up school districts in terms of the best interests of all the children and of the most complete utilization of the present physical plant; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That as of September 1, 1949, district lines as set by the board will be strictly adhered to according to best educational practices; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That effective at once all new entrants to the school system be admitted only to the school of the district in which they legally reside."

[6] The two schools are less than one-half a mile apart and Washington School is only partially filled.

[7] It is noteworthy that the board decided to replace Lincoln School without waiting for Mr. Johnson's final report, which was to deal with the Lincoln problem.

[8] The attitude of persons within the districts bordering Lincoln is illustrated by a statement prepared by the Mayflower Parent-Teacher Association at a time when the board was still considering alternatives to the replacement of Lincoln. The statement read, in part:

"In several schools where a well-integrated situation exists, the proportion of Negro students is steadily increasing each year. Even in those Mayflower neighborhoods where housing integration does exist, the turnover of homes is almost invariably from white to Negro students. In recent years, the proportion of Negro students at Mayflower has risen approximately 2 percent each year. Lincoln School rezoning would certainly hasten this process."

The statement criticized the Dodson proposals, commenting: "At the same time, the plan will increase the proportion of Negro children in several neighboring schools to such a degree that even according to Dodson's own quotation, a very rapid shift in proportion is likely to follow * * *" (plaintiff's exhibit 14).

It was testified that this statement was reecived by the board (record, pp. 301–302).

At approximately the same time, the president of the Daniel Webster Parent-Teacher Association wrote a letter to the board, which read, in part, as follows: "For several years Daniel Webster has been a well-integrated school. Because the increase of nonwhite pupils has been gradual, the neighborhood and school itself has been able to adapt and achieve a well-integrated atmosphere * * * [t]he Daniel Webster Parent-Teacher Association is most concerned about the recommendation in the Dodson report to increase the nonwhite population in this school to something around 30 percent. Any such move that would amount to a sudden readjustment in the school population would, in the opinion of the PTA, accelerate beyond control this normal and quite gradual adaptation that has been taking place in the school and neighborhood over the past several years * * * the Daniel Webster School Parent-Teacher Association Board cannot overemphasize what it feels to be a most important consideration, and that is the equilibrium of the student body * * *" (plaintiffs' exhibit 13).

[9] This would follow necessarily from the board's policy of refusal to allow children to transfer to schools in other districts.

[10] The converse of this situation occurred in *Gomillion* v. *Lightfoot, supra,* where the fact that a few Negroes were left within the city limits did not alter the illegal nature of the challenged rezoning.

[11] Actually, Dr. Dodson proposed a larger school at Lincoln to serve as a more workable basis for redistricting and integration.

[12] It is submitted that if these terms must be used, "de jure" should refer to segregation created or maintained by official act, regardless of its form. "De facto" should be limited to segregation resulting from fortuitous residential patterns. This decision does not purport to determine whether "de facto" segregation, in this sense, is violative of the Constitution.

[13] The board undoubtedly was aware of the permissive zoning policy instituted in New York City to cure a similar situation, under which children attending schools with a heavy concentration of Negroes and Puerto Ricans are permitted to transfer to underutilized schools with a more heterogeneous racial composition. The defendant board could not seriously have believed that, because of this policy, the New York City Board of Education was violating the Constitution. (See supplemental exhibit I.)

National Wildlife Week: March 19–25

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, during March 19 to 25, the Nation is observing National Wildlife Week. The theme of this 1961 observance is "Multiple Use—Balanced Conservation for the Future."

The commendable objectives of the week include efforts to:

Alert the people of America to the need for multiple use for our natural resources;

Plan and build a sound conservation program for balanced resource management;

Encourage all citizens to become better informed on the need for preserving natural resources for benefiting humanity; and

Unite conservationists in their common cause.

Across the Nation, conservationists are working in a realistic way to carry on appropriate observances of the special week.

In Wisconsin, the Wildlife Week chairman is Bernard Shearier, of Wisconsin Rapids.

I ask unanimous consent to have a list of the State sponsors and the 1961 Wildlife Week chairmen printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE SPONSORS AND THEIR 1961 WILDLIFE WEEK CHAIRMEN

Alabama—Alabama Wildlife Federation: Dr. William Rowell, Jr., 11 Upham Street, Mobile, Ala.; Burt Weeks, State Administrative Building, Montgomery, Ala.

Alaska—Alaska Sportsmen's Council: Vernon Haik, Post Office Box 1161, Chugiak.

Arizona—Arizona Game Protective Association, Inc.: Gordon Evans, 102 West Cedar, Flagstaff, Ariz.

Arkansas—Arkansas Wildlife Federation: Dayle Wiley, Stuttgart, Ark.

California—California Wildlife Federation, Inc.: Eddie Bruce, 905 East Mission Drive, Rosemead, Calif.

Colorado—Colorado Wildlife Federation: Herb Hockstrasser, Fort Morgan Junior High School, Fort Morgan, Colo.; Con D. Tolman, 1530 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.; Dr. Harley Glidden, Colorado State College, Greeley, Colo.; B. K. Linder, 149 North College, Fort College, Colo.; Richard Fawley, State Office Building, Denver, Colo.

Connecticut—Connecticut State League of Sportsmen's Clubs, Inc.: Donald J. Tragler, 76 Pine Ridge Road, Waterbury, Conn.; Malcolm H. Brinton, Department of Agriculture and Natural Resources, Hartford, Conn.; Harry Hammond, Old Tartia Road, East Hampton, Conn.

Delaware—Delaware Federation of Sportsmen and Conservation Clubs, Inc.: John Armstrong, Bayview Road, Middletown, Del.: Anthony Ferrara, 117 Mathes Avenue, Richardson Park, Wilmington, Del.; Mrs. Elizabeth Caulk, Chief, Information and Ed-

ucation, State Game and Fish Commission, Dover, Del.

District of Columbia—District of Columbia Wildlife Federation: Harry E. Radcliffe, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., suite 436, Washington, D.C.

Florida—Florida Wildlife Federation: Thomas N. Anderson, 101 East Charlotte, Post Office Box 1179, Eustis, Fla.; Jack Wilber, Sanford, Fla.; Mary Lou Brook, Twin Palms, Leesburg, Fla.; Denver Ste. Clair, Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission, Ocala, Fla.

Georgia—Georgia Sportsmen's Federation: Ray E. Tyner, Post Office Box 508, Cordele, Ga.; Bob Short, Game and Fish Commission, Room 411, Capitol Building, Atlanta, Ga.; J. L. McIntyre, Rome, Ga.; Paul A. Jones, Sr., 826 Third Avenue, Albany, Ga.; Clyde Greenway, care of Sears Foundation, Tucker, Ga.

Hawaii—Hawaii Wildlife Federation: J. R. Woodworth, Post Office Box 5425, Honolulu, Hawaii; Bernard Thom, Post Office Box 1913, Honolulu, Hawaii; Martin Pence, 297 Wainuenue Avenue, Hilo, Hawaii; James Clapper, Okaikaa, Kauai, Hawaii; Henry Yamashita, Kaunakakai, Molokai, Hawaii.

Idaho—Idaho Wildlife Federation: Pierre Pulling, Idaho State College, Pocatello, Idaho; Cecil McCracken, Route 2, Box 244A, Coeur d'Alene, Idaho.

Illinois—Illinois Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs: Frank Wilkinson, 7519 West Fullerton Avenue, Elmwood Park, Ill.

Indiana—Indiana Conservation Council, Inc., Stanley C. Taylor, Rural Route No. 3, Georgetown, Ind.; Walter L. Thompson, 311 West Washington Street, Indianapolis, Ind.; Charles Klausen, 680 Lake Street, Hobart, Ind.; Raymond Keim, Rural Route No. 2, Peru, Ind.; John Taylor, Guilford, Ind.

Iowa—All Iowa Conservation Council, Inc.: John C. Welter, 1130 I Avenue NW., Cedar Rapids, Iowa; Marshall J. Reichert, Box 344, Waterloo, Iowa; M. E. Clark, 1535 B Avenue NE., Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

Kansas—Kansas Association for Wildlife, Inc.: Roger Arensdorf, 811 Avenue B, Dodge City, Kans.

Kentucky—The League of Kentucky Sportsmen, Inc.; John Murphy, 512 Scenic Drive, Park Hills, Ky.; Harry Towles, Department of Fish & Wildlife Resources, Frankfort, Ky.

Louisiana—Louisiana Wildlife Federation: T. H. Roge, Post Office Box 415, Norco, La.; Steven Harmon, Chief, Division of Education and Publicity, Wildlife and Fisheries Commission, 400 Royal Street, New Orleans, La.

Maine—Maine Fish and Game Association, Inc.: Clarence Roth, Gardiner, Rural Free Delivery, Litchfield, Maine.

Maryland—Maryland Department of Game and Inland Fish: Malcolm E. King, State Office Building, Annapolis, Md.

Massachusetts—Massachusetts Conservation Council: Allen H. Morgan, Drumlin Farm, South Great Road, South Lincoln, Mass.

Michigan—Michigan United Conservation Clubs: Harold P. Hackett, Post Office Box 22, Battle Creek, Mich.; Volmar J. Miller, Rural Route No. 3, Paw Paw, Mich.

Minnesota—Minnesota Conservation Federation: Roger E. Preuss, 2224 Grand Avenue S., Minneapolis, Minn.

Mississippi—Mississippi Wildlife Federation: W. V. Robertson, Post Office Box 296, Gulfport, Miss.; Jack Warren, Post Office Box 451, Jackson, Miss.; Edgar R. Jones, Post Office Box 372, Cleveland, Miss.; Charles E. Beckman, Post Office Box 111, Quitman, Miss.; Russell Husband, Route 1, Columbus, Miss.

Missouri—Conservation Federation of Missouri: Ed Stegner, 130 East McCarty Street, Jefferson City, Mo.; Perry Hawes, Missouri Power & Light Co., Jefferson City, Mo.

Montana—Montana Wildlife Federation: Kenneth K. Baldwin, Box 548, Bozeman, Mont.

Nebraska—Nebraska Council of Sportsmen's Clubs: B. O. Robinson, 212 Farm Credit Building, 206 South 19th Street, Omaha, Nebr.

Nevada—Nevada Federated Sportsmen, Inc.: Mrs. Alicia Beck, Post Office Box 1137, Carson City, Nev.; Hugh A. Shamberger, Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, State Office Building, Carson City, Nev.; Carl Pacini, Post Office Box 707, Elko, Nev.; M. Sgt. Phillip T. Gregory, Jr., 24 Hunter Drive, Las Vegas, Nev.; Gene McDowell, Fish and Game Commission, 51 Grove Street, Reno, Nev.

New Hampshire—Federated Sportsmen's Clubs of New Hampshire, Inc.: Rachel L. Terrill, 298 North State Street, Concord, N.H.; Richard Tapply, 42 Lake Street, Bristol, N.H.; Clare Batchelder, 18 School Street, Concord, N.H.; Marion Kanter, South Lyndeboro, N.H.; Paul Gilman, 11 Dennison Road, Durham, N.H.

New Jersey—New Jersey State Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs: Harold E. Wilson, 8 Park Avenue, Smithville, N.J.

New Mexico—New Mexico Wildlife and Conservation Association: Don Clauser, 554 San Antonio Street, Santa Fe, N. Mex.

New York—New York State Conservation Council: Lawrence A. Williams, 303 Columbia Street, Ithaca, N.Y.

North Carolina—North Carolina Wildlife Federation, Inc.: Rod Amundson, Chief, Education Division, North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission, Raleigh, N.C.; Fred Norman, Elkin, N.C.

North Dakota—North Dakota Wildlife Federation: Carl Fredrickson, Box 504, Valley City, N. Dak.

Ohio—League of Ohio Sportsmen: Dr. James S. Greetham, 386 Brightwood Drive, Marion, Ohio; Carl Mosely, 1500 Dublin Road, Columbus 12, Ohio; Albert Trombetta, 628 Western Avenue, Mingo Junction, Ohio; Ed Nichols, 29679 Robert Street, Wickliffe, Ohio; Earl Schaffer, 221 East Pacemont Road, Columbus 2, Ohio.

Oklahoma—Oklahoma Outdoor Council, Inc.: Ralph W. Altman, extension wildlife specialist, extension division, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Okla.; Frederick M. Baumgartner, profesor of zoology, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Okla.

Oregon—Oregon Wildlife Federation: C. C. Schenck, 700 Northeast, Portland, Oreg.

Pennsylvania—Pennsylvania Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs, Inc.: Seth L. Myers, 480 North Oakland Avenue, Sharon, Pa.; M. J. Golden, Pennsylvania Game Commission, Harrisburg, Pa.; Albert M. Day, Pennsylvania Fish Commission, Harrisburg, Pa.; Dr. Maurice K. Goddard, Department of Forests and Waters, Harrisburg, Pa.; John E. Franson, U.S. Forest Service, Post Office Building, Warren, Pa.; C. L. Wilbar, Jr., Department of Health, Post Office Box 90, Harrisburg, Pa.

Rhode Island—Rhode Island Wildlife Federation: John M. Cronan, Hope Valley, R.I.

South Carolina—South Carolina Wildlife Federation: Gordon H. Brown, South Carolina Wildlife Resources Department, Post Office Box 360, Columbia, S.C.

South Dakota—South Dakota Wildlife Federation: Dr. G. B. Spawn, South Dakota State College, Brookings, S. Dak.; E. R. Mitchell, 702 Sixth Street, Brookings, S. Dak.

Tennessee—Tennessee Conservation League: Vern Snowden, staff, public information, U.S. Naval Air Station, Memphis, Tenn.; Fred Stanberry, State game and fish commission, Cordell Hull Building, Nashville, Tenn.; E. W. Means, 200 Butler Road, Oak Ridge, Tenn.; John H. Bailey, Route 8, Box 360, Johnson City, Tenn.; Ray Strong, 28 West Virginia Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.

Texas—Sportsmen's Clubs of Texas: Herbert Frensley, Post Office Box 3, Houston, Tex.

Utah—Utah Wildlife Federation: Gerald Folsom, 2968 East 4430 South, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Vermont—Vermont Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs, Inc.: Herman Dederer, Shelburne, Vt.

Virginia—Virginia Wildlife Federation: M. Rupert Cutler, commission of game and inland fisheries, 7 North Second Street, Richmond, Va.

Washington—Washington State Sportsmen's Council, Inc.: Howard Nelson, 2313 Mill Plain Boulevard, Vancouver, Wash.

West Virginia—West Virginia Sportsmen Unlimited: Skip Johnson, Charleston Gazette, Charleston, W. Va.; A. G. Fleming, Parkersburg News, Parkersburg, W. Va.; Robert Bowers, conservation commission, Charleston, W. Va.; Nelson Boord, 609 Laconia Building, Wheeling, W. Va.; Dr. J. M. Laing, Beckley Post Herald, Beckley, W. Va.

Wisconsin—Wisconsin Federation of Conservation Clubs: Bernard Shearier, 310 South 12th Street W., Wisconsin Rapids, Wis.

Wyoming—Wyoming Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs: John C. Borzea, 1313 Clark Street, Rock Springs, Wyo.; Tom Bell, Lander, Wyo.

How New Jersey Treats Its Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, as we weigh the merits and demerits of Federal aid to education, I urge Members of the House and Senate alike to give earnest attention not only to what needs to be done, but to what has been done without the proposals now under consideration.

An editorial published on March 15 in the Herald-News of Passaic, N.J., gives a very clear picture of what our State has accomplished by way of providing public school education of a very high order. The editorial is entitled "How New Jersey Treats Its Schools." Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, the editorial follows:

HOW NEW JERSEY TREATS ITS SCHOOLS

To dispel any false impressions about public education in our State which may have been created by the recent discussions of local school budgets and the Federal aid-to-education legislation, the statistics which follow are offered. They are taken from the newest research report of the National Education Association, entitled "Rankings of the States, 1961."

How do New Jersey teacher salaries compare with those elsewhere?

Our State ranks fourth in the estimated average salary of classroom teachers with a figure of $5,930. In California, Alaska, and New York, in that order, the average salaries are higher.

Is New Jersey niggardly with funds for public schools?

The estimated current expenditure per pupil in New Jersey is $512. Only two States, Alaska and New York, spend more. The figure is the same for both, $585.

How does the size of New Jersey classes compare with those elsewhere?

The pupil-teacher ratio in New Jersey public elementary and secondary schools was 23.3 in the fall of 1959. Our State, along with Illinois and New York, ranked 10th in this respect.

These figures show that New Jersey is in the forefront among the States in providing for public education. The next question and answer discloses that New Jersey is doing this reasonably good job by itself, with a minimum of outside help.

How does New Jersey fare under the present Federal aid-to-education program?

It ranks 48th, only New York and Vermont doing more poorly. The Federal Government contributes 1.4 percent of the total amount received by the elementary and secondary schools in our State. Alaska, the top beneficiary, receives 17.1 percent of its school funds from Washington. Among others at the top of the list are Georgia, 10 percent; Mississippi, 9.6 percent; Nevada, 8.1 percent. Even California and Connecticut do twice as well as New Jersey, each receiving 3.3 percent.

New Jersey could not reasonably expect to do any better under President Kennedy's proposal to enlarge the Federal aid program.

Fair Deal for Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the March 14 edition of the Newark Evening News. This article points to the urgent need to focus national attention on the plight of our cities.

As a sponsor of legislation to create a Department of Urban Affairs, I commend these comments to the attention of my colleagues:

FAIR DEAL FOR CITIES

Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey, addressing the National Housing Conference, endorsed President Kennedy's proposal to create a department of housing and urban affairs. It is time that Congressmen from predominantly urban States joined to demand a fair deal for the cities.

In his special message on housing and community development, the President indicated the new department would be given responsibility not only for the Federal housing program, but would aid cities in planning, land use, transportation and numerous other problems.

Remolding our cities and improving patterns of community development, said the President, will "contribute to the Nation's economic recovery and its long-term economic growth." That growth is now jeopardized by the decay of the cities, which they can arrest by their own efforts no more than can the farm States meet their difficulties unaided.

Urban problems differ in kind, but not in economic importance, from those of agricultural areas. No one disputes the need for a Department of Agriculture; no one should dispute the need for a department concerned with, and administering aid for, urban areas.

As to where the money is coming from, the first place to look is the scandalous farm subsidy expenditures, which come from taxes mostly paid by urban and suburban areas. Federal allocations in 1959 averaged approximately $3,000 for farm families, as compared with $84 for an urban slum family. Somehow a better balance must be achieved.

A Tribute to the City of Dubuque

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. BROMWELL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, the late Mr. Edward Matthews, of Illinois, left behind a bit of verse which his daughter, Miss Mary Matthews, of Springfield, has been kind enough to send me. Often our midwestern cities are praised; rarely are they praised in verse. For this reason as well as the unusual charm of this little poem, I include it here:

DUBUQUE

When from thy sight I passed, Dubuque!
I cast behind one lingering look.
One more look at thee I took.
And oh! thy deep majestic brook!

For my short stay I did rebuke
The haste with which I thee forsook.
This spot where Julien Dubuque
Potosi's hand in wedlock took.

Thy lovely place brought Pere Marquette
And Hennepin and Joliet,
In thy fair soil to sow the seed.
Of good, in thought and word and deed.

Hon. B. Carroll Reece

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has lost one of its great men, with the passing of our colleague B. CARROLL REECE, distinguished Representative of the First Congressional District of Tennessee.

CARROLL REECE's long career of public service is well known to all of us. It spanned nearly 40 years and included an outstanding World War I record, followed by some 36 years of selfless service in the House of Representatives.

CARROLL REECE was a happy man because he was a good man. He possessed a rare blend of strength of character and gentleness. He was firm in pleading his convictions, but always temperate in his dealings with others. He was truly a gentleman.

It was my privilege to serve with CARROLL REECE in the House for 10 years. During this time I grew to know, admire, and respect him as one of the outstanding Members of Congress. He will be sorely missed by his colleagues in both House and Senate, all of whom join in expressing profound sympathy to Mrs. Reece and the members of his family.

Congressional Recess

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. BARRY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, 13 Senators, headed by Senator MCGEE, of Wyoming, have introduced an excellent recommendation which should be seriously considered by the House. They suggest in Senate Concurrent Resolution 16 that Congress take its long recess in the summer instead of the early winter so that Members may go on vacation with their families.

I am today introducing an identical House concurrent resolution to give the House the opportunity of discussing this question. I think this proposal would increase the efficiency of the Congress and I urge that it be seriously studied.

Senator MCGEE said that when the children are out of school during July, August, and September, Congress is usually in session, preventing Members from leaving with their families. Then, when Congress adjourns late in August or early September, the children are getting ready to go back to school and a Member who wishes to return to his State must leave his family here.

To take care of any emergencies, the resolution would permit the leaders to call Congress back during the summer recess if necessary.

Since the end of the war it has become a fact of life that Congress is in session 9 or 10 months each year. The procedure of recessing during summer months would in no way change this. It would merely shift the period of our time off to a different season to make it possible to do some living with our families, our children—and I hasten to add, grandchildren.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

When Lyndon Johnson Talked to Businessmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, on February 13, 1961, the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, the Vice President of the United States, delivered a significant address to a meeting called by the National Industrial Conference Board in Washington, D.C.

U.S. News & World Report made the following editorial comment on the Vice President's address:

A little-noticed speech by Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON, delivered in Washington on February 13, 1961, is attracting growing attention among businessmen and Members of Congress.

The speech, delivered at a meeting called by the National Industrial Conference Board, was cleared by the White House. It dealt with the attitude of the Kennedy administration toward business.

I ask that the Vice President's speech as carried in the U.S. News & World Report be included as these remarks:

WHEN LYNDON JOHNSON TALKED TO BUSINESSMEN

(From Vice President JOHNSON's address in Washington, February 13, 1961)

Today you have heard the President. You have met distinguished members of his Cabinet. I believe you can leave Washington confident that your Government is in able, strong and—above all—highly responsible hands.

In these moments, I would like to offer you a perspective on the role of your Government during this period—and to make several comments about the relationship of the business community to Government.

It is no secret—and no criticism—to say that, when many businessmen speak, write, or think about Government, they use more shorthand than their secretaries.

In that shorthand, "new" means "more" and "more" is an ugly word: nearly as ugly as words like "welfare" or "planning"—or that word not to be spoken in mixed company, "Democrats."

This shorthand needs revision.

Yesterday is yesterday. The idiom of yesterday's politics and yesterday's prejudices no longer applies—not even for the word "Democrats." If we are to respond successfully to the new facts we must face, we must leave yesterday's habits behind us.

This first fact must be understood first: Both abroad and at home we have arrived at the start of a new era. The arrival of this new administration is a coincidence—not the cause.

Whomever history might have installed in America's leadership at this time would have to face new facts—new facts requiring new responses.

We must not allow our old preconceptions and prejudices to keep us from facing the new facts of our national life today—at home or abroad. I want to make this absolutely clear. This Administration does not—and will not—seek great new powers by proclaiming great new perils.

The purpose of your national leadership is to accomplish, not to aggrandize—to accomplish what will make the liberty of the people secure, not to aggrandize Government to make the state supreme.

Peril there is. Peril there will continue to be. In candor, we shall acknowledge it. But powers there are, also. In candor, we acknowledge that, to meet the perils, our need is less for new powers than for new resolve in using those we have—using them with new precision, new energy, and new results.

At home, as abroad, we must treat what is ill without injuring what is well. In nothing that we do can we—or shall we—be oblivious to the weight which government itself today presses down upon the people and their enterprise. As we will not ask what cannot be borne, neither shall we ignore the needs which a free society cannot neglect.

We shall do what is right because it is right, never because it is cheap—remembering, always, that it is never right to be prodigal and never wrong to be prudent.

In saying these things, my purpose is not to offer gratuitous reassurances to the business community. I do not believe any administration, chosen by the people to lead the strongest and most stable government on earth, must or should endlessly avow itself to be responsible, loyal, or sincere.

If there be a brand of partisanship which does not permit such fundamentals to be presumed, then it is that partisanship—and not its targets—which needs to be examined and reexamined.

Today, as in times past, the business community is being urged and encouraged to take up positions of opposition, to trifles—by men of trifling purposes. With ill-concealed relish such men summon the American business community to work for the failure—rather than the success—of this American administration.

No American, of any walk of life, surrenders his integrity by working for—rather than against—the success of his government. When some call you to oppose, ask: Oppose what? Oppose why?

An economy which can afford millions for the few minutes' life of a missile can afford 2 pennies for 1 minute of human labor. A people who believe in God who marks the sparrow's fall can heed the calls from their fellow men which come from out the darkness of all the lands like the Congo.

To honor our system of private enterprise and sustain it, we must be certain its promise is fulfilled—not for the few, but for all: for yesterday's miner of coal as for today's operator of a computer; for the bedridden aged as for the healthy bodied young; for the man whose skin is not white as for the man whose skin is white.

When we talk of these things, we talk not of burdening private enterprise—but of unburdening it of those things which detract from its force in the world.

The success and survival of our system depends upon things of principle as well as profit—and I believe those who suggest otherwise understand neither the system nor you who are part of it.

Take with you from Washington the message that yesteday's shorthand won't do. New does not automatically mean more—more spending, more taxes, more government. For a new generation and a new administration, new means new—new responses to the new facts with which we are faced.

The interest of business—the interest of all Americans—lies not in the failure but in the success of the search for such new responses.

We invite you to the labors of the search and to the rewards of its success.

Hawaii's Foresight Lauded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HIRAM L. FONG
OF HAWAII
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, as you and my colleagues in this body well know, my State of Hawaii is the 50th and newest State in the Union. I was most pleased to read in last night's edition of the Washington Evening Star a tribute to Hawaii.

While a half century ago one might have said that Hawaii was truly isolated—surrounded by the Pacific Ocean and situated 2,400 miles from the U.S. mainland—today, in this jet and space age, we consider the distance negligible. Those of you who have travelled there have been amazed to find such a modern community. I am very proud to say that Hawaii has always strived to meet its current needs as well as its needs of the future. The progress we have made pays tribute to the foresight and diligence of the people of Hawaii.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Evening Star editorial of March 21, 1961, entitled "Planning in Paradise" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLANNING IN PARADISE

As befits the youngest member of the family of States, Hawaii is making plans for its future betterment. And it is doing so in a way that sounds practical and realistic—with the advice of qualified counsel and through a long-term program involving many lines of action.

Possessed of many valuable natural resources, starting with climate and the fertility of much of its land area, the island State contemplates a 20-year program of land and economic development to cost an estimated $703 million. Holding high pri-

ority in the planning is the problem of transport, not only on and between the islands themselves (only 8 among 20 are now classified as inhabited) but between the island group and the west coast mainland of the United States. Highways, airports and harbors figure largely in this study, but for interisland purposes a private consultant agency has been engaged to examine expanded passenger and freight services by sea and air. Wisely, too, the planners are not overlooking the human needs in the light of estimates that the State's population by 1980 will have increased from its present 620,000 to about twice that total. In this social category, the State Department of Planning lists the requirements of more schools of all types, libraries, public health centers and hospitals.

It is not without reason that Hawaii calls itself "the Paradise of the Pacific." Its potential is as great as its attractiveness, and it is to the credit of its State government that plans are being made to make the bright future a reality.

Resolution on Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANCHER NELSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, a vast amount of mail has reached my desk dealing with issues before the Congress of the United States. Farm legislation of course has stimulated much comment.

A tendency that seems to prevail has been the disposition to line up into groups where one group proposes and the other opposes. This deals with farm organizations as well as political parties.

One of the most refreshing letters that I have received of recent date contains the note: "The signers of this resolution are a group of farmers union, farm bureau, and local farmers."

The enclosed proposal they sent me contains the following resolution which is copied below in full:

LAFAYETTE, MINN.
March 15, 1961.

Representative ANCHER NELSEN:

Resolved, At the present time we definitely want a farm program.

1. Program should be based on tillable acres rather than past history.

2. Curtail incentive payments that tend to increase surpluses.

3. Curtail further Federal grants to reclamation projects that tend to increase surpluses.

4. Administrative procedures and details to be made workable so that the individual farmer has an opportunity to obtain his own level of security.

Mr. Speaker, attached to that resolution was a sheet with the abovementioned note:

The signers of this resolution are a group of Farmers Union, Farm Bureau, and local farmers.

The following signatures were affixed:

LeRoy Martins, Amos L. Hayes, Kenneth R. Eckberg, Levern Carlson, Martin Fluegge, Clayton Peterson, Harley Traurig, Russell H. Malmberg, Willie Prodoehl, Lester W. Peterson, Merton Johnson, Evan Nelson, Marvin Rhodes, Elmer Longhorst, John E. Webster, Carl M. Youngblom, Albert Ulrich, Jay Salisbury, Carl Martins, Verl Koecher, Edwin Pierson, Rud. L. Bode, Alfred H. Bode.

Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the New Ulm (Minn.) Journal on March 16 an editorial pointing up the spirit of cooperation in this resolution and that editorial is appended hereto in full:

ON THE RIGHT TRACK

A group of Nicollet County farmers put aside partisanship Tuesday and sat down to decide what they want in the way of a farm program. They were about equally divided between the conservative Farm Bureau and the liberal Farmers Union, plus some independents. The county presidents of both groups, Verl Koecher of the Bureau, and J. Salisbury of the Union, were present.

It was significant that these two rivals for the right to speak for the farmer should meet together at Bernadotte Town Hall. It was real grassroots level, because the men are operators of family farms from 160 acres to almost a section. Two of them have half a section regularly in corn.

After a lively discussion, they came up with this program:

"*Resolved*, At the present time we want a farm program based on tillable acres rather than past history. Our program would curtail incentive payments that tend to increase surpluses. It would curtail further Federal grants for reclamation projects that tend to increase surpluses."

The group suggested that administrative procedures and details be made workable so that the individual farmer has an opportunity to obtain his own level of security.

Copies of the program were sent to Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, Senators Humphrey and McCarthy, and Representative Nelsen in Washington.

Koecher said the Bernadotte men would welcome others joining in the effort. It would be good if the spirit of cooperation would spread. The farmers have touched a sore spot in asking a halt to some reclamation projects. It is absurd to be draining swamps to provide more tillable acres, yet paying to put dry land in the soil bank. Take it from there, Orville.

Pattern of River Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. SCOTT. Mr President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Philadelphia Bulletin of March 19, 1961, entitled "Pattern of River Development."

This editorial points up the importance of the Delaware River to the four-State area comprising Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and New York.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PATTERN OF RIVER DEVELOPMENT

The Arkansas, like the Delaware, is one of America's great rivers. The Arkansas is longer; the Delaware serves more people in more ways. Development of the Arkansas is well along; that of the Delaware is in the talking and planning stage. Yet both, in their different ways, will follow much the same pattern.

The Arkansas has lost prominence because it is a tributary of the mighty Mississippi, yet it ranges through the State of its name, across corners of Oklahoma and Kansas, and drains a considerable part of Colorado, where the famed Royal Gorge marks the route it cuts through mountains on its way to the sea.

Development of the Arkansas is a $1,200 million project, more than twice the estimated cost of conserving the water of the Delaware. One reason for the added expense is that barge traffic is planned along the Arkansas, while there is no thought of locks on the upper reaches of the Delaware. But power, flood control, regulation of water flow in dry weather, and recreation are inherent in both.

The job along the Arkansas is slated for completion by 1975; there is little hope that the Delaware job can be done before 1980, and shortages as early as 1970 are forecast for some places. The work on the tributary of the Mississippi has been done largely with Federal money under the guidance of the Army Engineers. There is the expectation that the Delaware's main task will be done in the same way, but with assistance from the four States involved—Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and New York.

Out on the plains, barge traffic is an important factor in river development. In the East, the emphasis is on provision of enough water to supply the domestic and industrial needs of an area population that will reach more than 20 million within the next 20 years. Senators from the area affected by the Delaware are urging that its improvement be started without delay, so that burgeoning population and industry may suffer no shortages.

Realization is general that the Delaware Basin's improvement will require time—much time. If it is not started within the next year or two it may miss the opportunity to provide for the mounting needs of the growing four-State area.

The program outlined is not a fantastic dream, but merely the foresight needed to come up with adequate water when the forecasts of growth are realized.

Charles R. Hook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article carried in the Middletown Journal, an Ohio newspaper, relative to the recent retirement of Charles R. Hook, who resigned as director of the Armco Steel Corp. after 58 years of service.

Mr. Hook for many years has been one of the outstanding citizens of Ohio. He has served his Government and his country in many ways. During the life of the two Hoover Commissions he was chairman of the Task Force on Business Organization of the Defense Department, and as a result of the recommendations made by his task force and himself, many untold millions of dollars have been saved Federal taxpayers.

So it is a pleasure to quote herewith the newspaper article to which I have referred, inasmuch as it gives much additional information as to the many achievements of Mr. Hook throughout the years, which have been of such great benefit to our national life.

INDUSTRIALIST LEAVES BOARD OF STEEL FIRM

Charles R. Hook announced today he has resigned as a director of Armco Steel Corp. after 58 years' service with the company.

"When a fellow reaches 80 years of age he ought to have more time to devote to his own affairs," Hook declared. "So I am withdrawing from all business responsibilities. I recently retired as a director of the Westinghouse Electric Corp. and the Equitable Life Assurance Society.

"My term as a member of the board of directors of Armco would have expired in April. But since I plan to go to Florida in a few days to spend the remainder of the winter. I asked the board to accept my earlier resignation.

"My interest in Armco and Armco people will continue as long as I live. Over my 58 years at Armco, everyone has been very good to me, and I appreciate most sincerely all the friendly cooperation that I have received," he said emphatically.

"Even though I will be vacationing in Florida, I am not going to be idle. When a fellow has worked for nearly 70 years, he just can't spend his time in a rocking chair. I intend to continue to work for those organizations fighting to preserve free enterprise and democratic government.

"One of the organizations that made valuable contribution to the well-being of our country was the Hoover Commission. During its life, I served as chairman of the Committee on Business Organization of the Department of Defense. It has been my pleasure since the Commission made its report to the Congress to continue to work with former President Hoover as chairman of the Committee of Hoover Commission Task Force Members.

"President Kennedy is thoroughly familiar with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission to eliminate wasteful Government expenditures and lighten the burden of the taxpayers. In fact, while a Senator he took an active part in implementing the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. His father, Joseph Kennedy, was a member of the Commission," Hook explained.

"In announcing my resignation from the board of directors, I am particularly encouraged by the high caliber of Armco's management," Hook concluded. "I don't believe that any company has a more interested and able board of directors. I know from experience that the administrative management of the company is the most alert, capable and progressive in the steel industry. The men who manage Armco today have grown up under 'Armco Policies,' and will see to it that they continue to guide the company in the years ahead. Under such capable leadership, the future of Armco is bound to be bright."

Armco's board of directors accepted Hook's resignation "with the greatest regret" and adopted resolutions which paid tribute to his leadership and the great contribution he has made to Armco's progress.

"The growth of Armco over the years has been due in large measure to his strong leadership and exceptional understanding of business principles and human relations," the board's resolutions declared. "His ability as one of America's outstanding business leaders has been recognized everywhere * * * at future sessions of this board, we will miss his wise counsel and warm personality."

Armco President L. T. Johnston also expressed his regrets. "Mr. Hook will always be 'Mr. Armco' to all of us who have been associated with him for so many years. In spite of his heavy responsibilities, he has never been too busy to talk over our problems and give us the benefit of his long experience. Fortunately, he will still be available for advice and counsel for he will continue to occupy an office in Armco's general office building," Johnston said.

How Hook rose from a $2-a-week office boy in a Cincinnati steel plant to become an internationally known industrialist is one of the most interesting success stories that can be written. Wishing to know the steel business from the ground up, he asked to be transferred into the plant as a laborer.

After learning the roll-turning trade he became a foreman in an Indiana steel plant. Joining Armco in 1902 as night superintendent, he became general superintendent, vice president in charge of operations, and in 1930, president of the company. A director of Armco since 1918, he served as chairman of the board for 11 years.

During his Armco career he still found time to take an active part in a long list of national business organizations. He served as president of the National Association of Manufacturers in 1938, and later as its chairman. He was appointed a member of the Business Advisory Council of the U.S. Department of Commerce in 1935. He was elected a public member of the board of governors of the New York Stock Exchange in 1953.

The U.S. Government has frequently made use of his knowledge and experience. In 1938, President Roosevelt appointed him a member of an American mission sent abroad to study labor conditions in England and Sweden. Again he was asked to undertake a mission of importance early in World War II when the war effort was hampered by a serious shortage of steel. Hook was appointed chairman of the joint steel mission set up by the United States and Britain to study the steel industry in England and recommend how the combined production of the two countries could best be utilized.

President Truman also called upon him for assignments on several occasions. Truman made him a member of the Joint Labor-Management Conference. In 1952 he was appointed to the Government mission headed by Charles Sawyer, and went overseas again to study Europe's economy. He was made chairman of an advisory commission on service pay for the Armed Forces in 1947.

In spite of his many responsibilities, Hook has always devoted a large part of his time to helping American youth. For many years he took an active part in Boy Scout work both locally and as a member of the national council. He has served as president and chairman of the board of junior achievement.

He has frequently been honored for contributions to public service. The steel industry gave him the Gary Medal for outstanding achievement in the field of human relations in industry and for his more than half-century of service to the industry.

He was named Man of the Year by the National Association of Manufacturers in 1955.

Four years ago he received the Governor's Award, the highest honor Ohio can confer on a native son.

The American Society for Metals awarded him a medal for encouraging the advancement of metallurgical research.

The American Management Association and the American Society of Mechanical Engineers jointly presented him with the Gantt Medal for "distinguished achievement in industrial management as a service to the community."

Probably the award he prizes most is the Silver Buffalo, the highest honor the Boy Scouts of American can bestow.

Although Hook was unable to go to college, 11 universities and colleges have conferred honorary degrees upon him.

Mr. and Mrs. Hook will continue to make their home at 7 Alameda Circle.

Charles R. Hook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleague from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] and express best wishes to Mr. Charles R. Hook as he begins an active retirement in Florida.

Mr. Hook and I met and worked together on the Hoover Commission recommendations during recent years and his dedication to service to his country is well known by all who have worked with him.

We in Florida welcome Mr. Hook to our State, and hope he will spend a good deal of his time with us. His business and civic talents will find new avenues of expression in our fast-growing State, and we will encourage him to take an active interest in the development and expansion of Florida.

Revival of Art in Little Rock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the city of Little Rock, Ark., is rapidly becoming one of the leading art centers in the South. A cultural renaissance is taking place in the city, which should set an example for other cities throughout the Nation.

An interesting article concerning the revival of art in Little Rock appeared recently in the Arkansas Gazette. This article points out what can be done to enrich the cultural life of a community through active leadership by interested citizens. I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RENAISSANCE OF ART IN LITTLE ROCK (AND ARKANSAS) NEAR EPIDEMIC STAGE

(By Bill Lewis)

Little Rock is emerging from its own artistic dark ages.

There's a renaissance in art and rarely will a walk downtown fail to provide evidence of it.

What's more, the revival is spreading—all over the state and beyond, to persons hitherto disinterested in art and to other cultural areas like music, dance and drama.

The epidemic proportions of this new interest will be more than ever in evidence in the fourth Arkansas Arts Festival next month when sidewalks, store windows, banks and art galleries will bloom forth with colorful collections. Every downtown shopper will turn art critic—and perhaps even collector.

For aside from the pure pleasure of daubing canvas with paint and having others appraise the results, the revival is meeting a sterner test: Artists are selling and the people are buying.

This burgeoning new interest was scarcely spontaneous. Little Rock has long had a tight little coterie of artists, many of them talented, and known, and it's had a moderate share of monied collectors, mostly unknown.

It's also had amateur painters who, until about 4 years ago, hid their lights under a bushel or turned the walls of their homes into one-man gallery showings, with no onlookers.

An event of no mean consequence to Arkansas artists and amateurs took place at Hayden Lake, Idaho, on June 11, 1956. Jeanette Edris became Mrs. Winthrop Rockefeller and, subsequently, an Arkansan.

SEVERAL CONTRIBUTORS

There have been several outstanding contributors to the art boom—Mrs. David D. Terry, founder of the Art Festival; William E. Steadman, Jr., the temperamental former director of the city Fine Arts Museum, and others. But ask almost anyone now who was chiefly responsible, and the answer is the same: Mrs. Jeanette Rockefeller.

Mrs. Rockefeller, in the view of one local artist, had in years of exposure to art developed "excellent taste and a great deal of knowledge." She, the artist said, is "very genuinely interested in promoting art and other culture, for its educational aspects as well as for its cultural aspects."

"She and her husband have worked furiously, touring the State at their own expense raising money for the arts center," he said. "Mrs. Rockefeller arranges and pays for getting shows down here."

Five years ago, the city Fine Arts Museum was a moribund repository of mostly prints and one visit would have done for years. (Some decorators decry the use of prints for home interiors; artists are aghast at using them for museum interiors.) Original works were as scarce then as prints are now.

DINER'S PART

One bright spot was an annual Arkansas Artists' Competition, to which a newcomer named Jack Diner, medical illustrator at the university medical center and a serious artist on the side, offered some works. His arrival in Arkansas coincided with a blossoming art revival.

Diner was impressed with the talent the Arkansas show attracted, and distressed that it had so few places to be seen. The university's art colony (or department, in this case) was turning out some first-rate work. But largely because of the remoteness of the campus to the rest of the State, the university was making little headway in passing the word.

Diner asked the university administration for permission to begin holding one-man shows in a ready-made gallery—the student lounge—at the medical center. He absorbed the expenses, and the shows were a hit.

THEN CAME STEADMAN

Early in 1958 came Steadman, a brisque easterer with experience in museum management at West Point and elsewhere. The Rockefellers and others supplemented his city salary of $200 a month.

The upheavel at the Fine Arts Museum was immediate and thorough. Steadman began shuffling the collection around. He redecorated the old place, adding air conditioning and a music system, new lights and new life. New art, begged, borrowed, and rented began appearing at the museum, and so did new patrons.

Steadman started courses in art, mostly for children. The kids came, and so did their parents, often for the first time. Usually, the parents had something new to see on each trip. There were shows for local talent, and sales began to materalize from them.

Until then, Little Rock art collectors were spending their money at Chicago, New York, and New Orleans. Steadman's shows got them started to buying local art, and it's not unusual now to find the likes of a David Bing—who lives at 523 East Sixth Street—hanging besides a Picasso or a Braque in a Little Rock home—not bad company.

Diner was one of Steadman's first teachers of children.

Back then, about one Little Rock private gallery was in operation "Sunday painters displayed their paintings of cats playing with balls of cotton and such," an artist said of it.

The university (Fayetteville) group, principally Dr. David Durst, the art department head, began showing at Little Rock. Their talents become better known.

THE ARTS FESTIVAL

Then in 1958 Mrs. Terry inaugurated the Arkansas Arts Festival—an event that brought all of the performing arts into play in one week packed with shows, shows and more shows of all kinds of art from all kinds of artists. They all got a showing, whether on a clothesline at MacArthur Park or in a choice display window on Main Street. It was a tremendous impetus to the whole field.

"This definitely proved to everyone, I think," said Diner, "that there was talent here, and no question there was a huge amount of sales. Mrs. Rockefeller was very encouraging: She went to the clothesline show and bought several pictures."

The museum was by then a going concern. However Steadman, whose brusqueness in getting it, irritated some people, departed after about a year. The momentum the museum had acquired by then was continued and is gaining.

INFECTION SPREADS

Since the first festival, the art infection has spread: Hot Springs formerly had a small, struggling group called the Southern Artists Association and when one of the artists, Val Matthews, began to talk about "What Little Rock has done," she began to get results. The association bought an old skating rink and converted it into a combined art exhibition area and community theater, and it now brings in art teachers from all over Arkansas to teach. Pine Bluff officials have been talking about their own arts festival. One-man shows are springing up in other places—like the College of the Ozarks at Clarksville.

In 1957, the Junior League of Little Rock adopted as its major project the construction of a community arts center at Little Rock. (As the project progressed and funds for it were needed from all of Arkansas, the name itself was made the Arkansas Arts Center and its program is being planned to comply.)

The league, Little Rock businessmen, and the Rockefellers joined forces in the fund campaign, concluding it successfully last year. Center officials hope to have the structure under construction this spring. It will provide a home for virtually all the performing arts, crafts and artists. It also will have facilities for teaching the arts to all Arkansans.

The junior league has written letters, stuffed envelopes and provided other clerical manpower and legwork for the center. It was responsible for the hiring of Mrs. Anne H. Webb as artistic director of the center. Under Mrs. Webb, the variety of art shows has been continued (with considerable emphasis on Arkansas and regional talent). The center's teaching program also has been expanded to include classes in art for all ages, group classes in music, the forming recently of the center's own chamber orchestra—which already has given one concert, and, a ballet class which will provide the corps de ballet for future Arkansas opera productions.

SPECIAL AUTO

The center is having an artmobile built to carry traveling exhibits to communities throughout the State, and it is sending exhibitions of prints to towns that otherwise would have no art activities.

"When we started a year and three months ago," said Mrs. Webb, "we were not at all sure what the response would be; we didn't know whether the thing would be a success or not.

"We've had excellent response from the beginning, and there has been a steady use of facilities of the art center ever since they were begun. Because of that, we have been able to constantly raise the standard of teaching, and we are now seeing a need for the best possible teaching in every field."

The renaissance has been a small boon to art supply stores.

The Jungkind Co., for instance, has removed its greeting card section to make way for an expansion of the art supply department. A spokesman for that firm estimated interest in the field had expanded threefold in the last 2 or 3 years.

Not the smallest attraction about art is that the least it requires in the way of an investment are a drawing pad and pencil. Small sets of beginners' oils may be obtained for less than $3 and the sets go up to $30.

"It's just like fishing," said Miss Alice Young of Jungkind's. "You can start with a few small worms and work up."

Jungkind's, incidentally, regularly displays art in its windows.

Hungarian Freedom Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the revolutionary events of 1848 raised the hopes and revived the aspirations of all oppressed peoples. These momentous events foreshadowed the overthrow of autocracies, the establishment of democratic governments, and also the return of individual freedoms to the peoples who had been robbed of them under autocratic regimes. The Hungarian people at that time had been suffering under Austria's stern rule for more than 200 years, and their lot had worsened under the ruthless regime headed by arch-reactionary Metternich. The year 1848 offered the Hungarians the chance to regain at least a part of their freedom by forming an autonomous entity within the Austrian Empire.

Early in the year, as the revolutionary wave swept to all parts of Europe, governing leaders in many capitals literally

fled for their lives. In Vienna demonstrators nearly overthrew the Government, and the detested Metternich fled the city. Hungarian patriotic leaders in Budapest were following these startling happenings with keen interest. They knew that the Government in Vienna was badly shaken and was on the defensive. The Hungarian leaders proceeded calmly. Without resorting to the use of force, they presented to the Government a petition in which they demanded freedom and autonomy. On March 15 the Government responded by granting freedom and autonomy to the Hungarian people. That memorable day has become Hungarian Liberation Day, their national holiday.

The spirit of March 15, 1848, lives on in the hearts of the Hungarian people and is commemorated annually on the anniversary of that historic day. This spirit, which secured freedom for the Hungarian people 113 years ago, also roused them to fight their Communist oppressors in 1956. Though that gallant fight for freedom was ruthlessly crushed by the Red army, there is no doubt that the Hungarian people's love of freedom is as strong as ever.

The moral support of the free world for the Hungarian aspirations has been expressed in resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly, just as it is being voiced today in the Congress of the United States. Let us hope that these demonstrations of support will help the Hungarian people sustain their spirit, the spirit of Hungarian Liberation Day, through all adversity.

Total War Against Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer of March 19, 1961, entitled "Total War Against Unemployment."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOTAL WAR AGAINST UNEMPLOYMENT

America's battle against unemployment has gained momentum on several fronts during the past week. This is genuine cause for encouragement.

But the fight has hardly begun. The Nation must mobilize its economic resources in a mighty effort. It is no time to tolerate interminable delay by the faint-hearted and the half-hearted.

The unemployment problem can be licked—with compassionate understanding and vigorous action.

Congress, aroused at last from a profound stupor, has advanced two major anti-unemployment bills. One, approved by the Senate and now awaiting the attention of a House-Senate conference committee, provides emergency extension of unemployment compensation for up to 13 additional weeks. Another bill, passed by the Senate and sent to the House, calls for Federal grants and loans to stimulate industrial development in chronically depressed areas.

While Congress was shaking off its complacency there were other hopeful signs. Business is picking up along many lines. Employment opportunities—in some areas, at least—may improve noticeably in the weeks ahead.

What now? Where does the country go from here in its efforts to help the unemployed?

First of all, it seems to us, the unemployment compensation bill ought to be speeded toward final enactment before it is old enough to grow whiskers. It has been a long wait for the jobless—including many in Pennsylvania—who exhausted their unemployment benefits weeks ago and are in dire need of assistance.

Depressed areas legislation should be kept moving through the congressional mill, too. We urge that it be tailored specifically to the needs of depressed areas and not be generalized to the point where its effectiveness is lost. Under the eligibility formula in the Senate bill more than a hundred communities would share in the $394 million program. Acutely suffering cities and towns—as found in the coal regions of Pennsyvania, for example—should get the bulk of this aid. Congress ought to guard against writing the bill so loosely that it becomes a pork-barrel handout instead of a depressed areas benefit.

Extension of unemployment compensation, it should be noted, is a way of buying time until the jobless can get jobs. The only satisfactory solution to unemployment is employment. This is the goal to fix firmly to the fore.

President Kennedy has spoken of the need for tax incentives to spur industrial growth and employment expansion. Progress in this direction cannot begin too soon.

Shifting plants and jobs from one locale to another should not be the objective. The need is for new plants or additions to existing plants.

Creation of new jobs—permanent ones—should be the criterion for receiving tax incentives. This will require expansion of markets at home and abroad.

Superior salesmanship is required as never before—not to build artificial demands but to satisfy real wants. It is reasonable to believe that vocational opportunities in sales and servicing will provide a substantial number of new jobs to help offset layoffs resulting from automation.

Government, industry, and labor—together—must join forces in an all-out war against unemployment. To do this successfully they must be a peace among themselves. The need for labor-management harmony is paramount. It is, in the final analysis, the key that will unlock the door to millions of new jobs sought by waiting and willing workers.

Minimum Wage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Wausau Daily Record-Herald, Wausau, Wis., one of the leading daily newspapers in Wisconsin.

The editorial is as follows:

MINIMUM WAGE

It's very easy to favor raising minimum wage and difficult to register against—at first glance. There is a strong humanitarian motive cited by proponents.

However, there could be some faulty reasoning involved. We've all jumped at "good deals" before, only to regret it later. What looks like a good deal isn't always that.

Particularly unfortunate about the present legislation is the plan to extend coverage to include retail business. This industry provides marginal employment for beginners, teenagers, part-time housewives and others whose productive worth is limited. An out-of-line wage would automatically eliminate many jobs. A wage boost is somewhat less than good if you lose your job.

Life magazine recently commented editorially: "That is certainly not going to help the unemployed any. Some jobs just aren't worth more than $1 an hour and to make them illegal is to eliminate them."

Senator GOLDWATER has cited the case of a Michigan retail firm which did $2 million in business in a recent year and had a net profit of $34,000. Had the minimum wage law been in effect, the firm would have lost $100,000. In the Senator's words, "The company would have had either to fire some of its employees, or to go out of business entirely, depriving all of its 135 employees of jobs."

The New York Herald Tribune has described the proposal "a bad bill at the wrong time," referring, of course, to the recession. Senator FULBRIGHT concurs with this thinking, arguing that it would be "poor timing" to press it under present domestic and world conditions. Some leaders of both parties theerfore can see serious objections.

There are a few "you don'ts" which could be listed about this bill.

You don't get the unemployed back to work by raising minimum wage. You don't help depressed areas with wage boosts which raise construction costs of needed new plants. You don't raise the living standard—poor or not so poor—by raising costs and prices.

Experience has shown a minimum wage hike can cost jobs. When the last minimum raise went in effect in 1956, despite an expanding economy, the Labor Department noted "significant declines" in employment in most of the low wage industry segments studied.

Our feeling is that the individual States can do a far fairer and more effective job of handing wage and hour laws than can the Federal Government. They can better make legisltion fit varying local needs and conditions.

The Federal bill will be voted on soon in Congress. Why not contact your representatives now.

Migrant Farmworkers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, annually, the American farmer faces a special problem in obtaining labor to harvest seasonal crops.

For the most part, this problem is separate from the normal employment situation. However, the growers of vegetables, fruits, and other commodities requiring seasonal workers face particular problems in obtaining an ade-

quate supply of such laborers at the right time.

Currently, legislation is pending before Congress relating to migratory labor. As I understand, hearings may be scheduled in the near future.

Because the acquisition of such workers has become a difficult seasonal—and sometimes a political—problem for the American farmer, I believe that Congress should now attempt to crystalize a long-range policy to establish stability in this field.

We recognize, of course, that imported labor—particularly because of our current high rate of unemployment—should not be allowed to displace jobs for American workers. Nevertheless, there are circumstances in which the obtaining of large numbers of laborers is essential to our domestic farm economy.

Recently, the Janesville Daily Gazette published an article analyzing the situation in relation to the obtaining of Mexican labor for Wisconsin.

Reflecting upon this particular asset of a significant issue before us, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MIGRANT FARMWORKERS

Congress soon must decide on extension of a Federal plan under which Mexican labor may enter the United States to carry on agricultural labor. The matter is one which has held little public attention until now.

But as a result of a recent television film, classified as a documentary by some, and as the rawest type of propaganda by others, there is a national awareness of the problem. The confusing part is that it is not one problem but several.

The first, of course, is the social problem which arises when uneducated and unskilled families move from place to place, often under contract, to handle the planting and harvesting of food crops. Special concern attaches to the children of these families because proper schooling under these circumstances becomes difficult.

There are also the economic problems. From the grower standpoint, migratory workers are an essential part of the system for getting work done on time. Nature sets the time schedule, and expects human-workers to meet it. Otherwise the crops are lost.

The combination of emergency work needs and the ignorance of many of the field-workers is one which often leads to charges of exploitation. It is easy to believe that these charges often are true. It would be remarkable if some did not attempt to take advantage. Still, evidence has been produced to show that wage rates, working conditions, housing and arrangements for schooling of children have been making steady progress, and that the general situation is greatly improved over that of a few years ago.

Unemployment in the United States is now a new factor in the debate. The anti-Mexican campaign is based on the theme of American employment. Not many domestic ful, however, that the proposed extension would make any significant difference in American employment. Not many domestic farmworkers are interested in the types of work done by Mexicans in vegetable and fruit crops. To suggest that migratory farm-work would give help in the industrial centers of unemployment borders on the unbelievable. The jobless factory workers would be interested in that type of thing only as a last resort.

If it should be otherwise, it is obvious that an expanded force of American migrant workers would be created—hardly a goal to be sought. Meanwhile union organizing efforts in some sections have placed crops in real danger. Strikes, to be effective, have of course been timed for the critical days.

Considering the small amount of employment which might be created, it would appear that extension of the Mexican labor program is desirable. It can be granted that working conditions provided for these people may sometimes fall below proper standards. But from a realistic viewpoint it must be recognized that even so they fare better with these jobs then they would if temporary entry in the the United States were denied them.

The extension would at least provide some guarantee that the necessary food harvests would be carried through, and that food supplies would be available.

Man and God in Warsaw

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, peaceful coexistence has been a magic phrase for years. Misguided individuals, many of whom, unfortunately, seem to congregate in our State Department, advocate economic concessions to Communist governments, forgetting the atheistic dogma that is the foundation for all Communist thinking. The editorial, "Man and God in Warsaw," in the Washington Evening Star, Tuesday, March 21, is a penetrating observation of the latest church and state conflict which has erupted in the satellite nation of Poland:

MAN AND GOD IN WARSAW

Once again, with characteristic eloquence and courage, Cardinal Wyszynski of Poland has spoken out against the Communist regime's effort to atheize his countrymen, the overwhelming majority of whom are Roman Catholics.

Back in 1953, after having similarly resisted incessant Red attacks on Catholicism among the Poles, Cardinal Wyszynski was imprisoned by Warsaw's Stalinist dictatorship. In 1956, however, he was liberated as a result of the great revolt against that Moscow-imposed tyranny. The revolt, which came close to exploding into armed violence against the Soviet Union (as in Hungary), brought Wladyslaw Gomulka to power as head of a new "anti-Stalinist" regime, and this regime promptly negotiated a state-church accord promising to put an end to past repressive measures against faith in God and to remove all barriers to the "realization of the principles of full fredom of religious life."

But within the past year or so, with mounting intensity, the Reds of Warsaw have been carrying out a campaign to poison the minds of the Polish people not only against the Vatican and the church in general, but also against the very idea of believing in God. Denying all this, Mr. Gomulka has accused Cardinal Wyszynski of seeking to provoke the "persecution and martydom" of Catholics in Poland solely and simply to fight against communism and its programs—totalitarian programs that regiment the mass, and make the individual a creature of the state, in order to promote material progress, so called. As to that, affirming that man's spirit is "eternally in rebellion against slavery and falsehood," the cardinal has had this to say:

"Man is not made just to be a consumer animal. Man is called to something higher. The world assigns programs to men: 'Eat and shut up.' And Christ says to the world: 'I tell you man does not live by bread alone.' It is only necessary to ask what serves man better? Whether he licks their boots (the rulers) like a serf renouncing his freedom, his reason, his will; or whether he stands upright with his head high, courageously professing truth, defending his human dignity?"

Cardinal Wyszynski has no doubt about the human soul's ultimate destiny. Speaking from his pulpit in Warsaw to the Communist rulers, he has declared: "I tell you, you Caesars, you will bow to your God, and you will serve only Him. Satan is mighty, but man will not bow his head before him. * * * I tell you, you will serve only your God, because man is too noble to serve anyone but God."

Metaphysically and otherwise, this is perhaps a too hopeful view of the future, but freemen everywhere have reason to applaud and embrace it.

Honorary Membership of President Kennedy in Zuni Indian Tribe of New Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, it gives me pleasure to report that President Kennedy has been taken into the Zuni Indian Tribe of New Mexico as an honorary member. A certificate of tribal membership was presented to the President yesterday at the White House by Mrs. Clara B. Gonzales, educational supervisor of the Zuni Indian Reservation in New Mexico. She and other recipients of the National Civil Service League's Career Service Award visited the White House yesterday.

I ask unanimous consent that an account of this visit which was published in the Washington Star of March 21, 1961, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KENNEDY IS TRIBE MEMBER

(By Mohammed H. Rauf, Jr.)

The Zuni Indians of New Mexico have decided to appoint President Kennedy an honorary member of the tribe.

They also have conferred upon him the title of "A-chi-ya-la-to-pa," which means a very wise, powerful and prominent being.

Mrs. Clara B. Gonzales, educational supervisor of the Zuni settlement, presented the President today with a certificate conferring upon him the title and the rights and privileges of a governor as long as the green grass grows, and the rivers flow.

The title is derived from the name of a Zuni mythical hero with wings, who was supposed to hover over the tribe and protect it from all evil.

A GIFT

Gifts that will go with the certificate include a bolo tie, with a figure of the hero done in turquoise shells inlaid in silver.

Mrs. Gonzales, an employee of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of Interior, has been with the Zunis for more than 30 years, supervising the education and general uplift of the 4,200 members of the tribe.

Called "tsita" or mother by the Zunis, the hazel-eyed educator will be the recipient today of a career service award of the National Civil Service League for "competence, character, and outstanding achievements" in the discharge of her duties.

She is the only woman among 10 recipients this year of the award. Included in the list is John D. Jernegan, U.S. Ambassador in Iraq.

The Louisiana-born Mrs. Gonzales is credited with instituting almost 100 percent literacy among the Zunis, and also stimulating a desire for higher education among the younger generation.

Mrs. Gonzales, who is a member of the New Mexico Education Association and the American Association of School Administrators, said that the urge for college education is equally strong among the Zuni women.

She cited the case of young Carmelita Allapowa, one of the first women to graduate in nursing from the University of New Mexico.

Mrs. Gonzales said that the tribe is being modernized at a very fast pace.

Until recently it had a matriarchal system of society. This meant that when a man married, it was he who went to live with the bride's family, until the couple had their own house. Also, the children bore the name of the wife's people.

But now, said the educator, the children are given the father's name, and other facets of a matriarchal society are breaking down.

Marriage is not a question now of selection by the parents. The custom of dating has become fully established.

The younger generation speaks English, dresses in western clothes, drives automobiles, and dances "rock 'n roll," and is as impatient to get ahead as young people in other parts of the country.

The tribe has made a name for itself in jewelry making. Mrs. Gonzales displayed a squash-blossom, silver turquoise necklace she was wearing, and said it sells for about $75.

Other handmade jewelry includes bracelets, belts, watch chains, brooches, and pins.

Dryden Reports United States Is Not Using All Available Talent in Space Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Science and Astronautics has begun a comprehensive review of the American space program in order to determine where we stand now and what has to be done in the future to place this country in the forefront in space.

Under unanimous consent, I call the attention of Members of the House to an informative article on the launching of our hearings in Aviation Week of February 20, 1961:

DRYDEN REPORTS UNITED STATES IS NOT USING ALL AVAILABLE TALENT IN SPACE EFFORT

(By Ford Eastman)

WASHINGTON.—The United States is not using all of the scientific or industrial talent available in its space program, Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, Deputy Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, told the House Science and Astronautics Committee last week.

Dr. Dryden, responding to committee questions on whether the United States could expand its current space program, said there is surplus talent in both industry and universities that could be used in an expanded and accelerated space program. He also told the committee that "we as a Nation are in a scientific and technical competition with the Russians" and that NASA is working as hard as it can with the resources that are available to it.

OPENING WITNESS

He appeared as the opening witness in a major inquiry into the current status of the U.S. space program to determine whether its rate of progress is sufficient to catch and overtake the Soviet effort in this field and whether it is adequate to meet both U.S. scientific and military requirements. Dr. Dryden was scheduled to be followed by top technical officials from the Secretary of Defense's staff and by research and development commanders of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Dr. Dryden also told the committee that the new NASA Administrator, James E. Webb, had been ordered to make a comprehensive review of the Agency's space program and submit recommendations to President Kennedy for its revision or expansion.

He credited the current Soviet space achievements to a 4-year lead over the United States in organizing a national space effort and to a technical superiority in developing large thrust booster rockets. He noted the Soviets organized an interplanetary group of their Academy of Sciences in 1954, some 4 years before NASA was created in the United States.

The Soviets have been using their standard ICBM rocket booster as the first stage of their recent Venus probes, but have boosted their capacity for putting payloads into orbit to 7 tons by using improved second stage rockets.

DRYDEN WARNING

Dr. Dryden warned that the United States would not be able to match this current Soviet payload capacity until 1964, when the Saturn clustered booster is to be available, and he indicated that the Soviets would continue to employ their basic booster capacity to undertake a variety of space missions during this period that will be beyond any U.S. technical capability. These may include soft landings on the Moon, orbiting and returning a two-man astronaut team, and deep space probes to the area of Mars, he said.

Initial U.S. attempt to reach the vicinity of Venus will be made in August 1962 when two shots in the Centaur liquid hydrogen second stage rocket test program will be aimed at Venus with a 1,100-pound payload. Dr. Dryden emphasized that these shots are primarily Centaur test shots in the early development test cycle of this vehicle. The programing toward Venus is being included in the hopes of achieving a scientific bonus and is not the main purpose of the shots.

VENUS SCHEDULE

The first all-out Venus shots would be scheduled in March 1964, when the Centaur is to have completed its test program and should offer the capacity for a "very sophisticated job of reconnaissance" in the Venus area. Saturn is to be initially available for Venus probes in October 1965, Dr. Dryden said.

Dr. Dryden warned that there is no way to buy "a year or two of time" in booster development and that the United States will have to "sweat it out" until its big booster program produces the vehicles capable of putting large payloads into space. He pointed out that it is now impossible for U.S. boosters to put a scientific payload in the vicinity of Venus except on the days when Venus is closest to the earth, while the Soviets were able to make their shot almost a month after the optimum date of January 13 had passed because of their much greater booster thrust.

Dr. Dryden also said that:

U.S. guidance systems are "as good as the Russians" and that bigger and better systems are available, but the United States does not have the booster power to use them.

Scientific information gathered through Soviet space experiments and released at scientific meetings has been sketchy and not as detailed as U.S. scientists prefer. He said he did not know if Russians are withholding details of their experiments or if they did not have the information to begin with.

The United States has generally collected more valuable scientific information, especially in the communications satellite field, and made this available to all nations, than has Russia.

The United States favors talking with Russia at every opportunity in an effort to effect cooperation in space exploration projects, but it has been difficult to find a field in which Russia would readily consent to cooperate. Russia insists that there are political problems to be solved first.

Use of solid fuels for booster rockets will grow at a normal rate, but will not be used as a replacement for Saturn in heavy space missions. There are problems connected with transporting solid fuel rockets, more burning time is required to achieve a greater overall impulse and greater reliability is required.

National Home Rule Road Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON R. YOUNG
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, last year, Fargo, N. Dak., received an All America City Award sponsored by Look magazine and the National Municipal League. I just received a letter from Mayor Herschel Lashkowitz, of this outstanding city, together with a copy of a resolution adopted by the Fargo City Commission. The resolution requests the enactment of a national home rule road program and makes other recommendations relative to the highway trust fund.

Fargo is North Dakota's largest city and I believe that the views expressed in the resolution and in the letter from Mayor Lashkowitz represent those of a great many North Dakotans. In think they would be of interest to Senators and other readers to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter and the resolution printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF FARGO, N. DAK.,
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS,
March 15, 1961.

The Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
U.S. Senator, from the State of North Dakota,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YOUNG: You will please find enclosed herein a certified copy of a resolution adopted by the Fargo City Commission requesting the enactment of a National home rule road program and providing that the Federal gasoline and excise taxes be placed in a highway trust fund.

We feel that the home-rule-for-municipalities philosophy has great merit and we would appreciate your placing the enclosed resolution, together with this letter, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and please call this to the attention of your colleagues for their consideration.

Thanking you in advance for this courtesy and with kindest regards,

Respectfully yours,
HERSCHEL LASHKOWITZ,
Mayor.

NATIONAL HOME RULE ROAD PROGRAM

Be it resolved by the Board of City Commissioners of the City of Fargo:

Whereas official Government records show that there are 3,400,000 miles of public roads in the United States, 2,600,000 miles are State and local roads, and 755,278 miles are Federal-aid roads; and

Whereas in 1960 the Federal Government collected $4,300 million from the motorists in gasoline and other excise taxes for Federal-aid road improvements. Of this sum, $3,400 million or 59.6 percent, was authorized for expenditure on the Federal-aid system, and $1,700 million, or 40.4 percent, was diverted for other Government purposes; and

Whereas of the money allocated for Federal aid, $2,500 million was authorized for improvements on the Federal Interstate System, which is estimated will carry only 20 percent of the total highway traffic when completed; and

Whereas the State and local roads now carrying 34 percent of the total traffic receive no Federal-aid funds; and

Whereas, the motor fund diversion and taxing policies of the Federal Government have forced our State and local road officials to curtail essential improvements on the State and local roads which traffic figures show are of great benefit to the motorists; and

Whereas as a direct result of this policy the motoring public has been deprived of billions of dollars worth of critically needed road improvements, and hundreds of thousands of our fellow citizens have been deprived of employment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the undersigned, hereby endorse amendments to the Federal Aid Highway Acts to provide a national home rule road program to require that all Federal gasoline and excise taxes be placed in the highway trust fund to be used exclusively for road improvement purposes, 60 percent of the trust fund to be used to continue improvements on the Federal-aid system and the other 40 percent to be allocated to the States—20 percent to be used for State highways and the other 20 percent to be allocated by the States to their political subdivisions on a fair population and mileage basis for the improvement of local roads.

This program, when enacted by Congress, will end the multibillion-dollar diversion of motor revenues; guarantee the motorists a balanced program of improvements on all classes of roads—Federal, State and local; promote the civic welfare of every community in the Nation; help restore national prosperity by providing employment for over 400,000 men on the roads and in the road-building material, equipment, and construction industries; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the local newspapers, radio and television stations and to our U.S. Senators and Representatives in Congress to request their aid in securing prompt action by Congress.

The Burma Surgeon Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. HART
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a major portion of a script from a television program entitled "The Burma Surgeon Today." It was televised on Sunday, March 5, 1961, throughout the United States, by the Columbia Broadcasting System. It is a highly dramatic public service presentation. It reminds us of the road traveled by Dr. Gordon Seagrave during World War II. I think all of us who read it will be moved by it.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BURMA SURGEON TODAY

(An episode in "The Twentieth Century" as broadcast over the CBS television network, Sunday, March 5, 1961)

Mr. CRONKITE. He is Dr. Gordon Seagrave, the Burma Surgeon. He is still in Burma today. In World War II, he and a small band of volunteer Burmese nurses—perhaps the most decorated medical unit in the annals of the U.S. Army—made history in retreat and in bloody fight back to Burma with American Gen. "Vinegar" Joe Stilwell. At war's end, Seagrave returned to his bombed-out hospital at Namkhan. Later, during Burma's civil war, trying to protect the hospital from a second destruction by rival forces, he was arrested, tried for treason, convicted and imprisoned by the Government of Burma. He appealed and was acquitted and exonerated. He returned to his hospital—his health broken. He is there now.

At Namkhan, 19 staff nurses, 77 student nurses and two doctors serve an area of 400,000 people. Gordon Seagrave was born in Burma. Today he is the only American at Namkhan. When civil war erupted in 1948, his wife and two sons went back to the United States to stay. Another son had drowned as a boy in the lake near the hospital. Gordon Seagrave's salary is $90 a month out of which he pays for his own food. It costs $75,000 a year to finance Namkhan, almost all raised through voluntary contributions in the United States and elsewhere. Only private patients must pay. The needy pay nothing. Those who can, donate something—a chicken, some rice or tea, a little money in the collection box. At Namkhan, Gordon Seagrave has taught the shy and the ignorant to put their trust in modern medicine as well as their faith in God. To Namkhan, travel the young and old—over jungle miles—to see the Burma Surgeon. This is the story of a man and his dream—not a biography but the man himself—entirely in his own words.

Dr. SEAGRAVE: Bring that next patient in, will you? What's holding you girls up? This is a new ——— that just came in. A history of 3 months of diarrhea which began as a real dysentery with blood. Since then the stools have been indigested—a slight cough beginning yesterday and night blindness which is getting to be quite common around here.

(Crying of baby.)

Dr. SEAGRAVE. A child with his mouth open like that, looks for all the world, as though he's geting ready to kick off.

(Sound of baby and nurses voices.)

Dr. SEAGRAVE (in Burmese). He hasn't got strength enough to really give a cry. I don't like to hear sick babies cry, but I'd rather hear them cry than unable to cry.

(Baby cries.)

(Sound of nurses voices.)

Dr. SEAGRAVE (in Burmese). All right, darling.

Dr. SEAGRAVE. Thank you, ———. A funny thing about these Chinese is that we can get most of them well. They look like they're already dead when they come in. Yet, they respond to these new drugs that we got from the drug firms in America.

I didn't want to come to Namkhan. It didn't make any difference to me where I came, just so long as it was into Burma. You see, I was born in Rangoon and my people had been working for Burma ever since 1834 and 1835, when two grandfathers came out. My ancestors were all either preachers or schoolteachers, but I was determined I was going to be a doctor, and it didn't matter to me what part of Burma I went into, just so long as I was serving Burma. Then when I got to Rangoon, they told me if I came to Namkhan I'd find a hospital already built and that I'd have the good will of the people; that I'd be able to start right out. And then, when I came up here and I saw that little, old hospital building and I walked inside and there was just one patient in there and the largest number of inpatients that they'd had in a year was 28. That meant that the hospital was empty almost all the time. Well, I just broke down and cried. I shed real tears. A disgraceful thing for a man to say, but when you prepared your whole life to do something and it just doesn't turn out as though you could possibly succeed. Namkhan is just a little village, you know. There weren't any really rich people there. It was a large marketplace and it didn't seem to me that there'd ever been any funds coming in to build up a big practice. And so, the only thing I could do was to make the best of a bad bargain and learn the language. And I spent 3 or 4 months learning the language and learning the people. And during that 3 or 4 months, I began to get an entirely different idea about these people. I could see that their medical need and surgical need was about as great as you could find anywhere in the world. I came out here to Burma with almost no instruments excepting those that I'd gotten out of a wastebasket in a hospital where I interned in Baltimore. But the thing that was important to me, especially at the beginning, was the fact that as an American—just one American—just one American medical man, I just couldn't do one thing for these people that was worth while. I had to have assistance among the Burmese whom I could train. I looked all over Burma to try to get doctors and nurses. I didn't have the money in the first place and they didn't have the doctors and the nurses in the second place. And I decided that since training doctors was completely out of the question, I'd start training nurses.

Girls, first aid treatment, fractured clavicle, tying the bandage.

Dr. SEAGRAVE (in Burmese). I hope you girls have brought your safety pins. You tie any granny knots today and you and I are going to have a fight. When you girls get done, come and show me. This bandage is too narrow. You begin at the elbow—tighter—the rest is all right. That's the first time you two girls haven't given me a

granny knot for some days. Who's first? That's too high. It has to begin at the elbow—here. That's a granny knot. And then, I tried teaching doctors and that was very, very difficult for quite a while. You know a doctor has a peculiar psychology. The great number of doctors think that if they pass medical school and pass a Government examination, their State boards, then they've reached the pinnacle and they don't have to learn anything more. But my point is that surgery, especially, is a thing that you just don't learn up here. You learn it in your fingers. You've got to transmit your—the knowledge that you've learned in—in medical school from your brain to your fingertips and that was where I always came up against it here in Burma, trying to train doctors. It was years before I finally got doctors that I could really teach. Here we have this man Silgaro, Dr. Silgaro, who is helping me here in the hospital now.

Dr. SILGARO. Somebody send for the old man, please.

Dr. SEAGRAVE. Is that a cyst?

Dr. SILGARO. No, it looks as though a tumor has spread to the other organs. If you would look down here, you could see the bleeding of the——

Dr. SEAGRAVE. Do you mind if I get my hands in there?

Dr. SILGARO. I think it would be better if you did.

Dr. SEAGRAVE. Dr. Silgaro is not the only one that I've taught to do things so that he can do them better than I can. As for grandma, our matron, I taught her how to pull teeth. Without the Burmese personnel that we've got here we couldn't do any work at all. And of that Burmese group, the most important group of all is that superb group of senior staff nurses. Back there in the war, it was the toughness of these girls, you know, that made a success of things. I could move them around into all kinds of places. Now, the Americans didn't believe that. We started out of Burma with General Stillwell. There were some 18 of these girls along with me and my American officers. And I was told that one of the high ranking officers on Stillwell's staff said that these girls, with their little short legs, would never be able to march out of Burma and keep up with the long-legged Americans. Well, General Stillwell squashed that and he told me that I was to get my girls in here somehow or other and if I couldn't keep up with him just because their legs were short, then I could follow at my own pace. We not only kept up, but when got to a stop these girls took care of the Americans' feet. The 18 girls that marched out of Burma with us, every single one of them got a personal Presidential citation and a Bronze Star. Now, I got a Bronze Star by the skin of my teeth, coming back in but I didn't get any for going out and I never got a personal Presidential citation.

You know what these girls pray about every morning when we have chapel service? They pray that the good Lord will forever increase the size of this hospital until it reaches the nth degree. And every time they pray that prayer I'm scared because the good Lord listens to them. And we don't have the facilities to accommodate our patients. We have 262 patients here today—inpatients. We have a total of 250 beds. That means that the other 12 are lying on the floor somewheres. Let alone all of their relatives and friends that come along with them. When they come a long distance, they don't dare come alone for fear they'll die and nobody'll be here to bury them. They don't know whether to trust us to get them well or not, you see. But it's cruel to have these patients come in with conditions like this and have no place to put them. We haven't built a single building here which wasn't filled before the building was completed. And the question of building decent buildings to house them is—is really a terrific problem.

All through the east, all through India, all through Asia, the really needy man is—is the peasant, the common man. Now, beginning in a village like this, we reach those people first and those people are the people that get converted to all kinds of peculiar doctrines which they don't know anything about. You help them and then later on your influence spreads to some of the bigger towns and you can help the other people too. Now, only a private institution like this one can do that kind of a thing. If the U.S. Government helps the Government of the Union of Burma, no matter how many millions of dollars to do something or other, whatever they do has to start from the cities and then it spreads out. Eventually, we hope and pray to the common man in the villages, who is the real man of Asia. We can begin backward.

We can begin in a place like this, that can't afford to give us the equipment that we want. We never have had enough money to do one darn thing. But we can go ahead and give them good treatment. We can give them good surgery.

It's absolutely ridiculous, you know, the situation with regard to the children here. We see cases of malnutrition and starvation, which in the old days were always allowed to die at home and now they bring them to the hospital—emaciated little skeletons. It just breaks my heart to look at them. It nauseates me. It nauseated my son, too, actually when he came to visit me a couple of years ago. He went around in the hospital. He saw these—these horribly ill patients, men, women, and children—and he'd come back and tell me at dinner time that he just couldn't stand it. He was nauseated. He just couldn't eat. And he said: "Why don't you feel that way, daddy?" And I says: "I do." "Well," I said, "there's a difference between you and me. There's just one little difference that makes it tolerable and that is with me I know that I can probably help them and you know you can't help them. That's what makes you sick."

It took me years to get the women of this country to come to us for—for delivery. They'd get into the most horrible complications and they'd come here with the baby dead and with the woman dying. And that is about all I saw for 5 years. And so, we've put on a regular campaign with them, to persuade them to come ahead of time. Now, by George, they're doing just that. They're coming here ahead of time and we got a whole line of them already to deliver right away in the hospital now.

(Nurses work on baby.)

Dr. SEAGRAVE. What language does that baby speak? What is the baby, Emily? A boy or a girl?

EMILY. A boy.

Dr. SEAGRAVE. Well then, maybe someday that boy will grow up to be a Prime Minister of Burma. I was so darned busy during the operation I didn't have a chance to look. Is that—that baby the one I delivered just now?

NURSE. Yes.

Dr. SEAGRAVE. That's not a bad looking baby. It's pink enough now; I thought you said it was a blue baby.

NURSE. It was very blue at the beginning.

Dr. SEAGRAVE. What did you do, give it some oxygen?

NURSE. We gave everything.

Dr. SEAGRAVE. You gave it the whole works, huh? Well, thank the Lord we've got a live baby. If you get a live baby and a live woman, and this woman is more than alive, grandma says, then that's what I call a real success.

I've been ill—again and again and again. Sometimes I've been so ill that I've wondered whether I'd wake up the next morning. And that's what frightens me. My friends in America have tried to force me to go back on account of my health. And I know it would improve if I once got to America. But I'm still scared that accidents might happen on the way there, or on the way back. And I know it's corny. I've been told it was corny by a good many people. The only way that I can prove to these Burmese here in Burma that I have meant every word that I ever said to them on the subject is for me to die right here in Namkhan. They're scared to death that I'll die somewhere else. I don't want to die on the road back to the States. I don't even want to die in the United States, no matter how much I love the United States. By George, 267 patients. I'm going to need an extra cup of coffee on that.

Address by Hon. Willy Brandt, Mayor of West Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, our shores have recently been graced by the presence of the Honorable Willy Brandt, the dynamic governing mayor of Berlin. It goes without saying that his far-sighted leadership has made West Berlin a thriving island in a sea of Communist tyranny.

As the United States moves forward in the New Frontier of progress under the Kennedy administration, it is well to note that our American fervor has transcended all physical barriers in communication with our friends abroad. Thus, Mr. President, I wish to share with my colleagues Mayor Brandt's March 13 speech at the Roosevelt Day dinner entitled "New Frontiers for German Democracy," and request at this time unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW FRONTIERS FOR GERMAN DEMOCRACY—THE ROLE OF GERMANY IN WORLD AFFAIRS

(Speech of Willy Brandt, Governing Mayor of Berlin, to the Washington Chapter, Roosevelt Day Dinner at the Shoreham Hotel, March 13, 1961)

It is a great honor for me to be able to speak to you here in Washington on the occasion of Roosevelt Day.

My subject—"New Frontiers for German Democracy"—is not of my own choosing. I hope it will not be misunderstood—not in the German phrase, either. We are not speaking, of course, about the frontier lines on the map of Europe. What we are talking about are the new purposes which we must aim at in order to come closer to freedom from fear and freedom from want—despite all the difficulties.

I do not intend to conduct my election campaign in the United States. I am here as the governing mayor of Berlin, that is to say: of a city not only threatened and struggled over but also full of creative energy and of faith in the future. We can be proud of the rebuilding of our city as a

symbol of common effort and of an unbreakable will to remain free. I come to you as a man who is charged with political responsibility in his own country and who is convinced that he may speak as a friend to friends.

It is not for me to become involved in the conflicts and differences between political parties in this country, but in this moment I should like to be an ordinary European who respectfully pays tribute to a great democratic leader and social reformer of the United States. It is not a question as to when and where he may have been wrong. It is easy to be wise—20 years after the decision had to be taken. He who does nothing will make no mistakes.

In my image of Franklin D. Roosevelt there appears his profound conviction of the dignity of every single human being and his knowledge that freedom is indivisible, that democracy cannot be static. This image includes the awareness of a grave responsibility towards the whole world—to look upon it as one big family. I am happy to find this spirit alive.

For a moment, however, let me conjure up for you the world situation of 1932 and 1933. Roosevelt gave one answer to the great crisis, Hitler was the other answer. Perhaps much could have been spared to all of us if the American answer had been given sooner. No one can prove it. Nor would this relieve anyone of his share of the responsibility but it directs our attention to one important point—that in the life of nations there is nearly always more than one alternative and that the study of history is worth nothing if it teaches us merely that everything turned out the way it did because it had to turn out that way.

I speak to you as mayor of Berlin, and I am speaking of two things becouse of which my city has reason to be grateful to Franklin Roosevelt.

First of all, a general observation: We could not have survived if there had not been the transformation of the United States' firm democratic tradition into a firm and lasting commitment to assume responsibility and leadership within a community of free nations. There emerged from this a foreign policy which overcame the Berlin blockade and which leaves American soldiers and civil servants in my city—because a few million foreigners wish to remain free.

Berlin also has much to be grateful for to that part of the New Deal which led to the Marshall plan. Following the blockade—little more than 10 years ago—about one-half of the employable population in my city were out of jobs. The Federal Republic was still too young and itself still too poor. In this situation the Marshall plan's undogmatic and effective aid saved us.

Every visitor to my city can see for himself that we have spent the American taxpayer's money conscientiously and successfully. We can be proud that it has been possible—through common endeavours—to turn a heap of rubble into a new center of economic and cultural activity. It is not only in keeping with the Berliners' wish but just as much with the vital interest of the United States that the freedom of my city must never be traded for the false flag of a free city. This would be the death of freedom itself.

Of course, I need not have come to Washington to find out that the President of the United States has not the slightest intention of giving up the obligations assumed in Berlin. The opposite is the case and I am thankful for it. As Senator HUMPHREY told me when he was on his way to Moscow in November 1958: A new policy cannot be based on the breach of international obligations and on moral capitulation.

We in Berlin well understand the need for international economic assistance and cooperation.

The Federal Republic—it must be said—is not as wealthy as many people think. Some of my compatriots have managed to convey a wrong impression to the world, as far as that is concerned. But for me there can be no doubt that my country must make its fair contribution to the burdens of the western community, and that we must be ready for continuing adequate contributions to development aid. Reasonable arrangements to this end made by the present government with the allies will be honored by an alternative government. Natural limits are set only by the obligation which we have at home to demonstrate every day anew to a divided people the strength and success of democracy. Our people's immunity against Communist infiltration is a factor of security—also as far as our allies are concerned.

We have been helped. Together with our friends in Europe and America we must prepare for an attack against hunger and poverty, against epidemics and ignorance.

President Kennedy knows of the multitude of hopes which he has aroused throughout the world. He can be certain of the support of all of us when he sets out to come to the aid of starving and suffering peoples by tested means and by new ones—not in order to gain allies in the cold war but to help to assure mankind's future.

Your President's plan to establish a Peace Corps has found a worldwide echo. Among the young people in my country, too, I have encountered great interest and a number of organizations are already active in this field. I have asked some of my friends to look after this important task. We shall have to evolve our own forms, but at the same time we would like to be ready in case suitable methods of international cooperation should offer themselves.

I would like to recall Roosevelt's word of "the one big family." Perhaps it is different here, but in my country there are sometimes members of a family that one prefers to see leaving rather than coming. That is not a good family spirit—but it is not a good family spirit, either, to get together only on holidays and to be nice to one another. What we need is honesty and earnestness. Ineffective declarations and noncommittal protocol gatherings we don't need so much.

My country has become a dependable member of the western community of nations; so much can be taken for granted. But I believe—quite seriously—that being a dependable follower is not enough.

We have been led in a new direction—perhaps a little hastily in the direction of rearmament. We were taken by the hand and given assistance along the way. Having left this state behind us—in material respects, I mean—we shall also have to shed the remaining egg shells of our history. This means that we have to contribute our own proposals or objections as an independent partner in the western alliance with more emphasis than in the past, and then, of course, to put our weight behind the common policy without any qualification.

But—some may ask me—"Are you able to do that—has democracy struck roots among you, or must we expect bitter disappointments?"

Let me answer with a personal statement: After the Second World War I could not have returned from Scandinavia to my country unless I had hoped for a better future or believed in the good qualities of my people. I did the right thing then and I have not been disappointed. My hope and my faith in the German people's future—cautiously held at first, I will admit—have been confirmed more strongly than I could have expected then. Contemptible insinuations and the resulting disappointments have not made the slightest difference to this.

Do not think—I beg you—that I am trying to explain away any of the crimes perpetrated in the name of Germany. Anyone in Germany who seeks to gain advantage from an appeal to the evil past may achieve momentary success, but in the end he will be hit by a boomerang.

We have to contend with the shadows of the past; that remains a task. But the problems of the present time lie elsewhere. The young generation is our big chance. We have not gathered experiences with a totalitarian regime in order to put up with a dictatorship of another color. But we will have to bear in mind that freedom is more than mere anticommunism.

My people, too, have to live with their history and their memories. But they must also find the strength to look forward and to tackle tomorrow's problems. The new frontiers that we are aiming at here are those of reconciliation with ourselves—of a domestic political atmosphere in which dispassionate cooperation and fair adjustment become possible—of a sense of responsibility toward the great community of nations in which we desire to live, to which we belong and to which we have to make our contribution.

Among the most encouraging impressions to be gained in Washington these days there is what I would like to call the integration of the intellectuals. In the spirit of a living, creative democracy there appears an outline here of something that we in Europe should not pass over. In Europe, too, we cannot afford to sustain the intellectual forces largely in isolation from the state. Our communities will have to try, increasingly, to find a common denominator for points of view of practical experience and of theoretical insight.

The community of free nations reaches beyond NATO and SEATO although all concerned—including those in countries not within the alliance—should understand the importance of these alliances for the freedom of nations and for the peace of the world.

I should like to think that this community must never be placed in the position in which your country and mine found themselves in 1933. Economic crises and wars are not only the occasions calling for a Roosevelt, or capable of producing a Hitler. There is also such a thing—no need to stress the point here—as poverty in the midst of abundance. The aimless, empty condition of false content can also paralyze and blind men.

Confronted with a determined adversary—as in the case of the Communist world—the contrast between private wealth and public penury, the state of immobility in the midst of plenty, can become fatal for the community of free nations. But, it is my impression that the curse has been broken, that once again that same spirit will prevail which, in the thirties, helped to overcome here dogmatic views on the economic and social order. The free world's response must be powerful.

In economic terms, Germany has achieved more than we could have imagined 12 years ago. We need not be ashamed of the prosperity thus achieved—unless it be the fact that the various sections of the population have not obtained a more just share in economic growth. It is obvious, I should think, that, in addition to the successful concepts we also have taken over a few less happy concepts from the United States. Production indices, the level of the individual standard of living, television sets and iceboxes—these appeared to many people to be sufficient guarantee that we would pass the great challenge. Germany has copied this misunderstood concept of democracy with dedication and a certain thoroughness.

Meanwhile, we too have understood more and more clearly that we must not only insure a more just sharing of the proceeds of the common labors, but also make sure—

above all—that arrears be made up in those public tasks which hitherto were neglected. Public health, education, urban renewal, road building—these are some of the focal points in Germany demanding our attention. We too have our depressed areas.

We in Europe too will have to overcome the complacency and selfishness of an excessively superficial life. The efforts of the strongest man in a rowing team are of little avail, unless the others row towards the same goal by the same stroke.

In my opinion, cooperation within the Western Community should become closer than it was the case so far. We, certainly, should not neglect our military security. But, we must be on guard lest we look at everything from a military angle. Not only the recently developing countries are involved. Our relationship to the peoples in the Communist world is also at stake here. The ideas of freedom and of human dignity are being challenged as long as fellow men starve and suffer oppression—wherever it may be.

It is in the very nature of communism that it should claim to be gospel and to proclaim that our grandchildren shall be Communists. In Berlin, we need to look only across the street to see the Communists in their everyday appearance and not dressed up in their spotless Marxist Sunday best. Their perspective of world revolution need not make us tremble. It is the design of men and not of supermen. The difference between planning and reality is the incurable disease of communism. In Berlin, one can also learn that Soviet communism is not an elemental force in the face of which one is powerless.

We in Berlin are not in danger of being charged with weakness or receptivity to communism. Nor do we have any illusions. But, sometimes it would appear as if the fear of communism grew in proportion to the distance from it. The people in the Soviet-occupied part of Germany—which surrounds my city—have seen through communism—in their minds they have largely overcome it.

We really have no need to evade the spiritual struggle. Peaceful coexistence—that is another way to describe a struggle by every means short of war. But, it also means that within the Soviet sphere of power some of our standards have been accepted. The program to catch up with and to overtake the United States in production means that the West—to this extent—is the yardstick by which the Communist world wants to be measured itself.

I do not believe that the Communist leaders are in a position today to radically revise their long-term program. If that is a correct conclusion, certain consequences must be drawn. Then, new efforts make sense—efforts to banish the danger of war step by step, and to replace the balance of terror by the rules of a peaceful contest. This contest, however, has started already and no one will be able to escape from it. What we need is firmness in our fundamental convictions, self-reliance, confidence in our friends and—not least—an unprejudiced view not dimmed by yesterday's truths, but fearlessly studying what has to be done in a world of change. I know that the idea of freedom has the longer reach.

I can imagine a future in which Western and Eastern Europe will sensibly collaborate. Meanwhile, Germany will have to help in eliminating avoidable tensions in her relations with her Western neighbors.

Only one thing must not be expected from us: that we renounce reunification and agree to 17 million of our countrymen to be divided from us to be thrown on the rubbish heap of history. You would not allow this to happen either, say—to California and to one-quarter of your people. Dr. Adenauer once said that the day of the peace treaty will not only be a day of joy, but also a day of sacrifice for our nation. I think that is the right view. But I must add: we shall not pay in terms of human beings. It would be dishonest toward our allies if I allowed here any doubt to arise regarding my view, or if I allowed the opinion to go unchallenged that this question would be settled by the course of events.

I know: what used to be will not come back. But, we also know: many of the things now existing will not remain as they are. In spite of everything that has happened, my people have the same right of self-determination which other nations claim for themselves. And, I am convinced that this point of view will be understood and will, ultimately, prevail.

And now let me stress once more that we are not only called upon to arm and to parley, but that we also have to maintain ourselves in the economic and social and—above all—in the ideological struggle and, that in this struggle we must push on toward new frontiers.

In this quest, we can let ourselves be guided, I think, by the thoughts written by President Roosevelt for his Jefferson Day address which he never delivered, having died the day before: "The only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today. Let us move forward with strong and active faith."

Inducements to New Industry in Walsenburg, Colo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. CARROLL
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent article on the city of Walsenburg, Colo., recently published in the Pueblo Chieftain.

Walsenburg, in the southeastern part of Colorado, has, for the last several years, undergone an economic decline. The city, however, has not sat still. Blessed with a remarkable climate and scenery, the area offers much to the tourist. Available water and power should act as an inducement to new industry. The efforts of Walsenburg citizens to bring new development combined with the sound financial condition of both the city and county governments serves to make the future bright. The fact that Walsenburg qualifies under the terms of the area redevelopment bill which the Senate approved last week, offers additional promise for Walsenburg.

Mr. President, this article, written by Mr. Floyd Jeter, owner and manager of the local radio station KFLJ, joints out very well the attractions of Walsenburg.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WALSENBURG'S LARGE WATER SUPPLY ONE OF CITY'S OUTSTANDING FEATURES

(By Floyd Jeter)

WALSENBURG.—The city of Walsenburg is pulling itself up by its bootstraps, so to speak.

Among things about which the community can boost is an excellent water supply. Five to ten times as much water as is needed for domestic consumption is available in the town.

In 1945 water collections were only about $22,000 per year. Joe Mosco, who was elected mayor at that time, helped put the city on a businesslike basis.

Mosco states, "Water collections jumped up to $55,000 and $60,000 a year. The city began to pay on the bonds instead of just the interest."

There was not enough water, no filter plant, and an inadequate distribution system. More water rights were bought. A tank was erected on a nearby hill. A filter plant was built. Majority interest in Martin Lake and Kolar Ditch water rights were bought. The Harry Willis Ranch and water rights were also purchased. The city of Walsenburg bought the powerplant and installed new equipment. A swimming pool was built.

The powerplant now is paying for itself at the rate of $109,000 in principal and interest this year. The payment gradually will decrease. The water department is paying its own bonds with the exception of a 1¼ mill levy.

City operations recently have been on a substantial basis, sometimes with several thousand dollars surplus, occasionally a little in the red. An example of the latter occurred last year due to a change of the fiscal year from April 1 to January 1 and because two new pieces of street equipment were purchased. This meant that the last council left a few-thousand-dollars deficit from 1959 to 1960 fiscal year.

Eight years ago, the country was in debt about $60,000. However, financial conditions began to change gradually and at present, the county has no bonded indebtedness. The county owns good road equipment. Tom Solomon, county treasurer, reported that all funds carried over amounted to almost $102,000, of which $50,000 was loaned on interest in the form of bonds that brought the county funds $1,200 in interest in 1960. All buildings in the Walsenburg school district RE1 are paid for. A fleet of almost new schoolbuses transport the youngsters.

Last year, approximately $30,000 was spent in capital improvements, and in addition to this, new schoolbuses and a considerable amount of maintenance work was done. The school district's only debt of $20,000 in bonds cannot be paid off ahead of schedule because of the agreement with the bonding company.

Walsenburg and Huerfano County as a whole are in good condition. Neat houses painted in bright colors are in abundance. Green lawns and flower gardens are everywhere. Trees shade the many paved streets. Attractive churches invite worshipers.

Plans are being made for the Martin Lake development which would create two larger lakes. Walsenburg will furnish the water for this project which should spur the development of a golf course, of picnic areas, kiddie fishing lakes, camping areas, boating and water skiing, fishing and trailer parks. Altogether the area of approximately 1,100 acres will provide unlimited recreation facilities. Huerfano County has two winter sports areas, one currently in operation. A playground park, wading pool, tennis courts, and baseball diamonds provide recreation facilities for the youngsters.

Walsenburg has recently begun to get new FHA and new GI housing loans. Six new homes are under construction at the present time.

Progressive citizens are working on numerous projects to better Walsenburg, among these the new low-rent housing program and the proposed hospital. Walsenburg's people are working together toward a common goal.

Tribute to Hickman Price, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. HART
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. HART. Mr. President, one of the outstanding citizens of Michigan who now is serving this country in President Kennedy's administration is Hickman Price, Jr., Assistant Secretary of Commerce. Today, Mr. Price is also held in great esteem in Brazil, where, by his responsible example, he has countered the charge that North American business leaders working in Latin America are unable to generate goodwill for our country and at the same time serve effectively the business interests of the United States.

Upon Mr. Price's departure from Brazil, to take up his new duties, the Honorable Antonio Sylvio Cunha Bueno, Federal Deputy from Sao Paulo, recognized these qualities of Mr. Price, in the course of a magnificent speech which was delivered in the Brazilian Chamber of Deputies. I ask unanimous consent to have the speech printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There beong no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY DEPUTY ANTONIO SYLVIO CUNHA BUENO IN THE CHAMBER OF DEPUTIES

New and encouraging prospects are opened up for a strengthening of the bonds between Brazil, the United States of America, and other countries. President John F. Kennedy assumes control of the White House, and public opinion throughout the world is turned on him, due to the tension in the present-day world, created by the cold war. Latin America permanently passed over in programs of foreign aid, in view of the immensity of its requirements for development, awaits its opportunity. It wishes to see the economic and financial cooperation plan finally made real in order to raise the low standard of living of underdeveloped peoples, trailing along in the wake of industrialized countries.

It is a fact that capital, experience, and specialized labor has brought considerable progress to the peoples of America. The expansion in commercial interchange between countries in the hemisphere will allow an economic system to be formed capable of strengthening political and cultural relations, and of supplying the basis for its progress to the continent.

The example given us by Old Europe, by the formation of its free trade zones and common markets, is noteworthy in view of what it represents in complementing the economy. America can be proud of having offered the political bases of its international organizations to the whole world, when it idealized the inter-American plan. The time has now come for its economic integration as foreseen by President Juscelino Kubitschek in his doctrine on Operation Pan Americana.

It is never too much to recall that investments of domestic and also foreign capital have brought new possibilities to our people raising their standard of living.

Industrialization, allied to modern productive and mechanized agriculture, provides a larger amount of riches and, based on the theory and practice of mass production, besides affording a splendid labor market, creates better opportunities for a wider distribution of commodities and better standards of living for a large number of people.

Relations between Brazil and the United States of America have traditionally been good in the political, cultural, and economic fields. It is not only economic and political interchange which keeps us united, but, principally the joint feeling of our hopes in the past and in the present. First, the implantation of liberty in the New World, and, later, preservation of democratic liberties on the whole of the earth's face. This feeling and this hope, which have taken their course in our history, were well understood by statesmen of the Americas, among them Bolivar, Franklin D. Roosevelt and others. And, among us, D. Pedro II who on a visit to the United States of America, left his imprint on passing through that country, including in its best known universities, such as Harvard and Yale, Joaquim Nabuco, our first Ambassador to Washington, planted the seeds of political and cultural understanding. A significant fact in international relations was the launching of the good neighbor policy in 1933 by President Franklin D. Roosevelt. And, of more recent date, the launching of Operation Pan Americana by Brazil. The repercussions in the northern continent, added to various occurrences in the center of the hemisphere, were such that the two largest North American parties, in complete accord, included a solution on a large scale of the problem of cooperation with Latin American countries, in their presidential campaign platforms of 1960. This to our thinking, is the most significant change in North American foreign policy.

Inspired by the wish to become better acquainted with Latin American problems, principally those about Brazil, President Kennedy has just given concrete and undeniable proof of his concern to find solutions which will result in healthy and effective collaboration between our nations.

The first magistrate of the people, who today occupies the White House decided to enlist a countryman of his in Brazil who will make this approach through deeds and words.

I refer to the invitation addressed to Hickman Price, Jr., to occupy the post of Assistant Secretary of Commerce. All Brazilians who are more directly committed in the fight for the country's economic emancipation, respect and admire this North American, whose friendship to Brazil has been proved for many years. The new Assistant Secretary of Commerce of the American Nation is a man acquainted with the base problems of the country, having been a pioneer and one of the greatest enthusiasts and a real collaborator in the fight for the implantation of the automotive industry. It is worth glancing over his life which has been devoted to heavy industry, and where he has always occupied the highest position.

He was born in Nashville, Tenn., on August 14, 1911. At 23 years of age he already occupied the highest positions in the Bankers Trust Co. of New York. From January 1942 to May 1945 he was with the Foreign Economic Administration. From 1945 to 1952 he was vice president of Kaiser-Fraser Corp., and was also treasurer of the same company from 1945 to 1946. In the same company from 1946 to 1952 he rose to the high position of executive vice president. From 1952 to 1956 he was president of Willys-Overland Export Corp., and simultaneously vice president of Willys Motors Inc. from 1955–56.

In 1956 he was nominated executive director of Willys-Overland do Brazil S.A. In this company he showed his qualities as a pioneer. At that time Willys-Overland do Brazil S.A. was located in a building of restricted size and with some used machinery. In 3 years only, it was transformed into the largest plant for automotive vehicles in operation in Brazil. At that time the company employed 33 workers, today it employs 7,000. A 95-percent index of nationalization of its vehicles has been reached.

The cause of this speedy development in the company was in large part due to Hickman Price, Jr., who foresaw the need for participation by the small Brazilian investor in this new and growing industry. As a result, the company today has over 40,000 shareholders.

Through the intermediary of an agency of the French Government, Hickman Price, Jr., arranged for an investment of U.S. $11 million, for the production of the French Dauphine automobile.

Total investment in machinery and equipment in the company during Hickman Price, Jr.'s term of office was U.S. $33 million. For this work and contribution to Brazilian economy, he was awarded the highest decoration from the Brazilian Government to a foreigner—the Order of the Cruzeiro do Sul.

In 1959 he left the pioneer factory, after having placed it on the road to progress. In November he was invited by Mercedes Benz do Brasil S.A. where he is still executive vice president. This industry employs 6,000 workers, and is classified amongst the largest in Latin America.

At a press interview it was possible to feel and sense the new Secretary's resolution in regard to our future relations: "I am sure that the good sense of the Brazilian people and their wide capacity for work will bring profitable results to the country and toward its leadership in Latin America. During the last 5 years Brazil has undergone tremendous economic expansion, in proportion to other countries in the world. And, like all things which grow at a similar rate, Brazil has little time to breathe. But my confidence in its future continues strong. In 1980 Brazil will have a population of 125 million souls, approximately, and to be able to stand this increase it must continue its development at an accelerated rate."

Referring to his hopes for greater intensification of the relations between the United States and Brazil, where two new governments "undertake to develop a joint action, with a view to general development of the Americas and the maintenance of democracy," Mr. Hickman Price, Jr., said "Presidents Janio Quadros and John Kennedy are men who share the same ideals and principles, they were elected at the same time, they are of the same age, they take office at the same time, and they hold the mandates in the two largest countries in the hemisphere. Due to these reasons, one can only anticipate joint work in defense of the general welfare."

In closing Mr. Price emphasized that he leaves Brazil, but that all his life he will be a friend of this country "in the performance of my duties I shall do everything to encourage capital investment in Brazil with exact elucidation to investors as to possibilities in Brazil. My effort will be made for capital to enter in close association with Brazilian investors, through a system of 'help by participation' and not by stimulating the appearance of eventual monopolies. And this will be achieved, I believe, since the members of the new U.S. Government have more experience in foreign problems than those in the preceding governments."

Therefore, Mr. President and deputies, the nomination of the new Assistant Secretary of Commerce of the sister nation merits recognition in the annals of this house.

We believe that Hickman Price, Jr., through his qualities as a real leader, through the perfect and direct knowledge he has of Brazilian requirements, through his proven capacity for work, and above all, through the love which he has shown in the study and solution of large national problems, will be a splendid collaborator in the

work of promoting understanding amongst the two great nations who, due to the positions they enjoy at the moment, undoubtedly will be responsible for safeguarding a free and democratic world.

That was all I had to say, Mr. President.

Resolution of Oregon State Building and Construction Trades Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Mr. Joe L. Willis, executive secretary of the Oregon State Building and Construction Trades Council, has brought to my attention the resolution which was unanimously endorsed at the 46th semiannual convention of the council.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION TO PRINT A U.S. POSTAGE STAMP, "THE NUCLEUS OF CRAFTSMANSHIP—APPRENTICESHIP," RECOGNIZING THE BASIC PHILOSOPHY OF BONA FIDE APPRENTICESHIP AND BRINGING TO THE ATTENTION OF THE AMERICAN PUBLIC THE VALUE OF THE APPRENTICESHIP SYSTEM TO OUR NATIONAL ECONOMY

Whereas millions of our fellow workers, throughout the years, have given of their time and effort in the promotion of this philosophy, for the purpose of training competent craftsmen for the industrial welfare of our Nation; and

Whereas the future status of skilled manpower in the United States is becoming increasingly dependent upon apprentice training; and

Whereas there is a need to acquaint the American public with the gigantic strides, activities and efforts in establishing the philosophy of bona fide apprenticeship, and the efforts that are being taken by labor and management to provide the public with the highest possible grade of products and services in conformity with approved practices of safety and skilled craftsmanship; and

Whereas it is the desire of the Oregon State Building and Construction Trades Council to pay tribute to these fellow workers, apprentices and to labor and management representatives who have voluntarily contributed their time and effort to this very necessary industrial activity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Oregon State Building and Construction Trades Council go on record as approving, and to petition the Postmaster General to have printed, a U.S. postage stamp using a facsimile of the imprint on this resolution and the attached analogy; also to request our congressional delegation to so petition the Postmaster General.

JOE L. WILLIS,
Executive Secretary.

THE NUCLEUS OF CRAFTSMANSHIP—APPRENTICESHIP

Apprenticeship might well be called the nucleus of craftsmanship. Just as the sun is the nucleus of our solar system, holding in place the planets and their satellites by virtue of its enormous gravity pull, so is our economic system held in balance by the qualified craftsmen who staff the machines and build the artifacts of our civilization.

The sun nurtures and sustains all life as we know it—plant life that men and animals depend upon for life grow from this sunlight and warmth. Similarly, apprenticeship could appropriately be termed the sustaining force of our economic life, supplying as it does, qualified craftsmen who have learned their skills through apprenticeship. Through the vitalizing influence of apprenticeship the apprentice grows in efficiency, and with the skills of his trade firmly established and thoroughly mastered, matures into a craftsman, becoming an integral part of the vital lifelines of our production system.

Truly, as the sun is the nucleus of our solar system, apprenticeship is the nucleus of our craftsmanship.

Burshears' Remarkable Boy Scouts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. CARROLL
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a Reader's Digest article—condensed from the Denver Post—entitled "Burshears' Remarkable Boy Scouts."

We Coloradans know well of the activities of these young Colorado Boy Scouts, but I am proud that the widely read Reader's Digest thought it worthwhile to carry their story. As this magazine is read in 21 countries, and published in 12 different languages, this remarkable tale of Scoutmaster J. F. Burshears' Koshares of La Junta, Colo., will reach millions of people. These American youngsters are citizens who do us credit—both at home and abroad. In these days when juvenile delinquents are a cause of grave concern all over the globe, I believe the example of these young Coloradans can be an inspiration to parents, to teachers, and to young people everywhere.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BURSHEARS' REMARKABLE BOY SCOUTS

"The great chieftains have gone their way; the buffalo have faded into Mother Earth, never to return. So listen to the rhythm of the Great Medicine Drum. See again the life of the Red Man as the Koshares reveal the age-old scenes."

The narator stopped, and with war whoop and the boom-thump, boom-thump of the thunder drum, 100 young braves danced into the light of the tepee fires flaring in the night wind. The music of their ankle bells and their primitive Indian hand rattles mingled eerily.

For an hour and a half they weaved and stomped, their bare backs shining with sweat. They did a dozen stirring dances: a prayer for a successful buffalo hunt; a Pueblo house blessing; the traditional Hopi prayer for rain, with wriggling bullsnakes clenched in their teeth.

John Chapman, New York drama critic, declared: "I have seen many spectacles, but there is nothing in my memory to match the performance of these Boy Scouts."

For the Koshare Indian Dancers are Boy Scouts, and there is not a real redskin in the outfit. These lads from the southeast Colorado prairie town of La Junta are members of one of the best known Boy Scout troops in the United States. Their interpretive dances are so successful that the boys earn $500 a night, travel in their own bus thousands of miles each year, and have built their own $200,000 Scout headquarters.

Scoutmaster J. F. "Buck" Burshears, a heavy-set bespectacled man of 51, who contracts with the Santa Fe Railway to furnish crews to take care of livestock in transit, began building his troop nearly 30 years ago. An Eagle Scout himself, he was just out of college and holding his first job. He fixed over an old chicken coop for a meeting place. But he soon found that he needed something special to keep the older boys interested in scouting. "The kids always got steamed up whenever we went on a trip," he says. "So I figured we'd build a troop of entertainers and pay our own way on a lot of trips." The La Junta scoutmaster has done just that, and the youngsters have been beating at his door ever since.

The idea of forming a Boy Scout tribe stemmed from Burshears' own long-time interest in Indian lore and dancing. And the boys soon discover that being a Koshare (ko-shär-e is the Pueblo word for funmaker) is no idle play. Indian dancing is more strenuous than many sports. And the Koshares do more than just dance. "I want these lads to know how much we owe the Indian," Burshears explains. "I want to keep our heritage alive." Buck makes the Indian a fascinating study. He and his boys have worked up a repertoire of 100 dances, drawing for their material on scholarly studies of tribal life, authoritative books, and especially on visits to Indians.

Buck himself has spent 30 years researching tribal dancing from the Montana Blackfeet to the Florida Seminoles, and is still on the hunt. For a time he lived with a Southwest tribe and coauthored a book on Indian beadwork. Each year he travels with his scouts to such affairs as the great Indian ceremonial dances at Gallup, N. Mex., where he films the finest dancing and costumes, and records the Indian chants—some 50 hours of films and recordings to date. His big, inviting home, virtually an Indian museum, at times overflows with youngsters running the movies, poring over Buck's library and practicing new routines.

Last fall, with the aspens turning gold amid the snowcapped Rockies, I traveled with Buck to the ancient Taos, N. Mex., fiesta, for fresh material. We feasted with the Taos Indians and observed their rituals, danced in this same place for perhaps a thousand years.

"The Indians' dances," Buck told me, "were mostly ceremonies in which they worshipped their gods: the sun and moon, wind and rain, thunder and lightning, birds and animals." Other dances celebrated such events as marriage, death, the harvest. Many of the southwest dances, like the Hopi Snake Dance, were prayers for rain.

One of the Koshares' most spectacular performances is the Sioux Ghost Dance. In the late 1880's a Paiute Indian named Wovoka claimed he was the "Messiah" with power to crush all white men and raise the buffalo out of the earth again. Wovoka fired the Plains Indians with a religious dance in which they wore "ghostshirts"—supposedly impervious to white man's bullets. The dancing craze spread like prairie fire and terrorized the whites, until U.S. troops finally put an end to it at Wounded Knee in western South Dakota in 1890. Buck and his boys tramped the Wounded Knee battlefield, listened to firsthand accounts from surviving Sioux. Later, seeing the

Koshares dance, a withered chieftain appealed to Buck: "Come, teach our young people, too."

It takes a lot of time and determination to become one of Buck's Indians. He holds his troop to about 150 members, carefully selecting only 25 or 30 new boys a year. A junior high younster comes in on trial as a Papoose, and immediately starts to assemble his Indian costume, which includes such items as owl claws, horsetails and eagle feathers. To bead his breechclout and vest may take him six months. The boy must also devote several hours a week to learning the basic toe-heel and stomp steps. A Papoose must also earn 15 merit badges, read five recommended books on Indians, maintain a 75-percent atendance at Scout meetings and at least a "C" average in school.

After World War II Buck plunged into building a Scout headquarters modeled after the underground kiva or sacred meeting place of ancient pueblo. The Koshares subscribed $10,000 from their earnings, the townspeople $10,000, and city fathers sat down with the scoutmaster to blueprint a modest affair. But one day astonished La Juntans discovered that the Scout leader was pouring foundations for a structure with recreation rooms, trading post, little theater, Indian art museum and a ceremonial kiva seating 500.

"He'll never finish it," snorted a local businessman.

But the enterprising Scout leader marshaled the community. Citizens volunteered labor. The school board donated leftover pumice block. Scouts helped tear down a surplus Army messhall for lumber. Old telephone poles were scrounged to fashion Buck's huge dome-shaped kiva ceiling. A leading Pueblo artist, Valleno Herrera, painted a series of Indian dance murals. Since the headquarters opened in 1949 it has had nearly 1 million visitors.

Today the Koshares are big business. Traveling mostly during summer vacation, they earn from $25,000 to $30,000 a year (about half goes for expenses, the rest to the troop). New York's Madison Square Garden offered $1,000 a day for a month's engagement, but Buck declined because it would interfere with the boys' schooling. The troop travels in its own 37-passenger, air-conditioned bus. A faithful team of dads—businessmen, electricians, plumbers, doctors—assists the scoutmaster. One father, a telephone repairman, gives up his vacation each year and has driven the bus more than 200,000 miles.

The road show sets a rugged pace: Koshares stage an evening performance, clean up, reload the equipment and bunk down in sleeping bags in armories, gymnasiums, or under the stars. After a few hours' sleep, they drive maybe 400 miles and the next night dance again. It is a grind, but the youngsters thrive on it. Every third or fourth day, the road show halts while the Scouts sleep in, go sight seeing or attend a ball game. On Sundays the group splits up for church.

Every year the Koshares travel from 15,000 to 20,000 miles. "One summer my kid saw New York, Washington, Yellowstone Park, and spent 5 days off San Diego on a Navy carrier," a La Junta electrician told me proudly. "I have a hard time getting out of Colorado." Buck's youngsters have viewed America's agricultural and industrial might; toured our national parks and shrines; visited famous art galleries; flown to Canada; lunched with Congress; been received at the White House.

But exciting and educational as all this is, these Boy Scouts reap perhaps even greater rewards from the training, discipline and romance of being a Koshare. It grips them early. At the kiva one day I saw an 11-year-old sidle up to the scoutmaster. "Buck, it isn't my birthday yet," he beamed, "but I've already started beading my breechclout."

Said Jon Kolomitz, now a University of Colorado prelaw student: "As a brave, I learned hard work and sportmanship; and as head chief, I learned public speaking and leadership. I owe everything to the Koshares."

Dr. William McDivitt, president of Otero Junior College and father of three sons, calls the Koshare training "education beyond price—something the schools can't offer."

In 27 years, Buck has touched the lives of some 800 youngsters and now is starting on the second generation. He has seen over 250 Boy Scouts attain eagle rank, which is probably a record no other troop can match.

Saluting the devoted scoutmaster on his 25th anniversary with the Koshares, a citation from Colorado College said: "Buck Burshears has uncovered a small universe in our region; and he has shown the possibilities in a boy caught up by a truly worthwhile idea."

The Farmer Needs a Good Press Agent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial by Mr. Don Olson, of the Marshall Messenger, Marshall, Minn., is so factual that I believe every Member of the House and others reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD can well study it carefully.

THE FARMER NEEDS A GOOD PRESS AGENT

Big city people generally have two impressions of the American farmer and American agriculture. First, they believe the farmer has been riding a gravy train at the expense of the taxpayer and, second, the farmer is responsible for keeping food prices high.

This is the image most city people have of the farmer and why not? They have been told this repeatedly ever since the first corn-hog program was instituted back in the depression of the thirties.

The facts, however, do not point to the farmer as the one who is guilty of keeping food prices high. In fact, compared with most other commodities, food prices aren't out of line.

The average American householder spent 23½ percent of his disposable (after taxes) income for food in 1939. In 1959 he spent only 20 percent for food, and if he had eaten the same kind and quantities of food he bought in 1939, he would have spent only 15 percent.

The Japanese spend about 42 percent of their disposable income for food. West Germans spend 45 percent and the Russians the whopping total of 56 percent.

According to Robert C. Liebenow, president of the Chicago Board of Trade, "The food bill of the United States would be a lot more than it is today if it were not for increased farm productivity. With 1940 technology the yearly food bill of the consumer probably would be $13 billion more than it is now. That would really cause screams about the cost of living."

Secondly, most city people look upon the farmer as a rather small minority group that is fading fast from the American scene. They complain that this small, unimportant segment of the American economy is being supported by city people and the Government.

The fact is that agriculture still is one of the main businesses of the United States. American farmers buy $16 billion worth of farm machinery, gas, oil, electricity, and other products each year. Farmers use more steel annually than the tonnage that goes into passenger cars. Farmers produce 51 percent of industry's raw materials.

This doesn't sound small, petty, unimportant, does it?

Farming itself employs about 7.5 million workers. That total is more than is employed in the steel industry, or the automobile industry, or the transportation industry, or public utilities, combined.

And the industries which buy, process, handle and service farm products hire around 10 million more.

Few people are aware of these things. Certainly the big city people are not. To correct all of the missunderstandings about American farmers and agriculture in general, the farmer needs a good press agent. Heaven only knows he has had mighty poor press in the eastern cities.

And right here in Marshall the farmer could use a better press agent to correct some of the mistaken impressions some people have.

Our chamber of commerce certainly ought to have an agriculture committee, not necessarily to serve as press agent, but rather to keep the membership informed on our area farmers and their problems. If agriculture is big business on the national level, it certainly is important here in Marshall.

New Industries for Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Philadelphia Bulletin of March 19, 1961, entitled "Self-Help Continues."

This is further evidence of the excellent work done by the citizens of Wilkes-Barre, in their efforts to obtain new industries. I certainly want to commend Wilkes-Barre and other communities for successful efforts.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SELF-HELP CONTINUES

Once again, the "coal crackers" of the Wilkes-Barre area in Pennsylvania's anthracite region have shown that they are not going to sit still and wait for someone else to help them.

They are fighting to bring new industry into their region, to take the place of the dying coal industry, and spending their own money to do it. The Greater Wilkes-Barre Industrial Fund campaign has just gone over the top by $200,000 in a drive for $1,500,000.

This money is voluntary, pledged by labor and industry, and much of it will come from payroll deductions authorized by people fortunate enough to have a job in the area.

The fund will be used as the local share of money to build factory "shells" which can be leased to industry. Area bankers and the Pennsylvania Industrial Development Corp. will put up the remainder needed.

The public's share of the money came from an area with 12,000 jobless among the 185,000 residents. Two other drives in the past 12 years had already raised $2 million. Self-help of this kind is in the finest American tradition.

The Lummi Diking Project, State of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following petition:

To the Congress of the United States:

We, the undersigned Lummi Indians, being a large majority of Indian owners of lands within the Lummi Diking project in the Lummi Reservation in the State of Washington, and representing at least a partial ownership interest in substantially every Indian-owned tract therein, respectfully petition that your honorable body pass legislation which will permit the said project to be absorbed, and its purposes carried out, by a diking and drainage district to be organized and operated under the laws of the State of Washington. Such legislation should not otherwise reduce any of our Lummi treaty rights, nor otherwise subject our lands to State jurisdiction or taxation, and it should cancel past charges.

Such legislation should follow the lines of H.R. 11953, introduced in the 86th Congress and as passed by the House of Representatives. We approve that bill. If any changes are considered appropriate we authorize our Lummi chief, Norbert James, to speak for us, confident that he will express our wishes and represent our best interests.

We urge this legislation because for reasons rooted in mistakes of long past years, and the fault of no one person nor of anybody now connected with the project, and springing chiefly from the attempt to include white-owned neighboring lands in the project, its affairs are now so muddled and complicated that:

A. There has been gross unfairness against owners of certain classes of lands, particularly Indians, and under the present setup there is no prospect of remedy thereof. Only cancellation of claims can avoid further injustice.

B. Collection of assessments has been, and is now being, concentrated upon Indian owners of lands rented through the agency of the United States Bureau of Indian Affairs, and this is a great injustice to them.

C. A decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals in favor of the plaintiff white owner against the United States (*Hood v. United States* (256 Fed. 2d 522)), makes clear that no Government operation can reach all benefited land.

D. Operation under such a proposed district: (1) is the only way to bring in all benefited lands and to assure fair and equitable operation, (2) would permit drainage projects not possible now under a project limited to diking, thus greatly increasing the fertility and value of our lands, (3) would provide local "grassroot" control by elected officers assisted by county engineer and commissioners. All parties agree that thereby costs would be reduced, (4) would demonstrate the ability and willingness of whites and Indians to work together.

OWNERS OF LAND IN LUMMI DIKING PROJECT
NAME OR NUMBER OF ALLOTMENT

Eugenia E. Plaster, serial No. 28; Matthew Jones, serial No. 56; Kenneth Placid and Rosemary Placid, serial No. 20; Frank Plaster, serial No. 24; Stello James, serial No. 49–A; George Servegast, serial No. 56; Susan Jimmy, serial No. 27; Sindick Jimmy, serial No. 27; Herman McCluskey, serial No. 29–D; Ernist A. James, serial No. 60; E. J. Jones, serial No. 60; Mildred Jones, serial No. 60 and 20.

Eva Hillaire, serial No. 56; Herbert John, serial No. 58; Philip John, serial No. 83; Anna Lewis, serial No. 89; John B. Lewis, serial No. 38; Mrs. Clara Humphrey Cooper, serial No. 38; Bertha Lane, serial No. 78; Harriett Courtney, serial No. 52; Daniel Cush, serial No. 77; Edna D. Friday, serial No. 56; Vela Julius, serial No. 72; Simon Jefferson, serial No. 49B; Emma Edwards, serial No. 48; Mary E. Hillaire, serial No. 56; Amelia Lewis, serial No. 56; Haynes Julius, serial Nos. 49B, 72; Al Peters, serial No. 91; Charles R. Boyer, serial No. 72; Simon Jefferson, serial No. 49B; Verna H. Boyer, serial No. 72; Simon Jefferson, serial No. 49B; James V. Hoag, serial No. 47; Arthur Humphreys, serial No. 46; Mary Paul, serial No. 20; Benny Miranes.

Earl M. Thomas, serial No. 43; Mrs. Maria Thomas, serial No. 49–E and 29–23; Damierer Solmon, serial No. 64; Edward A. Jefferson, serial No. 49–C; Clarence Jefferson, serial No. 49–G; Mrs. Floyd Warbuis, serial No. 76; Ben Hallaire, serial No. 56—No. 61; James Joseph, serial No. 56; Ben Hillaire, serial No. 56; Ray Paul, serial No. 46; Clara Janus, serial No. 30, No. 34A, No. 34D, No. 48; Mrs. Theresa M. Thomas, serial No. 62; Mike D. Jefferson, serial No. 49–D; Thomas K. Jefferson, serial No. 49–D; Mrs. Laura Edwards, serial No. 48; Douglas Jefferson, serial No. 49–D–29C; Helena Jefferson, serial No. 49–J; Robert Placid, serial No. 20; Mrs. Victor Jones, serial No. 33, No. 56; Victor Jones, serial No. 33, No. 56.

Francis L. Jefferson, serial No. 50; Sarah James, serial No. 60; Ann Humphreys, serial No. 46; Louis Hellrod, serial No. 56; Gertrude Paul Misanes, serial No. 46; Bernice Paul Plaster, serial No. 46; Marian Peters, serial Nos. 32 and 38; Christine Basler, serial Nos. 29–B, 38, 56, and 48; C. W. LaClair, serial No. 20; Irarme Tom, serial No. 48; Floyd Warbros, serial No. 76; James G. McKay, serial No. 38; Francis Garipee, serial Nos. 36 and 37; Leonard Jefferson, serial No. 49–J; Charles Lane, serial No. 73; Frances James, serial Nos. 78, 80, and 40; Aloysius Charles, serial No. 33; Dorothy Charles, serial No. 33; Zeta Hillaire, serial Nos. 62 and 28; Henry Hillaire, serial No. 62.

Robert George, serial Nos. 50 and 48; Marion George, serial Nos. 50 and 48; George James, serial Nos. 34–B and 48; Irene James, serial No. 34–B; Christine Ballew Washington, serial No. 40; Arthur Pierre, serial Nos. 17 and 24; Angeline Alexander, serial No. 24; Violet Lane Hillaire, serial No. 20; Christina Placid Lane, serial Nos. 20 and 48; Viola L. Lane, serial No. 20; Thomas B. Jefferson, serial No. 49–J; Melvin Warbus, serial Nos. 76 and 49–H; Edward M. Warbus, serial Nos. 76 and 49–H; Frank Hillaire, serial No. 62; Roy H. Martin, serial No. 76; Walter John, serial Nos. 15 and 58; Wesley Martin, serial No. 76; Vernon Lane, serial No. 20; Leo Senior, serial No. 57; Rose Senior, serial No. 57; C. W. James, Sr., serial Nos 29–A, 30, 34–A, 34–D, and 48; Olen A. Solomon, serial No. 67; Gloria Kittles Johnson, serial No. 35.

$85,800,000,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal, known for its nonpartisan and exact editorial policy, certainly lived up to its standards with the concise comment on the issue of Wednesday, March 22, directed to the cost of our foreign aid program. I feel the inclusion of this item in the RECORD would be of educational value to the Members of the Congress.

The editorial follows:

$85,800,000,000

Give or take a few hundred million dollars, the figure above is the total cost of U.S. foreign aid programs during the 15 years since World War II. To those of us accustomed to dealing with homely sums like $1.98, it's hard to imagine the amount of money represented by those 11 digits.

Yet this sum that surpasses comprehension, we're told, isn't nearly enough; foreign aid must go on and on, as an obligation passing from one generation to the next. If this be so, we wonder what the sum will be, with digits strung out like boxcars, 10, 20, and 30 years hence.

Maybe some future generations, boggling at the foreign aid figure, will simply decide to stop counting, for the numbers are likely to run out long before the alleged need does.

The Minimum Wage Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am making a statement and including certain extraneous matter for the information of Members of Congress as to the minimum wage law.

I am not opposed to a minimum wage law as such, but I am opposed to a minimum wage law which stands any likelihood of furthering unemployment in my district, in my State, and in my country.

If H.R. 3935, the committee bill, is to be the bill which is to be pressed for passage, then I would hope that an amendment to that legislation would be accepted to take care of the rural areas of this country. As numbers of us know, who have studied and are concerned that the plight of the little small merchant, who has clerks who do not make enough sales at the margin of profit now existing in rural retail stores, to justify the raise in wages, the impact of extending the coverage to those areas and to those establishments would be to cause some layoff of people and further unemployment, as well as extend the economic difficulty in those little communities. In the small rural communities of this country, when a person is laid off it means a loss of income to the community as a whole and any widespread unemployment in these areas will affect larger communities.

I recognize the fact that in the larger metropolitan statistical areas of this country, because of the fact that cost of living is higher in the cities, the sales are greater, the sales per clerk are larger per hour, and the stores are for the most part modern, they pay higher wages, but in the rural areas of this country this

is not true, and I, therefore, would propose an amendment to H.R. 3935, as reported March 13, 1961, as follows:

AMENDMENT

(1) On page 19, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following new paragraph:

(2) "Any employee employed in a retail or service establishment, situated outside of the boundaries of a standard metropolitan statistical area as now delineated and now defined by the Federal Committee on Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas, under the direction of the U.S. Bureau of the Budget: or."

(Renumber successive paragraphs.)

For estimated coverage of employees I present the following tabulation:

EXHIBIT A

ESTIMATED COVERAGE—WAGE HOUR BILL USING STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS, BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

	Number employees covered
Total retail employees, 1958	7,942,914
67.7 percent in standard metropolitan statistical area	5,377,363
Standard metropolitan statistical areas, with $100,000 per store exemption test	3,129,625
With $300,000 per store exemption test	2,317,643

(1) Statistical Abstract of United States, 1960, page 834.

(2) Percent based on latest available census reports.

(3) Statistical Abstract of United States, 1960, page 833.

Worker by store size based on 1954 census.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-eight figures not available.

If we are going to extend the coverage, this amendment would serve to recognize the conditions which actually exist in our communities today. I have also introduced, for the purpose of allowing the House to vote, and I hope favorably, on the pure constitutional question, a bill which I believe will extend the coverage to those actually engaged in commerce, without any extension of coverage or invasion of those fields not engaged in commerce.

This bill consists of an amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended. The purpose of the amendment is to provide certain additional coverage for employees presently engaged in retail trade or service and of other employees engaged in commerce or in the purchase of goods for commerce, to increase the minimum wage under the act, and for other purposes.

You will note that the purpose and issue of this submission differs from the purpose and effect of H.R. 3935, as introduced by Mr. ROOSEVELT, and H.R. 5561, as introduced by Mr. KITCHIN, and H.R. 5537, as introduced by Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska.

In order more precisely to differentiate between the present submission and the former bills referred to, we note, briefly, that the Roosevelt bill, consists of "enterprise" tests under which all retailers are covered who come within the "enterprise" definition, and have sales of more than $1 million annually, regardless of the number of units or establishments making up the total enterprise; the Kitchin bill provides coverage only as the enterprise is engaged in business in two or more States and has five or more units, but otherwise accepting the enterprise criteria of the Roosevelt bill in all its vastness and complex impacts. The Martin bill is a simple amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act to increase the minimum wage to $1.15 without affecting present coverage provisions or the exemptions therefrom. The Martin amendment has great appeal to many people.

Constitutional questions plague both H.R. 3935—Roosevelt bill—and H.R. 5561—Kitchin bill. Under both measures, however, some extension of coverage is sought, and, not withstanding certain blanket exemptions contained in both measures, measurable additional coverage is provided.

The enclosed submission differs from any of the foregoing in that it will accomplish the following:

(a) It will avoid the constitutional question inherent in the Roosevelt and Kitchin bills, that is, the regulation of local business activities, that are truly and legally intrastate. This avoidance is accomplished by retaining the present format of the Fair Labor Standards Act, which has been held constitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States.

(b) It will provide additional coverage. This is accomplished by amending out the retail exemption. By repeal of the retail exemption, employees of retail and service industries will be covered to the extent that such employees are engaged in trade, commerce, transportation, transmission, or communication, among the several States, or between any State and any place outside thereof. Employees who engage in activities which are not interstate in character will not be covered.

The present test of the Fair Labor Standards Act, as land down and recognized by the Supreme Court has been an "employee" test: that is, whether or not the services of the "employee" has been those of one directly engaged in interstate activities. By retaining this test, all employees of retail and service establishments who are engaged in such interstate activities and transactions will be covered and it is estimated that there will be an additional coverage of 1,800,000 persons.

Individuals whose activities are intrastate in character, such as those individuals engaged in local retailing activities which are performed after the interstate movement of merchandise has ceased; will not be covered. By way of example, warehousemen, communication forces, and buyers will so be covered; local salespersons are not covered.

Much litigation over the past 23 years has produced a clear and definitive picture of the relative distinctions of interstate against intrastate activities. There will be no period of uncertainty, there will be no multiplicity of litigation, and there can be no distortion by regulation. Distortion by regulation can be a nightmare under the enterprise doctrine by the Roosevelt bill and by the Kitchin bill.

The complexity of retail distribution is such that the economics of the industry differ by locality, by region, by character of stores, by productivity of employees, by inventory turnover within the various segments of the retail industry—see Dun & Bradstreet study attached exhibit B—and many other similar significant factors of difference and variety.

Operating ratios for 41 lines of retail trade

Line of retail trade	Year	Cost of goods sold [1]	Gross margin [1]	Total expense [1]	Net operating profit [1]	Selected operating expenses					Inventory turnover per year	Source of survey [The ratios compiled by Dun & Bradstreet, Inc., may be reproduced or used publicly with credit to Dun & Bradstreet, Inc. The ratios compiled by others are provided through the courtesy of the compilers and cannot be included in published material or used publicly without permission of the compilers.]
						Owners' compensation [1]	Employees' wages [1]	Occupancy cost [1]	Advertising [1]	Bad debts [1]		
		Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Times*	
Appliance-radio-television dealers	1958	64.5	35.5	34.4	1.1	3.1	15.6	2.5	2.8	0.7	4.6	National Appliance & Radio-TV Dealers Association, 1141 Merchandise Mart, Chicago 54, Ill.
Auto accessory and parts stores	1955	65.6	34.4	31.7	2.7	10.5	9.8	4.7	1.2	.1	3.9	Dun & Bradstreet, Inc., New York, N.Y.
Auto dealers	1958	85.1	14.9	14.7	.2	[2] 7.5		1.2	.8	(3)	(3)	National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K St. NW., Washington 6, D.C.
Bakeries	1955	58.1	41.9	38.3	3.6	10.6	[4] 11.3	6.1	.6	(3)	18.7	Dun & Bradstreet, Inc., New York, N.Y.
Bars and taverns	1953	54.2	45.8	43.4	2.4	10.9	15.5	6.8	.7	(3)	13.5	Do.
Bookstores	1954	61.9	38.1	35.1	3.0	9.2	6.9	6.7	1.7	(3)	3.3	American Booksellers Association, Inc., 175 5th Ave., New York 18, N.Y.
Camera and photographic supply stores	1954	69.1	30.9	28.5	2.4	9.8	6.7	4.8	1.9	0	3.2	Dun & Bradstreet, Inc., New York, N.Y.
Candy, nut and confectionery stores	1955	64.2	35.8	35.4	.4	13.9	[4] 6.3	8.5	.3	(3)	11.8	Do.
Children's and infants' wear stores	1957	67.5	32.5	30.8	1.7	9.4	7.2	6.9	1.3	0	2.6	Do.
Department stores [5]	1958	68.1	31.9	31.3	.6	18.3		2.9	1.7	.2	2.5	Bureau of Business Research Bulletin No. 155, Harvard University, Graduate School of Business Administration, Soldiers Field 63, Boston, Mass.

Footnotes at end of table.

Operating ratios for 41 lines of retail trade—Continued

Line of retail trade	Year	Cost of goods sold [1]	Gross margin [1]	Total expense [1]	Net operating profit [1]	Selected operating expenses					Inventory turnover per year	Source of survey [The ratios compiled by Dun & Bradstreet, Inc., may be reproduced or used publicly with credit to Dun & Bradstreet, Inc. The ratios compiled by others are provided through the courtesy of the compilers and cannot be included in published material or used publicly without permission of the compilers.]
						Owners' compensation [1]	Employees' wages [1]	Occupancy cost [1]	Advertising [1]	Bad debts [1]		
		Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Times*	
Drugstores	1958	65.3	34.7	29.5	5.2	8.0	11.2	[8] 2.2	[2]	[2]	3.8	Eli Lilly & Co., Indianapolis 6, Ind.
Dry goods and general merchandise stores.	1957	70.5	29.5	27.6	1.9	8.6	8.6	4.5	1.3	0	2.4	Dunn & Bradstreet, Inc., New York, N.Y.
Family clothing stores	1956	69.4	30.6	27.9	2.7	9.4	7.7	4.2	1.5	0	2.3	Do.
Farm equipment dealers	1958	82.5	17.5	14.2	3.3	[7] 2.2	[4] 4.3	[3]	.6	.2	2.8	National Retail Farm Equipment Association, 2340 Hampton, St. Louis 10, Mo.
Farm supply stores	1956	84.1	15.9	14.4	1.5	4.2	4.8	1.6	.3	.1	14.2	Dunn & Bradstreet, Inc., New York, N.Y.
Floor coverings stores	1954	64.3	35.7	34.0	1.7	9.0	12.4	4.5	1.8	0	3.7	Do.
Florists	1953	52.6	47.4	44.1	3.3	12.6	11.7	7.0	1.8	.1	11.8	Do.
Furniture stores [5]	1958	61.6	38.4	37.9	.5	21.0		6.2	5.2	1.0	2.6	National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Dr., Chicago 11, Ill.
Gasoline service stations	1956	76.8	23.2	22.1	1.1	6.3	8.1	4.0	.5	0	21.3	Dunn & Bradstreet, Inc., New York, N.Y.
Gift, novelty, and souvenir stores	1957	60.0	40.0	38.1	1.9	13.8	7.0	8.7	1.2	[2]	2.4	Do.
Grocery stores	1952	84.1	15.9	14.4	1.5	6.0	3.9	2.7	.1	0	13.6	Do.
Grocery and meat stores	1950	83.7	16.3	14.3	2.0	3.7	5.4	1.9	.4	[2]	17.2	Do.
Hardware stores	1958	69.5	30.5	29.5	1.0	[7] 8.1	10.6	3.7	1.6	.2	2.0	National Retail Hardware Association, 964 North Pennsylvania St., Indianapolis 4, Ind.
Jewelry stores (cash and open credit)	1953	55.6	44.4	40.7	3.7	15.3	8.9	7.4	2.2	0	1.2	Dunn & Bradstreet, Inc., New York, N.Y.
Jewelry stores (installment credit)	1953	52.5	47.5	41.7	5.8	10.1	12.3	6.9	3.4	1.7	1.4	Do.
Juvenile furniture stores	1954	66.6	33.4	30.2	3.2	10.0	6.1	6.8	2.6	0	3.4	Do.
Liquor stores (package)	1955	80.3	19.7	17.1	2.6	7.6	2.9	2.9	.3	[2]	5.9	Do.
Lumber dealers	1955	75.5	24.5	21.1	3.4	5.5	8.7	1.8	.7	.3	4.3	Do.
Meat markets	1954	79.3	20.7	19.3	1.4	6.8	6.4	2.3	.2	0	53.3	Do.
Men's furnishings stores	1952	67.2	32.8	29.3	3.5	9.8	6.5	6.4	1.3	0	2.1	Do.
Men's wear stores	1958	65.5	[8] 34.5	[9] 32.1	[8] 2.3	7.0	11.0	[6] 2.9	2.8	.3	2.4	New York University on Grant from Men's Wear Magazine, 7 East 12th St., New York, N.Y., July 24, 1959.
Music stores	1956	64.2	35.8	33.3	2.5	9.6	9.2	5.2	2.1	0	3.0	Dun & Bradstreet, Inc., New York, N.Y.
Office supply and equipment dealers	1958	64.7	35.3	32.8	2.5	[7] 4.3	18.5	3.0	1.2	.2	3.0	National Stationery & Office Equipment Association, 740 Investment Bldg., Washington 5, D.C.
Paint and wallpaper stores	1956	66.9	33.1	30.1	3.0	11.4	6.9	4.9	1.4	.2	3.2	Dun & Bradstreet, Inc., New York, N.Y.
Restaurants	1950	52.7	47.3	44.0	3.3	7.9	21.8	6.7	.5	[2]	35.5	Do.
Shoe stores (family)	1958	63.1	36.9	33.1	3.8	[7] 10.1	8.6	[6] 4.0	2.9	[2]	2.0	Washington University, St. Louis on Grant from Men's Wear Magazine, 7 East 12th St., New York, N.Y., July 24, 1959.
Sporting goods stores	1953	71.4	28.6	26.6	2.0	9.3	5.4	5.1	1.7	0	2.5	Dun & Bradstreet, Inc., New York, N.Y.
Toy dealers	1958	64.2	35.8	[9] 24.4	[9] 11.4	[9] 0	8.2	7.8	2.7	[2]	3.1	Playthings magazine, 71 West 23d St., New York 10, N.Y.
Women's accessory and specialty stores.	1954	66.3	33.7	31.5	2.2	11.2	5.8	7.5	1.0	0	2.6	Dun & Bradstreet, Inc., New York, N.Y.
Women's ready-to-wear stores	1953	67.7	32.3	29.4	2.9	8.2	8.8	5.4	1.3	0	4.1	Do.
Women's wear stores [5]	1958	64.5	35.5	34.5	1.0	18.4		3.8	2.6	.3	4.5	Bureau of Business Research Bulletin No. 155, Harvard University, Graduate School of Business Administration, Soldiers Field 63, Boston, Mass.

[1] The bracketed ratios are based on net sales.
[2] Does not include mechanics' wages.
[3] Not available.
[4] Does not include manufacturing labor.
[5] Ratios shown are for stores in the following volume groups: department stores with annual sales volume under $250,000; furniture stores between $250,000 and $500,000; women's wear stores under $250,000.
[6] Rent only.
[7] Salaries of owners and managers.
[8] Total expense plus net profit does not equal gross margin.
[9] Before owners' salaries were drawn.

EXPLANATION OF TERMS

Advertising: Net expenditure for newspaper, radio, and other forms of advertising, exclusive of wages.

Bad debts: Receivables considered during the year as uncollectible, or the reserve set up to cover such losses.

Cost of goods sold: Opening inventory, plus merchandise purchased (including inbound freight and cartage), less closing inventory; after deducting cash discounts received.

Employees' wages: Gross payroll of all employees, including amount withheld for Federal income taxes.

Gross margin: The difference between net sales and cost of goods sold; also known as "gross profit on sales." This is a composite figure, the net result of selling different kinds of goods at varying markups. Cash discounts received are included in gross margin.

Inventory turnover: Cost of goods sold divided by average inventory (average of opening and closing inventories).

Net operating profit: The difference between gross margin and total expense; before deduction for Federal and State income taxes but after allowance for owners' salaries.

Net sales: Gross sales less returns and allowances and less sales and excise taxes collected, net after all discounts allowed.

Occupancy cost: The cost of occupying a store, whether rented or owned. For renters, this item includes rent, utilities, and leasehold improvements; for owners, it includes utilities, property insurance and property taxes, interest on mortgage and building depreciation.

Owners' compensation: Salaries or drawings of proprietors, partners, or officers.

Total expense: The sum of all individual expense items. It does not include income taxes and in most cases does not include nonoperating charges.

Year: This represents the period upon which the ratio figures are based. It is not the year the figures were published.

Conversion table

[In percent]

Gross margin	Markup	Gross margin	Markup
5.0	5.3	28.0	38.9
7.5	8.1	30.0	42.9
10.0	11.1	31.0	45.0
12.0	13.7	32.0	47.1
13.0	15.0	33.0	49.3
14.0	16.3	34.0	51.6
15.0	17.7	35.0	53.9
16.0	19.1	37.0	58.8
17.0	20.5	39.0	64.0
18.0	22.0	40.0	66.7
19.0	23.5	42.0	72.5
20.0	25.0	45.0	81.9
22.0	28.2	47.0	88.8
25.0	33.3	50.0	100.0

To obtain a gross margin shown in this table, multiply cost of goods by the markup percent opposite and add the result to cost of goods. This will give the selling price needed to obtain the desired gross margin.

By eliminating the problem of regulation of these intrastate activities, these economic complexities are avoided. Further, discrimination is firmly avoided, but, more importantly, the Commerce clause is neither ignored nor distorted, and is not made a basis of dangerous federalism in local affairs best handled at the State level.

Another objection to H.R. 3935, the Roosevelt bill, is the fact that it gives insufficient recognition to small and locally owned group operations in the retail field and in the farm cooperative field—such as FCX Farm Supply Stores—each of which establishment is a separate corporation in most cases. Many of these separate establishments are organized in separate corporations or other distinct legal forms and the local residents and management or the

employees or, in the case of cooperatives the patrons thereof, are also owners of the business.

There is a vast distinction between this type of locally owned, locally formed, "homegrown" mercantile operation and large integrated mercantile groups whose stock is publicly floated and issued in the large stock exchanges of the country.

I do not wish to discriminate in any way against any group in the mercantile industry, but I do feel that these separately organized, locally owned "homegrown" mercantile organizations deserve consideration.

I offer the following amendment to accomplish my expressed purposes on this matter:

AMENDMENT

On page 42, between lines 21 and 22, insert the following paragraph:

(3) "Any employee employed by any retail or service establishment, which is separately organized in corporate or other legal form, in which local residents of the State in which such establishment is located or local management personnel or employees (including district or group supervisory employees having supervision of not over 15 establishments) or their immediate families own at least 20 percent of the net worth of the establishment."

I hope the House will seriously consider my bill and amendments and what we have said here.

Promoting a Recession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD, a concise statement, full of wisdom, on the state of the U.S. economy.

It appeared in the magazine Furniture Field, and was relayed to me by one of my constituents:

HOW TO START A RECESSION

Take a booming economy, such as the Nation had in the beginning of 1960. Start issuing reports and studies, liberally sprinkled with quotations from usually reliable sources, on what's wrong with the economy. Make the economy an everyday issue. As the months progress, single out various areas of chronic unemployment and issue daily communiques on how bad things are in these areas. Keep up a steady stream of newspaper stories, radio and TV reports, and magazine articles on emergency measures for stricken areas including food trucks, clothing drives, city, county, State, and Federal aid. In no time at all, you'll have a beautiful, blooming recession.

The above paragraph could have been copied from a party line pamphlet sent by the Kremlin to the Communist Party of the United States, but it wasn't. It just so happens that, in this case, either intentionally or by coincidence, we are being bombarded with the kind of propaganda that acts to deepen a recession and weaken our national security. It's time to stop it.

Our gross national product is within a percentage point or two of its highest level in the history of our country. More than 60 million people are employed and taking home more money than ever before. Personal savings in banks and savings and loan associations are at their highest level. Billions are being spent in new industrial plants, machine tools, and public works including the greatest overall highway building program in our history. Why aren't we being brainwashed with this kind of positive information? Ask any furniture retailer who was operating a store in the thirties. If he can clear his mind long enough from the present overwhelming propaganda, he'll tell you that we are in a positive boom compared to those days.

The Court and the Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Commonweal of March 17, 1961:

THE COURT AND THE COMMITTEE

In its close decisions on the Wilkinson and Braden cases the Supreme Court has illustrated once again the perennial tension and conflict between individual rights and national security, between the limitations imposed by authority and the demands of liberty. And in these decisions it has to a considerable extent, unfortunately, invalidated the Watkins ruling of 1957 and strengthened the Barenblatt decision of 1959.

In these latest decisions the Court voted 5 ot 4 to uphold in broad terms the investigating power of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. The committee may, as it did in the cases of Wilkinson and Braden, demand of people who have criticized the committee whether they are members of the Communist Party without showing that such information is germane to legislative purposes.

If the vote of 5 to 4 shows how narrow the decision was, a comparison of majority and dissenting opinions show how far the Justices are from agreement on the crucial issues involved. The majority opinion stated in the Wilkinson case that the Justices were unable to say "on this record that the subcommittee was not pursuing a valid legislative purpose" and that they were not persuaded by the contention that public censure was the committee's intent. The majority stated further that a man was not immunized from inquiry merely because he had criticized the committee if there was reason to think he had Communist affiliations.

In one dissent Justice Black (with the concurrence of Chief Justice Warren and Justice Douglas) wrote: "I think it clear that this case involves nothing more nor less than an attempt of the Un-American Activities Committee to use the contempt power of the House of Representatives as a weapon against those who criticize it." Without proper limitations to safeguard the individual "the conclusion is inescapable that the only real limitation upon the committee's power to harass its opponents is the committee's own self-restraint."

Though not in agreement with every reservation of the dissenting justices, we place ourselves firmly on their side. It is not simply that we believe the great forces of modern history weigh heavily against the freedoms of the individual and that we must be forever alert to guard and preserve them. Nor is it that we question the right, indeed the obligation, of the State—as it channels its authority through the House of Representatives to the Un-American Activities Committee—to work for the common good by preserving national security.

The questions at issue are not to be settled by the clash of abstract principles, nor is the solution predetermined by simple allegiance to liberal or conservative attitudes that have all but lost their meaning in the terrible fluidity of modern history.

In the decisions at issue, for example, as both the majority and disenting opinions make clear, some judgment of the House committee becomes almost inevitable. Justice Black's opinion was made explicit when he spoke of the committee's "own self-restraint, a characteristic which probably has not been predominant in the committee's work over the last few years."

It is the history of this committee—a history of little good, much confusion and harmful acrimony—that emphasizes the need for clearly defined restraints. As the situation now stands in the light of these most recent Court decisions, the committee is free to harass any of its critics if it states as a reason for inquiry a purpose that is even remotely plausible. Such trust should not be demanded of the citizen and, indeed, the committee under Representative WALTER has not shown that such trust is merited.

H.R. 2797 a Bill To Establish Procedure for Determination of Economic Justification of Certain Inland Waterway Improvement Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on January 16, 1961, I introduced H.R. 2797, which if enacted into law will make possible Interstate Commerce Commission participation in economic surveys of proposed waterway navigation projects.

The Federal Government each year expends vast sums of money for the construction and improvement of navigation facilities of the inland waterways of the United States. Congress regularly enacts legislation authorizing the future expenditure of additional amounts for such purposes. There is a fundamental weakness in the procedure by which these projects are approved and Federal funds authorized and appropriated therefor. It is that the agency of the Federal Government charged with the responsibility of regulating surface transportation in interstate commerce—the Interstate Commerce Commission—is not consulted concerning the economic value of the proposed waterway project as a transportation instrumentality. Nor is there any requirement that surveys, studies, and reports with respect to proposed waterway projects give consideration or weight to the national transportation policy declared by Congress in the

Transportation Act of 1940. The procedure followed has led to the authorization and construction of navigation projects that are not economically sound additions to our national transportation system.

Before a particular waterway improvement for navigation purposes is undertaken, a survey is normally authorized by Congress and is then made by the Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army through the division engineer and submitted to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors for review and recommendation. In making such surveys and reaching conclusions as to whether a particular project should or should not be undertaken, the Board is required by statute to consider the amount and character of commerce which will be benefitted by the improvements, the relationship of the cost of the improvement, both construction and maintenance, to the commercial interests involved, and the necessity for the work, together with the propriety of its being undertaken, continued, or maintained at the expense of the United States. The statutory requirements provide only a very general standard to guide the engineers in reaching their conclusion.

In actual practice to arrive at their recommendations, the Engineers first perform their appropriate function as engineers in estimating the total cost to build the project. From this they calculate annual costs, against which they balance "benefits," consisting almost wholly of assumed "savings" in transportation costs as compared with charges over existing means and routes of transportation. These so-called "savings" are, of course, not true economic savings but result principally from shifting true transportation costs from shippers to taxpayers through providing the waterway at public expense. The Engineers have no responsibility with respect to the welfare of the national transportation system and in recommending inland waterway improvements give little, if any, weight to the effect on other existing forms of transport. They have the sole responsibility for surveying, studying and reporting to Congress upon the economic feasibility of constructing or improving an inland waterway navigation facility.

On the other hand, to obtain a certificate to operate as a common carrier by water application must be made to the Interstate Commerce Commission and a certificate is issued only after an ICC finding that the proposed service is or will be required by the present or future public convenience and necessity. To obtain a permit to operate as a contract carrier by water application must be made to the ICC and a permit is issued only after an ICC finding that the proposed operation will be consistent with the public interest and the national transportation policy declared in the Interstate Commerce Act. These requirements, essential as they are to the development and coordination of a sound national transportation system, are largely ineffective where they come into play only after huge expenditures have already been made to construct or improve a waterway transportation facility which is unnecessary or undesirable in light of public convenience and necessity, the public interest and the national transportation policy. Once such a navigation project has been constructed, no matter how uneconomic it may be, it would be anomalous for the ICC to deny applications to operate over it. Clearly, if the Commission is to have control over the issuance of certificates and permits it should be the agency delegated by Congress to make recommendations with respect to the wisdom of the Government constructing additional waterways, the provision of which has so much bearing on the effective exercise of authority over certificates and permits.

The ICC, as the agency directly charged with responsibility for the effectuation of a sound national transportation policy and the maintenance of a sound national transportation system, should have a direct and vital role in determining the economic suitability of proposed inland waterway navigation projects.

H.R. 2797 would require that the ICC consider and report to the Corps of Engineers with respect to public convenience and necessity requirements of all proposed inland waterway construction or improvement projects favorably recommended by the Engineers and not yet commenced or less than 25 percent complete. It sets forth eight specific economic factors to be considered by the ICC in determining the economic justification of such proposals. It would require the Engineers to submit its surveys and reports containing recommendations favoring inland waterway projects to the ICC for its investigation and report. The bill would require the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and the Chief of Engineers in reaching their determination of the recommendation to be made to Congress concerning the desirability in the public interest of any inland waterway improvement to give due consideration to the ICC report. Moreover, it would provide for Congress to have for its consideration the independent report of the ICC for all inland waterway projects favorably recommended to it by the Engineers as well as for previously authorized projects not commenced or less than 25 percent complete.

The interjection of the Interstate Commerce Commission into the existing procedure by which inland waterway projects are recommended would not alter in any respect the requirement upon the Corps of Engineers to furnish an engineering, cost, and related study upon which the Congress may rely in determining the feasibility of a proposed project. It would simply provide additional data for the guidance of Congress in the form of the ICC report that is required to accompany the engineers' report. Such additional data is vital to the preservation and development of a sound national transportation system.

Who Pays the Bill?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it must already be apparent to anyone who has listened attentively to President Kennedy that he talks with two voices—some people call it double talk. With the voice of calm reassurance he undertakes to quiet the fears of the average businessman and leads him to believe that his primary concern is with the financial stability of the Nation. And then with a strident—although sometimes cajoling—voice he asks Congress to authorize a program designed to spend additional billions that are nowhere in sight from existing revenue sources.

The time is here when the President must be reminded that he cannot have it both ways. If business is to prosper and expand, if our economy is to remain strong, we simply must abandon the fallacious idea that all of these vast welfare ventures can be financed with borrowed money. And as usual the do-gooder refuses to reckon the cost of his philanthropy and he apparently does not give a tinker's hoot if in the process of bringing the better life to the backward and the benighted we wind up bankrupt.

To repeat, Mr. Kennedy cannot have it both ways. Either he is going to accompany each new spending plan with the outline of where we are going to get the money or he must stop trying to quiet apprehensive businessmen with reassuring platitudes relative to a stable currency and economy.

The Lancaster (Pa.) New Era has put this proposition in much better focus than I can and I am pleased to commend the following editorial to your attention:

WHO PAYS THE BILL?

In recent weeks President Kennedy has sent a number of messages to Congress recommending new programs, some of which he labels crucial and needing instant attention.

In many cases the programs themselves, or at least their goals sound wonderful. Their aims are to further peace in the world, bolster our economy and plug up some of the weak points. Few could argue against these goals.

All of the programs involve the spending of more money. No one really knows how much in total, although in some cases, like the $600 million aid to Latin America, the President spelled out the estimated cost.

If the President's programs add up to $10 to $15 billion more than present Federal expenditures, as many are predicting, the big question is where will the money come from?

Our budget already is squeezed and the administration is forecasting a deficit due to the business slowdown. Therefore, funds must come from new sources and there are only two of those we can think of at the moment—higher taxes or bigger debt.

An increase in taxes at this time will hardly stimulate business; and more debt would simply mean more inflation and a weaker dollar.

So what do we do, throw out the whole program? Obviously that isn't the answer. It is up to Congress now to cull and weed and trim. Congress must decide which programs must be done immediately, which may not be needed at all, and which would be better for the Nation if they were modified.

Each of us would probably like a bigger house, a better car, a boat, etc. All of these things sound wonderful, just like the President's proposals. But, do we really need them and can we afford them? That is a fair yardstick for Congress to use.

Congress Overplays Hunt for Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Providence, R.I., Evening Bulletin:

CONGRESS OVERPLAYS HUNT FOR UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

The House Un-American Activities Committee easily is the most controversial congressional committee in modern times. College professors, including 87 of them at Brown, have signed petitions to abolish it; ministers from the pulpit condemn its inquiries as a technique in thought control; college students picket the White House in protest against its aims.

The committee has its defenders. On the day students in the ranks of the National Committee To Abolish the Un-American Activities Committee picketed the White House, three other groups marched in Lafayette Park across from them in support of the committee. These other groups represented the Anti-Communist International, George Lincoln Rockwell's American Nazi Party, and a third organization called Fighting American Nationalists.

Here is evidence, then, that the Un-American Activities Committee continues to polarize Americans, one camp working to do away with it and the other just as vociferously defending it.

Controversy by itself is not harmful. It can be a distinct public good. It depends on what all the shouting is about. In our opinion, the Un-American Activities Committee is provoking a lot of unnecessary shouting and, therefore, has run out of a useful purpose for existing.

If the committee were the only major Government agency competent to sift evidence of Communist infiltration and to offer suggestions for legislation to combat it, the committee would deserve an extended lease on life. These were the purposes of the committee before it was organized as a standing, or permanent, committee, and it was productive. But since taking on permanent status in 1946, the committee also has assumed increasingly the role of guardian of public thought, and has called before it in inquisitorial manner men who were no closer to communism than Thomas Jefferson, and smeared them for their ideas. This, perhaps, is the reason former President Truman has characterized the committee as "the most un-American thing in the country today."

This is not to say that Communist infiltration is not a threat in the United States. We may be sure that it is. But the Un-American Activities Committee is no more competent to search it out and correct the cause by legislation than a victim can cure a common cold by swatting the virus with a flyswatter. The FBI and other antisubversive agencies are far better equipped to find subversion where it exists, and if legislation is needed to stop it, they always can get the ear of Congress.

Continuation of the Un-American Activities Committee as a standing committee is, in our opinion, unwarranted as long as there are better and less controversial ways of discovering the hows, whys, and wheres of Communist infiltration as a present or future danger.

An Unnecessary Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Mr. George Sokolsky appeared in the Washington Post of March 21.

I believe Mr. Sokolsky's point is very well taken, namely, that this is not a constitutional matter. I can find nothing in the Constitution in any way relating to a public school system, and that is hardly remarkable because when the Constitution was written there was no such system and any schools that existed were mostly in the hands of, and taught by, the clergy of the various denominations.

The Constitution states very clearly only one thing in regard to religion and that appears in article I of the Bill of Rights:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

How the church schools of this country can be said to be in contravention of this article of the Bill of Rights is certainly utter absurdity. These schools certainly do not establish any religion as a State religion, as they represent and are supported by every sect in our country, of which there are literally hundreds.

Mr. Speaker, an awful lot can be tied to the Constitution, but this is carrying such reasoning beyond the realm of logic:

AN UNNECESSARY ISSUE
(By George E. Sokolsky)

The quarrel between President Kennedy and the Roman Catholic Church is unnecessary and pointless.

The idea of having two bills, one covering aid to schools generally and the other making a special provision for private and church-related schools, is a political gimmick which is designed to avoid an unfavorable Supreme Court decision on the major bill, should it be passed by Congress. The tendency of the Supreme Court to legislate has an ulterior effect upon both the executive and legislative branches of the Government.

The argument over separation of church and state is unrelated to the Constitution, which has not one word to say on the subject. The assumption that financial aid to parochial schools establishes a church is obviously fallacious, for no established church governs our Armed Forces which has the largest and most effective chaplain service; also every meeting of Congress is opened by a clergyman who, if he desires, wears the uniform of his church on the occasion.

The Constitution is opposed to an established church; that is a government-owned church, like the Anglican Church, whose titular head is the Queen of England. Opposition to establishment did not mean and could not mean opposition to religion per se or to the right of parents to send their children to denominational rather than to secular schools.

True, taxes are used for public schools, the parents who send their children to denominational or other private schools paying double for the education of their children.

There are many kinds of denominational-connected schools in this country—Roman Catholic, Episcopalian, Lutheran, Jewish, Hasidic, Nation of Islam, etc. The largest are the Roman Catholic schools, which in a city like New York include about one-third of the school population, according to Charles Silver, president of the Board of Education.

In the discussion of Federal aid to education, the term aid is false. The money comes out of taxes which all citizens pay. In fact, the citizens pay more than they receive back because there is a diversion of funds between collection and expenditure that almost amounts to a brokerage fee by the Federal Government. If enough tax money were left for local communities, they would have sufficient funds to take care of their own schools and would use those funds in accordance with local public opinion.

Furthermore, three formulas are possible for the distribution of aid. One is that aid go to State governments to be expended according to their judgment without Federal supervision; another is the expansion of Federal supervision until all forms of local control over education disappear and a vast Federal system of education takes its place. A third possibility is the current mixed system in which local direction of schools is ostensible, but many controls are set up, such as State boards of regents, State universities, college entrance boards, supervision through State aid to schools, supervision through Federal aid to schools—until their individuality disappears and every school, up to college grades, becomes identic.

There are proponents and defenders of each of these systems which grow in authority from year to year, so that local control of education weakens.

The church-related school is old in American history. In fact, at the beginning all schools were church related and the teachers were clergymen.

Stop Talking America Into a Depression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I included the following letter from Mr. James M. Ward, manager of the Shenandoah, Iowa, Chamber of Commerce:

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Shenandoah, Iowa, February 16, 1961.

Hon. BEN F. JENSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JENSEN: Local businessmen are beginning to view with alarm the continuing statements by President Kennedy on the lack of confidence by the administration in the Nation's economy. Continued talk of unemployment and depression will no nothing but hurt our chance of pulling out of the current recession.

One of our local industries cites the following example: In January of this year their sales were 41 percent ahead of a year ago. By February 1, sales had dropped to 10 percent behind, and by February 14, to 23 percent behind year to date figures. This firm serves 48 States on a wholesale basis. Top company management attributes the fall off in their orders to a hesitancy on the part of consumers to buy, and it is their belief that "gloom and doom" statements by the administration are a major cause of this customer hesitancy.

On behalf of the Shenandoah business community, I urge action on the national level in reversing this trend of negative thinking. Let's not allow our country to be talked into a depression. Positive action on both the local and national level, playing up the bright spots in our economy and expressing confidence in the future will do much to restore the faith of the public in our country's future.

Yours very truly.

JAMES M. WARD,
Manager,
Shenandoah Chamber of Commerce.

Salute to the Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IVOR D. FENTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion recently celebrated the 42d anniversary of its founding, and we are proud of an organization whose patriotic principles are a guiding light in the darkest hours. Their sacrifices and services are an inspiration to all who would fight, and if need be, die for the principles of democracy.

The 13th District of the American Legion in Pennsylvania, of which I am a member, is ever active in the welfare of a free society, and is an outstanding credit to the Nation and the communities it serves.

The Pottsville Republican, an outstanding newspaper in my district and State, gave considerable recognition to our 13th District Legion when it published in its editorial columns an article penned by Veteran Walter Kraus, of Cumbola, the current adjutant of this active 13th Legion District.

My colleagues, I am pleased at the request of my World War I buddies to present this editorial from the March 17 issue of the Pottsville Republican as follows:

SALUTE TO THE LEGION

The American Legion is celebrating the 42d anniversary of its birth March 15 to 17. It was born at the historic caucus of delegates from the first American Expeditionary Force in Paris, France, in 1919. The organization was completed at the St. Louis, Mo., caucus, May 8, to 10, 1919.

It has come a long way since its cradle days.

Today the American Legion is a three-war organization. It draws its membership from the eligible veterans of World Wars I and II and of the Korean conflict. It counts its ranks by the millions. It has 17,000 community posts, most of which own their homes. Its resources, prestige, influence and power for good are truly king-sized. Its good name and public good will are solidly entrenced in grassroots appreciation of its civic virtues and unselfish services to communities, States and the Nation.

From its beginning the American Legion has been dedicated to the promotion of the best interests of America and of the defenders of America. It believes these two go together—that you cannot foster patriotic services without also fostering a high appreciation of them. In this postulate, history supports the American Legion. The downfall of every great empire was first preceded by a discount of public service.

The American Legion continues to be the most outspoken patriotic force in our Nation. It has never compromised its dynamic conviction of Americanism. It never leaves any doubt as to where it stands on matters that affect the welfare of America and preservation of our free institutions.

It always speaks out in crisp and salty language for what it considers best for America.

So a 42-gun salute to the American Legion on its 1961 anniversary as the host of all the citizen armies of our time, manned by businessmen and laborers, professors and farmers, Protestants, Catholics and Jews, colored and white, men and women, American patriots—charter members, champions of democracy and soldiers of peace—who have put aside their uniforms but have never laid down their arms.

Indian Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, today one of the great American tragedies is the plight of the American Indians, who as the first Americans were sole landlords of vast and untracked lands for about 20,000 years before descending to North America by way of the Bering Strait and the Aleutian Islands about 9,000 years ago.

Ben Franklin said of the Indians:

Savages we call them because their manners differ from ours, which we think the perfection of civility. They think the same of theirs.

Failure to recognize and act on the very serious and specialized problems of the Indians living in 24 States containing Federal Reservations, and those in Alaska, is not only a disservice to our Nation but perpetuates an injustice upon people from whom we borrowed certain lofty ideas of democracy for our own Constitution.

The progress of time has not been kind to the first Americans but has ravaged them culturally, economically, and socially. While much can be said of the successful efforts of some tribes to sustain their culture the effects of prejudice and assimilation are evident. The American Indian, once the epitome of many men in one man—dynamic, powerful, fearless, and proud as he roamed the plains, the mountains and valleys, is less proud and less fearless as he ekes out an existence. The Indians, through the years, have developed a certain resignation that their status quo will continue. Understandably, many are Americans—with reservati ns.

Millions of non-Indian Americans enjoy and take for granted the highest living standards anywhere in the world. By contrast, the vast majority of the more than 380,000 American Indians exist under standards and conditions which are a generation and a half behind the rest of their countrymen.

Only an integrated attack on existing conditions combined with a united cooperative effort on the part of the Congress, the Federal Government, industry, organizations, and Indian leaders to improve the economic and social climate will avoid further degradation and decadence of the American Indians, who in spite of conditions are increasing, not vanishing. Indian children born today soon learn to expect little from the future. Many are without education because of inadequate school facilities. There is nothing ahead but more deaths in the first year of life; more disease from tuberculosis, heart, and infections; more outside toilets designated by health authorities as unsanitary; more unsanitary and contaminated water supply; and more brush wickiups (constructed of saplings or yucca fronds), brush shelters, hogans, tepees, wigwams, tar paper shacks consisting of one or two rooms with dirt floors, which more often than not are occupied by large families. Few are electrified, heated, or have adequate facilities for disposal of garbage and refuse.

These are but a few of the hard and sober facts as to what a large percentage of the Indians have experienced throughout their lifetime and what Indian youth faces today unless action is taken. We know what such conditions have brought in other nations.

Let's leave the disquieting effects induced by depicting the truth of the bleak and seemingly hopeless situation of the Indians and let's review a step taken recently which has created a new climate for seeking feasible solutions to the housing problem of Indians.

Both my colleague, BEN REIFEL, and I appreciated the opportunity to make a few remarks at the first American Indian Housing Conference held January 23 and 24 at the National Housing Center in Washington. The sponsor of the conference was Arrow, Inc., a nonprofit Indian organization. Sixty or more American Indians representing 25 different tribes attended. Arrow invited Government agencies, Members of the House and Senate, representatives from Senate and House Interior and Insular Affairs Committees, other organizations, private industry, tribal attorneys and inter-

ested individuals, directly or indirectly, concerned with Indian affairs to participate. The purpose of the conference was two-fold. First, Indian tribal leaders were given the opportunity to identify their general housing problems and to enumerate at length the difficulties Indians encounter in meeting the credit eligibility requirements necessary to purchase homes with mortgages insured by the Federal Government. Secondly, the representatives of the various Government agencies, particularly FHA and PHA, explained the laws and regulations governing their existing programs and services, which can be and have been utilized to assist Indians in upgrading their living standards. In addition, participants discussed areas which may require remedial, amendatory or new legislation. Efforts were made by legal counsels of the Housing agencies to determine which agency should appropriately have the major role in assisting Indians to improve their housing.

The Indian reservation lands, comprising many, many millions of acres present complex problems which must be resolved before a workable solution in Indian housing can be initiated. The complexities surrounding Indian lands are compounded by the fact that some of the land is restricted from being sold, mortgaged or leased because it is owned by the tribe and as tribal land is held in common by tribal members. Other land is allotted land, owned by individual Indians, but before it can be sold, the consent of the Secretary of the Interior must be obtained since it is trust land.

I commend Arrow, and all the participating agencies, individuals and organizations, and the Indians for their candor in discussing difficult and somewhat sensitive problems and for contributing a reservoir of important information. The success or failure of any such meeting depends largely upon the prevailing atmosphere in which the meeting is conducted.

Particularly, however, I want to express a special thank you to the Federal Housing Administration who was asked by Arrow to take the lead in the conference work. FHA officials gave generously and willingly of their time and knowledge about the agency's existing programs and services which have already been successfully used in Arizona and which can be used by individual Indians and groups of Indians in other areas in the transition to better housing.

The conference succeeded in getting across to the Indian representation that on the part of the Federal Government housing agencies there is genuine concern and desire to help all Indians to have decent, safe, and sanitary housing. The housing officials urged the Indian leaders to return to their tribes and decide on the kind of housing best suited to their needs. They should engage competent land planners and architects to carefully plan and develop a housing program with the aid of FHA consulting and advisory services.

A new spirit was born at this first American housing conference. It is a spirit which has rekindled hope in the minds and hearts of the Indians for a brighter future for their children and it has stirred the imagination of the Federal housing agencies to continue to explore every way in which Indians may share the productivity of our Nation both economically and socially as well as safeguarding their rights to benefit from the marvelous development we envision for the future.

The conferees adopted the following resolution at the conclusion of the conference which I anticipate will be properly presented to the new FHA Commissioner:

Whereas the first conference on Indian housing sponsored by Arrow, Inc., has focused attention of various agencies, groups, and individuals on the serious problem of Indian housing: Be it

Resolved, That—

A. A Coordinating Committee on Indian Housing be formed by the Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration including but not limited to Department of the Interior; Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Department of Agriculture; Federal Housing Administration; Public Housing Administration; Veterans' Administration; Indian representation; tribal attorney representation; industry representation whose function it will be to (1) examine existing public housing programs to determine their application to Indian need; (2) recommend such administration changes as may be necessary, and possible in rules, regulations, and procedures so that housing programs may be made available for Indian people; (3) recommend such amendatory or supplemental legislation as may be necessary to make housing programs available to Indian people; (4) stimulate activity in all organizations they represent to provide at all times under existing authority full opportunity for Indians to participate in housing programs; (5) take such other action possible to accomplish the objective of adequate housing for Indians.

B. Regional and other sectional meetings on Indian housing be promoted by Indian groups and tribes to reach better understanding of needs and desires of Indian people for housing. Reports on these meetings to be forwarded to the above coordinating committee.

C. Appreciation be extended to Arrow, National Congress of American Indians, Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the Federal Housing Administration as well as other agencies, groups and individuals for their interest in housing problems of Indian people.

Unemployment and Foreign Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE R. KORNEGAY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, in the light of the current and intense interest in the effect of the import of foreign textiles and textile products on our domestic industry, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the contents of a brochure recently issued by Mr. Spencer Love, chairman and president of Burlington Industries, Inc., entitled "Unemployment and Foreign Trade." I believe the Members of the House will be interested in Mr. Love's timely discussion of this problem:

UNEMPLOYMENT AND FOREIGN TRADE

(By Spencer Love)

We in the textile industry believe that American trade policy is outmoded, unrealistic and based on erroneous concepts of today's world conditions.

The import, trade, and foreign investment polices as encouraged and practiced over the last decade will in our opinion continue to expand our home roster of unemployed. President Kennedy has shown great concern over depressed areas and the need for helping them. If he cannot, however, correct some basic trade concepts he will find new trouble areas springing up about as fast as he can remedy those already existing. Many such areas are as a result of the shrinking of the textile and allied industries which alone directly employ over 2 million people.

The concept that more and more trade of any sort is good per se, and tends toward world peace and growth is a basically erroneous one. Imports or expansions of manufactured goods coming into one country from another which tend to undercut existing domestic industries already operating at less than capacity can be strong irritants to good relationships, and can create serious repercussions and antagonisms.

Except for some few notable exceptions we appear to be the only so-called free and thoroughly industrialized Nation where there is substantial unemployment which is tolerating increasing imports of manufactured articles. At the same time billions of our capital are going abroad into countries where such expansion of capital is not particularly needed, mainly because there appears to be a better investment return abroad. In many instances—and mark this—many manufacturers who are investing abroad have their eye on utimately bringing these more cheaply manufactured items back into the United States. There are many who will approve a drive for increasing exports of manufactured goods as a worthy endeavor. At the same time they know and say privately that it is foolish to think that we can importantly increase our exports of manufactured goods against growing and intensified worldwide competition from cheap labor countries. Many of those who give lip service to the export drive are quietly placing large sums of their new investment money into plants overseas.

Current trade policy evolved when our only major competition in manufactured goods was from the old Western European industries who were way behind us in mass production methods. Now we find ourselves faced with a rapidly advancing technology in the Western European countries and even more rapid advances in the cheap labor oriental countries—also Spain, Portugal, and the Middle East—not to mention what we will soon be facing from behind the Iron Curtain. Attempts to make adjustments to these rapidly changing conditions via the tariff route are bound to be abortive, because tariffs high enough to give reasonable protection against the exploitation of oriental and coolie labor would be prohibitive to the traditional amounts of specialties from our European neighbors and friends. GATT is admittedly out of date and no longer able to cope with present situations, such as the regional trading blocs.

In the textile industry our competition comes from all over the world. The Western European countries have wage scales something under half of ours. In addition they can buy most of their raw materials considerably cheaper than we can. They can even secure our own cotton at about 25 percent off our supported price and send it back to us in manufactured goods. Such countries as Hong Kong, Japan, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and many others with efficient plants have wage scales far lower than

Europe and constitute a threat to Western Europeans as well as to us. In these operations low wages, low raw material costs, low overhead, low taxes and the absence of protective laws for labor can be exploited to the fullest. Even with all our productivity and versatility only a fool would claim we can compete with such conditions under our wage scales and other rules. Make no mistake—these people have modern plants—they are efficient and resourceful.

In all the countries I have named, technological progress over decades has been leapfrogged and in the Orient wages are 10 to 20 percent of our legal minimum. Many of these countries tend to concentrate their expansion in a few products such as textiles. Our present policy encourages overexpansion, often gives them our machines and know-how and will ultimately permit them to wreck the established markets of the highly advanced Western World.

Lest you feel I am making a specific attack on the Japanese may I say that the Japanese were smart enough to understand these dangers and their inevitable consequences to international good will and negotiated reasonable textile quotas about 4 years ago through our Government. The Japanese should be commended for so doing. The Japanese, however, now feel frustrated and irritated over this because, while they have been living with reasonable limits, other areas have stepped into the breach and expanded enormously their exports to the United States.

Over the last year or two the largest expansions in imported textiles have come from or through the Hong Kong area. I hardly need point out that there can be no excuse along lines of international peace or good will, or other moral justification, for bringing enormous prosperity to the limited few who are exploiting the Hong Kong situation. It doesn't take much imagination to understand why the Japanese are quite restive and threatening to reverse their present policy of self-restraint.

The importance of early action cannot be minimized. Imports have more than doubled over the last couple of years and at the present rate of increase we will have no industry left worth mentioning in 5 or 6 years. New capital is sedulously avoiding our industry, as witnessed by the price of our securities. Yet once these countries have gained specific footholds in our markets, limitations cutting back such positions could be a source of serious friction, when by contrast there could be very little complaint against setting up reasonable quotas or limitations before dangerous levels are too well established.

The times call for bold action which disregards many past concepts. It is estimated that about 13 million will be added to our work forces during the next 10 years. When we add to this projection the 5.5 million workers unemployed now, plus the millions more on short time, the conclusion is inescapable that America's No. 1 problem is to assure expanding job opportunities for American workers.

There is undoubtedly great confusion on the entire subject of promoting trade and foreign investments. There is a vast difference between investment for profit in well-developed countries and invesement which may truly aid undeveloped countries or tend to spread further the cause of peace. A large amount of our investment capital is going to Europe. Most of Europe no longer needs such capital, and these moves may soon become much more a source of friction than a source of help. They are hurting our dollar balances.

At the present time our textile industry is in a much deeper recession than the average of the economy. This appears to be because our greatly improved year in 1959 invited an enormous new flood of imports. In this fashion our heads were chopped off before we had reached a level of profit return that would bring our stocks up to book value and attract capital on a fair basis for needed replenishment and modernization in the industry. I will not review the facts and figures of industry shrinkage, though I might observe here that about half of our worsted and woolen industry has now vanished, which of itself creates an alarming situation.

Before it is too late, before many new potential frictions are generated, before unemployment becomes too high, we must find solutions to these problems and we must adopt new and bold philosophies for directing world trade in keeping with today's facts of life. Solutions in the end must promote profitable trade in needed items among the nations of the world, but must provide protection against the impact of coming Communist and cheap labor competition in consumer goods and it must promote expansion of job opportunities here at home. Neither we nor the world will gain in the long run by our continued exportation of jobs, nor will anyone gain if we are forced to pull our living standards down and thus destroy the example we have been setting to the world of what can be done in distributing our wealth more and more broadly and improving the living standards of the masses.

The way we can be helpful to the rest of the world is to protect our jobs and keep our economy strong; then direct whatever surplus we can spare carefully and systematically toward helping improving living, health, and educational conditions of the underdeveloped countries. Such needs are much more basic and important to the masses of those countries than premature industrialization, which has all too often only resulted in the great enrichment of a few on a purely happenstance basis; these few in so many instances in the past have proven to be individuals or corporations who have no particular interest in improving the welfare of the masses. Hence they have speeded rather than deterred communistic tendencies.

Key to Farm Surplus Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the President has recently sent us his message on American agriculture. In his able analysis of the situation he points out that "our farmers deserve praise, not condemnation; and their efficiency should be a cause for gratitude, not something for which they are penalized." The same important point is made in the following article from last month's issue of the Oregon-Washington Farmer Union written by my friend Al Lamb. I think my colleagues will find it of interest:

MANAGED SUPPLY—NOT SOIL BANK—IS KEY TO FARM SURPLUS PROBLEM

(By Al Lamb, board member, Oregon-Washington Farmers Union)

The raw material for an example of nature's power is pouring in daily. Unfortunately the communications media in and out of Red China will likely prevent the whole story from being told. The story can be summarized in one sentence, "The great leap forward has fallen on its face." Evidence of this popped up recently at odd spots throughout the world. Item: East Germany began buying soybeans on free world markets. Item: Red China purchased 500,000 tons of Australian grain and some estimates indicate purchases may have been another 200,000 tons higher. Item: Canada sold Red China 28 million bushels of wheat and 12 million bushels of barley in one of the largest commercial sales ever made by our northen neighbor.

Remember Red China is the second largest producer of soybeans in the world. Her Iron Curtain cronies that depend on Chinese beans were acting like this year's crop had been a failure—witness items 1 and 2 above. The Chinese communes are being remodeled into more Russian-styled collective farms. One reason we don't assimilate all this evidence more quickly is due to the phenomenal ability of the American farmers to produce. Let's examine evidence to this effect. Item: U.S. population has increased 20 percent in the last 10 years and these people were fed the widest variety of food at the lowest relative cost in history. This was accomplished on 5 percent less acreage, on 20 percent fewer farms with 20 percent less labor. Item: We have grown from a nation in which 1 of every 4 workers had to produce food into a nation in which 1 farmer produces food for 24. In Russia one agricultural worker still produces enough food for only four or five people. If our farmers were no more efficient than the Russians, 22½ million workers would have to leave work in nonfarm business and return to food production.

Not only do we passively accept the American farmer's success, but many people damn him for it rather than respect him for it. The fruits of the farmer's ingenuity and nature's benevolence become "burdensome surpluses" rather than "bountiful harvests." We think it is time to reappraise our values and put our abundance in the proper perspective. Retiring acres and paying the farmer for producing nothing is one approach—a completely negative one. Rewarding full production by skillfully maintaining and distributing valuable supplies of foodstuff is another approach—a positive one. Surpluses are not a liability.

Abundance is an asset. We have a chance to dramatically show the world that our system is far superior to any other. Let's not ignore the eloquent example of Red China's agricultural failure. Let's capitalize on it. And let's never forget how quickly mother nature can wipe out apparently adequate reserves of grain. When properly directed our reserve of foodstuffs will continue to be the most valuable weapon for peace in the free world's arsenal.

Abolish the HUAC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Century of January 4, 1961:

ABOLISH THE HUAC

Numerous prints of a movie called "Operation Abolition" are now being circulated throughout the country. The movie is presented as a documentary coverage of student demonstrations during the meeting of the

House Committee on Un-American Activities in San Francisco, May 12–14, and suggests that the demonstrations were Communist led and inspired. Evidence mounts that the film, which opens with an introduction by Congressman FRANCIS E. WALTER, chairman of the committee, has been highly doctored to give the impression of mob action. Comments Reporter magazine: "The film shows students displaying defiance after police warnings, although actually the demonstrations occurred at a completely different time." In this issue (p. 14) we print the substance of a statement made at the fifth General Assembly of the National Council of Churches by Robert Moon, Methodist minister of San Leandro, Calif. His plea was referred to the NCC's Divsion of Christian Life and Work for investigation. We hope that such an investigation will be made speedily. If the reports we have received are accurate, the House Un-American Activities Committee has distorted the truth for propaganda purposes. Fiction is being presented to the public as though it were fact and the reputations of the students at the University of California in Berkeley are being unjustly and unnecessarily maligned. Who will curb the un-American activities of the Un-American Activities Committee? From its formation this committee has year after year done more harm than good. The American thing to do is to abolish it. Such an "operation abolition" would be in the best interest of the Nation.

Upsetting Anti-Red Dictators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Columnist Constantine Brown, in his syndicated column which appeared in the Washington Evening Star March 21, discussed a subject which certainly should receive the full attention of the Congress and especially the committees dealing with foreign relations. I submit this article and suggest that it be most thoughtfully considered:

UPSETTING ANTI-RED DICTATORS—POLITICAL WISDOM OF U.S. MOVE AGAINST PORTUGAL IN U.N. IS QUESTIONED

(By Constantine Brown)

Our dedication to seeing democratic governments established everywhere and our abhorrence of dictatorships are well known and appreciated by most of our friends throughout the world.

Only one facet of our present foreign policy drive is being questioned: Is it politically wise at this time of intensive world crisis to attempt to tumble dictatorships which are loyal to the cause of the free world and at the same time court and encourage Communist and pro-Communist regimes?

Have we learned nothing, it is asked, from the mistakes of the Eisenhower administration which brought the Castro gang to power in Cuba.

It appears that the new administration which has more energetic men than the Eisenhower government had in its last 3 years has chosen to continue and speed up these policies which caused even Republicans to castigate their own administration.

A case in point is our attitude toward Portugal which has been run successfully and for the good of the majority of its people by the benevolent Dictator Salazar, a former professor of political science. This reporter has received recently letters from American friends in Lisbon. They write about the efforts of a minority in Portugal—mostly intellectuals and students—to overthrow Salazar. There is no such desire, they say, among the Portuguese masses who live a relatively plentiful life. The leaders of the ring want more than drastic domestic reforms such as took place at our instigation in South Korea. Their battle cry includes also Portuguese neutralism. They want their country to leave the NATO, have diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union, Communist China, and their satellites, and neutralize the American airbase in the Azores.

On the surface the movement in Portugal cannot be described as Communist, but merely as an effort to obtain unadulterated democracy. All the same, it serves the strategic objectives of international communism.

The minority which is planning to overthrow Salazar uses Washington's attitude of "displeasure with the regime" as one of its main cards. America enjoys a tremendous prestige in the Iberian Peninsula. Salazar's opponents have taken advantage of the *Santa Maria* incident to point to the friendly attitude of the United States toward the would-be Portuguese revolutionaries and Washington's hostility toward the Salazar regime. But the incident and our complacent attitude toward Captain Galvao, the leader of the heterogeneous band which committed an act of piracy on the high seas, would have been a passing incident had it not been for our more recent attitude in the United Nations.

Last week the chief American delegate to the United Nations, Ambassador Adlai Stevenson, sided with the Soviet Union in the vote intended to castigate Portugal for its policies of oppression in its African area of Angola. The measure was defeated despite the American and Soviet vote.

Lisbon apparently interpreted our action as a gesture of the very liberal-minded Adlai Stevenson. Reports were circulated in this country, and abroad, that he had not consulted President Kennedy or Secretary of State Dean Rusk before casting his vote. The White House promptly denied the rumors and announced that Mr. Stevenson had acted on instruction from Washington, and that his vote represented our policy toward colonialism. This caused more than a temporary disturbance in Lisbon, where a highly responsible official stated unofficially: "We can protect ourselves from our enemies. But who can protect us from friends like the Americans who attack us in the U.N. when our hands are full?"

And, indeed, the hands of the Salazar Government are full. This is not due to any genuine difficulty within the country, but because of the incursions from the Congo into the northern portions of Angola. So far, some 80 to 100 Portuguese and peaceful Angolans have been massacred.

The efforts of Portugal to reestablish order in its own territory are going to be described in the U.N. as oppression. The murderous acts of the men who massacred the peaceful population are already being described as a freedom movement.

The African-Asian delegations to the U.N. are expected to soon make a request for a debate on the worsening situation in Angola, charging that Portugal is violating human rights and that the situation is a potential threat to international peace.

"K" Economics by Kennedy and Keynes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, the first 2 months of the Kennedy administration reveals a trend that merges the Kennedy New Frontierism with Keynesianism which heads us to more spending and more inflation.

The acceptance of the Keynesian economic philosophy by the Kennedy advisers is pointed out by Mr. Henry Hazlitt in a recent issue of Newsweek magazine under the heading of "Kennedian Economics."

It is worth considering in view of some of the proposals being presented to us during this session. It follows:

KENNEDIAN ECONOMICS

(By Henry Hazlitt)

Mr. Kennedy's economic program raises so many questions simultaneously that it seems best to discuss some of them in a series of brief notes.

Campaign document: The President's economic message of February 2 is a partisan document. It professes to be dealing with a crisis brought on by the apathy of his predecessor. "In the past 7 (i.e., Eisenhower) years, our rate of growth has slowed down disturbingly." Slowed down from what? In the 8 Eisenhower years our gross national product grew, in real terms, by 23.7 percent, or about 3 percent a year. Over the preceding 8 Truman years it grew 8.1 percent, or 1 percent a year.

The growth game: The fact that the American economy reached the highest production on record in 1960, at $503 billion, is treated not as an achievement but as a disgrace. This was nothing compared with what it ought to have done: "It was capable of producing at least $535 billion." If it had done what it ought, then $20 billion more personal income could have been earned * * *. Corporate profits could have been $5 billion higher" and everyone could have had a job. The growth slogans may be economic hocus-pocus, but they are a wonderful political device. No matter what an economy has done, it can always be argued that it ought to have done better, and that your own remedies would have done it.

Spending cure-all: Mr. Kennedy's own chief remedy is spending, spending in every direction, more and faster spending on agriculture, on housing, on highways, on urban renewal, on unemployment compensation, on depressed areas, on distribution of surplus food, on school lunches, on veterans, on defense contracts, on education, on flood control, on irrigation, on forests, on long-range energy resource development, and on a beefed up and expanded social security program.

No budget at all: How much would all this increased spending come to? Mr. Kennedy does not say. His message not only fails to give any total, but even the cost of the chief individual items. He is content to say that "the programs I am now proposing will not by themselves unbalance the budget which was earlier submitted"—apparently for the reason that he expects a deficit anyway, so

what difference can a few more billion make? We are to operate, apparently, with no budget at all.

To be sure: "This administration is pledged to a Federal revenue system that balances the budget over the years of the economic cycle—yielding surpluses for debt retirement in times of high employment that more than offset the deficits which accompany—and indeed help overcome—low levels of economic activity in poor years." The political advantage of this system is that no one can ever hold you to account, because no one knows when an economic cycle has begun or ended, or just where we are in it, or when employment is ever high enough to take the terrible risk of balancing or overbalancing the budget. We have already had 24 budget deficits in the last 30 years. The record will become even worse if we adopt the indeterminate cyclical-balance theory as official doctrine.

Social security: The most reckless spending proposal of all is that increasing social security commitments in all directions. The OASDI program has long cried for expert reappraisal and study. Its unfunded liabilities have been estimated by actuaries as already from $350 billion to $650 billion. The month-long strikes, riots, and violence in Belgium, when the Government proposed very moderate reductions in the social security benefits which some groups had got used to, were an ominous warning to other nations of the political as well as economic dangers of overcommitment. Social security benefits are easy to raise, enormously difficult to reduce.

Inflation: In brief, the Kennedy economic program accepts lock, stock, and barrel the Keynesian economic philosophy, which never sees the cure for unemployment in any adjustment of wages, prices, or costs, but only in more and more spending and inflation.

Division of Indian Health Employees Scholarship Fund in the Aberdeen, S. Dak., Area Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest projects of a group of Federal employees that has come to my attention is the Division of Indian Health Employees Scholarship Fund in the Aberdeen, S. Dak., area office.

The program was begun in 1958 when it was discovered that a number of Indian students desiring to continue their education in health programs were unable to do so because of lack of sufficient funds. The employees in the Division of Indian Health decided to take the initiative and establish a scholarship program to meet this need.

In addition to contributions by employees, various fundraising activities have been conducted including dances, bingo parties and the like. The employees and their families contributed of their time and energy in making these affairs successful, thus adding to the scholarship fund.

During the 1960–61 school year, six students received scholarships totaling $1,962. The scholarship fund currently contains $1,800.12 in savings and $509.50 in their checking account, for a total reserve of $2,309.62.

I would like to commend Dr. James R. Shaw, Chief of the Division of Indian Health, and Dr. Donald McNaughton, medical officer in charge of the Aberdeen area, for this fine effort, and their encouragement of the employees in the Division to assist in this very worthwhile endeavor.

House Backs "Know Communism" Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the American Bar News of March 15, 1961:

HOUSE BACKS "KNOW COMMUNISM" POLICY

The house of delegates of the American Bar Association has gone on record as urging the legal profession and the public to encourage and support the Nation's high schools and colleges to provide adequate instruction in the techniques and objectives of communism so as to better prepare young Americans to meet the challenge to our system of freedom under law.

HOUSE UNANIMOUS

The action was taken without a dissenting vote at the midyear meeting of the 258-member house in Chicago on February 20–21. The resolution calls upon members of the ABA, and the legal profession at large, to lead in mobilizing public support for teachers and school officials who wish to strengthen their school curricula in this area but have in the past been hesitant to do so because of uncertainty about public understanding. The resolution adopted by the house was presented by a special committee which held a 2-day conference with a dozen leading educators in Washington, D.C., on January 26–27. The educators unanimously endorsed the resolution. As adopted by the house it reads:

Whereas we recognize the urgency of instructing all Americans in the full scope and aims of communism and the increasing threat it poses to the free world and to our democracy and freedom under law to the end that an informed citizenry may successfully defend and preserve our American heritage; and

Whereas our educational institutions, both public and private, especially at the secondary, college and adult levels, afford the best means of developing sound programs of instruction in this area; and

Whereas these institutions and educators, in accepting this responsibility, must be given public understanding and support; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the American Bar Association:

(1) That through our members and the cooperation of State and local bar associations we encourage and support our schools and colleges in the presentation of adequate instruction in the history, doctrines, objectives and techniques of communism, thereby helping to instill a greater appreciation of democracy and freedom under law and the will to preserve that freedom;

(2) That to insure the highest quality of instruction in this area, those responsible for our educational programs be urged to provide the appropriate training of instructors and to stimulate the production of scholarly text books and other teaching materials of professional excellence;

(3) That we seek to implement this resolution through a special committee of seven members to observe and encourage progress in this educational program and to render annual reports to the association, the committee to include the chairmen of our Committees on American Citizenship, the Bill of Rights, and Communist Tactics, Strategy and Objectives, and one or more of our members who are educators.

PUBLIC SUPPORT NEEDED

In a report accompanying the resolution, the conference committee said: "Public understanding and support for this educational program will be essential. It is to be hoped that our members and the State and local bar associations will assist in developing proper understanding and in mobilizing public support."

"This program will be beset with many obstacles," the report added. "There are even those who deem it treasonable to mention communism in the classroom. Pressures and emotions will be brought to play upon any textbooks and educational aids. There will be those who fear that a well-meaning program may itself become infiltrated or perverted. A great host of patriotic educators, with proper public support, can see that these pitfalls and obstacles are avoided or overcome."

PRESS PRAISES PLAN

In the first days following the house of delegates action leading newspapers of the country, and many educators, expressed enthusiastic approval of the step. The gist of the press comment was that understanding the methods and aims of communism is the best defense against it, because the record of communism offers its own indictment of the system.

Through its president, Kenneth D. Wells, the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge offered its support and services to the ABA on "the plans you have in the fields of education and instruction on international communism."

The Rails Speak Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial as it appeared in the Washington Evening Star of March 21, 1961.

THE RAILS SPEAK OUT

The Nation's railroad industry is not crying wolf in its appeal to Congress, and more basically to public opinion, for help in treating its economic ailments.

There is plentiful evidence that the ailments exist, and that they have been getting steadily worse in recent years. The Association of American Railroads estimates, for example, that the profit rate of the carriers in 1959 was at the bottom of a list of 70 major industrial groups, that net income in 1960 was the lowest since 1949 and that 27 out of 106 Class I roads operated in the red last year. Employment of 780,000 on the carriers themselves was down 43 percent from 1946, and the job loss on the roads and in the industries supplying the rails has been increasingly heavy in the past 3 or 5

years. Unused capacity is calculated as high as 75 percent by some sources, a figure that represents a staggering waste of costly facilities.

In this period of declining fortunes, and a declining share percentagewise of both freight and passenger hauling, the rails have made efforts to help themselves. In 15 postwar years, expenditures of private capital for modernization of equipment and facilities have totaled about $15 billion. Currently, railroad managements are turning to merger possibilities as holding greatest promise of improved service and operating economies, but all of these call for the time-consuming examination and approval by governmental authorities. For the first time in years, there is hope that a Presidential commission will find a solution acceptable both to management and labor on the long-standing work rules controversy.

At this point, the rails are declaring war against what they consider the greatest obstruction to their well-being—discrimination in favor of competing services (air, highway, and water) at all levels of government. Their battlecry is a demand for four freedoms—from discriminatory regulation, discriminatory taxation, subsidized competition, and restrictions against providing a diversified transportation service. In place of these disadvantages, they ask equality of treatment, with the example to be set in the first instance by the Federal Government. Actually, most of what they ask has been recommended in numerous studies by governmental and private bodies over a long period of years.

Basically, the developing plight of the rails has not lacked attention: it has lacked action. There is no assurance that the result will be different now, unless government (at all levels) faces up to the fact that eventual deterioration of the railroad system could be damaging to the national economy in peacetime and disastrous to the Nation in wartime.

Wheelchair Club Will Send 100th Chair Abroad for Easter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article from the Wilkes-Barre Sunday Independent of March 19, 1961, which reports the truly humanitarian accomplishments of the Wheelchair Club, Inc., of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., founded and directed by Mrs. Paul Bedford. My compliments to Mrs. Bedford and her fine organization for the noble undertaking which they have successfully pursued for a number of years.

The article follows:

WHEELCHAIR CLUB WILL SEND 100TH CHAIR ABROAD FOR EASTER

Wheelchair Club, Inc., founded and directed by Mrs. Paul Bedford of this city, filled its annual 100-chair goal of wheelchairs for shipment overseas prior to the Easter holidays with the delivery of 10 chairs last week to the United Old Age Home in Jerusalem.

Mrs. Bedford said yesterday that requests from overseas for wheelchairs continue to arrive at her West South Street residence and she has always attempted to get 100 chairs overseas each year prior to Easter.

"Thus far we have been most successful," she reported. "I have to thank all the people who have assisted me in this work. I know the joy of Easter will be in the hearts of those who have received the chairs and those individuals wo have made it possible."

Mardi Gras Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, on February 10, 1961, the Louisiana Society had its annual New Orleans Mardi Gras celebration in Washington. I was not able to be present for that occasion but a representative of the Louisiana oil and gas fraternity, from my congressional district, Mr. Nicholas H. Wheless, Jr., made a most inspiring address at a luncheon in Washington in connection with this celebration.

This speech, although short, was very complimentary to the Louisiana delegation and was well thought out. I have therefore asked that it be made a part of the official RECORD at this point:

REMARKS BY N. H. WHELESS, JR., AT LUNCHEON IN OLD SUPREME COURT ROOM—FEBRUARY 10, 1961, IN CONNECTION WITH WASHINGTON MARDI GRAS CELEBRATION

Members of the Louisiana delegation, queens and maids and all Louisianians in attendance, I am privileged to bring you warmest greetings from the Louisiana oil and gas fraternity. In addition, I am charged with the pleasant task of expressing the appreciation of our people for the Louisiana delegation in the Congress of the United States.

Our Louisiana delegation has achieved recognition in many facets of government endeavor. They are without exception men intimately acquainted with their State, and dedicated to the service of all the United States.

We in the oil and gas business know them particularly for their understanding of our industry. This is no accident—all of our representatives have oil or gas production in their districts; 60 of the 64 parishes represented by our two Senators have petroleum production. One out of every eight Louisiana worker derives income from some phase of the oil and gas business—some 89,000 persons.

Our Louisiana Senators and Representatives represent the fastest-growing oil and gas area in the Nation. Over the last decade 40 percent of all the new reserves of oil and gas found in the United States was discovered under Louisiana soil or water bottom. This is an impressive record. A good share of the credit for its achievement should be given to the men who have labored diligently to create and maintain a healthy petroleum industry.

Louisiana once was predominantly agricultural. Now it ranks second among the States in both production and reserves of oil and gas. It has the third largest refinery capacity among the States and its petrochemical output is high.

But the real significance of oil and gas to Louisiana is in its role as a supplier of energy to America. For 67 percent of all the energy consumed in the United States is derived from petroleum—and Louisiana is the second largest source.

Energy consumption is translated into goods and services—into progress and prosperity. America's intelligent use of energy is the key to its stature as the foremost nation in the world.

Our congressional delegation, in its informed presentation of the oil and gas industry's problems and achievements, is acting in the best interest of all the people of this country. We commend them to you—not only for their service to us, the people of Louisiana, but for their equally great service to this Nation.

Professors Engage in Shallow Thinking About House Un-American Activities Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, 250 professors from 79 of the country's universities and colleges have proven to the Nation the truth to the saying that "a little learning is a dangerous thing."

These are the educators who joined the American Civil Liberties Union in its lang-range campaign against the House Committee on Un-American Activities. These professors, by their action, indicate that they are unread men, unversed in what is taking place in the world today. They appear to be unaware of a Communist conspiracy which would engulf this country were it not for the host of loyal Americans—perhaps less educated than the degreed professors but at least less gullible.

It was Alexander Pope who wrote of a little learning being a dangerous thing and the full test of the verse should be sound advice to the professors. What Pope wrote follows:

A little learning is a dangerous thing;
Drink deep, or taste not the Pierian spring:
There shallow draughts intoxicate the brain,
And drinking largely sobers us again.

I would suggest that the professors "drink largely" of the documented publications, the speeches of men who have the facts at hand, and of the public records of the Subversive Activities Control Board and committees of Congress. Shallow drinking and shallow thinking are apparently fellow travelers.

Mr. David Lawrence ably presents the case against the professors in a recently syndicated article which follows:

SUPREME COURT UNDER NEW FIRE—PROFESSORS HIT FOR SEEKING ABOLITION OF UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE

Not so very long ago those persons who publicly criticized the Supreme Court of the United States for its "desegregation" decision were being accused of defiance of our judicial institutions or of trying to undermine their prestige. But no such treatment probably is in store for the 250 "leading American professors" in 79 universities and colleges who have just issued to the press of the Nation a bitter statement criticizing the Supreme Court.

They object to the fact that the Supreme Court in two successive cases has declared

constitutional the right of the House Committee on Un-American Activities to require witnesses under certain circumstances to answer questions about Communist activities in America. Indeed, this is today the low of the land.

The professors, in their statement, contend that they are dedicated to the proposition that free inquiry and free expression nourish mental growth and are thus basic to the Nation's growth. But then the same 250 professors go on to demand the abolition of the House Committee because they do not agree with its expressions of opinion or its attempts to elicit information about Communist operations in this country.

While the same statement condemns trial by publicity, the officials of the American Civil Liberties Union—who say they canvassed the professors to obtain their signatures—announce that this organization is engaged in a long-range campaign against the continuance of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

It is not clear just what the professors want to accomplish outside or inside American colleges and universities, though there is an implication that they believe they have a right to carry this type of controversy directly to their classrooms. Presumably there would be nobody with similar knowledge present on the other side to rebut their arguments before the students. The professors, in their statement, complain that "Many teachers in the colleges and universities, as well as in the public schools, have grown timid about stating, even for classroom discussion, ideas which someone later might interpret as subversive."

What the professors really object to is the effort of the House Committee on Un-American Activities to do something which none of the executive agencies like the CIA or the FBI can do—namely, to expose in the midst of the cold war the workings of the Communist apparatus inside the United States.

The professors who signed the latest petition do not hesitate to identify themselves with the prestige conveyed by the names of the universities and colleges that employ them. Thus the statement, in giving the list of the 250 professors, attaches in each case the name of the university or college where they teach and their subjects. The following notation is included.

"The institutional affiliation of the remaining signers is for the purpose of identification only and in no way commits the institution to the views expressed."

But why is it necessary to identify these professors by using the name of their respective colleges and universities and by specifying the subjects they teach? Will the general public assume that, because these professors hold such positions, they perhaps reflect the views of a substantial number of other professors who were or were not canvassed?

There are, for example, among the signers 18 professors from Harvard, 13 from Yale and 5 from Princeton. Is the public to infer that the board of trustees of Harvard or Yale or Princeton or the faculty of each approves the use of the names of their universities in the public prints hereafter as an attachment to any political-propaganda document regardless of content?

Will the parents of students in those universities feel any concern that some professors holding views of this kind will dominate discussions of communism in the classroom? Will some of the donors of funds to the various universities begin to harbor fears that such funds may be used to hire professors who advocate that a gag be imposed on the free expression of ideas by a committee of Congress—especially on a topic of vital importance to the security and safety of the United States?

These are questions that naturally will arise now. The professors, in their statement, concede that the committee has latterly improved its hearing manners, but this apparently isn't enough—they demand that the committee be abolished altogether, notwithstanding the fact that the courts specifically are empowered to correct any abuses in the conduct of hearings.

The late Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes once defined "free speech" as "freedom for the thought we hate." But these college professors don't want the House Committee on Un-American Activities even to exist, let alone to speak out under the free-speech clause of the Constitution—which, incidentally, applies not only to the signers of petitions, but also to Members of Congress and its committees.

What Kind of Federal Help Do Our Old People Want?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Saturday Evening Post in connection with medical aid for our elder citizens:

WHAT KIND OF FEDERAL HELP DO OUR OLD PEOPLE WANT?

People have been growing old for as long as the human race can remember—not quite as old as most of us expect to become, by the grace of God and antibiotics, but old nevertheless. But now there is a widespread feeling that "the aged" have become a class for whose welfare younger people feel free to prescribe. The things that young people think ought to interest old people are terrifying: Morris dancing, bingo, "discussion with others of the same age group," basket weaving and adult education. Few of the professionals give much thought to the oddball senior citizen who prefers to work as long as they'll let him, to participate in family and community activities without worrying too much about his great age.

This sort of thing aside, the gist of the problem of "our aging population" is financial. At the recent White House Conference on Aging, attention was concentrated on the sections which were assigned to discuss the cost of medical care and the best way to meet it. There was no need of a conference to make it clear that social workers, labor-union leaders, professors of social science and bureaucrats would tend to favor a Federal system of health insurance, whereas doctors, insurance executives, and economy-minded Senators would be either against it or, at any rate, worried about it. And, of course, inasmuch as the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was putting on the show, it should have surprised nobody that the solution favored by HEW was the one favored by the conference. The surprise was that considerable opposition, criticism and reluctance cropped up.

Discussion of the financial problems of the aged, for example, was and is complicated by the variety of contradictory statistics presented on how the aged, sick or well, are doing as matters stand now. The Emory University survey, conducted under the direction of Professors Wiggins and Schoeck under a grant from the Foundation for Voluntary Welfare, indicated that a fair proportion of older people thought they were in good shape physically and weren't too much concerned over their ability to pay ordinary medical bills. On the other hand, George Meany, president of AFL–CIO, declared that three-fifths of our old people are forced to get along on less than $1,000 a year. Marion B. Folsom, former secretary of HEW, told his section that retired people now get along fairly well with their income from private savings, company pension plans and social security, as evidenced by the fact that only 15 percent of people over 65 receive old age assistance, and the percentage is much lower in some industrial States. Mr. Folsom added, however, that, "a high percentage of older people do have difficulty in meeting the cost of medical care."

Aside from the increase in longevity, the high cost of housing and the greater activity of social workers, why has old age become so much more of a problem than it used to be? One answer was suggested at the White House Conference by Dr. Maurice E. Linden of the Philadelphia Department of Public Health. It was Dr. Linden's contention that the tendency to make old age a problem is a manifestation of the same underlying disease—family, cultural and social fragmentation and breakdown. Historically the problems of life occurred in the outside world and were solved within the family, but today it would appear that conflicts of living occur within the family and seek solution outside the family.

Thus what used to be intimate family problems become matters for the marriage counselor, the parole officer, the psychiatrist, the disciplinary school. Grandfather and grandmother, instead of enjoying an honored position in the home, become a problem for social solution. That children, as well as the state, have some responsibility for the care of their elders is generally ignored. Indeed, a brochure issued by HEW suggests that parents now live so long that they can no longer expect to remain a part of their younger relatives' family. The idea of a statute of limitations on family loyalty is something new.

Just the same, even those who look to Federal bureaucracy to take care of our old people feel bad about it. Governor Meyner of New Jersey, for example, declared that "few of our senior citizens are crying, 'I am old, take care of me.' Rather I believe they are saying, 'Because of my age don't discriminate against me. Don't shut off employment opportunities.' "

Inflexible retirement plans were attacked by many delegates, although only Joseph Livingston, financial editor of the Philadelphia Bulletin, had the temerity to take the bull by the horns and urge the lifting of the earnings limitation for social security annuitants. The labor-union delegates, of whom there were 132, generally took the view that to do that would encourage the employment of old people at substandard wages—that is to say, wages which, while presumably satisfactory to the recipient, might compete with union wage scales in certain sheltered trades. Nevertheless the growing idea that men and women are better off employed at something, as long as they are physically able to work, is an interesting shift from the earlier view that retirement was the be-all and end-all of a worker's life experience.

It can be argued that the Government itself, partly through its efforts to solve the problems of the needy, has contributed to the sorry plight in which some old people find themselves. For one thing, over the years Federal income tax has taken from our generation more than our fathers habitually saved. And, as Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of

Arizona, pointed out in an address at the conference, Government extravagance and deficit financing have created the inflation which cuts the buying power of pensions, social security annuities or other income available to old people.

Mr. Meany estimated that the $32 a month, which was the average social security payment in 1940, would buy as much as $49 would buy in 1959. Mr. Meany then proceeded to endorse aid to education, assistance to distressed areas, loans and grants to communities for urban renewal and essential facilities and a broad housing program—a set of recommendations which could easily reduce the purchasing power of the current average social security check of $83 still further.

Inasmuch as it is admitted generally that indigence in old age by no means involves all old people, many question the good sense of firing a broadside at the whole aged population. The Kerr-Mills law now on the books attempts to confine the treatment to those who need it and to leave the administration of old-age medical care to the States, which are entitled to Federal grants if they adopt acceptable programs.

Few at the White House Conference thought favorably of the Kerr-Mills bill. The reason was that under it State authorities must establish the individual's need of aid before giving him any. To ask a man about to receive public money to show that he needs it is supposed to be an affront to his dignity and to make him a second-class citizen. Old-age health insurance, like social security, it is insisted, should be a matter of right because the recipient has paid for it.

Obviously this is an emotional rather than a realistic view because, actuarially speaking, the social security annuitant hasn't paid for more than a fraction of what he gets. His employer has paid for half of it, and what does the boss get out of it as a matter of right? Perhaps he benefits by not having to provide such a generous pension system as he might otherwise be compelled to adopt, but that is another story. Even so, the financing of social security, being based on calculated payments to people as they reach a given age or to their survivors, is calculable and manageable. But health insurance is another story. An attempt to cover chronic illness, mental illness, senility, complicated surgery and the host of minor seizures and ailments to which aging flesh is heir could be financially disastrous. A limited coverage, designed to be supplemented by private health insurance and local hospital plans, would appear to be the optimum solution. The current agitation has shaken the insurance companies out of their complacency, and several promising private plans have been announced.

However, political pressures can be counted on to expand the coverage far beyond that contemplated at the beginning. If old people, why not youth, prospective mothers, delinquent children, alcoholics? It is this expansionist tendency that should be worrying advocates of a universal, compulsory health-insurance system.

Papa Knows Best

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include, by unanimous consent, as an extension of my remarks, an editorial from the current issue of the Farm Journal, the caption of which is "Papa Knows Best."

This editorial expresses in simple but forceful language the thoughts which many of us had about the feed-grains bill that passed this House, and upon which action was completed with the adoption of the conference report.

I voted against this bill, Mr. Speaker. I agree with the editorial that "the feed-grains bill was a fine sample" of the idea that "a half-dozen planners sitting in Washington can try to tell farmers how much or how little of this and that to raise." What happens, as the editorial points out, is "a worse mess than they started with."

The editorial follows:

PAPA KNOWS BEST

The feed grains bill may be law or it may be dead by the time you read this—likely it will have been changed at least—but it is very much worth your attention anyway for it puts in clear view the farm philisophy of the new administration. It tells you what to expect from here on.

We don't question that Mr. Freeman and associates want to help farmers. But we challenge the idea that a half dozen planners sitting in Washington can try to tell farmers how much or how little of this and that to raise without creating a worse mess than they started with. The original feed grains bill was a fine sample. Its land-retirement purpose was good, but here were a few things wrong about the methods:

1. The office of the Secretary of Agriculture would become the feed-grain market of the United States. One man, the Secretary, would determine what the cash grain farmers would get for their crop, and what the livestock, dairy, and poultry farmers who buy feed would pay. The plan put no ceiling the prices the Secretary could set. It allowed him to take grain out of Government bins and sell it as much as 17 percent below support levels. That's too much power to give any one man. A very great deal too much.

2. The program gave the Secretary a whip to use on reluctant farmers. You didn't have to join his program, but if you didn't he could make it cost you—up to 17 percent of the support price. He had a persuader to make you crawl into the Government tent—unless you wanted to pay. How typical this is of the big Government crowd, the planners, and how revealing of their philosophy: "Papa knows best," and can remind you of it if necessary.

3. Wheat can be a feed crop, a big one, but wheat was ignored in the bill. We can't do anything about the wheat now in the ground but we could provide for what we're going to do when seeding time comes around again.

If there's anything we should have learned after 20 years or more of sad experience it's this: You can't legislate soundly for just one segment of farming at a time. Anytime we try it we only rotate the problem to another segment and wind up with a worse muddle than before. Yet here we are trying it once more.

4. The bill made no provision for retiring whole farms, which in some instances is best for all concerned.

5. The bill introduced the Brannan plan by the back door. Farmers who comply would get the support price but the Government could sell the grain at 17 percent less—a direct payment without name.

6. Fruit and vegetable growers would get new competition—you could put the idled feed-grain land into fruit or vegetables if you want to forego a Government payment.

7. Soybean farmers are about to see their markets hurt by an increase (that they don't want) in their support price from $1.85 to $2.30. The bean farmers have been doing fine. They've increased production of beans from 180 million bushes at the close of World War II to 550 million in 1960. They've taken 12 million acres a year out of other crops. They've exported a fourth of their beans—for dollars. In short they've been a problem to nobody.

So what happens? Without consulting the bean farmers the planners up the price support by 45 cents. Why? Because they first decided it would be good to raise corn supports to $1.20. When one went up the other had to for we already have too much corn and too few beans.

Actually, we need about 2½ million more acres of beans but we were going to get them anyway with prices the way they are. What's likely to happen now is that we could wind up with about as much corn as ever and one more surplus crop—beans.

Isn't it wonderful when the planners get going?

The Worst Flood in Alabama's History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a very fine letter from Mr. C. O. Mason, Sr., mayor of the town of Pine Hill, Ala. I agree thoroughly with what my friend, C. O. Mason has to say in this letter, and I believe every right-thinking man and woman will too. It is just too bad that the people who are trying to cause us trouble in our beloved Southland do not know of the cordial relationship that has always existed between the white and colored people of our part of the country, however, they are beginning to wake up in certain parts of the country up North, up East, and even out West. Anyway, the facts in this letter were certainly interesting to me and I am sure it will be to you.

The letter follows:

TOWN OF PINE HILL,
Pine Hill, Ala., March 19, 1961.

Hon. FRANK W. BOYKIN,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRANK: This section, as well as all along the Alabama River from above Montgomery south, is recovering from the worst flood in Alabama's history. There were no lives lost but property damage will run up into the millions.

The American Red Cross, the Salvation Army, the National Guard, and the sheriff's forces moved in and they together with the citizens did a wonderful job working around the clock with very little or no rest. Hundreds of families together with their livestock had to be taken from their homes, and had to be provided with food, clothing, shelter, and medical attention.

The facts that stand out so strong in this matter and that should be brought to the attention of the New York Times as well as other northern papers and to some of our Government officials are that notwithstanding the fact that 85 to 90 percent of the people that had to be taken from their homes and taken care of were Negroes. And

where was the NAACP and the Christian Improvement Association? They were not heard from.

The NAACP sends millions to the South to break down our way of life but they don't send a nickel to help their people in the time of a disaster.

I wish you would make this fact known to some of the people in Congress that are always talking about more civil rights.

I am glad to note that you are on the program for the dedication of the Jackson lock and dam. We have an invitation from the Warrior-Tombigbee Development Association and guess we will see you there April 7.

With all good wishes.

Sincerely yours,

C. O. MASON.

Jobs by Inflation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, the difference between a new dose of inflation and a logical coordination of wages and prices, at whatever average level, as the answer to the unemployment problem is set forth by Mr. Henry Hazlitt in his column the heading of which asks "Jobs by Inflation?" in the March 6 edition of Newsweek magazine.

The article follows:

JOBS BY INFLATION?

(By Henry Hazlitt)

We are in a recession. Unemployment is alarmingly high. We must act. "I hope we can get action as soon as possible."

Thus the Kennedy administration. And what is this action we must take so precipitously? It is more Government spending in all directions—on unemployment compensation, crop price supports, housing, highways, depressed areas, veterans, social security, Federal aid to education, and scores of other projects. It is lowering interest rates and increasing loans. It is, in a word, inflation.

Behind this proposed remedy is the same theory that has dominated the economic policy of most Western governments, especially our own, for the last quarter century. It is the theory made popular by union propaganda, and the late Lord Keynes.

Keynes himself recognized that raising wage rates would only increase unemployment. He left handedly conceded that unemployment might exist because real wage rates were already too high in comparison with prices and demand, so that the outlook for profits was to bleak to encourage full employment. But he argued that a direct lowering of money wage rates would be so strongly resisted by the unions as to be politically impossible. Therefore, the only way to lower wage rates to a workable level was to lower the value of money. The way to do this was to inflate, to print more money, and so to raise prices and monetary demand to a level at which full employment would be possible again.

WHY NOT FOREVER?

This is the process to which we have resorted again and again in the last 28 years. Economically, it has seemed to work. We have had continuous inflation, but we have also (at least since 1942) had fairly continuous employment. Politically, it has kept whatever administration was in power from having to face up to the problem of how to halt constant union wage demands and increases that exceeded the gains in labor's marginal productivity at the existing level of prices. We have floated ourselves out by ever new doses of inflation.

Well, why can't we do it again? Why can't we keep it up forever?

One reason it is especially dangerous to try it again now is that we have done it so much in the past that we have undermined international confidence in the dollar. Our labor costs of production on some items have been raised to a point that is pricing them out of the world market. American capital is being invested in new plants abroad rather than at home. Our existing inflation has already caused a deficit in our balance of payments. We have been losing gold at a dangerous rate. Further inflation will only intensify the problem.

DESPERATE RACE

And we can't keep inflating forever because the process inevitably becomes accelerative. With every dose of monetary inflation and increase of prices, the unions make demands for still further wage increases to keep up with or get ahead of the latest price increase. Each round of wage increases leads to another dose of inflation to pay the new wage level. There is a perpetual and increasingly desperate race between the printing press and the union demands.

Yet the whole race is needless. What is necessary for full employment is the coordination of wages and prices, at whatever average level. If this coordination does not exist, if a new dose of inflation simply touches off a new round of wage hikes, then the inflation is futile, even as a short-term expedient.

What labor is chiefly suffering from today is too many victories. It is no mere coincidence that unemployment now is highest in lines in which wage rates are highest. As compared with average wages of $2.30 an hour in all manufacturing industries, wages in automobile plants are $2.87 an hour, in steel mills $3.02, in bituminous coal mines $3.27. But in the excited calls of the Kennedy administration for action, there is complete silence regarding wage rates. They are treated as irrelevant.

Yet not quite. Among the proposed remedies for unemployment are higher and longer unemployment benefits and higher minimum wages to keep wage rates up or to force them still higher.

A Journey to Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include another in a series of articles written by Mr. Thomas Heffernan, editor, Sunday Independent, Wilkes-Barre, which appeared in that newspaper on March 19, 1961. Mr. Heffernan wrote this series of articles for his publication following an extended trip through Ireland last fall. The latest article in this series follows:

A JOURNEY TO IRELAND—TRADITIONAL HUNTING ATTIRE HAS BECOME QUITE DEFINITE

(By Tom Heffernan)

As most Wyoming Valley people realize, the manner of attire in sports is pretty well standardized, so a football player wouldn't come out in shorts, as do the British in the rather similar game of rugby, while a baseball uniform would be considered ludicrous if made with long trousers whereas British players of cricket, ancestor of our diamond game, do wear slacks—white ones.

Something of a peak in custom and tradition in dress is reached in foxhunting, where it has become quite formal and an interesting item in the ensemble is the stock—the tying of which probably always will baffle us.

It is a long piece, shaped or in a straight fold, of white or light colored cloth which is wrapped about the neck, first from front to rear, brought then around to the front again and tied.

COLLAR AND TIE IN ONE

Thus it serves both as collar and tie but it is not easy to handle for the uninitiated which we certainly were.

So when, the day before our first attempt, we saw a young Englishman in the lobby, we spoke to him. He nodded in return.

That happened again, later, with the young man showing the usual English reserve.

Finally we went to him, said we were about to try hunting for the first time and got a look of considerable surprise.

Everyone always was surprised to learn that we had selected Ireland as a starter, since the going is pretty rugged for a beginner.

A PLEA FOR HELP

Anyway, we wondered if he would help us since, we confessed, we didn't even know how to tie a stock—which we should have learned to do before we left America.

He said he would, came to the room just when, by some accident, all the lights in Adare went out accidentally so the period of instruction was delayed until next morning.

At that time, he suggested we come to the room occupied by him and a friend, Captain Beloe, who had served during the war with the British Combined Operations—a supercommando outfit.

In addition, the captain had ridden in that frightening Grand National at Aintree, with its awful jumps.

He said he would help us—and he did.

Perhaps we should add that our original friend was John Gouriet who, we found out on receiving a letter from him after our return to America, was an officer in the King's Royal Hussars.

ANNOYED BY PHONIES

As he helped us, Captain Beloe, with the complete accent of a British aristocrat, talked interestingly to us and to Gouriet.

"These people," he said, "who come over for the hunting, who know nothing, pretend they know everything, we let go out to make fools of themselves and perhaps break their bloody necks.

"Remember that millionaire chap from Australia last year, who even had some kind of monogram on his coat?" he said to John.

"You," he said to us, "came here, admit you know nothing and, my friend, I shall do everything in my power to help you.

"Hunting has been my life. I have been master of foxhounds. It has been my life."

Then we asked the captain about the black Melton coat we were wearing, which had three buttons.

"It seems," we said, "that it would be better if it had four.

"However, the customs and traditions of your hunting have added so much to the sport, it is a pleasure to observe them.

"So we hesitated about having another button added since there was no use making it wrong."

WE GET THE TRUTH

The captain just looked at us.

"That of course, is the coat they sold you in America and I swear I would have said nothing if you hadn't asked.

"But you did ask. And you ask me if another button would make it wrong.

"And all that I can say is that there is nothing right about your coat. It's all wrong."

Please bear in mind that all of the captain's remarks were made with a smile and in the best of humor. So he also added to reassure our shaky confidence.

"But we always say, you know, it's not the coat. It's what's in it."

YOUNG MAN IS MOST HELPFUL

For some reason, Captain Beloe (pronounced much like below) could not hunt with us that day, but John Gouriet (pronounced to rhyme with Duryea) did, for which we were thankful.

He helped constantly, watched over us at every difficult jump, introduced us to people and stuck with us right to the end.

Probably we gave him quick reason to fear for the worst because on this our first introduction to foxhunting, on the first day, at the very first jump, we were thrown.

Like a good fellow, soon after that he pulled up alongside to remark, "We're all even now, you know," as he pointed to mud on his sleeve to show that he, too, had parted company with his horse.

Then, right near the end of the day, as his horse made a mistake at a wall, he went off again only to arise, look for us, and call:

"I'm one up on you now, you know."

(P.S.—We still are hopelessly clumsy tying a stock and it usually comes out looking most of all like a mussy tourniquet.)

HUNTER SO BIG WE WERE HELPLESS

We called the horse big and it was much the biggest animal we ever rode.

For instance, the first day we had a handsome chestnut, looking big to us, and which stood 17 hands, belonging to Mickey Butler.

Then came this huge one, 17 hands 2 inches which, since his hand is 4 inches means the saddle was about 6 feet off the ground.

It belonged to John Liston, a successful farmer.

Butler, a workingman who loved hunting, made sure he was in Ireland during the season, and the days his horse was ready he rode it himself if it were not rented by a visitor such as we were.

Getting back to that big bay of Liston's, since we needed considerable help to get on, we never got off until the day's hunting was over, and one day, having to go through several fields with a charming young English girl named Diana Ash, we were embarrassed.

Twice it was necessary for someone to get off to open big iron gates and then, when we met a ditch and bank encumbered by a flimsy fence of barbed wire, someone had to pull out a couple posts and hold the wire down while the other drove over.

Since there was no way for us to get back on that huge mount, we stayed up there while Miss Ash got off and did the chores for us each time.

DRESS WASN'T FORMAL AFTER ALL

Our awe of the rigidity of English customs, with Americans convinced they will dress for dinner in the middle of the jungle, had us a bit uncertain what to wear when invited to the home of Lord Daresbury on an evening after a hunt.

Of course, matters were somewhat simplified by the fact that we could choose between only two outfits—a blue suit or a tweed jacket with gray trousers—so we wore the suit. * * * We had nothing else with us.

On arrival, already there was a delightful young couple from London, the Rallis, who also had hunted with the Limerick hounds that day—and he was in tweeds.

Next came Lady Hilton, lovely as always and this time in black sweater and black velvet slacks.

Major F. W. Kennedy, the efficient and most accommodating secretary, wore tweeds.

Finally Lord Daresbury arrived wearing, most comfortably, a brownish-green set of quilted nylons that are closely related to pajamas and which must feel good after a day in the outdoor chill of a rainy clime.

Taking one look at our blue suit, Lady Hilton said: "You look as if we were back in London."

TALKED WHEN WE SHOULD LISTEN

As it happened that day, when a confusion at the finish found the field scattered, we had wound up the hunt with the Rallis and it was a pleasure to be able to offer our car as a conveyance to get them back to Lord Daresbury's place, where they were guests.

And once again, we learned that when you don't know what you are talking about it is best to keep the mouth shut.

It was a little late when we arrived at Lord Daresbury's, getting rather dark and a bit foggy, so we didn't know what we were approaching when a wide and low building loomed mistily ahead.

"Is that the kennels?" we asked.

"No," came the quiet answer from the back seat.

"Oh. * * * Perhaps it is the stables?" we continued blithely but not brightly.

After a moment Mrs. Susan answered.

"It's the house."

A bit later, when we returned after dressing, we found it was not only the house but a most interesting one.

And in the big room at one end, with comfortable chairs, a blazing fire and relaxing atmosphere, were wonderful hunting scenes.

Not prints but paintings, with one so big it was almost like a mural and ran practically the full length of the wall in a big room.

Minimum Wage: 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following most timely editorial which appeared in the New York Times of March 21, 1961:

The United States has had a Federal minimum wage law since 1938; but even today only a little more than a third of the American labor force is protected by it. In the 23 years since the law has been on the books, there has been virtually no upward revision of its coverage; and even the monetary floor (originally 25 cents an hour; now $1) has not been raised in over 5 years.

President Kennedy is now proposing—as he did when he was a Senator—both a controlled increase in the minimum to reach $1.25 within two and a half years after enactment, and a limited extension of the coverage to include an additional 4,300,000 workers. While the bill is not an ideal one—for instance, it omits service workers in hotels and restaurants and agricultural workers on large-scale farms—it does represent a reasonable step toward the protection of some of the lowest paid segments of American labor. We favor the least possible Government interference in the fixing of prices or wages; but establishment of a minimum wage for those unable to protect themselves is a long-accepted and necessary function of the Federal Government.

Since long before the memorable fight in Congress over the first Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, some employers have always argued that they or their employees will be put out of business by imposition of a legal floor for wages. We do not share that fear, and neither history nor statistics bear it out. For example, in 1959 the Wage and Hour Administrator informed Congress that of the 2,100,000 employees affected by the 1956 increase in the minimum to $1, less than 2,000 were discharged or otherwise adversely affected. Last year Secretary of Labor Mitchell himself agreed that a "modest increase" would not materially curtail employment in the low-wage industries.

On the contrary, surveys have shown that a higher minimum in low-wage communities has actually stimulated, rather than depressed, employment, and has stimulated it not only far beyond the national average but to a greater degree in the specific industries affected by the new minimum than in the industries not so affected. As for the relationship of a rising minimum wage to foreign competition, wages in most of our export industries are already above the minimum, and in other cases the projected increase would have but a minor effect on the sale price of the product.

The reports are that the President is going to have a hard fight to secure passage of his bill. He should have the support in Congress of all who believe that one secret of American industrial success lies in its relatively high standard of labor and living.

Kennedy's Course

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following column by Roscoe Drummond entitled "Kennedy's Course," which appeared in the Washington Post of Wednesday, March 15, 1961.

The column follows:

KENNEDY'S COURSE—HALLMARK IS CAUTION AND PRUDENCE

(By Roscoe Drummond)

It is too soon to conclude that the Kennedy administration will continue to be as moderate and as traditional as it is today, but on the basis of the President's words and deeds thus far, it is accurate to report:

That the Kennedy administration is less reformist than F.D.R., less partisan—but not less political—than Harry Truman, and in degree somewhat less conservative than Dwight D. Eisenhower. The new administration is less conservative than the Eisenhower administration because it is more willing to use the power and resources of the Federal Government to achieve social and economic goals.

Obviously the end result may greatly diverge from this description. Unforeseeable events could alter its course. But the hallmark of the Kennedy Presidency after several weeks in office is one of caution and prudence. It is proposing no radical experimenting with the economy as did F.D.R. It is not petty or petulant in small things as H.S.T. (who, however, was magnificent in the great decisions). The Kennedy administration is not tampering with the main lines of foreign policy pursued by President Eisenhower.

It is clear that John F. Kennedy wants a better and more productive America in public services and in the private economy, but he is no passionate, doctrinaire reformer intent upon making over the United States.

Mr. Kennedy's speeches and actions quite accurately portray his concept of the Presidency at the start of his term.

There is nothing radically experimental or untraditional in the Kennedy program. Extension of unemployment insurance payments follows the Eisenhower precedent of the 1959 recession. Federal aid to education has been supported by both parties since Senator Robert A. Taft introduced his bill in 1948. Aid to depressed areas and medical assistance to the aged were debated in the Kennedy-Nixon campaign only on grounds of method.

I am not suggesting that Mr. Kennedy's measures are always the best or only way of reaching his goals. What I am suggesting is that both in method and in objective the Kennedy administration is acting within the framework of national policy and tradition as developed in America since the depression of the 1930's.

The most significant difference between the reformist era of the New Deal and the let's-make-things-better era of J.F.K. is the built-in hostility to business in the Roosevelt administration and the built-in cordiality to business in the Kennedy administration. It is noteworthy that President Kennedy's first public speech after his state of the Union address was delivered to the Industrial Conference Board. For years F.D.R. would not speak to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Kennedy said:

"Far from being natural enemies, Government and business are natural allies. * * * We know that your success and ours are intertwined—that you have facts and know-how we need. Whatever past differences may have existed, we seek more than an attitude of truce, more than a treaty—we seek the spirit of a full-fledged alliance. * * * We will not discriminate for or against any segment of our society or any segment of the business community. * * * We are not opposed to business."

This is not the credo of a reformist administration. And Mr. Kennedy is giving substance to this credo by advocating tax incentives to carry through plant modernization to enable the economy to produce more efficiently in the world market. Such tax incentives were not forthcoming during the Eisenhower administration.

This attitude bespeaks the political center which the President seems eager to occupy.

Disarmament Proposals of the U.S.S.R.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, in the March 17, 1961, edition of Life Line there appears an excellent article entitled "Disarmament Proposals of the U.S.S.R." Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this article:

DISARMAMENT PROPOSALS OF U.S.S.R.

When the leaders of Soviet Russia talk about world disarmament, what do they mean? We do not have to guess. They have told us themselves.

The Communist policy on peace and disarmament was set forth in a resolution of the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International. Here is what the resolution said:

"War is inseparable from capitalism. From this it follows that the abolition of war is possible only through the abolition of capitalism, that is, through the overthrow of the middle class.

"But the overthrow of capitalism is impossible without force. The revolutionary proletariat, precisely because it is fighting for socialism and for the abolition of war, cannot be against every war.

"The international policy of the U.S.S.R. is a peace policy which conforms to the interests of the ruling class of Soviet Russia. The aim of this policy is to guard the international revolution and to protect the work of building up socialism—the object of which is revolutionizing the world.

"The peace policy of the proletarian state certainly does not imply that the Soviet state has become reconciled with capitalism. It is merely another and, under present conditions, a more advantageous form of fighting capitalism, a form which the U.S.S.R. has consistently employed since the October revolution.

"The proletariat in the Soviet Union harbors no illusions as to the possibility of a durable peace with the imperialists. The proletariat knows that the imperialist attack against the Soviet Union is inevitable; that in the process of a proletarian world revolution, war between proletariat and bourgeois states, wars for the emancipation of the world from capitalism will necessarily and inevitably arise.

"There is a glaring contradiction between the imperialists' policy of piling up armaments and their hypocritical talk about peace. There is no such contradiction, however, between the Soviet Government's preparation for defense and for revolutionary war and a consistent peace policy. Revolutionary war of the proletarian dictatorship is but a continuation of revolutionary peace policy by other means.

"The proposals for general and complete disarmament submitted by the Soviet Government * * * differ radically in aim, sincerity, and objective significance from the phrases and schemes submitted by the imperialists. The aim of the Soviet proposals is not to spread pacifist illusions, but to destroy them; not to support capitalism by ignoring or toning down its shady sides, but to propagate the fundamental Marxian postulate that disarmament and the abolition of war are possible only with the fall of capitalism.

"The disarmament policy of the Soviet Government must be utilized for purposes of agitation much more energetically and to a wider extent than has been done hitherto (1) for recruiting sympathizers for the Soviet Union—the champion of peace and socialism; and (2) for utilizing the results of the Soviet disarmament policy and its exposure of the imperialists in the effort to eradicate all pacifist illusions and to carry on propaganda among the masses in support of the only way toward disarmament and the abolition of war: arming of the proletariat, overthrowing the bourgeoisie and establishing the proletarian dictatorship."

The moral is this: These mistaken enemies of America are not fooling themselves; let us make certain they do not fool us with talk of peace that means war.

The Medora: North Dakota Townsite Area Adjoining Teddy Roosevelt Memorial Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues, and ask their support of a bill which I have introduced—H.R. 2295—to assist my home community of Medora in a problem they face which they are unable to solve by themselves.

This small, historic cowtown of Medora has been totally unprepared and unequipped for the impact of the thousands of visitors who come there each year, attracted by the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, the Marquis de Mores Chateau, and the outdoor drama, "Old Four Eyes."

The legislation which I propose, and in which I have been joined by other members of the North Dakota delegation: Senators YOUNG and BURDICK, and Congressman NYGAARD, only authorizes the Department of Interior to extend its existing facilities upon reaching an agreement with Medora relative to the cost of service and the period of repayment. I want to firmly emphasize this does not provide a direct grant to the village.

Only with adequate sewage and water facilities can the community meet the dire need for sufficient eating, lodging, and restroom accommodations. We had this legislation prepared only after exhaustive study convinced us there is no way the town of Medora can finance construction of its own facilities. This bill provides that in order to afford this service to visitors to the area and to encourage the preservation and restoration of the pioneer cattle town of Medora, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to assist in modernizing the water and sewage facilities of the village. The cost of the proposed facilities may not exceed $100,000 and non-Federal users of the system would be charged enough to recover a pro rata share of depreciation, plus costs of the system's operation and maintenance. The existing water and sewage disposal system located within the National Park Headquarters area is ample to take care of the needs of the park and also allow the people of Medora to connect to that system.

This bill has been assigned to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, where we are hopeful of getting early and favorable consideration. The Departmental reports last year were favorable, but the shortage of time prevented getting final action on similar legislation.

I am happy to report that the 37th Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota in session this year joined in supporting this legislation, and passed Senate Concurrent Resolution 00, introduced by Senators Leland Roen and William R. Reichert, pointing up the need to remedy the situation and thus enhance

the whole Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Park development.

A copy of their resolution follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION COMMENDING THE SPONSORS OF LEGISLATION PRESENTLY IN CONGRESS WHICH SEEKS TO REMEDY THE SANITATION AND WATER SUPPLY FACILITIES OF MEDORA, N. DAK., AND ALSO URGING THE CONGRESS TO FAVORABLY CONSIDER SUCH PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Whereas House Concurrent Resolution U adopted by the 36th legislative assembly provided for the creation of a commission to cooperate with the village board of Medora, N. Dak, in the preservation of that community as a typical pioneer cow town in an area of State and national importance and interest; and

Whereas it has been proposed to restore Medora to its historic appearance at the time of Theodore Roosevelt, the Marquis de Mores, the Eaton brothers, and the colorful Texas and Oklahoma drovers whose longhorn trail herds grazed the Badlands of this State and blazed the routes into western North Dakota, followed by others for more than half a century; and

Whereas the impact of the ever-increasing activities in the adjoining Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park upon Medora has resulted in overtaxing and overloading the sanitation and water supply facilities of the village to the extent that the health and well-being of its inhabitants and visitors are seriously imperiled; and

Whereas U.S. Representatives DON L. SHORT and HJALMAR C. NYGAARD have introduced House bills Nos. 2295 and 2270, respectively, and U.S. Senators MILTON R. YOUNG and QUENTIN N. BURDICK have jointly introduced Senate bill No. 98 in the current session of Congress, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to provide water and sewage disposal facilities to the Medora area adjoining the park with a view to alleviating and correcting such dangerous situation and greatly enhancing the value of the said park development; and

Whereas the proposed legislation provides that such water and sewage disposal systems would be connected to those of the National Park Service in said park, and that the costs allocated to the village of Medora would be repaid by the non-Federal users thereof in such manner and under such conditions as may be determined by the Secretary of the Interior: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the North Dakota delegation in Congress, the sponsors of the aforementioned proposed legislation, be highly commended for seeking to remedy the intolerable situation in Medora, as described herein, through enactment of the legislation proposed in the aforesaid bills; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress is hereby urged to give favorable consideration to the legislation proposed by said bills to the end that the planned water and sewage disposal facilities proposed therein may be authorized and constructed; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state is hereby directed to mail copies of this resolution to Senators Young and Burdick, and Representatives Short and Nygaard; to Hon. Clinton P. Anderson, chairman, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; to Hon. Wayne N. Aspinall, chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; Hon. Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior; Hon. Conrad L. Wirth, Director, National Park Service; and to Hon. David E. Bell, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, all in Washington, D.C.

ORVILLE W. HAGEN
President of the Senate.
HOWARD F. DOHERTY,
Secretary of the Senate.
R. FAY BROWN,
Speaker of the House.
GERALD L. STAIR,
Chief Clerk of the House.

It is my hope that when these improvements are made in the facilities of the town of Medora that many of my colleagues will find the opportunity to visit the park and relax in the pleasant, invigorating atmosphere of the Badlands, where I have lived all my life.

Pioneers for the New Frontier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. FALLON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of the Secretary of Commerce, Luther H. Hodges, before the annual convention of the Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., on Monday afternoon, February 27, 1961, at the Statler-Hilton Hotel, Boston, Mass. It was a distinct privilege for me to be present on this occasion and to hear Secretary Hodges' speech:

PIONEERS FOR THE NEW FRONTIER

Governor Volpe, Mr. Miller, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is indeed a privilege to be with you at this 42d annual convention of the Associated General Contractors of America, and I appreciate your honoring the Department of Commerce in asking me to be here. I well expect my position as Secretary of Commerce to be my most challenging opportunity for public service. During my career in the business world I dealt at length with the numerous manufacturing problems of the textile industry as well as the merchandising problems of American business and in my capacity as general manager of a large textile corporation, I acquired some experience in dealing with the construction industry through our plant expansions.

Also, my involvement in the program of German industrial reconstruction after World War II, in the work of disbursing American foreign aid funds, as well as in fostering major industrial expansion in the State of North Carolina, afforded me unique opportunities to promote the construction and modernization of facilities which represent the backbone of our complex economic society.

I do not have to tell an informed group such as this about the vital value of the highways, factories, stores, schools, hospitals, homes, and other construction activity in the everyday life of our Nation. Nor can I overlook the size and importance of the industry which you represent, accounting as it does for almost 15 percent of the Nation's total economic output.

However, my experience has convinced me that many of us have failed properly to appraise the economic issues confronting us in the next decade. This is true, even when these issues have major implications for the outlook of the particular segment of the economy with which we are individually involved.

What are the issues we must face up to in the coming years if we are to fulfill our national objectives, our international commitments, and our promises to our children for a secure future of peace, prosperity, and progress?

We face difficult choices dictated not only by self-interest, but by the intense competition of other nations, both friendly and not so friendly. They have pushed modernization of industry and capital investment while we concentrated on producing abundant consumer goods with little regard to the prices or wage levels involved. They stressed research in science and technology—we too often reacted as if the news of their effort was science fiction. They built schools and universities while we in many areas debated problems of Federal aid to education—who learned to copy and improve on our methods of production, while we too often halted our major production facilities because of breakdowns in labor-management relations.

What is the current situation? At present 5½ million of our fellow Americans are unemployed. More than half of our major metropolitan areas are economically depressed. Costs continue to show the impact of a long period of wage-price spirals. We face the possibility of a continuing deficit in our balance of payments. We are almost certain to have an unbalanced Federal budget. We are confronted with difficult problems in the areas of international relations.

Where do we start, and what are the resources which we can bring to the task of meeting our national goals? If the nation's economic recovery and growth are to be energetically advanced, what will be the nature of the governmental actions needed, and what role will the business community play in advancing these goals both in its own interests and those of the Nation?

To get close to home, what is the task for the great construction industry of the United States, an industry which in scope, impact, and potential for releasing creative forces, ranks extremely high in the world? How can you bring fresh reality to your association's slogan, "America Progresses Through Construction"?

A number of specific problems suggest the magnitude of the challenge ahead. As President Kennedy observed in his state of the Union message, 25 million Americans are living in substandard homes.

What an opportunity for building we have here. Unhappily most of these people cannot afford the homes which are being built today by an industry which too often bears the burden of sky-high building costs—high money rates—inflated land values—antiquated building codes—restrictive work practices—and a singular lack of uniformity in design and equipment.

If we are going to build 2 million homes a year rather than the 1¼ million homes of last year, we will need breakthroughs in many areas. Onsite productivity will need to be advanced by both management and labor. Such matters as the most advanced design of equipment and basic materials will need new research with emphasis on practical application.

The monetary and fiscal policies of the Government and the lending policies of pri-

vate investors will need reappraisals. Cost cutting will need to be realized in dramatic ways. The pace of forward planning and execution of plans by local communities to provide supporting facilities such as schools, roads, water, and sewer works to sustain a higher level of new housing construction will also have to be stepped up in tune with the tempo of the times.

Another problem. We have growing classroom shortages despite the many new school construction projects underway and the record level of approvals by voters for financing these buildings. It has been estimated that there are 2 million schoolchildren with inadequate space. The crisis in secondary and college classroom space in particular is approaching an acute phase.

Assuming favorable action by Congress on President Kennedy's program, Federal grants may be forthcoming soon to help alleviate this problem, but money alone will not do the job. Our architectural and construction industries need to adopt new techniques to make sure that the taxpayers' money yields the highest return in this field lest we build structures that fail to meet the changing educational needs of even a single decade. The opportunity here for imaginative leadership is a challenging one.

Can you imagine the kinds of construction opportunities there would be if we really got to work to do a serious job of urban renewal in this country? Can you imagine the kinds of construction prospects we would have if we took full advantage of the opportunity for modernizing our vast industrial machine?

I am not asserting that we face today an immediate shortage of capacity, but I do believe we face a shortage of that kind of efficient physical plant which would make it possible to produce more economically and to perform the research which leads to the production of more new products—thus broadening the scope of both our domestic and foreign markets, and making our products and services more competitive.

Many people have been telling us that it is lower wage levels which have been permitting foreign nations to compete with us effectively in world markets. Although we compete with lower wage scales elsewhere, it seems to me that the truth is that more modern production facilities, more efficient labor practices, better planning, more aggresive salesmanship—in short, greater productivity, superior research efforts, and more initiative have enabled foreign producers to outdo us in many areas of legitimate business competition.

As I told the National Industrial Conference Board recently, we have in this country taken things too easy—we haven't really been selling. However, I see signs of improvement, and a reawakening of our people.

I want to emphasize that a lot of talk and grumbling will not solve our problems—we need to "dig" for business. We in the Government are taking some practical steps. By way of example, we are taking a new hard look at our tax laws and I am hopeful we can do something along this line. Without discussing specific proposals, if you will permit this generality, I will say that we must make our tax laws the instrument of incentive rather than an alibi for indifference.

We need provisions bearing on depreciation allowances to stimulate rather than retard the investment decisions of industry.

As the officer of the Government primarily concerned with the problems of business and industry, large and small, I consult with other Cabinet officers who represent the interests of the farmer, of labor, and of other sectors of our population. We also represent the interests of the Nation as a whole. I know that there is broad agreement among us on those policy matters which are crucial to reversing the present economic downtrend, reducing unemployment, and maintaining the purchasing power of the dollar.

Make no mistake. Whatever our immediate areas of responsibility, we are pulling together as a team. This is important.

This administration believes in fiscal responsibility and balanced budgets. But human wants and national needs are paramount. If necessary to spur recovery, I believe and I know my colleagues believe, that the Federal budget can be used effectively to help, not hinder, our forward progress.

The farmer must be helped to expand his real income so that he reinforces economic growth. Fiscal and monetary policies must be aimed at providing more funds for investment, at lower costs, within a framework of restricting inflationary forces. We must develop urban areas by more practical planning and well-placed financial assistance at all levels of Government. Furthermore, these programs must be carried on side by side with vigorous efforts to help the growing number of distressed areas of the country by long-term redevelopment programs as well as by more immediate relief measures.

You are, no doubt, aware already of the President's actions and proposals in regard to our human and natural resources, such as housing, surplus food, unemployment, old age security, health, taxes, veterans aid, education, minimum wages, and development of our land, water, forests, and minerals.

I might stress to this group our plans for expediting procurement and construction. We have already accelerated our Federal aid highway fund payments for this fiscal year and are urging the States to speed up contracts. Other departments of Government are working along the same lines.

But no short-range measures can substitute for a long-term effort to promote economic growth by fostering private investment, by maximizing our use of natural resources and the further development of energy sources, and finally by strengthening and utilizing to the full our human resources through broad advances in the fields of education and health, as well as through scientific and technological gains.

Underlying all our programs and proposals for their implementation must be stress and concern for achieving greater productivity and price stability. President Kennedy's recently announced Labor-Management Advisory Committee provides a vehicle for moving forward towards these objectives. The Committe is composed of a membership from labor, management, and the public. I have no doubt that in the final analysis the broad economic advances, which we must achieve to nurture our profit motivated economy, throughout the 60's, depends not only on the scientific breakthroughs which are sure to come, but on our development of sound wage and price policies within a framework of healthy competition, friendly Government policies, and a mutual understanding of economic problems by industry and labor and a rededication to the national interest.

A word about the outlook for your industry. The construction analysts in the Department of Commerce tell me that by 1965 physical output in construction should exceed 1959 record levels by 20 to 25 percent. This indicates a volume of new construction approaching $70 billion in current dollars. You also should know that we are closely cooperating with the leaders of your industry in a program to stimulate the participation of American construction firms in foreign work.

This effort, we hope, will open up in the next few years many new uncharted opportunities which should not only expand your profits but also reinforce the accurate image of American know-how in many parts of the world.

Having mentioned the Department of Commerce, I should like to say something more about my views of how this Department can best serve the construction industry as well as the other industries within our sphere of interest.

May I assure you that the Department of Commerce will pursue the goals of this administration with determination, dedication, and vigor. We shall respond with imagination and resourcefulness to the immediate needs of the economy as well as to the long-range requirements for growth. We shall be ever mindful of expanding markets, both domestic and foreign, and sustaining a healthy and attractive climate for investment not only to increase output but to modernize plant and equipment. In short, we in the Department of Commerce shall expend every effort to demonstrate beyond all doubt the superiority of the free enterprise system and the benefits it offers to all.

We cannot carry out our mission without your wholehearted cooperation, your constructive suggestions, and your criticism. We must not only have your figures for our statistics, but we must also have your opinions, outlooks, and proposals whether for administrative actions, for legislative considerations, or for analytical studies.

Since January 20 we have concentrated on sustaining and improving the organization of the Department of Commerce to increase its effectiveness—an effort which will continue with force and inspiration.

With many different areas of responsibility we shall study each to assure that our established programs will meet current and future needs. As examples, our steadily changing transportation picture requires a constant reappraisal of our highway program. Our system of patents encourages and protects invention to stimulate investment and production. Our foreign trade must be expanded by promoting markets and effectively meeting competition abroad. Finally, our domestic economy must operate with the full knowledge embodied in facts and figures to assure that our growth is balanced and our prosperity widespread. As Secretary of Commerce, I shall administer the Department so that it can and will meet its responsibilities.

The major responsibility of private industry is to avail itself of every profitable worldwide opportunity to invest, produce, sell, and grow. We in the Department of Commerce have no pat formulas to offer you to accomplish any of these, but offer valuable tools for your use. We have an abundance of statistical information which makes us the leading factfinding organization in the world. Our veritable stockpile of information covers population, business, science, and technology and many other facets of world developments. This is not a dormant inventory—it is kept up to date and it is useful.

The National Bureau of Standards has conducted research in the field of building technology for many years, and its work in this field is well known to all of you here. In an extension of this activity, the Bureau has recently been designated as a central agency within Government for coordinating a broad program of fundamental fire research to be carried out by the Bureau, the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture, the Bureau of Mines of the Department of Interior, and several private laboratories.

The goal of this research is additional knowledge of the why and how of unwanted fires, to help reduce the great loss of lives and property in accidental fires. Standards has been working in this field since 1914, developing basic information on ignition phenomena and fire resistance of materials, on flame detection and extinguishment, and on fire growth and spread. This new program is expected to remedy the present

scarcity of technical information required to improve fire fighting methods, and should eventually prove of great value to the construction industry as it seeks to meet the needs of our country.

Our Census Bureau, the Nation's major fact-finding agency, furnishes the construction industry with information on housing starts, the value of construction put in place and related data of importance to your industry. Figures on population growth, migration and family formation and income are also provided by the Census Bureau. All of this material is essential to prompt and accurate appraisals of economic trends. We are making efforts to improve coverage and expedite publication of results.

What is the value of these facts and figures which the Commerce Department furnishes? To quote an expert appraisal of Census programs submitted to the Secretary of Commerce several years ago "a free society is dominated by individual motivations and actions. Freedom of choice is its hallmark; freedom of choice of occupation and career; freedom of entry into business; freedom to buy or not to buy and freedom as to what to buy; freedom in the management of our far flung business system; and all other freedoms of choice that mark our liberties. These very freedoms impose on us the necessity of widespread information." You have these freedoms and choices. We have the information you need to exercise them wisely. Ask for our information and use it.

Furthermore, we analyze and interpret statistics and observations without partiality or favor in order to make clear their implications. We have experts who view current developments calmly and judiciously so that they assume proper proportions.

These facts, figures and analyses pertaining to our economy are yours virtually for the asking. Of course, there is necessarily a limit to the details we can collect and digest, but even that limit is being pushed back daily. I understand that we have been doing just this in our monthly publication devoted to your industry—Construction Review.

In the field of construction, particularly, we are now engaged in a major program of improving the quality, expanding the scope, and increasing the detail of the statistics. When the major objectives of this undertaking are attained all of us will have the "fever chart" for your industry. With total construction, including maintenance and repair, accounting for 75 billion of our 500 billion dollar economy, this body of information will assuredly give us, individually and collectively, greater insight into current economic conditions.

In connection with our dedication to economic progress, we are looking ahead ten years to estimate the direction of construction activities and what factors will influence them. Upon completion, this outlook study will be made available to you and the rest of American industry for guidance in making important business decisions.

The value of much of this information is sometimes difficult to appraise unless it is lacking. A case in point is our effort to stimulate foreign construction by American contractors, which I mentioned earlier.

This export expansion effort is an important part of a program I consider essential to our very existence. A number of you met at the Department of Commerce several months ago with our staff to determine how the Government could assist you in obtaining more foreign contracts. Up to now, great difficulty has been experienced in producing specific proposals, largely because of the lack of reliable information—information about the volume of work involved, information about prices, and information about financing terms. I might add that we are attempting to gather these facts now.

Facts and figures by themselves do not solve problems or bring about progress. They bring problems into focus, suggest solutions, and measure progress. It is up to us, you and the Government to act on these indicators by making sound private and public decisions.

A basic question which now arises is, Can we in Washington, civil servants and political leaders, discharge our responsibilities by simply operating within the Government? The answer is "No." As many of you are aware, it is very easy to lose touch with reality in the Nation's Capital. This places a number of responsibilities on you and your association, where they rightfully belong.

First of all, we in Government cannot make your individual business decisions for you nor would you want us to. You must make your own decisions with the facts you have and with whatever assistance we can give you. Secondly, we cannot make public decisions without your assistance. You must give us basic information; you may even have to tell us what questions must be answered and what kind of economic intelligence is required; you must let us know what your industry problems are; you must offer your solutions to national problems; and you must give us your views on our solutions.

To accomplish these things, we must have lines of communications. If you have them in your association, use them. If not, I would strongly recommend that you set them up. We have in the Department of Commerce, within the Business and Defense Services Administration, the Construction Industry Division. Your association officials are familiar with the officials of this division. They are there to serve you and are your best lines of communication with the Department of Commerce.

You must realize that you, too, have been called upon by the President to ask yourselves not what the country can do for you, but what you can do for your country. I suggest you examine closely any wasteful practices which impair productivity and retard progress. I suggest you not hide from technological advances in the unfounded fear that they may crimp your profits, but welcome and utilize them in the interests of improving the quality and value of your work. Admittedly, you have many obstacles to surmount, but as a major industry, you have the stuff to be pioneers for the New Frontier.

To give emphasis at the expense of repetition, I wish to conclude by saying once again that the Department of Commerce is dedicated to the administration program of providing our free enterprise system with the means of strengthening and enriching our national economy. We aim to do this by not only collecting, analyzing, and disseminating vital information but also by encouraging domestic and foreign trade as well as by studying and developing solutions to widespread business problems.

To do this, the Department needs and welcomes your participation and cooperation. Let us work together in the service of the Nation.

Constitutional Questions Involved in Connection With the Pending School Assistance Bill

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a very interesting legal opinion in the form of a letter sent to me in relation to the constitutional questions involved in connection with the pending school assistance bill, and particularly applicable to secondary and elementary private schools, by Prof. Arthur E. Sutherland, of the Harvard Law School.

Professor Sutherland is recognized as one of the outstanding authorities in the country on constitutional law. The views and opinions of Professor Sutherland, particularly on constitutional questions, is worthy of most profound consideration.

LAW SCHOOL OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY,
Cambridge, Mass., March 13, 1961.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN McCORMACK: This letter I write in answer to the request from your office for my views on the constitutionality of Federal legislation providing long-term loans of public funds alike to public and nonprofit private schools, for school purposes generally, even where the private schools aided are in many instances connected with or controlled by a church. I am very much obliged to you for sending to me copies of H.R. 4970 in connection with your inquiry; I have read the bill with much interest. Of course it is not, in its present form, intended to make any such provision as this letter discusses.

What I say in this letter is related solely to the issue of constitutionality. Quite different considerations arise in debate on legislative policy, or in marshaling reasons which might underlie the Presidential veto of any legislative measure. A Senator or a Representative has many responsibilities in the preparation of legislation in addition to those of compliance with the Constitution. Much legislation that could be within the constitutional power of the Congress may still be unwise and undesirable. Similarly the veto power is not entrusted to the President solely on questions of constitutionality; Presidents often veto legislation because they deem it unwise and not conducive to the general welfare of the United States even where it is clearly within the range of constitutional lawmaking. I am sure that these considerations are all entirely familiar to you; I here mention them at the outset only to make sure that we understand alike the purport of your inquiry, which went only to the constitutional power of the Congress.

For the purposes of this letter then, I assume, for example, a measure providing loans on terms similar to those provided by title 4 of the Housing Act of 1950 (12 U.S.C. 1749), and following. Suppose that the Congress should be convinced that better elementary and secondary education was necessary to the general welfare of the United States, to its capacity to produce necessary scientists and technicians to aid in our national defense, and to produce the necessary educated men and women to conduct our complex governmental and private economic system. The Congress might consider that our children and youths must look to the elementary and secondary schools in this country for a firm grounding in such basic building blocks of education as an accurate and understanding use of the English tongue; elementary mathematics; the history of the United States and its neighbor nations; some knowledge of the geographical fundamentals of the United States and of the rest of the world, and of our own resources and those for which we depend on other nations; a reasonable familiarity with the structure of our National and State Governments, with our constitutional ideals and practices; some knowledge of the basic prin-

ciples of the sciences on which we depend more and more for existence; and some acquaintance with some of the languages used by our friends of other countries. The Congress might also be impressed by the useful technical skills taught in many of our school systems.

Suppose, further, that the Congress should decide to promote the national welfare in aid of these educational objectives by making loans for, say, 50 years, at not more than 2¾ percent interest to such of our public and private nonprofit schools alike as attain reasonable standards. Would these loans violate the Constitution of the United States if a large number of the private schools to be aided should be church schools, including in their curriculums not only such standard lay learning as I have described, but also instruction in the doctrines of a religious faith?

The principal constitutional clauses which bear on this question are article I, section 8, clause 1, which provides that "the Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts, and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States"; and clause 18 of the same section "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

This general grant of power is to some extent limited by various other clauses. The one here relevant is in the first part of the first amendment: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

This portion of the first amendment contains two quite different provisions. The last six words eliminate from possible congressional power any law prohibiting the free exercise of any religion. Such a restriction is not relevant to this letter. I hear of no proposal for compulsory participation in religious exercises, nor for compulsory abstention from, or penalty for, religious exercises. Such a measure would raise considerations quite different from those discussed in this letter. The only question you put to me, as I understand it, is whether the Congress is devoid of constitutional power to make such long-term loans as I have described because they would be provided in a statute which should be considered a "law respecting an establishment of religion."

Relevant to this study are several possible sources of information. One of these concerns the frame of mind of the Senators and Congressmen who proposed the first amendment, and that of the State legislators who ratified it. This is a difficult inquiry; the men involved were very numerous; the records of their motivation are not complete; different men may well have been prompted by different ideas; and one who engages in this research may begin to doubt whether the Congress in 1961 should have its powers delimited by an uncertain guess at the frame of mind of men who lived 170 years ago.

Another source of guidance as to the meaning of the establishment clause is study of the decisions handed down by the Supreme Court of the United States. Under our system that Court has the last word in constitutional construction, but judgments on establishment are hard to find. Justices of the Supreme Court, in the course of opinions, have on various occasions expressed ideas having a general connection with establishment; but American lawyers traditionally draw a rather sharp distinction between those things which a court actually decides, and those expressions made by the way, obiter dicta, off the immediate issue, not directly involved in the adjudication. Thus the Everson case (330 U.S. 1 (1947)) which arose under the 14th amendment, presented an issue described by Mr. Justice Black in the Court's opinion as follows (the case involves schoolbus fares).

"The only contention here is that the State statute and the resolution, insofar as they authorized reimbursement to parents of children attending parochial schools, violate the Federal Constitution in these two respects, which to some extent overlap. First. They authorize the State to take by taxation the private property of some and bestow it upon others, to be used for their own private purposes. This, it is alleged, violates the due process clause of the 14th amendment. Second. The statute and the resolution forced inhabitants to pay taxes to help support and maintain schools which are dedicated to, and which regularly teach, the Catholic faith. This is alleged to be a use of State power to support church schools contrary to the prohibition of the 1st amendment which the 14th amendment made applicable to the States."

The majority of the Court found no constitutional obstacle preventing this reimbursement for bus transportation. But in his opinion Mr. Justice Black also wrote: "The 'establishment of religion' clause of the first amendment means at least this: Neither a State nor the Federal Government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, or prefer one religion over another. Neither can force nor influence a person to go to or to remain away from church against his will or force him to profess a belief or disbelief in any religion. No person can be punished for entertaining or professing religious beliefs or disbeliefs, for church attendance or nonattendance. No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion. Neither a State nor the Federal Government can, openly or secretly, participate in the affairs of any religious organizations or groups and vice versa. In the words of Jefferson, the clause against establishment of religion by law was intended to erect 'a wall of separation between church and State.'"

While all lawyers properly pay respect to such dicta, still statements of this sort, not directly relevant to the decision of the Court, do not carry the weight, as precedent, of an actual adjudication.

A third source of guidance can be found in the decisions of the Congress and the President of the United States appearing in the enactment and approval of legislation. Members of the Congress and the President are of course bound by oath to support the Constitution, and they conscientiously carry this out. Hence their judgment, expressed in the enactment or approval of legislation, properly has weight as precedent, particularly where, as in the field we are discussing, there is very little judicial decisional matter directly relevant. I shall in this letter briefly discuss these three sources of constitutional material, the opinions of the sponsors of the first amendment; judicial opinions; and legislative enactment and Presidential approval as an indication of constitutionality.

The subjective intention of the congressional draftsmen of the first amendment, and of the State legislators who ratified it are not clear. In 1789 when the Congress proposed the Bill of Rights, favored religions were supported by taxation and other measures in a number of States. Massachusetts continued such tax support until 1833. The Members of Congress who proposed the first amendment had before them as an example of establishment the Established Church in England; they knew or could have known of controversies over tax support for churches in various States. Part of the motivation for the first 10 amendments, which took effect in 1791, was a desire to protect States rights, as appears from the terms of the 10th amendment. Some who favored the first amendment may have thus desired to protect their existing State support for a favored church from Federal interference by a law respecting an establishment of religion. Others may have felt an opposition to any and all governmental intervention in religion. But the earliest Congresses provided for chaplains in the U.S. Army (see act of March 5, 1792, vol. I Stat. at L. 241); the earliest legislators must have recognized that no completely tight wall was possible between church and state. The words of the first amendment are not explicit on federally supported schools. It would be difficult, and probably not useful, to guess at whether the people who 170 years ago proposed and ratified the establishment clause would have thought it forbade the suppositious school-loan bill I have described.

Adjudications of the Supreme Court on Federal legislation challenged under the establishment clause are hard to find. (I here do not refer to such obiter dicta as I mention earlier in this letter, but to adjudications on the merits.) Perhaps the small number of such adjudications can in part be explained by the doctrine in the Federal courts that a Federal taxpayer, not otherwise affected by an act of Congress has no standing in court to argue that the statute is unconstitutional. Thus in 1928, the U.S. Court of Appeals in the District of Columbia held that a taxpayer had no standing to challenge the constitutionality of the payment of salaries to the Chaplain of the Senate, of the House of Representatives, the Army, or the Navy on the ground that this payment constituted a religious establishment violating the first amendment. *Elliott* v. *White* (23 F. 2d 997).

There are a few cases which approach the problem of this letter, though none is precisely in point. In 1899, a man named Bradfield sued the Treasurer of the United States to enjoin the payment of moneys to a hospital in the District of Columbia on the ground that, as the hospital was under the control of a Roman Catholic religious order, the payment would constitute an "establishment of religion." Passing over the question of the taxpayer's standing to bring the action, the Supreme Court, through Mr. Justice Peckham, unanimously held that the hospital was a secular corporation, and although its individual members might all be members of a religious order of the Roman Catholic Church, this would not characterize the hospital as a religious or sectarian body. The Court, therefore, affirmed the judgment of the lower court dismissing the bill.[1] In 1908 the Supreme Court decided *Quick Bear* v. *Leupp* (210 U.S. 50). By treaty with the Sioux the United States in 1868 had agreed to furnish a teacher and schoolhouse for every 30 Sioux children "who can be induced or compelled to attend." To carry out this provision the Congress appropriated funds, and in 1896 Francis E. Leupp, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, proposed to make a contract with the Bureau of Catholic Indian Missions, a Roman Catholic organization, by which the United States would pay funds to that Bureau in order to maintain and educate Sioux Indian pupils at the St. Francis Mission Boarding School on the Rosebud Reservation in South Dakota. Quick Bear, a member of the Sioux Tribe of the Rosebud agency brought an action in the Federal courts to enjoin Commissioner Leupp from carrying out the arrangement. The Supreme Court, dismissing the action, said of the constitutional question "Some reference is made to the Constitution, in respect to this contract with the Bureau of Catholic Indian Missions. It is not contended that it is unconstitutional, and it could not be."

[1] *Bradfield* v. *Roberts*, 175 U.S. 291 (1899).

In support of this statement, the Court cited *Bradfield* v. *Roberts*, the District of Columbia hospital matter which I described above.

There are a few cases discussing the constitutionality of "establishment" by a State, after the enactment of the 14th amendment in 1868. I have already mentioned the *Everson* case (333 U.S. 1, (1947), which upheld New Jersey payments for bus transportation of parochial pupils equally with others. In Mr. Justice Black's opinion in that case sustaining the constitutionality of the payment the Court stressed its concern for the safety of schoolchildren on the highways. The case could be thought of as upholding the New Jersey statute authorizing the payments, on the ground that the State legislature primarily considered the benefit to the children, not the benefit to the parochial school which was only incidental to the other primary objective. Another case involved provision by the State of Louisiana of lay textbooks for children in parochial as well as public schools. This was *Cochran* v. *Louisiana Board of Education* (281 U.S. 370 (1930)). Citizens and taxpayers in Louisiana brought suit in the State courts in an effort to enjoin Louisiana officials from paying out State moneys for this purpose. The plaintiffs argued that this violated the 14th amendment in that private property was taken by the State and used for private purposes, that it was so taken "to aid private, religious, sectarian and other schools not embraced in the public educational system of the State by furnishing textbooks free to the children attending such private schools." The Supreme Court upheld the State statute providing for the textbooks. Pointing out that among the books none was adapted to religious instruction, the Court held that the taxing power of the State was exerted for a public purpose. "The legislation does not segregate private schools or their pupils as its beneficiaries or attempt to interfere with any matters of exclusively private concern. Its interest is education broadly; its method, comprehensive. Individual interests are aided only as the common interest is safeguarded."

Some mention should here be made of the opinions in *Illinois ex rel. McCollum* v. *Board of Education* (333 U.S. 203 (1948)). Here a parent of a child in the Champaign, Ill., public schools, the parent being also an Illinois taxpayer, succeeded in enjoining a program under which teachers of religion not paid by public funds of any Illinois municipality came into the public schools each week, for 30 or 45 minutes, depending on the grade, to give religious instruction on the school premises to children of their respective faiths. Children not desiring to participate were allowed during that period to go to other places in the school building to pursue secular studies. Mr. Justice Jackson, in writing a specal concurring opinion in the McCollum case, pointed out that here, unlike the Everson case, there was no showing of any resulting measurable burden upon the complaining taxpayer. He points out that perhaps the religious classes might be said to add some wear and tear on the public buildings and they should be charged with some expense for heat and light, but he adds that the cost was neither substantial nor measurable and "no one seriously can say that the complainant's tax bill has been proved to be increased because of this plan." To sustain the jurisdiction of the Court in the McCollum case, recourse might be had to the personal embarrassment imposed upon the child for whom the parent spoke. The boy was obliged to dissent from his classmates, to claim exemption from religious instruction, in their presence, to embarrass himself by being different. The McCollum case, therefore, can be thought of as presenting a case of individual hardship imposed on a schoolchild, on religious grounds, which is quite a different thing from a religious objection put forward when no one is individually harmed. That McCollum may have to be sustained as a case of individual hardship appears from the later judgment in *Doremus* v. *Board of Education* (342 U.S. 429 (1952)), in which the Supreme Court refused to pass on the constitutionality of a New Jersey statute providing for reading of Bible verses in public schools on the ground that the facts presented no "case or controversy," essential to jurisdiction of a Federal court. The only standing of the plaintiff was that of a taxpayer, he had no child in school when the case reached the Supreme Court; and there was no demonstration of any State expenditure. The decision in Doremus appears to take away whatever force McCollum might seem to have as a judgment concerning a State establishment of religion, except as the Illinois arrangement may have caused individual hardship.

One ends with the conclusion that the Supreme Court of the United States has never held that a loan such as that in the statute which I outline above, would be in excess of congressional powers because of the first amendment. Insofar as actual adjudication on State statutes is concerned, the Everson and Cochran cases indicate the contrary. It may be significant that in those cases the aim of the legislation was not religious indoctrination but the safety and the lay educational advancement of the schoolchild, the aim which I assume the Congress would have if it were to provide for such loans.

Congressional and executive action furnishes more precedents concerning Federal aid which includes religious schools than can be found in judicial determinations. An unsuccessful proposal for a constitutional amendment is somewhat enlightening. The "Blaine amendment," passed by the House of Representatives in August 1886 by a vote of 180–7, proposed, among other things, to make a constitutional directive that "no public property, and no public revenue of, nor any loan of credit by or under the authority of the United States, or any State, Territory, District, or municipal corporation, shall be appropriated to, or made or used for, the support of any school, educational or other institution, under the control of any religious or antireligious sect, organization, or denomination, or wherein the particular creed or tenets of any religious or antireligious, organization or denomination shall be taught."

The amendment failed to gain the necessary two-thirds vote in the Senate however. But the offer of this Blaine amendment could be thought significant because its congressional sponsors evidently thought the first amendment insufficient clearly to inhibit appropriation, by the U.S. Congress, of funds for the purposes supposed earlier in this letter. The Blaine amendment is set forth in footnote No. 6 in the opinion of Mr. Justice Black in the *McCollum* case (333 U.S. 203 at p. 219).

A number of Federal statutes make grants of Federal funds in aid of some educational end, and include among the proposed recipients of distribution, nonprofit private institutions which may be under sectarian control. Instances are more numerous above the high school level than at or below it. Grade school children get the benefit of funds distributed under the National School Lunch Act, June 4, 1946 (42 U.S.C. 1760). Under this legislation (see 42 U.S.C. 1753) if the State is barred by its laws from distributing funds to nonprofit private schools of any category the United States may distribute funds directly to such nonprofit private schools.

The National Defense Education Act of 1958 provides for loans of Federal funds to elementary and secondary schools including private schools of a nonprofit character, for the purpose of equipping these schools with scientific and modern language instructional equipment. Congressional committee reports on this legislation (see United States Code Congressional and Administrative News, 1958, page 4731 and following) show the purpose of the Congress to increase the excellence of education in subjects thought necessary in our defense and foreign relations efforts.

Title IV of the Housing Act of 1950 (12 U.S.C. 1749), and following, provides for loans of Federal money for a period up to 50 years, at a rate of interest of 2¾ percent or less, to provide "housing and other educational facilities for students and faculties." At any public or nonprofit private educational institution, if it offers at least a 2-year program leading toward a baccalaureate degree. These loans, thus by the terms of the statute, go to institutions above the high school level, but the distinction in principle between a junior college and a senior high school is not entirely clear.

The United States is authorized by legislation (see 42 U.S.C. 2051) to make grants for reactors to "institutions or persons." The United States provides scholarship funds to various classes of deserving students: these funds in due time come to the institutions which the students attend. The GI bill of rights is a familiar example. Also familiar, so much so that it goes almost unnoticed, is the Federal provision of Reserve Officer Training programs leading to Army, to Air Force, and to Navy commissions. (See 10 U.S.C. 4382 and following.) Many of these programs are in effect at colleges and universities under the control of religious orders.

Certain common characteristics are observable in all this legislation. In the first place it does not make grants or loans to churches, religious missions, etc. The benefits go either to students, or to institutions training students; the benefits go to public and private institutions alike; they go to private institutions regardless of their religious or nonreligious affiliation. The religious affiliation of a school or college receiving a loan, or of a school or college to which students resort under scholarships, is therefore incidental and is not singled out by the Federal legislation. In the second place, there is in each of these pieces of legislation an observable end other than the cultivation of religion. Federal funds go to strengthen the Armed Forces, to build up our national scientific or linguistic capabilities or, as in the grants under the Housing Act of 1950, to build up our educational system generally.

The comment might be made that in none of these instances is there a Federal loan or grant of money to an institution to be spent however the institution sees fit, or to be spent as the institution sees fit except for religious instruction. This fact is notable; but perhaps the distinction between existing Federal provisions and an across-the-board benefit is more apparent than practical. Suppose, for example, a junior college with limited funds, needed essential faculty housing and student dormitories. A 50-year Federal loan for such precribed building under the Housing Act of 1950 would release the college's funds for other purposes: some of the college's general funds which otherwise would necessarily be used for student housing might then be available for religious instruction. An elementary or secondary school needing science and language equipment, but with a limited budget, has funds released for general educational purposes when the United States provides funds for scientific and linguistic purposes.

It seems to me that a congressional loan such as that outlined earlier in this letter, to raise the standard of instruction in basic lay educational subjects might well in its terms exclude the direct expenditure of its

funds for religious or sectarian purposes. But the indirect effect on a sectarian school would however be to release for general purposes some funds perhaps otherwise used for lay instruction. This possibility has not in the past inhibited the Congresses which passed such legislation as I have mentioned, or the Presidents who approved it. No governing distinction is apparent to me between these legislative precedents and the hypothetical measure which I described at the beginning of this letter.

During the mid-1930's, many writers sharply criticized the American doctrine of judicial review of the constitutionality of social and economic legislation enacted by the Congress. None of that criticism was directed against unconstitutionality on establishment grounds. Indeed I know of no case in which the Supreme Court ever had held any act of Congress invalid as a "law respecting an establishment of religion." But the Supreme Court for a number of years up to 1935 and 1936 did hold unconstitutional some Federal legislation on the ground that it exceeded the powers entrusted to the Congress by the Constitution, that, according to the then comparatively more limited view of congressional power over interstate commerce granted by article I, section 8, clause 3, it was ultra vires the national government. Examples are *United States* v. *Butler*, (296 U.S. 1 (1936)) and *Carter* v. *Carter Coal Co.*, (298 U.S. 238 (1936)), holding unconstitutional the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 and the Bituminous Coal Conservation Act of 1935.

Since 1936 the Supreme Court has held no Federal statute unconstitutional except where it imposed what the Court found to be an unreasonable hardship or injustice on some individual. The cases invalidate laws

(a) creating a presumption that, where an exconvict is in possession of a firearm, he received, shipped, or transported it in interstate commerce. *Tot* v. *United States* (319 U.S. 463 (1943)).

(b) prohibiting payment of any salary to three named persons, save for jury duty or military service. *United States* v. *Lovett* (328 U.S. 303 (1946)).

(c) penalizing, in self-contradictory terms, one who refuses to allow a Federal officer to inspect a food factory. *United States* v. *Cardiff* (344 U.S. 174 (1952)).

(d) providing for separate schools for Negro and white children in the District of Columbia. *Bolling* v. *Sharpe* (347 U.S. 497 (1954)).

(e) subjecting a former serviceman to trial by court-martial, after his discharge, for offenses committed while in service, *United States ex rel. Toth* v. *Quarles* (350 U.S. 11 (1955)).

(f) providing for trial by court-martial of dependents of servicemen, stationed overseas, for capital crimes. *Reid* v. *Covert*; *Kinsella* v. *Kreuger* (354 U.S. 1 (1957)). In 1960 the Supreme Court extended this holding to include dependents charged with noncapital crimes, *Kinsella* v. *United States ex rel. Singleton* (361 U.S. 234 (1960)); and civilian employees charged with capital or noncapital offenses, *Grisham* v. *Hagan* (361 U.S. 278 (1960)), *McElroy* v. *United States ex rel. Guagliardo; Wilson* v. *Bohlender* (361 U.S. 281 (1960)).

(g) depriving of U.S. nationality one convicted by court-martial of wartime desertion, and dismissed or dishonorably discharged from the Armed Forces. *Trop* v. *Dulles* (356 U.S. 86 (1958)).

As the school-aid legislation I here discuss would not impair any person's free exercise of religion, it would have to be judged as a question of ultra vires. The absence of any ultra vires holding on Federal legislation by the Supreme Court since 1936 increases my feeling that if in some way such a school-aid statute could be brought before that Court, it would be upheld.

I apologize for the length of this letter. The subject is long and complex. The effect of the relevant constitutional provisions is not clear and evident; it must be guessed at, as a matter of emphasis and degree. But assuming that the existing Federal aid to education is constitutional, which seems to me a reasonable assumption, the distinction between these existing programs and the proposal which I discuss is not sufficiently evident to persuade me that a measure providing for long-term loans of the character which I have described, to aid education in basic lay subjects, would conflict with the provisions of the first amendment.

Respectfully yours,

ARTHUR E. SUTHERLAND.

Driver Training, Philadelphia Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, the safety of our citizens is of universal importance. In Philadelphia the education of our young people in safe driving habits promotes the welfare of our community. The program is of such importance that I have included in these remarks a report written by one of our distinguished insurance leaders, Mr. Thornley B. Wood, and which appeared in the March 18, 1961, issue of the U.S. Review:

DRIVER TRAINING, PHILADELPHIA STYLE

(By Thornley B. Wood)

"Sleepy Philadelphia" is an epithet that makes the better informed cringe, yet all the while hoping that the others will speedily come to appreciate Philadelphia's true merit. For example, an area in which our city (far from being asleep) is awake and leading the pack is the driver training program of our Philadelphia Board of Education.

Insurance companies aware of the value of driver training allow a 10 percent reduction in the automobile insurance rates, yet one is astounded to learn that many cities and even whole States are doing little or nothing to further driver training, which has so definitely demonstrated its value in the curtailing of accidents. Contrast the indifference of other areas with the progress our Philadelphia School Board has made with driver training in recent years. The following is lifted from the bulletin of the Agents and Brokers Association:

"Most active members know (as another one of our public relations activities) our local association has successfully sponsored the distribution of a booklet entitled 'Understanding Automobile Insurance.' As a help in traffic safety and driver training, it is terrific.

"Our Philadelphia Board of Education, as many do not know, maintains a tremendous driver training program. Since our booklet avoids any attempt to sell insurance, they welcomed our offer to supply the book to their students taking driver training.

"Now for an amazing word. Do you really know how completely our school board sponsors and supports driver training? Well, this deserves 'honorable mention.' "

"The board employs 34 full-time teachers.

"The board maintains 37 driver education cars.

"The student carries a 5-month course of training.

"The course comprises 36 hours, of which the student is 8 full hours behind the wheel.

"Each student who passes, receives a wallet-size card entitled 'Driver Education Certificate.'

"Every passing student surely carries this with pride and satisfaction. His badge, if you will, of a safe driver:

" 'SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA DRIVER EDUCATION CERTIFICATE

" 'This is to certify that _____ has satisfactorily completed the course in driver education consisting of ____ hours of classroom and ____ hours of practice driving instruction as prescribed by the board of public education.

" 'Date of issue _____, superintendent of schools _____; operator's plate number _____; and _____.

_____ _____

Signature of student. Signature of principal.'

"You may get a better appreciation of what our school district is doing, when you recall that New York State, as a supplement to their present high school driver training program, received in February, this year, a proposal to raise $10 million to finance driver training in every high scool in the State."

The successful big league ballplayer must be more than a good hitter or a good fielder. Indeed the term "good glove no stick" may well sound his death knell as a pro. He must be a well-rounded performer. And here, too, our board hits the ball. In addition to the 37 cars and 34 teachers (full time) the board maintains nearly 20 different supplementary safety education facets. To name just a few—

1. The division of safety education consists of a director and a supervisor of safety patrols supplemented by six regularly assigned police officers and three firemen. The staff works with the advice of a schools' advisory committee on safety consisting of representatives from all levels and areas of the school system.

2. The assignment of six traffic policemen to full-time service in schools has been unusually successful as a cooperative venture between the schools and the Philadelphia Police Department. The policemen give safety talks in the schools to boys and girls and are of special service to safety coordinators, safety patrol sponsors and patrols, faculty groups, school councils, home and school asosciations, classroom groups, driver education classes, traffic survey committees and community groups.

3. Six thousand safety patrol boys who render fine, efficient service guarding the safety of children crossing the street.

4. Seven hundred and twenty women crossing guards under the jurisdiction of the Philadelphia Police Department. They are rendering a fine service to the schools and the community.

5. Teenage safety conferences: A most elaborate program, terrific in its impact on the teenagers.

Rome was not built in a day; hence one should point out that this work did not develop overnight—to summarize:

The driver education program was instituted in the Philadelphia public schools in September 1950 by the board of education. Many groups advocated and supported the formation of the program in the public schools, including such organizations as the Automobile Club of Philadelphia (AAA), the Keystone Automobile Club, the safety council of the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Philadelphia, the Philadelphia Automobile Trade Association, automobile dealers and numerous other civic and commercial interests.

Cars for the driver education program were furnished to the school district of Philadelphia by the Philadelphia Automobile Trade Association from 1950 to 1954. During 1955

and 1956 cars were furnished by the Associated Ford Dealers of Philadelphia. In September 1957 the school district of Philadelphia purchased its own cars for the program. A program of car replacement was instituted in 1960 on a basis of one-third annual turnover.

So we might go on and on. All this has come into full bloom largely because of the efficient coordination and supervision of Dalbor W. Kralovec, director, division of safety education.

Now finally the $64,000 question. Does safety education and driver training pay? Is it worthwhile? Here is your answer—from State statistics—

1. The accident rate for the untrained group is three times as great as for the trained group.

2. The arrest rate for the untrained group is five times as great as for the trained.

Startling? Sobering? Commit those four lines to memory and may they impel you to greater support everytime safety education driver training is the topic.

"United States Unprepared for Showdown in Laos," Pearson States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Mr. Drew Pearson that appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Record of March 18, 1961, on the position of the United States in the face of serious developments in Laos.

The column follows:

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

Drew Pearson says: "United States unprepared for showdown in Laos; U.S. Ground Forces have old-fashioned weapons; Red army is far more modern."

WASHINGTON.—The United States is now facing a serious showdown in Laos and a possible showdown over Berlin with ground weapons so inferior and obsolete that the American public would hardly believe the facts.

Communist intelligence has a pretty good idea of the facts, however, so the American public has a right to know them.

The raw truth is that our ground armies are not even equipped with second-rate weapons. They are nearer 10th rate.

Of the Army's present weapons, 70 percent date back to World War II, another 10 percent are of a vintage even more ancient, some designed as far back as World War I. Even the new weapons are mostly warmed-over World War II models, slightly modified and modernized to give them a new look.

The paradoxical fact is that the Army drifted into this state of unpreparedness under a President who had spent most of his life in the Army and once served as Chief of Staff.

On the Plaine Des Jarres of Laos, meanwhile, Red rebels are bristling with modern, airlifted Soviet arms. These not only are superior to the surplus U.S. arms we have turned over to Lao Government troops, but superior to the equipment our own GI's would carry if they should be rushed to Laos.

Or, suppose Cuba's beligerent, bewhiskered Fidel Castro should order an attack upon the U.S. Naval Base at Guantanamo. His motley militia would be better armed than the defending marines.

In contrast to the American arsenal, Russia has completely reequipped the vast, 175-division Red army since World War II and has long since started to produce a second round of weapons. On top of this the Soviets have had enough left over to supply their satellites and a few neutral nations with modern arms.

The U.S. Army, of course, has made a big noise about its wonder weapons. In effect, this was whistling to keep its courage up. Press releases have described such marvels as a combined howitzer-mortar rocket which can be fired from the shoulder, rifle cartridges which shoot three bullets at once, mobile radar that tracks enemy shells back to their source, jeeps which float on compressed air and can soar over obstacles. But these are in press release stage only. Unfortunately the weapons themselves have never progressed beyond the testing stage.

Even less exotic weapons, such as the M–14 rifle, have reached but few troops—notwithstanding planted Army stories to the contrary. A rash of Pentagon publicity in January 1960 described the M–14 as "a versatile weapon capable of firing faster than a machinegun" and announced it was already going to the 101st Airborne Division.

But the real fact is that the M–14 is merely a beefed-up M–1 rifle of World War II days with a longer bullet clip and a new bore for firing NATO ammunition. Furthermore the first M–14's weren't issued to the 101st Division until a year after the planted propaganda, then only in limited quantities.

PUBLICITY VERSUS PROCRASTINATION

The Army has also issued proud press releases about its new, heavy antitank gun, the M–56. This is a product of General Motors' Cadillac Division and was ready to roll in 1952. But the generals couldn't agree whether to put the gun into production or make it lighter for easier airlift.

Former Secretary of Defense Charlie Wilson, who came to the Pentagon from General Motors in 1953, was afraid to break the deadlock among his generals lest he be accused of favoring his former company which had developed the gun. General Motors then dispatched its vice presidents to go over Charlie's head and bring pressure on members of the Senate and House Armed Services Committee to activate the contract.

Even so, and despite the Army boasts, the M–56 still hasn't been approved for production.

In ground strength, Russia has 175 combat divisions, the United States has 14, of which only 11 are considered combat worthy.

All Soviet divisions down to the battalion level are equipped with chemical rockets. The U.S. Army has developed similar rockets, but none has been issued to the troops. Only the 101st Division is supplied with gas masks, and these are of dubious value against new gases.

All Soviet Divisions are equipped with modern heavy and medium tanks, less than a dozen M–60 medium tanks are scattered throughout the Army.

All Soviet combat troops carry up-to-date, automatic rifles and machine guns. Most American troops are still using World War II guns. Visitors have even spotted World War I weapons at U.S. outposts on the edge of the Iron Curtain.

IKE'S BUDGET CUTTING

Most Soviet troops ride in modern, armored personnel carriers. American GI's still travel in inferior M–59 carriers left over from World War II. More modern M–113 carriers are on order, but only the first few models have come off the production line.

Soviet divisions are equipped with self-propelled, multiple-rocket launchers which shoot 240 milimeter and 280 milimeter rockets. U.S. divisions have nothing like it.

The Russians also have a mightly 400 millimeter self-propelled mortar. The United States has nothing comparable.

In most other weapons the Red army surpasses the U.S. Army in quantity, quality, mobility, and firepower.

Reason for the American decline can be traced directly to Eisenhower's budget-first policy. Ike didn't allot the Army enough to keep its conventional weapons up to date and build up a nuclear arsenal at the same time. The Army preferred to spend its money on modern missiles and nuclear warheads.

Congress appropriated $382,600,000 for Army modernization during the 1960 fiscal year. All Ike permitted to be spent was a mere $38 million.

For fiscal 1961, Congress set a compromise figure of $158 million. But Ike released only $67 million for modern conventional weapons.

This is the reason President Kennedy is now desperately short of the arms needed to keep Laos from falling to the Communists. He has called Premier Khrushchev's bluff in a message delivered by American Ambassador Llewellyn Thompson. If the Reds go ahead with their offensive, however, Kennedy cannot stop them except with the nuclear weapons which are reserved for all-out war.

Best U.S. Product Not Dollar, the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, several exchange students from Chile recently have been guests at the University of Texas. They have lived with our students, they have gone to cattle auctions and basketball games, and they have seen our American life and our people. The conclusions which our guests from Chile have drawn from their visit are described in an excelent article, appearing in the Austin Statesman, Austin, Tex., by Marj Wightman.

I ask unanimous consent to insert this article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Austin (Tex.) Statesman, Mar. 3, 1961]

BEST U.S. PRODUCT NOT DOLLAR, THE PEOPLE

(By Marj Wightman)

We always thought dollars were America's best product, but they're not. Your best product is people."

This change of emphasis from decimal points to heartbeats sums up the impressions soon to be taken home by a group of Chilean students who have just spent 1 month on the University of Texas campus.

"I lived in the Delta Zeta Sorority House, was even initiated into the group," Ana Maria Jiminez, a University of Chile at Valparaiso English major said.

"There are some things we don't understand, things like the integration problem you have up here. But, then, we have only one race in Chile so perhaps there is no reason for us to understand your problem.

"But, on this and on other things I tried to think like the girls in the sorority house, like an American student. And you know," this Chilean coed who speaks English with little accent said, "It wasn't too hard."

Students, after all, are pretty much alike all over.

But university men and women in South America are much more conscious of national and international problems, according to Jose Jara, a philosophy student at the University of Chile in Santiago believes.

"In Chile if we don't get what we think the university should have all of the students go on strike. Our student leaders are members of the national political parties and it's all very effective," this intense looking young philosopher smiles.

"But, what has impressed me most up here is the intense interest of the people in all of Latin America. I just don't understand," the young man from Chile grinned, "why your newspapers don't reflect this.

"Yes, all the papers up here seem to concentrate so much on local interest and local activities," Senorita Jimimez added. "We miss the overall view of the Chilean news coverage."

Frederico Willoughby will carry more than a notebook filled with notes and maybe a few copies of American newspapers back to his classes at the University of Chile at Santiago.

"Just honorary, of course," the young future newspaperman grins. "But it was wonderful the way those boys in the fraternity house made me feel at home.

"I even went home with one of my fraternity brothers to Lampassa and saw a cattle auction.

"And the people in the big cities were so friendly, too. I had always thought anyone who lived in New York was cold, but they'd hear us speaking our own language and came over and ask us if they could be of help."

"This happens in Houston, too," Senorita Jimimez, adds. "And at the sorority house. One day I said I'd like to go to a basketball game because I'd never seen one. The next night—off we went to see Texas play."

"Yes, I think the memories of people are what we'll take home to Chile," Willoughby said. "They are America's best product."

Traffic Safety Hearings Scheduled March 27 and 28, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, on next Monday and Tuesday, March 27 and 28, the Subcommittee on Health and Safety will conduct hearings on H.R. 903, by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT]; and H.R. 1341, the so-called safe cars bill which I am sponsoring.

Both bills deal with the installation of certain safety devices into automobiles and are aimed at curtailing the terrible toll of life and health being taken annually on American highways, roads and streets.

H.R. 1341, which would require certain safety devices on automobiles purchased by the Federal Government, is the same bill which this House passed last year but which was not acted upon by the Senate before adjournment.

We believe we will have an interesting and informative hearing, with outstanding witnesses.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article which appeared recently in Parents' magazine, entitled "My Wife Was Saved by a Safety Belt."

This is a subject in which I am vitally interested. Safety belts are proven lifesavers. I certainly hope Congress will enact legislation such as H.R. 1341 and H.R.134, my safety belt standards bill, to encourage the use of safety devices such as seat belts.

The article follows:

MY WIFE WAS SAVED BY A SAFETY BELT
(By George J. Hecht)

No medical miracle * * * short of a cure for cancer or heart disease * * * can save so many lives.

"Don't forget to fasten your safety belt when you take the car out today." I had said this to my family hundreds of times in the 10 years since our first seat belts were installed. And on this particular morning I issued the warning again, more or less automatically, as I left for my office.

Just as automatically, I reached for the phone that rang on my desk a few hours later. Shocked, I learned that my wife had been in a serious accident. While she was driving on the throughway a car had sideswiped her, causing her to swerve to avoid a collision. Although she'd only been going about 35 miles an hour, she hit a light pole with sufficient force to break it off and plunged into the river on the other side.

How could she possibly have avoided serious injury? She escaped—I might say she survived—because she had heeded my warning: The impact of the crash did not pitch her through the windshield or out on the pavement, as so often happens, because her seat belt had been securely fastened. Although shaken by the ordeal, she suffered only a minor cut over one eye.

Since Mrs. Hecht's narrow escape, I've been painfully aware of the appalling frequency of accident reports and the human implications in such terse statements as "the driver was killed when the car went out of control." As this was being written, I learned that flags were flying at half-mast in Winooski, Vt., for seven fine young men hurled from their car when it hit a tree. The toll mounts, day by day.

I asked one of our associate editors to investigate the subject of traffic accidents and what might be done about them. She summarized her research by quoting John O. Moore, then director of automotive crash injury research at Cornell University, where an exhaustive study had been made on the 10 million auto accidents that occur annually in this country, killing 40,000 persons and injuring 4,500,000 more.

"The safety seat belt is the single most important item to be had to save lives," said Mr. Moore.

In the opinion of many, it is one of the greatest lifesaving devices ever invented. It has been publicized and endorsed by the American College of Surgeons, the U.S. Public Health Service, the American Medical Association and countless other Government and private agencies. But at the present time, fewer than 1 percent of our Nation's 60 million passenger cars have safety belts.

Dr. E. Vincent Askey, president of the American Medical Association, blames "instinctive human laziness * * * carelessness and ignorance" for the continuing slaughter on the highways.

The National Safety Council found that not one of the 442 victims of last July 4 highway massacre wore a seat belt, but a detailed investigation of each accident indicated that about half of these persons would have survived if they'd been wearing them. Other studies show a reduction up to 60 percent of the most serious crippling and maiming injuries. Another analysis of thousands of crashes concludes that the risk of death is cut four-fifths when a safety belt is worn.

Think what excitement would result if medical authorities were to announce the development of a pill which reduced mortality from two leading causes of death—heart ailments and cancer—to less than one-fifth. Yet for a third leading killer—accidents—there already exists a lifesaving device which relatively few people use.

Why don't all car owners buy safety seat belts for their cars? It's because they really don't know the facts. Here are the answers to the most common questions people ask about safety belts:

Aren't you safer if you're thrown clear of the car? IBM machines which have stored up crash analyses by medical and traffic experts in 22 States answer: you are five times more likely to be killed if you are thrown out of your car. The ejection of occupants is also the most frequent factor in serious injury. A study of fatal accidents on Indiana rural highways showed that one or both front doors opened in 72 percent of the crashes. In a significant number of cases, doors popped open at relatively low speeds in accidents of lesser severity.

Don't seat belts themselves cause injuries? In a severe crash a purple bruise on the hip may result—instead of a fractured skull or worse. The belt, when properly installed and worn snug, pulls down and back across the pelvis and hips, not across the abdomen. For this reason, even women in the last months of pregnancy may safely wear them, according to an article in the American Medical Association Journal.

What if the car is submerged or catches fire? In 10,000 accidents recorded by Cornell University's research project, only one-fifth of 1 percent involved fire and only three-tenths of 1 percent were underwater. Since a belt greatly reduces the risk of serious injury, it follows that you have a better chance of remaining conscious and being able to get out. Seat belt buckles can be released with one hand in 2 seconds.

Isn't wearing a seat belt in a soft-top convertible useless? Only 2 percent of all accidents on record involved a soft-top car overturned, but rollovers in convertibles are obviously dangerous with or without belts. However, since four out of five injury-producing acidents do not involve rollovers, and you are twice as safe in this type of accident with a seat belt, odds favor the seat belt wearer.

Aren't seat belts expensive, unattractive and uncomfortable? A current mail order catalog lists seat belts meeting the Society of Automotive Engineers' standards for under $10 a pair. Local installation costs from $2.50 up. Your best bet may be to buy the belts from your car dealer and have them installed by him. They are now obtainable in high fashion colors which coordinate with car interiors. Safety belts are adjustable to fit any size adult or child. While they are perhaps needed more in the front seat of a car, they afford valuable protection for those in the back seat, too. Far from being uncomfortable, safety belts worn snugly contribute greatly to your feeling of body security. They also prevent fatigue and backache by holding you in place so that less muscular effort is needed to maintain equilibrium on bumpy, twisting roads and for sudden stops. Long-distance drivers use them for comfort as well as protection.

If you're a careful driver and don't do much long-distance driving, why bother? Because the National Safety Council and other investigators have found that three out of five fatal crashes occurred on roads familiar to the driver. Half of those who died on last July 4 were only 10 miles from home and more than one-third were within 5 miles; this on a holiday weekend when most people take longer than usual trips. The

typical accident victim is not the speed demon who wraps his low-slung sports car around a telephone pole while doing 100 or better. He is a young homeowner hurrying to the hardware store before it closes, preoccupied with his do-it-yourself project, or a wife with a car full of youngsters on her way to pick up an impatient husband at the station, her mind on the dinner at home, or a teenager backing out of his driveway with a confident flourish, not seeing the delivery truck bearing down.

The demolished cars in scare safety campaigns tend to give a false sense of security to those who do not drive fast. But the fact is that 50 percent of all fatalities occur at travel speeds of less than 40 miles per hour. While there is an increased incidence of mortality as speeds go up to 50 and 60 miles per hour and over, one can also be killed or seriously injured in a car that's barely moving. Being a safe driver is no guarantee that you won't be struck from behind or sideswiped as my wife was. The best insurance is a seat belt which will hold you on impact. As a matter of fact, some insurance companies reduce your premiums 10 percent if your car is equipped with safety belts. In some European countries they are required by law.

But there is no use in investing in seat belts if you don't use them. A 1960 California Highway Department report on 54,348 accidents showed only one-third of the cars equipped with safety belts were using them at the time they crashed. Another report, in the American Medical Association Journal, stated that 80 percent of the crash victims observed did not have their belts fastened. On the other hand, John Moore, top safety consultant, found 3 out of 4 using their belts in a survey in a different part of the country. Some areas, such as Fort Wayne, Ind., at the present time are undergoing intensive educational campaigns on the safety advantages of such belts.

What about legislation? Ten States require one or more agencies to equip their cars with seat belts; many State trooper vehicles are equipped in other States. One Federal agency, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, requires seat belts in all its vehicles. Legislation to make seat belt floor fittings mandatory in every automobile is being considered by the State of Michigan. California's law under discussion would prohibit the sale or operation of a car without seat belts. New York, Connecticut, and Illinois have legislation pending. In Washington, D.C., legislation to require motorscars to have minimum safety devices was considered during the last session of Congress. The two bills, H.R. 1346, and H.R. 1341, were favorably reported out by a House committee. A congressional subcommittee declared in favor of the belts after several years' investigation.

The strongest seat belt available is completely useless unless it is properly installed—this means solid anchoring to the steel floor structure with reinforcing plates or, in older cars, to the frame.

Several automobile manufacturers are currently offering the option of factory-installed seat belts with this year's models. What the public demands, the manufacturers will be happy to supply. But so far, too few people are asking for safety belts.

Yet in the time it has taken you to read this article, some 680 drivers have been involved in accidents in this country. In the past 10 years, 374,650 persons, enough to fill a city the size of Louisville, Ky., have been wiped out in crashes. The U.S. Navy had around 8,500 combat casualties in the Korean war in 1951, and the Navy lost almost exactly that same number, during the same period, in off-duty car mishaps. Four-fifths of such loss of life and incapacity might have been prevented by seat belts.

I strongly advise all of you who read this article to have safety belts installed in your car during the next day or two while this counsel is still fresh in your mind.

SAFETY HINTS FOR DRIVING WITH CHILDREN

A reminder: Automotive accidents are the leading cause of death in ages 15 to 24; second, in ages 10 to 14; and third, in the 5- to 9-year-old group.

Infants are safest in a padded basket or car bed, with head protection, placed on the floor of the back seat. If necessary, an adult passenger wearing a safety belt and sitting in the rear seat should be the one to hold the baby. Never lay the baby on the seat—you wouldn't do this to fine china or eggs.

Babies who sit up should be in a car seat with an adult safety belt shortened so that it fits around them, seat and all. Special safety vests are being developed: They must be quickly removable and designed so that there is no danger of choking. To be effective, all harnesses and vests, as well as belts, should be properly installed. Just pinning or tying to the seat will not hold in a crash.

Three- and four-year-olds should be able to wear and operate a regular seat belt. Children will use belts conscientiously if you set a good example. Never permit standing in the car. Some special car seats for children are on the market; in using them care should be taken that they are securely fastened to the seat. Always push down the buttons that lock the doors from the inside. This helps to keep them closed on impact. Keep the car free of toys and other objects which might fly about in case of an accident.

The safest seat? Accident studies show that in head-on collisons, the driver gets the worst of it. In ordinary accidents—that is, in the medium range—the rear seat is safest. However, in a severe crash there is no safest spot—back-seated children can swan dive into the windshield with terrific force, much harder than if they were in the so-called suicide seat next too the driver in front. Obviously, the only way to feel secure is to drive carefully and have all passengers wearing seat belts at all times.

Serious Inaccuracies Claimed in Federal Census

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of the House of Representatives an article in today's New York Times in which Mr. Herman Wolf makes serious charges of inaccuracy in the 1960 Federal Census.

I have known Mr. Wolf for many years and I have a high regard for his judgment. I shall do my best to insure that the charges he makes are investigated most thoroughly.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I submit this article from today's New York Times:

CENSUS IS ATTACKED FOR TABLE OMITTING CONNECTICUT TOWNS

GREENWICH, CONN., March 21.—Serious inaccuracies were charged today to the U.S. Census Bureau by the chairman of the Connecticut Travel Council.

Herman Wolf, the council official, said the Bureau's final report for 1960 contained a table purporting to list the "population of all incorporated places and urban towns, and of unincorporated places of 1,000 or more."

But he said the table omitted 2 Connecticut towns of 20,000 population, 7 of 15,000 to 20,000; 12 of 10,000 to 15,000; and at least 17 towns of 5,000 to 10,000. Mr. Wolf said 30 other towns had been listed inaccurately.

He noted that table 8 on page 10 of the report omitted Westport, Darien, New Canaan or Trumbull in Fairfield County. Other casualties farther afield were said to be Berlin, Bloomfield, Farmington, Glastonbury, Newington, North Branford, North Haven, Orange, Woodbridge, Killingly, Waterford, and Watertown.

Mr. Wolf said more than 93 Connecticut towns were affected by errors in table 8. He said "serious errors and omissions" had been most "damaging to Connecticut's reputation and business."

The situation came to light when his young son began disputing his knowledge of local statistics, which was hard to take inasmuch as Mr. Wolf was an aid to former Gov. Abraham A. Ribicoff. The boy gave as his authority an annual supplement published by a standard encyclopedia, which quoted table 8.

Too Poor To Be a Communist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Al Capp as it appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of March 19, 1961:

TOO POOR TO BE A COMMUNIST—HOW LACK OF A DOLLAR KEPT "SUBVERSIVE" OFF RECORD

(By Al Capp)

One day the State Department called me from Washington.

"Mr. Capp," said the cultured voice, "please regard this as confidential. The President (it was Ike then) is considering your name for the chairmanship of a committee of his people-to-people campaign. Would you accept if he appointed you?"

I asked him what the duties were. They sounded irksome and I was to be paid nothing. So I said okay.

"There's one more detail," said the State Department man. "Since this appointment will come directly from the President himself, your name will have to be put through for top security clearance * * *."

He left that sentence dangling. He was giving me a chance to reconsider my acceptance, in case there was anything subversive buried in my past that such an investigation would bring to light.

"Go right ahead," I said, confidently.

My confidence in the purity of my political past was not misplaced. A few weeks later the President appointed me chairman of that committee, and I still serve.

I was clean.

But only because I couldn't afford to be snared into "subversion." All that prevented me from unwittingly becoming "subversive," and saved me from wrecking my career, was a dollar I didn't have.

Here's how it happened.

It was in the 1930's. In spite of the depression my family's way of life didn't

change. All that changed was that everybody else in the neighborhood was now as broke as we had always been.

I was a freshman at the School of the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston, lonely and miserable. I was new in town. I didn't have a car, or money, or buddies who had any.

My life was dull, but there seemed to be a lot of action for luckier kids. There was a particularly gay cluster of pretty girls and skylarking boys around a merry lad named Byron. They always seemed to be frenziedly getting ready for parties and giggling over parties they had been to.

I yearned to become a part of that rat pack.

One day Byron, the leader, sidled up to me.

"We're giving one of our li'l parties tonight," he said, "want to come?"

I was in.

He gave me the time, the address, and then added, casually: "You've got to have this card, and sign this paper. Makes you a member of the group, and then you can come to all the parties."

I whipped out my pen and looked for the place to sign.

"It'll cost you a buck," he said, holding his hand out.

I put the pen away. I didn't have a buck. My heart broke as he withdrew the card, which would have made me a member of the Young Communist League.

I tried all year to get up the dough to join that oddly named group and get to all those parties. Sometimes I came close—up to 70 or 80 cents. But I never quite made it, and the next year Byron and his merry crew had vanished.

If I had had that dollar, my name would have ineradicably been on their lists, entitling any congressional committee 30 years later to denounce me as a traitor, and any investigative agency to reject my services to my country, because I was once a card-carrying subversive.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

The Fogarty Bill To Promote the Education of the Blind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1961

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, blind children require for their education special equipment in the form of books in raised print, tangible apparatus and devices of various kinds. It was recognized early that the supply of such equipment would never be adequate if each State were left to its own resources. The first legislation providing aid from the Federal Government was approved on March 3, 1879, under the title "An act to promote the education of the blind," chapter 186, 45th Congress. According to this law, a perpetual trust fund of $250,000 was set up to be invested in U.S. interest-bearing bonds, the income from which, at 4 percent in the amount of $10,000 per year, would go to the American Printing House for the Blind in Louisville, Ky. The law also provided that the superintendents of the various tax-supported schools for the blind of the country become ex officio members of the board of trustees of the Printing House, and that books and tangible apparatus equivalent in value to the governmental grant be distributed among the schools for the blind in proportion to their pupil enrollment.

In 1906, the original law of 1879 was changed to provide a direct $10,000 appropriation to the Printing House to be made annually in perpetuity—Public Law 59–288. In 1919, the first appropriation in addition to the original $10,000 was authorized in the amount of $40,000—Public Law 66–24. Later amendments further increased the appropriation authorization to $65,000 in 1927—Public Law 69–584—and to $115,000 in 1937—Public Law 75–339—these sums always to be added to the $10,000 permanent annual appropriation. Then in 1952, Congress increased the authorized annual appropriation to $250,000—Public Law 82–354—thus making the possible total annual grant $260,000. An important change was made in 1956—Public Law 84–922—when the law was amended so as to authorize wider distribution of books and other special instructional material for the blind, thus regularly authorizing the Printing House to make available educational materials on a per capita basis to all blind children, either in special schools for the blind or regular public schools. Before this, regular public schools had received such materials as a result of an opinion handed down on January 30, 1912, stating that these schools were entitled to share in the free distribution of materials under this act. At present, more blind children are being educated in regular public school systems than in special schools for the blind. Furthermore, the law of 1956 increased the authorized appropriation to $400,000 per year, which, with the permanent annual appropriation, could make a total of $410,000.

The act of 1879 vested the control of the appropriation in the Treasury of the United States. The administration of the appropriation to the Printing House was transferred by joint resolution to the Federal Security Agency.

In the present interpretation, the term "books and tangible apparatus," includes books in raised print as well as talking books, talking book reproducers, and books in large type, in addition to special apparatus and devices. The present law is also interpreted to require that all books and apparatus furnished under its provisions must be manufactured by the American Printing House for the Blind.

Over the years since 1879, when the original law was enacted, there have been very few substantive changes except for the periodic increase in the authorization of appropriations occasioned by the growing population of blind school-age children. Despite the strong trend toward educating blind children in regular public schools with sighted children instead of in special schools for the blind, the law, which belatedly authorized the distribution of books and materials to them, provides only for a per capita quota system of allocating these materials. Thus, the practical effect virtually negates the advantages which should result from this entitlement. The per capita basis for allocating books and materials similarly discriminates against the smaller special schools for the blind and the separate Negro departments in special schools where there is racial segregation, since a substantial portion of the monetary equivalent to which these schools are entitled is used by in purchasing expensive instructional materials, such as braille globes and maps, braille dictionaries, braille writers, and the like. If the allocation is taken in textbooks, then not enough money is left for these equally important but expensive items.

The restriction to items manufactured by the American Printing House for the Blind is also archaic. Three dimensional models of plants, animals, the solar system, and so forth are in regular us in most public school systems for sighted children and are readily available from established scientific supply houses. These would be invaluable educational aids for the tactual instruction of blind children. In order to supply them under the act, the Printing House would have to tool up and manufacture them for a small consumer market, a costly process resulting in a high unit cost compared to purchasing commercially available items manufactured for a mass market. Similarly, the Printing House is prevented from purchasing for distribution under the act special aids and devices made by other agencies for the blind or adapted by commercial manufacturers for the use of blind persons.

In view of the foregoing, we believe that a substantial overhaul of the act of 1879 is highly desirable in order to meet the educational needs of blind children in 1961 and future years in a realistic and efficient fashion consistent with current practices in Federal grant programs. The proposed bill is offered as a means of achieving this objective.

ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED BILL

1. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 1 of the proposed bill would increase the authorization of appropriations by removing the present ceiling of $400,000 annually and leaving the annual appropriation to the discretion of the Congress. The sharp growth in number of blind children of school age due to retrolental fibroplasia in premature babies and regular population growth plus increased production costs make the present appropriation of $400,000 woefully inadequate.

In view of the fact that the program has been in existence for more than 80 years and that the Committee on Appropriations has had to approve an annual appropriation for more than 40 years, it would seem that a specific ceiling on appropriations is no longer necessary. Elimination of the ceiling would make it unnecessary for the Congress to take action periodically to increase the authorization in such a long-established and vital program and would have prevented the current situation for fiscal 1961, when it was obvious that the $400,000 annual appropriation would be inadequate, but that nothing could be done until the enabling legislation was amended.

2. RULES AND REGULATIONS

Section 1 of the proposed bill also authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make rules and regulations governing the administration of the act. There are presently no such regulations and, therefore, no clear guide on questions involving administrative procedures in carrying out the intent of the Congress. Such regulations would be extremely helpful to everyone interested in the education of blind children and would be consistent with procedures in other Federal grant programs.

3. AUTHORIZATION TO PURCHASE MATERIALS

The phrase "manufacturing and furnishing" and similar phrases have been changed to "manufacturing or furnishing" in order to authorize the American Printing House for the Blind to purchase items of equipment specially adapted or useful in the education of blind children from commercial supply houses and other agencies for the blind. The present law is interpreted to restrict everything furnished under the act to books and devices manufactured by the Printing House itself. As a result, blind children cannot be provided under the act with valuable, tangible educational aids readily available elsewhere. If the Printing House chose to provide these items, it would be required by the law to tool up and manufacture them. The purchasing authority provided under the proposed bill would be a much more economical way of furnishing such items, like three-dimensional tactual models for science instruction mentioned above.

4. ANNUAL APPROPRIATION

Section 2 of the proposed bill merely corrects an oversight when the law was amended in 1919 to provide for an annual appropriation in addition to the permanent annual appropriation of $10,000. The first sentence of section 102 of the act seems to limit the distribution of the books and materials to the value of the $10,000 permanent annual appropriation, whereas the intent of Congress is to distribute the total annual appropriation.

5. PER CAPITA QUOTA

Section 3 of the proposed bill authorizes the distribution of large expensive items of equipment, such a braillewriters, braille dictionaries, braille encylopedias, and the like on a school, classroom, or other practicable basis. This would make it possible for blind children in smaller special schools for the blind or in regular public schools to have the advantage of these essential educational aids without having their quota for textbooks and smaller aids used up. An Advisory Council on the Education of the Blind would determine what equipment would be provided in this manner. Textbooks and smaller educational aids would still be provided on a per capita quota basis determined by the ratio between the number of blind children enrolled in public institutions at the elementary or secondary school level in each State and the total similarly in elementary or secondary schools for the entire country. In addition, the proposed bill would authorize each State to receive up to 10 percent of its per capita quota in actual cash to purchase specific items locally or where available. For example, Hawaii or even Oregon or California could purchase record players for talking book records much more economically in their local areas instead of having such bulky items shipped from the Printing House in Louisville under the quota, with expensive shipping charges adding to the cost and decreasing the amount these States could have for actual items of equipment The Advisory Council would develop a list of approved items of equipment which could be purchased directly by the States.

The present law provides for a per capita quota system based on the ratio between the number of blind children enrolled in schools below the college level in all of the States and possessions and the number of blind children enrolled in special schools for the blind in each State, as well as a separate quota determined by the ratio of children enrolled in all special schools and regular public schools and blind children enrolled in regular school systems in each State. This cumbersome dual quota would be eliminated in the proposed bill in favor of a single quota system for each State.

The term at the "elementary or secondary school levels" in the proposed bill substitutes for "below college grade" in the present law to plug a loophole by which State-operated rehabilitation centers for blind persons are obtaining books and equipment under the act, which was clearly intended by Congress for blind schoolchildren in elementary and secondary schools. Federal regulations would undoubtedly have prevented this abuse. Federal funds for rehabilitation facilities are available under other laws.

6. STATE OWNERSHIP

Section 3 of the proposed bill not only eliminates the dual quota system for each State, but also gives title to books and equipment to the State receiving them. The State is authorized to assign title, thus providing for flexibility in the use of books and equipment where needed, whether it be in the State's special school for the blind or in regular public schools in the State. Under the present law, equipment and books presumably remain the property of the Federal Government and frequently pile up when use for them is past instead of being reassigned to another school within or without the State.

7. STATE AGENCY

Section 3 of the proposed bill provides for a State agency or agencies designated by the State to receive and distribute books and materials furnished through the American Printing House for the Blind under the act and otherwise to administer the program at State level. If the State designates more than one agency then the State department of education must attest to procedures for obtaining and distributing books and other materials within the State, in order to provide for coordinated utilization of books and materials by overseeing their transfer to other schools in the State when there is no longer any need for them in a given school.

A State agency administering the program under the act could be the State department of education, the special school for the blind, or any logical agency involved in educational programs for blind children which the State might designate.

8. ADVISORY COUNCIL

The Advisory Council on the Education of the Blind mentioned in sections 3, 4, and 7 of the bill would be established in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to select publications, to develop lists of approved tangible apparatus and other educational materials provided under the act, and otherwise to advise the trustees of the American Printing House for the Blind in administering the act.

The Advisory Council would consist of the superintendent of the American Printing House for the Blind, serving as chairman, and 12 members appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, 4 of whom shall be teachers of blind pupils in special schools for the blind or regular public schools; 4 of whom shall be administrators of educational programs for blind children, such as superintendents of special schools for the blind or the heads of State departments of education; and 4 of whom shall be individuals particularly expert in the development of educational aids and teaching methods for blind children. Thus, the Advisory Council would bring to this program a representative group especially knowledgeable about the problems involved in both types of educational programs for blind children—the special residential schools and the regular public schools. The Council would provide a mechanism which has proved to be effective and efficient in many other Federal grant programs.

The Advisory Council would supplant the ex officio trustees of the American Printing House for the Blind consisting of the superintendents of the special residential schools for the blind, who, under the present law, are responsible for administering the act. This body of ex officio trustees may have been a logical mechanism for supervising the administration of the act in 1879, when there were only 38 States and when blind children who were educated at all were in residential schools for the blind. Now there are 50 States plus Puerto Rico, Guam, the District of Columbia, and the Virgin Islands in the program. Now more than half of all blind children are being educated in regular public school systems rather than in special residential schools. Also, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare rather than the Treasury Department is the Federal agency to which the Printing House is directly responsible. For these reasons, the representative Advisory Council and the regular seven-member Board of Trustees of the Printing House will provide an effective and efficient mechanism for administering the program as Congress intends in order to serve the blind children of the Nation more adequately.

Furthermore, the existing ex officio trustees mechanism does not provide for representation of educators involved in educational programs for blind children in the regular public school systems, where the problems are completely different from those in special schools. There have been proposals to add the 54 heads of State departments of education—including the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands—to the ex officio trustees of the Printing House; but this would create an unwieldy group of more than 100 members. The Advisory Council, consisting of actual practitioners in teach-

ing blind children as well as administrators, is a much more practical solution.

The 12 members of the Advisory Council appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare are to serve for 4-year terms, except for the first group.

9. BUILDINGS, AND SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Section 4 of the bill broadens paragraph 2 of section 102 of the act, which forbids the use of funds for the erection of buildings, to authorize the expenditure of funds for salaries and expenses of experts and other staff to assist the Advisory Council and for the expenses of the Advisory Council and special committees which may be appointed. Under the present law, the Printing House has had to use private funds to pay the salaries and expenses of staff people involved in carrying out the program.

10. SALE AT COST

Section 5 of the bill merely broadens the wording of the act which requires the Printing House to charge only the cost of materials it manufactures and furnishes under the program to conform with the broader authority granted in the bill to permit the Printing House to purchase useful educational aids already available from commercial and other sources. Thus, although commercial sources of finished products would be able to charge a profit on items purchased for distribution by the Printing House in the same manner as suppliers of raw materials to the Printing House do under the present law, the net result would still be more economical than if the Printing House were required to tool up and manufacture items already available, as the present law requires.

11. WITHHOLDING OF FUNDS

Section 6 of the bill simply repeals the existing obsolete provision of paragraph 4 of section 102 of the act, calling for funds to be withheld from the Printing House if they are misused. Other Federal laws make this specific punitive provision in the act superflous.

12. CONFORMING AMENDMENT

Section 8 of the bill merely corrects an oversight in section 104 of the act which was not corrected by the 1956 amendments and still refers to the Federal Security Agency instead of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

13. EFFECTIVE DATE

Section 9 of the bill makes its amendments effective for fiscal years following enactment of the bill.

Carl Vinson, "Mr. National Defense"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable CARL VINSON is encouraging the textile industry and its growing list of unemployed by his leadership of our House group seeking quotas by country and by category. The following editorial from the Greenville, S.C., News, indicates the gratitude of our people:

TEXTILES AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

Congressmen and Senators of the textile States chose well when they selected Representative CARL VINSON, of Georgia, to lead the group which will present to a White House study committee their case for import quotas on cloth and finished goods from low-wage countries.

Their choice should make it certain that their case will reach the office of the President himself, and that it will be carefully heard, for when Mr. VINSON speaks, other statesmen listen, and his words usually are heeded.

The representatives of the textile areas are asking the administration to take executive action under the laws clearly authorizing such moves to curb, or control, imports country by country, and category by category.

They are not objectiong to imports as such, and they have as much at stake as anyone in a balance of trade, but the industry which is the primary mainstay of the economy in their States is in trouble.

In the absence of the kind of quotas they are requesting, the American textile industry is not free to plan either expansion or production. The manufacturers do not know which of the several other textile producing countries, where the industry has been built up with American aid, will be allowed to export large quantities of goods to the United States.

They do not know how much these countries will be allowed to export, nor what kind of goods will be shipped.

This, naturally, leaves them in a quandary when it comes to planning new facilities, buying new machinery, or even setting up their production schedules for a new quarter or season. Not knowing what the cheap foreign competition will be like, it is difficult for them to decide whether to concentrate on cottons or synthetics, coarse goods or fine goods.

And how they can quote a price on goods for delivery 3 to 6 months ahead is a problem that should baffle even a Harvard economist.

For these and many other reasons, the request of the textile States is a reasonable one. Yet it has been repeatedly denied by governmental agencies having the power to make recommendations to the President for final action.

It now appears that the advocates of a strong American textile industry are going to make a new plea, this one based on the importance of the industry to national defense. And again they are on sound ground.

Going to grassroots, textiles are fundamental to the national economy. The United States can no more afford a sick textile industry than it can afford a sick steel or automobile industry.

On a more practical level, textile production, research and development are no less important to national defense than steel, electronics, aerodynamics, and chemistry.

Should war come, can we depend on Japan to produce the materials to clothe our Army and Navy, can France supply the highly developed fabrics for flight suits for the Air Force and can we go all the way to India for the webbing for rigging a parachute for a paratrooper?

Obviously not.

And that is where CARL VINSON comes in.

He is chairman of the House Armed Services Committee and has been for more years than most of his colleagues in the administration and Congress have been in public life. He is, in a very real sense, "Mr. National Defense," for he has made the shoring up of the Armed Forces perhaps his primary concern. The Nation is indebted to him.

Now some of his colleagues are calling on his proven leadership ability to strike a blow for national defense, for an essential industry and for the economies of his own and several other States.

We believe, from our knowledge of his record as an advocate of the Armed Forces and as a supporter of the Kennedy administration, that they went to the right man.

On the Failings of Big Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1961

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post which is an extract from an address by W. H. Ferry, director of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions at Santa Barbara, Calif., an activity of the Fund for the Republic, Inc. It was presented at a seminar at Princeton University last week:

ON THE FAILINGS OF BIG BUSINESS

A cherished corporate legend is that governmental bureaucracy is inefficient, full of featherbedding dullards, and tends toward venality; while the bureaucracy of the large company comprises highminded and overworked gentlemen, whose eyes are on a brighter star.

This line is one of the main strands of the political irresponsibility of corporations. Though it might at first glance seem merely an engaging self-deception, it in fact tears away at respect for law and government, the joint creations of people for their own good, and aggrandizes the private company as somehow superior both in aim and practice.

Closely related to the managerial theory of dunderhead government is that of corporate perfectionism. This is the insistence that the corporation never makes a mistake, so that when something goes wrong the fault may always be found elsewhere—in some government offices, in the perfidy of unions, in unfair competition from overseas, or in the fickleness of the public.

A quaint consequence of this theory is that those few who make the mistake suffer little, while those many who had nothing to do with the decision suffer much. Thus a mistaken judgment about product lines does not result in laying off the managers who made the judgment but the employees who were not involved in it.

More significant by far is the general corporate outlook on the political scene. It is, not to put too fine a point on it, a clear and steady survey through the rear-view mirror. The same men who are enterprising and adventurous in laboratory and office and of consummate ingenuity on the sales front are starchy and nostalgic when confronted with political issues.

An especially prickly problem, for instance integration, will send them to the storm cellars, whence they send forth bulletins announcing that it is not business's business to take part in distasteful political discussions.

The irresponsibility of political short views is best illustrated by considering the big corporation vis-a-vis technology and jobs. We are moving into an epoch in which most of the ancient evils can be eliminated or

minimized: drudgery, want, war. The venerable rule which says the more machines, the more jobs is being repealed.

The probable extent of the effects of automation are a matter of surmise. What is not a surmise is that there will be a very great deal of automation, and that traditional ways of dealing with such developments—collective bargaining, for example—are clearly inadequate.

What will we do when we can meet all our needs with half or a quarter of the available supply of labor? This dark issue is lingering just over the horizon, its harbingers already among us in nests of technological unemployment. We are beginning to understand that automation means more centralized decisionmaking, more and more influence in the hands of fewer and fewer people.

A different style of political irresponsibility is starkly illuminated by our problems in Latin America and in the other less developed parts of the world. No one acquainted with the behavior of Western corporations on their pilgrimages for profit during the last 50 years can really be surprised to read that the African explosions now taking place are doing so in an "anti-American, anticapitalist, anti-Western" context.

For many years these continents have been happy hunting grounds for corporate adventurers, who have taken out great resources and great profits and left behind great poverty, great expectations, and great resentment. Gunnar Myrdal points out that capitalist intervention in underdeveloped countries thus far has almost uniformly had the result of making the rich richer and the poor poorer: a spectacular record of political irresponsibility on a global scale.

I doubt whether we shall ever be able to figure out the cost of these unfriendly raids on the resources of others, which of course have their domestic counterpart in undiminished raids on our own timber, oil, and grazing lands and mineral deposits.

The prospect of the destruction of civilization is looking us dead in the eye, all of us. The contribution of our industrial potentates to the debate, as far as I am aware, is almost exactly zero.

Letter to President Kennedy by North Atlantic Ports Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter to President John F. Kennedy by Michael M. Mora, president of the North Atlantic Ports Association, concerning a budget item for the St. Lawrence Seaway Corporation, to enable this agency to actively promote commerce for the seaway:

NORTH ATLANTIC PORTS ASSOCIATION,
March 6, 1961.

Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It has come to our attention that the Bureau of the Budget has been requested to augment the budget of the St. Lawrence Seaway Corporation in order to enable this agency to actively promote commerce for the seaway and as a natural corollary, for all Great Lakes ports.

The promotion of commerce for U.S. ports has traditionally been the responsibility of local port interests, both governmental and private, without use of funds or other resources of the Federal Government. This is completely right and proper since those who will receive a direct economic benefit from such promotional activities should logically bear the cost of carrying on these activities.

Port agencies currently exist in the Great Lakes, the majority of which are engaged in promotional activities in behalf of the ports they represent. They, like the agencies promoting commerce for other American ports, are now using and should continue to use local funds for their programs. The provision of Federal funds to be used by a Federal agency for the promotion of commerce to benefit only one area of the country, to the detriment of other areas, is obviously unfair and against the national interest. The net effect of such a program would be to require taxpayers on the Atlantic, gulf, and Pacific coasts, to finance efforts to divert cargoes and thus potential revenue, away from their own ports.

The North Atlantic Ports Association stands in complete opposition to involvement of the Federal Government in commerce promotion activities for the benefit of any port or ports in the Nation. The members of the association have expended great sums of money in the promotion of their own ports and feel that all the ports in the Nation should do the same if it is their intent to compete for trade and commerce in the free American economy. We, of course, do not object to the provision of adequate funds for public information activities of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, since such activities are clearly within the realm of the responsibilities of this agency.

Respectfully yours,
MICHAEL M. MORA,
President, North Atlantic Ports Association.

When Distress Proves Our System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1961

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, for generations the white and colored people in the South have lived side by side, amid a prevailing spirit of harmony, respect, and cooperation. This relationsip has been maintained despite the divisive efforts of outsiders.

Those of us who live in the southern section of the United States and who know conditions there have tried repeatedly to show others the real picture. Much too often our words have fallen on closed ears and minds. I am convinced, however, that racial agitation would be greatly reduced if those who are sincere but mistaken in their criticism had the opportunity to personally observe the true relationship between the races in the South.

As in any just cause, we who believe that our area has been misjudged continue our efforts to enlighten our adversaries.

Recently, severe floods devastated large areas of the State of Alabama. The manner in which the Negro and white races worked closely together during these floods to prevent death and alleviate suffering graphically illustrates the racial cooperation that has existed in the South for hundreds of years. The following editorial from the Greensboro (Ala.) Watchman, of March 9, 1961, emphasizes this point:

WHEN DISTRESS PROVES OUR SYSTEM

All over Alabama, the cry has been raised in the days of this distressing flood, as to where has been the NAACP, when so many of our Negroes have been in desperate need of help.

The question is really beside the point. The NAACP does not operate legally in Alabama, and it is largely just where we want it to be—in New York City. Neither the whites nor the Negroes of Alabama want or need it at this time. The real point is that, in the hour of trouble, the local white people helped the Negroes and, while this was the general pattern, there were other instances in which the Negroes helped the whites. To this we can testify. It has been shown that, in spite of the divisive efforts of certain outsiders, the human element is still the governing factor. The white people of the South are not going to stand idly by while the colored people drown or suffer from the cold or go hungry. There is a friendship based upon generations of living in a bi-racial society which makes this utterly abhorrent to us. Nor will the colored people permit their white friends to suffer, if they can do anything about it. The agitators dislike these attitudes as too much Uncle Tom, but as far as we are concerned, it proves again our old contention that nowhere in the history of mankind have two races, so utterly different in origin, been able to live so easily in peace and accord when thrown into juxtaposition. There is unfairness and inequity in the South, but it is the best, from a very practical standpoint, that has ever been achieved under similar circumstances. Ours is the successful system, fired and tempered in the crucible of experience.

Migrant Plight Examined

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, certain important aspects of the pressing migrant farm labor problem have been clearly pointed out in a recent article appearing in the Christian Science Monitor.

I urge my colleagues to read this article carefully as a part of their study of this serious problem:

UNITED STATES ECHOES MIGRANT PLIGHT
(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—Bumping over back roads with the 2 million migrant workers and families who follow the crops are 100,000 school-age children. A study indicates they average 1 to 4 years behind in school by the time they reach 14.

Migratory workers are the people the affluent society forgot. The crisp fruits and vegetables that come to the American dinner table were, like as not, picked by people working 10 hours for $6 or $7 at backbreaking labor in a blue sky sweatshop.

Farmers who hire them do not want to exploit them, but their cheap wages at the climax of the weeding and picking season means the difference between survival or bankruptcy. Many farmers narrow slim profits to provide better shacks and toilets for the workers only to complain that they are so ignorant or irresponsible that they do not use the facilities.

"I've built them new housing, put in toilet facilities, nice new bedding, plenty of garbage cans—and what happens"? asks one farmer.

"They mark up the walls, kick holes in the window screens, stop up the toilets, pull the knobs off the showers and stoves, tear the blankets, and tip over the garbage cans."

AGREEMENT WITH MEXICO

County health officials shake their heads as they tell the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, now considering reform bills, about the ditch used for drinking water, or the child who knows no cleanliness.

"Growers are not proud about much of the housing they offer," explains Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., Democrat, of New Jersey, chairman of the subcommittee, "but they don't know how to provide more."

Some 22 States depend on skilled or semiskilled labor forces ranging from 6,000 to 25,000 to harvest their perishable fruits and vegetables. Climate and crops differ. In Arizona migrants work on citrus and cotton; in Connecticut, tobacco; in Georgia, peaches; in Illinois, peas; in California, fruits and vegetables; in Texas, cotton, and so on.

American migrants often are Negroes. Lower in the economic scale are approximately 400,000 Mexican "braceros" imported temporarily each year under arrangement with the Mexican Government, and 12,000 British West Indians. They are willing to do the back-breaking "stoop labor" which the native born allegedly won't do. Increased use of cotton harvest machinery in Texas, Arkansas, New Mexico, and Arizona cut down the use of braceros sharply last year.

Braceros are fortunate in one way. The agreement with Mexico guarantees them certain minimum protection, free housing, and even free insurance against occupational hazards. They have somebody to look after them. The native Americans are exempted from almost all the welfare provisions that came in the New Deal social revolution.

The United States-Mexican agreement provides that braceros may not replace workers on strike or locked out. On March 4, Labor Secretary Arthur J. Goldberg ordered withdrawal of 2,800 braceros from 18 big farms in California's Imperial Valley at Mexico's request, because of a strike there.

CONSCIENCE TOUCHED

Church groups have increasingly interested themselves in migrants. Their plight touches the American conscience. Some consider it ironical that the Peace Corps of idealistic American youngsters should go abroad when so much remains to be done here.

This applies particularly to the monotony of the wandering children, brought up in road camps, waiting for somebody to breathe the spark of incentive for learning into them.

The Williams committee got a sanguine report from a superintendent of schools in Michigan where a pilot 5-week summer school was set up. One paragraph reads:

"I've never seen a nicer group of children to work with. For the most part they were smart children, eager to learn, appreciative, and loved books. Somewhere they have either learned good work habits in schools or are just that eager to learn. * * * They were constantly reading or looking at books. * * * From their conversation it was very evident that they were happy with the opportunity to go to such a school and also to be able to ride to and from school in a bus."

CAPITAL FIGHT STARTS

A congressional fight has started over proposals to aid migrants. It takes several forms.

The law governing Mexican braceros expires December 31 and must be renewed this session. The big issue is over proposed added protection to American farmworkers against wage competition from the Mexicans. Nearly all farm organizations except the National Farmers Union oppose stiffer restrictions. Hearings are proceeding before a House Agricultural Subcommittee.

Meanwhile, Senator WILLIAMS is pushing half a dozen proposals for Federal regulation of employers of native migrant workers, with emphasis on doing something for the children. This is attacked, too. The attack is the old one: too much Federal interference in private enterprise.

Nearly everybody agrees, though, that reform is needed.

The root difficulty, Senator WILLIAMS believes, is a lack of education in fundamentals of modern living. This is largely adult education. Until migrant workers get some outside help their plight is self-perpetuating.

Employment Statistics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, last evening I listened to a raido reporter commenting on our troubles in Africa and elsewhere in the world. One point he made was that quoting our unemployment figure as "over 5 million" gives many persons abroad a distorted idea of the state of the American economy. Persons whose homelands contain small populations are particularly unlikely to evaluate fairly such figures in relation to our population of over 180 million. Here are population figures for just a few countries: Switzerland, 5,235,000; Syria, 4,267,000; Uruguay, 2,700,000; Venezuela, 6,607,000; New Zealand, 2,381,000; Denmark, 4,457,000; Finland, 4,433,700; Ghana, 6,690,730; Ireland, 2,846,000; Israel, 2,105,530; Laos, 3,000,000.

Other inadequacies of the present reporting system are enumerated in the following editorial appearing in the Long Beach Independent Press Telegram on March 13:

DO OUR JOBLESS REPORTING METHODS NEED AN OVERHAUL?

Recession psychology is a subject disturbing to many people. They feel that frequent reiteration by official sources of adverse economic news, notably unemployment figures, tends to build up fear, with consequent belt-tightening by individuals and business and industrial firms that simply compounds the problem.

Unquestionably, they have a point. But a solution is not so simple as some may think. Attempts to ignore or to gloss over bad news would be quickly spotted by the public and the resultant effect on public morale could be worse than a recital of bleak facts.

This brings us to another question. How bleak are the facts? Honest official reporting would not gloss over bad news, nor would it make the news worse than it really is.

There is, for example, strong feeling in many quarters that U.S. unemployment figures are deceptive.

McGraw-Hill publications, in a current editorial, goes into this exhaustively in connection with unemployment comparisons with other countries. It charges that the broad concept of unemployment we use exaggerates our jobless situation as compared to most other nations.

It cites monthly Bulletin of Statistics issued by the United Nations last November, which showed that Sweden's annual average of unemployment in 1959 was 2 percent, while that of the United States was 5.5 percent.

On its face, this comparison shows a wide gap adverse to this Nation. But a U.S. Labor Department report from Sweden indicates that had Sweden used the same reporting methods as the United States, its jobless figure would have almost doubled.

Says McGraw-Hill: "In general, countries listed (in the United Nations table) use registrations at public employment offices as the basis for calculating their unemployment. The U.S. figures include unregistered, young people who are waiting for jobs or training opportunities and housewives who are looking for jobs but who have not registered anywhere in search of them. On graduation day, unless students immediately rush to jobs, they graduate into unemployment and swell the jobless figures."

The point made here is that deceptive jobless figures not only unnecessarily harm our own national morale, but viewed from abroad they unjustifiably downgrade the effectiveness of our economic system and weaken our influence.

The editorial makes the interesting suggestion that not only should there be some international standard for counting the idle, but that the official reports in this country should show not only the number of jobless, but the number of unfilled jobs.

We have not seen a report of the number of jobs that are open in this country, unfilled because of a lack of qualifications among the jobless or lack of interest or a desire to take this work. A properly balanced report on unemployment could well include this figure. It would give the economic picture a different slant, and it would point the way toward action, such as training programs, that would move jobless into available openings.

In view of the importance of avoiding unjustified undermining of national morale, and of avoiding distorted pictures abroad of our economic performance, the time is at hand for an official, high-level examination of our unemployment reporting methods.

Tax Loophole Closers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1961

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced two bills which I designate as "tax loophole closers." Their adoption would provide a substantial amount of the new money that will be required to finance the administration's various programs, and would do so without requiring any present taxpayer to dig deeper into his pocket.

One of these bills, which may be cited officially as the "Credit Union Tax Equalization Act of 1961," would tap a financial source that has never paid a penny of Federal income tax; a competitive lending business whose net income before taxes has increased 2,400 percent in the past 15 years; a parasitical, pseudo-banking institution that is growing like the wind and is very well able to pay its share of the cost of government.

The other bill, which is cited as the "Second Tax Equalization Act of 1961," would produce no such magnificent sum of tax revenue for the Treasury, but it would clear up a competitive situation between mutual and stock fire and casualty insurance companies that the tax experts of Congress have fretted and worried about for nearly 20 years, without ever quite coming to grips with the facts of the matter—the facts being that the tax discrimination in favor of the mutuals is without justification and always has been.

Mr. Speaker, this year's demands for extraordinary expenditures at home and abroad leave the Congress no option but to close every generous loophole in the tax code. Let it not be said that the 87th Congress is a weak-kneed and soft-headed as some of its predecessors, which accepted the specious argument and pleas of smart promoters that competitive businesses which were organized under such names as mutuals and cooperatives and credit unions would somehow always be without profit and therefore without taxes.

Credit unions, like their blood brothers, the savings and loan associations, the mutual savings banks and the cooperatives, were first granted tax favortism on the basis of their claim that they were organized for the sole benefit of the underprivileged little fellow. They may have started small, but they have long since outgrown their little britches. Let me quote, Mr. Speaker, from the American Banker:

> Credit unions are fast becoming big business. Some are subsidized by big business itself, which gives them rentfree office space, as well as clerical help to run the credit union at the expense of the business. Notable in their promotion is the Credit Union National Association, organized to carry out their national public relations, advertising, and provide certain management and insurance aids. They are supported directly or indirectly by small business, college professors, teachers, farmers, firemen and policemen, industrial employees, labor unions. Credit unions are found in city halls, State capitols, public schools, fire stations, police departments. Taxpayers, of course, are unwittingly supporting credit unions, which pay no Federal income taxes, whether chartered by State or Federal Government.

According to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, credit unions had total assets in 1958 of $4,347 million and net income of $178 million.

Mr. Speaker, that net income should pay income tax. It is earned like the net income of banks and small-loan companies. It should be taxed like the income of banks and small-loan companies.

Only a few days ago, the President asked the Congress for half a billion dollars of added appropriations for this and that. He did not specify—or even suggest—where or how the money should be raised, but we all know that it will not come out of the clear air. Someone will have to be taxed to pay the bills.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the cost of the expanded school-lunch program which the President suggested, plus the cost of new schools for Indian and Eskimo children, plus the cost of an expanded National Park Service, plus additional appropriations for the Bureau of Land Management, the Fish and Wild Life Service, and the Bonneville Power Administration, plus the cost of expanded U.S. Information Agency programs in Africa and South America would all be met by the imposition of the income tax on credit unions and there would probably be enough money left to pay for the proposed new African programs of the State Department.

Mr. Speaker, if we are going to spend more money we must raise more money by taxation. The best place to get more money by taxation is from sources that are now not paying the tax. As a loophole that may be profitably closed, I recommend the credit unions.

Getting Foreigners Off Our Backs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the last few days we have been apprised of the newest in a long line of proposals to save the world for democracy by the lavish foreign aid approach, and we have also been informed of waste of foreign aid funds in Peru, Laos, and a few other countries yet to be disclosed. In view of the intellectual nature of the new administration, I feel that in the public interest I must remind the Members of Congress and the citizens of the country of the forthright comments once made on the subject of foreign aid by President Kennedy. These are accurately described in an editorial in today's Chicago Daily Tribune which I submit for the RECORD:

GETTING FOREIGNERS OFF OUR BACKS

On November 10, 1950, a young Massachusetts Congressman told a gathering of students and professors at Harvard University that he thought that sooner or later we would "have to get all these foreigners off our backs." The Congressman was John F. Kennedy.

Yesterday, more than a decade later, Mr. Kennedy, as President, sent a message to Congress on foreign aid. After 15 years of postwar scattershot generosity, at a cost of $85.8 billion, Mr. Kennedy admitted foreign aid was a mess.

No one, he said, "can be satisfied" with a "multiplicity of programs," all of them "bureaucratically fragmented, awkward, and slow," their administration "diffused over a haphazard and irrational structure," many of their purposes "obsolete, inconsistent, and unduly rigid." The weaknesses of the whole "have begun to undermine confidence."

So has the time arrived, in Mr. Kennedy's estimation, to junk the whole thing and get those foreigners off our backs? No indeed. We shall, says Mr. Kennedy, reorganize the chain of command of the almoners and introduce efficiency into this rambling wreck. Furthermore, we must continue the handouts so that the 1960's will be a "decade of development" in backward lands.

Instead of appropriating the billions each year, we must, says Mr. Kennedy, commit ourselves to the recipient nations for "not less than 5 years" in advance, so that they may have confidence that the cash cornucopia will continue to flow. But we shall still need annual appropriations, too.

A year will be required to institute the new giveaway mechanism and to make "the necessary long term commitments." So Mr. Kennedy will not find it necessary to ask for "additional funds" this year. He will merely stand on the "rock bottom" figure already submitted by Mr. Eisenhower—$4 billion.

None of these plans, says Mr. Kennedy, need necessarily have more than a "marginal" impact on our international balance of payments. The United States has been losing dollars at the rate of $3.8 billion a year—that is, it has been spending that much more abroad than it earns from foreign sources. The result has been the loss of gold used to support the value of the dollar. If the gold drain continues unchecked, the loss could undermine the U.S. economy and our position in the world.

Only a month ago the Kennedy State Department said that this payments deficit arises wholly from America's foreign aid commitments. Yet Mr. Kennedy would have us believe that the threat is marginal. It is also marginal whether a high-wire walker keeps his footing or falls and breaks his back.

There is little here to encourage taxpayers whose existence, under Federal exacations, is also marginal to the point of the precarious. The only soothing sirup Mr. Kennedy is able to offer is that maybe some of our well-to-do allies, themselves the past beneficiaries of foreign aid, will chip in and assume some of the burdens of western man. Also, that maybe the giveaway can be converted from a basis of outright gifts to long-term loans, though at low interest or none at all, repayable, perhaps, in 50 years, when, to paraphrase the late Lord Keynes, most of us will be dead.

This is to go on until the ultimate day when all nations can be self-reliant and when foreign aid will no longer be needed. When does ultimate become final, if ever?

Just a Promise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1961

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important quotes of the recent campaign was the maintenance of fiscal integrity and the promise to balance the budget.

The editorial writer of the Newark (N.J.) Evening News under date of

March 21 has expressed the concern of many of our citizens very ably in the following editorial:

JUST A PROMISE

President Kennedy is presenting his 1961–62 budget recommendations to the taxpayers in easy installments. Yesterday he proposed increases totaling nearly a half billion dollars; tomorrow he is scheduled to present his bill for foreign aid. Later he will give his views on defense spending and following that a message will go to Congress on the overall 1961–62 budget.

The $80.9 billion budget President Eisenhower sent to Congress in January apparently is to undergo very few changes. What savings can be made on some items are expected to be offset by increased spending on others. The major boost contemplated is likely to be that for defense.

Mr. Eisenhower had estimated defense would cost $42.9 billion. Mr. Kennedy has indicated that if the budget can be balanced with that figure, Congress would accept his request for a supplementary deficit appropriation for another billion dollars. By handling the defense bill in this fashion, the President is represented as showing (1) that he is trying to balance the budget, and (2) that the reason he can't is the need of greater defense spending.

The increases Mr. Kennedy asked yesterday doubtless are all for worthwhile purposes—$442.5 million for Agriculture, $40.6 million for the Interior Department, $11 million for the U.S. Information Agency, and $1.3 million for emergencies in the diplomatic and consular services.

We recall that the President did say something about pay-as-you-go government and balanced budgets. But that was way back last fall.

The Crew of American Ship of State Should Beware of Calm in Red Storm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the San Diego Union of March 19, 1961:

THE CREW OF AMERICAN SHIP OF STATE SHOULD BEWARE OF CALM IN RED STORM

(By Ruthven E. Libby)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The author, Ruthven E. Libby, is a vice admiral, retired, in the U.S. Navy.)

"Caesar said to the soothsayer, 'The ides of March are come'; who answered him calmly, 'Yes, they are come, but they are not past.' "—Plutarch.

If by chance the captain and crew of the ship of state have never read Nathaniel Bowditch, I suggest they break out his "American Practical Navigator," first published in 1802, and read up on the laws of storms.

To the mariner unfortunate enough to be caught in the direct path of a hurricane, but fortunate enough to weather the violence of the forward semicircle, the calm in the eye of the storm comes as a welcome and most useful respite. But as Nathaniel pointed out, and as every experienced sailor knows, the worst is yet to come.

I hope, fervently, that I am wrong; but I cannot shake off a gnawing uneasiness over the possibility that the international weather phenomena are being misread.

Certainly the tempetuous goings-on in the first half of the current General Assembly session were stormy enough to be graded as of hurricane strength; and by comparison, there subsequently has been a period of relative surface calm.

In his March 7 statement to the resumed session of the General Assembly, Ambassador Adlai Stevenson urged a continuation of this clam, saying that the United States was "firmly determined to do all it can to alleviate the cold war instead of aggravating it."

Urging that the agenda be stripped of all items except those essential to the routine conduct of the United Nations' business, and that as many controversial items as possible be put over until the next regular session, he added: "We think a period of relative quiet would contribute to a better international climate for serious negotiations on such vital subjects as disarmament."

On the face of it, this proposal seems reasonable enough. It is consistent with the New Frontier approach to the "new diplomacy" of "politeness and business-if-possible."

It would be a wholly rational approach if we were dealing with individuals who, by Western standards, were rational; and it would be a logical road to agreement between parties, provided all parties concerned sincerely wished to reach agreement. But there's the rub.

Each day brings additional examples of the curious ambivalence displayed by the Soviet leaders. Less than 2 months ago, Premier Nikita Khrushchev indicated to the new President that with the departure of the bad old administration, the way was now clear for improving relations between the United States and the U.S.S.R. He announced that his country was eager to work toward that end.

On February 27 our Ambassador returned to Moscow with a personal message of good will from President Kennedy, intended among other things to set in motion a new series of diplomatic exchanges aimed at seeking settlement of the crucial issues between us.

Well knowing that the United States, at least, considered this message of some importance, Khrushchev showed his eagerness to cooperate by taking off for parts unknown, leaving Ambassador Thompson to cool his heels in Moscow for more than a week before graciously summoning him to the wilds of Siberia, to deliver the message. Whether or not he will condescend to negotiate with Thompson is something else again.

As a further earnest of his desire to improve relations, Khrushchev took time out from giving our Ambassador the runaround to reassert that the Soviet has sufficient atomic weapons to blast any aggressor off the face of the earth, and the rockets with which to deliver them. Well, so much for sweetness and light, Moscow style.

Red China, on the other hand, is not ambivalent. It is just downright hostile. The categorical rejection of our latest move toward improving relations in that quarter leaves no doubt on that point.

Their position is classic in its simplicity: unless we get out of Formosa, they have less than no interest in any move toward easing tensions, or in settling our differences by any means other than war. Be it noted in passing that it is these charming people for whom the entire British Commonwealth, with the single exception of New Zealand, seeks membership in the United Nations.

However, laudable our policy of "avoiding cold war acrimony" may be, its implementation entails the serious risk of being misinterpreted by our adversaries—of being regarded as an indication of weakness. Nothing could better insure our defeat across the negotiating tables than a belief on the part of the Communists that we are lacking in resolution.

In sum, whether swept under the rug or discussed in open forum and let the acrimony fall where it may, the issues remain.

Perhaps we shall be in better shape to face up to them later; but it is well to remember that the Communists improve each shining hour of delay by improving their military positions on odd corners of the globe, just as they did on the mainland of China and as they are now doing in Laos. One thing is certain—the issues will not just go away.

The present uneasy calm cannot long continue. There is rough weather ahead.

Should Not Be

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1961

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, it is often true that the most perceptive and penetrating analysis of a legislative issue comes from a source well removed from the location of congressional battle lines. Often separation from the actual scene of the debate allows calm reflection and encourages frank advocacy of a reasoned course of action. An excellent editorial in the Bloomsburg, Pa., Morning Press, of March 20, 1961, clearly demonstrates this point. The editorial vividly and concisely highlights the threat of Federal control inherent in the process of centralization and calls for Federal abandonment of some areas of the tax field so that State and local government may raise sufficient revenue to meet educational needs. Because of the significance of this outstanding editorial, I submit the entire material for inclusion in the RECORD.

SHOULD NOT BE

On one hand we cry to the high heavens against regimentation and on the other keep calling more and more to Washington for handouts, knowing full well that centralization of power leads to the thing we profess to unalterably oppose.

The battlelines are already formed on the President's aid to education bill. Despite the appeal of the Chief Executive for restraint this will get bitter and cause open sores that will be long in healing.

President Kennedy's stand that any Federal aid to schools must be limited to public schools is correct. The big error in this proposed legislation, however, is that it should not be offered in any form.

We are definitely for improved and enriched education. One way to get that is to have folks take care of their own. If the Federal Government is sincere in its declaration that education must be improved then all it has to do is allow the folks at home some local and State tax revenues to apply to the program.

Much more of the locally collected taxes goes to the intended place. Overhead of distribution is higher at the Federal level than at any other.

President Grover Cleveland a long time ago declared: "The people must keep the

Government for it is certain the Government cannot keep the people."

We have been trying for more than a generation to prove him wrong. We have not succeeded and we will not succeed.

The handouts that come from Federal Government are not plucked from the sky. They come from our pockets. What we need in this education program is to have Washington retreat a little from the tax field so we can do some cultivating of our own and get the funds to meet our educational needs.

That will put the program up to us and it will eliminate regimentation. It can be done. Whether it will be depends on whether we want what we say we do or whether it is just idle comment that has a nice sound.

Livestock Industry Is First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1961

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, the Kansas Livestock Association recently held its annual meeting in Wichita, Kans. Mr. Rolla Clymer, editor of the Eldorado (Kans.) Times, took the occasion to cite the importance of the livestock industry to Kansas economy. I believe that as the Congress considers various solutions to the farm problem it would be pertinent to place before the Members some of the facts of an industry which flourishes without a program of Federal subsidies. I insert in the RECORD the editorial from the Eldorado Times entitled "Livestock Industry Is First":

LIVESTOCK INDUSTRY IS FIRST

Livestock is Kansas' largest industry.

This is no new statement. What it declares has been a fact of many years' standing.

That fact, however, should not be forgotten. Governor John Anderson stressed it again in an address to the Kansas Livestock Association at Wichita last week.

This $549 million industry contributes 55 percent of the gross cash receipts from farming in Kansas, the Governor told his audience.

Butler County—which shares prominence among the manufacturing industries of the State largely because of its oilfield operations and four oil refineries—represents one of the kingpins in the Kansas livestock structure.

The 1959–60 report of the Kansas State Board of Agriculture shows that Butler County again ranks No. 1 in the number of all cattle and calves on farms. Only those with more than 60,000 cattle are listed in the top 10; Butler's average total nearly doubled that figure.

Thus, Butler is the leading unit in the procession which makes livestock the chief industry of the Sunflower State—and this is an achievement in which the Kingdom may well take pride.

At the moment, the beef cattle industry is flourishing. Unfortunately, the history of that industry has run through a period of cycles. Last year, nearly 5 million of cattle grazed on the State's ranges. Fully that many may be expected again this year. The influx of the beef animals to the Bluestem pastures will begin within another month. Cowmen believe that not too many cattle will be grazed on ranges or fed in the feed lots this year to disturb the market to any degree.

If so, cattle prices may hold steady for a time—and perhaps permanently, which is the desired condition.

But, whether the market is up or down at any given time, whether or not the cattlemen are facing handicaps, the livestock industry still leads the Kansas procession.

That ranking should be gratifying to the sturdy men who, without "Federal aid" of any sort, manage to keep their occupation true to the highest traditional standards.

"CAB Spurs Freight Rate War," Marsh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1961

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, there is increasing concern among the members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in respect to the future of our Nation's railroads. There is increasing concern among all Members of Congress over the increasing demand for Federal subsidies in the several segments of our economy. We are all aware that it is important to assure each phase of our transportation industry their fair share of the gross volume of goods transported.

With our concern that each phase of our transportation industry receives fair treatment, goes the concern that this is done at a fair cost to the customer and does not require a Federal subsidy that is beyond a reasonable assurance that this particular industry has an opportunity to become established. That has been the overriding philosophy in the various subsidies that were extended in the early development of our Nation's rails and still in some extent to motor carriers and airlines as well.

I am personally concerned with a recent CAB proposal to virtually discard all minimum air freight rates and to, in fact, assure airlines of a subsidy sufficient to compensate for any loss incurred by them in handling freight at a reduced rate. Even at the existing rate, a substantial subsidy was necessary to sustain the air freight industry but by removing all minimum air freight rates, I can only conclude that the Federal Government will now be asked to pay by increased subsidy the difference between the lesser earnings under the new schedule and the earnings under the existing rate. Not only do I feel that this action goes beyond the legislative intent for the original authority of the CAB to make subsidy awards, but it also distorts the historical concept of fair and reasonable competition.

In this connection, I would like to enclose a recent statement made by Ernest S. Marsh, the president of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, that emphasizes the concern of the rail industry over this recent action by the CAB:

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune, Mar. 15, 1961]

"CAB SPURS FREIGHT RATE WAR," MARSH—SAYS TAXPAYERS WILL FOOT BILL

(By Louis Dombrowski)

A Civil Aeronautics Board proposal to scrap minimum airfreight rates and subsidize all-cargo air operations was assailed yesterday by Ernest S. Marsh, president of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway.

He accused the CAB of "rank discrimination against the surface carriers," adding that eliminating rate floors "would precipitate a rate war, with the American taxpayers footing the bill."

Such a rate war is already in the making. United Air Lines has asked a rate reduction on many commodities to 13 cents a ton-mile from 16 cents on shipments from west coast cities to the Midwest and points East. It asked that the rates become effective on or about April 1.

SOME CUTS OF 40 PERCENT

Flying Tiger Line cut some of its freight rates as much as 40 percent on March 2. This reduction was approved by the CAB as part of Flying Tiger's plans to put new CL–44 turboprop cargo planes in service later this year.

A Flying Tiger spokesman conceded that the airline will lose money initially at the new rates, but contended that they will provide an opportunity to explore the extent to which shippers might use airfreight at lower rates for commodities which are not now extensively shipped by air.

"This is discrimination that goes beyond a destructive rate war," Marsh charged. "The air carriers under the CAB plan would have a ratemaking freedom not accorded to any other type of carrier."

CITES SUBSIDY PROPOSAL

The railroad executive cited a statement by Merritt Ruhlen, CAB examiner, who suggested that the air-cargo industry be regrouped for a new, federally subsidized invasion of freight business being handled by railorads and trucklines.

Ruhlen acknowledged that the subsidies would help divert traffic from surface carriers, but he added that Congress charged the CAB with the "promotion, encouragement, and development of civil aeronautics," and said that subsidies were fashioned by Congress as a tool for the CAB to use in carrying out its responsibility.

The examiner argued that air cargo, still in a developmental and experimental stage, should be subsidized as a matter of principle.

RECALLS CAB REFUSAL

"The irony of the whole thing," said Marsh, "is that after World War II, when the Santa Fe started its own air-cargo line, the Santa Fe Skyway, the CAB refused to give the airline a common-carrier certificate because it had a regulation prohibiting surface carriers from engaging in air transportation.

"We were willing to provide airlift, without any kind of Government subsidy or equipment development handouts, in the cargo field only. We offered a plan of air-surface coordination that would have expedited freight to hundreds of communities now without air service."

In the Santa Fe's annual report for 1947, Fred G. Gurley, then president, wrote: "Due to the obviously unfriendly and discouraging attitude of the Civil Aeronautics Board toward the Santa Fe and other surface carriers, decision was reached in January 1948 to abandon the Santa Fe Skyway."

CONDITIONS FOR REENTRY

Asked if the Santa Fe would consider starting an air-cargo line today, Marsh replied that the road "would give serious consideration to reentering the air cargo field under

favorable legislative conditions that would allow it to operate on an unrestricted private enterprise basis."

Marsh pointed out that airfreight rate minimums were put in effect in 1948 to stop a rate war. He cited the CAB as saying last month that there are no signs today of a rate war or an imminent threat thereof.

"If what the domestic and oversea airlines and cargo lines are engaging in now is not a rate war, what do you call it?" he asked.

Tribute to a Public Health Worker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1961

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the Members the long and distinguished career in public health work recorded by Miss Mary S. Gardner of Providence, who died February 20, 1961.

Miss Gardner herself was invalided in her twenties, but after she had recovered her strength to continue her education, she entered the Newport Hospital Training School for Nurses and was graduated cum laude in 1905. She organized and became the first director of the Providence District Nursing Association, a post she held until 1930.

While director of the association, Miss Gardner served as president of the National Organization for Public Health Nursing from 1913 through 1915. In 1916, her book "Public Health Nursing," was published as a standard textbook, and was subsequently translated into French, Spanish, Chinese, and Korean.

During World War I, Miss Gardner took leave of absence from her post to become chief of the nursing section of the American Red Cross Tuberculosis Commission in Italy. Later, in 1921, she became adviser to the American Red Cross on public health nursing in Europe, and was chairman of the standing committee on public health nursing of the International Council of Nurses from 1925 to 1933.

Miss Gardner wrote many educational pamphlets as well as several novels in which public health furnished the background.

In 1933 Miss Gardner won the Saunders Gold Medal "for distinguished service in nursing." Some of the modern practices that evolved in the first three decades of this century were first instituted by Miss Gardner.

Miss Gardner's devotion to service for the benefit of others is not without background. She was born in Newton, Mass., February 5, 1871, a daughter of the late Justice William Sewell Gardner of the Massachusetts Supreme Court and Mary Parker—Thornton—Gardner, a direct descendant of Matthew Thornton, signer of the Declaration of Independence from New Hampshire. Her interest in nursing stemmed from an association with the late Miss Eleanor B. Green, a sister of former Senator Theodore Francis Green.

Rhode Island primarily and the United States generally can indeed be proud of the outstanding contributions to health and well-being that have been made by Miss Mary S. Gardner. Her fine record of service should also serve to inspire all of us to help in the battle against disease, disability, and premature death.

Education for Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1961

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I want to insert in the RECORD the speech delivered by Allen Drury at Rollins College's Animated magazine recently. Mr. Drury points up in very thought provoking fashion the proposal that there be established in Washington a National Institute of Government—a living memorial to the great men of Government in America. It is a proposal in line with my Freedom Academy that I think merits the very careful consideration of every Member of Congress:

EDUCATION FOR POLITICS

(Text of speech by Allen Drury for Rollins' Animated magazine)

I thought that I would talk to you today—briefly, as Dr. McKean suggested, and briefly, as befits the spirit which now animates Washington speechmakers, and which I consider a very good thing—about "Education for Politics."

I use the word politics in the classic sense of the science of governing; and I say education for politics rather than education and politics because I think that in the age in which we live, and in the face of the perils we confront, it would be best for us if the two did not run parallel, but convergent.

As one of those who has believed for a long time that it will indeed be decided in these very few next years whether this Nation and the whole free world can continue to live, it seems to me imperative that we train and educate men and women capable of understanding and administering the great mechanisms of our liberty. And by this I mean not only the national level, but down through every level, from national to State to local.

We need people who realize what it means to have free government, and who know how to go about seeing that it is strengthened and maintained in every area of our national life. We need a general tightening up all along the line to get rid of the flabbiness which has crept into our attitude toward our own country in recent years. We have drifted too long on the theory that freedom is easy. It is time we realized that it is not, and time to begin consciously to prepare the citizens coming to maturity who will have charge of it in the fearful years immediately ahead.

We now have a President who sees this, and that in itself is a great step forward in setting the psychological climate without which the job cannot be done. But it is not enough—it is never enough—to slough off our own responsibilities upon the President, whoever he may be. The President has plenty to worry about without doing the jobs the citizenry should be doing for itself. And it is in our schools, and on just such campuses as this, everywhere throughout the land and at all grades, that the task must be accomplished.

Initially, it seems to me, there must be a drastic and immediate reappraisal of the teaching of American history, from the earliest grades on up. There is a great story here in this Republic, yet millions of citizens have come to voting age in the past couple of decades with only the haziest notion of what it is.

Along with the educative fad that it would be best not to teach anyone English, so that everyone could be sure to talk and write at the same level of scholasticized illiteracy, it has also been the fad to play down one of the greatest sagas of struggle and triumph that any people has ever known in all of recorded time.

Somehow—and, I suspect, good teachers with some sense of dedication to their country can do it without too much extra trouble and strain—Americans must be brought back to a realization of the glories of their own heritage.

They must be reminded, and made to feel, what it meant to cross the ocean in a tiny boat and land in an unknown and hostile wilderness to start a colony.

They must be reminded, and made to feel, what it meant to take up arms against what was then the overwhelming world might of the British Empire—and win.

They must be reminded, and made to feel, what it meant to sit down in Philadelphia in a steaming summer long ago and patiently, step by step and argument by argument, hammer out a constitution and a government that works.

They must be reminded of all the struggles that went on in the Congress as the Nation spread westward, the frontier opened, and Civil War threatened and finally came.

They must be told again of the awesome bravery of the pioneers, which was not a nice comfortable TV show that could be watched in your living room, but a matter of fortitude beyond imagination and courage beyond belief in which people died in terrible deserts and ate one another at Donner Pass.

They must understand anew the things earlier Americans did, and why they did them, in all the long pageant of nearly 200 years in which the Lord has seen fit to raise us up, from a handful of colonizers, scattered along a thin thread of seaboard, to what every day becomes more truly what Mr. Lincoln called it, the last best hope of earth.

They must be given again a sense of cohesion with their past, of unity with the Nation and with one another. They must find again a sense of their own history, for only out of it can come the inner conviction and courage to carry them on into a future, not of the death and extinction that the Communists intend for us, but of justice and strength and compassion in which we can both save ourselves and lead a world in shadows back toward the light.

In some such fashion, it seems to me, the schools and colleges of America can do their part; plus, also, a greater stress on political science and civics courses, the basic understanding of government; and a much greater emphasis upon what, in today's academic and social climate, may seem to be the rankest heresy; namely, the individual's obligation to be individual.

I spoke in October to the Whig-Cliosophic Society at Princeton, and after the session one of the students drove me back down to Philadelphia, where I was spending the night. He was a very nice kid, I would say about 18, from Illinois; very much disturbed about the college world.

"You know," he said, "I'm really bothered about it. The whole emphasis is on the

group—on everybody being equal—on nobody excelling anybody else—on everybody showing the same level of activity and achievement—on nobody showing initiative—on nobody being outstanding. The whole emphasis is that we should all conform to the same median pattern. It bothers me, and I don't like it."

His complaint—and certainly he is not the only one of his generation to voice it—might also be considered, I think, in connection with education for politics.

If the highest aim of American education in this fearfully threatened world is to grind out a bland paste of conformity in which all lumps and scratchy pieces have been ground away in a sort of vast academic Waring blender, then that is one thing.

But if the highest obligation of American education is to create leaders self-assured enough to lead and a citizenry intelligent enough to follow them constructively, then that is quite another.

Somehow, it seems to me, we have got to get away from this frightening insistance that everybody be exactly the same as everybody else. This was not the spirit that landed on alien shores, or went across the plains, or, on both sides, fought a civil war; or that helped us create the bounties we have.

The pressures for conformity which surround the young in school and college are bad enough without their being the organized objectives of an entire society. Somehow we have got to break the grip of the drab and lackluster level of sameness which is oozing like wet cement through all levels of our national life. A little while longer, and it will begin to harden; and then no amount of education for politics, or education for anything else, will be able to break through.

We need leaders. We need them desperately. We need every bright and unusual student we can get, because we are up against the grimmest foes that ever lived and we can't beat them with the second rate.

It is going to demand every bit of brilliance in this Nation to see us safely through what lies ahead. If we really want to win—and I don't know about you, but I do—it is going to mean the scrapping, completely and at once, of that other sickly educative fad of recent years, the one that says that everybody must be just alike and nobody must ever raise his head above the herd.

If we stick to that much longer, we are going to have a nation of mediocrities governed by mediocrities; and that is not the way to survive in this jungle century.

Education for politics; in conclusion, one specific proposal of my own, springing from a purely personal attempt to find some constructive alternative to the empty and endless proposals to clutter up the Nation's Capital with lifeless stone excrescenses in the names of great men who are gone.

Instead of a statue to President X or a stone monolith to President Z—why should we not have in Washington a National Institute of Government to do honor to them all—a living memorial in which all our great men could be honored in a way that would mean the most, both to them and to posterity—namely the education of men and women in the practical science of governing freemen?

It could be done, it seems to me, without much difficulty, and it could pay in living dividends of leadership 10,000 times over.

Let it be created by congressional charter as an educational institution supported partly by Government contributions, principally by private charitable donations.

Let it be established somewhere within the District of Columbia or in the immediate countryside nearby—a number of private estates would undoubtedly be available if the project were seriously proposed.

Let it have a grand entryway, if you like, with statues standing about and fine sentiments inscribed on the walls as you go in.

But inside, let it be alive.

Suppose it to consist of a 2-year postgraduate course, its students drawn by competitive examination and interview from all over the country. Suppose the staff to consist of a small administrative group and a constantly changing body of lecturers.

Suppose the lecturers to be drawn partly from universities, perhaps, but in far greater measure from those who really know the science of politics, because they have successfully passed the test; the Members of the Senate, the Members of the House, members of the President's Cabinet, other high administrative officials, possibly also members of the Washington press, who both record and at times participate in the processes of free government.

Let the students draw upon these men for lectures, ideas, just plain talk. Let them draw also upon all the vast resources that Washington provides for the study of government; the Library of Congress, the Archives, all the various departmental and agency libraries and files.

Further, let the 2-year course consist, and perhaps more importantly, of several direct and practical applications.

Let it consist of, say, 6 months attached to the executive department or departments of the student's choice, with the privilege of continuing to attend lectures when convenient. Let it consist of 6 months attached to the office of a Senator or Congressman on Capitol Hill. Let it consist, either in its first or last 6 months, depending upon whether the student starts his course in a congressional election year or an off year, of 6 months working in the home district or State of a Congressman or Senator, participating in the everyday drudgery of dealing with constituents, appealing to the electorate, rounding up votes.

Let it, in short, be informative, educative and practical, drawing upon all the wealth of men, material and knowledgeable experience that resides in the city of Washington. Let its students study government and politics at the fountainhead. Let it be truly a National Institute of Government.

Then there would be one memorial for all the men whom it is now proposed to honor by hunks of lifeless stone all over downtown Washington. Teddy Roosevelt's family is unhappy about the one they're proposing to him, Franklin Roosevelt's family is unhappy about the one they're proposing to him. Woodrow Wilson's family is upset, and sooner or later the Eisenhowers will be called upon to be unhappy about the one somebody will propose to him.

But, good or bad in design, they will still be cold, lifeless, sterile and unproductive pieces of stone, steel and marble, incapable of contributing to the country one one-thousandth of what could be contributed by a living memorial of governmental training in which all leaders could be honored and new ones could be constantly trained.

Let us reaffirm our past; let us educate our future. The times are hard, the cold winds of history blow about us. Whether we live or die depends, in some degree it is true, upon our enemies; but the ultimate answer as to which it will be depends upon us.

We must not fail history's challenge, my friends, for this is a lovely land we have; and it would be a shame indeed to lose it.

A Tribute to the Victims of the "Maine"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include an address delivered to commemorate the "Victims of the *Maine*" by a Cuban patriot, Dr. Carlos Márquez Sterling, whose father played a prominent role in winning Cuban independence. This speech was brought to my attention by the Reverend Father Joseph F. Thorning, Ph. D., D.D., associate editor of World Affairs and professor of Latin American history in Marymount College, Arlington, Va.

This address by Dr. Carlos Márquez Sterling emphasizes to what a degree fundamental human rights are at stake in Cuba today. Candid readers of this speech will see that much more is involved in the struggle for Cuba's freedom than mere commercial interests. Those who allege that it should be easy to resolve differences between Fidel Castro's Cuba and the other American Republics because these differences are "primarily economic," overlook the major fact that civil and religious rights have been destroyed by the Sino-Soviet Gauleiters in the Castro dictatorship. Property rights are important; human dignity and humane principles are paramount.

The address was given before the Maine Monument in Arlington National Cemetery.

A TRIBUTE TO THE VICTIMS OF THE "MAINE"

(By Dr. Carlos Márquez Sterling)

Ladies and gentlemen, 63 years ago today the 15th of February, 1898, the U.S. Navy's battleship *Maine* exploded in Havana Harbor while on a good-will visit.

We Cubans had been in arms against the mother country since the 24th of February, 1895. We were engaged in a war to win independence, an ideal which we had pursued for more than a century, and whose purpose was the creation of our own republic.

The *Maine* incident led to the U.S. declaration of war against Spain and the uniting of Cubans and Americans on the battlefields of the island. The result was that finally, at the beginning of the century, we won independence, founded our nation and established self-government.

THE JOINT RESOLUTION

There is, in the history of the United States, a document that admirably defines the situation as it was at that time. The document is known as the joint resolution and was issued by the Congress of the United States. In its first paragraph it declared that "the people of the island of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free and independent."

"The abhorrent conditions which have existed for more than 3 years in the island of Cuba, so near to our own borders—says the joint resolution—have shocked the moral sense of the people of the United States, have

been a disgrace to Christian civilization, culminating as they have in the destruction of a U.S. battleship, with 266 of its officers and crew, while on a friendly visit in the harbor of Havana, and cannot longer be endured, as has been set forth by the President of the United States in his message to the Congress of April 11, 1898, upon which the action of Congress was invited."

Unfortunately, the situation that today confronts the island of Cuba is much worse than that described by the joint resolution in 1898. Owing to historical accident, Cuba was the last American country to win its independence, and at the present moment, it is the first to have fallen under the domination of international communism.

We have not, of course, come here today to the foot of this monument honoring the memory of the *Maine's* victims to grieve, but to express a solemn oath, and to define a program that shall allow us to recover our lost homeland and to punish the traitors that have sold her, tied hand and foot, to Soviet imperialism.

A FIGHTING PROGRAM

The first objective to be won is the uniting of all Cubans who as yet have not understood our dramatic plight. We are duty-bound to make a reality of the dream of Jose Martí, which in his own words was "to surround the star of the new flag with the symbols of triumphant love, signifying Cuba's genuine aspiration toward all people and for the welfare of all people." Then we would turn toward the other countries of America, reminding them of that powerful statement of a great Argentinian, Roque Saens Peña who, on the occasion of the first meeting of the Pan-American Congress in Washington in 1889, exclaimed "Let America be for humanity."

It is high time that we understood that Cuba's drama has become something involving even more than the problem of communism. It has become a problem involving humanity. In the words of the Joint Resolution of 1898, it "has shocked the moral sense of the people of the United States (and it has) been a disgrace to Christian civilization," as it has been to all the peoples of the world who adhere to Western civilization, and who respect to the letter the personal and spiritual freedoms that distinguish man from the animals.

Whatever may be accomplished without the necessary recognition of all those internal and external elements vital to Cuba's liberty, and vital to the Inter-American system as well, may cause not only the consolidation of communism in the Caribbean, but also a threat to our continent by Siberian imperialism, and the necessity for a third world war. Such can be avoided now if the Organization of American States, out of respect to the treaties in force, executes its continental objectives and applies the resolutions that solemnly committed it to the exclusion of communism from America. The pacts and agreements signed in this regard are of the nature of a policy that has been restated in Rio de Janeiro, in Caracas, in Santiago (Chile), in Bogotá, and in Costa Rica and are binding not only on the United States, but also on all the countries of Central and South America.

CUBA'S CASE HAS BEEN DISTORTED

The case of Cuba, thanks to infamous Communist propaganda that has falsified and distorted it, is not well known to a large part of America's citizens. Thousands of people believe—and undocumented and superficial books have been written to substantiate the belief—that our basic problems during the revolutionary struggle were more economic and social than political and partisan in nature. And nothing is more inexact.

Although Cuba suffers inequalities, as do all present-day countries, the issues at stake during her armed struggle originated in a policy that opposed public liberties. But as can be easily ascertained by anyone who studies the matter, the case was that, concurrent with this struggle for public power, our country was enjoying great prosperity, the year 1957 being the best in all of our history in terms of economics and finances.

Actually, as a result of the truly socio-economic revolution of 1933, the last 25 years of our existence as a republic saw Cuba attain very great heights, that in some aspects put her among the topmost ranks of the American continent.

In answer to some mistaken notions held by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Dr. Manuel Antonio de Varona, coordinator of the Democratic Revolutionary Front (Frente Democratico Revolucionario), whose headquarters are in Miami, wrote a letter that appeared in the Washington Daily News some weeks ago, in which he was able to put those aspects in a clear light, thereby destroying the false picture of Castro's revolution as being beneficial in the social and economic order of things. Actually, as he points out with incontrovertible statistics and figures, Castro's action has had dismal results and has destroyed all our wealth.

Our constitution, promulgated in 1940, over whose assembly I had the honor of presiding, and for which I was the fortunate recipient of a good deal of public recognition, is one of the most advanced in the world. Our social laws, our banking and financial legislation, and our system of taxation, based recently on the income tax and on the graduated tax, and our sugar crop of 5 million tons, with the American quota assured at a price of 6 cents a pound, allowed us a budget of 400 million pesos a year, when our currency was at a par with that of the dollar. In a country like ours, with a population of 6 million, our per capita income was placed at no less than immediately behind that of the United States.

Since our principal source of income was sugar cane, the law of sugar crop coordination was in effect, voted into being by the Cuban Congress when I was fortunate enough to be presiding officer. This law divided profits among landowners, planters, and workers in accordance with the average sugar price, so that exploitation, in this great sector of Cuba's industry was rendered impossible.

In many, but not all, places on the island, the land was certainly badly divided, since unproductive landed estates were in existence, subject to the old laws of social progress studied by Henry George, and where agrarian reform was an indispensable necessity.

Such a reform would not have been difficult to put into effect, because fortunately, owing to the law of sugar crop coordination which we have already mentioned, and other laws that controlled urban and rural land, there existed in Cuba the right of land tenure. This made it impossible for planters, tenants, joint owners, and fieldworkers to be dispossessed even by the State itself, much less by the great monopolies which in Cuba, as is the case even here in the United States, are always after impoverished areas. They made it necessary for Cuba, just as it was necessary for this great democracy, to enact antitrust legislation to regulate these rights. In brief, if we could make general reference to our economy, it would not be difficult to demonstrate that Castro's regime has ravaged Cuba from one end to the other, increasing her unemployment figure to more than a million, and lowering the rate of exchange of her money to seven Cuban pesos to the dollar. Very well then; if acts of robbery, confiscation, execution by firing squad, and seizure of banks, businesses and free enterprises without any indemnization or payment, not even in bonds, represents liberalism and social progress, we must affirm that Castro is the man who has done the most for Cuba. He has made of a prosperous country an island wallowing in destitution and at its lowest standard of living since it became independent, and this because he has done away with legal measures, and because he has turned workers and laborers into volunteer uniformed soldiers who have to serve the State without remuneration.

CASTRO AGAINST HISTORY

Just as Castro has nullified all of Cuba's economic and social progress, just as he has shattered her public and private liberties by submitting the island to an ominous tyranny, and converting it into a Communist colony, officially sanctioning the murder of his compatriots and depriving everyone of property without compensation, so would he also destroy and silence forever the history of relations between our two countries. There would remain not even the vestiges of efforts concluded in behalf of human liberties.

A few days ago, Castro dismantled the monument to the Maine erected from the remains of that ship that we Cubans raised on one of our most beautiful avenues in Havana. He has also removed from the same place the bronze eagle that crowned the monument, and the statues of Presidents McKinley and Roosevelt and Governor Wood that used to be in an adjacent park. These historical figures were linked to the epic of our war of independence by ties of blood and affection with our young and ill-fated republic.

McKinley was the President who sanctioned the joint resolution. Roosevelt and Wood were the valiant roughriders who fought shoulder to shoulder with Cubans on the hills of San Juan, in Santiago, Cuba, under the command of one of our greatest generals, Calixto García, who years later, just as he was about to become President of Cuba, died of pneumonia here in Washington.

This modest speech would not be complete if before finishing it I did not leave a record of the great Americans, who among many others, are associated with the history of Cuba, and to whom the Cubans are indebted. They are Ohio Senator Joseph Foraker who in 1900 authored the beneficial law prohibiting civil concessions in Cuba during the first military intervention; Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Cordell Hull, and Sumner Welles, President, Secretary, and Under Secretary of State respectively, who in 1934 negotiated with our Ambassador, who was, of course, my unforgettable father, Don Manuel Marquez Sterling, the law of sugar quotas, the commercial treaty, and the abrogation of the Platt amendment that for many years had damaged the sovereignty of the Cuban people.

REVALIDATION OF THE MONROE DOCTRINE

We who are met here today at this statue, Cubans representing all tendencies and all groups, have no differences in our observations concerning relations between Cuba and the United States. We know that the right of intervention as such ceased to exist with respect to Cuba years ago. We also know that the diplomatic and international features that characterized past administrations are dead letter. We know too, however, that in the absence of old problems already disappeared, there exist new issues that oblige a revision of the international policy of America's countries. Such is necessary to prevent the fear of intervention on the part of one of our countries in the affairs of another from causing subversive intervention on the part of a power from outside the continent. An extracontinental power would take advantage of citizens who

betray their country and the traditions of the free world for illicit ends that they could never attain through free election, as Castro and his gang of common delinquents have done. These traitors at first facilitate the entry of an extracontinental power which, once established, first does away with the traitor who sells his country, and then eliminates the sound opposition that has opposed the treachery. In this way, owing to a failure to defend continental ideals, the overwhelming power of communism can consolidate itself. Communism, whose crushing tactics result in the domination of one class by another, has as its final and consolidating objective, the extermination of everything that would even serve as a memorial to Western civilization. Such is happening in Cuba, where the intention is to go to the extreme of erasing the history of her liberties from the book of her glorious deeds, as the recent incident of the monument to the Maine illustrates. These acts no longer merely affect the sovereignty of the Cuban people. They go further, much further, and owing to acts of violence and crime, they involve the moral sovereignty of all the rest of the countries in America. Of these countries some have been allies, not for the purpose of intervening in each other's affairs, but for the purpose of establishing the civil and political liberties that were born of Washington's revolution in North America and the wars of independence in Central and South America. The latter are symbolically immortalized in the names of Bolivar, San Martin, Máximo Gomez, Sucre, Hidalgo, Morelos, Artigas, Maceo, Morazán, Martí, O'Higgins, Lamar, Santa Cruz, and many others.

In honoring the memory of the victims of the *Maine*, it is necessary as well to remember the predecessors that served as worthy models. It is necessary that we give new value to the Monroe Doctrine, by breathing into it the spirit of the age. The countries of America, through their legal agencies and the Organization of American States, must declare that all those regimes, whether Communist or not, that do not seek public sanction by majority vote for the lawfulness of their revolutions within 3 years of victory by arms, are movements contrary to the popular will. They are traitors to democracy and to law and order. They are enemies of republican government and continental sovereignty. They are anticonstitutional, proslavery, reactionary and feudal. They deny all the human progress of past centuries whose objectives centered about man and his civil, political, social, economic, and spiritual rights; rights that are conclusively lost when international communism, that vile, atheistic expression of medieval absolutism, gains control of any given country. Communism, with its other deceitful characteristics, has raised its head in defiance to the world of liberties.

I should like to make a modest suggestion, the product of my studies and of the anxious times I have spent in the service of the American democracies. In tribute to the martyrs of American liberty, I suggest that the Organization of American States revalidate the Monroe Doctrine, making it a collective instrument, and orienting it in three broad directions, that is:

First, by stipulating that no revolutionary government be recognized until it stages popular elections.

Second, by maintaining relations with said governments, without express declaration, but only as a modus vivendi.

Third, by expressly breaking said modus vivendi when at the end of 3 years popular elections have not been staged, and by decreeing moral and material boycott of those countries that turn their backs on universal liberties.

If the Monroe Doctrine was the product of the Holy Alliance against the danger of restoration of absolutist governments in America, it is not at all surprising that by modifying it in accord with the demands of the times, it can be revalidated precisely to defend the same ends against the advance of Communist absolutism. Communism is more daring and more defiant than were the monarchs of years ago, and it would try to submerge the world in eternal darkness, drowning and choking the American continent, home of a political philosophy that gave birth in this new world to a cluster of free and sovereign republics, where totalitarianism has never gained a permanent foothold.

TRIBUTE TO THOSE WHO HAVE FALLEN IN THE PRESENT STRUGGLE

Let us now conclude these heartfelt words in memory of the victims of the *Maine* and of those Americans who accompanied us in our wars. A new group of this country's citizens have again fallen in the struggle for Cuba's liberty. Cubans and Americans have fallen before Castro's executioners, just as in other times Cubans and Amercans also fell in the defense of liberty. The crime of these boys, the children of this great Nation, was that they were protecting our liberties. Castro, who claimed to be defending those liberties, instead liquidates those who do defend them. Just as the *Maine* is enshrined in the hearts of all Cubans, so these young people who recently died will be remembered in the days to come. For in the end, with or without the help of America, we Cuban democrats will win this battle. In fact, the liberating war already rages in Cuba. In the Escambray and the Maestra hills, always a haven for Cuban rebels, there are thousands of fighters, preparing to wage a new war of independence; and only a few days ago, the Russo-Chinese backed troops of Castro, suffered a great defeat at the hands of those brave men, to whom we from here, send a heartfelt message of glory and liberty for the days to come.

I do not want to conclude without mentioning the names of the American citizens whom Castro, without any respect for this country, executed. They are Anthony Zarba, Richard Pecoraro, Allan Dale Thompson, and Robert Otis Fuller.

Some day, Fuller's cross and cap, raised in Miami by his parents as a symbol of his death, in the absence of the body which Castro cruelly refused to surrender, will be erected as a bronze and marble monument as the worthiest expression of the fact that America's young generation is on Cuba's side, just as it was in 1898.

Americans, Cubans, the die is cast. Neither you nor we can forget. Here beside this monument we renew the solemn oath of liberty or death. Let us raise the cry of recognition to the victims of the *Maine*, and of admiration to the memory of those sailors who lost their lives in that tragedy, once more declaring our communion in an event of extraordinary significance for the history of this continent.

We come, then, to reassure them that we are in circumstances that require us to repeat the declaration of the joint resolution of 1898, that we in 1961 must always keep before us: "The people of the island of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free and independent."

Dinner for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1961

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I submit an editorial telecast by the television station WLOF in Orlando, Fla., on March 18, 1961. It was telecast on the occasion of the Dinner for Freedom in Orlando which is the birthplace of the Freedom Academy idea:

DINNER FOR FREEDOM

Mid-Florida takes a pioneering step this Saturday night, a forward step for freedom everywhere, in its battle against communism. The event is a $10 fund-raising dinner to boost the Freedom Academy bill now before Congress. Mid-Florida's Representative SYD HERLONG will be on hand to introduce his cosponsor of the legislation in the House, Minnesota's Congressman WALTER JUDD, the man who electrified the Republican National Convention last summer as keynote speaker.

His present aim: To enlist support for perhaps the most important legislation ever brought before the Congress. The Freedom Academy (as outlined in the bill) would train Americans to combat communism at home and abroad, and would also educate the leaders of emergent nations in democratic methods.

Most of the isolated objections have been "nitpicking" at some minor point. The basic bill appears sound and well worth a try. The Freedom Academy idea, born and nurtured in Orlando, has attracted wide support throughout America—from members of both major parties, of all faiths, from every walk of life. Their one interest: To protect and defend freedom everywhere so democracy may endure.

Orlando is fortunate to be host for this first "Dinner for Freedom." Here is everyone's opportunity to support the defense of freedom with more than simply lipservice. Here is a way citizens can combat communism.

If the bill is passed and the Freedom Academy succeeds, Orlando may well be known as the place where free men turned the tide against our greatest enemy, the tyranny of communism.

Chemical, Biological, Radiological Attack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1961

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to an article appearing in the March 1961 issue of Today's Health entitled "The Three Deadly Faces of Modern Warfare." This article, from the pen of Mr. Dennis Orphan, results from an exclusive interview with Maj. Gen. Marshall Stubbs, the Army's Chief Chemical Officer, and Leo A. Hogh, former Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Washington, D.C.:

CHEMICAL, BIOLOGICAL, RADIOLOGICAL ATTACK—THE THREE DEADLY FACES OF MODERN WARFARE

(By Dennis Orphan)

INTERVIEW WITH GENERAL STUBBS

"Please describe exactly what you mean by chemical warfare, biological warfare, and radiological warfare? Give examples of each."

Chemical warfare involves the use of toxic chemical agents to cause physiological effects. An example of a compound that could be used in chemical warfare is nerve gas,

which produces casualties by paralyzing respiratory muscles.

Biological warfare involves the intentional use of micro-organisms (germs) or their toxic products to cause disease or possible death among humans, animals, and plants. Some of the diseases carried by the germs may produce slight and temporary effects, while others disable for varying periods of time, and still others may cause death. An example of a possible bacteriological warfare organism is bacterium tularensis, which produces tularemia (rabbit fever) in man.

Radiological warfare is the employment of agents or weapons to produce residual radioactive contamination, as distinguished from the initial effects of a nuclear explosion (blast, thermal, and nuclear radiation). An example would be the deliberate use of radioactive pellets to contaminate an area.

"What problems will face the medical profession should an enemy resort to biological and chemical warfare?"

A nation must be prepared at all times to immediately detect, identify, and take steps to neutralize or minimize the effects of biological and chemical warfare. In a sense, through the medical profession and public health workers, we are constantly on the alert to detect outbreaks of disease, identify the disease, and treat or eradicate the disease. With the potential employment of biological agents, these steps must be intensified.

In the fields of animal husbandry and crop management a whole series of workers—veterinarians, livestock officials, plant pathologists, laboratory workers, and others—wage a constant unseen and unheard of war against all forms of biological agents that threaten our animal population and crops. New and additional procedures must be instituted to guard against enemy chemical attack. The medical profession has done and is doing much to inform its members of the probelms concerned with chemical warfare.

"What should physicians do to be prepared to treat and care for biological warfare and chemical warfare casualties?"

There are several programs of instruction open to physicians that teach approved methods of treating biological warfare and chemical warfare casualties. Recently the U.S. Public Health Service has added more emphasis to these aspects of civil defense. Articles are printed in medical journals, lectures have been given before medical audiences, the Armed Forces medical officers have presented some splendid clinical material on the subject.

Exhibits have been prepared, seminars conducted on the subject, and all types of teaching methods have been used. Each physician in the country should fully inform himself of these threats of biological warfare and chemical warfare, how to recognize them, and how to treat them. The AMA, through its council on national security, has done much to aid physicians in the field.

"What kind of germs or poisons might be used in chemical and biological warfare?"

Agents used in chemical warfare could include blister gases, such as mustard, or nerve gases. Germs used in biological warfare could include those which produce tularemia, encephalitis, plague, typhus, undulant fever, and others, in man; and hog cholera, hoof-and-mouth disease, fowl plague, etc., among animals.

"Is there one single type of germ that will make everyone sick? Is there a germ that will knock out the entire country?"

There is probably no single type of germ that will make everyone sick. Almost everyone has some degree of resistance to germs, through natural or acquired immunity, or public health measures.

The influenza epidemic of 1918–19 is an example of a naturally occurring epidemic in modern times that took a large toll. Many people in direct contact with the influenza germs escaped the disease through an apparent immunity.

"Give some examples of what chemical and biological agents can do to kill or incapacitate a person."

Chemical agents can kill by stopping a person's breathing, as happens with nerve gas, or can incapacitate, as happens with tear gas. The nerve gases were developed during World War II by German scientists. At the end of the war, many of these scientists and a complete production plant were captured and moved to Russia. Biological agents can kill, as may happen when a person inhales tularemia germs.

"What are the advantages of chemical and biological weapons?"

Some of the features of chemical and biological weapons are:

Logistics (supply) economy—they can largely be used with existing and projected weapons systems, thus requiring no elaborate new systems. In comparison with conventional high explosives, they are less bulky and heavy for comparable results in many situations. Their research, development, and production require a relatively small fraction of the national effort and resources.

They are "search" weapons that can seek out the enemy underground or in concealment. They can be used to achieve a wide range of effects—from temporary to persistent, from mildly incapacitating to highly lethal. They can be used alone, or in conjunction with high explosive, or nuclear weapons systems. They can be used for deterrence, or preventing aggression, as well as for defeating it. They do not destroy installations and facilities, such as ports, factories, roads, and bridges. This is an important factor in preserving the facilities of friendly nations, or in restoring the facilities of a defeated aggressor.

"What are the defenses against chemical and biological warfare?"

Early detection, identification, and warning systems; protective masks and clothing; shelters, air filters, and similar protective measures; public health measures; means of decontaminating equipment, food and water supplies; immunization, first aid, and medical treatment.

"What is being done to meet the total infectious disease problem should it be used in warfare?"

By the total infectious disease problem it is assumed you mean the problem of disease germs being used against our civilian population as well as against our Armed Forces. It must be understood, that the U.S. Army has responsibilities only in the area of military defense. The Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization (OCDM), the recently combined organization of the former Federal Civil Defense Administration and Office of Defense Mobilization, has primary responsibilities at the Federal level in the area of civil or nonmilitary defense.

Other executive branch departments and agencies, such as the Department of Agriculture (USDA) and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (DHEW)—including the Public Health Service—also assist in civil defense in their specialized areas.

The U.S. Army Chemical Corps works closely with these other Government agencies and supplies them with information that may be helpful to them in civil defense, as do the Army Medical Service, Quartermaster Corps, Corps of Engineers, and other Army elements.

Accordingly, the Armed Forces would be primarily concerned with the total infectious disease problem within the Armed Forces. OCDM; Department of Agriculture; Health, Education, and Welfare, and other Federal, State, and local agencies would be primarily concerned with the total infectious disease problem within the civilian population.

"What are the psychochemicals? What do they do?"

Psychochemicals attack the nerve centers of the body and cause an individual to react or behave abnormally. The psychochemicals leave no harmful aftereffects.

"We know pretty well the destructive power of a thermonuclear bomb. Describe the destructive power of chemical and biological weapons."

Considered on the basis of physical destructive power, there can be no comparison between chemical and biological weapons and between biological weapons and thermonuclear weapons. A thermonuclear weapon could be employed solely for its destructive force to lay waste the enemy military or industrial installations by heat, blast, and radiation, in which case the accompanying radiation effect would be incidental.

Chemical weapons, such as incendiaries, can be physically destructive and are effective munitions, but their destructive effect is certainly not of a magnitude comparable even to tactical nuclear weapons. However, potent chemical and biological agents employed in intensity under favorable conditions against military and civilian populations could affect the outcome of a military operation while not destroying facilities.

"Can you estimate the number of casualties the country would have in a chemical and biological attack?"

The number of casualties that could be inflicted by biological methods would be dependent on the nature of the agents used; their virulence and the susceptibility of the population; the method of delivery and its intensity; whether the agent employed has a temporary, prolonged, or permanent effect; and the ability of the population attacked to take remedial measures. It is not possible to provide a conclusive statistical basis for gaging their effectiveness, but the potential of these weapons is known and further data is being sought to determine their role as both offensive and defensive factors in modern warfare.

"Is it true that biological and chemical warfare may each have the potentialities for injury as great as nuclear warfare?"

The answer has to be qualified, because much remains to be learned about the potential and ultimate military role of chemical and biological agents. Available knowledge does not provide a basis for comparing chemical, biological, and nuclear weapon systems. All unquestionably are tremendously effective weapons systems. It should be remembered however, that the effect to be achieved by chemical and biological weapons can be selected, depending upon the agent and how used. They need not always kill or even cause permanent injury.

"Why would an enemy use chemical and biological warfare over thermonuclear weapons?"

World War II was the most costly and destructive war in history. More than half of the 52 million people killed were civilians. The belligerent nations spent more than a trillion dollars on armaments and war materials. Other material costs were immeasurable. And the world has seen how costly it is to rebuild destroyed nations.

From this object lesson, the reason why chemical and biological weapons might appeal to an aggressor is apparent. The indiscriminate use of nuclear weapons would undoubtedly destroy the facilities that were the aggressor's objectives, or certainly render them useless for postwar use. To make aggression worth while, coveted productive

facilities would have to be reasonably intact at the end of hostilities.

If an aggressor covets physical spoils of war, he would use chemical and biological munitions which attack only people. By causing illnesses or death among industrial workers, an aggressor would decrease or destroy their productive capacity. Through chemical and biological attacks on military forces, an aggressor could curb their ability to fight. The resultant decrease in production would seriously weaken defending forces, who would lack munitions, equipment, food, and medical supplies, but the fruits of conquest would remain intact.

In addition, it is likely that an aggressor would consider the need for captive labor to man the factories he hopes to capture intact. Nuclear munitions would kill or maim great numbers of people, rendering them a liability rather than an asset in the postwar economy.

Chemical and biological agents are weapons of minimum destruction to facilities, but instead attack the people who operate the facilities. Further, the degree of their effect on people can to some extent be controlled.

Assuming chemical and biological weapons will assure an aggressor the same measure of military success as thermonuclear weapons and will successfully quell retaliative forces, conquest achieved by chemical and biological weapons will permit the aggressor to enter conquered areas that have not been devastated or contaminated. Destroying industrial potential, commerce, and communication facilities by nuclear force not only deprives an aggressor of the material rewards of aggression, but presents a need to restore the capability for human existence and rehabilitate captured populations.

"What effect do the nerve gases have on an unprepared population?"

To understand the effect nerve gases would have on an unprepared population, one must be aware of the characteristics of these agents. They are a family of chemicals which destroy the normal relationship between the nerves and the muscles they control. The gases have no irritant action but rather profound systematic effects. Symptoms develop rapidly.

Death will usually result if a victim has inhaled a heavy concentration of the vapors or if his body has come in contact with the liquid agent. Breathing the vapors from three good-sized drops of one type of nerve gas can, under certain conditions, cause death. Those receiving a dose less than lethal would require immediate treatment.

"What is adequate protection against nerve gases?"

Defense against nerve gases consists of detection and identification, individual and collective protection, and decontamination. Until the discovery of the nerve gases, most chemical agents had a distinctive smell that could be detected. Nerve gases normally cannot be detected through smell.

Adequate protection against the nerve gases depends on devices which give an audible or visual signal when gas is present. Detector paints, crayons, and papers which change color in the presence of gas are under study.

Complete protection would require both a protective mask and protective clothing as the gases can enter the body through the respiratory system, the eyes, or the skin.

There is a drug which can be administered to nerve gas victims to counteract the effect of the nerve gas. An initial dose of this drug can be self-administered, but a victim who has received a heavy dose of a nerve gas must be given a massive dose together with mouth-to-mouth artificial respiration.

"Are there any vaccines being developed to protect the population against biological agents?"

Yes, there are some. However, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare says there is an inadequate program for research, development, and testing of vaccines in animals and man under conditions similar to those which could be expected in wartime.

"How could a chemical and biological attack be initiated? By planes, rockets, submarines?"

Methods of launching a chemical and biological attack are almost limitless. They may be incorporated into warheads of missiles, in bombs, mortars, and grenades for delivery by land, sea (or under the sea), or air forces. Their adaptability to the element of surprise would increase their effectiveness for an aggressor.

The use of chemical and biological weapons could provide a decided tactical advantage, as the population under attack could be victimized before being alerted to the presence of the agent. Chemical and biological warfare presents the additional hazard of being capable of being initiated from within a country through sabotage as well as from outside the country.

"How long will germs stay around after an attack?"

The duration of a biological attack would be governed by the nature of the germs used, the density of the germs, susceptibility of the population, the weather and terrain, and other conditions.

"Describe an adequate home shelter."

An adequate home shelter would necessarily have to be airtight to prevent gas seepage, yet provide a means of assuring a supply of pure air. Incorporation of diffusion board in the construction of small shelters would permit the entry of purified air. This gas aerosol filter material is composed of fiber and activated impregnated charcoal material. It effectively filters out toxic gases, biological germs, and radioactive dust, while allowing carbon dioixde and moisture to diffuse outward. Diffusion board is not commercially available at this time.

"What Government agencies are responsible for the defense of our country in case of an attack?"

Primary responsibility for the defense of the United States rests with the Military Establishment—the Department of Defense and Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. Planning for civil defense is vested in the Office of Civil Defense Mobilization. Perhaps this definition with reference to civil defense responsibility is too confining. In the event of an outbreak of hostilities, it is assumed the Military Establishment will be required to employ all of its resources in the execution of its military mission.

Civil defense responsibility would be borne by nonmilitary national, State, and local civil defense agencies in concert with local law enforcement and public health services. The military's role would be to provide the maximum possible assistance consistent with execution of military responsibilities. The Armed Forces would employ manpower, material, and facilities to the maximum extent possible, but could not jeopardize the immediate, effective accomplishment of their primary task.

"Do the Russians have biological agents that could cause mysterious epidemics our doctors couldn't identify or treat?"

The United States cannot risk the comfort of assuming to know what weapons may be stockpiled in the arsenal of a potential aggressor. Because of the cloak of secrecy that has historically obscured interest in chemical and biological weapons, perhaps less is known about such developments than about any other area of military concern, including nuclear developments. While we are aware of chemical weapons developed by all major belligerents in World War II, we cannot confidently assume that much more fearsome chemical and biological weapons about which we know nothing have not been developed and stockpiled by potential aggressor nations.

As evidence of the secrecy that shrouds this area the allies did not know the Germans had stockpiles of nerve gases available even before the start of World War II, while the Germans mistakenly assumed the allies also had stockpiles of nerve gases and did not use theirs because of their fear of retaliation.

"Isn't it true that, if the enemy attacks, chemical and biological weapons are more humane than explosive weapons?

Attack by chemical and biological weapons could be considered to be more humane than attack by high explosive weapons. Chemical and biological weapons will not cause the human mutilation associated with explosive munitions. However, lethal chemical and biological weapons, though neater, need not be less deadly, nor can it be assumed that chemical and biological weapons will be so thorough as to eliminate suffering.

"What research and development are we doing toward improving our chemical and biological weapons, especially the nonlethal ones?"

A probing discussion of research efforts would infringe on security information. It can be said that the Chemical Corps—with industry assistance on both a contract and noncontract basis—is seeking more effective chemical and biological agents. However, a breakdown of the relative effort being devoted to incapacitating—as opposed to lethal—agents is impossible. If the Chemical Corps succeeds in standardizing effective incapacitants, it will represent a significant advance; however, the unqualified definition of a weapon as either humane or inhumane is questionable. By its very nature, it is difficult to consider a weapon humane. However, an effective incapacitant would certainly be more humane than any lethal weapon.

"Are we prepared to retaliate with a full arsenal of chemical and biological weapons?"

Again, because of security, there cannot be an extensive discussion of the ability of the United States to retaliate in the event of attack by chemical or biological weapons. But, it is the announced national policy to retaliate to chemical and biological attack in kind and it can be said that the United States maintains the ability to retaliate. With reference to a full arsenal of chemical and biological weapons, the Chemical Corps pursues an aggressive research and development program designed to provide the military with a wide range of weapons of maximum effectiveness.

INTERVIEW WITH LEO A. HOEGH

Most efforts in civil defense seem to be to guard our Nation against thermonuclear attacks. Why isn't more being done to guard the country in event of chemical warfare or biological warfare attacks?"

Civil defense efforts against biological and chemical warfare—like those against thermonuclear warfare and its consequent radiological dangers—are in proper proportion to the threat posed by these means of attack. We certainly don't discount the dangers of biological and chemical warfare. "Planning Basis," annex 1 to our National Plan for Civil Defense Mobilization, states that "a potential enemy could produce and stockpile biological and chemical warfare agents."

It also assumes that "in an attack on the United States, chemical and biological warfare might be used before, during, or after a nuclear attack, but would be on a smaller scale, in order to increase confusion, impair morale, reduce the will to resist, and impede military operations, and civilian survival and recovery activities; use before a

nuclear attack would probably be by clandestine means." These asumptions are compatible with curernt intelligence estimates.

There has been much talk about the seriousness of bioligical and chemical warfare, but this black art hasn't yet reached the level of efficiency of nuclear war. A recent special study for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has described chemical and biological weaponry as exaggerated as to present military utility and still far from any possible use capable of strategic decisiveness. This picture may change in the next few years, if biological and chemical warfare weapons and means of delivery can be perfected.

We intend to be ready for that eventuality. Meanwhile, the graver dangers of nuclear war merit our more intensive efforts. But we certainly aren't neglecting biological and chemical defense.

"What is being done for the civilian population to meet the total infectious disease problem should it be used in warfare?"

Policy guidance and procedures are established by the National Biological and Chemical Warfare Defense Plan, annex 24 of the national plan. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, under OCDM delegation of authority, has initiated the program to protect the civilian population. Its major objective is education of individuals and families in self-protective measures.

This program also includes the control and prevention of diseases resulting from biological warfare attacks; the safeguarding of our food, pharmaceutical, and water supplies; special training and education of doctors, nurses, and other professional personnel in the recognition and diagnosis of the diseases involved; rapid detection and identification of the causative agents; care, treatment, and rehabilitation of casualties; and the stockpiling of necessary emergency drugs, pharmaceuticals, equipment, and supplies.

The Department of Agriculture has a similar program that deals with the biological warfare hazards for livestock and crops. Other Federal agencies are making related preparations within their areas of responsibility. OCDM also is providing special training for Federal, State, and local government personnel in defense procedures against biological warfare. Our nationwide fallout detection and monitoring network is being equipped to detect gas and germ weapons effects. This will take time and money, but the work is proceeding.

OCDM is preparing for mass production of its civilian protective mask. These masks are of a new design. They do not have the cumbersome canister formerly necessary to filter out biological warfare and chemical warfare agents from the air. The canister is replaced by filter pads located at cheek positions. These masks will provide easy breathing, good vision, and easy conversation.

Public distribution will be through selected retail stores at about $2.50 each. They will be available in six sizes. A public information program concerning the use of the protective masks will be timed with their retail distribution. Highest priority has been given by OCDM to the research and development of immunizing agents against diseases for which no protective biologics now are available.

"Should the population be immunized for protection against biological warfare? What shots should be received now?"

Citizens should have all standard immunizations offered by your doctor and local health authorities, such as typhoid fever, smallpox, polio, diphtheria, tetanus, tularemia (rabbit fever), cholera, plague, and yellow fever, to name but a few.

"What is being done to alert the population on what to do in case of chemical and biological attack?"

In cooperation with the Army Chemical Corps, HEW, USDA, and other Federal agencies, training programs are being initiated to train not only professional and technical personnel, but the general public in defense measures. We feel that an informed public is a cooperative one. Once our people are informed of the hazards and the measures for self-protection, their fears of these new weapons will be greatly reduced.

"What must I do to protect my home against attack?"

Above all, install a fallout shelter now—preferably in your basement or yard if you have one. Stock it with enough food and water for at least 14 days. Include a battery-operated radio. a first aid kit, and other survival items. Inexpensive air filters will convert many fallout shelters into safe refuges from chemical and biological weapon effects. At least one member from each family should complete a course in first aid.

"How would we get word of an impending attack?"

Our national warning system, vigilant night and day, can alert the whole country in minutes. The attack warning will be sounded by sirens. Conelrad emergency radio stations will broadcast local survival instructions to the public on 640 or 1240 on the radio dial, during the attack alert period.

"What should I do during an attack if I am away from home when the attack comes?"

First, learn your community's emergency plans now and be prepared to act accordingly. Depending on attack circumstances and other prevailing conditions, you may be instructed to take shelter or to evacuate. Find out the location of your building's shelter or its safest area.

Know the warning signals and what they mean. These are two: (1) The alert signal, a 3- to 5-minute steady blast or tone, meaning "attack is probable—take whatever action is directed by authorities of the local government," and (2) the take cover signal, a 3-minute rising and falling tone or a series of short blasts, meaning "attack is imminent—take cover immediately in the best available shelter." During an attack, keep your radio tuned to 640 or 1240 for instructions. If protective masks are available, put one on.

"How about my wife at home with the children? What should she do?"

At home, the same general steps should be followed. That's why it's so important that your family know what to do even if you're not there.

"What precautions should be taken after an attack?"

Remain in shelters or basement areas until advised it is safe to come out. Listen for instructions over your radio and follow them. Avoid exposed liquids or foods which might have been contaminated.

"What publications are available to help people be prepared for chemical and biological attack?"

Your readers can obtain OCDM publications free, through their local civil defense offices. Or they may write to Publications Distribution, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Battle Creek, Mich. Sources of other agencies' material are as follows:

DHEW: Public Inquiries, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, room 5525 North Building, Washington, D.C.

USDA: Office of Information, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

DOD: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

The Conservative Baptist Association of Northern California Warmly Endorses the House Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1961

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a resolution endorsing the House Committee on Un-American Activities which was unanimously adopted by the Conservative Baptist Association of Northern California on March 7, 1961 at the First Baptist Church of Yuba City, Calif. The chairman of the resolutions committee, Dr. Roy H. Austin, is one of a group of ministers who were present at the congressional hearings of the committee at city hall in San Francisco on May 12 and 13, 1960. As eye witnesses to the mob demonstrations against law and order, they have publicly certified that the film "Operation Abolition" is a truthful and accurate representation of activities taking place at the hearings:

RESOLUTION BY CONSERVATIVE BAPTIST ASSOCIATION

Whereas the criminal conspiracy of world-wide atheistic communism is a plain and growing menace, not only to those precious liberties guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States, but to the practice and extension of the Christian faith (as recently demonstrated by the tragic loss of our Congo mission field); and

Whereas the House Committee on Un-American Activities of our U.S. Congress has courageously and capably persevered in investigating Communist penetration into many segments of American life and culture; and

Whereas the House Committee on Un-American Activities has been the object of relentless attack by communistic elements and their sympathizers and dupes: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we, the Conservative Baptist Association of Northern California, meeting in annual session at Yuba City on March 7, 1961, wholeheartedly commend these devoted public servants in Congress for their proven devotion to the ideals of freedom and justice, and that we urge that they fearlessly pursue their investigation into all areas of Red penetration, including such religious leadership as has become involved in the Communist apparatus, and that we assure them of our gratitude, our prayerful support and solid backing in their thankless but essential task of safeguarding our moral and spiritual heritage.

EYEWITNESS REPORT OF THE SAN FRANCISCO RED RIOTS—OPEN LETTER TO DEAN M. KELLEY OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES ON RIOT FILM

DEAR REVEREND KELLEY: In reply to your recent letter as to my impressions on the House Committee on Un-American Activities, perhaps some of the following would be helpful to you.

I was an eyewitness at the House Committee on Un-American Activities meeting

in San Francisco in May 1960, and attended the hearings every day. The film, "Operation Abolition," was shown Sunday evening, February 26 in the First Baptist Church of San Jose. After seeing the film, I can assuredly say that it is a fair and excellent presentation of the events and circumstances surrounding the riots at the hearings in the city hall. The one or two very minor divergencies from the sequence of events in no way alter the basic truth and accuracy which the film intends to convey. I was amazed that a film of so short a length could give so true a picture of what transpired over several days of hearings and hours of court procedure. I personally feel that the behavior in the court room, which was without doubt, incited by the Communists, was far worse than the film showed. I know that the great majorty of the students were not Communists, but the film accurately shows the advantage that the Communists take in a situation where differences are fanned into a riot. This the Communists did.

I feel that the accuracy and fairness of the film can be defended to anyone who wants to know the truth. Those who don't, could not be persuaded even though an angel from heaven were the messenger. The film does an excellent job in conveying what a law and order. I was in Russia a little over citing mass riot and disregard for decency, law and order, I was in Russia a little over a year ago and I feel that this film should awaken America to what could be accomplished in our country even as it was in Russia.

Trusting these few impressions will be helpful, I am,

Sincerely yours,

CLARENCE R. SANDS.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1961

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this occasion to greet you on the 43d anniversary of Byelorussian Independence Day, that memorable and glorious day in Byelorussia's modern history. After enduring the oppressive yoke of Russia's czarist regime, the Byelorussian people earned their long-cherished and well-merited freedom, culminating in their national political independence in 1918.

During the czarist autocracy, the Russians did their worst to eradicate and eliminate all Byelorussian traditional and national traits, including their fervent desire for freedom. Fortunately, the Russians were unsuccessful in their ruthless attempts. The more they oppressed the Byelorussians, the more tenaciously these people clung to their ethnic and national ideals, and longed for the day of their independence. The overthrow of the czarist regime in Russia in 1917 ushered in a new era for them. Early in 1918 they asserted their freedom and on that historic March 25 they proclaimed their independence by establishing the Byelorussian National Republic. But the independence thus regained and proclaimed did not last long. Early in 1921 the Byelorussian National Republic was treacherously attacked and overrun by the Red Army. Thus came to an end the Byelorussian Republic, but the idea of freedom and independence has not deserted the Byelorussian people.

I am glad to affirm once more that they still cling to their firm belief in freedom, in their eventual independence. In greeting you on this historic anniversary, I wish freedom to the Byelorussians.

The Small Business Investment Act of 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1961

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of interest in the recent progress of the Small Business Administration in carrying out the objectives of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. Under unanimous consent, I place in the RECORD the following statement summarizing the objectives of this act and the recent accomplishments in carrying out these objectives. These comments are based on the investigations of Subcommittee No. 1 on Organization and Operation of the Small Business Administration, of the Select Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives.

THE SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT OF 1958

After much study by the House Small Business Committee and the Banking Committees of both Houses of Congress, the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (Public Law 85–699) was passed and approved on August 21 of that year. This act provided for the licensing by the SBA of small-business investment companies which were to be a source of equity capital and long-term credit for small business concerns throughout the Nation.

At the end of the 1960 fiscal year (June 30, 1960), 109 licenses for small business investment companies had been granted by the SBA. Requests for licenses or proposals had been submitted by 217 companies. An updating of this information indicates that on March 14, 1961, 200 companies had been licensed and 431 proposals received.

Section 302(a) of the act authorizes the Small Business Administration to advance funds to the investment companies for the purpose of helping them obtain the minimum capital requirements. The maximum amount that SBA may make available to a single company is $150,000. These funds are to be advanced to small business investment companies through the purchase of subordinated debentures by the Small Business Administration. As of June 30, 1960, the Small Business Administration had committed $11,190,000 to be supplied in this manner to the investment companies licensed as of that date. Another $59,202,364 from private sources brings the total capital available to the 109 companies licensed as of June 1960 to $70,400,000. See the following table for a breakdown which shows the number of proposals received, number of licenses granted, and the capitalization of these companies through fiscal year 1960:

	December 1958 through June 1959	July through December 1959	January through June 1960	Cumulative through June 1960
Proposals received	92	48	77	217
Notices to proceed	46	59	75	180
Licenses approved	16	45	48	[1] 109
	Dollar value			
Initial capital	$5,196,000	$18,142,000	$15,355,000	$38,603,000
Subordinated debentures	(1,319,000)	(4,185,000)	(5,686,000)	(11,190,000)
Additional private capital	4,000	16,258,000	15,445,000	31,707,000
Total capital available	5,200,000	34,400,000	30,800,000	70,400,000

[1] 1 license surrendered Mar. 18, 1960; 108 licenses in force.

Source: Small Business Administration.

Under section 303(b) of the act, the Small Business Administration is authorized to lend funds to investment companies up to one-half of their capital and surplus. The act provides that SBA shall set the rate of interest on these loans. The rate has been set at 5 percent. As of June 30, 1960, based upon the $70 million capitalization of the 108 companies then licensed (one of the 109 companies surrendered its license on March 18, 1960), these companies were eligible to borrow $35 million from SBA under section 303(b) of the act. But only 11 licensees had made applications for loans totaling $2,390,828 under this section of the act, and only $800,000 of this amount has been disbursed by SBA as of June 30, 1960.

The act authorizes small business investment companies to finance small businesses by (1) furnishing equity capital under section 304 of the act, and (2) through long-term loans under section 305 of the act.

An analysis of the total immediate and potential capital of small business investment companies, and the loan potential for small businesses as of June 30, 1960, including 96 proposed companies which had not yet been licensed (12 proposals had been withdrawn or rejected), indicates a gross potential total of financing available for use under this program of only $234,765,000. This includes not only the present capitalization of the 108 companies licensed, but also includes public offerings not yet subscribed to by the 108 companies and the potential capital of 96 proposed companies not yet licensed, including the full amount of loans authorized under section 303(b). See the following table:

Total immediate and potential capital of small business investment companies and loan potential for small business June 30, 1960

Immediate and potential capital funds of 108 small business investment companies:	
Initial capital:	
Private subscription	$27,503,000
SBA (subordinated debentures)	11,190,000
Total initial capital	38,693,000
Additional public and private subscription	31,707,000
Total capital funds as of June 30, 1960	70,400,000
Public offerings:	
In progress	14,355,000
In registration	27,000,000
Total public offerings	41,355,000
Total capital funds of 108 licensed SBIC's	111,755,000

***Total immediate and potential capital of small business investment companies and loan potential for small business June 30, 1960*—Continued**

96 proposed small business investment companies: Initial capital	$44,760,000
Potential capital funds of licensees plus initial capital of 96 proposed SBIC's	156,515,000
Loan potential: Section 303 loans, 50 percent of total capital	78,250,000
Total	234,765,000

An analysis of the report of the small business investment companies submitted to SBA on March 31, 1960, indicates that $14.7 million in equity capital and loan commitments had been made to 250 eligible small businesses. The details of the small business financing by the investment companies as of March 31, 1960, is as follows:

	Number of small business investment companies	Number of transactions	Dollar amount
Convertible debentures	22	58	$4,356,176.91
Long-term loans	39	183	5,797,861.67
Capital stock of small business concerns (by conversion)	2	4	87,740.00
Commitments to finance small business concerns	17	41	4,498,450.00
Total			14,740,228.58

Thus we find that as of June 30, 1960, after almost 2 years of operation under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, 108 companies were in operation with a total capitalization of $70,400,000, with only $13.6 million of that being financed by the SBA. We also see that the total potential capital of all the companies which were licensed on June 30, 1960, plus those with proposals pending, including maximum possible loans from SBA under 303(b) of the act, is only $234,765,000. This is much less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the gross debt of all corporations in the country at the end of 1959.

These facts indicate that, while progress has been made, much more remains to be done before small business is to receive the full fruits of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. The recent acceleration in licensing of small business investment companies is very encouraging.

On March 16 the SBA announced it had licensed the 200th SBIC, and forecast a sharp increase in SBIC activities in the months ahead. The 200th SBIC brings to $188,636,677 the present capital of operating licensees for financing small business. Only $21.6 million of this came from the SBA.

It looks as if this program is really getting off the ground, and we are looking forward anxiously to the stimulating role this program will play in aiding the small business sector of the American economy.

Rising Expectations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as you know, our policies toward Cuba have been of concern to us all, and it is interesting to watch Cuban reaction to them. Mr. Carlos Todd, is doing an effective job in setting forth the feelings of the Cuban people. Mr. Todd, a Cuban now living in Miami, Fla., recently delivered an excellent speech at the MIT School of International Relations. A copy was sent to me by Mrs. W. W. Brown, of Fort Lauderdale, Fla. I am grateful to her for forwarding it to me, and feel it merits insertion in the RECORD:

RISING EXPECTATIONS

(Address by Carlos Todd)

Ladies and gentlemen, I feel a deep sense of privilege that the League of Women Voters of Massachusetts has seen fit to ask me to address this distinguished audience. The subject assigned to me is "Rising Expectations," an awesome task to cover in 15 minutes, with its very wide ramifications and the many implications that the title itself implies.

First, I would like to state that—although I may speak English without much accent—I am a native-born Cuban, who has lived most of his adult life on that unfortunate island. Therefore, the viewpoint that I shall be able to give you is that of a Latin American, but more definitely that of a Cuban who has lived through nearly 2 years of the frightful fiasco that is the so-called Castro revolution—in reality, the Communist conquest—of Cuba.

The very title of this subject, "Rising Expectations," betrays the fact that you in this audience are conscious of the reality that there is something amiss in the relations between Latin America and this great country of yours. My only quarrel is the use of the word "rising," since that would seem to imply that great expectations have only just begun to show themselves in the sister republics of this hemisphere. They have always been there, and if they are no longer dormant, it is simply because the cold war that rages in the world today has finally pierced the chrysalis that you thought safe from intrusion for so many years.

For there is an invasion of Latin America today, just as surely as there has been an invasion of Eastern Europe, of many Asiatic zones and of the African Continent. Belatedly, very belatedly, the people of this country are beginning to get glimmerings, hazy images at best, of the enormous threat that has been posed for the United States by the Communist invasion of this hemisphere. It has been very slow in coming—and pray God that it has not come too late.

Not so long ago, in the era of Franklin D. Roosevelt, U.S. relations with Latin American countries were at an alltime high. The political, the commercial and industrial prestige of this country remained unchallenged in the hemisphere. The cordiality between your neighbors to the south and your Government was a strong bond that made for hemispheric unity.

Curiously, the policy of the good neighbor became, unconsciously to the Latin American nations the policy of the good father. An umbrella of protection—real or imaginary, as you wish—did not permit the intrusion of world power politics on the Latin American scene. The peoples of our countries felt, at that time, that the United States was concerned with their welfare, and reacted accordingly.

It was only after World War II, when militant communism began to march inexorably in every single continent in the world, that the Latin American mind began to have serious doubts of American intentions. Aid in enormous quantities went to reconstruct the ruin of Europe; the Asians received their share of largesse; African countries began to acquire new importance in world politics; and in their comfortable acceptance of a sure thing, the United States did not turn an eye on Latin America. We became poor relations of no consequence.

Further, and more grievous still, the United States, whilst leaving the Latin American Republics to fend for themselves, resigned its position as the paterfamilias of the hemisphere; and in doing so, effectively relinquished its position of leadership. You were no longer captain of the vessel. You became a mere member of the crew, defaulting all the privileges of the master of the ship. You refused to assume the responsibility and the risk that had made you the undisputed leader of this hemisphere; and, instead of a former father, you became a rather questionable uncle.

Nothing has been basically changed in the everyday world of diplomacy, business, and industry; but there was a subtle difference in the overall picture that we Latin Americans were quick to notice. In the world of human relationships, there is nothing so appalling and insulting as to be considered safe by another person. It is an unspoken insult; and the dividing line between tolerance and contempt become very blurred under the circumstances.

That was the position in which you found yourself when the specter of communism began to haunt the hemisphere; and you frantically tried to buy and hold tin pot dictators in different Latin American countries to protect your holdings against the advance of the Red hordes. In doing so you played right into Communist hands by actions which brought the inevitable reaction to dictatorships: revolutions, and the installment of the so-called independent governments of the left. The leadership that you had once assumed and kept for so many years continued to slip from your grasp—and in your paralysis of action and with your political blunders, you continued to make matters worse.

For the liberty of action which you once possessed as the hemispheric leader, had now passed out of your hands. You were the leaders no longer; and our peoples began to look upon you with ever-increasing doubts. In 1958, following the innocent theory that making a better Humpty-Dumpty would clear up matters for all concerned, your aid and your confused torpor unleashed the one force in this hemisphere that you had been so earnestly trying to repel, international communism.

Following the insane belief that the creation of an independent government of the left in Cuba would show the rest of Latin America the prestine purity of your intentions, you were—to use one of your expressions—conned into believing in and vitally aiding and abetting the rise of Fidel Castro in Cuba.

Not that you were not warned. Your own special government departments informed your higher authorities of the nature of the hoodlums that run Cuba today before their accession to power. The information and the advice were ignored; and on January 1, 1959, Fidel Castro took over Cuba; and then, Ernesto (Ché) Guevara, of the Argentine and international communism took over Fidel Castro. Your independent government of the left became the first firm foothold of the Soviets and the Red Chinese in this hemisphere—and you helped them to do it.

Imagine, then, the feeling that has been rising in Latin America since then. Every day that passed brought new insult and calumny from the Cuban Communists; and the United States, the greatest power on this earth sat back and remained wrapped in silent dignity. "El que calla, otorga," says the Spanish proverb—"he who remains silent, relinquishes"—which is exactly the manner in which your actions were interpreted by the people of Latin America. The great nation of the north was great no more. A small speck on the Caribbean could insult it, confiscate its goods, jail its citizens, arrest its diplomats, snub its ambassador, and get away with it.

Oh, you had your troubles. If you intervened, you would be called bullies and aggressors. If you didn't, then you became the goat of the hemisphere and the world.

The picture of a declining United States, enervated, paralyzed, vacillating, robbed of the ability to act, was a delicious one to be enjoyed. You worried about popularity—about what the other fellow would say—in a world that couldn't care less. You were and still are, to some extent stymied.

For some Latin Americans, the time had come to take sides. Castro said early in 1959, "You are with the revolution or against it." This has become the cry in all Latin America. "You are with communism or against it." And never forget, that people always wish to be on the winning side. So far, you are losing.

The immediate rising expectations of the Latin Americans are to find a United States that demonstrates the same resourcefulness and intelligence, the same determination and vigor as do the Communists in this hemisphere, a United States that can recover its lost position of leadership through positive action against the Communists, something which you have not been able to do to any appreciable extent anywhere in the world.

You have to show the Latin American that you still maintain the heritage of fearless action and devoted struggle against tyranny that you received from your ancestors. You not only have to woo governments, you have to woo the people, the little fellow on the street. And you're not doing it.

A Nation that can sell Coca-Cola better than anyone else in the world cannot sell an idea. And you cannot sell ideas distributing pamphlets to schools and to institutions behind closed doors. You don't sell Coca-Cola or ideas that way. You must mobilize the overwhelming majority of the people of Latin America—for it is the overwhelming majority who are against Communism, and who will gladly fight against it if intelligent and forceful leadership is provided.

It is not enough to have ambassadors that can speak Spanish perfectly. It is not enough to have your experts tell your young State Department men going abroad that we frown on people wearing shorts in the street. It is not enough to have the American housewife in Latin America speak kitchen Spanish and learn to cook the local dishes.

You must approach and you must charm and you must make friends with our people, with labor leaders and with construction foremen, with the farmer and with the peasant, with the prince and with the pauper. You must reach the people.

The Communists have demonstrated themselves to be past masters at this art. You have ignored it altogether. You have been too busy selling Coca-Cola, and doing the round of colony parties. You have not learned to know us Latin Americans, you have not tried. Our rising expectations—and in this I'm referring to Cuba—is that you show more concern about what is one of the most serious situations, if not the most serious, for you in the world today. You worry about Laos and about Berlin. You fret over the Congo and keep an eye cocked on Quemoy and Matsu. The Communists might take over in these places. Yet you have not lifted a finger to halt the entry of communism, 90 miles from your shores, in what was once one of the most prosperous countries of Latin America.

You can deal with Communists in Cuba militarily, you feel, at any moment. But other Latin Americans, whose countries are being subverted by communism, somehow feel that you simply don't care; and that your power is truncated by your indecision and fear * * * your great worry about not being liked.

Rising expectations? You sit back and watch little Cuba settle hemispheric problems. We are the laboratory of communism in your backyard; and you wish to see how the experiment works out without dirtying your hands.

To the Latin American, the Communist onslaught on Cuba was not an attack on our little island. It was, as it is, a direct attack by Soviet Russia and Communist China on the United States of America. That you have permitted that attack with impunity—no matter what other consideration must be taken into account by you—was not lost on Latin America. If the United States is not ready to repel the Communist invader, if it does not lead us in the fight against these forces of evil, why should we act? In fact, how can we act * * * against the mighty power of the Soviet Union and its Chinese ally?

That is what the Latin American is asking today. For the attack is primarily against you, not against Latin America. If you are unwilling to defend yourselves and take action against the Communist invader, the Latin American will argue, why should we? If you do not take action, he will further believe that you are going to lose. And if you are going to lose, he will not be on your side. All the world loves a winner.

You are asking the Cuban people to take on singlehanded the arms and the power of Soviet Russia and Communist China—and this fact does not go unperceived in other Latin American nations. Cuba, today, is an economic and social ruin; yet you have not lifted a finger to keep communism out of the hemisphere.

The people of Latin America are taking good note of your actions and your seeming impotence. You simply don't look like a winner. And the time is fast approaching when those peoples are going to take sides against you.

Where there have been independent governments of the left, these have always presented a delicious morsel to the Communists. Such governments are inevitably open to immediate and dangerous infiltration.

And, never forget, that if we are incomprehensible to you, perhaps you are incomprehensible to us. You're not born with our blood, you haven't lived with our peoples, you don't speak the language, and you don't understand our mentality. The best you can do is try—and try very fast.

The deadly virus of communism has already invaded and conquered Cuba, and is beginning to spread throughout the hemisphere. Our expectations are, that if you wish us to conquer it and eject it, we also assume that you will enter the lists with us. We expect you to resume the leadership that you have so unfortunately renounced; and we expect you to assume the risks and the responsibilities that go with that leadership. The Russians are doing it, the Chinese are doing it. You are not.

You have not bothered to make use of the positive values of the people of Latin America; and you have concerned yourselves exclusively with the governments and misgovernments that rule us. You are too preoccupied with our politicians and ignore the creative forces within our countries.

Open your minds and your hearts, your schools, and your great universities to Latin America. Use more scholarships, use more tours, use all the weapons that your frightful enemy is using, but use those weapons as effective forces for good, and not as arms of evil.

One thing, if Fidel Castro, the Soviet puppet and his master Ché Guevara, faithful servant of the Communists, are allowed to remain as the undisputed lords of Cuba for 1 more year, kiss the rest of Latin America goodby 5 or 10 years hence. You will have lost it and you will have lost it for good. In the words of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, "It is no exaggeration to say that we, in America, are living at the point of a gun."

Our rising expectations hold that you look to the South; that you recognize quickly what is going on; and that you help us lick the Communist invaders. That is the immediate, pressing, and most urgent of the rising expectations of Latin America.

You hold to much of the future of mankind in your hands to allow it to slip so heartrendingly from your grasp.

Tennessee Legislature Supports Federal Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1961

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the legislature of the State of Tennessee recently passed a joint resolution supporting Federal aid to education and urging the Members of the House from Tennessee to work for the enactment of a Federal aid to education bill.

The resolution points out that Federal assistance to the Tennessee school system would be a great benefit and that "various programs of Federal support have been in operation since the founding of our Nation, and these programs have not resulted in undesirable controls."

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include House Joint Resolutoin 28, as passed by the Tennessee General Assembly, be in the Appendix of the RECORD. The resolution follows:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 28

Resolution on Federal support for education

Whereas education is vital to the general welfare and national defense of the United States; and

Whereas the Federal Government collects more than two-thirds of the total taxes paid in Tennessee while paying only about 4 percent of the cost of education in this State; and

Whereas U.S. Senate bill No. 8 which passed the Senate in the 86th Congress would have made available to Tennessee an estimated $25,501,000 for the 1961–62 school year; and

Whereas this money is sorely needed in Tennessee to improve our educational program; and

Whereas the application of the fair principle of taxing the wealth where it is and educating the child where he is would be of special assistance to Tennessee in its attempt to provide a more adequate educational program; and

Whereas Tennessee lost some 300,000 persons to other States during the past decade, and most of these persons were young people educated at Tennessee's expense, with other States reaping the benefits without sharing in the obligation of their education; and

Whereas various programs of Federal support have been in operation since the founding of our Nation, and these programs have not resulted in undesirable controls; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 82d General Assembly of the State of Tennessee (the Senate concurring), That this assembly urges Tennessee's congressional delegation to work for the enactment of a Federal support to education bill, which would partially equalize the cost of education among the several States, and which would retain complete State control of education, allowing the States themselves to decide how the money is to be spent for teachers' salaries and school construction.

Adopted March 2, 1961.

JAMES L. BOMAR,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

WM. D. BAIRD,
Speaker of the Senate.

Approved March 4, 1961.

BUFORD ELLINGTON, *Governor.*

Pennsylvania's Areas of Substantial Labor Surplus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following press release of March 17, 1961, issued by the Bureau of Employment Security, Department of Labor and Industry, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, which was sent to me by the secretary of the department, Mr. William L. Batt, Jr. The figures incorporated in this release are broken down by labor-market areas, and it is to be noted that 26 of Pennsylvania's 29 classified labor-market areas are areas of substantial labor surplus.

This report, Mr. Speaker, certainly underscores the need for the passage by the House of the area redevelopment bill, approved last week by a wide margin, 63–27, in the U.S. Senate. These depressed economic areas in Pennsylvania and elsewhere in the country are looking toward this aid for real and solid help to assist them in meeting their long-term, chronic unemployment problems.

The indicated press release follows:

According to January ratings, and following the national trend, 4 additional labor-market areas in Pennsylvania were classified as areas of substantial labor surplus, bringing the total to 26, according to a report released today by Secretary of Labor and Industry William L. Batt, Jr.

The classifications of the areas are made jointly by the U.S. and Pennsylvania Bureaus of Employment Security on the basis of the adequacy of labor supply as of January 15, 1961, and showed 9 major and 17 smaller areas in the substantial labor surplus category. This represented the addition of three major and one smaller area since the November ratings.

Layoffs in durable goods industries which were expected to continue over the next few months were primarily responsible for the reclassification of the three major areas, Philadelphia, York, and Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton. In Lock Haven, the smaller area, cutbacks in aircraft manufacturing and the anticipated closing of an electrical machinery plant prompted the labor surplus rating.

Of these 26 areas, 19 are designated as "areas of substantial and persistent labor surplus." This constitutes an increase of three over November, one major, Pittsburgh, and two smaller labor market areas, Indiana and Sayre-Athens-Towanda.

Since November, classification changes in the Nation as a whole resulted in an increase in the number of major areas of substantial labor surplus from 51 to 76. The number of smaller areas meanwhile rose from 123 to 152. Of the total number of substantial labor surplus areas in the United States, 103 are classified as "areas of substantial and persistent labor surplus."

In January, the U.S. rate of unemployment again remained well below the Pennsylvania rate. The national percent of labor force unemployed in January was 7.7 and the Pennsylvania percentage was 11.4. Seasonaly adjusted, the national rate was 6.6.

The areas in Pennsylvania which are presently classified appear on the list below. Data presented include the estimated total number of unemployed workers as of mid-January and their percentage of labor force unemployed. These data reflect a revised method of computing unemployment. The computations were made in accordance with a new, standardized methodology developed by the U.S. Bureau of Employment Security in cooperation with State agencies. The new method which incorporates newly available data and the results of special studies is designed to establish a uniform system in all the States for estimating the number of jobless workers.

Labor market area	Percent of total civilian labor force unemployed Jan. 15, 1961	Percent of total civilian labor force unemployed Nov. 15, 1960	Estimated total number of workers unemployed Jan. 15, 1961	November 1960-January 1961 net change in number unemployed
Uniontown-Connellsville [1]	27.9	22.1	13,000	+2,900
Pottsville (Schuylkill County) [1]	22.1	14.8	16,900	+6,100
Kittanning-Ford City [1]	21.1	15.8	4,800	+1,300
Clearfield-Du Bois [1]	17.2	13.3	6,100	+1,400
Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton [1]	17.1	12.4	23,300	+6,600
Johnstown [1]	16.6	16.6	16,200	+200
New Castle [1]	16.2	14.1	6,500	+900
Lewistown [1]	15.9	9.6	3,500	+1,400
Meadville [1]	15.2	12.1	3,500	+700
Scranton [1]	15.1	11.7	15,200	+3,700
Sunbury-Shamokin-Mountain Carmel [1]	13.9	10.2	9,100	+2,500
Erie [1]	13.8	9.3	13,400	+4,400
Altoona [1]	13.4	12.3	7,100	+600
Pittsburgh [1]	12.9	10.6	122,200	+21,500
Butler [1]	12.7	11.4	4,400	+400
Sharon-Farrell [2]	12.4	9.7	5,900	+1,200
Indiana [1]	12.0	9.9	2,500	+400
Lock Haven [2]	11.8	9.3	1,700	+300
Berwick-Bloomsburg [1]	11.5	9.0	2,800	+600
Oil City-Franklin-Titusville [2]	11.1	9.1	3,300	+600
St. Marys-Emporium [1]	11.0	9.9	2,000	+200
Sayre-Athens-Towanda [1]	10.6	8.0	2,100	+500
Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton [2]	9.9	6.4	22,100	+8,000
Williamsport [2]	9.9	7.5	4,300	+1,000
Harrisburg	8.0	5.8	13,400	+3,500
Philadelphia [2]	7.7	5.9	142,800	+32,900
York [2]	7.4	5.2	7,800	+2,300
Reading	6.9	4.6	8,600	+2,900
Lancaster	6.1	4.4	7,400	+2,100

[1] Area of substantial and persistent labor surplus.
[2] Area of substantial labor surplus.

Resolution by Miami Chapter of the Lithuanian American Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1961

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, with great pride do I call the attention of the Members to the resolution adopted by the Miami Chapter of the Lithuanian American Council at their recent meeting commemorating the 43d anniversary of the declaration of independence of their beloved homeland:

Resolution unanimously adopted at a mass meeting of Americans of Lithuanian descent, of the city of Miami and surrounding territory, sponsored by the Lithuanian American Council, Miami chapter, and held February 12, 1961, at the Miami Lithuanian American Citizens Club, to commemorate the 43d anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania:

"Whereas Moscow and Peiping of communistic dominated countries are openly reaching out to take over all nations of the world, as is illustrated by their activities in the Near East, Africa, and Latin America, by supplying arms and propaganda; and

"Whereas by their activities in neutral countries they are becoming a threat to the peace of all democratic countries; and

"Whereas Western nations, seeking the way of compromise with the despots, trying to overlook the millions of innocent people hurt by their oppression, are being forced to coexist with their aggressors: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That this gathering of Americans of Lithuanian descent demands that Prime Minister Khrushchev free the Russian satellite countries, before demanding freedom for colonies of Africa and elsewhere; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Soviets be urged to desist in oppressing the people of Lithuania, wiping out their nationalism and taking over their belongings; be it finally

"*Resolved*, That the Soviet Union by any means possible, be forced to vacate the illegally occupied countries such as Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and afford these people the opportunity of ruling themselves acording to the principles of freedom."

LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL, INC.,
MIAMI CHAPTER,
Mrs. HELEN VERBELA, *President*.
Mrs. JENNIE GOODWILL, *Secretary*.
V. SKUPEIKA, *Treasurer*.

Presto—Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wall Street Journal of March 10, 1961. In my opinion it graphically illustrates the manifest evils of inflation and the vicious circle involved in trying to create more purchasing power, which is one of the programs of the New Frontiersmen:

PRESTO—PROSPERITY

Let's suppose that tomorrow morning the President ordered the Bureau of Engraving to print up a few extra billions of dollar bills. And that then he parceled these billions of dollars among the other Government bureaus with orders to hand them out to people on relief, to home and highway builders, farmers, veterans or anybody else handy.

Well, we've no doubt there would be a spurt of business activity. These people would rush down to the store and demand goods for dollars, and the first comers might even get goods for dollars at yesterday's prices.

This would strip the grocer's shelves bare, and he would order more cans of peas. Orders on the canner's books would rise. So would the statistic of national income, as measured in dollars, and as the dollars changed hands, so would the dollar figures on the gross national product.

Yet we don't think anybody, these days, would be fooled into thinking the country was suddenly more prosperous as a result of all this new purchasing power. It would be evident to everybody that the national wealth had not been increased an iota by the mere process of printing more pieces of paper.

But now let us suppose that the President went to Congress tomorrow and said that since we have a recession the Government must spend more money than it takes in. That the Government must create new purchasing power by running a deficit. That this new purchasing power, created by Government, will create business activity, stimulate the economy and set things humming to the greater prosperity of all.

In this case the supposition is not wholly imaginary. Such a program has already been discussed gravely in the public councils, and you can be sure that if business doesn't spurt pretty soon, this is exactly the kind of proposal Congress will get.

This proposition differs from running the printing press only in that here the dollars will be credit dollars pumped into the banking system instead of pieces of green paper put directly into people's hands. In either case, the Government is going to pay out dollars that it has made out of nothingness.

Yet, stated in the abstract, this purchasing power theory will be supported by learned arguments. There will be some disputes, perhaps, as to whether it is necessary, there will be disagreements as to how much Government deficit spending it will take to do the job. A few will argue that the resulting inflation will be too high a price to pay for the results to be achieved.

But hardly anyone will doubt the proposition that the Government can create new purchasing power, and that if it just creates enough of it the Government can in fact pull us out of any recession and set things humming again. That proposition will be no more questioned in the business community than it will in academic circles or in the cloakrooms of Congress.

Yet where does this new purchasing power come from? Where was it hidden before? What is it created out of? This credit money that the Government is going to spend that it hasn't got, what is it made of? The only people who ask such questions are ridiculous old curmudgeons who want to stand in the way of getting us out of the recession.

It is not that the members of any Council of Economic Advisers, past or present, have the answers to these questions. It is simply assumed—like one of the fundamental propositions of Euclid—that the Government does create new purchasing power whenever it creates new credit. So if there isn't enough money available to build roads, the Government just creates it, and that's that.

Hence the whole country now accepts it as an article of faith that the Government can make up the deficit in private spending or put public capital into the economy by doing with credit dollars what is so self evidently a delusion with printing press dollars. Curious, is it not?

And more than curious, more's the pity. For if we could really do such magic with a little inflation, it might be worth the price—although in that case the printing press would be a quicker way of getting the new dollars into hands that would spend it.

But all across the land there are people serenely confident that, whatever the morality of inflation, the Government can indeed cerate the purchasing power we need to pull us out of a recession and lift us to greater prosperity. And there's nothing more pitiful than a patient who has suffered a painful cure only to find, after all, that its promise is just another delusion.

Italy Celebrates the Centenary of Her Unification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times, Sunday, March 19, 1961, as a tribute to Italy and the Italian people:

THE ITALIAN CENTENARY

It is a fascinating quirk of history that the year in which we commemorate the centenary of the beginnings of our Civil War is also the year in which Italy celebrates the centenary of her unification.

President Kennedy paid tribute on Thursday to Italy and to the ties that bind our two countries. In 1861 they were weak; in 1961, as the President said, "they have never been stronger."

We New Yorkers have our own special reasons to join Italians in their commemoration. There was a time within the memory of many of us when New York was the largest Italian city in the world, and even today, between the Italian-born and those of Italian descent, there are few cities in Italy that can beat us.

Mr. Kennedy took special note of the fact that "Western civilization as we know it" had come "from the banks of the Tiber." It was no accident of history that the three men who were most responsible for uniting Italy—Mazzini, Cavour, and Garibaldi—gave expression to the two great principles that had come out of the French Revolution and that dominated the 19th century. These were the principle of liberty and the principle of nationality.

One looks back now on those thrilling days of the Italian Risorgimento with a sense of nostalgia as well as admiration. Nationalism did not then mean, as it generally does today, an aggressive, destructive, xenophobic emotion. Liberty was struggling against the reactionary classes—and winning. The deadly enemy we call totalitarianism had not come on the scene.

Now we are in the midst of the cold war and Italy is again on the side of liberty. It was her greatest statesman, Count Cavour, who wrote: "There can be no liberty without social justice." This is what President Kennedy said to Latin America a few days ago. A century and an ocean apart, the United States and Italy stand close to each other.

Special Study Mission to Latin America: Venezuela, Brazil, Argentina, Chile, Bolivia, Panama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1961

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 13, Congressmen ARMISTEAD SELDEN and DANTE FASCELL issued a report on Latin America resulting from a study mission they conducted to that area during November–December 1960. The report examines the economic, political, and social conditions in Venezuela, Brazil, Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, and Panama and discusses the Communist and Castro threats to orderly evolutionary development in the region. It also makes recommendations for a foreign policy designed to strengthen inter-American relations and the democratic forces in Latin America.

Within a week after publication, copies of the report were exhausted. It was gratifying to find such widespread public

interest in United States foreign policy in Latin America.

The following are samples of editorials and commentaries received regarding the report:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 17, 1961]

There cannot be too many studies on Latin America these days. The area has become a major battlefield in the cold war; it is being subjected to great social and even revolutionary pressures, and withal it has a vital importance to the United States. Without the raw materials, the trade and investments to and with Latin America we could not keep our preeminent world economic position.

In the circumstances it is especially useful for our Congressmen to visit Latin America. Last week a group of Senators and Representatives were in Mexico for an interparliamentary conference. This week the results of a fruitful trip to six countries by two Representatives have been published for the use of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. The trip and the report were made by ARMISTEAD SELDEN, JR., of Alabama, chairman of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, and DANTE FASCELL, of Florida.

There is a mine of information in the studies on Venezuela, Brazil, Argentina, Chile, Bolivia, and Panama. The general observations at the beginning and the recommendations at the end are especially important.

The two Congressmen start with an observation that is beyond doubt the most important to be made, and it cannot be repeated too often. This is that the "old social structure is being challenged" and Latin Americans "want an end to grinding poverty." The visitors found "a general opinion that the United States has not appreciated the gravity of the situation in Latin America," but also that "elation in Latin America over the election of President Kennedy presents at once a hazard and an opportunity."

The recommendations made at the end are sensible, and in their restraint they are from our point of view realistic. The great question is whether we can win this battle in the cold war without a truly bold, costly, and imaginative program, and also whether the governing groups in Latin America will meet us halfway.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 8, 1961]

It is worth noting that the long-somnolent House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Latin America has come to life under the chairmanship of Representative ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, JR. Members of the subcommittee recently visited six Latin American countries and one conclusion in their report stands out: "We found a general opinion that the United States has not appreciated the gravity of the situation in Latin America—that we have, until very recently, miscalculated the depth of the unrest in the hemisphere."

This diagnosis suggests why it is so imperative for Members of Congress to break through the curtain of misinformation concerning Latin America. Personal contacts can dissolve abstractions and give meaning to the debates on hemisphere policy. In the case of Latin America, these trips seem very necessary indeed.

[From Mobile (Ala.) Press-Register, Feb. 21, 1961]

REALISTIC SUPPORT

Two U.S. Congressmen, including Represenative ARMISTEAD SELDEN JR., of Alabama, have made some observations following their 30-day sojourn in Latin America which should be very helpful to the United States in developing policies for the hemisphere.

While recognizing the need for U.S. participation in the economic development of her neighbors to the south, Representative SELDEN and Representative DANTE B. FASCELL, of Florida, caution against an aid program of the scope of the Marshall plan.

These two gentlemen are of the opinion that the election of President Kennedy presents at once a hazard and an opportunity in United States-Latin American relations. They found that people to the south were gratified over the Kennedy victory in that it represents reason for renewed hope of help from the United States.

But SELDEN and FASCELL state:

"The success of a cooperative program of economic and social progress will require self-help efforts on the part of the American Republics, and, in many cases, the improvement of existing institutions and practices, particularly in the fields of taxation, the ownership and use of land, education and training, health, and housing.

"We are convinced, then, that massive infusions of capital into Latin America are not only beyond our capacity to supply but are also beyond that region's present capacity to absorb."

Mr. SELDEN, as chairman of the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, thus takes a practical view of conditions, he saw during his visit in South and Central America.

Perhaps this report will help to convince our neighbors to the south that there are limits to which the United States can and will go to assist with their problems. Once faced with this fact of international life, perhaps some Latin Americans will intensify their efforts to ward off communism by doing more for themselves.

They have only to look at tragic Cuba to see what happens to a country that falls into the hands of a Communist-dominated regime.

From letter by His Excellency Victor Andrade, Ambassador of Bolivia, February 15, 1961:

"I have read the report with deep interest. Just to compliment you on your understanding of the situation would be inadequate for it is one of the most excellent I have read on this subject, particularly your insight of the Bolivian situation. It was so gratifying to find such an awareness of our complex problems. The social and economic changes in my country since 1952 are so profound I fully realize it is difficult for those who have not been associated with our drama to appreciate the innovations occurring today. This, to me, is the virtue of your chapter dedicated to Bolivia."

From letter by His Excellency Jose Antonio Mayobre, Ambassador of Venezuela, February 20, 1961:

"I have read it [the report] carefully and found it to be accurate and objective specially the part dedicated to Venezuela. It is amazing and gratifying at the same time, that in such short trip as you made, you were able to dig so deeply into the problems of all the countries you visited."

From letter by Dr. William P. Glade, assistant professor of commerce and Hispanic studies, University of Wisconsin, February 23, 1961:

"I have just finished reading it [the report] and wish to commend you for a truly exceptional piece of work. Those of us who are Latin America area specialists have been deeply concerned for years over our deteriorating relations in the hemisphere, as you well know. It is therefore especially reassuring to know that future policy will be formed with the participation of such perspicacious Members of Congress as you and Representative FASCELL. The New York Times did not exaggerate in its recent praise of your report.

"You might be interested to know that next fall we are contemplating offering a course at the undergraduate level on Latin American problems and feel that your report might well serve as required basic reading for the students."

From letter by Hon. T. Graydon Upton, executive vice president, Inter-American Development Bank, February 27, 1961:

"I spent Washington's birthday perusing your very interesting and informative report on your study mission to Latin America, which I am passing on to my associates in the Inter-American Development Bank.

"Though it is difficult to comment on one section of the report without appearing to minimize the others, I was particularly interested in the section on Bolivia, and in your recommendations.

"It seems to me particularly valuable to sum up your impressions which you have done in a summary section. The problem of coordination which you mention in paragraph 10f is one which has preoccupied me for many months, as one of my functions in my former role of Assistant Secretary of the Treasury was to attempt to achieve such coordination. At the present time, the Inter-American Development Bank, as the only institution whose entire activity is in Latin America, is making an intensive effort to bring about a far greater degree of coordination in Latin American loans than has existed in the past, between both national and international agencies."

From a letter by His Excellency Emilio Donato del Carril, Ambassador of the Argentine Republic, February 28, 1961:

"I read [the report] with great interest, specially the information concerning Argentina.

"I feel you have made with it a substantial contribution to enlarge the knowledge of Argentine problems."

Additional copies of the Selden-Fascell report are now available at the Foreign Affairs Committee, and I strongly recommend it to all those concerned with maintaining a strong and free hemisphere.

The Late Honorable B. Carroll Reece

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I was at home in Georgia last weekend when Congressman CARROLL REECE, of Tennessee, passed away at Bethesda Naval Hospital, and did not have an opportunity to participate in the memorial service on the floor of the House on Monday.

I learned with great sadness of his death. During my service in Congress, I became well acquainted with Congressman REECE. I admired him for his integrity, his courage, his understanding of our problems, both domestic and international, and for his unceasing effort to provide satisfactory solutions for those problems.

I treasured the friendship which existed between us. He was a person of whom it can truly be said that he was a great American. He will be greatly missed in the House on both sides of the aisle. His district, his State, and the country have suffered a great loss in his passing.

I extend deepest sympathy to the members of his family in this time of bereavement.

Keynote Address of B. T. Fitzpatrick of Washington, D.C., to the 30th Annual Convention of the National Housing Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS
OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1961

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. B. T. Fitzpatrick, of Washington, delivered an excellent address on the goals of our national housing policies. As chairman of the 30th Annual Convention of the National Housing Conference, Mr. Fitzpatrick, who is a member of the board of directors of NHC, presented a very realistic approach to the housing problems facing this country and I commend his remarks to the attention of my colleagues.

Following is Mr. Fitzpatrick's address at the 30th Annual Convention of the National Housing Conference at the Statler-Hilton Hotel on March 12, 1961:

KEYNOTE ADDRESS OF B. T. FITZPATRICK OF WASHINGTON, D.C., TO THE 30TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING CONFERENCE AT THE STATLER-HILTON HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 12, 1961

Mr. Chairman, New Frontiersman, Dr. Weaver; Old Frontiersman and honored friend, Warren Vinton; Mr. Mills; members and guests of the conference: Welcome to this 30th annual convention of the National Housing Conference and to Washington, the citadel, in the past, of the New Deal and the Fair Deal, and, now, of the New Frontier and our immediate future.

My friends, the advent of the new administration, with its concepts of new frontiers, high hopes and an America again moving ahead, seems to me to be of some special significance to the National Housing Conference. Prior to last Thursday, it was certainly to be anticipated that we might share a unity of purpose. Since last Thursday and the transmittal to the Congress of the President's message on housing and community development, there can be no doubt that, among us, there is surely the kinship which derives from unity of purpose. And I say to you, with absolute confidence, that time and the events of the future will prove that we are, indeed, brothers in arms, not only in high purpose, but, also, in the equally important area of the resolute and determined action required for the ultimate achievement of that purpose.

For 30 years, this conference has developed and established high hopes in the field of housing and community development. It has consistently sought to establish national goals and objectives realistically related to national needs. These goals and objectives necessarily have been high, because national needs have been great. In the future, these goals and objectives must be higher because national needs are increasing and, over the past years, we have accumulated a large backlog of unmet needs.

For 30 years, this conference has consistently sought to develop and secure the full range of effective means required to translate such high hopes into reality—the realization as soon as feasible of the goal of a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family. One great stride forward was taken 12 yeears ago with the winning of the Housing Act of 1949, which laid down the basic foundation on which there has been built the progress we have made in the intervening years. But we know that, in housing and community development, national accomplishments have not kept pace with increasing national needs. It is our earnest hope that, in this year 1961, there will now be taken the next great legislative step forward which will provide the basic foundation on which the sure progress required for the future can, and will, be solidly based.

In 1946, the first realistic studies were being released as to the extent of housing needs in the postwar period. These studies estimated a need for an average rate of new home construction over a 10-year period of 1,200,000 new dwellings a year. Do you remember the reaction to this estimate of housing need? There were many who applied to it the label fantastically idiotic. At that time, representatives of some of the major national organizations concerned with homebuilding and financing told the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives that, over such a period, this Nation could not produce and consume at an average rate much in excess of 500,000 new dwellings a year. I hasten to observe that the National Housing Conference was not among these organizations.

Can you remember, also, when President Franklin Delano Roosevelt assured our harried allies that a resolute and determined America would deliver planes at the rate of 50,000 a year, and the reaction of those of little faith to that? Yet, we did deliver at the rate of 50,000 planes a year.

Similarly in housing, over the 10-year period 1950 to 1959 our average rate of new construction exceeded 1,200,000 dwellings a year. While it may have taken some time before they saw the light seen long before by others with more vision but, perhaps, less political power, we have made some progress. I say this because certainly, over the past few years, a drop in the annual volume of new home construction below a level of 1,200,000 units or thereabouts has been viewed as a national calamity by many of those same organizations which, 10 or 15 years ago, stoutly contended that production of an average of some 500,000 new homes a year over a sustained period represented just about the absolute epitome of national endeavor.

I mention these matters merely to demonstrate clearly to all doubting Toms and others of faint heart that the National Housing Conferences was not crying "wolf, wolf" then, and that it certainly is not crying "wolf, wolf" now, when we say that what was good, in terms of volume, for the 1950's will not be nearly good enough for the 1960's and certainly not for the 1970's.

These are facts. They are not difficult to discover. The difficulty is not to run away from them. They are part of the history of the past, and it is from such history that we should learn well the lessons which can guide us more surely in the future. The lessons here are clear. They are that we tend consistently to underestimate our national needs; we tend consistently to underestimate our national resources for meeting those needs; and we tend consistently to underestimate our national ability to produce and to consume.

We have gone through the 1950's producing new homes at an average rate of 1,200,000. Probably for the first time in our history, we have, over a sustained period, produced new homes at an annual average somewhat in excess of the rate of new family formation plus dwellings removed from the housing supply during the same period. This represents some progress, but it is not nearly enough.

We have an accumulated large backlog of unmet needs. We still have more than 9 million substandard dwellings. We have more than 5 million dwellings which are deteriorated, and which can soon slip into the substandard category. We still have no effective means for securing the production of a substantial annual volume of new housing within the financial means of a broad range of middle-income families in the middle and lower ranges of this important segment of our total population.

The pace of the urban renewal program is far behind our needs and our ability for accomplishment. Our public housing program for our lowest income families has, over the past few years, been ignored and harassed to the point where it virtually disappeared. We have had numerous promises of needed housing agency reorganization and departmental status, all inevitably followed by a barrage of subsequent explanations which, however ingenious, always translate into variations of the simple theme "Maybe next year but, definitely, not this year."

The present FHA authorizations to assist in financing the rehabilitation of housing in urban renewal areas have been absolutely useless. This is a known and established fact. Yet, notwithstanding the need and notwithstanding the fact that more and more urban renewal projects involving rehabilitation of existing housing, rather than total clearance and redevelopment, are being approved, no effort whatsoever has been made in the past to make the present FHA authorizations fully effective or to develop new authorizations which will permit the FHA to provide the required assistance.

Programs to encourage and facilitate needed urban and metropolitan planning have been held to the timid and small. No effort has been made to assist in meeting the increasingly important public problem of mass urban transportation. No effort has been made, and we have no means, to assist urban communities to acquire and preserve open spaces, or to reserve them for future public or private needs. We have tolerated small and sporadic programs to assist urban communities to provide community facilities where needs, especially in suburban areas, have far outdistanced production.

These are some of the things which, in housing and community development, have urgently required national attention. Over the past several years they have not received that attention. Of a certainty, this has been due, in large part, to the fact that, over those years, no authoritative voice within the National Government has firmly called out for the necessary corrective and remedial actions. In those years the voice raised for housing and community development was, indeed, a "vox clamantis in deserto." Therefore our backlog of accumulated unmet needs has increased as we have moved toward the future where the known population explosion will present problems of far greater dimensions. If, after an annual physical checkup, any reasonable individual should receive this sort of an inventory of his physical failings, quick corrective action would seem to be just about as certain as death and taxes. Why should reaction to national ills be different?

We are approaching the period of the greatest population explosion this Nation has ever experienced. The estimates are that by the midseventies our population will stand at about 235 million. We know that, in the past, such estimates have always been low. We face the inescapable fact that both the volume and the kind of housing and community development production achieved in the 1950's will not be nearly sufficient for the 1960's and certainly not for the 1970's. We know this is so for housing and community development as, equally, it is for all other major contributors to our national economic growth and stability. If, as contemplated by the declaration of national housing policy and as necessitated by our

required national growth and development, housing and community development is to be truly enabled to make its full contribution toward an economy of maximum employment, production and purchasing power, then surely the time has now come when we must get quickly down to the solid business of forging the additional hard tools required for translating high hopes into the kind of housing and community development production that is necessary for the tomorrow which is no nearly today.

The question is not "Can we do this?" or "Should we do this?" The question is "Have we the national will to do this?" for, as the President said in his inaugural address, "man holds in his mortal hands the power to abolish all forms of human poverty and the energy, the faith, the devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and all who serve it—and the glow from that fire can truly light the world."

When the people of this country are aware of the real needs of this Nation, which are but a summation of their own individual needs and aspirations, this can be done. When they want it done, it will be done, for here, in America, the people are still the masters of their own destiny.

The arousing of this kind of a national conscience is an essential part of the national leadership function enjoined upon the President by the Constitution of the United States. The message on housing and community development which the President sent to the Congress last Thursday was in keeping with the highest traditions of this constitutional function of the Office of the President of the United States.

Similarly, the arousing of this kind of national conscience is an essential part of the work of the national housing conference. Therefore, let us now go about our father's business, joined in common cause with the new administration, to again arouse in this Nation this kind of a national conscience, remembering also the still timely admonition of Thomas Jefferson:

"I know of no safe repository of the ultimate powers of society but the people themselves; and if we think them not sufficiently enlightened to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them, but to inform their discretion by education."

So, also, that the work of this conference may truly "inform their discretion by education," most especially in the critical areas of unmet needs, let us here this evening finally resolve that, in our policies, in our recommendations and in our every action, the national housing conference shall be governed always by this eternal truth: "I am, indeed, my brother's keeper, and all mankind is, indeed, my brother."

Kennedy's Peace Corps Could Uplift Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1961

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the Members an interesting editorial taken from the March 17, 1961, issue of the Home News, of Hialeah-Miami Springs, Fla.

This article points out what a rewarding experience service in the President's Peace Corps could be to the youth of our country who may be lucky enough to be selected as participants in this challenging pilot program.

The article follows:

KENNEDY'S PEACE CORPS COULD UPLIFT YOUTH

We can visualize in President Kennedy's Peace Corps the potential for a great uplifting force for America's youth, aside from aiding the people of the world's backward countries. The condition is that the program be properly conceived, organized, and directed.

In certain types of youth, there has always been a yearning to engage in idealistic pursuits. A life of service to others and sacrifice of self has always held out a religious and a romantic appeal to the very young.

In a limited way, this desire to serve humanity has found outlet in social and church service and in the healing professions. But in a broader sense, this drive toward self-sacrifice has most frequently been turned to purposes of war.

In the President's new concept of a Peace Corps, we find the first large-scale effort by government to marshal this noblest of mankind's urges and harness it in the cause of peace.

RICH RETURNS POSSIBLE

We envision rich returns for all concerned in this project, if it is properly administered and if the right types of individuals are chosen as missionaries. And by "right" we mean young men who are tough physically, strong in character, emotionally stable—and possessed of a useful technical skill.

The enlisting corpsmen stand to gain much themselves. They should acquire, in the course of their service, a self-reliance, which no cushy job could give them. They should gain the kind of insight into alien peoples not found in the dramas of the TV or movie screen.

We imagine, too, the youths will come back with a deepened love of their own country, the kind that no amount of reciting the Pledge of Allegiance or singing the Star Spangled Banner can instill.

NEW PERSEVERANCE

Finally, they should return in possession of a new-found sense of perseverance and purposefulness, an element much needed today to buck up many of our young who have grown unduly soft.

The work in the world's depressed areas will be difficult, the living conditions unlike those of a resort area, the language barriers frustrating and the customs difficult to comprehend.

But for idealist youth willing to give himself to a real cause—not a synthetic one—enlistment in the Peace Corps should be both a noble and enobling experience.

A Statement on Farm Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1961

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to call attention to a statement on the general subject of farm policy made by our colleague, Hon. PHIL WEAVER, before a founders day luncheon at Omaha, Nebr., on Monday, March 20.

I have known PHIL WEAVER since he came to the Congress and have served with him on the Committee on Appropriations. I know of his deep concern over the years at the situation in which our farmers have found themselves—through no fault of their own.

In this speech PHIL WEAVER points up the need for a sound and workable policy for the Nation's farmers. He also points up the need for cooperation of all involved in order to work out such a program that might have some chance of success.

I commend these remarks to all.

Following is the text of our colleague's speech:

We in Nebraska who would hold fast to the Republican cause can be justly proud, as I am, of the vote of confidence we rolled up for Richard M. Nixon last fall. We gave him the largest percentage margin of any of the 50 States.

During the fall campaign our standard bearer, Dick Nixon, made a statement which I'd like to recall for you now. It was a statement that made a tremendous impression upon the Middle West. His resounding voice here in Nebraska can attest to that. Dick Nixon said, and I quote: "The Government got the farmers into this mess, and it is up to the Government to get them out of it."

Why did Dick Nixon and our Republican Party blame the Government?

Well, during World War II the Government asked the farmer of our country to produce as he never had before. The American farmer responded. He not only produced enough to keep our armies on the march, he supplied our allies with vast quantities of food and fiber and the essentials for making war. It was, in truth, a miracle of production.

A farmer today in the broad expanse of America is capable of producing enough food and fiber for himself and for 24 other people. This fact alone frees better than 90 percent of our working population to pursue other goals, to undertake other endeavors. This, and this alone, has permitted us to expand our industrial capacity and to raise our standard of living to the point where we are the envy of all the world.

We are able to buy and drive more and better automobiles, live in better homes, wear better clothes, go to better schools, read more books, than any other nation on earth only because the American farmer, through his efforts and efficiency, has made this possible.

It takes one-half of the total work force in Russia to supply food for the other half. And, at that, they are poorly fed. In America one-tenth of the population is able to do a more thorough job.

And what has the American farmer gained from all this?

Today we find our farmers on the short end of the economic stick.

The American farm operator has the lowest per capita income in our economy today. His average hourly wage—and this is a point I would like our friends who support an increased minimum wage to note—his average hourly wage is less than half of what the average factory worker earns—or 81 cents an hour for the farm operator as compared to $2.29 for the factory hand.

The buying power of our farm citizens has gone down and down—and with it the buying power of our Nebraska communities and cities.

Last fall Dick Nixon promised that the Republicans would do something about it. Well, I'd like to say this—Republicans who were elected and who want to represent the will of the people who expressed this solid support must keep that promise.

We can either approach the problem as Republicans who want to conserve our way of life, or we can turn our backs on the farmers and let every radical idea that comes into the minds of the Kennedy planners become the law of the land. The choice is ours. Dick Nixon and the Republican platform pointed the way.

As Republicans, we are dedicated to the preservation of America. More than that, we are dedicated to the development of a strong, free, and vigorous America. To achieve that kind of America and to pass that kind of life on to future generations, we must help maintain a vigorous, strong and healthy agriculture.

This is the key to American survival.

Let me tell you that our top military leaders who are charged with the responsibility of maintaining our strength and our position of leadership in the free world are fully aware of this need. I participate in hearings of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations of the House of Representatives and I have heard witnesses discuss the danger of growing Soviet might and power. It is not alone of missiles and submarines they speak. They are concerned with the potential industrial growth of the Soviet Union and her slave satellites as well.

Khrushchev knows this too. And he knows that only by building and maintaining a strong farm economy can he free enough of his slave labor to industry to begin to compare or compete with the United States on an equal footing—whether in the making of the instruments of war—or in the competition for world trade and world economic leadership.

Within the past month Khrushchev had to fire a half dozen of his top Communist planners and administrators because they have failed in the one area where the United States has been so dramatically successful—in developing a powerful and vigorous farm economy.

The Soviets know—and we must understand completely—that it isn't the missiles or ships that win wars, whether they be shooting wars or the silent, deadly cold war of economic survival. It is the farmer who can produce enough for himself and his country who can tip the balance of power in favor of one way of life or the other—toward freedom or communism.

As Republicans we can—whenever and wherever the opportunity develops—work toward the goal of a strong, well-rounded and healthy nation based upon productive, economically sound agriculture. This is the very essence of conservatism—the very essence of the platform which the Republican Party adopted in Chicago last summer—and this is the very essence of victory here in Nebraska and elsewhere in the Midwest and Plains States in 1962 and 1964.

The alternatives to this actively conservative approach to the farm situation are twofold. Either we can sit idly by and watch our agriculture destroyed—and with it the chances of survival in a tense and dangerous world, or we can sit idly by and watch our 49-percent administration turn out a 100-percent radical program to regiment our farmers completely and give another great segment of our country a Harvard accent.

Please do not misunderstand me. We cannot keep the present administration from moving toward the left and ultimate regimentation simply by noisy opposition. The noise may deafen our own ears but will not silence the economic planners and left-wingers.

We can and we must stand for realistic action to solve the farm problem and thus conserve and preserve our American system against all challengers—whether they be the radical economists in Washington or the Communist empire.

Let us not fool ourselves that the Republicans have the votes in either the House or Senate to do that now. We didn't have them even when Dwight Eisenhower was President. The American farmer cannot wait until we regain the House and Senate and the White House. His problem is urgent—immediate.

We must find a way to work with the present administration to solve these problems to bring about economic order for our farm citizens. It is not my job as a Midwestern Congressman to oppose legislation which the farmers themselves have proposed—simply for the sake of opposing.

The recent feed grain bill is an example. It was proposed by farm groups themselves. As it passed the House, there is no doubt the bill was lacking in some ways. In fact, I voted to recommit the bill and delete the controversial section 3. But, let me point out we had no Republican bill to work with and our job was to find and support a workable measure that didn't create more problems than it solved.

Last fall's vote here in Nebraska demonstrates that the farmers and ranchers had faith in the Republican Party. We must not let the farmer down. We must keep that faith.

We must reassess programs and positions of the past to make stronger our position in the future. And the future, my friends, is when we shoot for the top job again in 1964.

The Republican platform of 1960 looked to the future as we must. That platform said in part: "To utilize immediately surpluses in an orderly manner, with a minimum impact on domestic and foreign markets, we pledge * * * payment-in-kind out of existing surpluses as part of our land retirement program."

The recent feed-grain bill attempts to do just that. I was proud to be able to support the Republican platform and pledge myself to its continued support.

Mrs. Madaline A. Williams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1961

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues the following resolution which was approved on March 13, 1961, by the New Jersey State Senate. This resolution states that the New Jersey State Civil War Centennial Commission cannot participate in the National Civil War Centennial Commission's Fourth National Assembly if equal hospitality will not be accorded all members of the State delegation by the host city of Charleston.

The necessity for this resoultion arose, of course, when it became clear that Mrs. Madaline A. Williams, a member of the Negro race, and a duly appointed member of the State Centennial Commission, would be accorded hospitality on a separate basis. I cannot emphasize too strongly my extreme distress at this development, both as a very good friend of Madaline Williams, and as an American citizen.

Madaline Williams is a member of the Essex County delegation of the New Jersey General Assembly. She is currently serving in the elective post of Essex County register. She also happens to be one of my old and very dear friends. I deeply regret that this incident should have caused embarrassment to such an outstanding citizen; but I think that the greatest embarrassment must fall upon those who are responsible. They are abrogating the fundamental concepts of human dignity and civil liberties which we are proud to call the American way of life. And they are abrogating as well the very ideals which the Civil War Centennial Commission was designed to commemorate.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that all my colleagues will take note of this situation, because the National Civil War Centennial Commission was created pursuant to a resolution of the Congress.

SENATE RESOLUTION—STATE OF NEW JERSEY, ADOPTED MARCH 13, 1961

Whereas the New Jersey Civil War Centennial Commission, on March 9, 1961, adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas the Civil War, the greatest internal crisis through which this Nation has passed, was fought at tremendous sacrifice to preserve and to amplify the fundamental law of our land, as set forth originally in the Bill of Rights; and

"Whereas the perpetuation of this Union was guaranteed therewith forever; and

"Whereas the sons of both North and South have subsequently fought side by side for human freedom, justice, and the dignity of the individual among people everywhere; and

"Whereas the Civil War Centennial period has been conceived as a period for commemorating these basic American ideas above all; and

"Whereas the National Civil War Centennial Commission has scheduled its fourth national assembly on the dates of April 11 and 12, 1961, in the city of Charleston, S.C.; and

"Whereas the National Civil War Centennial Commission is a creature of the Congress of the United States; and

"Whereas custom and/or law in the city of Charleston forbids equal hospitality to members of the Negro race; and

"Whereas a national assembly under these conditions would abrogate the fundamental law of our land and the fundamental concepts of human decency and the fundamental guarantees of civil liberties under the New Jersey Constitution; and

"Whereas Mrs. Madaline A. Williams, a member of the Negro race, is a duly appointed member of the New Jersey Civil War Centennial Commission; and

"Whereas Mrs. Williams has served as an elected member of the Essex County delegation of the New Jersey General Assembly, and is currently serving in the elective post of Essex County Register: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That this commission cannot in good conscience, under its sworn obligations, participate in the fourth national assembly; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That members of all other State Civil War centennial commissions be urged to call upon their respective congressional delegations to demand that the fourth national assembly, as presently conceived, be canceled forthwith as an act of responsible national statesmanship and scheduled for a later date in a location which will respect the fundamental constitutional rights of persons of all races and creeds."

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of New Jersey, That the foregoing resolution

adopted by the New Jersey Civil War Centennial Commission is approved; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate provide the New Jersey Civil War Centennial Commission with a copy of this resolution attested by him in order that the said centennial commission may forward copies hereof to the other State Civil War centennial commissions; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate forward copies of this resolution attested by him to the U.S. Senators from New Jersey and the Members of the House of Representatives from the several congressional districts of New Jersey.

Temporary Gas Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1961

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a very timely and pertinent editorial from one of the leading Maine daily newspapers, the Kennebec Journal, entitled "Temporary Gas Tax."

As this editorial points out, Congress has a moral obligation to honor its pledge to let the Federal gas tax go back to the former 3 percent.

The editorial follows:

TEMPORARY GAS TAX

President Kennedy's February 28 special message to Congress, concerning the financing of the Federal highway program, contained one more reminder of the unhappy fact that a temporary tax is seldom temporary in fact.

When Congress in 1959 tacked a fourth cent on the gasoline tax, the Nation's highway users were asked once again to believe that this hike would be temporary, expiring June 30 of this year.

But the President's special message not only urged that the fourth cent of the tax be continued beyond the scheduled expiration date, but also intimated the White House would approve of an increase of an additional one-half cent.

The gasoline tax has been temporary since 1932, in Federal Government gobbledygook. The 1932 temporary tax of 1 cent was never lifted, and became permanent in 1941.

In 1951, to help finance the Korean war, the Federal gas tax was increased—temporarily—to 2 cents. Also temporary was the 1956 increase to 3 cents. And in 1959 the levy went temporarily to 4 cents.

But the 1959 promise that the rate would drop back to 3 cents in June 1961 looks somewhat meaningless now—with the President proposing that the fourth cent be continued, and indicating that an increase to 4½ cents "is clearly acceptable, and would have my support."

In the beginning, the gas tax was referred to as the painless penny. Now, with Federal and State taxes averaging over 10 cents on every gallon of gasoline, painless is hardly the word for it.

Congress should honor its 1959 pledge to let the Federal tax go back to 3 cents. Temporary should mean temporary.

Instead—as applied to taxes—temporary nowadays might better be spelled: "Entering wedge."

Letter in Television Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, a strong advocate of responsible television is Mr. Sol Paul, of New York, publisher of Television Age. Although I have been a sharp critic of television practices, particularly relating to the networks, I recognize that television has made a contribution in many areas. Mr. Paul has made an eloquent statement on behalf of the television industry on the subject of TV's contribution. His letter was published in the March 6 issue of Television Age, and I am pleased to insert it in the RECORD:

LETTER FROM THE PUBLISHER—IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

In 1960 U.S. television stations contributed $256 million—a quarter of a billion dollars—to public-service causes. This was revealed by the Television Age seventh annual public-service survey.

Television has given unstintingly of its time to check the scourges of mind and body. It has opened its facilities to drives of the American Red Cross to help the distressed at home and abroad, to Radio Free Europe to counteract the propaganda of the Communists, to CARE for food for the hungry, to the USO for providing better recreation facilities for our bases around the world. Television has willingly donated time to aid in the never-ending battle against muscular dystrophy, heart disease, cancer, rheumatic fever, tuberculosis.

Each year the amount of money donated in time to these public-service causes has been increased. The figure stands as a great tribute to a powerful communications medium.

Yet there is more than money involved in the public-service achievements of television. Over the past few years stations across the country have developed and produced powerful local documentaries that have thrown a glaring spotlight on local problems.

How can one measure in dollars the efforts of a station which has produced a series of programs that have resulted in a decrease in juvenile delinquency in the community?

What yardstick is placed upon results of exposing a local problem of dope addiction?

What monetary value can be placed on a crusade which exposes deplorable conditions in a community's public institutions?

In long-range terms, how do we measure the value of a get-out-the-vote campaign, which inevitably stimulates an interest in the entire democratic process, and a concern for political issues and political personalities?

In equally farsighted terms, what is it worth to the health and future of a community to have its attention directed toward the problem of slums, and the evils which result from them?

These immeasurables are all part of the story of public-service television—that programing, that on-the-air time, which actually serves the public. Another part of this story is public-affairs programing, and more specifically editorializing, whereby a station assumes a reasoned and not always safe position on important issues. In undertaking this responsibility many stations, as business entities, have come under fire, but at the same time they have become vital forces in their communities.

It is reasonable then, to suggest that the quarter-billion-dollar public-service contribution of television stations in 1960 is only a fraction of the real and largely unknown contribution they are making to the growth and development of this country. On this last point some people like to point to a paradox: that it is the station's commercial operation that makes public service possible. The paradox, if it is one, can be refined further: these very commercial interests have a profound and progressive influence on American life.

Favorable Reaction in Washington to New Frontier Program of President Adolfo Lopez Mateos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1961

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully call the attention of the Members to an article which appeared in the March 7, 1961, issue of Diario Las Americas, reporting the main points of Mexico's development program as recently announced by that country's President, Lopez Mateos.

As correctly noted in the article, this is Mexico's positive answer to President Kennedy's call for stepped-up efforts by the Latin American countries themselves to develop their resources and great potential, which this country will gladly support, morally and financially.

The article follows:

FAVORABLE REACTION IN WASHINGTON TO NEW FRONTIER PROGRAM OF PRESIDENT ADOLFO LOPEZ MATEOS

WASHINGTON, D.C.—With wide publicity display, the main dailies of Mexico officially announced President Lopez Mateos' border program, which has been entrusted to the capable direction of the distinguished continental personality, Antonio J. Bermudez. The program will start immediately and its main objectives are:

1. Accelerate and vitalize the links of the north and south border zones with the economy of the rest of the country and transform its physiognomy in accordance with the requirements of modern urban development and the needs of demographic growth.

2. Convert these cities into genuine testimony to the Mexico of today, in advancement of its decorum and its greatness, its art and its technical capacity.

3. Strive for the establishment of new industries.

4. Give to the youth at the border new orientations of culture, of art and of personal improvement, through adequate institutions which are now lacking.

5. Bring true incentives to tourism (hotels, towing fields, movies, theaters, museums, auditoriums, libraries, etc.).

6. Establish commercial centers where the best national products are offered at moderate prices.

Great importance has been given in authorized Washington circles to the official announcement made at the press conference held by Mr. Bermudez at the Mexican National Palace, since it was surrounded with special characteristics, such as its being held in the Palace's Pan American Room, a hall dedicated to inter-American solidarity, and the presence of President Lopez Mateos' brother, Don Mariano Lopez Mateos, director of national warehouses, of Mr. Manuel Fernandez Landero, president of the Federation of Industrial Chambers of Mexico. Also present at the press conference were the Messrs. Ramiro Alatorre, Engineer Antonio Gutierrez Prieto, Miguel Blazquez, Pablo Morera and Licenciado Mario Mendiola. The frontier development plans were brilliantly presented by the dedicated Architect Mario Pani.

The most outstanding fact of all, according to the reaction in Washington, is that the announcement was made on the eve of the so-called peace conference sponsored by ex-President Lazaro Cardenas. The border program dramatizes, undoubtedly, with facts, Mexico's positive answer to the New Frontier program enunciated by President Kennedy.

The Lamp Bulb Stranglehold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Mr. T. K. Quinn as it appeared in the New Republic, February 27, 1961, issue.

Mr. Quinn resigned at the age of 43 as a vice president of General Electric, "because," in his words, "of just such practices as those disclosed in the Philadelphia price collusion case."

The article follows:

THE LAMP BULB STRANGLEHOLD

(By T. K. Quinn)

General Electric executives now languishing in jail for their price collusion crimes in the sale of electrical machinery, owe their education in these illegalities, whether or not they know it, to the company's long continued monopolistic practices in the electric incandescent lamp industry. From the start, freedom of enterprise in manufacture and sale has been restricted by General Electric. Its position today is formidable, like that of other monster-big enterprises, because of the forceable exclusion of other companies over half a century. Today, it would take many millions of capital, not available to new concerns, to develop new know-how and build and equip factories to move successfully into the tightly controlled electric lamp business.

Competitive efforts have always been hampered and stifled, competition itself rejected as a constructive force. Any representations to the contrary are simply not true. The effect and purpose have been to keep prices and profits high and investment down. Under these conditions, there have been no major innovations or scientific advances for more than 30 years.

However, the lamp profits to General Electric, hidden in its overall figures, have been enormous, even when loaded with extraneous overhead. There have been bad times, notably during the thirties, when the lamp profits carried the whole company, although the lamp sales volume was only about 10 percent of the GE total. In fact, lamp profits not only made up for losses in other departments but actually provided an excess that permitted the company to continue its record of steady dividends throughout the deep depression years. There is no other household, commercial or industrial necessity that has extorted such excessive profits over so long a period for any private interest.

A Federal court decision in 1911 held that General Electric and a group of associated companies had violated the Sherman Antitrust Act. After this decision GE's control rested on a patent purchased from two Viennese scientists for $400,000 and upon the Coolidge and Langmuir developments. General Electric thereupon proceeded under cross-licensing agreements to fix prices and divide markets in this country and around the world. The last written agreement of record, with Westinghouse, dated January 1927, exchanged nonexclusive licenses on all present and future patents covering lamps and machinery, appliances and processes for the manufacture of electric lamps. Open control was continued until recently, when the patents were finally declared invalid by the U.S. Supreme Court.

The electric lamp bulb monopoly continues effectively to this day because of its head start and lengthened period of protection during which competitors were excluded. They were frightened, bought off or beaten in lower court lawsuits which they did not have the money to carry to higher courts.

Today, General Electric still has about 60 percent of the lamp bulb business of the country, Westinghouse about 20 percent, Hygrade about 12 percent, and the remaining 8 percent of the business is done by a few small concerns. Prices remain substantially uniform—regulated reportedly, by methods like those used in the sale of electrical machinery for which 7 executives were jailed and fined, 37 were fined, and 40 companies were fined—a grand total of close to $2 million.

When the TVA authorities protested the high prices on turbines quoted by GE and Westinghouse in 1959, and showed that even if labor costs were excluded entirely, the uniform prices were still higher than for the competing British product, GE lowered its prices but promptly increased the prices of electric lamps. Lamps are bought, for the most part, in small quantities where increases are measured in pennies and markets are scattered. The increases, however, may amount to exorbitant percentage increases. For want of exact but concealed data, we may estimate the take of industry at a quarter of a billion or more in annual sales.

At a congressional hearing in 1949, Chairman CELLER of the House Antitrust Committee noted that 16 cases had been instituted against General Electric under the antitrust laws from 1911 to 1947. In addition, eight proceedings were started against the company by the Federal Trade Commission. A number have been filed since 1947. Mr. CELLER wondered why the company could not operate under these laws, if they believed in them. Mr. Charles E. Wilson, then president of GE, spoke testily of his intimate knowledge of the company and its people. He testified (not under oath): "We all detest illegal monopolies. * * * It is my belief that the antitrust laws were designed to protect against monopoly or illegal conspiracy, while at the same time protecting—indeed encouraging—the growth and adaptation that comes from competition." This testimony, along with a since-proven wholly unwarranted attack on a previous witness, fell heavily on those who knew that GE then had and still has substantial control of the electric light bulb industry. It struck another harsh note at the Philadelphia price collusion hearings where it was disclosed that the practices which brought jail sentences and fines reached far back into Mr. Wilson's term of office as president of General Electric.

Federal District Judge Ganey's statement in the Philadelphia case that "one would be naive indeed to believe that such a vast conspiracy was not known to those in charge," is of course exactly right. He was convinced that in the majority of defendant cases, they were "torn between conscience and an approved corporate policy, with the rewarding objectives of promotion, comfortable security and large salaries—in short the organization or company man, the conformist." Still, the judge did not penalize either Mr. R. J. Cordiner, the incumbent chairman who is also Chairman of the Business Advisory Council to the Department of Commerce, or Charles E. Wilson, his predecessor.

Beyond the extortion, collusion, and crime there is the moral effect on the country. The cream of our youth aspires to executive positions in big business, positions which they now know to be occupied by men who must be fined and sent to jail. The hypocrisy of our business community has been shown and the end is not yet. We are left with the transparent mystery of why prices continue so uniform in the electric lamp, steel, drug, cement, roofing material and other industries.

Address by William A. White

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1961

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, with tremendous pride do I call to the attention of the Members an exciting movement which began in my district of Florida and is now spreading throughout the country "like wildfire".

I introduce to the Members the "BIBA" program. BIBA means, business is better already with Kennedy. This novel and exciting campaign slogan was created by Mr. Paul Rimmeir, of my district who is president of Seaview Industries, a manufacturing plant of aluminum awnings and shutters and other merchandise of that nature. Joining him in this week-long project was the Miami Junior Chamber of Commerce. The program, aimed at reviving consumer confidence in the upturn which business is now taking, was applauded by Florida's Governor and congresional delegation.

BIBA was launched in Miami on February 3 of this year with a citywide rally and bonfire, with an Indian war dance by local businessmen. Nationwide TV coverage was given to this dramatic and stimulating event and national magazines have further carried the story of BIBA to the Nation. Mayor High of Miami proclaimed a citywide BIBA Week in Miami beginning on February 22.

During that week, the BIBA program was further highlighted and complemented by the participation of Mr. William White, Administrator of Business and Defense Services in the Commerce Department, in the festivities. He addressed the Jaycee meeting which was attended by other business and professional organizations, and I am pleased

to insert in the RECORD, the fine speech which Mr. White delivered:

I bring to you from the Honorable Luther Hodges, the Secretary of Commerce, best wishes for success in BIBA Week.

The enthusiasm which was evidenced by the Miami citywide rally of February 3—with its objective of stimulating business—received national attention.

In my position as Administrator of the Business and Defense Services Administration of the Department of Commerce at Washington, I am concerned every day with providing services to business and assisting wherever possible in stimulating economic growth. When I heard of the rally and BIBA, my reaction was that I hoped that the Miami idea would spread like wildfire throughout the country.

Congressman FASCELL stated in his letter on BIBA to Secretary Hodges: "I know that you will share my enthusiasm for this excellent program." I can assure Congressman FASCELL—and you—that both the Secretary and I share his enthusiasm for this project.

I agree thoroughly with "Big Chief" Paul Rimmeir in putting the torch to "bad news" and emphasizing the positive—good news. And there is much good news to report. Let us look at some of it.

Through our free enterprise system and democratic processes, we in America today enjoy the highest standard of living this country or any other country has ever known. In this respect we are the envy of every other country on this globe.

I am in a unique position to report to you that there is much good news to report and substantial reasons for business confidence. In the BOSA which I head there are 25 industry divisions—covering practically all manufactured products of the United States. At the end of each year—following careful research and consultation with industry—the industrial specialists prepare a review of the preceding year and outlook for the next year. This year we published 91 such studies. I can tell you that in the preponderant number of these studies the outlook and projection are favorable.

We are all prone to look at statistics and data which describe trends. This is high fashion in business today. News letters, statistics, indices, etc. Sometimes in this welter of trend data we tend to forget to look at where we stand. Where do we stand today? There may be some trees on the plateau on which we stand, which can obscure our vision and make some people pessimistic. But it is a mighty high plateau, with a gross national production in excess of half a trillion dollars for the first time in history. Even though in Washington we are accustomed to hearing of ideas discussed in millions and billions of dollars—half a trillion has a new and to me a somewhat startling but inspiring significance.

Let us look for a moment at U.S. export-import position.

U.S. commerical exports for 1960 stood at $19.6 billion—close to the all-time record of 1957 (Suez crisis) and 19 percent higher than 1959. The export outlook for 1961 is considered very favorable. It will take hard work and influence to maintain this level—but we are pledged to this. In this connection we, in the Business and Defense Services Administration, with other elements of Commerce, under the energetic leadership of Secretary Hodges, are working in collaboration with U.S. industry, in a program to stimulate an increase in export of U.S. goods, eliminate discrimination abroad against U.S. goods in foreign markets, and develop additional export markets for U.S. products—I promise you that we will combine and intensify yours and my efforts in this respect.

A dynamic element in our economy today consists in the tremendous growth in Government and private research and development. We are truly living in a Buck Rogers era. Science fiction of yesterday is today's reality. Ideas considered exotic and radical become obsolete almost as soon as they became operational. In this age of scientific breakthrough, space problems, missiles, and automation, the United States will continue to make mighty strides forward. Industry representatives inform me that a whole succession of new products will enter the market in the near future. One industrialist (chemicals) recently explained that his company within the next 10 years expects to do 85 percent of its business in items that are in development and that his company is not now producing. To me, this means an abundant promise of an even brighter and fuller American future and standard of living.

We should bear in mind that some old indicators have lost some of their overall significance and meaning. Increasingly important elements in our national economy which are characterized by dramatic growth are the service industries. These have grown to such proportions that today there are more people in the United States employed in the service industries than in manufacturing. Moreover, some industries have demonstrated some counterbalancing influences during periods of production. The promise for continued growth in the service industries is abundantly evident.

Another indicator that pessimists use is the percentage of idle steel capacity. To compare a percentage of present U.S. steel capacity with previous years is meaningless. In the first place there is ambiguity in what is meant by capacity. In the second place steel capacity has been substantially expanded in recent years (a) by new plants and equipment, (b) by new processes. What counts is that the United States is first in steel production in the world and that we produced 99.3 million tons in 1960. Steel production figures in January show evidence of continuing strength. With the coming of milder spring weather construction should accelerate, requiring more steel and other building materials. The auto industry has curtailed production to match current sales. There should be a seasonal rise in auto sales in the spring and early summer months. Consequently, auto production should also increase with the increase in demand and production of steel. There are industries which the economists refer to as growth industries. These industries are developing and expanding at a rate far in excess of the growth rate in our national economy. These are solid building blocks in the foreseeable further growth of America. There are about 44 such industries—some of them are residents of the great and beautiful State of Florida.

Recently, Business and Defense Services Administration, at the request of the U.S. Study Commission, southeast river basin (which includes a part of northern Florida) made a study of growth industries and products. We identified the following as having growth characteristics: Scientific instruments, electrical measuring instruments, computing and related machines, electronic tubes and semiconductors, packaged seafood, photographic products, women's seamless hosiery, elemental gases, plastic materials and products, and many others. One of the purposes for our determining growth industries is to help a community or State to select appropriate industries to strengthen and expand the industrialization of the area.

President Kennedy in his special message to Congress (on balance of payments and gold) expressed the need for confident measures and vision when he said "Economic progress at home is still the first requirement for economic strength abroad, the real wealth of a nation resides in its farms and factories and the people who operate them; a dynamic economy producing goods competitively priced in world markets will maintain the strength of the dollar."

It is my feeling that the President—with a sense of high purpose—desires to transform the American people's way of thinking and the image which we present to the world.

I have spent many years in private business—a number of them here in Florida. I have spent some years also as a Government official. From both perspectives I see many signs in Washington that are reassuring.

I heard President Kennedy speak recently at the National Industrial Conference Board. He emphasized then the importance of modernization of U.S. industrial plant and equipment. He recognized the need for increasing our productivity, reducing production costs and placing our production plant in an improved competitive and defense posture. Legislation to advance these objectives appears to be favored in the new administration.

Some immediate-action measures which have been undertaken also underscore a basis for increasing business confidence. Some of these are:

Increase in contract letting in building U.S. defenses—notably in missiles and also in conventional areas.

Food-for-peace shipments and direction to the Department of Agriculture to expedite rental payments due farmers for crop storage, plus an additional $50 million for farm housing loans in 1961, and other measures which shuold benefit the agricultural industry.

Reduction of maximum FHA interest rates from 5¾ percent to 5½ percent and direction to HHFA to expedite projects. Following an exchange of letters between the President and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board—a series of steps will be taken to make more housing credit available at lower interest rates through savings and loan associations. (Increase from 18,000 to 22,000 maximum savings and loan association can loan; on $22,000 home downpayment reduced from $4,000 to $2,400; downpayment requirements will be reduced.)

Direction to Veterans' Administration to expedite payment of national service insurance dividends ($258 million).

Immediate increase ($1 billion per year) in social security benefits has been advocated by the President.

Reaction to such measures is setting in—at the convention of the National Association of Home Builders just recently concluded in Chicago a survey was made of a cross section of builders. The consensus of the builders responding reflected a highly refreshing and optimistic view for increased housing starts in 1961. I feel that this illustrates proof of Mr. Rimmeir's view that optimism and enthusiasm are contagious.

One barometer of current business conditions and indicator of trends that I find most reliable is the relationship of new orders to shipments in the durable goods field.

Shipments in December 1960 were $13.6 billion as compared to $13.8 billion in November, and $15 billion in December 1959. This reflects an 8-percent decline in shipments.

New orders followed a similar trend.

A point of particular significance, however, stands out when we consider the relationship of new orders to shipments.

In December 1959 new orders were $340 million less than shipments—this to my mind was a prediction of downtrend, in

fact the falloff widened during the year. The margin is now narrowing appreciably. In December 1960 new orders were but $210 million below shipments. It is a definite sign of better business and business confidence.

Let us also for a moment mention the inventories of durable goods manufacturers. At the end of 1960 they were $30.8 billion or only $700 million higher than for yearend 1959. If inventories are compared to sales, however, they represent 2.27 months supply for 1960 yearend at December sales rates. This compares with 2 months supply at yearend 1959. Total inventories of manufacturers and distributors were reduced by $540 million in December and I expect that inventories will decline further and that new orders will probably rise and go above shipments during the first quarter of 1961. This heralds the beginning of recovery in my opinion. After inventories have been reduced until they are in better ratio to sales, the recovery will be accelerated by demand for goods, to rebuild inventories.

No discussion of this sort would be complete without comment on the old bellweather, the stock market. The Dow Jones industrial average for 30 industrials has climbed from a value well below 600 at the beginning of 1961 to over 650 in recent days. The strength and upward trend reflects confidence of business and investors in the future of the American economy.

I wholeheartedly join with your chairman, Mr. Efthimiou, Mayor High, the city commissioner, Congressman Fascell, Senator Smathers, Senator Holland, and Governor Bryant in support of the BIBA thesis.

The Miami Junior Chamber of Commerce is to be commended for its positive and forward looking objectives. I know that other jaycees will pick up the torch and use BIBA as a new cornerstone for public and business confidence.

I extend to you every good wish for a tremendous BIBA week and successful follow-up. I know that you can spark on a national basis the conversion of BIBA from: "Business Is Better Already" to "Business Is Booming Again."

Along with Mr. White and the many others who have helped make the BIBA campaign a national effort, I congratulate and commend Paul Rimmeir and the Miami Junior Chamber of Commerce for their initiative and imagination in accentuating the positive. For there is good news to report and the Miami BIBA program is largely responsible for spearheading nationwide confidence that business is improving and will continue to improve in communities around our Nation.

The Late Honorable B. Carroll Reece

SPEECH
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I join all of my colleagues in the House in their grief over the loss of our friend, CARROLL REECE.

CARROLL REECE not only served his constituents well but all Republicans while national chairman of the Republican Party.

His passing will be felt keenly by his own State of Tennessee and by the entire country to which he gave so much of his time and ability as one of the ablest spokesmen of the conservative cause that this Nation has ever produced.

My heartfelt sympathy goes to Mrs. Reece and the family in their great personal loss.

The Situation in the Caribbean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter of transmittal which I received from Dean Clarence E. Manion, sponsor of the Manion Forum Network with headquarters in South Bend, Ind., dated March 16, 1961, with which he forwards a transcript of the March 12, 1961, program over that network, the title of which was "We Should Blot Out Communism in Cuba This Week":

SOUTH BEND, IND., *March 16, 1961.*

Congressman DANIEL FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I am very much obliged to you for inserting the Manion Forum interview with President Ydigoras Fuentes of Guatemala in the March 13 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I must credit you with having alarmed me originally about the situation in the Caribbean which grows worse by the hour.

Enclosed is a copy of my own speech of last Sunday, March 12. As you will see, it is addressed to President Kennedy. I honestly believe that all plans for the reformation of our domestic economy will dissolve into wishful thinking unless this administration faces up to the Communist menace and takes an offensive against it. Eisenhower wasted 8 crucial years, and our new President should frankly charge his predecessors with this delinquency and start to do something about it.

Your valiant service to the Nation and to the party entitles you to call this to the President's attention in the manner you deem best. I do know that millions of Poles, Hungarians, Lithuanians, and other relatives of the captive peoples in this country will be forever grateful to you for underscoring the urgency of an expedient program for the liquidation of the Kremlin jail system of so-called governments.

Very cordially yours,

CLARENCE MANION.

WE SHOULD BLOT OUT COMMUNISM IN CUBA THIS WEEK

(By Dean Clarence E. Manion)

During his first full month in office, President Kennedy sent a score of urgent recommendations to the Congress. All of these call for a speedup in Federal spending for the home front.

Recommendations ranged all the way from emergency injections for unemployment compensation to long-term reformation of Federal flood control.

Because of our unfavorable economic climate, all or nearly all of the new President's emphasis has been upon domestic problems and upon plans for their solution. He evidently believes that an unbalanced domestic business situation takes precedence over the needed repairs and reformation of our foreign policies.

President Kennedy has long been on record with his admiration for the courage and intelligence of the late Senator Robert A. Taft. Now would be a good time for him to recall the advice that the distinguished Ohio Senator gave to another new President just 8 years ago.

The statement turned out to be Taft's dying declaration on the subject of American Government and, as every trial lawyer knows, dying declarations are important and influential testimony. Here is what the dying Robert Taft declared to the new President, to the Congress and to the American people in 1953:

"The moral and political imperatives for a Senate audit of our foreign affairs from 1940 are beyond question. We cannot clean up the mess in Washington, balance the budget, reduce taxes, check creeping socialism, tell what is muscle or fat in our sprawling rearmament programs and purge subversives from our State Department unless we come to grips with our foreign policy upon which all other policies depend."

In spite of the fact that this was said 8 years ago and that it was directed to a Republican administration, there is nothing in this bill of particulars that is not applicable to the new Democratic administration today.

The conditions described and the objectives outlined are completely up to date. It is safe to say that, if the statement could be laid before him now, President Kennedy would readily admit that he is more than anxious to clean up the "confusion in Washington" which he described so graphically during the campaign.

He has expressed his determination to balance the budget and, at least on occasion, he has expressed hopes for ultimate tax reductions.

He has already announced plans for the reorientation of our military defenses and, ironical as it might sound to Conservatives, it is certain that the President would emphatically deny anything but firm enmity for socialism of any kind.

The question of subversives in the State Department and elsewhere in the Government would raise unpleasant partisan recollections but, in spite of the defections that have taken place since 1953, notably the departure of Messrs. Mitchell and Martin from our Defense Department's top-secret Security Administration directly to the Kremlin last summer, subversives are still lodged in virtually all of our key Federal agencies.

President Kennedy, being intelligent and well informed, certainly knows about this and if he could spot and expel these spies, which is questionable, he undoubtedly would do so.

We have seen that it was Senator Taft's considered judgment that none of these objectives, which are as appropriate for President Kennedy as they should have been for President Eisenhower, can be accomplished unless and until we come to grips with our foreign policy upon which, as he said, "all other policies depend."

The intervening years have proved that Taft was right. Unfortunately, the Eisenhower administration did not come to grips with the Roosevelt-Truman foreign policy which it inherited in 1953. On the contrary, the Eisenhower administration embraced, extended and embellished that foreign policy.

Consequently, none of the estimable objectives set forth in the Taft declaration has

been achieved. On the contrary, the prospects for their achievement are infinitely worse today than they were in 1953.

Unless President Kennedy quickly comes to grips with the ill-advised Roosevelt-Truman-Eisenhower foreign policy which he has inherited, then all other policies, plans and programs which he now envisions as a New Frontier will be buried under the collapse of this country into communism.

The audit of our foreign policies since 1940, which Taft urged upon the U.S. Senate as a moral and political imperative, has never been undertaken. On the contrary, this strange suicidal direction of our foreign relations has ridden unscathed through one administration after another, Democrat and Republican. It has been and still is the untouchable "sacred cow" of even the most acrimonious political debate.

Officially, its justification has been based in the defense of the free world against communism. Yet, the long expensive course of its conduct parallels the triumphant march of the Red menace in every direction all around the world right up to our own doorstep in the Caribbean Sea.

THERE IS SUBVERSION IN THE STATE DEPARTMENT

Three of our former Ambassadors to Cuba who have testified under oath before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee have stated that Castro and communism were brought to power in that island with the indispensable assistance of our American State Department.

Cuba is not by any means the only example of this official defense-in-reverse policy against communism. During the many years that have passed since we assumed the full financial and military responsibility for defending the free world against communism, the Red conquest has steadily advanced on all of its critical fronts throughout the world and retreated from only one.

The one country in the world that has successfully freed itself from Communist enslavement is the tiny Republic of Guatemala in Central America. If the United States had anything to do with Guatemala's successful revolution against its Communist government in 1954, then the story of our assistance to that revolution is the best kept secret of the so-called cold war.

But it is an indisputable and well-publicized fact that the ignorance, ineptitude, or infiltration of our State Department—you can take your choice—has now threatened the freedom of Guatemala with another attack by communism, this time from the new Red base and bastion in Cuba.

I hope that you heard His Excellency Miguel Ydiogoras Fuentes, President of Guatemala, describe the extent of this new menace to his country and to all Latin America over this microphone just 2 weeks ago. Said President Ydigoras:

"The presence of civilian and military forces of the Soviet bloc on the island of Cuba signifies not only an imminent danger to the preservation of peace for the American Hemisphere, but also constitutes a flagrant assault on inter-American solidarity. There is no doubt that the treacherous designs of the Communists go beyond the protection of their satellite in the Caribbean. It is urgent, therefore, to take prophylactic measures to prevent the spread of this terrible disease."

It will be a great tragedy if this grave warning statement from the head of a friendly anti-Communist government and made directly to the American people is ignored by Congress and the President of the United States. The people of Guatemala succeeded where the Freedom Fighters of Hungary failed in their valiant efforts to drive the brutal Communist pirates from control of their respective countries.

The voice of freedom in Hungary is now silenced by the grace of our abject subservience to the cowardice, or worse, of the United Nations Organization. But fortunately the experienced people of Guatemala are able to speak out about the terror that now plans to revenge itself upon them and in the process to advance its campaign of conquest against us and the entire Western Hemisphere.

The Communists in Cuba mean business. The Red stranglehold on that country represents a cunning conspiratorial coordination of Red Chines manpower with Soviet-supplied armament and ammunition.

The strength of this Kremlin-directed apparatus grows with every passing day. Its eradication is not going to be accomplished by a popular uprising of the oppressed, disillusioned and disarmed Cuban people waving sticks and throwing stones.

President Ydigoras told us that "urgent measures must be taken by our side" to stop the Cuban Communists. But, to all appearances, our Government does not share the concern that was expressed so earnestly by our good neighbor, the President of Guatemala.

On the contrary, newspaper headlines reveal that our State Department is dividing its official attention between the maintenance of U.N. prestige in the Congo and the sad fate of our expensive stake in Laos.

There is no denying the fact that the Reds have outsmarted us in Africa and that Laos, all of our numerous so-called ugly Americans and uncounted millions of dollars to the contrary notwithstanding, is now ripe for a coalition government of Communists, anti-Communists and neutrals.

Those who know the techniques of the Communist conquest and the history of their inexorable application all the way from Czechoslovakia to Korea, will realize that this coalition government will be the final step before the ultimate disappearance of Laos into the Kremlin-Red Chinese orbit.

SALVATION OF CUBA, OR COMMUNISM HERE

That will be a sad and serious loss for the free world but this success-in-reverse achievement is in the best tradition of our fatuous foreign policy with which our Government still refuses to come to grips.

However, the bright prospects for the Reds in Laos and the Congo are one thing; the accomplished Red conquest of Cuba is quite another. Laos and the Congo are each more than 10,000 miles from the United States, while Red Cuba is a scant 90 miles off the coast of Florida.

The Cuban Communists have turned off the water supply at our Guantanamo Naval Base and are now poised for the conquest of the American mainland, north and south. A polite arrangement of the agenda for discussion at the U.N. is not going to dissolve the urgency of this situation.

Either the Government of the United States acts now to dissolve the menace of communism in Cuba, or we—the people of the United States—must prepare ourselves for the same kind of conquest by communism that overtook Czechoslovakia and Eastern Europe.

Our official paralysis in the face of this deadly peril on our doorstep traces to our slavish narcotic addiction to the demonstrated idiocies of what is called "collective security." In 1958 we called off our helicopters from their projected protection of American lives and property in Cuba because our State Department ruled that our commitments to the U.N. and the O.A.S. prevented any military intervention by us in Cuba for any purpose.

Since then Castro has seized a billion dollars worth of American property and abused American citizens in Cuba with complete impunity. Thanks to Red China and the Kremlin, Castro's military strength is increasing every day. In the face of this danger, our State Department is preoccupied with the threat to Dag Hammarskjold's prestige in the Congo and with the seriousness of Great Britain's insistence that we recognize Red China and admit that bandit apparatus to the U.N. Security Council. The proper defense against this appeasing nonsense is a strong counteroffensive.

Former Cuban Ambassador Spruille Braden described the proper emergency remedy over this microphone 2 months ago. He said we should break diplomatic relations with Castro's government. We have since done that. He added that we should follow this by recognizing a responsible anti-Communist Cuban government in exile. We have not done that and until we do that it will be impossible for any anti-Communist Cuban uprising against Castro to succeed.

There are at least 100 anti-Castro groups of exiled Cubans now actively organized in this country. We must pick the right one of these, recognize it as the rightful government of Cuba and put it in the business of reclaiming Cuba for freedom. If this works—and it will work—we can adopt the same plan of action for every country in the world that is now controlled by Communist pirates who, like the Pirate Galvao with the Portuguese ship Santa Maria, have unlawfully and by force grabbed the steering wheels of government in Poland, Hungary and the other satellite countries, including Soviet Russia itself.

At long last, let us come to grips with our present suicidal foreign policy and announce that henceforth for purposes of official recognition we will make the altogether proper distinction between a civil government and a brutal jailer; that when a so-called government surrounds the governed country with barbed wire entanglements and mines its borders with high explosives to prevent the escape of its people, we will withdraw recognition from that so-called pirate government and invite its exiled people here or elsewhere to set up a government in exile for the recapture of their homeland and its freedom.

That will stop the British drive for recognition of Red China, but it will do more. It will bring forth governments in exile for every one of the Communist controlled countries of the world—including Russia.

The U.N. won't like this and neither will the British, but the oppressed people of the world will love it and, once it is announced, they will promptly proceed to melt down the Iron Curtain from the inside.

Mr. President Kennedy, as Senator Taft said, this is the policy upon which all of your other policies depend. Why not give it a trial?

Well, there you have it. With the Kremlin smothering a nation 90 miles from our shores, how long can the United States escape the Communist net?

This is a time for quick thought and action by the American people. It is 11:50 o'clock.

The Minimum Wage Law—A Necessity for the Development of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1961

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, on January 14, 1961, the Federation of the Italian-American Democratic Organizations of the State of New York, Inc., held a symposium at the Hotel New Yorker in connection with the minimum

wage laws. On this occasion, the Honorable ROBERT N. GIAIMO, from the State of Connecticut, and the Honorable DOMINICK V. DANIELS, from the State of New Jersey, participated. About 75 representatives of various labor and business organizations interested in this subject participated. After the speeches there was a stimulating question and answer period in which the various phases of the minimum wage law were discussed, and the impact of the proposed increase in minimum wage and the extension of coverage were explored.

At this time, 2½ months after the symposium, many of the statements by Congressman GIAIMO have gained greater meaning. It is timely that the speech delivered by the Honorable Representative from Connecticut be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, especially in view of the heated controversy regarding the minimum wage law, its proposed increases, extended coverage and last minute substitutions. I believe that Congressman GIAIMO's discussion will prove informative and enlightening to those interested in the welfare of the worker and the effect of increase in minimum wage and extended coverage this legislation would have upon industry. His talk follows:

SPEECH OF THE HONORABLE ROBERT N. GIAIMO, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, DEMOCRAT, OF CONNECTICUT, BEFORE THE FEDERATION OF ITALIAN-AMERICAN DEMOCRAT ORGANIZATIONS, NEW YORK CITY, JANUARY 14, 1961

There is no doubt that the Fair Labor Standards Act, enacted 22 years ago, will again be the subject of heated discussion in the Halls of Congress. It is altogether fitting, therefore, that this assemblage interested in the great issues facing our Nation, take note of the coming debate and—as informed citizens—individually determine a position that will strengthen the economic fabric of our society during this crucial period of our country's life. I would like to outline for you some of the arguments which I believe will be voiced on the floor of the House of Representatives within the coming months.

The objective of the Fair Labor Standards Act is to achieve in the United States as rapidly as practicable minimum wage levels necessary for the maintenance of health, efficiency, and the general well-being of workers. This is to be materialized without substantially curtailing employment and earning power. To achieve these dual, but frequently conflicting objectives, the Congress has acted cautiously in applying the law. It has established over the years minimum wages which affect directly only a limited number of employees at the bottom of the economic ladder. The Congress has also limited the application of the act to part of the labor force.

It is estimated that the Fair Labor Standards Act applies to about one out of two employees engaged in nongovernmental jobs. The employees currently excluded from the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act fall into two categories:

1. Coverage under the act is limited to employees engaged in commerce, or in the production of goods for interstate commerce, or in occupations directly essential to the production of these goods. This excludes from coverage under the act about one out of every three wage and salary earners in private industry, including the bulk of employees in local retail and services, and about half of the employees in construction. Some 14.5 million wage and salary workers in private industry are not covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act.

2. The act specifically exempts from coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act several groups of employees who are engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for interstate commerce. This category includes about 6 million employees or one out of every eight wage and salary earners in private industry. The largest groups in this category are engaged in agriculture, as outside salesmen, and in managerial and professional occupations. In addition, the act permits special treatment of handicapped persons and learners. Also, some other groups are exempt from its overtime provisions. Most of retail and service employees are specifically excluded from coverage by specific exemptions in addition to the limitation under the definition of commerce.

The Department of Labor has estimated that 23.7 million employees were covered in 1959 by the Fair Labor Standards Act. Six out of every ten of these were employed in manufacturing. Other large groups were engaged in transportation, wholesale trade, finance, insurance and real estate.

The bills as reported out by the House Committee on Education and Labor and the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare last year constituted a compromise between the initially proposed Kennedy-Roosevelt bill and the Eisenhower administration proposals. The major proposed change in both bills was the extension of coverage to retail and service enterprises with annual sales in excess of $1 million, exclusive of excise taxes.

In the limited time available to me, I would like to discuss this legislation as it affects the retail trade. A study by the Bureau of Labor Statistics showed that in October 1956, about 1 out of every 4 employees in all retail trade was earning less than a dollar an hour. The percent earning less than $1 and the impact of raising the wages would vary widely from region to region.

Of course, retail wages have increased appreciably since October 1956, as they did in the rest of American industry. Average hourly rates in retail trade between October 1956 and March 1960 rose 13 percent. The ratio of employees that would be affected by a $1-an-hour minimum today would, therefore, be considerably lower than 4 years ago. Moreover, the data I cite include employees in all retail establishments, regardless of size; generally hourly rates of employees engaged in retail trade tend to increase with the size of the establishment. However, it is clear that a uniform hourly minimum wage would have an appreciably different impact from region to region. There is no reason to believe that the increases in retail wages have been relatively greater in the South, the region with the lowest wages, than in the West where retail wages are highest.

There also exists a wide variation in earnings of employees in various types of retail establishments. Again, the latest national study on wage distribution in retailing by type of establishment is available for October 1956. At that time, more than a quarter of all retail employees earned less than $1 an hour, but in variety stores 3 out of every 4 of the quarter million employees earned less than $1 an hour, while in furniture and appliance stores the comparable ratio was 1 to 8.

Another problem with reference to the application of the FLSA to retail trade is presented by the overtime provisions. Four years ago, 45 percent of the employees in retail trade worked 41 or more hours a week, and 26 percent worked 48 hours or more. The variations in hours of work differed less than wage rates on a regional basis or by type of retail establishment.

The major objective of the Fair Labor Standards Act is the elimination of substandard wages. Not only are earnings in retailing insufficient to provide the needs of a family, but they are also inadequate to provide for the needs of a single woman without dependents. Recent studies in 11 different States indicated that a single woman required a median annual income of about $2,500 for a minimum adequate budget. This annual figure is equivalent to an hourly rate of $1.25 based on 1,900 hours per year. According to the U.S. Department of Labor, more than 4 out of every 10 employees in retail stores earned in 1959 less than $1.25 an hour and 1 out of every 5 earned less than $1 an hour.

In some cases employees in retail establishments earn less than State welfare agencies provide for the indigent and their income is occasionally supplemented by welfare funds. In such cases general tax funds subsidize the low-wage employer.

Elimination of substandard wages is already a function of the Federal Government. Reliance upon the States in this area to pass the necessary protective legislation is futile. The States are hampered from taking effective action because by raising minimum wages, one State would give neighboring States competitive advantages, since the States which do not require payment of minimum decent wages would enjoy lower labor costs. A fair minimum wage standard must be applied, therefore, concurrently for the whole Nation.

The underlying rationale for excluding retail trade from Fair Labor Standards Act coverage rests on the myth that retail business is local in nature. This belief is contrary to the structure of present-day retail trade in the United States and is based on a nostalgia for the simple agrarian economy of our early days as a nation, when the general store was a social center as well as a place to make purchases. Retailing is dominated by big business with some giant chains doing annually a billion dollar and more business with thousands of outlets spread throughout the 50 States. In food retailing, the small neighborhood store is fast disappearing. When the Fair Labor Standards Act was passed, supermarkets accounted for less than a fifth of the total food retail sales; at present, more than half of the dollar volume of food is sold by supermarkets.

Furthermore, the recent trends of growing concentration in retailing is expected to continue. Business Week commented on the activities of the 20 top retailers in 1959, whose sales ranged between $451 million to over $5 billion: "It was generally a year in which the big got bigger and the rich got richer."

Retailing can be considered as local in character only if it is viewed from a narrow technical approach limited to the fact that sales of an individual store are restricted to a given locality. But a realistic approach must also consider the origin of the goods and the structure of retailing used to sell the goods. There is nothing local about grocery chains which control and own integrated food processing factories. One of the chain stores is the world's largest purchasers of coffee, fresh fruits, and vegetables.

The management of the large retail chains is centralized. This results in uniform national pricing regardless of local conditions. Mail order stores use the same catalogues all over the Nation, and even local advertising by national chains is frequently directed by a central authority. Some giant retail chains advertise on national hook-ups and in magazines that circulate nationally.

The increased concentration in retail trade and the accompanying economies of large-scale selling and efficiencies of operations make it imperative that the coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act be extended to the

industry. Many firms now paying rates below the minimum provided by the Fair Labor Standards Act could no doubt afford to pay the statutory minimum from current high margins of profits. But extension of coverage is not intended to reduce profits, which is the lifeblood of industry and an essential reward for investment and efficient management. It is expected that the elimination of substandard wages would exert a salutary effect upon the productivity of management and labor in the industry. The experience of American industry has indicated that with increases in real wages and standard of living, management in retailing will be spurred to foster economies of operation which may more than compensate for the increased labor costs.

It must be recognized not only that the existence of substandard wages in retailing is a problem of the employees who are denied the means to achieve a decent standard of living, but that low wages in one industry tend to depress the economic conditions in other areas of economic activity. And in the final analysis, it is the total community which must pay the social cost of substandard wages.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

St. Patrick's Day Address by Senator Claiborne Pell, of Rhode Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an address entitled "To the United States," delivered before the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick on March 17 in Providence, R.I., by the distinguished junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR CLAIBORNE PELL AT THE 61ST ANNIVERSARY DINNER OF THE FRIENDLY SONS OF ST. PATRICK, FRIDAY, MARCH 17, 1961, 7 P.M., SHERATON BILTMORE HOTEL, PROVIDENCE, R.I.

TO THE UNITED STATES

I am deeply grateful to your committee for having invited me here this evening. Not only am I honored and grateful to you all, but knowing how distinguished through the years have been the previous speakers at this dinner, I am doubly honored.

I also bring you the greetings of my colleague and the friend of us all, whose birthday is today, Senator JOHN O. PASTORE.

President Kennedy some weeks ago said in his brilliant and stirring inaugural address: "Fellow Americans, ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country."

This is the thought around which I should like to revolve my remarks tonight.

First, in looking at our country, let us briefly examine her appearance and age. Both of these are relative factors. I can recall that 10 years ago I believed a man in his forties was definitely mature; in fact, perhaps a rapidly aging man. Now that I am in my forties, I think that the forties are an age of youth, vigor, and imagination. And, being human and an optimist, as I grow older I will probably always be convinced that my generation is the generation of youth, vigor, and imagination, no matter whether I am 40, 50, 60, 70, 80, or even 90.

And speaking of 90 years of age, my wonderful predecessor, Senator Theodore Francis Green, has a mind that is as vigorous and young as that of any of us at any age. As long as hope and optimism are in a man's heart, that's what counts.

Now, speaking of age, let us examine our country. In fact, the United States has had its system of government unchanged, has relied on the same Constitution, longer than has any other government in our world.

At the same time, our critics say that we are becoming decadent, old and weak. They cite our rate of unemployment, greater than that of any other industrialized nation. The fact that our young people's physical health and strength is poorer than that of youngsters of other nations is also used as an example. Recently tests showed that British boys scored 14 percent higher than American boys, and that British girls scored 23 percent higher than American girls. Japanese boys and girls outscored our American children by an even wider margin.

However, some tests were run recently in Pawtucket—and here you Pawtucket fathers or grandfathers can take particular pride. Pawtucket youngsters came out 16 percent higher than the 42-percent average scored by youngsters throughout the Nation.

Personally, though, I believe our country has in its grasp the potentiality and prospects, the vigor and life, of a young man, and not of an old man.

I must say, too, that the atmosphere in Washington, sparked and generated by our excellent President, gives off this spirit of optimism and confidence. In fact, I believe that John Kennedy will prove one of our truly great Presidents, ranking with Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, the two Roosevelts, and Woodrow Wilson. And in good measure, because of this, I see the United States—strong, morally and physically; powerful; and with a long, good, full life to lead.

But let us look hard at the image of the United States. What is our appearance? What do we look like? It depends on who does the looking.

To many of us, blessed with reasonable prosperity and circumstances, the United States looks pretty wonderful. But, let us look around, even in our own State, and see the variety of impressions.

This month, some 10,000 food packages are being distributed free to unemployed destitute families in our own State.

Our unemployment is high; 50 percent higher than the national average. I wonder how our United States, or even our Rhode Island, looks to the unemployed textile worker in Woonsocket or Central Falls, his unemployment compensation exhausted, dependent on public assistance, and with few job prospects.

Now, let us examine the problem of prejudice in our country. This last national election has, I believe, proved that religious prejudice is dead in our country. And, within our own State, my own election demonstrated the same.

For this, incidentally, I am fullheartedly grateful to many of you here in this room.

When it comes to racial prejudice, though, we still have a long way to go. The United States to a Negro, or even to a Jew, does not yet have the fullness of opportunity that it should. Just the other day, I noticed that our new Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, an old colleague of mine in the State Department (we both had desks side by side 15 years ago), bought a house in Washington, and in buying it, he refused to sign a covenant committing him, when he sold it, not to sell it to any non-Caucasian, i.e., a Jew, a Negro, or an oriental. Because our Secretary of State refused to sign this covenant, and was merely putting into his personal life our supposed national beliefs, it made headline news around the country.

So, while the United States seems full of opportunity to many of us, and to our children, it really does not offer the same full open doors to our unemployed and to others of our citizens.

Now, let us see how the United States looks from the viewpoint of other countries. First, let us take Great Britain. We were born in revolution against that country. We fought them hard, and they fought us. During the War of 1812, they even burned down our White House. We thought their policy harsh to our own forebears here in the United States. And the forebears of some of us here in this room shared an equal dislike from an even earlier period—from the days of Oliver Cromwell—than did the early American colonists.

Yet, today, to my mind, outside the United States, Great Britain is probably as strong and great a well of democratic values as exists in the present world. To her we sometimes seem bumptious and isolated, and even immature.

Now, let us go across the channel from Great Britain to Ireland, an appropriate trip on this St. Patrick's Day. How do we look from there?

Ireland's loss has been our gain in that its troubles have produced a great deal of the growth that is the United States by giving us her sons and daughters, who have become amongst our finest citizens. Incidentally, on this 100th anniversary month of the inauguration of the great President Lincoln, it would, I believe, be particularly appropriate to mention the fact, not commonly known, that just a century ago Irish troops were especially helpful to the Union Army during our Civil War. Between 150,000 and 170,000 Irish troops fought then. At Fredericksburg, Irish soldiers under General Meagher—wearing green twigs in their hats—made six of the most heroic charges of the Civil War. One Irish regiment of the Irish Brigade went into the battle with 700 men and came out with 150 men. Many of the Irish troops who fought in the Civil War remained in the United States after the war was finished.

We owe a great debt to Ireland, and we have enjoyed her friendship since our inception. However, let's not fool ourselves; to the Irish Free State, the United States may also sometimes appear a bit bumptious and even pigheaded.

And how do we look from the viewpoint of Africa or Asia? You are as familiar as I with the slowness with which we are implementing our Constitution and our laws when it comes to making available to all our citizens on an equal basis education, public facilities, and even the privilege of voting. In our own South, while the religious institutions, particularly the Catholics, and many moderates are doing as much as they can in the field of education, the great majority of our southern white Americans oppose integration in education.

Even here in our State there are problems. I have a Negro friend who told me that in the suburban block where he lives, not one of his neighbors had been friendly to him and his wife—though they had to their children—in the more than a year that they had been there. So, how do we look to people of color throughout the world. I leave you to draw your own conclusions.

Or, let us go behind the Iron Curtain, an area where I have lived a couple of years and visited most every other year since World War II. There, while their governments and the official propaganda line have done all that is possible to caricature the United States as a moneygrubbing, vicious, warmongering nation, the reservoir of goodwill that exists for us among its people is still as deep as ever.

I remember once taking a train from Warsaw to Moscow. I had no Russian money. Other passengers on the train shared their food and beverages with me for the whole of that long train ride. They did their best to make me feel at home. I wonder what would have been the fate of a Russian tourist on the New York, New Haven and Hartford for an equal length of time?

Actually, I guess it's a pretty tough fate to be dependent on the New York, New Haven and Hartford. And, one is usually on it longer than one intends anyway.

But, seriously, from the Russian viewpoint, we appear almost as threatening to their security as they do to ours. I remember once being struck by a Russian map of the world, which showed the American nuclear-armed bases surrounding its borders. The Russians are constantly told that these bases are for offensive operations, and we often join in saying how we can blast every Russian city from the face of the map. I must say that if I were a Russian and listened to either the bellicose speeches of the Communist propagandist or to some of the saber-rattling speeches of ourselves, much less both, and then looked at that map, I would be a bit worried, too.

Our way of life and outlook are, to my mind, the best and most natural for the expression of wishes and desires of people everywhere. And for that reason, in the long haul, our Judeo-Christian way of life will triumph over the Communists. This is particularly true in fair competition. I have seen Communist officials who go to the United States, come back a lot less convinced Communists than when they left.

Now let us look westward to the Pacific. The first and most amazing point here is our new State of Hawaii. In Hawaii we have a real amalgam, a real melting pot—even more than on the U.S. mainland. And this melting, like the tempering of steel, appears to have developed strong foundations and also charted a way toward improvements. What has happened in Hawaii can do a lot to change the image of us in the other parts of the world and to improve our posture as the world's leading democratic nation.

We go to Japan, and there is some confusion. A short 15 years ago we insisted that they disarm totally and completely, and forever forswear the use of arms. At our instance, the Japanese Constitution was written to say in part "sea, and air forces as well as other war potential, will never be maintained. The right of belligerency of the state will never be recognized." Now, a very few years later, we urge them to arm as quickly and vigorously as they can.

We talk about disarmament in the United Nations, and yet we watch Communist China the most populous nation in the world arm itself with new and more deadly weapons without making any effort to insure that she sit down and discuss her awesome threat to humanity.

Now forgive me for literally covering the waterfront, but I have tried to underline the point that the United States does not appear the same to everybody.

Now that we have made our world tour, let us return home to President Kennedy's inaugural words: "As not what America can do for you—ask what you can do for your country."

There are many things that each of us can do for our country. There are many things that each of us can do to reinforce the vigor and youth of America and to insure that we continue toward our own New Frontiers.

To be specific: our businesses, our bankers, and our credit associations can be more adventurous and not depend too much on the Government. The other day a friend of mine and an excellent banker here wanted the Small Business Administration to extend a loan to a business to which he himself would not extend a loan. In this case, actually, he would not lay on half the loan, although the Small Business Administration said that it would put up a half, if he would agree to accept the other half. Now, I believe bankers should be willing to share in the risk that they ask the Government to take.

Asking what you can do for your country means the full reporting of all our taxable income and the payment of all the money we owe to the Government. I believe that if all the money that is owed by the taxpayers to the Government were paid, it would be unnecessary to raise taxes. For instance, in answer to a question from me at his appearance before the Joint Economic Committee, Secretary of the Treasury Dillon said for the record that the Treasury Department estimates that several billion dollars in interest and dividend income is not reported each year. And, while I believe all of us here in this room are reporting our income, we can do what we can to make sure that those we do business with or have contact with behave the same way.

Our industrialists and businessmen can be more imaginative and confident, more adventurous. This means plowing back a larger portion of profits into capital improvements, developing new marketing processes and uses for our products and the keeping pace with technological advances in other areas of the world.

Our investors can have greater confidence in our industries, in the growth of the American industrial system. One evidence of such confidence would be a willingness to invest in common securities and stocks, rather than bonds. In this connection, not only industrialists and bankers can help by investing in industry, but the unions can share in this. The amazing thing is that at present such supposedly conservative institutions as universities and mutual funds have invested a high percentage of their funds in common stocks. For instance, in 1959, 80 percent of the portfolios of mutual funds were invested in common stock. And in the fiscal year ending 1960, 80 percent of universities had 56.1 percent of their endowment funds invested in common stocks. Yet, the emphasis of the investment patterns of union funds is upon bonds and mortgages.

What we can do for America is to practice in our own lives the elimination of discrimination. My fellow Americans, there can be only one nationality in America—American. Creed no longer enters the picture, but race, color, and age still do, and here each of us can do our own bit to help.

We must have greater faith and confidence in our own system, a realization that our democratic system provides not only the material welfare, but must meet the human and emotional and religious needs of all people. This is the field where communism fails.

We must have a willingness to sacrifice to obtain the good, the great, world that is within our grasp.

What can we do for America? We can act like Americans, talk like Americans, and think like Americans. And, most important, have the confidence in our own vitality that as Americans we must have.

Gentlemen, I give you a toast to our United States.

Boland of the U.N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting article concerning the President of the U.N. General Assembly, Frederick Henry Boland. The article appeared in Our Sunday Visitor issue of March 26, 1961. The article follows:

BOLAND OF THE U.N.

(By Bob Senser)

It may be true, as some critics suggest, that Catholic laymen are napping along the roadside while world events pass them by, but you'd never know it around the headquarters of the United Nations in New York. There Frederick Henry Boland, President of the U.N. General Assembly, moves in the center of current history.

Boland, 57, head of Ireland's permanent mission to the U.N. since 1956, is the fourth Catholic to be President of the U.N. in its 15-year history. When he was elected last September, newspapers quoted Boland's favorite line from Horace: "Aequam memento rebus in arduis servare mentem"—"Remember to keep a cool head in difficult circumstances." And he has, even during the commotion created at Assembly sessions by Soviet Premier Khrushchev.

I visited Boland recently at the unpretentious offices of Ireland's U.N. mission, located on the 15th floor of an apartment building a half block from the U.N. I expressed surprise that I had found him in New York at the time, since the General Assembly was then in a long recess. "There's something doing here all the time," he explains. Except for a 4- or 5-week vacation in Ireland, Boland stays in New York year round.

Boland said that there were certain issues facing the U.N. that he could not discuss because of his role as presiding officer. But some of my questions dealt with issues that never came before the General Assembly. For example, what about the accusation that the U.N. is "godless"?

"Well," Boland said slowly, "we live in a world that is in part godless." He paused for a few seconds, and then went on:

"Actually, the United Nations is certainly not godless in its essential nature, because Catholic teaching is that international society is a natural society, and the Holy Father himself in public statements has approved the idea of world organization and of the U.N.

"Remember, too, that there's a big Catholic representation in the U.N. On an issue like apartheid [South Africa's Government-enforced racial segregation] there are a variety of views expressed, but the Catholics here stand united against apartheid as a violation of the God-given dignity of the human person.

"The U.N., true, is purely a worldly organization—so is a corporation or a labor organization—but it does represent a society which is natural in the sense that it helps mankind achieve its destiny."

How do the people of Ireland regard the U.N.?

"The opinion in Ireland is very strongly pro-U.N. We are a very small country, you know, and the U.N. is more important to small countries than to large ones, who because of their power are able to fend for themselves. Remember that when Dag Hammarskjold, U.N. Secretary General, was first pressured by the Soviet Union to resign, his answer was quite simple: 'I am going to stay for the sake of the small countries.'

"But the position of Ireland isn't based just on political or opportunistic reasons. It is based on Catholic social thought, which places great stress on the need for international cooperation."

Do the Irish people feel the same after nine Irish soldiers were killed in the Congo?

"The Irish people were deeply moved by this tragedy. At the same time they felt that those who died did honor to themselves and to Ireland, because they lost their lives in an unselfish fulfillment of a completely idealistic assignment. There was never any serious suggestion in Ireland that the country should withdraw its troops from the U.N. Force."

Any comment on the incident when Boland gaveled a tumultuous U.N. meeting to adjournment with such vigor that his gavel smashed to bits?

"These things, you should remember, happen from time to time in our national parliaments—even in the oldest and most traditionally minded assemblies. One day many years ago, on November 11, 1912, to be exact, the British House of Commons had to be hastily adjourned to bring an end to a disorderly scene. A member of the opposition threw a book across the chamber which struck Winston Churchill on the head. The book happened to be a copy of the Rules of Procedure of Parliament.

"The U.N. is now more like a parliament of the world and less like a conference of diplomats."

Should new nations be required to undergo a probationary period before being allowed into U.N. membership?

"That would be resented by the small countries. They're very sensitive about their independence. To treat them as applicants would be bad politics. It should be remembered that most of the new countries of Africa have long been under U.N. and League of Nations trusteeship, and for years their leaders have dealt with the U.N. Trusteeship Committee. The leaders of these countries give every sign of great maturity and responsibility, and it would be wrong to treat them as apprentices."

I pointed out that when the U.N. was founded in San Francisco there were many glowing hopes about curing the world's ills, but that today we're in more of a mess than ever. What happened?

"There are a lot of misconceptions about the U.N. It isn't a world government, you know. People expect the U.N. to put things in order when the U.N. simply doesn't have the powers to do so.

"What the U.N. has become is the principal medium in the world for focusing the otherwise scattered forces of world moral opinion on the current issues of international politics."

What's the good of this moral opinion?

"No government can afford, at least in the long run, to remain indifferent to the opinion of mankind. When a government gets condemned in the U.N., as the Soviet Union did over Hungary, and as Red China did over Tibet, it is a setback.

"If the Communists were insensitive to what others think about them, why would they spend such fabulous sums on propaganda to create a good impression?"

I recalled a commentator's point that Boland and members of his "center party" in the U.N. are trying to bridge the gap "not only between the East and West but also between the North and South (as Boland puts it)." What does he mean by the North-South gap?

"Since the war, we in Europe—and the United States, too—thought of the world very much in terms of the East-West conflict, polarized between the Soviet Union and the United States. Today, since there are so many new Asian and African nations in the world, we are reminded of the hard fact that the world is also divided into the highly industrialized nations of the northern half of the world—Japan, Russia, the United States, most of Europe—and the more or less underdeveloped countries of Latin America, Africa, and Asia, which occupy the southern half of the globe.

"Although the West seems to think that the big issues of the world are those of the East-West axis, the newer countries are really not much interested in questions such as the fate of Berlin, but more in the problems of how to end poverty, colonialism, and racial discrimination."

With all these concerns in the UN, isn't the national sovereignty of individual nations endangered?

"None of us can insulate ourselves from the fact that there are forces in the world making us more and more interdependent and hence limiting each nation's sovereignty. Events are really forcing the world more closely together.

"We oughtn't bemoan this development. After all, the idea of a sovereign state is not such an old one. It's only four or five centuries old. Before that, countries were held together by the idea of the unity of western Christendom. Later we started making a god out of the sovereign state. In the intervening years, with all the rivalries between nations, Western civilization has paid very heavily for the luxury of national sovereignty."

(In a speech in New York last November Boland explained this point: "Within our respective national communities we take the concept of government for granted. We believe that the lack of an effective national government would spell chaos and anarchy, and we have dramatic proof of the soundness of our belief in the present situation in the Congo. What we all deprecate and deplore in the Congo, however, we all accept complacently in the case of world society. None of our governments has yet shown any disposition to accept the sacrifices of sovereignty required to establish a really effective world government.")

Should all of a country's foreign aid be channeled through the U.N.?

"Don't forget there are two kinds of foreign aid. There is Government aid of various types. A large portion of that should be channeled through the United Nations—if the Soviet Union also agrees to do so.

"What counts even more, however, is aid that comes from the private sector of the economy. This, from private business, will always be bigger in volume, and there can be no question of channeling it through the U.N. Of course it would be useful if the U.N. could set up some ground rules of international investment to protect both the investors and the countries in which investments are made."

Senator HUMPHREY, among others, has suggested that the United States should make its surplus food available to Red China, which is hard hit by crop shortages. Do you agree?

"This is a matter for the American people to decide. I don't think it would be in keeping with my position to advise the United States what to do. In general, however, I would say that a nation with excess food resources should help those in need."

Why has Ireland voted with the Communist bloc on the issue of Red China?

"We voted only that the issue should be placed on the agenda. The vote so far has been only a procedural one of whether the issue should be discussed at all. Until it is discussed, how can you bring out the facts of what Red China has done? We made quite clear why we thought that the matter was well worth discussing—because it would be an opportunity to have the world examine the credentials of the Red Chinese."

I asked Boland what he considers the greatest single influence on his own thinking.

"My education by the Irish Jesuits at Clongowes Wood College in County Kildare. They gave me a sense of history and of the world. They gave me a classical education. My son is attending the same school."

And then Boland, who reads Thucydides in Greek for relaxation, took a few seconds for a digression on education:

"People think that education is the acquiring of knowledge—no, it's the training of the mind. The question is not how useful is this course but what is it going to do for my mind? Cardinal Newman believed that this is the reason why a classical education is the best education."

As I rose to go, I told Boland that I hoped he would excuse my pressing him for answers on some hard questions.

"Perfectly all right," he said. "You know what Oscar Wilde said: 'there are no indiscreet questions—only indiscreet answers.'"

The United Nations in a Time of Transition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on March 22, 1961, the Honorable Douglas Dillon addressed the annual dinner of the United Nations Association of Maryland.

On this occasion, the Secretary of the Treasury chose as his topic "The United Nations in a Time of Transition." I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Dillon's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNITED NATIONS IN A TIME OF TRANSITION

It is a great pleasure for me to meet with the members of the United Nations Association of Maryland. For it is through the efforts of such organizations as yours that the message of the United Nations reaches the American public. Public understanding and support of the United Nations are, as you well know, fundamental to our country's fulfillment of its international responsibilities and objectives. We in Government are, therefore, deeply appreciative of the splendid work you are doing to help achieve this essential end.

Two decades ago, the idea of an organized world community seemed to many people to be no more than an idle dream. Some felt that such an organization was wholly impractical. Others feared that a successful world organization would impair the national sovereignties of member nations. Still others insisted that world affairs should be managed by a few of the great powers and that smaller nations should be compelled to follow their bidding.

Many obstacles were encountered in the creation of the United Nations. There have been further obstacles to its development and growth. But most of these obstacles have been surmounted. Today, the United Nations is one of the most vital realities in the entire sphere of international relations. We Americans can take justifiable pride in the role our country has played in helping to build and to preserve the United Nations system.

By a great many standards, the United States is classified as a "great power." However, throughout our history the American people have been devoted to the rights of small nations—the right to independence, the right to survive, the right to grow, and the right to pursue material and spiritual well-being for their peoples within a framework of free institutions of their own making. These rights have been achieved—as never before—within the framework of the United Nations.

The United Nations has amassed great support around the world in the 15 years of its life—although often for different reasons. This is at once a tribute to the many sidedness of the world organization, which plays a variety of roles in various parts of the world. It is also a tribute to the capacity of the United Nations to respond to successively different demands throughout its existence.

The world has moved onward—but unfortunately, not always upward—since 1945, when the United Nations was a fledgling hope of barely 50 members. The United Nations has also altered, both in its composition and in its functions. It was originally conceived as an organization dependent for action upon agreement between the permanent powers—notably the United States and the Soviet Union. In those days, a majority in the General Assembly could be obtained from the votes of Western Europe and Latin America.

But the strains of international events demanded that the organization either grow or simply wither away—discarded, like its predecessor, the League of Nations. The United Nations did grow. It has now reached a total of 99 members, with several more almost certain to join in the next few years. A majority can now be obtained from the combined states of Asia and Africa. The functions of the organization have also expanded to meet new needs, as more and more problems affecting its membership and the world as a whole have been thrown into the lap of the United Nations.

Throughout these changes and developments, the United Nations concept has retained the allegiance of the overwhelming majority of the people of the United States.

President Kennedy spoke for all of us when he said in his inaugural address that the United Nations is "our last best hope in an age where the instruments of war have far outpaced the instruments of peace."

Four months earlier, former President Eisenhower told the General Assembly that the United Nations "has accomplished what no nation singly or any limited group of nations could have accomplished * * * to forego the bonds and build the structure of a true world community."

Important as the United Nations is to us, it is of perhaps greater importance to the new and emerging countries. To them, it is the symbol of nationhood. Membership in the world organization has become tangible evidence of their newly won independence.

Only in the United Nations can a small country participate fully in deliberations of international developments. Without the United Nations, it is not likely that small African States would have much say in decisions that will not only shape the future of Africa, but of the entire world. Small or emerging nations desperately need the United Nations for their security and as a sounding board for their hopes, fears, and aspirations.

President Kennedy had this idea very much in mind when he called in his state of the Union message on "the many smaller nations of the world to join with us in strengthening this Organization, which is far more essential to their security than it is to ours—the only body in the world where no nation need be powerful to be secure, where every nation has an equal voice, and where any nation can exert influence, not according to the strength of its armies, but according to the strength of its ideas."

What, then, is this Organization which has grown and developed in ways not foreseen by those who wrote its charter in San Francisco 15 years ago?

It is, first of all—and I say this without apology—a debating forum. This characteristic causes some United Nations supporters to become impatient and to assume that the United Nations because it is often long-winded and, on occasion, even unproductive, is also ineffective.

But free, thoughtful debate is essential on such immense issues as the rights of man, the ways of seeking peace, the need for economic advancement and spiritual growth, and the importance of justice with freedom. These topics must be endlessly explored and debated according to the customs of free parliaments if humanity is to move forward out of the shadows which becloud this uneasy world. Indeed, if the totalitarian spokesmen through their contacts with the free world in the forum of the United Nations learn nothing more than the rules and procedures of a democratically conducted debate, perhaps a small dent will have been knocked into the theory of the autocratic state—a dent which one day may bring about repercussions in the proceedings of monolithic totalitarianisms.

The United Nations is also an operation—a limited operation it is true, but a crucial one. The United Nations has demonstrated that an international organization can mobilize people and resources for economic development; that it can supervise the administration of dependent areas; that it can whip together a military force to repel aggression, and that it can mobilize security forces and civilian administrators to bring about a modicum of order and security where there might otherwise be civil war and communal rioting.

Each time the world organization takes on a new and bigger task, skeptics wonder if it can survive the test. But it has grown stronger from adversity. Today it is meeting the test of the Congo, where there is a United Naions force of approximately 20,000 troops and several hundred administrators, paid for by a United Nations budget of some $135 million.

The development of the operating capacity of the United Nations is perhaps the most striking aspect of the organization since its inception. But there is considerably more to the United Nations. It is also a facility for the practice of multilateral diplomacy. The complex world of today presents us with issues which involve many different peoples. Hence, multilateral negotiations are required to supplement bilateral diplomaacy. They, in turn, require a place and an atmosphere that are suitable. The place should have corridors as well as council chambers, because some of the most important developments in international arrangements come, not from formal meetings and agreements, but from informal, unofficial understandings and exchanges of views. Indeed the very presence in New York for protracted periods in time of leading statesmen is a real if intangible force in bridging gaps of misunderstanding between ourselves and the world around us.

This bodes well for the present and for the future. It is a happy development in the current struggle between freedom and totalitarianism that statesmen from all continents and all sections of the world desire to mingle their voices in a cosmopolitan chorous demanding peace.

It is our duty to strengthen and to maintain this great experiment in international collaboration, particularly in these days when it is subject to heavy attack and severe testing. It is valuable as a unifying factor of free states against totalitarian assaults or infiltrations which challenge their independence and security. However, the United Nations should not be used as a means of extending the cold war but, rather, as a means of ending it. The world organization is needed to preserve national ways of life and the ability of individual nations to choose how they should live. But it is not a device to hold back the hand of time or to maintain the status quo. On the contrary, change is often good and desirable, and the United Nations should serve as the framework of change and progress throughout the world. Peoples are best cemented together, not by mutual fear, but by mutual hope.

Finally, there are contained within the framework of the United Nations many opportunities to develop what may be called "quiet diplomacy," free from the shrill urgencies of the crisis and the headline. We need to cultivate these opportunities, and we will be better enabled to do so as the world organization grows both more responsible and more responsive to world needs. We can perhaps do this best in many cases by operating quietly away from the glare of publicty which sometimes distorts formal United Nations meetings. Most important, we can seek to increase the sense of harmony among nations, particularly between the older industrialized states and the younger emergencies nations of Asia and Africa.

In these ways, we can seek solutions to international problems before they become conflicts. It takes great statesmanship to solve a world crisis. But it is a sign of greater, if sometimes lesser known statesmanship, to prevent the crisis from developing.

Never before has mankind been confronted by such grave dangers—nor by such magnificent opportunities. In the same hand we hold the power of death and destruction and the power of life and progress. We Americans have a profound conviction that mankind will choose the pathway of life. In this conviction, we must dedicate ourselves anew to the principles of the United Nations Charter and to the pursuit of peace, freedom, and prosperity for all the peoples of the earth. Our consciences as Americans and as members of the human race demand no less.

A National Lottery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, an interesting news item appeared in the press last week to the effect that a multimillion dollar gambling syndicate operating in the Pentagon was smashed in a raid conducted by Treasury agents.

The Federal prosecutor who led the raid described the operation in our Na-

tion's Defense Establishment as "unbelievable."

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether the Federal prosecutor was amazed at the tremendous amount of money our Federal employees spend to quench their gambling thirst or was he shocked at the discovery that such an operation could happen on Federal property.

In either event, the prosecutor should not have been surprised if he was willing to accept the indisputable fact that the urge to gamble is not only normal but a universal human trait. He should know that because of our own hypocrisy we have encouraged, permitted and allowed professional gamblers to capitalize on this human desire.

Mr. Speaker, the type of gambling activity uncovered at the Pentagon is no different than the kind of gambling that goes on everywhere else throughout this country. As a matter of fact Irish Sweepstake tickets are sold right in the House Office Buildings. I know. I have bought them right in my office.

All of this, Mr. Speaker, proves one point and that is that millions of American citizens enjoy the pleasures of gambling and the sooner we wipe out hypocrisy and accept the fact that man is by his very nature a gambler that much sooner we will cut off the underworld from this lucrative industry.

Mr. Speaker, the legalization of a national lottery under public control will not only satisfy the American desire to gamble but will easily pump into the coffers of our Government at least $10 billion a year in additional income which can help reduce our national debt and bring sorely needed tax relief to our wage earners.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the only realistic, sensible and courageous approach to this whole problem of gambling. It would be, I might add, a profitable and satisfactory solution to a pressing and disturbing human problem.

Address by Henry H. Fowler, Under Secretary of the Treasury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRESCOTT BUSH
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered last night in Washington, D.C., by Henry H. Fowler, Under Secretary of the Treasury.

The occasion for the address was the annual dinner of the Yale Club of Washington, which gave its annual award for distinguished public service to the Honorable William McChesney Martin, of the Federal Reserve Board. The award was presented to Mr. Martin by Mr. Eugene Black, President of the World Bank. Present also was the Honorable Per Jacobsson, the President of the International Monetary Fund.

The address is in a sense a very high compliment to the Honorable Mr. Martin, but also, and more important still, is the fact that it is a very fine essay upon the virtues of and the necessity for dedicated public service.

I think the record of Mr. Fowler is an example of the finest tradition of public service in this country. His comments on this subject I believe are worthy of consideration by all Members of Congress, and by all those who may have the privilege of reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS FOR DINNER OF YALE CLUB OF WASHINGTON, MARCH 23, 1961, BY HENRY H. FOWLER, UNDER SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

Prince Bismarck once said that one-third of the students of German universities broke down from overwork, another third broke down from dissipation, and the other third ruled Germany.

Let us not pass judgment on which third of the alumni of Yale are represented here tonight. To do so might revive the fading debate on whether Yale is ruling the country or merely seconding Harvard.

And I shall leave to others the privilege I would like to share of paying tribute to that great son of Yale, Bill Martin, whom we honor tonight for his magnificent contribution to public service.

In Washington, where so many Yale alumni are concerned directly or indirectly with the Federal Government, it seemed consonant with the spirit of this occasion to speak on—"The Motivations of National Public Service."

This Nation is in a new phase of its history. If it is to meet the challenges ahead, it will require a ministry of the best talents available—not just in the glamorous beginning of a new administration, but throughout the entire course of our time and thereafter.

For we in the United States are engaged in a vast and fearsome struggle—with both survival and freedom at stake. Ours is the leadership of the free world. To discharge that leadership, uninvited but obligated nonetheless, a strong and effective National Government is necessary.

And that means able people in government—not just a few in strategic places—but in elective office, in the key appointive posts, and in the career administrative service from the lower grades to the supergrades. Moreover, these persons of ability must have character. They must be ready to discharge their public trust with courage, judgment, integrity and dedication to the national public interest.

This need poses a question for the university, for the secondary educational system, for parents, for leaders in government and private life, for us all—are we doing what is necessary to assure that our national public service has an adequate number of the ablest and best?

I shall concentrate on one facet of this question, not because it is necessarily the most important, but because it is most often neglected.

It is my conviction that a renewed emphasis on the proper motivation for national public service is vital both to an enlistment of the ablest and their subsequent discharge of their public trust in the finest traditions of the public interest.

Why should there ever be in this great country, with all of its wealth of human resources, any serious question from objective sources about the quality and caliber of its public servants? Why should there be a constant churning in the press and parlor about conflicts of interest? Why should there be concern about enough of our finest people standing for elective political officer? Why should there be any conjecture about whether a President Eisenhower or a President Kennedy can get an outstanding leader in private life to come to Washington and agree to stay more than 1 year? Why should there be any failure of our Government personnel offices to recruit a fair share of the ablest and best of our college or university graduates?

Is it because we, as a people, have failed too often and too long to drive home to ourselves, our associates and our children President Kennedy's inaugural admonition—"ask not what American will do for you—ask what you can do for America."

Do our schools, our parents and teachers, in counseling young people on their opportunities, stress the obligation to help guide our country to its proper destiny?

It was over a decade ago when a noted public servant, David Lilienthal, made an interesting suggestion saying:

"I propose that, out of the best and most productive years of each man's life, he should carve a segment in which he puts his private career aside to serve his community and his country, and thereby to serve his children, his neighbors, his fellow men, and the cause of freedom."

The response of the Nation's young people to the Peace Corps proposal reveals that there will be an answer to calls of patriotism, without the sound of bugles and the summons to war.

But if young people of ability are encouraged and counseled to consider national public service, what are the values to be emphasized?

First, let us review a few that should not be stressed.

National public service should not be held out as a door to power and wealth. Out of this motivation comes the putting aside of the public interest and the favoring of private interest either of the public servant himself or of some person, faction or enterprise whose favor the public official hopes to enjoy then or later. Here is the root of the problem of conflicts of interest. This motivation cannot exist alongside a single-minded loyalty to the public interest.

"Taking care of No. 1"—worship at the altar of personal success in terms of power or wealth—this philosophy of the twenties may be still appropriate for much of the private sector of our society, but is not the right motive for national public service. For that we need men and women of integrity who will not let personal ambition or prospects of financial gain cut across their fulfillment of a public trust.

Said Plato in the Republic:

"Whereas if they go to the administration of public affairs, poor and hungering after their own private advantage, thinking that hence they are to snatch the chief good, order there can never be, for they will be fighting about office, and the civil and domestic broils which thus arise will be the ruin of the rulers themselves and of the whole state."

Nor should national public service be held out as an easy or pleasant life where one can avoid the stress of competitive society, being bundled comfortably in the secure lap of bureaucracy.

To participate in national public service today is to enter the roughest and most demanding competition of all time. It outstrips golf, tennis, or business and professional life in its competitive challenge.

America is leading the free world in the decisive competition with communism. It is engaged in a day-to-day demonstration of the values of democracy and freedom, hoping to win to our side in devotion to these values

both the emergent nations and those who have been embraced by tyranny.

Our Government team in this contest requires men and women of initiative, energy and judgment—no part of the national public service should be held out as a sinecure or a haven for mediocrity.

Nor should national public service be held out as the path to glory or the approbation of one's fellow men.

As wise Benjamin Franklin once put it:

"We must not in the course of publick life expect immediate approbation and immediate grateful acknowledgment of our services.—But let us preserve thro' abuse and even injury. The internal satisfaction of a good conscience is always present, and time will do us justice in the minds of the people, even of those at present the most prejudic'd against us."

Courage to stand up to public pressures, private greed and pursue only the public interest—without regard to personal place—this standard rather than pure crowd pleasing is to be preferred.

So much for the false or undesirable motivations for national public service—power, wealth, ease, comfort, personal vain glory.

Let us turn to the more difficult task of defining some of the more appropriate motivations.

In doing so, let us confess that Americans sometimes seem to have lost the habit of asking for or expecting dedicated action. Yet, more than any form of society, one governed in a democratic pattern calls for an optimistic view of men and their motives.

We should not be afraid of using words and concepts such as love of country, patriotism, public duty, obligation, sacrifice, rare privilege, and dedication in motivating our citizens to national public service.

Perhaps, some would quarrel with the idea of sacrifice. So would I, if it implies an acceptance of public breast beating by self-appointed heroes who seek or refuse high places, all the while talking of sacrifice. Compared to the privilege of serving his country, elements of personal sacrifice discount at a great rate.

Rather, it must be stressed that some element of sacrifice must be accepted if public service is to be performed by dedicated men and women. And like teaching or the ministry or military service in wartime, public service is better performed by dedicated people. Those who man the battlements or seek new frontiers in effective democratic government must be dedicated if they are to cope with their zealous and fanatical Communist competitors.

Dedicated to what?

To their country—to its survival and welfare, to the increasing excellence of its government in its performance of a key role in a free society, to ever higher standards of conduct in living up to its ancient ideals in a changing environment.

Can we hope for a better role for this and succeeding generations, than in the words of Plato:

"But when their turn comes, toiling also at politics and ruling for the public good, not as though they were performing some heroic action, but simply as a matter of duty."

But whether duty, obligation or privilege, public service seemed the natural course to our Founding Fathers and to the much admired ancient Romans such as Cato the Younger, of whom Plutarch said:

"Since it was not in the hope of gaining honor or riches, nor out of mere impulse, or by chance that he engaged himself in politics, but he undertook the service of the state as the proper business of an honest man, and therefore he thought himself obliged to be as constant to his public duty as the bee to the honeycomb."

Are there worthy motivations for public service other than love of country and dedication to its highest goals?

Yes, at least one deserves mention. It is the exciting privilege of being an active living part of one's times.

And what times they are.

The maintenance of peace or the holocaust of atomic war.

Economic growth or depression.

Sensible tax, fiscal and monetary measures or destructive extremes of inflation or deflation.

Expanding world trade or America isolated.

Increasingly effective systems of health, welfare, and education or inadequate public services.

Scientific progress on earth and in space or a stagnant society amid diminishing resources.

The rights and dignity of man increasingly respected at home and abroad or retreating to acceptance of tyrannies of man over man, new and old.

The happy resolution of these and other great issues of our time will depend in large measure on those who perform public service at the national level.

Perhaps, one story will make the point.

Toward the end of World War II a friend and associate left the Government to resume a highly successful private law practice in New York after 8 years of fine service at various levels of administration in the New Deal and wartime agenceis. Six months later, I saw him and asked for his impression of his tenure in Government. His reply went like this:

"I'm glad that when I was at the height of my powers, although I was wielding a very small brush, I was painting on a very large canvas."

There are many other good motivations. One was brought home to me recently. I was riding back through darkly lit downtown Washington, past the monument and the White House, on New Year's Eve with a man now in his eighties, who served with distinction under five Presidents beginning with Theodore Roosevelt and ending with Truman. He peered through the window at the passing scene he had viewed so often. I inquired as to his thoughts. Simply, he said: "I was thinking of all the fine, wonderful people I've known in this town."

Perhaps no treatment of this subject on a Yale occasion would be complete without a reference to that Yale man of other years whose public career under Theodore Roosevelt, Taft, Wilson, Coolidge, Hoover, and Franklin Roosevelt has never been surpassed in its high rectitude and fine motivation. I refer to Henry L. Stimson.

In the book written in association with McGeorge Brundy, it is revealed that at his 20th Yale reunion he spoke informally to his friends of his stint as a U.S. district attorney:

"When I was taken, as you might say by the back of the neck * * * and turned loose with nothing but my oath of office to guide me, the first feeling was that I had gotten out of the dark places where I had been wandering all my life, and got out where I could see the stars and get my bearings once more; and there has been, during those 2 years, a feeling that the work I was doing amounted to a little bit, or would amount to something if I put my whole heart into it and did it thoroughly. And it has made a tremendous difference and a tremendous change in the satisfaction of my professional life. There has been an ethical side of it which has been of more interest to me, and I have felt that I could get a good deal closer to the problems of life than I ever did before, and felt that the work was a good deal more worthwhile. And one always feels better when he feels that he is working in a good cause."

And so—love of country, a desire to be an active, living part of his times, associating with fine people in a good cause—these are some of the beter motivations for national public service.

No one has summed it up better than President Kennedy in his state of the Union message when he said:

"Let the public service be a proud and lively career. And let every man and woman who works in any area of our National Government, in any branch, at any level, be able to say with pride and honor in future years 'I served the U.S. Government in that hour of our Nation's need.'"

And so, as we pay tribute to a Yale man who has so served, may we hope that our university and this organization may find ways and means and will to cause an increasing number of Yale's finest to give fresh meaning to its ancient motto.

Becker Collection of Political Memorabilia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on June 8, of last year, the U.S. National Museum—the Smithsonian Institution—which I am privileged to serve as a member of its Board of Regents, opened a unique and historic exhibit of rare relics of our Presidential election campaigns from Presidents Washington to Eisenhower—and now to President Kennedy. All too often the visible manifestation of a political campaign, namely, banners, buttons, brochures, and the other objects associated with our unique system of electioneering, are discarded as worthless immediately following the election. However, historians have found much of this material of great interest and value in understanding personalities of the candidates and the issues of the patriotic election.

Washington is indeed fortunate in having among its citizens one of the Nation's foremost collectors of political memorabilia. Washington attorney Ralph E. Becker has massed a magnificent and representative collection of material which in and under itself gives us an insight into the whole spectrum of American politics over a period of 160 years. He is still acquiring valuable additions to the collection which has also stimulated other citizens to give to our National Museum.

I would like to take this occasion to call to the attention of the Senate the remarks by Dr. Leonard Carmichael, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, on the occasion of the opening of the exhibit of a part of Mr. Becker's collection. I hope that this collection may attract other gifts and receive cooperation from citizens and particularly Members of Congress to assure our National Museum that it will continue to grow in size and importance so that future generations may have insight into the politics of yesterday, today, and tomorrow. I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Carmichael's and Mr. Becker's remarks

on the same occasion be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY DR. CARMICHAEL

Distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, we are gathered this evening for a red letter event in the history of the Smithsonian Institution. Most of you in this audience know much about the Smithsonian. But I may remind you that the Institution was founded 114 years ago as a result of the generosity of the distinguished English scientist, James Smithson. He left his entire fortune to found in the city of Washington an institution for the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men.

Today, the Smithsonian has become, in number of objects, probably the largest museum in the world. In number of visitors it is also almost certainly the leading institution of its kind. In April of this year more than 1 million visitors came to the Smithsonian. In May more than 1 million people came to visit our buildings on the Mall. Until that time never before had as many as a million people come to the Institution in one month. The popularity of the Smithsonian has grown in recent years because of the work of the Regents of the Institution in allowing the rejuvenation of its displays. It has also grown in interest every year since its foundation because American citizens and indeed many residents of other countries have contributed outstanding gifts to the Institution.

Tonight we are met on one of the occasions on which we officially receive a great gift and express, on behalf of all Americans, the gratitude that we must feel for a notable addition to the collections of the Institution.

It may surprise some of the members of this audience to realize that the collection of the political items and memorabilia connected with political campaigns is a recognized field of historical research and of specialized collecting. There is, for example, an organization of some hundreds of members, the American Political Item Collectors Association which is dedicated to the advancement of knowledge in this field.

Through the years the Smithsonian has received many important gifts in this area. For example, we have in our collections notable items made possible by Mrs. Arnold Miles. We also have recently received from the family of Mr. Harry T. Peters over 2,000 lithographs of American scenes between 1840 and 1870, many of which deal with political subjects.

The greatest collection, however, in this field that is to come to the Smithsonian this evening is one presented by Mr. Ralph E. Becker. This collection of some 25,000 items represents Mr. Becker's original, insightful and effective work as a collector for a third of a century.

Ralph E. Becker, Esq., will now officially make the presentation of his collection. Mr. Becker is an internationally known Washington attorney, author, and civic leader. He is a member of the bar of the State of New York and of the District of Columbia and is especially well known for his legal work in international, administrative, and corporate law and in law as related to modern scientific developments. He has been a delegate to various international conferences and is a member of the Legion of Honor of France and a holder of the Southern Cross Decoration of Brazil. He also has a number of decorations awarded him during the time of his American military service during World War II.

We, at the Smithsonian, know and respect Mr. Becker because of his broad interest in the cultural activities of the Nation.

It is a privilege for me to introduce Mr. Ralph E. Becker. Unless the rumor that I have heard is incorrect, Mr. Becker at this time wishes to say something about a presentation of great significance to the Smithsonian Institution. Mr. Becker.

REMARKS BY RALPH E. BECKER

Dr. Carmichael and friends, I want to take this occasion to publicly dedicate to the Smithsonian Institution my personally valued collection—the memorabilia of the American presidential election campaigns of the 19th and 20th centuries. For over 30 years, in travels to every State in the Union, I have tried to amass material representative of the unique system of projecting personalities and issues to the electorate, to the use of objects symbolic to candidates and their views. From our country's inception (most emphatically from the days of Tippecanoe and Tyler Too) the banner, button, billboard, and broadside have played an essential role in broadcasting the nominees and their political philosophies. Our political system assured such development. Widespread suffrage and the State election process made the votes of every locale critical. However, our geographical size barred the candidates from personal exposure to the voters. The substitute for personal contact was the campaign prop, the cartoon, chapeaux, ceramics, and canes, gimmicks, yes; trinkets, yes—used today; forgotten tomorrow, yes. Worthless? Emphatically not. The value of this material is not, with few exceptions, intrinsic. Its significance lies in the story it tells of our political history. Since politics is the sine qua non of a democracy, we can learn of the campaign material much of the men who shaped our destiny.

In the firm belief that my collection is interesting, educational, and of historical purpose, I wish for it to be available to those to whom it rightfully belongs—the people of the United States. I have therefore entrusted my collection to the Smithsonian Institution whose national character, vital location, and vast facilities assure that this material will enjoy the largest and most diversified audience. My designation of the Smithsonian Institution as repository of this collection was done with the expectation that other individuals and collectors possessing like material will contribute all or portions of their collections, so as to insure the expansion and historical vitality of the Smithsonian's store of political Americana. Indications that this collection will continue to grow and be added to in the future are already present in the form of pledges by the chairmen of both major political parties to deposit with the Smithsonian representative material of each succeeding campaign. I should also say that all of the candidates mentioned, or who were in the running from January, have all agreed and are sending material to this Institution so it can be preserved for posterity. It is my fond hope that the Smithsonian will make my collection available to not only the casual visitor, but to the schoolchildren of America and the serious student of political history and science. I trust that by observance and study of my collection, many Americans will be brought to a fuller appreciation of our political heritage and a greater understanding of man's noble experiments in government—American democracy.

In conclusion, I cannot let this occasion pass without expressing my deepest appreciation for the gracious and willing help which I have received from this Institution's distinguished Secretary, Dr. Leonard Carmichael, and his entire staff—but most particularly to Dr. Wilcomb Washburn, Mr. Charles Dorman, and Mr. Robert Widder. Let me also pay tribute to Mr. Paul Weckesser and thank Maj. Gen. Brooke E. Allen for making possible the appearance of the Headquarters Command Band of Bolling Air Force Base, directed by Lt. James E. Johnson, on this occasion.

Problems of American Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an understanding statement on the problems of American youth which has just been issued by the Guild of American Lithuanian Lawyers and Jurists in Chicago be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROBLEMS OF THE AMERICAN YOUTH

America is the land of opportunity for people of all ages. The older generation is slipping away from the active ranks, and the youth will inherit the prerogative to perpetuate the existence of this great democracy. However, the last decade in the United States brought forth an unforeseen rise in juvenile delinquencies and the governmental agencies are finding it difficult to cope with its harassing problems.

The United States is the most powerful Nation in the world financially, economically, scientifically, and industrially. It is seeking to maintain the leadership for justice, peace, and tranquility throughout the entire world. But it is difficult for many nations to accept our leadership for the problems of the globe if our own leaders are unable to solve our immediate domestic problems.

It is estimated today that about 18 million youths are involved in one or another form of delinquency. The enforcement of law and maintenance of reformative institutions cost the taxpayers annually the astronomical estimated figure of $7 billion. The educators, psychologists and law enforcement agencies have failed to find the cause and the effective remedies for the elimination of this situation.

Former judges, prosecutors, and attorneys of Lithuania now residing in the Chicago area have joined our organization. The combined efforts of these professional men from Lithuania and of Chicago American Lithuanian lawyers will form a strong nucleus of activity in seeking a solution of juvenile delinquency problems.

Some TV is a destructive element influencing the inexperienced and immature minds of our youth. The daily TV programs portray murder, gangsterism, shootings, and such programs are influencing the minds of the youth, that the only way they will get around in the world is to have a gun and the knowledge of how to use it. Our modern society, while pursuing other problems, is bypassing the problems of impetuous youth. Many TV programs are poisoning the minds and injecting criminal tendencies in our children so that becoming so accustomed to the acts of crime glorified by some TV programs they will grow up with the desire to be likewise brave, independent, and rough and ready. In viewing TV programs day in and day out our youth becomes so influenced that they ultimately lose respect both for law and decency. Today's headlines cry robbery, larceny, rape, and gunplay, and the streets are no longer safe for the people. Hiring more law enforcement officers creates a still greater burden on the people. Yet a police officer cannot be placed on duty in every city block 24 hours a day.

We appeal to you individually and collectively, for a constructive plan to eliminate this daily school of crime so freely provided by some TV programs for delinquency,

instead of for decency, responsibility and honor in all walks of life. It is the hope of all parents that their children may achieve a higher education and gain dignity and respectability. We must stop the degrading influences to which our youth are subjected, and instead, provide sound and healthy influences. If it is too late to undo damages inflicted upon our present day teenagers, at least let us unite and avoid a future crop of delinquents. Your suggestions for an immediate citywide conference are desirable.

Wage and Hour Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the views of the Virginia Farm Bureau Federation on the pending House bill to amend the wage and hour law, as expressed this week at a meeting of its board of directors by Mr. C. E. Johnson, Jr., of Rappahannock County, Va.—an outstanding breeder of registered Angus cattle.

There being no objection, the views were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIRGINIA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION VIEWS OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION DEALING WITH WAGES AND HOURS (H.R. 3935)

An unemployed person is defined as one who cannot be gainfully employed in his neighborhood. For some months this country has been in a fairly serious business recession. Unemployment is heavy, there are a number of distressed areas, and automation is looked upon as a bad word. The plain facts are that in a number of areas wages have risen faster than productivity, automation is being pushed hard, and time is needed to get folks back to work.

The proposed bill on wages will raise wages and extend coverage. The result will be an increase in automation and more of these people will be laid off since their employers simply cannot afford to hire them. They will be at the bottom of the wage ladder where unemployment is greatest now. This will mean more welfare cases and less self-respect left for some good folks who don't mind work. Then this summer our youngsters will have a harder time finding employment, and hence gaining experience. Employers just cannot afford to use them.

That isn't all. When you pick up the bottom rung of this wage ladder, all the others go up, too. Labor is going to maintain its differentials. We will find that what looked like a modest little raise for a few people is now a big load for the whole country. Going from $1 to $1.25 is a raise of 25 percent, which may be the goal, and it is a high one. When you pay out more money for the same work, the whole thing runs us into higher prices, or more inflation. We will see fewer exports, fewer jobs, and more imports.

This brings up some other matters that are worrying our Government and our smart business people. One of these is loss of confidence in our dollar. The other, going along with loss of exports, is the drain on our gold reserves. Farmers aren't supposed to understand these things, and I am no exception. However, I am sure that my listeners understand.

Now another current and urgent problem comes up. Our old people have been so roughly treated by inflation that they are now very much on the public conscience. This bill on wages, through further inflation, can well wipe out some of the things that are presently being planned for our old folks and their position will be worsened.

You may be sure that farmers will be called upon to pay their part of the bill. This we will do, for our machinery and supplies as well as our marketing will cost more. Would someone recognize the fact that farm trouble is more a matter of costs being high than of our gross income being low?

On top of this, we will have to compete for labor, as always, and our labor costs will go up. For example, one of our labor competitors is the local sawmill operator, who softens his competition by buying logs from us—a fair source of farm income. However, the lumber market is a bit draggy, so if this man has to increase his wages, the only way he can get out of the squeeze is to lower the price of logs. The farmer pays again.

Last, but not least, I want to look at the general principles here. Federal control of wages and hours does not smack of freedom. If our Government can say that we work a maximum of 40 hours for a minimum of $50, can't it just as well say that we work a minimum of 60 hours for a maximum of $15? The farsighted labor leader should consider this.

C. E. JOHNSON, Jr.

Uniforms of American History, by Maj. Alexander R. Lawson, Army of the United States, Retired

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. CAHILL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, Maj. Alexander R. Lawson, Army of the United States, retired, of Thorofare, Gloucester County, N.J., who served 40 years in the civilian component parts of our Armed Forces, has prepared a most valuable historical set of pictures entitled "Uniforms of American History, 1600 to 1953." In collecting the material for this remarkable series of pictures he was ably assisted by Sgt.-Maj. Leon W. Little, U.S. Marine Corps, retired.

It has required untold hours of work and widespread research to obtain the basic information for this truly great collection. While the intent in producing this series of pictures was to depict the changes in the uniforms of American history, nevertheless, there are also included many examples of uniforms of other nations. Taking all of these pictures together they number upward of 400. These pictures are not only interesting, but highly educational.

The slides, that have been made from original water colors, have been shown all over this country. And, as an indication of the spirit of patriotism that dominates Major Lawson in this fine work he has performed, he will not accept any remuneration for their use and gladly and willingly makes the pictures available to all interested parties. Major Lawson is entitled to great credit for the fine service he has rendered.

Expanding National Park System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, on January 4 of this year the Christian Science Monitor published an interview of Conrad L. Wirth, Director of the National Park Service. The interview was conducted by Courtney Sheldon. In the interview Mr. Wirth described the plans and proposals of the National Park Service for an expanded national park and recreational area system.

Our fine system of national parks is one of our greatest national treasures, increasing in use, value, and meaning as our population expands and becomes increasingly urban. Congress would be well advised seriously to consider the further expansion of this system, especially with an eye to preserving for the future the remaining sites of particular historical significance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the report of this interview.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Jan. 4, 1961]

EXPANDING NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM—A CAPITAL INTERVIEW WITH CONRAD L. WIRTH

(By Courtney Sheldon)

WASHINGTON.—Conrad L. Wirth, who oversees the country's vast empire of national park and historic sites as Director of the National Park Service:

Says his Department is preparing "a full report on what we think the ultimate national park system should be."

Indicates new additions will be in "the seashore and historic field."

Plans to present a one-package program to Congress, including the overall program and its cost.

Mr. Wirth, where are some of the sites that you feel should come under the National Park Service in the future?

Well, within the next 6 months we hope to come out with a full report on what we think the ultimate national park system should be. There are sites that should be preserved that are historically important in developing America; sites that tell the story of our social, religious, economical, and cultural development as a nation. In addition, we will indicate areas of natural history that should be included in a well-rounded-out national park system. These will include all types of land forms, such as mountains, prairies, and shores with their various animal life and plant growths.

Which among these do you feel should have priority in the sense that if you don't move quickly, the chance of your preserving them will be more difficult?

Of course, the historic and natural areas closer to centers of population are rapidly being used up. If they are to be saved, we must move fast. Secondly, the land values all over are rapidly going up, so we must set our program and provide for carrying it out without delay.

For instance, up in Massachusetts the Minuteman site, which was approved last year, is estimated to cost $5,500,000 at the

present time. We are spending $500,000 this year. Well, if we spent only $500,000 a year on the Minuteman, it would take over 10 years to buy it, but by the end of that time my guess would be that we would have to pay better than $10 million for the area recommended, and in the meantime we would no doubt lose many of the historic values.

Is Congress quite responsive to these needs, or is this something the public should be more aware of and, in turn, inform Congress?

Well, that is why we are very anxious to get our complete program in one package so that Congress can see what the overall program includes and will cost. Congress reflects the reaction of the people.

Our recommendation will contain our estimate of the cost and how fast it would have to be done to stay within the estimates. We expect to submit our recommended program not later than June.

We hope to accomplish the acquisition of whatever program is approved within a 5-year period. Land values almost always go up. Further, land ownership of the type we are talking of is a sound public investment, not likely to depreciate and will have a good economical influence on the country in general, and the region in particular.

Does a big proportion of your long-range program involve new acquisitions or additions to present sites?

There will be some additions to existing areas. There are more adjustments to the boundaries for administrative purposes. By far the greatest part of the land purchase program will be for new areas, and we also expect donations for this purpose. I will say that most of the areas will be in the seashore and historic field and in the category of large recreation areas, rather than national parks as such. There will be, however, some additional national park areas.

Under your Mission 66, your 10-year plan for improvements, there was a provision for you to work out a national recreation plan with other agencies?

Yes, that was one item of the overall Mission 66 program. Since then Congress has established the National Recreational Resources Review Commission and we are cooperating with them, as are other Federal and State agencies.

Undoubtedly an overall plan for expansion of the NPS is going to have a high price tag. Is there any way part of this cost can be borne by either higher rates for the concessions in parks or more concessions?

No not to any great extent. We do not consider the national park areas as resort areas. They are set aside as a great national scenic and historic heritage for all of the people. They are an investment in the physical, mental, and spiritual well-being of Americans as individuals and indirectly contribute to the economy of the Nation.

A person who visits or camps in a park does pay an entrance fee. We feel if he can get to the park, he can pay $1, or $2, or $3 for a couple of weeks' use of the area. The concessionaire is an operator who has a contract with the United States. He is in business just like any other business in a town adjoining a park. He pays the same taxes that they do. He pays for all the improvements to handle the public that wish rooms and meals. We are interested in keeping his charges at a level with other businesses and have him give the best service possible to the public.

Our policy under Mission 66 is to require o the concessionaire to provide only those services necessary for the enjoyment of the parks in accordance with the purpose for which they were established. We have a definite policy of not putting developments and overnight accommodations in the parks when they can be handled equally well outside the park.

I notice you encourage people in some parks out West to stay overnight outside the parks.

Yes, this year there will be better than 66 million people coming into the parks. What this means to the business of the country in employment, income, and taxes along the Nation's highways, far exceed anything that we could possibly collect from increasing our entrance fees. It is hard to put an economic value on the parks, except we know they contribute greatly to the recreational travel industry of America.

How does the public react to what you are doing?

I think the national park concept is stronger today than it has ever been. The first national park in the world is Yellowstone National Park, established in 1872. The important thing now is that we have millions and millions of people living in the cities. There will be more in the future, and as our lands become used up for living purposes the national parks will become even more valuable to the Nation as a heritage to refresh the mind as well as the body. I would like to have my grandchildren and their grandchildren know and see nature at its best, how the earth is formed and provides for all living things as well as mankind. And further, I think it is important that we preserve some places where we can get some good clean dirt in our toes once in a while.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, there are some 10 million Byelorussians living in their historic homeland in the northwestern part of the Soviet Union, west of Moscow, but these sturdy and stouthearted millions have been so completely cut off from the free world that one seldom hears of them. They were almost lost in Czarist Russia in the old days, and today they seem to be lost in the Soviet Union. But if the free world does not hear of them, or from them, they should hear from the free world at least once a year, on March 25, for that is their independence day.

For centuries these unfortunate people had suffered under the autocratic regime of Russia, but they had not given up hope for their eventual freedom. Toward the end of the First World War when the czarist regime was not more Byelorussians were free to proclaim their independence, and this they did on March 25, 1918. Then for about 3 years they worked, fought, and lived freely in their reconstituted Byelorussian National Republic. But the new and weak state could not survive the attack of the Red Army. Early in 1921 the country was overrun, and then made part of the Soviet Union. Since then free Byelorussia is no more, and freedom survives only in the hearts of its liberty-loving citizens. In observing the 43d anniversary of their independence day we in the free world echo their genuine patriotic sentiment.

"Peace, Security, and/or Freedom?"—Address by Clif Stratton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, last November Mr. Clif Stratton, who served in the Press Gallery of the Senate for many, many years, made a speech in Topeka, Kans., entitled "Peace, Security, and/or Freedom" before the Fortnightly Club.

Mr. President, I submitted the remarks to the Government Printing Office, and I am informed the cost for printing will be slightly larger than the amount usually allowed. The cost to print the address in the RECORD has been estimated by the Director of Planning Service to be $222.75.

Mr. President, notwithstanding the fact that it will exceed the amount allowable, I ask unanimous consent to have the address by Mr. Stratton printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, members, I give you the theme song of what is perhaps the oldest profession in the world—the prostitute: "Whose bread I eat, his song I sing."

And also, an old French proverb: "The more it changes, the more it is the same."

Recently I read, and clipped, the following advertisement from Warner & Swasey in September 12 issue of Newsweek:

"Yes, there is something worse than an atom bomb; the abject fear of it. Enemies want us to believe they have a secret weapon—a gas which saps men's strength and willpower, leaving them no courage to fight, no desire to resist.

"It is true—Russia has such a weapon—fear. Fear of Russia's nuclear bombs and missiles has turned too many Americans into cowards and appeasers. They cry that anything would be better than atomic death. Would it? Would slavery?

" 'Give me liberty or give me death' was the courage that created and built America. We need to remember and revive it.

"The courage of character can make us safer than all the shelters in the world—safer and happier, because we would have self respect. Appeasers can never be anything but serfs. Would such a life be worth living for anyone who calls himself an American?

"Worse than war is the fear of it. Fear and fearful people have no place in this country."

And now I give, from the same source, in a recent issue of U.S. News & World Report:

"There weren't many fringe benefits at Valley Forge. Not much pay, either. Only cold, hunger, pain, danger. You wonder, sometimes, if the modern jukebox American would have stood it, or would understand that these early Americans were paid by self-respect, and kept alive by the faith that honor brings. Let us hope that the so-called modern parents, progressive schools and liberal courts don't smother that spirit before it is needed again— as it will be."

I say to you that the writer of those advertisements said a lot with us of comparatively few words.

In September issue of Freeman magazine I read an article by the Reverend Mr. Kenneth E. Sollitt, minister of the First Baptist Church of Midland, Mich., from which I quote:

"Are we changing our form of government?" he asks, and then proceeds:

"The writings and speeches of the founders of our Republic make crystal clear the fact that, to them, the primal, if not the only function of government, was to protect men in the exercise of their legitimate liberties. Probably nowhere is this better stated than in the Declaration of Independence * * *. Therefore in the writing of the Constitution, everything possible was done to protect the honest, industrious, freedom-loving American citizen from being deprived of his rights, either by other citizens or by the Government itself.

"A limited government of checks and balances was set up, and almost before the ink was dry on the Constitution itself, a Bill of Rights was added to it as a resounding exclamation point to emphasize the fact that our Founding Fathers were determined that every citizen should be protected in the exercise of his legitimate liberties. Powers not specifically mentioned in the Constitution were reserved to the States and to the people who comprise those States.

"For more than a century and a half 'freedom' was the central idea in the American dream and the big word in our language. Then came the 1930's. Thoughts of freedom gave place to thoughts of keeping body and soul together. Franklin Delano Roosevelt was elected President. Congress was bypassed. The Constitution was circumvented. But important things were done in behalf of the needy and the unemployed. And people showed every promise of voting for more and more of the same. In 1938 Mr. Roosevelt wrote:

" 'Government has a definite duty to use all its powers and resources to meet new social problems with new special controls.' This he justified on the ground that it was 'to insure the average person the right to make his own economic and political life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.'

"Unfortunately, this lipservice to the Declaration of Independence kept people from seeing that political liberty and social control are opposites—that you can't keep man in the exercise of his legitimate liberties by imposing on him controls which destroy those liberties. Mr. Roosevelt had invented a new parlor game in which we all stand in a circle each with his hands in the other man's pockets, all expecting to be richer thereby.

"Perhaps it was merely a coincidence, but about this time the Goddess of Liberty disappeared from our dimes and Mr. Roosevelt's picture took its place. The perfect symbol of what had happened to our Government. Another thing some of us didn't understand was that to make a government strong enough to give us all we want we must at the same time make it strong enough to take from us what we have. And what is communism but a government that takes everything one earns and gives back what is left after it fulfills its own desires? Is America moving in that direction, giving its citizens more and more and taking from them more and more until some day we may see it all taken from us on the pretext of protecting us from each other? Have we bought the idea that the redistribution of wealth is a legitimate function of government?

"If so, we have made a complete about-face and a government designed to prevent one man from robbing another has become the instrument through which one man is robbed for the benefit of another."

Next witness is Adm. Ben Moreell (retired), who brings some Hoover Commission reports up to date, after asserting:

"The basic and critical issue is freedom of the individual. We of the ACA (Americans for Constitutional Action) believe that free enterprise, freedom of speech, of doms are but reflections of this basic freedoms are but reflections of their basic freedom. Impair any freedom and you are sure to hurt some individuals."

In 1910 the Central Government cost the average American family $38 per year; in 1955 it had grown to $1,600, or 42 times. (Today it is $1,748.)

Government employees, civilian only, increased from 384,000 to 2,362,000, or almost seven times. (There are now 2,353,000.)

During the same period the population increased only 81 percent, less than double, but the debt of the Central Government went from $1 billion to $275 billion. (It is now $288.8 billion.)

The budget of the Central Government grew from $639 million to $65 billion, (or $6,500 million). (Fiscal 1960 it was $78.4 billion.)

The Central Government now owns about one-fourth of the land area of continental United States. (Government ownership still is growing.)

In 1955 it owned and operated some 3,000 different kinds of business and commercial enterprises in competition with its own citizens. The admiral comments:

"The history of human liberty, as Woodrow Wilson reminds us, is the history of limitations placed on government. As government expands, the liberty of every one of us contracts. It clearly is evident that the American people have been engulfed by the welfare state and its protagonists.

"How did this come about? It was accomplished legally by majority vote of legislators" (the admiral might well have added a Socialist-thinking U.S. Supreme Court) "elected to the U.S. Congress, who conceived it their duty to promote omnipotent government by taxing and spending and making more and more of our citizens dependent upon Government for their livelihoods and even personal needs.

"These legislators," Moreell charges further, "are proponents of enhanced and centralized political power at the expense of individual rights. That is socialism, the natural forebear of communism. The end products have been onerous taxation, politically engineered inflation resulting in a sharp decrease in the purchasing power of our money (some 55 percent since 1933), moral confusion and the decline of personal liberty."

And now let's hear from Maurice H. Stans, Director of the U.S. Budget. We quote from a speech Mr. Stans delivered at a meeting of the Tax Foundation last December 1:

"* * * The $290 billion of current (budgeted) national debt, plus $350 billion future obligations for past services, plus $98 billion of c.o.d.'s, adds to the almost incredible total of almost $750 billion. That, my friends, is the Federal (Central) Government's mortgage on America's future, beyond (in addition to) the annual cost of defense, welfare, and commerce."

The foregoing report from Budget Director Stans brings the following comment from Walter E. Spahr, heading the Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy:

"The national budget is out of control, and this control was lost when an irredeemable currency was inflicted on our people in 1933" (when United States went off the gold standard).

"If a currency is redeemable in that standard gold unit, every individual, to the extent of his purchasing power, can put pressure on his bank, and through it, on the U.S. Treasury and Congress. With a redeemable currency, every individual with buying power has a wire to the central signal system in Washington. With the infliction of an irredeemable currency on our people, those wires were cut and the central signal system was destroyed. The National Government and banks were freed from fear of appropriate pressures by individuals. The national spending orgy began."

And now let's hear from Felix Morley's book, "Freedom and Federalism," published only a few months ago, dedicated "to my grandchildren, hoping that they and their posterity may also continue to enjoy the blessings of liberty" followed by this from James Madison: "The error * * * seems to owe its rise and prevalence chiefly to the confounding of a republic and a democracy. A democracy will be confined to a small spot. A republic may be extended over a large region."

In the foreword to his book Felix Morley includes the following:

"Gradually I learned that the art of government, in all times and for all sorts of societies, may be reduced to very simple elements. It is at bottom nothing more than the reconciliation of two conditions—one essential for cooperative achievement, the other necessary for individual fulfillment. The social condition is order, without which men cannot work together effectively. The more personal condition is freedom, without which some men cannot work either happily or at their best.

"I further came to realize that the outstanding virtue of federalism, which is the distinctively American contribution to political art, is its facility in combining these naturally antagonistic conditions. Since the reconciliation of freedom and order is anything but easy, a Federal system requires both complicated government machinery and a high degree of interest and understanding among its citizens.

"There is a prima facie case for thinking that our Federal system, having at least survived the enormous changes since its establishment in 1787, will continue to serve for a future now unusually unpredictable.

"At least equally possible is the alternative that Federal theory will be discarded, even without war, by the voluntary action of Americans themselves, in favor of that highly centralized, managerial form of government which to many now seems demanded by the complexities of modern civilization.

"Somewhat paradoxically it is argued that dictatorship, the simplest form of government, is best suited for highly diversified societies, although it does seem psychologically desirable to call such dictatorship 'democracy.'

"Both the Constitution of the United States, and those of the 50 States that now together compose it, separate the legislative, executive, and judicial powers, and balance the one against the others. This has been a uniform interpretation of that rather vague clause in the Federal Constitution which says (art. IV, sec. 4): 'The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government.' Republican, as contrasted with monarchial or democratic, meant to the Founding Fathers the division, as contrasted to the concentration, of governmental power."

De Toqueville, the Frenchman, wrote of the U.S. Constitution, considerably more than a century ago: "In examining the Constitution of the United States, which is the most perfect Federal Constitution that ever existed, one is startled at the variety of information and the amount of discernment that it presupposes in the people whom it is meant to govern." And he predicted further that if this discernment should languish, as it certainly is languishing today, America eventually would "fall beneath the yoke of a centralized administration."

Now some words from Friedrich A. Hayek's "Road to Serfdom" (1944) dedicated to "the socialists of all parties". But first a few sentences by John Chamberlain in his foreword to the American edition of Hayek's book:

"The shibboleths of our times are expressed in a variety of terms: 'full employment,' 'planning,' 'social security,' 'freedom from want.' The facts of our times suggest that none of these things can be had when they are made conscious objects of Government policy. They are the fools-gold words. * * * The "Road to Serfdom" is a warning, a cry in a time of hesitation. It says to the British, and by implication to Americans: Stop, look, and listen. It does not make for ingratiating reading. But the logic is incontestable: 'Full employment,' 'social security,' and 'freedom from want' cannot be had unless they come as a by-product of a system that releases the free energies of individuals. When 'society' and 'the good of the whole' and 'the greatest good of the greatest number' are made the overmastering touchstones of State action, no individual can plan his own existence. For the State 'planners' must arrogate to themselves the right to move in on any sector of the economic system if the good of 'society' or the 'general welfare' is paramount. If the rights of the individual get in the way, the rights of the individual must go * * *. He cannot plan his own business, his own future, even his own family affairs, if the 'dynamism' of a central planning authority hangs over his head. In some respects Hayek is more 'English' than the modern English. It may be that he is also more 'American' than modern Americans."

And now from Mr. Hayek himself:

"Yet, although history never quite repeats itself, and just because no development is inevitable, we can in a measure learn from the past to avoid a repetition of the same process. One need not be a profit to be aware of impending dangers * * *. Although we had been warned by some of the greatest political thinkers of the 19th century, by De Toqueville and Lord Acton, that socialism means slavery, we have moved steadily in the direction of socialism. * * * We are abandoning rapidly not merely the views of Cobden and Bright, Smith and Hume, or even of Locke and Milton, but one of the salient characteristics of Western civilization as it has grown from the foundations laid by Christianity and the Greeks and Romans. Not merely 19th and 18th century liberalism, but the basic individualism inherited by us from Erasmus and Montaigne, from Cicero and Tacitus, Pericles and Thucydides, is progressively relinguished.

"It came to pass that toward the turn of the century the belief in the basic tenets of liberalism was more and more relinquished. What had been achieved came to be regarded as a secure and imperishable possession, acquired once and for all. The eyes of the people became fixed on the new demands (query, the New Frontiers), the rapid advance of which seemed to be barred by adherence to old principles. It came more and more to be accepted that further advance could be expected not along the old lines within the general framework which had made past progress possible, but only by a complete remodeling of society (query again, Kennedy and his "New Frontiers"?). The change amount to a complete reversal of the trend we have sketched, and entire abandonment of the individualistic tradition which has created Western civilization."

And, further, again quoting Mr. Hayek:

"That socialism has displaced liberalism as the doctrine held by the great majority of progressives does not mean simply that people had forgotten the warnings of the great liberal thinkers of the past about the consequences of collectivism. It has happened because they were persuaded of the very opposite of what these men had predicted.

"The French writers who laid the foundations of modern socialism had no doubt but that their ideas could be put into practice only by a strong dictatorial government. To them socialism meant an attempt to terminate the revolution' by a deliberative reorganization of society on hierarchial lines and by the imposition of a coercive 'spiritual power.' Freedom of thought they regarded as the root evil of 19th century society. And the first of 'modern planners,' Saint Simon, even predicted that those who did not obey his proposed planning boards would be 'treated as cattle.'

"Nobody saw more clearly than De Tocqueville that democracy as an essentially individualistic institution is in irreconcilable conflict with socialism.

" 'Democracy extends the sphere of individual freedom,' he said in 1848; 'socialism restricts it. Democracy and socialism have nothing in common but one word: "equality." But notice the difference: while democracy seeks equality in liberty, socialism equality in restraint and servitude.'

"To allay these suspicions and to harness to its cart the strongest of all political motives—the craving for freedom—Socialists began increasingly to make use of the promises of a 'new freedom' (the New Frontiers again?). The coming of socialism was to be the leap from the realm of necessity to the realm of freedom. It was to bring 'economic freedom,' without which the political freedom already gained was 'not worth having.'

"The subtle change in meaning to which the word 'freedom' was subjected in order that this argument should sound plausible is important. To the great apostles of political freedom the word had meant freedom from coercion, freedom from the arbitrary power of other men, release from the ties which left the individual no choice but obedience to the orders of the superior to whom he was attached.

"The new freedom promised, however, was to be freedom from necessity. The demand for the new freedom thus was only another name for the old demand for equal distribution of wealth. But the new name gave the Socialists another word in common with the liberals, and they exploited it to full."

But this probably only would heighten the tragedy if it should prove that what was promised to us as the road to freedom was in fact the high road to serfdom.

I have at hand pages more from Mr. Hayek, but time does not permit me to quote them.

Before we leave the matter of redistributing the wealth, however, I bring before you another witness—Jesus Christ. I read from Luke, 12th chapter, verse 13 "And one of the company said unto Him, Master speak to my brother, that he divide the inheritance with me." 14 "And He said unto him: 'Man, who made me a judge or a divider for you?' "

And in regard to peace at any price: Matthew 10: 24 "Think not that I come to send peace on earth; I come not to send peace, but a sword."

And for those who hold, or preach—even through the so-called Socialist gospel—that the Master was in favor of socialism and opposed free enterprise and the profit system, I suggest you read and ponder the parable of the talents. I read you from chapter 25, Matthew, starting with the 15th verse:

"And to one he gave five talents, and to another two, and to another one; to everyone according to his several ability."

16. "Then he that had received five talents went and traded with the same, and made them another five talents."

17. "And likewise he that had received two, he also gained another two."

18. "But he that had received one talent went and digged in the earth, and hid his lord's money."

19. "After a long time the lord of those servants cometh, and reconeth with them."

20. "And he that had received five talents came and brought other five talents, saying, Lord, thou deliveredst me five talents; behold, I have gained beside them five talents more."

21. "His lord said unto him, Well done, thou good and faithful servant, thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things; enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

22. "He also that had received two talents came and said, Lord, thou deliveredst to me two talents; behold, I have gained two other talents beside them."

23. "His Lord said unto him, Well done, good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things; enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

24. "Then he which had received the one talent came and said, Lord, I knew thee that thou art an hard man, reaping where thou hast not sown and gathering where thou hast not strawed."

25. "And I was afraid and went and hid thy talent in the earth; lo, here thou has that which is thine."

26. "His Lord answered and said unto him: Thou wicked and slothful servant, thou knew that I reap where I sowed not, and gathereth where I have not strawed."

27. "Thou oughtest therefore to put my money to the exchangers, and then at my coming I would have received mine own with usury."

28. "Take therefore the talent from him, and give it to him which hath ten talents."

29. "For to every one that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance; but from him that hath not shall be taken even that which he hath."

30. "And cast ye the unprofitable servant into the outer darkness."

In other words, instead of the social state and the "community owes every one a living" (the New Frontiers again?) Christ dealt with the individual. He favored free enterprise, He even indorsed the profit system, as evidenced by the parable of the talents. And payment of interest on borrowed or deposited money.

Now a few words from Howard E. Kershner, page 136 of his "God, Gold, and Government," and I quote his language:

"The 'social gospel' sought through the coercive power of the state is impossible of attainment. It develops hatred between those who are despoiled and their beneficiaries. Few people will work hard over a long period of time if they know they are going to be deprived of the fruits of their toil. On the other hand, those who receive more than they produce soon develop the attitude that the world owes them a living, and that they will be taken care of whether they work hard or take it easy."

I interpolate at this point the experience of the Massachusetts Bay Colony at Plymouth, where they started out with common ownership of land, and equal distribution of products, but had to turn to private ownership and individual enterprise—after which they were able to celebrate Thanksgiving Day. And likewise in Virginia where John Smith finally had to proclaim "they who do not work shall not eat"—and made it pay off.

Returning now to Mr. Kershner, editor of the Christian Economist:

"No civilization ever has been built on that ideology. No nation long has survived after it developed the practice of empowering government to take money from the public and distribute it to this, that, or the other group. When governments have obtained that power they have expanded its use under

the steady pressure of their constituents until high taxes, rising debt, inflation, and bankruptcy have destroyed the Nation. The only safety lies in depriving government of all power to take wealth from some and distribute it to others."

And now a few words from Herbert Hoover, speaking at San Diego, September 17, 1935:

"Our Constitution is not alone the working plan of a federation of States under representative government. There is imbedded in it also the vital principles of the American system of liberty. That system is based upon certain inalienable freedoms and protections which even the Government may not infringe, and which we call the Bill of Rights. It does not require a lawyer to interpret those provisions. They are as clear as the Ten Commandments. Herein is the expression of the spirit of men who would be forever free.

"Our forefathers migrated to America that they might attain them (these rights) more fully. When they wrote the Declaration of Independence they boldly extended those rights (Magna Carta, at Runnymede, 570 years before the Constitution was written; habeas corpus, the petition of rights, the declaration of rights, the growth of maxims of the common law).

"In the hurricane of revolutions which have swept the world since the great war, men, struggling with the wreckage and poverty of that great struggle and the complications of the machine age, are in despair surrendering their freedom for the promise of economic security.

"Even in America, where liberty blazed brightest and by the glow shed light on all the others, it is beseiged from without and challenged from within. Many, in honest belief, hold that we cannot longer accommodate the growth of science, technology, and mechanical power to the Bill of Rights and our form of government. With that I cannot agree. Men's inventions cannot be of more value than men themselves.

"But it would be better that we sacrifice something of economic efficiency than to surrender these primary liberties: in them lies a spiritual right of men. Behind them is the conception which is the highest development of the Christian faith—the conception of individual freedom with brotherhood."

Nearly 15 years later, April 27, 1950, Herbert Hoover addressed the American Newspaper Publishers Association. Owing to time limitations, I can quote from that only briefly, as follows:

"I need not remind you that our page one international issue is Communist Russia. There are seven phases of this experience which I must recall before I come to a proposal of action.

"The third historical phase arrived when our leftwingers had their way in our relations with Communist Russia. They produced the recognition of the Soviet in 1933. They produced the alliance with Russia in 1941. They produced the appeasement of Russia in Western Europe until its reversal by President Truman and Secretary of State Byrnes in 1945. I will not join in the explanations about China.

"Up to now there is agreement on only one point. We lost the game—400 million to nothing.

"Lest anyone think I am a recent convert to these views, I may cite that 9 years and 63 days ago in a public address I warned the American people that collaboration with Stalin to bring freedom to mankind was a gargantuan jest. I used the wrong word. I should have said tragic. For as a result, instead of the expansion of liberty, we witness a dozen nations and 600 million human beings enslaved.

"I have a proposal to make. I suggest that the United Nations be reorganized without the Communist nations in it. If that is impracticable, then a new united front should be organized of those peoples who disavow communism, who stand for morals and religion, and who love freedom."

Thanks for your attention, and if at times you feel a sense of frustration, take refuge in this old saying: "It is not whether you won or lost that counts—but how did you fight, and why."

Kennedy Should Heed Sound Money Counsel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, rather than be accused of any partisanship in discussing the President's economic program, I feel that the editorial of Wednesday, March 15, in the Chicago Daily News, pointing to the President's personal advisors, is worthy of study.

KENNEDY SHOULD HEED SOUND MONEY COUNSEL

For the first time, a top administration spokesman—Commerce Secretary Hodges—has sounded an optimistic note regarding the immediate prospects of the economy.

"I think we've hit the bottom of the recession," said Hodges. He added that the economy could now start an upward swing.

The same conclusion was reached simultaneously by the Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. in its monthly survey. Taking a look at a broad assortment of economic indicators, it said that business news is "more encouraging than at any time since the recession began."

The estimates are significant because they come just before the April 1 "second look" that President Kennedy promised as a prelude to launching, if necessary, a new and more drastic program of economic pumppriming to supplement measures already advanced. This would include a comprehensive tax cut and additional spending proposals.

The President still has to make his decision, and there are strong pressures on both sides.

The AFL–CIO is long since on record as believing that the program Kennedy has already advanced—increased relief and unemployment payments, increased social security payments and higher minimum wages, stepped up highway spending and the rest—falls far short of the need. Some of Mr. Kennedy's personal economic advisers have taken the same view.

These advocates subscribe to the philosophy that the Federal Government, with its vast taxing and spending powers, should be the prime factor in the Nation's economy. Reduced to its nub, their view seems to be that any given level of productivity and any given level of prosperity can be achieved by Federal action.

There have been some encouraging signs that Mr. Kennedy, while already committed to an extensive spending program, is not a doctrinaire welfarist in the image of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

In urging management and labor to coordinate efforts to hold down production costs, he has shown a basic understanding of the relationship between productive efficiency and a sound economy. In advocating more adequate tax writeoffs for depreciating plant and equipment, he has shown comprehension of the need of private enterprise to form new capital for investment.

The President's job is, of course, to strike balances—to serve the human needs of the people and simultaneously to keep the economy sound and strong enough to assure that those needs will go on being met.

Statements already in the record by Prof. Paul Samuelson, Chairman Walter W. Heller of the President's Economic Council, and others of his close economic advisers, make clear that the philosophy of expanding Government spending will go on being well-represented in the President's inner councils. We hope that Hodges, Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon, and other champions of sound fiscal management will not be outtalked and outvoted.

Pecular Opposition of Small Business Administration to Effective Small Business Procurement Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, S. 836 is a bill designed to give small businesses a better chance to obtain defense subcontracts. The great need for legislation in this regard is illustrated plainly in a letter recently addressed to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], a copy of which was also mailed to me.

In this letter the wife of a small electronics manufacturer in Chicago writes:

Just recently we were low bidder on an Air Force negotiated procurement. Everything was approved: our finances, technical proposal, facility, technical ability, etc., but another firm got the contract award. Because it was a negotiated procurement, the men in charge got the firm of their choice to drop down to our price, even though we enlisted the aid of the SBA, it was powerless. The Air Force would not tell them anything.

S. 836 would enable the Small Business Administration to find out just what the position of small businesses are on negotiated subcontracts. The letter is another illustration of the disadvantages suffered by small business when negotiated, rather than competitive procedures are used.

The writer of the letter expresses the same surprise that was felt by the Small Business Subcommittee last week when the Small Business Administration representatives indicated they did not want the authority which S. 836 would give them.

Mr. President, having been assured that Senator SPARKMAN has no objection to my doing so, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Mrs. Robert C. Shur, of Chicago, from which I have quoted, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 17, 1961.

Senator JOHN SPARKMAN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SPARKMAN: This morning, in the March 16 Wall Street Journal, I read with disbelief an article entitled "Small Business Agency Opposes Bill Giving It Role in Government Contract Policy." It seems completely ludicrous that a man President Kennedy picked to be the champion of small businesses all over the country, should turn down such a wonderful program. We were delighted to hear that a bill was being prepared to be presented to Congress that would finally (1) require all Government procurement actions to be made public, (2) allow the Small Business Administration to secure any information it required, (3) put extra loan money into SBA hands, and (4) give a greater percentage of Government work to small businesses. However, when I read that Mr. Horne, SBA Administrator, opposes all of this much needed legislation, I strongly questioned his motives. Whose side is he on? Certainly, he isn't with us.

As you can probably guess, I have a personal stake in all of this. Six months ago, my husband, an electrical engineer, and another extremely capable young project engineer left their very well-paid positions to start a new frontier of their own in America—the land of unlimited opportunity. They started their own electronics firm in Chicago, feeling sure with their combined experience and background of 20 years in handling Government procurements from design to finished product for their respective companies, that they could make a go of it. Needless to say, it has been a regular obstacle course. The fact that they have stayed in business, attests to their failure to be dismayed. It is the rare governmental agency that is willing to give a young company a chance. Never have these young men been questioned on their own ability, for it is well known that they have delivered some very important programs to the various services, but I feel sure only a General Electric could meet some of the other requirements. We are also in an area, where a day never goes by that two or three people don't come in right off the street, and ask for jobs.

Just recently, we were low bidder on an Air Force-negotiated procurement. Everything was approved: our finances, technical proposal, facility, technical ability, etc., but another firm got the contract award. Because it was a negotiated procurement, the men in charge, got the firm of their choice to drop down to our price, and even though we enlisted the aid of the SBA, it was powerless. The Air Force would not tell them anything. Is this the SBA that the taxpayers are paying for, that is supposed to go to bat for us little guys? They are our only spokesmen, yet they are powerless in negotiated procurements. Why must these procurements be so hush hush? It is difficult to even get to bid on these contracts. The defense agency gets together those firms that they wish to bid on a particular procurement. In our family we used to call the SBA the "little people" because we really thought they were for the "little people," but Mr. Horne makes it quite clear, he is not for the "little people." In the above-mentioned negotiated procurement, Mr. Hale, head of the Chicago SBA office (who is a wonderful man) said, if we wished to write a letter of protest, he would help us, but we felt that writing a letter of protest, we would antagonize the people involved, and that we would never be able to get Air Force business again.

I and a great many people say give the SBA some authority, and really give the "little people" a chance. I hope that you, Senator PROXMIRE and Senator CAPEHART will be successful in your fight to give SBA a meaningful role in Government contract policy. Thank you for your time.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. LENORA SCHUR.

The J. H. Jackson Plan for Racial Self-Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an interesting proposal by Dr. J. H. Jackson, president of the National Baptist Convention, U.S.A., Inc., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE J. H. JACKSON PLAN FOR RACIAL SELF-HELP

(Presented to the board of directors of the National Baptist Convention, U.S.A., Inc., by J. H. Jackson, president, January 19, 1961, and was unanimously adopted as the farm aid plan of the National Baptist Convention, U.S.A., Inc.)

INTRODUCTION

The writer of this plan believes firmly that the next step forward by American Negroes as well as the whole free world, will be in the field of an improved economic life. American Negroes must harness their economic resources and organize small possessions into powerful economic forces for the good of themselves, their community, and their Nation. American democracy must solve the problem of unemployment and learn a constructive technique of the distribution of goods and services so that each citizen will not only have his rightful share, but feel the responsibility of earning his share and giving to his Nation the full measure of economic services and dues.

While the author believes in protest as a means of arousing the conscience of those who sin against the principles of democracy and freedom, and as a method of driving out the evils in our society; he believes that we must go further than protest. We must move up to the level of production. We must do more than boycott, we must build. We must do more than condemn the enemies of freedom and democracy. We must conserve and construct and create the values on which freedom and democracy rest. We must do more than blame others for what they have done against us. We must build for ourselves, for our community, and for our country.

The writer has emphasized over and over again that the church should take part in economic life, and use some of its resources to aid others who are in need, and to create opportunities where men and women can earn their own livelihood and develop their own self-respect. The economic work of the church is not complete when it has passed resolutions condemning the sins of exploitation and injustice in our economic and social systems. We must use some of our resources to encourage men and women to so invest their little income that they might be able to develop more of the good things of life.

The soil is one of the primary sources of food and economic security. We must help those who live on the farm to lead a life of dignity, independence, and security. This philosophy has been implemented in what the National Baptist Convention, U.S.A., Inc., has done in Haywood and Fayette Counties, Tenn., to redeem property and to purchase land on which the citizens who were expelled from their former homes might be able to earn their livelihood.

THE PLAN

I. The farm-aid program

The farm-aid program of the National Baptist Convention, U.S.A., Inc., is designed to help create as well as to consume values. It is our belief that the "good earth" must be used constructively to help Negroes as well as other Americans to solve the problems of unemployment, freedom and democracy. We must do more than condemn an unjust and cruel landlord. We must assume some of the responsibilities of a landlord and show by precept and example how one can be both just and productive, and how one may combine friendly attitude and financial success in dealing with tenant-farmers. Its purpose is to put Christianity into business and more business into Christianity. The pastors and religious leaders must be linked directly to the struggles of their people for their help and for their betterment. We must do far more than collect our salaries. We must help our people to earn and preserve more of the good things of life.

It is not enough to throw a picket line around a lagging economy. We must help to bolster that economy and make it more sound, more productive and more just in the distribution of its goods and services. It is not enough to be content for a "lion's share" in a failing economy. We must make that economy more robust and more strong. We may picket to dramatize our resentment to unjust practices and in order to force from unwilling hands our share in an unjust economy, but we must both plant and produce if we are to help a failing economy to become more productive and hence, be of more service to a greater number.

If this Republic is to remain a great political, economic and cultural state, it must produce continuously more creators of values, both economic and political as well as consumers of these values. We must more and more feel the responsibility for contributing to the welfare of the body politic. Hence, we must produce as well as protest, plan as well as pluck out. We must toil as well as trust and sow if we hope to reap.

II. The purpose of this plan as implied above

The purpose of this plan is to go beyond protest to production. Protest is important as a means of registering our complaint and our disapproval of the evils of our society. It is a weapon by which we seek to change the minds and attitudes of those who believe in oppression. But protest is not enough. We must move to active production.

Because we believe that the soil is one of the primary sources of economic well-being, we must anchor our cause in the soil and solicit the resources of the earth to help us win our struggles. We must encourage our people to own more land, more real estate and more of the economic goods of this life. We must spend more time and energy and money building for ourselves a more basic and permanent place in the economic life of this country.

The next basic forward step among Negro people must come through a greater improved economic life. Our educational, civic, and cultural future rests very largely on a healthy, sound and constructive economic position. We must invest in real estate, agriculture, stocks and bonds and government securities, so that when the

wheels of industry and economic progress turn forward, we will move forward with the times and will receive our share of the investments. Voters must have some place to stay, and those who fight for civil rights must have the security that crusaders always need. Our organizations must be so supported that our people will be freed from the economic oppression of high interest rates and cruel mortgage masters.

III. The structure of this farm-aid program

A. Producers Clubs

There is to be, first of all, a producers fellowship or cooperative. This fellowship pools the money to purchase the land, modern farm equipment, and the necessary things to make farming possible. The money may be pooled by national church organizations, by State conventions, by individual churches, pastors, individuals, and other organizations who are interested in such a program.

B. How This Money Is To Be Used

1. To purchase large tracts of land that may be used by many families in a group or may be sold to individual farmers.

2. To purchase the most modern implements and equipment for cultivation of farms. There should be secured mechanics, both as farmers and as experts, to keep the farm machinery intact.

3. There should be agricultural experts who will help the people to make the best use of the soil.

4. There should be managers and leaders to aid the people in going forward in such a way that the best possible crops can be realized from the soil. It is possible that this fellowship could grow into farm cooperatives or producer cooperatives.

C. Consumer Cooperatives or Clubs

When the farmers have raised their crops, there should be created for them a market. This can be done through pastors and State conventions and other voluntary individuals who would be interested in making the farm program a success. The consumers cooperatives would be persons who are not related directly to the farms as such, but who would arrange and organize for the purpose of buying their produce directly from these farms and encouraging others to do so. These voluntary associations would agree to take their vegetables, eggs, chickens, and other available essentials from the farming group. The consumers group would also be responsible for making loans to farmers on large or small scale to enable them to produce their cash crops.

While this whole enterprise will be conducted so that a reasonable profit could be realized, the primary purpose is not profit. But the primary purpose is to help the people as a whole to live a more wholesome economic life on the farm, and to help remove the tensions both in the State and in the Nation. For constructive living on the countryside might do much to help to clear the slums in our cities and also to reduce the number of unemployed and greatly reduce the already overcrowded relief rolls of our metropolitan centers. Persons involved in this enterprise would seek to create those conditions that would guarantee the greatest possible degree of character growth and personality development. We must create a new economic leadership in terms of economic fellowship in cooperative groups, and develop an ownership whose primary interest is the welfare of the people in the community.

IV. The relationship of this farm-aid plan to the State and Federal Government

A. These cooperative units should be allowed to borrow money from the Federal Government on long term plans and low interest rates.

B. The Government should make available to such an enterprise some of the stores of surplus where such would be used to aid both the individuals and the community.

C. The U.S. Government should encourage a greater use of the land by more people which would greatly strengthen the Nation's economy.

D. And if the land is not available, the Government should begin a land reform program that would restrict the ownership of large tracts of land as a luxury for the few in the interest of the ownership and use of the land for the benefit and blessings of many. Such land should not be seized by the Government, but should be sold to the Government for the purpose of allowing large groups to purchase and use the same.

We believe that this farm-aid program will do much to destroy the evils of the sharecropping system and make it an enterprise of sharing the profits and goods in the field of agriculture. The evils of the tenant-farmers can be removed by allowing the tenant to be both tenant and part owner.

As a practical step, the National Baptist Convention, U.S.A., Inc., has already launched a program of purchasing land in Haywood and Fayette Counties, Tenn. Our plan is to have a farmers community occupy the land and a local committee of ministers in Tennessee to serve as a nucleus of the consumers' corporation. The Tri-State Bank, 386 Beale Street, Memphis, Tenn., is the depository for the funds of the National Baptist Convention, Inc. What we have started in Tennessee we hope can be reproduced over and over again throughout the agricultural States of the Nation. Any group or organization is invited to pool money to purchase land and to form consumer cooperatives.

We must know that American freedom may be found in the fields as well as in our metropolitan centers. And the blessings of American culture must extend to the countryside as well as our cities. We beg our Government to help us to teach our people that they can live with dignity on the dusty roads of the rural areas, and that they need not flee from the Southland to find security, peace, and economic salvation.

Let's Get Ahead With Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the industry of our country needs encouragement, especially when it indicates it is capable of growing without Federal pump priming. A recent example of encouragement appeared in an advertisement of the Wall Street Journal. Under unanimous consent, I include the advertising message in the Appendix of the RECORD as a portion of my remarks:

MR. BUSINESSMAN, LET'S GET AHEAD WITH BUSINESS—IS THERE A BIG DECISION PENDING IN YOUR COMPANY THAT YOU CAN GET FINALIZED FASTER?—IF SO, YOU WILL HELP STEP UP THE ECONOMY AND QUICKLY

For example, here is a decision the Wall Street Journal has just made:

We ordered construction started on a big new printing plant in Riverside, Calif. (our eighth plant, our second in California, our third new one nationally within the last year).

This will put a lot of people to work—constructing, roadbuilding, landscaping; making machinery and equipment; shipping, installing, testing; furnishing raw materials and services; operating and distributing. And, as always, still more buying will be generated all back along the line—as these dollars turn over in every kind of business.

Maybe you, too, really need a new facility that, like this one for the Wall Street Journal, can help you serve present and future customers better. One which can actually reduce costs, and provide capacity to serve what just have to be a vastly growing potential in the years ahead.

This much we know: We are never going to regret making our decision—nor our having made it now.

We believe it's a good bet that an important similar decision may be marking time in your company awaiting only a little more confidence and faith.

The only national business daily keeps on getting ahead because it wholly believes it has a tremendous future if it exercises its determination to keep on giving better service.

We hope you feel the same way about your company—and that we may help you.

Economic Conditions in the Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, on February 22 I received a letter from Mr. E. R. McCartney, dean of Fort Hayes, Kans., State College. Because what he expresses in his letter is so pertinent and practical, I ask that the letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORT HAYS KANSAS STATE COLLEGE,
Hays, Kans., February 22, 1961.

Hon. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SCHOEPPEL: Last Sunday afternoon, February 19, I watched Chet Huntley on TV review the terrible economic conditions which were revealed by Secretary of Labor Goldberg in his jaunt to a few of the depressed areas. The obvious implication is that these conditions were so very unusual and so bad that our whole economic society was in grave danger of a complete breakdown. It was implied that a pending disaster was in store for the whole country unless emergency action was taken by Congress at once.

Now I am only a grassroots economist from western Kansas but I cannot see much reason for being stampeded into following some of the misinformation or half truths being peddled from Washington. Here are the bases of my beliefs:

1. The stockmarket which reflects conditions has been rising for several weeks now. It is a pretty fair indicator in cyclical movements.

2. I believe the unions have been trying to stampede the new administration into action in their behalf. They sold the President Goldberg for the Secretary of Labor and another radical for the chairmanship of the National Labor Relations Board. It should be noted that union membership has been declining for sometime.

3. A very severe winter in the East has been hard on retail sales, including automo-

biles, yet for the country as a whole in January sales were only 2 percent below January 1960. On the other hand several nationally known chainstores have all experienced sales increases in January ranging from 1.8 to 7.2 percent.

4. Unemployment in seasonal industries such as the building trades always reaches a low in the wintertime. This is not unusual.

5. The figures on steel production have been misleading because the percent of capacity gives an erroneous picture since the industry never operates at capacity. I believe they consider 75 to 80 percent of capacity as optimum. Therefore if they are operating at 50 percent of capacity they are really operating at 65 to 70 percent of expected maximum.

Additional evidence might be cited but I have given enough to indicate that we are not too bad off in the country as a whole. I recognize there are areas which need some help but these do not produce a national emergency. We are in a recession which was predicted and out of which we will return to better times within this year. This is the pattern of the past.

May I hope you will do your best to help keep the present situation in Congress from becoming weakened by some of the erratic and unfounded grasping for weak straws to save an economy which has not gone to pot.

Greetings to you from your friends at Fort Hays, Kansas State College.

Sincerely yours,

E. R. McCARTNEY,
Dean.

Public Relations for the Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, in reviewing the laws, services, and funds appropriated for the rehabilitation of handicapped individuals in this country at the time of the 1960 National Rehabilitation Association Conference in Oklahoma City last October, I was impressed both by what we have accomplished and what remains to be done. Restoration of physical and mental health and vocational skills to handicapped persons has such a multitude of benefits. It not only restores the hope and confidence of the disabled person and his family, and demonstrates to ourselves and the world our confidence in the worth of the individual. Rehabilitation also brings strength to the Nation by enabling the disabled to become an asset to our society.

Public relations play an important part in building such a program, whether through the lives of a famous Helen Keller or an unknown Jane Jones next door, through the community spirit of newspapers, magazines, TV and radio stations, or through the magic of words and pictures conceived by supporters of rehabilitation activities.

For that reason, I ask unanimous consent for insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD of pertinent parts of a speech entitled "Public Relations for the Handicapped," delivered by William P. McCahill, Executive Secretary of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, at the national meeting, October 12, 1960.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC RELATIONS FOR THE HANDICAPPED

I'll not try to define public relations because that would just start an argument. Generally, we are dealing with human communications, whether from Madison Avenue or from a village main street. I've spent almost 20 years in Marine Public Relations of one kind or another and I am firmly convinced that the best public relations for the corps comes as a result of the conduct of individual marines and the reaction to that conduct by people around him.

It's the same thing with the handicapped to a large degree. Impressions and opinions are formed by people based on the good or bad reactions they have to certain handicapped persons they know, see or meet. This isn't very scientific and I guess the logic books call this generalizing from the particular, but it happens and we either profit or lose depending on the good or bad social, personal or work habits of handicapped individuals. It is our ability to communicate the good points to others—and also our ability to understand, explain or attempt to correct the bad ones—that helps determine the public's opinion of the handicapped. Communications is the key.

Helen Keller, who celebrated her 80th birthday recently, is one of the most celebrated women in history and yet, until the magic of communications opened up the world outside, she was a trapped soul, an almost half human. Communication was to her the touchstone of freedom, the opening door to a life of purpose. It has been thus for millions of handicapped persons who less dramatically have entered a life of purpose and of usefulness during the past years.

Liberty and freedom for the handicapped has been nourished and kept alive by many of the men and women at this convention with whom we have been communicating this week.

One of my favorite quotations and one which was sent to all State chairmen and secretaries of Governors' committee is a line written by Goethe many years ago. The quotation is simple but powerful. It reads: "There is nothing more frightful than ignorance in action." And, I believe that it goes without saying that where there is a breakdown in communications—in public relations—we are quite likely to be frightened by the resulting actions taken in ignorance. So, it is quite natural that this convention has chosen public relations as one of its discussion subjects. Because, if we are to get on with the job of doing the public's business, we have simply got to find new and better ways of improving our public relations. If our thoughts and ideas aren't getting through, we can very well end up frightened by the ignorance which results.

Mr. Victor M. Ratner, in addressing the 1958 Convention of the National Society for Crippled Children and Adults, said:

"I've spent my working life trying to move different kinds of ideas, with many different techniques, into many different kinds of heads. I might add, without any great success. For comunications, persuasive communications, is one of the toughest jobs on earth. It's been so for a long, long time, at least since the Tower of Babel. I think the biggest lesson I've learned over the years is how really tough it is to commnnicate well."

Mr. Ratner then went on to define communication as "It is to try to move a fact or an emotion or an idea from inside one head to inside another. And what makes communication such a peculiarly difficult job is that the space from inside one head to another can be one of the greatest spaces in the universe."

In a recent issue of the Public Relations Journal is an article titled "The Challenge of Space Communications," by Don Karshan. The subtitle assures us that the conquest of space will offer a new opportunity in communications—television, radio, teletype, among others.

Public Relations Executive Karshan then brings the Tower of Babel up to date, communicationswide, when he says:

"Communications satellites will introduce public relations problems almost as complex and mysterious as the maze of systems that comprize the towering launching vehicles. To cite a few: The peoples of the world speak in more than a thousand tongues. Hundreds of different dialects are spoken just in China; there are thousands in the Asian Continent. Multilingual channeling is within our present capability. We are even developing simultaneous machine translators. One problem is the distortion of content by automatic processing—those fine inflections and colloquialisms in the many dialects and cultures that can be twisted out of shape, meaning and accuracy. Then there will be content. What will offend and not offend among the hundreds of different societies, each with their own religious, moral, sexual and other traditional mores?"

If we think we have problems now, just wait until we are faced with the communications and public relations problems of the space age.

We have learned a great deal during the past 15 years regarding the roles of the handicapped as workers. We have assessed the roles of the several influences which have brought us to where we are today—two world wars, a Korean conflict, modern near miracles in medicine and research, the Wagner-Peyser Act, the Vocational Rehabilitation amendments of 1954, the philosophy that America, truly, needs all of us and most importantly, the performance of the handicapped. And, we have at long last begun to view the handicapped not as random people with differences but as intelligent persons functioning quite normally within their particular work situations, functioning in spite of physical differences. This, I submit, has been a victory for the handicapped on the public relations front.

A sterotype has been destroyed in large degree and today employers and the general public—and the communications media—are more concerned with what a man or woman can do than in what they can't do. The communication of this image of a qualified employee has given untold hundreds of thousands of handicapped persons a freedom economically, socially and spiritually undreamed of a short generation ago.

This century won't be remembered as much, in my opinion, for the marvelous man-made inventions as much as for its proper use of God's most marvelous invention, man himself. This will be remembered as the age of the one-legged halfback, the blind collegiate wrestling champ, of wheelchair basketball and amputee baseball. It will be the age in which one paraplegic worker dared to hope and write, "Maybe some day research can put me back together again."

Our ability to communicate to America—and to the world—that "ability counts, not disability," and that "it's good business to hire the handicapped" has been a powerful weapon against the deadly disease of materialism because we have communicated and substantiated the God-given dignity of the individual to find his place on the job. Each time a handicapped person is rehabilitated into employment and useful living, another resurrection of one of God's children has

been consummated. Ours is indeed a divine mission because if you recall, so much of Christ's life was spent with the lame, the halt, and the blind.

In the Old Testament, the shape of things to come, Isaiah said that in heaven the eyes of the blind would be opened, the ears of the deaf unstopped, the tongues of the dumb loosened, and the lame man leap like the hart. The handicapped have come to expect—and receive—these things this side of the grave. They have combined their faith in themselves with their hope in others to achieve freedom on the job.

We don't have to wait for a second Pentecost to still the babel of voices arising as we enter the space age. All we have to do is to remember that the handicapped can continue to achieve freedom through our ability to communicate their talents to others—from inside one head to inside another head as Mr. Ratner said.

I'd like to share with you a quotation which I read every day on my desk:

"On the plains of hesitation bleach the bones of countless millions who, at the dawn of victory, sat down to rest, and resisting, died."

I think that's where we are today. Public relations is not the end all and be all, the alpha and omega, but it does have a part and a very important part in our work for the handicapped.

Project HOPE: Its Work and Purpose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, in my district, as in the other congressional districts of our country, there is great interest in an unique humanitarian project—Project HOPE—which is carrying not only the good will but the good works of the American people to distant lands.

Recently Dr. William B. Walsh, the president and founder of that project, which has been indorsed by the Congress, and which is receiving the assistance and cooperation of various agencies of the Government, returned to this country, after being with the S.S. *Hope* in Asia. The interest on the part of people everywhere in what he has to report is tremendous.

Because I know what the things which he can report, better than anyone else can do it, will be of great interest to all Americans, I am pleased to have inserted in the RECORD a speech made a few days ago in New York by Dr. Walsh to the Pharmaceutical Advertising Club, as follows:

REMARKS BY DR. WILLIAM B. WALSH, PRESIDENT AND FOUNDER OF PROJECT HOPE

Project HOPE was conceived in late 1958 as part of the Committee on Medicine and Health of the People to People Program under President Eisenhower. It was begun because of a feeling that in the field of medicine and health we had a weapon which had been little used in our technical assistance programs. We have had religious missionaries, of course, but in the new countries the religious missionary has an ax to grind—he is saving a soul—which is laudable, of course. But in some of the Moslem countries, and as you are reading now, even in Africa, there is great resistance to this type of approach.

Nevertheless, the missionaries learned the lesson many years ago that before you save the soul it is better to cure a bellyache or a headache or save a life because in that way you gain acceptance for your religious preaching.

The American people seemed for many years just to take this type of thing for granted—this work in foreign lands—as being just for the missionaries. The Russians, Czechs, Yugoslavs, and even the Chinese have learned the lessons our missionaries have taught us. You may know, for example, that when the Russians built a hospital in Addis Ababa it became not only an excellent hospital, as it is, but a seat of Russian influence. The Chinese have been exporting doctors, as have the Russians, for many years—always following lessons they have learned from the missionaries of the West. They have found that the practice of medicine is one way to reach the people.

I felt, as did my colleagues, that as citizens we should stop beating the Government to death—blaming the State Department for everything that went wrong and counting as pure accident everything that went right. You can spread the Government just so thin so it was time that we, the American people, did something ourselves. Something of a symbolic nature was required—something that could be visualized and recognized and at the same time do some good.

We could have indulged in a treatment project alone—ours has had a significant amount of treatment, more perhaps than we wished it had in the beginning. But to go out just for the purpose of treatment into these parts of the world is like walking through quicksand. You never finish—there are too many to treat. There are too many sick. So we concluded that we should go with a mission, a purpose: that of teaching and training.

We would go only by invitation. We would go only if they shared in the cost. This is one of the advantages of being nongovernment. If it is a government project you not only bear the full cost but you pay taxes in the country in which you help.

We wanted to make a real impact to show these people that the American people are interested in the self-development of others in less fortunate countries. At the same time this was quite selfish because we feel that history hasn't changed. It's been shown time and time again that factories are no good if people cannot work in the factories. Great new highways are no good unless there is industry at either end of the road or something along the road that can lead to progress.

While democracy as we know it may be too expensive for every new government in this world, some form of democracy, some form of freedom must be kept paramount in the minds of these people.

We should stop worrying about what we call nationalism. After all, we were the greatest nationalists in the world in 1776. These people in the developing nations are children of freedom and they are nationalist today. Nationalism should be a weapon of America becaue it is simply another way of saying freedom from outside domination. But we must reach these people with some form of American interest—a form of demonstrable interest.

One of the finest ways to do this is through the medium of medicine and health, because here you reach the masses of the people. Whether they are literate or not, they feel pain, they fear death. We sometimes say life is cheap in the Orient, but it is cheap only relatively. They cry just as hard when their loved ones die. They don't like death. Above all, these nations on whom we're counting for the freedom of our children are losing their leaders, their businessmen, their wise and responsible citizens before they have reached a sufficiently mature age to make the contribution to the world of which they are capable.

So we felt that we had a vehicle—medical teaching and training—now we needed a symbol. We thought of the hospital ships from World War II which were in mothballs. The thought of using these ships was not original with me. We heard the usual objections, one of these ships would be too big, too exepnsive—it does cost $3½ million a year. But one bomber costs you four times that much. While we need the bombers to deter war, we must wage peace, or we are labeled, at least in the eyes of those who know no better, as a country interested only in arms and not in mercy.

Our feeling was that rather than pay taxes to keep these ships in mothballs, we must take one out and see if it will work. We had plans, by no means definite, but rather flexible plans. We knew in general what we needed and what we wished. We also knew that if we wanted a partnership and were to receive cooperation from the countries to which we were going, then not only must we be invited but we must let these countries share in the planning of our activities. That is the method we have followed.

In time we raised what we felt was sufficient money to put this vessel out with a small cadre of doctors, 25 nurses who are the prize of our entire project, a dozen technicians and other medical personnel—all of whom are individuals of great initiative, capable of flexibility, of teaching and treating.

In addition, we add to this cadre, on a rotation basis, doctors from this country who have volunteered to come as teachers for periods of from 2 months to 4 months. These periods have to be flexible because we found when we arrived in these nations that inland transportation is a real problem. So some of our doctors had to come and go more at the convenience of transportation available than at the convenience of our needs on board. Nevertheless, we survived all of these early growing pains.

The proof exists in Indonesia where the people were happy with what we had brought them. In fact, within 10 days after the arrival of our first group of rotating physicians with the ship in Djakarta, we were asked by the Ministry of Health to take over a hospital which they had built with their own funds and to staff it as a teaching and training institute. The United States has not been asked to do this kind of thing for many years.

It is proof to us that our work had been well received. It becomes more significant when considering the Russian reaction—and thank God they are reacting to us for a change—which was to offer a 200-bed hospital to the Indonesians. The Indonesians accepted the hospital on the condition that only Indonesian personnel would work in this hospital. This hospital will be completed in 1962, but we hope by that time to have a fully trained staff of Indonesians in the Ibu Sukarno Hospital to take that over before its completion. Thus our teaching and training is significant.

Other incidents which have occurred prove what we have accomplished. At Sumbawa in Indonesia we were told by one of the greeters that he didn't even know where the United States was; that he had never seen an American flag but that he would always remember the American people with a warm heart because this was the first time any foreigners had come to his island except to steal his rice.

Now, this is a positive ten-strike for us here in America. You must remember that each of these countries has the same vote

in the United Nations as we do and if Mr. Stevenson was correct in his estimate of the Red Chinese situation, you can see that our vote is getting to mean less and less as each of these new countries comes along.

It is vital that these countries understand the humanism of the American people. This may be hard for each of you to believe because you dig in your pockets constantly to contribute to one thing or another. But others in far off lands do not know the generosity and the selflessness of Americans.

I was in Djakarta when they were having the Gizenga and Lumumba riots there. Of significance this particular day is that the streets were spread with streamers put up by the PKI, the Communist arm in Indonesia, saying "Convene the Congolese parliament"; another read, "Down with the imperialists who have murdered Lumumba," and "Gizenga must be recognized."

That same afternoon I had to leave to join the ship at Ambonia which is about 1,800 miles north in the Molucca Islands. To get to the ship we had to go through about 35 kilometers of jungle road. As we drove along this road, the moment the children saw there were Americans in the jeep they came running out smiling and waving their hands and yelling "Hopie, Hopie, Hopie." This was gratifying to hear instead of "Yankee go home," believe me. As we came to town, we were in for a shock because we saw streamers spread across the street for about a half a mile. As we read these streamers, printed in Indonesian, it became a pleasant shock because they said "*Hope* represents the heart of America"; "*Hope* represents American beliefs in humanity," and so on.

The messages were put up there spontaneously by the people of the town and not by any organized party. This is the type of impact *Hope* had made throughout the Indonesian archipelago. This impact has been felt throughout Asia.

I think that so often, we in a democracy are fearful that that which may seem to be grandiose is offensive. The *Hope* ship is not offensive—it is not grandiose. The symbol of this white ship coming in with no propaganda leaflets to distribute, with nothing but American volunteers on board to render a service, is something which is seen by thousands and thousands of people in each of these countries, and for the first time it brings home to them what the American people are really like.

Project *Hope* is not government-to-government aid. More important, this is not a field in which the Soviets can compete.

I took the Russian Ambassador, who insisted on coming to the ship on an independent tour rather than coming with all the other Ambassadors who came through in Djakarta, aboard the ship when it first docked at Djakarta. The most frequent question that he asked was: "Do you mean to tell me that this is sent here by the American people—that this is not a Government project?" I repeatedly told him that it was sent by the American people and that it was not a Government project. Then he said: "But you can't do anything really serious on here." Well, we took him through some of the wards where patients were convalescing after some major procedures. He grunted—and then finally he said that: "If you people would only sign a disarmament pact this is a field in which we would like to compete."

I answered him by simply saying that we were perfectly ready to sign a disarmament pact, although I could not speak for the Government, and more than that, we are ready to compete in this field at any time because we have four more ships which are ready to be taken out of mothballs anytime the American people feel it within themselves to support them for use in other continents. He grunted and walked on, but this was something which bothered him.

Shortly thereafter, a Russian team of 10 doctors arrived in Djakarta and moved into a house next door to the house we call HOPE House—where we house our physicians who are rotating through on the way to transportation. The Russian team managed to find excuses to follow the ship, Bali is the last place they went, trying to determine the impact of the project—the impact on the people. We expected that they would make some inferential criticism of us but this they did not do. At least we did not pick up any evidence of such criticism because it is difficult to be against something like this. However, I am sure they learned a lesson and I wouldn't doubt that we will be seeing a Red fleet very shortly somewhere because I think they did learn some lessons from our operations.

With our facilities and our personnel we are trying to teach at every level—at the level of the ordinary nurses, the doctor when he is available. We are not trying to raise the level of medical education to great heights because I would be a liar if I said we could or would. What we are trying to do is to raise the level perhaps a bit now, and maybe next year a little higher. We are trying to give them the opportunity to improve so they can take care of their own. We are trying to make their orthopedic surgeons—they have two in the whole country—better skilled. We are trying to make their nursing students better nurses. Where we can train a specialist we are trying to train him. But above all, we are trying to train him in the area in which his training is to be applied. We are trying to fulfill what I think is a real concept of democracy in doing this.

To bring them over here and show them the Mayo Clinic or the University of California or Johns Hopkins, is almost cruel. If they study here for 5 years they may no longer be Indonesians but might become Indonesian-Americans. They would not be satisfied when they got home. Above all, they could not put to practice much of the training they have learned here. To bring them here on a 4-month rotational course, in my opinion, is an utter waste. They go from coast-to-coast and see things and return with the realization that they are likely never to have these things at home in their lifetime because they are too expensive. So they work years here and then you get a reverse reaction.

We now have, for example, the first fully trained Indonesian anesthesiologist on board. He is now ready to go back to the university where he can train other younger men.

We are giving him the machine on which he was trained. We have taught him to take it apart and put it together again, and we have left him some spare parts because this is also a vital thing.

This is the level of training that we are attempting to carry out and training should not be looked at in the manner in which we regard it in this country because they are years from our kind of training. Everytime one of our nurses or doctors opens his mouth to an Indonesian, that Indonesian is learning something, if not in the actual technique of medicine, then something in the art of medicine. As project *Hope* men were able to go ashore and take an outpatient facility and double its output by improving the techniques in that facility, they taught those people something which is going to benefit their own population.

That is *Hope's* work—that is *Hope's* purpose.

Statement by Lithuanian American Council, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an eloquent statement by the Lithuanian American Council, in Chicago, recalling the need for our country's continuing support of the aspirations for freedom of the peoples of Lithuania and of the other captive nations suffering under Communist colonialism. We must not relax our efforts until their sovereign rights, their freedom, and their self-government are restored to these peoples.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A STATEMENT BY THE LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL, INC., CHICAGO, ILL.

In view of the approaching of the 43d anniversary of the restoration of Lithuania's independence, the Lithuanian American Council, representing hundreds of thousands of American citizens of Lithuanian birth or extraction, and residing in many cities, towns, and villages throughout the United States, deems it proper to adapt the following statement:

"I

"Since 1918, for a number of years, we, the citizens and residents of this free country, used to celebrate with joy and pride the 16th day of February, because on that memorable day the recognized leaders of the Lithuanian nation, gathered in Vilnius, the historical capital city of Lithuania, and unanimously proclaimed the restoration of independent Lithuania.

"The determination of the people of our native land to get rid of the Russian despotic rule was crowned with success, and Lithuania became free, with her own government based on the principles of genuine democracy.

"The independent Republic of Lithuania, within a comparatively short period of 20 years had achieved a remarkable advance in material well-being of its population, in literature, fine arts and education.

"It has won respect and recognition of practically all nations of the civilized world, and was admitted as a full-fledged member of the League of Nations. The recognition de jure by the Government of the United States was granted in 1922.

"II

"However, the Communist rulers of Russia would not tolerate a free and prosperous country at her borders, and waited for an opportunity to destroy it. This they did in agreement, secretly concluded with Hitler's government of Germany.

"On the 15th of June 1940, the Soviet Union invaded Lithuania by its military forces and imposed upon her a dictatorial Communist regime similar to that of Russia. The human rights and all civil liberties were abolished and, within a few weeks, even the semblance of Lithuania's independence was wiped out. Lithuania was formally incorporated into a Soviet state—in flagrant violation of the peace treaty between Soviet

Russia and the Republic of Lithuania and of several other valid treaties that had been signed and ratified by both states.

"In addition to this, the tyrants of the Kremlin deported tens of thousands of men, women and children to the forced labor camps in Siberia, in order to break the resistance of the people, ultimately to destroy them as a nation.

"Thus Lithuania virtually became a Russian colony with their people robbed of land and other properties, mercilessly exploited for the benefit of their Communist overlords and reduced to utter misery. And these conditions generally prevail until this day.

"III

"As a consequence of the brutality of Soviet Union, the forthcoming anniversary of the proclamation of Lithuania's independence will not be a joyous event for Lithuanian Americans, but an occasion to express their grief over the tragic fate of their native land on the shores of Baltic Sea.

"We shall voice our emphatic protest against the enslavement of Lithuania by the powerful Communist tyranny of Russia and against the inhuman treatment of her people by the enslavers.

"We shall appeal to the Government and people of United States and to the conscience of the civilized world for sympathy and aid.

"As citizens of this great democracy, we are proud that the Government of the United States of America has never recognized the incorporation of Lithuania into Soviet state but, on the contrary, has officially denounced it as a manifestation of barbarism incompatible with the fundamental principles of civilized humanity.

"This attitude of American Government, for years, has inspired in us and our unfortunate brothers and sisters behind the Iron Curtain a hope that freedom of Lithuania has not been lost forever. We are finally convinced that sooner or later she will regain her undisputable right to self-government, and we consider that this is the time for an action to hasten the day of her liberation.

"The Government of Soviet Union has raised the question of 'colonialism' in the General Assembly of United Nations proposing that every nation living under colonial rule or foreign domination should immediately be declared free to establish their independent states and elect their governments of their choosing. Most certainly, this principle should unreservedly be applied to Lithuania which already had existed as an independent Republic and proved her ability to manage her own affairs.

"The Lithuanian American Council, therefore, urges the President of the United States and the Secretary of State to insist at the resumed session of the General Assembly of United Nations in March, that the sovereign rights and self-government of which she has been illegally deprived, be restored.

"Should the rules of Soviet Union reject this just demand, then they would stand condemned in the eyes of the world as hypocrites and enemies of freedom."

No Foreign Tourist Flood for United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Crosby Noyes from the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star:

NO FOREIGN TOURIST FLOOD FOR UNITED STATES

PARIS.—This being the time of year people start making vacation plans, we have made a preliminary check on prospects for foreign touring in the United States this season.

From the evidence so far, if President Kennedy is looking for floods of foreign visitors bearing gold to help replenish the supply at Fort Knox, he is likely to be disappointed.

The professionals here are all a little skeptical of the new administration's open door policy to attract foreign tourists. And there is woefully little to indicate that the Europeans themselves have caught onto the idea of spending their vacation making the grand tour of the United States.

There will surely be more foreign visitors than last year. The number, by some estimates, has quadrupled within the last 5 years. Even without any special effort it is expected to keep on increasing, though at a slower rate.

When it comes to the possibility of attracting tourists—people traveling for pleasure, rather than on business—progress so far has been negligible. Out of 179,000 visitors' visas issued last year, maybe 1 person in 15 could be classed as a tourist in the American sense of the word.

When this is compared to the nearly 800,000 Americans who are expected to visit Europe this year the dollar gap of more than a billion dollars is not hard to explain. And whatever may be done in Washington it is unlikely that this gap will be quickly closed.

VISA PROBLEM EXAGGERATED

There is a feeling here among travel agents and consular officials that the fuss being made over the difficulty foreign tourists are having in securing visas has been exaggerated a good deal "We put away our rubber hose some time ago," an official assured us. "For the vast majority of people who want to visit the United States it takes just about 30 minutes to get a visa good for 4 years and as many trips as they want to make. You can't get a French passport in less than a week."

If visas were abolished altogether it might make a difference of about 100 visitors a year from France, according to the guess of a leading travel agent. Consular officials also point out that without a system of work permits and residence cards and a central police organization such as exists in every European country it would be virtually impossible to distinguish between visitors and immigrants.

On the other hand, these professionals think that a serious effort to promote American tourism would produce results.

"The biggest hurdle—and one where a Government tourist office could really help—is to get across the point that a visit to the United States is not necessarily a hopelessly expensive proposition," we were told.

The idea of traveling for pleasure is new to Europeans. Today they have plenty of money and think nothing of spending 3 weeks or a month in the Middle East, but very few of them would dream of crossing the Atlantic."

NO COME-ON OR BASICS

These prejudices could be changed in time by a Government-backed promotional campaign, the experts think. For the time being there is a great lack of any kind of come-on. Any American magazine one picks up has full-page ads plugging the joys of traveling in Europe. But no private company at this stage is able to afford the same effort to attract the small European market.

The airlines this winter had some success by featuring 17-day special price excursion tours which can be paid in advance in local currencies. But much of this extra business was done in Britain where language is no problem and a great deal remains to be done before travel in the United States can be made attractive to the average European.

Among the most obvious deficiencies: Reception centers and tourist facilities similar to those of any major European city, including special guides and interpreters. At present, even the major hotels and travel agencies provide no help at all for non-English speaking travelers. American tourists facing the same conditions in Europe would find themselves hopelessly lost most of the time.

And then there is the problem of food.

"It's what worries them most," an airline official said.

"What they want is a meal at a moderate price that lasts for at least 2 hours and gives them a chance to enjoy themselves.

"We just don't have it. This hands-across-the-sea stuff is simple until you try to get a guy lunch."

NCAA Wants Law To Stop Gamblers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the National Collegiate Athletic Association recently called for more effective Federal laws to control organized gambling and stop efforts to corrupt sports.

Personally, I feel that Congress should give this matter consideration as soon as possible.

As will be recalled, hearings were recently held on such efforts at corruption in boxing. During the last session of Congress, I introduced legislation to provide stiffer penalties for such acts in relation to boxing. Regrettably, however, efforts continue to spread the poison throughout other sports, both in the professional and nonprofessional field.

Traditionally, sports in America have served usefully not only to improve health standards for our youth but also to strengthen the competitive spirit and improve standards of morality.

The brazen efforts to spread corruption in this significant field can and should be stopped.

Recently, the Washington Post published an article entitled "NCAA Wants Law To Stop Gamblers."

Emphasizing the need for tougher legislation in this field, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 23, 1961]

NCAA WANTS LAW TO STOP GAMBLERS; COLLEGES HAVE DONE EVERYTHING THEY CAN

KANSAS CITY, March 22.—The National Collegiate Athletic Association today called for a Federal law to control organized gambling and stamp out the despicable characters who seek to profit through the corruption of sports.

"The Nation's colleges and universities, athletic conferences, and the NCAA" said Walter Byers, executive director of the NCAA, "have taken every precautionary means at their disposal to guard against possible point-shaving or game-throwing in intercollegiate sports.

"The NCAA also has recommended to Congress that it take further legislative action in this area and has conferred with the Justice Department in an effort to enlist its support.

"Everybody picks at the kids, at the sport, and at the colleges when something like this basketball scandal happens," Byers said. "I don't defend the kid a bit. He should be indicted. He's selling his soul.

"But there has to be a way to get the source—the gambler, the despicable characters who want to influence the outcome of an event. Everybody who makes a bet—no matter how big or small plays a part in it.

"The more money bet, the more scandal of this type you breed.

"The NCAA can try to help improve the situation, as it has done since disclosure of the scandal of 1951. But we are limited. We can only improve the situation. We can't control the problem if it is not a crime under law to bribe or attempt to bribe a boy or an official.

"I feel the only solution is Federal legislation making it unlawful to attempt to affect the outcome of an athletic event."

The NCAA is an association of colleges and universities with current membership of 552.

Byers, a 39-year-old former newspaperman, heads the association, which has its headquarters just around the corner from Kansas City's Municipal Auditorium, where the NCAA basketball championships will be played Friday and Saturday.

Resolution Memorializing the Congress of the United States To Reduce the Eligibility Age of Persons Entitled to Old-Age Benefits Under the Social Security Act to 62 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by General Court of Massachusetts:

RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO REDUCE THE ELIGIBILITY AGE OF PERSONS ENTITLED TO OLD-AGE BENEFITS UNDER THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT TO 62 YEARS

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation whereby the age at which persons become entitled to receive old-age or retirement benefits under the Social Security Act shall be reduced from 65 years to 62 years; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

House of representatives, adopted, March 10, 1961.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

Senate, adopted in concurrence, March 14, 1961.

IRVING N. HAYDEN,
Clerk.

Ten Commandments for Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excellent article entitled "Ten Commandments for Children," as prepared by Rabbi Emmet A. Frank, of Temple Beth El in Alexandria, Va., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEN COMMANDMENTS FOR CHILDREN

1. THOU SHALT REMEMBER THAT THY MOTHER AND THY FATHER ARE NOT STUPID

Often children are too quick to find fault with parents. I think they believe that their parents are against any of their requests. It is obvious that conflicting standards do exist, due to the chasm of age. What is really happening, as Stephen Wise has said, "is nothing more than the wisdoms of the past meeting with the hopes of the future." Parents tend to be more conservative, where children seem too impetuous—filled with the exuberance of life—overflowing with unspent energy and enthusiasm. It is natural then that in certain instances children will find fault with their parents.

2. THOU SHALT HONOR THY CAR-POOLING MOTHER AND THY WAGE-EARNING FATHER

Sometimes I think children forget how very much the lives of their parents are wrapped up in their lives. There is no authority in the world that could drive a man or a woman to give so completely of themselves as do parents. Yet parents never weigh their deeds in front of their children. Parents really look for nothing in return for their service except honor. A wise parent realizes that the debt of a child is uncancelable—a debt that is to be obliterated from the child's mind—a debt for which the child owes nothing but to translate his parents' teachings into their daily experiences. It is thus in such a situation that love, rather than obligation, permeates the action of parents. The very least a child can do is to return that love—pure and with respect.

3. THOU SHALT NOT TREAT THY PARENTS AS ANTIQUES OF A BYGONE ERA, OR BECOME EMBARRASSED WHEN THY PARENTS ACT HUMAN

How often we look upon our parents as antiques of a bygone era—way gone. Yes, I remember the most famous term used to describe parents: "my old man." I want you to know that your father and your mother do not consider themselves old, but rather consider themselves in the best part of their life cycle. As such, parents like to act human—act as they feel—young—and they do not need to be told that they are acting childishly. Their lives course with the same hopes and dreams that fill the hearts of their children. Be not embarassed by your parents, but help your parents to live.

4. THOU SHALT SEEK AND RESPECT THY PARENTS' GUIDANCE, KEEPING OPEN THE DOOR OF COMMUNICATION BETWEEN YOUR PARENTS AND YOURSELVES

Whether children wish to admit it or not, parents can be of great help in making decisions. Parents really do have some good ideas under those partially grayed hairs. Their guidance is to be sought rather than shunned. Certainly at times there will be conflicting standards and opinions. This is only natural, but the tragedy occurs when a child shuts out a parent. The door of communication must be kept open. It must be a two-way relationship. Counseling sought from a parent is not one based upon blind faith. No parent wants a yes-child all the time. There has to be room on the part of the parent to welcome differences of opinion, and so it is true of the child as well. It is wise for parents and children to realize that differences of opinion will exist at times. However, let children not forget that parents do have certain inalienable rights in this field of guidance. Parents should exercise this right, as Stephen Wise has said: "Men and women are not worthy of the dignity and glory of parenthood who lack the courage to brave the frown of a child, the strength to front a child's displeasure."

"Remember that parents usually love their children not wisely but too well and that children love their parents wisely but not too well. Let the gentleness of parents be lifted up and hallowed by firmness, and the firmness of children be hallowed and glorified by gentleness."

How often have children thanked God that they listened to their parents' advice.

5. THOU SHALT HELP TO CREATE A HOME ATMOSPHERE THAT WILL ADD MAJESTY TO FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS.

Of all our experiences as we ramble down the road of life, the home is one that should linger in our memory. But will it be a memory of heavenly bliss or hellish recall? Let's face it. What type of home it will be is determined by mutual respect, by mutual experiences of sharing the responsibilities. The greatest achievement of all man's dreams was the creation of the democratic state. Here in the home, however, in so many instances the democratic ideal has lost out. It is true of the child as well as the parent. The home must be that place where parent and child sit as eager learners. Spencer sums it up when he says the ideal home is "to produce a self-governing being; not to produce a being to be governed by others." Maybe because of such an atmosphere in the home the world outside will be touched by some of its influence. To establish such an atmosphere there must be, on the part of the child and the parent, an attitude toward each other of reverence, courtesy, and consideration. A home so established can be a healing balm—an oasis of peace, and a fortress of strength.

6. THOU SHALT SHOW YOUR PARENTS THAT YOU CAN ACCEPT RESPONSIBILITY BY LIVING UP TO THE FAITH THEY PLACE IN YOU

I think in this realm, parents, as well as children, fail to play their role successfully. Parents want to keep their children as children all the time—never recognizing that they are growing up. The most difficult phase of parental maturity is to learn to wean one's children. I do not believe it is the normal desire of any parent to thwart the will or the growth of the child. However, even when a child does receive responsibility he may not live up to the confidence that his parent has placed in him, or he may suffer from a mixed emotion, for on the one hand the parent may remind the child that he is growing up and should behave as such, and on the other hand the parent at times will cry: "Not so fast. You are still a youngster."

A child who cannot accept responsibility, respecting the confidence that his parent has placed in him, deserves to lose that privilege. It is natural for an adolescent to desire to be an autonomous person. That autonomy has to be earned and won.

A little boy was sitting on the front steps pouting. His father comes home from work, sees him, and asks, "What's the matter, my son?" To which his son replies, "I can't get along with your wife."

7. THOU SHALT SET HIGH STANDARDS AND LEAD A MORAL AND ETHICAL LIFE

The world in which we live seems to base success, unfortunately, on financial achievement. Our first step, then, is to recognize false values for what they are and replace them with real values.

Andrew Carnegie amassed a fortune—I believe more than $450 million. But his greatness did not come until he began to give it all away. His success can now be measured in his service to others. In selfless service to our fellow man we rise to the heights of greatness and success. A man's character is determined by no other measure than the type of life he leads. Moral values and ethical standards will shape his personality with eternal values that neither time nor clime can destroy or take away.

Another real value is the discipline of cultivating a love for the arts—music, art, and literature. Such a discipline is the finest, most broadening experience to which man can aspire. Finally, with all thy getting, be sure to get two more things—wisdom and humility. You remember God's telling Solomon: "Since you asked not for riches, I shall give you wisdom." A life so dedicated will not succumb to the psuedo values which time will efface, but will reach out to a life of nobleness. The greatest inheritance a parent can leave to a child is not a financial will but an ethical will.

8. THOU SHALT REMEMBER THAT IT IS NOT SO MUCH WHAT YOU SHOULD NOT DO, BUT WHAT YOU SHOULD DO

Too often we fill our lives, or rather our consciences fill our lives, with negativism. We know we should not do certain things, but seldom does it go any further. We set the limits of our lives on the periphery of the negative. Our lives must also seek the opposite end of the pole—positivism. I remember a song that was popular when I was a youngster. I imagine that every once in a while it is still played. The thought it expressed was "Accentuate the positive—eliminate the negative." Only when we begin to set positive goals and work for them diligently are we playing the proper roles.

9. THOU SHALT NOT BE FEARFUL OF EXPRESSING YOUR OWN INDIVIDUAL PERSONALITY OR BEING A NONCONFORMIST

The great tragedy of our world today is in its producing the common man. Kids act alike, dress alike, and in too many instances think alike. It is part of the group spirit—the desire to be accepted or the fear that we will not be accepted. In this tide of life we have produced the common man, and in so doing established a cult of mediocrity.

Yesterday I listened to an eloquent speaker discuss Herbert Hoover's article, "The Uncommon Man." He asked if great advances have been brought about by the common man—no, sir, but by the uncommon man. Our Nation is the result of the common man—no, sir, the uncommon man. When we seek medical help, do we look for the common doctor; or legal advice, the common lawyer; or spiritual inspiration, the common minister—no, sir. We look for the uncommon doctor, the uncommon lawyer, and the uncommon minister. Parents should pray that their children will grow up to be uncommon, and children should strive to be counted among the uncommon. Let us crush, once and for all, the cult of mediocrity and the common man. Let us dare to be different. Let us dare to live life, impregnating it with our own individual talents.

And now the most important of all commandments, in which our lives reach the richest culmination:

10. THOU SHALT REMEMBER THE LORD, THY GOD, LOVING HIS TEACHINGS AND OBSERVING HIS LAWS

The ancient cry of Judaism resounds with freshness in every generation: "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is one." Let your hearts throb with the message of this watchword—to love God with all your heart, with all your soul, and with all your might. Remember the God of our fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, for herein lies the mystery of our existence. Israel's faithfulness to God has been her secret of life—eternal as is God, so are the children of Israel who remember His teachings and observe His commandments. Suffice it to say that Judaism's tenets encompass the whole of life—the home, the Temple, the world without. Here are the festivals of the home life. Here are the prayers of the liturgy. Here are the directives for human relations. Here the customs which glorify parent and child, as they partake of the ancient festivals of Hanukka and Passover. The great Sabbath, as parent and child kindle a light to God, raise an overflowing cup of thanksgiving and share the bounties of God's creativity—here parent and child worshiping in the solemnity of the Beth Ha Tefillah, united by eternal prayers and everlasting values. Here parent and child sharing the glories of Israel, which speak of the dignity and divineness of man. Only with such spiritual values will we fulfill God's commandment and become a kingdom of priests and a holy nation. These spiritual values will create a home atmosphere about which the Prophet spoke:

"And He shall turn the heart of the parents to the child and the heart of the child to the parents."

True not only for Judaism but all religions. Amen.

Assisting the Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, the Carlisle, Pa., Committee for the Employment of the Handicapped is to be commended for its continuing efforts in behalf of those less fortunate than others.

To Joanne Samuelson—16-year-old junior in the South Middleton High School—sincere congratulations on your prize-winning essay in which you state so clearly and beautifully the challenge of every community and the manner in which your community is accepting that challenge.

Many communities might well emulate the example of this area. The essay as printed in the Carlisle Evening Sentinel follows:

ESSAY OF GIRL WINS FIRST PLACE—GETS TOP AWARD IN COMMITTEE CONTEST

The following essay, "Jobs for the Handicapped: A Community Challenge," written by Joanne Samuelson, 16, a junior in the South Middleton High School, won first place in the contest sponsored by the Carlisle Committee for the Employment of the Handicapped:

"One of the cornerstones of democracy is the fundamental of equal opportunity. This means that a democratic way of life involves no discrimination between the handicapped and the unimpaired when it comes to employment. Giving to the handicapped equal opportunities, demonstrates the principle of humanitarianism. It exemplifies the American belief in the dignity and worth of the individual.

"In this day and age it is necessary to utilize to its capacity our most important natural resource: manpower. An important part of this manpower includes the handicapped, both the physically disabled and the mentally retarded. To return many of the handicapped to gainful employment would mean to greatly strengthen our Nation's manpower.

"Whenever we speak of the handicapped we always hear the word, 'rehabilitation.' Just exactly what is rehabilitation? To me, it means a chance to live again; a period of adjustment necessary to meet new conditions. Rehabilitation of the handicapped presents many problems, none of which is insurmountable. The most effective force in overcoming these problems is the community."

FOREMOST OBSTACLE

"The foremost obstacle in rehabilitation is to teach the handicapped individual to utilize his faculties to the utmost. Occupational therapy is of great advantage in the preparation of the individual for gainful employment. However, the preparation of the disabled person for employment is amazingly easy when compared with the real stymie: acceptance of the handicapped by employers and society. Here is where the community faces the real challenge. It is up to the community to dissolve prejudices and to encourage employment of the handicapped.

"Why is there prejudice against hiring the physically handicapped? There is no discrimination shown against those who are mentally and emotionally handicapped by tension, worry, and frustration. Statistics have proven that the turnover rate among the handicapped is comparatively less than that of the nonhandicapped group. This is a verity because the disabled realize and appreciate the value of holding a job. They recognize the fact that the handicapped as a group will be judged by their performance and therefore are willing to put forth great effort to do their best and to make a good impression on their employer. To back this up statistics have shown that the performance among the disabled equals and, in many instances, excels that of the nonhandicapped. Surveys show that rehabilitated workers maintain high safety records, achieve a remarkably low rate of absenteeism and have extremely good production rates. Whenever the employers in the community are attempting to decide whether or not to hire the handicapped, they should consider what the individual does have, and not what he doesn't have."

ESSENTIALS LISTED

"In the employment of the handicapped proper preparation and placement are essential. It is the responsibility of the community to utilize and protect the handicapped. When properly placed the handicapped can do amazingly well. The paraplegics are not at all inhibited in their ability to do sedentary work. In some instances, a handicap can actually aid the job. For example, the blind make excellent interviewers, for they are forced to rely upon qualifications, and are not influenced by personal appearances. Also, the person who had lost one of his senses becomes extremely proficient in the use of his other senses. A deaf person develops his senses of touch and sight. There are many occupations

which do not require sight, and where a high degree of hearing or sensitivity would be beneficial. Why, therefore, shouldn't these people be hired?

"In rehabilitation it is necessary for the recently handicapped individual to adopt a healthy, psychological attitude. He should try to comprehend the reality of his handicap and make a full-fledged effort to adapt to it. With will and skill, one can overcome any limitations. No one is truly handicapped unless he wants to be.

"The handicapped person does not expect any special treatment or favors; he only wants a chance. It is a challenge to the community to give him this chance. The disabled person wants to enter into the world of competition, to be a part of society, and to be hired for his capabilities. He does not wish to take charity, but has the honest desire to support himself and his family, to earn his own money, and to be independent."

EXAMPLE OF PROGRESS

"An example of the progress being made in hiring the handicapped can be found in some of the business establishments in our town. The employers have found it good business to hire the handicapped.

"One of the women working in a local business has a glass eye; yet, she is doing precision work that requires good eyesight. Although she is self-conscious about her disability, she is quite proud of her work, and does a fine job.

"In the same establishment there is a blind man, who is doing work that was formerly thought could only be done by a sighted individual. However, with a few adjustments in the method of procedure and with the help of one of his fellow workers, this man has become a very useful and valuable employee. Not only does his work sustain his own pride, but it instills a feeling of pride in the sighted coworker who helps him, for he helps, not out of pity but out of understanding.

"The telephone company in our community has provided a Braille switchboard for a blind husband-and-wife team in order that they might be self-employed. This blind couple operates a telephone-answering service, which is not only a means of earning a living for themselves, but also provides a very valuable service to the community.

"These are just a few examples of what can be accomplished by civic-minded members of a community. They have learned that hiring the handicapped doesn't cost; it pays. They are businessmen and know that it is a good investment."

CAPABLE OF EMPLOYMENT

"Why should we continue to pay high cost of keeping the handicapped in institutions and hospitals, when they are capable of entering into gainful employment? Wouldn't it be much more sensible to spend that money on rehabilitation? We would not only relieve the handicapped of being a ward of the State, but would lower taxes at the same time.

"The Federal Government has done much to promote the employment of the handicapped. The Government is strictly impartial in its selection of employees through its competitive civil service examinations. About 5 percent of all employed Federal workers are handicapped.

"Despite the great effort that has been put forth in the past few years in the rehabilitation and employment of the handicapped, there is much work still to be done. There is a wide gap between those receiving vocational rehabilitation and those who need it. It is truly a community challenge. With wholehearted cooperation and interest of the community, all obstacles can be met, and problems of the handicapped will no longer face our community or our Nation."

The Other Side of the Coin—A Report on Unemployment by the Late Eddie Collins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on March 8 of this year, Edward H. Collins—"Eddie" Collins—an economic columnist and editorial writer of the New York Times died. Eddie Collins was highly respected by both the journalists with whom he worked and the practitioners in the field of economics whose work he covered. A reporter for over 30 years, Collins also was a trained economist, having studied at the London School of Economics on a Pulitzer Scholarship after graduating from the Columbia University School of Journalism. He later taught at Columbia, while working as a reporter.

During his years in journalism, Collins worked for the Journal of Commerce, the New York Tribune and, finally, the New York Times. With the Times, his Monday columns became regular features of the economic page and he wrote with the editorial board on economic subjects.

Eddie Collins' last published piece was an editorial in the Times of March 9, the morning after he died, entitled "Report on Unemployment." I would like to insert this editorial at this point in the RECORD:

REPORT ON UNEMPLOYMENT

The number of jobless in the Nation reached 5,705,000 in the month of February, according to the official figures of the Labor and Commerce Departments, just released by Arthur J. Goldberg, Secretary of Labor. The 5,705,000 figure, the Secretary notes, is the highest since 1941.

On a seasonally adjusted basis, this total represents 6.8 percent of the civilian labor force. The highest adjusted rate for the entire postwar period was 7.5 percent, touched in April 1958. The 6.8 percent does not set a new low for the present downswing in business. The same level was recorded 2 months earlier, in December 1960.

So far as most persons are concerned, we think they are prepared and concede that the Labor Secretary, in his efforts to establish the fact that unemployment is running at a deplorably high level, has made his point. It might be reasonably asked, however, whether he is not displaying more zeal than perspective when he drags in comparisons of the years 1960–61 with 1941. True, the numerical unemployment figure for February is higher than for any month since 1941. For the whole year 1941, however, the total civilian labor force was 55,900,000, while it averaged 70.6 in 1960. This means that the average rate of unemployment for that earlier year—namely, 5,560,000, constituted nearly 10 percent of the number of people looking for jobs.

Discussion of the unemployment picture at this point is almost meaningless except in the context of the behavior of the labor force and total employment. It is not to gloss over the disappointing current figures on unemployment, however, to note that these were established at a time when the labor force was expanding at a rate nearly twice that of recent previous years, and in spite of the fact that February set a new historic high for employment.

The John Birch Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON R. YOUNG
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, many editorials, articles, and other information concerning the John Birch Society have come to me from all over the United States. A very fine editorial on this subject was carried in the March 16 issue of the St. Paul Dispatch, of St. Paul, Minn. Another very good editorial was contained in the March 14 issue of the Minot Daily News, of Minot, N. Dak. I ask unanimous consent that these two editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the regular "Application for Membership" required of prospective members of the John Birch Society. Of particular interest is this paragraph:

If my application is accepted, I agree that my membership may be revoked at any time, by a duly appointed officer of the society, without the reason being stated, on refund of the pro rata part of my dues paid in advance.

This is a strange procedure for an organization which professes to support the Constitution of the United States and the rights guaranteed under it.

There being no objection, the editorials, and so forth, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Paul Dispatch, Mar. 16, 1961]

A JOB FOR HUAC

Congress, at the request of President Kennedy, enthusiastically voted to restore to former President Eisenhower his five-star general rank, which he had resigned while in politics. Only one sour note of protest was sounded, the "No" vote of segregationist Congressman DALE ALFORD, of Little Rock.

All Americans should applaud this congressional gesture of honor to a great patriotic leader. Unfortunately there are a few who do not. They are the members of a secret society which, under the guise of fighting communism, sponsors smear attacks on the reputation and character of many honorable public officials and private citizens. Their program is reminiscent of the worst stages of McCarthyism a decade ago.

Recently Senator MILTON YOUNG, North Dakota Republican, told the Senate that members of the John Birch Society in his State had accused him of communism, and that similar charges were being made against General Eisenhower. Time magazine, digging into the background of the Birch organization, found that its leader, Robert Welch of Massachusetts, had published a book in which both General Eisenhower and his brother, Milton, are attacked as members of the Communist Party. The former President is specifically accused of treason. John Foster Dulles is labeled a Communist agent. His brother, CIA Director Allen Dulles, is called a supporter of communism. Impeachment of Chief Justice Earl Warren of the Supreme Court is demanded.

The Birch "Americanists," as they term themselves, claim cells of secret members in 35 States. They attack teachers and college professors and make anonymous telephone calls telling citizens that certain neighbors are suspected Communists. Welch has denounced social security and the Federal in-

come tax as part of a Communist plot to take over the country.

Such irresponsible divisive activities help the Communist cause by setting Americans against Americans. They smack of the methods of would be dictators. Welch describes democracy as a perennial fraud, yet sets himself up as a superpatriot to sit in judgment on the Americanism of those who do not share his ideas. He has duped some reputable citizens into following his lead by convincing them they are engaged in fighting communism.

Such activities as those of the Birch group should be brought into the open where the public can examine them. This would seem to be an excellent opportunity for the House Un-American Activities Committee to conduct a searching investigation of a thoroughly un-American program.

[From the Minot (N. Dak.) Daily News, Mar. 14, 1961]

TWISTED PERVERSION OF FACTS

This being a free country, citizens have the right to join what free associations they choose.

If they choose to join the Communist Party, the law allows them to do it. And if they prefer to affiliate themselves with organizations of radical right or ultraconservativism bent, that is their privilege.

Yet it has been shown time and time again that some of the splinter organizations set up in this country, and some of the hard core groups of fanatics, are people whose fanaticism has made them dupes of questionable organizers.

People with strong prejudices, it seems, are quite susceptible to the appeals of false ideologies developed by organizers who are professionals and who have questionable axes to grind. Not all the men and women who fall prey to this kind of deception are those of Communist or leftist leanings. Just as many, we fear, are folks who mean to be conservative, but have too readily been persuaded that the Nation is going to the dogs and that its leaders are members of devilish conspiracies.

For example, anybody who is taken in by the kind of propaganda which makes out that Dwight Eisenhower is either a conspirator with world communism, or a tool of any kind of subversive conspiracy, is just plain gullible.

If there are well-meaning people in this country who are falling for that kind of twisted perverson of the facts of our age, they would do well to take a second look. Perhaps the organization which is leading them into that kind of view is more reprehensible than the object of their hatred.

APPLICATION FOR MEMBERSHIP

----------, 19-----

The JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY,
Belmont, Mass.

GENTLEMEN: This is my application for membership in the ---------- Chapter of The John Birch Society, for 1 year from this date, and for automatic renewal each year thereafter, unless I resign in writing. I understand the dues schedule printed on the back of this sheet, as applicable to myself.

If my application is accepted, I agree that my membership may be revoked at anytime, by a duly appointed officer of the society, without the reason being stated, on refund of the pro rata part of my dues paid in advance.

Sincerely,

(Name)----------

(Address)----------

Application approved:

By----------

Title----------

Date:----------

Aid for Church Schools Befogs the Main Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, like all Members of Congress, I have been flooded with mail discussing the Federal aid to education spending scheme. All Members to whom I have spoken bear out the fact that the issue of aid to religious schools has completely diverted the attention of Congress from the original issue placed before us. An excellent summary of this confusing state of events is the editorial of Thursday, March 16, in the Chicago Daily News, which I place in the RECORD:

AID FOR CHURCH SCHOOLS BEFOGS THE MAIN ISSUE

The issue of Federal aid to education is being bogged down in controversy over the legality of some form of assistance to pupils in parochial and other private schools. We were glad to note the statement of Cardinal Spellman that the basic political and economic matter is whether there should be any Federal aid. How to make it equitable is a subordinate consideration.

The fact remains, however, that the decision on Federal aid will be affected by the prospects for extending it to church schools. If no satisfactory plan for so extending it can be found, opposition within the Roman Catholic hierarchy is certain to make itself felt.

At his press conference yesterday, President Kennedy expressed the hope that Congress would deal first with his original request for grants amounting to about $15 a year per pupil to States for public elementary and secondary schools. There seems to be no possibility that parochial schools could share in this fund. Not even the clergy are asking this.

The constitution of Illinois provides that no public body may disburse funds for the support of any church school. Whether this would extend to low-interest loans is a legal question, although this might be avoided by Federal loans made directly to parochial school systems.

In his statement, Cardinal Spellman took note of other means by which aid might be channeled to parochial school pupils. He mentioned tax deductions for parents, tuition subsidies, and "other forms of help" such as grants for the nonreligious aspects of church-school education.

The courts have held that free bus transportation for parochial school pupils, for example, was not an unconstitutional use of tax funds, on the ground that it was a service provided to the individual pupils and not for the school system. The same logic would seem applicable to a tax deduction for fees paid for tuition in any private school.

If congressional leaders agree on some program such as this, it would greatly increase the pressure for passage of Federal aid to public schools. It would resolve the long search of parents of parochial school pupils for some relief from the added cost that they bear for education.

Otherwise, the drive for Federal aid, in our opinion, comes simply from the desire to shift some of the cost to income taxpayers, in the conviction that it will fall mainly on the wealthy. This is a delusion.

Three-fourths of all personal income in this country goes to wage earners; the top brackets of the steeply graduated rates garner only 13 percent of the total Federal revenue. The middle-income group has most of the money, and it is this group that pays the bulk of the taxes.

Inasmuch as any Federal aid plan so far advanced would take more money from Illinois than would be returned, we remained convinced that this State has nothing to gain by the Federal aid proposals.

Republican Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have recently noted in the press several articles describing the plans of the Republican National Committee to undertake a series of extensive research projects to try to discover why the Republican presidential candidate carried only 14 of the 40 U.S. cities of over 300,000 population last November. According to these reports, Mr. Ray C. Bliss, Ohio GOP chairman, is heading up a special task force established for this purpose.

At the risk of being presumptuous, I would suggest to our Republican friends that they can avoid time, costly research, field studies, and complex statistical analyses in the effort to find an answer to this perplexing question. The Republican researchers need only to examine the dismal record of their own party in Congress on those issues which vitally affect the Nation's city-dwellers.

Of course, I realize the difficulty which they have always encountered in any attempt to look at voting records from an objective basis. I am therefore taking the liberty of supplying them with the statistical record of GOP votes in the House and Senate from 1947 to 1960 on legislation directly affecting the well-being of urban residents. It clearly shows the lack of GOP concern on such issues as housing and slum clearance, inflation, highways and airport construction, small business, the need of depressed areas, and the extension of minimum wage coverage and unemployment compensation benefits.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that in the cold light of post-election soul searching now going on in Republican ranks, the top Republican Party policymakers would prevail upon their congressional leaders to make substantial improvement in their party's urban legislative record by voting to support President Kennedy's constructive and realistic proposals in this important area. Only in this way can the GOP lay the foundation to make possible any effective appeal to city dwellers for support of Republican residential candidates in the future.

The analysis of GOP versus Democratic votes on urban issues follows:

Type of urban issue	1947–52						1953–60					
	Senate			House			Senate			House		
	Number of votes	Percent for—		Number of votes	Percent for—		Number of votes	Percent for—		Number of votes	Percent for—	
		Democrats	Republicans		Democrats	Republicans		Democrats	Republicans		Democrats	Republicans
1. Promotion of slum clearance and home financing	19	85	42	25	80	37	34	80	29	23	86	34
2. Legislation to curb inflation	40	83	34	27	81	39	4	81	26			
3. Legislation for highway and airport construction	8	70	29	2	99	82	11	93	37	9	85	58
4. Legislation to assist small business	9	75	44	3	84	36	7	75	12	3	92	66
5. Legislation to assist depressed areas							9	83	24	4	76	24
6. Expand minimum wage and unemployment compensation	6	64	47	7	69	28	20	72	30	10	78	53

Greek Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, it is only natural and quite human that all peoples and nations celebrate their national independence day, and that that day should become their most important national holiday. They do this because they all prize the attainment of their freedom and independence as the culmination of their political and spiritual aspirations. To this the Greek people are no exception.

They have especial reason to celebrate their independence day as their national holiday because they were the first among all peoples to have and enjoy freedom and independence, and therefore were keenly appreciative of the value of real freedom. And when they regained it after the lapse of 2,000 years, they rightly regarded the beginning of their national free life, as the beginning of a new era for them. This, more than anything else, is perhaps the reason why they have observed the anniversary of their independence day, so solemnly within Greece, and abroad, and have celebrated it as their national holiday.

The daring deed of a handful of gallant Greeks that had its beginning 140 years ago, under the leadership of an archbishop of the church, has become the most momentous event in the history of modern Greece, standing out as a brilliant landmark in the history of the Greek people. The war of independence, waged intermittently for more than 7 years, at times was no more than one wholesale slaughter by the Turks almost leading to the enslavement and annihilation of the Greeks.

But through their uncommon gallantry and indomitable will to sacrifice their all, and with the effective aid of their friends in many lands, they finally wrenched victory out of certain defeat. All that to the glory and honor of the Greek people, and to the credit of their friends abroad. I gladly join Americans of Greek origin and Greeks everywhere in the celebration of this day, the 140th anniversary celebration of Greek Independence Day.

The Federal Judicial System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to note that our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, has seen fit to send a very interesting communication to the Judicial Conference which is composed of the Chief Justice of the United States as Chairman, and the chief judges of the 11 judicial circuits and an elected judge of the district courts from each of those circuits.

This communication concerns itself with the supervision of the various Federal courts throughout the country. I remember when we passed—in 1939—section 332 of title 28 of the United States Code. It was our intention that the judicial councils, composed of judges from the various courts of appeals for each circuit, would oversee the operation of the judicial systems in the various district courts and circuits. It was to give autonomy to the local councils rather than to centralize such supervision by the Congress or by some other agency in Washington.

In life, judges are human; there has been evidence that the councils have not fully met the responsibilities imposed upon them by statute. While the great majority of our judges are scrupulously honest in the courtroom, it is evident that there are some judges who are arrogant, domineering, dictatorial, in fact, judicial tyrants. One such judge is one too many. Section 332 of title 28 of the United States Code reads as follows:

Each judicial council shall make all necessary orders for the effective and expeditious administration of the business of the courts within the circuit. The district judges shall promptly carry into effect all orders of the judicial council.

I know that following a previous admonition to the Judicial Conference on this very problem, a special committee on the responsibilities and powers of the judicial councils had been appointed and following Chairman CELLER's second communication that a report of that special committee was filed and adopted. Nonetheless, I do repeat that Congress must keep a watchful eye on this whole area.

If a vacuum exists, it is bound to be filled. Unless appropriate action is taken by the local judicial councils in performing the duties set forth, as stated above, Congress will be compelled to act.

The communication addressed by Chairman CELLER to the Chief Justice is as follows:

MARCH 10, 1961.

The CHIEF JUSTICE,
The Supreme Court,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHIEF JUSTICE: I regret very much that I am unable to be present this morning at the opening of the Judicial Conference of the United States. Unfortunately, an important engagement arose suddenly which required my immediate attention in New York City. However, the message which I contemplated presenting to the Conference today is of such importance and urgency that I am writing to you to request you to read this letter to the members present at the Conference.

You will recall that on past occasions I have raised the question before the Judicial Conference of the organization and powers of the judicial councils. I was very gratified to learn that you had appointed a special committee to look into this question. I have been informed that this committee may report to the Conference during its current session and I am looking forward with great anxiety to its report.

At the outset, I wish to state that my interest and concern over this question arose from personal experience as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives. At no time did anyone intercede with me to initiate the activities which I have pursued in this matter. On the contrary, during the course of legislative consideration of many of the laws which have been enacted to improve our Federal judicial system and to administration of justice, I have had problems presented to me which, in my judgment, should never have been permitted to exist and would never have come to the attention of the Congress if the judicial councils had exercised the powers and responsibilities conferred upon them by section 332 of title 28 of the United States Code.

For example, due to failure of proper direction of the Judicial Councils to provide appropriate geographic distribution of judicial talent there has arisen demands for additional districts and divisions in some circuits. If judges had been properly assigned to certain areas, I am confident there would have been no such demand. Some of the suggested changes are unnecessary and costly.

I do not wish to dwell on specific instances or individuals, but I can advise you that over

the course of the years several matters have been brought to my attention which have given me a great cause of concern. It was because of the undertone of dissatisfaction with the work of the Judicial Councils that I was motivated in presenting this problem to the Judicial Conference.

From my own personal experience and observation, I realize that by far, most of the members of the Federal judiciary are a hard-working, respected body of men. However, whenever the need for additional judges arises there is the immediate hue and cry concerning congestion and delay in our courts. If one goes back to 1906 when the American Bar Association first looked at the problem of court congestion and follows it down through the years to the present time, one finds the same criticism time and time again. Our courts are never criticized for their decisions but mostly for administrative deficiencies and excessive delay. It was these criticisms, together with the mounting public and professional impatience with the delay of justice, which created the necessary climate for reforms in Federal judicial administration. The act which created this body in 1922 and the act of 1939 setting up the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts and the Judicial Councils of the circuits amply demonstrate the concern of the legislative branch of our Government with these problems of administration.

As one who actively participated in processing the act of 1939, I have no doubts as to the legislative intent of that law.

The legislative history, in my opinion, conclusively demonstrates that the major reliance for improving judicial administration was placed upon the voluntary cooperation of the courts rather than upon any powers of compulsion. There have been many fields and instances where major improvements in court organization have been accomplished by legislation, and here this has been accomplished through the Judicial Conference which, in turn, had consulted with the Councils throughout the country. I approve of such consideration and presentation. These instances demonstrate the value of both the Conference and the Councils when they function in accordance with the responsibilities which the Congress placed upon them.

I fully realize that this is a delicate question. I realized it in 1939 when section 332 was under consideration. I understand that there may be some doubts in the minds of some members of our Federal judicial system regarding the rather general and vague language of that statute. I can assure you that the drafting of that statute was deliberate in order to provide elasticity in the procedure to deal with the many and varied problems which the Congress contemplated would arise for the consideration by the judicial councils. Indeed, I recall that it was the considered judgment of the Congress that the judicial councils were, by their very nature, the proper agents for supervising our Federal courts. These councils know the needs arising out of local conditions. They can fit their actions to these needs. Such actions are necessary and desirable and, therefore, the power conferred on the councils by the Congress was purposely designed to permit them to adopt these powers to the local problems and necessities, but they were never designed to lie dormant, particularly in light of public impatience and criticism with the law's delay.

Let me make it clear that neither then nor now do I wish to see any interference with the judicial functions of our courts. I am a firm believer in the doctrine of separation of powers. However, the growth of this Nation, both politically and economically, has transformed the basic structure of our Federal judicial system. I do not have to tell you that judges are now doing much more than judging. Judges exercise a legislative function in recommending legislation to the Congress and in formulating procedural rules under the authority delegated by the Congress. They exercise an executive responsibility in supervising the many day-to-day tasks of operating the judicial establishment. As Mr. Justice Burton once remarked, "Judging is also administration."

It is my honest opinion that there is an urgent need for the judicial councils to start functioning immediately along the lines which I believe Congress intended them to do. If there are any doubts concerning the statute it behooves the Federal judges to resolve that question and make recommendations, if corrective legislative is necessary. On the other hand, if it is found that the statute is adequate, then there should be no toleration of further delay. Action, and quick action, is warranted, in my opinion, at this time. Here, I most reluctantly sound a warning. If there has been a vacuum in the exercise of these powers it must be filled now lest some other agency be delegated to fill it. I, under no circumstances, wish to see either the Congress or any agency selected by the Congress, or any individual for that matter, interfere or take over the administrative responsibilities of our judicial system. I believe the judges should do their own housekeeping, but do it they must or someone will do it for them.

The progress which has been made in improving our Federal judicial system over the past 20-odd years has been remarkable but we are still faced, as you realize, with criticisms and problems which must be met. At this time I believe the needs for solving these problems are more acute than ever because there is a greater awareness and acceptance by the public as to the validity of the criticisms. Aside from my own personal experience in dealing with the complaints of other Members of Congress, I merely point out the recent Cotter report as well as the report of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Improvement in Judicial Machinery. Only last week during the course of the hearings before my subcommittee on my bill for additional judges, these criticisms could be heard. In the aggregate they toll a warning bell that this hesitation and delay on the part of the judicial councils must cease. I urge the Federal judges with all sincerity to do something about this matter and do it promptly. I assure them of all the help and cooperation I can give in assisting them to do that. I am confident that if they will help themselves the Congress will help them, too. But on the other hand, I am just as confident that if these judges do not do it someone will do it for them, to our mutual regret. I earnestly await their suggestions and their actions in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman.

Mrs. Clara B. Gonzales

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Clara B. Gonzales, reservation principal at the Zuni Pueblo, for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, is 1 of the 10 winners of the National Civil Service League Career Service Award for 1961.

The award was presented to Mrs. Gonzales by Nicholas Kelley, president of the National Civil Service League, on March 21. The citation on the scroll presented to her stated:

Mrs. Gonzales has planted in the hearts of the Zuni people a love and respect for education. When she came to the Zuni Pueblo very few of its members were in school. Now, largely because of her efforts, the percentage in schools and institutions of higher learning exceeds that of non-Indian communities on the periphery of the village. The Indian people do not hesitate to bring their problems to Mrs. Gonzales, so confident are they of her understanding and help. She has taken every opportunity to help them broaden their horizons. The Zuni people, as well as her coworkers, have a deep regard for Mrs. Gonzales because throughout her career the Zuni Pueblo has been her classroom; and the understanding, love, and affection for the Zuni people have been her basic textbook.

In announcing that Mrs. Gonzales had won the award, Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall stated on March 13 that she is the first woman employee of the Interior Department and the first person from the ranks of the Bureau of Indian Affairs to receive this award presented annually to 10 outstanding Federal career service employees on the basis of competence, character, and outstanding achievements. Mrs. Gonzales has been a teacher at the Zuni Pueblo for nearly 38 years. She is credited with bringing Zuni school enrollment to nearly 100 percent.

Conservation of Our Water Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, I have been keenly interested in conserving our water supply and have supported programs for controlling our major river valleys. With the present rate of expansion I foresee a critical water shortage within the next 20 years unless we support a constructive program for controlling the flow of water in the major river valleys. It was encouraging to receive a resolution this week from the Cumberland County Board of Supervisors in recognition of this problem. For the benefit of my colleagues I wish to include this resolution with my remarks:

Whereas Cumberland County is primarily an agricultural area, and

Whereas said county is regularly subjected to alternate floods and droughts with the resulting economic loss to its people, and

Whereas this body is constituted for, and its duties involve, the welfare of these people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we approve the plans and activities of the Cumberland County chapter of the Wabash Valley Association in having secured the cooperation and assistance of the Federal Government, through the Corps of Army Engineers, in a project of soil and water conservation for the Embarrass River Watershed, and that, such notice also be forwarded to Senators DOUGLAS and DIRKSEN, and, to Congressman PETER MACK.

KENNETH KIRK,
County Clerk.

Major Issues Recommendations by Methodist Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I wish to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a news release, dated January 16, 1961, concerning recommendations and resolutions on some major issues that were voted by the Women's Division of Christian Service of the Methodist Church's Board of Missions, during an annual meeting in Buck Hill Falls, Pa.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

METHODIST WOMEN ACT ON SOCIAL-POLITICAL PROBLEMS

BUCK HILL FALLS, PA., January 16.—Recommendations and resolutions on some of the major national and international problems facing the United States of America and the world—from the use of farm surpluses to disarmament and nuclear testing—were voted today by the Women's Division of Christian Service of the Methodist Church's Board of Missions. The board is now in annual session here, attended by some 600 members from all parts of the Nation, and missionaries from some 25 nations.

Some of the actions taken by the Women's Division of Christian Service will be transmitted to governmental officials and agencies by Mrs. J. Fount Tillman, of Lewisburg, Tenn., national president; others will be sent to the 15,000 local church women's societies across the country for study and local action.

Our recommendation requests Congress to take a more active role in determining U.S. policy toward and within the U.N.—a determination the women say is now left almost entirely to the President and the State Department.

"We believe," said the recommendation, "that the Congress should create an active United Nations Affairs Committee which would discuss United States-United Nations affairs in relation to pending legislation or policies. It might be within the Foreign Affairs and Foreign Relations Committees and include all Members of the Congress who have served on U.S. delegations to the U.N. We believe that the position of the U.S. delegation must be raised so that it becomes a body with prestige. They should be people of such experience and ability that they can have a voice in formulating the positions upon which they will speak at the General Assembly. This would make use of their on-the-ground experience. To further increase the prestige of the delegation, Congress should authorize Cabinet rank for the Ambassador to the U.N.

CONSISTENT POLICY

"We believe it is important that the United States have a consistent policy toward the United Nations. Our lack of consistency along this line has been puzzling and frustrating to other nations. Sometimes we have taken action through the United Nations. Sometimes we have bypassed it.

"It would be helpful to have a well-articulated, consistent policy regarding (a) our willingness to vote for debate in the General Assembly on grievances presented by a country or discussion of other issues (including mainland China's membership in the U.N.), so that any available light can be brought to bear on the issues; and (b) our attitude toward 'colonialism' in general. More adequate funds must be made available to permit U.N. operation on behalf of peace wherever necessary.

The women also instructed their department of Christian Social Relations (Miss Thelma Stevens, executive secretary), to provide factual material concerning China, and the problems of its admission to the United Nations, so that all local church societies can study it and determine their own opinions on the subject.

In another resolution, the women's division called upon Congress to expand the work of the Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament and to provide such other resources and agencies as will achieve economic readjustment during the stages of disarmament. The economic aspects of disarmament must be confronted intelligently and courageouly. Economists assert that an economy based upon production for peaceful purposes is, in the long run, a much sounder economy than one based on arms.

CONDEMN BACTERIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

"We view with alarm," the women continued, "the programs by which our Government is making chemical and bacteriological weapons, and we condemn them as inhuman and contrary to the love of God revealed in Christ. We call upon our Government to transform such facilities as Fort Dietrich (Maryland) into centers for world health research. We urge Congress to hold hearings and give full opportunity for the opposition to be heard, on the implications of chemical, bacteriological, and radiological war."

In the field of civil rights it was voted that the women's division "call upon Methodist women everywhere to work toward achieving the basic principles of human freedom in the field of civil rights. The minimum goals to be hoped for must include: a fair employment practices law, the creation of a permanent Commission on Civil Rights and the complete elimination of barriers to voting through increased powers of the Civil Rights Commission to secure the necessary evidence and have power to enforce the law. The peaceful demonstrations for first-class citizenship which have recently taken place in many parts of this country are a signal to all of us to make good at long last the guarantees of our Constitution.

STATE CONTROL OF FUNDS

Approval was given by the women's division of the proposal for Federal aid to education, but with emphasis on the principle of State control of the funds nationally provided. Methodist women were urged to work in their States for the allocation of both Federal and State funds on a basis of nondiscrimination because of race, and in compliance with the Supreme Court decision of 1954.

Methodist and other women are urged to contact Senators and Congressmen in favor of enacting education aid legislation; and in local communities to work toward this end through boards of education, PTA's, newspapers, radio stations, and so forth.

"Fifty million Americans—more than a fourth of our people—have no insurance protection against the high cost of illness," noted the Methodist women. The problem is particularly acute among the 16 million Americans over 65 years old, and among disabled workers, widows and orphans. Most of these have low incomes and the elderly among them suffer two to three times as much illness as the rest of the population.

"Therefore, we urge that the Federal Government provide health protection for older people using the contributary machinery of the social security system for insurance covering hospital bills and other high cost medical services. Those of our older people who have never been eligible for social security coverage should have corresponding benefits from general tax revenues. We feel that there should be no pauper's oath for those receiving such benefits. We also urge that the Federal Government limit payment of these benefits to hospitals and nursing homes which have met the standards of the professional groups accrediting such institutions."

General approval was given to proposals to renew and expand basic law 480, under which farm surpluses in the United States of America have been distributed to some of the world's needy peoples through Government and voluntary relief organizations, including Church World Service.

But it was recommended that in the extension of this legislation, "the strings" be removed from programs dispensed through the Government so that the receiving nations can be free to make the decisions about how the payment that they make shall be used in their country. These programs no matter how imaginatively expanded will probably not be enough either to meet the world's need or to dispose of our surpluses.

FAMINE RELIEF

"The women's division, therefore notes with gratification the adoption by the U.N. General Assembly of the World Food Bank plan to relieve emergency famine situation which will be channeled through FAO. We urge that Congress develop legislation that makes it possible for the United States to cooperate fully with this important program. And we further urge Methodist women to familiarize themselves with this plan and with the 5-year freedom from hunger campaign.

"As one dramatic symbol of the U.S. full support of this freedom from hunger campaign, it is recommended that plans be set in motion wherever possible through U.N. channels for the sending of U.S. surplus foods to help relieve the famine stricken people on the mainland of China."

The Women's Division of Christian Service, in another report, noted with deep regret that the U.S. Congress has authorized a 5-year commemoration and observance of the century-old Civil War.

"Such an observance at this time in our Nation's history may well provide the means for stimulating divisive elements, stirring up slumbering sectionalism, and generating strife that can result in untold damage," said the women.

However, the report urged Methodist women to exert every effort to maintain the high caliber of emphasis which characterized the initial observance of the commemoration both in New York and in Lexington, Va. There, it was noted, the observance emphasized the great gains made during the century in the area of human freedom.

Federal Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DURWARD G. HALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a letter received from Mr. D. D. Heter, civic affairs manager of the Springfield, Mo., Chamber of Commerce. If our country is to remain solvent, we cannot consistently spend more than our income. I think

Mr. Heter's letter is worthy of careful study by the American people:

MARCH 14, 1961.

The Honorable DURWARD G. HALL,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am sure that all Congressmen, if they used the factual rather than theoretical approach to our national problems, would agree that you cannot consistently spend more than you receive and remain financially sound. The day of reckoning must always come.

This being the case, why do not the Representatives of all the people take the necessary action to call a mortarium on all new spending and concentrate on making what we now have efficiently workable and financially sound. Can't this be done? Undoubtedly some toes will be stepped on but better this than continuing to spend ourselves out of existence to try to win votes at a later date.

Savings can be accomplished by a realistic approach in reviewing the funds requested for major national security, veterans' benefits, international affairs, commerce and housing, agriculture, labor and welfare, national resources and general government.

Further, economics can be insured by returning State functions to the States. Standardization of function for all the States is not a Federal right. Let's stop our march to socialism.

Let us stop trying to take care of people so they can take care of themselves.

This is a plea from just one little citizen of the 170 million, but a very fervent plea.

May I respectfully request that the above views be made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the 87th Congress.

Sincerely yours,

D. D. HETER.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, Byelorussia is hardly more than a geographic name today, almost lost in the huge and expansive Soviet Union. But 43 years ago this historic home of one of the oldest Slavic peoples was separated from the old czarist empire and its people proclaimed their independence. That was towards the end of the First World War, early in 1918.

The Byelorussian people, some 10 million hardy workers and gallant fighters, had been suffering under the oppressive czarist regime for centuries. Though they endured the heavy weight of the alien yoke, they retained their indomitable spirit of freedom, and they were always prepared to fight for its attainment. Their real chance came in 1918, after the overthrow of Russia's autocratic regime. Byelorussians were quick in taking advantage of this situation. They asserted their freedom, proclaimed their independence on March 25, and established the Byelorussian National Republic.

Thenceforth for almost 3 years Byelorussians divided their time between hard work and bitter struggle. They worked to rebuild their ravaged country and they fought against their foes on many fronts. But their enemies were too powerful, and one in particular among their foes proved fatal to their independence. The Soviet Red Army, reorganized and regrouped, attacked Byelorussia early in 1921 and overran the the country. Then it was incorporated into the Soviet Union. Thus ended the free and independent Byelorussian National Republic.

This brief 3-year period of Byelorussian history marks a turning point in the lives of Byelorussia's inhabitants. Though the happy and joyous period of freedom and independence was quite short, and vanished like a dream, its inspiring afterglow still survives in Byelorussia in the hearts of freedom-seeking Byelorussians. Today, on the 43d anniversary of their Independence Day, and 40 years after their enslavement under Communist totalitarian tyranny, the peoples of the free world still remember these devotees and gallant fighters for freedom.

Department of Agriculture Lamb-Buying Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ODIN LANGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture's recently announced lamb-buying program seems to be pretty much a matter of robbing Peter to pay Paul when viewed in the light of lamb imports. Thus far, the Department, by a program announced on February 27, 1961, in an attempt to improve prices, has acquired 4½ million pounds of lamb at a cost of $1¾ million. At the same time, we have imported over 14 million pounds of lamb at a cost of over $3½ million during the past 13 months.

The way the program is operating, the Department is buying lamb at about the same rate it is being imported. The latest purchase was 1,700,000 pounds, and we imported 1,600,000 pounds in January. First these imports are allowed to come in, and then the Department purchases them because of their bad effect on the domestic market. This must be one of the strangest applications of the quota and tariff system in history.

I certainly agree that net farm income needs improvement and that contributing commodities to nonprofit charitable institutions, as is being done with the purchased lamb, is a worthy means of distribution. But since all we are doing, in effect, is buying imports, we are wasting the taxpayers' money and giving the farmer no real or lasting help. The cost of the program, however, is charged to the farmer.

I am aware of the importance of international trade to international relations, and am in no way advocating a complete termination of farm imports. However, situations such as this one in lamb—and there are comparable ones in oats, barley, and rye, also—certainly point to the fact that a more sensible import policy is needed. The present policy is harming both the farmer and the taxpayer.

Foreign Aid Formula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the attention of my colleagues the following excellent article by David Lawrence as it appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on March 22:

PEOPLE SEEN UNINFORMED ON ISSUES IN FOREIGN AID

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, March 21.—When are the people of the United States really going to be informed about the issues involved in spending billions of dollars for "foreign aid"?

President Kennedy is planning to pursue the same formula, with some minor modifications, that was used by the Republican and Democratic administrations preceding him. The idea is to grant funds and lend money on the theory that the United States has a humanitarian obligation to the poverty-stricken countries of the world. There is also an implication that, unless the United States helps these various countries, Soviet Russia will move in and take over.

The time is approaching, however, for a showdown on just how far the United States should go in extending foreign aid and what it should expect in return from the countries aided.

The biggest single factor that calls for full and thorough exposure is what may be termed "official blackmail." Government after government takes money from both sides. The moment the United States slows down its aid, there is a noticeable manifestation of interest in what the Communists may have to offer. High officials of such a government promptly arrange to visit Moscow, or threaten to do so. This is perhaps the favorite of all the tricks to impress America.

NEUTRALIST RESPECTABLE

Just why any government would want to be neutral as between communism and democracy is difficult to understand, but the word neutralist has suddenly become a most respectable term. There was a time when the difference between freedom and tyranny was clearly understood, and no persuasive reason was offered why any country should be neutral as between the two.

The fact is, moreover, that many countries in Latin America, as well as in Asia and Africa and even in Europe, today are convinced that, if they adopt a neutral position, the United States will come through with large sums of money.

Congress has been bewildered by the growing scope of America's foreign aid program. It is recognized, of course, that some appropriations should be made to strengthen the military position of the United States and of the Western countries in the so-called uncommitted areas. In certain instances money spent to help a national economy or

to build up local military forces is a good investment in security for the United States. But when the program reaches into the broader aspects of culture and education, it becomes far more controversial.

NATIONAL DEBT NOTED

If America did not have a national debt of nearly $300 billion and were operating under a balanced budget, and if taxes in the United States were not so burdensome, and if there were no recession in America with more than 5 million persons unemployed, it might sound reasonable for a part of the surplus bounty of the American people to be given away. But the question now is whether the United States can afford to be as generous in its foreign-aid program as it has been in the past.

Undoubtedly the Marshall plan paid off. It gave the nations of Europe needed support in recovering after the war. But this was, in a large sense, a military proposition. It was important for the United States to build allies in Europe. There is no such justification for the building up of neutrals, for instance, in Africa among countries who never will ally themselves with the United States or the West.

Under the circumstances, America may well be paying out funds to countries which will soon be strong enough to become important adjuncts of the Communist apparatus. This is the chance which the American people are taking. The idea now is being advanced that the Washington government should exact some assurances as to how the money will be spent and as to whether the countries will put their military forces at the disposal of the United States in the event of serious trouble with the Communists.

EGYPT'S STAND NOTED

Unless the taxpayers' money is being spent for the defense of the people of the United States, it is difficult to see how, in the long run, huge expenditures to countries which are playing both ends against the middle can be justified. There are countries like Egypt, for example, which permit the Communist apparatus to function inside their borders, and yet who want financial assistance from this country. The real question is whether the countries that are being assisted are truly friends of the United States or whether they are now or may later become a part of the Communist apparatus.

It is upon these fundamental, issues in the "foreign aid" problem that Congress is being urged to require a great deal of information before embarking upon the programs being recommended to it by the Kennedy administration.

Rome Went Out of Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it has been my observation that a few newspapers which originate on the eastern seaboard have a dominating influence over the thinking of many Members of Congress. I have always thought that the grassroots philosophy expressed by the editors of weekly community newspapers throughout the country deserve equal attention. It is with this idea in mind that I submit for the study of the Members the editorial "Rome Went Out of Business," which appeared in the Palos Regional on March 16:

ROME WENT OUT OF BUSINESS

There is a common wish among people to peer into the future but the future cannot be visualized except through history—which often repeats itself. Due to the wide belief that the Federal Government should provide an endless list of benefits from welfare to education with centralized bureaucracy replacing local responsibility it is well to ponder possible results. The fate of the Roman Empire suggests what might happen to the United States.

The Encyclopedia Britannica says this about the decline and fall of the Roman Empire: "nothing could compensate for the lack of self-determination, and although during the first century and a half of imperial rule a flourishing local patriotism in some degree filled the place of the wider sentiment, this gradually sank into decay and became a pretext under cover of which the lower classes in the several communities took toll of their wealthier fellow citizens in the shape of public works, largesses amusements, etc., until the resources at the disposal of the rich ran dry, the communities themselves in many cases became insolvent * * * the organs of civic life became atrophied, political interest died out and the whole burden of administration, as well as that of defense, fell upon the shoulders of the bureaucracy, which proved unequal to the task. The gigantic bureaucarcy of the fourth century proved, in spite of its undoubted services, an intolerable weight upon the energies of the Empire."

History, let us remember, has a habit of repeating itself.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, the fate and fortune of the Byelorussians have been almost blended with those of the people of Russia for a long time, but they have always striven to maintain their distinct ethnic identity and their undying love for freedom. Their firm determination to be free, and their readiness to sacrifice all their worldly possessions, even their lives for their ideals, has kept the spirit of freedom and independence alive among them. Though their oppressive overloads, the Russians, have done their worst to eradicate these fine traits, under oppression they have doubled their power of resistence and have succeeded in maintaining their identity. They have always wanted to regain their freedom, and in 1918 they had the opportunity to be independent.

When the decrepit czarist regime was overthrown during the First World War, the Byelorussians proclaimed their independence on March 25, 1918. Then they set up the Byelorussian National Republic with its democratic government under which some 10 million Byelorussians lived and worked happily for about 3 years. Then began the unhappy period in their national life. Early in 1921 the Red army attacked and overran the country, thus putting an end to independent Byelorussia. Soon the country was incorporated into the Soviet Union and the Byelorussians were ensalved under Soviet tyranny.

For 40 years these people have been enduring the oppressive Soviet regime, but they have not lost their love of freedom; they still cling to their national goal, that of attaining independence and freedom. On this 43d anniversary of their independence day let us hope that they will reach their goal and attain their national freedom.

Statement by the Civil War Centennial Commission of the State of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, the President's comments at his press conference last evening are most heartening to all who are disturbed at the insistence of the Executive Committee of the National Civil War Centennial Commission upon holding the fourth assembly in segregated Charleston in April.

In order to clarify the issue, I submit for the attention of my colleagues the following statement issued on March 22 by the Civil War Centennial Commission of the State of New Jersey. The facts speak for themselves:

The New Jersey Civil War Centennial Commission is still in hope that the wisdom of President Kennedy and other responsible statesmen will prevail, and that the National Civil War Centennial Commission will see fit to change the site of its fourth national assembly, scheduled for April 11–12 in Charleston, S.C.

The national commission's decision to stand pat is at best disillusioning. And, in the words of U.S. Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE, Republican, of New Jersey, it is "incredible."

From the outset, the national commission in its statements has doggedly refused to recognize its responsibility as a Federal agency, operating with funds derived from Congress and ultimately from the citizens of all 50 States.

In its formal statement yesterday, the national commission sidestepped a fundamental issue of principle. The commission cannot avoid responsibility for sponsoring the fourth national assembly in Charleston, and it cannot place blame on the discriminatory law and customs of the State of South Carolina.

The New Jersey commission, as well as other state commissions and individuals who have joined in its position, is convinced that the national commission is derelict in its duty to the people of the United States if it does not alter its stand immediately. The New Jersey Senate and General Assembly have both approved this stand by unanimous resolution.

The New Jersey commission wishes to clarify the following points which have been clouded or skirted by the national commission in statements issuing from that agency:

(a) The national commission has spent considerable time and effort in promoting and organizing the fourth national assembly. It has mailed out hundreds of press releases, invitations, and hotel registration forms. The assembly is a commission-sponsored function, entirely separate from the fireworks display being planned by South Caro-

lina authorities to celebrate the firing on Fort Sumter.

(b) Mrs. Madaline A. Williams did not formally apply for housing at the Francis Marion Hotel, nor did she complain to anyone about being rejected. All inquiries were originated and made by other persons connected with the New Jersey commission, with the knowledge and approval of Mrs. Williams. It was at a public meeting on March 9, 1961, that the commission's stand was publicized, and Mrs. Williams was one of the commission members voting in favor of the resolution.

(c) For more than a month, Mr. Karl S. Betts, executive director of the national commission, ignored repeated inquiries regarding Mrs. Williams' acceptance in Charleston. The queries were made by Mr. Everett J. Landers, executive director of the New Jersey Civil War Centennial Commission. It was not until March 8, 1961, that Mr. Landers initiated a call and spoke twice by phone to Mayor J. Palmer Gaillard of Charleston. After checking with authorities at the Francis Marion, Mayor Gaillard called back to report that Mrs. Williams' arrival at the hotel would be "very embarrassing to all concerned," and that she would not be permitted to live or eat at the hotel. The mayor reported Mrs. Williams would be permitted to attend business sessions of the assembly, but it could not be determined if she would be required to sit in a segregated area at that time.

(d) It is conceded that the national commission has "no authority or jurisdiction" to challenge the rights of South Carolina hotel keepers in the management of their properties, but the national commission does have the authority or jurisdiction to cancel the fourth national assembly forthwith, and to reschedule the program in a city which respects the birthright of all people of all races.

Any member of the national commission who had troubled to read Representative Hugh J. Addonizio's statement in the March 13, 1961, issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, entitled "Segregation Policies in Charleston, S.C.," could not have possibly misinterpreted the New Jersey position.

Mrs. Williams was one of hundreds of persons receiving an invitation and registration forms from the national commission. Since there was no question regarding race or color on the form, it is evident that her application would have been honored until the moment she walked up to the room clerk to claim her key. At that time it would become apparent that "rooms have been oversubscribed."

Early but futile inquiries were made by this commission to determine Mrs. Williams' position as an official New Jersey delegate because it was hoped that the acceptance of Mrs. Williams as a first class citizen in Charleston would have been a glorious way of opening the centennial and proving to all humanity that the terrible American Civil War was really not waged in vain.

Veterans' Insurance: Mr. Teague of Texas, and Mr. Gross

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on March 21, at the time of the debate on the bill H.R. 4539, which proposes to pay a special dividend to holders of so-called RS and W insurance, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] and I engaged in colloquy concerning the general subject of insurance.

The question was raised as to why dividends on World War II insurance were so high. I have since written a letter to the gentleman from Iowa explaining in some detail my reasons. Under leave to extend my remarks I include the text of that letter:

MARCH 22, 1961.

Hon. H. R. GROSS,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Apropos of the discussion and colloquy between us on the Floor on yesterday concerning Veterans' Administration insurance, I thought I should write you concerning some of the background of this subject.

U.S. Government life insurance which was enacted for the benefit of World War I veterans has the premium rates based on the American Experience Table Mortality with interest at 3½ percent. This is set forth in section 743, title 38.

Section 702 of title 38 provides that premium rates for national service life insurance, the World War II variety, shall be the net rates based upon the American Experience Table Mortality and interest at 3 percent per annum. You will note, of course, that both of these provisions are set by law, and in the case of World War I, has been in effect close to 40 years and World War II since October, 1940. Insurance is the contract and may be subject to a suit. Any policyholder who is dissatisfied with a decision of the Veterans' Administration (or for that matter any beneficiary) may sue the Government in the nearest appropriate district court. You will readily appreciate that the Congress thus is without power to make a mandatory change of the mortality table just as a private insurance company cannot change the rules in the middle of the game; neither can the Government. If you attempted to do so, I think one suit would be sufficient to establish the fact that the Government is without power to change the mortality tables.

I cite all of this because the mortality table and the lengthened lifespan are the reasons for the unusually high dividends which World War I veterans and World War II veterans enjoy. There is nothing that the Government or the Veterans' Administration can do about either of these facts. I am sure you appreciate this.

Since the enactment of the two acts that I referred to above, the Congress has generally tried to put insurance, which has been written in recent years, on a more realistic mortality table basis. I cite the insurance written as "RS" and "W." "RS" insurance was not expected to produce any dividends and was made nonparticipating, but it did produce a surplus and therefore we had the equitable duty to distribute it as a dividend. This is the reason for the passage on yesterday of H.R. 4539. The experience of the Veterans' Administration in death claims has been so favorable on this insurance that approximately $65 million was accumulated.

The so-called "W" Insurance which was provided by Public Law 85–896 sets the premium on so-called X–18 table and you will be glad to know that this table of mortality is accomplishing its aim that Congress had for it; namely, providing low cost nonparticipating insurance.

I hope to introduce, as I said yesterday, a bill shortly which will provide for the payment of the administrative expenses for the operation of the insurance program by deductions from the dividends available to World War I and World War II veterans. There is a considerable question whether this can be done, since as I have indicated above the insurance is a contract. I plan to submit this to the Veterans' Administration as soon as I draft it, and also to the Attorney General so that the constitutional question can be resolved.

You can readily tell, of course, that I feel that there is no easy solution to this problem. If you care to introduce legislation which you think will correct it in any way, I'll be happy to request departmental reports immediately and see that you get a public hearing at an early date at which time you can present your point of view in the fullest possible manner. I would not limit this to insurance but will offer you the same opportunity on any matter coming within the jurisdiction of this committee.

Very truly yours,

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman.

More Truth Than Realized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently one of the dedicated community newspapers in my district, the Desplaines Valley News, directed their readers' attention to certain local conditions but in the process discussed in a frank manner issues which we face here in Washington. I therefore feel this editorial is worthy of scrutiny by Members of the Congress:

MORE TRUTH THAN REALIZED

Chicago's Mayor Daley defended his proposed 10 percent property tax rate increase facing city residents on the grounds that "taxes are increasing in all areas of government because people are demanding more services."

Mayor Daley pinpoints the real reason for tax hikes with that statement, for since the time the American Indians drew up treaties with the Federal Government in return for some Federal service, the American people have caught the habit of looking to the Great White Father in Washington for the solution to all their troubles.

More and more people feel that handing the Federal Government their individual responsibilities or community duties instantly frees them of further obligations and also any financial cost.

GOLDEN PROMISES NEED FINANCING

At each presidential election, both political party candidates promise golden benefits for a vote, and when elections are over, various pressure groups operate to make the party hold to its promises.

The current administration is carrying the weight of a large number of individual responsibilities and is enlarging its operations into State and community affairs at every opportunity.

Federal aid to education has become an issue at the grade school level to such an extent that parochial and private schools are part of the problem. Everyone wants a benefit, but everyone complains when the taxes zoom higher to pay for such benefits.

Housing in the past years has reached the highest level in American history, yet Federal aid is being asked to further expand

housing by virtue of slum clearance grants, low cost loans, and federally operated housing developments.

Unemployment and old-age security benefits are constantly being hiked to the extent that the worker's take-home pay is practically as much as the deductions taken for the various benefits.

So health hospitalization benefits are demanded. How the costs are to be paid without further income-tax hikes or payroll deductions is difficult to say.

Streets and roads were a township or community problem. Suddenly the Federal Government moved in and new toll roads and new bureaus are added to the Washington governmental responsibilities.

Recently a large number of volunteers are asking to enroll in an administration Peace Corps plan, mainly for duty overseas.

Yet, both the Army and Navy must draft youths for overseas duty at higher salaries than the Peace Corps will offer. Perhaps the armed services will find that they had been using the wrong idealistic and semantic approach to the problem of enlisting youth for duty.

MORE FEDERAL BUREAUS CREATED

The Peace Corps plan will mean that another Federal bureau will be created, and more obligations assumed.

Those familiar with Federal operations know that there are endless forms to fill out and endless investigations to undergo before they receive a dime.

More Federal employees must be hired to process various project applications or requests. More funds will be necessary to pay those employees and finance the projects.

So the revenue department asks for a tax hike. People scream to the heavens.

Pity they don't scream as loudly when the Government proposes handing out the benefits.

Phrasing Daley's truism another way, one can find that everyone tries to get something for nothing, but few are willing to dig into their pocket to pay for the same thing. Everyone wants the ride, but nobody wants to pay the driver.

Secretary Udall Addresses North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address by Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall at 26th North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conferences, Washington, D.C., March 6, 1961:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR STEWART L. UDALL AT 26TH NORTH AMERICAN WILDLIFE AND NATURAL RESOURCES CONFERENCE, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 6, 1961

I am very glad that you have given me this opportunity to address the General Session of this, the 26th North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference. I enjoy talking to people whose business is my business and whose interests are my interests, especially as we are about to share what I hope will prove to be some of the most far-reaching and productive years in the history of the conservation movement in this country.

The theme of this conference, "Planning for Population Pressures," is to me indicative of the breadth of purpose—and depth of understanding—of the conference's sponsors and participants.

Not so long ago, as time is reckoned, our natural resources appeared so limitless that people were no problem at all. As recently as the middle of the last century the French observer, de Tocqueville, was able to write of "that continent which still presents, as it did in the primeval time, rivers that rise from never-failing sources, green and moist solitudes, and limitless fields which the plowshare of the husbandman has never turned. Such is the admirable position of the new world that man has no other enemy than himself."

But man did turn out to be his own worst enemy, and all too soon it became the conservationist's mission to protect and preserve our land, water, and wildlife from the barren consequences of man's conviction that he held a special place in creation and that the land and its creatures were expendable. The conservation movement has—to its good fortune—had great champions in its hours of greatest need. With almost providential timing—men of extraordinary vigor and vision have taken up the cause of conservation and made it their own. To the wise counsel of Gifford Pinchot, John Muir, the two Roosevelts, and Harold Ickes—to name but a few—this generation owes a profound debt of gratitude. But more often than not their advice went unheeded.

Only four generations after de Tocqueville's visit to the "primeval continent" much of our land lay eroded. Many of our once vast forests were harvested wantonly and our great rivers ran unharnessed, and polluted, to the sea. It was not until the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt that the full development of our land and water resources and the careful protection of perishable natural assets truly became major expressions of national policy.

But with the coming of World War II and troubled times abroad, the attention of the public and of succeeding administrations was largely diverted from our own land. The Department of the Interior—until that time a prime mover in national affairs—slowly settled into a rut of lackluster performance, content to let others shape the country and the ideas which guided it. It has now been more than 20 years since the United States has engaged in any massive and sustained national conservation effort. The broad programs initiated by Franklin Roosevelt—the Civilian Conservation Corps, reforestation of public lands, sustained soil and water conservation measures—have either been allowed to lapse or to drift along on the momentum of the past.

Yet it is precisely those same twenty years that have fundamentally changed what Thomas Jefferson called the face and character of our land. Hundreds of thousands have pushed out from the cities into the countryside—a movement that has inevitably created vast stretches of urban sprawl.

The talk today is of overurbanization, exploding population, and vanishing countryside. And it would seem that this is only the beginning. Inevitably we, as managers of our natural resources, are faced with acute new responsibilities. We are today in a state of long-term crisis. Although we rarely concede the point, our modern industrial society depends for its survival on an equilibrium between man and nature. As Aldo Leopold, that most perceptive and eloquent conservation prophet, once said:

"Civilization is not the enslavement of a stable and constant earth. It is the state of mutual and interdependent cooperation between human animals, other animals, plants and soils, which may be disrupted at any moment by the failure of any one of them."

We have today a new dimension of urgency in the dependence of man on nature: I refer to the need for the human animal to recreate itself in nature. The necessity to meet the outdoor needs of our people now and in the future will in all likelihood be the sharpest and most consistent pressure on our land, water and forests in the years ahead.

The overriding mandate to conservationists today is to preserve the natural habitat of man—to preserve it against the onslaught of bulldozers, cement mixers and subdividers. Because no matter how seemingly industrialized and civilized man has become over the past two centures, he is biologically and temperamentally rooted in the soil. To allow ourselves to be cut off from our relationship with the earth, from our relationship with mountains and lakes, forests and open places, might well cause a fundamental change in our national character.

Never before has the need for imaginative and truly national leadership been as great as it is today. On the one hand we have an almost insatiable and evergrowing population. On the other hand, a limited reservoir of land and its resources. In between, as arbiter so to speak, we have a large group of dedicated and highly trained men such as those of you here today. The need clearly is for leadership in the very highest places of our Government so that we might define our objectives and proceed posthaste with meaningful planning—and action. It is therefore a matter of satisfaction that President Kennedy, in his special message to Congress on natural resources, has set forth a charter under which all of us can work with all the ingenuity, energy, intuition, and enthusiasm we can muster.

For, in my opinion, never before has a President of the United States given such a broad and comprehensive mandate to conservation policymakers. Particularly noteworthy is that section of the President's message which deals with recreation. It is significant indeed that for the first time in history the recreation potential of our land and water has been put on a par with, say the hydoelectric potential of our great rivers. Surely every conservationist who read the President's message must have felt a quickening of his pulse at the vast opportunities which we can achieve under this broad Presidential charter. I think I can safely say that my associates and I at the Department of the Interior felt a surge of purpose and momentum. That very night we sat down and began to assemble our plans and programs, with the realization that now, for the first time, we could put together a truly national program for the wise development of our resources including the acquisition of still unspoiled and water in every section of this country.

It is still too early to present here anything except a broad outline of the principles and objectives which will dominate the thinking of the new Administration.

We are first of all taking a hard new look at existing programs within the National Park Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Indian Bureau, and the Bureau of Reclamation. We are, for example, reassessing the objectives of Mission 66. There has been some concern on the part of conservationists whether some of our national parks are not being overdeveloped at the expense of their unspoiled grandeur. We are giving these considerations attention, area by area.

As you know, the administration has ordered an 18-month moratorium on the filing

of nonmineral claims on our public domain. Among the advantages to be gained from this breathing spell is the opportunity to prepare an inventory of the recreational opportunities offered by the public domain to all. Those areas which offer exceptional opportunities must be made available, through proper development, to the men and women who own the land.

Perhaps no other outdoor sport has grown as much over the past decade as has boating and here Federal reservoirs offer opportunities which often did not exist before. The construction of Tiber Dam in Montana, for example, created Tiber Reservoir where on a typical Sunday 300 boats were counted and where on the opening day of the trout season 1,750 fishermen caught 5,000 rainbow trout. But in the past recreational values of Federal reservoirs have received altogether too little attention. It is our intention to prepare plans to fully utilize recreational opportunities of new and existing reservoirs and to seek appropriations for their development.

We are giving very careful study on how we can speed up the vital wetlands acquisition program in the Fish and Wildlife Service.

We have been charged by the President to formulate plans for new starts. Obviously, a national program of this kind does not mean the acquisition of new Federal parks and recreational areas only. Inevitably, and most importantly, such a program must include devices for encouraging the States to develop land acquisition programs of their own.

The need is for a balanced program of National and State parks—wildlife preserves and local recreation areas. Our great national parks represent one of the few remaining opportunities for the leisurely enjoyment and admiration of magnificent landscapes.

But America's families should be able to spend a day in the outdoors—within an easy drive of their homes—whether they are picnickers, hunters, fishermen, or just looking for a place in the sun. They should not have to rely on the Federal Government for this, but rather on their own States and communities. And not so incidentally, such State areas would take much of the pressure off our national parks which now must take the impact of millions of visitors each year, some of them with only a casual interest in their significance and unique splendor.

This will be a real challenge to our States—and one that they must meet for the benefit of their citizens. Already some States—such as New York and California—have led the way with legislative programs or studies which point the way for all.

We hope to encourage not only State programs but joint ventures between neighboring States to acquire relatively large open spaces near cities where recreation land is most needed and hardest to come by.

We are in the process of finishing an inventory of areas of great scenic beauty which should become a part of the national park system. At the same time, we are giving a great deal of thought to whether some of these new national parks and new national seashores should not be managed as year-round recreational areas. It may well be that some areas whose beauty is fragile will serve only as living nature centers. The best management of other areas, however, may well allow more vigorous use, and be opened up to hunters, for example. We will decide in each case how to manage each area for its own best interest and for the interests of those who visit them now and in the generations to come.

I am especially eager to see that a part of the land adjoining our great rivers and streams be set aside for outdoor recreation. Such land offers unparalleled opportunities for the active enjoyment of the outdoors.

We are currently weighing various incentive programs to make it worthwhile for private landowners to open up their land to hunters, fishermen, and others. Programs of this kind are, of course, especially needed in the Northeast and Midwest where almost all land is privately owned.

And, as you know, this administration has urged the enactment of a wilderness protection bill, similar to the one now under consideration by the Congress.

I realize that we are about to undertake a great deal and I also realize that on each particular proposal we are going to receive encouragement from some, and criticism from others. We expect to rely substantially on the findings of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission as they become available and I intend to keep in close touch with the Commission as our plans develop. We are determined to do the best we can in consultation with all who have a working interest in these matters and we are equally determined to get the job done. The land which we save now is likely all that ever can be saved, and I know that I speak for millions of Americans when I say that this generation is willing to make the sacrifices to insure a good life for our children and grandchildren. As President Kennedy said in his resources message: "We cannot delude ourselves, we must understand our resources problems, and we must face up to them now. The task is large but it will be done."

The Chance for Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address by Mr. Ira N. Gabrielson, president, Wildlife Management Institute.

THE CHANCE FOR CONSERVATION

(By Ira N. Gabrielson)

Today's opening session of the North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference has a striking similarity with that of the conference held here 8 years ago. The national administration had passed into different custody in 1953. A new Secretary of the Interior delivered his first official public speech on natural resources at the 18th conference. In speaking, he reviewed the responsibilities of his Department and expressed hope for accomplishment.

This morning we had the honor and pleasure of the participation of Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior under a new administration. He, too, has expressed awareness of the Department's responsibilities in the field of natural resources and has voiced determination to overcome the many wildlife, park, public lands and other problems that concern all of us.

Eight years ago I observed that on the change of administrations, Washington was crowded with representatives of special interest groups who were soliciting support for efforts to get profitable use of the Nation's publicly owned natural resources. Everyone in this room is familiar with the self-seeking proposals that were advanced. It is history now that few succeeded and, in the process of their rejection, conservation emerged as a persuasive and tangible voice for the restoration and improved management of the country's natural resources.

Unlike 1953, many present obstacles to natural resources accomplishment are not entirely private versus public interests, but are conflicts of objectives within agencies of the Federal Government. These differences are not of recent origin, to be sure, but in the last few years they have become clearly visible to the public eye. Most represent fundamental policy and organization questions, which must be resolved if avowed natural resource goals are to be achieved.

Before commenting on the apparent inconsistencies within Government, I want to call attention to a substantial dissimilarity between today's session and that of 8 years ago. At no other time in the early days of a new administration, and at no time during the life of most, has a President sent such a compelling and comprehensive statement of natural resources problems and opportunities to the Congress. Most of us knew it was being developed, but few dared to hope that it would be so complete.

Perhaps less should not have been anticipated, for conservation is now a vigorous force in this country. The 1960 national political campaign marked the first time that major conservation groups were invited to appear before the platform committees of both parties. Most accepted, and their advice and suggestions are evident in the platform documents as well as in President Kennedy's natural resources message of February 23. Get a copy and study it if you have not done so already. Ask your Senator or Congressman for House Document No. 94.

The lack of centralized review of agency policies and programs for water, forest, park, public land, wildlife, and other resources is responsible for contradiction in the Federal effort. Special commissions have undertaken various investigations in the past, but their brief assignments have been limited in scope. Another drawback is that Congress rarely is eager to implement commission recommendations.

What has become almost a traditional practice of Government is that the larger agencies are able to obtain essential program support without too much difficulty. Equally deserving, but less influential, agencies must strive to justify their requests, and they are the first to be cut when reductions are made. This situation creates and perpetuates unfortunate imbalances in resource activities.

The President's message reveals that an Advisory Committee on Natural Resources will be formed within his Council of Economic Advisers. This parallels legislative proposals which seek a natural resources advisory group in the Executive Office. Extreme care must be exercised in appointing any such Advisory Committee so that all natural resources are represented. Disproportionate emphasis would result in further expansion of present inequities.

Water is discussed in a recent report of the Senate select committee, which recommends immediate action to prepare for ever-mounting demands. The President acknowledged this problem in his message. Two aspects of immediate concern to conservationists include the expansion and strengthening of Federal water pollution abatement activities and the renunciation of the previous administration's "no new starts" policy for water resources development.

This Congress will consider proposals for significantly expanding the existing Federal pollution control program. The public is demanding that the Federal Government recognize and accept its full share of responsibility in this vital matter. The President's message, like a number of bills that

have been introduced, calls for greater assistance to State and regional programs, expansion of grants-in-aid to municipalities for the construction of State-approved sewage-treatment facilities, accelerated research, and broader enforcement.

The suggestion for creating a water pollution control agency in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is in line with public thinking. That important activity must be taken out of the fifth subbasement of that large agency. Water pollution prevention must have equal rank with or even priority over flood control, navigation, and many other types of water programs. In addition, there should be greater research efforts to find more effective and cheaper methods of keeping pollutants out of our streams.

It is hoped that in rejecting the "no new starts" policy, the administration will not unleash projects that will destroy important resources. Projects made possible by the expenditure of public funds should be made to produce benefits public in scope. Projects which destroy or greatly impair existing resources, for example, those that threaten valuable salmon runs on the Columbia, should not be authorized or constructed until safe fish passage is worked out. Public access to water projects, shoreline recreation, fish and wildlife, and the provision of conservation storage pools must be considered. The Federal Power Commission should be forced to recognize that recreation, fisheries, and wildlife are valued by Americans, and that their continued sacrifice at FPC-licensed projects is not in the public interest.

Long-sought reorientation of the Bureau of Land Management programs has been much in the public view in recent weeks. The millions of acres administered by that agency never have approached their capacity to produce national benefit. Many of you know from personal experience that the BLM is dominated—and frustrated—by one small group of resource users. Requests for appropriations for the worthwhile programs that dedicated employees have sought to initiate invariably run aground. Most get no further than the front office. Few persons are aware of the resource opportunities that are being wasted, because that agency has never been permitted to state its case. Appropriations for BLM and for other resources agencies are investments in the future welfare of the country. They will be repaid many times over in coming years. Efforts to make the BLM a land management agency of multiple interests will be supported by all conservationists.

Retention of wetlands of primary importance to waterfowl in the tristate region of Minnesota and the Dakotas requires forthright action. Federal activities in that area, which is the prime waterfowl breeding and nesting habitat in the United States, exemplify the pointlessness of interagency contradiction. Responsibility for waterfowl preservation is vested in the Department of the Interior. Yet the technical and financial assistance programs of the Department of Agriculture are accelerating the destruction of good wetlands there faster than it can be acquired.

The widely publicized treaty joined in by the two agencies last summer held out tentative hope for progress. The Fish and Wildlife Service was to inspect potholes proposed for drainage and to recommend those that should be saved because of their importance to the national waterfowl program. This was done in 12 of the 90 counties in the three-State area. Of 1,629 potholes proposed for drainage and certified as eligible for Federal assistance by the Soil Conservation Service, 553 were recommended for preservation. Only 128—less than one-quarter—were saved. Privately owned waterfowl habitat will persist only if landowners can receive incentives to retain productive wetlands in their natural condition. A program must be developed without delay.

Proceeds from the sale of duck stamps cannot finance a large enough land acquisition program. The annual income is much too small for the ambitious action that is needed. The best plan that has been suggested is the advancing of $150 million by the Federal Government which the Fish and Wildlife Service could use to buy or lease land as rapidly as possible. Future receipts into the duck stamp fund would be pledged for repayment of the purchase-money loan.

Another must is that the United States initiate action with Canada and Mexico to explore opportunities for preserving vital waterfowl habitat in those countries. The State Department needs to be alerted to the serious situation that has developed with respect to the destruction of waterfowl habitat and the need for mutual action. Proposed developments, particularly in Canada, have wildlife leaders in both countries deeply concerned. Federal and Dominican leadership must be exerted in this important matter.

An interagency conflict that often occupies the headlines is the one between the Interior and Agriculture Departments over the use of toxic chemicals in large-scale plant and animal pest control programs. Most of you know the unyielding positions held by personnel of the two departments. The debates about the effects on wildlife and fish of the billions of pounds of highly toxic materials that are used annually are complex and unending, but they do emphasize one paramount point. Entirely too little is known about the real impact of these poisons on man, livestock, soil organisms, fish, wildlife, and all other living creatures. Chemical control programs receive millions of dollars of support, but the research work of both departments limps along on woefully inadequate budgets.

Pesticide research must be expanded. Future decisions cannot be made without necessary information. Much more attention should be given to the natural biological control of insects, the environmental factors that influence population outbreaks, and the useful management techniques. Little has been done in this challenging field in this country, but certain European experiments show considerable promise. We should insist upon knowing the harm that may be done by broadcasting huge quantities of powerful poisons over our lands and waters. Lack of knowledge can be serious.

A blueprint was prepared for recreation and fish and wildlife programs on the national forests a few years ago. Regardless or how good it might be, the program schedule cannot be met unless adequate appropriations are provided. The Forest Service also should seek additional funds so that it can carry out big-game habitat improvement on the national forests in line with its expressed intention.

The President's message made clear that he was instructing the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior and other appropriate Federal, State, and local officials and private leaders to formulate a Federal recreational lands program. An objective survey should determine where additional national parks, forests, and seashore areas are desirable. Care should be taken to select the right areas to make sure that their designation as forests, parks, or seashores takes into full account the public need and their capacity to serve that need in future years.

Other important matters demand immediate consideration. These include the complex problem of protecting Rainbow Bridge National Monument in Utah from the rising waters behind Glen Canyon Dam. This problem presents a threat to the half-century concept of the sanctity of the national park system. Its solution is made difficult by the contradictory positions taken by Congress. The act which authorized Glen Canyon Dam bars any dam or reservoir from violating any national park units. Congress, in a complete turnabout, subsequently refused to appropriate funds for the necessary protective works.

This is the fifth year that a national wilderness bill has been before Congress. Extensive hearings have been held in Washington and in the field. The original measure has been modified in order to incorporate suggestions that have been received and to make crystal clear that the administrative prerogatives of existing agencies will not be hampered. I doubt that those who continue to oppose the wilderness bill have read it or studied the hearing record. Communications between the Washington and field offices of one Federal resources agency also appear to need repair. Field personnel have been giving speeches in opposition to the wilderness bill at a time when the central office is on record in favor of it.

This proposal has been misrepresented more than any bill that has been before Congress in many years. Those who continue to misrepresent and oppose it appparently do so because they have designs on coveted value in the wilderness areas of our national forests, parks, and wildlife refuges. The wilderness bill has the President's support. It has the people's support, and it merits immediate approval by Congress.

One of the biggest boons to wildlife and to the building of precious soil fertility and moisture against a time of actual need is the conservation reserve program. Congress denied its extension last year. Only specious arguments can be used in attempting to justify the expensive production of tremendous volumes of unneeded agricultural products and the sacrifice of soil nutrients, moisture, and wildlife habitat. A rational plan for land retirement should be included in any farm program that is developed.

Affirmative action on the Tule Lake and Lower Klamath National Wildlife Refuges has been avoided for years. Those refuges have been compromised to the point where their fate and that of the birds using them depends on preserving the acreage that remains. Which is the most important—a few more homesteads or the waterfowl resources of the Pacific flyway?

I have touched on a number of the major conservation issues. Most are outlined in the President's message. Remember that they represent unfinished work. Listing them on paper means little if you and I and other conservationists fail to work vigorously for their adoption. Executive Office and departmental directives must be prepared and implemented, and legislative proposals drafted, introduced, and favorable congressional action obtained. All this lies ahead.

The paints merely have been mixed. Now they must be applied to the canvas. Only when we get our shoulders to the wheel, as we have done in the past, will there be a chance for a real advance in natural resources management.

Proposed U.S. Host Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. CARROLL

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, along with a number of other Senators rep-

resenting all parts of the United States I have cosponsored S. 610, introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. The bill, as we know, would put the U.S. Government actively on the job of encouraging foreign tourists to come to our shores. It is hoped that this measure would help the United States curb its outflow of dollars and gold, stimulate business in almost every State and improve worldwide understanding of our country and people.

There are problems involved in seeking a mass foreign market for our tourist attractions. Mr. Luther Hodges, our Secretary of Commerce, pointed to some of these problems in a talk delivered this week. He is concerned, and rightly, with the language barrier and with the kind of hospitality we offer our visitors from abroad.

I am happy to be able to say that a woman from my State of Colorado has been working on the very same problem, and that she has what seems to be a most sensible, creative plan.

She is Mrs. Mable Grimes, a retired but vigorous Denver businesswoman. Mrs. Grimes came to Washington a couple of weeks ago, having read about S. 610 and its almost identical predecessor, S. 3102 of the 86th Congress, which I also was privileged to cosponsor. She had an idea which she put into her own words in a memorandum prepared at the suggestion of Representative BYRON G. ROGERS of Colorado and myself. She personally delivered the memorandum to the Department of Commerce, and went on her way—an intelligent, interested citizen seeking nothing for herself but hoping to help her country.

One of the exciting innovations of the Kennedy administration to date is its resourcefulness in harnessing the energies of Americans who want to do something for their country in this era of great peril and change. To the plaintive question, "But what can I do?" the President has replied with creation of the Peace Corps. The press tells us that he may soon follow up with a Youth Conservation Corps, another proposal originated by the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and one which it has been my privilege to cosponsor for several years.

I suggest that Mrs. Grimes and Secretary Hodges have hit on a way of using the untapped talents of our mature citizens in the interest of our country. Americans can trace their ancestry to every part of this globe. Great numbers of Americans are proficient in the languages of their ancestors; many others have learned foreign languages and would like to keep up their proficiency.

This, I submit, could be a new corps—our "Host Corps"—which could utilize the priceless American resources of natural, unaffected friendship and hospitality in greeting foreign visitors and making them feel at home here.

Unlike the Peace Corps and the Conservation Corps, the Host Corps members would stay at home, remain with their families and their normal pursuits, but stand in readiness to make their time available on short notice to travelers from other lands. I see this Host Corps as an excellent opportunity to expand the vistas opened up by S. 610.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Evening Star of Wednesday, March 22, together with the covering letter for Secretary Hodges and the memorandum prepared by Mrs. Mable Grimes, of Denver, Colo.

There being no objection, the article, letter, and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOURIST PROBLEM HERE—WE JUST SPEAK ENGLISH

(By Bernard Gwertzman)

An Italian businessman, a German teacher, a French lawyer, and a Spanish physician all sit down for lunch in a downtown Washington restaurant. None speaks English. Will they get good service?

This was one of the problems posed today by Commerce Secretary Hodges.

An increase of foreign visitors can be expected to America soon, Secretary Hodges said in a speech to a convention of State planners here, but will the visitors go home contented?

"We must devise ways of overcoming the language barrier," he said, so that a foreign visitor "will be able to buy a meal in a restaurant, get service in his hotel, and understand what he is seeing at a historic site or a commercial attraction."

This will require some effort by local businessmen and tourist agencies, not accustomed to handling foreign travelers, he said.

Menus will have to be printed in several languages, directories established for hotels, restaurants, and other facilities.

"Hotel associations and chambers of commerce can compile lists of people in their communities who have foreign language abilities and might be happy to serve as guides for touring groups," he suggested.

"Where guides who speak other languages are not available, it might be possible to print guidebooks or pamphlets explaining what the tourist will be seeing at various points on a tour of a particular attraction."

"State development agencies have done an excellent job of promoting travel to their States from other States, but they have rarely attempted to tap the potential for travel from other countries," he said.

An effort is being made by Government officials to spur tourism here to cut some of the $1 billion balance-of-payments deficit caused by the numbers of American tourists abroad—twice the number of foreign visitors here.

DENVER, COLO.

HON. LUTHER HODGES,
Secretary of Commerce,
Department of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As a private citizen from Denver, Colo., who has traveled extensively in recent years, I have become deeply interested in S. 610, the bill which would create an Office of International Travel and Tourism.

It seems to me that this program has endless possibilities for improving international understanding, as well as boosting travel and partially overcoming the outflow of dollars and gold.

But to achieve the full potential, we must not only invite people to spend their money here; we must make them feel glad they came and eager to return.

I have discussed this subject with Senator JOHN A. CARROLL and Representative BYRON G. ROGERS, and have prepared a brief enclosed outline of my proposal, which I feel would utilize a vast reservoir of American talent and enthusiasm at virtually no cost to the taxpayers.

Mr. ROGERS is turning over a copy of this memorandum to Representative OREN HARRIS, Chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which is considering S. 610.

If you or one of your authorized representatives should be interested in developing these suggestions, I am at your disposal. I am quite willing to return to Washington at my own expense for further discussions at any mutually convenient time.

Sincerely yours,

MABLE S. GRIMES.

STATEMENT OF MRS. MABLE GRIMES, DENVER, COLO., RE S. 610

My name is Mable Grimes. I live in Denver, Colo., where until recently I owned and operated an industrial supply house. I am a private citizen representing no organized group, but feel that I speak for many vigorous, intelligent, retired executives who, like I, yearn for something useful and interesting to do.

I am grateful for this opportunity to show my interest and approval of bill S. 610. Such a bill will undoubtedly stimulate the desire to see the United States, and we must have a concentrated and well-directed effort to make visitors welcome and anxious to return.

From the experience of three recent trips to Europe, two in the past year, I have found people in all walks of life eager to see the United States. In Russia I was questioned about the cost of making such a trip. In Ireland the people I met felt the trip was far too expensive to even hope for. In England visa regulations were deplored. Hollanders felt that our accommodations were fantastically high. However, in spite of all these objections there is real interest that can be stimulated into action by a good Office of International Travel.

A specific example of our lack of activity in this area was brought home to me in London this winter. Friends told me of being unable to obtain an ordinary paper map of the United States even at our Embassy. This prompted me to make some inquiry on my own. In the London offices of two of our large U.S. airlines whose windows bore streamers advertising winter air excursions to New York, I asked what information they had on the United States and was casually directed to a well-worn book containing some travel folders and a wallboard of lighted pictures. These showed a New York skyline at night, San Francisco by day, a wheatfield in Kansas, a grove of yellow aspen and several others. No captions, no descriptions, and no attempt to sell the idea of a visit. I am sure I could get more and better information in Denver about Timbuktu.

Bill S. 610 has a fine program to stimulate travel into our country, but we must make our visitors welcome and create the desire to return. In Ireland everyone feels and acts like a reception committee. Denmark has a special bureau set up that gets visitors in personal contact with Danes of similar status, be they banker, student, lawyer, etc. Every visitor firmly resolves to return, and many do.

It is my suggestion that we tap the great unused ability, energy, and experience of our recently retired executives as good will representatives who could be leaders of a vast network of volunteer greeters. Their job would be to make the experience of traveling in this country pleasant, and give as many visitors as possible an opportunity to see the best of America—its grassroots. In every section of the country a dollar-a-year man or woman can be found for such a patriotic endeavor. These men and women could work through local chambers of com-

merce, etc. This in no way infringes on commercial efforts.

This program would necessitate one national director on salary and expenses with offices in Washington, who would work under the director as created in bill S. 610, and be a permanent member of the board. The primary responsibility of this office would be to seek out, appoint, and direct chairmen for well-defined districts all over the country, to establish and keep in operation local groups who would welcome foreign visitors.

Such a program might be held together by being called, "Dial Welcome (9352663) for friends in the U.S.A." The answer on such a number could be a recorded short welcome giving the phone number of the local committee, all repeated in several languages.

The possibilities of such a program are limitless. Any effort that enlists the enthusiasm and energy of a diverse and widespread segment of our population, as found in this retired group, has great potential.

The White House Conference on Children and Youth—First-Year Inventory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an address by the Chief of the U.S. Children's Bureau, Mrs. Katherine Brownell Oettinger, delivered on March 13, 1961, before the Boston University Women's Guild.

The address follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH—FIRST-YEAR INVENTORY

(By Mrs. Katherine Brownell Oettinger, Chief, Children's Bureau)

Just 1 year ago this month the Golden Anniversary White House Conference on Children and Youth assembled in Washington. Hundreds of thousands of people in every State and territory and in many foreign countries had participated in preparations for the conference. The conference itself brought together over 7,600 participants, including 1,400 youth and 500 guests from 73 countries. Many of you took active roles in the conference and saw the great vitality with which it approached its task of reassessing conditions affecting children in a world where so much has changed in so brief a span of time.

I know you are all familiar with some of the clear themes which emerged again and again:

The need to help our children find lasting values to sustain them even in a world where little seems stable or predictable.

The need for more effective efforts to help families provide and maintain stimulating and wholesome environments for themselves and their children.

The need to respond to our rapidly changing, dynamic culture with programs organized with flexibility and adaptability.

The need to correct the weaknesses in our social and program structures which allow such problems as dependency, delinquency, and illegitimacy to perpetuate themselves.

Now, as the first year of followup activities draws to a close, it seems an appropriate time to see just where we stand. What have all the hopeful words added up to? What has been done to implement the nearly 700 recommendations which came out of the conference?

And, of course, even more important: Where do we go from here?

The measure of any conference is what gets done afterward. By this criterion the 1960 White House Conference is well on its way to being one of the most significant conferences in history. With the continued help and effort of citizen and professional groups all across the Nation, it will fulfill that promise.

I cannot begin to give you a full report of all the followup activities of this year. So I have tried to make my selection on the basis of what I felt would be of particular interest to you, especially in areas where such groups as your own might help to bring about further action.

First perhaps I should tell you a little about the structures which have been devised to coordinate the monumental followup effort. National leadership rests jointly with the Children's Bureau and the National Committee for Children and Youth. This committee is composed of representatives of the President's National Committee for the White House Conference, the Council of National Organizations, the National Council of State Committees for Children and Youth, and the Interdepartmental Committee on Children and Youth, whose members represent the 34 Federal agencies which have programs relating to children.

The principal purposes of the National Committee for Children and Youth are to stimulate implementation of the recommendations and other followup of the Conference; to encourage further research and more effective utilization of research findings on behalf of children and youth; to promote cooperation and joint activities among the sponsoring groups; and to provide for an exchange of information on concerns affecting children.

Already the national committee has a major research project under way, in the form of a National Conference on Unemployed, Out-of-School Youth in Urban Areas. Financed by a Ford Foundation grant, this conference is scheduled for May. The distinguished Dr. James B. Conant will serve as its chairman. This is to be a working and action conference which will bring together 300 representatives of State governments, labor, management, school boards and PTA's, vocational education and guidance people, juvenile courts and youth commissions, health and welfare agencies, and other interested groups. With unemployment of those in the labor market who are in the 16–21 age bracket nearly four times greater than in other age groups, the need for definitive action is abundantly clear, and this conference will undoubtedly be an initial step of great value.

A major followup function shared by the National Committee for Children and Youth and the Children's Bureau is to make national organizations and the States aware of the vast reservoir of how-to-do-it material which is available to them as they try to meet their local problems.

I wish you could go with me into the oversized room in the Bureau which serves as headquarters for this unit. All around the walls are large tables, and every one is piled high with materials awaiting distribution. As I thumbed through these publications I was struck with the excellence of what they had to offer; the concrete, helpful, down-to-earth facts that will make preliminary planning so much easier in areas where programs are just beginning to pick up momentum. Distribution of this material is part of the Children's Bureau's continuing effort to encourage the use of what is known about ways of meeting health and welfare problems.

There are publications about all kinds of problems: adoptions, delinquency, rural development, to name only a few. Many of the publications from the States are reports of successful programs, such as one from Kansas called So You Want To Start a Youth Council. Here, in one compact little volume, communities can find the answers to such questions as:

Who should be involved in a youth council?

What projects might a youth council undertake?

How can community participation be encouraged?

Publications from both Federal agencies and national organizations are also being made available to the State committees. Recently, for example, the special unit has sent out a complete mailing of all Labor Department publications relating to children and youth. Twenty-three mailing pieces from the Academy of Pediatrics—on such subjects as accident prevention, health supervision in early childhood, and hospital care of children—made up another mailing.

The publications being distributed by the National Committee for Children and Youth are primarily materials prepared for the White House Conference or which have grown out of its recommendations. The heavy demand for these materials clearly indicates the high level of interest which is being maintained. The committee plans to issue a report on White House Conference followup at the halfway mark of the decade, in 1965.

The committee has made the photographic exhibit, These Are Our Children, which was such a popular feature of the Conference itself, available for a nationwide tour to stimulate further interest and activity in the States. In showings sponsored by the State committees for children and youth, the exhibit has already visited two of your neighboring States, Maine and Rhode Island. In the latter, Governor Notte served as host at a reception marking the opening of the exhibit. Our regional representatives tell us that the exhibit is proving very helpful in stimulating interest in followup activities.

Again and again during the White House Conference community organization was stressed as one of the most strategic ways of coordinating public and voluntary efforts to meet human needs as well as the more mechanical aspects of providing health and welfare services. Our failures in community planning are clearly evident in the blighted urban areas where so many families lack a planned combination of health, welfare, recreational, and other essential facilities, and as a result are unable to realize their full potentialities for growth and healthy living.

Reaction against these failures is becoming ever more widespread, as is the conviction that community organization is one of our most promising social tools. The recent International Congress of Social Work in Rome, for example, echoed the community organization recommendations of the White House Conference and called particularly upon social workers to take leadership in getting community organization past the planning stage and into purposeful use.

In October the Children's Bureau held a 2-day workshop to determine how facilities and resources could best be offered to help the State committees in their follow-up efforts. It was attended by representatives of the State committees, national organizations, and Federal agencies. One specific desire of the State committees, expressed during this workshop, was for consultant services to help with the problems of community organization.

In its effort to give a real forward thrust to this new and creative emphasis on community organization, the Children's Bureau has made consultants available in several regions. Regional workshops at which the States can discuss their follow-up problems and receive help from the regional represent-

atives have been scheduled in several areas. In fact one is meeting right now—today—in San Francisco.

Mr. Augustine Riccio, formerly Director of the Rhode Island Department of Social Welfare, was appointed a little less than a month ago to be consultant for your area. He has plans well underway for a regional workshop. He has already met with the Children's Bureau's regional medical director, medical social work consultant, nursing consultant, and child welfare representatives to review the follow-up situation in each State and to help the representatives define ways they can assist the State committees in follow-up activities. He will be meeting soon with representatives of other Federal agencies.

Mr. Riccio has also met with representatives of the public housing administration and several national organizations. At the meeting of district I of the American Academy of Pediatrics, for example, a number of child health problems on which the White House Conference had made specific recommendations were discussed, such as accident prevention, protection of the unborn baby and the young child, services for handicapped children, and delinquency prevention. The meeting provided an opportunity for the State chapters of the academy to compare notes on their program planning in these areas.

Our consultants are fortunate that they can work closely with the leaders of State Committees on Children and Youth. Dr. Martha Eliot, chairman of the Massachusetts State Committee and a former Children's Bureau Chief, is of course known to all of you for her continuing work on behalf of children. Dr. Reginald Robinson is executive secretary.

In addition to these basic services which form a network of know-how for White House Conference followup which spread throughout the States, numerous specific activities and programs have been undertaken by an unbelievably large number of groups at national, State, and local levels. Many of the Federal agencies whose programs relate to children have selected from the White House Conference recommendations, threads of particular interest to them, from which they are weaving a new fabric of action.

In November, for example, the Children's Bureau and the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor jointly sponsored a 2-day conference on day care for children of working mothers. The White House Conference had pointed out that one of the most significant social changes in this century is the great increase in the number of married women in the labor force. About 3 million mothers with children under six are now working, and about 5 million mothers of children over 6.

A study published by the Children's Bureau at the time of the White House Conference clearly indicated that the development of adequate day-care services has not kept pace with the new patterns of our society. It showed that whether for economic or for other reasons, nearly 400,000 children under 12 have no day care while their mothers work. Of the 1½ million children under 12 cared for in their own homes by relatives, well over a third are in the care of someone under 18.

Primarily the Day Care Conference was an effort to relate concerns which had been highlighted by the White House Conference to a realistic picture of present-day care needs on a national basis—to determine what services exist, what their strengths and shortcomings are, what untapped resources each community has. It examined how day-care programs can be most effectively organized and financed, and with what community agencies major responsibilities should lie. It looked at the adequacy of present licensing standards, and at unmet needs in facilities for children with special problems: children of migrant families, children with physical or mental handicaps.

A film prepared jointly by the Children's Bureau and the Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare is now available to help community leaders dramatize day care, and the proceedings of the Conference, which are to be released soon, will provide a further tool through which followup efforts can be carried forward.

In a similar effort to respond to the recommendations of the White House Conference the Office of Education, in October, brought together 35 top educators in the field of elementary education. They attempted to define in specific terms what the schools could and should be doing to implement the 235 recommendations related to their programs.

The Interdepartmental Committee on Children and Youth itself has several followup projects underway, such as revision of its valuable publication, Programs of the Federal Government Affecting Children, and proposed studies of ways of implementing particular recommendations. One example is the recommendation "that a special committee be authorized to study the immediate and long-range emotional, social, and economic effects of the peacetime compulsory draft law on our youth and our Nation, and to make recommendations." The Interdepartmental Committee on Children and Youth, recognizing the urgency of analyzing this perplexing problem which so vitally affects the young men of our country, has prepared a staff report on proposed objectives and methodology for such a study. This report is now being evaluated as a basis for more extensive examination of ways to minimize any negative impact of the selective service experience and assure that it will be a positive influence in the lives of our young people.

The National Committee for Children and Youth tells me that the variety and creative imagination shown in the followup programs of the national voluntary organizations is truly amazing. Participation of youth at the White House Conference was active, and this is being reflected now in such programs as that of the Future Homemakers of America, which has selected "Measure Your Values" as the theme for their July conference. As working papers in preparation for the conference they will draw upon the many discussions and recommendations of the White House Conference which dealt with finding lasting values in a changing world.

Other organizations are giving strong leadership to their local affiliates by helping them define ways they can stimulate followup in the communities. The National Congress of Parents and Teachers, for example, has issued its "Assignment for the 60's" on the basis of White House Conference recommendations. The State groups have picked up from there by listing specific targets in point-by-point form: what the home can do, what the school can do, what the community can do, and what the Congress of Parents and Teachers itself has done and proposes to do in the future to implement the recommendations.

There is a similar close correlation of national and local activities in a new interest of the National Council of Jewish Women which has grown out of the White House Conference. Through a committee on the employment of youth this national organization is helping communities evaluate their youth employment resources and improve their employment situations through the cooperative efforts of schools, trade unions, industry, and other community organizations. Other organizations are developing similar followup programs in their specific areas of concern.

At the time of the White House Conference all 50 States were represented in the National Council of State Committees, although only 28 States actually had functioning committees. This vitality did not die with this focal event, but has carried on into many followup activities, as is shown by the fact that 17 additional States are now taking steps to establish permanent committees on children and youth. This year the agenda of the annual meeting of the National Council of State Committees, held 10 days ago in St. Louis, focused on helping the State committees define their duties and responsibilities in White House Conference followup in everyday terms. I think the spirit and tone which is pervading so much of the White House Conference followup activity is evident in a memo which went out to the State representatives a month before the meeting. The memo lists specific things about which it would be helpful to exchange information: how are the States handling distribution of White House Conference publications? How is followup being financed? What sort of consultation are representatives of the State committees offering communities?

The conferees were asked to bring with them a file of the materials which they had found useful in their States; for, as the memo added signficantly, "We are convinced we have much to learn from each other."

This spirit of exchange and sharing is the very essence of the vigor which characterizes the whole followup movement. The committees and councils are not new—many of them have existed for years—but they are being used in a new way, with a more intensive effort to make creative, coordinated use of what is known about problems and their solutions.

The same emphasis on specifics is evident in activity at the State level. In Oregon, for example, representatives of every county were asked to "do their homework" before attending a statewide conference on children and youth in November. Each was asked to come to the meeting prepared to submit two recommendations: One in an area where they felt legislative action in 1961 was desirable; the other relating to an identifiable problem on which more statewide factfinding is needed as a preliminary to action. From such a working basis as this it was possible to use every minute of the conference productively.

The results were 13 recommendations on such subjects as child guidance and family counseling services, the establishment of a graduate school of social work, coordination of mental health efforts, and establishment of family courts. But these were not simply recommendations to be made and forgotten. Each recommendation was accompanied by a specific plan of implementation, defining what the Oregon conference and its member groups should do to assure action.

At the local level also many efforts are being made to assure that the recommendations of the White House conference become more than what one reporter feared might be "a mere accumulation of lofty words." In Fort Worth, Tex., for example, the Family and Children's Division of the Community Council decided that one of its first followup efforts should be to respond to the White House conference recommendations relating to the development of homemaker services—that commonsense plan that meets the characteristic rootlessness of our times by providing a substitute for the unwearying Aunt Minnies of earlier generations who were always ready to respond in times of family crisis.

The Community Council sought the guidance of the Red Cross, the Bureau's regional medical director, and its regional consultant on White House conference followup, who helped the Council gain perspective on homemaker service needs in the community

as a basis for accelerated action. In this community as in many others, there is increasing recognition of the value of homemaker services not only for families in which illness is a problem, but also in other situations where such services can be used to strengthen family life and make it possible to keep children in their own homes.

Perhaps one of the most imaginative follow-up efforts being made anywhere is the one in a small but active community near Nashville, Tenn. There were numerous White House conference recommendations stressing the responsibility of the community to provide vocational education and employment opportunities for youth, and Wilson County, Tenn., took these recommendations very much to heart. With residual White House conference funds and additional financial backing from the State board of education, the Committee on Children and Youth hired a retired contractor to teach carpentry, bricklaying, electrical engineering, and other basic building skills. Civic groups and banks made it possible for the committee to buy a lot. Electrical supply houses and lumber companies donated materials.

And the students began to build a house. Not a model house or a dummy house, but a real house, which will be valued at $14,000 when it is completed. The house will then be sold, and the proceeds will be used to finance further projects.

This project seems particularly significant to me because it is such a basic, practical kind of follow-up activity. Wilson County is a community which does not have the vocational education resources available to it which are sometimes to be found in larger communities, yet a way was found to "live up to" what the White House Conference asked communities to do.

This project, incidentally, represents the work of only 1 out of 10 active follow-up subcommittees in that single community. A report on this project, now in preparation, is to be one of a series of Children's Bureau "how to do it" publications reporting on community action on White House Conference follow up. We feel certain that the story will inspire other communities as much as it has us in the Bureau as we have watched it develop.

Reports from the States and the national organizations, prepared as part of the background papers for the White House Conference, identified priority problems recognized in the communities. One of the most frequently expressed convictions was that much more must be done to meet the needs of children with all kinds of handicaps.

Already President Kennedy has said in his health message that he is recommending to the Congress an increase in appropriations for the existing maternal and child health, crippled children, and child welfare programs of the Children's Bureau. By this means, he said, "The fruits of our research can move at a faster pace to those who need them most."

Such an increase will mean that an ever higher quality of preventive work can be achieved under the maternal and child health program in such areas as immunization, prenatal care, and mental retardation. In addition, the availability of more adequate Federal funds should make it possible for the States to take care of more children with handicapping conditions under the crippled children program; and to expand or improve their services also to children with a variety of nonorthopedic conditions such as congenital heart disease, hearing defects, cerebral palsy, or epilepsy.

Equally pleasing to those who recognize the need to combat the growing trend toward severe handicapping, which was stressed by the White House Conference, is the fact that the President has expressed his eagerness to get at basic causes of handicapping, and, through stepped-up research—coordinated in the interests of children—prevent them from happening.

In the meantime he directed the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service to establish a Child Health Center, an action that could be taken administratively without legislative appropriation.

In commenting on these developments, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Abraham Ribicoff said, "This new program in the field of child health shall have the fullest possible backing and encouragement. The new program will be further strengthened through close coordination with the programs of the Children's Bureau."

As the White House Conference opened many new doors in the health field, so, too, it drew on this interest and creative thinking of disciplines which had not been reached so extensively in any other way. Many professional groups—physicians, lawyers, and others—have met to define the specific ways in which they can participate in conference followup. Thus the number who can speak for children has been infinitely multiplied, and a new kind of national interrelationship and action has developed.

I know that as a great urban institution Boston University will be eagerly evaluating how it can relate the findings of the White House Conference to the broad scope of the interests and aspirations of university life. This is more than an opportunity: it is a solemn duty that comes only to free citizens who have the liberty to identify problems and work toward their solution. Let this first anniversary mark a renewed determination to join together to help each child achieve his full potential and contribute to the world in which he will be living.

National 4–H Club Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, "Learn, Live, Serve Through 4–H"—this is the motto of one of our outstanding rural youth clubs, the 4–H Club.

Over the Nation, this fine organization has more than 2.3 million members. Through creative programs, it is providing a splendid opportunity for our rural youth to obtain knowledge, skills and, above all, to build strong character. Recently, the 4–H Clubs observed a special week.

The Rice Lake Chronotype, of Rice Lake, Wis., published a splendid article, as well as an editorial, on the fine work being undertaken on the 4–H programs.

Representing a constructive program that serves usefully to channel the energies and abilities of our youth into constructive activities—as well as serves as an antidote to delinquency—I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL CELEBRATION CITES WORK OF 4–H CLUB YOUTHS

National 4–H Club Week, celebrated this year from February 26 to March 4, marks the yearly observance of the importance of 4–H club work by all 4–H club members all over the Nation.

The Chronotype this week, as it has for several years, presents a special section of the paper dedicated to furthering the ideals of this rural youth organization and telling of the achievements of club members and their leaders during the past year.

Another rural young people's organization, the Future Farmers of America, also celebrates its annual week during the period of February 19 to 25, and material on its work will also be found on the following pages.

During National 4–H Club Week, the 1,100 members in Barron County will join 54,000 of their fellows in Wisconsin and 2,302,000 throughout the Nation in a variety of activities designed to call public attention to the achievements of the 4–H clubs and to the advantages of 4–H club membership for other boys and girls not yet enrolled in the organization. We are happy to be able to help out in this cause.

The 4–H clubs are an organization of young people interested in learning by actual practice how to be better farmers, better homemakers, and better citizens. They work in close contact with the agricultural extension service and the agricultural experiment stations.

They benefit from the guidance and cooperation of the public education system; civic groups; city, county, State, and Federal governmental organizations; and business and industry leaders. They have as volunteer leaders in their activities thousands of farmers, homemakers, and other adults interested in the future of the State's young people.

The 4–H clubs have pioneered many improvements in farming and homemaking in Barron County. But no less important is the character-building that results from membership and active participation in 4–H work. Many former 4–H members now hold prominent places in agriculture and many other walks of life.

There is a place in 4–H work for many thousands of other young people—and for many other adults who want to make a contribution to the welfare of youth and the progress of the State by lending a hand with 4–H work.

Four-H Club work is an educational program for boys and girls. At present there are 51 clubs with a membership of 1,100 in Barron County. Some 280 men and women serve as community and project leaders for the boys and girls enrolled in club work. These men and women give freely of their time and talent so that boys and girls may have the benefit and training provided through 4–H. Without these public-spirited men and women it would be impossible to conduct a successful 4–H program.

Club work not only teaches boys and girls better farm and home methods and skills. It gives them training and experience in citizenship, community life, character building, and spiritual development.

The work is conducted on a community basis with a planned program including project work, recreation, and activities such as health, safety, conservation, courtesy, and grooming. Members participated in such events as National 4–H Club Week, State 4–H Club Week, community, county, district, and State achievement programs, 4–H Sunday, county recognition program, 4–H camp, and International Farm Youth Exchange.

The 70 projects available deal with practically every phase of farming and homemaking. Many of the projects require little, if any, expense by the member.

Four-H boys and girls are kept quite busy learning by doing. According to the records last year members in home economics projects planned and prepared 4,720 dishes and served 1,460 meals; they froze 390 quarts of fruits and vegetables and canned 470 quarts;

they made 3,840 garments in clothing projects; then they made 260 articles in improving their rooms.

Members enrolled in agricultural projects owned and cared for 594 dairy animals, 42 beef animals, 67 sheep, 124 swine, and 57 horses. Thirty-four members grew 196 acres of corn. One hundred grew 27 acres of vegetables for home use. Members in tractor projects maintained and adjusted 91 tractors. In electricity, woodwork, and rope projects, they made 651 articles.

The 140th Anniversary of Greek Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 140th anniversary of Greek independence. Because of the many folks of Hellenic descent in the 13th Congressional District of Massachusetts, I feel that it is especially fitting to call attention to this day in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY, MARCH 25

The Greek people have been the most persistent and proud advocates of freedom throughout their long and glorious history. They were the first to conceive and formulate the idea of freedom, and the first to practise it in their almost ideally organized state 2,500 years ago. There they enjoyed freedom in all its manifestation, freedom of speech, of conscience, of assembly, of movement, and also freedom from fear and freedom from want. All these freedoms were honored in ancient Greece, in classical times as never before in human history and nowhere else. Thus, Greek genius has a claim upon us, upon all men and women of the free world, and we all have always been conscious of our indebtedness to Greece for giving birth to this noblest of human ideals, freedom and independence.

It is one of the ironies of human history that these gifted and gallant people of Greece who gave birth to this superb idea were not allowed to enjoy it for almost 2,000 years. A few centuries after Athens had become the center of artistic, esthetic and philosophic learning of the then known world, with its citizens famous for their love of freedom and public spirit, Greece became a Roman province. The glory of Greece was gone and the Greeks were without their national freedom. Then during the late middle ages they were ruled by Frankish kings. And finally in the middle of the 15th century they were brought under their most despotic oppressors, the Ottoman Turks, under whom they suffered for almost 400 years and against whom they carried on their relentless struggle for their national independence. The independence which they proclaimed in 1821 was thus the culmination of an ideal fervently and dearly cherished by the people of Greece during their subjugation to foreign yoke for 2,000 years.

Neither under the austere and orderly Roman Government, nor under the greedy Frankish kings, nor under the ruthless Ottoman sultans were the Greeks at all happy. They were never willing to be reconciled to their unenviable lot under alien yoke. The longer they endured the foreigners' detestable regimes, the more oppressive became these regimes. Under the Romans they were captives, but as has often and with considerable truth been said, in this case the Greeks took their captor Romans captive. That is to say, the Romans were so much impressed and so completely overwhelmed by the Greek genius, that they became its disarmed devotees. The same cannot be said of the Frankish kings whose avowed crusading zeal was expressed in bitter religious ultrafanaticism, which was abhored by the Greek mind. But what the Greeks had to put up with under the ruthless and unscrupulous Turks was far worse. It is true the Mohammedan sultans did not interfere with the Christian religion of the Greeks, but as against this much misunderstood "religious tolerance" of the Turks, the Greeks were not allowed political, civil, or social equality. They were considered far less than second-class citizens in the Ottoman Empire in that all their worldly possessions as well as their lives were at the mercy of their overlords, the Turks.

Among the severe inequities under which they suffered was the immoral form of child taxation, which meant that the Turkish officials could go around and snatch away male children from Greek homes, who, when brought up in the sultan's palace schools turned into ferocious guardians of the Ottoman Empire. For decades and centuries helpless Greeks put up with these heartrending hardships and suffered immeasurably under the Turks. In their historic homeland, under the very eyes of Christian rules of Europe, Christian Greeks thus endured the inhuman rule of their unchristian oppressor. Then came the rebellion of 1821.

The Greek war of independence that started on March 25, 140 years ago today, not only spread instantaneously throughout the Greek mainland and all Greek islands, but it also roused many governments and all peoples of Europe. One might say it shook the conscience of Europe, and brought it to its sense of duty. All lovers of freedom and of Greece were elated and excited by the news of the revolt, led by an archbishop in a monastery in northwestern Greece. In the past, other Balkan peoples suffering under the same ruthless Ottoman sultans had revolted, and some had even attained autonomous status, but no previous revolt against the sultans, inside or outside of the Balkans, was to arouse so much public sympathy and enlist so much moral support as did the Greek war that began in 1821. In taking such a fair, upright, and sympathetic stand on this issue, the people of the civilized world were not only expressing their natural and genuine feeling toward a righteous cause, but they were also showing their unconcealed admiration and affection for gallant Greeks fighting for their lives as well as for the cause of freedom.

The war, fought continuously for almost 7 years, seemed a one-sided struggle most of the time, and at times it looked quite hopeless. The Greeks were overwhelmingly outnumbered from the beginning by the forces of their powerful enemy. Even the optimistic among Greece's friends were admitting that the Greek cause was lost unless some effective move was made, and a decisive step was taken by the governments in Europe. By mid-1827, Greece was almost bled to death; most of the country lay under the heels of sultan's soldiers. Peoples on both sides of the Atlantic were following the course of events with anxiety. Unofficial and semiofficial groups in many countries were sending much financial and medical aid, and England's great romantic poet, Lord Byron, had gone to Greece to have his magnetic influence felt there. And fortunately in the end the Greeks, through their tenacity and gallantry, and through their unswerving devotion to their freedom, wrenched victory out of defeat: with the aid of their friends their cause won out and they secured their independence.

Of course, this last act had its very sad twists and tragic turns, but even through tragedy the Greek people were to be freed and once more Greece was to be herself again. In 1827, as the sultan's ruthless agents were complete masters of nearly all Greece, they were committing a crime which could not be condoned even by the most inactive of European governments. At the time it was reported that the sultan's agents were deporting Greek people by the thousands to other parts of his empire, to be sold there as slaves. Peoples in Europe and America were horrified by this news. Now they wanted their governments to do something to stop this fiendish move on the part of the sultan, to prevent the enslavement of Greeks through the Middle East. At the time much as we wished to help the Greeks effectively, we could only do so privately, but fortunately for the Greeks, for the conscience of the civilized world, and also for the cause of freedom, certain European governments could and did act. In October the British, French, and Russian Governments informed the sultan to put a stop to such inhuman practices. The sultan did not take the warning seriously; nor did his naval commanders off the waters of Greece. Next the combined naval commanders there warned the Turkish admiral, and issued him what amounted to an ultimatum. The Turkish admiral at first vacillated and did not comply with the wishes of the European admirals.

But these admirals meant what they had said, when no satisfactory reply was received from the Turkish admiral, they ordered the decks of their ships cleared for action. On one memorable day, on the 20th of October 1827, as the combined British-French-Russian warships opened fire upon the Turkish flotilla, in a matter of hours that flotilla ceased to

exist, and out of this naval battle, fought in the bay of Navarrino, was born modern, free, independent, and sovereign Greece.

One hundred and forty years have gone by since the beginning of the Greek war of independence, and since then the Greek people have had many anxious years and endured many hardships. During the two World Wars they fought bravely, both times on the side of freedom and democracy, and fortunately for them, on both occasions their allies and their cause were victorious. For their steadfastness and unfailing loyalty to the cause of freedom, and for their readiness to sacrifice for the common cause they have earned the admiration and sympathy of the free world. We in this country have always held them in very high esteem. We have appreciated their contribution to the well-being of this great Republic as loyal, enterprising, and patriotic citizens, and we have admired them in their historic homeland in their political struggle. We have, of course, helped them not only financially, but I am proud to say that we were able to save postwar Greece from the throes of Stalin's totalitarian communism. Today we all join our friends in Greece, our faithful ally, on the 140th anniversary of their independence day.

Seattle Citizens Salute a Fine Officer of the U.S. Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, in the years I have served in the U.S. House of Representatives I have had occasion to work closely with a great many members of our armed services, and because the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard and the headquarters of the 13th Naval District located in and around the Seattle area, by association with Navy personnel has been particularly close.

In this connection, it has been my privilege to have associated on a very personal basis with many high-ranking naval officers and without exception I have found them to be men dedicated to their chosen careers and to the service of their country.

Ordinarily it would be difficult, if not impossible, to single out any one of this distinguished company. But on occasion, by force of circumstances, events sometimes take over and spotlight one individual in the life and activities of a community. Such an example of public leadership and interest in civic affairs has attracted my notice and is worthy of mention.

This is the case of Capt. Kenneth J. Sanger, commandant of the Naval Air Station at Sand Point, Seattle, Wash. Captain Sanger assumed command of his present post on June 27, 1959. Since that time, he has given so unselfishly of himself, both as a Navy and community leader, as to have earned the official and quite unusual commendation of civic organizations such as the Seattle Chamber of Commerce, the Reserve Officers Association,the Disabled American Veterans and the Navy League.

Captain Sanger's inspirational leadership of the approximately 2,000 officers and men under his command resulted in raising their standing in the Naval Air Reserve program from 18th place in the Nation to No. 1 naval air station in a 1-year period of time. For this outstanding accomplishment the CNATRA trophy was awarded on October 1, 1960. At the same time the Edwin Francis Conway Trophy was presented to Captain Sanger by Under Secretary of the Navy Fred A. Bantz. This trophy is given annually to the highest rated naval air station in the Nation.

Also, he was instrumental in aiding the Mayor of Seattle in establishing the Seattle American Leadership Council and has taken an active part in assisting the Mayor with the implementation of this important community activtiy.

A 1-day seminar for over 100 Seattle business and industrial leaders was held on October 18, 1960, which resulted in a program for citizenship education and action in the field of reawakening the citizens to our American heritage and our responsibilities as citizens.

These achievements in the field of public relations and his individual dynamic, enthusiastic and patriotic personal activities have resulted in the closest cooperation between the military and civilian community leaders in Seattle. Many of these latter have expressed regret that under rotation or transfer he might be sent to some other duty.

As one of his many friends and admirers, I have joined in expressing the hope that the Navy will find it possible to extend Captain Sanger's tour of duty so that our community can continue enjoying the benefits of his inspirational leadership. As a fitting tribute to this fine officer and gentleman and to the Sand Point Naval Air Station which he so ably commands, I am including with these remarks a resolution adopted by the board of trustees of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce under date of March 21, 1961.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE SEATTLE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, MARCH 21, 1961

The Seattle Chamber of Commerce expresses again its great pride in the achievement of the Naval Air Station, Seattle, in winning last year the Conway and Chief of Naval Air Training trophies for the most improved and most efficient naval air station in the Naval Air Reserve Training Command.

Further, the Seattle chamber takes favorable recognition of the aggressive and effective program of the Naval Air Station, Seattle, in emphasizing the Navy's all-out effort to revitalize leadership. This program is reflected in the goal of educating all individuals in the command to understand and practice the basic principles upon which our country was based. The program emphasizes that Navy men achieve, in addition to combat leadership, leadership in the cold war.

Further, the Seattle chamber commends Capt. Kenneth J. Sanger, USN, commanding officer, U.S. Naval Air Station, Seattle, and the other dedicated members of his command, for the results which have been obtained.

JOHN C. CROSTHWAITS,
Chairman, Armed Services Division.

Overestimating Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, in an article that appeared in the New York World-Telegram and Sun, on Tuesday, March 21, Mr. Ray Cromley has shown us an aspect of our defense program that requires close attention:

IS NIKITA TRICKING US INTO DEFENSE PANIC?

(By Ray Cromley)

WASHINGTON, March 21.—We are in danger of letting Nikita Khrushchev trick us into losing the defense race. He has so frightened us with reports of his great military and space might that we are frittering billions of our defense dollars in a wasteful scramble to catch up.

We are weakening our defense research programs by rushing into sterile alleys for quick solutions to get fast results we put missiles, planes and other defense systems into production without waiting for added research that would make them much superior. A little more research always means improvements and sometimes real breakthroughs.

We are adopting less than the best in defense weapons and equipment in a hurried fear to get something in place so Khrushchev "won't catch us naked." Then in big projects we add millions to the cost and add months to the program by contract changes during production and site construction.

We likewise are wasting millions and slowing the space program by rushing to use equipment in our space shots without waiting for it to be sufficiently researched and tested out cheaply on the ground.

The sad truth is, that if we would go at this defense-space race a little more slowly—spend more time on developing superior systems before putting them into production—we'd end up with a stronger defense system quicker. This is what Khrushchev's men seem to do—usually.

An extra year in research often can save more than a year in getting a missile produced, improved, a new model devised and the whole system mated to its site ready to fire. The resulting weapons system will certainly be much superior.

We rush down every road we hear that Khrushchev is going down so he won't be ahead of us on anything. Thus we divert our efforts from what may be more profitable lines for us. We play his game.

This hurry to get into production and turn out weapons and equipment has other evils. Frequently the hurriedly built missiles, planes, trucks or whatever, have so many weaknesses or bugs they have to be modified after they're built. There have to be continuous and time-consuming changes in the manufacture.

The missile is not quite so accurate or so reliable as it might have been had it been

developed along different lines. The equipment breaks down more frequently than it should. The missiles have to be used for shorter ranges than would have been possible.

The terrible part of these resultant not-as-good-as-possible weapons is that the failures are often in small component parts. A relatively small amount of extra research and testing on these components could add a great deal to reliability. There are indications that the Russians do this extra testing.

We hurry over details and they come back to trip us up.

But the scares that Khrushchev has thrown into us have convinced the Pentagon that we've got to rush even if it means slower progress in the long run.

This super caution is based on a general policy of overestimating the Russians because we had underestimated them for so long. It is this overestimating based on Khrushchev's missile-space showmanship that is causing us to run so fast that we are slowing ourselves down.

Gifts From the Maharajah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, it is a well known axiom that you do not get something for nothing, and this is particularly true in the case of Federal aid to the States in its various guises. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wall Street Journal of February 24, 1961, which draws a clever but rather tragic analogy between the present Federal aid programs and the methods used by the ancient maharajah to in effect "kill the taxpayer with seeming kindness":

GIFTS FROM THE MAHARAJAH

In ancient times, so we are told, shrewd potentates had a clever way of bringing local governors to heel, they smothered them with solicitous kindness.

Let a distant principality show too much independence and the gracious maharajah might pay it a visit, bankrupting the countryside which had to play host to his grand entourage. Or maybe the local ruler would receive the generous gift of a royal elephant who would eat him into ruin. Thus reduced to need, the local people would receive gratefully any largess from the maharajah. And, of course, receive resignedly the instructions that came with the relief.

This interesting gambit is still being played, as anyone might notice who listens to one of the current arguments as to why the Federal Government must give aid to the States for this or that costly program.

The argument runs like this: Education (or care of the indigent, or whatever) is one of the essential tasks of a community. The blueprint of the program needed, drawn up in Washington, runs into uncounted billions. These projected billions are obviously too much of the local communities whose tax resources are already exhausted. Hence there is no alternative but for the Federal Government to relieve the States of this burden.

To this argument it is not easy to turn a deaf ear; indeed, it seems a blessed relief to many a poor taxpayer already buried in local taxes to pay for the State's present program for schools, or hospitals, or roads, or any other community service.

And in his harassed condition, the poor taxpayer is hardly able to reflect how this state of affairs came about, or to think too much upon what else will come with this generosity from Washington.

Yet the process is, really, quite simple. Take that urban development project, down the street. It came as a gift from the Federal Government; but to get the gift the local community had to raise its own taxes a bit to pay incidental parts of the cost. The same is true of the new hospital or the new library. And, of course, the gift from Washington brought other hidden burdens; sometimes a drop in taxable property, sometimes the need for more roads, more police protection, more fire equipment. But all adding to the local burden. Enough such gifts from Washington and the town treasury is in dire straits.

Meanwhile, the Federal Government is doing other nice things for the people. The local veterans have been sent to school and the neighboring farmers have been paid for not growing things. Some of the community's money has been siphoned off and sent to Laos; there's that much less for the new school. And for more than a generation the Government has been quietly clipping the coins, so that the dollars which only a few years ago would have bought the school will not do so today. All calculated to shrink the local resources.

And consider those blueprints drawn in Washington. Citizens knowing their own community can judge whether the new school is needed and if so how big. But when Washington says the Nation needs to spend so many billions, what doctor in Duluth or plumber in Poughkeepsie can measure the sense of it all?

All he can know is that, sure enough, the taxpayers of Duluth and Poughkeepsie have already got enough trouble. Isn't it nice that the Maharajah on the Potomac is going to help out?

It is, when you think of it, a beautiful gambit. First of all the Federal taxgatherer milks the poor taxpayer as dry as possible. Next the Federal Government "gives" the people some nice things, being careful to see that the communities not only pay Washington for Washington's share but also have to dig up some more money to pay the local costs.

Then when the gifts from Washington have just about exhausted both the local treasuries and the local taxpayer, Washington discovers a new unmet need, the size of which, true enough, is bigger than the poor local communities can handle since the size is limited only by the imagination of Washington, in drawing the blueprints.

At that point in the argument comes that clincher. Nobody can argue against the desirability of schools. Nobody can argue that the blueprints as drawn can be met by "local action." So there's nothing left to do but run once more up Capitol Hill, hat in hand.

For of course hardly anybody ever suggests that this vicious circle could be readily broken by spending and taxing less in Washington, thus leaving more for the folks back home. Hardly anyone, indeed, stops to think that any way there's only one hide for all this to come out of, that same poor taxpayer's.

And by this time almost everybody seems beyond caring that with each gift come more and more controls from the faraway potentates. Or cares to notice that each new and gracious gift, for which relief we give such thanks, just makes the circle more vicious.

Clever fellows, those maharajahs.

Congressman Frank Chelf's Plan for a Living Memorial to Past Presidents Has Growing Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF], has introduced an extremely interesting bill, H.R. 5617, to provide for a living memorial to past Presidents of the United States, including Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and Theodore Roosevelt.

Congressman CHELF has said that "unless plans for a living memorial or memorials are vigorously pushed, the Nation's Capital will be overrun with statuary and resemble a graveyard."

It has been pointed out by such publications as the New York Times that there are nearly 200 statues to statesmen, many of them nearly forgotten, in the confines of the Federal City.

The major newspapers in the Nation's Capital have grown increasingly critical of the memorials proposed for our past Presidents, and the suggestion is being heard more and more frequently that living memorials for our past Presidents make a lot more sense than many of the plans for memorials currently being considered.

I include as part of my remarks a letter which was published in the always informative and readable "Letters to the Editor" column of the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star:

LIVING MEMORIAL

Representative FRANK CHELF, Democrat, of Kentucky, deserves the thanks of a grateful and patriotic public for his significant new bill to make the National Cultural Center permanent. Such a step is long overdue. Haste makes waste, and if we have more time to examine the plans for the center, and to raise the money, everyone, including the donors, will be more satisfied and the results will be more enduring.

At the same time, CHELF has taken steps to provide that the National Cultural Center shall, with its various facilities, such as auditoriums, libraries, and art galleries, be a living memorial to all past Presidents.

His reasoning is sound. He points out that "unless plans for a living memorial or memorials are vigorously pushed, the Nation's Capital will be overrun with statuary and resemble a graveyard."

The danger is real enough, heaven knows. Many people and publications have noted that, at last count, there were about 200 statues to statesmen, many of them forgotten, in the confines of the Federal City.

It is hard to understand how anyone could object to making a great auditorium, library, or art gallery a memorial to one or more of our great Presidents. It may be predicted with certainty, however, that backers of the memorials to Woodrow Wilson, the two Roosevelts (FDR and Theodore) and to other Presidents will find persuasive reasons for not combining their memorials with others in truly great memorials to all past Presidents.

The backers of the National Culture Center can reasonably counter, however, that the center is a concept big enough and important enough to honor all our Presidents.

It is to be hoped that President Kennedy will support this new and significant plan by Mr. CHELF and that Congress will enact it into law. For the Chelf plan, if enacted, could really put some steam into the drive for the National Cultural Center.

THOMAS A. WAGGONER.

The 42d Anniversary of the National Amputation Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, this year, 1961, marks the 42d anniversary of the National Amputation Foundation, founded in 1919 to aid the amputee veterans of World War I. In the intervening years since its inception, the foundation has aided the veterans of World War II and Korea; until today it has become the largest private organization dedicated solely to the amputee veteran.

Some may ask, What is the purpose of the foundation? Doesn't the Federal Government aid the disabled veteran? The answer, of course, is yes, but the foundation is able, through its 42 years of experience, to handle the special problems that face the amputee. The primary reason for this is because the foundation is staffed by fellow amputees who have encountered similar problems in their effort to readjust to a useful life.

The foundation offers legal counsel, training in the use of prosthetic devices, social activities, liaison with outside groups, psychological aid, and vocational guidance and placement. The amputee faces a definite need for these services, and the foundation, because of its acute knowledge of these needs, is able to adequately counsel the new member.

When the amputee faces the prospect of returning to work for the first time or resuming an active role in community life, complex and at times frightening problems confront him. The loss of a limb means, in many cases, an entirely new life.

Added to the economic problems are many serious psychological barriers. There may be manifested in the amputee's mind the idea that many will shun him because of his changed physical appearance, or even worse, that he will become an object of pity. He has possibly also built up a strong resentment to others who have not suffered the same misfortune as he. It is in situations such as these that only the counseling of people who have suffered the same physical problems and the same mental roadblocks that the foundation renders one of its greatest aids. It is easy for one to say do not worry, people will not shun you, or pity you, but the amputee in his special situation is not comforted by these words. But practical advice from one who has been in the same position may speed the patient to quicker physical and mental recovery.

The vocational guidance and placement programs sponsored by the foundation are vital to the amputee's process of rehabilitation. In many cases the individual may not be able to return to his former occupation, thus making him economically dependent upon others. This factor alone can destroy or at least greatly impede the process of readjustment. However, the foundation's program of vocational guidance can retrain the amputee in an occupation which can make him economically independent. The prospect of being independent in his mode of living helps to reaffirm the amputee's self-respect—vital to complete rehabilitation.

The placement program sponsored by the foundation is another step in returning the amputee to his rightful place in society. It matters very little if you retrain a person who has no opportunity to gain employment. The foundation works continually to educate the employer in the advantages of hiring not only amputees, but also handicapped individuals in general. They are able to point to both the high efficiency and safety record of the handicapped.

These various programs of the foundation may seem very broad, but they have one important element that no large organization can offer: Close personal service and counsel from people familiar with the problems of the amputees because they too have suffered the same handicap.

The National Amputation Foundation, as I have pointed out, was originally dedicated to the veteran amputees of World War I. However, in recent years the foundation, realiziny the urgent need of all amputees, whether they be veterans or nonveterans, for aid and counsel has opened its membership to all amputees.

The expanded activities of the foundation are based upon the premise that "no man is an island." This is especially true of people who have lost limbs, and face a psychological problem unknown to the majority of us.

I offer the foundation my heartiest congratulations on their 42d anniversary, and urge them to continue their fine work on behalf of both the veteran and nonveteran amputee.

The Communist Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Roscoe Drummond's article on the Lao situation will be of interest to all Members of Congress:

A SOVIET TROJAN HORSE—UNITED STATES WARNED TO BEWARE OF RED COALITION IN LAOS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON, March 21.—We face a new danger in Laos—while we may avert a Soviet military coup—that we will slip into the trap of encouraging the Lao Government to take the local Communists into the Government.

If you want a trojan horse in the living room, just invite in a Communist coalition.

We have had ample warning: The dead democracies of the Soviet satellites are strewn with Communist coalitions, who only wanted to help.

It is all to the good that Secretary of State Dean Rusk has warned Moscow that continued shipment of arms to the Communist Pathet Lao forces can lead to major hostilities. In delivering this warning, Mr. Rusk assured Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko that America's objective is an independent and neutral Laos.

He hoped that the Kremlin would support the same objective.

SOVIET STRINGS

Premier Khrushchev may well announce his support of a "neutral" Laos. But when he does, look to see whether there is a give-away condition attached to it. If Mr. K. proposes to impose a Communist coalition upon the Lao Parliament, then the Kremlin will be pursuing its long-established tactic designed to turn yet another country into a Soviet satellite.

How the Communists pursue this tactic has been set forth as badly as Hitler did in "Mein Kampf." If we are to avoid a sad mistake in Laos, we had better heed the signs.

Fortunately the independent information center in London has just published an English translation of the pamphlet prepared by Jan Kozak, a Communist member of the Czechoslovak National Assembly, who tells how the Communists overthrew parliamentary democracy in his country as a guide to how they can do it elsewhere.

Kozak advises that the best way to subvert parliamentary democracy is for the Communists to get a foothold in any government coalition. From this foothold, he explains, it is possible to combine pressure from above with pressure from below to destroy the democratic political parties one by one.

HOW REDS WON CONTROL

In the case of the Czechoslovak coalition, the Communists were given control of the Ministry of Interior and had roving commissions in some of the other ministries.

"These executive organs controlled by Communists," Kozak candidly explains, "became effective levers for further advance of the revolution. They enabled direct suppression of bourgeois counterrevolutionary elements." (In Communist terminology "bourgeois counterrevolutionary elements" is a synonym for supporters of parliamentary democracy.)

The main purpose of pressure from below, according to the Czech Communist leader, is to support action by Communists in the government "enhancing their strength and compensating for their numerical weakness limiting the influence of waverers and enemies who stood in the way of further progress of the revolution."

These mass pressures include calling of protest meetings, sending delegations, organized demonstrations and eventually the use of strikes and the general strike.

RED VIEW OF COALITION

Kozak stresses that Communist partnership in a coalition government is always viewed as temporary and is never allowed to dilute the end objective, which is the dictatorship of the proletariat; that is, the de-

struction of democracy. But he omits, no doubt purposefully, one significant fact—that the non-Communist allies of the Communists, those leftist parliamentarians who wish to use the Communists for their purposes, always, end up discarded or purged, once the Communists no longer need them.

It will be well to keep this longstanding Communist tactic in mind when we come to negotiating with Moscow over Laos. An independent and neutral Laos is a good answer, but when the Kremlin suggests that the way to keep Laos neutral is to have a coalition government, let us beware. That is not the path to neutrality; that is the path to a Communist takeover.

Greek Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, 1821, the Greek way of independence began when the archbishop of Patras raised the flag of freedom in the monastery of Aghia Lavra and the people of Greece dedicated themselves to the attainment of their liberty from the Ottoman Empire.

Today—March 25, 1961—Greece celebrates the 140th anniversary of the beginning of that struggle.

Freedom-loving civilizations can profit greatly from the lessons of the classical age of Greece. These are the lessons of excellence, education, freedom, and public service.

The survival of our political freedom may depend on how well we learn these lessons. In a world threatened by the tyranny of communism, we must strive always for excellence, for the probable consequence of mediocrity is the enslavement of the human mind.

To mark the occasion of Greek Independence Day, I have today introduced in the House of Representatives, the following resolution:

JOINT RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR THE ISSUANCE OF A PROCLAMATION DESIGNATING MARCH 25 AS GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

Whereas the democratic ideals that have made the United States of America the greatest free nation in the world were born many centuries ago in Greece; and

Whereas these ideals have kindled in the hearts of the people of Greece the determination that no sacrifice is too great for the cause of fredom and democracy; and

Whereas in every country people of Greek origin celebrate March 25 as Greek Independence Day, this day marking the beginning on March 25, 1821, of a seven-year struggle of the people of Greece to win their independence from the Ottoman Empire; and

Whereas free men in every nation rejoice that the principles of democracy are again firmly established in the land of their birth: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States be authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating March 25 of each year as Greek Independence Day and that he invite the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies.

Medical Student Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in an article which appeared in this month's issue of the IAA Record concerning a loan program for medical students sponsored jointly by the Farm Bureau and Medical Society in Illinois. This type of program is essential if we are to educate young men for the medical profession who are not from wealthy families. My fellow townsman, Dr. William P. Lesko, was one of the first participants in this program and served as a general practitioner in a rural community in Illinois. Two other participants in this program were Dr. Leonard Todd, Jr., and Dr. Roger Quinn, who are now practicing physicians in my hometown of Carlinville, Ill.

Mr. Speaker, because of the urgent need for expanding programs of this nature, perhaps through Federal participation, I am including this article as part of my remarks. A great shortage of doctors exists today and the outlook for tomorrow is not at all encouraging. We are nto expanding our medical facilnumber of doctors we educated in 1900. We are not expending our medical facilities and we are not educating young men to care for the increased medical attention demanded today with the poplation over twice as great as we had in 1900. The article follows:

"Healing is a matter of time, but it is sometimes also a matter of opportunity," wrote Hippocrates.

Likewise, becoming a physician is sometimes a matter of opportunity.

Farm Bureau and the Illinois State Medical Society offer this opportunity, in the form of the joint medical student loan fund program, to talented and deserving young men each year.

Purpose of the program is to place general practitioners in rural areas in Illinois. Loans are granted at a low rate of interest to medical students. Recommendations that certain students be accepted by the University of Illinois College of Medicine are made also.

The Illinois General Assembly, by joint resolution, made it possible that 10 places on the admissions list be reserved annually for students recommended by the medical student loan fund committee.

Each student who takes part in the program agrees to practice medicine in a rural community for 5 years after finishing medical school. The town may be selected by the doctor or may be assigned.

The program was started at the 1947 IAA annual meeting. Farm Bureau members were interested in encouraging more doctors to locate in small towns. A survey had indicated that some communities had no doctors and other communities had too few doctors or doctors who were near retirement age.

IAA delegates approved the program on the basis that the Illinois State Medical Society would match IAA funds and that the society would agree to permit a joint committee to administer the fund. Each student to whom a loan is made must be recommended by his county medical society and his county farm bureau.

The fund administrative committee consists of three members of the IAA board and three doctors.

IAA representatives are Edwin J. Gumm, vice president, and directors Merle Jeffers and Harold Hartley. Representing the Illinois State Medical Society are Drs. Harlan English, Edwin S. Hamilton, and Jack L. Gibbs.

Gibbs—named to the committee in 1960—was one of the first medical students to take part in the loan fund program. Dr. Gibbs completed medical school and established practice in Havana in 1954.

First National Bank of Chicago is trustee of the joint medical student loan fund. The program was set up on a 5-year trial basis. IAA delegates later voted to increase IAA funds available for medical student loans and to extend the time limit for the program. The medical society followed suit.

The plan permits a student to borrow $1,250 each year during 4 years in medical school. Maximum loan is $5,000. A doctor can spend 2 years as a medical officer in the armed services and another year as an intern before his first note becomes due.

The first doctor o complete the program started practicing in 1952. Last year 13 young physicians started practices in rural communities, in addition to the 39 doctors who are practicing in Illinois as a result of the program. Twenty-three doctors are eligible to begin practice or are completing internships.

Forty medical students are now studying because of the FB–Illinois State Medical Society programs: 11 seniors, 11 juniors, 9 sophomores, and 9 freshmen.

Of the 102 students who have taken part in the program, 56 received loans.

Eleven students will be added to the program this year. The joint committee last month approved for loans or recommendations the following: Bill Fulk, Pinckneyville; Edward George Eschenbaum, Jr., LaSalle; Charles W. Cummins, Harrisburg; Morris Alan Kugler, Okawville; Theodore Charles Little, Shelbyville; Robert J. Parks, Stonefort; Robert H. Pierce, El Paso; Franklin Lyle Stroud, Somonauk; Robert E. Cox, Wenona; James Fred Greenwood, Metropolis; James G. Blythe, Vandalia.

Byelorussian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Byelorussia's modern history is inextricably mixed with that of Russia, because during most of that period the country was part of Russia, Byelorussians had become subjects of Russian czars, and the Russian rulers had tried to eradicate all Byelorussian national traits.

The people of Byelorussia, who have had a longer history as a nation than the Russians themselves, were never willing to forego and forget their distinct identity, were never reconciled with their lot under the Russian czars, and have always yearned for their freedom and independence. For centuries they struggled for their goal and patiently waited for the opportune moment. That opportune moment came in 1918.

The Russian revolution of 1917 overthrew the decrepit and detested czarist

regime in Russia, thus freeing, for the time at least, all subject nationalities in the Russian empire. Freedom reigned from the Baltics to the Caucasus, where many national groups asserted their freedom and proclaimed their independence from Russia. The Byelorussians did this early in 1918, by proclaiming the establishment of the Byelorussian National Republic on March 25 of that year. In a joyful and optimistic mood, it was then hoped that some 10 million Byelorussians, having thus attained sovereign independence in their historic homeland, would be allowed to enjoy the fruits of their freedom in peace. Unfortunately that was not to be.

Early in 1921, before Byelorussians had the chance to put their house in order, before they could consolidate and strengthen their government, resurgent and aggressive Soviet forces attacked and overran the country, and independent Byelorussia ceased to exist as a sovereign state. For 40 years these stouthearted and liberty-loving Byelorussians have lived under the unrelenting rule of Communist Russia's totalitarianism. But even under this ruthless tyranny they have not given up their hope for freedom and independence. They still cherish that ideal as their national goal.

On the 43d anniversary of their independence day I wish them more power in their struggle against ruthless totalitarianism.

Edward R. Murrow Fails?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the following news item by Alvin Shuster, appeared in the New York Times, on March 23. Could it be that Mr. Murrow now realizes that his documentary was distorted?

MURROW FAILS IN EFFORT TO KEEP FILM ON MIGRANTS OFF BRITISH TV

(By Alvin Shuster)

WASHINGTON, March 22.—Edward R. Murrow, Director of the U.S. Information Agency, tried and failed to suppress the showing in Britain of a controversial television documentary on the plight of migrant labor in this country.

In an unusual intervention by a Government official, Mr. Murrow telephoned a high official of the British Broadcasting Corp. and asked that the film not be used. He was reported to have been told that the documentary, entitled "Harvest of Shame," had been too widely advertised in Britain to be withdrawn.

First word of the effort by Mr. Murrow to suppress the film he narrated as an employee of the Columbia Broadcasting System came today from Senator SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, Florida Democrat and long a critic of the program first televised in this country last November. He said he had been told of the intervention by Mr. Murrow.

Mr. Murrow said through a spokesman later that Mr. HOLLAND's report of their conversations was "roughly right."

It was learned that Mr. Murrow's call was placed yesterday morning to Hugh Carleton Greene, director general of the BBC, which purchased the film from CBS. The program went on as scheduled yesterday.

Mr. Murrow, who was confirmed by the Senate March 15 and sworn in yesterday, said he had produced the documentary "solely for domestic presentation." The sale, he said, was "entirely a decision of CBS, a network for which Mr. Murrow worked for 25 years before taking his Government post.

Ironically, it was also learned today that the information agency was seeking the use for worldwide distribution of another CBS documentary entitled "Africa Crossroads," also narrated by Mr. Murrow.

It was announced today, meanwhile, that "through the courtesy of CBS," the agency would make use of the televised film story of Dr. Gordon Seagrave, the renowned Burma surgeon.

In reply to accusations by Senator HOLLAND, CBS said that the migrant labor documentary, as a news report, was available for worldwide circulation just as was any American newspaper or magazine.

"To deny oversea subscribers the use of a news report would be inconsistent with basic principles of freedom of information and full circulation of the news," the network said.

It added that an announcement that Mr. Murrow had been associated with the documentary as an employee of CBS and before his appointment as director of the information agency was made before and after the telecast.

DISTORTION CHARGED

Senator HOLLAND and other Members of Congress from farm States has criticized the film as a "malicious distortion" of the migrant labor situation. He charged the show played "fast and loose" with the truth.

In a speech on the Senate floor today, Mr. HOLLAND renewed his attack. If the film presented an accurate portrait, he said, it would not be so objectionable. But, he continued, the "national image presented is not only an unfavorable one: it is also a very unfair and untrue image."

Since many of the migrants depicted are Negroes, he continued, the film fits "easily into the false picture of the position of Negroes in American society which our Nation's enemies are bending every effort to create throughout the world." He said it gave the impression that agricultural labor was exploited in this country.

According to the Senator, Mr. Murrow called him twice this week and said that he deplored and resented the sale of the film; that he was "deeply distressed" by it, and that he considered the CBS action as "wholly irresponsible." He emphasized to the Senator that the film had been made for domestic presentation.

Mr. Murrow could not be reached directly for comment on the statements attributed to him. But an aide relayed them to Mr. Murrow and reported that the accounts of the "conversations are roughly right as reported."

DEFENDED DOCUMENTARY

A week ago, Mr. Murrow defended the documentary from congressional attack when he appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on his nomination.

The American Farm Bureau Federation has been the leading critic of the film and its president, Charles B. Shuman, appeared on the CBS program "Face the Nation" after he demanded time to "set the record straight." The Farm Bureau reported today that it had been informed from London that a protest it had cabled BBC was used along with the showing yesterday.

The Farm Bureau also reported that it had heard that Australia had rejected use of the film as being "not in the best interests of either country."

The Independence Day of Byelorussia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, every year we, Americans, celebrate the Fourth of July—the day of the Declaration of Independence of the United States of America. The 25th of March is the Byelorussian national holiday—the day on which 43 years ago the Byelorussian Democratic Rada—Council—solemnly proclaimed the independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic—BNR—in the country's capital Minsk.

The history of these two nations was different. The young American Nation, after having become independent, could freely develop all branches of national life and create the most democratic and powerful state in the world. The fate of Byelorussia was different, because of her different geopolitical location.

Byelorussia, a country on the crossroads of Europe where Western culture and freedom met with Eastern barbarian despotism, was always the battlefield of these two antagonistic worlds.

In the past Byelorussia was an independent nation and played an important part in the medieval history of Eastern Europe. In the early Middle Ages Byelorussia appeared under the name of Kryvia and later on—13th century—was known as the Grand Duchy of Lithuania; in 1795 the country was forcibly incorporated into Imperial Russia.

Continuous efforts have been made by the Byelorussians in an attempt to regain their freedom. With Napoleon's assistance in 1812, by armed uprising under the leadership of Kastus Kalinouski in 1863, and others. The revolution in Russia of 1917 offered another opportunity to shake off the chains of slavery—this time by the means of democratic self-determination. Through the coordinated effort of all Byelorussian organizations, a national representation, consisting of 1872 delegates from all corners of the country, convened in Minsk on December 18, 1917. This all Byelorussian Congress became in fact the constituent assembly of Byelorussia.

The Congress elected the Rada and its Presidium as its executive bodies, which have assumed the responsibility for the fate of the nation.

On March 25, 1918, the Rada and its executive council solemnly proclaimed the independence of Byelorussia and published their third constitutional act containing the official text of the proclamation.

Without any help from outside the new Republic could not resist for too long a time the pressure of Russian imperialism and soon fell victim of new occupation, this time by the Red Communist army.

Her place was taken by the Bolshevik-sponsored Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, created on January 1, 1919, in Smolensk as a Communist counterweight

to the democratic republic. This "union republic" with its puppet government is still in existence within the structure of the Soviet Union.

The people by Byelorussia have never accepted the government forced upon them, and defended their rights by arms. The famous Slutsk uprising of 1920 was brutally crushed by overwhelming Communist forces, that is, suffered the same fate as the Hungarian revolution in 1956.

During the following 41 years the population has been subjected to a violent and ruthless persecution, deportation and extermination. As a result of Moscow's policy of genocide, Byelorussia lost 5 million people in 20 years, according to the Soviet census in 1959.

On the international forum the Communist puppet government of the B.S.S.R. continually abuses membership of Byelorussia in the United Nations.

The Byelorussian people know that thousands of their compatriots living in the free world are disseminating truth about their history, culture, and present colonial exploitation. They also know that the Byelorussian Democratic Rada leads the best forces of the nation in the fight for freedom and justice.

The Rueful Footnote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the editorial by Mr. Joseph Alsop, appearing in the Washington Post, this day:

THE RUEFUL FOOTNOTE

(By Joseph Alsop)

The Lao crisis has given President Kennedy his first major experience of the harsh ordeal which can never be escaped by any man who wins the leadership of a great nation in troubled times.

This is the ordeal of making choices, in closed and secret rooms, often for closed and secret reasons, with the heavy knowledge that the choices finally made must intimately and perhaps terribly affect the fate of tens and even hundreds of millions of men and women. It came sooner for Kennedy than for almost any of his predecessors.

How has he withstood this test? One can only judge by the choice that seems to be in the making, and by the reactions of the experienced officials who have seen Kennedy while he was meeting the press. Not a few of these officials can also remember the demeanor of Dwight D. Eisenhower, or of Harry S. Truman, or even of Franklin D. Roosevelt, when they too had to submit to this special ordeal which is the occupational hazard of national leadership.

It is not surprising that Kennedy's cool competence has much impressed these men who have been watching him, so to say, taking the heat in the sweatbox of history. His rapid mastery of facts, his knack of asking the right penetrating question, his power to envision problems both widely and in minute detail, are the current commonplaces of the political community. His bitterest enemies no longer argue that Kennedy is incompetent or juvenile.

What is surprising is the deep impression the President has made by his peculiar, highly personal response to the domestic-political implications of the Lao crisis. Being a thoroughly realistic politician, Kennedy is well aware that the Democrats' heaviest handicap is their reputation as the "party of wars," just as the Republicans' biggest assets is their repeated claim to be the "peace party."

The choice in Laos, as is becoming more and more clear, may eventually become a choice between war and peace. In the endless White House meetings on the Lao problem, the President has quite often drily noted that a war for Laos, or for almost anywhere else for that matter, would quite probably permit the Republicans to win the White House in 1964, and to remain in power for long thereafter.

But having said this, the President has always gone on to discuss without prejudice the facts of the Laos problem, its local difficulties, its worldwide dangers, and its possible solutions. The domestic-political aspect has only been mentioned, in short, as a kind of rueful footnote in the much larger and more important discussion of what needed to be done about Laos.

Probably the President is right that he will weaken his chance of reelection if he meets the Communist challenge in southeast Asia. Yet it is doubly unjust that this should be so. It is unjust, first, because American military intervention to prevent the Communist capture of Laos was already under active consideration at the end of the Eisenhower administration.

About 20 days before the White House changed hands, former Secretary of State Christian A. Herter and Defense Department representatives even agreed on a plan for immediate aid intervention by American planes flying from a carrier held ready in the Gulf of Tonkin, in cooperation with planes of Thailand's air force.

The plan, though agreed upon, was not executed because of the feeling that decisions of this gravity had better be left to the new administration. But on January 19, when the incoming Kennedy received his final briefing at the White House, part of the briefing was a clear warning that the position in Laos might deteriorate quite soon to the point where military intervention might be the only saving course.

At this juncture, Kennedy looked squarely at Secretary Herter and asked him what he would do in such circumstances. Herter replied that he would not duck the obligations of the United States, even if this meant the use of force. And President Eisenhower, presiding over the meeting, did not reject the formula of his Secretary of State.

In sum, the phoniness of the claim of the cheaper sort of Republicans, that they have an exclusive patent on peace, was very nearly proven in action before Kennedy took office. But that is only half the injustice, whose other half resides in the claim itself. Would these praters about peace and war parties have had Roosevelt tamely submit when the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor, or would they have liked Truman to yield all Asia to the Communists by ducking the challenge in Korea?

The answer given by Republicans like Herter is the same answer that one hopes Kennedy will also give, that the test of both parties in grave crises is whether their leaders do what needs to be done.

Leadership and Science: Keys to the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include, therewith, a splendid address by Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Chief of Research and Development, Department of the Army, before the Corps of Cadets at The Citadel, Charleston, S.C., on March 18, 1961. General Trudeau, who has made a distinguished contribution to his country and to humanity, spoke with authority to an attentive and magnificent group of Americans on whose shoulders could well depend the future destiny of our civilization:

LEADERSHIP AND SCIENCE: KEYS TO THE FUTURE

General Clark, staff and faculty, cadets of The Citadel, ladies and gentlemen, fellow Americans, I feel very much honored that you have invited me to come here today to this picturesque campus—to the home of one of our Nation's oldest and most celebrated military colleges—to speak to you about leadership and science—two fields, which, from my vantage point, are keys to our future.

Of these two, it is my conviction that leadership is preeminent.

You—the cadets and faculty of The Citadel—are indeed fortunate in having as your superintendent, General Clark, a man who epitomizes the best in leadership; a soldier-diplomat, world-renowned as a master of his profession and matchless ability to inspire confidence, respect, and loyalty in all who associate with him. In the life and career of General Clark you may view one of the most absorbing and rewarding studies of modern, military leadership on record. The magnificent structures and beauty of this place are another monument to this remarkable American, but more important is the spiritual impact that one can sense here. I am sure that you leave here with the certain knowledge that your strength is in your God.

No need is more apparent throughout the free world today than the need for leadership and character. It is the postulate for victory in today's cold war and tomorrow's time of trial.

On this occasion of The Citadel's 118th anniversary, I want to pay tribute to the sound leadership training that you are receiving here. Each one of you should rightfully be proud of this magnificent school—of its traditions and heritage. I know the distinguished records of your graduates speak for themselves. But more meaningful to me is the fact that you are acquiring a good basic education in many areas of learning—in the arts, sciences, engineering, and business administration—at the same time you are receiving your military training. Broad backgrounds of this type are badly needed, not only in the military but throughout our society, to bolster our national strength and determination during these troublesome times.

In all walks of life—in government, in industry, in labor, and in the military—the

central question is not money—or technological growth—or unemployment—or world trade—as important as these matters are—but rather, where will we find the right kind, and the right number, of leaders to direct our path through peace and progress into the dramatic decades of the future.

In this regard, I hope all of you young men miss no word or action of our President as he struggles daily for solutions to the serious, complex problems which now beset us and which will continue to beset us in the immediate years ahead. There is no example in American history where the President of this country called for support to meet a foreign threat that our people failed in their trust. Always our people have responded fully to the right kind of national leadership; always they will.

The continued, alarming, and ever-growing challenges of this day and age demand the highest form of leadership from the policy level to the grassroots. These challenges are arising from three concurrent phenomena.

One. The threat of the insidious ideology of world communism; next, the rising tide of ethnic nationalism in the underdeveloped areas of the world; and last, the worldwide explosion of science and technology.

These phenomena are thrusting upon us at one time more pressing and difficult problems in all fields than have ever before cried for the solution.

In evolving a dynamic forward strategy to solve these problems, I aver that our thinking must emphasize the point that the searchlight of science, guided by leadership, is the instrument to shake our world of vested interests—our world of status quo—out of its complacency. In business and industry—in politics and the military—even in the most fundamental unit, the family—the daily round has become firmly geared to scientific advances, but in an ever changing routine.

Modern science today is not yet 500 years old and technology is perhaps half of that—but in the last century—2 percent of recorded time—mankind has torn from Nature more of her secrets than during all past history. And the future is even more promising. Of all the men who have ever been trained in science and technology, it is estimated that nine-tenths of them are alive today.

The implications of scientific advances and our exploding technology are truly fantastic. Every day brings new evidences of growth in knowledge and its application—challenging our imagination, our ability, and our judgment to utilize this knowledge wisely. We must use this progress, to the maximum extent, to meet and beat the Communist challenge—and equally important—to wipe out backwardness, ignorance and poverty in the underdeveloped areas of the world. Here, I refer to the social and economic conditions under which the majority of men live—the 75 percent of the world's population that enjoys only 10 percent of the world's wealth. These conditions can be materially improved by science and technology.

The essential catalyst here, gentlemen, is leadership—and wisdom.

The tremendous influence of all the many factors that make up our mighty national strength is impotent without the spark of leadership spread to all echelons of our citizenry.

This spark—the catalyst necessary for a resurgence of bolder and more imaginative thought and action in all ranks of our society—must be ignited in the ranks by you—our young people. Only with it can you make a worthy contribution that will go far beyond any particular military assignment or civilian vocation. I urge you to be inspired—to be seized—by a vision of a greater America—a better world—possible for us all.

This morning I would like to bring into focus certain aspects of military leadership which I believe will stand you in good stead in the days ahead whether you enter the military services, industry, business, or the professions.

Leadership is one of the oldest and most distinctive arts in the proud profession of arms; in its simplest definition, it is the art of directing the actions of others. By and large it amounts to the guidance, direction or control a leader exercises over his subordinates—and it is still a most challenging art to master in this day and age. For the most part, the normal burden of military leadership is multiplied by such current problems as—rapid turnover of personnel, shortage of experienced subordinates, and the training and command of men from many nations; but most importantly by the ever-increasing impact of science and technology on the development and employment of new weapons and equipment.

Complications are also added by the shrinking dimensions of time and space. Whether engaged in allout nuclear war or in countering local aggression with conventional weapons, the time and space factors previously associated with warfare have lost all validity in the face of modern advances.

Paramount among the qualities you must possess to be equal to tomorrow's challenge is leadership.

It is not possible and certainly not desirable, that all men be blessed with the same talents. It would be a highly unsatisfactory world if this were so. Each of us has been endowed with certain qualities and characteristics, integrated in a manner more or less peculiar to ourselves, and consequently our fields of endeavor and the success we reach within them will be considerably varied.

When you graduate, your leadership, ability, and training will be put to the real test in whatever you do.

Only by full use of your imagination and your initiative will you ever know your own capabilities as a leader. You will never know your capacity until you stretch yourself, or are stretched by others beyond what you think you can do or should do. You must seek additional responsibilities and develop broad interests and comprehensive knowledge if you would ever reach your full potential.

Acquiring the art of leadership is simply a matter of mastering certain techniques, understanding men and building up those sterling qualities that gave effective and full expression to your natural talents. The average man can be a good potential leader provided he is willing to work diligently at being one. Leadership is not a sometime thing, and the best leaders I have known worked at improving their leadership all the time.

To paraphrase Kipling, if you can keep your head while all about you others are losing theirs, you have met the test. Inside your head is the basic knowledge of organization, tactics, weapons, and logistics. The challenge facing you is to combine this knowledge with an understanding of men.

Do not err, however, in thinking that leadership derives from a deep voice, a parade ground carriage, or athletic prowess. These physical attributes are rightly associated with good leadership, but real leadership comes from the mind and the spirit and is more dependent upon knowledge and character than on outward appearances. An intelligent man of character—built on the right foundation—is the man of power.

Elements of good character are inherent to different degrees and in different balance in different people. All of us know what they are—I only intend to mention them briefly. Here, we think of courage, honesty, tenacity, integrity, and moral ascendancy in living up to the things we believe in and believing in something that is worth living up to. High character is so important that it can truthfully be said that any officer who does not possess it will never really lead, much less inspire. The exceptions only prove the rule. Leaders who truly combine great abilities with sterling character cast an inspiring aura about them.

Tolerance, loyalty, and respect for the leadership exerted by other individuals, whether they be in superior, coordinate or subordinate positions to yourself, are other traits of leadership I want to stress. There are some functions that you can perform better than I; but there will be others that noncommissioned officers, whom you will command, will be able to do better than you. Consequently, in this life of give and take, of adjustment and tolerance, an important factor is the respect we earn from, the support we give to, and the example we set for, others.

It is seldom that the subject of leadership is discussed without mention of the related subject of discipline. Sometimes the relationship between these two subjects is confused. For instance, a very renowned general once made the statement that "Without discipline there can be no leadership." This is a very fine sounding statement, except of the fact that it is invalid because it has the cart before the horse. If you will stop and consider the relationship of leadership and discipline, you will readily admit that the only correct statement is that "without leadership there can be no discipline." That's the true statement.

Nearly 40 years ago, at our Military Academy at West Point, I learned the definition of discipline which I have always tried to employ throughout my military career. It is still completely adequate today. It is that, "Discipline is the instant and willing obedience to orders; and, in the absence of orders, to what you believe those orders would have been."

Now all military men understand "the instant and willing obedience to orders." Violation here infers that punishment will be given. This is what I term the discipline of coercion, and a most necessary part of the military order; it is nevertheless, in itself, inadequate. The martinets of old knew well this type of discipline, and as a result their subordinates were stimulated mainly by fear and not by confidence in or respect and affection for the commander. It was the kind of leadership that caused men in front of barracks to duck back into the doorway when the colonel came down the street for fear of criticism or reprimand, rather than being proud and happy in greeting their commander.

That is why—particularly in this changing world—you must be sure, if you are to develop your full leadership potential, that you also exercise what I term the discipline of volition; in other words, that you seek to instill the confidence, the respect, and, insofar as practicable, the affection of your subordinates for you. This later characteristic will largely be the unconscious result of your actions. It will stem from the opinion of your men as to your adequacy as a leader, not from yours. It will never come from back slapping or affectation.

General Schofield once described the discipline of volition well, when he said to the cadets at West Point in 1887:

The discipline which makes the soldiers of a free country reliable in battle is not to be gained by harsh or tyrannical treatment. On the contrary, such treatment is far more likely to destroy than to make an army (the commander) who feels respect which is due others cannot fail to inspire in them regard for himself; while he who feels disrespect toward others, cannot fail to inspire hatred against himself."

The discipline of volition is also well explained by the second part of the definition that I learned, "and, in the absence of orders, to what you believe those orders would have been." This is the tense situation where you are not paralyzed by fear although you may well feel afraid. You may be the last officer remaining in your command but, because of the confidence and knowledge you acquired from your absent commander you know instinctively what he would want you to do; and in the crisis you have the initiative, the courage and the will to carry out proper plans and orders as though he were giving them to you directly.

Most of the conspicuously heroic deeds of war have been carried out by individuals or troops where the discipline of volition existed—where officers and noncoms have succeeded in making themselves the guardians of their men's interests and in return have gained unstinted devotion and sacrifice from their troops.

In research and development, I am increasingly beset with the requirement for officers who possess high qualities of leadership coupled with fine scientific background. The complex weapons systems and materiel in use today require officers to have a better understanding of science and technology than ever before.

Educational institutions across our land must review their curricula and incentives must be found to stimulate increased excellence in the field of scientific education—if we expect to have the brainpower our exploding technology requires to maintain its pace. The Soviets, with their emphasis on Communist materialism, graduate twice as many scientists and engineers as we do every year. While we must train young people in science and engineering, we must go the Soviets one better. Our scientists and engineers must come out complete individuals with sound grounding in social sciences. Equally, our social scientists must be completely trained; they must be given an understanding of the physical sciences. We do not approach our potential in this now.

Human knowledge has expanded and is expanding at such a fantastic rate that there is practically no field left in which you can become an expert after only 4 years of undergraduate work. Consequently, you should not expect to gain from this college a mastery of your particular subject, but rather the thorough grounding which will enable you to master it in the future, given time and access to the necessary material.

For example, did you know that currently half of the graduates of the Military Academy at West Point receive graduate schooling at a civilian university as a part of their military careers? In time, this percentage will grow, and it is expected that up to 75 percent of the class of 1963 will do graduate work.

Let me briefly cover with you the Army research and development program and discuss some of the more promising weapons and equipment we are developing for the future—for potential use both on the atomic or nonatomic battlefield. My remarks should underscore that the professional military leader of tomorrow must be mentally well equipped due to the complexity of our weapons systems and the dispersed nature of future combat.

The Army's current research and development program supports extensive investigations into the field of basic research as well as into the field of applied research and development. The scope of our program is as broad as man's imagination, for our primary interest is in man—the soldier—and what it takes to sustain him in an environment more hostile today than ever before in all history.

The Army's efforts in basic research—to penetrate the ever-shifting boundaries of science—are extensive. We devote about $50 million per year to this effort, expended through more than 550 laboratories, universities, and industries, and 80 Army and other Government installations.

Fifty million dollars is quite a sum when you stop and consider that 40 years ago President Hoover, while Secretary of Commerce, advocated at the national level the expenditure of $30 million for basic research over a 10-year period. Today, on the other hand, the Nation is spending approximately $1 billion a year to insure that the reservoirs of knowledge do not run dry—almost a 500-fold increase.

Remember the end product of basic research is new knowledge, or new science, and this remains invaluable but dormant until applied research and development—or technology—molds it into the prototype or model which eventually becomes a new weapon or a new piece of equipment in the hands of troops—or a new commercial product.

Basic research looks into the future for a 12- to 20-year period—as an example, toward the battlefield of 1975. The Army is particularly aware of the necessity for basic research and will continue to stress it to the limit for available funding. It is the key to future developments—to the realization of radically new concepts and designs just over the horizon.

There are many promising results of basic research which we can expect to see incorporated into future equipment and more are on the way.

One of our most important basic areas is materials research. We know that our engineering design prospects are intimately bound up with discovery of new materials with greatly enhanced properties—conducting, semi-conducting, insulating, magnetic, and structural—and also important—with improvement of existing materials. In materials research, we are working on a variety of approaches—in plastics, ceramics, cryogenics, pyrogenics, and metallurgy.

The most pressing research and development programs are not in the field of development—but in research—in finding the new materials which can make creation of advanced military devices possible. The unprecedented demands for new materials in this area are staggering—materials, for example, that can withstand conditions of extreme heat and pressure in the order of a million pounds per square inch and 5,000° C. All the Armed Forces share the need, and are working jointly in this area on a variety of approaches—in plastics, in ceramics, in polymers, and in metals—spending several hundred million dollars a year.

It is important to point out that metallurgy is a field that has seen tremendous advances in the last 10 years and can be expected to surge beyond the boundaries of our imagination in the next few. For example, it is estimated that within the next decade we shall have beryllium alloys with the strength of steel, but one-fourth the weight. Shortly thereafter will come plastics and ceramics with the same strength-weight characteristics. New steels, with vastly improved characteristics, are in sight now.

Research efforts are also underway to bridge the gap between materials and solid state physics. Rich dividends, here, will permit us to chainlink large molecules so that materials—with properties we can hardly now imagine—can be created at our order. Instead of having to work with materials we have—we can have the materials we want. We can determine the ideal characteristics we need, then tailor them out of atoms and molecules as needed.

These and other materials research-sparked developments will redound to the benefit of our civilian industry and commerce as well as to the military, giving us greater utilization of energy, increased measures of reliability and more efficient space accommodations.

How many of us in these days of wondrous advances remain impressed by the fact that electronic parts have been reduced in size in the last few years by modular concepts so that now instead of 7,000 parts per cubic foot, we can put 350,000 parts in the same space. Now, even this figure can be increased by a factor of 10 in certain fuze applications, and using solid circuit techniques—or "molecular electronics"—even this is only a beginning. Just around the corner of tomorrow I predict we shall see a good wrist watch radio of the size of an after-dinner mint.

We are also pushing forward basic research in the field of new energy sources. We are redoubling our efforts to achieve new engines at less cost, with more economy, of less size and weight—and most importantly, with higher performance ratings under all kinds of conditions. Only at our peril, will we fail to investigate every new avenue that shows promise in the power spectrum—from today's gas turbine to tomorrow's fuel cell—from the magnetohydrodynamic generator to the solar cell—and in a future as awesome as it is near—nuclear power sources.

Of these, the fuel cell now seems the most promising for the 1970's.

The fuel cell is an electrochemical device that produces electrical energy by direct chemical reaction. It has all the features of a battery except that the reactants—oxygen and some companion fuel like hydrogen—are supplied continuously and the products—carbon dioxide and water vapor—are removed continuously.

There are several commanding reasons for military interest in this cell. Significant is its potentially high efficiency compared with that of a gasoline motor—about 60 to 80 percent compared with 25 to 30 percent. This means more efficient utilization of fuel with substantial reduction in the logistical load. The fuel cell has no internal moving parts—no pistons, crankshaft, transmission, and the like—and this means reduced maintenance. Of additional importance is the fact that fuel cells operate with an absence of noise or smoke, and generally without excessive heat. They therefore are harder to detect by the enemy on or above the battlefield.

Other significant basic research in medicine, chemistry, or unusual power sources—such as the nuclear reactor, the solar cell, the thermionic converter, or the magnetohydrodynamic process—which our Army is conducting is too numerous for me to cover in the brief time for this talk. But what I have covered should indicate that basic research is an essential ingredient of potential military power as opposed to military power in being.

These advances illustrate, moreover, the kind of basic research effort which is necessary to feed the insatiable appetite of applied research and development, for without new knowledge, without new science, applied research and development is limited to product improvement. Product improvement, important as it is, will not put us out in front where we belong, or keep us there.

Let us look now at the general areas of interest in our applied research and development effort in the classic fields of military endeavor—firepower, communications, and mobility.

Our military power today, in terms of firepower, is truly formidable. In communications, the sinequa non of command and control, we have leaped ahead. But the Army has one crying need today, and that is for revolutionary strides in the third vital area—mobility.

We must break the ground-bound barrier.

Now, in mobility, engineering and military imagination has outstripped existing materials and surpassed the state of the art in power sources. I forecast that through new advances in the science of materials research, we can cut through conventional barriers and attain the truly revolutionary improvements we require in mobility. Our progress here is dependent on the solution of crucial materials and energy problems.

With all our resources, we are working to overcome the lack of new and unique materials and develop true air vehicles that will fly just above the "nap of the earth," permitting the combat soldier of tomorrow to overcome terrain obstacles, such as mud, swamps, ravines, rivers, and forests. This type of vehicle will have the takeoff and landing characteristics of the helicopter, coupled with the advantages of the fixed-wing aircraft in forward flight—and will be able to fly fast, or slow, and quietly, just above the battlefield.

On the ground, we are seeking to improve all our surface vehicles. We are working toward the utilization of large wheels and low profile, low pressure tires—to the "GOER" type of equipment that is used in commercial earthmoving and heavy construction work—where large wheels and tires we know give true off-road mobility. We also expect the "GOER" to provide better logistic support to mobile and dispersed combat operations of the future.

Still on the ground you will see new tanks and armored personnel carriers. These, while not yet in the hands of troops, are in production and soon to be operational to back up the striking power of our powerful new weapons systems. The new ground vehicles represent great improvement over today's tanks and armored personnel carriers—in size and weight—in engine performance and fuel economy—and still better ones are in the offing—on the drawing boards. Where possible, all new ground vehicles will have both swim and air-transportable capabilities.

Communications and electronics are a most important part of our applied research and development effort. We recognize that a land force cannot navigate on or over any terrain, particularly in the Arctic, without some special means of communication control. It also cannot fire missiles effectively without electronic devices to collect target information and guide the missiles to the target.

Here, communications satellites will ultimately provide a reliable and efficient means of spanning the oceans and polar regions, of providing worldwide communications.

Last October, the Advance Research Projects Agency (ARPA) in our Defense Department turned over to the U.S. Army, the $23 million Courier and the $174 million Advent communication satellite programs.

Courier is the first important satellite communication system to be put through the research and development paces. This delayed-repeater type of an active relay system is capable of receiving and transmitting in one pass—about a 5-minute period—almost 340,000 words, or the equivalent of the contents of the Sunday edition of the New York Times. This amounts to over 1,400 words per second—a tremendous increase over any of our present systems. Courier will contribute immeasurably to all future communications systems—civil as well as military.

During the next 3-year period, it is expected that several Courier satellites will be launched. Each communications "package" will be developed by the U.S. Army.

Indispensable to the success of Courier, I must add, has been the solar battery. The more than 19,000 solar cells employed in Courier, which give the satellite a cellular appearance, represent one of the real achievements of our time.

Now, the satellite communication system offering the most advantages is the so-called 24-hour satellite that completes one revolution around the earth in the same time period that the point below it on the earth completes one revolution. This system is known as Project Advent, designed to position a microwave communications relay package 19,300 nautical miles above the earth in a 24-hour orbit.

This is truly an ambitious program, which will probably take from 5 to as many as 10 years to complete successfully.

However, we are well on our way, and when the project has been brought to a successful conclusion, we will have practically a real-time global communications capability, something that seemed impossible a few short years ago.

Now, a few words about firepower.

As you know, nuclear weapons have revolutionized firepower—missiles have boosted our ranges of delivery and tremendously increased our impact power.

In the nuclear area, we are making particularly fine progress in developing a formidable array of weapons with a wide range of yields. Not only are we fashioning warheads for nuclear-tipped missiles and rockets, but we are developing low-yield, lightweight, nuclear weapons that can be used effectively in close support of our combat forces.

We are also improving our tube artillery—it still retains its vital importance for close support and for delivery of conventional fires continuously if needed.

We are developing many types of improved guided missiles and rockets to supplement or replace those that we have now. Among these are Sergeant and Pershing, both long-range, surface-to-surface missiles being developed to fire at ground targets. In the shorter ranges we have improved our reliability and accuracy of delivery by developing Lacrosse. This highly accurate guided missile provides all-weather, close tactical support for the frontline soldier.

To meet our important mission in the air defense of our troops and people, we have under development both a shoulder-fired missile, called Redeye, for the combat soldier to use against attacking aircraft and the amazingly effective Hawk missile for employment by field units against low-flying aerial targets.

Unquestionably, the most important contribution we can make to the active defense of the United States in the near future is Nike-Zeus, the only weapon system in development anywhere, to our knowledge, designed to attack incoming ballistic missiles. It is under development by that same Army-industry team which developed the Ajax and Hercules, and is an outstanding example of the Army-industry partnership so essential to national security.

I want to stress right here that the 450,000-pound thrust Zeus booster engine is the most powerful single-unit, solid-propellant motor successfully fired in the free world—and I feel there is an urgent requirement for such a weapon while we are faced with the growing ballistic missile threat of the Communists. I am confident the Nike-Zeus can do this job in the 1960's.

In the nonnuclear area, we have improved rifles and other small arms. These weapons, soon to be in the hands of troops, outperform anything we have now. They represent the latest advancement in the state of the art, but we are striving for still better ones tomorrow.

There is one other area with which I assure you we are most concerned, and that is with the most important factor on any battlefield at any future time—the soldier. In the Army of tomorrow, man—the soldier—will still play the predominant role, regardless of the nature of the conflict.

The soldier on the ground is the man for whom we try not only to develop the finest weapons systems but also the best rations, clothing, shelter, and protective devices; for whom we are constantly striving to secure every possible advantage in future combat so that he can perform his vital missions and carry on to victory. A most important objective in this respect is to lighten the load the soldier must carry.

Now, I have covered the Army research and development program broadly and described a few of our more promising results. My remarks, I hope, have given you a flash insight into the research and development cycle which goes from the concept of an idea until it is turned over for production of hard-hitting hardware.

And this brings us back full circle to my beginning thesis—the military leader of today must be mentally well-equipped—better than ever before—due to the complexity of our weapons systems, the dispersed nature of future conflict, and the diplomacy required in dealing with allies and indigenous peoples all over the world. Moreover, he must be mentally dynamic and study and master a broad span of subjects and acquire knowledge not only in the physical sciences, but in the life and social sciences as well.

You have often heard the casual remark that "the Navy and Air Force fight with machines; the Army and Marines with men," but today all the services are emphasizing such fields, for example, as personnel or "human factors" research and engineering-psychological research.

There is a real need for research on man's behavior because the physical sciences are outstripping the social sciences. More must be known about the great and most important element in war—man. We must know more about why he acts and reacts as he does and how he can do better. Like a car speeding along the highway at night, we must not outrun our headlights. I can assure you that the newest and most advanced weapon of war is no better than the man controlling it. Moreover, the most advanced combat vehicle in the world is no good without the crew to fight it and the leader to lead them. It is toward training men that your initial and future efforts largely will be directed.

The modern military leader must also be physically vigorous and tenacious to withstand the hardships of the battlefield and to inspire his men with his own vitality and enthusiasm. Never forget the advice of Napoleon—it is always the last quarter of an hour that decides the fate of a battle. How many football games have you seen won in the last quarter? Or the last minute? This is the kind of tenacity, of determination, of the will to win, that so frequently makes the difference between victory and defeat, and so it will be in your personal lives, whatever the task before you. You must not let the frustrations or difficulties of the day deter you from overcoming or shedding them tonight and plunging on to new goals tomorrow.

We are sometimes lured by fantastic notions about men of genius. The men of genius whom I have known are the most indefatigable toilers in this world. Blood and sweat went into the writing of every great book—the painting of every masterpiece—the building of every magnificent structure—the winning of any military campaign. The best things in life come high.

The future today, while it is challenging and difficult to foresee, nevertheless does hold the same promise as the future viewed in earlier decades or centuries. It will be a measure of our personal and collective courage in meeting this challenge of the future that will determine not only your individual

success but whether the free world will survive and progress or else go down in the dust of despair and defeat, if the torch of liberty is snuffed out by the poisonous fumes of world communism. The eminent British historian, Arnold Toynbee, has pointed out that 19 of 21 notable world civilizations have died from within, and not by conquest from without.

My message to you this morning is that this Nation cannot afford to let our great Western civilization be number 20 on this list. The codes of ethics and morals that we have so painfully built up over a period of some 2,000 years are still the best mankind has yet been able to devise.

I often think of the inspiring words of Theodore Roosevelt, great soldier and man of strong convictions and high character, who was endowed with outstanding qualities of dynamic leadership. Listen:

"We know there are dangers ahead, as we know there are evils to fight and overcome, but, stout of heart, we see, across the dangers, the great future that lies beyond, and we rejoice, as a giant refreshed, as a strong man girt for the race. The greatest victories are yet to be won, the greatest deeds yet to be done. There are in store for our people and for the causes we uphold grander triumphs than have ever yet been recorded."

To meet this worthy challenge, we need a resurgence of that faith and that courage to reach our destiny; we need to banish fear and complacency, the palliatives of weak and ignoble minds.

The individual contribution of each of you toward this worthy goal will be a measure of the future success or failure that we, collectively, attain as a Nation. This is the challenge of today. This is your commission for the future.

I thank you very much.

Address of Congressman Thomas N. Downing, of Virginia, on the Occasion of the Presentation of the Portrait of the Late State Senator Robert O. Norris, Jr., of Lancaster County, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech delivered by my distinguished colleague from Virginia, the Honorable THOMAS N. DOWNING, at the presentation of the portrait of the late State Senator Robert O. Norris, Jr., to the circuit court of Lancaster County at Lancaster, Va., on Monday, March 20, 1961.

Senator Norris was, during his lifetime, one of our most distinguished Virginians. He was a lawyer, a legislator of great ability, and a gentleman of outstanding qualities of character. He served in the General Assembly of Virginia possibly longer than any other individual in the history of the Commonwealth. He was elected to the house of delegates in 1911 and served in that body until 1928, when he was elected to the senate to succeed the late Senator Thomas J. Downing, where he continued until his retirement in 1958, a period covering nearly 50 years. He served as president pro tempore of the senate and was also chairman of the finance committee.

I had the distinction of serving with Senator Norris in the house of delegates and in the senate where we were for a period of 10 years desk mates. I have never known a finer man, nor have I ever had a better friend.

The address of Congressman DOWNING is as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

As I reflect back on my memory of cherished friendship with many people, no figure stands so prominently as does Robin Norris. It was my pleasure to have known and loved him since my earliest recollections of childhood. It was my distinguished honor to have been related to him. He was an intimate and devoted friend of my grandfather, Thomas N. Downing, whose portrait also hangs on the walls of this historic courthouse. Visits were frequently exchanged between these two men and for me it was always the greatest of delights to be allowed in their presence and listen to past masters in the now forgotten art of conversation. But, whether the conversation was privately conducted or a public speech before the multitudes, the resultant impression of one and all was that Senator Norris was a wonderful and interesting man.

When I first entered the practice of law, I had a strongly entrenched drive to begin my profession here in the Northern Neck, and it was Senator Norris who permitted me to work side by side with him. For one short, but precious, year I was with him night and day—through periods of adversity and disappointment—and when his joys were unbounded. It was during this period that I began to appreciate the magnitude of the man himself. As a practitioner of the law, he had no peer. The walls of this very courtroom have reverberated more than once with his oratorical elegance and understandable logic. Fortunate clients represented by him knew that they had an advocate of superior ability, character and integrity, and that if their cause had merit, it would be promoted by every fiber of his strength and every ounce of his energy. No client ever had a more able counselor, no lawyer better promoted his cause.

As a man, he always seemed to me to be a tower of confident strength. No responsible person ever questioned his word or his motive. He was a man other men loved and respected. He was a man who loved and respected his fellow man. Perhaps this was the cornerstone of his greatness. He could dine with kings and queens, and yet he had the gentle and kind common touch that endeared him to the hearts of all who knew him. As every other man, he had his frailties, to be sure, but in R. O. Norris, Jr., his were uncommonly few.

Above all else, however, he was a Christian gentleman in the finest and truest sense. He was courtly in manner, polite in speech, his very presence radiated a warm feeling.

As a representative of the people he loved, his prime purpose was to do only those things which would best serve the interests of his constituency, his beloved State and his Nation. There are laws on our statute books today which bear his name symbolizing his untiring efforts to promote, preserve and protect our form of society and which will serve to perpetuate his memory for years not within our reach.

The good Lord gave Robin Norris his great talents to be used—and they were used as He intended.

I hope that this sensitive portrait will serve as a constant reminder that the Northern Neck has again produced a true and loyal son of which she can be justly proud.

"The tall Cedar fell and left a lonely place against the sky."

Federal Aid to Education: A Forecast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1961

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, while the great debate goes on concerning Federal aid to education, I know my fellow Members would be interested in reading the editorial views on this subject as expressed in the March 17, 1961, edition of the Albert Lea Tribune, Albert Lea, Minn.:

FEDERAL AID BILL CAN KILL SCHOOLS

Those who want the Federal Government to collect money for schools have ripped the lid from Pandora's box, hinges and all. For the last several years the public has been wooed with schemes all designed to pry money from Federal taxpayers in the name of "good works."

The Kennedy administration is proposing a multibillion dollar program ($3,327 million over 5 years for scholarships and construction of college buildings, $2,298 million more in 3-year grants to States for construction and/or teacher salaries) and makes signs of being serious.

Hardly has this measure been proposed than the National Catholic Welfare Conference composed of 200 cardinals, archbishops, and bishops served notice that when the money was being ladled out, the Nation's 12,000 Roman Catholic schools would expect a fair share.

President Kennedy has said he thought public money for religious schools was unconstitutional. That is, he said it one day, but a few days later said he thought "loans" might not be illegal. But, unconstitutional or not, the gold rush is on.

Protestant and Jewish bodies have gone on record as opposing the use of public money to support church schools, but if the Roman church succeeds in obtaining Federal money one could hardly blame other churches if they changed their minds.

In addition, many schools at all levels are private. Some are important such as Stanford, Harvard, Reed, Mills, Dartmouth, Carleton, Pennsylvania, et al. Spokesmen for these schools have not pressed the issue, but there are those who have said that if church schools get money, then private schools must receive equal treatment.

Already public money is used in many ways for parochial education: The school lunch is a case in point. GI school support went to private schools, church schools, and public schools, and this is being cited as a precedent for giving money to those who sponsor schools of special interest.

There are 99 Roman Catholic members of the Congress—12 in the Senate and 87 in the House of Representatives. They report their mail is running heavily in favor of including church schools and colleges in any program of Federal aids. Senator EUGENE MCCARTHY, of Minnesota, is one who is Catholic and who says his mail favors such aid.

And there you have it. Those who have nibbled away at Jefferson's "wall separating church and State" have loosened enough bricks that the structure is in a fair way of tumbling down.

There will be a great deal of eloquence expended on this issue, but it is the Tribune's considered opinion that if this measure—or one substantially like it—is passed by the Congress you can mark the date of its passage on your calendar as the day when public education began to fade from the picture.

It may take 20 years, or 50, or 100, but it is this newspaper's belief that if Federal aid to any schools is granted at this time, that the church and private schools cannot long be excluded. And the day that begins, there will be less real need for public schools and their decline immediately will begin.

Let the debate begin.

Dante's Dream

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my distinguished colleagues the following article which expresses some very fine thoughts on a celebration which took place this month:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 21, 1961]

DANTE'S DREAM

Where a generous portion of the American population has just engaged in "the wearing of the green," it may come as a bit of a surprise to many—but not to Italian-Americans—to learn that March 17 isn't exclusively St. Patrick's Day. For 100 years ago on March 17, 1861, a dream of the poet Dante took shape in Turin—the cradle of Italian unity—when the first Italian Parliament gathered and proclaimed the Kingdom of Italy, thus uniting into one nation the separate states that make up the boot we know today as modern Italy.

Modern Italy—the Po Valley and 20th century Milan, yes—but Rome with its centuries of civilization; Florence and its great art collections; Naples and its sparkling blue bay—there the past stirs strongly. Even as America molded 13 raw colonies into what has become the United States, so contemporary Italy's task is to continue welding that country of contrasts—the old and new, the economically strong north and agrarian poor south, pockets of ignorance and of intellect—into a creative, vital nation.

On her visitors and friends Italy leaves an indelible stamp; as it did on Browning:

"Open my heart and you will see
Graved inside of it, Italy."

This year America commemorates its Civil War—that great struggle to preserve the union of North and South in this country. And Italy also celebrates its corresponding struggle to become a unified and a free nation. Just as Lincoln knew "this Government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free," so, too, did Italy's great statesman, Count Cavour, proclaim: "There can be no liberty without social justice."

Some nations whose independence is older than Italy's still have that lesson to learn. And others still seeking nationhood could study with profit the restraint exercised by Italian patriots who while building a new state preserved so much of the good and beautiful in their heritage.

Milk Marketing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DURWARD G. HALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the marketing of milk is a matter of vital concern to my district, which constitutes one of the largest milksheds in the Nation. The use of artificial and unjustified health barriers to prevent the marketing of our products is a matter of grave concern to thousands of dairy farmers in southwest Missouri. The following recently appeared in the Springfield, Mo., Leader Press, and is worthy of consideration by the Members of Congress who may soon be asked to consider legislation in this field:

MILK MARKETING

Tears, recriminations, misinformation—if not milk—have spilled prodigiously over the Texas legislative proposal to bar the import of Missouri milk from the Lone Star State.

Yesterday, the issue splashed onto the Texas Senate floor for what promises to be a showdown. And here are some of the misrepresentations—the tears were there, but can be ignored—offered Texas' upper house:

That the milk from Missouri—actually, it's from southwest Missouri—is of poor quality; that the show-me standards of production are inferior; that cattle here are penned all winter in barns to protect them from the Ozarks' severe cold; that such practices are unhealthful; that Missouri cattle are diseased; that the frigid Ozarks climate helps "kill flies and preserve milk," etc., etc.

All so much nonsense, of course. The description might be fitting to milk produced farther north where cattle go in barns in the fall and remain night and day until the next spring. But Ozarks milk is produced much the same as Texas milk.

Dairy cows never spend more than the few minutes needed for actual milking each day in the barns here, therefore do not incur the sanitary problems that northern housing invites. There are few days in any winter that Ozarks cattle don't graze at least part of the day in the open pastures; none when they don't have the freedom of open lots and comfortable loafing areas. Many of our cattle lots are paved.

Much of the milk passes via pipeline milkers from cow to the most modern bulk storage in airtight, quick-chilling retaining tanks without ever coming in contact with air and other potential sources of pollution.

As a matter of fact, Ozarks milk has been demonstrated as superior to that of most of the rest of the Midwest in its milk solids contents.

Now this is misrepresentation that's deliberate for it was suggested in large part by a man intimately acquainted with Ozarks dairying, Dr. George Fischer of the San Antonio health department.

Of course, the real intent of the Texans is not to keep out impure milk—actually, our herds are regularly and rigidly inspected for tuberculosis and brucellosis, the two most infectious diseases carried by milk—but to keep out our milk.

That's understandable, even excusable, if it competes with Texas milk. But one thing should be kept in mind: Texas importers pay a premium over prevailing Texas prices to get Ozarks milk. And they take it the year around. That should provoke some Texas thinking.

Ours is a $600,000 annual stake—not big for the State as a whole, but a sizable one when one remembers it's confined to a few southwest Missouri cows.

Quite understandable, then, that southwest Missouri legislators have rallied to their dairymen's support with a threat of boycott on Texas citrus and other products if our milk is barred.

Comic opera? Maybe so, if one has no stake in it. But it's not so funny when it's bread and butter money for our own industry.

A Nonpolitical Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, following the announcement of the policy of Postmaster General Day to remove from the Postal Service any taint of politics, this editorial appeared in last night's Evening Star:

POSTAL BOOK BURNING

Postmaster General Day in the nick of time has saved his 550,000 postal workers from the possibly deleterious effects of reading the wrong literature—that is, literature prepared by and glorifying his predecessor, former Postmaster General Summerfield. If there has been more smoke than usual rising from the chimneys of post offices throughout the land, it was probably due to the burning of many thousands of copies of the February issue of the Postal Services News magazine. This was the final issue under sponsorship of the Republican administration.

The trouble with the February issue, according to a Post Office Department spokesman, was that it contained a feature "spread" praising Mr. Summerfield for his accomplishments. Among these, it was pointed out, were certain reforms which Mr. Day already has ordered halted—such experiments as postal automation and missile mail delivery. It was explained that the new Postmaster General felt the Summerfield article would be confusing to postal employees. So all copies of the February issue were ordered destroyed.

Somehow or other, this method of protecting employees from being confused, while possible effective, seems a bit drastic in a country and in an administration opposed to censorship in general and book burning in particulary. The better way, we think, would have been to set the employees straight with some right-thinking (Democrat brand) literature in the March issue.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Address by Senator John O. Pastore, of Rhode Island, Before the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. B. EVERETT JORDAN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, a few days ago the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and approximately 26 other Senators took part in debate in regard to the plight of the textile industry and the effect of imports on that industry. At that time the Senator from Rhode Island did a magnificent job, as did all the other Senators who participated in that debate.

On Saturday, March 25, the Senator from Rhode Island addressed the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, at its meeting at Miami Beach, Fla. The Senator from Rhode Island was received there extremely well, and made a magnificent speech. I ask unanimous consent to have the full text of his speech printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE JOHN O. PASTORE, U.S. SENATOR FROM RHODE ISLAND, GIVEN BEFORE THE AMERICAN COTTON MANUFACTURERS INSTITUTE, INC., AT MIAMI BEACH, FLA., MARCH 25, 1961

My good friend Seabury Stanton and fellow Americans, first of all, I should like to thank you for your cordiality and your hospitality. I am very appreciative of how pleasant you have made my stay here in Miami for the last several hours. I think I speak the appreciation also of Prof. William Miernyk, whom our committee was so fortunate to obtain, even at a very, very busy time for him, to assist and to counsel our endeavors in the investigation that we made pertaining to the decline of the textile industry in America.

Yesterday I met many of you personally. Your compliments were rather universal. Many of you said "Thank you for what you have done for me and thank you for what you have done for the textile industry."

Frankly speaking, and I would be less than honest if I did not admonish you to this, that was not my interest. I am not interested in the plight of the textile industry because an individual may be looking to his profit or to his losses. I am only interested in the textile industry because I think it is absolutely necessary to the economic stability of America. [Applause.]

My interest and my knowledge of the textile industry is not academic. I do not read many books on the subject, but I, in full modesty, will say that my interest is somewhat profound.

I have lived in an atmosphere where the textile industry flourished for many, many years. I have been closely associated with men and women who have managed mills, and I have traveled my daily chores with men and women who have worked at the loom.

Ten years ago in my own beloved State of Rhode Island there were 62,900 people employed in the textile industry. Today there are 27,900. There has been a decline in the textile industry of more than 55 percent in the last dozen years.

When I was Governor of my State between 1945 and 1950, our revenue from textiles alone was 45 percent of our gross. Today I dare say it is less than 15 percent.

Now, it is true that many of the jobs that have been lost in the textile industry have resulted from an increase in productivity, and I dare say that in the textile industry you bear favorable comparison with the acceleration of productivity in any industry in the United States of America.

It is true that we lost much of our employment because of the exodus of some of our mills to a region of our country south of the Mason-Dixon line. We did not like that too much. We do not enjoy it to any extent today, but we accept it as the facts of life; but be that as it may, we today have 27,900 of our working population engaged in the textile industry in the State of Rhode Island, and it is the interest, the concern, and I hope the devotion of the senior Senator of the State of Rhode Island to see to it that these jobs are saved, protected and made to endure in my State of Rhode Island. [Applause.]

Now, that does not mean that I am a protectionist. I am certainly not a protectionist. Some mention was made here that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act will come up for renewal in 1962. I voted for the extension in 1958. We were told at that time by President Eisenhower that he needed an extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act if he was to maintain the peace of the world and the security of our people. I believed him, and I voted for it, and I say to you of the textile industry that if in 1962, Mr. John Kennedy rises before the American people and says "For the peace of the world and the security of our people I implore you to again continue the Reciprocal Trade Act" I shall do so again as an American.

But that does not mean that our problem does not cry out for solution. The one mistake that is being made all along the line, and I do not know whether this has been already mentioned to you, is the fact that on two occasions our subcommittee made this investigation, and on each occasion we were very explicit in our declaration, that we were not urging, we were not appealing for, we were not recommending a change in our traditional foreign policy.

When we instituted quotas on agricultural products in the United States of America we did not alienate the rest of the world. We did so for economic reasons. We have a surplus that was cluttering up our agricultural storage, and it would have been next to folly if we increased that surplus astronomically, and for that reason we invoked quotas. These quotas are accepted by the American people, they are accepted in good grace, I am happy to say, by the rest of the world, and this idea that the word "quota" has become so obnoxious is so surprising to me.

Now, the facts of life in the textile industry are very, very simple.

I applaud and appreciate very much what the Secretary of Commerce had to say in commendation of our subcommittee. I am so happy, and I had Bob Jackson get his speech for me. When he said, "A national administration cannot settle the textile problem in a vacuum or without regard to other matters." I say no one is pretending that we do, no one is asking that we do.

He went on, "But I think I can promise that you will get a decision * * * you will get action." That, to me, is the core of the presentation that he made yesterday.

Now, I am happy to see that upon the recommendation of our subcommittee the President of the United States has appointed a cabinet-level committee. They have conducted investigations, they are in the process, as Mr. Hodges said yesterday, of analyzing that report, and they, in turn, will report to the President of the United States, and he in turn will report to the people of the country.

I quite agree with Bob Jackson that there is enough power in existing law, there is enough power in the Presidency of the United States to ameliorate the situation in the textile industry in the United States of America and to do so quickly. No further legislation, in my humble opinion, is required.

Two years ago we were quite disturbed over the number of imports that were coming into this country from Japan. Our committee cautioned the country and the world that this was only the beginning.

Since 1959, when our report was made, and within the past 2 years, imports generally have risen two and a half times more. Japan in 1958 exported to the United States of America, as the greatest exporter, about 60 percent of the entire imports in cotton that were coming into this country. Her quantity has gone up 8 percent in the last 2 years, but her overall share is down to 28 percent, which means that other nations have come into the field.

Now, I heard a man say on the floor of the Senate last Tuesday morning that we must not price ourselves out of the foreign market, and I say "Amen" to that, but how in the world is America ever going to price itself into the Hong Kong market. It is a fallacy that blinks its eyes to the truth and to the realism of the moment.

We of our committee feel that our recommendation of flexible, expandable quotas is a fair and reasonable compromise of a very knotty problem. We feel that the law can be administered and be administered effectively. We feel that this law will not only have a salutary effect upon our own American textile economy, but, indeed, will have a salutary effect upon our friends, who are exporting to us from abroad. For the worst thing that can ever happen to America is to lull the rest of the world into the notion that they can produce and produce and produce their textiles and sell them to the American consumer, and then one day, when the goose that has laid the golden egg dies, to wake up and find out that they must begin to close down their own mills. We will end up with more enemies in the end than friends we made in the beginning.

This matter must be discussed on an international level. Our friends must be made to understand that the American market still welcomes them, but we must convince them, as diplomatically as we can, that the

American consumer is not inexhaustible. He is alive and kicking only in so long as he has a job, and what we are talking about today, my friends, involves the jobs of two million Americans, be it in the textile, broad-woven, man-made, Wilton and carpet, and made-up apparel—two million American job holders are concerned with this problem.

We can absorb, as we have been able to, what has already come in. What concerns us most is the trend. If imports have gone up two and a half times in 2 years, what will they be in 5 years? What will the cure be in 10 years, and where will the textile industry be in 15 years? The one industry that is second only to steel in our national security.

I have heard so much about sacrifice. There is not an individual in this room who, this morning, would not be willing to sacrifice his plant and his fortune if he or she thought for 1 minute that the doing of it would mean to remain free and not become slave. But where did we ever get this idea that the American textile domestic industry must vanish in order to preserve the peace of the world?

You have been most helpful to our committee, but I daresay, in sounding this clarion here this morning, we have achieved no results. We have been complimented to the extent that we are dizzy with flattery, but flattery is not flexible, expandable quotas.

The job must be done, the responsibility must be met judicially and wisely.

I know it is not simple. I know that we have problems, but look at wilton and carpet—3 percent of our entire production in 1948, 10 percent of our entire production in 1956, and 26 percent of our production in 1960—how long will it take? You can take category by category and the story is all the same.

Now, we do not mind, in giving foreign aid to our friends, we do not mind in helping them to build their factories. I have fought for it. In philosophy I am an internationalists and not a protectionist.

We do not even mind the two-price cotton system, provided that when our friends make it into cloth they put it on the backs of their own people. [Applause.]

But to send it back to us in competition with us is again turning your backs to the facts of life.

Now, I know that what we have suggested is not universally popular. I know that it must be studied and studied seriously. In our first report we advocated that in the offshore procurement program a certain amount of those American dollars be expended to buy American-made products. We were flatly told that we could not interfere with the machinations of a foreign government. We could not tell it where to spend our aid because that would not be right, yet we have lived to see, in recent months, that that policy has been reversed.

If, 2 years ago, someone rose on the floor of the Senate and said, "$500 duty-free is too much to bring into America from abroad by an American tourist" they would have called him an isolationist, and within weeks we have seen that drop from $500 to $100.

All I am saying to this administration, please make textiles part of the New Frontier. [Applause.]

I say this to you, that if our cause does not receive a welcome reception at the hands of a Luther Hodges, who knows the textile industry even better than I do—if our cause is not received favorably by Mr. John Kennedy, who lived in the environment and the atmosphere of the textile industry and saw it decline in his own beloved State of Massachusetts, then I dare say, and I say this frankly and as honestly as I can, we either have no cause or our cause is destined to die on the vine.

This is the time, this is the place. These are the facts. We are saying to the administration, look at them realistically. It is not enough that you recognize how badly off we are unless you bring to us some kind of a reasonable remedy. If, in our recommendations, we have gone too far and, for the national interest we must retreat a little bit, show us where our patriotic duty lies and we will accept it, but whatever you do, please look at the textile industry, understand its plight and save it, not only for America but for the rest of the entire world. Thank you. [Applause.]

Woodrow Wilson and President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on March 19, my good friend and colleague, Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, of West Virginia, made a speech before the Knox County Democratic Women's Club, in Knoxville, Tenn. Like every speech my esteemed colleague makes, this one was filled with provocative thinking—especially with regard to our foreign aid programs and our import policies. Because I think Senator BYRD's remarks deserve the widest possible circulation, I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF U.S. SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD, OF WEST VIRGINIA, AT KNOXVILLE, TENN., MARCH 18, 1961

One of the fringe benefits of serving in the Senate is the pleasure which comes from working with your two fine Senators from Tennessee—ESTES KEFAUVER and ALBERT GORE. No Members are more highly respected by their colleagues on both sides of the aisle, or by so many persons in all branches of the Government.

If there is one characteristic that sets Senator KEFAUVER apart, it is courage. It took courage to challenge the power of the big criminal syndicates, as he did during his first term. It took courage to question whether so-called administered prices in the steel, bread, automobile, and, now, the prescription drug industry, are good for the consumer or for our total national economy.

In all of these battles, and in others in which Senator KEFAUVER has been engaged, the people have been the victors. Turning the spotlight on hoodlums and racketeers has brought a public awareness about crime that has made our communities safer for ourselves and our children. And in going to bat against monopolistic practices and concentration in some of our major industries, Senator KEFAUVER has applied the brakes on price inflation in many areas.

Your senior Senator has been no less a man of courage in international affairs. As much as 10 years ago, he took the risk of being called a dreamy-eyed internationalist by battling for an organization of Atlantic Community nations, which would give attention to common economic and political, as well as military problems. Only now is the wisdom of this viewpoint being realized in Washington.

For all of his activities in national and international statesmanship, Senator KEFAUVER is constantly attuned to the problems and needs of his constituents in Tennessee. He gets—and answers—probably as much mail and as many telephone calls from individuals as any Senator. And his office is one of the busiest on Capitol Hill. I know you are proud of ESTES KEFAUVER, and you have every right to be.

Your junior Senator, ALBERT GORE, is now in his 22d year of service in the Congress. This period includes service both in the House and Senate.

ALBERT GORE's record has been marked by support of progressive legislation. As you know, among his major legislative accomplishments, since coming to the Senate, is the Highway Act of 1956, of which he was coauthor. It has been largely as a result of his leadership that the Nation is now engaged in a mammoth program to bring into being adequate highways to serve the needs of an expanding economy and a growing population.

As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and before that, as a member of the Appropriations Committee of the House, Senator GORE has played a leading role in making nearby Oak Ridge the atomic capital of the world. The wealth of scientific resources developed at Oak Ridge constitutes an asset not only to Tennessee, but also to the Nation.

But ALBERT GORE's activities have not been limited to his support of specific legislative proposals. His has been an influential voice in the shaping of policies of the Democratic Party. He has the perception to understand that the policies which guide the Democratic Party are grounded in the best interests of all the people, and he has the courage to speak out about the things in which he believes.

The courage of Estes Kefauver, and Albert Gore, are in the tradition of Woodrow Wilson, that great Democrat whom we remember tonight. I might add, parenthetically, that they are also in the tradition of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, and John F. Kennedy.

Courage, I might say, is synonymous with the name of Woodrow Wilson. And because he had courage, we have inherited, through his actions, a tremendous legacy of democratic tradition and national purpose.

The debt this country owes to Woodrow Wilson is immeasurable. His contributions to the strength and growth of America are too long to enumerate. But his determined fight for passage of the 19th amendment—the right to vote given to the women of the United States—will always be one of the things which assure Woodrow Wilson, throughout all time, a place among the greatest of our Presidents. Not only was his fight a recognition of the role of women through the generations—in war and peace, in prosperity and poverty, in crowded cities and in sparsely populated villages—it also was an affirmation that America needed the political participation of the homemaker for a more responsible development of the human aspects of our national life.

The strength of America today was founded in our homes yesterday, and the strength of America tomorrow is founded in our homes today. For it is in the home that each generation of Americans learns to live and work with other people—learns to understand and appreciate the precious quality of the American way of life. This is what Woodrow Wilson so keenly comprehended when he waged his fight for woman sufferage.

While Wilson was waging a fight for political emancipation of our women, he was also seeking to emancipate American political thinking from its narrow provincialism—from its concept that the broad oceans would keep us free and clear of the political fer-

ment in other countries. He was a visionary, and he foresaw the day when great distances would be erased by scientific achievement, when economic and social upheavals in some far off foreign country would directly affect the peace and equanimity of the United States. To protect America from the contagion of such foreign afflictions, he fathered a League of Nations—but a Republican Congress never allowed the United States to sustain his brainchild.

Today, the Wilsonian concept of American participation in a society of nations is an accepted role for our country. And we have even gone beyond the Wilsonian dream by a show of brotherhood with the free nations of the world—through a program of almost unstinting aid in the form of grants of moneys, loans for economic and industrial developments, and wholesale shipments of food.

Perhaps Woodrow Wilson would not have gone so far and so fast in the program of brotherhood with which we have indulged ourselves. Certainly, I think, he would have guided our course with more caution—the way President Kennedy is doing today with respect to aiding our sister republics to the south. Certainly, too, like President Kennedy today, Wilson would have sought to revitalize our own areas of economic sickness through a domestic aid program, while helping other nations to rehabilitate their economies.

In some instances, our reckless indulgence in international aid has cost our Nation a pathetic toll in unemployment and underemployment. Yes, in some instances, prosperous communities have suffered economic decline because of our rush to accomodate the needs of other nations. We sent the very latest and the very best kinds of machinery and equipment abroad, and kept for ourselves at home the old and worn-out and antiquated machinery and equipment of yesteryears.

With cheap labor, and with the very latest and very best of manufacturing machinery and equipment, foreign producers have been able to undersell similar American produced products in our own home markets. Today, in my own State of West Virginia, there are islands of unemployment and underemployment in many cities and towns because the growing level of imports has adversely affected our previously healthy glassware, clay, and pottery industries. In New England and in the South, our textile industries are suffering because of the flood of cheaper produced textiles from abroad. Our coal mining industries are also being severely harmed by imports of foreign residual fuel oil—a waste product of foreign refining processes.

My State of West Virginia ranks second in the Nation as a glass producer. The world's largest plate glass factory is located in our capital city of Charleston. But because of the upward creeping tide of flat glass imports, this vital West Virginia industry is economically sick. In the Morgantown area alone, one of the leading glass-producing regions in my State, three glass manufacturing plants have shut down in the past several years due to the unequal competition of foreign produced glass imports.

In effect, through the years since World War II, we have hoisted ourselves by our own petard through foreign aid programs without any thought to our domestic economic needs. Even today, as we contemplate a program of aid to our own depressed areas, we hand the whole loaf of bread to our foreign friends and grudgingly reserve some crumbs for ourselves.

As late as March 1, the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Appropriations advised me that the total moneys available for expenditure by the foreign aid Development Loan Fund—including unexpended, unobligated, and new funds—amounted to $1,721,296,000—more than four times the total amount being requested in the Douglas Area Redevelopment bill for our own economically depressed areas.

Since our country is regarded by the entire world—including Russia and Red China—as the greatest and most powerful bulwark against Communist aggression, it is imperative that we not let a single fiber of our domestic strength erode through lack of proper economic nourishment.

Fortunately, President Kennedy sees the whole picture in its proper perspective. While he has proposed to the Congress a soundly based program of aid to our Latin American friends—and we can expect a revamping of our other foreign aid programs on the same terms—he has also proposed an encompassing program for domestic recovery. His program of aid to depressed areas is not solely and wholely in the Douglas bill. It also is in his programs for urban renewal and low-cost housing at lower interest rates; it can be found in his program for better education for our children through the construction of more classrooms and through the higher pay for teachers; and it can also be found in his determination to aid our elderly citizens through a realistic medical care program.

And there will be more Kennedy programs to strengthen the fiber of America—programs for the conservation and development of our natural resources, programs for the employment of our jobless youth, and programs for industrial growth.

It is through such programs, based on the plaform of the Democratic Party, that this country will overcome the effects of foreign competition with our own industries. The ingenuity of America has never been found wanting. If we can revitalize our economy through the Area Redevelopment Act and through President Kennedy's other progressive programs, there will be but few or no competitors who will be able to outdo us in the competition for markets at home and abroad.

Every today becomes a yesterday, and every yesterday becomes a prologue for tomorrow. The yesterday of Wilson is the President Kennedy of today—a leader carrying forward the progressive principles of the Democratic Party—a shirtsleeve leader who spends most of his time working behind a desk instead of on a golf course banging a small white ball. The lights burn late in the White House now—and not for the purpose of viewing western gun sagas on television.

We have a working President now—not a detached father image. We have a President who is in touch with the people—and not just in touch with the elite of big business. We have a President who sees the long lines of the unemployed, not one who ignores them and hopefully wishes they would somehow vanish. We have a President who wants social progress to go hand-in-hand with economic progress—a President who wants equality of opportunity for all, and for all a more abundant and meaningful life—a President in the true tradition of the truly great Democratic Presidents such as Jefferson, Jackson, Roosevelt, Truman, and Woodrow Wilson.

Vice Adm. William F. Raborn, Jr.: The Father of the Polaris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, last weekeild, while in Milwaukee, I had the opportunity to attend a luncheon meeting and special program sponsored by the Marquette University Graduate School and Phi Delta Gamma, graduate honorary society, which featured the lecture by Vice Adm. William F. Raborn, Jr., on the subject of "Polaris and the Fleet Ballistic Missile Weapons System."

The lecture was informative and enthusiastically received by persons attending the program. I am very pleased that I was able to be there and to hear it.

In the thought that it may prove of interest to Members of the House, I wish to include in the Record under leave to extend my remarks a feature article by Jack Raymond which appeared in the February 19 issue of the New York Times magazine and was reprinted in the March 18 edition of the Milwaukee Journal. The article is entitled "The Father of the Polaris," and it pays special tribute to Admiral Raborn and his accomplishments in strengthening the defense of our Nation.

THE FATHER OF THE POLARIS

(By Jack Raymond)

The Polaris submarine represents a revolution not only in sea power but also in military management and production. It sprang from drawing board to sea duty in less that 5 years, compared with other strategic weapons which have taken 10 years or more to become operational.

While it was not the invention of a single man, one man's name has become synonomous with the Polaris. It is that of 55-year-old Vice Adm. William Francis "Red" Raborn, Jr., born in Texas, schooled in Oklahoma, graduated at Annapolis and trained in Pensacola as an aviator.

That a flier should have been placed in charge of developing a new kind of submarine may seem incongruous, but one look at the burly, barrel-chested Admiral Rayborn is reassuring.

The idea of marrying a ballistic missile and a nuclear submarine was not new. The Germans had experimented with submarine-based rockets in World War II. Navy men had argued for years that nuclear submarines could carry nuclear missiles. Then in 1955 a committee headed by Dr. James R. Killian, Jr., recommended to President Eisenhower the development of a ship-based 1,500 mile ballistic missile.

What was sought was a missile that could live in water, in air, in outer space and come through the reentry barrier unscathed. The missile needed fuel that could be stored safely in a rolling, pitching ship. Also needed was a navigation system that could accurately measure the location not only of the target but of the submarine itself.

HE WAS THE MAN FOR THE JOB

The Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, explained recently why Admiral Raborn was chosen in the fall of 1955 to direct the Polaris development: "Our man had to be an aviator to assure cooperation from the Air Force. He had to be available from other duties, yet not a discard. But mostly, he had to be a nice person, who got along with people when the going was tough."

Admiral Raborn had been for nearly 2 years assistant to the navy's director for guided missiles. He won a commendation for organizing a gunnery school in Hawaii early in World War II and afterward was placed in charge of all navy aviation gunnery.

In 1949, as coordinator of the navy's air borne weapons, he directed the technical

branches in their quest for new guns, rockets, bombs and air-launched torpedoes—"in a small way, a job very much like the one he did on Polaris, drawing together hardware from various sources," a navy expert says.

So, a special projects office was established.

Admiral Raborn asked for his choice of 45 men as a start. The group soon numbered 400 men, both uniformed and civilian. This was a relatively small military task force for such a grand effort, but he said, "I can get more out of one overworked man than two underworked ones."

Carefully he built his staff, assigning one aide to do nothing but track down good men. A rocket fuel expert was brought in from the White Sands test range in New Mexico. An electronics expert was diverted from a new assignment at the naval research laboratory. A missile expert was detached from a destroyer at sea. A marine engineer was detached from a secret nuclear warhead center. In 6 months, as management problems mounted, he brought in an army financial wizard from the Pentagon.

The admiral felt from the start that there was little time. "None of this 5-day week stuff," he told his staff.

The original plan was to mount an Army Jupiter IRBM (1,500 mile range) on an oversized, 8,000-ton nuclear submarine—more than twice the size of the *Nautilus*. Tests during the summer of 1956 proved the inadvisability of this. The liquid fuel could not be handled aboard ship; the Jupiter missiles would be too big.

But to seek a radical change in the Polaris project could have meant being "cut off dead." By the end of 1956, Admiral Raborn had made up his mind. Luckily, a smaller nuclear warhead that could fit a smaller missile was developed around that time. James Baar and William E. Howard, authors of the book "Polaris" report that the then Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson looked "like a sulky Buddha" as he listened to Admiral Raborn requesting a major change in the program.

All of the admiral's vaunted powers of persuasion seemed to be failing until he flashed a chart at Wilson that indicated the new plan might save money.

"You've shown me a lot of sexy slides, young man," the secretary said. "But that's the sexiest, that half billion saving."

So the Jupiter was dropped and Raborn's team concentrated on an altogether new missile. It was the admiral who named it Polaris, for the north star, the mariner's friend and guide.

His team immediately ran into a new batch of problems. But Admiral Raborn within a few months was forecasting that he would have a Polaris submarine on station in 1963.

SUCCESSFUL SPUTNIK SPEEDED UP POLARIS

In October 1957, the Soviet Union launched the first sputnik. Admiral Raborn immediately brought his staff together and a plan was worked out to accelerate the Polaris program by 3 years—late 1960 instead of 1963. This could be done, they believed, by cutting the range of the missile from 1,500 to 1,200 miles, using less powerful propellants, and by further reducing the size of the warhead.

Again it meant program changes, new sacrifices, revised contracts. Again the determined Polaris salesman won everyone over to a new, exhausting try.

Meanwhile, missile tests began at Cape Canaveral, Fla. But in the critical months of 1958 and early 1959, despite official confidence, the Polaris test missiles kept blowing up on the pad or had to be destroyed by range safety officers. In the missile gap arguments of the time, the administration was reluctant to spend money on so unproven a weapon. A Polaris test missile was not launched successfully from a stationary pad until April 1959.

Still undaunted, smiling, ever the charmer, Admiral Raborn shrugged off appeals to slow down the pace. And on July 20, 1960, in contrast to the initial failures of Polaris tests on land, the pioneering crew of the *George Washington* successfully launched its first and second missiles out of the blue-green waters off Cape Canaveral, Fla.

"Polaris—from out of the deep to target—perfect," wired the jubilant commander, James B. Osborn. Raborn described the event as "the most significant happening in weaponry since the airplane first flew."

FIRST SAW THE SEA AT ANNAPOLIS

His father was a cotton gin owner in Marlow, Okla. William Francis, Jr., the second child of eight, never saw the sea until he got to Annapolis. There he was an "average" student, boxed and played tennis. He also got his nickname. His hair was auburn and he wrote that on a questionnaire. A superior crossed it out and substituted "red."

At Pearl Harbor, his patrol squadron was one of the few loaded with bombs and ready to fight back. He had anticipated trouble and swiped the ammunition. As executive officer on the aircraft carrier *Hancock*, he won a silver star for getting fires under control following a kamikase attack. After the war, he had been the skipper of the carrier *Bennington* for only 10 days when a catapault exploded during a maneuver and killed 103 men. He braved the flames and was awarded a bronze star for his efforts in controlling the damage.

Admiral Raborn met his second wife, the former Mildred T. Terrell of Baytown, Tex., a Navy nurse, while arranging some extracurricular activities for the men of his ship. They lived in Arlington, Va. Once a golfer, he now spends more time tending his 135 rosebushes, playing his electric organ and taking care of his beloved dachshund, Heinz.

"Heinzie," he often says to the dog, as they play on the patio at home, "stand up and salute the navy." The dog doesn't respond, but the admiral sits it upon its hindquarters and raise a paw to one ear.

And that's about the way he got the Polaris program completed.

Problems Facing the Fishing Industry in Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN A. SMITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, two articles appeared in the New York Herald Tribune yesterday and today on the problems facing the fishing industry in Massachusetts. They are problems being faced by this industry not only in Massachusetts but throughout the entire New England area. I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald-Tribune, Mar. 26, 1961]

FISHING BOAT'S DOOM SEEN IN PRICE SQUEEZE

(By William G. Wing)

GLOUCESTER, MASS., March 25.—Before dawn the fishing boat *Linda B.* dropped her net into the black ocean and began dragging for flounder and cod to be sold in New York.

She looked just right, bobbing along the track of the moon in Ipswich Bay. Boats have been fishing out of Gloucester since it was founded in 1623. Fifteen years ago as many as 411 boats were using Gloucester fish piers in the summer. Three-quarters of them are gone now. Of the hundred or so still fishing, 30 are big trawlers that go out to the North Atlantic Banks. The rest, like the *Linda B.* are inshore draggers.

The *Linda B.* belongs to a further subdivision, the Whiting Fleet, that spends its summers fishing for whiting. There are 42 boats in the Whiting Association on Fisherman's Wharf. Raymond Kershaw, who manages the association, says the average age of the boats is 24 years and he adds that not more than five of them are solvent. (It's customary to speak in terms of boats rather than persons because the boats are corporate enterprises. The crews work for a share in the profits instead of for wages.) The rest of the boats are in debt, Mr. Kershaw says, some by as much as $24,000.

This means the number of boats will continue to dwindle since there is no sign of hope. Many men on the piers think Gloucester will have no fish boats within a few years.

This situation is general, if not so desperate, throughout New England. Boston has 26 offshore and 35 inshore trawlers now, half the number it had 15 years ago. It seems that the fishermen, who did much in creating New England, are disappearing. They are taking their leave at the dawn of an era when the country may be forced to turn to the sea for more food.

The principal reason is foreign competition. Now that fish can be quick-frozen, fishermen from Iceland and Japan can send their catch to the American market. Foreign competition has been stiff enough to elbow the New England fisherman out of the biggest new development in the fisheries: fish sticks. These are finger-length pieces of fish meat, cooked, frozen, packaged on assembly lines and sold in chain stores from here to Bisbee, Ariz.

Fish sticks are changing eating habits from fresh to frozen fish. This also is hard on the New England fisherman, who works for the fresh fish market. He has been hurt, too, by the decrease in supplies of some fish. But the coup de grace comes from his continuing to sell at the prices of a decade ago while everything he buys—boats, nets, motors, insurance—goes up in cost.

So after the fisherman bring in a few brokers—trips with no fish—he sells out or goes broke. He has almost none of the cushions enjoyed by other American food producers. Fishermen are as far outside the comforts of the welfare state as was the *Linda B.*, rolling and pitching in the dark, from the sleeping mainland.

Capt. Rosario Testaverde stared through the *Linda B.'s* pilothouse windows at the cables that disappear astern, leading down to the net. "Every time that net comes up it has to have about $100 worth of fish in it for us to stay ahead," he said.

NO LIGHTS VISIBLE

He looked around the sea. No lights were visible. Winds of up to 40 miles an hour had been forecast and the other boats had stayed at the pier. Unlike offshore trawlers, which have heavy gear, the little draggers cannot work in bad weather because they keep bouncing their nets off the bottom. The day before, northeasterly winds had kept the fleet in—all but the little *Tipsy Parson* which had gone out and been arrested by a State warden for dragging within 3 miles of shore.

After 2 hours and 20 minutes, Captain Testaverde gave a toot to call his crew out of the forecastle. When the three appeared,

the captain joined them on the swinging deck to haul the net. Anthony Da Cruz, the captain's brother-in-law, ran the winch. Tony Fronteiro and Pasquale Lograsso guided the cables onto the drum. When the two big doors that hold open the mouth of the net broke surface, the captain helped hook them out of the way.

Then the net appeared, spangled with shells and starfish. The fish were dumped on deck and the men stared at the squirming mass. "No good," the captain muttered. It didn't look anything like $100.

NET AGAIN DROPPED

Again the net was dropped, the captain returned to the pilothouse and dragging resumed. The crew clambered over the pile of fish, hooking out yellowtail and blackback flounder and small cod and putting them into baskets. The biggest part of the pile remained and these fish—sculpin, skates, eels, and one big lumpfish—were thrown or pushed overboard.

At the wheel, the captain talked about fishing. He learned the trade from his father who came from a fishing family in Palermo, Sicily. (About two-thirds of the Gloucester fishermen are of Italian descent. The rest, like Tony Da Cruz, are Portuguese. Anglo-Saxon fishermen now are as rare as three-eyed flounder.)

Rosario's lessons began when he was 5, helping with the trawls in his father's small boat. When the weather was dangerous, he would be set ashore on an island to play for the day. And at night when they jigged for squid he wore a specially cut-down suit of oil skins to protect his clothes from the black ink that squid squirt.

After he grew up, the war gave him a chance to start on his own. Many Italian-born sailors were interned as enemy aliens and Rosario was able to get a berth on a big trawler, fishing on the Grand Banks. Fishermen made money during the war; Rosario saved his and bought a small dragger. This boat sank at sea some years ago, but Captain Testaverde was able to buy the *Linda B.*, a bigger boat.

Now the *Linda B.* represents an investment of $25,000. One nylon net with its gear costs up to $1,000 and if it snags on a wreck, it can be a clean loss. For that reason, Captain Testaverde keeps the locations of all known wrecks filed on cards in the pilothouse. No gear has been lost for some time and last year the captain and his crew cleared $3,000 apiece.

After 2 hours more, the net was hauled again with the same meager results. "We're going in," the captain said. "We're hardly paying for our fuel."

As the boat turned toward Annisquam Light, the crew weighed the fish and packed it with ice in boxes. There were about 400 pounds of flounder and 200 of cod.

BOAT TURNED BACK

The fish would be sold for 10 cents a pound, minus 2½ cents for the cost of trucking it to New York and for commission to the merchant who would sell it in the Fulton Fish Market. At 7½ cents a pound, the boat would collect $45. The captain estimated that after expenses, earnings for the 2 days would be about $3 a man.

Tony Fronteiro laughed wryly, Mr. Fronteiro is known throughout Gloucester as Tony Santa Claus because once when he was a boat captain during the black days of the depression, he gave away an entire trip of fish to the city's poor. Now he is the *Linda B.'s* cook and happy philosopher.

"What the fisherman gets," he said, beaming, as spray whistled back from the boat bow, "is lots of fresh air."

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Mar. 27, 1960]

OUT OF GLOUCESTER—DEEP FREEZE HITS FRESH FISH NEEDS—U.S. MARKET OPENED TO INFLUX OF CHEAPER FOREIGN CATCHES

(By William G. Wing)

GLOUCESTER, MASS., March 26.—The seafood business has grown more international than most fisheaters realize.

When one dines out it takes more than candlelight to tell whether the fish under the sauce came from the Jersey Shore or a Norwegian fjord. If the menu says gulf shrimp, it probably means Gulf of Mexico but it could refer to the Gulf of Aqaba or Finland or Tongking. Forty nations sell shrimp in New York City.

This is a remarkable change from a few generations ago, when seafood, because of its perishable nature, was eaten only by those who lived near the water.

The change was brought be the development of quick-freezing techniques, which not only standardized fish-eating tastes all over the country but put the Parisee and the Icelander into direct competition with the American fisherman.

There are other interesting phenomena connected with the coming of frozen fish. One is that although fish led to the development of the current deep-freeze age in the twenties, fish didn't get on the frozen-food bandwagon until 1953. And even with the fish abroad, the fishermen of New England haven't been able to find a seat.

INDUSTRY CHANGED

Another phenomenon is that, despite the changes in the business, the American appetite for seafood remains amazingly static. Year in and year out, the average American consumption has been about 11 pounds. One-fifth of this is supplied by New England fishermen. If something could be done to increase the average annual consumption, such as a national wave of asking for second helpings of halibut, there would be dancing in the streets of Gloucester and jubilation in Boston.

But before real prosperity can come, the New England fisherman will have to adapt himself to the new methods of marketing his catch. These methods have irrevocably changed mankind's oldest industry, the fisheries.

The eternal problem has been to find ways to keep a very delicate product from spoiling. Preserving fish by drying and salting is a centuries-old device. It was the basis of an international trade system in medieval Europe and the reason for Gloucester being started 338 years ago.

Canning was the next big development. It is believed to have been introduced from Britain at New York City in 1819. Later in the century icing of the catch became general in New England. Cold-storage warehouses appeared in the early 1900's.

In the twenties, New England fishermen were rescued from a depression when a Boston fish dealer developed a market for the fillets of haddock. Fillets are the boneless portions of side meat, something like steaks, which appealed to housewives because they needed little preparation before cooking.

At about the same time the fillet market was blooming, the first experiments were being made in quick freezing. Eskimos, of course, had been quick-freezing fish for eons. When they hooked a smelt, they would flip it onto the ice to freeze. The frozen smelt would keep indefinitely, or at least as long as the temperature stayed around zero.

In 1915, young Clarence Birdseye was in Laborador, trapping for furs. The story goes that he was struck with the possibility in freezing food when he found that a frozen haddock, which he had caught some time before, was still good to eat. This moment is comparable for the modern food industry with the moment the apple bounced off Isaac Newton's head.

ENTER THE FISH STICK

Mr. Birdseye returned to Gloucester, set up a plant on a fish pier and developed a commercially successful method of quick-freezing food. But when the frozen-food era began in America, it began with peas and beans and other foods. It was not until the 1950's that fish got into the convenience-food, or heat 'n' eat, market with small pieces of fillet—breaded, cooked, frozen, and packaged and generically called fish sticks.

This has created the market New England fishermen have been excluded from, so far, by foreign competition. Local fishermen will have to get into it, or develop something else, to survive.

Fishermen also face the basic problem of American taste. Surrounded by the most lavish supplies and varieties of fish any nation ever enjoyed, Americans are relatively indifferent.

Fish, considered as a food, is an easily digestible source of protein and other nutrients. Fish oils reduce the level of cholesterol in the blood serum; persons with high levels of cholesterol seem to be susceptible to heart disease. Furthermore, fish may have a mysterious effect on growth. Animals and poultry that feed on fish meal grow at a rate greater than the total of known food values. This unknown growth value is now being investigated.

As for taste, fish can have more variety than many people suppose. The Fulton Fish Market in New York offers 125 kinds of saltwater and 32 of freshwater fish and these run the gamut of tastes, according to John H. Von Glahn, executive secretary of the city's fisheries council and a spokesman for the market.

But most Americans live inland and are not used to eating fish. Besides, there is so much else to eat in this country. There is speculation that perhaps the average Japanese wouldn't eat 40 pounds of fish a year if he had the choice of turkey or pork chops or steak.

In addition, some Americans don't like fish and some think they wouldn't if they tried. On the other hand, it appears from surveys of taste that the greatest resistance to eating more fish occurs in areas where most of the people eat it regularly because they are Roman Catholic.

Mr. Van Glahn thinks the reason is that many Catholics equate all of it with the overfried, bland fish which is served in some homes on Fridays. The key to the Nation's indifferenece, he thinks, is that most Americans don't know how good a fish can taste. He writhes at the thought of the way fish is given a bad name by rough handling and overcooking.

Iowa State Commerce Commission Passes Resolution Urging Repeal of Federal Excise Taxes on Transportation of Passengers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Iowa State Commerce Commission re-

cently went on record asking for the repeal of Federal excise taxes on the transportation of passengers. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of that resolution in the Appendix of the RECORD so that the Members can have the benefit of this representative opinion from the great State of Iowa. The resolution follows:

Whereas the Federal excise taxes on transportation were initially levied or greatly increased during World War II, as war measures, to help defray war costs and to discourage unnecessary travel; and

Whereas more than 15 years have elapsed since the end of the war, and the special and urgent needs for the levying or increasing of such taxes no longer exist; and

Whereas there has been a substantial reduction in railroad passenger traffic during the past several years, with resultant unprecedented deficits in passenger service operations; and

Whereas in view of the changed situation respecting passenger travel the excise tax on such travel has reached the point of diminishing returns, since the Government is probably losing about as much revenue through decreased Federal income tax payments, due to deficits in passenger operations, as it is gaining in excise tax payments on such service; and

Whereas all such taxes are discriminatory against the long distanced user of transportation services, and against sections of the country far removed from centers of population; and

Whereas all such transportation excise taxes are discriminatory in many other ways, including the discrimination against public transportation agencies which must collect the tax and in favor of private carriers which are not required to; and the discrimination against businesses which have to make frequent use of transportation services; and

Whereas the following bills have been introduced in the 87th Congress providing for the repeal of the Federal excise taxes on transportation of passengers: H.R. 398 (HUDDLESTON, of Alabama), H.R. 532 (POFF, of Virginia), H.R. 2577 (SLACK, of West Virginia), H.R. 3226 (ASHMORE, of South Carolina), H.R. 3692 (WHITNER, of North Carolina), H.R. 4465 (SIBAL, of Connecticut), and H.R. 4518 (KNOX, of Michican): Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Iowa State Commerce Commission is of the opinion that the present excise tax on the transportation of passengers is inimical to the maintenance of a reasonably priced and nondiscriminatory public transportation service and that accordingly the excise tax on transportation of passengers should be repealed, and

Resolved further, That the secretary of this commission is directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the congressional delegation from Iowa; to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives; to the chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; to the Secretary of the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners; to the several State regulatory commissions and to the Secretary of the Iowa Railroad Committee.

IOWA STATE COMMERCE, COMMISSION,
BERNARD J. MARTIN,
Chairman.
RAY H. THOMPSON,
Commissioner.
HAROLD E. HUGHES,
Commissioner.

Attest:

CLAUDE E. DAVIS,
Secretary.

Dated at Des Moines, Iowa, this 14th day of March 1961.

Narcotic Addiction and the Teenager

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 22, 1961

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the problem of narcotic addiction is one of the most serious facing the American people, not only because of the injuries which result from this scourge on the health of our people, its impact on crime and family welfare, and its effect on the countless innocent victims who suffer from its results, but also because of the weakening effect of narcotics addiction upon our national strength in human resources.

Probably the most shocking aspect of this problem is the extent to which it involves teenagers, taking away a part of the potential strength of our Nation's future during their formative years. The Youth Board of the city of New York recently held a conference on this aspect of the problem, and the resulting summary report deserves the attention of all Members of the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the report, which covers the extent of the problem, who is the addict, prevention and control of narcotics, and treatment, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAPTER I. WHO IS THE ADDICT?

Three phenomena enter into the process of addiction. The individual develops an emotional dependence on the drug. Tensions and conflicts become resolved and one has a feeling of great "normalcy," euphoria and pleasure. There then comes a time when tolerance for the drug is developed. To regain the original effect one must take the drug in ever-increasing doses and at more frequent intervals. The one who then develops a physical dependence will become addicted for some reason yet unknown. The body mechanism alters the stability of the body's balance so that an addiction prone individual will develop withdrawal or abstinence if he should no longer have access to the drug. The addict then experiences, in addition to his fears, anxieties and depressions, physical torture. The organism becomes dependent on the drug. He not only has an emotional dependence but a physical dependence, a tolerance and craving for the drug. Others may use drugs infrequently, occasionally or consistently over a period of years and yet they do not become physically dependent or addicted. Why? We don't know.

The average age of 2,000 patients admitted July 1952 to October 1959 at Riverside Hospital, New York, was 18 years. Ten percent commenced using drugs at 15½ years of age. Forty-five percent of prisoner-patients admitted to the U.S. Public Health Hospital, Lexington, Ky., in 1955–56 stated that they had been under 19 years of age when they first became addicted.

Personalitywise, the addict is unmotivated, passive, lethargic, sensitive, dependent, frustrated, impatient and self-defeating. His behavior is impulsive, unpredictable, infantile, stubborn and demanding. His constant companion is fear. He is afraid of his aggressions; afraid of his hostilities; afraid of responsibilities and afraid of success. His social world becomes narrower and eventually his only concern is himself.

There tends to be a common syndrome of causative and conditioning factors within the background of addicted individuals.

A. Failure of normal identification patterns during childhood and an ensuing inability to initiate or maintain relationships with other individuals.

B. Strong dependency needs often reflected in extreme symbiotic relationships with the mother.

C. A lack of moral sense. These individuals can judge a given act as right or wrong or as socially approved or disapproved but don't themselves really believe it.

D. No racial socio-economic group is exempt from the use of narcotics or from addiction but the majority of addicts are concentrated in the deprived socio-economic neighborhoods and in minority groups of low socio-economic status where there is a high incidence of narcotic availability. Poor housing, poor educational experiences, crime and poor law enforcement exist within their early environmental background. Of the 2,000 patients admitted July 1952 to October 1959 at Riverside Hospital, New York, 15 percent had relatives who had taken narcotics and 73 percent had been arrested from one to seven times prior to hospitalization.

E. Confusion with regard to sex roles. There is a high incidence of homosexual traits among addicts.

F. A bleak, hopeless, defiant outlook on life which pictures oneself and the world as no good. Life is only real and worthwhile when they are pursuing the thrills, chances, and pleasures of the moment. A drug like heroin is a specific remedy against this kind of an impossible outcome with regard to one's self and society.

G. Aspiration to goals which cannot be achieved. Eventually one gives up striving and he shuts himself off from the realities which have created the frustrations and conflicts. The addict is unable to handle these feelings and he turns to drugs as a solution.

H. Today there has been an increase in the experimental type of drug use among teenagers and youth. The need for rationalizing their own habits and conformity pressures operating within adolescent peer groups seems to induce addicted individuals to encourage others to try. Ordinarily, the drug user, whatever his previous position in the group, falls to lower echelons once he has become habituated. He tends in time to become completely disassociated from the group and his reliance upon drugs as a solution to status deprivations becomes all the greater.

I. Infants born of addicted parents show withdrawal syndromes at birth.

CHAPTER II.—PREVENTION AND CONTROL OF NARCOTICS

There is no panacea which will immediately dissipate the narcotics problem. A fundamental prerequisite to solution lies in close cooperation between law enforcement authorities and various professionals in the field of rehabilitation and prevention—the enforcement agencies to clear the streets of dope pushers and the rehabilitation personnel to administer adequate treatment.

Enforcement, national and international in scope, is the first line of defense. Extensive and rigid control of smuggling is essential if the problem is to be controlled. Approximately 85 percent of narcotics users are addicted to heroin. It is manufactured in European and Asian countries. It is then smuggled into the United States in wholesale quantities to distributors who dilute the pure heroin with quinine, milk sugar or manite. It is next passed on to retailers in ounce quantities. It is again cut and dis-

tributed to peddlers who in turn sell it to the addict. The heroin at this third dilution—and at the point at which it reaches the users—is now 95 percent adulterated and an initial investment of $3,000 has netted the staggering return of $300,000.

Some panel members maintain that a second step toward prevention and control would be legislation requiring the registration and fingerprinting of all addicts. They recommend as a third step, lifting the ban on heroin and that free medical prescriptions of the drug be allowed to certified registered addicts. They maintain the position that there is nothing in enforcement to stop a person with a compulsion for drugs from getting them. The compulsive aspect of narcotics implies that a prohibitory or penal approach to the problem is futile and ineffective.

The Harrison Act of 1914 is regulatory in nature as interpreted in 1925 by the Supreme Court of the United States. The act is not intended to impinge upon the medical profession in the course of its treatment of addiction. However, there were several preceding decisions by the Supreme Court which interpreted the act as sharply limiting the discretion of the medical profession. These intervening decisions are presently in force notwithstanding the fact that the Supreme Court unanimously stated in 1925 that the said decisions were to be applied strictly to the facts of the given cases heard at the time. A general hospital may not specifically prescribe drugs in the treatment of the addicted. Narcotics may be dispensed only if it is necessary in the treatment of a concomitant illness. Thus, the drug addict has been denied medical assistance and, in turn, he has been driven into the hands of the underworld.

The illegality of the drug and the necessity of obtaining it on the black market at exorbitant prices forces the habitual user into criminal activities, criminal associations and a way of life which it totally subjugated to the anxious pursuit of the next hour's or next day's supply. Once addicted, one must spend $50 a day to support the habit and it is estimated that one addict may be forced to steal as much as $75,000 a year in merchandise. This consequence is where addiction becomes a major problem to society. Citizens are robbed and burglarized. A tremendous network of underground supply is maintained with all of its pernicious effects on society. What has happened in effect is that we have given organized crime a market and a guaranteed minimum number of customers. The bulk of those arrested for narcotics violations are the addicts themselves. Once released they again resort to pushing among friends in order to support the habit. They are haunted criminals. They have no escape. They are caught between the black market and the law.

The addict's progressive deterioration is an undeniable fact but the causes of the deterioration are completely obscured by the inescapable fusion of addiction with criminality.

Legalization of prescription of drugs to certified addicts would not imply a free-for-all distribution of drugs. Opiates should be made subject to the general restrictions concerning the sale and distribution of medical drugs. Black-market operators and pushers should be severely punished. Laws and the rules of evidence should be constantly tightened so that it becomes increasingly difficult for the drug peddler to operate. Stringent regulation should be enforced to prohibit an addict who received drugs regularly as part of ambulatory treatment from patronizing the illicit market or introducing the habit to other individuals.

A divergent position expressed at the conference maintains that a great majority of addicts do engage in criminal, anti-social and deviate activity, and they do so before they ever experience narcotics. Failure to recognize this preaddiction activity is probably one of the prime reasons for the large incidence of addiction in the New York City area. The average citizen does not know where to secure drugs. A drug peddler just does not sell to anyone for fear of arrest. The average person, if he is to have access to drugs, must be accepted by those on the fringe of a criminal element.

The profit motive is not the primary cause of drug addiction. Addiction is caused rather by the existence of addiction-prone individuals, the availability of drugs and a catalyst. This catalyst is the addict himself. He is the contagious carrier who translates to the neophyte the use of narcotics as a great experience. This environmental circumstance means that we shall continue to have addiction whether drugs are sold at $2 per capsule illegally or at 2 cents per capsule legally.

There is nothing punitive about an approach to prevention which seeks to reduce the availability of the drug. Isolation of disease-producing effects from susceptible individuals is one of the oldest and most reputable public health procedures. Actually this procedure is the best and only safeguard to both the individual and society. Otherwise the more people who have the drug available to them the more addicts we shall have.

It is further contended by some that ambulatory treatment of addiction is not a valid therapeutic practice. The nature of the narcotic problem is such that there must be a general and uniform enforcement of the Harrison Act. A majority of addicts take drugs for the euphoric effect or the "bang" or the "kicks" as they call it. Tolerance is acquired quickly and more and more intake is required for the desired effect. If the addict were to receive narcotics legally, but not in as large doses as he required, he would continue to purchase most of his drugs on the illicit market. Legal distribution would inadvertently remove whatever deterrent value lies in the fear of withdrawal. More dangerous would be the effect on the potential addict who would perceive no hazards in addiction. They might well matriculate into the ranks of full-fledged addicts by the thousands. Rather than legalize addiction we must suppress it if we are to prevent widespread social disintegration. It is a fact that the rate of addiction has been reduced 800 percent since legal controls were instituted.

A majority of the panelists agreed that the best cure for addiction is for it never to occur. Our chief and most practical concern must be for the nonaddict contemporary of the addict. We need bear in mind that prior to the passage of the Harrison Act there were no illicit traffic and no illicit markets. Narcotics could be purchased over the counter most anywhere merchandise was sold and the number of addictions at the time was approximately 200,000 as compared to current approximate number of 60,000. A further warning against free access to drugs was made by Dr. C. J. Glass-Bell, president of the Federation of State Medical Boards of the United States. The U.S. Public Health Service Hospital, Lexington, Ky., according to the doctor, admits each year 50 addicted physicians. The incidence of addiction in the general population is 1 addict to every 3,000, and in the medical profession it is 1 to every 100 physicians.

There is disagreement as to whether legalization of the drug would free society and free the addict from the unnecessary consequences of the illegality of his addiction but there is full agreement that it would not solve the problem. A fourth step would have to focus on a rehabilitation program geared to treatment of the human being as a whole and not to addiction as such which is merely symptomatic of the real problem. Ordinarily, coercion does have undesirable implications. However, in the case of addiction it is essential to assure adequately controlled and prolonged treatment as prerequisites for cure. The addict cannot be relied upon to either initiate or complete treatment on his own volition.

A compulsory program of treatment is dictated but some panelists ask whether it is possible to implement it. Are we justified in committing an individual to one of our very few institutions specializing in addiction when no one is sure that at any of these facilities a true rehabilitation program exists? Programs must be developed but shall we offer priority to those who have been finding an effective prop in heroin before we can offer adequate treatment to the thousands and thousands suffering from emotional, mental and physical illenss or disabilities? Should not public policy be geared to the development of resources to help the largest possible number of people most in need of assistance and most likely to benefit?

CHAPTER III.—TREATMENT

The first step in treatment is withdrawal or detoxification. It is the easiest, the simplest and the quickest aspect of treatment. The hospital is the preferable place in which to effect withdrawal but it can be accomplished at home under supervision of a reliable family member and with the attendance of a physician.

The problem is not to get the addict off drugs but to keep him off. One would believe that once withdrawal was completed the addict would be cooperative and desirous of a permanent cure. This is not the case. Proper motivation is absent. They undergo detoxification, not with the intent to permanently stop drug use, but to achieve a temporary respite or reduction to a lower dosage because of inability to maintain their supply or because of pressures by the police, the court and family members.

The problem is not primarily a physical or medical one. Studies at Riverside Hospital, New York, conclude that the number of patients following hospital discharge who permanently remain abstinent from drug usage is extremely small. A study in 1943 of 2,400 patients discharged from the U.S. Public Health Service Hospital, Lexington, Ky., showed that 800 had relapsed within 6 months to 6 years.

The basic problem seems to lie in the sphere of the emotional and the environment. If these problems are not counteracted, modified or eliminated, the addict is repeatedly driven to drugs to solve his problems. There must be a total program to include many services administered by experts representing the fields of medicine, nursing, psychiatry, education, vocational guidance, counseling, occupational therapy, social work, religion, and law enforcement.

Experiments should be conducted relative to a residential school-hospital wherein a patient might reside 4 to 6 months. This facility should provide not only a continuity of personal contact but a continuity of planning for a wide variety and graduation of sheltering and supportive assistance. Its program should include vocational training, psychotherapy and an opportunity to join nonheroin using social groups.

Programs should be structured and patients required to participate. We know that addicts respond well to organized, strictly enforced programs. If freedom of decision and choice is permitted to rest with them, they will tend to persist in the behavior which they had followed in the community—sleeping all day, lounging around in the evening and staying up all night. A resident school-hospital facility might afford a prognosis more favorable for retraining, reorientation and rehabilitation.

Inpatient treatment can initiate the process but the eventual adjustment must be

made in the community and not in the hospital nor the prison nor reformatory. Picture the discharged addict. He is shunned by employers, by legitimate members of the community, by community agencies. There is no one to extend a helping hand. He comes back to the same tensions, pressures, family, associates and environment.

It is a mistake to view an individual as an unattached person. He must be seen as a member of a family and the fact must not be overlooked that the family itself might well have been the original source of his difficulties. Family members must be helped to understand the meaning of narcotic usage; its causes; and the social, emotional, economic, physical, occupational and spiritual factors involved. They should be involved in every step of treatment so that they know what goals might be achieved and under what conditions. Otherwise there is only one eventuality for the patient—his return to drugs for relief.

The addict will need what might be termed an anchor relationship. Addiction is chronic and it is characterized by relapses. The traditional picture is two, three or four periods of relapse before any substantial improvement is to be observed. The key to rehabilitation is a continuity of contact and relationship. The addict must be kept in relatedness to himself and to society. If he is permitted to drift to a point where he is no longer subjected to group norms which require him to participate as a social being, readdiction is assured. The anchor relationship must be very close—almost as a shadow.

In addition to the anchor relationship and accepting family members the patient needs a non-critical therapeutic relationship. The crucial factor which determines if he will stay in treatment relates to whether or not he will feel free to express his aggressiveness and his hostilities. If not, he becomes frightened and he withdraws to himself and the use of drugs.

Another important aid in the posthospital rehabilitation is gainful employment. If the addict is not helped to earn a living, he is forced to return to criminal ways in order to satisfy the necessities of life. His need for a job is immediate and he is not receptive to anything which will take time. This attitude presents a serious block to effective placement and it is further aggravated by the fact that most addicts have limited occupational training and poor work histories. Many don't know how to work. Others never worked. The end result is that the only type of job available is marginal at best. The prospects of employment are further darkened by the fact that most employment agencies will not service anyone identified as a drug addict or former addict. They are bad risks.

The vocational training and counseling attached to the inpatient program must be complemented by an aftercare program of interpretation and support of professional personnel to employers. Psychologically, employment has an important value. It may afford the addict, perhaps for the first time, the feeling that he is engaged in something constructive and legitimate. The experience of the narcotic project of the New York State Division of Parole indicates that an encratic person with a history of drug addiction does possess the potentially to become a reliable, competent employee. Its record shows that 43 percent of 272 parolees abstained from the use of drugs over a 3-year period.

The addict must receive the interest, guidance, and support of the hospital, the community, and his family. The best method to accomplish this end would be to establish a community social work agency staffed by representatives of all disciplines. This center would be the follow-up arm of the inpatient facility. Its services should meet the total needs of the total personality. No longer should agencies have a little piece of the addict, where the pieces are never synthesized into one effective therapeutic service. The most skilled should constitute the center's personnel. Extra knowledge or added experience may spell the difference between success and failure.

A most important segment of the center should be its law enforcement personnel. The patient who has some element of compulsion or legal involvement appears to have a better prognosis. Approximately 90 percent of addicted physicians recover. There is an element of compulsion to their treatment. Their license has been suspended and they are given 5 years to rehabilitate themselves. A second example is the success of the narcotic project of the New York State Division of Parole as against the failure of employment agencies. A final example is the fact that no voluntary treatment program has thus far proven successful. Controls must be imposed promptly and effectively whenever the addict fails to adhere to his posthospital program of rehabilitation.

Some panelists ask, Don't we have to be practical? Many people suffer from diabetes and high blood pressure. Their ailments can be alleviated and arrested but not cured. This degree of improvement is acceptable. Why can't we say there is improvement when a person takes a shot once on a weekend rather than three times a day? Should not our immediate emphasis be to help the addict stay off narcotics for increasing lengths of time. Our focus on cures can gain momentum as our knowledge, skills, and techniques develop.

Aid to Education: The Missing Alternative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the Sioux City Journal, Sioux City, Iowa, on Thursday, March 23, 1961.

AID TO EDUCATION: THE MISSING ALTERNATIVE

Up to this point in the debate about Federal aid to education and the place of parochial schools in the program of grants and loans, the best thing that has been said is that everybody should study the question some more. And in studying it, in our own opinion, everybody should consider the missing alternative, which is for no aid at all to education, in that form, from the national level.

It is understood that Federal aid to education is a campaign pledge and that the subject must be debated, but Federal aid to education has neither the indorsement of all the people, nor do various parts have common support. At the moment the feeling of the Catholic bishops is that they cannot go with the measure unless it contains loans for parochial schools, which illustrates the latter point.

The vigor of the debate about Federal aid to education has an unfortunate tendency to shut from view the major discrimination of the measure, which is that States trying to do a good job educationally are to be penalized, and States which have not tried particularly hard to do a good job educationally, or which have permitted themselves the luxury of a double public school system in the name of segregation, are to be rewarded. That is the net result of the bill presented and considered; it takes what Holmes Alexander calls the "Robin Hood" approach which, although making an interesting movie, is nevertheless unreasonable.

Those who do not like the Federal aid to education idea have offered some suggestions that should not be waved aside as they have been. The problem is a financial one for the local communities and the general umbrella of rationalization of Federal aid is that Washington can tap many sources of tax revenue in support of schools, thus removing part, or even much, of the local burden. But that does not change in the slightest the source of the money, which remains the people; it does not change in the slightest the house percentage to be taken out of the pot at the start of each hand and paid to the bureaucracy that will handle the program.

At least one of the suggestions already made achieves considerable local solution without loss of the house percentage. It would simply turn back to individual taxpayers a set amount of what they have paid, to be used in the support of education. This has the additionally desirable merit of keeping school control, including control of educational programs and salary structures, largely in local hands, which is precisely where it should be. No matter how any Federal measure might be administered, the odds for decreased local control are great.

If one-half the enthusiasm and vigor—and lobbying money—that have been spent in support of Federal aid to education had been spent in serious efforts to solve the problem at the local level, or at the State and local levels in combination, we cannot help but believe the problem right now would be largely solved. At the very least the thus far missing alternative, that of no Federal aid in the terms being presently talked, deserves exploration that it has not yet had.

Safety Awards to Wisconsin Canners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the establishment of more effective safety programs to protect the lives and limbs of our citizens is a never-ending challenge. Across the country, for example, tragic accidents last year resulted in about 92,000 persons being killed—1 life lost every 5½ minutes—and about 2 million crippled. This is a tragic record.

To combat this dangerous trend, businesses and industries across the country are undertaking special safety programs. This is a well-warranted and much-needed endeavor. For the effort, these enterprises are to be highly commended.

Recently, 16 Wisconsin canning plants were given special awards for undertaking safety measures to protect their employees. Believing that such meritorious efforts deserve wider consideration, I ask unanimous consent to have an article from the Green Bay Press Gazette on the safety acheievements of these firms printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAFETY AWARDS GIVEN TO 16 STATE CANNERS

Sixteen Wisconsin canning plants were honored at the spring meeting of the Wisconsin Canners Association here recently for completing the 1960 season without a single disabling injury.

Plant representatives accepted safety awards on the basis of records made in a statewide contest in which 77 Wisconsin plants participated. The participating plants packed approximately 90 percent of the State's production of vegetables and fruits, so contest figures are representative of the employee injury experience of the Wisconsin canning industry.

LIST OF WINNERS

Awards were made to the following: The Larsen Co., Hortonville; Oconomowoc-Poynette Canning Co., Poynette; Markesan Canning Co., Markeson; Stokely-Van Camp, Inc., Horicon; Country Gardens, Inc., Gillett; Fruit Growers Cooperative, Sturgeon Bay; Lake Shore Canning Co., Cleveland.

Chilton Canning Co., Chilton; Country Gardens, Inc., Coleman; Pardeeville Canning Co., Pardeeville; Calumet-Dutch Canning Co., Waldo; Shawano Canning Co., Clintonville; Sauk City Canning Co., Sauk City; Libby, McNeil & Libby, Janesville Farms; Chippewa Canning Co., Inc., Bloomer; Knowlton Canning Co., Mosinee.

The 16 winning plants are listed according to man-hours of exposure.

SPECIAL TO LARSEN

Special honors went to the Pardeeville Canning Co., The Larsen Co. plant at Hortonville, and Oconomowoc-Poynette Canning Co., Poynette, for having the largest number of man-hours without a disabling injury for a continuous period of more than 1 year.

According to M. P. Verhulst, executive secretary of the WCA, who made the awards, State canning plants had an injury frequency rate of 18.40, 4.36 percent higher than in 1959, but considerably lower than the national rate of 21, set by the canning and preserving industry in 1960.

The canners safety institute is sponsored each year in cooperation with the industrial commission and the Wisconsin Council of Safety.

Is This What You Want?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Indianapolis News of March 17, 1961:

IS THIS WHAT YOU WANT?

American foreign policy has had many low points over the past two decades: Yalta, the fall of China, mute complicity in the torture of Hungary, the subversion of Cuba.

But for sheer folly, and for flagrant disservice to American interests, this week's performance must rank somewhere near the bottom of the list.

To begin with, the United States has taken no action to back the faltering confederation of states achieved a week ago in the Congo—a step which alone offers hope of rescuing that area from communism. Instead, our Government announces it will not support the confederation if it means the Congo will cease to be a single state.

Why? What is the compulsion to force these diverse ethnic groups into a single government? What happened to the revered principle of self-determination? If a confederation as separate states is what these anti-Communist leaders want, why should we take it upon ourselves to oppose them?

Indeed, if our policy had any semblance of reason, we would bend every effort to make the confederation succeed, because it represents a victory for the anti-Communists, a defeat for the Communists.

The stark truth of the matter is this: Our policy is devoted to doing whatever the United Nations wants; the United Nations is devoted to doing whatever the neutralists want; the neutralists are devoted to doing whatever the Communists want.

By that process of graduated submission, our own policy is made an instrument of Communist strategy. We are in effect destroying ourselves, our anti-Communist allies, and the cause of freedom.

If this indictment seems too harsh, consider two other items in the week's news concerning Africa:

It has been acknowledged, even by such liberal journalists as Stewart Alsop, that U.N. forces in the Congo are working to promote the pro-Communist elements, and to subvert the pro-Western government of President Kasavubu. The principal agent of the pro-Communist cause has been Rajeshwar Dayal, the Indian military chief of the U.N. mission.

Which side is the United States assisting? "The U.S. Air Force," reported UPI 2 days ago, "proceeded with plans to fly the first tough Gurkha warriors from India into the Congo despite protests of Congolese President Joseph Kasavubu." In short, we are actively supporting the cause of our enemies against our friends.

A vote in the U.N. Security Council Wednesday presented a clear-cut confrontation of East and West. A motion was proposed against America's stanchly anti-Communist ally, Portugal, concerning the Portuguese territory of Angola. The motion was prepared by "neutralists" and supported by the Soviet Union. What did the United States do? It joined the Communists in voting against its own anti-Communist ally.

The outlines of American policy under the Kennedy regime are thus becoming frighteningly clear: We destroy those who would help us, and help those who would destroy us.

At this rate—unless the American people wake up soon, and flood their Government with protests—it should not be long before communism absorbs all of Africa, and our disheartened allies in Europe and Asia give up the struggle altogether. Is that what you want? If not, why not let your Senators, Congressman, and President Kennedy know your feelings?

Resolution on Greek Orthodoxy as a Major Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, on February 16 I introduced, with Senators KEATING and PELL, Senate Resolution 88, which would grant Eastern Orthodoxy recognition as a major faith in the United States. I would like to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the resolution passed at last year's annual convention of the Greek-American Progressive Association, in support of such recognition.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON GREEK ORTHODOXY AS A MAJOR FAITH

Whereas Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE, Republican from New Jersey, introduced in the 2d session of the 86th Congress of the U.S. Senate, Senate Resolution 346 (S. Res. 346), a resolution resolving that the Eastern Orthodox Church is a major faith in this country; that all references by Federal agencies to major faiths now limited to Protestants, Catholics, and Jews include the Eastern Orthodox Church; and

Whereas the Eastern (Greek) Orthodox Church is a major faith in the United States and throughout the world; and

Whereas Senate bill 106, 84th Congress, introduced by Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Republican from Massachusetts, led to the designation of the Eastern Orthodox faith as a separate religious faith in the Armed Forces of the United States; and

Whereas several Federal agencies have omitted Eastern Orthodoxy in projects which Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish faiths have been invited to participate; and

Whereas more than half of the States in the United States through their legislators have passed resolutions recognizing Eastern Orthodoxy as a major religious faith; and

Whereas the Eastern Orthodoxy faith has 250 million communicants throughout the world, including 6 million in the United States; and

Whereas the President and the Vice President of the United States in 1957 invited the Eastern Orthodox faith to join with the Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish faiths in invoking the blessing of God on the President's inaugural in January 1957; and

Whereas certain mass media still do not afford the Eastern Orthodox faith the same privileges afforded the three other major faiths: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the delegates to the National Convention of the Greek American Progressive Association assembled on this 26th day of July, 1960, that the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States approve by more than a majority vote Senate Resolution 346; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House.

Since the above resolution was passed at the GAPA National Convention, U.S. Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE reintroduced Senate Resolution 346 as Senate Resolution 88 which was cosponsored by Senators KENNETH KEATING, Republican of New York, and CLAIBORNE PELL, Democrat of Rhode Island. The Supreme Lodge of GAPA heartily endorse Senate Resolution 88 and extend thanks to said Senators for the sponsorship of said resolution.

STAVROS KALARAS,
Supreme Secretary, GAPA.

Jerry Leland, 10th Grade Division Winner in American Legion and Legion Auxiliary Essay Contest for Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA, JR.
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, recently the Ohio American Legion Auxiliary in conjunction with the American Legion, conducted their essay contest among the

9th, 10th, 11th, and 12th grade students in the great State of Ohio.

I am happy to announce that one of my constituents, a very outstanding young man, Jerry Leland, of 525 Mayfair Drive, Washington Court House, Ohio, wrote an illustrious essay on the Constitution and what it means. As a result of his exceptional work, he was chosen one of the winners in the 10th grade division for the entire State of Ohio. Needless to say, I am extremely proud of this fine young American and consider it an honor and privilege to include the complete text of his work in the RECORD. Certainly, at a time when we apparently have been deviating from the true concepts of the Constitution, it is wise to stop and reflect upon what the Constitution means to us all; this exceptional essay is worthy of the attention of my colleagues:

THE CONSTITUTION AND WHAT IT MEANS

One hundred and eighty-five years ago a small group of men representing the struggling Government of the newly independent American Colonies met in convention. This meeting, first called to settle a dispute between Virginia and Maryland, was destined to change the course of history. This was our Constitutional Convention.

With each morning paper bringing fresh news of political unrest, revolution, and armed conflict in various parts of the world, I cannot help but be thankful that this Convention was held and that I was destined to become a citizen of the Nation it formed.

It is hard to realize that our United States of America owes its existence to the sound principles of democratic government laid down in our Constitution. It is hard to comprehend how a small group of men representing a small confederation of States could, in 100 working days draft a document which would give birth to a small nation destined to grow to world leadership. It is doubtful if any of them had the slightest idea that 175 years later this same Nation would be the hope and support of freedom-loving peoples throughout the world.

A great statesman, William Gladstone, has termed our Constitution "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man." My own feeling is that our Constitution has been the greatest document for mankind's benefit since the Holy Bible.

There is a great deal of the wording of the Constitution which I do not fully understand. I doubt if very many teenage boys and girls do fully understand very much of its legal meaning. I would like to think for a few minutes about what our Constitution does mean to me, a 15-year-old student in Washington High School.

For a few minutes I would like to think of our Constitution as the lifegiving blood to the structure which we know as our Government and the society I call my country.

Our Constitution guides our President, keeps our Congress ever mindful of its obligation to all our people and is the final law upon which our courts must render their decisions.

As an individual it assures me of a way of life which few boys and girls enjoy in other parts of the world.

Because of our system of government, I have grown up without knowing the meaning of fear or oppression. One of my earliest recollections was attending Sunday school with my parents in the church of their choice. At the age of 6 I was enrolled in what I feel to be the finest educational system for boys and girls in the world. This was made available to me not because of who my parents were or were not or because of what I could or could not afford to pay but was mine because of the system of government under which I live.

My friends and I have never given a thought to the serious plagues which take terrific tolls of life among boys and girls in many parts of the world.

The responsibilities of adult life and making a living have never concerned me greatly because in our country there is opportunity for all who work hard and are deserving. All of this means that I have the opportunity of growing up in the most advanced society the world has ever known. This society makes us one of the best housed, best fed, and most literate nations on earth. In addition to these basic necessities we also have a country where we can work, save, and accumulate property, investments, and smaller personal possessions with no fear of having them taken away from us by secret police, by government, or mob action.

All of these liberties which we so often take for granted could not just happen. They had their birth in our Constitution. Under its provisions our country has grown as our people have developed. While dictatorships may sometimes seem to make rapid strides, it is only in a free society that man can develop all of his talents to the end that we may establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.

This is what our Constitution means to me and why I am glad and proud to be an American citizen.

Where Is Ireland in the Fight for Freedom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on March 17 I had the privilege of addressing the annual dinner of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick in New York. This is one of the oldest fraternal organizations in the United States, dating back to revolutionary days, and its annual dinner is one of the principal St. Patrick's Day events each year.

My remarks at the dinner dealt with the historic contribution of Irishmen to the struggle for freedom around the world and the contrast posed by the more recent record of neutralism by the Irish Republic Government in the struggle between freedom and tyranny.

I ask unanimous consent that these remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD, OF CONNECTICUT, AT THE 177TH ANNIVERSARY DINNER OF THE SOCIETY OF THE FRIENDLY SONS OF ST. PATRICK; HOTEL ASTOR, NEW YORK, FRIDAY, MARCH 17, 1961

Only an Irishman can fully appreciate what is in our hearts on a St. Patrick's Day occasion such as this. For this annual observance brings a pleasant interruption in our lives; reminds us of the many ties that bind Irishmen together wherever they may live; inspires a remembrance of the half-forgotten events and emotions of an earlier time that lie close to the core of our lives.

In my mind, as I am sure in yours, this day recalls a whole series of pictures stretching back to early youth: St. Patrick's concerts in the church hall; the wearing of the green; the countless stories and ancedotes drawn from the measureless well of Irish humor; simple music with its power and poignancy; a whole pattern of commonly shared attitudes and loyalties and animosities growing out of the long struggle of our people for freedom and progress.

Hidden in the heart of each of us is the image of something ever green, something clean, something right, some breath of home which is a part of our heritage, which marks us apart and ties us together.

The Irish have been a poor and humble people. They had little of material wealth to give to the world. So they bequeathed those rare jewels of character which lend an eternal significance to their history.

They have fought for freedom with courage and perseverance in their own country and all around the globe.

They have clung tenaciously to the faith of St. Patrick, resisting all attacks upon it, whether of brutal suppression, of ridicule and social sanction, or of false philosophy.

They have, through all the wrongs and shames which have been heaped upon them, kept alive a cheerful optimism, a certain amiability in adversity, a good humor in bad times, a durability and staying power which brought them through centuries of cruel oppression unbroken and unspoiled.

Thus, to an age poisoned by indifference, fearfulness doubt and softness, little Ireland has given hosts of sons and daughters who have qualities which the free world desperately needs: a love of freedom, a courage in defending it, a steadfastness in religious faith, a hardy endurance in defeat and adversity.

For as long as many of us can remember, the condition of Ireland has been a constant object of our hopes and prayers and efforts.

Ireland in chains was admired and loved around the world, not for its military strength or material wealth, but for its spiritual strength and the power and inspiration of its ideals.

Ireland, free, was confidently expected to lead the world by its honest and forthright example; to be a national embodiment of that constancy of faith and devotion to freedom which was the inheritance of this fabled land of heroes and martyrs, of saints and scholars.

But something has gone amiss in Ireland. Perhaps I trespass when I, an American, presume to comment upon the conduct of the Irish Republic. But our interest in Ireland is too ingrained, our concern is too personal to give way to diplomatic niceties.

This is a holy day as well as a holiday. If we would truly honor St. Patrick we should sometimes speak of our people with the candor and even the severity with which St. Patrick spoke to them.

Our generation has faced the most evil and dangerous of all threats to Christian civilization, nazism, and communism. Free nations throughout the world, large and small, banded together in resisting the common enemies of decency. But in world war and cold war, Ireland officially has been among the missing.

However notable may be its achievements at home, the Irish Republic, in the brief period in which it has played a role on the world stage, has become known for four principal courses of action:

Ireland refused to join the other nations of the free world in the desperate fight against Nazi aggression.

Ireland has declined to join NATO or to bear its small share of the common defense against Communist aggression in the post-war world.

Ireland has become an advocate of neutralism in the raging conflict between Christian civilization and communism.

Ireland has lent its support to those who are today paving the way for the admission of Red China into the United Nations.

Ireland, in short, is pursuing neutrality in a struggle in which no Irishman should be neutral, a struggle in which no one devoted to the religious and philosophical tenets of Christian civilization can be neutral.

This seems to me a renunciation of the Irish heritage, of all that it has stood for, of all that Ireland should properly represent to the world.

I am saddened by this and I know that kinsmen of ours in every corner of the world are puzzled and hurt by it.

We cannot believe that the national traits of Ireland have suddenly changed, or that the clear trumpet of old is to be forever mute.

We hope that we misread the signs.

We hope that in Red China and its Communist allies, Ireland will soon see its natural enemy and the mortal enemy of all things decent and honorable, the enemy of all religion, of all personal freedom, of all national independence, of all international law and order, of all true peace.

And those of us who foresee for Ireland a higher role than that of a mere neutral can draw comfort from the spontaneous action of the Irish people during World War II.

The official policy of Ireland in that war was one of neutrality that denied to the side of freedom badly needed training areas and naval bases. This is painful to recall. But we also remember the thrill it brought to our hearts to learn that the young men of Ireland, by the thousands and tens of thousands, were enlisting under an alien flag in order to join in the struggle against Nazi tyranny.

Despite the policy of its government, the Irish people contributed to that war a larger percentage of volunteers than any other nation in the world. The divine spark was still there, and it is there today ready to be ignited into a consuming flame by a new O'Connell, another Parnell, an Emmet, or a Wolfe Tone.

We want to see in the world an Ireland that is prosperous, an Ireland that is united, but above all, an Ireland that takes its place, not among the neutralists of history's greatest conflict between good and evil, but rather its rightful place, its natural place in the front rank of those who are fighting against the gravest threat to our faith and our freedom that the world has yet seen.

I am sure that Mr. Aiken, the Irish Minister for External Affairs, who is here seated beside me, understands that my comments and observations tonight are made with regret and only because at this fateful hour in history we must face facts and tell truths and do all we can to help others to join full strength in this desperate struggle for freedom.

I say these things not in a spirit of rancor or hostility but in one of hope and affection. We Americans of Irish descent are helping our country to carry the mighty burden of defending freedom for ourselves and for all men. And we instinctively want Ireland, the other house of our family, at our side, not as a subordinate, nor yet as an estranged and distant onlooker of our struggles; but as a friend and a companion, a partner in the greatest enterprise of our history.

It will perhaps be a significant factor in history that millions of displaced Irishmen and their descendants, who but for chance circumstance would have lived out their lives in a small land, far from the storm center of world events, today are a prominent and influential force in America at a time when the actions of our country may well determine the outcome of 30 centuries of recorded struggle between tyranny and freedom.

I think we may be pardoned for taking pride in the fact that a man of Irish descent today sits in the chair of the President of the United States, and in the chair of the majority leader of the U.S. Senate, and in that of the majority leader of the House of Representatives.

It is here in America that whatever is of worth i nour race has been given a chance to develop and flower. It is here that the ancient Irish yearning for liberty and religious freedom was first satisfied. It is here that the hope and the fate of man is centered. And it is here that Irishmen can best justify their heritage by strengthening America in its determination to do the painful things that must be done if we are to gain and preserve for all men what we have here.

To the United States, our great Republic, "the last best hope of earth," we give our toast this day as we give our prayers in all the days ahead.

Effects of Proposed Highway-User Taxes on Independents in Tire Sales and Servicing Field

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a statement delivered by Mr. George J. Bruger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, before the House Ways and Means Committee during the committee's recently concluded hearings on highway financing proposals:

HIGHWAY PROGRAM: PROPOSED INCREASED TAX

Statement of George J. Burger, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business, before Ways and Means Committee, House of Representatives, March 21, 1961

I am George J. Burger, vice president in charge of legislative activities, National Federation of Independent Business, 740–742 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

We are a national organization composed exclusively of small, independent business, and professional people. We have the largest directly supporting membership of any business organization in our country. We have membership representation in federation chapters in almost all of the Nation's congressional districts, including Alaska and Hawaii. I am more than pleased to advise the committee that our membership each month is showing a very healthy increase and now totals 165,236 members, all individual members—not groups, which naturally included many independents in the tire sales and servicing field.

My appearance before the committee in behalf of our members is that we are committed to take every action to protect the business life of independent business. That is our main and principal reason for appearing.

The witness does not come before the committee as a professional trade association representative in view of the fact that I have had better than half a century active experience as an independent in the rubber tire industry, and during that period have been honored many times as the spokesman for the Nation's independent tire sales and servicing institutions, as well as during the greater portion of that time owning and operating an independent tire company.

It appears, up to this moment, that the greatest expression of alarm coming from independents is the injury that their businesses would suffer in inflicting an excessive tax on tread rubber.

The committee must be aware of the fact that for practical purposes, from the witness' own knowledge, the recapping of tires in the first instance originated among the ranks of independents. These stalwarts pioneered this new development where suitable, safe used tires could be adapted to recapping.

During their existence, prior to World War II these stalwarts in the many sections throughout the Nation faced some severe opposition within the ranks of certain sections of the rubber industry which could tend to discredit the safety factor of recapped tires, and still these stalwarts carried on. It's fortunate for the Nation itself they did during the critical days of World War II, and now some of these stalwarts like Mr. A. L. Sanderson of Tire Service Co., Spokane, Wash., advise us in regard to the proposal: "Again we find ourselves in the situation where the small guy is the fall guy."

This gentleman knows the score because he has had extensive experience over the many years.

The Paul E. Hawkinson Co., of Minneapolis, Minn., one of the original producers of tire recapping machinery—whose product is utilized today nearly worldwide, and the armed services is aware of it too—recently wrote me: "Economy has made our country one to be proud of."

Is this development by small business to be destroyed by discrimination in tax levy? That's the question that the committee must decide.

It is to be noted that the President of the United States, prior to his election—September–October 1960—is reported to have stated in an exclusive interview: "We can expect a Department of Commerce report early next year" (1961). And he further said: "I would want to review the Department of Commerce report early next year before making a final decision on this matter." Now the question is: Were the findings in the report of the Department of Commerce on the subject matter of tax on tires, tubes and tread rubber in any way influenced by members of the Business Advisory Committee? We are making no charge but nevertheless it should be thoroughly checked into.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, as a matter of information it would be well to quote from a letter we received on March 8, from Mr. E. F. Dandy, vice president of the Oliver Tire & Rubber Co., Oakland, Calif.—one of the most responsible producers in tread rubber in the Nation, whose business we believe is confined exclusively to the independent, and who is one of the pioneer quality producers of tread rubber—where he said:

"Taking an average price of 30 cents per pound paid by retreaders for raw material tread rubber, the proposed increase is equivalent to 33⅓ percent of the commodity cost. I cannot think of a single other necessity which carries such a tax burden or of a single other business so handicapped by taxation. Remove by taxation the right of retreading to compete in a free and open market and the foundation of the business is destroyed.

"The application of this unfair burden of taxation could only discourage the further

development of retreading and reduce the number of independent businessmen engaged in it. It would appear to be unwise since the experience of World War II and the Korean conflict thoroughly proved the extreme value of this segment of the tire and rubber industry during national emergency. To restrict the future growth and development of retreading would serve only to eliminate an important reserve. It might be pointed out that these independent retreaders, while forming a national pool which can be tapped on an instant's notice by the Defense Department, do not today participate in any governmental defense spending, as such.

"I am certain that it is not the intent of Government to penalize the small independent businessman of the Nation nor to impose additional costs on the consumers least able to afford an added tax burden. To place a tax on economy and thrift is to my way of thinking an assault on the American way of life."

Then from Melim Tire & Rubber Co., in Honolulu, Hawaii, they write me on March 10, as follows: "We do, however, sight this proposed increase of excise tax on retread rubber as an example of tax laws which unknowingly jeopardize small business in their efforts to grow competitively."

We could add many more of these reported, unsolicited statements as to the seriousness of this situation as it applies to the future business life of competent, trustworthy tire sales and servicing institutions, all of which would confirm the statements we have already quoted.

It's well for us to stress on the importance of maintaining a healthy, efficient independent business in the rubber tire industry. I cite this because in the critical days when we entered World War II the cry from the housetops was the need for a conservation program on rubber stockpile, and whatever use was to be made of the rubber stockpile for essential use it must be handled with the utmost care.

Well do I recall my voluntary action at that time assisting the Small Business Committee's of the Congress as it looked at that moment shortly after Pearl Harbor like the independent tire trade was through for the duration of the war. In fact some top executives of the big rubber producers believed in that theory. It happened in Great Britain.

The Small Business Committees of both the House and Senate, realizing that tire use is essential and must be maintained during the war period, resolved by unanimous action in January 1942 that all tire sales and servicing for the duration of the war be channelled exclusively through the independents. The Senate Small Business Committee in February 1942 followed with similar action, even strengthening their resolution by adding that all tire recapping equipment should be channelled exclusively through the independent tire sales and servicing agent.

It is to be noted that the late William M. Jeffers, then president of the Union Pacific Railroad, on loan by the railroad to the Government as rubber administrator for the War Production Board, in his appearance before the Senate Banking Committee, November 19, 1942 when a proposition was before that committee which would provide that during the duration of the war all tire sales and servicing for essential purposes be channelled through the independent dealer, said: "Gentlemen of the committee, I am not attempting to qualify as an expert on war. I think our people are doing a great job. It is our job to support them. At the same time it is equally important that we keep this country on rubber. That must be done because failure to keep this country on rubber, to my mind, would be equal to a military disaster, and maybe more than that."

It is to be noted that Mr. Jeffers, as rubber administrator, appearing before the Senate Small Business Committee on April 8, 1943, when the same proposition was before that committee for consideration (tire sales and servicing through the independents for the duration of the war) said, in answer to a question by Senator ELLENDER: "Now, you ask me as to my view on the bill. My view is this: I hold no brief for the big rubber companies. I think it is important and imperative that the independent be permitted to operate."

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the independent tire trade these many years has faced tax discrimination levy on their product that has created a most unfair competitive condition and to penalize efficiency in independent ranks such as is proposed in the highway program, being raised from 3 cents to 10 cents a pound on tread rubber is the rankest kind of discrimination. The revenue the Government would secure would be meaningless compared to the danger that would destroy individual initiative of those who created in its entirety this service to all types of the automotive trade.

We are duty bound to use our best efforts to protect efficient independent business, and more important, to keep the free enterprise system functioning within our Nation's economy. And it is for this reason, in behalf of our nationwide membership, and in fact all small business, that we oppose this increase from 3 to 10 cents a pound on tread rubber.

Vincent F. Sullivan's Back-to-Work Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I would like to call the attention of the Senate to a four-point back-to-work plan which has been developed by Mr. Vincent F. Sullivan, New York City newspaper executive and author.

The back-to-work plan is included in Mr. Sullivan's new book "How To Sell Your Way into the Big Money," and one of the points in this plan calls for an examination of the whole area of education.

Mr. Sullivan's four-point back-to-work plan has been strongly endorsed by more than 100 board chairmen and presidents of our great American corporations. These include such business leaders as: William E. Robinson, chairman of the board of Coca Cola Co.; Melvin H. Baker, chairman of the board of National Gypsum Co.; Arthur H. Motley, president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce; Clayton B. Hulsh, chairman of the board of Glamorene; Elmer H. Bobst, chairman of the board of Warner-Lambert Pharmaceutical Co.; and scores of others.

For the information of Members I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an excerpt from Mr. Sullivan's book which covers his four-point plan.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VINCENT F. SULLIVAN'S BACK-TO-SCHOOL PLAN

(Start of quote from book)

While I found that American educational standards are by far the highest in the world, some elements of the school system appear to be bogged down by a number of their problems and by a confusion of objectives.

There appeared to be a frustration in educational circles caused by a lack of funds. Important educators, who had devoted their lives to education with a true disregard of adequate compensation, summed up the major problem in just one word "money." Casting aside controversial areas of debate, they pointed out estimates of the U.S. Office of Education indicates a classroom shortage amounting to 132,400. But more alarming is the increase in the number of children entering school, now up about one and a quarter million a year, and in the years ahead it is projected that the average will run as high as one and half million. These learned gentleman advised me that the answer to this problem can be found only through extensive research.

I found that no other vital enterprise in America suffers from lack of funds as much as educational research. When one considers the vast research expenditures of industry and the almost total absence of research in education, one realizes why so many pressing questions remain unanswered. It would appear then that what is needed is a clarification of the goals of our educational system, a clear notion of just where we want to go as a nation and the necessary funds to reach our objective.

Educators were puzzled as to why the Congress would appropriate massive funds for extensive superhighway construction on one hand and then on the other hand delay and delay any and all constructive plans to aid education, which is still considered our front line of defense.

Let us refer to a recent report of the Ford Foundation. Mr. Henry T. Heald, president of the Foundation, and a man of great vision, has this to say concerning American education: "total preoccupation with immediate solutions often results in patchwork no more enduring that the alarmed outbursts created by the issue." He contended that the public attitude toward education was too narrowly "limited to the preservation of the process and a modest repair of the institution."

Mr. Heald called, instead, for "serious efforts to challenge, explore and, where necessary, remake the kind of education that has served American society for decades."

My research into industry unearthed vast areas of softness. There I found a lack of understanding that work is the most satisfying of all human desires.

The coffee break for example, has now developed into an American institution. Industrialists do not realize that this intruder has added an extra 15-day vacation to the employee. That, in itself, is not too bad, but here is a vicious addiction, developed during World War II on ships at sea, that has moved into industry on such a broad scale that the National Labor Relations Board is now ruling in its favor, and before long it will be a part of most labor contracts.

The amazing part of the coffee break is that the large majority of workers who are keen to get ahead in industry through intense application, are being forced to accept this slowup action because of industrial management's inclination not to combat the "less work all around" theory.

Another costly area in industry is the failure on a corporate level, of American business to recognize that alcoholism is a disease of the body—and one which can be arrested, through adequate multiple therapy. The disease itself is not complex. The person afflicted simply has a low supply

of a natural antitension substance called adrenochrome. That's all there is to it.

This disease costs industry over $2 billion annually. However, out of 482 of our largest industrial corporations, and many of these are multiplant organizations, only a scattered 11 are making constructive progress with the problem. And only two, yes, only two, are aware of the "direct-mail technique" used in arresting the disease.

I might add that Du Pont of Delaware is one of the few corporations doing a really outstanding job in combating this illness, but not many have followed.

Space limitations prevent further discussion within these pages of my 4-year research job, seeking the answers to the many questions developed out of the earlier editions of this book.

But out of this wealth of research there developed a plan. A plan that grew itself out of the thinking minds of a cross section of our American way of life. A plan that my advisers hold out as being the real challenge to the Soviets insofar as their overtaking American productive capacity.

However, a plan may have considerable merit, but if it is not accepted you might just as well file it away and forget about it.

So I decided to give my plan the acid test.

I submitted a comprehensive outline of the proposal to a number of our greatest American leaders. The list included board chairmen of international corporations, presidents of line corporations that have been a part of America for many years, judges, one a Supreme Court justice, top echelon educators, and other leaders known for their brilliant minds.

All great men, all name persons, with enormous reputations for farseeing vision and rich imaginations.

All men with an indescribable love of country.

All interviewed are greatly concerned these days. They see (as we all do) an alarming drift away from the underlying principles that built our Nation not only to world leadership, but to a standard of living far higher than possible for any other nation.

They recognize, too, that the sudden surge of the Soviet Union to match us in technology, in education, in public works and construction is not because of a Communist philosophy or system. Nor is it a weakness in the wonderful free-enterprise system which brought so much to the Western World.

Simply it is that the Soviets are working, and working hard to capture the rewards of free enterprise. In fact, they are using the methods of the capitalists. You find incentive pay, more consumer goods, installment buying (recently legalized), education for all—but on a regimented basis that requires hard work by every individual or the penalty of economic starvation.

Our challenge is simply this: Can free enterprise come up with a system to encourage every man and woman to put into every workday the full measure of effort that is required?

Certainly the men interviewed would be the last to decry the advent of the 40-hour week, or the 35-hour week. But they (and many others) recognize the fact that the attitude of the upcoming generation is to give as little in that 35 hours as possible. To demand security instead of success. To expect a paternal Federal Government to feed them, their family, and pay the doctor bills—but to give nothing in return.

Certainly history repeats itself. Ancient Greece before its eclipse was rotted with decadence, with low moral standards, and graft. When Rome began to coddle its citizens with the rewards of world conquest—and free them from the need for work—so began its decline.

We can prevent this happening to us.

And I now submit my simple plan * * * one which my advisors tell me offers more hope for our country than any other that has been presented to the American people.

This is the Sullivan plan:

Let's Get Back to Work: Let us instill in our children a restless ambition to develop a powerful sense of duty and responsibility, to give their best, to win approval, and to really work hard.

Let us make success something to be proud of and let us make certain that the money, the material possessions, and the prestige of success are not mocked by the pseudo-socialists thinkers.

How can we accomplish this?

But turning loose the mighty power of free enterprise to sell itself. By putting merchandising dollars and know-how behind a mighty crusade to get back to work.

The first step must be a thorough investigation by a high-level committee of the educational processes in this country.

Then we must examine carefully a number of areas in industry where softness and laziness is the insidious illness. We must then explore our theory of passing out money to those who prefer not to work. And lastly, this committee must develop a plan of action to be backed with the full resources of the Federal Government, State and local bodies—plus business itself.

Let's start with the committee itself. American business leaders have suggested the type of men that could make up the membership.

To represent the educators:

Dr. James Bryant Conant, president emeritus of Harvard.

Dr. James E. Allen, Jr., New York State commissioner of education.

Dr. Harld S. Sloan, director, Institute of Research, Fairleigh Dickinson University.

To represent free enterprise:

Thomas J. Watson, Jr., chairman of the board, IBM Corp.

William E. Robinson, chairman of the board, Coca Cola Corp.

Mark W. Cresap, chairman of the board, Westinghouse Electric Co.

Such a committee should be assembled by the President of the United States to report first to the White House. From their recommendations, enacting legislation would be presented to the Congress.

The study would run into four points:

1. What can Government do to clarify the goals of our educational system and what would be the cost to reach the objective?

2. What can industry and business do to rekindle the spark of desire for success?

3. Where can the line be drawn between honest community welfare and the current trend toward a free handout for the lazy?

4. And how can we bring home to the American people the importance of this program?

Well, there you have the Sullivan "Four-point back-to-work study." Brief, but all encompassing.

Recently I was asked if I would care to elaborate a bit more on each point and spell out what in my opinion would be the specific chore of the six-man task force. I am reluctant to do so.

The type of men suggested for the committee would be among the tops in our American way of life. I believe that such men would know what the score is today and that they would have the necessary know-how to tackle a large-scale problem and come up with the right answers. A detailed blueprint would be premature at this point.

Hagerstown Rides Comeback Trail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives will shortly consider area redevelopment legislation. In the meantime, a great deal of attention and emphasis have been placed upon certain depressed areas throughout the country, and particularly upon the city of Hagerstown in the Sixth District of Maryland.

In an article appearing in the New York Times on Sunday, March 12, Hagerstown, Md., was called a scale model for 105 depressed labor areas. On Friday, March 17, the Wall Street Journal considered editorially the case of Hagerstown, citing how the Federal Government might assist such an area, but urging other cities similarly affected to heed the words of Hagerstown's mayor, who observed "In the long run, we've got to save our own skins, and I think we can do it."

Today I am glad to be able to introduce into the RECORD an optimistic note in the form of Josephine Ripley's article entitled "Hagerstown Rides Comeback Trail," appearing in the Christian Science Monitor on Thursday, March 23. Miss Ripley depicts Hagerstown in the light of city officials, business leaders, and local industrialists fighting hard for a comeback. As a result of individual effort, local incentive and a free enterprise system, Hagerstown is taking the matter in its own hands by bringing new industries to the area, expanding existing plants, and beginning new building projects which should in the months to come bring a substantial increase in employment. Admittedly, it is a start only, but it is a start in the right direction.

In consideration of the area redevelopment legislation, it will be well to keep in mind that the wellsprings of American progress and prosperity are still located in the cities, towns, and farms of our country and must ride through the national economy rather than trickle down from Washington.

I include Miss Ripley's article in its entirety:

HAGERSTOWN RIDES COMEBACK TRAIL

(By Josephine Ripley)

HAGERSTOWN, MD.—Along with the touch of spring in the air at Hagerstown, here in the picturesque foothills of the Blue Ridge Mountains, there is a touch of hope.

Hard hit by high and persistent unemployment, Hagerstown has been—and is—among the most seriously depressed labor areas in the country.

Out of a total labor force of some 30,000 for the Washington County area, 15 percent are unemployed now. This compares with a national unemployment rate of about 5.7 percent.

But Hagerstown has not been sitting on its hands these past few years. Nor has it been holding them out.

The people of Hagerstown have a lot of pride and even more determination. City officials, business leaders, industrialists—all have been fighting hard for a comeback.

EFFORTS PAY OFF

Their efforts are beginning to pay off. New industries are coming into the area. Existing plants are expanding. New building projects are underway.

It will be some months before all this will bring any substantial increase in employment.

Even then, these projects alone will not take up the slack.

But it is a beginning, and Hagerstown takes hope. The worst, topped by the toughest winter on record for many years, is over.

"I think the low-water mark has been passed," says Mayor Winslow F. Burhans. He saw symbolism in the fact that he had just broken ground for a new $250,000 factory "with a gold-colored shovel."

James W. Stone, manager of the Chamber of Commerce, foresees 3,000 or more additional persons at work by the end of the year as a result of incoming industries and local development.

The city is buzzing with talk about the new Mack Truck Co. factory. The building will cover 1 million square feet. "Big as 22 football fields," is the way Hagerstowners describe it.

Scheduled for completion in October, it will employ some 2,000 workers eventually.

The coming of this new industry was like a sudden ray of sun through the gloomy clouds that had lowered over Hagerstown after the Fairchild Aircraft Co. in 1958, started to cut its 10,000 work force down to 2,000, due to loss of Government and other contracts.

Not that the truck plant meant Hagerstown troubles were over. What it did mean was that the Washington County Economic Development Commission, formed in 1959 to bring in new business and industry for Hagerstown, was beginning to function.

NEW FIRMS MOVE IN

Since then, an electric company has come in with a small new plant. A small furniture factory is scheduled to go up later. Ground has just been broken for a new electronics plant.

None of these plants are large, but they are new—and they have come into the community as the direct result of local initiative.

One day last fall a Hagerstown attorney reported to the economic development commission that he understood the Electronic Teaching Laboratories, Inc., a Washington, D.C., firm was thinking of building a new factory.

The commission immediately called the firm, put in the Hagerstown bid for the business—and got it.

A Hagerstown industrialist was responsible for the location of the Contempo Furniture Corp. in the town, having strongly urged its head, a Cuban exile, to choose this community.

AMAZING RESULTS CITED

The Hagerstown Chamber of Commerce has taken a strong lead in promoting business opportunities in the area. Some $185,000 was raised last year for the purpose of providing plant and equipment for lease to industries which prefer that kind of arrangement.

Construction plans within the city for a new department store, a new bank building, post office expansion, and an addition to the courthouse promise "one of the biggest construction years in the history of the country," according to Daniel S. J. Rohrer, Jr., executive director of the economic development commission.

Considering the comparatively short time the commission has been in operation, he feels that "results have been rather amazing."

A rousing series of editorials, called "Road to Recovery," in a local newspaper has touched off another round of developments.

The theme of the editorial series was that instead of waiting for new capital to come in from without, Hagerstown make use of the capital it has for expansion from within.

SELF-PUSH DRIVE

Inspired by this philosophy, the Elpern Manufacturing Co. which makes dresses for children announced plans for stepping up production, adding new employees, and making Hagerstown a regional center for fashion showings of the dresses the company manufactures.

As a result of the series Mayor Burnans called a meeting of industrial leaders of the town March 20 to explore further possibilities. Some 30 or more industrialists turned out.

Discussion brought out the need for more housing in the $30,000 to $40,000 bracket to meet the demand of executives of the Mack Truck Co. The success of a training school for workers in the needle trade in the community suggested the possibility of more educational opportunities in this area.

A survey of local industry was proposed to find out if supplies which industry needs and now purchases outside the area could be produced locally.

These were among the ideas generated at this initial survey of Hagerstown potentials by the men who run the town, industrially speaking.

DIVERSIFIED INDUSTRY

Hagerstown has a remarkably diversified industry for a town of its size, with a population of only some 36,000.

It manufactures L'Aiglon dresses for women, in addition to children's clothes; refrigeration equipment, cold storage doors, pipe organs, shoes, sandblasting and dust-removal equipment, toys, leather and rubber products, and cement.

Proposed Freedom Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, with the cold war continuing to expand and increasing in intensity it is becoming more and more evident every day that Congress should act promptly to authorize the establishment of the Freedom Academy proposed by Senate bill S. 822. Happily, more and more Members of Congress and commentators on public affairs, generally, are evidencing their support for this important program.

Clearly, we must no longer rely upon amateurs and untrained and unskilled representatives in the cold war areas of activity if we are to perpetuate the peace and promote the ideals of freedom around the world. Our American dollars cannot achieve the desired results alone. We must entirely revamp our thinking and update it to the point where those who represent the United States abroad are trained in their responsibilities and educated in the devices of the Communist conspiracy before they undertake to expend the resources and reflect the attitudes of this country overseas. The Communists rely upon professionals to carry out their nefarious undertakings—we must delay no longer in establishing a Freedom Academy wherein those who represent this country overseas are better trained for their tasks and equipped for their responsibilities.

At this point in my remarks I would like to call attention to an article in the March 20 issue of Life Lines, which, under the heading of "Are We Losing the Cold War?" discusses the need for a Freedom Academy. I ask that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARE WE LOSING THE COLD WAR?

Our country spends vast sums on complex weapons systems and large sums on foreign aid. But neither type of expenditure is proving itself effective in checking the advance throughout the world of the deadly enemies of freedom. These mistaken forces are gaining ground month by month.

The totalitarian excesses of Fidel Castro's Cuba continue to grow in number. On the African Continent, Communists dominate the Government of Guinea and are infiltrating other newly created nations. In north Africa, Red Chinese "technicians" are taking up key positions in the Algerian rebel army that is fighting France.

We seem virtually helpless against the conspiracy's techniques of war by subversion. The truth is, of course, that covert methods are favored by the conspirators. They expect to win world war III not with giant bombs or fleets of submarines but with saboteurs, political agents, and propagandists. To them the propaganda war is the heart of the battle.

It is a tragedy that we in the United States have so little with which to fight on this front. Instead of understanding and becoming expert in the areas where the cold war is being fought, we have squandered billions on military aid to countries all over the globe. Roads have been built overseas in lands that communism came to control. Dams have been constructed, only for a pro-Communist regime to deny the United States credit for them, and instead tell their people Russia was the helper. Scholarships have been given foreign students, only for them to return home to become anti-freedom fanatics. It is ironical that Raul Roa, Cuba's Red-lining foreign minister, was at one time given a fellowship on a grant provided by an American foundation.

Patriots can serve the cause of freedom in a great way by working to wake Americans up to the need for anti-subversion training. We need our own Freedom Academy—a cold war training school in which American officials, agents, and military men would receive instruction on the methods used by Communists and how they can be checked. All that patriots have learned about the threat to freedom could be taught in this West Point of political warfare.

For example, graduates of this Freedom Academy would know how to expose the fraudulence of mistaken propaganda, and how to break up Communist fronts. They would be the spearhead of freedom's resistance to totalitarianism. They would understand the means of preventing student riots. They would be in a position to detect the efforts of the mistaken to infiltrate Latin America, and to offset those efforts.

The United States needs trained professionals to help break the power of the mis-

taken ones who hope to subvert America, the stronghold of freedom. We urge that you look into this need and inform yourself as to how it can best to met. Freedom fighters need to be taught how to fight most effectively.

A Protest on the Soybean Support Price

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter from Mr. Dale W. McMillen, Jr., president of Central Soya, Fort Wayne, Ind., in which he enclosed a copy of a telegram which he had sent to Secretary of Agriculture Freeman protesting the unrealistic price support for soybeans.

In view of the fact that the Secretary has announced that the price support for soybeans will be $2.30 per bushel, I feel that Mr. McMillen's letter and his telegram to the Secretary should be called to the attention of the Members so that they will know about some of the reservations which the people at the grassroots have concerning the direction the farm program is taking.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. McMillen's letter and the telegram to Secretary Freeman in the Appendix of the RECORD:

CENTRAL SOYA,
Fort Wayne, Ind., March 20, 1961.
The Honorable FRED SCHWENGEL,
House Office Boulding,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCHWENGEL: The enclosed copy of a telegram and this correspondence constitute the letter of detail concerning the proposed soybean price support mentioned in my wire of last Friday.

In our considered opinion the $2.30 support price would expose this very important cash crop that provides the protein foundation for our animal agriculture's meat, milk, and egg production to the same fate that has befallen cotton, wheat, and corn.

In addition, the proposed program could price soybean oil out of the world market and force the price of the other urgently needed product of the soybean—soybean meal—to a level difficult for the production of reasonably priced meat, milk, and eggs for the U.S. food consumer.

With increased production costs for meat, milk, and eggs, these products would, in turn, become more costly for our food consumers at a time when they can ill afford an increase in their cost of living.

Historically, high support prices become ceilings rather than floors, and eventually depress the income of the groups they were originally designed to help. These facts are called to your attention in behalf of our company employees and the agricultural economy in your home State.

Respectfully,
DALE W. MCMILLEN, Jr.,
President.

MARCH 15, 1961.

HON. ORVILLE W. FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FREEMAN: I note that the Soybean Growers Association is protesting the suggestion of setting the 1961 soybean support at $2.30 a bushel. I note further they advocate a price of $2 per bushel, or 1.8 times the price of corn, whichever is higher. If the support price of corn was to be set at $1.20 a bushel, this would then mean that the support price of soybeans would be $2.16 a bushel. The association feels that a higher support than this would threaten the markets at home and abroad.

I say to you, sir, that it is my considered opinion that these men who are interested in the growing of soybeans know that they will be priced out of the market if as high a price is placed on soybeans. Throughout the years a ratio of 1.7 to corn has been considered high. On this basis $1.20 corn would produce a price slightly in excess of $2 for soybeans.

We are a surplus nation so far as fats and oils are concerned. We know that the starved nations of the world need this high-energy commodity. I believe that any land-grant college in the United States would say to you that insufficient protein is bad even at the present time with soybean meal at moderate prices as it has been the last year or two. In other words, I think that they tell you that livestock could be fed more economically with a greater intake of protein than they are getting at the present time.

Now, if you increase the support price of soybeans so radically, it seems to me that you would have an insurmountable burden on your hands to support the price of soybean oil to an extent that would permit a reasonable price for soybean meal. If soybean meal is not kept low you are doing a grave injustice to the livestock and poultry feeders of the United States.

Since this wire is coming to you from Florida and not from Fort Wayne, Ind., which is the home office of Central Soya Co., I would like to justify in your mind that I know something about the subject. I was processing soybeans when less than 10 million bushels were processed in the United States. Now we are processing 400 million bushels and our company processes over 50 million bushels of them. You may say that I am prejudiced because we are in the processing business, and to a certain extent that is true and it is true only to this extent, that we would like to keep our plants running and our people at work.

Now, Mr. Secretary, I could refer you to many men in the processing business and in the feeding of livestock who would understand very thoroughly my position in this matter. I will refer you to one, however, with whom I think you will be familiar. This man is Mr. J. McConnell, former head of the GLF and former Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

The volume of soybeans raised in the United States, if my memory serves me right, is raised principally in the States of Illinois, Iowa, Indiana, Arkansas, Missouri, Minnesota, and Ohio—I think it is in this proportion. On the whole, soybean country is corn country. If you can get part of the corn land in soybeans without affecting too seriously the ratio between carbohydrates and proteins you will have been a service to agriculture. If you make as abrupt a change as has been suggested in the price of soybeans, I think it would be a disservice.

Now to state to you that I have been registered as a Democrat since 1901 would mean nothing, because I would be for any administration during these troubled times, regardless of politics, who are doing their utmost to better agricultural conditions in this country. Furthermore, from what I see in the press you are a man who is attempting very strenuously to get all of the facts and I have great admiration for a man with an inquiring mind and I have deep admiration also for a man who has the courage to change his mind when all the facts are in.

Assuring you of my desire and the desire of our company to cooperate at all times, I am,

Sincerely and respectfully,
D. W. MCMILLEN.

Needed: Blueprints for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today the free world is confronted with an ever growing threat to its survival. All around the globe the Reds are thrusting forward to gain control of more lands and people. The ultimate objective—repeated again and again from Lenin to Khrushchev—is world domination.

In Laos, for example, we are witnessing one more effort of the Communists to penetrate and stir up trouble, arm and train a rebellious force, and then attempt to take over the country.

This must be stopped.

To more effectively combat the expansionist efforts of the Reds—not only in Laos, but elsewhere in the world—however, we need a more effective counter-offensive.

Yesterday, I was privileged to make an address over radio station WIND of Chicago. In the address I made some recommendations which I feel could well help to deal with such situation.

I request unanimous consent to have the text of this address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY, OF WISCONSIN

Friends, the Nation today faces greater, more complex problems to its progress, security and survival than ever before in history. However, this is no cause for defeatism. Why? Because the world of the 1960's also offers us better, more effective tools to find solutions to these challenges.

As a nation, we have the highest standards of living in history; the greatest defense military force in the world for our security; the most advanced scientific-technological program; the most productive agricultural-industrial systems; the greatest opportunity—within a climate of freedom—to attain our goals as individuals, and as a nation.

Now, admittedly, we face serious problems: At home, we have too much unemployment—still estimated over 5½ million—and regrettable lags in industry, business and other segments of the economy. Naturally, we must undertake strong, effective measures to cure these ills and further improve the outlook.

To keep the picture in perspective, however, we must remember that we also have a high rate of employment—estimated at about 65 million—and a gigantic gross national product of $503.5 billion.

In spite of our difficult problems, then, we must not allow—as some would encourage—"curtains of gloom" to descend over the Nation. In my judgment, falling prey to such an attitude of pessimism would cause the country far greater harm than the present economic problems.

Rather, we must go forward—confident in our ability to solve the problems; to provide for our defense; and ultimately to make—as I believe history will record we are now making—a constructive contribution to peace in the world, and a better life not only for our own people but for all mankind.

In a world shrunken by the ingenuity of man, controlling more of the forces of nature, our Nation cannot be isolated—an "island unto itself." Rather, the design of U.S. policies must consider universal as well as domestic factors in the overall picture. In this space age, events—economic, military, political and scientific—elsewhere in the world—affect, sometimes dramatically, our domestic as well as foreign programs.

PEACE—NO. 1 CHALLENGE

Now let's take a look at some of the major trouble spots on the globe: Headlines of newspapers across the country and around the world continue to spotlight the difficulties in Africa, particularly in the Congo. In that troubled nation, the UN—supported by the United States and other countries—is attempting to create stability and a climate in which the Congolese people can emerge as an independent, selfgoverning nation.

Unfortunately, the Communists are opposed to such a goal. Rather, they continue to attempt (a) to meddle in the internal affairs of the Congo; (b) and to defy, denounce and, as possible obstruct the efforts of the U.N.; overall, however, the U.N. continues to be the most promising hope for blocking a Red takeover and ultimately establishing stability in that troubled land.

The Congolese people themselves, however, need to demonstrate a greater sense of responsibility. The wanton killing, rape, and other atrocities, for example, reflect unfavorably upon the capability of the Africans to act humanely in relation to their fellow man or to govern themselves and their country.

COMMUNIST EFFORTS TO DESTROY THE UNITED NATIONS

For the future, however, we can expect that the Reds will continue to attempt—not only to stir up trouble in the Congo, Laos, South America, and elsewhere, but also to influence, control or destroy the United Nations. In attempting to cope with the growing threat to freedom in the world, there is a real need to review our policies. For too long, for example, the West has allowed Mr. Khrushchev to get away with the policy of considering the land and people behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains as taboo to the West, or sacred property for the Reds. By contrast, the Communists consider all areas outside the Red orbit to be open hunting grounds.

With these ground rules for power-ideological-economic struggles, the West, then, finds that it can only be stalemated, or else lose ground. However, the Reds in each such contest have everything to gain and only a little to lose. The free world, I believe, needs to develop a more effective action program to counter the Red offensive. This could involve more creative and effective efforts to penetrate behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

NEEDED: BLUEPRINT FOR FREEDOM

Globally, to attain their goals, the Communists design master plans that include (1) tactics for taking over a country; (2) techniques for transforming it into a Communist state; and (3) once controlled, establishing it as a subsidiary branch of the world conspiracy.

By contrast, the free world—although engaging vigorously in efforts to protect freedom—unfortunately has no master blueprint for the ultimate triumph of liberty. Why? Because liberty implies an inherent right of people to be self-determining. Consequently, we often feel a little conscience-stricken about efforts to influence them, even though we ourselves are dedicated to freedom.

In the face of a militant effort by the Communists to mobilize more people and resources to bury us, however, we need—indeed we must—design, and put into action, blueprints of freedom for the world. The efforts would include creation of plans for free self-government tailored for each country; educating a cadre of leaders within that country to carry the banner of liberty; insofar as possible, educate the people on the meaning of freedom, including the ways in which free institutions can serve them in attaining their personal and national goals; providing technical assistance, guidance and support—along the lines now being done—to help these countries establish a firmer foundation for attaining and perpetuating a free self-governing system.

The creating of such "blueprints" should, in my judgement, provide a greater sense of direction to our national and international efforts for winning more people for the ultimate triumph of freedom and for defeating communism.

CHAOS IN LAOS

Internationally, also, the spotlight is now on Laos. As this crisis is shaping up, it threatens to be a major contest between East-West forces. The Reds are supplying arms and ammunition to local Communists. Increasingly, these threaten the stability of the country and the survival of freedom for the Laotian people. The United States has taken a firm stand against aggressive policies of the Soviet Union. The Communists will not—I hope—turn the conflict into a Korea-type situation. The crisis, however, represents one more area in which the Reds are ready and willing to threaten world peace to further their aim of world conquest.

Currently, a meeting of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization is underway. I am hopeful that from the conference will come some realistic action to help halt the Communist tide in that area of the world.

UNITED STATES-UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS: DEFINITIONS OF COEXISTENCE

Despite Red-created warring in Laos, however, Mr. Khrushchev deceptively still endorses a policy of so-called peaceful coexistence. In Western understanding, coexistence is an inherent right of nations to live and progress together in the world. As possible, the United States has adhered to a philosophy of not only "live and let live," but also "live and help live."

By contrast, the Communists define coexistence as a period in which the Reds attempt by nonmilitary means—political, economic, ideological—to extend the influence and control of communism over more land and people. The result: a so-called "cold war."

For the future, the battle against communism will be fought on the production line, around the conference table, through trade channels, on the ideological plateau for the minds of men—all of these conflicts under the shadow of poised, ready-to-fire, pushbutton nuclear-warhead missiles. The free world can—and must—win the cold war. What is at stake? Our survival.

NEEDED: A STRONG U.S. DEFENSE

The "missile-muscle" of the United States—now and in the foreseeable future—will continue to serve as a major deterrent to military expansion by the Communists.

For fiscal year 1962, over $47 billion are earmarked for national defense programs. This includes production of advanced aircraft, missiles, guns, bombs, and other arsenal-for-defense materials for land, sea, air and space forces; maintenance of trained personnel; research and development for new weapons; and cooperating with other nations in common defense through the mutual security program.

As a leader of the free world, we need to maintain a strong, forward-moving economy, with full employment, for meeting the domestic needs of our citizens, as well as to retain a good, healthy lead over the Communists' challenge on the agricultural-industrial-consumer goods production line; further strengthen our jet-nuclear-missile-space defense—second to none—to guard the ramparts of freedom and to deter would-be aggressors elsewhere in the world; pace our scientific-technological programs to stay well ahead of competition; and carry forward a realistic foreign policy, designed to obstruct the expansionist efforts of Communists; accommodate, or negotiate, conflicts of interest among nations or blocs of nations; prevent a third world war; and, to promote the cause of peace.

Hon. William L. Dawson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, for the beloved dean of the Illinois delegation, the Honorable THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, and his colleagues from Chicago, I am extending my remarks to include the text of a telegram from President John F. Kennedy to Edward B. Toles, president of the Cook County Bar Association, on the occasion of a dinner conferring awards of merit on Congressman William L. Dawson, Judge Ervin Charles Mollison, judge of the U.S. Customs Court, Judge Scovel Richardson, also judge of the U.S. Customs Court, and the Honorable Herman Emmons Moore, retired judge of the U.S. District Court in the Virgin Islands.

It is doubtful that ever a President of the United States has paid a higher tribute to a Member of the Congress than these words of President Kennedy referring to Congressman DAWSON:

Your giving well-deserved recognition to a man who, through selfless dedication to principle and devoted service to his profession, his community, and the Nation has achieved a position of unique distinction in the life and the political institutions of the United States.

The full text of the President's telegram follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., February 16, 1961.

EDWARD B. TOLES,
President, Cook County Bar Association, Chicago:

I extend greetings and felicitations to the incoming officers, members, and guests in attendance at the 47th annual installation banquet of the Cook County Bar Association. In honoring Congressman WILLIAM L. DAWSON, you are giving well-deserved recognition to a man who, through selfless dedication to principle and devoted service to his profession, his community, and the Nation, has achieved a position of unique distinction in the life and the political insttutions of the Unted States. On this auspicious occasion I extend my sincere congratulations and best wishes to him and to your other honorees—Judges Irvin C. Mollison and Scovel Richardson, of the U.S. Customs Court, and Judge Herman E. More, retired, of the U.S. District Court for the Virgin Islands.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

The Philippines Since Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include a splendid article written by my valued friend, Hon. Carlos P. Romulo, and appearing in Current History of March 1961 entitled, "The Philippines Since Independence."

The Honorable Carlos P. Romulo is one of the outstanding statesmen of the world. His views on any subject are deep and profound. The article, "The Philippines Since Independence" is not only stimulating, but informative, reading.

THE PHILIPPINES SINCE INDEPENDENCE

(By Carlos P. Romulo, Philippine Ambassador to the United States)

During this revolutionary period in world history the new nations in Asia and Africa, emerging from colonialism to freedom, are the focus of universal attention. It is of interest to take the case of the first country—the Philippines—to become independent after the Second World War, and find out how it has fared since it achieved nationhood 15 years ago.

Devastated by war when its independence was proclaimed, how did it carry out the work of reconstruction and rehabilitation? How did it organize its government? How did it rebuild its economy? How are its government's finances? What happened after the death of its great president, the late Ramon Magsaysay? How are its foreign relations, particularly with Asia and with the United States? What has been accomplished by the incumbent administration under the leadership of President Carlos P. Garcia?

The answer to these questions will show how the Filipino people have met the challenge of their new responsibilities, how successful they have been in maintaining a government of their own, free from alien rule, and what is more important, how judiciously and wisely they have exercised the powers that sovereignty has given them.

In his speech before a joint session of the U.S. Congress on June 18, 1958, President Garcia summarized what the Philippines had achieved after 12 years of independence. He said that when independence was proclaimed, on July 4, 1946, the Philippines was a country in ruins, wrecked by 4 years of cruel enemy occupation, the country's economy completely destroyed.

Freedom is a heady thing but it can also awaken latent potentialities. It places in the hands of a people instrumentalities that when properly used can be for their lasting good.

RECONSTRUCTION AND GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION

The twofold task that confronted the Filipino people was reconstruction and establishment of a new government, democratic in pattern but molded after Philippine experience and tradition, a government by Filipinos and for Filipinos. Garcia declared—

"We like to believe that in our 12 years of independent existence we have proved to the world that we have not betrayed America's trust and confidence * * * and that in 12 years we have, with American assistance and cooperation, completed the task of reconstruction and restoration."

Anyone who has been to the Philippines, who saw our country in 1946 and can compare conditions then and now, will agree with the Philippine President. A beautiful job of reconstruction has been done. In his recent visit to the Philippines, President Eisenhower was amazed at the visible signs of progress that he saw everywhere. He said:

"Even in the short space I have been here, I have been struck by the vigor and progress that is evident everywhere. I see around me a city reconstructed out of the havoc and destruction of a world war. I know of the Binga Dam; the Maria Cristina Power and Industrial Complex; the Mindanao highway system; rural electrification; the disappearance of epidemic diseases; the amazing growth of Manila industry.

"Everywhere is inescapable physical evidence of energy and dedication, a surging faith in the future. But of even deeper significance is the creation here of a functioning democracy—a sovereign people concerned with the responsibilities in the community of nations. Those you have discharged magnificently even as you toiled to rebuild and to glorify your own land."

OUR FIGHT AGAINST COMMUNISM

During these 12 years, while rebuilding the country and organizing its newly independent government, the Philippines at the same time had to fight the danger of communism. Moscow-indoctrinated Communists, called Huks, tried to overthrow the fledgling Philippine Republic. It fought them in the hills and jungles as well as in the towns and cities and defeated them militarily. In the midst of the campaign against them, North Korea was attacked by Red China and the United Nations decided to intervene. The Philippines was among the first countries to send its troops to fight in Korea. When the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) was established, the first meeting was held in Manila; the Philippines not only joined the defensive organization but authorized the Pacific Charter which is an important part of the treaty. In it, the colonial powers agreed with us to uphold the principle of self-determination and the right of peoples of self-government and independence. The charter also stated that the dying colonial imperialism in Asia should not be replaced by the newer and even more dangerous species of Communist imperialism.

It was the late President Ramon Magsaysay who led the fight against communism and it was his interest in the welfare of the masses which helped mightily in defeating the Communist menace. Magsaysay justly won renown in the United States for his work, and when he died in an airplane crash in 1957, it was a real disaster for the Philippines. He was a leader who was loved by the people for his integrity and his sensitivity to their needs and aspirations.

However, in this connection, I wish to refer to the tendency I have noticed in the American press to write in terms of awed admiration bordering on hero worship about Magsaysay and, by an understandable but illogical inversion, to denigrate other Filipino leaders, including his successor, Carlos P. Garcia, who has been elected in his own right, in a clean and free election, as President of the Philippines.

Magsaysay was a leader sui generis. At the end of a long line of experienced politicians, and in a time of deep national distress, he burst upon the Philippine scene like an archangel of limitless energy, unsullied integrity and boundless love for the "forgotten man." Famed as a guerrilla leader, he was elected to our Congress and shortly afterwards acquired national prominence as secretary of defense, in which capacity he was mainly responsible for breaking the back of the Communist rebellion. The immense popularity he thus earned catapulted him to the presidency in 1953.

Magsaysay set a new style of national leadership. He established new standards of performance, morality, and dedication to the welfare of the people. He literally brought the Government closer to the people by going to them personally on every possible occasion, riding in bullcarts, eating with them in their thatched little huts, looking into their personal or community problems and solving them on the spot with a warm handshake, a gift of money or goods, or with an artesian well, a schoolhouse, a bridge, or a feeder road.

He represented an extraordinary cross between a barrio lieutenant (village leader) and President of a Republic of 27 million inhabitants. This style of governing had its inevitable drawbacks, and it does not detract from the unparalleled achievement of Magsaysay to point them out. They were the faults of his virtues.

MAGSAYSAY'S DIRECT ACTION

Himself an inspired amateur in the art of government and politics, he threw the careerists as well as the bureaucracy into disrepute. But in doing so, he also created a popular distaste for the established amenities and ordered procedures of public service. Paperwork and redtape which, unfortunately, are a necessary evil in any government were set aside in favor of direct action—a method which often made difficult the careful study of specific problems and the coordination of policies and programs.

Magsaysay disliked nothing so much as sitting down at his desk to read reports or listen to complicated technical advice or go to the roots of a problem. He preferred to be with the people and to go forth among them, knowing that the very sight of him would lift the hearts of the poor and the hopeless. He governed by ear and by instinct, and the former was as keen as the latter was sound.

The people loved him for this. True, in retrospect, this manner of running a government, while refreshingly new and popular, has its advantages. Yet it also can lead to regrettable errors and waste of time, energy, and resources. When Magsaysay died, he left a people whose faith in and dependence on the Government was as high as the latter's available resources were low. That is the legacy that has come to President Garcia. It is a legacy which is doubly difficult because the two men are poles apart in personality and experience.

GARCIA

Like Magsaysay, President Garcia rose by his bootstraps from the ranks of the poor. But there the similarity ends. He finished his law course as an outstanding student. He rose in politics by the proverbial step-ladder process: from Provincial Governor to Congressman to Senator to Vice President and Foreign Secretary and President of the Republic. He has never lost an election.

He is a quiet man of simple tastes. A devoted family man, he is a poet whose favorite form of relaxation is chess. After 35 years in the public service, he remains poor. He won the Presidency in an election held less than 9 months after he was elevated from relative obscurity, in the shadow of Magsaysay. That he is a loyal friend of the United States was shown unmistakably during the Second World War when he refused to collaborate with the enemy and preferred to risk his life in the hills as part of the resistance movement. It was he who signed the law outlawing the Communist Party from the Philippines. Recently, to show his faith and confidence in the United

States, he invited the American Government to establish bases for its missiles in the Philippines. This was at the time when America's NATO allies were refusing to do the same.

To write slightingly and abusively as some American correspondents have done of such a man is not only a gratuitous insult but a form of condescension which betrays in the writers a distrust of the democratic process. In the end, the real strength of democratic government lies in the slow maturing of experienced politicians rather than in the occasional spectacular emergence of an inspired popular idol.

CAUSE OF MISINFORMATION

I advisedly dwelt at length on the contrasting personalities of Presidents Magsaysay and Garcia because a lot of misinformation about the Philippines in the American press is due basically to a misunderstanding of the kind of leadership offered by each of them. Also because I believe it is high time that Americans rid themselves of the notion that Philippine progress came to an end when Magsaysay died. The great achievement of Magsaysay lay in setting up inspiring new goals for Philippine democracy and in turning the people's steps in their direction. It is left to the quiet, less spectacular, prudent and more experienced leaders like Garcia to bring the people measurably nearer these goals.

What then was the task that faced President Garcia when he took over after Magsaysay's death? In his own words, it was to be a new chapter, "The building of a national economy affording to the humblest citizen of a democratic Philippines, economic well-being, social security and stability." This he has done with concrete achievements as shown by the following facts and figures which speak for themselves; the larger share of the credit must be given to his administration.

AGRICULTURE

Despite the fact that it took several years to restore and rehabilitate agricultural production to the prewar level (in some cases, as in sugar, it took 8 years to bring it to its prewar output), there have been in recent years remarkable improvements in the acreage and output of the principal food and export crops.

In 1938, a total of 4,478,000 hectares was devoted to the production of food and export crops. In 1959, a total of 6,764,000 hectares was planted with these crops, or an increase of about 30 percent. Increase in production of these crops was more impressive, due to better methods and the use of fertilizers. In 1938, total production of these crops amounted to 5,366,000 metric tons which nearly doubled in 1959 when total production catapulted to 10,017,000 metric tons.

More specifically, the production of rice, the staple food of the people and the barometer of their economic life, surpassed the prewar output of 2,303,000 metric tons by 60 percent in 1959 when 3,685,000 metric tons of rice was produced. The year 1959 marked the turning point of the rice situation in the Philippines for we produced in that year, as a result of President Garcia's intensified 2-year food production campaign, sufficient rice to meet our domestic requirements and did not have to import this product, thereby saving considerable dollar exchange.

The production of corn, another staple food of our people, increased in 1959 by nearly 100 percent over that of 1938. Likewise, the output of the other food and export crops, such as fruits and nuts, root crops, sugar, and coconut products increased from 50 to 100 percent over that of the prewar year of 1938.

To accelerate the economic recovery of the country and to encourage and stimulate investment in new necessary industries, the Philippine Government approved Republic Act No. 35 in 1946, shortly after independence and later in 1953, Republic Act No. 901, exempting newly established industries from the payment of all taxes for a period of years. These incentives, together with certain import and exchange privileges and priorities, brought about the establishment of nearly 800 new industries in a decade.

Emphasis has been placed on the erection of factories to produce the finished products which have been imported and the utilization of raw materials locally produced. As a consequence, many of the products which the country previously imported in large quantities have been greatly reduced or entirely replaced by articles that are locally produced.

For instance, the Philippines in 1953 imported over $23 million worth of rubber tires and tubes. By 1958, rubber factories produced over ₱46 million worth of rubber tires and tubes, and the value of imports of these products decreased to ₱2 million. Importation of knitted cotton fabric which amounted to over a million pesos in 1953 was completely eliminated by 1958 and local production increased to ₱31 million, three times greater than that five years before. Importation of nearly ₱2 million of ready-mixed paints in 1953 was reduced to ₱228,000 in 1958 and during the same period our cigarette factories increased their production from ₱127 million to ₱237 million. The two flour mills recently erected now produce 75 percent of wheat floor for local consumption. The production of other manufactured goods likewise increased and imports of these items correspondingly diminished.

World War II destroyed completely the mining installations, equipment, machinery and materials in the Philippines. However, great efforts were exerted to rehabilitate the industry and production of minerals such as gold, copper, chromite, manganese, and iron ore increased steadily in the past decade. Today the output of Philippine mines has exceeded the ₱200 million mark or more than double that of the prewar years. Mining is one of the potential sources of wealth of the country as evidenced by the fact that for the 13 year period, 1946–58, the aggregate value of mineral production came to nearly ₱1.5 billion, as follows:

Gold and silver	₱435,000,000
Base metals	609,000,000
Non-metallic	423,000,000
Total	1,467,000,000

FOREIGN TRADE

The development of Philippine commerce during the 13-year period, 1946–58, reflected the many difficult problems that confronted the country in the reconstruction and rehabilitation of its industries and the stabilization of its economy and finances, at a time when the country was starting its existence as an independent nation. A notable aspect of Philippine postwar commerce was the recurring negative trade balances in contrast with the consistently favorable balances in prewar years. During the 8-year period before the war, 1934–41, the Philippines had a favorable balance of trade, with the excess of exports over imports, totaling ₱357.7 million; in the 8-year period, 1946–53, trade balances were from year to year in the negative, amounting to a total of ₱2,589.7 million. During the 5-year period, 1954–58, the Philippine trade deficit totaled ₱1,052.8 million.

Not until 1959, for the first time since liberation, did the Philippines attain a favorable balance of trade amounting to ₱40.7 million. This encouraging improvement in Philippine trade balance was brought about by a marked expansion in the volume and value of export shipments coupled with a substantial reduction in the importation of foreign goods. The 1959 export shipments amounting to ₱1,059 million reached an unprecedented level which surpassed the 1958 all-time high postwar exports totaling ₱985.5 million. Trade with the United States during the 10-year period, 1948–58, was also characterized by trade balances against the Philippines. It was only in 1959 that exports to the United States exceeded imports—₱583.3 million worth of exports as against ₱463.2 million imports, or a balance of ₱120.1 million in favor of the Philippines.

Another notable postwar trend in Philippine overseas commerce was the change in its direction from the United States to European and other countries. Philippine imports from the United States declined from 75 percent of the total imports during the prewar years, to 51 percent in 1959, and Philippine exports to the United States decreased from 83 percent to 57 percent of the total exports in the same period. Such a trend was, of course, envisaged in the Philippine-American Trade Agreement of 1946, as revised in 1955, as a consequence of the gradual elimination of tariff preferences. In accordance with the provisions of the Trade Agreement these tariff preferences will be totally eliminated in 1974. However, the United States continues to enjoy a dominant position in Philippine commerce, although its participation in both the import and export trade of the country has declined in the face of competition from other countries, principally Japan and European countries.

There was little change in the pattern of exports in the postwar years from that of the prewar period and five of the principal exports continued to constitute approximately 85 percent of the total exports. Sugar which was the No. 1 export product of the Philippines has been relegated to second place, copra taking its place as the premier export product of the country today.

The following statistics show the relative importance of principal Philippine exports:

	Value of Exports, 1958	*Percent*
Coconut products	₱340,719,662	37
Sugar	240,298,325	26
Logs and lumber	117,692,339	13
Abaca and other fibers	62,634,776	7
Tobacco products	16,411,346	2
Others	151,855,700	15
Total	919,612,148	100

The impact of the industrialization program of the Government changed the pattern of prewar imports, and reflected the increased demands for capital goods and raw materials required by the new industries established. This trend was more evident in recent years during the height of industrial development. While in 1949, capital goods and raw materials constituted 63 percent of the total value of imports, in 1959 these reached the proportion of 90 percent of the total imports. The principal Philippine imports are as follows according to their relative importance: Machinery, mineral fuels, textiles, cereal preparations, base metals, and dairy products.

POWER DEVELOPMENT

To exploit the hydroelectric resources of the country, the government established the National Power Corp. in 1937. Since its establishment several major hydroelectric projects have been completed, namely, the Maria Cristina on Mindanao, the Ambuklao and Binga on Luzon. In addition to these, the government has programed the erection of a multipurpose hydroelectric plant in Marikina near Manila and a thermal plant at Angat in Bulacan. Several other minor hydroelectric and thermal plants are being planned. By 1961, there will have been added a total of 270,000 kilowatts to the power capacity of the country. Under the 5-year economic and social program, it is envisaged that additional annual energy of 1½ billion kilowatt hours power will become available to the country.

An example of the phenomenal growth of electric production in the Philippines is the story of the expansion of electric facilities of the Manila Electric Co. which serves the city of Manila and its neighboring areas. Before the war the same firm produced approximately 175 million kilowatt hours. In 1959, it increased its production of electricity to over 1.5 billion kilowatt hours. The Philippines has abundant waterpower from its rivers, lakes and falls which can be harnessed to supply the electricity needed by homes and industries.

The overall Philippine economic progress made in the postwar years is evident from the growth in the national income of the country. According to the reports of the Central Bank of the Philippines, the national income more than doubled in the past 14 years from ₱4.36 billion in 1946 to ₱9.768 billion in 1959.

Government finances have likewise shown a steady improvement. Comparative monthly cash balances of the National Treasury during the period June to December show a considerable increase every month in 1960 over that of the corresponding month in 1959. Under the leadership of President Garcia the collection of taxes has been intensified, resulting in increased government revenues. Actual customs collections for the fiscal year 1960 amounted to ₱391 million against ₱289 million in 1959 or an increase of over 35 percent. Internal revenue collections amounted to ₱522 million for the fiscal year 1960 compared with ₱472 million in 1959 or an increase of over 10 percent. International reserves have reversed their downward trend of previous years and from their low level of $140 million in 1957, they reached the $200 million mark last year. Employment increased by over 16 percent and earnings of all workers went up 14 percent since 1955.

These notable accomplishments were attained by great hardships and sacrifices by the people. The government program of industrialization caused heavy demands on our international reserves to meet imports of capital goods and raw materials and, as a consequence, our reserves steadily decreased to dangerous levels. To arrest the continued depletion of our reserves it became necessary for the government to institute strict exchange control and later impose the 25-percent exchange fee. These controls placed heavy burdens on our producers and businessmen and encouraged smuggling and black marketing.

Fortunately, these controls, as repeatedly emphasized by our leaders, are only temporary measures and will be eliminated as soon as conditions warrant. Under the initiative of President Garcia the gradual decontrol required by law has been put into effect. The first step toward this end was inaugurated on April 29, 1960, when the Central Bank announced the free exchange market of the peso at the rate of 3.2 pesos per $1. Subsequently, on December 2, 1960, the Central Bank reduced the exchange margin fee from 25 to 20 percent and allowed the conversion of half of exporters' earnings at the rate of 3 pesos per $1.

There is a probability that decontrol may be completed before the end of 1962. When this takes place the Philippines will be the first nation in that part of the world to free itself from the shackles of controls and once more the country will be a free enterprise economy. It can thereafter look forward to greater interest abroad, particularly in the United States, in the exploitation of its hardly tapped resources.

Despite these improvements, the Philippines still faces many major and difficult problems before it can achieve a truly balanced economy. One of these is the continued domination of domestic and foreign trade by aliens. About 80 percent of the country's domestic trade and 50 percent of Philippine foreign trade is controlled by foreigners. The Philippines is probably the only nation in the world where aliens have a dominant position in the local and oversea commerce of the country. For this reason the Philippine Government has enacted the Retail Nationalization Act and more recently adopted the so-called "Filipino First" policy. These have evoked considerable criticism by foreign businessmen in the Philippines, particularly American companies doing business there. Explaining the origin of the "Filipino First" policy, President Garcia said:

"We have a background of centuries of foreign domination, during which period all policies favored the interest of the rulers. Since 1946 when we became independent and started charting our own policies, we discovered that the major part of our economy belonged to aliens.

I want to make it clear that "Filipino First" is not anti-American and cannot be anti-American even if I as President so desired. Under the so-called parity amendment of our constitution, Americans have exactly the same rights as Filipinos in developing natural resources and establishing public utilities. We are fortunate in the Philippines that the nationalist movement so forceful today is being pursued within the framework of a democratic system unlike those in other places where the fight of the common people for economic survival is being exploited by the enemies of democracy for their own selfish ends."

In fairness to the American businessmen in the Philippines I must state that some of their more enlightened leaders view the "Filipino First" policy with understanding. I have in mind the president of the long-established International Harvester Co. in the Philippines, Paul H. Wood, who publicly stated that—

"while some American companies have been affected by the growing nationalism here, this is a far better climate for American investment than some reports would lead you to believe."

He went on to say "we have a constant battle to keep some American companies, especially the newer ones here, from doing things that will get all of us tossed out."

DEMOCRATIC PROCESS

In the Philippines a government patterned after the American system and dedicated to democratic processes has been established. The Constitution specifically provides guarantees for the rights and properties of foreign nationals. Article III of the Philippine Constitution provides that property, whether owned by nationals or aliens, shall not be seized or confiscated without due process of law and shall not be taken for public use without just compensation. Moreover, the Philippine Constitution guarantees the inviolability of contractual obligations and provides that "no law impairing the obligations of contracts shall be passed." In the operation of their businesses, aliens are free to have associates or partners of their own choosing and are at liberty to employ their own men and fill positions in their firms with persons of their own selection.

The extraordinary rights and privileges enjoyed by American citizens engaged in business in the Philippines under the so-called party rights have been incorporated not only in the Philippine-American Trade Agreement, but also made a part of our Constitution. No other country has gone so far as to give such equal rights to its nationals and foreigners.

The pattern which the Filipinos would like to see adopted in their economic development is the joint venture system whereby both Filipino nationals and foreigners pool their resources to establish desirable enterprises. There has been in the last few years an increasing cooperative undertaking under this joint venture pattern of development.

A sector of the American press has published charges of graft and corruption against officials of the Philippine government. Like other countries, the United States and Soviet Russia included, we have had our share of corrupt and unworthy public officials, but their abuses have not been condoned or glossed over. Leading members of the party in power themselves are in the forefront in exposing those guilty of malfeasance in public office. There is a press in the Philippines which is among the freest and the most vigilant in the world, and publishes without fear or favor the abuses it believes should be known by the people. Public opinion is untrammeled. There is no censorship of any kind and consequently the government is under constant criticism and appears to casual observers in a worse light than it should.

It must be said that President Garcia has carried out a vigorous campaign against graft and corruption in the government. A Reuters dispatch published in the New York Times of November 30, 1960, says:

"The Philippine presidential office announced recently that since 1957, more than 19,000 government officials have been investigated for alleged corrupt practices. About 13,000 administrative cases have been decided, resulting in the conviction of about 9,000 officials and the exoneration of 3,000. About 6,000 administrative cases still are awaiting decision. There were 575 criminal cases. Of this number there have been 82 convictions and 76 exonerations."

This is a cleanup record that is unequalled by any previous administration in the Philippines. It shows that the healing process is going on, a sign of health and strength in the body politic, proof that the nation is constitutionally sound.

As shown in the enumeration of the Philippine economic achievements, since independence in 1946, the Philippines has continually grappled with the crisis of modernization trying to erect economic salients that will permit its people to have maximum necessities and more than a minimum of what more advanced countries call luxuries. This effort has been taken with the effort to preserve those political and social values which give the democratic ethos its vitality and at the same time give our people the dignity and self-respect that go with freedom.

FOREIGN POLICY

It is within this context that Philippine foreign policy and relations can be interpreted. Like some other nations which have newly emerged into the complexities of the 20th century, the Philippines has endeavored to examine itself with honesty and perception. This examination proceeds from a concern with the humane, with social justice and compassion for our people, and also from the forces that have shaped the world into its present state of anxiety, and will to live in peace.

Our relations with the United States since the end of World War II have been cordial and fruitful. There have been very few instances where the differences of our respective national interests could not be reconciled. But these differences have not visibly affected our friendly relations, as shown by the tremendous and unprecedented welcome accorded President Eisenhower which, in warmth and spontaneity, was a revelation of the Filipino popular sentiment of cordiality and good will for the American people.

A substantive part of the most delicate problems of Filipino-American relations has been settled. They include the payment of the gold devaluation claim for $23 million and the successful negotiations for the revision of the military bases agreement which resulted in definite accord on the transfer of the Olongapo community to the Philippines; reduction of the lease period of the American military bases from 99 to 25 years; the relinquishment of considerable area heretofore under American control and the determination of metes and bounds of remaining

areas to be retained; previous consultation with the Philippine Government before the United States could put up missile launching sites in the Philippines. This accord has been the result of American understanding of the defense concept of the Philippines.

It is confidently believed that the recognition of the mutuality of Philippine and American interests once brought to other sensitive areas of differences will again result in the settlement of other remaining problems, including the administration of the military bases and criminal jurisdiction over triable offenses committed outside and inside the bases; the additional Philippine claims such as those of our veterans who fought for America, filed with the U.S. Government; the adjustment of Philippine obligations under the Romulo-Snyder agreement and the claims for expenses of the Recovered Personnel Division; a more equitable Philippine-United States Air Agreement; a percentage share for the Philippines in the excess quota of the total American sugar import and the repeal of the 3-cent processing tax on Philippine coconut oil.

President Garcia recently made the statement after making state visits to south Vietnam and Japan last year that "the Philippines is in Asia geographically and is of Asia racially and must bend every effort to develop closer relations with its fellow Asians, never forgetting that in unity lies strength."

True to this assertion, since his inauguration, the Philippines has signed, first, a reparations treaty with Japan. A month ago, it concluded and signed in Tokyo a treaty of amity, commerce, and navigation. It has established diplomatic missions in India, Indonesia, Malaya, South Vietnam, Pakistan, Thailand, Japan, Republic of China, Burma, and Ceylon. We have exchanged cultural and trade missions with various Asian nations, thus developing closer relations with them. In February, this year, the Philippine President will make a state visit to Malaya to propose the creation of a Southeast Asia Association of States.

In 1961, we hope to complete agreements for trade expansion with Australia, Germany, Israel, New Zealand, Pakistan, South Korea, Spain, Taipei, and Vietnam; ratify and implement the Treaty of Immigration with Indonesia; implement the Treaty of Friendship with Vietnam; urge the implementation of the economic provisions of the Southeast Asia Treaty for the improvement of living conditions of underdeveloped member states; and further intensify educational and cultural interchange with other countries.

We have no diplomatic relations with Soviet Russia, Red China, and the satellite countries. We have made our choice and we do not believe in twilight zones. We cannot subscribe to a monolithic and ruthless ideology which reduces everything to materialistic dialectics. As we start as an independent country, history tells us that for 50 centuries men have had to choose either the hard sinews of freedom, integrity, dignity—or a gutless peace and the degradation of slavery. Freemen are free to choose and we have chosen.

Railroad Mergers Threaten 200,000 More Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, according to figures of the Railroad Retirement Board, the average total covered employment in the railroad industry dropped by 400,000 workers from December 1955 to December 1960. The average number of railroad workers employed for each year has been lower than the average for the preceding year, and it therefore is clear that over recent months railroad workers have been experiencing what is, for them, one of the greatest depressions in history.

Several reasons have been cited for this situation. One has been the rapid technological advance within the industry and the elimination of the need for many jobs through the introduction of new kinds of equipment, automation and new methods of operation. Another has been the phenomenal increase in the productivity of the railroad workers, who have been increasing their output at a rate about double that of the rest of the economy as a whole. A third factor also has been a serious undermaintenance of the railroad plant, with bad order locomotives and freight cars running at near-record or even record highs on some railroad properties, and with maintenance of track, roadbed, and signaling systems in some instances having been allowed to deteriorate dangerously.

Spokesmen for the railroad labor organizations have, with clear justification, warned that the lack of proper maintenance on some railroads is becoming a real threat to public safety. To have allowed such a situation to develop in the face of the grave problems of unemployment and underemployment which faced their employees, does not reflect creditably upon the personnel and managerial policies of the railroad industry. Certainly, the earnings picture of the railroads in general over the last 5 years did not reflect a depression level when compared with prior years, and there appears to be no justification, in terms of either humanitarian concern for the welfare of workers in the industry or from the standpoint of sound management practice, to have allowed maintenance work which is necessary to go undone, particularly in the face of the serious economic hardships being suffered by employees of the industry. This is especially true since the great productivity increase of railroad workers entitled them to a fair share of the gains to the industry which resulted from increased labor output.

Today, a new threat to railroad employment has appeared in the widespread move to merge and consolidate railroad properties. Railroad labor has estimated that if all proposed mergers are allowed to proceed to a conclusion, it will mean a loss of 200,000 additional jobs in the industry. This is because the so-called economies of railroad merger result basically from the curtailment and elimination of railroad services and facilities. Each merger curtails the railroad potential to meet future transportation needs that will come with a renewed expansion of the economy.

Our national transportation policies have long recognized that the adverse effect of railroad mergers upon railroad workers certainly must be considered as part of the public interest and Congress has instructed the Interstate Commerce Commission to weigh such effects before granting its approval to such consolidations. Because the present merger movement threatens to impose upon railroad workers, who have already unduly suffered from unemployment, an unprecedented burden of hardship, I believe that the Congress should take a new look at our national transportation policies with respect to railroad mergers in order to determine whether adequate protections exist to insure that the public interest in all its aspects is safeguarded sufficiently under present law.

In conclusion, I ask unanimous consent to include the RECORD as part of my remarks a statement to the press on its policy toward railroad mergers recently issued by the Railway Labor Executives' Association.

There being no objection, the statement of the Railway Labor Executives' Association was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

RAILROAD LABOR SPOKESMAN SAYS UNION OPPOSITION TO RAILROAD MERGERS IS BASED ON THEIR HARM TO PUBLIC INTEREST RATHER THAN LOSS OF JOBS

Railroad labor's belief that no further railroad mergers should be permitted until adequate safeguards to protect the public interest have been written into law is not based solely upon labor's justifiable concern over job losses but rather stems primarily from alarm over the many other adverse effects proposed consolidations would have upon the national interest, a spokesman for railroad labor said today.

A. E. Lyon, executive secretary of the Railway Labor Executives' Association, released the text of a letter to the editor of the Toledo Blade in which he termed "very unfair" a statement in an editorial in that newspaper that "the unions are basing their antilabor battle on the claim that mergers mean a loss of jobs."

Lyon said that the threatened loss of some 200,000 jobs in the railroad industry if present merger proposals are carried to their conclusion "is only one of many reasons for our stand." He detailed six specific adverse effects upon the national welfare that would result from the shrinkage of the national railroad plant proposed in pending mergers and pointed out that some of these objections were being advanced by railroad managements as well as labor.

The complete text of Lyon's letter follows:

"The EDITOR,
"The Toledo Blade,
"Toledo, Ohio.

"DEAR SIR: Your editorial entitled "Closed Mind on Mergers" which appeared in your February 25 issue has painted a very unfair picture of the position of railroad labor in regard to railroad mergers by claiming that 'the unions are basing their anti-labor battle on the claim that mergers mean a loss of jobs.'

"Since the reason you have cited is only one among many reasons for our stand—and certainly not the one which has been stressed in our statements to date—we can't help but feel that it may be the Blade editorial writer's mind that is closed, rather than our own.

"As you will note from the enclosed official declaration of our policy in regard to railroad mergers, the 23 Standard Railroad Labor Organizations are opposed to all pending merger proposals in the railroad industry primarily because:

"1. We believe that railroad mergers would weaken the base for national economic expansion by curtailing rail transport facilities to a point where they would impair the railroads' ability to handle the greater traf-

fic that will result when the economy once again begins to expand.

"2. The proposed mergers also would seriously weaken our national defense. If, during the last major merger movement in the 30's, the railroads had been able to overcome the objections of railroad labor and effect the then proposed consolidations, our Nation simply would not have had the rail capacity needed to meet the demands for mass transportation during World War II.

"3. The presently proposed mergers would result in a decline of competition and a growth of monopoly in railroad transportation, which has already been allowed to proceed to an alarming degree. This view has been supported by a large and important segment of railroad management, such as for example the Southern Railroad, which has charged that a great concentration of economic power destructive of competition would result from the merger of the Atlantic Coast Line and the Seaboard lines.

"4. The scrapping of lines of railroad, the retirement of equipment and facilities—the basic objective of railroad mergers—can only mean a loss of service to shippers, interference with the economic development of regions such as the Northwest and Southeast and in increased public criticism of the poor service being given by the railroads.

"5. Since consolidation means the curtailment of the mass transportation services supplied by the railroads, it means that the Nation must rely on less efficient forms of carriage with a resultant lower standard of living because of higher transportation costs. Mergers of railroads thus mean a considerable loss of the greater economies of rail transport.

"6. Many communities and thousands of industries have been established on the basis of availability of railroad service. To reduce or eliminate this service over thousands of miles of railroad—as is proposed in the pending merger plans is to create depressed communities, disrupt established homes and place obstacles in the way of industrial development.

"Finally, after setting forth these reasons, the policy declaration mentions, as another reason for our opposition, the loss to railroad labor. I quote this section exactly:

" 'The most drastic loss to railroad labor from consolidation is, of course, the loss of employment by thousands of workers who have spent most of their lives in railroad service. In addition to the direct loss of jobs, many more thousands of railroad employees must leave their homes and become established in other railroad centers. This so-called change in location of employment usually means the loss of jobs because of the inability of workers to move from long-established residences.

" 'These losses to railroad labor are great, but not so great as the Nation's loss from discarding a skilled labor force from our most economic transportation agency.'

"Our policy statement also spells out the inadequacies of present law with respect to protection of the public interest in railroad consolidations in some detail—a view which also is shared by some segments of railroad management, such as that of the New York Central which asked the Interstate Commerce Commission to hold up approval of pending mergers until their effect upon the national rail transportation network had been determined. The management of this railroad pointed out, as does railroad labor, that the present mergers are not taking place according to a plan to promote a more efficient national railroad structure, but are being shaped solely by the competitive pressures upon the financial groups controlling the merging properties. Weaker roads, which should be absorbed into stronger roads in any efficient merger program, are being ignored and placed in a position where their very survival is threatened.

"Finally, our policy statement concluded with a declaration that 'lack of protection of the public interest in railroad mergers at the present time is so shocking and insidious that the Railway Labor Executives' Association, representing the 23 Standard Railroad Labor Organizations, believes that no further railroad consolidations should be permitted until the threat to our Nation's future which is inherent in the present proposals is fully investigated and adequate safeguards are enacted into law.'

"In view of the foregoing, I believe that you will agree that your editorial was an unfair statement of our position. The fact is that, while we are naturally concerned over proposals to cut back railroad employment by an additional 200,000 jobs on top of the loss of 400,000 jobs in the railroad industry which has already occurred over the last 5 years, we are not basing our campaign against railroad mergers primarily upon this reason. Rather, railroad labor, like a large segment of railroad management and the many shippers and businessmen of the communities which will be adversely affected, is primarily opposed to pending merger proposals because of the many other adverse effects they would have upon the national interest as outlined above.

"Sincerely,

"A. E. LYON,
"Executive Secretary."

Gulf Coast Naval Reserve Law Seminar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, recently there was held at the U.S. Naval Station at New Orleans, La., the Gulf Coast Naval Reserve Law Seminar for 1961 as a training program for the inactive Reserve officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard in the 4th, 5th, 6th, 8th, and 9th Naval Districts.

We are rightly and justly proud of citizen-soldiers, citizen-airmen, and citizen-sailors in my district. My district is the home of Jefferson Davis. His proudest moment and biggest military success was attained when the citizen-soldiers of the First Mississippi Regiment of volunteers at Buena Vista in the War with Mexico carried out successfully his command: "Mississippians, stand fast." They stood fast, they saved that day at Buena Vista and helped win that war.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the welcoming address to the Gulf Coast Naval Reserve Law Seminar for 1961 by a friend and constituent of mine, Comdr. Robert W. Collins, U.S. Naval Reserve. The welcoming address follows:

GULF COAST NAVAL RESERVE LAW SEMINAR

Welcome, citizen-sailors and officer-lawyers, to New Orleans and the Gulf Coast Naval Reserve Law Seminar 1961.

To each of you citizen-sailors and officer-lawyers we extend a warm welcome to the Queen City of the South known also as America's most interesting city and express the hope your tour of duty at the Gulf Coast Naval Reserve Law Seminar will be truly worthwhile.

We welcome you as a body of lawyers who are taught that the prime source of Navy law is the Constitution of the United States. We know, too, that your task and mission always is to assist the Navy to maintain and employ her forces to: (1) Support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; (2) insure the security of the United States; (3) uphold and advance the national interests of the United States; and (4) safeguard the internal security of the United States.

In recognition of the fact that all true American lawyers appreciate history we invite you to note and reflect upon the great seal of the United States. It is portrayed on the back of the $1 bill.

One side describes the physical structure of our Government. The familiar eagle in whose claws are the arrows of war and the olive branch of peace. Over the eagle are the significant words "E pluribus unum"—"from many, one."

The other side portrays the spiritual character of our Republic. The pyramid of 13 layers of stone is an unfinished one. It symbolizes our work of building is not yet done. Above that pyramid is the all-seeing eye of Divine Providence surrounded by a glory. Above it is the constant reminder: "Annuit Coeptis"—"He has blessed our undertakings." At the bottom is this message for all of us: "Novus Ordo Seclorum"—"a new order of the ages."

That wise and patient, and oldest of the delegates to our Constitutional Convention in 1787 knew the meaning of our great seal. As Benjamin Franklin left that convention he made this simple statement: "We have given you a Republic, if you will only keep it."

While you are here we invite you to note and reflect upon the great seal of our host State, the Pelican State. Louisiana's great seal contains these all-important words: "State of Louisiana—Union—Justice, and Confidence."

Welcome to the Gulf Coast Naval Reserve Law Seminar for 1961 and do come back again for we have the hope the Navy will continue this seminar in New Orleans on a permanent basis.

The Alleghany Corp. Proxy Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most interesting and timely editorial by Leslie Gould, the well-known financial editor of the New York Journal-American.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON-AGAIN-OFF-AGAIN SONNABEND—HE CHOOSES TO FIGHT AGAIN

(By Leslie Gould)

The entrance of A. M. Sonnabend, the Boston hotel and real estate operator, into the Alleghany Corp. proxy fight presents a problem for the SEC and its full disclosure rules.

This is the second go-around for Mr. Sonnabend in Alleghany with its $7½ billion railroad, investment trust, and real estate empire a rich prize for any "takeover" operator.

Mr. Sonnabend first cast eyes on Alleghany late in 1959, with a great deal of publicity fanfare. He won for himself the nickname of "On-Again-Off-Again" Sonnabend, for announcing and then calling off plans for a proxy fight.

ONCE CLAIMED 700,000 SHARES

On Nov. 16, 1959, he announced he had "no choice" but to engage in a proxy fight against Allan P. Kirby, head of Alleghany. He revealed "a group of associates and myself" have acquired "over 700,000 shares of Alleghany Corp. common stock."

Around the same time, it was reported with no denial from Mr. Sonnabend that he personally had 200,000 shares of Alleghany.

There never was a disclosure to the SEC of his holdings then, nor the identity of his associates.

At the time of his announcement that he and his associates held 700,000 shares, this column reported that one individual—a New York garment center banker and head of an investment company—who bought stock along with the "group" at that time, had sold his entire holdings—90,000 shares—at a profit.

Now some 16 to 17 months later, Mr. Sonnabend has filed a report with the SEC and the New York Stock Exchange of his Alleghany stock purchases. These reports give his holdings presently at 135,000 shares.

NEVER HAD 200,000 SHARES

The reports indicate he never had any 200,000 shares, and probably the same holds for the 700,000 shares claimed for "a group of associates and myself."

The reports show that starting on September 29, 1959, Mr. Sonnabend bought 10,000 shares and by Oct. 9, 1959, had acquired 68,700 shares.

In November Mr. Kirby announced he had withdrawn his offer of a board seat to Mr. Sonnabend and his offer to buy the 200,000 shares the Boston hotelman and companies he controlled claimed to own. This was two weeks after Mr. Sonnabend made his first threat of a proxy fight.

SEC SLOW ON DISCLOSURE

There were no purchases by Mr. Sonnabend between October 9, 1959, and February 9, 1960, when he bought 3,200. By the end of December last year he reported all his purchases totaled 127,100 shares, and in January of this year he bought 22,800 shares. This brought his total purchases to 149,900 shares, but he also sold 11,500 shares and his 135,000-share figure as of now would indicate an additional small sale.

The SEC should have forced the present disclosure as to his holdings more than a year ago, when he was on again off again on a proxy fight. When he finally gave up the proxy fight idea on November 30, 1959, Mr. Sonnabend told a press conference:

"As of now I have no intention of soliciting proxies," but added "my intentions can change at any time."

MRS. YOUNG STILL TO BE PAID

When he was talking about a proxy fight in 1959, Mr. Sonnabend said he wanted on his directors slate David Wallace and Mrs. Young, widow of Robert R. Young. Wallace was dropped as an Alleghany officer by Mr. Kirby after it had been found he had been in communication with Mr. Sonnabend.

The two Murchison brothers—Clint, Jr., and John—who head up the new proxy fight with Mr. Sonnabend as an ally, have contracted to buy Mrs. Young's and the Young estate's holdings in Alleghany. These shares, however, haven't been paid for yet.

So, a question for the SEC to determine is whether the 1959 Sonnabend move and the present proxy fight are related or are really one and the same.

Jan Smith—Study and Research in Brazil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Local Student Returns From Year in Brazil," written by Clayton Willis, and published in the Albuquerque, N. Mex., Tribune of March 6, 1961, concerning the 1-year visit to Brazil by Jan Smith, of Albuquerque, in connection with an inter-American cultural convention grant for study and research.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOCAL STUDENT RETURNS FROM YEAR IN BRAZIL

(By Clayton Willis)

A University of New Mexico graduate just back from a year in Brazil has great hopes that new Brazilian President Janio Quadros will do much to curb inflation there.

Jan Smith, 23-year-old daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Mike Smith, 3124 San Pedro NE, said she thinks President Quadros is going to help the economy of Brazil because of the austerity program he has outlined.

"As Governor of Sao Paulo State, Quadros was very successful with his austerity program," Miss Smith said.

She was in Brazil on an Inter-American Cultural Convention grant which is given for study and research.

"When I left Brazil in early February the cost of living and the inflation was going up so much that I didn't see how the lower class could live," she said.

The 1959 University of New Mexico graduate says education is the thing Brazil needs most. She said that only 52 percent of the population is literate.

"I don't think the lower classes are going to be able to better themselves without education. And education is too expensive for them," the former University of New Mexico major in Inter-American Affairs said.

"And the upper classes don't care whether the lower classes educate themselves or not," Miss Smith observed.

She said that there is little public school type education in Brazil. What education there is is mostly of the private school kind, she noted.

The attractive Albuquerquean attended classes on a noncredit basis 5 months at the National University of Brazil in Rio de Janeiro. She also lived in the Atlantic coastal port city of Salvador 5 months.

Miss Smith spent the remaining 2 months of her year in the Portuguese-speaking country traveling through the interior of Bahai State. There she recorded folk music and visited several cattle ranches in this northeastern part of Brazil.

Four other observations she made in an interview at her home:

1. Communism is practically nonexistent in the part of Brazil she saw;

2. Students at the National University of Brazil gave her a somewhat cool reception as an American. But the university's professors were very helpful;

3. The Brazillian sees the typical American as someone with a lot of money who drinks and smokes and goes to a lot of parties (the impression they get from third rate American movies they see, she said);

4. Brazilians were surprised that she spoke Portuguese. "But when the merchants found out I was an American, you could see the dollar signs lighting up in their eyes," Miss Smith said.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of March 25, 1961:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

MARCH 25, 1961.

The New Frontier legislative program has everyone's attention. The leaders endeavor to meet an Easter deadline to get out legislation—whatever can be passed to show performance before the anticipated April upturn of business. The Ways and Means Committee has temporarily postponed the highway tax in favor of a study of social security changes and the reduction of the tourists imports of duty-free foreign purchases (from $500 to $100). Everything is urgent, whether the legislation would take effect soon or in the distant future.

The temporary unemployment compensation House-Senate conference report was passed handily. I joined debate to emphasize the inequity of the financing which most legislators, I am sure, did not intend. The employers of 40 States are forced to pay in more than they can get back, 3 States break even, and 9 States get back more than they pay in—all of this not intended but the result of the mandatory tax increase in violation of existing State law and procedures. In protesting this new forced taxation, I fail to see why Texas employers should pay for New York, New Jersey, Ohio, and other wealthy States costs of unemployment, not forgetting either that the States have vast reserves of $6.6 billion, particularly since the inequity results from local and States problems and program administration. The overriding danger is the Federal encroachment and breakdown of present State law, replaced by Federal standards. Time will show even more closely that the 31 of us opposing this bill are right.

Minimum wage legislation and debate, to increase minimum wages to $1.25 per hour and expand coverage under the Fair Labor Standards Act, dominated floor action this week. The 51-page bill, the 77-page report, the 637 pages of hearings, and the 2½ days of debate spell out one overpowering fact—minimum wage setting by the Federal law is unconstitutional. Infrequently is this mentioned. On the contrary, hours of technical and complicated amendments and differing solutions were the concern of the Members. The dilemma facing a constitutionalist is to listen, learn, and vote to bring out the least obnoxious bill—least endangering freedom of the individual and all the time realizing that every revision is unconstitutional, so that the final vote, no matter

how refined the bill is "No." As to the merits of the bill—whether $1 an hour, $1.15 an hour, or $1.25 per hour is the right amount, and how much coverage and exemption should be embraced—the evaluation of each side of the argument was almost impossible—first to reach an agreement of understanding when basic disagreements are so many and then decide the least undesirable solution, was an exercise in futility. Why? Because Government cannot equitably manage private enterprise without fully controlling all facets of enterprise, including price. In other words—business is either free or Government controlled—a solution embracing and endorsing both is inequitable and self defeating. Mainly, wage setting hurts people, the wage earners, because it results in unemployment, business failure, and higher prices.

Some of the inequities and unreal features are: (1) Minimum wages go to the unskilled, poorly educated, handicapped, young person, older person and these, all too frequently, will lose their jobs—no pay is hardly a better solution. (2) Interstate Commerce as the constitutional reason for Federal minimum wage setting has been discarded for an annual dollar volume of sales of not less the $1 million. (This figure can be reduced in the future until all business is covered.) (3) The escalator of $1.15 to $1.25, the latter to be imposed 2 years hence binds a later Congress which can take action on its own. (4) Some small merchants and services are exempt. Discrimination between businesses is arbitrary. The reasons for exempting some businesses apply to many of those not exempt. The bill finally passed raised minimum wages to $1.15 per hour and retained Interstate Commerce as the grounds for the increase rather than the arbitrary dollar volume proposed by the Democrat leadership.

Once again the emotional plea of substandard housing, clothing, food, and living conditions is used to demagogically show that higher pay is deserved. The plain fact is people must be paid what their services are worth, an agreement between employer-employee, not as a result of bureaucratic decision of Federal Government.

The four pillars of our national economic health (1) Federal budget, (2) fiscal policy, (3) debt management and (4) wage productivity need to be analyzed in the light of the New Frontier's radical spending and taxing plan. Then our people must realize where this course is taking us. In this connection a realization of the dedicated beliefs of men around the President advising him and administering the law should be known. Do the people and Members of Congress know the beliefs of these men: Goldberg, Schlesinger, Galbraith, Heller, Cohen, Bowles, Udall, Williams? The President's statement of foreign aid and fiscal policy received this week should be understood by everyone.

Lincoln National Memorial in Southern Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include the following resolution of the Lincoln Club of Southern Indiana, calling for the creation of the Lincoln National Park in southern Indiana, adopted on March 16, 1961:

LINCOLN NATIONAL MEMORIAL IN SOUTHERN INDIANA

Whereas Abraham Lincoln not only was the emancipator of the individual but also saved for the United States and the world a successful pattern of free government; and

Whereas Lincoln grew to manhood in southern Indiana and there began the study of the law, the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas in southern Indiana Lincoln first gave expression to those ideals which became the crusading purpose of his life: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Lincoln Club of Southern Indiana commends Senator VANCE HARTKE and Congressman WINFIELD K. DENTON for introducing in the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives bills to establish a Lincoln National Memorial in southern Indiana and urges their speedy enactment into law; and further

Resolved, That the plan to establish the Lincoln National Memorial in southern Indiana be activated with the greatest possible speed in order to demonstrate to the world in a tangible way the determination of the United States to perpetuate the Lincoln ideals of individual freedom and the free way of life.

SS "Hope" Brings Asia Image of Good American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, dedicated men and women who form the team on the SS *Hope* are doing much to eradicate the image of the "Ugly American" in southeast Asia. They are replacing it with the image of the good American.

Here is the story of Dr. William B. Walsh as told to and reported by Jerry Belcher of the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune. Dr. Walsh has recently return to America from Indonesia.

What the SS *Hope* has done, other dedicated Americans can do through the medium of the Peace Corps.

I hail Dr. Walsh and the good men and women associated with him. They are giving of themselves to help, not only the peoples of underdeveloped portions of the world, but those of us who sit complacently at home.

Here is Dr. Walsh's story at told to Jerry Belcher:

SS "HOPE" BRINGS ASIA IMAGE OF "GOOD AMERICAN"

(By Jerry Belcher)

Blinking back the tears welling in his dark eyes, the Indonesian village chieftain made a gracious farewell speech to the departing medical team from the SS *Hope*.

"I do not know even where the United States is," he said. "But you are always welcome in my village. You are the first foreigners ever to come here except to steal our rice."

And those who heard the chief's little speech knew he spoke sincerely and with deep gratitude, because only a few days befor one of the *Hope's* surgeons had removed the cataracts that had blinded his eyes for years.

INSPECTION TOUR

This dramatic vignette was related by Dr. William B. Walsh, president of the People to People Foundation, following a month-long inspection tour with the *Hope* in Indonesian waters. The *Hope* is sponsored by the foundation, which in turn is supported by private donations of the American people.

During a brief stopover in San Francisco, Dr. Walsh waxed enthusiastic about the big ship's first 6 months of operations as a seagoing medical school and treatment center.

He said the ship is received everywhere with almost unqualified enthusiasm by both government officials and plain citizens.

So great has been the impact of the mercy mission in creating an image of "the good American" that Dr. Walsh expects the Russians will be trying something similar in the near future. In fact, he said, 10 Soviet doctors arrived in Indonesia not long ago and spent a good deal of their time observing the *Hope's* operations.

From Jakarta, the *Hope's* information officer reported earlier this week that in its five stops in Indonesian ports, the ship's medical staff has played host to some 20,000 persons, performed at least 260 surgeries in the ship's operating rooms, presented more than 700 lectures and seminars for native doctors, nurses, and medical technicians.

SHORTAGE ACUTE

In addition to shipboard work, 12-member medical teams have roved through the jungle interior, setting up field clinics, treating as many as 800 patients a day, and training Indonesian physicians and technicians in more efficient methods.

Because of the country's acute shortage of doctors, increasing the number of patients a single physician can treat is one of the *Hope* staff's most important tasks, according to Dr. Walsh. In some instances, he said, Indonesian doctors are now able to treat 2½ times as may patients as before.

Dr. Walsh feels that some of the lessons learned from the *Hope's* mission may be of value to those setting up President Kennedy's Peace Corps. Above all, he said, patience and tolerance are required.

A well publicized tragedy marred the last days of Dr. Walsh's tour. He directed the mission in which a Navy plane flew staff technician Lois Boyce to an Air Force hospital in Japan, for emergency brain surgery.

Dr. Walsh explained that the flight was necessary because the medical ship's staff doesn't include a neurosurgeon. Miss Boyce, a 32-year-old former University of California Hospital medical technician, died Wednesday, after a 2-hour operation.

Dr. Walsh reported that the *Hope* will remain in Indonesian waters until June 1, then will call at Saigon and Vietnam ports before returning to the bay area sometime in the fall.

He expects the *Hope* to go back to Asian waters later. And, he said, he can guarantee enough doctors, nurses, and technicians to volunteer for similar mercy ships for Africa and South America if the American people will support the projects with their financial backing.

Byelorussian Independent Democratic Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, there is no real peace in the world today.

Everywhere we look there is terror, anxiety, hate, and bitterness. The shores of Africa tremble with violence. The mountains of Laos reek with suffering. Indeed man's eternal hope for world peace seems far from realization.

Let as long as aggressive forces continue to spout their line of hate and destruction, of control and oppression, as long as these forces continue to deprive peoples of their universal desire for national independence, for human dignity, for freedom, this struggle must go on. By right, there should be no struggle—for independence, dignity, and freedom should belong to the heritage of man—yet by necessity it exists. It is not an easy struggle. It is not a short struggle.

I make these remarks, Mr. Speaker, in connection with the impending 43d anniversary of the establishment of the Byelorussian Independent Democratic Republic. It was on March 25, 1918, that this nation, for centuries the pawn of czarist Russia declared its independence. From the cities of Minsk and Homel, to the marshlands of the Dneiper, the Dvina, and the Nieman, 10 million people announced their intention to live in dignity and self-respect.

The little republic did not last long, and within 3 years another Muscovite power—that of the Soviets—overthrew the fledgling government, again imposing the dreaded yoke of tyranny. For 40 years now the Communists have continued to hold sway over Byelorussia. But those 3 short years of freedom whetted the appetites of the Byelorussians, and the memory of them continues strong. Those of us familiar with the wonderful White Russian people are well aware of their cultural tradition, their common language, the history of their struggle, and their respect for free democratic principles. Many, after fleeing their tortured homeland, have become some of America's finest citizens.

I know that my colleagues will join me in the hope that someday Byelorussia will again be independent, that Byelorussia and all other lands will be free from the ravishes of Soviet domination.

Let us join hands the world over to defeat this menace to society. Let us work together for the dignity and freedom of man. And let us remember the heroic struggle of the Byelorussians as we rededicate our efforts in this direction.

Resolution Opposing Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the Board of Education of the Canton City School District has adopted a resolution opposing Federal aid to education and I ask leave to include it in my remarks.

The resolution is remarkable for its clarity and persuasiveness, and its author should be complimented for the excellence of the statement:

Whereas in the traditions of the United States, education of our children has always been a local responsibility; and,

Whereas the fathers, mothers, and local authorities in general have recognized and assumed their responsibility to produce the best educational systems in the world; and,

Whereas funds raised by self-assessment are carefully watched to see that maximum value is received in their use. Such assessments are 100 percent available, there being no shrinkage due to absentee national administration; and,

Whereas Federal aid will inevitably bring Federal control, with the resulting loss of local control and local interest in education; and,

Whereas local interest creates an atmosphere of parental interest in child education that is most valuable for child-learning; and,

Whereas if national aid preempts or supplements local responsibility, the local community interest ultimately will be weakened and discouraged to the point that more and more national aid will be required; and,

Whereas national aid can ultimately lead to total control of the education of our children, similar to that in the totalitarian countries, a form of education that could become the tool of destruction of the American way of life: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Canton City Board of Education is opposed to any form, or amount, of Federal aid to education, and respectfully requests our Senators and Congressmen to oppose with all their influence any attempt to impose aid and control over the traditional educational systems of our country.

Burden Must Be Shared

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the Lansing, Mich., State Journal on Friday, March 24. The article, I believe presents one of the most thoughtful discussions I have encountered of some important considerations to be borne in mind as the time approaches for legislation to implement our foreign aid program. The article follows:

BURDEN MUST BE SHARED

Many of the news stories about the programs President Kennedy has been submitting to Congress in rapid fire succession have one thing in common.

There frequently appears in such news dispatches from Washington the statement that the President put no overall price tag on his program.

This was the case with reports of Mr. Kennedy's foreign aid message to Congress Wednesday.

The President recommended a drastically revamped long-term foreign aid program which would include $7.3 billion in 5-year loan authority to meet "the crucial decade of development" abroad.

While no figure was given for the total cost to the taxpayers of a 5-year program, officials figured that total would be several times the $7.3 billion proposed for economic development loans overseas.

This would be true if annual foreign aid spending continues at the rate it has in the past.

Mr. Kennedy has proposed for the coming year a program equaling the $4 billion asked by former President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

There was no indication of any scaling down on annual foreign aid spending in the President's statement that the 1960's offer a golden chance to put more than half of the peoples in underdeveloped lands on their own feet economically and the rest closer to the day when they no longer need aid.

On the contrary, Mr. Kennedy seems to have in mind an ambitious extension of his New Frontier program far beyond American shores.

There are some attractive features in Mr. Kennedy's proposals.

Putting most existing economic aid programs under a single agency, as recommended by the President, could lead to more effective coordination in the interests of efficiency and economy.

Especially welcome is the emphasis which he places on helping nations which evidence a determination to help themselves.

The granting of special aid favors to nations which undertake social an economic reforms is likely to be criticized as an effort by the United States to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries.

No country is forced to accept American aid, however, and no one can fairly challenge the right of the United States to recognize self-help as a factor in the dispensing of foreign air.

If special favors are granted countries which do help themselves to the best of their ability, it follows that aid should be withheld from any nations which might be found to be using it as a source of graft and lush living by officials.

The United States should, as Mr. Kennedy proposes, encourage other industrial nations to share more of the aid burden.

There is likely to be strong opposition in Congress to the proposed 5-year loan program which would bypass congressional appropriations procedures.

Former President Eisenhower had been rebuffed on similar counts by key legislators in the past.

Congress could understandably prefer to retain year-by-year control, based upon changing conditions and needs, in spite of the arguments advanced in support of long-term loan commitments.

As Congress considers Mr. Kennedy's recommendations it should keep clearly in mind the fact that since the end of World War II this country has spent the astronomical sum of $85.8 billion to aid allies, nations which are supposedly friendly, and former enemies of the United States.

It also should be kept in mind that there is a limit to what this country can do in improving conditions in other lands.

It should be made plain to other countries that America cannot and does not intend to bear by itself the burden of aid to the free nations and that while it intends to discharge its responsibilities in the economic and military defenses of the free world it also must guard against a dangerous sapping of its own economic strength on which the preservation of freedom is so largely dependent.

Mississippi Oil Jobbers Association Testimony in Opposition to Extending Federal Gasoline Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the testimony given by Brown Williams of Philadelphia, Miss., representing Mississippi Oil Jobbers Association before the Committee on Ways and Means.

In his statement, made on March 17, Mr. Williams recommends that Congress let expire the 1 cent per gallon Federal tax on gasoline which is scheduled to expire on June 30, 1961.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF BROWN WILLIAMS, SECRETARY-TREASURER OF THE MISSISSIPPI OIL JOBBERS ASSOCIATION, 720 MILNER BUILDING, JACKSON, MISS.—BEFORE THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

My name is Brown Williams, of Philadelphia, Miss. I am appearing here at the request of Mr. H. S. Williford, of Jackson, Miss., president of the Mississippi Oil Jobbers Association, to present the views of our association regarding financing the Federal highway program. Our association is comprised of 140 independent jobbers who market a majority of the petroleum products in our State.

Personally, I have a great interest in not only our Federal highway program, but also our State highway program, as my father was chairman of the first highway commission with authority to build and maintain roads on a statewide basis in Mississippi, and served in that capacity until his death. As a member of the Mississippi legislature, I served on the House Highways and Highway Financing Committee.

We appreciate this opportunity to make this statement, and realizing the importance of your time, gentlemen, it will be brief. Attached as part of our statement—Exhibit A—is a resolution adopted at our last State convention which implements this statement. Our principal purpose in making this statement is to urge you gentlemen and other Members of Congress to give this legislation serious study as to how it will affect the economy of each of the 50 States as well as the general economy of the Nation as a whole.

Naturally, we all realize, or should realize, that the gasoline tax puts a drain on our citizens' resources, and therefore, vitally affects the consumption of our industry's No. 1 product—gasoline.

We think our industry deserves credit from its customers for a remarkable record in keeping the price of gasoline moderate, but we aren't getting that credit because of the steadily climbing gasoline taxes.

Take the period from 1950 to the end of 1959. Over that interval the price of gasoline rose only 5½ percent—that's based on the actual retail price, excluding tax. Over the same span of time, the price index for all items, according to figures compiled by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, went up 21 percent: Gasoline up 5½ percent, all items up 21 percent. To give you a few examples—milk up 27 percent, shoes up 30 percent, bread up 40 percent. While the price of gasoline moved upward by a mere 5½ percent, the national average tax on a gallon soared by 39 percent.

The Federal highway program now depends on gasoline tax revenue for over four-fifths of its support. The States, too, rely very heavily on this tax for matching funds to participate in the Federal program, for revenue for their independent highway construction projects, for financing highway administration and maintenance, and for the grants they provide for local highway work. A breakdown in gasoline tax collections could mean a breakdown in all these gasoline tax supported undertakings.

We are accustomed to hearing—as part of the ballyhoo for a gasoline tax increase—that the whole highway program will collapse (grind to a halt is the favorite phrase) if this levy isn't boosted. Economic realities must be faced, it must be recognized that putting too much strain on this one pillar can shatter it and bring all highway programs—Federal, State and local—crashing in ruins.

What an ironic twist this would be in view of what the public was told when the concept of the national highway program was first being discussed—in the mid-1950's. Then the prevailing theme was the all-around usefulness of this program—not to the motorist alone but to national defense, to civil defense, and to the economy as a whole.

From magazine advertising and other information distributed by the promoters of increased highway user taxes, the Interstate System helps industrial and other developments in the area which it serves. Therefore, there are other beneficiaries than highway users. On the other hand, the many people who may never actually use or seldom use the interstate facilities, are already paying for the construction of these roads and it would be manifestly unfair to force them to continue to pay the 4th cent of the gasoline tax, or increased automotive taxes.

For example, the 678 miles of Interstate System in Mississippi traverses 27 counties out of the 82. This means 55 counties in my State receive no direct benefit from this system of highways, only secondary benefit.

The highway financing legislation passed in 1959 that becomes effective on July 1, 1961, provides that the gasoline tax will be reduced from 4 cents to 3 cents, and in lieu thereof the highway trust fund is to receive one-half of the present 10 percent tax on new automobiles and five-eights of the tax on automotive parts and accessories. Under the present law, there will, according to Government estimates, be available for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961, an increase of more than $225 million for the Nation's highway construction program, and this estimate takes into consideration the reduction of 1 cent per gallon Federal tax as of June 30, 1961. Under the terms of this legislation, $690 million from the excise tax on new cars and $112 million from taxes on automobile parts will be earmarked for roadbuilding when the Federal gasoline tax drops back to 3 cents. This means that some $802 million a year in automotive excises will go to the highway fund instead of the general fund as of July 1, 1961.

What is the answer? The answer has been suggested time and again, and was proposed in legislation introduced in both houses of Congress in 1959. The forthright and practical answer is to earmark for the national highway program all the revenue from special Federal taxes collected from motor vehicle owners. Then the Federal gasoline tax could be cut back to 3 cents per gallon, the program could sail along smoothly on schedule, and the Federal Government would not be jeopardizing both its own highway plan and the plans of the States by leaning too heavily on one tax.

But even if it is decided to give the motorists no more than halfway justice, and, while continuing to make him solely responsible for financing the national highway program, at least give him credit for all the special Federal automotive taxes he pays. It will be asked: If revenue from the excise tax on new automobiles, from the other half of the truck tax and from the tax on parts and accessories were taken away from the general fund, where would the Federal Government get the money to fill the gap?

If we get into questions like this, it should occur to someone to ask: Where is the motorist going to get the money to pay the kind of gasoline taxes all levels of Government are loading on him? And, to also ask: If the motorist takes the other way out by buying a smaller economy-size car, and both Federal and State gasoline tax receipts start going into a tailspin—then Government agencies are certainly going to have to look for some other financing solution. But then it will be too late. Then our present automotive industry will have suffered severe damage, and the magnficent highways projected by the 1956 act will be monuments to fiscal folly, mocked by the traffic of compact cars toddling along massive expressways.

SUMMARY

Our association is for:

1. Terminating the temporary 4th cent of the Federal gasoline tax, on June 30 of this year.

2. Maintenance of primary responsibility in State governments for construction, maintenance, administration and policing highways.

3. Continued investigation into highway construction programs to avoid unnecessary waste and costs.

Our association is against:

Any increase of the gasoline tax or other highway use taxes as long as the Federal excise taxes on automobiles, trucks and their use are used for purposes other than highways.

The oil jobbers of our State want good roads. They want serviceable roads that will get the motoring public where it wants to go with a minimum of delay and inconvenience, but, like everything else in life, the extent of investment in roads should be kept in balance with the investment in all other essential functions of Government. In short, we believe the combined State and Federal gasoline taxes have already reached the point where our people are being forced to drive less and to buy compact cars to minimize the burdensome taxes. The net effect now is decreasing revenues in many areas.

RESOLUTION ON FEDERAL GASOLINE TAX

Whereas when Congress increased the Federal gasoline tax in 1959 it was understood that this would be a temporary measure, and that the added 1 cent of tax would expire on June 30, 1961, to be replaced by portions of the Federal automotive taxes not now being applied to the national highway program; and

Whereas over the protests of motor vehicle owners, Congress increased the Federal gasoline tax by 33 percent in 1959, but with a pledge to the Nation's car and truck owners that this added 1-cent per gallon levy would last no longer than 21 months; and

Whereas the national highway program—said to be the costliest public works undertaking in human history—is being financed entirely, at the Federal level, by taxes on motor vehicle owners, and nearly 85 percent of the program's support now comes from the Federal tax on gasoline; and

Whereas the national highway program was presented to the public as being essential to the national defense and the Nation's economic well-being, but its entire cost has been loaded on one group of taxpayers—the motor vehicle owners; and

Whereas military requirements, particularly the transportation of missile-carrying vehicles, have caused the Bureau of Public Roads to increase the vertical bridge clearances for structures on the Interstate System to 16 feet—from the previous 14 feet—meaning an added cost of nearly $1 billion to raise already completed bridges and those to be built in the future, a purely defense expenditure to be borne by the motorists; and

Whereas Federal taxes imposed on gasoline and on motor vehicle ownership and use now cost approximately $4.3 billion a year, but only about $2.7 billion of this revenue is being applied to the support of the Federal share of the national highway program; and

Whereas in addition to the Federal gasoline tax the State of Mississippi collects a tax of 7 cents per gallon, and collects a State sales tax of 3 percent on the price of gasoline and the Federal and State tax (tax on tax), and the cities and towns that levy one-half of 1 percent or 1 percent sales tax collect the tax on the price of gasoline and the Federal and State tax (tax on tax), thus the overall tax on gasoline in Mississippi is over 12 cents per gallon: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Mississippi Oil Jobbers Association in convention assembled this the 3d of March, 1961, in Jackson, Miss., takes this means of calling upon the Congress of the United States to keep the pledge contained in the 1959 Highway Act by letting the 1-cent increase in the Federal gasoline tax expire on the scheduled date, June 30, 1961, and by rejecting any and all proposals for further increases in this excessive tax, and be it further

Resolved, That wide circulation be given to this resolution so that the issue may be publicized and the car and truck owners of the State be alerted to the necessity of taking a firm stand on this matter now.

Minimum Wage Increase

SPEECH
OF
HON. JACOB H. GILBERT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3935) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, to increase the minimum wage under the act to $1.25 an hour, and for other purposes.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, a cruel and vicious blow was struck against millions of underpaid and unprotected workers of our Nation when the minimum wage legislation which the President requested was defeated in the House of Representatives.

I would have preferred a direct increase in minimum wage to $1.25 now, and in January of this year reintroduced my bill which so provided. However, the committee bill; H.R. 3935, embodied the President's proposals, ar.d while it represented a compromise, it was felt that it was the best bill on which we could hope to get favorable action. The bill would have provided much needed relief not only to workers, but also would have given the economy of our Nation a boost. Increased wages make possible increased spending by consumers, thus benefiting all segments of our economic structure.

At the last moment, in order to avert defeat, a second compromise bill was offered by the House leadership, for which I voted, and when this was defeated by the Republican-Southern-Democratic coalition, all hopes for even a reasonable, moderately helpful bill fled. In order to provide at least some assistance to our underpaid workers, which they must have in order to exist in view of present alltime high living casts, I was forced to vote in favor of the Republican-backed bill, which is totally unrealistic and unsatisfactory to me. The bill, which raises the minimum wage to only $1.15 for the 24 million employees now covered and which would grant coverage to only 1,400,000 workers formerly uncovered, does not begin to correct the tragic predicament of the vast majority of our workers.

For years, there has been overwhelming evidence of the need for strong, equitable, humanitarian minimum wage legislation, and necessary amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act have been long overdue.

The scaled-down coalition substitute which we were forced to accept, is in my opinion, a betrayal of the workers of our country, and is a grave disappointment to me. The House of Representatives has failed in its duty to the many millions who have looked to us for the assistance they sorely need. It is hoped that the Senate will come to the rescue and pass a much more satisfactory bill, so that when a new minimum wage bill is passed in its final form, by the Congress, it will more nearly approach the kind of legislation which our workers merit and to which they have long been entitled.

New Policies for Philately at the Post Office Department, an Address by James F. Kelleher, Special Assistant to the Postmaster General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, because it is clearly reflects the new policies and attitudes which will guide the Post Office Department under Postmaster General J. Edward Day, I wish to commend to the attention of Members a speech concerning policies in philately by James F. Kelleher, Special Assistant to the Postmaster General, given March 18 in New York at the Interpex exhibit. Mr. Kelleher, who comes to his new post from South Bend, Ind., brings valuable experience in newspaper and public relations work and represents the qualities of youth, vigor, and competence which have been called the hallmark of President Kennedy's administration.

The text of the address follows:

SPEECH BY SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE POSTMASTER GENERAL, JAMES F. KELLEHER, BEFORE THE INTERPEX EXHIBITION, NEW YORK, N.Y., MARCH 18, 1961

Ladies and gentlemen, misrepresentation of myself, this administration, and our stamp program will definitely not be the approach which Postmaster General J. Edward Day will take to philately during the administration of President Kennedy.

As for myself, I make abundantly clear that since my very amateurish childhood efforts, I have not been a collector.

My responsibilities in my new post are varied and interesting, but philately should not and cannot be the major preoccupation of my department.

Mr. Day believes, as I do, that we have a great potential in the reservoir of professional talents in all fields which are represented by the career service. Wherever and whenever the career service can supply specialized talent we intend to utilize it to the utmost and give to career personnel of the Post Office Department the authority commensurate with their responsibilities.

This approach the Postmaster General will take toward management, mechanization, personnel, and most explicitly toward philately.

We have announced our firm intention to limit commemorative stamps to 15 per year. This is not a hope but a promise of the Department.

COMMEMORATIVE STAMP AN HONOR

But more important than this fact is the thinking behind it. We believe a commemorative stamp is an unique honor bestowed by the Government of the United States. For this reason, we believe its subjects should be of broadest possible national interest in either the contemporary or historic vein.

For this reason, we believe that our stamps should represent the best in design and production.

For this reason, we believe our stamps should take advantage of the maximum capabilities of those most expert in the field.

With this in mind, we will soon name a Citizens Stamp Advisory Committee whose membership will give us the breadth of judgment and depth of experience in numerous areas of competence which influence the subject matter, character and beauty of the stamp we will issue.

We have not rushed into the selection of this committee in spite of our desire to have it functioning as quickly as possible until we can assure ourselves of the kind of membership that will be most advantageous to the Department and to philately.

I might add that the Postmaster General will rely heavily upon the judgment of this committee on the final selection of all stamps in our annual program.

DIRECTOR OF PHILATELY

I might also add that the Department will be represented on the committee by Mr. Franklin R. Bruns, Jr., who will function fully as our Director of Philately—will serve as our liaison between my office and the Chairman of the Citizens Stamp Committee elected by its membership.

To carry out the recommendations of the committee we will name, we feel very strongly that the full creative talents of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing should be utilized to a greater extent than has been possible in recent years.

We are equally convinced that the interest of the Post Office Department and Philately will best be served by a thorough exploration of the full capabilities of our Giori press equipment which, I am convinced, have never been completely realized.

Our stamps will be designed to take advantage of the multicolor, color blends and color paper combinations available to us.

The Bureau will not be asked to attempt the adaptation of design to equipment; rather our artists will be asked to create designs with a full prior knowledge of the potentials of the Giori.

It is our belief that this approach will result in fine stamp designs produced in the finest possible way.

Inevitably I have been exposed to the varying opinions of the potential of the Giori press production methods. Over a period of many weeks, I have investigated pros and cons of this issue with a basis of many years' experience in the graphic arts.

It is my firm conclusion, graphically demonstrated by test work now being printed for the guidance of our designers, that given adequate time our presses will produce work that will amaze and delight you with its beauty of craftsmanship.

We are also convinced that the best steel engravers and designers will be found at the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. We will give them the opportunity to do their job as they best know it.

CIVIL WAR COMMEMORATIVES

They are now at work, for example, on designs for Civil War Commemoratives that will not appear for 1, 2, 3, or even 4 years. They are designing them to take full advantage of the largely unrecognized potential of our press equipment, with leisure to refine and polish within the full scope of creative opportunity.

I am fully confident that their work in the future will justify the faith which the Postmaster General and myself have placed in them. With the same confidence, optimistic predictions can be made for the men specializing in production and our Giori presses.

When outside artists are called upon to supplement the design work of the Bureau, our first step will be to fully brief them on the requirements of design, engraving, and color necessitated by available facilities. This will permit them to prepare their design on an intelligent basis.

Against this factual background, let me express a few more general ideas regarding the program on which we have embarked and upon which we earnestly solicit your comment and suggestion.

We are aware of the tremendous cultural and artistic interests of the hobby which you so impressively represent at this show.

We are also aware that the commemorative stamp program is a profitmaking aspect of the Post Office Department and you are aware, I am certain, that philately must of necessity be a subordinate function in our Department—subordinate to our responsibilities of moving 65 billion pieces of mail annually.

In assessing the Department's planning, its programs, the Postmaster General and his staff are putting the emphasis on improved management, efficiency, economy, and a realistic appraisal of each phase of our operation. Philately has gotten its share of reevaluation.

PHILATELIC PROGRAM PROFITABLE

Delighted as any of us might be to discuss huge but vague profit figures in philately, I think we can all appreciate that realistically the philatelic program produces a profit to the Department of approximately $3 million per year.

I cite this figure not to disparage higher estimates sometimes called up, but to emphasize the need for a realistic appraisal of the relative functions of the Post Office considered from the standpoint of efficient management.

I think we should agree that both philately and the Post Office Department suffer when large numbers of commemorative issues force the adoption of production standards below the level which we naturally would like to attain.

There are other changes which will interest you in our program.

All future printings of the U.S. stamps will be in units of 50 to 100. This stamp utilization will be in the best interest of the Department, its personnel and philately, in our opinion.

Champions of liberty, if continued by our committee, will be issued only in 4-cent commemorative denominations.

Our basic printing order for commemorative stamps will be reduced from 120 million to 100 million.

Again, realistic management based on an accurate appraisal of average present demand suggest that this step, too, will be in the interest both of the Department and philately.

In the same vein, we will insist as rigidly as we can on our 5-day in advance provision for first day covers.

COOPERATION WITH USIA

We have initiated a program in cooperation with USIA, which will distribute our philatelic news and information throughout the world in some 23 native languages.

For the press, our philatelic news will be presented on distinctive and readily identifiable new philatelic release forms.

Let me add here a personal note. My necessarily limited contact with philatelists to date has been both enjoyable and stimulating.

I am here tonight because we of the new postal administration want to extend and deepen this relationship with all collectors and the organizations they represent. I will, however, ask one favor of you. I hope you will appreciate, as we must, that the primary function of our Department, the Postmaster General and those of us who have the privilege of serving on his staff is to expedite the delivery of the mail to everyone in this country. Secondarily, a hope that our services to philately will be constructive and useful.

I hope that as we embark on a New Frontier of commemorative issues that we may merit your support, attract your suggestions and therefore be enabled to consider your constructive criticisms.

Postmaster General Day and I will consider that we have made a contribution in this field if, at the end of our administraton, you can say we have made your hobby a more enjoyable one, and therefore a more popular one.

Mr. Speaker, I should also like to insert in the RECORD a column by Ernest A. Kehr from the February 26, 1961, New York Herald Tribune entitled, "Stamp News: Kelleher Has Some New Ideas":

STAMP NEWS: KELLEHER HAS SOME NEW IDEAS

(By Ernest A. Kehr)

He may not know too much about the philatelic aspects of postage stamps, but James F. Kelleher last Wednesday impressed this writer with his knowledge of the requirements necessary to produce such as will be a credit to the United States. Mr. Kelleher has been selected by Postmaster General J. Edward Day as his special assistant. Among his duties will be the chairmanship of a committee which will consider future stamp issues and decide upon the designs that will be engraved on them.

According to his own admission while visiting the Herald Tribune, he has been saturating himself "with the fundamentals of stamps and getting acquainted with philatelic personalities in an effort to come up with a program that will do credit to the department as it develops goodwill in stampdom's circles."

As part of this aim he visited the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, that division of the Treasury Department which produces U.S. stamps under contract to the Post Office Department. Unlike most of his predecessors since James A. Farley's day, he had a meeting with the Bureau's Director and staff to obtain their views and "was amazed to discover that they rarely ever had been consulted in such matters although these are the men who know most about the subject."

Mr. Kelleher stated that "as long as we have such know-how within the Government" he sees no reason why the Department should have to go to commercial fields "to obtain all designs that will appear of stamps made by processes whose techniques require skills few nonengravers have."

FIFTEEN STAMPS A YEAR

After the conference he concluded that "about 15" stamps could be issued each year without unduly taxing the output potential of the Bureau, its personnel and printing equipment. He also indicated that he is completely aware of the time necessary properly to engrave a stamp die. He plans to give "the Bureau enough advance notice so the engravers can create a die that will meet their own high standards of perfection."

Mr. Kelleher intends to continue the idea of a citizens advisory committee such as had been functioning for 5 years until January 20. But its "membership will be confined to an absolute minimum, and based on knowledge of the individual in his particular field."

There probably will be only three representatives from the stamp world and one qualified art critic. One innovation will be the addition of an "eminent historian" whose job it will be to pass upon "the historical importance of a stamp suggestion and the accuracy of its subject." This, he hopes, will obviate the possibility of having to issue stamps for events that have little national or international significance, regardless of "how much political pressure is put upon the Department for special commemoratives."

NUMBER OF IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. Kelleher has already set in motion a number of other improvements in Post Office Department procedures which affect stamp collectors. Among them is the modernization of press releases distributed in connection with new issues. Until now, these releases have been far inferior in contents and appearance to those turned out by many foreign administrations.

In addition to supplying the technical description of future stamps, these soon will emphasize their purpose and serve as instruments of propaganda. Except in unusual cases, no release dates will be placed on them so they may be published upon receipt by editors. As soon as possible they will be printed in the major foreign languages that they may be more widely understood and used by the editors of publications abroad whose knowledge of English may be limited. This is hoped to give U.S. stamps wider publicity abroad and increase demand for them.

Mr. Kelleher's aims are ambitious, but considering how much he has learned in less than 5 weeks, and what measures he already has taken in the direction he wants to go, he may have a program which might revolutionize the Department's relations with philately and philatelists.

Highways in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, in the hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means on the highway trust fund

reference was made by a witness to a letter addressed to the President by Governor Rockefeller. In order that the exchange of correspondence might be completely available, it is my privilege to include herein the reply to that letter sent by the President. It follows:

MARCH 14, 1961.

Hon. NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER,
Governor of the State of New York,
Executive Chamber, Albany, N.Y.

DEAR GOVERNOR: I want to thank you for your letter of March 5 in response to my telegram of February 15 urging action to stimulate employment and invigorate the economy.

In my special message of February 28, I recommend to Congress a fiscally sound method of completing the 41,000-mile Federal Interstate Highway System on time by 1972 without violating the pay-as-you-go principle, with which you have often stated your agreement. To meet this completion date set by the 1956 act requires additional authorizations of $11,560 million and additional revenues to the trust fund of $9,740 million. The legislation I have recommended accomplishes this goal.

In your letter you indicate that New York is able to proceed even faster and suggest Congress "authorize individual States to draw on their Federal highway fund allocations as rapidly as they can provide matching funds." This would involve repeal of the Byrd amendment and open-ended deficit financing, or, in the alternative, greatly increasing proposed highway user taxes.

The acceleration program I have proposed will increase the Federal highway expenditures by almost $1 billion per year and reaches the full extent fiscally sound at this time. If New York wishes to go even faster, the Highway Act (23 U.S.C. 115) allows you to do so. A State may finance total projects costs currently and be reimbursed from its Federal allocation for a subsequent fiscal year. I understand that Connecticut and several other States have already accelerated their Federal highway programs under this procedure.

You also can further increase your share of Federal highway funds by complying with the Federal standards for control of outdoor advertising along the Interstate System. I hope you will urge the current session of the New York Legislature to take such action—and also join me in urging Congress to extend the billboard control provision (as U.S.C. 131) for another 4 years and increase the incentive bonus from one-half to 1 percent of a State's allotment.

In closing, may I thank you again for having expressed such an interest in our vital Federal highway program and solicit your support for the sound method of financing I have recommended which I believe is the best for the country.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

A National Policy for the Establishment and Protection of National Parks and Monuments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the National Wildlands News of April 1961:

A NATIONAL POLICY FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT AND PROTECTION OF NATIONAL PARKS AND MONUMENTS

(This declaration of policy is a revision of the standards originally developed by the Camp Fire Club of America and endorsed by nearly a hundred organizations, including the National Parks Association. Offered by the association to help crystallize fundamental ideals, it is based on the thinking of the National Park Service and a number of organizations and individuals through the years since the establishment of the first national park in 1872. (For a history of these standards, see National Wildlands News for February, p. 4.))

DEFINITIONS

National parks

National parks are spacious land and water areas of nationwide interest established as inviolable sanctuaries for the permanent preservation of scenery, wilderness, and native fauna and flora in their natural condition. National parks are composed of wilderness essentially in a primeval condition, of areas of scenic magnificance, and of a wide variety of features. Their unexcelled quality and unique inspirational beauty distinguish them from all other areas, and make imperative their protection, through act of Congress, for human enjoyment, education, and inspiration for all time.

National nature monuments

National nature monuments are established to preserve specific natural phenomena of such significance that their protection is in the national interest; they are the finest examples of their kind, and are given the same inviolate Federal protection as the national parks. While there may be wilderness and scenery in some of the nature monuments, their primary purpose is to protect geological formations, biological features and other significant examples of nature's handiwork. The monuments differ from the parks in that they usually do not have such a wide variety of outstanding features. They may be set aside by act of Congress, but more often they are established by Presidential proclamation, under authority of the Antiquities Act of 1906.

APPLICATION OF PRINCIPLES

1. National parks and monuments are of national importance

An area is judged to merit national park or monument status and commitment to Federal care by the degree of its value and interest to the Nation as a whole. Every proposal for the establishment of a new national park or monument should be carefully examined lest it lead to the admission of an area of lesser importance, and thus form a precedent for the future admission of inferior areas which would dilute the splendor of the system. The sanctuaries should differ as widely as possible from one another, and represent a broad range of features of supreme quality.

2. Adequate area is required

National parks and national nature monuments are set aside for the enjoyment, scientific study, and permanent preservation, in a natural state, of the native plant and animal life and other features within them. Each should be a comprehensive unit embracing sufficient area for effective administration, and where the fauna and flora are of major significance, should include adequate year-round habitat.

3. Protection is based on scientific and esthetic values

Federal guardianship of national parks and national nature monuments involves sound scientific research looking to the protection of wilderness, and plant and animal life and other natural features, and it recognizes those great intangible values of inspirational beauty that make their protection imperative. The highest scientific and inspirational quality of the areas are the special, unique values of the national parks and national nature monuments. Visitor enjoyment is based on seeing and experiencing wilderness and the wonders and beauties of nature, without interference from man-made distractions. Future generations have the right to enjoy these sanctuaries unimpaired by present-day use as required by the act of 1916, establishing the National Park Service.

4. Congress intends enjoyment of unimpaired nature

When Congress adopted the act of 1916, establishing the National Park Service, it made that agency of the Government the guardian of national parks and monuments, and it charged the Service with the responsibility to "conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." Public enjoyment of the natural features of the national parks and national nature monuments is their basic reason for being; the areas are, in fact, living museums. Necessary facilities for visitors should, therefore, be constructed with the least possible alteration of the natural scene.

5. Private inholdings are being acquired

The acquisition of privately owned lands within national parks and national nature monuments is imperative to facilitate administration and protection, and to prevent intrusion of undesirable developments and activities on them. Such acquisition is being carried out as rapidly as feasible.

6. Wilderness preservation is vital

Wilderness is one of the most significant attributes of the national parks and national nature monuments, and because it is fragile and irreplaceable, it is kept inviolate and is accessible only by trail.

7. Commercial uses are destructive

The national policy recognizes no use of national parks and national nature monuments for commercial purposes, because such use would alter natural conditions and scenery, which these areas have been established to preserve. Every alteration of the natural landscape, however slight, by such activities as logging, mining, grazing, airport and railroad construction, or damming of water courses, is a direct violation of a fundamental principle of national park management.

8. Amusement attractions are inconsistent

National parks and national nature monuments are not resorts or amusement centers. The introduction of incongruous recreational features diminishes visitors' enjoyment of the basic character of the sanctuaries. Resort amusement facilities, such as golf courses, swimming pools, ski lifts, tramways, skating rinks, tennis courts, and speedboats, abundantly available elsewhere, destroy wilderness atmosphere, and defeat the purpose of visitors who wish to derive inspiration from contact with pristine nature.

9. Interpretation is the key to appreciation

Interpretive programs, with museums, adequate literature, visual aids, guided trips, and lectures, are based on the natural features of each area, and are given special emphasis by the National Park Service. The Service informs visitors about the purposes of the areas under its care, stimulates respect for the irreplaceable objects of natural and scientific interest, and emphasizes the special significance of the particular area, as

well as of the system as a whole. The National Park Service needs adequate funds to employ a sufficient staff of naturalists to serve the rapidly growing number of visitors.

10. Protection of plants and animals is fundamental

Public shooting of wildlife in national parks and national nature monuments is contrary to the basic principle that these areas are inviolable sanctuaries, and it is prohibited throughout the park and monument system. Whenever scientific research shows that a native species has become so abundant as to endanger its habitat or the survival of another native species, the National Park Service has authority to reduce its numbers. The introduction of nonnative species is contrary to the principle that the national parks and monuments are sanctuaries for native wildlife.

Sport and commercial fishing are incompatible with the concept that the national parks and monuments are inviolable sanctuaries for native fauna. Commercial fishing is prohibited, or eliminated as soon as possible. So long as sport fishing is legal, streams and lakes are stocked only when natural reproduction fails to provide enough fish for angling, and then only with species native to the area. High country lakes, where fish do not occur naturally, are not stocked.

Indiscriminate cutting of trees and shrubs and mowing of meadows, and the picking and digging of wild flowers and other plants, are contrary to the principle of inviolate protection of nature. At important overlooks along roads and trails, and at locations where people may observe outstanding manifestations of nature, thinning of vegetation sometimes may be necessary, and it is performed under trained supervision. The removal of dead or dying trees that may endanger people in areas of heavy use, also may be required at times, as in campgrounds and picnic areas, or along trails and roads.

11. Mechanical noise is an adverse intrusion

Where airfields and railroad stations exist in national parks and monuments, long-range planning looks toward their removal at the earliest time to sites outside the boundaries. Because outboard motors, Speedboats, and airplanes are a disturbing influence to those seeking the quiet serenity of nature, as well as detrimental to wildlife, they should be prohibited in national parks and monuments. Low altitude flying over national parks and monuments should be restricted to patroling, forest fire suppression, rescue, and supply service to ranger outposts that are difficult of access.

12. Roads are held to a minimum

Only such roads are built in national parks and national nature monuments as are needed to provide access to some of the principal features of the sanctuaries, and to facilitate their protection. Roads are located so they will mar scenery and natural features as little as possible, and they are constructed for leisurely driving and not for speed or commercial traffic.

13. Buildings should be designed to blend with environment

Buildings within national parks and national nature monuments are designed to be as unobtrusive as possible, and to harmonize with their surroundings. They are erected only where necessary for efficient administration and for the convenience of visitors, at locations where they will least interfere with the natural scene or, where feasible and desirable, outside the boundaries of the parks and monuments. Wherever existing facilities detract from important scenic and scientific features, every effort is being made to move them to unobjectionable sites. Long-range planning envisions the eventual removal of many hotels and lodges to sites outside the boundaries.

14. Concessions are only for necessary accommodations

Concessions in national parks and national nature monuments[1] are granted only for the necessary care of visitors, and then in restricted locations; and they are operated so as not to lower the dignity of the sanctuaries. National parks and monuments are not established and maintained to provide local or personal profit, and the installation of crowd-attracting facilities and amusements to increase concessioner revenue, or to bolster local income, is a misuse of these reservations.

15. National archeological monuments are similarly guarded

National archeological monuments, which are established specifically to protect the structures and other remains of indigenous civilization, are administered under the same principles as set forth herein for the national nature monuments, wherever these are applicable.

16. The violation of one park is a threat to all

Any infraction of these principles in any national park or monument constitutes a threat to all national parks and monuments.

---

[1] The term "national nature monument," while not official, is used here for the sake of clarity to show that the monuments under consideration are those established to preserve the wonders of nature.

Bad to Worse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARLETON J. KING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, on March 16, 1961, the President sent to Congress a message embodying his farm program. Recently, there appeared in the Saratogian, a newspaper published in Saratoga Springs, N.Y., under the editorship of Fred Eaton, an editorial which I believe should be read by each Member of the House of Representatives.

The editorial is as follows:

BAD TO WORSE

The worst suspicions of those who feared what the Kennedy administration would do to the concept of free agriculture have been confirmed by the President's farm message to Congress. And then some.

It's as if Kennedy and Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, not knowing just how to get the Nation out of the farm mess, collected all the worn-out, far-out, left-out ideas on farm control and threw them into one big pot. Out of this conglomeration, they seem to hope, something may emerge that works.

The new farm program isn't all bad, of course. There are proposals to expand consumption, boost exports, aid depressed farm areas, bolster forestry and soil conservation programs and such. These have been proper parts of agricultural policy for years.

It's in the sweeping attempt to juggle food and fiber supply against demand all while raising farm income through Federal fiat, that the new program sinks deeper into a morass of more controls, greater government costs and higher food prices.

This does more than discard the efforts of former Agriculture Secretary Benson to effect a gradual return to a free farm economy. It positively gallops in the opposite diection.

One section of the program raises the specter that every commodity produced on the farm, from Maine's potatoes to California's grapes, will go under controls. That could involve more than 200 commodities, instead of the score now subject to some kind of price support or marketing control.

According to the proposals, growers of each commodity would work out their own price support program and clear it with the Secretary of Agriculture. Congress would have a veto power but no positive control.

This would give farmers almost a blank check on the U.S. Treasury. It could lead to Government control of almost every facet of farming. That would mean higher food prices for consumers and Federal costs eclipsing the $3.5 billion now spent every year on Federal farm price and income supports.

The President doesn't foresee such results, of course. This is his way, and the way of his farm advisers, of doing something about a Democratic-created farm program that, in Kennedy's words "is drifting into a chaotic state, piling up surpluses, penalizing efficiency, rewarding inertia and noncompliance, and constantly being torn and weakened by disputes and conflicting pressures."

But Kennedy's solution is based on the mistaken notion, in our view, that the Government can fix things for the farmer by wrapping him tighter in controls. It ignores the demonstrated fact that those parts of the farm economy which are now free are generally enjoying more prosperity than those parts under control. It's blind to the inevitable revolution in agriculture; it belittles free enterprise.

The President concedes that "we cannot expect to solve the farm problem in a day or in a year or perhaps even in this administration." If his program prevails in Congress, he can add: "In this generation."

Address by John F. Morse to the Association of Virginia Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, my proposal for assistance to community junior colleges—(H.R. 16)—continues to generate increasing interest and support from around the country. Mr. John F. Morse, vice president of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute at Troy, N.Y., spoke recently to the Association of Virginia Colleges and made specific mention of the breakthrough that is being made in education through the growth of community junior colleges. I think the following excerpt from his address will be of interest to my colleagues:

Much is heard these days about talent-searching. We are told, and there is surely some truth in it, that there is a staggering waste of human resources in the failure of as many as half of our ablest young people to go on to higher education. Better guidance, bigger financial aid programs, and greater awareness are all having their effect on this. But I believe the real breakthrough is coming through the growth of community and junior colleges. I think it can be shown that the establishment of such an institution has an immediate and profound effect

on the entire area surrounding it. Youngsters who would previously have taken terminal courses in high school take college preparatory courses instead. Those who would otherwise have discarded college as economically impossible find it within reach. At the risk of seeming terribly provincial, for I know what great things are being done on the west coast, let me give you a small illustration. When in the early 1950's a community college was established in Orange County, N.Y., a rural and not very prosperous section of the State, we assisted them in planning and establishing a preengineering program that would prepare their students for the third year at R.P.I. and other comparable engineering schools. We further agreed to be liberal in accepting such students as transfers on the basis of grades the meaning of which would, in terms of our own students, be uncertain, and on the basis of the thoughtful endorsement of their dean. Since that time we have admitted 29 of their students. Five are still at Renselaer Polytechnic Institute, two of them on the dean's list, one flunked out. The other 23 have received their engineering degrees, 7 of them with honor averages, and several have gone on to graduate school. I wish we could bat this high with our freshman admissions. This may seem a tiny and insignificant example, but I think it important. For the point is that I know, because I took a particular interest in those lads, that not more than four or five of them would even have started college if it had not been for the community college. I maintain that this is genuine talent-searching and talent-development.

Let's look at it from another angle. How many institutions assign their top faculty to the work of the first 2 years? Is it not at least possible that as good teaching of elementary subject matter goes on in junior colleges as in some of our great 4-year institutions? And is it not possible that the important contribution the great institutions have to make is in the upperclass years, where the scholarly faculty meets the mature undergraduate mind? The junior college movement is going to grow and unless the private institutions encourage it and find ways of making room for the best of its product, they will, I think, be shirking their duty and making a little hollow their protestations of concern over the Nation's waste of human talent.

Proud Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, it is a real pleasure to compliment a wonderful organizations that has had 25 successful campaigns for the worthy purposes of improving the life and lot of those who need help and who are less fortunate than we are. I am particularly impressed by the fact that this effort is made by private enterprise, and the results are magnificent. It is my hope that all of the Members will join with me in wishing them well in the 26th annual campaign, and I call particular attention to the editorial that appeared in the Newark Evening News on March 26, 1961:

PROUD RECORD

The United Jewish Appeal of Essex County, which is about to launch its 26th annual campaign, has raised since 1936 more than $37 million for local, national, and oversea causes.

UJA funds have helped the people of Israel welcome a million immigrants, build homes and schools, hospitals and industries, drain swamps, irrigate the desert, reforest barren slopes, and divert rivers.

At home, the Jewish migration to the suburbs has brought new challenges to the local community organization, the Jewish Community Council, and its related health, welfare, education, and cultural services. To all these needs the Essex Jewish community has responded conscientiously. In 1936, it contributed $46,000; in 1960, $1,181,334.

UJA embarks on a new campaign, its goal $2,503,384, sustained by a proud record.

Land O'Lakes Favors Milk Sanitation Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the delegates to the 1961 annual meeting of the Land O'Lakes Creameries, Minneapolis, Minn., passed a series of resolutions pertaining to the dairy industry which have national significance. Among other things, they went on record in favor of my national milk sanitation legislation to permit the free flow of high quality milk from State to State. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include six of the resolutions in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION OF LAND O'LAKES DELEGATES

TAXATION OF COOPERATIVES

Land O'Lakes reaffirms its position that net margins of a cooperative returned to patrons on a patronage basis in any form (cash, certificates of equity, or allocated book credits) are income in the hands of the patron in the year of the distribution and are not income of the cooperative making the distribution. Such margins should not be taxed to the cooperative but be included in the computation of tax of the recipient. This is in accord with the clear intent of Congress. It is consistent with the basic concept of a cooperative as a nonprofit institution in which any income above operating costs rightfully belongs to member patrons.

We request that Congress enact into law the substance of the Internal Revenue regulations first promulgated on patronage dividends after the passage of the 1951 Act of Congress so that the courts will have clear instruction regarding cooperative patronage refunds.

PRICE SUPPORT FOR MILK

A goal for dairy farmers in the United States is to produce sufficient milk to provide: first, high standards of milk and dairy product consumption for all Americans; second, the quantity of manufactured dairy products needed as a tool for improving international relations; and third, an adequate supply for foreign trade.

1. Exportation of dairy products provides a means for settlement of international debts using money earned by exports instead of gold.

2. The conversion of larger quantities of feed grain into animal and poultry products for human food improves living standards and also reduces feed grain surpluses. Milk price supports which stabilize farmers' incomes and encourage conversion of feed grains into dairy products are therefore desirable.

3. Efficient farmers should produce adequate supplies of milk at prices which are not inflationary, but such farmers should receive income and economic opportunity equal to other citizens on a comparable basis.

4. The means for distribution of the needed milk supply is inadequate; consequently, prices falter. It is necessary, therefore, that price supports be continued until adequate distribution systems have been developed both at home and internationally.

In consideration of these several desirable objectives, it is recommended that the prices at which manufactured dairy products are purchased by the price-supporting agency of the Government should yield a price for milk not less than $3.35 per hundred pounds.

STANDARDS FOR IMPORTED PRODUCTS

It is neither equitable, economical, nor right that milk or manufactured dairy products from foreign countries should be permitted to enter the United States for use by domestic consumers when such products are manufactured under conditions not acceptable within the United States. Standards of composition and purity for imported dairy products are often different than those imposed on domestic producers. Often standards of purity for imported products do not exist. Whenever laws or regulations prescribing labeling, packaging, sanitation, composition or other standards with respect to production or use are applicable to producers within the United States, the Secretaries of the Treasury and of Helath, Education, and Welfare should be required to apply similar standards to products imported. Each imported dairy product should conform to standards of sanitation, composition, and purity developed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

We recommend that the Secretary of Agriculture promulgate standards of sanitation, composition, and purity for all dairy products imported consistent with the quality of milk used for manufacturing dairy products in the United States.

IMPORT QUOTAS

The quantitative determination of import quotas under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act has become unrealistic and quotas for products are increased when such products compete with other farm products included under price support programs. We recommend that section 22 be amended in such a way as to make import quotas mandatory whenever products imported are in competition directly or indirectly with domestically produced products included under any legalized national price support program.

MARKETING AGREEMENT AND FEDERAL ORDERS

Procedures for marketing milk under marketing agreements have brought order out of confusion in many milk markets. More recently, however, the knowledge and practices in production, transportation, and distribution of fluid milk have made it feasible to transport milk greater distances and across State lines for the supply of urban populations. Milk pricing also should be related to prices at the source of the milk supply and the location of the market. Class prices should be related not only to the cost factors in producing an adequate supply of pure and wholesome milk, but also to costs of producing and distributing products.

We recommend that the Congress increase the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture in dealing with the marketing of milk, particularly in those areas where State milk control legislation produces rules and regulations which are inconsistent with the public interest and the interest of milk producers in adjacent areas. The principles set up by the Secretary in the handling of milk should not be made inconsistent through the exercise of local authority.

NATIONAL UNIFORM SANITARY STANDARDS FOR MILK

Municipalities, counties, States, and other governmental units rely more and more on the sanitary standards and code of the U.S. Public Health Service in the formulation of sanitary regulations for milk and dairy products. Such regulations have demonstrated their adequacy and usefulness over a wide area and for many years. Such regulations are consistent for the best interest of farmer producers of milk and the best interests of consumers.

Land O'Lakes favors mandatory legislation applicable to all milk shipped in interstate commerce prescribing the uniform sanitary standards for milk recommended by the U.S. Public Health Service. Such standards should be administered by qualified personnel, presently available through the local units to whom these personnel usually report, but under the supervision and control of the U.S. Public Health Service.

Resolution of the City of Swartz Creek, Mich.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the current debate between economists as to whether or not the slump has yet hit bottom seems to me to be a largely academic question. What matters is that large amounts of unemployment exist throughout the Nation. Instead of talking about a lot of statistics as to the number of people in need of work, I believe we should take some positive action toward curing the cause rather than the effect of unemployment.

I have introduced legislation to repeal the automobile excise tax which would doubtlessly result in increased sales and auto production and have the overall effect of bolstering the economy of our Nation. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to inform my colleagues of another expression of support for my bill, H.R. 3647, contained in a resolution passed by the City Council of the City of Swartz Creek, Mich.:

CITY OF SWARTZ CREEK, MICH.,
March 13, 1961.

Whereas the economy of the great State of Michigan is suffering from a general recession in business activity; and

Whereas the economy of Michigan depends heavily on the automobile industry; and

Whereas at the beginning of the Korean conflict, a Federal tax was levied on all automobiles; and

Whereas the Korean conflict has all but ended several years ago, but the Federal tax on new cars has not yet been repealed; and

Whereas the tax on new automobiles increases the cost of a new car enough to delay or discourage such purchases with a resultant slump in the economy of Michigan: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Council of the City of Swartz Creek, That the elected Representatives to the Congress of the United States be requested to make every effort to have the Federal tax on new cars repealed at an early date, so that the economy of the United States and Michigan particularly will be stimulated by the sale of new automobiles; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the elected Representatives of the State of Michigan with the request that they work toward repeal of the Federal tax on automobiles.

For Philadelphia Visitors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Members to a well-written article appearing in March 25, 1961, issue of United States Review, one of the leading insurance journals in Philadelphia, regarding the famous Science Museum of the Franklin Institute.

The Franklin Institute aids our Government through research. I believe that this report will enlighten readers on the value of the institute and will explain why it is one of the reasons why so many visitors come to the city of Philadelphia:

FOR PHILADALPHIA VISITORS

This summer millions of Americans will be on the move—enjoying their travel vacations. Several hundred thousand of these Americans, including insurance men who will attend the eastern agents' conference and midyear meeting of the National Board of State Directors of the National Association of Insurance Agents in mid-April, have already set their 1961 vacation sights on Philadelphia and especially on the world-famous Science Museum of the Franklin Institute.

There they will briefly stand in awe before the heroic marble statue of another well-traveled American—Benjamin Franklin, in the Institute's Memorial Hall. After a visit with Ben, they'll probably take a walk through the biggest heart in the world—15,000 times bigger than their own—listen to its beat, and marvel at the durable structure of all hearts. From large to small, the mechanical-minded will study the mechanical perfection of the Chambers steam engine, a working model of a horizontal engine which was made from a sterling silver spoon just a little smaller than their thumb.

Then, these inveterate, traveling Americans may look at some of the means of travel in the various transportation halls of the Science Museum. In the hall of aviation, they may marvel at the daring of flyers of 50 years ago when they see an original Wright brothers airplane. Then, too, they may try a little flying themselves in a Link trainer, "high above the city" yet only a few feet from the floor.

Far from home, these traveling vacationers may think of phoning home just to assure themselves that they did leave a note for the milkman. For them, there is the telephone room where they may laugh at the sound of their own voice talking back to them, or learn how their phone call rushes with the speed of light, via microwave transmission, back to their home.

In the railroad room, there is a bit of nostalgia in the No. 60,000. Here, inside the building is one of the biggest steam locomotives they'll ever see: 350 tons of steel, over a hundred feet long, huge and black and ready for the visitor to operate himself. Over several yards of high iron, the man from Portland or the lass from Grand Fork will, for a short time, become an engineer. For the nautical-minded midwesterner, there is the marine room where he may stand at the helm on a full-size ship's bridge and guide his own, personal liner over the seven seas. Here, too, the steamers, the pleasure boats and their uses are told in model form. And there is a model of a curious thing called an Amphibolus Oruktor, America's first combination automobile-steamship-truck-dredge, dated 1805.

In this amazing science museum there are complete and elaborate stories of the production of steel—from mine to its multiple uses. And for the southwesterners, there will be a bit of home in the big exhibit, "The Story of Oil." The story of how steel and stainless steel are formed and welded into all the fantastic shapes of automobiles, railroad cars, and refrigerator doors also is told. For the northwesterner there is a bit of remembrance, too, in "The Story of Paper." Here, the story of that prime necessity to American life—from the forests to the home—is told in a large exhibit hall. Other stories are told and questions answered.

How do you make a magazine? There's an exhibit on that too, along with stories of manmade lightning, atomic energy, printing, and a multitude of other parts of our technological civilization.

When his time grows short, the vacationer may want to check his watch. He may do so by consulting a Chinese water clock, King Alfred's candle, or the very latest in electric wrist watches in the time exhibit.

From there, it is but a step to the largest public observatory in the world, where the travelers from the 50 States (and from almost all of the countries of the world) may fix their eyes to one of several large telescopes and observe the timelessness of the heavenly bodies.

Recently the museum has added a "venture into space room" which features a display showing current positions of all known satellites. On display also is one of the complicated space suits.

The Franklin Institute aids the Government through research. In its laboratories located behind and nextdoor to exhibits it is studying how and astronaut might use star radiations as his compass and speedometer when he is midway on a long space journey. This and other technical problems are studied both at the laboratories on the Benjamin Franklin Parkway and at the Bartol Research Foundation in nearby Swarthmore, Pa.

The Government is not the only one to use these research and development facilities. The laboratories also work for foundations and a great variety of industries to solve problems that range from glaucoma-detection to development of adding machines and nuclear reactors.

There is also the hall of chemistry with a periodic table that answers questions when a button is pushed. In this hall many visitors are attracted to an "odor bar" where they test their sense of smell on various odors.

These Americans on vacation in Philadelphia's Franklin Institute Science Museum would miss one of the best parts of their

visit if they didn't sit in the Institute's Planetarium and marvel at the stately procession of the heavenly bodies across the cloudless, stainless steel sky. There, the stars in all of their glory, from millions of years in the past to billions of years in the future, move at the wave of the lecturer's hand.

Health Hazards From Agricultural Chemicals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the attached article entitled "Health Hazards from Agricultural Chemicals" by Dr. Francis M. Pattenger, Jr., which appeared in Let's Live magazine:

HEALTH HAZARDS FROM AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS

(By Francis M. Pottenger, Jr., M.D.)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following is from a talk, presented September 16, 1960, at Los Angeles, before the Governor of California's special committee on agricultural chemicals.)

Pesticide poisoning from agricultural products is not new. In the 1930's lead and arsenic were so heavily used as to constitute a real hazard and much of the summer diarrheas frequently resulted from its usage. In the mid-1930's we had an epidemic at Pottenger Sanatorium in which 80 patients were stricken with arsenic poisoning, one of whom almost lost her life. Stool samples from this epidemic as well as other occurrences were analyzed for arsenic and diagnoses established. From that time on, at the suggestion of Dr. Stone, Los Angeles County Health Department, I recommended to my patients the use of washing all fruits and vegetables first in sal soda, running water, then in vinegar, and again in running water. This method of control practically eliminated the recurrent gastrointestinal upsets which we had previously experienced. However, following World War II and the release of the chlorinated hydrocarbons pesticides (such as DDT, chlordane, lindane, etc.) to agriculture, we are confronted with a new situation. We found that the simple washing with sal soda and vinegar no longer was effective, and again we began to see gastrointestinal problems.

PARTICULARLY HAZARDOUS

Among the fruits and vegetables that we found particularly hazardous were apples, pears, and many of the leafy vegetables. We sent several samples to the State for analysis with the reports that pesticides were present within legal limits.

There were certain things that were noticeable in these early cases, namely, patients would frequently state that they ate something, usually salad, or a fruit, which caused a burning in the throat and was accompanied within the next few hours with a gastrointestinal upset and, on numerous occasions, in about 10 days to 2 weeks with a pulmonary episode.

FINDINGS IN FAT SAMPLES

Over the years I have taken numerous fat samples and I find that the general average of chlorinated hydrocarbon storage in the fat of my patients today is much higher than it was formerly. For that reason it is very difficult to establish that a given episode of burning in the throat, gastrointestinal upset, diarrhea, exhaustion, cough, disturbances in locomotion, etc., which I frequently see, is due to a recent chlorinated hydrocarbon exposure. They may have had considerable in their food beforehand. (There are very few people in my practice who have not had numerous gastrointestinal upsets since the first of the year.) But, on the basis of information obtained prior to the widespread use of these chemicals, it was possible to assume with a reasonable degree of certainty that the accumulation of organic chloride in the fat was from immediate origin. Now, one can only infer that the episode was acute and probably of pesticide origin.

It has been my general finding that the degree of storage of chlorinated hydrocarbons in the fats of individuals is increasing over the years, which would correspond to the finding of Hays, et al., who reported that it is impossible to get a meal without having some pesticide in it.

I have cared for patients who have been poisoned by chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides both from agriculture usage and domestic. The most successful elimination of chlorinated hydrocarbon from a given individual occurred in a woman nursing her infant, and during this period lactation she dropped her titer of fat 30 parts per million to 0. She lived in an agricultural area and suffered as a result of agricultural sprays.

GREATER STORAGE

I do know that the public is showing greater storage of chlorinated hydrocarbons in their fat and that if we are similar to experimental animals, over a 10- to 20-year span of our life we may expect to see serious detrimental effects. As a clinician, it is my opinion that chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticide poisoning is a chronic poisoning that affects different individuals differently; that the storage rate depends upon the oxidative level of the individual, such as the low metabolic hysterectomized female who shows far greater storage than her highly active husband, who is carrying on vigorous activity in the open air; that individuals, who have as high a titer as 100–300 parts per million DDT or equivalent in their fat, can go on for weeks and months, possibly years, without difficulty. But if they miss meals or are under a physiological strain of illness or partial starvation which causes them to utilize their own fat, they can be thrown into acute, pesticide poisoning from the chlorinated hydrocarbons stored in their fat. In the same manner as the diabetic may shows signs of hyperinsulinism, if he rapidly drops from a blood sugar of 300 to 185, and can be thrown into shock.

SERIOUS INJURIES

Sensitive people have been seriously injured by community spraying of trees, such as the precipitation of asthmatic attacks and extreme exhaustion. The drift from the crop dusting by airplanes cannot be controlled, and it has been necessary for me to recommend to some of my patients to leave agricultural areas during the season of heavy dusting, or to equip their homes with extensive and expensive mechanical air conditioning and filtering, for both particulate matter and chemical contamination, in order to enable them to live (as hermits) within their necessary environment.

I have had innocent patients who were driving along major highways run into a cloud of agricultural spray, become completely incapacitated, followed by a pesticide pneumonia, which continued to disturb them for not only the duration of the spraying but for a prolonged time afterward.

OFFERS SUGGESTIONS

Inasmuch as Lehman, et al., showed that pigeons could not be housed in rooms that had been sprayed sometime previously with chlordane, one of the chlorinated hydrocarbons; and inasmuch as it has been shown in experimental animals that the increase in the storage of the chlorinated hydrocarbons in their tissues interferes with their general metabolism including their reproduction, and alters their longevity; inasmuch as it has been shown by many workers that there is a continual increase in storage in the fatty tissues and structures of the body, especially the brain, adrenals, liver, and the fat depots; and inasmuch as there is no positive information to date as to the longtime effect of such storage on the population in general, it would appear to me any such toxic material should be eliminated from the environment. I would like to make the following suggestions:

1. That any application of a pesticide, such as the chlorinated hydrocarbons that can in any way escape the locality where it is applied, such as the spraying of trees, markets, etc., in cities, and aerial spraying in agricultural areas, or by any other means in which the drift cannot be controlled, should be prohibited.

2. That all foods that contain residual hydrocarbon pesticides should be so labeled and the relative amount stated.

New Look at Surpluses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN REIFEL
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, within a short time this body will act upon a bill to provide an additional authorization to carry out our food-for-peace program for the balance of 1961.

The American people would rather see their tax dollars being spent to advance this program than spent to finance continued storage of our abundance in Government warehouses at an average of 16 cents a bushel per year.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, it ought to be made clear that the expenditures under our food-for-peace program are part of our total foreign aid effort to strengthen friendly nations abroad. These expenditures should not be reflected as part of the Department of Agriculture budget and thus be charged to the farmer.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial on this subject appearing in the Yankton, S. Dak., Press and Dakotan, of March 20, 1961:

NEW LOOK AT SURPLUSES

All the evidence that can be mustered suggests that great farm surpluses will be with us for at least the next generation, no matter what farm programs Government devises.

That they represent a heavy drain on the U.S. Treasury is a long established fact. Increasingly, however, those concerned with the problem are trying to find a bright side.

The developing attitude seems to be: "The surpluses are going to be with us, so let's use them, and preferably abroad, where they can do the most good."

Said one agricultural specialist:

"We're a little like a guy with a million dollars. He's got problems. But there are worse ones. It's better to have too much than too little.

"What a potential weapon these reserves are for us in the world economic struggle.

Think what Khrushchev would do if he had them."

With our storage bins groaning with our excess production, no one pretends that more than a small dent has been made thus far. But there has been progress.

Our total farm exports in calendar 1960 came to a record $4.8 billion, up $800 million from the previous year. Exports of farm commodities have in fact been running consistently at high levels for several years.

Regular commercial sales and movement of farm products under the foreign aid program account for a heavy proportion of this. In addition, there has been a growing flow of crops and livestock under a law adopted in 1954 to help develop foreign markets.

This flow includes products involved in donations, barter deals, sales in foreign currencies, famine and other emergency transfers. Continuous effort is made to increase it.

All told, farm exports on the average represent about 15 percent of farmers' annual cash receipts in this country. But the net benefit to farmers may be only from a half to two-thirds of that figure since imports of comparable products partly cancel exports.

Nevertheless, their gain is a clear one. And U.S. leaders—and farm experts—seem heartened that whatever enlargement of exports has occurred has not only helped at home but has served our larger strategic and economic aims abroad.

J. T. Lykes Honored as Man of the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, Dr. J. T. Lykes, an outstanding businessman of Florida, Fla., has been selected as Man of the South for 1960 by Dixie Business magazine and its publisher, the Honorable Hubert F. Lee, of Decatur, Ga.

Dr. Lykes and his family have left a deep imprint on his home State and the South. The Lykes family built the largest single cattle operation in Florida, the largest meatpacking plant in Florida and developed the great shipping industry which made their name.

Presentation of the Man of the South award was made at a banquet in Tampa and the occasion was given excellent coverage by Florida newspapers, including the Tampa Tribune.

Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent to insert the article from the Tampa Tribune in the Appendix of the RECORD.

J. T. LYKES HONORED AS MAN OF THE SOUTH
(By Bob Fellows)

Joseph T. Lykes, in an occasion of dignity and solemnity received the "Man of the South" award last night before several hundred of the State's top business, political, and civic leaders at a dinner here.

Head of one of the world's largest steamship lines, among other interests, Lykes received the award from Dixie Business magazine, of Atlanta.

U.S. Senator SPESSARD HOLLAND told the group Lykes was "a distinguished citizen * * * who has done a great deal of good, and earned in a real way this award."

LOVE OF THE NATION

The award to Lykes represented a love of the Nation, and particularly the Southland, the privilege of private enterprise, a family which succeeded in their ventures, "and a flower of appreciation and gratitude to a gentleman while he may enjoy the fragrance of that gratitude," Holland said.

HOLLAND said Lykes was the last surviving member of seven brothers who accomplished "so much for themselves, their associates, the State, and the Nation."

The Senator outlined the Lykes family's pioneer activities, saying they were not a high-hat group, but rather a typical American family.

CITES ENTERPRISES

The Lykes family built the largest single cattle operation in the State, built the largest meatpacking plant in the State near Tampa, entered into the citrus industry in a large way, and "developed the great shipping industry which made their name," HOLLAND said.

"They were seven 'cracker' boys who grasped an opportunity," he added, saying that because of the Lykes family, the Nation will never again be caught without fast and adequate merchant service during wartime.

"Just as they became great from the cattle industry and the citrus industry, they saw fit to develop a great shipping industry," HOLLAND said.

EVERY FLORIDIAN PROUD

"And it should make every American, and every citizen, and every Floridian proud."

No other American family could point to the same record, "without making great outcry, but just going ahead," the Senator said. "I can't think about, nor praise too often, the Lykes family record," he added.

Carl D. Brorein, Sr., president of General Telephone Co., acted as master of ceremonies.

Hubert F. Lee, publisher of Dixie Business magazine, made the award to Lykes, saying the industrial leader represented "fine character and Christian principle."

Lee said Lykes was named for the honor by an overwhelming majority of votes from not only business leaders in the South, but also from foreign countries.

Accepting the award Lykes said:

"The South has been blessed with superior climate, abundant natural resources, and above all—citizens of outstanding character. The South has been good to Lykes, and it is my conviction that my associates in Lykes will continue their full measure of effort in the continued progress of our Southland."

"I accept this award with deep appreciation and humility on behalf of several generation of the Lykes family, and our associates."

A trustee of Washington and Lee University, from which he graduated, Lykes holds an honorary degree of Doctor of Humanities from the University of Tampa. He is a director of Tampa Electric Co., Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co., Gulf and South American Steamship Co., and the American Merchant Marine Institute, among other important posts.

He was born in Brooksville in 1886, and is married to the former Margaret Keenan, of Galveston, Tex. They have three children, Joseph T. Lykes, Jr., of New Orleans, and two daughters, Mrs. R. C. Colton, of New York, and Mrs. John F. Carrere, of New Orleans.

Commonsense in the Congo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Marguerite Higgins in today's New York Herald Tribune, gives keen insight in how not to win in the Congo:

THE EXCITED NATIONS
(By Marguerite Higgins)

LEOPOLDVILLE.—Soviet blasts at United Nations Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold are, of course, built on lies and intended to destroy the world organization. But it is also obvious that the nefarious intentions of the Russians are no reason to rule out another and necessary kind of criticism—criticism aimed at the exposition of mistakes with a view to their correction if possible.

It should not come as a surprise to the American people that the United Nations here, being made up of countries with differing, often clashing, interests, and led by human beings whose fallibilities do not vanish with the donning of the U.N.'s blue hats, can and often does do wrong.

And the greatest mistake made by the U.N. has been to incur the hostility of the Congolese people, the Congolese Army, and the Congolese Government of President Joseph Kasavubu. The hostility is bound to continue so long as the U.N. is guilty of the attitude that brought the reaction on in the first place, its attempt to ram decisions down the throat of this Government without consultation and whether the Government likes it or not.

The comment most often heard around here from the U.N. officials is a revealing one: "The only way to handle the Congolese is to treat them as children."

Therein lies the clue to mistake No. 1. For the Congolese violently object to being treated as children, confronted with accomplished facts and actions taken in defiance of this allegedly sovereign regime's best estimate of its own national interest.

The dispatch here of Prime Minister Nehru's Indian troops is an example of an action taken by the U.N. in defiance of the publicly expressed opposition of President Kasavubu and every one of his ministers. The Congolese object for the simple reason that they believe that India, being allied to left-leaning Ghana, this country's bitter enemy, simply is not neutral.

The question of attitude begins with the reign here as director of the U.N. of Rajeshwar Dayal, an Indian national. According to dispatches printed in the local Congolese press, Mr. Dayal in a speech to U.N. corerspondents described the Congolese army as a rabble and called General Mobutu, army chief of staff, "a bandit." This press dispatch does not come as a surprise as Mr. Dayal has said the same thing often in private in Leopoldville.

And General Mobutu, who happens to be intense, hard working, intelligent and about as far from banditry as is Dayal himself, has had this to say about the news dispatch: "I had always thought it was the function of a diplomat to be diplomatic. But perhaps it is just as well that Mr. Dayal's thoughts are on the record. Perhaps it will make it

clearer why his return would be most unwelcome."

Before coming to this part of Africa, this correspondent had the occasion to interview statesmen of every single one of the new African states admitted to the U.N. The leadership of Leopoldville from President Kasavubu on down compares favorably with the best of them. Even George Washington, Alexander Hamilton, Thomas Jefferson, and Abraham Lincoln all put together would have had an incredibly difficult time trying to master the chaotic circumstances confronting this government and in many ways the wonder is that the Kasavubu regime has survived at all.

According to General Mobutu, "The mutual suspicion between ourselves and the U.N. does not need to exist. In the days when Ralph Bunche was here there was real cooperation and I am not saying that just because you are an American. But this neocolonialism—this imposition of the U.N. will irrespective of either our wish or our knowledge—can you think of any nation in the world that would welcome this? And if you Americans blindly and unconditionally go along with this policy, it cannot help in the long run but to undo the good relations we want so much to have. Has Washington really thought through the meaning of this precedent the U.N. is trying to set? Are you going to insist on carrying out a mandate from the Security Council if this mandate is against the will of the nation most concerned—the Congolese themselves? Are you Americans really anti-Communist? If you are, why do you ask us to surrender our guns to a U.N. force that so often has sided with the leftists? The whole world knows that it was the U.N. that let the rebel (Stanleyville) forces into our Kindu Province and then prohibited us from counterattacking. And you ask us not to be suspicious."

Of late the U.N. headquarters here has been dubbed the excited nations because of dire pronouncements about the perils of letting the Congolese run such things as the unloading of U.N. vessels at the port of Matadi. Yet even though the U.N. officials have not been permitted back into Matadi, the supplies including those of the U.N. are coming off the ships right on schedule under purely Congolese management.

Observed a Western diplomat: "One way of fostering a sense of sovereignty and responsibility is to treat a nation as both sovereign and responsible. It is not too late to begin."

Forty-third Anniversary of the Proclamation of Independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the Byelorussian-American Association, Inc., with national headquarters at 401 Atlantic Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y., are celebrating the 43d anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic on March 26, 1961, at the Biltmore Hotel, New York City.

It is an honor to note my sentiments on behalf of the recovery of the independence of the Byelorussian people now held in servitude under Soviet domination.

It is organizations, such as this one, whose patriotic support, together with a unified program of disseminating information as to the culture and historic significance of their contributions to the civilization of our times that instills a great admiration on the part of all Americans.

A request for a telegram, as follows, is indicative of our feelings in the sad plight of the Byelorussian Republic:

MARCH 26, 1961.

Mr. CONSTANT MIERLAK,
National President,
Byelorussian-American Association,
New York City, N.Y.:

Byelorussia's struggles to regain its freedom can be aided in purpose by establishing Byelorussian broadcasts by the Voice of America.

It is for our Government to do everything possible to further the dissemination of information among the Byelorussian people who are now under the Soviet yoke. The spirit of independence is still alive among the Byelorussians, even though the Republic with its puppet government is still smothered in the covering structure of the Soviet Union leadership. It is a sad commentary that following the 41 years of Byelorussian independence, she has suffered the loss of 6 million people in 20 years. The thousands of Byelorussian people living in the free world are carrying on the fight to acquaint the world with the plight of their compatriots, in their exploitation by Russia.

These brave people must be given courage and help in order to overcome and overthrow their Communist enemies. We must never forget Byelorussia's plight and we must show the greatest vigilance toward ultimately freeing her from the captors of her people.

Congressman ROLAND V. LIBONATI.

Ex-Ambassador Wires Protest to President on New Orleans Integration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, the President has strongly endorsed efforts to force integration of the people of New Orleans, La., although the people, themselves, have resisted every attempt to usurp their laws and traditions.

The Honorable Hugh G. Grant, a former Minister to Albania and Thailand, pointed out in a telegram to President Kennedy that the right to operate segregated schools has never been prohibited to the States by the Constitution.

Mr. Grant also reminded the President that the separation of the races had its beginning in the North. He cited the famous case of Roberts against City of Boston in which the court in 1849 upheld that city's right to maintain segregated schools.

I commend to the Members of this Congress the text of Mr. Grant's telegram and the accompanying news article that appeared in the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle on February 27, 1961:

EX-AMBASSADOR WIRES PROTEST TO PRESIDENT ON NEW ORLEANS INTEGRATION

A protest against President Kennedy's approval of efforts to integrate New Orleans public schools was wired to the President Sunday by Hugh Grant, of Augusta, former Ambassador to Albania and to Thailand.

The telegram read:

"My attention has been called to press reports today quoting you in a telegraphic message to the U.S. Civil Rights Commission meeting in Williamsburg, Va., as strongly endorsing efforts of those who are trying to carry out court-ordered integration of New Orleans public schools as follows:

" 'This is no time for schools to close for any reason, and certainly no time for schools to be closed in the name of racial discrimination. If we are to give the leadership that the world requires of us, we must be true to the great principles of our Constitution.'

"Mr. President, as a fellow alumnus of Harvard University who majored there in the study of government, I wish to suggest that you take a refresher course of study in American Government, giving particular attention to those great principles of the Constitution of the United States governing the proper relationship between the States and the Federal Government. I am sure you will discover in such a study that the right to operate racially separate schools has never been prohibited to the States by any provision of the Constitution. In this connection, may I call your attention to the significant fact that the separation of the races in the schools had its beginning in the North—not in the South. For instance, the right of your own native city of Boston, Mass., to maintain racially separate schools was upheld in the famous case of *Roberts* v. *City of Boston* in 1849.

"May I suggest further that if our so-called world leadership requires that we surrender a cornerstone of our American political structure, to the detriment of our own people, then we should take a long, hard look at the value of such leadership.

HUGH G. GRANT."

Testimonial to William F. Casey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I consider it an honor to place this speech, which was my privilege to deliver Saturday night, March 25, 1961, in Greenfield, Mass., in honor of a great American citizen, William "Bill" Casey, in the Appendix of the RECORD:

SPEECH BY THE HONORABLE SILVIO O. CONTE, GIVEN IN HONOR OF WILLIAM F. CASEY AT THE TESTIMONIAL BANQUET HELD IN GREENFIELD, MASS., SATURDAY NIGHT, MARCH 25, 1961

It gives me great pleasure to be here this evening. Above all, I consider my presence here a distinct honor. It is not often that praise can be aired in public, nor is it often that tribute is made until a man is gone. But this evening, we are going to honor a man who is very much alive and who is with us. We are going to say those things we have carried in our hearts—things we have

known so long but kept within ourselves or shared them in the confidence of others—our sincere feelings about Bill Casey.

I know that we have often heard it said, that this person or that one, has restored our faith in humanity. I believe that our consideration should be over the key word "humanity." By having lost faith in our fellow men we are opening the doors to an attitude toward life of cynicism, suspicion, pettiness, and even hate. There are those humans who have stalked through history to bring misery and suffering to their fellow men. Yet, despite these black moments in the chronicle of man's time on earth, we find those bright lights who restore our faith in the good * * * and that the eternal things of value must have their foundations in virtue alone. Along with the Judases, Hitlers, and Stalins, who have portrayed the baseness to which humans can descend, let us never forget that we have the greater balance on the scale of humanity represented by such men as a St. Francis, an Abraham Lincoln, and just recently in our time, a Dr. Dooley.

Of this group who spend their lives restoring man's faith in himself in his power to do good, to leave everlasting traces of the time spent on this earth displaying the values which have the eternal stamp of this group, Bill Casey certainly belongs.

If I may, I would like to review Bill's life to date. He is a native of our great Commonwealth, and came from Peabody, his birthplace, here to Greenfield in 1907. Before World War I he enlisted in the Navy and served aboard the U.S.S. *Nebraska*. Long before we ever heard of amphibious operations, Bill Casey participated in the landings at Vera Cruz, Mexico, in that famous expedition. During the Great War, he served aboard the armored cruiser U.S.S. *Seattle*, and he was in convoy with the first contingent of American troops to France.

Interesting enough, Bill transferred to the infant submarine service and saw duty in the Atlantic on submarine hunting. After the war, he worked for the Lake Torpedo Boat Co., testing submarines for delivery to the Navy. I understand that these tests consisted of dives to test the hull strength of the craft. It was men like Bill, early pioneers in submarines, who led the way to the great fleet we have today.

After being hospitalized for war injuries, Bill returned here to Greenfield. This was the best move he ever made. I am sure that everyone in Greenfield feels the importance of that decision.

He opened an automobile electrical shop which, from 1931 to 1952, was located on Main Street. In 1952 he assumed the post of veterans agent for Greenfield. But during the years I have spanned so briefly in my biographical sketch, Bill Casey was not by any means inactive in many civic activities. He was commander of the John F. Harrington Post of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in 1926 and 1927, and he was also first county commander for that organization. Since 1933, he is president of the Greenfield Patriotic Societies, and has served Greenfield on many committees like the Fourth of July, Armistice Day, and the February anniversaries. He was a Cubmaster of the Newton School Cub Scouts from 1940 to 1944. As if these activities were not enough to wear down any man, Bill has given of himself to even more. Board of the Registrar of Voters, secretary of the Greenfield Finance Committee, Military Manpower Committee during World War II, and since 1951, director of civil defenses for Greenfield. There are so many more things he has done, and is currently undertaking, that he seems like a "one man" city of Greenfield. It would take many people to do all the things he has, and in the manner he has, over the years. I know that Bill has done all of these things, and will continue to do them, because he has faith in his fellow men and he derives that lasting merit which comes from dedication to his service.

What emerges so clearly from his biography, is not the quantity of activities, organizations, or endeavors—for they in themselves, could be unimportant and valueless—no, what has made a great impact on us, is the quality of the motivation which Bill Casey has constantly kept as his ideal.

For I know, as do all of us here, that he seeks no reward, needs no praise, nor does he want a public display of his works. For indeed, Bill Casey is one of the great examples of what men should be, of what men want to be, and of what men can do. His humility would prevent hollow praise, and his sacrifices do not demand vocal approval.

To reassure you, Bill, that we are grateful, let me say that what you have done rests deep in our hearts, spirits, and minds—there, like a seed, your deeds prompt our sincere thanks and set before us the great examples of those values which have virtue as their basis and eternity as their objective. Because of you, we have once again come to understand the immortal fact that man can be a power for good. That good in itself, is sufficient. In us, Bill, you have cast living monuments, and you have set up again within us all, the faith and hope in humanity, in man himself, which we all need.

I know that in the years ahead, we shall have the unique benefits of your virtues to continually guide us, to lead us, and to refresh our dampened spirits.

For these reasons, we speak without shame or embarrassment—and I am positive that everyone here, in their hearts and minds, join me in saying that we are profoundly grateful for not only what you have done and will do, but because you came to live among us and with us you shall remain forever.

United States Can't Afford Strikes Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the problem of the nationwide strike, and the strike which disrupts public services is one which increasingly draws the attention of thinking Americans.

As a contribution to sober thought on this difficult problem, I should like to call attention of the House to the following article by Rev. William J. Smith, S.J., which apeared in the Catholic Transcript of Hartford, Conn., in its issue of March 16, 1961.

Since Father Smith is customarily an apologist for the organized labor movement, his concern and his suggestions have particular significance.

I sincerely hope that the proposals of reasonable friends of labor like Father Smith will bear fruit, so that legal compulsion will not become necessary to secure the public welfare.

The article follows:

PROBLEM MUST BE SOLVED—UNITED STATES CAN'T AFFORD STRIKES TODAY

(By Rev. William J. Smith, S.J.)

The recent strike of the flight engineers on the airlines cost the companies an estimated $25 million in about a week's time. The frustrated, potential passengers suffered a proportionate loss in time and money. Coming as it did on the heels of the railroad-tugboat crisis, this stoppage shook up a lot of people—mentally, physically, and emotionally.

The inevitable showdown on this type of organized chaos cannot be far off. The question must be asked and a definitive answer given: "Who is to make the decision when a crisis arises that is loaded with potential harm to the Nation as a whole and to the common good?"

No one of knowledge, experience, and ability with whom I am acquainted wants compulsory arbitration. Management doesn't want it. The reasonable labor leader doesn't want it. The capable public official, who understands the problem, doesn't want it.

Regardless of what anybody wants or doesn't want, strikes of this kind must go. As a matter of fact, it is becoming more and more difficult to justify any kind of strike in America today.

Not so many years ago we were just evolving from a condition of monopoly capitalism in which management held most of the cards. Trade unions were weak. The public was ignorant of labor relations. The Government had little or no machinery to deal with union-management disputes. The spirit of individualism was rampant. Mediation, conciliation, and arbitration were undeveloped. Resort to the strike was about the one effective means the labor unions could take to protect their rights.

In a sense, we could afford work stoppages in earlier years. Over and above their economic benefit to the workers, they had an educational value for the general public as well as for trade unionists and management.

Today, things are very different. Too often our backs are to the wall in the serious threats we must face in the international arena. The American economy must get moving and keep moving. In a word, our national life and security is at a turning point; at the crossroads of the future. We just can't afford strikes.

The present administration in Washington is determined to play its part in attaining rational solutions to union-management disputes. We have experienced arbitrators in abundance. In practically every locality there are enough men with sufficient grasp of union-management affairs to play the part of arbitrator. Most of the States have labor boards, mediation boards, and other services which can be used to obviate the drastic action of the strike.

On the national level, in Secretary of Labor Goldberg we have one of the most distinguished and talented men in the field. His office is equipped to render every needed service no matter how serious a situation may arise. The U.S. Conciliation Service has talent galore.

We have need, great need, of a thorough study of the long-neglected problem of automation and the harmful consequences that it is bringing in terms of unemployment.

We have need, and great need, of bringing our top industrialists, our labor men and public experts together to diagnose the problem of the wage-price spiral and tangent issues.

We have need of digging deeply in the causes of strikes and to find remedies for the ills that spring from these causes.

We have a hundred and one problems in industrial relations that must be studied and solutions for them found, as far as it is humanly possible to find such solutions.

We have, above all, the need of developing the determination on the part of all concerned that a substitute for the strike can be and will be found with justice to all. To date the thinking has centered around concrete, specific cases and crises. We should start thinking in terms of isolating and destroying the virus itself.

It is as necessary for us to formulate and develop that determination and that attitude of mind as it is for the medical profession to be determined to eliminate cancer and its causes; for educators to find ways and means to train American youth; for legislators and private industries to eliminate slum conditions.

If human society is to be really human, the citizens must learn to act habitually on the law of reason. No nation can reach its full potential while a large segment of it accepts the principle of force as an ordinary means of settling disputes.

We have all the means today that are necessary for solving industrial conflict, if not in an amicable way, at least in a reasoned way. What is lacking is the firm resolve to reject the principle of force as a substitute for peaceful negotiation.

Where there is a will there is a way. We can find that way if enough people in influential positions really want to find it. We will find it, if the public insists strenuously enough that it must be found.

If we can find ways and means to reach the moon, given the same attention why shouldn't we be able to reach the minds of men?

Broadcasters' Responsibility for Improved Programing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, Gov. LeRoy Collins, the new president of the National Association of Broadcasters, has made important proposals looking to the elimination of excessive violence on television programs and the increase of outstanding drama, fine music, public information and educational programs during prime evening hours. In an effort to support Governor Collins' drive for improved programing, I have written a letter to him and I would like to use this way of informing other members of Congress and the public of the support which the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce hopes to give in this connection to the National Association of Broadcasters. The exchange of correspondence with Governor Collins is as follows:

MARCH 20, 1961.

Hon. LEROY COLLINS,
President, National Association of Broadcasters, Washington, D.C.

DEAR GOVERNOR COLLINS: In the past, whenever this committee has received complaints with regard to television or radio programs from viewers or listeners, or had referred to it by individual Members of Congress, complaints received by them from viewers or listeners, it has been the policy of this committee to transmit such complaints to the Federal Communications Commission with a request that such complaints be placed in the file of the particular station to be given attention at license renewal time.

The committee has always advised complainants and Members of Congress that the primary responsibility for programing rests with the licensees, that the Communications Act of 1934 specifically prohibits censorship by the Federal Communications Commission, and that the Commission's responsibility with regard to programing is limited (except in cases where a program violates specific criminal statutory provisions) to an overall review of programing at license renewal time in the light of promises made by licensees in their license applications.

In view of the strong stand which you as the new president of the National Association of Broadcasters have taken with regard to the responsibility of broadcasters in connection with programing, especially with regard to the need for eliminating excessive violence and for increasing "blue ribbon" programing, the committee will be glad to assist you in your efforts by furnishing you with copies of communications received by it or referred to it which deal with radio and television programing.

It has always been my conviction which I have expressed in speeches before broadcasters that the licensees and not the Government must assume the primary responsibility for improved programing, and I share your feeling that the National Association of Broadcasters can greatly assist in bringing this about—be it through the formulation of improved codes of good conduct or through other methods such as the plan which you suggested aiming at increased high level television network programs during prime evening hours.

I trust that our close cooperation with your organization in these matters will produce the results which we are seeking.

With kindest regards,
Sincerely yours,

OREN HARRIS,
Member of Congress.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS,
Washington, D.C., March 23, 1961.

Hon. OREN HARRIS,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I want to thank you for your letter of March 20, in which you extended the offer to furnish to me copies of complaints received by your committee which deal with radio and television programing.

Your sharing the conviction that the licensees and not the Government have the primary responsibility for programing is another indication of your dedicated and informed interest in broadcasting and its service to the American people.

I gratefully accept your offer. I feel confident this information will prove helpful in administering the self-regulatory efforts of the radio and television codes. You are aware, of course, that favorable comments as well as complaints will assist in making the necessary assessments for carrying out our program. Will you also forward copies of these?

With appreciation and high regards, I am,
Sincerely,

LEROY COLLINS,
President.

MARCH 24, 1961.

Hon. LEROY COLLINS,
President, National Association of Broadcasters, Washington, D.C.

DEAR GOVERNOR COLLINS: I have your letter of March 23, 1961, replying to my letter of March 20, 1961. I am glad you feel that the transmission of comments received by the committee with regard to radio and television programs will be helpful to the broadcasting industry's self-regulatory efforts.

Of course, the committee will include any favorable comments which it might receive along with any complaints which reach the committee. As a former Governor of the great State of Florida you will appreciate, however, that constituents usually are more ready to reach for the pen to express dissatisfaction with some occurrence than they are to convey their pleasure over a job well done.

With kindest regards,
Sincerely yours,

OREN HARRIS,
Member of Congress.

Federal Aid to Education: One View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. QUIE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, it is my conviction that the surest route to a sound decision on the entire Federal-aid-to-education proposal is an atmosphere of free and unfettered expression of differing views. In that spirit, the March 24 edition of Life magazine presented some of its views on this subject, and I believe my fellow Members would be interested in reading those views:

SCHOOL AID AND RELIGION

The hottest opposition to President Kennedy's school bill comes not from those who sincerely doubt the need or wisdom of such massive Federal aid. It comes instead from the President's fellow Catholics who resent the bill's discrimination against the 6.5 million students (most of them Catholics) in church and private grade schools. The National Catholic Welfare Conference insists that such schools be eligible at least for Government loans. And House Leader McCORMACK, like many other Catholics, will oppose the bill unless it is so amended.

Kennedy justifies this discrimination in his bill on constitutional grounds; that direct aid to any church school would breach the first amendment's so-called wall of sepation between church and state. In taking this stand Kennedy is fulfilling a campaign promise but he is also cloaking a political decision in constitutional clothing that doesn't fit it.

He cites the Everson case of 1947, in which the Supreme Court allowed public buses to serve parochial schools but indicated it would go no further. A year later, in the McCollum case, it even forbade religious instruction on public school premises. But in 1952, in the Zorach case, the Court upheld the "released time" accommodation for religious teaching and remarked, "When the State encourages religious instruction or cooperates with religious authorities it follows the best of our traditions." The narrow-mindedness of the McCollum rule was excoriated by so great a (non-Catholic) constitutional authority as Edward S. Corwin. Another, Arthur Sutherland of Harvard, remarked last week, "If I were President, I could think of no clear constitutional reason to veto a bill aiding church and private schools." Still another, Philip Kurland of Chicago, says "Kennedy is wrong." The least that must be said is that the constitutional issue is uncertain.

Is Congress considering a "law respecting the establishment of a religion," which the first amendment forbids, or merely aiding education? Congress clearly has the power to do the latter. Moreover, it has the duty not to "prohibit the free exercise" of any religion and while discrimination is not prohibition, it is not equal justice either.

Catholics have long felt a grave injustice in the fiscal segregation to which their schools are subjected by the States. They pay taxes for the public schools but maintain their own as well because they believe that religion is an essential part of education.

The authors of the Constitution would have been surprised to hear that it penalizes that belief. The Northwest Ordinance of 1787, our first national venture in school aid, reads: "Religion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged." As the Supreme Court itself has said, the first amendment did not make our Governemnt hostile or even indifferent to religion.

Among other arguments for discrimipation against private schools, one is the assumption that only the public school system is a fit vehicle for the Government's interest in education. Catholics reply that the pluralistic nature of our society has no room for an "official" school system. Some Protestants would agree with this much but argue that the Catholic school system encourages too strong a Catholic "separateness" and an intolerance toward other aspects of American pluralism. Since five-sixths of all private school students are in fact in parochial schools the practical effect of nondiscriminatory Federal aid would be to strengthen the Catholic schools. But Protestants and Jews might be asked whether the comparative paucity of Protestant and Jewish church schools indicates a lack of seriousness about religious education. Certainly education needs all the going concerns it can get: the greater variety the better and the more religious schools the better, too.

Whatever the fate of Kennedy's bill, it is healthy that the discrimination issue has been aired. There is a grave issue of public policy and social justice here which will not be settled until the argument, in the courts or out, has gone much further. Democracy depends on education; but does that mean it can depend primarily on nonreligious education, which is often in effect antireligious? Protestants, Catholics, and Jews have a lot more thinking to do on this vital subject.

A Pioneer Project in Medical Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the city of Syracuse, N.Y., which I have the privilege of representing, has long been recognized as one of the most progressive communities in the country. The city has pioneered in the fields of housing for the elderly, housing for lower-income groups, and urban renewal. The Syracuse story has been second to none in demonstrating what the foresight, initiative, and drive of a community can accomplish.

Syracuse has now embarked on another pilot program, one which I feel will give ample evidence of the benefits accruing to all concerned when citizens set out to deal with a community problem through community action.

Pursuant to unanimous consent authority, I include at this point in the RECORD, an editorial which appeared in the Syracuse Herald-Journal of March 20, 1961:

A PIONEER PROJECT IN MEDICAL CARE

Medical care for the aging is receiving a major share of public attention, mostly in the abstract. The talk often is in general terms, about all the aging, and all the proposed programs to help a constantly enlarging segment of the population.

A project opened in Syracuse last week, the James Geddes Health Center, deals in specifics—the aging themselves, and their health problems. Besides the 500 residents of the Geddes Homes, the center will serve the entire area bounded by South Geddes, West Fayette, South West, and West Onandaga Streets.

It will be active service in the sense that it involves attempts to contact others besides those who actually ask for help. Public health nurses have visited each elderly resident of the housing development to learn their problems and explain what aid is available.

The center itself, in the basement of the development, has 17 diagnosis and treatment rooms, including facilities for physical therapy.

This is a pilot program of the Syracuse Health Department, and the Syracuse Housing Authority. Health Commissioner David Bigwood terms it "an aggressive attempt to get in touch with the elderly, to define their problems, and to make available to them the resources of the community."

The ultimate benefits, obviously, will also extend to the entire community.

Olivetti Aids Underwood Corp.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, about a year and a half ago, an unusual development in the control of American business corporations took place in my home city of Hartford. An Italian firm, Olivetti Co., bought into and obtained control of a respected old line American corporation, the Underwood Corp.

There were, at that time, some misgivings about what might happen. Olivetti was in competition with other American firms, both in this country and in foreign markets. It was recognized that Olivetti was an aggressive, intelligent firm, with a great record of accomplishment abroad, but what plans did it have for its new American affiliate? Would it affect employment?

It did affect employment, and for the better. Under Olivetti management, Underwood has made some notable gains. I offer for the RECORD an article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune last Sunday outlining this remarkable case of reverse lend-lease of managerial talent. I also offer a letter written by a distinguished and respected labor official and former mayor of the city of Hartford to the agent of another typewriter company in which he expresses the view of the Underwood union regarding the accomplishments of the new management.

I believe these reports show what is often forgotten but what is in the textbooks of economics—that alert, aggressive salesmanship and management are important factors in the progress of any firm, and that this managerial know-how is not just exclusively a domestic possession.

The achievements of Olivetti with Underwood deserve to be noted and recorded. I recognize that a fresh approach and the psychological determination of the new management may have played a large part in the success, but I believe that it is a fundamental acknowledgment that confidence and ability may not only be found abroad, but may be exported as well.

The article and letter follow:

OLIVETTE AIDS UNDERWOOD BY U.S. RX FOR EUROPE—BOOSTS JOBS AND RETURN OF DOLLARS

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

WASHINGTON.—An Italian company is giving the United States a dose of the medicine this country has been prescribing for other nations since the end of World War II and the remedy is going down very well indeed.

The story is summed up in a two-page memorandum that is being read with deep interest—and considerable amusement—by top advisers to President Kennedy.

It's the case history of Olivetti Co., the up and coming Italian office-machine manufacturer, and of the things that happened after it obtained control of Underwood Corp., the Hartford, Conn., typewriter maker.

What the United States told the devastated Western European countries after World War II—and since has been preaching to underdeveloped countries—is that they must attract foreign capital, must learn from the technical know-how of industrialized countries, must improve their productivity and must specialize in products they need at home and can export.

PEPS UP UNDERWOOD

Olivetti gained control of Underwood in the fall of 1959 and completed the takeover in mid-1960.

Underwood had been slipping, but it's been making notable strides since the merger and the turnaround has been due to the production and marketing know-how that have been contributed by the Italian company's efficient management.

One of the big U.S. contentions over the years has been that managerial skill goes hand in hand with private capital investments and Olivetti has been giving a brilliant demonstration of the American theory.

The Italian company streamlined Underwood's production and modernized its organizational structural. It eliminated unprofitable products and concentrated on selected and tested merchandise.

Olivetti saw to it that Underwood developed new models. Total production last year was three times as big as it was in 1959.

Productivity has been climbing, too. Overall production costs were slashed 30 percent last year.

SENDS FUNDS HERE

And Olivetti has sent funds into the United States. Its total contribution to Underwood in cash and in credit totals a sizable $51 million.

One of the most impressive Olivetti contributions has been the chalking up of a sharp rise in employment at a time when the United States has been in a recession.

The Underwood work force at Hartford fell to a low of 2,500 in early 1960, but it has been gradually rising under the Olivetti management and at last reports had climbed to 3,300. Wages were boosted 5 percent in 1960 and another 5-percent hike will take effect automatically this year.

GREATER HARTFORD DISTRICT LODGE
No. 26, INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS,
Hartford, Conn., December 27, 1960.

Mr. P. A. FILLER,
Salesman, Butler Typewriter Co.,
Warren, Ohio.

DEAR MR. FILLER: In answer to your letter of December 21, concerning the products of the Underwood-Olivetti Corp., may I say that if it hadn't been for the purchase of the old Underwood firm by the new management, many of our union members now gainfully employed here at the Hartford plant might have been among the unemployed of this community.

We have only praise of the new management. Since the Olivettis assumed direction, control, and management, we have had an increase in employment of approximately 30 percent.

The Olivetti management group have proved to be understanding, liberal, and eminently fair in our relations with them.

They have invested large sums of money in the corporation in order to improve physical facilities, modernize the plant, and make the entire organization more efficient.

Our contract and wage structure, negotiated with representives of the new management is one of the best in the industry.

Other managements should be encouraged to emulate the Underwood-Olivetti management, and to invest in American industry, and American workers as has been done in this case.

We use Olivetti products in our own union offices here, and would urge other unions to do the same. As you may know, this company has a reputation in Europe as one of the most liberal and enlightened industrial organizations in the world.

If there is any other information you desire, please feel free to write.

With best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH V. CRONIN,
Business Manager, District 26, I.A.M.

P.S.—Incidentally, at a time when the Remington Rand Corp. has announced the removal of its standard typewriter operations to Europe, for manufacture there, it is refreshing to note that Underwood-Olivetti manufactures its standard typewriters here in Hartford, and sells them in competition with other firms, in various parts of the world, including Europe.

Urgent Need for Adequate Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include the following column by Inez Robb appearing in the Topeka Capital on March 16:

URGENT NEED FOR ADEQUATE CIVIL DEFENSE
(By Inez Robb)

One way or another it has always been difficult to sell people on salvation. But if civil defense is to be anything but a continuing fiasco, then salvation in case of nuclear war is going to have to be sold to the American people. Furthermore, it'll require a hard sell.

That, in one woman's opinion, is the major problem of Frank B. Ellis, Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization who is preparing a new program of civilian defense for presentation to the President.

Surely, few persons will want to argue with Ellis' estimate of the present civil defense program as completely inadequate. Worse, the program has been completely unrealistic from the beginning.

More than 10 years ago I was horrified at New York City's first civilian defense exercise. As one who had had some small experience with non-nuclear bombing in England and Africa in World War II, I was appalled that officials could pretend to themselves or the public that persons were safe as long as traffic was stopped and everyone was off the streets and sidewalks.

The fact that hundreds of thousands of persons were herded off sidewalks and crowded behind plateglass windows on the city's major avenues was, and is, a wanton mockery. Even a small World War II bomb would turn that glass into lethal shards that would cut hapless persons to ribbons.

That has set the pattern for every civil defense exercise since, an exercise in futility that is dangerous, useless and deceitful. How many persons have been cheated into a false sense of security by such tactics?

Part of the congressional and civilian indifference to national salvation in case of nuclear attack is probably traceable to the fact that all of us, confronted with the terrible statistics of nuclear destruction, stick our respective heads in the sand.

It is almost impossible for us to grasp the fact that a minimum of 20 to 40 million of use could die in the first atack and that as many as 85 million, or half the Nation's population, can be casualties of the initial strike.

But the Government and its proper agencies, if they want the civilian population to survive and the Nation to continue, are going to have to force us to understand and digest those appalling figures before it can hope to make us interested in our own salvation.

No one is going to be interested in a shelter program unless the Government leads the way and sells that program.

In the past various Federal agencies have estimated that an adequate shelter program would cost a minimum of $40 billion; maybe more. No one will deny that that is a tremendous sum—to spend on civilians. The Armed Forces get that much annually.

But we should either make up our minds that the continuity of the United States is dependent, per se, upon the continuity of civilian life and act on that conviction, or we should decide that salvation is too expensive and we aren't worth the cost of saving, and then scrap such fumbling civil defense as we have had up to now.

The one essential reform is that we stop kidding ourselves that the present civil defense program guarantees the Nation's survival. I don't want to be buried by indifference any more than I crave to be buried by Khrushchev. First, we need a tough educational program and, second, the courage to face up to the fact that salvation can't be had on the cheap.

The Politics of Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an article entitled "The Politics of Pollution," by Mr. William L. Rivers appearing in the March 30 edition of the Reporter magazine.

That article tells how 50 million pounds of solid sewage are dumped daily into waterways that provide our drinking water, water for industry, water for recreation and other uses.

This is a well-thought-out commentary on why Americans must begin to react vigorously to clean up the soiled and foul waters of our land. The frightening instances mentioned in this article are repeated daily in almost every corner of our land. Unless some serious action is taken to rectify the frightening situation it sets forth Americans face not only a growing and calamitous water shortage in this country, but a desperate problem of danger to the health of our people from our dangerously polluted waters.

The article follows:

THE POLITICS OF POLLUTION
(By William L. Rivers)

Last September, the U.S. Government filed a suit against St. Joseph, Mo., the first time the Federal Government has ever brought suit against a city. The suit was filed in desperation, after 3 years of unsuccessful attempts to persuade the city to stop polluting the Missouri River.

St. Joseph, which publicizes itself as the "home of the pony express," also has some old-fashioned notions about sanitation. The city and its industries have been pouring raw sewage into the Missouri River for more than a century.

On occasion the waters south of it have become so thick that some of the hardier entrepreneurs in the area have taken to their boats and worked up a good business peddling the grease they skimmed from the surface. A Public Health Service engineer who inspected the sewage flow into the river testified that it is not safe to come in contact with the water.

The Missouri River is a boundary between Kansas and Missouri. Twenty-four miles south of St. Joseph, the city of Atchison, Kans., takes its water supply from the polluted river, Atchison goes to extraordinary lengths to purify the water, but with limited success. An Atchison resident testified during a Public Health Service hearing: "We have grown accustomed to it, but at times * * * the chlorine content was such as to cause a serious odor and also some sickness among people in Atchison." His wife's parents had moved to town to enjoy the amenities of urban life, he said, but they were hauling their drinking water in from the farm.

CRACKING DOWN

The U.S. Public Health Service brought health officials of Kansas and Missouri together for a conference with spokesmen for St. Joseph and 18 of its industries in June

1957, but little was accomplished until the Federal Government pushed the water pollution board of Missouri into cracking down. In 1958, St. Joseph held a bond issue referendum for a sewage-treatment plant. The voters rejected it. A year later, the Public Health Service held a 5-day public hearing that resulted in a notice to the city and the 18 industries to stop polluting the river; they were given a schedule that was designed to get sewage-treatment facilities into operation by June 1963.

The industries that had been polluting the water gave in at that point. When city officials rejected as inadequate their offer to contribute $1,350,000 toward construction of a plant that would serve the entire area, industry leaders got together and decided to build their own facilities. St. Joseph conducted a $9,500,000 bond issue referendum last May. The voters rejected it again, this time more decisively, prompting a newspaper to applaud them for "pioneer independence and be damned if they aim to stand still while some bureaucrats in Washington tell them what to do." The "bureaucrats" then brought the suit against St. Joseph for failing to keep to the schedule of sewage plant planning and construction.

The case of *United States* v. *City of St. Joseph*, which is still pending, is a small symbol of the breakdown in efforts to control wastes that endanger the health and welfare of millions. Although this is the only suit that has ever been filed under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, the problem is so general and persuasion has accomplished so little that others are sure to follow.

St. Joseph is not the only city that has been accused of turning a river into a sewer. In fact, St. Joseph itself is the victim of the dirty habits of cities and industries farther north. The Missouri River begins in Montana and winds through the Dakotas into Iowa, reaching its first urban complex at Sioux City. There, according to Public Health Service engineers, "Floating excrement and other sewage solids were obvious, and gas bubbles from sludge deposits rose to the surface." The point where the Floyd River meets the Missouri "appeared almost clogged with untreated packing plant wastes. Where the water was not red with bloody wastes, it was gray with decomposing organic wastes. Offensive odor filled the atmosphere." At Omaha, 135 miles down the river, some of the grease passes through the plant intake, coating the walls of the concrete basins used in treating the water. Omaha's complaints, however, must be balanced against its own sewage-disposal practices: fish taken from the river below Omaha sometimes taste like kerosene, and crows ride on the patches of solid grease that flow from its packinghouses.

The Missouri has been described as a thousand-mile sewer, but it is no more polluted than many another U.S. waterway. Thirty thousand municipal and industrial sewers empty directly into waters that are used to supply municipal water-treatment plants. In earlier days, even sanitary engineers repeated the rhyme that justified dumping filth into water: "Dilution is the solution to pollution." There is reason to doubt that this ever was true, but it is certainly not true today. The purifying properties of water are being used up so rapidly by increasing quantities of new oxygen-demanding wastes that many streams and rivers barely flow. Fifty million pounds of solid sewage go into water every day.

In a Public Health Service hearing, a Louisiana farmer testified that 95 of his 140 cattle died from drinking the water in the creek that ran beside his 90-acre farm. When the creek overflowed, the trees along the banks began to die, and more than 60 acres could no longer be used for pasture or for growing crops. A trapper added: "Everything has been killed in that creek, and the fur-bearing animals have done quit traveling it. There's nothing for them; not even a frog."

POISONS IN OUR WATER

Alarmed by such incidents, Representative JOHN D. DINGELL, Democrat, Michigan, started collecting newspaper articles and editorials about pollution. He labeled them "Poison in Your Water," numbered them, and had them printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He now has nearly 200, many of them relating pollution to illness. No. 161 is an editorial from the Salt Lake City Deseret News & Telegram listing three Utah rivers as health hazards and linking them to "an alarming increase in the incidence of infectious hepatitis." No. 165 is an article in an Arkansas newspaper, in which a physician reported that all but 1 of 34 Arkansans stricken with paralytic polio resided in areas of the State that have no sewers.

No one can be certain about the full effects of water pollution on public health. Too little money and attention has gone into research, especially to studies of new industrial chemicals. Public battles are fought over fluoridation of water supplies to prevent dental cavities, but almost unnoticed is the fact that water-treatment plants nearly everywhere have to add massive doses of chemicals to drinking water so as to counteract the industrial chemicals that are polluting it. Farmers now spend nearly $300 million a year for chemicals other than fertilizers which are washed into drinking water. Experiments show that the use of insecticides can produce infertile eggs and weak chicks. When water is introduced, the insecticides are even more destructive to small game, fish, snakes, and frogs.

Former U.S. Surg. Gen. Leroy Burney commented somewhat helplessly on detergents, which cause the clouds of foam that blow from treatment plants on windy days and, in some areas, form a froth on top of a glass of water that compares favorably with the head on a stein of beer. "They're not killing us," Dr. Burney said, "or making us clinically ill. But how does the human body react to steady doses of diluted chemicals? What happens if the concentration increases, either suddenly or gradually? We cannot say we know the answers."

Those who are most disturbed about water pollution emphasize a scarcity of water. The Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources reported in January that the latest estimates of water supply and demand indicate that conversion of salt water may be essential by 1970. Five Federal demonstration plants are being constructed, but the costs of desalinization are still too great by current rate standards, and transportation of desalted water to inland cities will increase these costs. Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK, Democrat, of Minnesota, states, "The control of pollution is a key aspect of the entire water resource problem."

Cleaning the Nation's water is a political chalenge that arouses implacable resistance. St. Joseph was taken to court only after many conferences, warnings, and a hearing. Throughout the hearing, a transcript of which ran to 426 pages, the city's attorney spoke of the alleged pollution despite clear evidence that untreated sewage from 80,000 people was being dumped into the river every day.

Much of the foot dragging by municipalities can be explained by an axiom of local politics: building a water treatment plant to clean up the water used by voting citizens is almost always easy to accomplish; however, a sewage plant that will treat a community's wastes benefits only the neighboring communities downstream. A Public Health Service official says that he detects a slow change in this selfish attitude, in part because of the growing popularity of water sports, which need clean water, in part because "almost all cities are downstream from at least one other city."

In contrast, the resistance of industry to enforcement actions is growing, even though many manufacturing plants cannot use polluted waters. By 1980, industry will need nearly twice as much water as agriculture and all municipalities combined. And the Nation's industries are by far the worst polluters, dumping twice as much waste as the municipalities.

Spokesmen for industry do not deny that industrial pollution is a critical problem, but they claim that their research program will lead to improvement. Leonard Pasek, an executive of Kimberly-Clark Corp., told a Senate committee that the National Council for Stream Improvement, which is financed primarily by pulp and paper companies, has a research budget of several million dollars a year. In many cases, competitive pricing makes the cost of building sewage-treatment plants prohibitive. An executive of a plant that produces soda ash said during a Public Health Service conference that forcing his company to install treatment facilities would drive production costs so high that his plant would close down because it would be unable to compete with the other nine soda ash producers.

CLEANUP VERSUS INDUSTRY

Since the Federal Water Pollution Control Act restricts the authority of the Public Health Service to pollution that flows past State lines, most of the work of pollution abatement is left to the States. Many States are so solicitous of their industries and so eager to obtain new plants that pollution controls are weak. In arid west Texas, oil drillers dump brine into shallow earthen pits, where it seeps into the ground water or is washed into streams with the first rain. Often, drillers go on to seek their fortunes elsewhere when they fail to strike oil, leaving unsealed holes that permit subterranean salt water to seep into ground-water strata or into surface waters. One of the 112 oil companies in west Texas dumped 4,000 barrels of salt water into a single stream every day for months.

Early in January, E. V. Spence, general manager of the Colorado River Municipal Water District, pleaded for legislative action at a meeting in Texas of the Governor's water coordinating committee. Gov. Price Daniel pointed out that laws prohibiting oil drillers from polluting the State's water and requiring that wells be plugged have been on the books for 25 years. It is a fact, however, that the Texas Railroad Commission, which is charged with controlling oil-industry pollution, spent nothing on control last year and very little during the past 10 years.

Keeping pollution control at the State level has long been a goal of those fighting effective cleanup. The lobbyists were able to defeat meaningful national legislation until 1948, when the late Senator Robert A. Taft, of Ohio, who had long held that a Federal act to control pollution was unconstitutional, changed his mind and helped push the bill for the Federal Water Pollution Control Act through the Senate (and the Public Health Service's Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center was established in Cincinnati). Even with Taft's help, the 80th Congress had a harder time passing the pollution act than any other health bill. As it turned out, industry's fear of a federally enforced cleanup was unfounded. According to the 1948 act, there had to be an agreement between the State where the pollution originated and the State that brought the complaint. There has been only one agreement.

The 1948 act did, however, permit strong interstate compacts. The Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission was formed

under this provision, with the expressed determination that communities and industries would undertake to clean up—"by persuasion where possible and by compulsion where necessary." Last year, the eight States in the compact—Indiana, Illinois, Kentucky, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia—announced that most of the communities and many of the industries in the drainage area have adequate installations. But 225 industries still have not met the basic control requirements that were established 6 years ago, and a sanitary-engineering specialist says that after nearly 13 years the compact has not accomplished its purpose: cleaning up the Ohio River.

In 1956, 3 days before the act was to expire, Congress passed an amended version providing $50 million a year in Federal matching grants for building community sewage facilities. The National Association of Manufacturers opposed that provision and another calling for stronger enforcement of pollution abatement. According to expert estimates, industry was then dumping into the water every day untreated wastes equal to the sewage created by 110 million people, but the NAM held that "State and local governing bodies are competent to handle pollution abatement and stream improvement * * * much more will be accomplished by cooperation than by compulsion." Despite this, both Houses approved the conference bill. President Eisenhower said it went beyond his recommendations, but he signed it.

In 1959, in the face of Congressman BLATNIK's estimates that the Federal grant program had stimulated municipalities to spend more than half a billion dollars for sewage-treatment facilities, President Eisenhower asked that the grants be reduced and that the States take over the program altogether after 1960. Both the House and the Senate, however, passed even stronger bills, then postponed the conference-committee meeting so as to prevent the President from killing the bill with a pocket veto after Congress had adjourned. When the conference committee met after the beginning of the 1960 session, it reached a quick compromise. Mr. Eisenhower vetoed it.

In his message, the President called polluted water "a uniquely local blight," then announced, paradoxically, that he had asked the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to call a national conference on water pollution. In the steering committee sessions where the broad outlines of the national conference were planned, NAM representatives tried to convince the other committee members that the conference should be devoted to success stories of municipalities and industries that had solved their problems. That was squelched, and a subcommittee was appointed to formulate conference objectives. According to one of the members, NAM spokesmen "flew into rages." Daniel Cannon, an NAM executive, later wrote to every member of the steering committee to protest the creation of a subcommittee that would formulate a manifesto.

On the last day of the National Conference on Water Pollution, the same Mr. Cannon pressed for a recommendation that the Nation's waterways should be only "as clean as is economically feasible." There were no votes on recommendations, but an informal vote was taken on whether the Federal Government should be allowed to enforce pollution abatement not just on interstate waters but on all navigable waters of the United States. Many of the delegates had already left the conference, but some had been prepared for the informal vote and rose in full strength to oppose the extension of Federal authority.

The fight in Congress this year will be primarily on this issue. By extension of Federal authority to enforce pollution abatement to all navigable waters, almost every waterway in the United States would be brought under Federal protection. Mr. BLATNIK, the House leader on water-pollution legislation, has introduced a bill to accomplish it. President Kennedy was not explicit about his own views on this question in his message to Congress on natural resources, but he called for legislation to "strengthen enforcement procedures to abate serious pollution situations of national significance," pointing out that "pollution of our country's rivers and streams has * * * reached alarming proportions." Noting that a national total of $350 million will be spent this year on municipal waste-treatment works, Mr. Kennedy said that an expenditure of $600 million a year is necessary, and he asked Congress to increase the amount of Federal assistance to municipalities.

A key man in the congressional decision will be Senator ROBERT KERR of Oklahoma, who was chairman of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources and who is now chairman of the Senate River and Harbors Subcommittee, which will handle Senate legislation. His book, "Land, Wood and Water," makes this plea for preserving the Nation's waters: "Unless we do combat the menace of pollution, it will be like storing our precious waters in a garbage can." But there are some who doubt that Senator KERR means business. They point out that his own Kerr-McGee Oil Co. has been fined by Louisiana for polluting the waters of Bay Garden and Chandeleur Island.

In January, Senator KERR introduced his bill for amending the Pollution Control Act. It called for $75 million a year in Federal grants—$15 million less than the bill Mr. Eisenhower vetoed—and said nothing whatever about Federal enforcement.

Hospital Facilities Needed for Veterans on Long Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most vital needs for hospital facilities for war veterans exists on Long Island—the Queens-Nassau-Suffolk area.

To resolve this highly desirous need, I have introduced in this House legislation calling on the Veterans' Administration to construct and maintain such a hospital. This bill has the full support of all veterans' organizations on Long Island and its enactment will fulfill their long sought objective.

The fact that there are now 3½ million people in the Queens-Nassau-Suffolk area, but no general hospital for veterans stresses this appalling need for such facilities. If a veteran in this three-county area needs medical or surgical attention, he must apply for admission to either the veterans' hospital at Fort Hamilton in Brooklyn or to the one on East 23d Street in Manhattan. These facilities are vastly inadequate and have long waiting lists for admission. There is a neuropsychiatric hospital for veterans in Northport, but here again there is a list of over 2,500 waiting for admission.

Realizing that the approval of such a hospital is within the province of the Veterans' Administration, I, as a member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs and its Subcommittee on Hospitals, and so many others interested in the project have been in constant touch with the administration and have repeatedly pointed out the necessity for the hospital and solicited its support for inclusion in the projected hospital construction program.

In response to my appeal to the Veterans' Administration for this Queens-Nassau-Suffolk VA Hospital, Mr. John S. Gleason, Jr., VA Administrator, wrote to me as follows:

DEAR MR. HALPERN: This is in reply to your letter dated February 22, 1961, concerning your bill to provide for the construction of a general medical and surgical hospital on Long Island, N.Y.

You will be glad to know that consideration is being given to the feasibility of constructing a 1,000 bed hospital on Long Island. This new hospital is needed to offset the reduction of approximately 800 psychiatric beds which will result from the modernization of our hospital at Northport. Since there is an unmet demand for medical, surgical and neurological beds in the general area, the new hospital would include 200 beds of this type.

Your kind interest in the welfare of veterans is appreciated.

Sincerely,

J. S. GLEASON, Jr.,
Administrator.

Mr. Speaker, a recent development offers an ideal site for the construction of the hospital. I have strongly urged the Administrator to seriously consider this site for the location of the hospital. I refer to Mitchel Field which is owned by the Government and which has been announced as obsolete for continued use as an Air Force base.

This property would provide a perfect location and ideal setting for the hospital. It would save a considerable sum to locate the hospital there since the Government already owns the property. It is easily accessible by highway and public transportation for all Long Islanders.

Mr. Speaker, the advantages of this sight are pointed out in my most recent appeal to the Veterans' Administration and I cannot prevail enough that immediate steps be taken to acquire the site for the Queens-Nassau-Suffolk Veterans' Administration Hospital.

Clinton Methodist Church Withdraws Financial Support From National Council of Churches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a resolution unanimously adopted by the official board of the Clinton Methodist Church, Clinton, Miss., on March 12, 1961. The resolution is as follows:

RESOLUTION BY THE OFFICIAL BOARD

Whereas the Clinton Methodist Church reaffirms its belief in the doctrine of individual responsibility, the Christian obligation and privilege of love and charity toward one's fellow man, total separation of church and state, and loyalty and devotion to the United States of America, and

Whereas the National Council of Churches, through various actions, has opposed continuation of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, has supported proposals for a system of socialized medicine being sought in H.R. 4222, a bill before the 87th Congress and has opposed publication by the Department of Defense of information on the threat of communism in Protestant church organization; and

Whereas these actions are totally unrepresentative of the views of the Clinton Methodist Church, now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the official board does deplore the stated actions by the National Council of Churches and does reaffirm its belief in lawful prerogatives and, indeed, duties of the Congress to investigate and expose subversion wherever and whenever such exists; does reaffirm its belief in a system of private enterprise, local self-help for the needy sick, and opposes any and all forms of socialized medicine, especially present proposals before the Congress, and, finally, the official board withdraws all financial support of the National Council of Churches while rededicating the energies and resources of the Clinton Methodist Church to the service of God, love and charity toward the needy sick, and loyalty to our Nation as a free, self-determined state under divine providence.

Adopted unanimously this, the 12th day of March, A.D. 1961.

Wm. R. Chambers; Ralph Stutt; James L. Denman; B. E. Martin; H. T. Busby, Mrs. H. T. Busby; Bernard Blackwell; Jack L. Williamson; Albert L. Craven; Jack W. Lilley; H. F. Crisler, Jr.; Loyn H. Williams; Marian B. Lyons; Graham B. Kennedy; David J. Callahan; W. M. Bryson, Chairman of the Official Board; Earl Chesley, Pastor.

Multiple Illegitimacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, the growing problem of illegitimate births in the United States is one that is costing Federal and State treasuries almost $1 billion a year in aid to dependent children.

Statistics prepared by the National Office of Vital Statistics show that the rate of illegitimate births more than doubled in the period from 1940 to 1958, the last year for which official figures are available.

Records show that in 1940 a total of 89,500 illegitimate births was registered; the total in 1958 was 208,700. White illegitimate births in 1958 averaged 20.9 for every 1,000 live births; Negro illegitimate births for the same year averaged 212.3 for every 1,000 live births. This ratio between white and Negro illegitimate births has remained constant down through the years.

It is obvious that in far too many cases mothers of illegitimate children are taking deliberate advantage of laws that permit them to draw aid to dependent children funds for each child they bear out of wedlock. In one Southern State, for example, 6,000 unmarried mothers are being paid assistance for their 23,000 illegitimate children.

The General Assembly of the State of Georgia in 1951 enacted a law prohibiting payments to any mother for more than one illegitimate child. The effectiveness of this reasonable law was destroyed when the Federal Government threatened to withhold all welfare funds from the State of Georgia unless the law was repealed.

The General Assembly of Georgia, on March 6, 1961, adopted a resolution protesting and deploring this Federal intervention, which, in effect, condones and rewards multiple illegitimacy. This resolution follows:

H.R. 106

Resolution relative to certain welfare benefits; and for other purposes

Whereas in many areas of this State the number of births of illegitimate children has sharply increased during the last few years; and

Whereas, although laws have been enacted in an attempt to stop illegitimate births, under Federal rules and regulations welfare payments are still authorized for illegitimate children; and

Whereas at the time the General Assembly of Georgia enacted a law prohibiting payments to any mother for more than one illegitimate child, the Federal agency administering the welfare program threatened to withhold all funds from the State of Georgia unless such laws were repealed; and

Whereas there is no action which might be taken on the State level to cope with this situation, but action needs to be taken on the Federal level: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of Georgia, That the members of this body deplore the situation existing at the present time which, in effect, condones illegitimacy and rewards persons for illegitimate births, and request that the Members of the U.S. Senate and the Members of the U.S. House of Representatives from Georgia do all in their power to take whatever action necessary to prevent welfare payments for illegitimate children; be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the house is hereby instructed to transmit a copy of this resolution to each member of the Georgia congressional delegation.

Read and adopted in the senate, March 6, 1961.

GEORGE D. STEWART,
Secretary.

Read and adopted in the house, March 1, 1961.

GLENN W. ELLARD,
Clerk.

Misinforming the Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, David Lawrence, in his article in today's New York Herald Tribune, shows how easily misinformation can get to the American people, especially when a President spreads it:

DANGER OF LIVE PRESS TALKS SEEN IN KENNEDY TV ERROR

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, March 26.—President Kennedy made a serious mistake at his press conference last Thursday which ought to spell the end of so-called live performances on radio and television. For the net effect of the error—which, of course, was unintentional—was to mislead the American people and give them an erroneous statement about the minimum-wage legislation now pending before Congress. The President's exact words are recorded in the official transcript as follows:

"I find it difficult to know why any one would oppose seeing somebody by 1963 paid $1.25 in interstate commerce, and in the new coverage we're talking about businesses which make over $1 million a year, and I find it difficult to understand how anybody could object to paying somebody who works in a business which makes over $1 million a year by 1963, $50 a week."

It will be noted that the President twice used the phrase "make over $1 million a year." Probably most listeners agreed immediately with the President that any company making such a profit could well afford the increase from $1 an hour to $1.25 and that those opposing such an increase would just seem to be cruel-hearted, selfish business men. This is the kind of innuendo which adds to class antagonisms and is the sort of argument on which the labor demagogs thrive.

NOT PROFITS BUT RECEIPTS

But what are the facts? The legislation now pending in Congress doesn't make any such classification of businesses with profits of $1 million or over per year. Instead, the bill sponsored by the President—and which was defeated last week by the House of Representatives—called for measurement by gross receipts or sales of $1 million and not by profits. The language in the bill read "$1 million gross annual volume." There's a vast difference, of course, between what a business takes in and what it has left after paying wages and other expenses as well as all taxes.

Indeed, out of the total number of businesses in the United States, at least 90 percent do not make as much as $1 million a year after taxes.

The bill as finally approved by the House last week would exclude a lot of service trades altogether and would continue existing exemptions for employees of hotels, restaurants, lunch counters, cafeterias, hospitals, laundries, drycleaners, motion picture theaters, amusement parks, parking lots, beauty shops, barber shops, gasoline stations, and automobile sales dealers. The reason for this is that many of these employees get tips and other gratuities which increase their income, or else they are largely part-time workers anyway.

The new House bill would require an employer who operates five or more retail chainstores in two States to come under the law, but if any such chainstore has gross receipts of less than $250,000 a year, it would remain exempt.

Now why is there opposition to these measures? Some employers say it will force many present employees out of work altogether. Unions want the legislation because it will enable them to press for a rise in wage scales generally. For, obviously, giving a worker the new $1.25 minimum will cause another worker alongside of him who already gets $1.25 an hour to feel that his pay ought to be stepped up because he has previously been rated higher in skill or experience than the $1-an-hour employee. It really could

bring demands, even during the recession, for a new cycle of wage increases and could affect wage differentials all along the line and not just the employees at the minimum-wage base.

Unfortunately, the whole presentation made on this issue is an example of how one-sided and unfair is the system of forming public opinion by Presidential press conferences, since the President of the United States can unwittingly make erroneous statements, and the many millions of persons throughout the country who hear him have no chance of being given immediately the true facts when errors are made.

One solution of the dilemma is to abandon the live presentations and let them be recorded on tape for showing later in the day or evening, as are so many other television programs. This would afford an opportunity in the meantime for careful revision of any factual errors or misstatements instead of allowing errors to mislead the American people. There is altogether too much preoccupation hereabouts with publicity stunts and live shows for political purposes instead of interest in the orderly and impartial processes of transmitting the Government's information to the people.

Correlation of Federal Activities in Combating Juvenile Delinquency and Cooperation With State and Local Groups—A Constructive Suggestion From the Metropolitan Youth Commission of St. Louis and the Encouraging Response of the Department of Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the Congress periodically—and enthusiastically—votes for additional Federal funds to help in combating the alarming extent of juvenile delinquency in this country, although, of course, this is and must be primarily a problem for localities. But Federal assistance and cooperation and leadership, particularly in the fields of research and vocational education, encouraging the training of teachers with special skills in teaching disturbed children—such as called for in my bill H.R. 15, dealing generally with all types of exceptional children—and in other ways can be most useful.

There is a strong feeling, however, that various Federal agencies engaged in activities intended to help combat juvenile delinquency have been operating in something of a vacuum, isolated and insulated from each other, and without much regard to or knowledge of the work being done on the local level in communities which are trying to face up to this great problem and challenge.

Because of that widespread feeling, I am delighted to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some correspondence indicating that the Department of Justice under Attorney General Robert Kennedy is aware of the situation and is disposed to try to work closely with other Federal agencies and with groups such as the outstanding Metropolitan Youth Commission of St. Louis and St. Louis County. The executive director of that organization, Mr. Eugene P. Schwartz, recently made some very constructive suggestions and some provocative comments to the Attorney General bearing on this issue, and was thoughtful enough to send me a copy of his letter. It stimulated me to write also to Attorney General Kennedy.

This correspondence will, I believe, be of great interest to other Members of Congress and to all Americans who are intensely concerned over juvenile delinquency and over the extent of cooperation among Federal agencies with each other and with State and local agencies in combating it.

This correspondence, including Mr. Schwartz' letter of March 10 to Attorney General Kennedy, my followup inquiry to the Attorney General of March 14, my reply to Mr. Schwartz of the same date, the Attorney General's reply to me and his response to Mr. Schwartz, and also a letter to Mr. Schwartz from David L. Hackett, Assistant to the Attorney General, all dated March 23, 1961, follows:

METROPOLITAN YOUTH COMMISSION, OF ST. LOUIS AND ST. LOUIS COUNTY,
St. Louis, Mo., March 10, 1961.

The Honorable ROBERT F. KENNEDY,
Attorney General of the United States, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: It was with much interest that I read of the request by President Kennedy for an additional $1,158,000 to "battle two phases of crime: organized syndicates of hoodlums and juvenile delinquency."

There are some serious questions I would like to raise in inquiry for information about any plans, particularly as they might relate to the problems of juvenile delinquency.

The statement, as it appeared in our local newspaper, indicated that $618,000 would pay for a program aimed at wiping out juvenile delinquency. There is so much confusion already as to who is doing what in this field of delinquency that I wish there might be a top level conference on this matter before any plan goes ahead.

For example, we already have a little-supported Juvenile Delinquency Section of the U.S. Children's Bureau, a program of delinquency research through the National Institute of Mental Health and, of course, the repeated "expert" announcements from the FBI about what should be done about delinquency. The public, as well as agencies, are so confused as to who should take the lead that I hope the Juvenile Delinquency Section of the U.S. Children's Bureau will at least be consulted.

One of the great problems in our field has been the lack of coordination and interagency planning. The FBI as a law enforcement agency, certainly ought to work cooperatively with social agencies at the national level. Here in St. Louis we have an excellent example of how the law enforcement agencies, social workers and juvenile courts and Metropolitan Youth Commission work together and not against each other. There has been too much professional jealousy and criticisms of other professional disciplines from each other at the national level to keep the public informed as to what should be done.

It is my personal belief that whatever should be done at the national level, as well as at the local level, must be on a coordinated basis. On May 11 and 12 there will be a meeting of local municipal and State youth commissions, youth boards and other public agencies with the responsibility for delinquency control in their respective communities. This will also be a meeting for the formation of a National Association of Public Agencies for Delinquency Control. It is my fervent hope that you will consult with representatives of this group before any plan, either by the FBI or individual agencies, is presented and supported.

Needless to say, I am very grateful for your personal interest in this matter, and we at the local level, who have the responsibility for controlling delinquency in our communities, look for some Federal help. However, this should be on a well planned and coordinated basis. There is much to be questioned as to the role of the FBI with relation to juvenile delinquency. Their responsibilities and activities should be clearly defined in relation to the roles of other agencies working in the same field.

Could we not discuss this matter before we again get the public aroused with misinformation and unsound plans for delinquency control which has already confused our citizens who are anxious to help. There must be a great deal more teamwork by all professional disciplines, and I believe you can give us the leadership to facilitate this.

With sincere best wishes,
Respectfully yours,
EUGENE P. SCHWARTZ,
Executive Director.

MARCH 14, 1961.

Hon. ROBERT F. KENNEDY,
Attorney General United States, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KENNEDY: I have read a great deal of interest a copy I have received of a thoughtful and provocative letter written to you on March 10 by Mr. Eugene P. Schwartz, executive director of the Metropolitan Youth Commission of St. Louis and St. Louis County on the various Federal programs, funds, efforts, studies, and demonstration projects relating to juvenile delinquency and the seeming lack of coordination or meshing of efforts and findings. I would be extremely interested in having your comments on Mr. Schwartz's discussion of this issue, and would appreciate receiving a copy of your reply to him and any other comments you might care to make—or legislative suggestions.

With kindest regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
LEONOR K. (Mrs. JOHN B.) SULLIVAN.

MARCH 14, 1961.

Mr. EUGENE P. SCHWARTZ,
Executive Director, Metropolitan Youth Commission of St. Louis and St. Louis County, St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR MR. SCHWARTZ: Thank you for keying me in on your letter to the Attorney General. I am enclosing a copy of my followup letter to him, one which is intended not only to reflect my interest in what you have written but also to expedite the course of your letter "through channels" at Justice. I will certainly be interested in his comments.

Sincerely yours,
LEONOR K. (Mrs. JOHN B.) SULLIVAN.

MARCH 23, 1961.

Mr. EUGENE P. SCHWARTZ,
Executive Director, Metropolitan Youth Commission of St. Louis and St. Louis County, St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR MR. SCHWARTZ: Your letter to the Attorney General regarding juvenile delinquency has been referred to me, and I am looking forward to discussing this matter with you in person.

I find that I will be in the St. Louis area in the not too distant future, and hope that I may call your office for an appointment.

Very truly yours,
DAVID L. HACKETT,
Assistant to the Attorney General.

MARCH 23, 1961.

Mr. EUGENE P. SCHWARTZ,
Executive Director, Metropolitan Youth Commission of St. Louis and St. Louis County, St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR MR. SCHWARTZ: Many thanks for your good letter of March 10 regarding juvenile delinquency.

As you know, this administration is very interested in this problem, and for the past 2 months the Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare and Justice Departments have been working together on a program which we hope to be able to announce very shortly. In the meantime, the $618,000 requested for the Bureau of Prisons would be used in the following manner: $300,000 would be spent for demonstration release guidance centers (half-way houses); the remaining $318,000 would be spent on demonstration vocational, counseling and correctional education programs as well as training manuals and institutes for correctional personnel and a statistical program.

I have referred your letter to Mr. David Hackett of my staff who is particularly concerned with this project and have asked him to contract you when he is next in the St. Louis area.

We welcome any further views you may have on this very serious problem.

Sincerely,

———— ————,
Attorney General.

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., March 23, 1961.

Hon. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: Thank you very much for your letter of March 14 regarding correspondence received from Mr. Eugene P. Schwartz, executive director of the Metropolitan Youth Commission of St. Louis and St. Louis County on the subject of juvenile delinquency.

As you know, this administration is trying very hard to coordinate the activities in this field and for the past 2 months the Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare and Justice Departments, have been working together on a program that we hope we will be able to announce very shortly.

The attached copies of letters to Mr. Schwartz will indicate that Mr. David L. Hackett, of my staff, is already making plans to call on Mr. Schwartz in the near future. We are most interested in his views on this problem and look forward to discussing this matter with him further.

Your interest in this serious problem is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

ROBERT F. KENNEDY,
Attorney General.

Textile Imports—Resolution of General Assembly of Georgia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, our inequitable and unfair system of tariffs which favor imports at the expense of our own economy is having a serious ill effect on the industries of the United States.

Inequitable tariffs undoubtedly have contributed to the recession which we are now being asked to vote billions of dollars to combat.

Imports from cheap labor countries have caused temporary unemployment in some fields and the elimination of jobs in other fields. Imports have caused some businesses to retrench and others to lock their doors and go out of business.

The textile industry, for example, has suffered severe losses in recent years because of excessive importation of textile products.

More than 800 textile plants in the United States have been forced out of business in the last 13 years. This resulted in the unemployment of almost half a million people.

The General Assembly of Georgia, at its 1961 session, adopted a resolution urgently requesting the Congress of the United States to make a full study of the present tariff rates on goods imported into the United States, and to determine whether tariff rates should be charged on the basis of wage standards of the country exporting such goods.

This resolution—which I hope will be given attentive consideration by the Congress—follows:

H.R. 202

Resolution requesting the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress from Georgia to make a study regarding tariff rates of certain imported goods; and for other purposes

Whereas the textile industries and certain other industries located in the State of Georgia are suffering because of the importation of goods from foreign countries; and

Whereas the wage standards and the standards of living in certain of these foreign countries are much less in comparison than the wage standards and the standards of living in the United States of America; and

Whereas because of such wage standards and standards of living, it is possible for such countries to export goods to the United States of America at a much lower price than the same goods can be purchased from American industries; and

Whereas it is only fit and proper that the citizens of our great country be encouraged to purchase American made goods: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of Georgia, That the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress from the State of Georgia are hereby respectfully and urgently requested to encourage the proper committee or committees of the U.S. Congress to make a full study of the present tariff rates on goods imported into the United States of America, and such committee or committees making such study are hereby respectfully and urgently requested to determine whether or not tariff rates should be charged on the basis of the wage standards of the country exporting such goods.

Be it further resolved, That the clerk of the house of representatives is hereby authorized and directed to send a copy of this resolution to each member of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States from the State of Georgia.

Read and adopted in the senate, March 6, 1961.

GEORGE D. STEWART,
Secretary.

Read and adopted in the house, March 4, 1961.

GLENN W. ELLARD, *Clerk.*

Minimum Wage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from today's New York Herald Tribune, comments fairly on the minimum wage legislation passed by the House last Friday:

THE HOUSE PASSES A BETTER WAGE BILL

The House of Representatives passed a better minimum wage bill than the one asked by President Kennedy, and showed again that Congress has a will of its own.

The most significant difference between the administration proposal and the Kitchin-Ayres bill, which finally passed, was in the criteria for coverage of retail workers. The administration bill would have based this on a store's annual sales volume, a new departure which would have opened the way for eventual wage regulation of ever smaller and smaller enterprises. The Kitchin-Ayres bill, by contrast, bases Federal regulation of retail wages clearly on the historic concept of interstate commerce, limiting it to chains with five or more outlets in two or more States.

The Kitchin-Ayres bill adds far fewer new workers to the bill's coverage (1.4 million, against 4.3 million in the original administration bill). The important point, however, is not one of numbers, but rather of the virtually inevitable future consequences of adopting the sales-volume standard. Once the principle is accepted, no arbitrarily set limit (in this case, a dollar annually) can long be maintained.

The President's defeat was by the irreducible minimum of a single vote. And the Senate, which last summer passed a Kennedy-sponsored bill similar to this year's administration measure, has yet to act. But a defeat it was, nevertheless, and it follows razor-thin victories in past legislative tests. It by no means indicates that the so-called coalition of Republicans and Southern Democrats is in control of Congress, or even of the House. But it does make clear that the President's wish is not automatically going to be Congress' command.

President Kennedy is not likely to take defeat lying down. He has shown a readiness to use the powers of his office to the full in bending Congress to his will when he thinks the issue warrants it. And minimum wage has been high on his "must" list. But if he uses pressure injudiciously he runs the risk of offending a Congress which, he well knows, is jealous of its independence.

An independent Congress is essential to a government of checks and balances, and the House chose a good issue on which to assert itself.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Report on Africa by Assistant Secretary of State G. Mennen Williams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAT McNAMARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, G. Mennen Williams, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, has recently returned from a journey which covered 16 African nations.

Upon his return, he was invited to speak before the National Press Club in Washington.

I feel his remarks make a great contribution to the knowledge we must have to understand the explosive African situation, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of his speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE G. MENNEN WILLIAMS, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR AFRICAN AFFAIRS, TO THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON, D.C., FRIDAY, MARCH 24, 1961

It is a pleasure to come before you today to make a brief report on a trip through 16 of the nations of Africa. My mission on this trip was twofold. First it was my pleasure and privilege to bring personal greetings to African leaders from President Kennedy and Secretary Rusk, and to convey to them and to their peoples new assurances of the strong and positive friendship of the United States. Second, and quite simply, I went to learn.

We flew down over the great desert and stopped first beside the Nile at Khartoum in the Sudan. Next day we were at 8,000 feet in Addis Ababa, capital of the oldest independent country in Africa. Two days later we were sweltering beside the Indian Ocean in the Somali Republic, one of the newest nations in the continent. And so it went. British East Africa, including storied Zanzibar, the two Congos, Cameroon, Nigeria, Togo, the Ivory Coast, Liberia, Ghana and my favorite new frontier, the capital city of Ouagadougou in Upper Volta. Our new Embassy there is safely in the hands of a pair of ex-Marines, an experienced foreign service couple, and the lady in question is a wandering constituent from Marinesco, in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan.

During this long trip I met one of the last Emperors in the world. I talked with presidents and prime ministers, colonial administrators, tribal chieftains, labor leaders, businessmen, students and farmers and fishermen. I have visited mission stations, factories, schools, hospitals, in jungle villages and in sprawling cities where skyscrapers push up beside thatched huts.

To three of my traveling companions I owe a real debt of gratitude. I refer to Warren Unna of the Washington Post, Judd Arnett of the Detroit Free Press and Alan Morrison of Johnson Publications. They have set a high standard in getting a trip like this, and the image of Africa, on the record.

In fact, I did not lack for expert assistance in this journey. Traveling with me were several foreign service and USIA officers who know Africa well and who, in West Africa, stood ready to rescue me when my command of the French language was being put to the test. Perhaps the best qualified, most vigorous and eminently successful expert of them all was one who bore the simple but all-important title, "Mrs."—my wife, Nancy. Like many American women she is much experienced in the world of schools, hospitals, nursing and the basis of all civilization, children and mothers. Her keen perception gave us all insights we might have missed, and her intense and friendly interest delighted the Africans even when she was lecturing them for having so few girls in the schools.

Then, too, I had the help of the men and women of our Embassies, consulates, ICA and USIS, and permit me here to throw another spadeful of earth on the dead image of our foreign service people as striped-pants, high-style bureaucrats ping-ponging from one cocktail party to another. These are wash-and-wear people, working with their sleeves rolled up and working hard. And we learned much from the dedicated American missionaries, businessmen, and educators who also represent America in Africa.

We were met everywhere with the greatest friendliness and warm hospitality, from governments and from people on the street and in the countryside. The peoples of Africa unquestionably have a great reservoir of good will toward America. Once in the Congo an overly-eager U.N. sergeant broke up what he apparently thought was a riot but was only an impromptu crowd gathering to say hello and shake hands with us. The Africans place much trust in America, even to the extent of being quite candid about our shortcomings here at home and in our responses to their needs and hopes.

We found great contrasts in Africa, and observed many stages of political, economic, and social development. Yet there are certain aspirations held in common in the countries we visited. Let me place them under nine headings:

1. The Africans want freedom from colonialism, from any form of outside domination.

2. The Africans want and will insist on racial equality in the world.

3. The Africans do not want to align themselves in a great-power struggle. They are for the most part neutral in international politics, or perhaps more accurately they are not ready to commit their new independence elsewhere.

4. The Africans naturally want government institutions which fit the values of their own societies. This may sometimes mean a greater reliance on some aspects of centralized authority than in the advanced democracies of the Western World, although democratic forces will make themselves felt.

5. A good many African leaders feel they must plan their economies for rapid development, and seem to favor a mixture of private and government-owned enterprise. In part this is because of a lack of local capital. Some call this a socialist approach, but almost without exception it is far from rigid or doctrinaire. Actually I thought I was back in American State Government when I visited western and eastern Nigeria and saw the regional governments encouraging private industry and investment. We saw this elsewhere, too.

6. African leaders want economic development, but many of them have yet to assess not only the opportunities but the limitations which confront them in the economic field. They are bound to make some mistakes before they hit the stride which their nations can maintain in a competitive world.

7. There is a growing awareness of the need to raise standards of health and vitality in Africa. This means not only more medicines and doctors and hospitals; it means a more adequate diet and a lot more protein intake.

8. Agriculture is the main African occupation and a drive is beginning to raise yields and income from farming. The importance of doing so is indicated by the extremely low per capita income figures.

9. Finally, the most commanding, is the need, the burning desire for education. The literacy rate in Africa is something less than 10 percent. I repeat, 10 percent. The educational need is thus felt not just at the top, in terms of college graduates, but in the primary and secondary school levels. We learned that in many local communities the people were raising school buildings with voluntary labor, as frontier communities did in this country.

If we accept these nine points, we can begin to look realistically at the problems of Africa. In my own reckoning they lead to this first conclusion:

Africans are generally agreed on their goals and aspirations and feel they must be achieved in the relatively near future. As a result in tropical African countries there is a race between the rising expectations of the people and what their governments can deliver. This race is the basic issue in Africa today, an issue which in fact is critical for the world and for us here today.

The dangerous side of this race is not hard to see. Africa's new leaders are faced with a situation which invites demagogery and reckless opportunism. These forces, wholly apart from communism, will seek to stimualte and exploit any failure or discontent. This greatly increases the challenge to responsible leadership, the challenge to build for genuine progress. It was a privilege to get to know many of these leaders and I have a great respect for their general level of competence and devotion. I wish each of you could have been with me to feel the intensity with which one outstanding leader said to me: "Mr. Williams, we have won our freedom; we have a democratic society—now we need help." This leader knows he must produce.

This can be better understood if we look briefly at the historical setting. Tropical Africa was long isolated from the rest of the world. Its own special history is essentially one of minor kingdoms and many tribes, of local wars and scattered migrations. Unlike the peoples of other continents the Africans have not been mouled through force of arms and cultural dominion into one or a few broad cultures. The tribe is still the underlying base of society, and the degree of fragmentation is suggested by the fact that 800 to 1,000 languages are spoken

in the continent. The colonial imprint on Africa has been important but incomplete.

Africa's journey in the great world is thus of very recent origin. But it has been gathering momentum at a terrific pace. There were four independent nations in all Africa in 1945. In 1959 there were 10. Today there are 27. This is an absolutely unprecedented transfer of power and it has created an atmosphere of great expectations, of great new beginnings. The aspirations of the African peoples have been brough to the fore by leaders determined to realize rapid advances in human dignity, physical well-being, and national progress.

Really we should try to put ourselves for a moment in the position of one of the leaders of the new Africa—let us say, of Dr. Azikiwe in Nigeria, of Felix Houphuet-Boigny in the Ivory Coast, of Julius Nyerere in Tanganyika. They have led their peoples to independence or in the case of Nyerere to the threshold of independence. But the African peoples are only now beginning to think in national terms. We hear much about "African nationalism" but more correctly what is meant is the immemorial urge, this time in Africa, for freedom. African leaders and their supporters have won freedom from something, from colonial rule. Now they must give content to the momentum that has carried them to independence and get their peoples to use freedom for something, for the building of modern nations and the realization of economic and social progress.

For this task they have, in modern terms, all too little to work with.

That is why I say that the new governments are in a race with time and the expectations of the African peoples—expectations which are fed by today's easier communication and wider contact with the world outside. Newly won independence means newly assumed obligations for Africa's leaders, and they need outside support and assistance. Without exception they have turned to the West first and for most of the assistance they must have. Only where that help has not been forthcoming, or where it has been too little or too late, have they placed their primary reliance elsewhere. It is not an easy thing, I can tell you, to hear out young and progressive African leaders as they earnestly discuss minor amounts of American aid in terms of the political life and death of their countries.

In the field of economic aid and investment, the main facts today are these: British and French assistance, which except in Guinea has not dried up when a country has become independent, is at an annual level of over $700 million, according to a leading university report. These contributions are a vital base for most African economies, and let me say here that I believe both France and Britain have done commendable jobs in tropical Africa. U.S. aid programs are supplemental and in this fiscal year will total about $250 million. This covers grants, loans, and technical assistance but not surplus agricultural commodities. Almost half of this total is going to three North African countries.

What can be said of these figures? Are they large in relation to the need, or in relation to development aid given elsewhere—or are they small? The fact is they are small, on both counts. To take an example from aid given elsewhere, we gave more to Austria alone in the first year of the Marshall plan than the figure I have just given you for all of Africa this year. To measure Africa's needs is not a simple matter, but it may help to cite two figures. The first is per capita national income, which for Africa as a whole is $89 a year. This compares to $171 for the Near East, $253 for Latin America, $790 for Western Europe and over $2,500 for the United States. The second figure represents the total value of all the goods and services produced by Africa, in comparison with the United States. The figure is 3 percent—Africa produces 3 percent of what we do—and yet that continent is three times the size of the United States and supports over 200 million people.

If we cannot equate such figures with needs in any absolute sense, we can certainly use them to gage where Africa stands in the world's lineup. Africa can not be neatly lumped in with our usual generalizations for the world. Africa's problems are new and different, and we must mark the differences and understand how they affect the total world balance.

It would be rash of me to venture very deeply into what the U.S. role toward Africa should be. Yet it is impossible to miss the point that Africa's leaders expect from the United States a greater response to their needs at this time of the birth of nations throughout a continent. And for me it is impossible to imagine that we will miss seeing the consequences of failing them. I am encouraged in this by the first reactions to President Kennedy's appeal of 2 days ago for a new approach, designed to fulfill our moral, political and economic obligations in support of freedom.

Such talk may in your minds conjure up thoughts of vast new sums of money for aid programs. It is true, of course, that it will cost money to enable African leaders to meet the dangerous challenges of ignorance, poverty and disease. But the need is not for a sudden and unlimited increase in funds. We are not alone in extending aid. And the capacity to absorb and put economic assistance to work productively is limited in Africa at this time. What we can and should do is well within reasonable expectations when judged by the criteria of our wealth and leadership in the world, by the record of our performance in the past, and be the stake we have in human dignity everywhere.

There is, however, an urgency, a timeliness that we must not miss in anything we do or hope for in Africa. We must act more quickly; we must throw in our support now, today. We must help Africa's leaders to build schools and get teachers into them—some from our own shores, many more from Africa itself. We must export our know-how to the farmers of Africa and we must be ready to help get more food from our surpluses into African stomachs. We must support community development. We must help small industries, like that of a trader I saw in Kenya who started his small store with an ICA loan. In some cases we should take on larger schemes for the development of power and new manufactures. In doing so, we shall be enhancing the probability that American private investment can play a growing part in Africa's future development.

The sum of these contributions will not transform Africa overnight. And in any case, that transformation is ultimately in the hands of the peoples of Africa and of their new leaders.

Essentially and in conclusion, these are the impressions I have come back with. You may remark that I have not talked about the Communists or the Congo or the cold war. I will try to answer questions, if you wish to ask them, about these and other points I have not touched on. Just let me say, however, what we had better be coldly realistic about Communist bloc influence in Africa. The new nations there do not emerge into a one-sided world. They see it whole and they are not going to slam the door on another great power which commands large political and economic resources. The Sino-Soviet presence will inevitably increase in Africa, and its emmissaries will be well armed with promissory notes—some open, some offered covertly to ambitious and unscrupulous powerseekers. The push of a new imperialism is thus certain to seek headway in Africa. This is one more reason, and a weighty one, for us to get busy learning all we can about Africa, understanding the aspirations of its peoples, and supporting its new leaders in the great enterprise of construction that lies before them.

Finally, let me say Africa is not only a challenge but an opportunity—we saw it in the bright eager faces of hundreds of young school children. And I remember especially visiting a mission station 50 miles from Leopoldville in the Congo. The missionaries were back only 3 days since evacuation. They said they had left long after the other whites because the indigenous Africans had protected them and finally warned them they had better go—they left by helicopter. All the while the missionaries were gone, the Africans ran the mission church, the school and the hospital—as we could see. Africans when given the opportunity can and do hold high the finest values of human dignity. This, then, is the real challenge of Africa, the real opportunity—to fulfill our American philosophy by helping our fellow human beings realize for themselves the full significance and rich blessings of individual dignity as well as national freedom.

Hon. B. Carroll Reece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOWARD H. BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the very appropriate editorial comments on the life of our beloved coleague, the late Congressman B. Carroll Reece, First District of Tennessee.

I should like to include the editorials from the following Tennessee newspapers: the Knoxville Journal, the Nashville Tennessean, the Nashville Banner, and the Bristol Herald Courier.

The editorials follow:

[From the Knoxville Journal, Mar. 21, 1961]

TENNESSEANS RECOGNIZED REECE'S STATURE IN NATION, BUT THEY WERE DEVOTED TO HIM AS HUMAN BEING

In the death Sunday of Carroll Reece the Nation lost one of its great conservative leaders, and the Republican Party nationally and in Tennessee lost one of its most valued chieftains.

At an age just a little past his 3 score and 10, the First Congressional District Congressman had rounded out a career which carried him to the heights of public service as a statesman and politician, he had achieved leadership in the world of business, and above all, he had won the confidence and affection of literally thousands of persons in both political parties who reacted to his death as a personal loss.

It was this last facet in his career that he would want emphasized, even beyond the honors conferred upon him as a soldier, an educator, and as a State and national political leader.

Carroll Reece both loved and respected his fellow man. Those who came in contact with him sensed it instantly. He was not kind, considerate, and helpful as a matter of political expediency. Rather the fact

that he was all of these things drew his fellows to him and created the devotion which it has rarely been the good fortune of any man to possess in such full measure as was the case with him. It was this aura of friendliness and helpfulness which established a bond between him and thousands of Tennesseans, and no less made him one of the most effective men in the Capital, both within the Halls of Congress and in the departments of the Government. In the truest sense of the term, he became the Representative of his constituency in its contacts with their Government, nor was his representation confined to the geographical limits of his own district or his own State.

Some of us in Tennessee have observed his career, and have to a degree participated in it, in the process of its building up to a point of national prominence. Some of us have watched the development of his stature, beginning with that first campaign in 1920 to the present, with pride and devotion. For us, the memory of this man, his intelligence, his steadfastness, his affection, and above all his faith in his fellow man, will be treasured for as long as we shall live. This is a measure of immortality in itself.

To be a statesman with courage and tenacity; to be a politician with conscience and consideration; to be a friend with affection and devotion; to be a husband and father with love and tenderness; Carroll Reece was all of these through a long and busy life. If he had been allotted more years there was nothing in his living that he would have wanted to change.

That this is so must prove the greatest source of comfort to Mrs. Reece, to his family and to his friends.

[From the Nashville Tennessean, Mar. 21, 1961]

TENNESSEE'S MR. REPUBLICAN

Tennessee conservatism has lost one of its most eloquent spokesmen with the passing of U.S. Representative B. Carroll Reece, of Johnson City.

This newspaper did not often agree with the philosophy of Mr. Reece, but seldom was there any reason to question the sincerity of his convictions or the honorable basis of his motives.

Mr. Reece possessed extraordinary political insights which he wedded to an unusual business acumen to become truly Tennessee's Mr. Republican. For several decades he had been the party's most influential leader in this State, and his influence in national GOP circles was considered.

It is unlikely that the minority party will soon develop another leader in this State capable of consolidating so much of its political power in a single personality.

Younger men who aspire to Republican leadership in Tennessee would do well to understand those qualities which made Mr. Reece so successful. For his influence was not based solely upon political or fiscal skills.

Rather, the broadest base of his support could be found in a warm personality, in an inherently kind spirit, in a deep desire to serve what he believed to be the best interests of his constituents, and in a personal political credo by which both friend and foe knew him: A promise made was a promise to be kept.

Mr. Reece was partisan in his views and partisan in his deeds and words. But he was never bitterly so; therefore those who differed with him held him in highest esteem, and considered him a devoted patriot in the best tradition of freedom's way.

[From the Nashville Banner, Mar. 20, 1961]

REPRESENTATIVE B. CARROLL REECE

State and national tributes unite in evaluation of a lifelong service, the notable career of B. Carroll Reece—and in recognition of the public loss sustained with his passing. He was a stalwart American; as former President Eisenhower said of him, "an able and courageous leader in war and peace."

The First Tennessee District honored him by election 18 times to Congress, a tenure second only to that of Speaker SAM RAYBURN in the House. From 1946 through 1949 he served his party as Republican National Chairman, and other party honors included chairmanship of the State Republican Executive Committee, and long membership on the national committee.

East Tennessee knew him, boy and man, as one of its own, whose success stemmed from innate qualities of character, zeal and toil up the ladder to fulfill worthy aspiration. Early poverty was for him a challenge to self-improvement. He measured to it, with determination, and for education, creating its own opportunities.

On that solid foundation, he built a career distinguished for its service. As a soldier in World War I he was cited for extraordinary courage and heroism under fire. He received the Distinguished Service Cross, the Distinguished Service Medal, the Purple Heart, and the French Croix de Guerre.

Politically a conservative, he commanded the respect of colleagues on both sides of the party aisle. A power in Congress, a stabilizing factor in that realm of legislative give and take, he exercised an influence on the direction of Government, and he faithfully represented the interests of his district—no less concerned for the interests of his State and his Nation.

These unite in appraisal of an extraordinary career, self-made, and in the sense of loss occasioned by his death. To his memory respect belongs.

[From the Bristol Herald Courier, Mar. 22, 1961]

B. CARROLL REECE: A MAN OF STATURE

On this day we pay our last respects to B. Carroll Reece. We are not alone in sorrow. His colleagues in the Congress of our Nation, his countless friends across the State of Tennessee, a host of men and women at every station of life, all share the sadness which is ours.

How can you appraise, with any hope of adequacy, the life of men like Carroll Reece?

He came down from the mountains of east Tennessee and walked along a path which is open to few men, and which fewer still possess the courage and ability to tread.

Along that pathway, which ended Sunday, Carroll Reece tasted often the sweet wines of victory. He also, one some occasions, knew the disappointment of defeat. But Carroll Reece was never one to chart his course by battles won and lost. He turned his efforts always toward today and toward tomorrow—and grew in stature and in service until the very end.

Wherever his responsibilities and his duties led, Carroll Reece never relinquished his love or his loyalty for the First District of Tennessee. He served it with devotion; he gave himself full measure to each of those who came and sought his help. These mountains were his home, and the ties that bound him to his district were much stronger than such bonds are usually thought to be.

His name fell from the lips of those who knew him with the ease and affection of a loved one. He was more than a Congressman to all of them; he was a friend. At crossroads stores and country homes, they spoke of Carroll Reece as a personal benefactor. He helped an aged mother get a phone in a remote rural area; he worked to get electric power service so that poor farms might become more prosperous. During times of stress, he was the one answer for bereaved families who knew not what step to take to bring a serviceman home from some farflung outpost. Whatever monuments we may erect to Carroll Reece, none will speak more eloquently than those he built himself in the memories of men.

He was unquestionably the greatest Republican leader ever produced in the State of Tennessee and, also unquestionably, he was one of the greatest national figures of our generation. He was a patriot, in war and in peace. He was a legislator, astute in the ways of legislators and ever mindful that his actions could, and often did, alter the course of life for millions of Americans. He was an educator, a businessman, an economist, an historian. He read the lessons of life; he understood what he read; and, with understanding, he gave his own life to public service.

The mountains which bred him will stand silently for years unnumbered before they give us once again a man to equal Carroll Reece.

Mandatory Quotas on Textiles and Textile Products—Resolution of American Cotton Manufacturers Institute

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. EVERETT JORDAN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, on last Saturday, at Miami Beach, Fla., at the time when the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] addressed the meeting of the delegates to the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, that convention adopted a resolution.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPORT POLICY

Whereas the major American economic aim is growth and the creation of job opportunities; and

Whereas world trade on an orderly basis which is not disruptive of existing markets or creative of tensions is a desirable objective; and

Whereas the American fiber, textile, and apparel industries are vital to the national interest and employ 2 million persons in fiber production and another 2 million in textiles and textile products; and

Whereas the major deterrent to stability of employment and growth in the textile industry is the excessive and rising importation of textiles and textile products;

Whereas the competitive position of the American textile industry will be severely damaged by the rising differential between the cost of cotton to the American and foreign manufacturers; and

Whereas such excessive and rising imports: (a) increase unemployment and reduce work time; (b) worsen our balance of payments position and increase our potential gold loss; (c) deter sound forward planning essential to growth: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the ACMI strongly endorses all the recommendations of the Pastore Committee and especially the recommendation that mandatory quotas on textiles and textile products be established by country and by category of product on a fair and equitable base period; and be it further

Resolved, That the ACMI commends the unusual action of President Kennedy in appointing a Cabinet-level committee to

consider the textile problem and urges that the recommendations of the Pastore Committee be implemented by the President at the earliest possible moment.

Virginia: All America City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD H. POFF
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, the city of Radford, Va., where I was born and make my home, has recently been awarded the title "All America City." In every sense of the word and by every yardstick, Radford is all America.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I quote herewith the contents of an editorial which appeared in the March 16 issue of the Radford News Journal, an editorial which appeared in the March 17 issue of the Roanoke Times and an editorial which appeared in the March 17, 1961, issue of the Roanoke World-News:

[From the News Journal, Radford, Va., Mar. 16, 1961]

ALL AMERICA CITY

This newspaper, like every citizen of Radford, is bursting with pride today in connection with Radford being chosen an All America City.

The fabulous honor is doubly punctuated by the fact that no other southern city received this award. We stand alone in this whole section of the Nation.

We would like to commend the delegation which journeyed to Phoenix and "brought home the bacon." The city's trust and confidence in the delegation was completely justified. So to Messrs. Whitehead, Price, Coleman, and Silverman goes a hearty, "well done."

Radford is 1 of 11 cities selected from over a hundred which pursued this honor. It is an appropriate award since citizen participation is the dominating factor in the competition and this has been the primary factor in the mass of outstanding accomplishments in the community.

The people of Radford responded magnificently when called upon to pass a bond issue for a much-needed expansion of our school system. Later when the need for a sewage treatment system became necessary, again our citizens answered the call with a resounding 7 to 1 majority. When the idea of an area airport was first advanced, Radford was beating the drums early on its behalf. This set the stage for other area developments whereby the several communities in the New River Valley have joined hands to further develop the area. The outcome of the area concept of development bred the Fantus study, closely followed by the New River Valley Industrial Commission. A need for vocational training was realized and joint community action created the New River Vocational Technical School. Probably the most unique contribution by Radford's citizens in recent years was last year's Project Color Styling. The overwhelming support given this attempt to present a more attractive face for visitors to our city (as well as ourselves) is noteworthy and has attracted much publicity throughout the Nation. The need for a substantial amount of local funds for the creation of our newest industry, Grafio Rubber Co., received outstanding support from our citizens. Once again, our people had responded in true all-America fashion.

Radford can look forward to expanded industrial development if we utilize the guide of the Fantus study. As yet, not a single new industry has been secured from the blueprint submitted by Fantus. It is mandatory that this be pursued with increased vigor. There are still many structures whose appearance can be greatly enhanced through the suggestions of Project Color Styling. Expanded library facilities are sorely needed for our people. The advancement of our excellent recreational facilities would be another desirable endeavor. Improvements in our zoning and planning for improvement of our shopping facilities should come under close scrutiny at an early date. An educational program to acquaint our citizens with the desirability of spending most, if not all, of their dollars locally would reap huge dividends to every citizen of our city. Of course, these are just a few of the many tasks ahead to which we must address ourselves. There are obviously many others.

[From the Roanoke (Va.) Times, Mar. 17, 1961]

CONGRATULATIONS

Few cities of Radford's size have ever won the coveted All America City Award. Since it was instituted the honor has come to scarcely half a dozen Virginia communities, of which Roanoke is one.

So Radford has good right to be proud of the fact that it is one of 11 cities of the United States to win the "All America" designation this year. Roanokers share in their neighbor's rejoicing.

Radford's good fortune is not the result of any single individual's effort though, to be sure, there was excellent leadership. It is a recognition, more than anything else, of a vigorously progressive civic spirit and a cooperative attitude in civic improvement. The award is a deserved tribute to the forward look and enterprise of the people.

We have an idea that this recognition and sense of achievement will stimulate Radford to accomplish greater things, that its citizens won't be content to rest upon their laurels. They have our congratulations and best wishes.

[From the Roanoke (Va.) World-News, Mar. 17, 1961]

ALL AMERICA RADFORD

Congratulations, Radford.

Recognition as an All America City by the National Municipal League and Look magazine is a deserved achievement and one in which every citizen has a right to take pride.

Being the only Southern winner among the 11, chosen from a field of 22 in the final competition, makes the award even more pleasing.

Radford shortly will receive its 1960 prize for citizen leadership in getting neighboring communities to join hands in common area projects such as the New River Valley Airport, an industrial commission, and a vocational school. In addition it enlarged the local hospital facilities, improved the water and sewage systems, launched a school building program, and staged a general refurbishing of its downtown area.

Thus, Radford joins Roanoke, Richmond, Norfolk, and Petersburg in the selected circle of communities which have earned national recognition for their progressive spirit.

Roanoke, All America of 1952 salutes Radford, All America of 1960.

Proposed Trout Hatchery on the Jordan River, Mich.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the scourge of the sea lamprey has fallen heavily on all States bordering on the Great Lakes in recent years.

The Great Lakes Fishery Commission is at last winning the battle against the lamprey, but the result of its earlier spread remains. The trout population of the Great Lakes has been virtually eliminated.

A vast quantity of lake trout fingerlings will be needed to restock Lake Michigan and Lake Huron, two of the hardest hit. To rehabilitate the trout population, a large lake trout hatchery must be constructed.

The Conservation Department of the State of Wisconsin reports to me that the most suitable location for this hatchery is located on the Jordan River in the State of Michigan. The need is urgent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter to me from the Wisconsin Conservation Commission explaining this need be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF WISCONSIN
CONSERVATION DEPARTMENT,
Madison, Wis., February 17, 1961.

Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: I am writing to you at this time as a Commissioner of the Great Lakes Fishery Commission and as Director of the Wisconsin Conservation Department in regard to an appropriation which has been included in the Department of Interior budget for fiscal year 1962 for the construction of a lake trout hatchery on the Jordan River in the State of Michigan. It is my understanding that hearings will be held shortly by an appropriate subcommittee on this allocation of funds.

The Great Lakes Fishery Commission, as well as the Great Lakes States, the Province of Ontario, and the Canadian and U.S. Federal Governments have been actively engaged in the sea lamprey control program and lake trout rehabilitation. Considerable progress has been made in the control of the sea lamprey, and as of this date all of the streams tributary to Lake Superior inhabited by larval sea lamprey have been treated with specific toxicants to bring about eradication and control. The next step, of course, is the rearing and stocking of large quantities of lake trout to bring about the reestablishment of the population. Chemical treatment of streams tributary to Lake Michigan and Lake Huron will begin this spring, and subsequently lake trout fingerlings will be needed for the rehabilitation of the lake trout populations in these two lakes.

In order that a vast quantity of lake trout fingerlings can be made available for this

restocking, a large lake trout hatchery must be constructed. The most suitable location for this hatchery is located on the Jordan River in the State of Michigan. This site was selected only after extensive and exhaustive investigations were made by State and Federal experts. The Jordan River is the only site which has a water supply of sufficient quality and quantity to operate the size of establishment which is necessary. We in Wisconsin located several sites which had water of suitable quality but lacking in volume.

It will be greatly appreciated if you will lend your support to the allocation of funds necessary for the establishment of the Jordan River lake trout hatchery. I am certain the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife of the Department of Interior will be most happy to provide you with further details. Should you have any further questions, I anticipate that I will attend the North American Wildlife Conference which will be held in Washington on March 6, 7, and 8. I would be most happy to answer any questions or provide whatever additional information which might be necessary.

Thanking you for your consideration, I am,

Very truly yours,

L. P. VOIGT,
Conservation Director.

Death of the Dollar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, how much can our American taxpayer stand? Lyle Wilson's article in the March 27 issue of the Washington Daily News is very timely:

NICKED AGAIN
(By Lyle C. Wilson)

Your bank account, your insurance policy and the dollar in your pocket were nicked by the budget message sent to Congress last week by President Kennedy.

All three will be nicked again by this week's defense budget message. These are the thousandth or ten thousandth such nicks suffered by the U.S. dollar in the past 20 years. These nicks are painless, less than a pin prick.

It is a fact, however, that mere nicks can cause the U.S. dollar to bleed to death. The dollar has been bleeding a little ever since it was established as the basic unit of our money in the infancy of the Republic. This bleeding process is called currency inflation. Currency inflation, in turn, is a process of shrinking the purchasing power of the dollar.

There was some currency inflation in Mr. Kennedy's Friday budget message. It was not identified as such, but it was there. It was disguised but identifiable in the language and the figures estimating Treasury revenue and proposed spending for current (1961) and next (1962) fiscal years.

The Treasury experts are estimating deficits in both of those years. Deficits tend to rot the dollar. How large those deficits will be depends on the sum proposed by the President for national defense spending. Last Friday's budget covered only nondefense items.

Both of these budget messages are revisions of budgets previously proposed for those years by former President Eisenhower. Messrs. Eisenhower and Kennedy jointly are responsible for the end product, including the inevitable further inflation of the currency and rotting of the dollar.

This process proceeded at a gallop in the Roosevelt and Truman administrations. It slowed to a crawl or a creep during the 8 Eisenhower years. Even so, the impact on your bank account, your insurance policy and on the buck in your pants has been devastating. The Senate Finance Committee calculates that the dollar since 1939 has lost about 53 cents in purchasing power.

The committee took 1939 as a reasonable jumping-off place for such calculations. It arbitrarily assigned to the 1939 dollar a purchasing power of 100 cents. Month by month the Government issued cost-of-living figures on the basis of which, month by month, the committee recalculated the dollar in terms of what it actually would buy.

As prices rose, the dollar bought less and less. That beautiful buck in your pants pocket is worth right now 47 cents in terms of 1939 bacon and beans.

This dollar devaluation is sometimes called the rotting of the dollar, a better phrase. It also is the grandest larceny. It robs everyone but it robs some more than it robs others. The hardest hit are those who can least afford it—the common men and their women.

Civil Rights Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article, by the distinguished Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG], on the subject of civil rights legislation, which appeared in the Honolulu Advertiser on March 12, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I should like to know how he obtained that much space in a daily newspaper. It was a remarkable achievement.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL RIGHTS PLAN PERKING
(By Senator OREN E. LONG)

The outlook is good for progress in the civil rights field under the Kennedy administration. The President and the majority leadership in Congress have skillfully avoided the boobytrap which has destroyed civil rights efforts so often in the past—a bitter, drag-out fight over legislative procedure.

To have pressed Congress immediately for a sweeping civil rights program, with the dramatic threat of a filibuster, would have been a spectacular gesture by the new administration.

But the President and the majority leadership in Congress were well aware that any such grandstand play would have jeopardized the administration's entire legislative program.

Instead, the administration has wisely chosen first to use the tools at hand—tools which the previous administration also had, but failed to use fully. These tools are the Executive actions which can be taken under existing law and authority.

Some of these steps are being taken quietly, with little or no publicity. Others are public actions such as the President's Executive order setting up the new Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity. This is indicative of the new administration, showing what can be done if the effort is made.

As the New York Times commented on March 8:

"For some years it has been the official policy of the Government not to discriminate against its own employees because of race, creed, color, or national origin. And the same policy has been required of companies in Government contract operations. But enforcement by the two previous committees in this field was much too sketchy—especially in the case of private contractors—largely through the lack of clearly defined powers and also personnel.

"President Kennedy's order meets both these shortcomings with an imaginative and hard-hitting program—hard hitting in its possibilities, but tempered by education and persuasion."

Although progress will be made by executive action under the Kennedy administration, this is not to say that legislative action is not also needed. That is why I have joined with Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY of Minnesota in introducing a seven-point civil rights legislative program.

The bills are:

S. 1253—Bar racial discrimination in the use of facilities or equipment used for interstate travel. This bill would apply to terminal facilities and local transportation to and from terminals in the same degree as to the transportation equipment itself.

S. 1254—Extend to all members of Armed Forces the protection now afforded to Coast Guard personnel against bodily attack. The bill would make an attack upon any serviceman in uniform a Federal offense.

S. 1255—Strengthen criminal statutes and provide additional civil remedies to persons deprived of their civil rights. This would be accomplished by outlawing certain actions that may be prejudicial to the rights of citizens under the Constitution and by providing civil remedies against persons contravening such rights.

S. 1256—Define lynching as an assemblage which: (1) commits violence on any citizen because of race, ancestry, or religion; or (2) exercises by physical violence any corrective measure over a prisoner, suspect, or convict to prevent apprehension, trial, or punishment. So defined, lynching would be a Federal criminal offense with severe penalties.

S. 1257—Extend indefinitely the Civil Rights Commission as now established. Under the present law which expires November 8, 1961, the Commission would be eliminated as of that date.

S. 1258—Create an Equality of Opportunity in Employment Commission to administer a program of nondiscrimination in employment. The Commission would be given, subject to judicial review, broad powers of preventing discrimination and investigating employment conditions.

S. 1259—Outlaw the poll tax as a voting requirement in all elections where Federal officers are chosen.

This bill would affect only the five States which still retain a poll tax.

I am hopeful that in due course, after the other major parts of the administration's legislative program are acted upon and the threat of a filibuster is therefore weaker, Congress will give proper consideration to the bills which Senator HUMPHREY and I have proposed.

To me, the program envisioned by the bills is more than the sum of its parts. Each bill is designed to correct or ameliorate some

specific evil or injustice which is now prevalent or is possible under present law. But I believe the program would represent much more.

Its enactment would be a milestone in the slow progress of humanity toward humanitarianism—a way station on the long road toward the realization of the American dream.

Anti-Communist Group Necessary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM W. SCRANTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. SCRANTON. Mr. Speaker, I find that young America is more interested than ever in the many major issues of our day. It is particularly encouraging that the college students seem to be so alert to the threat of communism to the world and to the Nation.

As a clear and forthright indication of this, under unanimous consent, I include the following editorial from the Aquinas, a newspaper published weekly by the students of the University of Scranton, Pa., and thus bring it to the attention of the Members of the House:

ANTI-COMMUNIST GROUP NECESSARY

The House Un-American Activities Committee and in particular its film, "Operation Abolition," have come under fire recently from college newspapers and student associations throughout the Nation demanding that the committee be disorganized.

In addition, some Members of Congress, led by JAMES ROOSEVELT, of California, have attacked the committee and tried to halt appropriations this year for the committee.

The main contention against the House Un-American Activities Committee is that it is un-American. Opponents of the committee constantly revert to mentioning that the Supreme Court of the United States is split by a close vote of 5–4 on the committee's constitutional basis.

This type of faulty argument was most recently used by Representative ROOSEVELT on March 1. When speaking before the House of Representatives, he noted that only a few days previous had the Supreme Court in the Wilkinson and Braden contempt cases, split 5–4 on its decision. In all cases, the majority voted in favor of the committee.

The HUAC is one of the many ways by which the people of the United States, through their duly elected representatives, can take a forward step against communism.

J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, recently stated that "communism was never more dangerous to American freedom than right now."

With this in mind, civic-minded people of the United States can do one of two things; either stand around twiddling their thumbs and allow communism to gain a stronger hold in this hemisphere, or they can take constructive forward action against this menace to mankind. Americans should not only be prodemocracy but anti-Communist.

Support the House Un-American Activities Committee is one of the best means of combating the communistic threat in the United States.

We were specially gratified by the recent vote of the House of Representatives favoring the appropriation of funds for the HUAC. The vote was 412 yeas, 6 nays, and 14 not voting.

Of special note regionally was the fact that both Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, Democrat and Congressman WILLIAM W. SCRANTON, Republican, voted in favor of the resolution.

This overwhelming vote of confidence should promote the HUAC to continue its relentless work which is so important to the well-being of the United States.

The Aquinas, at this time, wishes to go on record supporting the House Un-American Activities Committee, and asking other college publication and student groups to take a realistic look at the total picture of communism and its influence on the United States. If they do this then they will see the necessary duty of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Economic Bootstrap Operations in Mellen, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, across the Nation serious economic problems still confront us in many communities.

Fortunately, a number of these areas, through constructive, forward leadership, are attempting to undertake "bootstrap" operations to improve their economic outlook.

As a splendid example of this, the citizens of Mellen, Wis., are undertaking a vigorous effort to promote tourism. The objective is to take advantage of the splendid natural resources of the area to,

First. Provide a wonderful place of recreation for the people of Wisconsin, the Nation, and other countries, and

Second. Boost the local economy.

Recently I received from President Howard Peters of the Mellen Area Development Corp., a statement revealing their efforts at improving the economy. Reflecting the realistic, forward-looking way in which this community is endeavoring to grapple with these economic difficulties, I ask unanimous consent to have this statement published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMIC BOOTSTRAP OPERATIONS IN MELLEN, WIS.

The sight of skis atop of automobiles, going from ski hill to ski hill in northern Wisconsin and upper Michigan is a recent phenomenon to the Midwest. To most this is just one more sign of the American, with increased leisure, seeking outdoor recreation in what is the Nation's fastest growing outdoor sport. However, to the long depressed areas of the north where ski developments have been made it is a new and dynamic economic factor, a factor that has brought about a healthy resurgence in the recreation industry. Skiing has made these areas four season vacationlands, converting this once highly seasonal industry to a year-round basis. In these communities new moneys and energies are now available to develop fully all the vast recreational resources that abound in the north. Existing motels, resorts, restaurants and other tourist facilities have been able to greatly improve and new facilities have been built or are a-building. Recreation on a year-round basis is just beginning to be recognized in these areas as the great economic force that it is.

To most experts the best potential ski hill in northern Wisconsin is Mount Whittlesey, located just outside the city limits of Mellen, Wis. Here in the heart of the snow belt Mount Whittlesey rises to a height of 1,872 feet, the highest point in the Penokee Range. The northern slopes afford a usable vertical drop of substantially more than 400 feet, down hill runs in excess of 5,000 feet and an average snowfall of over 100 inches. The mountain is accessible and visible from three State highways, Nos. 13, 77, and 169. The general geographic location places it within easy reach of three giant metropolitan areas, Chicago, Milwaukee and Minneapolis-St. Paul. These factors have made winter sports enthusiasts look longingly at Mount Whittlesey for the past 30 years.

The mountain was named for Col. Charles Whittlesey, who in 1849 was sent by the U.S. Government to make a geological study. In the colonel's letters to his younger brother, Asaph, he told of the promise of iron ore mining in this area. Asaph came north and built the first home in what is now the city of Ashland. He later was instrumental in forming Ashland County. Today, 112 years later, people are still waiting for the iron ore mining.

The land needed for the surface development of Mount Whittlesey as a ski hill represents but a small fraction of the land in the Penokee Range now controlled by the Oliver Mining Co. A subsidiary of the giant United States Steel Corp. The year 1929 marked the first date in which efforts were made to obtain this excellent hill for recreation. This proposal was submitted to the steel interests by the Chicago Toboggan Club and it was turned down on the grounds that the development of Mount Whittlesey would interfere with planned mining operations. Over the next 32 years numerous requests were received by the mining company for the use of this land for recreation and each was turned down. The most recent request was contained in a comprehensive proposal, including firm financial backing, drawn up by private individuals of the Mellen area. On June 14, 1960, the secretary of the Pewabic Corp., a subsidiary of the subsidiary, rejected the proposal "somewhat regretfully" and stated once again that the reason was that the surface development of Mount Whittlesey would "represent an additional encumbrance and consequent interference with exploration or the mining possibilities."

Today venture capital is waiting to develop Wisconsin's finest ski hill and the Mellen area is making an effort to create conditions whereby they can exploit their rich recreational resources as well as the possibility of mining. This depressed area has the summer assets of one of Wisconsin's most beautiful State parks, Copper Falls, many lovely small lakes nestled in the rocky highlands of the Penokee Range, fine trout streams and the vast Chequamegon National Forest with its wildlife. To date, the short northern summer vacation season has precluded any full development of these resources. But with skiing on Mount Whittlesey, the area would become a compact four-season recreation area where present limited facilities could be greatly improved and new ventures established. Conservative estimates show that the need for recreational facilities in our Nation will grow 10 times in the next two generations and the Mellen area cannot afford to overlook their underdeveloped recreational resources as means of economic betterment.

The proposed ski development looks for an initial investment on Mount Whittlesey

that would in a few years bring 40,000 skiers to the Mellen area during the 13-week ski season starting at Christmas. Over the years the hill could be expanded to accomodate up to 60,000 or more. Figures show that the average skier spends 10 percent of his dollar in transportation, 10 percent at the hill and 80 percent for lodging, food, beverages, and entertainment. On the basis of 40,000 skiers, it can be estimated that each skier would spend $7 at the hill for a total of $280,000 and eight times that amount in the area, or $2,240,000. A total of over $2½ million would be brought into the area during the worst 3 months of the yearly economic cycle. This money and the summer potential would make the building of facilities economically sound and would do much to hold in this area a great percentage of the over 140,000 visitors who yearly visit the State park. Other developments will follow. The YMCA of Metropolitan Chicago has already expressed definite interest in developing a year-round camp for high school and young adult groups. This one organization alone has spoken of an initial development costing over a quarter of a million.

In order to bring about an economic resurgence to their community, interested citizens of the Mellen area have formed the Mellen Development Corp. to explore and exploit all of their resources. The development corporation has taken up the ski hill project and are bending every effort to get a sympathetic hearing from the Oliver Mining Co. for the multiple land use of the small area in the Penokee Range that is needed for the Mount Whittlesey ski hill. Through their legislative representatives in the State senate and assembly a nonpartisan resolution has been submitted calling on the mining interests to "seriously consider the leasing of this property to the Mellen Development Corp." The executive branch of the State government has been enlisted to help this small northern community help itself.

The need for prime outdoor recreational areas for those caught in the web of metropolitan living is recognized by all business, intellectual and government leaders. Four-season vacationlands are a vital need in our complex industrial society and their economic worth to northern Wisconsin is just truly starting to be felt. Mellen is a prime area for just such development and the people of this community are striving today to bring an enlightened view of multiple use of both the recreational and undisclosed mineral resources of the Penokee range. It is their hope that the full exploitation of these two resources can be made in such a way that one will not compete with the other.

Statistics Show the Need for Oil Depletion Allowance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB CASEY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, the need for continuation of the present oil depletion allowance has long been understood by Members of Congress familiar with the many problems of the petroleum industry.

But if there is any doubt in the minds of some of my colleagues, I respectfully call to their attention the short editorial from the Houston Chronicle of March 20, 1961. I think the statistics cited in this editorial clearly point the need for continuation of this allowance.

WILDCATTING REPORT UNDERLINES NEED FOR DEPLETION ALLOWANCE

Those who think the oil industry is getting undue tax benefits as a result of the 27½ percent oil depletion allowance ought to peruse the 16th annual report on exploratory drilling by the American Association of Petroleum Geologists.

The risks the industry takes in its search for new oil reserves are dramatized by the report's disclosure that during 1960 the industry enjoyed a success ratio of only 10.18 percent. Of the 7,320 new field wildcats drilled, only 745 produced some oil or gas.

However, the full story of the risks encountered is not seen in last year's operations.

Of the 7,033 new field wildcats drilled in 1954, there were 875 discoveries, but only 117 of these are producing today.

The report draws the conclusion that only 2 percent, or 1 in 60, rank wildcats drilled in the United States discover profitable fields.

On the basis of last year's operations, it costs an average of $53,000 to drill a new oil or gas well, according to a joint survey by the American Petroleum Institute, the Independent Petroleum Association of America, and the Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association.

But an individual well can cost as much as $2,207,000 as each of nine dusters drilled in Alaska last year showed.

Nanticoke High School Wins Pennsylvania State Basketball Crown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely proud and happy to announce that a high school in my congressional district, Nanticoke High School, last Saturday evening won the coveted honor as Pennsylvania's State Class A basketball championship in a stirring clash with Hickory Township High School of western Pennsylvania by a score of 56–46, before a huge crowd of nearly 9,000 at the Farm Show Arena in the State capital, Harrisburg. All in Luzerne County are thrilled with this truly outstanding and memorable accomplishment and to the coach, Mr. Syl Bozinski, his talented squad, and to the people of Nanticoke who supported the team most loyally throughout a long and often-difficult season, my warmest congratulations on this great honor. So that others may have the opportunity of reading of the accounts of this great game, I submit the story from the Wilkes-Barre Sunday Independent of March 26, 1961, written by the paper's sports editor, Mr. Lou Rauscher:

NANTICOKE WINS STATE CAGE CROWN—NANS LEAD FROM START TO FINISH—JAMES AND LEGINS LEAD FINE TEAM IN GREAT VICTORY

(By Lou Rauscher)

HARRISBURG.—Nanticoke High School, a team with determination to match its skill, last night made modern-day cage history here at the Farm Show Arena by winning the PIAA class A basketball championship in soundly outclassing Hickory Township, the western representative, 56 to 46, before 8,841 paid onlookers.

The State's team of destiny led throughout, controlling both boards and utilizing superior speed in bringing Wyoming Valley its first State crown in 25 years and the school's first in 35 years.

Coach Syl Bozinski's boys made their seasonal record 26 and 1 and hung the second defeat of the year on the Hickory boys who had practiced all week with the Sharon team which earlier in the year put the only blemish on Nanticoke's record.

	G	FM	FT	Points
Nanticoke (56):				
James	8	3	4	19
Yanchik	4	0	0	8
Legins	5	6	7	16
Shepela	1	4	6	6
Kiewlak	3	1	2	7
Dudrick	0	0	0	0
Total	21	14	19	56
Hickory Township (46):				
Crumbacher	2	7	9	11
Roberts	4	1	1	9
Greene	5	2	3	12
Lenzi	5	2	3	12
Schuster	1	0	0	2
Beader	0	0	0	0
Crisan	0	0	0	0
Aspery	0	0	0	0
Total	17	12	16	46

Nanticoke	19	15	7	15	56
Hickory	13	14	8	11	46

REAL TEAM EFFORT

It would be a rank injustice to single out any individual for a sparkling effort as all the Nans pitched in to bring home the bacon. But, at one point in the third period, when All-Stater Ken Legins was taken out of the game with his fourth personal, the Nans looked to Billy James to carry them over and he came through in fine style.

James, in addition to being a whiz off the board, wound up as high scorer for the winners with 19 points, many of them on smashing drives into the basket. Legins followed with 16 points 6 of them on fouls, and played an outstanding game on defense. The Nans as a team converted 14 of 19 free throws, while their opponents were making 12 of 17.

The Nans got off to a 2 to 0 advantage on Legins' goal and were never headed, forging to a 19 to 13 first-period bulge and making it 34 to 27 at the half. However, at one point toward the end of the second period, Hickory put on its only sustained offensive of the night, causing Nanticoke to come up with a case of butterfingers in narrowing the gap to three points, 30 to 27.

The game developed into a racehorse affair at this point and marked the only time during the contest that the western Pennsylvanians matched the winners in sheer hustle.

Then, when it seemed disaster would overtake the Nans, George Yanchik, who with James and Legins controlled the rebounding on both boards, sank a goal and James added two fouls to stake the Wyoming Valley League champs to their seven-point halftime advantage.

Legins, who had 10 of the Nans 19 points in the first period, was blanked the entire second quarter as Hickory's big boys, Fred Green at 6 feet, 4 inches and John Crumbacher at 6 feet 5 inches, ganged up on him from the Hornets' optional man-for-man defense.

As has been the case all season for the Nans, when their big man is tied up, one or the other rises to the occasion. This time

it was James who dumped through three goals and two fouls to lead his team's scoring in the second period.

Hickory took the court after intermission to insert a modified full-court press, but soon thought better of the idea when they couldn't match the Nans' speed. It was about at this point that Nanticoke's superior conditioning began to tell.

LEGINS TAKEN OUT

The Champs built up a nine-point lead at 38 to 29 in the third period when Legins was charged with his fourth personal. The big guy was lifted in favor of John Dudrick and the team missed him, being outscored in this stanza, 8 to 7, and winding up the third period with a six-point lead at 41 to 35.

The Nans could muster only one field goal during the period, a neat drive-in by Yanchik.

The fourth quarter saw Legins back in action and collaborated with James for four quick buckets to up the Nans' lead to 51 to 39. This 12-point spread came about when James drive in for a shot and hit the deck hard on the way down. The six-two ace wound up with 11 of his team's 15 points in this period to apply the clincher.

SENSED BIG VICTORY

As the Nanticoke partisans sensed the impending victory, they let out a roar during the time-out session that must have been heard all the way back to Tilbury Knob.

Hickory's Green, playing mainly in the corner, came up with 12 of his team's points. He was joined in the scoring department by Guard Bill Lenzi, the Hornet's equivalent of Nanticoke's Richard Kiewlak.

Crumbacher, the other big man for the losers, came up alent of Nanticoke's Richard many easy shots.

Rounding out the scoring for the Nans were Kiewlak, seven points, eight by Yanchik and six by Joe Shepela, who began leading an informal one-man cheering session as the championship hovered in sight.

Two of Kiewlak's goals came early in the first period as he thrilled the lively throng with set shots from near-center court.

FAN FARE

Nanticoke owned a substantial bulge in the rebound department clearing the boards 45 times to only 29 by the losers.

Of the champs' total, James picked off 16, Yanchik 13, Legins 10, Shepela 4 and Kiewlak 2. Crumbacher and Green led the rebounding for Hickory. Nanticoke outscored Hickory 15 to 11 in the final period as the Hornets seemed to be dragging. The scene on the floor after the game was one of unbridled joy as the Nans presented their coach Bozinski with game ball and carried him off the court. State Police cordon ringed the floor shortly before the end of the contest to keep spectators off. Legins did a marvelous job of playing the entire final period without committing another personal. It was a long ride back for Hickory's partisans—their town is located near the Ohio border. Incidentally, Hickory has an enrollment of 600 in Grades 10 to 12 while Nanticoke has about 550 in Grades 9 through 12. Green left the game for the losers on personals in the fourth quarter, the Champs really played Hickory off their feet with their dashing fourth quarter. Nans enjoyed a 48 percent accuracy average. Hickory seemed nervous in the first half, while Nanticoke was poised after playing in the arena for the third time within eight days. Hickory had a hard time penetrating the Nan's sliding zone defense. Lenzi was the loser's spark and was a threat throughout. Nanticoke's band did a fine job with their rendition of the national anthem and this time a color guard was on hand to present the colors. Referee Steve Honzo of Palmerton and Zig Mahalik of Ford City did a good job of calling 'em. Legins now has over 600 points this year and Bozinski's 7-year record is 141–30. Bozinski readily admits that he has about had it as far as basketball for this season is concerned. He said, "The boys and I are getting just a bit tired and we're starting to feel like the Harlem Globe Trotters with all the bus rides we've taken in the last two weeks." Nanticoke supporters staged a huge bonfire at the Lincoln Stadium in Nanticoke on Friday night. An old home razed in the redevelopment project was used as kindling. Bozinski was high in his praise for the work turned in by his assistant, Norm Groblewski. Norm played football at Nanticoke and one year under Biggie Munn at Alabama before finishing at Albright. He didn't have much in the way of basketball experience until Stretch corralled him.

Termination Date of Menominee Indian Reservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Clintonville, Wis. Association of Commerce recently wrote me to request a postponement of the termination date set for the Menominee Indian Reservation until such time as the Tribe is ready for self-government. Clintonville is located 23 miles south of the reservation, so the members of the Association of Commerce have personal knowledge of the serious financial and other problems which the tribe must solve before termination can work successfully. The decision of their board of directors to ask for a postponement of the termination date, now set for April 3, should therefore carry considerable weight.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Mr. James C. Huffman, president of the Clintonville Association of Commerce, be printed in the Appendix in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE,
Clintonville, Wis., March 24, 1961.

Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It was the decision of the Clintonville Board of Directors of the Association of Commerce to request that you delay the termination date of the Menominee Indian Reservation until they are ready for self-government.

In the interest of good government and human relations, we suggest that date of the termination coincides with time that they are sufficiently organized to be self-governing.

In only this way, do we feel that the Menominees would have a fair opportunity for good self-government that would be a credit to their country, State, neighbors, and themselves.

We think they deserve this opportunity in interest of good government; and we ask the Department of Interior to give serious consideration along these lines.

Very truly yours,

JAMES C. HUFFMAN, *President.*

A U.N. Seat for Communist China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, it is disturbing to hear and read from time to time that serious and favorable consideration is being given by responsible governments of the West to the admission of Red China to the United Nations. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial entitled "A U.N. Seat for Communist China?" by William Henry Chamberlain which appeared in the New Leader of March 27, 1961. Mr. Chamberlain points up some obvious but basic considerations in this crucial issue:

A U.N. SEAT FOR COMMUNIST CHINA?

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

It is becoming increasingly probable that the first big test of nerve, skill and firmness in foreign policy for the Kennedy administration will come in the Far East. In Europe there has been no sign of weakening or wavering. Apart from geographically isolated West Berlin, there is no point in Europe that seems vulnerable, politically, economically or militarily.

But in the Far East the ideological line of the new administration looks less firm. Whatever may fairly be said in criticism of some aspects of the foreign policy of the Eisenhower administration, it held the line in the Orient. There was no war and there was no appeasement. When the Chinese Communists put on their big bluff of launching an intensive bombardment of Quemoy and Matsu in the autumn of 1958, and a vociferous chorus of faint hearts on both sides of the Atlantic was predicting the direst calamities if the United States did not pull the rug from under Chiang Kai-shek and force the evacuation of the islands, Eisenhower and Dulles refused to panic. The bombardment in due course ceased; the Kuomintang flag is still flying over Quemoy and Matsu.

But some men who are high in the councils of the new administration are on record as favoring substantial revisions of this policy of defending Formosa and other countries in the pathway of Red Chinese aggression. Both Adlai Stevenson, Ambassador to the United Nations, in an article in Foreign Affairs for January 1960, and Thomas K. Finletter, Ambassador to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, in a book on American foreign policy, are on record as favoring a plebiscite in Formosa to determine its form of government.

This seems to ignore the fact that there is a recognized government on Formosa, that of the Republic of China, with which we are in formal treaty alliance. To repudiate the legitimacy of this government by trying to stage a plebiscite would be the surest way to inaugurate chaos on Formosa and pave the way for possible seizure of the island by the Communists.

Stevenson, in the same article, suggested an abandonment of U.S. resistance to admission of Red China to the U.N., and more recently he remarked that it might be difficult to continue keeping Red China out. It is not surprising, therefore, that a propaganda campaign has been launched in London in favor of the admission of Red China. This has taken the form of statements by high British officials, including Foreign Secretary Lord Home, and of inspired leaks to foreign correspondents in the British capital. The recent Commonwealth Conference

served as another forum for advancing this program of appeasement. The issue also may figure prominently in the coming talks between Prime Minister Harold Macmillan and President John F. Kennedy.

In view of this pressure from London and the prospect that some votes in the U.N. may shift on the issue (for example, Brazil's new government seems to favor admission), is there a serious case for changing our position against admitting Communist China to the U.N.? In my opinion, all the arguments for admission do not hold up under examination.

One argument that is often put forward is that Communist China would be amenable to the influence of the world organization and moderate its policies of violence and aggression. Of this there is not the slightest probability. One need only look at the Soviet record in the U.N., with special reference to the lesson of Hungary.

Another argument is that China should be recognized in the interest of international disarmament. But this is getting far ahead of present realities. It remains to be seen whether a nuclear test ban treaty, with satisfactory safeguards, can be arranged with the Soviet Union. Even if this should come off, it is extremely doubtful that the Soviet Union, even if it so desired, could prevent Red China from seeking and ultimately achieving the status of a nuclear power.

Nothing in Communist Chinese public statements and actions would seem to qualify this regime for membership in an organization supposedly composed of "peace-loving" states. Nor could the admission of Red China to the U.N., or its diplomatic recognition by the United States, be justified on the ground that this is simply acceptance of realities.

It is pernicious nonsense to say that nonrecognition can be equated with an ostrich-like refusal to recognize the existence of Communist China. Americans, especially relatives of Korean war casualties, know very well and to their sorrow that Red China exists. Our purpose in withholding admission and recognition is to give heart and confidence to our allies on Formosa, and to anti-Communists in other Asian countries.

Resolution on Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the resolution of Freeholder Thomas G. Dunn on Federal aid to education, as adopted by the Board of Chosen Freeholders of Union County, N.J.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION BY FREEHOLDER DUNN

Whereas the parochial schools of Union County, representing all major religious faiths, and private schools, contribute vastly to the educational welfare, cultural, and financial betterment of the county; and

Whereas the parochial and private educational systems of the county are finding it increasingly difficult to finance its operations without assistance from sources other than those already contributing; and

Whereas there is before the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, proposals that would, if enacted into law, allow for governmental loans to parochial and private school systems, that would permit new construction, expansion, and improvement to said school systems: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this board of freeholders go on record favoring such loans, and be it further resolved that forthwith Senators CASE and WILLIAMS, and Representative DWYER, be informed of the sentiments of this board.

The Sergeant Alvin C. York Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the need of a great American hero Sgt. Alvin C. York, now disabled and bedfast, has come to the attention of the patriotic citizens of this Nation as Speaker SAM RAYBURN last week accepted the chairmanship of the Help Sergeant York Committee and donated his personal check for $1,000 to begin the campaign to raise funds to pay off Sergeant York's income tax indebtedness to the Government. Other members of this committee are Hon. Robert F. Kennedy, the Attorney General, Hon. Silliman Evans, publisher of the Nashville Tennessean. Actor Gary Cooper, who played the part of Sergeant York in the film of his deeds of heroism and the Representative of the Fourth District of Tennessee, Sergeant York's Congressman, who is serving as treasurer of the committee.

The press, radio, and TV of the Nation has rallied to the cause and has helped focus attention on Sergeant York's difficulties. Among the newspapers which have given the York matter excellent coverage are the Nashville Tennessean, the New York Journal American, the Baltimore Sun and the National Tribune—the Stars and Stripes. Both Ed Sullivan and Dave Garroway of TV fame have contributed much to the fund raising campaign. We have passed the halfway mark as contributions of generous Americans continue to be received at our office for this purpose.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include a representative sampling of these articles from the press across the country on the Sergeant York campaign in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The articles follows:

IRS TO SETTLE YORK'S TAX DEBT FOR $25,000—SPEAKER SAM RAYBURN KICKS OFF CAMPAIGN TO GET NEEDED FUNDS

(By Lois Laycook)

WASHINGTON.—The Internal Revenue Service agreed yesterday to settle Sgt. Alvin C. York's tax debt for $25,000 and House Speaker SAM RAYBURN immediately kicked off a national drive to raise the money.

The speaker announced the formation of a "Help Sergeant York Committee" to conduct the fund-raising campaign.

Appointed to the committee to serve with Rayburn as chairman were Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, Representative Joe L. Evins, Democrat of Tennessee, Silliman Evans Jr., publisher of the Nashville Tennessean, and Gary Cooper, Hollywood film star.

Rayburn called a rare Saturday afternoon press conference to announce the action.

He told reporters that the Government had agreed to lop off almost $150,000 of its claim against Sergeant York which it said the World War I hero owed in taxes, penalties and interest on royalties from a book and the 1941 film version of his life. "Sergeant York," starring Cooper.

In New York, Cooper said:

"I worked with Sergeant York when we filmed the movie and he is a great patriotic American. I am delighted and pleased to take part in a drive to raise money to pay off Sergeant York's tax debt."

IRS contended York owed $172,000, a figure which the Tennessee Medal of Honor winner vigorously disputed. In announcing the settlement and plans to conduct a campaign in York's behalf, Rayburn said:

"This is a matter that appeals very much to my heart. Alvin York was the greatest hero of World War I. He's had a great deal of financial trouble in recent years. He's very ill now and will not be a well man during the rest of his life. He has had two severe strokes."

"I am interested for another reason. I was born about 50 miles from where Sergeant York lives."

RAYBURN was born in Roane County, Tenn.

In Nashville, Tennessean Publisher Evans said after RAYBURN'S announcement:

"I feel very honored to be associated with this project to ease the financial burdens of Sergeant York, one of the greatest heroes of the Volunteer State, home of so many illustrious warriors."

To start the fundraising drive, RAYBURN presented Representative EVINS with a personal check for $1,000. EVINS, who represents York's district in Congress, will serve as secretary-treasurer of the campaign.

"I hope this check made out to the 'Alvin C. York Fund' will challenge others to give at least $24,000 more so we can take this debt off the mind of this great hero," RAYBURN declared. "In fact I hope the campaign will raise more than $25,000. Sergeant York has only a small pension and a little social security. That makes it pretty thin as far as making a living is concerned."

York received the Congressional Medal of Honor for killing 25 Germans and capturing 132 singlehandedly Oct. 8, 1918, during World War I. He is still Tennessee's most famous war hero.

RAYBURN told newsmen EVINS first approached him several weeks ago after talking with the Attorney General and officials of the Internal Revenue Service on the possibility of settling York's tax troubles.

"We decided on a course if we could get a reasonable compromise," the speaker said. "We now have a letter from Internal Revenue stating that the Government will compromise for $25,000."

EVINS had previously introduced a bill to wipe out the tax debt. However, RAYBURN said the Congressman later agreed that settling income tax difficulties was "not a proper subject for legislation."

In announcing Evans' appointment to the committee, RAYBURN said the Nashville publisher "has been interested in this matter and he has wanted to find some way to get this man out of debt."

The Speaker expressed the hope the campaign will receive wide publicity.

He said checks should be made to the "Alvin C. York Fund" and mailed to Representative JOE L. EVINS, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Representative EVINS said the checks will be deposited with the House sergeant of arms office in the Capitol.

He praised RAYBURN for his most generous gesture in presenting a $1,000 check to the fund.

He said various American Legion posts in Tennessee have previously raised approximately $2,000 to help pay off the debt "so we are starting off with $3,000."

York received $150,287.76 in 1942 and 1943 for the book and movie rights to his life story. The Internal Revenue Service held this income to be taxable as ordinary income rather than as capital gains.

York disagreed with this ruling and petitioned the U.S. Tax Court for a redetermination of his liability as capital gains. Complicating the case was York's earlier action in giving almost all the money he had received from the royalties to York Institute and other schools. IRS held he could not deduct these gifts as charity.

The case, although set for trial several years ago, has been continued from time to time because of York's long illness. Meanwhile, IRS estimated interest and penalties ran the tax debt up to $172,000.

York has a monthly income of $135.45 as a veteran's pension, $32 monthly from social security, and $10 monthly from the Government paid to all Congressional Medal of Honor winners.

J.F.K. JOINS DRIVE TO HELP SERGEANT YORK

(By Marianne Means)

WASHINGTON, March 22.—President Kennedy, a war hero with a deep sense of history and an admiration for courage in battle, is taking a personal interest in the troubles of a man whose name has become part of America's heroic tradition.

The President learned of the plight of Sgt. Alvin C. York, the greatest hero of World War I, through the Attorney General, Robert Kennedy.

Robert was told last week by Internal Revenue Commissioner Mortimer Caplin that Sergeant York, who wiped out 25 Germans by himself and captured 132 in one battle in 1918, was in deep income tax trouble. The IRS claims that Sergeant York owes $172,000 in unpaid back taxes.

Mr. York, now an invalid of 73, ekes out a bare existence in a rugged mountain farm in Tennessee, and simply doesn't have the money.

The near-illiterate soldier never did have any money, really. The funds from his book and movie in 1941 which the Government wants to tax all went to build a small Bible school and high school.

Robert Kennedy remembered Sergeant York's heroism, and recalled he had hoped to stop to see Mr. York while campaigning in Tennessee this fall, although he had not had time. He asked Mr. Caplin: "What can we legally do?"

Robert Kennedy told his big brother J.F.K. about Sergeant York's problem, and the President too was sympathetic. The Attorney General's legal department ruled, however, that an Executive order from the President relieving Sergeant York of his tax liabilities would be illegal.

So the President instructed the executive departments, specifically the Treasury which harbors IRS, to do whatever possible to assist Sergeant York. Representative EVINS, Democrat, of Tennessee, Mr. York's Congressman, had tried repeatedly to get tax relief through congressional action, but with no success.

REDUCE DEBT

The Attorney General, Mr. Caplin, and Mr. EVINS huddled in three long meetings. Finally it was Speaker RAYBURN, who was born less than 50 miles from Sergeant York's home in Tennessee, who suggested the solution.

He proposed a fundraising drive, and promised to donate the first $1,000. Robert Kennedy went along with the idea, and promised another $1,000. The Internal Revenue Service compromised and reduced Sergeant York's indebtedness to $25,000, the amount the fund drive set as its goal.

Robert Kennedy told the President about the way out for Mr. York which had been found. The President said he was pleased something could be done.

Speaker RAYBURN, as chairman of the Help Sergeant York Committee, launched the fund drive.

Another besides Messrs. Rayburn, Kennedy, and Evins serving on the fund drive committee is Actor Gary Cooper. Mr. Cooper played the role of Sergeant York in the movie based on his life.

The fund drive, although only 4 days old, has already pulled in $5,000, Representative EVINS, who is acting as treasurer, reports.

RAYBURN OPENS DRIVE TO AID SERGEANT YORK—GIVES $1,000 TOWARD $25,000 SETTLEMENT OF WORLD WAR I HERO'S TAX DEBT

WASHINGTON, March 18.—Speaker RAYBURN, Democrat, of Texas, personally launched a nationwide subscription campaign today to raise $25,000 to pay off the tax debt of Sgt. Alvin C. York, of Tennessee, the World War I hero.

The 73-year-old soldier is now ill and bedridden in his hillside home, probably never to be active again. For many years he had owed the Government a debt of $172,000 that had its origin in a gesture of generosity by York and a misunderstanding of the Federal tax system.

The Government, after years of discussion, will compromise with York, the holder of the Nation's most coveted medal—the Congressional Medal of Honor. It has agreed to accept $25,000 in full settlement of the claim.

YORK MIGHTY GRATEFUL

In Tennessee, York said he was "mighty grateful." The big mountaineer added:

"Those tax folks have been a-houndin' me so long and I been a-fightin' them so long I just thought it'd never end."

He chuckled over the reduction of the debt. "Seems funny," he said, "talking about reducin' something I don't owe."

RAYBURN DONATES FIRST

Speaker RAYBURN made the first donation to the fund—a check for $1,000—and as he handed it to the secretary-treasurer of the fund, Representative EVINS, Democrat, of Tennessee, York's Congressman, the Speaker said:

"I hope this initial gift will move other like-minded citizens to come forward and donate the other $24,000 so that we may ease the last days of one of the Nation's greatest war heroes."

"This is a matter very close to my heart," RAYBURN said at a special news conference today.

He said that he had accepted the chairmanship of the "Sgt. Alvin C. York Fund" and that other members of the committee will be the Attorney General, Robert F. Kennedy, the publisher of the Nashville Tennessean, Silliman Evans, Jr., and the actor who played the role of Sergeant York in the film about the war hero, Gary Cooper.

1918 ACT OF HEROISM

It was on a dull, chilly October day of 1918 that Sergeant York came upon a German machine gun nest deep in the Argonne Forest and performed the act of heroism that won him world acclaim.

After York had killed 25 of the German machine gunners, he captured the remaining 132 men—4 officers and 128 enlisted men—and marched them back to American field headquarters.

For this exploit he was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor, and heaped with other honors when he returned to the United States.

Cordell Hull, a fellow Tennessean, and RAYBURN, who was born in Tennessee only 50 miles from York's home—both then Members of Congress—greeted the hero when he came home from the war and took him to the Halls of Congress, where he received great welcome.

MOVIE RIGHTS SOLD

Later York wrote a book, which he sold, along with the movie rights for $150,287 in 1942 and 1943.

But, believing he would have only a modest, if any, amount of taxes to pay on the proceeds, York donated the entire sum to establish a Bible school and York Institute in Tennessee.

York regarded the contribution as a charity but the then Internal Revenue Bureau ruled it was not a tax-free gift. The Bureau ruled that his tax liability was $85,442.03.

York disputed this, and appealed to the Tax Court in the 1940's. The case has never come to trial and meantime, RAYBURN said, York has had many financial troubles.

FARMING PROHIBITED

Once a powerful, 6-foot-2-inch mountaineer, York lived on a 395-acre farm in Fentress County near Pall Mall, Tenn. But now he can no longer farm, as a result of a cerebral hemorrhage 7 years ago. He is partially paralyzed and bedridden.

He has also had lobar pneumonia, heart trouble, high blood pressure, and a hemorrhage of his right eye.

RAYBURN noted that York is not able personally to pay off his obligation to the Government and that this inability "weighs heavily on his mind as he does not want to be in debt to his Government."

The old veteran has an income of $177.45 a month—$135.45 as a veteran's pension, $32 from social security and $10 as a Medal of Honor winner.

INTEREST MOUNTS

The Internal Revenue Service stated that with accumulated interest amounting to about 102 percent York's total debt on the basis of the original claim would now amount to $172,000.

But a letter was forwarded to RAYBURN today saying that the debt would be settled on payment of $25,000.

"I hope enough people of the country will remember this great soldier and relieve him of the worry that he owes his country something," the Speaker said.

RAYBURN said that Representative EVINS will serve as secretary-treasurer and that checks should be made payable to the "Sgt. Alvin C. York Fund" and sent to EVINS at the Capitol.

PRECEDENT FEARED

RAYBURN pointed out that a number of bills have been introduced in Congress to relieve York but said, "I do not think this is a proper matter for legislation." It might set a bad precedent, he said.

EVINS disclosed that the American Legion of Tennessee had raised $2,000 toward relief for York.

RAYBURN said as he handed EVINS his $1,000 check, "I hope this challenges 24 other people to give $1,000."

He recalled that York once could have cashed in his experiences for a vast fortune but rejected offers aggregating more than $1 million with the simple statement "This uniform is not for sale."

FORM COMMITTEE TO AID SERGEANT YORK—RAYBURN HEADS GROUP TO ASSIST AILING HERO; VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I PRESENT CHECK FOR $500

On Saturday, House Speaker SAM RAYBURN called for public subscription to help Sgt.

Alvin C. York, of Pall Mall, Tenn., with his tax indebtness. York was the outstanding hero of World War I and won the Congressional Medal of Honor together with dozens of other military decorations from a number of allied governments.

Serving with Rayburn, who wrote a personal check for $1,000 to inaugurate the drive, were Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, Congressman Joe L. Evins, who represents York's home district in Tennessee, Silliman Evans, Jr., publisher of the Nashville Tennesseean and Movie Actor Gary Cooper, who played the part of York in the story of York's life.

CALLS FOR CONTRIBUTIONS

RAYBURN has called upon patriotic and generous Americans throughout the country to come to the assistance of the ailing hero of World War I. York, who suffered a cerebral hemorrhage 7 years ago, is paralyzed from his waist down and confined to his mountain home at Pall Mall. In addition to this, he is under constant harassment from the Internal Revenue Service, who have charged him with owing some $172,000 in taxes upon his movie and his book depicting the story of his life.

York insists that the Revenue Service is in error in its claims for tax payment. He declared that virtually all of the proceeds from the movie went for the establishment of two schools in his Tennessee mountains. Government tax officials admit that the legal question is a most complex and involved one.

Representative EVINS has introduced legislation to alleviate York of this tax burden but his efforts have met with no success. After a conference with Speaker RAYBURN and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue the Government offered to compromise the claim if a payment of $25,000 was made. Accordingly, RAYBURN and EVINS formed the Help Sergeant York Committee and are appealing to all patriotic Americans for voluntary subscriptions.

The once powerful York, who killed 25 Germans and captured 132 more, an act which won for him the Nation's highest military award, the Congressional Medal of Honor, is now bedridden and has no assets. He relies for his existence on a non-service-connected World War I pension of $135.45 per month plus $32 monthly social security benefits and he is also awarded $10 monthly as a Congressional Medal of Honor winner. This adds up to $177.45, much too little to care for the ailing World War I hero in his present physical condition.

SERVED WITH YORK

National Commander John E. Erickson, of the Veterans of World War I, who served in the same company with York and witnessed his parade of German prisoners in 1918, visited the Tennessee mountain man in November of last year. He found York cheerful in spite of his physical disabilities but worried considerably over the tax burden which hung over him. One of the major legislative objectives of the Veterans of World War I was to sponsor legislation which would provide relief for York from his tax liabilities.

On Tuesday of this week, National Senior Vice Commander John Bashara of the Veterans of World War I, on behalf of the VWWI, presented a check to House Speaker SAM RAYBURN in the amount of $500 for the Help Sergeant York fund. This action was taken after every member of the national board of administration had been polled over the telephone as to his position on the award to the committee. Every board of administration member voted for the donation.

It is understood that other veterans organizations have promised substantial amounts to the committee and Congressman EVINS reports that on Tuesday morning some 200 letters had been received by the committee. These returns have not as yet been tabulated so that there is no account of the moneys that have been received. EVINS said scores of small contributions had poured into his congressional office on Monday.

President Kennedy has been personally interested in seeing that York is alleviated of his tax indebtedness and is being advised on the progress of the matter through the Attorney General. The President has instructed the executive departments, specifically the Treausry, to do all that is legally possible and appropriate to assist Sergeant York in his difficulties. Contributions for York are being received at the following address: Help Sergeant York Committee, Washington, D.C.

HELP SERGEANT YORK COMMITTEE

The organization of the "Help Sergeant York Committee" by House Speaker SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, and Congressman JOE L. EVINS, from Sergeant York's congressional district in Tennessee, should meet with the hearty approval of every patriotic American. The Tennessee mountaineer who had to struggle with his conscience to enter military service in World War I, has suffered cruel vicissitudes in recent years.

York received approximately $150,000 in 1942 and 1943 for book and movie rights to his life story. The Internal Revenue Service held this income to be taxable as ordinary income and the approximate tax amounted to about $85,000. York questioned the Internal Revenue statistics and asked the tax court for a redetermination of his liability on the basis that this income was taxable at capital gains rates. York gave almost all of the receipts from the movie to establish a bible school and the York Institute in his beloved Tennessee mountains.

Some 7 or 8 years ago Sergeant York suffered a disabling stroke and has been an invalid since that date. His only income is a non-service-connected pension for service in World War I of $135.45, $32 monthly from social security and $10 monthly as a Congressional Medal of Honor winner, a total of $177.45 monthly. This is a meager sum to sustain York in his present physical condition and his aged wife. Added to his straightened circumstances was the harassment of a threat of a suit by the Internal Revenue Service to collect the sum allegedly due the Government.

Representative EVINS had introduced legislation asking forgiveness of the Government debt and he had been promised the support of the major veterans organizations in seeking this remedial legislation. EVINS found that there were a number of obstacles in the path of securing favorable action upon his legislative proposal so he met with House Speaker RAYBURN and together they formulated the idea of setting up a committee to raise the necessary funds to pay off York's tax debt. The Internal Revenue Bureau had indicated that it would accept a compromise offer of $25,000 to settle the indebtedness.

On last Saturday, Speaker RAYBURN announced the formation of the Help Sergeant York Committee and at the same time wrote his personal check to the committee in the amount of $1,000. Serving with the House Speaker and Congressman EVINS on the committee are Attorney General Robert Kennedy, Silliman Evans, Jr., publisher of the Nashville Tennesseean, and Gary Cooper, who played the part of York in the movie. Representative EVINS is serving as treasurer of the committee.

York, who is now 73 years old, lives on his mountain farm near Pall Mall, Tenn. He was once a powerful 6-foot-2, 210-pound mountain strong man. He is now partially paralyzed and bedridden as a result of the cerebral hemorrhage which struck him down 7 years ago. Since 1942 he has suffered lobar pneumonia, heart trouble, high blood pressure, a hemorrhage in his right eye, and the cerebral hemorrhage.

Upon his return to the United States at the close of World War I, York was besieged with flattering contracts and offers which would have made him a rich man. He was offered a million dollars by various promoters but he told them, "This uniform is not for sale."

York was one of the founders of the American Legion and represented the 82d Division at the organizational meeting in Paris before he returned home.

The National Tribune-The Stars and Stripes deems this effort a most commendable one and we hope that not only veterans and veterans' organizations will respond to this appeal, but every patriotic American should feel it his duty to help alleviate the distressful condition in which this ailing World War I hero now finds himself.

CAPITOL COMMENTS

(By Hon. JOE L. EVINS, Member of Congress, Fourth District of Tennessee)

SGT. ALVIN C. YORK

On January 3, 1961—the opening day of the 87th Congress—your Representative introduced a bill for the relief of Sgt. Alvin C. York of Fentress County—to relieve Tennessee's distinguished World War I hero of his tax indebtedness to the Government.

This effort has resulted in the formation of a committee to raise funds to pay off Sergeant York's tax indebtedness. Both the bill and the fund raising campaign has had the same end in mind—tax relief and peace of mind for the greatest hero of World War I, who is now disabled and bedfast.

The change from one course to the other came after many conferences and attempts to work out the most satisfactory method of relieving Sergeant York of additional tax claims arising from the filming of his life story and heroic deeds.

In an effort to get a favorable report on our bill—H.R. 1305—your Representative conferred with the new Commissioner of Internal Revenue and later with the Attorney General of the United States, Robert F. Kennedy. Both the Commissioner and the Attorney General were very sympathetic with the purpose of this bill and expressed a desire to be of assistance, but indicated that by providing a favorable report a precedent would be established for other veterans with tax cases. They indicated also that they were precluded from participating in the case as the matter is now pending in the U.S. Tax Court.

The Attorney General in one conference expressed the belief that his brother, President Kennedy, would favorably receive the idea of an Executive order to relieve Sergeant York of his tax indebtedness if this were found to be a proper course of action. However, the top legal minds of the Treasury Department, the Justice Department and Legislative Counsel of the House of Representatives expressed opposition to this course of action—no matter how bad the need.

Following the end of World War I, Congressman SAM RAYBURN and Cordell Hull were among those meeting and greeting Sergeant York on his return from Europe.

Speaker RAYBURN listened sympathetically to your Representative as he requested his assistance in securing passage of our bill. However, the Speaker proposed the forming of a special committee to raise funds to settle the tax case and agreed to serve as chairman of the committee with your Representative as treasurer. Others serving on the committee include Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, Mr. Silliman Evans, Jr., publisher of the Nashville Tennessean, and Gary Cooper, who played the role of Sergeant York in the movie.

The response from all sections of the country has been generous and most encouraging. At this writing the campaign

has reached a total of $13,700—slightly more than half the goal set to settle the long pending case. Generous Americans all across the Nation have been sending some large and many small contributions as an expression of appreciation of the heroic service of Sergeant York in helping to preserve freedom for our Nation.

Meeting of the Pacific Regional Roads Conference of the International Road Federation, Sydney, Australia, February 27 to March 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT E. JONES
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it has recently been my privilege to chair a three-man delegation of the Public Works Committee that was designated to represent the Congress at the recent Pacific Regional Roads Conference of the International Road Federation. This meeting was held in Sydney, Australia, from February 27 to March 2, and was attended by more than 250 delegates from 17 countries, including Burma, China, Ceylon, Fiji Islands, Hong Kong, India, Indonesia, Japan, Malaya, New Zealand, South Africa, Philippines, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom, Australia, and some 30 representatives in various fields from our own country. I would like to briefly report to the Congress the results of this meeting.

May I preface these remarks by saying that I found this trip an extremely profitable one and the exchange of views that took place at this meeting, both in an official and in an unofficial capacity, beneficial to myself, to the other Members of the Congress who accompanied me and, I hope, to our country as a whole. We attended this meeting basically to consider the interrelated highway problems that criss-cross our entire world, but, in addition to that, I personally, and I am certain my colleagues, obtained a deeper and fuller understanding of other problems of the peoples with whom we met, particularly with reference to the Commonwealth of Australia.

I was deeply impressed by Australia, by the Australian people and by the rapidly developing expansion of this great continent. I found these people to be very similar to ourselves, to be deeply interested in our affairs and to be bound to us both in a spirit of friendship and also in a very important military fashion. My brief visit to Australia convinced me that we have indeed in the people of that nation real friends, ones who admire and respect us and are ready to work shoulder to shoulder with us in solving the many problems that face us in this troubled world today.

I was privileged to be one of the two principal speakers at the opening session of the Pacific Regional Conference of the International Road Federation. Might I digress for a moment to explain for the benefit of the members that the International Road Federation came into being some 13 years ago as a result of the realization that high wastages were occuring through the inadequacy of road systems through the world.

The advance of scientific and industrial developments have resulted in the production of new and wide ranges of all types of vehicles possessing greatly enhanced efficiency potentials. These can contribute direct and substantial reductions in the cost of living if road systems which will enable the full effect of vehicle improvement to be achieved are constructed.

The truth, however, is that gains in efficiency through better management techniques, improved equipment, work developments, new inventions and increased output per worker have not resulted in the reduction of prices which the consumer should enjoy because much of the savings is dissipated by the excessive cost of using inefficient transport systems.

The realization of this worldwide handicap, which prevents the fruit of enterpise, energy and invention reaching those who should benefit, in 1948 brought into existence the International Road Federation whose basic purpose was and is to develop better roads throughout the world by an interchange of ideas among all nations and as a result of these interchanges, which create better roads, bring about better living for all.

I am sure you will agree this is a worthwhile purpose to which all of us who are interested in the development of highways for future use and the advancement of economic status of mankind should pay careful attention.

At this meeting among other subjects that were discussed was the need for expanded highway programs; new development in road research; the future of highways and highway transportation; highway construction and maintenance and traffic engineering, as well as that overall most important problem which is ever present, that of proper highway financing.

In keeping with our increased interest in the International Road Federation the United States sent to this particular meeting the largest delegation, some 30 members, including technical experts, a highway safety expert, one of our most efficient highway engineers, Mr. D. C. Greer of Texas, and a representative of the U.S. International Cooperation Administration.

I am certain that out of the interchange of ideas that developed at this meeting our exports in highway matters have brought back to this country further information that will enhance the development of our own road program. Further I believe, our experts contributed to the meeting information that will be beneficial to the highway users of the other countries who were present at this meeting.

Although this was the main purpose of our visit to Australia, we also took the opportunity while in that country to visit the Australian capital of Canberra which is still in the process of being constructed.

This is a wholly planned city some 200 miles from Sydney which is being built and developed in a manner similar to that of Brasilia in Brazil, South America. We were deeply impressed by the modern progressive appearance of this capital. While in Canberra we also took the opportunity to meet with several members of the Australian House of Representatives for an exchange of ideas on problems affecting both our countries.

I would be remiss in my comments on Canberra if I did not mention briefly two most impressive memorials—one the American War Memorial built by the Australian-American Society out of private funds which commemorates the part played by our men in the victory in the Pacific in World War II. Further, we had an opportunity to visit one of the most vivid examples of spirit and pride I have ever seen in my public or private career and that is the Australian War Memorial which tells fully, in my mind, the spirit of the Australian people.

Of particular interest to us as members of the Public Works Committee was the vast Snowy Mountain project now underway in Australia. Although time did not allow for a full and sufficient examination of this tremendous project, we were able to briefly consider the main aspects of what is being attempted in the field of water resources by the Australian Government.

Knowledge of the Snowy Mountain project requires a background as to the problem of water resources in Australia.

The average annual flow of Australia's rivers, if spread evenly over the continent, would give a depth of water about 1⅓ inches. The United States of America on the other hand, from its 10 main rivers alone, would obtain a depth of water of almost 6 inches.

It is vital that full use be made of Australia's water resources. This is the principle on which the Snowy Mountains scheme is based.

Remnants of an ancient alpine range skirt Australia's eastern seaboard. By European, Asian, and American standards these mountains are not high. In fact, compared with the might and grandeur of the Himalayas, Australia's mountains are merely foothills, the highest peak, Kosciusko, rising to an elevation of only 7,314 feet. And yet Australia's Great Dividing Range is vital to the life of her people.

In southeastern New South Wales and the adjacent areas of Victoria, the section of this range known as the Snowy Mountains forms the central and highest area of the Australian Alps. Snow clad for 5 or 6 months each year this area is the source of the westward flowing Murray and Murrumbidgee Rivers which cross dry but otherwise fertile plains stretching over hundreds of miles to the coast of South Australia. Irrigation farming on these plains is already a well established and prosperous industry, but further substantial expansion of production depends on augmenting the flow of these rivers.

The Snowy River rises in the same area as the Murray and Murrumbidgee Rivers. It receives a large share of the runoff from the winter snow fields but flows in the opposite direction of the nearby southeastern coast, traversing an area of reliable and adequate rainfall where water is not required for irrigation.

Not only are the waters of the Snowy River considerable in volume but also, they flow from high altitudes. By diverting them inland through long tunnels driven under the mountain ranges they can be utilized for the double purpose of producing very large quantities of electricity for industry and of enabling 1,000 square miles of drylands on the western plains to be brought into use for flood production.

With this background proposals for the development of Snowy Mountain first came into existence in 1884 and finally, on August 1 of 1949 the Snowy Mountain Authority came into existence. Detailed investigations and construction work started immediately.

This act is now supported by a comprehensive agreement between the Commonwealth of Australia and the States of New South Wales and Victoria covering the construction and operation of the scheme, the distribution of power and water and other development matters. Basically what is intended hereunder is to use by diversion the waters of the Snowy River combined with the Murray and Murrumbidgee Rivers to create large hydroelectric power stations and, at the same time, provide ample water all year round for the vast inland areas of New South Wales, Victoria, and South Australia through which these rivers flow. It is one of the largest civil engineering projects ever undertaken in Australia and one of the largest of its type in the world. It involves the construction of 9 large dams and several smaller ones, at least 11 power stations, over 100 miles of large diameter tunnels, over 80 miles of aqueducts, shafts ranging up to 1,100 feet deep, and hundreds of miles of mountain roads in rugged alpine country.

The total cost of the whole scheme is estimated at $748 million and it will provide nearly 2 million acre-feet of water per annum enabling irrigation production to be increased in value by approximately $60 million per year. In addition, the output from the Snowy Mountain operation will provide approximately 2½ million kilowatts of power and 5,300 million kilowatt-hours per annum of energy. I have outlined very roughly what this project contemplates and attempts, but I think even this brief mention of it will point up the progressive attitude of the Australian Government and the Australian people in the field of water resources.

This trip to Australia was a difficult one involving long flights over vast stretches of water and land mass which gave little rest or comfort to the delegation en route. But our short sojourn in Australia more than rewarded us for any difficulties we experienced in reaching Sydney.

But once we reached Sydney and had an opportunity to fully participate in the Road Conference, to meet with the delegates from the southeast Pacific area nations and to see firsthand the spirit and vigor of these peoples, and particularly of the Australians, any discomfort we may have experienced en route quickly vanished and we found ourselves caught up in the spirit and drive of these Australian people. They are indeed true friends of the United States. They were really delighted to see us. They made us feel at home. They want more and more American recognition and interchange of ideas and I think this should be a two-way street. I trust that over the years to come there will be a continuing flow of ideas between our Nation and that of the Commonwealth of Australia and that delegations in all fields that affect the national interest of both countries will take the opportunity to visit back and forth to develop the strong bonds of friendship and mutual interest that now ties these two great nations together.

Speaking for myself and the members of our delegation, I can truly say this was a unique and stimulating experience. I am proud to have been part of this particular meeting and to have a first-hand opportunity to see even briefly one of the most important sections of our world community.

A Soldier's Views on Current Problems of National Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER S. BARING
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to insert in the RECORD a letter from a constituent of mine who is now serving in the Armed Forces of the United States. It is not important that I do or do not agree with everything that Steven B. Miller said in his letter.

From an idealistic standpoint his views should be an inspiration to the youth of America and his letter is worthy of recognition by this body.

The letter follows:

HEADQUARTERS DETACHMENT,
NINTH HOSPITAL CENTER,
APO New York, N.Y., March 15, 1961.

Representative WALTER S. BARING,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BARING: I am an American soldier and native Nevadan, and will become eligible to vote this July. Since the cold war GI bill entered the political scene in the last term of Congress and was revived this term, I have been reading and thinking and moralizing on many of the current political issues. I would like to impart my views to you.

Cold war GI bill: This is a well-meaning but superfluous gesture. The National Defense Education Act of 1958 adequately cares for discharged soldiers and anyone else seeking educations. The idea that we one-term soldiers have given up anything (and therefore should be repaid) is wrong, for military service when needed to defend national and individual freedom is a moral imperative. I realize that I am one of those toward whom the bill is directed. After discharge I will attend college, working parttime and receiving aid from my parents (my father is a telephone repairman in Winnemucca). It is generally acknowledged nowadays that anyone who really wants an education will get one. If the person "can't" get one, he hasn't enough in him to even indirectly benefit the country at large, as some people claim. Some of the soldiers I know are very excited about the bill, even though they are aware of other ways they can go to college. They are under the impression they'll get something for nothing.

Five billion six hundred million dollar education program: Unconstitutional. In my high school civics class we were taught that the 10th amendment to the Constitution meant what it said: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." Aid to education is specifically not "delegated to the United States." And it does not matter how wonderful this thing may be, it should be passed only after a constitutional amendment. That argument about promoting the "general welfare" (as stated in the preamble) authorizing it is quite fallacious: under that argument, anything that Congress and the President deem in "the general welfare" would be permissible. I think the Founding Fathers had a good reason for omitting education from Federal powers: the ability to dole out large sums of money, or withhold them, is the power to control. And I honestly believe that quality of education, not quantity, is our best bet in this cold war.

The President's housing program: Unconstitutional again (for the same reason). Also, the President is in effect overruling the cities who have already reached decisions on this matter concerning themselves. The principle of a limited central government was established in the Constitution for a very good reason: the Thirteen States, up until then, had felt the effects of domination by a distant, relatively unconcerned Government. If the housing problem were really so horrible, the local citizens of the cities concerned would have taken action. Local problems are best handled by local people.

More unemployment compensation: I don't think any extension of this is warranted. The only possible excuse (though still questionable) for paying a man who isn't working is pump priming, and the present unemployment benefits take care of that quite adequately: we're on our way out of this recession.

Proposed farm program: (and the entire Department of Agriculture). Unconstitutional. The Federal Government was given no authority over agriculture. Besides, all the Government intervention since 1933 has led to surpluses, high prices, $6 billion in taxes annually, and the farmers' losses of individual freedom. There is no excuse for continuing it. I don't think you need fear antipathy from the farmers themselves—back during Benson's tour of duty they showed a lot of sympathy for him and in the recent national elections, went Republican. I think if any mandates were given in the election, this was a real (though backhanded) mandate for the dropping of controls and supports. And as for the currently proposed program, it will subsidize farmers who give up their right to dispose of their own property as they want, and will penalize farmers who don't want to forsake this right. The entire program should be promptly ended.

Social security: I don't like it. The Government takes my money, promising to give it back when I reach 65 or die (a lot of good it will do me then). Beside the fact that inflation will have sapped the value of the money by the time I reach 65, beside the fact that the Government will have withdrawn a handling fee before returning my money, and beside the fact that if I become a financial flop it won't be enough to do me any good anyway, the damning point of the program is the fact that it is compulsory.

If this thing is the will of the people, it would be able to operate on a voluntary basis, and if it is on a compulsory basis, it can only mean that the public wouldn't stand for it. Note the fact that the law is not to save, but to save through this inefficient Government monopoly.

Tax reform: It is needed all right—all the way back to an equal percentage of each man's earnings. It is quite unjust to take 90 percent from a man who earns $100,000 annually and only 20 percent from one who earns $10,000. Capacity to pay is irrelevant. "From each according to his ability, to each according to his need" is the keystone of Marx's doctrine.

The cold war: The United States must acknowledge that the cold war is a real war—a war marked by Communist advances and freedom's retreats. If an enemy is trying to conquer your country, has sworn to do so, and is aggressively working toward that end through all means (propaganda, subversion, military action, nuclear blackmail, etc.) and is making visible progress, and is achieving visible victories, then any effort toward accommodation is folly, since success encourages further aggression. Did Hitler go away just because we wanted him to? No aggressor ever does. Each instance of appeasement (such as the British and French propose in Laos) shifts more weight on the balance-of-power scales. Unless we take the initiative, even though it may mean risking war, the Communists will continue to cause crisis after crisis, each time forcing us to choose between risking war and retreat. This means that eventually we will be forced to go to war under the most disadvantageous circumstances or accept surrender. We must take the offensive, because that is the only course that can lead to victory.

To insure preparation for any eventualities: We should expand our efforts in the political and psychological warfare area immensely. We should, as President Kennedy has ordered, build up special forces and American guerrillas to assist in the defense against Communist guerrillas throughout the world. Nuclear tests should begin again immediately. As has been evident ever since Lenin signed the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, the Communists negotiate only for advantages and the best we can hope for from negotiations is to end up where we began. And there is no reason to believe the Communists will keep any agreement any longer than it suits their purpose. They never have. Since we can't even hope to match the Communist world's numerical advantage, we need an armory of limited-yield, tactical nuclear weapons.

Sometimes I think Washington has the idea that Americans, like Bertrand Russell, "would rather be Red than dead," or to paraphrase: would rather give up all dignity, joy, and the things life is worth living for, in exchange for living a life not worth living. It's not true. We're still the same people who, for the defense of liberty, "mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

Respectfully,

Sp.4c. STEVEN B. MILLER.

The Meaning of Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, courage is a prominent word in the philosophy and the life of President John F. Kennedy. He has been called upon to show personal courage in overcoming a physical disability. He has written a book "Profiles in Courage"—a tribute to bravery in public life—and his inaugural address called upon Americans and our free world allies to show courage in the critical hour with which we are all confronted.

The President in response to a request from Parade magazine has given a personal definition of courage which I believe should be preserved, and I ask unanimous consent that the President's definition and meaning of courage be reproduction in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Parade's succinct article on President Kennedy's definition of courage follows:

THE MEANING OF COURAGE

(By President John F. Kennedy)

Courage takes many forms. It can mean bravery under fire, an inner struggle for self-awareness, or the willingness to risk career, reputation, and friends in steadfast adherence to principle and conviction.

This last is the courage I have written about—the kind of courage which all of us, sooner or later, may be given the opportunity to demonstrate. For at all the levels of our national life, each man is sometimes called upon to stand for what he believes to be right against the pressures and opinions of friends, fellow workers, constituents, or the force of popular attitude.

At such a time each individual must look within himself for the resources to pursue his own course. But all the rest of us can contribute to the vitality of our democracy by refusing to join in unreasoning attacks upon those with whom we disagree; and by respecting them for having the strength to wage such a lonely struggle.

President John F. Kennedy's personal courage has been tested many times. In his 43 years, he has faced crises like these below:

PREWAR

Kennedy—frail, gaunt, weedy—nonetheless tried out for freshman football at Harvard. Knocked off the squad by a severe back injury, he became instead a backstroker on the swimming team.

Just before the Harvard-Yale meet, he was hospitalized with grippe. Kennedy arranged for his roommate, now Representative TORBERT MACDONALD, to smuggle in steaks to keep up his strength. He did exercises in his room, and once crept off to the pool to practice. The coach clamped down, however, and a substitute replaced him in the big meet.

WARTIME

Kennedy visited Great Britain during the German blitz, wrote his first book, "Why England Slept," in an attempt to wake up America to the dangers of Nazism. His trip so moved him that he came home and tried to enlist in the Army. Turned down because of his back troubles, he took special exercises for 5 months to pass the Navy's fitness test. After Pearl Harbor, he persuaded his influential father to help get him a battle assignment.

Kennedy's experiences as a PT-boat commander in the South Pacific have been much publicized, but they still have the ring of a movie thriller. A Japanese destroyer ran down his torpedo boat, slicing it in half. Kennedy was slammed to the deck, jarring his chronically ailing back.

Despite acute pain, he rescued several crewmen. Clutching the strap of one man's lifejacket in his teeth, Kennedy towed him to the nearest island. He swam for 5 hours.

After that, Kennedy built up a reputation for courage virtually to the point of recklessness. Says his old squadron commander, Al Cluster of Van Nuys, Calif.: "Jack took so many chances, it got so the crew didn't want to go out with him."

Finally Kennedy picked up malaria, to go with his back troubles. Emaciated and fever-ridden, he was compelled to go home. The Navy gave him a back operation and a discharge.

POSTWAR

Kennedy's ailing back nagged him throughout his early years in politics. He ran three times for the House, waging whirlwind campaigns. He won each election. In 1952, when he ran for the Senate, every step was agony. He could not climb stairs without dragging one leg. When he was not campaigning, he was in a hot bath, trying to ease the pain.

By 1954, Kennedy was on crutches, and his malaria had flared up again. At his wedding to Jacqueline Bouvier, the pain was so bad he could scarcely kneel at the altar. He decided upon drastic action to rid himself of his problems.

His doctors told him a double fusion of the spinal discs might cure him—or cost him his life. The chances, they estimated, were about 50–50. Characteristically, Kennedy took the gamble.

For weeks he lay at the brink of death. He was given his church's last rites; only his family was allowed to see him. He progressed so slowly that doctors sent him to Florida in the hope sunshine might speed his recovery. He left Washington on a stretcher.

Shortly afterwards, he was back for a second operation, to remove a plate from his spine. Again, his life was despaired of. Says his father, Joseph P. Kennedy: "God's hand is on Jack's shoulder. I have sat at his bedside three times when everyone thought he would die before morning. Everyone but Jack, Jack knew he would come through."

(The White House physician, Dr. Janet Travell, has told Parade that today Kennedy's back is entirely well.)

The final operation was successful. Kennedy spent a few more weeks in Florida, then came back to the Senate, having been gone nearly seven months. A wheelchair and crutches were waiting for him at the airport. Kennedy waved them away. "I threw away my crutches 2 days ago," he told reporters.

Later, a few vigilant reporters noted that he still seemed to be limping slightly as he climbed the steps of the Capitol. Kennedy saw them watching and grinned. Then he gritted his teeth and climbed on.

Up those steps lay the road to the White House.

Library of Congress and World Understanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, March 5, I was the speaker at the International Crossroads breakfast at the Central YMCA in Washington, D.C.

On this occasion, I spoke on the "Library of Congress and World Understanding." These remarks were well received and I have had several requests to make them available in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that other Mem-

bers and interested parties could read them.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that the speech "Library of Congress and World Understanding" appear in the Appendix of the RECORD:

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS AND WORLD UNDERSTANDING

It has always been my conviction that an after-breakfast speech ought to be considerably shorter than an after-dinner speech. (One reason is that your audience is apt to be more alert and more critical in the morning.) The heavier indulgence of dinner is apt to make an audience more receptive, more acquiesant, more amiable, and less conscious. I like an audience like this because I happen to be partial to small and intimate groups. This is a sort of board of directors and I can talk to you with a certain earnestness—perhaps even persuasiveness—that permits me a kind of confidential relationship with you I would not attempt with larger groups.

For the subject I want to talk to you about is the "Library of Congress as a Force for World Peace Through Cultural Communication."

Culture may be said to be accrued education.

And education is the open road to communication. And once you have these—education and its handmaiden, communication—you have the beginnings of a major breakdown of prejudice: racial, religious, cultural.

There are certain important repositories of world culture.

In a very active and dynamic sense this institution the world over—the Young Men's Christian Association—is a great center of deposit for the cultures, the thinking, the religious outlook, the education, and the recreation of whole varieties of people in the family of mankind.

Libraries to be sure are everywhere the repositories of world culture. And they have been since the days of Alexandria of antiquity. In this sense and in our time the Library of Congress occupies a special and a very dominant place.

Now I like to think of a library not as a museum although it is that, too.

Rather I like to think of a library as a workshop and a think shop where we carry out the admonition to seek the truth.

I like to think of a library as a scintillating, interesting, exciting, strength-giving, and dynamic force for broad human understanding.

The reason the United Nations is perpetually pleading for peace, peace when there is no peace, is because the basis for human understanding does not exist among the peoples of the earth. It is one of the tragedies of mankind that misunderstanding can be quickly and easily engendered. But understanding and mutual appreciation are difficult to come by.

There is nothing I believe more strongly as a politician who must appeal to people and present himself to them for their approval, than this simple truth. That is it is impossible to hate people you know. It is possible to hate individuals and whole peoples if you know them somewhat. It is possible to form dislikes and nurture them out of some kind of perverse satisfaction. But there is no such thing as really knowing your man, or knowing your people, or of being fully informed, and then finding in information and in knowledge a basis for dissension or disagreement. Oh, it may very well be that your problem is not that you do not know the other man; but rather that the other man does not know you. And ignorance, whether on your side of the fence, or the other side of the fence, is just as destructive.

That is why I feel it so important to disseminate as a living and vibrant force the sum of human knowledge. That is why I am so proud that the Library of Congress may be singled out as one factor in justifying America's leadership of a free mankind. The Library of Congress is not a warehouse for old and new books. It is not a massive edifice for miles upon miles of bookshelves and decks and stacks and dry-as-dust volumes about a dead past and a stagnant present and an unexplored future.

For me the Library of Congress is the cultural showcase of America; just as a library anywhere may be or should be a cultural showcase—an influence to make good men able and able men good.

It is a living testimony of our interest in all of mankind from the dim days of antiquity to the immediate moment. It is a humming, busy, cultural factory and inventory of ideas and policies and living action and progress. It is concerned not only in hewing out new paths in library science as such. It is concerned with providing for men everywhere, the free and the slave, the half-free and the half-slave, the truths about the condition of man.

A savant from Ceylon, a professor from Bonn, a scientist from Japan, a finance analyst from Wall Street or the Bank of England, a statesman from anywhere, finds a hospitable and an inviting atmosphere and a precisely tailored source of knowledge and research for a general or a particular quest here in our Library of Congress. Or it may be a delegation or delegations from the far corners of the earth. Here in this atmosphere of academic freedom, here amid these volumes, among this Library personnel, they find welcome and friendship and assistance. Here is the congenial atmosphere of a scholar among scholars. They find this atmosphere even if they come—as some do—with suspicion and perhaps a suppressed hostility. If we are sucecssful in our Library of Congress, we shall have disabused them of their prejudice. And we shall have sent them home wondering deep down whether somewhere in their home propaganda they have not been misled. For they come here from Moscow and Prague and Belgrade and from Budapest and Albania and everywhere.

How exactly—you may ask—is all this implemented?

For one thing, and just as a single example, the Library of Congress performs a prodigious service, a function, in the international exchange of official publications. On the combat front of ideas, in the areas where policy is made and action is taken, the Library of Congress is a practically unbounded pool of limitless depth for the ascertainment of facts, opinion, commentary, truth, and apocrypha. I can give it to you in figures but they hardly tell the story:

I mentioned the exchange program. When the present Librarian, L. Quincy Mumford, accepted the post he now holds, the Library had only three exchange agreements with institutions in the Soviet Union. Today there are 300 such agreements.

I ask: Is there a more vital area of communication for the knowledge and welfare and well-being of all mankind everywhere?

In addition to this the Library has a worldwide network of about 20,000 exchange agreements with governmental agencies, universities, and other research institutions.

This brings in over half a million items a year.

Without going into the filing techniques I can tell you that in about a half decade the number of publications from the Iron Curtain countries has jumped from 32,620 publications to 64,330 ingeniously indexed so as to make them easily identifiable and available.

There is, for example, an Africana Section.

The Library has an incomparable 1,500,000-volume collection of scientific and technical materials. There is besides a massive quantity of potent and valuable and needed scientific abstracts. But the emphasis on science is no greater than the emphasis on the humanities. One is not pampered at the expense of the other. Rather they are supplemental and complementary in the total story of world culture. And this is an abiding principle in the Library under its present leadership.

When I examined the most current data on the Library I found it impossible to tell the story adequately in a breakfast talk. How can I tell you about the Library's holdings of American and international history and politics except to say it is fabulous. There are original and private documents from the Presidents. There are the instruments of our freedom and the original materials that surround these instruments. There is bibliography and library science and the publications of learned societies. Intensive use is made hourly and daily and the year around of the Library's files of American and foreign newspapers, its maps and atlases. The Library is, of course, rich in rarities ranging from the Gutenberg Bible and the rough draft of the Declaration of Independence to Abraham Lincoln's first drafts of his Gettysburg Address.

I ask you to consider what an immense contribution all this is to the betterment of human understanding. For, of course, understanding is the key to peace. Members of Congress must know quickly and accurately and fully all the facets of an issue about which they are asked to make a decision. Here the Library of Congress steps in with its invaluable Legislative Reference Service. These are scholars and savants and research people and specialists, carefully selected, of proven ability and background, who stand by to brief legislators—usually in writing—on the facts. This is the service that—with hardly more than 200 people—answered more than 81,000 inquiries in 1960 from Members of Congress and from committees of Congress. Many of these inquiries called for highly technical reports, analyses, assessments of assembled data, and conclusions upon which legislators could predicate judgment and decision. The materials thus supplied are highly prized, not only because of accuracy and depth, but even more because of disinterestedness and objectivity.

Since we are talking about the contribution to human understanding let me throw in here another statistic. In fiscal 1960 more than 700,000 readers were supplied with books and other materials and were given other reference assistance. Of course there are other services of the Library which I cannot now pause to describe: its interlibrary loan system, for instance, reaching to libraries all over the world. From the Library of Congress through its National Union Catalog on cards you can learn the location of some 8,500,000 books printed before 1956 in more than 700 libraries in the United States and Canada. An auxiliary catalog records the location of some 550,000 works in Slavic, Hebrew, Japanese, and Chinese. I could talk to you about the Library's library for the blind, the Copyright Office, the Library's cultural activities in the field of music and literary readings. The Library is a vast storehouse of Americana from folk music to motion pictures. When I use the word "understanding" and talk about Americana I have in mind also that the Library has in one form or another the songs of many Indian tribes. It has a growing archive of Latin American poets and their poetry and it has these on tape.

What I have just told you explains why I made it a point to be here today: human understanding.

Nothing in a book, not a whole planet of libraries, can take the place of this, I hope, warm, personal, and friendly contact we are having here today at this Young Men's Christian Association which will enhance our understanding of each other. The very words "Christian association" carry a world of meaning for the mission in human understanding I am trying to perform and that the Library of Congress performs on a huge and mighty international and national stage. This meeting, personal and intimate and friendly, is basic, and the books and paraphernalia of culture are, and must always remain, supplemental. What we learn from books supports what we learn from human contact and vice versa. As we broaden our knowledge of each other we deepen it. We give it sustenance—encourage its growth. Once this knowledge is rich and full, it may not always lead to mutual love but it surely can and should lead to mutual respect. This will shorten the road to peace.

What the influence of libraries everywhere—and the Library of Congress especially—prove above all else, is the great value of variety in human tradition and culture. Let each of us, as a people, develop and cherish, our own culture and tradition, our own religious and spiritual values. If we live up to the tenets of our faith I think—by and large—we shall avoid trespass.

What needs to be established is that all peoples in the variety of their cultures and traditions are asked only to respect and honor each other. What is dangerous is not learning, knowledge, friendly and scholarly criticism and judgment of each other; what is dangerous is ignorance and the resulting suspicion. What we need to remember is not that power per se is a menace, but power without a sense of morals and spiritual values is a menace. This is why in the field of communication and exchange, in the field of mutual knowledge, institutions like the Library of Congress, are a prime potential.

I am inestimably proud as an American to be told by reliable experts that the Library of Congress is the greatest of all libraries in our time and that it is perhaps the greatest in all history. I am proud, not as one is proud of a possession or a property. I am proud as one who is proud of an asset that makes for world comity, world peace, world understanding.

You have honored me both by having me and by listening so intently—I close with hope that I may have stirred your heart and mind to feel and think on these things and with a plea that when you take a book you first thyself prepare to read with zeal and mark with care—and when thou hast read what there is writ then let thy best practice to second it then twice each precept read shall be once in the book and next in thee.

And remember—that there is an admonition to go and teach and preach. Another seer has told us that it is our business to make other men wiser and better as we can make or find opportunity.

A Well-Deserved Tribute to Bill Clay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, it was indeed a pleasure to learn of the passage of a resolution by the Maryland House of Delegates, in their present session, congratulating William R. Clay on his election as State commander of the Disabled American Veterans, Department of Maryland, for the year 1960–61.

I have known Bill Clay for many years and can personally attest to the fact that since his discharge from the service, his greatest concern has been for the veterans, especially the disabled ones, and most of his time, outside of his regular employment, is spent in their behalf. Therefore, I feel that the tribute paid to him by the Maryland House of Delegates is a well-deserved one and to bring it to the attention of other Members of the Congress who may have had some contact with Bill Clay, I am inserting in the Appendix, a copy of the resolution.

The resolution follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 57

Resolution to congratulate William R. Clay on his election as State commander of the Disabled American Veterans, Department of Maryland, for the year 1960–61

Whereas Mr. Clay is a member of the Bethesda-Chevy Chase No. 10 of the Disabled American Veterans, Department of Maryland; and

Whereas since 1949 he has been legislative officer for the Disabled American Veterans, Department of Maryland. In this capacity, he has been active on both State and National levels in connection with major veterans' legislation. He has at various times conferred with the Maryland delegation in Congress on veterans' matters; and

Whereas Mr. Clay's associates recognize him as a gentleman of good character, capable, and a hard worker. His services to veterans are deemed particularly valuable because of his experience in the field of legislative planning, dissemination of information, and coordination; and

Whereas Commander Clay, in addition to his veterans' duties has served for many years in Government service in positions of trust and responsibility: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Delegates of Maryland, That the members of this body express their congratulations to William R. Clay on his election as State commander, Disabled American Veterans, Department of Maryland, for the year 1960–61; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Mr. Clay at 620 Sheridan Street, apartment 113, Hyattsville, and to the Bethesda-Chevy Chase Chapter No. 10, Disabled American Veterans.

Speedy Action on Textiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the following timely editorial is from the Greenville News, Greenville, S.C.:

SPEEDY ACTION ON TEXTILES

The textile industry is entitled to the speedy action it requested of President Kennedy's Cabinet-level committee studying the problems imposed by increasing imports from low-wage nations.

The matter is already acute. Textile imports have increased steadily over the past few years and have brought heavier and heavier pressure on domestic mills.

And last Thursday the Japanese Embassy in Washington revealed that its Government will ask for an increase in the volume of cotton goods it may send under a voluntary import quota which expires at the end of the year.

The Japanese base their request on figures purporting to show that their share of the American cotton cloth market has declined drastically since 1957. They claim that, whereas Japan supplied 70 percent of the cotton cloth shipped to the United States in 1957, it sold only 18.4 percent in 1960.

These figures do not tell the whole story, however. Indeed they are quite misleading.

Japan's textile exports to this country have not declined as much as a hasty inspection of the Embassy's figures might indicate. On the contrary, the total volume has increased. What has reduced the Japanese percentage share of the American market has been the great increase in imports from other textile-producing nations.

Japan is still the leading foreign shipper of cotton textiles to the United States. In recent years other countries have become interested in our market and have stepped up their shipments, thus cutting deeper into domestic sales.

The Associated Press the other day reported how this stream of imports from many nations has swelled since 1956. At the risk of boring our readers with statistics, here are some of the figures:

"In dollar value imports from Japan amounted to $169.7 million in 1956; $162.8 million in 1957; $185.6 million in 1958; $241 million in 1959; and $131 million in the first half of 1960.

"From India came imports valued at $79.3 million in 1956; $81.4 million in 1957; $75.1 million in 1958; $92.6 million in 1959; and $49 million in the first six months of 1960.

"Textile imports shipped from Hong Kong were valued at $3.5 million in 1956; $10.3 million in 1957; $25.5 million in 1958; $61.4 million in 1959; and $50.2 million in the first half of 1960.

"Imports from the United Kingdom were valued at $111.7 million in 1956; $102.2 million in 1957; $88.3 million in 1958; $100.2 million in 1959, and $57.5 million in the first half of 1960.

"Italy sent $44.5 million worth in 1956; $45.3 million in 1957; $45.3 million in 1958; $69.9 million in 1959; and $40.7 million in the first half of 1960."

One final set of statistics from the Associated Press story:

"In 1947 employment in the U.S. textile industry totalled 1,325,000. Ten years later the number of workers hired was 1 million. Last year the figure had dropped to 807,300."

This, then, is the direct effect of the rising tide of imports—a loss of 500,000 jobs. To this must be added the costs of idle machinery and plants, and the damage done to those services and industries which are dependent in one way or another upon a prosperous textile industry.

Some of the reduced employment is due to technological advances, to be sure. Better machinery and more advanced production methods have resulted in greater output with less labor. If these new techniques had not been applied, the domestic textile industry would have collapsed long ago.

But there can be no doubt that much of the decline in employment is the direct result of the loss of markets to cheaper foreign-made products.

And there can also be no doubt that if the tide of low-wage imports is permitted to rise further, more unemployment will follow.

President Kennedy, Commerce Secretary Hodges, and Labor Secretary Goldberg have all expressed themselves as being intensely interested in finding a solution to this pressing problem. That solution must be found soon.

Survey Highlights Indian Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, an outstanding group of Americans announced last week a summary of important new findings and recommendations regarding the American Indian.

At the executive meeting of the National Congress of American Indians, the recommendations of the survey group established 4 years ago by the Fund for the Republic were an important highlight of the meeting.

The findings were particularly significant because the survey group included the Honorable W. W. Keeler, principal chief of the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma, who is now heading a special task force on Indian matters appointed by Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall.

Others in the group, in addition to Chief Keeler, include: Meredith O. Wilson, president of the University of Minnesota, who is chairman; Karl N. Llewellyn, professor of jurisprudence, University of Chicago; Arthur M. Schlesinger, professor (emeritus) of history, Harvard University; and Charles Sprague, editor and publisher of the Salem (Oreg.) Statesman.

Because of the long study which preceded this report, and the distinction and ability of the members of the survey group, I am sure this summary of findings will be of importance to all who are interested in the American Indian.

The summary follows:

COMMISSION ASKS NEW POLICIES FOR AMERICAN INDIAN

WASHINGTON.—Recommendations for fundamental revisions in U.S. policy toward the American Indian were made today by a commission of leading citizens in a report released by the Fund for the Republic.

The 45-page report, a "Program for Indian Citizens," is a summary of findings based on a 4-year study. The full report will be published later this year. It was prepared by the Commission on the Rights, Liberties, and Responsibilities of the American Indian, established in 1957 by the Fund for the Republic.

The chairman of the commission is Meredith O. Wilson, president of the University of Minnesota. Other members are W. W. Keeler, executive vice president of the Phillips Petroleum Co., and a former chief of the Cherokee Nation, who is now consultant to the Secretary of the Interior on Indian Affairs; Karl N. Llewellyn, professor of jurisprudence, University of Chicago; Arthur M. Schlesinger, professor (emeritus) history, Harvard University; and Charles Sprague, editor and publisher of the Salem (Oreg.), Statesman. The commission had two executive directors: William A. Brophy, a former Commissioner of Indian Affairs, who served in 1957, and Dr. S. D. Aberle, who served from 1957–61.

Single copies of "A Program for Indian Citizens" are available without charge by writing to the commission, 424 First National Bank Building, Albuquerque, N. Mex.; the Fund for the Republic's headquarters at Box 4068, Santa Barbara, Calif.; or to the fund's New York office at 133 East 54th Street.

The report examines seven major aspects of the Indian problem and makes recommendations dealing with termination, Indian values and attitudes, economic development, tribal governments and law and order, education, health, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

TERMINATION POLICY

One of the commission's major recommendations is a thorough reexamination of the Federal Government's policy of "termination," whereby it is proceeding to cancel various treaty obligations under which it has given special protection to the economic, social and educational welfare of the Indian citizen.

The report criticizes the hasty manner in which Concurrent Resolution 108, passed by the U.S. House of Representatives in 1953, has been implemented in order to carry out termination. It charges that termination as it is being applied threatens to bring about disruption of the Indian's tribal and legal systems, the forced sale and wasteful exploitation of Indian lands, inequitable taxation, and abandonment by the Federal Government of educational, medical and road-building and other services without first establishing other sources of support for such services.

Termination has been carried out in many cases without knowledgeable consent of the Indian tribes affected, the report declares. It recommends that Indians participate fully in the working out of all termination agreements and that such participation should be made a "prerequisite" to the acceptance by the Congress of any termination plans.

The report suggests that Indian tribes be afforded competent technical assistance, paid for when necessary by the Government, to aid them in preparing for termination plans. Such plans should, among other things, adequately safeguard Indian water rights, conserve natural resources, allow Indian tribes to incorporate for business purposes, permit Indian-held lands to remain tax exempt until it is determined that the land can support taxation, and provide for adjustment of the Indian to a new political, social and economic environment.

"For the Government to act out of a sense of frustration and of haste to rid itself of the vexing questions involved in administering Indian affairs is bound to insure failure," the report declares.

"American policy, if it is to succeed, must aim at helping Indians to prepare themselves in advance of termination for self-reliant living in whatever is their prevailing social and economic framework. As this is accomplished, tribe by tribe, termination will follow and follow from the Indians' own desire. Termination so conceived will be an act of statesmanship in the best American tradition."

INDIAN VALUES AND ATTITUDES

The report stresses that "an objective which should undergird all Indian policy is that the Indian individual, the Indian family, and the Indian community be motivated to participate in solving their own problems. The Indian must be given responsibility, must be afforded an opportunity he can utilize, and must develop faith in himself.

"Indian-made plans should receive preferential treatment, and when workable, should be adopted.

"Government programs would be more effective if plans for education, health and economic development drew on those parts of the Indian heritage which are important not only to the Indians but also to the cultural enrichment of modern America."

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

A grim and complex economic future lies ahead for a large segment of American Indians whose reservations lack sufficient land or resources to provide a decent standard of living, the report declares. What land they do retain is being diminished by action of the Federal Government in withdrawing its trusteeship of Indian property and allowing it to be sold to individual private owners.

The report points out that reservations are often too isolated to allow establishment of industry, and yet when the Indian leaves the reservation to seek better jobs and wages, he is severely handicapped by a lack of education and training in skilled occupations.

To meet these and other economic problems of the Indian, the report recommends that the U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs cooperate with the tribes in developing an economic planning program. The planners, drawn both from Government and private sources, should make population analyses with a view to ascertaining employment possibilities. Planners should also seek ways of developing investment in land, resources, location and conduct of industry, service businesses, and recreation areas.

If planning programs require more capital than available from Indian sources, the Government should be prepared to make grants, short- and long-term loans, and loan guarantees to the tribes and to qualified Indians, the report states.

It declares that the efficient use of Indian land requires merging. In some regions, to prevent disintegration of the land base, the tribe must obtain control of small tracts for reassignment or rental to individuals in larger units.

The problem of Indian unemployment and substandard job levels could be dealt with in part by giving special instruction to untrained Indians, supplemented by education in management of money, the function of savings accounts, relative values of commodities, ways of locating city jobs, and how to adjust to city living.

Priority should be placed on finding jobs for tribesmen near the reservations. When they secure positions far away from their homes, guidance and financial help should be made available to them until they become adjusted to their new environment, and an effort made to locate them in neighboring living quarters.

The report stresses the importance of maintaining field employment offices for the Indians, and of systematic development of industrial employment opportunities on or near the reservations. It also emphasizes the desirability of preserving the practice of Indian arts and crafts.

The report recommends that, like other Americans, Indians should be eligible to participate in the national economic improvements which are not administered by the Secretary of the Interior, such as programs for depressed areas, housing developments, small business, and the like.

TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS AND LAW AND ORDER

"The national policy, which for more than a century and a half has authorized the maintenance of tribal governments should be continued," the report states. "They should be dispensed with only when a tribe so desires. Until then the authority of these governments in local affairs should not be curtailed through unilateral action of the United States except in one respect: Federal law should require that tribal actions safeguard certain basic civil rights and provide for appeal of civil rights cases to Federal and State courts.

"By thus governing themselves, Indians will among other things gain knowledge of and experience in the laws and procedures of the greater community. When it is to their advantage, they should adopt the good features of these other governments. The costs of tribal government should be met, when feasible, by an equitable system of taxation of the members and others rather than exclusively from the collective tribal resources."

EDUCATION

The report says that present "low levels of achievement among Indian children present a situation that will take time, even under the most favorable conditions, to correct."

While Indian children have a mental capacity equal to that of white children, they are too frequently handicapped by poverty, inadequate educational facilities, a lack of parental understanding of the importance of education, and by a confused cultural background.

The report recommends expansion of adult education programs, as well as provisions of Government financial aid to Indian education when tribal resources are insufficient. Public schools attended by Indian children should have programs designed to meet their special needs, and under no circumstances should such schools allow their educational standards to decline.

"Only if greater progress is made in the future than in the past and if programs of education for Indian children at each stage of the acculturation are developed and swiftly put into effect can many of today's pupils be saved from becoming problem children, unable to cope with life."

HEALTH

The report says that, although the record of the U.S. Public Health Service has been "excellent," the Indian health problem remains a serious one.

Substandard housing, inadequate sanitary facilities, contaminated water, frequently scanty medical services, and ignorance of how to seek and use professional care all contribute to the bad health situation, the report declares.

The average Indian life span is 40 years as compared with the national average of 62. Certain tribes are badly afflicted with illnesses due to microbes, while in others obesity, alcoholism, diabetes and hypertension are relatively common. Dental diseases also abound. The worst sufferers from poor health are infants and children, whose death rate is twice the national average.

The report suggests that the Public Health Service and Bureau of Indian Affairs work more closely in attacking the Indian health problem. An example of how the agencies sometimes work at cross purposes is that on occasion the Bureau encourages Indians to leave the reservation while the Public Health Service will not give medical aid to Indians living off the reservations.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

The report recommends continuation, for the present, of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, but suggests that it be supplemented by an Indian Advisory Board of distinguished citizens appointed by the President to report to him at regular intervals on the state of the tribes.

"The primary function of the Bureau should be an affirmative one: Always to counsel and assist the Indian, not to control or regiment him. It should offer him technical advise and other help in the initiation and execution of plans for developing and managing his natural resources, for expanding his economic opportunities, for operating his government, and for bettering his living conditions. To this end, the Bureau should create a special division staffed with competent economists, planners, and community analysts."

The report also calls for repeal of outdated legislation and revision of statutes, regulations, procedures, tribal constitutions, and corporate charters affecting the conduct of Indian affairs—so as to simplify administration and permit Indians to make their own, unsupervised decisions over a greated number of subjects than is now allowed.

"The Bureau's aim should be to let Indians conduct their own affairs as soon as possible without supervision. Accordingly, it should encourage their assumption of responsibilities for different functions on a piecemeal basis. Tribal land and resources should, however, remain under the Federal trust until the Indians, when able to hold and manage their property, decide otherwise."

The report declares that "under the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 the Secretary of the Interior is required to inform tribes falling under the law as to the appropriations he will request for their projects before he submits estimates to the Bureau of the Budget. This principle of prior tribal review, now frequently ignored by the Bureau, should be enforced and extended to all tribes.

"Finally, the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Indian Affairs should speak consistently in announcing policies. Conflicts between the policies proclaimed by the Secretary and those executed by the Bureau should never occur."

The Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, a thoughtful appraisal of the Peace Corps is given by Kenneth Holland, President of the Institute of International Education, in a letter to the New York Times. Mr. Holland, who is the author of "Youth in European Labor Camps" and "Youth in the CCC," weighs the administration's new Peace Corps program in the light of his own practical experience in and his knowledge of earlier projects which have broken ground for the Peace Corps.

Under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Holland's observations in the Appendix of the RECORD:

PEACE CORPS IDEA PRAISED—VALUE AS PRACTICAL EDUCATION SEEN IF PLANNED WITH CARE

(By Kenneth Holland, a letter to the New York Times, Sunday, March 12, 1961)

The proposal for a Peace Corps made by President Kennedy during his campaign has appealed to the imagination of both young and old Americans. Those who remember the successful Civilian Conservation Corps camps established in the early days of the Roosevelt administration and various other youth service projects conducted at that time by both governmental and private organizations do not find the President's proposal impractical or visionary.

The idea of providing an opportunity for American youth to serve and to gain experience in real life situations probably grows out of our belief in the constructive effect of frontier experience on previous generations of young American men and women. George Washington, the surveyor, Abraham Lincoln, the railsplitter, and Daniel Boone, the scout and explorer, are all part of our heritage from days when we were extending our frontiers.

As the physical frontier in the United States disappeared, some of our best minds proposed substitute experiences for our youth. In 1912 William James in his essay "The Moral Equivalent of War" proposed a type of peace corps.

YOUTH SERVICE

He suggested "a conscription of the whole youthful population to form for a certain number of years a part of the army enlisted against nature. * * * No one would remain blind, as the luxurious classes now are blind, to man's relations to the globe he lives on * * * our gilded youths would be drafted off, according to their choice, to get the childishness knocked out of them, and to come back into society with healthier sympathies and more sober ideas." This proposal and others resulted in many projects and experiences with youth services.

Immediately following the First World War a Swiss Quaker, Pierre Ceresole, organized a group of young men, some of whom had fought on opposite sides during the war, to help in the rebuilding of the devastated area of northern France. This Voluntary Service for Peace spread to other countries.

In 1919 Bulgaria developed a compulsory labor service that required every young man upon reaching the age of 20 to give 8 months to compulsory community labor. In the period between the two World Wars most governments of Europe developed some kind of a labor service for their young people, and there were also many privately financed projects.

Most of the governmental projects were designed to provide real and satisfying work for the unemployed. Most of the privately sponsored camps were established to give college and university students from many other countries an opportunity to work together improving underdeveloped areas, while becoming acquainted with the peoples, their problems, hopes and aspirations.

MINING EXPERIENCE

In 1932 I worked in a camp in a depressed coal mining village of Wales, sponsored by the National Union of British Students. This camp was building parks and recreation facilities. We had some fifteen different nationalities in the camp.

We slept on straw mattresses on the floor of a school. We had our meals in the rectory of a little Church of England. We started working with pick and shovel at 6 a.m. leveling talus slides and piles of debris from coal mines.

I worked in another camp sponsored by the National Union of Swiss Students at Ausserberg in the Swiss Alps. There we constructed a "studentweg," or studentway, from the village of Ausserberg to the village of Luerig. Some of the students in these camps, especially the girls, also did some teaching, directed discussion groups and recreation projects for children.

I also worked in camps during the summer of 1932 administered by the Bruening Government of Republican Germany which brought together unemployed workers, peasants and students to attempt to overcome the violent antagonisms of Nazis and Communists.

As these few examples indicate, there is a wealth of experience with voluntary services, civilian conservation corps, work camps and other projects that demonstrates the feasibility of the President's recommendation of a Peace Corps.

Universities and other nongovernmental organizations should be encouraged to utilize corps members in connection with their projects overseas. Agreements with governments that welcome the corps should be developed in writing, setting forth the project's administrative plan.

The Peace Corps is basically a sound idea. If care is used in its planning and administration it will contribute greatly to the practical education of our young people, to better understanding of the motives of the United States and at the same time assist the developing countries of the world.

Our Big Handout Needs Overhauling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. HALEY
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time, an article entitled "Our Big Handout Needs Overhauling," which appeared in the Tuesday, March 21, 1961, issue of the Miami Tribune.

Of course, my long concern over the waste and extravagance in the foreign aid program is well known. I believe Mr. Jack Kofoed has made a good case in this article and I hope that each of my colleagues will consider the questions he has raised in "Our Big Handout Needs Overhauling," which follows here:

OUR BIG HANDOUT NEEDS OVERHAULING
(By Jack Kofoed)

Franklin Delano Roosevelt started the big handout. Harry S. Truman carried it on. Dwight D. Eisenhower did nothing to slow the pace. Now John Fitzgerald Kennedy asks for a 5-year $7-billion development fund, and promises to overhaul the entire foreign aid program.

Brother, if ever overhaul is needed, it's in this department. A sutdy of General Accounting Office, and other reports, discloses staggering waste, plus stupidity. There has been talk in the past about reforms, but nothing much happened. If something isn't done we'll run out of money ourselves.

If that happens, do you think countries we helped to prosperity will take up the slack?

A certain amount of foreign aid is needed, but the kind we've splashed around for years, while piling up a national debt of nearly $300 million, is ridiculous. Mr. Kennedy says he will try to convince take-it nations to spread some of the loot among their poor people to make them less susceptible to communism. When it is suggested that aid payments to poor Americans be increased a racketing "no" arises from many sources. Giving them more dough would make beggers of 'em, but handouts to foreigners would merely protect them from Red influences.

Remember when bearded, turbaned King Saud, of Saudi Arabia, visited the United States? His country is backward, illiterate, one of the few where slavery remains an established custom. He and his retinue ride in air conditioned Cadillacs. The poor burn their feet on desert sands, are empty bellied while Saud fills his with delicacies.

The United States has an air base in Saudi Arabia, used for military air transport and air-sea rescue operations. We will give it up next year. Saudi Arabians don't like our friendly attitude toward Israel, so out we must go. When we do, runways will crack, buildings decay. Millions sunk in the base can be written off as waste.

Yet, the State Department says there "are no plans to cancel aid in general to Saudi Arabia."

Why not? During the years we have been parceling it out, the miserable, down-trodden poor of the country have never benefitted, only the head man, already fat-rich from oil money. But, we announce that we'll pour more dollars down the Saudi Arabian drain, even though we are kicked out of the country. Why complain? Such doings are par for our foreign fiscal relations.

Then, there is a $65 million Army camp we built for Pakistan. From the American point of view the layout is fine, having all modern conveniences for troops, including lavatories with mirrors, so GI's can shave, and deep freeze units for storing food. It doesn't suit the Pakistani, who squat in the street and pay stumble bums to scrap off the whiskers. They also look suspiciously on refrigeration. The soldiers drive food animals into camp, slaughted them, and eat the meat the same day.

If we're going to blow public funds like Coal Oil Johnny on a spree taking care of foreign countries, why not spend it in accordance with local customs?

I never did understand why we suffer from a give-away compulsion, when it has been proved over and over again that much of the money we taxpayers sweat to earn is completely wasted. Sixty-five million dollars may be a drop in the bucket to the free handed in Washington. Spent in proper ways it could do considerable good. But, not this way. Even Pakistani GI's are laughing at us.

PTA Endorses H.R. 4970

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, with a membership of 11,500,000, is the one organization closest to the problem of improving educational opportunities for our boys and girls. I think it is most significant that this organization is one of the most active in urging that the Federal Government assume its responsibilities by providing some financial underpinning to our public elementary and secondary schools.

Mrs. James C. Parker, of Grand Rapids, Mich., president of the PTA, has called for decisive action in the April PTA magazine. The highlights of Mrs. Parker's editorial comment are summarized by a press release from PTA, which I include as a part of my remarks.

The press release follows:

PTA PRESIDENT CALLS FOR ACTION ON EDUCATION-AID PROPOSAL

CHICAGO, ILL., March 24.—Mrs. James C. Parker, of Grand Rapids, Mich., president of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, called today for "decisive action" on President Kennedy's proposals for Federal aid to education.

Writing in the April PTA magazine, published today, official magazine of the parent-teacher organization, Mrs. Parker declares:

"It would be difficult to think of any legislative proposal more important for children and the future of our country than the message that the President of the United States sent to Congress on February 20.

"His sober appraisal of the urgency of educational needs and his proposals for a Federal program of assistance to improve children's educational opportunities from elementary school through college deserve our most thoughtful consideration."

Noting that the Nation's some 47,000 PTA's have long been "aware of school needs" and interested in securing "adequate funds for education," she points to a continued "grievous shortage" of classrooms and teachers:

"In 36 States more than 500,000 children (last fall) were on shortened or half-time schedules.

"In 1960 the classroom shortage was worse than the year before.

"American children are being taught by some 90,000 persons who are not fully certified, fully qualified teachers."

Mrs. Parker's editorial affirms that "the PTA is deeply and wholeheartedly committed" to the goal stated in the President's message, "the maximum development of every young American's capacity," and notes that "on the need for Federal aid to achieve this goal there is less and less controversy.

"Undoubtedly there are conflicts of opinion about the aid-to-education legislation now before Congress," she points out, adding that it "deserves study by every citizen.

"It is incumbent upon each of us, as parents, teachers, and citizens, to inform ourselves thoroughly and to let our Senators and Representatives know our views.

"Now is the time to secure for education the priority it must have if our country is to remain strong and free, and if our children are to grow into their finest possibilities. It is a time to take decisive action so that American education may achieve unmatched excellence."

Conference on Footwear Imports, Hotel Congressional, Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BURKE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Monday, March 27, 1961, in company with other members of the Massachusetts congressional delegation I attended the Conference on Footwear Imports at the Congressional Hotel, Washington, D.C. This conference was conducted by the National Shoe Manufacturers Association.

Mr. Walter T. Spicer, executive secretary, Associated Shoe Industries of Southeastern Massachusetts with offices located at the Commercial Club, 54 North Main Street, Brockton, Mass., was present. The city of Brockton is in my congressional district. Brockton is one of the great shoe centers of America. For many years the shoe industry has been the mainstay for employment.

The following information on imports and exports—other than rubber—in the foreign trade in footwear was released at the conference.

CONFERENCE ON FOOTWEAR IMPORTS, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 27-28, 1961

Percy N. Burton, president, NSMA and Craddock-Terry Corp., Lynchburg, Va.: It is difficult to watch an industry or business suffer from competition that works with a set of rules and standards below our own. Recent inroads by foreign competition into the U.S. footwear market have been made on this basis.

A. W. Berkowitz, chairman, NSMA Imports Committee, president, Songo Shoe Manufacturing Corp., Portland, Maine: Over 36 million pairs of leather footwear and over 94 million pairs of rubber and canvas footwear were imported in 1960. The combined increase over 1959 amounted to 73.4 percent. Where will this rate of increase take our industry if it continues?

Some segments of our industry are hurt more than others. Here are percents of leather footwear production enjoyed by foreign imports.

Imports as percent of U.S. leather footwear production

	1954	Estimate, 1960
Women's and misses' cements	2.0	23.0
Women's and misses' cements under $6	4.0	32.0
Men's, youth's, and boys' cements	6.7	130.0
Skating boots	.4	15.0
Track shoes	3.0	27.5
Little League baseball	0	40.0

U.S. foreign trade in footwear (other than rubber), 1900–1960

Year	Imports		Exports	
	Million pairs	Million dollars	Million pairs	Million dollars
1960	26.6	53.3	3.2	10.9
1950	6.1	9.4	3.7	12.2
1940	2.8	1.3	2.4	4.3
1930	5.7	11.3	3.7	8.3
1920	.2	.8	10.4	10.7
1910 [1]	.1	.2	7.3	12.4
1900 [1]	.05	.1	3.0	4.3

[1] Imports are estimated. Until 1912, boots and shoes were imported under "Miscellaneous leather manufactures."

Source: "Foreign Commerce and Navigation of the United States," Department of Commerce.

U.S. foreign trade in footwear (other than rubber), 1951–60

Year	Imports		Exports	
	Million pairs	Million dollars	Million pairs	Million dollars
1960	26.6	53.3	3.2	10.9
1959	22.3	44.4	3.5	11.4
1958	23.6	32.9	4.2	13.4
1957	10.9	22.1	4.4	13.9
1956	9.8	18.3	4.5	14.1
1955	7.7	13.5	4.6	14.4
1954	5.6	10.3	4.7	14.6
1953	7.2	12.7	5.2	16.2
1952	5.3	11.1	4.3	15.3
1951	5.4	11.0	4.2	14.0
Percent change, 1960 compared to 1951	+393	+385	−24	−22

Financing the Balance of the Federal Highway Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK M. CLARK
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation that I believe will provide adequate financing for the balance of the Federal highway program. This legislation uses only highway-user taxes as was intended by the Congress when the basic 1956 act became law. It, further, contemplates the completion of the system by 1972, as was also intended by the 1956 Highway Act. I believe this legislation is the best possible approach to this program. It adds no new taxes but simply, and in all equity, transfers from the general fund to the highway trust fund those user taxes which have up to now been kept out of the fund.

My bill is a fairly simple one. It provides for the transfer of the remaining 5 percent of the tax on trucks and 5 percent of the tax on parts and accessories, and five-sevenths of the tax on automobiles. This would provide for the period ending fiscal year 1972 aproximately $11.9 billion, which combined wtih the borrowing authority now existing in present law would be more than sufficient to finance the rest of the program.

In addition, the so-called Byrd amendment, or section 209(g) of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956, is repealed. I believe that if we are to finish this program on schedule we should face the situation fairly and squarely and allocate funds to the States in such a manner that they will know how to plan for future years' construction, and provide enough financing to take care of these allocations. In other words, this time we must make a decision and set up a firm financing plan to provide for the balance of the program. I believe my bill does just this and I hope it will receive the serious consideration of all the Members.

Let me conclude by saying that I am a firm believer in good highways and I believe they are essential to our national self-interest. I believe this program should be completed on schedule, and I believe that highway-user taxes should be used to finance this program.

Minimum Wage Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include an editorial published in the February 26 issues of the Greensboro Daily News, of Greensboro, N.C., entitled "Juggler Kennedy and Minimum Wages," and an Arthur Krock column published in the March 28 issue of the New York Times.

These articles point up the danger of the Government causing more unemployment by forcing an increase in operating costs and expenses on the business community at a time when the country is in a recession and many business enterprises are finding it difficult to keep operating. It is my judgment that what the country needs today is an expansion of business activities to provide additional jobs and thereby reduce unemployment. But if the Government forces an increase in operating expenses, the result may well be more unemployment and therefore more hardship. As the editorial points out, new jobs do not grow on trees in a recession, and eliminating some marginal businesses is not a way to recover from a recession. The articles follow:

[From the Greensboro (N.C.) Daily News, Feb. 26, 1961]

JUGGLER KENNEDY AND MINIMUM WAGES

President Kennedy is like a juggler who has more objects in the air than he can handle.

He is trying to beef up U.S. business productivity and efficiency because we need to compete better in world markets.

But the President also has a business recession on his hands at home, and that requires Government action in distressed areas.

On top of that he has sent new minimum wage legislation to Congress calling for gradual increases during the next 3 years, from $1 to $1.25 per hour, and extending coverage to about 4,300,000 workers.

Some of these juggler's balls are threatening the airspace of others. Minimum wage legislation is the most flagrant example.

The legislation in itself might be justified in some areas. Certainly, living costs and productivity have increased, as the President notes. But the administration must face the facts of life. Increased labor costs are bound to produce increased consumer costs. If added to the bottom of the salary ranges, they would surely affect labor costs all up the line.

These salary adjustments are not brought on because of greater productivity. Their effect would necessarily be inflationary.

But worst of all, they would hit some marginal businesses and hit them badly. In good times the Government might dismiss this as part of the law of the economic jungle. But in a time when the President is trying to increase the number of jobs available, he cannot take that attitude. New jobs do not grow on trees in a recession. And a recession is what the President has been telling us we are having. Eliminating some marginal businesses—and this legislation would affect retail and service establishments, laundering, cleaning and clothes-repairing businesses, local transit, construction, and some gasoline service stations—is not the way to recover from a recession. Dismissed workers are not helping the economy.

Doubtless Mr. Kennedy knows there will be some conflicts in his program. With a President in office determined to take the overall view, rather than a particularist one, he is bound to meet himself coming and going at one time or another.

In this case curing the recession and improving our international business posture should have priority over trying to help marginal income employees.

Timing of the minimum wage legislation is bad. Its effects could hurt the overall Kennedy program and result in fewer job opportunities.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 28, 1961]

A SMALL BUSINESS AND THE MINIMUM WAGE BILL

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, MARCH 27.—In his advocacy of a gradual rise of the minimum wage from $1 to $1.25, and the addition of millions of workers to its beneficiaries, the President has stressed two arguments outside the economic area. One is humanitarian—that it would provide a "decent" living wage standard for large groups of unskilled and semiskilled workers. The other is ethical—his longstanding pledge and that of the Democratic platform of 1960.

"I find it difficult to know," said the President at his last news conference, "why anyone would oppose seeing somebody, by 1963, paid $1.25 an hour who works in a business [entering interstate commerce] which makes

over $1 million a year. I think anyone who is paid less than that [$50 a week] must find it extremely difficult to maintain themselves and their family. I consider it to be a very minimum wage so that I'm hopeful that the House will pass legislation as close to the bill that came out of the committee as possible * * * because * * * I must say we are talking about a standard for fellow Americans and millions of them * * *."

The premise is that the proposed rise in the scale would relieve this difficulty for such employees and that in general the bill, as the President also said, would serve "the national interest." Since it is indisputable that neither of these results would occur if an increased cost-of-living scale, small business failures and additional unemployment were the consequences, it follows that the President rejects all judgments that they would. This supports an estimate of his Secretary of Labor that the Administration's bill would provide an increase of hundreds of millions in purchasing power and many more jobs.

The resistance to this bill in Congress, where the House already has lowered the proposed minimum wage and the scope of the workers' coverage, reflects strong disbelief in such expectations among the small business establishments principally affected by the legislation. These are private enterprises which gross—not, as the President said, "make," which is fundamentally different—$1 million a year and touch, though often remotely, the stream of interstate commerce.

A good example of their contention that the administration measure will have effects opposite from those the President has in view was supplied by the head of a company which manufactures mechanical pens and pencils. In a letter to President Kennedy from this small business manager, Remmie L. Arnold, the following statistics, and conclusions drawn from them, were offered:

1. At $1.25 an hour an employee who at $1 now earns $40 for a 40-hour week would get $50. After the legal subtraction of taxes his week's net would increase from $31.50 to $39.40. The employer's payroll and tax outlay per employee would rise from $42.44, of which the Government gets $10.94, to $53.05, of which the Government would get $13.65.

2. But, said this small manufacturer, "When we increase the minimum wage we will be forced to increase upward the higher-paid," which means more additional expense of doing business. "I will have to add the additional increase and taxes to my products; the people who sell me raw materials will raise their prices to me; the chainstores to which my products mostly are sold will increase their retail prices for them."

AS TO PURCHASING POWER

3. "You cannot take more money from a small business * * * and give more to Government and more to employees and increase our buying power * * *. And the increased minimum wage and coverage will not help the unemployed because they reduce our buying power and cut back money that could be used for capital outlay." Also, the inevitable price level stimulation will absorb the employees' extra take-home pay, and send many retailers into the foreign markets.

His particular factory, Arnold wrote the President, has made no profit since the imposition of the Korean war 10 percent excise tax on such products (still in force); and some of its labor force already has been replaced by automatic machinery as a matter of necessity.

The administration makes the strong point that one example like this does not create an average. But it is sufficiently typical of protests sent to the Capitol from small businessmen to explain the resistance in Congress. And that is fortified by long experience that rising production and consumer living costs, like Floyd Patterson's knockout combination, usually come one, two.

Pearl Harbor Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, too often we are prone to permit the valiant deeds of those who have given their all that the Republic might survive to be forgotten. Some years ago Mr. Ed Clark Ford wrote an editorial in the Nashville Banner in a critical vein about the rickety stand built above the *Arizona*, which lies half buried in Pearl Harbor, the victim of the sneak Pearl Harbor attack. This editorial awakened the conscience of the readers of that publication. The first to contribute to the Pearl Harbor Memorial Fund was Mrs. Veva Perry Capsas. To stimulate the interest of the people of this country, Mrs. Capsas, a former constituent of mine, wrote a poem entitled, "Remember Pearl Harbor: The *Arizona*."

Mr. Speaker, in order that some permanent record may be made of the poem and of the splendid contribution made by Mrs. Capsas, I submit the poem herewith:

REMEMBER PEARL HARBOR: "THE ARIZONA"
(By Mrs. Veva Perry Capsas)

Ah, build the bastions high and deep,
Encase that shattered hulk;
For a thousand heroes sleep down there
Within that rotting bulk.

Make her a shrine for all to know
Whenever we look back;
That fatal Sunday of yesteryear
The vicious sneak attack.

They wrecked our Navy on that day
There was no Declaration;
Yet we were welded by this thing
A strong, determined Nation.

And so we fought the enemy
On land and sea and air,
The way was hard and grievous long;
We often knew despair.

All the beaches of the seas
Ran red with our men's blood,
We took the islands one by one
'Til finally, 'twas a flood.

A flood of victory that we knew
On Hiroshima's plain;
The atom bomb had done its work
And peace had come again.

The Harbor holds our sunken fleet,
Ah, may we not forget
The men who died upon that day
Defending ship and deck.

Let's build the bastions high and deep
About the *Arizona's* bulk;
Salute the heroes who lie there
Within that rotting hulk.

James E. Murray

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, a friend of mine for many years died in Butte, Mont. He was one of the most famous liberal Members of the U.S. Senate has ever had, and his name was James E. Murray. He represented his State in the Senate for more than a quarter of a century.

Though the Senator spent most of his life serving Montana and the United States, he was born May 3, 1876, in Canada on a farm near St. Thomas, Ontario. His parents, who were Irish immigrants, were Andrew James Murray and Anna Mary (Cooley) Murray. In 1897, when the Murrays moved to Butte, the Senator's uncle, whom the Senator was named after, sent "Young Jim" to New York to study law. The young Canadian became an American citizen, took his LL.B. at New York University Law School in 1900, and an LL.M. in 1901. After graduation, the Senator returned to Butte, which in those days was one of the roughest towns of the West, and started to practice law. A couple years later, in 1905, he married the former Viola E. Hogan, who is now deceased, and raised a large family.

The Senator's first elective office was county attorney of Silver Bow County; he was elected when 30 years old, and served from 1906 to 1908. For the next two decades, the Senator, always a retiring man, led that sort of life. As his uncle grew older, the Senator handled more and more of his affairs, and eventually inherited his uncle's wealth, which was largely in mining investments.

Though a man of means, Senator Murray was a liberal who strongly supported New Deal legislation. His first formal political job was chairman of the Montana Advisory Board of the Public Works Administration in 1933. He was first elected to the U.S. Senate in 1934 to fill the unexpired term of the late Senator Thomas J. Walsh, and soon achieved fame as the author and champion of social welfare legislation that aided factory workers and small businessmen alike.

In 1938, he led a vigorous fight for the Fair Labor Standards Act, and in 1946, he sponsored the Full Employment Act of 1946, which Walter Lippmann called "one of the most significant enacted by Congress in this century." He worked for a higher minimum wage, aid to farmers, and Federal assistance in public health. He sponsored the Indian Sanitation Act of 1959, was a strong backer of a Youth Conservation Corps, and was coauthor of the Murray-Metcalf bill, during the 86th Congress, for Federal aid to education. He was also stanchly for public power legisla-

tion and conservation and was publicly critical of the Eisenhower administration's reclamation programs.

Murray was close friend of organized labor while in the Senate. In 1947 he voted against the Taft-Hartley Act and in 1959 voted against the McClellan "bill of rights" to the labor reform bill. In 1951, the Congress of Industrial Organizations presented to him the Philip Murray Award as "one of the country's outstanding liberals."

When he retired from the Senate in January, he was chairman of the Senate Interior Committee, a high-ranking member of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, and a member of the Senate Democratic Policy Committee.

Montana, the land where the Great Northern Plains and mountains meet, will long remember this quiet, purposeful man.

What's Next?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I invite our colleagues' attention to a very penetrating and thought provoking editorial written by Mr. George Watson Marble, editor and publisher of the Fort Scott Tribune. George Marble's editorial is to the point of one of our Nation's most critical challenges:

WHAT'S NEXT?

During the political debates last year we heard much about the need to speed up the rate of the Nation's economic growth. That was the major domestic problem as Kennedy saw it. It may still be, but so far he has been too busy trying to get the country out of a minor cyclical depression to give much attention to the Nation's long-term growth.

That will come in time, but the economists are saying what is needed is another baby industry to emerge from the research laboratories and create a great deal of new employment to take up the slack resulting from automation.

What they are talking about is the birth of some great new industry to do for the next decade or two what the automobile, radio, television, the airplane did to impel economic growth and employment in recent decades.

Those inventions did grow into great new industries, but they were not really new, we are told. Radio, for instance had its start in 1827. It took another century before many people had a set in their homes. Television was proved feasible in 1884, but became a popular household fixture only in recent years. The airplane made its first flight nearly 50 years ago, but required several decades to grow into an industry.

So whatever new industry does come along to take up today's employment slack is probably already well along in the making, and will not prove new at all. Our guess is that it will come through present nuclear research. And its products will bring other great new problems. Rather than provide employment for everyone, nuclear power is more likely to put more people out of work than any other invention in history.

The prospect is that finding jobs for everyone who needs them is going to be an unending problem for all time. So will be the problem of putting men's leisure time into wholesome channels.

There is one old-time industry that is the greatest jobmaker in history. It could put everyone to work overnight. We hope it won't. War has done it before and can do it again. Even today, a large percentage of the Nation's income is being spent for, and a large part of the Nation's employment is in the work of getting ready for war if it does come again.

Will our Nation and the other world powers deliberately choose the problem of unemployment in preference?

Federal Aid to Jewish Parochial Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include an interesting letter received from Rabbi Morris Sherer, executive vice president of Agudath Israel of America, of New York City.

AGUDATH ISRAEL OF AMERICA,
New York, N.Y., March 27, 1961.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN McCORMACK: We wish to bring to your attention that our organization representing Americans of the orthodox Jewish faith organized in local chapters throughout the United States, favors Federal aid to parochial schools. Thousands of American Jewish parents are laboring under an undue hardship, because they must bear the heavy brunt of supporting huge budgets of the Jewish parochial schools to which they send their children as a matter of religious conscience.

We appeal to you to remove this discrimination by providing aid to these parents, whether in the form of tax deductions for their tuition, long-term loans to the schools, or outright grants for the secular programs of the parochial schools, which would bear no relationship to the principle of separation of church and state.

The Jewish parochial school system is an integral part of the educational plant of our American society, and it would be in the finest spirit of our American ideals to enable Americans who choose this type of schooling for their children to benefit from their taxes. Otherwise, they are being unduly penalized for practicing freely their religious choice.

We would sincerely appreciate your maximum efforts to help rectify this situation, through enacting legislation which would grant Federal aid to these parochial schools. We would also be grateful if you would kindly arrange for a representative of our organization to appear at any Senate or House of Representatives hearing which will be held in the near future on this subject, so that we could properly present our view to the legislators.

Through your efforts in this direction, you will have earned the grateful recognition of our people.

Very sincerely yours,
Rabbi MORRIS SHERER,
Executive Vice President.

Utica, N.Y., Applies the Self-Help Method

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, there are in my State several communities which are economically distressed. One of the most serious areas of unemployment in New York is the Greater Utica area, which has a population of 300,000 and a working force of more than 100,000, of which some 8 or 9 percent are presently unemployed.

Like many other communities of excessive unemployment throughout the country, Utica is not content to stand still.

The people of Utica have demonstrated gratifying vigor in attacking their economic ills. They have applied what I refer to as the "self help" method with great enthusiasm. There is no question that wherever communities face unemployment problems like Utica, N.Y., the best and most logical solution is through the vigorous efforts of community and civic leaders to help their city help itself.

I have no illusions. The problems of the Utica area will not be solved simply and easily. I commend the Mohawk Valley Federation of Towns, Villages, and Municipalities and Dr. Virgil C. Crisafulli for the work which has been done in attempting to analyze and deal with Utica's economic difficulties. I also want to pay tribute to Utica's forward looking mayor, Frank Dulan, who originally proposed the establishment of a federation to promote and develop the economy of Utica. The cost is high and the job is tremendous. But, the people of Utica, under Mayor Dulan are going forward, and that is what counts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excellent article from the Rochester Times Union of Wednesday, March 22 discussing Utica's redevelopment efforts be inserted at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PATTERN FOR COMMUNITY PROGRESS—GREATER UTICA AREA BECOMES A LITTLE UNITED NATIONS

(By Harold Whittemore)

UTICA.—An American city looked in the mirror, didn't like what it saw and decided to do something about it.

A federation of communities, cities, villages and townships, working for the common good—is the result.

A 48-year-old college professor is the prime mover in a pioneering endeavor that could set a pattern for progress.

The concept is not new, but the progress made in the Greater Utica area in rallying support for such a federation raised many eyebrows.

What civic leaders saw when they looked in the mirror were two of the deadliest enemies of civic growth in America—public apathy and provincialism.

These twin termites of community decay were accompanied by familiar companions—unemployment, slums, undeveloped natural resources, hit-and-miss planning, and highways, hospitals, and utilities a step behind on the path of progress.

"The people of our area just haven't realized, at least in large enough numbers, what has been going in the outside world," the Utica industrialist said.

The Mohawk Valley's mirror was a painstakingly prepared, carefully documented, penetrating economic anaylsis of Greater Utica. Reflected were two heavily industrialized counties, Oneida and Herkimer, with a population of 300,000, a working force of more than 100,000—and 10,000 jobless.

The author of the analysis, which was a project of the Council for Economic Development, was Dr. Virgil C. Crisafulli, an associate professor of economics at Utica College.

Crisafulli is the architect of the Mohawk Valley Federation of Towns, Villages, and Municipalities. He often calls it a "United Nations of Communities."

Crisafulli diagnosed the economic illness, recomended a cure, awaited 2 years for signs of recovery, then decided to seek faster relief.

Prodded by the indefatigable professor and shocked by skyrocketing unemployment, Greater Utica, like a mother hen, gathered its brood of smaller cities, townships, and villages and set about to create a new image.

When the federation was proposed by Mayor Frank Dulan of Utica, Dr. Crisafulli (then serving as the unpaid secretary of a mayor's conference) accepted the paid post of executive secretary and trimmed his college schedule.

The 4-month-old federation is scarcely out of the incubator. The formula may be a bit strong. There are about 100 communities in the area. Planners wanted a minimum of 10 for the federation. Already 29 have signed up. Costs to communities are on a per capita basis.

Bringing up this baby is expensive. The cost is estimated at $220,000 the first year, mostly for regional planning, and $70,000 the next year, with $50,000 earmarked for promotion, and the remainder for research.

The baby has some well-to-do and concerned uncles, however. More than $100,000 in Federal and State aid is anticipated for regional planning. This money, Crisafulli explained, would not be available to individual communities.

Crisafulli sees the federation as a united front in competing with their communities. The federation proposes surveys in the fields of regional higher education new sources of tax revenue, use of land, labor supply, and highways, sewer, water and utility programs to keep pace with growth.

Onue maneuver to get sturdy help is to tap second-level executives in industry and the professions to do the planning and organizing. The theory is that topmen usually are too busy.

Emerson C. Itschner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the Army Engineers paid well-deserved tribute yesterday to a great soldier-engineer, Lt. Gen. Emerson C. Itschner.

In a retirement review at Fort Belvoir, the pride of the Engineers passed before the retiring chief of the corps to salute him for a job well done.

General Itschner has been a sterling example of patriotic service, and the Presidential Medal which was pinned on his uniform yesterday was recognition of that service.

During the years of his leadership, the Corps of Engineers has undertaken some of the biggest jobs in its history, including the tremendous Arkansas River development program.

In the Second District of Oklahoma, General Itschner has personally inspected all of the major works in this great program, and has given tremendously of his time, energy, and great talent to speed the work of flood control and water development.

I am certain that hundreds of my distinguished colleagues in this body will join me in expressing the hope that General Itschner will enjoy a fruitful and satisfying retirement, secure in the knowledge that he has made his country stronger through his service.

University of Cincinnati 1961 NCAA Champions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON H. SCHERER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, too often here in Washington events both at home and abroad cause us to view with alarm. This week all Americans, especially those from the city of Cincinnati, can point with pride to the University of Cincinnati Bearcats basketball team.

On last Saturday night at Kansas City, Mo., the Cincinnati Bearcats defeated the Ohio State Buckeyes in the National Collegiate Athletic Association finals and became the 1961 national champions.

Mr. Speaker, for 3 years prior to 1961 the Cincinnati Bearcats, led by that great all-American, Oscar Robertson, had won the title of the Missouri Valley Conference, the toughest in the country. The team went to the NCAA those 3 years but did not quite bring back the big prize, although rated the top team in the Nation in 1959–60.

The 1960–61 season for the Bearcats did not look too good. All-American Oscar Robertson had graduated. Charles Mileham, the university's fine athletic director for many years, had been promoted to a University of Cincinnati vice presidency. The team's great coach, George Smith, had succeeded Mileham as athletic director. The Bearcats had a new coach, Ed Jucker, assisted by Tay Baker and John Powless. There were no all-Americans on this team around which to build.

At the beginning of the season the Bearcats were not even rated in the top 20 in the country. Most sportwriters outside Cincinnati, who had drooled over the "Big O," looked for other heroes and completely ignored Cincinnati.

For the first few weeks of the new season it looked as if they might be right. The once-powerful and feared University of Cincinnati Bearcats had only a 5-to-3 record. The coaches and team, however, quietly but with confidence and determination, supported by a small but loyal University of Cincinnati boosters club, went to work on a long, tough, and grueling schedule. They won 21 straight games from some of the toughest teams in the country.

Gradually their phenomenal wins forced skeptical sportswriters and coaches to push them into the top 20 teams, then into the select top 10. They went on to win what no one expected—the fourth straight Missouri Valley Conference title.

As the season ended, the Cincinnati team found itself rated No. 2 in the Nation, second only to Ohio State. Ohio State, with the all-American Jerry Lucas, according to many was supposed to be the greatest basketball team ever assembled.

For years big Ohio State, defending NCAA champion, had looked down its nose at the University of Cincinnati. It had refused to even consider scheduling and playing the Bearcats. The two had not faced each other on the court for 38 years.

Last Saturday night at Kansas City these two great teams were forced to meet as both won their way to the NCAA finals.

In what students of basketball called one of the finest and most thrilling contests in the game's history, the University of Cincinnati Bearcats beat the Ohio State Buckeyes 70 to 65 to become the 1961 NCAA champions—the No. 1 team in the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, this all-American team, coached by the phenomenal Ed Jucker, displayed all those qualities of sportsmanship and character so vitally needed by this Nation today; namely, skill, spirit, devotion, determination, and courage. It is comprised of the following players: Mark Altenau, Cincinnati; Carl Bouldin, Cincinnati; Jim Calhoun, Carr Creek, Ky.; Fred Dierking, Valley Stream, N.Y.; Dale Heidotting, Cincinnati; Paul Hogue, Knoxville, Tenn.; Ron Reis, Cincinnati; Larry Shingleton, Madison, Ind.; Tom Sizer, Middletown; Tom Thacker, Covington, Ky.; Frank Turner, Knoxville, Tenn.; Bob Wiesenhahn, Cincinnati; and Tony Yates, Cincinnati.

There are many other Cincinnatians who deserve much credit for the glory that this team has brought to Cincinnati. Among them are Dr. Walter Langsam, president of the University of Cincinnati; Ralph Burseik, it vice president; Dr. William Schwarberg, assistant director of athletics; Hod Blanye, sports publicity director; Jeff Hanselmann, assistant sports publicity director; Ed Coons, ticket manager; Dr. Don Jacobs, team physician; Joe Keefe, team trainer; Bill Roth, team manager; Joe "Scotty" Kolp, equipment manager; Roy Hodgins, program manager; and Don Galvin, cameraman.

Mr. Speaker, no team could enjoy the prestige that has been achieved by the 1961 University of Cincinnati aggregation without the splendid coverage and cooperation which has been given by the Cincinnati Enquirer and the Cincinnati Post and Times-Star and their outstanding and truly objective sportswriters, Dick Forbes and Walter Forste.

We in the Congress salute the 1961 University of Cincinnati Bearcats.

Sister Barbara: Administrator of Holy Family Home, Parma, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, throughout the land are those who are devoting themselves to helping the sick and making their lives more comfortable. Too often, these individuals receive little or no recognition for their devotion.

A typical case is that of Sister Barbara, mother general of Holy Family Home at Parma, Ohio. Her devotion is well portrayed in a newspaper article recently appearing in a Cleveland, Ohio, newspaper, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(By Beatrice Vincent)

No matter what the weather outside, it's always on the bright side at Holy Family Home, State Road, Parma.

"We want it to seem like a home rather than a hospital," says Sister Barbara, a tiny, bright-faced nun who is starting her 5th year as administrator at the hospital.

To the 55 guests, all victims of incurable cancer, it does seem almost like home. Children and grandchildren can visit. Even the bedridden spend a good part of the time out of their rooms.

The nuns wheel their beds into the specially constructed chapel, out onto the wide lawns for picnics or through the gleaming halls into the recreation room for movies.

Sister Barbara, although mother general of the home, helps keep the halls gleaming. With the other 11 nuns, all Dominican Sisters of the Congregation of St. Rose of Lima, she rolls up her sleeves and pitches into the laundry, the scrubbing, the window-washing when not actually tending the patients.

Like their foundress, Mrs. Rose Hawthorne Lathrop, Nathaniel Hawthorne's daughter, they literally—and cheerfully—serve the sick poor. One of the rules of their order is never appearing shocked or repelled by any manifestation of the disease that brings their guests to Holy Family.

It was less than 70 years ago that Rose Lathrop discovered that New York hospitals refused to treat victims of incurable cancer—and decided to do something about it.

Today the 100 or so, members of her order, some of whom worked with her, conduct seven homes for cancer patients. They accept any race, any creed.

American Jewelry Industry Severely Penalized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the Boston Globe of Wednesday, March 22, relating to the unfair burdens placed upon the American jewelry industry and its employees by a discriminatory excise tax and imports from abroad which damage the home industry while drastic restrictions impede its export markets:

TWO-DOLLAR CUFF LINKS TAXED BUT NOT $12 SHIRT—JEWELRY MAKERS HIT EXCISE LEVY AS UNFAIR—PROTEST FLOOD OF IMPORTS

(By Howard S. Rains)

Do you know:

That you pay an excise tax on a $1 pair of earrings? But none on a $100 negligee?

Of that you pay the tax on a $2 pair of cuff links—but not on a $12 shirt?

Of that you pay the tax on a $1 lipstick, but none on a $500 hi-fi set?

Let's give you some background of this peculiar situation.

Back in the early part of World War II a retail excise tax was imposed on jewelry, furs, luggage, and cosmetics.

Basic purpose was to divert materials, money, and workers to the war effort.

Question: Other than the money, why should the tax (10 percent) be in effect today?

And even for the revenues involved, why should these industries be so burdened today? Why them and not others?

It looks very much like out and out discrimination.

In other words, grossly unfair, and contrary to our concepts of proper taxation.

For purposes of this discussion we'll stick to jewelry because it is prominent in the New England economy—mostly Rhode Island and southeastern Massachusetts.

We think its argument against the retail excise tax is completely justified.

As the industry points out, some mistakenly assume it is a luxury tax. This, of course, is absurd. Most extreme luxuries—a yacht for example—bears no similar tax burden.

Leaving jewelry for the moment, we also can't understand why a woman is forced to pay a retail excise tax on her cosmetics but none on some fancy gadget.

This is more than economics. It's a matter of commonsense.

Jewelry has another problem that makes one wonder.

Jewelry imports have been leaping—and hurting in a very serious way.

Yet many of the countries sending this jewelry here have not permitted the reverse. They have seriously curbed importation of American jewelry.

Now, this column favors greatest possible freedom of international trade. But it must work both ways.

Here's what we mean:

"A concrete example is a country now having unheralded prosperity at the expense of American jobs.

"In 1959 the American jewelry industry sold 76 orders, $444,288 worth of jewelry and novelties to Japan.

"MITI, the Japanese import licensing agency, approved only $50,000—11 percent of the orders—for entry into Japan.

"The other $400,000 we never shipped.

"During that year tens of millions of dollars worth of Japanese jewelry and allied products flowed freely into this country at a tariff that permitted their sale at one-half to two-thirds of the price of similar American products."

That was one example offered to a U.S. Senate subcommittee at a recent hearing in Providence.

The spokesman for the industry was George R. Frankovich, executive secretary of the Manufacturing Jewelers and Silversmiths of America, Inc.

Mr. Frankovich wisely minimized talking about imports. Rather, he dwelled upon what he called fair play. He cited the retail excise tax, export restrictions and such.

We think that is a step other industries should adopt.

They will get a better hearing. And more attention than they would if they aimed only at imports.

The import picture has been distorted by some. And there are two sides to the situation.

But discrimination is another matter—it demands definite correction.

Sees Midwest Economic Lead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, out in the midcontinent of America, in the heartland of the United States, we are indeed fortunate. Although economic conditions are far from perfect, we are much better off than are many other areas of the country. The Kansas City Star of March 21, carried a news story reporting on a leadership luncheon given by the Honorable Harry Darby, now a civic leader and industrialist in Kansas City, Kans., and formerly a U.S. Senator. I invite the attention of the Congress to that story, which, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert at this point:

SEES MIDWEST ECONOMIC LEAD—ROCK ISLAND OFFICIAL SAYS HEARTLAND FARES BETTER THAN THE EAST—A BOON IN AGRICULTURE—BUSINESS CONNECTED WITH FARMING AND FARM EQUIPMENT CALLED BRISK

The Midwest is faring better than the eastern part of the country in the current economic picture, R. E. Johnson, executive vice president of the Rock Island Railroad, said today.

"The strong position of agriculture and agricultural products makes this so," Johnson said in an interview here.

GRAIN IS VITAL

He noted that the 7,600-mile Rock Island system relies on agricultural commodities, especially grain.

He added that the moisture outlook in the grain belt is favorable, and he is looking for another big Kansas wheat crop.

Johnson, 51 years old, is a native of Osawatomie, Kans. He began work here for the Rock Island in 1936 as secretary to the general manager, later serving at Little Rock, Ark., and returning here as assistant general manager.

Johnson and Eaton Adams, vice president and general counsel of the railroad, both of Chicago, were guests of honor at a luncheon at the Hotel Muehlebach.

Harry Darby, Kansas City, Kans., industrialist, was the host. About 90 civic and business leaders of Greater Kansas City attended.

The railroad official said the Rock Island's business is a good gage of the economy.

He said he expects 1961 net earnings to be just about equal or better than last year, despite recession talk around the country.

"January this year was about even with a year ago," he said. "February was down a little, and March so far is about even."

The Rock Island has gone into the piggyback business of hauling motor cars and now owns 106 bilevel and trilevel motor-car carriers.

"Railroads are now aggressively trying to win back business they have lost in past years to truck and barge lines," Johnson said.

NOTES RAIL EFFORT

He also pointed out that railroads are generating business through development of industry along their own lines.

Passenger business, however, has declined, but now is holding steady.

Need for a Select Committee on Consumer Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution to create in the House a Select Committee on Consumer Problems.

The committee, as proposed in my resolution, is to consist of nine Members of the House of Representatives, appointed by the Speaker. Its duties shall be to conduct studies and investigations of the problems of consumers, with particular reference to the following:

First. The administration of Federal laws relating to consumers, in order to determine whether the administration of these laws serve the needs of the American consumer.

Second. The extent to which Government agencies adequately serve the needs of consumers or give due consideration to consumer problems.

Third. The collection of facts and information on consumer problems which would be of public interest generally and would also aid the Congress in enacting remedial legislation.

My bill provides, however, that the select committee "shall not invade any subject matter under active consideration by any standing committee of the House." The committee is authorized to submit preliminary reports of its activities, as well as a final report on the results of its study and investigation at the close of the present Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I was particularly pleased to note several days ago that President Kennedy is setting up an Office of Consumer Counsel in the White House to represent consumer interests. It is also reported that Dr. Persia Campbell will be named to this post. If true, this will be an excellent choice. Dr. Campbell has served as consumer adviser to Gov. Averell Harriman during the years he served as Governor of New York and she has a great deal of knowledge and experience in this field.

Several years ago, when I served on the House Agriculture Committee, I was instrumental in the creation of a Consumers Study Subcommittee, of which I was the chairman. Our subcommittee made several important studies at the time on trend in food prices, food marketing costs, agricultural surpluses and farmer-consumer problems, on meat processing and distribution, food stockpiling, the food stamp program, and several other subjects. The subcommittee was very effective in giving the American consumer a voice, and also in bringing about better understanding between farmers and consumers as to their specific problems.

On several occasions we were privileged to have Dr. Campbell testify at our hearings, and she was most helpful to the subcommittee. After I left the Committee on Agriculture in January 1959, the Consumers Study Subcommittee was dissolved. As far as I know, there is no other committee or subcommittee in the House now which deals with consumer problems specifically.

During the 1960 presidential election campaign, Mr. Kennedy several times mentioned in his speeches that he would appoint someone in his administration to look after consumer interests. This promise he is now keeping.

Mr. Speaker, it is one thing to look after consumer interests such as is to be done by the President's Consumer Counsel, and another thing for Congress to have a committee which is to study and investigate consumer problems with the idea of serving the needs of consumers and giving them the necessary protection through legislation. I believe Congress has a direct responsibility here and should assume this responsibility as soon as possible. Aside from the direct interests of the consumers, there is involved here the general economic condition in the country, matters of consumer interest which come before our regulatory agencies and in such departments as Agriculture, Labor, Commerce, Health, Education, and Welfare, and others.

Just as Congress gives a voice to farmers, to labor, to education, to science, to the armed services, to the veterans, to business and finance, and to other phases of our national activity through its committees, so it must give a voice to the consumer, the housewife, the elderly people, the family wage earner, who struggle with the problem of the high cost of living and how to cope with it. This can be accomplished through the establishment of a committee such as is proposed in my resolution.

Mr. Speaker, our economists and statisticians have figured out that in 1960 the personal consumption expenditures in the United States reached about $328 billion, which is approximately two-third of our gross national product. In 1961, they estimate that these expenditures will rise another $10 or $11 billion. This, in itself, is reason enough why the American consumer's voice should be represented at the highest levels in government.

Think of all the instances that have come to light in recent years involving price-rigging, fraudulent advertising, low standards of purity and wholesomeness of food and other articles, misleading labeling, deceptive packaging, misrepresentations in manufacturing, and other ways to deceive the American consumer. This requires not only continual study and investigation, but also careful oversight by Congress. It is time to stop making an easy victim of the consumer and to see that he obtains his dollar's worth in the marketplaces of our Nation.

It is not enough merely to have a Consumer Counsel at the White House or even advisory committees in one department or another. This is too big and too vast a part of our economy which deserves greater recognition. A congresisonal committee to deal with consumer problems would be the best answer.

President Kennedy has shown deep concern and understanding of the problems of the American consumer when he stated recently:

> The housewives who shop for their families—the wage-earners who pay the rent and meet the bills—all have a vital interest in the activities of government which affect the value, the quality and accessibility of the goods which they buy. And yet those interests have been virtually unrepresented before the agencies, the congressional committees and the executive departments whose work has a direct impact on the daily life and long-term standard of living of the American consumer.

Mr. Speaker, time is of the essence. I think it is of utmost importance to act on my resolution and to set up as soon as possible the Select Committee on Consumer Problems so that it can undertake its work in the near future.

The Recession Under Attack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABNER W. SIBAL
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, I believe the effects of an economic recession often can be magnified by gloomy talk spreading among the people. This sort of scare talk tends to tighten their purse strings and discourage businesses from their normal plans for growth and reinvestment.

On March 18, the Bridgeport (Conn.) Telegram published an editorial directed to this point and praising a proposal for combating the depressing effects of such talk. I would like to have it printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

THE RECESSION UNDER ATTACK

For the third time in 7 years the Nation's businessmen, acting through the advertising council which they support, are attacking recession "through the minds of men, where all action starts."

Theodore Repplier, council president, thinks this psychological warfare probably did some good in 1954 and 1958, though he says frankly there's no way to prove it. Most Americans, especially the hard hit, probably would agree it's worth a good try.

In the new campaign, called "Confidence in a growing America," the planners insist there's to be no "Pollyanna stuff," no blinking of the facts of recession. In the words of one, they simply want to "look at the whole stairway instead of the broken step."

What this means is that they intend to emphasize what they consider is legitimate optimism about the country's long-range future. The soberest economic projections largely agree, they say, that by 1975 we'll have a hike in gross national product from $500 billion to $800 billion, and a 22-million boost in jobs.

Some of the advertisements already prepared suggest the council is using what might be termed the "four B" approach. Again and again, alluding to the future, the campaigners say: "Brilliant—Bigger—Better—Brighter."

Heavy stress is laid on the value of organized research in fulfilling this promise.

The council's figures put U.S. business research today at $12 billion a year. By 1969 it's expected to reach $22 billion. Says Mr. Repplier: "It's the best answer to automation."

In its 1958 campaign, the council got donations of 25 million dollars' worth of advertising space. This time it figures on at least 10 million dollars' worth, and possibly much more.

For this time the program won't end once the recession danger is over. It will be continued at lower pace, with the idea that some constant psychological stimulus will do the economy good.

President Kennedy's Commerce Secretary, Luther Hodges, like the whole idea, providing the rough facts are always faced. He should have plenty of company. The campaign, if it's realistic, can't hurt. And it might help a lot.

Byelorussian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the 43d anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic is observed annually on March 25. It was on that day in 1918 that the people of Byelorussia set themselves up as a free and independent nation, only to be crushed a short time later by the Communist armies.

The anniversary of Byelorussia's independence occurs at a time when our Nation is embarking on a new era under a new leadership. We hope it will be an era of peace and freedom for all nations, including the captive nations of Eastern Europe who are suffering under communism. These nations, such as Byelorussia and others, have been the first and greatest victims of the Kremlin's policies.

Today the Byelorussian people are a silenced nation, but their kinsmen living abroad in this country and elsewhere are maintaining their history and culture and are also keeping world opinion informed on the subjugation of their people in their ancestral homeland Byelorussia by the Communists. The hope of these people to regain their freedom has not been crushed, however. We must help them keep this hope alive until it is realized.

Slowly and Surely

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN REIFEL
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appearing in the Pierre (S. Dak.) State News of March 21, 1961, pinpoints the disturbing situation in which our State legislatures are finding themselves, not only in South Dakota, but all across the Nation. This problem is that the State legislatures are becoming little more than a rubberstamp for the programs of the Federal Government.

While $67.4 million was appropriated by the 1961 South Dakota legislature, over $176 million actually will be spent by the State government with this additional two-thirds coming from the Federal Government. This shows the large degree of Federal control that is rapidly diminishing the fiscal say-so powers of the State legislature.

Another alarming aspect of the dependence of the State upon the Federal Government is the fact that South Dakota stands to loose $2 million worth of Federal funds because our people simply cannot afford to provide the matching funds.

I urge Congress to take note of this trend which is occurring in other States, too. Caution should be used in proposing programs calling for the States to match funds with the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the editorial to which I have referred:

[From the Pierre (S. Dak.) State News, Mar. 21, 1961]

SLOWLY AND SURELY

A favorite game among newspaper editors the past couple of weeks is called "Let's dissect the 1961 legislature." Most of them have performed their postmortems and concluded that the lawmakers did a good job, worked hard, and left State government in sound shape for the next 2 years.

It is nice to believe that our elected representatives did their tasks well, and we will agree with that analysis. However, there is one important point which many people continually overlook when they talk about accomplishments of the legislature. That is, simply, that the powers of State legislatures are slowly but surely being removed from them. More and more duties are being assumed by the Federal Government and State legislatures have gradually become little more than "approval agencies" for Uncle Sam.

Consider the amount of money which is spent through our State government. The 1961 legislature appropriated a total of $67.4 million and most lawmakers agreed that was too much money for them to approve.

However, that's only about one-third the amount which State government will spend during the next 2 years, according to United Press International Writer Wes Pippert. He says audits show the total will be over $176 million. The additional money will come from State taxes which are already earmarked, license fees, and, last but far from least, from the Federal Government.

We have, then, arrived at the point where our elected legislators have a voice in only one-third of the amount of money which State government handles. All they do is place a rubber stamp on the remainder so that various State agencies can spend it. Today, State government is, in the main, merely a subagency for the Federal Government when it comes to fiscal matters.

So, when we say the 1961 legislature "did a good job," we should realize that the area in which State legislating bodies are permitted to operate is growing ever smaller. Federal matching programs are drawing a noose about the necks of our State lawmakers, leaving them little room in which to make their own decisions.

More and more, when we assess the value of a State legislature, we will have to say "they did a good job," and then add the conditioning phrase, "within the boundaries in which they were permitted to operate."

Youth for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DURWARD G. HALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, an entire generation of Americans has grown up under the New and Fair Deals and were taught to believe, "the Government owes everyone a living." The New Frontier represents a substantial portion of those who were taken in by this philosophy. Today still another generation is showing signs that it does not relish the economic burdens of debt and confiscatory taxes which it has inherited. These young men and women are organizing politically to restore the tradition of the American free enterprise system. This philosophy is accurately described in an editorial in the Joplin, Mo., Globe, and under leave to extend my remarks I submit the article below for inclusion in the RECORD:

YOUTH FOR FREEDOM

The first among the future generations whose heritage the Nation started mortgaging back in the thirties now is coming of age. And there are growing signs it doesn't relish the economic burdens of debt and confiscatory taxes it is inheriting.

Soured somewhat by sudden realization that they have been robbed of their birthright by a 30-year deficit spending binge into welfare statism, many in this generation now reaching maturity are reported to be turning conservative. They are organizing politically, principally in colleges and universities, to restore the traditional American free enterprise system.

Their "cry in the wilderness" is to restore integrity in government, and to swing the curve of the Nation's social order upward again to restore individual freedoms and self-reliance, and shake off the shackles of big government regimentation under a fallacious welfare state.

We hope this is truly a new and great national movement, for it well might become the salvation of America, rescuing the country from its drift into socialism and democracy's destruction from within.

The new movement has been attracting considerable publicity lately. The central organization is the Young Americans for Freedom and it already has more than 100 affiliates on college campuses.

These vigorous young Americans openly reject the so-called liberal philosophies of the New and Fair Deals and the New Frontier. They prefer patriotism, national, and individual pride, self-reliance, and independence. They hold that the welfare state philosophies are phony, in the light of what they have done to the historic American way of life.

Indeed, these young people, born in the late thirties and early forties, regard President Kennedy and his New Frontiersmen as middle aged and not representative of the new youth of America. They recognize that President Kennedy and his contemporaries grew up under the New and Fair Deals, and really belong to the generation taught to believe the Government owes everyone a living.

It is most refreshing to hear about these courageous young Americans thus going into action. We hope their ranks are joined by oncoming generations—our leaders in government tomorrow—and that they will somehow fortify the country's weary will to resist the erosion of our liberties before it is too late.

Education—Local Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to point out to the Members of the House a resolution adopted by the board of education of the Washington local school district relative to their views on proposed legislation for Federal aid to education:

Be it resolved by the board of education of the Washington local school district operating schools in Dublin and Jerome, Ohio, That the board of education of the Washington local school district of Franklin County, Ohio, does hereby express its opposition to Federal aid to education for the reasons that under the principles of American democracy and the provisions of the Constitution of the United States of America, the education of schoolchildren is primarily the obligation of State and local governments and for the further reason that the Washington local school district and all other school districts in general in the State of Ohio are providing adequate school and education facilities at reasonable costs under our constitutional theory of local self-government.

It is the consensus of opinion of the Washington local school district board of education that Federal aid to education will sooner or later result in Federal control of local school matters, which is solely a matter of State and local concern.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two editorials, appearing in the Advocate, the archdiocesan newspaper of Newark, N.J. on March 16 and 23, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

These editorials, entitled "Read and Write," and "Honor the Whole Constitution," give, I think, an excellent presentation of the view of many Catholic Americans toward Federal aid to education.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Advocate, Mar. 16, 1961]

READ AND WRITE

Discussion of the question of Federal aid to education, especially to the parochial school section of our national system, waxes hot. That is, indeed, as it should be and in full accord with our American way. Much heat will no doubt be generated but, we believe, there will be also a compensating intensity of light.

In that light, we trust, we shall be able to see whether there is really any need for Federal aid, any need sufficient to excuse so great a departure from our traditional division of power between the States and the people on the one hand and the Federal Government on the other, sufficient to justify the unquestioned and unquestionable danger of Federal control of our schools, sufficient to warrant a further step along the path that may lead to the destruction of our Federal system, the great safeguard of our liberties.

In that light all will see, we trust, the eminent fairness of the claim of our bishops that Catholic children have the right to participate in any Fderal aid program and that, if they are excluded, they will be the victims of discriminatory legislation.

In that light we shall, we trust, be able to see that, while the President may be being practical in asserting that the Constitution clearly prohibits aid to parochial schools, he is relying upon a Supreme Court decision (in the New Jersey Everson case of 1947) which has no sound basis in history, in the Constitution or in any other legal source, which, in fact (as one of the Justices was honest enough to admit later), rests on nothing more than the personal opinions and prejudices of the members of the Court.

In that light we shall see, we trust, that eventually the Court must change that unsound, unfounded and unhistorical opinion to one more honest and more to the credit of our highest tribunal. That the Court can—and does—change its mind we can easily realize by recalling its stand in the matter of racial segregation in the schools in 1896 and in 1954.

(We said that the President was being practical in being guided by the distortions of the Everson decision. This is true because, given the present makeup of the Court, there is little, if any, chance of the expected reversal taking place in the foreseeable future.)

In the light that comes from open discussion we shall see, also, an important—perhaps vital—distinction which the President has made. While he has refused to sponsor any form of Federal aid to parochial grammar and high schools, he has defended, as free from any constitutional obstacle, a proposal of aid for college students and for colleges; this, he has said, "is aid to the student, not to the school or college."

Can we not see in this distinction a solution of the insoluble? If it is constitutional to grant aid to the student on the college level, it surely cannot be unconstitutional to do the same for the student in the grammar or high school; that is as simple and as true as the irrefutable fact that two and two make four. There is no relevant difference between colleges and grammar and high schools; what can be done for students in the one can be done for students in the other.

This concept of public aid to the student does more than solve the allegedly insoluble. It is also a practical recognition of the proper relationship between government and the family in the matter of education, a relationship which has been expounded again and again in these columns.

The family is, by the law of nature, that is, by the law of God, the primary educator; even the U.S. Supreme Court has recognized this in the Oregon case of 1925. Government, local, State, Federal, enters the picture only in order to assist the family to the extent that may be necessary for the proper fulfillment of the latter's right and duty; if the family needed no assistance, there would be no government participation in education at all.

(To some extent we in America have always accepted this family basis even of so-called public education. With us these schools are operated, not by the city or the State, that is, by the government, but by specially chosen or elected boards of education who represent the parents or families of each community and act in their name.)

If, then, there is to be Federal aid to education, let it be in the form of aid to the student and/or his family. Against this no valid constitutional objection can be cited; in it all can participate in the properly American, equal way; by it the longstanding injustice suffered by our Catholic people will, in part at least, be redressed. How it is to be carried out—whether by tax rebate or tax exemption or whatever—we leave to experts in fiscal matters to work out.

Our Catholic parents, our Catholic people, must call upon their elected representatives in Congress to enact such a school aid program, if there is to be one at all. Only the pressure of an aroused—and enlightened—public opinion can control the dangerous tendency Congressmen have to "follow the leader."

Let us not be taken in by smooth promises that, if opposition to the President's (discriminatory (and, therefore, un-American) proposal is halted, consideration of our demands—the demands of fairness and equity—will be taken up after the "public school only" bill has been passed. It is extremely unlikely that such promises would ever be honored, so unlikely that we would betray our own interest and right if we were to rely upon them. Now is the time, this is the opportunity. We must not let it slip away.

[From the Advocate, Mar. 23, 1961]

HONOR THE WHOLE CONSTITUTION

Catholics pressing for aid from public funds to parochial schoolers are widely accused of defying the Federal Constitution.

This is calumny. No American Catholic wants, now or ever, anything contrary to that glorious charter. We treasure it, we honor and abide by it, and not just part of it but the whole of it. We wish that our critics would do likewise—honor and abide by the whole of the Constitution.

Instead, they speak as though the question of public aid to parochial schoolers

turned on and is to be settled by the meaning of the "no establishment of religion" provision in the first amendment.

They speak as if that provision were, not just one clause in, but the whole of the first amendment, indeed the whole of the Constitution.

Their tactic is to maneuver us into fighting only on the battleground chosen by themselves, the terrain of church-state relations, where we are bound to bog down and victory is precluded.

So long as our critics succeed in confining the debate to that area, that of the limitations imposed by "no establishment," they can say: "Let's grant for the sake of argument that the 'no establishment' provision, as reinterpreted by the Supreme Court in the Everson and McCollum cases, while forbidding all direct governmental aid to religion or religious institutions, does not prohibit what might amount to indirect aid. But so what? It doesn't command such aid either. By what right, then, do you demand it? We don't have to give it to you. What's more, even if the Constitution doesn't bar indirect aid, public policy does."

So long as foes of public aid for parochial schoolers are allowed to dictate the battleground, so long as we fall in with their arbitrary demand that the issue be debated exclusively in terms of "no establishment," we are foredoomed to a stalemate, in effect a defeat—as were our troops in Korea when they were forbidden to carry the fight north of the 38th parallel.

Such a defeat would be costly not just to ourselves but to the Nation at large, for it would be achieved precisely by obstructing the Constitution itself. Our opponents will have won their victory, not on truly constitutional grounds, but by tearing out of context and exploiting a single clause in complete disregard of and defiance of the rest of the Constitution.

The Advocate has been spelling this out for years. We have contended and we contend that the terrain of church-state relations is the wrong battleground, or at least not the only legitimate battleground on which the contest should be waged and decided. The issue of public aid for parochial schoolers is not primarily, if at all, a question of church-state relations. It is primarily a question of family-state relations.

We have contended and we contend that the "no establishment" clause, if relevant to the dispute at all, is not the only relevant part and certainly not the most relevant part of the Constitution. And we have submitted and we submit that whatever the meaning of the first amendment's "no establishment of religion" clause may be, even as reinterpreted by the Supreme Court, it cannot be one which conflicts with the Constitution elsewhere, it cannot be one which nullifies, abridges, or renders illusory positive rights guaranteed elsewhere in that wise document.

In asking that parochial schoolers be allowed to participate in public funds expended for education, Catholics are not assaulting America's constitutional separation of church and state, we are not asking for governmental support of our religion or of the teaching of it.

We are asking simply that parents who happen to be Catholics may be effectively enabled to direct and control the education of their offspring. We are asking that parents and pupils who happen to be Catholics may be effectively enabled to exercise freedom of choice in education.

We are not asking that non-Catholic taxpayers support parochial school education. We are asking, as Bishop Bernard J. McQuaid of Rochester put it in 1875, "to educate Catholic children in Catholic schools with our own (tax) money. We do not want Protestant money, nor any State money that was not taken from our purses." We are asking that part of the taxes collected from us as citizens for educational purposes be channeled back to us as citizens for the nonreligious aspects of the education of our children.

And these things, we ask, not as largess or condescension, not in circumvention of the Constitution's "no establishment" clause, but in the name of our constitutional rights, rights set forth and documented at length by Virgil Blum, S.J., for one, in his book "Freedom of Choice in Education" (Macmillan, 1958).

Briefly, the Constitution guarantees that the parent is the primary educator of his offspring, has the fundamental and inalienable right and responsibility of controlling and directing his children's education according to his free choice and conscience. The Constitution guarantees freedom of choice in education, the free exercise of religion, and that no one should have to yield any of his constitutional rights in order to participate in public benefits. One or another of these constitutional rights must be surrendered by Catholic parents and children as long as participation in public funds is conditioned upon attendance at public school, as long as parents are economically penalized for exercising their right of sending their children to parochial schools.

We ask our fellow Americans, of whatever persuasion, to honor these our rights, if they would honor and abide by the Federal Constitution, not just in part but the whole of it.

We ask for aid from public funds for parochial schoolers in the conviction that this does not at all conflict with the several State constitutions forbidding use of public funds in support of denominational schools.

We ask for such aid in the conviction that public policy cannot be invoked against it. (It is interesting that foes of aid to parochial schoolers are now raising this issue. Are they growing less sure of their constitutional ground and therefore are preparing a second line of defense?) Since when would it be bad public policy for the Nation to live up to constitutional rights? And even if it were ruled that the Constitution merely permits, does not require, aid from public funds for parochial schoolers, the public interest would still demand, as Father Blum shows in his first chapter, diversity of educational opportunity as an indispensable bulwark against totalitarianism.

Finally, rather than wait patiently, as has been suggested in some quarters, until the Protestant, Jewish, and secular humanist conscience is disposed to accord us our rights, we ask for them now and insistently, because we have already waited patiently and in vain for over a century and, to judge from the current Protestant, Jewish, and secular humanist outcries, very likely we would have to wait at least another century, whereas right now public aid to parochial schoolers is rapidly becoming a matter of survival.

We urge our fellow Americans not to obstruct but to acknowledge and support our rights lest they be party to a vast conspiracy to coerce all children, contrary to the will of millions of parents, into a single, monolithic school system—call it Operation Kidnap. Lest they be party to the injustice of refusing to Catholic parents a fair return on their own tax moneys—call it Operation Pickpocket. Lest they be party to downright discrimination which would make Catholics second-class citizens—call it Operation Ghetto.

A Journey to Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include another in a series of articles on Ireland written by Mr. Thomas Heffernan, editor, Sunday Independent, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., which appeared in that newspaper on March 26, 1961. Mr. Heffernan wrote this interesting and informative series for his newspaper following an extended trip through Ireland last fall.

The latest installment follows:

A JOURNEY TO IRELAND—COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL ATHLETES WOULD SPURN THESE ACCOMMODATIONS

(By Tom Heffernan)

The high school football players of just about every Luzerne County high school would feel rather badly treated if given the accommodations provided the athletes of Dublin's Trinity College—the highly respected Irish university that is situated almost in the middle of Ireland's capital city and surrounded entirely by a high wall.

The building provided for the athletes is situated at the far end of the playing fields, at an elevation some 50 feet above the level of the fields which provide space for cricket and rugby and the building, consisting of a single story and basement, is reached over a series of concrete steps which serve also as seats for the spectators.

There probably is space there for about 200.

Main feature of the building is the long room leading directly out to the top row of seats and its equipment consists of a long serving bar, tables and chairs, plus facilities to provide boiling water.

Tea is served as the athletes and spectators gather in a special get-together after the contest.

FOR THE ATHLETES

Down below, in the basement, is the space for the athletes, consisting of two rooms, each about 20 feet square and when we looked at them we thought first of the fine dressing rooms, showers, and jampacked equipment rooms of most of the county's high schools.

Because there are just two items of equipment in those dressing rooms for the athletic heroes of Trinity College—and these are just about the same as will be found in all the other famed and splendid old schools of the rest of Great Britain and the continent of Europe.

These two items are hooks and benches.

The hooks are in a line around the wall and serve to hold the street clothes of the players when they change into sports gear.

The benches line the walls beneath the rows of hooks.

There is nothing else. No lockers, no extra equipment, no showers—no nothing.

TEA COMES FIRST

The athletes, after the game, join their friends at tea and, that period of pleasure ended, go down into the basement and change into their street clothes.

If they want to have a bath they get one after they reach their places of residence—in the old dormitories of Trinity College.

One of the other playing fields—a rugby field—had accommodations for spectators the full length of the field on both sides.

These accommodations consisted of a single row of benches. That was all.

Obviously, sports are held in quite a different light than here in the county and the rest of these United States.

In Ireland, as in Britain and Europe, there is no such drive for perfection to bring victories. They play for fun.

The star of the rugby team has not been practicing rugby or the plays all week. Far from it.

Instead he has been enjoying as many of the other available sports as he can.

So a boy may play on the rugby team on Monday; have a go at some football (soccer) if it is available on Tuesday; have a game of cricket, if in season, on Wednesday; pull an oar in the shell on Thursday; try still something else like golf on Friday, and then devote Saturday to his social engagements.

They like to win but they are not going to slave all week, to the neglect of all their chances for fun, just to improve their chances for a win in a single sport.

That's not their way of enjoying themselves in athletics.

VIKINGS FOUNDED CITY OF DUBLIN

The far-ranging Vikings, pouring out of Scandinavia as the result of a population explosion and whose wonderful longboats and their fierce fighting qualities took them to conquests in so much of the known world—from the Middle East, to Sicily, up through Russia, in France and England—left their mark on Ireland.

They founded or occupied Dublin late in the Eighth Century—about which time they also started settlements which grew into Limerick and other of the leading cities of the Emerald Isle.

Credited to them also is the second street in importance in Dublin, now known as Dame Street.

But it used to be Dam Street, so called because the Vikings there dammed the River Poddle to create space for their boats.

And now also the National Library and Museum is full of relics and archeological discoveries of Viking remnants. We should add also that, in Ireland, the Vikings are usually called Danes.

FRIENDLY PEOPLE AT THE HOTEL

We had more good fortune in being made to feel at home in the Royal Hibernian, the hotel in which we stayed.

Knowing we had just come from there, one of the three lovely young ladies behind the desk—a dark-eyed, dark-haired colleen—let us know she was from Adare.

Her name was Mary Bowkley.

Then there was the handsome waiter in the excellent dining room, with his wave of dark hair and quite a regal manner in that fine place to eat—until he came down to being the friendly and most helpful sort of chap you'd want to meet.

His name was Tom McGann.

Formal as it could be, the Royal Hibernian had three grades of men in the dining room.

McGann was one of those who took the orders and saw that all was well and who work with tails.

Then there were those who served in gray, cotton coats.

Finally the young bus boys, wearing the tuxedo but with a big, wide apron tied about their middle.

But it was McGann who did so much to make our meals in Dublin, otherwise taken mostly in solitary splendor, far more agreeable.

And when it came to serving meals the Royal Hibernian did not stint space.

One large dining room was for the breakfasts, the main dining room for lunch, a large and really spacious, marble paved entrance foyer leading to the dining room was used at tea time (about 4 p.m.) and then the main dining room for dinner, which started about 7:30.

We had to make special arrangements for an early dinner the night we wanted to see "Ben Hur"—which was advertised to start at 7 p.m. but, with the usual Irish refusal to rush things, started about 7:14.

HOW TO HANDLE STRAYING GOATS

The Irish farmers have their own way of keeping goats from straying too far or getting into too much trouble.

They put collars around their necks and then lash them together in pairs with a rope about 3 feet long. When they try going through the hedges that border most fields they meet little success.

Since even the most advanced goats have not yet reached the point where they try to develop teamwork—with ideas of travel differing widely much of the time—they remain well in hand.

GOOD PARKING AT NO COST TO CITY

Parking is permitted at an angle in the center of O'Connell Street—in certain areas—and it is kept well in hand and in order at no expense to the city of Dublin.

Instead, the task is handled by men who are licensed by the city and assigned certain areas, but are not paid.

They have to depend entirely on those they help to park—who know also that their cars are left under a watchful eye.

As a result, the service they supply is excellent and you never have to wait for them since they do not want you to have to try to park without them.

They come on the run—overcoats flapping—and their only sign of office is the special military-type caps they wear.

Financial Aid for a Homebuilding Program in Latin American Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include a letter from a constituent of mine, Alan Carnoy, a well-known builder from Westchester County, N.Y., which proposes financial aid for a homebuilding program in the Latin American countries.

Mr. Carnoy has a reputation of being one of Westchester County's leading builders for a number of years.

Currently he has embarked on a program which envisions homeownership for multitudes of workers in Central and South America as well as in other countries throughout the world. Mr. Carnoy believes sincerely that homeownership is the finest way of combating communism. When a man, regardless of his financial status, owns a home, he has an equity in his country and is fortified against the subtle blandishments of communism.

To provide funds for the construction of these homes is Mr. Carnoy's objective. He feels that through U.S. Government loans to existing savings and loan banks it will be possible to provide mortgage money for the thousands upon thousands of workers who cherish the dream of having their own homes.

These homes which Mr. Carnoy builds—a number of them have been built in Mexico at his own expense—could be purchased for as little as $4,000 or $5,000 on a long-term amortization arrangement where the purchaser pays from $25 to $40 a month. Mr. Carnoy is so enthused about his objective of homeownership that he is risking his own capital and is willing to undertake doing the task without profit. He is convinced that the apartment or unit arrangement for workers as seen in certain European countries is not the proper answer to the question. Without any equity in their homes the workers sometimes feel they are industrial slaves rather than freemen. They had no gardens to tend, no land to call their own, no home for their progeny. In countries where unit dwellings are prevalent on a large scale, communism has gained ground.

Mr. Carnoy is very concerned about the future of Latin America politically. He believes that his project is of utmost political importance because for about a year now local investors throughout Latin America have become increasingly apprehensive. He feels that should one more country of any significance turn to the left, panic will ensue.

The first result of this situation would be the collapse of exchange rates of most Latin American currencies because of the stampede of local capital to get out. As elections become more and more legitimate in Latin America, it is Mr. Carnoy's belief that a majority of people will vote increasingly to the left for the simple reason that they have seen little if any benefit to them economically in democracy. Communists may then infiltrate their governments and aline themselves with the Soviet bloc.

Mr. Carnoy feels that in the final showdown with communism for Latin America, the psychological impact of a program demonstrating the value of homeownership would inspire the local investors' confidence in the political stability of that area and gain for democracy millions of ardent supporters whom we badly need on our side.

Mr. Carnoy has taken pains to answer the objections heard during past years to his pilot homebuilding project.

The letter and answers follow:

CARNOY INTERNATIONAL BUILDING CORP.,
New York, N.Y., March 18, 1961.

Hon. EDWIN B. DOOLEY,
House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DOOLEY: I believe that it is imperative that within the framework of President Kennedy's program, a pilot home project be built in a Latin American country. Such project would serve the purpose of exploring the legal and financial ways and means of achieving the results we want in housing stimulated by American loans.

Without such demonstration of our ways of creating homeownership, we will not effectively "help to establish free economic institutions in the field of housing abroad," as directed by the amendment of May 14, 1960, to the Mutual Security Act.

All that is needed is the same kind of loan which DLF has been granting and will be granting under the President's program to savings and loan institutions, except that

this loan should be for a specific project, and to an existing private savings and loan bank, instead of a savings and loan association. Awaiting the creation and proper operation of this form of banking institution is delaying the program in most countries.

The pilot home project has objectives far beyond the obvious ones of demonstrating American methods of land development and homebuilding, establishing standards of values in homes and lots, and giving a boost to savings for future homes. The great goal of the project is to convince Latin Americans that good homes will be available to them as a matter of course through normal, private business. A longer term objective is the reforms in taxation and other conditions which only their own citizens, working through independent homeowners associations, as in the United States, can achieve.

The project will have assured support from the press. Wire service representatives have told me of their concern and interest in seeing homeownership become available to all in Latin America. The most important weeklies have promised me full coverage. As I would immediately start housing exhibits in all Latin American countries, all local newspapers would carry stories about the project. And what is important in Latin America, word of mouth would carry the news throughout the continent.

The project will be an achievement of local private builders.

Please note that I do not want and will not make a penny on this job. I have very strong reasons for this decision. I believe this project is of utmost political importance, because for about a year now, local investors throughout Latin America have become increasingly apprehensive. Should one more country of any significance turn leftist, there will be panic. The first result of this would be the collapse of exchange rates of most Latin American currencies because of the stampede of local capital to get out. Now, as elections become more and more legitimate in Latin America, a majority of the people will vote increasingly to the left, for they have as yet seen little if any benefit to them economically in democracy. Then Communists will infiltrate their governments and aline them with the Soviet bloc.

In this final showdown with communism for Latin America, the psychological impact of a campaign demonstrating the reality of homeownership would inspire the local investors' confidence in the political stability of Latin America, as well as gain for democracy millions of ardent supporters whom we badly need.

This, I believe, is a matter of national urgency.

Sincerely yours,

ALAN CARNOY.

OBJECTIONS HEARD DURING PAST YEARS TO MY PILOT HOME PROJECT

1. There are millions of people in the United States who live in substandard housing. This comes before our financing of housing in foreign countries.

The United States should not finance housing in foreign countries, which is their own business according to Latin American governments, but the United States should help to demonstrate on every continent how homeownership for all can be achieved in every country. It is a matter of utmost importance for the political security of the United States.

2. Pilot home projects are a good idea, but they should be sponsored by foreign governments whom we should help and advise.

The great majority of Latin American governments are convinced that low cost housing should not be built by private enterprise as in the United States.

However, in most Latin American governments there are men who will support American ways if it can be proved that they will work in their country. Therefore, it is necessary to demonstrate how easily homeownership can be put within the reach of many. Necessarily, it has to be done without any special endorsement by the local government, but of course within the framework of existing institutions in that country, which obviously are approved by their respective governments.

3. One thousand homes? It's meaningless. They need millions of homes. To achieve what you want, you need $10 billion not $10 million.

A demonstration properly carried through and properly promoted should be sufficient to start the ball rolling in all Latin America. Thus, it will eventually lead to millions of homes which will be financed by local public savings over years to come.

In Latin America, good homes for low downpayments and at low monthly installments are not available because:

(a) Insufficient amounts of public savings are destined for home mortgages. Promotion of such is inadequate as there are no homes worth saving for.

(b) The taxation system is unfavorable for small homeownership.

(c) Prices for suburban land are higher in Latin America than in comparable areas in the United States.

(d) The requirements and regulations for developments are unfavorable for low cost housing.

4. Land should be donated for workers' communities. Homes should be built by contractors on competitive bids. Owners making low wages should be exempted from real estate taxes. Builders should invest in the projects.

This basis for loans breaks every rule of the American way of creating homeownership.

(a) Workers communities emphasize permanence of class differences. Some of the recent riots in Caracas started in a workers' housing project.

(b) To our knowledge, not a single home development in all the United States has been built by contractors on bids. The best results for the public are obtained from competition among builders who build model homes in various places.

(c) Expropriated land, exemption from taxes, from fees for utilities, permits, etc., helps to maintain low wages for workers.

(d) An American home builder never invests in homes he builds except for the working capital during construction. Any participation in long-term mortgages would force the builder to increase his profit.

5. It is fraudulent to make people in Latin America believe that they will have nice homes. Their wages are too low.

I sincerely believe that they will have such homes when these countries adopt our ways. In any case, a large proportion of the urban population, the middle class, could afford to buy homes right now. As countries develop, more and more workers will get higher wages and qualify to buy homes.

6. It is too late. Communism is inevitable in Latin America.

It is not yet too late. Most of the causes of the social discontent can be quickly removed by making home ownership available for all, and by the reforms in various fields which will result from this.

Out-of-Classroom Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VERNON W. THOMSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call to your attention an editorial in the Muscoda Progressive recognizing the great value of vocational education and the contribution its leaders make beyond the classroom:

OUT-OF-CLASSROOM SERVICE

This newspaper does not pass out editorial backslaps very often. But especially because of the developments in watershed promotion which have taken place in this area the past few weeks we would like to give a pat of the editorial hand to vocational ag teachers in this vicinity.

Although the watershed is a farmer project to be governed and operated by farmers for the specific benefit of farmers, nevertheless, the ag teachers, including Howard Jones at Muscoda, Fid Bosch at Highland, Mike Gundlach at Montfort, and Don Kolar, Fennimore, deserve a lot of credit for the "above and beyond the call of duty" work in promoting the development of watersheds.

Mr. Bosch was instrumental in generating watershed interest in the Otter Creek area and now he, Mr. Jones, Mr. Gundlach, and Mr. Kolar are working to help promote interest in the Blue River Valley. They have already held a successful meeting at Muscoda. The Muscoda meeting was credited with being the most successful watershed meeting held to date in any place in Grant County.

A meeting scheduled for Monday night at Highland was postponed due to the inclement weather of the day.

We do not mean to say that these fellows are to be given all the credit for this watershed work, as there have been numerous folks, both rural and village, who have put in a good deal of work toward watershed development, but we do believe the ag teachers are doing a commendable piece of community promotion with their watershed work and deserve their rightful credit for being real assets to their communities as well as their schools.

An article which appeared in the publication titled "Iowa Farm Science," bears out our theory on the value of these men to a community. The article follows:

HOW EFFECTIVE IS VO-AG TRAINING?

How effective is vocational agriculture training in high school? How much does such training benefit the students after graduation—both those graduates who enter farming and those who enter nonfarm occupations?

These are some of the questions researchers at the Iowa Agricultural Experiment Station are trying to answer with a series of studies of high school graduates from 20 communities, which offered vocational agriculture, and from 20 similar communities which did not offer such training.

Here are a few preliminary conclusions from these studies:

1. Farm operators who had completed 3 or more years of high school vocational agriculture had higher crop and livestock production and higher total gross products from their farms than did high school graduates who hadn't received such training. Vo-ag trained operators also used a greater number of improved production and management practices on their farms than did graduates without vo-ag training.

2. Farm operators who had lived on larger home farms when they graduated from high school operated larger farms with more crop acres and produced more total gross products than did high school graduates who had lived on smaller home farms.

3. Vocational agriculture training proved to be as valuable to graduates who entered nonfarm occupations as other high school courses which might have been substituted for vocational agriculture.

4. No difference in the occupational status of high school graduates in nonfarm jobs was found between those who had had and those who had not had vocational agriculture training. The measures of status were:

annual earned income, degree of expressed satisfaction and score of their occupation on a scale of occupational prestige.

The top yearly earned income for the high school graduates was attained at age 35. This information was compared with information from an earlier study of Iowa State agriculture graduates. The total lifetime earnings for high school graduates was about $238,000, for the college graduates it was $360,000. The college graduates reached their top income at age 53. The average yearly earned income for high school graduates was $5,062, and for college graduates was $8,370.

The Textile Industry and National Economic Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. EVERETT JORDAN
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, on Friday, March 24, the Secretary of Commerce, the Honorable Luther H. Hodges, delivered a very fine address at the annual meeting of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, at Miami Beach, Fla. I had the pleasure of introducing Secretary Hodges to that fine group.

I ask unanimous consent that his complete address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY AND NATIONAL ECONOMIC GROWTH

(Address by Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges at the annual meeting of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, March 24, 1961, Miami Beach, Fla.)

It is a particular pleasure for me to be here this morning. I have been away from the textile business for more than 10 years now, but I have kept up with your program and your problems. It is good to be with you and share your warmth again.

And I might add, to share the warmth of this lovely Florida sunshine, which the Commerce Department's Weather Bureau so thoughtfully arranged.

I suppose my main distinction in this new, young Kennedy administration is that I happen to be the oldest member of the Cabinet and its only tie with the 19th century. Well, I concede my age and I confess I am not quite the downfield man in touch football that some of my colleagues may be. Nevertheless, as I remarked the other day to a reporter who seemed transfixed by my antiquity at age 63, "I do drive a Thunderbird." And for your own private information, I am seriously considering installing a supercharger on it.

This administration, pledged to a new vigor in American affairs, has now had 64 working days, including Saturdays and Sundays, in which to set about the critical task of getting this economy moving forward again. Much has been accomplished in the brief time, but much remains to be done.

Many people seem to expect of us in 8 weeks what was done in the previous 8 years.

I have said on several public occasions recently that President Kennedy's legislative program, generally supported by the public, is helpful in showing to our people that their Government is trying to assist in areas where they cannot help themselves. The effect is to build a national spirit of confidence and cooperation which is essential if we are to move forward soundly toward a stronger economy and a stronger Nation.

This is not necessarily in conflict with President Kennedy's ringing declaration in his great inaugural address, "Ask not what your country and do for you—ask what you can do for your country."

I realize, and have said so publicly, that many of us are not doing our part. We are not really trying, not really selling. Many of us are asking the country to take care of us before we have done all we can.

These situations may represent a minority, but they are still serious. May I just say to you and to others, we must all do our part if we are to turn things around for your industry and for the whole economy.

The turning of the business tide—getting people back to work and reviving lagging purchasing power and markets—has been, and is, the essential first step for recovery. But full economic recovery in 1961 involves far more than the spin of the business cycle.

Confronting us, over and above the present recession, is a problem of chronic slack in the economy, a growing gap between what we can produce and what we do produce. This problem, evidenced by our disturbingly slow rate of growth in recent years as compared with other industrialized nations, is in need of urgent solution if America is to meet the demands of national well-being and security and the obligations of world leadership.

Because the problem affects your industry directly, I should like to emphasize it in some detail today.

First, let me say that while this administration is not a businessman's government, neither is it an antibusiness government. In attitude and action, it is committed to the support of the private enterprise system and a sound currency and to a relationship with business marked not by antagonism and suspicion, but by respect, understanding, and fruitful collaboration.

"We know," the President said recently to the National Industrial Conference Board, "that your success and ours are intertwined and that all elements in national economic growth are interdependent."

For its part, this Government intends to take every possible action, consistent with the public interest, which will promote the growth and prosperity of business and enable it to attain its full economic potential.

In return, we expect business to meet its obligations: to help itself and to exert to the fullest measure its powers of innovation, initiative, and hard work.

In short, we seek a true alliance with business—one in which both the public and private sectors of the country will, by fulfilling individual obligations, move forward together toward our goals of economic growth, plant modernization, and price stability.

We in the Department of Commerce bear a very special responsibility to such an alliance. Commerce is the Government's primary business development agency. Under this administration, the Department's total resources are firmly committed to the goal of strengthening the economy and allowing business to prosper. These resources are both vast and fundamental.

Within the walls of the Department is the Bureau of Foreign Commerce, which, at the direction of President Kennedy, is today mustering a vigorous campaign to expand the export side of our Nation's business.

Commerce is also the home of the Bureau of the Census, perhaps the most important of our vital information services; the Office of Business Economics, which keeps the national economic accounts that measure current activity in terms of gross national product, national and personal income, the balance of international payments, and the rest; the Business and Defense Services Administration, a source of invaluable information on specific industries and a main point of contact for business in its dealings with the Government; the Weather Bureau; the Coast and Geodetic Survey; the Patent Office; and the Office of Technical Services, which is charged with collecting and disseminating the flood of American and translated foreign scientific and technical articles so essential to the scientific and business community.

The Bureau of Public Roads is part of the Department of Commerce, and so is the Maritime Administration. The Area Redevelopment program has been centered in Commerce for many years. In addition, the department has important national security responsibilities, particularly the planning for economic mobilization in a national emergency.

All these vital functions are today being massed and strengthened in a comprehensive effort to stimulate the American economy to realize its fullest potential. It is in the spirit of such an effort that this administration has approached the problems of the textile industry.

As you probably know, the President last month appointed an Inter-agency committee of Cabinet rank members under my chairmanship, to examine the current economic plight of textiles and to recommend to him ways in which the Government and industry acting together might better conditions. This Committee, which includes Secretary of the Treasury Dillon, Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, Secretary of Labor Goldberg, and Under Secretary of State Ball, has now received an extensive report from an examining subcommittee, and it expects to send forward recommendations to the President in the next few weeks.

Naturally, you would like to know what the Subcommittee reported and what our Cabinet Committee may recommend to the President.

As regards the Subcommittee (or study committee) report, let me say that under the chairmanship of Mr. Hickman Price, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Domestic Affairs, it did an outstanding job. I believe that Mac Cheatham, Bob Jackson and others will agree with this. They held many sessions at which representatives of industry, labor and others "spoke their piece" and made suggestions.

There was already available to the committee a wealth of statistical data, but your association and others clarified and elaborated on this data.

The Subcommittee was asked to make no specific recommendations but to specify various possible solutions.

Let me quote here our press release following the Cabinet rank meeting of last Thursday, March 16, which just that morning had received the Subcommittee report.

"Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges issued the following statement today after a meeting of the Interdepartmental Textile Committee:

" 'The subcommittee of the Interdepartmental Textile Committee filed its report this morning, and we have not yet had an opportunity to fully consider it.

" 'However, the report consists largely of a synopsis of the testimony received and a statement of many possible courses of action—ranging from no action at all to the imposition of quotas.

" 'I would prefer not to comment upon their report until the full Committee has had an opportunity to give it the serious and thorough consideration the gravity of the problem merits.

" 'The subcommittee did not make any recommendation, but listed possible courses

of action for the Cabinet Members' consideration.'"

Now as to the Cabinet group—it met for about 2 hours to review in a preliminary way the summary report of its subcommittee and agreed to meet again the first part of April. I can assure you that your problem has already had more top executive attention than it previously received.

But the solution, or the easing, of the problem is not simple, is not easy, and it presents many collateral problems as you can well imagine. Justice Holmes used to say that "the important thing is not where we are, but where we are gonig."

Thus I shall not burden you with a lengthy recapitulation of your problems, which you probably know better than I, anyway. It is enough to note, I think, that because of lagging growth, total textile mill production last year was only 21 percent above the average for 1947–49, compared with 64 percent for all manufacturing production. In cotton broad woven goods, output, measured in yardage, has been below the level of 1947 for the past 4 years.

Total textile-mill employment has been trending downward since 1955, industry profits have been running well below the average for all manufacturing and overcapacity has been an increasing reality. From 1947 through 1960, a total of 838 mills, which formerly employed more than 249,000 workers, were liquidated.

This deterioration has been brought on by a number of elements. First, increased competition from paper and plastics has reduced the size of several textile markets. In automobiles, for example, where interiors used to be finished with textile products, it is now customary for seat covers, headlining, side panels, and floor coverings to be made from nontextiles.

A shift in consumer expenditure patterns, resulting in a dropoff in clothing's share of the consumer dollar, has also been a factor. In addition, there have been strains and dislocations caused by the introduction of newer fibers and, more important, by the industry's intense internal competition, and its continuing difficulty in gearing its output to what the market can absorb at a profitable price.

This particular affliction has produced a long-term series of two-year ups and downs, quite apart from the course of the general business cycle.

Finally, and of greater consequence, there has been a sharp rise in imports of textile products.

In 1960 imports of cotton cloth, which were 122 million yards 4 years ago, rose to 455 million yards, and for the first time since 1875, total cotton cloth imports exceeded exports. The inflow, mainly from Japan and Hong Kong, but also from other areas, amounted to 6 percent of the total domestic consumption of raw cotton.

In certain product lines, however, the ration of imports to production was most substantial.

Gingham imports were more than 22 percent of domestic output, and the inflow was also high in velveteens, coarse sheetings, and in some types of apparel. Imports of blouses, for instance, amounted to more than one-third of U.S. production.

This sharp reversal of the Nation's role as textile exporter, has, understandably, caused great concern. It has alarmed both labor and management of this industry, and it has been the subject of lengthy study by the Congress under the energetic leadership of Senator Pastore's committee.

Since January 20, it has also been one of the major preoccupations of the present national administration: first, in terms of our obligations to the domestic economy; second in light of our commitments to the free world and to the cause of increased international trade through the reciprocal removal of unnecessary trade barriers.

Because of its adverse balance of payments, the United States today needs most urgently to maintain and improve its present favorable balance of trade. To do this, though, we must raise our exports, not our tariff and quota walls.

As the President said in his balance-of-payments message to the Congress: "A return to protectionism is not a solution. Such a course would provoke retaliation; and the balance of trade, which is now substantially in our favor, could be turned against us with disastrous effects to the dollar."

There are other effects to consider.

In the cause of freedom, human dignity, and our own national security, we stand committed to assist the developing countries of the world in their drive for a higher standard of living. These countries need to earn abroad so that they can spend and improve within. Should we turn from them and close our markets to their goods, they will turn from us and look elsewhere for allies—and I am afraid in only one direction.

As Secretary of Commerce, the agency charged by statute with fostering, promoting and developing foreign as well as domestic commerce, I have a continuing, advisory role to play in the setting of U.S. tariffs and quotas. Although the basic power to fix tariffs belongs to the Congress, the President, under the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, has certain authority to enter into agreements with foreign nations to effect changes in tariffs which are mutually beneficial to both parties.

We at Commerce participate, along with other Federal agencies, in the negotiation of tariff changes through GATT, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. But the direct responsibility for recommending tariff changes under the escape clause, which provides aid to industries in distress, lies squarely with the Tariff Commission. The Commerce Department can only suggest to the President that he accept or reject their recommendations.

There are one or more avenues which can be taken which will help you and at the same time preserve our international position but they need careful consideration. I have been particularly impressed with the workings of the voluntary quota agreement which we concluded with Japan in 1957. Under this agreement, you may recall, the Japanese voluntarily agreed to limit and diversify their cotton textile shipments to the United States for a 5-year period.

The original agreement provided for an annual overall ceiling of 235 million square yards equivalent—approximately the rate of 1955—although this was later raised to 247 million yards. Five major subgroups with separate ceilings were established: cloth; made-up goods; woven apparel; knit goods; and miscellaneous. Within these groups, specific ceilings were set for 14 sensitive items.

While there was some flexibility provided for movement from one quota group to another, quotas for items specifically enumerated could not be increased. Although this arrangement has had the defects of its virtues—that is, it has covered only one source of imports—I believe it has been most effective from our standpoint.

I think, too, that through international machinery, voluntary agreements might well be concluded on a much broader base. Expanded to cover all important sources of imports through multilateral concurrence, voluntary quotas could go far toward safeguarding the domestic industry without jeopardizing our interest in trade. The voluntary quota situation is, however, complicated today by the emergence of several nations and areas as important textile exporters.

Taking the largest new shippers, these are Hong Kong, India, Egypt, and Spain. Since 1958, U.S. imports of cotton manufactures from Hong Kong have climbed from an equivalent of 60 million square yards to 271 million yards, a gain of 352 percent. Imports from Spain, Egypt, France, and Portugal have risen from an equivalent of 5 million yards to 230 million yards, a staggering 4,500 percent, and those from Formosa, Korea, Pakistan, and India have shot up from 8 million yards to 112 million a jump of 1,300 percent.

A national administration cannot settle the textile problem in a vacuum or without regard to other matters. But I think I can promise that you will get a decision, you will get action.

That's the way President Kennedy operates, and I believe in the same thing.

Whatever action the President finally takes or imports, you, the leaders of this industry, will still have much to do. Only by your determined efforts to raise productivity, modernize equipment, improve merchandising and selling methods, and pursue research to a far greater extent can textiles achieve their full potential and escape from the slough of lagging growth.

Productivity in textiles has risen impressively in recent years and you are to be commended for what you have done. It must continue to rise, if you are to lower your prices and enlarge your markets. Capital spending for new plant and equipment, which has bumped up and down with the industry's cycles, needs consistent expansion.

Roughly one-fourth of all the textile machines now in place were installed at least 20 years ago and your competition abroad is generally in better shape. In research and development, spending has increased markedly in the last decade, but it still lags, as a percentage of profit, far behind the outlays of all manufacturing. Between 1953 and 1959, research and development expenditures by textile companies increased from $26 million to $35 million a year, a gain of about 35 percent.

However, in the same period the research and development expenditures of all manufacturing companies more than doubled from $3.3 billion to $8.6 billion. That's a gain of 161 percent. What is more, this investment of $8.6 billion by manufacturing companies equaled 53 percent of their total after-tax profits.

On the other hand the R. & D. expenditures of the textile industry equaled only 8.4 percent of its after-tax profits.

There is need for much more research, backed by the industry itself, and especially in the areas of new end uses which might recapture the industrial market.

Finally, the industry has far to go in improving its marketing techniques and its understanding of market forces if it is to escape its chronic cycle of expansion and contraction.

The ACMI has done much to bring cooperation and realism to the industry, but I need not tell you that until and unless you have more unselfishness and more long-range planning and thinking, nobody can really help you stay in business and make a profit; and this comment has no direct relationships to imports.

Now let me take off my textile committee "hat" and put on my Department of Commerce one.

Let me commend to you right here the excellent new economic studies now being developed by the Textiles and Clothing Division of the Department of Commerce. Three studies have already been released and the newest, a report on the role of inventories in the textile cycle, is just out. Others are to follow in a series.

Get them. Read them. They can be most helpful.

In closing let me say that I am confident, more than ever today, that this country and your great textile industry can achieve in the next decade an economic greatness and security of which we can all be deeply proud.

If the past is beyond our control, and the present only tentatively within it, the future can be very much within our grasp and can be, to a great extent, what we make it.

This is the challenge and the opportunity which we as allies face. With solemn hope, I trust we shall not be found wanting.

Thank you for inviting me to be with you.

Socialized Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DURWARD G. HALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the people of the Ozarks of southwest Missouri, whom I am privileged to represent, take pride in the fact that they have never asked for one penny for public housing. I would remind the administration that our district is far from being wealthy. Our per capita income is far less than many of the large metropolitan areas in this Nation which make a habit of coming to Washington for direct assistance in housing, and so it is not difficult to understand why our residents strongly object to the use of their tax dollars for public housing programs. It seems only just that metropolitan areas which desire public housing should pass revenue bond issues since these same cities also represent areas of the greatest wealth.

I cannot see why areas which do not believe in public housing and which have extremely moderate per capita income should be expected to subsidize housing in cities of high per capita income. Under the urban renewal program the Federal Government can assist in the condemnation of blighted areas. It can offer tax incentives to stimulate private development without the use of tax dollars. The feeling of the people in my district has been expertly told in a recent editorial in the Joplin Globe. Because of the significance of this outstanding editorial and under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the article for inclusion in the RECORD:

SOCIALIZED HOUSING

The administration's housing bill is the most sweeping socialistic measure sent to Congress thus far by President Kennedy. Except for its benefits to cities through urban renewal, it is one of the least needed at this time.

You can find plenty of people in the business who will tell you the Nation comes closer to a housing surplus than it does to a housing shortage after an unprecedented 15-year, postwar, homebuilding boom. America boasts that the majority of its families are homeowners, or at least have equities in homes. More than 10 million new houses were built in the decade of the fifties.

Look magazine recently reported that 29 million families own their homes, and quoted the National Association of Real Estate Boards as saying the trend now is toward second homes, with 200,000 a year to be built by the end of the sixties.

Why, then, all the new billions for Federal housing? The President's own answer is that it is primarily to stimulate jobs and more income in the construction industry, admittedly slowed the past year. The other side of the coin is that it is bound to cause fresh deficit spending and to spur inflation, damaging to everyone, including homeowners. No provision is made to raise the extra money.

In his message to Congress, the President said he wants to provide better housing for 14 million Americans now living in "substandard" houses. In his campaign speeches he said the number of ill housed was 25 million. One wonders if he really knows, and how many would prefer tailfins to new houses.

It is proposed to double the urban renewal program, with $2.5 billion in Federal grants and loans, to help cities fight blight. This program has merit, since more than 90 percent of the people now live in cities and suburban areas, but the question is whether it should be expanded this much after all that has been done. Of course, some cities, like Joplin, have just entered this field and would be helped.

The Kennedy housing bill would further liberalize the FHA insurance program by requiring no downpayments for low-cost housing. Any banker will tell you this approach is fiscally unsound and dangerous. It is a welfare state program, as is building 100,000 more public housing units.

The President also proposes to set up a Department for Urban Affairs, with Cabinet rank. But one wonders if such a Department might mess up the cities as farming has been snarled since creation of the Department of Agriculture.

Such is the new housing program as outlined. No one can accurately estimate its ultimate cost. Congress will do well to take a long look at this proposed spending spree.

Our Young People Are Being Educated Right Now by Programs Which Are Being Broadcast on the Commercial Channels and Stations—They Are Learning All the Latest Devices for "Doing People In"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I feel it is essential that additional educational television stations go on the air, and one of my reasons for such a conclusion is that our young people must be exposed to something more challenging than hillbilly and rock 'n roll music, or the endless expanse of soap operas, and insipid westerns, which are all alike, and the crime and violence of the many private-eye programs.

Our young people are being educated right now by these programs which are being broadcast on the commercial channels and stations—

It may be doubted whether we'll be able to prevent the Soviet Union from burying us as they have announced they will with the kind of programs we're getting on most of the commercial television stations these days.

It may come as a surprise to many people, but only about 20 percent of the channels designated by the Federal Communications Commission for educational television stations have been utilized.

Undoubtedly a much higher percentage of such stations would be able to operate if a bill such as my own H.R. 5536 were enacted into law.

Fifty-one major organizations throughout Delaware have endorsed the use of channel 12 for educational television purposes. These groups include the Delaware State Education Association, the Catholic Diocese of Wilmington, and the American Association of University Women.

Delaware's able Governor, Elbert N. Carvel, also supports the use of channel 12 for educational television purposes.

Adoption of a bill such as I have developed, H.R. 5536, would greatly assist the establishment of an educational television station to serve our State.

I include as part of my remarks an excellent article on the newer educational media from the March 1961 issue of the Delaware School Journal. This fine publication is published by the Delaware State Education Association.

The article follows:

DELAWARE STATE RESEARCH CONFERENCE IN NEWER EDUCATIONAL MEDIA

One important consideration in teaching-machine design is experimentation with computerized or other complex machines for experimental or research purposes. It is possible that devices may be designed which permit a wider range of instructional capabilities with less extensive pre-programed materials. Also, various technical innovations to reduce the labor and cost of programing may appear. If so, relatively greater costs for electromechanical or electronic devices might be practicable in the light of the resulting reduction in program costs. The serious application of technology to the programed-instructional concept is only in its infancy, and it is obviously impossible to foresee all of the possibilities which may become technically and economically feasible during the next few decades. What does seem certain is that change in current instructional practices, materials, and standards is inevitable and that progress may occur in a variety of possible ways. The history of technological development in other fields would suggest that the machines and programing techniques of today are likely to be superseded, within a relatively few years, by improved devices and methods resulting from well-conceived and vigorous continuing research and development.

Conclusions resulting from experimentation with instructional television:

1. Disregarding the caliber of the instructor, a television lecture is as effective as face-to-face instruction (a) for presenting new information to students, (b) for teaching students an understanding of principles, and (c) for instilling desirable concepts and attitudes.

2. Any competent person may present factual information; but

3. Experienced teachers do best in the matter of teaching students to understand principles and integrate knowledge.

4. An experienced or an inexperienced teacher may or may not instill attitudes he deems appropriate. Only by pretesting will he know whether he has done the most effective teaching possible.

5. As expected, students rate teachers as more potent and more active in class than on television.

6. Students rate experienced teachers as more potent and more active than their substitutes; however

7. Experienced teachers transfer to television with less loss than their substitutes. On the average, the experienced teacher was rated only 2 percent less potent and 4 percent less active on television than in class (an insignificant decrease); while the sub-

stitute teacher was rated 8 percent less potent and 11 percent less active.

8. Teachers were rated more confident and more relaxed on television than in the classroom.

9. Experienced teachers were rated more authoritative and more brilliant than substitute teachers teaching identical material.

10. Students may sense greater satisfaction from total use of the medium rather than partial use. Teaching by television was rated significantly higher at the conclusion of the one experimental lecture that made extensive use of a visual aid.

11. Contrary to impressions from other less controlled experiments, after exposure to good instructional television, students rated teaching by television as slightly more profound, slightly more clear, more authoritative, more intimate, much more personal, and much easier to take notes than they at first had thought.

Experiments conducted by the University of North Carolina confirm the following statements:

It appears that in-school TV in North Carolina is here to stay. The systems which entered the program in 1957 are still in it and are now starting their fourth year although they are under no compulsion nor even obligation to continue. Since inauguration of the program 71, additional school systems have officially joined the project. Now that foundation support has practically disappeared, the State legislature, local school systems and the university are assuming the financial obligations necessary to maintain and expand the program. The number of schools adequately equipped for TV reception is growing yearly and new school plants are being designed with TV classes in mind. Teacher education institutions are training prospective teachers for a better utilization of ETV and are assisting local school systems with in-service education activities designed to help presently-employed teachers to make better use of the medium.

At the present time signal coverage of the entire State is impossible. Only those school systems within an 80-mile radius of Chapel Hill are assured programs originating over a State-owned station; other school systems are dependent upon pickup and re-broadcast by such commercial stations as are willing to donate air time. Much thought is being given to the possibility of a State-owned network which will blanket the State. If a State network becomes a reality, the present schedule of 2 hours of in-school TV could easily be increased to 6 hours and TV lessons in foreign languages, advanced science, advanced mathematics and other subjects could be added to the restricted list of courses now being telecast.

School superintendents in North Carolina say that their ultimate objective is an expert, master teacher in every classroom. With today's severe shortage of expert teachers, the only way this can be accomplished is through TV. Growing high school enrollments, a continuing teacher shortage and growing demands for more efficient school plant utilization point to an increased use of TV in our schools for the decade ahead.

Gen. David Wooster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, the 250th anniversary of the birthday of Gen. David Wooster, of Danbury, Conn., was celebrated. To mark this occasion, I would like to have printed in the RECORD the following tribute which appeared in the Danbury News-Times on March 3, and the accompanying editorial which appeared the same day:

DAR SALUTES WOOSTER

This week marks the 250th anniversary of the birth of a Revolutionary War hero, Gen. David Wooster, who has special interest to Danbury.

David Wooster was born in Huntington (Stratford) Conn. on March 2, 1711, was educated at Yale and played a heroic part in the Revolutionary War.

It was in the Battle of Ridgefield, while fighting a rearguard attack on General Tryons' troops, who had just burned Danbury, that General Wooster received a mortal wound.

He was carried back to Danbury to the Dibble home on South Street, the same house which the night before held some of the British troops, where he died on May 2, 1777.

He was first buried in the old cemetery back of the Danbury jail and for years his grave went unmarked. Years later, his remains were moved to Wooster Cemetery, named in his honor, and it was then the lofty monument was erected in his honor and dedicated April 27, 1854.

General Wooster was a versatile man. Not only was he a soldier, he served in His Majesty's army as captain, he was also a sailor, serving as a lieutenant and later captain of a sloop of war during England's war with Spain in 1741.

He was appointed brigadier general in the Continental Army and first commanded troops sent to guard New York. In 1776 he returned to Connecticut and was appointed major general of the militia in this State.

He was organizer and the first master of the first Masonic Lodge in the Connecticut colony. Between serving in wars, he was a businessman, importing goods for sale in the colony and was also collector of the port, collecting duty from his competitors.

Danbury has honored Gen. David Wooster in many ways, such as Wooster Square, Wooster Street, Wooster Cemetery, Wooster School, and Wooster Hose Co. Streets in Bethel and Ridgefield bear his name.

The local Daughters of the American Revolution chapter is named for his wife, Mary Wooster, and our Children of the American Revolution group also bears his name, David Wooster.

Each year in commemoration of his death and to honor him, special services are conducted at the monument in Wooster Cemetery by the Masonic Lodge.

Let us take time this week to pay homage to a great man, a devoted patriot, an able general who came to our assistance in the War for Independence.

We, the members of Mary Wooster Chapter, DAR, salute the memory of Gen. David Wooster on the 250th anniversary of his birth.

JOHNNY WOOSTER

The DAR's letter of tribute to Gen. David Wooster recalls a thought we had some years ago, that an interesting story of Danbury could be written just around the organizations and places which have borne the name Wooster.

Not too many years ago, if you mentioned Wooster Village, nearly everyone knew you meant the area around West Wooster and Division Streets. Use of the term seems to be going out of vogue.

Twenty years ago, the business block at Main and White Streets was still generally known as the Wooster Block and the third-floor space as Wooster Hall. Today, people would wonder if you asked about the Wooster Block. But say the Feinson Block and they would know what you mean.

Commercial firms using the name Wooster have come and gone. Thirty years ago there was a Wooster Auto Service and 40 years ago the Wooster Square Market and Wooster Square Taxi.

A half century ago, the Wooster Club was located at 281 Main Street. Sixty years ago there was the Wooster Inn at 107 White Street.

And 70 and more years ago, the Wooster House served travelers and was the scene of local functions. Located at Main and White Streets, it was sold at a public lottery and then gave way to the Wooster Block—oops, the Feinson Block.

In local sports, there have been the Wooster A.C. and similar groups from time to time. And let's not forget Wooster Mountain, the undeveloped State park off Sugar Hollow Road.

People, businesses, activities may come and go but there's one thing pretty sure about Danbury—the name Wooster will go on just about forever.

Northwest Passage: Japan to Milwaukee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the St. Lawrence Seaway project, completed in 1959, has opened new opportunities for economic growth and progress in the country.

The Great Lakes region, particularly, is reaping the rewards.

Realistically speaking, there is, of course, still a great deal to be done to expand trade and commerce through its full potential to the waterway. Nevertheless, the Lake ports, once inland cities, now are participating in trade and commerce destined for the far corners of the world.

The long-range benefits of the Seaway, I am confident, will be an important aspect of the history of trade and commerce of the United States.

Soon the 1961 shipping season will be opening. The occasion will offer new opportunities to obtain greater benefits from expanded traffic; as well, it will, of course, present contingent problems.

Overall, however, I believe that we can and will, if we adopt realistic policies, further expand traffic for the benefit not only of the Great Lakes region but the whole country.

Recently, the Milwaukee Journal published an informative article by Harry C. Brockel, Municipal Port Director of Milwaukee, entitled, "'Northwest Passage': Japan to Milwaukee." The splendid article reveals the way in which the St. Lawrence Seaway offers new commercial opportunities for Great Lakes ports with countries around the globe. I ask unanimous consent to have this fine article published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"NORTHWEST PASSAGE": JAPAN TO MILWAUKEE

(By Harry C. Brockell, municipal port director, Milwaukee)

The new Japanese general cargo liner *Muneshima Maru* left Yokohoma last Tuesday and, as you read this, is cutting through the blue waters of the broad Pacific somewhere north of Hawaii on an historic first voyage into the Great Lakes to Milwaukee and Chicago, by way of the Panama Canal.

The *Muneshima Maru*, a 2-year-old ship of 12,000 tons, 511 feet long, with a speed of 20 knots and accommodations for 12 passengers, will make the run between Japan and Milwaukee in 40 days, including numerous ports of call. Its owners, Iiono Kaiun Kaisha, Ltd., of Tokoyo, promise monthly service by their ships to and from Lake Michigan ports.

SECOND JAPANESE LINE IN PROSPECT

A second Japanese service, not yet publicly announced, is said to be in the making for Lake Michigan, with good prospects for regular service to Japan, Formosa, Korea and the Philippines.

There are also strong possibilities of a direct trade link with Australia this spring via the Swedish-flag Atlantrafik Express Line. Last year this line made its first runs into the Great Lakes, and is firming up its plans for this year with the likelihood of regular service between Milwaukee and Chicago and the ports "down under."

A direct voyage from Milwaukee to ports such as Sidney or Melbourne would involve a voyage of about 12,500 miles, or half the distance around the globe.

Voyages of 17,000 and 18,000 miles from Milwaukee have already been recorded with shipments to Ceylon, the Malayan Peninsula, Indonesia, Thailand and other ports in that exotic area of the world.

Thus if history and geography failed to produce a practical Northwest Passage to the Orient, once the dream of empires and the goal of dauntless and hardy explorers like Cartier and Nicolet, they have combined to provide another solution. The Orient is now coming to the midcontinent of North America through the same St. Lawrence River and the same Great Lakes which raised the hopes and spurred the ambitions of early seekers for the Northwest Passage.

FOUR LINES TO ASIA

The invetiable facts of economics and geography had led to the building of the St. Lawrence Seaway, so that on these waters, once traversed only by Indian canoes and French bateaux, are now seen in growing numbers the merchant fleets of the world.

The opening of the deepened seaway in 1959 had such great impact on the shipping world and on foreign trade, that by 1960 four regular shipping services were in operation from Milwaukee and Chicago to Asia.

These included the Crescent Line, operating to the eastern Mediterranean, Egypt, the Middle East, West Pakistan and ports on the western coast of India. The Orient Mid-East Great Lakes Service has monthly sailings to the Red Sea; the Persian Gulf; Karachi, Pakistan; Bombay, India; Singapore; Djakarta, Indonesia and Saigon, South Vietnam. The Hellenic Lines Ltd. offers monthly service from Milwaukee to Red Sea ports, the Arabian Gulf, the west coast of India and West Pakistan. A fourth service to the east established in 1960 was that of Nedlloyd Middle East Express, with monthly sailings from Milwaukee to Beirut, Aqaba Karachi and Arabian Gulf ports.

All four of these services go to Asia via the easterly route through the Mediterranean, the Suez Canal, the Red Sea, the Persian Gulf, and the Indian Ocean. A wide variety of agricultural and manufactured goods have been moving from the Middle West through the port of Milwaukee to distant eastern ports over this trade route. The names of ports in India, Ceylon, Malaya, Burma, Thailand, Vietnam, and Indonesia appeared for the first time in history in 1959 and 1960 on steamship manifests made up in Milwaukee.

JAPAN OUR FOURTH BIGGEST CUSTOMER

It is a romantic and exciting prospect to have handsome ships loading in Milwaukee's outer harbor, with the thought that they will drop anchor in Yokohama, Nagasaki, Hong Kong, Manila, Saigon, Rangoon, Calcutta, or Bombay, a part of the world best known to the Middle West through Kipling's poems and through travel literature. But what are the practical economic values involved, and what is the trade potential for such long and costly voyages?

Japan ranks as the fourth largest oversea customer of the United States. During 1960, U.S. imports from Japan were valued at some $1.1 billion, while exports to Japan were valued at more than $1.3 billion.

There is a good potential for a healthy balance of trade between Milwaukee and the far east. Imports from that area coming into Milwaukee and the middle west in volume include bicycles, woodenware, tropical woods, canned tuna, canned pineapple, and a great variety of general merchandise. Japan and the far east are major markets for milling machinery, Milwaukee beer, tractors and farm implements, construction machinery, outboard motors, gasoline engines, grain, flour, dairy foods, cattle and poultry feed, cereals, soaps and chemicals, canned goods, and many other items.

AUSTRALIA BUYS HERE

Australia is also a major American market. Exports from the United States to Australia were valued at $266 million during 1959, and imports from that country were worth $196 million. Australian meats are finding an increasing market in the Middle West. Milwaukee foundries, for example, would be strong users of zircon sand, an essential foundry material found only in Australia, now imported to this area through west coast ports with a costly overland haul to Milwaukee. Direct shipping service should substantially reduce the cost of such imports to the middle west.

Milwaukee and Wisconsin find in Australia an active market for electrical appliances, mining machinery, construction machinery, farm implements, outboard motors, locks, canned goods and dairy products, along with consumer and industrial items too numerous to list.

If the three new oriental services projected all materialize, Milwaukee will find itself served by four shipping services operating easterly through the Mediterranean.

Resolutions Passed by the Wisconsin Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, 65th State Conference, La Crosse, Wis., March 14, 15, 16, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the Wisconsin Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD, the resolutions passed at their State conference. The resolutions are as follows:

That each Daughter may have a more thorough understanding of the reasons for the stand taken by the Daughters of the American Revolution, through its resolutions, the national board of management has recommended that the delegates elected as chapter representatives to State conferences and to the national continental congress be those who have studied our national defense material, the DAR magazine and the national defender. Every delegate should be an informed voter and should be able to communicate her knowledge to others who do not have direct access to our documented publications.

The resolutions presented are always consistent with the ideals and policy of our national society. Your resolutions committees, both State and National, keep constantly in mind the following requirements:

Does it uphold the rights of the individual?

Is it in the best interests of our country?

Does it adhere to the original concept of the Constitution of the United States?

REDEDICATION

Whereas the historical, educational, and patriotic objectives of our society and our efforts to foster true patriotism, love of country, and the maintenance of moral and spiritual values, the liberties, cherished freedoms, and governmental philosophies, that have made America preeminent among nations, are now challenged as never before by opposing ideologies and constitutional violations.

Resolved, That the Wisconsin society, Daughters of the American Revolution rededicates itself to active citizenship pledged anew to the perpetuation and preservation of the great constitutional principles of this Government, with its careful delineations of powers and Bill of Rights; and further

Resolved, That we reassert our stand for national care and pride, for free enterprise, fiscal solvency, and a strong defense, in order that we as a nation may survive.

REAFFIRMATIONS, 1961

All past resolutions, State and National, are in effect unless rescinded, but because of continuing pressures within the Nation, the Wisconsin Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, reaffirms its stand on the following resolutions:

"We support:

"1. Legislation to end presently heavy and illegal 'back door Treasury spending' raids by requiring all Government appropriations to be channeled entirely through the House Appropriations Committee, in accordance with the Constitution.

"2. The U.S. Congress in its stand against the recognition of Red China or Red China's admittance to the United Nations.

"3. An unchanged Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, the revocation of which is a prime Communist target.

"4. Retention of the Connally Act reservation against World Court intervention into domestic affairs.

"5. The textbook 'Study by the National Defense Committee of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution," as a vital program for each chapter to support in the 'war of ideas.'

"6. The student loyalty oath of the National Defense Act of 1958 as a basically prudent provision.

"We urge:

"1. That examination and courses requiring thorough grounding in the American Constitution and American history be made mandatory for high school and college graduation.

"2. Appropriate antisubversive legislation to restore to the States their rights to combat subversion within their borders.

"We oppose:

"1. U.S. participation in GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) as detrimental to American jobs and economy and

for the loss of our autonomy over American's own trade problems.

"2. U.S. participation in the ILO (International Labor Organization) where we are outvoted 36–4 by the Communist block of nations.

"3. Internationalization of the Panama Canal.

"4. Political activities of the National and World Council of Churches as a violation of the principles of separation of church and state and because of their consistent socialist and one-world aims.

"5. UNESCO activities undermining the national allegiance of our teachers and students.

"6. All forms of world government, in the belief that a strong, free America offers the best moral force and hope for peace.

"7. Summit meetings for their Soviet propaganda potential and repeated submission to Soviet demands.

"SUPPORT OF CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATING COMMITTEES

"Whereas Congresional investigating committees, which have long been under intensive attacks by subversives, recently received overwhelming endorsement from the House of Representatives in Congress, by a vote of 412–6, for continuation and support.

"*Resolved,* That the Wisconsin Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, applauds the ringing stand of Congress supporting the House Un-American Activities Committee and the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security in their valuable investigations into communism and in their legislative contributions toward curbing communism.

"PEACE CORPS

"Whereas advocates of the so-called Peace Corps as a desirable 'force for peace' also boldly suggest that the mission of the corps might usefully be extended to domestic as well as foreign assignments, thereby laying the groundwork for future regimentation and expansion of the group to a youth draft for civilian as well as military purposes; and

"Whereas the U.S. Congress alertness to the inherent risks of work corps plans has defeated similar plans hidden within both the 1951 universal military training bill and the 1960 foreign aid bill; and

'Whereas the risks enumerated in Congress for former plans, now renamed, are as follows: (1) control of education by curricular requirements and promotional college subsidies, (2) eventual 'universal service drafts,' both domestic and foreign, (3) downgrading of the military by favoritism in deferments and exemptions, or by drafting only the less educated, (4) possible Communist penetration of the corps, (5) diplomatic repercussions if the corps is immature or unskilled in language or aptitudes needed for primitive areas, (6) duplication of existing technical and foreign aid assistance, and (7) creation of a possible 'elite' corps, favored with subsidized college education in the current plan.

"*Resolved,* That the Wisconsin Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, calls on the Congress to avoid potential regimentation of American youth by opposing all use of foreign aid or domestic appropriations for the so-called Peace Corps.

"FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

"Whereas a powerful movement is underway in this Nation to transfer educational control from local and State authority to a nationally organized bureaucracy; and

"Whereas despite claims to the contrary, educational needs have been commendably well met at local and State levels, where the responsibility historically rests; and

"Whereas Federal aid invites wasteful spending, arbitrary standards, and unchecked Federal control over courses, textbooks, and every educational area,

"*Resolved,* That the Wisconsin Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, unalterably opposes Federal aid to education.

"SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

"Whereas present welfare programs provide medical care to needy older persons; and

"Whereas the Social Security program already operates at a deficit, and to add medical aid to the aged to the present social security program would (1) sharply increase social security taxes far beyond present inadequate estimates, (2) lead to demands for overall matching programs for individuals not covered by Social Security, and (3) expand the already swollen power of the Federal Government, by providing aid to those who neither need nor want such aid,

"*Resolved,* That the Wisconsin Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, opposes a Federal medical aid program.

"FOREIGN AID AND THE GOLD CRISIS

"Whereas the strength of the free world depends upon the continued fiscal solvency of this Nation, and extravagent spending at home and abroad has already resulted in loss of gold from this country, with consequent weakening of the dollar; and

"Whereas deficit financing has been employed to aid not only our allies but neutral and pro-Communist countries, who directly oppose American interests; and

"Whereas foreign aid and foreign trade policies have built up foreign industries to the great detriment of American industry and employment,

"*Resolved,* That the Wisconsin Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, calls on Congress and the administration to (1) immediately terminate all aid to pro-Communist and neutral countries, and (2) examine and curtail all aid and nonessential military spending abroad, as steps needed to balance the budget, avoid financial catastrophe, and maintain the strength and integrity of this Nation among its allies.

"ORGANIZATION FOR ECONOMIC COORDINATION AND DEVELOPMENT

"Whereas the proposed OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development) treaty would surrender congressional power over tariffs and foreign commerce to an international organization over which the Congress of the United States would have no control; and

"Whereas the proposed OECD incorporates a scheme to make foreign aid a permanent feature of our policy, and to channel such aid through this international agency, thereby disenfranchising the Congress and the American people from authority over foreign aid and trade policies; and

"Whereas this convention or treaty is an attempt by indirection to legitimize GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade), which has done great harm to American industry; and would wrest from the Congress the direction of our policy respecting the efficient use of our economic resources and the development of our scientific and technical resources; and

"Whereas the treaty text states: 'General expenses of the Organization shall be determined in accordance with a scale determined by the Council,' thereby specifically denying the Congress any review of the cost of American participation in the Organization; and

"Whereas any treaty supersedes the Constitution,

"*Resolved,* That the Wisconsin Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, opposes participation in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development as an unconsitutional delegation of power and a threat to our sovereignty.

"NUCLEAR TESTING

"Whereas fear of nuclear war has led this country into a self-imposed ban on underground nuclear testing without exacting a similar program from the Soviet Union; and

"Whereas continuation of this ban threatens our national security by making obsolete and freezing our progress in nuclear technology, while permitting the Soviet Union to develop technically and to expand its capacity to stockpile nuclear weapons; and

"Whereas so long as the Kremlin is dedicated to world domination, no strategy against them, including summit negotiations, can succeed which is not based on superior strength and a superior striking force—an air, space, missile and nuclear weapons system,

"*Resolved,* That the Wisconsin Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, urges the U.S. Government to end this self imposed ban on underground testing in the interest of national security.

"THE THREAT OF FEDERALISM TO CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT AND ECONOMY

"Whereas Federal paternalism and increasing centralization of power are changing our form of government by gradual erosion and special interest pressures; and

"Whereas Federal grants-in-aid and subsidies to agriculture, industry, power, health, housing, urban renewal, education, and welfare invade the responsibilities of States and localities; cost more than State and locally administered programs; accelerate inflation and increase of the public dept; and impair the will of the people for responsible State and local government,

"*Resolved,* That the Wisconsin Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, favors: (1) cutbacks in all Federal grants-in-aid programs and subsidies, (2) elimination of Federal competition with private business, (3) reduction of the public debt, and (4) economy in government, as necessary measures to maintain confidence in the American dollar and to halt the drift from constitutional to socialistic government.

"EXECUTIVE CENSORSHIP AND NATIONAL SECURITY

"Whereas 'the gag rule' imposed on the executive branch of Government has deprived congressional committees of the power to investigate communism in high places in Government, and has denied the American people full information for adequate appraisal of the conduct of foreign policy, and

"Whereas the recent executive effort to silence criticism of the Soviet Union constitutes a new threat to freedom of information and the press,

"*Resolved,* That the Wisconsin Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, requests the administration to reevaluate the effects of existing censorship on national security, and to restore to the people and the Congress their historic access to information concerning the affairs of Government.

"VIOLATIONS OF VISA LAWS BY 'EXCHANGE' POLICIES

"Whereas testimony before Congress has shown that every cultural, diplomatic, or scientific exchange mission of the Soviet Union has been trained for espionage; and

"Whereas the State Department continues to grant visas to hundreds of these spies in violation of congressional immigration laws concerning the admission of alleged Communist agents.

"*Resolved,* That the Wisconsin Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, again opposes the so-called cultural exchange program and endorses the congressional investigating committees inquiries into the violations of the visa laws by State Department policies."

School Aid a Thorny Issue for Many Other Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH L. CAREY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Fred M. Hechinger has published several cogent and enlightened articles on the subject of Aid to Education which appeared in the New York Times. It is my feeling that the resolution of this complex problem will be best accomplished by impartial and unemotional consideration of the huge mass of factual data available. The experience of other countries in dealing with the same problem should be helpful to us in our deliberation and in this connection Mr. Hechinger's latest brief is submitted for the information of my colleagues.

The articles follow:

SCHOOL AID A THORNY ISSUE FOR MANY OTHER NATIONS

(By Fred M. Hechinger)

The issue of church and state, though currently a key question in the debate over Federal aid to education, is by no means an American phenomenon. The problem of public support for nonpublic education has had to be faced in the policy decisions on school financing and control in many nations, including those with greater religious homogeneity than the United States.

To document the many ways in which the issue has been faced elsewhere, questionnaires were sent to correspondents of the New York Times in more than a dozen nations.

No simple or consistent pattern emerges. National solutions and compromises range from broad, all-inclusive government subsidy to schools of every kind—public, church related and private—as in the Netherlands, to the other extreme, in Greece, where taxes levied on private schools are used to help finance the public ones.

At one time attempts to maintain the separation of church and state in France led to a compromise of subsidizing the student rather than the school. To a surprising degree the plan resembled Governor Rockefeller's controversial "scholar-incentive" grant of between $100 and $300 to most New York State college students.

The only nearly universal trend is one of definite supervision of educational standards and teacher qualifications by the national or state government over nonpublic schools once they accept public aid.

Probably the closest parallel to the decentralization in the American tradition is that of the Swiss schools. The best example of a compromise between strong local responsibilities and controls despite clearly defined powers of the national government is offered by the schools of England and Wales.

Public reaction to the issue has ranged from complete apathy, as in Sweden, to near violence, as in France. Offering a direct parallel to President Kennedy's appeal not to let the issue divide the Nation, French Premier René Pleven in 1951 pleaded with "both sides unfailingly to remember how important it is that no imprudence or violence of language run the risk of inflaming passions that might tear France asunder."

In countries whose people appear strongly oriented toward religious schools, government subsidies to private education have weakened the public-school system to a point at which public schools are no longer available in all areas. This has happened in the Netherlands.

Following is an analysis of the situation and background in each of the nations canvassed for this study:

BRITAIN

Publicly financed schools in England and Wales (Scotland has a separate education system and Northern Ireland its own government) are divided into the voluntary-controlled and voluntary-aided. The first receive all their funds from the local education authorities and the Ministry of Education; the second get 75 percent from these public sources.

Under the Education Act of 1944, which introduced universal education through high school, both types of schools must provide religious education and prayer time.

The difference is that the controlled schools use a religious instruction syllabus agreed on by all denominations, while the aided schools are operated by denominations and these, in return for supplying 25 percent of the funds, determines religious instruction. The majority of the Roman Catholic and Anglican schools fall in the latter category.

A third category of schools, called independent, is entirely self-supporting and free to determine the curriculum. They are, however, accredited and inspected by the Government.

These independent schools, many of them the most influential institutions in the country, have no formal representation in the Ministry of Education but are organized through the powerful headmasters' conference.

While there has been much debate over questions of curriculum and school-leaving age, there has been practically no conflict over the church-state issue.

FRANCE

Ever since the French Revolution, which ended the complete control of education by the church, the debate over the state's relations with Catholic schools has been among the most impassioned issues in France. The issue, however, is considered one of law or principle rather than of constitutionality.

In 1951, a law was passed giving supplementary help for school equipment for any institution, public or private. At the same time, faced with impoverished church schools—which enrolled 43 percent of all secondary-school pupils—France evolved a compromise. This was an effort to avoid a head-on clash with the principle of separation of church and state.

"Maintenance scholarships" at 1,000 francs a person, not to be paid to the schools themselves, were given to students attending public or approved private secondary schools. A fund was also provided for state aid to pupils attending private elementary schools.

The controversial law, which closely resembles some current American efforts to avoid constitutional conflict, was passed in the national assembly by 378 votes to 236.

This appears to have prepared the way for the most controversial battle, won in 1959 by the Catholic schools. Direct aid to nonpublic schools was voted. About $40 million was made available in 1960–61 for those schools, provided they agree to one of three options:

They might ask to be completely integrated into the public education system and have their costs met in full. Hardly any schools accepted this offer.

They might sign a contract of association that put their teachers on the public payroll and offered payments for most other expenses, in return for a program conforming with that of the public schools. A small minority, largely secondary schools chose this.

Finally, schools might ask for a simple contract that gave the state some supervisory rights over the school buildings and teacher qualification, but almost none over curriculum. It offered public funds for part or all of teachers' salaries. The vast majority of private schools accepted this offer.

In the religiously neutral French public schools, religious instruction has long been permitted in the school buildings, provided it does not interfere with regular school programs. In secondary schools a chaplain is often named by the church authorities, with the theoretical agreement of the State.

WEST GERMANY

Following longstanding tradition, West Germany's public, private, and church-related schools receive government funds. The country's 11 states, which constitutionally are sovereign in cultural matters, not only pay public school teachers' salaries but also come to the rescue if local communities cannot pay for school construction or improvements.

Private or church-related schools are responsible for their teachers' salaries, but can obtain state aid for other purposes, if a need is proved.

The state, however, sets standards for the accreditation of all teachers and schools. To be eligible for aid, a private school must meet those standards. Though this gives the state a powerful means to control school affairs, nonpublic schools are usually protected by other state laws that define their rights.

The parents decide whether a pupil takes religious instruction both in public and private schools.

In recent years, there has been little controversy over the church-state issue.

THE NETHERLANDS

The National Government and the municipalities in the Netherlands finance almost all elementary and secondary education, both in the so-called voluntary and the public schools. Public funds pay for buildings, equipment, and teachers' salaries of the nonpublic schools.

To receive public funds, a voluntary school must have a sufficient number of pupils—50, in cities of fewer than 166,000 population; 125 in larger communities.

Curriculum and teacher qualifications in all schools are subject to state inspection. Students in all schools must attend courses in religion and morals, taught by the clergy.

The present system is based on a law passed in 1920. There has been no controversy in recent years. The support of nonpublic schools, however, has reduced the public schools to a minority position.

In the primary grades, Catholic schools enroll 43 percent of the pupils; Protestant schools, 27 percent; the public schools 28 percent. The remaining 2 percent are in nonsectarian private schools.

BELGIUM

The Belgian Government aids private elementary and secondary schools, mainly Catholic, through a system of grants designed to offer free education for all pupils.

Government grants to private schools are applied to operating costs, technical equipment and teachers' salaries but not to school buildings. Aid was increased through a school pact in 1958, signed by the Christian Social, Socialist, and Liberal Parties. The pact also subjected the private schools to Government inspection and standards.

Slightly more than a half of all pupils attend nonpublic schools. All pupils, in public and private schools, must receive religious instruction, given by the clergy, but choice of denomination is left to the parents.

At present, there is little controversy over the school issue.

ITALY

The national government and the municipalities give subsidies to private schools,

which enroll about 700,000 pupils. Public schools enroll 5,800,000.

In addition to getting operating aid, the private schools, most of them Catholic, may use government-owned buildings and equipment.

The constitution gives the state the same supervisory powers over accredited private schools as over public ones. Religious instruction must be offered in all schools, but public school pupils may ask to be exempted.

There has been continuing controversy, with the leftwing parties and the anticlerical conservatives accusing the governing Christian Democrats of favoring the church schools.

IRELAND

The Irish Republic has no state schools. All schools are under religious management—of Catholic, Protestant or Jewish clergy.

The state pays practically all the costs of teachers' salaries and school construction, thus it offers a special system of almost total sectarian control, combined with almost total public financing.

The constitution provides a reverse example of separation of church and state by prescribing that "the state shall not oblige parents in violation of their conscience and lawful preference to send their children to schools established by the state or to any type of school designated by the state."

SWITZERLAND

Switzerland's 25 cantons have exclusive jurisdiction over their schools. The federal constitution demands only that education be compulsory and free and be provided for children of all creeds, without interference with religious convictions.

In cantons with an overwhelming majority of the same religious background, as in Catholic Fribourg, church schools can be made a part of the public education system. Whether or not financial aid is provided to nonpublic schools, the cantonal department of education sets and enforces education standards.

Most cantons, however, do not assist church schools. Religious classes in public schools are voluntary.

SWEDEN

Any denomination in this country, which has a Lutheran state church, may start its own school. However, only one such church-related school exists—a small Jewish one in Stockholm, partly run with annual grants from the government.

Lutheran religious instruction is part of the public school curriculum, but Catholics and Jews may be excused if similarly instructed by their own clergy.

NORWAY

Practically all Norwegian pupils are in public schools. Some special government allocations are made to the few nonpublic schools, on the theory that, since teachers and classrooms must be of the same quality as in public schools, such aid is fair. All private school pupils must stand examinations in the nearest public schools.

GREECE

Greek school authorities point that the nation's resources are too limited to consider any aid to nonpublic schools. In fact, they say, Greece annually gets more than $130,000 taxes levied on the private schools. This money contributes to public education.

Private schools are considered private enterprises. Their certificates are not valid for university admission unless students pass state examinations to qualify.

Religious instruction in the Eastern Orthodox faith is compulsory in public schools with a few exceptions.

ISRAEL

In 1953 all elementary schools were consolidated under the state education law.

Teaching in "state schools" is in Hebrew for Jewish children and Arabic for the Arab population.

An alternative or subdivision is provided by the category of the "state religious schools," attended by 25 percent of the Jewish children.

Six percent are in "recognized" schools, run by the ultraorthodox Agudat Israel Party. Though not state schools, they get some state support.

Secondary education is neither free nor compulsory. However, the state has begun to aid these schools, run largely by the political parties, through payments based on tuition costs.

Wherever the state contributes funds, it supervises the curriculums and approves teacher qualifications.

LATIN AMERICA

Nongovernmental schools in Mexico do not receive any financial assistance from the government.

Private schools, both religious and nonsectarian, are maintained in Mexico by fees and by contributions. These schools must prove to the Ministry of Education that they can support themselves before they are allowed to function.

This is not true of Central and South America. In many sections of Guatemala, for instance, there are no public schools, only missionary schools of various denominations. Some of these get slight Government help.

Government assistance is given to some denominational schools in Nicaragua, but it is also small. There is none in Honduras. Some slight help is given in El Salvador.

There is none in Costa Rica, where the Government runs probably the most elaborate public school system in Latin America.

Catholic schools in Colombia get considerable Government help, but the Protestant schools get none.

The teaching of religion in private or public schools is prohibited in Mexico. Religion is taught at Sunday schools for Protestants and at Saturday afternoon classes in the churches for Catholic pupils attending public schools.

There is no released time in public schools in Central America for the teaching of religion. In most of the countries, the denominational schools are allowed to devote part of their time to teaching religion. In most Catholic schools outside Mexico this teaching consists of the catechism and Bible history.

However, some religious teaching is done in denominational schools in Mexico in spite its being prohibited.

CANADA

Canada's school system varies from one Province to another. The British North America Act, the written constitution, guarantees the rights of language and religion in the Province of Quebec and the rights of minorities as they existed at the time of confederation.

Ontario has a public school system and a separate one, almost entirely Catholic. The separation is made at the tax level. The Catholic schools are maintained by Catholic real estate taxpayers and the public schools are supported by non-Catholic taxpayers.

In addition, both public and religious schools gets provincial grants toward salaries, textbooks, and construction.

All schools are inspected by the provincial department of education. The Federal Government has no direct jurisdiction.

No grants are made to other private schools.

Public schools provide nondenominational religious instruction. There is some controversy about this at present, with some parents demanding that such instruction be given outside regular school hours. Generally, however, there is little conflict over school financing and the church-state issue.

Award of Citation to National 4–H Club Foundation by Institute of International Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the National 4–H Club Foundation late last year was awarded a citation for distinguished service by the Institute of International Education.

This fact has just recently come to my attention. It is of sufficient merit and worthiness, however, that I ask unanimous consent that the text of the statement made at the time of the award be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF THE INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION'S CITATION FOR DISTINGUISHED SERVICE PRESENTED TO THE NATIONAL 4–H CLUB FOUNDATION ON FRIDAY, DECEMBER 2

To the International Farm Youth Exchange of the National 4–H Club Foundation, an organization which has dramatically demonstrated that young people of all nations can build understanding on the farm and ranch as well as in the cloisters of the university, the Institute of International Education presents its award for distinguished service.

IFYE, as it is known throughout the world, has a clear and simple objective and program. The members of the 4–H Clubs, deeply interested in international affairs and convinced that "you learn another way of life by living it," arranged to work from 4 to 6 months on farms and in rural centers of 60 countries throughout Europe, Asia, Latin America, and Africa. In return, they invited young people with similar interests from other nations to American farms. Since 1948, more than 2,500 Americans and foreign citizens have had this experience. Throughout the world 18,000 rural families have welcomed IFYE participants to their homes.

Through this worldwide opening of doors to other ways of life, the insights and understandings of IFYE participants have broadened.

They know firsthand the fundamental common need of men everywhere for food and a better way of life. These young men and women have shared their experiences widely and contributed greatly to the sympathetic understanding by many thousands of people of the aspirations of other nations. The members of this growing corps of dedicated young people are now assuming leadership roles not only in agriculture but in civic affairs in countries around the globe.

In typical U.S. fashion, the 4–H Club Foundation has enlisted a host of groups in financing the IFYE program. The Department of Agriculture, of course, cooperates, but funds primarily come from private donations here and abroad—4–H Club members and leaders, local business firms, civic and agricultural groups and foundations. The outreach of American voluntary effort is demonstrated by the fact that in many cooperating countries rural youth organizations modeled after U.S. 4–H Clubs raise funds for the program.

Because these young people have demonstrated how the seeds of better world understanding can be planted and nurtured, the Institute presents its Distinguished Service

Award to the International Farm Youth Exchange of the National 4–H Club Foundation.

The award was accepted by John K. Romig, and IFYE delegate from the United States to Brazil, now a teacher of vocational agriculture in the Leipsic (Ohio) High School.

Only Strong and Firm Actions Now by the United States Can Prevent Serious Defeats by the Communist Bloc

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. JUDD. My Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

ACTIONS WOULD SPEAK LOUDER THAN WORDS
(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

The new Kennedy policy of "civility" in international relations with the U.S.S.R. is bankrupt before it has really started. Our President and his Secretary of State are learning the hard lesson that Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower learned before them: the more they seek to "relax tensions" with the East, the tighter Moscow pulls them.

For communism deliberately provokes tensions and creates one incident after another in order to secure ever more concessions from a West that is still afraid to look the Cold War in the face—and play to win.

Ever since he took office, Mr. Kennedy has tried to treat the U.S.S.R. as a normal government and Mr. K. as a reasonable man with whom it "ought to be possible" to reach a logical point of agreement. He has not succeeded.

In his Inaugural Address, our President offered to make a "new start" with the U.S.S.R. Nothing happened, except that the Kremlin doubled its efforts to disrupt the Congo and communize Laos. Mr. Kennedy next sent Ambassador Thompson back to Moscow with an urgent personal letter to Khrushchev. In that letter he begged the Soviet leader to realize that the United States meant business and would not permit the Reds to walk off with Laos.

Mr. K. found the message so "urgent" that he first allowed Thompson to cool his heels in Moscow for several days while he lingered in the Siberian sticks, then graciously allowed the Ambassador of the United States of America to fly to Novosibirsk and deliver it in person. Mr. K. then stepped up military aid to Laotian Communists still more.

In desperation, the U.S. administration, doubtless coached by the ever-conciliatory Adlai Stevenson, planned to ask India's Nehru to deliver another message to Khrushchev and try to convince him that we had made our "last offer." Nehru was not interested.

There the situation stands—as I write.

It is no different in the field of negotiations for a treaty to end nuclear tests. There have been almost 300 meetings, and nothing has come of them. Why should it? The U.S.S.R. has secured from anxious Americans a stoppage of tests with no supervision whatsoever.

Conceivably for over 2 years, Moscow has been continuing low-power tests underground while the United States has stopped all tests. Why then, should Khrushchev do anything but stall indefinitely? President Kennedy has said that without an agreement he would start testing again. Khrushchev does not believe him. Why should he? Eisenhower said the same thing but did not resume tests.

At the recent meeting the Russians found a new excuse. They don't want any agreement until the United States prevents France from making tests for more bombs. France already has bombs and is trying to make smaller ones. It still lacks an efficient delivery system. If Mr. K. can induce Kennedy to try to make France stop—and still not sign an agreement—well, that will be Kennedy's fault.

Meanwhile he continues to benefit from the incurable optimism of American leaders who cannot—will not—dare not admit that Khrushchev is an irreconcilable enemy far more dangerous than Hitler.

He will never stop—I repeat, never—until either he is overthrown by the Russians (which seems unlikely), or made to see that if he continues his drive for world rule he is heading for disaster, that the West has reached the limit of its patience and will settle down to winning the cold war with the same intensity—and success—as it displayed in the hot war waged against Nazi Germany and Japan.

When President Kennedy makes this clear by acts, and not by words, he may begin to make progress in negotiations; but not until then—barring an act of God.—This is the cold and cruel fact of the year 1961.

Tribute to the Seventh Regiment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, today I have the honor to introduce a resolution to provide for the erection of a tablet in the Hall of the House of Representatives—or immediately adjacent to its entrance—commemorating the 100th anniversary of the quartering of the 7th Regiment, New York State Militia in this Hall. The 7th Regiment arrived in Washington on April 25, 1861, in response to President Lincoln's request for troops to defend the Nation's Capital at the outset of the Civil War. They were quartered in the Hall of the House of Representatives from April 25 to May 2, 1861.

On April 25, 1861, the 7th Regiment, New York State Militia, marched up Pennsylvania Avenue in the City of Washington and was reviewed by President Lincoln in front of the White House. The arrival of the 7th Regiment in Washington was described by Messrs. Nicolay and Hay, President Lincoln's secretaries as "an epoch in American History."

It is difficult for us to realize, a century later, the drama underlying the arrival of this one regiment of militia troops in tension-charged Washington on April 25, 1861. Its significance lay in the fact that this was the best-known regiment of militia troops of its day and its arrival in Washington in response to the President's call was the first tangible demonstration of the willingness of the people to aid the Union.

After the firing upon Fort Sumter on April 12, 1861, President Lincoln called for the militia of the several States of the Union, to the aggregate number of 75,000 to defend the Union and provide for the execution of its laws. He also arranged, through Brevet-Lt. Gen. Winfield Scott, as Chief of Staff of the Army, that certain of the militia troops thus called forth would be assigned to protect and defend the Capital.

President Lincoln knew well the importance of and the need for defending Washington against attack. At the time of his militia proclamation seven States had already seceded, including South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Florida, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas. They were joined a few days later by the State of Virginia, Washington's southern neighbor across the Potomac. North of Washington, telegraph wires and railroad transportation from the north were severed at Baltimore. The city of Washington was almost completely surrounded by those hostile to President Lincoln's determination to defend the Union.

President Lincoln and his principal advisers expected the war to begin in the city of Washington, with a drive to capture the White House and the Capital. It was said that the White House is turned into a barracks. Two Senators, Cassius M. Clay and James H. Lane, both with military backgrounds, formed a last-ditch "palace guard," to protect the White House and the safety of the President. This feeling that Washington was the immediate target of the seceded States was shared by the press of the South. The Richmond Examiner declared:

> There is one wild shout of fierce resolve to capture Washington City at all and every human hazard.

There was reason for concern for the safety of Washington. The Regular Army, totaling about 17,000 officers and men, was stationed for the most part in the West and Southwest. The civil servants in Washington were predominantly citizens of the seceded States. After the fall of Fort Sumter, Regular Army officers from the South resigned their commissions and returned to their home States to offer their services to the Confederacy.

Any well-organized attack upon Washington would have succeeded. However the Virginia troops did not cross the Potomac. Instead the Virginia Volunteers, on April 18, 1861, the day after the secession of the Old Dominion, marched north and captured the Federal fort at Harpers Ferry and with it a tremendous supply of weapons, ammunition, and equipment. Two days later, on April 20, 1861, the commander of the U.S. Naval Yard at Norfolk, Va., fearful of the capture of the yard by Virginia troops, destroyed $30 million of naval ships, guns, equipment, and munitions.

It was in such an atmosphere of concern for the safety of the Capital and confusion as to the intentions of the forces of the seceded States, that the 7th Regiment marched up Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington to the relief of President Lincoln and the members of his Cabinet. The 7th Regiment brought

a measure of security to the city of Washington, but more importantly, it was the harbinger of men and arms to come, and a symbol of the desire of a united people to fight for and defend the Union of the States.

Just as the arrival of the 7th Regiment in the city of Washington on April 25, 1861, was a symbol of the desire of the people to defend their Union, so also it served in New York City.

Prior to the departure of the 7th Regiment from New York City there was reason to believe that the North would not support a war against the seceded States. The mayor of the city of New York, Fernando Wood, had called seriously for the secession of New York City from the State and from the United States. Rumblings of discontent were heard throughout the North, but with President Lincoln's proclamation calling forth the militia, on April 25, 1861, and the response of the 7th Regiment to that call, fear for the safety of the Nation and concern over the support which might be rendered by the people to the Federal Government was assuaged.

The service of the 7th Regiment in defense of the Nation's Capital, and specifically, in defense of the Halls of Congress and the White House, was an important duty which should be recorded by the erection of a tablet in the Hall of the House of Representatives because this regiment, the first organized, fully equipped and armed regiment to respond to the President's call for volunteers, typified the spirit of unity in support of President Lincoln's determination to preserve the Union, and is a lasting tribute to the patriotism of the citizen-soldier.

Pentagon Butterflies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on April 15 the greatest of all institutions, the taxpayer, will once again be subject to tender treatment by the Federal Government. By that time we will have collected billions of dollars from hard-pressed individuals and then, through the inefficiency that has been perfected by our Federal bureaucracy, we will proceed to spend that money just as if it were pouring from an endless funnel. The editorial in the Chicago Sun-Times on Friday, March 24, called to the taxpayer's attention an insignificant little item for which their hard-earned money was being spent:

PENTAGON BUTTERFLIES

As we await new Federal Budget figures from President Kennedy, we should like to dwell for a moment on a seemingly unrelated subject—the Pentagon's new butterfly switches.

Pentagon brass recently put a rush order in with the Signal Corps to buy 25,320 walkie-talkie type telephone handsets, equipped with a butterfly switch. Joe O'Brien of the telephone company tells us that a butterfly switch looks like a wing nut, and, of course, a wing nut looks like a butterfly.

The Signal Corps on Wednesday awarded a contract for handsets to the Yankee Telecommunication Laboratories, Inc., of Meriden, Conn., at a cost of $171,958.25. That figures out to $6.79 apiece.

This is a little better price than the Government paid the last time it bought handsets with butterfly switches. That was $6.95. But we are not about to compliment the Pentagon on getting a bargain. There is a surplus radio sales company in Lima, Ohio, that has a good supply of the gadgets. And it paid only 50 cents apiece for them. The Lima people know how to get a real bargain.

Of course, the handsets that the Lima company has on hand are the same ones the Signal Corps bought for $6.95 apiece. Somewhere along the line the military brass decided it didn't need those $6.95 handsets with butterfly switches, declared them surplus property and sold them at 50 cents apiece. Then somebody decided later that butterfly switch handsets were vital, after all.

Well, this is the sort of thing that leaves many citizens with the impression that the Military Establishment costs the taxpayers more than it should. And they'll be looking at Mr. Kennedy's budget with this in mind.

Area Redevelopment Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANCHER NELSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, with the area redevelopment legislation now before us, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a letter which I have received from the chamber of commerce at St. Cloud, Minn.

The legislative affairs committee of the St. Cloud chamber has gone on record opposing the enactment of S. 1.

In a letter bringing this action to my attention, Mr. Charles H. Richter, chairman of their legislative affairs committee, reports the reasons for their action.

The letter from the St. Cloud Chamber of Commerce is appended hereto in its entirety.

ST. CLOUD CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
St. Cloud, Minn., March 17, 1961.

Congressman ANCHER NELSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The legislative affairs committee of the St. Cloud Chamber of Commerce has asked that I forward to you the following resolution concerning the Douglas area redevelopment bill (S. 1), designed to channel industrial expansion into depressed areas:

"Our businessmen deplore the implications of the area redevelopment bill, an extension of Federal intervention in local and State affairs, as it will inhibit local leadership and local initiative. Here in St. Cloud, the organization St. Cloud Opportunities, has induced several manufacturers to locate here. Our success has been accomplished by local (and area) business people, with locally subscribed funds. For the Federal Government to use moneys from Minnesota to build, in other States, direct competition for business here, is unsound economics and may merely lead to the relocation of so-called depressed areas."

This resolution was brought before the legislative affairs committee of the St. Cloud Chamber of Commerce and approved by a vote of 15 to 1.

The committee bases its recommendations on the following arguments:

1. The bill does not guarantee economic revival.
2. It will create another permanent agency.
3. It will subsidize competitors and penalize progressive communities.
4. It will be impossible to legislate against transfer of jobs—i.e., industries moving from Minnesota to take advantage of Government subsidies offered by another State.
5. There are better means to encourage economic redevelopment. Lack of finances is not the basic problem to an area's problems, it is the area itself.

The one negative voter on the resolution based his support of the bill on the following arguments:

1. Will decrease unemployment in those areas.
2. Will stimulate the economy of the whole Nation.
3. Will stimulate local leadership and local initiative.
4. Depressed areas, if not checked, spread depressed economy over larger and larger areas.
5. It is the Christian and charitable thing to do, help the brother who is in a bad way.

It is with the knowledge that you represent the people of Minnesota that we send this resolution to you believing that the bill as presently written will do much harm to the working people of this State by robbing them of their jobs.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES H. RICHTER,
Chairman, Legislative Affairs Committee.

Mermaid With a Broom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in Skipper magazine of March 1961, chronicling the diligent efforts of our able and beloved colleague, the Honorable JOHN BLATNIK, to clean up water pollution and to have an effective and forceful Federal Water Pollution Control Act to meet one of America's most pressing natural resource problems.

I wish to join others in saluting JOHN BLATNIK for his great endeavors in this field of desperate need and in praising his efforts to meet perhaps the greatest single problem the United States has in the field of natural resources.

The article follows:

MERMAID WITH A BROOM

(By Robert Burkhardt)

Early in January, shortly after the new Congress opened, several bills were introduced to increase Federal aid for water pollution control. The bill put in the hopper by Representative JOHN BLATNIK, Democrat, of Minnesota, was similar to the one passed by

the last Congress and vetoed by former President Eisenhower.

Last year's bill would have increased the Federal grants from $50 million annually to $90 million. Representative BLATNIK's new bill provides for an increase to $100 million annually. It stands a good chance of early passage—partly because the economic recession has inclined lawmakers to view favorably a modest increase in Federal pump-priming measures. For the same reason, President Kennedy is expected to give his support to the new Kerr-Blatnik program—Senator ROBERT S. KERR, Democrat, of Oklahoma, has plans to introduce a companion measure in the Senate.

This new legislative push is in a sense an outgrowth of the water pollution conference held by the U.S. Public Health Service in Washington last December. The Public Health Service deserves little credit for any new Federal effort at pollution control, however. For the most part theirs was a captive conference, run by a small group who oppose further Federal efforts at water pollution control.

Despite the worst blizzard to hit Washington in a decade, more than a thousand determined people showed up for the 3-day meeting. At first I thought they were there to do something about water pollution control. Events proved otherwise. A few sincere people did show up to warn that one of these days we may all be inundated by our own sewage. But in terms of results they had about as much effect as those groups that advocate peace, single taxes, waterways improvement, simple yacht racing rules, ban the bomb, and abolish the income tax. We've got all kinds in Washington; so it was no surprise when a few clean-up-our-polluted waters advocates showed up for the Public Health Service conference.

This small starry-eyed group was lost among the larger numbers of tight-lipped special pleaders who came to the conference by the scores. They scored well, too. Not a single specific suggestion to end, or even to try to reduce, stream and lake pollution was adopted by the conference. One speaker went so far as to suggest that the Government itself was adding to the pollution problem by dumping its atomic waste in our rivers and seas, and there was a brief flurry of interest. But no resolution condemning this was passed, or even introduced. And next day the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission issued a statement reassuring everybody that the concrete drums used to package dangerous atomic byproducts will last up to 10 years.

All was not apathy, however. At one point in the proceedings a large group of delegates to the conference did leap to their feet in standing support of the New England Industrial Water Pollution Commission when a representative of that group declaimed in ringing tones: "We have no pollution problems in New England that require additional Federal help." Leaving no doubt as to where he stood on the more urgent problems of pollution control, he said firmly that enforcement is the primary concern of the State.

Keynote of the conference was set by President Eisenhower himself. He did this in the first instance by his veto of the bill to enlarge Federal participation in the water pollution control work. More to the point was his later letter of instruction to the Public Health Service on the call of the conference. "Arrange," he said, "for a national conference on water pollution." Purpose of the conference was to "help local taxpayers and business concerns to realize the obligations they have to help prevent pollution."

It has to be admitted that arrangements were excellent. By handpicking speakers and key panel members, the Public Health Service saw to it that the conference was all wake and no way. It wasn't easy to do; there were several crucial moments when it seemed almost as though the conference might break its lines and try to go somewhere.

Several of the panels had the temerity to propose some "ideas" for the consideration of the conference. One reporter counted 31 such proposals—the number was not important, though, for none was acted upon. Just as well. One idea was directed at Federal tax officials; they were called on to grant a special income tax benefit to corporations that spend money to treat their waste water. Another idea was to tax all pleasure boats, with the annual receipts to go into a special fund to combat water pollution.

There were some sensible suggestions, too. One lady delegate said her organization hadn't been able to rally any community interest in its Texas-size pollution problem until they adopted the slogan: "Beaumont Is Beautiful—But It Stinks." And Senator KERR said that maybe what is needed is a public symbol to dramatize the water pollution control battle. He suggested a mermaid with a broom.

But it was Congressman BLATNIK's speech that really hit the fan. He let the delegates know that all the talk in the world wouldn't aerate a single drop of sewage. Further, he said, he was not only going to propose a course of action; he was going to act himself. He and Senator KERR were going to introduce bills in the Congress to double the size of the Federal water pollution control program. This they are now in the process of doing.

But even if the program is doubled, it is still—so to speak—only a drop in the bucket, compared to what needs to be done by both the Federal Government and the State and local governments. It looks like it will be a long time before any but a lucky few of us will be able to dip a bucket oversides and come up with water fit to drink. That's the real lesson of the conference.

The Visa: Shorter but Still Required

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, one of the largest wholesalers of travel in the world—Maupintour Associates—is located in my hometown, Lawrence, Kans. It is for that reason that I have a special interest in visa reform. The Kansas City Star, of March 21, made an editorial statement in connection with visa reform, and under leave to extend my remarks I include that editorial at this point:

THE VISA: SHORTER BUT STILL REQUIRED

In the years immediately following World War II, most of the governments of Europe eliminated the requirement of visas for persons traveling with an American passport. These nations needed dollars desperately. The best way to lure tourists obviously was to make travel as easy as possible. The approach worked.

In a similar situation, the United States recently decided to minimize visa requirements in an attempt to attract more foreign visitors. So far, so good. The old long form, used at the discretion of consular officials, contained many questions relating to morals, money, and intentions. At best, it was cumbersome and annoying. At worst, it discouraged foreigners from visiting the United States. In its place will be a short form, requiring only basic information.

Minimizing visa requirements is much more than a courtesy to friendly nations. The Government hopes it will mean more tourist dollars at a time when conserving the outflow of money is extremely important. Last year Americans abroad spent $1.2 billion more than foreign travelers spent in this country. This enormous sum represents about one-third of our unfavorable balance of payments. If the travel gap can be at least partly closed, it will substantially ease the flow of gold abroad. And in the process, American travel should give foreigners a better view of our Nation.

Visa reform is an obvious starting point. Other countries are making progress. An American in Paris, wishing to spend the weekend in London, need only grab the next plane or boat train and he's on the way. At the border, a landing card satisfies all Government requirements. A Briton in Montreal, wishing to spend a weekend in New York, still must apply for a visa. The new rule simply stops the excesses in use of visa authority. The general requirement of red-tape continues.

Having taken the first big step, the State Department might well study the feasibility of dropping the visa requirement for nationals of approved countries. There may be sound objections to the change, but it would stimulate travel to America—and help save our gold.

Conservation Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Massachusetts State Senator Paul H. Benoit of the Worcester-Hampden District, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the timely remarks of my valued and dear friend, the Honorable F. Stanley Mikelk, of Gilbertville, Mass., member of the Administrative Board, Fish and Game Division, Massachusetts Department of Natural Resources, regarding Senate bill 158, now before the Massachusetts Legislature.

A very touching feature of Mr. Mikelk's testimony is that reprints of the full text are being distributed under a gift of his devoted wife and helpmate, the late Carmen C. Mikelk, to the conservation education fund of the Izaak Walton League. Like her distinguished husband, Mrs. Mikelk was dedicated to many good causes and was especially interested in conservation education.

I trust that Mr. Mikelk's very admirable remarks will be helpful in pointing up the need for expanding conservation education activities and developing additional conservation measures:

CONSERVATION AND RESOURCE-USE EDUCATION IN MASSACHUSETTS TODAY MEANS A BETTER MASSACHUSETTS FOR ALL TOMORROW

Past: From its days as the earliest permanent settlement in the New World, Massachusetts has drawn strength from nature's resources. The soil, forests, minerals, wa-

ters, and land were crucial in enabling the citizens of Massachusetts to lead the way in economic development and to enjoy enriching recreational and cultural pursuits.

Present: But the past has had its effect on the present. The long years of tapping nature have taken a heavy toll from some resources—there have been abuses by men—and uncontrollable disasters have destroyed valuable resources—and the pressures of more and more people for food, clothing, shelter, space, and recreation are relentless.

Future: And so Massachusetts faces a future in which natural resources are the number one need. Decisions about resources are of greatest significance:

Will there be enough of nature's resources to sustain the demands of personal and industrial needs?

Will the cities have land, water, and air which they need to provide for wholesome living?

Will there be adequate sites to meet the recreational needs of growing populations?

Can you be absolutely certain of the answers to these questions?

No, but you can be certain that (1) what the people of Massachusetts do about their natural resources will have the greatest influence on whether the needs will be met; (2) the key to what is done is education—education concerning the use, conservation, and development of the State's natural resources.

To that end: A concerted effort is underway to develop a statewide program in conservation and resource-use education. From the first days of school and community experience through the last, the people of Massachusetts will be assisted in understanding how best to use, conserve, and develop nature's resources. Looking to the future, the focal point of the program will be in the State department of education. In the development, Massachusetts would be moving ahead as have such States as Illinois, Ohio, Florida, Tennessee, and Texas.

A vital program is planned: When underway, the program calls for a supervisor of conservation education to carry out a diversified, dynamic program. Under Senate Act 158 authorizing the position, the supervisor would "serve in the division of elementary and secondary education, whose duties shall be to set up and maintain a conservation education center, to promote improved educational methods, to organize workshops and encourage the training of teachers, to integrate existing education programs of private groups and other government agencies affecting resources, and to provide useful educational materials for schools at all levels, youth groups and adult organizations for the enlightened advancement of resource management."

From which it can be seen: Massachusetts will be well on its way toward developing citizens who can take intelligent action to use, conserve, and develop their natural resources. And the answers to questions about whether the needs of the people will be met will be a most emphatic, confident "yes."

So pitch in and help: Your support is needed. Contact your legislator and tell him how important you feel it is to provide immediately for the establishment of the position, supervisor of conservation education. After the position is established, do whatever you can to help the supervisor carry out his program effectively.

And Massachusetts will have reason to face the future with confidence that its natural resources will be adequate to meet the needs of the future.

Financing the Highway Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, there is great interest throughout the country in continuing the vital Federal-State highway program. President Kennedy has made proposals for the imposition of special taxes on the trucking industry to meet part of the rising costs of this necessary program.

It is my considered judgment that we must not repeat the mistakes made years ago in railroad taxation by imposing discriminatory and ruinous burdens on trucking at this time.

I have set forth my views on highway program taxation in a letter to Chairman MILLS of the House Ways and Means Committee and I ask unanimous consent to have the letter placed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 28, 1961.

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman, Ways and Means Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee on Ways and Means is now considering the President's proposals for financing the Federal-State highway program. The purpose of this letter is to set forth briefly my views on the subject for the consideration of the committee.

President Kennedy proposes a 3-cent-a-gallon increase in the tax on diesel fuel, as well as steep increases in the excise taxes on trucks, truck tires, tubes, and tread rubber. With a few exceptions, as a general principle, I oppose the imposition of any excise taxes on necessities during peacetime, particularly when they bear heavily on a specific industry. That is why I have been urging Congress for several years to approve my bills which would repeal certain remaining World War II excise taxes on such items as transportation, communications, appliances, cameras, luggage, etc. Therefore, in my opinion, the President's recommendations for sharp increases at this time in the excise taxes on trucks, truck tires, tubes, and tread rubber should not be approved.

The 75-percent increase in the diesel fuel tax proposed by the President would be borne entirely by about 15 percent of the heavy-duty trucks now operating. In my opinion, such a discriminatory increase would put a number of trucking companies out of business completely and seriously injure many others, with resulting unemployment. Thus, the anticipated revenue from diesel fuel taxes would be lower, thereby partially defeating the purpose of the increase. It seems to me, that if there is need for additional revenue to continue this highway program, as planned, it should be met by a modest increase in the present 4-cent tax on all gasoline and diesel fuel such as the half-cent proposed by President Eisenhower.

In my judgment, an economically sound trucking industry is necessary for a healthy economy just as an adequate highway system is an absolute requirement for the continued growth and development of all motor transportation including the trucking industry. Accordingly, the Federal-State highway program will continue to have my full support, as will any equitable taxation to pay for it.

Discriminatory overly burdensome taxation was a major factor in placing the Nation's railroads in the trouble they are in today. Let us not repeat the mistakes of history by taxing large segments of the trucking industry out of business. There are some who feel that harmful taxes on trucks will somehow help railroads. Two wrongs never make a right. Railroad problems must be solved affirmatively here in Congress and at the State capitals, not by crippling the trucking industry.

For the reasons set forth, I urge the Committee on Ways and Means to reject these discriminatory taxes on the trucking industry.

Sincerely yours,
FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

Anniversary of Hungarian Independence

SPEECH
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, March 15, the anniversary of the Hungarian Revolution of 1848, is of great significance not only to the valiant people of Hungary, but to all freedom-loving people of the world. This day reminds us of centuries of struggle for freedom and self-determination by a courageous, dauntless, strong spirited and persistent nation, sometimes against the Turks, later against the Hapsburg Emperors and the czars, after the First World War against the Fascists and the Nazis, and now against the Kremlin. Their victories have always been short but sweet enough to encourage them to go on fighting and sacrificing for their great cause. Their thirst for liberty has been so strong that not even Soviet machineguns and tanks could discourage their will or dampen their spirit in the dark days of October 1956.

I find this a great opportunity, Mr. Speaker, as an American to salute the people of Hungary, wherever they may be, for their love of freedom and their long struggle to achieve it. I want to assure those valiant people of Hungary that they are not forgotten by us in the free world today and that we shall keep alive the memory of their constant struggle for freedom, while they, themselves, are unable to celebrate this occasion in their own homeland. Let us today reaffirm our belief in the freedom of Hungary and all other nations who are suffocating under the yoke of Soviet tyranny, whether they be within or outside the Iron Curtain.

This being the 13th year of the 2d century of the anniversary of the Hun-

garian independence, let us all hope that it will be an unlucky year for all tyrants in the world, and let us hope and pray that the valiant people of Hungary will soon be able to celebrate with us a genuine and lasting life of freedom and of peace.

Foreign Policy Versus Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, this very penetrating editorial in the April 3 issue of U.S. News & World Report, rightly recommends that we stand behind the President of the United States in stopping the Communist military onslaught. This, despite the fact that in the previous administration, under the same foreign policy situation, shameful politics entered the picture.

THE PENALTY OF CHANGE
(By David Lawrence)

Many millions of persons, with the best of intent, voted last year for a change of administration.

Many millions of others, also believing that they were doing what would be best for America, voted against change.

Today all the people of the United States are paying the penalty of the change. It is costly. It could lead us into a war that nobody wants.

If this happens, it will not be the fault of our President. For he will earnestly strive to keep up from such a catastrophe, and he will have the support of the American people, irrespective of party.

But 1960 was not the time for a change in administration, and events now unfortunately are proving that thesis true. The risk we have taken by "changing horses in midstream" is being revealed in the headlines.

We didn't take such a risk in the midst of World War II, when we even broke the third-term precedent by reelecting a President for a third and a fourth term.

What is being revealed today is that a cold war is really not much different from a hot war as far as possible dangers are concerned. A fixed election date therefore is risky. Flexibility in the date for holding national elections—such as the parliamentary systems provide—would be a wise precaution.

Nikita Khrushchev and his clique in the Kremlin knew, of course, that the Eisenhower policies would be maintained by a Nixon administration. But Moscow had been led to believe that the United States would be softer under a Democratic administration.

Hints to this effect were given to the Kremlin from time to time in the last few years by prominent Democrats, inside and outside of Congress, who criticized the Eisenhower policies.

Will the United States now suffer the effects of the Kremlin's miscalculation?

Almost immediately after the election last November, the Communists stepped up the cold war. They increased military support to their stooges in Laos. They sent arms to Lumumba's forces in the Congo in direct defiance of the United Nations. And they have moved more intensively in Cuba and other areas.

All through November, December, January, and February, the cold war was pressed with renewed vigor by the Communists throughout the world, while American policies stagnated. Though ostensibly concerned with the possibility of reaching agreements in negotiations for disarmament and on such issues as the status of Berlin, the Moscow government saw a chance meanwhile to build a stronger position for itself in Latin America, Africa, and southeast Asia.

Unfortunately, partisan comments in recent years in this country indicated that maybe a Democratic President in the White House would bring a "peace at any price" policy. It will be recalled that in the spring of 1954, when the Indochina crisis was developing, the United States was ready to take a firm stand to meet Communist aggression in southeast Asia. Vice President Nixon made an off-the-record speech to the American Society of Newspaper Editors that was later paraphrased in print and viewed as threatening military action. It was indeed a show of firmness that was essential to our diplomacy. It led to bitter attacks by the Democrats. Senator Kennedy said at a political fundraising dinner in Chicago on April 20, 1954:

"The American people should be told the truth about the situation in the Far East. For if Secretary Dulles' and Vice President Nixon's words are to be taken at their face value, we are about to enter the jungle and do battle with the tiger. But I do believe it both proper and necessary that those who bear responsibility should indicate in advance the course that should be adopted."

So the Kremlin in 1961 apparently decided to test Mr. Kennedy's philosophy.

Another Vice President of the United States—LYNDON JOHNSON—now has made, after a conference with the President, the following statement:

"And I think it should also be known to the world that the United States, while it is going to be reasonable and prudent in all of its moves, is not in a mood to meekly permit an independent nation to be gobbled up by an armed minority supported from the outside."

It is to be hoped that blind partisans and the advocates of "peace at any price" will not again endanger American foreign policy by disparaging the comments of the present Vice President, who has just proclaimed the resolute policy of the United States.

Despite what was said by the Democrats in their ridicule of the policy of the late Secretary Dulles, called "brinkmanship," it is a fact that after 2 months of a Democratic administration we are the brink of armed conflict. It is important, therefore, to let the Soviets know that the American people stand solidly behind their President and will back him fully in whatever stand he may take to resist any further aggression by the Communists in any part of the world.

Grove Minister Blasts "Judas" in the National Council of Churches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include therein an article appearing in the Garden Grove News under date of March 23. This article consists of excerpts from a sermon by the Reverend Robert Schuller, who has been one of the outstanding opponents of communism in my district. It deals with the position taken by the National Council of Churches and reflects the thinking, I am sure, of a great majority of the members of the Protestant faith whose churches are affiliated with the National Council of Churches:

GROVE MINISTER BLASTS "JUDAS" IN NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES—SCHULLER SEES RED IN READING LIST
(By Samuel G. Campbell)

The outcry of "Judas" was raised today by a Garden Grove minister against the National Council of Churches to which his own congregation belongs.

The Reverend Robert Schuller, pastor of the Garden Grove Community Church, today released the text of a sermon delivered this week.

Schuller, who for 3 summers took Norman Vincent Peale's pulpit in Marble Collegiate Church of New York, blasted the National Council's repeated stands on issues involving communism.

CHURCH HAS ITS JUDAS

"Now the church, too, has always had its Judas," he declared, "and in my opinion it would be the height of selfrighteousness and credulity for the church to proudly assume that it has managed to keep out of its ranks today the spirit of men who would betray the church into the hands of sinners," the minister declared.

Schuller pointedly defended the National Council for its charity toward the Jewish people and for its position with respect to the Roman Catholic Church.

Nor did he object, he said, when a study group of the National Council advocated the admission of Red China to the United Nations.

Schuller admitted that he along with others once had considered the Air Force manual, charging Communist infiltration, as "another dirty smear, completely untrue, simply radical rightwing ultrafundamentalists."

CONGRESS HEARD EVIDENCE

But then, he said, he learned the Congress of the United States heard evidence that the National Council published a reading list recommending books authored by Communists.

Among these is a poem by W. E. B. DuBois which begins, "Down then, religion and church, temple and pagoda; away myth and miracle, creed and dogma," and ends, "Commune, communes, with the elect of heaven with mother earth, daughter of sky and sun, born of democracy, fertilized by communism, parents of revolution, makers of the world."

When J. Edgar Hoover gave his warning 4 months ago, Schuller declared, "I began to give the warning voices a fair hearing."

SURRENDER ADVOCATED

"Then came the December meeting of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in San Francisco," he continued, "And I will never forget the morning I listened to Dave Garroway and heard the early morning news announce to America that, 'Yesterday the National Council of Churches of Christ in San Francisco passed a resolution calling upon the American people to prepare to surrender the will of the United States to the will of the United Nations'."

He continued:

"Then came the general board meeting last month in Syracuse. And from the hot wires of the news media came the report that 'the National Council warns against the film Operation Abolition with this presumptuous appendix the National Council speaks for 40 million Americans'."

POWERFUL PULPIT VOICE

Schuller, a powerful pulpit voice, explained that the representative denominations had no opportunity to debate that issue, that because of an airline strike only 115 of the 250 board members were actually present.

Then he declared:

"They do not speak for me on this issue."

Schuller cautioned against suspicion of every liberal Protestant minister. He denounced that as sin.

But he called on the Protestant clergy and the National Council itself to agree to a "clean, honest, fair investigation into the problem of Communist infiltration into the church."

"What have we to fear, what have we to hide?" he challenged.

As a prelude to his remarks, he retold the story of betrayal by Judas which began in the Upper Room and ended in Gethsemane:

"Before the bread was broken, our Lord paused to make this grim announcement—'One of you will betray me.'

"Strange that all 12 did not proudly, arrogantly resent this charge. But in the rare display of genuine humility, the question was repeated, 'Lord is it I?—Is it I?'

"Then to the lost soul Jesus said, 'What thou doest, do quickly.'

"And Judas left to walk into the shivering darkness, into the chilly night, into the gaping gate of his horrible hell.

"Only hours later this same Judas stepped from behind his hiding place in the trees of the Garden of Gethsemane to plant his infamous kiss of death on the face of our Redeemer."

Making the Peace Corps a Reciprocal Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, as Members of this House are well aware, there has been tremendous interest expressed by the people of this country, old as well as young, in the so-called Peace Corps recently activated on a trial basis by President Kennedy. In view of this extensive interest, and in view of importance which this dramatic proposal has assumed in our worldwide American image, I was especially impressed by reading a newspaper account recently of certain comments on this program made by a college professor in my district, Dr. Herman Keiter, chairman of the Department of Philosophy and Religion at Hartwick College in Oneonta. I believe Dr. Keiter's constructive recommendations deserve to be carefully considered by Members of this body, as well as by those charged with the responsibility for operation of the new Peace Corps. Under leave to extend my remarks I enclose the following article from the Binghamton Press of March 26, 1961:

U.S. PEACE CORPS AS RECIPROCAL PROJECT CALLED POSSIBLE—FOREIGN VOLUNTEERS SUGGESTED FOR UNITED STATES BY HARTWICK PROFESSOR

International application of President John F. Kennedy's Peace Corps is posed by a professor at Hartwick College in Oneonta.

Dr. Herman Keiter, chairman of the department of philosophy and religion, pointed to the possibility of other countries sending volunteer workers here, even as Americans will be going abroad.

Such application of the Peace Corps proposal, he indicated, could keep it from becoming interpreted as an instrument of U.S. propaganda or charity.

Dr. Keiter headed a relief committee in work camps of Finland after World War II. The volunteers were sponsored by the American Friends Service Committee and the National Lutheran Council.

He was one of several persons heard during a meeting of the International Relations Club yesterday on Oyaron Hill.

Other speakers included Dr. Katherine E. Hobbie, professor of education at Oneonta State University College of Education, and Lawrence Hiler, a sophomore at Hartwick.

DIVIDED OPINIONS

All three discussed implications of the Peace Corps. Students and guests appeared to be divided in their opinion of the proposal.

Dr. Keiter referred to similarities between the Peace Corps and the Finnish work camp program conducted after World War II.

The postwar program included rehabilitation and reconstruction work by young people from America, Finland and other Scandinavian countries. Their task was to overcome the scorched earth left by the Germans during the Nazi withdrawal.

Under direction of a technical adviser provided by the Finnish Government, they worked with the families of Finns whose homes were being repaired.

MEANS OF SHARING

Dr. Keiter explained philosophy of the "sacredness of work" connected with the workcamp idea, in which manual labor becomes a means of sharing.

He emphasized the Peace Corps should avoid the danger of becoming another handout in which participants are made to feel they are recipients of charity.

Initially, the Peace Corps program will be concerned primarily with teaching and education.

Dr. Keiter voiced hope that participants will not be afraid of manual labor and that such activity would be included in the President's program.

THEIR COMFORT

"The willingness of Americans to leave their comfort and go to Finland after World War II was appreciated by the people with whom we worked," he said.

"Today, the Peace Corps promises a similar appreciation by people who find Americans willing to get out of the seclusion of their ivory towers and become involved in meaningful contacts."

Dr. Daniel S. Allen, professor of history and political science, moderated the panel presentation and questions which followed.

He said the Peace Corps is aimed at destroying the image some persons overseas have of Americans as fat, overstuffed individuals driving overpowered automobiles.

PEACE CORPS

Students questioned whether the Peace Corps is practical.

Several who had served with the Armed Forces in civilian or military capacities said they doubted that Americans could survive at the subsistence level of the natives in some countries overseas.

In general, they agreed that the effect of the Peace Corps would be good if it is operated in practice as it has been ideally proposed.

Dr. Hobbie described her experiences as a teacher at a girls' school in Damascus, at a time when the Arabs were becoming aware of the value of educating women.

WORLD WAR II

She also spoke of her reconciliation activities at a Japanese-American War Relocation Center in northeastern California during World War II.

Dr. Hobbie stressed the importance of obtaining an understanding of people who live in a different culture.

Mr. Hiler, whose home is in Phoenix, is a political science major. He summarized the Peace Corps proposals as made public by various media.

"The program is not limited to the young or college students, but probably will attract the largest number from this age because they are most available and best trained to fit into Peace Corps requirements," he declared.

FIVE GROUPS

He said the Peace Corps proposal involves approaches by five different groups. These are private volunteers, college oversea projects, international agencies, U.S. Government agencies and the Peace Corps itself.

A student asked, "Will a training period of a few months be sufficient to prepare adequately Peace Corps workers with a country?"

"Identification with the people is the most important thing," replied Dr. Hobbie. "If a person is willing to try to understand, the training period will be enough to get him started."

Dr. Keiter said a typical tourist could be overseas for 20 years and not know the people, "but an interested coworker can show by his attitude his willingness to learn new customs and traditions."

EAST GERMANY

Gerhard Sommer, a Hartwick freshman who lived in East Germany under Russian domination, also was heard.

He described the "appalling conditions" in Japan, Korea, and Hong Kong which he saw while serving with a civilian branch of the U.S. Armed Forces.

Mr. Sommer stressed leadership and a strong awareness of the values of democracy as prerequisites for participants in the Peace Corps.

"They must know the language and must know their own point of view," he declared.

OWN COUNTRY

The freshman indicated that ill will exists in these countries because of distrust of occupation forces and incidents between natives and servicemen.

"We had better know the conditions in our own country (United States), too," said Mr. Sommer.

He said he has been in sections of the South where conditions also are "very bad."

Another student said it is highly idealistic to think that Americans can adjust to the living standards of some countries overseas.

NATIVE FOOD

Dr. Hobbie said she does not believe the Peace Corps will be expected to exist "at a subsistence level on native food entirely."

"I managed to live through a period in southeast Asia with a diet primarily at the level of a middle-class native," she declared.

Dr. Keiter questioned the possibility of recruiting only personnel who are "well to do" for the Peace Corps.

"Countries should come into contact with Peace Corps people whose income level is not always the highest," he said.

COLD WAR

"Perhaps the program as proposed will prevent lower income people from becoming members of the Peace Corps."

Still another student asked whether the cold war could be reduced by activities of the Peace Corps.

He was answered by a fellow student, who pointed out that communism is a materialistic ideal and not just a temporary thing.

As the session drew to a close, a student not previously heard characterized the Peace Corps as a way of showing parents that the younger generation are not hollow men.

"We have to prove that we can endure hardships which they think we are too soft to handle," he commented.

We Still Need Bedside Nurses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it is hardly necessary for me to remind you and most of the Members of this body of my lifelong interest in the care of the sick. It was through my efforts that the Public Health Department was able to secure a quarter of a million dollars for an effort to increase the number of students in the larger schools of nursing of the country when in 1942 war had once again emphasized the need for a greatly increased reservoir of trained nurses. Under the leadership of the then Surgeon General Thomas Parran and Miss Pearl McIver, so fine a job was done that when a year later, I presented the bill to establish a U.S. Cadet Nurse Corps both Houses put it through without delay. Some 125,000 young women received their training (a little abbreviated because of the wartime emergency need) during the life of the Corps. Many of these used their GI status to finish out a full training. But the need for additional trained nurses continued.

Reports from many States told of the closing of a large number of smaller schools. My long association with all phases of nursing needs prompted me to try to find out causes. Why were the schools being "partially accredited" or closed by the accreditation committee of the League for Nursing. Why were students not staying in their chosen profession when they had their RN's, and so forth. I sent out a questionnaire to nurses, nursing schools, hospitals, doctors, and so forth. Some 10,000 in all replies poured in. I made the results available to all and sundry. Then with the most responsible advises, I submitted House Joint Resolution 485 of the 84th Congress. Briefly, this would have set up a Commission to gather together the existing research on the subject, and then to set up a program which would bring down-to-earth, practical action into the whole situation. This bill was killed in committee by the ANA and the league. The arguments were that only they could make and evaluate such research and all others must keep their hands off.

Since that time there has been no alleviation of the shortage of RN's. Indeed, the closing of smaller schools continues. One finds the RN at desks doing paperwork and women with no more than perhaps a year's schooling and practice caring for the sick without even an adequate supervisory staff.

No one appreciates more sincerely than I the splendid work of the practical nurse who has had training in the simplier sides of patient care. Indeed, my home city, Cleveland, has one of the outstanding practical nurses training schools in the country, and its graduates are greatly sought. Ohio has a licensing law that protects the sick against the heartful but unprepared person. Toward the end of last Congress, after many years, we finally passed a bill to require licensure of practical nurses in our Nation's Capital.

Very recently there has come into my hands a guest editorial from the Missouri Nurse which reemphasizes the sad fact that the ANA and the League are still unaware or unwilling to act constructively in the results of their continued emphasis upon certain so-called standards—all of them measured by degrees, and their failure to resolve the tragic dearth of trained personnel to care for the sick.

Dr. Scorse's editorial highlights the problem anew. It would seem that the nursing profession would do well to aline itself with the doctors who see the problem from their own and the patients' need as well as with the intelligent, long suffering and knowledgeable, nonprofessionals who too long have been rendered powerless by the prejudices of the group in control of hospitals and nursing schools.

Under unanimous consent, I include the editorial and certain letters from wise medicos of long experience in these areas:

[Guest editorial from the Missouri Nurse]

THE SMALL SCHOOL VERSUS FINANCIAL AID?

(The Missouri Nurse is privileged to present the following editorial in its entirety. It was written by S. W. Scorse, M.D., F.A.C.S., Joplin, and it concerns a problem that is well known to all in the profession. Dr. Scorse was born in Wellington, England, and came to the United States as a teenager. He was graduated from the Medical School of the University of Cincinnati in 1931 and was assistant in surgery at Deaconess and Christ Hospitals in Cincinnati from 1932 through 1939. Dr. Scorse served with the 69th and 100th General Hospitals, U.S. Army, 1941–45, in the China-Burma-India Theater. He is an active member of the American Medical Writer's Association, American Physicians Artist's Association, American Medical Association, Missouri Medical Association, and Jasper County Medical Association.)

(By S. W. Scorse, M.D.)

The shortage of nurses will not be resolved by the paradoxical closing down of the smaller schools of nursing such as was recently done to St. John's Hospital Nursing School.

Having been on the advisory board of the St. John's School of Nursing for several years, I can speak with a little authority and experience; and, from what can be gathered, it seems that the National League of Nurses, which sets the standards of the school, have made it impossible for the smaller nursing schools to cope with the situation. This tragedy, and truly, that's what it is, represents the shortsighted action of a minority group who put educational standards above the realistic resolution of a rather serious national problem.

It would be well for the leaders in the nursing profession to approach the problem much as a few of the foremost medical schools in this country are doing at the present time; recognizing the fact that a big slice of a young man's earning and productive years are taken away in his preparation for being a doctor. They have cut the requirements of premedical education down, to be more compatable with conditions as they exist today.

The 3-year nursing school, to my way of thinking, will always have a place in medical nursing. It cannot be replaced or substituted for the 1-year program of practical nursing. Neither can it be replaced or substituted by the 5-year course entailing a B.S. degree.

The pushing of a pen versus actual good bedside nursing care has been vigorously advocated during the last two decades so that the graduate and registered nurse of today gets far less actual beside nursing than did her predecessors. Neither the nurses nor the doctors appreciated this.

Geographically and strategically located nursing schools are essential to the economy and well-being of our Nation. In all cases of a strategic and a geographic location for a nursing school, however, does not entail its proximity to a higher school of learning whereby they could obtain a bachelor of science degree. The obtaining of a B.S. degrees does not offer the resolution of the nursing situation, either strategically or geographically. It is indeed very unrealistic.

As the wind is blowing now, in 10 years registered nurses will only be obtainable from higher centers of learning, which are usually situated in the larger cities. It can be taken more or less for granted that most of the nurses will remain there. Unfortunately, all the people in the United States do not live in larger cities; and they are the ones that are going to suffer, chiefly because of the fact that the smaller schools scattered throughout the smaller towns in the United States are being closed because of the aforementioned reasons.

The National Nurses Association can be a very powerful deterrent to such a trend. It is going to require vigorous work, organization, and perseverance to prevent the further onslaught of the smaller nursing schools. Being a registered nurse does imply certain very definite responsibilities beyond the scope of merely taking care of patients. One of these responsibilities is that each and every registered nurse should take an active part in their organization on their own level and institute a practical program whereby the smaller schools of the Nation can survive.

The attrition rate of the smaller nursing schools is alarming. It has already assumed serious and critical proportions; and if allowed to go unabated, it can only end in disaster.

Young women by the thousands are being robbed of the national heritage of wanting to be a nurse by the closing down of these smaller schools. Many of these young women who are desirous of becoming nurses find it financially impossible to attend the 5-year schools, so that by allowing this attrition of the smaller schools to continue, we are literally throwing down the drainpipe thousands of potential good nursing candidates. What a waste of manpower—waste is not the proper word; sinful would be better.

To make up for the financial deficit incident to the training of a nurse, several avenues are open; namely: (1) Charging a few cents extra each day for patient care. (2) Obtaining State financial aid. (3) Obtaining Federal financial aid. (4) Make a few compromises here and there and cut down on the amount of affiliation during which time the nurse is away from her home training school.

Certainly St. John's Hospital School of Nursing is to be congratulated for having carried on the fine work it has throughout the many decades insofar as the training of registered nurses is concerned. It is hoped and desired that in the foreseeable future they will again be able to resume the school of nursing.

In conclusion then, this country and this locality is faced with the serious problem of a shortage of trained registered nurses, which is incident to an unrealistic and paradoxical approach to the resolving of nursing standards insofar as they relate themselves to the educational requirement set down by the National League of Nurses. In my opinion, this program is destructive rather than constructive. It is high time, therefore, that a practical resolution to the problem be found and executed.

SPRINGFIELD, MO., *February 8, 1961.*

Re nurses training.

S. W. SCORSE, M.D.,
Docter's Building,
Joplin, Mo.

DEAR SID: Sister Ralph showed me your editorial in the Nursing Journal in which you condemned the progressive closing of nurses' training programs in small hospitals. Your statement that the more highly trained a nurse becomes, the more apt is she to spend most of her time doing paperwork is certainly true. When I was a deputy surgeon of the Second Army and we would put in a requisition for 50 nurses and the Surgeon General's Office would send us down 20 lieutenants, 20 captains, and 10 majors, we would refuse to take the majors on the basis that we needed nurses, not secretaries.

The same thing is true right now on our psychiatric ward. We have two graduate nurses who spend about 80 percent of their time in the nurses' office doing paperwork, typing, etc. I have agitated enough that they have decided to hire someone whom we can train as a ward secretary, thus releasing the two graduate nurses for nursing duties.

The problem which is the subject of your editorial is one that I have had more than a little to do with, not so much because of any position I held, but because of Mary. She was assistant chief of nursing personnel when we were married and she left the service. During the next 2 years that we stayed in Washington many of her old friends in the nursing profession would drop over, and most of these were nurses both in military and civilian life who were very high up in nursing circles. I cannot tell you how many hours I have spent listening to them discuss this very problem.

The best solution that was ever discussed among them was one in which it would be officially recognized that all registered nurses did not have to have the same amount of training, e.g., operating room nurses, bedside nurses, ward supervisors, and nursing educators. Just as various hospitals are approved for only 1 year of residency training, others for 2 years, and others for the full 3 years, hospitals could be accredited for 2 years of nurses' training, 3 years of nurses' training, etc., to fit in with the various levels of registered nurses. There would then be different courses leading to a certificate as a registered bedside nurse, which might require 2 years training; a registered operating room nurse, which might require 3 years training; a registered supervising nurse, which might require 4 years of training; or a registered nurse educator, which might require 5 years training and a B.S. in nursing education, just as any college has different courses leading to various degrees such as B.A., M.A., or Ph. D., yet all are college graduates. In this way, hospitals that could not qualify for accreditation for one of the longer courses might otherwise qualify for one of the shorter courses, rather than as it is now where a hospital either qualifies for all or none, bringing on the difficulties of which you spoke.

However, this thing has been going on now for at least 13 years that I know of, since that is when I was in Washington listening to all of this; and if they have not done anything yet, I don't expect them to do much in the next 13 years.

Oh tempora; Oh mores!

Sincerely,

ALEX L. BROWN, M.D.

KANSAS CITY, MO., *February 13, 1961.*

S. W. SCORSE, M.D.
Joplin, Mo.

DEAR DR. SCORSE: I have just read your very fine editorial in the Missouri Nurse, February issue. I think you are to be congratulated for the very fine presentation and bringing it to a head among the nursing profession. Your feelings in regard to the National League of Nurses is shared by each and every Doctor that is practicing clinical medicine, and unless we state our opinion freely and openly these conditions will continue to grow worse as time goes on. Again, we appreciate this fine article and congratulate you on presenting it in such a fine manner.

Yours truly,

B. W. ANDREWS, M.D.

DISA Delegates Hear About National Milk Sanitation Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on March 10, I had the pleasure of meeting with the delegates to the 42d annual meeting of the Dairy Industries Supply Association and telling them of the work that is being done to enact my proposed national milk sanitation legislation and take the interstate marketing of milk out of the horse-and-buggy era.

As I observed in my speech, these dairy equipment suppliers have a large stake in this type of legislation to permit the free flow of high quality milk from State to State. At the present time, they must go to the added expense of custom-making dairy equipment to meet the varying State and local sanitation regulations. Naturally, the extra expense must be passed along to the purchasers of the equipment and eventually to the consumers of milk.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include my speech to the DISA delegates in the RECORD:

VARYING MILK REGULATIONS ADD TO COST OF DAIRY EQUIPMENT

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was very pleased to accept the invitation to speak to you delegates to the 42d annual meeting of the Dairy Industries Supply Association on a subject that is close to all of us, national milk sanitation legislation.

As a Representative of a dairy district in the dairy State of Wisconsin, I have a longtime and deep-seated interest in the many phases of the dairy industry. This interest has led me into a 4-year fight to correct one of the most unfair and costly milk marketing situations which confronts the dairy industry today. I am referring to the use by all too many States and municipalities of varying, arbitrary, and frequently outdated health standards as trade barriers against the free flow of high quality milk in interstate trade.

As dairy equipment suppliers, you are unhappily familiar with the confusion and unnecessary expense which results from the difference of opinion among many State and local sanitarians about construction requirements for equipment used in handling milk. Dairy equipment is manufactured for sale and installation all over the United States. In the interest of efficiency and economy, it is essential that once an effective standard for a piece of dairy equipment has been established, this standard be universally accepted.

You can well be proud that your organization was a pioneer in the effort to establish a set of sanitary standards for dairy equipment which would provide adequate protection for the public health. As early as the 1920's, the Dairy Industries Supply Association, then known as the Dairy and Ice Cream Machinery and Supplies Association, was working with city, State, and Federal sanitarians in developing what are now known as our 3–A sanitary standards for dairy equipment.

The first rough equivalent of a 3–A sanitary standard was developed in 1929, and applied to sanitary fittings used in milk plants. Throughout the 1930's the work on standards was slowly broadened. Following World War II, the sanitarians, the users, and the manufacturers of equipment began to formulate and publish the standards in the manner in which we know them today.

DISA has continued to make a vital contribution to this program through its task committees, which conduct the initial investigation on any request that a standard be developed for a certain type of equipment. That request may come from a sanitarian, the U.S. Public Health Service, representatives of users or an equipment company. As you know, a proposed standard must undergo thorough examination and considerable revision before it is signed by the chairman of the Committee on Sanitary Procedure of the International Association of Milk and Food Sanitarians, by the Chief of the Milk and Food Branch of the U.S. Public Health Service, by the chairman of the sanitary standards subcommittee of the dairy industry committee, and by the chairman of the DISA technical committee. With all of this study by all interested parties, including the watchdogs of our public health, a 3–A standard is certainly a valid standard for dairy equipment.

However, even though these 3–A standards are recognized as valid and in the public interest, they are not accepted in many areas by local sanitarians who are enforcing that area's particular and frequently peculiar set of milk regulations. As a result, equipment must be custom made to conform with varying standards, and this adds to the cost of the equipment. Naturally, the extra expense must be passed along to the purchasers of the equipment and eventually to the consumers of milk.

In discussing this problem with a Wisconsin manufacturer of bulk milk tanks, I learned his company has to manufacture a special tank for the State of Louisiana, which requires that a pipeline milk hole be added in the bridge of each tank and that a special valve be used on Louisiana installations. The States of New York and Georgia require a special type dipstick, and this means additional manufacturing steps and increased inventory for farm tank manufacturers. One county in Pennsylvania insists upon a stainless steel drip shield around the agitator shaft, even though all other areas accept a

neoprene or hard rubber shield for this purpose.

In the course of my work with national milk sanitation legislation, I have made an extensive study of milk regulations in different areas, particularly those which appear to be using their health rules to create a milk monopoly for local producers. For the life of me, I cannot see what some of those regulations contribute to the production of wholesale, sanitary milk.

Take, for instance, the regulation calling for longer legs than the accepted standard length on bulk milk tanks. I can't imagine what benefits can come from an extra 2 inches of leg on a bulk tank, unless perhaps the local health officials feel the farmers need the additional exercise that is involved in lifting the pails of milk the extra 2 inches. Now I am familiar with the amount of physical labor involved in farming, and I can assure you a farmer really doesn't need any extra exercise. Matter of fact, he could do with less.

Another ridiculous regulation which is used in some areas calls for a mirrorlike finish on the exteriors of bulk milk tanks, which never come in contact with the milk at all. One sanitarian insists that he will not approve a tank unless he can see his reflection when he looks at the equipment. I would suggest that he invest in a pocket mirror for that purpose.

One of our Southern States requires the bulk-milk pickup trucks to have refrigeration capacity to cool the pump compartment as well as the milk tank. Inasmuch as the pump compartment has to be opened at each farm on the trucker's route, you can imagine how much good is derived from this extra refrigeration equipment, which adds an additional $1,700 to the cost of each truck. I might add that only one State has this requirement. All of the other States have found such a regulation to be unnecessary and useless.

Milk is one of our most basic foods. It is also the only one of our major food products which is not allowed to more freely from State to State. In this day and age of modern transportation and refrigeration methods, we are still hampered by a horse-and-buggy type of interstate milk marketing. This works to the disadvantage of you dairy equipment suppliers, the bulk of dairy producers, and last but not least, to the disadvantage of consumers, who eventually have to foot the bill for the costs of custom-made equipment and duplicate inspections of milk.

Under the provisions of my proposed National Milk Sanitation Act, the U.S. Public Health Service's proven Milk Ordinance and Code would be established as the quality yardstick for milk shipped in interstate trade. Fluid milk and fluid milk products meeting the standards of this code could not be kept out of interstate trade because of varying local health rules.

My bill is designed to avoid adding another layer of expensive milk inspections to the existing system. Under the provisions of this measure, dairy plant inspections would continue to be carried on by State and local health officials. The results of their inspections would be certified by the U.S. Public Health Service. Milk from certified plants could move freely from State to State.

Fortunately, we did not have to start from scratch to formulate a good, sound set of uniform standards for quality milk. We already have a proven set of health regulations in the U.S. Milk Code. Designed as a model for the industry, the code is the work of top technical experts in both the health and dairy fields. Since the first code was published in 1924, it has been revised 12 times to keep pace with the rapid improvements in milk processing, handling and shipment. The code has already been voluntarily adopted as the basis for milk sanitation regulations by 36 States and 2,000 cities and municipalities.

However, we still have the hold-outs who are not about to give up their pet theories on milk sanitation to voluntarily accept the Public Health Service's Milk Code. These holdouts are the ones who are causing you to custom-make dairy equipment rather than produce it all on an efficient assembly-line basis.

I might add that the U.S. Milk Code recognizes the validity of your 3–A sanitary standards. The section relating to these standards reads as follows: "Health officers should accept new dairy equipment which complies with the 3–A sanitary standards promulgated jointly by the sanitary standards subcommittee of the dairy industry committee, the committee on sanitary procedure of the International Association of Milk and Food Sanitarians, and the milk and food program, Division of Sanitary Engineering Services, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Equipment manufactured in conformity with 3–A Sanitary Standards complies with the sanitary design and construction standards of this ordinance and code."

Actually, the introduction of my national milk sanitation bill, H.R. 50, on the opening day of the 87th Congress was act three in my fight for this type of legislation. I had introduced my first milk sanitation bill, H.R. 7794, during the 85th Congress, and hearings were held on the measure before the Health and Science Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. The subcommittee did not report the bill to the full committee, and the measure died at the close of the 85th Congress.

However, testimony at those hearings proved very useful to me in pointing out a number of weak spots in the legislation, and I set to work with public health officials to iron out those difficulties. By the time that the 86th Congress opened in 1959, I was ready with an improved milk sanitation bill, the much discussed H.R. 3840. This measure used a new approach to the problem and satisfied the major objections raised to my first milk sanitation measure.

I might add that H.R. 50, my national milk sanitation bill now before the 87th Congress, is almost identical to H.R. 3840. Only a few minor technical changes have been made in order to clarify the wording of several provisions relating to the State milk sanitation rating agency. Therefore, any references which I make to the provisions of H.R. 3840 also apply to H.R. 50.

Objections had been raised to the tendency of my first bill to force all milk up to the standards of the U.S. Milk Code. Many sanitarians were also of the opinion that this bill took away their rights to control the quality of milk shipped within their state or locality.

The new version does not require any State or municipality to adopt the U.S. Milk Code, nor must all milk shipped in interstate commerce conform to the code. However, milk which meets the high standards of the code cannot be excluded from any interstate market on health grounds.

My bill also contains many safeguards for areas receiving milk shipped from certified plants. Local health authorities would retain the right to inspect the milk upon arrival to make sure it had not deteriorated or been mishandled in transit. From there on, the handling, processing and sale of the interstate milk would have to meet the requirements applied to milk entering the market from sources inside the State.

This concept of Federal legislation to eliminate the misuse of milk sanitation regulations was proposed and developed by a committee of the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers. Following the introduction of my original milk sanitation bill, the association set up a committee to study the matter of Federal milk sanitation legislation. A year later, the Committee issued an official report titled "Need and Recommended Principles for Federal Milk Sanitation Legislation."

My bill is in full agreement with the principles set forth by the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers. And when hearings were held on H.R. 3840 in April of last year before the Health and Safety Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the association sent Dr. Russell E. Teague, commissioner of health of Kentucky, to present a strong statement in support of the legislation.

The revised national milk sanitation measure drew much stronger and more varied support than the original bill. When I introduced the first bill, I was joined by two of my colleagues in the House of Representatives, Minnesota Congressman FRED MARSHALL and EUGENE MCCARTHY, who is now Senator MCCARTHY. On the Senate side, the measure was sponsored by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota.

But when I introduced my revised milk sanitation bill, H.R. 3840, 19 other Congressmen introduced identical measures, and the bill had four sponsors in the Senate. To date, my current bill, H.R. 50, has been introduced by 13 Congressmen and has 4 sponsors in the Senate.

When hearings were held on H.R. 3840, so many witnesses appeared that the subcommittee was hard put to hear them all in the 3 days allotted to study of the measure. The list of supporters is an impressive one. In addition to the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers, we had favorable testimony from the National Association of Dairy Equipment Manufacturers; the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; the International Association of Milk and Food Sanitarians; the Dairymen's League Cooperative Association of New York; the General Federation of Women's Clubs; the National Consumer's League; the Connecticut Milk Consumers Association, Inc.; the National Creameries Association; the Pure Milk Association of Chicago; the State Farmers Unions and Farm Bureau of Wisconsin and Minnesota; the Wisconsin Association of Cooperatives; the Wisconsin Council of Agricultural Cooperatives; the Governors of Wisconsin and Minnesota; the sanitary engineers from the North Carolina State Board of Health, and many other interested groups and individuals.

The bill received a favorable report from the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Commerce and the Bureau of the Budget. The Department of Agriculture remained uncommitted on the measure. When asked if Agriculture opposed the bill, a USDA witness replied: "No, but neither do we favor it."

However, when H.R. 50 comes up for hearings, I am hopeful that the Department of Agriculture will join the ranks of active supporters. Our new Secretary of Agriculture, former Minnesota Governor Orville Freeman, has always supported this type of legislation, and testified strongly in its behalf during the hearings on H.R. 3840.

President Kennedy endorsed the principles of national milk sanitation legislation at a midwestern farm meeting held in Des Moines, Iowa, last August. He noted that our constitutional convention was originally formed in order to promote interstate commerce and provide for its free flow. He added that he didn't believe any unnecessary or artificial standard should be used in any area in any part of American life to block the flow of commerce.

Incidentally, the 1960 Republican Party platform endorsed the National Milk Sanitation proposal, so both parties are on record in favor of the legislation.

Shortly after I introduced H.R. 50, I was pleased to learn that the American Public Health Association had gone on record in favor of the National Milk Sanitation measure. This action was taken by the association's governing council, which passed a resolution calling for enactment of legislation to permit the free flow of high quality milk from State to State. The association is the major organization of public health officials in the United States, having over 13,400 members. Significantly enough, this association seldom takes a position on proposed national legislation. National milk sanitation and Federal water pollution control are two of the few exceptions made to this rule by the association.

I understand that we are going to have a question and answer session following my talk. The question I hear most frequently is: What are the chances for passage of national milk sanitation legislation during the 87th Congress? Lacking a crystal ball, I can only assess the progress which has been made in this direction since I introduced my first milk sanitation bill and note the steadily snowballing support for this type of legislation.

As I mentioned before, my original milk sanitation bill received hearings but was not reported out by the subcommittee. My revised measure, H.R. 3840, had hearings and was favorably reported by the Health and Safety Subcommittee to the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. However, the full committee took no action on the bill, so it never reached the floor of the House for a vote. This year, I am pressing for early hearings before the full Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and I am optimistic about the possibility of getting them.

Eventually, Federal legislation must come in this field, and the sooner it does, the better for the general welfare of the citizens of this country. Our present system of Balkanized milk markets benefits only the small minority of milk producers who are protected by these local milk monopolies. The perverted use by some States and municipalities of sanitary regulations as trade barriers against high-quality milk from other areas, works a hardship on you as dairy equipment suppliers. It works a hardship on your customers in the dairy industry. And it works a hardship on all of us as consumers.

Sanitary regulations should be used only to protect the public health, not for the protection of local monopolies. No one can question the fact that the U.S. Public Health Service has always been and always will be a zealous watchdog of our public health. For this reason, my national milk sanitation legislation calls for the use of the Public Health Service's Milk Code as the quality yardstick for milk moving in interstate trade and provides that the program be administered by the Public Health Service. I strongly feel that this is good, sound legislation and should be enacted into law as soon as possible.

Thank you for asking me to take part in your meeting. It has been a pleasure for me to be here.

Federal Excise Tax on Jewelry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the Kansas Retail Jewelers Association, I wish to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the association relative to the excise tax on jewelry. I believe this resolution should be considered in the overall study of tax revision:

To the Honorable U.S. Congress:

Whereas the 180 members of the Kansas Retail Jewelers Association request that the Federal excise tax on jewelry be transferred from the retail to the manufacturer's level in order that they may eliminate the unfair competition and discrimination against the products they must sell to sustain a livelihood; and

Whereas there is a definite relationship between those taxed products which the jeweler sells, competing with other items sold as gifts in substantial quantities which are untaxed, and taxed at the manufacturer's level. These items, therefore, discriminate against the jeweler. This tax acts as a deterrent to sales. The effect of the increase of the cost of the taxed article to the consumer, acts as a brake on sales. This was, in fact, the original purpose of the tax. That is, it was intended to cut down the sales of certain items in a wartime economy. The need to curtail sales has long passed—the present need is for more production and consumption to fit the needs and to expand our economy. This tax acts in exactly the opposite way; and

Whereas this tax is difficult and costly to administer. Not only is a hardship placed upon the small retail jeweler who ordinarily does not have a complete accounting department to calculate, collect, and remit this tax on behalf of the Government; but it is extremely costly for the Government to administer this tax since there are so many outlets from which this tax must be collected. Manufacturers ordinarily have complete bookkeeping departments to calculate, collect, and remit. Therefore, transferring this tax to the manufacturer's level would not only grant relief to the small jeweler, but would also simplify collection on the Government's behalf because of the relatively small number of retailers and so-called wholesale retailers from which this tax is collected. Therefore, this would not only reduce the costs substantially, by saving the Government money administering the tax, but would plug many loopholes on the literally thousands of items where the tax status is doubtful, and the collection of the tax often has led to arbitrary practices. This would also increase revenues by plugging the loopholes in tax collection by taxing the article at its source—the manufacturer's level, thereby eliminating many items sold through certain outlets, etc., on which the tax is overlooked: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Kansas Retail Jewelers Association and its 180 members respectfully request and urge the Honorable Congress of the United States of America to take immediate action toward transferring this 10 percent Federal excise tax on jewelry at the retail level to a 10 percent Federal excise tax at the manufacturer's level thereby:

1. Eliminating unfair and discriminatory competition.

2. Removing sales deterrents placed in wartime for the duration and six months, to discourage sales of jewelry; thus fulfilling a need for more production by encouraging consumption, providing a much-needed expansion and employment in our economy.

3. Lowering administrative costs to the Government giving needed savings of tax dollars.

4. Removing loopholes to increase revenues by taxing the article at its source.

5. Relieving the hardships placed on the small businessman by removing from him the responsibility of calculating, collecting, and remitting this burdensome tax.

Excessive Importation of Lamb and Mutton Must Be Curbed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday I introduced H.R. 5935, which reads as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph 702 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C., sec. 1001, par. 702) is amended by inserting "(a)" after "702." and by adding the following subparagraph:

"(b)(1) Sheep, lambs, mutton, and lamb, provided for in subparagraph (a), entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, during any calendar year, in excess of the average annual quantity thereof imported during the five-year period ending December 31, 1960, shall be subject to duty at the following rates, in addition to any other duties imposed upon the importation of such articles:

"Mutton and lamb, 10 cents per pound.

"Sheep and lambs, $1.50 per head.

"(2) The quantity of the above articles entitled to enter under this subparagraph during the unexpired portion of the calendar year 1961 without payment of additional duty shall be the annual quota quantity less one-twelfth thereof for each full calendar month that has expired in such year."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall take effect as soon as practicable, on a date to be specified by the President in a notice to the Secretary of the Treasury following such negotiations as may be necessary to effect a modification or termination of any international obligation of the United States with which the amendment might conflict, but in any event not later than sixty days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. Speaker, the need for this legislation becomes apparent when we survey the vast increase in the imports of lamb and mutton, especially during the past 3 years, from countries with much lower production costs than ours. I am alarmed because dressed lamb is being landed in this country, duty and freight paid, and offered to our retail outlets at prices 10 to 15 cents per pound below our dressed market. Making the situation even more critical is the fact that lamb and mutton imports are arriving here at a time when our own live lamb market is experiencing a 15-year low in prices.

Even though Australian and New Zealand meat board officials, as well as American packers and importers, have given assurance that it is not their intention to injure the American lamb producers through the importations of lamb and mutton, there arrived in Newark, N.J., early this month the S.S. *Essex* from Australia with 220½ tons of lamb cuts and 2,016,512 pounds of boneless mutton. It arrived here right in the midst of the lowest U.S. lamb prices since the end of World War II.

In view of this record, who can say the imports are not excessive, and who can say that these excessive imports have not and are not now doing serious dam-

age to our domestic producers? The record speaks for itself. Five years ago, before the massive upsurge in imporattions of lamb and mutton began, our lamb market was fairly stable and steady. The domestic demands were being met. But 5 years later, after the vast increase in imports, what do we find? We find the American lamb growers getting the lowest prices for their lambs since World War II.

The bill I have introduced would not prevent 1 pound of lamb or mutton from coming into the United States. It simply provides that whenever in any calendar year imports exceed those based on the a verage annual quantity imported during a 5-year period, that the tariff would be increased from present extremely low levels on the remaining quantity shipped in during the year. This would partially compensate for the increased costs of production in this country.

Lamb producers in the United States, through research, breeding programs, promotion, and through innovations in greater operating efficiency, such as fencing, reseeding, health measures, and conservation practices, are endeavoring to reduce costs of production. Progress has been made. But it is obvious that even with very peak efficiency, high operating costs in the United States would prevent our ever being able to produce lambs which could compete pricewise with those from New Zealand, Australia, and Iceland.

Let us again look at the record. Dressed lamb imports rose from 1.4 million pounds in 1955 to an alltime high of 12.4 million pounds in 1960. Last year mutton imports so overshadowed the market that prices for domestic ewes dropped to approximately $2.75 per hundredweight live. In many cases this would not even pay freight and handling charges from the ranch to the market.

While shipments of live lambs are halted at the present, at least temporarily, such imports could again become a threat as they did last year. Duties on live lambs have been reduced from $3 per head in the Tariff Act of 1930 to 75 cents per head. My bill provides for a partial restoration of this duty, or an increase to $1.50 per head whenever lamb imports in any 1 year exceed the average annual importations for a 5-year period.

Mr. Speaker, it is evident that my bill is a fair one, not only from the standpoint of our own growers but also as applied to our friends who choose to make use of the American market for disposal of their lamb and mutton. An escape clause action under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Act would permit maximum duties considerably higher than those set forth in this bill.

Ever-increasing importations of lamb and mutton furnishes a good example of how an American industry can be seriously adversely affected as a result of our foreign trade policies of the past 25 years. We must encourage foreign trade, but in the administration of our trade policies let us not lose sight of the well-being of our own people. Other countries do not hesitate to protect their own people against the adverse effect of excessive imports. Why should we not do as much for our citizens?

I know a great number of my colleagues share my concern over domestic industry and job losses occasioned by the flood of imports. It is my hope that prompt and favorable consideration can be given this bill by the Ways and Means Committee.

Lifting of Ban on Importation of Russian Crabmeat Ignores U.S. Fishing Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, as a result of numerous complaints from interested constituents, my attention was attracted to an administration proposal to lift the ban on the importation of Russian crabmeat into the United States.

I immediately addressed a letter to the Secretary of State, The Honorable Dean Rusk, protesting any such action, in the strongest possible language. My objections were based on the effect the policy decision would inevitably have on the economy of the vital fishing industry in my district and State of Washington.

I deliberately avoided any reference to the obvious appeasement implication in the lifting of this ban. That letter was mailed on March 16. Four days later, on March 20, I was advised by telephone that within 30 minutes the Treasury Department would formally announce by means of a press release the lifting of the ban.

Three days later, on March 23, the State Department finally favored me with a "too little and too late" reply to my formal protest. Too late in that the announcement had already been made and too little, by way of justification of the decision—and I quote from the State Department's letter:

> The Secretary of the Treasury, pursuant to his responsibilities, under the applicable law, (sec. 307 of the United States Tariff Act), found that there is no current evidence that prison or forced labor is still being used in the production of Soviet canned crabmeat. On the basis of this judgment, he determined that the prohibition should be removed.

The fallacy of this argument is obvious. Indeed, it would be laughable were we not dealing with such a serious matter involving the foreign policy of the United States.

But I challenge either the State Department or the Treasury Department to produce documented evidence of any proper investigation to determine whether or not Soviet canned crabmeat is still packaged by slave or prison labor.

Neither the CIA or any other cloak-and-dagger agency has filed any report to substantiate this statement. Consequently, the only obvious current evidence is that furnished by the Kremlin itself.

If my judgment is wrong in this instance, then let the administration's policymakers present documented evidence to support their statement "that prison or forced labor" is not currently being used in the production of Soviet canned crabmeat.

Furthermore, the untimely haste involved in finalizing a policy decision involving, as it does, an important segment of our domestic economy, is certainly subject to critical review and censure. Why was the fishing industry never consulted or invited to express its view?

If the fishermen and the fishing industry of the Pacific Northwest are to be the expendable shock troops in this friendly gesture to the Kremlin, they should at least be told what they are dying for. Instead, and by administrative edict, to paraphrase the gladiators of ancient Rome, the fishermen of America can only stand before the State Department and say "We who are about to starve salute you."

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge that the House Committee on Foreign Affairs undertake an investigation of this policy decision, so destructive to the vital fishing industry in the Pacific Northwest. Otherwise, I predict that the housewives of America will enter the fray, wielding the most potent weapon of all, a national boycott against the purchase of Soviet crabmeat—crabmeat tainted, either directly or indirectly, with the blood of freedom-loving people from all four corners of the earth.

President of Inter-American Press Association Diagnoses "Yankee Imperialism" Smear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the editor of La Nacion, San Jose, Costa Rica, and president of the Inter-American Press Association, addressed the recent meeting of the directors of the press association on "Yankee imperialism."

Mr. Ricardo Castro Beeche told the newspapermen what "Yankee imperialism" has really meant to the world and clearly refutes statements which Soviet propagandists use in an attempt to embarrass the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the Nashville Banner reprinted Mr. Beeche's very excellent tribute to this country in its March 23 issue and I ask unanimous consent that the article be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

WHAT IS "YANKEE IMPERIALISM"?—SACRIFICE FOR OTHERS, LATIN EDITOR SAYS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—While blackguards rant, with posters and utterances translated "Yankee, Go Home," there still are voices of

reason rebuking that canard with truth. While Castroites in the Caribbean or closer home vilify the United States to woo Latin America into their camp of malice and contempt—there are men with respect for facts and the courage to employ them in answer to the screed of hate. Ricardo Castro Beeche, editor of La Nación, San José, Costa Rica, is such a man. He is president of the Inter-American Press Association. Two weeks ago, at the Acapulco meeting of IAPA directors, he diagnosed the "Yankee imperialism" smear. Because of his tribute to our country, the Banner is publishing his remarks.)

Yankee imperialism means a country that has gone to two World Wars with enormous sacrifice of lives and money and which hasn't taken a single inch of land from the beaten countries.

It means a nation which devoted hundreds of millions of dollars for the reconstruction of the defeated countries after the war through the Marshall plan—and these are the very countries whose people were victims of their own dictatorial governments.

Yankee imperialism is a country which has spent millions of dollars in technical assistance and in food over all these years in order to have many people of the world from hunger and misery. Yankee imperialism says a man has a right to happiness through a worthy life.

Perhaps Soviets could tell us how this compares with the imperialism which Russia exercises. The Soviets maintain all the countries defeated and occupied by them under their yoke without freedom at all; and moreover, they try through subversive means to destroy the democracies in order to make themselves the lords and masters of the world.

Washington Daily News Publishes Anfuso Article on U.S. Science Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, today's issue of the Washington Daily News carries a special 24-page section on "Science in the Nation's Capital," containing many interesting articles which show that Washington is rapidly becoming the science city of America.

Among the articles published, is one written by me and entitled "Why Not a U.S. Science Academy Here?" in which I discuss the proposal to establish a Science Academy. As my colleagues well know, I had introduced a bill H.R. 1 on the first day of the present session. It so happens that today and tomorrow the House Science and Astronautics Subcommittee, of which I am the chairman, is holding hearings on this bill. This is, therefore, very timely and for this reason I wish to insert my article into the RECORD:

WHY NOT A U.S. SCIENCE ACADEMY HERE?
(By Representative V. L. ANFUSO)

I have had bills in the previous two Congresses advocating the establishment of a Science Academy along somewhat different lines. The new bill, H.R. 1, has been completely rewritten after consultations with leading scientists, educators, and Government officials, and after hearings held in recent months by a House Science and Astronautics Subcommittee of which I am chairman.

The proposal to establish a National Science Center is intended to meet future national needs for trained manpower and new scientific knowledge, and also to help win the scientific and technical phase of the cold war. As proposed in the bill, the Science Center would be comprised of:

THE BEST

First. An educational institution of the highest caliber to be known as the National Science Academy, intended for both undergraduate and postgraduate studies in science and engineering.

Second. Research institutes in various scientific fields for the promotion of scientific knowledge and research to advance the Nation's economy, health, welfare, and progress.

Third. A Scientific Career Service for obtaining and retaining the personnel necessary to carry out the scientific, technological and research functions of the U.S. Government. Graduates of the Science Academy and other qualified persons able to meet its standards would be eligible for placement in the Scientific Career Service.

COEDUCATIONAL

The educational institution would be open to young men and young women desiring to make a career in science, while the research institutes would invite outstanding scientists to work in their laboratories on scientific, medical, and other projects designed to benefit humanity.

The realization of my proposal would unquestionably have a beneficial impact on scientific progress and education in this country, and it would also go far in building up the image of America as a nation devoted to the utilization of science for the benefit of all mankind and for the attainment of a peaceful world. A science center of this type, dedicated to peaceful purposes, would help raise our prestige in the eyes of all nations to new and greater heights.

GRADUATE WORK

Graduate training will be provided for those who have completed undergraduate studies at accredited schools and possess special qualifications for graduate work in the sciences. A 6-year straight-line program leading to a doctor's degree is authorized for undergraduates. Also authorized are a program of college scholarships in science and engineering at other schools and a program of graduate fellowships both at the research institutes of the Academy and at other colleges and universities.

Research institutes in specialized fields of science are to be established, among them an Institute of Meteorology, an Institute of Oceanography, an Institute of Astronautics, an Institute of Medicine, and others deemed necessary.

A limited number of foreign nationals from friendly countries may be admitted, provided they pass a security check, but their number shall not exceed 10 percent of the total number of science trainees attending the Academy.

The proposed Science Center would be nonmilitary in nature and would emphasize the peaceful pursuits of the United States in the sciences, which can and must be separated from military scientific research. It would compete with the so-called Freedom University in Moscow by inviting foreign students to come to the United States to study and to develop into mature scientists able to help their underdeveloped countries. Here they could pursue their studies and research in freedom, observe our way of life, and become convinced of our peaceful intentions.

"GAP"

The Science Center would fill a gap presently existing in trained scientific personnel by providing education and training for young men and young women who, under present circumstances, could not obtain such an education. Outstanding graduate students and noted scientists from all over the country would be attracted to the Academy and its research institute. Creation of a Science Career Service would elevate the scientist's stature in the public eye as a man interested in the promotion of human welfare and peace. At the same time, the U.S. Government would be guaranteed of a sufficient supply of scientists in this fast-moving era of world competition.

The research institutes, which we would strive to make the largest in the world, would provide the most modern facilities available for research. The best scientific brains from our own country, as well as selected scientists from abroad, would be invited to work there.

There is no need to stress the importance of the basic and engineering sciences in the world today. My bill would go a long way toward meeting our most urgent national problems in science and engineering: The shortages of trained manpower (and womanpower) for private and public employment, of qualified science teachers, and of facilities and funds for scientific research. The bill would also help to overcome our lag compared with the U.S.S.R. in the annual number of graduates both in engineering and in many forms of natural science.

REDS AHEAD

In 1959, for example, the U.S.S.R. produced about three times as many graduate engineers as the United States. The figures given by our National Science Foundation show 38,000 graduating in the United States, compared with 106,000 in the U.S.S.R. More surprising still, the United States is lagging even in the total number of professional engineers: 850,000 compared with the Soviet figure of 894,000. In graduates specializing in purely scientific studies, apart from engineering, the only field in which we lead the U.S.S.R. at the present time is the physical and mathematical sciences.

The Science Academy and its research institutes would serve to stimulate the people of the underdeveloped countries in furthering their economic growth, in improving their national health, in developing their human and material resources, and in attaining a higher standard of living. In this way, we could be instrumental in creating through science a world of abundance where no people need be in want. In the years to come, this important institution would pay for itself in many ways through better education, advanced research, scientific progress, and good will.

Not So Flexible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in view of the greater than usual budget-busting request for foreign-aid handouts, an editorial which appeared in Chicago's American on March 21 is a vivid reminder to the Congress that the entire

program should receive a thorough and nonpartisan discussion this year.

NOT SO FLEXIBLE

We Americans like to boast of the flexibility of our thinking, but our foreign-aid efforts keep demonstrating that we don't really have much of it. At least those Americans who are sent to design and build facilities in foreign countries often don't.

Take those barracks for the Pakistani tank force, which the United States military-aid people have built at Kharian. As the House Foreign Affairs Committee has reported, building them cost the American taxpayers $83 million and they are replete with costly fixtures which bemuse the Pakistani tankmen.

These include huge walk-in refrigerators in the messhalls. They were designed to keep the meat supply fresh until it can be cooked and served. But the soldiers are Moslems, and the Moslem religion prefers that the animals be killed the same day the meat is to be eaten. So the meat never goes into the refrigerators. It comes into the station on the hoof and easily stays fresh long enough to get into the pot.

Also, the barracks washrooms are equipped with long rows of shaving mirrors. The Pakistani finds these admirable but baffling.

A Pakistani soldier doesn't shave when he gets up in the morning. He doesn't shave himself at all. He waits until siesta time, then squats companionably face to face with an itinerant barber, also squatting, and gets shaved.

The refrigerators and shaving mirrors demonstrate, we're afraid, a rather shocking one-trackness in the world-saving American mind. The Americans who installed them were thinking only of what they would want installed in a kitchen and in a washroom, not of what the Pakistani would want.

And maybe this partly explains our failure to buy more love abroad with our do-gooding.

Civil War Reminiscences Have Special Meaning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, one of the few remaining Civil War widows in Wisconsin lives in my home district at the town of Elmwood, Wis. As we observe the Civil War centennial during these troubled times, her reminiscences of her husband's devotion to his country take on a special meaning. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD Mrs. Maud Green's story as it appeared in the Elmwood Argus:

ELMWOOD CIVIL WAR WIDOW IS ONE OF FEW REMAINING IN WISCONSIN

Mrs. Maud Smith, a familiar figure to Elmwood residents as she takes her almost daily walk to the post office and cheerily greets her friends in passing, was featured in a story in the Eau Claire Leader this week.

Mrs. Maud I. Smith, 87, has an apartment in the Leo Manor home and has walked the five blocks to the business district many times in the 14 years she has lived in Elmwood. Cold weather doesn't stop her nor do the hints from her daughter, Mrs. Earl DeLong, Elmwood, that she restrict her travel. Talking about that advice to a third person, Mrs. Smith confided jokingly, "Things have certainly changed. I used to tell her what to do." A son, Ira, also lives in Elmwood.

Mrs. Smith married Willard H. Smith December 4, 1900, and they lived in Eau Galle. She had met him when he stopped at the farm to pick up cream and remembers him as a good man and a fine father. She was born in the town of Rock Elm.

Smith was born in New York State but grew up around Eau Galle and worked as a youth for a lumber company, piloting a boat in the summer and cooking in the camps during the winter.

In March of 1864 he enlisted at Eau Galle in company E of the 37th Wisconsin Infantry and served in the Army of the Potomac under Grant at Spotsylvania, Cold Harbor, and 10 months in the siege of Petersburg before Richmond fell. He was present at Appomattox and took part in the Grand Review in Washington receiving his discharge in July 1865.

He was wounded in the left leg at Reams Station, Va., and spent 16 days in a hospital. After the war he was commander of the John Green Post of the GAR for 12 years. He farmed about 7 miles southwest of Eau Galle for many years.

He first married in 1872. Of the eight children by that marriage, four sons and a daughter survive. They are Milton, Harrison, Mrs. Cora Klatt, Elmwood, Harwood, of Eau Claire, and Edwin, Madison.

Mrs. Smith and Mrs. DeLong both recall his devotion to his country. The American flag was always flown on holidays and Memorial Day services were one of the highlights of each year. He was 56 years old when he married Maud Smith and she was 27.

Smith was a Dunn County board supervisor for 17 years and its chairman for 4. He was a school district clerk for 20 years and served one term as sheriff. He was also active in Masonic affairs. He died September 26, 1929.

Mrs. Smith reads a veterans' paper, "The National Tribune" regularly. "What little housework there is to do doesn't take me very long," she says. Her hearing isn't as good as it once was but it doesn't interfere with her sense of humor.

Lower Missouri Basin Under Attack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, although competition with the Soviets seems to be the watchword, it has been proven time and time again that only by cooperation with one another can we in the United States achieve the orderly and dynamic progress that has characterized, for instance, the development of the whole Missouri Basin under the Pick-Sloan plan. The Kansas City Star of March 21, has commented editorially on some recent developments in that connection, and I would like to draw the attention of the entire Congress to the situation as outlined in the editorial which, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert at this point in the RECORD:

LOWER MISSOURI BASIN UNDER ATTACK

After many months of threats the public power interests of the upper Missouri Basin have moved to seize the main benefit of the upstream reservoirs for the upriver States. Speaking through their Senators, they have asked the President to shut off the flow of impounded waters for use downstream in Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, and Iowa.

The attack, specifically, is aimed at stopping the flow of water for navigation. But the scope of the assault is much broader. The Missouri River program (the Pick-Sloan plan) was set up for the development of the Missouri Basin through all the benefits that come from flood control and the impounding of water behind the big dams. To the upriver States hydroelectric power is the basis for industrial development and irrigation is the means of developing agriculture.

Farther down the river, the hope for industrial growth depends on a bountiful supply of water for industries and low-cost barge transportation for the bulk commodities used by industry.

The proposal for shutting off the flow of water would deny the downriver States their share in the growth promised by the tremendous tax investment in the greatest series of reservoirs ever built by man. Of course, it would leave the downriver States with the benefits of flood control which is very important. But far more was promised by the Pick-Sloan plan.

If this move succeeds it will be a conspicious failure to keep faith by upriver States. The dams were made possible only because the whole basin joined in a common effort.

Prior to the Pick-Sloan plan the upper and lower river States fought for their special interests and got nowhere. The dry northern States tried to sell the Department of Interior plan for irrigation and public power with the participation of the States downstream. Their spokesman was W. G. Sloan, of the Interior Department.

At the same time the downstream interests gave their support to the Corps of Engineers plan for Missouri River development. The Corps of Engineers concentrated on flood control and the stored water that could be used for navigation and industrial growth. The spearhead of this plan was Col. Lewis A. Pick (later Chief of Engineers and a lieutenant general).

At the end of World War II, the two conflicting groups faced the fact that neither could succeed alone. They joined forces and Congress put the two plans together into the one big program known as the Pick-Sloan plan.

Working together for their mutual purposes, the two groups and the two departments of Government were able to achieve an unprecedented series of manmade dams. The reservoirs now extend all the way from the South Dakota-Nebraska line to the far reaches of the river in northern Montana.

This great public works project is a monument to cooperation. It has already virtually ended the threat of big floods on the main stem of the Missouri. Several more years may be required to give the reservoirs the amount of water intended for permanent storage.

Already it has been possible to raise the commitments for hydroelectric power above the original plan. The lower river States are beginning to feel the benefit of an assured supply of water. But the overall development expected from the Pick-Sloan plan is still in its early stages. If it continues as planned the future is almost limitless.

Now the big job is to keep the principle that made the Pick-Sloan plan possible. That principle is cooperation—cooperation for the benefit of the whole Missouri Basin. If the upriver States were permitted to get by with their destructive maneuver the

whole cause of American river development would suffer. No part of the country would be able to count on any commitments that might be made by an administration or Congress.

We would say this is the time for all Congressmen and Senators in this part of the country to start fighting. And the challenge should stir action among all other Members of Congress who believe in the multiple purposes of sound river development.

Reports Submitted by Department of Interior on Wilderness Preservation System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD copies of the reports submitted by the Department of the Interior to the chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on my bill, H.R. 1762, and similar legislation to create a national system of wilderness preservation. The administration has endorsed such legislation.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., March 17, 1961.

DEAR MR. ASPINALL: Your committee has requested reports on H.R. 293, H.R. 299, H.R. 496, H.R. 776, H.R. 1762, H.R. 1925, and H.R. 2008, all of which relate to the establishment of a national wilderness preservation system.

We urge the enactment of this proposed legislation for the establishment of a national wilderness preservation system. We recommend that it be amended in conformance with a similar proposal, S. 174, and our suggested amendments thereon, as set forth in our report of February 24, 1961, copies of which are enclosed.

Wilderness resources contain basic values and provide undeniable benefits to the American people. Establishment of a wilderness system is in the public interest and we believe the current proposals recognize equitably the various facets to the problem of wilderness preservation. We believe that many if not all of the objections that have been raised in the past to wilderness proposals are resolved by the current bills.

These proposals would delimit the wilderness system to well-defined areas and would prescribe an orderly method for establishment of the system. Also, these proposals prescribe sound procedures applicable to both executive and legislative branches of the Government in determining the particular areas or parts of Federal reservations to be included in the wilderness system.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that, subject to your consideration of our recommended amendments, the enactment of this proposed legislation would be in accord with the President's program.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES K. CARR,
Acting Secretary of the Interior.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., February 24, 1961.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: Your committee has requested a report on S. 174, a bill to establish a national wildlife preservation system for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes.

We urge the enactment of this proposal. We suggest hereafter certain minor amendments to the bill that we believe would be desirable.

Wilderness resources contain basic values and provide undeniable benefits to the American people. We believe this has been amply demonstrated from the previous hearings of your committee on wilderness proposals. In our opinion, the establishment of a wilderness ssytem, along the lines outlined in this bill, is in the public interest.

This proposal recognizes equitably the various facets to the problem of wilderness preservation. We believe that it resolves many, if not all, of the objections that have been raised in the past to wilderness proposals. It clearly delimits the wilderness system to well-defined areas and prescribes an orderly method for establishment of the system. It prescribes sound procedures applicable to both the executive and legislative branches of the Government in determining the particular areas or parts of Federal reservations to be included in the wilderness system.

The system to be established by this bill would be composed of federally owned lands. Portions of the National Park System, wildlife refuges, and game ranges administered by this Department, and portions of the national forests administered by the Department of Agriculture would be included in the system. It should be noted in this connection that the National Park System areas, wildlife refuges, and game ranges that we administer would not be included immediately following enactment of the proposal in the wilderness system. Portions of these areas would be selected and included in this system over a 10-year period, in accordance with prescribed procedures set forth in the bill. In the case of the national forest areas, however, there would be included in the wilderness system immediately upon enactment of the legislation those national forest areas classified by the Department of Agriculture as wilderness, wild, primitive, or canoe. The primitive group of areas, however, would be subject to subsequent review over a 15-year period in order to determine which of these areas should be retained in the system.

One of the major provisions of the bill is contained in section 3(h). This subsection provides that the addition of new wilderness areas to the system or the elimination of the areas from the system that are not specifically provided for by the bill shall be made only after specific authorization by law for such addition or elimination. We believe this requirement is desirable.

Section 2 of the bill contains a statement of policy that would express the desire of the Congress to secure for present and future generations the benefits of an enduring resource of wilderness. Sections 2 and 6 contain the general provisions that would govern the administration of wilderness areas as well as prescribe the purposes and uses of the system. Significantly, the bill provides that the system shall be administered for the use and enjoyment of the American people, in such manner as will leave the system unimpaired for future use and enjoyment as wilderness, and so as to provide for the protection of the areas, and the preservation of the wilderness character. This provision is very similar to the requirements now applicable, pursuant to the basic National Park Act of 1916 (16 U.S.C. 1–3), to the National Park System. On this point we observe that wilderness type areas constitute an important segment of the National Park System and have contributed heavily over the years to the enjoyment by the American people of wilderness values.

We believe that section 6(a) is worthy of special note. This subsection provides that nothing in the act shall be interpreted as interfering with the purposes stated in the establishment of or pertaining to, any park, monument, or other unit of the National Park System, or any national forest, wildlife refuge, game range, or other area involved, except that any agency administering any area within the wilderness system shall be responsible for preserving the wilderness character of the area and shall so administer such area for such other purposes and also to preserve its wilderness character. This provision, we believe, has the effect of preserving the status quo to the maximum extent in the management of the Federal reservations in question, subject however to the overall requirement that the administering agencies carry out the essential requirements set forth in the bill for wilderness preservation.

While the bill prohibits, consistently with wilderness preservation, as prescribed in section 6(b), commercial enterprises within the wilderness system, roads, motor vehicles, motorized equipment, et cetera, it provides in section 6(c)(4) that commercial services may be performed within the wilderness system to the extent necessary for activities which are proper for realizing the recreational or other purposes of the system.

In addition to the general provisions relating to administration of the wilderness system, there are specific provisions in the bill that are applicable to national forest areas. These provisions would permit certain uses to continue that are already well established within the forest areas in question. Also, certain additional uses may be authorized by the President upon his determination that such use or uses in the specific area will better serve the interests of the United States and the people thereof than will its denial. In the case of wildlife refuges and game ranges, the bill provides that any existing use or form of appropriation authorized or provided for in the Executive order or legislation establishing such areas and which use exists on the effective date of the act may be continued under such authorization or provision. In this connection, we note that the bill makes no provision for special uses within the National Park System. We believe this is appropriate and is consistent with long established policies and standards, established by the Congress for administration of that system.

There are other provisions that are worthy of mention. Boundary adjustments may be made in wilderness areas in accordance with certain prescribed procedures whereby the appropriate Secretary after public notice and hearing, subsequent recommendations to the President and transmittal of such recommendations to the Congress the boundary adjustment may be accomplished if the Congress makes no objection thereto. We note that in the case of areas of the National Park System the bill provides for the inclusion of those areas of more than 5,000 acres where such areas exist without roads. The Secretary would be required to determine what portions of the parks would be required for roads, utilities, et cetera. The bill contains no minimum acreage limitations regarding wildlife refuges and game ranges to be included in the system.

We recommend the following amendments to this bill:

1. On page 5, line 7, strike out the word "ten" and insert in lieu thereof the word "fifteen".

This amendment is suggested in the interest of uniformity. Fifteen years are allowed in the bill for the review of certain national forest areas to determine their suitability for inclusion in the wilderness system. We believe that National Park System areas, as well as the wildlife refuges and game ranges, should be governed by the same requirement.

2. On page 6, line 16, beginning with the word "Further" strike out the language in the sentence up to and including the word

"area" in line 20, and substitute in lieu thereof "The purposes of this Act are hereby declared to be within and supplemental to but not in interference with the purposes for which parks, monuments, and other units of the National Park System are administered".

This amendment is desirable in the interest of clarification. It is in harmony with a similar provision relating to national forests in section 3(b)(2).

3. On page 7, line 10, strike out the word "ten" and insert in lieu thereof the word "fifteen".

As previously explained regarding a similar amendment relating to national parks, this amendment is suggested for the purposes of uniformity. If this amendment is adopted, in the interest of promoting further clarification, the next amendment would be desirable.

4. On page 7, line 10, insert a period immediately following the word "Act" and strike out the rest of the sentence beginning with ", and" in line 10 and ending with the word "jurisdiction." in line 16.

5. On page 8, line 10, following the words "shall" insert ", if found to be justified by the Secretary,".

6. On page 9, revise line 8 to read "(g) Public notice when given by either the Secretary of the".

We consider this amendment to be desirable in the interest of clarification. Subsection (g) provides that "The public notice by either the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture that any areas to be proposed under the provisions of this Act for incorporation as part of the wilderness system shall segregate such area from any or all appropriation under the public land laws to the extent deemed necessary by such Secretary." The only requirement for the giving of public notice, however, is contained in subsection (e) concerning modification of boundaries. We believe the language of subsection (g) probably would be limited in application to boundary modifications under subsection (e). On the other hand, it appears that the intent of subsection (g) is to have the provision apply also to new areas. Our amendment is suggested in order to permit the giving of notice, and the segregation of the lands in question from the public land laws pursuant to subsection (g), in the discretion of the particular Secretary. There would be no need to give notice or use the authority under subsection (g) to segregate the lands within the National Park System from the public land laws as these areas are already segregated from such laws.

7. On page 9, line 22, following the word "any" insert the word "new".

This is a clarifying amendment.

8. On page 10, line 7, strike out the words "privately owned" and insert in lieu thereof the words "non-Federal".

This is a clarifying amendment.

(9) On page 10, line 25, and on page 11, line 1, strike out the words ", except that any", and insert in lieu thereof ". Each".

This amendment is suggested for clarification. So far as the national parks are concerned, the present language indicating that an exception is required to preserve the areas for wilderness purposes is inaccurate. These areas, as we have indicated previously are administered in keeping with wilderness standards.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that, subject to your consideration of the foregoing amendments, enactment of S. 174 would be in accordance with the President's program.

Sincerely yours,

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

The Crusade for Democracy in the Western Hemisphere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a statement by Luis A. Ferre, a partner in the firm Ferre Enterprises at Ponce, P.R.

Mr. Ferre indicates that he for one has not lost faith in the democratic way of life and feels it can be adapted successfully to South American countries.

Through the establishment of a Pan American Code, Mr. Ferre believes that much could be accomplished in the way of economic, cultural, and political progress. Virtually every facet of our democratic way of life, including unionization, collective bargaining, minimum wages, maximum hours of work, unemployment insurance, and even social security, could be incorporated into the Pan American way of life if the governments of those countries interested would but approve of such legislation.

Homeownership must be spurred on by a system like our FHA, cultural centers should be financed from a common fund, and a student exchange program must be established to better acquaint all concerned with the patterns of existence in the various countries.

Mr. Ferre's statement follows:

THE CRUSADE FOR DEMOCRACY IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

(A program for action by Luis A. Ferre, partner, Ferre Enterprises, Ponce, P.R.)

There are many contradictions in the U.S. relations with Latin America. The people of the United States are free and enjoy all the benefits of democratic government. And our country is rich, too. We have the greatest productive machine in the history of the world and we have bolstered our economic system by a whole complex of social safeguards, including minimum wages, social-security benefits, FHA home construction loans, free education, and many others.

And yet we have complacently acquiesced while our sister republics south of the Rio Grande continue enmeshed in the old social system—exploitation and economic tyranny. What is worse, our own capital investments have many times unwittingly contributed to the perpetuation of that system. Thus, even though we condemn and punish governmental corruption where we find it in the United States, we have felt no compunctions in dealing with corrupt governments in Latin America. As a result we have seemed to condone the economic oligarchies and the military strongmen these regimes have represented.

This sort of inconsistency has provided a veneer of plausibility to communistic popaganda here in the Americas and facilitated the penetration of our hemisphere by Communist agents. There is no difficulty in finding an example; Castro's Cuba is only minutes away from both Florida and Puerto Rico.

Of course, some of the advantages that our tacit acceptance of social injustice provided the Communists have now been undone by Castro. The slogan "To the Wall" epitomizes the violence and mob hysteria that has characterized the Cuban regime. The lesson is unmistakably sinking in with the people of this hemisphere.

And Fidelism has certainly helped to open the eyes of the people of the United States, too. We were not ignorant of Communist oppression before. We had read of the way in which Poland, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Bulgaria, Rumania and, most poignantly, Hungary were crushed.

But that seemed remote, somehow. It did not fully register in our minds. Dictatorship is now right on our doorstep, however. Thus, once the haven for Europeans fleeing Old World despotism, our hemisphere now harbors the worst sort of Communist police state. Tyranny, we see, is not a phenomenon of time or geographic situation; unfortunately, it is contained in the very nature of man.

The feeling of isolation which gave all the Americas a sense of security has been shattered by Castro. The barbarians are literally at our gates. Our mission is like that of Charles Martel who fought off the Moors at Tours. This is no mere historical flourish; I deeply believe that the threat to the survival of Western civilization is now precisely as grave as it was in A.D. 732.

What can we do? As the first imperative, we must not any longer accept the defeatist notion that democratic institutions cannot be adapted for use by all peoples. That simply is not true.

Instead, we must convince the people of the world (and certainly of Latin America) that representative democracy is, as Winston Churchill put it, "the best form of government ever devised by man to guarantee his fundamental freedom and to insure his material progress." We must put it across that, given the proper training, any people can and will learn to thrive under democratic institutions. And, basic to all, we must win recognition for the fact that only government "of the people, by the people, and for the people" can safeguard against the sort of authoritarianism that has made this a century of war and now threatens a new outbreak that might end civilization and literally vaporize mankind.

But how can we convert this general approach into a working program?

As a first step I urge that we combine with all our fellow members of the Organization of American States and establish a Pan American Code.

The cornerstone upon which such a code should be founded would be a prohibition against the creation of any government in our hemisphere that is not some form of representative democracy. A basic requirement, therefore, would be regular—and absolutely free—elections. Possibly, the code would go as far as laying down some formula under which the OAS would supervise such elections.

Indispensably, the code would also commit the nations to economic progress for all classes. Necessary steps would include:

1. A common market, in which tariffs and other trade barriers are gradually reduced as wages are increased.

2. A Pan American loan fund to finance economic development (a great part of the capital would, of course, come from the United States, and we should insist upon the same sort of self-help system among the recipients that crowned the success of the Marshall plan).

3. Regional minimum wages, to be attained within a fixed period of time, say 10 years. This phase of the code program

should be supervised by regional boards that would review the minimum standards periodically and raise them in line with the gains scored in productivity (which should be considerable—thanks to the adoption of better production techniques and the economic stimulation of the common market).

4. A minimum standard of social protection, establishing the rights of unionization and collective bargaining; workman's compensation; maximum hours of work per week and per day; the employee's right to regular vacations with pay; unemployment insurance; social security and all other basic social benefits.

5. The encouragement of private investment (the U.S. Government should help in this by guaranteeing private investments by U.S. entrepreneurs against unlawful and willful expropriation or blocking of currency, provided these investors are willing to permit local participation in their Latin American ventures equaling at least 40 percent of total capital).

6. Special tax treatment by host countries (and by the United States) on profits returned to the United States where the entrepreneur has assumed leadership in the payment of higher wages and broader fringe benefits.

7. A progressive income tax—the foundation of an equitable tax policy—to be established in all countries. The code would prescribe minimum standards.

8. Standards on public education, sanitation and health, norms to be determined in terms of minimum percentages of national budgets to be appropriated to these purposes.

9. An FHA system for all those acceding to the code in order to spur homebuilding throughout the hemisphere.

10. Pan American cultural centers for the various nations, to be financed from a common fund, with the objective of stimulating the exchange of students throughout the Americas.

This is a practical plan. It would work. And, I am convinced, it can be attained. By it, we shall be able to strike a massive blow against poverty, tyranny and prejudice.

But there is no value in merely spinning out 10-point programs. Instead, we must all go to work—energized by the huge need that exists and by our moral obligation to extend the frontiers of freedom to all the peoples of the world.

This is another hour of trial for the human spirit. We must recognize that either the whole world will be free, or it will inevitably be wholly slave. Establishing the Pan American Code for a stronger Western Hemisphere can help us tip the world balance toward freedom.

Postmaster General Day's Reply

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1961

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, on March 14, I placed in the RECORD a copy of a letter which I had that day addressed to the Honorable J. Edward Day, Postmaster General, containing a number of questions regarding personnel and other matters involving the Post Office Department on which he had acted or publicly commented.

Under permission to extend and revise my remarks, I include his reply of March 17.

On the floor of the House I today discussed the matter of Project Turnkey, in the course of debate on the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill. Subsequently I expect to have additional comments regarding some of the other matters referred to in the exchange of letters with the Postmaster General.

While I am by no means satisfied with many phases of the Postmaster General's response to my inquiries, I appreciate the promptness of his reply.

Postmaster General Day's letter follows. I have retained in my files the names of the persons affected by the personnel actions as included in a list which accompanied the letter:

OFFICE OF THE
POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., March 17, 1961.

Hon. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JOHANSEN: This is in response to your letter of March 14 and will answer the specific questions which you asked:

1. Of the 4,000 regional people, all except about 130 held career civil service status as of January 20, 1961. Two assistants to the regional directors have been replaced since my administration took office, and we contemplate replacing the remaining 13 assistants to the regional directors and many of the 15 regional directors. Actually four of the assistants to the regional director positions were vacant on January 20, 1961. One of the regional directors had already applied for disability retirement, and 11 others have either applied for retirement or have voluntarily accepted appointment to other high salary positions. Names of all of these regional directors and assistants to the regional directors are attached, along with the name of the one person whose regional job has been abolished. That one job had been created in December, 1960, specifically for the incumbent who was then assistant to the regional director. Civil service laws and regulations have been complied with in every respect. I do not feel free to deliver the civil service records of these people to you.

2. In the Washington headquarters, 21 employees with competitive status, and principally having very high grades, have been adversely affected. Five of them were in excepted positions. The positions of eight have been abolished, and the incumbents have received reduction-in-force notices. Of the remaining eight, two have resigned and six have voluntarily accepted change to lower grade positions. A list reflecting these names and their changes in position is attached. I do not feel free to deliver their civil service records to you.

3. Undistributed copies of the two issues of the Postal Service News were withdrawn from circulation because they contained inaccuracies and potentially erroneous statements regarding policies which were being considered for change, and it would have been confusing to the employees of the Postal Service to have allowed further distribution.

4. My public statements regarding Turnkey have been accurate. The statement of mine to which you refer was made February 9, 1961, in reference to the previous administration's publicity to the effect that Turnkey was a completed and completely working post office and was the world's first automated post office, which previous publicity was not accurate. The Post Office Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, after its inspection of Turnkey, launched an investigation and requested the Post Office Department to withhold any further payment to Intelex Systems, Inc., until the congressional investigation is finished.

5. It would be historically inaccurate if the plaques installed on buildings dedicated after January 21, 1961, bear the names of officers from a previous administration. Plaques on buildings dedicated subsequent to that date bear the names of President Kennedy, myself, and Deputy Postmaster General Brawley.

6. A proposal has been received and is being considered by the Post Office Department that it consider changing to flat payment in cash the $100 per year uniform allowance to letter carriers in lieu of the present reimbursement basis. No decision to change from the present system has been made.

Sincerely,

J. EDWARD DAY,
Postmaster General.

Make Way for the B–70

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the January 1961 issue of the Reader's Digest, entitled "Make Way for the B–70."

This article, which is a condensation of one written by Mr. Ed Rees and which appeared in Life magazine on October 17, 1960, provides an excellent analysis of the deterrent capacity represented by this great new supersonic bomber. In my capacity as ranking member of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, as well as ranking member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I was one of those who urged continuation of the B–70 program and voted for the necessary funds to accomplish this purpose.

I feel strongly that every effort should be made to accelerate planning and construction of the B–70, in order that it may become an operational reality at the earliest possible time. In my judgment, this country will have need for manned aircraft, with the inherent capabilities of the B–70, for a number of years to come.

I commend the reading of this extremely important article to all Americans.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAKE WAY FOR THE B–70

(Condensed from Life by Ed Rees)

One day in 1962 a test pilot named Alvin White will open up six mighty jet engines and take off in an enormous, dart-shaped, goosenecked airplane that may be the most controversial military venture of the decade.

Those who have fought for its construction believe it will travel 2,000 miles an hour,

faster than the earth's rotation; that it will climb to its cruising altitude of almost 15 miles at a beginning rate of 25,000 feet per minute; that it will ultimately bring about 75-minute transcontinental travel. Most important, they say that for years to come this 250-ton plane will be a deterrent to war more effective than ballistic missiles.

This airplane is the Air Force's B–70 bomber, and the battle over it has been raging for years. At one point its development was brought almost to a halt after nearly one third of a billion dollars had been spent on it. A vigorous Air Force campaign got the project restored. Present plans call for the delivery of 250 B–70's, starting in 1962.

Right now the B–70 exists only as a flightless metal model—a full-scale mockup supported by guy wires. Hidden within its mass is a new aerodynamic concept that is intended to help bridge the gap between current aircraft and the space ships of the future.

The B–70 evolved from what today seems to have been an almost laughably modest request for a good, fast bomber. On October 14, 1954, Gen Curtis E. LeMay, then boss of the Strategic Air Command, wrote a top-secret letter to the Pentagon laying down his requirements for an aircraft to succeed the brand new eight-jet, 500 miles-per-hour B–52 bomber. He wanted an airplane with a range of 6,000 nautical miles, one that could fly from a northern U.S. base to any Soviet target, deliver its bomb load and continue on to another friendly field—all without refueling.

Speed was another requirement. LeMay asked for a plane that would cruise at about 590 miles per hour for most of its range and yet have the ability to go much faster—1,100 miles per hour would be adequate—for about 1,000 miles as it flew over enemy territory.

Engineers and designers were taken aback at LeMay's conditions. Airplane design is a compromise in which the plane's total performance can be thought of as a whole pie. The larger one slice is, the smaller the others. A bomber usually has a big slice for range but a relatively small slice for speed. LeMay was asking for an airplane where all the slices were huge.

Two big manufacturers, Boeing and North American, entered the competition. Their first designs were turned down as impractical. Months passed. It began to seem that the huge long-range bomber could never be built.

Then, almost by accident, came a breakthrough. In 1957 a North American engineer, checking through the library of high-speed engineering, came upon a recent report by two engineers working for the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics. The report was entitled "Aircraft Configurations Developing High Lift-Drag Ratios at High Supersonic Speeds." Within its formula-cluttered pages lay the key to an airplane beyond General LeMay's wildest dreams.

An airplane traveling at high speed creates a shock wave as it smashes against air molecules. The pushed-aside air is piled up in a V-pattern similar to the bow wave made by a ship. The two NACA engineers suggested that a really fast airplane might take advantage of this wave and, through ingenious design of wing and underbelly, climb right on top of it and ride it like a surfboard. Such a plane would gain enormous extra lift without an extra pound of thrust or gallon of fuel.

North American's engineers seized on these dramatic possibilities. The drawing-board version of the B–70 they presented to LeMay in February 1958 had a 185-foot-long fuselage and a vast delta wing whose outer edges would fold downward at top speed. Its speed would be much greater than LeMay had asked for.

For more than 10 years designers of large aircraft had been blocked by the problems of the speed zone between mach .75 and mach 1.5 (490–985 miles per hour).[1] Flying through this zone, in which the air is broken up into pressure ridges, is like racing a car along a rocky, potholed road. But beyond mach 2, according to every slide rule, a plane would recapture much of the flight efficiency it had at subsonic speeds, when the flow of air around it was smooth. Mach 3 speed should be even better—and the B–70 would do just that. LeMay's pie was bigger all around.

Air Force approval of the suggested new plane was enthusiastic, and North American was awarded a $300 million contract. For strategic defense during the 1965–75 period, the Air Force wanted 250 of the craft. Total cost: $6.4 billion, the largest single weapon-system expenditure in U.S. history.

The possibilities of such a plane, the Air Force pointed out, went far beyond its ability to deliver bombs. The B–70 could, indeed, carry an enormously destructive load. It could fly so high and fast that interceptor planes and missiles would have great trouble reaching it, and it could fire missiles of its own while still 1,500 miles from target. But the B–70 also had important peacetime potential in the field of commercial aviation. Military air developments traditionally lead to major advances in civil aviation. They made possible pressurized cabins and turbojet engines, for example, and without these advances there would be no commercial jets flying in the United States.

Building a plane that would operate at the B–70's speed and altitude, however, required a whole new technology. Because even such minute imperfections as fingerprints caused trouble when certain sections were fused together, the workers had to wear gloves. Because weight in such a supersonic giant is critical, the steel skin had to be rolled as thin as possible—down to six one-thousandths of an inch.

One of the major engineering problems was the great friction heat that the B–70 would create as it ripped through the air at 2,000 miles per hour. The temperature on the plane's skin would climb to an unbearable 500 degrees. The engineers struck on a unique solution. Instead of a single layer, they devised a three-thickness skin consisting of a one-inch layer of honeycombed foil between two thin plates of steel. When this was brazed together with another metal foil, the resultant sandwich was lightweight, strong, and would keep the B–70 alive at its infernal cruising temperature.

But even with this insulating skin, some of the frictional heat would still get inside. The engineers then thought of using the airplane's 300,000 pounds of fuel to absorb this residue of heat. Fuel was to be stored nearly everywhere in the great plane—throughout the wing, along the fuselage—and whatever heat got through the skin could be fed into this cooling reservoir.

In October 1959 the B–70 was on schedule, within cost estimates, and the equipment was meeting all performance requirements. Then the ax fell.

The B–70 budget request for fiscal 1961 (which would begin in July 1960) was sent to the Director of the Budget for approval. The Defense Department, which had already cut the Air Force request by $100 million, was asking $360 million for the B–70. The military budget requests before Budget Director Maurice Stans totaled $41.3 billion—well above the administration's $40.7 billion ceiling. Substantial cuts had to be made somewhere. President Eisenhower decided that the B–70 program should be canceled.

The Air Force Chief of Staff, Gen. Thomas D. White, called his top advisers into an emergency meeting. "I want you to tell me how little money we can get along with," he said, "the minimum which will keep the B–70 alive and breathing." Within moments busy pencils and slide rules came up with the answer: a single airplane—not a full-fledged bomber with all the equipment needed for combat, but a flying shell—would require $75 million in 1961. White got the Secretary of Defense to approve the figures, and went directly to the White House.

It would be barely possible to proceed, he told the President, with $75 million. If the President canceled the program entirely, the United States would halt a vital advance in aviation and writeoff a critical future weapon for defense. The program must go on.

President Eisenhower reluctantly agreed. The gleaming shape in the Los Angeles hanger would survive and grow to full size. But it might well be the only one of a species that would be extinct before birth.

Then Francis Gary Powers' U–2 was shot down over Sverdlosk on May 1. Immediately, circumstances were violently altered. With the abrupt tightening of world tension and the growing truculence of the Soviet Union, the case of the B–70 was reopened.

The main argument against further development, aside from cost, was that manned bombers would be obsolete in the age of missiles. The B–70 would not become operational until 1965, which time we would have the Titan, Atlas, Minuteman, and Polaris systems. These ballistic missiles are enormously difficult to detect, hard to stop, and can deliver tremendously powerful bomb loads with great accuracy to any point on the globe. What can the B–70 do that these weapons can't?

The B–70 group had some solid answers. Where precise marksmanship is required, because an installation is hidden or hardened so that the bomb burst must be placed virtually on top of it, the missile is not nearly so dependable as the airplane. And the missile cannot be used against targets where precise geographic information is lacking: for example, it takes a pilot to hit a target that is somewhere near this bend of the river of just beyond that mountain. Also, the B–70's exposure time on a bombing run is fantastically short. A B–70 spotted off Leningrad is about 10 minutes from Moscow, 386 miles away. By the time the Soviet defense forces have identified and tracked it and dispatched missile-carrying fighters to try to knock it down, the U.S. bomber probably would be in danger of attack for less than 2 minutes.

Gen. Nathan F. Twining, then chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, told Congress: "I am convinced we will have bombers all the way through 1967, 1968 and maybe beyond. The B–52 will be on the way out but the bomber will still be a useful weapon system in the inventory, regardless of how good the ICBM may get. We would be much better off with a more advanced plane like the B–70."

One other argument was presented for the mach 3 high-altitude bomber. The U–2 made many flights above 70,000 feet before Powers was downed, and U.S. officials still do not believe that Soviet fire did it. The Russians, moreover, have an obsessive fear of such high-speed, high-level penetration, and would presumably try to defend against it. Experts of the Strategic Air Command recently made a detailed operational analysis

[1] Very high airplane speeds are measured by using the speed of sound (650 miles per hour at sea level) as a unit called a mach after the 19th century Austrian physicist Ernst Mach. Thus the speed of sound is referred to as mach 1; twice the speed of sound, mach 2, etc.

of the amount a mach 3 air defense would cost the Russians. It came to $40 billion—as against the $6.4 billion it would cost the United States for 250 B–70's. And the expenditure still would not give the Soviets an ironclad defense.

Last July the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee recommended that appropriations for the airplane be brought back up to the amount originally requested by the Department of Defense. In the appropriations bill finally passed by both Houses of Congress and signed by the President, the B–70 program got an additional $190 million.

So, test pilot Al White will fly his prototype in 1962, and there is strong hope that the first combat-ready B–70 will be on the line in 1965. Thus, after all the wrangling and uncertainty it now seems likely that within 5 years the United States will boast the world's fastest, hardest punching operational aircraft—and perhaps the last piloted bomber in military history.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Liberalism's Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN O. PASTORE

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on Thursday, March 23, 1961, my colleague from Rhode Island addressed the National Civil Liberties Clearing House in Washington, D.C. The subject of his remarks was "Liberalism's Responsibility" and I ask unanimous consent that my colleague's remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIBERALISM'S RESPONSIBILITY

(Speech by Honorable Claiborne Pell of Rhode Island, before the National Civil Liberties Clearing House, March 23, 1961, Washington, D.C.)

Ladies and gentlemen and those interested in civil liberties—and I don't believe that these are mutually exclusive terms—I am indeed glad and honored to be here with you this evening. First, as a brandnew Senator, ranking 100th out of 100, I would like to briefly assure you of being a bona fide liberal. I have been arrested three times by Communist officials and three times by Fascist officials; a nice liberal balance.

The theme I would like to go over with you today is to show how illiberal we liberals can sometimes become. The maxim I want to underline this evening is a very old-fashioned one indeed: "What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander."

By this I mean we must be dedicated to our liberal traditions, even when such dedication would appear to go against our short-term interests, or, at first glance, produce results that go against our liberal grain.

At this point, we should examine the definition of a liberal. To my way of thinking, the best definition of a liberal is a person with an open mind—that is why there can be liberal Republicans as well as liberal Democrats. The success of the open mind, which permits constitutional change without revolution was best shown in the past century by the triumph of the liberal tradition in Britain, which produced the great reform bills in that country.

The liberal tradition means that we must protect the rights of those who urge causes which we may abominate. The statement attributed to Voltaire, "I disapprove of what you say, but will defend to the death your right to say it," might well be our guide.

The long experience of mankind indicates that the restless groping thinker is as necessary to the growth of ideas, as is the honeybee to the pollination of flowers. Of course, every democratic society has its crackpots, its lunatic fringe, its subversives, most of whom make no impact whatsoever upon a civilization. The reason is that just as a better version of the truth will supersede the previously accepted, so the nonsensical will be discarded.

Truth crushed to earth will rise again; a lie or a false theory, though raised to the skies, will fall, in the end, of its own lack of susbtance.

Mr. Justice Holmes called the exchange of men's thoughts "the free market of ideas." It is the consecrated purpose of the first 10 amendments to preserve and protect the rules of fair trading in that market of fair play. And in that course, not delude ourselves into believing that we are self-righteously dispensing the boon of a society so strong that can dispense small favors. A new world is upon us, with new frontiers which expand at the speed of electricity and spaceships. We shall have to stretch our minds, our senses, our spirits, and our hearts to encompass the new world forming. Our old concepts will need considerable review, and we will not further our effectiveness by precluding full consideration of every thesis, no matter how novel or painful. The absolute necessity for entertaining painful criticism has been recognized by even the most stable of institutions. St. Benedict, in discussing the methods of conducting a monastery, once declared, "If a pilgrim monk come and should reasonably, modestly, and charitably censure or remark upon any defect, let the abbot consider the matter precedently, lest perchance the Lord have sent him for this very end."

But, just as you can get upset with those you love—your parents, your spouse, or your children—so, too, I find myself disturbed when I find friends, calling themselves liberals, who show as closed a mind as those they criticize.

I believe that the very essence of the liberal way is to provide for its own continuous self-criticism. The liberal way reaches its peak, not as a recital of the status quo, but as a means of making conditions better. It means that we cannot benefit by our mistakes, unless they are identified and frankly discussed. Let us look at the truth, however painful it may be.

For instance, we liberals must and do oppose a man being denied any position of honor or trust on account of race, color, or creed. Neither, however, should a man be given preference for a particular office because of race, color, or creed. Public office of any kind should not be assigned on a de facto proportional representation based on race, color, or creed. I am not blind to the fact that such de facto political arrangements exist, but I believe that liberals, given their strong desire to see minority groups afforded equal opportunities, should not fall into the trap of urging that a person be given preference for a position because of his creed, color, or country of ancestral origin. We politicians are sometimes guilty in this respect when we put together, or even seek office on the theory of the "ethnic balanced ticket."

We have pointed, and justly, to the shocking abuses of segregation by law in Southern States. But can anyone doubt that economic segregation in effect at least as cruel exists in the Northern States? And how many liberals sign restrictive covenants when they buy a house?

The United States to a Negro, or even to a Jew does not yet have the fullness of opportunity that it should. Just the other day, I noticed that our new Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, bought a house in Washington, and, in buying it, he refused to sign a covenant committing him when he sold it not to sell it to any non-Caucasian, i.e. a Jew, a Negro, or an oriental. Because our Secretary of State refused to sign this covenant, and was merely putting into his personal life our supposed beliefs, it made headline news around the country. What is even more significant is that the Supreme Court has ruled that these covenants are illegal and unconstitutional.

Actually, when Dean Rusk and I were working together in the Department of State some 15 years ago, I can recall that the only place where we could eat with our colleague, Dr. Ralph Bunche, was in the Union Station cafeteria. Even the official State Department cafeteria was segregated at that time.

So, while the United States seems full of opportunity to many of us, and to our children, it really does not seem to offer the same full open doors to all our citizens.

The very word "liberal" has become a bit tarnished. I know in my own campaign I sometimes found myself even leery of the word "liberal." In fact, I characterized myself as a forward-thinking Democrat. The reason for the lack of popularity of the term "liberal," an adjective that 20 or 30 years ago carried with it the highest connotation of fine, good thinking, is partly the acquisition of rigidity and the performance of illiberal acts by so many of we liberals.

Some of the finest words in the English language are to be found in the definition of the word "liberal"—"large and noble way, generous, bounteous, openhanded, ample, free from restraint, not narrow or contracted in mind, broadminded."

In a discussion on philosophy, by its very nature, it must be personal. One's own experiences and environment mold and frame the individual. Therefore, I ask your indulgence tonight in talking from a very personal point of view.

I mentioned a moment ago my belief that no man should be given preference for public office by virtue of race, creed, or ancestral origin. Actually, I have vested interest against proportional representation on any such basis. I was a member of a minority in my State primary campaign, and many people thought because of this my chances of election were not too good. Yet this factor was scarcely mentioned, and the people of Rhode Island were kind enough to make me the first unendorsed candidate for a statewide office to win a primary in the history of our State. And, in the November general elections, they gave me the largest plurality in the history of our State. Why? It seems even stranger when you realize that earlier in the primary, my party leadership voted against me 30 to 1, the labor unions twice supported my opponent, and even highly respected polls portrayed me as being defeated in the primary by a margin of 4 to 1.

The answer, to my mind, lies in a bit of history and in our liberal tradition. The first settlement in my State of Rhode Island—Providence—was founded by Roger Williams in 1636 in the spirit of real religious tolerance. One of the first actions of the settlers of Providence was to provide for religious liberty and complete separation of church and state. In his most celebrated work, "The Bloody Tenent of Persecution," published in 1644, Roger Williams asserted that "God requirith not an uniformity of religion," and held that pagans, Catholics,

and Jews had a natural right to religious liberty. During Roger Williams' presidency of the colony, Jews and Quakers were welcomed to Rhode Island. Rhode Islanders are proud to have the oldest Jewish synagogue in America located in my own home city of Newport.

But even the tolerance established in early Rhode Island on occasion was found lacking. Even then there was room for improvement, as it was not until February of 1783 that Roman Catholics were given political privileges, and Ann Hutchinson, having fled from Boston, was unable to stay on in Rhode Island and departed for Connecticut. Then, she continued to live and practice her tolerance until scalped by a local Siwanoy Indian Sachem, called Wampage. And here, parenthetically, I must add that my own eldest daughter is called Wampage, for this very Wampage was my own direct forbear. And so, I guess I, too, am guilty and should hang my head in shame since this forbear of mine literally scalped the Liberal tradition.

In any event, as I worked and fought in my political campaign, I came to realize how deeply ingrained was the liberal tradition in my State, real liberalism, not skin-deep liberalism. All our children had been taught and had absorbed this liberalism in their schools, public or parochial. If my State had not been liberal-minded, or open-minded, I, as a member of a minority, as an inhabitant of that portion of the State which has not been represented on the ticket for many years, who was regarded by many political leaders as being as impossible, improbable, and implausible a candidate as came down the pike in many a year, would never have been elected. So, I guess, my own appreciation of and gratitude to the liberal tradition is more ingrained than that of most people. In this connection, during my own few months in the Senate, I find myself constantly examining my own liberal conscience.

There is the question of limiting debate in the United States Senate. At the moment, because of the urgent necessity of strong civil rights legislation, liberals are pushing for a majority cloture rule, whereby a bare majority of those present and voting can cut off debate.

From the long-term viewpoint, let us not lose sight of the fact that we liberals have used the filibuster a number of times to prevent hasty consideration of what they consider to be damaging legislation.

There was the case of the Vreeland-Aldrich currency law, 1908: It was hoped by the framers of this legislation that it would provide a more elastic currency and stabilize the values of many securities. Conservatives had been alarmed by the number of bankruptcies and other financial difficulties which had been experienced in 1907 and felt that measures must be taken to preserve business. The opponents of the plan considered it just another device by which the privileged few could tighten their control upon the country's capital and credit.

That towering Liberal, Senator Robert M. La Follette, Sr., of Wisconsin, led a filibuster against the bill during which, on one occasion, he spoke continuously for more than 18 hours.

There was the resolution to admit New Mexico into the Union in 1911. Proposals had been made to admit both Arizona and New Mexico, but Arizona had been eliminated because of provisions in her proposed Constitution for popular initiative, referendum and recall; provisions which were opposed by many conservative Senators. Senator Robert L. Owen, of Oklahoma, who favored admission of both New Mexico and Arizona, filibustered against the New Mexico resolution for the purpose of persuading the majority to agree to include Arizona. His filibuster resulted in only partial victory. It succeeded in killing all statehood legislation for the session.

There was the tidelands oil debate in 1953. After the Supreme Court had decided that certain submerged lands lying offshore belonged to the United States rather than the abutting States, proposals were made to confirm title to these lands in the States. Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, was one of the most tireless opponents of such proposals. Between April 1 and May 5, while the Senate debated the tidelands measures, Senator MORSE spoke often and long for a good cause, with one of his speeches setting a new record of 22 hours and 26 minutes. The measures were defeated.

I do not believe that any minority should have the right to indefinitely prevent the Senate from reaching a vote. However, it seems to me that there is danger also in terms of making sure that the minority has a right to be heard, if we permit a simple majority in the Senate to cut off debate, unless ample provision is made to not only permit full debate, but allow ample time for the alerting and marshaling of public opinion. Actually, I believe that the three-fifths compromise that will probably emerge is a pretty fair one.

The essence of fair play is that the rules must work both ways. For that reason, I believe the time has come when we liberals and progressives must take counsel with ourselves. Frankly, to the extent we do not practice what we preach, we shall be deemed hypocrites; and to the extent that we seek laws to enforce upon others what we do not observe ourselves, we shall be deemed seekers, not of the rights for all, but of special privileges for ourselves.

For example, it is our position that financial institutions, as custodians of the Nation's savings, are to be held as fiduciaries of highest trust, and subject to regular report, inspection, and regulation by the Government. Can we possibly argue that such duty is lessened if the depository happens to be the funds of a labor union?

We have often deplored the voicelessness of the stockholder in the large corporations and the vested interest of management in its own perpetuation. But is it not true that in some unions the individual worker is nigh as voiceless as the stockholder in a large corporation?

Liberals, as persons dedicated to man's inalienable right to seek the truth, find political requirements abhorrent in the field of the performing arts. We condemned, and rightly so, attempts to prevent Paul Robeson from giving concerts.

However, liberals would do well not to forget the furor caused over the award of the Bollingen prize for poetry in 1948 to Ezra Pound. At that time, the liberals called for a congressional investigation of the Fellows of the Library of Congress in American Letters, who made the award. "The Fellows" included such people as Conrad Aiken, Archibald MacLeish, Robert Penn Warren, and William Carlos Williams. The award was also bitterly attacked by one of our leading liberal magazines, which, on the other hand, has consistently opposed the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Let us also not forget that in early 1949, representatives of the Nation's leading liberal veterans' organization, the American Veterans' Committee of which I am proud to be a member, picketed Carnegie Hall in New York against the proposed appearance of the brilliant German pianist Walter Gieseking.

I know all too well, my fellow liberals, that we are human. We are bound to make mistakes.

I am also aware that in my talk tonight I have only pointed out where liberals have failed. I cite these instances because I believe that liberals, as peoples who strive for open minds, must set the most rigorous standards for their conduct. What I am saying is that what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.

Jesus Christ gave us something to think about when he said "Be ye doers of the word and not hearers only. For if any be a hearer of the word, and not a doer, he is like unto a man beholding his natural face in a glass. For he beholdeth himself, and goeth his way, and straightway forget what manner of man he was."

Sell America Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, because of the hearings beginning today before the Commerce Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on proposals to increase foreign travel into the United States, I believe the editorial "Sell America Campaign Should Attract Foreign Visitors to America" will be of interest to all Members. This editorial appeared in the Fort Lauderdale News of Fort Lauderdale, Fla., and was written by Editor Jack Gore. Interest in these proposals to ease travel restrictions and otherwise encourage visitors is widespread and editorial comment has been encouraging, as will be found by reading the well-expressed views of Mr. Gore:

SELL AMERICA CAMPAIGN SHOULD ATTRACT FOREIGN VISITORS TO AMERICA

Among the most sensible and perhaps the most workable suggestions of many advanced by President Kennedy a few days ago for halting the flow of gold from this Nation was a proposal to embark upon a "Sell America" campaign designed to attract more foreign visitors to the United States.

While this proposal has been advanced before by various groups and individuals who believe this country is missing a good bet by not jumping into the oversea tourist market with both feet, nothing much could be done about it until somebody high up in Washington was ready to go along with the deal.

The difficulty in launching such a campaign does not lie in the fact that there isn't a great deal of interest overseas in visiting America. The interest is there, and always has been, but up to now there have been two major barriers standing in the way of any successful "Sell America" campaign.

The first of these barriers has always been the cost barrier. Up until recently a trip to America, even on a short vacation basis, was a luxury that could be afforded by only a relatively few foreigners.

But two factors have acted to change this in recent months. The big industrial revolution overseas has now created a fairly substantial market for American vacation packages. More people now have both the desire and the resources to travel, and the advent of the jet-air age has now brought this country within easy reach of the lucrative foreign travel market.

But even so, American interests can never develop this market until our own Government acts to make it a good deal easier for foreigners to enter this country on a temporary basis.

Many people don't realize it but it is a tedious and sometimes a highly exasperating task for foreigners to get a visa to enter our country. Most other nations make it very easy for Americans to enter their countries. Redtape is cut to a minimum and seldom does an American traveler face any embarrassing questions or extensive investigations into his background before he is permitted to enter a foreign country.

But over here we operate on a much more exclusive basis. Our policy has always been to screen potential visitors very closely with the result that visas are not too easy to secure, and those who wish them usually have to go through a long rigmarole and an indefinite waiting period before their clearances can be issued.

Under the circumstances it is no great wonder that most foreign travelers prefer to go other places rather than go through the tedious process of getting a visa to come to the United States.

President Kennedy has recognized this difficulty and, as part of his "Sell America" campaign, he has proposed an easing of the visa restrictions as a means of encouraging more foreigners to visit this country.

We think that is a splendid move as with Americans now spending well over $2 billion annually in visits to foreign countries, we think it is about time we take steps to make this travel flow more than just a one-way street.

As many of our Broward County business people already know from their experience with foreign passengers from cruise ships docking at Port Everglades, one of the great attractions this country has to foreign visitors is the wealth of high quality merchandise available in our stores and shops.

It is not at all unusual for wealthy foreigners to spend upward of $1,500 on a single shopping trip of just a few hours duration hereabouts, and while these people may not be exactly typical of the average foreign visitor, it can be taken for granted that if our travel restrictions were eased most of the people who would come here from other lands would return well loaded with American merchandise.

When one considers the vast vacation resources, cultural opportunities and the host of other attractions our Nation has to offer foreign visitors, it seems rather ridiculous to bar these people from our shores by technical restrictions and redtape that other nations have long since gotten rid of in the interest of drawing American tourists.

It was just a short time ago that a veteran foreign correspondent wrote that it was hard to find any anti-American sentiment among Europeans who had been to America and seen for themselves how we live and what our country is truly like. The bulk of the anti-American sentiment, he wrote, is centered among those who have never visited America and have formed their impressions from distorted propaganda and stories circulated by our Communist enemies.

The world we live in today is no longer cut apart by boundless oceans which separate one continent from another by days of tedious travel. Now we are living in an era of fast transportation which brings all nations much closer together, and Americans are taking advantage of this jet travel age to travel abroad in constantly increasing numbers.

This, certainly, should not be a one-way street. There are uncounted thousands of foreigners who have the resources and who would like nothing better than to make a trip to America. We should make it easier for them to do this, as we will not only give a lift to our own economy but we will wind up making more friends for ourselves abroad than we can ever make by giving away our dollars.

Seize the Initiative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial from the Indianapolis News dated Saturday, March 18, 1961, entitled "Seize the Initiative."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEIZE THE INITIATIVE

The Communist strategy of protracted conflict is finding almost classical expression in the tiny Asian kingdom of Laos.

Essentially, this strategy is to use the threat of force simultaneously in several key areas of the globe, without actually exercising it sufficiently to provoke a showdown. Korea may have been an exception to this policy, although there is reason to believe the outcome there was about what the Kremlin had in mind all along.

In Laos the Communists have strength available to them to overrun the whole kingdom. But so far they have made no such attempt. They may be deterred in part by fear of an all-out war. But their larger consideration seems to be to wage a campaign of attrition—a technique which has in the past proved effective in diffusing the conventional military strength of the United States.

Were this country, for instance, to decide to clear the Communists out of Laos short of using ultimate force, a painful effort equaling or surpassing that in Korea would be required. And even then the Red rebels would merely withdraw to communized North Vietnam, where they would continue to be a threat.

So we hesitate, and in our hesitation entertain notions that Laos can be "neutralized" at the conference table. This mood of indecision is the true objective of the Kremlin in thrusting Laos into a twilight zone just this side of all-out war. At the conference table, experience has shown, threat-of-force strategy can gain bloodless victories. For example, the Communists might promise to behave in Laos if we will be more "reasonable" about Berlin.

There are two effective responses to this strategy. One is war, in which none of our superior force is held back, no substitute for victory sought. But war on such a potential scale is a court of last resort.

The other response, never yet tried to its fullest in dealing with the Kremlin, is to take the offensive in protracted conflict.

Where and how?

This newspaper long has believed that the softest spot in world communism's armor is Germany. Rather than go to the surrender table to haggle over a meaningless "agreement" on Laos, why shouldn't America enter into unilateral negotiations aimed at achieving a United States-West German peace treaty—and, beyond that, agitate militantly for the removal of all foreign forces from East Germany?

Granted, this involves many complex problems. But the effort would capture the initiative from the Kremlin, and alleviate pressure on such areas as Laos.

We shall never win by going to the enemy hat in hand; let's try to make the enemy come to us for a change.

The Soviets' Real Goal in the Underdeveloped Countries: Hit the United States Where It Hurts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent appraisal of the economic offensive being conducted by the Soviet Union entitled "The Soviets' Real Goal in the Underdeveloped Countries: Hit the United States Where It Hurts," which has been prepared by a well-known and highly competent observer, Maj. Gen. Julius Klein, retired.

I commend the reading of this excellent analysis, together with that of concurrent studies on the same general subject, which has been prepared by General Klein, to the careful reading of the American public.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SOVIETS' REAL GOAL IN THE UNDERDEVELOPED COUNTRIES: HIT THE UNITED STATES WHERE IT HURTS

Exercising sole command and direction of a concerted economic offensive by its constellation of captive states, the Soviet Union is carefully selecting targets in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, through which it is striking at the economic foundations of the United States and the free world.

Selection of the target countries is governed by these considerations:

1. The extent to which new and as yet tenuous governments afford opportunities to bring about the installation of Communist regimes.

2. The existence of economic conditions which make possible entanglement in the Soviet web, i. e., single commodity countries which are in urgent need of substantial exports to aid their future development.

3. The existence of natural resources which, while unneeded to supplement Soviet raw material requirements, may be of key importance to the United States or other Western nations.

To these countries, Soviet pied pipers herald the economic growth and the rise in living standards of Soviet bloc countries by way of showing what can be achieved by new and weak states prepared to follow the Communist blueprint.

The newly developing countries are in the midst of a population explosion. By 1970, a 30 percent increase can be expected in these lands, as against a predicted world average of only 20 percent. The aspiration of the former colonial peoples to decent living standards is being shrewdly exploited by Soviet economic planners and strategists. Since 1954, the Soviets have pledged the equivalent of billions of dollars in credits to developing nations. India has been given a billion and a half rubbles in industrial credits alone. Indonesia has been promised 1 billion rubles, Mexico 400 million, Ethiopia 400 million, and Guinea is on the waiting list for a handsome but as yet unannounced figure. Cuba and Argentina in Latin America and Finland are other beneficiaries of Soviet largess.

The Soviets are backing their low rate loan program with a capital investment pro-

gram whose outcome cannot be foreseen. One of their prize exhibits is a steel mill in India. Two other mills have been built or are in construction, financed by Britain and West Germany. The Soviets alone are in a position—should the political reward be appetizing enough—to serve notice at a given moment that they have decided to make the Indian government an outright gift of this industrial facility. The Soviets can do this anytime it would serve their purpose. Unlike the British and the Germans, who must account to lending institutions, shareholders, etc., there is no one in all the Russians to say nay to Khruschev if he should decide to make an outright gift to India (in the name of Soviet-Indian brotherhood, of course) of the fruits of Russian workers' toil and a Russian treasury unbeholden to anyone but the ruling Communist camarilla. For the basic premise of Communist economic policy is that trade and investment must be used to reward the Soviets' friends and punish their enemies.

High on the list of implements to execute this commandment is price cutting in world markets. As Soviet prices are not cost prices but arbitrary or political prices, there are virtually no limitations on price cutting. This device has been used directly against the United States without warning. And even a country with comparatively little dependence on imports and exports is not completely invulnerable to the effects of this type of competition. There can be no doubt that we would feel very serious effects if the Soviets were to attack our economy with the entire force of the heavy potential they and their captives command. The foreign trade monopolies of the Soviets dispose over a variety of weapons, ranging from considerable underpricing of their own exports to dishonest trade practices and unannounced price reductions. They have shown a keen sense of timing in the use of the price-cutting device. The Soviets have been supplying potassium to U.S. purchasers at prices up to $2 less than their nearest American and European competitors. During the strike of the United Steelworkers, the Soviets sold 2,500 tons of pig iron in the United States.

With a full bag of tricks that includes such harassing techniques as dumping, initiating politically motivated purchases at premium prices or other sacrifices, and steadily enlarging the ranks of their economic dependents in underdeveloped countries, the Soviets continue to probe the possibility of further incursions into western Europe.

The arithmetic of international trade shows that at the present time 21 percent of U.S. exports, amounting to about $4½ billion, go to Europe. The loss of export markets for grain, dried fruits, raw products, etc., would be a severe blow to the U.S. economy.

Meanwhile, the urgency of the situation created by creeping Soviet envelopment of countries on which the United States depends on such key products as mineral oil, rubber, copper, and tin, etc., is highlighted by the following table showing the degree of dependence of the U.S. economy on essential imports:

Raw material	Main supply source	Degree of dependence, in percent
Natural rubber	Southeast Asia and Liberia.	100.0
Tin	Southeast Asia and Central America.	100.0
Chromium	Turkey and South Africa.	91.3
Manganese	India and Africa	85.9
Tungsten	South America, Canada, and Australia.	58.6
Bauxite	Canada, Jamaica, and Surinam.	78.4

With few exceptions, these supplier countries and regions are getting concerted attention by the Soviet economic juggernaut, while at the same time Soviet hawkers are busily peddling in Europe raw and basic materials available to them in excess of their own requirements. They are making it plain that they are prepared to cut their shipping costs and take other losses to supplant the United States as a supplier of raw materials needed by the European states. Any significant success in these operations will mark the first step in creating western European dependence on Soviet raw material imports with consequences whose gravity defy imagination.

CAN WE GO IT ALONE AGAINST THE SOVIET ECONOMIC CHALLENGE?

The Soviet economic offensive against the United States is being waged by a Communist phalanx whose component parts are the Soviet satellites, organized and directed under the central command of the Kremlin. What must be recognized is that this is a multilateral threat which cannot be dealt with unilaterally. No Western state, no matter how powerful, can hope to contain, much less overcome, this assault through sole reliance on its own resources.

American leadership in forming the North Atlantic Treaty Organization was a tacit admission that unilateral defense against Communist military attack was impossible. While time still permits, while the United States and her friends in western Europe still retain command of superior productive resources, our common survival demands that the Soviets' multilateral economic threat be met by a multilateral defense.

A go-it-alone policy which assumes that we have the economic self-sufficiency necessary to survival or which places reliance on protective tariff devices will fall far short of providing the means to defend against Soviet economic encroachment or to mount the counteroffensive vital to free world security.

At the Paris Conference, December 19–22, 1959, the United States took the initiative in urging closer Atlantic cooperation in the economic sphere. The U.S. move was motivated by anxiety over the potential political impact on European solidarity of the divisions between the two European trade blocs (European Economic Community and European Free Trade Association). A concomitant U.S. concern was the effect that prolonged differences between the two trade groupings might have on the development of coordinated Western policies with regard to aid to the underdeveloped countries.

It cannot be again said that formidable problems loom in the path of organizing a coordinated Western defense against the Soviet economic thrust. But it is equally clear that the Western nations are heading for a moment of decision at breakneck speed. The imperative of the Soviet challenge demands that Western ranks be closed or the way will be open for the Soviets to pick off individual European states like a marauding wolf preying on sheep that have strayed from a protected flock.

Clear thinking observers of the Soviet grand design for economic conquest, economists and geopolitical authorities on both sides of the Atlantic who have followed the course of Soviet economic expansion closely, are in general agreement on steps that should be initiated without delay to check and overcome the Soviet drive. They are:

1. The Western nations must move promptly to coordinate their trade and economic policies as a first step in marshaling their combined productive strength to meet the Communist economic challenge in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

2. The primary focus of the Western nations must be on using their economic resources to assure the achievement of full employment and the maintenance of high living standards in the Western community. Simultaneously, they must marshal their productive might to assist in raising living standards among the neutral and uncommitted nations of Asia and Africa, as well as among the friendly nations of Latin America.

3. The Western nations must establish a common front in trade relations with the Soviet bloc. The Communists should be given to understand in no uncertain terms that if they persist in waging political and economic war against any nation or combination of nations in the West, particularly through the use of dumping and price-cutting tactics, they can expect retaliation of the type West Germany has taken against East Germany because of the threats to Berlin.

4. The Western nations must examine candidly and without regard to short-term profits the effect of trade with the Soviet bloc in terms of how this trade is used to further undermine the Western position in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. This will demand the voluntary acceptance of discipline by the private sectors of the Western economies. It will be necessary for governments and private industry alike to face up to the fact that undisciplined Western trade with the Soviets generates a flow of hard Western currency to the Communists, who can be counted upon to use it to underwrite the destruction of Western economic foundations.

5. Essential to the organization of an effective coordination of Western trade and economic policies is a greater degree of uniformity in the control of exports to the Soviet bloc. It makes no sense for the United States to restrict shipments of certain types of industrial equipment to the Soviets when this same equipment is shipped eastward by other Western nations. As long as these goods fill gaps that cannot be met by the Soviets' own productive resources, as long as the Soviets are thereby helped to allocate part of their own industrial production to achieve their political objectives in the Afro-Asian and Latin American nations, not just the United States but the entire Western community is the loser.

6. The Western nations would better serve their own interests and the interests of freedom in general if they were to route capital investment goods now going to the Soviet bloc to non-Communist countries in a sufficient state of development to use goods effectively. Undoubtedly, this would entail financial sacrifices. But in the long run it would serve to free these countries from dependence on the Soviets and would go far toward preventing their political subjugation by the Communists. It would, therefore, strengthen the general climate of freedom.

7. The Communist economic challenge has underscored the need for expanding the participation of private investment in the development of Latin America and the new states of Asia and Africa. An enlargement of the private investment role can ease burdens that would otherwise have to be imposed through fresh Government levies on already restive taxpayers. At the same time, private investment is a powerful implement for overcoming Communist propaganda against the private enterprise system and helping to build and strengthen the will to freedom among peoples whose political destinies hinge on the outcome of the gigantic ideological struggle between communism and the community of free nations. But if private investment is to contribute effectively toward building the will to freedom among underdeveloped and politically uncommitted nations, a system of firm and binding international safeguards will have to be established that will assure investors against loss through arbitrary confiscation or expropriation.

The United States has sought to deal with this problem through a system of bilateral treaties backed by an investment guarantee program. A European solution, spurred by West Germany's leading banker, Hermann Abs, has been proposed in the form of a multilateral draft convention under which signatory nations—both exporters and importers of capital—would agree to protect the rights of private investors.

A reexamination of this proposal by the United States is in order, for without U.S. leadership the adoption of this needed covenant would be unlikely and needed sources of venture capital would remain untapped.

For Rails in the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Indianapolis Star on Sunday, March 26, 1961, entitled "For Rails in the Future."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR RAILS IN THE FUTURE

The railroads of the country have started a new drive in their campaign to shake off the strangling web of outmoded Government regulation and frustrating handicaps of an unfair tax position and competition which is subsidized out of public funds.

The railroads were the first to feel, as an industry, the strong arm of Government regulation. No one today argues the fact that they brought it on themselves. But that was in the last century. It was in an era long since vanished. Since it vanished there has been a procession of Government administrations dedicated to getting America out of the horse and buggy days. But the Government itself is still there, as far as its attitude toward transportation is concerned.

The Government still regulates the railroads as if the times were the same as they were three-quarters of a century ago. It still behaves as if the railroads had a monopoly on transportation and were waiting breathlessly to start gouging a helpless public the instant Government's control is relaxed the least bit.

This goes on despite the fact that Government itself supports facilities used by competitors of the railroads, and in some cases has actively sponsored the development of competing services. Public tax funds are used to build and maintain highways over which roll trucks and busses. The Government maintains guidance and other necessary services for airlines, and controls traffic in the air. Airports and other terminal facilities are often provided with public funds. Government funds maintain the waterways over which barge and ship traffic moves.

All of these provide tax-subsidized competition to the railroads. Besides, the Government in the past has paid direct subsidies to airlines and ship operators, to encourage them. Some fees and special taxes are paid in connection with highway and air facility use; the use of waterways in general is free. In none of these cases are user charges based on any kind of formula intended to reflect reasonable cost allotment for commercial, profitmaking use of a public facility.

To compete with these, railroads build and maintain their own rights of way and terminal facilities. When a new road is built, or an old road or waterway relocated, the railroads must bear the cost of making their crossings conform to the new construction.

In addition to paying these costs, the railroads also pay property taxes on these rights of way and facilities.

The railroads are barred, however, from making use themselves of public highways, waterways or airways, except under certain limited circumstances.

It is for these inequities that they seek correction. They want to be freed from regulation based on conditions which no longer exist. They want their competitors using publicly owned facilities to pay user charges which accurately reflect a fair share of their cost, including the taxes which would be paid on such facilities if they, like rail facilities, were privately owned. They want the right to own and operate other types of transport equipment, in conjunction with conventional rail operations.

To accomplish these gains, the railroads will need a lot of friends at court. They will need friends, and they ought to have them. For rail transport is still basic to the American industrialized economy and it will continue to be in the foreseeable future. Its survival therefore is essential.

Basic or not, the railroads can survive only if they are able to meet their competition and function at a profit. This is primarily a responsibility of management, but management now is hamstrung. It cannot make and put into effect the decisions which the situation requires, and it has no defense against competition subsidized with its own tax money.

Rainbow Bridge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, preservation of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument in southern Utah is of concern to Californians. So is the construction of Glen Canyon Dam on the Colorado River, which will back up water close to Rainbow Bridge.

The Bakersfield Californian, which is devoted to the cause of conservation of our natural resources, has expressed this joint interest in a recent editorial which emphasizes the need for settling the Rainbow Bridge issue. I, too, suggest that the solution advanced by Secretary Udall is a worthy proposal.

Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAINBOW BRIDGE COMPROMISE REASONABLE

It is hoped that Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall is successful in his efforts to settle the dispute involving the picturesque Rainbow Bridge area and the Glen Canyon Dam project, an altercation that has brought into play the most energetic spokesmen on the part of both conservationists and water development exponents.

Rainbow Bridge, one of the West's most spectacular sights and the largest natural bridge in the world, is located in southeastern Utah on almost the Arizona border. The monument, established a half century ago, is difficult to reach and it is visited by a comparatively small number of persons each year, yet it is certainly deserving of preservation, and indeed its remoteness assures a longer existence than if it were immediately accessible to great numbers of tourists.

For those who wish to read more about it and see some excellent photographs of the bridge, we recommend the latest book on our national parks and monuments published by the National Geographic Society. Unlike most natural bridges, Rainbow Bridge arch is curved and symmetrical and it rises more than 300 feet above the canyon floor.

When the Upper Colorado Storage Act was passed in 1957, it contained a provision that no project could bring water near the bridge, in answer to those who contended that the water would destroy it. But to keep water away would cost $25 million in works, and getting this kind of money for such a purpose from Congress is highly doubtful. Department of the Interior geologists say that water would not erode or harm the bridge.

Secretary Udall, to meet the objections of the conservationists and assure progress of the Glen Canyon Dam, has suggested that the national mounment containing the bridge be expanded and made more easily accessible to the public and water be allowed to back up to the bridge without the construction of the costly works. The water, as he notes on advice of the geologists, will not harm the bridge, and more people will be able to see this extraordinary natural wonder.

Competent authorities in Washington and elsewhere have expressed approval of the suggestion by Secretary Udall, and it is hoped that the idea will be given legislative sanction so that the dilemma involving Rainbow Bridge National Monument, which may later be expanded into a national park to include more of the startlingly beautiful scenery in the area will be resolved.

Mr. Udall is to be commended for his suggestion and for his genuine concern over the problem of protecting and preserving the natural scenic areas under his charge.

Wrong Way in Laos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Indianapolis News on Monday, March 27, 1961 entitled "Wrong Way in Laos."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WRONG WAY IN LAOS

There are reasons for gratification in this country's response to the crisis in Laos. The suggestion that America is willing to take action to stop the communization of this Asian kingdom, conveyed by President Kennedy in his press conference last Thursday, is one of them. The unity of the two parties in recommending a firm stance is another.

Yet the net effect is disturbing. For it appears the United States is prepared to commit the paradoxical error it committed in Korea—that of being too soft and too reckless at the same time.

In Korea, it will be recalled, America found itself on a bloody treadmill. U.S. troops were ordered to "push back" Communist aggression, but not to pursue the aggressors and destroy them. The Chinese Communists, were able to fight from a "privileged sanctuary" north of the Yalu River. American fliers were given the almost impossible task of knocking out bridges on a river which they could not cross. Staging points for Communist arms and supplies were completely invulnerable.

We were involved in a war which, by definition, we could not win. Our commitment was total—the sacrifice of thousands of American lives; yet that sacrifice became a horrible waste because the goal we sought to attain was strategically meaningless: namely, that of stalemating communism, rather than defeating it.

The identical situation seems to be taking shape in Laos. President Kennedy, of course, said merely that if Communist intervention did not stop, we shall "consider our response." This could mean almost anything, but the mobilization of American forces has suggested it means committing our own troops to the fighting. If this proves to be the case our commitment, as in Korea, would be total. But, again as in Korea, our objective would be without merit.

Kennedy's stated goal is to achieve Lao "neutrality," as specified by the Munich-like Geneva Conference of 1954. That goal would be achieved, presumably, by driving the alien troops back across the border into Communist-ruled North Vietnam. Assuming this happens, with American lives being lost in the process, what happens then? We can only speculate, of course, but the Korean example and administration rhetoric suggest something like the following:

First, since our aim is "neutrality," we could not very well pursue the attackers into their homeland. That would be an attempt to eradicate the force which has caused the trouble, an objective we clearly have repudiated.

Second, since Laos is not to be a "cold war pawn," it is unlikely we should hold the area under our own military stewardship. More probable is that the three-nation Commission advocated by Britain would take over, until it could install a government to its liking. Since this Commission as now envisioned would contain one Communist and one pro-Communist representative, we can imagine that the new "neutral" government would be neither strong nor anti-Communist. Then the Commission would withdraw, and leave the new government to its own devices.

At that point, what is to prevent the Communists, in China or in North Vietnam, from invading the country once more, and starting the whole bloody process over again? Nothing whatever. After the sacrifice of American lives, the United States would have achieved precisely nothing.

For an alternative to this dismal go-round, we should pay close attention to Soviet policy in Laos. Whereas our goals are limited, but our commitment total, the Communists have completely reversed matters. Their goal is total—the communization of Laos. But their commitment is limited: no Russian troops are involved in the fighting; it is being conducted by proxy regimes in Asia—and even that fact is not officially acknowledged; they may withdraw from the struggle or return to it at their own convenience, because they know we will not carry the fight to their homeland.

In such a contest, it is clear Moscow holds all the aces. The Kremlin is playing for huge stakes, and risking little or nothing. We are risking everything, in terms of American lives, and can expect to win nothing.

The alternative, therefore, should be to reverse the order of our policy: (1) To establish as our goal, not a neutral Laos, but a free and anti-Communist Laos; (2) to employ to that end, not American troops, but the troops of our allies in Southeast Asia, who are ready and willing to take on the Communists and carry the fight to victory.

Televised Presidential Press Conferences

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting article entitled "Kennedy Fluffs in TV Press Talk," written by David Lawrence, and published in the Washington Evening Star of March 27, 1961.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KENNEDY FLUFFS IN TV PRESS TALK—ARGUMENT AGAINST LIVE COVERAGE SEEN IN ERROR ON FIRMS MAKING $1 MILLION

(By David Lawrence)

President Kennedy made a serious mistake at his press conference last Thursday which ought to spell the end of so-called live performances on radio and television. For the net effect of the error—which, of course, was unintentional—was to mislead the American people and give them an erroneous statement about the minimum-wage legislation now pending before Congress. The President's exact words are recorded in the official transcript as follows:

"I find it difficult to know why anyone would oppose seeing somebody by 1963 paid $1.25 in interstate commerce, and in the new coverage we're talking about businesses which make over $1 million a year, and I find it difficult to understand how anybody could object to paying somebody who works in a business which makes over $1 million a year by 1963, $50 a week."

It will be noted that the President twice used the phrase "make over $1 million a year." Probably most listeners agreed immediately with the President that any company making such a profit could well afford the increase from $1 an hour to $1.25 and that those opposing such an increase would just seem to be cruel-hearted, selfish businessmen. This is the kind of innuendo which adds to class antagonisms and is the sort of argument on which the labor demagogs thrive.

But what are the facts? The legislation now pending in Congress doesn't make any such classification of businesses with profits of $1 million or over per year. Instead, the bill sponsored by the President—and which was defeated last week by the House of Representatives—called for measurement by gross receipts or sales of $1 million and not by profits. The language in the bill read "$1 million gross annual volume." There's a vast difference, of course, between what a business takes in and what it has left after paying wages and other expenses, as well as all taxes.

Indeed, out of the total number of businesses in the United States, at least 90 percent do not make as much as $1 million a year after taxes.

The bill as finally approved by the House last week would exclude a lot of service trades altogether and would continue existing exemptions for employees of hotels, restaurants, lunch counters, cafeterias, hospitals, laundries, dry cleaners, motion picture theaters, amusement parks, parking lots, beauty shops, barber shops, gasoline stations, and automobile sales dealers. The reason for this is that many of these employees get tips and other gratuities which increase their income, or else they are largely part-time workers anyway.

The new House bill would require an employer who operates five or more retail chainstores in two States to come under the law, but, if any such chainstore has gross receipts of less than $250,000 a year, it would remain exempt.

Now why is there opposition to these measures? Some employers say it will force many present employes out of work altogether. Unions want the legislation because it will enable them to press for a raise in wage scales generally. For, obviously, giving a worker the new $1.25 minimum will cause another worker alongside of him who already gets $1.25 an hour to feel that his pay ought to be stepped up because he had previously been rated higher in skill or experience than the $1-an-hour employe. It really could bring demands, even during the recession, for a new cycle of wage increases and could affect wage differentials all along the line and not just the employes at the minimum-wage base.

Unfortunately, the whole presentation made on this issue is an example of how onesided and unfair is the system of forming public opinion by presidential press conferences, since the President of the United States can unwittingly make erroneous statements, and the many millions of persons throughout the country who hear him have no chance of being given immediately the true facts when errors are made.

One solution of the dilemma is to abandon the live presentations and let them be recorded on tape for showing later in the day or evening, as are so many other television programs. This would afford an opportunity in the meantime for careful revision of any factual errors or misstatements instead of allowing errors to mislead the American people. There is altogether too much preoccupation hereabouts with publicity stunts and live shows for political purposes instead of interest in the orderly and impartial processes of transmitting the Government's information to the people.

Donations of Surplus Personal Property for Purposes of Education, Health, and Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD herewith a report from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which shows that eligible educational, health, and civil defense units received surplus personal property with acquisition cost of $25,310,206 in the month of February 1961. This brings the total for the fiscal year to $206,304,524.

The report follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

OFFICE OF FIELD ADMINISTRATION

Surplus personal property report for the month of February 1961

Regions and States	Property located in the State and frozen on Forms HEW 136	Property allocated to other States or regions from locations within the State	Total property allocated to the State	Total property received by the State	Adjusted allocation
REGION I					
Connecticut	$108,773	$7,593	$194,697	$753,344	$95,041
Maine	190,224	3,780	235,816	182,786	218,803
Massachusetts	248,582	33,128	247,428	644,337	222,900
New Hampshire	48,528	4,447	103,335	53,604	92,985
Rhode Island	140,735	88,008	93,852	68,505	87,428
Vermont	221		47,018	47,931	34,873
Total	737,063	136,956	922,146	1,750,507	752,030
REGION II					
Delaware	24,552		100,479	49,938	93,660
New Jersey	551,874	103,009	1,079,017	629,406	349,641
New York	1,709,679	490,869	1,377,153	1,542,245	982,600
Pennsylvania	1,333,153	122,891	1,232,183	882,183	1,067,131
Total	3,619,258	716,769	3,788,832	3,103,772	2,493,032
REGION III					
District of Columbia	183,776	124,508	141,398	121,475	141,398
Kentucky	378,029	97,766	382,406	453,524	347,727
Maryland	360,141	55,057	458,600	416,046	444,503
North Carolina	270,528	38,597	535,361	675,253	419,683
Virginia	1,489,506	407,502	1,172,725	665,198	953,971
West Virginia	1,290,356	974,346	404,040	263,010	404,040
Puerto Rico	252,951		252,951	141,475	252,951
Virgin Islands					
Total	4,225,347	1,697,776	3,347,481	2,735,981	2,964,273
REGION IV					
Alabama	673,217	237,977	773,406	706,846	745,020
Florida	1,287,696	187,472	1,256,123	1,013,577	797,221
Georgia	1,283,272	724,493	606,134	288,026	573,114
Mississippi	375,368	139,693	522,995	620,199	460,325
South Carolina	149,223	34,198	140,043	325,729	123,243
Tennessee	361,999	56,131	728,397	699,997	580,263
Total	4,130,775	1,379,964	4,027,098	3,654,374	3,279,186
REGION V					
Illinois	298,511	25,466	539,644	682,717	485,985
Indiana	908,830	37,917	1,019,517	286,260	987,480
Michigan	226,218	15,015	633,387	1,050,833	551,362
Ohio	2,132,572	633,767	1,557,692	1,321,392	1,170,105
Wisconsin	304,443	3,432	500,730	922,994	405,766
Total	3,870,574	715,597	4,250,970	4,264,196	3,600,698
REGION VI					
Iowa	$27,946	$141	$56,396	$98,222	$56,396
Kansas	107,677	36,690	176,774	392,233	176,774
Minnesota	80,748	5,071	311,054	288,312	297,161
Missouri	360,247	199,652	172,522	249,179	170,602
Nebraska	100,302	6,000	81,829	387,482	81,829
North Dakota	39,792		63,261	192,791	63,261
South Dakota	95,540	11,394	92,760	57,128	92,760
Total	812,252	258,948	954,596	1,665,347	938,783
REGION VII					
Arkansas	154,309	917	693,971	227,919	692,963
Louisiana	262,853	27,908	334,634	590,015	334,159
New Mexico	380,523	621	308,511	229,454	308,511
Oklahoma	267,932	7,837	623,058	413,361	602,157
Texas	1,789,565	94,655	1,306,536	724,285	1,200,433
Total	2,855,182	131,938	3,266,710	2,185,034	3,138,228
REGION VIII					
Colorado	255,350	22,384	297,766	182,382	291,979
Idaho	58,695	1,061	56,533	158,581	56,533
Montana	14,379		80,139	93,499	79,165
Utah	2,137,112	183,398	218,695	350,533	160,390
Wyoming	12,843	30	39,541	41,037	39,204
Total	2,478,377	206,873	692,674	826,032	627,271
REGION IX					
Alaska	184,888	22,617	159,574	60,276	151,468
Arizona	183,469	42,102	110,138	280,301	110,138
California	4,495,994	585,673	2,562,958	3,744,661	1,874,788
Hawaii	295,847	14,050	290,414	233,322	79,537
Nevada	28,532	28,822	44,316	109,250	42,491
Oregon	65,131	3,500	501,004	369,030	470,717
Washington	572,533	20,303	665,377	328,123	489,703
Total	5,826,394	717,067	4,333,781	5,124,963	3,218,842
Grand total	28,555,222	5,961,888	25,584,288	25,310,206	21,012,343

Goodby Freedom of Speech?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Churchman for March 1961, an independent journal of the Protestant Episcopal Church:

GOODBY FREEDOM OF SPEECH?

Americans who value the free speech guaranteed by the Bill of Rights had better be concerned about the recent Supreme Court decision on censorship. By the close vote of five to four the Court ruled that cities and States may require a censor's permit before a film may be exhibited to the public. Four States and eleven cities have such licensing systems. The four dissenters, Chief Justice Warren, Hugo L. Black, William O. Douglas, and William J. Brennan, Jr., branded the majority ruling as a retreat from free speech, adding that the opinion comes "perilously close" to holding that a licensing system may also be applied to books, newspapers and periodicals, radio, television, public speeches, and every other medium of expression. Said Chief Justice Warren, "The Court no way explains why moving pictures should be treated differently than any other medium of expression." This is a strange departure by the Court from its earlier decisions that invalidated individual censors' rulings. It will be a great day for American freedom when every clergyman is forced to submit his sermons to a public censor—perhaps J. Edgar Hoover?—before he enters his pulpit.

Aid to the Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a letter I received from one of my South Dakota constituents. This letter describes in most eloquent terms the problems facing the parents of deaf and other handicapped children. As the Congress discusses the overall aid to education legislation, I should like to call the problem presented in this letter to the attention of every Member. Certainly we owe it to our handicapped children to provide them a chance for a better life.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator KARL E. MUNDT,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D.C.

DEAR KARL: I don't know whether you are aware of it or not, but I have a son 8 years old who is deaf. At the age of 3 we sent him to Milwaukee to a special school. He was there for 1 year. During this time my wife became ill. For a number of reasons it became necessary that he return to South Dakota for his schooling. Since that time he has attended South Dakota School for the Deaf in Sioux Falls.

At the age of 6 months we took him to Dr. Jordan at Vermillion. At the age of 1 year we took him to Dr. Gregg in Sioux Falls. At the age of 1½ years we took him to Dr. Timothy Smith in Omaha. At the age of 2½ years we took him to Dr. Myklebust who is the head of Northwestern Aphasia Clinic.

About a year and a half ago we went to Dr. Graham Smith in Minneapolis and to Dr. Lassman who is on the faculty of the University of Minnesota. We were advised by Dr. Smith that his partner, Dr. Bofenkamp, also had a deaf son. He had traveled the width and breath of the United States and decided that the one outstanding school for the deaf was St. Joseph's of St. Louis, Mo. We applied for Robert's admission therein approximately 1 year ago. Last summer we had a special tutor from their school for 6 weeks who stayed with us.

This school has a waiting list much greater than its present enrollment. We were unable to get Bobby into such school. We personally visited the school last June for a period of several days. We were quite awed by the progress that they can make in speech and lipreading for totally deaf children. We were quite heartstricken to think that our son was unable to get into this wonderful institution. We have our application for a tutor this summer also and are hoping that Bobby will be allowed to attend the school next year.

In all our travels around the country it is amazing that it was not until our son was 8 years old that we knew what would be the best available education for him. It was also quite a shock to realize that there is an extremely long waiting list in this school even though the tuition alone is $1,500 for a 9-month school year. I believe it is quite obvious that the total expense would be approximately $2,400 for a 9-month school year and still there is no room available even to those who can afford this payment.

It has been a traditional function of government to care for the handicapped. This has been true not only in this country but throughout the world. At this juncture, when the Federal Government of this country is presently contemplating assuming new responsibilities in the field of general education, it is amazing to realize what a poor job is being done in the field of a traditional duty, education of the handicapped; namely, the deaf.

If you could but see the results of St. Joseph's as compared to those being done by our governmental institutions in this field, it would be quite a disappointment to you. If you were a parent of a deaf child on the outside looking in, it would be life's greatest frustration. You would learn with joy what could be done and with sorrow what the lack of enough facilities excludes. If parents such as we, who can afford the financial burden of special training for a handicapped child, cannot avail their child of first-class educational opportunities because "there is no room at the inn," what must be the chances of the other thousands of persons with a similar handicapped problem?

At St. Joseph's they have two teachers for approximately every six children. The one teacher does the general teaching and the other keeps taking one child aside and giving individual attention to any faults made in speech, lipreading, et cetera. By the time the children are 8 years old they are able to begin communicating by means of voice and lipreading. The emphasis on speech and lipreading extends beyond the classroom and every phase of the school life.

The public schools in this field normally have one teacher for every eight students. When they leave the classroom they are in charge of a housemother with no training whatsoever in dealing with the deaf. Even though the school might claim to be an oral school, all those we have seen use signs almost exclusively outside the classroom. Naturally the results are very poor as compared to a school such as St. Joseph's. This is no one's fault except the limitation in the budget. There are no funds to hire specially trained persons as housemothers and, in fact, at one time the teachers in the South Dakota School for the Deaf in Sioux Falls were being paid less than their counterparts in similar grades in the public school system in Sioux Falls.

I am certain that there is no provision in the new Federal aid to education bills for education of the deaf.

Why is it that deafness has received such slight consideration in our great country? Possibly it is because it does not dramatically meet the eye as the crippling diseases and similar handicaps. It just very silently passes you by.

It would seem to me that these people need a champion. I hope that you will use your wonderful ability at oration in their behalf. I am certain that God could have given one man no greater glory on this earth than to be the spokesman for the 145,000 deaf people of this Nation.

It would appear to me that the great opportunity for the education of the deaf in this country comes now when our Congress is considering national educational matters. It would certainly be tragic if a traditional field of education is ignored while new obligations are assumed.

I know that at this time there are efforts being made in Minneapolis to establish for the Midwest a school for education of the deaf. I have heard that this group might be interested in obtaining a Federal grant or loan for this purpose. I do not know definitely what they have in mind, but would assume that it is something along the line of the Hill-Burton. I will try to find out what they have in mind and let you know.

As a friend I ask you to give this some consideration.

Yours truly,

JOHN ZIMMER.

Statement Signed by 250 Leading American Professors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following ACLU press release and attached statement urging discontinuation of the House Un-American Committee, signed by leading American professors:

NEW YORK, N.Y., March 19.—A statement signed by 250 leading American professors called today for abolition of the House Un-American Activities Committee because the committee has "repeatedly undermined the freedoms essential for national well-being."

The statement, released by the American Civil Liberties Union, under whose auspices the professors were canvassed, declares that the HUAC "continues to abridge citizens' rights of free speech and association (and), we call upon the House of Representatives to vote it out of existence. To perpetuate this committee is to perpetuate a threat to our liberties."

The professors who signed the statement are actively engaged in teaching. They come from 79 colleges and universities, including many of the major educational institutions, and cover the fields of economics, English and modern languages, government and political science, history, law, natural sciences, philosophy, physical sciences, and sociology.

The ACLU's executive director, Patrick Murphy Malin, and Prof. Louis M. Hacker, chairman of the union's Academic Freedom Committee, noted that the professors had approved the statement personally and their action does not commit their institutions.

Amplifying the professors' statement, Malin and Hacker declared that even though the House of Representatives recently had approved the HUAC's appropriation, the educators' appeal is being issued at this time to alert the public and the Congress to the basic issues involved. "We are engaged in a long-range campaign to make clear to the American public and through it, to the Congress, the great harm done to civil liberties and freedom by the HUAC. The distinguished men and women who have signed this statement are concerned, as is the ACLU, that the HUAC's attacks on free inquiry and free expression must cease. We feel this even more strongly in view of the Supreme Court's recent Wilkinson and Braden decisions which upheld the committee's power to investigate those who criticize it. This creates an urgent need for wider understanding of the dangers of the HUAC so that, in the near future, legislation action to end the committee will result."

The full text of the statement follows:

"STATEMENT URGING DISCONTINUATION OF THE HOUSE UN-AMERICAN COMMITTEE, SIGNED BY LEADING AMERICAN PROFESSORS

"As educators actively engaged in teaching we are dedicated to the proposition that free enquiry and free expression nourish mental growth and are thus basic to our Nation's strength. The House Committee on Un-American Activities has in our opinion repeatedly undermined the freedoms essential for national well-being. We call on the House of Representatives to abolish the committee.

"During its 24-year history the House committee has been unrelenting in its harassing of teachers. It has again and again subpenaed them. It has grilled them about their political associations, past and present. It has enquired into the textbooks they use. In these ways the committee has created fearfulness within the academic world—and, perhaps even more dangerous, public distrust of teachers and the institutions in which they serve.

"By exercising the powers of prosecutor and judge, the committee has caused grievous harm to teachers and weakened the educational process. Two professors have served prison sentences after invoking the first amendment. A much larger number of teachers, some in the public schools, have lost their positions, either because they declined to testify before the committee about what had been in most instances youthful associations, or after they had been publicly named by it. Those dropped have often found it impossible to obtain new teaching positions. As a consequence, educational abilities and skills developed through long years of training have been withheld from the community. And this at a time when qualified teachers are in tragically short supply.

"The committee has latterly improved its hearing manners; it has also attempted through consultations to examine the causes for the spread of communism throughout the world. Yet it continues to be careless or unscrupulous in vilifying its critics. Students who assert their legitimate belief that the committee should be done away with because it has seriously damaged freedom have been labeled Communists or

dupes of Communists. The same fate has befallen others who have sought openly to discuss the merits of this governmental organ. Democracy cannot flourish when a legally unaccountable body intimidates dissenting citizens.

"Under these circumstances, we find it understandable, though deplorable, that many teachers, in the colleges and universities, as well as in the public schools, have grown timid about stating, even for classroom discussion, ideas which someone later might interpret as subversive. 'There can be no academic freedom,' Mr. Justice Douglas has said, 'in that environment. Where suspicion fills the air and holds scholars in line for fear of their jobs, there can be no exercise of the free intellect.'

"Unlike the House committee, we are not afraid. 'Exercise of the free intellect'—to examine and to test ideas, behavior and institutions, wherever found—is our duty as teachers and scholars. In the troubled world in which we live, where the battle for men's minds will be the decisive factor, it is imperative that we expose students to all manner of beliefs so that they will be able to differentiate for themselves between the true and the false, the beautiful and the spurious. Only free minds thus rigorously trained can triumph over Communist and other totalitarian ideologies, all of which we condemn and eschew.

" 'Exercise of the free intellect' will in no way endanger the country's internal security. Whenever and wherever agents of totalitarian powers commit acts of subversion, the Government's counter-intelligence agencies, with their professional staffs, may be relied upon to detect such activities. This is the only proper—and effective—way of dealing with such conspiratorial aspects of the Communist movement.

"We recognize that the House committee's roving commission 'to investigate un-American propaganda' was found to be constitutional by the U.S. Supreme Court in the Barenblatt case in 1959, and was reaffirmed in the recent Wilkinson decision. But both decisions were by a narrow 5–4 majority. We applaud Mr. Justice Black's dissent in both cases. Speaking for himself and three other members of the Court, he declared in *Barenblatt:*

" 'The first amendment says in no equivocal language that Congress shall pass no law abridging freedom of speech, press, assembly, or petition. The activities of this committee [on Un-American Activities] authorized by Congress, do precisely that, through exposure, obloquy, and public scorn.'

"Not only teachers, but all Americans, we insist, must be free from trial by publicity—from what Mr. Justice Black has called 'exposure, obloquy, and public scorn.' We would be the first to concede that teachers have no greater rights than other citizens—just as they have no lesser rights.

"Because the House Un-American Activities Committee continues to abridge citizens' rights of free speech and association, we call upon the House of Representatives to vote it out of existence. To perpetuate this committee is to perpetuate a threat to our liberties.

"All of us, inside and outside the university and college community, must understand the threat, must call upon our legislators to act to end it. Let us head Judge Learned Hand's admonition that we not 'rest our hopes too much upon constitutions, upon laws, and upon courts. Liberty lies in the hearts of men and women; when it dies there, no constitution, no law, no court can save it; no constitution, no law, no court can even do much to help it.'

"PATRICK MURPHY MALIN,
"Executive Director, American Civil Liberties Union.
"LOUIS M. HACKER,
"Chairman, Academic Freedom Committee of the ACLU.

"(The institutional affiliation of the remaining signers is for purposes of identification only and in no way commits the institution to the views expressed.)"

"Economics

"Lawrence Abbott, Union College; Moses Abramovitz, Standford University; Clarence Ayres, University of Texas; Harold Barger, Columbia University; Kenneth Boulding, University of Michigan; Emily Brown, Vassar College; O. H. Brownlee, University of Minnesota; Alexander Erlich, Columbia University; John Gambs, Hamilton College; William Haber, University of Michigan; Bernard Haley, Stanford University; William Haller, University of Rhode Island; James Houghteling, Carnegie Tech; Holland Hunter, Haverford College; Slade M. Kendrick, Cornell University; Harold W. Kuhn, Princeton University; Charles Larrowe, Michigan State; Albert Lauterbach, Sarah Lawrence; Abba P. Lerner, Michigan State; Richard Lester, Princeton University; L. J. Pritchard, University of Kansas; Theodore Schultz, University of Chicago; Carl S. Shoup, Columbia University; George R. Taylor, Amherst College; William Vickrey, Columbia University; Henry H. Villard, City College of New York.

"English and modern languages

"Gay W. Allen, New York University; Carlos Baker, Princeton University; Herschel Baker, Harvard University; Walter Blair, University of Chicago; E. Sculley Bradley, University of Pennsylvania; Douglas Bush, Harvard University; James R. Caldwell, University of California; Oscar Cargill, New York University; Angel Del Rio, Columbia University; Herbert Dieckmann, Harvard University; Dwight Durling, Queens College; Leslie Fiedler, Montana State University; Frank C. Flint, Dartmouth College; Donald M. Frame, Columbia University; W. M. Frohock, Harvard University; Albert Guerard, Harvard University; Ernest Hassold, University of Louisville; Walter Hipple, Cornell College (Iowa); Edgar Johnson, City College of New York; Howard Mumford Jones, Harvard University; Edgar Knowlton, Wisconsin State College; Harry Levin, Harvard University; George McCue, Colorado College; Waldo McNeir, Louisiana State University; Arthur Mizener, Cornell University; Charles Muscatine University, of California; William Nelson, Columbia University; Arthur Nethercot, Northwestern; J. Saunders Redding, Hampton Institute; Henry H. H. Remak, Indiana University; Mark Schorer, University of California; Henry Nash Smith, University of California; George R. Stewart, University of California; Austin Warren, University of Michigan; Hermann Weigand, Yale University; Virgil Whitaker, Stanford University.

"Government and Political Science

"Ross Beiler, University of Miami (Florida); Donald Blaisdell, City College of N.Y.; Lawrence Chamberlain, Columbia University; Herbert Deane, Columbia University; Robert Engler, Sarah Lawrence; John Ferguson, Pennsylvania State; John M. Gaus, Harvard University; Leland Goodrich, Columbia University; Samuel Hendel, City College of N.Y.; Robert Hirschfield, Hunter College; J. C. Hurewitz, Columbia University; Seymour Martin Lipset, Yale University; Thomas Peardon, Barnard College; C. Herman Pritchett, University of Chicago; Allan Richards, University of New Mexico; John P. Roche, Brandeis University.

"History

"Julia Allen, Berea College (Kentucky); Charles Barker, Johns Hopkins; Ray A. Billington, Northwestern; Solomon F. Bloom, Brooklyn College; Julian P. Boyd, Princeton University; Samuel Brockunier, Wesleyan University; John W. Caughey, UCLA; Robert Christen, Manhattan College; Wallace Davies, University of Pennsylvania; Robert A. Davison, Hofstra College; Rhea Foster Dulles, Ohio State University; John Hope Franklin, Brooklyn College; Dewey Grantham, Vanderbilt University; Fletcher Green, University of North Carolina; Oscar Handlin, Harvard University; J. H. Hexter, Washington University; C. William Heywood, Cornell College (Iowa); W. Stull Holt, University of Washington; Harold M. Hyman, UCLA; Eric Kollman, Cornell College (Iowa); Joseph Mathews, Emory University; Henry F. May, University of California; Horace Merrill, University of Maryland; William Neumann, Goucher College; Howard Quint, University of Massachusetts; Franklin D. Scott, Northwestern; Charles Sellers, University of California; Kenneth M. Stampp, University of California; C. Vann Woodward, Johns Hopkins.

"Law

"Albert Beisel, Boston University; Edmond Cahn, New York University; David Cavers, Harvard University; Julius Cohen, Rutgers University; Alfred Conard, University of Michigan; Thomas Cowan, Rutgers University; Caleb Foote, Harvard University; Harrop Freeman, Cornell University; Walter Gellhorn, Columbia University; Fowler Harper, Yale University; C. Willard Heckel, Rutgers University; Ira Heyman, University of California; Mark DeW. Howe, Harvard University; Harry Kalven, University of Chicago; Spencer Kimball, University of Michigan; David Kochery, University of Buffalo; Harold Lasswell, Yale University; Douglas Maggs, Duke University; Robert Mathews, Ohio State University; John Henry Merryman, Stanford University; Nathaniel Nathanson, Northwestern; Monrad Paulsen, Columbia University; Cornelius Peck, University of Washington; Louis H. Pollak, Yale University; Daniel Pollitt, University of North Carolina; Fred Rodell, Yale University; Louis Schwartz, University of Pennsylvania; Melvin G. Shimm, Duke University; Boaz Siegel, Wayne State University; Roland Stanger, Ohio State University; Roscoe Steffer, University of Chicago; Victor J. Stone, University of Illinois; Clyde Summers, Yale University; Jack B. Weinstein, Columbia University; Bertram Wilcox, Cornell University.

"Natural Sciences

"E. J. Boell, Yale University; G. E. Hutchinson, Yale University; Beatrice Konheim, Hunter College; Ashley Montagu, Columbia University; William Sleator, Washington University; Philip Smith, Stanford University, Kenneth Thimann, Harvard University; George Wald, Harvard University; Sewall Wright, University of Wisconsin.

"Philosophy

"Charles Bayliss, Duke University; Monroe Beardsley, Swarthmore College; Arthur Bierman, San Francisco State; Brand Blanshard, Yale University; Richard Brandt, Swarthmore College; Stuart Brown, Cornell University; Justus Buchler, Columbia University; George Dykhuizen, University of Vermont; Loyd Easton, Ohio Wesleyan University; Herbert Feigl, University of Minnesota; Roderick Firth, Harvard University; Charles Frankel, Columbia University; Wil-

liam Frankena, University of Michigan; Edwin Garlan, Reed College; A. C. Garnett, University of Wisconsin; Alan Gewirth, University of Chicago; Lewis E. Hahn, Washington University; Charles Hartshorne, Emory University; Carl G. Hempel, Princeton University; Horace Kallen, New School for Social Research; Albion Roy King, Cornell College (Iowa); Y. H. Krikorian, City College of New York; John Lenz, Brown University; J. Loewenberg, University of California; Victor Lowe, Johns Hopkins; Maurice Mandelbaum, Johns Hopkins; Bertram Morris, University of Colorado; Glenn R. Morrow, University of Pennsylvania; Francis Myers, University of Denver; Ernest Nagel, Columbia University; Stephen Pepper, University of California; Donald Ayres Piatt, UCLA; Melvin Rader, University of Washintgon; J. H. Randall, Columbia University; Evelyn Shirk, Hofstra College; Manley Thompson, University of Chicago; Paul Weiss, Yale University; Warner Wick, University of Chicago; Richard Wiebe, Johns Hopkins.

"Physical sciences

"Cyrus Barnum, University of Minnesota; F. Bloch, Stanford University; Lyle B. Borst, New York University; Wayne Bowers, University of North Carolina; Frances Brown, Duke University; E. U. Condon, Washington University; John Edsall, Harvard University; Eugene Feenberg, Washington University; Henry Foley, Columbia University; Jules Halpern, University of Pennsylvania; Arthur Kornberg, Stanford University; William Robertson, University of Vermont; S. J. Singer, Yale University; Walter Stockmayer, MIT; Gilbert Stork, Columbia University; Julian Sturtevant, Yale University; Henry Taube, University of Chicago; Harold Urey, University of California, San Diego; Kenneth Wiberg, University of Washington.

"Sociology

"Franz Adler, Los Angeles State College; Gordon Allport, Harvard University; Daniel Bell, Columbia University; Jessie Bernard, Pennsylvania State; Brewton Berry, Ohio State University; Robert Bierstedt, New York University; Edmund deS. Brunner, Columbia University; H. Harry Giles, New York University; William H. Goode, Columbia University; Melville Herskovits, Northwestern; Robert Hosack, University of Idaho; Leland Jenks, Wellesley College; Mirra Komarovsky, Barnard College; Manford Kuhn, University of Iowa; C. Wright Mills, Columbia University; Talcott Parsons, Harvard University; Hortense Powdermaker, Queens College; Mel Ravitz, Wayne State University; Arthur Stinchcombe, Johns Hopkins; Wellman Warner, New York University.

"Miscellaneous

"T. W. Anderson, Math Statistics, Columbia University; Rudolf Arnheim, Psychology, Sarah Lawrence College; Charles A. Baldwin, Religion, Brown University; David Berninghausen, Library School, University of Minnesota; Derk Bodde, Oriental Studies, University of Pennsylvania; Urie Bronfenbrenner, Child Development, Cornell University; Hollis Cooley, Mathematics, New York University; Joseph Fontenrose, Classics, University of California; William Grummel, Classics, University of Washington; Franklyn Haiman, School of Speech, Northwestern; Merwin Humphrey, Forest Management, Pennsylvania State University; Reynold Jensen, Psychiatry, University of Minnesota; Arthur Kornhauser, Psychology, Wayne State University; Robert Lauer, Mathematics, University of Delaware; Eric Lawson, Finance, Syracuse University; Curtis MacDougall, Journalism, Northwestern; Paul MacKendrick, Classics, University of Wisconsin; A. H. Maslow, Psychology, Brandeis University; Wesley H. Maurer, Journalism, University of Michigan; Cedric H. Whitman, Classics, Harvard University; Benjamin Youngdahal, Social Work, Washington University."

Kennedy's Foreign Aid Will Boost Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the Indianapolis Star on Sunday, March 26, 1961, entitled "Kennedy's Foreign Aid Will Boost Socialism," by Michael Padev.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KENNEDY'S FOREIGN AID WILL BOOST SOCIALISM

(By Michael Padev)

WASHINGTON.—The main feature of President Kennedy's foreign aid program is its emphasis on so-called long-term planning. The Presidential foreign aid message says that "special attention" should be given to "those nations most willing and able to mobilize their own resources, make necessary social and economic reforms, engage in long-range planning, and make the other efforts necessary if these are to reach the stage of self-sustaining growth."

The message further stresses the need for "long-term planning and financing" and says that all aid plans should be "tailored to meet the needs and the resources of each individual country, instead of a series of individual, unrelated projects."

CALLED "ESSENTIAL"

In talks with newsmen, spokesmen of the Kennedy administration have further emphasized the importance of country-by-country and long-term economic planning, which is said to be "essential to serious economic development." Foreign states which do not engage in long-term economic planning would—under the Kennedy aid proposals—get less assistance than foreign countries which operate long-term plans for economic growth. The same idea—long-term economic planning—was stressed in Mr. Kennedy's aid proposals for Latin America.

Now let us see what all these high-sounding phrases—long-term planning, economic growth, social progress, mobilization of resources, etc.—mean in practice. They mean one thing only—the organization of a Central Government planning authority controlling and directing all economic activities in the state. This, of course, is another word for socialism, or state capitalism, or statism or any other "ism," including fascism, which preaches the gospel of a centrally planned and Government-controlled economy.

Socialist philosophers and propagandists have been attacking the free enterprise capitalist system for many years—indeed for many decades—mainly on the ground that the free economy allows the growth of individual and unrelated economic projects, while only socialism, through central government planning and control, could guarantee long-range economic development. We also know that all Socialist countries in the world (and this, of course, includes all Communist states) boast with their long-term economic planning—their 5-year, 7-year and 10-year economic plans. Soviet Russia has been developing under long-term economic plans since 1929. Red China has lived through several economic plans and so has Soviet enslaved East Europe.

Needless to say, Castro's Cuba also has a long-term plan for economic growth. So does Nehru's India—and the purpose of the Indian plan is to make the Indian economy Socialist—this is proudly admitted by the authors of the plan, as well as by the leaders of the present Indian Government. By contrast, no free enterprise capitalist country is ever subjected to government economic planning (except in wartime). We have only to look at the economies of the United States, Canada, Britain, West Germany, Japan, France, and other free states to see this obvious truth. The more an economy is centrally planned and government controlled, the more it is Socialist. The less it is government planned and controlled, the less it is Socialist. A country is completely Socialist when all the economic activities of its citizens are planned and controlled by the state.

SOCIALIST ENTERPRISE

If President Kennedy's foreign aid proposals are approved by Congress, and long-term country-by-country economic planning becomes the guiding policy line of the American foreign aid program, the United States will find itself, within the next few years, supporting and financing—on an international scale—the greatest Socialist economic enterprise of our time. As each country receiving U.S. assistance would be encouraged to organize a central economic long-term planning authority, more and more states would adopt Socialist principles and programs for economic development, until finally, all the so-called less developed nations become Socialist, in fact, and, perhaps, even in name.

What would happen to political freedom in such Socialist economies? It would, of course, die, because it would be strangled by the powerful central planning authority, which—and this is a crucial point—would enjoy political power as well. We should never forget that the economic planners and controllers in all these states would be their political rulers, too. This is, in fact, the most dangerous side of government long-term economic planning—that it is done by the same people who exercise political power. Give to any government the power to control all economic activities in the country and you are well on the way toward the absolute totalitarian states and the destruction of both economic freedom and political democracy.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH J. RIVERS
OF ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, in my testimony today before the Subcommittee on General Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor, I pointed out that Alaska, among other impacted districts, would lose instead of gain under provisions of H.R. 4970 as presently written, which is the administration bill for Federal aid to education. Since my testimony also referred to the other States, I am prompted to make known to all my colleagues the substance thereof. In general, I speak in support of this legislation, which represents an effort on the part of the Federal Government to improve and equalize minimum standards

of education throughout our country, and I find from discussing this subject with many of my fellow Alaskans that my State may be recorded as strongly in support of the principle of Federal aid to education. This enthusiasm, however, has been postulated upon the understanding that appropriate legislation designed to carry out this urgent national purpose would increase financial implementation of Alaska's school program as well as the school programs in the other States. Imagine then my consternation, and like feelings on the part of my fellow Alaskans, when analysis of H.R. 4970 disclosed that Alaska, which is a recipient of Federal school impact funds, would get $68,800 less per year under said bill than if it had never been introduced. This figure is based upon an estimate for 1962 shown by the following figures from tables prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

STATE OF ALASKA ASSISTANCE TO IMPACTED SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Under Public Law 874:	
If retained as is	$8,090,300
If amended by title II of H.R. 4970	7,577,800
Loss, this phase	512,500
Under Public Law 815:	
If retained as is	2,447,300
If amended by title III of H.R. 4970	2,336,000
Loss, this phase	111,300
Total loss under titles II and III	623,800
Offset by $15 per pupil payment	555,000
Net loss under H.R. 4970 if enacted with titles II and III retained	68,800

As you may know, several of our colleagues have advised that similar losses would result to their impacted districts if H.R. 4970 is enacted as written. I expect that H.R. 4970 was drafted in haste, and that HEW knew this committee might in the course of its studies discover inequities and take appropriate amendatory action to remedy the miscarriage of this program as it would apply to Alaska and a few other districts.

From developments thus far I am able to pinpoint several alternative remedies.

May I first mention the idea of extending Public Law 815 and Public Law 874 in full force and effect. In H.R. 3677, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] proposes a 2-year extension, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIKE] through the medium of H.R. 3566, proposes a 4-year extension, and Senator ENGLE has introduced in the Senate S. 1078 to make permanent the existing provisions of Public Law 815 and Public Law 874. The purpose of any of these proposals can, of course, be accomplished by striking all of the titles II and III from H.R. 4970 and substituting simple extension provisions. This I recommend and would fully support.

Passage of H.R. 4970 after being so amended would produce for Alaska the estimated sum of $555,000 the first year, $645,000 the second year, and $750,000 the third year over and above entitlements under Public Law 815 and Public Law 874. Because of the many financial demands upon Alaska incident to these first years of statehood, there is an acute need for such aid to help meet the educational demands of Alaska's rapidly increasing school population and for improving its already excellent public school system, with regard to which high standards are maintained in spite of handicaps. Because of the high cost of construction and high operating costs, Alaska disburses approximately 50 percent of its total tax revenues, both State and local, in behalf of education, including support of the University of Alaska.

A related factor to consider is that Federal aid to education in Alaska looks more impressive dollarwise than in practical results. According to statistics prepared by the Office of Education of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the per pupil cost in Alaska of a minimum school facility under Public Law 815 came to $2,300 in 1958 and $2,630 in 1959. In New York, for the same period, the 1958 cost of $1,810 shrank to $1,750 in 1959. Ranking the States in this regard from highest to lowest, the median is found in Maine with a 1959 per pupil construction cost of $1,1150, which is less than half of such cost in Alaska. This, I believe, graphically demonstrates one of the handicaps with which Alaskans are confronted in maintaining their school system.

Reverting now to another idea, I would like to have you consider a defect in title I discovered by Dr. George Rogers, in analyzing the administrative procedure involved. Dr. Rogers, a highly competent economist presently on the faculty of the University of Alaska, has pointed out that in computing the total earnings of individuals within each State and in the Nation as a whole, the statisticians at the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have included the pay of military personnel within each State and the Nation as a whole. As you know, the total of individual earnings within each State is divided by the number of pupils therein to determine the income per public school pupil for each State. We also know that the pay of military personnel is exempt from State taxation and would not, therefore, reflect upon the ability of a State to maintain its public school system. Accordingly, the pay of military personnel should not be included. Although this factor increases total individual earnings within all the States on an average of only 3½ percent, it hits Alaska very hard. Tax-free military payrolls constitute 26 percent of total individual earnings within Alaska. Accordingly, an entirely false impression is created as to total earnings of individuals in Alaska subject to State taxation, with the consequence that Alaska is erroneously rated in this regard as one of the richest States and placed in the category of States slated to get only $15 per pupil as contrasted with more than twice that much for certain other States. This military pay factor, unless corrected, will also adversely affect other States within which are located substantial military establishments. Thus, individual earnings throughout the program should be computed without including the pay of military personnel. This point, which was brought to light by Dr. Rogers, has already been submitted to the Senate Subcommittee on Education by Senator GRUENING of Alaska as part of an amendment which he has proposed to S. 1021, the Senate counterpart of H.R. 4970. Senator GRUENING's amendment would also take into account comparative costs of construction in the several States. The remaining feature of his amendment, which is postulated upon retention of titles II and III, would add $84 million to the $666 million already specified for fiscal year 1962 to accomplish the purpose of offsetting losses to the impacted school districts which would result from the cutbacks under Public Law 815 and Public Law 874.

Another alternative which would resolve the problem as to Alaska has been suggested to the Senate Subcommittee on Education by Senator BARTLETT of Alaska. Senator BARTLETT suggests, if titles II and III are to be retained, that there be created a discretionary fund to be administered by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for supplemental grants to remotely located school systems suffering unusual transportation and climatic problems and where estimated construction costs exceed the national median by a factor of two or more.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that all of us recognize the desirability of preventing the inequities which would flow from H.R. 4970 if it were enacted in its present form. Therefore, I wish to be counted among those who strongly support appropriate amendatory action. My choice of the proposals which I have mentioned would be an extension of Public Law 815 and Public Law 874 in full force and effect, together with a provision requiring exclusion of the pay of military personnel in computing total individual earnings.

Hon. Leroy Johnson

SPEECH
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my own sympathy to the wife and family of our former colleague from California, Leroy Johnson. He was my good friend, and his counsel when I first came to Congress was of considerable assistance. As an aviator during World War I, he brought to the Congress an invaluable experience especially to the Armed Services Committee where he served with distinction. A devoted servant to his district and country, he was likewise devoted to his wife Betty and their family.

Our hopes are that the passing of time will soften the loss and bring to them a sense of satisfaction because of his great contribution to his country.

Fair Labor Standards Amendment of 1961

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3935) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, to increase the minimum wage under the act to $1.25 and hour, and for other purposes.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I support a $1.25 minimum wage bill and expanded coverage. It is my intention, therefore, to cast my vote for the committee bill and against the substitute bill, which is a flat $1.15 bill with less coverage.

An adequate minimum wage is not a vehicle for Government regulation of industry nor should it be. The goal of any minimum wage legislation should be to afford a minimum standard of living and a healthy atmosphere for competitive industry without turning loose the long tentacles of Government that could strangle the efforts and ingenuity of a free economy.

The bill before us providing for an increase to $1.25 and extending coverage to certain retail and service industries by means of a dollar volume test is both realistic and sound. Competitive advantage based on substandard wages will be reduced. Less efficient businesses will seek to offset any increased labor costs by improvement of production methods. Greater productivity will increase purchasing power, relieve localities of unemployment claims, and go a long way toward enabling workers receiving substandard wages to gain a reasonable standard of living.

In my view there should be no argument as to the propriety of the dollar volume test. The committee bill presents no severe departure from the traditional concepts of commerce and production for commerce. An enterprise engaged in activities affecting commerce is by no means a novel test. Nor is the dollar volume test so applied. Such a test has been sustained by the courts over and over-again witness the Taft-Hartley Act and the Landrum-Griffin Act. There is no dubious scheme here to include enterprises unrelated to each other, for only those industries bound by a common chain of business can be related. Furthermore the legislative record written thus far is most explicit on that point. Conversely the interstate commerce test of the substitute bill strikes me as being quite arbitrary. It predicates coverage on businesses which have five or more outlets in two or more States. This can result in the anomalous circumstance of the marginal small business being covered and a large big-dollar volume competitor being exempted.

I am not persuaded by the argument that the economic impact of a minimum wage increase will be unfavorable. The history of the Fair Labor Standards Act does not bear out such a contention. The increased labor costs to the employers have been adequately offset by other internal improvements geared to greater production. This benefits the employer and the employee. Higher minimums in the past have not increased unemployment.

Lastly, a realistic $1.25 minimum wage bill is badly needed for it will certainly help to reduce runaway industry. This is serious in New York and it is equally serious in many sectors of the Nation. We cannot continue to provide a climate that produces less than minimum standards of living, reduced purchasing power, runaway industry, unfair competitive advantage and heavy drains on local communities for welfare assistance.

We can go a long way toward improving such conditions by enactment of a sound minimum wage bill. The prescription has been written. I hope that we can resolve our differences on coverage extensions and provide new ingredients for a healthier economy by enacting this bill.

Encourage Travel to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, during his economic message to the Congress the President indicated the need to increase foreign travel into the United States and suggested that action be taken in this field. Hearings are now being held by the Commerce Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on several proposals to assist this worthy effort. Editorial comment in Florida has been most favorable to such a program and because it is timely to the current hearings, I request that the editorial of the News-Tribune, of Fort Pierce, Fla., be placed here in the RECORD:

PROMOTING TRAVEL TO THIS COUNTRY

President Kennedy, in his special message to Congress Monday on the gold problem, emphasized the important role played by tourism in the economy.

Americans now spend about $2 billion abroad in pleasure travel each year. Foreigners visiting this country spend about $1 billion a year. The difference accounts for a substantial proportion of this country's deficit in the balance of payments.

President Kennedy did not propose setting a limit on the amount Americans can spend abroad. He did suggest that Congress seek to discourage some spending abroad by reducing from $500 to $100 the duty-free goods Americans can bring home.

Such a change is not likely to result in a substantial cutback in spending by Americans abroad. The great bulk of these expenditures are for transportation, food, and hotel accommodations. A study of 65,000 customs declarations made by the collector of customs in New York during July of 1959—a heavy travel month—showed that 82 percent of returning travelers spent less than $200 on gifts and similar items; only 10 percent spent more than $500. Spot checks since 1959 have confirmed the original findings.

A more effective means of reducing the dollar gap is through increased spending of foreign tourists in this country. Last year, 5,384,000 visits were made to the United States. But 4.8 million were by Canadians and Mexicans and many of these were by the same persons who crossed the border frequently and stayed for short periods. Only 544,000 visitors from another continent came to the United States last year, compared to the more than 700,000 Americans who visited in Europe in 1959.

Each visitor to this country spends an estimated $200 in addition to expenditures on transportation. This obviously could be a sizable source of income. But the United States to date has made only the most superficial efforts to attract more visitors.

President Kennedy has promised that the Departments of Commerce, State, and Treasury will announce a major program to encourage more travel to this country. An effective program could yield important dividends in understanding as well as needed foreign exchange.

Galindez Will Be Vindicated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered on Saturday evening, March 18, at the Columbia University Club in New York City at a dinner commemorating the fifth anniversary of the disappearance of Columbia University Scholar Jesus de Galindez. The dinner was sponsored by the Inter-American Association for Democracy and Freedom.

My address follows:

GALINDEZ WILL BE VINDICATED

Five years ago last Sunday Jesus de Galindez vanished from the heart of New York City. Some of you knew him, perhaps as a young man in Vasconia, or later here in the New World where he continued to fight for the principles of freedom and human dignity.

I did not have the pleasure of knowing Dr. Galindez. But as a graduate of Columbia Law School and as Democratic leader of the seventh assembly district, which encompasses Columbia University where Dr. Galindez studied and taught, I have had a deep interest in the matter since the first chapters of this horrid international crime began to unfold.

THE TRAIL LED TO TRUJILLO

I profoundly regret that I was not a Member of Congress 5 years ago. Galindez deserved the most ardent pursuit of his murderers by all legitimate means. A mountain of evidence indicated Dominican complicity in the disappearance of Galindez. The Department of Justice followed the trail straight to Trujillo's door.

Trujillo frustrated U.S. legal procedures by refusing to drop the mantle of diplomatic

immunity from General Espaillat, the Dominican consul-general in New York, who was seen at the airport when the abduction plane was rented. But alternate procedures were available. Congress, through its investigative powers, should have brought to public attention the evil nature of the Caribbean dictatorship that dared to carry out its terroristic activities within the United States. Furthermore, the U.S. Government could have carried its charges against Trujillo to the Organization of American States.

I am aware that the Inter-American Association for Democracy and Freedom has done much to combat Trujillo's sinister machinations in the hemisphere. Your constant efforts to throw the spotlight of truth on the Caribbean situation have helped considerably to neutralize Trujillo's venal propaganda. You can take much satisfaction in the fact that the millions of dollars Trujillo spent for whitewash have been largely ineffective.

GALINDEZ IS NOT FORGOTTEN

This gathering tonight is proof that Galindez is not forgotten, and that there are those who will not rest until the perpetrators of his dastardly kidnaping and murder are brought to the bar of public condemnation.

This year, the fifth anniversary of Galindez's disappearance, there are hopeful signs that his unwavering courage and devotion to justice were not in vain. As Dr. Galindez repeatedly urged, the United States has abandoned its disastrous and farcical policy of regarding Trujillo as a reliable and honorable ally in the defense of Western civilization. Gone, too, is the old excuse that denouncing Trujillo's outrages would constitute "intervention." The United States has realized at last that sweeping Trujillo's brutal behavior under the rug weakens the moral foundations of hemispheric unity and emboldens the dictator to commit more repugnant crimes.

How pleased Dr. Galindez would have been to hear Douglas Dillon, when Under Secretary of State, tell the House Agriculture Committee that the Generalissimo is "a tyrant, a torturer, and a murderer."

FLAGRANT VIOLATIONS

The change in policy is clearly reflected in the inter-American community. In May 1960 the Inter-American Peace Committee—headed by the U.S. Ambassador to the Organization of American States—made an unprecedented investigation of the violation of human rights in the Dominican Republic. The Peace Committee delivered a severe condemnation of the Dominican Government for its "flagrant violation of human rights." The verdict came as no surprise to those familiar with brutal conditions in Trujillo's fiefdom. But, coming as it did from an unimpeachable international organization, Trujillo's powerful apologists were dealt a heavy blow.

The Peace Committee went further. Just as Galindez had argued previously, the committee declared that Dominican violations of human rights aggravated tensions in the Caribbean area.

A PLOT THAT BACKFIRED

Trujillo fought back with his usual terroristic methods. Holding President Betancourt responsible for the stiffening inter-American attitude toward his regime, Trujillo plotted with and aided enemies of the democratically-elected Venezuelan Government. He personally supervised a mission sent to Caracas to assassinate President Betancourt. The plot, as diabolic as the Galindez kidnaping backfired. As you know, Betancourt miraculously lived through the explosion that turned his car into an inferno.

Again the Organization of American States moved. For the first time in history, the inter-American organization invoked collective sanctions against a member state. The Foreign Minister, meeting at San José last August, agreed to break relations with the Dominican Republic, embargo all armaments shipments to the country, and to consider the suspension of trade in other articles. Subsequently, the OAS extended the embargo to include petroleum, petroleum products, trucks, and truck parts.

Trujillo's mask of respectability finally had been ripped off. No longer can he masquerade as a stanch Catholic, an ardent anti-Communist, a great humanitarian. He stands naked in the public eye: "a tyrant, a torturer, and a murderer."

THE "BENEFACTOR"

Take, for instance, Trujillo's pose as a good Catholic. The pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are full of praise for Trujillo, the Catholic benefactor. As a religious man, observers could be expected to ask, how could Trujillo be guilty of the savage excesses of which he is accused? Trujillo apologists are going to have a hard time peddling that line in the future.

Ever since the roundup and sadistic treatment of scores of Dominicans from good families suspected of plotting against the Generalissimo, the church has spoken out. The first step was a pastoral letter of January 1960, in which all six Dominican bishops called clearly for "freedom of conscience, press and assembly," for a climate of liberty, and for an end to "anonymous denunciations." Since then, Trujillo has made war on the church.

INSULTS BY RADIO

Trujillo's Radio Caribe launches a daily, virulent assault, calling priests "psychotics, perverts, parasites." The Papal Nuncio, Archbishop Lino Zanini, has had his life threatened, and the Minister of Justice and Worship called him "an international provacateur."

One month ago Bishop Reilly of San Juan de la Maguana was cut off the air during a sermon when he said that reports in the government-controlled press and radio of the country are untrustworthy. Trujillo's agents constantly intimidate Boston-born Bishop Reilly.

The Bureau of Investigation of the National Catholic Welfare Conference reports that Trujillo's stepped-up antichurch activities include the expulsion of 150 Sisters in charge of government hospitals and charitable institutions, and about 50 priests; the closing of 3 Catholic schools which have had government subsidies; the promulgation of a law to eliminate all religious instruction for Catholic children in primary and secondary schools.

Meanwhile, Trujillo, the supreme cynic, presses his long campaign to have the church accord him the title of "Benefactor of the Church."

A SUDDEN SWITCH

Trujillo's pose as a firm friend of the United States in the cold war also has crumbled. In the time it takes to snap a light switch, Trujillo reversed his position a full 180 degrees.

First, he put through his docile Congress a constitutional amendment legalizing the Communist Party. Then his news media began to take a new tack. Radio Caribe, the dictator's powerful Caribbean mouthpiece, blasts a constant diatribe against the United States.

Some samples: "Sowing disunity is the policy being pursued by the North American imperialists against the countries of Latin America"; "General Eisenhower is waging a war against Latin America on behalf of the monopolistic interests"; "the most inveterate enemies of Dominicanism—the priests, those traitors and vagabonds, and the Yankee imperialists."

PRAISE FOR CASTRO

We know, too, that last August the Generalissimo sent emissaries to Europe for a series of secret meetings with Iron Curtain country leaders. Trujillo also switched gears on his opposition to Castro. It is reported that Johnny Abbes, a former secret police chief who is violently anti-American, and General Espaillat, who figures so prominently in arranging the kidnaping of Galindez—attended a secret meeting in Cuba. There they concocted a nonaggression pact between the two Caribbean dictators. Since then, Trujillo's news media have only praise for Castro.

While the figurehead President of the Dominican Republic occasionally makes sounds along Trujillo's old line of strong ties with the Western democracies, the real power rests with the gang of hotbloods, including Abbes, Espaillat and Ramfis Trujillo, who passionately hate the United States. And let no one doubt, it is the Generalissimo himself who has given them the go-ahead.

TRUJILLO EXPOSED

Under these circumstances, anyone who continues to extol Trujillo as "our great and good friend and ally" and as "a bulwark against communism" is ludicrous.

Trujillo at last has been publicly exposed as the menace Galindez knew him to be. Like a leper, he is quarantined in the hemisphere. But like the calculating caudillo he has been for over three decades, he still sits at the seat of power.

The OAS boycott has been largely ineffectual in bringing Trujillo to his knees. He can buy oil from the Near East, trucks and spare parts from branch plants in Europe.

The embargo has intensified a recession already underway because of failing commodity prices and large expenditures for arms. The economy is at a standstill. The Treasury is out of foreign exchange. Public works expenditures have been cut to the bone, throwing thousands out of work. Fearful of political upheaval, private investment has ground to a halt.

TRUJILLO TAKES THE MONEY

Trujillo, however, simply cinches in his people's belt while looting the Treasury to make deposits to his personal accounts in Canada and Europe.

Meanwhile, Trujillo's principal income earners, sugar and coffee, are unaffected by the sanctions. Some people contend that cutting off purchases of sugar from the Dominican Republic will hasten the demise of the dictatorship. Perhaps. But it is doubtful that even this slap at Trujillo, who owns 65 percent of Dominican sugar production, can push him from his throne. He can still sell on the world market.

I do believe, however, that the United States should not make it any easier for Trujillo by cutting him in on the extra quotas which results from the cutoff of Cuban sugar from the U.S. market.

Last year Secretary of State Herter pleaded in vain with Congress for authority to bypass the Dominican Republic in purchasing the extra sugar needed to fulfill Cubas share of the U.S. market. The Eisenhower administration wisely canceled a special, 2-cents a pound premium—the only authority the administration had to reduce some of the windfall benefit showered upon the Dominican Republic, since Congress had not acted.

TIME FOR CONGRESS TO ACT

Last month President Kennedy likewise asked Congress for discretionary power to purchase the amount of the Dominican Republics windfall sugar from other suppliers. I am hopeful that Congress will act this time, and I suggest that all of you express your views on this matter to your Congressmen.

Meanwhile, mere punitive action is not enough. Revulsion against Trujillo's crimi-

nal despotism must not blind us to the problem of what comes after his fall. Will Ramfis and his henchmen, schooled in the generalissimo's savage and totalitarian methods, seize control? Will Communists move in to steal power from sincere patriots whose inexperience in representative government makes them easy prey for trained agents?

Trujillo, Jr., or any of his ilk, spell a continuation of the brutality and oppression which have infected the area during the generalissimo's reign. A Communist takeover would exchange a home-grown tyrant for one manipulated by Moscow and Peking.

ENEMIES ON THE LEFT AND RIGHT

The problem extends beyond the borders of the Dominican Republic. The dedicated men throughout the hemisphere who are struggling to make representative democracy a reality in their countries have much to fear from either of these possibilities. We have seen how Trujillo's interventionist tactics can threaten the security of a neighboring country. We are learning, now, to what extent Communist agents will go in the hemisphere to impede or wreck reforms initiated by democratic regimes.

The best defense of freedom in the Western Hemisphere, in my view, is the uniting of the democratic forces against their common enemies of the right and of the left. As Professor Galindez himself wrote in his "Era of Trujillo":

"The only truly effective way to confront communism is through a positive policy which can solve social problems with justice and freedom, with that freedom which both the Communist regimes and the Latin American dictatorships lack equally."

Jesus de Galindez did not sacrifice his life in vain. His voice and his pen were brutally silenced, but today his ideas permeate our hemisphere. Earlier this week, 5 years almost to the day since Galindez disappeared, the President of the United States delivered a stirring speech which mirrors Galindez' credo.

Said President Kennedy last Monday: "Our unfilled task is to demonstrate to the entire world that man's unsatisfied aspiration for economic progress and social justice can best be achieved by freemen working within a framework of democratic institutions. Our alliance for progress is an alliance of free governments—and it must work to eliminate tyranny from a hemisphere in which it has no rightful place. Therefore let us express our special friendship to the people of Cuba and the Dominican Republic—and hope that they will soon rejoin the society of freemen, uniting with us in our common effort."

President Kennedy goes on to pledge U.S. help in the battle against poverty, ignorance, hunger, and disease. His message is a masterful blueprint for inter-American cooperation. It now remains for the American republics to take concrete action along the path outlined by the President.

The United States alone can accomplish little in Latin America. It is the Latin Americans themselves who must remove the obstacles in their social and economic systems which hinder development.

UNITE THE REFORM LEADERS

There is one major thing the United States can do. We can act as a catalyst. We can unite those liberal reform leaders in the hemisphere who have demonstrated a willingness to proceed in orderly fashion with the difficult task of reconstructing obsolete societies. We should build a democratic fraternity, united in its determination to resist tyranny and united in its resolve to raise the living conditions of the mass of people.

Those leaders clearly devoted to freedom and reform should be shamelessly favored. They should have easy access to our highest officials and speedy action on their requests for assistance.

AN END TO DICTATORSHIP

The social ferment in Latin America today cannot be stifled. Its energies can, indeed must, be channeled into constructive purposes. The fraternity of builders will be able to inspire the spark of hope for a better future around which the restless youth of the continent can rally.

This meeting tonight is a reminder that there are many who yearn for an end to totalitarianism. Multiply our numbers by those in cities, towns and villages throughout the hemisphere and you will find a considerable force. We must each, in our own way, continue to struggle against the forces of tyranny. In paying our respects to Dr. Jesus Galindez, a gallant fighter for the rights of man, let us renew our own determination to work for the realization of Galindez' goal: a free and prosperous America.

Do-It-Yourself Farm Kit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, recently I took the floor of the House to voice some of my reservations about the administration's jerry-built plan to help the farmer. It pleased me to note that a recent editorial in Life magazine expressed many of the same reservations. Under leave to extend my remarks, I call the attention of the Members to this editorial, "Do-It-Yourself Farm Kit." The editorial follows:

DO-IT-YOURSELF FARM KIT

President Kennedy, whose programs have maintained a generally high batting average for statesmanship, struck out ignominiously in his proposed solution for the farm mess, our No. 1 domestic scandal.

The only farm commodities in trouble are those which are under close Government control and subsidies. One might logically suppose that Kennedy would try to get these, too, out from under that kiss of death. Instead, his program would do just the reverse. It's a sort of do-it-yourself kit for many commodities which would allow farmers to write their own tickets on prices and production. By so doing, it would offer them the opportunity to mess up, themselves, commodities which the Government otherwise might not be able to mess up for them.

This is the way it would work: If, say, mustard-seed growers decided their product needed less production and higher prices, they would elect a committee to work out a program of crop control and minimum prices which, if approved by two-thirds of U.S. mustard-seed growers and the Secretary of Agriculture, would go into effect. Congress would have a veto power over the program, but if it did not use that veto in 60 days, then the plan would become operative. In other words, Congress would abdicate its control of farm programs.

The scheme is modeled after the system which already exists for tobacco. Under it, growers have voluntarily cut their overall plantings more than 15 percent since 1955, but have kept their prices so high that they are beginning to price themselves out of their once lucrative export market. And the system itself resembles the kind of price-fixing cartel for which industrialists can be—and recently have been—sent to jail.

Vermont's liberal Republican Senator GEORGE AIKEN made this wry comment: "If the farmers can get together to write their own program with the Secretary of Agriculture, why can't the manufacturers get Hodges to do the same for them and the labor unions get Goldberg?"

Moreover, each commodity program would be vertical, i.e., unrelated to any other. How foolish this would be is illustrated by the tobacco program itself—where the land taken out of tobacco production is often put into corn and wheat, whose surpluses are the two worst already plaguing the Nation. Quite likely, the mustard-seed growers in our example would do the same with their cutback acreage (present laws allow 15 acres of wheat to be raised exempt from controls).

What makes the program even more mystifying is that it is virtually identical to one which Texas Congressman W. R. POAGE introduced last year. It never had a ghost of a change of getting through Congress. Some of Kennedy's own advisers doubt if this warmed-up version has any better chance. We certainly hope not. As we have repeatedly urged, the only way to stop the farm scandal is to stop it—by restoring a free market to those crops still victimized by controls, by helping the marignal farmers to get off their unproductive land and by ending the subsidies which simply pile new gluts on old.

This Is Our Town

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, several years ago grave doubts arose in some minds when a large corporation purchased an old, established family firm in York, Pa. Comparable transactions had not always fostered a better economic environment in the community. Some concern was felt when the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co. purchased the S. Morgan Smith Co., at a time when it was the largest manufacturer of hydraulic turbines in the world.

The Smith Co. was established in 1877, incorporated in 1896, and remained in the family until purchased by Allis-Chalmers. The company has always been a very important segment of the economy in the York area. Prior to selling, the Smiths erected a new and modern factory. This plant has now become too small and plans are on the drawing board for further expansion. Mr. Burwell Smith and Mr. Beauchamp Smith, of the original Smith family, continue active in the management of the industry.

The company is now one of the bright spots in our local economy and has been a tremendous asset to the community.

By a strange coincidence, the A. C. Scope, a magazine published by the Allis-Chalmers Co., reached my desk the day the area redevelopment bill will be considered by the House. It contains a very informative article setting forth what one company and its employees are doing to help build a strong economy in the area, without governmental assistance. Today the House may well decide whether, in its opinion, the precedent of furnishing Federal aid to some areas in

direct competition with other areas receiving no assistance, shall be established.

The article follows:

Wimpy Fourhman, machinist at Allis-Chalmers York Works, bought a pair of shoes for each of his five children in York last September. In December, he repeated the purchase.

Otto Koerner, Yorks Works purchasing agent, authorized the procurement of tens of thousands of weld rods from York area manufacturers throughout the year.

At the same time, George Schmidt, a Works engineer, was planning better roads, parks, water conservation, zoning and land subdivision as a member of York area Planning Commissions.

Through men like Fourhman, Koerner, and Schmidt, the York area, day after day, is experiencing the snowballing effect of an industry on a community.

In York last year, Allis-Chalmers spent $8,453,000 for such items as payrolls, materials, taxes, and certain fringe benefits. These expenditures were repeated in all Allis-Chalmers plant communities, the amount varying with the size of the plant and local services available. These expenditures were multiplied for every other industry located in those communities.

The impact of an industry is felt well beyond the gates of a plant and the doors of employes homes; the full scope of employment brought about by an industry is broader than its roster of shop and office people; and, finally, the full story of industrial impact is more than a story of dollars and cents.

For every 100 industrial jobs in a community it's estimated that there is a net increase of 74 local jobs in other fields and an average annual increase of well over a half million dollars in personal income. These 100 industrial jobs mean 296 more residents, four more retail stores, 112 more households.

For every 100 Wimpy Fourhmans, additional jobs are created for something like 0.30 firemen, 0.66 bank clerks, 0.50 teachers, 0.20 shoe clerks, and 0.40 gas station attendants, 0.14 librarians, 1.3 food clerks.

Industrial paychecks make the Wimpy Fourhmans VIP's—very important purchasers—in their communities.

The shoes that must be bought and paid for are only a fraction of Fourhman's personal expenditures. Mrs. Fourhman explained that their growing children, ages 1½ to 9 years, are "hefty eaters." She said, "We buy at a locally owned chainstore and always in the large economy size. We buy potatoes in 100 pound bags, five or six big boxes of cereal a week, at least 20 quarts of milk a week, in addition to fruit juices. That grocery cart is really loaded when we do our Friday shopping."

Homeowners, the Fourhmans anticipate a sizable purchase for their house—a new rug, for example—every 3 years. With growing children, trips to the clothing store are regular events. A few month back, their 1956 Ford needed a new carburetor.

Fourhman recently bought a boat for family summer recreation. At Christmas, among the other presents, were four new pairs of ice skates. "And every now and then we buy a phonograph record," said Mrs. Fourhman.

The list, of course, could go on and on, with some variations, matches the shopping lists of most York families. The 247-yellow-page directory in the York telephone book probably summarizes the extent of purchases made by York Works families as well as any other source.

Like nearly all, if not all, York Works families, the Fourhmans do most of their buying right at home, although several large cities are nearby. "York has a nice selection of stores of all kinds. There isn't much you can't buy here," said the Fourhmans. "Anyway, we have no problem spreading our money around the city."

Koerner and his staff face a little different situation in their purchase of supplies and services for the company. The greater York area, with a population of 100,000, can hardly be expected to quarter the vast variety of suppliers required by any one industry. Yet, for its size, York has an excellent diversification of suppliers.

Koerner said, "We like to do as much buying as possible from local sources. Because of their location, they can usually give us faster service and naturally we all like to foster our own community—this is a matter of community pride.

"We must naturally be guided in our buying by considerations for quality, price, and service. The supplier who can give us the best combination of these three, regardless of his location, is the one from whom we buy. We find, however, that those items which are manufactured in York can generally be bought to advantage in York.

"Just as an example, in 1960 we spent in excess of $100,000 for electrical power for the York Works from our local utility. We bought approximately 500,000 board feet of lumber for such things as shipping boxes, crates, and skids from local firms and brokers. Some of this lumber was harvested right here in York County. We bought approximately 224,000 gallons of fuel oil from local firms."

York suppliers total well into the hundreds. As a company, Allis-Chalmers in 1960 used in excess of 10,000 suppliers.

The York Works buys more than materials. It uses the services of: local window washers, who periodically spruce up the plant, a dozen local trucking firms who pick up and deliver at the plant, a rigging firm well equipped to install equipment such as large cranes, a local test laboratory that occasionally checks out special materials, typewriter repairmen, independent businessmen hired on a contract-service basis.

One supplier spends most of his workday at the Works. He is Martin Paige, who, in conjunction with his parents, operates the two employee cafeterias at our No. 1 and 2 plants, plus cafeterias at two other York industries. On Paige's personal payroll are 11 full-time and 1 part-time employees serving the York Works.

Paige said, "I buy most of my cafeteria food products right here in York. I try to buy locally as much as possible."

Building contractor Deitz Smith also has a crew at the plant at all times. Later this year, when work on a new 650- by 56-foot addition gets under full swing, this crew will mushroom to between 40 to 50 men, including those of subcontractors.

Added to expenditures for payrolls and to suppliers are employee benefit costs. For example, for life and hospitalization insurance programs alone, the York Works spent $169,000 in 1960.

Beyond actual cash expenditures, industry attracts and holds people who contribute their time, as employees and as private citizens, to projects that benefit the community.

Fourhman, before transferring to the second shift, served as a scout counselor and on a scout troop board. Harry Shive, valve department sales service manager, is chairman of a sewer authority for Springettsbury township. Bob Scheffer, working foreman in the laboratory, is chairman of the West York Borough Council.

Considerable assistance is given schools. Phil Barnes methods supervisor of the tool design department has helped prepare, on his own time, a course in machine design for the Pennsylvania State University. This course will be available to local residents through the university's York campus.

Bill Kling, training and safety supervisor, has represented the company on an industrial committee to set up a safety program for the York Vocational School. Kling, along with other industrial relations department men, has participated in guidance counseling programs at York schools. The plant has been host to many tours for school groups.

Kling said, "We have donated remnant steel to the vocational school for training purposes. In a letter, the school's director said, 'This gift is symbolic of the close relationship which exists between the schools and local industry'."

Said Kling, "Allis-Chalmers and other industries in York want to do the best they can by the community. This is our town. Any good we can do comes back to us and our employees."

Financial support of schools cannot be overlooked. As taxpayers, both the Works and its employees do their share in providing buildings, paying teachers. The York Junior College, a privately operated institution of higher learning, has received monetary aid from the York Works, as have local hospitals and charitable organizations.

Through pensions, social security plus their own savings, the York Works elder citizens leave an impact all their own. The Works has 138 retirees to date. One of these—Martha Bender, 66 years old—is hale and hearty enough to bowl in two leagues each week.

She is still an active Red Cross volunteer. After 8 years' service, she has 680 hours as a Red Cross receptionist at the York hospital and the county home. She has no intention of slackening the pace.

Wherever you look in York, or around any Allis-Chalmers plant community, there are examples of industry and its employees fulfilling their obligations as good citizens.

Another Farm Experiment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the South Bend Tribune on Tuesday, March 21, 1961, entitled "Another Farm Experiment."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANOTHER FARM EXPERIMENT

The farm program submitted to Congress by President Kennedy does not promise an enduring, generally satisfactory solution of the farm problem which has become steadily worse year after year.

The administration proposes legislation ostensibly to stabilize the prices of farm commodities, to stabilize production, to stimulate farmers' earning power and to eliminate the vast stockpiles of commodities bought with the taxpayers' money. These are legitimate objectives.

In the new attempt to attain them, however, President Kennedy and his advisers project a shifting of production-control authority to the Secretary of Agriculture and the farmers themselves.

If Congress approved this program the Secretary of Agriculture would be authorized to supervise election of advisory committees

in each farm commodity grouping. The farmers in each group would elect the committee members.

If market prices dropped below certain levels the Secretary of Agriculture and the advisory committees would be authorized to project price-raising programs. If the price-raising project involved price controls or acreage controls, it would be submitted in a referendum to the farmers growing the affected commodity.

Among the devices that could be considered in the price-raising attempts, in addition to price controls and acreage controls, are flexible marketing quotas, incentive payments, surplus commodity purchases, payments for diversion of commodities into by-product usage or other usages, and export subsidies.

It is to be emphasized that although this program is supposed to abate the overproduction and stored commodities situation, the range of choices for the Secretary of Agriculture and the commodity growers' committee include things that have been tried without success from the general viewpoint.

Price supports have unbalanced markets and caused consumers to turn to some substitutes. Acreage control has been ineffective. Nowadays farmers can grow more on less acreage.

So in the last analysis, it seems to be a program for postponement of the vitally necessary showdown on the farm problem. Truly profound efforts to solve it would be delayed. That might give it practical political attraction.

In this projected setup the farmers would have opportunities to decide for or against more Federal control of their operations. They might not find that enchanting.

An important question is whether the majorities in the two Houses of Congress are willing to shift so much power to the Secretary of Agriculture and farmers' committees. Congress would have veto power if price supports and acreage controls were approved by two-thirds of the affected farmers where each commodity was concerned.

The legislators might be even less comfortable in that situation than they have been up to now—and most of them have been decidedly uncomfortable.

Connecticut School Superintendents Urge Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of the House a letter I received today from the Connecticut Association of Public School Superintendents, urging enactment of legislation providing Federal aid to schools.

It is significant that this organization of educators most familiar with the problems that exist on the local level has come forward with an endorsement of H.R. 4970.

As the letter points out, the Federal Government must recognize its obligation in the field of education.

The letter follows:

THE CONNECTICUT ASSOCIATION OF PUBLIC SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS,
March 27, 1961.

Hon. FRANK KOWALSKI,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KOWALSKI: H.R. 4970, School Assistance Act of 1961, will benefit education in Connecticut as well as that in the rest of the country. It will make funds available from the Federal Treasury which collects these funds more economically and expeditiously than they can be collected in either local or State revenues, and to redistribute the funds without imposing Federal control or interference. Not only will this act give material assistance to schools, but it will also indicate to people in our country, as well as other countries, that our Federal Government is recognizing that education is vital to the welfare of the country as a whole, and should, therefore, be recognized as a responsibility to be shared by the Federal Government, as well as by State and local municipalities.

I respectfully urge that you support this bill in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Respectfully yours,
JOHN W. WALLACE,
President, Connecticut Association of School Superintendents.

Nigerians Are Eager To Learn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, in Africa a dynamic and somewhat impatient desire to get ahead is pushing the old way of life out of existence. Nowhere is this more visable than in Nigeria. The following article by the Detroit Free Press' man in Africa, Judd Arnett, gives a vivid impression of the vitality and energy of this country:

(By Judd Arnett)

LAGOS, NIGERIA.—By plane and auto we took to the boondocks again, traveling more than 600 miles roundtrip to visit the University of Nigeria, deep in the eastern precincts of this bustling eager nation.

The Honorable "Soapy" Williams led the way, rallying his troops against the inertias of fatigue and the midday sun, and in a moment, I will attempt to tell you why this junket was important.

But first a note about the new Africa that is being superimposed on traditions and cultures centuries old.

The bush dust scrubbed away, I am writing from an air-conditioned room in the Federal Palace Hotel in Lagos, which would not be put to shame by the Sheraton-Cadillac in Detroit.

Below, on a moonstruck veranda, African boys as neat as freshly starched napkins are serving high-caloried chow to suited and necktied business types. The stock market reports from London and New York were scanned here today, and five newspapers were delivered to my room this morning.

What I am trying to say is that the old Africa lives on in many ways in sundry places, but the new is also pushing in—an office building here, a school or factory there, a hospital where once trap-jawed crocodiles threshed in a slime-covered swamp. Roads have been built and there are airports near communities with improbable names.

I do not quite understand why they decided to build the University of Nigeria at Neukka, which is far off the beaten path even by African standards, but I presume there was politics involved. There usually is in such matters.

Anyhow, to reach Neukka we flew for 2 hours to Emagu then traveled another hour by motorcade, wending through a section inhabited by natives with primitive instincts.

By American standards, the University of Nigeria isn't much at the moment and will never equal Colgate or Harvard in physical facilities or quality of curriculum, but to the people of Nigeria it is the greatest thing that has happened to them save independence.

I am very proud that a Michigan school is associated with the development of this steppingstone to African intellectual uplift.

Michigan State University accepted a grant last year from the International Cooperative Administration to advise Nigeria in the founding and establishment of its school, and today there are eight advisers from East Lansing (plus one from Ann Arbor) at Neukka. Their problem is currently not to get things going—but to keep them from moving too swiftly.

For on a hot, wind-disturbed plateau outside of Neukka, buildings are going up out of cement blocks made by native workers; classes are being held in half-completed structures; homes are being erected for professors and staffers.

To give you some idea of the impatience of the Nigerians, remember that the first ground was not broken at Neukka until last September—but they wanted to have 5,000 students in classes by the first of the year.

The Michigan State advisers kept on the lid by a great deal of persuasion and limited the initial enrollment to 260, but the pressures for more pupils are mounting. One of these days, impatient Nigeria will have the largest university in Africa.

The Michigan State University delegation is headed by a distinguished educator, Dr. George M. Johnson, who serves as chief administrative officer and guiding light. Other advisers are Noble Bright, Jr., Richmond C. Davis, Alfred L. Edwards, LeRoy C. Ferguson, John W. Hanson, Masel C. Hill, Kirk Lawton, and Dr. Alvin P. Loving. A tenth member, Troy L. Stearns, will return to Neukka in 2 weeks.

Dr. Loving, on loan to the staff from the University of Michigan, is widely known in Detroit, where he taught for 16 years before transferring to Michigan State University.

At the present time, courses of instruction are limited to education, agriculture, sociology and economics, but these will be expanded as fast as teachers become available. I met as many students as possible during a too-limited stay, and you can accept this as the gospel truth: these kids are desperate for knowledge.

In a way, the University of Nigeria is typical of the nation—of the African countries I have seen. Nigeria has the most drive, the highest degree of vitality, the greatest burning urge to get ahead. And it is willing to pay the price of progress: already 43 percent of the national budget is going into education and there are schools everywhere.

The eagerness of the students comes down from their political leaders, who make no bones of the fact that they are going to push Nigeria to the absolute forefront of African nations, one way or another.

There is a brashness connected with this will to get ahead: at a luncheon following our visit to the school, the Premier of East Nigeria put it on the line—his country wants foreign capital.

"If we can get the capital," Dr. Michael Okpara promised, "we can get the experts. And then Nigeria will become a great bastion for freedom. * * *"

Nigeria has just about every problem, or challenge, you can think of, including poverty, illiteracy, lack of industry, political divisions inspired by tribalism, archaic means of transportation. Still, I do not sell it short.

For here the people have energy. To them, independence has also meant freedom—some people think the country has too much freedom, and this will be the hub of the political battles of the future. But now, at least, Nigerians are saying or writing what they think, with the press bordering on the inflammatory most of the time.

I have no idea what Governor Williams and his associates will recommend in the way of aid for Nigeria. Personally, however, this is one of the few places where I would like to see Uncle Sam go for broke. American dollars spent in this not-so-pretty but highly inspired nation might pay the free world big dividends in the years to come.

Nigerians are convinced their country is destined to become a major power in world affairs, and their nationalism is directed to this end. If we want to make a bet on spirit and enterprise, we could pick many worse places on the Dark Continent—but few better ones.

Educating Citizens to Dangers of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in our life-and-death struggle with communism, the battle cannot be won unless the American people are fully educated and alerted to its dangers at home and abroad.

For leadership in this national endeavor, we cannot depend solely upon Uncle Sam. Rather, patriotic individuals, organizations, public information media, including newspapers, and others, must participate in such a national security program. The struggle against communism—if nuclear war can be averted—will be a long-run, not a short-term, battle. Controlling about a billion people and vast land and natural resources, communism is a formidable enemy. Unless we mobilize our people in spirit and action, we could well lose the contest.

If, however, we bring to bear the full potential of our manpower, brainpower and resources in all-out support of the ideals of freedom and how it can best serve humanity, then I am confident that we will win.

Recently, the Milwaukee Sentinel of Milkaukee, Wis., has been publishing a series of articles entitled "On Your Guard" written by Jack Lotto. The purpose of the articles is to keep readers on guard against Communist propaganda, as well as to provide a weekly roundup of Communist and pro-Communist activities. Reflecting a realistic, significant effort by an outstanding newspaper to alert and mobilize public opinion and action against the Red conspiracy, I ask unanimous consent to have some of this series printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REDS GIVE GO-AHEAD ON UNREST

(By Jack Lotto)

U.S. Communist bosses, in a secret "Little Kremlin" meeting, have given the go-ahead for an ambitious plot to stir nationwide unrest.

The Red decisions on their own version of the New Frontier, hold this grim promise for the immediate future:

Big strikes, wild demonstrations reminiscent of the thirties, and other mass forms of lawlessness to weaken our country at home and abroad.

No segment of the population will be immune from the Red agitational virus. As part of the Communist program of action, a special woman's commission is being established to concentrate on the female population.

Youth, labor, Negro, Spanish-speaking, religious and political groups are all targets in the planned bold onslaught against the Government.

The 50 members of the ruling national committee of the U.S. Communist Party okayed the troublemaking schemes at their second meeting since December 1959.

The Red commissars approved unanimously a resolution agreeing to continue to take orders from Moscow and reaffirmed their allegiance to revolutionary Marxist-Leninist doctrines.

They did so when they indorsed the December statement of the 81 Communist Parties in Moscow, which hid revolutionary aims behind talk of "peaceful coexistence."

This phrase, which will be heard with increasing frequency, in the Communist lexicon, does not mean peace or conciliation as many innocently believe.

Here is exactly what the Communists mean when they, from Premier Khrushchev down, talk about "peaceful coexistence."

This is the official text released by the world Communist movement and indorsed by the U.S. Communist Party:

"Peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems does not mean conciliation of the Socialist (Communist) and bourgeois ideologies. On the contrary, it implies intensification of the struggle of the working class, of all the Communist Parties, for the triumph of Socialist ideas."

The U.S. Reds, in their conference, agreed that widespread unemployment makes conditions ideal for them to stimulate mass participation of the people. In plain talk, this means organizing big demonstrations. That's one of the meanings of the call that went out for a vast upsurge of the people and creation of sharper conflict between labor and management.

To gain even wider influence, the Communists are going to try to form coalitions or united fronts. Thus, they will attempt to join forces—temporarily—with many groups which oppose communism, but which may agree with them on a few points.

REDS SEEK BRAINWASHING OF NEGROES

(By Jack Lotto)

U.S. Communists are going to try brainwashing Negroes on a national scale.

They will attempt to convince the loyal Negro population to turn into a Government-hating mob of lawbreakers.

The creation of an antigovernment Negro force, allied with the world Communist movement, was a major decision at a secret meeting of the Communist Party's "National Negro Commission."

The 2-day strategy and tactics meeting, in Philadelphia, was attended by top Negro agitation specialists from all over the country, (including New York, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Baltimore, and Albany, N.Y.).

The main discussion centered on an agitational program outlined by party leaders Claude L. Lightfoot, of Chicago, and Moscow-trained William L. Patterson, of New York.

Lightfoot told the meeting that "U.S. Negroes must have knowledge of our mutual enemy and knowledge of when and how to fight against him. This the left can give to the Negro American."

The Reds agreed on a stepped-up plan of agitation and propaganda in heavily populated Negro and Spanish-speaking sections of the Nation.

They intend to pound home the claim that the "enemy" of all Negroes is the U.S. Government, while Russia and Cuba are their true friends and "allies."

They also will attempt to get Negroes to violate the Government ban on travel to Cuba.

"Negroes," said a Red document, "should be encouraged to visit Cuba."

The Government barred travel of all Americans to the Communist-run island after it broke off diplomatic relations with the Soviet satellite. The action followed a long series of insults, confiscation of U.S. property, and jailing of American citizens on trumped up charges.

Patterson, who set the tone for the conference, won hearty applause when he said the time was right for a "get tough" program to "force" the Government to end segregation.

He singled out New York, Philadelphia, Detroit, Cleveland, Los Angeles, and San Francisco as northern cities where concentrated mass activities could supposedly wipe out segregation overnight. This could happen, he asserted, "if we (Communists) work correctly, if the masses are drawn into unified action."

Meaning of such doubletalk from a Communist: Big strikes.

Said Patterson: "Let us help make history. Let us help increase the tempo and the scope of the struggles for equality * * *."

The Communist Party is never satisfied with legal ways to end problems. It prefers mob violence, strife, and class conflict—and will attempt to stoke mass disorder—for the benefit of the Kremlin.

REDS BLAME UNITED STATES FOR LUMUMBA DEATH

(By Jack Lotto)

The U.S. Communist Party this week hypocritically blamed the U.S. Government and the Rockefeller family for Lumumba's killing, and ordered demonstrations to continue.

A document drafted by the four-man secretariat showed the Reds intend to combine their agitation for the Communist-desired Congo with racial problems in this country.

The Communists want to curry favor with American Negroes by posing, falsely, as their champions and friends. In this manner, they hope to get many Negroes to back Communist demands for taking over the Congo behind a smokescreen of liberation talk.

All Reds and pro-Communist fronts in every phase of American life were told to keep the pressure on to win support for Soviet ideas.

Said the action-now manifesto: "We call upon labor and the American people—trade unions, people's organizations, churches, fraternal societies—upon women and youth, to demonstrate in every democratic and peaceful manner; in meetings, parades, and

through telegrams, resolutions and statements.

"The monstrous assassinations of Lumumba and his aids are crimes against colonial freedom and against the noble cause of Negro liberation in the United States. The United States stands guilty before world opinion of doing everything possible in creating the conditions which led to these barbarous crimes."

Unsaid by the Communists: The United States is supporting United Nations attempts to bring peace and stability to the Congo. The United States backed an African-Asian sponsored U.N. resolution to strengthen the U.N.'s hand in the Congo. The Soviet Union did not support the resolution.

The first big demonstration, openly organized by the Communist Party, was set for Friday night (March 3) in New York's Carnegie Hall.

This Red rally started out as an 80th birthday tribute to William Z. Foster, longtime party boss, now in Moscow. The death of Lumumba gave the Reds the opportunity to use the occasion to turn the pro-Red Lumumba into another propaganda martyr.

Among the claims by the Reds: The Rockefeller family has vast holdings in the Congo, and therefore this country supposedly would "risk a world nuclear disaster to protect their monopoly superprofits."

Also unsaid by the Reds: The Congo is rich in uranium deposits, which they want. The first American A-bombs were made with uranium from Katanga, a province now controlled by pro-Western President Moise Tshombe.

If the Reds really wanted to see peace in the Congo, they would back the U.N. instead of trying to undercut it. They want to get all U.N. troops out of the Congo.

"Let the Congolese people settle their own affairs" is the pious but phony chant of the Reds and their cohorts. What they mean is let the Soviet Union have a free hand in turning the Congo into another Red colony.

REDS PUSH 1961 U.S. HUNGER MARCHES

(By Jack Lotto)

The Communists are drumming up nationwide hunger marches.

Thirty-one years after they led the big March 1930 demonstrations, the Reds are working to spark new mass struggles.

The plans to sharply increase agitation among the Nation's unemployed were OK'd in a recent secret meeting of the party hierarchy.

A letter-directive to all district and State Communist locals ordered immediate concentration on the task.

A special depression issue of 100,000 copies of the party's newspaper was printed and is being distributed in key unemployment areas across the country.

Every article had one theme: The mass demonstrations and battles of the depression days have lessons for today's struggles. Meaning: Get such marches going again in major cities and State capitals—with one march toward Washington.

"Prepare for sharper struggles" was the word sent to the comrades by Gus Hall, national secretary of the Communist Party.

Indications are the Reds will begin setting up on local, State, and National levels so-called unemployment councils, as they did in the 1930's. Where such groups are already organized by legitimate labor unions, the Reds will attempt to infiltrate or "guide" them.

Said an editorial in the Worker, official party paper: "Only struggles like those waged by the unemployed and many unions during the 1930's can force new urgent advances on the welfare front * * * conferences of a few public figures along with union officials will not impress anybody * * * we need grassroots action and conferences of many thousands, if the country is to be really aroused * * *."

Thus, the Reds belittled the efforts of the anti-Communist AFL–CIO on the jobless problem. They claimed that only the Communists truly represent the needs of the unemployed.

The Communists see wonderful trouble-making opportunities in the real unemployment problem. Discontent is the breeding ground for the Reds to find recruits among those who have nothing to lose, and to push their divide and conquer strategy.

Among the proposals being peddled by the party supposedly to aid the jobless was one for a big increase in trade with Red China and Russia. Shipping strategic goods to the Communists to build up their war potential—now banned by law—would make plenty of work, the local Reds claimed.

Another demand in the peddling of utopian ideas to pose as the friend of the needy and unemployed: The U.S. Government should pay two-thirds of every jobless worker's wages indefinitely.

MARTH STERN TURNS PROPAGANDIST

(By Jack Lotto)

Amid the cries for revenge for Lumumba, a strange winter wonderland tale popped up in the U.S. Communist press this week.

The article appeared odd in Communist publications full of agitational directives, calls for mass meetings, etc., but the author was even more unusual.

It was the once-beautiful Mati Hari, and American fugitive, Martha Dodd Stern.

She and her multimillionaire husband, Alfred, have been wanted since 1957 on an espionage indictment, linking them with a big wartime Soviet spy ring in the United States.

The Sterns went into the "deep freeze" after escaping behind the Iron Curtain from Mexico, leaving behind a final diatribe, blaming the United States for world tensions.

The unusually lengthy and flowery story about a peaceful winter scene in a tiny Czechoslovakian village was actually a signal to the comrades. It meant that the turncoat daughter of a former U.S. ambassador was coming into the open to engage in a new role for the international Communist conspiracy—that of a propagandist.

One would hardly suspect the hard drinking, ruthless character of the woman who wrote colorfully of the supposedly blissful life under communism:

"Coming upon the healthy red-cheeked women was like walking into a garden of summer flowers. In their luscious colored kerchiefs and brilliant costumes, they moved gracefully, one more alluring than the next."

Contrast this with the last statement by Mrs. Stern, issued in 1957, when she arrived in Prague, and vanished:

"The ruling groups in the United States, instead of accepting the challenge of peaceful economic and political competition with the Socialist countries, launched a national policy of cold war, dedicated to greater and greater profits for the monopolists, and to the oppression, if not the destruction of mankind."

Imprisoned spy boss, Jack Soble, who admits receiving espionage reports from Mrs. Stern, told the writer that the accused agent, in her twisted loyalty to Russia, would go to any length to help the Reds.

She bragged to him how she stole U.S. Embassy secrets during her late father's term as Ambassador to Hitler's Germany in the 1930's. The information was turned over to a Soviet agent with whom she was having an affair.

It was she who first suspected FBI counterspy Boris Morros and so informed the Soviet Embassy in Washington. Luckily for the motion-picture producer, the Soviets took no immediate action against Morros.

Watch for possible big outbreaks of violence stirred by pro-Communists in Harlem and other Negro-populated areas of the country this week.

"Memorial" rallies for Lumumba are in the works, the biggest scheduled for New York's Harlem Sunday afternoon.

Soapy's Wife Proves To Be One-Woman Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, Judd Arnett recently discovered that it is no mean task trying to keep up with a person as active as Mrs. Nancy Williams, wife of Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs Williams. While accompanying her husband on his recent tour of Africa, Mrs. Williams displayed a vigor and stamina that came close to exhausting the male members of the entourage. In the following article, Mr. Arnett describes how this "one-woman Peace Corps" was able to project an interest, warmth, and understanding that found an encouraging response in all the people she met.

The article follows:

SOAPY'S WIFE PROVES TO BE ONE-WOMAN PEACE CORPS

(By Judd Arnett)

ANYWHERE IN AFRICA.—At dawn this hot and muggy morning, Mrs. Nancy Williams, the wife of G. Mennen, turned off the alarm and made ready for another day.

After a hasty breakfast she kissed ol' "Soapy," Michigan's ex-Governor and the incumbent Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, who said "Goodbye, Honey," no doubt, and then she resumed a schedule the likes of which would make a Marine gunnery sergeant go AWOL.

This is what she did:

At 8, met the embassy staff; 8:40, toured the embassy building; 9:30, had coffee with assorted American ladies; 10:30, departed for radio interview; 10:45, arrived at local YWCA; 11:15, inspected a maternity hospital; 11:45, visited a nursery school; 12:20, toured a girls' school; 1:25, lunched with a women's group; 3, chatted with a distinguished native lady; 4, romped through a museum; 5, was present for the opening of a library; 7, appeared fresh as a daisy at a sundowner, Africa's cocktail party, or reception; 9, dined with "Soapy" and important national politicians.

This was not an unusual day in the life of Nancy Williams, who has been on the campaign trail since 1948. It was just another whirl on the merry-go-round she has been riding since February 15, when she left New York as the only female member of the entourage bent on a hurried look-see at 16 African nations.

And now is the time for a public confession: The early skeptics, myself included, bow to superior strength and stamina. She has run us ragged, she has remained well and vital while the rest of us were going through various stages of the vapors—she has been the best advertisement America has had during this often trying month.

AFRICAN WOMEN GET A RAW DEAL

More than any other member of the American party, Mrs. Williams has met the people of Africa. Practically all her time has been spent in hospitals, schools, nurseries, market places.

She has left the politicking to others, her distinguished husband included, and as a result I suspect that she knows far more about the problems of this struggling, chaotic continent than any of the rest of us.

If Congress really wants to know what Africa is all about, perhaps they should call the Governor's wife to testify before the budget committees.

Certainly she would say kind words for the women of Africa, for she has told me that the greatest need out here is twofold with one central goal—the emancipation of the weaker sex through education and medical care.

By any standards, the African woman gets a raw deal, for she is the fetcher, the toter, the family member who does the work while the old man sits in the shade or goes fishing.

A common sight in all African countries is this: Here comes a housewife, a bundle of wood, or a jug of water, or a pan of food plucked from the forest, balanced on her head. More often than not, a baby will be riding on her back, held in place by a length of cloth.

You seldom see a man carrying anything. Yet men have all the hernia operations. Africa is not a woman's world.

One of the big problems in most native communities is lack of water, and Momma must do the going after and the bringing back. This keeps her busy and out of the affairs of the menfolk, who have a great deal of heavy thinking to do, and resent interference at the family levels.

THE WELL INTERFERED

The story is told of a tribe that lived for years, perhaps centuries, through succeeding generations, on a high hill. It was 5 hours, coming and going, to the nearest water, and the women made this trip each day during the long and hot dry season.

The British dug a well nearby, and cut the traveling time to a matter of minutes. Progress? For the women, yes. But for tribal life, this was a very disturbing development—for the distaff members of the community now had time on their hands, and it was soon common gossip that they were interfering in the orderly processes of government at the precinct level.

It is into this strange and curious world that Nancy Williams has injected her personality for 4 weeks.

The response to her has been overwhelming. More than once I have seen and heard groups of Africans applaud when Nancy Williams appeared. She has never been afraid, not even in the Congo, where you couldn't have offered enough money to get some of us into the native quarters.

Nancy Williams has been a "one-woman peace corps" in Africa. Leaving her at home would have been the biggest mistake "Soapy" could have made.

AFRICA'S NEED

Out of Nancy Williams' experiences in Africa have come positive impressions. This is what she believes:

The work of the missionaries, Protestant and Catholic alike, has been very impressive. Without them, Africa would be much more retarded than it now is.

It is a mistake, Nancy Williams insists, to "talk about Africa in the lump sum. Different countries have different problems."

The quickest way to help Africa "is to see to it that more little girls are admitted to the schools. If we teach them homemaking and sanitation, they will have a great influence on the welfare and progress of their nations in the years immediately ahead."

She believes, too, that the social graces should be imparted to the young girls of Africa.

In too many instances, international scholarship grants have been withheld from girls and women. Therefore, the higher education of Africans has fallen "out of balance."

In the field of health, Mrs. Williams has found a high incidence of gastric diseases. Some people are affected 95 percent of the time, with resultant drains upon their abilities to resist fevers. In her hospital tours she has also found ailments which "we have not seen in the States for a long time—leprosy, yellow fever, tetanus."

It is in the cities that the greatest progress has been made, and in these areas Nancy Williams has learned that the women of Africa are aware "that there is a better way of life. They are avid to share in it, for the sake of themselves and their families."

And above all, she is convinced that Africans are "the friendliest people on the face of the earth."

Plight of the New England Fishing Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN A. SMITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the New York Herald Tribune published two additional articles yesterday and today concerning the plight of the New England fishing industry. The last of these is about the vital work being done by the Federal Government to aid the industry through research. I would like unanimous consent to have these articles printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROSPERITY ELUSIVE FOR U.S. FISHERMAN

(By William G. Wing)

GLOUCESTER, Mass., March 27.—The bronze fisherman that stands on the waterfront, staring out toward a sea where fewer and fewer Gloucestermen are fishing, seems to have a wistful expression these days.

Hard times have come to Gloucester's fishermen. Their fortunes have declined even though the United States remains one of the great fish-catching powers. The only countries that catch more, according to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, are Japan and Communist China.

But since 1959, the biggest part of the U.S. catch has been for factories and chicken farms rather than food for people. These are the so-called industrial fish, mostly a sardine-like species called menhaden, which are squeezed for oil for paint and other uses and ground into meal for animals and poultry.

TITLE MOVES SOUTH

Most of this kind of fishing is done south of New England. Two years ago the menhaden fleet took away Gloucester's title as the country's first fishing port and gave it to Reedville, a pungent little village at the tip of the Northern Neck in Virginia.

Gloucester, like the rest of New England, is chiefly interested in edible fish, precisely the kind called groundfish. These are such species as cod, halibut, haddock, redfish and flounder that feed on or near the bottom—the "ground." They are scooped up in huge, bag-like nets and principally sold to such fresh-fish markets as the Fulton Fish Market in New York.

IMPORTED FISH BLOCKS

These markets have been hurt in the last 8 years by the advent of packaged, frozen, precooked fish. Right in the forefront of this new development is the city of Gloucester which has 25 factories processing fish. Fish is still the No. 1 industry here, with tourists second.

But Gloucester's fishermen haven't shared in the boom. The fish used in the frozen packages are the kind they catch—cod and haddock, mostly—but the fish that flow along the production lines here were caught by Canadians, Icelanders, Danes, Japanese and other foreign fishermen.

The reason is that the basis of the production lines is a commodity called fish blocks. These are frozen blocks of pure meat, uniform in size, that look like slabs of marble. They arrive in Gloucester stacked in holds of refrigerated cargo ships and move on to the production lines like lumber, first through bandsaws that cut them into small portions and then through cascades of batter and bread crumbs, tanks of hot cooking oil and then blasts in subzero air. Then the portions are sorted into boxes, sealed, stamped and sent away in refrigerated trucks all across the country.

U.S. MEN UNDERSOLD

New England fishermen have not been able to compete in the business of producing fish blocks for a number of reasons. Their prices for fish are low but foreign fishermen can sell lower. Workers in the foreign fish-block plants are paid less than Americans would work for. On top of this, the imported frozen fish have an advantage in quality.

The sooner a fish can be frozen after it is caught, the fresher it will taste. Foreign fishermen are closer to the grounds where the fish live. Boats from Nova Scotia and Iceland can get their catch to the freezer within a few hours; a Gloucester trawler that goes out to the Grand Banks may have to keep fish in its hold a week before reaching shore.

TOO INDEPENDENT

There are other factors that work against the Gloucester fishermen, including his temperament. Hazardous, chancy work at sea has made him one of the Republic's most self-reliant citizens. There are no employers and employees in the boat. The men work on shares. Independence has been a greater virtue among fishermen than cooperation. They just don't think in terms of organization and long-range plans in comparison to other industries.

They have never gotten much outside help. Fishermen stand in striking contrast to their fellow food-producers, the farmers, in regard to the Government and public money. Farmers are swathed in Government controls and protections, but fishermen's prices are not supported; they receive no subsidy—so far, at least—and the product with which they compete comes in from abroad with low duties or no duties.

GOVERNMENT EFFORT

Their foreign competitors on the fishing grounds usually are subsidized and often work as part of a corporate or government-directed effort. This sort of fishing is epitomized by a Russian fishing fleet recently described in an English newspaper.

The fleet showed up near some English trawlers and went to work like a naval task force, flashing signals and maneuvering itself into position. Within a short time, it

had swept up the fish in the area with the efficiency of a vacuum cleaner.

This is extreme but it may be the face of the future. Having to meet this kind of competition from abroad is bad enough, but what really rankles the Gloucesterman is the feeling that he has to meet it while his own country is working against him.

U.S. HELP FOR FOREIGNERS

The feeling comes from the fact that so many foreign fisheries have been made strong and efficient by American gifts and loans. American help for fisheries around the world from Albania to Vietnam has been on a tremendous scale as a means of helping these countries feed themselves again after World War II. The help has enabled some of the countries to acquire fishing facilities New England can't match. The Gloucesterman is galled by having had to help pay for them.

He is also hobbled by a law that forbids him from buying a boat on the open market. His boat is the biggest investment and usually the key to whether he can fish successfully. But he can't shop, like a yachtsman, for a boat built in a foreign yard. He can only buy an American-built boat which is generrally more expensive.

LAW DOESN'T HELP

The law that restricts him was passed to protect American shipbuilders. To offset the builders' higher prices, some shipowners are paid subsidies. Fishermen get nothing.

As a step toward correcting this situation, the last Congress appropriated $750,000 to be given as part of the cost of new boats, if the owner could prove his business had been hurt by imports. The money given could be up to a third of the cost of the boat. But not a cent was paid to fishermen last year because of technicalities in the wording of the legislation.

There are two Federal loan programs. One has loaned fish boatowners $11 million at 5 percent interest during the last 3 years for construction, repairs and equipment. Another program just starting will insure loans and mortgages fishermen obtain to build or fix their boats.

NEED FISH TARIFF

Asked what help they need to survive, fishermen have a standard answer: higher tariffs on foreign fish. Four attempts to gain an increase on imported fillets were made by the New England fishermen during the last administraton. The Tariff Commission approved two but both were denied by President Eisenhower.

The President said he was reluctant to impede trade with foreign nations. He also said he thought higher tariffs were not in the fishermen's best interests. Many others agree that a tariff would not accomplish what the fishermen want; they think it would run up the price of fish, make supplies more uncertain and make fish less acceptable to the public.

OPPOSING FACTORS

In Gloucester, the fishermen think there are two specific factors working against a higher tariff. One is that the U.S. Government would not raise the duty on Icelandic fish as long as we quarter our troops in Iceland. The other is that the automobile makers in Detroit are against a higher fish tariff for this reason: if the United States makes it harder for Canada to sell fish here, Canada may make it harder for Americans to sell automobiles there. Automobiles weigh more than fish in Washington.

Besides bitterness about imports, the age-old gripe of the fishermen is still current on the waterfront. This is that the fisherman is robbed blind by the middleman. The markup between prices paid at the wharves and prices paid by the consumer keep this alive.

MARKUP EXAMPLE

A week or so ago, for instance, fishermen here were getting 7½ cents a pound for flounder; the fillets were selling the next day in New York for 60 cents a pound. Since it takes 3 pounds of whole flounder to make one pound of fillet, the markup appears to be from 22½ to 60 cents. This is said to be a mild example.

The risks and waste in handling fish account for the markup and, as Heaven knows, marketing fish is a vast, complex problem of its own. Tomorrow we will look into the Federal Government's efforts to help fishermen through technical research.

UNITED STATES TURNS TO RESEARCH TO HELP FISHERMEN

(By William G. Wing)

GLOUCESTER, MASS., March 28.—No one before has seen what a trawler's net looked like as it scraped along the ocean floor, but here it was on a screen. The Government's fishery research people had put a television camera in a net and now were showing the film to an audience of trawler captains.

The film showed that as the net was dragged at about 3 miles an hour, the meshes opened wide. They were perfectly square. It was a brilliantly conclusive answer to the long-argued question of the shape of meshes under pressure. Most fishermen had thought they were pulled sideways and narrowed.

The lights went on and a fisherman said flatly: "That's not right."

"But you just saw it," the Government man said.

"Yeah," said the fisherman, "but I don't believe it."

This illustrates both the difficulty of forcing new ideas on that most conservative breed, fishermen, and also the sort of thing the Federal Government's Bureau of Commercial Fisheries is doing to learn basic facts about the ancient but little understood fisheries.

TRACK DRIFTING EGGS

Government researchers have tracked drifting cods eggs by dropping bottles from dirigibles, herded schools of herring with air bubbles, discovered new haunts of lobster and tuna and are spending endless hours twiddling with test tubes and sniffing, seeking to learn why a fish smells like a fish.

The television camera in the net showed not only the shape of the meshes but also the reaction of fish when a great gaping net comes blundering into their school; they turn and swim directly before it like dogs at a smalltown parade.

"It looks like the only fish that get caught are the ones that stumble," a researcher said.

Next the researchers plan to send men down to ride in the nets and watch what happens. An underwater car has been made from a plane's wing tank which will be towed directly in front of the net. The bomb-shaped car has short wings and holds two skin divers, one sitting like a tail-gun Charlie in the rear, working a television camera, the other in front working the controls.

TRIED LAST SUMMER

The device was tried out last summer and the only shortcoming was that the divers almost froze while being towed through the icy ocean of Cape Cod. More protection for them has been built in the car and this summer it will be used in experiments on electronarcosis. Electric shocks will be sent into the water to stun fish and cause them to stumble into the net. The Government's skindivers, who have the outlook of Nathan Hale, seemed unworried at the risk of both drowning and electrocution.

This research, as well as all the Federal efforts to help fishermen, is done by the Burea of Commercial Fisheries, which is part of the Interior Department's Fish and Wildlife Service. The Bureau is old—fisheries having been the first natural resource to arouse the American public's concern—but it has recently been given new life.

This came from the passage of the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act in 1954, allocating 30 per cent of the duties collected on fish imports for research to help the fisheries. The act gave the Bureau an additional $3 million a year, making possible many of the present projects in Gloucester.

The name of the act also explains why the Government fisheries people, if not the fishermen, seem heartened by the advent of the new administration. John F. Kennedy was well versed in the problems of Massachusetts fisherman as a Senator. As President, he mentioned fish in one of his first speeches, the message on natural resources. Gloucester noted that he called for increased efforts under Federal leadership to rehabilitate stocks of various fishes, including groundfish, the principal catch in New England.

VILLAGE IS HAPPY

(Gloucester also is not unhappy that Mr. Kennedy's replacement as Senator is the city's former mayor and former president of a fish-processing firm, BENJAMIN A. SMITH II.)

In Gloucester are the Bureau's North Atlantic headquarters and most of the Government's research activities. A big technological laboratory was opened last June, concerned with improving the quality of marketed fish, finding better ways to handle it and developing new seafood products.

At the State pier another Federal laboratory works to make fishing gear more efficient. It keeps the big trawler *Delaware* engaged in exploratory fishing from the Grand Banks to Bermuda. The Biological Laboratory, which worries about the management of supplies of fish in the ocean, is at Woods Hole on Cape Cod.

Smells and tastes of fish are studied at the technological laboratory. Scientists hope to find ways to stop the fishy smell that develops after fish has been kept on ice a week. They think it may also be possible to restore the taste and smell of fresh fish to the processed product, a standard procedure in some other foods.

PRESERVE FRESHNESS

The laboratory is also trying to pinpoint the change that takes place in all frozen fish with time, making it tougher in texture although not decreasing its nutritional value. The laboratory is working on new methods of preserving freshness, including storing fish in refrigerated sea water (which seems to keep fish up to 4 days longer than ice) and irradiation (under contract from the Atomic Energy Commission).

The *Delaware*, which uses the underwater television camera, is at sea most of the year. It found new supplies of tuna offshore and located lobster in deep water south of Georges Bank. The trawler is also used by the biologists at Woods Hole.

Some of these activities are watched with a skeptical eye by the fishermen. Their complaint is that the techniques developed by the Government are too visionary or too expensive to be of use to them.

"And if they find something like those offshore tuna," a fisherman said, "they run to one of those blasphemous obscenity conferences, tell them the exact location and some Nova Scotia trawlers will go and catch every one before any American has a chance."

Another kind of bitterness is aroused when a fisherman, slogging home through the streets of Gloucester after a poor trip, sees a Government man drive past him and

thinks: "There goes the guy who is using up the money that's supposed to help me."

A fisherman said: "The Government might find something good in all those laboratories, but when they do, there won't be any fishermen left to use it."

John T. Gharrett, who is director of the bureau's North Atlantic region, is convinced, that the Nation will soon have to turn to the sea for more protein. He is just as convinced that basic research is necessary to make sure the supply will be available.

Address by the Honorable Alan S. Boyd, Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, Before the Orlando Junior Chamber of Commerce on the Occasion of Aviation Day, Orlando, Fla., March 18, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, on March 18, 1961, the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Orlando sponsored the celebration of Aviation Day in that city, and the city of Orlando took this occasion to rename its municipal airport in honor of a distinguished public servant, A. B. (Pat) Herndon.

We were honored on this occasion to have as our principal speaker another distinguished public servant, the Honorable Alan S. Boyd, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, whose speech I have asked unanimous consent to place in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY HON. ALAN S. BOYD, CHAIRMAN, CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD, BEFORE THE ORLANDO JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE ON THE OCCASION OF AVIATION DAY, ORLANDO, FLA., MARCH 18, 1961

On New Year's Day in 1914, on a typical sunny morning, Tony Jannus flew from Tampa to St. Petersburg. This flight marked the beginning of scheduled commercial air service in the United States. Florida was in the forefront of commercial aviation. On a greatly expanded basis, it still is; as we all know. We Floridians can be justly proud of this record and the part that men of this State, such as Pat Herndon, have played in developing the record.

Only a few months ago, on television, I had occasion to observe that no State of comparable size and population enjoys greater air service than Florida—8 of the 12 U.S. trunkline carriers offer services to and from the State. In addition, a local service carrier operates in the northern part. Four certificated carriers have their head offices here. Twenty-eight foreign airline companies come here from abroad, and five U.S. airlines operate abroad from Florida cities. The most modern air navigational, airport, passenger, cargo, and mail facilities are available to the public locally, along with the latest jet aircraft. Shortly Florida will also have the latest in all-cargo aircraft. Only last Tuesday the Civil Aeronautics Board released its opinion in the Southern Transcontinental case, which permits of single-carrier, single-plane service between Florida and California via the southern tier of States.

Still, there is much to be done. While we do honor to Pat Herndon by renaming the airport after him, and while we salute the aviation industry and its accomplishments, we should also concern ourselves with the record we will show to those who look back on our role in aviation 25 or 50 years from today.

Scheduled commercial aviation has undergone some radical changes and developments since the day Tony Jannus flew his primitive flying boat over the waters of Tampa Bay. Many of us became acquainted with flying during World War II. We were fascinated to discover that it provided a way of passage over mountains, swamps and oceans with ease, and at great speeds. We saw the development of airfields all up and down the peninsula of Florida. We thought that with the great advantages of flight, every town and city having an airport would be served with scheduled airplanes to anywhere—near or far.

The fact is that today many of these airfields have grown up in weeds and the sounds of an airplane taking off or landing haven't been heard in years. Real estate developers are now busy trying to salvage something by promoting these idle fields as industrial parks.

In this context of progress on the one hand, and distress on the other, let us see what has happened and what it means to a vital aggressive community such as Orlando. What, in short, are the lessons to be gained from experience?

These airports to which I allude were expensive to build and were intended to be valuable assets to the communities where they were located. However, it was soon discovered that very few people are willing to travel several miles from downtown to an airport to fly short distances and land at another airport several miles from destination. Furthermore, there are not enough people traveling in and out of many towns or cities to permit an economical airline operation which could provide a reasonably frequent service. The modern aircraft is a costly machine to buy and to operate, and no company can long remain in the business of providing air service unless it carries substantial loads.

So these airports did not become aviation centers essentially because there was not enough traffic to support them. The problem has become more acute with the advent of jet aircraft. They are larger and faster than anything we have previously known. They cost more to own and to operate. They cannot land and take off every few miles, or even every few hundred miles. If the cost of flying is to remain within reach, these planes must be utilized to serve only those places providing heavy traffic in passengers, cargo and mail.

In order to expect or require good schedules and good service from airlines, a community must provide the passengers and shippers. By this I do not mean all the traffic the community can generate; rather I mean all the traffic the airlines need to permit them to offer a satisfactory service and to be financially healthy as well as operationally sound.

Granted that air service must be reasonably adequate and reasonably priced to the public, and economically sound or at least potentially profitable on a system basis to the carriers, a serious question of necessity presents itself. Are too many airports being served by commercial airliners today? The facts that too many communities are receiving below average service, and that the airline companies are quite often losing their shirts in providing same, would seem to indicate that the answer to the question is "Yes," as unpleasant as that may be.

In the light of this inadequacy and uneconomy, and with an eye to a mounting Federal subsidy bill which must be checked at some point and eventually reduced, one is forced to conclude that the present situation cannot be permitted to continue, much less to deteriorate. The second question which presents itself is therefore: What is to be done about the problem?

One of the major factors giving rise to the problem of too little service at too many points is political. The residents of one town do not want to travel 15 or 20 miles to board an airplane serving a neighboring and perhaps competing community. This apparently is abhorrent to civic pride. Furthermore, if one city enjoys a certain level of service, its neighbors will not rest until they achieve the same or better. This can mean complaints to airline management, calls to Congressmen, petitions filed with the Civil Aeronautics Board, and, frequently, litigation.

It is often a physical and legal impossibility to oblige carriers to provide the same or a similar level of service to neighboring towns. Yet this is what is not only expected, it is demanded. The Civil Aeronautics Board has granted many such pleas in the past. It must be borne in mind, however, that the Board acted favorably on many of these applications on the basis of the economical characteristics of earlier types of aircraft. With a rapidly changing airline economy and equipment position leading to tremendously increased costs, it cannot be expected that the Board will always react favorably to petitions for airline service as it has done so often in the past.

The airplane knows no political boundaries. Flight operations must be established in the light of what an airplane is designed to do, not on the basis of what someone or ones would like it to do despite the economic facts of life.

The logical solution to our problem in my mind lies in the establishment and acceptance of the idea of regional airports. If we are to have a good airline service and a healthy aviation industry, there seems to be little other choice. At some point the economics of aviation will force us to give up the idea of a competing municipal or county airport for every town or community, and go over to the idea of several neighboring towns and communities supporting one airport for airline services which they can afford to build, and at which they will enjoy adequate service with modern flight equipment and facilities. This appear to be the best solution to the ineconomy of the so-called adjacent airport problem.

Any community desirous of becoming a central location for an airport serving neighboring communities must bend every effort to assure good roads and facilities in the surrounding area. It might even have to give credit to some other community in the airport name. It must provide facilities for a comfortable ride at reasonable rates between the airport and the destination of persons within its service area. Secure parking spaces should be provided at an absolute minimum cost to those who would leave their cars at the airport while on trips. Efforts should be made to extend the local telephone base rate area into the service area.

If Orlando aspires to this central position, most important is an active, intelligent campaign to convince your neighbors that the utilization of the Orlando facilities is in their interest. You now have here a good service pattern. With more air travelers you can demand and obtain a better one, particularly if neighboring cities will drop their present requirements in your favor. You will have to sell them on the proposition that by giving up their individual meager service, and by supporting a regional airport at Orlando, they will enjoy a superior centralized service with the latest facilities and adequate schedules. It is a hard but worthy task. Everyone can gain in such an exchange. If you accept this challenge, you will do a great public service and acquire the very finest transportation system in the process.

Protecting the Interests of Consumers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the attorney general of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Hon. Edward J. McCormack, Jr., who is my nephew, established in the office of the attorney general of Massachusetts some 3 years ago a consumers council, which has rendered outstanding service to the people and the consumers of Massachusetts in looking after and protecting their interests.

In connection with the bill to establish by law a consumers council on a cabinet level in Massachusetts, which bill is pending before the Committee on State Administration of the House of Representatives in Massachusetts, Attorney General McCormack appeared in support of the same, also Rev. Father Robert J. McEwen, S.J., chairman, Department of Economics, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Mass., and who is chairman of the Massachusetts Attorney General's Advisory Consumers Council. In my remarks I include statements made by Attorney General McCormack and Father McEwen.

I note with pride that President Kennedy has recently taken a further important step in connection with protecting the interests of the consumers of the United States.

The statements follow:

PROTECTING THE INTERESTS OF CONSUMERS

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, "for too many years the consumers' problems have been thought of as everybody's business but ignored as nobody's business. We now realize that everybody's business must be somebody's business.

In our fast moving, intricate, and impersonal economy a spokesman for the consumer is essential. The National Democratic platform in 1960 stated: "In an age of mass production, transportation, and advertising, consumers require effective Government representation and protection."

The Massachusetts Democratic platform in 1960 stated: "In these days of big business, big labor, and big government the consumers are in danger of being ignored. We favor creation of a consumers council."

I would like to point out just a few of the areas where this protection must be provided.

First, the consumer must be protected against deceit, dishonesty, and deception in the marketplace.

False advertising: An estimated $2 billion are annually taken from Americans by fraud. If to this figure is added the amount taken by schemes which are shoddy and disreputable even though technically within the law, the total amount is almost incredible.

Deceptive interest rates: Unscrupulous installment sellers and credit lenders are continually victimizing citizens through nondisclosure and camouflage of true interest charges.

Fraudulent selling schemes: Because of the negotiation of his promissory note a defrauded consumer is deprived of his remedies. Through high-pressure tactics of hit-and-run operators he is duped into purchases he doesn't need and cannot afford. Hardly a day goes by when I do not receive numerous complaints along these lines—many of them heartrending.

Second, the consumer must be represented in decisions involving the cost of living—in hearings on compulsory automobile insurance rates, on utility rates, on milk regulations, on railroad passenger service, and the like.

In 1958, I established an advisory consumers council in the office of the attorney general. This is a purely voluntary group of dedicated persons. They have had their work cut out for them. The council has protected the consumer by successfully opposing milk price fixing, and unwarranted curtailment of railroad commuter service. It has spoken for the consumer in hearings on automobile insurance rates. We have attacked fradulent food-freezer plans, price-fixing arrangements, and deceptive advertising.

To continue to be effective, the consumers council must be established on a statutory basis. Already New York, Washington, California, Texas, and New Jersey have formally recognized this need. Massachusetts must do the same.

The great majority of the business communities also recognize this need. The better business bureaus recognize the need.

Massachusetts cannot allow its citizens to be victimized by fraudulent selling schemes, by deceptive advertising, by camouflaged interest charges, or by unjustified increases in the cost of goods and service.

Deceit, dishonesty, and deception used against the consumer is a vital concern of Government. Unwarranted increases in the cost of living must be stopped.

The establishment of a consumers council in the attorney general's office is essential to furnish real representation for the millions of Massachusetts consumers.

CONSUMERS COUNCIL IN MASSACHUSETTS

(Testimony of Rev. Robert J. McEwen, S.J., chairman, Department of Economics, Boston College, before Committee on State Administration of Massachusetts General Court, March 15, 1961)

Gentleman: My name is Father Robert J. McEwen. I am chairman of the Department of Economics at Boston College and also chairman of the attorney general's advisory consumers council. Let me give you a little background to illustrate my interest in this area. I spent many years investigating the conditions for justice and equity in markets and in prices. One of my conclusions was that the market and price system would grow more perfect in proportion as we improved the intelligence and knowledge and freedom from fraud and coercion of both buyers and sellers.

In 1956 I addressed the convention of the Catholic Economic Association in Cleveland on this topic. Speaking of information on the properties and qualities of consumer goods and their substitutes, I said:

"Such, of course, is the information that consumer organizations typically try to provide for their members. Worthy of imitation too is the action of New York State in setting up a special department of consumer interests. Ideally the more knowledge a man has, the better should be his choice. Reformers might usefully concentrate their efforts on this factor. It may prove to be the best way to improve the correctness of markets without destroying freedom, mobility, adaptability, and initiative."

Later, speaking of the businessmen, the sellers in the marketplace, I asked:

"Are men chiefly moved, and should they be so moved, by the profit motive, by self-interest, by altruism, by service to society, etc.? There is a very strong movement in the United States at the moment, especially in the universities and the larger corporations, to emphasize the social duties and responsibilities of the businessman. So much so, that Professor Hacker, reviewing Clarence Randall's new book, could say: 'It is evident today that private enterprise and public responsibility can go hand in hand.'

"The outcome of this development could conceivably be the creation of a business ethos quite strong in its sense of social values which would effectively restrain individuals tempted to engage in submarginal practices. Perhaps the force of public opinion could be mobilized through institutions such as better business bureaus, consumers councils, etc. In this case the moral suasion of public opinion would be used to bolster an individual's sense of social duty or social responsibility."

Then my further study of constitutional and administrative law revealed a growing problem connected with the regulatory agencies. Both these factors made me conclude that an agency to give voice to a consumer viewpoint in economic affairs was extremely necessary and desirable.

I therefore appeared before the Massachusetts Legislature in 1958 in support of bills that had already been filed to establish a consumer counsel. At that time I pleaded with the general court to grasp the opportunity of leadership among the States and be the first State in the Union to set up officially a consumers council. I appealed to them at that time to keep Massachusetts' reputation as a pioneer and leader in social progress legislation.

You all know that this was not done and that we have lost the initiative in this matter to New York, California, Michigan, Connecticut, Washington, West Virginia, and so forth. In all these States, the consumer now has representation. I do hope that shortsighted and ill-conceived opposition will not thwart the adoption of a consumers council in Massachusetts until such time as Massachusetts finally falls in line as the 49th or 50th State in the Union to adopt such a measure.

In this connection, I may add, it would be doubly ironical if a leading son of Massachusetts, who now sits in a small private dwelling on Pennsylvania Avenue, should institute, as he has promised, a Department of Consumer Interests in the President's Office, while his native State still refuses to accept a consumer representative in the State government.

Let me now summarize the main benefits that would follow in Massachusetts from the establishment of the permanent consumers council.

1. Improved consumer information and education.

Competent political scientists and responsible business analysts agree that reputable businessmen selling first-class products will be helped by a high level of consumer information and education. Only that small minority of businessmen who are trying to put something over on the public would desire to have a low level of consumer education.

2. The good reputation of business as a whole.

Enlightened businessmen therefore should support this measure for increased attention to consumer education and protection. Such support will indicate their genuine interest in consumer improvements and their desire to assist the public—and incidentally all good businessmen themselves—in defeating and exposing the schemes of sharp operators or shady businessmen who would try to exploit the consumer.

Such operators and their tactics damage the good name of business as a whole, create a cynical distrust of the honesty and integrity of all businessmen and further widen the gulf between business and the general

public. It should be in the interest of all reputable businessmen to demonstrate their support for measures like consumers council bills to protect the consuming public.

3. Financial saving to the Commonwealth.

A permanent office of this nature will be an economical replacement for the hurried and last-minute special investigations that the general court sets up every time a problem becomes acute in this field. Appropriations for such special investigations frequently run in terms of $100,000 or $200,000, and there have been several examples of these in years past.

It should not be forgotten that many members of the general court have used the office of the Advisory Consumers Council in the Attorney General's office as a vehicle for handling complaints from their own constituents. These members of the house and senate should have a pretty good idea of the valuable function, in removing consumer complaints and consumer irritation, that the mere existence of such a consumer council can provide.

At this point someone may bring up the fact that there are allegedly many agencies already protecting the consumer, such as, the Massachusetts Federation of Taxpayers, Department of Public Utilities, and so forth. Gentlemen, can anyone still make that argument with a straight face after the reading of the Landis report?

4. Equality of representation for both business and the consuming public.

After all, gentlemen, it is well known that every business interest has its own government relations counsel and public relations counsel jealously watching its interests before both government bodies and the general public. Is it too much for the public to expect you to grant them the right to have similar representation, specifically assigned the task of representing the consumer interest in the State government?

Federal Aid Without Federal Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Col. W. D. Workman, one of the South's most distinguished newsmen and authors, has written an article on Federal aid to education which merits the attention of the Congress and the people of our country. It is entitled "Federal Aid Without Federal Control" and appeared on March 27, 1961, in a number of daily newspapers. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this article which appeared in the Columbia Record of Columbia, S.C., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

In this excellent article Colonel Workman points out that there can be no Federal aid without Federal control, and he recommends very highly two books by Mr. Roger A. Freeman entitled "Taxes for the Schools" and "School Needs in the Decade Ahead," which I have found to be most helpful and most scholarly prepared.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL AID WITHOUT FEDERAL CONTROL
(By W. D. Workman)

"Federal aid without Federal control" is the spurious cry of those assorted educators, politicians, and do-gooders who wish Congress to dish out more money for schools, schoolchildren, and schoolteachers.

Yet without Federal control, there is grave doubt that mere financial assistance will do all those things the Federal aiders want done. This column opposes Federal aid, with or without control, but it seeks as well to expose some of the addled preachments with which Federal aid is being sold.

Federal aid is, of necessity, a pattern of redistributing that portion of the Nation's wealth which the Federal Government thinks should be applied to education. This obviously involves taking (through the compulsion of taxes) from the rich to give to the poor. For the Government has no money of its own—and what it gives away it must first take away.

MORE FOR LESS

If the poorer States are to benefit, they must get back from Uncle Sam more money than he takes from them. By the same token, Uncle must take more from the richer States than he will return to them. The net result will be that some States will have more money available for school purposes, while others will have less.

Let's assume that all Federal aid will be used for education, and that it will be in addition to school funds already being raised on State and local levels. What then?

A great deal of the criticism of American schools is directed at education in the teeming population centers of the Nation. These, mind you, are located in States where per capita income is high, where total wealth and taxable property are great, and which will lose rather than gain revenues under the redistribution device of Federal aid.

Is it reasonable to expect that a State or city which now tolerates inferior schools will immediately correct them under a program of Federal aid? Can we expect them to do more for their schools when they have less money with which to do it? The only guarantee of improved conditions would be through the imposition of Federal control, assuming that the "improvement" must be to national standards. This would give the lie to the chant "Federal aid without Federal control."

Federal aid without control would be ineffective. With Federal control, Federal aid inevitably leads to nationalization of education, further erosion of local self-government, and mass conditioning of youthful minds according to uniform standards prescribed from Washington. Actually, this is precisely what is desired by more and more professional educators who yearn to take over the Nation's schools—lock, stock, and barrel.

REQUIRED READING

This frightening state of affairs is evidenced on every hand. It is documented, with chapter and verse, in Roger A. Freeman's new book, "Taxes for the Schools." That work, a compansion to his earlier "School Needs in the Decade Ahead," should be required reading for both the proponents and the opponents of Federal aid to education.

It is worth the price for one chapter alone—"Powers and Responsibilities in Education," a thought-provoking exploration of all facets of Federal aid, and of the trend of professional educators to grasp the reins of school authority through Federal aid.

On this particular score, Mr. Freeman has served posterity by putting down in permanent form Paul Woodring's paraphrase of the Clemenceau axiom:

"Just as war is too important to be left to the generals, education is too important to be left to the educators."

An Address by Hon. Elmer J. Holland, of Pennsylvania, Before the Graduating Class of the McKees Rocks High School on June 7, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Labor and Education Committee, I have been privileged to hear our colleague, the Honorable ELMER J. HOLLAND, of Pennsylvania, as the presiding chairman on a subcommittee studying automation.

Back in June 1955, when the Congressman was still serving in the State senate of our great State he addressed a graduating class in McKees Rocks, Pa.

His prophetic words and grasp of our present problems of education, automation, unemployment, and economic decline shows that even at that early date he sensed the coming crisis in our body politic.

All too often we place too little attention to what is said and too much on the person saying it.

I served many years with our colleague, Congressman HOLLAND, in both the House and the Senate of Pennsylvania. I am privileged to serve with him here in Congress.

Congressman HOLLAND's many years of experience as a legislator, industrial leader, business executive, and a union representative qualifies him to head the serious and timely study of automation and its impact upon unemployment.

The American Nation today is in the same position as a tourist driving on a strange road without a map right after a tornado.

He is on his way, he can drive a car, he knows where he wants to go, but needs a guide.

In this day of our history we need a guide to direct our great and limitless production facilities, our fruitful farms and our abundant manpower on a route that will lead to ever-increasing human benefits and a safe arrival to our eventual destination, a better way of life.

Men like ELMER HOLLAND who devote their time and talents to charter a safe and sane course, pointing out the rocks and shoals give all of us added incentive and encouragement as we pilot and crew the ship of state.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the following address given years ago by Congressman HOLLAND is as timely and apropos today as it was then:

ADDRESS GIVEN BY HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND, 38TH DISTRICT, PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE THE GRADUATING CLASS OF THE MCKEES ROCKS HIGH SCHOOL, JUNE 7, 1955

I remember the speaker at my high school graduation saying these words: "You are no longer girls and boys, but ladies and gentlemen. You have responsibilities. How you assume these responsibilities will decide—not only your future—but the future of the world."

This is truer today than then, as the world has grown smaller in judging distances due to advanced aircraft.

Do you realize that in your short 4 years of high school you have seen distance fade away? The jetplane has brought far distant parts of the world, that took weeks to reach, only hours to reach. And, with the coming of the atomic planes, who knows what speed of travel will be attained? Today we can eat breakfast in London or Paris and lunch in New York City.

Your generation shall write a chapter of history never equaled by any other chapter of history since the beginning of the world.

This chapter can be known as the great advancement of man in social and economic progress, or it can be known as the enslavement of man. Two hundred years ago our Western World experienced the beginnings of a movement that changed the lives of all mankind. It took men off the fields and out of small shops, it put them—for the first time—into factory life. It gave us mass production, and, through mass production, it gave us the first civilization in the history of the world in which luxury was not confined to just a few; it gave us, as well, a sense of hurry, of time, which is still unknown in countries that are "preindustrial"; it changed agricultural societies into mighty industrial nations; it altered the face of our own country, and it produced wealth, the like of which the world had never been before.

We were taught in school, as you probably were, to call this movement the 'industrial revolution." But today we find that name being changed. Today, we call it the first industrial revolution. For, suddenly, we find that our whole Nation is aware of a new movement—a new force—which holds promise of great social changes and increased economic benefits for all of us.

We are told that a new industrial revolution is in the making; in fact, it has already begun.

This second industrial revolution is called by the name "automation." This new word has cropped up in a changing America. It has been developed so recently that even the word is in few dictionaries. It is unfamiliar to many opinion makers. It is a mystery to the man in the street, unless it has cost him his job. I think that there is a good deal more confusion surrounding the word than some of us would like to admit. Perhaps the confusion begins in another word—in the much overused word—"revolution."

There seems to be a political revolution somewhere in the world at least once a year. And—every time a manufacturer puts a new girdle on the market, he calls it revolutionary. I even saw a sign in a New York bakery recently that read "Revolutionary New Old-Fashioned Doughnuts." But when we use the word "revolution" to describe the new movement of automation—we, of course, do not mean it in the sense of a political upheaval or of something that is merely new, gadgety or startling.

We mean it in the broadest sense of the word—in the sense in which we speak of the industrial revolution.

When we look back on that great upheaval 220 years ago—what was it that gave to it the name industrial revolution? Was it just the wonderful machines that lightened man's toil?

No; I think it was much more than this. I do not think it was used because of the riots that accompanied the introduction of some of the machines used at that time. Nor do I think it was used to describe the speed with which these changes took place. I believe it was used because the industrial revolution was revolutionary in the broadest sense of the word. It created a whole new environment for mankind.

The industrial revolution gave history more than just the steam engine, the cotton gin, the railway, and the power loom. It gave society—civilization—a whole new tempo; a whole new way of life.

As for the word "automation" I find it very difficult to define. Just what is "automation"? To some automation means nothing more than mechanization. It is a label that is applied to anything automatic—or even semiautomatic. To others it conveys a sense of robots, of machines that think and will eventually take over all of man's functions, to still others it means the answer for all our troubles by securing the 7-day weekend.

The Wall Street Journal has defined automation as: "Doing a job by machine with the minimum of human assistance. It implies also the use of electronic controls to automatically schedule and guide the production process".

It is, in simple terms, the highest stage of development in a completely automatic factory—where machines, untouched by human hands, can turn out a product untouched by human hands. This, then, is the beginning of an era when machines—not men—run other machines. This is the beginning of the second industrial revolution. The first one replaced man's muscles with machines. The second one is replacing man's judgment with machines.

Specifically, we are entering an age when a machine can dig a hole, measure it, decide the hole is wrong and correct its own mistake.

Output during the machine age increased productivity.

This came about as the machine took over jobs that man was doing or helped to do them faster—the conveyor belt, or a fork lift truck moved merchandise that a man used to push or carry—a pneumatic drill replaced the pick.

Through the years we have lost track of the men who were displaced by machines. They were absorbed by the expanding economy and shared heavily in the increased purchasing power as well as with shorter working hours.

This does not mean that all displaced workers shared well as there were many cases of bitter hardships when the conversions took place.

Today, we are entering a new era. One that dwarfs the past rate of increased productivity.

In the long run we will be bound to enjoy shorter hours and higher living standards, but in this changing period of automation, there will be many displacements which we hope will be temporary but which will cause much suffering.

Just to give you some examples of automation as it now operates—as of today: In a radio plant in Chicago, 2 men assemble 1,000 radios a day. It took 200 men to do this before automation. In an electrical equipment company, 90,000 light bulbs per hour are produced with 230 employees. Before automation they used 75,000 workers.

Utility and insurance company officials have stated that electronic brains, now available, will replace over 200 clerks with just 1 clerk on their bookkeeping staffs.

The Admiral Corp., with equipment it calls robot 1, can now assemble half a TV receiver chassis in a matter of seconds.

It is estimated that over 900,000 men in coal and steel have been displaced by automation. This is the dark side of automation. The benefits from the changes will be enormous eventually.

We can look forward to a day of astonishing living standards achieved by nominal working hours. But the penalties in the short run threaten to be mass displacement, as man gives way to automation.

What are these robots that can do the work of a man's mind? Basically, they are electronic brains that run on the principle of "feedback" or self-regulation. After they are set, or taped, they can regulate a producing machine.

The familiar household thermostat gives some idea of how they work. Once it is set to a certain temperature, it measures the temperature in the surrounding room and regulates the furnace so that the desired degree of heat can be achieved.

Today's machines are the peacetime results of the basic research and development that came about during the war as part of the atomic and guided missiles program.

We must remember that revolutions, such as we are now going through, never go backward.

Progress, and man's inventive genius, must be encouraged, but in this great process of automation man's dignity must not be lowered to that of a robot.

If all these improvements can be made for the betterment of man—and I believe they can—they will be a blessing. But if greed of money is to be made a standard, then they can be a curse.

It would, of course, be foolish to contend that automation is not without growing pains.

For any of us to minimize the widespread social and economic effects, that automation is sure to bring, would be to close our eyes to a fact that is already part of everyday life.

But I would like to emphasize that no one, today, is in a position to do more than speculate on the nature and extent of these social and economic effects—for no one has yet made the detailed analysis that is necessary for their true understanding.

While it is obvious that, in the long run, automation will be of tremendous benefit to all of us—it is the short run that worries most of us.

We should begin our planning and preparation immediately.

All parties—unions, management and Government—recognize they have a common interest in the successful integration of automation into our society. No one wants to see increased unemployment. All stand to gain by automation as long as we stand together.

Education is our primary need. We must learn that automation is something good and we must learn to use it—not fear it. Men, whose jobs may someday be replaced by machines, should be encouraged to begin their training in the newer skills which automation creates.

You younger people—with all of this before you—should further your education along the lines that will prepare you to take your rightful places in the development of this new discovery. You can be on the ground floor—so to speak—and grow with the industry.

Automatic factories will not be workless factories. There will be the need for more and more technicians and highly skilled maintenance men. We are already woefully short of personnel in this regard. The statisticians say that we need some 25,000 more engineers and 70,000 more technicians each year than we are now training.

Automation holds no threat to our economy. By giving us increased productivity—it promises to invigorate our economy.

I think it fair to say that automation offers as great a challenge—and reward—as any which we have ever known.

For the first time in history, technological progress—unleashed by the dynamic incentive system—is beginning to give people what they want.

All over the world, people are restlessly, grimly searching for a way of life that will give them what they want—and more and more of what they want.

Even we favored and fortunate Americans want more—more security, more inde-

pendence, more leisure, more freedom from drudgery, more and better homes and schools and communities. There's just no limit to our appetite for more.

By a happy combination of circumstances, we Americans have in our hands a magic key of priceless value. We Americans—the keepers of the key—must learn to know and appreciate the value of the thing we have. We must use it to help open up—for all mankind—ever greater areas of progress and hope.

You who are starting out have a great responsibility as well as a great opportunity. You are in a social dynamic changing world. You must find out what makes the world tick.

The great productivity, achieved by automation, must be balanced by a great consumers' buying power.

Keeping a "status quo" in a country—and not sharing the gains with the workers of the country—will cause injustices, poverty and hunger. We all know that the road to Communism is travelled through the wrinkles of an empty stomach.

Are these machines good or bad? Are they to be geared to unlimited production for the unlimited needs—of all the people? Or, are they to be geared for the benefits of a few selfish people, whose greed of profit shall dig our economic grave?

You are the ones who must answer these questions because it is your world, and you shall be running that world. Your generation shall decide whether or not we shall have peace, freedom, and social security or poverty, hunger, and desperation.

You are well prepared—coming from the community in which you live—where you are acquainted with the social and economic ills that your fathers lived through in the years gone by.

You now have your chance to build a better America.

Communism can be answered in only one way: that answer is that America can solve the problem of proving that—without taking away freedom, without taking away our liberty, and permitting the worker to share in the profits of his company—America can prosper and can prove to the world that we can produce for the joy of living.

I know that everyone of you are prepared and determined that your generation can accomplish this as a fact.

May God give you the wisdom and the courage to carry on.

Guiding Principles of Labor Law Administration Are Set Forth by NLRB General Counsel Stuart Rothman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the lives of all of us are vitally affected every day by actions taken under our Federal labor laws. The administration of these laws is, therefore, extremely important to the welfare of every American, whether his primary interests lie with management, with labor, or as a member of the general public.

A set of seven principles for the administration of labor law has been developed by Mr. Stuart Rothman, General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, and published in the March issue of Manage, a magazine which is the official publication of the National Management Association.

These principles clearly state certain basic methods for the effective administration of Federal labor laws. Because Mr. Rothman has done such a superlative job of implementing these principles at the NLRB, and thus speaks with considerable authority on the subject, I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in its entirety in the Appendix of the RECORD.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES OF LABOR LAW ADMINISTRATION

(By Stuart Rothman, General Counsel, National Labor Relations Board)

Alexander Pope once wrote, "For forms of government let fools contest; whate'er is best administer'd is best." In a free society, the very best in administration must be the goal of anyone who attempts the serious task of administering legislative enactments. And particularly is this true in connection with the administration of Federal labor laws, which affect so directly and so intimately the daily lives of the working men and women of America.

I should like to set forth briefly, my own views, based upon my experiences about the way labor laws should be administered, and the principles which a labor administrator should follow in order to carry out his responsibilities.

SEVEN GUIDING PRINCIPLES

1. First and foremost, labor laws deserve vigorous enforcement. The labor laws, like other laws, embody public policy which must not be frustrated by ineffective enforcement. However, vigorous enforcement does not contemplate punitive measures and reprisal; the emphasis is on sound and judicious remedies, comporting with the seriousness of the violation, and aiming for restoration of the injured parties to the status quo. Public awareness of effective enforcement will necessarily encourage voluntary compliance and thus avoid expensive and time-consuming litigation.

2. Prompt determinations at all points of the administrative process are essential. No one feels the drag of time more keenly them a person deprived of his lawful rights. A businessman harrassed by illegal picketing, a union wrongfully denied recognition, an employee discriminatorily discharged—all want and deserve prompt relief. Moreover, prompt handling reduces indirect losses for which the law offers no compensation, such as lost opportunities for new markets by businessmen and other employment by workers. Like vigorous enforcement, prompt determinations give impetus to voluntary and swift settlements and, where no settlements are effected, to better and fairer hearings in which the evidence adduced is fresh and the recollection of the witness is clearer.

3. Laws must be administered with both real and apparent impartiality. All of us necessarily have some predilictions and points of view which conscious or unconsciously may influence our approach to problems. Only by rigid and continuous effort can administration be kept free from these influences and impartiality be achieved. In the emotionally charged labor field, impartiality involves dealing evenhandedly with three competing interests—management, unions and employees. Impartiality is particularly important in my role as General Counsel for the Board, since my determination of whether to issue a complaint is not subject to review. I have been called a middle-of-the road General Counsel, and I think that is where a General Counsel should be. One of my first official acts was to stress among the employees of my office the need for impartiality and for avoiding even the appearance of favoritism.

4. Two-way channels of communication must be kept open between the Administrator and the public, including labor and management, if the Administrator is to secure the respect and trust of the people with whom he deals. What is needed is not only a closer understanding of the interests and positions of each side by the other, but also a determined effort to make clear to all parties their rights and obligations under the act.

5. Voluntary compliance and informal settlement are the best means of achieving harmony. Formal litigation, with its attendant acrimonious and other ill effects should be a last resort. Voluntary adjustment of disputes is the lifeblood of sound democratic society. Such adjustment not only enhances amicable labor-management relations, but also increases respect for law and permits the overburdened administrative agency to attend to other necessary tasks.

6. The agency must pursue personnel programs which attract, retain capable people. A labor agency responsible for the protection of the rights of working men and women should not lose sight of the fact that it, too, has responsibilities as an employer. Although Government service offers many unique advantages and satisfactions, the agency is in competition with private industry in recruitment. Enlightened personnel policies must be developed if the agency is to attract and hold the type of people it needs.

7. The Administrator must make a continued study of the laws, and suggest improvements. Social and economic changes over the years necessarily affect labor legislation. No one can have a better understanding of the measures necessary to maintain or increase effectiveness than those who have the day-by-day responsibility for the administration of a labor law. While ultimate solutions must come from legislative or executive action, the Administrator should provide constructive ideas and factual information from which to gage the impact of existing or proposed legislation.

APPLICATION OF PRINCIPLES

It is, of course, impossible in the limited space allotted to enumerate all of the techniques and devices I have applied both in the Department of Labor and at the National Labor Relations Board in effectuating the foregoing principles. In addition to the development of new management techniques, hard work, and maximum utilization of the available professional skills have contributed to the results achieved. A few examples will illustrate the effectiveness of the principles of administration to which I have tried to adhere in the administration of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Vigorous enforcement of the law has resulted in collecting more than $1,450,000 in back pay in the fiscal year 1960 for employees unlawfully discriminated against—the largest sum recovered in any of the past 10 years. Expeditious case handling also enabled my office to reduce the median time from the filing of a charge to the issuance of a complaint, from 76 to 44 days. Median time from the issuance of complaint to the close of hearing has been reduced from 95 to 44 days, and from the filing of the charge to the close of the hearing from 134 to 88 days. As of today, 87 percent of the unfair labor practice cases are disposed of, on an average, within 30 days after receipt. Our success in the fields of voluntary compliance and informal settlement is even more noteworthy. During the fiscal year 1960, more than 1,900 meritorious cases were settled; from the beginning of the year until August, the percentage of settlements rose from

48 to 66 percent. Contributing to our success in these areas have been innovations of such techniques as improved settlement procedures, the use of educational devices such as meetings with representative groups, the establishment of time targets for adjustments and complaint issuance, and concentration upon preventive law techniques.

I have particularly stressed the need for voluntary compliance in cases involving jurisdictional disputes at missile sites where I feel that the statutory procedures for handling such disputes are inadequate, because the Board is given no criteria for resolving the conflict, and the use of the statutory injunction proceeding is not conducive to industrial peace and cooperation. Unlike ordinary jurisdictional disputes, these disputes involve contractors as well as unions, all competing for work, and the construction industry joint board is not equipped to handle them.

In other matters, such as channels of communication, improved personnel programs, and impartial administration, progress cannot be measured by statistical data, but none of these fields has been neglected. For example, we have established in each regional office a regional advisory conference composed of local representatives of the regional offices, the labor bar, and labor law professors for exchanging views, disseminating information, and developing improved techniques; also an official has been made available in each regional office to discuss day-to-day problems with parties. Our present recruitment and promotional program is designed to attract highly professional help, to reduce turnover, and improve morale. Our record of impartial enforcement has been good because our primary aim is to be fair to all sides, and not necessarily to win all cases, although even so, we did succeed in 86 percent of the cases tried before the Board.

Finally, in the field of suggestions for improvements of existing legislation, I have, for instance, recommended corrective legislation dealing with national emergency strikes. Suggestions have heretofore been made to limit these strikes after the breakdown of collective bargaining. However, I believe that greater emphasis should be made on improving collective bargaining itself, placing the focus on the earlier bargaining stages. A redefinition of the statutory duty to bargain, insofar as it involves nationwide industries, may be helpful even if the changes effected are essentially procedural, such as requiring more detail in proposals, more utilization of mediation services, and more frequent bargaining sessions.

The principles which I have discussed do not, of course, exhaust the means by which we may achieve the very best in labor law administration. However, I sincerely believe that these principles, when carefully and intelligently applied, will go a long way toward insuring an administration that is effective and equitable.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial on the subject of Federal aid to education which appeared in the San Francisco News-Call Bulletin, of March 15, 1961:

SHORTSIGHTED SCHOOL AID

Catholic leaders, asking to share in Federal school aid, are making a mistake similar to that of local public school organization officials who are promoting the same kind of subsidy.

Catholic parents make great financial sacrifice to maintain their parochial schools. This is their privilege under a free, popular Government, just as it is the privilege of local school boards to manage their own public schools as they see fit. When either, or both, starts depending upon the Federal Government for substantial support, the loss of their independence of action is only a matter of time.

If the Federal Government puts up the money, it must make regulations for its spending. This is the beginning of thought control—however mild or well intentioned.

In totalitarian countries control of education is a primary aim. Early in the Nazi regime Hitler took over the free German school system, the primary grades through college in a deliberate and effective effort to snare young minds.

Nothing of the kind would be expected for America but a centrally-controlled school system would be a handy means to enforce educational fads or eager new political notions. Diversity of thought—many points of view on life—are prime requisites of social progress.

The American school system is nowhere near as bad as it is pictured by the enthusiasts for Federal intervention. Schools are being built and teachers hired to care for the new hordes of children though it must be admitted progress is too slow in many areas. And the rising cost of education has placed a backbreaking burden on real estate, which is a main source of this tax money.

The schools needs help but it is not necessary to gather them into a dangerous Federal system. If Congress really wants to help it can provide the means for the States to provide their own aid money.

This can be done by repealing some excise taxes such as those presently imposed on telephones and allowing the States to reimpose them.

Such a policy not only would preserve school independence, it would enforce economy since the States would be spending their own money instead of handouts wangled from Washington. There would be far less temptation to get as much as political pressure could provide and spend it carelessly on the theory there was plenty more where that came from.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, March 25, 1961, marked the 43d anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic.

The Byelorussians form one of the many Slavic peoples who have lived under Rusian domination for centuries. However, they have tenaciously clung to their distinct national traits and have kept their national traditions alive. These sturdy and stouthearted people, numbering close to 10 million today, have lived in their historic homeland in the frigid north country between eastern Poland and Moscow throughout their recorded history, long before the rise of modern Russia. Early in modern times the country was conquered by Russian czars. Since then, except for a brief period after the First World War, these people have suffered under Russia's czarist autocracy, and today they are suffering under Soviet totalitarian tyranny.

Toward the end of the First World War when Russian autocracy was overthrown, peoples oppressed under that decrepit regime were freed, and they all proclaimed their independence. The Byelorussians were among the first to do this. On March 25, 1918, they proclaimed their national independence and founded the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. That historic event ushered in a new era. It was the rebirth of a free and independent Byelorussia, the most important landmark in Byelorussian history.

During the next 3 difficult years the new and weak state fought valiantly for its very existence, but in the end it was overwhelmed. Early in 1921 the country was overrun, and then made part of the Soviet Union. Thus ended independent and free Byelorussia. For 40 years these people have been living under the unrelenting tyranny of communism. Hard pressed, miserable, and constantly harassed, they still breathe the spirit of freedom and independence, and long for their deliverance from the Kremlin's tyranny.

Mr. Speaker, we commend them for their courage.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, Byelorussia is the country extending from the western borders of Poland to the approaches of Moscow. It is a cold but fertile land, and its inhabitants are—for the most part—rugged peasants. These people numbering some 10 million have been living in that country from time immemorial. There they led a simple life and were content with their lot until they were brought under Russian czars early in modern times. Then began the unhappy period of their history. The Russians proved very oppressive, and they tried to absorb the Byelorussians by attempting to suppress all Byelorussian national traits. But the Byelorussians clung to these and struggled against the czarist regime to maintain their national identity, and to regain their freedom. In 1918 when that

regime was no more they asserted their freedom and independence.

Byelorussian leaders seized upon this chance, proclaimed their independence on March 25 and established the Byelorussian National Republic. Then it seemed all joy and gaiety for these oppressed people. They were enjoying their freedom and working hard to guard their well-earned freedom. But they were faced with numerous powerful foes, and among these Communist Russia proved formidable. Early in 1921 the Red Army attacked Byelorussia, overran it and soon the country became part of the Soviet Union. Since that fateful year, the Byelorussians have been suffering under Communist totalitarian tyranny in their historic homeland. But they still cling to their ideals, and still pray for their deliverance from Communist tyranny. On the 43d anniversary of their independence day we echo their genuine patriotic sentiments and wish them more power in their struggle for freedom.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, may I call attention of my colleagues in the Congress to a letter just received from my constituent, Mr. Lewis E. Kimball, Jr., headmaster of Crane Country Day School, Santa Barbara, Calif.:

MARCH 23, 1961.

Hon. CHARLES M. TEAGUE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The matter of Federal aid to education, currently much in the local press, is now before Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL'S committee. It may be of help to that committee to have before it the statement of position taken by the California Association of Independent Schools. This statement was drawn up in response to an earlier attempt to introduce tax support of independent schools, and I have no reason to believe that the opinion of the members has changed since that time. I am enclosing a directory so that the association may be more closely identified.

The following is the policy statement regarding tax support of independent schools adopted by the CAIS May 4, 1956:

"POLICY ON TAX SUPPORT OF INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS

"Independent school initiative and enterprise contribute vitally to the growth of American education. This contribution is made possible chiefly through the freedom of independent schools from those regulations and controls which are inherent in and essential to tax-supported institutions. If their historic role in educational development is to continue, independent schools must maintain freedom to explore new methods and to evolve new patterns.

"It is our belief that the particular contribution of the independent school would be lost if any part of its educational program were financed directly through public taxation; therefore, we are opposed to either Federal or State direct support of nonpublic schools.

"Approved May 4, 1956."

Very truly yours,

LEWIS E. KIMBALL, JR.,
Headmaster.

Some Budget Director

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial in this morning's Chicago Tribune discusses recent profound statements by the Budget Director, Mr. Bell, in such a manner that further comment on my part is unnecessary.

SOME BUDGET DIRECTOR

Congress has listened to a lot of people spout a lot of economic nonsense, but surely it has never heard such concentrated nonsense come from a director of the budget as it did on Monday.

David Bell, who holds this position under Mr. Kennedy, appeared before the Joint Economic Committee to explain the Kennedy budget for 1962. He told the members what was already common knowledge: that the balanced budgets planned by Mr. Eisenhower for this year and next are out of date; that this year will end up with a deficit of about $2.2 billion, and that an even greater deficit is likely for 1962.

To cap it all, he says that it would be a serious error to reject public spending programs simply because we cannot afford them.

The Director of the Budget doesn't seem to be the least perturbed by all this deficit spending. On the contrary, he told the committee members that Federal outlays would be expected to climb steadily in the years ahead. He said that a consistent effort to balance the budget would be not only extremely difficult, but positively harmful. He said that deficits this year and next are "clearly essential to economic recovery" and won't lead to any significant inflation. And he said there is no use hoping for a decline in Federal spending unless there is a substantial reduction in armament.

What does Mr. Bell think the budget is? Most people think of it as something to live within. Historically it is based on the amount of money available to spend; the word itself, centuries ago, meant wallet. The British Government still "opens" the budget.

Our Bureau of the Budget was established in 1921 in response to protests that the Government was living beyond its means. It was designed to fix responsibility for a sound fiscal policy. In 1939 it was made an independent office under the President, but the law still says that its studies and reports are to be made "with a view of securing greater economy and efficiency in the conduct of the public service."

Here we have a Director of the Budget saying, in effect, that the budget should not stop anybody from spending what he wishes to spend. The agent who is expected to stand up against the extravagance of his colleagues (as Mr. Stans often did, to their discomfiture) is actually promoting extravagance. If the Budget Bureau is to become a spineless tool of the spenders, we would be much better off without either it or its Director.

"Flasher" Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues the following resolution which was adopted by the Connecticut House of Representatives on March 22. The resolution commends the establishment of the *Flasher* Memorial, dedicated to the heroes of the U.S. submarine force during World War II:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 80

Resolved by this assembly:

Whereas the Navy Department has recently made it known that it will turn over the submarine *Flasher* to the U.S. submarine veterans of World War II for the purpose of incorporating it in a permanent memorial to those men of the submarine forces who made the supreme sacrifice in World War II; and

Whereas one out of every five officers and men who served on submarines during World War II never returned from their last war patrol; and

Whereas the U.S. submarine force, comprising only 2 percent of the Navy, delivered a mortal blow to our World War II enemy, Japan, by sending to the bottom one-third of the warships and almost two-thirds of the merchant ships sunk by anybody and everybody; and

Whereas this country will always need the kind of skill, spirit, and devotion to duty shown by a submarine force of 14,750 officers and men which sank 1,178 enemy merchant ships and 214 naval ships, damaged hundreds of others and conducted fearless raids of all types without ever looking back; and

Whereas these are feats that any nation would be proud to have as a heritage; and

Whereas the U.S.S. *Flasher*, selected because it sank the most tonnage of any submarine during World War II, is symbolic of all the submarines and all the men who served on them during the war; and

Whereas the *Flasher* Memorial, to be located in Groton, the hub of the Nation's submarine activity, will be such a dramatic reminder that what we have, what we presently enjoy, was purchased and guaranteed and passed on to us because many were convinced that America, the living America, which survived them, was indeed worth dying for; and

Whereas the *Flasher* Memorial will be so fashioned that it will provide the heraldry, the shrine to honor the submarine dead for valor and to alert the living to loyalty and gratitude: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of this general assembly join in commending the U.S. submarine veterans of World War II for their dedication in establishing the *Flasher* Memorial; and be it further

Resolved, That the members of this general assembly join in urging the citizens of these United States of America to volunteer their fullest financial and spiritual support

to build this shrine incorporating the U.S.S. *Flasher* in a permanent memorial to those men of the U.S. submarine force who made the supreme sacrifice in World War II; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerks of the house and senate shall send copies of this resolution to all U.S. legislators from Connecticut and also to the President of the United States, and to Thomas M. Dykes, rear admiral, U.S. Navy (retired).

Hon. Leroy Johnson

SPEECH
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly shocked and most profoundly grieved to learn of the untimely passing of my dear, esteemed and beloved friend, former Congressman Leroy Johnson of California.

I served with Roy Johnson for many years on the House Military Affairs Committee and later on the House Armed Services Committee, and he was my devoted, and valued colleague and friend.

Never in my public service, or in my lifetime, have I known a finer, more dedicated American, a more amiable, humane human being, or a more loyal friend.

Roy Johnson was a man of superb intellectual powers, possessed of a keen, penetrating, legal mind, endowed with complete awareness of the critical public problems with which he had occasion to deal.

There was a broadness and a depth to his searching mind, a comprehending sweep to his training and his interests that made him an exceptionally valuable member of our military committees and a truly outstanding Member of the House.

His lofty character, his exhalted idealism, his profound sense of humanity and justice and his unalterable fidelity to country, to duty and to every worthy, inspiring value of our national life, brought this noble son of the great State of California the respect, admiration, and affection of all those who knew him, especially of those of us who had the great privilege and honor of his friendship and of sharing with him public service in this great historic and world-renowned body.

Courageous, strong of conviction, independent minded and animated always by a rugged sense of justice and deep, abiding faith in American institutions, Roy Johnson exemplified the noblest attributes of a dedicated public servant and a noble Christian gentleman.

Great war hero, highly decorated and lauded for his loyal, magnificent service to the Nation in time of grave peril, honored in many ways and raised by his admiring fellow citizens to high public office, Roy Johnson nevertheless retained his basic sense of true values and his innate humility and simplicity of heart and manner that endeared him to all.

A great American has passed to the Great Beyond. A very dear friend has departed from this life. But his spirit, his devotion, his dedication, and the stirring example of his good life and splendid public service will long remain with us.

With a heavy heart, I join his lovely wife, his family, and many friends in mourning his loss and tender my most heartfelt sympathy to them.

May our beloved friend, Roy, find rest and peace in his eternal, heavenly home.

Activities of Allegany County League on Behalf of Crippled Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on April 17 and 18, Cumberland Lodge 63, BPO Elks will present the musical comedy, "Annie, Get Your Gun." The proceeds from this entertainment will go to the Allegany County League for Crippled Children.

Cumberland Lodge 63 sponsored its first theatrical performance in 1891 and through this medium has made great contributions to the charitable needs of the county. This year's presentation comes at a time when the Cumberland lodge will be celebrating its 75th or diamond jubilee.

Mr. William Hunt, in his column "Across the Desk," published in the Cumberland Times, describes the activities of Cumberland Lodge 63 as well as the wonderful efforts of the Allegany County League for Crippled Children.

I ask unanimous consent that this article may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIG BROADWAY STAGE HIT, "ANNIE GET YOUR GUN," AT MARYLAND NEXT MONTH MARKS START OF DIAMOND JUBILEE OF CUMBERLAND LODGE BPOE—TRIBUTE TO MISS SCHWARZENBACH, AID TO CRIPPLED CHILDREN AND ENTERTAINMENT WITH EVERY TICKET

Back in 1949 while he was directing that year's Elks' benefit show for the crippled children of Allegany County, Leo H. Ley reminded those who bought tickets that each stub represented not only a seat for an entertaining performance but also a share in the happiness that the proceeds of the show would provide for hundreds of handicapped youngsters.

Through the years under two other outstanding directors (French Sensabaugh and now Harold C. Wickard) Cumberland Lodge 63, BPO Elks, has continued to provide area people an opportunity to enjoy superb stage entertainment while helping the Allegany County League to care for the large number of little ones who have been crippled by polio, cerebral palsy, rheumatic fever, birth defects, and numerous other ailments that require long and expensive treatment.

Last year Cumberland Lodge changed the theatrical format from minstrels and revues to the production of Broadway musical comedy hits. "Oklahoma" was an overwhelming popular success, and this year's big stage offering will be "Annie Get Your Gun," a New York hit that will be a rousing musical presentation at the Maryland Theater April 17 and 18.

This year a great personality will be missing at the annual Elks benefit performance.

From the time of the incorporation of the Allegany County League for Crippled Children 27 years ago until her death last October, Miss Henrietta Schwarzenbach was president and the real moving spirit in promoting and keeping up the best local organization in the United States for aiding handicapped youngsters. On the day she died she insisted on going out to see the first station wagon purchased for league purposes. Her constant thought was for the hundreds of area children who needed physical therapy, body braces, clinical examination, hospital treatment, home care, corrective shoes, medicines, and checkup diagnoses.

The league was a volunteer and dedicated agency with particular goals when it was set up a generation ago. And it is the same today. It is not a part of any community fund raising group. As frequently expressed by Miss Schwarzenbach, the league has no criticism of any agencies that join with others in seeking public support. But the league is not permitted by the National Foundation and the National Easter Seal Society to merge its identity with other groups. It has provided its manifold services for over 27 years to thousands of crippled children without aid from community chest or United Fund, and continues in its consistent course with respect for all other charitable and service organizations. But it does make its own appeal for your aid to crippled children.

Approximately half of the needed annual income is provided by funds from the sale of Easter seals and from the proceeds derived from the Elks benefit shows. This year's souvenir program will be a memorial issue in honor of the founder and first president of the Allegany County League for Crippled Children, and hundreds of friends and admirers of Miss Schwarzenbach are making donations for which they will be listed in the beautiful program. Business firms, industry, labor unions, and other organizations are taking advertising space in the realization that the 1961 program will be kept for years to come, and that the crippled children of this county will be aided, Miss Schwarzenbach's life of service will be recognized, and incalculable good will is certain to accrue to the advertisers.

Aiding the league in the first of two lily parades, Cumberland Aerie 245, Fraternal Order of Eagles, yesterday held the first parade assisted by bunny-garbed Tri-Hi-Y girls from Allegany and Fort Hill high schools. Next Saturday the second parade will be sponsored by Cumberland Lodge 271, Loyal Order of Moose. Frostburg Moose will also conduct a parade, and in Lonaconing a street sale will be conducted by the Alvin C. Neat Post 5280, Veterans of Foreign Wars. Paper lilies will be offered on the streets and any donation will be accepted with a smile on behalf of the county's crippled children.

In previous years there have been benefits sponsored by other organizations—including the Red Men, Knights of Columbus, the Owls, American Legion, and Lions.

It is appropriate that this year's benefit show be presented in April, because Cumberland lodge begins its 75th, or diamond jubilee year, next month.

Cumberland lodge, the 63d organized in Elkdom, was instituted on April 24, 1887.

First theatrical performance sponsored by "Old 63" was, as is this year's show, a musical hit of bigtime caliber, "Erminie," produced in 1891. Gilbert and Sullivan's "Pinafore" was presented in 1893, both of these light operas at the Academy of Music (burned in 1910).

A participant in those Elks shows of 70 years ago is still active in Cumberland business, Charles G. Holzshu. He played in the orchestra of the first stage productions ever sponsored by the local Elks.

Early rehearsals of "Annie Get Your Gun" point to a lively fast-moving metropolitan production at the Maryland on opening night, 3 weeks from tomorrow.

Director Wickard, never prone to optimism in the preliminary stages of producing a show, is already convinced that he has a winner for April 17 and 18. Several of the principals in the cast are finds of the first rank, and the singing-dancing choruses are the best assembled in recent years.

For Broadway entertainment as a boost in aid to crippled children, and as a tribute to Henrietta Schwarzenbach—all that and a deep down satisfaction of participating in a good cause—all yours for the tickets you buy to "Annie Get Your Gun."

There are few occasions these days for people to get together in the stimulating and social atmosphere associated with live entertainment. There is something stirring and exciting about stage show audiences, and this feature alone should be a stimulus to more than enough people to assure two capacity reserved seat audiences at the historic Maryland Theater April 17 and 18, just a week before Cumberland Lodge 63 begins its diamond jubilee in Elkdom.

Kansas Helps Self

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the executive vice president of the Kansas State Chamber of Commerce, Mr. C. C. Kilker. It is an interesting letter, and I call it to the attention of my colleagues to illustrate that—in the area of "distressed areas"—Kansas helps herself, and there is considerable opposition in my district and State to the present proposed Federal intervention in the area.

The letter follows:

KANSAS STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Topeka, Kans., March 27, 1961.

The Honorable ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: Just a brief reminder of our opposition to proposals to grant Federal aid to depressed areas—H.R. 4569 and S. 1. We feel that Federal intervention in this field cannot be justified on any practical grounds.

We cannot recall a session of the Kansas Legislature in which industrial development programs have received the serious and favorable consideration that has been given to them this year. Add to this the many active and vigorous community and area programs within the State, and we can only conclude that Kansas has the interest, the desire, and the capacity to solve its own problems in this area.

We sincerely hope that you will vote against this proposed new Federal spending program of, at best, highly questionable value.

Sincerely yours,

C. C. KILKER,
Executive Vice President.

Nationwide Support Is Growing for Legislation To Preserve the Historic Buildings on Lafayette Square in the Nation's Capital, Introduced by President Kennedy Last Year and by Senators John Sherman Cooper, Wayne Morse, and Carroll D. Kearns This Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the able and distinguished president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, Mrs. E. Lee Ozbirn, has written a letter to me in which she outlines the views of the 5 million American women of that great organization, which the Congress itself chartered in 1901, on the important subject of the preservation of the historic buildings on Lafayette Square.

Mrs. Ozbirn begins by saying:

I wish to commend you and your colleagues in the 87th Congress for your continued effort to try to preserve the Lafayette Square area.

Then, on behalf of the members of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, Mrs. Ozbirn declares that—

We all know that this square and the buildings surrounding it has a unique importance because it is the view from the front door of the President's home—the White House. Certainly all Americans who are students of history know of the famous historic houses which include the Dolly Madison House, the Tayloe House, and the Belasco Theater. These buildings depict a very important era of American history and are in keeping with the structure of the White House and should be preserved not just as a monument but they could be used for historic or cultural purposes which would perpetuate the heritage for future generations.

This is an extremely interesting proposal, and it is in line with one which I have received from Joseph Watterson, editor, the Journal of the American Institute of Architects. In a letter under date of February 29, 1961, to me, Mr. Watterson wrote in part as follows:

The American Institute of Architects deplores the apparently impending destruction of certain buildings fronting on Lafayette Square and the construction of large Federal buildings in their place. Although by now many of the buildings on the square may be of a nondescript architectural character the flavor and charm of the square have not been destroyed. It is still a fitting forecourt to the White House—which it must always be. This fitness would be lost with marble monumentality flanking the square—east and west.

Since the Decatur House, on the northwest corner of the square, and the Blair and Lee houses on Pennsylvania Avenue, are to be preserved, and the new executive office building designed to surround them with low wings and courts, it would seem that the same approach could be taken on the east side of the square. The Madison house, on the northeast corner, and the Tayloe house in the middle of the block, are worthy of preservation and restoration, both historically and architecturally. Rather than preserve them purely as monuments, suitable uses can be found for these buildings, as is done in so many of the old cities of Europe. It is a brash generation indeed which will destroy all physical evidences of its great heritage.

The General Federation of Women's Clubs and the American Institute of Architects do not stand alone in their concern for preserving the historic flavor and charm of Lafayette Square. Many other organizations and individuals are deeply interested in preserving the Dolly Madison house, the Benjamin Tayloe house, and the Belasco Theater for historic and cultural purposes, as proposed in a bill, S. 3280, which President John F. Kennedy himself, when a Senator, introduced on March 24, 1960. Members of the Senate and House from both parties have introduced legislation for this very same purpose in the 85th, 86th and 87th Congresses.

Mrs. C. Arthur Bullock, president of the National Federation of Music Clubs, and a citizen of the great State of Pennsylvania, has written me in support of my own bill to save the Lafayette Square buildings, and she has included a letter which she has written to President Kennedy.

In her letter to the President, Mrs. Bullock declares that—

Personally and on behalf of the approximately 600,000 members of the National Federation of Music Clubs, this is to express commendation and appreciation to you for your vital interest and support of the arts in our national life. It is with substantiation by even many specific acts including the introduction of your outstanding bill, S. 3280, in the spring of 1960; and a telegram placing importance on music for use in our 1961 National Music Week brochure in conjunction with our annual sponsorship.

May we go on record in support of these bills, introduced in the 1st session of the 87th Congress; and urge your support of their immediate enactment:

H.R. 3982, introduced by Representative CARROLL D. KEARNS and S. 1020, introduced by Senator JOHN S. COOPER and WAYNE MORSE—for establishing a Commission on the Cultural Resources in the Nation's Capital—these including the preservation of the historic buildings on Lafayette Square and the Belasco Theater.

We feel that these historic buildings on Lafayette Square in our Nation's Capital should remain protected as historic monuments to our culture; and for the sake of economy as well.

The General Federation of Women's Clubs, the National Federation of Music Clubs, and the American Institute of Architects will surely be able to mobilize the grassroots support needed to save the historic buildings on Lafayette Square, for most people would agree that the destruction of these buildings for the stated reasons is unwise and totally unnecessary.

Someone has suggested, facetiously, that the way to save Lafayette Square as well as its historic buildings would be to lease everything to Harvard University. By way of explanation it was pointed out that Harvard Yard was recently rescued from a similar plan for a great office building, but, then, Harvard Yard had the President of the United States on its side.

I include the New York Times account of the saving of Harvard Yard at this point in my remarks.

HARVARD, AGAIN

Another item the White House has said nothing about is how, in the midst of questions of national and international import, the President took up a cause with Harvard.

It was proposed that Cambridge, Mass., sell a piece of the Common as the site for a 15-story office building. The land is near Harvard Yard.

The President thought he had better stay out of the fight. But when the legislature's Democratic majorities pushed through a bill authorizing the sale, he quietly let his views be known in the right places.

Kenneth P. O'Donnell, class of 1949, and special assistant to the President, phoned leading State Democrats urging them not to make the project a party issue.

McGeorge Bundy, Yale 1940 and a Republican, former dean of the Harvard faculty, and now special Presidential assistant for national security affairs, passed the word to some Republicans.

Also active was Mr. Kennedy's one-time Senate colleague from the Bay State, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, a Republican.

Last week, Republican Gov. John A. Volpe vetoed the bill. The State senate, with some Democratic support, upheld the veto.

What would extremely be helpful, too would be an observable determination on the part of the leading newspaper publishers of Washington, D.C., and throughout the Nation, to wage an unremitting campaign to save the historic buildings on Lafayette Square. The New York Herald Tribune is currently engaged in a campaign to save the Metropolitan Opera House in New York City from destruction. Carnegie Hall in New York City was saved from destruction some months ago, so it would be instructive for such newspapers as the Washington (D.C.) Post, and the Washington (D.C.) Star to study the techniques used by New York City's great newspapers in mobilizing the support needed to successfully save buildings and sites of which possess historic and cultural values.

I include as part of my remarks the letter I received from Mrs. E. Lee Ozbirn, president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, as well as an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune urging that the Metropolitan Opera House be saved:

GENERAL FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS,
Washington, D.C., March 15, 1961.

Hon. CARROLL D. KEARNS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KEARNS: I wish to commend you and your colleagues in the 87th Congress for your continued effort to try to preserve the Lafayette Square area.

We all know that this square and the buildings surrounding it has a unique importance because it is the view from the front door of the President's home—the White House. Certainly all Americans who are students of history know of the famous historic houses which include the Dolly Madison House, the Tayloe House, and the Belasco Theater. These buildings depict a very important era of American history and are in keeping with the structure of the White House and should be preserved not just as a monument but they could be used for historic or cultural purposes which would perpetuate the heritage for future generations.

The General Federation of Women's Clubs continuously works for the preservation of the early cultural and historic influences for future generations. We know that there are those who think progress is measured by a new and changing pattern but we would remind them that in a few decades the structures of today will be old and obsolete and will be torn down but let us remember that buildings of today are not symbolic of our early history. Only the authentic buildings of the early days of our national development depict our progress and our heritage.

We do not want to see our generation destroy things that have long been accepted as historic. We believe that the beautiful surroundings of the President's home should be preserved and the White House should not be situated in the shadow of high, modern stone buildings.

We appreciate what Senator ELLENDER has said about the preservation of the Lafayette Park area and we think his leadership will surely be worthy of sincere consideration. We commend Senator ELLENDER for his attitude and his willingness to devote much effort to a cause that some feel is lost.

I should like to urge that action taken by the 86th Congress to have the buildings on the east side of Lafayette Square demolished be rescinded. I have great hopes that this will be done because President Kennedy, when a Senator in the 86th Congress, presented a bill to preserve them and because both the President and our lovely First Lady have the wisdom and the desire to restore the White House to its original charm, it surely would be a grave mistake, at the very time they are making every possible effort in restoring the White House, to destroy the historical surroundings. Surely it is more pleasant for the occupants of the White House to look out upon the lovely surroundings than to look out upon cold stone structure that over shadow their home.

Again I wish to commend those who would preserve the beautiful Lafayette Square area in our Nation's Capital, and I trust your efforts will be fully rewarded.

Most sincerely,

MRS. E. LEE OZBIRN, *President.*

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Mar. 26, 1961]

MORE ABOUT SAVING THE METROPOLITAN

Judging by readers' letters to the editor of the Herald Tribune, there is considerable public interest in the future of the present Metropolitan Opera House.

The question, to state it once again, is not whether the old house should continue to serve as the home of the Metropolitan Opera Co. after 1964. That is when the Met will move to its new home at Lincoln Center and no one has any thought that it should try to remain at its old stand a moment longer than it has to.

The question is what will happen to the old opera house once the present company pulls out? Should it be torn down and replaced by an office building, as the Met management desires? Or should an attempt be made to preserve it as an auditorium that still can play a useful part in New York's entertainment and cultural activities?

Several correspondents have pointed out the deficiencies of the present Met building from the standpoint of audiences and performers alike. Shortcomings it has in abundance, and some of these may have to be corrected if the building is preserved.

But even when allowances are made for the side seats with no view of the stage, the inadequate storage facilities, the cramped quarters and outdated equipment, the fact remains that foreign ballet companies and other visitors have been able to play at a profit in the old theater on 39th Street. And it seems reasonable to expect that there would be impresarios ready to book such attractions into the old Met once its present company vacates it.

If New York had a superabundance of capacious theaters suitable for use in the international cultural exchange era we are just entering, there might be no impulses to save the Met except nostalgia and sentimentality. But in point of fact, New York has a lack of such theaters. At present, largescale foreign companies must play either in the present Metropolitan Opera House during the Met's off-season, or at the City Center. If both of these buildings are gone when Lincoln Center is operating, only the new Metropolitan Opera House will offer a 3,000-plus seat capacity, and this will be preempted by the Met itself most of the year.

So it's entirely possible that the old opera house, with all its flaws, still might have some servicable years ahead of it. In any case, we believe the pros and cons should be carefully weighed—and not merely by the directors of the Metropolitan, who own the building, but by the citizens of New York, whose future pattern of cultural growth may be deeply influenced by the decision.

Death of Former Congressman J. Leroy Johnson

SPEECH
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, we are all saddened to learn of the death of former Congressman J. Leroy Johnson, of Stockton, Calif.

For 14 years he ably represented the Stockton area in the House. Because of his excellent record in the 104th Aero Squadron, American Expeditionary Force of World War I, he was assigned to the committee that later became the House Armed Services Committee. He was a strong and effective advocate of the universal military training program.

It can truly be said that Leroy Johnson devoted all of his adult life to the service of his district and the Nation, because shortly after he returned from his service in World War I he became deputy district attorney of San Joaquin County in California and later was city attorney for Stockton, Calif. He came to Congress in 1942 and served until 1956.

Mrs. Younger and I extend our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Johnson, their daughter, Mary E. Parr, and son, William, in their loss, which is a loss to the community, the State, and the Nation.

Pat Thomas Helps Build Glen Canyon Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following story from the Fort Scott Tribune of March 25, 1961.

The story is about a remarkable and enterprising constituent of mine, Pat Thomas, who is helping to build the giant Glen Canyon Dam in Arizona:

FORT SCOTT CEMENT MANUFACTURER HELPS BUILD GIANT ARIZONA DAM

The Fort Scott Hydraulic Cement Co. is a small plant as cement companies go, but today its equipment and its owner have an important part in constructing one of the largest dams in the country.

This giant concrete dam is going up in the spectacular Glen Canyon of the Colorado River in Arizona. It is above the noted Hoover Dam that helps regulate the same turbulent river, but when finished in about 3 years from now will contain 50 percent more concrete than the Hoover Dam, a total of 5 million cubic yards.

How Pat Thomas and his cement plant got into the big Glen Canyon Dam project as an associate with one of four prime contractors building the dam sounds like a Horatio Alger story. It started from a chance remark by a friend in Texas and developed through quick action and enterprise on the part of the young cement manufacturer.

A plane trip to Arizona brought Thomas into contact with the contractor, a Texas landowner, with whom he is now associated on the Glen Canyon dam. The contractor needed help in the form of equipment and technical abilities. Thomas had both in substantial quantities, and he soon found himself cut in on the contract with the U.S. Reclamation Bureau.

Fort Scott cement has gone into a number of other sizable dams. The new Table Rock Dam in Missouri is one of them. But strangely enough, Thomas is not furnishing cement for the great Arizona dam. His contract involves another ingredient, a mineral called pozzolan, which is a volcanic pumice. This material he is mining and processing near Flagstaff, more than 100 miles from the dam site.

The pumice material, ground to a fine powder, is used to give the cement certain qualities needed in the dam. Cement for the dam is also being produced in Arizona and hauled to the site in huge bulk trucks, one every 40 minutes, day and night.

Fort Scott equipment for mining the pozzolan was moved to the Flagstaff site. For several weeks Thomas was flying home from Flagstaff for weekends. Since the project there will continue for another 2 or 3 years, the Thomas family have moved to Flagstaff taking some household goods with them. They left this week.

Thomas said his Glen Canyon venture will not affect the Fort Scott Cement Co. operation. It will continue producing cement just as it has for the past 90 years, he said. The plant here is Fort Scott's oldest manufacturing industry. "We're not about to close it down, as some rumors have had it," Thomas said.

There has been a change in the market for Fort Scott cement Thomas admits. Until recently the hydraulic or natural cement was in demand for mixing with Portland cement in dams, giving desirable qualities of slow setting and density. Then it was discovered that carbon black did the same thing for the cement mixture at far less cost.

Fort Scott cement probably will not be used in any more dams, but it will continue to be in demand as a mortar cement, Thomas said, which has been the steady market for the product from the time it was first produced here.

Understanding Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Arthur Krock, which appeared in the March 28 issue of the New York Times, indicates how difficult it is for one who has never met a payroll in his life to understand the effects of a sudden increase in the wage rate on a small businessman.

The article follows:

A SMALL BUSINESS AND THE MINIMUM WAGE BILL

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, March 27.—In his advocacy of a gradual rise of the minimum wage from $1 to $1.25, and the addition of millions of workers to its beneficiaries, the President has stressed two arguments outside the economic area. One is humanitarian—that it would provide a decent living wage-standard for large groups of unskilled and semiskilled workers. The other is ethical—his long-standing pledge and that of the Democratic platform of 1960.

"I find it difficult to know," said the President at his last news conference, "why anyone would oppose seeing somebody, by 1963, paid $1.25 (an hour) who works in a business (entering interstate commerce) which makes over $1 million a year. I think anyone who is paid less than that ($50 a week) must find it extremely difficult to maintain themselves and their family. I consider it to be a very minimum wage so that I'm hopeful that the House will pass legislation as close to the bill that came out of the committee as possible * * * because * * * I must say we are talking about a standard for fellow Americans and millions of them * * *."

The premise is that the proposed rise in the scale would relieve this difficulty for such employees and that in general the bill, as the President also said, would serve "the national interest." Since it is indisputable that neither of these results would occur if an increased cost-of-living scale, small business failures and additional unemployment were the consequences, it follows that the President rejects all judgments that they would. This supports an estimate of his Secretary of Labor that the administration's bill would provide an increase of hundreds of millions in purchasing power and many more jobs.

The resistance to this bill in Congress, where the House already has lowered the proposed minimum wage and the scope of the workers' coverage, reflects strong disbelief in such expectations among the small business establishments principally affected by the legislation. These are private enterprises which gross—not, as the President said, "make," which is fundamentally different—$1 million a year and touch, though often remotely, the stream of interstate commerce.

A good example of their contention that the administration measure will have effects opposite from those the President has in view was supplied by the head of a company which manufactures mechanical pens and pencils. In a letter to President Kennedy from this small business manager, Remmie L. Arnold, the following statistics, and conclusions drawn from them, were offered:

1. At $1.25 an hour an employee who at $1 now earns $40 for a 40-hour week would get $50. After the legal subtraction of taxes his week's net would increase from $31.50 to $39.40. The employer's payroll and tax outlay per employee would rise from $42.44, of which the Government gets $10.94, to $53.05, of which the Government would get $13.65.

2. But, said this small manufacturer, "when we increase the minimum wage we will be forced to increase upward the higher-paid," which means more additional expense of doing business. "I will have to add the additional increase and taxes to my products; the people who sell me raw materials will raise their prices to me; the chainstores to which my products mostly are sold will increase their retail prices for them."

AS TO PURCHASING POWER

3. "You cannot take more money from a small business * * * and give more to Government and more to employees and increase our buying power * * *. And the increased minimum wage and coverage will not help the unemployed because * * * they reduce our buying power and cut back money that could be used for capital outlay." Also, the inevitable price-level stimulation will absorb the employees' extra take-home pay, and send many retailers into the foreign market.

His particular factory, Arnold wrote the President, has made no profit since the imposition of the Korean war 10-percent excise tax on such products (still in force); and some of its labor force already has been replaced by automatic machinery as a matter of necessity.

The administration makes the strong point that one example like this does not create an average. But it is sufficiently typical of protests sent to the Capitol from small businessmen to explain the resistance in Congress. And that is fortified by long experience that rising production and consumer living costs, like Floyd Patterson's knockout combination, usually one, two.

Postal Note

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I am in complete accord with the philosophy that party workers should be rewarded for their effort if their candidate is successful in his campaign for any public office. The civil service system has removed many Government jobs from the conventional patronage role, but generally speaking the policy-making posi-

tions are subject to political appointment, as they should be. Under unanimous consent, I include an excerpt from a recent column in the Washington Evening Star that is an example of an appropriate recognition for campaign services rendered:

POSTAL NOTE

Tyler Abell, 28, has been appointed assistant to the executive assistant to Postmaster General Day. Mr. Abell, who is the stepson of Columnist Drew Pearson, will get a salary of $13,730 a year.

Address by Ambassador Phelps Phelps at Byelorussian Independence Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of an address delivered by former Ambassador Phelps Phelps before the Byelorussian-American Association on the occasion of the 43d anniversary of the declaration of independence of Byelorussia, at the Biltmore Hotel in New York on March 26, 1961.

Ambassador Phelps has some thought-provoking views regarding the Communist drive to dominate the world, which I commend to the attention of my colleagues. His address is as follows:

ADDRESS BY AMBASSADOR PHELPS PHELPS AT BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE ANNIVERSARY

The 43d anniversary of Byelorussia's independence day finds the world face-to-face with an intensification of communism's insatiable drive to dominate the world. Whether we look to the North, the East, the South or the West, the signs of Communist activity are evident—in some areas, more evident than in others. The influence of communism has spread greatly, even since you last marked the anniversary of that day—43 years ago—when the Rada in Miensk declared the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. It is anchored in Cuba. It is about to force itself upon the people of Laos. It is threatening to achieve a foothold in South America—in fact, communism may indeed have established a beachhead in Brazil, where our President's personal envoy was recently snubbed openly, and where steps are being taken to resume diplomatic negotiations with Soviet satellite countries, such as Romania, Hungary, and Bulgaria. In itself, a resumption of such relations may be a good thing; it could provide a ray of light for people on the dark side of the Iron Curtain. But if the step is taken to spite the United States, it is not a good sign—and there are more than a few who believe that Brazilian intentions are to eventually resume diplomatic relations with Russia, in an attempt to play the Soviet Union against the United States—a dangerous game.

There was another bit of unsettling news recently—the action of the Indonesian President, Soekarno, in seizing Netherlands and Belgian properties. The free world has obviously, lost the Indonesian people, who are now existing under a totalitarian form of government, whether Soekarno calls it guided democracy or by it true name, dictatorship.

Then too, there is the attempt of the Soviets to maintain an atmosphere of tension and unrest in Africa, despite warnings from the Western Powers to the contrary.

I saw one of those documentaries last week on television, which was very well done, and which showed the extent to which Fidel Castro has captured the imagination of the people and to what extent he has stirred their hopes for a change—a change in the drudgery and the hopelessness that accompanies continual poverty. This documentary concentrated on the country of Guatemala, where only U.S. intervention prevented a Communist coup from succeeding last year. According to this documentary, the active Guatemalans—the students and the businessmen to a large extent have become disillusioned with Castro and his Communist antics—the nationalization of industries, suppression of the press and so on. But neither are they anxious to become any more closely associated with the United States. Some nations will have nothing to do with us or our assistance, because they have previously been requested to involve themselves militarily in return for such aid. The Guatemalans want as little to do with us as possible to reduce the amount of our interference in their political and other domestic affairs.

This is true not only of the people in Guatemala, but with the people in other countries. When they are fortunate to discern or to suspect the grave disadvantages of communism, and when they are fortunate enough to be able to reject it in time, they have only the free world, led by the United States, or nothing. As a result, a cautious neutralism is beginning to take root—already has taken root in some countries.

Whether this neutralism will grow, its component parts unite and become strong enough to deal with both the Communist and the free world, and not succumb to either, is moot. But history, from which we never seem to learn, will demonstrate one important point—that Russia will accept this neutralism as a half-open door policy, taking advantage of every opportunity to undermine, infiltrate, and finally pry each component part loose from the whole. In every instance, history shows, where communism has been allowed to even see the light through a door, it has taken over at least half of the house. More often, it has taken over the whole house.

But even were this not so—even if neutralism were to prosper and to flourish side by side with communism and the free world's brand of democracy—this would not be enough. More than that, it would not be right. It would be peace, perhaps, but peace without honor. It would mean the abandonment of all the previous victims of Communist tyranny. And the crown of peace bought at such a price is thorny, indeed.

I fear for the world and for all of mankind. I fear that it is human nature to struggle against something, or someone regardless of circumstances good or circumstances bad. At a certain moment, one issue transcends all others in importance, and the struggle will revolve around that. At other times, this issue may fade before the importance of another, and the struggle is redirected—even, perhaps, with new alliances.

Nevertheless, we have a solemn duty, and that is—not to make the world free—but to give every person in it the opportunity of deciding for himself—without the exertion of force or other pressures—to whom and to what shall be entrusted, the course of his life on earth.

There are, as I see it, three alternatives available for accomplishing this objective. There is force of arms from without, which would involve a terrible, allout nuclear war which no one might survive. There is force of arms from within, which involves much intricate planning, perfect timing, great danger and sacrifice against overwhelming odds. There is also, as the sorrowful example of Hungary showed, grave risk of ruthless interference from the outside. The third alternative is expressed beautifully and succinctly by Goldsworthy Dickinson, English philosopher-essayist, who died a comparatively short 30 years ago: the true way for one civilization to conquer another is for it to be so obviously superior in this or that point, that others desire to imitate it.

We have, for a long time, been obviously superior in this or that point, and so obviously, that others desire to imitate our way of life. But unfortunately, we have behaved in such a manner throughout the years, that the desire in some instances became less keen, and then when opposition developed, we became panicky and tried to force peoples and countries to accept our civilization.

The opposition, unfettered by any Christian principles, was quick to take advantage of this weakness in our armor, and to exploit it along with other methods—including false revolutions, murder, and brute force—to enlarge the sphere of its influence. And as each new victim is notched on communism's gun butt, the already weakened hopes of the old victims suffer another agonizing spasm.

But in these old victims lies a great source of anti-Communist material—in these old or initial victims we have eyewitnesses to the rape and the torture and the ruthless murder of men, women and children, and even whole countries, that mark the inception of communism anywhere.

In the various nations of the world, we have people exiled from their native hills, and farms and cities rather than live under the shadow of Communist domination. Most of you here tonight, or your families and friends are in this category—most of you here can attest to the merciless manner in which Soviet armed might stamped out the spark of Byelorussia's independence completely, 40 years ago, at the Baltic port of Riga. But there are other exiled people—from Georgia, and from Hungary, and Romania, and Bulgaria and Poland, from East Germany, Lithuania, China, Tibet and from Czechoslovakia and now from Cuba.

If we are to defeat communism, and restore these people to liberated homelands, we will need their help. Any realistic reappraisal of the present free world Communist situation must conclude that the free world is retrogressing, while communism is progressing. Such a reappraisal must conclude that whatever we have been doing, however we have been doing it, is not successful. It will conclude that while there exists a desire for our way of life, there is no desire to have it forced upon any one or any national economically, physically. There is a strong, urgent, undeniable desire within people to be free and to govern their own course of existence. For some it is too late—they have been conquered physically, or economically, and they have not the means or the strength to rid themselves of their burden. Others are about to fall into this category, unless they are assisted—not to arm and to make war, but to live and to grow.

Fortunately, the United States seems to have adopted a more realistic approach to foreign assistance. This was demonstrated in President Kennedy's multimillion-dollar plan for aiding Latin American countries—for the first time since implementation of the point 4 program, in the Truman administration, we are offering help with no strings attached—a program which does not seek any military ties at all with recipient nations. Our new approach also was demonstrated in President Kennedy's Peace

Corps program which shows his realization of the problems we face abroad.

But it takes more than a day, a week or a month for a leopard to change his spots—all the programs in the world aren't going to succeed, unless we can convince recipient peoples and nations of our integrity—of our sincere desire to help for help's sake—not because the Communists will get them and eventually us, if we don't watch out.

It is true that we must cease trying to get people to reject communism, and concentrate on trying to get them to accept free-world democracy. Nevertheless, the dangers that communism holds for the rights and the dignities of man must be emphasized, and this is where the people exiled from their homelands by communism, can help. They know and they can relate the horrors of Communist occupation—the criminal acts, the degradations, the programs of rehabilitation without regard to family ties; the attempts to break up whole races, their cultures and their lineage. They know, and they can relate, these exiled people, the merciless methods of Communist force, the trickery used to usurp power of governments.

Once we achieve our objective of increasing living standards for all free peoples, and of helping them attain economic and political freedom, the exiled people can pass on to the ones they have left behind the Iron Curtain, the accomplishments of the free people. While we may conquer by showing our obvious superiority in one point or another, the enemy must be ousted, somewhere along the line. This cannot, as has been pointed out, be accomplished by force of arms from the outside; it can be achieved from the inside. All revolutions must develop from within, or they will not succeed. But they must develop in such a way that the large majority—including the various forms of force such as the military and police—are desirous of change. Our task is to create the kind of world that will be desired; yours to see that the enslaved millions become aware of this world; they will do the rest. Together, working with integrity of purpose, and working diligently, we can achieve great things. But it will be hard work—as Henrik Ibsen put it—do not wear your best trousers when you go out to fight for truth and freedom.

Chamber Opposes Fences

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution presented by the Bellingham, Wash., Chamber of Commerce.

This resolution, passed March 13, 1961, concerns fencing in the International Peace Arch Park.

Mr. Speaker, I have the good fortune to announce that the Bureau of Public Roads has informed its regional office there will be no fences in the park. I wish to take this opportunity to thank the Secretary of Commerce and officials of the Bureau of Public Roads for the consideration they have given me in this matter.

The resolution follows:

Whereas it has come to the attention of the members of the Bellingham Chamber of Commerce that with the construction of the Blaine, Wash., section of the new freeway-style Highway 99 there will possibly be installed a fence extending through the area now established as the site of the Peace Arch Park, and

Whereas such a fence is not deemed essential or desirable from a public safety or aesthetic standpoint: Then, be it hereby

Resolved, That the Chamber of Commerce of Bellingham, Wash., does go on record as vigorously opposing the creation of such a fence, or any fence through or within the Blaine Peace Arch Park area.

Done the 13th day of March 1961.

BURTON KINGSBURY,
President, Bellingham Chamber of Commerce.

Just Whose Tax Money?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I do not think it necessary to make any comment on this exchange of correspondence. It speaks for itself.

How ridiculous can some people get? The correspondence follows:

MARCH 13, 1961.

Mr. JOHN E. HORNE,
Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HORNE: I would like to know the reasoning, if indeed there be any, for the ruling of the Small Business Administration that precludes loans to small businessmen who derive half or more of their receipts from the sale of alcoholic beverages.

I consider this regulation arbitrary and highly discriminatory.

Worse, it is aimed at the hand that feeds, for one of the largest contributors of taxes to the public coffers at all levels—municipal, State and Federal—is the alcoholic beverages industry.

I am informed, for example, that in the year 1959 public revenues from alcoholic beverages totaled $4,298,465,834. Of this figure, the Federal Government received a slice coming to $3,154,556,000. Yet the small businessman dealing in alcoholic beverages is not permitted by administrative ruling to receive an SBA loan, even though his taxes are used in the broad sense for SBA loans and for the administration of the SBA itself.

As to the importance of the alcoholic beverage industry to the tax structure of the United States, it may interest the Small Business Administration to know that these particular tax receipts would almost support the entire Veterans' Administration; the same applies to the labor and welfare program; these tax receipts would support commerce, housing, and space and still have nearly $1 billion left over. Further, these taxes could support the entire operation of the General Government—including the Small Business Administration—and still have nearly $2 billion left over.

I protest most emphatically the discriminatory regulation of the SBA, and invite your comments.

Sincerely yours,

F. EDW. HÉBERT.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR,
Washington D.C., March 24, 1961.

Hon. F. EDWARD HÉBERT,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HÉBERT: Thank you for your letter of March 13, 1961, concerning our policy which prohibits the granting of financial assistance if a substantial portion of the gross income of the applicant is derived from the sale of alcoholic beverages.

The policy in question has been in effect since the beginning of the agency's lending functions in 1953. It is part of the loan policy statement promulgated by the Loan Policy Board and most recently published at page 8325 of the Federal Register dated October 14, 1959 (24 F.R. 8325).

The loan policy statement is the implementation of section 4(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended, which provides for a Loan Policy Board to establish general policies, particularly with reference to the public interest involved in the granting and denial of applications for financial assistance by the Small Business Administration. While it is true that it is the purpose of the Small Business Act, as expressed in the law itself by the Congress, that the Government should aid, counsel, assist, and protect insofar as possible the interests of small business concerns, it is also clear that Congress intended there should be some limitation. Otherwise, the provision establishing the Board would have little meaning.

In the discharge of its responsibility under the Small Business Act, the Board has repeatedly given consideration to the question of whether or not it is in the public interest to use taxpayers' funds to promote the sale of alcoholic beverages, and although many arguments have been presented, the Board has been unable to reach a conclusion favorable to the industry. I should like to make it clear that the Board has never taken the position that the alcoholic beverage business is not in the public interest. The Board's position relates only to the use of Government funds. The Board is of the opinion that the subject of alcoholic beverages presents a controversial issue with very strong differences of opinion, and even in those States where the sale of alcoholic beverages has been legalized there remains opposition thereto on the part of many taxpayers. This is evidenced by the fact that the industry is extensively regulated by Government, both State and Federal.

Since neither the Small Business Act, nor its legislative history, defines what is meant by "public interest," its determination must be the result of the judgment of the Board. However, it is significant to note that a similar Board, created for the same purpose in previous legislation, reached the same conclusion.

In addition, the policy in question was certainly not intended to cast any stigma on the alcoholic beverage industry, and there is no inference in the Board's decision that this industry has been singled out for discrimination. You will find that the loan policy statement includes other businesses which are not eligible for loans, for example, newspapers, magazines, radio and television broadcasting companies, and similar enterprises. Also prohibited are loans to enterprises primarily engaged in the business of lending or investments and this would include banks, insurance companies, finance companies, and similar businesses.

The Board has on several occasions, reconsidered this policy which concerns business loans to applicants engaged in the sale of alcoholic beverages, and decided to make no change in that policy.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN E. HORNE,
Administrator.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 29, 1961.

Mr. JOHN E. HORNE,
Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HORNE: I want to thank you for you for your remarkable reply of March 24 concerning the policy of the Small Business Administration in refusing to make loans to those small businesses dealing in alcoholic beverages.

I say your reply is remarkable for these patent reasons:

You state, for example, that the Loan Policy Board "has repeatedly given consideration to the question of whether or not it is in the public interest to use taxpayers' funds to promote the sale of alcoholic beverages, and although many arguments have been presented, the Board has been unable to reach a conclusion favorable to the industry."

I am reassured to learn that I am not the first to request reconsideration of this policy. And I am further reassured to learn that many arguments have been advanced. I detect the possibility of understatement here.

If the Board applies the yardstick of whether such loans are in the public interest, and then decides not to make such loans, the logical deduction is that the Board decided it was not in the public interest. I trust the Board, through unable to reach a favorable conclusion, is able to follow the above reasoning.

I am touched by the Board's concern for the use of Government funds. As I pointed out in my initial letter, a good portion of these sacrosanct funds is provided by the alcoholic beverages industry. If the Government considers these funds to be sullied, then don't take them.

I acknowledge that the sale of alcohol was once controversial. I thought that had been ironed out in 1933, that the people had spoken when the 18th amendment was repealed. I thought the people themselves decided then what was in the public interest. Of course what your Board has done here is to elevate its opinion over that of the American electorate.

Inasmuch as you understandably elect to ignore the contributions made by the alcoholic beverages industry to the Federal Government, it might interest you to know that in 1959 my State alone contributed $28,332,000, a figure more than five times what was appropriated for the salaries and expenses of the Small Business Administration, and well better than half what was appropriated for your revolving fund. And that from just one State.

I wonder whether your Board is aware of that. Doubtlessly not because it appears the Board is under the impression we are still attempting to function under the Volstead Act. Please tell them it was repealed nearly 28 years ago.

Sincerely yours,

F. EDW. HÉBERT.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, Byelorussians are one of the score of larger racial groups who have been suffering under the Soviet regime. As a matter of fact throughout their modern history they have been enslaved under Russian regimes, both czarist and Communist. Except for the very brief period of 3 years their history is one of subjection to Russian autocracy and tyranny.

In 1918, however, when the czarist regime in Russia was no more they asserted their freedom and proclaimed their independence on March 25. That was 43 years ago, and the event constituted a veritable landmark in Byelorussian modern history. Then the Byelorussian National Republic was set up and the people of Byelorussia, some 10 million of them in their historic homeland, worked hard to strengthen their country against its foes. Unfortunately they were faced with powerful and deadly enemies, who could be fatal to their independence. Early in 1921 the Red army attacked and overran the country, thus putting an end to independent Byelorussia. Then the country was incorporated into the Soviet Union and its people became submerged in the vast Soviet empire. Fortunately, however, in this submerged and enslaved state Byelorussians are not lost. They still retain their love for freedom and cherish their national independence. On March 25, their Independence Day, our good wishes go to her and let us hope they will once attain their goal of freedom.

Small Town No Handicap to Genius

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I suggested that the administration's proposed Department of Housing and Urban Affairs is unnecessary. I suggested that we might consider instead a Department of Small Towns and Rural Affairs.

I have enjoyed reading the comments I have received on this subject. I realize, of course, that there is more attention these days to urban areas and that this will probably continue. But I believe we owe it to the millions of people in our small towns to consider their situation too. Indeed, as I suggested, we may find that the small towns have found a way to dispose of the very same problems which—on a larger scale—trouble our urban areas.

In connection with this suggestion, I include an article which appeared in the Omaha World-Herald recently. Mr. Andre Maurois writes from Paris about the intellectual level in small towns under the heading "Small Town No Handicap to Genius."

I include this article and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

SMALL TOWN NO HANDICAP TO GENIUS
(By Andre Maurois)

PARIS.—An unknown and second-rate composer, who lived in a small German town, once wrote to Beethoven and complained of the provincial circles where he led an aimless life. Ah—If fate had surrounded him with cultured people in a metropolis, what a different man he would have been.

Beethoven answered: "I do not propose myself as a model, but I can tell you this: For a long time I lived like yourself in an insignificant small town and it made no difference. Whatever I became there or here, I became by myself."

Beethoven was right. A brilliant mind, great character will develop anywhere. It is even more so nowadays, for the smallest town today has a good public library. Radio and TV help men and women anywhere to keep in touch with everything. A real talent will be recognized wherever it comes from.

One might even say that the small town suits the artist better. In a metropolis he finds too many opportunities to amuse himself. An attractive woman in a large town has so many engagements that she will have no more time left to read. You might say that in the large town she has a chance to attend lectures, concerts, plays. But there are now good lectures practically anywhere and moreover nothing prevents here from going to town from time to time.

As to the idea that intelligent men and women, in the provinces, will not find partners worthy of them, it is quite wrong. William Allen White, one of the most brilliant Americans I have known, lived in Emporia, Kans. You might say: "There were not many like him." Quite so, but do you think there are many in New York or Chicago?

Does one need many congenial friends to lead a happy life? Too many friends, no real friends.

The surroundings do not make a great man. If he is really an asset to his country, that will be known, sooner or later. Any artist of talent, any woman of genius makes his way. As to others their real happiness depends on quality, not on numbers.

Key Issues of the 1960's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Erwin D. Canham, editor of the Christian Sience Monitor, was one of the principal speakers at the 42d annual convention of the Associated General Contractors of America held in Boston recently.

All of those who heard Mr. Canham's excellent analysis of the key issues of 1960 were tremendously impressed. The Members of Congress, who are daily dealing with these issues, I feel, should have the opportunity to read this outstanding address:

KEY ISSUES OF THE 1960'S
(By Erwin D. Canham)

The key issue of the 1960's, after the primal problem of war or peace (and closely related to it) is the vigor of the American economy. Will the American economy recover the driving force necessary to forge ahead in national growth, providing jobs for the vast tide of young Americans coming of working age in the decade, and furnishing the resources with which to meet our social needs and fulfill our international responsibilities?

In the few brief weeks of the Kennedy administration, the President has been be-

ginning to fulfill some of the promises he and his party made at Los Angeles, and during the campaign. These pledges are not very helpful toward the goal of greater economic growth, though some of them may have some short-term economic relief value.

That is to say, some of the proposals for aid to distressed areas, for financial help to the health needs of the aged, for extension of unemployment compensation, and for raising of the minimum wage may be useful for temporary aid, but they are all to some degree contributory to inflation, they increase tax burdens, they tend to increase rather than cut down unemployment. They do nothing to stimulate the economy on a long-range basis.

Yet the strength and vigor of the economy is the central factor in our long-range well-being. We must create jobs. We must create at least 25,000 brandnew jobs a week if the American economy is to be healthy in this decade.

And how do you create jobs? How do you generate strength in the economy? Not just by stimulating consumption through additional benefit payments. Our great need is not consumption, which has stood up fairly well through the recession. Our need is long-range capital investment in new enterprise, in rebuilding of plant and equipment, in breaking through into new areas of economic growth and need.

The best way to stimulate the accumulation and risking of capital, to produce growth, is surely through tax revision and reform. There must be quicker depreciation allowances, so that our obsolescent plant and equipment can be replaced. There must be relief of the overburdened urban real estate taxpayer so that our cities can be rebuilt, as largely as possible through the investment of private capital. There must be recognition of the varying quality of investment, rewarding through tax advantages the kind of investment that contributes to economic growth. There must be relief of the penalty taxes which today inhibit the risking of capital.

There are, of course, other good reasons why tax reform is needed. Our present inconsistent, contradictory, jerry-built system has loopholes, it fosters evasion and immorality, it is unequal, it preserves slums, it destroys incentive. It has produced the expense-account economy.

When President Kennedy and his advisers began to see that the international imbalance of payments made a domestic lower interest rate policy dangerous, the business community was greatly relieved. When Douglas Dillon was made Secretary of Treasury there went up a sigh of respite among businessmen. But until business sees the outlines of a tax reform program (perhaps Secretary Hodges will give it to us this afternoon, though that is not his special bailiwick), it will not know whether it is out of the woods or not. The present legislative program makes business burdens heavier. When will a stimulus and a lightening come?

Meantime, new labor contracts are being signed which would push the inflationary spiral higher. Already, the biggest and most powerful union—the Teamsters'—has obtained approximately a 14 percent increase in wages. If such an increase becomes the pattern in the automobile industry and elsewhere, inflation will have won another battle and recovery will be doubly hard. The decision time for the administration will come before many more months are past. Will the decision be for economic growth, true growth, or for mere inflation—with all its hazards?

The world is knocking hard at the doors of the American businessman. No longer is it necesary to spend time in proving the interrelationship of the American to the world economy.

The policies which the Democratic Party drafted and adopted in Los Angeles last summer have already been considerably modified and will be altered still further by the pressure of world affairs—specifically by the international balance-of-payments situation.

In Los Angeles last summer, and for some months thereafter, the Democrats advocated lower interest rates as the magic device which would pay for the costly programs they were proposing. They also claimed lower interest rates would stimulate the American economy out of a recession and into a sturdier growth rate.

Frankly, I do not believe such a program would have worked. It was no panacea. But the administration has been spared the experience of trying it. It has now been seen that to drive interest rates down would drive more dollars and more gold out of the United States to greener interest-rate pastures. In the face of the international payments crisis, a lower interest rate program, at least on short-term funds, had become economic madness. It was dropped, although the latest Presidential proposal is to pay higher rates for foreign short-term funds and lower rates to Americans. Whether Congress will approve such discriminatory interest-paying on behalf of foreigners remains to be seen. With the abandonment of a general low interest-rate policy, and with growing awareness of the gravity of the payments crisis, the incoming administration's fiscal and monetary visage became increasingly orthodox. It became possible for a Douglas Dillon to be designated as Secretary of the Treasury, a New York Federal Reserve bank official to become Under-Secretary, and for the President to deny that he had any intention of trying to force the resignation of William McChesney Martin as Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board.

Of course, we are not out of the woods yet by any manner of means. The Kennedy administration still has to face the payments crisis, it—and all of us—have an economic recession at home to cope with—and the new administration has various planks in its platform to deal with and various pressure groups who will present their bills for collection.

These three areas of economic challenge are not altogether compatible. To help curb the outgoing dollars we must not only persuade our allies to pay a larger share of defense and aid costs. We must not only persuade them to lower remaining barriers against U.S. trade and keep their own interest rates as low as they can in comparison with ours. We must also—and here in my judgment is the vital point—become more effectively competitive in world markets. In a word, to the very best of our ability, we must stem the wage-cost-inflationary spiral in the United States. To keep costs down at home—to keep them level with productivity gains—will help us stay competitive in world markets, will reduce the gratuitous advantage we present to foreign imports, and will curb the drain of inflation on our own standard of living and the stability of savings and forward planning.

I also believe that a wage-price freeze would be a mighty contribution to recovery at home, to a healthier domestic economy and a healthier society. Thus the things the Kennedy administration might do to get us out of the international red ink can coincide with and support some of things that might be done to promote internal recovery. But those parts of the Kennedy program which would increase costs of production, which would enlarge tax burdens, which would stimulate the wage spiral, would both impede recovery and gravely worsen the balance of payments.

A good illustration is the proposal to increase the Federal minimum wage to $1.25 an hour. I do not defend paying lower wages than this figure and I suspect there are few employers in this room who do. But a Federal law setting a higher minimum is inevitably inflationary to some degree and perhaps to a serious degree. It would beyond a doubt increase costs of production and of services in the American economy without any compensating increase in productivity whatever. If the worst should happen, and the new minimum wage became a new base above which all age differentials were pushed upward by labor pressure—and labor traditionally seeks to maintain its set differentials—then the cost to the American economy in inflation would be very great. President Kennedy is personally committed to a higher minimum wage but he cannot be very comfortable about the consequences at home and abroad of such an inflationary step.

Some of the economists who advise the new administration, having quieted down about lower interest rates, have now turned in a much more promising direction. They are preaching the sounder doctrine of tax reform. Of course, their kind of tax reform may not be the kind that would satisfy most of us here today, but there is a surprising and growing concentration on the need for revision of taxation policies. And there is some agreement on what we should do, for the need of capital accumulation and of stimulating incentive within the economy is very great.

It is elementary that the American economy must move upward out of the present slump, and must grow healthily. The present unemployment figures are a grave challenge. We cannot go on long with over 6 percent of our labor force out of work. Moreover, unless our economy moves into a period of solid growth—say at a rate of at least 3 percent a year—the unemployment situation will get worse. We are moving ahead in a decade when the young people resulting from the birthrate explosion of the mid-1940's will be arriving at the doors of the labor market. In this decade we must create—must generate—new jobs in the American economy at the rate of 25,000 jobs a week or 13,500,000 for the decade. Moreover, millions already working will lose their old jobs through technological change. We must generate new jobs for them.

How do you generate jobs? Research helps. Risk taking helps. The bold, new ideas of American enterprise help. But there must be incentive. There must be capital. To create one new job in our industrial economy requires the accumulation and the investment of at least $12,000 and in some industries as much as $25,000. How do you provide for the accumulation of capital? Partly, at least, through tax policy. And there must be incentive and reward for risk. Our present tax rates are a brake on incentive.

There is plenty of work that needs doing in America—plenty of jobs to be created. Much of this work lies in the shadowy borderland where public and private operations intermesh and overlap. Take the problem of our cities. Many of them badly need rebuilding. Despite the magnificent building and growth to be seen in such fabulous megapolitan complexes as Los Angeles, it is clear that much remains to be done to make our cities livable or even tolerable. The central core of cities must be rescued from the slums and made attractive again, while the new slum rot of the suburbs must be arrested.

Unless the problems of urban, suburban, and exurban living are solved in American society, population growth will result in chaos. Now, just to set up a Federal Department of Urbanism, just to use the handy Federal taxing power to siphon local money to Washington and spray it back after a tidy evaporation or brokerage fee,

will not solve the problem. Acceptance of civic responsibility on the local level is the beginning of wisdom, coupled with the release of the full dynamics of enterprise and the profit motive. It is true that greed and selfishness have produced many of our past and present eyesores. I do not obscure any part of the sordid picture. But we can do better as we awaken to our civic responsibilities. In the first place, not a new Federal Department of Government in Washington but better regional metropolitan instruments of government, close to the people, are required. Citizens in our great metropolitan regions must see the need for coordinated planning and action at the wide community level.

It should be perfectly apparent that most of the problems of the many metropolitan complexes of America are entirely interrelated. They cannot be handled on the township or small-city basis. In Boston we suffer severely from the selfishness and not always unfounded suspicion of the towns and cities which make up the area. The only way to avoid excessive Federal intervention and control is effective cooperative action at the level of the local region.

Again taxation comes close to the heart of the problem. Excessive real estate taxes, such as we have in Boston, effectively prevent the inflow of capital which is ready and available for private investment in rebuilding to meet our manifest needs just as soon as investors can make a fair return on their money. Too heavy real estate tax burdens, on a dwindling base, prevent this healthy inflow of capital. Municipalities plainly need new sources of revenue. This is only one way to unleash the forces of private enterprise for the tasks which need to be done to make our cities and our society more worthy of a progressive people. This is one way to create the jobs we must have if the dry rot of unemployment is not to sap our strength and prevent us from fulfilling our responsibilities for stability and peace in the world.

So let us turn to the threats and challenges throughout the world which today menace the rights of businessmen to perform their essential tasks. We are grimly reminded off the coast of Florida that communism and chaos have come to our doorstep. No longer is Red revolution far away, no longer are satellites only in Eastern Europe. And the great danger of Castroism is that it may spread elsewhere in Latin America, where some of the elements that led to tragedy in Cuba are already present.

One thing is very clear in Cuba, in Laos, and in many another troubled spot: the mere outpouring of American dollars is not enough to solve problems. At the heart of our difficulties everywhere is something far more important: it is the integrity of the American dream or mission in the world—what we stand for—and the intelligence and character with which we implement our mission. Our need, in all realism and practicality, is for a kind of spiritual awakening and awareness. What do I mean? Simply this: The United States must stand for something in the world—something tangible and intangible, something real and important in the lives of people. We did once—more than once—and we can again for underneath the present turbulent surface there is still memory and respect for what we mean in world history, yesterday, today, and tomorrow.

We were once the great revolutionaries. Our Revolution lifted the hearts of oppressed men everywhere. For over a century we were the continent of opportunity, of refuge, of hopes and dreams unlimited, of human liberation on a scale previously unknown in history. The shrewd and wise idealists who put together the American frame or constitutional government attributed their liberties to an all-wise God and enshrined their hopes and plans in noble words which have never been forgotten. They were not only great political scientists, they were also (if you will forgive the expression) great propagandists and they emphasized the importance of "a decent respect to the opinions of mankind."

Other Americans also meant much to the world: Jefferson of course, Lincoln and also Lee, Emerson, and Thoreau, Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, a young man named Lindbergh in a disillusioning time, Franklin Roosevelt, and in our own time Dwight Eisenhower. In all these lives, and others—Edison, Henry Ford, and even the buccaneers of finance and industry—various aspects of the American role in history shone through. This image was particularly bright and shining when most of our problems were still unsolved, when we stood for hope and aspiration rather than satisfaction and satiety. Indeed, it would be far better for us in the world if we emphasized more our problems and our unfinished business rather than boasting of our wealth and accomplishments. We must never forget how it feels to be hungry and we must let the world know that we know. Indeed, I believe that a large part of our difficulty both at home and abroad is the result of how much we have achieved. A kind of smugness and apathy tends to replace the lean and hungry spirituality of an unsatisfied society.

There is much to be unsatisfied about in today's Nation and world.

There is off-shore communism.

There is a domestic slump.

There is rising unemployment.

There is the confrontation with Soviet Russia.

There is the grim portent of Communist China.

There is the danger of enlarging the club of nuclear nations, down to the most reckless dictator.

There is, of course, the international threat to the dollar.

There is the possibly continuing spiral of wages and prices beyond the pace of productivity.

There is the hectic confusion of the newborn nations.

There is the blindness of neutralism.

We can face up to these problems and take realistic action regarding most of them. Of course, we must preserve our retaliatory power in order to prevent a nuclear war. But we must also press harder for ways to bring nuclear weapons and other armaments under effective control. President Kennedy's selection of John J. McCloy to head this task is excellent.

But whatever tangible steps we must take to cope with all these problems will only be effective in the setting of a deeper awakening and action. Let us remind ourselves and others (as I began saying a moment ago) of our attiude toward and meaning to every one of God's men and women and children on this little planet. Our society with all its present problems of half-fulfillment, stands as the transitional result of the greatest revolutionary tide history has ever seen. This tide did not begin at Philadelphia in 1776 or Jamestown or Provincetown in 1620. It began with the dawning awareness on the hills of Judea of the central importance of one God and the Law—Monotheism and the Ten Commandments. This tide flowed on in the life, example, and teaching of the Christ Jesus with his proof of universal love and the brotherhood of all mankind. Into its mighty current came the streams of Grecian beauty and truth, and Roman order, law, and organization. The tide flowed on when an awakening Western Europe rediscovered the creative powers of men turning toward spiritual freedom. It swept out of the Old World and into the New as men sought new opportunities for universal progress. And in our happy, resourceful, unrestrained continent the tide of freedom reached its climax—so far—in a society in which the inherent rights of God's men received their fullest recognition and chance.

The inspiration which the American example gave the world has had fruit everywhere. The present surge toward freedom of the colonial peoples is in large part a direct result of the revolutionary tide which brought our own society into being.

But today much of the world regards—and has been deluded into regarding—the American example as a form of reaction. Again we must make clear to everyone that we are a part of the world liberating movement. In practice, therefore, we must be an example to the world instead of a benefactor. Our technological experience can help them. Some adaptation of our political and economic experience can help too. But in deepest realism, our place in the world must be that of friend of the rights of man. And in all humility we must make plain to others how much we realize we must improve in our own society. Respect is what we want and need in the world, not gratitude.

While keeping ever alert to the challenges which pour in upon us from every corner of the globe, perhaps the best thing American businessmen can do is to attend first and foremost to the unfinished business in our own society. We must get our own economy in high gear. We must rescue the dollar, for it is vital not only to our own stability but to the exchange systems of much of the world. We must maintain the deterrent vigor of our armaments, and we must strive to bring all armaments under effectively administered controls. We must stabilize our economy so that we are not increasingly barring ourselves from world markets. We must rebuild our cities, enlarge our educational facilities and make them better qualitatively and rigorously, get our agriculture back into economic viability—to put it all together—accept and manifest the duties of freemen in a society where acceptance of individual responsibility is the key to well-being.

Our capacities are great, once we awaken. Our spiritual heritage is potent. Our problems are grimly challenging: within the world, within the Nation, within ourselves. It is perhaps true that our Nation and its people, like every other free and great people, are always at their best in moments of challenge and seeming adversity. Nineteen hundred and sixty-one is in many ways one of those moments. Let our response be as vigorous as it has been in the past, and we can emerge from the darkness into light.

Policy of Appeasement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the following article by David Lawrence, which appeared in yesterday's New York Herald Tribune, is very disturbing. Are we to have another period of appeasement?

ANOTHER NEUTRAL COUNTRY IN ASIA SEEN WON BY REDS

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, March 27.—Peace in Laos is far off—and so is war. Despite all the outward display of firm diplomacy by the West, the Soviet Government will have its way in the end.

First there is to be a cease-fire, but it will come only after more conversations and propaganda interchanges. It will be hailed, of course, as a victory for the West. Then there will ensue a three-nation conference to work out a truce. Next will come a 14-nation conference to set up a neutral government in Laos. All this takes time—maybe months—but eventually the Communists will have obtained a substantial part of Laos, if not all of it. That's the defeat which lies ahead because the West will not unite to take decisive action to stop Communist penetration in Asia, Latin America, and Africa.

For the history of so-called neutral setups is that the Communists move in and take over from the inside. They resort to bribery, intimidation, and actual incitement to riots and demonstrations. The outward profession of interest in neutrality has resulted in Communist victories in several instances in the past—first in Poland, then in Czechoslovakia, next in China, as coalitions were formed of Communists and Nationalists. Then Indochina was carved up in 1954 by the same formula of a cease-fire followed by a true commission and the setting up of so-called independent states.

KENNEDY'S MOVES A GAIN?

What did President Kennedy gain, therefore, by the dramatic announcement at his press conference last week, by the dispatch of Secretary of State Rusk to Bangkok for the meeting of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, and by the sudden conference with Prime Minister Macmillan?

There is no evidence that the Communists have been impressed by these moves. Moscow knew all along that the United States was bargaining for a cease-fire, and that the threats of military intervention meant little. Spokesmen for the British Government notified the world that it was not getting ready to send British troops into Asia. The United States, of course, had said that it would not act alone, but only in cooperation with its allies.

Russia has known all along that it could halt any military moves of the West by agreeing at any moment to a cease-fire. With characteristic boldness when holding trump cards, the Kremlin decided first to get as many conditions as possible accepted before agreeing to a cease-fire in the local fighting in Laos. It's what comes after the truce that's really important. For the Communist plan is to take over from within after the "neutral" status of Laos is supposedly established.

SHOWDOWN TO COME

While a big war seems unlikely just because of Laos, sooner or later a showdown will be forced between the Communists and the free world. This is what happened in the 1930's after Munich. The Soviets now have rendered the United Nations helpless in the Congo, as Moscow continues to send arms and supplies to so-called neutral states in Africa while refusing, of course, to pay any of the expenses of the U.N. for the whole Congo operation. Yet the West doesn't do anything about this default.

British officials in London, moreover, are reported to be saying that it's too late now to save Laos, that the most the West can get from the Communists is another divided country, with northern Laos going to the Communists and southern Laos going to a so-called neutral regime.

REDS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

But what happens in a neutral country? From south Vietnam, for instance, which is next door to Laos, comes word that the military situation is almost as bad as it is in Laos. South Vietnam's army has been getting military help from the West, but the area is infiltrated by 10,000 disciplined and highly trained men from Communist-controlled north Vietnam. Almost half the 6,000 villages in south Vietnam have been taken over by Communist agents.

What is the answer? The United States and Britain and France, despite the talk of military intervention, reveal every day that they do not wish to take any such action because it might lead to a big war like the one in Korea. The Communists are betting that the Western allies are bluffing. So, as in the days of Hitler in the 1930's, the free world retreats step by step, hoping against hope that a dictator will be reasonable.

A cease-fire seems likely now only because the Russians know it will lead to a neutralized Laos. This is exactly what they want, but between now and the day the cease-fire actually takes effect, Communist forces will gobble up some more territory in Laos.

President Kennedy is earnestly grappling with the whole complicated situation. But "brinkmanship" that isn't well coordinated or backed up by allies who will fight if necessary—but who appear to be unprepared to go to the brink of war or to take the consequences of their firm statements—will have little effect on Khrushchev. That's why this year he may chalk up another conquest in Asia.

Mature Women Get Bad News on Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, today, there are more women employed on a full- or part-time basis than ever before. Yet, there are indications that this encouraging news does not apply to all women jobseekers. The mature woman who desires employment is faced with discouraging reports on many fronts, ranging from age requirements to inability to receive specialized training. Recently, a conference was held in Detroit on this subject and the news item on it follows:

MATURE WOMEN GET BAD NEWS ON JOBS
(By Ruth Carlton)

A thousand women turned out for a self-help conference—"Employment and Training Opportunities for Women" yesterday afternoon at the Rackham Educational Memorial.

The three topics of the day were titled: "The Mature Woman as a Jobseeker," "The Job Itself," and "Sources of Training."

The need for a definition of mature was evident. Only one speaker defined it:

"In our organization we consider the mature women to be 30 to 35," he said.

The majority of the audience were over 50.

The first question from the audience pointed up this same lack of definition. It was aimed at Mrs. Helen Biehl, director, Detroit Practical Nursing Center.

"I tried to enroll in a school for practical nursing and they told me I'm too old. I'm 54 and strong and healthy," said the woman on the third row.

"The rules allow us to accept students 18 to 50," Mrs. Biehl replied. "We are advising women to prepare early for the jobs they may want in later years."

"But I've been busy with my family," persisted the woman from the audience. "Now I have time and want to become a practical nurse."

The answer remained—she can't.

Most of the word the audience received during the afternoon was equally discouraging.

"The Mature Woman as a Jobseeker" was Mary K. Guiney's subject. Mrs. Guiney is planning consultant for United Community Services.

"Women surely work for the same reasons men do," she said. "Many present hiring policies, related both to sex and to age, need to be reviewed.

"The homemaker who decides to get a job must be ready to give up the authority she has had in her home.

"She must be willing to take orders and to take criticism," Mrs. Guiney said.

PREPARE, IS ADVICE

Speaking on "The Job Itself," Frederick Mitchell, director of employment service division, Michigan Employment Security Commission, advised women to prepare for jobs for the better days ahead.

"To be brutally frank, there is not much of anything available in the Detroit area today," he said.

He stressed the drastic changes in the employment pattern in recent years toward increased demands for experience and training.

"There was a day when if the body was warm and could stand we could refer it for a job," he said. "Today the job goes to the 'fustest with the mostest.'"

He advised the jobseeker to study job classifications and prepare for a specific job.

"One guaranteed way to stay unemployed is to say 'I can do anything.'" he said.

EYES CIVIL SERVICE

He read the official list of job classifications, stopping to comment on a few which normally have openings. These included cooks and chefs, group workers and other social workers, dietitians and nurses.

"Investigate the Government field," he advised. "Civil service jobs cover every classification from sweepers on up. It's a growing field, not so concerned about your age, and offers security."

A panel which discussed sources of training was made up of Mrs. Biehl, Mrs. Opal Cunningham, training director, Crowley's; Arthur Greiner, training director, National Bank of Detroit; and Dale Curtiss, executive administrative assistant, adult education, Detroit Public Schools.

"Age is no barrier to continuing training in practically any field you can name in Detroit's educational institutions," Curtiss said.

Polish Primate to Clergy: Prepare for the Worst

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM W. SCRANTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. SCRANTON. Mr. Speaker, all Americans, regardless of their religious affiliations, cannot help but be concerned with the struggle still continuing in Communist Poland by Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski and the Red regime.

Communism, wherever it has appeared in the world, has recognized Christianity as one of its prime opponents. Consequently, the Communists continue to spare no effort in their attempts to crush religion.

The following article, which appeared in the March 21, 1961, issue of the Polish-American Journal, describes the current status of the church-state struggle in Poland:

DEFENDS WESTERN BORDERS: POLISH PRIMATE TO CLERGY: PREPARE FOR THE WORST

WARSAW.—Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski has called upon the clergy to close ranks and "prepare for the worst" in a deepening struggle for survival of the church in Poland.

The primate of Poland warned 15,000 priests to be ready for any sacrifice in defense of the faith—even "punishment, exile, loss of freedom."

The cardinal directed his severest admonitions to priests tempted by self-love and excessive ambition to collaborate with Poland's Communist regime. The number of such priests is increasing and this problem is among the most acute facing the primate.

NEUTRAL IN POLITICS

In his private letter to the clergy, Cardinal Wyszynski laid down explicit rules for the attitude of the clergy toward politics, telling them to keep out of politics.

The cardinal's stand means that the church will remain neutral in the next month's national elections—neither urging Catholics to go to the polls to vote for the single national front list—as the government wishes—nor will it advocate a boycott of the election.

BACKS REGIME ON BORDERS

The primate alined the church with the Communist government on only one subject—the preservation of the western territories, recovered from Germany after World War II.

He also acknowledged the reality of Poland's firm membership in the Communist bloc under Soviet leadership.

PRESSURE ON CHURCH

Since last summer, government pressure has been applied quietly but relentlessly to curtail church privileges and freedom of action. The church has seen religious instruction eliminated from almost all Polish schools. Priests and parishes have been subjected to tax increases. Seminaries have been placed under stricter government control, including censorship of their libraries.

Some seminary students have been drafted into the armed forces. Building permits for churches and parish houses have become difficult to obtain and the church's title to certain properties has been made uncertain.

Under these difficult conditions, the cardinal commanded the parish priests to carry on regular religious instruction in churches, private homes, or elsewhere, regardless of any obstacles raised by "atheism" and at the cost of any sacrifice.

The Choice We Face

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, a storm of controversy is fiercely raging in Washington and throughout our land between those who hurl the label "liberal" or "conservative" as an epithet against their ideological opponents. It would be well, therefore, for us to reexamine these terms to learn what, if anything, they mean and to determine whether the so-called liberal or conservative course will best serve our national interest.

The question is not merely which path will lead us to prosperity. The stakes are greater than prosperity. The stakes are survival itself. The collegiate debate as to whether we can best be prosperous via Franklin D. Roosevelt or Calvin Coolidge is so limited as to be outmoded within the frame of reference of the 1960's. The question is which path will enable us to win the battle of democracy against communism for the minds of men. For unless we win that conflict, our survival as a free Nation is impossible.

Traditionally, the liberal has been regarded as the person who would, by experimentation and innovation, change basic patterns and structures. The conservative, on the other hand, has been looked upon as the one who would preserve and maintain these patterns and structures. It may well be, however, that if the conservative were to be successful in 1961, our way of life would become radically changed by 1970. Conversely, it may be the liberal who will ultimately be responsible for the conservation and continuation of much of our fabric of Government as we now know it.

In the struggle for the minds and the loyalties of mankind both at home and throughout the world, only that doctrine which can reasonably bring the hope and expectation of improvement in the economic and social status of the vast number of the have-nots can prevail. Improvement, of course, means change. Thus, the conservative may unwittingly be the radical because by his desire to change little, he may forfeit much by a loss of the competition for the fealty and commitment of the uncommitted peoples of the world. The liberal may truly be the one who "conserves" because by his desire to change much, he may forfeit less.

Let us first consider whether the liberal or conservative approach to our dometic problems will best serve to stave off the onslaught of the Communists, not only at home where they are presently weak, but also abroad where they strongly stalk. In the field of domestic civil rights, it is not an exaggeration to state that no single factor is greater in turning the people of Africa and Asia against us than our unfortunate refusal to act to insure social justice for our Negro citizens in the United States.

I happen to regard the guarantee of civil rights to all Americans to be a moral obligation of all Americans. However, even if we are to disregard the moral issue involved, do we dare to overlook the political impact of the civil rights issue on the world stage? Can we expect to gain the friendship of the millions of nonwhites who make up the majority of the world's population so long as the opponents of civil rights for all Americans refuse to relinquish their prejudice in the national interest?

We sparked a revolution on our shores in 1776 by the electric declaration that taxation without representation is tyranny. Yet two centuries later, a sizable segment of American political thought would tax our Negro citizens while at the same time denying them the right to vote. Indeed these "conservators" would even ask, and have asked, American Negroes to fight our country's wars and shed their blood to protect a political system in which they are refused a voice. We delude ourselves if we believe that the rest of the world is blind to this cruel inconsistency, and that the Communists are not making political hay out of it.

In the field of social legislation generally, the liberal approach is and has proven to be the best answer to and protection against communism. The Communist movement was never stronger in the United States than in the early 1930's when we were floundering in a heartless depression during which the unemployed, the homeless, the ill, and the aged felt that their Government simply did not care. It was not until Franklin D. Roosevelt began to remember "the forgotten man" with broad social programs such as the WPA, unemployment compensation, social security, fair labor standards, and housing that the rising tide of homegrown communism in America was stemmed.

Yet in spite of this lesson of recent history, a strong body of conservative opinion in our country continues to revile Franklin D. Roosevelt, and to oppose the initiation of new social programs and the expansion of existing social programs championed by John F. Kennedy as the path for the 1960's. Although it is almost axiomatic that the Communist virus thrives on despair and want, the conservative spokesmen oppose programs designed to alleviate these twin menaces. These political physicians to the body politic eschew the preventive medicine which would eliminate the germ of communism by positive programs, preferring to snipe only at the symptoms.

We hear it argued, however, that if we adopt and expand these broad social programs, the result is not to conserve our basic way of life, but to install a system alien to our fundamental concept of America. Such an argument cannot sustain analysis. The thing that is really fundamental about democracy is freedom. Freedom is essentially what democracy is all about. It is guaranteed by the Bill of Rights of our Constitution.

Who would argue that the vast social programs enacted since 1932 have deprived us of the really basic freedoms safeguarded by the Bill of Rights? Freedom of religion in America is unabridged. Freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of assemblage are all happily a part of our daily existence. They are not threatened. They would indeed be threatened and snuffed out under the very communistic movement which has been rendered weak and impotent in the United States by the social legislation opposed by the conservatives. Furthermore, if the rest of the world can be made to see that the people in our country are decently housed, are decently treated socially,

and are generally "cared about" by their Government, we shall have made a giant step in the contest for the minds of the uncommitted millions on our planet.

There are those Americans who say that these great social programs are too costly financially. However, if it is true that these programs have rendered communism weak at home, and may through propaganda combat the appeal of communism abroad, they are worth their cost a thousandfold. One never hears the argument that we should abandon the search for more explosive bombs or more far-probing missiles because we cannot "afford" them. There are some things we must afford. First among them is our democratic free system of government.

Turning to the problem as to the approach to follow on the international level, we have only to consider communistic propaganda techniques in order to arrive at our best course. The Communists have not changed their propaganda tune since Karl Marx wrote his Manifesto in 1848. Exhorting the workers of the world to arise, he told them they had nothing to lose but their chains. To the starving and tattered of Asia and Africa today, this exhortation can be as effective as it was to the Russian masses in 1917 unless the free nations of the world come up with something more positive of their own.

The bewildered and hungry peasant of Asia and Africa can be wooed and perhaps won by the blandishments of the siren songs from Moscow and Peiping promising him his acre of land. Without possessions and bereft of human dignity itself, he has, in fact, nothing to lose. And what have we offered him for the future? Which of his local leaders have we supported to lead him toward tomorrow?

Although sending him aid for the present, we have recommended to him the status quo of conservatism for the future. While the Communists hold out to him the hope of the acre of land, we tell him of the blessings of democracy, forgetting that a man must first be fed and clothed and housed before the aspiration for freedom can be strong within him.

We have also by our essentially conservative approach given over by default to the Communists those surging movements of protest and revolt which will not be denied, and which have caught the imagination and support of many of the people of the world. Unmindful that the United States itself burst forth through revolution in the 18th century, we have tended to assume that revolution is always the product of the Communists in the 20th century.

Our Nation, which still remembers with gratitude the help given the struggling American Revolution by Kosciusko and Pulaski from Poland and by Lafayette from France, has discouraged any such aid or comfort to foreign vehicles of protest by Americans in our modern day. Yet there is real doubt whether all these movements of protest and rebellion which have shaken the last several decades were Communist-inspired in their origins. There is no doubt, however, that through the indifference and with the hostility of the free world to these eruptions, these movements have turned out to be Communist-dominated in their conclusions.

The conservative approach of the status quo has led us to a total lack of communication with those voices of protest which now lead, or which ultimately will lead, to their people. Into this vacuum moved the Communists who, like nature, abhor a vacuum.

It is not unusual for Congressmen to receive mail from constituents protesting against liberal programs as not being faithful to the America we grew up in. The question we face, however, does not require us to decide whether the unwitting twenties were wise, or whether the gay nineties were really gay. Those eras have passed from the American scene forever. There may be those among us who grow nostalgic for them, but the fact is that they simply will not come back again.

Times have changed, and changed times present changed problems which require changed solutions. The first question which destiny poses is whether now, in the 1960's, we can refuse to follow the course of social progress at home and to support it abroad. The ultimate question is whether, if we fail to follow such a course, we can remain free.

This is the choice we face.

Days Ahead Seen Crucial for Exporter Finance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Francis X. Scafuro, of the National Coordinating Committee for Export Credit Guaranties. Mr. Scafuro is also vice president of the Bank of America. The article appeared in the Journal of Commerce, March 21, 1961:

DAYS AHEAD SEEN CRUCIAL FOR EXPORTER FINANCE

(By Francis X. Scafuro)

In an article which appeared in the Journal of Commerce, November 11, 1960, I pointed to some of the deficiencies in our existing export credit guarantee facilities with those of other countries.

In his February 6 balance-of-payments message, President Kennedy confirmed that our export credit facilities "are not yet adequate, nor or they comparable to those offered by foreign countries." Accordingly, he directed the president of Export-Import Bank to prepare and submit by April 1 a new program to place our exporters on a basis of full equality with their competitors in other countries. The President also asked the Secretary of the Treasury to initiate and submit by the same date a study of the methods through which private financial institutions can participate more broadly in providing export credit facilities.

International traders are gratified by this top-level recognition of their long-felt need for more comprehensive credit and financing facilities to help them meet the foreign competition. Especially are they hopeful that the program adopted to meet this need will make the fullest possible use of private insurance and financing institutions, with Government participation held to the irreducible minimum.

As the experience of other countries clearly demonstrates, this export credit problem requires a double-headed instrument for its solution: (1) an export credit guarantee system which protects against all unavoidable hazards involved in granting short- and medium-term payment facilities to customers abroad; and (2) a financing system, based upon and broadened by reason of these guaranties, that will enable commercial banks and other private lending institutions to provide the funds needed by individual exporters to sell on payment terms equivalent to those granted by suppliers of other industrial countries. Obviously, it is always prerequisite that the customer and the destination country be creditworthy at the time of sale.

Our international trade financing mechanisms cannot work efficiently unless all parts are supplied and functioning. Without any one part, the machine cannot operate at full power.

So far as the credit guarantee portion of the problem is concerned, the proposal which has been carefully developed by the National Coordinating Committee for Export Credit Guaranties offers a sound and practical program. In brief, this calls for the passage by the Congress of legislation to federally charter an American Export Guaranty Corp. Privately owned and administered, this corporation would insure U.S. exporters against unforeseen credit losses which might be encountered in their sales of goods and services of all types to responsible and creditworthy customers abroad. Commercial risks (insolvency and protracted default) would be insured to 85 percent; noncommercial risks (including prolonged exchange transfer delays) to 95 percent of invoice value.

The corporation—in effect a pool or syndicate of commercial insurance companies—would bear the entire burden of commercial loss. It would, however, require standby financial backing from the U.S. Treasury for losses resulting from political and catastrophic risks, but only to the extent that such noncommercial losses exceeded the corporation's specially earmarked political risk loss reserves. These reserves would represent an accumulation of all political risk premium income, less a small allowance for its management expense.

U.S. REPRESENTATION

The U.S. Government would be represented on the guarantees corporation's board of directors, and this Government director would have the final say as to global and country exposure limits and other elements involved in the corporation's underwriting of political risks only.

In short, though the proposed corporation would be privately owned and would operate on commercial insurance lines, with limited Government participation, it would provide the same degree of comprehensive cover, and the same speed and general efficiency of operation as the credit-insuring organizations of other principal trading nations now do.

It must be emphasized, however, that any export credit insurance system, no matter how comprehensive or efficient, will provide the basic foundation, the cornerstone, upon which to build an export financing mechanism. Credit insurance, by itself, does not provide the funds necessary to finance oversea transactions. As the experience of other

countries demonstrates, however, once a truly comprehensive export credit guarantee system is functioning, relieving the exporter and his banker of a substantial part of their contingent liability on discounted receivables, the financing problem is greatly simplified.

ECONOMY OF RESOURCE

Essentially, credit insurance by separating the risk bearing from the lending function, paves the way for an economy of resources. In the management of $100, for example, one must have $100, but, working on the law of averages, a $100 account can be safely insured with resources of $5 or even less. Thus, on an insurance basis, $1 can do the work of $20 or more. Having his account insured, the exporter can safely be granted more liberal accommodation by his banker, often at a saving in the financing cost which largely offsets his risk insurance premium charge.

In Canada, the United Kingdom, Germany, France, and many other countries, export trade financing, especially for medium term credits, is conditioned upon the financed transaction being guaranteed.

A most interesting illustration of this is to be found in the latest development in the Canadian export credit insurance and financing structure. All nine of the Canadian chartered banks have now combined to take over the Export Finance Corp. of Canada, Ltd., which was set up by the Canadian Government in June 1959, but never actually got into operation. This Export Finance Corp. of Canada, Ltd., has an authorized capital of $50 million and can borrow up to 10 times that amount. So effectively it could have an available ceiling for financing of $550 million. The nine commercial banks have paid into this Export Finance Corp. an initial capital of $10 million, so they can borrow 10 times that amount which gives them a total financing capacity of $110 million, to be expanded as need arises.

CANADA EXPORT FINANCE

The Export Finance Corp. will finance sales of capital goods with terms of payment that do not extend beyond 5 years, always provided that such export transactions are insured by Canada's Export Credits Insurance Corp. Under this arrangement, Canada's exporters will continue to deal with their own commercial bankers, and these private bankers will make all the other arrangements for the Export Finance Corp. to take over the actual financing.

The Canadian chartered banks and the Canadian Government have agreed that, if the bankers will make financing readily available on all export transactions up to 5 years, then the Canadian Government will provide financing for export transactions extending beyond 5 years. However, these project loans beyond 5 years will be handled by the Government without export credit insurance, as Canada's Export Credit Insurance Corp. adheres to its firm policy, also followed by credit insurers of other countries, not to insure capital goods beyond a maximum of a 5-year credit period.

In the United States, under a like arrangement, commercial banks and other private lending institutions could safely finance insured transactions up to 5 years, leaving the longer term projects to Export-Import Bank of Washington.

SPECIFIC SUGGESTIONS

The following are some other specific suggestions which I would like to offer at this time as the steps which should be taken to broaden existing U.S. finance facilities once an effective and comprehensive export credit guarantee system is established:

Commercial banks should be permitted to accept drafts (i.e. create bankers' acceptances) for tenors or periods up to 5 years from date of shipment to correspond with prevailing market credit terms for our manufactured goods. Sound regulations would have to be put into effect governing the length of credit extended by means of such bankers' acceptances for specified groups of goods. This broadening of the bankers' acceptance base would go a long way toward resolving the medium term money shortage. There is always an investment market for prime bankers' acceptances.

JOINT BANK VENTURE

A system of private funding of export financing must be created. Just as the German commercial banks have banded together to create both a credit insurance organization (Hermes) and a medium term financing institution (Ausfuhrkredit); just as the nine Canadian charted banks have now followed suit with the formation of the Export Finance Corp. of Canada, Ltd., so might the leading American international banking institutions combine in a joint venture to create a new (Edge Act) financing corporation to provide a common rediscount pool for international trade finance paper. Such a new finance corporation would make no direct loans to exporters but would only rediscount for its stockholder member banks with recourse to them. A well sponsored and adequately capitalized corporation of this sort should be able to float sizable bond issues (at reasonably low interest rates) with which to raise funds to purchase insured, or guaranteed, export paper from member (stockholder) banks.

To round out our modernized national system of international trade credit, there is also a need for Federal central rediscounting facilities for international trade finance paper. Our commercial banks (as well as the new financing corporation suggested in the preceding paragraph) should have access to central rediscounting facilities for medium term paper, just as such rediscounting facilities are available to practically all European commercial banks engaged in international finance.

UNITED KINGDOM REDISCOUNT FACILITY

The Bank of England recently announced the establishment of rediscount facilities enabling the commercial banks to sell to the Bank of England foreign trade finance paper which is insured by Export Credits Guarantee Department and which at time of discount would mature within 18 months. Thus what was medium term paper becomes an almost cash reserve item.

The days immediately ahead will determine whether the financial community and the Government will respond adequately to the need for the credit and financing machinery vital to the growth and maintenance of our international trade.

Plight of the Truckers—Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I believe my colleagues will be interested in the anomoly which exists with regard to Alaska in relation to the Federal Interstate Highway System. Although Alaska participates in the regular A–B–C system of primary, secondary and rural roads, it is not yet ready to build any extensive amount of four-lane highways so is not included in the Federal interstate highway construction program. Nevertheless, the people of Alaska are subjected to the tax on motor fuel and tires from which the revenue is derived to carry out said program. Thus, on its face, this situation indicates that Alaska should be exempted from that portion of the Federal tax on motor fuel and tires which is applied to the interstate highway construction program. A second look, however, makes clear that since all the proceeds of such tax flow into the highway trust fund from which both the regular A–B–C Federal aid program and the Interstate System are funded, there is no exact portion of the tax collected specifically for the Interstate System which can be translated into an ascertainable exemption for Alaskans. Furthermore, the trust fund first meets the needs of the A–B–C program and the Interstate System gets only what is left. Thus it apears that the constitutional requirement of uniformity in tax laws binds Alaskans to pay the full Federal tax on motor fuel and tires even though Alaska is not included in the interstate highway construction program. It is on this basis that I contend Alaska is building up an equity in a future equalization road program to enhance the equity it already possesses by virtue of its noninclusion under the Federal aid highway program during all its years as an incorporated Territory up to 1956, which fact has resulted in many of its towns not being interconnected by means of roads.

May I now speak in behalf of the trucking industry in Alaska in regard to the President's proposal which calls for retaining the present Federal gas tax of 4 cents a gallon and greatly increasing the tax on diesel fuel, trucks over 26,000 pounds, and highway tires, inner trubes and tread rubber.

Notwithstanding the fact that the Alaska Carriers Association, Inc., is made up of member firms operating in a State without interstate expressways and without prospects of getting same, this association, in an official release which I received recently, expresses a broad national view in the following language:

> This association, representing those trucking firms and associate members (shown on its membership list) is completely in favor of the earliest possible competition of the Interstate Highway System and thinks that it should be accomplished with all practical speed.

However, complete opposition is expressed by the association to the proposed increase on diesel fuel, large trucks and tires, in the following language:

> Every member of this association is utterly and completely opposed to any further increases in taxes leveled solely at the trucking industry. The industry is not financially able to bear such a burden at this time and feels strongly that it would definitely not be in the best interest of the Nation to impose such a staggering burden on an industry that operates on such a marginal profit level but who nevertheless provides direct employment to millions of people. To im-

pose this burden, at least at this time, would have disastrous results on the economy of the individual trucking companies and would very seriously endanger their ability to continue operations.

To cease their operations to any extent would decrease employment in direct ratio. To decrease employment would eliminate or decrease the trucking industry's ability to provide the transportation service that is an absolute necessity to our way of life, our national defense, and which is the one thing that ties our Nation together and makes it strong. The trucking industry must prosper and grow stronger if the best interests of the Nation are best served. This cannot be done if the Federal Government takes from it more than a reasonable amount of its lifeblood.

The industry has never been lacking in its support of our Government and the functions and performance of necessary services by our Government. It does hold with the common feeling, however, that equitable treatment should be accorded all of the people—including the trucking industry. Therefore, it is our feeling that any further increases in taxes that are necessary to support the interstate highway construction program should be equitably spread across the broadest base possible. Let every user of the highways pay the small amount, according to amount of usage, necessary to obtain the needed funds.

The President has indicated that an additional one-half cent per gallon, assessed against all users, would provide the increased amount neeeded. It is suggested that this or some other equitable and fair method be used.

The trucking industry in Alaska is even more hard pressed because of the Federal Government-owned Alaska Railroad competition. It operates on a so-called out of revenues basis, but its expenses do not include the payment of taxes on the items discussed herein, or on its properties or revenues to either the Federal Government or State government. This is wrong. It is not even regulated as to ratemaking by the Federal Government or State. This is wrong also, and lessens the ability of the Alaska trucking industry to pay even the present heavy taxes.

All, to whom this letter is addressed, are respectfully urged to exert their every effort to insure that the proposed new taxes not be enacted and, instead, find a more fair and just method of obtaining and/or allocating the funds necessary to move ahead with the interstate highway program properly.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the handicap entailed in competing with the Alaska Railroad, which, under operation of the Department of the Interior, is not, as are the truckers, under the ratemaking and regulatory power of the ICC, the truckers must traverse rugged terrain on narrow roads in weather which in the winter is severe and very hard on equipment, entailing high costs in regard to maintenance and replacement of equipment. Thus, the need for a small margin of profit and indeed survival is a constant struggle. Accordingly, I believe that the proposed high tax on truck fuel, large trucks and tires would hit the members of the Alaska Carriers Association, Inc., in Alaska with greater impact than anywhere under the American flag, and I plead their cause, as most effectively stated in their own words.

SS "Hope"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the SS *Hope* is proving to be one of the most successful humanitarian ventures ever undertaken by the people of the United States. Reports of achievements come to us from the *Hope*'s every port of call.

I think it is proper to call attention to the fact that one of the principal contributors to the *Hope* project has been the American President Lines which not only assisted in the acquisition and conversion of the ship, a period of nearly a year before it sailed, but also agreed to operate the vessel on a nonprofit nonremunerative basis.

When Mr. George Killion, president of American President Lines, was first apprized of this project, he immediately offered his company's services. He was convinced that the SS *Hope* would offer tangible evidence that the people of the United States do care about the condition of less fortunate people throughout the world, and are eager to extend firsthand personal aid as proof of their concern.

To speed the project on its way, Mr. Killion directed that various departments of his company begin work immediately to determine the overall requirements for operating the ship. After a comprehensive study of the ship's design, the company participated in the arrangements required for the conversion of the ship to conform with U.S. Coast Guard standards of merchant marine operation, and to provide adequate medical facilities. Subsequently, the Navy awarded a conversion contract to the Puget Sound Drydock & Shipbuilding Co.

The effort by American President Lines had only started. Two men were assigned from its engineering department to represent the company in Seattle, and a former ship's captain was named project officer to prepare the ship for its mission of mercy.

Almost every department in American President Lines assisted. The steward's department spent weeks compiling commissary lists for the first voyage. The legal department reviewed the many complex contractual arrangements required to establish the program. The finance department set up a cost-accounting system and developed financial data to permit People-to-People Health Foundation to plan the financing of the project. The industrial relations department worked out the involved bargaining contracts with the seamen. The insurance department developed an insurance program for the project. The service and supply department handled the inventory, the purchasing, and the organization of the storing program. The operating department had the responsibility of consolidating all data pertinent to getting this "city" of 200 officers, crew, and medical staff ready for a voyage to foreign ports thousands of miles distant. And the public relations department assisted in planning the publicity needed to gain support for the project, and in the raising of funds to finance it.

Not least in the contributions made by American President Lines was the assignment of Capt. J. M. Windas as master of the SS *Hope*. A 43-year-old graduate of the Merchant Marine Academy, with 22 years' experience with American President Lines, Captain Windas had been serving on American President Lines' SS *President Polk* when he undertook his new assignment.

In the words of Mr. Killion:

American President Lines is proud to have been a part in organizing and carrying forth this humanitarian project, and to be linked with the many others whose contributions have made its success possible.

National Choir Recognition Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution which would designate the first Sunday of October in every year as National Choir Recognition Day.

Singing in the choir always has been in our country a recognized and highly approved form of musical self-expression. Until recent times, it has been almost the only one. Mass instrumental musical culture has begun to approach the ubiquity of choral music only within the past few decades. It is impossible to estimate the number of choirs with which this country is blessed—certainly one would guess that there is at least one in each village large enough to have a church or a synagogue, and the urban centers have hundreds, ranging in size and skill from the most meager to the most awesome. Schools such as the Westminster Choir College in Princeton, N.J., and many others, are completely devoted to the training of choir leaders. There must be tens of thousands of choirs in the United States—perhaps they might be numbered in six figures.

At first in church and synagogue, everybody sang. Except for the chanting of the cantor, music was congregational. Then, as a means of supporting and leading the congregation, instruments were introduced for accompaniment—as the Old Testament tells us—and some of the better singers of those

particularly interested in music began to have extra practice sessions and to sit together in the place of meeting. Thus choirs came into existence and this, in essence, is the early history of the development of choirs in our country.

When the Pilgrim Fathers arrived on our shores in 1620, many of them were skilled in singing music, and when the Puritans landed in Massachusetts Bay some years later, the singing of psalms was one of the ordinances of their faith. Indeed, the first book printed on the soil of what is now the United States was one intended as a singing book—the so-called "Bay Psalm Book"—from the Massachusetts Bay Colony where it was intended to be used—of 1640. Although it contained no musical notation, there were included specific directions to the colonists who used it as to tunes they were to sing to the psalms, tunes which must have been familiar and beloved of the founders.

But as life was hard in the wilderness, there was little time for singing, and the skills of the fathers were lost by the songs. By the end of the 17th century, the ability to read music from the printed page had virtually disappeared, and the remembrance of the old tunes, passed down from generation to generation, had become dim. In fact, congregational singing had become so poor that the clergy, who had to listen to it weekly were impelled to do something about it. By the second decade of the 18th century, a reform based on teaching people to read music so that they could sing together in an orderly fashion was well underway.

The instrument in this reform was the singing school, a social institution which flourished in this country for considerably more than a century. From the singing schools, the first choirs—that is, organized groups of skilled singers sitting in a specified place—developed some decades before the Declaration of Independence. Although there was a certain amount of opposition to the development of choirs on the part of those who felt that the prerogatives of the congregation in praising the name of the Lord in song were being usurped, by the end of the 18th century choir singing was firmly established as a normal American musical pursuit, and choirs and singing schools began to proliferate rapidly.

The choir is and always has been peculiarly the musical home of the amateur, and because American singing schools—one of the earliest manifestations of the democratic philosophy in action on this side of the Atlantic—imparted vocal and choral skills to vast numbers of ordinary citizens, the early American musical tradition is basically a choral tradition. In our country it is a great tradition. Beginning with the establishment at Boston in 1815 of the Handel and Haydn Society, large choral organizations fully equivalent in quality to those developing in Europe began to appear, among them such representative groups as the New York Sacred Music Society, established in 1824; the Apollo Club of Chicago, established in 1872; the Oratorio Society of New York, established in 1873; the Bethlehem Bach Choir, established in 1900. There were countless others.

These groups represented the flower of the art of performance of choral music in America—they could not have been possible had there not been in existence a countless number of humble church choirs scattered throughout the length and breadth of our land. These we take too much for granted—they inculcated in our people a deep love for and understanding of choral music, and they provided the basic knowledge, skill, and enthusiasm without which the performances of the towering masterpieces by the great choral societies would have been impossible.

The choir and its singing members, in education for peace, in energizing for work, in liberating man's spirit from the immediate into the infinite, and in uniting worshipers into a spiritual brotherhood, has an endless mission. Petty triviality has no more place in music sung by the choir than does ostentatious virtuosity. Sincerity and directness are its essentials.

All these benefits and many more have accrued to us through the instrumentality of the choir, an institution with a long and honorable history in this country. Surely it is fitting that we as a Nation formally recognize the progressive role it has played in the development of our musical heritage.

To that end, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution which designates a National Choir Recognition Day and authorizes the President to issue annually a proclamation inviting the people of the United States to observe such day in churches and other suitable places with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

Resolution Concerning Restrictions on Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, in a resolution passed by the Bellingham, Wash., Chamber of Commerce, March 13, 1961, this organization opposes legislation which would decrease the amount of duty-free imports which American citizens can bring into the United States from the Dominion of Canada and the Republic of Mexico.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this resolution which follows:

Whereas it has come to the attention of the Bellingham Chamber of Commerce that certain restrictions on the value of imports that may be returned to the United States by American tourists have been proposed for congressional action; and

Whereas such restrictions will undoubtedly effect the amount of American moneys flowing to other countries, with a resultant deterioration in the local economies of those countries; and

Whereas such deterioration would have a repercussive effect on the relations between those countries and the United States which would probably take the nature of a reciprocal action; and

Whereas the United States of America, the Dominion of Canada, and the Republic of Mexico now enjoy a tourist relationship tremendous in mutual benefits, which relationship would undoubtedly be strained or destroyed by the passage of such proposed legislation: Then be it hereby

Resolved, That the Chamber of Commerce of Bellingham, Wash., goes on record as opposing such legislation decreasing import of purchases by tourists insofar as the Dominion of Canada and the Republic of Mexico are concerned; and does strongly urge that Canada and Mexico be exempted from any such legislation in the future.

Professional Engineering-Scientific Classification Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on March 14, 1961, I introduced a bill, H.R. 5563, to establish a classification and compensation system for professional engineering, physical science, and related positions in the Federal Government. This bill has aroused a good deal of interest among engineers and scientists.

I have had many requests for information about the bill. Consequently, I have prepared a section-by-section analysis which explains the measure. It is as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF H.R. 5563

To establish a system for the classification and compensation of professional engineering, physical science, and related positions in the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

It is a generally recognized fact, based on numerous studies and reports prepared under the direction of both the executive and legislative branches of the Government, as well as by nongovernmental organizations concerned with the problem, that the Federal Government has been experiencing considerable difficulty within recent years in attracting and retaining high-quality engineering and scientific personnel in sufficient number for the continued implementation of necessary programs requiring such talent and capabilities. Federal agencies and departments have not only been unable to recruit the number and quality of engineering and physical science graduates due to the generally unfavorable position of the Government with respect to starting salaries, but perhaps more importantly, the increasing rate of attrition due to resignations among higher level engineers and scientists is a matter which has caused considerable concern.

Basically, the Government's problem is twofold: (1) A salary system which, in general, does not compare competitively with current rates for similar personnel in private areas of employment; and (2) the present lack of an effective program which will recognize and encourage the professional status and development of engineers and scientists.

As for the first, this problem area was succinctly pinpointed when the Eisenhower administration arrived late last year at a number of conclusions resulting from the Bureau of Labor Statistics "National Survey of Pro-

fessional, Administrative, Technical, and Clerical Pay: Winter 1959–60." One of these conclusions was that, "Unless future salary action is in the direction indicated by the survey; namely, less emphasis on lower level pay and more competitive salaries at the higher levels—the Federal Government will be forced to rely at best on mediocre management and professional talent, particularly in the scientific and engineering fields."

The second is a more complex problem which involves several aspects and which requires a number of approaches toward a proper solution. One approach which is strongly supported by the engineering and scientific community is to establish a separate classification system for these key personnel. Such a system would serve to acknowledge their professional status and would provide that degree of identification which is necessary for their continued professional growth. Further, it would show that the Federal Government appreciates the unique contributions of these people and by so doing, serve to improve the desirability of Federal employment.

This bill seeks a positive solution to these two problem areas through the establishment of competitive salary rates and by affording engineering and physical science personnel the professional status and recognition that is so imperative in these critical times.

SECTION 1—PURPOSE

This section explains the purpose of the bill which is primarily to improve the Government's competitive position in the recruitment and retention of engineering and scientific personnel through a system which accures adequate salaries and professional prestige.

SECTION 2—PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERING-SCIENTIFIC SCHEDULE; CONVERSION

This section establishes a compensation and classification system for professional engineering, physical science and mathematics positions. The professional engineering-scientific schedule is divided into 10 grades which are designed PES–1 through PES–10. The salary levels assigned to each of the grades are comparable to current rates for similar classes of employees in non-Government employment. The Bureau of Labor Statistics survey, referred to above, served as the basic guide for the salary levels for each grade. There are seven in-grade salary steps in each of the first nine grades generally following the present arrangement under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. For purposes of uniformity, each step increment amounts to $200. For grades PES–1 through PES–5, there is a $400 increase between the top step of the grade and the minimum rate of the next higher grade. For grades PES–6 through PES–9, there is a $200 increase between the top step of the grade and the minimum rate of the next higher grade.

The professional engineering-scientific schedule does not provide for longevity pay.

Initial conversion from the present general schedule for those positions placed in the new professional engineering-scientific schedule would be as shown in the bill. Engineers, physical scientists and mathematicians currently at the GS–5 grade level, as well as those at the GS–7 level, would be converted to PES–1 on the new schedule. This reflects the professional nature of these positions and would permit individuals in these fields, who are recent college graduates, to be hired at salary rate which is competitive with what they could expect in nongovernmental employment.

During initial conversion, the salary of each employee on the general schedule who is transferred to the new schedule would be adjusted to a comparable rate on the new schedule which does not result in a decrease.

SECTION 3—COVERAGE

This section authorizes and directs the Civil Service Commisison to place in the new schedule all positions in the engineering, physical sciences, and mathematics occupational groups which require professional qualifications. This would include all such positions for which rates of compensation are fixed by the Classification Act of 1949, as well as the so-called Public Law 313 positions.

In order to guide the Commission in making the necessary detreminations, the bill contains definitions of "engineering," "physical sciences," and "mathematics" groups in terms of the type of work performed and the qualifications required.

Provision is made for the Commission to periodically review all positions placed in the professional engineering-scientific schedule and to make any studies which may be necessary to determine whether and to what extent additional positions should be placed in the new schedule. Additionally, the head of each department or agency may recommend to the Commission the addition or removal of positions under his jurisdiction.

SECTION 4—STEP INCREASES

The professional engineering-scientific schedule provides for a uniform within-grade increment of $200. These increments may be earned by employees performing satisfactory service after each 52 weeks of service if in grades PES–1 through 4; after each 78 weeks if in grades PES–5 through 8; and after each 104 weeks if in grade PES–9. The term "satisfactory" as used in this bill has the same meaning as when used in existing efficiency rating systems.

SECTION 5—PROMOTIONS, APPOINTMENTS, TRANSFERS

Unless otherwise authorized by law, new appointees to the professional engineering scientific schedule will, after initial conversion has been completed, start at the minimum rate of the appropriate grade. The Civil Service Commission is authorized to issue appropriate regulations governing the rate of basic compensation for persons transferred to the new schedule from a position to which the bill does not apply, when there is a transfer from one position to another position in the new schedule, when a person is demoted to a lower grade in the schedule, when his type of appointment is changed, when his employment status is changed, or when the position in which he is employed is changed from one grade to another grade in the schedule.

This section further provides that no person can be promoted or transferred to a position in a higher grade in the new schedule unless he has completed at least 12 months in the next lower grade if the position from which promoted or transferred is in grade PES–1 through 3; 18 months if promoted or transferred from grade PES–4 through 6; and 24 months if promoted or transferred from grade PES–7 through 9.

SECTION 6—OVERTIME

Under this section, employees in grades PES–1 through 5 can earn either overtime pay or compensatory time off for authorized work in excess of 40 hours in any administrative workweek. Overtime pay is computed at 1½ times the actual hourly rate for employees whose basic compensation does not exceed the minimum scheduled rate for grade PES–2, and 1½ times the hourly rate of the minimum of PES–2 if the employee's basic compensation exceeds the minimum rate of PES–2. This conforms to current procedures under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

However, the bill authorized the head of any department or agency to grant employees in grades PES–1 through 5 compensatory time off in lieu of overtime payment, for an equal amount of time spent in overtime work or holiday work.

Employees in grades PES–6 through 10 will not be entitled to either overtime pay for compensatory time off for any work performed in excess of 40 hours in any administrative workweek. This reflects the philosophy that employees in these grades exercise considerable independent judgment and discretion in performing their duties and that a certain degree of flexibility may be required in the time spent to complete assignments or projects. Such an arrangement is in accord with accepted practices involving engineering and scientific personnel in higher level positions in private areas of employment.

SECTION 7—GENERAL PROVISIONS

This section explains the general coverage of the bill among Federal departments and agencies and lists three specific exemptions.

This section also provides that after 2 years from the effective date of the act, no person may be appointed, promoted or transferred to the new schedule unless he is a holder of a bachelor's degree signifying graduation from an accredited engineering, physical science or mathematics curriculum, or is licensed or certified as an engineer-in-training or professional engineer under the engineering registration law of any State, territory, or the District of Columbia. This will serve to raise the standards for the new schedule and assure continued professional qualifications among individual engineers, physical scientists and mathematicians placed in the professional engineering-scientific schedule.

SECTION 8—APPEALS

This section grants appeal rights to any employee for Civil Service Commission review of any action placing or refusing to place him in the new schedule, or the assignment of his position to a grade or per annum salary rate, in order to determine whether such action has been taken in accordance with the act.

SECTION 9—SAVINGS CLAUSE

This section provides that all statutes, regulations, orders, standards, and procedures applicable generally to Federal employees will apply in like manner to employees placed in the professional engineering-scientific schedule unless they are either expressly, or by necessary implication, made inapplicable to such positions.

SECTION 10—EFFECTIVE DATE

This section provides for an effective date as of the first day of the first month after the month in which the act is approved.

Textiles, Fashions, and Tax Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACKSON E. BETTS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, in a recent speech before the American Cotton Manufacturers Association, the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, [Mr. BAKER], made some timely remarks which are discussed in the following editorial from the Press-Chronicle of Johnson City, Tenn. Mr. Baker's interest in the domestic textile industry goes back many years and represents much study and firsthand experience. For that reason, his views and his proposal for relief to

the industry should be given special consideration.

The editorial also discusses a tax-reduction program cosponsored by Mr. BAKER and the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG]. These two highly respected colleagues have identified themselves with a proposal that is not only sound but is meeting increasing popularity.

I suggest the editorial as required reading:

TEXTILES, FASHIONS AND TAX REFORM

Representative HOWARD BAKER, of Tennessee's Second District, offers a sensible suggestion that would help this country's textile industry.

Why, he asks, do we not stop thinking it is fashionable to wear imported clothes? Why do we not encourage the idea that it is smart to wear the made-in-America garment?

We suppose the Congressman is talking primarily to women, although there are some men who also go for the foreign label just because it is foreign.

Mr. BAKER believes there must be some changes in economic trends and governmental policies if the American textile industry is to be healthy.

Addressing a tax symposium of the American Cotton Manufacturers Association in Charlotte, he pointed to figures showing that textile imports had risen to $932 million in 1960 from $368 million in 1947. While this surge has been occurring, he said, the American industry has been "literally on the ropes."

Making it more fashionable to wear domestic clothing is only one step the Congressman has in mind to shore up sagging textile fortunes. He has offered a bill requiring the labeling of all imported textiles with the name of the country in which the goods originated. And, along with Representative A. S. HERLONG of Florida, he is sponsoring a measure for reform of the entire individual Federal tax structure.

The Baker-Herlong tax bill, which has been introduced in previous sessions of Congress and is being offered again now, calls for a 5-year plan for bringing taxes down. Eventually, the top rate would be cut from 91 percent to 47 percent, and the rate of persons in the 20-percent category would be cut to 15 percent.

BAKER and HERLONG tie their plan to an increasing gross national product. One percent gross increase in production brings an estimated $1 billion in additional revenue.

Increased revenue from the gross national product is being absorbed at present in steadily increasing Federal budgets, the Congressmen maintain. Their bill would hold the budget at its current level and reduce income taxes by the amount of the increased revenue.

This measure, or one of similar effect, deserves the earnest consideration of Congress. It would help the textile industry and the industrial climate in general. It would also be a boom to the individual.

A Policy of Truthfulness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial, which appeared in the March 28 issue of the Washington Evening Star, points to the possibility of our allies being misled. I hope our policy will be forceful.

LAO OUTLOOK

Thailand is one of the neighboring countries which would be endangered by a Communist takeover, total or partial, in Laos. This is a fact of life which has its bearing on the statement by Thailand's Prime Minister Sarit Thanarat to the SEATO conference.

Recalling that southeast Asia has lost about 200,000 square kilometers of land and some 10 million people to the Communists, the Prime Minister said that further territory, meaning Laos, may be lost or partitioned in the near future. "History," he added, "is going to repeat itself unless we can change its course. Now is the time to test the ability and usefulness of our organization."

If this language means anything, it is a call for forcible opposition to the Commmunist effort in Laos. The real outlook, however, is for a negotiated settlement there, not a settlement imposed by force of arms. In the former case, given the prevailing military situation in the country, there can be no doubt that concessions to the Communists would have to be made, including possibly the partition feared by Mr. Thanarat.

The alternative presumably is war, and while there has been much tough talk on the Western side there is no real evidence that President Kennedy or any other Western leader believes the Lao crisis can be satisfactorily resolved through an appeal to arms. If this is the case, if our hope, not to mention our intention, is to seek a settlement through negotiation with the Russians, then we should guard our tongues. American spokesmen, official or volunteer, should not be saying things calculated to lead such men as Mr. Thanarat to believe that we intend to safeguard the independence and territorial integrity of Laos at all costs. This can only lead, if there is to be a compromise settlement, to disillusionment with the United States and even a sense of betrayal.

The St. Louis Globe-Democrat Comments on Efforts To Discredit the Un-American Activities Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of March 24, there appeared an editorial which I believe makes a very valid point about the efforts which are now in process to discredit the House Un-American Activities Committee. I am especially distressed to see that groups which have as their express purpose the preservation of civil liberties are making use of the very tactics which are employed by those who would undermine civil liberties. There is a wide range of opportunity for civil libertarians to pursue their very commendable goals without their having to turn to the tactics of deceit.

ACLU'S SMEAR CAMPAIGN

Once more, the American Civil Liberties Union, a misleading label if there ever was one, is waging a smear campaign against the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

This outfit could teach Adolf Hitler tricks in propaganda and molding public opinion.

Its latest assault on the committee takes the form of a petition. It was signed by 250 college professors, and its asks Congress to do away with the committee.

This is apparently an effort to convince the public that the Nation's educators oppose the committee—and that the committee oppresses them.

News stories and headlines refer to the educators' petition. Actually, it was drafted by the ACLU. Its local chapters simply persuaded 250 educators to sign—among them 6 members of the Washington University faculty.

Thus, the petition is really the ACLU masquerading in educators' clothing.

This document accuses the House committee of creating fearfulness within the academic world and, perhaps even more dangerous, public distrust of teachers and the institutions in which they serve.

This is a large order, even for a House committee.

How did the committee perform this Herculean task of destroying the public's confidence in the teaching profession and in its schools? It did it, says the ACLU, by getting two college professors sent up for contempt of Congress when they refused to testify.

"A much larger number" have lost their jobs, it adds, because they were named by the committee or refused to testify before it.

To put the facts more accurately, very few teachers have fallen afoul of the Committee, and only two were sentenced for contempt. This is hardly surprising.

The Committee's objective is not to discredit the teaching profession, nor the schools. On the contrary, it has worked hard and fairly to probe the extent of Communist subversion, propaganda and espionage in this country.

Naturally, few teachers have come up in its net, because very few help the Communist cause knowingly, or through ignorance.

This latest campaign was undertaken, the ACLU admits, because the U.S. Supreme Court has twice recently upheld the right of this Committee to conduct its valuable investigations. It is, of course, a phony campaign. It hasn't a chance in the world of persuading Congress to do away with the Committee.

Congress backed the committee to the hilt only a few days ago, when it voted 412 to 6 to appropriate funds to continue the Committee's work.

This is an ACLU campaign to influence the public, not Congress; to destroy the Committee's good name, not its congressional support. To describe it with the right, ugly word, it's a form of character assassination.

That's the noble goal of a group that parades its "Americanism," and goes about as a self-anointed champion of "civil liberties."

Against All of It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, a group of my constituents has asked me to insert the following editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer, of March 3, 1961, so that it may be read by many, and also to include a letter from Mrs. Mary Kinnaird and others in the group.

The letter and editorial follow:

MARCH 8, 1961.

Hon. FRANCES P. BOLTON,
In the House of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. BOLTON: We the undersigned, are anxious to express our disapproval of the proposed program of the Federal aid to education.

We endorse the article printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix on March 1, 1961, entitled "Federal Aid to Education," by Hon. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, of New Jersey, and the enclosed editorial printed in the Cleveland Plain Dealer March 3, 1961, entitled "Against All of It."

Only harm can come from a program where the Government would be in the position to control the curriculum.

Our system of running all branches of our Government has proven to be far superior to all other nations, so much more effective that we have helped many other countries with fabulous sums of moneys. Why then should we change our methods or accept the minority group's plan for Federal aid intervention, when such methods have proven a failure in other countries. At any rate, it would seem that those wishing to change any proven system, would first send an investigating committee to those nations which have such a method or plan to see if it would be more profitable.

We believe it can be said that the majority of the people of this country showed their disapproval of the vast spending programs when they voted against them November 8, 1960, of which the Federal aid to education was a part.

We would like to see our views, including the article, "Against All of It," printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. Mary Kinnaird; Dale A. Thomas, Richmond Heights, Ohio; C. E. Cutler, Lakewood, Ohio; R. J. Wilson, South Euclid, Ohio; George C. Muchi, Cleveland, Ohio; Charles E. Hoover, Bay Village, Ohio; Cameron P. Young, Westlake, Ohio; David F. Gottschab, Bratenchl, Ohio; Elmer E. Cameron, Jr., Maple Heights, Ohio; Leonard J. Keller, Independence, Ohio; Leonard Benko, Lakewood, Ohio; Lee Kinnaird, Richmond Heights, Ohio; Ellis M. Haughton, Albert G. Boros, Cleveland, Ohio; Pauline S. King, Richmond Heights, Ohio; Mrs. Blanche Wilkie, Cleveland, Ohio; Mrs. John Fuscoe, Cleveland, Ohio; Mr. John M. Fuscoe, Cleveland, Ohio; Mrs. Hazel Keidd, Cleveland, Ohio; Mr. K. V. Keidel, Cleveland, Ohio.

AGAINST ALL OF IT

A reader sends a copy of an out-of-this-city editorial criticizing Cardinal Spellman's statement that parochial schools should be included if a vast Federal aid for education program is adopted by Congress. The sender wants to know why we don't comment on that situation.

Our position over the years has been consistently this: We oppose widespread Federal aid for parochial schools. We oppose widespread Federal aid for public schools.

In the past we've occasionally warned that passage of multibillion-dollar aid for public schools would work a hardship for Catholics and others supporting their own schools, since more of their Federal taxes would go to pay for the public schools' bills or the interest on the national debt incurred on those bills. They thus would wind up with less cash of their own to make their voluntary contributions to maintain their parochial schools. It's no wonder that some of the church leaders are fearful of a big aid program unless their schools share in it—they are making dollars stretch as far as they can now.

We've been repeating our opposition to Federal aid for public schools each year since the National Education Association and other interests have whipped up enthusiasm for it as a panacea.

We don't believe widespread Federal aid is needed for construction; in those areas which have taxed themselves to the limit and still don't have enough classrooms, State grants should be forthcoming.

We don't believe widespread Federal aid should be used for paying public school teachers—once that would start, why not tap Uncle Sam for paying police, firemen, councilmen, rubbish collectors?

We don't believe widespread Federal aid should go to States insisting on keeping their schools segregated—why federally support a system which the Supreme Court says must be terminated?

We believe the traditional way of supporting and controlling public schools locally and within the State is sound and right. Economically it's sound, too: You have to pay off State and local bond indebtedness within a specified time, whereas Uncle Sam's debt gives promise of going on and up interminably, with higher and higher costs for interest.

Don't forget 11 percent of all the income, excise and corporation taxes you pay and everyone else pays goes just for interest on the Federal debt. It'll be worse if billions more of new types of debt are saddled on the Federal Treasury.

Project "Hope"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the people-to-people program was initiated at the suggestion of President Eisenhower to promote world peace through increased understanding between the people of the United States and the peoples of other nations.

The value and effectiveness of this program is strengthened by the fact that it is not a Federal Government project but is, instead, supported directly by the American people—individually and in groups.

The Project *Hope* is a part of this people-to-people program and this example of individual American initiative, this activity of free enterprise in the field of medicine and health, has been tremendously effective. I am very proud of the fact that one of my constituents, Miss Lois Virginia Fernbach, of New Hyde Park, is a member of the medical team on this great floating hospital center.

The following is an article that appeared recently in the Long Island Daily Press:

NURSE SETS SAIL—FINDS NEW FRONTIER ON HOSPITAL SHIP

A Long Island nurse has discovered the New Frontier in the steamy islands of Indonesia.

She's Lois Virginia Fernbach of New Hyde Park, 1 of the 60 medical staffers on the floating hospital ship *Hope*, recently given a pat on the back by President Kennedy.

The Chief Executive wrote to the ship's crew: "*Hope* is a project that demonstrates to the people of the world the strong desire of this Nation to share our technological advances in medicine with the rest of the world."

Miss Fernbach, the assistant chief nurse on the *Hope*, is 1 of 28 American girls putting in long hours under difficult conditions on the ship that sails from port to port in Indonesia.

But like the rest of them, the Long Islander isn't complaining about the assignment, according to her father, Jules Fernbach, of 96 Aspen Street.

"The girls work 12 hours a day sometimes, but they love it," he says.

The main purpose of the *Hope* is to train Indonesian personnel in medical science so the girls do double duty as teachers and nurses.

"Lois says there are plenty of nurses in Indonesia, both male and female, but they haven't sufficient training," Mr. Fernbach reports. "But they're anxious to learn. They appreciate anything they're shown. There are 22 nurses from the University of Bandung on the ship now."

The ship's crew often finds that ideas of sanitation in parts of the country are backward by American standards. "They permit people in street clothes to walk through operating rooms and nurseries," he notes.

The good ship *Hope* creates good will for the United States as it goes on its island-hopping journey, advancing medical technology.

"They have had quite a bit of opposition from the Communists," Mr. Fernbach says. "They set up a trade fair to try to distract the people's attention from the ship, but people were more impressed by the *Hope*."

Miss Fernbach, a graduate of Roosevelt Hospital School of Nursing and a former Nassau County Health Department staffer, set her sights on a position on the ship 3 years ago. She read in a national magazine that the People-to-People Health Foundation, a volunteer group, was outlining plans for project *Hope*.

"That's the best public relations we could have in a foreign country," she decided, and sent in her application.

It took 2 years to process it; more than 1,500 girls were screened, tested, and scrutinized by the FBI. Finally, the ship's complement was chosen, and the *Hope* set sail from the west coast in September.

"City Council of Maywood, Los Angeles County, in the Great 23d Congressional District, California, Unanimously Adopts Resolution Supporting House Un-American Activities Committee"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I present to the attention of this great legislative body the text of a resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Maywood, Calif., which is in my great 23d Congressional District, in support of the work of the Un-American Activities Committee of which I am a member. I also call your attention to the letter accompanying same and my reply thereto.

CITY OF MAYWOOD, CALIF.,
March 13, 1961.

Congressman CLYDE DOYLE,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CLYDE DOYLE: At the last regular meeting of the Maywood City Council February 28, 1961, the enclosed resolution was adopted.

The city council instructed that you be mailed a copy which is self explanatory.

Yours very truly,

ISABEL L. DEDMORE,
City Clerk.

RESOLUTION 1784

(A resolution of the City Council of the City of Maywood urging that the House Un-American Activities Committee be preserved by Congress as an effective deterrent against the enemies of internal security and the American way of life as developed under the Constitution of the United States)

Whereas it is fundamental that self preservation is the first law of nature; and

Whereas it is the inherent right of the Government of the United States to preserve itself from destruction by enemies from within as well as from without; and

Whereas it is generally well established that Communist subversives working secretly within the United States have delivered important military and atomic secrets to foreign powers to the detriment of the United States; and

Whereas the Communist conspiracy is, among other things, the overthrowing of the American system of government by force and violence; and

Whereas constant vigilance is required to observe and expose the enemies of the United States; and

Whereas the House Un-American Activities Committee has in the past been most successful in exposing to public light the enemies of the internal security of the United States and this committee should be preserved for the self defense of this Nation so that those persons intent upon destroying the Smith Act, the Internal Security Act and the Communist Control Act can be revealed for what they represent: now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House Un-American Activities Committee be preserved by Congress as an effective deterrent against the enemies of internal security and the American way of life as developed under the Constitution of the United States.

Passed, approved and adopted this 28th day of February 1961.

GEORGE G. GLENN,
Mayor.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 27, 1961.

Hon. MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL,
City Hall, Maywood, Calif.

MY DEAR FRIENDS: I acknowledge receipt of your letter of recent date with your very worthy resolution 1784 enclosed, said resolution being entitled as follows: "A resolution of the city council of the city of Maywood urging that the House Un-American Activities Committee be preserved by Congress as an effective deterrent against the enemies of internal security and the American way of life as developed under the Constitution of the United States."

I thank you for sending me this after having taken the time and trouble to adopt the same by unanimous vote.

Because of the very important city of Maywood which you gentlemen have the privilege of representing by due election of the citizens thereof being in the great 23d Congressional District which I represent in this, my 15th year in the U.S. Congress, and, furthermore, because I have already been a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee for about 14 years and am now a member thereof; and also, Mr. Mayor and councilmen, because this resolution is unusually timely and pertinent in view of the unfounded and unwarranted attacks upon the committee, I—with great appreciation to you—say that I shall promptly ask unanimous consent to insert same, and your letter to me conveying same, into the next issue of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am sure that no Member of the great Congress of the National House of Representatives will make any objection to the inclusion thereof.

If you have not already learned the fact which I now relate, I wish to say that when the effort was made by Congressman ROOSEVELT of California to have the budget of the House Un-American Activities Committee reduced a short time ago on a rollcall vote, the House membership voted for and in support of the committee's budget as asked for by an aye vote of 412 and a nay vote of 6. I, of course, voted "aye." I herewith enclose a copy of my short speech in the House of Representatives on the 1st day of March 1961, in support of the House Un-American Activities Committee and against the Roosevelt resolution.

Our beloved Nation deserves the best of whatever we are.

Cordially, your Congressman,

CLYDE DOYLE.

A Community Studies Red Tactics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, it is generally accepted that congressional mail is an excellent yardstick of public opinion. On this premise, I am encouraged by my own mail which reflects a revival of interest in our American heritage and a growing awareness of the Communist conspiracy and its despicable tactics.

The American giant is stirring and once aroused will remove the threat to our Republic of the danger of international communism and its godless ideology.

I have long advocated an organized constructive program to teach the meaning and purposes of Marxist communism, believing with George Washington that if the people have the facts they will always do the right thing.

In line with this philosophy, a patriotic and enlightened newspaper in my district, the Bothell Citizen, has published the following editorial which I am proud to include in this RECORD. In line with this editorial I am including also a news item from the same edition of this newspaper, which emphasizes that Bothell citizens have a program to inform themselves as to the nature of the Communist conspiracy and the tactics which it employs in carrying out its announced purpose of worldwide domination.

THE THREAT OF COMMUNISM

Recent weeks have seen considerable controversy over two films dealing with communism and its threat to the United States. The films in question are "Communism on the Map" and "Operation Abolition," scheduled for showing in Bothell this week.

The crux of the controversy centers around whether the films present a true picture of the Communist threat to our country or, as one University of Washington professor maintains, they are simply incorrect in placing the Communists in such a bad light.

The first point which must be stated in unequivocal terms is that communism has never altered its original and most fundamental goal; that is the complete and lasting victory over capitalism. The Communist leopard may change his tactics but never his spots. Our destruction is his ultimate goal, despite all his pious protestations for coexistence and economic competition.

It is therefore somewhat dismaying to hear Americans such as the group of University of Washington professors, label these films as propaganda. Unfortunately, in the last few years there has been entirely too much talk which tells us not to call these ruthless aggressors by their true names. All too often there is an insidious conspiracy among a few of our citizens which tries to prevent the American people from knowing the truth about communism.

The policy of this newspaper is that all Americans should be made to realize the threat to our security as posed by the Communist menace. This menace is in the overt form of Communist aggression and deliberately instigated internal revolutions. It is also present in a more subtle and dangerous form, the constant effort to make Americans believe that their efforts to defend themselves from Communist infiltration are morally wrong. This approach would have us believe that there is nothing dangerous or menacing about Communists.

It is this latter method which attempts to prevent us from showing communism in its true light. It is the method which tells us not to stand up to the Russians, but instead to give in repeatedly until we are a an untenable disadvantage. It is the method which tells us that coexistence is possible while at the same time the Communists are using every means at their disposal to bring us under their control.

There is nothing wrong, morally or otherwise, in defending ourselves against a government who has boasted that they will bury us. People who maintain that communism is not a threat to the United States are either dupes of the Communists or they are fellow travelers.

It is time for all of us to wake up. It is time that all our citizens, be they adults or children, learn of the danger to our very way of life. If these films are a step in that direction, then by all means they should be shown to the largest number of people possible. One thing must be remembered; it is you the Communists have said they are going to conquer, do not make it any easier for them by believing those who say it is not true.

RED TACTICS TO BE AIRED AT MEETING

A daylong seminar, designed to acquaint local residents with Communist activities in the United States and to help them find methods of combating Red influence, will be held Saturday beginning at 9 a.m., in the auditorium annex of Anderson Junior High School. The program is sponsored by the Christian Anti-Communist Crusade and is open to the public.

Director of the seminar is Charles E. Sarvis, Kenmore businessman, who has conducted similar sessions throughout the Northwest since he became interested in the anti-Communist movement 2 years ago. Featured speaker will be Dr. Joost Sluis, California surgeon, director of the northern California chapter of the crusade. Dr. Joost has just

completed a tour of South America. He will speak on four topics during the program, "Marxist Philosophy," "Communism in Latin America," "Communism in Economics," and "You Can Trust the Communists."

Sarvis will discuss "Lenin's Program for World Conquest" and "Communist Fronts and Captive Organizations," and conduct a closing session titled "What Can We Do?", when possible courses of action will be outlined. A question period will follow.

Two widely publicized films, "Operation Abolition" and the film strip, "Communism on the Map" will be shown, as well as two U.S. Army films explaining Communist methods of gaining sympathizers and seizing power.

The seminar will run in three sessions starting at 9 a.m., 2 p.m., and 7:30 p.m.

Petition by Anti-Communist Action Committee of Western New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, it was a distinct honor today to present a petition signed by 10,000 residents of western New York State to Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, chairman, and Representative GORDON H. SCHERER, of the House Un-American Activities Committee. It is also being presented to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

The petition praises and supports the patriotic efforts of the House and Senate subcommittees. The language of the petition is:

We, the undersigned, recognize the serious nature of the Communist conspiracy, which aims to overthrow our constitutional government and establish Communist dictatorship. We praise the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee for their diligent and patriotic efforts to expose, analyze, and publicize the true nature of the Communist conspiracy, and to recommend legislation to protect us against communism. We reaffirm our support of these committees in their valuable and necessary work of exposing Communist treason and subversion, and proposing remedial legislation.

The petition submitted today is being compiled by the United Anti-Communist Action Committee of Western New York. It is only a portion of the number of citizens who are expressing their support of these congressional committees.

The committee's executives are: Francis M. Kindel, chairman; Albert J. Weinert, the committee's speakers' bureau director; Walter V. Chopyk, secretary of the Erie County Planning Board; Almond E. Fisher, contact officer of the Veterans' Administration in Buffalo; Joseph P. McNamara, an attorney, and formerly the Americanism chairman of the Erie County American Legion; and Andrew Diakun, an attorney. This committee and its executives are performing a distinct public service in alerting our citizens to the menace of communism.

The petitions are being compiled in coordination with the showing of the film "Operation Abolition." This film is being presented to audiences consisting of school pupils and citizens in all walks of life.

The American people must be kept realistically aware of the continuing dangers of communism. We must never forget for a moment the evils of the communistic antigod philosophy, it is criminal tactics, it is socialist economy, it is totalitarian government, it is immorality and it is contempt for the individual citizen.

The United Anti-Communist Committee of Western New York and the individual citizens who signed this petition are to be commended for their patriotism and their sincere interest in the welfare and safety of this Nation and the free world.

CAB's Program in Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 16, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting article by Joseph O. Fluet, Chief, Operations Division, Bureau of Safety, Civil Aeronautics Board:

CAB'S PROGRAM IN SAFETY
(By Joseph O. Fluet)

The main objective of the Bureau of Safety of the Civil Aeronautics Board is accident prevention. Cause determination also is, of course, a major concern, since it is considered a logical step in the foundation for preventive action.

In this light we have, for instance, recommended the use of a very important tool of investigation, the flight recorder. One type of flight recorder is an instrument which is shock- and fire-proof and which now provides five kinds of operational information for its interpreter. The information is recorded on a metal foil tape by a stylus and gives the aircraft compass heading, the altitude, G-forces on the structure, speed, and time.

I need not point out how important this information would be to a CAB investigator.

For several years the Board recognized its value and encouraged its development for practical use. Today, it is installed in all pure jet air carrier aircraft operating above 25,000 feet and is being installed in other transport aircraft. This device should not only assist in cause-determination efforts but will produce information which should be invaluable in preventing accidents or other costly incidents.

Our concern with prevention parallels the cause-determination efforts, and during the course of factfinding we initiate studies and recommendations which serve prevention. Our group technical system of investigation affords all interested parties the same opportunity in these areas, since our teams, each headed by an expert CAB investigator, are composed of representatives of the operator of the aircraft involved, the Federal Aviation Agency, the manufacturer of the airframe and engines and certain other aircraft products, the Air Line Pilots Association, Flight Engineers International Association, and the Air Line Dispatchers Association. The development of this system, where technicians obtain firsthand information for timely preventive action, has provided much assistance to the Board and enhances our prevention activities.

We attract considerable attention in the cause phase of investigation, but the public and the Congress always pose the most logical question after the cause is cited: "What have you done to prevent the repetition of such accidents?" So now we know the cause, but what real good does it do except remove the mystery of the crash?

The individual who pays the fare is much more interested in the steps taken to prevent him from becoming a statistic, and rightly so. This is accident prevention, an area which you all know is not exclusive to any one agency or person, and all represented here have accomplished a great deal in this direction.

There is an area of concern in our investigations which has often drawn criticism. It is the time consumed from the date of the accident to the issuance of the final public report of the cause by the Board. May we emphasize, without the tinge of excuse, that factfinding is one of the most time-consuming aspects of our job, made even more so now as we probe more deeply into the many complex technical factors surrounding a major aircraft disaster. In this process we cannot afford conjecture or guess, since accuracy of fact and soundness of analysis are prerequisites to establishing cause and making practical recommendations for prevention. If exhaustive investigation is deficient, the end products which are of great concern to the victims, survivors, and the public can be seriously affected.

Another phase of aircraft accident investigation unknown to those outside our agency is the intense study and analytical process which takes place after a public record has been assembled. This, coupled with investigative assignments requiring further research, flight tests, special studies, and laboratory analyses, requires weeks and months of additional work. Each of the bureau's divisions participates in the report preparation. In several major accidents, more than 1 year of concerted effort was required before accurate causes were established. When released, however, they withstood the shock of public exposure, since they were well founded. Generally, those who are prone to criticize this process are not usually placed in the unenviable position of defending the end product should it be challenged, as sometimes happens. We feel certain that the public interest is best served by a sound report of cause, and the time required to achieve such results is of secondary importance.

We are presently planning a new method that we hope will expedite reports without sacrificing quality, by applying the task-force concept to the problem. This, if the workload permits, involves keeping all Board investigators assigned to one investigation until the report is completed.

Let us briefly outline the bureau structure, and its basic functions of accident cause determination and prevention. But, first, let me emphasize that the Civil Aeronautics Board is an independent agency of our Federal Government. It has no connection with any other department or agency. And one of its major functions, bestowed upon it by Congress, is sole responsibility for the investigation and cause determination of U.S. civil aircraft accidents.

Upon being notified of an accident, the field investigator immediately requests all available information to classify the accident or incident. He determines the status of the wreckage and issues strict instructions for its protection against disturbance, looting, and souvenir hunting. This is very

important and cannot be overemphasized, since past history has proven that valuable information necessary for the investigation has been unnecessarily disturbed. This made the investigation much more difficult and our findings less secure. There have been several occasions in major disasters when it was necessary to appeal to the public, through the press, radio, and TV, for the return of missing parts which had been picked up as souvenirs or for other purposes.

There have even been occasions when looting of the dead has occurred; items such as billfolds, rings, and other jewelry were physically removed from the bodies and in some instances buried in the vicinity for later recovery. As shocking as this may sound, it is still a problem to be reckoned with today. Therefore, we seek all possible aid from all news media to impress upon the public the importance of security at the scene of an accident. I have stressed this point to you in order to enlist your aid in coping with this problem.

Last year the bureau formalized its procedures for authorizing and obtaining autopsies of crew members involved in fatal accidents and of other occupants of the aircraft. These procedures are, of course, completely consistent with State and local statutes governing the legal authorization for autopsies. In addition, we have added a new group to CAB investigating teams, known as the "human factors group" headed by a CAB investigator from the Engineering Division. This group is composed of pathologists, physicians, and aeronautical engineers, whose objective is to conduct a complete medical and engineering study of a crash.

Medically, they examine occupants of the wrecked aircraft and assess how the fatal or nonfatal injuries occurred. They perform a similar engineering analysis of damage to seats, structure, emergency equipment and exits, and other items of safety equipment necessary to determine what failures, human or mechanical, may have occurred, and how such failures can be prevented.

In the Analysis Division of the Bureau are contained the world's most complete statistical record of aviation safety. We plan to use this vast record more fully and directly than heretofore. It is our hope to be able to translate these statistics into meaningful studies, bulletins, and posters, which will be made available to the entire aviation community, so that it may profit from the experiences and mistakes of its fellow operators.

Approximately 30 percent of all fatal accidents in small aircraft occur in adverse weather conditions. The Board's meteorological staff has therefore initiated a more intensive investigation of these accidents probing such areas as preflight and inflight operational planning, and the establishment, operation, and maintenance of meteorological facilities and services.

Wasteful and Undesirable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

WASTEFUL AND UNDESIRABLE

The depressed areas bill (S. 1) is a wasteful and undesirable means of attempting to relieve economically distressed areas.

Why this is so was pointed out this week by the Council of State Chambers of Commerce in an analysis prepared by Eugene F. Rinta, the council's director of research.

The legislation in question was passed last week by the Senate and is pending in the House.

Rinta outlined the following reasons for opposition to the bill:

(1) The bill does not get at the source of the problem, (2) is discriminatory in several respects, (3) opens doors to political pressures and favoritism, and (4) is costly, though little more than a pilot program.

What it will produce, in Mr. Rinta's opinion, is disillusionment and disappointment for the unemployed in many depressed areas. He said:

"It will lead them to believe that the Federal Government is about to help create jobs for them, although, at best, it can help only a few."

He cited surveys to show that the financial resources that the bill would make available are not the major factor in attracting an industry to an area. The more important factors are proximity to markets, availability of raw materials, good transportation, low fuel and power costs, favorable business climate, fair tax structure, etc.

As to its discriminatory features, Mr. Rinta pointed out that it would make funds from general tax revenues available for the sole benefit of certain favored areas which would be made eligible on the basis of arbitrary criteria. And the fate of individuals under the bill would be decided on the accident of residence.

Because the bill can meet more than a fraction of the needs of eligible areas, he declared it opens the possibilities of political influence and favoritism in connection with public facility loans and grants as well as with loans for industrial facilities.

According to latest data, total unemployment in these eligible areas was 648,400 a few months ago, although it is probably higher now. Of the 648,400 total, the aggregate number of unemployed which exceeded 6 percent unemployment in each area was 257,900.

"Now let's see," says the researcher, "what the $100 million loan fund might do toward eliminating this 257,900 unemployment total and bringing unemployment in the eligible areas down to 6 percent. If the Federal loans were used for the full 65 percent of all new industrial plants, the $100 million loan fund would make possible a total investment of $154 million. If the average Federal share is only 50 percent, the total investment would be $200 million; and even if the Federal share average only 25 percent, there would only be $400 million available for creating new jobs.

"There has been considerable testimony in the hearings on depressed areas legislation over the past few years that the average investment needed to create 1 industrial job is about $15,000. If Federal loans were to cover the full 65 pecent of project costs, the $154 million investment would create only 10,266 jobs. A 50-percent average Federal financial would create 13,333 jobs. Even if the Federal share were only 25 percent, which is hardly likely, the total $400 million investment would only provide 26,666 jobs.

"Thus, on this most favorable basis, the $100 million urban loan program would cover only one-tenth of the need merely to reduce unemployment in eligible areas to 6 percent of the labor force in these areas. On the more probable basis of 50 percent Federal financing, the program would do only 5 percent of the job—assuming, of course, that the program were successful. Accomplishment of the bill's objective for urban areas alone would require at least $2 billion of Federal funds."

Michael J. Wargovich

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM W. SCRANTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. SCRANTON. Mr. Speaker, I join all the American Slovaks in their grief over the loss of one who devoted his entire life to the cause of the American Slovaks here in America. I speak of Michael J. Wargovich, who died in McKeesport, Pa., on January 17, 1961. My heartfelt sympathy goes to Mrs. Wargovich and the family in their great personal loss.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article on the life of Michael J. Wargovich, written by John C. Scéranka and appearing in the Good Shepherd, the official publication of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America:

MICHAEL J. WARGOVICH: NOTED AMERICAN SLOVAK FRATERNALIST

(By John C. Sciranka)

On Tuesday, January 17, 1961, the American Slovaks lost a noted fraternalist and a leader—Michael J. Wargovich, who died in McKeesport, Pa., after a brief illness at the age of 65.

The name Wargovich is known throughout the world, where the Slovak people live. He was born in Slovakia and brought to this country as a mere child. His parents after a brief stay in Brooklyn, N.Y., settled in Pennsylvania. McKeesport was the city where the late fraternalist learned his ABC in fraternalism. And since McKeesport has the distinction of being also the domicile of the first American Slovak newspapermen and organizers of a fraternal society—Ján Slovenský and Julius Wolf, who settled there in 1879, Big Mike, as he was widely known, followed in their footsteps. But his inspiration came from the late pastor of the Holy Trinity Slovak Catholic Church, Father Panuska. Here Mike served as an altar boy 55 years ago to a noted priest during the national convention of the First Catholic Slovak Union of United States and Canada, which is the largest Slovak organization in the world and which the late Michael J. Wargovich headed as supreme president for 20 years. Praiseworthy is the fact the Junior Order of the Union was established then. The priest, to whom Mike served was the Reverend Stephen Furdek, known as Father of American Slovaks. This meeting with the famous priest inspired the late Michael J. Wargovich to the dedication of his life to the American Slovak fraternalism.

The writer had the pleasure to attend the first national convention of this the largest Slovak fraternal organization in the summer of 1922 in Bethlehem, Pa., with late Wargovich. It was the first national convention for both of us. Shortly after this convention, the writer became assistant editor of "Jednota" (Union), published in Middletown, Pa. Michael waited for his chance until 1926, when he was elected supreme auditor at the national convention in Scranton, Pa. This was followed by chairmanship of the board of auditors. Then in 1940 during the Pittsburgh national convention he was elected supreme president and reelected at every national convention, which grew steadily under his leadership. The organization's headquarters are in Cleveland, Ohio, where it was founded in 1890 but it maintains a printery, orphanage and an old folks home at Middletown, Pa., on a

large farm near Harrisburg. Pennsylvania has over 60 percent of the organization's membership.

OFFICER OF NATIONAL FRATERNAL CONGRESS

During the past 20 years, Mr. Wargovich attended all the conventions of the National Fraternal Congress of America in which he served on various important committes and also as member of its executive committee. He was also president of the Pennsylvania Fraternal Congress and treasurer of the Slovak Catholic Religious Association, which raised a quarter million dollars under the auspices of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America and the National Catholic Welfare Conference during World War II for the war-torn Slovakia.

He attended and served on the important committees of the Slovak League of America and the Slovak Catholic Federation of America. During that period he visited every State in the Union and all the principal cities of the United States and Canada at various celebrations and functions of his organization.

SERVED UNDER FIVE GOVERNORS

Mr. Wargovich was a stanch Republican and took active part in all Republican activities from the time he started to vote. He served on local and county, as well as State committees. The Republican National Committee recognized his services and he served on its advisory board. He was also national chairman of the Slovak division of the Republican Party for several years and took part in various campaigns, visiting many States as a speaker. His voice was heard over the air during the last presidential campaign in English and Slovak languages. During the 1960 Republican National Convention in Chicago, Ill., he had the honor to serve as one of the assistant secretaries of this historical conclave, which he considered one of the highest honors. Mr. Wargovich served as district representative of the Pennsylvania State Workmen's Insurance Fund under five Governors. He also served as the treasurer of the Pittsburgh Fraternal Societies.

He was active in civic affairs and served as officer of the local branch 60, of the First Catholic Slovak Union, also was member of the National Slovak Society Assembly 31, which is one of the oldest Slovak societies in America. Also the Knights of Columbus, Council 955, the Slovak Gymnastic Union Sokol, Assembly 46 and the Serra Club.

Under his leadership the organization had youth conferences in the principal cities of the United States and Canada and the last such conference was in August 1960 in Washington, D.C., with a solemn mass at the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception. He arranged the programs for these conferences and the national conventions of the organization which he headed. The writer had the privilege to be temporary chairman of two such national conventions in New York City, the first one in 1928, when the late Patrick Cardinal Hayes greeted the convention and second in 1952, when Francis J. Cardinal Spellman presided at the pontifical mass in St. Patrick's Cathedral. Similar conventions with solemn pontifical masses were held during his tenure of office in Chicago, Ill. Youngstown, Ohio, Milwaukee, Wis., New York City, Reading, Pa., and Detroit, Mich., with Cardinals Stritch, Mooney and McQuigan pontificating and preaching.

The most impressive celebration under Wargovich's presidency was held on Labor Day 1955 in Cleveland Public Auditorium in honor of the centennial birthday of Father Furdek, founder of the union. The late Cardinal Stritch preached the sermon and some 30 American archbishops and bishops took part in the picturesque celebration with many monsignori, priests and all American Slovak fraternal leaders present.

He was in midst of gigantic preparations for the national convention to be held in August 1961 in Pittsburgh, Pa., when death put an end to his prolific fraternal career. He is survived by his widow, Mrs. Mary Lucanish Wargovich; two sons: Dr. Raymond Wargovich of McKeesport, Pa., active fraternalist and Matthew Wargovich of Bel Air, Md., also two daughters, Miss Dolores Wargovich at home and Mrs. Mildred Coffman of Akron, Ohio; two brothers, Joseph and Andrew of McKeesport and a sister, Mrs. Anna Evans of Munhall and seven grandchildren.

In spite of inclement weather, all American Slovak fraternal organizations were represented at his funeral on Saturday, January 21. Rt. Rev. Msgr. Clement J. Hrtanek preached the eulogy and represented Most Reverand John J. Wright, bishop of Pittsburgh diocese and Rt. Rev. Abbot Theodore G. Kojis, O.S.B., celebrated pontifical mass of requiem, assisted by local pastor, Father Edward J. Duwell, who officiated at the Calvary Cemetery, Port Vue, Pa.

Msgr. Andrew Biros, supreme chaplain; Msgr. Michael Shuba, organization's supreme chaplain for Canada; Very Rev. Canon Joseph S. Atlany, L.L.D., editor of Slovak Catholic Federation; Rev. Martin B. Rubicky, former supreme president of the Slovak Catholic Federation; Rev. Louis P. Hohos, supreme chaplain of the Slovak Catholic Sokol and many priests attended funeral. The fraternal leaders were led by John A. Sabol, supreme executive vice president of the organization and the successor of late Michael J. Wargovich from Phoenixville, Pa.

Mr. Wargovich was a lifelong resident of Allegheny County and a great citizen of Pennsylvania, who preached and lived as a true American Slovak fraternalist, aiding his fellow men for a better tomorrow.

He will always be remembered by his countrymen as a typical American Slovak fraternalist.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall Announces Administration Support for Legislation Proposing National Fuels Study During Significant Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it was my privilege, along with a substantial number of colleagues in the Congress and other citizens who attended the annual dinner meeting of the National Coal Policy Conference at the Statler-Hilton Hotel in Washington last night, to have heard the distinguished Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Stewart Udall, deliver a significant address.

Secretary Udall spoke of reasons why the new administration and the producers of fuels can no longer allow our energy production "to grow like Topsy," pointing out that "the primary concern of the Department of the Interior—under explicit instructions from the President—is with the conservation and development of our natural resources."

The Secretary further stated that "under the Kennedy administration, the Interior Department will always favor long-range resource planning—and the wisest possible use of the God-given bounties of nature," following which he declared support, in the following words, for pending legislation which would set up a study in the Congress of the Nation's fuels and energy resources:

"I can state to you this evening the position of the President of this administration with regard to a national fuels study. The administration wants what is good for the Nation. The administration wants a type of long-range study, a balanced study, that will look into this subject very thoroughly and will use the yardstick and the only test that I think your industry wants, and that is what is good in the long run for the country. This is what the President wants. This is what the Department of the Interior wants. We cannot, in something as important as fuels and energy, let policy be set by drift or by default, because we need a policy which will take into account considerations—paramount considerations—of national security and of the health of our economy. And, therefore, we shall support before the Congress the legislation which is pending for a national fuels study because this is in the interest of all of us, in the interest of the national defense, in the interest of our national security, and in the interest of the growth of our economy."

Mr. President, there is pending in the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a resolution (S. Res. 105) which I introduced for myself and 62 colleagues, "to create a Senate Special Committee on a National Fuels Study." A modified version of this resolution is pending in the House of Representatives.

It is most gratifying to have the forthright assurance of the esteemed Secretary of the Interior that the administration, appropriately responsive to the prior position statements by President Kennedy, supports this legislation for a national fuels study. I know I bespeak the sentiment of the 62 Senators cosponsoring the resolution which I introduced when I express the hope that this measure will have expeditious attention by appropriate committees, and that it will be adopted by the Senate at an early date in order that the important and necessary study of the Nation's fuels and energy resources may be undertaken soon and completed during the life of this Congress.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the following excerpts from the text of Secretary Udall's forthright speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR STEWART L. UDALL AT NATIONAL COAL POLICY CONFERENCE DINNER MEETING, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 29, 1961.

Thank you very much, George Love, John L. Lewis, my former colleagues in the Congress, and friends. Let me say that my training in Washington is on the 5-minute speech and not the Senate variety, so I won't detain you too long.

It is a real honor for me to represent President John F. Kennedy here this evening. As you know, about a year ago, this time, the President got out in the coal country, got some of the coal dust in his system, and his interest in the problems of the coal industry and the people affected by the coal industry has been very deeply and sincerely felt since that time. I am going myself next week to the coalfields of West Virigina. The two Senators from West Virginia have invited me to go and to get out and get my shoes and hands a bit dirty and find out some of the things I don't know about the coal industry.

I believe all Americans admire the underdog. They admire a fighter, and I know more about this from what I have seen in the past 2 months. I have come to admire those of you who formed this conference and other of your spokesmen because there are fighters among them. Not so long ago everyone was ready to count coal out, but as Mark Twain put it, your death, or the reports of your death would seem this evening, George and John, to be grossly exaggerated; the corpse has a lot of kick, as they say. But, of course, there has always been a lot of fight in the coal industry. It has always been a turbulent industry.

But we admire, all of us, the statemanship that has brought you all together. The fact is refreshing that you who were formerly antagonists sit here this evening as partners and allies in an attempt to revive and keep going and strengthen one of the great industries of this country. I have learned much in the last 60 days about a lot of things, about coal and about oil, and I know you gentlemen in these industries are stern teachers. I have taken my lumps but, of course, I take this physical fitness business seriously. I move in fast company and when I haven't been wrestling with oil or coal, I go out and take on professional football players, so you see I'm really staying in good shape.

One fact already has made a deep impression on me as far as your industry is concerned. I do not think you have done a complete job of selling the public on it, namely, that coal is a modern industry. Mr. Lewis mentioned it, Mr. Love mentioned it, and that is that coal is not an outmoded, dirty industry but today one of the most modern industries. In fact, you should take a leaf from one of the statements, again I am sorry, Mr. Lewis, but you seem to be adding spice to my speech, another of the famous statements of John L. Lewis in the 30's at the time when he was speaking up loudly and, some say, vociferously for the men he represented. At one time he was upbraided by someone for speaking too long and too loudly in behalf of his people, but, indulging in a Biblical paraphrase, said that "he who tooted not his own horn, the same shall not be tooted for him." And so toot your horn a little louder. I think you have a story to tell.

I was surprised after assuming my office when I learned of the coal industry's remarkable achievement in production effort. The increase in productivity is in itself a fine tribute to your industry. Today a coal miner produces 13 tons of coal each working day—more than double the individual production of 1947 and about 10 times the output per worker in Western Europe and Great Britain.

I am even more impressed by the fact that, in these years of inflation, the mine price of commercial coal has been reduced 15 percent in the past 12 years.

In fact, you people, in terms of stability and resisting the inroads of inflation, probably deserve one of the biggest medals which could be rewarded.

This remarkable achievement is a tribute to all segments of your industry—to Mr. John L. Lewis and the United Mine Workers, who were clearheaded enough to see that the efficiencies of automation were absolutely essential if coal was to survive; it is a tribute also to the mine operators, to the railroads, and to the utility people who invested millions in plant improvements in a time of adversity; and to the manufacturers of mining equipment, whose fantastic automatic machines have wrought a revolution in mining technology.

Your aggressive determination to expand existing markets and create new ones deserves our commendation. It is no happenstance that the use of coal by electric utilities has increased in almost direct proportion to the reduction in the amount of coal required to produce one kilowatt hour of electricity.

Your efforts to regain a part of the home heating market through electric home heating; through the transmission of high voltage over long-distance lines; the use of pipelines for moving coal—all of these strike me as signs of an alert and vigorous industry.

My remarks would be wide of the mark this evening if I did not discuss with you the vital subject of America's future energy potential—the question of a sound fuels policy for our country.

When we speak of natural fuels it is the end product, the energy, in which we ultimately are interested. It is this energy, be it heat or light, which is of ultimate significance to an expanding society in a turbulent world.

I know President Kennedy shares with me the conviction that our energy capacity is the index of our national strength and growth potential. It tells far more than carloadings, housing starts, or bank deposits. It is the one authentic utterance of how big a punch we pack, of our vitality, our maneuverability, of our ability to sustain a rate of growth that will vouchsafe our national strength in the years ahead.

During this decade of the sixties we must consciously plan our energy production and use requirements so that we will have a stable and sensible fuels picture in the troubled decades ahead.

There are three obvious reasons why the new administration—and the producers of fuels—can no longer allow our energy production to grow like Topsy:

First, and obviously, there is the exploding population. By 1967, it is estimated that the population of the United States will be 235 million. And these Americans will be using more energy in daily living, doing more traveling, consuming more than we do today.

In the second place, the gross national product will increase to $1 trillion—doubling the figure for 1960. This means at least twice as much energy will be consumed industrially.

And, thirdly, we are in an across-the-board competition with the Communist world. We must be in a position to meet our energy needs at all times.

Our energy supply is like a bank balance. Every check drawn against that balance is good, except the last one which overdraws the account. We will undoubtedly have to cash some big checks against our energy balance in the years ahead—and we cannot afford to have any of them bounce.

This is probably as good a point as any for me to refresh your memories with the fact that I am not, as Secretary of the Interior, a czar of prices, or franchises, or economic intricacies. The primary concern of the Department of the Interior—under explicit instructions from the President—is with the conservation and development of our natural resources. We are concerned with their intelligent use today, and their exploration and development for tomorrow.

Under the Kennedy administration this Department will always favor long-range resource planning—and the wisest possible use of the God-given bounties of nature.

And I can state to you this evening the position of the President, of this administration, with regard to a national fuels study. The administration wants what is good for the Nation. The administration wants a type of long-range study, a balanced study, that will look into this subject very thoroughly and will use the only yardstick and the only test that I think your industry wants, and that is what is good in the long run for the country. This is what the President wants. This is what the Department of the Interior wants. We cannot, in something as important as fuels and energy, let policy be set by drift, or by default, because we need a policy which will take into account considerations, paramount considerations, of national security and of the health of our economy. And, therefore, we shall support before the Congress the legislation which is pending for a national fuels study because this is in the national interests (applause); it is in the interests of all of us, in the interest of our national defense, in the interest of our national security, and in the interest of the growth of our economy.

I assure you that we in the administration will go just as far as we can in helping the coal industry to achieve its proper goals. Over the past 2 months I have been tremendously pleased at the cooperation and advice I have received from the leaders of the coal industry.

Of course, we've looked each other in the eye a time or two and disagreed, but that is part of the game, too. And in the process we've learned understanding as well.

I sat within the past month with many of you in the room. You were spokesmen for all segments of the coal industry, and I threw a challenge at you. I said I wanted for the Office of Coal Research a Director who would be one of the top men in the country in this field, and I am happy to say, although I am not quite in a position yet to announce his name, that he is an outstanding figure and one who will serve in this Office not simply to direct the research program but as one of my advisers on fuels policy, on natural resources, and as my special adviser on all coal matters. So we look forward to his services with us, and we know he is going to strengthen our Department and the administration in this important field.

We are also fortunate in the outstanding members of the Resources Advisory Council we have whose advice and guidance we seek on broad policy matters on coal and fuels.

And now a final word about how the Kennedy administration hopes the Office of Coal Research will function: The industry itself—you who hear my voice here—will bear a heavy responsibility for the success or failure of your Government's attempt to help the industry help itself. You know where work needs to be done to strengthen coal in the marketplace. You know better than anyone else where extra effort will produce results.

In our research work we want to explore new ideas. We want to broaden the scale of the research now underway and we want research that will encompass the entire industry—utilization, transportation and the technology of mining itself. The Laboratory will be industry itself. We are not talking about abstract research in laboratories. We are talking, in the main, about research that will be conducted in the industry itself. For our part I can promise you we will move energetically to implement the projects approved.

I am already on notice from the President himself that he is deeply interested in this program, and I know he will give it the support and muscle we need to do a strong job in this field.

We must boldly face the tremendous demands that our Nation will make on the suppliers of basic fuels in the years immediately ahead. You must bear a heavy part of the load in this task. There is work for all of us to do, in the words of President Kennedy, "Let us begin."

Underwood Sardine Fleet Uses Radar, Sonar Devices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, Maine is a State of many distinctions, one of these being that it has within its borders our Nation's oldest canning operation. This operation is associated with the William Underwood Co., a Massachusetts firm that produces a wide variety of canned delicacies and functions to harvest and pack sardines at various locations in Maine.

In this respect I submit to the RECORD an article from the February 28 issue of the Kennebeck Journal that highlights some of the interesting aspects associated with this company's operations in Maine.

UNDERWOOD SARDINE FLEET USES RADAR, SONAR DEVICES

YARMOUTH.—Boats of the "Underwood Fleet" use such jet-age trappings as radio telephones, radar and sonar devices to corral mouth-watering sardines.

At prearranged rendezvous, the boats of the William Underwood Co., packers of sardines at McKinley, Jonesport, and Yarmouth, meet fishermen offshore, transfer the fish into their holds where they are salted down and returned to respective plants.

At Yarmouth this task is performed by the *Royal*; at McKinley, the Underwood boat is the *Roamer*; and at West Jonesport, the *William Underwood* and *Henry Underwood*. The two latter boats are the newest and largest in the fleet.

Contributing in significant measure to the industrial progress of Maine is the company's America's oldest canner. Today one of the leading producers of sardines in the United States, the Red Devil firm can lay claim to being one of Maine's oldest industrial residents, having originally had an Eastport cannery pack lobsters in 1846, replaced a short time later by another at South Harpswell. There, the records show that the original William Underwood came up from Boston about 1848 with his son, William James, and joined others in boiling out the first lobsters in a large iron pot set up on a tripod on the beach. In 1853 Underwood pulled up stakes at South Harpswell, but opened two other locations—one on Mount Desert Island (Southwest Harbor) on the coast and the other a salmon canning plant at Bathurst in New Brunswick.

The Underwood plants today are implementing the most modern techniques in the purchase and packing of sardines. Much of the sardine catch today is obtained from seiners, although fish weirs are also still used.

During the packing season Underwood's three Maine plants employ an average of 350 persons, two-thirds of whom are women.

When a boat is on the way in to discharge its fish, the news is messaged ahead and crews start assembling to begin the necessary cutting and packing operation when the fish arrive.

The Yarmouth plant (formerly the Royal River Packing Co.) is managed by Ralph Stevens and packs sardines by the convention "steam pack" system. At McKinley, Underwood packs the "Mooseabec" sardine using the French deep fat frying process brought there half a century ago.

"We're the only plant on the coast of Maine to fry," says manager Rodney Latty. Clams were also packed at McKinley for many years. Latty's father, the late Vernon Latty, was also plant manager, having worked there for 35 years before his son took over the reins.

Jonesport, Underwood's oldest plant, still relies on fish weirs for about half its supply for sardines. V. P. McFadden, manager, reports the only real trouble any sardine packer has is fish. "When we're getting enough fish, I have no problems," he smiles.

Maintaining a program of rigid quality control, Underwood has also instituted

many research projects to improve the final canned product.

Underwood sardines from Maine, bearing the famous "Red Devil" label, are packed in oils, mustard, and tomato sauce, and are distributed nationally. Mooseabecs, considered by some to be of gourmet quality, are limited in quantity and practically the entire production is restricted to the New York, Miami and Philadelphia areas.

Today the company is a farflung operation, producing Underwood deviled ham, liver pate, and other items at its headquarters plant in Watertown, Mass. In addition the company operates as wholly owned subsidiaries, the Sell's Specialties Co., in New York and the Richardson and Robbins Co., packers of boned chicken, plum puddings, and other products, at Dover, Del. In January, 1961 the company opened its new Cagua, Venezuela plant to pack Underwood deviled ham for the Latin American market.

Address by Mayor Olgiati of Chattanooga Before Tennessee Valley Public Power Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, it has been more than 25 years since this Government embarked on the boldest resource development program ever undertaken by creating the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The success of this great project is written across the face of the valley and is apparent far beyond its boundaries. Yet there are many far-sighted leaders in the valley who are unwilling to say, "This is it—this is Utopia."

One such leader is the Honorable P. R. Olgiati, the Mayor of Chattanooga and president of the Tennessee River and Tributaries Association. In the latter role, Mayor Olgiati addressed the Tennessee Valley Public Power Association at Chattanooga on March 21.

His was more than a speech; it was a firm declaration that much remains to be done in the valley and that the successes of the past must not blind us to the challenges of the future.

I ask unanimous consent that Mayor Olgiati's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY P. R. OLGIATI, MAYOR, CITY OF CHATTANOOGA, PRESIDENT, TENNESSEE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES ASSOCIATION

For the past 13 months I have been taking the story and meaning of three words to the people of the Tennessee Valley. "Coordinated, Comprehensive development" has been the gospel I've carried. Those three words tell a story which is little understood by people here and elsewhere in this great country. The rest of the world seemingly understands and appreciates the changes that have been wrought in the valley of the Tennessee River better than do we who live here. This is unfortunate but not completely incomprehensible. Often those who are caught in the middle of a great event have the poorest perspective of the total happening. So it is with us, or at least too many of us.

It is rather ironic that the mayor of Chattanooga should head an organization devoted to promoting the concept and application of coordinated comprehensive development. A little over 3 decades ago another mayor of Chattanooga led a delegation of valley manufacturers, businessmen and utility executives to the U.S. Congress to protest some of the actions of the pioneering Senator, George Norris, actions which ultimately proved a significant contribution to the establishment of the Tennessee Valley authority.

The degree of economic and social change in the Tennessee Valley between that day and this is comparable to the vast change in attitudes between that mayor and this one. And this is not to say that my predecessor did not have every good intention. He wanted to get more industry to provide jobs for the people of his city and he figured private development of the river was the best way to accomplish this. How times have changed.

It was not many years ago that life in this valley was serene and peaceful. It was also very often short; many suffered from the aches and pains of malaria and illnesses brought on by poor diet. Nor was life in this area very rewarding either. The income was well below half of the national average; the farms men worked were washed away by flood in the winter and dried out by the hot sun in the summer; ugly erosion gashed the land; the great timberlands had been cut and left to the whims of a nature which shows little appreciation for man's neglect. There was no sizeable industrialization, and, consequently, too few jobs outside the farm. Except for a privileged few, life generally lacked the amenities which make it liveable.

All that is changed today. It is changed because a few far-sighted men saw the magnificent opportunities available in harnessing a mighty river and making it work for, rather than against, the people of this region and this Nation.

No longer is there a regionwide health problem stemming from malaria and poor diet. The land is firm and green and abundant. The forests boast strong new pines, black walnuts, black locust and other varieties; a valuable timber crop every year is now a reality. Industries line the river from Knoxville, to Paducah, Ky. I knew this valley when it was barren. I toured it again last spring and saw for myself the mighty industrial complex which has come into being since TVA. In dollars and cents this new industry represents nearly a billion dollars of investment. All of these things, of course, work to the economic benefit of the people here: The income that was less than half the national average has dramatically risen to more than two-thirds of that average.

It is hard for us to realize the enormity of the changes that have taken place in the Tennessee Valley in the last 25 years. To the motorist driving across our Market Street Bridge, the water of the Tennessee looks no different today than it did 25 years ago; but there is a great difference. This is working water today. From the time it falls as raindrops in this valley to the time it empties into the Ohio River, the water of the Tennessee works for man. It produces energy, provides irrigation, furnishes recreation, makes possible commercial navigation, nourishes giant industries, cities and people.

Think about it. The Tennessee is no spring branch. It is the fifth largest river on the North American Continent, one of the great streams of the world. Yet, in our lifetime, this mighty river has been tamed and harnessed. It used to be a wild river. But no more. Now, it reacts to the directions of men like a finely trained seal. From one room right here in Chattanooga it can be made to stop or move at Knoxville, or at Guntersville in Alabama, or at Iuka in Mississippi, or Paducah in Kentucky.

We are uncommonly lucky people to have had the Tennessee River to begin with. A river can't be built or acquired. Regions that have none to start with have none forever. Lucky for us, the Tennessee was here, and even when it was wild, it was always our greatest natural resource just waiting to be put to use.

At last we have begun to make real use of our river, to cash in on its manifold potentialities for navigation, electricity, recreation and all the agricultural, industrial and municipal possibilities it offers. But we have just begun; the best is yet to come if we apply our minds and energies to the task at hand. The situation is prepared, the basic facilities are at hand. This is where we stand. Much has been done; but there is still much more to do. We have reached a point of departure from which new works, which can accrue to the lasting benefit of the Nation and capture the imagination of the world, can and should be undertaken.

The act which created the TVA charges that agency with development of the "Tennessee River system." That word "system" is the key word now, and a very important reason for the formation of the Tennessee River and Tributaries Association.

TVA has virtually completed its development work on the main stem of the river, except to enlarge several locks to facilitate navigation. And that work is underway now. Wilson Dam lock has been enlarged to 110 by 600 feet. Joe Wheeler lock is being enlarged to that size now. From Joe Wheeler, TVA plans to move upstream to enlarge the locks at Guntersville and Hales Bar Dams. Tennessee River and Tributaries Association, I might say, has been active in pressing for this work.

Although development of the main stream has been virtually completed, little has been done on the tributaries. And the tributaries are a very important part of the Tennessee River system. This is no time for TVA to rest on its laurels. There is still much unfinished business at hand.

This association will work to the end that the Tennessee waterway be extended as rapidly as is feasible and possible by the control of all the tributaries of the Tennessee that have potentialities for multipurpose development. This is the next logical step. It offers the opportunity to become the "second great phase" of the Tennessee Valley development. People all across this valley sense this need and this unique chance. Already, development associations are organized on the Elk, the Duck and the Clinch-Powell rivers; and each is affiliated with the Tennessee River and Tributaries Association. There is also a wide community of interest along the Holston and French Broad Rivers and the organization of similar associations along these two rivers is probably not far off.

The President has charged TVA to continue and expand its work and be an example to this Nation and other nations in water resource development. When the President of the United States charges me to a job, as he did recently in connection with our urban renewal and housing programs, lights burn late at city hall. The starter's gun has sounded and already the baton has been passed to TVA. To my mind, there could be no better direction in which to run than up the tributaries. The Nation and the valley are watching and keeping time with great interest.

The enlargement of navigation locks on the main stem and the multipurpose development of streams tributary to the Tennessee, where feasible, are principal interests of

the Tennessee River and Tributaries Association, but they are not the only interests.

We feel one of the greatest economic uplifts this area could have would be the development of a direct link from the Tennessee River to the Gulf of Mexico. The Tennessee-Tombigbee seemed to our membership the most feasible way to accomplish such a link, and we went on record in support of it at our organizational meeting last June in Shelbyville. Since that time we have continued to work toward the end of making this onetime dream a reality.

We have and will continue to work closely with groups and individuals seeking more industry and jobs for our area. Our plans call for a concentrated drive to encourage municipalities and counties along the river to zone or otherwise set aside appropriate and adequate waterfront sites for industrial uses.

We have and will continue to support fully the TVA and States and local governments in the valley in their conservation and wildlife programs.

We have and will continue to lend our efforts to the support of worthwhile water resource development programs throughout the United States.

We have met with officials of the largest water resource development organizations in the Nation and are currently analyzing ways and means of cooperation which will be mutually beneficial to this valley and areas served by the other organizations.

We have contacted key members of the U.S. Congress and officials of State and local governments in the valley and got their pledges of support for the work of the Tennessee Rivers and Tributaries Association.

We have taken the story of resource development and the possibilities it offers for all of us from one end of this valley to the other. We often had bigger turnouts of people who wanted to know the story of coordinated, comprehensive development than did candidates in recent statewide elections. People filled banquet halls and auditoriums in every town and city we visited. Manifestation of such interest was indeed pleasing and inspiring.

In short, we have been laying the groundwork for the significant contributions this association can make to our region. We have been striving to instill an interest in and an appreciation of the mighty transformations that have been brought about in this valley, the needs that still exist, and what our region can become if we pool our efforts and work together as a united community. We have every reason to work together as a united community. For the Tennessee River is not only the unifying physical feature of our region; it is also the now-harnessed natural wealth from which all this fortunate valley—from the mountain tops to the Ohio—can draw a better life in the measure that we plan and pull with the unity of a common purpose.

What has already taken place dramatically illustrates the point that the whole valley ultimately prospers from developments in any part of it. We, in Chattanooga, want to see the economy of the tributary river basins upgraded. We know some of the increased wealth which will come from such a happening will find its way to our city. We can also see the potentials for trade which would be involved. But most of all we should—and I think most of us do—aspire to the economic improvement of these areas because it is needed, because the people are willing to work and sacrifice to bring it about, because they are our neighbors, because the natural resources so abundant in this valley ought to be developed, utilized, conserved and made to work for this generation and others which will follow.

The development program in this valley did not spring from pork barrel legislation. Men like George Norris who had no selfish interest in this area conceived the Tennessee Valley development, and the legislation which made it possible was initiated by President Roosevelt, who, also, had no selfish interest here. These men saw the Tennessee Valley Authority as a pilot project, a demonstration of what could be done if all the resources of an area were coordinated in a unified plan and made to work for the people and the Nation. This pilot project has exceeded even the fondest hopes of those who conceived it. It is looked upon today as a model for the whole world. Kings, queens, presidents, and premiers of many other nations come here to marvel at what has been done and to take back development ideas for their own lands. The term pilot project implies a beginning of something, which, if successful, will be followed by other projects of similar nature. That the TVA experiment has been successful is beyond doubt. Yet, the full impact of its success has been slow to be realized elsewhere in this country for reasons this group undoubtedly understands better than I.

Certainly, the TVA has demonstrated its ability to get more out of funds allocated to it than any other arm of the Federal Government engaged in similar work. All this is to say we have the ideal instrument to achieve the kind of additional development this valley needs to enable it to reach its full potential.

And, if we unite our efforts, the potential available in this region is staggering. Already, we are fast becoming the new Ruhr we were only dreaming of 30 years ago. In the past few years, the tonnage on the 640 miles of our navigable Tennessee waterway has been the fastest growing in the Nation. This past year it went over the 12-million-ton mark and General Vogel foresees it reaching the 25-million-ton mark by 1975. Chemical and allied industries are booming along the river. The growth in the feed grain industry has been staggering. Former TVA Director Brooks Hays said in a recent speech that this region has definite possibilities of becoming the feed grain center of the Nation. Our tourist industry keeps going up and up, and recreation, a side benefit that wasn't even considered 30 years ago, is constantly growing. Over $100 million is now invested in lakeside resorts and housing and close to 50,000 boats of every size and description are skittering on the river, the lakes and coves. And, of course, you know the electrical industry here is not doing badly either. In 1933, electrical use for all purposes in the area now served by TVA was less than one-half as large per capita as in the rest of the United States. Today, use of electricity in this same area is nearly twice as large per capita as the average for the rest of the Nation—even if you deduct the huge amounts of TVA power used by the Atomic Energy Commission.

To continue and expand this sort of growth, we in the Tennessee Valley need to reaffirm our sense of being of one valley, one united and interdependent community acting in concert for the good of our region and our Nation. The Tennessee River and Tributaries Association seems to me an ideal expression of such unity. Through this association we can join our interests and put our collective shoulder to the wheel and push for the progress that is certain to come our way if we but work together.

We need to put aside whatever timidity we may have been induced to entertain in the past about the development program in this valley and be bold in proclaiming the virtues of accomplishments in this region.

As eyewitnesses to the world's most effective and efficient resource development program, we owe it to ourselves and posterity to work for the application to the tributaries of those same techniques which have proved so successful on the main stream.

To accomplish these objectives, the Tennessee River and Tributaries Association will need the interest, support, and, not infrequently, the work of each of you and hundreds of other valley citizens, who, like you, are interested in the economic betterment of this region through resource development.

When business spends money to develop a new product, or build a new plant, or expand an old one, it is called an investment. When Government spends money to develop our resources, to conserve our resources, or to improve our environment, it is called spending.

The propagandists have been dismayingly effective in inculcating this sort of cloudy reasoning in the minds of a great number of our citizens. But I say to you there can be no more sound investment than one which is made in the interest of developing or conserving our resources or improving our environment. These are the foundation stones upon which rests the whole structure of our national life.

For these reasons, this association shall be forthright and bold in seeking funds for these purposes. We shall make no apologies to anyone for what has been done in the Tennessee Valley development program. Rather, we shall point with pride to a great Federal conservation program that pays its own way.

The time is at hand to begin work on all these possibilities for our valley. The opportunity is also at hand. We need only to be determined enough to grasp it.

The Justification for Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the ever-present crisis of our times is the threat of nuclear war. Since this is a threat which challenges the very survival of humanity, we cannot afford to overlook any means of insuring lasting peace.

The new administration has moved rapidly to bolster our military strength. It has prepared a stronger foundation for conferences on nuclear testing and it has moved swiftly to lay the groundwork for progress in the field of disarmament.

There is one further area which I believe needs to be emphasized and this is the defense of our civilian population. Civil defense preparedness can be just as important to deterring the threat of war as military preparedness, because potential enemies consider the psychological factors of mass destruction and death of the civilian populace just as important in their military strategy, as the obliteration of military objectives.

Recently, Mr. Paul A. Reyff, under the auspices of the Civil & Industrial Research Corp., published a report entitled "A Study of Civil Defense." Mr. Reyff's technical background in radiological defense, public safety, and governmental operations well qualifies him for such a report.

Excerpts from his report are as follows:

THE JUSTIFICATION FOR CIVIL DEFENSE

To restore the proper balance to civil defense efforts and to obtain practical results of real benefit to the citizens of the United States, the justification for civil defense must be made clear and the appeals for civil defense effort must be realistic.

In the first place, civil defense should not be identified, as it has been in the past, as "a nonmilitary deterrent to war." Only a few aspects of civil defense realistically discourage an enemy from attacking; namely, our economic recovery potential and our stockpile of essential materials. And even here, the effects of nuclear war on both sides are so severe that considerations of economic recovery are low on the list of reasons for going or not going to war. Self-deception as to the rewards for civil defense tends to unbalance the legitimate achievements of civil defense, and distort the relative importance of negotiations for disarmament and of general preparedness of the military.

It should be recognized, starting at the highest levels of Government, that civil defense is not a hobby, not a self-help program, not a bargaining point to bluff with at the conference table; but, on the contrary, a responsibility for the protection of the general welfare conferred by the Constitution on the Federal Government. The promulgation of civil defense in October 1958 contains the simplest acknowledgement of this fact: "So long as direct or indirect aggression is used as an instrument of national policy by any nation, common prudence requires that every effort be made to protect the people of the United States."

THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR CIVIL DEFENSE

It is the stated policy of present civil defense authorities that the responsibility for civil defense rests on everyone. The practical result of this policy is that the responsibility has come to rest on no one very heavily, and on the Federal Government least of all.

Over and over we read the honeyed words "leadership, guidance, coordination, direction" as signifying the role of the Federal Government in civil defense. And yet the common complaint of 35 State and 66 local civil defense headquarters in a survey conducted in 1960 was that such leadership, guidance, coordination, and direction were virtually nonexistent. It is no wonder that civil defense has become something of a national disgrace, attached as it is to the Office of the President, and that the very concept of civil defense has been widely challenged on the basis of its very practicality. So far, at any rate, civil defense efforts have succeeded in demonstrating one fact: that it very likely won't work.

The so-called "National Plan for Civil Defense and Defense Mobilization" is largely a fiction, a fantastic compilation of empty headings, subheadings, and sub-subheadings which can be reduced, at best, to commonsense and at worst to the make-work of a bureaucrat.

For example, under annex 2 to the national plan, subheading XI. Maintenance of Government, law and order, is contained the following sentence, the entirety of this section: "Individuals must respect the law and cooperate with law enforcement officers."

It is common practice to point to natural economic or cultural developments as parts of the "plan." What is worse, there is no priority as between any two, not to say all 40, of the annexes to the plan and the aspects of civil defense which they represent. The course of action in attacking any problem is first to make a survey, then find a Federal agency for jurisdiction over the problem, then provide funds for that agency to secure outside help, which finally results in a public education program whereby the problem is ultimately dumped onto State and local authorities. If this may seem to be a frivolous description of the process, it is only because it reflects the frivolity of the process itself.

The responsibility for civil defense must be shouldered by the Federal Government, and until that happens we cannot speak realistically of leadership and direction. In the reorganization of 1958, when the OCDM was created in the executive office of the President, it was argued that civil defense required the direct and compelling leadership of the Presidency. In a sense, OCDM was given a status higher than that of a Department, to protect it from interdepartmental rivalry. And yet by official policy and by unofficial laxity the OCDM has become a mere provider of funds for other branches of the Government, and a nonentity as far as the broad public is concerned.

The bad effects of the current "self-help" policy are apparent on all hands. Citizens are asked to spend considerable sums of money for their own protection, variously estimated at from $25 to $4,000, for a shelter for a minimum family, without any real hope of a favorable response from the vast majority. The result is widespread skepticism on the part of the public. Industrial dispersal is "urged." The answer is "consultation" by industry, but no real program other than a purely economic one. OCDM has left the evaluation problem up to the personal initiative of the individual citizen, and yet almost every city of any size has elaborate rules merely to expedite rush-hour traffic. It is no wonder that the public is apathetic about the chances for survival, and that the next war is usually referred to as the "last war."

In the recommendations which follow, means are discussed whereby the Federal Government can assume the leadership of the civil defense program in a way that extends beyond the mere pronouncement of "leadership, guidance, direction, and coordination" in a national plan. More than words are needed.

A COMMON PLAN

Before any realistic action can be taken in civil defense, a common plan of the objectives and responsibilities for each project must be agreed upon. This will require a meeting of minds by those in actual charge, at the highest levels, of Government agencies connected with civil defense programs. This need not, and indeed should not, be a large-scale conference. It could be initiated by policy statements on the part of each agency, reinforced by a series of interagency meetings. OCDM must set the agenda, which would encompass warning systems, communications, shelters, training, industrial dispersal, public information, transportation, food stockpiling, storage of fuel, etc. Already there has been amassed a considerable body of knowledge on each of these subjects. The task now is to organize that knowledge into fundamentals, and derive methods of estimating the feasibility and cost of bringing each project to completion. Finally, the group must pass judgment on the relative importance and relative practicality of each program.

A fundamental principle in this study is that it is impossible, and indeed disastrous to try, to advance adequate programs on every single front. Definite priorities of progress must be established for each program. Specific time sequences must be established for checking progress and measuring success.

In the assembling and evaluation of the materials that go into the common plan, no one but the Director of OCDM must be responsible for getting the program underway. He must have the authority to call for a meeting of minds and a series of position-papers by the Government agencies working for OCDM or with OCDM funds. Indeed, there must be a completion date for even this first phase of the reorganization program.

PERSONNEL SELECTED ON MERIT AND SPECIALIZATION

Too often OCDM positions have been filled by unsuccessful political candidates, by the "castoffs" of defunct agencies, and in general by the prerogatives of a bureaucracy. Hand in hand with a strict policy of recruiting and discharging men on the basis of merit and specialization. This is in line with the general tenor of the Landis report, and it makes even more sense in the case of OCDM, where technology is often as important as broad policy.

Decision-making within OCDM must be placed in the hands of personnel with sufficient technical background to work intelligently with other agencies and achieve realistic progress.

MEANINGFUL PUBLIC INFORMATION PROGRAMS

A public information program for civil defense cannot be carried out in the same way as a campaign for a new product. The ordinary media and the ordinary approaches do not suffice, because civil defense in this age is an extraordinary matter. At present, civil defense campaigns are conducted along the lines of recruitment campaigns for the Armed Forces and other public service announcements. OCDM "commercials" are shunted into Sunday morning TV time periods, and stories about civil defense in the newspapers lack coordination because they emanate from various State and local authorities as well as from the national headquarters.

It is not enough to tell people to build shelters. They must be motivated for civil defense efforts of all kinds. And a single authority for public information must take charge of all public information campaigns. Such an authority now exists on paper within the OCDM. It should be made clear to all local and State groups that this authority is ethe clearinghouse for all policy decisions regarding public information. At present, this authority is connected with training as well. The two functions must be separated.

There are many aspects of civil defense over and above the building of shelters and the establishment of warning systems. The public should be kept abreast of developments in industrial recovery programs, in food stockpiling, in postattack housing, and the like. The civil defense plans for California were recently revealed to be contained in a book the size of the San Francisco telephone directory. Such information, if useful at all, must be available in readable form to all the citizens. Above all, the information publicity disseminated must not be bureaucratic puffing, but must have a meaningful, practical application for the public.

PUBLIC TRAINING

There exists, at the present time, a great opportunity to use many public and military organizations to train the Nation in civil defense. And civil defense training represents the fastest and most basic form of protection from the effects of a nuclear war. Training is in fact the sine qua non of a civil defense program. It is the basis for an adequate warning, shelter, and recovery program.

The present Reservist program is ideally suited for civil defense training. It would be a simple matter to require that one-half of all Reserve programs be devoted to civil defense to qualify for acceptance. Reservists would accept such a requirement as a practical, serious measure, for it affects their own lives and their families in a real way.

The director of the civil defense training program should consider it his first act to mobilize the Reserves, ROTC units, physical education classes, and similar groups, with appropriate legislation, under his direct authority for civil defense training.

LEGISLATIVE SUPPORT

There is no lobby for the general public and hence no lobby for civil defense. Legislators, nevertheless, must be educated to the goals of civil defense before any concrete action can be taken. At present, civil defense is devoted largely to warning systems and shelter programs. But there are many other, more important parts of civil defense: control of port areas, emergency transportation, fuel and food supplies, industrial capability and recovery. Each of these areas must receive immediate study, for presentation of a national plan to the Congress. With appropriate Congressional action, the President and the leaders of OCDM will be able to assume their rightful duties in conducting their part of the defense of the United States.

Profile of Red Economic Aggression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today the East-West blocs are at a relative standoff militarily.

Under such a dark, ominous cloud of potential war, the Communists are concentrating more and more upon a nonmilitary offensive.

In Red strategy, economic aggression rates a high priority. Why? Because the Reds find it possible to use economic channels as inroads to planting the seeds of communism.

To more effectively combat the offensive, we need a better knowledge of, first, the scope of their economic penetration; and second, the techniques by which they utilize economic assistance to exert and extend their influence.

If war can be averted, then economic competition will be one of the major battlegrounds.

Recently, the March issue of Economic World published an informative article giving a profile of Red bloc activities. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREE WORLD COOPERATION FACES INCREASING COMMUNIST BLOC PRESSURES

June 5, 1947: "Our policy is directed not against any country or doctrine but against hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos. Its purpose should be the revival of a working economy in the world so as to permit the emergence of political and social conditions in which free institutions can exist."—George C. Marshall, Secretary of State.

Jan 20, 1961: "To those people in the huts and villages of half the globe struggling to break the bonds of mass misery, we pledge our best efforts to help them help themselves, for whatever period is required—not because the Communists may be doing it, not because we seek their votes, but because it is right."—John F. Kennedy, President.

At the time George C. Marshall made the above offer to help with the recovery of Europe, Stalin refused to let the Communist nations participate. Instead he organized the Communist countries into an economic bloc of their own, Comecon.

In the intervening years other nations have joined the United States in a task that has no precedent in history—a cooperative international effort to help one-third of the world's people achieve economic progress.

This time an initiative has come from the newly elected President of the United States. In January 1961, Premier Khrushchev bluntly told the world that the Communist bloc would go its own way and that development assistance was a tool of Communist conquest.

Starting in the early 1950's the Communist bloc has steadily increased its bilateral economic activities in the strategic areas of the world with only a token contribution to U.N. assistance agencies.

Analysts in the field of Soviet relations have termed the objectives of the Communist economic drive as: To expand Sino-Soviet political influence; to make the developing nations economically more dependent on the Communist bloc; to create a psychological climate which would make the developing nations more receptive to Communist solutions to their economic, social, and political problems.

Whatever the ultimate goal, the size and direction of the Soviet bloc economic tactics continue to hamper attempts to remove development assistance from the context of the cold war.

Following is a report on the devices and resources which the Communist bloc is employing on the international economic front.

COMMUNIST TOOLS

Technical assistance, closely integrated with Communist trade, barter and credit activities, is being stepped up. Some 8,000 Communist advisers and technicians worked in 22 developing countries during the last 6 months of 1960, an increase of 21 percent over the same period in 1959.

Increasing numbers of trainees from the developing nations went to Iron Curtain countries for study. In addition to paying for their transportation, upkeep, and tuition, the Communists are paying many of them a handsome salary. Since 1955, some 11,000 trainees and students have availed themselves of this opportunity.

Of these, 85 percent came from 9 countries: Argentina, Cuba, Ethiopia, Guinea, United Arab Republic, Iraq, Afghanistan, Indonesia, and India. The same countries accounted for 90 percent of all Communist grants and credits, and hosted 75 percent of all Communist advisers and technicians serving in the non-Communist world.

Grants, a small portion of Communist development assistance, concentrate on visible, prestige items not necessarily related to economic development. Typical are China's gift to Cambodia of a powerful new radio station, or the Soviet Union's delivery of jet aircraft to Morocco.

Credits, rather than grants, have dominated Soviet economic aid. This approach is based upon a policy of low interest rates and deferred, or long-range repayment. A recent Chinese loan to Guinea is illustrative of this policy. The equivalent of $25 million, the loan was interest free, repayment deferred for 10 years, and then stretched over an additional, 20-year period.

Commodity trade is an important Communist tool, because many developing nations depend upon select commodities for the bulk of their foreign exchange earnings and investment in economic development.

State-controlled purchasing policies have enabled the Communist nations to make purchases that helped the developing nations dispose of their surpluses, or were instrumental as an indirect price support.

Barter is closely tied to commodity trade. The Communists are willing to accept the developing nations' commodities in exchange for their exports of manufactured goods and services. This helps emerging nations which are short of foreign exchange and has the psychological advantage of establishing a trading relationship rather than one of donor and recipient.

Rice from Burma; fish from Iceland; cotton from Egypt; rubber from Ceylon are some of the prominent commodities and countries involved in bloc barter transactions.

Careful selection of projects and concentration of efforts in selected geographical areas have netted the Communist bloc a fairly high return on a relatively small investment. Since 1954, total Communist bloc aid to the developing nations amounted to $5 billion, of which the U.S.S.R. furnished about $3.2 billion. This compares to $8.8 billion nonmilitary development assistance of the United States alone.

CHANGING TRADE PATTERN

Skillful application of all economic and psychological tools at their disposal has not only had significant political impact in selected areas, it has also affected the traditional world trade patterns.

From 1954 to 1958, the last 4 years for which complete figures are available, Communist trade with the developing nations increased by 143 percent. Consequently, the Communist bloc now accounts for 10 percent of the total trade of such nations as Uruguay, Turkey, Syria, Greece, Iceland, and Afghanistan. Cuba has been added since. During the same period bloc nations increased their trade with Egypt from 23 percent to 38 percent.

By the end of 1960, Soviet bloc trade with free world nations reached $7 billion annually. Included in this figure are a 50 percent increase in exports to Latin America amounting to $88 million, and bloc imports from that area amounting to $177 million.

Expansion of trade and aid on one hand, was accompanied by Soviet moves to disrupt world markets on the other. Frequently this occurred at the expense of the developing nations. Oil exporting nations of the Middle East and Latin America were adversely affected by Soviet dumping of crude oil. Cuba found that her sugar purchased by the U.S.S.R. was being sold at bargain rates, spoiling traditional markets. Greek tobacco and raisins fared a similar fate.

A PROFILE OF BLOC ACTIVITIES

The intensity of the Communist economic activity around the world is indicated by the major public announcements which took place during a typical month, December, 1960.

December 1: Communist China and Burma negotiate an $84 million credit agreement.

December 5: U.S.S.R. and Indonesia work out details for extensive Soviet aid to Indonesia's armed forces.

December 6: U.S.S.R. works out with Ghana details for the implementation of a $40 million credit for hydro-electric projects, housing, and other projects.

December 8: Poland signed a contract to deliver to India a $5 million scooter and motorcycle plant.

December 12: Hungary announced the building of a glass factory in Conakry, Guinea, to start in 1962. Meanwhile the Guinean managerial staff will go to Hungary to study manufacturing methods.

December 13: Ghana's Minister of Industrial Development, Ayah Kumi, visits Hungary and makes preparation for a commercial treaty.

December 15: Poland signs second agreement with Cuba for delivery of construction machinery.

Somali's Minister of Education arrives in Czechoslovakia for talks on cooperation in the field of education, including teacher training, and curriculum development.

December 17: Poland announces completion of $1 million transaction with Cuba for design, delivery and asembly of two window and bottle glass factories. Representatives of Czechoslovak cooperatives return from trip to India, Ceylon, Indonesia, Burma and Japan made for the purpose of expanding trade between cooperatives.

East Germany and Cuba sign 5-year, $25 million trade agreement, calling for delivery of 17 light industrial plants to Cuba.

December 19: Syrian-Czechoslovak agreement on sale of Czechoslovak industrial equipment.

Egypt purchases Czechoslovak locomotives.

U.S.S.R. signs four agreements with Cuba, covering technical assistance—supply of Soviet technicians for Cuba, training of Cubans in U.S.S.R.—payments, cultural cooperation, and Soviet purchases of Cubar sugar.

December 21: Czechoslovak technicians leave for Ethiopia to serve as supervisors in industrial and agricultural projects.

Soviet parliamentary delegation visits Bolivia, discusses Soviet aid to help Bolivia process raw materials.

December 22: Ghana signs contract to export raw woods to Czechoslovakia, becoming its largest supplier of this commodity.

December 23: Polish-Cuban trade protocol signed.

December 24: Poland concludes agreement on scientific and technical cooperation with Iraq, Guinea, Cambodia, Afghanistan, Burma, Ceylon, Indonesia, India, Ghana and Cuba.

Hungary and United Arab Republic sign for Hungarian credits for Egyptian purchases of heavy industrial equipment, and preferential prices for Hungarian purchases of Egyptian cotton.

December 26: Romanian delegation leaves India after agreement to accept Indian iron ore in exchange for delivery of Romanian oil equipment.

Cambodia concludes aid agreements with U.S.S.R., Czechoslovakia and Communist China. Under these agreements China will make available $14 million for four unspecified factories, $26 million for a steel mill and a farm implements plant, and $1 million for technical assistance.

December 31: Czechoslovakia and Afghanistan negotiate scientific, technical cooperation programs.

James Francis Reilly, New Chairman of the District of Columbia Armory Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House District Committee, it is my pleasure this date—March 29—to join my colleague, Senator ALAN BIBLE, chairman of the Senate District Committee, in nominating my friend of over 15 years, James Francis Reilly, as a member of the District of Columbia Armory Board to succeed Floyd D. Akers who recently resigned.

Mr. Reilly took the oath as a member of the Board in the Old Supreme Court room, and I assume that he will be elected chairman of the Board at its next meeting.

Mr. Reilly is one of the city's most prominant lawyers, and he has had a distinguished career in public service as well as in the private practice of the law. Mr. Reilly has been a resident of this city for almost 33 years. He has been very active in civic, political, and charitable affairs in the District of Columbia. Mr. Reilly has a unique competence in the legislative, judicial, and executive branches of both the local and Federal Governments.

So that my colleagues may be aware of Mr. Reilly's qualifications and background, I am inserting a biographical sketch of Mr. Reilly as part of my remarks today:

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF JAMES FRANCIS REILLY

Born: Pittsburgh, Pa., February 28, 1908; married December 23, 1935, to Mildred Patricia Ricciardi; children: Anthony (deceased), Peter, Patricia, Kathleen, Francesca, Ann Marie, and James Francis, Jr.

Schools: Mount St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, Md., 1929–31; Columbus University (now Catholic University) Law School, Washington, D.C., LL.B. degree, June 1935. Mount St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, Md., LL.D. (honorary), June 1959.

Courts admitted to practice: U.S. District Court, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Court of Appeals, District of Columbia Circuit; U.S. Supreme Court; and before various Federal and District of Columbia administrative agencies.

Law: Private practice 1937–38, and 1945 to present. Specializing in public utility, aeronautical, legislative, and administrative law. Counsel for United Air Lines in Washington, D.C., and counsel to Potomac Electric Power Co., Washington, D.C., among others.

Public service: Appointed by the chief judges of the various courts and president of the board of commissioners as one of seven original members of board of trustees of Legal Aid Agency established June 27, 1960 by Public Law 86–531. Appointed by President F. D. Roosevelt as a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia and confirmed by the U.S. Senate, assuming office in July 1944 and resigning in August 1945 to return to private practice of law; executive assistant to the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D.C., 1943–44; examiner, Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D.C., 1940–44; Assistant Corporation Counsel for the District of Columbia, 1938–40.

Professional associations: vice chairman, legislative committee, District of Columbia Bar Association, 1960; member, Judicial Conference Committee on Representation of Indigents, 1960; American Bar Association; Federal Bar Association; District of Columbia Bar Association; National Lawyers Club; Barristers; ICC Practitioners Association; and the Counsellors.

Teaching: instructor, Catholic University School of Law, Washington, D.C., 1946.

Clubs: University Club; Columbia Country Club.

Societies: the Society of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick of Washington, D.C., president 1958–59.

Politics: Democrat. Member, District of Columbia Democratic Central Committee, 1945–55; delegate to 1948 and 1960 Democratic National Conventions; special assistant to National Chairman Frank McKinney, Democratic National Convention 1952.

Business affiliation: member, advisory board of the branches of the Riggs National Bank.

Problems of American Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Indianapolis Star on March 22, 1961, entitled "Congress Must Decide."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS MUST DECIDE

In a country which functions through processes often called representative democracy, the Kennedy agricultural proposal to "let farmers decide for themselves" has considerable initial charm. Politically and philosophically an idea of this kind sounds awfully good. After all, who knows more about farming than farmers, and who can provide the most expert advice on agriculture, if not farmers?

Yet, a quick second look discovers the major, fatal flaw in this plan that sounds so good.

Would the farmers be really deciding for thmselves, or for millions of other Americans? Can American agriculture be isolated from the rest of the economy and from life in general? If farmers regulate prices for their crops, will they also decide the price of food for the housewife?

Even more critical than all these is whether Congress can delegate and abdicate its power to make laws for the nation. In essence, President Kennedy asks Congress to give away its power and authority when he proposes that farm committees be permitted to enact programs having the full force of Federal law. If Congress can give away its ability to legislate, then the very structure of constitutional Government is in danger.

Consider only a few of the major powers that President Kennedy asks Congress to donate cheerfully to some undefined farmer committees and the Secretary of Agriculture. These committees would have the power to levy taxes, because they could obligate the Government to pay subsidies or price supports if that's what the farmers decided upon. The money for these subsidies would not come solely from farmers, but from the general treasury and from citizens throughout the Nation.

The committees could regulate prices and interstate commerce. Farmer committees could decide to fix commodity prices, and thereby set food prices throughout the Nation. The same committees could act to prevent the dumping of agricultural products in any chosen spot. This is not a matter of conjecture. The Indiana General Assembly just got through defeating a milk-control bill which would have operated in exactly this fashion. Federal laws functioning in the same manner and intent already are in force in some instances.

The Kennedy farm program asks Congress to abdicate its responsibility to the farmers, and to the rest of the American people. Instead of asking Congress to take some constructive steps in agriculture, Mr. Kennedy suggests that the Congressmen wash their hands of the whole mess. This is worse than no farm program.

Members of Congress should realize just what the President is asking of them in his agricultural proposals. Certainly the Congress will not be so ill advised or so beguiled as to voluntarily give away its own power and authority for a vague proposal to "let the farmers decide."

Military and Civic Responsibilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the military is frequently subject to criticism because of lack of community interest by individual officers and their failure to participate in civic affairs. This lack of responsibility on the part of military personnel is due largely to the transient nature of their assignments, as well as fear of inviting civilian resentment from one side or another on issues of a controversial nature.

My hat is off to one officer of the U.S. Navy in my congressional district. I refer to the commandant of the Sand Point Naval Air Station in Seattle, Wash., Capt. Kenneth J. Sanger.

Captain Sanger has endeared himself to a host of admiring friends and supporters in Seattle and the Puget Sound area, by his inspirational leadership in exposing the Communist conspiracy and its tactics and by his activities in establishing positive and constructive programs for the development of community leadership.

As evidence of Captain Sanger's outstanding accomplishment in his field of prime responsibility, the Department of the Navy awarded Captain Sanger and the Sand Point Naval Air Station the coveted CNATRA trophy and the Edward Francis Conway trophy. The latter trophy is awarded annually to the highest rated naval air station in the Nation.

But especially referring to his inspirational, active interest in good citizenship, under consent previously obtained, I include a recent speech by Captain Sanger which I believe illustrates the type of leadership and constructive thinking of this fine officer on a matter of vital interest to our Republic and to freedom-loving people of the world everywhere:

FREEDOM ON TRIAL

(By Capt. Kenneth J. Sanger, U.S. Navy, commanding officer, U.S. Naval Air Station, Seattle, Wash.)

From earliest recorded history, freedom has been on trial in a continuing conflict of ideas. As each alien idea is vanquished by the forces of freedom, a new tyranny arises to launch a new attack on liberty. Such is the case today in freedom's struggle against tyranny. The stakes are high, the minds and allegiances of mankind rest on the outcome. The trial is bitter, in nature a war—a war of ideas. This war, the adjective "cold" nothwithstanding, has all the attributes of war in its common meaning, including the ingredients of victory and defeat.

The total nature of this conflict can best be described by picturing a wheel of freedom, liberty, and human dignity. At the hub of this wheel is mankind. We move ahead only as the wheel of freedom revolves. Dr. Albert Schweitzer reasons that "civilization presupposes freemen, for only by freemen can it be thought out and brought to realization * * * [man] must be free in order * * * to launch his ideals out into the general life."

Mankind's wheel of freedom is supported by many spokes, representing institutions of culture, science, economics, politics, psychosocial, psychological, and military forces. Each spoke is under attack, is being nibbled away, and if enough spokes are severed the wheel will collapse and mankind's progress will be terminated. All the spokes are important. Whenever we concentrate in one area and become weak in another, these are the spokes that freedom's enemy will try to subvert, try to cut. What is this enemy and what are the ideas in this world conflict characterized primarily by a battle of books, not bullets.

It is Marxist communism. Yet as we consider communism, we must be certain that it is Marxist communism we are talking about. Communism in the classical sense prescribes the formula "from each according to his ability and to each according to his needs." You find this in the Bible in Acts 2 and 4 of the Apostles. This concept may be found practiced in family life. The mother works around the house, shops, plans and prepares food. The children go to school, that's their job, and sometimes they do odd jobs around the house. The husband works and bring his pay home. So it's from each according to his ability. The money taken in is then distributed to each according to his needs. This is classical communism and this is the type of communitarianism under which the Plymouth Colony operated for 3 years. At the end of this time, Governor Bradford said in effect, "if we don't stop this communitarianism, this communism, we're all going to starve to death." The system hasn't worked above the level of the family unit.

Marxist communism is quite a bit different. It is an idea of a perfect state, based on a foundation of materialism. It is interesting that Karl Marx used a Greek word, "utopia," meaning nowhere, to describe it. There are two types of materialism according to Marx, dialectical materialism and dialectical historical materialism. To understand the dialectic we must go back to the dialogues of Plato who used the dialectic to show differences in thought processes; e.g., differences in definitions so as to arrive at a better definition of something. Take the definition of friendship for example. Plato puts into one man's mouth, perhaps Thrasymachus, "here's what I think friendship is." This is a thesis, the definition of friendship. Then Socrates answers with an antithesis, or a contradiction of it. He asks, "how about acquaintance, how does this fit in your definition?" They reason this out by discussion in the dialogue, the thesis and antithesis, and reach a synthesis, which is a better definition of friendship.

Then some other Greek says, "Well, how about relationship?" and a new antithesis to the new thesis of friendship has been formulated. "How about relationship between father and son? Would you say the father is a friend of the son, or that a mother is friend of the daughter?" By reasoning still a new synthesis of meaning is attained and a new thesis is stated which is even a better definition of friendship. In the fourth century B.C. then, dialectics was strictly a method of attaining or deriving by a reasoning process something better in the way of ideas. In the 19th century A.D., Hegel, a German philosopher, took this dialectic reasoning of Plato and refined by Kant a step further. He though that throughout all history you have various shades of meaning and through the dialectical process men become more intelligent and obtain more wisdom. This started from the day of primitive man when he knew virtually nothing. Through this dialectical process of thesis and antithesis, always a contradiction to what is first thought, we have come in the 19th century to a period of great reasoning power and great knowledge. Hegel believed there are absolutes in the world and there is a difference between the unity of the one and the many. For example, each considers absolute truth and absolute beauty or absolute untruth and absolute ugliness, but people using reasoning power in this dialectical examination of many shades of opinion between, for example, ugliness and the absolute of beauty will always have contradictions until the absolute reasoning power, the absolute truth is achieved.

There was another man on the scene with Hegel, a renegade German theologian named Feuerbach, who believed that there is nothing in life except matter, actually atoms, material things and that this is the only thing that counts, the only thing there is. Man has no heart, man has no soul, and there is no God according to Feuerbach. Man is only what he actually is, he has no soul.

Marx read both Hegel and Feuerbach and decided to marry the two ideas together, to come up with dialectical materialism. Previously until Marx grabbed hold of it, this idea was nothing but an idea in the mind showing reasoning power and processes of reasoning, historical processes of reasoning. Dialectical materialism then, with its handmaiden of economic determinism, teaches that nature and progress always come about through matter in motion and the contradictions of matter in motion. Again this same dialectical reasoning is applied to matter, applied to material things as Plato and Hegel and Kant had applied it to ideas of the mind. Marx thought he had discovered that everything we are, everything we have, everything that is in nature, man's development included, happened by accident. They happened because of these conflicting forces in nature. These dialectical ideas applied to nature make man what he is and make man nothing more than, according to Marx, a highly elevated beast. Again he has no heart, he has no soul, he has no spiritual being or feeling whatsoever within him, and the reason he acts the way he does is because of his economic environment. Because of the method of production and distribution of goods, man becomes what he is.

Upon this basis Marx thought he had made a remarkable discovery. All of man's history and his social development could be scientifically explained. He took credit for discovering how history started, how history has progressed and where history is going. With absolute accuracy he felt he could predict man's ultimate development by means of his own dialectic process. In such process he perverted Plato's, Kant's and Hegel's teachings. He didn't pervert Feuerbach, he just applied Feuerbach. Marx considered that all history started out with man in the primitive state of development. He had no tools. He had nothing but his hands with which to work. How did this primitive society develop? Well, some men found out how to make hatchets, found out how to make shovels, how to make tools. The thesis of primitive man with nothing was met in the antithesis of man with a few tools. This synthesized into the next step, something better, slavery. This was now a new thesis now in society, the institution of

slavery. Slavery had its antithesis and its contradictions of master and slave. Marx says this synthesized into something better than slavery, feudalism. A new thesis in history, in material history was derived.

Feudalism had its own contradictions the thesis and antithesis of landlord and serf and these contradictions synthesized into something better, capitalism. Capitalism in turn has its own contradiction of, as Marx puts it, bourgeoisie and proletariat. These contradictions will synthesize, according to Marx, into something better, Marxist socialism. But, at this stage of development, of Marxist socialism, society will become so productive and so wonderful that the contradictions of this new thesis of socialism will actually disappear. When we get Marxist socialism throughout the entire world, not just socialism, for again its a definition of terms that we have to watch out for and not every socialist is a Marxist, then the government can wither away. There will be no reason for any institutions whatsoever. Then and only then can mankind achieve universal communism and the ultimate Utopia, a homo marxian utopia. This is dialectic historical materialism.

We wonder many times how Marxist communism, with its military atheistic system, could have made such progress. The answer is that it is a secular religion. Marxist communism is secularism on the march. It denies God, natural law and moral law. There is no theology to it. As a secular religion the original sin, according to Marx, occurred in that period of time when man devised tools, when man took a piece of property and said, "This piece of property is mine." This is what communism explains to be the source of all evil. Capitalism is evil because it has its original sin of property ownership and this can only be expiated at the last judgment in communism when the whole world abolishes capitalism and the whole world is Marxist socialist and nobody owns property. Nobody owns a thing. The shirt on your back, your eye glasses, your shoes, nothing is yours. Therefore, nobody can give anything and quite a few of the rewarding emotions that we have in life, such as giving, would certainly be lost if we could not own a thing.

Now, the Communists, according to Marx, are not just atheistic. If they were just atheistic this would not disturb us because we have religious freedom and we are religiously tolerant. In our society a man has a right to worship or not worship God according to his own convictions. Thank God, however, the great majority of us do believe in a Supreme Being. Marxist Communists, however, are not content to be atheists themselves, they want and militantly claim that everyone else must also be atheists. We can neither have a God nor have any belief in God. They even tell you how to think and you can't think about God if you are going to be living under marxist communism.

It is imperative to understanding of the ideas and practices of marxist Communists to assess their standards of morality. In this light we can no more understand their behavior using our own standards of morality and Christian ethics as a measure than we can measure the brightness of a lamp with a yardstick. Volume 30 of the Great Soviet Encyclopedia explains their morality in Lenin's words, "We say; that is moral which serves the destruction of the exploitative society and the uniting of all workers around the proletariat creating the new society of Communists. In our time the only scientific criterion of morality is the defense of the interests of the victory of communism." In short, their only standard is that the end justifies any means. By our standards then, Marxist Communists are amoral.

Now let's consider the dictatorship. Where does it fit into the picture? This is a pretty neat device in Marx but it bears remarkable resemblance to Plato's theory of the perfect state. In the Utopia of Plato we have to have guardians because the people don't know what's good for them. They can't possibly rule themselves or judge themselves. They have to have a group of dedicated, superior people to rule and protect them. That's exactly what the dictatorship of the proletariat is, nothing but the guardians in the Republic of Plato: A group of people who know what is best for all the rest.

There are only 4 percent in the Communist world who are ruling one-third of the people of the world. There are only 4 percent who are Communists. The rest of them are merely there because they can't do anything else or are held together by terror or they are getting some material gain by working for communism and, therefore, they submit to it. J. Edgar Hoover says that the Communists are the masters of deceit. Their system is readily apparent to world eyes as promising a utopia, a heaven on earth. Closer examination reveals that the structure of ideas is based on a shallow foundation of materialism, but deeply hidden are the two keys that hold the structure intact. The first is terror and oppression, but there is also dedication, willingness to sacrifice, and zealous belief in their cause. The only way we're going to achieve victory in this conflict of ideas is not to simply hate communism without understanding it, but to have at least an equal determination, an equal zeal and equal love for the ideals and principles embodied in the political philosophy upon which this country was built. Let's turn to an examination of the concepts embodied in our American heritage of freedom, liberty, and dignity of man.

A fundamental belief in God is the foundation of our American heritage and the beginning of our living American revolution. Successive generations retained this basic source of strength. It is evidenced today by the motto of our coins and new dollar bills, "In God We Trust." Our forebears had this fundamental faith, this fundamental belief in God. There was no question in their minds whatsoever of this creed but they wanted to be sure that people could worship God according to their own convictions and according to the form that they chose—freely. Not freedom from religion, but freedom of religion.

The American Revolution, representing a giant stride to freedom, was not a revolution likened to an explosive blast from which the dust has already long since settled. The American Revolution is a living revolution.

Now one of the reasons that I submit that our revolution has lasted and the French Revolution did not (12 years of liberté, equalité, fraternité, and the French were right back under the thumb of oppression, the dictatorship of Napoleon) is the completely unselfish basis for our Revolution. July 2, 1776 would be the selfish date for celebrating our independence because that is the date we declared ourselves free. That's the date the Lee resolution was adopted. It said, "That these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be free and independent States, that they are absolved from all allegiance to the British Crown, and that all political connection between them and the state of Great Britain is, and ought to be, totally dissolved." But our Founding Fathers did not choose to celebrate July 2, which would be the selfish date, the date we got something for ourselves. They chose to celebrate July 4 because July 4 was the date we set forth a declaration of principles available, and applicable to all mankind of all races, creeds, and color. They existed from the time of Aristotle, and the Greek city states and perhaps long before, but it was the first time in a new continent that these principles were put into action. The ideas are very eloquently and simply stated in the declaration of principles enunciated July 4, 1776: "That we hold these truths to be self evident that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights such as life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." This phrase is not only eloquent and simple, but it very well articulates our entire political philosophy of freedom. The simple philosophy that all men are created with equal opportunity for success and failure. They are equal before the bar of justice. They are free to live their lives and pursue their objectives according to their own free wills. Furthermore, if these rights come from God, no mortal being, no dictator or tyrant can take them away. Of course, with every right we have a responsibility and obligation. As we have these rights from God, we have a responsibility to Him. That responsibility is also defined in our declaration of principles. Our obligation, "is to have a decent respect for all mankind." The declaration of principles further stated that "to secure these rights governments are instituted among men."

Governments are not instituted because governments just ought to exist for selfish reasons. Governments are instituted to secure and insure these basic rights of man to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness and, they further added, "they are instituted among men with the consent of the governed" in a form which to man seems most appropriate. Once having established this government, man has the responsibility to respect, support, and preserve it. The form of government that we later adopted was not considered in this Declaration of Independence. It could conceivably have taken the form of a monarchy, republic, Periclean democracy, platonic aristocracy, or others. The protection of the basic rights, however, lay in the guarantee that if government becomes destructive of his rights, then man has the duty and obligation to alter or abolish that form. This then gives our declaration of principles universal application. Freedom was thereby extended to all mankind regardless of what part of this earth he inhabited, so long as he aspired to freedom and the majority of his nation had a fundamental belief in a Supreme Being, in Divine Providence, in natural law, all of which are above the collective body of mankind—above the state. Then man could espouse the concept of political freedom so eloquently expressed through the courage and spiritual strength of the Founding Fathers of our great country.

Abraham Lincoln recognized this worldwide applicability of our American Revolution. On his way to Washington for his inauguration as President, he stopped by Philadelphia and gave a talk on liberty. This is in part what he said, "I have often inquired of myself," he said, "what great principle held the Confederation together * * * it was not mere separation of the Colonies from England, but that sentiment expressed in the Declaration of Independence which gave liberty not alone to the people of this country, but I hope, to all the people of the world for all future time."

The next step in the building of our American heritage comes in 1787 when the Constitution was adopted based on the principles declared in 1776. To show further the living aspects of the American Revolution, right after the Constitution was developed and adopted by the Thirteen Colonies our Revolution was perfecting itself or trying to make itself as perfect as possible by adopting 10 amendments to that Constitution, our Bill of Rights. The Constitution was developed on the great principles of the Decla-

ration of Independence, but still it wasn't perfect. We had to immediately come out with 10 amendments to it to make it better.

A little further in the development of our heritage we come to 1863 when Abraham Lincoln said, "As long as any of our people are living in slavery, none of us can be assured of our freedom." The institution of slavery was incompatible with our principles and ideals. The Emancipation Proclamation which freed the slaves was indispensable to our political maturity. Abraham Lincoln instinctively knew that our American Revolution is a living revolution. His Gettysburg Address, perhaps better than any other single event, expresses the true nature of our living revolution. "Let us be here dedicated to the unfinished task (of the American Revolution) so that this Nation under God might long endure."

As a living principle, demonstrated throughout our growth, the statement and documentation of principles and ideals, based upon natural or moral law, have always preceded the development of institutions compatible with these standards. Capitalism as an economic system falls into this institutional category. Its early philosophy stated by such political economists as Adam Smith, Malthus and Ricardo is simply amass great private wealth and power in the hands of the owners of capital goods through the incentive of profit. The use of capital, therefore, may be likened to use of a gun. It may be employed for good or evil. As long as a worker was considered only a hand, as Dickens called him, with no means of attaining a just share of the material abundance which the system of capitalism was capable of producing, capital was being used for evil. Inexorably the ideals and principles of the revolution permeated the structure of capitalism. The process would be expected to continue until the dignity of man, his right to share and enjoy material abundance was achieved.

As an example of this development, Henry Ford in 1914 reduced the hours of labor of his workers to 8 and doubled their pay. He recognized the mutuality of interests of labor and capital as partners in production with a goal of capital producing goods for the benefit of all, not for a few. Samuel Gompers similarly recognized this and pressed toward it in the labor union movement. The abundance and prosperity subsequently achieved belies Marx's theory that an abundant society could be attained only in a Marxist Socialist state.

In the light of our political principles we could not exist half enfranchised, and toward still greater freedom the Constitution was amended to provide franchise for all citizens of age, regardless of sex, and women were empowered to vote. And today, in further demonstration that each generation is building on the living heritage of the past, this generation has achieved educational freedom by Supreme Court decisions requiring that all public schools be open to any child, regardless of his race or color.

Like our Founding Fathers in "76," we must have the courage to stand by our principles uncompromisingly against evil and tyranny, neither palsied by fear nor duped by false words and promises. We must rededicate ourselves to the unfinished task of the American Revolution. We must practice as well as preach our basic American values of integrity, honesty, rugged individualism, courage and selflessly participate in government and civic affairs and problems. Know the issues, avoid "packaged" mentality. Form our own ideas based on knowledge, reason and experience.

Our ultimate weapon of ideas is the weapon system that will enable us to prevail in this period of unprecedented peril. We have to show the rest of the world by our action, by our example, that this weapon is not window dressing to which we only give lipservice. It's a living weapon, the basic principles of which have universal application to all mankind whether he be a Buddhist, Mohammedan, Native Tribesman, Jew or Christian as long as he has the basic fundamental belief in the supremacy of a Divine, a Supreme Being, moral law. It makes no difference what his form of government is as long as that government is not instituted to enslave mankind, but to serve it and that it is instituted with the consent of the people, not seized by criminal conspiracy. The form of government of the United States, a democratic republic is certainly not applicable to all mankind but the principles on which it stands can be a standard to which all those aspiring to freedom can repair. The principle of all rights stemming from God the Creator to man who institutes government in a form determined by him to be most likely to secure his inalienable rights and thereafter it's man's responsibility to support and obey his government and be willing, if necessary, to lay down his life for it.

This country will long endure providing we adhere to and go forward with one great source of strength that the atheistic Communist conspiracy ignores the motto of our great country, "In God We Trust." Then and only then will the prayerful ending of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address be realized, "Let us be here rededicated to the unfinished task so that this Nation under God might long endure, and that government of the people, by the people and for the people shall not perish from this earth."

Educational Television in New York State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the Federal Communications Commission is undertaking a study to determine whether New York City should have a noncommercial educational television station. There has been a great deal of interest in this question. Many people in New York City have expressed the desire for educational television facilities that can be seen and enjoyed by a large number of viewers.

Commercial television has put on many outstanding programs in the New York area—more than are available in any other part of the country. But there is also an increasing need for educational television. S. 205 which passed the Senate last week will provide Federal funds to help set up the expensive equipment needed. Further investigation by the FCC may well turn up alternative possibilities and make possible a further growth of educational television.

I recently received from the New York State Commissioner of Education a letter indicating his support for S. 205 as amended and outlining the history to date of educational television in New York State. I ask unanimous consent to have printed this account in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPENDIX A—BACKGROUND OF EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION IN NEW YORK STATE

The regents of the University of the State of New York took an early interest in the possibilities of television as a means of helping to meet the critical educational problems which were emphasized by the growing number of students, the continuing shortage of able teachers and the unparalleled expansion of knowledge.

Since 1950 the regents have supported the use of television for the improvement of education. Early in 1951 when the Federal Communications Commission announced the lifting of the "freeze" on the allocation of television channels the regents requested the allocation of a number of noncommercial channels to be used exclusively for education and cultural purposes. Soon thereafter the Commission allocated 10 UHF channels to the regents.

A plan was prepared and published under the title "The Use of Television for Educational Purposes," in 1952.

This report suggested that the role of the regents in a statewide system of noncommercial television could best be described as that of a working trustee for the benefiit of all educational and cultural interests of the State. The proposed plan of operation involved the following: (a) Capital construction: the State to pay the cost of constructing and equipping each of 10 local television stations; (b) the State to pay the cost of maintaining and operating each of the local stations (including the provision of a skeleton programing and production staff to work with participating educational and cultural agencies and to coordinate their programing activities); (c) the establishment of local control by the creation of television councils appointed by the regents to represent the educational and cultural interests of any given area; (d) the provision by the State education department of consultation and supervision through a specialized staff.

A temporary commission was appointed by the Governor in 1952 to determine the need for a State-owned station. The majority of the commission believed that commercial stations could furnish the time required by educational institutions.

During 1953–54 the regents granted charters to three educational television councils: the Metropolitan Educational Television Council, the Mohawk-Hudson Council on Educational Television, and the Western New York Educational Television Council. Subsequently, councils were chartered at Rochester and Watertown. The Metropolitan Educational Television Council has since been dissolved.

By 1955 enthusiasm for educational television had grown to a level where it seemed advisable on the regents to formulate a temporary study committee on educational television. After due deliberations this committee made the following recommendations to the Commissioner of Education in January 1956:

1. The appointment of a broadly representative advisory board.

2. Development of a limited form of State assistance for the purpose of stimulating greater television activity by local communities, including the building of "production centers."

3. Establishment of at least one State-owned noncommercial television station.

4. The installation of two closed-circuit television systems in one elementary and one secondary school.

5. The centering of responsibility in the State department of education for the growth and guidance of education by television by professional personnel.

6. Appropriation of $900,000.

7. Request that the Federal Communications Commission continue the reservation of educational channels.

Since 1956, the department has initiated several exploratory programs, each aimed at determining the potential role of television—both broadcast and closed-circuit—as an instrument for improving the quality of education. A primary focus of these experiments has been to multiply the effectiveness of able teachers through the use of television.

These exploratory programs have been financed by an appropriation from the legislature in the amount of approximately $500,000 annually.

During the fall semester of 1956, a junior high school and a senior high school at Levittown were each equipped with closed-circuit television facilities, as were State university teachers' colleges at Brockport and Albany.

During the summer of 1957 the equipment at Levittown was transferred to Cortland County where the project opened in the fall, using two studios and coaxial cable to join school buildings in the city of Cortland, and rural districts of Truxton and Virgil. In the fall of 1958 the regents educational television project over channel 11 in New York City marked the department's first experience in broadcast television. In 1959 the department transferred operational responsibilities for the two college closed-circuit systems to State university.

Currently, the department's emphasis has been placed on experimentation with improvement of education by broadcast television in New York City and by use of closed-circuit television in Cortland County. In order to achieve maximum return in money invested in the regents educational television project, an extensive experiment has been carried on by making kinescope reproductions of the best of the New York programs. These kinescope recordings have been used in upstate New York over both commercial broadcasting stations and in individual school systems. There is a steady increase in demand for these recordings for supplemental teacher training and for total teaching, as in the case of conversational Spanish for the elementary pupils.

Beyond the Call of Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, all of us know men and women in our congressional districts who have rendered services to their community above and beyond the call of duty.

Americans respond in a magnificent way in emergencies, but a few men and women are known for their long and devoted work on behalf of the people of their own community. They are pointed to by their neighbors as examples of the kind of person parents want their children to be when they grow up.

Wide approbation is all that most of these selfless citizens ever receive, but it is enough for they know that they are appreciated by their fellow men. This is, indeed, the ultimate accolade.

Such a person was Norris Clay Phillips of Middletown, Del.

A friend and neighbor, Mr. Phillips was chief of the local fire company for many years and he served in other positions as well during his 37 years of service in the fire department.

He contributed to and was a living embodiment of the spirit of neighborliness which has always characterized American life.

It is with a sense of personal loss that I record his passing here.

I include as part of my remarks a report from the Middletown Transcript of March 23, 1961.

NORRIS C. PHILLIPS

Norris Clay Phillips, 56, an electrical and general contractor of this town, died suddenly about 3 o'clock Tuesday afternoon, on West Lockwood Street here, where he was installing a supplemental siren for the Volunteer Hose Co. His death was a severe shock to his relatives and many friends throughout this entire community where he was held in high esteem. He was the son of the late H. Clay and Clara Insley Phillips, and was born in Bethel, Sussex County, Del.

Mr. Phillips, a former chief of the local fire company and active for many years in that organization, had held many posts including those of assistant chief and membership on the board of directors. He had been a member for 37 years.

He was a past president of the New Castle County Firemen's Association, served on the executive committee of the State association and has been associated with the DelMarVa Volunteer Firemen's Association.

Survivors include his wife, Mrs. Bertha Ratledge Phillips, one brother, Herbert L. Phillips, of this town, and four sisters, Mrs. Mallie Weaver, Miss Pauline Phillips and Miss Eva Phillips, all of Wilmington, and Mrs. Walter Kohl, Chevy Chase, Md.

Funeral services will be held tomorrow (Friday) afternoon, at 2 o'clock from the Mears Funeral Home, 215 North Cass Street, this town. Interment will be in Old Drawyers Cemetery, near Odessa.

Friends may call at the funeral home tonight after 7 o'clock.

Haiti Doesn't Fear Battleground Prospect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled, "Haiti Doesn't Fear Battleground Prospect," written by Clayton Willis and published in the Albuquerque (N. Mex.) Tribune of December 30, 1960, relating to the prospect of Haiti becoming a battleground between Cuba and the Dominican Republic.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAITI DOESN'T FEAR BATTLEGROUND PROSPECT

(By Clayton Willis)

Haiti, a country sandwiched between dictatorships in Cuba and the Dominican Republic, has no fear of becoming a battleground between Fidel Castrol and Gen. Rafael Trujillo, a visiting Haitian said here today in an interview.

Fritzler C. Gaillard, one of 24 foreign teachers in Albuquerque today on a 3-day visit, tossed off recurrent talk of this possibility as rumor. Haiti at its most northwestern point is 60 miles from Cuba. It occupies the western third of the island of Hispaniola. The Dominican Republic has the eastern two-thirds of the tropical island.

DON'T AGREE

Mr. Gaillard said the Haitian Government of Dr. Francois Duvalier doesn't agree with the political system of Castro because the Duvalier government "doesn't practice any Communist ideas. [The Communist Party is outlawed in Haiti.] And it's really difficult for Haiti to have good diplomatic relations with Cuba," he commented.

He said Haiti still has diplomatic relations with the Dominican Republic, but "not as strong" as before the Organization of American States condemned the Trujillo regime last summer.

Gaillard, who is doing graduate study at the University of Michigan under the State Department teacher training program, said that the education problem is the biggest one the country faces. "Seventy-five percent of the population of 4½ million is illiterate," he said.

The 26-year-old resident of the capital city of Port-au-Prince said his country badly needs economic help. Foreign investment to develop Haiti's principal agricultural resources of sugar, coffee, and sisal is needed to overcome Haiti's primitive development of those resources, he said. More technical assistance is needed, too, Gaillard added.

He said that the former regime of Col. Paul F. Magloire (1950–56) did as many Latin American governments did in using much U.S. aid to consolidate its own power. "But the Duvalier government is much better and has more of a responsibility to the people," Gaillard declared.

COLOR QUESTION

Gaillard also had some comments on the touchy "color question" in Haiti.

He described the Duvalier government as a step in the social revolution in which the predominantly Nego society is getting more representation. The Magloire government only represented the minority group (mostly mulatto).

Historically speaking, he added the mulattos have controlled the financial and economic possibilities of the country. He said President Duvalier, an American-trained physician, is popular with the people.

The national art movement in Haiti has had a wide international following. Object of the movement, he said, is to make the people conscious of its real culture, which is still basically African.

The movement, he explained, is a translation in the painting and other art forms of Haitian folklore—largely representative of African culture. The voodoo culture which comes from Africa and provides much of the inspiration of Haitian art, is an example of this, Gaillard said.

The Haitian, who speaks English well, will return to Port-au-Prince late in February to teach at the College of St. Pierre (private school with grades 6–12) there.

Stella Pays Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I request permission to revise and extend my remarks, including extraneous material in the Appendix of the RECORD of this date.

This material includes a story, dateline—Stella, Mo.—in one of the leading daily newspapers of my district—the Joplin Globe—of March 19. It is self-explanatory, but the particular attention of the Members is called to the fact that I am today submitting a private bill for the relief of the Stella Reorganized Schools R–1, at Stella, Mo., to provide for their reimbursement in full of the sum of $1,500 paid for rental of space in empty, unused buildings at Fort Crowder, Mo., following their disastrous fire.

We are daily voting huge sums for subsidies, foreign relations, and educational purposes within and without the boundaries of these United States. It seems utterly unsound to me that we should charge one of our own school districts for the use of unused buildings at an adjacent armed services base on a standby basis. This is sufficient and an adequate reason, Mr. Speaker, but further attention is called to the fact that while these distressing negotiations were going on, the school district has, in keeping with the traditions of a prideful, God-fearing segment of our Nation, rebuilt their school, and in order to pay what the law of the land decreed was a just debt, have forgone the use of sidewalks and a much needed library. The peoples of Stella think it is now all over, and they are still first-class citizens and proud of their children, community, and the Nation, but I submit that we should return this fee in accordance with equity, principle, and fairness to all concerned.

The story supporting this point of view follows:

STELLA PAYS ARMY

STELLA, MO.—It's all over at Stella. "We just didn't feel like fighting the whole government anymore," said Alvie Kinbrough, school board member.

The Army finally has been sent payment of $1,500 rent for the school district's 1-year occupancy of a Fort Crowder barracks as a temporary school, it was announuced Saturday.

As a result of paying the bill now Stella's school probably will have to do without a library and sidewalks for a while, according to Ivan Rowe, board secretary-treasurer.

Stella's school was destroyed by fire January 15, 1959, so school officials decided to hold classes in one of Fort Crowder's unused buildings.

The Army agreed Stella could use the building until a new school could be built, in return for a "nominal" rent. Two months later, the nominal rent turned out to be $6,200 a year.

School Superintendent Don Parsons described it as "a terrific shock." The board didn't have the money.

Missouri Senators STUART SYMINGTON and Thomas Hennings introduced a bill in the Senate to let Stella use the building rent-free. A similar proposal was introduced in the House by Seventh District Representative Charles Brown.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The Eisenhower administration's civil rights program was offered as an amendment to Stella's bill. Then came a 30-day filibuster on civil rights.

Finally a House civil rights bill was used and Stella's school officials thought the trouble was over. But, Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, insisted that the school district pay a fair rental.

Army evaluators visited Fort Crowder and decided $3,000 would be enough rent. Under a proposal by Senator MORSE, the amount was trimmed to $1,500.

The Army again presented its bill. The school board received $18,700 this month from the State, as second payment of $32,000 aid to help finance the new high school, which cost $131,000. Part of this money went to pay the Army.

It is not likely construction of sidewalks and a library for the new school will be possible for some time, according to the board secretary, since it probably would require a levy increase to finance those things now.

Stella's present school levy is $2.55.

MORSE DISLIKED

Senator MORSE became a much disliked figure in Stella because of his insistence that Stella pay rental.

In April 1960, Stella's Mayor Orville Pogue said:

"The people involved in this situation are taxpayers who have built our Government through a system of taxation. They have been taxed almost to the point of destitution and now the Government, or at least a few persons in power who do not know the situation, refuse them the right to use an abandoned barracks building in which to educate their children—unless they pay a fantastic rental fee. It's disgraceful that Congress would have let this wrangle go on this long.

"We, as taxpayers, have supported our Government without question for many, many years and in this type of an emergency we don't feel that we are asking for charity—just assurance that the Government still has the good of the people in mind," Mayor Pogue continued.

"If the Senator from Oregon was in our shoes and the citizens of Stella in his," the mayor said, "you can rest assured we would not be thinking about preserving the principle of a 'formula,' we would free him of this unfair obligation."

The mayor said that Senator MORSE was "getting in their hair" and, said the mayor, "I'm fighting mad."

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT of Arkansas also got into the squabble in February 1960. He sought to introduce a bill of his own to grant Stella use of the building rent-free.

FULBRIGHT suggested the Government was trying to "wring the last nickle out of the poor little school district down in the Ozarks."

"How can anyone be so picayunish," FULBRIGHT said, "Maybe it is because the cumulative vote of the entire population of the school district could not, by any stretch of the imagination, influence the outcome of a national election."

Senator DIRKSEN of Illinois also got into the Stella act in February, 1960.

After what he called a tearful Senate discussion of the measure DIRKSEN went home "full of compassion about the plight of the schoolchildren of Stella." He said a personal check with the Army indicated to him that there was no intention to push for the rent payment.

"Thus," he said, "there is no intention to turn these tender little children out into the snow, unshorn, into the wintry blasts."

VICE PRESIDENT

Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON (then Senate majority leader) compounded Stella's problems when he secretly and surprisingly used the Stella rent-relief bill in the Senate as the civil rights vehicle.

The Stella bill had nothing to do with civil rights and southern Senators said use of it was irregular.

JOHNSON took the Senate floor to protest that "It is untrue, unfair and unjust to say that I outfoxed the southern Senators in this matter."

He contended that he had followed an honorable course. Stella had no choice in the matter.

Stella rocketed into the Nation's headlines by becoming unwittingly involved in the civil rights fuss.

Said Stella School Superintendent Parsons:

"The people and school pupils of the district have been subjected to enough hardships since the school burned. We don't intend to harass them with additional problems."

The townfolk of Stella were stunned by the national publicity.

The little town was shaken when it found itself on the front pages of the Nation's newspapers. Life magazine called to say it was on the way if someone could tell its men how to get to Stella. Dave Garroway called from New York. NBC and CBS were sending camera crews, and newspapers from major cities were either sending correspondents or calling long distance for information.

Finally the Congress agreed with Senator MORSE's proposal and sent a bill, ordering rent payment of $1,500, to the White House. President Eisenhower signed it.

NEW SCHOOL

In the midst of all the fuss Stella's students got a new school on February 15, 1960. They left behind the brick barracks building at deactivated Fort Crowder, but the problems continued.

They recalled how the flash fire had raged through their old building leaving only the brick walls. Donations of books, paper and pencils came from throughout the four-State district. New furniture and books were purchased with insurance from the fire loss, and the use of the Army building seemed a fine solution about where to hold classes.

Stella approved an increased tax levy to help pay for the new building. The basketball team played on the courts of their opponents.

Now it is all over. Stella students are in their new building with a gymnasium, cafeteria and kitchen. Grades 6–12 attend there. Other grades are in buildings near the site of the burned school.

Money from the State helped pay for the new school, and now it has helped pay off the Army.

When the receipt arrives from the Army there probably will be a celebration in Stella. Then the agricultural community can settle back out of the national spotlight and concentrate on just rooting for its winning Stella Eagles.

The Menace of Weed Seed Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, last month, Roy F. Hendrickson, executive secretary of the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, delivered a most significant and informative address in Denver, Colo., before the Weed Society of America. I ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Importations of farm products in competition with our hard-pressed American producers is bad enough, Mr. President, but it surely adds insult to

injury when we also import weed seeds, since weeds do so much to curtail farm income on our American farms.

Mr. President, a number of us have introduced S. 1314 for the purpose of doing something effective to stop this importation of weed seeds. I sincerely hope that early hearings and prompt favorable action will take place on S. 1314 since this is one area of activity in which Congress should move with unanimous support in its desire to be helpful to American farmers.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MENACE OF WEED SEED IMPORTS

(Remarks before the Weed Society of America at Denver, Colo., February 24, 1960, by Roy F. Hendrickson, executive secretary, National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, Washington, D.C.)

Farmers spend an immense amount of time and money to combat weeds. Detailed specific cost estimates are not available. In the U.S. Yearbook of Agriculture for 1948, cost for Iowa alone was estimated at $50 million. Estimates of costs running nationally into the billions of dollars each year have been made recently.

Many species are classed as noxious. L. W. Kephart some years ago said: "With the possible exception of the Canadian thistle, quackgrass is the most notorious of all weeds and probably causes a greater monetary loss than any other single species of plant." Many other weeds are candidates for the role of top villain.

Taking into account the time and cost weeds require, their serious effect on crop yields and quality, and their all-around nuisance defects for farmers, it is remarkable how tolerant we are as a Nation of their introduction from beyond our borders.

It is truly fantastic to see the ease with which they can be distributed to infest our farms and ranches. This apathy is not justified.

There is need for more uniformity in laws, regulations, and enforcement zeal at both State and Federal levels. Especially is there needed major change in the provisions of the Federal Seed Act of 1939 to cut down or eliminate entirely the flow of noxious weed seeds from other lands to reduce the great economic waste these weed seed imports represent.

The fight on weeds native to the United States is hard and costly enough without attracting these noxious invaders from beyond our borders.

The worst loophole at the present time is represented by imports of grain and flaxseed and screenings. These contain vast quantities of noxious weed seeds, and often rich in two of the worst—Canadian thistle and quackgrass.

Tests on imported screenings by inspectors at ports of entry show that weed seed content ranges from about 8 percent to 60 percent.

Over the years the average is 35 percent weed seed content. Most of this is viable seed. The average screenings imported include 4 or more—often 8 to 20—varieties of weed seed.

These find their way to farms and feedlots of many States, spreading the noxious effects over fields and pastures.

This is entirely unnecessary and can be stopped by changes in laws and regulations if farmers, their organizations, State and Federal officials with responsibilities in this area, will mobilize their knowledge and force for one swift assault on the problem.

Currently there is no economic need for the import of these screenings. There seldom, if ever, has been. Inded, their importation at any time represents exactly the reverse of satisfying an economic need. We have an abundant supply of cereal, feed grains, and oilseeds for milling, livestock feedings, and crushing for oil. No economic need for the screenings is evident. There are good and substantial reasons for counting these imports as uneconomic and undesirable.

The prices of feed grains and oilseeds are under steady, relentless pressure domestically and in world markets. The farmer is caught in the price-cost squeeze, and obviously he can use help to reduce his cost of production which includes a substantial annual outlay for combating weeds.

The provisions of the Federal Seed Act, enacted in 1939, prohibit the importation of seed containing noxious weed seeds in excess of specified rates of occurrence.

Specifically, section 301 of the Federal Seed Act prohibits the importation into the United States of "screenings of any seed subject to title III of this act"—but then note this exception wider than a barn door—"(except that this shall not apply to screenings of wheat, oats, rye, barley, buckwheat, field corn, sorghum, broomcorn, flax, millet, proso, soybeans, cowpeas, field peas, or field beans, which are not imported for seeding purposes and are declared for cleaning, processing, or manufacturing purposes, and not for seeding purposes); * * *"

Thus, the exceptions are more substantial than the prohibitions. Indeed, so far as weeds are concerned, the law is a welcome mat. It should be revised, brought up to date.

Screenings are defined under the act to include "chaff, sterile florets, immature seed, weed seed, inert matter, and any other materials removed in any way from any seeds in any kind of cleaning or processing and which contain less than 25 percent of live agricultural or vegetable seed."

It is evident that this is not a prohibition on weed seed imports but only a provision intended to minimize the use of screenings as an adulterant in seed. Only to that small extent was it addressed to weed seed. Of course, weed seed can be spread fast and over vast areas in feeds in which screenings are used. Usually screenings are used as a small percentage ingredient in feeds, and thus the imported weed seeds influence a vast tonnage distributed to farms and feedlots.

All of the major types of screenings are exempt. The biggest of all in the case of Canada are wheat screenings, and this type well pinpoints the problem.

That great, fertile area, the Prairie Provinces of Canada, produces large annual crops of wheat, barley, oats, rye, and flaxseed. Most is destined for export in competition with our grains and oilseeds.

In its energetic effort to expand markets for its wheat, Canada has adopted tighter policies to overcome one of its serious harvesttime quality problems, the presence in the grain of substantial weed seed and other dockage and foreign material.

At local and terminal elevators a standardized program of cleaning is carried on under government leadership in the reception and settlement for wheat with farmers on a quantity and quality basis. This results in the creation of a vast volume of screenings, as Canada now offers in world markets regularly wheat with maximums as low as one-half of 1 percent of dockage and foreign material combined. Such wheat, requiring low cleanout by mills abroad, finds strong market demand.

These screenings, in abundant supply in Canada, are usually available at prices representing little more than actual grain or oilseed content (under 25 percent to qualify as screenings) plus loading and freight cost at such large grain terminal centers as Vancouver, British Columbia, and Fort William-Port Arthur. The tariff on imports into the United States is low and on an ad valorem basis. Sometimes the screenings seem attractive because they narrowly clear the 25-percent maximum of live agriculture seed which keeps them barely within the screenings category. Thus their true grain content, often of high quality, sometimes induces a premium payment, in competition with U.S. feed grains in surplus supply seeking domestic outlets.

Under these conditions it would seem logical to see bills pending in the U.S. Congress to set up reasonable protection against the flood of weed seed crossing our borders.

But instead, the only bill pending in House and Senate is one pending to broaden the list of commodities whose screenings are exempted. S. 214, introduced (by request) by Senator MAGNUSON of Washington State, would insert after the word "buckwheat" the words "rapeseed, mustard seed."

If passed, which is not likely, you would witness an added flow of screenings consisting of up to 24 to 24½ percent rapeseed and mustard seed, with an average of 35 percent weed seed, and the rest inert matter. This would compete with our protein feeds as an ingredient, and these are in abundant supply. But this competition is not our concern here—rather it is the menace represented by the import and distribution of this vast volume of weed seed.

The Department of Agriculture has reported unfavorably on S. 214. I understand that of 35 States replying to a USDA questionnaire sent out in September 1959, 24 reported they favored Federal legislation restricting importation of screenings. I am surprised that the number was not higher. Who can justify this gaping loophole?

It is not only a problem in States along the border. I have seen the weed screenings from Canada frequently, in fact routinely, in dairy feeds sold within 10 miles of the Nation's capital.

What is the magnitude of the importation of screenings? In the last decade, in terms of tonnage, grain screenings except flaxseed range from 150,000 to nearly 300,000 tons a year. But the significant point is that on the average 35 percent of this is weed seed. That means from 50,000 to more than 100,000 tons of weed seed a year.

In value stated for purposes of determining duty, the group ranges from $2.5 million to $6 million.

In addition, flaxseed screenings alone, all from Canada, have ranged since 1954 from about 30 million pounds to 92 million pounds, with a value of about one-half million to well over a million dollars a year. They are filthy with weed seed content, many noxious under definitions used in most States.

Canada is the chief source, but shipments of Mexican, Brazilian, and Argentine origin are also shown. Last year Cuba was also a source.

In terms of volume, here is a picture of receipts in carload lots at one port of entry—Duluth—alone:

	Cars
January–March 1958	59
April–June 1958	50
July–September 1958	64
October–December 1958	69
January–March 1959	164
April–June 1959	96
July–September 1959	63

Briefly let us look at the content of typical shipments, as shown in the reports of inspectors.

Here is a car received at Duluth last October 20. It contained 33.658 percent of weed seed. There were 900 or more Canadian thistle seeds to the pound; 3,600 or more mustard seeds to the pound; 24,750 Frenchweed to the pound; and some 200 or more sowthistle to the pound.

Quackgrass seed is typically found in large numbers, a study of many samples shows.

The vast quantities of weed seed thus introduced is the important point. Few nations share our tolerant laws in this respect.

The impact of these imports in terms of harm tends to be great and usually is concentrated in areas of distribution dictated by transportation costs and available modes of transportation, including rail, trucks (within the United States), and lake vessels.

It is true that some States have stringent paper requirements with respect to grinding or heating the weed seeds, intended to render them nonviable. Such measures are seldom wholly satisfactory.

These rules vary, and a helpful movement toward greater uniformity is underway. Of course, such paper regulations are not self-enforcing. Faith to that effect would be misplaced. Often State enforcement personnel is limited. The primary need is to concentrate on halting the unneeded and undesirable imports rather than on expensive policing followup often required here.

It seems to me that, in view of the potential damage to the fields and pastures of the U.S. farmer, this whole area of weed seed distribution requires some further research, but actually more the application of what is known but not well undertsood. There is a need for education and the building of interest and understanding which will lead to prompt and effective action.

The first need is to attack effectively these wholly unneeded, unworthy, and unwelcome imports.

Certainly a vigorous self-defense effort in this respect could not be interpreted as an unfriendly act by any exporting nation—chiefly Canada in this case. No country, least of all Canada, would take pride in serving as the source of noxious weed invaders.

Canada does not permit truck shipments of such weedy screenings, to protect her farmers and roadsides. She treats her own weed seeds like smallpox, would hardly expect more neighborly treatment elsewhere. For example, in 1950, the Canadian Feed Law prohibited the sale of screenings in Canada containing over 1 percent of certain named ground seeds considered injurious to the health of animals. They included seeds in the mustard family. The Canadian law also limited the number of viable noxious weed seeds to 15 per ounce. Thus, the Canadian standard was and is higher than our standard.

How can we do less for Canada re its screenings than it does for its own farmers?

This society has an opportunity and a responsibility, in my opinion.

To you who are technically trained and competent, and capable of full awareness of the danger and damage of weed seed importation and migration, we must look for leadership.

I am sure that utilizing the information already at hand, and alerting all who have a genuine basis of interest in this serious matter, including Members of Congress, would soon achieve results.

I know that farmers who have formed and control grain cooperatives will actively support a program to meet this problem, not only those marketing grain but those manufacturing and supplying feed to their farmer members.

Personally, I served as a member of the original USDA committee which developed the Seed Act of 1939. I am now aware of many of its deficiencies, especially its grave defect on imports of weed seeds in screenings. I will volunteer to be of any possible assistance if you will assume leadership to obtain needed action in behalf of producers.

Imports Are Exporting Your Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in my remarks an excellent article by A. F. Franz, president of the Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp., which appeared in a recent issue of the Blast, the company publication printed at Pueblo, Colo. Mr. Franz calls attention to the fact that imports are taking the jobs of American steelworkers, and his observations deserve our serious consideration. The article follows:

IMPORTS ARE EXPORTING YOUR JOBS

The trend in steel import and export statistics for the past several years reveals disturbing evidence that foreign competition is seriously affecting the economy of America and particularly some of the smaller steel companies. Foreign competition is hitting hard at Colorado Fuel & Iron and you. Our sales people know how deeply imports have cut into Colorado Fuel & Iron sales and profits. They have learned firsthand that imports are a real threat to Colorado Fuel & Iron business, and promise to become even greater.

Colorado Fuel & Iron is not the only company affected. One source reports that since 1956 2 million Americans have lost their livelihood because of foreign trade changes. Metalworking managers are wondering where the boom promised for the 1960's has gone. Many suspect it has "gone abroad."

While American business limps along at a disappointing pace, steel mills, auto plants, and other metalworking establishments abroad are zooming ahead at almost full capacity with up-to-date mills. Foreign steel companies are supplying more goods to the world market; the United States is supplying relatively less. Our imports are high. Our exports are lagging. Our steel companies are losing business. Our workers are losing jobs. Our Government is losing tax revenues.

Never has competition been so dramatically obvious. Everywhere we look—we find steel, automobiles, machinery, hardware, appliances, housewares, toys, and other items with such bargain-promising stamps: "Made in West Germany," "Made in Japan," "Made in Belgium," or "Made in Hong Kong." These items often are made as well as ours and almost always sell for less.

WORLD STEEL PRODUCTION

Within the past 10 years the steel industry throughout the world has grown tremendously. Foreign countries have spent, and are spending, billions of dollars to expand and improve their steel production. During World War II, the European and Japanese steel industries were, in great part, destroyed, and have since been rebuilt with modern equipment, much of which was financed by the United States. Flat on their backs 15 years ago, many of their plants today are as good as our most modern installations and far superior to much of our older equipment. These foreign countries are now producing excellent products by means of efficient low-cost operations—which sell much cheaper than American-made steel products. They are becoming more competitive every day.

I pointed out the dangers of this situation in my address to the American Iron and Steel Institute on May 28, 1959, entitled "The Big Squeeze on Little Steel," when I said:

"We no longer have the superiority in facilities that for years permitted us to pay higher wages, and still produce cheaper and better steel. Moreover, foreign producers have wage rates much lower than those paid in the United States, and, because of modern equipment, their productivity and sales are increasing rapidly at our expense."

STEEL IMPORTS AND EXPORTS

We at Colorado Fuel & Iron have particularly felt the impact of imports.

In 1960 Japan, West Germany, and other foreign countries dumped into Colorado Fuel & Iron's backyard (and the backyards of other steel fabricating companies) tons of precisely those products we make—at prices far too low for us to compete on a satisfactory profit margin.

The increase in imports, and the decline in exports of steel mill products, including pig iron, did not occur overnight. It has been developing for a number of years, as shown in the following table:

[In tons]

Year	Exports	Imports
1957	6,074,163	1,388,752
1958	2,802,805	1,931,559
1959	1,697,313	5,137,349
1960	3,100,711	3,720,349

We hear much about "imports and exports" of steel balancing each other, which may be true for the industry as a whole. However, the following table clearly exhibits the impact of the unfavorable balance of total U.S. imports and exports on Colorado Fuel & Iron Product Mix:

Total U.S. imports and exports of C.F. & I.-type products for 1960

[Net tons]

Products	Imported to the United States	Exported from the United States
Wire rods	408,216	10,237
Concrete reinforcement bars	515,541	15,872
Hot rolled bars	127,787	43,833
Structural shapes	501,287	283,972
Steel pipe and tubing	480,091	195,197
Wire nails	231,759	4,661
Wire fencing	27,949	1,350
Barbed wire	52,973	565
Wire rope and strand	36,000	9,400
Round wire and steel wire	206,661	13,951
Galvanized and other coated wires	26,969	8,392
Pig iron	330,847	111,773
Total	2,946,080	699,203

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce.

WHAT ABOUT COLORADO FUEL & IRON?

As far as Colorado Fuel & Iron is concerned, foreign competition is no phony scarecrow. It is a startling reality. Imports from Japan and Europe of products made by Colorado Fuel & Iron are much greater than exports. This unfavorable balance is squeezing Colorado Fuel & Iron and Colorado Fuel & Iron employees. It means fewer jobs.

Other steel companies were also affected by the above import-export product-mix. However, the companies who operate sheet and strip mills had the advantage in 1960 of exporting more tonnage than was imported, as shown in the following table:

U.S. imports and exports of flat rolled products for 1950

[Net tons]

Products	Imported to the United States	Exported from the United States
Sheets and strip, hot and cold rolled	350,949	1,333,354
Tin and terne plate (including tin mill black plate)	39,264	685,753
Total	390,213	2,019,107

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce.

In making an appraisal of the unbalanced import-export situation, our State and Federal Governments must study the impact on unemployment in individual companies—rather than on industry as a whole. What happens on a national basis is of no help to the Colorado Fuel & Iron man who loses his job in California, Colorado, New Jersey, New York, or Massachusetts.

WHAT DOES FOREIGN COMPETITION MEAN?

Let's look at foreign competition in the steel industry. Why is it so threatening? What is its effect on you? The answer: fewer jobs—unless we halt the tide.

Foreign competition emphasizes that we are not alone in the marketplace. For every product we make there is a list of competitors turning out a similar product. The competition is not only foreign but American as well. And every competitor wants to sell his products just as much as we do ours. Competition has been the driving force behind American achievement and has made us the most progressive and the most envied people of the world. In America we have been champions of the right to compete. Our hard-working forefathers challenged world leaders in almost every market, and won.

Now we are being challenged.

Some are questioning whether the economic system which made America great should be continued or abandoned. Perhaps we have just awakened to the fact that we have always known: This is a competitive world. No laws, agreements or protective organizations are going to change that fact. If foreign competition jolts us out of our smugness and arouses us to the realities of competition, we must face the challenge. Meet the competition wherever it comes from, and we progress and grow. Fail to meet it, and we are out of business. That's the way the game is played. We have to contribute our best to earn the best.

WHAT IS COLORADO FUEL & IRON DOING?

In spite of the "impact of imports" on Colorado Fuel & Iron, we are not taking a backward step. We plan to move ahead.

1. Your management has appealed to the President of the United States through our Senators and Congressmen to reestablish the 25-percent differential on Government bids which was generally in effect from 1933 to 1954, and was changed to 6 percent by Executive order of the President in 1954. What does this mean? The Government now awards contracts to American firms over foreign companies so long as our bid does not exceed theirs by more than 6 percent. The present differential of 6 percent is too small. If the 25-percent spread was important from 1933 to 1954—it is imperative today.

Your management has also appealed to the governments of the various States to enact legislation protecting American industry against foreign competition.

2. Your management is striving for more favorable tax statutes on capital expenditures and depreciation rates to enable us to compete at home and abroad by rebuilding, modernizing, and expanding Colorado Fuel & Iron facilities.

Such a move would create a climate of business opportunity, a better sense economic stability and economic progress, and thus make jobs available to American workers.

3. Your management is continually searching for new ideas, new methods and techniques, new products and product development. Constant research and improvement is necessary if we are to keep abreast and move ahead of competition.

WHAT CAN YOU DO FOR COLORADO FUEL & IRON ON YOUR JOB?

If we ask that question seriously, we once again recognize a challenge which has always been around, and we are ready to stop kidding ourselves.

Just as we know the problem, we know the answer. Let's face it. We know what we have to do. This is not just a task for management. It's a battle every Colorado Fuel & Iron employee must fight.

1. We must maintain quality standards that assure a quality product which is second to none.

2. We must provide service which is the best.

3. We must give the customer what he wants when he wants it.

4. We must fight for the order, and work our heads off to keep it.

5. We must do an honest full day's work for a full day's pay.

6. We must handle machinery, equipment, and supplies with care and without waste.

7. We must constantly look for new ways to do a job better and more efficiently.

8. Each of us must consider that it is a personal obligation and responsibility to reduce costs and increase performance.

9. There must be complete cooperation between labor and management.

Manufacturers, labor unions and the public must unite in a common effort to keep the American steel industry competitive at home and abroad. Foreign competition and rising unemployment are the major problems confronting us. Now is the time to contact your representatives in Government. Tell them what imports are doing to Colorado Fuel & Iron and your job. They are interested in preserving American jobs.

Results of Questionnaire Mailed by Hon. John F. Baldwin of California, to Residents of the California Sixth District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, 6 weeks ago I mailed a questionnaire to every family of registered voters in the California Sixth Congressional District. The response to this questionnaire was so large that my office was swamped for weeks with returned completed questionnaires and accompanying correspondence. Many constituents not only answered the questionnaire, but wrote detailed comments on the back of the questionnaire, or attached supplementary letters. I have spent many hours personally reading all these comments, and they have been most helpful. I am firmly convinced that a Congressman can better represent his constituents if he knows the views of all of those constituents on important issues pending before Congress, than if he does not know them.

The tabulation of the questionnaire is summarized below:

1. A constitutional amendment has been introduced in Congress to eliminate the electoral college procedure for electing the President, and to provide for the election of the President and Vice President by direct popular vote. Would you favor or oppose this amendment? Favor, 82 percent; oppose, 13 percent; undecided, 5 percent.

2. If Premier Castro of Cuba demands that we give up our Naval Base at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, do you believe that we should give it up, or that we should stand fast and defend the Base if necessary? Give it up, 6 percent; stand fast, 87 percent; undecided, 7 percent.

3. In view of present world conditions, do you believe that our defense expenditures should (a) be increased 56 percent; (b) remain the same 34 percent; or (c) be decreased 10 percent?

4. If Russia and the United States cannot agree within, say, 6 months, on a written agreement for the permanent cessation of nuclear tests, do you feel that the United States should resume underground testing of nuclear weapons? Yes, 80 percent; no, 9 percent; undecided, 11 percent.

5. Do you believe that the House Un-American Activities Committee should be continued or abolished? Continued, 70 percent; abolished, 18 percent; undecided, 12 percent.

6. In the past our major U.S. Embassies at London, Paris, Rome, etc., could only be filled by Ambassadors who were personally wealthy because Congress had never appropriated an adequate sum to operate these Embassies. Would you be in favor of having Congress increase the appropriations for operating these Embassies so that career diplomatic personnel could be assigned to them without personal financial sacrifice? Yes, 80 percent; No, 12 percent; undecided, 8 percent.

7. A proposal has been made that the United States should establish a "Foreign Service Academy" to train personnel properly for service in overseas posts, including foreign language training. Would you favor or oppose this proposal? (a) Favor, 85 percent; oppose, 9 percent; undecided, 6 percent.

8. The United States has been experiencing a serious outflow of gold to other countries. In view of this fact, would you favor a limitation on the expenditures of U.S. tourists in foreign countries? Yes, 73 percent; no, 19 percent; undecided, 8 percent.

9. Do you believe the President should, by legislation, be given the right to require compulsory arbitration of a strike where he determines that the safety or welfare of the Nation is adversely affected by the strike? Yes, 86 percent; no, 9 percent; undecided, 5 percent. Answers from union members: Yes, 87 percent; no, 10 percent; undecided, 3 percent. Answers from non-union members: Yes, 87 percent; no, 9 percent; undecided, 4 percent.

10. The Aid to Needy Children Program has been criticized because it requires one spouse to leave the home before a family can qualify for "Aid to Needy Children" payments. Would you favor a modification in the Law so that a family whose wage earner is unemployed or underemployed could qualify for "Aid to Needy Children" payments without one spouse being physically required to be absent from the home? Yes, 57 percent; no, 25 percent; undecided, 18 percent.

11. We have a serious postal deficit, which this year will exceed $800 million. Would

you favor increasing postal rates so that each class of mail pays its own way? Yes, 74 percent; no, 18 percent; undecided, 8 percent.

12. It has been proposed that the Federal Internal Revenue Laws be tightened up so that deductions for business entertainment expenses would be materially restricted in scope. Would you favor this proposed change? Yes, 80 percent; no, 13 percent; undecided, 7 percent.

Profit-Price Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, an editorial in the March 1 issue of Justice, published by the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, contains one of the clearest definitions of consumer dilemma that I have read in a long time.

It makes the excellent point that while free collective bargaining enables the worker to influence to some extent the amount of his earning power, he is virtually powerless as a consumer to influence the prices he must pay for what he buys.

The result is what I would call an inflation gap in which the only effective buffer between corporate giants who set prices and the consumer who must meet them is Government vigilance.

I am appreciative of the kind remarks accorded me in this editorial. As chairman of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, I am naturally proud of the contributions our group has made in the effort to keep prices down.

At the same time, I am delighted to note in the press that the President plans to create a Consumers' Council within the executive which will, among other things, represent consumer interests before regulatory bodies whose decisions affect a broad range of prices for goods and services.

From the information I have, many of the objectives in the President's plan are similar to those in a bill which several other Senators and I have introduced previously to create a Department of Consumers.

It has been my purpose to reintroduce this bill at this session. We are giving this matter further study and have discussed it with the administration.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from Justice which I referred to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROFIT-PRICE INFLATION

More than a century ago a great New Englander noted that the mass of men lead lives of quiet desperation. Despite the progress made by the world since then, most Americans can vouch for the continuing truth of this judgment: Pay envelopes lag behind bills, high-pressure selling opens new desires beyond the reach of current income, indebtedness multiplies in variety and becomes increasingly heavy.

The worker has only his earning power to contend with these. Standing alone, this is not much of a weapon for the single worker. But joined together, that power mounts and must be dealt with. Collective bargaining through unions is the worker's answer to the bosses' monopoly control of money and jobs.

For the worker, bargaining is essential. But he cannot bargain for everything. He can, through his union, bargain for wages, for working conditions, for health and retirement safeguards. He can, as the expression goes, "give a little and take a little."

But there are other areas of life in which the ability to bargain is curtailed or even nonexistent. There is bargaining with the storekeeper if there are other stores in which to do comparison shopping. But there is no bargaining with a landlord when there are no other homes to be had.

Through the chain of bargaining, the worker as consumer is linked to storekeeper to supplier to manufacturer but he can bargain, if at all, only with the first of these. It is with the storekeeper that he must deal when he buys electric bulbs or canned goods and he never meets the great giants which supply the bulbs and the tins and, in their own mysterious way, set the unbargained prices for them.

There has been much wringing of the hands over the so-called inflationary impact of higher wages. But wages are the bargained ingredient of price while other ingredients are not bargained. Wages are always limited by the downward pressure exerted by employers. But there is no limit on the upward price pressure that results from the ability of corporations, out to maximize their profits, to set prices without bargaining with those to whom they sell and without competing with those who supposedly are their competitors.

Bargaining is the essence of the free market, the key to free enterprise. It is the free play of supply and demand until they come to rest at a crossing point labeled "price," we were taught in school.

Yet, where was free enterprise, where was the free market, where was free bargaining in the case of the giant electrical equipment corporations, 44 of whose second echelon true-blue American managers have been sentenced for rigging prices on products that go into every worker's home?

In their case freedom was the freedom of a handful of well-kept individuals to set prices with no regard for supply, demand, wages, inflation, farmers' welfare, national security, humanity or anything else—except how to get the highest possible profit without giving the game away.

Only the eagle eye of a shrewd and skilled investigator named ESTES KEFAUVER led to their exposure. The Senator from Tennessee, head of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, caught on to their game when they submitted identical bids for the sale of equipment to the Tennessee Valley Authority.

No single consumer could have dealt with the electrical Goliath. That's why big business resents Government policing in such matters. But if inflation is paying for something that isn't there, that's exactly what the giants make Americans do.

We applaud the efforts of the Senator from Tennessee as he continues to track down other inflators of prices and deflators of American ideals.

Forty-third Anniversary of the Byelorussian Declaration of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, March 25 marked the 43d anniversary of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic's declaration of independence. It is fitting that we should pause at this moment in history to remember this day and to pay tribute to the brave people who must celebrate their anniversary of freedom in silence and amidst the cruelty of Soviet domination. For the record of the Byelorussian people dramatically gives lie to the Soviet pretentions of serving the cause of the world's oppressed.

Byelorussia is a culturally and historically independent nation. Situated at the crossroads of West and East, Byelorussia as an independent country held an important place in the medieval history of Eastern Europe. Late in the 18th century the country was forcefully absorbed into the Tzarist Empire. Since that day, the people of Byelorussia have continuously sought to regain their freedom and independence. The 19th century was marked by several courageous revolts against Russia domination.

The national aspirations of the Byelorussian people were finally realized on March 25, 1918. On that day the elected representatives of the people seized upon the opportunity created by the Russian Revolution and declared the independence of Byelorussia. The promise of freedom was realized only to be frustrated again by military force. Against overwhelming odds, Byelorussia could not long resist the pressure of Soviet imperialism, and the young nation fell victim to the Red Army.

Since that tragic day the people of Byelorussia have been constantly subject to the most ruthless of persecutions. Millions of these brave people have been deported and millions of others exterminated. The Kremlin's efforts have been heartless and they have been thorough, but they have not been successful. Despite decades of cruel oppression the spirit of freedom and the desire for independence continues to live in the hearts and minds of the Byelorussian people.

As we commemorate the anniversary of Byelorussian independence, let us hope that our sympathy for and our deep admiration of these courageous people will be of some comfort to them. We who are more fortunate pray and hope that the time will not be long before the Byelorussian's long nourished aspirations will be once again fulfilled and the people of this unfortunate nation can openly and joyously celebrate the anniversary of their independence as we in free nations celebrate ours.

Migrant Farm Labor: A Serious National Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the truly significant domestic problems which we as a Nation face today is the plight of the migrant farm laborer.

On March 9, 1961, CBS Television presented a memorable debate entitled "The Migrant Farm Worker—Is Federal Legislation Necessary?" Arguing against Federal legisaltion was Charles Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation. Presenting the affirmative, and basing his discussion on his experience as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, was Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS, of New Jersey.

Senator WILLIAMS and Mr. Shuman sharply defined many aspects of this serious problem and, under unanimous consent, I include the text of their debate in the RECORD.

While arguments are raised against enacting Federal legislation which would insure minimum standards of protection for these interstate workers and their families, I am acutely aware of the discouraging conditions under which our migrant farmers live. These conditions constitute a serious problem for all Americans, for they include homelessness, poverty, ignorance, hunger, and disease.

Senator WILLIAMS' arguments are forceful and to the point, and I believe that it is time for Federal action in this field of human need:

Mr. SMITH. Good evening.

Last November CBS Reports televised "The Harvest of Shame," a 1-hour examination of the conditions of the men and women who move from State to State harvesting our bounty of fruits and vegetables. "Harvest of Shame" was highly praised and criticized in editorials throughout the Nation, and praised and criticized on the floors of the Senate and the House here in Washington.

The program helped to bring national attention to the condition of the migrant farmworkers, about which subject 11 bills were introduced in the Senate just last week.

Tonight, for 30 minutes, two distinguished authorities on the issue will debate the question: "The Migrant Farmworker—Is Federal Legislation Necessary?"

For the affirmative, Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS, Democrat, New Jersey, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, and author of the bills on the subject; opposed to Federal legislation, and representing most of the growers of the Nation, Mr. Charles Shuman, the president of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

Mr. Shuman feels that migrant workers should have the right to join unions and to strike, but not during harvest season.

First to speak, for Federal legislation, Senator WILLIAMS.

Senator WILLIAMS. Thank you, Mr. Smith—Mr. Shuman.

First let me say that I am very grateful for this opportunity to discuss one of the hardest problems we have yet before us in this country. As a citizen, I have been interested for many years in the problems of our migratory farmworkers. Recently, as chairman of the subcommittee, for 18 months I have been intimately associated with these problems.

When we started our work 18 months ago, we believed that we then knew certain problems of the migratory farmworker, we knew that there were up to 2 million Americans traveling this country, bringing in the harvest, leaving Florida, traveling up the east coast through the various States to New Jersey, New York, on into New England; leaving Texas, and traveling up through the interior to the northern States of Minnesota and Wisconsin; and on the west coast, leaving southern California and traveling on to Oregon and Wisconsin—Oregon and Washington.

And we knew, too, that the children of the migratory farmworker did not share in educational opportunities enjoyed by all other American children.

And we knew that the average income was a pathetic $900 a year.

We knew at that time, when we began our work, the sad facts of high infant deaths, of tragic highway accidents in vehicles that were dangerous.

We knew, too, that children spent all day in the fields with their parents, or perhaps even more tragically, were left back at the camp to shift for themselves while their parents were out planting or picking the crops.

These were cold statistics that we analyzed when we started our work, but that was not enough. We wanted to understand and feel these problems, and following our creation as a subcommittee, in order to understand the wretchedness that had been diescribed, the deprivation that had been described, we took our Committee all over this country, and there we saw the statistics come to life.

We saw families crowded into one room shacks. We saw the men and women working in the fields 12-hour days. We were there at the middle of the day at high noon, in hundred-degree temperatures, and we were there at the end of the day, when they got $6 for their day's work. We saw them at the end of the day, back in the camp, when literally there was nothing—nothing to do, no plans to make, no hopes to nourish.

Mr. SMITH. Senator, we are almost at the end of your time.

Senator WILLIAMS. I will say that we have seen these barren lives, we have seen youngsters whose only playground was a battered old car littered with glass, and there they played barefoot.

It seems to me that in this country where we have done so much for ourselves, where we have brought health care to all of our poor people, welfare to all of our poor people, we have excluded it from this group of people who are rootless and homeless, who have no State and no residence. We have protected ourselves in so many ways with minimum wages, child labor prohibition, short workweek of 40 hours, all the new deal has been excluded from the lives of our migrant farm families in this country.

I think the answer is yes, the time has come when our Nation must recognize that these people are entitled to the same protections that all other Americans enjoy.

Mr. SMITH. Senator, you will be able to come back to that.

Can we have the opening statement now from Mr. Shuman?

Mr. SHUMAN. Thank you, Mr. Smith, and Senator WILLIAMS.

I appreciate very much the opportunity to come here and first to compliment Senator WILLIAMS and his Subcommittee on Migrant Labor for the conscientious job that they did in examining the conditions, inquiring into it, and giving many people a chance to make statements as to what the conditions were in agriculture and in migrant work.

Now, we, representing farmers, frankly admit that we have problems. As far as migratory workers are concerned, these problems are more social than they are employer-employee relations problems. These problems are serious but they are not as serious, Senator, as you have described. They are not as serious as were described in "The Harvest of Shame," of November 25.

This was a very obvious propaganda piece. It was slanted, distorted, untruthful. For instance, "The Harvest of Shame" indicated, and I notice the Senator indicated, that 2 to 3 million migrants, "The Harvest of Shame" tried to make it appear that there was a dollar a day wages; you said six. At least we are $6—six times as well off as we were.

"The Harvest of Shame" tried to make it appear that these children had little or no schooling, said there's no record of a college graduate among the migrants. It pointed out that transportation was like cattle.

Now these are serious charges. It said that the housing was miserable, that these people had no chance to get out of the migrant stream.

What are the facts? I think that is the thing that the American people want to know, and I realize that I come here somewhat as an underdog. Farmers are one-tenth of the population, we are the lowest major segment on the totem pole, economically, our prices and our income are down. We have been regulated by the Federal Government and subsidized to the place where we are almost broke and much of our trouble is due to too much Government.

Now we come here with this distorted propagandized type of approach to justify Federal legislation.

What are the true facts?

Instead of 2 million to 3 million migrants, it's 400,000.

Instead of a dollar a day or $6 a day, many of these migrants make $15 to $20 to $35. The average pay is over a dollar an hour and not a dollar a day. They are transported under Federal interstate commerce regulations. If anybody transports them any size, any great distance in cattle trucks, they should be prosecuted.

The housing is not all the best that we would like, but it's improving a great deal.

And, Senator, I notice that in the hearing record that the folks who know about the migrant program and the problems best were the ones who were not enthusiastic for Federal regulation. For instance, a friend of mine, Martin P. Castlewood, Commissioner of New York State Department of Labor said "My own personal opinion is that any Federal legislation in the area of migratory farm labor should be on a basis which permits the States which are willing to accept the responsibility for reasonable standards, to continue to have the responsibility for the enactment and administration of such standards."

Then from your own State, Senator WILLIAMS, a friend of mine, Phil Lamphey, Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, he said "We have made tremendous progress over the past three decades in establishing suitable and adequate migratory labor camps."

Mr. SMITH. Excuse me, Mr. Shuman. I have allowed you 2 minutes beyond your time.

May I open up the discussion, but before I do, I wouldn't want my silence on your criticism of the program that we produced, the "Harvest of Shame," to be considered an agreement with what you said.

Since you did criticize the program, I would like to say to you that though I said there was praise and criticism, in fact there was much more praise than criticism

and we received the remark from the executive secretary of the President's Committee on Migratory Labor to this effect "CBS Reports is receiving the same treatment everyone receives who dares to question labor practices in agriculture. If your program had not been attacked by the growers, it would have been a meaningless one."

However, that's about that program.

I hope we can now go back to the subject, and you can debate, not me, but Senator WILLIAMS.

Senator, the floor is yours, now.

Senator WILLIAMS. Thank you again, Mr. SMITH.

I don't want to take all of my time here in rebuttal to general statements of Mr. Shuman. I gather when he was talking about the propaganda piece he was talking about the CBS program "Harvest of Shame." CBS certainly does not need me in its defense and I don't believe you meant to imply that any of the work that we were doing receives the Farm Bureau charge that we are propagandizing or using——

Mr. SHUMAN. No, no.

Senator WILLIAMS. Any unhappy devices.

I would say in answer to, first of all, an observation—I got the impression that you're feeling a bit sorry for yourself, Mr. Shuman, that the farmer is the underdog, he is only 10 percent of the population. We are dealing here with the problem of farmworkers and these farmworkers are excluded from every piece of social and economic legislation in our Nation, with the exception of social security. And, believe me, I've been through many States and I have yet to see social security withholding on the average migrant farmworker. So here, to, in fact as a practical matter he is excluded. So, as underdogs, and if you are opposed to legislation you have certainly had your way but I would like to deal first of all with some of the legislation that we propose and I think we should get your view on it.

One of the hardest problems we have seen is the failure of communities to—to make possible education for the youngster who is there for a few weeks or maybe a month or two. We know that the young people of migrant farmers are falling every year farther and farther behind their age groups.

We have a report from Time magazine that, in August, out of 8,000 youngsters only 600 had gotten an education while they were in Colorado.

In response to this, a real, real problem, we have legislation that would provide Federal assistance to communities that try to welcome these youngsters into their school systems while they are there—a 75-percent grant of the operating costs, that scales down to 50 percent.

We also, and perhaps even more importantly, provide grant money to communities who will—who will start summer schools for these youngsters. They are there, as I describe, they are either in the fields or they're shifting for themselves. The schoolhouses are empty. The teachers could be found at very modest cost. We provide $250,000 a year, only that for summer schools for the youngsters when they are traveling north in the areas where schools are not in session.

Now it seems to me that the Farm Bureau could be proud of itself if it would recognize this as a problem and support this. I know that they know, and that you do support better educational opportunities for migrant farm youngsters and I just can't understand the opposition to this measure.

Mr. SHUMAN. Well, Senator, we are not opposed to regulation, per se. We are not opposed to the idea of improvement. In fact we recognize that there has been a tremendous improvement in the way in which the migratory workers are treated, their living conditions, their educational opportunities and all the rest and I think the hearings of your subcommittee——

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, now——

Mr. SHUMAN. Recognizes this and I think that you, sir, certainly do after hearing the testimony of the folks who know best.

Senator WILLIAMS. Here and there there is a blue patch in a very dark sky, I will grant that, and I always recognize it and applaud those people who are showing improvement—but, across the country they are being left out of education, the youngsters. Can't we have a view here, of—an understanding of the problem, at least?

Mr. SHUMAN. Now, let's get it straight.

The proposed legislation is a subsidy from the Federal Government to the States for the education of the migrant workers.

Now, the point that I want to make is that educational subsidies from the Federal Government will not necessarily improve the educational opportunities of these people. They are subject to the same compulsory school attendance requirements that any other children are and——

Senator WILLIAMS. And they are not getting the education, because the school communities can't stand the operating cost burden that this would impose.

(Simultaneous voices.)

Mr. SHUMAN. I don't think——

Senator WILLIAMS. It seems to me——

Mr. SHUMAN. I don't think this is true, Senator, because there is absolutely no evidence, either in the hearing record or anywhere else, that we cannot afford a good educational system with the resources we have at State and local levels. The Federal Government is far more—far less able to take care of the additional needs of the people, based on the relationship of the Federal debt to the resources and the tax load, than is the local and State school system.

Senator WILLIAMS. That is a conclusion, of course, not shared in by a majority of the people in the country, and the President has asked us to give him a program of support to public education for permanent residents.

But let us move on to one other aspect of the legislative program that we propose.

You and I know that the average adult who travels as a migrant farm worker, he, too, has been left out in his early years of the fundamentals of education to the point where he or she doesn't even comprehend the rudiments of simple living, using the flush toilet or the shower or the running water.

Wherever we go the growers first complaint is: When I put a shower in, the nozzle is taken off, the facilities are abused. If I put screens on, they are kicked out.

Now, we have a bill that again provides a modest amount of money, again it's $250,000 annually for adult education in just the rudiments of simple, sanitary, decent living. If your folks, when they tell us that this is a problem that they feel concerned about, they, I would think, would see here an opportunity to do something about our adults, too.

Mr. SHUMAN. Senator, the folks on the farms, a million, 600,000 families in our organization, a pretty good chunk of them——

Senator WILLIAMS. They are (words lost).

Mr. SHUMAN. Are just as much concerned, were just as much concerned about the education and good treatment of these folks as any Member of Congress or anyone else, and we are the ones that are doing something about it.

Now, will this progress, this is the question, will this progress that we've been making, and you admit that there is considerable progress that has been made in the last several years——

Senator WILLIAMS. I can't use the adjective "considerable."

Mr. SHUMAN. All right, I can. But——

Senator WILLIAMS. Measured, very halting progress by a few enlightened people.

Mr. SHUMAN. All right.

Will this progress, then, be speeded up by Federal legislation? And we say no, simply because whenever you pass legislation to subsidize education, to subsidize anything else, when you pass legislation to assume the regulation and the regulatory responsibilities, immediately then local communities and States transfer this responsibility to the Federal Government. And that has been going on in the field of housing and many other areas where the Federal Government has stepped in. We think that the best place to solve the migratory problems, the social, educational, and other problems of migratory workers, is right back in the local communities where people know what the need is, where they can do something about it with the resources which they have. And this is where the economic benefit comes to us, back in the local community, and that is where the burden of the cost of the program should be——

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, I will say that not all of your colleagues who are growers, or associated with growers, agree with you.

Mr. Abney Cox(?), who is a grower of Princeton, Fla., perhaps you know him, and other growers, have supported our legislation.

But I wish you would perhaps talk to the farm bureau of my State. They came in last week, or a couple of weeks ago, to talk to me, they were negative on my program for migratory workers, this I knew before they came, and they—certainly testified again when they were here, and at the end of our discussion they told me about the problem they were having with blackbirds. Blackbirds are spoiling their fruit crops, their corn crops, and they asked us at the end of the breakfast, at the end of our meeting, if the Federal Congress wouldn't appropriate $250,000 to do something about the blackbirds that are plaguing the crops and the farms of this country.

Now, I just cite this——

Mr. SHUMAN. Well, don't misunderstand——

Senator WILLIAMS. It seems to me that the farmers, where the program goes to their economic betterment, very, very easily see the advantage of a national program, a Federal program; where it will come to the benefit of others, perhaps they are slower.

But let me please try to make one point: If we improve the housing, the education, the working conditions, the general lives of these folks who are desperately wretched, and I know you have conclusions that progress is being made, but I have seen the misery and it's—it's not the exception, it's the rule——

Mr. SHUMAN. Senator,——

Senator WILLIAMS. The exception is not misery. And you will have better workers.

Mr. SHUMAN. Senator, there is misery in the slums of Newark and Jersey City.

Senator WILLIAMS. And Federal legislation to deal with it.

(Mixed voices.)

Mr. SMITH. Let Mr. Shuman make his point.

Mr. SHUMAN. Federal legislation will not cure the slums of Jersey City or Newark any more than it will cure the slums in the migrant labor camps. It's got to be done by local initiative and local effort. And this is the trouble of the subsidy route, or the regulation route of the Federal Government.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, of course, I must disagree. I know there are problems with some of our metropolitan programs, but we are persisting in them and they are cleaning slums and they are providing decent housing and they are doing a job in our cities, and a lot more must be done. But we have a problem in Congress on that score. We can get hundreds of thousands of dollars for metropolitan problems, while you and I know we spend billions of dollars on farm problems.

Mr. SHUMAN. Let me get this straight, though. Now the farmers in the United States, most of them, the majority of them that are in our organization, and for some 15 years we have been urging that the Congress turn around and reduce the—price fixing subsidy control programs in the United States for agriculture. We are consistent, we are saying that we don't want these programs, they have hurt us more than they've helped us.

Senator WILLIAMS. You are here speaking for one group of farmers.

Mr. SHUMAN. The biggest group.

Senator WILLIAMS. The Farm Bureau.

Mr. SHUMAN. Over 50 percent of the organized farmers.

Senator WILLIAMS. Other farmers disagree with you on that.

Mr. SHUMAN. They do.

Senator WILLIAMS. I might advise you and you know that other farmers disagree with you on the comprehensive program that we had for migratory farmworkers and their families. The Farmers Union supports most of the 11 point legislative program that I have introduced into the Congress——

Mr. SHUMAN. That's right.

Senator WILLIAMS. And with that support we are very grateful.

Let me deal with——

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Shuman, I don't think has had his full share of the time.

If there are some points you would like to make, Mr. Shuman——

Mr. SHUMAN. Yes, I would. I would like to make a very definite point that when you get Federal legislation, regulation, then you have to have administration; and in a country as large as the United States a federally administered program cannot take account of the extreme variation that there is from community to community and State to State. Furthermore you have the kind of thing, Senator, that we experienced with the former Secretary of Labor Mitchell who strained the interpretation I think of the legislation and certainly used rather dictatorial authorities to move into the farm labor field. I don't think that any of us believe that with increased Federal legislation we will have any more—any less of this approach to the solution to problems than we had with Secretary Mitchell.

We are going to have more of it because we'll have more administrators, more folks watching every community in the United States, huge cost to the Federal Government and slowing down progress to the rate of the slowest. That's what happens under Federal regulation, the minimum becomes the maximum. You transfer responsibilities from local people and local communities to the Federal Government and that's not a good direction to go.

Senator WILLIAMS. Is this what happened when almost 30 years ago we enacted a minimum wage, unemployment compensation, workmen's compensation——

Mr. SHUMAN. In my opinion——

Senator WILLIAMS. And limited workweek?

Mr. SHUMAN. It's my opinion that the laborers of the United States have been hurt more by the increased unemployment generated by the increase in minimum wages than they have been helped. I think the competitive way is the way to improve conditions for not only labor but agriculture and all the rest.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, I would think that most of the people in this country recognize that with those built-in security measures that we have enjoyed for 20 to 30 years, has come the new opportunity for the average American to enjoy some of the good things of life.

But we're not asking anything extravagant for the farm worker, all we are asking for is education for—for his youngsters, an opportunity to have——

Mr. SMITH. Gentlemen——

Senator WILLIAMS. Health care and welfare care——

Mr. SMITH. I'm sorry to interrupt but we have to have the summaries now.

Can Mr. Shuman give his summary statement—2 minutes.

Mr. SHUMAN. Actually I think that we have seen the essential elements of the disagreement here. We on the farms of the United States are just as interested and just as—going to work just as hard to improve the conditions of these poor folks as anyone else. We have crops that still must be harvested by hand unfortunately, and we are—we're conscious of the fact that the way to solve the migrant labor problem is to do away with the kind of work that makes it possible. Federal legislation may in effect continue the migrant worker many, many years longer than he would be continued if we continue the way we have with research and emphasis on ways to eliminate the problem by eliminating the work.

Now, our basic belief is that the centralization of power in the central Government or Federal Government, power and authority, and encouragement of lack of responsibility by individual citizens is one of the greatest perils that we have to the future of our Republic and to our competitive enterprise system.

It has not been demonstrated that increased Federal responsibility improves the conditions for these people and this Federal legislation is an entering wedge to be broadened out, it's really a part of the campaign on the part of the monopoly powers in labor to organize and control the food industries just as they are commencing to control the transportation industry.

Mr. SMITH. Excuse me, Mr. Shuman, I'm sorry your time is up.

Could we have Senator WILLIAMS' concluding statement?

Senator WILLIAMS. Well I want to first of all give Mr. Shuman every credit for good will and a good heart, but the fact is, notwithstanding the good will expressed here, the average American migratory farmworker right now makes less than $900 a year. His youngsters are falling further and further behind in education. He does not receive any of the public health and welfare services that all other poor Americans receive. He has not had the opportunity to benefit from a floor for wages, there is no minimum wage that applies.

His youngsters are not protected, they are excluded from the provisions of the child labor law except for during school hours. Wherever you look for those legislative efforts to make the beginning of a better life, the American migrant farmer and his family have been left out. They are truly outcasts. Our legislative program deals with every, almost every item, those that we understand at least, the wages, economic conditions, the situation of the children, and opportunity to join in labor unions, yes, I thought we had grown up in this country to know that labor unions are a part of our way of life and that a working man or woman should have an opportunity to express himself and bargain collectively. And this we provide for, as well as looking into the future and providing for an advisory council to advise the President and the Congress on the continuing and the persistent problems of almost 2 million Americans who are desperately left out of the affluent society most of us enjoy.

Mr. SMITH. Gentlemen, I have done nothing but interrupt both of you and I apologize to you.

The time has been simply too brief for such a serious topic.

Thank you very much for coming here to debate this question.

Migrant Farm Labor Problems and "Harvest of Shame"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, recently, through a Columbia Broadcasting System television presentation entitled "Harvest of Shame," considerable attention has been called to the problems facing migrant farm labor forces in the United States.

The residents of Florida who had welcomed this program and its production crews into their towns and farms, had expected a fairminded program showing a true picture of the current problems and what is being done to resolve them. Unfortunately, they later saw a show edited for shock value that distorted many of the actual conditions and overlooked much of the work in progress to cure the ills affecting migrant labor. The efforts of thousands of individuals and groups who have worked countless hours trying to better the working and living conditions of the migrant laborer were overlooked. Needless to say, the one-sided picture presented by the film greatly disheartened those individuals and groups who are trying to meet the problem.

By presenting only one side of the migrant story and raising many questionable statements, the program created an erroneous impression in minds of thousands of Americans. Now an even graver matter has been created by the sale of the program to the British Broadcasting Co. for broadcast in Great Britain.

The showing of films such as this one in foreign countries may not be in the best interest of the United States.

Furthering complicating the showing of "Harvest of Shame" abroad is the fact that the U.S. Information Agency, the governmental department charged with creating a better picture of America abroad, now is headed by Edward R. Murrow, the commentator of the "Harvest of Shame" program.

While Mr. Murrow was an employee of CBS News at the time the television program was made, in his present position, the broadcasting of the program overseas now could only embarass Mr. Murrow, personally, and the U.S. Government.

In an effort to present a true picture of what is being done in Florida to improve the lot of migrant workers, the Palm Beach Post of West Palm Beach, Fla., printed a special supplement on February 8, 1961, discussing the issues as stated in the "Harvest of Shame." These articles clearly illustrate what is being done and what the television producers neglected to mention. Because of the new developments regarding the rebroadcast of the program, I believe these articles from the Palm Beach Post will

be of interest to every Member of Congress.

In bringing these points to public attention, the Palm Beach Post has performed a service to all interested in migrant labor problems, as well as to the migrants themselves. No effort is made to mislead or distort. The series is one of many that the Palm Beach Post has printed over the years, and is based on a genuine concern for the welfare of the migrant rather than on sensationalism. For this the Palm Beach Post deserves high praise.

The first of the series by the Palm Beach Post recognizing the problem, but presenting both sides, is printed here today. I shall present the others over the next few days. It is my hope that the Members of Congress will take a few moments to read these articles.

MIGRANTS: THE GLADES SIDE OF THE STORY

On the night of November 25, 1960, millions of people all over the United States watched a documentary film "Harvest of Shame," on the TV network facilities of Columbia Broadcasting System.

The film depicted the migrant agricultural worker as a modern-day slave—

Paid unbelievably low wages by farmers who could easily pay more.

Robbed of these wages by landlords charging high rentals for dirty shacks and by crew leaders who take advantage of their poverty to make thousands of dollars while the migrants starve.

Denied educational opportunity by school systems set up for permanent residents.

Welcomed only when there was work to be done, and then kicked out.

Caught in a hopeless, dreary routine from which there is no escape.

Unwanted, uncared for, forgotten by the civilization they feed, and in desperate need of Federal legislation which, according to the impression left by the film, was the only help for an otherwise hopeless situation.

Reaction to the film from all over the country, but particularly from the people of the city of Belle Glade, Fla., was immediate and strong.

Belle Glade had welcomed the TV caravan and accepted at face value the frequent assurance that the report would be fair and impartial and "show both sides of the story," a promise that was made in writing by CBS before the film was shown.

Privately, however, David Lowe, producer, told a staff member of the Florida Christian Ministry to the Migrants that he was only interested in getting shots showing the bad side.

The private admission proved far more accurate than the public protestation.

Interviews with persons like Ralph Moss, chief of the Farm Labor Division of the Florida State Employment Service, obviously an impartial source, were completely cut out of "Harvest of Shame." Other interviews were expertly trimmed, leaving only such information as reflected poverty and dejection.

Even in the first reactions to a film which they knew would damage the name of their town, perhaps irreparably, the citizens of Belle Glade were remarkably objective.

No one claimed, then or now, that the life of the migrant is a bed of roses, that his housing is palatial, that he is paid for his unskilled labor what factory technicians are paid, that the travels in jetliners or dines with kings.

Here in Florida, perhaps better than anywhere else in the Nation, the fact that there are serious unsolved problems in the field of migrant agricultural labor is realized and acted upon.

Certainly there has never been an inclination in Palm Beach County to hide the facts, or to view them through tinted glasses. For many years the bad facts of migrant labor have been squarely faced, investigated, and alleviated to an extent viewers of "Harvest of Shame" might find unbelievable.

It might come as a distinct shock to them to learn that in 2 hours the Post-Times obtained 18 names of graduates of college from migrant families, now living and working in the county. "Harvest of Shame" said there were no cases on record.

Viewers might be surprised to learn:

That a corporation started by migrants, currently with 49 migrant stockholders, just purchased a $50,000 property on which they plan an FHA housing project of 24 homes.

That migrants have been the subject of one of the most advanced and intensive social science projects ever devised for a subgroup of American culture..

That both of Belle Glade's two public swimming pools are used by migrants.

That Interstate Commerce Commission inspectors check vehicles used in interstate transportation of migrants every year.

That the correct number of workers in the migrant stream would be far closer to 400,000 than 3,000,000.

That Harvey Pool, a Negro leader in the Glades area, has listed the names of 100 migrants who own their own homes.

That the 1959 Florida Legislature passed laws which are being used to bring sanitation in migrant camps up to standard American levels.

That far from ignoring school dropouts among migrant children, Palm Beach County employs two special teachers to work with this problem in the Glades area, and has a special school for non-English-speaking migrants west of Delray Beach.

The good facts disclosed in this special section are in no way meant to say that there are no serious problems in the migrant labor field.

In 1957–58 these newspapers led a fundraising drive which collected $27,000 for migrant relief—a drive which resulted in the formation of a county-wide migrant committee which now has charge of a $15,000 fund for any future general emergency.

We could not have been so closely involved without knowing that there are many problems and much need for improvement.

The story as seen from here is one of definite, tangible progress toward the solution of one of the Nation's most difficult and perplexing social and economic problems.

It is a story of the lowest strata of American society, and all that this involves in terms of poverty of mind and spirit as well as of pocketbook.

It is also a story of men and women who have given themselves selflessly in attempts to understand and help this poverty, and of those who have risen above it, and now extend a helping hand to those who follow.

The facts presented here are largely from Palm Beach County, but could be duplicated to a large extent in Broward and Dade Counties, and throughout Florida.

The story we tell is by no means all there is to say on the other side. CBS used 9 months and a crew of cameramen and reporters. This section is the work of reporter-photographer Jack Thompson, executive editor Jonathan Koontz, and advertising saleswoman Helen Hulick, working an average of 2 to 3 weeks, with occasional assists from other staff members.

It is presented here in the belief that our readers will want to know that there is another side of the story, a side not presented in the "Harvest of Shame."

Revaluation of the German Mark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Maj. Gen. Julius Klein, retired, on March 27, 1961, giving his personal observations on German reception of the American reaction to the recent revaluation of the German mark.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY MAJ. GEN. JULIUS KLEIN, RETIRED

During an intensive 5-week business trip in Europe, there was an opportunity to view at firsthand the effects of the revaluation of the German mark.

It was apparent that the Federal Republic of Germany found it necessary to restrain inflationary pressures. To tighten up the liquidity of the money market, the revaluation of the mark was a logical first step.

This posed some difficulties because Germany's high interest rates have attracted a flood of capital from abroad. The revaluation measure should make it possible to manage this problem more effectively.

The German move should be helpful to the United States because it will serve to reverse the outward flow of capital that has been going abroad, and it should improve our trade position vis-a-vis the Germans. It should also militate to the Federal Republic's advantage by slowing down the potential distortion of the Germany economy resulting from the influx of liquid foreign funds.

To bring the Federal Republic's economic picture into focus, it should be remembered that at the end of 1952, the German Central Bank's gold and foreign exchange reserve stood at 1.2 billion. This mounted to 5 billion at the end of 1959, and at the close of 1960, it had grown to 7.2 billion.

The German industrial recovery has been proceeding at a vigorous pace.

The Federal Republic has been able to increase its proportionate share of exports to most countries in which it competes with other nations. On top of this basic industrial strength, the Germans have been able to attract tremendous amounts of liquid capital from abroad, particularly in the last half of 1960 because of the relatively high interest rate structure in the Federal Republic. During most of last year, the German rate stood at 6 percent compared to our 3 percent, and now stands at 3½ percent. This provided both opportunity and incentive for money to go to Germany.

The revaluation of the mark increased the value of the German currency in relation to all other countries with the exception of the Dutch guilder. Instead of holding fast to the high interest rate structure, they have moved to correct the imbalance in world international transactions by making their currency more expensive. This has had two effects, one on the trade balance, and the other on international capital movements.

1. The move should reduce Germany's merchandise trade surplus because German exporters in some fields will have to raise their prices in terms of the currencies of their customers, while at the same time im-

ports into Germany will become cheaper for the German consumer.

2. At least some of the capital that flowed to Germany in the past year went there because it was expected that there would be a revaluation of the mark, one way or the other. Now that the move has been made, it can be anticipated that some of the foreign capital will go back home, and as a result tighten up the German economy.

I found considerable disappointment in the Federal Republic over the mild U.S. reaction to the revaluation move. This is understandable. The German citizen is carrying the heaviest tax burden anywhere in the Western community. Very heavy drains on the budget are being made by the necessity of absorbing and rehabilitating many thousands of refugees who continue to cross the Federal Republic's borders in their flight from Communist tyranny. The revaluation of the D-mark was a genuine sacrifice by the Germans and its motivation and effects deserved a much warmer reception in the United States than has been manifested until now.

A Comment on Antitrust Activities: The Bicks Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the key feature of our private enterprise system is the competition of the marketplace, where our economic decisions are made. For sound decisions to be made, the competition must be free, for distortions which block free competition in the marketplace introduce influences into this give and take which prevent its proper functioning. One of the threats to free competition is monopoly and the regulatory efforts of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice are vital in preventing this imbalance from distorting the competition of the marketplace.

In the previous administration, the Antitrust Division was under the very capable leadership of Robert Bicks, an intelligent and energetic young man who compiled an enviable record for the Division. Bicks made a real contribution to the successful functioning of our free enterprise system in his work. It is sincerely to be hoped that the antitrust enforcement of the present administration will be similarly dedicated to the protection of private enterprise.

In the February 10 issue of the Baltimore Sun, Mr. Thomas O'Neill wrote on the work Bicks did in the field of antitrust. This was reprinted in substance in the Christian Science Monitor of March 21 and I would like at this time to introduce the Monitor reprint of Mr. O'Neill's article in the RECORD:

THE BICKS CASE: MIRROR OF WORLD OPINION
(By James O'Neal)

President Kennedy praises the trust-busting record of the Department of Justice in recent years and his brother, the Attorney General, drops from the Government service the man who made that record, a contradiction commending an improvement in communication within the administration, and perhaps within the family.

The Government's top trustbuster since early 1959 has been the youngest man who ever held the job, the 33-year-old Robert A. Bicks, who has also been the most successful. He was leaving office at the moment of his biggest triumph, the shock applied to the Nation's major electrical manufacturers who had been rooking the public by a conspiracy to fix prices.

The resignation he offered according to custom at the change of administration was accepted routinely, although other holdovers have been invited to stay on.

At his third press conference, expressing a hope that the Department of Justice would continue to stir itself about monopolistic practices, the President said with what appeared to be a touch of apology in his voice that the antitrust division had been "very ably led in recent months"—the period it was directed by Mr. Bicks."

The case of Mr. Bicks presents puzzling aspects leading to conjecture as to how deeply committeed are some important Democrats to prosecution of monopolistic practices in restraint of trade.

His nomination by President Eisenhower as Assistant Attorney General in charge of the antitrust division of the Department of Justice was ignored for months by the Democrats controlling the Senate Judiciary Committee in the last Congress, and when he finally acquired the title it was by recess appointment.

Unlike other nominations of the outgoing administration that were shelved in Congress, there was no concern that the incoming President would be saddled for a specified term of years with an unwanted holdover official. Appointments as Assistant Attorney General are at the President's pleasure, terminable at any time.

The disinterest of the Senate committee was unbroken by impressive support volunteered for Mr. Bicks.

Among those who spoke up for him was the Democratic chairman of the House antitrust subcommittee, EMANUEL CELLER.

A number of State law enforcement officers added their recommendations.

An interesting indorsement was filed by Whitney North Seymour, president of the American Bar Association, who as an attorney has been on the losing side when Mr. Bicks blocked a projected merger of Bethlehem Steel and Youngstown Sheet and Tube.

The record they supported is the brightest in the 70-year history of the antitrust laws.

Last year's 92 cases brought by Mr. Bicks was the highest number in any year.

When Judge J. Cullen Ganey in Philadelphia accepted guilty pleas from General Electric and other electrical giants prior to imposing jail sentences and staggering fines, he complimented Mr. Bicks upon "a splendid job."

Greek Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the Greek war of independence, which began 140 years ago and culminated in the birth of modern Greece, was one of the major political events in 19th century Europe. That successful revolt also proved that regardless of the physical weakness of an oppressed people, and also regardless of the number of centuries they are held down by their overlords, stouthearted and gallant people will always try to free themselves from oppressive tyranny.

Greeks had enjoyed freedom and practiced it in their homeland centuries before any other people. In this as in many other social and political experiments they were pioneers, the real creators of our Western civilization. But even before the beginning of our era, the glory of Greece was gone, and the Greeks had lost their freedom. Thus for nearly 2,000 years they lived under alien regimes, first under the Romans, then under Frankish kings, and finally, from mid-15th century down to the time of their independence under the Ottoman Turks. During their long suffering they revolted more than once, but each time their attempt ended in failure because physically they could not cope with the powerful Ottoman forces. Their daring revolt in 1821 was successful because the awakened consciences of Europe and America were in wholehearted sympathy with their righteous cause, and the governments of Europe could help the Greeks in time to save them from almost total extermination. That is what certain European governments did in the fall of 1827. When gallant Greeks were almost down and out, public opinion in Europe practically forced Britain and France to action. In October of 1827 the navies of these two countries and that of Russia took part in the Greek war of independence and annihilated the Ottoman fleet, thus assuring the victory of the Greek cause.

March 25 was the 140th anniversary of Greek independence. We salute the gallant Greek people for their loyalty to our common ideals, freedom and independence.

The Superbomarc

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the President has asked Congress to review the defense picture and has called for stepped up missile development.

In this connection, the following editorial from the Seattle Times points up the Superbomarc's proven capabilities which should not be overlooked:

SUPERBOMARC'S REMARKABLE RECORD

All of the public attention being focused on the progress of the Minuteman, the Polaris and other offensive missiles should not serve to obscure the remarkable test record that is being achieved by the Superbomarc defensive missile.

The Boeing-built interceptor set altitude and distance records yesterday in scoring its 19th successful flight out of 21 launchings over the Gulf of Mexico.

The weapon destroyed a simulated target more than 100,000 feet high and 446 miles distant from its Florida launching site, responding perfectly to radio signals from a control center far away in Alabama.

By means of repeated tests, the Superbomarc has demonstrated its capability to seek out and destroy attacking jet aircraft or air-breathing missiles hundreds of miles from their potential targets.

Despite Soviet ballistic-missile developments, it is the Russian strategic bomber force that would pose the greatest potential threat to the United States if war came in the near future. It is to be hoped that Congress and the administration will not lose sight of the Superbomarc's proven capabilities as they prepare the fiscal 1962 defense budget.

I Speak for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address given by a young constituent of mine, Joseph G. Quill, Jr., of Faynham, Mass., at the "Voice of Democracy" contest national awards luncheon in Washington, D.C., on February 22, 1961. I am proud of the fact that this young man represented the State of Massachusetts in the contest which was an inspiration to all who were privileged to observe it. Mr. Quill's address was so mature and enlightened, I am pleased to insert it in the RECORD:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Joseph G. Quill, Jr.)

Three thousand years ago there was formed a social system which was destined to change the lives of millions of people. In these primeval periods of social organization, among the Hellenic races gathered about the Aegean Sea, in the city-state of Athens, a unique form of government came into existence. It was the basic conception of rule by the ruled, government by the governed, and it was named accordingly. Democracy comes from the Greek, meaning a rule by the citizens, or demos. This democracy was of a primitive, simple, but pure form. Primitive in that it contained the barest essentials of good government; simple because the civilization was simple; and pure because the people directly indicated their mandates.

Since that time, democracy has existed in one of a dozen forms during each moment of time; and I believe that one of its strengths is that it was flexible enough to change its form to fit conditions, without altering its basic premise. The Romans had a type of democracy for a time, although imperialistic designs coupled with a pagan nationalism overshadowed it as the outward form of government. Rome was an empire in theory, but a democracy in practice. Public opinion was the mainspring of the political idealist.

However it was not until the 17th century that one could really justify democracy with the presentation of genuine philosophical evidence. The most important philosopher was John Locke who first stated authoritatively that man has the right to govern himself. This was heretofore an absurdity. But conditions were perfect to test out this idea. People were tired of the old feudal and class systems. They were looking for something new which would improve their lot. Finally, man produced his first formal declaration of a choice in favor of this democracy. It was the declaration of the independence of the American territories united to accomplish a separation from the British Empire.

It was a reiteration of what had been implied from the very beginning: that all men are created with certain inate rights; that all governments derive their power from the consent of the governed; and that man has the right to change his government to accomplish these ends. Voltaire contributed the idea of separation of church and state; and Montesquieu set down rules that a democracy should follow to function properly. These are the basic tenets of modern, representative democracy and as Americans, this is our heritage.

As I said, one of the strengths of democracy is that it may adapt to fit a wide variety of social and cultural circumstances. The American system of democracy does precisely this. But it does not only fit in with our modern technological civilization. It plays a far greater role in this new age. It is the fulfillment, the culmination of our civilization. The world in this era of progress and human advancement has become a complex place indeed, but democracy has become complex also. Not only has it served as an adequate form of government but it has, and still is promoting the best interests of our age. Democracy is the motive force behind the free enterprise system, not only economically, but intellectually as well. We owe the strides we have taken in science and philosophy to a system which draws out the creative energy in man and which creates an atmosphere of competition for otherwise complacent and therefore useless minds.

Democracy is the greatest social weapon that we have at our disposal to fight the menace of conformity that will stifle all our efforts if certain other systems are allowed to gain momentum. The responsibility is on you, and me, and all other citizens.

While democracy makes us free to accept or reject, we are free to accept or reject it. Keeping our proud heritage in mind, we are duty bound to uphold the very thing our fathers fought for—the crown and the glory of modern man, democracy.

Address by Edward C. First III, of Harrisburg, at National Bellamy Flag Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the 19th National Bellamy Award in honor of the author of the Pledge of Allegiance—was presented to a high school in Maine at ceremonies in Augusta, Maine, last October. Among those participating in the ceremonies was Mr. Edward C. First III, student council president of John Harris High School in Harrisburg, Pa. Because of the importance of the ceremony and the fine things Mr. First had to say about our State, I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To Maine with its rockbound coast I bring greetings and congratulations from the rock-bedded Susquehanna River where sits Harrisburg, the city beautiful—just a stone's throw from the home of the Pittsburgh Pirates.

Once, along the Susquehanna's banks, Indians trapped, hunted, fished, fought, and feuded. Then came the white man and his civilization. One such was John Harris from Yorkshire, England. He set up a trading post and ferry. Now, where Indian paths were, came roads, Conestoga wagons, canals, the iron horse—and Harris Ferry became a city celebrating its 100th birthday this year.

During last September we celebrated this 100th birthday with a spectacular weeklong centennial.

We have had a wonderful birthday party. Harrisburg never looked more beautiful but that is as it should be, for nowhere along its 441 miles of winding curves is the Susquehanna more lovely than at Harrisburg, Pa.

At the party we remembered the great events of an eventful life. The visits of George Washington, Lincoln, Dickens, the Lincoln funeral train that day it rained tears in Harrisburg.

But it is the present I would speak of—Harrisburg, beautiful, historical, cultural. Religions of all faiths lift their spires to heaven.

Our schools are a credit to the Nation. At a time when youth and learning are on the defensive, our entire school system has met the challenge and our product will give America tomorrow the best of citizens who, in turn, will bring about the decline of crime and corruption, lessening of divorce—a bigger, better, more beautiful Harrisburg. Yes, all America.

John Harris, one of three high schools in Harrisburg along with William Penn and Bishop McDevit, famous when it was built as a million dollar institution—indeed a staggering sum in those days when the dollar was triple its present value.

Spread out in present day ranch type style with long wings and flat roofs, the new visitor inevitably concluded that this is a postwar structure and so we are understandably proud of our school plant.

Dedicated to uphold and further the principles of education, in these 34 years John Harris has served well the thousands of graduates who have left its doors to use profitably the knowledge and experience gained at Harris.

During the flood of 1936, more severe to Harrisburg than the famous Johnstown flood, John Harris served as a refuge for hundreds of men, women and children.

The Susquehanna runs on like Tennyson's immortal brook. But I'm going to stop—for blessed is he who gives short speeches for he shall be invited again—and I love lobster.

Come to Harrisburg, the city beautiful, and feast on shoo-fly pie, scrapple, and pig's feet jelly.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, today about 10 million Byelorussians live in their historic homeland under the Soviet totalitarian regime, but the Soviet Government has always acted as though there is no such distinct ethnic group,

and has tried to obliterate all Byelorussian national traits. For that reason we in the West hear little of these people, and know very little of their history. Nonetheless, there they are, and they have persistently resisted all Soviet attempts to Russianize them.

These people lived under their own government in their historic land, between eastern Poland and western Russia, long before the formation of the modern Russian state, but in 16th century Russian czars overran and conquered the country, and since then, except for a period of 3 years, they have been living under czarist autocracy and under Communist Soviet tyranny.

The 3-year brief but unforgettably happy interlude between 1918 and 1921 was the only time these people were free in modern times. In 1918, on March 25, they had proclaimed their independence and had established the Byelorussian National Republic. Then until early 1921 the new state struggled against formidable odds for its very existence. In the end it was defeated, the country overrun by the Red Army in 1921, and then made part of the Soviet Union. Since then the fate of the Byelorussian people has been no different from that of other peoples suffering under the Kremlin's unbearable yoke. Fortunately these people have not lost their hope for freedom, and they still cling to their national ideals, their national independence. On the 43d anniversary of their Independence Day let us hope they will someday be restored to freedom and independence.

Woodland Gift

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the following commendation of Mrs. Albert Fraser Keister, for her most generous gift of land to the Western Pennsylvania Conservancy. This well-deserved praise appeared in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette and Sun-Telegraph as an editorial on March 23, 1961.

As a member of the Western Pennsylvania Conservancy, I should like to suggest that it is a reflection of the feelings of this group toward Mrs. Keister, and citizens like her, who contribute in so many ways to their communities:

WOODLAND GIFT

Those who enjoy the loveliness of Cucumber Falls, at Ohiopyle in Fayette County, can forget any fear they may have had about the area's future.

Mrs. Albert Fraser Keister, of Sewickley, after working more than a year to acquire the property along this stretch of the Youghiogheny River gorge, has given her one-half interest in 589 acres to the Western Pennsylvania Conservancy as a preserve for public recreation and wildlife conservation.

The gift area will be called Keister Park—a memorial to the family long identified with the region's once active coal industry.

We agree with Maurice K. Goddard, secretary of the State department of forests and waters, who said:

"This is a thrilling challenge to conservation throughout Pennsylvania. Mrs. Keister's act is a heartening example of enlightened citizenship at its best."

The woodland gift is another shot in the arm for the conservancy in its quest to develop and improve the natural glories hereabout. The conservancy, true to its purpose, will now attempt to acquire more land in the Ohiopyle area. Mrs. Keister's gift makes a superb beginning.

Self-Service Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CATHERINE MAY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, since the Members of Congress have been studying President Kennedy's recent farm message with some puzzlement and mixed emotions I should like to call to their attention the following article which appeared in the March 24, 1961 issue of the Time magazine:

AGRICULTURE—SELF-SERVICE PLAN

In his farm message to Congress last week, President Kennedy sounded a bit like a doctor who, noting that the patient suffers from cramps and rashes after eating strawberries, advises him to eat plenty of strawberry jam.

Federal farm programs, said the President, are "drifting into a chaotic state, piling up surpluses, penalizing efficiency, rewarding inertia." Very true. But then the President went on to prescribe a big dose of the same kinds of programs: direct and indirect subsidies, plus entangling controls to cope with the surpluses that the subsidies help to create. If carried out, the Kennedy proposals would even extend subsidies and controls to farm products—most fruits, vegetables, and livestock—that are now normally outside the farm policy mess.

PLOWED UNDER

The kernel of the New Frontier proposals calls for establishment of a "national farmer advisory committee" for each farm commodity or group of related commodities. Each committee would draw up a "supply adjustment program" for its commodity, if it took a notion to do so. The turnip committee, say, would draft a turnip plan and submit it to the turnip growers. If two-thirds of them approved it, it would automatically become law, at the expense of consumers and taxpayers, unless Congress vetoed the program within 60 days—and what Congressman would vote against turnips if his onions might be in the scales next day?

In effect, the drafting of farm legislation would be lifted from Congress and given over to the particular farmers who would benefit from it—an approach not so very different from letting smugglers write the customs regulations. Texas' Democratic Congressman WILLIAM ROBERT POAGE put forward a similar plan last year, but the House plowed it under. The New Frontier version is likely to get plowed under, too.

The farm message stirred strong reactions. Holding aloft a copy, Minnesota's Democratic Senator HUBERT HORATIO HUMPHREY told a cheering convention of the National Farmers' Union, meeting in Washington, that "the President of the United States is on your side now. All I can say is, thank God—and with all reverence, thank you, Mr. President, for the farm message you sent us today." Some other remarks were less ecstatic. "Nebulous and rather complicated," sniffed Louisiana ALLEN ELLENDER, chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee. "A do-it-yourself kit for every farm commodity," hooted Senate Minority Leader EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN of Illinois: the executive branch "could completely divest itself of all responsibility." Argued Vermont's Republican Senator GEORGE AIKEN: "If farm groups can write their own tickets, some will ask: Why not let labor or industrial groups do the same thing?"

MOVING AGAIN

The President's farm message was of a piece with other bits of farm policy that had slipped by all but unnoticed in the crowded early days of the New Frontier. Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman's first major official act was to raise cotton subsidies, a move that drew jeers from just about everybody except cotton farmers. Pointing out that hefty U.S. cotton exports had been cutting down the cotton surplus, the Farm Bureau Federation's President Charles Shuman groaned that Freeman's decision would "reverse these favorable trends" by pricing U.S. cotton out of some overseas markets. Commerce Secretary Luther Hodges, his team loyalty strained beyond the breaking point, complained that Freeman's generosity would make it all the harder for U.S. cotton-textile mills to compete against foreign imports. Undaunted, Freeman went on to raise support prices on dairy products and promise increases for feed-grain crops.

In farm policy, in short, the new administration is getting things "moving again," but in the wrong direction, toward more rather than less Government involvement in agriculture. The record so far adds a special credibility to one sentence in the President's farm message: "We cannot expect to solve the farm problem in a day or in a year, or perhaps even in this administration."

And All Done Right at Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix a recent editorial from the Detroit Free Press which makes a very good point relative to the need, or rather lack of need, for Federal aid to education:

AND ALL DONE RIGHT AT HOME

A survey of school construction completed in 1960, claimed by the maker to be the most accurate ever made, knocks down the claim of Federal aid proponents that local school districts lack ability to build classrooms.

School Management Magazines, Inc., in a detailed study of 10,547 of the Nation's 12,343 school districts that have more than 300 pupils, found that 1,819 new schools and 2,137 additions were built last year. They provided space for 1,465,635 new students.

Further indicating that local school districts are not desperate for classrooms was a breakdown of the special purpose areas included in the national totals. These included the following:

Gymnasiums	1,224
Cafeterias	1,625
Auditoriums	764
Science labs	966
Home economics	783
Shops	806
Language labs	82
Music rooms	240

If local citizens can provide such facilities, the shouted-about need for an infusion of the same taxpayers' money under Federal guise and control appears tremendously overplayed.

Finland and the Free World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. BENNETT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, as one who has long been interested in the development of increased trade with Finland, it was reassuring to learn that this democratic country will be the site of a giant U.S. Government-sponsored U.S. industries exhibition in May. I understand that it is to be one of the largest and most impressive foreign trade events staged by the Department of Commerce in the 6 years of its program to sell American industry abroad.

On February 21, the director of the Office of International Trade Fairs, Walter S. Shafer, told a luncheon meeting of the Finnish-American Chamber of Commerce in New York that more than 100 U.S. industrial firms will participate in the first American Trade Fair in Helsinki, from May 26 to June 11. The fair, created around the theme of "Industry in the Service of the Consumer," will occupy 130,000 square feet of area in the heart of Helsinki and will be presented in a department store setting.

The principal objective of this Department of Commerce project is a worthy and timely one. It is to be the encouragement of two-way trade, together with a demonstration of the friendliness of the American people for the people of Finland, and the presentation of quality products made under our system of free, competitive enterprise.

It is of interest that the exhibit at Helsinki will feature: "Circarama," a giant, circular-screen color travelog of America; two modern bowling alleys with automatic pinsetters; the "Levacar," which rides on a thin film of air a fraction of an inch above a rail; and a large display portraying the widespread use of Finnish newsprint in representative American newspapers. Other exhibits will include appliances, household wares, musical instruments, television sets, a model apartment, cameras, and scientific development in various fields.

This American Industries Fair in Helsinki will demonstrate to the Finnish people some of our latest industrial innovations and our desire for expanded reciprocal trade between our two freedom-loving countries. It is pertinent, in that it helped to advance this latter concept, to cite the fact that an excellent editorial appeared in one of the most highly esteemed newspapers in this country during the period of our congressional recess. The editorial stressed the Western orientation which underlines the course that this vigorous Scandinavian nation has been following, and under permission I include this significant editorial from the September 29, 1960, issue of the Christian Science Monitor, entitled "Finland and the Free World," in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the International Management Digest, October 1960]

LETTER FROM HELSINKI

Prior to World War I, Finland's famed distance runner, Hannes Kolehmainen, literally ran his country onto the map of the world. The map has changed considerably since then. But until recently, the Finns have not bothered much about telling their story to the world—and especially to the business world.

Now the Finns are coming out of their Nordic hibernation. They are excited about the growing diversification of their economy; they are proudly pointing to new export successes in Western markets. You could see a changed Finland at last month's Finnish Industries Fair, in Helsinki. One-third of the space was reserved—not for the traditional forest industries—but for the metalworking industries. (Finlands' wood, pulp, paper, and board still add up to nearly 80 percent of total exports, and when bad times hit the forests, the whole nation suffers.)

Look at the progress in metalworking. Capacity has been expanding at a healthy 7 percent annually, providing today 17 percent of total exports. Mining, too, is assuming greater importance (note the new undersea iron mine off the southern coast, to be producing 300,000 tons of ore by 1962; a joint Finnish-Swedish venture will process the ore). Nor is the forest industry standing still—it is in the midst of a $340 million expansion, to be completed in 1962.

Growing production—in a nation of only 4.4 million—is making the Finns export-hungry. And they are getting results by following two business principles and an unusual marketing effort.

The first principle lies in specialization. The Finnish metalworking industry concentrates on offering paper and sawmilling machines, cables, electric motors, transformers, icebreakers and refrigerator ships, and materials-handling and earth-moving equipment. (Finns believe their rugged terrain has inspired some especially well-engineered heavy equipment.)

How successful? Kone of Finland supplies 50 percent of Sweden's harbor cranes. Valmet is building a tractor works in Brazil.

The second principle is to concentrate on the potentially good markets, in the industrial and semi-industrial nations, not so much the underdeveloped lands (the Finns have real difficulty granting extended credit terms). In the process, Finland is breaking its trade dependence on the Russians. For one thing, the Finns are tired of the caprice of the "purchasing agents" in the Kremlin; for another, they are meeting much stiffer competition from other Westerners in the Communist market. One big Finnish company, which once sold 60 percent of its exports behind the Iron Curtain, now reports the total is only 7 percent. By 1965, Finns believe that 50 percent of their metalworking exports will go West, compared to 35 percent now.

To market its machinery exports, the Finns set up Metex Corp., a private company linking 42 member firms with 87 factories and an annual turnover of $250 million. The roving salesmen of Metex have made contacts in about 100 foreign markets, and won contracts to build factories or supply major machinery components in 23 nations, from India to South America.

The Finns also hope their European trade may improve, now that Mr. Khrushchev has given his tentative blessing to Finnish membership in the European Free Trade Association. The price: a guaranty providing the Russians with the same trade privileges that the Finns would grant to EFTA members. Next month, President Kekkonen will journey to Moscow to start negotiations.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 29, 1960]

FINLAND AND THE FREE WORLD

As the struggle between East and West evolves, the battle continues to move further toward the realms of economics and ideology, and away from hot-war weapons.

But one historic military truism remains virtually unchanged: in the struggle between two great powers, the battlefield is often unwillingly provided by smaller nations caught helplessly in the middle.

One such nation today is Finland, whose role—unlike so many countries which have firmly fixed themselves in the world consciousness as "neutral" or "uncommitted"—is little understood by many in the West.

In a recent survey taken of some 270 United States businessmen, half of those queried felt that Finland is "too closely allied" with the U.S.S.R.; and about 60 percent felt that the Soviet Union is the primary consumer of Finnish exports.

The fact is that Finland (whose dependence on Soviet trade stems from crushing war reparations imposed at Yalta) has been gradually weaning its economy away from the Soviet Union. Today the Finns export more to Great Britain than to the Soviet Union, with West Germany coming up a close third. Exports to West Germany are expected to surpass those to the U.S.S.R. within 18 months.

All of this reflects a basic fact not yet generally understood in the United States—that Finland is a Western country with Western ideas, and Western orientation. While it is true the Communist Party is active there (made legal under the postwar peace treaty at Soviet insistence), the large majority of Finns have bitter memories of the Soviet invasion during the winter war of 1939.

These facts should help persuade Western businessmen that Finland, as a self-declared neutralist nation treading a delicate path between East and West because of geographic position, should be welcomed as an active participant in Western markets.

The Finns themselves are making a vigorous effort to bring this about.

The West should welcome trade with Finland, not only to help free that nation from dependence on politically motivated (and manipulated) Soviet whims, but also for the freshness and vigor which the Finns display in their design of everything from textiles to turbines.

House Committee Upheld

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit a letter to the editor which

appeared in the New York Times of March 11, 1961.

The author of the letter, Roy M. Brewer, is extremely knowledgeable with respect to the operations and techniques of the Communist Party and he has engaged in a long and courageous struggle against the Communists' efforts to exert their subversive influence within America's motion picture and other entertainment media.

As leader of a union of motion picture technicians, Mr. Brewer foiled a very nearly successful Communist plot to capture his union in the late 1940's and he has since devoted untiring efforts to alert members of the entertainment field to the dangers of Communist infiltration as well as to assisting those in the media who have been innocently duped into serving Communist causes. The article follows:

HOUSE COMMITTEE UPHELD—UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES GROUP BACKED IN FIGHT ON COMMUNISM

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

May I comment on your editorial of March 1 concerning the Supreme Court's decision upholding the right of the House Committee on Un-American Activities to demand answers from persons appearing before it.

I have worked closely with the House committee over the period of the last 15 years. Nothing in my experience would justify in any way your unsupported statement that this committee has been a disgrace to Congress. The extreme effort which the Communist Party is making to destroy and discredit the committee is evidence of the fear which the party has for the disclosures of the committee.

I doubt if there is any person in America who has spent a greater personal effort to hedp those persons who have been victimized by the deception of the Communist conspiracy than have I. No one has more fully recognized the necessity of separating the hard core, who are the perpetrators of the conspiratorial work, and the victims who make up the periphery of the apparatus, under the mistaken belief that they are working for civil rights and humanitarian causes.

PERIPHERY'S IMPORTANCE

But this should not blind us to the fact that the periphery is an important part of the Communist apparatus. Without it the Communist Party could not confuse and divide us as they now do. Therefore any disclosures which tend to break the line of communication between the hard core and the periphery group reduce the effectiveness of the overall operation to the degree that the real nature of the conspiracy is disclosed.

The usual cry against the committee is that it is maligning innocent people. Innocent in what respect? Innocent of membership in the party, perhaps, but not of being a part of the transmission belt that has sold much of the Communist line to America and the world. Such people are entitled to be treated as misguided persons, but they are not entitled to secrecy to the degree that the apparatus remains hidden and undetected in its operation. The people who are drawn unwittingly into this web should not be branded as traitors, nor should they be considered disloyal. But they should assume responsibility for their acts.

It is really the lack of understanding of the true nature of communism that has caused the greatest criticism of the committee. The public doesn't fully understand that one can really be a part of the Communist apparatus without intending to be; that one can serve the Communist purpose without being sympathetic to its aims.

ROLE OF LIBERALS

If the so-called liberals of America want to be worthy of the name, then they must assume the leadership against the most reactionary force in the history of the world—the world Communist conspiracy.

In the meantime it is our duty as citizens to help the American people understand the problem and to interpret the disclosures of the committee and other investigating groups rather than try to destroy them because we don't like the facts which they have disclosed.

ROY M. BREWER,
Vice Chairman, Council Against Communist Aggression.

Peace Corps: Sound Concept

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the proposal to establish a Peace Corps to aid the peoples of nations over the globe is a noble one which presents us with a great opportunity to promote the cause of freedom throughout the world. In order for this program to be most effective, we must exercise the greatest care in its organization and administration, and that I think, the new administration can do.

With these thoughts in mind, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial from the Times Picayune, New Orleans, La., which appeared earlier this month:

PEACE CORPS: SOUND CONCEPT

There is something contagiously attractive about the currently faddish Peace Corps that can make of the admittedly visionary idea a vital instrument of national purpose.

Practically every gibe and plaudit aimed at the Peace Corps has substance. It was indeed born of a campaign slogan. It may be turned by some into a lark. It will attract a proportion of starry-eyed zealots.

It is, of course, absurd to think of the Peace Corps as a brigade of willing youngsters leading the world out of its morass of problems, or to believe that all the necessary skills can be attracted without a stronger incentive.

But in its concept, the Peace Corps is a rare combination of idealism and the practical which are the essence of the American spirit. Careful planning is going into its organization. Equal care must be given its administration. While young college graduates are expected to make up the bulk of its personnel, skilled technicians and semiskilled workers of all ages and backgrounds will be recruited.

Its program will be coordinated with efforts of native governments and with projects of universities, foundations, and other U.S. Government agencies engaged in providing technical assistance to underdeveloped countries. The Peace Corps' role, however, will not be so much advisory or fiscal as it will be to show, by example, how to carry out the projects.

A significant feature of the Peace Corps' work will be to teach, particularly to teach the English language which is becoming an increasingly important tool for economic progress everywhere.

Thus its motivation might be idealistic but its projects will be eminently practical. Schools and sewers, health programs and agricultural increase, roads and dams will be its end products.

To this country the Peace Corps is at once a challenge and an opportunity. It promises only sacrifices but holds out rich rewards of experience and achievement.

And while it is a secondary consideration, the corps efficiently administered in Washington and ably carried out can create a welcomed residue of good will for the United States abroad.

The Impact of the Civil War on Iron Ore Mining in Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. BENNETT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as our Nation is now observing the Civil War Centennial, it seems to be fitting and proper for the Congressman from the 12th District of Michigan to call to the attention of the Congress of the United States, the impact of the Civil War on iron ore mining in Michigan. This impact had its origin within the district of the Upper Peninsula which I represent in the Congress. It so happens that the chairman of the Michigan Centennial Observance Commission, Prof. Floyd L. Haight of Dearborn, has appointed one of my constituents, Victor F. Lemmer of Ironwood, as the State chairman of the committee for the research on "The Impact of the Civil War on Mining in Michigan." Mr. Lemmer is a past president of the historical society of Michigan, and he is an industrial relations agent for a number of corporations interested in iron ore mining. Mr. Lemmer's article entitled, "The Impact of the Civil War on Iron Ore Mining in Michigan," was published in Skillings' Mining Review, October 8, 1960, and it has been said that the thesis is perhaps the first one of its kind that has ever been entirely devoted to the impact of the Civil War on iron ore mining. The following consists of excerpts from this historical document which is now in the collections of the Library of Congress:

THE IMPACT OF THE CIVIL WAR ON IRON ORE MINING IN MICHIGAN

(By Victor F. Lemmer)

"The Impact of the Civil War on Iron Ore Mining" may appear as a striking title for the story about a strategic mineral which, 100 years ago, was in its infancy as a potential product of tremendous commercial value to the welfare of our Nation. The Civil War was surely an era of striking impact. Prudent men were to strike it rich in enterprises resulting from staking iron ore claims, while others, too conservative to realize the future value of the nonglamorous mineral, found greater appeal in words like gold and silver, and in pioneers' stories of endless pine and masses of copper in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan. For example, the first two iron ore mining organizations, the Jackson Iron Co. and the Cleveland Iron

Co.) were originally set up to mine gold, silver, and copper.

A brief history of the discoveries of iron ore formations in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan helps to understand why the impact of the Civil War was the key timing factor in making a success of these mining ventures, which during the first stages of the war, appeared doomed to failure.

Thirty years before the Civil War, in 1831, Dr. Douglass Houghton, Michigan's earliest State geologist, began his systematic, scientific exploration of the Upper Peninsula. In 1840, Dr. Houghton wrote a report in which he stated: "Ores of zinc, iron, and manganese occur in the vicinity of the shore (south shore of Lake Superior) but I doubt whether either of these, unless it be zinc and iron, is in sufficient abundance to prove of much importance." Dr. Douglass Houghton had no special knowledge of the existence of iron ore in quantity, until 1844, when William A. Burt, a U.S. deputy surveyor, and his assistants, officially established the fact. The development of these huge mineral resources was largely due to the fact that the U.S. linear surveyors were required at that time to combine topographical and geological observations in their work.

Jacob Houghton tells the story of the remarkable variations in the magnetic compass observed by Burt's party on September 19, 1844, when the men were working in Marquette County about a mile south of Teal Lake—near the site of the present city of Negaunee. Burt's own invention, a solar compass, also carried on these trips, was unaffected. The surveyors looked for the cause of this magnetic disturbance and found chunks of glittering magnetite. On their map of this section William Ives, the compassman, printed the words "Iron Hills". Without the steady reliable solar compass the survey could not have continued, and Jacob Houghton said that "Old Man" Burt was far more elated over the dependable performance of his invention, than at the discovery of mountains of iron ore in that remote uninhabited wilderness.

The first location of iron lands was made in the summer of 1845, by means of a permit applied to the same lands on which the variations had been noted. The entry was obtained by men who had come to the area from Jackson, Mich. These men described the outcrop as bright and shiny, leading them to suspect that the metallic content would be gold or silver. Although the party from Jackson was in search of mineral, it was their hope that something would be found more valuable than iron ore. They ended up by forming the "Jackson Mining Co."

A few years after the beginning of iron ore mining operations on the Marquette Range, eastern financiers and "iron-works" owners from Pennsylvania bought sufficient stock in the Jackson mining operation to control the management of its affairs. These men decided that, as soon as practicable, the best policy for Lake Superior iron mines to follow would be to sell their ore to the furnaces of Ohio, and Pennsylvania, there to be made into pig iron. Although, in the early years ventures with forges and furnaces for the manufacture of metallic iron were moderately successful in the Lake Superior iron region, before long, it became easier and also cheaper to send the ore eastward. Shipping by lake is believed to have started in 1854. The ore was hauled to Marquette in wagons, shoveled on the decks of small schooners, unloaded at the St. Mary's River, hauled by wagons past the rapids, and then reloaded by hand into larger vessels and thus transported to Cleveland. There the ore was transferred to freight care and shipped by rail to the furnaces in Ohio and Pennsylvania. In these States the initial experiments with Michigan ore, in the blast furnaces and rolling mills, before 1860, served to prepare the new industry for the requirements of the Civil War. Furnace owners found the Lake Superior ores to be far better than local ores, and as a result the rolling mills were able to make fine quality boiler plate, bar iron, nails, spikes, suitable for the needs of the railroads, and for strategic war materials. In 1862 the American Railway Times made this comment: "Twenty years ago it was difficult to find a good American lathe, planer, or gear cutter. But all this is changed. American iron tools, as now manufactured, are of a very superior character." It was Michigan's iron ore that assured the economic and industrial success of the cities which manufactured iron and steel materials. Yet until the time of the Civil War, the history of all the Marquette Range mines was one of struggle and discouragement. However, the large requirements for iron brought about by the War, caused a demand for iron ore from the Upper Peninsula, which for the first time, made these mines successful financially, since they became a patriotic necessity.

The first regular shipments of iron ore totaling 12,442 tons were made by the Jackson Mine in 1857. These figures are taken from the official statistical table of gross tons of iron ore shipped, as prepared by Charles E. Wright, the Michigan Commissioner of Mineral Statistics. The report shows, however, that the Jackson mine had already previously shipped 25,000 tons during "years unknown." Accurate records were not kept in the early periods. The shipments by years before, during, and immediately after the Civil War, are of special interest. The history of the things that occurred "behind the scenes" is a story in itself of plank roads, railroads, successes, failures, organization, reorganization, management, mismanagement, intrigues, personalities, and eastern financiers, and their guests mingling with rough and tumble stalwart pioneers in the rock strewn wilderness of the Upper Peninsula.

In 1860, just before the beginning of the Civil War, three iron ore mines were in production in upper Michigan, namely, the Cleveland, the Jackson, and the Lake Superior. Gross tons shipped totaled 114,401 tons. The following year, which witnessed the outbreak of hostilities, the shipments dropped to 49,909 tons at these same three mines on the Marquette range. When in 1861 the immediate need of iron was greatest, production had dropped over 56 percent. This was no doubt due to the attitude of the people resulting from the feeling that the mines must close down to enable the men to fight to save the Union. However, in 1862, as need for implements of war, manufactured of iron and steel, became more and more apparent, the shipments of the same three mines totaled 124,169 tons.

Fortunately, the Bessemer converter, invented in 1856, proved to be vitally important; its success in the industry became a major factor in the upswing of an industrialism which had obtained its important spark or incentive during the Civil War. The first Bessemer steel plant in the United States was built in Michigan in 1864. Located near Detroit at Wyandotte, it produced steel for early railroads and steamships.

In the beginning our Nation was primarily engaged in agricultural pursuits. But now, as a result of industries brought into being by the Civil War, our material civilization took on new and far-reaching enterprises that were destined to create an American industrial revolution. Iron was king. Because of the war, need for ore was felt all over the Union. The Lake Superior district became very influential as this demand continued and increased in the years that followed. Abandoned mining enterprises were rejuvenated, and new ventures were undertaken. The ore was surprisingly rich and plentiful; the strength and tenacity of the iron and steel manufactured therefrom, surpassed all expectations. To the miner and the boss, big business extended a challenge to produce more and more. They accepted the task without question and the results appear in the glorious history of that particular era.

In 1873, just 8 years after the end of the Civil War, the annual shipments of iron ore from the Marquette Range totaled 1,195,234 gross tons. The shipments 20 years before, that is, in 1854, were only 3,000 tons. This shows very plainly that the impact of the Civil War and its aftermath on the use of iron and steel had been tremendous, and beyond the expectation of even the most optimistic industrialist. For instance, in 1854 only 1 mine was operating, but by 1873 on the Marquette Range alone there were 40 mines in operation. Even the panic of 1873 was merely a period of readjustment. Better years of prosperity were in the making.

The requirements of the Civil War brought about the realization that the movement of iron ore by hundreds of thousands of tons from the mines to the furnaces required steel railroad systems on a large scale. As far back as 1851 promoters broached a project to build a railroad from the mines to Marquette. This proving too difficult, the idea was abandoned, but immediately a plank road was built by the Jackson and Cleveland iron mining concerns with mules as motive power. In 1854 this road was replaced by an iron strap railroad. Finally, in 1857 an iron rail system was completed, where steampower replaced animalpower as a means of transportation. And so, already by the time of the Civil War, the iron horse had experienced a few years in the long haul to the furnaces and steel mills.

Added to the railroad improvements, in 1855 came the completion of the vitally important canal around the rapids of the St. Mary's River, the outlet to Lake Superior. In the years that immediately followed, during and also after the Civil War, the ship channels were widened and deepened through Lake George and the St. Clair Flats above Detroit. To carry the traffic, the Sault Locks were also widened, deepened and the capacity doubled.

As for the mines, it was not until 1862, during the Covil War, that the Jackson and Cleveland iron ore companies declared their first dividend. About the same time national banking laws went into force which tended to give stability to financial investments such as mining stocks. However, beginning with the panic of 1857, for about 15 years, the iron ore companies had difficulty in getting actual currency from the U.S. Treasury, due to the lack of banking facilities in the mining towns. During this period the companies issued iron money which was a medium of exchange in the form of engraved and printed paper drafts that looked like currency, but were made payable by the treasurer of the home offices of the companies. This ingenious idea enabled the operators of the mines to pay their workmen promptly. The local banks accepted the company drafts just as they accepted regulation Government currency.

During the critical war years, men became wealthy. Iron ore could be bought at $15 per ton at Marquette and sold for about $20 at lower lake ports like Detroit. The original sellers would often buy the ore back for $26 at the ports, and then travel to Cleveland and sell the same original ore for $42 a ton. Charcoal iron was being sold for as much as $95 per ton, and the clever "horse trader" was making fortunes out of an "iron horse." Tremendous price fluctuations resulted from heavy iron and steel

orders received from the National Government for railway equipment, as well as for cannons and ammunition.

An impressive list could be prepared of geologists, prospectors, "guiding lights," financiers, industrialists, and political figures, who should receive credit for their pioneering spirit and firm belief in iron ore mining ventures under the private enterprise system. These men, among many others, provided the leadership, the inspiration, and the "do or die" spirit, which have brought our Nation through many crises such as the Civil War. We must not fail to include a word of gratitude to the clergymen who as missionaries directed and administered the spiritual wants of the pioneers in the mining towns.

Where else in the annals of the Civil War was there a parallel impact for economic good and industrial development? The strategic part played by the iron ore miner is perhaps best expressed by a writer of that period, when he wrote in poetic fashion:

"The miner with his skill—
Nonglamorous his chore
Digs in with might and will
To get the iron ore.
The North and South can't kill
Near Lake Superior's shore
And ev'ry iron hill
Will win the Civil War."

The Procter & Gamble Program for Educational Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I received a very interesting letter from Mr. Bryce Harlow, telling of the truly great and important work being done in the field of education by the Procter & Gamble Manufacturing Co. I think this letter and the accompanying program are most worthy of the attention of the House of Representatives:

THE PROCTOR & GAMBLE MANUFACTURING CO.,
Washington, D.C., March 24, 1961.

Hon. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

In the light of current preoccupations with problems of education, it strikes me you will find the enclosure meaningful evidence of energetic business leadership in the same effort—surely, the kind of effort that ought not be lost sight of as attention rivets upon public participation in this field.

The support of graduate schools of education indicated in the enclosure is only the newest part of a Procter & Gamble program which also includes: 240 4-year scholarships; certain technical scholarships totaling about 30; payments to all of the 40 State and regional associations of colleges, including approximately 475 different colleges; $20,000 each year to each of 10 large universities, to be used as the universities may choose; certain special grants to such organizations as the National Fund for Medical Education and the United Negro College Fund.

The total being contributed has now reached $1,100,000 per year.

The thought occurs to me that this kind of voluntary, private support of education is about the finest aid to education our free system can produce. Many other business groups are similarly engaged, and a compilation of these efforts ought to be illuminating. Certainly, an accurate appreciation of such efforts ought to give perspective to those who contend that public instrumentalities alone have the ability and zeal to advance the cause of American education.

With warm regard,
Sincerely,

BRYCE N. HARLOW,
Director of Governmental Relations.

THE PROGRAM FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

The newest phase in our program of aid to higher education is grants to support graduate schools of education. Beginning in 1961, we are providing $15,000 per year to each of thhe following graduate schools. We hope to be able to continue this level of support for a total of at least 5 years: Graduate School of Education, University of Chicago; Teachers College, Columbia University; Graduate School of Education, Harvard University; Graduate School of George Peabody College for Teachers; Graduate School of Education, Stanford University.

These grants are in special recognition of the fact that the quality of education depends on the quality of teaching—on the knowledge held by the teacher, on his ability to impart this knowledge to others and on his capacity for stimulating thought. As these areas of teaching capability are expanded, education itself is moved forward. Advances here come principally as a result of research and of sharing the results of this research throughout the broad spectrum of the educational system.

There are relatively few graduate schools in the country which not only train teachers but which also, through research, advance the art of teaching. The institutions named above are among those which are providing outstanding leadership in advanced education. On a highly selective basis they train those who are to teach and those who are to teach others to teach. In addition they carry on broad programs of educational research, the results of which are available to all other educational institutions. Thus, in supporting these graduate schools, an important measure of support is provided to all education throughout the country.

These graduate schools have another claim to the name of "national" educational institutions. They select their students from all parts of the United States and from an impressive part of the rest of the free world, returning them after training to schools, colleges and universities throughout this country and abroad. For this reason also, it is appropriate that support of these graduate schools of education should come from organizations which are, themselves, national or international in character and outlook.

Finally, our support of these graduate schools is impelled by the absence of well-to-do alumni of schools of education. In some other fields, successful alumni are in a position to make substantial contributions to the institutions which provided their education. With only a few exceptions, this is not the case with those in the teaching profession, whose earning power is relatively restricted. Unfortunately, this is true not only for the alumni of these graduate schools but for teacher-training institutions throughout the country. This fact opens a special opportunity and justification for the exercise of corporate support.

As stated with respect to large universities in our university program, we do not suggest that only these five graduate schools of education are worthy of corporate support. Many others also make heavy contributions to teaching and to the improvement of learning methods. Many others, which do not do extensive educational research themselves but which translate the advances of others into better education of teachers, also deserve financial assistance. It is our hope that other organizations, believing as strongly as does our own in the essentiality of meeting the Nation's need for more and better teachers, will compile their own lists of deserving institutions and provide to them the support they richly deserve.

Amending the Reorganization Act of 1949

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 153) to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before June 1, 1963.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I support the adoption of S. 153 to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949 as amended. This law, when adopted will continue the same reorganization powers that were enjoyed by former President Eisenhower. As a member of the Committee on Government Operations and further as a member of the Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization, I have made some study of the history of this legislation since its original adoption. The power to submit reorganization plans has been vested in every President since former President Hoover was given this authority in 1932. I am happy that S. 153 retains the provision that a simple majority of either House may disapprove a Presidential reorganizational plan. I think that any step beyond that point would represent an undesirable accretion of legislative authority in the President. Indeed there are those who would say that we have gone too far in even permitting the President to submit reorganization plans subject only to legislative disapproval by a simple majority of either House within 60 days. However, it seems to me that in view of the swollen and sprawling Federal bureaucracy that we have today that steps are urgently needed to streamline, simplify and reduce the many overlapping agencies, departments, and bureaus of the Federal Government. I was pleased to note the other day in the press that the President had by Executive order abolished a number of moribund interdepartmental and interagency committees. I sincerely hope that this is a harbinger of the type of action that the Chief Executive will take under the powers given him by this extension of the Reorganization Act. However, there has been likewise some talk in the press that the President may exercise his authority under this act to superimpose new agencies or new departments, even some of Cabinet level upon the unwieldy structure that we already have.

As a member of the subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee

that will have an opportunity to examine the reorganization plans submitted by the President I want to take this opportunity to express the hope that the President will concentrate his efforts on the elimination of agencies within the executive branch and not use this power to create new and unnecessary Federal bureaucracies. I would also hope, particularly in view of the comment that has been made on the floor of this House during the last few days, that the President would not attempt to use his authority under this act to in any way interfere with the independent operation of the various regulatory agencies. I agree that the wording of the act is quite clear; that Presidential authority is limited to those agencies which are located within the executive branch of the Federal Government. This clearly does not encompass the independent regulatory agencies which have traditionally been regarded as an arm of the Congress.

In conclusion, as one who is a new Member of this body and new to the Washington scene, I have been particularly appalled at the constant proliferation of new Government agencies and bodies of all kinds. We had an example of that today in the House when yet another new position, that of Area Redevelopment Administrator was created. Unless this trend is halted the day will soon come when there will be more chiefs than Indians in this country. The powers granted the President under S. 153 present him with an opportunity to reduce the size and cost of the Federal Government in order that we can give some much needed tax relief to the already overburdened taxpayers of this country. I sincerely hope that he will use this act for the purposes that I have indicated.

Kennedy Housing Bill To Cost in Excess of $7 Billion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, on March 13, I presented to the House an itemized cost of President Kennedy's housing program based on his message submitted to the Congress on March 9.

At that time I noted that the total financial impact of the President's housing message involved an ultimate expenditure of $6.813 billion.

However, without touching on the merits of the specific proposals in the President's message I noted that only $50 million, or less than 1 percent of the $6.8 billion would be subject to the Appropriations Committee.

I would like to submit for the attention of the Members a revised statement of the administration's housing program based upon the legislation introduced in the House on March 29 as H.R. 6028.

The itemized cost is as follows:

Financial impact of S. 1478 (H.R. 6028), the Housing Act of 1961

[In millions]

Program	Grants	Loans
Urban renewal capital grants	[1] $2,500	
Planning grants	[2] 80	
Permanent open land acquisition	[1] [3] 100	
Open land for future development		[3] [4] $100
FNMA special assistance		[4] 750
Direct loans for elderly housing		[2] 50
Public housing	[1] [5] 1,943	
Additional subsidies for elderly tenants	[1] [6] 240	
Demonstration grants for public housing	[2] 10	
Community facilities		[4] 50
College housing		[4] [7] 1,350
Total	4,873	2,300
Total loans and grants	7,173	

[1] Authorizes contracts pledging faith of U.S. Government. Congress is legally bound to appropriate money in future years.
[2] Appropriation by Congress necessary before contractual obligation effective.
[3] Included in Kennedy housing message, but not in housing bill because of pendency of Williams bill, S. 858. HHFA will endorse Williams bill on this subject as part of housing bill.
[4] Not appropriated; Treasury withdrawals are noted as "public debt transactions."
[5] Based on HHFA estimates of subsidies to be actually disbursed with credit given for reducing contract subsidies through excess receipts at fiscal 1958 rate of 17½ percent ($3.16 billion would be maximum permissible authorization available under present statutory contract authority—$79 million per year for 40 years).
[6] Based on ½ of new public housing authorizations for elderly persons (Kennedy message).
[7] College housing loans have always been part of omnibus housing bills. It was requested in a separate message, although HHFA will still administer program

I note that we may now refer to the administration's housing program as a $7.17 billion program. This represents the total loans and grants, or the total moneys withdrawn from the Treasury should the bill be enacted. I note that of this $7.17 billion only $140 million, or less than 2 percent, would be subject to the Appropriations Committee. The other 98 percent would either involve loans from the Treasury or contractual obligations which will make it necessary in future years to appropriate the money, with no room for discretion or judgment by the Appropriatons Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I was most disappointed to read in the press that this bill has a price tag of approximately $3 billion. The reason is that the press accepts the Agency handout at face value. Yet, an inquisitive reporter, and I like to think that all reporters are inquisitive, would note that the administration was asking for an additional 100,000 units of public housing. Yet, the cost breakdown supplied by the administration contained no estimated dollar figure for the cost to the taxpayers of these 100,000 public housing units.

If any Member of the House believes that public housing costs nothing, let him look on page 323 of the Budget of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962 and he will note a request for an appropriation of $169,300,000. This money will be paid during the fiscal year 1962 to service the debt on existing public housing. This is an outright subsidy because the rental income from public housing units pays only the operating costs. Now, when the Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee goes into session to ponder this request for $169,300,000, it will find that it has absolutely no discretion in eliminating the item or even reducing it. The United States is legally bound to appropriate and disburse this money on the basis of contracts which the Congress authorized in 1949 to be executed in the name of the United States.

This is a glaring example of the lack of control of the public purse, control which the Congress has relinquished to agencies of the executive branch.

It is therefore utterly fantastic for anyone to label this bill as a $3 billion or $4 billion measure by not including an estimate of cost for public housing.

It is to correct this glaring defect in pinning down the actual cost, current and ultimate, to the taxpayers of these programs that I introduced House Resolution 115 which would require that all legislation involving the expenditure of public money be subject to the Appropriations Committee. I regret that the House Rules Committee has refused to let the House work its will on House Resolution 115.

Soon the House will have an opportunity to work its will on this $7.173 billion measure. I hope that at that time we can raise a standard for fiscal responsibility to which all men might repair.

Water Pollution in the Past and in the Sixties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Mr. Kenneth E. Biglane, appearing in the Louisiana Conservationist of February 1961, entitled "Water Pollution in the Past and in the Sixties."

This article, by one of the outstanding men in the field of water pollution control and the head of the agency charged with that responsibility in the State of Louisiana, makes some sobering points on pollution and the danger it poses to our people:

WATER POLLUTION IN THE PAST AND IN THE SIXTIES

(By Chief of WPC Kenneth E. Biglane)

The contamination of water by man's activities has been a problem as old as man himself.

The widespread sufferings of the human race caused by the defilement of his water supplies is recounted in every history book and it is doubtful that the historians recognized that along with the summation of all of the wars, all of the plagues, all of the events which were recorded to plot civilization, from the Dark Ages to the present, a story of water pollution was being depicted just about as detailed as if a trained ob-

server were on the spot. Man's habit of throwing refuse out of his dwelling to be digested by the world has provided archeologists with many "objects d'art" on which to base the development of civilization.

The remains of Neolithic villages in Switzerland, Italy, and Denmark showed them to be built on poles driven into the beds of lakes or ponds. These "dawn of civilization villages" were unearthed by the discovery of shell heaps, kitchen middens, and other trash which was merely tossed out of the openings of the crude twig huts. Certainly these lake dwellers must have obtained their drinking water from this same area of disposal. While it would only be of academic interest to know the prevalence of waterborne diseases among the inhabitants, it is doubtful that the incidents of these maladies were much higher then than now. Man's practice of refuse disposal into his water supply has not changed very much, just refined.

The mysteries of water were incorporated into the philosophies of the ancient Greeks. Thales, a displaced Phoenician and the pioneer of Greek natural philosophy, taught that water was the cause of all things. Later thinkers shifted to air (Anaximenes), then fire (Pythagoras), until finally Empedocles assumed all things arose from fire, air, water, and earth. Heracleitus recognized that "fire was the soul of man" and that "diseases arise mostly through water." A temperate man, he also made the observation that "the driest soul is the wisest."

The famous medical pioneer, Hypocrates, gave brilliant observations on climatical and geophysical conditions on mankind in his main treatise, "Airs, Waters, and Places."

History tells us that the builders of the Roman Empire constructed waterworks for domestic supplies and sewage disposal systems. History also tells us that the collapse of this great empire was probably hastened by the diseases and plagues which swept the populace who had carelessly allowed these sanitary systems to deteriorate.

Possibly because water is so commonplace, familiarity has bred neglect. Popular indifference toward safe and clean water prevailed well into the 19th century. Epidemics of waterborne diseases such as dysentery, typhoid fever, cholera, and parasitic infections were wheeled through Europe, Asia, and North America by the vehicle of water. These killers made no distinction between the rich or the poor. King Louis VIII, of France; Charles X, of Sweden; Prince Albert, of England; and Louis Pasteur's two daughters are said to have succumbed to waterborne diseases.

Aside from the silting of rivers from drainage arising from unwise farming practices, a new way to degrade water appeared on the horizon during the period known as the industrial revolution. Up to this point we have been discussing water contamination from a domestic sewage point of view; that is, refuse and excreta originating from man's domicile or home. Beginning with the industrial revolution and continuing to the present, industrial wastes from manufactured or refined products have created additional loads for the world to bear, particularly the world of water. Whitney's cotton gin, the stocking frame of the Lombe brothers, Hargreaves' spinning jenny, improved methods of dyeing, and the discovery of the bleaching properties of chlorine ushered in the textile industries with their great volume of wastes. The art of making paper has been known for over 1,800 years, but it was not until mid-19th century that man applied his full techniques of chemistry and machinery to mass produce this product. At the turn of the century there were over 800 pulp and paper mills in the United States, each using water and discharging wastes in tremendous volumes. In 1810, the pounds of paper consumed per capita was only 1; by 1947, it had risen to 344.

The chemical industry burst forward with the utilization of the Frasch process for mining sulphur. During the Civil War, an entire year's production of sulfur amounted to only 40,000 tons; that quantity is now the production for about one day. Sulfuric acid, the man-of-all-work was ready to go into the thousands of chemical processes, most of which require water and have a waste discharge.

The mass production of hydrochloric acid was discovered in an ironic manner. In the course of the manufacture of soda ash by the old LeBlanc process there was discharged into the atmosphere a steady stream of hydrogen chloride. On humid days, the neighborhood of such a plant was shrouded in a fog. Because of this air pollution, the English Parliament passed the Alkali Act in 1863 which forbade the discharge of such concentrated gases. It became necessary for manufacturers to erect absorbing towers, in which the gas was absorbed in water. The resulting solution was the first commercial hydrochloric acid and is probably the first example of a waste product which was saved and changed into a useful one.

What man discovered and learned to mass produce in the 19th century, he put to furious use in the 20th century.

Large-scale metal production and the utilization of Pasteur's food preservation techniques boomed the canning industry and more waste discharges.

Twentieth century United States was not yet a decade old when oil—black gold—was being pumped from the ground in ever-increasing volumes. Oil refineries immediately appeared on the scene, each using copious quantities of water for cooling, condensing, and process.

Without further citations, it should be obvious that the United States in the 19th and early 20th centuries was directing almost all of its entire civilized activities toward the production of finished goods and refined products. For all of his refinements, however, man had not much improved on the Neolithican method of waste disposal and all of his "objects d'art," domestic and industrial, were directed into the nearest waterway for future archaeologists to ponder.

Danger was ahead for the polluters, however, for in 1888 the Congress passed a law prohibiting the discharge of refuse in the New York Harbor. In 1899, Congress broadened its water pollution law to prohibit the discharge of refuse from ships and manufacturing establishments into navigable waters of the United States. It exempted liquid refuse flowing from streets and sewage lines, however. The Oil Pollution Act of 1924 was passed but referred only to shipping.

Prior to 1924 several States had passed laws for the protection of public water supplies and public health, but it was not until the early thirties that the hue and cry against industrial polluters brought torrents of regulations, rules, etc., into State legislature hoppers. It was at this time the tactics of industrial lobbying against all antipollution bills became an exact science. Some of these tactics are still used today in varying forms, but entirely recognizable.

In one State an antipollution bill was opposed on the ground that pollution was definitely a Federal and not a State matter. Just a few years later this same group opposed Federal legislation on the ground that it was an invasion of State rights. At about the same time, in a meeting of industrial representatives, a statement was made that "in a few years there would be no water pollution problems." Other arguments and reasons were advanced by industry, but always in opposition to whatever legislation was proposed unless it was regarded as harmless. In effect, water pollution became the subject of what could be regarded only as a controversy, with the general public, various sportsmen's clubs and commercial fishermen, nature, health, and similar associations on one side, and a large part of industry on the other.

The position of industry was set out in bolder relief between 1932 and 1942, for during this decade many sewage-treatment plants were installed and a great deal of pollution of surface waters by municipal sewage was eliminated. As a result, pollution by industrial wastes became as obvious as the dead fish in a stream.

Immediately after World War II, a majority of the States, and the Federal Government, revised, strengthened, or implemented many antipollution laws. However, the majority of these laws contain such vague terminology, complicated enforcement proceedings, and a tendency for broad interpretation so as to make most of them unenforcible by a water authority and, therefore, innocuous to industry.

Since 1956, the tempo of water pollution enforcement and abatement has been stepped up considerably. Public Law 660, passed by the 84th Congress, contained three important considerations. First, it provided for matching funds to bolster each State's water quality organization. Much needed equipment and valuable technical personnel were secured as a result of this section. Next, a provision to provide grants to municipalities to construct sewage treatment plants has resulted in a sharp national increase of these much needed facilities. Finally, stronger interstate pollution laws led to enforcement actions by the Public Health Service and began to clear streams that formed State boundaries or flowed in a polluted condition from one State to another. This latter provision has prompted many States to strengthen their entire water quality program so that they could better handle these problems without having to knuckle down under Federal enforcement actions.

Louisiana has materially benefited from the passage of this very important and highly successful act of Congress. The State has received and utilized moneys for bolstering the activities of the division of water pollution control and the Louisiana Stream Control Commission and for aiding municipalities in constructing sewage treatment plants. The first interstate enforcement action occurred between the States of Louisiana and Arkansas and led to the clearing up of Arkansas oil field brines from the Corney-D'Arbonne drainage basin.

Most authorities agree that those deeds accomplished in the water pollution control field during the 1960's will have far-reaching effects on the health and welfare of our country for the next 20 years. Because these are critical times and because water pollution is such a critical reality, it may well be that what we do or fail to do in the next 10 years will determine whether or not the United States starts the 21st century as the world's most powerful nation. A nation should do for her natural resources what her resources have done for her. Let not any summation contain the paraphase, "E tu pollute."

Chicago: Crossroads of the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, following is an excellent article about the city of Chicago which appears in the 1960

Illinois Bell Telephone Co. annual report.

Although Chicago may have its critics, this article points out some of the reasons those of us who live in Chicago still believe it is the most wonderful city in the world.

The article follows:

CROSSROADS OF THE NATION—AND ONE OF THE 400 HOMETOWNS WE'RE PROUD TO SERVE

Ninety years ago Mrs. O'Leary's cow kicked over a lantern, so legend says, and within hours, one of America's boisterous and promising young cities was mostly ashes and rubble.

Then a city of less than 300,000, Chicago has come a long way since that fateful October night in 1871. Today it is the crossroads of the Nation's transportation, a top-ranking industrial center, the commercial and financial capital of the Midwest, and hometown to 3½ million people.

Illinois Bell is proud to count Chicago as one of the 400 hometowns that make up the territory it serves. Since the opening of the city's first telephone exchange just 7 years after the great fire, the telephone has played an important role in the building and development of the new Chicago.

Actually Chicago is not one big city, but an aggregation of hometowns. It is the Loop and Logan Square, near North Side and Norwood Park, Beverly Hills and Bridgeport, Lawndale and Lake View, Austin and Albany Park, and dozens of other neighborhoods, each with an identification and character of its own.

To the millions who live, work, shop, or play there, Chicago is State Street and Michigan Avenue's magnificent mile, steel mills and grain elevators, Merchandise Mart and McCormick Place, Comiskey Park and Oak Street Beach, food processing, metal fabricating, and printing plants, Navy pier and the old Water Tower, ocean ships and a river that runs backward.

Chicago ranks high in the country's commercial and industrial life. It rates first in the world as a grain trading, furniture marketing, mail order, convention and trade show center. Within the city and its metropolitan area, 14,000 factories employ a million people and turn out $24 billion in manufactured goods a year. The area is America's No. 1 producer of a great variety of items ranging from diesel engines to candy.

Chicago, in the words of poet Carl Sandburg, is the Nation's freight handler. No trains go through the city; 20 major railroad lines converge there. In or out of the city daily go thousands of motor freight trucks and hundreds of passenger buses. Its two major airports are among the world's busiest. And with the completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway, Chicago is becoming the world's greatest inland port.

Few cities rival Chicago as a cultural center; education is one of its biggest businesses. As a group, its 40 colleges, universities, and professional schools and its more than 500 private trade and career schools offer one of the most diversified curriculums available in any educational center in the world. Its art, science, industrial, and natural history museum attract millions of visitors annually.

Chicago's pioneering accomplishments in city planning and in the arts and sciences are world renowned. Here the skyscraper came into being. Here was born the atomic age in 1942 when scientists at the University of Chicago achieved the first nuclear chain reaction.

In tune with the times, Chicago today is moving ahead. A great network of expressways is taking shape; blighted areas are being cleared. Handsome new office structures and high-rise apartment buildings are springing up, and plans for others have been announced. Total construction volume in the city in 1960 for schools, churches, apartments, public housing, commercial and industrial and other buildings came to more than $400 million.

What does it take to serve the communications needs of a city such as this? First of all, it takes skilled telephone people. Some 22,000 Illinois Bell employees work in Chicago. Their main job is to see that the 8 million calls Chicagoans make daily over the city's nearly 2 million telephones go through smoothly.

And it takes complex equipment, including 26 central office buildings, 3 major long distance switching centers, and more than 8½ million miles of wire, most of it underground.

Beyond our company's carrying out of its responsibility to provide Chicago with telephone service of the highest quality and usefulness, there are other ways in which Illinois Bell and the Bell System contribute to that city's general well-being. They include the taxes we pay, our payroll, purchases we make from suppliers, payments to contractors, public telephone commissions, and dividends paid to Chicagoans owning shares in our business.

In 1960, Illinois Bell paid nearly $24 million in taxes and franchise fees to the city of Chicago. This money helps to support the city's more than 445 public schools, its 168 parks, and its fire, police, and other municipal services. The amount does not, of course, include the taxes we paid to State and Federal Governments and to local taxing bodies outside Chicago.

In the same year, telephone company wage payments in Chicago came to about $135 million. A large part of these wage payments to employees working in Chicago is poured back into the city's economy.

In a recent 12-month period, purchasers from Chicago firms, of materials, supplies, equipment and services by our company and Western Electric, the Bell System's manufacturing and supply unit, totaled $70 million. Western bought from 2,800 Chicago suppliers, and the items ranged from mechanical pencils to motor trucks. These purchases provide jobs and wages for thousands of people in hundreds of businesses and trades.

Along with their everyday job responsibilities, telephone people throughout Chicago give their active support—many of them in leadership roles—to a multitude of civic, welfare and other community endeavors aimed at making their city a better place in which to live and work. Their record of generosity in support of Chicago's annual Joint Appeal has time and again been cited as an outstanding example for other employee groups in the city to emulate.

Both as a corporate citizen and as members of the community, we of Illinois Bell consider it a privilege to be part of Chicago, and to contribute to its social and economic progress. The fact that nearly half of all the customers we serve are Chicago homes and businesses points up the importance of this city to the success and prosperity of our business.

Kremlin Canned Crab Will Cripple U.S. Fishermen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, on previous occasions I have pointedly criticized the administration's recent decision to lift the ban on importation of Russian crabmeat.

Ignoring the questionable political soundness of the decision and by way of reemphasizing my previous criticism relative to the crippling economic effect the removal of this embargo will have on a vital American industry, I am including a letter from Mr. George Johansen, Secretary-Treasurer of the Alaska Fishermen's Union.

Mr. Johansen enjoys the confidence and respect not only of the members of the Alaska Fishermen's Union, but also of the fishing industry as well. Furthermore, there is no one better qualified to testify as to the serious economic impact of this unfortunate policy decision.

The letter follows:

ALASKA FISHERMEN'S UNION,
Seattle, Wash., March 23, 1961.

Washington State Congressional Delegation.

DEAR CONGRESSMEN: Recent newspaper announcements would indicate that the United States has lifted the 10-year ban on importation of canned crabmeat from Soviet Russia. We are strongly opposed to the lifting of any restrictions which may be in existence on Russian fisheries products.

As you know, the Russians are rapidly expanding their fishing fleets all over the world, and while we do not have exact information available relative to their North Atlantic fisheries, we certainly know that on the Pacific coast they are expanding by leaps and bounds. In the past 2 years they have greatly extended their fishing efforts. We look for a further expansion in the North Pacific waters and in the Gulf of Alaska.

In my last letter to you, I pointed out that this extension of Russia's fishing will be very detrimental to American fishermen because the amounts of fish which they will take will probably exceed 1 billion pounds in 1961, and in our opinion, will have a definite influence on the coastal stocks of fish in Alaskan waters. While they do have a legal right to fish in international waters, such fishing on an ever-increasing scale is going to soon call for conservation measures or else these fisheries will become depleted.

I would also like to point out that Russia's fisheries are a state operation, financed entirely by the Government itself and they do not have to follow usual business procedure in showing a profit on their operations in order to stay in business. It looks from here as though the only thing we can gain by lifting trade restrictions on fishery products from the Soviet Union is to encourage and help them to further expand their fisheries by providing a market for their products in the United States. We can't compete against a state-owned operation—we can't even compete against a private fishing industry located in a foreign country, operating on its own—because they are more or less subsidized by their respective countries. On the one hand, we are trying to make a living within our U.S. fishing industry, and on the other hand we are trying to preserve a valuable food resource that may become vital to our Nation in the future. To do this, we must have some help from the U.S. Government, but the lifting of trade restrictions on fishery products, particularly as far as Russia is concerned, seems to us to produce the opposite results to those we had expected to get from our Government. For these reasons we strongly oppose the lifting of this trade restriction and ask that there be a reexamination of the whole problem.

In 1956 when we set up the office of under secretary of fisheries and commissioner, we thought that this would give us a voice on a policymaking level. It is beginning to appear that the overall policy on U.S. fisheries is not working out as we had anticipated.

It still looks as though decisions are made within various departments without close cooperation between the State Department and Department of the Interior and without evaluation of what effect actions taken by the Department of State would have on fisheries as a whole. All we can do is try to explain to our representatives in Congress what our problems are and, of a necessity, we must depend upon you to bring those problems to the attention of the proper departments and the administration. This we hope you will do.

As far as the crab industry in particular is concerned, it has been one of the few industries where we have had an opportunity to sell our product on the American market at a price whereby the industry could show a reasonable profit. Also, it has helped us to build up this industry in the State of Alaska to a point where it has alleviated some of the strain that formerly was put on the salmon resource in Alaskan waters.

To a great extent, the crab industry has proved a welcome addition to the economy of the resident fishermen of Alaska. Inasmuch as we do not have too many industries in that State, the crab industry has certainly been of vital economic importance.

We have many fisheries resources in Alaska and on the Pacific coast which would be highly beneficial to the economy of the West Coast States if we had a market for them. Let us not destroy the markets we have but let's try to build additional markets by a sensible import policy that would allow us to live and let live.

Sincerely yours,

ALASKA FISHERMEN'S UNION,
GEORGE JOHANSEN,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Remarks by Mr. John L. Lewis, National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., Annual Dinner, March 29, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the speech made by Mr. John L. Lewis, president emeritus of the United Mine Workers of America, at the annual national dinner of the National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., on the evening of Wednesday, March 29, 1961.

It is, in my opinion, the most sincere and revealing exposition I have ever heard of the immense importance to our national life and economy represented in the coal industry of the United States of America:

REMARKS BY MR. JOHN L. LEWIS, NATIONAL COAL POLICY CONFERENCE, INC., ANNUAL DINNER, MARCH 29, 1961

Mr. Chairman, fellow Americans, I am going to be most considerate and not undertake to crowd the program with a speech from me tonight. I am waiting all agog like the rest of you to hear from the distinguished Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Udall; because as a public representative of great and far-reaching interests throughout our country, the Secretary of the Interior is going to be faced with many heavy responsibilities in the future. I am sure that throughout the Nation hundreds of thousands of our citizens are going to be waiting to read and appraise the views he may expound here tonight.

I only want to sustain and approve the factual things that have been said here tonight by our distinguished chairman, Mr. George Love. Mr. Love represents the largest coal-producing company in this or any other country, in the free enterprise list of nations. No other coal mining organization approximates the volume, or the magnitude of his interests unless we might say that the British Coal Board, might be a coal company. However, the British Coal Board functions by token of nationalization of the coal measures and the coal producing properties of the United Kingdom; whereas, here in America we are devoted to the principle and dedicated to the principle of free enterprise: investment for profit, reward for incentive, progress to permit the coming generations to participate in the bounties of nature and Providence in this great Nation of ours.

And coal is one of nature's greatest gifts to our Republic, our people, our institutions. It is the greatest of our national resources. Our coal measures contain all the values inherent in organic life, through the millions and millions of years it has taken for coal to form. Almost everything of organic nature may be found in coal. It only waits for us to develop formulas whereby we can extract and isolate those values and reap the reward in greater expansion of our economy, the greater advances toward the cultural objectives of our Nation and our people. It remains for the genius of man to make those values increasingly competitive and available for usage to the coming generations.

The problem of keeping our coal industry in adequate condition to meet the requirements of this Nation in the future is of tremendous public interest and of vast concern, not only to our generation, but also to the coming generations; because we have to demonstrate whether free enterprise as we know it, understand it, cherish it, can exist in a world facing the phenomenon of vast population increases in every land, with teeming millions and millions of people, heretofore oppressed, neglected, exploited, demanding a participation in the rewards of nature and the bounties of providence.

The question of coal runs to all the major considerations of policy now facing our Congress and our people and the present administration. It runs to the safety of this Nation in time of war. From day to day we may hope war will not come, but we must conclude that war at any time is a potential, is a possibility. It runs to the question of whether American coal, the greatest natural resource of America, can participate in the world markets based upon its ability to compete in those markets. That has been established now, in the past decade, by experience, because, as our chairman says, we have the greatest productivity per man employed in the industry of any civilized country in the world. And we can mine coal cheaper and lay it down in these countries for as high as $2 a ton cheaper than they can mine it in their own national measures in their own land.

It runs to the question not only of the balance of trade but it runs to the question of the stability of our gold reserves. And the gold outflow from this Nation has aroused the concern of many of our statesmen in recent months. It is solved not yet. Some years ago we pledged ourselves to peg the price of gold at $35 an ounce, an increase from the world standard of $20. The Commonwealths of the United Kingdom—the remnant of the British Empire—produces three-fourths of the gold produced per year. We have given grants and awards to various countries to increase their production of gold so that we could enjoy the privilege of taxing our people more heavily to provide the money to buy it.

And we have built them up through our aid to these foreign countries, as witness the flight of American capital to some of those countries now and in the erection of producing plants to compete in the world markets with our products at home. And we have added to and increased our national debt and the burden of it. The interest on our national debt today costs $17,000 per minute, according to a governmental report. And $10 billion or more must be expended in payment annually in interest charges on our outstanding Government paper before a dollar can be spent by the departments or the agencies of Government to serve the American people in their constitutional enterprises.

Yet we have reserves of coal for thousands of years to supply any conceivable demand of a greater and greater Nation during that period. The State of Wyoming alone has 121 billion tons of known deposits of lignite and sub-bituminous coal. And if necessity existed we could exist on our reserves in the State of Wyoming for hundreds and hundreds of years at our present rate of consumption.

This country is consuming oil and gas at a rate that some day may prove to be highly embarrassing. It is well-known to all that most of our refineries are located on the gulf coast and the Atlantic coast and are vulnerable to submarine attack with modern equipment—not the ultimate weapon. Our potential enemy has submarines vastly in excess of our own establishment and has been turning those submarines out in recent years—the conventional type—so fast that it has been a marvel to our technicians and our military men who study those problems. I hope we have not forgotten our experience with submarines during the last war. It was almost a miracle that we were able to devise a counterweapon that abated the submarine menace; because they were sinking our oil tankers in the gulf; they were sinking them along the Atlantic seaboard within sight of some of the luxury hotels bordering the Florida coast.

If that happens again, what will be our situation? We are geared to oil. Our transportation will be stopped. Our railroads could haul no coal to market even if we were able to mine it. Our economy would collapse. Our factories could not operate. Our available highways could not carry any traffic in trucks; because oil would not be available for the trucks, even if we barred all other traffic on the highways to make way for them.

These questions, gentlemen, of whether we are going to keep the coal industry stable, whether we are going to develop and exploit and utilize the great wealth stored in our coal measures; whether we are going to unlock, by research, more of the mystery of those components of coal, with all the organic values available, or whether we are going to let our coal industry dwindle to the point where it can no longer sustain or justify its investment of capital or pay reasonable returns on the vast investments—these are the questions that face our statesmen today; that face this administration today; that face every citizen of a thoughtful nature who has, at least, a small conception of our interdependent economy.

So we have formed this organization (NCPC) that the distinguished Secretary is going to address tonight. We formed it because of the recognition by every element that has to do with the coal industry of the stern, naked necessity of stopping the eternal caviling within our ranks and to use our collective energy with such knowledge as we may possess, in behalf, not alone of the coal industry but also of the future of this Republic of ours and its free institutions to which we are all dedicated.

My compliments to my colleagues in this organization, to its officers, to its boards and committees, to the participating organiza-

tions—to the 31 railroads that are represented here.

May I say this, just in passing, that in 1959 the railroads received for the transport of coal in excess of $1 billion. I do not know how much less that figure was in 1960. It was the greatest volume of revenue from a single commodity, greater perhaps than any other groups of products, aside from agricultural. The railroads are in desperate need of assistance to rebuild and modernize our rail transportation service.

There are those who are inclined to believe and think that the coal industry is obsolete. There could be no greater mistake. Coal is coming into its own again, through sheer, stark necessity on the part of the people and our integrated economy. Coal's troubles have been greatly magnified and increased by the depression that has existed progressively since 1958. Solve coal's problems and you have the answer to the distressed areas problem. There is no other answer. The Government can help; the Congress can help; the administration can help; the Secretary of the Interior can help; and the President of the United States, who is committed on this subject, can help greatly in his recommendations to the Congress and the public agencies having to do with this question.

It is idle to assume that we can entice into a State like West Virginia, or Pennsylvania, or Kentucky or any other State of magnitude in its coal production, enough consumer industries to provide employment for those distressed areas. And it would take so little coal at so litle cost to provide the character of employment for which the people are trained and upon which the industry and the social and economic life of the State is builded to provide for employment of those men trained in that vocation in the business of managing the mines and producing coal. And to the pride of the industry, let me say, that the coal industry has solved the question which comes up from time to time in discussion by economists: the question of whether or not a peacetime economy can expand sufficiently and provide enough jobs for each generation of young people who come from our preparatory and vocational schools and are asking for a participation in the future of this Republic by having a job available for them.

Next year, 1,300,000 young people are going to be available for jobs, on top of the millions now unemployed. We must solve the that question because increasingly our population, expanding as it is, is an urban population, quartered in the cities and the great centers of population and not on the land to the same degree that existed easily within the memory of all of us. And with this increasing population, this world phenomenon of increasing population, we cannot indefinitely hope to maintain public stability in our Nation if work is not available, if income cannot be had by teeming millions of the population, if these young people are deprived of participation in the bounties inherent in this country of ours. We will not be able to protect and preserve public order when children finally must eat or die.

If there is one lesson that Hitler taught the civilized world it is the lesson that food and shelter and participation are requirements that come before any other considerations, i.e., loyalty to the state, loyalty to the church. Hitler took the young people of Germany away from the German economists' theory. Hitler took the young people away from the church. And he created his mad device which has cursed the world since it was formed—bread, shelter, activity, and participation as an inherent and hereditary right of every daughter and every son of every citizen. So my fellow Americans, asking your pardon for wandering further afield than I had intended, I say that our citizens, our industrialists, our investors, our statesmen, our Federal administration will do well to see that this industry and all its values for the future are continually available as a constructive unit of the free enterprise system of our Republic.

Thank you.

The U.S. Treasury Is Losing Hundreds of Millions of Dollars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Will Clayton, of Houston, Tex., is a wise and thoughtful and very understanding businessman. He has served our Government well in numerous capacities. He is, I should say, an economist among other things—not of the theoretical, visionary, spendthrift school which is so much in evidence today, but of the hardfisted school of business, made up of men who have learned tne value of money by earning it and not merely by spending what others have made.

Mr. Clayton has been in the cotton business for a good many years. He has known cotton in good times and in bad times. Today he is uncomfortably aware of the fact that the taxpaying cotton business—his business—is being strangled and destroyed by tax-favored, cooperative competitors.

Along with my colleagues of the House Ways and Means Committee, I recently received a letter from Mr. Clayton, which I should like to insert in the RECORD. The letter says:

ANDERSON, CLAYTON & CO., INC.,
Houston, Tex.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MASON: In looking for tax loopholes, please give attention to the tax-free status of cooperatives.

If a cooperative corporation wishes to use its profits for expansion of its business (as nearly all of them do), they can keep the tax-free dollars earned by the simple process of issuing to their patrons little pieces of paper indicating the amount placed to the credit of the patron.

Since this little slip of paper has no due date and, in most cases, bears no interest, the courts have held that they are not taxable because they have no market value.

Thus, the cooperative corporation and its members escape completely the payment of any income tax.

No business paying 52 percent of its profits in income tax can possibly compete with cooperatives paying no taxes, as outlined above.

In consequence, one sees in the newspapers regularly notices of sales of businesses to the cooperatives to be paid for over a period of years with tax-free dollars.

The U.S. Treasury is losing hundreds of millions of dollars in this way.

This thing will surely be corrected one of these days, but I am afraid not until most of us who are in activities highly competitive with cooperatives have been compelled to sell out to them.

Sincerely yours,

W. L. CLAYTON.

I have only to add, Mr. Speaker, that adoption of my bill, H.R. 3550, will correct the situation at once, before Mr. Clayton and many others—not only in the cotton business but in practically every other business in the United States—are compelled to sell out to the tax-favored cooperatives.

Massachusetts Needs Development and Expansion of Health, Recreation, and Resort Centers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter which I received from Mr. Anthony W. Spadafora, assistant director of waterways for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and copy of his letter to the Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS, DIVISION OF WATERWAYS,
Boston, Mass., March 14, 1961.

Hon. THOMAS LANE,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANE: The need for the development and expansion of health, recreation and resort centers in our Commonwealth are undoubtedly well known to you. Therefore, I am taking the liberty of enclosing herewith a copy of a letter sent to Secretary of the Interior Udall, the contents of which are self-explanatory. The success of such a venture, needless to say, will depend on your unqualified support. We in the department earnestly solicit this, and assure you of our personal gratitude for anything you may do to further this program.

Respectfully submitted.

ANTHONY W. SPADAFORA,
Assistant Director of Waterways.

THE COMMONWEALTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS,
Boston, Mass., March 14, 1961.

STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Recently, the Boston newspapers carried a story from President Kennedy concerning the loss of billions of dollars in tourist trade throughout the Nation. As I recall, you also were quoted in relation to this matter. It is my understanding that these above referred to remarks of both the President and yourself were intended for the entire country.

In 1953, under former Gov. Christian Herter, all Massachusetts State beaches were placed in the division of beaches; subsequently, this division was assimilated into the division of waterways, a division under the jurisdiction of the Massachusetts Department of Public Works. Recently, I was placed in charge of the subdivision of beaches. It is the intention of my department to seek an appropriation from the Massachusetts Legislature for a study which would not only unify all public beaches under this department but consolidate beaches now under the control of the metro-

politan district commissions and the Massachusetts Department of Natural Resources, both separate and distinct agencies under separate and distinct heads with no affinity or identity with the division of waterways.

The intent of this study will be to coordinate all public beaches under one head not for only maximum efficiency but for a wide expansive development of many more miles of public beaches.

This is necessary in Massachusetts, because an expanded highway program without public beaches available to tourists is of little benefit to our resorts on the north and south shores, as well as to present and proposed State and National parks at or near the ocean's shore.

A further reason for an expanded beach program is to make available beaches now being absorbed by private developers, and thereby preventing public development for the benefit of all our citizens and tourists. From not only an economic standpoint, but in keeping with the new Federal policy of encouraging health and recreation, these encroachments on the public domain create an increasing danger.

It has come to my attention that the Department of the Interior, under your jurisdiction, is about to embark on a wide program of Federal financial assistance for the benefit of the several States along the line of our proposed study.

I have been authorized and directed by my supervisor to make formal application to you for participation in this program by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts through its division of waterways (beaches).

Naturally, outright Federal grants are the ideal and most desirable method of commencing such a program. Presently, the Massachusetts taxpayer is under a heavy financial burden. However, if such a program is not availbale from your Department, I can assure you of our desire to cooperate on some matching fund basis.

Since our legislative requirements must be acted upon within a very short period of time, I would appreciate an early reply to this request if possible.

If necessary, I can appear in Washington to confer with you or any of your aids and outline in person this program of expansion, and also, submit to you the results of documentary studies made of the tremendous possibilities for developments for health and recreation here in the Bay State. The favor of an early reply will be greatly appreciated.

Respectfully submitted.

ANTHONY W. SPADAFORA,
Assistant Director of Waterways.

A New School Aid Bill With No Strings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce to the House that I have introduced a new school bill. It is H.R. 6074 and would provide direct aid to the States for educational purposes only.

In previous Congresses, I was the sponsor of the so-called Pelly bill which would have returned 2 percent of all Federal income taxes collected in the various States to them to be expended by each State in accordance with its own budget. Based on Federal income tax collections, this bill would have refunded $1.1 billion without any Federal controls. No cost of Federal administration would have been involved. The only procedure would have been 50 checks from the Treasurer to 50 State treasurers.

There was one flaw in this proposal; namely, the fact that corporation taxes are paid in one State but the profits which are taxed are often earned in several States. States such as Alaska or my own State of Washington would have suffered because many big corporations have their headquarters in cities like New York, Chicago, Boston, or San Francisco. As a result, income tax returns paid in some States reflect profits earned in other States.

To make a long story short, I admitted that weakness in the bill and since the 86th Congress have sought to come up with a new and more equitable basis of tax refund.

My new bill, H.R. 6074, removes the inequity. It would limit the refund to a percent of personal or individual taxes. In other words, my new proposal is to turn back 5 percent of the taxes on income paid by individuals. It excludes refunding of payroll taxes under social security and likewise does not include any part of the income taxes on corporation profits.

Based on a breakdown of such taxes furnished me by the Library of Congress, I have estimated the annual return of taxes for education under my bill as follows:

	Amount
Alabama	$13,705,000
Alaska	2,080,000
Arizona	8,615,000
Arkansas	5,890,000
California	207,285,000
Colorado	35,255,000
Connecticut	38,095,000
Delaware	12,735,000
District of Columbia	14,588,000
Florida	34,400,000
Georgia	22,265,000
Hawaii	5,695,000
Idaho	4,070,000
Illinois	160,855,000
Indiana	47,475,000
Iowa	17,635,000
Kansas	15,220,000
Kentucky	14,385,000
Louisiana	17,915,000
Maine	5,305,000
Maryland	43,215,000
Massachusetts	64,700,000
Michigan	106,765,000
Minnesota	32,420,000
Mississippi	5,350,000
Missouri	48,015,000
Montana	4,065,000
Nebraska	13,270,000
Nevada	3,910,000
New Hampshire	4,755,000
New Jersey	63,980,000
New Mexico	5,865,000
New York	335,435,000
North Carolina	20,990,000
North Dakota	2,775,000
Ohio	131,885,000
Oklahoma	16,775,000
Oregon	16,770,000
Pennsylvania	138,960,000
Rhode Island	9,255,000
South Carolina	7,590,000
South Dakota	2,985,000
Tennessee	18,375,000
Texas	72,695,000
Utah	6,325,000
Vermont	2,165,000
Virginia	$23,685,000
Washington	27,755,000
West Virginia	8,095,000
Wisconsin	36,100,000
Wyoming	2,420,000
Total	1,961,180,000

Address by Charles Nutter, Managing Director of International House in New Orleans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to include the following address made by Charles Nutter, managing director of International House in New Orleans, before the Houston World Trade Association, World Trade Committee of the Chamber of Commerce of Houston, and the Propeller Club of Houston, on January 9, 1961:

ADDRESS BY CHARLES NUTTER, MANAGING DIRECTOR OF INTERNATIONAL HOUSE IN NEW ORLEANS, BEFORE THE HOUSTON WORLD TRADE ASSOCIATION, WORLD TRADE COMMITTEE OF THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF HOUSTON AND THE PROPELLER CLUB OF HOUSTON, IN THE GALLERY ROOM OF THE HOUSTON CLUB, HOUSTON, TEX., ON JANUARY 9, 1961

At yearend it is a time-honored American custom for newspapers, Government officials, and business authorities to review and summarize the departing year and gaze into the crystal ball for a portent of the future. We have just passed such a milestone and we have seen our experts agree that conditions in the United States are slow but face a brightening future. Within 6 months or a year we should recover a full head of steam.

The people who know about foreign affairs have told us, on the other hand, that conditions in vast areas and important but remote corners of the world are bad and that time is running out rapidly in the struggle of the so-called free world to hold the line against communism.

I believe that these two facts, so contradictory and disturbing, should warn us how far from reality we in the United States actually are living in today's world. Recently I attended a small dinner party where the guest was a world authority. The conversation ranged the world, touching on problems and crises in all continents.

At the conclusion of an enlightening if gloomy evening one lady remarked, in some confusion, that she did not simply understand it, she didn't see why things had to change.

Unfortunately I believe that this reflects the attitude of most of us today. We are satisfied with the status quo. We have the highest standard of living in the world. Business is excellent. Almost everyone is living well. We are relaxed, comfortable, happy. Why change? Let the rest of the world figure out its own problems; we should be allowed to enjoy the pleasant civilization which has been developed here for us by our forebears.

In another day and time our smug self-satisfaction might make sense. But unfortunately this is the year 1961. We are locked in a desperate economic-political

struggle for our existence, but many of us aren't even aware of that fact. The Pearl Harbor of this conflict, which we might as well call world war III, already is several years behind us. But as a nation we are not yet alarmed or ready to mobilize our energy and purpose for survival.

I accepted this invitation to come here today to speak on the communistic economic penetration of Latin America because I hope that something I say, and I say this as often as I can, might help a little to arouse us to reality and the brutal danger just around the corner.

The fact that we are so little aware or alarmed by the present conflict reflects the astonishing success of the enemy strategy and propaganda and the entirely unrealistic world which we, as a nation, have been living in for at least three decades. We have failed, despite many warning signs, to recognize the nature of the beast, the Communist enemy, which threatens our survival.

On the north shore of Colombia in South America there is a charming little city which once was the second most important city in the New World, next to Mexico City. Cartagena has some 40 forts, walls and moats surrounding it which now are nice museum pieces today. It was supposed to make Cartagena impregnable but it had the wrong defenses. Once it was taken from the land side by foot soldiers unmenaced by artillery aimed at sea.

We all remember the story of the Maginot line; it was easily turned and bypassed when the time came. I mention these facts to emphasize that attack doesn't necessarily come from the front or from the sea or from the obvious or expected quarter. It may come from behind as it did at Cartagena or it may come on an economic-political front as it is today in the world, thus making it difficult for people trained only to recognize military danger to understand the new problem of political or economic warfare.

The plain truth is that in our preoccupation with nuclear weapons, outer space, and material defenses and advances we have been lulled into a false and dangerous sense of security. We have neglected or failed to understand the twin dangers of economic and ideological subversion in our own vital areas.

I sincerely believe that the real Communist threat to the world is not a military threat at all. It is an economic struggle. We are vastly better equipped for this kind of warfare except that we do not understand it, and therefore are rapidly losing our superior advantages as Soviet economy develops and plans materialize.

I do not believe that history will forgive a nation and people which at the height of its civilization and economic advantages, prosperity and well being of its millions, allows or allowed an idea and ideology completely contrary to the best interests of humanity to sweep across the world to conquer and destroy the Christian teachings of 20 centuries.

Yet that is the position in which we find ourselves at the beginning of 1961. After more than four decades of steady advance international communism now has accelerated the pace of conquest and revised its timetable. I believe that the Communist architects of the Kremlin believe that much of Latin America can be won over to communism, as Cuba already has been won, within this decade or maybe even within this year or next.

I know that within the last fortnight trained writers and commentators have predicted that large areas of Latin America, as well as of the rest of the world, will be lost to communism this very year in the accelerated drive mobilized by the Kremlin. I believe that this not only is possible, but probable barring only one development—that the incoming Kennedy administration realizes that no problem, I repeat no problem in a world of problems, be allowed to take precedence over the redemption, salvation, and development of Latin America.

There is no question in my mind but that this is the No. 1 problem of the United States today either in foreign or domestic affairs. The loss of Latin America, already well advanced in Cuba, means the loss of our final offshore rampart against communism. We will have lost 200 million Christian people, vast wealth and economic opportunities, and the final hopes of free people everywhere.

This is not necessary but it is likely unless we adopt a crash program to redeem Cuba and close our American portals in whatever nation to the sinister and sinuous advances of communism. We can only hope that President-elect John F. Kennedy and the men around him in government do truly understand the nature of the foe, and do indeed realize that peaceful coexistence as preached by the Communists is a pious bit of Trojan horse propaganda, impossible in fact.

The truth is that we can no more live with present day international imperialistic communism bent on world domination than we can live with cancer. We must conquer it or die. The only alternative is to make Communist advance and conquest so costly and impossible that it will renounce world conquest and hold to present confines. This is impossible, of course, for should communism once be halted or driven back even a little it will disappear from the face of the earth far quicker than it appeared.

The idea born of Marx and nurtured by Lenin long since has been perverted by Stalin and Khrushchev into an imperialistic power grab based upon a false concept of human relations and values which if exposed and challenged would quickly wither and die. The trouble today is that, because we do not know what we want or how to preserve what we have, we allow a false but alluring concept in human relations to outmaneuver us and sell the idea, particularly in the vast poverty ridden and backward areas of the world, that communism is the wave of the future, the promise and hope of tomorrow.

What utter nonsense that becomes to any student of history or economics, to any traveler who visits the Communist regions, to any Christian, or to any enlightened human being. Yet we have seen this false doctrine grow and enslave a billion people, more than a third of all the people on earth and vast land areas of our globe.

The fact is that communism, wherever it exists, is not there by the will or consent of the people. It is there because the people are prisoners of brute force, power, and terror. It would change, overnight, even in Soviet Russia and in China if the majority of the people's will could prevail. This is the Achilles heel of the Communist conspiracy. We know it can be attacked and destroyed, probably with remarkable speed given the right set of circumstances.

Now I want to turn to Cuba, the danger and the opportunity it offers the free world and particularly the United States in these opening days of 1961. Cuba could become the graveyard of international communism in the Americas and the world; it could also become the capital and fortress of a Communist Latin America. What happens is almost entirely in our hands. We have a world of ready allies in Latin America crying for leadership and direction which we alone can supply.

Cuba today is a well developed Communist state and a glaring worldwide symbol of U.S. indecision, unpreparedness and lack of purpose. Castro's Cuba is a series of ghastly diplomatic, political and journalistic mistakes in the United States upon which we might reflect at length. But what is past is prologue and not my job to review here today. I know you are aware that there are in this country political leaders, diplomats, businessmen, editors and journalists whose judgment on Cuba was so bad that it could be treasonable if it was not so stupid but well intentioned.

So what do we have barely 100 miles from Florida's shores. We have a strong and growing Sino-Soviet fortress in the Americas—the Communist goal for a full four decades. We have a police state in which private property has all but disappeared, a state where 5 billions of Cuban and foreign investments have been confiscated without indemnity or hope of same, a reign of terror that has slaughtered thousands, imprisioned tens of thousands, and driven into exile a hundred thousand middle and upper class people who could escape.

U.S. investments in Cuba already seized and written off the books by American companies are 20 times greater than all the American investments expropriated and lost in Russia in 1917. The American investments lost in Russia when communism came were $59 million. Somewhere in the neighborhood of a $1½ billion of American investments already have been lost in Cuba, and a total of $5 billion of private property has been stolen from its owners in sugar and cattle holdings alone.

A traditionally happy and generous nation is torn by hatred and terror; its people living in misery and despair. Yet there are journalists and others in this country who today still doubt whether Castro is a Communist even after he has been taken over completely by the Communists who are mounting a military bastion in Cuba and who have fanned out to infiliterate and subvert all of Latin America from this ready, helpless, Red beachhead in our bosom.

Latin America is the prime objective today of the Russian and Chinese Communists in their plan for world domination. We know they have made remarkable progress in some areas through successful infiltration of the schools, colleges, labor unions and even the governments themselves. Their goal now is not a distant one; the Communists are in a hurry and they believe and plan to win now, even this year, rather than in some future decade. The acceleration of their new drive probably reflects their knowledge that a quick victory is essential. Time is not on their side now.

There is good reason for this. The Red tide is at the flood stage; the momentum is great. No one knows better than Peiping and Moscow that the forward impetus and power of this surging flow will not be recaptured if it is contained or lost. So the timetable has been advanced for the conquest in Latin America as soon as possible.

Russia now is spending a half billion dollars in Latin America in straight out-and-out ideological and educational propaganda. European-trained Spanish-speaking agents have fanned out all over this continent. The Cuban diplomatic missions have become the Communist general headquarters in every country. A daily hate America campaign is flooding newspapers and radio and television stations throughout the continent, and men's minds are being corrupted and inflamed everywhere down there.

This is true because of the very simple reason that economic conditions in Latin America are substandard and getting worse. The people in many areas are embittered and discouraged and are at the stage where change, any change, looks better than what they have. When people reach the "What have I got to lose" stage, they are ready for desperate adventures. They are grasping at any hope, even the false hope of communism. The personal per capita annual income of Latin America is $234 against almost $2,000 in the United States. In some

countries and areas there it is not even 10 percent of $234, it cannot be measured at all in money.

Much of Latin America is underdeveloped, it is poorly housed and too often poorly fed, transportation is virtually nonexistent in some areas and job opportunities are indeed nonexistent. Its economy usually is based on one or two products and export earnings hard to achieve. Adequate domestic industry too often is impossible because the markets are so small. All this in a really rich treasure house of natural resources.

Latin America desperately needs economic integration.

There are vast areas in Latin America where, despite the enormous natural but undeveloped wealth of the land, the living standards of millions ranges down to less than 5 percent of that in better developed areas. In a world where distances have shrunk through modern methods of communication, travel and infiltration, these great disparities are painfully obvious. Even primitive people now know there are better things in the world. And the great gap in living levels is widening. Despite all the bright new technological and economic progress of modern times there are more poverty-stricken people in Latin America today than at any time past. Economic progress has been slow or nonexistent in some areas while populations grow explosively.

Poverty and hunger, disease and lack of opportunity are not new conditions in the world. What is new is the consciousness of poverty, the realization that it is not the inevitable lot of man, the knowledge of better things elsewhere and the determination to do something about it, something drastic and unreasoned if necessary.

There is a vague but rising wave of resentment of man against his lot in two-thirds of the world, and all over Latin America. A ferment is at work that already has produced irresistible demands for a stepped-up economic and social change.

Political leaders, who aspire to popular support, must promise economic improvement. Failure to produce visible gains more and more is going to provoke unrest and bring extremists to power. Passivity, fatalism and renunciation are falling before radical new thinking and demands for change.

This revolution is happening now, instead of 50 or 100 years ago, largely because the miracles of 20th century communications, travel, the movies, the press, television and the radio have reduced the size of the globe and made people all over the world aware of the high economic developments of the Western world. What they see they want and this they will have; either in guided or misguided leadership.

Fired by a growing knowledge of conditions in better developed countries people are no longer content with the status of "the man with the hoe" and are not prepared to accept for long for themselves and their children a permanently inferior place in the world society.

All too often communism for desperate people in this explosive situation does not seem dangerous or faulty but rather a practical expedient by means of which a poor people can ruthlessly mobilize and attain economic and military strength and world esteem.

Is it, indeed, to be wondered at, that when such people are told the wonderful things that have been achieved in Soviet Russia and Communist China and are denied the facts that communism has not delivered the goods, they fall victim to our own failure to spread the truth and are won over by the transparently dishonest but well placed lies of the Communists? Our inability in projecting the real image of our country in contrast to the image the Communists spread is deplorable.

The Communist world is willing to promise anything toward fulfillment of all hopes. It will do this despite its enslaved people and their own low living standards. We know, of course, that such aid will be short lived or never given at all. But if it succeeds in extending Communist rule in Latin America the Kremlin will have won further victories in the battle for the world. Police power will hold the people once cornered under control as it has in Cuba.

Economic integration and development will come eventually in Latin America through our help and direction; or it will come through Communist rule. Cuba is the key. Our greatest mistake in Cuba thus far has been our failure to recognize that this Cuban revolution was not just another Latin American revolution in the traditional, classic pattern to which we have grown so accustomed and which ofttimes are not very important outside the country or area affected.

We failed to recognize that Castro's revolution meant that communism had come to Cuba in the guise of an economic revolution; that Castro was the American Lenin in sheep's clothing who stole the people's hopes and turned Cuba over to the international conspiracy. The revolutions that come after Cuba and which the Kremlin is plotting will follow this same pattern if we permit it; if we do not find the way to redeem Cuba and bring it back into the free world. Whatever the price for restoration of Cuban freedom, it must be paid.

This is by no means a simple or easy task. Indeed it seems almost a desperate problem because the Communists, Russian, and Chinese, have entrenched themselves in Cuba, politically and militarily. Tens of thousands of Communists have taken over in Cuba and now control. Castro is not going to fall because of broken diplomatic relations even by all the Latin American nations. He is not going to fall through economic sanctions because Cuba is worth a substantial Communist investment in men and money. And this will be made. Russia and China will not surrender Cuba except through force; it is too valuable and important to them.

It should be clear that Castro may go, as everyone predicts, but he will be followed by worse. The sheep's clothing will disappear in the transition and we will see raw communism in Cuba. A Spanish-type civil war or another Korea may eventually transpire if Cuba is to be saved; you may be sure it will be by force of arms either from within or without. And it will be a desperate struggle that could take months or years. Castro has already promised to reduce Cuba to ashes if he meets any opposition.

But nothing short of restoration of Cuban freedom will suffice. For so long as Cuba is Communist, Latin America will be endangered by communism.

I believe that if we ever turn the tide of communism in Cuba, as we should have done in Hungary nearly 5 years ago, the ebbtide of communistic disillusionment will sweep this menace back from Asia and Latin America, and Africa and Europe and may eventually liberate Russia itself where the Russians have endured but never embraced economic slavery as practiced by the Kremlin. Revolution will never come to Russia from within but it might sweep the Soviet Union from without. The Soviet Union is no true union of states at all; it is a union held intact by power and terror.

Communism is so patently specious, so brutally inhuman, so unsatisfactory economically, so junglelike in its concept and so antichrist in its practice that if we believe in Christ, in peace, in the brotherhood of man and a world of law, order and equal opportunity we must believe that communism will fail.

The road will be hard and long; the Communists have a tremendously productive machine and the slavelike labor of nearly a billion people to feed their expansion plans; they are resourceful, they know what they want; they are controlled by a small disciplined dictatorship and they will follow any means to an end.

But the weakness of communism is its falseness and its inability to deliver its promises, and its effort to uproot and change human nature.

The first great defeat of the Communists anywhere may be the last battle of this war, since communism cannot stand great reverses. The present victims of communism will become the shocktroops that will sweep this system from the earth, because it is hated and feared by its victims and prisoners.

Our weakness in dealing with communism is our division of opinion in the Western World, lack of authoritarian command, failure to grasp the real significance of communism or our evaluation of it in idealistic terms or principles instead of hard and harsh realism, and a general belief that somehow we can live with communism.

Too often our people appear panicked by Soviet purpose and resolve. They seem to be desperately anxious to take the Communists at their word whenever peaceful coexistence, disarmament, entente and trade are mentioned. The Soviet campaign against the free world is based primarily against the United States which it seeks to isolate, morally and physically.

The Communists hope to upset Latin American economy to the point that our investments and interest would decline and the countries there would fall into the Soviet orbit. The Soviets will support and bolster Cuba as an example and showcase for leftish elements elsewhere in Latin America, and the influence of these elements has always been obvious in the very gingerly manner in which most Latins have dealt with the Cuban problem.

This cautious approach and the time lost because of it has further benefited the Communists in fortifying the Cuban arsenal economically and using it as a base of supply to subvert Venezuela, Central American countries, Brazil, Ecuador, Bolivia, and many other areas in South America.

If democracy and so called free enterprise has the right to survive it also has a stern duty. And that duty is to turn back and destroy the international menace of imperialistic communism. Truth and determination are the weapons we need to use.

We all know that change is inevitable. Today we are the richest, most highly developed Nation on earth, and we are not even 200 years old. But we have no guarantee or contract of remaining so. Three centuries ago Spain was the richest, most powerful nation on earth; but it passed its zenith. Brittania once ruled the waves. Rome, France, and a dozen other nations and civilizations which come readily to mind have tasted great glory no longer enjoyed.

Already some people see in our civilization the seeds of destruction. We have no right to survive unless we can prove and defend our right. And you may be sure that we cannot long live on the lofty plateau of relaxed prosperity while billions flounder hopelessly in the jungle of economic chaos.

Turning communism back, and I believe this can be done much easier than it seems, is not enough. We must rescue Latin America from its economic entrapment. And this could be vastly profitable because the thing most needed in Latin America is capital to develop raw resources which the world needs.

In a sense Cuba went communistic because a vacuum was created there and we allowed the Communists to fill it; this must not happen elsewhere in Latin America.

I sincerely hope that our new administration in Washington will not repeat the mistakes of the past three administrations in thinking that the Unied States can deal with communism and survive.

The United States is the only strong threat and obstacle to Communist domination of the world. Therefore it is the principal target of communism. This battle cannot and never will be compromised; it will only be won or lost. This is a bitter, stern fact we must face.

True understanding of communism and action by our national leaders is our only hope for survival. Let us pray they will have this understanding.

Area Redevelopment Act

SPEECH
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 1) to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment in certain economically distressed areas.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for the support which the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], chairman of the subcommittee, has given to my amendment and also for the support of the distinguished chairman of my own Committee on Armed Services, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

This is the amendment to which I referred in general debate a moment ago. It is an amendment designed to insure that on the basic issue of unemployment the right hand of our Government will know what the left hand is doing, and attempt to coordinate with it.

S. 1 is legislation designed to deal with the problem of unemployment. I am sure that the overwhelming majority of the Members of this House feel that there is an urgent need for us to do something to alleviate the suffering being caused around the Nation by unemployment, particularly in areas which are critically and chronically affected. In fact, action to relieve unemployment has been one of the central objectives of this administration, and it has also been one of the central objectives of this Congress, as is amply demonstrated by the No. 1 given to this legislation in the other body.

But Mr. Chairman, as was made abundantly clear only yesterday in the President's special message on the Defense Department budget, action has been taken or will soon be taken in many areas of our country by one important agency of this Government which will seriously aggravate the whole problem of unemployment we are trying to alleviate in this bill. Whether we like it or not, the Department of Defense is one of the major employers in the Nation, employing not only men and women in uniform but also vast numbers of civilian men and women as well. Any major reduction in defense operations is bound to have important consequences on local and national unemployment, particularly where these installations represent a major part of the overall employment in the area. Any serious reduction or disestablishment of a major defense installation in an area of serious unemployment, in other words, can turn this area into an unemployment disaster area or into a redevelopment area as defined by this bill virtually overnight. We ought to try not to let this happen.

On yesterday the President's message announced the fact that in the near future, perhaps within the next 24 hours, would come an announcement of the deactivation of some 73 military installations here and abroad. I have no way of knowing which installations are included on this list, of course, but I am sure that every Member of this House who represents a district in which some military installation is located recognizes what the drastic reduction or the complete closedown of the installation of his district could mean in terms of added unemployment in his area.

Does it make sense for us to pass a bill today authorizing the appropriation of hundreds of millions of dollars to aid unemployment, and at the same time say or do nothing about actions being taken by some other agency of Government which could seriously aggravate the unemployment problem?

There has been talk in the Air Force, for example, in my home State of New York, of closing down the Air Materiel Area at the Griffiss Air Force Base in Rome, commonly referred to as Roama, with a consequent loss of 6,200 jobs. Fortunately, in response to pleas of members of the New York State congressional delegation on both sides of the aisle, the Air Force has now agreed to defer any final decision on this projected closedown, as my distinguished colleague and friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE], has already mentioned in the general debate, for at least 6 months. But it is already clear what the devastating economic impact of this decision, if it should eventually be taken by the Air Force, would be. The Utica-Rome area is already an area of major unemployment. The loss of 6,200 jobs, a very substantial percentage of the total employment of the whole area, would turn this community, which has been struggling for years to combat unemployment, overnight into a major disaster area.

Surely there is something which can and should be done to try to prevent this sort of a development. Surely the decisions of the Defense Department cannot be considered completely in a vacuum, without any regard for their impact on the civilian economy of the Nation we are addressing ourselves to here. Surely it is not asking too much to ask that the actions of one agency of Government should be considered in the light of policies and programs being followed by other agencies. Surely there must be some overall coordination even in a Government as huge and as unwieldy as our own.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, it would not be in order under the rules, in the case of a bill which deals with unemployment areas and places certain obligations and responsibilities upon the Secretary of Commerce, to offer an amendment which would direct certain actions on the part of the Department of Defense or the Secretary of Defense. Such an amendment would not be germane to the bill, although perhaps the most direct way to deal with this serious problem would be with legislation of that kind. But the amendment which I am offering is directed only to the Secretary of Commerce and to the subject with which this legislation specifically deals. It is, as a matter of fact, very similar to an amendment offered in the other body the other day by the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana, Mr. Long, and which failed of adoption there, according to my information, by only a very narrow margin, and after it had been perfected and improved in its form as a result of rather general discussion in the other body over a period of 2 days.

Mr. Chairman, the present wording of section 27 of S. 1 is in my judgment not really adequate to meet the situation to which I have been referring. In particular, it deals to facilities or bases which have already been phased out or which are not now being fully utilized, whereas the big problem which will be facing most of our districts is the problem of preventing the increased impact on unemployment that will be caused by the closing of the 73 bases to which the President has referred, as well as other closings which may well be coming along in the future. For this reason, I am offering my amendment as a substitute to section 27.

Briefly, my amendment would call on the Secretary of Commerce, whenever the Defense Department announces plans to deactivate a military installation or whenever it is in the process of deactivating a military installation in an area which is suffering from serious unemployment, defined as 6-percent unemployment or more, to look into the overall economic consequences of this action. Under my amendment this study would not be made frivolously or even automatically, but only upon application by the governor or governors of the State or States directly affected by the closedown. The Secretary of Commerce would be authorized to look specifically into all of the costs to the Government involved in these deactivations, whether a full base or a major part of a base, as in the case of the Air Materiel Area at Rome, N.Y. The Secretary would examine, for example, what additional costs might be incurred by other branches of the Federal Government and by local governments, costs such as the relocation of families, defaulting on FHA mortgages, increased outflow of unemployment compensation, costs of moving equipment and families, and costs of retraining new workers. This study, with all of these economic facts set forth and with a full description of the impact on the local economy, and with appropriate recommendations, would then be made available to the Congress and also to the Secretary of Defense.

My amendment cannot properly go beyond that in this legislation, because in this bill we cannot of course direct the Secretary of Defense to do anything. But the economic information developed by the Secretary of Commerce under my amendment would, I am sure, have tremendous impact on the final decision reached in the Defense Department. Surely it would be difficult for the Department to proceed if the facts of a closedown motivated by economy proved to involve greater overall expenses, or if the impact on unemployment was tremendously severe. The spotlight of publicity in this case, in other words, would serve as a great moral if not a legal persuader.

Mr. Chairman, I believe my amendment represents the very least that we in this House can do to insure that whatever actions may be taken by the Defense Department in the next few months will, insofar as humanly possible, not be taken in such a way as to aggravate the total unemployment problem to which this very important legislation is addressed. Unless the jobs which we are attempting to create in this legislation through the front door are effectively prevented from slipping rapidly away out the back door, we will not have accomplished what we hope to accomplish in passing the committee bill.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of my amendment.

Confederate Flag Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DALE ALFORD

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, the General Assembly of the State of Arkansas, in its session in 1957, adopted, and the Governor signed, act No. 124, designating the Saturday before Easter of each year as Confederate Flag Day.

I have heartily commended this action in the past, and I now call national attention to the fact that this observance falls upon Saturday of this week. On that occasion, members of the United Daughters of the Confederacy in all parts of the State of Arkansas will not only make patriotic display of the glorious Stars and Bars of the Confederacy, but also plan to distribute miniature copies of the flag to the citizenry in general.

This exemplary action by a dedicated group of southern patriots is entitled to the applause of all those who cherish the memory and the ideals of the Confederacy. I am proud and happy to join in this salute.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

The Crusade for Democracy in the Western Hemisphere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, Luis A. Ferre, business, political, and civic leader of Puerto Rico, has made a real contribution to current discussions of Latin American policy in a paper entitled "The Crusade for Democracy in the Western Hemisphere." Under leave granted, I include it with my remarks and urge its consideration by all who are interested in this most important problem:

THE CRUSADE FOR DEMOCRACY IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

(A program for action by Luis A. Ferre, partner, Ferre Enterprises, Ponce, P.R.)

There are many contradictions in the U.S. relations with Latin America. The people of the United States are free and enjoy all the benefits of democratic government. And our country is rich, too. We have the greatest productive machine in the history of the world and we have bolstered our economic system by a whole complex of social safeguards, including minimum wages, social security benefits, FHA home construction loans, free education, and many others.

And yet we have complacently acquiesced while our sister republics south of the Rio Grande continue enmeshed in the old social system—exploitation and economic tyranny. What is worse, our own capital investments have many times unwittingly contributed to the perpetuation of that system. Thus, even though we condemn and punish governmental corruption where we find it in the United States, we have felt no compunctions in dealing with corrupt governments in Latin America. As a result we have seemed to condone the economic oligarchies and the military strongmen these regimes have represented.

This sort of inconsistency has provided a veneer of plausibility to communistic propaganda here in the Americas and facilitated the penetration of our hemisphere by Communist agents. There is no difficulty in finding an example; Castro's Cuba is only minutes away from both Florida and Puerto Rico.

Of course, some of the advantages that our tacit acceptance of social injustice provided the Communists have now been undone by Castro. The slogan "To the wall" epitomizes the violence and mob hysteria that has characterized the Cuban regime. The lesson is unmistakably sinking in with the people of this hemisphere.

And Fidelism has certainly helped to open the eyes of the people of the United States, too. We were not ignorant of Communist oppression before. We had read of the way in which Poland, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Bulgaria, Rumania and, most poignantly, Hungary were crushed.

But that seemed remote, somehow. It did not fully register in our minds. Dictatorship is now right on our doorstep, however. Thus, once the haven for Europeans fleeing Old World despotism, our hemisphere now harbors the worst sort of Communist police state. Tyranny, we see, is not a phenomenon of time or geographic situation; unfortunately, it is contained in the very nature of man.

The feeling of isolation which gave all the Americas a sense of security has been shattered by Castro. The barbarians are literally at our gates. Our mission is like that of Charles Martel who fought off the Moors at Tours. This is no mere historical flourish; I deeply believe that the threat to the survival of Western civilization is now precisely as grave as it was in A.D. 732.

What can we do? As the first imperative, we must not any longer accept the defeatist notion that democratic institutions cannot be adapted for use by all peoples. That simply is not true.

Instead, we must convince the people of the world (and certainly of Latin America) that representative democracy is, as Winston Churchill put it, "the best form of government ever devised by man to guarantee his fundamental freedom and to insure his material progress." We must put it across that, given the proper training, any people can and will learn to thrive under democratic institutions. And, basic to all, we must win recognition for the fact that only government "of the people, by the people and for the people" can safeguard against the sort of authoritarianism that has made this a century of war and now threatens a new outbreak that might end civilization and literally vaporize mankind.

But how can we convert this general approach into a working program?

As a first step I urge that we combine with all our fellow members of the Organization of American States and establish a Pan American code.

The cornerstone upon which such a code should be founded would be a prohibition against the creation of any government in our hemisphere that is not some form of representative democracy. A basic requirement, therefore, would be regular—and absolutely free—elections. Possibly, the code would go as far as laying down some formula under which the OAS would supervise such elections.

Indispensably, the code would also commit the nations to economic progress for all classes. Necessary steps would include:

1. A Common Market, in which tariffs and other trade barriers are gradually reduced as wages are increased.

2. A Pan American Loan Fund to finance economic development (a great part of the capital would, of course, come from the United States, and we should insist upon the same sort of self-help system among the recipients that crowned the success of the Marshall plan).

3. Regional minimum wages, to be attained within a fixed period of time, say 10 years. This phase of the code program should be supervised by regional boards that would review the minimum standards periodically and raise them in line with the gains scored in productivity (which should be considerable thanks to the adoption of better production techniques and the economic stimulation of the Common Market).

4. A minimum standard of social protection, establishing the rights of unionization and collective bargaining; workman's compensation; maximum hours of work per week and per day; the employee's right to regular vacations with pay; unemployment insurance; social security and all other basic social benefits.

The encouragement of private investment (the U.S. Government should help in this by guaranteeing private investments by U.S. entrepreneurs against unlawful and willful expropriation or blocking of currency, provided these investors are willing to permit local participation in their Latin American ventures equaling at least 40 percent of total capital).

6. Special tax treatment by host countries (and by the United States) on profits returned to the United States where the entrepreneur has assumed leadership in the payment of higher wages and broader fringe benefits.

7. A progressive income tax—the foundation of an equitable tax policy—to be established in all countries. The code would prescribe minimum standards.

8. Standards on public education, sanitation and health, norms to be determined in terms of minimum percentages of national budgets to be appropriated to these purposes.

9. An FHA system for all those acceding to the code in order to spur homebuilding throughout the hemisphere.

10. Pan American cultural centers for the various nations, to be financed from a common fund, with the objective of stimulating the exchange of students throughout the Americas.

This is a practical plan. It would work. And, I am convinced, it can be attained. By it, we shall be able to strike a massive blow against poverty, tyranny, and prejudice.

But there is no value in merely spinning out 10-point programs. Instead, we must all go to work—energized by the huge need that exists and by our moral obligation to extend the frontiers of freedom to all the peoples of the world.

This is another hour of trial for the human spirit. We must recognize that either the whole world will be free, or it will inevitably be wholly slave. Establishing the Pan American code for a stronger Western Hemisphere can help us tip the world balance toward freedom.

Medical Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 3, 1961

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, on January 27, the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] delivered before the Harvard Medical Society, at Boston, Mass., a speech entitled "Medical Care for the Aged." Because of the importance of the speech and its interesting content, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

(Speech by Senator BENNETT on January 27, 1961, Harvard Medical School, Boston, Mass.)

It is good to be with you today to discuss some of the problems pertaining to medical care for the aged. It is rather an unusual situation in 1961 for someone to be coming from Washington to Harvard. The trend in recent weeks has certainly been quite the reverse. However, I appreciate the invitation which was extended to me by Dr. Peterson to meet with you and give you some of my views on this important problem.

The problem of medical care for the aged has been with us for many years. However, the problem has only come to the forefront as a political issue during the past two Congresses. The length of the working life and the number of years an individual spends in retirement have increased tremendously since 1900. The average number of years an American male could expect to spend in the labor force increased by over 11 years between 1900 and 1961. At the same time, the number of years a male at age 20 could expect to spend in retirement increased by 3.6 years. In the year 1900 life expectancy in the United States was only 47.3 years, whereas today it is 69.7. Thus, we can see why this problem has grown to the extent where today we have almost 16 million persons over the age of 65.

Congress has not been unmindful of this problem as is evidenced by the enactment in 1936 of social security legislation which has been changed and added to by almost every Congress since that date. Last year, Congress passed a law setting up a program to supply medical and institutional care to meet the needs of people over 65 years of age. This legislation is referred to as the Mills-Kerr bill and is now Public Law 86–778. This law calls for cooperation between the Federal Government and the States and provides for Federal grants on the basis of local needs and efforts to meet the problems of the aged who are in need of medical attention. Several States have already passed legislation to implement the medical care bill passed by the last Congress and it is expected that most States will have this new program in operation before the end of this year.

Yet, even before this new law can become operative we are being asked to reconsider the problem and accept a different solution—a solution which was considered and rejected less than 6 months ago. At least seven bills have been introduced in the House and two in the Senate, all patterned after the Forand-McNamara-Kennedy bills of the last Congress which would institute a compulsory system of medical care for the aged under the social security system.

Why is there so much pressure being exercised for this new legislation? The answer is simple. There has been no change in the need for a law of this type, but there has been a change in the political administration in Washington. Last year, as a candidate, our new President supported the social security approach and used all the power he could exercise to get Congress to adopt such a plan. He failed. Now, with the greatly increased power he has as President, he is going to try again. Unfortunately, this time he may quite likely succeed.

ANALYSIS OF TWO APPROACHES OF MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

Let's look at the situation, first as it existed last year, and secondly, as it exists now, and explore the two different approaches in trying to solve this problem.

1. Has there been, or is there now, any spontaneous public demand for any such program? The answer is no. During the months in which this legislation has been pending before Congress, I have received from my constituents only a handful of what I would consider personally written letters urging the adoption of a medical care program tied to social security. It is true, I have received several hundred identical form letters inspired by labor unions and other pressure groups urging approval of the social security formula for solving this problem. Generally, however, I have not received mail in sufficient volume to indicate that there is any great ground swell demanding enactment of a compulsory medical care program, such as that advocated by President Kennedy and his legislative leaders in the House and Senate. In fact, most of the mail received in my office has indicated just the opposite—that there is no emergency which would require a crash program in this area. Consequently, I am convinced that whatever pressure exists for this legislation has been politically generated. Last year medical care for the aged was a good campaign issue. Now it is a campaign promise to be kept.

2. Next we turn to the question of need—national and personal.

At the present time, the population of the United States is slightly in excess of 182 million people.

Of this number, approximately 16 million are 65 or over.

Only 4 million of the 16 million are not under social security.

Of the 16 million only half a million can be classified as suffering from chronic illness.

According to the Health Insurance Association of America, 49 percent of persons 65 or over are covered by health and medical insurance, and at the present rate of growth, this coverage is expected to reach 75 percent by 1965 and 90 percent by 1970.

According to a recent national study published last August by Dr. James W. Wiggins and Helmut Schoeck of Emory University, the medical needs of our aged have been greatly overexaggerated. Their survey indicated that:

Nine of every ten older persons report they have no unfilled medical needs.

Ninety percent of those 65 or over reported they enjoy good or fair health.

Sixty-eight percent said they could pay for a medical emergency out of their own means.

Half of the persons queried reported income in excess of $2,000 per year; 1 out of 20 had income in excess of $10,000.

Most of the aged reported net worth in excess of $10,000.

Sixty percent did not think a new Federal program could do anything for them personally.

Majority indicated life was much easier for them than for their aged parents.

Ninety percent could think of no medical needs that were not being taken care of.

Sixty percent are now covered by private voluntary health insurance.

Eighty percent are member of a church. If special care was needed for outside the family, twice as many elderly Americans would prefer to get such assistance from their church rather than from the Government.

Wiggins said much of what has been reported in the past about the health and welfare of older persons is based upon inaccurate data derived from the experiences of a generation ago or from the studies of the hospitalized or chronically dependent.

The Wiggins report indicates that the great majority of Americans over 65 are capably financing their own health care and prefer to do it without Federal Government intervention.

3. Based on the facts and statistics before us, Congress had to decide whether this record justified a Federal program—even in the face of the lack of public demand. But politics in a presidential election year creates its own demands and they were great enough to produce action. In the final debates in the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee, and again on the floor of the House and Senate, the Forand and McNamara bills were soundly defeated. Likewise, the Kennedy-Anderson amendment, which preserved the social security approach, but which was more restricted as to benefits, was defeated 51 to 44. As I previously indicated, bills patterned after the Forand and McNamara approach have been reintroduced in this session.

4. Regardless of the details of any program selected to solve the medical care problem, we in the Congress are wrestling with a philosophical decision represented by three essentially different points of view. Briefly described they are the following:

1. Should the Federal Government recognize the value of the growing volume of private health insurance, and help to expand this protection by contributing part, or all, of the cost of premiums to those who could not provide these funds themselves?

2. Should these benefits be available to particular people as a matter of special right regardless of need, under a program added to the Social Security System?

3. Should we make actual need the basis of the distribution of benefits and thus reduce the cost by taking advantage of private funds available in each case? Under this approach, the States would share in the cost and administer the program, including the criteria for the determination of need.

The first-named program, introduced by Senator JAVITS, of New York, with the support of Vice President Nixon, was never really seriously considered. It got 28 votes on the Senate floor, and passed out of the controversy.

The social security approach, represented by the Forand bill in the House, and McNamara and Gore bills in the Senate had the support of AFL–CIO, as well as Candidate Kennedy, but was rejected by both Houses, even in such modified form as the Anderson amendment.

The "needs" approach had the approval and support of the AMA. It was worked out by the Ways and Means Committee of the House and adopted there. When it came to the Senate, the Finance Committee modified it further, but did not change its essential features, and it was passed on August 23 and became Public Law 86–778 on September 13, 1960.

RIGHTS AND NEEDS

The contest between the "rights" and the "needs" approach was bitterly fought, and is not settled yet. Each point of view has its strengths and its weaknesses, and these are worth cataloging.

A. Those who advocate medical care for the aged tied to the social security system, hope to benefit from the general public acceptance of that system. But as an opponent to this approach, I would like to point out the following weaknesses:

1. A medical care plan placed under social security would change the basic pattern of payments from one of cash benefits based on earnings to service benefits without regard to contributions.

2. Its added cost would overburden the social security system. Social security taxes, now at 6 percent, divided between employee and employer, are due to go to 9 percent by 1969. If medical care benefits are added this tax could conceivably rise to 20 percent in the not too distant future.

B. Cost estimates for the various medical care plans:

1. Forand-McNamara bills: Most conservative estimates place the initial cost between $3 and $4 billion with sharp increases ex-

pected as additional benefits and persons are added to the plan. In fact, if the same extensions are made to the medical care plan as has been our experience with other social security benefits, we could expect the cost of this program to soon be in excess of $8 billion per year.

2. Anderson amendment: Proponents of this bill estimated it would cost $700 million the first year and $1 billion each year thereafter. However, actuaries for the Health Insurance Association in reviewing this measure said the cost would be almost double the first year ($1,331 million) and would be in excess of $2 billion per year thereafter.

3. The Senate Finance Committee bill, which is now Public Law 86–778, is estimated to cost the Federal Government approximately $190 million per year.

Government security welfare programs incubate an overwhelming political demand for more welfare. Our own programs indicate this. But Sweden is much more of a welfare state. There, pensioners have become politically powerful, demanding even more from the rest of the people. During the past year, Sweden was forced to slap an additional 4 percent sales tax on top of all other taxes to help pay the ever-mounting costs of their cradle-to-the-grave welfare programs.

It is important to point out that all of these plans are now in their infancy and would undoubtedly grow in the future. Originally, the cost of social security when it was enacted in 1936 was to be 2 percent on the first $3,000 of each worker's income. The cost is now more than 450 percent higher. We are now paying 6 percent on the first $4,800 of income each year and the program is still underfinanced. Deductions will go up to 9 percent by 1969.

Six major changes (four in the last 6 years) have been made in the social security program since its birth. Retirement benefits have been increased 17 percent more than the increase in the cost of living. Coverage has been vastly extended. Survivor benefits have been enlarged. The age for eligibility for women has been lowered to 62 and bills are now pending which would grant earlier retirement to men.

4. Malingering would be rampant if care as a matter of right were extended to all. This system which would substitute entitlemetn by right in place of actual need would encourage widespread overuse and abuse of medical facilities.

I have always remembered a personal experience I had 25 or 30 years ago. A small company with which I was connected instituted a system to provide sick benefits for employees and entitled each worker to a limited number of days of sick leave each year. One employee near the end of the year suddenly became sick almost every other day. When the visiting committee went to call on him unexpectedly, they found him in bed with his clothes on, including his shoes. They chided him for it and asked him why. His answer has been ringing through my mind ever since. He said, "I means to have my share." I am certain there are many persons who will attempt to have their share on the basis of entitlement rather than need.

5. Under the Forand-McNamara approach, service will be supplied as a matter of right to many who don't need it and will be denied to some who do. For instance, there are more than 4 million persons over 65 who are not covered by social security who would not be entitled to any benefits. Likewise, retired railroad employees and also Federal employees would not be covered under the plan even though their medical needs are certainly as great. On the other hand, many veterans would be eligible for double entitlement and could pick and choose wherever they thought they could obtain more benefits.

6. It would put an unfair burden on the presently employed people contributing to social security. Nine million would get benefits for which they have made no contribution.

7. It concentrates on a narrow tax base—$4,800.

8. It has been called pay-as-you-go but social security is pay now, you get benefits later—maybe. (There is no relationship between payments and benefits.)

9. Contributions would be compulsory, just as is England's health scheme but this was carefully played down, and the idea of "rights" was stressed.

10. To the doctor it represents an unhappy intrusion of the state into his relationship with his patient. While under the Anderson bill, he could get no money from the program for his services, the money to pay the other bills would come directly from the Social Security System to the vendor—the person would not pay his own bills. This would involve a proliferation of local social security office and eventually a new health care agency—duplicating existing State and local ones.

ADVANTAGES OF THE VOLUNTARY APPROACH

We who supported the Mills-Kerr approach, based on need, made the following arguments:

1. Under the present old-age assistance program, we have an existing system professionally staffed to care for the needs of our elderly—including to a limited extent health needs. The Mills-Kerr approach will add responsibilities but will be no wrench to the system, and would not adopt any new method of handling payments.

2. The costs can be kept at a minimum.

a. State participation will help control it.

b. Costs would vary only with need—might actually be near their peak now. The proportion of the aged in our population is now 8.6 and it is expected to level off at 9 percent.

c. Less susceptible to political measures.

d. Full needed services available—no foot-in-the-door limitations.

3. Cost would be spread over broadest possible tax base—all Federal and State taxpayers. It is a true pay-as-you-go basis.

4. No compulsory contributions—no double burden for present wage earners.

5. Services of doctors included—no change in present patient relationship.

The chief argument against the Mills-Kerr bill was a bold falsehood—that the bill required a pauper's oath. No such thing is required. The basis for determining need is left to each State. If this is degrading then all service involving decisions by trained social service workers is degrading.

WHAT TO EXPECT

The Kerr-Mills bill is now Public Law 86–778. I sincerely doubt it will be repealed. Instead, some version of the original Forand bill will probably be superimposed on top of it, and require two parallel organizations. Eventually, under Gresham's law, the rights approach will drive the needs approach out, and we may end up with compulsory Federal health insurance, covering all needs for all people. At first, we can expect medical care just for the aged, but eventually the age limit will be gradually reduced, and finally eliminated. Simultaneously, the definition of "right" will become fuzzy and disappear. This will be the end of the present social security, and we will have federalized medicine, dentistry, hospitals, nursing homes, medical education, and drug production for all our population.

Can it be stopped? We won the battle last August, but it will be much harder this time, with the power of the Presidency behind it. I think it's worth the fight.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in the current controversy over whether private and parochial schools should be included as recipients of Federal largess in the proposed aid-to-education program, the basic issue is being shoved into the background. The question of whether Federal aid to education is necessary or desirable is being sidetracked.

It is time to get back into focus, for we must not let our citizenry lose sight of the fact that the big billion-dollar lollypop for the Nation's schools would be manufactured with taxpayers' contributions and then wrapped for distribution only after the Washington bureaucracy had taken a substantial bite out of it. With the passing of years, the share for the several States and local schools would become progressively slimmer, for big government has an insatiable appetite.

For the State of Pennsylvania, the stick of candy handed to us by the patronizing bureaucrats would from the start be much smaller than what we put into it. The Federal aid to education bills are nothing less than an insult to the intelligence of the people of our State, inasmuch as those bills brashly set forth a set of calculations which would require us to put millions of dollars more into the school kitty than we would get back for our own educational needs.

Pennsylvania, plagued with critical unemployment in scores of communities, would experience only additional hardship if the proposed legislation were to be enacted. Of course, some of our friends who have cooked up this expensive scheme are attempting to cover up the deficit that would be incurred by our State by indicating that the whole program can be carried merely by undertaking to put the Federal Government further into debt. Our people have had enough of these delusory promises. Our citizens recognize only too well that increases in the Federal debt are the direct cause of inflation, which cruelly reduces the buying power of wage earners, pensioners, and all others who look to savings and social security payments to see them through their twilight years.

Back in 1956 some Members of Congress began making headlines with the idea of setting up a $400 million fund annually for a total of 4 years to provide for construction of schoolhouses. At that time we were assured that $400 million was the maximum figure that proponents wanted, that 4 years would be the limit of the program, and that construction alone was the objective. Since then this balloon has been inflated out of all proportion, teachers' salaries have been thrown into the recipe as an added sweetner, and where it will all

end is too vague for conjecture. What will come in the next go-round would tax the most precocious imagination, but the history of the program could very well lead one to believe that the local school board member will be offered a sugar plum in hopes of promoting additional support for the Federal aid project.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that Congress can better promote the general welfare and national defense by getting the Federal aid to education bills out of the way and moving on to the business that we have been sent to Washington to handle. I do not deny that many local school districts could find their burden much lighter and be able to provide well-deserved increases in teachers' salaries through congressional action. I stand ready to help in this worthy objective by any of a number of sound legislative possibilities.

For a number of years I have proposed a larger deduction in income tax rates for all individuals—men, women, and children. I know of no more convenient way to make more funds available for educational needs and for other local purposes. If our constituents prefer that some portion of Federal taxes now being channeled into Washington be earmarked specifically for school funds, then there is a variety of ways in which this mission can be accomplished.

Perhaps the simplest method is for us to pass a law ordering the Director of Internal Revenue to remit to each State a check for an amount equal to an agreed-upon percentage of the personal and corporate Federal income taxes collected for any 1 quarter, or any 1 year, with said sums to be used by each State for educational purposes only. Such a plan would enable the States, on a fair basis, to help themselves to solve their educational problems—whether they pertain to schools, equipment, or teachers—in their own way without any Federal control, intervention, supervision, regulation, or interference.

The matter should be settled promptly. I have read recently of isolated cases in which communities have rejected bond issues designed to provide the wherewithal to build new schools. Unless the Federal aid problem is disposed of once and for all, there is a serious danger that promises made in Washington will prompt more and more communities to hesitate in planning for new schoolhouses. If the Federal free-spenders are going to make funds available for obligations that have heretofore been our own responsibility, why should the local citizens bother to put up the money? Thus the promises being made by proponents of Federal aid to education become a detriment to local initiative and industry.

There is also the case of the failure of St. Louis voters to accept a bond issue to build new schools and modernize some of the old ones. As reported in the Johnstown Tribune-Democrat on March 24 by a staff writer for the Associated Press:

Apathy, ignorance, and resistance to taxes were major factors, but in St. Louis it was something more.

It was distrust of the St. Louis School Board, rocked by scandal and hint of scandal.

I have excerpted the crux of the article, Mr. Speaker. There were other reasons cited by the writer, but I believe that what I have quoted should give Congress reason to ponder.

If the citizens of a city are so distrustful of their own school board as to hesitate to approve a bond issue for new schools, can the Federal Government in conscience turn over Treasury funds to such groups? Does Congress have no more pride in its own stewardship? Furthermore, Federal grants would tend to destroy whatever interest a community has in cleaning up unsavory conditions, for when local funds are not involved the incentive for keeping a close watch on responsible parties would be lacking. I also point out that, according to proponents of Federal aid to education, the Federal Government could do nothing regardless of how dishonest a local school board happened to be, for no control from Washington is one of the assurances that perennially goes with the proposal.

I regret that interest in the basic premise—whether it is good or bad for the Federal Government to get involved in local school problems—is being diluted by the important but only collateral issue regarding private and parochial schools.

When we get back on track, let us hope that the bills will be defeated on principle—a principle laid down by our Founding Fathers and respected until the whole concept of government by the people became distorted through attempts to advance a people-for-the-government philosophy.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent heretofore granted, I include the following article from the Johnstown Tribune-Democrat of March 24, 1961:

BOND ISSUE REJECTION ADDS TO ST. LOUIS WOE

(By G. K. Hodenfield)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—"Somehow we have to get our messages across," says the superintendent of schools in St. Louis. The message: More money needed. But the city's voters turned thumbs down all last year. This is the last of three articles on school financing problems.)

ST. LOUIS, MO.—St. Louis has found an enormous rathole and is busy shoveling dollars into it.

In March, in May, and again in November last year, the voters turned down a $24.3-million bond issue to build new schools and modernize some of the old ones. They also rejected, three times, a $5.2-million bond issue for school fire protection.

Because the bonds weren't passed, and the schools can't be built, the school system this year is chartering 70 buses to transport 3,600 pupils from their home neighborhoods to schools up to 9 miles away.

BUSES COST $195,000

The buses are costing the city $195,000 this school year, plus $40,000 in overtime pay for teachers who supervise the bus rides. This is $233,000 for the 1960–61 school year.

No one seriously argues here that the new schools aren't needed: Six elementary schools are at double their normal capacity; 2,000 elementary school pupils are attending classes in high school buildings; 525 elementary pupils are being taught in rented church quarters; some classrooms have as many as 60 pupils.

Then why did the bond issues fail?

Apathy, ignorance, and resistance to taxes were major factors. But in St. Louis it was something more.

BOARD DISTRUSTED

It was distrust of the St. Louis School Board, rocked by scandal and hint of scandal. A racial problem apparently was involved also.

Perhaps most of all, it was a State law requiring that school bond issues must be approved by a two-thirds majority. "We can get 60 percent," one leading citizen declared, "but that last 6 percent comes mighty hard."

A school building commissioner, appointed by the school board, was removed from office by a circuit court on charges of gross misconduct in office. Several board members have resigned amidst charges they used school board labor and materials on their own homes.

The voters are well aware of this state of affairs. One board member himself said that, under the circumstances, the people of St. Louis would be justified in turning down the bond issues.

Said one homeowner: "Of course I voted against the school bonds. Why should I vote money into the hands of those people?"

POPULATION DOWN 100,000

St. Louis has a population of about 750,000, a drop of more than 100,000 since the 1950 census.

Much of the loss can be attributed to the flight to the suburbs, which many American cities are experiencing.

But in that same 1950–60 decade, the average daily attendance in the St. Louis public schools rose from 80,626 to 90,581. Much of this increase has been in Negro pupils, who now make up about 45 percent of the school population.

Many of St. Louis' problems can be traced directly to the slum clearance project in Mill Creek, a section in the near-downtown area. Negroes from Mill Creek moved en masse to North St. Louis, which had been a predominately white neighborhood. There weren't enough schools to handle the influx of pupils, and it is these children who now are being taken by buses to other parts of the city.

RACIAL FEELING

"It's up North where they need the schools," said a housewife in conservative South St. Louis. "We don't need them down here. And if those colored folks think we're going to carry them on our backs, they've got another think coming."

In all three St. Louis elections the school bond issues carried by what, in suburban Parma, Ohio, would have been a comfortable majority. In February the vote was 62,236 for and 35,772 against (63.5 percent approval); in May it was 35,826 for and 21,453 against (62.5 percent approval); in November it was 95,565 for and 64,755 against (59.6 percent approval).

But in St. Louis, where it takes 66.6 percent approval, these are recorded as just three consecutive defeats for the school bonds.

But apathy played a big part, too.

In March, the "No" votes of 11.1 percent of the registered voters were enough to defeat the bonds.

In May, it took only 6.7 percent of the registered voters to block the passage.

In November, the "No" votes of 18.6 of the registered voters were decisive.

NO ORGANIZED OPPOSITION

As in Parma, there was no organized opposition to the school bonds. Both metropolitan newspapers urged their passage, al-

though both papers had serious reservations about the school board. Catholic and Lutheran church officials supported the bond issues wholeheartedly. Parent-Teachers' Association groups worked hard for them.

It was stressed that the bond issues would not be expensive. The average cost to homeowners: About $5 to $6 a year in increased property taxes.

"I voted against them," a white-collar worker said. "I'll vote against them every time they come up. It means an increase in our taxes, and I can't afford it.

TAX BILLS COMPARED

"Look, here are my tax bills. In 1949 my property tax was $43.52, now it's $106.12. That's more than a 100 percent increase. How much do they want, anyway"?

A housewife said, "Our property tax is high enough right now. Those people at city hall are just trying to stuff something down our throats. I don't trust them."

On April 4, St. Louis will hold a school board election. Shortly after that, the school bonds will almost certainly be put up to the voters again.

MUST KEEP TRYING

"We have to keep trying," said Philip J. Hickey, superintendent of instruction for the St. Louis schools. "We just have to. Things are going to get worse as we go along.

"Our transportation costs will be much higher next year. We expect at least 2,000 new pupils, perhaps more, next fall. We can't keep those elementary pupils in high school buildings, the high schools themselves need the room.

"Nearly half our schools are more than 50 years old. Some of them go back almost to Civil War days. Some of them are fire traps.

"We'll just have to try again. Somehow, someway, we've got to get our message across."

Industrial Progress of Fort Smith, Ark., Through Voluntary Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 3, 1961

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, much concern is currently being expressed for the so-called depressed areas across the country. I am proud to point to a city in the State I represent that, despite adverse circumstances, has avoided this appellation through the effective efforts and unrelenting initiative of its resourceful citizenry.

I speak of the city of Fort Smith which is located on the Arkansas River, in the western part of the State. About 2 years ago, the Army's installation at Fort Chaffee, on the outskirts of the city, was deactivated. That came as a tremendous economic blow to the area, and caused an estimated population loss of some 6,000 persons, and erased over 1,000 civilian jobs at the Fort.

Since that time the city of Fort Smith has literally pulled itself up by its own bootstraps. Last year, alone, the city attracted enough new industry to more than make up for the jobs lost by the closing of the Fort; and today the area is among the most progressive in the Nation, in the matter of industrial expansion.

The amazing story of the accomplishments of the citizens of Fort Smith is very interestingly told in a current bulletin published by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce; and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRESS THROUGH VOLUNTARY ACTION

Business and community leaders in the city of Fort Smith, Ark., fretfully expected for a number of years eventual loss of one of the area's biggest payroll producers.

The day of reckoning came in 1959. That's when the U.S. Army closed down huge Fort Chaffee, sprawling infantry center on the outskirts of the city.

Almost overnight, free-spending GI's disappeared from the town's wide streets. Simultaneously, paychecks ceased for more than a thousand civilian employees on the shuttered post.

For sale and for rent signs dotted lawns in front of hundreds of vacant dwellings. Businessmen catering to Army personnel folded up.

Fort Smith and environs sustained an estimated population depletion of 6,000.

Under current criteria, Fort Smith should have qualified as a depressed area.

NO DISTRESS LABEL

Instead, 1960 saw the thriving little city on the eastern side of the Arkansas River acquiring a reputation as one of the best jobmaking, hottest industrial developments locations in the Nation.

That it didn't receive the depressed area appellation is a tribute to far-sighted business and civic leadership that revitalized itself more than 5 years ago.

Realizing that an inevitable economic shock would result when military planners in far-removed Washington, D.C., decided that Fort Chaffee's days of usefulness were over, these leaders went to work to put new lifeblood into the Fort Smith Chamber of Commerce.

GETTING INTO GEAR

Engaging a new, hard-driving executive manager of proven performance for the chamber, they were almost immediately confronted with his ultimatum that they fall to, give more of their time to the chamber's program and also kick in more dues money to make the overall effort move. They acceded.

One of the first steps was a complete overhaul and expansion of the chamber's industrial development program.

To begin, a 100-man industrial development committee was organized into minutemen teams to inventory the area's tangible assets.

The results substantiated facts the community of 60,000 persons had always known, but had never assembled in an accumulative package as a sales piece, plus some facts that were surprising even to knowledgeable natives.

When put together, their survey results asserted that Fort Smith could show prospective industry lower operating costs than in many other locations in the country; that there was no congestion; that adequate municipal services were available on a lower tax bill; that its school system rated high; that it had excellent transportation, recreation and hospital facilities, and that it was blessed with an abundance of natural resources, including an almost inexhaustible supply of fuel (natural gas and coal), power and water.

WEATHER PICTURE

Added to these tangibles were climatic conditions that permit year-round construction activities, favorable plant maintenance costs, plus low employee absenteeism.

The portfolio didn't neglect an explanation of Arkansas' State law on financing aid for new industries, a law that permits communities to vote tax-free revenue bonds to be retired through plant lease and lease-purchase arrangements.

Armed with this evidence, industrial location teams, summoned at a moment's notice by the Fort Smith chamber upon the faintest glimmering of interest indicated by a prospective new industry, have been darting out of town to the home offices of prospects.

ON THE GO TEAMS

On one hurry up occasion, five Fort Smith businessmen were alerted late on a Thursday. An hour or so later they were winging away from the airport to headquarters of a large company in the East.

They were laying their wares the following morning before the firm's executive officers. The effort loaded and tipped the scale in favor of their city as a location over several other areas under consideration.

In 5 years, 45 new industries have been brought to Fort Smith through the unity of purpose, business-civic effort that started as a precautionary movement and then became one of prime economic necessity after the Army post closed.

When the newest and largest plant, now under construction, is completed, Fort Smith will have 4,500 persons added to its manufacturing payrolls.

FILLING THE JOB GAP

Last year alone, the city added 1,188 new jobs. That erased the 1,053 jobs lost when Fort Chaffee went silent. Seven brandnew industries, and 22 industrial expansions in 1960 meant a total capital expenditure of $18,047,000.

The big new plant nearing completion is the Norge unit of Borg-Warner. This is a $10-million, 25-acre plant on a 104-acre site—largest single industrial start last year in the Nation by private industry.

Production started last month in the new $3 million Ohio Rubber Co. plant, fabricating auto floor mats, industrial tires, and other molded rubber products. Initial employment was 300.

The Dixie Cup Co., a post-World War II arrival, is undergoing its third expansion, which, when completed, will increase its employment total to around 1,200.

INTANGIBLE COUNT

Admittedly, the tangible assets have played a big role in Fort Smith's economic muscle building, but its prime assets are the intangibles generated by people.

Friendliness on the part of everybody in Fort Smith, plus a good supply of people ready to work, provided the reason, in the last analysis, for his company's decision to come to Fort Smith, said the manager of one of the newer plants.

The building superintendent on the big new Norge plant marvels at the "full day's work for a full day's fair pay" that he is getting from the construction workers. "And they aren't reluctant to tell me—the boss—how we can speed things up to make the job go faster," he declared.

Fort Smith's two lively newspapers and the chamber of commerce are hand-in-glove, reminding the people almost daily that every citizen is a salesman for Fort Smith.

EVERYBODY SELLS THE CITY

Taxicab drivers, waitresses, barbers along with businessmen and housewives are urged to speak up about Fort Smith's good points, to give all visitors the sincere impression

"that we all like and believe in the section we live in."

That visitor, the chamber tells the home folks, may be nosing around to discern the people's attitude, the business climate and other vital facts that might weigh strongly when it's time to decide whether Fort Smith gets another job-creating plant.

Beneficial offshoots from the perked-up economic situation in Fort Smith are numerous.

Last fall, the people voted $2,500,000 for additional school facilities, and just prior they endorsed a bond issue of $1,500,000 to apply on a new civic auditorium.

A new vocational training school is being established on the Fort Smith Junior College campus through business firm donations.

New street lights glow up and down the city's main thoroughfare, Garrison Avenue, so named for the early 1800 billet of Army men who established the original Fort Smith.

New shopping centers are springing up, new office buildings are abuilding and there's renewed interest in improving municipal facilities through an unusual family-type cooperation between the city administration and the chamber.

A building store front facelifting is further transforming the appearance of Garrison Avenue. One of the scheduled remodelers: the chamber of commerce.

When asked if they'd like to see Fort Chaffee reactivated, Fort Smith businessmen declare they'd rather not resume the frets they knew for such a long time, and that the better course might be for Uncle Sam to surrender the installation so in some way it could go back on the county tax rolls.

Disdaining any kind of Federal aid from Washington, Fort Smith's business leaders declare: "We're a city on the move. There's no limit where we can go."

Reports on Project Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, in a world torn asunder by irreconcilable ideologies, and with the dread "four horsemen" on the prowl in various parts of the earth, it is appropriate at this Eastertide to gaze with hope at one bright spot on an otherwise drab horizion.

Project Hope is no longer an experiment. It has proved its worth by emphasizing America's faith in a lesson taught 2,000 years ago—peace on earth, good will toward men.

Hope is indeed an appropriate name for this humanitarian program which to the extent possible is bringing the miracle of modern medicine and sanitation to underdeveloped areas and emerging nations of the free world.

In connection with this effort, I am privileged to include two news articles from the Seattle Times, reporting on the activities of two Seattle physicians, Dr. John F. LeCocq and Dr. Bernard Goiney, who volunteered their medical skills for service aboard the SS *Hope I*. These two fine physicians have demonstrated in a very practical way their dedication to the Hippocratic oath and have earned the plaudits of their fellow countrymen:

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Times, Feb. 24, 1961]

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF MERCY SHIP "HOPE" OFF INDONESIA LAUDED BY SEATTLE PHYSICIAN

(Dr. Bernard J. Goiney, of Seattle, is a volunteer aboard the hospital ship *Hope* off Indonesia. He describes his experiences for the Times.)

(By Bernard J. Goiney)

We had no sooner finished dinner on the day we arrived in Jakarta—several days before we boarded the *Hope*—than our houseboy came in with a note stating that there was a sick baby outside.

When you come right down to it, I was the only practicing physician present. There was a radiologist, a pathologist, an oral surgeon, a general surgeon, and me, just a plain old working doctor.

I saw the infant, 10 months old. It had been ill 7 days with fever and diarrhea. It was pitifully dehydrated and looked to be at the point of death. There were no phones so I sent a runner to get an ambulance to try to take the baby to a hospital for fluids.

The baby died before anything could be done. I really felt helpless.

We spent the next day seeing the hospitals and medical installations in Jakarta. Transportation is a big problem.

If you can imagine the traffic both foot and automobile after a football game, add thousands of bicycles and pedal-type rickshaws, then put all 3 million in Lake Forest Park, tear up the roads, add torrential rain and 90° heat—you might get a picture of what happens here.

The work that the ship *Hope* is doing medically and surgically is terrific, fantastic and unbelievable. There is so much medical work to be done in these areas that one could spend a lifetime of surgery and medicine in the United States—and accomplish the same thing here in 1 month.

These are not tropical diseases, but heart, kidney, lung and other systemic diseases. There is a surgical opportunity unparalleled here.

The other day I was part of a surgical team that did the first open-chest work in Makassar. We removed a large tumor. Everything went perfectly and the patient is doing well.

The people are friendly and constantly try to assure me that they love the Americans and do not like the Communists. Project Hope is probably the most wonderful thing that has come out of the States. For the small cost and the terrific impact on the people, this is a huge success.

I am convinced that I will benefit immensely from the short time I will be here. I only wish other doctors could see this. They, I am sure, would be eager to come here and participate.

But even more important than the experience available to doctors is the reaction of the Indonesians. I have met and talked to many. They tell me that up to now their impression was that the American thought only of himself. This project is changing their minds.

Our State Department could well take the time to evaluate and promote this project. Its value is greater than the hundreds of millions that have been spent on other projects in these areas.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Contributions to Project Hope, sponsor of the hospital ship, may be sent to Box 9808, Washington 15, D.C.)

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Times, Mar. 9, 1961]

DR. LECOCQ WINS INDONESIA'S THANKS

(By Carrie S. Midgley)

(An author in Jakarta sent the following account of honor paid Dr. John F. LeCocq, Seattle physician, who was a Hope Foundation volunteer in Indonesia.)

Every seat in the tile-roofed auditorium in central Java was filled and the crowd of doctors, nurses, technicians, and reporters fell silent as the guest of honor entered.

They were gathered to bid farewell to a skilled doctor and a good friend, Dr. John F. LeCocq, of Seattle.

Dr. Soeharso, director of a rehabilitation center at Solo, Indonesia, rose to address Dr. LeCocq, an orthopedic surgeon.

"We have learned more from you in 3 weeks than we could have learned in many years had you not come," Dr. Seharso told the physician. "We learned not only medical skills, but also the dedication and spirit that you brought with those skills.

"We thank you for your untiring efforts here in Solo and ask your permission to hang portraits of you and your nurse in our hospital center."

Dr. LeCocq was accompanied to Solo by Miss Marjorie McQuillan, another Seattle volunteer to Hope. She was a nurse at the Seattle Orthopedic and Fracture Clinic.

Solo, an ancient city hundreds of miles inland on the banks of a chocolate-colored river, is the nucleus of orthopedic rehabilitation in Java.

Dr. LeCocq wasted no time on arrival in Solo. He arranged to perform two operations a day for his 3 weeks. In addition to surgery, the first Hope doctor at Solo was responsible for guiding Indonesian technicians in converting American braces for the smaller Indonesian patients.

With the aid of an orthopedic-equipment catalog—where he pointed to pictures of items he needed—and a skilled mechanic, Dr. John built his own equipment.

The Asian custom is to start work early in the morning and quit at lunch time. The American doctor insisted on maintaining his normal work schedule.

"I've never stopped working in the middle of the day for more than 40 years," he said with a smile, "and I can't start now."

"It took a lot of energy just to keep up with him," Miss McQuillan said.

Dr. John is quick to praise the Indonesian physicians who work under handicaps of lack of equipment and trained personnel.

When the staff of the hospital learned of Dr. John's imminent departure, they quickly arranged the farewell testimonial.

Dr. LeCocq's portrait will hang in the small hospital in Solo, and his bust will stand in the nursing academy at Jakarta. As an Indonesian doctor said:

"We may forget many things in our lifetime, but we will never forget our teacher."

The John Birch Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GALE W. McGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 3, 1961

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Birching the Birchites," published in the Washington Post of April 2, 1961. The editorial deals with the activities of the John Birch Society.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIRCHING THE BIRCHITES

We can't think of two groups that more richly deserve each other than the John Birch Society and the House Un-American Activities Committee. Still, we are troubled by the demands that the committee in-

vestigate the ultra-right-wing society. The Birchites are indubitably American, as their incubus on American soil attests; and they also are patriotic within the somewhat narrow and twisted framework in which their views operate. They may be a nuisance, their methods may be reprehensible, and their attacks upon respected public figures may be disgusting, but they scarcely now constitute a threat to the security of the Republic.

For this reason we commend Chairman WALTER of the Un-American Activities Committee for his apparent reluctance to investigate the John Birch Society—even though a committee member, Representative GORDON SCHERER, says of the group: "I look with favor on it." Too often the justified complaint is that the Un-American Activities Committee can't keep its hands off those who utter unpopular views.

Under the Constitution members of the John Birch Society are free to propound their doctrines—however noxious—without being tried by congressional inquisitors. This does not and should not shield them from criticism and their views from scrutiny. We welcome the forthright condemnation of the society by Chairman DODD of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, whose previous denunciations have usually been directed toward the other side of the political spectrum.

In one sense there is a close analogy between the John Birch Society and the Communist Party, which the society professes to combat with every means at its command. In politics the shortest distance between left and right can be a circle in which the extremes intersect at a common point. Like the totalitarian left, the Birchites have patterned their organization on semisecret, authoritarian lines and use the tactic of infiltrating front groups. There is the same contempt for democracy, the same belief that conspiracy explains all history, the same conviction that dissent from the party line cannot be tolerated.

The society also has its cabalistic scriptures, the most notorious of which is "The Politician," a book written by the group's organizer, Robert Welch. Among solemn revelations in this volume is the assertion that Dwight D. Eisenhower is a part of the international Communist conspiracy along with his brother Milton and that the late John Foster Dulles was "a Communist agent."

This is such palpable nonsense that even the group's more respected fellow travelers have been defensive about Mr. Welch's extravagance, and now Mr. Welch has sought to divorce his views from those of the society. But the fact that people can be attracted to a society built on such doctrines is testimony not merely that the crackpot fringe is still around, but also that the urge to pounce on scapegoats for national frustrations, so avidly exploited by Joseph McCarthy, is by no means dispelled. The John Birch Society does not yet represent the new McCarthyism, but it could.

Still, we think that the best remedy is the commonsense of the American people in detecting spurious political prescriptions. It is true that groups like the John Birch Society could acquire a more sinister significance in the case of a major debacle in U.S. foreign policy. The country cannot be complacent when men of wealth and influence seriously contend that President Eisenhower was a traitor. But the proper offset is continued exposure. We do not think that Mr. Welch's doctrines can survive this examination—even in the balmy season.

Problems of Small Businesses in Smaller Labor Surplus Areas Are Acute; New Categories and Legal Changes Advocated To Spread Procurement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 3, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the question of small business—especially small business in chronic labor surplus areas—participating to a greater degree in Government procurement is one about which literally millions of words have been spoken, written, and printed. Many ideas have been advanced; many proposals have been made; numerous legislative measures have been introduced and debated; riders have been attached to appropriations bills; and Executive orders have been issued by our country's Presidents, each supported by departmental and agency regulations—but the arguments continue and the evidence accumulates concerning the degree and the nature of small business and depressed area firms' participation in contract awards by the Federal Government.

In remarks made last Friday, I commended President Kennedy's and the Defense Secretary's efforts to improve the machinery by which Federal contracts can be channeled to firms located in labor surplus areas, and in that instance it was necessary for me to note that a ruling by the Comptroller General of the United States on March 3 had upset the President's and the Defense Secretary's plan to set aside some types of military requirements for bidding by firms in labor surplus areas only.

We are aware that the Comptroller General wrote in an opinion for the Secretary of Defense that a 100-percent set-aside of procurement of any item for bidding exclusively by firms in labor surplus areas is illegal because it would not "in the absence of free and unrestricted competition, assure the lowest obtainable price" to the Government, as required by law.

I expressed then, and I repeat the hope now that the President will not be permanently blocked in his praiseworthy efforts to have distributed on a more equitable basis the Federal contracts for military procurement.

Not only must appropriations act riders be made less stringent, but, indeed, other changes in law must be made if small businesses in general and those in the smaller labor surplus market communities are to participate in any effective and helpful manner and degree in contract awards and expenditures for Government-procured goods and services.

This fact is brought to attention again in an article which appeared in the Charleston (W. Va.) Sunday Gazette-Mail of April 2, 1961, under the headline "Small Business Not Helped, Burgess Says; Disgruntled Logan Manufacturer Wants Changes in U.S. Purchasing."

The article relates to experiences of a small businessman in a community situated in the depressed bituminous coal mining area of southern West Virginia who sought ways and means to participate in government procurement of items manufactured by his and his father's small industry. This gentleman, Jim Burgess, of Clothier, W. Va., related a story to Don Marsh, able staff writer for the Charleston Sunday Gazette-Mail, which is not unfamiliar to me because it is typical of many other similar recitations of experience by constituents who have brought their problems to my office.

I believe we in the Congress should do more than we have been doing about the problems of the Jim Burgesses, and I agree with an observation made by this gentleman that the area redevelopment legislation will be relatively ineffective for many communities and the businesses situated in them, or new industries hoped to be brought to them, unless and until substantial changes are made in laws and regulations having to do with government procurement policies and practices.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from the article to which I have been referring.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISGRUNTLED LOGAN MANUFACTURER WANTS CHANGES IN U.S. PURCHASING

(By Don Marsh)

Jim Burgess, proprietor of a small business located in a depressed area, thought he had a sterling idea:

Why not, he asked himself, take advantage of special concessions made by procurement officers to small businesses and to depressed areas and obtain a Government contract?

Burgess, whose close cropped hair is turning gray at the temples, sometimes talks like a combat infantryman, which he once was.

Burgess and his father, James, Sr. own the Mine Ventilating System in Clothier. They make protective cloth used in coal mining.

They've also devised self contained barricading units for use by men who are trapped in gas filled mines. In the 3 years the company has been in business, it has grown steadily.

"The Government buys millions a year in protective covering which is the same kind of material we're utilizing," Burgess says. "They use it for all sorts of things—the Navy, the Army, the space program.

"We had our own financing and we had a building. The Bank of Danville had promised to help if we ran into any kind of money troubles. I thought there was every reason to believe we could get some Government work.

"I don't know how familiar you are with Government purchasing but they have what they call a 'set-aside' program which is supposed to benefit small businesses or depressed areas.

"On any Government procurement, they'll set aside approximately 50 percent for bids and restrict bidding to small businesses or to depressed areas. The set-aside isn't used for programs that call for research and development. But it covers millions of dollars of purchases.

"To get a set-aside, I wouldn't have to be the low bidder. I'd have to be within 20 percent of the higher bidder. Then I could get a part of the contract.

"That's fine. That's a good system of procurement if you want to help depressed areas and small business. I thought, 'Man, this is made for me.'

"So I got Representative JOHN SLACK to arrange some meetings. He scheduled them in Washington with all sorts of agencies—the Army, the Navy, the Post Office Department, the Space Agency, the Maritime Commission, and the Department of Agriculture.

"I saw right away after I got there that I wasn't going to get a contract. But I wanted to chase it out. So I went to Philadelphia and saw a couple of more offices.

"I'll say one thing: they were all nice. They all said they wanted to help me. They all talked to me. But they couldn't do anything."

The trouble, Burgess thinks, is that standards set by the Government are not realistic.

"Do you know what they call a small business?" he asks. "It's one employing 625 men or less. Now, how can I compete with them? That's a big business. How many businesses in West Virginia employ 625? You could count them almost on two hands.

"Then they say any area with 6 percent or more unemployed is a depressed area. Now what kind of a rule is that? Charleston is classed the same as Boone County or Huntington is the same as McDowell County.

"In Boone County and McDowell County we have 20 to 30 percent unemployed. My argument is that there should be a further breakdown because to me, conditions in Charleston or Huntington are nowhere like they are in Logan or Boone or Mingo or McDowell.

"And another thing. Suppose I got a contract. Now they would send an inspector out in 90 days. They would send him down here to see if I had the facilities to produce, plus a bond; so the question I asked the man was:

" 'Well, what are we supposed to do? Put up a plant and buy the equipment hoping we'll get a Government contract because we can't get a contract until we have the equipment?' "

Burgess said his experience convinced him that major changes would have to be made before industry would move into the depressed areas of West Virginia.

"I learned one thing," he said. "This hollering ain't going to help the people of West Virginia. These people are just living in false hopes because there's not much help they can get except 12 more weeks of unemployment and more mollygrub.

"You take these redevelopment companies they're setting up. They're speaking of getting large industries. There's no large industry that's going to come into Madison.

"Why should a man move a plant into one of the coal-mining counties when he can go over on the river and have all the advantages of water transportation, better roads and closeness to markets?

"In Madison, they've secured this land and they say they'll give it to industry that employs 250 people or more. Why, there's not an industry that's going to come in and support 250.

"It's not a question of capital, either, I say if a man has a sound business proposition, he wouldn't have any trouble raising $5 million right in Charleston.

"But if you say to a man, 'If you put up $10,000 in this company we might get a Government contract to use the equipment we'll buy with your $10,000.' Nobody but a fool would do it, see? That's my argument."

Burgess says he thinks the area's best hope for recovery is in attracting numerous small businesses, such as his.

"But the Government is going to have to change its standards. It's got to if really small businesses are going to compete."

He says he thinks two things should be, and could be done immediately. First, different ratings should be assigned companies, depending on their size; and depressed areas, depending on their unemployment rate.

"I think we could have four classes of companies," he says. "Class I could be from 1 to 50 workers; class II from 50 to 150 and so on.

"I also think we should have classes of depressed areas. Class I could be with 6 to 9 percent unemployed, as an idea. Class II could be 9 to 12 percent and so on.

"I think it's silly to expect a little business that hires a dozen men to compete against a company that hires 625. And I think it's silly to say that Charleston or Huntington are as depressed as Boone County or McDowell County."

He says he strongly endorses Governor Barron's crash program ("because we've got to do something for these people now, not next year") and he supports Barron's hiring of a liaison man to work with Federal authorities.

"You got to camp out there. These big companies do that. They know when a contract is going to be let. They get the information. Small companies can't do this."

Burgess says he is not seeking personal publicity. "One of my troubles is that I shoot off my mouth too much," he adds. "I don't want to get out on the string about this thing.

"But it burns me up for people to be living under the conditions they're living under with the hope they're going to be helped because they're not going to be helped. * * *

"These coal mines are never going to employ these men again. Those men laid off, think someday they're going to go back to work and they're wrong. Look at your tonnage records compared to men employed. We're right now producing more coal with 48,000 miners than we used to with 120,000. And they're not even working full time.

"Something's got to be done about the rules for determining a small business and a depressed area. All the procurement officers said it would take an Executive order by President Kennedy to do it.

"One of the procurement officers told me he'd give me a contract today if he could. He said honestly I'd like to help you. But I can't. It's against the law."

Light and Power Lines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD an excellent editorial entitled "Light and Power Lines," written by P. B. Garrett, publisher of Electric Light and Power magazine:

LIGHT AND POWER LINES

The enigma of the Government-business alliance: "Your success and ours are intertwined," said President Kennedy in sizing up the interrelationship between the Federal Government and American business enterprises, in his recent address before the National Industrial Conference Board. Last year's $6-billion drop in corporate profits, he pointed out, cost the Government more than enough tax money to pay for its whole health and education program in 1961.

Then along came President Kennedy's Interior Secretary, Stewart L. Udall, with the statement that "We are not out searching for ways to let private industry have access to major hydroelectric sites and to the falling water at some of the dams built with Federal funds." Making it plain that the Federal Government is back in the electric-power business in a big way, his pronouncement spells trouble for all investor-owned power companies. And so does the later indication by Mr. Kennedy, in his special message to Congress on natural resources, that his administration intends to meet what it considers a Federal utility responsibility.

Now a 5-State, all-Federal transmission system to carry to preference customers the 1.2-million kilowatts of power to come from hydro plants of the Colorado River storage project has been approved at the highest administration level. It is the key link in a federally-dominated giant power grid envisioned by the late Leland Olds in the 1930's and still the goal of a crusade by his disciples. As pointed out by Ralph Elliott, our Washington editor, in his "Washington Outlooks" comments in our March 1, 1961, issue, this giant power grid idea has long since passed the dream stage and is moving grimly close to reality.

The inconsistency of our Government's statements and actions in the entire field of Government-business relationship was stated in concise and arresting form in a recent letter from one of our readers. He reported a recent conversation with a Hollander who said: "I can't understand your Federal Government. Industry contributes so much to your welfare yet it seems that your Government consistently does everything in its power to destroy it. You charge the same price for your products as your competitors and you are charged with collusion. You lower your prices and you are charged with unfair competition. You raise your prices and you are liable to be accused of making an unfair profit. And after all this, if you do make a profit, the Government takes 52 percent of it. I just can't understand your Government's attitude toward business."

Our Electric Light and Power reader concluded his letter with the statement "And I thought to myself: 'I doubt if anyone else does'."

There is little that can be added to so apt a remark except to say that this whole situation has deadly serious implications for all of our American business enterprises—and particularly for our electric-power industry.

Address by Robert E. Lee, Federal Communications Commissioner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 3, 1961

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, on March 7 of this year, the distinguished Commissioner Robert E. Lee, of the Federal Communications Commission, addressed a legislative dinner of the New York State Broadcasters Association. The address was made before members

of the legislature and other dignitaries, including Governor Rockefeller and industry representatives. Because of my interest in educational television and because of the interest in that subject on the part of many of my colleagues in the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY COMMISSIONER ROBERT E. LEE, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION, NEW YORK STATE BROADCASTERS ASSOCIATION, LEGISLATIVE DINNER, ALBANY, N.Y., MARCH 7, 1961

In my opinion, most of the States of the Union look to New York State for leadership in common problems and from where I sit it appears to me that such leadership has been singularly lacking in the field of educational television. There are many reasons that I know contribute to this and probably many other reasons that I am unaware of and this is why I emphasize that this fact is apparent to me from where I sit.

In 1952, the Federal Communications Commission wisely reserved several hundred television channel assignments for noncommercial educational television broadcasting.

I have been impressed with the importance of this decision and have virtually stumped the country in an effort to encourage the implementation of these channel assignments by educational authorities.

There are over 50 educational stations now in operation and many more being planned throughout the United States. I consider this progress encouraging, yet I had hoped for more.

There have been several barriers to educational television but I think they are being overcome.

For a time it was new and there were, and perhaps still are, skeptics as to the effectiveness of classroom teaching by television since some professional educators considered that there was a plan afoot to substitute television teaching for the teacher himself. May I remind you that when the printing press was invented hundreds of years ago there was a great hue and cry from a significant part of the academic world to the effect that the printed word would obsolete the teacher. Funds for educational broadcasting were slow to be authorized. However, the biggest bugaboo appears to have been the fact that many important cities were not assigned VHF channels. While this proved in error, it may prove to be a blessing in disguise for now it appears that the educational use of the UHF band will save these frequencies for broadcasting since two-thirds of the educational assignments are in the UHF.

As you may be aware, commercial UHF broadcasting has done anything but flourish. There are about 70 commercial UHF stations presently on the air and I suspect the majority are not doing too well financially.

There are technical reasons for the inability of commercial UHF stations to compete with VHF stations in the same markets. I need not dwell at length on these reasons except insofar as they pertain to educational broadcasting. UHF stations do not produce usable signals as far as VHF stations and many areas do not have sets capable of receiving UHF signals.

It took many years for educators to recognize that the competitive problems that beset commercial broadcasters were not common to educational stations; that in-school television could be theirs by the expenditure of but a few more dollars for all-channel television receivers; and that the shorter range of UHF signals was not a serious handicap to their television plans. Now educators recognize that they must have more than one channel to perform the task before them. Pittsburgh, Milwaukee, and Oklahoma City are authorized two channels each and I confidently expect there will be many more—doing the job of filling in for missing teachers and unbuilt classrooms.

Many States are now, at this moment, busily reexamining their statewide requirements in this area and are finding that the allocations available are insufficient for a statewide integrated system. Petitions are and will be coming before us for additional allocations which are only available in the UHF portion of the spectrum. I believe I can say that the Commission is sympathetic to these requests but I caution that the problem becomes almost impossible if the request comes when these channels have been granted to other users.

Of course, there is the problem of money, for it costs hundreds of thousands to build and operate stations. Some of our great foundations have made significant contributions to the furtherance of educational television and there are several bills pending before Congress which would grant States funds to help in this endeavor. There is every expectancy that a bill will be signed into law.

I don't think I need tell New York or any other State how badly it needs more funds for education—for classrooms, for teachers and for the administrative personnel necessary. America spends $3½ billion annually for educational facilities and we are about 200,000 classrooms short. These classrooms cost from $25,000 to $50,000 each and require teachers which we do not have.

Mr. Paul L. Chamberlain, an official of General Electric, recently released some interesting figures with respect to educational needs in the Empire State. He advocates incidentally, four UHF television stations for each school district. To accommodate the increased birthrate in this State, 3,700 new classrooms will shortly be needed and you now have a shortage of 9,500 classrooms. New York will need 70,000 new teachers. Where will they come from? One-half of these will be needed to accommodate new enrollments. There will be a 100-percent increase in college and university enrollment by the year 1970. I know that New York will meet this grave responsibility and also retain its very high academic standards. I suggest that you utilize educational television to make a more effective use of the educational dollar.

There are economies that will flow from educational broadcasting that a prudent administration could scarcely afford to forego. It has been estimated that only one-third of school space is devoted to the classroom proper and the remaining two-thirds to such as gymnasiums, auditoriums, cafeterias, and offices. Were these large rooms equipped with large screen receivers or a number of normal screen receivers, as many as hundreds of students could learn their science and math with only a monitor to keep order.

Centralized school districts by broadcasting with four channels, as an example, and utilizing their auditoriums and other large rooms, when not otherwise in use, can cut education costs drastically.

There are fringe benefits too. Exceptionally gifted students, as well as slow students, could receive extra training which would not disrupt the curriculum of average students.

I have suggested that multichannel broadcasting will soon be universally recognized as the only economic means by which our teacher and facility shortages can be overcome. Since the VHF spectrum is virtually saturated with stations, largely commercial, it will become necessary to implement the UHF which is ready, available and adequate.

The only drawback to use of these channels is that in many areas, receivers are incapable of utilizing UHF signals because of scrimping by manufacturers in a highly competitive field. While this poses no problem for in-school education, it will deter adult education until overcome. We at the Commission have recommended to the Congress that we be empowered to require the manufacturer of all-channel sets. It is difficult to predict whether our proposal will be enacted into law. It is safe to say that if it were, the country would have such receivers in a few years to the extent that adult education would become effective.

Adult education will undoubtedly have a profound effect upon our lives. What is more, educational programing can be attractive, fascinating and not without entertainment value. There is no question that the whole fabric of commercial broadcasting could be enhanced. Commercial stations would find serious competition to their too frequently tasteless and unimaginative fare and would conceivably broadcast a greater portion of their programs to satisfy adult minds. These improvements will not come overnight and they won't come without cost and bold imagination. Certainly the public is cheated if they are never started.

Perhaps you have heard of the UHF tests which the Federal Communications Commission is to conduct starting this Fall. This project, which is partly to obtain technical data and partly demonstrative, will furnish valuable information with respect to the feasibility of UHF television operation in large cities which are difficult, even for VHF stations, to serve with good picture quality. This project has stirred much interest in government and industry and has prompted the city of New York to enter into discussions with us which we expect will lead to cooperation which will be mutually beneficial. At the completion of our tests, I am sure that a sale or gift of the equipment could be negotiated. This, of course, presumes that our tests will furnish satisfactory evidence that UHF broadcasting hitherto confined to much smaller cities will provide a satisfactory medium in New York City and its environs.

We expect to have this station on the air by October 1, 1961, broadcasting from the Empire State Building with about a megawatt of power. Observers will compare the signal quality with the existing services from several thousand observation points. At a later date, in the experiment, we very likely will install a second station to improve coverage and a scheme called multicasting.

Another valuable project which will have its impact on education and UHF broadcasting is that which is being pursued by the University of Purdue in cooperation with educational and civic leaders in six States, with a $4.5 million grant by the Ford Foundation. The experiment is designed to transmit simultaneously over six channels and thereby telecast 71 expertly taught programs per day. This will be a great boon to rural areas.

But education via television can take any form ranging from high-powered airborne transmitters to low-power stations and translators which pick up signals from the air, convert their frequencies, and rebroadcast to small communities. Or it can take the form of closed-circuit television. I note that New York City, in addition to educational programing over a commercial VHF station, has closed-circuit language programs to low-cost housing developments to overcome the language barrier between English- and Spanish-speaking peoples. This closed circuit broadcasting could, of course, be more economically achieved if New York City had their own station on the air.

However, regardless of the medium or techniques, educators must provide good equipment and assure dependable pictures or else there will be losses of instruction time, high maintenance costs, and losses of confidence in the system and the medium.

I mentioned earlier that the educators may someday save the UHF for broadcasting. As you perhaps know, the Commission licenses radio to many users. The television band is quite suitable to other uses and many licensees which are jammed into other bands have been seeking the use of the UHF band allocated to broadcasting. Their arguments are quite valid and difficult to resist. There are 12 VHF channels and 70 UHF channels. If the educators come forth with their plans for multichannel UHF operations at this time and act effectively to implement these channels, they can be saved for the needs of both educational and commercial broadcasting. Otherwise, it is difficult to say what the outcome will be.

I believe that television will ultimately be moved to UHF. There are very practical obstacles but the overall public interest dictates that this must be done. To make it as painless as possible, I have suggested that we permit a conversion period of perhaps 5 years during which interval the existing VHF operators would broadcast on two frequencies—the UHF and the VHF. This would minimize the cost to the public since the average television receiver is replaced within this period of time.

We have been hearing a great deal about the New Frontier these days. We are told that we are in a slack or a soft economy. I submit that the introduction of UHF broadcasting would stimulate the manufacturing industry in the expectation of building an estimated $30 billion of receiving sets over the next 5 years. I could not begin to calculate the stimulus to the economy (in dollars) that would flow from freeing the existing VHF broadcasting space for other users. This would provide new and remarkable tools for improving the American way of life.

We at the Commission have studied the plight of commercial UHF operation. We are firmly convinced that the UHF must become a viable medium for broadcasting. Through appropriate procedures we have made certain areas all UHF and are considering others.

Recently the Commission authorized pay television tests in Hartford, Conn., which operation will be in UHF. It is conjectural as to how the public will respond but it is apparent that if successful in this city, pay television may be authorized in others. It is principally the UHF portion of the spectrum which is feasible and available for this new use.

I emphasize the feasibility and desirability of UHF station operation with full knowledge that the board of regents of the State of New York was awarded construction permits in New York City, Binghamton, Buffalo, Ithaca, Albany, Rochester, and Syracuse and has an application on file for Utica. All of these contemplated operations are in UHF but to date there has not been great evidence of putting these valuable facilities to work. I know of only one educational station in operation in New York State and that was a gift from a defunct UHF operation.

I suggest that the Empire State has a great responsibility in the education of its children and that the contributions which these enlightened children will make to the Nation's welfare are far beyond my limited means to evaluate.

However, I can tell you with assurance that other States look to New York for leadership in many fields and I can assure you that Educational TV is on the march and I hope the Empire State joins this big parade.

Thank you.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Address by Daniel E. Lambert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 6, 1961

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Daniel E. Lambert, of Orrington, Maine, fifth district commander of the American Legion.

The address was held before the 42d anniversary banquet of the Daniel E. Geagan Post No. 98, the American Legion and Auxiliary of Brewer, Maine, on Monday, March 13, 1961, at the Brewer Auditorium, entitled "The American Legion Faces the Future." Commander Lambert's address is a sterling call to duty for all citizens of the Nation.

Commander Lambert is a four time wounded veteran of the famed "Darby's Rangers" of World War II and currently directs the Legion activity in the Penobscot, Hancock, and Piscataquis County areas of the Maine department. One of the Legion's key speakers, Commander Lambert gives over 175 talks and addresses during a year in the program to promote Americanism. He has maintained that record for 10 years.

A member of the Brewer American Legion, Commander Lambert serves as district chaplain for the district No. 4, VFW of Maine, is a past president of the St. Teresa's PTA unit of South Brewer, Maine, and is a member of the board of directors of the Eastern Maine Friends of Retarded Children, the Bangor-Brewer Catholic Social Service Bureau, and the American Legion District Service Board.

A member of the Maine Civil War Centennial Commission, Commander Lambert has a deep and abiding feeling in the American heritage of freedom. Commander Lambert comes from an all Legion family. His wife is the former Capt. Elise C. Pooler, ANC, who served in the Pacific area during World War II and belongs to the Brewer Legion and Auxiliary groups. The Lamberts have three daughters, Cynthia, Margaret, and Maureen who also belong to the Brewer Junior American Legion Auxiliary units.

In 1960, Commander Lambert was awarded the George Washington Honor Medal Award from Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge for his addresses. On March 1, 1961, it was announced that Commander Lambert had been awarded the honor for a second year for his talks on freedom.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My fellow Americans, we are assembled here to celebrate the 42d birthday of America's champion—the American Legion.

I refer to our organization as a "champion" because no other single word encompasses so aptly the principles and purposes of the American Legion.

Webster defines a champion as "one who acts or speaks in behalf of a person or a cause; a defender." For 42 years, the American Legion has spoken convincingly and acted boldly in behalf of the preservation of the American ideal. The American Legion has become a living symbol of the highest form of love of country, patriotism personified by millions of men and women serving their Nation in time of peace as well as during the crisis of war.

Today, the American Legion not only stands ready to refend the American way of life against all challengers, but also maintains a ceaseless vigil for possible threats by would be aggressors.

Ours is a unique organization. The American Legion first saw the light of day on foreign soil. The first AEF breathed life into the Legion at the historic Paris caucus on March 15 through 17, 1919, and sent it on its way to become the fighting organization it is today. Forty-two years and two wars later, membership in the American Legion signifies fulfillment of the highest obligation of citizenship—the bearing of arms in defense of America in time of war.

From its humble beginning 42 years ago, the American Legion has surpassed the fondest dreams of its founders. Born in the minds and hearts of valiant men—nurtured by leaders of great foresight—and dedicated to the most noble of causes, the American Legion today is a powerful bulwark against the forces of evil.

To reach such a prominent and respected position, the American Legion has had to accomplish mighty achievements. Our founders must have foreseen something of our destiny when they cemented the foundation of this organization with the immortal words of the American Legion preamble.

Upon that foundation have been built monuments to American Legion accomplishments, each one the answer to a great challenge.

We are here to close the 42d chapter of American Legion history. It is appropriate that we pause to reflect on American Legion accomplishments of the past in the light of the challenges of the present.

There is no greater monument to the Legion's endeavors than the Veterans' Administration, with its hospitals and domiciliary institutions. They have made the American war veteran the best cared for in the world. They symbolize the American Legion's success in keeping the Nation mindful of its obligation to the men and women who have sacrified much to keep America free.

The benefits of the VA program have not been confined to the Nation's veteran population. Progress attained through VA research and study has helped to raise health standards and alleviate suffering for all mankind.

There is scarcely a family in our Nation which has not been helped in some way by the American Legion's fight for economic readjustment of the wartime veteran.

The American Legion's GI bills of rights assured the veterans of World War II and the Korean war that they would be spared much of the heartbreak and neglect which faced those returning from World War I. These great legislative achievements by the American Legion did more to raise the educational level and promote homeownership in this country than all other laws combined.

Today, we are a great Nation—but tomorrow, we must be even greater. The American Legion is contributing much to the development of able leaders and enlightened citizens of the future. They are the youth of today who are learning the responsibilities of citizenship and discovering their leadership potential through positive programs of Americanism.

America's future is being built solidly today through such activities as Boys State and Boys Nation, the National High School Oratorical Contest, School Medal Awards, and Boy Scout sponsorship.

Because of the American Legion's active role in child welfare, many a youth will assume his citizenship responsibilities tomorrow with a sound body and a sound and intelligent mind. "A Square Deal for Every Child" has been more than a slogan to the American Legion. Dedicated to this ideal, we have successfully sponsored Federal and State laws streamlining the concepts of child care. These laws have established new legal safeguards for children, modernized juvenile courts, improved adoption and probation laws, and halted child labor exploitation.

Today, our Nation is in the midst of a cold war—a war of nerves. That this cold war hasn't erupted into a hot one can be attributed mainly to the military strength of the United States. A great measure of this strength stems from the American Legion and its continuing campaign for adequate military preparedness. It is obvious today that the great retaliatory power of our Nation is a major deterrent of would-be aggressors who seek world domination.

The pages of American Legion history are filled with great accomplishments which resulted when dedicated Legionnaires met head on the challenges facing them. We have shown ourselves to be able to withstand the verbal attacks of those who strive for a weakened America.

An article in a recent issue of a national magazine had this to say about the American Legion:

"The thing about the American Legion that impresses the objective historian is that on the big issues—the issues that have cut most deeply into our national character—it has had the disconcerting habit of being right.

"The two great issues on which it has made its stand, from the day of its conception, have been communism and disarmament. Any appraisal of the Legion's record in these critical areas shows that it was 100 percent—yes, 100 percent—right, and that its enemies, its detractors, and its mockers were tragically and almost fatally, wrong."

But, we cannot stop with a recounting of past achievements and say that our job is done. Far from it: The preservation of our

Appendix

Address by Daniel E. Lambert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 6, 1961

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Daniel E. Lambert, of Orrington, Maine, fifth district commander of the American Legion.

The address was held before the 42d anniversary banquet of the Daniel E. Geagan Post No. 98, the American Legion and Auxiliary of Brewer, Maine, on Monday, March 13, 1961, at the Brewer Auditorium, entitled "The American Legion Faces the Future." Commander Lambert's address is a sterling call to duty for all citizens of the Nation.

Commander Lambert is a four time wounded veteran of the famed "Darby's Rangers" of World War II and currently directs the Legion activity in the Penobscot, Hancock, and Piscataquis County areas of the Maine department. One of the Legion's key speakers, Commander Lambert gives over 175 talks and addresses during a year in the program to promote Americanism. He has maintained that record for 10 years.

A member of the Brewer American Legion, Commander Lambert serves as district chaplain for the district No. 4, VFW of Maine, is a past president of the St. Teresa's PTA unit of South Brewer, Maine, and is a member of the board of directors of the Eastern Maine Friends of Retarded Children, the Bangor-Brewer Catholic Social Service Bureau, and the American Legion District Service Board.

A member of the Maine Civil War Centennial Commission, Commander Lambert has a deep and abiding feeling in the American heritage of freedom. Commander Lambert comes from an all Legion family. His wife is the former Capt. Elise C. Pooler, ANC, who served in the Pacific area during World War II and belongs to the Brewer Legion and Auxiliary groups. The Lamberts have three daughters, Cynthia, Margaret, and Maureen who also belong to the Brewer Junior American Legion Auxiliary units.

In 1960, Commander Lambert was awarded the George Washington Honor Medal Award from Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge for his addresses. On March 1, 1961, it was announced that Commander Lambert had been awarded the honor for a second year for his talks on freedom.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My fellow Americans, we are assembled here to celebrate the 42d birthday of America's champion—the American Legion.

I refer to our organization as a "champion" because no other single word encompasses so aptly the principles and purposes of the American Legion.

Webster defines a champion as "one who acts or speaks in behalf of a person or a cause; a defender." For 42 years, the American Legion has spoken convincingly and acted boldly in behalf of the preservation of the American ideal. The American Legion has become a living symbol of the highest form of love of country, patriotism personified by millions of men and women serving their Nation in time of peace as well as during the crisis of war.

Today, the American Legion not only stands ready to refend the American way of life against all challengers, but also maintains a ceaseless vigil for possible threats by would be aggressors.

Ours is a unique organization. The American Legion first saw the light of day on foreign soil. The first AEF breathed life into the Legion at the historic Paris caucus on March 15 through 17, 1919, and sent it on its way to become the fighting organization it is today. Forty-two years and two wars later, membership in the American Legion signifies fulfillment of the highest obligation of citizenship—the bearing of arms in defense of America in time of war.

From its humble beginning 42 years ago, the American Legion has surpassed the fondest dreams of its founders. Born in the minds and hearts of valiant men—nurtured by leaders of great foresight—and dedicated to the most noble of causes, the American Legion today is a powerful bulwark against the forces of evil.

To reach such a prominent and respected position, the American Legion has had to accomplish mighty achievements. Our founders must have foreseen something of our destiny when they cemented the foundation of this organization with the immortal words of the American Legion preamble.

Upon that foundation have been built monuments to American Legion accomplishments, each one the answer to a great challenge.

We are here to close the 42d chapter of American Legion history. It is appropriate that we pause to reflect on American Legion accomplishments of the past in the light of the challenges of the present.

There is no greater monument to the Legion's endeavors than the Veterans' Administration, with its hospitals and domiciliary institutions. They have made the American war veteran the best cared for in the world. They symbolize the American Legion's success in keeping the Nation mindful of its obligation to the men and women who have sacrified much to keep America free.

The benefits of the VA program have not been confined to the Nation's veteran population. Progress attained through VA research and study has helped to raise health standards and alleviate suffering for all mankind.

There is scarcely a family in our Nation which has not been helped in some way by the American Legion's fight for economic readjustment of the wartime veteran.

The American Legion's GI bills of rights assured the veterans of World War II and the Korean war that they would be spared much of the heartbreak and neglect which faced those returning from World War I. These great legislative achievements by the American Legion did more to raise the educational level and promote homeownership in this country than all other laws combined.

Today, we are a great Nation—but tomorrow, we must be even greater. The American Legion is contributing much to the development of able leaders and enlightened citizens of the future. They are the youth of today who are learning the responsibilities of citizenship and discovering their leadership potential through positive programs of Americanism.

America's future is being built solidly today through such activities as Boys State and Boys Nation, the National High School Oratorical Contest, School Medal Awards, and Boy Scout sponsorship.

Because of the American Legion's active role in child welfare, many a youth will assume his citizenship responsibilities tomorrow with a sound body and a sound and intelligent mind. "A Square Deal for Every Child" has been more than a slogan to the American Legion. Dedicated to this ideal, we have successfully sponsored Federal and State laws streamlining the concepts of child care. These laws have established new legal safeguards for children, modernized juvenile courts, improved adoption and probation laws, and halted child labor exploitation.

Today, our Nation is in the midst of a cold war—a war of nerves. That this cold war hasn't erupted into a hot one can be attributed mainly to the military strength of the United States. A great measure of this strength stems from the American Legion and its continuing campaign for adequate military preparedness. It is obvious today that the great retaliatory power of our Nation is a major deterrent of would-be aggressors who seek world domination.

The pages of American Legion history are filled with great accomplishments which resulted when dedicated Legionnaires met head on the challenges facing them. We have shown ourselves to be able to withstand the verbal attacks of those who strive for a weakened America.

An article in a recent issue of a national magazine had this to say about the American Legion:

"The thing about the American Legion that impresses the objective historian is that on the big issues—the issues that have cut most deeply into our national character—it has had the disconcerting habit of being right.

"The two great issues on which it has made its stand, from the day of its conception, have been communism and disarmament. Any appraisal of the Legion's record in these critical areas shows that it was 100 percent—yes, 100 percent—right, and that its enemies, its detractors, and its mockers were tragically and almost fatally, wrong."

But, we cannot stop with a recounting of past achievements and say that our job is done. Far from it: The preservation of our

Nation faces the most crucial test in its history. America is being challenged by a force far more sinister than any which would lay waste our fair land through war.

We are living in perilous times. Our precious American heritage—our fundamental belief in the dignity of the individual—is threatened by the scourge of godless communism.

This is our challenge which America's champion must meet. For 42 years, the American Legion has been an enemy of communism. The Communist movement which the world is suffering today is just a few months older than our own organization. Yet this scourge which seeks to dominate our planet by the subjugation of individual dignity has engulfed two-thirds of the earth's population. Today, it is entrenced only 90 miles from our shores.

Recently, the leader of the Soviet Union declared that communism would gain world domination through "peaceful coexistence." He warned that any interference with Communists aims by capitalist powers would lead only to war.

This despotic butcher has dared to tell us that we must stand idly by and watch freedom-loving people subjected to the yoke of world communism—or else.

As America's champion, the American Legion must answer this challenge. Millions of dedicated Legionnaires have faced squarely the challenges of the past to contribute much to the greatness of America today. It is our duty to carry on in this tradition.

So, we are here on this occasion in a spirit of rededication. We are here to keep the faith of those who met 42 years ago in Paris. We are here to reaffirm our belief in the American way of life.

If America is to be preserved, the march of world communism must be halted. Our Nation's ability to retaliate against any military aggression has helped to stem the Red tide. But, if we are to bring this enemy's drive to a standstill, we must counter his offensive in another arena—the battle for the minds of men.

In this engagement, the exotic tools of warfare are of little use. In this theater of operations we must employ weapons which will build, rather than destroy. We must devote our talents and our energies to an America which will continue to set the shining example for freedom-loving men everywhere.

The challenge facing America today affords a golden opportunity to the American Legion to once again prove itself a champion. Our history has shown that we have been equal to the challenge of the past. Now, we must show ourselves to be equal to our tradition and worthy of the trust of our founders.

For such a difficult challenge, our battle plan is amazingly simple. The blueprint for victory is clearly outlined on the back of every membership card in the immortal phrases of the preamble to the Constitution of the American Legion. For 42 years, this declaration of principles has inspired countless Legionnaires to overcome the challenge of the hour.

We can muster the strength necessary to meet our enemy today. Armed with the knowledge that we are in the right, we can face this aggressor in the finest tradition of the American Legion. Dedicated to the high principles that have carried our organization over seemingly insurmountable challenges of the past, we will attain the victory.

For God and country, it shall be done.

A Push for the Port

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting article which appeared in the Boston Traveler on March 29, 1961:

A PUSH FOR THE PORT

Boston's long fight to win freight rate parity with competitive ports has scored a small but encouraging gain through this week's action of the Department of Justice.

The Justice Department has asked that a Federal court set aside a December ruling of the Interstate Commerce Commission which refused Boston's bid for port freight rates as low as those of Baltimore, Philadelphia, and Hampton Roads. The case is slated for argument July 18, on the Justice Department's contention that the ICC order was erroneous.

This is by no means a decisive victory for Boston, but at least it's a reprieve from defeat. And it keeps alive our protest against an unjust ICC attitude that has crippled our port activity and is costing us millions of dollars a year.

The ICC had some logic to its case back in 1905. In those days, Boston's comparative nearness to Europe made this city a booming center for export and import shipments. So in order to give a fair break to southern tier ports, the ICC decided that rail freight shipped through Baltimore should move at 3 cents less per 100 pounds than freight through Boston or New York. For Philadelphia, the rate was 2 cents less.

But times have changed since that ancient ruling. And for the past 40 years, Boston has been fighting for the removal of the obsolete rate differential.

The prize is worth the battle. If we had equal freight rates for the port of Boston, our cargo shipments would jump by 10 million tons a year. This would mean at least $140 million a year extra pumped into Boston's economy, and roughly $500 million a year for the economy of New England.

We're not asking for an edge over other ports. All we ask is a fair chance to compete. It's time we got it. And the Justice Department's action should help our struggle.

Gold Reserve and Unfavorable Balance of International Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 6, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Gold Is Good for It," which appeared in the Indianapolis Star, March 31, 1961.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOLD IS GOOD FOR IT

It is being quite seriously proposed that the present requirement of a 25 percent gold backing for the U.S. currency be abandoned. There have always been some who wanted to dispense with the gold backing, but the proposal comes up now as a supposed way out of the gold problem.

The problem is that a persistent unfavorable balance of international payments for more than 10 years has been causing an outflow of gold reserves which has now become quite serious. The reserves have dwindled to such a degree that it is now possible that the Treasury will soon have nothing left except the required gold reserve.

The practical means of stopping the outflow lie in reducing the Government's spending overseas—chiefly for military operations and foreign aid. The liberals and internationalists will not think of such a thing for a moment.

Hence the proposal to dispense with the required reserve. Then, the argument goes, it would no longer matter how much gold the Treasury had. It could go on paying out gold to foreign creditors, as long as it lasted, and not worry about it.

This is like amputating an arm to remedy a broken wrist. To be sure, that would get rid of the problem of the broken wrist. Furthermore, the problem wouldn't recur. But it could hardly be called a remedy.

Dropping the reserve requirement would get rid of the problem of having to keep gold in reserve. But when the gold was all gone, what would you use then to settle the balance of payments, if it was still unfavorable? Not dollars. For without gold to be paid out at a standard ratio on dollar claims, the dollar would not for long be worth anything in international exchange.

A startling sign of the nature of some of the thinking within the Government about the gold reserve is found in the memorandum on foreign aid and payments which in February went from the U.S. Government to the West German Government.

It implied that the last decade's sustained annual loss of gold is a laudable achievement on the part of the United States. It declared that the opposite, a sustained accumulation of gold and other international reserves by any one country, is "disruptive to the international community." In this context, the memorandum said that "we must learn to use our reserves on a communal basis, recognizing that one nation's gain can only be another nation's loss."

This approach dovetails with the proposal that the gold backing of currency be dropped.

There is here an abysmal lack of understanding of the nature of money. The detractors of gold—after all, you can't eat it—seem to think that the printed paper which the Government issues is real money, that it has been endowed with a self-sustaining value of its own. It is not so. Nor can it be so, unless all of the history of economics is wrong.

The dollar is kept "as good as gold" by two things. One is the discipline of the reserve requirement, which prevents the unbridled issue of printing press money. The other is the availability of gold in foreign exchange for dollars, at a fixed rate. If either were taken away, the dollar would become a shifting commodity, its value subject to the whim of the Government and the manipulation of speculators.

Dollar Will Still Shrink Under Kennedy Budgets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the President's budget message which was delivered to the Congress was certainly a masterpiece in juggling the figures. Rather than take the face value of the statements emitted from the Budget Bureau, I feel that the following editorial entitled "Dollar Will Still Shrink Under Kennedy Budgets," which appeared on Monday, March 27, 1961, in the Chicago Daily News, deserves our serious consideration:

DOLLAR WILL STILL SHRINK UNDER KENNEDY BUDGETS

As a critic of Federal budgets, President Kennedy is superb. In his message to Congress on fiscal policy he tore to shreds the artifices and excessive optimism by which the Eisenhower budget submitted in January contrived to show a surplus.

It is regrettable that Mr. Kennedy is not sitting on the opposition side to dissect his own device of separating his budget into two doses. He thereby distracts attention from his proposition that no matter what we may have to pay for security, it should not interfere with spending on civilian and vote-getting welfare programs.

The bad news was that we are in for 2 years of red ink—a combined deficit for fiscal 1961 and 1962 of $5 billion. The national debt will climb to a new record high, even assuming that Mr. Kennedy does not find additional unmet needs requiring increased defense outlays.

The President was critical of the Eisenhower budget for its failure to provide for a number of inescapable commitments made by the last administration. In his own forecast for 1962, however, he budgets $843 million from a postal rate increase, which in fact he has hardly more hopes of getting from Congress than did Mr. Eisenhower.

The President said bravely that he intended to be "a prudent steward of the public funds." He defined that to mean obtaining "a dollar's worth of results from every dollar we spend."

Results to the head of a political party intent upon maintaining itself in power are quite a different matter from results sufficient to justify perpetuation of staggering taxes the while we plunge deeper into debt.

Even the forecast of a 2-year deficit of $5 billion was as full of ifs as a tipsheet on a maiden race: If Congress doesn't get spending fever; if revenue estimates prove accurate; if taxes are not cut; if farm subsidies do not rise, and so forth.

More evidence will be required to clinch it, but the President's first budget message places him with those to whom the meeting of politically conceived needs is more important than the question of whether the country can afford them.

He is in distinguished company to be sure; it has been the pattern of every President since Herbert Hoover. That is why in the last 8 years the Federal Government wrung from the taxpayers $53 billion more than it did in the 164 preceding years—in addition to another $23 billion which it borrowed and spent.

That is why Mr. Kennedy was obliged to ask that the present $293 billion limit on the Federal debt be again hoisted to a higher figure. He pays the same lip service as his predecessors to the desirability of debt reduction in good times, but there is no sign that Uncle Sam will ever be prosperous enough to pay his debts.

Anybody who thinks this is compatible with pledges to maintain the stability of the dollar ought to read the grocery ads over the last two decades.

The Johnsons of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 6, 1961

Mr. SMATHERS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD what I consider to be a very well deserved editorial. It appeared in last evening's Washington Star, and is entitled "The Johnsons of Texas."

It is a very commendatory editorial dealing with the fine work Vice President JOHNSON and his lovely wife are doing as representatives of the President on the African Continent.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE JOHNSONS OF TEXAS

In this era of most sensitive person-to-person diplomacy it is gratifying, but in this instance not surprising, that the Johnsons of Texas have been welcomed with the warmest of acclaim as America's foremost representatives at Senegal's Independence Day festivities in Dakar. For LYNDON and Lady Bird long ago—in Texas, in Washington, and on the nationwide campaign trail—demonstrated the charm and graciousness that win friends. On this basis alone, President Kennedy chose wisely in asking the Vice President to represent him officially at the anniversary ceremonies.

The occasion has brought to light other gratifying aspects. The warmth of welcome to Mr. and Mrs. Johnson and others of the American delegation obviously was not based entirely on personal grounds. Greetings from the Dakar crowds reportedly included shouts of "long live the United States, champion of independence"—a recognition not always accorded to our country in the current maelstrom of African politics. For the record, too, both the popular and official reaction toward the United States and its delegation was in contrast to the perfunctory reception given the representatives of the Soviet Union.

Perhaps most significant of all, however, were the words of President Leopold Senghor of the Senegalese Republic, itself a former French colony. Addressing his own countrymen in the presence of nearly 100 foreign delegations, Mr. Senghor saluted President de Gaulle of France as a statesman who has opened the road to independence for much of Africa, and warned the new nations of the continent against the error of attacking their former rulers. "Remember," he said, "that the colonizers of yesterday are the friends of tomorrow." It is, of course, an apt reminder, fully justified by the interest and willingness of such former colonial powers as Britain and France to contribute to the political and economic development of these young countries. As for our own country, not a colonizer, it has been made amply clear that we are ready and willing to aid in the same ways. In this context, the visit of the Vice President to Dakar is a manifestation of meaningful sincerity.

Agriculture in an Uneasy World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 6, 1961

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, several weeks ago I observed a most interesting article published in the Washington Star. As a matter of fact, it was published in the Star under date of February 26. It was from the pen of former Secretary of Agriculture Henry A. Wallace. I was greatly impressed by the article. A few weeks later I met the former Secretary and Vice President at a social affair in honor of former President Truman. I complimented Mr. Wallace on the article, and I told him that I had intended to have it inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Thereafter he sent me the full text of his remarks, which were made at a forum conducted during Farmers' Week by the Michigan State University, on February 1, 1961.

The statement by the former Secretary of Agriculture is a very fine contribution to our efforts to solve this very serious farm problem.

I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I may say that there were many things in Mr. Wallace's philosophy with which I did not agree. In fact, I was diametrically opposed to some of his views. However, Mr. Wallace was a great Secretary of Agriculture, and whenever he speaks on farm problems, he is entitled to be heard.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT PREPARED BY HENRY A. WALLACE FOR THE FORUM, "AGRICULTURE IN AN UNEASY WORLD," FARMERS' WEEK, MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST LANSING, MICH.

Chairman Hannah has asked each of the five former Secretaries of Agriculture to cover the same three points in 12 minutes.

First I would say that every Secretary of Agriculture must have a fixed goal. In my case I wanted the farmers to get equality of bargaining power and parity of income while at the same time increase soil fertility and feed the people of the United States and the world more abundantly. I could never forget the masthead motto of the farm paper of which I had been editor for many years, "Good Farming, Clear Thinking, Right Living."

Of course every Secretary wants the conditions of living and the opportunities for education on the farm to improve. Therefore every Secretary wants greater security of tenure but no diminution in the speed of adopting modern technologies.

In 1933 when I became Secretary the situation was so desperate that the farm organizations, many insurance companies, and

even the U.S. Chamber of Commerce were behind me in getting action legislation from the Congress.

I had fought for the McNary Haugen bill and its equalization fee when my father was Secretary of Agriculture. Therefore, I was in close contact with farm organization leaders. These people looked on me as a special pleader for their cause. But I felt I had to be more than that.

Moreover I found what every Secretary of Agriculture knows, that I had to reckon with the Budget Bureau, with the Secretary of State, with the Secretary of Treasury, with the House and Senate Committees on Agriculture and the House and Senate Subcommittees on Agricultural Appropriations. And above all there is the need for loyalty to the President's overall program. A Secretary soon discovers that Senators and Congressmen often sympathize much more with high pressure, special interest groups, than with the President's program as set forth in either legislative requests or budget askings. Sometimes there is discord even in the Cabinet family.

The crosscurrents probably put the Secretary of Agriculture in more uncomfortable and difficult positions than any other Cabinet officer. He must balance off a large number of conflicting forces. He usually ends up by pleasing no one completely.

My second 4 minutes are supposed to center around the changes that have taken place since I ceased being Secretary of Agriculture in 1940.

First the war made temporarily irrelevant my ever-normal granary legislation of 1938 which was based on crop loans at 52 to 75 percent of parity. Great war needs rapidly used up the supplies accumulated in the ever-normal granary and the farmers were assured of a good price for everything they raised. The farmers responded so terrifically, partly because of price incentive, partly because of patriotism, and largely because-of very rapid improvements in seed, fertilizer, machinery, and management that postwar surpluses rapidly accumulated.

When I left the agricultural post in 1940 1 worker on the land could support 10 people. Today 1 farmworker can support 25 people. In other words farmworkers since 1940 have been increasing their efficiency at the rate of 4.3 percent a year. For the 60 years before 1940 farmworker efficiency increased at the rate of only 1.2 percent annually. Population in the United States and the world at the present time is increasing at the rate of only 1.6 percent annually.

No one can say that the American farmworker is not doing his share of carrying the world's burden.

The one large area where the American genius for organization and efficient, hard work shines forth most clearly in definite superiority over all other large nations is in agriculture. Russia will overtake us in many industrial fields before she begins to catch up with us in agricultural efficiency. Here we are supreme and are likely to remain that way for a long time.

Where else can one farm worker feed 25 people with abundant supplies of good food containing excellent proteins from animal sources as well as a variety of fruits and vegetables? From the standpoint of health most citizens of the United States get too many calories rather than too little.

If they pay too much that is not the farmer's fault. During the past 13 years farm net income has gone down more than 35 percent whereas nonfarm income has gone up more than 60 percent. Prior to World War II the income of livestock farmers went up and down almost precisely in step with the total payrolls of labor. Since 1946 payrolls of labor have left livestock farm income far, far behind.

It is much more difficult for a Secretary of Agriculture to sponsor continuous wage increases for city labor in 1961 than it was in 1935 or even 1946. The bargaining power of labor has outdistanced the bargaining power of the farmer. The gap between what the consumer pays and what the farmer gets continually widens. The Secretary of Agriculture must more and more appeal to the Secretary of Labor and labor leaders for labor statesmanship in the general interest.

In 1932 agricultural surpluses were built up partly because of low purchasing power on the part of our unemployed and partly because of unemployment overseas. Today only a small part of our surplus is due to unemployment at home. The surpluses accumulated during the past 10 years are due largely to rapidly expanding technology.

The problem is to turn these vast surpluses into a blessing instead of a curse. Public Law 480, passed in 1954, is one mechanism for doing this. We can use our vast surpluses either as a weapon in the cold war or to develop backward nations to a point where they can help themselves. We can store vast quantities in places where they can be protected from fallout both in this country and abroad. A strategic reserve is all-important. I felt this in 1939. I feel it many times as strongly in 1961.

Lastly, looking ahead 10 years I feel that all Secretaries of Agriculture will have to recognize that Government is in the agricultural business to stay.

I do not like it. Farmers do not like it. But how are farmers to get equality of bargaining power without help from the Government? The bargaining power of both corporations and labor comes largely from Government. If minimum wages are guaranteed, farmers will insist on minimum prices. They will never get parity of income as defined during the campaign. If they could be sure of half that amount year in and year out they would be lucky. As long as there are subsidies direct or indirect either of power or money to nonfarm groups, farmers will want their equalizer.

The Secretary of Agriculture in the future will be subject to greater pulling and hauling than any previous Secretary. His only safety will be in defining his goal in such a manner that when he lays down his office he can feel:

1. He has done his part to improve the soil of the United States.

2. His use of Government power has enabled the farmers of the United States to feed the people of our country well while at the same time farmers have been able to bargain more successfully in the marketplace.

3. His use of Government surpluses and surplus legislation have made our beloved country safer at home and abroad.

4. He has maintained the forward march of agricultural technology.

5. He has increased the pride of the farmers in their calling.

6. He has cooperated with his fellow Cabinet members in serving the welfare of the world.

7. He has convinced city people that food surpluses properly used are a blessing and that agricultural welfare is vital to city welfare.

8. He has convinced the State Department of the dominance of the agricultural problem in all of the crowded, undeveloped nations of the world.

In order to give life to these eight goals he must get the best judgment of—

1. The farm organizational leaders.

2. The land-grant college technicians and farm management experts.

3. Key men from Congress.

4. Farm economists in the USDA.

5. Agriculturally minded men in the State Department.

6. Commodity and cooperative leaders who are well posted on the details of the great surplus crops produced on 20 million or more acres.

7. Experts in the livestock-feed grain complex.

There will be many conflicts as many selfish interests collide. In 1935 we tried to reconcile these conflicts county by county, State by State, and region by region. That might be well done again against the background of 1961 realities.

It is quite possible that philosophers and historians at the end of the year 1999 looking back over the 20th century as they prepare to greet the 21st century will say:

"The United States failed because she failed to understand the earth-shaking potentialities in the nationalistic aspirations of the people in the crowded, underdeveloped areas. She could have used her agricultural surplus and agricultural technology to have prevented much of that destructive violence which has stained the last four decades of the most bloody century in all history. She did not bring together the best brains to meet that problem and act accordingly."

The statesmanship of the Secretaries of Agriculture and State during the next three administrations will largely determine whether or not this judgment of doom will be passed upon our beloved country.

Unemployment Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 6, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Job Incentives, Not Doles," which appeared in the Indianapolis News, March 20, 1961.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOB INCENTIVES, NOT DOLES

Most of Governor Welsh's conference on unemployment problems was devoted to extolling Indiana participation in the new Federal jobless pay program.

We could not disagree more on the merits of this plan. Not only is it a temporary palliative, but it does long-range harm to its recipients, the low-seniority workers who are always the first to be laid off.

The conference on unemployment problems might far better have occupied itself with incentives to business confidence in the State than in the ballyhoo of rewards for unemployment.

The principle of Federal extension of unemployment pay and its creeping increase should be of great concern to everyone. It can lead only to a kind of permanent dole, placing a premium on many to stay unemployed.

This increase, for example, is actually discouraging to a return of full business prosperity, since—in Indiana—it will place an additional tax burden on already hard-pressed employers, estimated by the Federal authorities at $28 million.

Furthermore, the added tax falls most heavily on new employers—the ones who have to pay high rates until they can prove the stability of their enterprises. Increasing taxation of this nature is the very opposite

of encouraging the new business Indiana needs to insure full unemployment.

The Governor's conference should have devoted its major attention to getting people back to work by giving their employers assurances that new taxes and new restrictions will not be imposed on them at the very time they need encouragement to resume and rehire.

Indiana's unemployed deserve every State help, but with emphasis on the word State. And with emphasis on job restoration and new job opportunities rather than on extension after extension of unemployment pay.

Some Hard Facts About Good Union Operations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the labor movement in the United States has had a brilliant history in working for the social and economic welfare and justice of workingmen and women of this Nation.

The road has not been easy. At every turn the labor movement has been confronted with opposition and hazards. In recent years, the public press has carried many adverse comments concerning individuals and practices within organized labor.

In view of this, I was most gratified to see the following editorial which appeared in the San Leandro Morning News of my district, which is a timely reminder of the many good labor leaders and unions which exist in our great democracy. I am delighted to submit it for the RECORD:

SOME HARD FACTS ABOUT GOOD UNION OPERATIONS

Good works, unfortunately, are seldom heralded by headlines.

The newspapers save the big headlines for stories about gangsters moving into unions and for articles about billion dollar price rigging conspiracy by industrial giants.

These are examples, we like to believe, of the exceptions to the rule. The majority of the labor movement, and leaders of industry are honest in their operation.

This week the East Bay Labor Journal printed some hard facts about good unions. Declared the voice of the labor movement in Alameda County: "No union corruption is right. No business corruption is right."

Russell Crowell, president of the county central labor council declared, "We must differentiate between the union in which an isolated union officer goes bad, and one permeated by corruption."

This is not to mean that the labor movement should try to gloss over the convincing evidence which the McClelland committee has produced—of sweetheart contracts, gangster tie-ins, looting of treasuries, perversion of the legitimate ends and aims of unionism, denial of union democracy and intimidation and violence. A black eye on the labor movement—whether they are AFL–CIO or not—hurts all who carry union cards.

Crowell declares that "there are some unions whose leaders have forgotten how to lead." No union member or officer should forget that the union exists for the rank-and-file membership.

Alameda County is fortunate that both Crowell and Executive Secretary Robert S. Ash stresses the need for responsible labor leaders. Labor leadership in the county has been a clean, vigorous movement with an outstanding record.

Project Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 6, 1961

Mr. SMATHERS. Madam President, a group of business leaders in Milton, Fla., has responded with a novel idea to President Kennedy's plea to the American people to think in terms of what they can do for America.

Their idea is called Project Employment. It calls upon the citizens of Santa Rosa County to provide a boost to the economy of the United States by making needed repairs and purchases now. They reason, and rightly so, that such a move would help to provide employment and help the Nation's economy.

I commend both their ingenuity and their sense of civic responsibility.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the presentation of their idea as it is contained in an advertisement published in the Pensacola Journal of March 3, 1961.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROJECT EMPLOYMENT

The President has asked the American people to think in terms of "what we can do for the Government" and not in terms of "what can the Government do for us."

In response to his suggestions, we are now submitting to the people of Milton and Santa Rosa County: Project Employment.

The idea is simple:

If your house needs painting, paint it now.

The money you spend for such work will give employment and such employment will put money into circulation.

Multiply the number of homes that do need painting and you will come up with many jobs for many people.

In each case, the person who has his home painted is not giving money away. He is merely insuring and, perhaps, increasing the value of his property.

The same holds true in such projects as reroofing, planting shrubbery, trees, flowers, and lawns. Property value is enhanced. Properties are beautified.

Business properties fit into the same category.

Ask yourselves these questions: What can I do to put more money into circulation? What can I do to fortify our economy?

Perhaps your automobile needs repairing. Do it now.

Perhaps your boat needs repairing. Do it now.

Perhaps your home needs electrical wiring. Do it now.

Perhaps you need to trade your present automobile. Do it now.

Perhaps you need a new suit of clothes. Buy the suit now.

There are many ways we can help.

Fortunately, in Santa Rosa County, our economic position appears sound at this time.

But we can better keep it that way by sponsoring Project Employment.

By adopting such a schedule, it may be that we shall be the first community in America to accept the President's suggestion.

We believe we will be the first. Be this as it might, we three Milton business houses are happy and consider it a civic privilege to point out our opportunity with you.

Military Invasion of Other Countries by Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 6, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Big Words Won't Do It," which appeared in the Indianapolis Star, Thursday, March 30, 1961.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIG WORDS WON'T DO IT

When the armed forces of one nation invade another and occupy nearly half of the territory of the invaded state, international law, diplomatic usage, and the rules of war provide three possible courses of action for the victim of the invasion:

First, the invaded state might capitulate and ask for an armistice of surrender. The invaders then are usually allowed to occupy the whole territory of the invaded state and impose their own conditions of peace as victors.

Second, the invaded state might ask for a cease-fire to be followed by negotiations for armistice and peace based on existing military positions at the time the cease-fire agreement is signed. That means that the invading forces are allowed to hold all the territories they have occupied by force of arms. This kind of cease-fire request is not a full surrender, but is the nearest thing to it. It acknowledges that the invading armed forces have been victorious in battle. In future negotiations, which may or may not lead to armistice and peace, the invaders enjoy all the diplomatic advantages, since the negotiations themselves are the direct result of their military victories and provide a de facto recognition of their military conquests.

Third, the invaded state might demand the withdrawal of the invading armies from the territories they have occupied and then back this demand with military action, or the threat of military action. The course of events after that depends on the military strength and the political skill of the two opponents. If the invaders become convinced that the invaded state might be supported by superior military forces of powerful allies, then the invaders are likely to retreat without serious fighting. Or they might be forced to retreat after the armed forces of the invaded state have won a decisive battle.

In Laos the United States and the West have so far chosen the second course of action—the nearest thing to a surrender offer. This is the British proposed cease-fire agreement based on existing position, i.e., the Communists holding all the territories they

have occupied by force of arms. This puts the Communists in extremely advantageous diplomatic positions, as the cease-fire—if signed—would officially acknowledge that the Communists are de facto rulers of the territories they have conquered, i.e., nearly half of the Laos State.

Of course, in future negotiations the West might demand that the Communists should leave the territories they have occupied. Western diplomats might even persuade the United Nations Assembly to pass a resolution to that effect. But the Communists would pay as much attention to such demands and resolutions as they did to the demands and resolutions which asked them to withdraw from North Korea, from Hungary, and from Tibet.

Communists never, absolutely never, withdraw voluntarily from territories they conquer by force of arms. The Communists will not leave the territories they have already occupied in north and central Laos, unless they are forced to do so. And unless they are forced to do so by the threat of military action, neither the Communists nor anybody else would take the serious warnings of the West very seriously.

The Communists do not plan and organize invasions of foreign countries for the sake of impressing the West with their political moderation or good will, or intentions to work for a better international atmosphere. Communists plan and organize invasions with the purpose of conquering territories and enlarging the size of the Communist empire. The Communists will not be stopped on their road to world conquest by big words or vague warnings. They will be stopped only when they are confronted with superior military forces united against them and when they become convinced that aggressive military moves into the territories of their neighbors do not bring them military victories and diplomatic advantages, as they have done in Laos.

National Scholarship Auditions of Friday Morning Music Club Foundation, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 6, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, most of us are aware that when George Washington directed Maj. Pierre L'Enfant to plan a Federal city 170 years ago, he specified that it should be planned as a cultural and civic center for the new United States. The father of our country recognized, even at that early date, that our Capital City would be a showpiece of our way of life—a window through which much of the world would view our new Republic and its people. And, in his great wisdom, he recognized, too, that the fine arts and education would continue to reflect the true status of our Nation—the values which, in the words of President Eisenhower, "make our civilization endure and flourish."

We in America have every right to be proud of the diversified cultural life of our country and of the continued efforts by our citizens to encourage and expand appreciation of the creative output of our poets, playwrights, composers and visionaries of the past and present. We, here in the Congress, have demonstrated our recognition of the significance of the national level of our cultural heritage through enactment of Senate bill 3335 during the 85th Congress—which bill I was happy to cosponsor, and which resulted in Public Law 874 for the establishment of a National Cultural Center here in the Nation's Capital. Many of my colleagues will recall the long and sometimes discouraging battle fought by many dedicated Members in both Houses of the Congress in order to secure legislative approval for such an international cultural beacon, which will be commensurate with our leadership in world affairs. Many public-spirited citizens maintained the courage of their convictions that here was a project which would enrich countless numbers of lives through expansion of cultural horizons. They realized that this was an absolute necessity in order for our Capital City to fufill its role of importance as a tourist center from which local and foreign visitors derive their knowledge and lasting impressions of the United States. And, a splendid example of how Members from both sides of the aisle can work together in harmony for the cultural advancement and mutual benefit of our great country was shown in the commendable bipartisan spirit which marked enactment of this legislation.

Since that time great progress has been made by many prominent individuals who are contributing their time, efforts, and funds toward eventual realization of this center which will belong to every citizen of the United States. Such a national cultural establishment will develop a greater knowledge, understanding, and appreciation of the fine arts by providing a suitable building for the presentation of music, opera, drama, dance, and poetry.

Mr. President, I wish to call attention at this time to an outstanding example of our Nation's cultural maturity to be found right here in our Capital City—the Friday Morning Music Club, Inc. Founded in 1885, this pioneer organization is well qualified to assume its place in the forefront of our expanded cultural horizons; for the objectives of the Friday Morning Music Club are dedicated generally to the ennoblement of the spirit and specifically toward the promotion of musical culture among its members and in the community. One of the largest and most active musical organizations in the Capital, the club has a membership of 600 women musicians—active, associate, honorary, and student—who periodically sponsor concerts of local and world renowned artists.

In 1949, through the untiring efforts of one of its distinguished members—Mrs. Florence Howard, the club expanded its objectives to the younger generation by forming the Friday Morning Music Club Foundation. Incorporated in 1948, the foundation—of which Mrs. Howard is the capable director—establishes a legal means for the club to receive and administer bequests and gifts in order to promote and provide musical education for the especially gifted student; and particularly for those who need help to launch their careers or to provide further training.

As a result of this fine program, national scholarship auditions are held every 18 months for young musicians who compete for awards of $1,500, $1,000, and $300. After 3 days of elimination competitions, in which selected members of the music club choose six finalists, the winners are chosen by judges of outstanding reputation in the music field.

On Friday night, April 7, the foundation will hold the finals in its national scholarship auditions at the John Wesley Powell Auditorium, here in Washington. The auditions this year are for singers between the ages of 18 and 26 and applications for the contest came from 165 young singers from all our 50 States, including Hawaii. Applications were carefully screened by members of the foundation and 40 were accepted to compete in the auditions. The finalists on Friday night will be judged by a panel of distinguished musicians including Boris Goldowski ("Mr. Opera"), Julius Rudell, director of the New York City Opera Co., and Rose Bampton, former leading soprano of the Metropolitan Opera Co. Previous winners of the national auditions have included violinists, pianists, singers, and a cellist; all of whom are now actively pursuing their careers and some of whom have already made such names for themselves as to give promise of becoming stars in future years.

The top award this year has been named by the Friday Morning Music Club "The Florence Howard Award," in honor of the founder and director of the foundation; who, through her untiring efforts, has fulfilled so completely the club's purpose of "promoting musical culture among its members and in the community."

Mr. President, in these times when the United States is faced with the challenge of providing the alternative to the path toward communism, I believe that we need more such constructive efforts which prove to the world that the citizens of our great country are not materialistic—that our own unique approach to private action, endowment, and support of the arts produces the finest artists; and that we are truly worthy of being the leader among nations—culturally and spiritually, as well as economically and defense-wise.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a listing of the officers and trustees of the Friday Morning Music Club Foundation, Inc.; along with a listing of honorary membership in the foundation and past scholarship awards.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FRIDAY MORNING MUSIC CLUB FOUNDATION, INC.

OFFICERS

Director of the foundation, Florence Howard; chairman of auditions, Kathryn Hill Rawls; secretary, Constance Russell McKay; treasurer, Katherine Riggs Burchard; assistant to the director, Jane Lea; assistant to the chairman of auditions, Lenore Bryan; president of the Friday Morning Music Club, Dorothy Raynor.

TRUSTEES

Nabiha Gazda, Helen Grimes, Neva Garner Greenwood, Evelyn Swarthout Hayes, Alma Mitchell, Alice Nagle, Miriam Taylor, Margaret Tolson, Olive McD. Witters.

HONORARY MEMBERSHIP IN THE FOUNDATION

National Judges

Miss Alice Eversman, Dr. Rudolph Ganz, Mr. Walter Golde, Mr. Julian de Gray, Mr. John Gutman, Mr. Mieczyslav Horszowski, Mary Howe, Mr. Alexander Kipnis, Mr. Boris Kroyt, Mr. Marks Levine, Mr. Eugene List, Miss Mildred Miller, Mr. Mischa Mischakoff, Dr. Howard Mitchell, Mr. Homer Mowe, Miss Elena de Sayn, Mr. Mischa Schneider, Mr. Leonard Shure, Mr. Martial Singher, Dr. Reginald Stewart, Mr. Roman Totenberg.

SCHOLARSHIP AWARDS

September 8, 1950: The Friday Morning Music Club Foundation and Patrick Hayes $1,000 award. Winner, Diana Steiner, violinist, Philadelphia, Pa.

April 16, 1952: The Friday Morning Music Club Foundation Award for Singers. Winner, First award, $700—Madelaine Chambers, White Plains, N.Y.; winner, second award, $300—Bettye Brown, Nashville, Tenn.

September 11, 1953: The Bonita Crowe $1,000 Piano Scholarship. Winner, Naomi Weiss, New York, N.Y.

April 13, 1955: The Friday Morning Music Club Foundation $1,000 Scholarship for Strings. Winner, Elaine Skorodin, Chicago, Ill.

September 12, 1956: The Friday Morning Music Club Scholarships for Singers. Winner, first award, $1,000—Robert Kerns, Detroit, Mich.; winner, second award, $300—Gilderoy Scott Memorial—Robert Moulson, Atlanta, Ga.

April 11, 1958: The Friday Morning Music Club Scholarships for Pianists. Winner, first award, $1,000—Virginia Hutchings, Atlanta, Ga.; winner, second award, $300—Jerome Rose, San Francisco, Calif.; winner, third award, $100—Emily Zachary Bayly Memorial—Anton Baker, New York, N.Y.

September 11, 1959: The Friday Morning Music Club Scholarships for Strings. Winner, first award, $1,000—Toby Saks, Cellist, New York, N.Y.; winner, second award, $300—Charles Castleman, Violinist, Braintree, Mass.; winner, third award, $100—Frances Steiner, Cellist, Philadelphia, Pa.

April 5–7, 1961: The Friday Morning Music Club Scholarships for Singers. The Florence Howard Award, $1,500 (honoring the founder and director of the foundation); the second award, $1,000, the Church-Lyons-Scott Memorials Award, $300.

Prospects for Negotiated Truce in Laos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 6, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Terms?—Theirs," which appeared in the Indianapolis Star, March 31, 1961.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TERMS?—THEIRS

Before there is too much good feeling about the prospects of a negotiated truce in Laos, the people of the United States should understand the basis for these diplomatic conversations.

The United States, Great Britain, and any other of our allies who enter talks with the Russians about Laos will do so on Communist terms even though our diplomatic corps will attempt to paint the scene in the colors of a victory.

The first and glaring inconsistency in the whole business is the expressed Russian hope that Laos may be a truly neutral nation, and not a pawn of the great powers. This is an absurdity. If Laos were capable of being anything of its own volition—neutral, pro-Communist, pro-American—there would be no crisis in southeast Asia today.

Laos is a pawn in the power struggle because the Communists made it so. The Reds have poured military hardware and supplies across the border to the pro-Red forces in Laos. In the face of constant warnings by this country and by other nations, the Communists have persisted in military operations against the Lao Government.

Two other points will show the real grounds for negotiations on Laos. President Kennedy has set no time limit for a cease-fire, nor has he indicated where a so-called cease-fire boundary will be drawn.

The Communists, in Russia and China, can continue to talk, and may continue to fight in Laos. Only when they are ready to stop shooting will the war there end. The Reds started the invasion of Laos, and they will be able to continue that intrusion at their leisure.

If past history offers any sort of precedent, the Communists will negotiate to keep absolutely all of the territory they have conquered in Laos. Current reports indicate the Pathet Lao has cut the narrow-waisted little country in two. If that is the case, the Communists will be happy to accept such a situation in the knowledge that the two amputated parts of the nation may be picked up at their later convenience.

A few concrete examples of this Communist method will serve to emphasize the statement made above. In Korea, the boundary lies right along the line of farthest Communist advance. The Reds are in East Germany and Berlin to stay, they say, even though a final agreement for Germany has never been reached. In Hungary, the Russians were willing to talk after they crushed the freedom fighters and reoccupied the country.

Measured coldly by the facts, the United States and its allies are preparing to negotiate on Communist terms for the dismemberment of Laos. Under such circumstances, there can be no diplomatic victory for the United States. At best, a nasty war fought a long way off from either Moscow or Washington may be averted. At worst half of Laos will be lost and the rest may follow later.

Tribute to Dr. Roy Lynde, of Ellendale, N. Dak.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 6, 1961

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, many interesting stories have been written concerning most unforgettable characters. The current issue of the Reader's Digest has such a story concerning a Dr. Roy Lynde, of Ellendale, N. Dak., a city close to where I lived most of my life. I have been privileged to know Dr. Lynde for many, many years. The fine things said about him in this article are all true; and even much more could be said. He spent a lifetime helping others, oftentimes, without compensation, especially during the depression years. Most of his reward will be in the world to come. Probably one of the greatest joys of his life has been in being able to help other people.

Having grown up in a rural community, I am very familiar with the hardships endured by Dr. Lynde and other country doctors. Often such a practice involves night trips far into the country during all kinds of weather, including the worst of blizzards. Theirs has been a great contribution to mankind.

This particular story concerning Dr. Lynde was written by Helen Graham Rezatto. I am privileged to know the author, as well as other members of her family. Her father was a very public-spirited person and greatly interested in community, State, and National affairs.

I ask unanimous consent that this story be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the story was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MOST UNFORGETTABLE CHARACTER I'VE MET

(By Helen Graham Rezatto)

"I've got to make a call," Doc Lynde said to me. "Want to come along?"

"Oh, yes, Doc," I cried. All the kids in Ellendale, N. Dak., vied to accompany Doc on his rounds and this time I, a 10-year-old, had beaten out the teenagers.

I delivered the exciting news at home and raced back to Doc's garage. Dr. Roy Lynde loved medicine and machinery in about equal parts, and with his brother Guy had the town's Plymouth-Chrysler agency. It was a two-story brick building with salesroom and service garage on the first floor, Doc Lynde's office and bachelor living quarters on the second.

Doc was waiting for me, and off we rolled over the flat farmlands toward the Coteau-Missouri hills. This was the fall of 1930, and the land was in the grip of the great drought. As we drove through the desolate countryside I saw endless drifts of dust, once topsoil, piled against the fences. Sometimes grasshoppers blanketed the road, and as we drove over them we'd hear a crisp crackling sound and the car would skid a bit. We talked about the drought, about school, and the teachers, about the football team. I talked as if he were 10 years old and he talked as if I were 55. We understood each other perfectly.

Finally we turned in at a farmhouse, and out of it came a man and woman in faded, patched clothes. Inside we found a boy, about my age, in bed. His face, terribly pale because of a blood disease, lit up when he saw us. Doc took his temperature, thumped and poked him, all the time talking about a baseball game he'd seen recently. Finally he poured some pills into an envelope and handed them to the anxious mother.

"You know what's gonna fix you up?" Doc said to the boy, "Frog spit." The boy let out a whoop of delight. "You do what your mom tells you, and when you're strong enough to get outdoors, then you get some frog spit on the middle finger of your right hand, and you'll be fit as a fiddle."

As we were going out through the kitchen I saw the farmer reach up on a shelf for a Mason jar half full of coins. Doc saw this, too, and hustled me out the door. "Next

time," he called over his shoulder, "Next time."

As we roared away Doc grumped, "The damn fool. Last money he had in the world and he wanted to give it away."

Strangers sometimes thought Doc Lynde was a grouch. True, there was a downward set to his month and a bulldog thrust to his chin and he said "hell" and "damn" a good deal, two words not generally employed in our Lutheran and Methodist town. But all you had to do was look at his eyes to see the merriment inside. He was every kid's friend, and the grownups' too.

Doc didn't have office hours; he was available around the clock. The 1,900 people in Ellendale went to bed early, but at any hour of the night in the darkened town you could find one square of light: Doc's window. It told us that he was sleeping lightly, ready to respond to any need. It gave everyone a feeling of security.

Realizing that his appearance at a bedside was good medicine, Doc would make a house call no matter what the distance or difficulties. I remember one January day during a terrible blizzard when the county road foreman stomped into my father's law office, shaking his head in disbelief. "You know what Doc just did? He came into the highway garage and said he had to make a call at the Schmidt farm and wanted me to plow him a way to it. I told him that's a back road and I've got barely enough men to keep the county roads open. Next thing I knew he jumped into one of the plows and took off into the storm. He's got 20 miles to go and he's never handled a snowplow."

"He'll make it," my father said.

He did. And he made it in another storm, too, a few winters later. That time he borrowed a handcar and we watched him head down the railroad tracks, pumping for all he was worth, to see a sick man in the north part of the county. It was midnight before he got home, by the same method.

Doc's bedside manner was unique. He'd enter the sickroom cracking jokes or telling stories, and never give the patient a chance to list his complaints. But all during his monolog he would carefully probe, touch, look, analyze. His theory was that if he ever appeared to take the symptoms seriously, the patient would imagine that he was sicker than he really was.

Actually, Doc's diagnostic skill was amazing, and he was ahead of his time in treatment. He massaged polio victims before Sister Kenny was heard of, and he gave thrombosis patients limited exercise when the rest of the country was giving only bed rest. Hypochondriacs and malingerers received short shrift, however. "Dam it," he'd say to a patient. "I wish I had your heart."

The Lynde garage was an after-school hangout for kids. We delighted in the practical jokes Doc and his cronies played on one another. We laughed when they laughed, and felt grownup. Doc always treated us as if we had good sense and opinions that deserved an audience.

The town's No. 1 sports fan, Doc didn't miss a single high school game if he could help it. When the games were out of town, he'd pile his car full of kids and off we'd go to cheer for Ellendale. When we grew older, Doc would loan us brandnew cars out of the showroom for joy rides and out-of-town games. (He still carries special insurance to cover this.) He never said, "Be careful." He said, "Take her out and see if she's any good." And because he assumed we were responsible, we were.

I never had an accident with one of Doc's cars, but I did with my father's. I wrinkled a fender against a telephone pole, then drove the car to Doc's garage and broke into tears.

"Hell," he said. "You didn't do much damage. We can fix that so your dad will never know."

He and Alvin, his mechanic, went to work on that fender and it came out smooth and shiny, and Dad never did know. No charge, of course.

Ray's Cafe was another hangout, where we went for sodas after school. Whenever Doc happened to drop in, every booth would set up a clamor for him to sit there. One time he paused before the booth where I was jammed in with seven other girls, looked directly at me (I thought) and said, "Damn funny thing. All the kids I deliver turn out to be the best looking."

I blushed with pleasure and pride, then suddenly realized that every girl in the booth had been delivered by him. Still, we each took it personally.

My first really objective view of Doc came after I had gone away to college and returned home for Thanksgiving vacation. Visiting his office, I observed his habit of dipping the thermometer in alcohol, then wiping it on his necktie before putting it in a patient's mouth, and noticed how he allowed Tom, his big striped cat, to sleep in the baby incubator when it was not in use. So what? Nobody ever got sick from the germs on Doc's tie, and no baby objected to Tom's use of the incubator.

I made a few country calls with Doc, but now he had a new systm of priorities; any medical student who was home vacationing had first rights. At least 10 boys from Ellendale were becoming, or had become, doctors because of Doc's inspiration—and often with the help of his cash. Kenneth Leiby was one of the medical students that fall. One morning as I was talking with Ken's mother, Doc's car came down the street. Ken was with him and his face was split with a triumphant grin. Even Doc was allowing himself a small Cheshire-cat smile. Ken jumped out of the car and came racing toward us.

"Do you know what happened?" he cried. "We went on this OB case about 50 miles out in the country, and she delivered at about 6 this morning. Well, Doc has the baby up by the heels and is spanking some wind into it when he turns to me and says, 'I got mine, now go get yours.' Gee, she was having twins—and I delivered a baby. What do you think of that?"

We thought it was pretty wonderful, and no one was prouder than Doc.

After college I married, and in 1943 my husband went off to war leaving me in New York, pregnant. I went to an immaculate, efficient obstetrician with a starched nurse and gleaming equipment, and I hated every minute of it. I wanted an old, cluttered medical office over a garage. I went home. Doc Lynde had delivered me, and it was he who delivered my baby son. With my husband away, it gave me a comforting sense of the continuity of life.

Doc was always there when needed. One afternoon while my father was working in the garden he had a heart attack. Doc was at our house in minutes and this time there were no jokes. Crisply he ordered me, "Run down to the garage and tell Alvin to bring the oxygen tank, the one we've been using to weld broken springs."

When we returned with the tank we found that Doc and my mother had improvised a tent with bed sheets draped over the four-poster and pinned down to the mattress. He inserted the valve of the oxygen tank under the sheets and began turning it on and off by hand. This makeshift arrangement needed constant attention and Doc was on his knees with it for 4 hours straight. He saved my father's life. It was this kind of devoation he gave to every sick man and woman and child in the county.

Despite other heart attacks, my father lived an active life for 9 more years. Then even Doc Lynde could do no more. After my father's funeral the family returned to the bleakness of an empty house. Each sat with his own heavy burden of loss. Suddenly up the sidewalk came Doc. He entered the room briskly, tossed his hat and coat in a corner and said, "Well now, that was a mighty fine speech the minster made about Fred. Don't you think so?"

The text had been from Timothy: "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith." Doc grinned at us. "Now, you can't deny it, Fred did have some good fights."

My father had indeed been a strong-willed, rugged individualist. Doc now began to recall his more notable legal and political battles, and we found ourselves smiling, then laughing. Soon we were immersed in wonderful, sustaining memories of the living man. Doc helped us through that first day without our even realizing that we were his patients, that he was prescribing the potent medicine of good memories.

It took our town a long time to discover that Doc was growing old. He was so much a part of our daily lives that we failed to notice the slow accumulation of wrinkles on his face, or that he paused more and more frequently to catch his breath. It was hard to face the fact that one day the beacon light on the second floor of the garage would be extinguished.

Suddenly we all wanted to express to Doc how we felt about him. But how? Then someone thought of giving him a surprise party on his 76th birthday. On that evening he was taken out for an automobile ride. As the car approached the high school Doc saw the drum majorettes standing by the gym and he exclaimed, "Damn it, have I forgotten a game?"

His host suggested they stop and find out. As Doc stepped from the car the majorettes surrounded him and escorted him in. A mighty roar went up from the residents of Ellendale and Dickey County, and then the throng burst into "Happy Birthday." Doc looked stunned and glanced behind him as if to escape, but the drum majorettes were between him and the door. With a sheepish grin on his weatherbeaten face, he took the place of honor at the head table.

There were skits, speeches and gifts. Dr. Kenneth Leiby, the boy who had delivered the twins with Doc and was now a successful general practitioner in New Hope, Pa., had commissioned a large oil portrait of Doc, painted from photographs, which he now presented to the community.

At one point during the speeches the toastmaster said, "Of course, since Doc is a bachelor he has no kids."

"I'm Doc's kid," squeaked a 3-year-old, jumping up.

"I'm Doc's kid," called out a young housewife, standing.

"I'm Doc's kid," boomed the town newspaper editor, rising to his feet.

One by one, people identified themselves until there was a great throng standing. They looked at Doc and he looked back at them and suddenly his chin began to quiver. We had found a way to thank him. Our very existence was our tribute to his skilled and loving hands.

In recent years we've tried to honor Doc in other ways. We built the Dr. Roy Lynde Memorial Nursery section of the county hospital. On the 50th anniversary of the day he began medical practice after graduating from the University of Minnesota, we held a civic holiday with a parade and a doubleheader during which we dedicated the ball park as the Dr. Roy Lynde Memorial Athletic Field.

Today he is 86. The dust in his office is undisturbed, for his instruments are now relics of the past. When he leaves the garage to go to the restaurant for dinner he walks very slowly and, should he falter, a dozen people are at his side. Each night a

different neighbor looks in on him to be certain he's all right. During the week the population of Ellendale parades past his chair in the garage just to say, "Hi, Doc." The mighty force of the love he has given others over the years now returns to range protectively around him.

I look at him and think of all the sick people he's held in his arms, the bills he's forgotten, the jokes he's laughed at, the kids he's spoiled, the kind deeds he's hidden. And I think of the richness he's brought to our town. Each of us has tried to be a little bit like Doc. None of us made it all the way, but we're more understanding and generous and loving than we would have been if he hadn't lived among us.

Could any man hope to accomplish more?

The American Essay Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 6, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The American Essay Contest—I," from the Indianapolis Star of April 2, 1961; an editorial entitled "The American Essay Contest—II," from the Indianapolis Star of April 3, 1961; also an editorial entitled "The American Essay Contest," which appeared in the Indianapolis Star on April 4, 1961.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN ESSAY CONTEST—I

We have been both delighted and dismayed by the results of the Star's American Essay Contest—delighted because the winning papers were so excellent, showed thorough preparation, research, good writing, and a clear understanding of the difference between a republic and a democracy—dismayed because the great majority did not.

But in this first editorial on the subject we want to speak of our delight in the job done by the 33 winners and several hundred other entries. These contestants made a real effort to discover the fundamental nature of the two contrasting systems. Most of them gained a fairly clear undertsanding of the obvious differences. As one of the top three winners put it, quoting former Chief Justice John Marshall, "Between a balanced republic and a democracy the difference is like that between order and chaos." Pure democracy, as it was under the Greeks, can become mob rule and usually does. As this same essay reminded us, Christ was crucified because of the democratic vote of a mob incited by the priests. Socrates took the hemlock for much the same reason.

Another of the top three papers made a vitally important point that was missed by so many of the others. Only in a republic are the rights of minorities protected. "In a democracy," this essay said, "the will of the majority suppresses minorities. Each man is equal before the law, but he is not equal in his ability to make the laws." It was for this reason that the Founding Fathers established a republic with the Constitution and Bill of Rights. It was for this reason that they sharply divided the powers of those who govern and left so much authority in the hands of the States—to prevent the centralization of political power so that it could not be seized in time of crisis by tyrants, either elected or imposed. Because they knew from history that this happened in democratic Greece and later in republican Rome, they went even further than the Roman Republic in providing protections for the people from the advent of tyranny.

Another thing that pleased us greatly about the winning papers was the excellent selection of a bibliography for reference. The best papers were uniformly the ones with the best reference works, not only books but also articles and papers like the Federalist Papers. Without a study of a variety of books and other material on the subject, a first-class essay simply is not possible. Not only were the best essays based on good sources, they also showed that what they read was applied in their work.

We are happy that we have received so many letters and calls from students and parents and teachers and others who are pleased that this American essay contest has stimulated a real interest among our high school students in the principles of American government. One contest winner's father came in to tell us that his son had now decided to make the study of government his main academic concern because of his experience in preparing his essay.

Finally we were very much encouraged to note that even in those papers that did not measure up, the ones that showed poor preparation and weakness in understanding, the participants were eager to learn about their country's institutions. They clearly showed their pride and gratitude for being Americans. They appreciate the liberty and the opportunity that the American way of life offers them.

Certainly the results of the American Essay Contest have been worth all of the time, effort, and money spent. The Star is proud of our young students and especially proud of those winners who did such a splendid job.

THE AMERICAN ESSAY CONTEST—II

Yesterday we said we were both delighted and dismayed at the results of the American essay contest sponsored by the Star. A minority of high school students did do a good job of differentiating between a democracy and a republic. That delighted us. But what dismayed us was that the majority did not. Their essays were, in many cases, simply almost word for word repeats of part of what they read in two encyclopedias, the Brittanica and the Americana. Some who added other books to their reference list plainly either did not read them or did not understand what they read. A great many showed by their essays that they had virtually no training in formal essay writing. In fact one teacher who wrote us said that this was the first chance her class had to write a formal essay. This astonished us.

And so did some of the conclusions reached by the students. Let us quote some: "There are many more people who immigrate from their republican form of government to our democratic government, than emigrate from our democratic government to a republican form of government [sic]."

"Republics fail to recognize the dignity and worth of the individual."

"I believe that our Government has gone through a great change. We have grown from a small colonial nation, which persecuted the minority, through our democratic and republican stages of government, and we are now entering what could be the answer—the socialistic stage. Could it be that this type of socialism is the same socialism that Russia is seeking so unsuccessfully?"

"I have always been taught that we live in a democracy. I can see now that this statement is not always true."

"What is the difference between a democracy and a republic? It really never occurred to me or probably to anyone else."

"In a republic a change of authority generally is begun or ended with riots."

"A democracy believes in more responsibility for economic conditions of the country by the government, and republics believe [sic] that most economic decisions should be left to private companies and to the people themselves."

"A republic, in my eyes, is a state led by a dictator and his own self-appointed people. The people can't go to bed at night without fear of bodily harm."

"A democracy is people working for themselves in free enterprises and paying taxes to local and State governments, for support, in proportion to what they earn. Therefore, the United States is an example of a democracy and the Soviet Union is an example of a republic."

These quoted ideas ran through hundreds of the essays we read. What conclusions should we draw from this?

First we must conclude that in many Indiana schools children are not taught the difference between a republic and a democracy, and their history or government books do not explain it.

Second in many schools essay writing is not required in English or other courses.

Third, in many schools students are taught that the United States is a democracy and not a republic despite the words of the pledge of allegiance and the history of the founding of the Republic.

No wonder so many students wrote that they hadn't considered the question before because "it really never occurred to me."

It seems clear, therefore, that school boards and principals and teachers should take a second look at the books they use and the courses that are taught about the Government of the United States. As we said, the majority of the entries do not show any understanding of the difference, which simply means that they were never taught the difference.

When asked about the results of the Constitutional Convention Benjamin Franklin replied, "We have given you a republic if you can keep it."

How can we keep it if we don't know what it is?

So what must the student do to make a clear distinction between a republic and a democracy? If he is not taught it in school he has to go outside to fundamental sources. Reading "The Federalist" papers, of course, would be instructive. But there are many books on the subject. For instance, Felix Morley's "Freedom and Federalism" is an excellent sourcebook. Morley, a political philosopher, journalist, and student of government, points out that the United States was conceived as a Federal Republic deliberately designed to limit democracy and avoid dictatorship. Quoting John Adams he writes, "There never was a democracy that did not commit suicide." He adds that democracy "was certainly not the system these men were supporting for the United States." And, "The theory of check and balance, as superimposed on our Federal structure, was derived from the writings of the French philosopher Montesquieu and has no relation whatever to the English political tradition."

Students preparing essays for the "American Essay Contest" should begin first with pondering the roots of the word "republic." It comes from the Latin res publica—meaning public things or something belonging to the people. If a government belongs to the people it cannot be either a dictatorship or a Communist state, for in those states the people clearly belong to the government.

We hope that teachers, students, and parents will all take to heart the lessons learned in this first "American Essay Contest." It has

been most gratifying to know that some of the students have come to learn well the distinction between a republic and a democracy. It has been useful to learn that many others, the majority, do not. For now that unfortunate situation can be corrected by students, teachers, and book publishers alike.

Santayana once wrote that "people who don't know history are bound to repeat it." If Americans don't know the nature of their own government, they are bound to lose it.

THE AMERICAN ESSAY CONTEST—III

In our second editorial on the Star's "American Essay Contest" we revealed that the majority of students competing either did not know or had only a vague idea of the difference between a republic and a democracy. The reason for this is quite clear. They are not taught the difference in their history or government courses in many schools. The references they used, chiefly two encyclopedias, the Americana and the Britannica, gave them only what might be termed the "modern" interpretation of the two concepts of government—which is most confusing.

This interpretation, used particularly by the Encyclopaedia Americana, classifies any government which calls itself a republic as a republic. We don't know why the Americana doesn't also claim the same for democracies, for the Soviet Union calls itself a republic, but it also calls its captive states "people's democracies." It should be clear to anyone who has studied the history of the American Republic and the Roman republic and also the government of the socialist Soviet Union that the Soviet Union is neither democratic nor republican. But the Encyclopaedia Americana states that there are three kinds of republics: "(1) democratic republics of the West," "(2) states officially designated as republics although they are in point of fact military or junta dictatorships." "(3) the Communist republics." Thus the average high school student would conclude, if this is his only source, that a republic can be a dictatorship or a Communist state, which is nonsense.

The Encycloaedia Britannica does not go nearly as far in making this distinction. It states, "The insistence that a republic is not synonymous with democracy either as direct democracy or as absolute majoritarian democracy, but rather as synonymous with constitutional democracy is correct in the specific U.S. context, though that usage is a narrowing of the wider use of the term to denote any nonmonarchial regime."

Of course any "nonmonarchial regime" could be a Communist state, and the student could conclude from this definition that outside of the United States a Communist regime could be a republic.

This kind of definition dilutes and destroys the true meaning of the word "republic" until it has no clear meaning at all.

Lift From Bootstrap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 6, 1961

Mr. SMATHERS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a well deserved editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday, April 2, entitled "Lift From Bootstrap." It is an endorsement of the nomination of Mr. Teodor Moscoso, the former director of development in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, to be Ambassador from the United States to Venezuela. I am certain that Mr. Moscoso and President Romulo Betancourt will be able, together, to work toward improving the economic and political conditions in that important country, which is obviously so necessitous, and whose freedom and economic strength are so important to the Western Hemisphere.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIFT FROM BOOTSTRAP

Teodoro Moscoso, who has been designated as U.S. Ambassador to Venezuela, is a singularly able economic planner and a likeable public servant. He is also a Puerto Rican. In some Latin American capitals, where the myth persists that Puerto Rico is an unhappy colony, the appointment of Mr. Moscoso may be regarded mistakenly as a diplomatic slight. We think that President Kennedy was right in feeling that the merits of the appointment are well worth the risk.

It is understandable that some Latin Americans are confused about Puerto Rico's status—it is sometimes perplexing to a continental. Although Puerto Ricans are citizens of the United States, they have freely chosen commonwealth status. If Puerto Rico wanted independence, there is little doubt that the request would be granted. But the islanders themselves have voted to remain within the Federal system as a self-governing commonwealth.

No one is better qualified to explain Puerto Rico's unique status than Teodoro Moscoso. As the administrator of "Operation Bootstrap," he can give first-hand testimony on how the island has benefited from its status and has managed to double living standards in a generation. No less important, he can make clear that there has been no loss of dignity or of liberty under the island's elective government.

Puerto Rico's experience under "Operation Bootstrap" is a precious resource that can be profitably used in other countries facing similar problems of growth. But before the resource is employed, the myth of Puerto Rican servitude must be exploded. One way to do this is to appoint more islanders in a variety of posts until the service of Puerto Ricans is taken for granted.

Mr. Kennedy has already named Dr. Arturo Morales Carrion as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State. The assignment of Mr. Moscoso to Venezeula is all the more welcome because it will hasten the time when further appointments will become matter of course.

Opportunities for Use of Retired Persons in Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 6, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Why Not Try This?" which appeared in the Indianapolis Star, Thursday, March 30, 1961.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY NOT TRY THIS?

Since the United States apparently is going to have a Peace Corps, complete with a Kennedy kinsman at its helm, the suggestion of Forest M. Shafer of this city deserves serious consideration. More than a month ago, he came up with the sound idea that retired persons be used as ambassadors of free enterprise in under-developed areas.

He broached the plan to Dr. Cleo Blackburn, director of the board for fundamental education, also of this city. Dr. Blackburn said, "It is my opinion that these mature senior citizens might provide a much more stabilized leadership in guiding people in underdeveloped countries than young people." There shouldn't be any serious argument with that statement.

Retired citizens, who wished to join the Peace Corps, could certainly serve as counterweights for some of the more enthusiastic young folks who undoubtedly will find their way into the organization. By the simple exercise of experience gathered over a lifetime, the older men and women would have knowledge and skill readily available without training. They could, if they wished, work in foreign nations at salaries under the figure which the Government has been accustomed to pay "career workers" in this field.

The retired man or woman will not have to learn about America or the free enterprise system of business from a textbook. He will know. The lives of the older citizens will be a human reflection of what the American system can do for its people.

As long as the New Frontier is looking for new ideas, this seems to be much sounder that the original plan which drew so much uncritical applause from the colleges of the land. Peace is not the prerogative of youth, but rather of advancing years. The President should think seriously about asking retired Americans to aid in the Peace Corps.

A Crusader Against Government Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CALEB BOGGS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 6, 1961

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, Delawareans are proud of the senior Senator from Delaware, JOHN WILLIAMS, and his continuing fight for economy in Government.

I commend to my colleagues in the Senate an article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on April 2 by Victor Wilson which tells the story of Senator WILLIAMS' crusade against Government waste.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CRUSADER AGAINST GOVERNMENT WASTE

(By Victor Wilson)

WASHINGTON.—Members of the Senate are waiting with anticipation—tinged with just a bit of apprehension—for its strongest foe of waste in Government spending to unveil his latest finds in that field.

That Senator is JOHN JAMES WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware.

Though he helps to represent the second smallest State in the Union, there is nothing puny about Senator WILLIAMS' unrelenting campaign for economy in spending the taxpayers' money and against its misuse.

It shouldn't be long now before the gentleman from Delaware speaks out. An associate confirms that the Senator has a number of private investigations underway, and it's just a question of time until one of them jells firmly enough for him to provide details publicly.

The reason there is just a bit of apprehension among Senator WILLIAMS' colleagues about what he might disclose is their knowledge that he plays no favorites.

His next target could just as well be an influential constituent of a Senator or Representative, as the Pentagon, the Agriculture Department, the Internal Revenue Service, or the Federal Maritime Board. All have felt the whiplash of his senatorial indignation at one time or another.

The nature of Senator WILLIAMS' political courage is well illustrated by a vote of his a couple of years ago. His home State has frequently been called "The Du Pont Duchy." However, when a bill came up in the Senate beneficially affecting that giant company's interests—but failed to square with the Senator's conscience—he unhesitatingly voted against it.

At the last session of Congress Senator WILLIAMS spelled out in detail, on the Senate floor, the probable loss of millions because of the President's penchant for negotiating defense contracts with individual firms instead of calling for free-for-all bids.

Later in the session he told Senate colleagues how a group of westerners bought up some virtually worthless swampland, did a bit of crop-planting to "create a record," then quietly put it in the soil bank and collected Federal fees for not planting more crops there.

Wherever there's waste, or a lack of economy, one usually finds Senator WILLIAMS poking into it. Two years ago he revealed that one company collected $14 million in one year from the Government for storing surplus crops and another more than $13 million for the same purpose.

Three years ago he tried but failed to bar free, or cut-rate, trips on Government-subsidized vessels for Federal officials and Members of Congress. Last year he tried, but failed again, to require all Congressmen traveling in this country or abroad on Federal business to submit detailed expense accounts.

Way back in 1951, however, he had a bill passed making the salaries and expense funds of Presidents, Vice Presidents, and Congressmen liable to income tax, minus only legitimate business expenses. He declared that the previous practice of making the expense funds nontaxable favored these officials over ordinary citizens.

The value of a dollar came to Senator WILLIAMS early as the 9th in a family of 11 children. He was born May 17, 1904, on a Frankford, Del., farm and attended that community's grammar and high schools.

At 18 he struck out for himself, moving to nearby Millsboro, Del., and starting a chicken farm and a feed and grain business. He still lives there and still runs the farm and business, with his brother's help.

He got his first political experience on the town council of Millsboro (population about 1,000). In 1946, to use his own words, he became "fed up" with what was going on in Washington, particularly continuation of price controls by the Truman administration. He decided to make a bid for a Senate seat.

He ran against New Deal Senator JAMES M. TUNNELL, pushing hard on the issue of Federal controls on the national economy, and trounced him, 62,603 to 50,910. He took his Senate seat January 3, 1947, was reelected in 1952 and again in 1958.

Even before he went to the Senate, Senator WILLIAMS began to suspect something was wrong in the Internal Revenue Service because of a rather involved incident in his own bailiwick. In 1951 he helped expose corruption, fraud, and bribery in that agency. Sixty-one officials quit, resigned, or were indicted in the scandal. It's one of the Senator's proudest trophies.

Senator WILLIAMS has good sources of information as ranking Republican on the Senate Finance Committee and as a member of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation and the Joint Committee on Reduction of Non-Essential Expenditures. He also watches General Accounting Office reports, which check Federal outlays.

Married, with one daughter and three grandchildren, Senator WILLIAMS likes hunting, when he finds time. He's also rather proud of the fact that he makes the AFL–CIO Committee on Political Education list of least desirable legislators as frequently as any Republican Senator.

States' Rights and Federal Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 6, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Why States' Rights?" which appeared in the Indianapolis News, Tuesday March 28, 1961.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY STATES' RIGHTS?

Last week a letterwriter challenged the News on its continued defense of States' rights. Surveying some of the absurdities and malfeasances of the late legislature, the reader said:

"These, then, are the clowns to whom the News and others would relegate our destinies. You go on preaching States' rights and the evils of the Federal Government. As for me, I am willing to pay a little more and take my chances with Washington." As we see it, the point is a good one to raise—not because it disproves the case for States' rights, but because it establishes it.

The reader, who signs himself "Servetus," seems to think that, in some way, the same legislators who are "clowns" in Indiana become statesmen when they are transported to Washington; that an agency, government, which acts foolishly when we are close to it, acts wisely when we are far away from it; that, by increasing size and distance, government gains in virtue.

As it develops, exactly the opposite is true. Government is government at all levels—an instrument of compulsion, wielded by fallible men. When it becomes more distant from us, and more complicated in its workings, it does not lose any of its flaws. The only real difference is in the ability of the voter—such as our irate reader—to keep tabs on what is going on. Thus when government acts absurdly in Indianapolis, it is recognized as being absurd. But when it acts absurdly in Washington, it is either pictured as too much a matter for "experts" for the average citizen to understand, or else labeled "confidential."

Granted, hula dancers and a lost thoroughfare bill are ridiculous. But what about building roads in Laos that don't lead anywhere, or uninhabited apartment houses in Lebanon? What about misestimating Federal road costs by $1 million a mile? Or a farm program that pays farmers to produce and not to produce—and has piled up $9 billion in surpluses? Or Federal aid programs which "help" us by selling us dollars at $1.87 apiece?

Could anything be more ridiculous than these actions by our Federal Government? Yet, because that Government is distant from us, we have accepted these and other absurdities as a matter of course. To make the point specific, let us consider two instances involving increased taxes—at the State level, and at the Federal level.

There was considerable unhappiness when Governor Welsh proposed a reduction in the gross income tax exemption. The change would have raised Indiana taxes by about $9 million a year. No one, including Democratic legislators, wanted any part of it, and the proposal never got off the ground.

Now look at the Federal level. President Kennedy proposed, and Congress passed, an unemployment compensation bill that will raise Indiana's taxes by $28 million. The measure passed with hardly a ripple of protest, and our taxes will go up to pay for it.

Why did no one protest this tax increase, after all the outcry against Welsh's program? The answer seems clear enough. The Federal proposal was so distant, and its mechanics so unfamiliar, that many people did not realize they were being asked to accept a tax increase. The remoteness of the Federal Government makes it seem like a cornucopia of subsidies—benefits which somehow do not have to be paid for. At the State level, this fiction cannot be maintained.

It is precisely for this reason that we prefer to keep government close to home, where the people can control it.

Economic Losses in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 6, 1961

Mr. SMATHERS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Make the Break Complete," published in the Miami News, of March 15, 1961. I commend the editorial to the reading of all Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAKE THE BREAK COMPLETE

The Miami News believes that if the United States continues to pour $70 to $80 million a year into Cuba, our Government is abetting Cuba's leaders in their avowed purpose of spreading communism throughout Latin America.

Fidel Castro's vituperative reaction to President Kennedy's proposed 10-point plan for the revitalization of Latin America is simply another in a long line of Castro insults to the people of the United States.

These insults we have endured, and we would continue to endure them if we thought there were any hope that economic relations would be of benefit to the Cuban people. There is on longer basis for such hope.

Continued purchase of products from Cuba can only prolong the tyranny in which the Cuban people are held.

We doubt that many Americans realize as well as we in south Florida that when this country stopped buying Cuban sugar, only about two-thirds of Cuba's exports to the United States were eliminated. Some 3 million pounds of Cuban fruit, vegetables, molasses, and tobacco still enter U.S. ports each week. Florida markets alone contribute $25 million annually to what remains of the Cuban economy.

Our own economic losses have been fantastic since the Castro regime came to power in January 1959. Millions of dollars in American property have been nationalized, and there is no hope that Castro will ever fulfill his promise of repayment.

All this from a regime that has ground to dust the basic democratic freedoms enjoyed by so many in this hemisphere and sought by so many others.

Hospitality for Foreign Visitors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. CARROLL
OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 6, 1961

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, on several occasions recently I have discussed on the floor of the Senate the need for a Host Corps here at home in the United States. This Host Corps would provide hospitality, guidance, and helpful reception for foreign visitors in conjunction with our newly accelerated efforts to improve the tourist industry within our country.

The American Bar Association has written to me acknowledging its interest in this project and describing its own efforts to further international understanding.

The American Bar Association's hospitality work among foreigners visiting our shores is to be highly commended and so that all may read of its endeavors, I ask unanimous consent that the association's letter to me be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., March 30, 1961.

Hon. JOHN A. CARROLL,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CARROLL: I have read with interest your remarks in the March 1961 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD regarding hospitality for foreign visitors. The work of the American Bar Association and of the many lawyers on the local level in this field may be of interest to you.

Recognizing the need for making proper contacts for the many foreign lawyers and judges who visit this country, the association has established a special committee on relations with lawyers of other nations, composed of members in each State. The Washington office of the association acts as a clearinghouse for information about foreign visitors by maintaining liaison with embassies, the State Department and private organizations which arrange itineraries for the visiting lawyers. The special committee of the association has held a series of luncheons in Washington for representatives of the various Embassies to impress upon them the desire of the lawyers in this country to assist in making the proper contacts for visting lawyers and judges. This activity has been warmly received by Embassy officials. We make an effort to contact lawyers and judges in every community to be visited by the foreign lawyer. The success of this activity is evidenced by the comments of our foreign visitors after their stay in the United States.

The association is doing a great deal of other work to further international understanding. The annual meeting in Washington last August at which we had as our guests some 1,400 solicitors and barristers and their families from Great Britain, was perhaps the largest undertaking of its type by any voluntary association. The American Bar Association and some State and local bar associations are carrying on projects to collect modern lawbooks for the universities and courts of foreign countries. You may also have read that the association has now established a special committee to cooperate with Cuban lawyers in exile.

The nationwide observance of Law Day is one of the most extensive public relations projects of its type undertaken by voluntary associations. By action of the Congress, May 1 of each year has now been designated Law Day U.S.A. The purpose of Law Day is to foster an increased respect for law, to encourage responsible citizenship and to make more meaningful to Americans of all ages their inheritance of "freedom under law" and in doing so to point out the contrast between the great principle and the subordination of human rights under communism. This observance has international effect in that speeches are broadcast behind the Iron Curtain by the Voice of America, Law Day materials are sent to foreign countries, and Law Day observances are held in some nations.

An extensive program is being carried out by our world peace through law committee to crystalize the ideas of leading lawyers of the world as to effective steps that can be taken toward the establishment of the international rule of law to bring about an orderly conduct of relations between countries. In the pursuit of this objective continental conferences are scheduled for lawyers of the Americas, of Asia, of Africa and of Europe sponsored by the American Bar Association Special Committee on World Peace Through Law with funds supplied by the Ford Foundation and the International Cooperation Administration. The continental conference will have the participation of the national bar associations of 23 nations in the Americas, 19 participating associations of Asia, 29 participating associations in Europe, and in Africa delegates from 33 nations. The continental conferences are to be exploratory and educational in character, with the purpose of helping to lay a proper foundation for a world conference of lawyers. The first conference is that of the Americas and is scheduled to be held in San Jose, Costa Rica, on June 11–14, 1961, and the second, the Asian Conference is scheduled for Tokyo, Japan, on September 17–20, 1961. Plans for the European and African conferences are yet to be finalized.

Through these activities many American lawyers are striving to bring about a better understanding throughout the world of our system of law and justice.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD E. CHANNELL,
Director, Washington Office.

Espionage Activities by the Kremlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 6, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Moscow's U–2," which appeared in the Indianapolis News, Tuesday, March 28, 1961.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Moscow's U–2

A sardonic footnote to the London spy trial would be good for a laugh if it did not so deeply expose the Western World's potentially fatal loss of will.

The footnote is this:

A lawyer for the defense of two of the spies disclosed that "U–2" was the designation of one of the hiding places used by the group convicted of employing elaborate equipment and methods to send secret submarine data from London to Moscow.

The Kremlin made an unholy fuss last year about the reconnaissance flights over Russia by the American plane designated U–2. Khrushchev and all the little Khrushchevs of the world threw up their hands in mock horror. A "summit" conference was wrecked. A President of the United States was humiliated. Further flights by the remarkably effective U–2 were canceled, a wrongheaded decision that has the hearty endorsement of the current President.

So perhaps the Slavic funnybones of the Kremlin agents involved in setting up the London espionage stakeout were tickled by the idea of naming one of their activities "U–2." Last year the Khrushchev gang obviously got a great wallop out of the way their very mention of the term "U–2" produced twitches of guilt in westerners who still believe we must court world opinion by going skunkhunting in top hats.

Despite legends to the contrary, Britons have a sense of humor. We hope they will find the disclosure of the London espionage hideout arrangement named "U–2" worthy of both a self-deprecating smile and a reappraisal of the way some of them carried on in protest against "those warlike Americans" after the original U–2 episode.

Espionage, as both Britons and Americans should know, is a two-way street. The enemy travels his way with determination and effectiveness. We of the West should do the same and not be detoured by spurious shrieks of "warmongering" from the Kremlin and from the faint of heart.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Now That the President Has Asked the Congress To Provide Federal Aid for Public Schools He Should Also Ask the Congress To Modernize the Tax Structure in Order That Citizens May More Easily Give Financial Aid to Private and Public Educational Institutions

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, along with all other Americans I am deeply concerned over the financial plight of private educational institutions in our country. Now that the President has asked the Congress to provide Federal aid for public schools he has a clear moral responsibility to ask the Congress to modernize the tax structure in order that citizens may more easily give financial aid to private and public educational institutions in accordance with their own wishes.

As a member of the American Association of School Administrators, a former superintendent of public schools, and as ranking minority member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, I feel that the present educational misunderstanding need not have arisen, that it is serving no useful purpose, and that it is divisive at a time when unity of our people is more vital than at any previous period in our history.

Historically, financial support for American education has had two major facets: Public support for public education, and private giving for public and private education, the latter assisted by wise tax laws.

The new Democratic administration would have the Congress provide major benefits for public education but refuses to take, at the same time, the steps necessary to provide the essential tax reforms which would make possible private giving of the magnitude required by private education at this time in our history and without which it cannot and will not long survive.

Aid to public and private education through the tax route is as historic and as constitutionally sound as are Federal contributions to public education.

Private education is the leaven of our educational system, and democratic government such as we have always known in America cannot possibly long survive the disappearance of private education from the American scene.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation, H.R. 5673, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide funds for educational purposes by providing increased incentives for private giving through the allowance of a tax credit for charitable contributions to educational institutions, and to allow a deduction for tuition and other expenses incurred by a taxpayer or his spouse or dependent at an educational institution.

I was highly pleased when the majority leader [Mr. MCCORMACK] praised my bill recently and pointed out that a study of his own legislative record would show that he had sponsored and worked for similar legislation since coming to the Congress.

The approach to the problem of financing education represented in my bill, H.R. 5673, is clearly nonpartisan and my mail, which is coming in from all sections of the country, proves that it is a bill which is popular with, and appeals to, all segments of our people.

The Clark-Morse plan for Federal loans to private education is a blind alley and American leaders in the field of private education should waste no more time on it. If grants to private schools are illegal, as President Kennedy says they are, then the loans which the Clark-Morse plan would provide are equally illegal.

Senator CLARK, apparently, is really trying to solve, with his educational loan bill, his personal political problem in Pennsylvania where Democratic Congressman WILLIAM GREEN, if he chooses to enter the senatorial campaign next year, will certainly beat him soundly. It may well be doubted if the Clark-Morse plan was really seriously designed to solve the dilemma which has developed over the growing financial needs of private education in our country.

Our private school educators should mobilize to support my bill, H.R. 5673, and the other bills, to modernize and update the tax structure of our Nation, which are gathering dust in the files of the House Ways and Means Committee.

The other educational advisers to the new Democratic administration are no more sound—if we are to judge by their recommendations in the field of education, and how else can we judge them—than Senator CLARK and Senator MORSE. Some of these advisers are grossly misleading the American people on the educational issue. Their approach to American education, by tackling at this time only one-half of the problem, is grievously dividing our people. This situation, I fear, will get worse before it gets better. These advisers should stop insisting that the appropriation of tax money by the Federal Government is the only legal way to help American education.

They are completely ignoring the role which tax incentives, provided by a modernized and updated tax structure, could play in providing, without any possibility of Federal control, and without the appropriation of a single cent of tax revenues, the funds necessary to adequately finance private education in the United States.

A half-truth is worse than no truth at all. I as astounded that the new Democratic administration should be so busily engaged in trying to sell the American people a half-truth. The entire performance of these New Frontiersmen regarding education is definitely misleading and devisive, because they refuse to take up, concurrently with their drive for Federal aid to public education, the equally pressing financial problems of private education. Division of the American people over any issue—and especially such a totally unnecessary issue—is morally wrong. And, unless decisive steps are taken to end this growing educational misunderstanding, the Democratic administration may entirely lose its school bill.

At his press conference on March 15, President Kennedy was asked what his position was regarding the proposals for modernizing the tax structure and to provide tax incentives for private giving to education which were before the Congress, especially to view of the fact that His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman had endorsed the tax approach to aiding private education.

The President replied that:

I think all of this matter should be examined carefully by the Congress. The Senator from Oregon, Mr. MORSE, has asked the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to send him up a brief on all of the various kinds of assistance which are given to nonpublic schools and colleges, which the Secretary is preparing to do. The committees then of the House and Senate, and the House of Representatives, can consider what kind of program they wish to put forward and at that time we can consider what the constitutional problems might be. But it is very difficult as new proposals are made for me or for anyone else to be giving constitutional opinions on each of them as they come up, without seeing the definite language. That obvious is not my function. I would be glad to have the departments of Government participate in considering these matters with the Congress. But my view on procedures which I hope the Congress will follow are well known. I am hopeful we can get the program which we sent to the Hill out of the way. Then the Congress will have to consider what it wants to do in this other area. And the administration will be delighted to cooperate. But I could not possibly, unless I saw exactly what kind of language, give even a private opinion as to its constitutionality.

In his March 28, 1961, report to Senator WAYNE MORSE, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Abra-

ham Ribicoff, bypassed entirely, private giving to education and the historic tax route by which private giving to education has been encouraged by the Federal Government, to which the President had referred on March 15.

Yet the President, on March 15, as I have noted stated that:

> The Senator from Oregon, Mr. MORSE, has asked the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to send him up a brief on all of the various kinds of assistance which are given to nonpublic schools and colleges, which the Secretary is preparing to do.

Because the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare did not make any reference to the tax route aids to education written into the Internal Revenue Code I have taken certain definite steps which I trust will remedy this deficiency.

I asked two of Secretary Ribicoff's top aides to meet with me in my office on Tuesday, April 4, to discuss this glaring oversight.

Jim G. Akin, Congressional Liaison Officer of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Philip DesMarais, assistant to the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, conferred with me for an hour and a half on April 4, and promised to make a study of the entire subject to private giving to education now provided under the tax laws, and to furnish this report to me.

As I have said, the President declared, at his March 15 press conference, that he—

> would be glad to have the departments of Government participate in considering these matters with the Congress.

Since the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is already hard at work on these matters, the President should now request the Department of the Treasury and Treasury Secretary C. Douglas Dillon to study and report "on all of the various kinds of assistance which are given to nonpublic schools and colleges" in the special field of Federal tax policy.

In other words, now that the President has asked the Congress to provide Federal aid for public education he cannot continue to ignore his responsibility to ask the Congress to modernize the tax structure in order to increase private giving to private and public education. For, clearly, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Ribicoff, is at a grave disadvantage in reporting on taxes and tax incentives, a subject which is so clearly in the province of the Treasury Department, and the Treasury Department is most unlikely to report favorably on any tax bill to aid education until the President requests it to do so.

I am taking the statement of the President of March 15 at its face value, and, for my part, have asked the House Ways and Means Committee to request reports on my bill, H.R. 5673, from the Treasury Department, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Bureau of the Budget.

I want at this time to thoroughly endorse the study in depth of the educational problem by leading educators from both the public and private educational fields meeting together for this purpose. Such a conference was suggested in the debate over the Columbia Broadcasting System on April 6 in which the participants were Msgr. F. G. Hochwalt, head of the education department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, Dr. Oswald C. J. Hoffmann, director of information of the Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod, and Howard K. Smith, CBS news chief. If such a conference is held the tax approach to the financial needs of American education outlined in my bill, H.R. 5673, will surely be one of the major recommendations to come out of such a meeting. It is extremely doubtful, however, if the Clark-Morse bill would even get to first base at such a conference.

H.R. 5673 provides the same kind of privileged giving status to millions of Americans which is presently being provided in the Internal Revenue Code to those few Americans in the highest income bracket. At the present time it costs a person in the 91-percent income tax bracket—$400,000 a year and up—only $9 to give $100 to education. It costs the rest of us, on an ascending scale, up to $80 to give a $100 to education.

The Democrats, whose hearts always bleed for the little fellow, as they continually remind us, certainly ought to be wholeheartedly in favor of my tax incentive plan to encourage private giving to education. In fact, some tax incentives are already provided in the Internal Revenue Code for private giving to American education and it can be readily demonstrated that both major parties have supported and voted for this type of Federal aid to education through the years.

I include, as part of my remarks, a summary of the changes in deductions permitted for charitable contributions to education from 1917 to 1957. This summary appears in a study prepared in 1958 for the American Association for the Advancement of Science by the Surveys & Research Corp., of Washington, D.C. This information was supplied by the Internal Revenue Service.

The tax approach set forth in my bill is in line with recommendations advanced by such organizations as the Association of American Colleges, American Association for the Advancement of Science, U.S. Chamber of Commerce's Education Committee, National Planning Association, American College Public Relations Association, American Alumni Council, and the Council for Financial Aid to Education.

The summary follows:

Summary of changes in deduction permitted for charitable contributions and in standard deduction, Federal income tax laws, 1917–57

Income year	Maximum deduction permitted for charitable contributions [1]	Standard deduction
1917–40	15 percent of net income computed without benefit of personal exemptions and contributions.	None.
1941	Same	Tax reduced by 10 percent on gross income under $3,000 in lieu of deduction.
1942–43	15 percent of net income computed without benefit of personal exemption, contributions, and medical expense deduction.	6 percent of gross income for gross under $3,000.
1944–47	15 percent of adjusted gross income	10 percent of adjusted gross income up to a maximum of $500.
1948–51	Same	10 percent of adjusted gross income up to a maximum of $1,000.
1952–53	20 percent of adjusted gross income	Same.
1954–55	20 percent of adjusted gross income plus an additional 10 percent for contributions to churches, tax-exempt hospitals, and educational institutions.	Same.
1956–57	Same as for 1955, but the additional 10 percent can include contributions to medical research organizations.	Same.

[1] Applicable, except for a few individuals who during the years 1924–57 qualified for unlimited deductions for charitable contributions. (See sec. 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and corresponding sections of earlier revenue acts for a complete treatment of this feature of the tax laws.)

Source: Communication, Treasury Department, Internal Revenue Service.

Father Eusebio Francisco Kino

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, in 1962, Arizona will have much to celebrate—not that she is not possessed of these opportunities every year, but 1962 becomes a special one. First, we shall have been a State for 50 years. At the same time, we shall have been a member of the Union for 100 years. In addition, we shall celebrate rightly the 50th anniversary of my senior colleague [Mr. HAYDEN] in the Congress of the United States.

With all of these things to be grateful for, one could not imagine a State so rich in memory that she could possess even more. But 1962 will also be the 250th anniversary of the passing of Father Eusebio Francisco Kino, the illustrious Catholic priest who brought religion into what is now the United States, by building the string of missions for which the Far West is famed, beginning at Guevavi, and being topped by his most famous mission, San Xavier del Bac. A delightful article about Father Kino appears in the March issue of the Catholic Digest; and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIRST RIDER OF THE DEVIL'S HIGHWAY

(By Weldon F. Heald)

March 15, 1961, marks the 250th anniversary of the death of Father Eusebio Francisco Kino, who penetrated the arid wilderness of northern Sonora and southern Arizona and almost singlehandedly planted the seeds of civilization there. Where Father Kino went, divided highways now follow. The heroic black-robed Jesuit looms large in our American past as a champion of God and as a man of action.

But what is planned by way of celebration on March 15 to honor our most distinguished founding father? I decided to find out. I could visualize a color-splashed series of pageants, Indian ceremonials, Mexican fiestas, and religious services—even perhaps a commemorative stamp issued by the Post Office Department; 1961 would be a Kino year in Arizona, for sure.

The Tucson area was the scene of much of the great padre's spiritual and temporal labors, so I called on five organizations which represent the religious, cultural, economic, and tourist activities of the city. At the first I was told that they knew of no plans whatever. The priest at San Xavier del Bac, Kino's most famous mission, said no particular observances had been scheduled. The mission is now Franciscan. At St. Augustine's Cathedral they said that it was too early to know; and at the fourth place I was informed that nothing had been planned.

I called the office of the tourist organization, and the personable young secretary offered to help me—but as she had never heard of Kino, she said she would have her boss call me back as soon as he returned.

But this indifference shouldn't have surprised me. It's typical. The sole "Kino" listed in encyclopedias is an astringent drug obtained in East India. And only three rather insignificant southwestern geographical features are named for him: Kino Bay and Puerto Kino on the Sonora Coast of the Gulf of California and the 4,200-foot Kino peak in southern Arizona's Growler Range.

North of the border there is but a single modest monument raised to Kino's memory. It stands unobtrusively in a little park back of Tucson's City Hall. The memorial was erected in 1936, and consists of an oblong block of dark lava rocks, with a bronze plaque showing Father Kino striding across the desert in his long robes, led by an Indian boy. The artist must have been unaware of the fact that he was depicting the tireless Padre on Horseback, whose equestrian exploits equaled or surpassed those of the best cowpokes who ever raised Arizona dust.

In fact, for more than two centuries the name of Kino and his activities in the Southwest were more legend than history. No picture or likeness of him had survived; no book had been written on his life; no exhaustive studies made of his remarkable achievements, nor any detailed chronicle of what he had actually accomplished. While Coronado, de Anza, and Father Serra grew in fame, Father Kino's brilliant light became dimmer as the years went by.

Then suddenly in the 1930's three eminent historians clearly revealed the true greatness and commanding stature of this extraordinary missioner, explorer, scholar, and empire builder.

They were the University of Arizona's Frank C. Lockwood, Herbert E. Bolton of the University of California, and Peter Masten Dunne at the University of Santa Clara. As early as 1919 Professor Bolton translated and edited the padre's own narrative as Kino's Historical Memoir of Pimeria Alta. This monumental two-volume work gives a description of the topography, plant and animal life, and natives of northern Sonora and southern Arizona.

Pimeria Alta—the upper country of the Pima Indians—was Kino's vast field of activity. It stretched 250 miles east to west and 200 miles from the Gila River southward.

But the two popular and definitive books on Kino are Lockwood's "With Padre Kino on the Trail," published in 1934, and Bolton's "Rim of Christendom," which appeared 2 years later. Both are based upon thorough research among original sources, and Bolton personally followed Kino's trails and visited the sites of all his missions. They make fascinating reading for those interested in the background of the desert Southwest. Father Dunne's contribution was to place Kino accurately in the long procession of Jesuits who carried the cross through the barbarian lands of northern Mexico to the shores of the Pacific in Baja California.

Because of this historical triple grand slam, we now know almost every detail of Kino's life.

He was born on August 10, 1645, of German-Italian background, in the little Tirolese hill town of Segno, 18 miles north of Trent, Italy. The Italian form of his name is Chini, and members of his family still live in the community.

Young Eusebio was well educated, having attended five south German universities. His proficiency in mathematics gained him the offer of a professorship at Freiburg. But after an illness and wondrous recovery, he adopted Francis Xavier, apostle of the Indies, as his patron saint, and entered the Society of Jesus in 1665. From then on he burned with unquenchable missionary zeal and constantly petitioned superiors for assignment to the wild frontiers of Christianity.

Kino's wish was finally granted, and he sailed from Cadiz, Spain, for Mexico in 1681. His first labors in the New World were in Lower California, where the Spanish attempted to plant colonies and missions. Because of international politics and other matters beyond Kino's control, the project was abandoned by order of the king, and he was transferred to northwestern Mexico.

There, on the outer fringe of civilization, Kino established his headquarters, Mission Nuestra Señora de los Dolores, in 1687. The site is a hilltop beside the San Miguel River, about 20 miles east of the present Sonora city of Magdalena, but no sign of the mission remains today.

At that time this was the end of the road—northward in all directions stretched an utter wilderness of deserts and rugged mountain ranges; unknown, and inhabited only by Indians. The region is still in a sense "Father Kino's country," for in his 24 years of ceaseless activity he pioneered there the main routes of travel we use today, and laid the foundations for many of our leading communities.

Historian Bolton mapped 35 major journeys, or entradas, made by Kino through Pimeria Alta. They followed down the Santa Cruz, San Pedro, and Gila Rivers westward to the site of Yuma and across the Colorado River. He also blazed the fiendish short cut across the desert along the Arizona-Sonora line, still known as El Camino del Diablo (the Devil's highway). According to one authority, between 3,000 and 4,000 travelers have since died on this trail from hunger, thirst, and fatigue.

Alone or accompanied by friendly Indian guides, and sometimes with a small military escort, the invincible padre rode the Rim of Christendom for God and the King of Spain. Kino's four-legged journeys were prodigious, and even his horses must have sensed the epic nature of his errands. In 1695, when 51 years of age, he covered 1,500 miles in 53 days. Two years later he made a trip of 700 miles in 30 days, and in 1700, he traveled 1,000 miles in 26 days, for an average of 40 miles a day. Once, between sunrise and sunset, he rode more than 75 miles in response to an urgent message from a brother priest.

But besides being one of our foremost early explorers, Father Kino achieved international fame as a cartographer, and his maps gave the first accurate delineation of the whole region. To him also belongs the credit for discovering that California is not an island, as was supposed, and for finding a practical land route from northern Mexico to the Pacific coast.

However, the great-hearted padre made his major exploration among human souls. Wherever he went he preached to the Pima, Papagos, Cocopas, Maricopas, and Yumas in their own languages, and he personally baptized 4,500 Indians. He established 25 missions—more than one a year—and many smaller vistas in the native villages.

He taught his converts how to plant wheat, maize, beans, and melons—and even furnished the Indian women with recipes for making bread and tortillas. He also brought in the first fowl, sheep, goats, cattle, and horses. In fact, Kino introduced large-scale stockraising, becoming Arizona's first "cattle king," with prosperous ranches totaling hundreds of thousands of acres. When San Xavier del Bac was started he was able to stock it with 700 head of domestic animals.

For a quarter of a century on the remote frontier of New Spain, Father Kino was builder, statesman, teacher, rancher, student, writer, and priest. A small band of stalwart Jesuits assisted him. But there were never enough and he constantly petitioned for more.

Three Kino missions were located in the Santa Cruz river valley in what is now Arizona. First was Guevavi, founded in 1692 8 miles north of present Nogales. It was devastated by the marauding Apaches in 1773. The ruins are barely traceable today.

The second mission, Tumacacori, established in 1697, still stands beside U.S. Highway 89, 17 miles north of Nogales. No sign of Kino's original church remains, and the present building, dedicated in 1822, is in partial ruins. Tumacacori, now preserved as a national monument, is an impressive structure, 100 feet long and more than 40 feet wide, with adobe walls 6 feet thick. At the monument entrance the Park Service has built a museum which houses exhibits pertaining to the early days of the mission and the life of Father Kino.

Nine miles south of Tucson stands by far the best known of all Kino's missions, San Xavier del Bac, founded in 1700. It seemed to be closest to the padre's heart. When there he became Arizona's first enthusiastic booster and predicted that someday a great city would rise nearby. The 1960 census figures have proved Kino to have been a true prophet. However, as at Tumacacori, he never saw the present establishment. After the Jesuits were expelled from Mexico in 1767, the mission passed to the Franciscans, who completed a new church in 1797. Called the White Dove of the Desert, it is considered today to be the most beautiful of all Spanish missions in the United States.

Situated in a reservation of Papago Indians, San Xavier del Bac is still active, and ministers to the descendants of its original communicants. They serve as choir, altar boys, decorators, and janitors. Men outstanding for their good deeds are annually chosen as the "12 apostles," and are the mission's leaders and deacons for the following year. The ceremony of their installation occurs over the vigil and the feast of St. Francis Xavier, December 2, 3, and 4. This is the mission's big fiesta and is a picturesque event worth going far to see.

The Tucson Festival Society has developed a brilliant pageant which is held each April at San Xavier. There are bonfires in the plaza, fireworks, religious processions, dancing, and feasting. In 1961 the festivities are scheduled for April 7, and I hope that some special observances in honor of the mission's distinguished founder will be included. Such would be particularly fitting at San Xavier. The Papagos are peculiarly Father Kino's people, for they have continued to this day the customs and ceremonies their ancestors learned from the great padre.

Iron men are not really made of iron. On March 15, 1711, while dedicating a new chapel at Mission Santa Maria Magdalena, Father Kino became ill. He died a few hours later. He was 65 years old. History gives no details, so we can only conclude that he was simply worn out from years of constant self-sacrificing service to his fellow men. He was buried in the chapel beside an image of St. Francis Xavier, who had been the guiding inspiration of his life.

We have made fetishes of our early Western gun slingers. But they were second-string people compared to the padres, like Kino, when it came to courage, fortitude, and stamina, in addition to zeal for God's greater glory.

NEW HONORS

Father Kino will probably enter the Hall of Fame in the U.S. Capitol soon. The Arizona Historical Foundation, recently established, has voted that such a statue be commissioned for presentation to the Statuary Hall. Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, foundation president, said he would introduce Federal legislation necessary for acceptance of the Statue. Each State is allowed two figures in the Hall of Fame; Father Kino would be Arizona's second, joining Gen. John C. Greenway of the First World War.

Freedom Is Sold, Not Bought, by Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I have often said that the accomplishments of a Member of Congress, and his contribution to the Nation, are to be judged not by what he says but by what he does. The same holds true for the President and his Cabinet.

The following is an editorial which appeared in the New York Daily News on April 3:

JUST HOW FREE ARE WE?

At a banquet laid on here the other evening by the Four Freedoms Foundation in honor of the AFL–CIO President George Meany, Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg orated as follows:

"The true national interest in America is the attainment of individual freedom—not only intellectually, so that we may look any man in the face and speak our piece, but economically, so that want and fear do not become the landlords of our private stations in life."

Those are noble sentiments, and it seems to us that all Americans can endorse them without reservation.

It happens, though, that we've just run across a news item, from the Tax Foundation, Inc. (nonprofit research), of New York, which makes us wonder just how free Americans are and are not, and what if anything the Kennedy administration is doing to make them more nearly free and less unfree.

The Tax Foundation's news is that the average American now has to pay out more of his hard-earned money on taxes than on food. This means all kinds of taxes—Federal, State, and local, visible and invisible.

In his working day, he puts in 1 hour and 39 minutes to earn enough for the day's food; and he labors 2 hours and 29 minutes to get up the money for his taxes.

Thus, in an 8-hour day, he gives just about 30 percent of his time to government as represented by the taxgatherers.

Since these gentry are extremely tough about collecting the last cent due them, it is fair to say that all of us are 30 percent slaves to government.

Of course, there have to be taxes, and no human being is completely free. But wouldn't it be a nice gesture if all our politicos, from President Kennedy on down, were to set their sights on cutting our tax bills to the level of our food bills, at the least?

The Case for Simplified Spelling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLAN HAGEN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include as part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the Parents' magazine, issue of January 1961, entitled "The Case for Simplified Spelling." The article is under the byline of Mr. George J. Hecht, publisher of the magazine.

I am bringing this matter to the attention of my colleagues because of my interest in reformed spelling of the English language. In each of the last three Congresses I have introduced legislation which would provide for the establishment of a National Spelling Commission, which would study our current language deficiencies and make general recommendations as to the means by which reforms and simplifications could be effected.

I feel that the material contained in the article by Mr. Hecht is of great interest in this regard. The article follows:

THE CASE FOR SIMPLIFIED SPELLING—IT WOULD SPEED UP THE EDUCATION OF OUR CHILDREN

(By George J. Hecht)

(This thoughtful article will undoubtedly give further impetus to the healthy movement to reexamine all facets of the proposal. One of the greatest needs in education today is for more research wherever it may carry us.—Lawrence G. Derthick, U.S. Commissioner of Education.)

The education of American children (and those in other English-speaking countries) could be speeded up very considerably by the adoption of a simplified system of spelling. Let's face it: English is one of the world's most difficult languages—especially difficult to spell and with many words difficult to pronounce.

If written English could be made phonetic, as is possible—with words all spelled as they sound and all pronounced as they are spelled—it would reduce the time devoted to the study of spelling by 2 years, according to experts. This would sharply reduce school costs or provide time for students to take additional courses. Another important point is that if written English were made phonetic and thus easier to master, this would remove one of the chief hurdles to the rapid spread of English as a world language.

The English language is composed of 40 basic sounds, but our alphabet contains only 26 letters, so certain sounds have to be designated by combinations of letters. Even so, pronunciation and spelling would be relatively simple if each sound were represented by a specific letter or a specific combination of letters. Unfortunately, this is far from true. First, the same letter often represents many different sounds. The letter a, for example, is pronounced in eight different ways (not counting the silent a in such words as dead): quota, are, any, make, image, what, walk. The same is true of letter combinations, such as ough in cough, rough, though, thorough, through, plough, thought, hiccough. Second, a single sound can be represented in many different ways. In the following sentence the long sound of o is spelled in nine different ways: "Tony, our chauffeur, and Mary's beau, yoemanly towed our bags to the depot even though he had stubbed his toe against the coalbin." Third, many English words contain unsounded letters, such as the b in debt, c in scissors, h in school, u in build.

The result of these irregularities is that children must memorize the appearance of words in order to learn to read and write them, instead of learning to associate appearances with sound. Estimates of how many words must be so memorized range from about 2,000 to 25,000. Obviously it would be a great deal easier if each of the 40 basic English sounds were indicated by a single letter. In many languages this is so. Russian, Turkish, Italian, Hungarian, German, and many other languages are almost entirely phonetic.

Originally, English also was a relatively phonetic language. Anglo-Saxon (also called Old English), spoken from about the year 500 until about 1066, was spelled much as it was pronounced. During the period when so-called Middle English was in use, from about 1066 to about 1450, many inconsistencies were introduced, largely because there were many dialects with variations in spelling. Then, in the early days of movable type, England imported many of its printers from Holland, and these men added to the confusion. Finally in the 18th century, when classical studies assumed a new importance, scholars tried to spell words so as to make clear at a glance their Greek or Latin origin, and even though in many cases their assumptions as to origin were incorrect, their way of spelling survived. The most notable of these men was Dr. Samuel Johnson, whose dictionary was enormously influential. He, probably more than any other man, should be blamed for the irregularities of English spelling.

Attempts to counter these tendencies and simplify the spelling of English began at a very early stage. Among the very first efforts at spelling reform were those made in the 1550's and 1560's by John Hart, Sir John Cheke, Sir Thomas Smith, and James Howell. Many other attempts to simplify spelling have been made since then but none of the radical ones has succeeded to any great extent. Prominent men who have advocated spelling reform include Noah Webster, Charles Darwin, Alfred Tennyson, Mark Twain, Jacob Grimm, Theodore Roosevelt, Andrew Carnegie, George Bernard Shaw, and Col. Robert McCormick. Shaw left a considerable portion of his large estate to be used for research and trials of a new 40-letter phonetic alphabet, and McCormick instituted a certain amount of simplified spell-

ing in the Chicago Tribune, such as tho, thoro, and thru.

Many plans of simplified English spelling have been advanced. The two leading organizations in the field, the Simpler Spelling Association of America and the Simplified Spelling Society of Great Britain, jointly suggest a choice of two different systems of simplified spelling. One is called world English spelling which would retain the present 26 letters but would make each of them designate a single basic sound, and would have certain combinations of these letters indicate each of the remaining 14 basic sounds.

The other most advocated system of simplified spelling uses the so-called Spelling Reform Alfabet. This system would add 14 new letters to our present 26-letter alphabet so that each of the 40 letters would indicate one of the 40 basic sounds out of which all English words are composed.

For many years, leading American educators have urged the simplification of English spelling. William T. Harris, who was U.S. Commissioner of Education from 1889 to 1906, devoted space in his annual report in 1889 to the advantages of phonetic spelling. He said, in part: "The American child must spend a large portion of his school days in learning, one by one, the peculiar combinations of the written words of his language. In fact, there are at least 5 years as good as thrown away in learning the mass of heterogeneous conventionalities dignified by the name of 'orthography.'"

Dr. Frank Laubach, who has taught many millions of people to read and write their native language in more than 100 different countries, and who is one of the world's leading authorities on linguistics and a strong advocate of simplified spelling, said: "In English we can never know with certainty how to pronounce a word which we have only seen written but never heard, or how to spell a word which we have only heard, unless someone tells us, and then we cannot be sure that he knows."

In 1918, the year after they gained control of Russia, the Communists modernized the Russian alphabet so that 36 symbols could be used to write the 34 standard sounds of which all Russian words are composed. In 1930 Kemal Ataturk not only changed Turkey's alphabet from the Arabic to the Roman one but added a letter to it so that each of the 27 basic sounds of the Turkish language could be represented by a single letter.

The French Government is now considering spelling reform of the French language and has set up a government committee to examine various possibilities. Among basic changes this committee has recommended that all "parasite consonants" (i.e., those silent ones in which French abounds) be thrown out altogether. There is no need, the committee said, for children of this modern day to spell words the same way their grandparents did.

A practical demonstration and scientific test on how simplified spelling speeds up the learning of English was conducted, strangely enough, in Sweden, shortly before the beginning of World War II. English was taught in a number of elementary schools as the second language, using the world English spelling system (which was called Anglik). That this system substantially speeded up the learning of English is certified to by Dr. Helge Kökeritz, now head of the English Department, Graduate School, Yale University, and formerly the assistant head of the demonstration and experiment in Sweden.

Dr. Ralph D. Owen, president of the Simpler Spelling Association, has said: "It takes most of our children 2 years of extra concentration on beginning reading and the necessary followup of spelling in order to compete with children who are fortunate enough to have a language that has a phonetic alphabet."

Russian children learn Russian very much more rapidly than American children learn English because Russian is a phonetic language. This gives the Soviet Union a great advantage in our education race with them. Parenthetically may I say that after I visited the Soviet Union in the spring of 1956 I wrote an article for Parents' magazine entitled "The Coming International Brains Race" (published in the November 1956 issue) which expressed the thought that we are in an arms, trade, scientific, and brains race with the Soviet Union, and that the most basic of all is the brains race. If for no other reason, should we not simplify our English spelling to eliminate our handicap in our educational competition with the Communist powers?

The Ministry on Education of Great Britain is currently greatly concerned about the difficulty that many British youngsters are having in learning to read. It is conducting an experiment this year, in which some 1,200 schoolchildren are learning to read and write with a 42-character alphabet, one for each of the 42 sounds which the Ministry calculates can be made by the human voice. No children are being pressed to participate in the experiment if their parents are opposed to it. In the new alphabet the letters "c," "q," and "x" are being dropped and 19 new letters are being added. Later, the speed with which these children learn to read and write, using this enlarged alphabet, will be compared with the learning time of those using the conventional one.

The adoption of any system of extensive spelling reform would require governmental action, preferably jointly by the United States, Great Britain, and the other English-speaking countries. First a commission, preferably but not necessarily an intergovernmental one, should be set up to decide which of the presently proposed systems of simplified spelling is the best, or to develop some better and simpler one. Furthermore, a standardized pronunciation of all words would have to be adopted. Then a date, some years hence, would have to be selected at which time the new system would be put into use.

If additional letters are to be added to the alphabet, new typewriters would have to be built and new typesetting machinery would have to be developed. Everyone would, of course, have to learn the new system of spelling. On a selected date, all newspapers, magazines, and new books would have to change over to the new spelling. All dictionaries, encyclopedias, and textbooks would, of course, have to be revised. Difficult as all this would be, such drastic reforms have been successfully accomplished in other countries. English-speaking countries should be able to do what others have done.

Although, in the 86th Congress, Representative HARLAN HAGEN, of California, introduced a bill to establish a National Commission for English Spelling Reform, I do not believe that the United States is ready to adopt any of the proposed systems at this time. Considerably more research is needed before legislative action should be attempted.

A thorough, far-seeing study of the whole question of simplified spelling should be made to investigate scientifically the desirability of a new system, which of the systems proposed or what new system would be the best, and how the selected system could be put into operation. The study should be undertaken by some outstanding American university or research institution, the National Education Association, or the American Council on Education. As far as I know, no funds are now available for this purpose. My hope is that one of America's great foundations or some other organization interested in education in particular, and public welfare in general, can be persuaded to finance the needed research. Then, on the basis of the experts' findings, a system of simplified spelling could be introduced through legislation and put into effect over a period of 5 years or so. The transition would be difficult, of course, but other countries have proved that it is not only possible but infinitely worthwhile.

The Capehart Housing Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, retention of able, trained personnel is still a central problem in our defense preparedness. One of the farsighted proposals which is creating conditions favorable to retention of armed services personnel is the Capehart housing program.

Here is an article from the Air Force Times which analyzes the current situation in terms of benefits to service families:

CAPEHARTS PROVING "LIFT" FOR FAMILIES

(By Ed Gates)

WASHINGTON.—U.S. Air Force families receiving orders for a faraway station, like Kincheloe Air Force Base, Mich., can cast aside their apprehensions—about housing and hence their finances—if they are assured of Capehart quarters.

The same applies in only slightly lesser degrees if the orders are for a close-in post like McGuire Air Force Base, N.J. At scores of stateside bases the success of the family's tour may well turn on whether a Capehart is available.

The lucky ones live comfortably in modern, well-equipped homes, at a price they can afford—their quarters allowance. Dwelling on base, they are close to the exchange, theater, commissary, club, etc.—the things which comprise the little extras which make life in the service satisfying.

The unlucky ones, who can't rate good on-base quarters because there are not enough to go around, may find living difficult and life in general a financial headache, or both.

Civilian rentals normally are neither adequate nor reasonably priced. Frequently they are located miles from base, which makes continual travel costly and inconvenient and hence discourages families from taking advantage of the little extras found only on the base.

U.S. Air Force housing officials last week toured new Capehart projects recently completed at six bases. The Air Force Times representative who accompanied them had strongly suspected that getting a set of Capeharts can make considerable difference in whether a tour succeeds or fails for the family.

The journey confirmed it.

In addition to McGuire and Kincheloe, the housing party inspected quarters at Griffiss Air Force Base, N.Y., Syracuse Air Force Station, N.Y., and Selfridge and Wurtsmith Air Force Bases, Mich. The locations, except for the frosty climate, are held to typify various housing situations found at bases throughout the country.

At each the story was similar: the family's morale rose when they moved into their new Capeharts. Pride in occupying a nice, new home was reflected in the care given the facilities and the attractive furnishing schemes individual families came up with.

Many obviously stretched their budgets a bit to purchase furniture to match the quality of the quarters.

Near McGuire and Griffiss, for instance, $125 for rent and $30 for utilities was reported as typical. These outlays, they said, by no means assure a home as nice as Capeharts, yet for an NCO drawing $96.90 in quarters allowance the arrangement requires he dig down into his basic pay for nearly $60 if he rents outside.

At Syracuse, station commander Lt. Col. Jerome Schweickert said that a typical NCO family living off base might well pay $125 plus utilities, while an officer family (for something slightly better) could expect to pay $150–$200 plus utilities.

At Wurtsmith, a resort area, the off-base rate for little more than a cabin may hit $100 a week during the summer months.

At Kincheloe, on the upper Michigan Peninsula only a stone's throw from the Canadian border, where things are truly remote, officials say the off-base rental story is one of "very little selection, and where something is available it is far below standards."

The point has been reached at many U.S. Air Force locations where the quarters allowance meets little more than half of a family's monthly housing expenditures, so rapidly have rents and utility charges climbed. An alternative is to occupy submarginal off-base quarters, which far too many families must do. But this is not the way U.S. Air Force officials want it, which is why they are arguing strenuously for authority to build 50,000 more U.S. Air Force Capeharts during the next 3 years.

Added to the 46,000 Capehart units already built, and the 14,000-plus under construction or already scheduled for construction, Air Force would then have around 110,000 Capeharts which, officials contend, is the "bare minimum" to handle requirements.

The odds on getting the administration and then Congress to approve a program of this scope are not good, Air Force this week was presenting its case for more Capeharts to the Senate.

At Kincheloe, meantime, 507th Fighter Wing Commander Col. Thomas W. Hornsby and his associates are bursting with pride over the 475-unit project recently completed and occupied. And well they might, for the quarters are delightful—inside and out.

These are slant-roof split-levels, featuring a large snug basement which easily converts into a spacious recreational room.

Exteriors are part brick, part aluminum siding, and the entire project is handsomely wedded to the pine trees native to the area. Through some magic of design, the homes appear to contain much more living space than is actually there.

The principal Headquarters U.S. Air Force housing officials in the inspection party, Mr. George Robinson and Col. Guy Goddard, promptly awarded the Kincheloe project a rating of "9.00."

Kincheloe, while low in personnel strength at the moment, is representative of other bases in the total housing need department. When the named missions arrive at the base, during the next year, total military strength will hit nearly 4,000. Base officials estimate 2,500 units will be required to properly house the families. Here's what they can expect to satisfy this need:

The 475 just-completed units; a second project of 330 Capeharts now under construction; and a third project of 190 units which, with luck, will be completed by December 1962. Add some trailer pads and a drop of "community support," and the most the site can count on is around 1,300 in another couple of years.

To bridge this gap closer to the ultimate 2,500-unit total requirement (which includes airmen of the lower grades) Air Force would like to get 400–500 additional Capeharts in a fourth project for Kincheloe. This seems very "iffy" at the moment, however.

Even if all these plans eventually produce constructed homes, some Kincheloeites in the near future face one of two alternatives: (1) Try to find something off base, which won't be easy or satisfactory, or (2) leave the family behind.

Here is a capsule report of the other sites visited:

McGuire: A 300-unit Capehart project fully occupied, and a 1,450-unit project just completed and about two-thirds occupied, with others filling up rapidly. When fully occupied, the base will still be about 2,000 units short of what is needed. There are nothing like 2,000 adequate units in the nearby communities, according to Base Commander Col. Albert W. Brownfield.

Griffis: Two Capehart projects of 460 and 270 units each completed, the latter only very recently. Bids have just gone out for a third project of 135 units. The base also has 250 substandard Lanham Act quarters, for lower grade airmen, and 28 reconverted barracks for company grade officers. Air Force plans to tear down the Lanhams and the barracks. While the overall housing picture seems less difficult than at the other sites, base officials said they need 300–400 more Capeharts.

Syracuse: This Sage site has 216 new Capeharts, all occupied. Need for more is not too great, and none are planned.

Selfridge: This large site has many types of housing, totaling 1,205 units of which 918 are adequate. The newly completed 380-unit Capehart project, entirely for officers, is a beauty, although it's 3 miles off base. The 489 Wherry quarters, 367 of which have been rehabilitated, are exclusively NCO. The base wants $2,500 to improve its substandard Lanham Act quarters, but Air Force indicates they are beyond repair and plans to tear them down: (See story p. 44).

Wurtsmith: Has two attractive projects, beautifully situated in pine forests. The first project of 618 units is occupied, and the second of 330 units is moving fast toward completion and families probably will begin moving in it this summer. There is a small development of appropriated fund houses, and an on-base trailer park. Off-base selection is about nil, as there is no community of any size for 55 miles.

A Full and Complete Investigation and Study of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency Would Be Helpful

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation today to provide that the Committee on the District of Columbia shall conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the District of Columbia Land Agency.

I am moved to do this by two things: First, the study of this Agency by the Committee on the District of Columbia of the Senate which is already underway, and, second, the irregularities uncovered by the Comptroller General of the United States in his audit of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency for the fiscal years 1957 and 1958.

I include as part of my remarks an excerpt from the 1959 report to the Congress by the Comptroller General on his audit of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, May 29, 1959.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Herewith is our report on the audit of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency for the fiscal years 1957 and 1958. Our audit was directed principally to a review of transactions involving Federal financial assistance provided by the Urban Renewal Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, for slum clearance and urban renewal work.

The findings noted during our audit are summarized in the forepart of the accompaying report and concern principally (1) tentative approval by the Urban Renewal Administration of estimated cost of facilities as noncash local grants-in-aid (a) which do not directly and substantially benefit the slum clearance projects, as required by law, (b) where cost estimates were not supported with documentary data, or (c) where the bases used to determine percent of project benefit were not proper or not supported, (2) scheduled demolition of sound commercial structures which could possibly be retained, (3) costs of holding cleared land for redevelopers not reimbursable, (4) proposed disposition of land without competitive bidding, (5) need for followup on land value, (6) ineffective followup on collections of rent due from delinquent tenants, and (7) deficiencies in RLA operations pertaining to families self-relocated in private housing.

This report is also being sent today to the President of the Senate. Copies of the report are being furnished to the Chairman, District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency; Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency; and Commissioner, Urban Renewal Administration.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

REPORT ON AUDIT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY FISCAL YEARS 1957 AND 1958

The General Accounting Office has made an audit of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency (RLA), for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1957, and 1958, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53). This audit was our first, other than preliminary surveys, of the RLA and included limited reviews of operating activities and financial transactions before fiscal years 1957 and 1958. The scope of the audit is described on page 72 of this report.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Our principal findings and recommendations are summarized on pages 1 to 8 and, together with other findings and recommendations, are discussed in detail in later sections of this report.

1. Federal subsidies may exceed total cost of facilities provided by District of Columbia as noncash grants-in-aid

Under existing law the District of Columbia is permitted to receive Federal subsidies which exceed the total cost of facilities provided as noncash grants-in-aid to slum clearance and urban renewal projects. No other local community is in this same position. If the Congress desires that the credit received by the District of Columbia for noncash grants-in-aid be limited in the same manner as for other local communities, sec-

tion 20(d) of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 will have to be amended. (See p. 20.)

2. Approval as noncash grant-in-aid of facility that will benefit the entire community

For project areas B and C, Urban Renewal Administration (URA) tentatively allowed one-third of the estimated total cost of the Southwest Expressway as a part of gross project cost and as a noncash grant-in-aid even though the expressway is of communitywide benefit.

We are recommending that URA adhere to the policy set forth in the Local Public Agency Manual (LPA Manual) and not allow the cost of facilities of communitywide nature as noncash grants-in-aid. (See p. 24.)

3. Certain cost estimates not supported with documentary data

The RLA files generally did not contain data to support the cost estimates for noncash grant-in-aid facilities to be provided by the District of Columbia. In addition, officials of RLA and of the District of Columbia were unable to locate data in support of cost estimates of the Southwest Expressway and a proposed grade separation at South Capitol and M Streets. Nevertheless URA had tentatively approved the loan and grant application for project area B which included these estimates.

We are recommending that URA require the RLA to submit to URA current cost estimates for all facilities to be provided by the District of Columbia, including sufficient supporting data to enable URA to make an adequate evaluation of such estimates, before approval of the amounts claimed as noncash grants-in-aid. (See p. 28.)

4. Bases used to determine percent of project benefit not proper or not supported

The percent of benefit claimed by the RLA for certain facilities was in our opinion determined on improper bases, and the data used to determine the percent of benefit on another facility was not supported by adequate documentation.

We are recommending that URA review the determinations and followup to obtain the needed supporting information. We are recommending also that, if revisions are found necessary in credits tentatively allowed, URA revise the project budgets accoordingly. (See p. 29.)

5. Scheduled demolition of sound structures

With some exceptions, the renewal of project area C will be accomplished by a strict clearance operation rather than by rehabilitation (demolishing only those structures which cannot be conserved). We were informed that certain commercial structures which, during our site visit, seemed to be sound in appearance and condition would probably be demolished. These structures, in areas which are to be redeveloped for commercial uses, have an estimated cost of about $2 million for acquiring and demolishing.

So that Federal costs would not be increased unnecessarily, we suggested that RLA consider the feasibility of retaining additional commercial structures in areas which are to be redeveloped for commercial purposes. The Chairman subsequently advised us that RLA will consider further the feasibility of the retention of additional commercial structures in areas which are to be redeveloped for commercial use. (See p. 35.)

6. Costs of holding cleared land for redevelopers not reimbursable

The RLA has agreed to hold certain acquired and cleared land for public and private redevelopers but will not be reimbursed for the costs it incurs from the date the land was available for delivery until possession is taken. These costs consist primarily of real estate taxes and interest on borrowings, which, with respect to land held for the General Services Administration, will amount to about $52,000 annually.

The Chairman, RLA, informed us that it is now the policy of RLA to assess private redevelopers carrying charges but that he did not believe that RLA could require that public redevelopers pay such charges because there is no agreement of a contractual nature.

We are recommending that in the future, where land is held for specific public redevelopers, the agreements provide that RLA be reimbursed for all costs of holding the land from the dates the land is available for delivery until possession is taken. (See p. 38.)

7. Proposed disposition of land without competitive bidding

The redevelopment plan for project area B was prepared jointly by the RLA and the National Capital Planning Commission. The redevelopment plan for project areas C and C–1 was prepared, in part, by a potential private redeveloper of the area. Because of the redeveloper's assistance, the RLA entered into a memorandum of understanding with him and believes that it has a moral obligation to negotiate only with him for the disposition of land that he desires to redevelop in project area C. Our review indicated that the RLA, therefore, has neither invited nor encouraged other potential private redevelopers to submit bids or proposals for the disposition of that land. We also noted that neither the RLA nor the URA obtained for comparative purposes independent appraisals of the Town Center land from Federal Housing Administration (FHA) when the initial value of $4 per square foot and the later value of $2.50 per square foot were established by the appraisers employed by RLA. FHA is expected to insure the mortgage on the Town Center.

We believe that generally the sale or lease by competitive bidding results in the disposition of land in a fair and impartial manner. We believe further that competitive bidding generally will give reasonable assurance that the highest return is obtained in the disposition of land. The disposal of project land on a negotiated basis does not appear to us to provide such assurance.

We are recommending that URA require the RLA to—

(a) Discontinue the practice of negotiating with only one potential private redeveloper.

(b) Publicize the availability of land and invite competitive bids or proposals.

(c) Refuse to accept redevelopment plans prepared by a private redeveloper if such acceptance obliges the RLA to negotiate only with such redeveloper.

We are also recommending, when it appears that FHA will insure the mortgages of property in the redeveloped area, that, before URA approves the disposition prices, it require the RLA and other LPA's to obtain independent appraisals from FHA for comparative purposes. (See p. 41.)

8. Need for followup on land value

The estimated value of $2.50 per square foot for the Town Center land was based on tentative plans and specifications of the redeveloper. At October 1958, the redeveloper had not submitted, for RLA's approval, the final plans and specifications for the construction of the Town Center. In view of the method used by the appraisers to value the land, we are recommending that the RLA have the appraisers review the final plans and specifications to be submitted by the redeveloper and report any construction changes that would result in a change in their valuation. If significant changes are made, we are recommending that the RLA require that appropriate changes be made in the potential selling price of the land and the annual ground rent. (See p. 48.)

9. Waiver of rent from former owners

On May 6, 1958, the RLA's Board of Directors approved a resolution whereby former owner-occupants would be given free rent until the first day of the second month after acquisition of their properties by RLA. This waiver of rent reduces potential revenue and results in increased net project costs.

We are recommending that URA revise part 3, chapter 3, section 4, of the LPA Manual to prohibit the granting of free rent periods to former owner-occupants unless satisfactory evidence of the necessity for granting free rent is submitted by the LPA and approved by URA. (See p. 55.)

10. Follow-up on collections of rent due from delinquent tenants not effective

In our review of accounts receivable from tenants in project area C, we were informed that through May 9, 1958, the RLA (a) obtained 175 judgments against delinquent tenants for possession of the properties, (b) evicted 3 tenants for nonpayment of rent, and (c) obtained no judgments to attach the assets or income of delinquent tenants. Of the 172 delinquent tenants that were not evicted by RLA, through May 9, 1958, 8 tenants had fully satisfied the judgments and 64 tenants had partially satisfied the judgments by the payment of rent. The other 100 tenants, however, had not paid rent after the judgments were obtained.

After completion of our review the RLA advised us that its procedures for collecting delinquent rentals have been strengthened. (See p. 58.)

11. Control over relocation operations deficient

The RLA's control over the records pertaining to the relocation operations in project area C is inadequate and statistics maintained by the RLA are inaccurate. We also found that suspected violations of the District of Columbia housing code were not reported to code enforcement units.

We are recommending that URA include a provision in the LPA manual requiring that LPA's report in writing to local code enforcement units those dwellings at which LPA's inspections disclosed obvious code violations of a serious nature. (See p. 60.)

12. Deficiencies in accounting procedures and financial statements

In our audit we observed a number of deficiencies in the RLA's methods of recording financial transactions in that Agency's accounting records and, because of these deficiences, we are unable to state that the accompanying financial statements present fairly the assets and liabilities of the RLA at June 30, 1957, and 1958. (See p. 67.)

Real Champions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, as one who many years ago participated in basketball, I am proud to advise my colleagues in the House that the basketball team of Wittenberg University, Springfield, Ohio, in my congressional district, won the NCAA championship as the best small college basketball team in the United States. The Wittenberg team this year had 25 victories, and the winning of the championship gave it its 100th, under the direction of Coach

Mears. It is pleasing to note the national press, and such news magazines as Sports Illustrated, have given full recognition to the championship victory of the Wittenberg University team.

I am also very proud of the fact that from my own district the basketball team of Urbana High School—the smallest school participating in the State tournament—took second place in the Ohio State AA Tournament among the 399 high school teams participating in the championship playoffs at district, regional, and State levels.

Farmers Face Income Loss as Result of Feed Grains Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL FINDLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, market trends of the past 3 weeks indicate that the New Frontier feed grains bill will cost farmers $75 million in lost income on their 1960 corn crop.

The sudden drop in the corn market is attributed by market experts to Government selling of surplus stocks plus fears that the Government will market even larger amounts of corn to keep market prices down.

The feed grains program enacted by Congress 3 weeks ago—over my opposition—permits Uncle Sam to sell surplus corn to depress prices. The aim is to induce farmers to agree to cut 1961 acreage and thus qualify for price supports.

The corn market the past 2 weeks confirms my fears that the bill would drive market prices down. The market is down about 15 cents a bushel, and with about 500 million bushels of 1960 corn still unmarketed, that means an income loss of about $75 million.

Market observers also predict that fear of Government price breaking will force a record number of farmers to seal their 1960 corn with Commodity Credit Corporation. This will add to Federal costs for handling and storage. The new feed grains bill has already had the effect of hurting farm income and adding to our tax burdens.

The current marketing year for corn started October 1, 1960, and runs to September 30, 1961.

When farmers planted last year's crop in the spring of 1960, they expected that the then existing program would be in effect throughout the entire 1960 marketing year. Now that the Department of Agriculture is intentionally depressing corn prices to stimulate sign-up in the new feed grain program, corn farmers rightfully feel that the rules have been changed in the middle of the game.

The corn market 10 days ago was actually reported by newspapers down 15 cents, the sharpest March decline in 13 years.

Since corn farmers have until May 31 to place their 1960 corn under loan, the lowered market price is encouraging more farmers to put more corn into Commodity Credit Corporation hands. This can mean only more storage costs, more handling costs, and a total increase in Government expenses.

The Wall Street Journal reports that grain men expect loans on 1960 crop corn will cover a record total of 600 million bushels.

Diplomatic Blunder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, we have dealt from weakness in the Lao situation and as indicated in the following news article by Edgar Ansel Mowrer, which appeared in the Long Island Daily Press on March 31, our future position in that part of the world is quite clearly defined:

WE'VE LOST AGAIN TO MOSCOW
(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

Whatever comes out of the Lao negotiations, one thing is certain: the United States has suffered a defeat and the free world has once more retreated in face of advancing communism. This is the price for avoiding a nasty fight in another faraway country of which we know nothing as Britain's Chamberlain called Czechoslovakia in 1938.

The United States thought, and rightly so, that Laos should be kept in our orbit. Now it is certain to be neutral in the unpleasant way of Indonesia and will probably go Communist.

Lenin's threat to take Paris and London through Peiping and New Delhi is one step closer to realization. And what is worse, this has been done with the connivance of Paris and London.

One can understand the reluctance of France—with its army bogged down in Algeria—to get into another Indochinese mess. Besides, France has never really forgiven the United States for urging it to relinquish Indochina and then stepping into France's former place as the chief adviser and protector of South Vietnam.

Britain has no such excuse. Yet the truth is, since 1945, the British have favored every decision that aided communism in Asia—not, of course, because the British favor communism but because they had no stomach for trouble in the Far East and hoped that the developments in that area would not ultimately endanger Britain.

Certainly, every time the United States has followed British policy in that area we have lost something.

Then, as now, Eisenhower chose to give in to avoid the risk of war.

Since then Britain has arranged two disastrous summit conferences at both of which the U.S.S.R. got unilateral concessions from the United States. It endeavored unsuccessfully to shackle the United States at the Formosa Strait and is trying—in the teeth of American congressional opposition—to get Red China into the United Nations and recognized by us.

Now it has masterminded another Western retreat—all, naturally in the name of peace and in areas remote from Britain.

The American administration had better ask itself how long it can afford to follow the policies of an ally whose people are still suffering from the shell shock of their marvelous wartime effort.

Some Americans refuse to blame Britain for the setback in Laos. They say that Laos was no place to fight a local war. The advantages were all on the other side, since Laos is contiguous to Communist strength in China. But actually the United States did not have to fight in Laos to save that country. It had the chance to bring pressures upon the Soviet Union elsewhere. President Kennedy could have informed Khrushchev that unless he stopped sending arms into Laos the United States would—

Break off negotiations and resume nuclear testing.

Refuse to negotiate disarmament or arms control until the Communists in Laos gave up.

Inform Russia and China that not only will we yield no more territory and peoples to communism but that our policy is to liberate all those peoples everywhere who were brought under communism against their will.

Such a threat—or only part of it—would have forced Mr. K. to do some frantic thinking. But it would require a real revolution in the thinking of many of President Kennedy's closest advisers.

For the First Cruise of the "Hope," Well Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the following interesting editorial appeared in the Kansas City Times of March 18, 1961.

FOR THE FIRST CRUISE OF THE "HOPE," WELL DONE

The SS *Hope*—America's medical ambassador to southeast Asia—is home again. The overall effect of its shakedown cruise has been summed up by Dr. William D. Walsh, director of the People-to-People Health Foundation:

"Whenever one of us goes ashore in a jeep on the outer islands (of Indonesia), kids dart out of the jungle and yell 'Hopie, Hopie.' They certainly don't say 'Hopie, go home.'"

For 6 months the *Hope*, a former Navy hospital ship that borrowed the name of a distinguished World War II ship, cruised the Java Sea. Its 520 feet of glowing whiteness was a symbol of the good will of the people of the United States. As a joint effort of private citizens and the Government (which provided only the vessel and $2 million for refitting), the *Hope* was in a sense a pilot project for Mr. Kennedy's Peace Corps. The sponsoring foundation was so pleased with the results that it hopes eventually to send similar ships to Africa and South America.

In the beginning, the Indonesian reaction to the *Hope* was not entirely unmixed. Initially, the ship anchored in the larger ports. The more metropolitan areas of the sixth largest nation were disappointed. They had expected, apparently, a floating medical school. In Jakarta, some officials suggested that the United States would do better to establish permanent hospitals ashore, "as the Russians are doing."

But anticipation is usually greater than realization, and perhaps the publicity build-

up had been too great. At any rate, the *Hope* later encountered its greatest success in the more primitive areas. Skipper Jack M. Windas told the New York Times of the crowds that lined the beaches of Sumbawa for treatment in a clinic on the beach or on the ship. The few local doctors were instructed in the latest medical techniques.

In June, the *Hope* is scheduled to sail again, for South Vietnam. As a symbol of U.S. intentions, the ship should have a long and fruitful career afloat. And its record to date—its many successes and relatively few failures—might be instructive reading for the enthusiastic Peace Corps.

The Recession—Overall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the current recession which has caused so much comment from the administration is not alarming when compared with other recessions which have occurred since World War II.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to insert the following survey by Nate White, business and financial editor of the Christian Science Monitor, which is a reprint from the March 28, 1961, edition:

THE RECESSION—OVERALL

(By Nate White)

BOSTON.—It may be surprising to the reader to know that the recession now ending is the second mildest of the seven which have occurred since the end of World War II—second to the recession of 1948–50.

After all of the publicity about the sad state of the U.S. economy the past year, it is now time to take an objective look.

First, it is important to record that no recession can be taken lightly. It is basically an attack—an attack of bad planning, bad economic planning, for the economy is both flexible, resilient, and accommodating.

It is important to remember that numbers, as such, do not tell the story. For instance, 5,560,000 people were out of work in 1941. This was 9.9 percent of the 1941 labor force of 55,910,000 persons. In February 1961, 5,700,000 persons were out of work. This was 6.8 percent of the labor force of 70,400,000 persons.

The percentage rate in persons out of work has ranged as follows since the end of the war:

1945	1.7
1946	3.9
1947	3.9
1948	3.8
1949	5.9
1950	5.3
1951	3.3
1952	3.1
1953	2.9
1954	5.6
1955	4.4
1956	4.2
1957	4.3
1958	6.8
1959	5.5
1960	5.6

January 1961, was 6.6 percent. February 1961, was 6.8 percent.

MANUFACTURING HIT

The only years that unemployed persons numbered under 2 million since 1929 were 1943, 1944, 1945, 1952, 1953—all war years. The only years the unemployment rate fell under 4 percent, since 1929, were years of immediate postwar boom and Korean war boom, 1945–48 and 1951–53.

For this reason, it may surprise many to look at the picture of employment and unemployment. Employment steadily rises while unemployment has held relatively at the same levels.

Where the 1960–61 unemployment hurts is in manufacturing.

The 1960–61 recession took the following pattern: The economy hit a peak high in May 1960, and then held, as Chase Manhattan Bank terms it, "roughly level." This was an indication that it had stopped going up. What was not known was whether this was a "plateau" in which the economy stayed at a high level but went no higher, or whether it was the beginning of a decline. During the fall, most economic indicators began to slide, and as they did so, they increased in speed. February and early March found them beginning to make the turn back.

While this recession hit mainly in production, nevertheless production fell less this time than in any other postwar recession. It stopped greatly above the 1957–58 recession, and notably above the average of all of the others. See the Chase Manhattan chart accompanying this column [not printed in RECORD].

IN 1959, DISTORTIONS

Unfortunately no one has charted the decline in expectations. This would show probably an alltime and sharp falloff.

Two distortions occurred in 1959 which were destructive and gave a false impression of the economy.

One was the rapid production buildup in steel after the destructive strike in that industry in 1959. This led the economy to an abnormal pitch of activity in January, February, and March 1960, and has exercised a distorted effect ever since. Despite efforts to write the steel strike off as inconsequential in the strange pattern of 1960, it cannot be written off. It distorted the picture in every major category.

The second distortion was in the advertising of expectations which were not founded in solid fact. Those talking and writing about the sizzling sixties usually failed to note that the increase in population would not begin to affect markets for houses and durable goods until about 1965 or 1966.

The sudden decline in expectations was more damaging in some respects, mainly psychological, than the actual declines which eventually took place.

For instance, the gross national product—which is the total output of all the Nation's work—increased substantially in 1960. It jumped from $482,100 million in 1959 to $503,200 million in 1960—a dollar increase of $22,100 million—or in noninflated dollars, equated in 1960 prices, an increase of $13,800 million.

FALLOFF IN GNP

That is a substantial increase in a year in any kind of language, inflated or noninflated. However, the economy was running at an increase rate of $25 billion the last quarter of 1959. It failed to sustain this rate and fell off 1 percent. This was not a major falloff. Here is the falloff picture in GNP as it occurred (expressed in 1960 prices):

Quarter 1, 1959: $485.1 (B).
Quarter 2, 1959: $497.9 (B).
Quarter 3, 1959: $488.5 (B).
Quarter 4, 1959: $491.5 (B).
Quarter 1, 1960: $504.8 (B).
Quarter 2, 1960: $506.3 (B).
Quarter 3, 1960: $501.7 (B).
Quarter 4, 1960: $500.4 (B).

The noninflated GNP ran at an increased rate of between 3¾ and 3⅞ during the early peak and the final falloff.

This kind of increase is not to be laughed at, yet for a growing, dynamic economy, many political economists argue that it should be greater.

RESEARCHERS REPORT

One of the finest research teams in the United States has made a careful study of the 1960–61 recession and finds it showing the following:

Industrial production: Milder, slower, more quickly over in its decline than any of the seven. The worst decline was 1957–59, next worst 1953–55, next 1948–50.

GNP: The same pattern.

Personal income from production: Here the 1960–61 recession was lightest in its impact, hardly approaching the others. Worst was 1948–50, next worst 1953–55, next 1957–59.

Employment: In this category 1960–61, despite the large talk about joblessness, showed plus factors with employment showing its seasonal (students back to school, etc.) dropoff, but otherwise a steady increase. Worst, 1948–50, next 1957–59, next 1953–55.

Unemployment: Worst, 1953–55, next 1948–50, next 1960–61, next 1957–59.

Average workweek in manufacturing: Worst, 1960–61; next, 1953–55; next, 1957–59; next, 1948–50.

Real retail sales: Worst, 1957–59; next, 1953–55 but closely approached by 1960–61; best, 1948–50.

Total new orders in manufacturing: Worst, 1953–55; next, 1948–50; next, 1957–59; best, 1960–61.

Excess of new orders over sales in manufacturing: Worst, 1953–55; next, 1957–59; next, 1948–50; best, 1960–61.

Housing starts: Worst, 1960–61; next, 1957–59; next, 1953–55; best, 1948–50.

Plant and equipment expenditures: Worst, 1957–59; next, 1948–50; next but ending sooner, 1960–61; next but declining longer, 1953–55.

Change in business inventories: Worst decline, 1957–59; next, 1948–50; next, 1953–55; sharply down but now at an end, and least in duration, 1960–61.

Consumer prices: Sharp, prolonged decline, 1948–50; steady plateau, 1953–55; steady, gradual increase, 1960–61 (1.5 percent); sharp, prolonged increase, 1957–59.

Federal expenditures: Sharpest decline, 1953–55; steady, steep rise, but violently fluctuating up and down, 1948–50; steady rise, 1957–59, almost paralleled by 1960–61.

Federal surplus or deficit: Steady, sharp decline and recovery in budget supply, 1953–55; 1957–59; 1948–50, with 1960–61 the mildest and due for a sharp decline, as deficits increase.

Money supply: Steady but low, 1948–50; falling but then sharply rising, 1957–59; steady rise after a slump, 1953–55; sharp increase, sudden drop, then recovery, 1960–61.

Yield on long-term Government bonds: Worst, 1953–55; next, 1957–59; next, but recovering, 1960–61; best for 8 months but then gradually declining, 1948–50.

Interest rate on Treasury bills: Sharpest down, gradually up, 1953–55; next sharply down, deeper, but sharply up, 1957–59; next sharpest down, but evening and trending slightly up, 1960–61; high on a nonvariable plateau, sharply off for 2 months and resumption of plateau, 1948–50.

In human terms—the terms of persons out of work—no recession can even be pictured for its intensity. But in overall economic impact, 1960–61 comes off with the judgment "mild and short."

Audit by U.S. Comptroller General Indicated That District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency Has Neither Invited Nor Encouraged Other Potential Private Redevelopers To Submit Bids or Proposals for Disposition of Land

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, in his 1959 report to the Congress on his audit of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, for the fiscal years 1957 and 1958, the Comptroller General of the United States states that—

Our review indicated that the RLA, therefore, has neither invited nor encouraged other potential private redevelopers to submit bids or proposals for the disposition of that land.

We believe that generally the sale or lease by competitive bidding results in the disposition of land in a fair and impartial manner. We believe further that competitive bidding generally will give reasonable assurance that the highest return is obtained in the disposition of land. The disposal of project land on a negotiated basis does not appear to us to provide such assurance.

In connection with a bill I have introduced to provide for a full and complete investigation and study of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency I include here an excerpt from the report to the Congress by the Comptroller General to which I have referred:

PROPOSED DISPOSITION OF LAND WITHOUT COMPETITIVE BIDDING

The redevelopment plan for project area B was prepared jointly by the Redevelopment Land Agency and the National Capital Planning Commission. The redevelopment plan for project areas C and C–1 was prepared, in part, by a potential private redeveloper of the area. Because of the redeveloper's assistance, the RLA entered into a memorandum of understanding with him and believes that it has a moral obligation to negotiate only with him for the disposition of land that he desires to redevelop in project area C. Our review indicated that the RLA, therefore, has neither invited nor encouraged other potential private redevelopers to submit bids or proposals for the disposition of that land.

We believe that generally the sale or lease by competitive bidding results in the disposition of land in a fair and impartial manner. We believe further that competitive bidding generally will give reasonable assurance that the highest return is obtained in the disposition of land. The disposal of project land on a negotiated basis does not appear to us to provide such assurance.

On March 15, 1954, the RLA and the potential private redeveloper executed the memorandum of understanding which stated, in part:

"1. The redeveloper had already expended substantial sums of moneys for a schematic proposal for the redevelopment of the area and desired a memorandum of understanding with the RLA before additional sums were expended for further studies and plans.

"2. It is understood that the RLA does not intend to negotiate with any other potential private redevelopers, except by mutual understanding between the parties, for the disposition of land in the area during the period, not to exceed 15 months, when steps leading to a definitive proposal by the redeveloper are being pursued.

The period for the submission of definitive proposals was extended on several occasions and did not expire until September 15, 1957. At that time definitive proposals had been submitted for the construction of a proposed town center and about 50 percent of the residential property in project area C. In a letter dated September 24, 1958, to the redeveloper, however, the chairman of RLA stated that certain procedures had been approved by RLA's Board of Directors for disposing of land in the proposed plaza area of project area C. The procedures indicated that the redeveloper would have 6 months in which to submit plans and a proposal for developing the plaza area and that the RLA would not negotiate with other potential redevelopers for the disposition of this land during that period.

In May 1957, three appraisers employed by the RLA to jointly appraise the town center land submitted their report to RLA showing a value of $4 per square foot (about $2.4 million). The RLA advised the potential redeveloper that the selling price of the land would be equal to this value and that if the land were leased the annual ground rent would be based on that value. In June 1957, the redeveloper declined to purchase or lease the land on this basis and offered to lease the land on the basis of a value of $1.25 per square foot (about $0.75 million). In September 1957, the three appraisers employed by RLA reduced their appraisal to $2.50 per square foot (about $1.5 million). In October 1957, the RLA submitted this appraisal to URA for approval. The URA advised the RLA that a value of $2.50 per square foot was unacceptable and suggested that the RLA explore the possibility of disposing of the land by public auction. RLA's Board of Directors expressed the belief that a public auction of the land could be construed to be inconsistent with the intent of the memorandum of understanding with the redeveloper. In December 1957, URA approved the value of $2.50 per square foot and the RLA offered to lease the land to the redeveloper at an annual ground rent equal to 6 percent of the purchase price of $2.50 per square foot. The redeveloper accepted the offer in January 1958 subject to agreement being reached on the terms and conditions of the proposed disposition document.

Shortly before the redeveloper accepted the offer of $2.50 per square foot, the RLA received and rejected an uninvited offer of $4 per square foot for the land. RLA's Board of Directors stated that the offer of $4 was unacceptable because of the memorandum of understanding between the RLA and and the redeveloper who had prepared part of the redevelopment plan.

In arriving at the values of $4 and $2.50 per square foot for the land, the appraisers employed by the RLA used only the land residual method of valuation. The use of this method required that the appraisers estimate (1) the rental income and operating expenses of the proposed Town Center, (2) the construction cost of improvements, (3) a fair rate of return to the owner of the improvements, and (4) a fair rate of return on the land. The value of the land is determined by (1) multiplying the estimated construction cost of the improvements by the estimated rate of return for improvements, (2) deducting the product (the estimated income attributable to the improvements) from the estimated total net annual income, and (3) dividing the residual amount (the income attributable to the land) by the estimated rate of return on the land.

After a review of the land disposition phase of the slum clearance and urban renewal program, a firm of expert real estate consultants reported to URA in January 1956 that—

"There is a tendency among many of the reuse appraisers to use the land residual method, too often with little, if any, consideration of comparative land prices. The land residual method can be a treacherous procedure when applied to proposed or nonexistent improvements unless it be thoroughly understood, handled by extremely competent men and most astutely used in each one of its numerous important and critical steps. This method should never be used without full inclusion of checks against or with comparative transactions."

In appraising certain residential land in project area B, FHA used this method and three other methods of valuation. Regarding the land residual method, an FHA appraiser stated:

"As is always the case, we must caution that the land residual approach can at least be considered a 'check' and cannot be depended upon to be an accurate indicator of value."

We discussed the value of $2.50 per square foot for the Town Center land with FHA officials and they informed us that commercial land, such as that to be used for the Town Center, generally should have a higher value than residential land, such as that in project area B to be used for an 8-story apartment building. FHA valued this residential land at $2.50 per square foot, but has not appraised the Town Center land.

In a letter dated February 26, 1959, the Chairman, RLA, informed us that—

1. The RLA entered into a memorandum of understanding with the potential private redeveloper in order to secure a plan with a known market for a very large area. When the memorandum was executed on March 15, 1954, there was serious question whether a market existed for a project as large as area C. The redeveloper guaranteed to cooperate in the development of a plan and to underwrite the market for half of the area when the plan was approved. The firm did this and RLA has been negotiating in good faith with it for the lease of certain land in the project.

2. The RLA had advertised twice for proposals on the disposition of land in project area B and expects to advertise the availability of other land in the future.

The Chairman, RLA, also informed us that—

"As the audit report (draft) indicates, the reuse value for the Town Center land was set without FHA approval. The reason for this is that at the time the value was approved neither RLA nor the developer had considered FHA financing. * * * It might be pointed out that at the time the RLA price of the Town Center ($2.50 per square foot) was approved by HHFA and subsequently accepted by the redevelopers in January 1958, the redeveloper had not filed an application with FHA for mortgage insurance. Until FHA received such an application accompanied by a fee, it was precluded from pricing land. * * *."

In contrast to these stated reasons for not requesting FHA to appraise the Town Center land before approval of the price, we found that—

1. Representatives of the redeveloper, the RLA, and the FHA attended a meeting on November 18, 1957 (before the value of $2.50 per square foot was approved), and discussed the possibilities of the redeveloper's obtaining FHA financing, and on December 20, 1957, FHA administratively ruled it could insure a mortgage on the Town Center.

2. The FHA appraised the residential land in project area B in July 1955, and again in June 1956. FHA did not receive any appli-

cations for mortgage insurance and the required fees until December 14, 1956.

In March 1959, the RLA received uninvited offers of $3 and $3.50 per square foot for the land. The offerer of $3.50 also offered to reimburse the proposed redeveloper for all costs incurred at that time. Shortly thereafter the proposed redeveloper informed the RLA that he was willing to pay whatever value between $2.50 and $3 per square foot is set by FHA when it appraises the land for mortgage insurance purposes. The RLA then proposed to revise the value of the Town Center land upward to $2.75 per square foot. The redeveloper agreed to this revision provided that the FHA concurs in the valuation. If FHA considers the value of $2.75 per square foot to be too low, the matter will be restudied. If FHA considers the $2.75 per square foot value to be too high, the RLA will lower the price in accordance with the value established by FHA, but not below the initial agreed-upon price of $2.50 per square foot. The RLA rejected the other offers and accepted the revised proposal.

Considering the following facts, we believe that, when FHA appraises the land for mortgage insurance purposes, it will find establishing an independent value of more than $3 per square foot (if warranted) extremely difficult.

(1) The RLA and URA had previously approved a price of $2.50 per square foot.

(2) The RLA has now accepted a proposal between the limits of $2.50 and $3 per square foot.

(3) Five years have passed since the RLA and the redeveloper executed the memorandum of understanding, and all parties are anxious for construction to start without further complications.

(4) Both FHA and URA are constituents of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

(5) If a mortgagor defaults on an FHA-insured mortgage, the FHA has an option to purchase the land for a price equal to the value set by FHA for mortgage insurance purposes.

We believe that the RLA or the URA should have obtained for comparative purposes independent appraisals of the Town Center land from FHA at the time the initial appraisal of $4 per square foot and the later appraisal of $2.50 per square foot were obtained from the three appraisers employed by the RLA.

We believe also that, even if the RLA obtains a rental based on a land value of $3 per square foot, it still will not have reasonable assurance that it has obtained the highest return obtainable. Our belief is based on the fact that, at the time offers of $3 and $3.50 were received in March 1959, a proposed price of $2.50 was public knowledge and the offerers were no doubt influenced by that price.

On July 8, 1958, the operators of a restaurant to be acquired and demolished by RLA submitted an uninvited schematic plan for a restaurant and planetarium on land in project area C that had been planned for an overlook of the waterfront and requested that the RLA not negotiate for the sale or lease of the land for a period of 1 year. On September 9, 1958, RLA's Board of Directors accepted this proposal subject to the approval of URA. On December 10, 1958, the URA requested the RLA to reconsider the proposal because such disposal was not in accordance with the urban renewal plan.

The RLA files show that, in August 1958, other restaurant operators and owners to be displaced by RLA objected to the exclusive negotiation aspect of the proposal and indicated interest in developing the overlook land. We believe that the RLA should not have accepted a proposal of this type because it was similar to the memorandum of understanding dated March 15, 1954, and could create a moral obligation to negotiate exclusively with one redeveloper.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE COMMISSIONER, URA

We recommend that URA require the RLA to—

1. Discontinue the practice of negotiating with only one potential private redeveloper.

2. Publicize the availability of land and invite competitive bids or proposals.

3. Refuse to accept redevelopment plans prepared by a private redeveloper if such acceptance obliges the RLA to negotiate only with such redeveloper.

We recommend also, when it appears that FHA will insure the mortgages of property in the redeveloped area, that, before URA approves the disposition prices, it require the RLA and other LPA's to obtain independent appraisals from FHA for comparative purposes.

Children's Crusade of 1961, Potential for Tragedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in his column appearing in a recent issue of the Washington Evening Star, Constantine Brown describes the alleged Peace Corps as "a publicity stunt with the potential for tragedy." His valid criticism of the scheme deserves the widest possible circulation, and I desire to include the column as part of my remarks:

In the year 1212 a group of idealists, aided and abetted by some of the most naive parents, led thousands of children on a march from their homes in Europe to free the Holy Lands from the grip of infidels.

The debauchery, the horror, the torture, and the enslavery of these pathetic children is without parallel in history. By the time the atrocity was abandoned, the lives of 50,000 children had been sacrificed on the altar of human stupidity.

With the lessons of history behind us, the bold New Frontier plans to launch the children's crusade of 1961—the Peace Corps—to spread enlightenment and establish the brotherhood of man. This action could be likened insofar as the concept is concerned with the blunders of seven centuries ago.

It is remarkable that in this enlightened country few voices have been raised to label this proposal for what it actually is, a publicity stunt with the potential for tragedy.

A young man, Sargent Shriver, has been appointed to head the program. His only qualification seems to be that he is a very nice young man, a very sincere young man, who hates war. Perhaps, however, his lack of qualifications makes him eminently qualified as head of the Peace Corps because, insofar as can be determined, this 20th century crusade has no duties, no missions, no obligations, and only few chances of performing real services.

Any attempt to elicit from any public official the work to be performed by the Peace Corps is met with a rambling, nebulous discourse on the advantages of people-to-people communication in the name of freedom, love, and democracy.

Young American college graduates are expected to mingle with Congolese, Ghanians, and a host of others, trying to ingratiate themselves into their society.

Under the point 4 program, the Marshall plan, and the technical assistance program, we have for years been attempting to send to many areas of the world trained and talented specialists to assist these people to improve their economic status, their agriculture, industry, hygiene, etc. Billions of dollars of the American taxpayers' money have been invested in these projects. Does anyone believe that the innocence of the youngsters of the Peace Corps will succeed where the knowledge of the mature and the experienced has thus far faltered?

Medical missionaries of every faith, such as Dr. Albert Schweitzer and the late Dr. Thomas E. Dooley, have devoted millions of dollars and their lives in efforts to bring to the unenlightened the message of hope in the hereafter and better, more healthy, prosperous life in the present.

How can we suppose that any part of the world desires to be invaded by a corps of American adolescents whose mission seems to be only to win friends and influence people?

Furthermore, we have been told publicly that these youngsters will not be allowed to preach either religion or anticommunism, since this would lend a political aspect to their undertaking and can be exploited by the Communists to create incidents which might have serious consequences.

On the other hand, we are told that the preliminary budget for this escapade will be about $10 million the first year and that aspirants to membership will be subjected to the most rigorous training. One might assume that by "rigorous training" is meant that members will be taught to be agricultural experts, medical doctors, engineers, biologists, chemists, linguistic or diplomatic experts, or industrial technicians. Such an assumption, however, obviously is fallacious since, if it were true, by the time the youngsters finished their training they would be adults competent to assist in the technical assistance program and not eligible for the children's crusade.

Of all the propositions advanced within the recent history of the United States this truly is the most astounding. Yet there has been so far little criticism of this amazingly naive project.

There was a day in America when the authors of such a scheme as the Peace Corps would have had to answer to very pertinent questioning of an alert, intelligent citizenry. Today they are fawned upon as though they had just found the Holy Grail.

The Flash of Lightning and the Deeper Tides

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL FINDLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, this article by James Reston, published in the New York Times of March 24, 1961, analyzes the foreboding outlook for freedom in the Lao area. Mr. Reston also points with clarity and vision to the need for an effective consolidation of the free nations which are frequently known as the Atlantic Community.

I believe this article deserves the attention of all thoughtful Americans:

The Lao crisis is bad, but not all bad. It is a flash of lightning on an ugly truth. The situation was worse before the flash because Laos was slipping away in the dark. Now at least we can see a little of what is happening and President Kennedy is beginning to tell the country what it should have been told some days and even weeks ago.

In the process, it is fairly clear that, while taking precautionary military moves in the Pacific, the President is seeking an international solution to the problem, and any international solution is bound to be a compromise solution.

What the President said was impressive, but no more so than what he didn't say. He avoided any go-it-alone commitment to intervene in the Lao war. He put the question to his allies in the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, including Britain and France, who are in no mood for any adventures in the Lao jungle.

What is happening there is roughly what happened in North Korea and North Vietnam. The Communists are expanding from their central position on the Eurasian continent into areas adjacent to their borders. They are close to home; to oppose them, we must travel to the end of a long line of communications and either intervene in the jungle of Asia ourselves or rely on troops that have little will to fight and little capacity to understand what the fight is all about.

The history of these battles close to the Communist empire is that they usually end in a truce. Thus both sides settled for a division of both Korea and Vietnam. Whenever one of the great powers was so committed to battle that the intervention of the other side might have produced a major war, the second always held back, or compromised.

This was what happened in Greece and Turkey in 1946–47; in the Berlin blockade in 1948–49; the Korean war of 1950–53; the Hungarian revolt of 1956, and the Lebanon crisis of 1958. In every case, either Moscow or Washington abstained when the other risked war, and when the war was fought by proxy through third-power troops, some accommodation was always reached, usually at the West's expense.

Thus what is happening in Laos is not the first skirmish on the fringe of the Soviet empire and it won't be the last. The outlook in these areas is not good. The assumption of the bold is that somehow the West can keep the Communists out of all the once-free areas adjacent to Russia and China despite the rise of Communist power, but it is not the kind of assumption most governments like to risk a major war to prove.

THE VITAL QUESTION

The drift of all this is that each side in the cold war tends to prevail when geography is on its side. The Communists may influence Cuba but they will not hold it. We may by bold maneuvers influence events in Laos and even save its independence for a while, but the odds are against us. It is not like the Congo, where we can beat Communists to the scene.

Two vast consolidations are now proceeding in the world: The Communist consolidation of all but a few areas next to their frontiers, and the Western consolidation of the free nations. In the Communist case the nations concerned are comparatively underdeveloped and therefore easier to control; in the other, the nations are old and proud and highly developed.

Accordingly, the Communist consolidation is going ahead faster than our own. It is proceeding by subversion and force, but it is moving fast.

The same goal is available to the West. It has the capacity, if it has the will, to create a commonwealth of the Atlantic, strong enough to stand against any threat from the expanding Communist nations.

Even in Laos, however, the Atlantic nations have had trouble working out a common policy or even adequate consultations.

Events in that area, they complain, are "uncontrollable," and this may be true despite the President's bold moves, but events in the Atlantic are controllable if somebody will concentrate on the task.

Control by District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency Over Relocation Operations Held To Be Deficient by U.S. Comptroller General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, in connection with a bill I have introduced today, to provide for a study of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency by the Committee on the District of Columbia of the House of Representatives, I include an excerpt from the U.S. Comptroller General's report of his audit of this Agency:

RELOCATION

CONTROL OVER RELOCATION OPERATIONS DEFICIENT

We reviewed Redevelopment Land Agency's relocation operations in project area C and noted a lack of control over records, reports, and inspections pertaining to families self-relocated in private housing.

Section 105(c) of title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1455), provides that with respect to the relocation of displaced families:

"There be a feasible method for the temporary relocation of families displaced from the urban renewal area, and that there are or are being provided, in the urban renewal area or in other areas * * * at rents or prices within the financial means of the families displaced from the urban renewal area, decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings * * *."

In Report No. 1, transmitted to the House Committee on Banking and Currency on January 31, 1956, the Subcommittee on Housing made the following comments on the relocation of displaced families:

"The subcommittee is concerned that adequate safeguards are being taken to see that such families are transferred, as painlessly as possible, to alternative decent housing which they can afford. * * * The subcommittee urges that the Federal authorities charged with overseeing relocation responsibilities exercise increased vigilance to make sure that the municipalities are in fact doing an effective and humane job in this area. Every effort should be made to insure a workable relocation plan with adequate personnel to supervise the working out of the program. If displaced families are merely shunted to another slum area or an area which is on the verge of becoming a slum, the problem is only aggravated further."

Regarding voluntary rehousing, part 3, chapter 4, section 5, of the LPA Manual provides, in part, that—

"The local public agency should request permission to inspect the unit into which the family has moved.

"Results of these inspections shall be recorded. If the unit is not 'decent, safe, and sanitary' by the standards, which the local public agency has established, the move should be considered temporary offsite relocation, and further assistance in locating decent, safe, and sanitary housing should be made available to the family. Records of the action taken to encourage the family to move to decent, safe, and sanitary housing should be maintained in a manner which will enable the local public agency to report upon the status of families voluntarily rehoused at all times, until the relocation responsibility of the local public agency has been discharged."

In a report of relocation progress (form H–666) as of June 30, 1958, submitted to the URA, the RLA showed that 1,315 families in project area C had been relocated—310 families in public housing and 1,005 families in private housing. The report showed that, of the 1,005 families relocated in private housing, 956 families self-relocated and 49 families were relocated by the RLA.

Noted during our review were the following principal deficiencies:

1. Records made available for our review pertained to only 747, rather than 956, families self-relocated in private housing. We believe that RLA's statistics are inaccurate and that the number of families self-relocated in private housing and the total number of families relocated at June 30, 1958, were overstated in the report to URA.

2. RLA's report to URA showed that 340 dwellings to which families had relocated had not been inspected at June 30, 1958. We reviewed RLA's relocation record folders on July 29, 1958, and observed that 240 folders did not contain inspection reports—35 folders were segregated and awaiting inspections and 205 folders were mingled with about 870 other relocation record folders.

3. We observed 10 inspection reports on dwellings to which families had moved that showed the dwellings to be substandard and were filed in the relocation record folders which were mingled with over 1,000 other folders. The 10 relocation record folders did not contain evidence indicating that the RLA had (a) encouraged the families to move to decent, safe, and sanitary housing or (b) reported the substandard conditions of the dwellings to the city's code enforcement units.

4. From RLA's relocation records, we selected at random 37 families relocated in private housing to evaluate RLA's inspection procedures. Three families had moved to dwellings which had not been inspected by RLA and 10 families were not at home at the time of our inspections. Our findings concerning the 24 inspection reports are presented below:

(a) No dwellings existed at two of the addresses even though inspection reports had been completed fully.

(b) Tenants at nine dwellings informed us that an RLA inspector had not visited the dwellings. The description of the exterior design of two of the nine dwellings shown on the inspection reports was materially inaccurate.

(c) Tenants at three dwellings informed us that an RLA inspector had visited the dwellings but did not inspect the interior.

(d) Using RLA's standards as criteria, we observed that one dwelling, which the RLA certified as standard, was actually substandard.

5. We also inspected six dwellings to which families had moved in an area near the project area. RLA had certified all six dwellings as being standard. Tenants at four dwellings informed us that an RLA inspector had not visited the dwellings and a tenant at one dwelling informed us that an RLA inspector had visited the dwelling but did not inspect the interior. We observed that two of the five dwellings were actually substandard.

We discussed the above deficiencies with the chief of RLA's project management division and furnished him the addresses of the dwellings concerned. He informed us that action would be taken to (1) review all relocation record folders and to segregate those folders on families that have self-relocated in private housing which is substandard and in housing which has not been inspected by RLA, (2) inspect those dwellings that have not been inspected, (3) followup on families that have relocated in substandard private housing, (4) require that 1 out of 10 inspections of private housing to which families have relocated be independently checked by another employee, and (5) review and reconstruct the statistical data to be included in future reports to URA. Shortly thereafter, we noted that relocation record folders were being reviewed and segregated. On March 3, 1959, the RLA project management division issued new procedures designed to control inspections of private housing and provide for systematic followup on families relocated in substandard housing.

The Chief of RLA's project management division informed us also that the URA had suggested that all suspected violations of the District of Columbia housing code be reported to code enforcement units but that the RLA believed that such action would jeopardize its relationship with realtors and owners of the dwellings.

In a letter dated February 26, 1959, the Chairman, RLA, stated that (1) the RLA believed that if it were to report such violations, its ability to obtain listings from real estate firms would be impaired and (2) in certain respects RLA standards exceed minimum code requirements and a violation of RLA standards may not be a violation of minimum code requirements.

We agree that a violation of the RLA's standards may not be a violation of the District of Columbia housing code. However, when RLA's inspector encounters conditions which are obviously serious code violations, we believe that such conditions should be reported to the local code enforcement agency.

We believe also that URA should make periodic reviews of RLA's relocation records, reports, and inspections in order to determine whether adequate controls are maintained to avoid the recurrence of the above-cited deficiencies.

In a letter to us dated March 23, 1959, the Commissioner, URA, stated that HHFA regional office relocation staff made periodic visits to projects in execution to review relocation and property management activities of the LPA's. The Commissioner stated also that the supervision of these activities is now being strengthened through the use of site inspectors on the regional office staff who will be required to make monthly reports on their assigned projects.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE COMMISSIONER, URA

To retard the spread of blight and slums to other areas, we recommend that URA include a provision in the LPA Manual requiring that LPA's report in writing to local code enforcement units those dwellings at which the LPA's inspections disclose obvious code violations of a serious nature.

PAYMENTS FOR PROPERTY LOSSES IMPROPER

We tested relocation payments totaling $45,256 that were made to families and business concerns displaced from project areas B and C. These payments included three payments totaling $5,850 to business concerns for alleged losses on fixtures and equipment moved by the business concern to their new location. The HHFA project auditors had questioned one of these payments which occurred in the period covered by their audit. The payments represented the difference between the replacement value and the liquidating value of the property.

We discussed the three payments with the chief of RLA's project management division and he stated that the three payments were proper because (1) in one case the business concern was required to construct an addition to the building at the new location to house the equipment and did not receive payment for any moving expenses, (2) in one case the business concern also received a payment for moving expenses, but that payment did not include the cost of dismantling and reinstalling equipment, and (3) in the other case the business concern did not receive payment for any moving expenses.

We believe that the RLA should have made payments to the business concerns for moving expenses, including the cost of dismantling and reinstalling equipment, rather than for losses of property.

The Housing Act of 1956, approved August 7, 1956 (70 Stat. 1101), authorized the making of relocation payments to individuals, families, and business concerns for their reasonable and necessary moving expenses and any actual direct losses of property, except goodwill or profit resulting from their displacement from a project area. Such payments may not exceed $100 to an individual or family, or $2,500 to a business concern.

Since August 1956, the URA has issued a number of LPA letters and revisions to rules and regulations prescribed by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator. In April 1958, URA issued an advisory bulletin titled "Questions and Answers on Relocation Payments," which interprets the rules and regulations. In October 1958, however, the LPA Manual (pt. 2, ch. 6, sec. 5, and pt. 3, ch. 4, sec. 8) contained provisions which (1) related to financial assistance to site occupants that were dated February 11, 1953, and May 19, 1955, and (2) were inconsistent with provisions of the Housing Act of 1956.

We recommended that URA revise its LPA Manual to include specific policies and procedures to be followed in making relocation payments, as authorized by the Housing Act of 1956.

In a letter to us dated March 23, 1959, the Commissioner, URA, stated that he agreed with the above recommendation as it applies to relocation payments authorized by the Housing Act of 1956. Pending the issuance of policies and procedures which are now in clearance for inclusion in the LPA Manual, LPA letter No. 171 was issued on December 31, 1958.

Kennedy School Bill Should Not Be Amended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BAKER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very fine editorial which appeared recently in the Maryville-Alcoa Daily Times, Maryville, Tenn.

The editorial follows:

KENNEDY SCHOOL BILL SHOULD NOT BE AMENDED

The Kennedy bill on education has received many plaudits and educators have called the message in which he delivered the bill to Congress one of the great documents in the history of American education.

There is no doubt that this bill will become one of the landmarks in our educational system for it will start, if passed, a whole new idea of direct Federal help in this field heretofore considered a State responsibility. The fact that some States have not accepted their responsibility has brought the Federal Government into action and this time without the normal control which the central government exercises over all its other aid programs.

Incorporated in the bill is the following paragraph:

"SEC. 103. In the administration of this title, no Department, Agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, or the administration or operation of any school or school system."

This paragraph, if left in the act at its signing, should allay any suspicions that Federal grants will mean Federal controls on our educational system. True, the natural bureaucratic tendency would be to advance interpretations which would weaken and change the intent of the no-control clause but the language is so definite and positive that little misinterpretation could take place.

The proposal of President Kennedy is fourfold. There would be grants to States for public schools for teachers' pay or construction or both, grants for 212,500 college scholarships to be issued on the basis of ability and need, long-term, low-interest loans for college academic facilities and finally more loans for residential housing for college students and faculty.

In all, the bill calls for $5.6 billion to be spent in support of the Nation's educational program.

As could be expected, many proposed amendments will and have cropped up. Some of them will try to circumvent the no-control clause such as the one proposed to allow no Federal aid to go into a school system which is not intergrated. This is a definite control measure and should be treated as being outside the intent of the bill.

Another measure which has caused a great deal of comment is the proposal by some bishops of the Catholic Church to include parochial schools in the program. Almost all churches have some type of church-supported school but, as far as we have been able to ascertain, this request by some members of the Catholic Church remains by itself.

In fact, the other religious groups are rather firmly against any intervention of the Federal Government in the financial affairs of their schools. Commercial and trade schools are also viewing the Federal grants and will act if other amendments are successful.

Many of the educators who helped write the bill are fearful that the zealous efforts of private groups will defeat the bill by the amendment route. The tacking on of these will add other groups in opposition.

The bill as designed will assure that every child is given the opportunity to learn in a school prepared to foster health and higher achievement. We are in full accord with the bill and with the benefits that are certain to accrue to the advancement of education in this country.

We cannot condone the amendments that private groups are proposing which will threaten the bill. It is our hope that they will defer their own selfish desires in order that the problems confronting public education in this country can be overcome.

The greatness of this country and the advancement of it in all fields of endeavor can be traced back to the public school system. This has failed to keep pace in many areas of the country and the Federal bill is designed to aid these without control.

Hope Dims for A-Test Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Mr. Roscoe Drummond appeared in the Washington Post of today, April 10. Having just returned from Geneva, where I attended the spring meeting of the Inter-Parliamentary Union, I can agree 100 percent in what Mr. Drummond says of the Russian strategy. It is always the same; they will never give in and they will never take "No" for an answer. They are willing to wait years to obtain their objectives and they believe they can wear us out eventually.

It is for us to realize the truth and to face it without compromise and without fear. Any other action on our part can but spell the defeat of our cause.

REDS AT GENEVA—HOPES DIM FOR A-TEST TREATY

(By Roscoe Drummond)

We should be ready for bleak news on test-ban and disarmament negotiations with the Soviets.

I suspect the real state of affairs will soon be out in the open at Geneva.

The Russians are now backing away from any inspectable treaty to end the testing of nuclear weapons.

There is yet no solid Soviet agreement to begin the talks on comprehensive agreement August 1.

There is an appearance of an agreement, but Moscow has attached a condition. The United States, Britain, France, Canada, and the others are ready to resume the Disarmament Conference, where they left off last year. Moscow says yes, but only if some additional nations are brought to the conference table. So there is nothing firm about the August 1 date.

Such news from Geneva can only mean that the Soviets do not want to negotiate a test-ban agreement which has any element of secure enforcement. Naturally they do not say so. That would be bad propaganda, but their actions reveal their intentions:

1. The United States and Britain have made seven significant concessions to Soviet views on inspection. The Russians offer nothing in return.

2. Actually the Soviet delegate not only makes no return concessions, but he has withdrawn Russian approval of one of the most important agreements already reached in previous Geneva meetings—that a single neutral administrator be in charge of the test-ban control commission.

3. In place of a single neutral administrator, Moscow now says it will only accept a three-man committee on which, at all points, each would have to agree before any inspection was authorized.

4. This means inspection only at the will and wishes of the Kremlin. This means that the Soviets could stop the control machinery at any time, anywhere.

No wonder Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, after conferring with the American negotiators at Geneva, warned that the United States will not be lured into a treaty "just for the sake of a treaty" and will not accept a veto-locked inspection system.

It is quite possible that the Soviets have decided that the value of a test ban is not equal to the amount of inspection needed to make it work. Or, they might have decided that they can get the United States to continue the moratorium on testing without any inspection agreement at all.

Whatever their reasons, the Soviet demand for a veto-laden control commission makes the outlook for any kind of disarmament agreement nearly hopeless.

It now seems clear that the Kremlin is insisting upon a veto over any international agency which could affect the Soviet Union. Their demand at Geneva for a "committee secretariat" to run the test-ban control commission is exactly what Premier Khrushchev has been demanding at the U.N.—a committee to run the secretariat of the United Nations with a Soviet veto over any action.

Is there any reason to think that the Soviets will accept a veto-free inspection system for general disarmament when they will not accept a veto-free control commission to verify the test ban?

Thus far the Soviet record at Geneva is a dismal dashing of the hopes of the whole world for serious negotiation.

Participation in an Airborne Alert Mission Flown in One of SAC's B–52 Jet Bombers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to report to the House of Representatives about a most memorable experience which occurred recently when I visited my home, the Sixth Congressional District in the State of Oklahoma. During this visit, as many of you may know, I was privileged to become the first Member of Congress to participate in an airborne alert mission flown in one of the Strategic Air Command's giant, eight-jet, B–52 bombers which is assigned to the 11th Bombardment Wing.

We have two Strategic Air Command bases located within Oklahoma's Sixth Congressional District. They are Altus Air Force Base located in the southwestern corner of Oklahoma and Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base in the west central part of our State. Both bases are equipped with the Strategic Air Command's giant B–52 bombers and the high-altitude, high-speed KC–135 jet tankers which are used for in-flight refueling to greatly increase the range of SAC's bomber force.

Further, Altus Air Force Base has been assigned the task of establishing and maintaining 12 Atlas intercontinental ballistic missile sites. The Altus Base is also presently involved as one of the first operational bases to receive the Hound Dog, air-to-ground missile, which is carried beneath the wing of the B–52 to greatly increase that bomber's striking capability.

Altus Air Force Base is the home of the Strategic Air Command's 11th Bombardment Wing, commanded by Col. Frederick R. Ramputi. Under his able command, Colonel Ramputi has jet bombers, jet tankers, air-to-ground missiles, and will soon have operational ICBM's. To visit the 11th Bombardment Wing is to see a truly integrated aerospace force in operation.

Besides being one of the first bombardment wings within the Strategic Air Command to attain an integrated systems status—that is, to have both jet aircraft and ballistic missiles—the 11th Bombardment Wing has a long history of firsts and of excellent achievement. Most of you gentlemen are aware of the combat competition held annually by the Strategic Air Command. Top aircrews from all over the world compete for the huge Fairchild trophy which is given for excellence in bombing, navigation, aerial refueling and the highly technical field of electronic countermeasures. When you have the top crews, from the most awesome fighting force the world has ever known, competing for the Fairchild trophy, the winner must be really good. Gentlemen, the 11th Bombardment Wing has won that Fairchild Trophy three times during the 12 years of the trophy's existence. No other bombardment wing has ever won that trophy more than once.

In the 1960's Strategic Air Command's combat competition the 11th Bombardment Wing became the first to win the Fairchild trophy while using the B–52 bomber and the KC–135 jet tanker. Besides the huge Fairchild trophy, the 11th Bomb Wing also brought home the trophy for having the best jet tanker unit—the 96th Air Refueling Squadron—within the Strategic Air Command. These are the men that I was privileged to visit and to fly with.

Upon arrival at Altus Air Force Base, I was immediately given a tour of the newly completed Hound Dog missile facilities and it was explained to me how this missile would be carried beneath the wings of the B–52 to be launched hundreds of miles from a potential target or be used to wipe out enemy defense which might stand between the bomber and its primary target area. The B–52 is our Nation's first airborne missile platform bomber. The destructive capability of this weapon system defies the imagination.

From the Hound Dog facilities, we proceeded to the far north end of Altus' 2½-mile runway where I saw demonstrated the capability of the Strategic Air Command's ground alert concept. Aircrews, housed in a giant, half buried, concrete and steel building, maintain the ability around the clock, every day of the year, to launch SAC's retaliatory force. Within sprinting distance from the heavily guarded alert building many B–52 Stratofortress bombers and KC–135 Stratotankers perch, fully loaded and ready to roll down a high-speed taxiway to the runway. These dedicated men spend 25 percent of their lives living in isolation within the alert compound, always ready to perform their awesome task.

The men who fly these aircraft are highly motivated with their mission. When the klaxon horns sound an alert one had better get out of the way fast. If he does not, I will guarantee you that, Congresman or not, he is liable to be trampled. These men fully realize that

they must utilize every second of any warning they may receive of an impending attack and they are not going to be caught on the ground. There is not much humor in their deadly business.

The following day, it was my privilege to tour 1 of the 12 Atlas intercontinental ballistic missile sites presently under construction near Altus Air Force Base. These are to be hardened sites. That is to say, the missiles will be housed in giant silos buried 180 feet deep into the ground. This is to make them invulnerable to anything other than a direct hit by a weapon from any potential aggressor.

Conducting me on this tour were Air Force Col. Ernest L. Ramme, commander of the Site Activation Task Force and Lt. Col. Carl F. Baswell, project engineer for the Army Corps of Engineers, who are responsible for construction of the Atlas missile facilities. They explained to me many of the complicated problems involved in this $65 million project. I came away convinced that this is a sound investment of our defense dollars, because, as I stated earlier, these sites will be nearly invulnerable to attack.

Gentlemen, the real highlight of my tour came when approval was granted for me to fly aboard one of the 11th Bomb Wing's B–52 Stratofortress bombers on an airborne alert mission. The hours immediately preceding the mission were so filled with events that it is difficult to recall everything that happened.

Briefly, I sat in the premission briefing with the flight crew where top wing specialists outlined the requirements of the flight and briefed us on the weather that we could expect along our route.

After the briefing I was given a complete physical checkup and a clean bill of health by Lt. Col. Bradley W. Prior, the 11th Bomb Wing Flight Surgeon.

From the flight surgeon's office I was taken to the wing's personal equipment section where I was completely outfitted from head to toe with the heavy-duty clothing worn by all SAC crews whenever they fly. I was fitted with special, quick-donning alert boots, heavy winter flight coveralls, gloves, and jacket. Last but not least came the jet helmet—SAC men refer to them as "brain buckets"—and the very necessary oxygen mask which connects to the helmet. By the time they had a parachute strapped on my back I was beginning to wonder how these men managed to wear all this paraphernalia throughout a long airborne alert flight.

Gen. Thomas S. Power, SAC Commander in Chief, announced in January that Strategic Air Command aircraft were participating in airborne alert training which means that a certain number of aircraft are in the air at all times as part of the command's routine aircrew readiness program.

As the Members of the House are aware, the funds for the airborne alert training program are provided from money previously allotted to the Department of Defense to develop an airborne alert "on-the-shelf" capacity. I must say that these highly skilled men are making good use of those funds.

Missions, such as the one in which I participated, are flown under quite realistic conditions. At all times during the flight we were in direct radio contact with Strategic Air Command Headquarters at Omaha, Nebr., and could have been ordered to change course and strike any potential enemy target.

Colonel Ramputi, the 11th Bomb Wing commander, said that the feasibility of maintaining a part of the SAC bomber fleet in the air around-the-clock has been proven by over 6,000 airborne alert training sorties completed successfully by SAC bombers during the past 2 years.

In the cockpit I watched as Maj. Thomas W. Martin, pilot and aircraft commander of this giant craft, and his copilot, 1st Lt. Wilber H. Smith, went through page after page of checklists to prepare for flight. Behind me, 1st Lt. Raymond C. McAdoo carefully checked the maze of gear required to conduct electronic countermeasures activity. Downstairs, on the lower deck, Capt. David G. Ebert, the radar-navigator checked his bombing equipment while Capt. Frank M. Nakamura, the navigator, made certain that all navigational equipment was functioning properly. In the tail section M. Sgt. Russell D. Bick, tail gunner, busied himself checking out the defensive gunnery system.

The coordination required between these crew members both on the ground and throughout the flight is simply fantastic to one who has never witnessed these men on the job before. Their language, like their jobs, is highly technical and it was difficult to really understand all that seemed to be going on. I did know, the meaning of the term "roger." The crew, at every opportunity, explained to me what they were doing so that I feel I can really appreciate the tremendously technical business of getting a giant jet bomber into the sky.

When we took off, rain clouds hung low over the airfield but we climbed through them on instruments, along a designated flight path, almost as if the clouds did not exist. Soon we burst into bright afternoon sunshine, as if climbing into another world. During the takeoff, I had buckled into an ejection seat and connected my quick release parachute lanyard as Major Martin had shown me, however, I never had the slightest worry about having to make use of this equipment.

After the aircraft was established in the climb to altitude, I was free to move about and visit each of the crew member's positions, watch over their shoulders and learn something of each man's job. It was tremendously interesting. At some time during the flight I sat at each position while the crew set switches, tuned radios and focused radar scopes; all the while explaining to me what I was seeing or hearing with their equipment. At one time I was allowed to take the aircraft's controls and make a turn.

To maintain the bomber in the air for so many hours requires both day and night aerial refueling. Many hours after takeoff we rendezvoused with a KC–135 jet tanker of the 96th Air Refueling Squadron, also a part of the 11th Bomb Wing at Altus.

I was truly amazed at the precision flying required to place these two aircraft in position for refueling and I was astounded at the amount of fuel that flowed from the tanker into our bomber. It was almost unbelievable to see those pilots, strapped into the same seat for so many hours, make a night hookup and fly perfect formation, get their fuel. Believe me, they must have tremendous stamina, because refueling is really handwork.

During the 24 long hours of an airborne alert mission they continually fight cramped muscles and other physical inconveniences Under these conditions I think it must be doubly hard to maintain an alert, quick thinking mind, which is a prime requirement when flying at jet speeds. A continuous vigilance for other aircraft must be maintained by the pilots, who only leave their positions when it is absolutely necessary. But this crew never once slowed down. I found them highly conscious of air safety problems and extremely competent and careful.

During this long flight, I did manage to catnap on a couple occasions, however, I was far too interested in the activity around me and in these hard working airmen to worry very much about losing sleep.

As I talked with the men and it started to get light again in the east, I began asking myself what it must be worth to our Nation to have airmen such as these dedicated, devoted professionals, willing to endure the physical discomforts created by 5-pound helmets, heavy parachutes, and the many other inconveniences demanded of them in order to keep this weapons system ready to strike should ever the need arise. I came to the conclusion that these men are worth a great deal more than we are willing, at least at the present, to give.

These men told me of the thousands of man-hours and great technical knowledge that are required by their ground maintenance personnel in order to provide them with sound aircraft and reliable bombing, navigation, electronics countermeasures and gunnery systems which are required to make this an effective weapons system. The aircrew had nothing but the highest praise for the technical specialists who spend untold extra hours to make sure that their equipment was the best that was humanly possible to provide.

Gentlemen, I have always felt that the Strategic Air Command had mighty good men and equipment, but this flight made me appreciate them and the job they are doing a lot more. These men are a far cry from the old scarf and goggles Air Corps. I witnessed highly trained, highly skilled men doing a professional job infinitely more complex than I can begin to explain. And I must add doing it effectively and efficiently.

One of the greatest problems that the Strategic Air Command faces is that of holding their men. SAC spends millions of dollars training these men only to

have them leave the service for higher paying, less demanding careers in civilian industry. This is a great loss to our Nation; an unnecessary drain of defense dollars.

I walked away from that flight—truly one of the most thrilling experiences of my life—firmly convinced that we, the Congress of the United States, are not providing adequate compensation for these SAC men. As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I shall strive to enact legislation to provide extra pay for the air crews who man SAC's alert force; for the highly skilled technicians who maintain SAC's intricate weapon systems and to find a way to provide more promotions for these most deserving men.

We can, and we must, provide greater incentives for these professionals to remain in military service. Their job is tough, demanding, exasperating and particularly hard on their families—yes, the average SAC man does have a family. If we fail to find the added incentives necessary to keep these men in SAC we shall have failed to spend our defense dollars wisely and—worst of all—we cannot help but to slip behind in our efforts to contain the Communist threat to world peace. I stand firmly convinced that we need immediate approval for increasing subsistence allowance for SAC's airmen, increase in SAC officer and airman promotions, establishment of an SAC alert pay and to do something about proficiency pay for these highly skilled technical specialists.

We, as Congressmen, must evaluate our positions, particularly with regard to defense spending, to see if we are really up to date with the requirements for establishing and maintaining the fantastically technical and complex aerospace force that present-day military concepts demand. I am certain that if every Congressman could just realize the type of prepardeness program that the Strategic Air Command has built and the great sacrifices that are made to maintain this vigilance, he would plainly see the immediate necessity for remedial legislation.

My flight aboard one of the 11th Bombardment Wing's B–52 bombers marked the anniversary of my first trip to Congress 20 years ago. The military services—and particularly the aerospace forces—have undergone a tremendous change in all areas of operation during that time. One cannot begin to draw a comparison between the efficiency and complexity of the forces today to those of 20, or even 10, years ago. Why, then, should we expect these men to work for the same pay or the same promotional opportunities that they have in the past?

In conclusion, just let me say that as a result of my flight aboard one of the world champion 11th Bomb Wing's B–52's, I have returned to my seat on the floor of the House of Representatives, a much more interested, more highly motivated, more determined Member of Congress. I shall work tirelessly to see that no stone is left unturned toward seeing the U.S. Air Force and the Strategic Air Command realize their famous slogan, "Aerospace Power for Peace." Thank you.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, because we are approaching the time when this body will be engaged in debate on Federal aid to education, I believe it behooves all of us to select from our reading articles which we feel will be of value to our colleagues as they try to make up their minds about the correctness or incorrectness of this proposed step.

There was published in the Chattanooga Free Press of Friday, March 31, a very excellent editorial entitled "The Facts Refute the Lobbyists." The writer of the editorial correctly pointed out that—

One of the most significant things about the current agitation for massive Federal aid to education is that its primary source has not been the people on the local level who are supposed to be in such need of Federal help.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FACTS REFUTE THE LOBBYISTS

One of the most significant things about the current agitation for massive Federal aid to education is that its primary source has not been the people on the local level who are supposed to be in such need of Federal help.

Most of the propaganda for Federal aid has come from professional educationists such as those running the National Education Association, which maintains a lobby in Washington that even the AFL–CIO, with all its big spending for lobbying, might envy. And the Federal aid to education propaganda has spread from the NEA to various school administrators.

There are several things basically wrong with the idea of Federal aid to education.

For one thing, such a program as has been proposed would be unconstitutional, because the Constitution of the United States simply does not provide any authority for Federal aid to education, and does provide that the powers not specifically delegated to the Federal Government shall remain in the hands of the States or the people, where education is, has been, and should properly remain.

Another thing wrong with the idea of Federal aid to education—although the fact that it is unconstitutional ought to be enough by itself to cause its discard—is that it is economically unsound. The Federal Government has no money except that which its gets from the people. The Federal Government never returns to the people in aid more than a fraction of the money collected from them. So Federal aid, rather than creating more money actually shrinks the money available on the local level so that it buys less education than otherwise could be bought by proper local action.

Still another major fault of the idea of Federal aid is that it inevitably poses the threat of Federal control. Any level of government handing out tax money has a responsibility to direct how that money shall be used. Federal control of education would be extremely dangerous. The control might not be very noticeable at first. But after a short time local communities drained of tax funds to finance the Federal aid program would become dependent upon it, and then would be powerless to resist controls in the form of strings attached to the aid funds.

But there is still another overriding reason the Federal aid scheme ought to be rejected.

That reason: It is not needed.

Federal aid proponents claim 60,780 classrooms need to be built each year for the next 10 years. Current classroom building already totals 70,000 a year—without Federal aid.

Aid proponents say Federal intervention is needed because of increasing school population. The average annual increase in school enrollment for 1955–59 was 1.2 million; for 1960–64 it is expected to drop to 1.1 million—and for 1965–69 will decrease still more to only 0.6 million.

Furthermore, the aid backers are using phony statistics. For example, the Bureau of the Budget found that aid proponents claimed Alabama had a 256-percent increase in "pupils in excess of normal capacity"—although the school population had not increased but the number of classrooms had been increased by 4,200.

Just a few days ago we received, and assume that other newspapers across the Nation did too, a stack of eight alleged "news" releases that were propaganda from the lobbying NEA and the National Congress of Parents and Teachers agitating for Federal aid.

These outfits are pretty good at lobbying, but they can't change the facts that what they propose is: (1) Unconstitutional, (2) uneconomic and requiring high taxes, (3) an opening for Federal controls, (4) proposed on the basis of false statistics, (5) unneeded. Any one of these reasons ought to be enough to bring rejection; surely all together are reasons enough.

Death Claims Dr. Cloyd S. Harkins, of Osceola Mills, Pa., Internationally Famous Dentist and Pioneer in the Field of Cleft Palates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the death on March 22, 1961, of Dr. Cloyd S. Harkins, of Osceola Mills, Pa., ended his distinguished career of 51 years in the practice of dentistry.

Dr. Harkins' two sons, Dr. William F. Harkins, of Osceola Mills, Pa., and Dr. John F. Harkins, of Erie, Pa., followed in their father's footsteps in the dental profession assisting him in the operation of the Harkins Cleft Palate Clinic at Osceola Mills, Pa., founded by their internationally famous father.

The grief occasioned by the death of Dr. Cloyd S. Harkins is not only prevalent in his home community of Osceloa Mills, Pa., but is shared throughout the world by members of the dental profession and the countless thousands who have benefited from his expert knowledge which earned him world acclaim as a renowned specialist in odontology, orthopedics and prosthetics. Dr. Har-

kins' pioneering spirit and the dental techniques he developed remain as an enduring monument to his humanitarian and professional accomplishments.

It was my privilege to value Dr. Cloyd S. Harkins as a personal friend for many years. His sudden death is a source of deep personal sorrow. The community of Osceola Mills has lost a distinguished resident while the dental profession here and abroad has suffered the loss of an outstanding member.

Mrs. Van Zandt joins me in extending sincere expressions of deepest sympathy to Mrs. Harkins and sons Dr. William F. Harkins and Dr. John F. Harkins in their loss of a devoted husband and loving father.

In further tribute to the memory of Dr. Cloyd S. Harkins, I wish to include the following article concerning his notable career which appeared in the Clearfield, Pa., Progress March 23, 1961, and a subsequent editorial in the March 30, 1961, issue titled "He Left His Mark":

[From the Clearfield (Pa.) Progress, Mar. 23, 1961]

DR. C. S. HARKINS, INTERNATIONALLY KNOWN, DIES AT 72—OSCEOLA MILLS DENTIST, EXPERT IN CLEFT PALATE WORK, STRICKEN AT PHILADELPHIA

PHILADELPHIA.—Dr. Cloyd S. Harkins, of Osceola Mills, internationally known expert in cleft palate work and dentistry, died suddenly yesterday en route to Hahnemann Hospital at Philadelphia after suffering a heart attack.

Dr. and Mrs. Harkins and their son, Dr. William Harkins, also of Osceola Mills, were in the city attending the Greater Philadelphia Dental Association meeting.

In Dr. Harkins' death, Clearfield County loses an internationally known and honored citizen. Thousands of persons afflicted with a cleft palate lose the man who directly, or indirectly, made it possible for their handicap to be corrected.

Born November 16, 1888, at Orafino, Nebr., Dr. Harkins was the son of John and Josephine (Klare) Harkins. The family later moved to Mount Pleasant, Mich., where his father died of typhoid fever. Following her husband's death, Mrs. Harkins brought her children back to Wallaceton, her native home.

Dr. Harkins was graduated from the University of Pennsylvania with a degree of dental surgery in 1910 and the same year opened the dental office at Osceola Mills where he practiced continuously until his death.

The office at Osceola Mills became more than just a smalltown dental office. There Dr. Harkins developed the techniques and innovations which made him a recognized specialist in odontology, orthopedics, and prosthetics. He was a pioneer in research and rehabilitation of the cleft palate patient, a field virtually untouched until his work in it.

University professors, specialists in dental and palate prosthetics, and public health officials from all sections of the United States and from abroad came to observe and work with Dr. Harkins.

In 1935, the honors which were to continue throughout the remainder of his life began to come. That year he was made a fellow of the American College of Dentists. Four years later, after conducting clinics throughout the Argentine and classes at the University of Buenos Aires; the University of Litoral at Rosario; and at the University of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, he was made a member of the Sociedad Odontologica Argentina de Proteses.

The following year, in 1950, Dr. Harkins received the Certificate of Honor from the American Dental Society at its national convention and in 1951 a similar certificate was presented to him and his two sons—Drs. John F. and William F. Harkins—who followed their father into dental work and the cleft palate specialty.

The same year Dr. Harkins received an honorary degree from Temple University and was made a member of Omicron Kappa Upsilon, honorary dental society; 1952 found the Osceola Mills dentist abroad again, this time in London where he was a speaker at the 11th International Dental Congress and honored by the Congress with its Certificate of Service. This was followed by honorary membership in the Congreso Universitario, Panamericano de Odontologia and being awarded a prized Thomas P. Hinman Medallion Award for leadership in dental progress.

Recognition in his home county came to Dr. Harkins in 1953, when the Clearfield County Medical Society presented him its first Benjamin Rush Award for outstanding health services.

For many years Dr. Harkins served as a member of the Pennsylvania State Dental Council and Examining Board and as a member of the State advisory board of vocational education. In addition to his private practice and public clinic work, he was an instructor and member of the staff of the Philipsburg State Hospital; founder and director of the State Department of Health Cleft Palate Diagnostic Clinic at the Philipsburg State Hospital; staff member of the Cleft Palate Clinic at Allegheny General Hospital at Pittsburgh; and consultant to the Diagnostic Cleft Palate Clinic at the Temple University Hospital and St. Christopher Hospital for Children, both at Philadelphia.

He was the author of "Cleft Palate Rehabilitation," used as a text in dental and medical schools, and just last year, of a second book, "Principles of Cleft Palate Prosthesis" written in collaboration with his sons. The prosthesis, or light plastic speech aid, he developed for the cleft palate patient is now, like his books and professional papers, standard therapy in their treatment.

Away from his professional life which also included membership in a dozen or more societies, Dr. Harkins found time for community and civic affairs. At one time he was a Scoutmaster and a member of the Executive Board of the Bucktail Council, Boy Scouts of America. He was also a member of the Osceola Mills First Presbyterian Church, the B.P.O. Elks and several Masonic organizations.

Included in the latter are the Moshannon Lodge No. 391, F. & A.M.; the Clearfield Royal Arch Chapter, the Moshannon Council, Royal and Select Master Masons; Moshannon Commandary, Knights Templar; the Williamsport Consistory, and the Jaffa Shrine.

Dr. Harkins was married in July 1911 to the former Irene Fritzinger of Slatington, who survives. His son, Dr. William Harkins is associated with the Harkins Cleft Palate Clinic and private practice at Osceola while Dr. John Harkins is located at Erie, Pa.

He also leaves five grandchildren.

Funeral services will be held Sunday at 2 p.m. from the Heath Funeral Home at Osceola Mills, with the Reverend Graeme Sieber officiating. Burial will be in the Umbria Cemetery.

Friends will be received at the funeral home from Saturday evening until time of services. Masonic services will be conducted at 7:30 p.m. Saturday.

[From the Clearfield (Pa.) Progress, Mar. 30, 1961]

HE LEFT HIS MARK

With the death of Dr. Cloyd S. Harkins of Osceola Mills a week ago yesterday while attending a dental association meeting at Philadelphia, not only Clearfield County and the Moshannon Valley but the Nation and, it is not exaggerating to say, the world, lost a great man and a great humanitarian.

Dr. Harkins was a pioneer in the field of cleft palate (open roof of the mouth) rehabilitation and his achievements in this field brought him international recognition. Few, if any residents of our area, can claim or ever attained the national and international honors that did Dr. Harkins in his lifetime. As is so often the case, his fame and contributions to humanity were never really understood or fully appreciated in the area that he called home. Not that we fellow citizens didn't appreciate his talents, but it was difficult to realize the worldwide respect that he enjoyed in his field of endeavor.

The work that Dr. C. S. Harkins did in his lifetime for cleft palate victims will live on for long years after his untimely death. His pioneering in cleft palate treatment and rehabilitation has given new hope and new life for victims of this birth-originated defect. We have no idea how many youngsters, and older men and women, too, Dr. C. S. aided by correcting a serious physical handicap but the total must be tremendous. His achievements and the knowledge he left behind him will be the means of aiding hundreds and thousands of such victims in the future. Undoubtedly, his methods will be improved upon by those who follow him, but his original pioneering and teachings will remain the basis for such improvements.

The success and fame that Dr. Harkins achieved did not surprise those who came in contact with him. He possessed the patience of Job in the trying and difficult task of working with his patients. Inborn or developed through his work, he had a determination to solve the cleft palate problem, regardless of the reluctance of his patients to accept treatment. Those who visited his office for ordinary dental work, at which he also excelled, came away marvelling at his patience and perseverance in the face of patient opposition. He was a fighter, and a stubborn one, too, for the cause in which he believed. He pulled strings, played politics, demanded until he gained recognition of the plight of the cleft palate victim and what could be done about it. For that fight we must be grateful, for without it cleft palate treatment and rehabilitation of its victims might still be unknown and its victims handicapped throughout life. Dr. Harkins was a worker who did not know the meaning of an 8-hour day, a 40-hour week. His sacrifice of his own personal health and life for the benefit of his fellow men possibly led to his death of a heart condition at 72, not an elderly age in these days.

Those of us who were privileged to know Dr. Cloyd S. Harkins professionally or as an acquaintance will never forget him or the work that he did. In the years to come, the youngsters with cleft palates and their parents will have cause to pay tribute to his memory because of the leadership in treatment that he gave to the medical and dental profession in this fairly common birth defect. We in the Clearfield County-Moshannon Valley area can take pride in the fact that he was a fellow citizen.

Supergraft on Superhighways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK M. CLARK
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, ever since the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 was enacted by the 84th Congress, the

Federal-aid highway program has been the target of criticism.

Criticism was to be expected in connection with the most ambitious public works program in history, especially when it was geared to anticipate the Nation's needs almost two full decades in the future, and especially when it called for the expenditure of billions of dollars to bring into existence a national network of adequate, modern superhighways linking together the principal metropolitan areas from border to border and coast to coast.

It is an indisputable fact that the 84th Congress acted with commendable foresight. The intervening years have underlined with disturbing clarity an ever-growing transportation crisis, particularly in the urban areas, for which relief must be provided.

The 41,000-mile Interstate System and a sustained program of primary, secondary, and urban construction are pressingly vital to the national economy and the national defense.

There has been criticism of the Federal-aid highway program in the past. It is under fire now. It will be criticized in the future. It probably will always be subject to criticism.

Criticism is healthy when it is constructive and generates corrective action. It is destructive when utilized as a vehicle for condemnation merely to accentuate a posture of unalterable opposition.

The Federal-aid highway program has its friends and it has its enemies. Numbered among the latter are a great many reactionaries who refuse to equate costs with commensurate benefits that are evident in terms of the greatest good for the greatest number.

Some of the criticism of the Federal-aid highway program has been justified; much of it has not. Admittedly there was enough justifiable criticism to warrant the formation of the Special Public Works Subcommittee on the Federal-aid highway program on which I have been privileged to serve as a member.

Under the very capable and energetic leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, the Honorable JOHN A. BLATNIK, this subcommittee has been engaged in the separation of the factual from the fanciful. In a series of hearings conducted during the past year the subcommittee has been successful in bringing to light a number of serious deficiencies in the conduct of the program at both the Federal and State levels. Immediate corrective action has followed.

More than anything else, in my opinion, the work of the subcommittee has emphasized the necessity for maintaining the traditional congressional watchdog function during the life of this all-important program. The magnitude of this undertaking is indeed formidable. Many areas remain to be explored.

Members of the House can be confident that our subcommittee and its capable and indefatigable chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota, will continue to carry out its assignment with vigor and determination.

My observations today are prompted by an article written by Stanley Meisler in the April 1 issue of the Nation. It bears the title "Supergraft on Superhighways."

Under the present state of the record before our subcommittee the title definitely represents too great an exercise of journalistic license and is designed, as so many such headlines are, solely to direct attention to the article.

I do not doubt that Mr. Meisler was motivated by a desire for reasonable objectivity. Obviously he has carefully scrutinized and weighed all of the testimony thus far adduced at subcommittee hearings. He has achieved a fairly creditable analysis of the testimony. I have noted, not without a sense of satisfaction, that Mr. Meisler praised the subcommittee for one of the fairest and most painstaking investigations of recent years and that he has placed a proper emphasis on the corrective action resulting from the subcommittee's hearings.

I concede that Mr. Meisler's article is studded with some painful truths.

Because I believe all Members of Congress should have access to material presently being disseminated, under leave to extend my remarks I desire to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full text of the article.

THE FEDERAL HIGHWAY PROGRAM—SUPERGRAFT ON SUPERHIGHWAYS

(By Stanley Meisler)

In 1975, Americans will have 111 million cars, trucks, and buses. To keep these wheels rolling, the Federal Government has embarked on the biggest public works project in history, spending billions of dollars for 41,000 miles of superhighways crisscrossing the Nation. Millions of this money already have been spilled over into waste, inefficiency, and fraud.

There is nothing secret about this. Newspapers and Congress has uncovered scandal after scandal. But the revelations have not evoked the same indignation and outcries that scandals like the Dave Beck plunder of the Teamsters treasury have caused. Instead, much of the public has a boys-will-be-boys attitude about corrupt highways. When you spend $41 billion in a public program, influential and impatient people say, you have to expect some tomfoolery, so let's get on with the show. Americans want their highways in a hurry.

"When you have a program of this magnitude," Representative GORDON H. SCHERER, Republican, of Ohio, told the House last July 1, "you are bound to attract the chiselers and the grafters." Carl A. Carpenter, Assistant Chief of Physical Research for the Federal Bureau of Public Roads, questioned closely about deficiencies in a road inspected by State officials who had accepted secret payments from the contractor, offered a House subcommittee on December 13 this analysis: "If we have to face these slight deficiencies in jobs that we have, I think they may be a lot easier to live with than extensive deliberation in this interstate program." What about the money lost by the taxpayers? "The taxpayer is the same person who is eagerly waiting for this job to get done * * *," Carpenter replied. And Al C. Church, State highway engineer for the Florida State Road Department, dismissed deficient roads and paid-off inspectors by noting, "If the taxpayers never get a worse job than that, they are going to be mighty lucky."

These statements evolve from a national mood, a mood aptly summed up by Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK, Democrat, of Minnesota, who heads the House subcommittee investigating the highway scandals: "In the 14 years I have been here, never has a multibillion-dollar tax program and construction program had such overwhelming confidence and support, not only in Congress, but from taxpayers all over America."

Taxpayers are supporting the program because it promises to satisfy their hunger for cars and roads. If the program progresses, by 1972 superhighways will link 90 percent of all cities with more than 50,000 population. A driver will be able to travel from coast to coast at 60 to 70 miles an hour without encountering a single stop sign, traffic light, or railroad crossing. In the main, these highways, with entry only at selected places, will have four lanes, swelling to six and eight lanes near metropolitan areas. President Kennedy has predicted that "the Interstate System when completed * * * will save at least 4,000 lives a year."

The estimate of total cost has varied. When Congress approved the program in 1956, the Bureau of Public Roads figured the cost at $27.5 billion; Congress, raising the Federal gasoline tax, agreed to put up 90 percent, the States paying the rest. Since then, however, the Bureau has raised its estimate to nearly $41 billion, and a controversy is brewing in Congress over President Kennedy's proposals for levying taxes to meet the difference. In fact, some of the attempts to minimize the scandals stem from the fear of highway supporters that Congress, in disgust, will refuse to authorize enough money to complete the system by 1972.

How corrupt is the program? A veteran newsman has said that if an editor sent six reporters around the country digging up information, he could put half the country's State highway officials in jail. The statement is no doubt somewhat exaggerated. But BLATNIK's subcommittee, in one of the fairest and most painstaking investigations of recent years, has quietly uncovered a depressing panorama of bumbling Federal bureaucrats, bribe-taking highway engineers, chiseling contractors, fat-cat State commissioners, and cracking roads in the Federal superhighway system.

At its first hearings in February 1960, the subcommittee unfolded a near-comic tale of bureaucratic ineptitude. The highway program had been sold to many Congressmen as a defense measure. The program officially is titled the "National System of Interstate and Defense Highways." But truckers, assigned to cart missiles from California to Cape Canaveral, testified they almost never could move the Atlas and other huge weapons under the 14-foot clearances of the highway overpasses. Sometimes a driver would deflate the truck's tires and move the Atlas under a bridge inch by inch while traffic on the highway backed up for 20 miles. On other occasions, the truck simply took an alternate, roundabout route.

For years, the Department of Defense and the Bureau of Public Roads had been unable to clear through their labyrinthine channels an agreement on a minimum height for bridges and overpasses. One unit of the Department of Defense told the Bureau in 1957 that 14-foot bridges were fine, while another ordered the production of missiles that could not clear these bridges. In 1959, the Department and the Bureau decided to study the matter further. But, while more study was underway, the Bureau continued to approve bridges with only 14 feet of clearance. Suddenly, on January 27, 1960, when BLATNIK's investigators started probing the matter, the Bureau and the Department hurriedly reached a decision; all bridges and overpasses must have 16 feet of clearance.

Since the start of the program, the Bureau of Public Roads had approved 2,259 bridges and overpasses on the 14-foot standard at a cost of $374 million. If the structures had had 16-foot clearances in the

first place, the cost would have been only $18.7 million more. Reconstruction will cost $205.7 million—a clear waste of $187 million.

In May 1960, the subcommittee investigated construction of the 13-mile Skelly bypass in Tulsa, Okla., which had cost the Federal Government almost $6 million. After examination of the finished product, already starting to crack, the directors of a private engineering firm and private testing laboratory testified that the contractor evidently had billed the State for $524,689 worth of materials which he had never put into the road. Testimony revealed that the contractor and the State engineers and inspectors had covered up the shortage by submitting false testing samples, making fraudulent bookkeeping entries, using improper scales, padding bills, adjusting record-books and ignoring State specifications. There was no evidence, however, that the contractor had bribed the State engineers and inspectors.

But the subcommittee did hear testimony linking the contractor, Layman & Sons, with a State highway commissioner. Lee Olen Downey, a partner in the D. & G. Construction Co. testified that Commissioner Tom H. Kight was a silent partner in D. & G. when the State highway commission awarded a contract to Layman & Sons for a section of the Skelly bypass. Layman & Sons immediately subcontracted half the sodding work to D. & G.

Federal inspectors never uncovered any of this fraud. Even after the Tulsa Tribune, in a November 1959, editorial, "Is Uncle Sam on the Job?" questioned the worth of the road, the Bureau of Public Roads found nothing. Disturbed by the newspaper criticism, the Bureau ordered its regional inspector, Ralph Cecil Glover, to examine the bypass again. "No stone was left unturned in efforts to secure the highest type of performance from the contractor," Glover wrote in his report. "* * * While accusations have been made * * * [they] have not been substantiated to date. Those making the accusations can hardly be said to be competent to judge such matters." But Glover, following Federal policy, simply had scrutinized the reports of the State laboratories and engineers—reports based on fake samples and fraudulent bookkeeping. He had not made a single attempt to test the road material himself.

Subcommittee Counsel Walter R. May questioned Glover at the hearing:

"Question. Did you accept those reports at face value?

"Answer. Yes.

"Question. You did not ever go behind those reports to determine exactly what was happening?

"Answer. No.

"Question. Does the Bureau of Public Roads expect you to go behind those reports?

"Answer. No."

The subcommittee turned to Florida in hearings last December. Testimony revealed that six contractors, who had handled Florida road contracts worth more than $70 million in the last 4 years, had distributed $54,000 to $75,000 in gifts to 33 Florida State highway engineers since 1956. These came in the form of secret cash payments, unrepaid loans, liquor, lumber, hunting licenses, and bonuses for extra services. William L. Cobb, head of a large construction company, admitted he also gave gifts to State road officials in Georgia, Mississippi, Tennessee, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Alabama.

Cobb told the Congressmen he deplored the practice and had ordered an end to it, but other contractors and State personnel professed to see little wrong with the gift-giving. Charles E. Bailes, Jr., general superintendent of Cone Bros. Contracting Co., said his firm had mailed State engineers secret payments of $25 a week to get "that little effort" the company needed to complete the job. "And I believe the payments helped." Bailes said. "I am obligated to my company to do the best job I possibly can. * * * As long as I didn't engage in anything that I though was faulty, I would employ many different things to get this accomplished." One after another, the State engineers denied they had done anything improper to please the gift-bearing contractors.

But the subcommittee heard evidence that indicated laxity, at least, on the part of some of these paid-off engineers in seeing that the contractor met specifications. H. C. Weathers, Florida's chief testing engineer, testified that he had found substandard material, poor workmanship and poor inspection on a $2.5 million strip of highway built by Cone Bros. near Tampa. Weathers said some of the deficiencies were serious. Representative WILLIAM C. CRAMER, Republican, of Florida, described the Howard Franklyn Bridge over Tampa Bay as rough and substandard. It had been built under the supervision of State Engineer Joseph R. Maseda, Jr., who received $4,700 in 4 years from several contractors, including the Hardaway Contracting Co., which had built the bridge. "If this is the kind of bridge we're building in America then there is something wrong with our standards," CRAMER said. In closing the hearing, BLATNIK said he found "it difficult in the light of all the testimony to believe that the conditions prevailed without involvement of a quid pro quo, whatever its nature might have been."

In its latest hearings, which ended March 10, the subcommittee, again spotlighting Florida, discovered that the State had lost hundreds of thousands of dollars because of the slipshod way it got rid of houses and other property on rights-of-way it had acquired. In many cases, the State paid a contractor to dispose of a house, which he proceeded to sell at a neat profit. For example, one contractor, Paul Slusher of Maitland, testified the Florida Highway Department had paid him to clear a house on an Orlando right-of-way for $100. He then sold it for $24,500. Testimony revealed that the State paid $103,000 for the removal of structures in Miami when it might have sold the property for $372,500. The loss to the State: more than $475,000. In contrast to this sorry situation, Frank Balfour, former chief of the rights-of-way division of the California Highway Commission, testified his State had made a 6-percent profit on the sale and rental of properties it had acquired on rights-of-way since 1956. At the close of the hearings, BLATNIK cautioned all States to get every possible dollar out of the houses and properties on lands they acquire for highway construction.

Despite the muck it has uncovered, the subcommittee still has not reached the core of corruption. The most damaging fraud in the program involves the $7 billion the States will spend to acquire rights-of-way.

A consulting firm hired by the Federal Bureau of Public Roads has produced a 200-page report on land appraisals in Massachusetts. The report is still secret, but, in a series of articles last May, the Boston Traveler said that an unnamed State official had put pressure on land appraisers to issue false, inflated evaluations. The Traveler said the estimates appeared to be 25 to 50 percent too high. The subcommittee has opened an office in Massachusetts and its next hearings probably will focus on that State. In the meantime, the Bureau has refused to reimburse the State for its rights-of-way purchases.

A scandal on rights-of-way acquisitions also appears to be stirring in Florida. Last December 1, Al Rogero of the State road board admitted to a legislative committee that he was an unnamed partner in a group that had bought a tract of land in St. Petersburg which was later needed for a highway. Rogero testified that the group bought the land for $165,000 in 1956 and sold it for $240,000 a year later. Rogero's fee: $24,000. But the official denied any conflict of interest. "I simply have refused to build a wall around myself and stop the purchasing, selling and developing of properties simply because I was a member of the State road board," he testified.

The subcommittee has a host of other areas awaiting investigation: an evidently excessive use of expensive, private consultants by several States, including Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Maryland; monopoly practices by suppliers of highway material, particularly in the West; collusive price-fixing among contractors, such as the subcommittee noted in Oklahoma, where sodders met in secret before submitting bids to the State; the care of homeless persons who have been bulldozed out of the way by highways cutting through large metropolitan areas; and waste such as the General Accounting Office found in Nevada, where 3 interchanges were built on a 3-mile stretch of highway to handle an average of 89 cars a day.

It is not difficult to spot the reasons why the interstate highway program reeks of corruption. In a recent interview, BLATNIK, in his precise, articulate way, outlined the causes. First, he noted, State highway departments traditionally have been close to the Governor's office. The departments have become centers for dispensing patronage and extending favors to contractors who contribute to the party treasury. Next, the States have poor recruitment policies and low salary scales. As BLATNIK had pointed out in an earlier hearing, "You find some of these inspectors and even engineers working at a salary at which you couldn't hire a good file clerk here for the wages they are getting back there." To these men, a $25 cash payment, a loan, a turkey at Thanksgiving, a bottle of whisky at Christmas, become formidable gifts. Finally, BLATNIK said, there has been inadequate supervision both by the States and the Federal Government. In many cases, the States make no checkup at all. And, BLATNIK emphasized, there has been "an utter failure by the Bureau of Public Roads to poke through the façade." The Bureau traditionally never disputes the word of the State.

Anyone attending the hearings can sense certain attitudes that supplement BLATNIK's outline. An observer is struck, for example, by the corruptibility of small people: How simple it is for a man to participate in a system of bribery without a twinge of conscience or even a realization of his wrong. A business ethic also emerges from the testimony, a feeling by the contractor that anything goes so long as the job gets done and the profits pile up. When the ethic is questioned, the contractor reacts by despairing that congressional investigators ever will understand the business world. This attitude evokes sympathy from highway bureaucrats, particularly State officials who like to feel that they understand the peculiar problems of the contractor and that this understanding allows them to wink, when the contractor cuts corners to get the job done. An observer quickly senses that these State officials were totally unprepared to handle the billions of dollars suddenly put into their hands by the Federal Government. At the same time, a smugness, an almost lazy indulgence, is exhibited by Federal bureaucrats as they talk vaguely of States rights while justifying their refusal to interfere with the machinery of the State, no matter how lax or stupid or corrupt.

But, knowing the causes of the trouble does not lead automatically to finding a solution. The subcommittee has not made any legis-

lative recommendations and evidently does not have immediate plans to do so, even though the staff has drafted a tentative report. Most likely there will emerge limited proposals for revision of the income-tax laws to discourage gift-giving and increased appropriations to the Bureau of Public Roads for more inspectors. No radical change in the program is expected.

Any such change would stir enormous complications. In view of all the corruption, one logical change would be to slow up the program, at least until the States clean house. But this would ignore two factors: that the administration is using highway funds to stimulate the economy and that the country, no matter how much the critics of Detroit decry a culture on wheels, actually will need the roads in 1975.

An even more logical change suggests itself. If the States can't do a proper job, the Federal Government must wrest control of the highways from them. State officials recognize the validity of this threat to their power. At the annual meeting of the American Association of State Highway Officials last November 28, its president, David H. Stevens, warned: "If the States cannot satisfactorily demonstrate that they do have the ability to carry on the program in a proper manner, then the Federal-State relationship will be further modified or eliminated. It will be a tragic day for the States if either should occur."

If Congress does hand control of the highways to the Federal Government, the day could be somewhat tragic. The highway program will have proven that Federal aid really does eventually become Federal control. And the proof will drop new weapons into the laps of the enemies of such needed spending programs as Federal aid to education, who have always argued that Federal aid leads to Federal control. For this reason, liberal Congressmen, no matter how appalled at highway corruption, will not find it easy to vote control to the Federal Government.

These complications, however, do not mean that the country is powerless to eliminate corruption from the highway program. The subcommittee's hearings themselves have had some beneficial effect. State highway officials seem to have been attempting to tighten up the program on the State level, if only out of fear that Blatnik's subcommittee may strike them next. The American Association of State Highway Officials has revised its handbook to suggest ways of eliminating some of the abuses uncovered by Congress. And the Federal Bureau of Roads, smarting from the barrage of congressional criticism, has taken steps to initiate some realistic inspection.

But the subcommittee continually faces two obstacles as it tries to carry the story of highway corruption to the public. One is an undertone of Republican disparagement based on fears that the Democratic-controlled subcommittee will use the scandals to embarrass Republicans. (But during the Eisenhower administration, the subcommittee investigated Democratic State highway boards with as much vigor as it investigated the Republican-administered Bureau of Public Roads.) A second obstacle involves news coverage. Newsmen in Washington have tended to treat the hearings as regional stories. In this way, stories about the Oklahoma hearings were filed mainly for Oklahoma newspapers. The same was true of the Florida hearings, which made headlines in Florida newspapers and almost nowhere else. The subcommittee must share the blame for this. Its hearings generally have focused on a specific bit of wrongdoing in a specific area, instead of spotlighting corruption in several areas at once. If, in its next hearings, the subcommittee would show how fraud has infested right-of-way acquistion in several States and would call a parade of witnesses from areas all over the country, the press would suddenly grasp the national implications of the highway scandals and treat them accordingly.

The end of highway corruption will be signaled when the American people begin to realize that there is nothing normal or playful about contractors, State officials, and speculators stealing millions of dollars from the Federal Government. Public indignation may be a more effective weapon than legislation in the battle against highway corruption. And the time for public indignation has come.

Recession Not in San Mateo County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following page from the March 29, 1961, issue of the San Mateo Times, San Mateo, Calif., which shows that the business people in our county are doing business and not talking about recession:

RECESSION? NOT IN SAN MATEO COUNTY—BUSINESS IS BETTER THAN EVER—MERCHANTS FROM PALO ALTO TO SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO TELL US

Here are some statements and figures for you to ponder:

TO OPEN NEW BRANCH

"We really believe in our specialty of serving skin divers, outfitting and equipping them. As is customary with a new business, we did so 3 months ago with confidence in ourselves, but with some caution regarding the public's acceptance of us.

"Whatever reservation we had has since been swept aside in these last 3 months by the public's interest and demand for our services and equipment. We have been so greatly encouraged that we have taken the further step of opening a branch in Monterey.

"We wish to take this opportunity to thank the Times for their aid in making this possible.

"T. H. DUFFY,
"*The Seven Seas.*"

AN 8 PERCENT INCREASE

"As you know, every February Loewe & Zwierlein holds its annual spring fabric event. This year, in spite of recession talk, we had a very nice 8 percent increase during this month long event. We are looking forward with enthusiasm to our annual anniversary sale and anticipate increase in volume.

"LOEWE & ZWIERLEIN,
"HERBERT WALCHA."

SUBSTANTIAL GAIN

"A substantial gain for the month of February and so far in March are running well ahead. We feel that this spring season will be much better than 1960. Business looks good.

"J. C. PENNEY CO.,
"W. I. HANKS."

BEYOND OUR EXPECTATIONS

"Our San Mateo store is one of three locations. Concerning business here, we find such far beyond our expectations during this first year. We have done better in San Mateo in the opening of our Ski Shop than in our Sacramento grand opening which took place 5 years ago, and with the present excellent business indications, we expect before long to exceed anything we have ever done in our Sun Valley shop.

"HELM OF SUN VALLEY,
"C. J. HELM."

EXCEEDED LAST YEAR'S SALE

"Our fourth anniversary sale was a smashing success. The first day's business exceeded last year's, a feat which we thought to be impossible. There's no recession at Rakestraw's.

"RAKESTRAW'S MARKET,
"BILL RAKESTRAW."

TWENTY-SIX PERCENT INCREASE

"What we have done to offset the recession is simply to step up our advertising and do more of it. We have studied * * * all our advertising efforts, and have concentrated most of it in what we consider our best media * * * newspapers. This year we advanced our usual spring program about a month, but I think the consistency of our advertising has been one of the greatest factors in its effectiveness. The results: Last year a 22-percent increase over 1959; the first 2 months of this year a 26-percent increase over the same period last year.

"BAILEY RUG & UPHOLSTERY CLEANERS,
"D. W. BAILEY."

WHAT CAN "NORMAL" BE LIKE?

"My experience hereabouts may be somewhat unique in comparison with the majority of business firms in the area, being engaged not only in retailing, but also as a wholesaler and manufacturers' representative * * * as well as being relatively new in the area. Also, the retail branch of my business operations is predicated on a somewhat different and individualized approach to the selling of high quality imported furniture, home accessories and gifts from Scandinavia at low prices on a direct-from-importer-to-you basis.

"However, perhaps for the very reason of being engaged in both wholesale and retail operations, I have been privileged to observe both aspects of business in recent months. And because of being relatively new in the area, perhaps I have also been able to view the situation open-mindedly. In any case, I can assure you that I have found every justification for the confidence I originally felt when, after careful consideration, comparison and evaluation, I chose to set up business operations and make my residence in the beautiful and prosperous San Mateo area.

"As far as the public is concerned, the retail aspect of my business operations, known as Kjell of Norway, is perhaps the more familiar. * * * This retail store in San Mateo was opened early in February of this year. Of course, I had read and heard much about the so-called 'recession' and the dire forebodings for business and economic conditions. However, I felt that this talk was somewhat overdrawn, and ventured ahead anyway.

"From the first day the store was opened, business has not only justified but has exceeded expectations many fold * * * and if this kind of result can occur in what some people are terming a 'recession,' then I can only wonder what 'normal' business conditions are like in this wonderful section of this marvelous country. Of interest also may be the fact that the only advertising or promotion undertaken in behalf of my Kjell of Norway retail store has been a relatively small and modest program of advertising in the San Mateo Times. The results have been exceptional, and convince me of two things: (1) there is no 'recession' if you offer people what they want when they want it and at the right price; and (2) the Times is the strongest medium for advertising and promotion available to local businesses, and has readers who possess discriminating taste and

the buying power to act on purchases which appeal to them.

"KJELL OF NORWAY,
"KJELL REIMERS."

BUSINESS MOST GRATIFYING

"Thank to the faith of our clientele in us and in our country's economy, business is most gratifying at present and most encouraging for the future.

"ROBERT W. GATES OF BURLINGAME,
"ROBERT W. GATES."

GRAND RESPONSE

"Although we have only used the San Mateo Times and San Mateo Post once a week since our grand opening March 1, we are very happy with the grand response the readers of these papers have made to our ads.

"We will be making every effort to perpetuate the fine trend of customers that the Times and Post has helped us to achieve by continuing to give good values and service.

"FARMERS MARKETS, INC.,
"WILLIAM F. SCHMITZ."

SAVINGS BONDS SALES UP

"Sales of U.S. savings bonds in San Mateo County during January and February showed a big gain over the same period in 1960.

"Sales for first 2 months in 1961 totaled $973,623 against $882,512 a year ago, showing a net gain of $91,111 or 10 percent.

"GEORGE A. MCQUEEN,
"Volunteer County Chairman."

MOVING FORWARD

"The cooperation of the San Mateo Times in assisting the Hillsdale merchants plan and execute our 1961 spring merchandising events has been most rewarding.

"Business is good at Hillsdale and we are constantly moving forward. Our plans and programs are optimistic for the rest of 1961."

"HILLSDALE SHOPPING CENTER,
"CLARK C. MADSEN."

TEN-MILLION-DOLLAR EXPANSION

"California—particularly the bay area—has a challenge and an opportunity. We have the greatest number of people employed in the history of this State. But at the same time, the labor force in California during the last calendar year increased by more than 240,000. This means we must find jobs for this addition to our actual work force.

"People create business opportunity and markets. Business will take advantage of this opportunity, thus creating more job opportunities. Thus, the total velocity of growth will be accelerated.

"An example of this is the expansion now starting at the Hillsdale Shopping Center where approximately $10 million is being committed in new construction and store development. This is evidence that knowledgeable businessmen are aware of the increasing purchasing power. The expenditure of $10 million, in itself, creates hundreds and hundreds of job opportunities. The completed stores, such as the Emporium, will permanently employ hundreds of people. This is a local example of confidence.

"DAVID D. BOHANNON ORG.,
"DAVID D. BOHANNON."

NEW SALES RECORD

"Levy Bros. is confidently predicting and planning for a new sales record during 1961.

"LEVY BROS.,
"G. W. BROMFIELD."

GOOD RESULTS

"Very good results obtained in advertising in your St. Patrick's Day ad."

"MIRACLE AUTO PAINTING,
"JOHN THAYER."

BUSINESS IS GOOD!

"Here are examples that business is flourishing:

"1. Five hundred thousand dollar office building under construction in Mills Estate—27,000 square feet of luxurious offices for national tenants being built by George E. Congdon Construction Co. and Delcon Realtors.

"2. A new office building for the Girl Scouts Council of San Mateo County, to be constructed on the corner of Juanita and California Drive in Burlingame.

"3. New apartment buildings soon to be built: 121 Lorton Avenue, Burlingame; 1108 Peninsula Avenue; and 124 El Camino Real, Burlingame.

"4. Recent sales include the commercial property located at the corner of Murchison Drive and California Drive, Mills Estate—the future site of a service shopping center; an eight-unit apartment building on Lorton Avenue, Burlingame; a new four-unit apartment building in San Mateo; three new homes in Mills Estate and Burlingame Hills.

"DELCON REALTY,
"DON NAHRWOLD."

CONFIDENCE AND HARD WORK

"As far as we're concerned, our viewpoint is that there just isn't any recession or anything else wrong with business conditions that confidence and a little hard work won't cure.

"In our own particular case, we can report that every month so far this year we are well ahead of last year's sales volume. And last year was the biggest in our history (and we've been in business for many years).

"We commend the San Mateo Times on its positive approach to dispelling this recession talk * * * and we shall continue to depend on the Times not only for straightforward news coverage, but also, and of vital importance to a local business firm, for our advertising and promotional efforts to build our business even bigger.

"TALBOT'S TOYLAND,
"GORDON MOORE."

OVER $200,000 SALE

"We have just * * * completed a sale of a new 16-unit apartment house in Belmont at 180 Irene Court for the price of just under a quarter of a million dollars.

"NICK CARTER CO., INC.,
"G. CECIL MARTIN."

EMPLOYMENT

In the bay area, 1,125,200 people were gainfully employed during Februray 1961, as compared to 1,114,300 in 1960, an increase of 10,900. Unemployment is up, too 86,000 in February 1961, but shows signs of decreasing. During the second week of March, the number of claims started dipped to 264 from 362 claims started during the week of March 6 to 10. The problem in San Mateo is that new workers are arriving at a faster rate than new jobs. If we keep moving ahead, that problem can be licked.

INCOME

People in California have more money to spend than practically anywhere else in the United States. The county income per family, according to Sales Management Annual Survey of Buying Power, the leading authority on the subject, is $8,350. That rates as the highest in California and the 16th richest county in the United States. Income per person, $2,657, is even higher ranked. We are second richest in California and fifth richest in the United States.

RETAIL SALES

According to sales management, effective buying income makes San Mateo County the newest billion-dollar market in California. The 1960 effective buying income is $1,087,-225,000. Retail sales per family are $4,757.

POPULATION

According to the 1960 census, population in San Mateo County is 444,387. This represents a 10 year gain of 208,728 over the 1950 figure of 235,559. The number of dwelling units has more than doubled in 10 years to 143,039 from the 1950 number of units, 71,448.

INCREASES IN BUSINESS, INDUSTRY, AND TRANSPORTATION

There are over 6,000 businesses in San Mateo County, an increase of over 1,600 in 10 years. Likewise, there are close to 1,200 industries, an increase of 631 in 10 years. Air travel increased threefold in 10 years, with over 4½ million passengers passing through San Francisco International Airport. In the first 10 weeks of 1961, there were 33 announcements of new plants and 30 expensions of existing plants announced in this county. All evidence that San Mateo County is dynamic and growing.

Newsweek magazine's continuing survey of consumer buying plans indicates Americans are optimistic. A rundown on buying plans as indicated in the survey which was conducted during November and December 1960:

HOUSES

"House buying plans at year's end were at the same level as a year ago, but considerably improved over the second and third quarter rates. Plans to buy new houses were 2 percent below 1959 levels, but buying plans for older houses scored a 6-percent advance. The overall pattern shows that the decline in homebuilding is about over, and builders can expect a somewhat better year than they had in 1960."

APPLIANCES

"Of all the items surveyed, television sets showed the best improvement over 1959 levels, with buying plans up 21 percent. Hardest hit were the 'luxury' appliances: buying plans for air conditioners, dishwashers, driers, and freezers were running, on the average, some 20 percent below 1959 levels. The more essential appliances whose market depends on replacement demand (e.g., refrigerators, ranges, and vacuum cleaners) were holding near the 1959 levels."

AUTOMOBILES

"Plans to buy autos were 5 percent above 1959 levels in November and December, due to a 22-percent surge in plans to buy used cars. Plans to purchase new cars were 4 percent below the 1959 figures. While a better year than 1960 is still possible, it's more likely that auto sales this year will be somewhat less than in 1960 and somewhat more than in 1959. Best sales area: The South and Far West."

VACATIONS

"Americans will travel more in 1961 than in 1960 although they may not travel as far. The biggest gains were in vacationers' plans to travel in their own State and to visit neighboring States, or Canada. Plans to take a European vacation were down 25 percent, and plans for trips to other places abroad dropped 26 percent."

Centennial Anniversary of the Civil War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, in this year of the centennial anniversary of the

Civil War many admirable ceremonies, publications, and other forms of commemoration are being conducted to remind our citizens of the great tragedy of a century ago out of which our forebears forged in blood and pain the more perfect union of which we are the beneficiaries.

One of the most notable of the centennial events is the publication of Newspaper Americana's Civil War papers. It was recently my privilege to be presented with Newspaper American's copy of the New York Herald headlining the inauguration of Abraham Lincoln as President of the United States.

Newspaper Americana's Civil War papers, published by Mr. Robert Miller, of New York City, are a significant set of historical documents which constitute a worthy contribution to the centennial commemoration while contributing to the knowledge and edification of all who read them.

University of Redlands, Redlands, Calif., Associated Students President Writes Congressman Clyde Doyle, 23d District, California, in Support of Youth Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I wish to call to your attention, and the attention of my other distinguished colleagues, a letter I have recently received from the student body president, Redlands University, Redlands, Calif., concerning the student council's support of the "proposed Youth Peace Corps":

ASSOCIATED STUDENTS,
UNIVERSITY OF REDLANDS,
Redlands, Calif., March 1, 1961.

Rep. CLYDE DOYLE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE DOYLE: The student council of the associated students of the University of Redlands takes this opportunity to express to you its deep concern over the recently proposed American Youth Corps and we enclose a resolution adopted by the student council of the University of Redlands supporting the proposed Youth Peace Corps.

As the resolution indicates, we believe the establishment the the Youth Peace Corps would again demonstrate to the world that the United States is still primarily concerned over peace—in eliminating poverty and underdevelopedness from the world for that reason alone. We find that the positive benefits of the Youth Corps, in terms of American public relations and foreign policy effectiveness, far overshadow any minor problems involved in establishing it.

In actively supporting the Youth Corps proposal, we are not advocating, and we do not believe it is even implied in the proposal, that the American Armed Forces be weakened. This proposal is supplementary in our national defense, but nonetheless vital. We are especially concerned over the draft-alternative controversy, and we cannot help but feel that all the arguments which have been asserted thus far objecting to the selective service alternative are nothing short of ridiculous.

We send you the enclosed resolution, unanimously adopted, and the accompanying student newspaper articles, with the hope that your convictions will lead you to actively support the Youth Peace Corps idea—which perhaps is the most dynamically new, forceful and idealistic peace proposal in years.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

JERRY TINKER,
Student Body President.

The Blame for the Deficit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Roscoe Drummond from the Washington Post of April 1, 1961:

BUDGETS AND POLITICS—THE BLAME FOR THE DEFICIT

(By Roscoe Drummond)

President Kennedy is, I think, making a serious mistake by claiming that the next two budget deficits, this year's and 1962, are due to Eisenhower "miscalculations."

This claim is made over and over again in the President's message and in Budget Director David Bell's testimony. Repetition does not make it true. The budget figures just do not bear out this claim.

This kind of thing can't do anybody any good. Certainly it is not going to win Mr. Kennedy the support of those Democratic and Republican liberals who believe that a larger Federal deficit is desirable during the present recession. And it is not going to win Mr. Kennedy the support of those Republican and Democratic conservatives who will judge the President's "fiscal responsibility" by what he does, not by what he says.

Mr. Kennedy is not one who is overly eager to spend the public money. He does not belong to the school of "when in doubt, let's spend." When you consider the high cost of defense and the urgency of the Nation's needs—highways, housing, schools and aid to depressed areas—the Kennedy administration has acted moderately in adding to probable Eisenhower deficits.

But the President cannot claim that the projected 1961 and 1962 deficits will be the result of past misjudgments on income and spending. Such a claim is sheer political propaganda. It is inaccurate and misleading, and violates a pledge which, as candidate and President, Mr. Kennedy made: to neither blur nor sugar-coat the facts.

Here is the way Mr. Kennedy put it in his budget message: "Should there be a deficit in 1962, it will be the consequence of the overestimation of revenues and underestimation of expenditures" in Mr. Eisenhower's January budget.

The catch in this claim is all in one little word—the word "it." The "it" refers to the anticipated deficit 18 months from now. The budget message repeats again and again that the deficit will be limited to the miscalculations—the overoptimism of his predecessor, not at all to the Kennedy administration's own spending programs.

But do the figures in the Kennedy budget confirm the Kennedy words? Mr. Kennedy's own figures show that, while the new administration's expenditures do not alone create the deficits this year and next, they do increase the size of those deficits appreciably. That seems to me quite different from what the President is saying.

It is quite true that, because of the recession, the economy is producing less revenue than the Eisenhower administration expected, that Mr. Eisenhower underestimated his own expenditures. The truth is that Mr. Eisenhower would almost certainly have had a deficit and that Mr. Kennedy has increased it. The facts are these:

Mr. Kennedy's additional spending programs this year will produce an estimated deficit of $2,169 million while, even on Mr. Kennedy's own calculations, the Eisenhower deficit would have been $805 million. And in June, 1962, the Eisenhower programs would have produced a $704 million deficit while the new Kennedy programs, including $655 million increase in the defense budget, will produce a deficit of $2,826 million.

President Kennedy may have felt he had to go through this strained political exercise of blaming his predecessor for the upcoming budget deficits. Only 2 months ago he went far out on a precarious limb by declaring that his programs would not "of and by themselves unbalance" the earlier budget—and there he hung.

The President can reasonably defend his spending programs as prudent and necessary, but what seems unfair is to give so much "credit" to Mr. Eisenhower for the size of the deficits.

Free Flow of Dairy Products Between the States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED MARSHALL
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the House a resolution adopted recently by the Minnesota State Legislature urging Federal action to encourage the free flow of pure and wholesome dairy products between the States.

This problem has concerned us for some time since unrealistic regulations have frequently been used to create and protect monopoly markets that are costly both to consumers and to the dairy industry itself. By the same token, reasonable and constructive action in this area will benefit the entire industry by improving and expanding the market for quality dairy foods.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION 3

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact laws to permit the free flow of dairy products

Whereas the economy of the State of Minnesota is based to a large degree upon its large and productive dairy industry; and

Whereas production of pure and wholesome dairy products in the State of Minnesota exceeds the consumption in the State; and

Whereas certain dairy interests in the eastern markets have been instrumental in

the erection of artificial milk barriers under the guise of health barriers which inhibit the free flow of milk and dairy products from the productive areas of the Midwest; and

Whereas it would be to the mutual interest of the midwestern producer and eastern consumers to have Federal health standards for milk and dairy products which would be uniform throughout the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, That the Congress of the United States be requested to enact Federal laws which will permit the free flow of pure and wholesome dairy products between the States; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be requested to send copies of this resolution to the Members of Congress from the State of Minnesota, to the President of the United States, and to the Secretary of Agriculture.

The Victory of Bataan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 9, the 19th anniversary of the fall of Bataan was observed here in Washington when the two streets near the Philippine Chancery named Bataan and Corregidor by the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners were dedicated.

The ceremonies were attended by high Government officials as well as many former servicemen who took part in the Pacific war. Recognition was given to the loyalty of the Filipino people to the ideals of democracy and freedom as shown by those who fought on Bataan during the dark days of 1942.

The following article by Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Philippine Ambassador to the United States, describes in detail the ceremonies as well as a defeat which was turned into a great victory.

The article follows:

THE VICTORY OF BATAAN

(By Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Philippine Ambassador to the United States)

Sunday, April 9, is the 19th anniversary of the fall of Bataan. To commemorate the event, the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia decided to name two streets near the Philippine Chancery, Bataan and Corregidor. At the official naming ceremony which will take place at 3:30 in the afternoon, Secretary of State Dean Rusk will deliver the main address.

That Bataan and Corregidor should thus be remembered in the Capital City of the United States recalls the inner meaning of the blood brotherhood between the American people and the Filipino people that was sealed on that little peninsula and on that little rock whose names are enshrined in the histories of both our countries.

Bataan fell but its fall was really a victory. It was the victory of the human spirit. It was such a victory because it was a strange and wonderful symbol of what the 20th century could mean to the human race. Ever since these terrible days of 1942 we have been aware of this symbolism. It does no harm to repeat it now—because, like all great verities, it seems to acquire new truth each time it is repeated.

We recall the victory of Bataan: The demonstration to the whole world that people of different races, different origins, different backgrounds, have a common cause in liberty. That the old and despicable balance of mastery and slavery, of colonial power and subject nation, can be wiped out in a spirit of mutual trust and respect. That the men of the west and the men of the east can face a common foe in absolute and unquestioned equality.

That was the victory of Bataan. It sealed the bond of friendship between Filipinos and Americans—a bond already established through the long years that led up, before the great war came, to the guarantee of national independence. As the long shadows of military defeat fell over those Philippine and American warriors in the tropical night in Bataan, the victory of the free spirit hovered overhead. It foretold the irreversible march of nationalism in Asia and Africa, the massive and exciting roster of nations that would quickly win their freedom in the years to follow—India, Pakistan, Burma, Ceylon, Indonesia, and all the others.

The victory of Bataan showed the way. It was important in time of war. It is even more important now. For we can now place the troubled problems of relationships between nations against the background of the lesson we taught ourselves on Bataan. Today we are faced with a new menace. We are really still fighting the battle that we fought on Bataan. It is a new threat, this menace of imperialistic communism. We see it in Laos, in South Vietnam, in Berlin, in the Congo, even in the august halls of the United Nation. And under the leadership of President Carlos P. Garcia, we are meeting it in the Philippines with the same determination and the same courage that we showed in Bataan 19 years ago.

Asia and Africa are afire with nationalism. This powerful force, which in a different incarnation gave Europe its bloodiest centuries and its most magnificent civilizations, can now do the same, one or the other, in the rich and vast continents peopled by human beings in the millions. American survival and that of freedom itself depends on the capacity of the people of the United States to recognize what is happening in the world; and, having recognized the nature of the upheavel, on the ability of American leadership to act with wisdom and imagination.

To us in the Philippines and to you here, Bataan is a symbol of the bond between us. Bataan is of the past; but the bond lives, and must never be shaken. And today we look to America for more than maintenance of that bond. It may be a natural human impulse to pay closest attention to those who waver than to those who are trusted; to give greater help to the uncertain, the uncommitted, than to the committed, to take stanch allies for granted. But it may be good to remember that this impulse, however human, does not always coincide with the realities of world affairs. Bataan should always stand as a reminder of the continuing mautuality of Philippine-American friendship.

So today, in 1961, we Filipinos and Americans recall the symbolism of Bataan—the spiritual victory that makes the military defeat look puny—and in the remembrance of that gerat moment in our common history we have the right to stand side by side through all the years to come, certain of the rightness of our cause and the timelessness of our frinedship.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—General Romulo was General MacArthur's aide-de-camp in Bataan, Corregidor and Australia and returned to the Philippines with the U.S. forces that landed in Leyte.)

Putting the Farm Situation in Proper Perspective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, we read so much concerning the farm situation that I am sure a great many people in this great country of ours are completely confused.

Some publications emphasize the fact that statistics show farmers as a class are not receiving their fair share of the national income and are not deriving proper remuneration for the time they devote to producing the necessary food and fiber for the American people and an ever-growing number of people in foreign lands. They make the argument that the farmer is particularly deserving of sympathetic consideration by the American people and treatment by the Congress of the United States.

On the same day, you can read in another publication a story condemning the farmer for being subsidized and pointing out the great cost to the taxpayer of the farm programs.

There is some truth in each story and the degree of truth is almost as broad as the total number of farmers in the country and the number of other lines of endeavor which are also directly or indirectly subsidized.

I believe the last election indicated that a majority of the farmers are about like any other cross section of American citizens. They do not want sympathy. They want an unrestricted opportunity to run their own farms to the best of their ability and judgment and an even break in our competitive economy. In spite of Senator Kennedy's lavish promises of help, sympathy, and higher price supports during the election campaign, many predominantly agricultural districts elected Republicans to Congress. Why did this happen? Largely, I believe, because a majority of the farmers know that Republicans are just as sympathetic with the problems of agriculture as the Democrats. Further, that the farmer is considerably disillusioned over the results of Government farm programs over the past 25 years. He has come to recognize that for some reason, the price of some of his products such as cattle, hogs, potatoes, and soybeans which have had little or no help from the Government are enjoying the highest prices.

The farmer recognizes that if prices are to be maintained at a high level by Government assistance, production controls must be applied. Our sizable surpluses of wheat, corn, cotton, and grain sorghums—to name only a few—are the concrete proof that with a price incentive established by law production will exceed consumption unless production controls are in effect.

I believe the farmers do not believe the so-called supply management approach endorsed by Secretary of Agri-

culture Freeman can effectively apply to every farm. When Senator Kennedy stated in many speeches in farm areas his belief that all of agriculture must have "supply management" by Government, he scared the daylights out of a lot of farmers who still think they can do a better job of running their farms than any Federal agency in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, Newsweek magazine in its issue of April 10 carried an excellent editorial entitled "The Farmer's Best Friend," which puts the farm situation in extremely clear perspective. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE FARMER'S BEST FRIEND

(By Raymond Moley)

Last summer after traversing several of the major farm States during an automobile trip from New York to the Pacific coast, I expressed in this space some doubt whether there was any identity between the farmer himself and the image so pitifully portrayed by his political friends. For by observation and from what I heard along the way, the farmer's lot was not so unhappy after all. Then came the election and a great majority rejected the political party which had promised most to the farmers.

President Kennedy has now presented to Congress a plan the enactment of which may take weeks of hearings and debate. Then, if adotped, many months will pass before it is in full operation. Meanwhile, natural developments in agriculture will continue which may go a long way toward remedying the farmer's problems. If given time, the farmer may save himself and measurably eliminate Government from his business.

To the farm politician "the family farm" is an expression which calls for devout genuflections and muttered prayers. Scratch the skin of a family farmer in the Midwest and the hot blood of a score or two Congressmen and Senators will flow copiously.

Those politicians have been telling us about how farmers have been driven from their ancestral holdings in great numbers. Senator BENTON said a century and a quarter ago that in those stricken farm regions there is no sound but the auctioneer's hammer knocking down the family heirlooms.

SIZE BRINGS EFFICIENCY

It is true that the family-size farm is vanishing. But not the family farm. It has simply been growing in size and in well-being.

More than 1 million farms have "disappeared" in the past 5 years—a drop of 23 percent. In 1920 the average size of a farm was 148.2 acres, in 1940 170 acres, in 1954 it was 242.2 acres, and now it is 302.4 acres. This change has come about through the operation of economic law in a free society. It is an example of free enterprise. And it has not been accompanied by increasing distress.

A farmer can no longer realize a profit on what used to be a family-size farm. He must have more of the techniques of agriculture and more mechanical equipment. The farmer has learned to use machinery and to take advantage of new chemical discoveries. He now has the use of the internal-combustion engine and electrical equipment. His production per hour of work has risen. He must have more land, fully to utilize his time and equipment.

NATURE TAKES OVER

The economic status of the farmer has been gaining as the number of farms has decreased. Seventy-nine percent of the farms in the United States are owned by the people who operate them, an increase of 22 percent since 1935.

But what of those "poor" fellows who have left the farms which they have sold to other farmers? They have been getting excellent prices for their acres so that they carry away to other regions or into the towns a nice package of greenbacks.

In 1959 the selling value of land and buildings averaged out at $121 per acre, an increase of 44 percent in 5 years. For whole farms the average value of land and buildings has increased 63 percent since 1954. There are 12 percent more tractors than in 1954, 12 percent more trucks, 7 percent more combines, and almost 100 percent more forage harvesters and balers. More than 35 percent of the farms have two or more tractors.

I was told by a farm editor in Tulsa 2 weeks ago that until recently a good deal of "La Salle Street money" was available for financing corporate farms but that it has been "scared away" by the high prices demanded for farmland.

The farmer is irked by the controls now imposed upon him. Essentially he believes in a free market. He wants above all to be rid of government in his business. This cannot be accomplished at once—that would be a disaster. But surely and steadily the Government should take itself out of the farming business. It is getting to be a sector of the economy which will be able to stand on its feet if it gets the chance.

Freedom and Responsibility Within the University Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, Clark Kerr, President of the University of California, is one of the foremost leaders in the field of higher education today.

At the university's 93d Charter Day ceremonies in March, President Kerr made some penetrating and thoughtful remarks regarding freedom and responsibility within the university community.

I believe that my colleagues will find these remarks of interest and value.

EXCERPTS FROM PRESIDENT KERR'S CHARTER DAY ADDRESS

And now for a few moments I should like to share with you a concern which goes to the very heart of the university—a concern about freedom and responsibility within the university community. In 1953 I delivered my first farewell to a graduating class of the University of California and I chose to welcome the members of that class as new alumni. One paragraph from those remarks applies perhaps as much today as it did then:

"One reason for stressing the importance of the alumni relates to the times in which we live. This is perhaps the most continuously troubled period internationally which has ever beset our Nation, and the consequences are felt far beyond the Army, the Navy, and the State Department. We do not exaggerate when we speak of ourselves as engaged in an enormous struggle for the preservation of the right of personal independence against the constantly pressing forces of totalitarianism. The consequences of a political climate of this sort will always be severely felt upon a university campus. The lifeblood of an intellectual community is free inquiry and discussion, yet on every hand the question is raised whether there is a right to freedom of inquiry and freedom of discussion, with the Nation in its present peril. Thus an important and even imperative function of an alumni body is to carry back to the community, by means which the college professor cannot command, the conviction that there cannot possibly be any connection between blindness and survival; that the right to free inquiry, even the necessity of free inquiry, is an integral part of the strength of a progressive society; that the nonconformist, as contrasted with the conspirator, today as in ages past also serves humanity and that the university is one of his havens; and that when freedom of thought and expression has died on a university campus, it has died everywhere."

Freedom of thought and expression has not died at the University of California; nor, despite the currently rising passions of the radical left and the radical right, will it die. As in all the affairs of men, freedom must be matched by responsibility if freedom is not to die. And the university has the responsibility to insure that the search for truth will never be subverted internally. For this precise reason, the University of California has refused to employ persons whose commitments or obligations to the Communist Party, or to any other organization prejudice impartial scholarship and the free pursuit of truth. That has been the policy of the regents and the academic senate for many years. That is our policy today. That will continue to be our policy.

Members of the university community, faculty members and students alike, deserve the same right to freedom of thought and expression which every citizen enjoys outside the campus boundaries. They are not, however, entitled to trade on the university's good name, or to use the university community or a part of it as a captive audience, or to violate the law. The university, in turn, is not entitled to place limitations upon the off-campus actions of students or faculty members in their roles as private citizens. Participation in the university community does not sever either the rights or the obligations of citizenship in the broader community.

Those of little faith are disposed today to see in one episode, or in one speech, the end of all they hold dear. But America is stronger than that; the way of freedom has more to commend it than that. Our Nation was founded not on fear, but on faith. Those persons who act as agents of suspicion and distrust, or who resort to conspiratorial action to defeat another conspiracy, are unwittingly forsaking the very heritage they claim to protect. Our American ideals are not fragile objects of historical interest to be sheltered from the reality of today's world. They are strong and resilient and as serviceable today as in 1776. They need no special care except daily exercise, and no shield but truth.

We need today a fresh avowal of confidence in traditional democratic principles and in good American commonsense and decency. We need a reaffirmation of faith in our citizenry, including its younger members, among them the students at this university; and of faith in the established institutions of our society, including its universities, among them our own. We welcome the voices of sanity and reason that are giving expression to that faith and confidence today.

Let us as members of a great academic community assembled here this afternoon rededicate ourselves and our institution to both preservation of freedom and the exercise of responsibility.

I should like to conclude by quoting from the celebrated essay by Cardinal Newman

when he was rector of the Catholic University of Dublin, on "The Idea of a University." The university, wrote Cardinal Newman, "is the place to which a thousand scholars make contributions; in which the intellect may safely range and speculate, sure to find its equal in some antagonist activity, and its judge in the tribunal of truth. It is a place where inquiry is pushed forward, and discoveries verified and perfected, and rashness rendered innocuous, with error exposed by the collisions of mind with mind and knowledge with knowledge."

That is "The Idea of a University." That is the "idea" of the University of California.

How To Depress Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, who fools whom with "pie-in-the-sky" legislation? The so-called area redevelopment effort of the Federal Government was discussed in the Wall Street Journal, this morning, in an article by Paul Duke, and further in a sensible editorial, both of which I submit for the interest of the Members of Congress:

HOW TO DEPRESS AREAS

By arbitrary definition of the Government, a "depressed area" is one which has reached a certain percentage of unemployment. Yet, as Mr. Duke notes on this page today, even the backers of the Federal depressed-areas bill before Congress doubt that it will have any appreciable impact on unemployment.

There are many reasons. A region receiving Federal aid to attract new industry may simply attract industry—and employment—from another area. In any case capital is by no means the only consideration in attracting industry; some depressed areas are depressed because new industry has no logical reason, in the form of good transportation or natural resources or whatever, for coming to them.

Nor are the defects of this proposed legislation solely negative. A community that is truly depressed for inescapable economic reasons cannot be given prosperity by Federal aid. It can only be put on a Federal dole. Such subsidy is hardly a prescription for economic growth or for combating unemployment; it is a prescription for permanent depression.

Thus the trouble with this bill, it seems to us, is that it misunderstands just about everything it is trying to deal with. It misunderstands the problem of unemployment and it misunderstands the economic development of the United States. It even manages to misunderstand human nature by supposing that handouts create incentive.

Is there, then, nothing the Government could do about depressed areas? There certainly is. The biggest imaginable spur to general economic growth would be a Federal spending-revenue balance that permitted large tax cuts.

That, it will be objected, would not help the people in an area depressed because the economy has passed them by. But real, noninflationary economic growth would obviously reduce unemployment and attract those in depressed areas to firmer ground. Since when is it a crime for Americans to follow the beckoning of opportunity?

The contemporary political mind, admittedly, doesn't work that way; it prefers to preach economic growth and practice stagnation. Even so, it would seem axiomatic that any welfare measure must provide welfare; otherwise it is a fraud and delusion on the general taxpayer and the specific would-be recipient. And that isn't even very good politics.

DEPRESSED AREAS

AID LEGISLATION RAISES SKEPTICISM EVEN AMONG BACKERS

(By Paul Duke)

WASHINGTON.—Within the next couple of weeks an uncertain Congress will put the final legislative touches on an ambitious new Federal program that even some ardent supporters doubt will be able to accomplish its assigned task.

The bill, a major recommendation of the Kennedy administration, is designed to rehabilitate areas suffering from prolonged unemployment by funneling more than $400 million in Federal grants and loans into hard-hit reigons of Pennsylvania, New York, West Virginia, Kentucky, Michigan, Illinois, and elsewhere.

Yet, even those who have fought hardest for the new program are skeptical of its potentialities. A Democrat from depression-ridden West Virginia is typical. "If anybody thinks this will solve the unemployment problem, he's crazy," the lawmaker declares.

If such a remark seems strange, it expresses perhaps the overriding contradiction of a new Federal program that is riddled with paradoxes. Consider: President Kennedy listed aid to depressed areas as part of his anti-recession program to pep up the economy quickly and put people back to work. Yet, Labor Secretary Goldberg and "liberal" Democratic sponsors in Congress don't regard the program as an antirecession device at all, but rather an attempt to revive communities over a period of years. "There's nothing (in it) that will put a man back to work tomorrow," says a House Democrat from Ohio.

Far from curing unemployment, many liberals who support the new program fear its chief impact may be merely to reshuffle unemployment geographically. That's because, despite alleged safeguards written into the bill, they're afraid the result may be to encourage the pirating of industry from one region of the country to another. "The Jolly Roger is flying at the masthead of this bill," gripes a New England Senator.

To win the votes of southern Democrats, a special provision was inserted in the bill to permit Federal aid for rural areas. Yet, almost no one thinks such a program is necessary because the Agriculture Department already has a rural development plan.

LOTS OF CAPACITY

Though the aid-to-depressed-areas scheme is designed primarily to help medium-sized communities, such industrial giants as Detroit and Pittsburgh would also qualify for assistance in building new plants and for community facelifting projects. Yet, their unemployment troubles stem more from unused rather than a lack of industrial capacity. "We've got more damned plant space in our State than we know what to do with," snaps a Michigan Democrat.

These, then, are just some of the more obvious difficulties involved in undertaking from Washington the job of invigorating local economies. The more subtle complexes can be enormous. Solutions that may seem logical on the surface can turn out to be illogical upon closer examination; actions to help can produce conuteractions of harm.

Consider, for example, the plight of a major company that planned to move its plant from one area of a State to another. To soften the impact on the community it was leaving, the company decided on what it thought was a bold stroke—save the jobs of its 300 workers by taking them along. Not that simple, however. New employment opportunities were scarce in the community where the plant was relocating, and the influx of 300 new workers threatened to create bitter antagonism from the local citizenry.

If the program's chances of success are so doubtful, why then is it all but certain to become law? The answer is not unfamiliar in the realm of politics: It's hard to oppose extending a helping hand to the drowntrodden, even if the gesture outdoes the accomplishment. Most liberals, when discussing aid to depressed areas, will echo the philosophy voiced by President Kennedy in his inaugural address: "If a free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich." But many of these same liberals, when pinned down on the potential effectiveness of the legislation, agree with one colleague who concedes that "the chief value of this bill will be symbolic." Or, in the words of still another: "This is like the United Nations, the faith will greatly exceed the accomplishment."

To be sure, supporters of the depressed areas legislation see some solid good coming from the new multi-million-dollar rehabilitation effort. The very passage of the legislation, they believe, will lend new encouragement and hope to scores of areas on the economic skids. In more practical terms, backers believe the program will genuinely help some areas which have been unable to attract industry because of a lack of lending funds.

In West Virginia, for example, a shortage of private credit is cited as a major adverse factor in the State's drive for new businesses. Proponents of the new legislation note that the Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority has lent $17 million since its creation 5 years ago and this has accounted for 26,000 new factory jobs with payrolls of $99 billion annually. If such a program can work at the State level, they ask, "Why can't it work on a bigger scale nationally?"

THE 1946 EMPLOYMENT ACT

Advocates claim that the Government already has a mandate to clear up pockets of depression under the 1946 Federal Employment Act which calls for policies promoting full employment in the United States. The longer Uncle Sam remains aloof, they contend, the more serious the blight becomes. Besides, the argument goes, the Government is losing potential tax revenue from economically depressed regions while Federal and State welfare and unemployment compensation payments mushroom.

Moreover, the plan's pushers envision it as the last barrier to a general public works program that would cost billions instead of millions. Commerce Secretary Hodges has already said that a new PWA will be necessary unless the economy snaps back soon and reduces the number of areas with substantial unemployment, now at 101.

Critics don't question the motives behind the new program, only its chances for success in easing unemployment. "This is one of the biggest phonies to come down the legislative pike in a long time," grumbles a Virginia conservative. What provokes him and others of like mind is that the program probably will take years to produce results, which may well be niggardly. For example, it's been estimated that only about 1 of every 17 unemployed workers in a depressed locality could hope to obtain a job as a direct result of the Federal help that's contemplated.

Most importantly, perhaps, many opponents think the program skirts the root problems of persistent unemployment. "It prescribes a painkiller without being concerned whether the pain is caused by an incurable cancer or a hangover," cracks a Western GOP critic. Better, the foes say, to remove the 10-percent excise tax on automobiles to help stimulate car sales; or to launch a crash program to find new uses for

coal; or to undertake a major job retraining program; or to reconsider trade policies.

Besides, the argument goes, factors other than favorable financing are frequently more important to business in choosing a plant location. What industry can overlook an area's transportation connections, the availability of raw materials, and the closeness of markets? Too, business is increasingly concerned about the character of the community—its schools, its recreational facilities, the quality of the work force. Some lawmakers suggest the Federal inducements will tend to attract only speculative and undesirable industries looking for windfall aid.

And, of course, it's pointed out that the Federal Government already is offering some area assistance through the Small Business Administration and the community facilities loan program. Moreover, 22 States now have privately financed development corporations to help in the obtaining of credit; Pennsylvania and nine other States have gone even further and set up State-supported credit corporations. New Hampshire and Maine have established public authorities for the construction of industrial parks.

PHILOSOPHICAL QUESTION

But even granting that economically stricken regions do need more help, there's the philosophical question of whether the job should fall to a special Federal program. And opponents pose these other questions: Should hard-hit communities be helped while others, only less slightly depressed, be denied assistance? What about the communities which aren't depressed but are earnestly trying to build up their economies and will face rougher competition in attracting new businesses? Should the Government favor some areas over others? Concludes a New England conservative: "This is a bad bill because it forces Uncle Sam to play favorites among his children." Possible upshot: Greater political pressure to enlarge the program to include more areas.

For all their self-doubts, supporters of the new depressed areas legislation tend to reject as exaggerated claims that the program eventually will expand significantly. "This is a rifle for a specific target," proclaims a Pennsylvania Democrat. "It was never meant to be anything else, and if properly administered, should not be anything else."

Nevertheless, friend and foe alike can pretty much agree on one basic conclusion: Even if the rifle does strike the target, it's not likely to penetrate deeply.

A Well-Known Constituent in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. CORMAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's Capital has had the distinct honor recently of having as a visitor a well-known constituent of mine, Mr. Jack La Lanne. Mr. La Lanne is more than a television personality and advocate of physical fitness. He is a welcome fixture in households from coast to coast. His bright and cheerful program each morning has brought enjoyment to the lives, and slimness to the waistlines, of millions of American housewives and husbands.

During the last week, while Mr. La Lanne has been here in Washington, D.C., he has been in touch with members of the Government on the subject of our country's physical fitness. He has an especial interest in the Peace Corps, and I am certain Mr. La Lanne's counsel would do much to enhance the image of a vigorous American youth that we hope to project abroad through this exciting experiment.

Mr. La Lanne, as I said, is more than a television personality. His articles and books on physical fitness are read by thousands and thousands. Yet that is not all. For Mr. Jack La Lanne is, besides that, a man who devoutly believes in what he professes. He lives the sort of life he advocates, and is walking proof of his own good advice.

Next week, Mr. La Lanne will be broadcasting his daily television show from Baltimore. I would commend his counsel, and his programs, to all my colleagues.

Address of Constant Mierlak, National President of Byelorussian-American Association at the Commemoration of the 43d Anniversary of Byelorussian Independence at the Biltmore Hotel, New York City, on March 26, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, on March 26, 1961, the Byelorussian-American Association held a special ceremony at the Hotel Biltmore in New York City to commemorate the 43d anniversary of the independence of Byelorussia. It was my privilege to be present at that occasion and to bring to the group the greetings of the Congress of the United States and our assurance that we share with them the hope that the couutry of their origin will soon be free from Soviet oppression.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of the address made to the group by Mr. Constant Mierlak, national president of the Byelorussian-American Association and also the text of a resolution adopted unanimously by the meeting. The address and text of the resolution follow:

ADDRESS OF CONSTANT MIERLAK, NATIONAL PRESIDENT OF BYELORUSSIAN-AMERICAN ASSOCIATION AT THE COMMEMORATION OF THE 43D ANNIVERSARY OF BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE AT THE BILTMORE HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY, ON MARCH 26, 1961

Your Excellencies, distinguished guests and representatives of friendly nations, ladies and gentlemen, "we, therefore, the representatives of the United States of America, in General Congress, assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, do, in the name, and by authority of the good people of these colonies, solemnly publish and declare, That these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be free and independent States."

This is a quotation from the Declaration of Independence of the United States of America in Congress on July 4, 1776.

Nineteen years later Byelorussia, at that time known, as the Commonwealth of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, lost her independence, having been forcibly incorporated in 1795 into Imperial Russia.

Since then, the United States of America enjoyed the blessings of freedom in all branches of national life and built the most powerful and democratic nation in the world.

On the other hand, Byelorussia, during 123 years, endured russification and colonial exploitation, as a result of which, Byelorussia became the poorest country of all in the Russian Empire.

Having lost her independence, Byelorussia lost the right to live by her own laws, to speak her own language and to pray in her own churches.

During that time of persecution and slavery imposed by imperial Moscow the Byelorussians attempted several times to regain their freedom and independence and finally they succeeded in 1918, on March 25.

The Presidium of the Rada (Parliament), which was elected at the All-Byelorussian Congress in December 1917, declared in its Third Constitutional Act:

"Now we, the Rada of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic, are liberating our country from the last vestige of state dependency imposed by the Russian monarchy upon our free and independent country.

"From now on, the Byelorussian Democratic Republic is proclaimed a free and independent state. The peoples of Byelorussia through their elected constituent assembly shall themselves determine the future relations of Byelorussia with other states."

Although the Byelorussian independence was declared 142 years later, the wording of the declaration is almost identical with that of the United States. The fate of these two nations, however, has been entirely different due to many factors: a different geopolitical location being one of them.

Today, 43 years later, we gathered here to commemorate the magnificent act in Byelorussian history and also to pay a tribute to the heroic generation of that time, who envisoned a free and independent Byelorussian state.

We also shall pay tribute to all who died since then defending the principles of freedom and democracy.

Free and independent Byelorussia, as well as other countries which became a part of today's Soviet Union, could not resist for a long time and fell victim to new Soviet or Communist imperialism which surged from the old traditional Russian messianism.

The historic Russian imperialism, now under new leadership, systematically destroyed people after people, nation after nation. Thus from 1920 to the present they have subjugated at least 23 nations which had been independent in the past and lived peacefully, respecting human rights and international treaties. Since that time the Russians completely destroyed and virtually wiped out from the surface of the earth about seven nations or ethnic groups consisting of several millions of people.

Nobody seems to have learned the lesson from Byelorussian history and from history of other nations which later on also lost their independence, that Communist imperialism destroys everything which stands in its way to world domination.

Through policy of containment, coexistence, etc., and due to misunderstanding of the nature of Russian imperialism and to our American complacency the Communists gradually succeeded in spreading their domination and influence as far as 90 miles from U.S. borders, and they are challenging our very existence through overt and subvert activities.

The manifest published by 81 Communist parties in Moscow demonstrates unequivo-

cally the conviction that the free world is unable to resist their aggression and therefore the Communists believe that it will not be necessary to use physical force in conquering other lands, as they have done before, but that the domination of the world will be accomplished through the coexistence policy.

According to the declaration there will be no nuclear war at all. The fear and lament, that the civilization will be destroyed in an event of such a nuclear conflict, is raised by the pro-Russian and pro-Soviet circles or by the pretended defenders of humanity in the United States. In reality this is simply an attempt to divert the attention of our Government from the real danger which our country is approaching.

Various actions coordinated between internal and external elements demonstrate how easily our society is led astray by disguised Communist organizations. This can be illustrated by the following facts:

The student demonstration in California against the hearings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the organized "Operation Abolition" which culminated in the resolution introduced in the House of Representatives calling for the dissolution of the House Committee, show that all efforts were made to destroy the Committee in order to carry on the subversive activities more effectively.

Another fact, the authorization given by the Commerce Department to sell precision machinery to Russia which would enable the Soviets to put missile production on assembly line is extremely discouraging. It shows that the Federal Agencies are packed with politically immature elements, which should have been cleared off a long time ago. Thanks to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and particularly to Senator THOMAS J. DODD who objected strongly, the Commerce Department was forced to withdraw the authorization, but unfortunately it was too late: the Russians already got the blueprints.

To this, we may add the suppression and boycoting by the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty of the joint congressional resolution on Captive Nations Week (Public Law 86–90). The policymakers and so-called experts on Soviet affairs in the U.S. Information Agency and other private committees considered themselves better Americans who know better than the entire U.S. Congress what is best for the United States.

And here is another fact that concerns exclusively the Americans of Byelorussian descent: the attempts made by the Byelorussian-American Association to convince the proper U.S. agencies of political value and actual urgency of establishing Byelorussian-language broadcasts by the Voice of America have simply remained futile in the last 10 years. The director of the broadcasting service of the Voice of America writes: "The limitations of both the voice's funds and technical facilities have not changed since I wrote you on this matter on September 16, 1960."

After having read this and the headlines that the United States again granted assistance of $100 million to Tito of Yugoslavia one can become worried indeed about the fate of this country.

Ladies and gentlemen:

We gathered here not only to commemorate an act of declaration of independence, but also to remind the free world that there are nations which aspire to be free and which unfortunately are almost forgotten today in political dealings. Some countries, as for instance, the countries of Africa, are helped in gaining the independence; on the other hand, countries dominated by Soviet Russia are left at the mercy of their enslavers.

We also assembled here to rededicate ourselves in the struggle for liberation of our old country and to rededicate ourselves to the cause of preserving this country free forever.

The nation which aspires and fights for its freedom will eventually become free and equal among all nations and under God.

Thank you.

RESOLUTION SPONSORED BY THE BYELORUSSIAN-AMERICAN ASSOCIATION, UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED AT THE MASS MEETING COMMEMORATING THE 43D ANNIVERSARY OF BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE ON MARCH 26, 1961, AT THE BILTMORE HOTEL IN NEW YORK CITY

We, Americans of Byelorussian descent, assembled at the commemoration of the 43d anniversary of Byelorussian independence, declare—

That the United States of America, politically and economically the leading nation of the democratic world, guarantees its people political, religious, cultural, social, and economic freedom;

That the American people have long accepted the basic principles set forth in the American Declaration of Independence that "all men are created equal" and that they are entitled to the enjoyment and exercise of freedom and independence;

That on the other hand, during its 43 years of existence Communist Russia has enslaved many nations of Europe and Asia by means of aggression or subversion and deprived them of basic liberties;

That Russia has become a great imperialist peril which threatens all free nations and particularly the United States of America—our new fatherland; and

That the United States of America has the necessary strength and the will to resist aggression of Communist Russian imperialism and to defend the principles of freedom for all enslaved nations and for the Byelorussian people.

We protest—

Against imperialist aggression of Communist Russia, against enslavement of Byelorussia and deprivation of Byelorussian people of political, religious, cultural, and social liberties; against forced russification, economic bondage, and colonial exploitation; and

Against the government of terror in Byelorussia, against mass deportation and the policy of genocide which has resulted during the last 20 years in a demographic deficit of 6 million people on the territory of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.

We condemn—

Any policy of coexistence and complacency with Communist Russian imperialism, any policy that approves the acts of aggression committed by Moscow, any policy that might assist in spreading the totalitarian Communist ideas;

Any policy of discrimination of nations, for example, a policy which supports the liberation movements in Africa but which, at the same time, denies the right for freedom to the nations enslaved by Russia;

The ignoring and boycotting of the resolution of the U.S. Congress (Public Law 86–90) by certain official agencies and privately sponsored committees;

The Communist-organized "Operation Abolition" and conscious support of this action by some American circles in order to destroy the House Committee on Un-American Activities and to weaken the Federal Bureau of Investigation and thus to paralyze the security laws of our Government; and

The discriminating attitude of the U.S. Government agencies regarding the Byelorussian language which is excluded from the programs broadcast by the Voice of America.

We support—

The Government of the United States in its aspiration to achieve a permanent peace in the world by means of securing freedom and justice for all men and nations;

The resolution (Public Law 86–90) which was unanimously voted by both House of the U.S. Congress and the proclamation by the President of the third week of July as "The Captive Nations Week";

The House Committee on Un-American Activities and its patriotic and indispensable services rendered in strengthening the security of the United States;

Senator THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut, for his patriotic and farsighted action in halting the shipment to the Soviet Russia of precision machinery which would speed the limping production of Russian military missiles; and

The resolution sponsored by Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD, Representative of Pennsylvania, in the House of Representatives proposing the creation of a Special Captive Nations Commission.

We pledge—

To strengthen our efforts to create a united front of Americans of Byelorussian origin in order to join more actively the political cultural and social life of the United States, in order to increase our contribution to the economic and spiritual growth of this country; and

To disseminate knowledge and truth about the Byelorussian people and their independence aspirations in order to win the sympathy and support of the American people for the cause of liberation of Byelorussia and restoration of the independent Byelorussian state.

We appeal—

To the people of the United States and of the whole free world to provide all possible assistance for the Byelorussian people in their perennial struggle for liberation from Russian communism;

To the U.S. Government to be on guard and properly prepared against inevitable aggression that is being planned by Communist Russia which intends to dominate the world; and

To the U.S. authorities to give due consideration to our request concerning the Byelorussian-language programs to be broadcast by the Voice of America.

The Sad Story of Haj Mohammed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the April 1, 1961, issue of the Chicago Tribune tells a story with a moral of which we should all make special note:

A 95-year-old Egyptian, Haj Mohammed Marzouk, has retired after spending 85 of his years embroidering quotations from the Koran in gold thread on the enormous black plush covers used to cover the Kaba stone in Mecca, toward which all devout followers of Islam face when they pray. His covers for the holy shrine reach Mecca each year before the arrival of the faithful on their pilgrimage.

Mohammed began this service to the Prophet as an apprentice of 10. A few days ago, when his final embroidery was finished, he was retired, receiving a pension of seven Egyptian pounds, or $20, a month after having been classified as a civil servant in the ministry of religion.

Then around came the tax collector, to say that the classification was wrong and that Mohammed really was a craftsman who should have been paying income tax at a

rate 5 percent higher than had been deducted from his pay during his working life. The collector thereupon presented a bill for £212 ($615) in back taxes.

To satisfy it, Mohammed was obliged to sell his few household effects, among them his bed and blanket. At 95, he is down to a ragged coat, without a piastre to his name. The man who covered the Prophet's shrine for 85 years hasn't a blanket to sleep under.

Somehow we see in this pathetic person a symbol and forerunner of that merciful governmental dispensation known in this country at the moment as the New Frontier. When we have all passed through the grinder of spending and taxing for the greater glory of the public sector, will we have a blanket to our name?

Distinguished Editor, Tom Goff, Huntington Park Daily Signal, Huntington Park, Calif., in the Great 23d District, Writes Two Timely Editorials Pointing Up Some Errors of Opponents of House Un-American Activities Committee and Critics of Film "Operation Abolition"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present the text of two editorials written by Mr. Tom Goff, editor of the Daily Signal at Huntington Park, Calif., in the great 23d District which I represent this my 15th year. Because almost all of these years I have been an active member, and now am, of the House Un-American Activities Committee, I deem it especially appropriate I have the privilege of unanimous consent to insert these editorials which appear to me timely, pertinent, and crystal clear for any reader who is unbiased, unprejudiced, and who, Mr. Speaker, is anxious to throw all of his or her influence toward strengthening the international security processes of our beloved Nation against the deceitful, destructive, aggressive and subversive activities and programs and propaganda which emanates and grows out of the Communist conspiracy.

The first editorial "Ministers Overlook Basic Message of Anti-Red Film" follows:

MINISTERS OVERLOOK BASIC MESSAGE OF ANTI-RED FILM

The last thing in the world I want to do is to offend a couple of courageous gentleman of the cloth, but I am compelled, nevertheless, to voice the opinion that I believe both the Reverend Richard Dunlap, of Huntington Park, and the Reverend Norman Taylor, of South Gate, missed completely the principal message carried by the film, "Operation Abolition."

The premise, as I see it, is not as the reverend gentlemen stated in this paper yesterday that "to oppose the House Un-American Activities Committee is treason per se." It is, instead, that loyal Americans were led into committing illegal acts by an element whose loyalty is, at the very least, questionable.

NOT A QUESTION OF RIGHT TO OPPOSE

There is no question in my mind—or in any other thinking American's mind—that those who disagree with the purposes, methods or any other aspect of the committee have every right in the world to oppose it—by peaceful and legal means.

The truly appalling thing the film does show, however, is that a group of Americans—many of them college students—took it upon themselves to go far beyond this point. Following the lead of a few well-placed Communists they attempted to disrupt the committee session, in one instance, by catcalls and chants inside the hearing room, and in another, by creating a vocal disturbance in the hall outside the hearing room.

Furthermore, when ordered by police officers to stop the noise, they persisted and made it necessary for the officers to eject them bodily.

Now this type of thing is not mere opposition. It is, at a minimum, disturbing the peace. Those who express their opposition to the Un-American Activities Committee in this fashion are, no matter how high minded their individual motives—serving as duptes for the Communists.

HOW ABOUT CHURCH?

Let's bring the issue up to the level of religion, a field in which both the Reverend Dr. Dunlap and the Reverend Dr. Taylor are eminently qualified.

Now both of these gentlemen are Methodists, one of the great and widely accepted Protestant denominations. No American in his right mind would dream of challenging their right to conduct their business despite the fact some people disagree, to one degree or another, as to the correctness of their approach.

But let's suppose, just for the sake of argument, that some other denomination decided that the Methodist approach not only was incorrect but was harmful. And let's suppose that several members of this denomination decided to let their views be known by picketing, for example, the Reverend Dr. Dunlap's church.

Once again just for the sake of argument, let's suppose, too, that a handful of still another group—let's call them "church wreckers" for lack of a better name—joined the picketers and convinced some, not all, of the picketers that the best way to get their message across was to demand entrance into the church, interrupt the services with catcalls and boos and make so much noise on the steps of the church that the services could not continue.

Now, those who went along with the proposal would not, perhaps, be "church wreckers" per se. But they would be dupes of the "church wreckers." And they would be wrong.

RED TECHNIQUES

The Reverend Dr. Taylor made the statement in criticizing the committee that "you don't overcome it (communism) by adopting the same techniques they use."

I agree. And I would add that you can't correct any injustices—real or imaginary—caused by the Un-American Activities Committee by adopting Communist techniques such as were used in San Francisco.

And I say further that even tacit approval of the San Francisco demonstrations is an open invitation to the ridiculous type of thing I have described above in relation to the church. An encouragement of the San Francisco type of demonstration is aiding and abetting the Communist cause far more than any of the "injustices" charged to the committee.

The second editorial "All Americans Should See San Francisco Riot Film," follows:

ALL AMERICANS SHOULD SEE SAN FRANCISCO RIOT FILM

I'd like to devote this column to a discussion of "Operation Abolition," the controversial documentary film showing last year's violent attacks on the House Un-American Activities Committee during 2 days of hearings in San Francisco.

The film, being widely shown in the southeast district as elsewhere, is under heavy attack by Communists; their dupes who, for one farfetched reason or another, would terminate the work the committee is doing, and still others who naively argue the film does not offer a fair presentation of the San Francisco hearings facts.

The film has its weaknesses, to be sure. The commentary, for example, is far more heavily editorialized than necessary; its impact is lessened materially by too frequent "commercial" breaks to allow various members of the committee to make a pitch.

A MESSAGE FOR ALL THINKING AMERICANS

But these and other faults are minor points in the final analysis. Stripped to its bare bones, the picture carries a message which should be seen and absorbed by all thinking citizens of this country.

Parents, particularly, and youngsters starting or preparing to start a college career should make a special point to see the film. It should be required fare for every senior class in every American high school.

For "Operation Abolition" shows in the most graphic manner possible precisely how a few Communist agitators—expertly trained and wholly dedicated—can incite, cajole and seduce a group of young men and women into the misguided belief that open defiance of law and order is a crusade against "tyranny."

And that is the issue. There is no quarrel with the right of Americans, young or old, Communists or non-Communists, to picket or otherwise peacefully protest the work of the committee if they so desire.

On the other hand, wilful disobedience of the law, physical interference with the work of a legally constituted congressional committee, popular or not, and outright defiance of law enforcement officers carrying out legal orders in the performance of their duties is wrong. There can be no legitimate defense made for it.

I can readily understand why the Communists are enraged by the film. Not only does it lay wide open the particular techniques used in the San Francisco incidents, but it bares to all an eye-opening explanation of how they have been able to generate the riots which have become their favorite weapon throughout the world.

SPECIAL PREY

The special prey of the Communists in these activities everywhere have been college students and other young people.

Men and women at this stage of life, fortunately in most instances but not in this, are at their most idealistic. They want to do things; they want to crusade; they want to set the world on fire.

They become too easy victims of the professional agitator who would lead them to glorious victories over imaginary forces of evil.

Those who see "Operation Abolition" should not be misled, however, into believing that all or even most of those young people in the crowds around the San Francisco City Hall were there as participants. Far more of them, I am sure, were at the scene out of curiosity more than anything else.

Nor should parents be led to mistakenly believe that all—or even most—of the youngsters in today's colleges are willing Communist dupes.

The proportion really is small. The danger is that the youngster who hasn't been informed—the boy or girl who doesn't know what to look for—can end up a participant in a disgraceful exhibition such as that staged last year in San Francisco.

SHOE ON OTHER FOOT

I think, too, that it's about time we start putting the shoe on the other foot with regards to this Un-American Activities Committee.

It's time that we say a few words, even shed a few tears, for the men who sit on this committee and hearing after hearing, year after year, have the vilest kind of abuse heaped upon them by those who strive by every foul means written in the Communist library to put this Nation under the yoke of the cruelest tyranny the world ever has known.

Our sense of personal liberty slips way out of line when we make monsters out of the men who try to preserve this country by exposing these conspirators for what they are and make heroes out of those who would destroy us.

Sure, the Un-American Activities Committee and similar bodies have made mistakes. When battling shadows it becomes very easy to mistake a misguided dupe for the real thing.

But this committee and others like it have done a tremendous and thankless job in pointing out very real and very frightening dangers which do exist.

Only those who have reason to fear exposure to public view have anything real to fear from well-conducted committees of this sort.

Neat Budget Trick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following three articles from the Wall Street Journal of March 24, 1961, on current Government problems:

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK—NEAT BUDGET TRICK

Washington reports indicate that President Kennedy's budget message today, revising the Eisenhower budget for the next fiscal year, will be minus a sizable piece—namely defense costs. A revision of the defense budget, it's said, will be sent separately to Congress next week.

And the suspicion in Washington is that this is partly an attempt to allay any fears that the Kennedy administration is off on a wild spending spree. For it can be argued that, if you forget defense for the moment and assume the Eisenhower budgetmakers were correct in their revenue expectations, the nondefense budget would not necessarily be unbalanced, or hardly unbalanced.

In other words, the Kennedy increases in domestic spending might come to just about the $1.5 billion surplus forecast by the Eisenhower administration. As for the increases in defense outlays, to be presented separately to Congress, who can argue against spending for national security?

We hope this interpretation of the administration's thinking is wrong, for it smacks of devious devices to persuade the people that Federal "civilian" spending is not on a drastic rise. But in any case, the separation of defense from other outlays is a novel approach to budgeting which has disturbing implications.

It seems to be saying that all is well if part of the budget is in balance, or nearly so, even though the total plainly will not be. Thus it distorts the whole Federal financial picture.

Moreover, it seems to be putting defense into a category of its own, too sacred to be subject to the secular restrictions of normal budgeting. Obviously it is imperative to spend as much on defense as is demonstrably necessary. It is equally imperative to spend no more than that.

Once the idea became prevalent that defense is something apart from the regular budget, the quality of defense would dangerously deteriorate. Such an approach would be an invitation to still more waste and duplication and mismanagement. For when the yardstick of strict financial control is thrown away, it becomes impossible to establish defense priorities or intelligently allocate defense resources.

Finally, this separation of defense from other spending tends to put the finger on the Pentagon as the chief reason the total Federal budget has been soaring like a missile for so many years. The increases in domestic welfare costs, it's suggested, are minor compared to the enormous boosts in defense costs.

That assertion, however, is not borne out by the budget documents over the years; they show just the opposite. Since 1955, for example, Defense Department spending has gone up something like $5 billion, but total Federal spending has gone up about $15 billion. The bulk of the increase is not defense but the proliferating host of domestic subsidies, handouts, and whatnot. The budget category called "labor and welfare" has doubled in a decade.

And it is these domestic programs President Kennedy is so busily trying to add to and magnify. Perhaps their additional cost in fiscal 1962 will be no more than the $1.5 billion surplus estimated by Mr. Eisenhower, but no one has even tried to figure their eventual cost beyond the obvious fact that it will be staggering.

What is urgently needed now is a facing up to the financial meaning of the President's proposals, not a political budget trick to disguise their meaning.

WHAT'S 1 PERCENT?

As part of President Kennedy's approach to foreign aid, the United States reportedly will suggest next week that the members of the newly created Development Assistance Group, embracing Western Europe and Japan, join the United States in pledging 1 percent of their annual gross national product to aid the underdeveloped countries.

This formula seems at once modest and magnanimous, although a closer look reveals that it's neither. One percent of anything sounds insignificant, but 1 percent of the U.S. gross national product this year would be more than $5 billion. As for the estimated $8 billion in aid money which this approach would draw from the 10-nation group that sounds more impressive than it really is. Right now, by one means and another, economically advanced free nations are pumping out almost that much in aid.

What else may be said of this scheme that isn't all it seems? Well, it's strange to hear that this country's gross national product and foreign aid budget are intimately related. By this reasoning, our generosity to Upper Volta is in part determined by how many automobiles Detroit sells and what sort of year soybean growers have and the number of people who decide to buy houses. Never mind whether aid to Upper Volta makes any sense on its own merits.

Actually, the 1-percent formula contains a built-in apparently endless escalator. Since Government spending is included in the gross national product, an increase in foreign aid expenditures would automatically increase the gross national product. And that, of course, would make the proposed 1-percent aid allotment proportionately larger, which would automatically boost the gross national product and begin the cycle anew.

Of course, there's a hitch to hooking ourselves into this belt. The present weakness of the dollar, reflecting the large and persistent deficit in U.S. international payments, is an urgent warning that Government spending overseas must be cut back sharply. The warning, apparently, hasn't troubled the formulamakers. After all, what's a measly 1 percent?

SPECTACULAR HOMEWORK

In his recent message to Congress proposing Federal aid to school construction, President Kennedy observed:

"It is clear that we do not have enough classrooms. In order to meet current needs and accommodate increasing enrollments, if every child is to have the opportunity of a full-day education in an adequate classroom, a total of 600,000 classrooms must be constructed in the next 10 years."

Since the President left that stark statistic unexplained, one might easily suppose that here is another unmet need of the country which only Government can provide; that without Washington's help communities won't begin to build those 600,000 necessary classrooms. Happily, the impression is mistaken.

According to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the country is building classrooms at such a clip that 1970 could bring a surplus. It is noted that the Government's generous estimate of future needs, proposed by the U.S. Office of Education, is 610,000 new classrooms by 1970. Local communities over the past 5 years have been building classrooms at the rate of 69,000 a year—a pace that would produce 690,000 by the end of the decade, or 80,000 more than Washington deems necessary.

No one, of course, would argue that each community in the country has all the classrooms it may need or desire. But neither can it be argued convincingly that the unmet needs of some localities add up to an unmet need of the Nation which only Washington can handle. On the contrary, the chamber's findings confirm the fact that parents and taxpayers in communities across the country are meeting their responsibility to their children, without aid or advice from Washington.

This spectacular achievement ought to delight educators and cheer up politicians who fear that the country is inadequate to the challenges of the 1960's. Yet, in the President's message and other pleading for Federal aid, it passes unnoticed and unapplauded. Obviously, if there is an unmet educational need, it is to enlighten Washington about the way communities are doing their homework.

The Penalty of Change

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the following editorial to the attention of my colleagues. The editorial ap-

peared in the April 3, 1961, issue of U.S. News & World Report and was written by David Lawrence:

Many millions of persons, with the best of intent, voted last year for a change of administration.

Many millions of others, also believing that they were doing what would be best for America, voted against change.

Today all the people of the United States are paying the penalty of the change. It is costly. It could lead us into a war that nobody wants.

If this happens, it will not be the fault of our President. For he will earnestly strive to keep us from such a catastrophe, and he will have the support of the American people, irrespective of party.

But 1960 was not the time for a change in administration, and events now unfortunately are proving that thesis true. The risk we have taken by "changing horses in midstream" is being revealed in the headlines.

We didn't take such a risk in the midst of World War II, when we even broke the third-term precedent by reelecting a President for a third and a fourth term.

What is being revealed today is that a cold war is really not much different from a hot war as far as possible dangers are concerned. A fixed election date therefore is risky. Flexibility in the date for holding national elections—such as the parliamentary systems provide—would be a wise precaution.

Nikita Khrushchev and his clique in the Kremlin knew, of course, that the Eisenhower policies would be maintained by a Nixon administration. But Moscow had been led to believe that the United States would be "softer" under a Democratic administration.

Hints to this effect were given to the Kremlin from time to time in the last few years by prominent Democrats, inside and outside of Congress, who criticized the Eisenhower policies.

Will the United States now suffer the effects of the Kremlin's miscalculation?

Almost immediately after the election last November, the Communists stepped up the cold war. They increased military support to their stooges in Laos. They sent arms to Lumumba's forces in the Congo in direct defiance of the United Nations. And they have moved more intensively in Cuba and other areas.

All through November, December, January, and February, the cold war was pressed with renewed vigor by the Communists throughout the world, while American policies stagnated. Though ostensibly concerned with the possibility of reaching agreements in negotiations for disarmament and on such issues as the status of Berlin, the Moscow government saw a chance meanwhile to build a stronger position for itself in Latin America, Africa, and southeast Asia.

Unfortunately, partisan comments in recent years in this country indicated that maybe a Democratic President in the White House would bring a "peace at any price" policy. It will be recalled that in the spring of 1954, when the Indochina crisis was developing, the United States was ready to take a firm stand to meet Communist aggression in southeast Asia. Vice President Nixon made an off-the-record speech to the American Society of Newspaper Editors that was later paraphrased in print and viewed as threatening military action. It was indeed a show of firmness that was essential to our diplomacy. It led to bitter attacks by the Democrats. Senator Kennedy said at a political fundraising dinner in Chicago on April 20, 1954:

"The American people should be told the truth about the situation in the Far East. For if Secretary Dulles' and Vice President Nixon's words are to be taken at their face value, we are about to enter the jungle and do battle with the tiger. But I do believe it both proper and necessary that those who bear responsibility should indicate in advance the course that should be adopted."

So the Kremlin in 1961 apparently decided to test Mr. Kennedy's philosophy.

Another Vice President of the United States—LYNDON JOHNSON—now has made, after a conference with the President, the following statement:

"And I think it should also be known to the world that the United States, while it is going to be reasonable and prudent in all of its moves, is not in a mood to meekly permit an independent nation to be gobbled up by an armed minority supported from the outside."

It is to be hoped that blind partisans and the advocates of "peace at any price" will not again endanger American foreign policy by disparaging the comments of the present Vice President, who has just proclaimed the resolute policy of the United States.

Despite what was said by the Democrats in their ridicule of the policy of the late Secretary Dulles, called "brinkmanship," it is a fact that after 2 months of a Democratic administration we are at the brink of armed conflict. It is important, therefore, to let the Soviets know that the American people stand solidly behind their President and will back him fully in whatever stand he may take to resist any further aggression by the Communists in any part of the world.

U.S. Savings Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, many of our colleagues during the 8 years prior to January 20, 1961, joined me in urging the Treasury Department to give more attention to savings bonds and to paying a fair return on them, commensurate with market rates on other securities. Most of our efforts were ignored.

I am pleased to note that without any prompting from us, the new Secretary of the Treasury has increased interest rates accordingly. Secretary Dillon is to be commended for his early attention to this important problem.

The Treasury Department's release of March 24, 1961. I am sure will be of interest to all our colleagues. It is as follows:

TREASURY ANNOUNCES HIGHER INTEREST RATE FOR LONG-TERM HOLDERS OF SAVINGS BONDS

Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon today announced new regulations that will benefit some 10 million Americans who own series E savings bonds issued from May 1941 through May 1949.

Under the new regulations, these bonds—the first of which will be 20 years old on May 1—will earn a full 3¾-percent interest a year. They may now be held for an additional 10 years. About $15 billion of the $43 billion currently outstanding in series E and H savings bonds will be affected by this action.

"In addition to benefiting the bondholder," Secretary Dillon said, "this action to encourage him to retain his bonds will diminish the Treasury's problem of refinancing the public debt and will contribute to the contry's stability by keeping a sizeable portion of it in the hands of the average citizen.

"By retaining their matured bonds and purchasing new ones, individual citizens will not only prepare themselves and their children for a more secure future, but will help strengthen the economy of our country. The more than $43 billion now outstanding in series E and H bonds testifies to the foresighted thrift of our people and to their faith in the future of America."

The new rate of interest on series E bonds bearing issue dates from May 1941 through May 1949 is comparable to the yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States that have 10 years to run to maturity. These bonds originally earned 2.90 percent if held to maturity. In their first extension period they have been earning from 2.90 to 3.47 percent if held to extended maturity. During the second extended maturity they will all earn a straight 3¾ percent per year, compounded semiannually.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

APRIL 1, 1961.

More new tax increases are shaping up (beside earlier unemployment compensation insurance costs; see newsletters, February 25, March 4, March 25) in user taxes in the highway program and social security program. The highway taxes will include, I suspect, an increase in the gasoline tax and truck taxes. Social Security will raise the employer and employee one-eighth of 1 percent each on the pay base of $4,800 annually and self-employed three-eighths of 1 percent. These are in addition to the escalator taxes already in the law to go up to 9 percent.

Aid for depressed areas or the area redevelopment bill, as it is variously called, was the big debate and controversy before Easter adjournment. Two days of debate and voting confused more than clarified the scope, intent and anticipated operation of the bill. On the surface, the language was repeated over and over, but the true implication, I must assume, the Members did not comprehend, unless, of course, politics completely replaced a sense of reason.

The Federal Government would extend outright grants and loans to "redevelopment areas" as determined and so designated by the Secretary of Commerce. One hundred million dollars would go to industrial area plant loans, $100 million to rural areas, $100 million for public facility loans, $75 million for public facility grants, $4½ million for technical assistance, $10 million for subsistence payments and $4½ million for occupational training, for a total of $394 million (as a starter). Everyone agreed this sum was a flyspeck compared to the amount really needed to do the job.

Let's look at the logic (as I endeavored to do in floor debate) of the declaration of purpose of the bill. "The Federal Government, in cooperation with the States, should help areas of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment to take

effective steps in planning and financing their economic redevelopment; that Federal assistance to communities, industries, enterprises, and individuals in areas needing redevelopment should enable such areas to achieve lasting improvement and enhance the domestic prosperity by establishment of stable and diversified local economies and improved local living conditions; and that under the provisions of this act new employment opportunities should be created by developing and expanding new and existing facilities and resources." Isn't that carte blanche control directly or indirectly in the bureaucratic hands of the Federal Government over private enterprise? Isn't that unconstitutional in a limited government of checks and balances wherein all rights reside in the people except those specified in the Constitution as the prerogative of the Federal Government? Doesn't that declaration of purpose put the Federal Government in the position of helping anyone or everyone according to bureaucratic whim from a complex industry and a whole community down to each and every specified individual of any designated area? It can mean nothing else. Here are other quotes from the bill:

"The Secretary is authorized to make loans to aid in financing any project within a redevelopment area for purchase of land and facilities, for industrial or commercial usage, including construction of new buildings, the rehabilitation, alteration, conversion, or enlargement of existing buildings.

"The project for which financial assistance is sought must be reasonably calculated to provide more than a temporary alleviation of unemployment or underemployment within the redevelopment area wherein it is, or will be, located. [What does that actually mean?]

"No such assistance shall be extended hereunder unless the financial assistance applied for is not otherwise available from private lenders or other Federal agencies on reasonable terms."

Loans or grants if "the project for which assistance is sought will tend to improve the opportunities."

Other features: (1) Secretary will work with local authorities determining their needs; (2) Secretary will "establish new rules, regulations, and procedures as he may deem appropriate in carrying out the provisions of this act." (3) The Secretary (of Commerce), Secretary of Labor, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will work together to "determine the occupational training of individuals residing in the redevelopment area"; (4) all wages paid on projects under this act will be at a rate set by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act; (5) the Secretary is authorized to delegate to the heads of other departments and agencies of the Federal Government any of the Secretary's functions, powers, and duties under this act as he may deem appropriate, and to authorize the redelegation of such functions, powers and duties by the heads of such departments and agencies.

Where is the constitutional limitation of power in this nightmare jumble of bureaucratic planning, regimentation and control? To do what—to help? No, to spend money the Federal Government doesn't have until it collects more taxes (Uncle Sam is worse than broke by hundreds of billions). What is this legislative sickness? It is: (1) An almost hypnotic belief in the efficiency of Federal spending, planning and taxing; (2) failure to understand basic economics, private enterprise and the right of property ownership—that what the Federal Government puts into the economy as aid is first taken out in taxes; (3) never to be forgotten, of course, is the determination of each politician to stay in office. My answer to "aid to depressed areas" is to lighten the tax load. A substantial tax cut within a framework of a balanced budget (less Federal spending) would spark an economic expansion and prosperity eclipsing anything in the history of our Nation.

Secretary Goldberg: Come See How Omaha Does It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, Omaha is one of the four cities in the Nation with a balanced labor market. We have no serious unemployment in Omaha and we have not had since prior to World War II.

Such a situation does not just happen. It is the result of sound planning and a confidence in the future of the Omaha area, Nebr., and the Nation. It is typical of the attitude in the Middle West—an attitude that we can plan for the future, a prosperous future, without massive doses of Federal aid, but by having confidence in America.

The city of Omaha, Omaha Chamber of Commerce, and Omaha AFL–CIO joined last week in inviting Labor Secretary Goldberg to visit Omaha and learn how a nondepressed area operates. Noting press reports of Secretary Goldberg's visits to depressed areas, these Omaha leaders believed it would be valuable for the Secretary also to visit an area that is enjoying good business, high employment, and vigorous planning and expansion to take care of the future needs of the area.

Certainly if there are lessons to be learned from tours of depressed areas, there must be more lessons to be learned from tours of prosperous areas.

I hope Secretary Goldberg will be able to visit the Omaha area personally. I know he would learn a great deal about how a city operates and how its people, businessmen, and labor representatives work together for the common good.

I would like to include now a copy of the letter addressed to Secretary Goldberg and signed by the mayor of Omaha, president of the Omaha Chamber of Commerce, and president of the Nebraska AFL–CIO:

HON. ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG,
Secretary of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GOLDBERG: Citizens of Omaha have been very gratified, but hardly surprised, to read recent reports from the U.S. Department of Labor describing our city as one of four balanced labor markets in the country. We had been well aware in Omaha that our economy was maintaining a generally prosperous level, and even improving in some sectors, while there was news of mounting unemployment and business slumps in many major cities.

We have noted with interest that you and representatives of your department have been visiting some of the designated depressed areas to gather information on the causes of the economic ailments which afflict them, with an eye toward finding possible cures.

As representatives of the city of Omaha, the business community, and the labor force, we feel that you and your investigators would find it equally valuable to study information on an area that is not depressed, that has succeeded in maintaining a favorable employment level and a confident spirit throughout this period of uncertainty in many industrial areas.

It is our opinion that Omaha's fortunate position at this time is the result of many factors. Among these are our diversified industrial economy, a business climate which has encouraged expansion of basic industries and development of a variety of new industries, a spirit of fairness and cooperation in labor-management relations which has given our city an enviable record of labor peace, a tax structure which has succeeded in providing needed Government services on a local level while giving rein to private initiative to solve local problems.

We were never more confident of Omaha's bright future, in terms of the period immediately ahead and for years to come, and it is our feeling that conditions here, created in part by circumstances but also through the vision and faith and integrity of our people, can be an inspiration if not a pattern for other communities in the United States.

The resources of the city of Omaha, the Omaha Chamber of Commerce, and the unions of the Omaha AFL–CIO are at the disposal of the Labor Department in assembling data for your study of economic problems of metropolitan cities.

If your busy schedule permits, we would welcome the chance to tell you our story personally in Omaha; if not, representatives of our city and our organizations would be happy to take our story to you in Washington. Communications on this matter can be addressed to Mr. Ralph E. Kiplinger of the Omaha Chamber of Commerce, 108 South 18th Street, Omaha, Nebr.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN ROSENBLATT,
Mayor, City of Omaha.
RALPH E. KIPLINGER,
President, Omaha Chamber of Commerce.
RICHARD NISLEY,
President, Nebraska AFL–CIO.

New England Council Requests White House Investigation of Residual Oil Quotas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a release by the New England Council for Economic Development at Boston, indicating that it has asked for an investigation by the White House of residual oil import restrictions and resulting increased fuel prices to the New England consumer:

WASHINGTON, April 9.—The New England Council announced today that it has asked the White House to conduct a full scale investigation of residual oil import restrictions and resulting increased fuel prices to the New England consumer.

The regional economic development organization petitioned the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization to restudy their original recommendations which resulted in Presi-

dent Eisenhower's March 1959 proclamation imposing mandatory quotas.

Charles W. Colson, Washington counsel for the New England group, said that "the new quota system announced by Secretary Udall last month is totally unsatisfactory. The Secretary of Interior has said that the new system is intended to permit an adequate supply of residual oil and that the quota would compensate between domestic production and domestic demand. This new system makes the existence of the quota program even more fruitless since it can no longer be said that the system is designed to limit imports.

"We think it is fair to ask why quotas should be imposed at all if they are no longer intended to restrict importation. Even more than before, the quota system is an artificial restriction on the normal competitive process and tends only to create monopolies in fuel oil distribution; its only result can be increased prices to the consumer."

The council's formal petition seeks removal of the mandatory quota system and asks for "an immediate investigation to determine the effect of the residual oil import program on the price of residual oil and other fuels in the East; and to determine the efficacy of the program with respect to the purpose for which it was established—to promote national security.

"We are convinced that an impartial study by the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization would demonstrate clearly that the residual oil restrictions have not fulfilled in any way the national security objectives of this proclamation, but rather have resulted only in increasing hardships to industry and consumers."

Nearly 1,000 in Orleans Learn Now, Pay Later

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, one of the grave problems confronting many high school graduates who desire college training is lack of money with which to do so.

Through the National Defense Education Act, our Government has helped many young Americans to meet their financial needs for a college education—particularly in the sciences and in engineering, but not limited to these fields. Mr. Robert N. Kelso, a reporter for the New Orleans (La.) States-Item, has written a very fine series of three articles dealing with the availability and the workings of federally financed student loans at New Orleans universities and colleges. Mr. Kelso describes what a particular American community is doing through its institutions of higher learning to aid well-deserving students to obtain university training.

With these thoughts in mind, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on consecutive days. Mr. Kelso's three articles which appeared late last month in the States-Item. The first article follows:

[From the New Orleans States-Item, Mar. 27, 1961]

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT CHIEF UNDERWRITER: NEARLY 1,000 IN NEW ORLEANS LEARN NOW, PAY LATER

(This is the first in a series of three articles dealing with the workings of federally financed student loans at New Orleans colleges and universities which help meet the current high cost of education.)

(By Robert N. Kelso)

Nearly 1,000 students are financing at least part of their college education in New Orleans on a "learn now—pay later" basis.

Chief underwriter of loans bolstering student pocketbooks is the Federal Government.

Congress in the summer of 1958 authorized a 4-year program to get more talent into and out of college through the National Defense Education Act.

Solons were spurred to action by the firing of Russia's Sputnik I on October 5, 1957, a scientific feat that brought searching analysis of the quality of American education.

The act was designed to "identify and educate more of the talent of our Nation" and to "insure trained manpower of sufficient quality and quantity to meet the national defense needs of the United States."

Special emphasis was given to training more and better teachers, and to turning out more engineers, scientists, mathematicians and experts in modern foreign languages to meet challenges this country faces in the space age.

Loans to needy and academically sound undergraduate and graduate students in colleges and universities are a key part of the program.

A total of some $295 million was to be pumped from Government coffers during the 4-year period ending June 30, 1962, into student loan funds administered by participating colleges and universities.

Expectations are the program will be continued beyond the expiration date of the National Defense Education Act.

Colleges struggling to help out needy students with their own heavily committed resources leaped at the offer to fatten loan funds.

Asked what their estimated needs for student loans were when the U.S. Office of Education began mapping operational plans for the program in the fall of 1958, 1,000-odd institutions came up with a total figure of $79 million.

Urged to whittle this figure, by the Office of Education, they pared the sum to $62 million.

But Congress had goofed. It had authorized spending of up to $47.5 million for the first year's operation of the student loan program, but wound up appropriating only $6 million.

The program, consequently, got off to a slow start. But it was in full swing by February 1959.

In New Orleans, Tulane University has asked for and received $250,000 annually—the top amount allowed any one institution—for the 2 years of full-scale operation.

Loyola University has funneled some $203,000 to needy students during the same period.

Lesser amounts—depending generally on the size of the school's full-time enrollment—have been parceled out by Dillard and Xavier Universities and St. Mary's Dominican College.

Louisiana State University in New Orleans has handled very little of this Federal money because the need for student loans at the lakefront facility is minimal.

LSUNO charges no tuition, and exacts annual fees totaling only $80. Ninety-six percent of its students live in the New Orleans area with parents or relatives, further cutting their expenses.

The student loans underwritten with Federal funds are far from signature only deals.

Participating schools take a hard look at the financial resources of the student and his parents.

They also scrutinize his academic accomplishments and capacity.

If the student is granted a loan it is no greater than needed to bridge the gap between what he can scrape together and what a year's attendance will cost him.

Under terms of the Federal law, a student may borrow no more than $1,000 in any academic year, for a total of $5,000.

Repayment of the loan starts 1 year after the student finishes school, and is paid back with 3 percent interest at a rate of 10 percent a year over a 10-year period.

Borrowers who become full-time elementary or high school teachers are exempted for repayment of up to 50 percent of the loan, plus interest, at the rate of 10 percent for each year of teaching.

Another easement is offered borrowers during periods of military service (or up to 3 years), or while they are attending an accredited college or university on a full-time basis.

No repayment on principal or interest is required during such period.

The college or university participating in this Federal student loan program has exclusive responsibility for selecting students who will receive the loans, for administering the program, and collecting the debt.

Each institution must put up $1 of its own money for every $9 it gets from the Government in the student loan program.

One fly in the ointment from the institution's standpoint—say local administrators—is that the Government so far hasn't put up a cent to help defray administrative costs. They fear these will run into substantial amounts when collections start on a large scale.

But they don't expect to lose money because of loan defaulters.

Tulane's student loan administrator, Dr. Joseph E. Gordon, says educational institutions with long experience in handling a big loan program for students find defaulters are rare birds.

"Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) has been in the big time loan business for about 20 years," Dr. Gordon said, "and they've found the bad debt writeoff to be about 2 percent."

The Reverend Father Robert L. Boggs, dean of students and loan administrator at Loyola, confirms this.

"The Government has made a study which shows that all institutions engaged in a loan program come up with gains because of the interest rate," Father Boggs said.

"There are a number of defaulters, but not enough to put anybody in the red."

Federal funds aren't the needy student's only hope.

There are also scholarships and part-time employment arranged by the school which can bolster student finances.

Some schools also arrange loans for students with big commercial finance companies offering low interest rates for such a purpose.

Beyond this, many schools have continued their own student loan programs alongside that underwritten by the Government.

Tulane, for example, lent out some $50,000 of its own money this year to graduate students, and provided some $10,000 from small endowments earmarked for loans to students needing emergency assistance.

A common practice at many institutions is to offer financial assistance in a "package" including loans, scholarships, and part-time jobs.

The applicant who proves his need may get help from any or all of these sources.

At Tulane, for example, an estimated one-third of its 4,500 full-time students are receiving some kind of financial assistance.

Dr. Gordon points out that 90 percent of the scholarships offered at Tulane are limited to tuition charges.

This still leaves a big gap for a student short of money.

A freshman at Tulane needs another $600 to meet expenses, says Dr. Gordon, "and a freshman normally can't make that much in a part-time job.

"If we just had tuition scholarships to offer," he added, "an impecunious student, even if he was the brightest boy in the world, couldn't come to Tulane."

The Aim and the Health of the American People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, we Americans owe an immense debt of gratitude to the physicians of this country. American medicine at its best has no equal anywhere in the world. We can indeed be proud of the dedicated men and women who are our doctors of medicine.

The organization which speaks for these physicians on matters of national concern is the American Medical Association. The American Medical Association has well served the health of the Nation in many areas of its activity. It is the American Medical Association which is in large part responsible for the development of standards and procedures for specialty certifications which contribute significantly to maintaining high quality medical care. The excellent training provided in our medical schools is a product of the American Medical Association's efforts to upgrade the quality of medical education to equal any in the world.

These facts make it all the more appalling to observe the role being played by the American Medical Association in the political and social sphere. The American Medical Association is in the midst of a campaign to distort the President's program to provide health benefits to the aged through social security. It is distorting the President's proposal beyond recognition and beyond the bounds of decency. I am convinced that the American Medical Association, when it does this, does not speak for the majority of informed American physicians. I suspect that a large number of doctors share the thoughts expressed by Samuel Standard, M.D., associate professor of clinical surgery, New York University. In the New York Times of February 26, he wrote:

When the American Medical Association leaves medicine, and enters into the field of economics, politics, and general sociology, our paths of thinking diverge. I cannot agree with the AMA's insistence that, despite the advances in the science of medicine, the methods by which it shall be distributed to society's needs must remain unchanged.

What is most distressing is that the American Medical Association's fight against a new way of financing the hospital and related care needed by the aged is but the latest in a long history of opposition to social progress. The extension of social security benefits to the disabled, the elimination of a means test in the Federal program for crippled children, Federal grants to the States for material and child welfare programs—and even voluntary health insurance—all of these were at one time bitterly and vigorously opposed by the American Medical Association. All of these measures are today in effect over the original opposition of the American Medical Association, and all of them have made life better for vast numbers of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to put into the RECORD the documented history of the American Medical Association, related to the points that I have mentioned, in the hope that knowledge of these facts will provide the Members of the Congress with some perspective to assist them in evaluating the current activities of the American Medical Association:

THE DOCUMENTED RECORD OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

1. OPPOSITION TO THE EXTENSION OF SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS TO THE DISABLED

American Medical Association bitterly opposed from 1948 to 1956 the extension of social security to provide cash benefits to the permanently and totally disabled at age 50. The American Medical Association cited this program, which was enacted in 1956 and which is in its 5th year of successful operation, as a serious threat to American medicine. The incalculable cost to the public which the American Medical Association foresaw has been so moderate that the Congress in 1960 found it possible to eliminate the age limitation without any increase in social security taxes.

Source: The house commended the following statement by Dr. F. J. L. Blasingame and recommended that each delegate bring it to the attention of his constituent association:

"The proposed amendment to the Social Security Act, embodied in H.R. 7225, which would establish a cash benefit under the Old Age and Survivors Insurance System for disabled beneficiaries beginning at age 50, constitutes a serious threat to American medicine. It is obviously one important step on the road to a system of complete Federal medical care. No government can long provide cash benefits as a right under a so-called social insurance system without eventually injecting itself into the physician-patient relationship. It will necessarily become a responsibility of government to regulate the medical care and the rehabilitative programs that are associated with the payment of the cash benefits. Because of this undesirable impact on medicine, the incalculable cost to the public, the inhibiting effect on the patients' will to be rehabilitated, and for other reasons which have been detailed in many communications to you from our Washington office and the committee on legislation, we have properly opposed this proposal and recommended that a careful nonpartisan study be made of disability as it relates to employability for the purpose of determining the best possible methods of conducting constructive programs in this area." (Official proceedings of the house of delegates, American Medical Association, June 1956: 18, 66, 67; Digest of Official Actions, 1846–1958, American Medical Association, p. 661.)

2. OPPOSITION TO THE ELIMINATION OF MEANS TEST IN CRIPPLED CHILDREN'S PROGRAM

The American Medical Association in 1953 called socialistic a Federal regulation requiring that State crippled children's services shall "provide that diagnostic services * * * will be made available * * * to any child (a) without charge, (b) without restriction or requirement as to the economic status of each child's family * * * and (c) without any requirement for the referral of such child by any individual or agency."

Source: The house of delegates adopted the following resolution from Indiana: Official proceedings of the house of delegates, American Medical Association, June 1953: 56, 61, 62; December 1953: 50, 90, 91:

"Whereas section 200.9 of part 12–4 of regulations for maternal and child health and crippled children's programs, entitled 'Crippled Children's Program; Diagnostic Services' states as follows: 'State plans for crippled children's services shall provide that diagnostic services under the plan will be made available within the area served by each diagnostic center to any child (a) without charge, (b) without restriction or requirement as to the economic status of each child's family or relatives or their legal residence, and (c) without any requirement for the referral of such child by any individual or agency: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the board of trustees work through whatever channels may be necessary to eliminate this section of the regulations, the same being a socialistic regulation." (Digest of Official Actions, 1846–1958, American Medical Association, pp. 90–91.)

3. EARLY OPPOSITION TO VOLUNTARY HEALTH INSURANCE

Until the American Medical Association, in the midst of its fight against a national health insurance program, was advised by public relations counsel to support voluntary health insurance, organized medicine had been a barrier to the development of voluntary plans. In December 1949 the Journal of the American Hospital Association commented editorially that "It is a sad fact that through the 1930's and early 1940's the American Medical Association did not believe in voluntary sickness insurance, did almost everything possible to prevent its development."

Source: The American Medical Association's defense of its early record on the prepayment issue is set forth in Dickinson, "A Brief History of the Attitude of the American Medical Association Toward Voluntary Health Insurance" (AMA Bureau of Medical Economics Research Bulletin No. 70, 1949). The American Hospital Association, an organization in a position to know, reacted skeptically to this document:

"Bulletin 70 sets out to prove that the American Medical Association has never opposed voluntary sickness insurance plans in this country as they exist today. It quotes many official statements between 1916 and 1938. It points out that the opposition expressed—and this was sometimes pretty vicious—was aimed at earlier types of plans, not at those currently in operation. This document is not wholly convincing to hospital and Blue Cross leaders whose experience dates back a few years. Nowhere in the selected quotes is there a genuine word of encouragement to voluntary plans, much less a sign of leadership. There are words of caution, of criticism, of fear and warning. There are no words of confidence in the pioneers of voluntary sickness insurance, no words of faith in the principle of prepayment, and not even a forthright statement that some way must be found to make medical and hospital services more widely available.

"It is a sad fact that through the 1930's and early 1940's, the American Medical Association did not believe in voluntary sickness insurance, and did almost everything

possible to prevent its development." (Editorial, "Hospitals," Journal of the American Hospital Association, December 1949, p. 60.)

"It is difficult to reconcile with actuality the popular fiction * * * that the American Medical Association has always fostered experimentation in voluntary prepayment plans. The fact is that the American Medical Association did nothing positive to encourage voluntary health insurance until the formation of associated medical care plans only a year ago, though in 1938 the house of delegates had enunciated certain principles approving voluntary hospitalization plans, reversing an action taken 5 years previously when the plans had been roundly condemned. During the early struggles of the plans, many State and county societies, far from aiding in their development, actually opposed them; and it is reported reliably that American Medical Association officers from time to time expressed consternation at their growing popularity. To Blue Cross executives, among others, the doctrinaire view crediting the American Medical Association with early sponsorship of experimental voluntary prepayment programs emerges as a simple untruth." (Medical Economics, February 1947, pp. 80, 84.)

4. LABELING OF OLD-AGE AND UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AS A STEP TOWARD EITHER COMMUNISM OR TOTALITARIANISM

Speaking in 1939, on behalf of the American Medical Association board of directors, Dr. Morris Fishbein stated that "a Federal security plan * * * will be the first step in the breakdown of American democracy." He went on to say that "Indeed, all forms of security, compulsory security, even against old-age, unemployment, represents a beginning invasion by the state into the personal life of the individual, represent a taking away of individual responsibility, a weakening of national caliber, a definite step toward either communism or totalitarianism."

Source: Dr. Fishbein, speaking to the annual conference of secretaries of Constituent State Medical Associations, held in the American Medical Association Building, Chicago, November 17–18, 1939, said:

"The introduction into this Nation of a Federal security plan whereby the Nation itself, as a Federal agency, will step intimately into the sickness and life of every person in the country, will be the first step in the breakdown of American democracy. Indeed, all forms of security, compulsory security, even against old age and unemployment, represent a beginning invasion by the state into the personal life of the individual, represent a taking away of individual responsibility, a weakening of national caliber, a definite step toward either communism or totalitarianism. The people of this country today have begun to awaken to the insidious approach of such new forms of government."

The speech which ends with these words, begins with a statement by Dr. Fishbein that "the board of trustees has asked me at this point to interpolate a statement relative to a proposed platform of the association * * *." It appeared in the Journal of the American Medical Association under the heading "The Platform of the American Medical Association." (Journal of the American Medical Association vol. 113, No. 27, p. 2428, Dec. 30, 1939.)

5. OPPOSITION TO FEDERAL GRANTS FOR MATERNAL AND CHILD WELFARE PROGRAMS

In 1930 the American Medical Association condemned the principle of the Sheppard-Towner Act, granting Federal funds to appropriate State health agencies to reduce the death rate among mothers and children, as unsound in policy, wasteful and extravagant, unproductive of results, and tending to promote communism.

Source: The house of delegates approved the following resolutions and requested the board of trustees to initiate a movement to enlist every member of the medical profession to carry into effect the policy defined in these resolutions. (Official proceedings of the house of delegates, American Medical Association, June 1930: Pp. 35, 40, 41:

"Resolved, That the house of delegates of the American Medical Association condemns as unsound in policy, wasteful and extravagant, unproductive of results and tending to promote communism, the Federal subsidy system established by the Sheppard-Towner Maternity and Infancy Act and protests against the revival of that system in any form;

"Resolved, That it is the sense of the house of delegates that each State should be left free to formulate its own health programs, with the coperation of the U.S. Public Health Service if desired by the State, free from any inducement or compulsioh in the way of Federal reward or coercion;

"Resolved, That any legislation involving cooperation between the Federal Government and the several States in the field of public health must, in the interest of efficiency and economy, in the judgment of the house of delegates, be administered under the joint supervision and control of the U.S. Public Health Service and the State health authoritites." (Digest of Official Actions, 1846–1958, American Medical Association, p. 92.)

Hiring the Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1961

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the employment of handicapped people is a cause which should be championed by every fair-minded American. It is inspiring to know that this cause is vigorously supported in Oklahoma, and that our State has an effective program in this field.

In that program, one of the greatest influences operating in our State is the Oklahoma State Technical College in Okmulgee, which was recently saluted in an honor winning essay by Pat Deatherage of Okmulgee.

With pride in this high school student's achievement, as well as in the cause and the institution which are saluted, I am commending to the attention of my colleagues this essay, "Jobs for the Handicapped":

JOBS FOR THE HANDICAPPED—A COMMUNITY CHALLENGE

(By Pat Deatherage)

A challenge is something which offers real opposition to one's mind and body. Getting employers to realize the importance of hiring the handicapped is such a challenge. Breaking down old prejudices and replacing them with modern principles is many times an opposition to the mind which is almost overpowering.

Hiring the handicapped is our challenge, which we must meet if we expect the people of our Nation to be happy. But, what must we do to meet this challenge? First of all, we must educate ourselves with facts about the handicapped; what is being done to help them and what has already been done. Then we can present sound reasons to other people in persuading them to hire the handicapped.

Many times in talking with our friends, we may have a chance to put our education to work. For instance, a friend makes the remark that he would not hire a handicapped worker because a handicapped worker would not be as productive as other workers. If we can show our friend actual facts and figures which show that, quite often, the handicapped worker is more productive and efficient, and is a safer worker on the job than able workers, we may be able to change our friend's mind. If our friend will think about it, he will realize that it would only be natural for the handicapped to work a little harder on his job. The handicapped worker knows that he has to keep the job he has because another one may be hard to find. This tends to make him more productive and efficient. He also knows what it means to be handicapped, and this may tend to make him a safer worker than an able worker who does not realize how terrible a handicap may be.

It is also up to us, as a community, to see to it that the places of business have certain devices which will enable a handicapped worker to work there. By this, I mean, that the businesses should be equipped with elevators and ramps instead of stairs so that workers in wheelchairs can work there. When these businesses install the ramps and elevators, they will find that they are really helping themselves as much as they are helping the handicapped. They will receive goods returns from the handicapped worker in the form of efficient and productive work.

We should feel a definite responsibility for helping the handicapped. Wouldn't it be better to help them to help themselves than to pay taxes to support them when they don't want our help in the form of welfare? These people can be happy only when they feel they are a part of our society. So shouldn't we try to help them be a part by giving them an equal chance to work as normal people do? We must strive to make all our people happy, so, as a nation, we can stand united in the face of danger. We should also stop to think that some of these handicapped people may have received their handicaps while fighting for our country. Could we, as human beings, shove these individuals into a corner and just forget them when they have given so much for us? Likewise, we should also feel a responsibility for other handicapped people. Could the reason for their being handicapped be attributed to us? Was the car accident our fault in which the young girl lost her legs? Did we mean to check that piece of machinery to see if it was safe and just forgot to do it, and then someone lost a hand or arm because we forgot? We need not feel as guilty about being the cause of a person being handicapped as we should about not doing something about it.

Another reason we just can't forget these people is that they may be an inspiration for others. To see a blind girl holding a typist's position, or a man without legs doing the job of a draftsman, may be the inspiration needed by some other handicapped person who just needs a little push to make him have faith in life once again. It may also make able workers try just a little harder when they see how well some handicapped workers do their jobs.

Helping the handicapped to help themselves should give us a lift, too. Although we may never realize the thrill the handicapped worker gets when he can buy his family the things which they need with his own hard-earned money, we can realize the thrill of knowing that we have been even a small part in making someone else very happy.

In our own community we are very fortunate to have a trade school which has a rehabilitation center. I am referring to Oklahoma State Technical College in Okmulgee, Okla. At the rehabilitation center, the han-

dicapped are given therapeutic treatments, and at the same time they can learn a trade at which they can work with their particular kind of disability. The State aids the handicapped financially so that all handicapped people can attend and not just a few of them. This kind of center is one of the most wonderful opportunities for handicapped that there can be. People from all parts of the country come to the Oklahoma State Tech Rehabilitation Center to learn a trade so they can lead a normal, self-subsistent life.

If our community and all the communities in our Nation will realize the importance of hiring the handicapped and then meet the challenge which is put before them, our people will become a happier people, and our Nation will become more prosperous and united.

Wisconsin Loses Four Electric Co-op Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, a tragic car-truck collision at Mount Pleasant, Tex., took the lives of four of Wisconsin's outstanding rural electrification leaders. Killed in the accident were H. O. Melby, Mr. and Mrs. N. F. Leifer, all of Westby, Wis., and Elmer T. Smith, La Farge, Wis.

In addition to helping organize Vernon Electric Co-op and Wisconsin Electric Co-op, Mr. Melby served as president of these cooperatives for many years. Mr. Leifer was manager of Vernon Electric Co-op since 1937, and his wife shared his intense and active interest in a forward-looking rural electrification program. Mr. Smith was treasurer of Vernon Electric Co-op. All found time to be active in civic affairs in their communities.

As the Madison Capital Times observed in an editorial:

Without people of this stature, REA would never have become the great instrument of service it is for the farmers of this Nation.

Wisconsin and the Nation are better for the fact that they lived, and have been made poorer by their deaths.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD two articles from the Wisconsin REA News about the lives and deaths of these public-spirited citizens:

DEATH AT A PLACE CALLED PLEASANT

It had been such a pleasant affair, this 19th annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. For the first time in many years, apprehension over frowns from the White House was absent. Instead there was enthusiasm over a statement from the Department of Agriculture that revealed a belief in the same principles which NRECA members had been advocating for many years. There was also enthusiasm over the man President Kennedy had designated to be the next Administrator of REA—Norman Clapp, of Wisconsin. Those in Dallas from his home State were very proud of him.

For everyone, and for Wisconsinites in particular, it had been the most enjoyable meeting in the history of NRECA.

But four persons from Wisconsin were destined never to get their enjoyment out of Texas.

The first news of the tragedy in Wisconsin was as terse as a police report. Some heard it via radio, others read it: "Four persons from Wisconsin were killed Thursday night when a truck-tractor skidded on wet pavement and crashed into the station wagon in which they were riding. The Texas department of public safety identified the dead as Norbert F. Leifer, 55, of Westby; his wife, Violet M. Leifer, 52; Helmer O. Melby, 72, of Westby; and Elmer T. Smith, 52, La Farge. The driver of the truck, Lloyd D. Lowe, of Iowa Park, Tex., was injured."

The impact of the news was not immediate because the names played tricks. Norbert F., Violet H., Helmer O. * * * could it possibly be Lefty, Pat, and H. O.? People called newspapers and radio stations for verification of the names, hoping perhaps for a mistake, but there was none. It was enormous truth.

Subsequent newspaper editions unfolded more of it. The ill-fated four had been heading east from Dallas on the road to Texarkana when a big truck, headed west, swerved into their lane to avoid another vehicle which had stopped in front of the truck to make a right turn. The station wagon from Wisconsin was smashed almost beyond recognition and four lives were ended there on the highway near a town called Mount Pleasant.

PERSONAL MEMORIES

(By Les Nelson)

When life ends for people dear to you, your mind reaches back beyond death for memories that suddenly stand out against the black curtain of today like precious cameos. Yesterday these memories were lost in the blur of current action; today they are so sharp and clear and prominent that even tears cannot blur them.

Everyone who knew Lefty and Pat Leifer, H. O. Melby and Elmer Smith is the possessor of such memories. Some will be able to discuss them with their friends, others will remain silent because voices break at times like this. A typewriter, less likely to fail, is a friend through which I can relay the memories made silent by the tragic anticlimax to last month's NRECA annual meeting. These are foremost among the many memories, some of them shared with others, some of them mine alone:

Last summer's pilgrimage with Lefty Leifer, Cliff Hooverson, and Harvey Schermerhorn to the Crawford County apple tree under which this publication was started 20 years ago. Lefty Leifer had been the first to see the importance of rural electrification publications and had published one of his own before he helped launch the Wisconsin REA News. The postal permit under which this publication is mailed was originally obtained for Vernon Electric Co-op by Lefty Leifer.

Although our purpose that day was to look back at history, Lefty characteristically looked ahead. He asked again the question he had asked so many times during the past several years: When are you going to print offset?

Lefty Leifer was the first and most active advocate of printing this publication by the modern offset method rather than letterpress. The decision to do just that was made during his lifetime, but the first issue printed by the new method will not be out until July or August.

The day in May 1953 when I first met Lefty and Pat. It was my first day on the job as a member of the REA News staff; in fact I had not yet been assigned a desk. Ten minutes after I walked in the door of the News office I was on my way to Westby. The Leifers treated me like an old friend and instilled in me a conviction I have never lost; that there is no better way to spend one's life than in this business of cooperative rural electrification. Later I learned that to visit Vernon Electric Co-op was traditional first assignment for REA News staff members. Jim Sullivan's first assignment was a trip to Westby. The same was true of Dick Priebe, and 2 years ago the tradition was passed on to Walt Seaborg. To go to Westby was the best possible way for a man to start off on the right foot.

The time in the fall of 1957 when I traveled to the NRECA regional meeting at Springfield, Ill., with Lefty, Pat, and H. O. Melby. I remember so many things about that trip—where we stopped to eat, what we talked and laughed about. But especially I remember the incident of the hotel keys on our way back to Wisconsin.

Mr. Melby had shared his room with me in the hotel at Springfield. About an hour out of Springfield, while talking about the World Series which had ended during the meeting with a Braves victory, Pat mentioned that the Braves players would certainly get the keys to the city when they returned to Milwaukee. This prompted me to search my pockets, where I found my hotel room key. Then Mr. Melby searched his pockets and found another key to the same room. He laughed uproariously and I laughed with him. It gave me great pleasure to share a small weakness with a man of so many great strengths.

The time I first met Elmer Smith. Lefty introduced us, and Mr. Smith in that tall, quiet, and sincere way of his, invited me to drop in to see him next time I was in the La Farge area. I promised that I would, a promise which this day I am sorry I never kept.

Then Lefty, talking through a grin to Mr. Smith, said "I hope you realize you are one privileged character as far as the REA News is concerned. Remember that picture they had of you in the paper a couple of months ago after you were elected to the board? Remember when that picture was taken at the annual meeting? I was shaking hands with you. Well, you saw what they did with the picture—they cropped me off and left you on."

"Well," replied Mr. Smith, who was 3 years younger than Lefty, "maybe they didn't want any youngsters like you in the picture."

I wasn't sure what they were joking about at the time because I hadn't been the one who took the picture and cropped it. I made a mental note to look for it but didn't find that note until tragedy sharpened my memory. Then I found the picture and wanted it and all of it and more.

New Britain Surgeon Back From "Hope" Tour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, there recently appeared in the Hartford Courant, my district, a story of Dr. Paul Tisher, a New Britain surgeon who is back from serving 2 months aboard the hospital ship *Hope* in Indonesia.

Dr. Tisher's story is an encouraging one of what can be accomplished through people-to-people contacts, such

as President Kennedy's Peace Corps hopes to accomplish in other areas. The story of the *Hope*, and what it is doing, should be of interest to all of us and I commend it to the attention of the House.

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Courant, Mar. 19, 1961]

NEW BRITAIN SURGEON BACK FROM "HOPE" TOUR

Dr. Paul Tisher, a New Britain eye surgeon who returned home this week after serving 2 months aboard the *Hope*, says the friendliness of the Indonesian people toward the American doctors and nurses extended from the bottom to the top of society.

President Sukarno received Dr. Tisher and his associates at the presidential palace in Djakarta and talked with them for an hour "in fluent English." Tisher said, "Sukarno couldn't have been nicer."

The people of Ambon held a party for the Americans in the school building, and at Makassar in the Celebes Islands families came as many as 200 miles through hill country to see the ship. In every port the piers were jammed with sightseers.

THE "HOPE'S" MISSION

The mission of the *Hope* is primarily to teach, Dr. Tisher says. More can be accomplished by teaching local doctors than by treating patients.

At one port he said, the local Chinese eye doctor told him 300 patients needed treatment. Dr. Tisher, who was accustomed to seeing about 50 patients in one morning, thought the workload a light one until he learned the 300 on the list were blind. The Chinese doctor was a thoroughly competent man, but he had been away from the centers of modern teaching for so long he did not know how to operate on cataracts.

In a few days Dr. Tisher and the local surgeon performed as many operations as possible, starting with younger patients and working through the list. They did not finish, but when Tisher left the Chinese could remove cataracts himself. Dr. Tisher's work in that village, and the work of the *Hope*, will continue. It is teaching which pays the greatest dividends, Dr. Tisher says.

PEOPLE TO PEOPLE

"The *Hope* is divorced completely from from military or government contact," Tisher told the Courant. "It is part of the People to People Health Foundation. The American people are sending American doctors, nurses and technicians to other parts of the world as teachers and ambassadors. And we learn as much from the Indonesian doctors as they learn from us." By and large Indonesian doctors are very capable. Their only handicap is being removed from teaching centers.

In their country infectious diseases, malnutrition, malaria, leprosy and tuberculosis are widespread, mainly as a result of poverty and certain unhygienic habits.

The country is progressing rapidly, using its own energy and resources as well as outside help. The Universities of California and Kentucky are assisting medical schools in Indonesia to expand their programs and improve their methods. "There are three good medical schools in Indonesia." Dr. Tisher said. In one of them "every member of the faculty will be American-trained when the University of Kentucky completes its program there in 3 years. And they will all be under 40 years of age."

Tisher concludes, "We are one step ahead of the Russians there. Our diplomacy is extremely effective."

WITCH DOCTORS

Alluding to the unhygienic habits of some of the Indonesians, Dr. Tisher said that in interior sections some witch doctors are still practicing; but the local doctors do not fight them. "They work with them, because the witch doctors do a certain amount of good with their herbs."

The universities are graduating about 100 doctors a year, with every prospect of increasing the number. And Tisher emphasized, "They are good doctors." The trouble is the enormity of their job. In an American city a doctor might operate 5 or 6 times in 1 day—and that would be a hard day's work—but in Indonesia 20 or 30 operations are sometimes necessary in a day.

One doctor, a permanent member of the *Hope's* medical staff, said the need is so great the ship could remain in Indonesia for years to come. The people are to erect a hospital in Djakarta to be staffed with American doctors. The cost of such a project is great. Operating expenses of even one hospital ship, the *Hope*, are $3.5 million per year, and all the money comes from private contributions within the United States.

The need is so tremendous and the obstacles so large, Dr. Tisher says, that the *Hope's* staff sometimes wonder whether the effort is worthwhile. "The morale of the ship fluctuates," he said.

Dr. Tisher was asked what was his answer to the question, "Is it worthwhile?" He said, "I have to wait and see. There is no immediate answer" in a long-term effort like this.

One index of effectiveness is that during his 2 months aboard the *Hope* Dr. Tisher trained three Indonesian doctors in up-to-date methods. He recalls talking about glaucoma with one doctor from 9 a.m. to 3 p.m.

One afternoon an Indonesian doctor, a member of the permanent staff of the *Hope*, talked to us directly from the heart. He explained patience was necessary in working in the Orient, where obstacles are overwhelming. The speaker cheered his listeners, and there was a visible change in morale aboard ship.

In every port the piers were jammed with sightseers.

"They wanted to see the ship," Dr. Tisher said, "and they also heard we were giving out ice cream.

"And we were."

Some Budget Director

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Appropriations Committee, I am impressed with editorials appearing in the March 29 and 30 issues of the Chicago Tribune. Evidently the Harvard brain trusters think the New Frontier has unlimited boundaries. The editorials referred to follow:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Mar. 29, 1961]

Congress has listened to a lot of people spout a lot of economic nonsense, but surely it has never heard such concentrated nonsense come from a Director of the Budget as it did on Monday.

David Bell, who holds this position under Mr. Kennedy, appeared before the Joint Economic Committee to explain the Kennedy budget for 1962. He told the members what was already common knowledge: that the balanced budgets planned by Mr. Eisenhower for this year and next are out of date; that this year will end up with a deficit of about $2.2 billion, and that an even greater deficit is likely for 1962.

The Director of the Budget doesn't seem to be the least perturbed by all this deficit spending. On the contrary, he told the committee members that Federal outlays would be expected to climb steadily in the years ahead. He said that a consistent effort to balance the budget would be not only extremely difficult, but positively harmful. He said that deficits this year and next are clearly essential to economic recovery and won't lead to any significant inflation. And he said there is no use hoping for a decline in Federal spending unless there is a substantial reduction in armament.

To cap it all, he says that it would be a serious error to reject public spending programs simply because we cannot afford them.

What does Mr. Bell think the budget is? Most people think of it as something to live within. Historically it is based on the amount of money available to spend; the word itself, centuries ago, meant "wallet." The British Government still opens the budget.

Our Bureau of the Budget was established in 1921 in response to protests that the Government was living beyond its means. It was designed to fix responsibility for a sound fiscal policy. In 1939 it was made an independent office under the President, but the law still says that its studies and reports are to be made with a view of securing greater economy and efficiency in the conduct of the public service.

Here we have a Director of the Budget saying, in effect, that the budget should not stop anybody from spending what he wishes to spend. The agent who is expected to stand up against the extravagance of his colleagues (as Mr. Stans often did, to their discomfiture) is actually promoting extravagance. If the Budget Bureau is to become a spineless tool of the spenders, we would be much better off without either it or its Director.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Mar. 30, 1961]

The second section of Mr. Kennedy's budget, dealing with defense expenditures, discloses that he has upped Mr. Eisenhower's proposed spending on the Military Establishment by $700 million for the coming fiscal year. Coupled with Kennedy's proposals last week for nondefense spending, the combined budget is $3.4 billion higher than the $80.9 billion in spending recommended by the outgoing Republican administration.

Whereas Mr. Eisenhower had anticipated an estimated $1.5 billion surplus in revenue, Mr. Kennedy is reconciled to a deficit of at least $2.8 billion. The probability is that the deficit will be much larger than that, with spending both on nondefense and defense items destined to continue rising in the years ahead. All this is in prospect although Mr. Kennedy's conceded total spending in the fiscal year starting July 1 will hit just short of $85 billion, far and away a record for any peacetime year and a figure exceeded only in two of the World War II years.

The largest increases in spending are in the welfare categories of the nondefense budget, where Kennedy has added $3.2 billion, about 4½ times the increase for defense. As we suggested when, for the first time in American governmental practice, the revised budget was submitted in two installments, it is as is nondefense items bore no relationship to defense spending or to aggregate spending. The apparent intention was to confuse the people.

The result is what has been described as a fiscal fable and a confused apology for a deliberate program of deficit spending. In a recession and facing a troubled world situation, with an imminent threat of war, Kennedy proceeds unconcernedly as if there were no need to husband resources through fiscal discipline.

"We can afford," he says, "to do what must be done, publicly and privately, up to the

limit of our economic capacity—a limit we have not even approached for several years."

This is a statement that, although yesterday has failed to provide for today, tomorrow may be trusted to bring out today's improvidence all even. Things are to balance over the years of the business cycle—a theory that has been applied for 30 years and has yet to prove itself. Publicly—that is, by Government—Kennedy may think the country can afford anything. But if every citizen set out to govern his private affairs by the same standard, the Nation would be one vast and continuous sheriff's sale.

Department of Agriculture Has Positive Attitude on Farm Credit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the current attitudes and actions in the U.S. Department of Agriculture are refreshing and encouraging not only because they are positive, but because they are rooted in optimism and determination.

In the field of farm credit, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman recently had this comment:

> To the extent that farm loan policies and available funds can prevent it, no qualified family farmer will be required to give up farming because of his inability to finance his 1961 operations.

The Secretary at that time asked the Farmers Home Administration of the Department to review its regulations and take every step within its authority to meet farm credit needs. The Secretary's request accompanied action by the President making an additional $35 million available for farm operating loans during the 1961 fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, over the past 9 years, declining farm prices and income have caused many beginning and other farmers to exhaust their normal sources of credit. This is a poor time to throw upon the labor market families which can, through loans and guidance enabling them to achieve full utilization of earning resources, continue in a way of life they know and love.

It is the intention of the administration, working in cooperation with the Congress and the farmers of our Nation, to reverse the downward farm income trend so our efficient family farmers can earn and get a parity of income. Secretary Freeman has said:

> When the new farm program becomes effective, these family-type farmers will again be good commercial credit risks. It would be unthinkable to allow many efficient farm families to give up the struggle now because they are unable to obtain credit needed to finance 1961 operations.

The Farmers Home Administration's broadened look at the credit needs of small farmers does not mean individuals will be financed beyond ability to pay—but it does mean that problems will not be allowed to overshadow potentials. The revised loan eligibility requirements give increased consideration to young farmers who in the future will be able to obtain additional land and other resources, and to young and middle-aged farmers who may be able to obtain off-farm income in the future. The operating loans are made for purchase of livestock and equipment, for fertilizer, tractor fuel, feed, and other essential farm and home operating needs, and to refinance chattel debts. The loans are scheduled for repayment in accordance with borrowers' abilities, over periods not exceeding 7 years.

Mr. Speaker, experience has shown that Farmers Home Administration loans do not result in increased expenditures by the Federal Government, because borrowers have an outstanding repayment record.

Secretary Freeman and the Department of Agriculture deserve appreciation for their recognition of a genuine social and economic need in the field of credit, and their constructive attitude and actions in meeting it.

Some Guideposts for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, today the eyes of all Americans are rightly focused upon our educational system, and the need for its improvement wherever possible.

In a recent edition of an Oklahoma daily newspaper, attention was directed to some of the genuine virtues of the educational system of the Cherokee Nation, as that system operated in Indian territory before it became the State of Oklahoma.

In the middle of the 19th century, the Cherokees National Male Seminary and Female Seminary at Tahlequah began making a great contribution to the culture and progress of this great people.

We could learn a lot today from an examination of the operation of those seminaries, more than 100 years ago.

In the Tulsa Tribune of March 22, 1961, the Tribune's correspondent, Frosty Troy, summed up the story of the Cherokees educational system in this way:

CHEROKEES HAD RIGOROUS SCHOOLING—CATALOG OF TAHLEQUAH SEMINARIES REVEALS STERN DISCIPLINES

(By Frosty Troy)

"Morality and knowledge being necessary to good government, the preservation of liberty and happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged in this nation."

These words are found in the constitution of the Cherokee Nation, once the wellspring of educated red men whose profound effect upon Oklahoma affairs is still felt today.

The educational system of the Cherokees set them apart from other Indians, and from their lofty eminence they produced intellectuals, politicians and poets who had a hand in shaping the destiny of the 46th State.

The Cherokee thirst for knowledge led to the founding of the National Male Seminary and Female Seminary at Tahlequah in 1850.

Both institutions brought honor and fame to the Cherokees at a time when the white man's educational opportunities on the American frontier were primitive. The Cherokees were undoubtedly far in advance of their white neighbors in matters of education.

An old "Catalogue of the Cherokee Male Seminary" rests in the archives of the University of Oklahoma, and it contains the key to the success of the seminaries under the title of "Daily Programme." The schedule:

Students rise 5:30 a.m.; study hall 6–7 a.m.; breakfast and detail 7–8:30 a.m.; chapel service 8:30–9 a.m.; recitations 9–12 a.m.; recess 12m.–2 p.m.; recitation 2–4 p.m., military drill 4:15 to 4:45 p.m.; supper 5 p.m.; study hall 6:45–8:45 p.m.; first bell to retire 9 p.m.; final bell 9:15 p.m.

There was no beadwork, leathercraft or pottery in a Cherokee school. The male and female seminaries taught metaphysics, ancient languages, higher mathematics, natural sciences, English, history, music, military tactics, and domestic courses for the girls.

There were no fraternities or sororities, and all students, rich or poor, took turn washing dishes and waiting on tables, plus handling chores such as sweeping and cutting wood.

Students took turns reading at meals, sometimes from books, generally from the news of the day and the literary articles of magazines.

"The object being to stimulate reading and conversation upon current topics," the catalog said.

The institutions were nonsectarian, but this did not mean they were nonreligious. Moral training, the founders agreed, was every bit as important as Latin and Greek.

To make free time interesting, the Male Seminary built a greenhouse and stocked it with the finest in common and rare specimens of flowers and plants.

The catalog also explained the philosophy of discipline: "Correct teaching is one mode of discipline. Discipline itself is a great educational process. The well disciplined alone are well educated. Discipline can add nothing to the mental or moral capacities; but can bring them under such a process of training as to develop the latent energies of the mind and body, and direct them to a course of right action, so that the future citizen and law giver may be fitted for his great work."

By keenly selecting the students to attend the seminaries, the Cherokee Nation was able to produce leaders of unparalleled stature in Indian territory.

Not many decades after the schools were founded, one of the Nation's leaders boasted: "In no other country can such advantages be found in a first-class institution. The Cherokee Nation is not excelled by any other country in the inducements offered the youth."

During the Civil War, both seminaries were demolished, but the undaunted Cherokees rebuilt. It took the influx of white men to finally bring about the deterioration and eventual closing of the seminaries.

The Cherokees were a people who relied heavily on strict tribal discipline, but their young people were no match for the temptations of the settlers. Whisky, broadcloth, and trinkets and redistribution of Indian territory lands by the great white father eventually brought poverty and ruin to the Cherokee Nation.

When the Russians dazzled the world by sending the first sputnik aloft, an agonizing reappraisal of the American educational system was touched off.

Parents and educators began to discuss whether courses such as driver's training, home economics for boys, golf, personality development, and similar courses were really

necessary in the public schools and universities.

There was a hue and cry for hard education—math, science, languages, history, English—the type of educational process the Cherokee Nation had honed to a sharp degree on these very plains over a hundred years ago.

Former House Page in December 1887, When 10½ Years of Age, Writes Congressman Clyde Doyle of His Page Experiences and Recollections—He Writes at 83 Years of Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I herewith present the text of a letter written to me recently by Mr. E. L. Conklin, Compton, Calif. Mr. Conklin was born June 25, 1877, and became a page in the House of Representatives when he was a few days less than 10½ years of age: to wit, in December 1877.

In writing this letter to me he knew that my eldest grandson, Danny Doyle Stanton, is now a House page. I mention this because at the close of his letter he mentions Danny.

Historical comments and personal experiences of this senior American citizen who, as he says, was "stationed on the Republican side," will be of very great interest to all who read.

I am sure you, Mr. Speaker, and all my distinguished colleagues join me in thanking this distinguished American, Mr. E. L. Conklin, for writing this letter to me.

Supplementing his letter to me is a letter to me from his daughter, who is mentioned in his own remarks:

COMPTON, CALIF., *February 24, 1961.*

HON. CLYDE DOYLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DOYLE: Complying with suggestion in your letter of February 14 addressed to my daughter, Mrs. Mildred C. Specht, I will endeavor to give a brief résumé of my experiences and impressions gained as a page in the House during the 50th, 51st, and 1st session of the 52d Congresses. I hope it may be of some interest to your grandson.

I was born on June 25, 1877, so upon assuming the duties of a page on the first Monday in December 1887, I was a few days less than 10½ years old, which was about 4 years younger than the next youngest boy. I was informed that I was the youngest to serve up to the time I was appointed. Whether there have been any boys who have served at a younger age since then I would not know.

My father was a veteran of the Civil War, serving under Generals U. S. Grant and Geo. G. Meade in the Army of the Potomac. He contracted typhoid-malaria during the campaign in the Virginia swamps, a fever which recurred each year with increasing intensity and longer duration, finally to the extent that he could not hold a job in private industry. Incidentally my father is buried in Arlington National Cemetery and upon visiting there 2 years ago, I found the marking on the headstone to be quite legible.

As was customary in those days, a committee from the Geo. G. Meade Post, GAR, of which my father had b[illegible] member, investigated our financial [illegible]on and obtained my appointment [illegible]ge. You may or may not know tha[illegible]hat time the GAR was a very powerful organization, politically stronger than veteran groups of more recent days. I trust you will understand that I have to go into so much detail regarding myself in order to explain why I received the appointment at such an early age.

There were, as I recall, 30 page boys; I was No. 28 and still have my badge "Page 28, H.R." We lined up in the lobby at 10 a.m. for rollcall; as there was no page school at that period, some of the intervening time until 12 noon when the House convened was spent placing in the file of the Congressmen's desks the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the previous day. The pages then took their places on the carpeted steps leading on either side to the Speaker's rostrum; the one in front answering a summons (the Representative signaling by clapping his hands) and the one returning from an errand taking his place at the end of the line.

It so happened that during my entire service on the floor of the House I was stationed on the Republican side. The 50th Congress was fairly serene although there would occasionally be a waving of the "bloody shirt" which would call forth some vituperative exchanges of language. My service during the 50th Congress was very limited due partly to my youth which gave the other pages an opportunity for teasing and it didn't help that my mother had enrolled me as "Bertie" when I much preferred being called Bert (actually my real name is Egbert Hopkins Conklin). I finally became fed up and suddenly hit one of my tormentors, unfortunately at an inappropriate time—directly after the House had been called to order—and place, center of the main aisle directly in line with the Speaker where I was standing awaiting the Chaplain's invocation.

Captain Chauncey who occupied a position of authority between the chief page and the Doorkeeper, doubtful of my promise to engage in no more fisticuffs and of the pledges of the others to behave, transferred me to the Press Gallery. However, I didn't remain there long as I naively repeated in my mother's hearing, some stories the reporters told and at her request (poor Captain Chauncey) was transferred to the ladies' reception room. I was the only page on duty there and was under the supervision of Captain Cunningham, titled the "Card Writer." He would write the lady caller's name on a card which I would take into the Member she desired to see. Now I must inject a personal incident into this already lengthy account. Early in my ladies' reception room duty I took a card in to a certain Member who, after looking at the card said "Tell her I'm not in." I was speechless for a minute for I had been trained to never lie; then I asked him to rise and I would report that he was "not in his seat." I mentioned this for I had occasion to use the same tactics on many occasions and believe I established a precedent as on a visit to Washington several years later I sat in the visitor's gallery, saw a page come in and hand a card to a Congressman who rose from his seat and handed the card back to the page.

The 51st Congress, Republican, was anything but serene. Thomas B. Reed of Maine was the Speaker and was known as Czar Reed. He had a heavy, raspy voice and was the most sarcastic man in public life; also the fact that he had held the House in continuous session for 3 days and nights, doors locked, in order to defeat a Democratic filibuster, helped earn the appellation. It was during this extended session that Representative Kilgore of Texas achieved passing fame for kicking down a door and striding out.

The Doorkeeper was our boss and under him were Captain White, a one-armed Confederate veteran on the Democratic side, and Captain Chauncey, a Federal veteran, on the Republican side. The men who actually were Doorkeepers serving both the doors to the House floor and the galleries, were all disabled veterans with one or more limbs missing. Indeed many of the Representatives themselves were disabled especially on the Democratic side, the South having "scraped the barrel" to maintain their army. There were also many military titles from major on up, so much so in fact that Representative Allen, of Mississippi gloried in the title "Private John Allen."

While I was reared in a northern, Republican family (where Democrats were usually spoken of as "rebels" or "copperheads") I had many more friendships among the affable and considerate Democratic Congressmen.

Awed and impressed as I was on my first day as a page, as I think every young man must be on his first day, I think the most impressive occurrence I have ever witnessed was the funeral for Chief Justice Waite, of the U.S. Supreme Court. The President and his Cabinet were there in the House Chamber, members of the Supreme Court, the Senate, the members of the diplomatic corps in their brilliant uniforms—I particularly recall the Chinese and Japanese Ambassadors in their richly embroidered uniforms—and the galleries filled with the wives and families of the statesmen. But the one whose appearance really thrilled me was Gen. Philip Sheridan, then commanding General of the Army who was the particular hero of my father and his veteran friends. The Commanding Admiral of the Navy was also there with his staff, in dress uniform as was General Sheridan and his staff. I wish I could recall the eulogy and by whom delivered for I remember it as being a masterpiece, even to my young ears.

Of course there were tedious times too during long debates but these were far outweighed by the exciting times as, for instance when Wm. F. Cody with his full-dress Indian chieftains talked to us all and gave us his autograph and Henry Stanley of Livingston fame addressed the House.

Should Danny have the patience to wade through this, he may possibly be entertained by contrasting a page's life in 1887 with that of 1961.

I should like to add that while I am not a constituent of yours, my district (the 15th) also has a very capable Representative, HARLAN HAGEN.

I appreciate your interest and should you see fit to answer am staying for the winter with my daughter Mrs. Specht, 704 South Ward Avenue, Compton.

Very truly yours,

E. H. CONKLIN.

COMPTON, CALIF., *February 24, 1961.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DOYLE: I am happy that my father complied with your wishes—he did the writing and I typed it for him. I thought you might be interested in seeing this snapshot of him and my mother, though it was taken before she passed away 7 years ago. Unfortunately more recent pictures are slides which we haven't yet made prints of. I would appreciate it very much if you would return this picture.

Very truly yours,

MRS. MILDRED C. SPECHT.

A Good Omen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Walter Trohan's column, "Report From Washington," in the March 28 issue of the Chicago Tribune, pointed up some interesting and heartening developments among the young people of America. I wish to insert this article in the RECORD as follows:

A GOOD OMEN

WASHINGTON, March 28.—A strange and heartening movement is developing among the young people of America—those on college campuses and those who are making their way in the world.

Youth is in revolt, which is its right, but the curious thing about the current revolt is that it is on the right. Perhaps it is because there is no room on the left for revolt, but it is more likely due to sincere concern over an economic system which resists the pride of the young by doing too much for the individual and making it all but impossible for him to assert "the world is mine oyster" and proceed to open it with the keen blade of his own talents.

In the initial issue of a conservative magazine, the New Guard, Lee Edwards, an assistant to Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Republican of Maryland, sounded the call which is echoing over halls of ivy. He wrote:

"Ten years ago this magazine would not have been possible. Twenty years ago it would not have been dreamed of. Thirty-five years ago it would not have been necessary. Today, the New Guard is possible, it is a reality, and it is needed by the youth of America to proclaim loudly and clearly: We are sick to death of collectivism, socialism, statism, and other utopian isms which have poisoned the minds, weakened the wills and smothered the spirits of Americans for three decades and more."

MEMBERSHIPS IN CONSERVATIVE CLUB SWELLS

At Harvard, where the yard has been emptied to fill saddles of power on the New Frontier, the head of the student council is a crusading conservative, who has tossed down the gage of battle to departing professors. At Yale and Princeton where conservative clubs were as forlorn as a corporal's guard, membership is swelling to trumpeting legions.

At the University of Wisconsin in Madison, where a conservative had long been regarded as something for exhibition alongside a two headed calf in a side show, a student publication termed professors "a smug collection of liberals." Similar phenomena have appeared on other campuses where conservatives were long without honor, but where conservative groups now find students beating paths to their doors.

Three decades ago the mellifluous accents of Franklin D. Roosevelt were summoning a generation of young people to remove economic risks in their path. Today a new generation finds that the risks were reduced at the price of freedoms and wants the freedoms restored.

Today's generation appears to have been mobilized to action because the recent presidential campaign served to emphasize how little difference there is between the two parties.

GENERATION CALLS TEACHINGS TO ACCOUNT

Young people found the only challenge in the thunder on the right from the conservative wings in both parties.

This generation is openly calling to account the teachings of professors in economics and political science, if one can ever call the game of chance for power a science, just as the previous generation called the lessons taught in its day up for question.

One of their battle cries was drafted at a meeting of conservative groups in Sharon, Conn., during the campaign. These formulated a declaration of belief which read in part:

"That foremost among the transcendent values is the individual's use of his God-given free will, whence derives his right to be free from the restrictions of arbitrary force; that liberty is indivisible, and that political freedom cannot exist without economic freedom; that the purposes of Government are to protect these freedoms through the preservation of internal order, the provision of national defense, and the administration of justice; that when Government ventures beyond these rightful functions, it accumulates power which tends to diminish order and liberty."

One day the young people are going to own this country. Who has a better right to challenge the teachings of a generation which is piling up a public debt approaching $300 billion?

World's Largest Flatcar Completed at Delaware & Hudson Shops at Oneonta, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, symbolic of the major role which the city of Oneonta plays in the railroad industry of our country was the announcement made last week that the largest flatcar ever built in the world was recently completed in the shops of the Delaware & Hudson Railroad located in my district in Oneonta, N.Y.:

In view of the great skills in railroading which are represented by the people of Oneonta as well as other communities in my district, it is most imperative that Congress should take steps to see that the railroads are not allowed to die of neglect.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a news report from the Oneonta Star of Monday, April 3 describing this important event:

WORLD'S LARGEST FLATCAR COMPLETED HERE—CALIFORNIA JAUNT NEXT FOR "SPECIAL"

The Delaware & Hudson Railroad has completed the assembly in its Oneonta Shops of the world's largest capacity flatcar, J. P. Hiltz, Jr., vice president in charge of operation and maintenance, said Sunday.

The car will be available for the transportation of huge machinery units beyond the present capacity of existing equipment on American railroads.

Its first use, Mr. Hiltz said, will be in the shipment of a 535,000-pound turbine from the General Electric Co.'s plant in Schenectady destined for Bellflower, Calif.

The turbine was loaded aboard the car yesterday.

It will be shipped over the D. & H. to Jefferson Junction, Pa., where it will be turned over to the Erie-Lackawanna Railroad for the second leg of its journey to the Pacific coast.

Other railroads participating in the movement include Nickel Plate, T.P. & W., Santa Fe, Union Pacific, and Pacific Electric.

The car is 60 feet 6 inches in length and has four six-wheel trucks equipped with roller bearings and multiple-wear steel wheels. The load platform is constructed of cast nickel steel.

A complete set of the latest designed air brakes are installed on each end of the car along with handbrakes.

The car weighs 148,300 pounds and has a load limit of 604,700 pounds for a gross weight on rail of 753,000 pounds.

Mr. Hiltz said the car cost $110,000.

The car was designed by D. & H. enginers and built entirely by the railroad's own employees in the Oneonta Shops.

Rural Electrification Builds the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, more than 7,000 members of rural electric and rural telephone cooperatives across the Nation met in Dallas, Tex., in February for the 19th annual convention of the National Rural Electric Co-op Association, which has generally been termed as "the best, most enthusiastic NRECA annual meeting ever held." They passed a series of resolutions that adequately cover the broad field of rural electrification and public power. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a number of these resolutions in the RECORD:

PREAMBLE

As we enter the 26th year of rural electric development, it is heartening to the large number of rural as well as Government people who started this necessary program and carried it forward with courage in the initial 25 years, to realize that in the 1960 silver jubilee year a significant number of our Nation's people, who had known little about rural electric development before, came to accept the fact that "rural electrification is truly good for all America."

These first years have been in part exploratory, then developmental and now beneficial projection of good and dependable power service. The facts are impressive. The record is a challenge to accomplish substantially more for America's future as the experience gained in the past is applied to the effort exerted in the future.

About 16 million consumers have power because of this proved sound program of real consumer-government cooperation, thousands of new jobs have become available that never would have existed without this multibillion dollar new market for the goods used in generating, delivering and using power; the national wealth and economy has been substantially increased and advanced without the slightest loss of Government loan funds. This was done in the testing period behind us. The years ahead will be years in which we shall more completely than ever cooperate to the benefit of this program and this Nation. This cooperation will also exist between the rural consumers and their organizations and our Government officials in their expressed objectives of getting on with the job and making giant power do giant jobs across the total countryside of this Nation for the good of every American.

We shall not rest on our laurels, but, heeding the experience gained in the past,

we shall advance with a new and positive vigor to provide sources of supply and distribution of power and to aid in the effective use thereof—all in the Nation's interest.

To this task and objective we do subscribe and pledge our every capability, and now, in this 19th annual members' meeting, do lay out guidelines for its achievement by the resolutions herewith submitted:

"REA LOANS AND ADMINISTRATION—GENERATION AND TRANSMISSION LOAN FUNDS

"Whereas the continuing policy of REA under the Rural Electrification Act has been to make adequate loans available to borrowers to finance construction of generation and transmission projects where needed, making it possible to furnish adequate electrict service at the lowest cost consistent with sound business management to ultimate rural consumers; and

"Whereas from time to time attacks have been concentrated against the making of such loans; and

"Whereas if these attacks should be successful in jeopardizing the past prevailing policy in curtailing either the right of the Administrator to make such loans, or the past policy of the Administrator in actually making them, irreparable harm would result not only to consumers presently dependent for ultimate source of power or REA-financed generation and transmission facilities but on other consumers of REA distribution cooperative borrowers who would then be subject to increases in energy costs due in turn to unwarranted increases in wholesale rates charged by private commercial suppliers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the continuation of the established policy of REA—to make loans available for the financing of the construction of generation and transmission facilities and a continuation of the past and present policy of Congress to make available through REA of an adequate and secure source of loan funds for generation and transmission facilities—is essential to the sound and continued development of rural electrification and the attainment of the objectives of that program for the benefit of peoples in rural areas; and be it further

"Resolved, That any measures or activities designed to curtail or limit the established policies of Congress and REA with respect to generation and transmission facilities be vigorously opposed.

"LOAN AUTHORIZATIONS AND APPROPRIATIONS

"*Be it resolved*, That we respectfully request the Congress to authorize and appropriate the following amounts to maintain and carry forward the REA program during the 1962 fiscal year:

"(a) A new electric loan fund authorization of $220-million and a $60-million contingency fund which, with the expected carryover, is estimated to provide adequate loan funds to bring the electric program through the 1962 fiscal year; and

"(b) An administrative fund appropriation of sufficient size to maintain the REA staff and the legal staff at an efficient level; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the legislative committee be authorized—as in the past—to make final adjustments in the above estimates as may be indicated when the NRECA annual loan needs survey is completed; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we strongly support the National Telephone Cooperative Association in its recommendations for adequate loan funds which it makes on the basis of its annual survey of rural telephone systems, and that we lend our strong support to the efforts to correct the unbalanced ratio of loans between telephone cooperatives and commercial telephone companies since it is apparent a more vigorous promotion of cooperatives is needed if area coverage telephony is to be achieved.

"SECRETARY FREEMAN'S STATEMENT ON REA PROGRAMS

"*Be it resolved*, That the Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, be highly commended for the excellent statement of principles with regard to the REA programs which he outlined in a memorandum dispatched February 3, 1961, to the REA staff and to the rural electric systems; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That NRECA, being wholly in accord with the policies the Secretary set forth, pledges him its full support in carrying out those policies.

"REA INTEREST RATES AND MONETARY POLICY

"*Be it resolved*, That we reaffirm our long-standing support of the 2 percent REA interest rate and REA loan terms in order that the rural electric systems and the rural telephone cooperatives may be able to carry out the purposes of the Rural Electrification Act, as amended, in building a better rural America; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we reaffirm our position taken at previous regional and annual meetings in support of a sound Federal monetary policy and an abandonment of the high-interest and tight-money policies which have added to the burdens of the residents of rural America during the last several years.

"TELEPHONES—TELEPHONE PROGRAM

"Whereas it is recognized that the original purpose and intent of the Rural Electrification Act, as it applies to the telephone program, was to provide telephone service to rural America on an area coverage basis; and

"Whereas in recent years the area coverage basis appears to have been disregarded; and

"Whereas some commercial interests are attempting to use the REA telephone program as a vehicle to purchase rundown telephone companies, rehabilitate them with REA loans and then reap a financial harvest by disposing of them at lucrative profits: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the present administration be advised of this situation and that we request that REA practices conform to the purpose and intent of the act and that REA promote, aid and assist telephone cooperatives in accomplishing this original purpose to a greater degree; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That electric cooperatives also be urged to promote, aid and assist the telephone cooperatives to do this job."

Ancient Lesson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial in the April 4, 1961, issue of the Wall Street Journal by William H. Chamberlain is an excellent accounting of how Roman fiscal policy brought the downfall of that great civilization and an event from which we all can learn a lesson. The editorial follows:

A BURGEONING CENTRAL AUTHORITY PRECIPITATED ROME'S FALL

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

The greatest collapse of a mighty state, a large society and a fruitful civilization of which we have a reasonably full record has been immortalized by Gibbon's historical epic, "The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire."

The eternal appeal of Gibbon's classic lies not only in its factual narrative, but in its superb literary style and its presentation of the rationalistic, commonsense philosophical outlook of the 18th century. As the modern British woman historian, C. V. Wedgwood, remarks in her essay on Gibbon, the latter, although he could not understand the soul of a Christian slave, could appreciate the mind of a Roman senator.

The Canadian Prof. W. G. Hardy, of the Classics Department of the University of Alberta, recently delivered and published in paperback form a series of lectures on the Graeco-Roman world, of which one, entitled "Why Rome Fell," presents in brief compass many of Gibbon's explanations of the Decline and Fall. Gibbon designated the era of the five so-called good emperors, ending with Marcus Aurelius, who died in A.D. 180, as the happiest and most prosperous in the history of the human race.

VOLUNTARY LOANS

And yet, as Prof. Hardy notes, even in this age of internal peace and security against external attack, internal weaknesses were developing which became aggravated with the passing of time and finally proved fatal to the very existence of the empire. One early symptom of trouble was that wealthy men began to dodge the expensive honors associated with the office of local magistrate. This was because constantly rising rates of taxation were shearing them more and more closely. Moreover, they were expected to help their communities out of debt by "voluntary" loans.

By the middle of the second century there were cases when individuals had to be drafted as local magistrates. And, as cities got into financial difficulties, imperial curators were put in charge and the cities lost their self-government.

This extension of paternalism, according to Professor Hardy, was accompanied by a tremendous increase in the personnel of the imperial civil service. Every bureau expanded its field and new bureaus were constantly being added. By the third century, to quote the historian Trever, "the relentless system of taxation, requisition and compulsory labor was administered by an army of military bureaucrats. Everywhere were the personal agents of the emperors to spy out any remotest case of attempted strikes or evasion of taxes."

Another financial burden was the growing cost of the handouts of free food and the public games which were considered the best means of keeping the Roman proletariat peaceable and contended. Originally a fairly frugal allotment of food was made once a month. By the time of Marcus Aurelius there was a daily distribution of bread, pork, and oil. The expenditure on gladiatorial combats and public spectacles continued to climb, until it reached the estimated equivalent of $100 million a year.

Roman financial policy became one of creeping and not-so-creeping inflation. The most common Roman coin, the sestertius, lost about 98 percent of its value between the time of Augustus, at the beginning of the Christian era, and the reign of Diocletian, almost three centuries later.

Perhaps the principal reason for the declining state of the Roman finances was the increasing burden of the military establishment. The cost of the army, according to Professor Hardy, doubled between A.D. 96 and A.D. 180, and this rate of progression most probably increased during the later phases of the decline. The proportion of Romans or Italians in the legions steadily diminished and Hadrian and other emperors pursued the policy of recruiting barbarian mercenaries and filling up the ranks

with peasants from the more remote and least civilized parts of the empire.

The consequences, according to Professor Hardy, were as follows: "The army became composed either of ignorant countymen from the most backward parts of the empire or of foreigners. In spirit and in culture they were peasant wolves with little, if any, respect for the fat sheep they were supposed to protect. This divorce between barbarzied army and civilized but soft civilians was the immediate cause of the collapse."

MILITARY ANARCHY

A period of military anarchy, in which emperors were put up and dethroned and murdered by the legions preceded the final inundation of the western part of the empire by the barbarians.

Diocletian, who brought some temporary order and stability into the declining empire about the end of the third century, issued an edict fixing the maximum price for all goods and all kinds of labor. Death was the penalty for breaking the code. Yet prices continued to rise, and this supreme effort to enforce economic regimentation ended in a fiassco.

The more well-to-do citizens in each community were made collectively responsible for bringing in the taxes, as a result of which they soon ceased to be well-to-do. Farmers were tied to the soil; and their sons had to remain farmers. Similarly the sons of artisans had to follow their father's trade. As Professor Hardy sums it up: "There was no escape from this relentless regimentation. For regimentation was the end result of the abdication of political freedom and of the pursuit of materialism. The welfare state had become a despotism."

Ever higher taxes, an ever-increasing bureaucracy, the growth of an omnipotent state, the paralysis of local initiative, a growing reliance on a central authority that started with some features of a welfare state and ended in full-fledged totalitarianism—such was the unhappy story.

Does it require much exercise of the imagination to recognize in our own country and our own time some germs, at least, of the political diseases that first sapped and finally brought down the "grandeur that was Rome"?

Great Decisions Program Discussion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, across the country, many thousands of people have been engaged this past winter in the great decisions program sponsored by the Foreign Policy Association. Based on concise summaries of major international problems, these discussion groups center on what alternative policies exist for this country.

I was interested recently to receive a letter from one of these discussion groups and a consensus of opinion on major issues that resulted from that group's course. I commend the people who took part in drawing this up, and I am sure their study will help them understand better the difficult questions that face our policymakers.

I pointed out in reply to them that theories and principles drawn from such study must then be translated into day-to-day decisions in foreign affairs, and this is not the least difficult part. I want to bring the results of this study to the attention of the members by placing it and the accompanying letter in the RECORD. While any examination of politics, international or domestic, brings with it controversy, the study and analysis of all these great decisions by as many of our people as can devote the time adds greatly to public understanding of what this Nation faces:

DEPARTMENT OF ADULT EDUCATION,
West Hartford, Conn., April 1961.

Hon. EMILIO DADDARIO,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This is a rather unpolished but absolutely honest outline which was developed and agreed upon by a class in foreign policy in the West Hartford, Conn., evening school in the winter session of 1961. The guide we used in the 10-week session of presentation and discussion was from the "Great Decision" booklets, a series of eight topics on world problems issued by the Foreign Policy Association.

It was our intention on the final evening to arrive at some kind of composite score for our semester's work. It was the decision of the class to complete a simple outline of our work and to send it on to our Members of Congress. Much of what we concluded we felt was not in need of any extensive degree of elaborate amplification, because such a communication might lose its value due to sheer length and rhetoric. This is only a humble but yet vitally concerned opinion of 28 American citizens.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES MCINERNY,
ROBERT DEROSIER,
Instructors, West Hartford Evening School.

I. "Deadlock over Germany."
(a) Forget unification.
(b) Maintain strength and status quo in Berlin.
(c) Assist and encourage Bonn Government to assume role of full-fledged member of Western alliance.

II. "Soviet Challenge and World Leadership."
(a) To achieve a nondiscriminating, practical, and realistic foreign policy in order to meet Soviet challenge.

III. "France and Western Unity."
(a) Perpetuate our traditional and historical relations.

IV. "Japan—Future of an Asian Ally."
(a) Constructive, reasonable, and equitable tariff program.
(b) To become equal ally and partner in defense.

V. "U.N. in Explosive Africa."
(a) Recognition of nationalistic aspirations in Africa, even to point of disagreement with allies.
(b) Evolve a U.N. timetable for future independent states.
(c) Continue to censure South Africa on policy of apartheid.

VI. "Americas in Jeopardy."
(a) Better and increased student exchange program.
(b) Avoid identifying all turmoil in Latin and South America as Communist inspired.
(c) Equitable trade policy and strong hemispheric policy in terms of the "good neighbor."

VII. "Arms and Survival."
(a) Keep strong and alert.
(b) Continue development of nuclear power only as a deterrent.
(c) Continue disarmament negotiations on open inspection basis.

VIII. "Blueprint for the World Economy."
(a) Trade with view of progressively liberalizing tariffs.
(b) Wise development of world resources in line with the conservation of world resources.
(c) Raise the living standards of people of the world.

Los Angeles County School Superintendent C. C. Trillingham Informs Congressman Clyde Doyle, 23d District, of County Board of Education Initiating Improvement of Administration Program of Schools, and Exploration and Study of Communism as a Real Threat Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I wish to call your attention, and the attention of my other distinguished colleagues, to a letter I have recently received from the distinguished superintendent of the Los Angeles County schools concerning their countywide approach to stimulate and assist school districts in their programs of Americanism.

His letter along with copies of various editorials illustrate what they are doing in this important project.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,
SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS,
Los Angeles, Calif., March 3, 1961.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
Member of Congress, 1030 New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DOYLE: Thank you very much for your kind letter on our countywide approach to stimulate and assist school districts in their programs of Americanism.

We are at the present time inviting each school district to send representatives to a meeting which will probably result in the formation of a countywide committee to study such areas as: How to evaluate materials to determine their accuracy and value; how to develop in-service programs for interested groups of teachers; what curriculum emphasis might be stressed at various grade levels and what might be suggested as possible board policies, including public relations programs. This countywide committee will be meeting in the near future and we anticipate real progress.

Am enclosing copies of editorials and a news release on the subject and will try to send along progress reports.

Thank you again for your interest and concern.

Cordially yours,

C. C. TRILLINGHAM,
Superintendent.

SCHOOL VITAL IN RED THREAT

(While Dick Turpin, education editor of the Times, is on assignment in Europe, this column will be written by leading educators. Today's writer is Dr. C. C. Trillingham, superintendent of Los Angeles County schools)

Recent events at home and abroad have shocked many Americans into the realiza-

tion that the Communists are making good on the timetable laid out by Lenin 40 years ago.

The demonstrations in Japan by Japanese youth which led to the cancellation of the President's visit, the taking over of Cuba by Castro and his influence in Latin America, the Communist-led youth riots in San Francisco against the House Un-American Activities Committee, the continuing ideological struggles in the new and developing nations of Africa and the recent efforts of Khrushchev and his cohorts at the United Nations meeting to take over the controls have dramatized the uncomfortable fact that it is later than we think.

FACTS OF COMMUNISM

Such organizations as the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Bar Association, to mention only a few, are calling on the schools to teach the facts about communism—its purposes, its tactics and how it contradicts everything in which free people believe.

Some say that our best defense is a good offense. They suggest that the schools emphasize the positive by helping our youth understand and appreciate our institutions, ideals, freedoms, and opportunities that we too often take for granted. I believe that these critical times call for both treatments—an emphasis on the benefits and advantages of what we have and what we believe as well as a realization of the dangers of communism both within and without our Nation.

FOUNDATION STONES

On the positive side, the schools can teach more realistically about four foundation stones of freedom that have contributed to America's greatness. They are (1) our systems of constitutional government and the Bill of Rights, (2) our system of free, competitive, economic enterprise that has given us great productivity and increasingly high standards of living, (3) our system of universal education giving every boy and girl an opportunity for an education as long as they can profit from it, and (4) our system of Judeo-Christian religion which through the centuries has given man motivation, purpose, and direction.

All four of these foundation stones place emphasis on the importance and value of the individual. They support each other. When any one of them fails or falls, the entire structure will tumble. They are the embodiment of our great American ideals. We frequently fall short in actual practice because we human beings fail to measure up to the great promise of these foundation stones of freedom.

Under these concepts of individual freedom and responsibility, American standards of living and health and education have become the highest in all human history. Our human rights and equality before the law are without match anywhere in the world.

The world was saved from the scourge of Hitlerism by the miracles of American industrial output and technological genius, backed by American idealism. In the struggle against the present scourge of communism the United States represents the main bulwark and hope of Western civilization.

FEEDING AND HEALING

The wealth generated by our free economy and individualist philosophy is today feeding the hungry and healing the sick in vast segments of a distressed world. Millions of men and women in other countries have no higher dream than migration to the soil of the United States. Never before has a nation so powerful as the United States been less of a menace to weak neighbors or more of a hope to enslaved peoples.

Our youngsters must build a new loyalty and a new dedication based upon an awareness of the many freedoms and opportunities as well as the comfort and conveniences that are theirs.

As to the teaching of the dangers of communism, we are in the process of setting up a countywide committee that will develop a selective list of reliable instructional materials—books, reports, and films—that may be used by the schools in informing and alerting their youngsters to the fact that trained agents of the Soviet Union are working like termites everywhere, probing for our weaknesses and attempting to take us over without a fight.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS LAUNCH SPECIAL AMERICANISM PROGRAM

At its regular meeting on February 6, 1961, the Los Angeles County Board of Education authorized County Superintendent of Schools C. C. Trillingham to set up a countywide committee of school people to stimulate and upgrade the teaching of the American way of life, as well as the dangers to our way of life.

The action of the county board of education grew out of proposals of a small steering committee of school superintendents and county office staff members. This exploratory group considered all aspects of the problem and recommended that Trillingham invite the superintendents of all school districts in the county to designate one or more of their staff members to serve on such a countywide committee.

The full committee will be brought together to consider what needs to be done to improve the Americanism programs of the schools and how the job might best be done. Subcommittees would have responsibility for the review and evaluation of all types of instructional materials, including films and film strips, the development of in-service programs for interested groups of teachers with emphasis upon what Americans believe and stand for, the threats to the American way of life, the curriculum emphases to be stressed at the various grade levels, and such matters as board policy and public relations.

The superintendent reported to the board that the exploratory committee had agreed that there is a real Communist threat today, as well as other dangers, and that the schools should do something tangible about these threats, that the schools should emphasize the positive side of our way of life as well as the dangers facing it, that Americanism programs should be based upon authentic and accurate information, and that the schools are legally responsible for development of their own programs of citizenship and patriotism. The superintendent pointed out that outside groups may help but the schools are responsible to the public and must not become unduly involved in outside programs over which they exercise no control. It is anticipated that all school districts in the county will participate in this cooperative effort.

ARE WE AWARE

(By C. C. Trillingham)

The Canadian Intelligence Service has recently released some dramatic excerpts from "Brainwashing," a synthesis of a Russian textbook on psychopolitics used in training Red agents. These paragraphs appeared in the November issue of American Mercury under the heading Planned Delinquency. They were brought to public attention locally by George Putnam who read them on all of his television news reports during the week of March 7, 1960.

The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors has urged the county superintendent of schools office to bring this message to the attention of all students in the schools of Los Angeles County. It is hoped that school district administrators and boards will cooperate by alerting their youngsters to this danger.

Here is the statement from the Russian textbook used in training their agents to take over the world.

"By making readily available drugs of various kinds, by giving the teenager alcohol, by praising his wildness, by stimulating him with sex literature and advertising to him or her practices as taught at 'Sexpol,' the psychopolitical operator can create the necessary attitude of chaos, idleness and worthlessness into which can then be cast the solution which will give the teenager complete freedom everywhere.

"If we could effectively kill the national pride and patriotism of just one generation we will have won that country. Therefore, there must be continual propaganda abroad to undermine the loyalty of the citizens in general and the teenager in particular."

This is one way the Communists are doing their part to soften the younger generation. They seem to have considerable help inside our own country. Wittingly or unwittingly, they seem to have plenty of assistance in preparing our young people for the "moral decay" that has preceded the fall of all previous civilizations, according to historian Toynbee. With alcohol, narcotics, and pornographic materials available to our youth and with much of our movie and TV fare featuring crime, violence, and loose morality, it is time that our homes, churches, schools and government combine forces to convince youth that honest and decent living represent the highest type of intelligence and patriotism.

Too many unscrupulous individuals are permitted to ply their nefarious trade for the dollars in it and do so under the guise of freedom and democracy. Without regard for the common welfare, freedom becomes license.

The high summit meeting of Communist leaders and representatives of the West is just ahead of us. Millions of people everywhere have great hope in the outcome. American visitors to the U.S.S.R. are impressed with the smiles, the handshakes, and the talk about peace and friendship.

But the declared purposes, the avowed timetables, and past records show that trained agents of the Soviet Union are working like termites everywhere, probing for our weaknesses and attempting to take us over without a fight.

Let's inform our youngsters what the Communists are trying to do to them. Then, let's review with them our many freedoms and opportunities, our comforts and conveniences that are too often taken for granted. Let's try to build a new loyalty and dedication to our Bill of Rights, our free enterprise system, our universal education, and our Judeo-Christian religion. Let's begin living up to the best promises of these great foundation stones. Let's help the youngsters see that we're in a battle of ideologies for keeps.

THE SCHOOLS AND THE COMMUNIST THREAT

(By C. C. Trillingham, county superintendent of schools)

There is evidence of increasing concern on the part of representative public groups that the schools step up their programs portraying the continuing encroachment and expansion of communism in the world today.

Not long ago any school official who suggested that we teach boys and girls about communism was under suspicion. Today responsible groups such as the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Medical Association are asking that the schools teach the cold, hard facts about Communist purposes and tactics.

As a means of exploring this problem, the county board of education authorized the staff to meet with a small steering committee of representative school administrators. This joint committee of school dis-

trict and county office personnel has met once and is scheduled to meet again later this month.

Thorough discussion has brought out some points of view that should be reported at this time. A full report will be given later. Here are some of the points of agreement:

1. There is a real Communist threat. A loyal American citizens who doesn't believe this today is either a confirmed optimist or a nonreader.

2. The schools should do something about the Communist threat. To acquaint boys and girls with the philosophy and strategy and the dangers and encroachments of communism is a responsibility of education.

3. What the schools do should be based upon authentic and accurate information. The schools should use materials that present incontrovertible facts. They should be concerned with sound education. This may call for appropriate inservice activities for teaching personnel.

4. The schools should be responsible for developing their own programs of citizenship and patriotism. Outside groups may help but schools are responsible to the public and must not become unduly involved in outside programs over which they exercise no control.

5. The positive side of our way of life should be strongly presented. This is basic to any consideration of the dangers of communism. There should be emphasis on what we believe in and what we stand for.

6. Each school district has responsibility for its own program. However, there may be strength in coordinating our activities on an areawide basis. It might be possible to do some things better together than to go our own separate ways.

7. There is need to keep those who support our schools fully informed concerning our programs of citizenship and patriotism. Too many times schools carry on good programs that are relatively unknown to the lay public.

One of the most difficult responsibilities is making sure that books, films, and other instructional aids—including speakers—are factual and acurate.

This is a project in survival in which all school districts can participate. It is anticipated that the next meeting of the special steering committee may result in plans for countywide efforts to deal constructively with the Communist menace on a sound educational basis.

Double Threat—Silt-Erosion Problem Greater Than Expected

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the Dickensonian, of Clintwood, Va., on March 17, 1961.

DOUBLE THREAT—SILT-EROSION PROBLEM GREATER THAN EXPECTED

The Flannagan Reservoir faces the threat both of pollution and siltation, according to surveys made recently, and reports of which have been received here. A report made by the U.S. Department of Agriculture a few days ago to Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON shows that the situation as regards the filling of the reservoir with silt is a more serious problem than was at first believed.

Senator ROBERTSON, in an accompanying letter, says that it is now apparent that a major reforestation program is needed, and the construction of small check dams, to prevent dangerous siltation. It was his opinion that the State water control board would take measures to prevent pollution, but that it had no jurisdiction over the damages already done by the strip mines.

The report of the Agriculture Department follows:

"Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
"*United States Senate.*

"Dear Senator ROBERTSON: Following our letter to you of January 30, 1961, concerning the flood and sedimentation problem above the John Flannagan Reservoir site in Dickenson County, Virginia, we have obtained additional information which we are glad to present to you.

"Strip mining began in Dickenson, Wise and Buchanan Counties about 1946. At first, this type of operation was on a small scale. As the demand for coal increased, and larger and better machinery was developed, strip mining really began to expand. Since 1950 strip mining has continued to increase until now approximately one-third of the coal mined in this area comes from strip mines.

"As a result of strip mining operations, thousands of acres have been laid bare and have contributed to increased flooding, erosion, and siltation of streams and bottom land. It is a well established fact that the disastrous flood of 1957 was much worse because of the large, barren, stripped areas.

"A recent survey by the Soil Conservation Service and the Virginia Division of Forestry shows that approximately 20,000 acres of land in the watershed of the John Flannagan Reservoir have been strip mined or affected by strip operations. Land is being stripped at the rate of 700 to 1,000 acres per year within the Flannagan Reservoir watershed. About 4 weeks ago, a stripping operation was started just above and around the proposed permanent pool of the John Flannagan Reservoir. This operation is going ahead at full speed. The back slope of this operation will extend down into the permanent pool of the reservoir. As of today, it is estimated that at least 15,000 acres of strip mine spoil need vegetative treatment in addition to other control measures.

"Prior to 1953, very little attempt had been made to reforest or revegetate strip-mined areas. Through the efforts of the Lonesome Pine Soil Conservation District, organized in the fall of 1953, a planned and deliberate approach was made on the problem. Trial plantings of trees, shrubs, grasses, and legumes were made on these problem areas.

"The results were very encouraging. As a result of these trial plantings, some of the larger coal companies have initiated a revegetating program as a part of their business operation.

"At present, approximately 1,000 acres of mine spoil in the three counties are either set to trees or seeded to some type of vegetation annually. Approximately 5,000 acres have received some sort of vegetative treatment.

"The larger coal companies have been very cooperative. The big problem is trying to get private landowners, who have had their land stripped, to do something. They either can't afford to revegetate, or they don't want to spend money on such a barren, seemingly unproductive area.

"There is no law in Virginia at this time requiring coal operators to revegetate strip mine areas. Such laws are in force in West Virginia and several other States. What has been accomplished thus far in Virginia has been strictly on a voluntary basis.

"We do not have facilities to accurately measure the amount of sediment going into the streams. However, we know that many landowners have brought suit against the coal operators for damages resulting from the siltation of streams and bottom land. Most of these lawsuits have been decided in favor of the landowners. Many of the streams have silted up completely. The Virginia Highway Department has a crew of men that spends full time unstopping drainpipes and ditch lines. This is a direct result of silt from strip mine areas.

"Although the Lonesome Pine Soil Conservation District, along with all the cooperating agencies, organizations, and individuals, has the technical know-how to combat this problem, it appears that additional means and authority will be needed before a high degree of sediment control can be secured in the John Flannagan Reservoir drainage area.

"We trust that you will find this information useful.

"D. A. WILLIAMS,
"Administrator, Soil Conservation Service."

Figures Show Federal Aid to Education Unnecessary and Undesirable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the existence of a national classroom shortage, a claim circulated by proponents of Federal aid to education, is purely fictitious as indicated in the following broadcast from the "Manion Forum." Moreover, even if these claims were true, there still would be no need for Federal action.

The claim that schools are not getting enough money serves largely as an alibi for the poor showing of many of their graduates when they reach college or start on their jobs. In addition, the popular impression that money from the Federal Government is free is fallacious. The Government first has to take money from the people before it can give any back.

These and other facts were brought out by Roger A. Freeman, a vice president of the Institute for Social Science Research and chairman of the committee on financing public education, on March 26, 1961, in a discussion with Dean Clarence Manion on the latter's weekly radio show. The discussion follows:

Dean MANION. Here, on my desk, are two big recent books dealing with the rising cost of public education and describing ways and means for raising the necessary money. At this moment, these subjects are critically important to every parent, child, and taxpayer.

These books, published by the Institute for Social Science Research, Continental Building, Washington, D.C., comprise a thorough, objective, and analytical study of the subject that is now shaking Congress and the country. ("Financing the Public Schools," 2 vol.)

It is a great tragedy that all of our Representatives and Senators will not be required to read both of these volumes before they vote on President Kennedy's recommendations for Federal aid to education.

Through his professional reputation for study and research, I have known the

author of these books for a long time. In 1953 and 1954, when I was Chairman of the first Presidential Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, this author, Mr. Roger A. Freeman, was an assistant to the Governor of the State of Washington.

At that time, he was recommended to our group as the best available man to direct the Commission's study on the relationship of our public education to the Federal Government. Mr. Freeman accepted the assignment and did an excellent job. But he went on from there to extend and elaborate upon his findings in many official and unofficial positions at home and abroad.

The first of his two volumes on "Financing the Public Schools" was published in 1958; the second appeared last December.

In addition to his assignment with the Institute of Social Science Research, this tireless and scholarly man is presently working with the Institute for Studies in Federalism at Claremont College, in California.

On this program a few weeks ago (Manion Forum Broadcast No. 328), I called attention to a pamphlet on the subject of Federal aid to education which Mr. Freeman prepared for the Citizens for Educational Freedom in St. Louis.

That reference brought such a flood of inquiries that I decided to answer them all at once by the direct presentation to this audience of the author himself. He is here with me now. By all professional standards, my distinguished guest qualifies as an expert witness on the subject of public school financing.

Mr. Freeman, I realize that you were required to write these two big books in order to give us all the answers on Federal aid to education, but I hope that you can hit some of the high spots in the course of this broadcast. For instance, do your findings reveal that Federal money is needed now to bring public school construction abreast of the increasing school population?

Mr. FREEMAN. Thank you, Dean Manion. The reports on classroom construction show that States and communities are doing very well and that they need no help nor prodding. They have built 625,000 classrooms in the past 10 years, which is over 200,000 more than would have been needed to take care of the 11 million increase in the number of children.

In 1950 Congress ordered a national school facilities survey which was completed at a cost of over $5 million and reported a shortage of 312,000 classrooms. In 1954 the U.S. Commissioner of Education said that we were 370,000 classrooms short.

Then the figures started coming down, and 2 months ago the Office of Education said that we are 142,000 classrooms short—which is 230,000 fewer than 6 years ago.

Now, most of these shortages are purely fictitious but, even if they were correct, there would still be no need for Federal action. The Office of Education, taking all of these claims at face value, has estimated that we shall need to build 600,000 classrooms in the next 10 years, or 60,000 classrooms a year.

That is the figure which President Kennedy used in his education message. But, States and communities have been building 70,000 classrooms in each of the past 5 years. So, the volume of school construction could substantially decline from its present level and still produce all the classrooms we can possibly use.

But, the year 1960 established a new all-time record in school bond approvals, which suggests that school construction will continue at a record level.

The State school superintendents reported, in a survey of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, that only 237 school districts, out of a national total of 40,000, were unable to build the schools they need. So, the facts don't add up to a situation which calls for action by the National Government.

Dean MANION. As far as overcrowded classrooms are concerned, are our American schools in worse shape than their opposite numbers in Europe and Russia?

Mr. FREEMAN. As far as Russian classrooms are concerned, one need only to look at Moscow schools to find the answer. The typical elementary school class in Moscow numbers 40 to 45 children compared with an average of 28 to 33 in our urban school districts. Practically all Moscow schools are on double shift while 98 percent of the American schools are not.

Many of the Muscovite teachers work two shifts, which is unknown in the United States. Russian teachers are poorly paid, contrary to some claims, and need two salaries to earn enough for a decent living. They get $100 a month or less for one shift.

The Russians have reported that they have built schools to accommodate 9 million children since World War II—and they are not likely to understate their case. American public schools have built classrooms for more than twice that many children and private schools have added space for another 1½ to 2 million. Moreover, Russian schools look like warehouse lofts to American observers who are used to our spacious well-constructed and well-equipped public schools. Similar comparisons could be made with schools in many of the other European countries.

EDUCATION COST OUT OF PROPORTION WITH RESULTS

Dean MANION. Mr. Freeman, is it true that good education is a matter of financing? In other words, does good education necessarily cost more?

Mr. FREEMAN. If the quality of education were proportionate to the amount of money going into the schools, our students ought to be doing very well, indeed. Since 1900, enrollment in the public schools has slightly more than doubled while expenditures multiplied 80 times. They jumped from $200 million to $16 billion. Cost per pupil in dollars of constant value multiplied eight times. Do children now learn more? According to many reports they learn less—at least in such basic subjects as languages, mathematics, history, or geography.

The fact is that training in mathematics or history cost less than in coed cooking or homemaking for boys and that insistence on rigorous mental discipline does not raise costs.

To be sure, the public schools need a great deal of money to give a good education to some 37 million boys and girls. A comparison with school outlays in other countries and with most private schools here—with their buildings, class sizes and teachers' pay—proves that our public schools have ample funds to provide standards of excellence second to none. But standards of learning, of promotion, of graduation in most public schools have declined or been abolished.

The most urgent need today is not so much to get more money for education but to get more education for the money.

If the available resources were fully and efficiently used, our graduates would rank far ahead of those of all other countries and we would not need to worry about them.

The claim that schools are not getting enough money serves largely as an alibi for the poor showing of many of our graduates when they reach college or start on their jobs.

Dean MANION. Would taxpayers save money by shifting the financial burden of the schools to the Federal Government?

Mr. FREEMAN. The advocates of Federal aid are promoting the idea that local support means higher taxes while Federal money comes for free. To some extent they seem to have proven their point. Over the past 10 years all Federal grants in aid to the States combined totaled $30 billion and Federal budget deficits amounted to $34 billion. So, it looks as if the money did come for free.

We know, of course, that in the meantime the dollar lost more than a fifth of its value. This means that we paid for the deficit not in taxes but by depreciation of our savings, pensions, life insurance, etc. This is a dishonest way of supporting Government which sets a demoralizing example to our youth.

If the schools or any other public services are to be supported from taxes, then they cost taxpayers at least as much if they are financed through the National Government as through State and local governments, and probably more.

The claim that Federal taxes are paid by rich people and corporations and State and local taxes by low-income people is a myth. More than five-sixths of the Federal individual income tax comes from the basic 20-percent rate and most of the corporation tax is shifted to consumers through higher prices.

The fact is that in a country in which well-being is as widely distributed as in ours, where three-fourths of all personal income goes to labor, and where taxes take about one-third of the people's income, most of the taxes must come from where most of the money goes: persons in the medium brackets.

The great mass of Americans who are neither very rich nor very poor bear the bulk of taxes no matter by what level of government and by what type of tax they are collected. The average man cannot escape his share through Federal aid and attempts to tell him otherwise is sheer demagoguery.

Dean MANION. By way of conclusion, Mr. Freeman, do you believe that we can have Federal financing for education without Federal control and what, if any, are the disadvantages of establishing national educational standards through Federal control of American education?

PROPONENTS OF FEDERAL AID UNTRUTHFUL

Mr. FREEMAN. You know, Dean, that the proponents of Federal school aid have been telling Congress and the public that there can and should be Federal aid without Federal control. They pay lip service to local control when talking for publicity because they know that the great majority of the American people want to retain power over their schools. But, when the professors of education and the school administrators talk to each other, they speak a different language.

A few months ago, Overview, the magazine of the school administrators, editorialized:

"The United States is inexorably moving toward a national system of education * * * the long-held views that education is largely a personal concern and that educational policy should be made by local units of government will have to go * * *. The national welfare demands a national system of education."

Other educators have ridiculed what they call our historical love affair with what might be called "grassrootsism" in American education and claimed that our present system of local control of education is far more conducive to totalitarianism than a national system of schools would be.

It is quite evident that the issue at stake is not so much the size of school support but who is going to run the schools and decide what to teach and how to teach it.

If it were true that the schools need more money than States and communities can raise—which it is not, but suppose it were true—then the money could be supplied through higher Federal taxes by methods that involve little or no control.

For example, it has been proposed in Congress that a percentage of the Federal income or cigarette tax collections be channeled back to the States with no strings at-

tached. The States could then use the money according to their own judgment. This proposal is being condemned and combated by the Federal school aid lobby because the funds would bypass Federal and State departments of education.

Another plan would either reimburse parents for tuition payments to public and private schools or permit them to deduct such tuition payments from their Federal income tax. That would leave the money in the communities rather than send it to Washington and back.

But, the educational bureaucrats fight such proposals violently, and thus reveal their real goal: they are not so much interested in getting more money as in wresting power over the schools from the parents and communities because they aim to reshape the schools according to their sociological theories. They want the schools to be institutes for life adjustment rather than institutions of learning.

That is the story, Dean Manion.

Dean MANION. Thank you, Mr. Roger A. Freeman. My friends, send these indisputable facts and figures to your Congressman and Senators now. Send them to your newspaper, to your local radio and television newscaster, to your local school board. You can defeat Federal control of your school with these facts and these figures if you act at once.

Timely Resolution of the Board of Supervisors, County of Los Angeles, Calif., on the Important Subject of Air Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, there follows for your attention and the attention of my other distinguished colleagues, a resolution recently adopted by the county of Los Angeles, Calif., board of supervisors, dealing with the very serious national problem of air pollution:

"Whereas the pollution of both urban and rural atmospheres has become a serious national problem; and

"Whereas carefully coordinated programs at Federal, State, and local levels are necessary to bring about the rapid restoration of acceptable air quality levels; and

"Whereas this need has been recognized by the executive legislative branches of the U.S. Government through the implementation of an air pollution research and advisory program being administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and

"Whereas the required inter-jurisdictional program coordination was substantially enhanced by the National Air Pollution Conference held in Washington, D.C., November 18–20, 1958; and

"Whereas the need for another such conference has been demonstrated by the rise of new air pollution programs at all levels of government by the growth of scientific knowledge and by the election of a new national administration, since November 1958: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles does hereby join with the Southern California Air Pollution Coordinating Council in the following petition to the President of the United States and to the California delegation in Congress assembled: That a White House Conference on Air Pollution be conducted in the fall of 1961, with special emphasis on the need: (a) for new air pollution research, advisory, and control programs at all levels of government; (b) for improved methods of coordinating existing programs; and (c) for improvement in air quality levels throughout the Nation in view of current medical opinions relating to the effect of air pollution on human beings."

I, Gordon T. Nesvig, clerk of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles and ex officio clerk of the Air Pollution Control Board of the Air Pollution Control District of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true and correct copy of a resolution which was adopted by the Air Pollution Control Board of the Air Pollution Control District of said county on March 28, 1961, and entered in the minutes of said Board.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the Board of Supervisors this 3rd day of April 1961.

GORDON T. NESVIG,
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles and ex officio Clerk of the Air Pollution Control Board of the Air Pollution Control District of the County of Los Angeles, State of California.

Hawaii Foundation for American Freedoms, Inc., Honolulu, Hawaii, Unanimously Passes Resolution on House Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent having heretofore been granted me, I bring to your attention, and the attention of my other distinguished colleagues, a letter I have recently received from the executive vice president of the Hawaii Foundation for American Freedoms, Inc., Mr. Lawrence V. Cott, with which he enclosed copies of the resolution unanimously passed by that organization commending the House Committee on Un-American Activities. The letter and resolution follow:

HAWAII FOUNDATION FOR
AMERICAN FREEDOMS, INC.,
Honolulu, Hawaii, March 30, 1961.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It is a great pleasure to forward to you 10 copies of the resolution on the House Committee on Un-American Activities which passed last Monday at the annual meeting of this citizen anti-Communist educational organization.

We hope that our small gesture will compensate in some measure for the abuse you must sustain by the mere fact of membership on the committee, but more importantly we hope it conveys our gratitude for your service to the Nation.

Sincerely,

LAWRENCE V. COTT,
Executive Vice President.

RESOLUTION ON HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Whereas there is an international Communist conspiracy directed from the Soviet Union and dedicated, as its leaders have said innumerable times, to the complete conquest of the world; and

Whereas the United States is the avowed ultimate objective of the international Communist movement as enunciated in public documents and statements by Lenin, Stalin, and Khrushchev; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has a duty to inform itself of all dangers to the Nation with the view to writing legislation to protect the freedoms of the American people from all enemies, foreign and domestic, including the international Communist conspiracy; and

Whereas the House of Representatives of the United States has delegated some of those duties and responsibilities to a Committee on Un-American Activities; and

Whereas the Committee on Un-American Activities, under the able leadership of the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, has performed its duties efficiently, courageously and honorably and has fulfilled its mandate without deviation or temerity and with due regard for the law, the rules of Congress and civil liberties, and has accomplished its task despite the most vicious slanders and provocations by Communists and their fellow travelers, and despite little understanding of the nature or nearness of the Communist danger by some of those who should know better: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Hawaii Foundation for American Freedoms, Inc. (Imua) commends the House Committee on Un-American Activities for its signal service to the Congress and the American people and express its gratitude to the committee and to the Congress that has so recently given its own overwhelming endorsement to the committee; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Speaker of the House, Chairman WALTER, and the members of the committee and to the Honorable DANIEL K. INOUYE, Representative from the State of Hawaii.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Appendix

Cordell Hull's Historic Role in Income Tax Struggle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Charles Bartlett, distinguished journalist and reporter for the Chattanooga Times, recalling events which led to ratification 48 years ago of the 16th amendment authorizing Federal income taxes.

This historic change in our national tax policy was, as the article by Mr. Bartlett notes, to a large extent the achievement of Cordell Hull, then serving in the House as the Representative from the Fourth Congressional District of Tennessee. In the long legislative struggle over this issue, Judge Hull carried to successful completion a reform battle that had been started by another distinguished Tennessean, Benton McMillin—both my distinguished predecessors—from the district which I have the honor to represent in the Congress.

Without the income tax today our Government would not have sufficient revenue to support the defense of our country.

Mr. Bartlett's article, published in the Washington Sunday Star, gives insight into some of the traits of character which contributed to Mr. Hull's success as a Congressman, as a U.S. Senator, and as Secretary of State in the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt, from 1933 to 1944. The same qualities of foresight, dedication, and resourcefulness which earned him fame as the author of the Federal income tax law later brought him international renown as author of the reciprocal trade agreements programs, father of the United Nations, and architect of the good neighbor policy.

The article by Mr. Bartlett follows:

THE INCOME TAX—HOW WE GOT IT

(By Charles Bartlett)

The docile acquiescence with which Americans have come to pay their income tax is a pale reflection of the sharp struggle which preceded the imposition of the tax less than 60 years ago.

The public's acceptance of the tax as a fact of life is a faint echo also of the Republican platform of 1894 which warned: "In this country an income tax of any sort is odious and will bring odium upon any party blind enough to impose it."

The ultimate responsibility for the tax was bipartisan in a curious way. The Republican conservatives who hated it the most made the tax possible with a huge miscalculation.

Some Democrats, particularly the Western Populists, had pressed for many years for an income tax. Other Democrats, like President Grover Cleveland, opposed it. Cleveland was in fact instrumental in keeping the chairmanship of the House Ways and Means Committee from a Tennessee Congressman, Benton McMillin, who was an ardent advocate of graduated taxation.

In vengeance Mr. McMillin managed, as chairman of a taxation subcommittee, to force enactment of an income tax provision in 1894. It was quickly declared unconstitutional.

CORDELL HULL'S ROLE

A young farm boy, Cordell Hull, succeeded to Mr. McMillin's seat in 1907. He was deeply schooled in his predecessor's battle and impressed by the inequities of a system under which the Government was financed by duties on imports and excise taxes on items like whisky and tobacco. He set about renewing Mr. McMillin's struggle, studying nights and Sundays in his office, larding the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with information about the tax as it was applied in other countries and in the United States during the Civil War, and pressing his views upon the legislative leaders, who came to shrink at his approach.

His issue had growing support. Theodore Roosevelt had railed at the vested interests and William Howard Taft, campaigning for the Presidency in 1908, endorsed a constitutional amendment to make the income tax legal. Mr. Hull's chance came in the course of debate on the Tariff Act of 1909, a supreme effort by the conservatives which was later known as the Payne-Aldrich Act. He proposed the inclusion of an income tax and the idea gathered momentum, particularly among the Republican progressives from the Middle West. In a last-ditch effort to defeat the tariff act, Democratic Leader Champ Clark proposed that the bill be recommitted with instructions to add an income tax. His motion fell before the Republican majority.

A CASUAL CONVERSATION

But as the powerful Republican majority in the Senate, led by Nelson Aldrich, of Rhode Island, was preparing to take up the tariff bill, Mr. Hull fell into conversation on a train with Senator Joseph Bailey of Texas, a Democrat who had been part of the 1894 fight for the income tax. Mr. Hull brought him up to date on developments and interested him in the plan of adding an income tax amendment to the tariff measure. Mr. Bailey's move was quickly joined by Senator Albert Cummins, Republican, of Iowa, and the momentum began to mount.

Mr. Aldrich, whose attention was centered completely on the bill to raise tariffs, did not like the menace of the Bailey-Cummins move. Aware of the strong possibility that it might pass, he coolly determined to enact a constitutional amendment, get the issue out of the way, and rest comfortably upon his estimate that the State legislatures would never ratify an amendment to make the income tax legal.

UNANIMOUS PASSAGE

The amendment passed unanimously after 2 days of mild discussion in a Senate that included 23 millionaires. Mr. Aldrich's strategy was expressed by Senator H. D. Money, Democrat, of Mississippi: "We can feel quite sure that an act of such far-reaching importance, that touches the pockets of very many rich people, is not very likely to become a part of the organic law of our Republic or of our Confederation."

Seven days later the House passed the amendment 318 to 14 with Mr. Clark asserting that the amendment "is simply a scheme to keep Congress from passing an income tax now." Mr. Hull and others continued to press for direct congressional enactment of an income tax as the amendment began its rounds of the State legislatures.

Four years later on February 3, 1913, only a month before Woodrow Wilson's inauguration, Wyoming became the 36th State to approve Aldrich's amendment and it became the 16th amendment to the Constitution.

Please Send Check

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives a very fine editorial which was published in the Mansfield News-Journal, an independent daily newspaper at Mansfield, Ohio, on Thursday, April 6, 1961. I am sure that the message it conveys will come through clearly to the reader and I know you will agree that it represents more that the satirical quality which obviously commends it well. It pierces with clarity the illusion of "something for nothing" which seems to be a major national pastime for some of our citizens and indicates the real fallacy of the welfare state.

The editorial follows:

PLEASE SEND CHECK

The SECRETARY,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

HONORED SIR: I understand you pay people for not growing things. How much will you pay me if I do not plant my garden this year? Usually I have a dozen tomato plants, some sweet corn, a row or two of beans and peas. I've had pretty good luck with squash, too, but my potatoes are generally just mediocre.

I'll be glad to discontinue this effort. I began it during the war when it was considered patriotic. Now I can see how it adds to our national surplus and cuts the market for what other people grow.

If you pay me enough so I can buy these things I usually grow, why naturally I'll be happy to collaborate. As my uncle says, it's silly to work for something when you can get it for nothing.

You will have no problem with me. Just write out a check for what you think my vegetables would be worth and I'll put the garden in the soil bank or let my wife put

it in flowers. (She won't sell any, but she'd like to know if it's all right to give some of the glads to the neighbors? If they are sick?)

Where you may run into trouble is with my cousin. He's a knucklehead. He says he never did grow anything and never got paid for it either. He threatens to stake out a garden and start growing things unless you pay him to not.

Somebody told him you get the best deal for not growing rice, cotton, and wheat and he would like you to please advise if this is correct so he'll know which seed not to buy.

It has been carefully explained to my knucklehead cousin that he can get paid for growing things as well as for not growing them, if he'll just go along with your regulations.

He says this sounds like an even better deal.

So please send the regulations on how to get paid for growing things as well as for not growing them.

That is for my cousin, you understand.

All I want is one check for my nongarden.

Sincerely,

E. G. R. BEAVER.

P.S.—Would I also be entitled to compensation for not working in my garden? I'm not pressing you. It's just a thought.

Field Day for Sharpies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the other day the House passed the so-called distressed areas bill and except for the neccesary adjustments to be made in conference, it will soon be the law of the land. However, the Chicago Sun-Times in an editorial entitled "Field Day for Sharpies," on April 3, 1961, offered some sobering thoughts to those who advocated this latest brazen raid of the Treasury at the taxpayers' expense:

FIELD DAY FOR SHARPIES

When President Kennedy proposed, shortly after his inauguration, that Federal money be spent in economically distressed areas we commented:

"If an area has economic potential, business can be attracted without Federal help. If the area is hopeless, Federal efforts to pump private enterprise life into it will provide only a field day for politicians, bureaucrats, and business sharpies out to make a quick buck."

We had in mind coal mine ghost towns or rural areas that have no appeal for business investment because of location, lack of raw materials, or other reasons.

Republicans obviously had this thought in mind when they tried to squeeze the pap out of the administration's distressed areas bill in the House last week. They were willing to make Federal loans available to areas with economic potential and to provide funds for retraining unemployed workers in distressed areas, but they drew the line at providing $100 million for industrial loans and $75 million for public facility grants for rural depressed areas, virtually all in the South or border States.

The Republicans called this fund a "bribe and a boondoggle." Pouring money into rural areas that are not suited for economic or industrial development won't hasten the end of the current recession or promote national prosperity.

Representative ALBERT RAINS, Democrat, of Alabama, frankly admitted that the money for rural areas was included in the administration bill to get votes of Southerners for it. And that's the way it turned out. A GOP substitute minus the Southern comfort was voted down and the bribe and boondoggle bill was passed.

Since the Democratic Senate has already passed a similar bill and President Kennedy is ready to sign the measure, a raid on the Treasury in the name of helping the unemployed will soon begin.

We suggest that the Members of Congress with respect for the taxpayers' dollars scan closely each proposal to lay out Federal money in backward areas. It should be possible to put the finger on the politicians, bureaucrats, and business sharpies out to make a quick buck.

In the long run, of course, prosperity is promoted by individual effort and private enterprise, as Representative LESLIE C. ARENDS, Republican, of Illinois, tried to tell the House in reciting the bootstrap accomplishments of Danville, with a long history of being a distressed area. But the House wasn't interested in how private enterprise built up Danville and how it can help other communities willing to help themselves; it was hellbent for a Treasury raid and it voted one.

Pennsylvania School Study Council Signally Honors Dr. A. Bruce Denniston, Superintendent of the Altoona, Pa., Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, at a recent meeting of educators at the Pennsylvania State University, the Pennsylvania School Study Council honored its retiring president, Dr. A. Bruce Denniston, superintendent of Altoona, Pa., schools, by selecting him as recipient of its first award as "Administrator of the Year."

Dr. Denniston is completing 42 years of dedicated service in the field of education and has richly earned the great honor bestowed upon him because of the indelible imprint he has made as an educator in the Keystone State.

Altoona, which is my own hometown, has benefited greatly the past 11 years from the progress made in the public school system during Dr. Denniston's tenure as superintendent. He is recognized as an able administrator with the happy faculty of being able to inspire initiative and leadership in his associates. The result is that members of the staff and faculty have evidenced their great respect for Dr. Denniston and their wholehearted desire to emulate him in his dedicated efforts to advance the best interests of the Altoona Public School system.

Dr. Denniston, in addition to being elected recently as president of the Altoona Rotary Club, has long been active in civic affairs among the most outstanding citizens of Altoona, and one whose exceptional ability and sincere efforts have touched many facets of community life.

In extending my sincere congratulations to Dr. Denniston, I wish to include in my remarks the following editorial from the March 25, 1961, issue of the Altoona (Pa.) Mirror as it is a deserved tribute to an outstanding educator:

DISTINGUISHED HONOR

A most appreciative honor, a brandnew title and a laudatory acknowledgment of extraordinary service in the field of education came to Dr. A. Bruce Denniston, superintendent of the Altoona schools, this week and this community is rejoicing, along with the recipient, in the award of the designation "administrator of the year," bestowed at a meeting of educators at Penn State University.

Dr. Denniston so richly deserves the distinction designated by the Pennsylvania School Study Council. The award has an added interest in that it was the first ever presented by the council and selection of the Altoonan is highly complimentary and greatly valued as an endorsement of the educational advancement as promoted by the superintendent.

The award carries with it a bronze plaque and, in addition, provides financial aid by a scholarship to a graduate assistant in the field of educational administration at Penn State.

Dr. Denniston's career in education covers 42 years, classroom teaching, director of secondary education at Slippery Rock and 12 years as superintendent of the Greenville schools and 11 years as superintendent in Altoona.

His accomplishments as a leader in professional and lay groups has been noted, his long-range improvement of the Altoona School District being lauded. He has also given of his time for various community enterprises and his service as president of the Pennsylvania School Study Council the past year was highly praised as he was designated an inspirational leader, a dedicated schoolman and educator.

The Altoona School District, the community and teachers generally, most cordially congratulate their educational head for the high honor attained, being profound in their thanks for the excellent services, which reflect most encouragingly the high standard of the schools and the city generally. Altoonans are most grateful for the action by the council, which certainly made no mistake in honoring Dr. Denniston and recognizing his vast abilities.

Hope for the Sick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Massachusetts Committee for Project Hope, I respectfully request your attention to the following editorial:

"HOPE" FOR THE SICK

The floating medical center *Hope*, dreamed up in a great splash of publicity, has gone about its business in the Far East in a quiet and effective way. The *Hope* is a World War II Navy hospital ship, refitted as a floating

clinic and instruction center, and operated by the American President Lines for the People-to-People Health Foundation that runs it as a privately financed undertaking.

The ship has been serving in the ports of Indonesia. It carries some 15 doctors, 20 nurses, and 30 medical technicians, and is outfitted with closed circuit television and classrooms, as well as 3 operating rooms and 230 beds, so as to give instruction to native medical personnel. But despite its up-to-date facilities, the *Hope* often sends its staff ashore to set up what turn out to be primitive clinics. News of the ship's arrival travels fast, and the sick are brought from far inland.

It costs $3½ million a year to keep the *Hope* running, and it is expected that eventually other ships can be sent to Africa and South America. The *Hope* itself is going to spend the summer along the coast of South Vietnam.

Those who have worked on the *Hope* report that the people it has served in Asia are deeply impressed to learn that it comes, not from the U.S. Government, but from the private effort of American people. This allays suspicions of political motives in areas still very sensitive about colonialism and subject to steady Communist propaganda.

In emphasizing medical instruction over stopgap medical services the *Hope* leaves a continuing service behind to a certain extent, whenever it leaves an area. Any such program that encourages the self-sufficiency of people in various kinds of need deserves applause.

Student Returns From Year in Brazil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article. I believe that in view of the President's recent statements regarding the need for the revamping of our policy toward Latin America in general, this article would be of some interest not only to the Members of Congress, but also to the policymakers of our Government. I am therefore delighted to submit this article for the RECORD:

LOCAL STUDENT RETURNS FROM YEAR IN BRAZIL

(By Clayton Willis)

A University of New Mexico graduate just back from a year in Brazil has great hopes that new Brazilian President Janio Quadros will do much to curb inflation there.

Jan Smith, 23-year-old daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Mike Smith, 3124 San Pedro NE., said she thinks President Quadros is going to help the economy of Brazil because of the austerity program he has outlined.

"As Governor of Sao Paulo State, Quadros was very successful with his austerity program," Miss Smith said.

She was in Brazil on an Inter-American Cultural Convention grant which is given for study and research.

"When I left Brazil in early February the cost of living and the inflation was going up so much that I didn't see how the lower class could live," she said.

The 1959 University of New Mexico graduate says education is the thing Brazil needs most. She said that only 52 percent of the population is literate.

"I don't think the lower classes are going to be able to better themselves without education. And education is too expensive for them," the former University of New Mexico major in inter-American affairs said.

"And the upper classes don't care whether the lower classes educate themselves or not," Miss Smith observed.

She said that there is little public school type education in Brazil. What education there is is mostly of the private school kind, she noted.

The attractive Albuquerquean attended classes on a noncredit basis 5 months at the National University of Brazil in Rio de Janeiro. She also lived in the Atlantic coastal port city of Salvador 5 months.

Miss Smith spent the remaining 2 months of her year in the Portuguese-speaking country traveling through the interior of Bahia State. There she recorded folk music and visited several cattle ranches in this northeastern part of Brazil.

Four other observations she made in an interview at her home:

1. Communism is practically nonexistent in the part of Brazil she saw;

2. Students at the National University of Brazil gave her a somewhat cool reception as an American. But the university's professors were very helpful;

3. The Brazilian sees the typical American as someone with a lot of money who drinks and smokes and goes to a lot of parties (the impression they get from third-rate American movies they see, she said);

4. Brazilians were surprised that she spoke Portuguese. "But when the merchants found out I was an American, you could see the dollar signs lighting up in their eyes," Miss Smith said.

A Sensible and Timely View of a Certain Constitutional Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I take satisfaction in presenting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a few passages from "The Life of Col. David Crockett," by Edward S. Ellis, published in 1884. Colonel Crockett's treatment of the constitutional question involved in congressional appropriations for charitable purposes is, I submit, both valuable and timely today.

A SENSIBLE AND TIMELY VIEW OF A CERTAIN CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTION

From time to time, Congress has appropriated money for charitable purpurposes. The following account of Crockett's experience, while in Washington, is in that line, and is therefore timely and instructive. The narrator says—

While Crockett was in Congress I had business which required me to spend several weeks in Washington City. Waiting upon one of the departments, or rather one of the chief clerks, for my turn, I had much leisure upon my hands; for, though my business might have been dispatched as well in 2 hours as in 2 months, yet I had to wait. I had made up my mind that I would not leave until my business was settled. My only regular employment was to go every day to the office to learn that it could not be attended to that day.

Crockett was then the lion of Washington. I was a great admirer of his character, and, having several friends who were intimate with him, I found no difficulty in making his acquaintance. I was fascinated with him, and he seemed to take a fancy to me.

I was one day in the lobby of the House of Representatives when a bill was taken up appropriating money for the benefit of a widow of a distinguished naval officer. Several beautiful speeches had been made in support, rather, as I thought, because it afforded the speakers a fine opportunity for display than from the necessity of convincing anybody, for it seemed to me that everybody favored it. The Speaker was just about to put the question, when Crockett arose. Everybody expected, of course, that he was going to make one of his characteristic speeches in support of the bill. He commenced—

"Mr. Speaker, I have as much respect for the memory of the deceased, and as much sympathy for the sufferings of the living, if suffering there be, as any man in this House, but we must not permit our respect for the dead or our sympathy for a part of the living to lead us into an act of injustice to the balance of the living. I will not go into an argument to prove that Congress has no power to appropriate this money as an act of charity. Every Member upon this floor knows it. We have the right, as individuals, to give away as much of our own money as we please in charity; but as Members of Congress we have no right so to appropriate a dollar of the public money. Some eloquent appeals have been made to us upon the ground that it is a debt due the deceased. Mr. Speaker, the deceased lived long after the close of the war; he was in office to the day of his death, and I have never heard that the Government was in arrears to him. This Government can owe no debts but for services rendered, and at a stipulated price. If it is a debt, how much it is? Has it been audited, and the amount due ascertained? If it is a debt, this is not the place to present it for payment, or to have its merits examined. If it is a debt, we owe more than we can ever hope to pay, for we owe the widow of every soldier who fought in the War of 1812 precisely the same amount. There is a woman in my neighborhood, the widow of as gallant a man as ever shouldered a musket. He fell in battle. She is as good in every respect as this lady, and is as poor. She is earning her daily bread by her daily labor, and if I were to introduce a bill to appropriate $5 or $10,000 for her benefit, I should be laughed at, and my bill would not get five votes in this House. There are thousands of widows in the country just such as the one I have spoken of; but we never hear of any of these large debts to them. Sir, this is no debt. The Government did not owe it to the deceased when he was alive; it could not contract it after he died. I do not wish to be rude, but I must be plain. Every man in this House knows it is not a debt. We cannot, without the grossest corruption, appropriate this money as the payment of a debt. We have not the semblance of authority to appropriate it as a charity. Mr. Speaker, I have said we have the right to give as much money as our own as we please. I am the poorest man on this floor. I cannot vote for this bill, but I will give 1 week's pay to the object, and if every Member of Congress will do the same, it will amount to more than the bill asks."

He took his seat. Nobody replied. The bill was put upon its passage, and, instead of passing unanimously as was generally supposed, and as, no doubt, it would, but for that speech, it received but few votes, and, of course was lost.

Future Homemakers of America Look Toward New Horizons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, the period of April 9 through 15 has been set aside this year as National Future Homemakers of America Week, and it gives me a great deal of pleasure at this time to commend the over 500,000 members of this fine organization. They fully deserve our recognition for the outstanding job they are doing in preparing themselves for the vital role they will have in the future of this Nation.

The Future Homemakers of America, which is a national organization for high school students studying homemaking, was organized in June 1945 and now has 10,000 chapters throughout the United States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Cosponsors for the organization are the Home Economics Branch of the U.S. Office of Education and the American Home Economics Association. The Commonwealth of Kentucky was the first State to charter the Future Homemakers of America, and in the Second Congressional District of Kentucky, which I have the honor to represent, members of local chapters of the FHA are extremely active and well organized. Their participation in civic projects, their willingness to be of assistance at all times, the skills they have acquired through FHA activities, and their sense of good citizenship make them highly valuable members of their community. These young women are ably assisted in their endeavors by their home economics teachers and other interested women who appreciate and understand the importance of training these girls in the art of homemaking.

Members of the Future Homemakers of America through their chapter and individual activities work toward four objectives: To develop potential abilities; to develop a better understanding of family members and to contribute to their well-being; to interpret the value of home economics as a basic part of total education; and to promote good will through getting to know neighbors at home and abroad. It can readily be seen that concentration on these four objectives will ultimately bring the girl to the maturity required of a successful wife and mother.

The young woman's innate abilities and talents must be recognized, encouraged, and developed so that she will be able to contribute the full potential of which she is capable to her family and community.

By learning early in life to be aware of others and their problems will enable the future homemaker to care for her family with an understanding and intelligence she might otherwise lack.

Certainly the value of a thorough knowledge of home economics as a basic part of total education has been well established as evidenced by the many courses offered in this subject at our colleges and universities. No longer is the modern wife and mother considered simply a household drudge concerned only with the traditional duties of homemaking such as marketing, cooking, cleaning, and child raising. The American housewife is now expected to be an accomplished hostess, chauffeur, nutritionist, educator, psychologist, practical nurse, and efficiency and budget expert. While all these skills are important to the smooth functioning of the modern home, the most essential quality of a successful homemaker is the ability to bring love, harmony, and a knowledge of God to the family unit.

In order to promote better understanding with young people of other nations, FHA'ers read books, entertain foreign visitors, hear guest speakers and exchange letters with youth overseas. In addition, they make contributions to other nations directly and through other agencies which give material and technical aid.

Mr. Speaker, the members of this national youth organization deserve our commendation for preparing themselves to be better citizens of tomorrow, and not only do the Future Homemakers of America look "toward new horizons," but they "face the future with warm courage and high hope."

Reality and the Electrical Company—Sherman Act Cases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEM MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the electrical company conspiracy cases have been somewhat in the news of late. Not nearly enough, however.

For years we have been submitted to an unrelenting barrage about the glories of the competitive price system. In every book on economics, every financial page, the marketplace has been extolled as the all-inclusive answer to our economic ills.

Yet, for anyone with a grain of curiosity the fact is that there has been no price competition in many key industries for a long, long time. Competition, in the public understanding of that term, has been an old wives tale, suitable for sophomore textbooks. What is so astonishing about the electrical cases is the open mouthed outrage expressed in periodicals like Life and Time. Where have they been since Mr. Luce went to Yale?

Administered prices have been part of the game for many years. The trial and conviction of a few electrical executives is not going to halt the trend either. In one guise or another the noncompetitive price is the order of the day, and will continue to enlarge throughout a broader and broader spectrum of American industry.

This is the reality of modern corporate life. The moralizing on the subject is well-nigh insufferable.

In many ways the real censure belongs not to those benighted officers who were punished with jail sentences, but the highly placed critics who refuse to look the facts squarely in the eye.

We cannot live in a hypocritical world which deals with facts as though they did not exist. Citizens cannot come to any meaningful decisions if they are given only half the basic presumptions. Congress cannot function when it must deal in terms of unreality, the nonexistent world of price competition, for example.

The real conspiracy is not a few electrical executives meeting clandestinely in hotel rooms. The real conspiracy is a continuing one of long standing—the reluctance of Time, Life, U.S. News & World Report, and the other mythologists to start giving people the facts of life.

I include an article by Bernard Nossiter appearing in the Washington Post:

LEGAL PRICE FIXING NEW SHOCK THERAPY
(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

Some business leaders have found a new answer to the electrical machinery price-fixing scandal which would drastically alter traditional American ideas of a competitive economy.

At this point, most businessmen make conventional remarks about the meaning of the case. They talk of the need to take a closer look at what their subordinates are doing to insure that they are complying with the law.

But another idea is growing among a few business leaders. It is based on a much more realistic image of how the economy works. To be sure, this image is not cast in terms of a chamber of commerce speech. It would also disturb the mythmakers who picture ours as an essentially competitive economy.

In blunt terms, here is the solution some businessmen have suggested to the problems raised by the electrical machinery case: Let us legalize cartels, making lawful the very price fixing and market sharing for which the seven electrical machinery executives went to jail.

Most executives, toying with this idea, would simply let each industry on its own agree on prices and division of the market. A few acknowledge that token Government supervision would be a political necessity.

The historian will find nothing new in this. It has echoes of syndicalism, the corporate state and the techniques of much modern business in Europe. The New Deal's brief experiment with the NRA was a conscious effort to fix prices and allocate the market with Government sanction.

But for those who think there are values in a purely competitive economy or those who believe that competition is the dominant mode of the American economy, such an idea is repugnant.

Nevertheless, it is very much in the air as this reporter, an occasional visitor to executive suites, can testify. A knowledgeable vice president of one big corporation was thinking out loud the other day about the electrical case.

"Suppose," he said, "that unrestrained competition prevailed in the heavy equipment industry. What do you think would happen? It wouldn't be long before all the smaller, weaker companies fell by the wayside and one strong dog ate up all the other dogs.

"What is the end result? The very pursuit of unfettered competition would lead to one

firm in the industry or monopoly. Isn't this a paradox?"

The Trade press has been voicing this same theme with increasing frequency in recent weeks.

Item: A cement company publicly deplores plans of a rival to build a new plant. The venture, said the Marquette Cement Manufacturing Co., could lead to "an unrestrained competitive scramble for business in the Northeastern States along with severely reduced prices."

Item: A shipping news writer notes that some Congressmen are taking a dim view of steamship conferences—a device which enables competing lines to fix prices legally. "To the confirmed steamship conference man," the knowledgeable writer says, "the absence of a conference means rate wars and chaos."

The frankest expression of the renewed interest in legal cartels comes from a sophisticated investment advisory service called the Value Line. Published in New York by Arnold Bernhard, it sells for $144 a year. This price alone means that it would be inelegant to call it a stock market tip sheet.

From time to time the Value Line runs Bernhard's analyses of current problems. His views deserve attention on two counts:

His service is held in high esteem by Wall Street and reaches an influential investing audience.

His statement of the meaning of the electrical machinery case has been reprinted by one of the largest of the convicted firms for distribution to selected offices.

Bernhard's thesis is comparatively simple. It parallels the ideas quoted above and runs like this: If laws against price fixing were enforced to the hilt, they would "actually bring about monopoly." Large firms generally have lower unit costs of production than small ones. The big firms could continue to cut prices until the small firms in their industry disappeared. Even if the small firms were more efficient, they couldn't sustain an unlimited price war.

"The big corporation, like General Electric, can sustain a loss in one of its many divisions and offset this loss against the profits of its other divisions, thus reducing its taxable profit." The corporate tax rate is 52 percent, so, the U.S. Government assists the big fellow by absorbing half his loss while the little fellow engaged in only one particular business sustains his full loss without offsetting profits from other divisions (which he simply does not have)."

In fact, the analysis goes on. "The free enterprise system in which prices are free to fluctuate without restraint has not existed for a couple of hundred years." Typically, Bernhard says, price leadership (or administered prices) prevails. That is, the biggest producer in an industry announces or confirms a price and the smaller companies follow its lead. The price is an umbrella held high enough to permit the least efficient produced to make a profit.

This technique sets prices, Bernhard observes. But if products and prices are identical, how do you assure each producer a share of the market?

"Here is where the conspiracy comes in, and in practice has got to come in," the analysis says. "It usually works out that definite percentages of the market are allocated to particular companies by the sellers themselves; they make their bids in such a way as to assure the division of the market according to the prearranged agreement."

While deploring the methods of the electrical machinery makers ("their conspiratorial practices were carried on with the sophistication of teenagers"), Bernhard argues that they had some unique and sticky problems.

He contends that they sell to informed customers—utility company purchasing agents and governments—who would quickly catch on and object to ordinary price leadership. The fact that so many didn't catch on to identical bids for so long makes this a dubious contention, however.

More importantly, perhaps, is that much of the machinery is tailor made for a unity or a government power company. You can't post a uniform price on a product that is changed for each order. So, in effect, the electrical machinery makers were driven to their teenage conspiracy methods.

Bernhard also observes that fixed prices operate legally in many areas of the economy. Floors are set under the price of labor (minimum wage), farm products (price supports) and some retail products (fair trade laws).

Unions are a legal device to fix labor prices, specifically exempted from antitrust laws (unless they are engaged in collusion with employers).

Bernhard argues that there is a contradiction between a government putting a floor under labor's price and prosecuting business for doing the same thing—a point some alerted editorialists are beginning to make.

For now, the argument is left at this point, but its logic is clear: Let us permit market-sharing and price fixing to avoid chaos, rate wars, and the destruction of smaller firms.

Left unanswered is the question of power. Who is to decide what prices shall be and how markets are to be allocated? An instinctive industrial reaction would be, Why us, of course. But this is political fantasy. If cartels were legalized, the cry would inevitably follow that the public interest must be protected, that the Government must have veto power at least over cartel decisions.

Calling the Turn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the April 3 issue of Barron's entitled "Calling the Turn" by Dr. John H. Hoagland, associate professor of management, Graduate School of Business Administration, Michigan State University:

CALLING THE TURN

(By Dr. John H. Hoagland)

EAST LANSING, MICH.—Purchasing surveys now indicate that the business upturn will begin before mid-1961. A business recovery should begin within a few months and the current recession should prove to be relatively short and mild, according to the latest monthly change in indexes of purchasing business surveys. These were the salient conclusions of reports on the January and February surveys made by the National Association of Purchasing Agents. As expressions of confident forecasting, they ran well ahead of most official and private analyses of leading economic indicators. That confidence, in turn, rested securely on the knowledge that for a decade or more, NAPA's surveys successfully have called the turn on the ups and downs of business.

For example, in early March NAPA indicated that order backlogs were shrinking substantially less than in the preceding 6 months; new orders were declining less than in the 1957–58 recession; curtailment in output remained relatively mild; declines in employment were slackening in most areas; industrial inventories were being liquidated at a slower rate; prices remained fairly stable; sellers were offering somewhat faster deliveries; and buyers were tending to stabilize their forward commitments.

At first sight, such developments might seem difficult to appraise. In recent years, however, NAPA data have yielded a gage which, instead of trying to weigh the aggregate of a large number of business indicators, focuses on the changes. For example, the surveys ask purchasing agents to state whether inventories, new orders, production and employment are higher, lower or unchanged; NAPA then tabulates the responses in percentages of the total number of those surveyed.

By easing an index on the monthly changes in such seemingly simple data, a first-class forecasting device has emerged, the usefulness of which has been affirmed time and again. For example, monthly change indexes, based on NAPA reports, clearly revealed the presence of the 1951–52 recession, which was known to every businessman but ignored by official observers. Similarly, early in 1953, these indexes pointed to the subsequent recession. They also indicated that the 1957–58 setback, which followed the 1955–56 recovery, represented a reaction which was delayed by the Suez crisis of 1956–57.

Contrariwise, in the bleak winters of both 1954 and 1958, the monthly change indices suggested the likelihood of recovery, just as they proceeded to do again early this year. Successful experience thus appears to justify the confident conclusions stated in the NAPA reports of early February and March.

A major reason for the conviction carried by the surveys, and the indices based on them, is the honesty and seriousness with which purchasing executives provide accurate information. Moreover, since NAPA conducts its surveys during the third or fourth week of each month, and tabulates and publishes the results by month's end, its data lead all other indicators by weeks and even months.

In the latest recession, according to the monthly change indices, the business decline reached its peak rate in the final quarter of 1960. The slope started flattening in December, and subsequent trends point toward a general upturn in the near future. Whether the indices supply clear evidence in that respect for March or April matters little besides the discovery that recovery clearly is in sight.

The NAPA business surveys thus have proved to be helpful tools of business analysis. Beyond this achievement, they have given rise to useful observations regarding the business cycle generally. For example, in determining business trends, industrial purchasing agents often carry more weight than consumers' demand. Purchases, after all, are the largest cost element in the industry; manufacturers on average spend twice as much for goods as for wages and salaries. By their decisions and their policies, purchasing executives exert an important influence on their firms' profits. Their combined actions, in turn, have a major impact on the business cycle.

As intermediate consumers, industrial purchasers in the aggregate commit their employers to outlays of $10 to $15 billion a month. Changes in such commitments clearly carry great weight. Between periods of business expansion and contraction, the average forward commitment of industrial purchasers has varied by as much as 1 month, thereby shrinking, or adding to, order backlogs by $10 to $15 billion per year. On certain occasions, the shifts have been much greater.

Business sentiment, in turn, usually reflects rational considerations. When vital channels of supply are threatened, for instance, purchasers of necessity will seek protection for their concerns. Thus, in

anticipation of the 1959 steel strike, some purchasing executives in the fall of 1958 began accumulating inventories. In the winter of 1959, steel buying swelled to such dimensions that order taking became chaotic, and many buyers did not know when to expect delivery. As a result, they resorted to duplicate or multiple ordering, in the process building up a very large inventory of metal in the first half of 1959. Moreover, in advance of the shutdown, steel parts and products also were hoarded.

Thus, the anticipation of a strike pushed business activity to unprecedented peaks. Owing to the purchase and inventory imbalances, moreover, the effects of the strike carried beyond the settlement. In 1959, when the impact of the strike on delivery schedules and prices was uncertain, many purchasers placed large steel orders for post-strike delivery; indeed, most steel shipments made last winter filled orders of this kind. Such prior commitments, then, prevented purchasing executives from shifting their policies quickly.

By last April, however, many firms found themselves with excessive stocks of steel. Drastic shifts in buying policy and substantial reduction of steel inventories proved necessary. As these shifts persisted through 1960, they made a major contribution to the recession.

The latter also reflected a widespread misunderstanding of the "strike anticipation boom" of 1959, which caused excessive optimism for 1960. After the strike, the reasoning seemed to run, business will take up where it left off in mid-1959. This author, however, forecast a recession starting during the second quarter of 1960. He had noted that within 12 months of the steel strikes of 1952 and 1956, a business recession developed, and he expected history to repeat. By the same token, it now seems likely that a strike threat in steel for mid-1962 will stimulate business activity late this year and through the first half of next year.

From a study of the monthly change indices of the NAPA business surveys, it thus is clear that major strikes, and threats of strikes, have affected both the timing and the magnitude of business ups and downs. Obvious though it is, however, few economists have studied or even recognized the effect of strikes on the business cycle. Moreover, since strikes upset long-range business planning, they also tend to interrupt economic growth.

It surely is no accident that these insights have resulted from a close study and analysis of NAPA's monthly business surveys and the monthly change indices. While most official statistics are collected and interpreted by agencies subject to political influence, the NAPA is interested only in supplying its members with a tool for understanding business conditions. Like many disinterested intellectual efforts, the NAPA's surveys have succeeded in achieving more than their primary aim. As a byproduct, they have furnished the Nation with a reliable gage of the business cycle and its turning points.

Just To Be Friendly?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Reds and the Chinese and other participating governments are pursuing the cold war with all their normal vigor. A pertinent commentary on the dropping of espionage charges against a Red official is appropriately discussed in the March 28, 1961, issue of the Chicago American:

JUST TO BE FRIENDLY?

As explained by Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy and the State Department, the Government's decision to drop espionage charges against Igor Y. Melekh makes no sense at all. Since they're not normally given to talking nonsense we conclude, hopefully, that the official explanation isn't the real one.

Melekh, a Russian employee of the United Nations, and his codefendant, Willie Hirsch, were accused of trying to obtain aerial photos of Chicago, presumably for potential use by Russian bombers.

Friday, on orders from the Justice Department, U.S. Attorney Robert F. Tieken moved to dismiss the charges against Melekh, on condition that he gets out of the country. Federal District court Judge Edwin A. Robson had no choice but to let Melekh go.

Robert Kennedy explained that Secretary of State Dean Rusk had urged this move in the hope that it would "contribute toward improving our position as regards the protection of U.S. citizens in Russia." If Rusk genuinely believed that freeing Melekh would somehow make the Russians feel obligated to do something for us in return, he is astoudingly naive.

Soviet foreign policy is not run on the basis of vague impulses toward charity. The Russians will offer us concessions when and if they consider it advantageous to them, and for no other reason.

Frankly, we're unwilling to believe Rusk and Robert Kennedy are such innocents as their explanation makes them out. We assume that something concrete was gained through this move; possibly a break for U-2 pilot Francis Powers. Whatever the trade may have been, it's a shame that justice for Melekh had to be short-circuited for it, but in any deal with the Russians justice usually is the loser.

Symbolism and the Eagle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech given before the Fraternal Order of Eagles in North Adams, Mass., Saturday, April 8, 1961, praising the Eagles and giving the historical origin and the symbolic importance of the eagle:

It gives me great pleasure to be here this evening. It is always a particular source of gratification, and an honor, for me to address a group of those with whom I share common ideals. In this case as a brother Eagle. Therefore, you will appreciate that I am going to speak in a fraternal manner, because we understand and believe in the great ideals and noble goals of this organization.

While I was contemplating what I was going to say this evening, an interesting thought crossed my mind. I thought of the name and symbol of our order—the eagle. My meditations took me back through history, some ancient and some quite recent. I began to consider the many different meanings which this great bird has represented to many people at certain periods of recorded time.

The eagle was used as an art symbol by the early Assyrians and Egyptians. The Persians used the eagle on their ensigns. The armies of Rome carried the eagle as their standard, and so, the legions were known by that name. During the Roman Empire, the eagle was used to represent the deification of the Roman emperors. In ancient times, too, the eagle was often considered as a symbol of the soul's flight after death. Christianity uses the eagle to represent the evangelist, St. John. In this case it symbolizes his wonderful divine vision and spiritual flights. In the days of chivalry and knighthood, heraldry employed the eagle as a symbol used on coats of armor, shields, or standards.

Napoleon Bonaparte used the eagle as a symbol of his empire and his armies carried it into battle on their uniforms and flags. The Austrian Empire of the Hapsburgs, and the German Empire under the Kaisers used an eagle with twin heads, which referred to their assumption of power both east and west. In recent times, this noble bird had come to have even another and more sinister meaning. The Nazis adopted the eagle, clutching a swastika in its claws, as the national emblem for Germany. Mussolini too, hoping to imitate the ancient Caesars in his dream for empire, had the eagle holding fasces in its talons.

But throughout the years in which man has often seen the eagle stand for alien ideologies, we have also had our proud American eagle—a symbol of hope and not despair—a representation of freedom not oppression—the manifestation of right rather than might. Indeed, for us and for free men everywhere, the eagle is a noble bird and not one which means hate, fear, or tyranny.

If I may, I would like to give you a brief account about our adoption of the eagle which is the central figure of the Great Seal of the United States.

The Founding Fathers, feeling that the new Nation needed a symbol to express its sovereignty, adopted a resolution providing "that Dr. Franklin, Mr. John Adams, and Mr. Thomas Jefferson be a committee to bring in a device for a seal for the United States of America." Six years were to pass and two more committees were to work on the job, however, before the Congress, on June 20, 1782, approved the design of the Great Seal.

As you know, for the central figure of the seal, the designers chose a bird. Not just a bird, but the American bald eagle—the mightiest of birds, a high-flying bird that overcomes all obstacles for its young or dies in the effort.

As I mentioned, throughout history, the eagle has been used to denote strength and power. Since the hopes and aims that the men who planned the Great Seal had for our Nation have been borne out, they could not have chosen a more apt bird to express the ideals of this country. We soar high in ambitions and intentions, and our history has shown that we fight not so much for ourselves as for the rights and freedoms of others.

Another interesting fact you might not know. In the eagle's tail the designers placed nine feathers, not because this is the actual number of feathers in an eagle's tail, but because of the meaning of the number nine. Nine is the square of three, the Trinity of the Christian God. Nine would thus indicate a super accentuation of God, indicating that the very foundation of our Nation is God.

So far, I have discussed with you the symbol of the eagle. But a symbol is important only insofar as it represents something. It can speak for an entire philosophy of life or government, as well as particulars.

It is not the physical appearance of the symbol itself which has any merit or value for it does not live, does not believe nor act. What is important, however, is the philosophy which lies at the very fundamental cause for its existence. This is a fact which we as Americans and Eagles must always bear in mind. We have used the noble eagle to represent those ideals and goals in which we believe—we have stated our purpose quite clearly under this symbol for all to see—but it remains a dead symbol unless those who use it translate its philosophy into positive action.

Our order, for example, is called "fraternal." The word itself means "brotherly" and that we are bound together in mutual respect for one another and for our fellow men. This forms the basis for the eixstence of our organization. But while we all subscribe to this lofty ideal, we will be judged, nevertheless, only as to how we place it into practice.

As Americans, we know that we are faced with the symbols of a new tyranny—the Red star and the hammer and sickle. We know exactly what they stand for. But we must also remember that millions of human beings are dedicated to the advancement of the philosophy and way of life they represent. All over the world, in every field of human endeavor and activity, they are putting their corrupt beliefs into action. They are willing to make any sacrifice, even death, to achieve their objective of world domination. They will not cease in their efforts until the hammer and sickle have replaced the cross, the star of David, and our bald eagle as the universal symbol to be worshipped and to represent the sole hope and aspiration for all mankind.

True, you might say, but then ask the question about the many millions more for whom this symbol of communism represents terror and slavery—what about those poor helpless people? How can their example, strong and powerful that it is, still not deter others from accepting the doctrines of the Reds? Because, there are still those who have faith in the perverted ideals of communism. Despite this inhumanity, for all to see, these apostles and disciples are willing to give of themselves totally to its worship and practice. It is this dedicated mass of people, burning with the fervor of faith, carrying their symbol and their bibles by Marx and Lenin who are presenting to we, who live under the noble eagle, the serious and great challenge.

The lessons which we can draw should be quite clear—we must not only match their devotion and their willingness for action, but we must surpass them. There are millions of humans, some free and others in bondage, who look toward our American eagle as the symbol for their hopes on earth.

As members of this great fraternal order, we already know the true meaning of brotherhood. We are conscious of the noble ideals which are the objectives and which afford us guidance. In other words, by belonging to this organization, we have the great foundation from which we can spring into action. We are, in this respect, very fortunate indeed.

Having such a firm basis, assisted by our belonging, we are better able to understand our responsibilities and to appreciate the rights and privileges which our way of life guarantees. Therefore, to counteract the evil force pitted against us and dedicated to our destruction, we must first practice our high ideals among ourselves and our fellow men. And, second, we must always keep in mind that our actions must be related directly to our faith. By so doing, we shall have strengthened our position from within our minds and hearts, and we shall have also dealt apathy and indifference, our own worst enemies, a crushing blow.

Then, without any fear of failure whatsoever, we can present a solid wall of power which no enemy can breach. At the same time, we shall have carried our symbol forward, in progress and action, to hold its virtues before all men.

If we belong to the Fraternal Order of Eagles keeping this in mind, and if our organization fulfills this need as it certainly does, then availing ourselves of its sources for guidance and strength, we can contribute them to our national life—in our community and State—bringing new vigor and power of conviction. Thus, we shall be performing our duty to our great Nation and shouldering our share of the responsibilities. Being true members of this order is synonymous with being good American citizens. By doing all these things, men the world over will have cause for continued hope and faith that they, too, may someday enjoy the same freedoms and way of life, which is our good fortune to have as members of the Eagles living under the bald eagle.

Multiple Benefits on the Shakopee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Robert S. Anderson, of the Soil Conservation Service, Montevideo, Minn., points out the many benefits which are becoming evident from the Shakopee watershed program in Minnesota. This article appeared in the April 1961 issue of Soil Conservation:

MULTIPLE BENEFITS ON THE SHAKOPEE

(By Robert S. Anderson)

Shakopee Creek is a principal tributary of the Chippewa River in western Minnesota. The Shakopee watershed, which includes about 205,000 acres of farmland, is part of the Chippewa tributaries and Hawk Creek pilot watershed protection project.

Flood prevention, erosion control, and reduction of sediment damages to farmland were the principal objectives outlined in the work plan for the Shakopee watershed. But developments have proved that waterfowl, upland game, and other wildlife also are principal beneficiaries of the watershed program as it nears completion.

Structural measures, including two floodwater retarding structures and 25 miles of floodway improvement, have been completed on the Shakopee. Land treatment measures in the upper part of the watershed are being applied by farmers at a stepped-up pace and are proving effective in controlling runoff and erosion. Flood and sediment damages to the lowlands were practically nonexistent in 1960.

The floodway, completed in 1959, not only controls flooding of adjacent farmlands, but also provides an outlet for farm drainage ditches. The two large floodwater retarding structures have, up to now, kept floodwaters down to the capacity of the floodway; and, in addition, they have created permanent lakes from formerly intermittent lakes and greatly enhanced their value to waterfowl and other wildlife.

The storage reservoir in the upper floodway is Swan Lake in Kandiyohi County. It has a surface area of approximately 700 acres and temporary storage capacity of 3,000 acre-feet. The storage reservoir in the lower floodway is Shakopee Lake in Chippewa County. This lake has a permanent pool of about 300 acres and has a temporary storage capacity of 2,000 acre-feet with a surface area of approximately 500 acres at flood stage.

The water control structure at the outlet of each lake consists of an earthfill dam and a concrete drop spillway. They contain neither gates nor valves. These control structures maintain a stable pool level in the lakes throughout the summer. The water rises only during periods of heavy runoff from heavy rains in the watershed.

In the fall of 1958, there was less than 5 acres of water in Shakopee Lake. The control structure, completed just before freezeup that winter, maintained a constant water level in the lake throughout 1959 and 1960. Even with less rainfall in 1959 than in 1958, there was 300 acres of surface water in the lake that fall.

There is a small local hatch of ducks, mostly teal, in both Swan and Shakopee Lakes. The chief advantage of the lakes to waterfowl is a stopover or resting area during the spring and fall migrations. In the falls of 1955, 1956, and 1957 there were up to 5,000 mallards feeding out of Shakopee Lake during the migrations. Needless to say, duck hunting was tops in the lake and the surrounding cornfields.

In 1958, due to the drought, there was only 5 acres of water left in the lake and this was used only by a few great blue herons and wilson snipe.

In 1959 the big northern mallards returned. Again thousands of them used Shakopee Lake as a stopover during their southern migration. The 300 acres of shallow water provide just the spot for the ducks to use as headquarters between their daily trips to the neighboring cornfields. They remain here until the lake freezes, then take off for the South. Escape cover and nesting areas plus winter protection are provided for pheasants all along the shoreline of the lake. This makes the area ideal for the permanent production of pheasants and other wildlife.

Wildlife enthusiasts and sportsmen are happy with the new Shakopee Lake. The farmers in the watershed benefit from the controlled water and managed soil. The people in the cities downstream on the Chippewa River know that their flood problem has been greatly decreased.

Only the United States Has Power To Stop Reds in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, in view of the gravity of the present situation in Laos, I should like my colleagues to have the opportunity to read the following excellent article from the Minneapolis Star of April 7, 1961:

ONLY THE UNITED STATES HAS POWER TO STOP REDS IN ASIA

(By Keyes Beech)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM.—"If I were a Communist general I would be celebrating right now. Why wait?"

This statement, by a three-star Western general, underlines something of more than passing interest—the Communists are rapidly taking over southeast Asia.

The United States, and only the United States, has the power and prestige to stop them.

Whether the United States, or more specifically the Kennedy administration, is willing to take the risks and pay the price is the key to whether the Communists succeed or fail.

For it seems clear that the United States must commit American troops to check Communist ambitions in this part of the world. Whether the Americans will have to fight depends on the Communist response.

But they must be prepared to fight. The time for bluff is past. The most potent weapon in the Red arsenal today is Western fear of war, even a limited war.

The thought of American boys slogging through the jungles of southeast Asia and dying for places with names like Sala, Phou Khoum, Ding Dong or Binh Hoa is far from agreeable to a peace-loving and affluent society.

But it's a project, if not yet a reality, that must be faced. If it comes to that, Americans will not fight alone.

Thailand will fight. It's generally forgotten now but Thai soldiers died on Pork Chop hill in Korea.

With Communist lapping at their borders in neighboring Laos and their very survival threatened, the Thais have all the more reason to fight again.

The South Vietnamese would fight. They are fighting right now less than 30 miles from the air-conditioned hotel where this is written.

The Philippines will fight.

The Laotians won't fight but they might if they knew the Americans were willing to fight alongside them.

Britain, although London denies it, has pledged a brigade if the worst comes to the worst.

Australia will fight because its own security is at stake.

Massive intervention on the Korean scale isn't considered necessary at present by qualified military men. It might come later. That would depend on Communist response.

However, a landing of battalion or regimental size combat units in northeastern Thailand, near the Laotian border, might give the Communists cause for reflection.

There are obvious hazards to this sort of operation, not all of them military.

Screams of "American imperialism" would reverberate through the Communist world. They already reverberate.

A bold, determined American stand—backed up by American troops as well as arms—might conceivably reverse the tide in southeast Asia.

Burma has necessarily made its peace with Red China because it must get along with China the way Finland gets along with Russia.

Roughly the same thing can be said of neutralist Cambodia.

Cambodia's shrewd Prince Sihanouk made his peace with Peiping because he believes the Chinese will ultimately dominate, if not occupy all of southeast Asia.

A stiff American stand might cause him to change his mind.

Certainly nothing else worked.

The Russians and their puppets were notably unimpressed by the landing of a marine helicopter unit in Thailand.

Nor did they recoil in terror from the paper missile hurled at them by the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization during its recent Bangkok conference.

Nor did they cringe with fear at all the tough talk relayed by the U.S. State Department through gullible correspondents, including this one.

Unless the Russians agreed to a cease-fire in Laos in 3 days, newsmen were told, the United States was going to move for immediate military intervention.

The Russians went blithely ahead with their airlift, refusing the United States even a crumb of satisfaction.

They agreed to a cease-fire in their own good time on their own terms—a 14-nation conference which will include Russia and Red China.

There isn't much time.

The Communists already own or control roughly half of Laos. Neighboring South Vietnam is being bled to death by Red subversion and warfare.

Whatever happens at the 14-nation conference, one thing seems reasonably certain. The Communists aren't going to give up what they have.

A neutral sovereign Laos, primly aloof from either side in the cold war, is fine in theory and dear to the hearts of the good-natured, peace-loving Lao.

But it won't work. When American officials talk about Austrian-type neutrality for Laos, they omit two vital factors: Laos isn't Austria and Lao aren't Austrians.

In the opinion of most competent observers, a neutral Laos will inevitably mean a Communist Laos.

With all or most of Laos in Communist hands, South Vietnam will be isolated from anti-Communist southeast Asia.

Neighboring neutralist Cambodia offers no comfort.

On the contrary, it shelters Communist guerrillas when things get too hot for them in South Vietnam.

With Communist cadres assured of free passage through Laos, it is difficult to see how South Vietnam can long stand under the battering it is already getting.

From this point, it's only a matter of time before Thailand begins to make its own arrangements with Red China.

Physician Cites Medicine's Challenges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, an address recently was printed in the Bulletin of the Academy of Medicine of Cleveland which was delivered by Robert A. Hingson, M.D., professor of anesthesia at the Western Reserve University School of Medicine, and director of anesthesia at the University Hospitals of Cleveland, Ohio.

This is an outstanding statement of the challenges facing medicine today, and under unanimous consent, I include it at this point in the RECORD:

CLEVELAND MEDICINE CHALLENGED BY OUR CITY, OUR COUNTRY, OUR CHANGING WORLD

The 2,300 physicians within the Cleveland Academy of Medicine, and the 1,300 dentists in the Cleveland Dental Society, have through the years rendered a service to the scores of thousands of our citizens in the metropolitan area and also through the city's outstanding clinics and hospitals to additional thousands referred for diagnosis and treatment from the entire Midwest. This service involves medical, obstetrical, surgical, and dental treatment of almost a million patients annually, of which almost 200,000 are for surgical operations, 40,000 obstetrical deliveries; several hundred thousand for medical, diagnostic, and dental problems. Of equal importance has been the application of preventive and public health medicine in millions of immunizations against poliomyelitis, the childhood diseases, and the fast disappearing contagious diseases. Outstanding among the medical accomplishments of the area has been the development of unexcelled facilities for the treatment of the chronic debilitating diseases of the aged in our world-renowned Highland View and Sunny Acres Hospitals.

Even though the U.S. Public Health Service Section on Vital Statistics has reported that for the Nation as a whole the Negro maternal mortality is 3.9 times that of the white, Cleveland with its 20 percent Negro population, from its largest general hospital, was able to report between the years 1954 through 1957, 5,000 consecutive deliveries of Negro mothers without a single maternal mortality from any cause during the hospital stay. Significantly, this occurred in a series of 12,000 births to mothers of all races without a death.

For the national and world community Cleveland's Western Reserve University trains approximately 100 medical school graduates and 80 dental school graduates annually. Its 30 hospitals provide advanced training for more than 1,000 interns and residents and research fellows. These physicians supply much of the required medical demands of Ohio's other cities and smaller communities and also those throughout the entire Nation. At least 20 physician graduates of Western Reserve University are serving as medical missionaries in many of the underprivileged countries of the world. Other scores of Cleveland citizens and graduates of other medical schools are serving in similar capacities. The Frances Payne Bolton School of Nursing and other nurse training programs have sent hundreds of nurses to mission hospitals and to International Cooperative Administration projects in major capacities of responsibilities.

At the present time more than 500 physicians from other countries are completing advanced graduate training in Cleveland's hospitals and from them the scientific and technical advances of Cleveland medicine are being daily used around the world. In 1958 in Moulmein, Burma, our interdenominational medical mission survey team for Asia and Africa found 12 Cleveland doctors and nurses on duty in one city.

This type of dedicated medicine has been a major factor in expanding the longevity of the U.S. population to its all-time high of 70 years, and in making Cleveland one of the most efficient health centers and one of the healthiest cities of the world.

These are our resources—the safeguards of our city for its future.

NOW THE CRISIS

In these days, still under the shadows of the summit collapse, at the time when the world's eyes too frequently focus on the "ugly American," Cleveland medicine has an opportunity to strike a real blow for world betterment and world peace through medicine. This is in complete accord with former President Eisenhower's people-to-people program, and President Kennedy's plan for using a professional youth army for world peace through service. Our Academy of Medicine has in action a committee to consider specifically what can be offered and delivered immediately in alleviating medical disasters, and perhaps through an alert forward-reaching program in preventing medical disaster.

This committee under the chairmanship of Dr. Robert A. Hingson, with Drs. Eugene Ferreri, Leon Dembo, and John Dingle, has at its fingertips the facts of two recent world medical surveys in Asia, Africa, and South America. It combines the abilities of both clinical and academic medicine in several fields. From its contacts in these areas it is able to develop recommendations for Academy approval, where requested, both con-

sultation and active direction in recruitment of supplies and personnel in international emergencies.

The committee believes that this assistance should be integrated properly through a nonsectarian, humanitarian plan in the highest American tradition, and offered as a part of an American Medical Association cooperative program with our State Department's consultation and channelled as indicated through the World Health Organization. The American Medical Association in its November 1960 Washington mid-year clinical meeting supported this view and is developing a foreign division for consultation and education. It furthermore approved the Oregon resolution to implement this program, under Dr. Frank Yoder, as follows:

"RESOLUTION 9

"Resolution by American Medical Association on emergency medical services to foreign mission fields

"Whereas the house of delegates of the American Medical Association at its 1959 clinical session declared itself to be in sympathy with resolution No. 9 introduced by the Oregon State Medical Society to help American physicians serving abroad in mission hospitals; and

"Whereas the past three presidents of the American Medical Association have recognized and made it a principle of their tenure of office to increase the influence of American medicine abroad; and

"Whereas the mission hospitals are established in every uncommitted country in the world; and

"Whereas they have established a good base in every country in which American medicine can work, even in the presence of political unrest; and

"Whereas the vacuum created in the Congo by the flight of 420 out of 441 physicians has created a desperate need for medical care; and

"Whereas our mission physicians in the Congo have developed plans for using the services of volunteer physicians to meet this need; and

"Whereas we believe that there are American physicians who would be willing to volunteer for such service; therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the American Medical Association shall immediately investigate the feasibility of developing a mechanism whereby members of the association may serve in the foreign mission fields on a temporary basis when emergencies arise and shall then seek volunteer physicians to serve in such capacities."

One example of such a need was transmitted to the committee from Dr. Glen Tuttle, director of an international pioneer project in the new nation of the Congo. Dr. Tuttle indicates that as many as 200 volunteer doctors are needed immediately. Since the withdrawal of the Belgian doctors who had just completed last year the splendid buildings for a modern medical school, a standard equipped 200-bed tuberculosis hospital, and a general hospital of major proportions with 15,000 obstetrical deliveries each year. The latter ranks as the world's fifth largest. Significantly when our medical survey team held a clinic there in 1958, there were 12 Cleveland-made incubators in the pediatric nursery. Modern X-ray equipment, laboratory facilities and huge modern diet kitchens and tremendous wards were observed by us. Now the entire medical staff has left en masse, leaving almost only the outer shell of a university medical school temporarily in the hands of Dr. Tuttle, from Minnesota, who had to leave his own tremendous medical mission center 160 miles away at Kimpese in the hands of assistant doctors (practical nurse technicans). In 1 day last month these workers performed two cesarean sections in lifesaving emergencies.

Already the Cleveland Academy has through this committee distributed 6,000 syringes and 12,000 needles from the 1958 polio program to Dr. Tom Dooley and Medico, to the Congo, Nigeria, Korea and Burmese interdenominational missions.

The auxiliary of the academy with Dr. Hingson collected and distributed to oversea missions 600 pounds of drugs and medical instruments in 1959.

The Negro physicians of Cleveland and their wives provide Dr. Hingson with 200 medical texts, already received and in use in an interdenominational center in the Congo.

There are three influential and most significant groups in our population who could without challenge or obstruction negotiate the majority of these steps now because they speak the universal language in which people in all countries are in universal agreement. These groups are: (1) Our physicians, (2) our educators, and (3) our women. They are capable of supplying man's most basic needs through improving his health, education of his mind, and maintenance of his inner security and nutrition in his home.

First, let us look at the Nation's doctors: More than 240,000 of them, representing in America's 6 percent of the world's population more than 20 percent of the world's physicians. They are banded together in more than 1,800 county medical societies and through their efforts have extended our health and longevity for the first time to 3 score years and 10 in our most recent estimate from the Bureau of Vital Statistics of the U.S. Public Health Service. This is a striking achievement, in startling contrast to the average longevity of 29.3 years in the nation of Burma; 27 years in Korea; and 22 years in the villages of central Africa. Our doctors through their medical societies at the county, State, regional and national levels within the framework of the American Medical Association and the World Medical Association, and within the framework of each specialty, have a definite responsibility, a challenge and an opportunity toward the alleviation of the world's suffering and in making the most meaningful contribution toward world peace.

As a start, each local county medical and dental society (there are more than 100,000 dentists in the United States, constituting more than 30 percent of the world's total) could adopt one single medical mission or foreign national clinic or hospital and supply it with continuing provisions of medical texts, instruments, and drugs. The immensity of the task should not ensnarl us in the whirlpool of attempting too much through dispersion of our efforts too far, too soon. There are 2 billion people in Asia and Africa and South America, or more than 10 people in urgent need for every single person in the United States. The majority of these people are under the domination economically or politically of "enlightened" European powers. A tremendous and dangerous vacuum is developing with almost one-third of Negro Africa achieving independence this year. In these nations there is only an average of 1 physician for each 30,000; one dentist for each million; and less than 100 college graduates per country among the native population.

As America tackles the problem of the world in such projects as the Great White Fleet of mothball hospital ships privately manned, with the initial ship *Hope* already in Indonesia, in peoples' to peoples' programs, with Medico, with the foundations, and with denominational missions (even though each of these is important in the long-range ultimate objectives), there should be established first certain priorities and proving grounds and trial flights for reassessment and planning additional phases in the light of developing world events. These are just as necessary on the world scene as the steps in our space program have been in Cape Canaveral.

There is a developing resource within our medical profession capable of reinforcing any significant world health program. It is represented by our Flying Physicians' Association, in which there are already 3,500 physician pilots who own their own plane. These physicians have offered themselves to our Government and to the Red Cross for sudden national disasters and catastrophies from natural causes such as floods, fires, earthquakes and attendant epidemics, and in industrial blasts. From my own experience in the bush and jungles of Africa and from making a few flights with members of this association, I know that this association could be of inestimable value in ridding these developing countries of endemic diseases through mass inoculation programs and therapy excursions. For example, through cooperation exercises with such friendly nations as Liberia in West Africa, where English is understood throughout even the villages, as few as 40 volunteer flying physicians over this little country, no bigger than Ohio and with only a few more than a million citizens, could be freed from both smallpox and yaws by total inoculation and simultaneous penicillin injection at the village level, within a short 2-month period. Fortunately, already Liberia under President Tubman's leadership has constructed small and usable airfields in all parts of a little country whose natural resources of rubber and iron are contributing so much to the economic health of America. The needleless jet injector in its present form is capable of innoculating 1,000 people per hour per instrument. For 15 years I have tested this instrument in more than a quarter of a million injections against diphtheria, leprosy, tetanus, tuberculosis, typhoid, cholera, poliomyelitis, and influenza. With one physician assistant I inoculated 90,000 as only one part of our service in Asia and Africa.

Second, let us examine the field of education. At the present time there are more than 200 million children of school age who have never learned to read and write. In Liberia from the Secretary of Education we learned a new term "the functional illiterate," of the child who has been attending school for 5 years who is still unable to read or write. So inadequate has been the number of available teachers in this and many other countries that even where compulsory education is in effect there are insufficient teachers to do the job effectively. Most American teachers would be excluded from their profession in most countries by language barriers. However, there are thousands of capable teachers of retirement age in America who would be welcomed for short- and long-term assignments in the Philippines, Burma, British Africa, and Liberia, where English is the prevailing language in the schools. In the field of education, the greatest needs and the greatest opportunities I observed in the world to offset the Communist dynamic foreign Leadership University being developed and already in operation in Moscow for Asian and African nationals, who can attend tuition free, would be the development of two Government-supported universities and medical schools to offer educational scholarships for Asian, African, and South and Central American students.

One of these for Africa and Latin America should be built in San Juan, P.R., which is ideally situated as 1,000 miles nearer these areas than most of our American centers. The other, for Asia, should be erected in Honolulu, in a city and State long recognized for its wholesome and unprejudiced acceptance and assimilation of all races, with predominant proportions already familiar with the languages and customs of all these people. The ideal climate, the friend-

liness of the inhabitants, the economic and geographic advantages of these two welcome mats to continental America in such a field of host educational centers would become invaluable assets in a most needed area.

Finally, the third group of Americans with the largest numerical strength and with the greatest combined influence is 50 million women with the key to standards of living—the home. Stuart Cloete, the British journalist and novelist, declared by Time magazine to be the man "who probably knows more about black Africa than any other white man alive," has written in the African Giant: "The civilization of the women with the corollary that a civilized man must come from a civilized home. This is the key to all African progress." In other words Africa, regardless of medicine and missions and education, will remain backward and substantially savage as long as young Africa grows up at a savage mother's knee. Perhaps, it is the American women with the most sensitive outreach toward our neighbors. In the past 2 years I have addressed more than 250 groups of them in study and mission organizations. They know the stakes are high—that a political vacuum is developing and that the future of the developing countries must be bound to the West at the fireside of the home if it is not to pass into the hands of the Communist East.

Hospitalization for Alaskan and Hawaiian Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH J. RIVERS
OF ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to speak of much needed veterans' legislation now pending in this body, which is couched in general terms, but which would have specific application to America's veterans living in Alaska and Hawaii. Since these veterans have come from all our States and fought for all of us, I seek the consideration and support of my colleagues for my bill, H.R. 2923.

This legislation, with regard to which I have already testified before the Subcommittee on Hospitals of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, would allow the Veterans' Administrator to make contracts with private hospitals for the treatment of veterans with non-service-connected disabilities, if said veterans reside in States not having a Veterans' Administration hospital or in States not having such facilities within 500 miles of their borders. In practical effect, this bill, if enacted, would apply only to the States of Alaska and Hawaii.

It is the purpose of this legislation to effectuate a simple and inexpensive solution to a defect in the Veterans' Administration program, having to do with Veterans' Administration facilities in Alaska and Hawaii.

Let us start with the fact that there is no Veterans' Administration hospital in Alaska and none in Hawaii, and there never has been. During the years when Alaska and Hawaii were territories, this situation was no problem because existing law—section 601(4) of title 38, United States Code—then authorized and still authorizes the Veterans' Administrator, among his other functions, to contract with private hospitals for the care of veterans with non-service-connected disabilities or ailments in a territory, commonwealth, or possession. Now that Alaska and Hawaii are States of the Union, however, the Veterans' Administration has lost its general authority to provide contract hospital care in Alaska and Hawaii in such cases.

Admittedly this authority so exercised by the Veterans' Administrator in a territory, commonwealth, or possession, and which he previously exercised in Alaska and Hawaii, is an exception to the general rule allowing hospital care for non-service-connected disorders only in Veterans' Administration or other Federal hospitals on a beds available basis. The reason for the exception is stated in the Administrator's report on the legislation now before you, as follows:

> Historically, the exception to permit hospital care in private facilities for war veterans with non-service-connected conditions in a territory or possession was based upon special considerations. These apparently included the factors of great distances from the mainland, difficulty in transferring patients to the States, and the relatively small volume of patient demand in the territories and possessions.

These words are well spoken and they apply to Alaska and Hawaii today as much as they did during the days of territoriality. Alaska and Hawaii are just as far away from the other States as they were then, transportation difficulties still persist, and the patient demand is too small to justify the great expense of constructing and operating a VA hospital in Alaska and one in Hawaii. Since neither Alaska nor Hawaii have sought VA hospitals, and are not about to become that kind of a burden on the General Treasury, I am offering and urging the simple, equitable, and comparatively inexpensive solution contained in my bill, H.R. 2923. I also point out that the savings in transportation which would be effected by my bill would constitute a substantial offset to the cost of hospital care in private local hospitals.

May I now speak of that portion of the Administrator's report which says:

> We have beds allocated for VA beneficiaries in hospitals of the Department of Defense and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In Hawaii beds are allocated for our use by the Defense Department in Tripler General Hospital. We believe that the needs in both Alaska and Hawaii are being met to a reasonable and proper extent by the use of these Government facilities.

This statement sounds good on its face, but does not work out in practice in Alaska. To be sure, there is a military hospital at Elmendorf Air Force Base near Anchorage and one at Fort Wainwright near Fairbanks, which meet the needs of the veterans in the rail belt.

The Health, Education, and Welfare Hospital at Anchorage plays little part in this picture because it duplicates the care available at the Elmendorf Air Force Base Hospital in the cases with which we are presently concerned. Since the rail belt is about midway between Ketchikan near the southeastern extremity of Alaska and the most westerly part, the problem still remains as to the greater part of the great area of Alaska. Veterans in Ketchikan and Juneau and other communities in southeastern Alaska are an average of about 1,000 miles from Anchorage at the southerly end of the rail belt and a like distance from Fairbanks at the northerly end. In other words, they are as far away from the hospitals on the rail belt as they are from the VA hospital at Portland, Oreg. Veterans at Nome are 500 miles from the rail belt and those of Bethel, Dillingham, and other places farther west a comparable distance, but with less frequent plane service. Right at hand in the communities I have named are good local hospitals where the lives of our veterans can be safeguarded instead of jeopardized by waiting for the next airplane departure, and then suffering the rigors of getting to the plane, aboard the plane, and disembarking therefrom in all kinds of weather.

Some of the private hospitals with which the Veterans Administration made contract arrangements during the days when Alaska was a territory are at such widely scattered locations as Ketchikan, Juneau, Sitka, Wrangell, Petersburg, Cordova, Glenallen, Anchorage, Seward, Kodiak, Palmer, Nome, and Fairbanks.

Because of the vastness of Alaska and its great distance from the nearest State, it is apparent to me that for the welfare of the veterans involved these cases arising in communities distant from the rail belt should be cared for locally in private local facilities. I also suggest that because of these great distances and transportation difficulties, Alaska can readily be distinguished as a State apart from the usual situation in the southerly 48 States, and that the Administrator may forget the fear he has expressed that this legislation, if enacted, might become a precedent for extending the idea to all the States. I sincerely urge that this legislation be considered on its merits.

To strengthen the statement which I made to the subcommittee, I submitted for the record of the hearings supporting documents which I recommend to your attention. These documents consist of a strong statement of Alaska's Governor, William A. Egan, an urgent joint resolution of the Alaska Legislature, detailed facts and figures provided by Ernest E. Lincoln, manager of the VA regional office at Juneau, and statements and telegrams from veterans' organizations throughout Alaska.

I trust, Mr. Speaker, that Alaska's veterans, numbering approximately 15,000, who are so far away from VA hospital facilities but who did so much for America in times of national peril, will be granted the benefits which would be authorized by my bill.

Mrs. Nellie M. Thomas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABNER W. SIBAL
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, on March 31, my home city of Norwalk, Conn., suf-

fered a very great loss in the death of Mrs. Nellie Thomas, president and publisher of the Norwalk Hour. She was a lady of countless charities whom a grateful community will sorely miss. In tribute to her I should like to have the obituary and editorial on her that appeared in her paper, the Hour, printed in the RECORD:

MRS. NELLIE M. THOMAS

Norwalk today mourns a leader in philanthropy and the Norwalk Hour its owner, president, and publisher in the death this morning at the Norwalk Hospital of Mrs. Nellie M. Thomas.

Mrs. Thomas' death came as a terrific shock to the community. She had fallen at her home, 17 Berkeley Street, Wednesday and was admitted to the hospital Thursday with a fractured arm and hip.

Mrs. Thomas had directed the Norwalk Hour since the death of her husband, Edward J. Thomas in 1933 and under her guidance the Hour grew steadily and prospered.

Mrs. Thomas took an active interest in community projects and was a generous contributor to the Norwalk Hospital, churches, and scores of charitable projects. Only recently she made a substantial gift toward the furnishing of the recreation room in the new police building at Veterans Park. At the Norwalk Hospital there is a room called the Nellie M. Thomas Room, honoring her for her substantial contributions to the institution.

The host of Norwalkers and others who knew of Mrs. Thomas' philanthropic deeds sadly mourn her passing.

MRS. NELLIE M. THOMAS DIES—OWNER, PUBLISHER OF THE HOUR; ALSO WAS PRESIDENT OF NEWSPAPER; NOTED FOR HER PHILANTHROPIES; FUNERAL SERVICES TO BE HELD 11 A.M. MONDAY

Mrs. Nellie M. Thomas, owner, president and publisher of the Norwalk Hour, died suddenly at 9:30 this morning in Norwalk Hospital.

Mrs. Thomas was admitted to the hospital Thursday morning, after suffering a fall in her home Wednesday night in which she fractured a wrist and her hip. Mrs. Thomas resided at 17 Berkeley Street.

Mrs. Thomas, noted for her support of civic and church endeavors, had been directing the activities of the Hour Publishing Co. since the death of her husband, Edward J. Thomas, in 1933.

AIDED MANY CHARITIES

After the death of her husband, who purchased the Hour in 1901, Mrs. Thomas took over direction of the newspaper. Mrs. Thomas' brother, the late Charles E. Kellogg, joined the newspaper in that year as a bookkeeper.

He served in several capacities with the paper, advancing to advertising manager and later general manager. As general manager, he carried out the operation of the paper under his sister's direction after the death of Mr. Thomas. When Mr. Kellogg died, Sidney A. Bedient, then managing editor, was named editor and general manager by Mrs. Thomas.

Mrs. Thomas took a keen interest in many community activities. Although many charities were the beneficiaries of her generosity, she was particularly interested in the benevolent funds of the police and fire departments, and recently aided in a financial campaign to furnish the dayroom in the new police building at Veterans Park.

Her interest in the two municipal departments was stimulated by her late brother's activities as a fire commissioner and later as police commissioner.

For many years, her support was vital to the success of the kiddies' Christmas party for the benefit of the city's less fortunate children.

A member of Norwalk Methodist Church, to which she gave substantial support, Mrs. Thomas also was generous in her assistance to other churches in the community, regardless of faith.

The Nellie May Thomas room in the new community pavilion at Norwalk Hospital stands as a reminder of her unflagging support to that institution.

Mrs. Thomas is survived by a niece, Mrs. Marjorie Kellogg Mather, a grandniece, Mrs. Donald Sala, the former Melinda Kellogg Mather; a great grandnephew, Mark Mather Sala, and two cousins, Miss Beatrice Hunt, who lived with her in Berkeley Street, and Mrs. Lou Strauss, of Long Island.

Mrs. Thomas was the daughter of the late Martin and Jennie Pooley Kellogg. Her father was Norwalk's street commissioner.

Funeral services will be held at 11 a.m. Monday in the Norwalk Methodist Church, with Rev. Barton Boyce, pastor, officiating. Interment will take place in Norwalk Cemetery, Union Avenue. Friends may call at the Raymond Funeral Home, 5 East Wall Street, Sunday, from 3 to 5 p.m. and 7 to 9 p.m.

The Russian Beachhead in Berkeley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Lucius Beebe which appeared in the San Francisco Chronicle of April 3, 1961:

THIS WILD WEST: THE RUSSIAN BEACHHEAD IN BERKELEY

(By Lucius Beebe)

A good deal of comment has been accorded in recent weeks to the uncommonly handsome issue that Holiday magazine devoted to San Francisco, and to the fidelity of its overall picture to the image San Franciscans like to believe the city projects. Seldom has such an ornately framed and flattering mirror been held up for a community's self-admiration, which is a very abundant quality indeed around the Golden Gate. That Holiday may have painted so rhapsodic a picture as to oversell the town is a hypothesis that can be pretty well discounted. As the late Arthur Brisbane used to say, "repetition is reputation."

Quite aside from its joyous impact on San Francisco itself, this is even more of a promotional triumph if it is widely accepted as the veritable likeness of San Francisco and northern California generally, for, whether or not folk hearabouts realize it, the nationwide image of San Francisco isn't as favorable and gracious as it might be.

In an age of rapid communications and detailed news analysis of matters that a few years back would have been strictly parochial, San Francisco in recent years has acquired a celebrity that is quite as unwholesome as that of Little Rock, albeit of a different sort.

Its reputation outside of the West is that of a nest of subversionists, pacifists, defeatist whiners and Communist fellow travelers. It has the name of being a haven for crackpots and agitators of every hue and complexion and a sounding board for every degree of defeatism, treason, and Red-petting. Its universities have a name as campus cells for the expression of Russian ideologies and its press and some of its legal practice as apologists for Communist tendencies under the tiresome and by now putrescent banner of liberalism.

The rest of the country knows, even if self-satisfied San Francisco does not, that open hostility to the House Un-American Activities Committee, and the activities of liberal subversionists, influential publicists whimpering over atomic annihilation, and self-styled legal luminaries championing everything Russian, are not just playing along with the enemy. They are devised and implemented by the enemy. Liberalism has long since in the United States ceased to mean anything but active treason. The Russians took it over long ago.

This unfavorable image of San Francisco had its inception back in the thirties and if San Franciscans are prone to forget the general strike of that period and condone Harry Bridges as a tame Communist, the rest of the country doesn't go along with it. The Chessman business, which through the chemistry of subversion somehow turned from a case of legal jurisprudence into a liberal cause with anti-American demonstrations in places that had no least imaginable concern with the matter, marked the image still further.

Chessman's advocates and supporters locally were recruited from one of three categories—professional exhibitionists, professional crackpots, and professional subversionist agitators, with the latter predominating. So far as the rest of the United States is concerned the Chessman agitation was simply additional proof of the overall Red infiltration of the California consciousness. It wasn't his crime, but his friends that made his elimination mandatory.

The current tendency of completely irresponsible publicists to condone the recent Communist-led, Communist-organized, and Communist-conducted riots at city hall and to disparage the official films documenting them as such doesn't speak well for the San Francisco press.

Neither does the much-publicized stand of the president of the University of California permitting the appearance on his campus at Berkeley of a well-identified Communist agitator sit well with what remains of the responsible element in the California community or with the country at large. It's all very well to invoke the memory of President Lowell of Harvard in retaining German in his curriculum in 1916. Harvard and President Lowell enjoyed a secure position in the community not shared by President Kerr or the University of California.

These are elements in the San Francisco image outside of San Francisco that don't jibe with the stately pleasure dome devoted to the abundant humanities depicted by Holiday's word painters. There is a fairly widespread belief that behind its affluent front San Francisco harbors a tainted core of ideological putrescence, a whited sepulcher with treason nesting in its vitals. Fellow traveler college presidents, student subversives, and the American Civil Liberties Union do not, in any realistic appraisal, add up to the Augustan Age of music, fine art, bountiful gastronomy, and suburban splendor that San Francisco likes to imagine for itself.

As the multiple crises of Russian devising build up to the inevitable open conflict that Russia wants, these people and attitudes must be identified for what they are: Subversives, Communists, defeatists, and the enemy. The University of California campus, as long as President Kerr traffics in fraudulent "liberalism," is as much an outpost of Russian aggression as Laos or the Congo. So is the Governor's mansion in

Sacramento. There is no room in the world any more for the obsolete thesis of "liberalism." You are on the side of civilization or on the side of Russia, and the Russians long ago made what may once have passed for "liberalism" part of the apparatus of world conquest.

Federal Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, there are many ramifications to the problem of Federal controls. The problem raises many questions. Should there be more control? Or, should there be fewer controls by the Federal Government in its relationship with the various States? These are questions that are difficult to answer. In my own mind, I feel that the Federal Government should operate with as few controls as possible.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to include an editorial that was published April 1, 1961, in the Port Angeles Evening News, entitled "Fund Control." This newspaper is published daily at Port Angeles, Wash., in my district and often presents editorials that give new outlooks to old problems. I believe this editorial is worth reading and presents a conclusion that deserves study.

FUND CONTROL

Important examples are turning up which indicate that the various States have recently been more successful than some of us realize in resisting Federal control in aid programs.

A prime instance is the interstate highway program, where the States put up 10 percent or less of the money but dispense 100 percent of it.

Some veteran observers of U.S.-State relations see this as an open invitation to carelessness, if not deliberate waste and corruption. Inquiries by a congressional group and others found exactly this, on an astonishing scale.

Fear is now being expressed in some quarters that another big door may be opened to trouble if the aid to education program retains its present control features. As drafted, it gives the States the option whether to spend aid money on school construction or teachers' salaries.

Since school buildings are more enduring monuments to the particular State governments involved, the feeling is that many will succumb to the temptation to weight construction heavily, even though salary needs may be acute.

On top of that, they will be subject to the same sort of pressures from potential political contributors that appear to have brought scandal to the highway program. The bright chance for private gain is thoroughly clear.

The whole issue is delicate. The danger of the Federal Government overstepping reasonable bounds of authority is always present. But knowledgeable men in the intergovernmental field believe that lawmakers and Federal officials in recent years have leaned too far backward in an effort to avoid this peril.

One experienced official, whose sensitive position limits him to private comment, thinks it is always a grave mistake to dispense large sums of Federal money with loose strings on it. He believes that control and responsible use of funds go together.

Where State resources do not permit a matching of U.S. funds, as in the interstate highway program, this theory inevitably leads to a larger Federal say in matters.

But in this official's view this need not be destructive of State rights and interests. He believes experience shows that the technicians who carry out these joint programs work in a cooperative spirit respectful of both U.S. and State concerns.

The question deserves a fresh review. For it seems obvious we must somehow find a narrow path between too much Federal control and too little.

Automakers' Switch of Car Window Glass Touches Off a Feud

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, during hearings recently before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on my bill, H.R. 1341, testimony was given relative to the type of glass used in automobile windows.

An article of interest on this subject appeared in the Wall Street Journal recently, and under unanimous consent I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 7, 1961]

AUTOMAKERS' SWITCH OF CAR WINDOW GLASS TOUCHES OFF A FEUD—GLASS DEALERS CONTEND NEW CHEAPER GLASS IS UNSAFE; AUTOMEN DENY THE CHARGE

(By Jack Hanicke)

DETROIT.—Harry A. Pratt, a 170-pounder, suspends a square-foot sheet of automobile glass between two boards, steps on it and jumps up and down—without effect on the glass.

Stepping off, he picks up the glass and strikes it with a sharp steel punch. It shatters completely into small fragments—leaving several small cuts in the palm of his hand.

Mr. Pratt, sales manager of the Glass Division of Shatterproof Glass Corp., a Detroit manufacturer of replacement auto glass, is trying to prove a point: That the type of glass that goes into the side windows of nearly all new automobiles is unsafe. This charge is hotly denied by the carmakers.

THE BIG SWITCH

Until recently, laminated safety glass, made by sandwiching a plastic sheet between two plates of glass, was used in most car windows. The plastic is used as a binder to prevent shattering. However, for their 1961 models, all car makes except Cadillac have adopted solid tempered, or hardened, safety glass in car side windows although they continue to use laminated glass in windshields.

The tempered glass now being substituted is akin to that used in the heavy, frameless all-glass doors used in many stores and offices. Typically, such glass is formed into the desired shape and then hardened by first subjecting it to heat and then to a blast of cold air. This gives the glass an extremely hard surface, much as in metals that are case hardened. It also has tremendous strength against blows from dull objects.

But such glass also has the characteristic of breaking up into small pebble-sized pieces, once the hard surface has been penetrated. The pieces either remain in place, making the glass opaque, or fly out with considerable force. Automakers claim these small pieces do not have sharp edges and are less dangerous than the large chunks into which laminated safety glass divides when it is broken.

This is disputed by companies such as Shatterproof and trade groups such as the National Auto and Flat Glass Dealers' Association, which represents many of the Nation's 10,000 glass dealers. In addition to tempered glass' alleged greater vulnerability to flying stones, they say this glass' toughness against blunt objects greatly increases the danger of head injuries to auto passengers and makes escape difficult for them if they are trapped in a car.

A WIDENING CONTROVERSY

The clash between the automakers and glass dealers is rapidly widening to include Congress, State legislatures, labor unions and a large number of trade associations. Here are some of the developments so far:

Bills that would ban tempered glass in side windows have been introduced in a number of State legislatures. The States include California, Kansas, Massachusetts, Missouri, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Washington.

A congressional committee is pondering a proposal that automakers be required to use laminated glass in side windows. The proposal is part of an overall auto safety bill that has been under consideration for some time, and also is included in a bill setting up safety requirements for cars purchased by the Federal Government.

The American Standards Association, which serves as a clearinghouse for many industries and Government agences by establishing uniform national—and industry-wide—standards that guide both manufacturers and lawmakers, in currently reviewing its code on automobile glass. Sighs Cyril Ainsworth, its secretary, "There is a tremendous controversy going on."

The switch to tempered glass was made by the auto manufacturers with little of the fanfare that usually accompanies such changes. Chrysler Corp. was the first to use tempered glass on all side windows of all cars; the change was made on its 1958 models. American Motors Corp. made the change a little later. Ford Motor Co. and General Motors Corp., however, did not use tempered glass extensively until the introduction of their 1960 compact models. By the time the 1961 models were introduced, however, all major U.S. makes, except Cadillac, had made the switch.

The automen claim both types of safety glass, while having different characteristics, are equally safe. They also claim tempered glass gives more mileage to auto owners because of its greater hardness. This is disputed by critics who insist that tempered glass loses much of its strength with aging.

Automakers don't deny that one of the main advantages of tempered glass is its lower cost. According to one estimate, tempered safety glass is between 10 cents and 15 cents a square foot cheaper than laminated safety glass. This means a minimum manufacturer's saving of about $1.50 a car. This is a sizable saving when spread over the millions of cars built in the United States each year.

The economics of the change can have a major impact on the profits of glass dealers, who supply replacement windows for autos. Laminated glass side windows can be cut from standard sized sheets according to easily stored patterns. But tempered glass must be formed before it is heat treated. Dealers fear that within a few years they will have to stock different sizes for each year and make of car, much as they do windshields now. At present, most tempered glass win-

dows can still be replaced with laminated, but dealers say automakers are beginning to attach parts, such as lock devices, directly to holes drilled in the glass before it is treated. Laminated glass cannot be used to replace such windows.

Suppliers to auto and glass companies also have an interest. Monsanto Chemical Co., a major producer of the plastic used in laminated glass, has made a movie showing what it considers the advantage of laminated glass. Du Pont, another maker of the plastic, also has published studies on the merits of this glass.

Major glassmakers, caught in the middle of the squabble, have been largely silent. However, Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass Co. has announced it will lay off more than 1,000 workers in Toledo, partly because of the switch to the automakers' glass preferences. In its 1960 annual report, Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass Co. blamed lower sales in part on the growing use of the cheaper glass.

American Bourbon Whisky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. WATTS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to bring to the attention of the House the following article:

At a time when few international meetings result in accord and agreement, I should like to bring to your attention an occasion when representatives of Old World nations paid their respects to a tradition of the New.

At the annual meeting of the Federation Internationale des Vins et Spiriteux in Paris, this distinguished body of recognized authorities of wines and spirits gave international testimonial to a tradition as old as our country's Constitution—American Bourbon whisky.

In adopting a resolution proposed by the Bourbon Institute, representatives from 14 European nations granted the "Appelation d'Origine" to this historic American spirit. The name "Bourbon" can be applied only to whisky produced in the United States under U.S. Government standards.

Unfortunately, there have been several attempts by foreign concerns to apply the name to certain spirits produced abroad in hopes of marketing them here and capitalizing on Bourbon's trademark. The agreement binds members of the federation to assist the Bourbon Institute in protecting the name of "Bourbon," should the institute take legal action against overseas distillers who would attempt to thus mislabel their products.

The resolution should dissuade any firm from attempting to deceive that most abused figure—the American consumer.

We live in an era when international travel and trade restrictions are subjects of great concern. In this instance, however, the American traveler has been afforded protection. During his visits to European nations requests for Bourbon will be answered through service of the same whisky he consumes at home.

As a Representative of the State of Kentucky, which has given this product to the world, I note that the official body of the great wine and spirit houses of Europe has given Bourbon whisky the same recognition accorded to the Scotch whisky of the United Kingdom.

I should like to commend the Bourbon Institute and its president, Vice Adm. William J. Marshall, U.S. Navy (retired), a native of Henderson, Ky., for taking the lead in establishing this international protection for American distillers. As the representative member from the United States, the Bourbon Institute is the spokesman for the American distilling industry in the Federation Internationale.

By proposing the resolution and pressing for its adoption, the Bourbon Institute proved that a responsible presentation of evidence can still result in agreement among the international trade community.

The Federal Excise Tax on Jewelry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, the following is a resolution passed by the Kansas Retail Jewelers Association in convention on March 18 and 19, 1961, in Wichita, Kans. I commend this resolution to the attention of all Members of Congress.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the 180 members of the Kansas Retail Jewelers Association request that the Federal excise tax on jewelry be transferred from the retail to the manufacturers' level in order that they may eliminate the unfair competition and discrimination against the products they must sell to sustain a livelihood.

Whereas there is a definite relationship between those taxed products which the jeweler sells, competing with other items sold as gifts in substantial quantities which are untaxed, and taxed at the manufacturers' level. These items, therefore, discriminate against the jeweler. This tax acts as a deterrent to sales. The effect of the increase of the cost of the taxed article to the consumer, acts as a brake on sales. This was, in fact, the original purpose of the tax. That is, it was intended to cut down the sales of certain items in a wartime economy. The need to curtail sales has long passed—the present need is for more production and consumption to fit the needs and to expand our economy. This tax acts in exactly the opposite way.

This tax is difficult and costly to administer. Not only is a hardship placed upon the small retail jeweler who ordinarily does not have a complete accounting department to calculate, collect, and remit this tax on behalf of the Government; but it is extremely costly for the Government to administer this tax since there are so many outlets from which this tax must be collected. Manufacturers ordinarily have complete bookkeeping departments to calculate, collect, and remit. Therefore, transferring this tax to the manufacturer's level would not only grant relief to the small jeweler, but would also simplify collection on the Government's behalf because of the relatively small number of retailers and so-called wholesale retailers from which this tax is collected. Therefore, this would not only reduce the costs substantially, by saving the Government money administering the tax, but would plug many loopholes on the literally thousands of items where the tax status is doubtful, and the collection of the tax often has led to arbitrary practices. This would also increase revenues by plugging the loopholes in tax collection by taxing the article at its source—the manufacturer's level, thereby eliminating many items sold through certain outlets, etc., on which the tax is overlooked: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Kansas Retail Jewelers Association and its 180 members respectfully request and urge the Honorable Congress of the United States of America to take immediate action toward transferring this 10-percent Federal excise tax on jewelry at the retail level to a 10-percent Federal excise tax at the manufacturer's level thereby:

1. Eliminating unfair and discriminatory competition.
2. Removing sales deterrents placed in wartime for the duration and 6 months, to discourage sales of jewelry; thus fulfilling a need for more production by encouraging consumption, providing a much-needed expansion and employment in our economy.
3. Lowering administrative costs to the Government, giving needed savings of tax dollars.
4. Removing loopholes to increase revenues by taxing the article at its source.
5. Relieving the hardships placed on the small businessman by removing from him the responsibility of calculating, collecting, and remitting this burdensome tax.

Time Saved for What?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the caption given these remarks has been taken from an editorial which appeared in the Philadelphia Bulletin on April 7, 1961, and poses a question that has always inrtigued me; namely, "What use are we making of all the leisure time we are supposed to accumulate through a shortened workweek and the supersonic speeds that are now being reached in air travel?"

The editorial properly underscores, in my opinion, some skepticism as to just what real benefits will accrue to humanity from the exploration of outer space, save perhaps the satisfying of our curiosity. But the real issue raised by the editorial cneters in, Just what do we plan to do with all of the time we will have saved when it becomes possible to span the continent in an hour and a quarter or perhaps circumnavigate the globe in half a day?

We are told that aerial transportation has shrunk the world to half its original size and all I can do is to plaintively ask, "And in what way has that benefited humanity or improved international relations?" As a matter of fact the closer we come in hours to our global neighbors the more our friendship worsens, and we have largely ignored the old axiom that "strong fences make good neighbors" with the result that we are increasingly getting into each other's hair.

In my opinion we would be a happier people if we were all back on the 44-hour week which is routine for most Congressmen. And most of my congressional colleagues would be a lot happier and live a lot longer if their districts were not so readily accessible via the airplane. In the old days of rail travel, which is still my favorite mode of transportation, the home folks in the districts remote

from Washington did not expect to see their Representative until the Congress had adjourned, whereas now they expect him to return for each clambake regardless of the fact that it means neglecting his strictly legislative duties, to say nothing of the out-of-pocket cost of his airplane fare. Instead, from that standpoint most Congressmen would be doing a better job and saving a bit more out of their annual stipend if the Wright brothers on the day that they invented the airplane had simply "stood in bed."

Too much spare time, too much saved time, too many opportunities to get into trouble and spend money we do not have. Instead of increased speed, instead of engines with greater thrust, instead of missiles with greater reach, what is needed is increased attention to the braking system, the development of measures that will slow us down. Life can be beautiful if we will only take time to look at it. But assuredly we cannot appreciate nature or our own capacity for brotherly love if we continue to hurtle through space at 2,000 miles an hour.

The article that prompted this outpouring is appended to and made a part of these remarks and I hope that you will agree with me that the writer makes a lot of sense.

The editorial follows:

TIME SAVED FOR WHAT?

Scientific curiosity motivates plans to investigate the Moon, Mars and other occupants of limitless space. But what is the urge behind plans to build a plane that can fly between New York and Los Angeles in 76 minutes, with corresponding schedules to foreign airfields?

When man is able to travel at 3½ times the speed of sound—the objective of planning due for fruition by 1970—what is he going to do with the time saved? Is it really so desirable—for other than military objectives—to knit the world's centers of population still closer together? Recent years have disappointed many hopes that closer contact would bring greater understanding.

We are no better off in our relations with other countries than we were when, by the clock, they were much more distant. To point this out is not to decry the merits and gains of present-day air travel. But is there to be no limit?

If time saved were sure to be put to productive uses we could justify our yearning for speed, speed, and more speed. But will it be? What does the officeworker-commuter do with the few seconds saved by standing up in the aisle of his suburban car long before it reaches the station, so as to be among the first off the train? Do we not save time largely to waste it?

The Peace Lobby and the Russians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in the court of world opinion American disarmament proposals often have seemed to pall when compared to Russia's.

Jerome Spingarn, in a recent article appearing in the Washington Post, has astutely pointed out that this has important implications both for our Government and the American peace movement.

Disarmament is certainly one of the vital issues of our time, and this well-balanced analysis of one important aspect of this problem deserves the attention and consideration of my colleagues.

A new U.S. Disarmament Administration is now functioning in the State Department, John McCloy is serving as the President's disarmament adviser, and in the Pentagon an elaborate pattern of offices deals with disarmament for each of these segments of the Defense Establishment.

Concomitant with this growth of governmental competence has been a parallel growth of concern with the disarmament problem in private centers and graduate schools of international affairs.

What does all this activity mean? Is the rose of arms control about to be plucked from the thistle of H-bombs?

It would be rash to predict this, but it is clear that defense, peacekeeping, and the leashing of armaments are receiving more serious and more sustained attention here in the United States than they have ever received anywhere before.

Jules Moch wrote the famous Anglo-French disarmament proposal (which Nobel Prizewinner Philip Noel-Baker characterizes as the great "moment of hope" in the search for peace and disarmament) in a London hotel in one evening in 1954. It was still a collection of jottings on hotel stationery when it was passed around a breakfast table and received French Cabinet approval.

The Quai d'Orsay has been content to give Jules Moch wide powers because "he makes beautiful music." The Kremlin apparently feels the same way about Nikita Khrushchev. And music—the appeal to the minds of men—has always been a very important aspect of arms control proposals.

The chances are that a highly organized, well-staffed (American) program will not make good music, which is almost always a matter of individual, rather than staff, effort. The products of the new and highly organized effort may seem uninspired and overintellectualized. But they will be more carefully designed to serve the common needs of competing nations.

The disturbing factor in the present picture is the fact that there is no evidence whatever of parallel activity in the Soviet Union.

They refuse, even in off-the-record conversation, to talk in realistic terms about existing weapons systems, about the specifics of warning and detection systems, and about initial measures to frustrate surprise attack. They feign horror when it is proposed candidly to discuss evasion techniques.

The Americans, on the other hand, discuss gory details quite openly. Just as medical students, who are devoted to a life of healing, traditionally indulge in a gay and macabre humor, so arms control strategists use military jargon in a clinical manner which often disguises their genuine zeal for peace.

The public, unfortunately, does not always see this as candor versus deviousness. Too often it just sees nice Russians speaking about brotherly love and sunlight, while Americans talk about sneak attacks, thermonuclear destruction, military strategy, and clandestine tests in dark caves.

The result is that thousands of well-meaning people demonstrate for unilateral disarmament in England and many Americans, in churches, in universities, and elsewhere, while mistrustful of the Soviets, believe that the Soviet complete disarmament proposal is sound and honest. They demand policies that reflect Western hopes for the perfectability of man. And they denounce as bloodthirsty ogres those who try to make an objective analysis of thermonuclear strategy.

When the Kremlin can get so much mileage on a vague and superficial proposal for complete and general disarmament, it feels little pressure to come to grips with Western first-step proposals for inspection or for surprise attack prevention. Why should they bother?

There is a lesson in this for the American peace movement, and there is also one in it for the American Government. The peace movement must remain aware of the fact that the Russians are an indispensable party to arms control, and that it is just as important to place pressure on the Kremlin as on Western governments, more important, in fact, because there are no local peace movements to do the job in Russia.

For the new administration there is also a lesson in the need to season highly technical and intellectualized proposals with an appeal to deeper aspirations.

We will know that we have turned the corner when the Soviets begin to talk more candidly about the modern weapons that must be controlled, and when disarmament talks are moved out of conferences where there is no temptation to grandstanding.

Dollar Devaluation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, some time ago, an abortive gold speculation on the London market did not worry some of us much for what it actually was, but for what it indicated. It could not have helped but reflect a questioning of confidence in the dollar. It resulted in a rash demand for devaluation of the dollar by marking up the price of gold. We were happy that the administration stood firm and the threat evaporated.

However, recent events have rather shocked us into an appreciation of the seriousness of the situation regarding confidence in the dollar. We had been accustomed to believe that evaluation is a matter that we ourselves could control. The marking up of the German mark, vis-a-vis the dollar, and the probability of the readjustment of the Dutch guilder and, perhaps, the Swiss franc and others in dollar revaluation rather startles us.

To be learned again is the lesson of fiscal responsibility and fiscal sanity. Thereby, and only thereby, can we retain the confidence of the other 47 nations—those are pegged to the dollar which means to the price of gold. For as long as we remain firm on the price of gold, so long will the dollar be the measure of the value of world currencies. A most interesting article by J. H. Kelleghan appeared in Money Trends the financial bulletin published by Money Research Associates of Chicago which by unanimous consent is inserted herewith:

THE DOLLAR PROBLEM THAT WON'T SHOO AWAY

(By J. H. Kelleghan)

The new administration in Washington, like the one it succeeded, refuses to face up to the realities of the persistent dollar problem. Like the dog that followed the little

boy to school, it just won't shoo away. The dog's name, by the way, is Dollar Devaluation.

President Kennedy and his financial advisers have been throwing sticks and stones at the little beast, insisting that the doggy dollar problem really isn't as bad as it looks, but the pesky animal simply retreated a respectful distance waiting to continue its pursuit when the administration turned to other problems.

Hence, it was not a little startling when the canine turned up in West Germany and was firmly tied up there.

The dollar problem which Washington chose more or less to ignore, was not treated so casually in Europe. When West Germany and Holland raised the par value of their respective currencies in relation to gold and the dollar, they officially recognized the devaluation that has taken place in the dollar in relation to the mark and the guilder.

It now takes only 400 marks to buy 100 U.S. dollars, whereas it previously required 420 marks, a devaluation of the dollar amounting to 20 marks per $100. This, moreover, represents a permanent change in the "parity" value of the mark in relation to the dollar, recognized by the International Monetary Fund. A similarly permanent devaluation of the dollar in relation to the guilder has been established by Holland. In fact, most of the European currencies, except the British pound sterling, are showing strength against the dollar, indicating that there may be further currency "revaluations."

Apparently most of us Americans are still under the impression that dollar devaluation must take place as it did in the past with a reduction of the gold content of the dollar. Actually, we now have to look for evidence of dollar devaluation in the relative values of foreign currencies with respect to the dollar.

What we Americans have failed to realize is that the postwar arrangements entered into with other nations through the International Monetary Fund have completely altered the nature of dollar devaluation. It is no longer necessary or possible to accomplish devaluation by changing the gold content of the U.S. dollar. That is permanently fixed. Devaluation is now accomplished by altering the gold content of the currencies that are presently tied to the U.S. dollar, the only major currency in the world that remains freely convertible into gold at a fixed price.

Instead of having 48 free currencies, each tied independently to a free gold standard as in the past, we now have 47 nations tied into a planetary system of parity values around the U.S. dollar as the base and anchor. In this system the U.S. dollar is not free to change its base in any degree with respect to the other 47 nations, but these 47 nations are free to change their parity relationship with the U.S. dollar if they do it through the International Monetary Fund.

This is what has happened. The dollar is tied to a fixed gold price under international agreements and, therefore, its value is no longer free to fluctuate except in terms of other currencies. Foreign currencies, however, are free to fluctuate within stated boundaries with respect to the dollar (1 percent upon or down from "parity"). Foreign nations may change this "parity" relationship to the dollar by clearing the change through the International Monetary Fund.

This all sounds quite complicated and, in fact, it is. Nevertheless this does not diminish its importance. We Americans on the whole have not paid much attention to the dollar shenanigans taking place outside the United States. The postwar monetary arrangements which this Nation entered into with the International Monetary Fund with the approval of Congress replaced the old arrangements completely. At the time, in 1945, it all seemed too complicated and remote to merit attention. Now we suddenly find that these new arrangements have an immediate bearing on the soundness of the U.S. dollar and therefore on our national welfare and can hardly be ignored any longer. We find the dollar being devalued in a way we do not understand and had never expected.

As a people we do not realize apparently that devaluation of the dollar is rarely a deliberate decision on the part of any monetary authority as it was in Franklin D. Roosevelt's administration. Such authorities do not deliberately adopt a course that is certain to downgrade a monetary medium. A debased dollar is the involuntary consequence of abuses of long standing. The monetary authorities officially recognize the fact and reality of dollar devaluation only when it has become so obvious it can no longer be denied. The U.S. dollar has already been devalued by excessive issues but the authorities are not yet being forced to acknowledge it.

So it has become apparent that if we Americans are going to save the U.S. dollar from ultimate ruinous devaluation we had better make up our minds to keep informed of what is going on.

It is difficult to describe the structure of the postwar world monetary arrangements in simple terms. The International Monetary Fund was set up to facilitate the rehabilitation of foreign currencies after the war and to provide the means of maintaining sound and stable currencies when restoration had been achieved.

The International Monetary Fund consists essentially of an agreement signed by 48 nations to establish a parity value for their currencies in terms of gold and dollars binding for their foreign exchange as well as their gold transactions. The U.S. dollar is the only one of the 48 currencies that is directly convertible into gold. The par values of the other currencies are expressed in terms of gold or in terms of the U.S. dollar and its fixed price in gold.

Foreign central banks are free to exchange their currencies into dollars which they can use to buy gold from the U.S. Treasury at its fixed price. The U.S. Treasury has agreed to sell or buy gold on demand from the other 47 nations. By the same token the 47 nations are required to buy dollars when the value of their currencies rise one percent over parity value in dollars or sell dollars when values decline one percent below parity value in dollars. The dollar is thus used as a leverage by other nations to raise or lower their currency prices in foreign exchange markets. Each nation, of course, acts separately and independently.

Operating within the narrow range of two points, this arrangement assumes an impregnably strong dollar and vulnerable foreign currencies. Hence, it is easy to imagine the consternation of the world's money managers when the gold price of the dollar began to fluctuate wildly on the free London gold market. It was immediately attributed to the work of nasty old speculators, but the evidence of dollar weakness was too strong and too sustained to give this smoke screen much substance.

The 48 central banks of the various nations each with its separate and complete banking system, are tied together through the International Monetary Fund to what has been called a gold exchange standard. This means that these 48 nations have returned to the gold standard but in a modified structural form. Gold for the most has been made captive by the central banks which use it as bank reserves. It is estimated that 90 percent of the world's gold is held by the central banks. The ordinary citizen is no longer able to use gold as a monetary medium. Actually gold does not sell at a genuinely free price. The price of gold has been fixed by one government and then another for more than a century and a half; first by the British and then by the United States. The gold price in the free market in London fluctuates only in terms of the fixed dollar price. The bank reserves of international Monetary Fund member nations may also include United States dollars and British pounds known as international reserve currencies.

Until the explosion of gold prices in the London market made the dollar's decline agonizingly clear, its steadily depreciating value was concealed by the huge dollar purchases in foreign exchange markets made by West Germany, Holland, Italy, and other nations.

A major part of these huge dollar acquisitions was converted into gold and accounted for most of the heavy loss of gold by the United States in 1959 and 1960. A central bank bearing the responsibility for the banking welfare of its nation could hardly be expected to retain large balances of a currency that is steadily depreciating in value.

When West Germany and Holland officially raised the parity value of their respective currencies with the International Monetary Fund, they simply gave official recognition to the fact of dollar devaluation in relation to their currencies.

Thus, the pesky canine is being released and may be expected to show up again in Washington soon to pursue its worried masters.

It Should Be the Morgan Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, John Tyler Morgan, of Alabama, spent several years of his life attempting to stir up interest in the need for a sea-level canal at Nicaragua.

The late Senator Morgan's proposal is as timely today as it was when he first presented it. Attesting to this is an editorial which appeared recently in the Anniston (Ala.) Star. Col. Harry M. Ayers, editor and publisher of the Star, has been a consistent promoter of the Nicaraguan route and his editorials cogently point out what such a canal could mean to this country.

The editorial follows:

[From the Anniston (Ala.) Star, Apr. 2, 1961]

IT SHOULD BE THE MORGAN CANAL

Ever since the late Walter E. Edge of New Jersey, noted as a businessman of acumen, as an editor and banker and Senator, plus Ambassador Extraordinary to France, wrote a series or articles in the Saturday Evening Post some 40 years ago in advocacy of another interoceanic canal, this paper has kept up the fight toward that end.

Senator Edge said that we might just as well have but one battleship on the high seas as to have but one canal. Sink the ship or sobatage the Panama Canal and we then would become more or less land-locked, and without the military and commercial value that the Panama Canal is and has been to us since 1914.

It is of interest to note, therefore, that the Kennedy administration has revived the issue of a new isthmian canal. And according to an informative article in the

March 28 issue of the Wall Street Journal, the President "is thinking of restaging a drama from the days of Teddy Roosevelt."

But as much as we admire the old Rough Rider as he is pictured to us in history, and as much as we needed a man of his courage and decisiveness during the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration, any new interoceanic canal should bear the name of John Tyler Morgan of Alabama.

But while it is true that Teddy brought to bear practically the entire U.S. Navy in order to force Colombia to release her claims on Panama and to sell her interests in the isthmus to the United States on our own terms, it was Morgan who led the fight in the Senate that made the Panama Canal possible.

Morgan did not favor Panama originally, as he fought for the Nicaraguan route and a sea-level canal. And in so doing he carried his point on the floor of the Senate four times in spite of the opposition of the railroads, the French interests, and so forth, and had to come to the rescue of the Panamanian group when they got bogged down over technicalities.

We might go further in the field of nomenclature, and state that but for the ability, courage, and pertinacity of three other Alabamians besides Morgan—General Gorgas and General Noble in the field of medicine, plus the engineering genius of General Sibert—there might not have been any canal at all.

Morgan had an encyclopedic mind, and it was after years of careful study that he saw the advantages of a sea-level canal, which would not only be safer, more economical and nearer to our coastline, but one that also would be of advantage to the whole United States, and to the entire civilized world.

The wisdom of that great Alabamian, highly acclaimed by Chauncey Depew, Henry Cabot Lodge and other great Senators who served with him in the Senate for many years, although of a different party, has been proved in many ways since his death; and it is nothing less than foolhardy that we have not followed his advice.

As to the necessity of another interoceanic waterway as advocated after Morgan's great battle, we have the example of Japan in getting England and France to cooperate during the Russo-Japanese War by the closing of Suez to the Russians, who then had to make the longest naval voyage in history, and thereby to meet with defeat by the Japanese fleet.

Moreover, still later history as to Suez should convince any doubting Thomases as to the inadvisability of having too many stockholders in any new international waterway that should be constructed. For our present experience with NATO shows how onetime friends will fall out when most needed.

A few years ago, President Figueres of Costa Rica wrote to this paper that he would be favorable to a contiguous sea-level canal, as did President LaGuardia of Nicaragua. But President Jiminez of Costa Rica is not so favorable. And we do not know just how much trouble Castro of Cuba has wrought in the last few years.

Panama, too, who is almost wholly dependent upon the Canal for her livelihood, has become infected with the Communist virus and she probably would be gobbled up by Colombia again if we should stop feeding her. Hence, it has been suggested that we give Panama the present canal in the event we should rebuilt elsewhere.

Be all this as it may, however, Gen. William E. Potter, who recently retired as director of our Panama operations, is quoted as saying that "the time is not only on us, but we're in a rush position as far as committing ourselves to building a sea-level canal is concerned."

According to information furnished this paper by Yale University experts, we are almost wholly dependent upon foreign countries for raw mineral material, most of which comes through the Panama Canal. And that which we get from Africa will hereafter become a doubtful product.

The canal originally cost $375 million, but it is not stated whether or not that included the cleaning up of the miasmic conditions then existing in Panama. It is now proposed to do the necessary blasting with nuclear charges, however, and it is believed that this can go so far down as to eliminate any recurrent danger.

All in all, it is heartening to know that we now have in the White House a man who can "see life steady and see it whole;" and one who when he takes hold of a big problem like the canal, which means so much to our lives and our continued prosperity, will not give up until a new canal is built at a cost of about $1,250 million.

The State of Washington To Oppose Northwest Railroad Merger Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, according to reports in the press, Attorney General John J. O'Connell and Gov. Albert D. Rosellini, of Washington, have both announced that the State is planning to fight the proposed merger of the Great Northern, Northern Pacific, and Burlington railroads into a sprawling network of unprecedented size, covering nearly 25,000 miles of track. The Attorney General is quoted as saying that a petition has been sent to the Interstate Commerce Commission asking leave for the State to intervene in and oppose the application for authority to carry out the merger, which was recently submitted to the ICC by the railroads involved.

I am happy to support this action by the State of Washington, which is one of some 17 States that would be affected adversely if this proposed merger is permitted to go through. It is my understanding that other States in the areas served by these railroads also are filing similar protests with the Commission, and certainly many communities also have protested, as have a large number of civic bodies and individual citizens.

It is my sincere hope that their protests will be properly weighed by the ICC when it acts upon the merger applications. I know that the alarm and concern of the people of Washington and the other States served by these railroads is great and significant, and rests upon valid fears over the future transportation facilities which would be available to them if the merger were to be approved. Both the house and senate of the Washington State Legislature are reported to have reflected this concern by passing a resolution opposing the merger.

In order to bring before the Congress some of the reasons for the opposition of the people and State officials of Washington, under unanimous consent I include several articles which have appeared about this subject in Washington newspapers in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Yakima Herald, Dec. 11, 1960]

RAIL MERGER PLAN HAS UNIONS UNHAPPY

Railroad unions are staring unhappily at a proposed merger of four northern railroad lines, especially in view of the fact that the Interstate Commerce Commission has never denied a merger application of this type.

Principally the 17 legally recognized unions are concerned with job losses, but they claim a great many communities will be "hurt irreparably by the drying up of rail services, loss of payrolls and taxes." Railroads involved in merger talks are Northern Pacific, Great Northern, Burlington Lines (C.B. & O.) and the Spokane, Portland, and Seattle system. Edward Kermit, Yakima, a legislative representative for the Order of Railroad Conductors and Brakemen, pointed out how the proposed shift may affect Yakima.

Freight shifts: Railroads which are suggesting the merger have announced that, between Spokane and the west coast, all freight traffic south of Tacoma will move over the existing S.P. & S. tracks. All freight traffic north of Tacoma will move over existing Great Northern tracks. Result: Yakima will become a branch line operation, losing all four of its daily through freights. Robert MacFarlane, president of the Northern Pacific, said passenger service via the North Coast Limited and the Mainstreeter will be as at present, and freight service will be geared to giving the best and quickest service to the shippers of the area.

Yakima loses: But Kermit noted that loss of ranking as a division point will cost Yakima financially. As a division point, traincrews on through freights lay over at Yakima. Crews beginning work at Auburn west of the Cascades end their day at Yakima; crews starting at Pasco also end their work shift at Yakima on NP's east-west route. These people eat, stay overnight, and make purchases in Yakima, Kermit said. Additionally, as a branch line, Yakima may not be entitled to as many employees or as many railroad facilities as at present although the exact changes have not yet been determined.

Trucks hurting: MacFarlane, in a statement to employees of Northern Pacific, declared, "Highway competition has been particularly devastating" to railroaders' efforts to show a profit "and with the rapid expansion of interstate highways truck competition is steadily growing more difficult to cope with." He said no important changes in passenger service are anticipated. In addition, consolidation plans do not provide for any important or substantial abandonment of freight lines. In their statement, the unions claim the railroads are better off financially than the airlines, truck lines, or inland waterways.

Profit ratios: In 1958, for instance, railways spent $16 million to gain a net income of $1 million. Airlines spent $34 million for the same profit, truck lines $71 million. Waterways had an income ratio slightly under that of the railroads, the unions declared. They said railroads had an average net income, after depreciation of $233 million a year more in the 1950's than in the previous decade, which included the war years. According to figures of the railroad companies, 8,100 jobs will be affected by the merger. In about 2,900 of these the position would remain but the place of employment might be changed from one area to another.

Few jobs: Approximately 5,200 jobs would be discontinued at some stage in the consolidation, over a 5-year period, McFarlane said. The time spread would permit the consolidated company to place men in positions made vacant by attrition or death or retirement. So, MacFarlane noted, of the men in the 5,200 jobs, some 4,250 eventually could be reemployed at the same locations as now. "This would leave about 950 men who probably would have to transfer to fill vacancies. But our studies indicate clearly that there will be jobs somewhere on the railroad for everyone presently employed," he declared. Unions believe the loss is grossly underestimated, on the basis of checking how the merger will affect individual areas. Cited as a possible big loser is the Tri-Cities area.

Impact noted: "The impact of this displacement of employees should not be overlooked, considering the fact that $3,500,000 annually in railroad wages is spent in the Tri-Cities area," the unions declared. "They [the companies] promise better service to the communities, yet they will reduce the number of through trains from Spokane to Seattle via Pasco from approximately 16 to 18 trains a day to one time freight a day in each direction. If this is better service we certainly fail to see it." And a last word from NP's MacFarlane: "From the proposed consolidation will emerge a dynamic new transportation system which is destined to provide such an improved and expanded service that it is bound to command a greatly increased volume of business, thus creating additional jobs and making an increasingly important contribution to the economy of the vast territory it serves."

[From the Tri-City Herald, Dec. 3, 1960]

IMPACT STUDY POSSIBLE

(By Charles Lamb)

Effect on the Tri-Cities of the impending railroad merger will be discussed Tuesday night by the Pasco and Kennewick city councils, the Herald learned Saturday. The discussion will lead to appointment of a committee to study the proposal of the Northern Pacific Railway and the Great Northern Railroad to merge, it was indicated. Mayors Ray Hicks of Pasco and Glenn N. Felton of Kennewick said discussion of the merger would be on the council agendas because of the possible loss of payrolls.

S. R. Bichsel, general chairman of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers for the Northern Pacific and other national railroad union officials, recently estimated as many as 300 of the 750 Northern Pacific Railway jobs in Pasco would be threatened by the merger. It was said the merged lines would route most westbound traffic to Seattle over the Great Northern route, missing the Tri-Cities entirely. The unions also said the merger would result in establishment of an $11 million electronic switching yard in Spokane. Tri-City railroaders believe Pasco's $7 million retarder yard, one of the area's industrial strongpoints, then would greatly diminish in importance.

Both Mayor Hicks and Felton said they favor a special committee of Tri-City leaders to ascertain impact of the merger on the Tri-Cities and to protest to the proper agency—the Interstate Commerce Commission—which must approve mergers. "I have talked to many railroad men and they are rightfully concerned," said Mayor Hicks. "I believe the merger would be harmful to the whole Tri-City area by depriving the area of several hundred thousand dollars annually in payrolls—not to mention individual hardship to the affected employes themselves. I for one, think that Kennewick, Pasco and Richland city councils should pass a joint resolution opposing and protesting the merger." Mayor Felton said the Tri-Cities should work as hard to retain all its railway industry as it works to land a new one. "We've always advertised the hump yard and other railway facilities—even bragged about them. Now they're worth fighting to keep." He added, "Anything that hurts Pasco hurts Kennewick," and that while the majority of NP workers live in Pasco, many also live in Kennewick and Richland.

Mayor Joyce Kelly, Richland, said he would hesitate to join in a protest against the merger, despite his reluctance to see the Tri-Cities lose payrolls. "We must have the railroads and if a merger will keep them from going bankrupt, then we must live with it." He pointed out that three big rail mergers have occurred in the east and more will follow because of increasing competition, operational costs and other factors.

[From the Tri-City Herald, Dec. 11, 1960]

TRI-CITY RAILROAD EMPLOYMENT MAY JUMP FROM MERGER

(By Charles Lamb)

A proposed merger of four railroads should not jeopardize the present Tri-City railway employment level and may possibly increase it, officials of the Northern Pacific Railway said Saturday. The "trump card" in keeping local railroad employment at its present high level will be the increased use of the Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railway if the merger is achieved. Not one switch engine assignment will be pulled out of the Pasco hump yard, they declared.

The merger, which the railroads hope will go into effect in mid-1962, involves the Northern Pacific, S. P. & S., Chicago, Burlington & Quincy, and Great Northern. Assurance on the local job situation was given by N. M. Lorentzsen, Spokane, superintendent of the Northern Pacific's Idaho division, following a meeting in Spokane Friday with C. H. Burgess, operating vice president of the Northern Pacific. Burgess met with Lorentzsen and other officials of the Idaho division. One of the officials was R. C. Webb, Pasco, assistant Idaho division superintendent. Both Webb and Lorentzsen reported Burgess told them no present Northern Pacific employee in Pasco will be displaced by the merger—contingent upon satisfactory negotiations with railway management by operating and nonoperating railroad labor organizations. In addition, Webb stated that Pasco would become headquarters for a new division—to be named Pasco Division—which will be created when the 25,000 miles of mainline track under the four railroads become one major system.

Besides boosting Pasco's prestige, its division—point status would involve between 25–40 new jobs and may require a new division building in Pasco. Although Northern Pacific through traffic as it is known today would drop drastically, Northern Pacific operating crews thus affected would be picked up to operate trains over the present S.P. & S. line to Portland, Lorentzsen said. Pasco would continue as their home station. Under the merger, through trains to coastal areas north of Tacoma which now go via the Northern Pacific through Kennewick would bypass the Tri-Cities by going the Great Northern route. But, said Lorentzsen, freight to and from areas south of Tacoma will use the S.P. & S. route. This would swell Pasco traffic to commensurate for the decrease expected over the present Northern Pacific route.

Burgess' report conflicted somewhat with impressions received by union heads of all crafts on the four lines when they met in October with management of the Northern Pacific, Great Northern, C.B. & Q. and S.P. & S. Pasco railway union representatives have predicted a drop in through-train movements in Pasco to affect 102 train-crew jobs. They expect a loss of some 300 cars of freight daily, resulting in an additional force reduction of Pasco of some 150 switch crew members, carmen, clerks and others. Lorentzsen said the figures might be true on the basis of Northern Pacific mainline traffic reductions. But the increased traffic through Pasco over the S.P. & S. will balance the picture again, he said. "There will still be fruit trains, other freight service and passenger trains on present Northern Pacific tracks to Yakima and Ellensburg areas, but no more through freights," he explained. Both Lorentzsen and Webb asserted that "Not one switch engine assignment" would be pulled out of the Pasco hump yard. They said the yard will continue to make up east-bound fruit trains and will assemble freight trains bound for Minneapolis and St. Paul.

The executives' assurance of continued, or increased, Tri-City railroad employment volumes was based, however, on successful negotiations between management and the unions and willingness of present Northern Pacific crews to work on the present S.P. & S. route. "We feel the employees can do better by negotiating with management than by seeking relief through the Interstate Commerce Commission," said Lorentzsen. He added, "We know what management will do—we don't know what the ICC will do."

The merger plan is expected to reach an ICC hearing by February 1961 with a possible decision to go ahead in mid-1962. Webb said the four-system rail "marriage" will take about 5 years to implement.

[From the Columbia Basin News, Dec. 15, 1960]

ORAL COMMITMENT ISN'T ENOUGH

Oral commitment by Northern Pacific and Great Northern that Pasco would become a division headquarters has only slightly altered Tri-Cities viewpoint toward the proposed merger of the rail lines. Officials of the railroad brotherhoods would like to see a firm commitment in writing. Their fears that Tri-Cities would become a secondary rail point, causing layoff or transfer of many employees, have not been soothed even though Northern Pacific representatives said they do not anticipate that any Tri-Cities employees would be adversely affected.

Stickler in the Northern Pacific announcement was reference to the working status of operating and nonoperating crafts would need to be agreed upon. This can mean many things, and in some cases for reclassification could be a polite term of demotion. Railroad union representatives are taking a wait-and-see approach. They won't need to wait long, since the Interstate Commerce Commission is expected to begin examination of the proposal next February. A decision probably won't be forthcoming until the middle of 1962.

When it was first anticipated that Pasco would be downgraded as a rail center, Columbia Basin News suggested that railroad spokesmen make their position as clear as possible, spelling out in specific terms what the merger would mean to Tri-Cities and other communities now served by the four lines involved in the merger. Last week three top officials of Northern Pacific did dispel some of the fear that Tri-Cities would suffer drastic reduction, but they left important points open to discussion. The entire proposal necessarily will be presented in detail to the ICC in February, and naturally the railroads will be unequivocally committed to whatever plans they submit. Railroad officials have said that yard and road operations should increase as a result of improved rail service, and that this would directly affect the Tri-Cities area. But this is only speculation. Tri-Cities cannot support the merger until it has more substantial evidence that the plan would not work to the area's detriment.

[From the Tri-City Herald, Dec. 21, 1960]

RAIL UNION OFFICIAL DISPUTES THAT MERGER TO BENEFIT PASCO

(By Charles Lamb)

Sacrifices by the Northern Pacific Railway, its employees and cities along its route for the benefit of three other railways involved in a proposed merger were predicted here today by J. S. Turrell of St. Paul, Minn., general chairman of the Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen for the Northern Pacific.

Conferring with members of local 260 in Pasco, Turrell said, "Let's face it. The Northern Pacific would become a secondary line and Pasco and a number of other traditional Northern Pacific towns would suffer. In most cases, however, the positions of the Great Northern, Spokane, Portland & Seattle, and Chicago, Burlington & Quincy railways would be enhanced," he said. His view is almost opposite of predictions made in Spokane December 9 by C. H. Burgess, operating vice president of the Northern Pacific. Turrell said his opinions are based on information, "however meager," the company has put out to employees in St. Paul. Burgess said Pasco would become a division headquarters, would lose no payroll and that "not one switch engine would be pulled out of the Pasco Northern Pacific yards." "I wish I had that in writing about the switch engines," Turrell declared. He recalled one company estimate that the merger would cancel 49 switch-engine assignments in S Paul and Minneapolis alone every 24 hours. "You say it wouldn't affect one of the 19 engines in Pasco?" he challenged.

Turrell was also skeptical about a division headquarters in Pasco. "Since 1920, railroads have been lengthening divisions. Why now would they create new divisions in between old ones?" he asked. Aside from local freight trains arriving from the Yakima-Ellensburg area, Turrell expects not more than one or two freight trains would have to stop in Pasco a day for switching. Mainline freight from Tacoma and North would miss the Tri-Cities on the Great Northern route and S.P. & S. trains going East from the Tacoma South coastal area would probably come no closer to Pasco than the roundhouse curve, Turrell said. "Why would the combined line use the Pasco hump yard when 150 miles away it will have an $11 million electric switching yard at Parkwater near Spokane?" was another question Turrell posed.

He said the mayor of St. Paul inquired if the 13-story Northern Pacific and Great Northern general offices operation would stay in St. Paul after the merger. "He was told that the company didn't know. The Northern Pacific wants the unions to 'come in and negotiate,' but it hasn't given us any information to work on." Consequently, Turrell said, "We must draw conclusions from the facts we have." Among these is that 5,200 jobs in the existing Northern Pacific and Great Northern lines will be eliminated—an 8-percent reduction. "We think that 8 percent is conservative, since history shows mergers usually affect some 25 percent of the jobs. They claim their plans are not definite enough yet to tell what categories of work the reductions will affect," he said.

Turrell and local members expect Pasco to bear its share of the announced $40 million annual cost reduction the railroads expect from the merger. "Much of this will be payrolls and taxes—both of which support communities along the Northern Pacific line," the union official said. As an example, Turrell said Mandan, N. Dak., will lose 57 percent of its present $69,000 bimonthly payroll.

He said Northern Pacific President Robert MacFarlane has predicted "everybody will have a job inside of 5 years." Turrell said, "The way that works, the 5,200 jobs being reduced will be attrition through retirement and death with no replacements." He also predicted many young railway employees with little seniority will be dropped. Turrell said MacFarlane will be chairman of the board and Ralph Budd, present Great Northern president, will be president of the as-yet-unnamed rail combine. Turrell said the stockholders of all four lines must be polled by vote before the merger can come off. "I seriously expect many stockholders to balk," he predicted, pointing out that because Northern Pacific has oil wells and timber operations in addition to rail operations, its stock is more valuable per share than stock of the other three lines. "Funny thing," Turrell concluded, "all four companies are making money and none are in financial trouble. And most of the changes being considered could be achieved without merging. Why they have to merge at all is beyond me."

Some Crimson for the Republicans Also

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great personal satisfaction that I have noted the outstanding notices being received by Advance, the journalistic venture launched in February by an up-and-coming group of young Harvard Republicans. It is high tribute, indeed, when a distinguished journalist of Arthur Krock's stature heralds such an endeavor, and I would like to share his words of praise with my colleagues. The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 14, 1961]

SOME CRIMSON FOR THE REPUBLICANS ALSO

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, February 13.—The appearance of a periodical of opinion designed to promote the political fortunes of the Republican Party deserves the rating of an event. Among the foremost of these reasons is that for years the principal interest of many of the ablest editors and writers in the periodical field has been to promote the political fortunes of the dominant group in the Democratic Party.

But the launching of this journal of opinion has claims to being catalogued as an event beyond its general—though not undeviating—purpose to replace Democrats in office with Republicans. It has no financial backing or organization cachet in that party. It is a campus product by undergraduates. And it originates on a campus where the voice of Democratic liberalism has largely prevailed: the celebrated Yard of Harvard College.

Advance is the name the young publishers and editors have chosen for this duckling among a brood of cockerels whose ambition is one day to grow into great political gamecocks like Schlesinger, Jr., Galbraith, and Harris. It is to be published five times a year from Quincy House, Cambridge, Mass. In its first issue—that dated February 1961—Advance expresses the belief that "a new philosophy, not yet fully articulated, will mostly likely evolve within the Republican Party" and "most likely * * * will emanate * * * from the progressive Republicans." To help develop this philosophy, from that source, is its announced mission.

The psalmist has not yet made good his prediction that the meek shall inherit the earth. But the young, or at any rate the comparatively young, have certainly inherited the executive power in this Nation. And, since—without any noticeable signs of meekness—they are governing their inheritance in the name, and for the political longevity, of the Democratic Party majority, it is in the national interest of the future that other unmeek young shall arise to contest that future with them. The odds are very obvious and very great in favor of the group in power. But that is the best possible reason why the challenge, as yet so small, should be recorded.

The Harvard collegians sound it on no uncertain trumpet. "We are Republicans," they announce, with "no apology of any kind" for a party and its candidates after an eletcion in which, "though registered Democrats held a substantial majority."

Nixon and Lodge came very close to capturing the popular vote and the Republican delegation in both Houses of Congress was significantly increased. It would thus be unrealistic as well as cynical to assert that the Republican Party could profit by adopting Democratic programs or tactics. But it would be equally unrealistic to fail to reassess our position in the light of 1960 Republican defeats.

This reassessment leads Advance to the conclusion that progressive or—with important qualifications—liberal Republicans formulate any successful party program for the 1960's. And several articles which follow make clear that the undergraduate editors of Harvard identify such progressives with Senator CASE, of New Jersey, Senator COOPER, of Kentucky, Governor Rockefeller and Representative LINDSAY, of New York; and also that they are disposed to exclude Senator GOLDWATER from the category. Yet some of the lines GOLDWATER would draw to enable a bewildered electorate to differentiate between the central groups in both parties, and some on the left fringes of each, seem to appear in shadowy outlines in these extracts from the definitive editorial.

As the Democratic Party grew big it also grew ideologically flabby. Many of the Democrats who today call themselves liberals seem to equate liberalism with reckless spending and steady aggrandizement of Federal power. We are conservatives in our dedication to the traditional freedoms which permit individual realization.

On the issue of overriding certain vetoes by President Eisenhower, based by him on this same asserted dedication, several of the new magazine's preferred Republicans voted to override and GOLDWATER voted to sustain. But such crossovers occur in both parties on promptings that range from principle to pressure from special interest groups. And it is to be hoped this will not discourage the young staff of Advance in their gallant attempt to show that "atque ex Harvard semper aliquid novi."

What's Wrong With America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following essay which was written by a young constituent of mine, Miss Linda Beatty, a student in the seventh and eighth grade class at Our Saviour Lutheran School, Kansas City, Kans. The principal of the school, Mr. Robert C. Stebbe, sent this essay to

me, saying that he thought it represented a succinct statement, from the viewpoint of a Christian child, of what is wrong with America.

WHAT'S WRONG WITH AMERICA

(By Linda Beatty)

There are many things which can be said about America that are considered wrong and yet there are many things that are said about America that aren't true.

The most important thing that is wrong with America is that there are not enough believers in Jesus Christ. Of course there are many who know there is a God, but they don't believe there is a Triune God, Father, Son and Holy Ghost; they don't believe that God the Father sent his son, God the Son, to die and save people from their sins.

There are other things wrong with America like, I think people should think more about the poor people and the needy people. People should try to get Bibles and pastors to the poor so they also can get the teachings of Christ.

Electric Power From the Pick-Sloan Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Kansas City Star of March 23, 1961. The editorial speaks for itself—points to an alarming situation involving a conflict between public power interests and the Pick-Sloan program, and one which I respectfully urge my colleagues, to note by reading this editorial:

ELECTRIC POWER FROM THE PICK-SLOAN PLAN

The effort of the upstream public power crowd to blow up the whole cooperative plan of Missouri basin development comes at a time when the production of public power at Pick-Sloan dams is expanding rapidly. This is a move to destroy the plan that is showing results for the whole Missouri basin. And the most impressive gains are being made in the States that are now trying to seize all the benefits of the Pick-Sloan program except flood control.

In the early 1940's when W. Glenn Sloan of the Interior Department proposed his river plan, he suggested construction of facilities to produce 758,000 kilowatts of electricity. Today the current capacity of four big upstream dams—Fort Peck, Garrison, Fort Randall and Gavins Point—totals 905,000 kilowatts. And much more is coming.

The ultimate capacity under the Pick-Sloan plan of cooperation calls for 2,048,000 kilowatts, nearly three times the original proposal. Next year, the first units of a new 595,000-kilowatt installation will be available with completion of the big Oahe Reservoir. Big Bend, to be completed in 1964, will provide additional capacity of 468,000. It is interesting to observe that Big Bend originally was planned as a 100,000-unit operation. But changes were made and a new site selected to provide for a far greater capacity. Thus two new dams will more than double the present power output.

Of course, water is required to run the generators. It is true that for several years precipitation in the northern areas has been less than normal. Still, the reservoirs aren't about to run dry. And it isn't a case of using separate, distinct quantities of water for each dam. The same flow runs through all generating facilities. The main additions will come from more generators, not from a huge storage of water.

People up and down the river have supported power development—together with the other essentials of basin development, flood control, navigation and irrigation—for 17 years. But if the public power interests now intend to press their demand for sole benefits from the river, they can hardly expect the continuing cooperation from people interested in the industrial growth of Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, and Iowa.

It strikes us that this is a poor time for the power group to move to wreck the very foundations of the succeeding Pick-Sloan program.

Resolution by State of New York on Trade Restrictions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, both the Democratic and Republican Party platforms of 1960 pledged to seek an end to trade restrictions, blockades, blacklists, and the cessation of discrimination against Americans on the basis of religious beliefs. In keeping with these pledges, the Senate and the Assembly of the State of New York, has recently adopted a resolution memorializing the Department of State of the United States to take steps to discourage and nullify the effects of trade restrictions and boycotts by the nations comprising the Arab League against American citizens of the Jewish faith.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following resolution adopted in the Senate of the State of New York on March 24, 1961:

RESOLUTION 131

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Department of State of the United States to take steps to discourage and nullify the effects of trade restrictions, blockades, and boycotts by the nations comprising the Arab League against American citizens of the Jewish faith and against American companies controlled or managed by such citizens

Whereas Arab nations, including the United Arab Republic, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Libya, Sudan, Tunisia, and Morocco, functioning as the Arab League, have been conducting a boycott of American citizens, business and industry; and

Whereas the Arab League has blacklisted all American ships which have touched at Israeli ports of call; and

Whereas American firms doing business with Israel are cut off from trade with Arab countries; and

Whereas most American companies controlled or managed, partially or wholly, by Americans of the Jewish faith are not permitted to establish commercial relationships with countries that are members of the Arab League; and

Whereas American service men and armed force employees of the Jewish faith are not permitted to serve at the Dhahran airbase in Saudi Arabia; and

Whereas American citizens of the Jewish faith are generally not permitted to disembark on Arab soil, by land, sea, or air; and

Whereas approximately 500 American business firms during 1960 received warnings through the U.S. mails from Arab boycott officers in Damascus and Kuwait that if Americans have commercial dealings with Israel, they must forego doing business with Arab countries; and

Whereas individual Hollywood motion picture stars have also been blacklisted; and

Whereas American citizens of the Jewish faith are generally excluded from private employment in any capacity in any Arab owned or controlled company; and

Whereas the U.S. Navy reserves the option to cancel the charter of any vessel carrying Navy cargo, if any Arab country refuses to allow the vessel to load or unload cargo, because the ship's charterers or owners have previously done business with Israel; and

Whereas with the approval of the Department of Agriculture, Commodity Credit Corporation, and the U.S. Navy, contracts for the shipment of U.S. surplus wheat to the United Arab Republic provide that the vessel may not have traded at Israeli ports; and

Whereas the Democratic Party platform of 1960 pledged the protection of the rights of American citizens to travel, to pursue lawful trade, and to engage in other lawful activities abroad without distinction as to race or religion; and has further pledged to oppose any international agreement or treaty which by its terms or practices discriminate against American citizens on grounds of race, or religion; and

Whereas the Republican Party platform of 1960 pledged to seek an end to transmit and trade restrictions, blockades and blacklists, and further pledged to secure freedom of navigation on international waterways and the cessation of discrimination against Americans on the basis of religious beliefs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That the Department of State be and is hereby respectfully memorialized—

(a) To take a firm position against Arab interference in the conduct of the affairs of American citizens and businessmen.

(b) To abstain from any cooperation with Arab League boycott activities and policies.

(c) To resist any efforts by Arab nations to maintain or widen its boycott activities in the United States.

(d) To exert all possible efforts and utilize its resources to the fulfillment of the spirit and purposes of this resolution; and it is further

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress of the United States duly elected from the State of New York, and that the latter be urged to devote themselves to the task of accomplishing the purposes of this resolution.

By order of the Senate:

WILLIAM S. KING,
Acting Secretary.

Concurred in without amendments in assembly:

ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

Big Dialing Step

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, in my district there are new com-

munities with the same name as great cities of the world. One of these happens to be the city of Newark and recently communication history was made when a direct distance dialing system was installed in my district which allows citizens of Newark, Calif., to contact their fellow citizens in Newark, N.J. This accomplishment was highlighted by the conversation recorded in the following newspaper account which appeared in the Fremont News-Register of March 29, 1961, and I am happy to extend these remarks for your interest:

BIG DIALING STEP

Mayor Leonard Lucio of nearby Newark, sitting behind his desk last Friday helped make communications history when his telephone rang and he answered it—Mayor Leo P. Carlin of Newark, N.J., was on the other end of the line.

Their talk marked the inauguration of direct distance dialing in the New Jersey metropolis. Newark, Calif., has had it since 1958.

Students Hike Future Earnings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the first of a series of newspaper articles by Mr. Robert N. Kelso, a reporter for the New Orleans States-Item, on the current federally financed student loans at New Orleans universities and colleges appeared in the RECORD. Today, I am pleased to include the second of these fine articles which describe in detail what New Orleans institutions of higher learning are doing to aid young students to continue their education through the National Defense Education Act. The second article follows:

STUDENTS HIKE FUTURE EARNINGS—LOANS HELP COVER RISING COSTS

(By Robert N. Kelso)

Educators figure that the average college graduate earns $100,000 more in a lifetime of work than a person with only a high school education.

However rough this estimate may be, it is certain that the unskilled or partially trained worker comes out at the short end of the horn, moneywise, in this world of rapidly expanding expertise, technology, and automation.

Brainpower trained in specialized channels draws the premium pay.

But it is also costing premium amounts to turn out this brainpower—in many cases more than a talented youngster and his parents can afford.

This situation was recognized by Congress in 1958 when it passed the National Defense Education Act to provide for student loans, along with specialized training and research programs, in the Nation's colleges and universities.

The act authorizes institutions to lend able and needy students up to $1,000 a year, for a total of $5,000, while they complete their training.

Some 1,400-odd institutions are participating in the national defense student loan program, enabling more than 40,000 students to continue their higher education.

In Louisiana, 15 institutions are administering such student loans. Six of the 15 colleges and universities are in New Orleans.

Approximately 1,000 students in New Orleans are now getting at least part of their college education on a learn-now-pay-later basis.

The bulk of the money for student loan programs here is that appropriated by Congress. Participating institutions put up $1 of their own money for every $9 they get from the Government.

How does a student go about getting a loan?

As far as the loans underwritten by the Government are concerned, the procedure at all schools is similar.

The procedure at Loyola University, which now disburses loans only under terms of the National Defense Education Act, is typical.

Anyone eligible to attend school as a regular-enrolled, full-time student is eligible to apply for a loan.

Special consideration, under terms of the Federal law, is given to two categories of students:

1. Those with superior academic backgrounds who state they want to teach in elementary or high schools.

2. Those whose backgrounds indicate superior capacity or preparation in science, mathematics, engineering or modern foreign languages.

Such students have loan priority.

But so long as the priority groups are taken care of, loans are also available for other capable students who can demonstrate financial need.

Demonstrating need requires the applicant to supply detailed information on his own and his parents' financial resources.

This information, which is held in confidence, includes items on the net taxable income of the father and mother, or guardian, along with the value of their bank accounts, investments and real estate holdings.

Allowance is made for obligations and special situations—such as sickness—which may be a drain on the family income.

University authorities administering student loans want a clear idea of what the family can reasonably afford to contribute, and the families are expected to come up with their fair share.

The applicant himself is asked to supply a proposed budget for the duration of his loan.

This is to compare his anticipated expenses with his available resources—his personal savings, estimates of his earnings during vacations, part-time earnings during the school year, aid he expects from his parents, guardian or relatives, and any financial help he will get from scholarships, veterans' benefits, or other sources.

He is also required by Federal law to sign a loyalty oath.

This requirement created a furor when educators learned it had been tacked onto the congressional bill authorizing student loans. Campus critics contended it was a blow to academic freedom.

Several institutions—among them Harvard and Yale—pulled out of the loan program when congressional opponents of the requirement (one was the then Senator John F. Kennedy of Massachusetts) failed to get this restriction lifted.

The loyalty oath, as such, was not the chief target of the critics.

It merely required the applicant to swear he bears true faith and allegiance to the United States of America, and will support and defend the Constitution and the laws (of the United States) against all its enemies, foreign and domestic.

What really irked campus critics was an accompanying affidavit the applicant also has to sign.

It requires the applicant to swear:

"I do not believe in, and am not a member of and do not support any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods."

Faculty members on many campuses bridled at this, perhaps because they were still smarting from a postwar campaign to get college teachers themselves to sign loyalty oaths or be fired.

But prospective borrowers from the Federal student loan fund have been less antagonistic to the requirement.

No student seeking a loan at Loyola University, says Father Robert L. Boggs, dean of students and loan administrator, has balked at signing the oath and affidavit.

At Tulane University, Dr. Joseph E. Gordon, associate director of admissions and loan administrator, declared:

"Our experience has been that no borrower has complained or refused to sign the oath.

"We officially registered our unhappiness with the requirement, but have not chosen to deny students the benefit of the Federal loans, because we object to the oath."

Tulane has disbursed $500,000 from the Federal student loan fund in the 2 years since the program got into full swing. Loyola has parceled out $203,000.

Other New Orleans institutions participating in the national defense student loan program include Dillard and Xavier Universities and St. Mary's Dominican College.

Louisiana State University in New Orleans, which charges no tuition and fees of only $80 a year, has participated in only minimal fashion through its parent institution at Baton Rouge.

Few students are allowed to borrow more than tuition costs at their schools, because of the relatively high number of applicants.

Tulane and Loyola set no maximum to tuition, but other participating schools here do.

How many New Orleans students are getting their education with the help of pay later loans underwritten with Government funds?

Here is a rundown on the figures, compared with full-time enrollment at the school and its tuition charges.

Tulane: 550; enrollment, 4,500; basic tuition, $990.

Loyola: about 100; enrollment, 1,600; tuition, $600.

Xavier: 101; enrollment, 850; tuition, $400.

Dillard: about 100; enrollment, 900; tuition, $450.

Dominican: 21; enrollment, 309; tuition, $600.

LSUNO: about 15; enrollment, 1,805; no tuition.

This total does not include students receiving financial assistance through other loan programs conducted at the schools.

Tulane, for example, has another 100 students getting aid from the university's own loan funds.

The tabulation shows that from 11 to 12 percent of students enrolled full time at Tulane, Xavier and Dillard have gotten loans through the Federal loan program.

The percentage at Loyola is 6 percent, at Dominican 7 percent, and at LSUNO, less than 1 percent.

This is by no means the percentage at each school who are receiving some kind of financial aid, however.

Scholarships and part-time jobs provided by the institutions are assisting hundreds more.

An estimated one-third of Tulane's 4,500 full-time students are getting financial assistance through loans, scholarships and part-time employment.

Amounts disbursed this year under the national defense student loan program were:

Tulane, $250,000; Loyola, $100,000; Xavier, $40,000; Dominican, $29,707.

Authorities at Dillard declined to reveal the total of Federal funds disbursed. The figure at LSUNO, which doesn't do its own bookkeeping on the program, was not immediately available.

Institutions are permitted to apply for Federal loan money totaling up to $20 per full-time student enrolled.

They may ask for more, but must give justification on such grounds as the high cost of tuition and fixed expenses to students on their campuses.

Figures on the total amount spent in the Federal program this year aren't yet available, but the tally last year hit $58,340,000.

New Orleans administrators of Federal loan funds say they could use more money. A majority of them expect prospective borrowers to show up in greater numbers next fall.

An Open Letter to the President in Response to His Housing Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter addressed to the President by the editors of House & Home magazine following his housing message. It points up the problems connected with the housing goals so "devoutly to be wished."

The letter follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT IN RESPONSE TO HIS HOUSING MESSAGE

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: House & Home could not agree more wholeheartedly with all the objectives urged in your eloquent and moving housing message—the strongest, longest, and broadest message in many a year.

Like you, we find it shocking and shameful that in the richest nation on earth so many families are still ill housed. Like you, we want a good home for every American, poor or rich, city or farm, young or old. Like you, we deplore urban slums and suburban sprawl.

We agree that the Federal housing program should put more emphasis on urban needs. We share your wish for better planning on an area scale. We share your desire and impatience to remodel our cities, to improve our patterns of community development, to provide for the housing needs of all segments of the population. Who could question your statement that "meeting these goals will contribute to the Nation's economic recovery and its long-term economic growth. * * * A nation ill housed is not as strong as a nation with adequate homes for every family. A nation with ugly, crime-infested cities and haphazard suburbs does not present the same image to the world as a nation characterized by bright and orderly urban development."

And of course we welcome your concern for the depressed state of homebuilding (which is America's biggest industry) and the effect of the depression on all the industries dependent on homebuilding. We welcome your concern for its high rate of unemployment—the highest rate of unemployment in any major American industry. We welcome your call for a steady and progressive increase in the rate of homebuilding, beginning now. And we are more than pleased that you believe a construction rate of at least 2 million new homes a year will soon be required.

You first made manifest your deep concern for better homes and better communities by the high caliber of the public servants you chose to work and advise with you on these needs. You made your concern manifest a second time by your prompt attack on mortgage interest costs, for last year's tight money hit housing first and worst of any industry. Now you have emphasized your concern by making housing needs the theme of your most far reaching special message to Congress on any strictly domestic problem.

Because we share your housing hopes and purposes so deeply, because we welcome your concern for housing and homebuilding so gladly, and because we regard your housing advisers so highly—for these very reasons we are all the more disappointed to find that, although many suggestions in your message are indeed very important (like speeding up urban renewal processing, developing new tools to finance home improvement, providing better statistics on the market), the multibillion dollar program you propose is far too small to cure the vast needs you state.

If, as you say, 14 million families (26 percent of the Nation) are still ill housed, your plan to subsidize another 100,000 public housing units would meet just two-thirds of 1 percent of their needs; and giving Fannie Mae another $500 million for special assistance loans to consumer co-ops, nonprofit associations, and limited dividend corporations could barely rehouse even one-third of 1 percent.

If, as you say, we must provide good homes for millions of elderly couples living on less than $3,000 a year and for still more millions of widows living on less than $2,000, your plan to earmark another $50 million for direct loans to the aged and to reserve 50,000 of the added public housing units for their use would meet less than one-half of 1 percent of the old folks' need you dramatize.

If, as you say, almost one-fifth of the occupied houses in rural areas (they totaled 14,300,000 in 1950) are so dilapidated they must be replaced and if hundreds of thousands of others are far below adequate standards, extending the $200-million-plus unexpended balance of the 1956 farm housing credit as you suggest would meet hardly 2 percent of the need you state. It would provide less than a $75 loan toward the cost of each needed replacement, even if nothing at all is spent on the other substandard homes.

And if, as you say, we need a broader and more effective program to remove blight, your plan to spend another $2.5 billion to buy up slums at prices three and four times their reuse value would not go very far. New York City alone might need every cent of that money to reclaim its 7,000 acres of blight and decay, for New York slum prices are so inflated by overcrowding and undertaxation that redevelopment purchases have averaged $481,000 an acre.

As for your other two major proposals—selective credit controls to induce builders to build low-priced houses and Federal funds to buy land reserves now for future suburban development—we are sorry to have to say we believe these two programs could do as much harm as good, because:

First effect of no-down, 40-year financing for new homes priced under, say, $13,500 might be to break the price or weaken the market for 22 million reasonably good existing nonfarm homes now priced below the ceiling (not counting 6.7 million that are dilapidated or lack a private inside bath). This in turn would make it difficult or impossible for owner-occupants to sell their under-$13,500 homes and so get their equity out to buy the better homes many of them can now afford. So the more cheap new homes are sold to first-time buyers by the no-down financing you propose, the fewer better homes can be sold to second-time buyers trading up.

As the shelter shortage disappears, used-house prices are falling, so low income buyers in more and more markets are finding they can get more for their money in existing houses than in new homes built at today's costs and today's wages. In these markets the No. 1 reason why lower income families still buy new homes when they could get more house for the same money second-hand is that the new homes (which are financed wholesale) can be bought for $300 or $400 cash, whereas existing homes at the same price (which must be refinanced one at a time) are likely to require $2,000 or $3,000 cash.

Concluded Dr. Louis Winnick's excellent research report to Action on rental housing: "The problem is not likely to be solved with making the trade-up process work better." Your proposal would almost inevitably make it work worse.

First effect of Government spending to buy land reserves at today's sky-high prices might be to bid suburban land prices still higher, thereby driving builders further out into the orchards and cornfields to find land they could afford to build on. This would spread suburban sprawl and premature subdivision over added miles of open country.

Stockholm's land-reserve plan worked so well mainly because the land was bought with pre-World War I kroner before the automobile started suburban land prices soaring. That is something quite different from starting to buy reserves at the peak of today's land inflation.

Combined cost of the programs you propose has been estimated at more than $5 billion for open or concealed subsidies. If $5 billion can meet only 2 percent or at most 3 percent of the need you dramatize so eloquently, what clearer demonstration could there be that America's need for better homes can never be satisfied by subsidies?

This is a very tough problem, for which there is no quick or easy solution. It cannot be solved by a liberal program (meaning, by today's definition, liberal with the taxpayers' money). It can be solved only by a radical program (meaning, literally, a program that attacks the problem at its roots).

So we wish your message proposed to attack basic causes instead of relieving symptoms.

We wish you had said even one word questioning why slums in so many places are still spreading faster than new homes can be built to replace them, why private enterprise cannot meet the need of better housing for low and middle-income families in big cities, why cities are disintegrating in suburban sprawl instead of expanding in a plannable way, why good new housing costs too much and why home improvement costs still more, why, slums are the most profitable property anyone can buy, why urban expansion consumes four times as much land as it uses, why homes that cost $12,000 around some cities cost $18,000 to duplicate in others, why city planners and regional planners are so often helpless and frustrated, why the profit motive is harnessed backward to better land use in cities and suburbs alike, why cities subsidize slums by undertaxation and penalize improvements by overtaxation.

Or perhaps it would be better to combine all these questions into two: (1) What are the roadblocks and impediments that still make it impossible for the dynamics of private enterprise to meet all our needs for better housing (just as the dynamics of private enterprise meet our needs for almost everything else); and (2) what can and should be done to remove those roadblocks, so private enterprise can do the job.

We believe there are five major roadblocks. All of them are caused or perpetuated by some Government failure at the Federal, State, and/or local level. Your help is urgently needed to attack them. They cannot be removed by bigger subsidies or more liberal spending, but they can all be eliminated or minimized at no cost to the taxpayers by new fresh thinking and new vigorous leadership—the kind of new thinking and new leadership you promised us when you proclaimed the New Frontier.

1. THE HIGH COST OF CODE CHAOS

Conflicting and archaic building codes add a thousand dollars to the cost of a small house, partly because so many of their requirements are as useless as they are costly, partly because their differences frustrate the vast economies offered by standardization and industrialization. Around Washington, for example, some builders have to build under 12 different local codes and find their costs varying from jurisdiction to jurisdiction by as much as $1,000 per unit, with even the lowest cost inflated by the impossibility of standardizing their production.

Under our form of government, code responsibility is delegated to the local authorities, but it is wishful thinking and close-to-nonsense to expect local authorities to meet this responsibility without Federal help. They cannot afford the testing needed to keep their codes abreast of new products and new technology. They are not strong enough or informed enough to stand up against the powerful interests—local and national—that profit by code confusion (including the sponsors of the proprietary model codes that have to be kept different to be salable). And how can any local government bring its code in line with national standards when there are no national standards to get in line with?

Canada has shown the way to solve this problem by buttressing local authority with Federal assistance. Through the Canadian counterpart of FHA (the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation) Canada is preparing a domain code for housing—a code all local governments will be urged to adopt by reference, a performance code that will meet every local requirement (just as the New York State code provides for tropical hurricanes on Long Island and Arctic snows in the Adirondacks).

By instructing FHA to prepare, service, and promote a similar national code recommended for coast-to-coast adoption by reference in every U.S. community, you could lay the foundation for cutting the cost of building better homes by more than a billion dollars a year—at a yearly cost to FHA of less than a million dollars.

2. THE HIGH COST OF REAL ESTATE TRANSFERS

Archaic closing costs (not including prepayments) cost the buyers of new and existing houses more than a billion dollars a year. They discourage new-house sales by often taking more cash than the downpayment. They choke used-house sales by almost doubling their selling cost (trade-ins usually mean accepting 15 percent less than the appraisal value of the house). They thereby create the illusion that lower priced homes are in short supply, whereas the Census Bureau's housing inventory indicated that there are far more reasonably good nonfarm housing units priced under $12,400 than there are nonfarm families who could not qualify FHA to buy a more expensive home. The No. 1 reason more low-priced units seem to be needed is that so many millions of low-priced homes are still occupied by families who could afford to pay an average of 71 percent more.

Our whole system of real estate transfers and title searches is a hangover from the days when all land was royal (i.e., "real") property. The king has been gone for 185 years next July 4, but we still perpetuate the legal fictions of feudal tenure. This archaic system of real estate transfer may have been good enough in the days of the old homestead passed down from generation to generation. It is too costly an anachronism now that homes are resold once every 7 or 8 years.

What we need is a new legal fiction to make house transfers as quick and inexpensive as car transfers or security transfers. And the precedent of cooperative housing with proprietary leases backed by stock ownership or trust certificates of beneficial interest suggests how this need might be met if you provide the leadership and enlist the constructive cooperation of the American Bar Association.

Cooperative housing units can be sold and resold without a penny wasted in legal fees, title searchers, and closing costs because, like stocks and bonds, they are transferred as personal property instead of real property. Nominal ownership in the actual land and buildings remains unchanged in the proprietary corporation or trustee, so the real estate title and the all-important title insurance are not affected by the sale.

Project homes are already being sold as cooperatives under FHA section 213. Next two steps to make a new legal fiction workable might be: (1) A new FHA title to insure chattel mortgage loans backed, not by real estate, but by the security of stock ownership and proprietary leases, and (2) similar authorization from the Home Loan Bank Board to let Federal S. & L. S. lend on this type of security.

As you know NAREB has long advocated FHA insurance for individual mortgages inside cooperatives.

3. THE HIGH COST OF UNDEPENDABLE FINANCING

Ever since 1951 homebuilding and homebuilders have been tossed from boom to bust and bust to boom by the alternation of too easy and too tight money (which inevitably hits homebuilding first and worst). This uncertainty about money makes it dangerous if not impossible for builders (and others) to make the long-range investment in equipment and personnel needed to rationalize homebuilding costs at a lower level.

The need for a bigger and better central mortgage facility to help stabilize the flow of mortgage money has been clear as far back as the presidency of Herbert Hoover, who sponsored the establishment of the Federal home loan bank. So here we will only say we were disappointed that your long message included no mention of this need and no proposal to meet it.

4. THE HIGH COST OF LAND IN CITIES

This is the No. 1 reason (and perhaps the only reason) why private enterprise cannot meet the need for good low-income housing and good middle-income housing in big cities. A builder who pays too much for city land is then forced to compound his problem by building high rise to spread his land costs—and building high-rise costs twice as much as building walkups or townhouses.

The No. 1 reason city land costs too much is that city land is so underassessed and undertaxed. So the owners (including, most notoriously, the slumlords) can capitalize the too big spread between the rents they can collect and the taxes they must pay, translating the spread into too high prices.

Said the 1960 report of the mayor's special adviser on housing in New York: "The $2 billion public housing program here has made no appreciable dent in the number of slum dwellings. No amount of code enforcement will be able to keep pace with slum formation until and unless the profit is taken out of slums by taxation."

5. THE HIGH COST OF LAND IN THE SUBURBS

Since 1950 building material prices have risen 24 percent, building trades wages have risen 60 percent, but suburban land costs have risen an average of at least 300 percent. High land costs are now the No. 1 problem of the homebuilding industry, the No. 1 factor threatening to price new houses out of the market. Home buyers balk at paying $2,000 more and $3,000 more when all they get for the higher price is a higher price tag on a farther-out lot.

Once again the No. 1 cause is undertaxation, which makes it easy for land speculators to hold millions of acres off the market, including much of the close-in land that should be developed first. This creates an artificial shortage which sends prices skyrocketing and sprawls the suburbs farther and farther afield as builders move out to find land that is still cheap enough to build on.

Local governments subsidize land speculation by underassessing and undertaxing underused land; States encourage land speculation by setting low limits on land taxes; the Federal Government subsidizes land speculation by letting speculators deduct their costs from ordinary income taxes and then cash in their profits as capital gains.

Land-price inflation inside the cities and outside the cities is no longer a local problem. It is a nationwide and a national problem, for land prices are now swollen to the monstrous total of nearly half a trillion dollars ($500 billion)—much more than the national debt, much more than the resources of all our financial institutions. They threaten not only the building industry, but the whole national economy as well.

If local governments are powerful to meet the problem, it is high time the Federal Government took a hand. A stiff Federal tax levied ad valorem on today's market price of land (like the land tax levied five times in the first 100 years of the Republic) would almost certainly be constitutional if the receipts are prorated back to the States. This levy would offer the two fold advantage of (1) deflating land prices before they are too deeply involved in the Nation's credit structure, and (2) providing more than enough money to minimize the need and pressure for further financial assistance to State and local governments.

A land tax is almost the only practical tax that can be counted on to lower prices and stimulate consumption instead of raising prices and inhibiting production.

Whatever you may decide to do or not to do about the five basic impediments that make it hard for private enterprise to assure every American a much better home at a price he can afford, we wish your program for tomorrow's housing were aimed at tomorrow's needs—not yesterday's.

We are disturbed that your message talks and plans so poor about housing when you talk and plan so rich for the economy.

You have criticized the Eisenhower administration again and again for not expanding the economy faster; you have undertaken to double this rate of growth. But if incomes rise throughout your administration no faster than they rose under your predecessor, the entire net increase in nonfarm population from now to 1965 or 1969 will be families who could qualify FHA to pay at least $17,500 for a good house, and more than half the increase will be families who could pay at least $23,000. Conversely, by 1969 there would be 4 million less nonfarm families than there were in 1957 who could not afford to pay more than $13,500.

Why then do you say that the great need is for still more cheap houses? Why do you say "selective credit devices must now be used to encourage private industry to build more housing in the lower price range"—a price range whose upper limit you set far lower than the new ceiling your administration has just set for subsidized public housing for the very poor?

You cannot raise the American standard of living by forcing more new housing into a low-price market that would already be oversupplied if so many millions of families were not underliving their incomes by staying on in homes much cheaper than they can now afford.

The New Frontier for housing is not the minimum house; we have already built too many minimum houses since the war.

The New Frontier for housing is the quality house—a house so much better than yesterday's best that yesterday's best is as obsolete as yesterday's car. The New Frontier for housing is a home that takes all the drudgery out of housework, a home that is cool in summer and warm in winter, a home that is well lighted day and night, a home with big enough rooms and ample storage, a home that costs much less to heat and much less to maintain, a home planned for more enjoyment of the land, a home in a better planned community.

And if you will help the housing industry save the money now wasted on the chaos of codes, the money now wasted on closing costs, the money now wasted on the discounts necessitated by uncertain financing, and the money now wasted on land-price inflation, the housing industry can build and sell those quality homes at prices so attractive that millions of families will want to buy them and housing can once again be a great growth factor in our expanding economy.

Criticism of House Un-American Activities Committee Rules Invited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I hope the statement made yesterday by our distinguished colleague from California [Mr. DOYLE] did not escape the notice of the six Members of the House, who voted a month or so ago against the resolution to allow funds for the House Un-American Activities Committee.

This statement was to the effect that all Members of the House are invited to make suggestions as to changes in the committee rules which will govern the operation of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the rules of this important committee protect witnesses who appear before the committee and that every precaution has been taken to safeguard those whose names are mentioned in committee hearings.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that great care has been exercised in these matters and that a committee of the American Bar Association, after studying certain hearings in which the House Un-American Activities Committee was engaged, reported favorably as to the conduct of hearings during the period of study.

However, I doubt if the public recognizes the fairness of these rules or knows of the careful screening and annual review of Congress that has been practiced each session by the committee so as to avoid any basis of criticism.

As pointed out by our colleague [Mr. DOYLE], for several terms of Congress the committee rules have not only been studied and appropriate changes made, but these rules are printed so every witness or his attorney can have them.

Certainly it is a good time, when these rules are being reviewed, for critics of this committee to suggest to Members of Congress any improvements to protect individual rights as guaranteed by our Constitution. I do not know of any changes I would make recognizing the responsibility of Congress to investigate internal subversion.

However, I think any Members who disagree should speak up now, rather than saying later on that witnesses before the committee were not treated fairly.

Physican and Burning of Rome

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, in the magazine American Practitioner and Digest of Treatment, volume 10, No. 10, there appeared an editorial by Dr. Robert A. Hingson, who is professor of anesthesia at the Western Reserve University School of Medicine, and director of anesthesia at the University Hospitals of Cleveland, Ohio.

It is entitled "The Physician and the Burning of Rome," and I think Members will find it interesting and informative. It is exceptionally well done.

Under unanimous consent, I include it at this point in the RECORD:

THE PHYSICIAN AND THE BURNING OF ROME

(By Robert A. Hingson, M.D.)

In the first century A.D., a Roman emperor with a callous conscience observed the collapse of the acme of civilization in the burning of the Eternal City. Historians record that Nero fiddled as the flames consumed Rome.

During the past year, in a 45,000-mile journey a periglobal survey of medical missions and national hospitals of many faiths and sects was completed. Our team of 16 specialists in medicine, nursing, and nutrition, with hospital supply executives, paused in 32 countries of the outer rim of Asia and Africa to observe and record; and in some instances to render medical treatment. We found a world in which more than one-third of its occupants were being destroyed by the flames of disease. We knew that the world was sick—but it was much sicker than we thought.

As we, representing the specialties of anesthesia, medicine, obstetrics and gynecology, pediatrics, public health, and surgery, examined the hospitals, clinics, public health stations, and schools manned by the thousands of selfless and dedicated missionaries as our most tangible and consistent examples of concern for our neighbors, we came face to face with mankind's greatest enemy, disease. We observed its vectors, its tragic onslaught upon the economy of many nations, and its devastating and paralyzing effects upon men of all races. We who had observed the effects of World War II at close range became convinced that war ranks a poor third behind famine and disease in its destructive force.

After conferences with ministers of health and government officials in each of these nations; after study of the health statistical reports of each; after seeing the patients in the overpopulated city slums, in the villages, in the jungles and in the bush of these countries of more than 2 billion human beings; after immunizing 90,000 of them by American gift vaccines against poliomyelitis, cholera, or typhoid, we tabulated and estimated the disease problem in these nations. The 10 major diseases as we found them were:

1. Malaria, 200 million new cases each year.
2. Tuberculosis, 75 million cases.
3. Malnutrition, including severe anemia, Kwashiorkor, starvation, 50 million cases.
4. Intestinal diseases of cholera, typhoid, dysentery caused by bacterial flora and amebas, 50 million cases.
5. Intestinal parasites and worms, 150 million cases.
6. Trachoma, affliction of eyes, 50 million cases.
7. Bilharzia or snail disease, 50 million cases.
8. Infectious diseases of the skin, yaws, jungle rot and smallpox, 50 million cases.
9. Severe mental apathy inconsistent with self-sustenance, 25 million cases.
10. Leprosy, 20 million cases.

One of our surgeons remarked to the writer after participating in this experience: "To consider one of the world's major health needs as surgery would be the same as fiddling while Rome burns." Indeed, in these days when many plans are being proposed by statesmen, physicians with limited experience in only one or two countries, neophytes of problems of monsoon, jungle and desert, specialists who plug a hobby, and textbook specialists in disease and international politics, we are getting ahead of reason in translating our emotions into action.

First there is a need for factfinding surveys in bilateral concert with the agricultural, educational, medical, engineering, sociologic and political leaders of the indigenous peoples toward whom we are directing our assistance. Only then can we tie man's resources intelligently to man's need in an acceptable form. Educational assistance can be offered when we are ready to carry through a continuing plan. The exchange students now in most of these countries and our country can pave the way.

The physician who has rendered such a creditable service in making America the healthiest Nation in the World has much to share through coordinated effort, but he has much to learn too. Our medical schools which have geared their training to combating the diseases of our prosperous country to Main Street, U.S.A., can learn too through sending members of their faculties in rotation to assist in neighboring, friendly, and receptive underdeveloped countries. Teams of medical students in their free elective quarter, and young physicians in training, can be taught the principles of vaccination and immunization, and loaned to a specific area in which there has been prearranged transportation, sustenance and supervision and planned direction. Such would be a rewarding experience for the medical student, the physician in training and the responsible medical faculty as well. Such experience would enrich the institution and personnel who sponsor it toward becoming important factors in a world community. This loan of personnel could be effectively correlated with the splendid lifesaving gifts of supplies and food through our national philanthropy of CARE and our Christian medical mission programs.

The medical society at the county, State, regional, and national levels within the framework of the American Medical Association and World Medical Association, and within the framework of each specialty, has a

definite responsibility, a challenge, and an opportunity toward the alleviation of the world's suffering and in making the most meaningful contributions toward world peace. As a start each local county medical and dental society could adopt one single medical mission and supply it with continuing provisions of medical texts, instruments, and drugs. The immensity of the task should not ensnarl us in the whirlpool of attempting too much through dispersion of our efforts too far, too soon. There are 2 billion people in Asia and Africa alone or more than 10 people in urgent need for every single person in the United States. The majority of these people are under the domination economically or politically of enlightened European powers. As America tackles the problems of the world in such projects as the Great White Fleet of mothball hospital ships privately manned, in people-to-people's programs, with the "Medico," with the foundations, and with denominational missions (even though each of these is important in long-range ultimate objectives), there should be established first certain priorities and proving grounds and "trial flights" for mastering the same lessons that have been learned at Cape Canaveral, in the World Health Organization, in the United Nations, and in the historic contacts with the recipient nations themselves.

The Philippines, our most tested and trusted ally in the Pacific and a courageous lighthouse for democracy there, is in great need from a public health, educational, and economic viewpoint—particularly in the southern islands. The West African nation of Liberia under the forceful and statesmanly leadership of President Tubman, which had its origin and its recent stimulus for development in the American system of freedom for the individual and for progressive enterprise of industry, at present contributes significantly to our rubber and steel requirements. Liberia's health needs were greater per capita than those observed in any other nation in our survey, exclusive of Korea. Liberia furnished an essential landing field for 170,000 military flights during the launching of attack through North Africa into the captive citadel of Europe in World War II. Liberia would welcome our professional and our cooperative denominational help. With concerted action on the agricultural, educational, economic and health fronts we could immediately achieve the lasting friendships of people in great need in these countries in which there are no entanglements in European politics. Our present very laudable point 4 programs in southern Asia, in Indonesia, in the vacuum of India, are achieving commendable results on an unprecedented scale through multimillion-dollar Federal assistance programs.

As we preach democracy and salvation we should keep our eyes on the fundamental health needs of Asia and Africa (all beginning with the letter S): (1) Sanitation, (2) sewers, (3) sprays, (4) screens, (5) schools, (6) soup, (7) shots, (8) shoes, (9) self-respect, and then only (10) salvation. We should first demonstrate in two areas mentioned above with 20 million in the Philippines and a possible 2 million in Liberia that we can be faithful in a few things before we become ruler over many things. Indeed, the needs of the world are primarily public health and nutrition.

The development and application of the Salk vaccine has taught us the lesson that with all of our propaganda, all of our medical and scientific knowledge and skill of our physicians, we have protected only less than one-half of our population. Our needles, syringes, sterilization, transportation processes, and available personnel were simply not enough to tackle the social impediments of our well organized America. Twenty-six preparation minutes per injection through this approach has not eliminated poliomyelitis in America, now in its worst outbreak in 6 years, nor will it eliminate the millions of other pestilences which beset the world. For the past two decades the author of this editorial has developed the principle of jet inoculation, and now adapting the repeat jet principle from immense reservoirs we proved in inoculating 41,000 children and employees of the U.S. post office in Cleveland, and 90,000 on our world journey within a space of 4 months, that we can deliver one immunizing injection each 6 seconds without resterilization.

It will take such total mobilization of planned effort and mass volunteer teams of indoctrinated physicians who will donate their time to join other concerned Americans and world citizens of many nations and of all religious faiths who can provide transportation, equipment, diplomatic international contacts, education and simultaneous agricultural and engineering assistance, to make lasting contributions in the vital field of world health and world peace. To dissipate effort in tackling all the world's problems at once is competition and out of step with the British and the French and the Belgians and the Dutch and the Russians, would be the equivalent of "fiddling while Rome burns."

Public health, improved nutrition, and education are the basic needs which must be supplied before the medical specialties of surgery, radiology, anesthesia, pathology, and physical therapy can be intelligently and effectively developed in these countries. Never before has the welfare of two continents presented itself before such a capable and scientific medical profession with such a limited timetable. We, the physicians, can and must extinguish the flames of mass disease and suffering in the vanguard of civilization's most promising era.

Massachusetts Port Authority Recommends Creation of Office of International Travel in Department of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the statement of Frank E. Hickey, Washington representative of the Massachusetts Port Authority at Boston, before the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, relating to several pending bills to establish an Office of International Travel in the Department of Commerce:

STATEMENT BY FRANK E. HICKEY

The Massachuetts Port Authority has directed that I submit the following statement to your committee in support of H.R. 4614 and related bills, and to present some facts relating to the progress that has been made in expanding the various transportation facilities under its jurisdiction.

The enabling act that created the Massachusetts Port Authority is covered by the following: chapter 465 of the Acts of 1956; as amended by chapter 599 of the Acts of 1958 and chapter 476 of the Acts of 1959 and chapter 525 of the Acts of 1960:

"An act * * * creating the Massachusetts Port Authority and defining its powers and duties; providing for the issuance of revenue bonds of the authority, payable solely from tolls and other revenues, for * * * refinancing * * * the Mystic River Bridge and refinancing and improving the State-owned airports and Port of Boston facilities; and providing for the transfer to said authority of said * * * bridge, airports and port facilities."

Under this trusteeship the authority sold on February 17, 1959, a revenue bond issue of $71,750,000. These funds are to be used for operating expenses and the expansion of facilities at the Port of Boston, Logan International Airport, Hanscom Field and the Mystic River Bridge.

Boston is one of the oldest ports in the United States. However, the facilities and equipment have been maintained and modernized to meet the technical and physical requirements of our expanding economy.

After World War II the taxpayers of the Commonwealth invested approximately $30 million for the improvement of the Boston waterfront. In addition there was expended $70 million for the construction of airplane, automobile, and truck facilities at the Logan International Airport.

At the present time the passenger accommodations and facilities in Boston are adequate to meet the present demands. However, new construction is now being completed and additional contracts will begin in the immediate future and will be sufficient to handle the program that is planned under H.R. 4614.

The Logan International Airport is considered one of the finest airports in the country. It is adequate at the present time to handle the largest jetplanes. Plans have been in progress for an additional passenger terminal at a cost of $6 million. It will accommodate 49 new plane positions close to shelter areas. Work is now in progress on four finger piers, to be air conditioned and will include several lounges to accommodate approximately 100 people each awaiting departure of their planes, and removed from the congestion of the ticketing area. This construction includes a $1,500,000 International Terminal, consisting of 98,533 square feet which is more than three times the present area. The International departure area will include 27,414 square feet, and the International arrivals area, a total of 36,305 square feet. The finger pier to serve International passengers will have 34,825 square feet of floor area.

From July 1, 1959, to July 1, 1960, the total of international plane arrivals and departures was 8,152, and 127,435 International passengers. At the present time there are approximately 4,000 employees at this airport, with an estimated annual payroll of $18 million.

Commonwealth pier, designed to accommodate passengers as well as cargo, is a 2-story steel and concrete structure with access to both levels direct from main highways. This pier is considered to be one of the finest of its type in the world. It is approximately 1,200 feet long and is capable of accommodating the largest passenger ships afloat. This present year there are approximately 40 scheduled sailings from this pier.

If passengers bring their automobiles for the purpose of touring the country, they would have easy access to highways north and south, as well as the Massachusetts Turnpike which connects with the New York Thruway. There are continuous superhighways as far west as Chicago. These are intersected by numerous highways north and south. Massachusetts has a large construction program in progress at the present time, to augment the existing highways systems.

Boston is a natural port of entry, being the nearest port on the Atlantic coast to European ports and the east coast of South American. Traffic can be easily funneled through New England and all points to the Middle West and the Pacific coast.

There are many attractions in Metropolitan Boston and the whole New England area, having great appeal to foreigners coming to this country. In addition to the natural scenic beauty, it has an abundance of historical attractions and is known also for its educational and cultural centers. During the past generation it has been referred to as one of the world's great medical centers. Students come to this area from all over the world, and attend Harvard University, the oldest in the United States, and one of the world's greatest technological institutes, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. To name a few, of the universities in this area, there are Yale, Amherst, Williams, Boston University, Boston College, Tufts, Dartmouth, Wellesley, Radcliffe, Smith and Mount Holyoke, all having an international reputation. There are many other internationally known educational institutions with many international exchange students in attendance.

During the last 20 years there has grown up a concentration of research organizations which draws from the various technical schools in this area. Located in Massachusetts are the largest electronics manufacturing and research industrial developments in the country. Another interesting development in modern science is the atomic powerplant which has recently been placed in operation in western Massachusetts.

The aforementioned are only a few of the interesting attractions for the foreign tourists, many of whom combine business and pleasure on trips to the United States.

The Massachusetts Port Authority is continually planning for the anticipated increase in transportation of freight and passengers by plane, ship, rail, truck and bus, and is prepared to take any additional action necessary to cooperate in making this international tourism a success.

The Massachusetts Port Authority strongly supports and recommends the passage of this proposed legislation to create an Office of International Travel in the Department of Commerce, for the purpose of strengthening foreign and domestic commerce, the improvement of the foreign payments position, and to facilitate international travel.

An Unfortunate Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday of last week Governor Swainson of Michigan, issued an order forbidding the Michigan State police to continue public showings of the film "Operation Abolition."

While I do not question the authority of the Governor to issue this order, I do very seriously question his judgment in acquiescing to pressures from persons and groups who vehemently oppose anyone showing the film.

I reject completely the charge that the film is a distortion of the events which occurred in San Francisco last May during the hearings of the subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and I deeply regret that the Governor of Michigan accepts this view of the film.

The Governor's action is all the more unfortunate because he has given no specifics as to the alleged distortions and because there is no evidence that members of his staff who recommended the action had at any time consulted with any member of the committee, any member of the committee staff, or with the Federal Bureau of Investigation regarding the happenings at San Francisco.

Fortunately, there are numerous individuals and organizations throughout the State of Michigan, as elsewhere in the Nation, who are continuing to make the film available to citizens interested in learning about this Communist-organized and Communist-led attack on a committee of Congress.

The finest comment on the Governor's unfortunate action which has come to my attention is an editorial which appeared in the April 8 Battle Creek (Mich.) Enquirer and News. Under permission to extend and revise my remarks, I include the full text of this editorial:

A QUESTIONABLE ORDER

Governor Swainson's order prohibiting the Michigan State police from showing two controversial films on communism is open to considerable question. There is no doubt but that the Governor's motives were well intentioned, but this does not preclude the belief that he could have been mistaken in his judgment.

The Governor's action is disturbing in his admission that he, personally, had not seen the films—"Operation Abolition" and "Communism on the Map"—before he issued the order. Instead he acted on the advice of several staff members who, according to Mr. Swainson, "confirm criticism that the films are inaccurate and distorted and thus harm, rather than advance, the purpose of an intelligent anti-Communist campaign."

Mr. Swainson further said that his order to State police was issued after many people in the State brought the films to his attention.

From all these facts, we can only infer that Mr. Swainson has succumbed to pressure from certain groups that appear to be as ill-informed as he about one film in particular. We, personally, have not seen "Communism on the Map," therefore we are in no position to comment on it. But, we have viewed "Operation Abolition," which is a documentary film on the Communist-instigated student riots at hearings by the House Committee on Un-American Activities in San Francisco last year. Admittedly, the movie has been edited to depict precisely what it is intended to show—howling mobs of misguided young people swarming through the San Francisco city hall and disrupting not only the House hearings, but regular court proceedings as well.

In some strange manner, which we strongly suspect was an outgrowth of ultraliberal attacks on the House committee, itself, many intelligent people who normally would refuse to accept such reports without first-hand confirmation, have eagerly swallowed the charge that the film is distorted. Few among this group could have possibly witnessed the riots. How can they, in justice to their own consciences, charge inaccuracies and distortions in something of which they have only hearsay knowledge?

On the opposite side of the issue, we have the word of Representative AUGUST E. JOHANSEN, who was at the San Francisco hearings, that the film is not distorted. In his support we offer the report of J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which confirms that the students did cause a riot and that they were led by known Communists.

We prefer to accept the latter statements, rather than those of people who were not at San Francisco or who have not even seen the film.

"Operation Abolition" was prepared to show how Communists have tried to destroy the committee and to portray how the Reds can infiltrate American college campuses. It, therefore, does serve a valuable purpose in helping to inform the public of how the Communists work. For the first time, the average citizen has had a chance to see Communists in action in America, and he is rather appalled by what he sees. And, the Communists, themselves, know that the film is making their work harder.

Under Governor Swainson's order, however, the security investigation squad can no longer show the movie. Thus, the State's "little FBI" has lost a valuable instrument in the fight against subversion. While private groups can continue to show it, the Governor's order is certain to cast a shadow over its value.

We recommend that if Governor Swainson has not already persused the Hoover report on the San Francisco riots, that he do so forthwith. And if he has, we call on him to explain how he can accept charges of distortion in the film against the facts offered by Mr. Hoover.

We earnestly urge the Governor to reconsider his decision in this matter.

Crash Program Needed To Save Waterfowl Wetlands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, if our dwindling duck population is to be saved, Congress must act soon to speed up the purchase of lands for migratory bird refuges and waterfowl nesting areas. In 1954, I exposed the diversion of the bulk of income from Federal duck stamp fees to purposes other than wetlands acquisition, for which purpose hunters had voluntarily accepted the fee in the first place. During the next 4 years, I battled for legislation to insure that all income from the stamps would go to provide more refuges for migratory waterfowl. This legislation was enacted into law in 1958.

However, even though all duck stamp money is now earmarked for the purchase of wetlands, it will take years for the program to reach the anticipated goal of 4,500,000 acres. Meanwhile, many areas marked for acquisition will have been drained or converted to other uses, and land prices will most likely have become prohibitively high. The next 10 years are the critical period. Wetlands must be acquired now, or it will be too late to save continental flights of waterfowl.

As every duck hunter knows, waterfowl hunting has grown poorer in recent years, and fewer hunters have taken to the field. As a result, duck stamp sales have lagged. During the 1960 fiscal year, only 1,628,365 Federal duck stamps were sold. This figure is 741,575 below

the number sold during the peak year of 1955.

Mr. Speaker, with fewer duck stamps being sold, less money has been available for purchase of new refuges. This, in turn, has resulted in poorer hunting, fewer hunters, smaller duck stamp receipts and a further lag in the acquisition program.

In order to break this vicious circle, I have joined my colleagues, Congressmen HENRY REUSS and JOHN DINGELL, in introducing a crash program for wetlands acquisitions. The measure authorizes a loan of $150 million over the next 10 years to purchase the needed property. Starting in 1971, the money would be repaid to the U.S. Treasury from duck stamp revenues.

This buy-now, pay-later plan will enable the Nation to safeguard its valuable wetland resources during the critical decade of the 1960's. Thereafter, full repayment of the loan will be made from funds contributed by the duck hunters themselves. By creating the wetlands, we shall also be creating the means to repay the purchase-loan money.

Matzke Claims Africans Need Aid From United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article from the Lawrence Daily Journal-World of March 31, 1961, telling about a talk given before the Lawrence Kiwanis Club by Dr. Howard Matzke, professor of anatomy at Kansas University, and one quite familiar with the African continent and its people. In his talk, Dr. Matzke pinpointed several situations and problems with which the United States is confronted, and with which we must deal, concerning Africa and her quest for independence. Because Dr. Matzke favors real and vital help for Africa, and because his considerations make a great deal of sense to me, I am pleased to call this article to the attention of my colleagues:

MATZKE CLAIMS AFRICANS NEED AID FROM UNITED STATES

"Africa needs our help, not American companionship," Dr. Howard Matzke, Kansas University anatomy professor, said Thursday in a talk to the Lawrence Kiwanis Club.

Dr. Matzke, who returned in January after completing a research project in the Congo region, viewed America's volunteer Peace Corps—which he labeled Kennedy's Kiddie Corps—as an impractical attempt to help the Africans.

He also termed a recent utterance by G. Mennen Williams, new U.S. envoy in Africa, of the slogan "Africa for the Africans" as "one of the most stupid statements ever made."

The word "Uhrhu"—Swahili for independence—is on the lips of many Africans now. Yet few Africans understand what independence means, Dr. Matzke said.

"I asked some of my African medical students what independence means to them," he said. "They replied, 'freedom'—but they did not know freedom from what. They are not aware of the increased responsibilities of independence."

Dr. Matzke said that America can best help Africa by sending doctors, engineers, teachers, and other capable persons to Africa, to work with Africans on the spot in order to best learn their needs. He cited mass illiteracy, strong tribal loyalties, and a lack of public moral concepts as Americans understand them as major obstacles to African self-government. At best, he envisioned a loose federation of tribal states, with most of the governing power remaining in local hands.

"We must be very patient, and help as much as we can," he said. "We must not just send money, we must send real help for the African people."

Migrant Farm Labor Problems and "Harvest of Shame"—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is the third in a series of articles presented in the public interest by the Palm Beach Post-Times to show the Members some of the progress being made in Florida to solve problems relating to migrant farm labor which were left out of the television presentation "Harvest of Shame." The omissions of all that has been, and is being done in this field did a great injustice to the Floridians who have given their time and efforts to these problems over the years. It is hoped that by reading these articles and the ones to follow the Members and public will have a better understanding of this important matter.

The article follows:

ALL COUNTY HEALTH SERVICES ARE USED BY MIGRANT WORKERS

"What happened to your foot Jerome?"

"I give it a little down by the washhouse."

"I see, you drove a nail in it down by the washhouse. What did your mother do for that?"

"Put some alcohol on it."—"Harvest of Shame."

Belle Glade physicians, aware of the needs of the community, soon will open their third clinic for indigent persons.

A spokesman for the doctors said a new "morbidity clinic" might be put into use this week or next.

"It will be free for all indigent patients, including migrants," the doctor said. "Patients will be examined at Belle Glade Memorial Hospital from 12:30 to 2 p.m., Mondays through Fridays."

Actually, he said, migrants are expected to make up the largest number of the patients.

"They may report for treatment of anything not covered by our two other clinics," he said. "It might be pneumonia, tonsilitis, ear disorders, or even surgery. Nobody who is indigent will be refused treatment."

The doctor said physicians of the area are concerned that "Harvest of Shame" producers saw fit to show only the negative side of the migrant health picture.

"Much has been done for the health of Palm Beach County's migrants," he said. "As a matter of fact, our county was one of only two in the entire Nation to receive commendation from the President after a national study was made of migrant health."

Working at Memorial Hospital, the physicians maintain cardiac and obstetrical clinics for the indigent.

"The hospital provides its equipment free of charge—including the electrocardiograph apparatus—and medicines are supplied by the Palm Beach Heart Association," the doctor said.

The cardiac clinic functions once each 2 weeks. Up to 20 patients report for aid each day.

"Some are required to attend each day. Others report in every 3 or 4 months," the doctor said. "There is no charge."

The obstetrical clinic is open each Wednesday and provides a low-cost maternity plan. For $80, the patent is provided both the physician's services and the hospital's facilities.

Laboratory work is done by the Public Health Service. Physicians rotate to deliver the babies. Up to 30 patients per week are handled.

"It is not necessary for the patient to pay anything at the time of enrolling," the doctor said. "That can be arranged later."

Actually, migrants receive considerable medical aid outside the clinics, the doctor noted.

"A tremendous number report to the hospital to have wounds and lacerations patched without cost," he said. "There always is a physician on call or present at the hospital to care for these people, and we are proud that nobody ever must wait more than 5 minutes to have a doctor's service in an emergency."

Who began the service?

"Nobody in particular wants credit for it," the physician said. "It is just something that developed to meet the needs of the community."

Palm Beach County's migrants also have access to other free or low-cost medical service and advice.

The county maintains health centers at 1024 Northwest Avenue D in Belle Glade and 612 East Main Street in Pahokee.

Dr. C. L. Brumback, who is in charge of the centers, said money for emergencies has been made available through voluntary contributions in addition to governmental appropriations and other sources.

"Continuous efforts are being made to adopt services to the special conditions of these people. Over a period of years, certain clinics have been held at night in order to be available for migrants after working hours," he said.

"Mobile clinics and other programs have been taken out into migrant areas. Free transportation has been provided to clinics not available in rural areas."

If migrants can't afford private medical care, they are eligible for low-cost maternity programs, immunizations, well-baby conferences, tuberculosis and other communicable disease services, and consultation or referral for many other health problems, Dr. Brumback said.

Hospital care also is available, he indicated.

Physicians and dentists work unselfishly in behalf of the indigent, Dr. Brumback reported.

"This is a county where our physicians have provided care to indigent patients in hospitals without remuneration," he said.

Many hours of service have been given, too, in various outpatient clinics such as obstetrical, well-baby, dental, pediatric, orthopedic, tuberculosis, venereal disease, cancer,

heart, and general illness by private physicians and dentists, Dr. Brumback said.

The State as well as the county maintains special services in Palm Beach County, Dr. Brumback noted.

In addition to providing bedside nursing care, the nurses refer patients to appropriate agencies for care, school health programs, mental health nursing service and communicable disease services, the physician said.

"Welfare workers offer consultation and referral services and assist in obtaining medical care. Nutritionists give advice and help toward obtaining an adequate well-balanced diet within financial resources," he added.

A number of other services for migrants are provided in this county by the Florida Vocational Rehabilitation Service and such voluntary agencies as the Visiting Nurses Association of Palm Beach County, Tuberculosis and Health Association, Heart Association, Cancer Society, and Mental Health Association, Dr. Brumback pointed out.

"A big problem in providing health services is lack of understanding of the need for these services or sufficient motivation to seek help when problems arise," the physician said.

"The solution lies in appropriate education, and this has been the subject of considerable study and research with some hopeful results," he added.

Research by the Belle Glade Chamber of Commerce shows the community during a 5-year period charged off a $318,777.81 hospital bill accumulated by indigent patients.

"Most of this was for migrants who did not qualify for county welfare aid," the chamber reported.

At Belle Glade, the chamber said, seven persons in public health service work are employed at the health center with county personnel.

And from 1957 to 1959, the two groups examined in family clinics about 850 patients. Of these, more than half were migrants, the chamber found.

In 1958, the chamber said, about 7,000 migrants were given blood tests and chest X-rays and provided with health records.

"We are cognizant of the health problems of Palm Beach County, and progress is being made," the chamber said. "We shall continue to direct our efforts toward the protection and promotion of the health of all people in our county."

The Shame of Poor Government Rests on Voters Themselves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, my hometown newspaper, the Lowell (Mass.) Sun, has been performing an outstanding service by editorially tapping the knuckles of citizens who are inclined to let the reins of good government slip through their hands. One of the Sun's recent editorials, which appeared on Easter Sunday, particularly merits the attention of the House of Representatives. Under leave to extend my remarks, I now insert it in the RECORD:

THE SHAME OF POOR GOVERNMENT RESTS ON VOTERS THEMSELVES

On this Easter day as the Christian world is observing the joy of the resurrection of Christ, it is fitting that the people of Massachusetts should give some thought to the problems besetting the Commonwealth and the low ethical standards of too many of our elected officials.

Ethics has to do with the science of moral duty, and one of high ethical standards is one who lives up to the best in exercising his moral duty, be it in politics, in business or in the home.

On the Friday before His resurrection Christ gave to the world the best possible example of ethics when His moral duty compelled Him to suffer death on the cross rather than to yield to the easier way out of His problems—and His example has come down through the ages as a guide to mankind.

We do not expect our elected officials to have the courage or the moral stamina of Christ, but neither do we expect them to stray so far from existing ethical standards as to jeopardize the continued success of the Commonwealth for the sake of a mess of pottage.

Regardless of how an elected official votes on any proposal, so long as he is voting according to the dictates of his own conscience, he is exercising his prerogative as it should be exercised.

By the same token, when an elected official allows material or any other gain to influence him to vote other than his sense of right dictates, he is not living up to the ethical standard which we should expect of all who take public office.

The Democratic or Republican officeholder who bows to the dictates of his party leadership to vote for any issue which he honestly believes is not in the interests of good government is violating the self-same code of ethics of which we are writing, for he is acting not according to his sense of moral duty but merely to win for himself party support when the next election comes round, or for personal advancement within the party.

That there should be any talk of a need for a legislated code of ethics in this or any other State is in itself a confession of moral weakness, for there are few in or out of public office who do not recognize right and wrong, and this can be the only true guide.

But it is not sufficient to hold only elected officials to a code of ethics, or rather to ethical behavior in their public office.

We must remember at all times that all elected officials are selected by the voters—by you and by me—and their continuance in office depends entirely upon the will of the voters.

If we, as members of the electorate, would base our selections at election time on the simple fact that we believe the one we vote for will serve in the best interests of the town, city, county, State, or Federal Government, we shall have accomplished more than all the codes of ethics written in the lawbooks ever shall accomplish.

If we, at election time, close our ears to the blandishments of the skilled orator and weigh only what he offers against what we believe the office he seeks requires in order to raise the level of government, we again shall have done more than such a code could ever hope to accomplish.

Each and every elected official is answerable at election time to the people who have sent him into office, and if we would turn thumbs down on the man who has played politics regardless of the good of the city, town, or State, we would have done more to elevate the level of government than anything else could accomplish.

We as citizens have the answers right in our own hands.

If we live up to a decent sense of moral standards at election time, and let our conscience rather than anything else dictate our choices, we would not have to hide our faces in shame when questionable practices in Government rise into view.

Good government rests with each individual voter. We can have good government without a legislated code of ethics if we, ourselves, would exercise the same sense of moral duty at election time which we want our elected officials to exercise when they are serving in our town governments, in our city governments, or at the county, State, or Federal level of government.

That there is any need for a code of ethics regulating our lawmakers is more a reflection on us, the voters, than on anyone else.

Salem Editor Charles Sprague Urges Community College Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, in a recent column which has been reprinted in the Bend (Oreg.) Bulletin, Editor Charles Sprague of the Oregon Statesman urged action in our State to expand the system of community colleges. Although Editor Sprague was primarily concerned with proposals before the Oregon State Legislature, the points which he makes regarding the need for an expanded community colleges system are not relevant only in Oregon. They are basic points and indicate some of the reasons for my sponsorship of H.R. 16 to provide Federal assistance to States such as Oregon which are attempting to meet the pressing need for additional education beyond the high school level through the community college institution. I believe that the following excerpts from Editor Sprague's column will be of interest to my colleagues:

[From the Bend (Oreg.) Bulletin, Mar. 16, 1961]

SALEM EDITOR CHARLES SPRAGUE URGES COMMUNITY COLLEGE PROGRAM

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following commentary on junior colleges was written by Charles A. Sprague, editor and publisher of the Oregon Statesman, in his page 1 column "It Seems to Me." Mr. Sprague is a former Governor and former educator who is eminently qualified to speak on education.)

(By Charles A. Sprague)

The community college idea has been kicked around a lot in Oregon, especially at the legislative assembly. It isn't just an Oregon problem; other States are wrestling with the same thing. In California the community college program has grown like Jack's beanstalk. Most everywhere the idea originates at local levels, in cities which have no institutions of higher learning, yet feel the need for providing education beyond high school.

In Oregon the idea of local 2-year colleges has had more kicking than action. The only city which has experimented with such a college is Bend where it is administered by the school board. That college has survived for over a decade, but not without struggle—and its struggle wasn't ended with provision of State aid for one-third the operating expense. Other cities which have had some aspirations for a community college are Coos Bay and Astoria. It happens that there are three separate bills in the present legislature dealing with community colleges, each

having as chief sponsors, legislators from Clatsop, Coos, or Deschutes Counties.

There is a pressing need for additional education beyond the high school level, and this justifies a community college system. First, there are many youth whose interests and capabilities do not run to those best served in the 4-year colleges. Second, there are many youth who can't afford to go away to college but who would profit from another year or two of instruction. Finally there is the very real need for upgrading the preparation of young men and women for the world into which they will enter. This means more of elementary science and mathematics and English and social studies. It means more, much more in vocational guidance and training. I am not limiting this to trades. Trades are still important, but with advancing mechanization, old trades suffer from declining demand. This mechanized age calls more and more for those with mental alertness and manual dexterity to run and service machines. Vocational training should include courses enabling youth to adapt themselves to varied employment situations. Statistics show that the ratio of common labor to all labor is declining. As a result those who lack qualifications above the common labor level are apt to be surplus save in times of full employment.

SUGGESTS THE ANSWER

How can we get these community colleges or educational centers? The extension division of the State system of higher deucation is providing many and varied courses all over the State. They are mostly part time, and are not usually oriented to vocations. We can have community colleges either by joint local-State support or by having the State assume the burden. The system just can't exist with only local property tax support plus tuition, or even with one-third support from the State. The best plan would be for the State board of education to set up and run the schools, at State cost over tuition. For the intermediate period local government with State support of at least one-half or two-thirds may have to serve.

Sure, the system is going to cost—but, if these institutions are infected with a serious purpose and well staffed, they will pay rich dividends in the later attainments of their students. This legislature should face right up to the problem, for time is wasting for hundreds of Oregon young men and women.

Traffic and Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following excerpt from the April 10, 1961, issue of City Club Comments, a publication of the City Club of New York. Traffic, particularly commuter traffic, is an increasingly difficult problem for the city of New York. The problem we face and some suggestions as to possible solutions will be found in this article. It should be particularly interesting to those concerned with urban planning and mass transportation:

TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORATION—COMMUTATION AND FRUSTRATION

When William Reid, who has served our city well in such top administrative posts as deputy mayor, city treasurer, chairman of the board of transportation, and now, chairman of the housing authority, received our club's award of merit last month, his response stressed that "a more perfect city" must be based on a solution of the transportation problem.

Commissioner Reid praised the planning commission for its decision not to build parking garages in the already congested central business district of Manhattan and criticized the Port of New York Authority and the Tri-Borough Bridge and Tunnel Authority for their narrow interest in revenue-producing vehicular traffic without regard to its effect upon the city.

(We regret that we were not able to get sufficient copies of the planning commission's report, "Proposed Municipal Garages for Midtown Manhattan," to mail one to every member but copies may be obtained by writing direct to the commission, 2 Lafayette Street. We think every serious student of municipal problems will want to read this paper.)

Councilman Stanley M. Isaacs, who also was honored by the club, commented that our city needs plans of a size and scope to capture the imagination. He cited the fact that the planners of our subway system, starting 60 years ago, boldly extended it into the far-off Bronx, Brooklyn, and Queens, into areas where few families and fewer industries were located, confident that the existence of adequate transportation would assure growth.

Both men taxed as timid souls those who today build bridges to Staten Island and New Jersey for automobiles only, because they believe only the automobile driver will pay the cost.

Unfortunately, it is easier to agree that automotive transportation is inefficient in New York than it is to figure out how to organize and pay for a more efficient system.

In connection with the troubles of the New Haven Railroad, the suggestion was made by a Federal official at a recent public hearing that the road go into bankruptcy as a preliminary to reorganizing on a more efficient basis. Later someone offered the corollary suggestion to place all commuter railroads serving New York under a Federal court receivership, throw in the New York subway system, the Port of New York Authority, the Tri-Borough Bridge and Tunnel Authority, the commuter buslines, the city and State park departments, and the New York City Planning Commission.

Laugh all we want, that's the true size of the commuter problem, and all the engineering schemes ever dreamed of will never mean much until there is a way of coordinating the businesses and agencies which must work together if the problem is to be solved. Most of the previous, ballyhooed studies of transportation and traffic problems have been designed to serve one or another of the competing transportation interests or have been simply expensive political boondoggles with various lawyers and engineers filling paper to justify fees. Obviously, few politicians would turn the job over to those not identified with their political persuasion, and no business group would hire a consultant who wasn't precommitted to support its financial interest.

THE PROBLEM

Simply stated, the transportation problem is that travel by any means into New York City, especially Manhattan, is becoming slower and more expensive. At the same time, automotive traffic within New York City has become denser and slower, as more large trucks and private cars seek to use the city's streets, not only to move on but to park on. The more efficient forms of transportation are losing out to the less efficient forms. The enormous growth of auto ownership and use has had the effect of slowing down movement within the city and raising the cost of numerous city services. However, because no one wants to get rid of the automobile, an effort must be made to effect a satisfactory accommodation to it.

THE OBJECTIVES

The objectives of a program for traffic and transportation should be:

1. To provide for rapid, economical mass transportation from all existing commuter areas and from new centers of population, such as Staten Island and northern New Jersey, into New York City and efficient distribution of commuters within the city.

2. To provide adequate offstreet parking at reasonable prices both convenient to commutation facilities and in peripheral areas within the city.

A POSSIBLE PROGRAM

To achieve these objectives, most or all of the following ideas may have to be used:

1. Coordination of all existing commuter rail facilities into an effective system, tying in at logical crossings or transfer points with the subway system serving New York City.

2. Construction of new rail facilities to serve areas not now adequately served. This might require provision for suburban transfer points from rubber to rails and use of the George Washington and Verrazano-Narrows Bridges for rail as well as automotive traffic.

3. Use of major parkways, now closed to bus traffic, for higher speed, longer haul bus transportation. If busses ran on the parkways, more cars could be left at home.

4. Tolls on present free crossings to discourage casual auto traffic into Manhattan and to help provide revenue for the rest of the program.

5. Construction of large scale public garages in renewal areas outside the central core of Manhattan to be rented at very low cost, and, if necessary, subsidized, in order to permit the city to enforce stricter no-parking regulations. Such garages should be large enough to accommodate, on a permanent basis and at a modest price, everyone who owns or operates a car in Manhattan. The problem is too big for the city to be greatly concerned with the matter of competition with the commercial garages, which will, in any event, have the advantage of better location.

6. The strict requirement of off-street or night loading in congested areas, with strict enforcement of no-standing regulations for trucks as well as private cars.

The relocation of whole industries into renewal areas where traffic control can be planned.

DIRECTION AND PLANNING

Although we suspect that such a program, considering its scale, would not be too expensive and might come near paying for itself, we somehow doubt that it will ever be undertaken on a realistic basis without Federal intervention, or at least Federal leadership. It seems to call for a scale of thinking and coordination of which cities alone, or even cities, States and private industry working together, have not been capable. But if man is capable of recognizing a problem and visualizing a solution, it should not be impossible to carry out a program.

In Washington today, urban problems are being considered really seriously for the first time. Can cities be made more livable? How shall we handle the complex jurisdictional questions which arise when cities spill out in all directions, across State lines and other lines of political jurisdiction and must still somehow be served as if they were single political organisms?

We must welcome the growing interest in urban problems. Some day, soon we hope, there will be a need for gigantic peace programs. Compared to our present socially wasteful expenditures for military purposes, the cost of properly renewing our cities, even if expressed in billions, will be insignificant.

We emphasize, for the benefit of any Federal planners and thinkers who may read this comment, that the transportation and traffic problem in the New York area is no petty problem. We are talking about 16 million people, 10 percent of the Nation, possibly 20 percent of the Nation's productive capacity.

Socialism Would Be a Strange Export for the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Saturday Evening Post of March 25, 1961:

SOCIALISM WOULD BE A STRANGE EXPORT FOR THE UNITED STATES

In announcing the appointment of a new member to the Board of the Tennessee Valley Authority, President Kennedy urged that organization to "study ways in which the lessons it has learned in the Tennessee Valley may be exported abroad." While few dispute the accomplishments of TVA as an engineering achievement, it would be less than accurate to send abroad the impression that only by tax-consuming, semisocialistic projects have we taken long leaps forward.

Actually, the most striking progress in this industry, as in most others, has been made by private-investor companies. Despite taxes and interest rates which favor public power, with more to come in the new administration, at least 80 percent of our electric power is produced by private-enterprise companies. The Idaho Power Co.'s Hell's Canyon dams add enormously to the power resources of the area and, incidentally, pay $10 million in Federal, State, and local taxes. Experimentation in the use of nuclear fuel for electric-power production is being carried on—with the money of American savers and investors—by a number of power companies. Seventeen nuclear plants are in construction at a cost of about $700 million.

Obviously a vast publicly financed and virtually tax-exempt enterprise like TVA can produce electricity, but the message which one might expect an American Government to send abroad is the fact that the most significant American economic progress, including that in the electric power industry, has been made by private corporations and individuals. Sometimes one is tempted to believe that many American politicians have forgotten this fact. On the other hand, it is difficult to find much public support for socialized industry. Last November in the so-called public-power States in the western part of the country—despite the effort of Democratic candidates to make public power an important campaign issue—Republicans won in most of these States. It is not insisted that efforts to plug public power account for the defeat of Democratic candidates in these States—only that the alleged issue did not generate enough steam to elect them.

It is curious that politicians should place so much emphasis on public power and public projects generally when in other countries the passion for Socialist adventures is fading Great Britain's exercise in denationalizing its formerly nationalized industries has given that country a new birth of economic freedom which has left the Labor Party with no issue worth fighting for except getting the Americans and their Polaris missile off the island. New Zealand has retired its Socialist regime of many years' standing, and West Germany, whose prosperity is driving the Communists crazy, is well launched on a series of privatizations of its government-owned industries including Volkswagen.

What the West Germans have been doing ought to be of great interest to Americans, because it suggests a page out of our own "people's capitalism." In the recent denationalization of Volkswagen, investors were limited to those with incomes of no more than $3,200 a year. They were encouraged to hang onto their stock by promise of a big dividend after 2 years. The program, worked out by Economic Minister Ludwig Erhard, is called Eigentum für Federmann (property for everybody) and up to now has been an enormous success. Already some 216,000 Germans own pieces of Preussig, a mining-and-smelting firm long owned by the government. They bought the shares for $34 each and, according to the Wall Street Journal, the recent price is about $75. The Volkswagen deal went through in January and resulted in the distribution of ownership of Hitler's prize state corporation among probably 500,000 people. This, of course, isn't everybody, but after all, investing isn't compulsory.

Coming soon will be a public offering of stock in Prussian Electric, the nearest thing in Germany to our TVA. A few years back former Senator Edward Martin of Pennsylvania proposed a similar disposal of TVA, arguing, among other things, that this would give the Government and local authorities a chance to tax TVA revenues and properties. The German Government appears to lack that reason for denationalizing Prussian Electric, for that power complex in 1958 paid 37 percent of its gross revenues in taxes. This compares with an average of 23 percent paid by American investor power companies and, of course, distances TVA completely.

If the New Frontier wants to do something handsome for other countries, why not let them in on some of the things our people have been doing for themselves without bureaucratic interference? Actually delegations from all over the world visit our private powerplants, as well as TVA, to get ideas on engineering, management, and finance. It looks as if some other countries have done their homework on this subject and may wonder why the capitalistic United States should attempt to educate them on the virtues of socialism.

SECONDARY BOYCOTTS HAVE BEEN A HEADACHE; NOW THERE'S A MOVE TO MAKE THEM LEGAL

The beginning of an effort to whittle away the legal protection against secondary boycotts by labor unions takes shape in the introduction in the House and Senate of bills which would legalize common-situs picketing by building-trades unions.

What this amounts to is that, if a subcontractor on a building job in New York were involved in a dispute with a union, say, in Pittsburgh, perhaps as the result of an effort to pressure workers into a racketeer union, all the hundreds of painters, carpenters, plumbers, electricians, and so on, on the New York enterprise could be called off the job.

Under the Landrum-Griffin law such picketing is not permitted. The power the new law would give to union bosses—including some of the worst racketeers—is easily imagined. The harassed general contractor would be tempted to throw up his hands and demand that the subcontractor submit to the union demands, whatever they were. He might be compelled to force his men to join the union whether they wanted to, or whether they were satisfied with the union they already belonged to.

Secondary boycotts have already plagued our defense installations. A plumbers' union shut down Cape Canaveral for 15 days. Other secondary boycotts occurred at two Atlas bases and a Titan base in Kansas, three missile bases in Wyoming, and an Air Force base in Missouri. The new bills provide that military installations and missile bases shall be warned 10 days in advance of a strike. But there is not even this modest protection for the private contractor or the already thoroughly plucked homebuilder.

The Landrum-Griffin Act prohibits picketing for extortion, picketing which interrupts deliveries or service to an employer, and other unfair picketing. It also bars secondary boycotts. These operate to deprive thousands of the right to work, as happened in the recent tugboat strike which put thousands of railroad men off the job at the bidding of a few hundred tugboat employees who had been declared surplus.

Those who defend this change argue that it gives the building-trades unions privileges which industrial unions already enjoy. They insist that industrial unions may picket a factory site, but that construction unions cannot do so because a number of employers are involved. This argument ignores the fact that industrial unions are not permitted to impose secondary boycotts—that is to say, tie up a plant because of a labor dispute somewhere else. The real necessity is to tighten the restrictions on secondary boycotts rather than to assist the union bosses in an effort to break through existing limitations.

Migrant Farm Labor Problems and "Harvest of Shame"—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is the second in a series of articles presented in the public interest by the Palm Beach Post-Times to show the Members some of the progress being made in Florida to solve problems relating to migrant farm labor which were left out of the television presentation "Harvest of Shame." The omissions of all that has been, and is being done in this field did a great injustice to the Floridians who have given their time and efforts to these problems over the years. It is hoped that by reading these articles and the ones to follow the Members and public will have a better understanding of this important matter.

The article follows:

[From the Palm Beach Post, Feb. 3, 1961]

GOVERNOR BRYANT WRITES

The producers of "Harvest of Shame" did a great injustice to the many Floridians who have worked long and hard to improve the lot of the migrant worker.

Local committees, leaders of the Florida Legislature and officials of concerned State agencies have done much to better housing conditions and to make available to the migrant workers who flock to Florida each year the supplies of foods and medicines which are necessary to a healthy and productive way of life.

Perhaps the greatest injustice, though, was done to the migrant workers themselves.

These individuals who for years cared as little for their surroundings or their way of life as did the majority of people with whom they came in contact, have responded to the interest taken in their well-being by concerned groups with a fine spirit of cooperation and a desire to obtain self-betterment.

They are beginning to take pride in their surroundings and in the recognition of their human worth being given them by employers, the governmental officials who seek to help them and citizens generally.

There are improvements yet to be made. There is more help to be obtained, and indeed there are the occasional tragic stories of starving and penniless families which make headlines. These serve to remind us of the work yet to be done, and the diminishing number of such headlines is a source of pride in the steps toward a better tomorrow we have already taken.

The "Harvest of Shame" is over and done with. We should look now to the day when a new documentary is prepared and produced, telling the story of Florida's migrants and their harvest with pride.

Jack Williams—Editorial Commentary for March 16, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, one of Arizona's finest editorial commentators is Jack Williams, of radio station KOY in Phoenix. Mr. Williams is a former mayor of Phoenix, and for years has been a favorite radio personality of the people residing in a large portion of Arizona. Jack Williams has always opposed bigotry of any form, and from whatever direction it might come. I think his commentary of March 16, 1961, is particularly good, and under leave previously granted to extend my remarks, I wish to share it with my colleagues in the Congress:

A friend said to us the other day, that the precise moment that the Communists take over this country—if they do—would pass unnoticed at the time.

I have pondered that remark ever since.

We are prone to think that the Communists' takeover would be to the accompaniment of guns and mobs in the street, and torches to the shops.

Actually, he who controls Washington, almost controls the country now; and with the drift toward a centralized state, will control it soon. The transition from a free republic will be accomplished by the citizens themselves who pervert the very goals that seem attractive to some today.

Through a relaxation of our freedoms, and especially our first 10 amendments, these perversions will be easily accomplished because we will be accustomed to them. All political parties will be outlawed except those we consider proper. And ultimately, there will be but one party, the union of free American patriots. Some of us will protest, but it will be too late to ask why we can't have a Republican or a Democratic Party. And a law will have been passed and properly approved to remove all firearms from citizens unless proper licenses are secured for possessing same. And only free American patriots can have guns of course.

There is a special kind of oath that everybody takes swearing not to work against the Government in any way whatsoever and by means of this oath, anybody who doesn't belong to the patriotic party is judged.

A lot of us are pretty concerned because we think that all of this is unconstitutional, but we are told that the Constitution is a flexible thing and when we protest too much we are hauled into court and following a session of brainwashing, we find ourselves admitting our own guilt by association. In fact, the infamous fifth amendment was repealed in a burst of enthusiasm; this was the amendment that all those crooks used to hide behind, and now anybody can be forced to be a witness against himself. They use this brainwashing deal but some folks say that an old-fashioned rack and thumbscrew in the basement of the White House is quicker.

Does what I say tonight sound farfetched? There isn't a thing I've discussed that hasn't been advocated and some of the actions have been already put into effect.

The freedoms our forefathers fought for, we're apt to lose simply because we have failed to read history and understand it.

Communist Hemispheric Conquest Via Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in numerous addresses in and out of the Congress, which are based upon careful research, personal observations, and extensive consultations with many persons of experienced judgment, I have repeatedly described the growing dangers to the south from Communist penetration, infiltration, and subversion, particularly in the strategic Caribbean.

It is indeed fortunate that we have in our country some who are endowed with the combination of ability, experience, and courage to present the picture of what now faces us with clarity and insight, at the same time outlining a course of action to meet the challenge.

In the March 10, 1961, issue of Duluth Publicity of Duluth, Minn., there appeared a highly revealing address by Hon. Spruille Braden, one of the country's leading authorities on the diplomatic problems of Latin America.

To make Dr. Braden's penetrating analysis and suggested program available to the Congress and the Nation at large, I quote the entire text at this point in the RECORD, and commend it for study by all concerned with the security of the Western Hemisphere.

THE COMMUNIST PATH TO CONQUEST OF WESTERN HEMISPHERE IS VIA CUBA

(By the Honorable Spruille Braden, former U.S. Ambassador to Cuba and numerous South American countries, in a speech delivered at the annual Founder's Day luncheon of the National Society of the New England Women, January 25, 1961)

For more than three decades, the Communists have been seizing the favorable opportunities afforded by peaceful coexistence for subversion, class struggle, and sabotage everywhere and for revolution wherever and whenever they could get away with it, as they now have in Cuba.

Eudocio Ravines, former Peruvian Communist, tells of a Moscow meeting during 1934 of several Latin American and Russian Communist leaders. It was suggested that actual insurrection might be provoked in Brazil, but that any advances in the other American Republics should be made through "popular front governments" and subversion. Ravines objected that the United States quickly would suppress by force any attempted uprising in Brazil. Dmitri Manuilsky, who was presiding, sarcastically replied:

"Our dear comrade would be right if the United States were to dispatch its ships and troops to Brazil. Clearly, we could not ask the people to fight with clubs or orchids against cannons. But, happily for us and for the luck of the world proletariat, we have resolved the problem far in advance. Comrade, the International has concerned itself not with controlling cannons and warships, but influencing and absolutely controlling the finger which would press the magic button, the one which would make the fleet sail."

Manuilsky then detailed the great Communist accomplishments in penetrating the highest, most important and powerful spheres in the United States—the fundamental positions of "the high command of capitalism."

ALARM SOUNDED

Based on several personal experiences, I can attest to the existence of this penetration.

In 1954 I testified before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee that while serving as Ambassador to Argentina, in early July 1945 I sent two top secret cables for the President and the Secretary of State who were about to attend the Potsdam Conference. I referred to a long list of telegrams, dispatches, memoranda, and reports in person to the State Department made over a period of several years on Communist activities throughout this hemisphere. I told how Peron was playing hand in glove with the Communists. I urged in the strongest terms that Truman and Churchhill at Potsdam lay it on the line with Stalin, that these machinations and subversions must stop immediately.

As I discovered years later, someone in the State Department or somewhere along the line so contrived that those extremely urgent messages never reached the President and Secretary of State. Who pressed that magic button? The question never has been answered.

Among the many alarms I repeated through the years, both in and out of Government, as to the Communist danger in this hemisphere, I specifically warned about the Communists' attempts to control Bolivia and Guatemala—but all to no avail.

CASTRO, CHAOS, AND COMMUNISM

I testified on July 17, 1959, before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee that on October 4, 1957, I went out of my way to warn the top echelons of the State Department that if they continued their present policies, they would bring Castro, chaos, and communism to Cuba. I was assured that my message had gone to the very top. Yet 1 month later, on November 6, the Secretary of State in a press interview, declared that the United States did not consider Communist activities in Latin America as dangerous [sic].

The time has come to find out who deceived and kept the truth from the Secretary of State. Was it only the result of stupidity, or did someone control the finger that presses the magic button?

WHAT GOES ON?

The State Department and the Central Intelligence Agency should have had far better

knowledge than I—as a private citizen—about Castro and his Communist background; what he had done and planned to do; what was happening and going to happen. If they did not, why not? Actually, we know they were informed. Why then did they fail to protect the United States? Why was aid and comfort given to Castro and the Communists?

This state of affairs is all the more shocking, because there never has been any secret about Fidel Castro and some of his government colleagues being all-out Communists.

CHRONOLOGY ON CASTRO

In early 1943, along with other young Communist league members, Fidel was known to have been put through a course of instruction by Gumer W. Bashinov of the Soviet legation in Havana. In the university, Castro was recognized by both professors and fellow students as belonging to a Communist apparatus.

In 1948 he was sent by the party on a vitally important mission in Colombia. There he may have had a hand in the assassination on April 9, 1948, of Gaitan, a leading Colombian presidential candidate.

There is positive testimony by the Colombian chief of national police and others that Castro incited, and actively participated in the rioting and looting, incendiarism, and murdering during the Bogotaza which was planned and directed by international communism, and which destroyed that capital city. There are responsible accounts that Castro boasted of having killed three priests.

When, during 1955, Fidel, his brother Raul, Che Guevara, and others were being trained for guerrilla fighting by the notorious Spanish Communist, Colonel Bayo, in Mexico, our Embassy in Mexico City officially reported to the State Department that Castro was a Communist.

SOMETHING VERY WRONG

It appears that this report and often others from the CIA, the FBI, and the State Department's intelligence staff were not even read. The officer in charge of Mexican, Central American, and Caribbean affairs in August 1959 was unaware, or claimed to be unaware, of an analysis of Castro and other Cuban Communist governmental leaders which had been prepared by the State Department's research staff.

Castro's revolution, generally called the 26th of July movement, is the direct offspring of, and includes much of the same membership as, the "Buro del Caribe" (Bureau of the Caribbean) which was a section or branch of the Comintern. This bureau was in existence when I served as Ambassador to Cuba from 1942 to 1945. Its chief, Fabio Grobart (a Polish Red who traveled under 9 different nationalities and 11 aliases) directed all Communist activities throughout the hemisphere except for propaganda aimed at the colored people around the Caribbean which was directed from Harlem in New York City.

WRONG U.S. POLICIES

Fidel's conduct of the revolution from the Sierra Maestra was characteristically Communist—typified by his kidnaping of U.S. citizens and a group of Marines from our Guantanamo Naval Base. After suffering from this indignity, we humiliated ourselves by sending two consular officers to negotiate with Raul Castro for the release of these U.S. citizens.

Instead of demanding their release, we treated the Communist bandit as if he were the head of a sovereign power. This unprecedented self-abasement reinforced the conviction—already created by previous stupidities showing utter ignorance of Cuban psychology—that the United States was backing Castro against Batista.

Of course, many Cubans who had become fed up with long years of corruption, were desperately anxious to get rid of the old type government. So, not unnaturally, they stumbled into supporting Castro. Even so, they primarily are responsible for their present desperate straits. But the U.S. Government must accept its share of the guilt. With a little commonsense diplomacy, Batista could have been eliminated and replaced by a reasonably honest, constitutionally elected, representative government. Instead, either we committed one of the most grievous and costly blunders of our history, or some finger pressed the "magic button" and thus helped to bring the Communists to power in Cuba in what may turn out to be the worst catastrophe ever to strike this hemisphere.

COMMUNIST SCOURGE

The bloodthirsty Communists have scourged and defiled Cuba, destroyed decency and obliterated every right and freedom. The extent of their property confiscations from Cubans is rivalled only in part by the more than $1 billion of U.S. investments they have seized. They have corrupted the young; set children to spy against and denounce their own parents, and condemned and punished the innocent. They have made thousands of Cubans homeless and jobless. Weeping mothers, wives, widows, children, and orphans testify to the imprisonments and slow death in the Isle of Pines and in other prisons. Worse than all these barbarities has been the searing of Cuba's soul and the scorification of her spiritual values.

It would be inhuman of us to abandon our Cuban friends to Communist slavery and Soviet-Sino domination. Over 18 months ago, at a press conference in Chicago, I said I had been praying to God that the Cubans might rescue themselves. I am still praying, although the record shows that no people ever have been able to overthrow a Communist police state without strong assistance from abroad. The Communists are entrenched so strongly in Cuba that liberation becomes more difficult with each day that passes.

The Cubans must have our allout moral support, arms, and money. To give them these things now would not be giving something for nothing; it would be self-defense.

We cannot tolerate a Communist satellite state on our very threshold, controlling the Caribbean and the approaches to the Panama Canal and the Mississippi Valley. The last bulwark in the defense of our territory and the Western Hemisphere is at stake.

WE MUST STAND FIRM

We must fight. Only by our vigorous and courageous stand can we attract other nations to our cause and induce them to make themselves strong in order to fight at our side. Such a stand will help to restore confidence in our loyalty to our friends. Too often the U.S. Government is distrusted, because it turns against friends and allies and goes along with the enemy, as in the case of Suez. Finally, resolute and brave action now will show that all our vacillations, weaknesses, and faintheartedness in the United Nations and the Organization of American States were merely passing phases in our international conduct.

Castro and his accomplices frankly proclaim their intention to become the Mao Tse-tung's of the Western Hemisphere, including the United States. They are propagating communism among the Cuban workers in Florida and appealing for Negro sympathizers all over the United States. (Witness Castro's planned hocus-pocus in moving to a Harlem hotel during his last visit to New York City.)

In recent years, the Chinese Reds have become increasingly active in the subversion of this hemisphere. They seemingly inspire more confidence among intellectuals and students, even in the secondary schools, than do the Russians, Czechs, or Poles, perhaps because the Red Chinese are not so well known.

CUBA'S RED AGENTS EVERYWHERE

Now the Cuban Government is spreading its Red agents over the entire hemisphere; they are financed lavishly and are proving to be far more effective than agents of any other nationality, including the Chinese. They travel in the garb of diplomats, cultural, trade, or labor delegations, or of simple tourists.

Cuban Communist attempts at subversion have induced Peru, Nicaragua, Guatemala, Paraguay, and the Dominican Republic to break diplomatic relations with the Castro regime. Other nations, such as Uruguay and Panama have expelled the Cuban Ambassadors and other Communist diplomats.

CARIBBEAN UNDER ATTACK

The Caribbean is in danger of becoming a Red lake. The Communist Cheddi Jagan, is top man in British Guiana. The French islands, such as Martinque, are represented in the Paris Parliament by Communists. Betancourt's government in Venezuela, while admittedly leftwing, has barely escaped from being upset by the Communists, and might fall at any time. Panama is weak, and the comrades are infiltrating there as they have been trying to do again and again throughout Central America. Trinidad grudgingly permits us to retain our military base at Chaguamaras; but other bases in the West Indies have been, or will be, abandoned.

Of all the Caribbean republics, by instinct and experience the one which should be least influenced by totalitarianism is Colombia. Yet, since 1948 it has suffered continuously from Communist inspired and directed guerrilla bands operating in outlying districts. As a result, in these areas the national economy has been disrupted and agriculture paralyzed, thus raising the cost of living.

The terrorized peasants have had to seek refuge in the cities where they can find no work. The ensuing chaos has broken down law and order and eased the way for communism. Two Red enclaves, Viota and Sumapaz, exist in the interior of Colombia. They collect their own taxes, run their own schools and fly the hammer and sickle as their flag. Colombian officials and troops must obtain permission from the Communist leaders to pass through these districts.

PROPAGANDA SHOW

Two tons of Communist propaganda are flown daily from Havana to the Cuban Embassy in Mexico City. Former President Cardenas of Mexico, always an extreme leftist, recently returned from Moscow and Peiping and again is exercising an evil and powerful influence behind the scenes.

He is organizing a Latin American Conference to condemn the United States as the despoiler of Cuban liberty, justice, and peace. In Mexico, and throughout the hemisphere, the Communists are poisoning public opinion and arousing hatred and demonstrations against the United States by every conceivable means.

They have a receptive audience among the intellectuals. For instance, there are 55,000 students in the University of Mexico, and it is estimated that 90 percent of the professors are Communists. In contrast, our propaganda and defense are insignificant and inept, dated and uninspired.

Parenthetically, I am sorry to admit that one of the largest U.S. foundations presently is financing to the tune of several hundred thousand dollars a notorious European Communist professor in Latin America.

Were Mexico to fall under Communist control, the conditions would not be within the relatively mild limitations set by President Lopex Mateos, when he declared a few months ago that his government was "of the extreme left, within the constitution."

The Mexican situation would be more serious than that in Cuba due to a population four times as large and a 2,000-mile frontier along the United States.

COMMUNIST CUBAN TACTICS

Presently, the Communists probably do not control or even have the sympathy of, more than 15 to 25 percent of the Cuban people. However, the Communists always are a small minority. Even in the Soviet Union, they constitute not more than 4 percent of the population. They hide within other political parties and are hard to detect or expose.

Communists, to gain temporary benefits, will enter into a united front with anyone—with reactionary dictators, nationalists, or sworn anti-Communists. They try to create new conflicts and to deepen those already existing. They gladly reverse themselves, sacrifice and kill their own agents, and always will go back two steps in order to take three forward. Fidel Castro could become expendable and be wiped out by his comrades overnight—just as was done to Beria in Russia.

Playing both ends against the middle, Communists often pretend to have intraparty disputes with one group supporting and the other opposing a particular government. This situation developed for a time vis-a-vis Peron in Argentina.

COURSE OF ACTION

Based on the circumstances I have described, during the last 2 years I have urged, publicly and privately, the following course of action:

1. Inform the other American republics that:

We now expect them, belatedly though it may be, to fulfill their solemn commitments in cooperation with us "to take the necessary measures to protect their political independence against the intervention of international communism, acting in the interest of an alien despotism." These words, from the Declaration of the Organization of American States, exactly fit existing conditions in Cuba and the Caribbean.

If they fail to take collective action with us against this Communist attempt to seize the Western Hemisphere, then for its own security the United States will be forced into unilateral action. The other republics and not we will have destroyed the OAS and hemisphere solidarity. The responsibility will be theirs.

Fortunately, we still retain the inherent right to collective and individual self-defense under the U.N. and the OAS charters. But, far more important, it is our patriotic duty to save our Nation.

NOT INTERVENTION

Action by the United States, strictly speaking, would not be unilateral. On the contrary, it would be at the earnest behest of all anti-Communist Cubans. It would not be intervention.

Since October we have had as Assistant Secretary of State for American Republics a man of courage and intelligence, Mr. Thomas C. Mann. Given adequate authority, he may be able to lead us out of the Cuban morass. Already Mr. Mann has brought about the break in diplomatic relations with the Cuban Communist regime. Our next steps must be:

2. Recognize a responsible Cuban government in exile, just as we recognized the Free French and other regimes in exile during World War II.

3. Give that government our full support, morally and materially with arms and money.

4. Invoke a pacific blockade of Cuba, to halt trading by the Communist nations. Incidentally, some of our NATO allies and the other American republics who want to increase or at least continue business as usual with Cuba, should be induced to desist.

5. Continue U.S. cooperation and guidance after the Communists have been driven out of Cuba in order to rehabilitate it and bring it back to freedom and constitutional representative government.

If speedily enacted, such a program could succeed. Although several of my Cuban friends insist that, in addition, the United States will have to help with its armed forces, both to throw out the Communists and thereafter, as a simple humanitarian measure, to preserve order and save Cuba from a horrible blood bath. I pray they are wrong. but I fear they are right.

Taxes and Spending Can Be Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I should like to place in the RECORD an article written by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] which appeared in the April issue of the magazine Nation's Business. The gentleman's knowledge and interest in the field of government spending and taxation are well known. I believe that this article is well worth the attention of the Congress and the country.

The article follows:

TAXES AND SPENDING CAN BE CUT

(By Representative BRUCE ALGER)

In pushing ahead to new legislative frontiers, the Government should offer greater opportunity for the individual to improve his own condition with his own resources.

We can meet not only our goals of more economic growth and employment, but also the threat of communism, by:

1. Recognizing the need for major reform of our Federal tax system.

2. Adopting a tax program which will strengthen our capitalistic private enterprise society.

3. Enlisting the support of 60 million taxpayers in this reform through a widespread awareness of the potential savings as well as tax reduction involved.

FAULTS OF TAX SYSTEM

The present tax system stunts personal ambition by denying just rewards for individual effort.

Through capital-starvation, it has made the American dream of going into business for oneself more difficult to fulfill.

It has reduced the job opportunities which only a free flow of investment funds can make possible.

It has helped to feed inflation by smothering the rate of savings and destroying accumulated capital.

It has slowed the rise in living standards which depends on capital formation.

The cause of these national blights is the involuntary diversion of savings—the only source of private capital—from their natural flow toward urgently needed investment fund reservoirs to the Federal Treasury.

It is about time that we got tough fisted about a problem that has consistently resisted solution through a more restrained appeal.

There is no sound reason why we should accept the inevitability of the present tax system.

Even more important, we must be careful that much-talked-of future reforms are revisions that encourage private incentive.

As compelling as are the domestic reasons for tax rate reform, the situation is even more critical in view of Russia's threat to bury us in a production race.

We cannot win playing it the Communist way, the way of government control. We became the foremost Nation of the world through free enterprise and individual initiative and we can maintain our position only if we continue to grow through that philosophy.

Soviet planners are aware of the way our tax system is retarding our economic growth and they are banking more on our weakness to defeat us than on their strength.

For more than 12 years we have poured billions of taxpayer dollars into the economies of free world nations—and encouraged huge private investments—in order to build up their supplies of capital and stiffen their resistance to communism. At the same time we have ignored at home the very lesson we are striving to teach abroad, that adequate capital funds are vital to the stability and growth of a free economy.

ROLE OF BUSINESSMEN

In an international economic war, the businessman is the frontline soldier because the achievements of those engaged in commercial activities largely decide the rate of our economic growth.

Yet we are, in a sense, demanding that our business community demolish Russia's challenge without permitting it to use the only weapon that can effectively turn the tide. That is a steady flow of investment funds for starting and expanding business enterprises.

We must unshackle the business community so that it can meet the Russian thrust on more equal ground. If we are to show the world the genuine flowering of free enterprise, we must first achieve an enlightened transformation of the tax system.

How can we ever expect to get the recipients of foreign aid funds off our fiscal backs unless we demonstrate, by our own example, that the true path to the full rewards of a free economic system is a sound tax program? Failure in this could mean that we will be committed to keeping recipient nations on American taxpayer-dollar doles from now on.

The most comprehensive program for reform of Federal tax rates and methods is now before the Congress in several bills. The legislation is best known as the Herlong-Baker bills. My colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee—Representative A. S. HERLONG, JR., a Florida Democrat, and Representative HOWARD H. BAKER, Republican, of Tennessee, are the chief sponsors. After studying the Herlong-Baker bills I have introduced an identical bill. (In the House each Member has his own bills.) The legislation would reduce both individual and corporate income tax rates over a 5-year period; defer taxes for individuals on long-term capital gains as long as the taxpayer reinvests his holdings; reduce the rates of tax on estates and gifts, and establish more realistic depreciation rules.

HOW TAXES WOULD DROP

The top rate of individual income tax rates would be brought down, by the end of the fifth year of application, from 91 to 47 percent. The first bracket would be reduced from 20 to 15 percent and there would be corresponding reductions in all the interim rates.

Let me cite a few examples. The $8,000 to $10,000 bracket of taxable income would be brought down from its present 34 percent to 19 percent; the $16,000 to $18,000 bracket from 50 to 23 percent; the $50,000 to $60,000 bracket from 75 to 31 percent for single taxpayers.

The top corporate rate would be reduced from 52 to 47 percent through annual reductions of one point each year over the 5-year span. The linkage of the top rates of individual and corporate taxes is an especially enlightened move, since 85 percent of the total business population is composed of unincorporated firms. In fairness they should not be taxed at higher rates than corporations.

Over 5 years, a reduction of 25 percent would be made in the time during which businesses could charge off the cost of depreciable property. Estate tax rates would be reduced from a top of 77 to 47 percent and the top rate of gift tax from 57.75 to 35.25 percent. All lower rates of both taxes would be reduced in proportion.

These bills strike at the crux of the tax problem which is the sharp climb in the graduated rates in the middle-income brackets. This is the bottleneck that has slowed the flow of investment funds, especially the risk venture variety, since our capital availability is firmly tied to the rate at which savings can be accumulated.

None can refute that we must look to the savings, principally of those in the middle and upper brackets, for the venture funds to create jobs, start and expand businesses, make products available at prices within reach. Even though we sometimes forget or turn away from it, every material need, every benefit, every business advance, every rise in living standards has a common progenitor, and that is capital. When tax reduction is mentioned it tends, sometimes, to produce twin fears in the minds of many Americans, not excluding those who appreciate the need for action.

The first of these concerns is based on the apprehension that deficit spending would result. The second, and allied fear, is for the revenue effect of the reductions.

Our bills have provisions which completely dispel both fears.

POTENTIAL FOR SAVINGS

A built-in safeguard eliminates the possibility that the bills will cause deficit spending. This safety valve is a provision that permits postponement of rate reductions in any year in which an unbalanced budget is threatened. Certainly this should allay the fears of even the most stanch budget balancers.

As to the revenue effect, the authors of this legislation believe that any loss will be more than offset by the increased revenue resulting from the greater economic growth made possible by the unleashing of investment funds.

This appraisal is based on the calculation that each 1 percent annual increase in the rate of economic growth will produce $1 billion in additional Federal revenue. As the revenue effect of our bills would average out at less than $3.5 billion annually, or the equivalent of a 3.5-percent rate of economic growth, a 5-percent average rate of growth over the next 5 years would not only offset the revenue effect but provide an excess of $1.5 billion.

Over and above these benefits is another that could prove to be the most important of all.

This is the postponement feature, which can be the launching pad for the greatest and most dynamic offensive against Government waste that our country has ever witnessed.

Over the years the Federal Government has been growing rapidly at the expense of economic growth, upon which it depends for revenue. This process has gone unchecked because there has been no competing claims for the use of the revenue overlap. Our bills fill this void by setting up an effective counterclaim.

Every one of the country's 60 million income-tax payers would be enrolled automatically as a watchdog of the Treasury. Taxpayers are bound to insist that the Government exercise every possible economy because their anticipated tax reductions will depend upon it.

When the people have a clearly defined choice between tax reform and increased Federal spending, you don't need a crystal ball to predict which they will choose.

The collective weight of this pressure for economy is guaranteed to have a restraining effect on the size of public expenditures. As a Congressman, I know that Members of both Houses will be loath to vote for appropriations that would tip the scale of budgetary balance. The executive branch should be just as fearful.

No one would invite the wrath of taxpayers who did not receive tax reductions upon which they had counted. The economies resulting would in no way restrict military and other essential expenditures.

We have in this legislation, then, dual forces for impressive and lasting public betterment—the urgently needed tax-rate reform and a checkrein on Government spending.

The Spirit of NATO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, to any who may have reservations about the effectiveness or the spirit of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, I call attention to the article "This We Will Do." Written by Adm. Charles R. Brown, the article appeared in a recent issue of the Vigilance supplement of the Fifteen Nations magazine which is published in Holland by Our Army, a Royal Netherlands association. This publication is financed entirely by the Our Army Association without assistance from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The story of NATO, as presented in the article "This We Will Do," is told by an expert on the Organization. A native of Tuscaloosa, Ala., Admiral Brown is currently commander in chief of Allied Forces Southern Europe, the NATO command responsible for the defense of Italy, Greece and Turkey, the alliance's right flank. The air, sea, and land forces serving in the area are Admiral Brown's responsibility—a responsibility he has accepted with fortitude and determination. He describes his defensive bulwark as "a formidable barrier to Soviet aggression," but he adds the warning that "we must never allow ourselves to become complacent."

Recognized as one of NATO's most vigorous leaders, Admiral Brown has a long and outstanding naval career to his credit. Among other assignments, he has served as a naval instructor, held the post of deputy commander in chief of the U.S. Atlantic Fleet, and for the past 4 years he has been stationed in the Mediterranean area, first as commander of the U.S. 6th Fleet and presently in his NATO command. He holds the record for the naval aviator with the longest tour of service on flight duty, as well as the record for perfect naval aerial gunfire.

Among his decorations are the U.S. Navy Distinguished Service Medal, the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star and the Presidential Unit Citation. In addition, he has received many honorary awards from his own country as well as from nations overseas.

I believe every Member of Congress will enjoy reading Admiral Brown's interesting and informative article which follows:

THIS WE WILL DO

(By Adm. C. R. Brown)

Living and working behind the 1,700-mile arc of rugged land masses, plains and waterways separating Resia Pass in Italy and Mount Ararat in Turkey, are approximately 84 million free men and women and their children—the latter learning to assume their future roles as responsible citizens in those portions of the world where liberty, dignity of man and the individual's choice of a way of life are still richly treasured rights.

These are the people of Italy, Greece and Turkey, 3 of the 15 nations belonging to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. To these 84 million people the Allied Forces of Southern Europe owe two solemn obligations:

First, to prevent involvement in a war. This we are striving to do.

Second, to defend these countries if—and pray God it doesn't—aggression should occur. This we will do.

The two responsibilities I mention are common to each of the commands in our great Atlantic Alliance: to prevent war, or, if aggression occurs, to defend the NATO nations. All of us who wear the uniforms of the various NATO nations are dedicated to the accomplishment of these basic tasks.

In Southern Europe, French, Italians, Greeks, Turks, British and Americans serve on staffs or in units of the armed forces committed to the Alliance. Sharing in the tremendous responsibilities confronting us are the major army and air units of the three countries situated behind our 1,700-mile defense line; the U.S. 6th Fleet, in its NATO role of Striking and Support Forces Southern Europe; sizable elements of the U.S. Air Force; the U.S. Army's Southern European Task Force; and a component of the British Royal Air Force. Combined, they provide an overall capability ranging the entire military scale from the foot soldier to modern missiles.

Soldiers, sailors and airmen comprising these forces are imbued with high spirit and grim determination. We will discharge to the utmost of our ability the solemn obligation we owe to the men, women and children who have been entrusted to our care. This we will do.

It may be noted that no reference has been made to the navies of five of the six countries supporting the mission of my command. This is because ships and men of the navies of France, Italy, Greece, Turkey, and the United Kingdom assigned to NATO in the Mediterranean area are under the operational control of our neighbor on Malta, Allied Forces Mediterranean, whose commander in chief presently is British Admiral Sir Alexander Noel Campbell Bingley.

Joint planning between Admiral Bingley's staff and my own is carried on constantly so that cooperation, coordination, and mutual support would be effected immediately should aggression occur, and so that free use of the sealanes of communications will be maintained in the event of aggression. In time of need, too, we would have the support in this area of heavy bombers of the United Kingdom and the United States; planning is being carried on constantly to insure that

maximum utilization will be made of these units in this area. There is complete understanding between these naval and air forces and my own command. Everything at our disposal can be applied anywhere, against any aggressor who dares transgress any portion of the area.

But back to Allied Forces Southern Europe.

Direction, guidance, advice, and operational control flow from my headquarters at Bagnoli, near Naples, down through four principal subordinate headquarters. Italian Army units available to us, and the U.S. Army's Southern European Task Force are under the operational control of Land Forces Southern Europe or Landsouth, commanded by Gen. Antonio Gualano of the Italian Army, with headquarters at Verona, Italy. Greek and Turkish Armies are under the Land Forces Southeastern Europe of Landsoutheast, commanded by Lt. Gen. Harry P. Storke, U.S. Army, at Izmir, Turkey. All air elements—Italian, Greek, Turkish, British, and American—are under Allied Air Forces Southern Europe or Airsouth, commanded by Lt. Gen. Ralph P. Swofford, Jr., U.S. Air Force, with headquarters here at Naples.

The Striking and Support Force Southern Europe (Strikforsouth) is commanded by Vice Adm. George W. Anderson, Jr., who remains at sea with his fleet, but maintains a planning staff in Naples under his deputy, Rear Adm. Ralph Sperry Clarke, U.S. Navy.

Numerous and complex problems, which must be taken into account in everything we plan, confront our command as a result of geographical and other considerations peculiar to southern Europe:

The terrain requires that we provide for land operations in four distinct areas: Italy, northern Greece, western Turkey, and eastern Turkey. The Russian satellite, Bulgaria, faces two of our nations, Greece and Turkey. Albania, another satellite, is in our very midst. Soviet Russia borders directly on Turkey. Obviously, measures must be taken to protect against any enveloping movement toward the Middle East which would outflank our forces on the right.

The principal means of communication between Italy, Greece, and Turkey are the Mediterranean and adjacent waterways connecting with the Mediterranean. It is of paramount importance that the free use of these sea lanes of communication be available to us at all times to insure proper logistic support, movement of forces, and the like.

Directly facing us, too, is a large number of Soviet and satellite army divisions; thousands of modern combat aircraft of the U.S.S.R. and her satellites; and a good portion of the Soviet Navy—second largest in the world. The Soviet fleet, including that segment which is deployed in the Black Sea, is well balanced with cruisers, destroyers, and submarines. The Soviet submarine force is the largest in world history—many times the size of the German U-boat force which terrorized the seas during the two great wars. This force is the Soviet's principal offensive naval threat.

The defense of Italy's rugged mountainous northern and northeastern frontiers rests in the hands of Landsouth. The importance of Italy to the defense of Western Europe cannot be overemphasized. In the words of the then General of the Army Eisenhower, when he was Supreme Allied Commander Europe: "Italy, projecting into the Mediterranean, offers us a strong lateral position and sea and air bases of tremendous value."

Supporting the Italian armed forces is the U.S. Army's Southern European Task Force (SETAF). In time of war, this force would be responsible to the commander, Landsouth. In time of peace, it is administratively responsible to Headquarters, U.S. Army, Europe, located in Heidelberg, Germany.

Within SETAF is a missile command—the first such command organized overseas. It is a medium missile outfit, which means that it employs the Honest John rocket and the Corporal guided missile, both medium range weapons. The missile command is at Vicenza, a few miles east of Verona, where SETAF headquarters is located.

The commander of Landsoutheast is responsible to me for the overall conduct and coordination of land operations from the eastern mountains of Turkey to the western shores of Greece. Izmir was selected for reasons of its locality, communications, transportation, and weather conditions. A small advance headquarters, capable of being expanded rapidly in the event of war, is located at Salonika, Greece. In Landsoutheast, there are two assistants to the commander, a Greek general and a Turkish general.

When Greece became a member of NATO, the Western democracies plugged one of the last Balkan gaps through which communism might flow. Bulgaria and Albania were already Red satellites, but Greece's adherence to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization stalled the Soviet steamroller on her border.

Today Greece has one of the toughest armies in NATO. It is, furthermore, an army rich in tradition and esprit de corps, led by veteran combat officers who saw service in World War II, in guerrilla action, and in Korea. And it is firmly, unequivocally anti-Communist.

The hard core of the Turkish Army is composed of professional soldiers—officers and noncommissioned officers trained in leadership. But Turkish strength is in some 400,000 men, most of them hardened by the rugged life of farm and plain, who are performing their 2 years of military service. Their loyalties are unquestioned. They are steadfastly opposed to communism and Communists.

Turkey's modern armament was improved greatly last year with the completion of negotiations for construction of an intermediate ballistic missile range. The IRBM's, which have a 1,500-mile range and which can be armed with nuclear warheads, could be fired against any of the European territory of the Soviet Union and against a large part of central Asia.

In each of the three countries of the southern region is a balanced force of atomic strike, conventional fighter bombers, reconnaissance, air defense, and transport aircraft. In each zone we have also various surface-to-air missiles, the control and operation of which are integrated with that of the aircraft. These forces, assigned to Airsouth, are aircraft organized in two Tactical Air Forces—the 5th, based at Vicenza, Italy, and the 6th, based at Izmir, Turkey.

Under the 5th ATAF is the Italian 56th Tactical Air Force, at Vicenza. Under the 6th ATAF are the Greek 28th TAF, with headquarters at Larissa, Greece and, in Turkey, the Turkish 1st TAF, at Eskisehir, the Turkish 2d TAF, at Ankara, and the Turkish 3d TAF, at Diyarbakir.

The Italian Air Force was a charter member of Airsouth. Even before the formal activation of the present 5th Allied Tactical Air Force, on October 14, 1953, Italian fliers performed ATAF functions on an interim basis. Today, the Italian Air Force has reached a strength of 50,000 men, servicing and flying several hundred jets, interceptors, and fighter-bombers.

A substantial addition to the potential of Afsouth—and of NATO general—is the Italian aviation industry. The Fiat G-91R, an Italian-built jet aircraft, was selected recently to be the NATO lightweight strike reconnaissance aircraft. This was the first major item of equipment designed especially for use by NATO forces.

The Royal Hellenic Air Force has a strength of about 20,000 men. During the past 10 years, it has undergone a remarkable evolution in which obsolete propeller aircraft have been replaced by jets; new airfields designed for modern craft have been constructed; radar warning and control systems, and modern means of telecommunications have come into being.

The fighting squadrons of the Royal Hellenic Air Force are equipped with F-84 and F-86 aircraft, guided missiles of the Nike type, and all-weather fighters.

When Turkey entered the NATO alliance she committed immediately all three of her newly organized, tactical air forces to the cause of Western freedom.

Air coverage of this great land of 300,000 square miles, with its 1,000-mile land and sea border along the "Iron Curtain," is of vital importance to NATO defenses. Turkey is probably the most exposed NATO country.

The Turkish Air Force fighting squadrons are equipped with F-84, F-86, and F-100 type aircraft and Turkey has more than a dozen excellent air bases.

The sea power of this command is provided by "Strikforsouth." As I have mentioned already, Strikforsouth is the U.S. Sixth Fleet, a modern, well-balanced naval force which includes an attack carrier striking force, an amphibious landing force and a variety of auxiliary ships, which enable the fleet to operate indefinitely at sea without shore bases. It is always battle ready.

The fleet normally consists of about 50 ships, manned by 25,000 men and carrying about 200 planes.

Exercises are conducted periodically each year by these forces to insure that every available man and weapon may be brought to bear as quickly as possible to defeat any aggressor as soon as possible. This is the aim of any military commander, and, of course, it is what we are striving for, too.

Our aim is to attain perfection in operational planning—perfection in the execution of plans drafted and approved—and to test our ability to revise and improvise these plans under unexpected conditions and unforeseen developments. Our exercises are directed also toward testing the combat spirit, the effectiveness and flexibility of all units; the adequacy of supplies for any emergency; the adequacy of training; and the effectiveness of communications.

There are still problem areas, of course, for the purpose of all operational exercises is to uncover weaknesses, to reveal the needs for further training, better coordination, improved planning and further study. However, on the whole, we are gratified by the tremendous progress that has been made since this command was activated by Adm. Robert B. Carney on June 21, 1951, on the U.S.S. *Olympus*. At that time, only one southern European country, Italy, was a member of the alliance, and there were few military and naval units committed to NATO. One year later, however, Greece and Turkey joined us, and there is now a strong organization of fighting men ready and able to provide support.

During the past decade, impressive advances have been made in training, in planning, in operational readiness, communications, construction and supply, and especially in our understanding of each other's methods and in our ability to work together as a smoothly functioning organization. Our building program has included airfields, naval bases, oil pipelines, and storage systems and sites for air defense missiles. In the recent fall exercises, our performances in air defense, air support of ground forces, the operation of amphibious forces, communications, and antiaircraft and antisubmarine defense measures met, or exceeded, our highest expectations.

Much still remains to be accomplished, but the strides which have been made in southern Europe and in NATO generally are

evident. The accuracy of this statement is readily borne out by the fact that in this area, as elsewhere throughout NATO, we continue to thwart the primary objective of the Communists, which is to destroy the Atlantic Alliance. It is inescapably obvious that this is the first step in their campaign to crush and govern the world.

When NATO was established in 1949, it was an association founded largely on hope and faith. It has fully justified both. Determination, hard work, dedication and countless sacrifices have achieved a degree of solidarity within NATO never before attained by any alliance during peacetime. It is an alliance that is unique in that it possesses permanent forces-in-being as contrasted to the paper organizations of other alliances which, in the event of aggression, must first form and then act. The prospect of facing the dedicated people of NATO and our forces in being requires pause and deliberation by any would-be aggressor before he decides to trigger a war that could result in self-destruction.

Much of what takes place in the world today transpires in an atmosphere of tension created and deepened by the dangerous practices of Communist leaders' intervention and meddling in already serious situations with the ever-prevalent possibility that their tactics will incite a war of catastrophic dimensions. Their tactics are calculated to destroy everything liberty-loving people revere and represent.

However, it is my conviction that the stature of the men who represent us in the conduct of NATO business insures the greatest protection possible in these tenuous times, and that their wisdom, supported by our potentials in manpower, industry, and commerce, by our scientific knowledge and by our great spirit, will deter the Communists from intentionally inciting war. No one is going to take over the entire world, and especially that portion of it protected by our alliance. We intend to remain free and we will remain free.

It appears obvious that the determination, vigor, and spirit of NATO's people serve as a major deterrent to any overt act on the part of the Communists—determination, vigor, and spirit which have exerted a stabilizing influence not only on the Soviets but on all free nations everywhere. These free nations have taken heart as a result of our firm stand, which has not yielded 1 inch of NATO territory to Soviet domination since the signature of the Atlantic Treaty nearly 12 years ago.

Spirit is the one thing we have in abundance in Southern Europe. This is something in which we acknowledge no peer. I never cease to be moved by the great spirit I observe everywhere in my travels throughout this area. No one country and no one region of any country of the area has a monopoly on these expressions and evidences of this great spirit, but it is probably epitomized by the following remark made to me by Lt. Gen. Athanasios Frontistis, Chief of the Hellenic National Defense General Staff:

"This poor land with its many problems and difficulties is our lot and our love. We always have and we always will defend it against all aggressors. We want your help, we expect your help, and we are grateful for your help. But, with or without your help, we will always fight to defend Greece."

Despite repeated Soviet diplomatic threats, Greece has remained steadfast in its support of NATO. It is this type of spirit, prevalent everywhere in southern Europe, which convinces me that I am right when I speak of our responsibilities and our determination to defend this area, and say:

This we will do.

One of the missions of all NATO commands is to press for the victorious conclusion of any war that may be forced upon us.

This, too, we will do.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Jefferson-Jackson Day Address by the Vice President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. KEFAUVER. Madam President, last Saturday, in Nashville, I was privileged to join nearly 3,000 of my fellow Tennessee Democrats in hearing a most heartening address by the Vice President of the United States and the Presiding Officer of this body, the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Vice President JOHNSON had just returned from a trip to world capitals in Europe and Asia; and his first public report on his tour was to the effect that the tide is running for the United States, not against it, in the hearts of the peoples of the world.

The Nashville Tennessean, published by our mutual friend, the Honorable Silliman Evans, Jr., on Sunday published the text of the Vice President's address. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE MUST NOT LOSE THIS GOLDEN MOMENT

I know of no place I would rather be tonight than here in Nashville—among some of the oldest, most cherished, and most devoted friends any man ever had.

I have a story to tell. I am glad to tell it here for the first time. It is a story that will thrill and excite all Americans—as it does me—without regard to party. But remember what you will never forget of Tennessee's past 30 years ago, having seen the miracle you have seen wrought along this valley of the Tennessee, you will feel a very special enthusiasm—and a very special pride.

Only 24 hours ago I returned to the United States. For 7 days I had been flying 13,000 miles on a mission for our country—a mission requested by the President of the United States. I had flown to San Juan, Puerto Rico, to Dakar, Africa, to Geneva, Switzerland, and to Paris, France. I flew at the request of the President of the United States—to carry the message of America's determination to build strength for freedom and hope for peace.

I left with many messages. I returned home with a far greater message than I carried abroad. I came back with a message from the people of distant lands echoing in my ears—a message of a great and new outpouring of trust and enthusiasm and faith in America.

SHOWCASE FOR DEMOCRACY

It began in the Latin world of Puerto Rico—that marvelous island showcase for democracy where men who have chosen the way of freedom are surging forward to a prosperity and social justice undreamed of a generation ago. My coming was unannounced. But when I arrived, we began to visit in the humble homes of workingmen, walked through the slums they are clearing away, went through the factories of their Operation Bootstrap, visited the young people on the campus of their university.

As the car passed, men and women and children would shout "Viva Kennedy, Viva Kennedy."

The next day we flew across the Atlantic to Dakar in the proud new Republic of Senegal. Twelve hours earlier the plane bearing the delegate of the Soviet Union, Mr. Jacob Malik, had landed, and there was no greeting. We landed in the hours after midnight. There at the foot of the ramp—in long white robes—stood Senegal's brilliant Prime Minister, Mr. Dia.

HE EXTENDED HIS HAND

Behind Mr. Dia were the members of Senegal's famous Red Guard—in flowing red capes with swords drawn. The Prime Minister extended his hand and said:

"Mr. Vice President, there are kinships between the Senegalese people and the American people—the ardent love of liberty is characteristic of your people and my people. Now that we have recovered our liberty, we wish to be more than ever the champion of that liberty and democracy. We know that in this struggle we can count upon the American people with President Kennedy at their head. You are in a friendly country, among friends."

The next day day we presented our credentials to the new nation's President, Mr. Senghor. We went back to the automobile and began riding through the streets. Along the curbs thousands were gathered and as they saw the car coming—with the American flag on it—they crowded into the streets, reached out to shake hands, reached out to touch, shouting: "Long live the United States, champion of independence."

THERE IN THE DARKNESS

Three days later we landed after nightfall in the great world city of Geneva, Switzerland—far from Africa's heat in the great snow-covered Alps. There in the darkness stood a great crowd of friendly, smiling men and women—waiting patiently for hours so they, too, could cheer your country.

The next day it was Paris—and once again the same. At the headquarters of our NATO forces—our old and trusted allies from Western Europe gathered round wherever we went to express the warmth and faith they felt for the United States, and for the new administration. On the streets and along the boulevards, whenever we were identified, spontaneous cheers came forth again from our old and cherished allies, the French.

In the important and decisive duties at Paris—both as Ambassador to France and Ambassador to NATO—two great Americans of the highest intellectual abilities serve their country at great sacrifice. There are no two men of more outstanding character or higher attainments in their field than General James Gavin and Thomas Finletter, the former Secretary of the Air Force.

STRONG REPRESENTATIONS

These two men—together with General Lauris Norstad, Supreme Commander of the Allied Forces in Europe—constitute one of the strongest representations that this country has had in our old ally of France since the days of Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin.

With this strong representation America is serving notice on those who would divide the Western alliance that we are placing new and great strength at the heart of Western Europe to add new strength to the alliance on which freedom has stood for so long. With Americans leading the way, the strong democratic nations of the Western World are going to reach out to help create in new nations the rising levels of opportunity which we in these countries enjoy and want all free men to enjoy with us.

On and on I could go. What I heard from the lips of the people, I saw mirrored in the eyes of their leaders—leaders from more than 70 nations I met during the week. There was hope. There was trust. There was optimism. There was confidence, confidence in America.

THE RUNNING TIDE

I want you to know—and I want all Americans to know—that this is happening. I say to you, the tide is running for the United States, not against it, in the hearts of the peoples of the world.

The greatest and grandest opportunity to lead the world toward peace and toward freedom is opening before this generation of Americans. We must not, we shall not fail that opportunity or lose this goldern moment.

I do not say that the trials are past or that the tests are over—because I know they are not. But I do know that the world of men who want to be free—the world of men who want justice in their times and opportunity for their children—the world of men who want to build instead of bicker—that great world is looking to America with a faith not seen in many a long and barren season.

WHY IS THIS SO?

Why is this so? It is so because the world believes that America has now the leadership to bring our great strength alive once more—leadership to make America young and confident again—leadership that personifies American faith rather than preaching doubt. The world knows, the world likes, the world trusts the President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

That is one reason I am proud to be here with you for this first report on this first mission into the world. It was here in Nashville, 8 months ago, that the Democratic campaign began. I shall be grateful to you for that wonderful evening. Ten thousand Democrats filled the park. From throughout the South, great Democratic Governors—Hodges of North Carolina, Combs of Kentucky, Collins of Florida, Patterson of Alabama—came to stand beside your own Buford Ellington.

Together they took their stand behind the Democratic Party—and stood their ground all the way. From that night on, I never doubted that Democrats would win.

NO PARTY LINES

But feeling as I feel tonight, I do not find it in myself to speak of party concerns. For peace is not a partisan work and freedom has no party lines. The work before Americans today—the challenge before Americans today—the opportunity before Americans today knows no partisanship, gives no favors, tolerates no division.

This moment of opportunity is so great—and so rare—that unity and only unity is the response of responsible Americans.

When I was with you last summer, at the start of our campaign, I said then what I would repeat now. Wherever I go, whatever I may do, I shall never speak as southerner to southerners, Protestant to Protestants, or white to whites, but only as an American to my fellow Americans.

AS AN AMERICAN

Tonight I speak only as an American when I call to all Americans—of all regions, of all races, of all religions—to lay down divisions of past and party and take up the cause of supporting the man who speaks for America in the world: the President of the United States, John F. Kennedy.

America at this moment stands at the center of the world's stage.

The world's eyes are upon us.

The world's ears are listening to us.

Rarely have Americans had so splendid a moment to lead toward the goals in which Americans all believe.

At stake is the future of your children—and mine—and Jack Kennedy's. The world those children will live in is being determined by how Americans respond to the world of today. The burden of decision—the burden of leadership—rests upon one man: our President.

DAYS OF TRIAL

The first 75 days have proved John F. Kennedy.

These trying days have proved his capacity for greatness.

He has met the Communist threat in Laos—and all Americans approve. He has met the challenge of alliances in disrepair—and he is mastering them. He has raised the sights of Americans—and raised the hopes of the world.

Let all of us—of all parties—say now, at this hour, as our President said: "Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you will do for your country."

AMERICANS AT WORK

I saw Americans out doing for their country this week.

I saw a quiet, modest young man living with his family in Africa—a man named Jack Vaughn—going among the people of Senegal and other lands seeking to start them up the same road to a better life men have walked here in Tennessee.

I went beside him into the village of Kyar—40 miles from the city streets of Dakar in the brush of Africa at the edge of the great Sahara. There men live their lives on $6 a month or less. There the practice of medicine is older than the birth of Christ.

There blind children play about in the mud and filth of an ancient society. There illness afflicts nearly every person, young or old—illiteracy blights their lives—and their horizon is no greater than the eye can see.

TO IMPROVE LIFE

I asked the chief of the village what he most needed—what would he like to have to make life better for his people? His answer was not a great loan or a great gift. He wanted one thing: a motor for a boat to help his tribesmen in their trade of fishing. I didn't wait to pass a bill through Congress—I told him when I got home I would send him one.

I talked to their President and he told me he was dedicating his new government not to building great arms, not to embarking upon strange doctrines and philosophies, but to one goal: putting every child in a classroom in 10 years.

I talked to their Prime Minister. He told me that his government wanted no gift, no giveaway. His government has planned an orderly 4-year program to raise the people upward—and for that program, he said, they want loans to repay, not gifts to take.

FOR HIS COUNTRY

Yes, far from Africa, in Geneva, I saw another American—a wealthy lawyer, a corporation lawyer, relinquishing his practice, relinquishing his opportunity for personal gain and even financing activities for the benefit of his country out of his own pocket.

Why was he in Geneva? For his country, for mankind. Mr. Arthur Dean is there working every day to develop a treaty with the Soviet Union to end tests of nuclear bombs—a first step toward peace for our children.

Mr. Dean is a Republican—but politics matters not to him as it should not dominate any of us. He is there to carry out the wish of your President that the United States go as far as it can go, try as hard as we can try to bring agreement on this important subject.

I want you to know that your Government will do everything—repeat, everything—that honorably can be done to make this step toward peace. If these efforts do not succeed, the failure will not be on the conscience of freemen.

THESE INSPIRING STORIES

On and on I could go with these inspiring stories of the great works being performed by responsible and self-sacrificing Americans everywhere. All these stories only underscore what I know your President believes: that this generation in this country is ready and willing to go to work proudly for their country's cause.

In this world today, the cause of your country is little different from the cause of your country 30 years ago in the valley of the Tennessee River. Over much of the world, men live now as Tennesseans themselves were living not long ago—living in poverty, living in sickness, living without schooling, living without real hopes for a better life.

But where men live in such fashion—whether in Africa or Asia or Latin America or elsewhere—there is about them the resources of nature to make their lives better as life here has been made better.

THE WORLD AWAITS

People who have done here in the Tennessee Valley Authority what Americans have done can offer to the world the leadership the world awaits. We are ready to try—and try we must.

That is the challenge of your President today.

Try for peace, try for freedom, try for a stronger alliance among free nations, try for better relations with old allies and for good relations with new nations.

We know the road is long, the way is hard, the turns are many. We know that before success is finally achieved there will be disappointments to endure. We know there are threats that will require steel nerves and opportunities that will require warm hearts—and America has both.

The times can be ours—if we are equal to them.

THE RALLYING POINT

That is the demand pressing down upon us: to see if we are big enough to lead history's biggest cause—or only so petty the cause is lost in partisanship.

As a Democratic President—Grover Cleveland—once said: "It is a condition that confronts us, not a theory." A condition confronts us in the world today—not a theory. The world needs desperately those basic things we take for granted casually, and both first and last the need is for leadership.

This administration is on the way to becoming the rallying point for freemen everywhere. For sake of country—never for sake of party alone—we must not fail.

MESSAGE TO AMERICANS

Let me conclude tonight with this message—a message not to Democrats alone, but to all Americans.

It has been said that those who would forget the past are condemned to relive it.

In our past history, our most tragic national experiences have come when partisan divisions among us were misinterpreted by those who were against us.

THE KAISER MISREAD

The Kaiser misread the close elections of Woodrow Wilson and made the move for world domination which precipitated World War I. The Japanese war lords misinterpreted the divided Government in 1930 and moved into Manchuria. Mussolini did the same 25 years ago amid a period of partisanship here and moved into Ethiopia. Hitler did the same 20 years ago and moved into Poland.

When Americans divide, the world is open to warmakers. When Americans unite, the world is open to the peacemakers.

This we must not forget. This past we must never relive.

Blind partisan divisions are a threat to the peace of our world. Blind partisanship is a folly this generation of Americans cannot afford. Such partisanship is America's greatest danger to its own peace and security today.

RAISE THEIR VOICE

Americans who love their country, love peace, love freedom, must raise their voice against the folly of those who try to tie the hands of the men who lead our own land.

I call upon you—Republicans as well as Democrats—to make it clear that the only acceptable partisanship in these times is construtcive partisanship which respects America's position in the world.

Thomas Jefferson said to his countrymen when he was elected by the smallest of margins—"We are all Democrats. We are all Republicans."

ACCEPTS NO DIVISION

As with our party's founder, so with our President today. President Kennedy accepts no division among our people—not divisions of party, of religion, of race. It is to this work of maintaining the Nation's unity that Democrats must now dedicate themselves.

If our President is to do the work American leadership must do in the world, we who are members of the President's party must do our work at home.

By our conduct in political affairs we must show the world's new nations what mature responsibility means. To keep the peace, let all of us declare war upon the partisan divisions among us and send our President into the world with the support of a fully united America.

The Practical Nurse Training Extension Act of 1961

SPEECH

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this bill provides an appropriation of $40 million; does it not?

Mr. GIAIMO. Five million dollars per year.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Forty million dollars; is that right?

Mr. GIAIMO. For how many years?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. This bill—this is a comparatively simple question, I hope—authorizes an appropriation of $40 million; does it not?

Mr. GIAIMO. I am under the impression it authorizes $5 million a year for 4 years.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. For 8 years.

Mr. GIAIMO. A total of $20 million.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It provides $5 million for 8 years; does it not?

Mr. GIAIMO. Five million dollars for 4 years—a total of $20 million.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Where does the gentleman get the four? In the bill does it not say eight?

Mr. GIAIMO. I may say to the gentleman we are asking for an extension of the program for 4 additional years.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Section 201 reads:

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for each of the next 8 fiscal years a sum not to exceed $5 million.

Mr. GIAIMO. That was the original bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is $40 million in my book. Is it the purpose to substitute the Senate bill?

Mr. GIAIMO. It is the purpose to substitute the Senate bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Why?

The SPEAKER. The Chair may say that that has already been done. The gentleman from New York moved to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Why?

Mr. GIAIMO. I cannot answer that question.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I think that is all.

Loyalty Oath on the New Frontier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD an editorial from the Wisconsin State Journal, Madison, Wis., under date of April 10, 1961, as follows:

LOYALTY OATH ON THE NEW FRONTIER

Wallace L. Mehlberg, a Pierce County farmer, is new chairman of the Wisconsin Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation (ASC) Committee.

That's the agency that administers the farm programs from Washington. Its authority comes down through counties and on to the township level.

Addressing his ASC county committeemen and office managers last week, Mehlberg declared:

"The ASC is not and shall not become a political organization. However, we all realize the extreme difference of direction we are now taking in the field of farm legislation.

"We need and we shall find people who are and will be dedicated in the promotion of this new approach. Let there be no doubt about that."

He further noted that all ASC personnel had the duty and responsibility "to take a personal inventory of your activities in the past 8 years and conscientiously determine if you are an asset or liability to the progress and promotion of the liberal farm legislation which people in your offices and areas can administer in a dedicated and efficient manner."

The 8 years he referred to were those under former Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson.

The chairman said that he contended that "ASC personnel who wholeheartedly supported and promoted the programs of the past administration owe it to themselves and the farmers of Wisconsin to step aside or do a complete about-face if they are to place themselves in a position to sell Secretary Freeman's feed-grain bill and all legislation now in the process of enactment."

The implication of Mehlberg's remarks is that a Government employee in the ASC organization could not do a job for one Congress and still carry out a program that is coming from about the same kind of Congress.

This kind of talk does not reflect the situation in Wisconsin—and does not help agriculture. ASC office managers and county committeemen have done a job that even Mehlberg should be proud to commend.

The real gain in Wisconsin's program has been the increasing cooperation of all agricultural agencies.

Mehlberg has nothing to condemn except his own political approach to a nonpolitical program.

He might recall how Wisconsin voted in the past election. And he might think twice before telling Federal employees to sell programs hatched by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman.

Tribute to Ronald W. May

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a moving tribute to Ron May, Washington correspondent for the Madison, Wis., Capital Times, was written by Ed Koterba, United Features Syndicate columnist Tuesday. It appeared in the Washington Daily News of April 4. May died Monday morning of a heart attack.

Mr. President, Ron May was a diligent, imaginative reporter. He was a hard, conscientious worker. He had a sensitive heart for the little people, and indignation against injustice and arrogance. His book—with Jack Anderson—"McCarthy, the Man, the Senator, the Ism," was a courageous and useful exposé. May wrote many a revealing, informative story for the Capital Times on the misuse of power in this capital of the free world. My sincerest sympathies go to Rons' lovely wife and family.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled, "There Is an Empty Space in the Gallery," from the Washington Daily News for April 4, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THERE IS AN EMPTY SPACE IN THE GALLERY

(By Ed Koterba)

In the U.S. Senate press gallery, opposite this desk, stands an empty typewriter.

In the afternoons over the years, as I'd sit at my machine, trying to make it say something, I'd glance over at Ron May at that other machine. I envied his capacity for work, the way he poured out reams of copy hour after hour—all of it good.

The other boys marveled at his dogged, diligent attitude in digging out the "cover-up" stories. A reporter's reporter, always on the go.

BIG BREAK

His biggest break came just a week ago. Ron was vibrating with wound-up emotion. "Life magazine," he said, "is planning to buy my story." He had been working on it for a year. "I'm meeting with their people tonight," he said.

Hard work paid off for young May. He had just moved into a new home in suburban Maryland (at 4809 Middlesex Lane, Bethesda), then he and his wife were blessed with their second child.

Ron, tall and lean, had been saying he was going to spend more time with his kids. It was amazing how he was able to keep so many news irons going in his never-ending blaze of journalist endeavors. He corresponded regularly for a half-dozen newspapers. Then he freelanced for others. He was always pounding away.

HAD TIP

Last weekend, he bubbled over to my desk. "I have a terrific tip for a column for you," he said. He spelled out the story and was to supply a key name from his files at home.

"I'll have it to you first thing Monday morning," he said. If it all checked out, it would make a fascinating story.

Monday morning, I was at this desk, scanning the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, awaiting young May's breezy entrance. Instead, Joe Wills, superintendent of the gallery, came up from behind. He said:

"Ron May just died at his home—of a heart attack."

(Services will be held tomorrow at 2 p.m. at the Ft. Myer Chapel. Burial will be in Arlington Cemetery.)

PENALTY

This fine young lad, though his name had not yet carried the fame of an O. O. McIntyre, Arthur Brisbane or Ernie Pyle, had paid the penalty too often assessed against our world of promising, hard-working newspapermen.

My friend, Ron May, had, in death, kept his promise to me. Among his last words to me were: "I'll give you a column to write." I wish it hadn't been this one.

The Duties of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, a young student at Washington-Lee High School in Arlington, Va., Mr. Jay Kelly Wright, has been declared winner of the American Legion high school oratorical contest in my 10th Congressional District.

I have read Mr. Wright's oration and think it excellent. I am proud, indeed, to present it for inclusion in this RECORD so that my colleagues can have the benefit of the sincerely patriotic reflections of a fine northern Virginia youth:

THE DUTIES OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Jay Kelly Wright, winner, 10th Congressional District of Virginia American Legion high school oratorical contest)

On September 17, 1787, the Constitution of the United States was submitted by the Constitutional Convention to the 13 Original States for ratification. After nearly 4 months of considerable disagreement among the delegates, sharp debate, and compromise, the honorable statesmen who were delegates to the convention agreed upon a plan for the establishment of a new Government for the United States. The document they produced was a blueprint of the structure of this new Government. It divided Federal governing authority among three branches, defined and limited the powers of the Federal Government, and clarified the position of the State governments. It provided for its own enforcement, interpretation, and amendment, so that it might have the proper amounts of both rigidity and flexibility necessary for it to be effective as the Supreme Law of the Land not only at the time it was written, but also in the years to follow. The Constitution was, in short, a plan to secure permanently for the citizens of America the inalienable rights and privileges with which all people are endowed. In the words of the preamble, it was designed "to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."[1] The Constitution, then, in defining clearly and precisely the powers of the Government, insured the protection of the rights of each American citizen.

Today one hears a great deal about the rights granted by the Constitution. There are arguments concerning the relative rights of the Federal and State Governments and, more often, disputes involving an individual's rights in relation to those of the higher governments. Most American citizens seem to know something about their constitutional rights. Although they are not students of the law they nevertheless have some knowledge of their basic liberties, such as freedom of speech or the right to assemble. At any rate, they are quick to sound off about their rights and profess such knowledge, especially when they feel they have suffered infringement of their legal privileges. Unfortunately, much of the citizens' comment about rights is misdirected, for although many Americans are very concerned about the rights which the Government grants them, they have little thought for their responsibilities, in return, to the Government.

It is possible that some Americans have never considered their responsibilities to their Government. Perhaps they do not know that the Constitution not only grants rights but also imposes upon each individual certain obligations—the obligations of good citizenship. But here again, the many Americans are somewhat confused, for they are not certain of the meaning of the term "good citizenship." Perhaps they have always defined a "good citizen" as a law-abiding man. If so, they have been mistaken, for good citizenship involves more than mere obedience to the law. The democracy which the Constitution established is based on the sovereignty of the people, and its strength therefore depends upon an active, interested populace. If the people exercise their rights vigorously and intelligently, self-government is effective; but if the people neglect their government and allow it to deteriorate, poor government is the result. It is obvious, then, that the success of any democratic system requires that the citizens take an interest in their Government. It is also evident that a good American citizen is one who demonstrates such interest.

The good American has been generally defined as one who is interested in his Government. But what does this mean? In practice, what is a good citizen?

First, he is one who learns what is happening in his country. In America there are many media through which citizens can become informed about current events. The responsible citizen takes advantage of them. In newspapers and magazines, through radio and television he can learn about news event. In our modern world there is indeed little excuse for any citizen's ignorance about current happenings.

Second, a good citizen forms his opinions intelligently. After learning about controversial issues, the good citizen carefully weighs and considers the facts, then develops his opinions. He makes his own decision upon the facts, independent of the views of others. He does his own thinking, rejecting conformity, prejudice, or tradition as bases for judgment. His views having been formulated, the intelligent citizen constantly reexamines them in the light of new ideas or more recent evidence. His is a continual process of challenging his own views, then defending or rejecting them. He is always prepared to reverse his opinions should new evidence prove them incorrect. He never stubbornly clings to outmoded beliefs which have been discarded. He is prepared to move with the growth of his country.

Third, a good citizen is one who works to see that his ideals are carried out. He expresses his will through the ballot, or he participates in civic organizations to help to bring about implementation of his ideas. He works to campaign for the political candidate of his choice or he supports a community reform project in which he believes. He does not watch others take care of his responsibilities.

There are, then, three general duties of good citizenship which the Constitution, in granting rights, has placed upon every American. These are, becoming informed, formulating opinion, and carrying out ideals. The citizens who do not fulfill these are obstructions to effective democracy. The man who reads only the comic or sports sections of his newspaper, the man who is too busy with his business affairs to attend an important school board hearing, the man who is afraid to be the sole member of his community to speak for integration, the man who believes that America should return to the doctrine of isolationism, the man who votes a straight party ticket simply because his father and grandfather did so, the man who couldn't choose between Mr. Nixon or Mr. Kennedy, the man who feels that his vote simply doesn't count—all of them are detriments to democracy.

Today, as perhaps never before, it is vital that the citizens of America take a continuing interest in their Government. Without such interest our individual and collective security is threatened. America is engaged in an arms race and a cold war. At a time when the formidable bloc of Communist countries threatens the security of every free nation, America must be able to give undivided attention to maintaining her high position among the world powers. This she cannot do if she is plagued by the indifference, the lack of interest, and the unconcern of her citizens. Americans all must work with and give support to the Government if our country as we know it today is to survive.

One hundred and seventy-three years ago our forefathers established this democracy. Today it is the responsibility of each one of us, the citizens of America, to guard this gift and to keep it functioning. Indeed, it is the solemn duty of every American to meet fully his obligations of citizenship. If each of us will take the time and effort throughout our lives to study the issues, to keep an open mind, to express our views, to cast our votes, then we can be more assured that "government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth."[2]

[1] From the preamble to the Constitution of the United States of America.

[2] From Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg Address.

Canada and the United States—A Traditional Friendship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the week of April 23–29 has been designated by Kiwanis International as United States-Canada Good Will Week. The forthcoming observance of this week has been noted by the Kiwanis Club, North Ridgeville, Ohio, of which Mr. John C. Vopat is president. Kiwanis Clubs throughout the world, especially in Canada and the United States will emphasize the traditional friendship between these two neighbor countries.

It is appropriate, therefore, Mr. President, that there be given broad recognition of United States-Canada Good Will Week. A review of the long and unbroken period of peace and friendship between these two neighboring countries stands out in today's troubled world as a lesson, a guide—yes, an example—that should enlighten all nations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my further comments on this subject be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES—A TRADITIONAL FRIENDSHIP

The traditional friendship which exists between Canada and the United States cannot be too often emphasized. Since the United States first emerged from the Revolutionary War there has been a mutual effort to promote good will and cooperation between the two countries. These efforts must never flag. The good relations must never be taken for granted. No condition remains static.

Before the eyes of the world our two countries have set an example of peaceful boundaries, happy relationships, and a common effort at understanding. We must not let that image fade. Complete accord is not always possible between two sovereign and independent nations. No two friends are constantly likeminded but differences of opinion need not alter friendly relations; indeed they may enhance them. For a willingness to arbitrate differences, and a distinct effort at mutual understanding may weld loose ties of acquiescence into strong bonds of cooperation.

The mutual desire of Canada and the United States to cooperate is evidenced by the fact that they have concluded nearly 200 treaties and agreements on a variety of subjects ranging from amity to weather.

Basic to our mutual good will and most renowned of our treaty arrangements is that

governing the boundary between the United States and Canada, the unfortified frontier. Provision for the abolition of armed forces on the Great Lakes and along the land frontier stemmed from the peace negotiations following the American Revolution. Effected by the Rush-Bagot Agreement of 1817–18, the undefended border by a series of treaties has been extended from the Atlantic to the Pacific, a stretch of almost 4,000 miles (3,987). Added to this are 1,540 miles of boundary between Canada and Alaska—a total of over 5,500 miles bearing witness to a mutual desire for friendship and understanding.

Another milestone in the history of the good relations between the United States and Canada was the treaty of 1909. By this agreement all of the waters along the international boundary were to be used for the benefit of both countries. The import of this provision may be inferred when one considers what a large proportion of the boundary consists of water. Of the 3,987-mile stretch from the Atlantic to the Pacific only 1,789 is land, and 2,198 is water. Another 183 miles of water and 1,357 of land mark the Alaskan boundary. In order to insure the effectiveness of this arrangement the treaty also provided for a permanent International Joint Commission—United States and Canada. It was established and has operated harmoniously for over five decades, resolving the innumerable problems which inevitably arise when the peoples of two great nations share the thousands of miles of water resources along the common border.

More specific arrangements concerning the use of particular bodies of water along the boundary have also been momentous in the development of mutual benefits and understanding. The treaty relating to the uses of the waters of the Niagara River, signed in 1950, took the place of earlier ones and provided for a vast increase in the power output of the Niagara River, but with safeguards to preserve the scenic beauty of the famous falls. An equal diversion of the waters available for power, without disturbing the unbroken crestline of the falls, made it possible for both countries to provide for large areas of their population a source of cheap power and development, at the same time preserving for posterity the world-renowned grandeur of the natural scenery.

The culmination of decades of effort to resolve the question of the joint use of the whole of the great St. Lawrence was realized finally with the signing of the treaty of 1954. It provided for the construction of facilities for navigation which were to open up to ocean-going liners passage through the giant seaway stretching from the mouth of the St. Lawrence to the westernmost tip of Lake Superior. This massive cooperative project was also of immense importance to the future development of electric power. Above all, however, the significance of the treaty lay in the fact that the United States and Canada, looking together toward the protection of world peace, and with mutual concern for any situation that might arise, gave evidence of a really effective working partnership between two independent and sovereign nations.

The most recent treaty between the United States and Canada is likewise a momentous one. On January 17, 1961, the two countries signed the Columbia River Treaty. It represented the solving of difficult and complex problems by resourceful collaboration. At the signing ceremony the Prime Minister of Canada, Dr. Diefenbaker, said, "[It] is more than a blueprint for technical and economic cooperation. * * * It is a symbol of intelligent partnership. * * * Indeed, there could be no more impressive evidence of the capacity of the United States and Canada to pioneer in new methods of cooperation to their mutual advantage." [1]

The magnitude of this vast cooperative undertaking can be only faintly conceived when one considers that of some 24 separate projects listed in the treaty, one alone involves the mighty Grand Coulee and another the enormous Bonneville Dam, and that there are multiple aspects to each project of collaboration.

The opening up of the St. Lawrence Seaway has already meant that the ports on either side of the Great Lakes have had a phenomenal increase in exports. They have set records for oversea and total tonnage. In the harbors, docks and facilities are being rapidly expanded to keep pace with the Seaway traffic development.

Canada and the United States are the greatest trading neighbors in the world. Not only are they each other's best customers, the volume of trade is such that the United States is the third largest and Canada the fourth largest of the trading nations around the globe.

This large scale contact in business and commerce bears witness to the good relations between the United States and Canada in the economic field. There must be both mutual understanding and forbearance between countries to maintain good will. For joint economic, commercial and business interests not only create benefits. They promote rivalries and create problems as well. We find Canada and the United States making definite and concrete concessions in order to insure that the relationship is not only pleasant but mutually beneficial. There is vigor in the effort of the two countries to find solutions to difficulties; and this effort engenders approval and appreciation.

The volume of travel between the United States and Canada is tremendous and constantly increasing. Of the 27,329,000 persons traveling from Canada in 1957 (the latest available figures) 99.6 percent went to the United States. The total number of Canadians crossing to south of the border was 27,209,000. 26,619,000 citizens of the United States went to Canada that year. This figure represented 97 percent of all of Canada's visitors in 1957.

The expenditure of these U.S. citizens in Canada during that year was $325 million. That of the Canadians in the United States $403 million. The latter figure represented an increase of about 400 percent over the previous 10 years.

Travelers to and from Canada and the United States went by automobile, rail, boat, aircraft, international bus, local bus, and on foot. By far the greater number, about two-thirds, traveled by auto on short-term visits, under 48 hours.

Travel facilities between the two countries are well coordinated. The courtesy with which Americans are treated while traveling in Canada is memorable for those of us who have been there. The customs officers perform their tasks with tact and the minimum of inconvenience to the visitor. It is to be hoped that our Canadian visitors are equally happy with the treatment they receive at our hands.

The coordination of transportation between the United States and Canada is a matter of great importance to the vital field of defense, in which the two countries are inevitably and inextricably associated. In the realm of defense Canada and the United States have gone even beyond cooperation. There has been voluntary integration of many defense measures.

What is known as Norad—North American air defense—was formally established in 1958. Many cooperative steps in defense were already under way. Not since the first coordination in 1941—for World War II—had there, in fact, ceased to be consultation and preparation for joint defense. The present setup of Norad is, however, on a more extensive and more closely integrated scale than ever before. It includes the DEW line, a joint radar system for distant early warning. It stretches for 3,000 miles, across northern Canada to the Aleutian Islands, Alaska, and the Baffin Islands at the Northwest Passage.

Norad includes also the mid-Canada line, the Pinetree system, a number of radar extensions and observation posts, and SAGE. SAGE—semiautomatic ground environment—is an information-gathering system for air defense purposes. Eventually the entire United States and the more densely populated areas of Canada will be linked in one defensive network.

There is the Ground Observer Corps, made up of Canadian civilian interceptors, spotting planes that might fly too low for radar warnings. From the hilltops and the valleys they act as air-defense protectors.

There is coordination of defense production on a scale which would astonish the rest of the world, could the full story be told.

In the matter of civil defense there are regular exchange visits between the U.S. Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization and the Canadian Civil Defense authorities.

There are many fields of cooperation between the United States and Canada which I have not even touched upon. Of enormous importance and of as long standing as the two countries have been cognizant neighbors are their combined and adjusted fishing arrangements. Both bilateral and international agreements involving other countries such as Russia and Japan have been in effect since the 19th century and earlier, to regulate, preserve, and coordinate the various fishing interests of joint concern. There are many other economic as well as social and cultural fields of endeavor in which the Canadians and their American neighbors south of their border have combined their forces and their wits.

Good relations between the two countries cannot, however, rest upon the laurels of past peaceful policies. Nor can they be complacently regarded as permanently established, even in view of the many gratifying evidences of current collaboration. The maintenance of good relations for which these neighbors, Canada and the United States, are justly famous is dependent upon continuing effort, understanding, and initiative on the part of both.

To this end there has recently been established another very important bond between us. It is one of tremendous significance and potential efficacy. It is the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, composed of a number of the representatives of the people of both countries. It has been in existence about a year and a half and has periodic meetings to further cooperation, to discuss the common problems and means of settling inescapable differences with amity, mutual trust, and constructive understanding. One commentator has spoken recently of the treasured partnership between the United States and Canada. Another has said, "The unity, fellowship, and common dedication to the heritage of freedom is to the peoples of the United States and Canada a living thing." [2]

---

[1] Canadian Weekly Bulletin, Jan. 25, 1961, p. 5.

[2] Canada. Statements and Speeches, No. 59/27. Ottawa, 1959.

United Nations Military Aggression Against Katanga Government in the Congo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "We Knock Ourselves Out," by Eugene C. Pulliam, publisher of the Indianapolis Star, which appeared in that newspaper on Sunday, April 9, 1961.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE KNOCK OURSELVES OUT

Criminal folly—that's the only way to describe the United Nations military aggression against the Katanga state government in the Congo. The most alarming feature of the aggression is the fact that it has been made possible only because of U.S. Government support. This means that the United States in actual fact now is engaged in aggressive military operations against the constitutional and legal government of a nation which has done no harm to America and whose government is one of the very few African governments that openly proclaims its friendship and loyalty to the United States and the West.

Katanga is the southern, richest and best governed state, or province, of the Congo confederation. It is the only part of the Congo which never suffered any serious internal disturbances. The ruler of Katanga, President Moise Tshombe, is a well-educated, moderately conservative leader who has organized an efficient government and a small but well disciplined national army. He is supported by a democratically elected parliament and has not had any serious opposition to his regime since the Congo became independent in the summer of 1960.

Tshombe is, however, intensively hated by the Communists as well as by the "neutralists" represented in the Congo by the United Nations overlord, Dayal, an Indian Government official. Tshombe was the driving force behind the formation of the Congo confederation, proclaimed last month by all Congolese national leaders, but not yet recognized by the United Nations.

Tshombe never asked for United Nations troops to be sent to his country. He never asked for any U.N. military or financial assistance. He is on good terms with the former Belgian authorities in Katanga and has retained the services of about 600 Belgian and other European government financial and business experts. Tshombe's government is one of the few African regimes which shows amity toward the white man.

Yet Katanga has now been chosen by the United Nations Secretary General, Dag Hammarskjold, as the victim for "an impressive show of force." Without asking Tshombe's consent, the United Nations has sent several strong army detachments to occupy, by force, strategic points in Katanga, including the important airport of its capital, Elizabethville. Hammarskjold officially boasts in New York that his plan is to send, within the next few days, a total of 7,000 Indian troops to Katanga.

Hammarskjold makes no secret of the United Nations aims in Katanga—he wants the so-called foreign element in Katanga withdrawn. In practice, this means the forceful expulsion of the 600 Belgian and European military experts. But such an expulsion is sure to bring the downfall of the Tshombe regime which badly needs the services of these Western experts. Katanga would then certainly become the center of serious internal strife, after which, presumably, peace would have to be restored by the U.N. Indian troops.

We must also remember that the Indian troops were airlifted to the Congo by the U.S. Air Force at, of course, the expense of the American taxpayer. While in the Congo the Indians are officially paid, fed, and supplied by the United Nations. But, as Uncle Sam foots most of the United Nations Congo bills, it can be said without exaggeration that the American taxpayer is responsible for the operational costs of the Indian troops in Katanga.

The United States has thus been put in a truly fantastic situation. It pays for and supports aggressive military actions aimed at the overthrow of a foreign government friendly toward the United States. The troops engaged in these aggresive moves are under the direction of a "neutralist," Dayal, who hates America and is known to be "neutral" in favor of Moscow. And the political control of all these military operations is in the hands of an anti-American group of states—the so-called Afro-Asian group, which is led by such states as Ghana, Guinea, Mali, Indonesia, and Yugoslavia.

The United States is thus actively involved in aggressive military moves which are directed against America's own interests and which can only harm the cause of freedom and democracy throughout the world. To top it all, these incredible operations are supervised by an organization which has its headquarters in the center of New York and performs its anti-American activities largely with American financial support and in full view of the American people.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANCHER NELSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks a good deal of discussion has centered around the very controversial issue of Federal aid to education. Many of us have received a good deal of mail with opinions for and against this measure and of recent date I received a communication from Sisters M. Derwa and M. Cyril, associated with the Holy Trinity School at Winsted, Minn. This school has performed a very fine job of providing education in the Winsted community and I represented this area in the State senate for many years, beginning in 1935. With the communication that I received was enclosed an article by Don Raihle, which appeared in a recent issue of the Wanderer, a Catholic publication with wide circulation in the State of Minnesota. This article, in my judgment, presents some very pertinent points and I believe that Members of Congress should have the opportunity of examining in detail the points set forth in this very well prepared article.

The article is herewith appended in full:

WHAT THEY'RE TALKING ABOUT
(By Don Raihle)

"Ribicoff at the outset sought to allay fears that the legislation might lead to Federal interference with the schools. He said a Federal role has been legitimate and accepted since 1790 and these programs he said, have 'been administered without evidencing one shred of Federal control.'"

Background: The foregoing is quoted from a news story in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune on March 9, 1951. Federal rule book—page 4—says: "Administration of Vocational Education: Each State is required to submit a plan which must meet the approval of the Federal Office of Education."

Allen P. Burkhardt, superintendent of schools at Norfolk, Nebr., commenting upon his own experience with Federal money in the field of vocational agriculture and home economics, said this:

"To get this money we have to accept and adopt the course of study outlined and specified by the Federal Government through the State department of education. We have to permit inspection by State employees who receive part of their money from the Federal Government.

"We have to hire teachers whose qualifications are approved by the same groups. We have to send our teachers to conferences designated by those authorities.

"Because we get Federal support for agriculture and home economics, we have to accept courses of study worked out by other people.

"We are told how long our periods of recitation have to be. * * * We are told how large the classrooms and the shops have to be, what type of equipment we have to have, even the type of floor in the rooms. We are told about how much money to spend per student. We are not allowed to use the teachers in those departments in any other fields. If we do, we lose our Federal money.

"If this doesn't constitute control from Washington, then at least it's a reasonable facsimile."

Federal aid-to-education legislation is almost always prefaced with a disclaimer of Federal control as was the National Defense Education Act of 1958. It said: "Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system."

In spite of this, the act goes on to set forth numerous regulations, requirements, and directives which local school systems must meet and observe in order to qualify for Federal funds under the act.

About a year ago I talked before a group of parents at Hamel, Minn. A high school teacher told me they had obtained an adding machine under the National Defense Education Act of 1958. A short time later a Government employee dropped in to look around. The high school teacher told me that he was advised that the adding machine was to be used only in the teaching of science and if it was used for any other purpose—at any time—the Federal Government would take the machine away. That is Federal control.

When Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Ribicoff appeared before the House Committee on Education and Labor on March 8, 1961, and said that present Federal aid-to-education programs have "been administered without evidencing one shred of Federal control," he either lied or was totally ignorant of the facts. He certainly was not speaking the truth. In either instance he seems to be lacking some of the necessary qualifications for the high office that has been handed to him by the President.

You cannot have Federal aid to anything without Federal control. The U.S. Supreme

Court has said so. The Court says that with every Federal subsidy must go some Federal control. Secretary Ribicoff should know that, and the President should know it very well. To say that we can have Federal aid to education without Federal control is just about the most misleading statement that has ever been concocted for public consumption.

Michael J. Wargovich—Noted American Slovac Fraternalist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, all of us who knew Michael J. Wargovich mourn his recent death. He was one of the great leaders of the American Slovak movement which has made many contributions to American life. Mr. Wargovich was also active in politics throughout his lifetime and served in a wide variety of important poses with the Republican Party.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article on this noted American which appeared in the Good Shepherd, official publication of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MICHAEL J. WARGOVICH, NOTED AMERICAN SLOVAK FRATERNALIST

(By John C. Sciranka)

On Tuesday, January 17, 1961, the American Slovaks lost a noted fraternalist and a leader, Michael J. Wargovich, who died in McKeesport, Pa., after a brief illness at the age of 65.

The name Wargovich is known throughout the world where the Slovak people live. He was born in Slovakia and brought to this country as a mere child. His parents after a brief stay in Brooklyn, N.Y., settled in Pennsylvania. McKeesport was the city where the late fraternalist learned his ABC in fraternalism. And since McKeesport has the distinction of being also the domicile of the first American Slovak newspapermen and organizers of a fraternal society—Ján Slovensky and Julius Wolf, who settled there in 1879, "Big Mike," as he was widely known, followed in their footsteps. But his inspiration came from the late pastor of the Holy Trinity Slovak Catholic Church, Father Panuska. Here Mike served as an altar boy 55 years ago to a noted priest during the national convention of the First Catholic Slovak Union of United States and Canada, which is the largest Slovak organization in the world and which the late Michael J. Wargovich headed as supreme president for 20 years. Praiseworthy is the fact the junior order of the union was established then. The priest to whom Mike served was the Reverend Stephen Furdek, known as Father of American Slovaks. This meeting with the famous priest inspired the late Michael J. Wargovich to the dedication of his life to the American Slovak fraternalism.

The writer had the pleasure to attend the first national convention of this the largest Slovak fraternal organization in the summer of 1922 in Bethlehem, Pa., with late Wargovich. It was the first national convention for both of us. Shortly after this convention, the writer became assistant editor of Jednota (Union), published in Middletown, Pa. Michael waited for his chance until 1926, when he was elected supreme auditor at the national convention in Scranton, Pa. This was followed by chairmanship of the board of auditors. Then in 1940 during the Pittsburgh national convention he was elected supreme president and reelected at every national convention, which grew steadily under his leadership. The organization's headquarters are in Cleveland, Ohio, where it was founded in 1890 but it maintains a printery, orphanage and an old folks home at Middletown, Pa., on a large farm near Harrisburg. Pennsylvania has over 60 percent of the organization's membership.

OFFICER OF NATIONAL FRATERNAL CONGRESS

During the past 20 years, Mr. Wargovich attended all the conventions of the National Fraternal Congress of America in which he served on various important committees and also as member of its executive committee. He was also president of the Pennsylvania Fraternal Congress and treasurer of the Slovak Catholic Religious Association, which raised a quarter million dollars under the auspices of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America and the National Catholic Welfare Conference during World War II for the war-torn Slovakia.

He attended and served on the important committees of the Slovak League of America and the Slovak Catholic Federation of America. During that period he visited every State in the Union and all the principal cities of the United States and Canada at various celebrations and functions of his organization.

SERVED UNDER FIVE GOVERNORS

Mr. Wargovich was a stanch Republican and took active part in all Republican activities from the time he started to vote. He served on local and county, as well as State committees. The Republican National Committee recognized his services and he served on its advisory board. He was also national chairman of the Slovak Division of the Republican Party for several years and took part in various campaigns, visiting many States as a speaker. His voice was heard over the air during the last presidential campaign in English and Slovak languages. During the 1960 Republican National Convention in Chicago, Ill., he had the honor to serve as one of the assistant secretaries of this historical conclave, which he considered one of the highest honors. Mr. Wargovich served as district representative of the Pennsylvania State Workmen's Insurance Fund under five Governors. He also served as the treasurer of the Pittsburgh Fraternal Societies.

He was active in civic affairs and served as officer of the local branch 60, of the First Catholic Slovak Union, also was member of the National Slovak Society Assembly 31, which is one of the oldest Slovak societies in America. Also the Knights of Columbus, Council 955, the Slovak Gymnastic Union Sokol, Assembly 46, and the Serra Club.

Under his leadership the organization had youth conferences in the principal cities of the United States and Canada and the last such conference was in August 1960 in Washington, D.C., with a solemn mass at the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception. He arranged the programs for these conferences and the national conventions of the organization which he headed. The writer had the privilege to be temporary chairman of two such national conventions in New York City, the first one in 1928, when the late Patrick Cardinal Hayes greeted the convention and second in 1952, when Francis J. Cardinal Spellman presided at the pontifical Mass in St. Patrick's Cathedral. Similar conventions with solemn pontifical Masses were held during his tenure of office in Chicago, Ill., Youngstown, Ohio, Milwaukee, Wis., New York City, Reading, Pa., and Detroit, Mich., with Cardinals Stritch, Mooney, and McQuigan pontificating and preaching.

The most impressive celebration under Wargovich's presidency was held on Labor Day 1955 in Cleveland Public Auditorium in honor of the centennial birthday of Father Furdek, founder of the union. The late Cardinal Stritch preached the sermon and some 30 American archbishops and bishops took part in the picturesque celebration with many monsignori, priests and all American Slovak fraternal leaders present.

He was in midst of gigantic preparations for the national convention to be held in August 1961 in Pittsburgh, Pa., when death put an end to his prolific fraternal career. He is survived by his widow, Mrs. Mary Lucanish Wargovich; two sons: Dr. Raymond Wargovich of McKeesport, Pa., active fraternalist and Matthew Wargovich of Bel Air, Md., also two daughters, Miss Dolores Wargovich at home and Mrs. Mildred Coffman of Akron, Ohio; two brothers, Joseph and Andrew of McKeesport and a sister, Mrs. Anna Evans of Munhall and seven grandchildren.

In spite of inclement weather, all American Slovak fraternal organizations were represented at his funeral on Saturday, January 21. Rt. Rev. Msgr. Clement J. Hrtanek preached the eulogy and represented Most Rev. John J. Wright, bishop of Pittsburgh diocese and Rt. Rev. Abbot Theodore G. Kojis, O.S.B., celebrated pontifical Mass of Requiem, assisted by local pastor, Father Edward J. Duwell, who officiated at the Calvary Cemetery, Port Vue, Pa.

Msgr. Andrew Biros, supreme chaplain; Msgr. Michael Shuba, organization's supreme chaplain for Canada; Very Rev. Canon Joseph S. Altany, LL.D., editor of Slovak Catholic Federation; Rev. Martin B. Rubicky, former supreme president of the Slovak Catholic Federation; Rev. Louis P. Hohos, supreme chaplain of the Slovak Catholic Sokol and many priests attended funeral. The fraternal leaders were led by John A. Sabol, supreme executive vice president of the organization and the successor of late Michael J. Wargovich from Phoenixville, Pa.

Mr. Wargovich was lifelong resident of Allegheny County and great citizen of Pennsylvania, who preached and lived as a true American Slovak fraternalist, aiding his fellow men for a better tomorrow.

He will always be remembered by his countrymen as a typical American Slovak fraternalist.

National Transportation Week

SPEECH
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman give consideration to the bill I sent over last week?

Mr. CELLER. I do not recall the nature of the bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I did not think you would.

Mr. CELLER. If the bill has merit I am quite sure the gentleman will receive every consideration.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will you give it long consideration?

Mr. CELLER. I do not know about long consideration; we will give it earnest consideration.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will you give it any consideration?

Mr. CELLER. We certainly shall.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The Program for Educational Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, under our free-enterprise system many business concerns are providing effective and worthwhile aid to our educational system. Oftentimes the educational aid programs financed through business in our capitalistic system are overlooked.

Recently there was called to my attention the outstanding work of the Procter & Gamble Manufacturing Co. in support of education. The Procter & Gamble Co. is currently supporting 240 4-year scholarships; certain technical scholarships totaling about 30; payments to all of the 40 State and regional associations of colleges, including approximately 475 different colleges; $20,000 each year to each of the 10 large universities, to be used as the universities may choose; and certain special grants to such organizations as the National Fund for Medical Education and the United Negro College Fund. The total being contributed has now reached $1,100,000 per year.

Recently this concern has embarked upon a new educational program in support of graduate schools of education.

Under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD excerpts from the statement of this company setting forth their new program for educational leadership. This kind of voluntary private support of education is about the finest aid to education our free system can produce. Excerpts from the Procter & Gamble statement covering their new graduate program follow:

THE PROGRAM FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

The newest phase in our program of aid to higher education is grants to support graduate schools of education. Beginning in 1961, we are providing $15,000 per year to each of the following graduate schools. We hope to be able to continue this level of support for a total of at least 5 years.

Graduate School of Education, University of Chicago.

Teachers College, Columbia University.

Graduate School of Education, Harvard University.

Graduate School of George Peabody College for Teachers.

Graduate School of Education, Stanford University.

These grants are in special recognition of the fact that the quality of education depends on the quality of teaching—on the knowledge held by the teacher, on his ability to impart this knowledge to others and on his capacity for stimulating thought. As these areas of teaching capability are expanded, education itself is moved forward. Advances here come principally as a result of research and of sharing the results of this research throughout the broad spectrum of the educational system. There are relatively few graduate schools in the country which not only train teachers but which also, through research, advance the art of teaching. The institutions named above are among those which are providing outstanding leadership in advanced education. On a highly selective basis they train those who are to teach and those who are to teach others to teach. In addition they carry on broad programs of educational research, the results of which are available to all other educational institutions. Thus, in supporting these graduate schools, an important measure of support is provided to all education throughout the country.

These graduate schools have another claim to the name of "national" educational institutions. They select their students from all parts of the United States and from an impressive part of the rest of the free world, returning them after training to schools, colleges, and universities throughout this country and abroad. For this reason also, it is appropriate that support of these graduate schools of education should come from organizations which are, themselves, national or international in character and outlook.

Finally, our support of these graduate schools is impelled by the absence of well-to-do alumni of schools of education. In some other fields, successful alumni are in a position to make substantial contributions to the institutions which provided their education. With only a few exceptions, this is not the case with those in the teaching profession, whose earning power is relatively restricted. Unfortunately, this is true not only for the alumni of these graduate schools but teacher-training institutions throughout the country. This fact opens a special opportunity and justification for the exercise of corporate support.

As stated with respect to large universities on our university program, we do not suggest that only these five graduate schools of education are worthy of corporate support. Many others also make heavy contributions to teaching and to the improvement of learning methods. Many others, which do not do extensive educational research themselves but which translate the advances of others into better education of teachers, also deserve financial assistance. It is our hope that other organizations, believing as strongly as does our own in the essentiality of meeting the Nation's need for more and better teachers, will compile their own lists of deserving institutions and provide to them the support they richly deserve.

Wisconsin Backs Resources Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on March 21 I invited the attention of the Senate to the text of Gov. Gaylord Nelson's message on the State's natural resources to the Wisconsin Legislature. The New York Times for Sunday, April 2, reported on the forward-looking program which the Governor is proposing and on the broad bipartisan support it has already received. Governor Nelson is to be congratulated on the leadership he is offering in this vital area.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the April 2 New York Times entitled, "Wisconsin Backs Resources Plan," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN BACKS RESOURCES PLAN—NELSON WINS BIPARTISAN AID FOR PROGRAM TO ENLARGE ENDANGERED OUTDOORS

(By Austin C. Wehrwein, special to the New York Times)

MADISON, WIS., March 31.—Gov. Gaylord A. Nelson has won bipartisan support for a broad, coordinated 10-year program to save and enlarge Wisconsin's vast but endangered outdoor resources.

In terms of need he called it a "crash program" crying for "dramatic and decisive action." But the remedies he has designed suggest more of a "prudent investment" for the future.

He urged that the State be empowered to use easements on a far broader scale than any State has used them. An easement is the right to use a privately owned land for various purposes while the title to the land stays in the hands of the original owner.

Thus, the Governor explained, the State could buy the right to prevent unsightly billboards, or to have access to a lake stream or a beauty spot.

Buying an easement would be cheaper than buying the land outright and in the meantime the land would stay on the tax rolls.

WIDER ZONING SCALE

The Governor could also use zoning on a broader scale to achieve some of the same purposes and, if necessary, purchase land outright.

In general the Wisconsin program is in line with New York State's $75 million park land purchase program but it is broader in concept.

In broad outline, the Wisconsin program would enlarge State park and forest recreation and camp site areas, improve and increase fish and game habitat, set up a youth conservation corps, protect landscapes, build new lakes, aid cities in creating parks on their edges and promote tourism.

The vacation-recreation business is worth $600 million to Wisconsin annually but the Nelson program is directed more at preserving the State's natural beauty than at exploiting it. Nevertheless, it was generally agreed in the areas where the vacation business means dollars in the bank that such a broad program in the long run would be very much worthwhile.

TAX-RISE FINANCE

Long-range plans have been lacking both at the State and National level, Mr. Nelson declared.

To be financed by a 1-cent increase in the cigarette tax, the Nelson program stresses "additions to capital assets" rather than additions to the State payroll, the Governor went on.

It would jibe with existing fish and game programs. But the key to his concept is that the State must plan ahead for the needs of everybody—the birdwatchers, the campers, the family vacationers, and the canoers.

Traditionally, too, conservation programs have been largely paid for from license fees from users. The Nelson program, drawing on a special excise tax, would break new ground in this regard. Fish and game license fees would be restored to fish and game activities exclusively.

TO BE SUBMITTED SOON

The Governor's bill was being drafted by his lawyers this week for submission within a week or two to the legislature.

Mr. Nelson is a second-term Democrat and both houses of the legislature are Republican controlled. Nevertheless his proposed

measure has won stout bipartisan support and chances of passage appear bright.

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, wrote to the Governor this week that his Department regarded the program as one of the boldest and most comprehensive put forward by any State. Similar praise came from Francis W. Sargent, executive director of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, a special Federal body created by the Eisenhower administration under the chairmanship of Laurence S. Rockefeller.

Address by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on March 29, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman addressed the National Water Research Symposium here in Washington. I was impressed and encouraged by the Secretary's remarks. I will willingly support the program he has set forth for watershed, woodland, forest land, and research development.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of Secretary Freeman's address in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN BEFORE NATIONAL WATER RESEARCH SYMPOSIUM, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 29, 1961

I feel honored to have the privilege of speaking to this National Water Research Symposium. May I congratulate the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts and the National Reclamation Association for their foresight in organizing this very impressive event.

I think you will understand when I say that I feel a little hesitant in talking about conservation to such a group as this. Some of you were probably actively concerned with conservation before I was born. And I know very well that when the Senate confirmed me as Secretary of Agriculture it did not thereby confirm me as an authority also on conservation.

Nevertheless, I do have some basic ideas on the subject. I firmly believe that conservation is something that happens not only to resources—conservation happens to people. Conservation is for people. It has both intimate and far-reaching effects upon their prosperity, their jobs, their diets, their health, their recreation, their culture; in short, their lives.

As Governor of Minnesota I saw this many times. A year or so ago I went with a party of about 25 Minnesotans who share a deep interest in conservation programs on a 3-day tour of conservation installations and projects around that State. While on the southern leg of the tour we drove through farm areas where some of the tree farms this organization has helped to form are located.

I was amazed to learn that with the help of some very simple management practices, one farmer had sold nearly $2,000 worth of timber from a hardwood tree lot on his farm. He will do this once every 5 years or so. This section of his farm until very recently returned nothing of value.

Now there is a specific case of what I mean in saying that conservation happens to, and is for, people.

You have assembled an impressive team of land, water, and other resource experts, some of them members of the USDA. Their job is to go into the technical aspects of how best to use that drop of water. My task as Secretary of a department with paramount responsibility for much of the Nation's renewable natural resources is to discuss in broad terms the wise use and conservation of soil, water, and related natural resources.

The theme of your meeting—"Better Use of Every Drop of Water Through Research." is most appropriate. It stems from a growing awareness that water is scarce, and that in many regions lack of water has become a limiting factor to further agricultural and industrial development.

Most people think of water as something to drink and as something to bathe in. They would be surprised to learn that only 10 percent of the water used in this country is employed for domestic purposes.

Fifty percent is utilized for agriculture and 40 percent for industrial purposes. When we realize that 9 out of every 10 gallons of water used in this country enter into the production of food, fiber, and manufactured products, we begin to see water as a key factor in further economic development as well as in the production race with the Communist nations. Our watersheds have become a vital element in our national defense.

President Kennedy has made it very plain that we shall attack our natural resource problems with renewed vigor. The challenge he has placed before us, and specifically before the Congress and the executive departments of Government in his messages on natural resources and on agriculture, is loud and clear.

We are a fast-growing Nation. Our national population is rising at the rate of 340 persons per hour, 8,000 per day, 3 million per year. This is a faster rate than that of any major industrialized nation and faster than many underdeveloped countries. Our families today are larger than they were half a century ago—3.2 children as against 2.4 in 1910. As of noon today our estimated population was close to 183 million. If present trends continue, just 39 years from now we will have to provide for twice as many people as we now do.

But the demand for water is growing even faster than population. Now in 1961 we use about 300 billion gallons of water per day. In 1980—only 19 years hence—we will require 600 billion gallons of usable water per day.

That's the size of the problem.

The renewable resources conservation job is tremendous. Congress has charged the Department of Agriculture with the major share of the leadership required to get it done.

Fortunately, our renewable natural resources are also vast.

The land area of the 50 States comprises almost 2.3 billion acres. Prior to the time Alaska and Hawaii jointed our Nation as States our land area was about 1.9 billion acres.

We have, in addition to urban lands, 460 million acres of farm cropland, 630 million acres of grazing lands, 500 million acres of commercial forest land, and 155 million acres of noncommercial forest land. Everyone of these roughly 1,750 million acres is to some degree watershed land.

The responsibility of the Department of Agriculture in providing conservation leadership encompasses more than half of all these lands.

We will work through every appropriate channel to achieve a common goal of abundant water, stable soil, and plentiful renewable resources.

Now what is it going to take to get the job done? The detailed answer to that question you probably know far better than I. But there are, I believe, three elements that are absolutely essential.

First, we must approach this problem with an overall point of view. Water, soil, agricultural crops, forage, timber, wildlife, and outdoor recreational opportunities are all members of a closely knit resource family. What happens to one affects the others for better or for worse.

The day when the forester, the biologist, the soil conservationist, the agricultural extension agent, the hydrologist, or the recreation planner could go it alone is long gone. The only way the conservation job can be done is by cooperation, understanding, exchange of information, and genuine teamwork between State, Federal, and private land resource people working in all areas of conservation.

We must look at conservation in the light of the interdependency of all programs, whether they be in water, forestry, game and fish, soil conservation, mineral development, or recreation.

Second, we must impress upon the citizenry that if conservation is for people, then people have a responsibility to be for conservation.

Resource management, therefore, is an inescapable responsibility of each citizen, as well as of the community, the State, and the Federal Government.

If we, as a heavily industrialized Nation, are to build a civilization which is in harmony with nature, we will have to take from the earth the pure, the useful, and the valuable and return to it the pure, the useful, and the valuable.

The third essential is that we shift without delay from the remnants of the old concept of conserving resources to the new concept of building and improving resources.

Not too many years ago when Gifford Pinchot succeeded in illuminating President Theodore Roosevelt with the magnificent concept of conservation, the primary concern then was to protect natural resources from the destructive wastefulness of people.

The maturing of thought and action in conservation since that time is apparent in the growing recognition that conservation's primary challenge today is to protect man from the consequences of entrapping himself in a self-built jungle of concrete and brick.

What began as a program to protect the forests and the land has now become a program to protect the quality of our way of living.

And if we do not encourage and foster this concept, the grim appraisal of Gen. Omar Bradley may well be realized.

"Year after year," he wrote after a penetrating appraisal of his country, "our scenic treasures are being plundered by what we call an advancing civilization. If we are not careful, we shall leave our children a legacy of billion-dollar roads leading nowhere except to other congested places like those they left behind. We are building ourselves an asphalt treadmill and allowing the green areas of our Nation to disappear."

We in the Department of Agriculture pledge that we will do our part in the immense job of building up natural resources adequate to all foreseeable needs.

We will revitalize the Nation's small watershed program to get more rapid action in meeting future water needs.

We shall accelerate the work of our Soil Conservation Service in providing basic land use practices on farm crop lands.

We shall take strong and positive steps to achieve better management of small privately owned woodlands.

We shall rejuvenate the Forest Service's long-range program for the development and improvement of our national forests.

We shall help develop a sound and full body of scientific data to guide us in soil, water, forest and range conservation programs. While the Department's resource program is a vigorous one, basic research data in this field still fall short of needs. I have directed that we review the requirements and fill in the gaps. This review is now underway.

These are some of the things government can do. But I do not need to tell you government cannot do the job alone. The task of building our resources is a task for everyone—the farmer, the rancher, the woodland owner, the agriculture extension agent, the forester, the soil conservationist, the biologist, the hunter, the fisherman, the hiker, the industrialist, the city man—for all the millions of Americans who use our natural resources and who conscientiously accept the responsibility of leaving to their children a land better, richer, and more livable than they found it.

National Transportation Week

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary if it is now the policy of the committee to approve 2 special days on one date. To illustrate, Congress several years ago approved a bill, which is now a law, designating May 1 as Loyalty Day, and this day is observed throughout the Nation based on sponsorship by hundreds of posts of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. Now I understand a bill is at the White House designating May 1 as Law Day.

Mr. CELLER. It is not the purpose of the committee to duplicate days for commemoration. The particular bill that the gentleman has in mind was approved by all members of the Supreme Court and the various bar associations throughout the Nation. They recommended it.

Incidentally, I have the pen with which our distinguished President signed the bill, so the bill has been signed and is now law. We do not deliberately set more than one commemoration on a particular day.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Did the gentleman's committee take into consideration the fact that May 1 is already Loyalty Day and observed nationwide in accordance with sponsorship of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States?

Mr. CELLER. These bills create a great deal of difficulty for the Committee on the Judiciary. We have a plethora of these bills, and we are at our wits end at times as to what to accept and what to reject. We hope the gentleman will be charitable.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Therefore, I am to assume the committee will follow a policy of duplicating days for commemoration?

Mr. CELLER. No; that is not our purpose.

Address by Hon. Frank P. Graham at the Dedication of the Elizabethan Garden, Roanoke Island, N.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, at Fort Raleigh, N.C., on Roanoke Island, the Garden Club of North Carolina has sponsored the establishment of the Elizabethan Garden. At the dedication services Hon. Frank P. Graham, United Nations representative to Pakistan and India, delivered the dedication address, which I insert in the RECORD under leave to extend my remarks:

We especially salute today the four State chairmen, Mrs. James Tyler, Mrs. Roy Homewood, Mrs. Glenn Long, and Mrs. Corbett Howard and through them the generous benefactors and coworkers. Their devoted leadership and hard work resulted in this fitting memorial of the gallant women who shared in the great adventure which led to the founding of the British Empire and the American Union.

The Elizabethan Garden, planted and nurtured by the Garden Club of North Carolina, is the precious alabaster box of love and beauty laid in tribute at the feet of the British-American cultural heritage planted on these original shores 373 years ago. From this garden the women of North Carolina wave their flowers of friendship across the seas from the America of Elizabeth the First to the Britain of Elizabeth the Second. These flowers are the symbols of the ties which bind together in freedom the English-speaking nations in our imperiled world.

The birthday of Virginia Dare, which is annually celebrated by Paul Green's majestic symphonic drama, we join in celebrating today. Virginia was conceived in England and born in America. This child became symbolic and prophetic of the spiritual flowering of her heritages and her hopes. She is the symbol of Britain, mother of parliaments, civil liberties, the common law, and a commonwealth of free nations on four continents. She is prophetic of America, mother of religious liberty in the separation of church and state, of a commonwealth of States in a Federal structure on a continental scale, and of the great American dream.

As symbol and prophecy, we see people, with an old courage and a new hope in their hearts, cross dangerous seas, become lost on these rugged shores, and rise from the dead all the way from Maine to Florida. With axes, muskets, and Bibles in their hands and with an unconquerable and sometimes too ruthless will in their souls, they cross a continent and build a more humane America out of the spiritual stuff of their revolutionary, unresting, and immortal dream, unfulfilled but ever unfolding in this age of hazard and hope.

For these men and women and their children, was made the revolutionary American Declaration, the first universal declaration of human rights ever adopted by the delegates of the people. The words of the American Declaration, which, on that memorable day in July 1776 gave birth to a revolutionary political faith, went ringing around the world and down the centuries and are still singing in the hearts of the people in two hemispheres. Across the years we hear the great Virginian, Thomas Jefferson, as he declares for America and all the world the still revolutionary ideas that "All men are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these rights are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." We respond deeply to another noble flowering of the British-American heritage, Robert E. Lee, also grown in the garden of Virginia, brilliant in victories and sublime in the duties of defeat, as his spirit worked mightily for the reconciliation of people in the reunited States. In these perilous and tyrannous times of hydrogen bombs, intercontinental missiles, and outer space, we highly resolve, with the wisely magnanimous and the nobly great Abraham Lincoln, that, "This Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

Of such faith and purpose are the soil, the fruits, and the flowers of our Hebraic-Christian-Greco-Latin-European-American Western culture, which, together with the ancient spiritual heritage, the cultural flowers, and the fresh democratic hopes of the great Eastern peoples, make up the foundations, purposes, and programs of the United Nations. In this turbulent world the United Nations by its organic growth, increasing wisdom, and moral power is working against the self-annihilation, East and West, of all civilization.

In this age of engines and gadgets, alarms and perils, the women of the North Carolina Garden Club would remind us that man cannot live by bread and bombs alone. They would teach us that love and reverence, work and worship, truth, goodness and beauty, are the enduring ways to the good life of the great society of the unfolding American Revolution to whose survival and fulfillment for all people on the earth we must again "pledge our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

The Elizabethan Garden and the gardens in all our towns and cities have already given spiritual reenforcement to your sisters on the farms in their home demonstration clubs. These women, also under gallant leadership, work together to make their clubs not only clubs for growing, canning and marketing fruits and vegetables, but also clubs for growing flowers in their gardens and nurturing flowers of the mind and spirit in their homes, churches, schools, and rural neighborhoods, with all their meaning to the State, Nation, and world community, as ways of making living on the farm a productive, satisfying, and beautiful way of life in our sometimes too strident, modern industrial society. These women bring us back to the beauty and the ways of nature, the good earth, the fields, forests, spacious vistas, and the cooperation of sun and soil, air and rain, toward providing the food, clothing, shelter, and flowers for people in all lands.

In the fulfillment of the meaning of the ideas planted in this place, the people of America and the freedom-loving people of both hemispheres, hopefully stand together today. With the reverent faith of their spiritual heritage and the dynamic hopes of their democratic commitments they struggle for equal freedom and enduring peace among all peoples on the earth.

In this world of the precarious peace of deterrent terror, with the alternative between the drift toward universal annihilation and the struggle toward more effective cooperation of nations through a more adequate United Nations, may this commemoration of the pioneer women of Roanoke in a century long gone and the pioneer women on the go in the North Carolina Garden Club today, mean the rededication of us all to things of their venturesome human spirit. May we variously commit ourselves not only to the cultivation of flowers of the earth and of the spirit but also to the cooperation of governments and peoples for equal justice under law and human brotherhood under God in this time of mortal peril and immortal hope for all mankind.

Standards for Movies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, there has always been an important place in the motion picture industry for the experimental film as well as the film that deals courageously with current social issues. In the past some of these films have met with success at the box office, more often they have not. Nevertheless their value at home and before foreign audiences has repeatedly been demonstrated.

The place of such films in the public arena is cogently discussed by the well-known producer and playwright, Dore Schary. I ask unanimous consent to print in the Appendix of the RECORD his address on this subject at the 13th Annual Conference of the National Civil Liberties Clearinghouse, March 24.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY DORE SCHARY

The title for our panel discussion seems to be somewhat abbreviated. It occurred to me that it should be "Mass Communications Media and the People's Right To Know—What They Want To Know." This elongation hits at the nub of the problem which is, "What is it that they want to know?"

From the diet of pap served to them in television; from the vast amount of yellow journals still in existence and from the violence, sex and spectacle being bought in huge colored gobs on movie screens, one could conclude that the public is getting what they want and it serves them right.

But such a point of view would be far too cynical for the temper of this meeting. After all, the National Civil Liberties Clearinghouse is an agency with faith in man and it is armed with purpose to help make this place a better haven for all men. To have worked in this field of civil liberties is not only a tribute to their high goals but also to their dogged determination.

Some creators who work in the field of motion pictures have this same high purpose and some also are blessed with the same dogged determination—and, believe me, the livin' ain't easy.

There is an ebb tide and flood tide in audience response to pictures that deal with some brutual realities—and the failure of one film that reaches out to touch the conscience of man stultifies the ambition and closes the checkbook. Forgotten are the commercial successes such as "Crossfire," "Pinky," "Gentlemen's Agreement," "The Defiant Ones," "Trial," "On the Beach," and others. If one labors long in the field of pictures that aim for the objective of man's mind—he is likely to be dubbed a maker of "message pictures." You see, a "message picture" is any picture with a point of view which is a failure. If it succeeds, it becomes a "picture of content."

This ebb and flow is the first barranca and of course it involves audience indifference. During my tenure of over 8 years at a major studio, the boldest film made was one called "Intruder in the Dust." It was beautifully directed and written and expertly played. The critics were ecstatic—the public couldn't have cared less—and in some areas of the country it could not even get bookings. Public indifference murdered it. The fact that William Faulkner wrote the novel probably was one reason we weren't accused in some quarters of being pro-Communist.

This then leads to the second barranca, which is pressure from certain groups and certain areas. A studio or releasing company will in these days of "jackpot" motion picture making view with intense dismay the making of a film that may not be able to play in the South—or may offend someone in the Government—or may provoke the Catholics or the Jews or the Protestants. The sensibilities of national groups such as the Irish-American, Italian-American, German-American, Japanese-American, Polish-American, must also be reckoned with—and I have had letters of concern from architects, lawyers, doctors, Indian Chiefs, motel owners and hearing aid manufacturers. I once had a sharp letter of protest from some society organized to protect the reputation of German police dogs because in one film a dog of this breed bit an actor. As a consequence, films began long ago a basic and theatrical right—the right to offend. Becoming frightened of everything, they decided to be all things to all men—and only the bold and responsible picture maker—with enough bargaining power to overcome some failures—was willing to stick out his jaw—which was instantly clouted by some one.

This circumstance has now been aggravated by the economic pressure on film companies. With television income from sale of old films carrying a major source of profit—the companies are producing huge mammoth films that will stun the audiences with length and breadth and width and height and color and sound. The major promotion is once again related to how much did the picture cost, how long does it run, how long did it take to make and how many stars decorate its main title.

Too often everything is accounted for except the plot. But the audience apparently couldn't care less—they go to the big ones—occasionally to the freak little one—but many pictures of leisurely pace and serious content with some degree of nobility are quietly ignored and quickly hidden away.

There are good pictures finding their way into the art houses and in some big cities they are commanding real attention. That's a good sign. Perhaps soon films in America will again be searching for the special picture—the good little picture—but usually if those stories are submitted today they are brushed off as being "good for a TV show," which is the faintest praise with which one can damn.

Another problem to consider: the foreign market. What image will be exhibited to the world away from the United States of the American personality? I don't dismiss this as an issue—but again, what image do we want to present? Do we stop, or prevent, or inhibit, the production of powerful pictures of protest that might give to the world a view of Americans as a people still in revolt against injustice? Do we inhibit or prevent pictures that would prove that our Nation is so strong, so secure, that absolute freedom of the screen is still a sacred civil liberty?

Or, are we naive enough to feel that vapid pictures that glorify violence and reduce sex to moronic vulgarity are really doing us no harm? Do we really believe that just because the good guys always win (be they cowboys in white hats or policemen or G-men or private detectives), that we can show men and women slapped, raped, slugged, shot, knifed, burned and drowned without damaging our national image?

There is no way to censor bad taste and if there was I'd be against it—but somewhere there must be a way of creating a jury of peers who will judge what is shown abroad not by what the film says or doesn't say—but rather by a standard of whether it's a good picture or a lousy one.

And what's wrong with the concept of making films purely for American exhibition? Nothing, except—it isn't profitable in a complex world that demands that pictures get bigger and wider and are seen by more people than ever before. Someone—some day—will break the trend—but it will need cooperation from creator, financier and exhibitor. Sometime, in the future, major companies and major talents will be willing to spend some effort and time in exploring the fields that present no financial bonanzas of good will and good deeds—the field of educational films, for instance. It would be something to see if skilled craftsmen teamed up with brilliant teachers and started to create a backlog of films for our schools and colleges. Hollywood did a magnificent job in making training films during the war—they could do a magnificent job in peacetime.

But once again—perhaps petulantly, we have the right to ask—what is it that the public wants to know? Even during the war, great documentaries such as "The True Glory" went begging for audiences. Truth was not a good enough substitute for fiction. For the record, I'm not arguing for the abolition of entertainment. I'm arguing that if the public is surfeited with some of the junk that comes under that loose heading of entertainment that they kick up a fuss. Let them besiege the sponsors of TV programs; let them berate the publishers of bad books; let them stay away from the theaters exhibiting tripe—as soon as they make bad taste unprofitable it will cease to exist. And let the devoted worker in all creative fields also try to clean his own house; if he does not he will find himself fighting the battle against censorship in the wrong place, at the wrong time, against the wrong odds.

I'd like to find myself fighting for freedom of the screen by defending the right of someone to make a picture about the bigots in New Orleans, rather than for some cheap, obscene film that might be called "I Was a Teenage Werewolf Who Ate Marihuana in a House of Shame."

But if it comes to that— we will have to fight I suppose. The tragedy will be that the fight will be lost—because the theater will be burning and someone will have the right to yell, "Fire!"

The very term "mass communication" makes a clear definition. A communication aimed at or reaching the mass. Let the masses declare what they are for and what they are against—and let up hope that the tenor of their demand will uplift us and not disillusion us.

They, the people, have the right to know everything—it's a right they can exercise if they choose to and I, for one, hope they do—and I, for one, believe that they, in time, will alter the shape, the sound, the size, and the soul of all our communications.

Thank you.

Address by Hon. John E. Fogarty, of Rhode Island, at Dedication of the Maurice L. Briedenthal Laboratory, Kansas City, on April 5, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, April 5, I welcomed to my district a large number of distinguished visitors who had come to Kansas City to dedicate the Maurice L. Briedenthal Laboratory, a field station Laboratory of the Communicable Disease Center, U.S. Public Health Service. The laboratory is located on the campus of the University of Kansas Medical Center and has been and will be instrumental in forging the essential link between fundamental research and the frontline battle against fungal and viral diseases in the entire Missouri River Valley. We were greatly honored and, indeed, thrilled, to have Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island, address the hundreds of people gathered there in Kansas City for the dedication. Congressman FOGARTY, in a very stirring address, challenged all of us in America to become concerned with environmental research. But this magnificent speech stands on its own, Mr. Speaker, and I commend it to my colleagues in the Congress:

REMARKS BY HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY, OF RHODE ISLAND, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S. CONGRESS

This is the second time within the past 6 months that I have been privileged to attend the opening of a new research facility of the Public Health Service. The first was your parent agency, the Communicable Disease Center at Emory University in Atlanta, Ga., a facility in which you and the Nation can take justifiable pride.

We can be equally proud of the field station we are opening today. Like the center's headquarters, it is located on the campus of one of the Nation's great universities—an ideal place for research. The building and the equipment in this station have been designed and selected to give our scientists every advantage in their search for answers to the still unsolved problems of disease.

The university and its friends, whose great generosity brought this building into being, and the people of the Nation who will pay to keep it operating—we all expect great things from the studies that will be conducted in this new research facility. And I know that the men and women who will labor here will do their utmost to see that we are not disappointed.

The study of virus and fungus diseases for which this station was established demonstrates the importance of a much broader research area that we are only beginning to explore; namely, the whole relationship of man's modern environment to his health.

It was at this station, in its old makeshift quarters, that one of the truly great research breakthroughs of this cenutry occurred. I refer, of course, to the work done here on histoplasmosis. Thousands of patients were erroneously treated in tuberculosis sanitaria, tens of thousands of dollars were wasted on such treatment, before your work here revealed that it was a fungus in the soil, not the tubercle bacilli, that was rotting the lungs of so many people in this section of the country.

In the dramatic story of histoplasmosis research I believe there is a lesson that we as a nation will do well to heed.

It was when our scientists began to look for factors in the environment, rather than within man himself, that they found the source of histoplasmosis in soil rich in bird droppings. Isn't it also possible that more intensive study of our environment will yield clues to the prevention of other diseases?

I ask, is it just a coincidence that lung cancer, emphysema, and other respiratory ills are increasing in the areas where there is most air pollution? What is the connection between hepatitis epidemics, broken down sewage systems, septic tank suburbias? Why are heart disease and mental ills such big problems in the urbanized parts of the world and almost unknown in the so-called underdeveloped countries? We can't expect our doctors to give us all the answers. We must study the environment itself.

We are not doing this. Worse, we are not even doing the simple ordinary things we already know we ought to do to protect ourselves in this fast changing world.

Within the next 15 years, we are going to build the equivalent of 12 cities as large as Chicago to take care of our increasing population. If we follow our present pattern, we will do it in a day by day, hit or miss way. Invade more and more farmlands with housing developments and shopping centers. Add new highways when the old ones can't bear any more cars. Bulldoze down more forests to make room for more industries. Sewage and refuse will be handled in whatever way seems easiest and cheapest at the moment. Maybe heavy chemical dosage will keep our drinking water safe.

The only comfort we can take in this hodgepodge is that, because each day's changes are slight, we are saved from the shock of the sum total of change that results in a year, or a decade. The impact of the whole horrible mess we are creating never really hits us.

Yet we have warning signs aplenty that we are following a dangerous road.

In a certain section of Tennessee, you can see a strange sight—a gray, desolated wasteland right in the midst of an area of green flourishing forests. There isn't a bird, or a blade of grass, or any life at all in the wasteland. Why? Air pollution—smoke and fumes and an industrial plant miles away. Is this the air you want to breathe?

That's the effect of air pollution you can see. But there's another kind you can't see and it may be the most dangerous of all. It spouts from the tailpipe of your car. It spouts from 70 million other cars. And you breathe this devil's brew. When a snowstorm hit New York City last February and cars were barred from the city for 2 days, air pollution dropped 60 percent. The auto industry has been mighty enterprising about getting us pushbutton windows and tailfins and a lot of other gadgets we could do without. But what about devices that will stop air pollution? What about the seat belts that would prevent fatal accidents?

It is time and overtime for the auto industry to show that it cares as much about our health and safety as it does about our comfort.

Other industries also are big, are growing, are polluting air, land, food, water. Must these industries pollute as fast as they grow?

Thousands of entirely new chemicals are being used every year with no study of the possible effect of lifetime exposure to them. One of the few chemicals that has been thoroughly studied is the fluoride used in drinking water to prevent tooth decay—a measure found to be entirely safe and beneficial. Ironically enough, this measure has encountered public opposition while, at the same time, there is virtually no public concern over the thousands of unstudied chemicals we are absorbing into our bodies every day.

Radioactivity is another hazard we know little about. The more we learn, the more we realize how careful we must be to cut down unnecessary exposure.

But we aren't doing it. The medical and dental uses of X-ray have increased over 300 percent in the past 20 years. But how many communities have any regular system for checking whether the X-ray machines in doctors' and dentists' offices are operating properly? I know of just one—New York City—and it's just getting started. In 17 States, shoe stores can still use fluoroscopic shoe-fitting machines—machines that are giving hundreds of children unnecessary doses of dangerous radiation.

The Atomic Energy Commission is promoting more use of atomic energy and radioactive materials in industry. That's fine. That's progress—provided it can be done safely. But what worries me is that this same AEC, which is responsible for promotion, is also responsible for protection. That's like putting a wolf to guard the sheep. I, for one, don't like it. Last summer, when a spillover from a uranium plant in New Mexico poured a quarter of a million gallons of radioactive stuff into the San Juan River, the health authorities didn't even know about it until citizens 65 miles downriver reported dead fish floating by. I say our health agencies, Federal, State, and local, should have clear-cut responsibility for the health and safety factors of radiation. But along with that responsibility must go the funds and the personnel to do the job. Most State and local health departments today are doing so little in radiation control it is hardly worth mentioning. I also think the Federal Public Health Service program is too little and too late.

Water pollution is another environmental hazard—an old story to those of you who live along the Missouri River, sometimes called the "thousand-mile sewer." I understand, however, that both Kansas City, Kans., and Kansas City, Mo., have done their part to give the old river a better reputation. Kansas City, Mo.'s overwhelming vote last fall of over 4 to 1 in favor of the bond issue for sewage treatment facilities is an inspiring example of enlightened citizen action. It was almost as impressive as the 6 to 1 vote Kansas City, Kans., gave its bond issue in 1954.

Those were battles well won, but the big war for water is still ahead. Within two generations, there's been a radical shift in our living patterns. Families who used to have five rooms and a path now have five rooms and a bath—or even two or three baths. They also have dishwashers and clothes washers and air-conditioning systems—all taking water. And at the same time that we are using more water, we're polluting more water. Housewives are using millions of pounds of detergents. If you draw a glass of water from the tap on wash day in some communities, it foams like a glass of beer. Industries are using 10 times as much water as they did 60 years ago. We still have some pure streams—but they're pure chemical, not pure water.

My own State of Rhode Island, along with 22 other States, has a big shellfish industry. This industry has been outstanding in its insistence that its fish be raised in wholesome waters. It is proud of its record. But that record is getting more and more difficult to maintain. Even the ocean is getting polluted as we dump more and more radioactive and other waste into it. Recently, down in Mississippi, some shellfish poachers took their crop from a polluted area. This

was quickly discovered and action taken—but not before over one hundred people got hepatitis. As water gets scarcer, the temptation to use unsafe water grows. Last month it was a shellfish poacher in Mississippi. Next month, it may be a farmer, or an industry, and you and I may be the victims.

Where are the health officials, the food and drug inspectors and all the other people we pay to protect us from such hazards? They are on the job, I can assure you. But there aren't enough of them and the problem is growing so fast both in size and complexity that they can't keep up with it.

Maybe you've noticed—I have—the deterioration in the food served on planes, trains, and buses. Maybe you've noticed—I have—that there have been a number of cases of food poisoning on these carriers. There were two or three on airlines last fall; a big one on a railroad in Washington, D.C., a couple of years ago. It's the job of the U.S. Public Health Service to see that passengers get safe food, but how many inspectors do they have? How many to protect the millions of people who are traveling every day? I'll tell you. They have exactly 31. Is it surprising that the food service is deteriorating? I'm surprised that it is safe to eat at all when you travel.

What can you and I and every other American do to make this modern world safe and to keep it that way? What can we do about air pollution, radiation, water pollution, food poisoning and all these other hazards?

One thing we can do is use our specialists, give them a chance to apply their knowledge of how to control pollution and create safer cities. To do that, we must recognize that, for the better or for worse, most of us, and those who come after us, are going to live in about 200 densely populated areas. This means that we must think, plan and act in terms of a whole metropolitan complex, not in terms of each separate city and suburb. No part of the complex can hope to wall itself off from the problems of the other parts. Build a fine home in the suburbs if you want to, but remember you can't shake off the big city and its problems. It is still your city—you couldn't live without it.

So, whatever town or suburb you call home, be prepared to pay for metropolitan living—one way or another. You can pay for it by damage to health, by inconvenience, by ugliness and increasingly unpleasant living conditions if you continue to let matters drift. Or you can pay for programs that will give you and your descendants a decent place to live. The choice is still ours, but we'll have to make it soon, because once buildings are up and pavements are down, it's too late.

The second thing we can do is expand our research program. We need to know the precise effect our rapidly changing environment is having upon our health. We need to find better and cheaper ways of building health protections into our environment.

To get research of the scope needed and at the speed needed, I have proposed that a National Environmental Health Center be established, comparable to the National Institutes of Health, the world's greatest medical research center.

This ceremony, marking as it does the opening of a new facility for studying two hazards of the environment (viral and fungal diseases), seems to me an appropriate time to announce that my proposal for a National Environmental Health Center has now reached the blueprint stage.

This center should have many buildings as fine as this new field station. It should have over 30 different types of laboratories where physicists, chemists, radiologists, biochemists and other scientists would do research. The problems they might solve by such research would help all communities to have better and cheaper control of their environment. The center should be equipped with greenhouses and with a farm of experimental animals so that, by testing pollutants on lower forms of life, we could learn more about their effect on man. Scientists from all parts of the world should be trained in this center.

Like the National Institutes of Health, the Environmental Health Center should be the hub for an expanding national program. It should provide grants to universities and other research installations in all parts of the country. It should serve as a clearinghouse and coordinating unit to prevent duplication of effort and to see that every promising clue is being followed.

The Nation's most productive years of medical research came with the development of our National Institutes of Health. It spurred on the whole medical research movement, producing results far beyond those that can be directly traced to NIH resources.

Similarly, I predict that, if we can develop a great national center for environmental research, it will mark the turning point from neglect to aggressive attack upon the health problems of the modern environment.

Before such a center can move from the blueprint to the brick and mortar stage, however, we must know whether the American people want it. There is no use perfecting our ability to create healthful, beautiful, and convenient cities if we are going to ignore this knowledge and go on creating ugly, ferry-built, traffic-jammed urban sprawls.

The Congress of the United States, responding to the will of the people, took medical research out of the doldrums. Surgery is safer; diseases and disabilities that used to be hopeless are now curable because we've gone all out for a big national medical research program.

We can do the same to make our environment safer. President Kennedy, in his message on natural resources and on urban affairs, pointed out the danger of neglect. He called for more action on air pollution, water pollution, metropolitanism. But he hasn't spelled out his proposals. Will they be big enough? Will they come fast enough?

We stand at a turning point right now. We can silently accept a future of cancer-laden smog and sewage-burdened waters or we can rise up and demand action, big action, fast action throughout the length and breadth of the land. The choice is ours, but time is running out.

Some of us, some of our children, may already have absorbed the posions that, working slowly in our bodies, will find their fatal targets 10 or 20 years from now. That's how modern pollution works—slow, but deadly.

In this field station we dedicate today, we have taken one step in the right direction. Let us follow it with the giant stride that will enhance the potential of this and of every other center for genuinely productive research.

We Arm Our Enemies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "We Arm Our Enemies" by Eugene C. Pulliam, publisher of the Indianapolis Star, which appeared in that paper on Sunday, April 9, 1961.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE ARM OUR ENEMIES

A victory of some significance was won a few weeks ago when the Department of Commerce, after second thought prompted by congressional inquiry, canceled an export license which had been issued for the sale of American-made ball-bearing machines to the Soviet Union. But this victory only scratched the surface of the problem of arming the enemies of the United States with American tools and American money.

Within the last few days it was brought out that an American firm, on American tax money under the foreign aid program, has been building a steel plant in Poland. Let's say that again.

The United States is building a steel plant in Communist Poland.

It takes a while for the full significance of that to sink in. The threat of war with the Communist empire has hung over the United States continuously since the end of World War II. There were the years when the war was not just a threat but a reality in Korea. Of late there has also been considerable talk of economic war.

Whether the war threat is military or economic, steel is one of its basic sinews.

Poland is a captive nation of the Soviet empire. All the production of all the parts of the Soviet empire goes into the universal program of building the strength of the empire and serving its military, economic, and political objectives.

What this all adds up to is that the U.S. foreign aid program has been used, with the American people's money and with American equipment, knowledge, and skills, to build a direct addition to the war potential of the Soviet conspiracy, directed against the United States as its major ultimate target.

Forestry History Is Made in North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. PAUL KITCHIN
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, for the second time within the past decade forestry history has been made in the Eighth Congressional District of my State.

In both instances the Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co., through its forestry division, has led the way. General Forestry Agent Robert N. Hoskins, directing the Seaboard's forestry program, was in charge of both of these cooperative forestry demonstration field meetings.

As a direct result of the first forestry meeting held in my home county of Anson nearly 10 years ago a tree planting machine was given to the landowners by the banks of Wadesboro, N.C. Recognizing the importance of putting their land back into a productive crop, the landowners planted over a million trees, thus making Anson County the first "million tree" county in forestry history in North Carolina.

On Wednesday, March 29, 1961, a new chapter in forestry was written in the Eighth District, particularly Moore County, as well as in the State of North Carolina and the Nation. A special train was run by the Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co. from Raleigh, N.C., to Southern Pines, N.C. This was a seven-car special train with six coaches and a dining car. Included in the distinguished group boarding the train at Raleigh were: 75 members of the North Carolina General Assembly, State cabinet officers, and 180 business and industrial leaders from Raleigh and such outside points as New York City, Washington, D.C., Richmond, Va., and Atlanta, Ga. Upon arrival in Southern Pines this group was welcomed by the top business leaders, Seaboard officials headed by John W. Smith, president of the company, and by one of the fine high school bands in my district—the Southern Pines High School Band.

This assembled group was then taken to the field forestry program in activity buses provided by the Moore County School Board through assistance of Mr. Louis Scheipers, town manager of Southern Pines.

Upon arrival in the woods at W. O. Moss's Mileaway Farm, about 1½ miles east of Southern Pines, one of the most complete forestry demonstration programs ever held in my district was carried out. Joining the 250 passengers from the special train, were 650 other farmers, business leaders, and future farmers.

At this great forestry field meeting the following persons spoke briefly during the morning session: State Representative Clifford Blue, from Aberdeen, N.C.; J. M. Osteen, district supervisor, vocational agriculture, Rockingham, N.C.; Fred H. Claridge, North Carolina State Forester, Raleigh, N.C.; and Douglass A. Craig, assistant regional forester, U.S. Forest Service, Atlanta, Ga.

Following the early morning speakers, Robert N. Hoskins, the Seaboard's general forestry agent, directed the overall field program which consisted of the following demonstrations:

Station 1: Cone collection and nursery production; Floyd M. Cossitt, U.S. Forest Service, eighth region, Atlanta, Ga. Forest genetics; Dr. Bruce Zobel, School of Forestry, North Carolina State College, Raleigh, N.C.

Station 2: Mechanical tree planting and hand planting; Russell K. Hallberg, Bowaters Carolina Corp., Jamestown, N.C. Fire control; James A. Pippin, district forester, North Carolina Department of Conservation and Development, Rockingham, N.C.

Station 3: Insect and disease control; H. J. Green, forestry division, North Carolina Department of Conservation and Development, Raleigh, N.C. Markets and marketing of creosoted wood products; Robert S. Speicher, United States Steel Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.

Station 4: Hardwood control; Sam Hughes, Riegel Carolina Corp., Bolton, N.C. Service forestry; H. J. Anderson, Halifax Paper Co., Roanoke Rapids, N.C.

Station 5: Fence post treatment and pole barn construction; Johnnye U. Foster, Atlantic Creosoting Co., Savannah, Ga. Pulpwood production and paper manufacturing; J. P. Harper, International Paper Co., Raleigh, N.C.

Station 6: Sawmilling; D. W. House, Southern Wood Preserving Co., Atlanta, Ga. Seasoning of lumber; Ernest E. Graham, tie and timber department, Seaboard Railroad, Jacksonville, Fla.

Station 7: Pole production and classification; Alton H. McCullough, Koppers Co., Inc., Florence, S.C. Cross tie production; E. L. Kidd, tie and timber department, Seaboard Railroad, Jacksonville, Fla.

Following the field portion of the meeting, the group reassembled at which time the Honorable Terry Sanford, Governor of North Carolina, spoke briefly and said:

Forestry is extremely important to the full development of North Carolina's resources. We want to take full advantage of all our possibilities. I am proud of our work in forestry, but we are not using even 50 percent of our possibilities. We can more than double what we have done.

The principal speaker of the day was John L. Tower, vice president, International Paper Co., New York City, who was introduced by Warren T. White, assistant vice president, Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co.

Mr. Tower said:

Over 5,000 different wood products are needed to keep our vast American economy moving and to meet our daily needs. He said the Nation requires 2½ acres of trees per person just to keep us going and demands will increase as the population soars to an expected 300 million by the year 2000.

The wood-using industries of North Carolina employ 18 percent of the State's labor force and annually turn out products with a value of over $750 million.

No other region approaches the South in forest resources. Sixty percent of the Nation's tree farms and 66 percent of its tree farm acreages are in the South. Two-thirds of the wood needed to feed the Nation's gigantic appetite for pulp and paper is supplied by the South.

The State's wood-using industries have provided jobs and income where they are needed most, in rural areas, and on a non-seasonal basis.

After Mr. Tower's speech, airplanes of the North Carolina Division of Forestry gave a spectacular aerial demonstration of the newest methods of controlling forest fires by water bombing with chemicals.

Cooperating on the special train project were the nitrogen division of the Allied Chemical Corp., West Virginia Pulp and Paper Co., Union Bag Camp Co., International Paper Co., Halifax Paper Co., and Regal-Carolina Paper Co.

In recognition of this great educational contribution to forestry in North Carolina, the following resolution was presented by State Senator Henry Gray Shelton, chairman of the senate agriculture committee, and by State Representative J. Raynor Woodard, chairman of the house agriculture committee, and passed by the 1961 general assembly of my State:

JOINT RESOLUTION EXPRESSING APPRECIATION FOR THE HOSPITALITY AND CONSTRUCTIVE PROGRAM PRESENTED BY THE SEABOARD AIR LINE RAILROAD CO., THE FEDERAL AND STATE FORESTRY DEPARTMENTS, AND THE FOREST PRODUCTS USERS AND MANUFATURERS TO MEMBERS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Whereas the forest products of this State are an important economic asset to North Carolina and the potentials of this crop have not been realized or fully developed, and it is recognized by the members of the General Assembly that the cooperative efforts of the Federal and State forestry departments and the forest products users and manufacturers have accounted for progress in both technological and economic fields relating to forestry, thus greatly augmenting the income of this State and its people through their combined efforts, research, and in the dissemination of information regarding production, handling, usage and marketing of this valuable crop; and

Whereas to further promote sound forestry management in North Carolina, the Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co., in association with the aforementioned Federal and State agencies and companies, provided a special forest field day train and program, in which members of the General Assembly of North Carolina participated, giving to the members of the general assembly much valuable information through demonstrations and discussions provided for their benefit and entertainment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring):

Section 1. That the general assembly does hereby extend this expression of thanks and appreciation to the Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co. and to the Federal and State agencies and companies for the hospitality, efforts and demonstrated concern for continued progress in the fields of forestry management and development and for the many courtesies extended at the forest field training program.

Sec. 2. A copy of this resolution shall be transmitted to each agency and company taking part in the program.

Sec. 3. This resolution shall become effective upon its adoption.

The Communist Bargain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the Woburn Daily Times, an outstanding newspaper in the Fifth District of Massachusetts, which I have the honor to represent, recently ran an editorial which succinctly sums up the latest stratagems of the Soviet Union to ease world tensions. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this editorial:

COLD WAR TACTIC

The Soviet Union has dropped its demand that the United Nations hear its complaint concerning U.S. plane flights over Soviet territory.

The Commies then suggested that the United States might agree to drop its request for U.N. discussion of Hungary and Tibet.

All this would be in the interest of improving Soviet-United States relations.

The comparison between what the U.S.S.R. is giving up and what it would have the United States concede in return evidences again the brazenness of the Red regime.

We are forgiven the flight of the U–2 spy plane if we will absolve the Kremlin of the rape of Hungary and Red China for its overwhelming of Tibet.

The Soviet objective—easing of world tensions and the establishment of better relations with the administration of President Kennedy—is a praiseworthy one.

But what a bargain the Reds offer.

The Constitution and What It Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM V. MOOREHEAD
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. MOOREHEAD of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, next week 12 young Ohioans will come to the Nation's Capital to visit the historic shrines of the city and to witness the operation of the Government in this Federal City. Each has carefully studied the meaning of our constitutional processes and has expressed conclusions in written form. They are the 1961 State winners of the American Legion Essay Contest.

For the first time in the 27 years this contest has been conducted, two of the winners are students of the same high school. I am very pleased that such distinction has been accorded two young people in my congressional district. Their pride in achievement can be shared by their parents, teachers, and the principal of the Marietta, Ohio, High School, Mr. Fred H. Manning. The essays are by Tim Nice, son of Mr. and Mrs. James C. Nice, now in his sophomore year at Marietta High School, and Beth Wolford, a member of the senior class and daughter of Mr. and Mrs. D. M. Wolford.

I should like to call to the attention of the Congress these two award-winning essays. What these young people are saying as they speak for their generation is a refreshing appraisal and appreciation of our constitutional guarantees and the fabric of American society this living document enriches.

THE CONSTITUTION AND WHAT IT MEANS

(By Jim Nice)

"Divine inspiration" englightened the Founding Fathers at the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia, in 1787, and a nation found itself.

The growing pains of this new country pointed to the need for a "more perfect union." This Nation was without government—the empty shell of a loose union. The people had joined together to fight for their independence, but as always happens, they found that war had profoundly altered their lives and their thinking.

This drastic change notwithstanding, America hoped to become a great nation. From a population just twice the size of Los Angeles today, came 55 men whose character, ability, and broad mental attainments caused them forever to remain a most distinguished group. The talk of the people everywhere was the need for a workable plan of government. Though his spelling and English left much to be desired, a New England farmer wrote, "We do not need any Goviner but the Guviner of the universe and under him a states Gineral to consult with the wrest of the united states for the good of the whole."

With similar comments for background, and with many misgivings, these men set forth to accomplish their big task. After 3 months of deliberation, the document was complete—the first written Constitution offered to any nation. The American dream was now beginning to come true. These new principles by which the Nation agreed to govern itself were put into effect, and a way of life that granted freedom to the individual citizen was now being achieved by slow and certain growth. In this present age we are still "trying" this new form of government as it stands the test of our times.

The Constitution is the basis of government by which we, the people of this country, live. The first and fifth amendments, sometimes called the "soul" of the Bill of Rights, give us the freedom to make choices and assure us that we may not be deprived of life, liberty, or property "without due process of law." This integral part of the Constitution shows its significant value to us, and when truly obeyed, promises the accomplishments of justice, and liberty, and peace at home and abroad.

A great power stems from our Constitution. It not only insures my rights as an individual, but provides for the orderly function of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches. This great system, when contrasted with other governments, is like comparing *Old Ironsides* with the *Guerrier*. Under the Constitution, the powers are divided between the State governments and the National Government, thereby creating a Federal system. Clearly defined are the actions each may take.

The Preamble states at the outset that the Constitution is explicitly a "creature of the people." These words are very important ones, for they establish beyond doubt that this document is not of any one faction, party, or group. Our Government belongs to the people, is administered by the people, and exists for the good of the people.

The glory of our system distinguishes it from every other government in the world. With the needle of dauntless courage, our forefathers wove together a governmental fabric for our freedom and protection. To the degree that we today interpret and adhere to the meaning of the Constitution—to that degree will be seams of its fabric hold firm and fast.

OUR CONSTITUTION AND WHAT IT MEANS

(By Beth Wolford)

The Constitution has a different meaning for every generation, every family, and every individual. When our forefathers founded this country and raised it from a land of forest paths and log houses to cobblestone streets, brick homes, and towns, they proved the Constitution was a working form of government. Every generation since then has had to prove the Constitution would work for them also.

What is this document which has meant so much to so many Americans? It is a manuscript now yellowed with age, carefully placed in a glass-covered case in our Nation's Capital, but it is also a living force in our daily lives. It is the Pilgrims crossing the Atlantic Ocean in the Mayflower; the heritage we have received from them; a group of American patriots who "sounded the shot heard 'round the world"; the men who died during the Revolutionary War that we might be free. It was written by the actions of these early Americans, more than by the goose-quill pen of Thomas Jefferson as he sat in a candle-lit room, putting down the ideas of early Americans.

It was made sacred 100 years ago by the blood of brother fighting brother to keep that Union "one Nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Today, in that indivisible Nation, this masterpiece is the symbol of all that is dear to the hearts of Americans.

It is our family sitting in church on Sunday morning, helping with the worship service, planning the activities of the church youth group, attending a summer church camp, and learning to know those from other churches.

It is written in the headlines of our newspapers, the chapters of our books, and letters to Congressmen, telling them of our problems and asking for help in finding the solution.

It is paid for when we fill out the income-tax forms to give a certain amount of our earnings to keep the Government going.

It is spoken in the United Nations headquarters when we oppose a program that would hurt another nation and its people, as well as when we propose a plan beneficial to the whole family of nations.

It is "shot off" with every rocket we send to further our knowledge of outer space and with every plane we send on a trial flight.

It is spoken in Congress and whenever the people gather to talk free from the fear of being arrested or otherwise punished. We can discuss dates, teachers, the President-elect, the answer to segregation, and a better foreign policy.

It is freemen working at the trade of their choice, buying the products they make, selling our own goods, and opening bank accounts to keep our money working.

It is engraved on the hearts of men whenever they hear Lexington, Gettysburg, the Battle of the Bulge, or Heartbreak Ridge.

It is found in the heart of a mother as she holds her infant son in her arms and dreams that he may grow up to be the leader of this country.

Look around you, America, and see what this "piece of yellowed paper" has given you. Then thank God that you were born in America.

The Future Role of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, because of the prevailing interest in the problems and the future of agriculture, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from a talk given by Sam H. Bober, of Newell, S. Dak., at the soil conservation award dinner held in Buffalo, S. Dak., on March 23. These excerpts are taken from the Bober speech as it was reported in the Valley Irrigator, a leading South Dakota weekly newspaper, published in Newell, S. Dak.

Mr. Bober is one of South Dakota's most successful farmers and businessmen. He has devoted a lifetime to studying agricultural problems and needs. Presently and for some years back, Sam Bober serves as an outstanding member of the Federal Farm Credit Board. I believe my colleagues in Congress will be interested in his experienced observations.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOBER DISCUSSES FUTURE ROLE OF AGRICULTURE

The lifestream of a nation is its agriculture. The management of soil is among the oldest of the arts, but none is changing more rapidly than it. We know more about taking care of soils and conserving water than our fathers and grandfathers did; there is much more that we should know.

Agriculture is the business of clothing and feeding humanity. Our immediate business is to furnish 540 million meals for 180 million Americans to eat every day.

At the moment our farms seem too productive, and some of us wish that our Government would stop spending money improving efficiency while we are producing more than we can use, and instead help us in marketing and disposing of the surplus food where there is an urgent need for it in other parts of the world where people go hungry part of the time.

Surpluses are not necessarily an indication that our techniques are always the best. Egypt raises more cotton, Britain more wheat, and Japan more rice per acre than we do.

Our specialty is raising more food and more fiber per man. Research helped us in this, and no other nation has introduced mechanization into agriculture like the United States has. We have substituted capital for labor in the form of labor-saving machinery.

At the moment we have more land than we can use, and some of the unneeded cropland shuold be retired until needed. Our granaries are overstocked with surplus crops, even though our per-acre yields are low. It's because we have a higher percentage of arable land than most countries.

But let's talk about explosions in today's world. Not about nuclear bomb explosions, but about population explosions. At the beginning of this century we had a population of 75 million people in these United States. Now in 1960 we have 180 million people and in 40 years more, barring wars, we are likely to have to feed 320 million people in this country of ours.

Look at the world. In 1830, only 130 years ago, there were a billion people on this planet. In 1935 the world population had increased to 2 billion. Today, in the year of 1961, the population is 3 billion, and in only 5 years more the population of the world will reach 4 billion people. We are increasing at the rate of 2½ million every 10 days. Think of the increased food we will need to produce for the fast expanding population.

Now we use the production from 3 acres per capita. At the rate we are increasing, it is probable that we will have only 1½ acres per capita available in 30 years from now. The surplus food problem is not likely to continue to be a distressing problem for long.

We can fly satellites to the moon, but we cannot control weather. We cannot prevent a cycle of drought any more than the Egyptions could 4,000 years ago, nor could we our own drought cycle in the thirties.

We have a choice of fostering a healthy growing agriculture or stifling it. For the Nation and the individual, it is cheaper and better to be assured of too much, rather than face the risk of too little. The whole problem of our ability to produce in the future rests primarily with our water and land resources, and our ability to use them wisely.

In the combination of research and field experimentation, and group cooperation from folks like you, lies the hope of meeting the Nation's agricultural needs of the future.

Reality Versus the Myth in Monopoly Pricing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEM MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks there has been a great deal said about the electrical antitrust cases. For a frank discussion of what many are really thinking about pricing policies in many industries I commend the "Commentary" from the March 13 issue of the Value Line Investment Survey. It goes far to separate myth from reality.

UNITED STATES VERSUS ITSELF—THE ANTITRUST CONVICTIONS IN THE ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT CASE

On February 6 and 7, 1961 Judge J. Cullen Ganey of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, imposed fines of $1,787,000 on 29 electrical equipment manufacturers, most prominent among which were General Electric and Westinghouse, and sentenced seven executives in the industry to prison for conspiring to violate the antitrust laws against price fixing. Twenty-three others received suspended sentences. The executives sentenced to prison, until then respected senior citizens of their communities and Nation, were thereupon manacled like common felons and led off to jail in full glare of the publicity that passes for journalism these days.

Judge Ganey said, "Before imposing sentence, I want to make certain observations * * * what is really at stake here is the survival of the kind of economy under which America has grown to greatness, the free enterprise system. The conduct of the corporate and individual defendants * * * has flagrantly mocked the image of that economic system of free enterprise which we profess to the country and destroyed the model which we offer today as a free world alternative to State control and eventual dictatorship."

General Electric, although it found itself compelled to plead guilty to some of the indictments as a matter of practical expediency, vigorously and on the whole successfully, disassociated itself and its chief officers and directors from its guilty agents in the lower echelons, and clearly proved that it had honestly tried to enforce its own regulations against price fixing upon the executive heads of its more than 100 departments and 20-odd divisions, which regulations were even more stringent in certain respects than the antitrust laws themselves. (The Government brought no charges against the Westinghouse directors and upper echelon executives.)

The whole country was immediately aroused to a high pitch of moral indignation, sensing as it did, that the very soul of America, its free enterprise system, the bulwark against communism and the only alternative to State control and dictatorship, to use Judge Ganey's words, had been betrayed.

The Attorney General, Mr. Robert F. Kennedy, writing on this case in Life magazine under date of February 24, 1961, said, "Our antitrust laws were written in an attempt to control business monopoly * * * but in * * * earlier trust cases the punishment was usually in the form of fines, and after it was over, business went on as usual. The businessman who participated was not treated as though he had really done anything wrong. He was just following the accepted practices of big business in the 20th century, U.S.A. He was accepted as usual at the country club, he was appointed as usual to be the chairman of the community charity drives * * * more and more often, corruption and dishonesty have been excused because 'everyone does it' * * * Judge Ganey's decision had great impact because it showed that somebody is willing to say 'I am not going to accept this. We can do better.'" In the same tone, Life magazine declared in its editorial columns, "* * * The crooks in the electrical industry have set back the progress of the modern corporation toward public acceptance of its claims to wider social responsibility and a quasi-political role"; and then, in a burst of sadistic exultation, published a picture of one of the condemned executives behind prison bars, his downcast, bald head and spectacled eyes a portrait of shame; and it pilloried the other condemned by publishing their pictures for public recognition.

What is the truth of the matter? Were a few little fellows thrown to the wolves to protect the higher ups? Has America's image of a free economy been betrayed by crooks? What about the laws that were so long breached in 20th-century United States without meaningful penalty, thus ascribing to them the sanction of custom?

Unprejudiced examination of this case will, we think, reveal the following:

(1) The condemned did indeed conspire to violate the law against price fixing.

(2) General Electric did, indeed, make every effort that a big company could make at the top to prevent violation of the antitrust laws in its decentralized subdivisions. Westinghouse also had directives designed to achieve compliance with the antitrust laws.

(3) The method by which businessmen attempt to carry out the purpose of the antitrust law, which is to prevent monopoly, and to do so without creating monopoly, draws such a fine line between legal and illegal price stabilization, or price fixing, as to be impracticable in the workaday world.

(4) The Government and the consumers of this country were not, in any meaningful economic sense, defrauded by being sold goods higher in price than would have been paid had the guilty practices to which the defendants pleaded guilty not been committed.

(5) The free enterprise system, in which prices are free to fluctuate without restraint, which is the system that Judge Ganey says America professes to its people and the model which it holds up as a free world alternative to state control and tyranny, has not existed for a couple of hundred years.

(6) There is a large body of law and a long political and economic tradition that not only permits, but even requires, control over price fluctuations.

(7) Finally, and here is the heart of the problem, the law against price fixing through which the Government attempts to control or prevent monopoly, would if enforced to the letter, actually bring about monopoly.

Let us examine these conclusions one by one:

(1) The condemned did indeed engage in a conspiracy to violate the antitrust law. Their conspiratorial practices were carried on with the sophistication of teenagers and the Government investigators had little trouble getting the evidence on them, cold. No need to discuss this further.

(2) General Electric's top management did indeed make vigorous efforts to prevent such violations as the Government charged. It has, and had, a company regulation (20.5) which specifically prohibited illegal price fixing and the head of the company frequently stressed to subordinates the impor-

tance of observing this regulation. In fact, a number of General Electric executives had, previous to the trial, been demoted for breach of directive 20.5. But General Electric is a company whose greatness was built very largely upon a policy of decentralization of managerial control. Its hundred plus departments enjoy a large measure of autonomy making it difficult for top management to police every detail of each division's business. The remarkable thing about it all from this standpoint is that among the hundreds of executives who might have violated directive 20.5 of the General Electric Co. and the antitrust law of the United States, there were only a handful who could be found indictable.

(8) Business leaders in their effort to abide by the law and also by the intent of the law, which is to prevent monopoly, find themselves compelled to stabilize prices in certain of their markets. Had General Electric's directive 20.5 been followed to the letter and had General Electric and Westinghouse exercised their competitive strength to the full, marginal producers in the electrical equipment industry might have been driven out of existence. The big companies could have cut prices below the costs of their smaller competitors and thus forced them to the wall. Although General Electric and Westinghouse then would have avoided violating section I of the Sherman Act, which prohibits conspiring to fix prices, they would have been guilty of violating section II of the same Act, which makes it a crime to "monopolize or attempt to monopolize." And the latter possibility has and does now appear to be the more imminent.

There is a practical and legal way to set prices in industries where the product is standardized. The industry leader, usually the lowest cost producer, publishes a price list based on his own costs and analysis of the market. Usually the prices are high enough to let the highest cost marginal producer (of significant size) break even. If—in the press for business during cyclical slumps in demand—the marginal producer cut his price, he could be sure that the leader would cut prices also—and still make a profit—so that price cutting would not win the additional sales volume the little fellow desperately needed to absorb his overhead costs. The price cutter would simply get the same share of the market but at a lower price. Under this system of price stabilization or fixing, the industry leader "holds an umbrella" over the marginal producer, and thus protects the small businessman from exploitation and itself from violation of section II of the Sherman Act.

However, this method, although it can legally set a price, cannot effectively divide up the market among competitors who charge identical prices. Where everybody's price is identical and the quality of the product uniform, who is to get what share of the business? Here is where the conspiracy comes in, and in practice has got to come in. It usually works out that definite percentages of the market are allocated to particular companies by the sellers themselves; they make their bids in such a way as to assure the division of the market according to a prearranged agreement. Thus, they deprive the buyers of an opportunity to buy below standard, or fair, price.

This part—the conspiratorial agreement to divide the market—is illegal. But how do you get your share of the business if your price and product are identical with the other fellow's, except through allocation? In actual practice it would be almost impossible to avoid carving up the market. Were the industry leader to take advantage of his lower costs and underprice his competitors, he could increase his volume, lower his unit costs still further, and increase his total profit. Thus, he exercises restraint by pricing at a level above that which would maximize his total profit. Perhaps the most frequently cited example of this pricing policy in action is the automobile industry. As the largest volume, lowest cost producer, General Motors could quite readily force the marginal companies (themselves giants of industry) to the wall and thereby considerably enlarge its already superior profits. An immediate result, of course, would be that the Justice Department would seek to break up GM, a move which the company's management would obviously prefer to avoid. Hence, GM exercises restraint in its pricing policies. Competition in this industry takes the form of quality, styling, accessories, etc., where the size of the manufacturer is not the determining factor.

The advantage that the big producer has over his smaller competitor derives in the first instance from the fact that his actual costs are usually lower. But there is a tax aspect to this problem, too: When the Sherman Act was passed, there were no income taxes on corporations. Today the corporate income tax rate is 52 percent. The big corporation, like General Electric, can sustain a loss in one of its many divisions and offset this loss against the profits of its other divisions, thus reducing its total taxable profit. In that way the U.S. Government assists the big fellow by absorbing half his loss while the little fellow engaged only in one particular business sustains his full loss without offsetting profits from other divisions (which he simply does not have).

Now, why was the presumably legal way of stabilizing prices (by publishing the standard price list of the industry) not used in the heavy electrical equipment markets? For one thing, the dominant factor in the industry, General Electric, has publicly disavowed any intent to exercise price leadership (a stand for which it has been roundly criticized by many executives of its smaller competitiors). General Electric's top management has said, in effect, that its department general managers are not to attempt to "hold an umbrella" over the marginal producers. The company's directive 20.5 is but one manifestation of this attitude. (This directive, and its enforcement, were obviously prompted, too, by the realization that GE is, and long has been, a prime and popular target of the antitrusters.)

As a practical matter, moreover, price leadership in this particular area might well prove impossible. The product mix is far from homogeneous. Posted prices are even more meaningless than those in an automobile showroom. In practice, virtually every item of heavy equipment (as opposed to the many smaller standard items) is sold at a discount from "book." The amount of the discount is quoted in discussions between the manufacturer and the customer (although it will quickly become known, via the grapevine, to other manufacturers and customers). In any case, it would be extremely difficult for GE, or any other company, to meet lower prices immediately on every piece of equipment on which purchase negotiations are in progress. Secondly, the customers for the equipment here referrred to are the Nation's Government-owned and investor-owned utilities—a limited number in comparison to, say, car owners, or even steel buyers. The utility purchasing agents are sophisticated and well informed. Moreover, they are themselves primarily concerned with the prices they pay and, if they grow somewhat lax in this regard, are quickly prodded by their regulatory commissions. Thus, they would be much more likely to press for elimination of the higher prices resulting from price leadership (regardless of the impact on marginal producers) than would the average industrial customer. For these and other reasons, price leadership to "hold the umbrella" over the marginal producer would be very difficult even should GE attempt to exercise it.

Moreover, even if price leadership were possible, we do not believe it would necessarily assure the economic survival of the little fellow. Reason: styling, appearance, extras, etc., have little influence on utilities. If the prices on competitive models are the same, the purchasing agent will buy based on a thorough analysis of the technological advantages, services available, product guarantees, etc. And, in these attributes, the size of the manufacturer is almost as important as are the prices. Thus, stabilized prices would not necessarily assure the small producer of a share of the market as they do in many other industries.

General Electric's corporate policy on these points is quite clear. It believes in free competition and directs its operating managers to exercise its competitive advantages to the full. But, out on the firing line things may look different. For, if an operating manager realized that compliance with policy would force a smaller competitor out of business, would he risk bringing the Justice Department down on GE for violation of section II of the Sherman Act? Moreover, what if the small competitor pointed out his danger and added that his only recourse was an appeal to Washington? We do not imply that this was the case; obviously, the motives of the conspirators were complex and, possibly, conflicting. We simply wish to point out that full compliance with GE's emphatically promulgated corporate policy and with section I of the Sherman Act might well have put the company afoul of section II. Perhaps the latter seemed the more imminent possibility to the operating executives. If so, as explained above, the nature of this industry is such that the only way to "hold the umbrella" was by agreeing (i.e., conspiring) not only to set prices, but to allocate shares of the market.

Despite the conspiracies in the electrical equipment industry, the statistical evidence indicates that the prices of electrical equipment have risen no more—indeed less—than the prices of other equipment in industries where no violations have been charged.

Here, by way of example, are the trends of prices in (a) construction machinery and equipment, (b) metal working machinery and equipment, and (c) electrical machinery and equipment. Prices in the electrical lines went up less than in the others, indicating that the consumer was not disregarded nor the Government defrauded in this market.

On the other hand, consider the violence of the cycle in the electrical equipment industry—a typical "prince or pauper" business, despite the fact, as this chart also shows, that its customers, the electric utilities, have an exceptionally stable sales trend. Were the strong companies to take full advantage of their power to cut prices and survive, the little fellows in the industry, who had less strength and less ability to pass 52 percent of the loss to Uncle Sam, would obviously be forced out of business during the "pauper" period.

Did Judge Ganey in making his observations on the vital issue at stake, namely America's image of a free economy, and did the editors of Life in their denunciation of the "crooks" who have set back the American corporation in its progress toward a more responsible role in social and quasi-political life, take into consideration the fact that a perfectly free price economy, in the Adam Smith sense of the word, has not been in existence for over 200 years? Has our leadership forgotten that America imposed tariffs upon imports long, long ago, for the express purpose of protecting, or putting a floor under, the prices of our manufactures? Are they unaware that we have a law fixing the minimum wage for labor, regardless of supply and demand, and that the present administration, with the assistance of the Attorney General, is trying very hard, and right now, to fix the price higher than before? Is it possible that the editors of Life

are ignorant of the laws to keep up, or raise, the prices of agricultural products, thus defrauding the American public of billions of dollars a year? Has the administration forgotten its avowed purpose of manipulating the short-term interest rate upward while rigging the long-term rate lower?

But hold, you may say. These interventions are Government interventions into the free market. They are sanctioned by law and executed in the public interest. The antitrust laws are designed to control or prevent monopoly precisely because monopolistic control would enable private interests to set prices just as the Government sets prices but without the Government's responsibility for the consumer's interest. Therefore, monopoly and price fixing by private interests cannot be tolerated nor judged on the same basis as price control by Government. Corporations that, to use Life's language, are to progress toward "social and quasi-political responsibility" must have a conscience about these things. They must avoid monopolistic abuses, which means, apparently, that they must permit prices to fluctuate without restraint in the private sectors of the economy.

The first point to recognize here is that because of Government intervention in the markets, especially in such critical sectors as wages, agricultural prices, interest rates, and manufactured goods prices, the free economy that Judge Ganey says America professes to believe in and holds forth as a model to others is a myth. What we mean by a free economy, in reality, is a market economy in which prices are allowed to fluctuate within socially tolerable limits.

What are the socially tolerable limits?

The classical example of free prices that went beyond the socially tolerable limit and also failed to perform their function as a regulator of supply and demand is agriculture, especially during the late twenties and thirties. According to theory, agricultural production should have diminished from 1925 to 1932 because agricultural prices were falling during those years. But wheat, corn, and other agricultural products were not produced in diminishing quantities; they were produced in increasing quantities between 1925 and 1932, not despite falling prices but because of falling prices. The farmer who had debts to pay and an accustomed standard of living to support, worked harder to grow bigger crops in order to compensate for the lower price he was receiving. (The prices he paid for manufactured products, although they too declined during these years, did not fall so rapidly as farm prices, partly because of tariff protection for the manufactured goods.) Now, in time, the lower prices would have liquidated a large portion of the farm population and farm production. Such liquidation would have been in conformity with the law of supply and demand as it expressed itself at the time—and it might have been wise. But it might also have proven unwise in the long run, and besides, the farmer who was about to be liquidated, had no place to go. If he surrendered his farm, he had little prospect of getting a job in the city which was then crowded with unemployed. So the farmers simply refused to allow the mortgage companies to foreclose on their farms. They defied the orders of the court with arms. Their insurrection in 1933 was, in fact, a revolution against constituted authority and an act of open rebellion. Rightly or wrongly, the Government (Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal) decided that in this instance rulings under the law of supply and demand were to be suspended and the liquidation of marginal farm producers enjoined. The socially tolerable limit of price fluctuation had been exceeded. To this day, we have laws which regulate the tolerable limits of price fluctuation in agricultural commodities relative to other products.

We also have laws which set a minimum floor on wage rates. No matter how great the surplus of labor, under law an employer may no longer pay an employee less than the minimum wage. This is a direct contravention of the law of supply and demand and an expression of the conviction that free price fluctuations must be contained within socially tolerable limits.

What would American manufacturers say if tomorrow all tariffs were to be abolished? What would the farmers say if tomorrow price supports on agricultural products were to be removed? What would laboring men say if minimum wage rates were to be abolished? Obviously the question is a reductio ad absurdum. Today nobody really wants prices to fluctuate with perfect freedom.

How then do we meet the problem of determining the socially tolerable limits of price fluctuation in markets other than the labor market and the money market? Tariffs, of course, are an effort to put a floor under the market for some manufactured goods. But that the problem cuts much deeper than can be handled by tariffs alone is proved by the existence in no less than 18 States of laws which compel private industry to recognize price agreements designed for the express purpose of keeping price fluctuations within socially tolerable limits. In over one-third of the States of the Union, a perfectly free price fluctuation is prohibited by law.

During the first 4 years of the New Deal, the NRA was set up for the express purpose of determining fair prices and controlling the socially intolerable fluctuations in prices that might have been brought about by the unfettered play of demand and supply.

For many years thereafter, as the Attorney General attests in the Life article, the efforts of businessmen to stabilize prices, or fix them, if you prefer a harsher word, was sanctioned, or at least condoned, in that the maximum penalty was a slap on the wrist in the form of a fine that did less economic injury to all concerned than the continuation of the violations. Business then went on again, as usual. But the violation was condoned, not because "everybody was doing it". (This is putting the cart before the horse.) Everybody was doing it because it was the only way in which to limit the excessive price fluctuations that nobody wanted.

The heart of the problem is that the antitrust laws, if endorsed to the letter, would have the effect of destroying their own reason for being. General Electric and Westinghouse would, in a relatively short time, become the only competitors in their field. In the case of practically all the major cyclical industries—steel, machinery and equipment, textiles—the entire market would soon be preempted by the strongest company if prices were allowed to fluctuate without control.

The cyclical swings in demand for electrical equipment are extremely wide. When demand falls so low as it does at times in this industry, the economic compulsion, if no price controls are enforced, is to lower the selling price below the cost of production in order to absorb at least a portion of the overhead and general administrative expense that must continue whether the companies are doing a satisfactory volume of business or not. The problem is especially relevant to General Electric, for GE is not one industry but dozens of industries. Some of these industries in fact a majority, make profits in most years. A minority may suffer losses during a cyclical recession. If the loss divisions of General Electric had to operate in a perfectly free price economy, they would drop their prices as low as was necessary to capture the total demand during a cyclical depression. The losses in those divisions would be paid for to the extent of 52 percent by tax rebates on the profitable divisions of the company. The small producer, who had no profitable divisions to absorb the losses sustained in the unprofitable market, would simply have to go out of business. In time, General Electric and Westinghouse would stand alone on the field, the sole survivors, and the giant monopolies that the law had intended to prevent.

Thus, the big fellow in the cyclical industries is on the horns of a dilemma. If he fixes prices or stabilizes them, he may be guilty of conspiracy to violate the antitrust laws. On the other hand, if he observes this section of the law and is governed only by the law of supply and demand, he soon destroys all his competition and emerges as the monopoly power in his field and a violator of section II of the same law. Which horn would Judge Ganey prefer to sit on? Which perch would the Attorney General prefer? Where does the editor of Life think would be the moral seat?

Here, then, is the confusion we actually live in.

In truth, the United States has not been betrayed by crooks, as Life blares, nor has its ideology been subverted, as Judge Ganey charges. Yet the American people are in real danger: their leadership has failed them. It simply has not done its job. Would that it were possible to say merely that the leadership was either hypocritical or ignorant. Were this the truth, the remedy would be clear. Unfortunately, the far more terrifying truth of the matter is that the leadership is probably neither hypocritical nor ignorant, but schizophrenic—that is to say, compulsively determined to believe in a fantasy that is at odds with reality. Naturally, it reacts in blind rage when its dream world is impunged. If the Attorney General truly desires both completely unrestricted price fluctuation and protection of the small businessman, and if the fantasy that America lives in a free price economy is breaking on the rocks of everyday living, before our very eyes, would it not be wiser, instead of striking out in a rage at a few victims of the circumstances, to explore the possibility of writing laws that could govern in reality? Reflective citizens might well say, in the words of the Attorney General, "We will not accept this. We ought to be able to do better."

Keynote Address Delivered at the 1961 Annual State Convention of the South Dakota Young GOP College Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the keynote address delivered at the 1961 annual convention of the South Dakota GOP College Federation, at Huron, S. Dak., on March 25, 1961.

Once in a great while a significant contribution is made in the broad scope and sweep of philosophy, principles, and ideals which in one sense are described as politics but in a broader sense are the great American ideal. Such a contribution was the address by Bob Ruddy, of Aberdeen, a University of South Dakota student, who served as past pres-

ident of the University of South Dakota Young Republican Club of 1959–60.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEYNOTE ADDRESS GIVEN AT 1961 ANNUAL STATE CONVENTION OF SOUTH DAKOTA YOUNG GOP COLLEGE FEDERATION HELD AT HURON, S. DAK., ON MARCH 25, 1961

(Presented by Bob Ruddy of Aberdeen, a University of South Dakota student who served as past president of the University of South Dakota Young Republican Club, in 1959–60 as State chairman of the college federation, in 1960–61 as chairman of region VIII (four Midwestern States) in the national college federation, and who was voted at the recent State convention as recipient of the first annual "Outstanding Young Republican" award presented by the South Dakota College Federation.)

It is significant that we are gathered here today during a period which has a great meaning for all of us. The year 1961 marks an important date in the history of all South Dakotans, for it was 100 years ago that this land in which we live gained the status of a Territory.

Dakota, the wild land, has been conquered. From out of the barren wilderness of the frontier, strong men and women had claimed a piece of land and called it their domain. This was not an easy task. In fact, it was exceedingly difficult.

The problems they faced were legion: harsh winters, hostile Indians, a scarcity of food and water, and the inconveniences and hardships of the Dakota prairies, to name just a few. In addition, they met and solved the ultimate problem that all men who desire to live together in harmony must somehow solve, how to govern themselves.

IN SOUTH DAKOTA POLITICS

Then men and women who accomplished this task were not supermen, but mortal men. As mortal as you or I and with the same traits of greatness and weakness. Nor were they old men, ths eepolitical forefathers. On the contrary, most of them were in their early thirties and some younger still. Yet these men and women blazed a trail in South Dakota politics that I believe should be emulated by us today.

It should be emulated because this State is lacking an important substance, a substance that is lacking now but was present in pioneer days, and—of most consequence at the present time—a substance that is necessary if this State is to keep pace with the rest of the Nation to maintain for this State the one product that it can least afford to lose—youth.

The advance report for the 1960 census shows that, from 1950 to 1960, our State lost 21.6 percent of its population between the ages of 20 and 24, and 22.7 percent of those between 25 and 29. Figures such as these indicate that something is drastically wrong with the health of South Dakota. Young people leave this State because they feel that it has little future. This is wrong.

It is wrong because South Dakota stands on the verge of fulfilling its great promise. It will not be fulfilled, however, until we have restored that missing substance—the substance that will keep the young people here, by demonstrating to them that at least one agency in this State is cognizant of their problems, is interested in them, and will make an all-out effort to realistically solve them.

POLITICAL LEADERSHIP OF YOUNG PEOPLE

That missing substance that we must restore in order to do all of this is the voice and the political leadership of the young people themselves. What we lack in this State is a symbol of hope for the future, an indication of promise and planning that can be demonstrated to others by a forceful, energetic, forward-looking political movement.

Our State discovered, developed, and led by young men and women has seen the pendulum swing to the opposite extreme to such an extent that our youthful viewpoint is rarely expressed, our leadership conspicuous by its absence.

I have been privileged to sit in at times with the leaders of our party. I have watched our State legislators in action. I have examined the various candidates for political office, and always I am bothered by the same questions:

"Where are the energetic young leaders in our State? Why have we seen the pendulum swing the other way? Is our State destined to remain devoid of young leadership? Can we afford to remain this way?"

IF YOU MAKE UP YOUR MIND

The answer is no. It cannot and it will not, but only if you are ready to recognize that the solution to the problem lies within this group. It will not if you make up your mind that it is time the pendulum started to swing back again. The initiative must come from this group, for you are best suited to fill the void that now exists. The initiative must come from this group because every action must have a reaction.

Sometime during the past century—and particularly during the past quarter of a century—the young people of this State let the reins of leadership slip from their hands and we must take up once again those reins so that we will have some influence with the political dynasty of this State.

The initiative must come from this group, because the first move on the downhill slide was made by our age group, so consequently the initial move to start on the road back must also be with our group. As each beginning has an end, each end is also a beginning. This can be the end of one era and the beginning of another.

MY PLEA TO YOU

And so, my fellow students, this is my plea to you. Let us pledge ourselves to restore to the youth of South Dakota the position in State government that it once held, and to which it rightfully belongs.

Let us do this by utilizing once again those qualities that enabled the pioneers of our State to form a territory from a wilderness: leadership, initiative, the courage of their convictions and loyalty to a cause.

To accomplish this purpose, it will be necessary for the college federation to set up a twofold plan of action designed to give strength to our position, for our voice and our leadership will never be recognized unless we speak from strength.

ON BEHALF OF THE PARTY

First, we must step up our activities on behalf of the Republican Party. The past campaign afforded us an opportunity to work for our party, and the response was most gratifying. It was gratifying because we have gained the respect and the gratitude of the senior party, and we can take pride in the fact that we contributed to the Republican victory in this State.

This, however, should not be considered as the end but rather only the beginning. We must be active every year, not just in election years. It was gratifying for another reason, and that is because many of us found that working for a political party is exciting, interesting and educational. In addition to that, it fulfilled a need that we all have—the need to feel that we are doing something to better the society in which we live.

It is upon this basis that I believe we can expand our activities and that, although this year is not an election year, we can continue to seek out means by which we might do our part.

In this area, we should strive to reach a mutual agreement with the Young Republican League as to which projects will be theirs, and which projects will be ours. The keynote should be cooperation and not competition, but we should enter into this agreement with both organizations realistically accepting the fact that we are equals—both dedicated toward the same end.

MUCH EFFORT ON OUR PART

To sit in the councils of the party, and to be accepted by the senior Republicans, will require work and much effort on our part. Our strength will be in proportion to the work we accomplish. We cannot expect to receive the position we desire on a silver platter.

The second part of the plan will be more difficult to accomplish and may take longer because we are sadly lacking in this area. We must educate our fellow students in political philosophy. If our voice is to be heard it must ring with the sound of authority, and authority can only come with knowledge.

The problems that will confront us in our task of educating ourselves will be divided primarily into two groups. You can expect to find some opposition from both our elders and our fellow students.

Unfortunately, we are living in a period when society, and particularly school authorities, have adopted a policy of encouraging coddling rather than maturity—protection rather than stability. Society will not encourage you to speak out, you must take the initiative yourself. We can, however, succeed if we pursue our objective with dignity, thoughtfulness, and honesty.

WE SUFFER LESS

Political apathy is a result of political ignorance. Those that know nothing or understand nothing of political problems care not for political problems. This is a sickness of the body politic that paralyzes all segments of our population, not just the young. In fact, my experience has shown that we suffer less from this malady than do the others.

The tragedy is that we are in the position of being able to do better. What more logical function could our organization have than to stimulate our fellow students in the quest of political knowledge? You will find no greater opportunity for such an undertaking, capitalizing on the atmosphere of learning that surrounds every college campus.

Initiate an informative program that will bring to your members the true principles of our party; discuss political problems from all perspectives; do not hesitate to approach a problem that seems to be controversial; do not hesitate to suggest solutions that differ from those our elders have expressed.

THE CLOAK OF LEADERSHIP

This will take great leadership. You may face disappointment and even ridicule. Success will not come easily, but if you are willing to expend an effort for a cause in which you believe, you will succeed. The cloak of leadership can be tailored to fit anyone who has the desire to wear it. Will you wear this cloak, or will you be content to wear the mass-produced coat of the follower.

Once we have educated ourselves to the problems, we must give body to our solutions. It has been said that "the true object of education should be to train one to think clearly and to act rightly."

Therefore, if we are to follow through this objective, we must meet and discuss—and eventually formulate—a policy that reflects the will of this organization. This task should not be taken lightly, for it can have far-reaching implications.

Today, in our deliberations, we represent the various college Republicans clubs from which we come and yet, in a larger sense, we

represent more than that. We represent the hopes, spirit, and the expectations of all young people.

LIKE A BOAT WITHOUT AN ANCHOR

Do not shrug off these decisions as not concerning you, because, by so doing, you say that young people do not care what course our Government takes. I personally am not willing to believe this is the case, that our generation has no aspirations, believes in no guiding principles, cannot make intelligent decisions, and like a boat without an anchor simply drifts with the tides of time and the waves of events.

I believe that many of us are more aware of the ills that beset our Government than we will admit. I believe that it is much easier to close our eyes to these troubles than to attempt to solve them.

I further believe, however, that you—as well as I—realize this is wrong, that we cannot go on forever with our head buried in the sand, that these problems will not solve themselves, and that we must make an honest attempt to examine them, weigh the alternatives, and select the solution we feel most compatible to our generation.

BORN INTO DEPRESSION

And ours is a generation quite different from all the rest. Many of us were born into depression and raised in war, aware of the fact that our Nation faces a constant crisis. Educated in a world that has changed drastically from that in which our parents and grandparents were raised, our generation will have a different outlook on life.

Today we stand on the threshold of assuming a tremendous responsibility. The responsibility of facing up to, and handling, each new crisis as it arises—and recognizing the fact that what was sufficient in the past may not be adequate in the future.

AS SOUTH DAKOTA'S FUTURE LEADERS

The problems that our generation will be called upon to solve will have long-lasting effects, for we must live with them for many years. As South Dakota's future leaders, it is imperative that you consider long-range solutions. In this day and age solutions built upon expediency many times merely postpone and pile up the problems we must eventually meet and solve.

Our generation will inherit much that is good, in the sense of governmental policies, but also some that is bad. We can profit by the mistakes of the past, but we must be concerned with the future. It is here that our generation will provide the political leadership, the forward thinking, the new ideas, that our State needs from us. Our generation must provide the stimulation for positive action, because it is our generation that will reap the positive results.

All this, however, will not accomplish our purpose of assuring a voice in the councils of our party. For once having strengthened the position of the college federation by our increased education and actual contributions to the party, we must press onward—prepared to fight, if fight we must, for what we believe to be true.

Do not expect to be greeted with open arms by the senior party on all occasions. While the vast majority of them sincerely welcome our participation and our thoughts, there will be those who jealously guard their position and will view us as intruders.

WE SHOULD NOT HESITATE

Nor will our ideas be accepted by the majority of the party at all times, but disagreement within a political party is not unheard of—it is common—and it is not bad, but rather it is healthy. When we disagree with a position taken by the senior party, we should not hesitate to make our disagreement known to them.

Not publicly, if we can to it privately, but we must be active rather than passive. Above all, we must be true at all times to ourselves, for if we fail in this, we have forfeited all rights to call ourselves leaders.

If we have fought and lost, do not become disheartened. At times the decision will be justified because we will not be infallible. However, even when we may feel it is not justified, we must forget our difference and give our wholehearted support to the majority opinion. At this point we must exhibit the loyalty to a cause that is much larger than any one portion of the party.

COOPERATION SHOULD BE EQUAL

To the senior party I would say this: The burden of leadership still lies heavy upon your shoulders, but the spirit of cooperation should be of equal weight. In the past 2 years you have made a noble effort to help our growth, and we are grateful. I say what I say not out of ingratitude, but only because I am concerned for the future greatness of our party in South Dakota.

Do not close your eyes and your minds to our appeals when they come. Do not force us to foresake the State in which we were born, in which we have played, in which we were educated, in which we cherish. Let our voice be heard.

OUR MOST PRESSING PROBLEM

I have deviated somewhat from the general conception of a keynote speech. I did this not because I could not praise our party—for there is much to praise. I did this not because I could not attack the opposition party—for there is much to attack. I did this because I feel that the problem I have just outlined is our most pressing problem, and that it must be solved. It must be solved for the future welfare of the State, and it must be solved by the Republican Party for the future welfare of the party It would have been much easier not to mention these problems, but we must be realistic.

Our party has always been the leader in this State, and I want to make sure that it continues to be so. We will continue to be if we can maintain the political loyalty of our youth. But we must also recognize that South Dakota will soon undergo the political revolution that is now sweeping other States, and that—sooner or later—one party must provide the nest on which the loyalty of the youth of this State will come to rest. It must be the Republican Party.

I cannot accept the argument that our party is not conducive to attracting young people. I am firmly convinced that the basic principles of the Republican Party are those most suited to appeal to young people. All that remains is for us to generate the enthusiasm and for the party to accept our leadership.

This is our greatest challenge * * * to strengthen our party by bringing a new voice and a new spirit into the Republican ranks. The danger to the Republican Party in South Dakota is just as much from within, as it is from without. Our party must be strong inside if it is to withstand the attack on the outside. The new blood and new ideas that you college people represent can be the salvation of our party.

TO A PARTY STRONG

My thoughts are those of a young man about to leave this State, but who some day hopes to return. I want to return to a party as strong then as it is now.

Many of us have labored long and hard to bring the college federation to the position it now holds. We have achieved much of what we set out to achieve, and yet much is left undone. It will be up to you to complete this work.

The future will be up to you. Therefore, strive to build a better college federation in the knowledge that, by so doing, you will build a better party, and ultimately a better State.

A Tribute to Franklin D. Roosevelt, American Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the name of Franklin D. Roosevelt is brought to mind today for two reasons. First, it is the 16th anniversary of his death; and, second, the times are calling forth a demand for statesmanship, a quality for which Franklin D. Roosevelt was justly famed.

Statesmanship is about as rare in this world as a precious diamond. Yet, unlike the diamond, it is essential in the life of a nation. And, again unlike the diamond, it is not consistently appreciated.

In times of tranquillity the statesman is often forsaken by the people. For statesmanlike leadership requires that the people act in unison, and the activity thus evoked is exhausting to everyone concerned.

Yet, as soon as crisis threatens, the people invariably cry out again for statesmanship, and woe betide them if the cry goes unanswered.

At the opening of the present century, our Nation was imperiled by giant industrial trusts and the people called upon Teddy Roosevelt to solve the resulting economic crisis.

Soon afterward, international aggression periled American freedom, and the people called upon Woodrow Wilson to settle that issue for them.

Then came a decade of tranquillity, in which statesmanship was forgotten; and at its close, the Nation stood faced with disaster.

Lack of statesmanship in economic matters had brought us to the brink of economic revolution; Wall Street was in turmoil, millions were unemployed, banks were failing daily and radicals, economic and political, were crying for the head of American free enterprise.

Lack of statesmanship in foreign relations had bred political upheaval in Europe and Asia; democracies were falling right and left and dictatorship was becoming the order of the day.

At this point the American people appealed to Franklin D. Roosevelt, then Governor of New York, to lead them from the swamp of chaos and despair. The issues were momentous: depression at home, aggression abroad, and the ominous threat of national destruction on every hand. But Roosevelt met the tasks before him in the manner of a statesman, with astonishing results.

Mustering the national wealth in behalf of the needy, he provided food for those who were hungry and jobs for the unemployed. Utilizing his knowledge of economic history, he revised the economic framework of the Nation, to bolster and strengthen its capitalist basis with Federal aid and Federal regulation. Critics cried paradox; that the Roosevelt

New Deal would kill off capitalism in America. But instead American capitalism was revived and Roosevelt was vindicated.

In the matter of international relations, Roosevelt again stood forth as a statesman: rallying the support of all the American nations to the common cause; urging the vigilance of the United States; bolstering the Army and Navy, and aiding the valiant British people in their struggle for democratic liberty.

When war came it was violent and terrible, but the Nation, under Roosevelt, was strong enough to meet the foe with a counterattack that carried the day, won the respect of our friends abroad, and established the United States as the leading power on earth.

Such were the exploits of Franklin D. Roosevelt, statesman extraordinary. Faced with two of the greatest crises in American history, he dealt with each in turn and brought his people through to victory. Nothing less than statesmanship could have saved the Nation when he appeared upon the scene. Sensing this, Roosevelt provided what was needed. For so doing, his memory is blessed today in the hearts of millions who worked and fought beneath his banner, and millions more to whom he was merely a name—yet a name symbolic of American statesmanship in action.

Migrant Farm Labor Problems and "Harvest of Shame"—IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is the fourth in a series of articles presented in the public interest by the Palm Beach Post-Times to show the Members some of the progress being made in Florida to solve problems relating to migrant farm labor which were left out of the television presentation "Harvest of Shame."

The omissions of all that has been, and is being done in this field did a great injustice to the Floridians who have given their time and efforts to these problems over the years. It is hoped that by reading these articles and the ones to follow the Members and public will have a better understanding of this important matter:

[From the Palm Beach Post, Feb. 3, 1961]

THREE MILLION IS FAR TOO MANY

("From towns like this throughout Florida and throughout the South, the 2 to 3 million move out on their annual migration, which ends in late November—"Harvest of Shame.")

According to the U.S. Department of Labor, approximately 400,000 different individuals at some time of the year engage in migratory farmwork.

The American Farm Bureau Federation cited figures supplied by the U.S. Department of Agriculture as grossly misleading, if improperly used without explanation, as in this instance.

The figures show the total hired farm labor force varies from 900,000 in winter to 2,800,000 during the late summer. Those apparently were used by CBS.

"The harvest labor force includes hundreds of thousands of local people—children, high school students, retired people, housewives and others who work a few weeks at harvest period, but who are not a permanent part of the farm labor force, and in most cases, are only interested in temporary local employment," the federation said.

In "Farm Labor Market Developments," the U.S. Department of Labor reported 293,000 was the largest number of seasonal farmworkers employed in a 1-month period (July) of 1960.

In May of 1960, the figure was only 114,000.

What about Florida? What portion of those persons worked here?

The figures are not available. But in May of 1956, 32,654 Florida-employed workers signed up for work in the Atlantic Seaboard States following the end of the Florida harvest, the Florida State Employment Service reported.

Of that number, Pompano Beach led seven cities in this area with 4,089. Belle Glade had 4,006 and Fort Pierce 3,448. Pahokee signed up 2,070, Immokalee 2,082 and West Palm Beach 599.

Under the cooperative plan, 14,577 workers agreed to go to New York and 10,629 to Virginia. Maryland obtained 6,604 and North Carolina 5,226 to lead the others.

Such an arrangement, the FSES said, prevents countless hours from being wasted in the search for jobs.

Food for Peace Program in the Congo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the most effective programs for peace through the means of humanitarian assistance is that of the food for peace program under the directorship of George McGovern. It is with pleasure that I call attention to this agency's most needed efforts to raise the minimum nutritional standards of the starving people of the Congo, and I ask unanimous consent that an article describing this program entitled "Food To Save 300,000 Sent Congo by United States" in the April 10, Washington Post be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOOD TO SAVE 300,000 SENT CONGO BY UNITED STATES

The chairman of the food-for-peace program said today the United States has shipped enough food into the Congo to save 300,000 people from starvation for a year.

George McGovern said that, if need be, his agency stands ready to make additional shipments available.

"There are about 300,000 people in the Congo who are confronted with acute hunger and we're trying to gear our shipments to feed that many people at minimum nutritional standards," McGovern declared.

The director, appearing on a New York State TV program with Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York, said Russia and Red China are far behind the United States in the shipment of food to the hungry nations of the world.

McGovern said the Soviets, with food production problems and Communist China, with "a very acute food famine," are physically unable to compete with the United States in the field.

He said that as long as there is hunger in the world and as long as the American people have the capacity to assist, "I'm convinced we will have a food-for-peace program."

McGovern said operations are conducted in such a way that shipments do not compete with the flow of commodities that would normally be handled in commercial channels.

Contributions to Sgt. Alvin C. York To Erase Income Tax Owed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, there follows a fine letter from Mr. Melvin T. Weakley, of Dyersburg, Tenn., and an editorial, which are self-explanatory. I think all of these concerned in this matter have certainly done a wonderful job. The letter and editorial follow:

DYERSBURG, TENN., *April 6, 1961.*

Hon. ROBERT A. EVERETT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ROBERT: As you probably know, Jere Cooper Dyersburg Post No. 30, American Legion, Department of Tennessee, originated the now apparently successful drive to get Congressional Medal of Honor Winner Alvin York's alleged income tax liability compromised and paid through public subscription.

Sometime prior to the department convention here last June, our post adopted a resolution, which was subsequently adopted at a district meeting and finally adopted as a department resolution at the June 1960, convention. After that, our post commander and other local officials visited Sergeant York on several occasions, contacted Representative JOE EVINS for assistance in procuring a compromise settlement of the alleged tax liability and raised over $2,000 by public subscription long before the compromise settlement was finally worked out and the national fund drive started.

In the March 30, 1961, issue of our Dyersburg Daily State Gazette, Editor Russell M. D. Bruce, World War I veteran and longtime member of the Dyersburg post, published an editorial recognizing the efforts of our post. Having been a member of this local post since the close of World War II and one of its past commanders, I felt that you would be glad to see that a copy of the editorial mentioned, which is enclosed herewith, is inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Our entire post membership will greatly appreciate your doing this for our post and we would like to have you send us a copy after you get it put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely yours,

MELVIN T. WEAKLEY.

[From the Daily State Gazette, Mar. 30, 1961]

BIGGEST CONTRIBUTION

Members of Jere Cooper Dyersburg Post No. 30 of the American Legion must feel very proud of the manner in which the

Nation is responding to the move to raise money to pay off the income tax obligation of Sgt. Alvin York, America's greatest hero in World War I.

Among the stirring moments devoted to the fundraising campaign was the lengthy time given to it Sunday night by Ed Sullivan at the outset of his weekly Sunday evening program.

For years the Internal Revenue Service had dogged York in trying to collect the tax which it was claimed he owed from income on the motion picture, "Sgt. Alvin York," which starred Gary Cooper.

York did not have the money to pay. He had given away practically all of the movie earnings to build schools in his beloved east Tennessee rural country. He had little property left and less income.

For years the efforts of the Internal Revenue Service to collect went on, while the World War I hero, whose outstanding feat, despite the fact that he was a conscientious objector, still amazes the world, grew old and sickened.

Several months ago the Dyersburg post of the American Legion conceived the idea of turning to loyal and patriotic Americans to collect the money and pay off the obligation.

They moved slowly, but succeeded in getting information about their undertaking spread far enough to receive donations from more than half the States of the Union and three foreign countries.

They succeeded in having their fundraising resolution adopted by the district and then the State Department of the Legion while news of their gallant efforts spread across the country and caught the fancy of those who had not forgotten York and those who seemed never to have heard of him despite his outstanding heroic accomplishment.

Finally success was achieved in having the income tax obligation reduced to $25,000, and by that time the idea which originated in Dyersburg was taken over at Washington by national leaders in the Congress.

Dyersburg post tossed in the mite which it had collected to start the movement. It amounted to almost 10 percent of the total, but the biggest local contribution was awakening the Nation to a neglected obligation.

Five Thousand Additional Industrial Jobs Target of Greater Wilkes-Barre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the most gratifying and highly optimistic news story from the New York Times of Sunday, March 26, 1961, which reports on the highly successful industrial fund drive recently carried out in my congressional district of the Greater Wilkes-Barre area where the target of $1.5 million was exceeded by over $200,000. It indeed gives me a great deal of personal pleasure and satisfaction to insert this news story written for the Times by Mr. William G. Weart.

The indicated news story follows:

GIFTS BRINGS JOBS IN WILKES-BARRE—1.7 MILLION IS CONTRIBUTED IN LATEST SELF-HELP DRIVE OF DEPRESSED REGION

(By William G. Weart)

WILKES-BARRE, PA., March 25.—Once again the Wyoming Valley, center of a depressed anthracite area of northeastern Pennsylvania, is tugging at its own bootstraps.

With $1,703,000 raised in the midst of the recession and the prospect of Federal aid, the Greater Wilkes-Barre area has embarked on a new era of self-help. This time it is after 5,000 additional industrial jobs.

The area, frequently at the top of the Nation's list of economically distressed sections, knows the value of such hometown effort. In the last decade, with $2,088,000 contributed to previous campaigns, the Greater Wilkes-Barre industrial funds have obtained land and buildings valued at $9,375,000, created 8,000 jobs and picked up 6,000 others in service and retail trades.

But even this success, before last year, had not been sufficient to keep pace with the loss of employment arising from the closings of collieries and strip mines. The scars of these enterprises dot the countryside.

"We reached the break-even point in 1960," said Samuel M. Wolfe Jr., chairman of the industrial development committee of the Greater Wilkes-Barre Chamber of Commerce.

"Twelve years ago there were 30,000 miners in the Wyoming Valley," he recalled. "Now there are less than 900 and mining has become just a part of an economy that is growing more diversified each year."

The goal of the 1961 industrial fund campaign, which is to continue for 3 years, had been $1,500,000. Last week it was announced that pledges solicited from labor and industry had already surpassed that by $203,000.

Previous campaigns had been limited to big contributions, but the latest appeal was communitywide, with labor leaders taking a prominent role. Through payroll deduction workers contributed $331,000 "to get jobs for unemployed relatives, friends and neighbors."

To date the industrial funds have been directly responsible for the establishment or expansion of 30 industries. They attract new industries by building shells and providing financial aid in other ways.

Generally, the funds supply 20 percent of the initial cost and the Pennsylvania Industrial Development Corporation 30 percent, at 2.5 percent interest. Bankers provide the balance in 6 percent loans.

Similar self-help programs are operating throughout the 10-county anthracite region. However, according to Frank W. Earnest, Jr., executive vice president of the chamber, the Wilkes-Barre funds "are unique in that all contributions are outright gifts."

Most business and industrial leaders of the hard coal region are against "handouts" from the Federal Government.

"We're not in favor of giveaway programs," Mr. Earnest observed. "In the Federal program we'd like to be able to borrow another part of the money we need to go along with our own."

As a whole, the anthracite area wants Federal aid in a form that will help it solve its own problems. The Federal Government, it is felt, can help with highways, industrial development loans, urban funds, defense contracts, and decentralization of government.

The population of Luzerne County, of which Wilkes-Barre is the seat, has declined 100,000 to 348,000, because of the migration of surplus workers. Hundred of young job hunters, especially women, have gone to Washington for secretarial and clerical employment.

Decentralization of government, it is claimed, "would stop this migration, and would be of benefit to national defense in an emergency."

Unemployment in the Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton labor market, which takes in most of Luzerne County, totals 17,958, or 14.9 percent of the total labor force. About three out of every four job seekers, are men. Of the total, approximately 58 percent are skilled or semiskilled.

VA Domiciliary Facility for Boston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my statement in support of my bill H.R. 694, to provide for the establishment of a VA domiciliary facility in the vicinity of Boston, Mass., in connection with my appearance before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee on April 10, 1961:

STATEMENT OF HON. THOMAS J. LANE, OF MASSACHUSETTS, IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 694, TO PROVIDE FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION DOMICILIARY FACILITY IN THE VICINITY OF BOSTON, MASS., BEFORE THE HOUSE VETERANS' AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, APRIL 10, 1961

Mr. Chairman, in proposing "the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility in the vicinity of Boston, Mass., and to operate and maintain a convalescent and rehabilitation hospital of not less than 1,000-bed capacity at such facility." I am concerned with the average age of our veterans, and particularly those of World War I.

In meeting their needs, we shall have the facilities in being, to provide for the veterans of World War II, and Korea, when they in turn reach the age where some of them will require the services of "an old soldiers' home" and convalescent care.

The increasing life span of our population, accompanied by the steady increase in the number of private nursing homes to meet the special needs of the aging, is a fact of modern life that we cannot ignore.

Ever since World War I, the Government of the United States has recognized its responsibility to provide medical and surgical care for veterans whose disabilities are a direct, or indirect result of their military service.

Apart from the small number who are the victims of an incurable mental breakdown, it was taken for granted that most veterans, after medical or surgical treatment, would return to their families, their jobs and to participation in the general life of the community.

But, the more than 2 million surviving veterans of World War I, whose average age is between 67 and 68, confront us with a new problem. A few of them, without families and dependent upon public assist-

ages, are living a lonely and threadbare existence in "skid row" lodging houses. A larger number have reached the stage of physical deterioration requiring the care that their families cannot provide for them. This is a problem that will become more urgent month by month.

Mr. Sumner G. Whittier, the previous Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, in a letter to me dated December 21, 1960, replying to my suggestion that more beds be made available for veterans in Massachusetts, made the following comment:

"I would rather not use the phrase 'long term' because it does not quite describe the two basic types of veterans: Those needing hospital or medical care; and those needing only nursing home care. This becomes quite a complicated problem with many ramifications. The States are attempting to come to grips with it; so is the VA. And although the VA would prefer to maintain as its primary aim, the hospital program, next year the Committee on Veterans' Affairs will consider a new program involving intermediate care for veterans which will be a step in the right direction. VA has worked out such a program and had I stayed as Administrator, I would have presented it to Congress. Whether I remain or not, the program will be carefully reviewed because it is a matter in which OLIN TEAGUE has a deep interest.

"Indeed the committee staff and VA staff people here have been working together on this."

There seems to be general agreement that we must work out a new program to provide for veterans who need "long term" or convalescent care, as distinguished from the conventional hospital and medical care.

As concerns the aging veteran, he frequently needs both domiciliary and convalescent care.

The Veterans' Administration has no domiciliary beds in the whole six-State New England area. It is not an adequate excuse to point out that State soldiers' homes are maintained in four of these six States. Such an argument is an attempt to shift the Federal Government's responsibility over to the States.

Massachusetts, for instance, has two veterans' hospitals of its own, at the State (soldiers') homes in Chelsea and Holyoke. They can only accommodate a limited number of applicants. The one at Chelsea always has a waiting list.

This is so because the Federal Government is not fulfilling its obligations to the aging veterans of World War I. They feel, with good cause, that they are second-class veterans in the eyes of their own Government, insofar as entitlement to benefits is concerned. There was no GI bill of rights for them. To compensate for this lack, they believe that the Government should provide care for those of their comrades who cannot look after themselves.

As of June 30, 1959, the Veterans' Administration had 17,395 operating beds for domiciliary care, but not one of them was available within the New England area with its large population of veterans.

With a clearly expanding need for this type of service, top priority should be given to the establishment of a VA domiciliary facility and to operate and maintain a convalescent and rehabilitation hospital of not less than 1,000-bed capacity at such facility, in the vicinity of Boston, Mass.

H.R. 694, the bill I have introduced for this purpose, will authorize and direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to establish such a facility.

Migrant Farm Labor Problems and "Harvest of Shame"—V

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is the fifth in a series of articles presented in the public interest by the Palm Beach Post-Times to show the Members some of the progress being made in Florida to solve problems relating to migrant farm labor which were left out of the television presentation "Harvest of Shame." The omissions of all that has been, and is being done in this field did a great injustice to the Floridians who have given their time and efforts to these problems over the years. It is hoped that by reading these articles and the ones to follow the Members and public will have a better understanding of this important matter:

[From the Palm Beach Post, Feb. 3, 1961]

ONE HUNDRED DOLLARS A WEEK—
THE KING STORY

"Aleen King, I saw your children yesterday at the Okeechobee Camp. Why don't you put them in the nursery?"

"I don't have the money to pay for it."

"How much does it cost to put them in?"

"Eighty-five cents."

"Eighty-five cents?"

"That's right."

"Tell me, what time did you come out to the field this morning?"

"Six o'clock."

"What time will you get home?"

"About 3:30 to 4."

"From 6 this morning to 4 o'clock this afternoon?"

"That's right."

"How much did you earn?"

"A dollar."

"One dollar?"

"That's right, $1."

"Is that because the beans were of poor quality?"

"That's right."

"How much money does food cost you today?"

"About $2."

"Aleen, how old are you?"

"Twenty-nine."

"How many children do you have?"

"Fourteen."

"Hold old were you when you first started working in the fields?"

"Eight."

"You've been working 21 years in the fields?"

"That's right."

"Aleen, do you ever expect to be able to get out of this work?"

"No sir."—"Harvest of Shame."

As this story of abject, hopeless poverty unfolded before the cameras of CBS, Aleen King's husband, Will King, went about his customary duties as a laborer in a regular weekly job in the Glades.

His regular weekly salary is $83.40.

This would still be a small amount for 14 children, even after adding Aleen's wages, but the truth of the matter is that there are only seven living King children. Seven are dead, with twins having been stillborn.

Two different committees who have investigated some of the scenes in "Harvest of Shame" have singled out this interview as an excellent example of how much misinformation can be implied by leaving out highly pertinent facts.

Members of the Belle Glade Chamber of Commerce committee pointed out that bean pickers just don't get out into the fields at 6:00 in the morning.

"They just don't start picking until after the beans have dried in the sun," Urban Felsing, committee chairman, said.

"There has never been a time when bean pickers made only $1 a day in this area," another member said.

The committee statement of migrant earnings is supported by the American Farm Bureau Federation which says: "The minimum rate for picking beans in the area is 60 cents a hamper."

And most workers have little difficulty in picking two hampers an hour, according to the federation.

A committee of the Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association, headed by Ruth S. Wedgworth, reported detailed facts of King's employment and of the number of King children to Senator SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, of Florida, and added this paragraph:

"Lest it be alleged that the deceased children were the victims of inadequate medical care due to the 'financial plight' of this family, the record shows that in 1958, the county welfare agency in West Palm Beach paid $943.30 to St. Mary's Hospital for the care of Katherine King (still living), and additionally, over $1,000 in hospital and medical bills have been written off by the local hospital and doctors at Belle Glade in connection with medical treatment afforded the King family over the last several years."

Day-care nurseries giving supervision, a meal and snacks are available to migrants at all large camps, and none charge as much as 85 cents per day.

Although accurate records are not available, it appeared obvious from the findings of the two committees that when the King family heads north each year, they will be leaving a 4- or 5-month period in which the family income has been considerably higher than $100 per week.

Kennedy's Tax Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, will President Kennedy's tax proposals, now awaited by the Congress, offer safeguards against Government's abuse of our tax system, as well as individual abuse? Here is an interesting article by David Lawrence, which appeared this morning in the New York Herald Tribune:

TODAY IN NATIONAL AFFAIRS—KENNEDY'S TAX MESSAGE MAY CHANGE IMAGE OF HIM

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, April 11.—Within a few days the American people will get for the first time some basic information which will enable them to begin to make up their minds whether or not they like their new President.

For what has happened thus far hasn't realy been decisive. It doesn't matter much whether the Kennedy household hires a French chef or whether the Peace Corps is going to convert native Africans to civilization. What does matter is whether the Federal Government is going to collect more tax money out of the worker's take-home pay.

The President is planning to send his tax message to Congress next week. It has been delayed for unexplained reasons, though it is widely suspected that the drafts of the message proposed by the President's "task forces" and advisers—the "theoretical" boys—have run into some penetrating criticism from Members of Congress—the "practical" boys.

It's always wise to have a lot of idea men around. Perhaps, however, the comment of Prime Minister Macmillan in a speech in Britain not long ago apropos of the Socialist Labor Party is worth repeating as applicable to the current situation in this country. Mr. Macmillan said the Socialists have had some "original and sound ideas, but the trouble is that some of the ideas that are original are not sound and some of the sound ideas are not original."

A COMPLICATED AFFAIR

Tax rates and regulations are at present a complicated affair that cannot be defended as either equitable or productive of adequate tax revenues. There isn't, to be sure, any tax system that will yield enough revenue for the "spenders." But the important fact today about new taxes is not whether they are going to be made more equitable as between different classes of taxpayers, but whether forthcoming changes will disrupt the economic stability of the country for a long time to come. Far from being a cure for recession, tax changes can prolong a recession by producing a disequilibrium in the economy.

The average citizen will be affected in many ways and particularly in his purchasing power. It seems ironical that, with all the talk about increasing consumer power to buy, the Government should be considering a tax program that will curtail incomes for many people and many businesses.

Take, for instance, the Social Security taxes which affect almost everybody. Some will go up in a few months, and some will be further increased at the end of the next year. If Congress goes ahead with pension changes and medical care for the aged, the Social Security taxes on the whole program will go up by nearly 33 percent on a person who makes a little less than $90 a week. Thus, the man who earns $4,800 a year or more now pays $144 a year in Social Security taxes, but the amount the Federal Government will take from him will go up to $193.75. This means that the employer and the employee together will pay nearly $100 a year more than they do now. This may subtract billions of dollars in purchasing power.

MORE REDTAPE

Perhaps the most irritating change is coming in the plan to withhold taxes on interest and dividends at the source. Low-income persons, especially retired people who do not have much income, will find their regular monthly stipend decreased. Also, if the companies have withheld more than later will be found due in taxes on certain individuals, a lot of redtape and plenty of time will be necessary before the money improperly collected will be refunded. Likewise, this means more trouble and expense for the businesses concerned. It is not clear as yet whether this procedure will apply to interest on savings accounts, but it does mean a lot more work without recompense.

There's another item that will cause much controversy. It is the proposal to remove the limited tax credit on dividends. The argument against full taxation of dividends is that the citizen is taxed doubly if he puts his money in a corporation but not if it is invested in a partnership or a proprietorship. The argument being made here in favor of it is that double taxation is a myth.

Another plan of the administration calls for an increase in certain taxes which will add to the cost of tires, tubes and the like. This isn't going to help business, either.

"HAVENS" NEED CORRECTION

There are, to be sure, some "tax havens" that need correction, such as those enjoyed abroad by individuals who stay there for relatively brief intervals and get certain benefits anyway. Also, there is need to eliminate abuses in what is defined as "ordinary and necessary expenses" in business. But such a reform process tends to upset many established practices that have long been considered legitimate and equitable but which the Government, in its zest for more tax collections, feels it will have to modify.

All this adds up to painful change—an impact on the economy which may not be felt for some months but would appear to be inevitable.

Once the tax message of the President is sent to Congress, it will be interesting to see what happens to the popularity curve of the President in the Gallup poll.

FBI Figures Refute High Crime Rate Charge in Luzerne County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsstory from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of Tuesday, March 21, 1961, the figures in which refute the charge made by a newspaper columnist in New York City that my congressional district has a high rate of crime. It indeed gives me great pleasure to set the record straight on this most vital subject. I wish to compliment Mr. Herman Otto, director, Wilkes College Community Research Center, Wilkes-Barre, for the thorough manner in which he compiled this report.

The indicated news story follows:

VALLEY IS NOT BANDIT RIDDEN—FBI FIGURES SHOW LOW CRIME RATE

Despite the below-the-belt swing taken at greater Wilkes-Barre recently by a New York columnist, the area ranks third lowest in total crime offenses compared with 182 metropolitan areas in the United States, according to a comprehensive report based on authentic figures made public today by Community Research Center of Wilkes College. All data in the report have been extracted from Uniform Crime Reports issued September 16, 1960, by Federal Bureau of Investigation, according to Herman Otto, director, Wilkes College Community Research Center.

Mr. Otto revealed the center's report was compiled to refute a statement made by Victor Riesel, columnist for the New York Mirror, who in his column of February 20, carrying a Wilkes-Barre dateline, wrote: "If you go east by northeast into this corner of Pennsylvania, you roll into some sectors tougher than the bandit-ridden hills of Sicily."

The community research report is based upon surveys by some 7,000 law enforcement agencies throughout the country who report regularly to Federal Bureau of Investigation. These reports, begun 30 years ago, have been constantly refined and improved. They are recognized as the most complete, uniform, and reliable crime statistics available on a nationwide basis.

The purpose of the center's analysis made from the FBI report is to compare the rate of incidence of crime in the Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton area with other standard metropolitan areas of the United States, of 14 Northeastern States and with Pennsylvania.

COMPARES FAVORABLY

Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton's relative position as to the rate of incidence of crime per 100,000 population speaks very favorable for itself.

Compared with 182 metropolitan areas, it is third lowest in total offenses. Compared with 51 standard metropolitan areas in Northeastern United States, it is third lowest in total offenses; compared with 12 standard metropolitan areas in Pennsylvania, it is lowest in total offenses.

Pennsylvania cities used for comparable analysis include Allentown, Bethlehem, Easton, Altoona, Erie, Harrisburg, Johnstown, Lancaster, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Reading, Scranton, Wilkes-Barre, Hazleton, and York.

Principal cities in the following States are included in the report: Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, New Jersey, New York, Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Ohio. Total figures of the entire United States were also used, but were not broken down into specific areas.

Compared with 182 metropolitan areas of the United States, the Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton area ties for lowest in murder and nonnegligent manslaughter; is 43d lowest in forcible rape; 2d lowest in robbery; 16th lowest in aggravated assault; 4th lowest in burglary; 9th lowest in larceny; and 6th lowest in auto theft.

Compared with 12 standard metropolitan areas in Pennsylvania, the immediate area is lowest in total offenses; lowest in murder and nonnegligent manslaughter; lowest in robbery, fourth lowest in aggravated assault; lowest in burglary; fifth lowest in larcency of $50 or over, and third lowest in auto theft.

LOWEST IN REGION

Compared to Scranton's 1960 population of 232,702, Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton's population of 345,952 shows 296.6 per 100,000 in total offenses as opposed to Scranton's 453.4; Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton's 344.4; Reading's 413.5, and Lancaster's 321.7.

It is interesting to note that Atlantic City with a 1960 population of 157,139 shows 1,521.6 total offenses per 100,000 population as compared with 1,304.7 total offenses for New York City with a 1960 population of 10,545,360; and 927.4 total offenses per 100,000 population for Philadelphia with a population of 4,289,194.

As Wilkes-Barre and the Wyoming Valley have endeavored to develop a new economy based upon multiple industries, the need for research and planning have become ever more essential. Each successive effort for community redevelopment has created a greater awareness of the need for facts and figures. In consequence, Wilkes College and other agencies have been called upon to make a number of isolated studies. These studies have served a limited purpose and then have become useless because no person or office has been responsible for the continued gathering and reporting of significant facts.

Because of this situation, Wilkes College organized and developed the Community Research Center, located in Parrish Hall and supported partially from funds of the Ford Foundation. The foundation also supports

in like manner the Institute of Municipal Government and the Labor-Management-Citizens Committee, all three functioning outside the specific Wilkes College area.

The purposes of the research center are to coordinate studies of community problems; to assure continuity of studies and to make special studies for public and private groups.

Migrant Farm Labor Problems and "Harvest of Shame"—VI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is the sixth in a series of articles presented in the public interest by the Palm Beach Post-Times to show the Members some of the progress being made in Florida to solve problems relating to migrant farm labor which were left out of the television presentation "Harvest of Shame." The omissions of all that has been, and is being done in this field did a great injustice to the Floridians who have given their time and efforts to these problems over the years. It is hoped that by reading these articles and the ones to follow the Members and public will have a better understanding of this important matter.

[From the Palm Beach Post, Feb. 8, 1961]

SOME MIGRANTS ARE CAPITALISTS

"Some have tried to leave the endless migrant stream."

"I'd like to get on a farm somewhere out away from so many people, where they could attend one church and be interested mostly in one school. In that way, I think they'd all be better satisfied."

"Mr. Parson, do you think this will ever happen?"

"Not at the rate I am going now, no."

"Aleen, do you ever expect to be able to get out of this kind of work?"

"No, sir."—"Harvest of Shame."

In Belle Glade, members of Everglades Progressive Citizens Inc., are looking forward to a good year.

W. C. Taylor, who founded the organization in 1954—largely in behalf of migrants—points with pride to its accomplishments during the 6 years as evidence the community is doing something about its problems.

The group began operation with 13 members, who put up $20 each and agreed to contribute at least $10 per month.

Now the number has grown to 244. The number includes 49 stockholders who were migrants at the time of the telecast.

And 26 still are in the migrant stream, Taylor said after a study of his records.

The corporation pays regular dividends to its stockholders. The story of its success is an amazing one.

Taylor's group recently bought a 15-acre plot on Avenue E for $50,000 and plans to create an FHA housing project of 24 homes. The corporation posted $5,000, and the FHA office has stamped its approval on the work, subject to the city's completion of drainage and sewage plans.

The project can grow, Taylor pointed out, because there is space for 65 homes, and the area is suitable for 12 new places of business.

The corporation has been recognized by lending institutions as qualified for construction work, and it regularly bids against older contracting firms. Right now it has two homes for school teachers under construction and plans to start two others soon.

W. L. Clark is in charge of construction.

He is one of many former migrant workers in the area who have emerged successfully from the stream.

Questioned at the scene of a job, Clark commented with assurance, "You can get out of the stream if you want to."

He was supervising construction of apartments over the Citizens' Service Station at Seventh Street and Avenue E.

The corporation invested $15,000 last year to buy the land and build the station, which also includes a garage.

The station is managed by the corporation president, Ulysses Kerr.

Like Clark, he is a former migrant. He got out of the stream in 1952.

Former migrants are easy to find in the corporation. The board of directors includes seven.

Taylor, a funeral home operator, said the corporation began its investments in 1957 by building the Cozy Queen Diner at Seventh Street and Avenue East at a cost of $9,000.

In 1958, he said, $32,000 went into an eight-unit CBS apartment building at 514 Seventh Street, mostly for permanent Belle Glade residents. These now rent for $14.75 per week.

How did the group come into existence?

As a businessman, Taylor said, he cosigned notes for some migrants, and a few of them defaulted.

"They were not being dishonest," he said. "It was just that they had no education in money matters. They were good people."

But as a result of that, he said, he called the original group together to see if something could be done for their mutual benefit.

"We finally agreed to put up $20 each and contribute $10 a month into a fund from which we could borrow," he continued.

"Many of them at first said they couldn't do it because they didn't make enough money. But we drew up lists of our income and wrote down just where all of the money was spent. From that, we determined just where money was being wasted and what could be done to make the plan possible."

The group was in conference for 5 hours, Taylor said, and he found many migrants had obligated themselves to pay 25 percent interest for the privilege of borrowing money.

Chuckling, Taylor recalled a telling sales pitch he gave the original group to convince them of the wisdom of the plan.

"My daughter drew a picture of some telephone wires filled with birds," he said. "Other birds were flying around looking for a place to land. I asked the group where they thought they were going to land if they didn't start saving."

The plan worked so well, Taylor said, that it was possible to incorporate for $20,000 after 2 years. New Citizens is incorporated for $75,000 and planning to enlarge that figure as soon as the housing project details have been ironed out.

The corporation has been paying 5 percent dividends.

Taylor's group, anxious for the welfare of the migrants, sponsors an educational program for them to show it is possible to get out of the stream if they so desire.

The corporation has found jobs for some migrants, Taylor said, but has found that many other migrants have accepted their life and show no desire to get out of it.

The funeral director is a native Floridian. He appears much younger than his 53 years. Active in scouting, he also is a deacon in the Baptist Church and teaches Sunday school.

With a desire to be a funeral director, he went to Palm Beach County and worked as a cane cutter to earn money for his education.

"It was while I was working in the fields that I learned I'd have to serve a 3-year apprenticeship with a funeral director before I could go to embalming school," he said.

Citizens contains 10 of the original 13 members.

"Only one dropped out," Taylor said. "Two others moved away."

Taylor himself hasn't taken any money for his work, he said, and his wife also worked years for the corporation. Now she is the secretary and draws $35 per month.

He now is business manager and director of the corporation.

Active assistance is provided by President Kerr, Treasurer Haywood Campbell, Secretary Willie M. White, Director Charles Butts, and F. Malcolm Cunningham, legal adviser.

St. Louis Globe-Democrat Calls for Return to Real Issue in Aid-to-Education Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in its issue of March 27, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat pointed out in an editorial, "Federal Aid—Back to the Issues," that the interest of the Congress and the people of this country has strayed from the truly basic questions involved in the controversy over Federal aid to education. As the editorial points out:

It would be tragic if the main issues were lost sight of in the smoke of battle over loans or grants to private schools.

I should like to enter this editorial into the RECORD at this point and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

FEDERAL AID—BACK TO THE ISSUES

Ever since Catholic spokesmen asked for Federal loans for private and parochial schools, the matter of Federal "aid" to education has been bogged down on a side issue. The crux of this matter is not whether private schools should get Federal "aid"—but whether any school districts need it, or should accept it.

To get the debate back on the tracks, the Globe-Democrat would like to point out that the main objections to so-called Federal aid are these:

First. Federal subsidies will lead to Federal control in education as in any other field.

Second. The States and local school districts have been meeting their educational needs with flying colors.

Third. Federal "aid" is a misnomer, since every dime kicked back to local taxpayers must be taken from them in the first place by Washington.

These are the important issues in the debate over Federal "aid." They are the reasons why the proposal will be defeated, we believe, just as it has been every other time it was proposed.

When Washington helps pay teachers' salaries, or helps build local schools, it will say who qualifies, and how. In fact, the bill already lays the groundwork for Federal regulation when it set forth the formula for distribution of funds.

When Washington dictates how the pie will be cut, it is already sticking its foot in the door of the public schools.

Let no citizen, or schoolteacher, be misled on this point. When the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare starts handing out funds, it won't be long until it lays down detailed rules on who gets the money, how it will be spent and why.

Ample facts and figures show that the American people, through their State governments and local school districts, are already meeting the challenge. In the last 10 years they have tripled the amounts spent on public grade schools and high schools.

This sum has gone up from about $5,800 million a year in 1949–50 to $15,500 million in 1959–60. This, of course, is almost seven times as much as the $2,300 million spent in 1930.

In the last 10 years, the number of public school classrooms has increased 60 percent.

Spending has increased far faster than the increase in school population. In the past 30 years, school enrollment climbed 42 percent, but spending on schools rose 571 percent.

Nor does this mean that a few States are meeting their school obligations but others can't.

Just a few years ago, the White House Conference on Education candidly conceded that no State was too poor to provide schools for its children. It conceded, however, that taxpayers in some States were not willing to make the effort.

Finally, it is important to point out that no one gets something for nothing from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Its Federal "aid" is simply Federal taxes, collected locally and returned minus Health, Education, and Welfare's handling charge.

It would be tragic if the main issues were lost sight of in the smoke of battle over loans or grants to private schools.

Federal "aid" to our local school districts is a snare and delusion. No one will really benefit, least of all the taxpayers.

Winchell Should Apologize and Retract Insult to Italian-Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, in his column of April 3 Walter Winchell struck below the belt. He insulted millions of Americans of Italian descent by insinuating that President Kennedy has not appointed any Italians to high public office because Italians are controlled by or linked with "the Big M," presumably meaning the maffia.

I have this day sent a letter to Mr. Winchell demanding an apology and a retraction for his insult against a whole people. If he has any decency left in him and an appreciation of the feelings of other people, whom he has caused untold harm, he should publicly recant for his misdeeds in this instance.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting into the RECORD the text of my letter to Mr. Winchell so that my colleagues in both Houses of Congress may read it. In order that I may not be accused of quoting out of context, I want to quote here exactly what Mr. Winchell wrote in his column:

Insiders say the reason Kennedy hasn't made an Italian appointment is not his fault. More than 100 names, prominent Demos, were submitted. But always lurking in the background "is the Big M control or link." Characters right out of "The Untouchables."

I invite my colleagues to comment either on Mr Winchell's statement cited above or on my letter to him. They may do so on the floor of their respective Chamber, through the pages of the RECORD, or via direct mail to me. Incidentally, I am sending copies of my letter to President Kennedy and Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy.

The full text of my letter to Mr. Winchell is as follows:

Mr. WALTER WINCHELL,
Daily Mirror,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. WINCHELL: I was shocked to read your column of April 3 in the New York Daily Mirror, in which you bluntly state that it has been impossible for President Kennedy to make "an Italian appointment" because "always lurking in the background is the Big M control or link. Characters right out of 'The Untouchables'."

I don't believe that you personally wrote this article, since I have always thought of you as being tolerant of all minorities. The article, however, is published as yours and you must take the responsibility. You refer to Italians in a slurring manner as though the name "Italian" is supposed to be something evil. By the use of the "Big M," you brand all Italians as members of the Mafia. And by saying that the hundred names submitted to President Kennedy were all "characters right out of 'The Untouchables'," you not only implied, but openly went on record as saying that there wasn't an Italo-American qualified to hold public office in this country.

I have never been one to appeal to racial and national prejudices. I have always spoken as an American and I have not hesitated to criticize members of my own national origin whenever they have appealed to Italian audiences on strictly national lines.

Although I was not born in the United States, I have always been proud of the opportunities which this country has afforded to me and to millions of others of Italian ancestry. I have been in the forefront of various movements to aid minority groups to better their lot in this country. Need I tell you that without minority groups there would be no America today? Need I also remind you of the tremendous contributions made by Italo-Americans in all walks of life? Our history books are replete with such contributions, from Columbus down to our own times, which are too numerous to mention here.

To be as blunt as you have been, I want to say that by your article you have insulted every American of Italian descent including prominent legislators, the Governors of four great States, many mayors, judges, and others, all of whom are upholding the dignity of America.

Furthermore, you have insulted the intelligence of our great Chief Executive, President Kennedy, who has many friends in Italian circles—and I pride myself in being one of these—and who has already appointed a number of them to high public office.

You have conceived the idea, which I know is only a minority view, that the power of the press is the power to destroy. Many of our great writers, editors, and publishers take pride in the contributions of all Americans. They do not feel as restricted as you do in writing, unless they can resort to slander or unless they can associate Italians with the Apalachin raid, the Mafia, and "The Untouchables."

On behalf of all the decent upright Italo-Americans, I demand not only an apology from you but a full retraction in your column. If you wish to treat this matter lightly, let me advise you that I will sponsor a congressional investigation of such un-American activities as these. It may interest you to know that I have already introduced a bill, H.R. 4502, to make it unlawful for radio and television stations to portray in their broadcasts any religious, racial, or nationality group in a degrading or criminal manner. This bill can easily be amended to cover the situation at hand to expose all of the destructive influences in our country.

At a time when this country should be more united than ever to combat the foreign evil of communism, it ill behooves a writer such as yourself, by means of a poisonous pen, to cause disunity, cofusion, and chaos.

I sincerely hope that I shall not have to resort to any of the things which I have mentioned in this letter in this moment of anger, for which you alone are the cause. It would be in the best interests of all concerned for you to print an appropriate retraction. I want to assure you that what I have said above expresses the views of every Italo-American in public office.

Copies of this letter are being sent to the President, and to the Attorney General of the United States.

Sincerely,

VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
Member of Congress.

Proposed New Rule for Congressional Investigating Committees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have been concerned for some time with the complex and time-consuming processes now required to test the lawfulness of challenged congressional inquiries. In my opinion, the present procedures are unfair both to the committees of Congress and to the witnesses involved. I have proposed legislation on this subject under active review at this time, and I intend to introduce my specific proposal in the very near future.

Recently, Mr. Ralph de Toledano, the well-known King Features Syndicate columnist, discussed my proposed bill in his "In Washington" column. His analysis of the subject is very incisive. It is apparent that Mr. Toledano has given this problem careful study.

Mr. President, because Mr. Toledano's article may be of interest to many Members of Congress who are concerned with this problem, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN WASHINGTON
(By Ralph de Toledano)

A NEW RULE FOR INVESTIGATING COMMITTEES?

"Cumbersome" is Senator KENNETH B. KEATING's word for the way in which House

and Senate committees must handle contempt-of-Congress cases. For some time, Mr. KEATING has been troubled by what he considers these outdated procedures. To protect witnesses and to expedite the work of congressional probers, he believes that legislation should be enacted to modernize the current practice. Two examples demonstrate what bothers Senator KEATING:

1. Recently, Chairman EMANUEL CELLER of the House Judiciary Committee mounted an investigation of the New York Port Authority. When he attempted to subpoena its records, however, he ran into the objections of Austin Tobin, head of the authority. Mr. Tobin and his attorneys argued that the port authority was a State agency, independent of Federal control or coercion. In this, the port authority was backed by Gov. Nelson Rockefeller. Cited for contempt of Congress, Mr. Tobin was arrested, mugged and fingerprinted, and subjected to litigation that will undoubtedly wend its weary way to the Supreme Court.

2. Dr. Linus Pauling, a Nobel Prize physicist who has participated actively in several scores of Communist-front groups, was subpenaed by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. He was ordered to produce the signatures of 11,000 scientists who signed a petition calling for an immediate ban on nuclear testing—and to supply the names of those who helped him collect those signatures. Dr. Pauling reluctantly submitted the signatures—earlier he had made them a matter of public record—but he flatly refused to give the subcommittee any information about those who had worked with him. He thereby paralyzed one phase of an important investigation into the widespread "Communist peace offensive." His reason: this information was "not pertinent."

In Dr. Pauling's case, the subcommittee was intimidated by the outcry he made, allowing its authority to be challenged with impunity. Had the subcommittee chosen to cite Dr. Pauling, he would now be spending his days with lawyers and in courts. In both the Pauling and the Tobin cases, however, congressional procedures were clumsy and unfair to the Congress and the witnesses.

"As the law now stands," Senator KEATING protests, "if a witness refuses to appear or to testify, the subcommittee must first report the matter to the full committee, the committee must then report to the Senate or House, which must then resolve to cite the witness for contempt, after which the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House must refer it to a U.S. attorney, who must in turn present the case to a Federal grand jury. If an indictment is returned, a full-scale trial must follow." By the time the courts have ruled, "the original investigation has long been closed without having obtained the desired testimony or evidence."

Senator KEATING recognizes that there are times when a witness is fully within his rights in refusing to answer particular questions or surrender his records. The Supreme Court has repeatedly ruled that pertinency is necessary before a witness can be compelled to answer questions or be penalized for failing to do so. KEATING is also aware that on occasion congressional committees go far afield of their mandate. Therefore, if a witness is right in questioning pertinency, he should not be put through the time-consuming and expensive process of defending himself. If he is wrong, there should be some way of making this known to him promptly. His refusal, then, becomes deliberate contempt.

The solution suggested by Senator KEATING meets both these tests. If a witness refuses to testify, KEATING proposes, he should be required to appear in Federal court that same day. A judge, who unlike a committee is not a party to the dispute, would then determine whether the witness' refusal was justified or not. If the judge decided that the committee's demands were pertinent, the witness could acquiesce or face immediate contempt-of-court action.

"The net effect of this procedure," says Senator KEATING, "would be both to restrain unauthorized inquiries and to facilitate compliance with proper demands for information." It would also satisfy the requirements of due process and speed up the work of investigating committees. Simultaneously, it would strengthen the Bill of Rights without crippling the congressional investigative process.

Oddly enough, there is one major block to enactment of the legislation Senator KEATING proposes. Is it constitutional? Does Congress have the right to surrender some of its powers to the Federal courts? Able lawyers in Washington are divided on this point, though they all agree that Senator KEATING has a first-class legal mind.

Nevertheless, the legal consensus in Washington is that the Keating proposal be put to the test. (The Supreme Court will be the final arbiter.) Particularly in the internal security field, congressional committees have been systematically hampered by efforts to halt their investigations. Students of government concur with Woodrow Wilson's contention that orderly congressional investigation is not only a vital part of the American system but also serves an educational function by giving the public a chance to know what is happening in the darker corners of the national life. Anything that streamlines this process is all to the good.

Comment on National Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, during the past few weeks I have been receiving a tremendous response to the questionnaire I distributed throughout my district. In a number of instances, individuals have found they could not adequately express their views on the questionnaire and have chosen to write letters instead. Such was the case when Dr. R. C. Erdmann of Rapid City replied to my questionnaire. I felt his letter was so well written and reflected a deep understanding of the problems facing our Nation that it should be shared with other Members of Congress.

Under leave to extend my remarks, therefore, I wish to include Dr. Erdmann's letter as follows:

RAPID CITY, S. DAK.,
April 8, 1961.

Hon. E. Y. BERRY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BERRY: This is a singular privilege for me, and I want to express my gratitude for your questionnaire. Because of the complexity of the many problems facing our Nation today and the confusion that exists in my mind because of those problems, this reply to your questionnaire is belated. In opinion, I concur with you, in the realization that a yes or a no is not always adequate and it is for that reason my reply is in the form of this letter instead of your answer sheet.

Today, as never before we are faced with a heterogeneity of circumstances, not of our individual creation, but those that require the deference of our integrity. I would be remiss if I did not express my respect and appreciation for what you are trying to do. Both the patience portrayed and the fair-mindedness exhibited would command the respect of any honest-minded citizen.

My attitude is based principally on the dislike for the "hidden power" that seems to control our great country through our Government with questionable "pressures." Unhappily, my contentions inflict the accusations that we have been and are being controlled by a block of "internationalists" and "do-gooders" that originally sought growth and function in an environ incongruous in standards, cloistered in attitude and ambivalent in purpose. However, since War II, this group has undergone a noticeable change in intent, attitude and disposition of function; namely, a deliberate, unmitigated design to use a bureaucratic, big tax Government as the instrument for elimination of our Constitution and all for which it stands. The inroads in this situation are so deep and the diameter of coverage so expansive, that any attempt to outline in one letter, the ramification of the issues involved, or to attempt to prognosticate the eventual outcome would be ludicrous. Therefore, I seek simply to function as competently and honestly as I can with things as they are and may evolve with a sincere hope that I will be granted the privilege for continuation of occasional sincere criticism and reflection. It is in this spirit that I try to focus other persons attention on how I look at the issues.

All of the things I have in mind result in the American people being forced into either direct or indirect Government dependency with yours truly being no exception. This circumstance is and should be our concern but it does not and should not constitute a moral persuasion for the acceptance of the circumstances as they exist today. With this in mind I make the following comments and evaluations.

I am among those that would like to continue to evolve as a strong Nation, representing a society including a mosaic of occupations, degrees of education, ambitions, and wealth. On the other hand, we have those that want to establish a common denominator in technique of government and distribution of wealth, that they consider to be fair and equitable to all—for example, a welfare state and a welfare world. In all fairness, I carefully think this over and I must always ask the questions:

How can I with my sincere attitude, say yes to higher wages, higher taxes, increase in postal rates, more social welfare of great variety, and a high tariff as a necessity caused only by pricing ourselves out of the world markets? I cannot help but feel a moment of vindictiveness when I find our people expect to be asked about massive Government ownership and the continuation of pouring our money down foreign "rat holes". Because of the road block of poorly managed economics we must experience a serious threat from foreign competition and consequently suffer from unemployment and its complexity of associated problems.

Certainly, we should keep our Un-American Activities Committee and we should augment that committee and insist they do their very best to destroy the power that threatens our freedoms and even our country from within.

Believe me, it seems ambiguous and ridiculous to try to cure the malignancy of creeping socialism with the medicines of increased spending, big government, government in business, government control in business, government interference in business, forced higher wages, higher taxation, foreign aid, etc. Why not try the medication provided for in our Constitution, then destroy the

slums and disease of bureaucratic government and build anew.

It should be stated that you, of the U.S. Congress, are charged with a very difficult task; namely, to seek the right answers for the many important questions that you are confronted with daily. May God grant you the strength that will command extended wisdom, foresight, and tolerance. Progress in Government is also difficult to attain. It demands tremendous sacrifice of personal time and effort. The statesman, the individual who qualifies for statesmanship, is often the forgotten man in our society and the ideals and integrity that a statesman must have do not always pay off very handsomely, yet, you are compelled to persist and make improvements when they can be done. For men like you I am grateful. I only wish most of your colleagues looked at our important issues and problems the way you do.

Mr. BERRY, my comments have been too extended. I hope they have not been distasteful. Whatever has been intimated or suggested has been done, I assure you, with a feeling of deference. Our problems are not easy and I realize their solution cannot be immediate and complete. I sincerely request that you grant me the continuation of the privilege of your counsel. I know that you will constantly try to find new and good ways for Government improvement.

With kindest regards to you and yours, I am,

Sincerely,

R. C. ERDMANN, D.C.

Social Security Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the social security system has become so much a part of our lives that today most of us take it for granted. We take it for granted that we will pay social security taxes and that when we retire we will have an income to support us in our declining years. It is easy today for young people especially to fail to realize what a tremendous problem would face them if they had to undertake their own individual planning for their old age; how extremely difficult it would be for them to provide an adequate retirement income without the systematic operation of social security.

In a recent issue of Vogue, Sylvia Porter, in some excerpts from her forthcoming book, tells her readers, "You're Richer Than You Think." Her discussion of social security points up very dramatically the great benefits which our system of social insurance brings not only to the individual but to the economy as a whole.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOU'RE RICHER THAN YOU THINK

(By Sylvia Porter)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—A handsome woman with a flash of brown eyes that see clearly through figures and production indexes, Sylvia Porter writes a column with the fascinating name, "Your Dollar," and the biggest distribution 333 newspapers, in the business column business. When she was just out of her teens and out of several Wall Street brokerage firms, she started writing that column for the New York Post as S. F. Porter, because it seemed wiser to attribute her extraordinary perception in finanicial matters to a man. The wife of G. Sumner Collins, and the mother of an 11-year-old daughter, she runs two houses, one in New York, one in the country, produces, in addition to her column, a weekly newsletter on Government bonds, "Reporting on Governments," and an annual Income Tax Guide. Twenty years ago, in Vogue, she started her first magazine article, one of five financial primers Vogue published between 1941 and 1943, with these words: "You know, a fallacy that we've permitted to go unchallenged because of innocence or indifference is that men control the wealth and finances of America." Now, in this article from her book to be published in May by the World Publishing Co., she explores and dismantles some other fallacies.)

Most of us are worth a lot more than we may think. You would need a fortune of over $100,000—invested at 3-percent interest tax free—to produce interest to duplicate the $254 a month maximum benefit a family will be able to get under today's social security law.

You would have to have an estate of more than $76,000, also bringing you 3 percent a year tax free, to produce interest to duplicate the $190.50 maximum pension that a retired worker and his wife, both 65 or older, will be able to get under the social security law now in effect.

You would need a hefty nest egg of over $50,000, again invested at 3 percent tax free, to produce interest to match the $127 a month maximum you, as an individual worker covered by social security, will be able to get when you retire.

As these calculations surely dramatize, that social security card of yours really is becoming the equivalent of a fortune in retirement benefits. Few of us could even hope to accumulate the estates essential to give us the monthly incomes that payment of our social security taxes guarantees we will receive when we retire in the years ahead.

What's more, millions are also accumulating impressive retirement incomes under private pension plans; it is estimated that 34 percent of all workers in industry are covered by private pension programs now. Millions of others have insurance programs that will pad their retirement incomes, too; 8 in 10 families have life insurance coverage today and many have annuity and similar policies. And a growing percentage of us have reserves in cash, U.S. bonds, stocks, and other investments which will, in addition to our social security benefits, help us live on a decent scale in our senior years.

We are, in fact as well as in theory, creating an economy in which the person working today and contributing to public pension and private retirement programs can look forward to retirement with confidence that he will not need to depend on family charity for support. We are doing it by taxing ourselves on an increasing scale. Let's not kid ourselves—the social security tax is becoming a real pocketbook "bite." Consider the record just of the past 10 years.

In 1949, the social security tax was a minor 1 percent on a maximum of $3,000 of your pay, meaning it amounted to $30 a year at most. In 1950, the tax went up to 1.5 percent on a maximum of $3,000, meaning it amounted to $45 a year at most. In 1954, the tax went to 2 percent on a maximum of $3,600 of annual earnings, a top of $72 a year. In 1958, it was 2.25 percent on a maximum of $4,200, a top of $94.50 a year. In 1959, it was 2.5 percent on a maximum of $4,800, a top of $120. In 1960, it rose to 3 percent on a $4,800 maximum, a top of $144.

What are we getting for this? The answer is, "Plenty." For as the taxes on our pay have climbed so have the expected benefits they provide. In 1949, the peak benefits an individual worker could get were only $45.20 a month, and the peak social security benefits a family could receive were only $85 a month. Under the latest law, the peak an individual can get is $123 a month while the peak a family can get is $254 a month.

What do these tax and benefit changes mean to us?

They certainly mean that the millions of us who have been working for years and paying social security taxes, and who will continue working and paying the taxes for many more years, are now contributing major amounts of our pay to the support of our older citizens. Our taxes are providing the benefits to those already retired, maintaining the basic social security pension at a decent level. And, incidentally, a record 14,800,000 are now drawing social security benefits.

They also mean that these taxes are helping to protect our own jobs, for one of the great props under our economy today is the spending of social security checks by our senior citizens. The spending of these benefits has become a crucial jobmaking and antirecession weapon.

And, most important, they mean that we are building a system which some day will give us in turn an adequate, basic retirement pension.

Glance again at the jump in the benefits in one decade. Let yourself enjoy the feeling of confidence inspired by the knowledge that there will be a pension for you, too. Then you'll truly understand how rich our older folks are now and how rich you will be.

A YOUNG WIDOW'S FORTUNE

Social security is not just of value to older people. A young father of three infants was killed in a freak accident in our community the other day, leaving not only a heartbroken widow but also an empty bank account. While we were discussing with the neighbors how to east at least her financial tragedy, I volunteered, "One 'good' angle is the fortune she'll get from social security from now on. It'll run into tens of thousands of dollars in cash."

The astonishment at the size of the "inheritance" I mentioned pounded home again the fact that most Americans—and this probably includes you—don't realize that social security can be worth more to young people than to the older citizens of our land.

The cash stake of this young widow and her infants could be almost $70,000. And this inheritance is free of income and estate taxes. Social security is so very much more than retirement benefits, pensions for aged widows, aged parents, and retired people. It is, as the following details dramatize, also tremendous protection for young children and young widows. In our neighbor's case, the father had been fully insured at the top social security salary level of $4,800 a year. His infants are 1, 2, and 3 years old. Now:

On application, his widow will get a lump-sum death benefit. This amounts to $255.

His infants and their mother will get a pension of $254 a month until the oldest child is 18. Assuming she doesn't remarry during the 15-year period, this adds up to $45,738.

For the next 12 months, his widow and her two children still under 18 will still get a monthly pension of $254. This amounts to $3,048 over the year.

For the next 12 months, she and her one child still under 18 will get a monthly pension of $180. This amounts to $2,160 over the year.

Her widow's pension ceases when all three children are 18, but she gets widow's bene-

65 when she reaches her 62d birthday. At that date and for the rest of her life, assuming she hasn't remarried, she draws $90 a month, equal to three-quarters of her husband's monthly retirement pension. If she then lives for her normal life expectancy of about 17 years, she will receive an additional $18,360.

Add it up. It comes to $69,561. And all this income is, by law, free of all tax.

Of course, the totals will vary from family to family, depending on the number of children, their ages, the amount of credits in the social security account. But the key angle is not the precise total of benefits; rather it is the impressive value of social security to the young family as well as the old. How many young people can accumulate nest eggs and invest them at returns sufficient to guarantee over $250 a month for years?

The ironic tragedy is that it often is those most in need who forfeit their benefits because they don't know the elementary details of the social security program. If this tale of the young widow's fortune jolts you into learning more, her heartbreaking loss may be your gain.

The knowledge of your earning credits should give you a lift, and the knowledge will be vital to your intelligent planning for your financially independent older years. Of course, a social security pension is hardly adequate for comfortable retirement, but it is a darn good base on which to build a personal investment program. And the knowledge will give you new understanding of how your social security tax contributions are protecting not only your future but also your Nation's future. For you, as a citizen with a pension check to spend every month, will be a distinct prop under the economy's prosperity. So check your credit now. Whatever is in it is a plus for you, and I'll wager you'll find more in your account than you think.

Inheritance of a Kansan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD the following poem "Inheritance of a Kansan," by Mrs. Hazel M. Hardtarfer, of Sedgwick, Kans.

Mrs. Hardtarfer's poem in free verse won two State prizes in the 1961 literature contest of the Kansas Federation of Women's Clubs. In this centennial year of Kansas statehood, this poem expresses so eloquently for all Kansans their awareness of the rich heritage we celebrate this year that I feel it deserves a wide audience.

The poem follows:

INHERITANCE OF A KANSAN

(By Mrs. Hazel M. Hardtarfer)

Why should I seek Cibolas in my land?
Riches lie at my feet;
Riches in traveled trails and pathless skies;
Mine is the heritage of pioneers
Who crossed the hills and plain
To build their homes of prairie sod—
Wealth of the prairie's openness,
And ocean-waves of wheat;
Ice-diamonds on nude trees at misty dawn—
Then heat, and sunset like a painter's dream!
Sunflower and tumbleweed; song of meadowlark;
Wide shallow streams, and on their banks
The Judas tree, red sumac, yellow cottonwood.
My legacy embraces the whole of Kansas' lore:
Tales of Apache raids, and John Brown's fiery work;
The bitter strife that came before the calm—
The growth of cities sprawling on the countryside;
Jet-birds that split the air with sound;
Chisholm and old Santa Fe—ribbons of concrete and of iron.
This opulence is mine.
But millions share my heritage:
The proffered gold
Of Kansas' destiny.

What's Wrong With Urban Renewal?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the March 1961 issue of the Mortgage Banker contains an article on the Federal urban renewal program which should receive the careful attention of all those concerned with the continuing viability of our cities. This article, written by James Wm. Gaynor, housing commissioner of the State of New York, points out the inherent problems in the present restricted urban renewal program, which is able to deal only with scattered symptoms once they have become serious community problems, rather than being able to deal with the broad causes of urban blight and contributing to its future prevention.

Mr. Gaynor recommends that urban renewal programs be broadened, not only in their physical area, but also in their scope of planning, that rehabilitation and modernization be stressed equally with new construction, that there be adequate recognition of the importance of retaining the middle-income family in the urban area, and that more participation be encouraged by the private homebuilding industry.

I hope this article will receive the careful attention of all Members of the Congress. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT'S WRONG WITH URBAN RENEWAL

(By James Wm. Gaynor)

Urban renewal—the current "catchall phrase for expressing our efforts toward renewing and rebuilding our urban areas—was once considered the exclusive province of the esoteric planner—in the main, trained as architects, and emphasizing in our earlier urban renewal programs the single element of physical planning.

During the last few years there has been a growing awareness among the business community that urban renewal is more than just physical redevelopment; it is also good business. Economic and civic improvements, in addition to physical redevelopment, are basic considerations today; and a comprehensive urban renewal plan requires the teamwork of not only architects, but economists, engineers, public administrators, and builders.

Despite the broadened scope of our urban renewal planning, we can still be considered fumbling pioneers if we compare the scale of our efforts with the scope of the problems these efforts are intended to resolve. Consider New York City, the largest urban center, and where the State has invested most of its housing and community renewal resources. It has:

The largest public housing slum clearance program in the country.

The largest, and (despite criticism of several projects) by far the most successful title I urban renewal slum clearance program.

A pioneering State- and city-financed program to aid private builders with low-interest mortgage loans for middle-income housing.

A consolidated housing and title I urban renewal program under one agency.

A revitalized city planning commission which has embarked on total planning by area or neighborhood under the community renewal provisions of the National Housing Act.

A $52 million garage construction program in the business center of Manhattan.

These efforts represent a massive attack on the urban renewal problems of the country's largest urban center, expenditures of private and public funds in the billions, renewal of thousands of acres of city slums, generally improved business conditions, and increased tax revenues to the city.

Yet, the maximum potential of this massive program probably will not be realized because the program lacks an essential element: an effective transportation plan. 3,300,000 persons enter Manhattan daily, almost 2,500,000 of these by public transportation that is far from adequate. Sleet, snow, heat, and rain stay all but the postal workers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds, and newspapers carry regular boxes under the head "Why you were late today."

The 800,000-plus persons that arrive in Manhattan daily by private cars, taxis, and trucks represent only one-quarter of the daily travelers to the heart of the city, but they cause almost all the street congestion. The solution proposed at present is more parking in the center of the city. Experience elsewhere has shown that additional parking brings additional congestion and commercial stagnation.

The trip from Newark airport to the center of Manhattan, a distance of 13.5 miles, can be made by public transportation at the rush hour in 1 hour and 30 minutes, or about one-sixth of a mile a minute. A hundred years ago a horse and buggy could travel the same distance in 1 hour and 17 minutes, or just a little faster. So much for progress.

Victor Gruen, the country's outstanding planner of large urban and suburban shopping centers, has analyzed New York City's parking program and is convinced that the direct gain in retail sales in the center of Manhattan would be only a fraction of the $100 million a year that the garage planners anticipate. The intent to provide a place to park is laudable, but the economic objective is unrealistic. The answer is not more parking to attract more cars into the center of the city. The answer lies in more parking at the periphery and, most importantly, improved public transportation into the center core.

This particular situation represents only one aspect of urban renewal; but it should demonstrate in a concrete way the need for a comprehensive approach. It may show how

the lack of an adequate long-range view and proper coordination in planning public improvements not only will not restore an urban core, but, conversely, can ultimately destroy the economy of the entire urban area.

Another new concept in urban renewal requires not only comprehensive planning for redevelopment, but comprehensive planning for conservation as well. Rehabilitation of existing housing is an aspect of conservation that must be undertaken on a vast scale as part of our urban renewal efforts. An effective financing device exists under section 220 of the National Housing Act, provided a more imaginative and effective administration of the section can be brought about. David Walker, the outgoing Urban Renewal Commissioner, recommended income tax benefits, for homeowners as a means of creating customers for a new industry to develop competent, all-around conservation and rehabilitation contractors.

The third new concept in urban renewal is the general recognition that a basic need in our urban areas is an expanded housing inventory—an inventory that will emphasize housing for middle-income families. Too late have we witnessed the results of piecemeal planning that has produced a concentration of low-rent subsidized public housing and a spate of so-called luxury housing for high-income families. The effect now so readily apparent brought about the exit to the suburbs of middle-income families, the prime element of our urban society.

My recommendations are:

Urban renewal programs must be broadened, not only in the physical area covered, but in the scope of planning. Specifically, the Federal title I program should require a comprehensive area plan, in greater detail than at present, as a condition of assistance for even a small urban renewal project that lies within the greater area. This would assure that overall area needs had been considered, and that a given project is a part of a long-range program and not, as at present, a neighborhood renewal plan not necessarily related to the larger area's needs.

In broadening our urban renewal plans, rehabilitation and modernization of existing housing must be emphasized as well as the construction of new housing. We must prevent the economic waste that results when residential areas decay, real estate tax returns decrease, and capital improvements such as schools and utilities are underutilized while others must be built for new housing elsewhere.

We must recognize the prime importance of retaining our middle-income families in our urban areas. To continue to exclude them from our reuse programs will be fatal to our urban economy.

Finally, we must develop more participation of the entire homebuilding industry in urban renewal.

Fallacy in Revival of Buy American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following column by Joseph Ator from the Chicago Daily Tribune of Monday, March 27, 1961:

FALLACY IN REVIVAL OF BUY AMERICAN—CAN'T SELL EXPORTS UNLESS NATIONS ABROAD HAVE DOLLARS TO PAY

(By Joseph Ator)

The worst thing that has happened to efforts to increase American export trade is the recession-born revival of the Buy American fallacy. There are several reasons why it is poison.

First and foremost, we can't expect to sell things to foreigners if they don't have the dollars to pay us. The dollar shortage of the late 1940's has vanished, thanks to our antiquated Good Time Charlie foreign-aid policy. We can't pay our current foreign obligations without dipping into our slipping gold reserve.

It doesn't take a genius at political science to figure out that we are better off to give foreign purchasers the dollars to buy our exports by buying from them, instead of giving to them. And it should take no more than elementary arithmetic to figure out that we wouldn't have realized $19,600 million on our exports last year if we hadn't provided most of the dollars that were paid for them through $14,700 million in American imports.

START OF TROUBLE

That is just the beginning of the Buy American trouble, however. One of the principal obstacles to American exports is restrictions that other nations have placed on them, through tariffs and quotas. Our State Department can't argue very convincingly for the removal of these barriers if we start erecting some of our own for the benefit of American industries which complain that they can't meet foreign competition.

Such tactics are not only self-defeating in specific cases, they buck a world trend toward freer world trade. Trade between countries today is at a higher level than it ever has been in history, even accounting for the inflated prices in which its total is reckoned.

The old rationale of free trade is still sound. If every nation does what it can do best and most cheaply, the whole world benefits by free exchange of goods. There are thousands of exceptions to this rule in the form of tariffs and quotas, but bit by bit they are being relaxed. Any trend against this relaxation hurts us more than anyone else, because we are the biggest exporter.

The normal objective of placing a tariff umbrella over a weakling industry is to assure it of a monopoly in the country in which it is. If it can't compete at home, it pretty obviously can compete in the export field.

Such special favors do more than invite foreign reprisals. They make it harder for existing exporters to compete on a cost basis. Their employees' cost of living is increased by the added cost of protected articles. As wages go up, ability to compete in exporting goes down. Frequently tariff protection will destroy more jobs in export industries than it saves in the protected domestic industry.

Recognition that we have to buy if we are going to sell in foreign trade is the keystone of the campaign which the Chicago Association of Commerce is conducting to increase Chicagoland's trade. Its annual international trade fair, the largest in the Western Hemisphere, will be in McCormick Place July 25 through August 10.

PROMOTION AND DISPLAY

Foreign governments, manufacturers, and merchants will promote tourism and display their products at the fair, as they have at two preceding fairs, the first of which was in 1959 to celebrate the St. Lawrence Seaway opening. Alongside them will be the exhibits of American manufacturers of products which they offer abroad.

There have to be two parties to every sale. Getting those two persons together is the primary purpose of the fair. Present will be 500 to 1,000 foreign buyers and salesmen, and a far larger number of buyers of imports and salesmen of exports from the United States. All of these will exchange ideas at two conferences to be held in conjunction with the trade fair, the Chicago World Marketing Conference and the 1961 Inter-American Industries Conference, both of which will run from July 24 through 28.

Tribute to Ronald W. May

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the sudden death of Ronald W. May, Washington correspondent for the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times, shocked and saddened all who knew him either personally or as readers of his independent, searching coverage of Washington.

Ron May knew that our society's freedom and survival are dependent on integrity in every individual at every level of government and he knew that the essential responsibility of the press is to demand this integrity. The press, Ron May believed and proved, must make this demand by searching out failures no matter who the individual or organization involved.

Another respected Washington correspondent and author, Tris Coffin, wrote the following tribute to Ron May which I would like to share with my colleagues. The tribute appeared in the Capital Times of Monday, April 10, 1961:

RON MAY, A REPORTER WHO STIRRED SILT AT BOTTOM OF GLASS OF LIFE

(By Tristam Coffin)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Tristram Coffin is a Washington correspondent who knew Ron May, the Capital Times Washington correspondent who died of a heart attack last week. Coffin is the author of a new book about Washington which is causing widespread comment.)

A big, crumpled brown manila envelope with notes scribbled and clippings foaming out of the top was his hallmark. When this envelope was tipsily leaning against a typewriter in the Press Gallery, we knew Ron May was wandering around.

A tall, rugged fellow in a rumpled blue suit, a wild shock of hair and some of the keenest eyes in Washington, Ron could usually be found—a cigarette clamped in his lips—a stub of pencil in his hand, furiously writing notes on napkins.

He was the correspondent of the stubbornly independent and clear-thinking Capital Times of Madison. But even this stamp is too limiting. Ron was a breed of reporter almost entirely died out—the muckraker. These were the great reforming newsmen of the twenties, who stirred into the silt at the bottom of the glass of life, particularly of Government, and brought to light infamous abuses. Reform usually followed their revelations. Men lived better and freer because of their digging.

Ron was constantly on the trail; he could pick up a lead most of us would miss and track it down with an awesome thoroughness.

Nothing stopped him. He kept on asking blunt questions and demanding answers. He seemed driven by a furious reforming spirit most of us, his colleagues, lack. We are content to rewrite the mimeographed handout or take down the words of the press agent. This never satisfied Ron. He knew that behind the false front, there was many times corruption, stinking corruption.

Ron May was one of the first to tear the mask from Joe McCarthy. His stories and his book, with an almost ruthless tolerance and patience, described the petty hates and fears and jealousies of a politician who stunned other reporters to silence or nervous praise.

He helped drive from power a big west coast politician by showing his unseen alliance with the Mafia. His articles on millionaire oilmen who abused their friendship with President Eisenhower were devastating. His file on the blunders of the Central Intelligence Agency is startling. He had been working, more recently, on lifting the lid on congressional conflicts of interest.

What bothered Ron the most was the indifference with which editors, investigating committees and the public received his research and prying. "Nuts," he would say in an occasional moment of bitterness, "no one seems to give a hoot whether a Cabinet member or a Presidential assistant or a Senator steals or cheats, so long as they've got their TV westerns to watch."

Then he would brighten quickly and follow a new stink with all the enthusiasm of a child hunting hidden Easter eggs. His untidy files in the Senate press gallery, in the Library of Congress, and at home were bulging with odd scraps of information which he patiently put together with the thoroughness of a great detective. Ron would notice a one-paragraph item in a newspaper—innocent enough to the rest of us—and let out a wild whoop.

"This is it," he would cry. "This is the missing piece of the puzzle."

Ron spent hours talking to people—Senators, crime investigators, elevator operators, reporters, clerks. He had an engaging charm; he was the country boy in town looking at the sights and asking questions. In the most unlikely casual contacts, Ron picked up clues leading to hidden guilt. The blurted word of a secretary, the boasting of a Congressman, the inference of a general.

His life must have seemed frightfully daring to the Government clerk who comes to work precisely at 8:30 and leaves at precisely 3:30, and has annual leave and a pension. Ron would get up around 10 or 11, stretch and yawn over hot coffee, and be off. On the bus jolting downtown, he did his reading—books, newspapers, investigations. He usually arrived at the Capitol shortly after noon, his big legs taking him impatiently across the plaza. Then in the halls or over the long table in the Senate restaurant, he talked and listened. He drank coffee. None of us ever recall seeing Ron eat a whole meal.

Scraps of his philosophy would drift out. He demanded much of the men and women of politics. He asked them to be dedicated to public services, to be scrupulously honest, to be fair and just and tolerant. He was surprised, hurt and angered when he discovered the opposite.

"What's the matter with that guy?" he would ask indignantly. The rest of us shrugged our shoulders. Ron went to work.

He spent afternoons and far into the evening digging, digging, digging. He rarely left the press gallery before 9 o'clock. You would see him, a big, engrossed man hunched over his typewriter. Then a lonely ride on the bus, thinking and reading and planning. He rarely went to bed before early morning. He could not shut off that great engine of thinking that consumed him. He did not let ideas go, even to eat or sleep.

Once he came to my house and met a friend who was talking of waste and corruption in foreign aid. Ron became so excited, he walked downtown with my friend and at 4 o'clock in the morning they were seated at a counter of a White Tower with coffee still talking.

Many times I wished I was the editor of a very large newspaper or magazine with a crusading spirit. For then I could hire Ron May to do this kind of work he was ideally suited for—lifting off the top soil and exposing rot. Our country would be stronger, more dedicated for Ron May's digging.

But the chance is gone. It was only a dream anyway. A few days ago, Ron May's heart stopped beating. He was only 38. For even a big, rugged fellow as he was, the strain was too much. Indifference, frustration, the choking mass of weeds in our national life took their toll. One gallant reformer.

Today, I wandered into the press room. Unconsciously I looked to the corner where the big, brown paper envelope used to rest. The corner was bare. I felt a pang of loneliness. The good guy was gone.

Salute to Local Heroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of Thursday, March 30, 1961, which comments upon the tribute paid by the Greater Wilkes-Barre Chamber of Commerce to John and Timothy Connolly whose actions saved the lives of five people in an explosion and a disastrous fire last March 13. I, too, wish to compliment and recognize the brave exploits of these two men in the face of a grave emergency and I certainly join the Luzerne Lions Club who have adopted a resolution nominating the Connolly brothers for an award by the Carnegie Hero Fund Commission. In my judgment there are none more deserving of this high honor.

The indicated editorial follows:

SALUTE TO LOCAL HEROES

Directors of the Greater Wilkes-Barre Chamber of Commerce voiced the sentiments of the community at a luncheon meeting of the board yesterday afternoon when they paid an impressive tribute to John and Timothy Connolly, of Luzerne, for saving the lives of five workers at the risk of their own in two explosions and a fire at the Schuyler Manufacturing Co. plant on March 13.

Spokesmen for the board lauded them for their valor and its members gave them a rising vote of thanks. Russell Gardner, president, presented each with a letter of commendation, signed by the officers, with plaques, now being made, to be presented later. The board adopted a resolution to join with Luzerne Lions Club in nominating the brothers for an award by the Carnegie Hero Fund Commission.

Their feat is a matter that concerns more than Luzerne. The chamber's interest stems from the fact that it has been spearheading industrial development in its own name and through its affiliates. Moreover, it speaks for the whole area which is proud of the heroism of the Connolly brothers on the home front.

It is a privilege to salute these young men, not only for their courageous actions in a grave emergency, greatly reducing the toll, but for their stimulating example of initiative, cooperation, and unselfishness, the solid foundation on which the future of the area must be built.

Newel Perry: Teacher of Youth and Leader of Men—Speech in Honor of Blind Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 10, 1961, Dr. Newel Perry died in Berkeley, Calif., at the age of 87. He was thus full of years, and his years were full of accomplishment.

During most of his long life Dr. Perry lived and carried on his work in Berkeley. His career was that of a pioneer in the fields of public welfare and education of the blind. He was founder and first president of the California Council for the Blind. He was for 35 years director of advanced studies at the California School for the Blind in Berkeley. It was through his inspiration and leadership that the blind people of my State came to be welded into an organized democratic movement to improve their status and condition.

On March 25, 1961, a memorial convocation was held at the School for the Blind in Berkeley in honor of Dr. Perry. The main address was delivered by another noted Berkeleyan and leader of the blind, Dr. Jacobus tenBroek, president of the National Federation of the Blind, chairman of the California Board of Social Welfare, and chairman of the Speech Department of the University of California. I believe that Dr. tenBroek's moving address deserves the attention of Members of Congress and of all citizens concerned with welfare and the public good.

The article follows:

NEWEL PERRY: TEACHER OF YOUTH AND LEADER OF MEN

(Address by Prof. Jacobus tenBroek at a Memorial Convocation for Dr. Newel Perry at the California School for the Blind, Berkeley, March 25, 1961)

I come before you today—indeed we are all gathered here—to discharge a public duty and to honor a private debt. Newel Perry was a public figure. To us, he was also a personal friend. We can appraise his public contribution. We can only acknowledge our private obligation and personal attachment. We can detail his public record, define his influential role, itemize his accomplishments, recount his deeds, enumerate his statutes, specify his doctrines, disentangle the elements of his social philosophy, identify the general and the institutional fruits of his life's work, analyze and psychoanalyze the personality traits that made him a leader. Upon the life we shared, we can

only dwell in memory, sifting through the loose meshes of the mind the hours, the days, the nights, the months, the years of our common experience; the fears, the travails, the aspirations, the laughter that were ours together.

We were his students, his family, his intimates, his comrades on a thousand battlefronts of a social movement. We slept in his house, ate at his table, learned geometry at his desk, walked the streets interminably by his side, moved forward on the strength of his optimism and confidence.

The boundless devotion to him of his wife Lillie (to whom he was married from 1912 until her death in 1935) spilled over onto us to balm our institution-starved spirits, to lighten with gentle affection the bewilderment of our eccentricity and the unnatural confinement of our segregation. Upon a later generation of us, after the death of Lillie the same bounty was conferred in her turn by his sister Emma Burnham, who lived with Doctor during the last 21 years of his life.

As a forward youngster of 12, who made so bold as to address him as "Doc," I was once thrown out of a class by Doctor with such a lecture as still rings in my ears. As a somewhat older youngster, still forward but now also bored by the slow pace and the unimaginative techniques of high school, I was expelled by him altogether for incorrigible recalcitrance. Eventually, despite these unpromising beginnings, I did graduate from high school. With plenty of ambition but no money, I prepared to enter the university. At that point I was denied State aid to the blind, a program then newly instituted as a result of Doctor's efforts in sponsoring a constitutional amendment and a comprehensive statute. The reason was not that my need was not great. It was that I intended to pursue a higher education while I was being supported by the State. That was too much for the administrative officials. Almost without discussion, Doctor immediately filled the gap. Just as Warring Wilkinson had earlier done for him, he supplied me with tuition and living expenses out of his own pocket for a semester while we all fought to reverse the decision of the State aid officials.

It was ever thus with Doctor. The key to his great influence with blind students was, first of all, the fact that he was blind and therefore understood their problems; and second, that he believed in them and made his faith manifest. He provided the only sure foundation of true rapport: knowledge on our part that he was genuinely interested in our welfare.

Aside from these immediate personal benefactions, there were three habits of life—one might almost say three elements of personality—which I formed out of his teaching and example when I was an adolescent in his charge. First, an attitude toward my blindness, a conception that it is basically unimportant in the important affairs of life. A physical nuisance, yes. A topic of unembarrassed conversation, a subject of loud questions by small children in the street as you pass, certainly. But not something which shapes one's nature, which determines his career, which affects his usefulness or happiness. Second, a basic assumption that sighted people generally have boundless good will toward the blind and an utterly false conception of the consequences of blindness. It is their misconception about its nature which creates the social and economic handicap of blindness. Third: public activity as a rule of life, a sense of responsibility to exert personal effort to improve the lot of others. While I was still a lad in my teens, I was attending meetings and doing work that Doctor assigned me in the blind movement. He was a social reformer. He made me one, too. Through participation with him, these attitudes and practices became habits of my life. So deeply instilled were they that they have remained ever after an almost automatic behavioral pattern—potent and often governing factors in my outlook and activity. Mature reflection in later years could only confirm through reason what his influence had so surely wrought in my youth.

It is altogether fitting that we should hold this memorial convocation at the California School for the Blind. It was here that Newel Perry came in 1883 as a 10-year-old boy—penniless, blind, his father dead, his home dissolved. Two years earlier, he had lost his sight and nearly his life as the result of a case of poison oak which caused his eyeballs to swell until they burst and which held him in a coma for a month. It was here at the school that Warring Wilkinson first met and took an interest in him, laying the basis for future years of intimate relationship and mutual endeavor. Warring Wilkinson was the first principal of the California State School for the Deaf and the Blind. He served in that capacity for 44 years, from 1865 to 1909. With his characteristic interest in his charges, he soon saw young Newel's full potentiality. He sent him from here to Berkeley High School to complete his secondary education. It was he who overcame the numerous obstacles to this arrangement, so fruitful in its understanding of education and of the needs of the blind. Newel continued to live here at the school while he attended the University of California from 1892 to 1896. Again admission had to be secured over strong resistance. Again Wilkinson was the pathfinder; Newel his willing and anxious instrument. Wilkinson's role in Newel's life as a youth can hardly be overestimated: father, teacher, guide, supporter—in Newel's own words, "dear Governor."

As this institution was not only the school but the home of his boyhood and the foundation of his manhood, so 16 years later, in 1912, at the age of 39, Newel Perry returned here to take up his permanent career as a teacher. He remained in that post until 1947—a third of a century. It was here that his life's work was accomplished. It was from this place as a base that he organized and conducted a movement for social reform. It was here that many of us first met him as his students. It was here that his impact upon us first made itself felt. It was here that our lifelong association with him began. How often in these halls have we heard his footsteps? How often in this chamber, his voice? The sound of those footsteps and that voice have now gone from the world as a physical reality. How often hereafter will they continue to sound in the halls and chambers of our lives?

In the years between departure from the school in 1896 and return to it in 1912, Newel Perry devoted himself to further education and to the search for an academic job. He took graduate work at the University of California, meanwhile serving successively as an unpaid teaching fellow, a paid assistant and finally as an instructor in the department of mathematics. In 1900, following a general custom of that day, he went to Europe to continue his studies. He did this for a time at the University of Zurich in Switzerland and then at the University of Munich in Germany. From the latter he secured the degree of doctor of philosophy in mathematics with highest honors in 1901. He lingered in Europe for a time traveling and writing an article on a mathematical topic which was published in a learned journal. He then returned to the United States in 1902, landing in New York where he was to remain until 1912. He had about $80 in capital, a first-class and highly specialized education, and all the physical, mental, and personal prerequisites for a productive career, save one, visual acuity.

During this period, he supported himself precariously as a private coach of university mathematics students. He applied himself, also, to the search for a university position. He had begun the process by mail from Europe even before he secured his Ph. D. He now continued the process on the ground in New York. He displayed the most relentless energy. He employed every imaginable technique. He wrote letters in profusion. In 1905, he wrote to 500 institutions of every size and character. He distributed his dissertation and published article. He haunted meetings of mathematicians. He visited his friends in the profession. He enlisted the aid of his teachers. He called on everybody and anybody having the remotest connection with his goal.

Everywhere, the outcome was the same. Only the form varied. Some expressed astonishment at what he had accomplished. Some expressed interest. One of these seemed genuine—he had a blind brother-in-law who, he said, was a whiz at math. Some showed indifference, now and then masked behind polite phrases. Some said there were no vacancies. Some said his application would be filed for future reference. One said for what—ironically, "as an encouragement to men who labor under disadvantages and who may learn from it how much may be accomplished through resolution and industry." Some averred that he probably could succeed in teaching at somebody else's college. Many said outright that they believed a blind man could not teach mathematics.

Many of these rejections were, of course, perfectly proper. Many were not. Their authors candidly gave the reason as blindness.

We know about this period of Newel Perry's life from reports of contemporaries or near contemporaries such as Hugh Buckingham, a student at the school from 1896 to 1900 during Doctor's absence, who has prepared a manuscript about Doctor's boyhood and youth. We know about it from what Doctor told many of us in later years. But we know about it in all its poignancy, desolation and bleakness, from Newel Perry's own intimate accounts written at the time to his old mentor and true friend, Warring Wilkinson. These accounts, with copies of many of the letters of rejection, have been preserved by the Wilkinson family through the intervening years. In the last 2 weeks, they have been opened to my inspection by Wilkinson's granddaughter, Florence Richardson Wyckoff, who is here with us today.

I have dwelt on this period and these experiences for several reasons. They reflect, they accurately portray, a phase of all of our lives as blind people. In fact, 35 years later, I personally received identical letters from many of these same institutions. It was almost as if a secretary had been set to copying Doctor's file, only changing the signatures and the name of the addressee. Yet great progress has been made. Many of us are now teaching at colleges and universities around the country and filling many other jobs hitherto closed to us.

Doctor Perry's reaction to this decade of defeat and privation was remarkable. He did not break. He did not resign. He did not even become embittered. Discouragement, frustration, a sense of wrong and injustice, certainly these; but never collapse. He was not licked. We see in these bitter years of hunger and rejection the source of true knowledge about the real problems of the blind and an ineradicable determination to do something about them. Here was a mainspring of social reform, an ever-flowing motivation to redirect public attitudes and actions toward the blind. To this was added the thrust of an active and restless disposition and the wit to perceive remedies and adapt them to the need.

Out of these elements of mind, personality, and experience were compounded the public career of Newel Perry; and out of these elements also were constructed the programs the initiation of which made that career publicly signficant.

First of all, the distress of poverty must be relieved. The necessities of life must be available. The minimum essentials must be assured. So much in some way had been provided in the Anglo-American system for three centuries before Newel Perry faced near starvation and economic exclusion in New York City. The Elizabethan poor laws did it in one way. County direct relief, instituted in California in 1901, did it in another. The almshouse and the county hospital and poorfarm did it in still other ways. At the very minimum, it had to be done better. It should be done by a system of cash grants, adequate in amount to maintain standards of decency and health, receivable upon fixed and uniform standards of eligibility, made generally applicable by State participation and control, and expendable by the recipient through a free exercise of self-management and consumption choice. To bring this about, however, prohibitions in the State constitution would have to be removed by the arduous process of a people's amendment, an organic statute would have to be lobbied through the State legislature, faithful administration would somehow have to be secured. Year by year and session by session into the indefinite future, the myriad minor corrections and major improvements made necessary by time and disclosed by experience would have to be worked through the legislature and the administration. And so indeed it came to pass in California.

Secondly, much more had to be done than merely relieve the distress of poverty. Security is a necessity. As an unmixed blessing, however, it is a stultifying concept. An indispensable ingredient of any welfare system is opportunity. One of the objects of public aid must be to stimulate and enable people to become independent of it. Accordingly, their initiative must not be hemmed in. The means of productive activity must not be withdrawn or denied. Independence of action and self-reliance must be encouraged. Legal liability of relatives must be relaxed so as not to spread poverty, increase dependence and disrupt family life. Economic resources, reasonable amounts of real and personal property must be devotable to plans for self-support instead of being required to be consumed in meeting daily needs. Incentive to earn must be constructed out of retention of the benefits of earning. And this too presently came to pass in California. The new system took cognizance of the need of the blind for adjustments on the social and psychological as well as the physical level. It permitted and encouraged them to strive to render themselves self-supporting. It applied the democratic principle of individual dignity to an underprivileged class of American citizens. It guaranteed them a fair measure of independence and self-respect in the conduct of their lives. The California system, the Newel Perry system, was thus far in advance of its time. It is still envied and emulated throughout the Nation.

Thirdly, the reintegration of the blind into society on a basis of full and equal membership could only be achieved if they had a chance to earn their daily bread as others do in the community. Accordingly, action must be taken to eliminate restrictive barriers and legal discriminations. The main channels of opportunity must be swept clear of artificial and irrational obstructions. The public service, private employment, the common callings, the ordinary trades and occupations, the professions must be rescued from arbitrary exclusions based on blindness when blindness is not a factor bearing on competence and performance. Doctor was a prime mover in securing legal, constitutional and other provisions which; protect the right of the blind to enter a number of professions; forbid arbitrary discriminations against us in the State civil service and in secondary teaching; enable blind college students to pursue their studies with the aid of sighted readers hired by the State; bring the blind in an ever-increasing stream into the colleges and universities of the State and thence into the higher callings.

These achievements—legal, social, economic and political—have been the fruits at once of Dr. Perry's leadership and of the collective self-organization of the blind which that leadership engendered. More than any other person, it was Doctor who implanted and nurtured among the blind of California the sense of common cause, the spirit of collaborative effort in seeking solutions to our problems. More than any other person, it was he who taught us that the blind can and must lead the blind and the sighted, too, when dealing with the problems of the blind. More than any other person, it was he who made us aware that to go on unorganized was to remain disorganized, that only through concerted action can the blind hope to convert and enlist the power of government and to defeat the thoughtless tyranny of public prejudice and opportune ignorance.

Newel Perry was a teacher: a teacher of subject matter and a teacher of men. He taught his specialty of mathematics and taught it very well indeed; but he taught his pupils even better. To be sure, not all the students who came his way during his 35 years on this campus were wholly inspired by him. His personality was vigorous and his standards rigorous. But for many of us who attended the school during those three and one-half decades it was Dr. Perry who furnished the impetus and incentive, the goad and the goal, that would light our later lives and nourish our careers. Our bond with him was not broken when our schooldays ended. We went on to become his comrades and colleagues in the cause which was always his true vocation.

Newel Perry was, in short, both a teacher of youth and a leader of men. These two roles were not, however, quite separate. For the secret of his success in both of them lay in this: that his teaching was a kind of leadership, and his leadership a kind of teaching. In his pedagogical method as well as his social purpose Doctor was thoroughly Socratic. His classroom manner was essentially that of the platonic dialogue: dialectical, inquiring, insistently logical, and incessantly prodding.

In this Socratic combination also lies, I think, the secret of Doctor's success as the leader of a social movement. Just as in the classroom he taught his students by leading them, so as the pioneer of the organized blind movement he led his followers by teaching them. His power, like that of all leaders, rested in the last analysis upon persuasion. His triumphs, however, were not the product of oratorical or literary skill, although he had a notable gift for trenchant and incisive phrasing, the epigrammatic thrust which distills the essence of a complex issue. His persuasive power was not that of the demagog but of the pedagog. And it was not only his followers who learned from him. He educated the blind people of the State to an awareness of their capabilities as individuals and of their powers as a group. He educated the legislators in the State capitol by dint of dogged, relentless, well-nigh incorrigible campaigns of persuasion carried on year after year and decade after decade. He educated the general public by his preachment and his example to regard the blind not in the traditional terms of charity and custody but in the realistic terms of normality and equality.

And most of all, in his role as leader, Newel Perry educated, indoctrinated, and persuaded a distinguished group of cohorts to join him in carrying on the struggle and carrying out its goals. Those whom Doctor gathered around him were other blind men and women, mostly former students, whose special talents and professional positions uniquely supplemented his.

Raymond Henderson: By profession an attorney, self-taught, by preoccupation a reformer, with poetry in his soul and literature in his stylus. Born in 1881, he attended this school from 1889 through high school and continued to live here until his graduation from the University of California in 1904. He practiced his profession in Bakersfield, Calif., from his admission to the bar until his death in 1945. Raymond came to the organized blind movement in his maturity from a long background of experience in other causes. He brought to it a notable array of personal abilities, a high degree of professional skill, a fine spirit of humanity, and the enrichment of wide and intensive activity.

Leslie Schlingheyde: also by profession an attorney, gentle and religious by disposition, practical rather than reflective in frame of mind, with a brilliant academic record and a liberal outlook. He was born in 1893, attended this school from 1906 to 1913, and thus came under Doctor's influence in the year of his graduation. He received a J.D. from the law school of the University of California in 1920 and from that time until his death in 1957 practiced his profession in Modesto, Calif., and served the blind movement all over the State.

It was Raymond Henderson and Leslie Schlingheyde who were primarily responsible for handling cases in court, for preparing innumerable legal briefs and arguments, for drafting projected bills and constitutional amendments, for continuous legal counsel during the insurgent and formative years. They were in a real sense the legal arm of the organized blind movement.

Ernest Crowley: again by profession an attorney but distinguished for his service in another arena. He kept a law office open in Fairfield-Suisun from the time of his graduation from the University of California Law School in 1923 unti lhis death in 1952. To him, however, the law was only a necessary and not a particularly attractive means of earning a living. His law office was a cover for his real love and active life—the practice of politics. He was born in 1896 and attended this school from 1910 to 1916. He was thus under Doctor's tutelage as a student for 4 years. His significant contribution was made as a member of the State legislature from 1928 to 1952. It was he who introduced and skillfully maneuvered through to passage the memorable bills which are now the statutory landmarks of our movement. In a very real sense, he was the legislative spokesman and arm of the movement.

Perry-Sundquist: social worker and public administrator by profession, bringing to his work a sympathetic personality, an unshakable faith in blind people and skillful management of administrative techniques and devices. He was born in 1904 and attended this school from 1918 to 1922. For exactly 20 years now he has been chief of the division for the blind in the State department of social welfare. During those two decades he has translated the principles of the organized blind movement into concrete administrative action, from legislative parchment into practical reality. Under his direction programs for the blind have multiplied and prospered, services have been expanded and their benefits spread. Most important of all, the working philosophy of the movement has been transformed into a working practice. In a very real

sense, he has been the effective administrative arm of the movement.

Through the years this little band grew in numbers and evolved in formal structure. It formed the nucleus of the California Council for the Blind, which came into being in 1934 with Doctor Perry as its first president. For 19 productive years, until his retirement in 1953 at the age of 80, Doctor forged and shaped the council on the anvil of his own will into an instrument larger and more formidable but essentially similar to the informal group from which it originated.

Doctor's social vision in the field of blind welfare outdistanced his time and placed him in the advance guard of thought and planning. His liberality on these matters gains, rather than loses, in significance when it is placed alongside his broader attitudes toward politics and human affairs; for in matters unrelated to the blind, Doctor was fully an heir of the 19th century, conservative, even reactionary, by nature, often inflexible and not without a touch of old-fashioned nationalist-imperialism. When it came to the cause to which he was most committed, he was far less a victorian than a utopian—less a standpatter than a restless progressive in search of new horizons.

How shall we sum up a man's life? How capture the essential quality of a human career? How convey the inward meaning, the imponderable and intangible qualities of will and heart and spirit? There are the vital statistics. But they are more statistical than vital. All that they can tell us of a man is that he was born, he lived, he loved, he died. For Newel Perry we must amend the litany at least this much: he lived, and he brought new life to many; he loved, and he was beloved; he died, and he will not be forgotten.

On the day following the death of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Walter Lippmann wrote some words about him which might also stand as an epitaph to the leader and comrade whom we honor today: "The man must die in his appointed time. He must carry away with him the magic of his presence and that personal mastery of affairs which no man, however gifted by nature, can acquire except in the relentless struggle with evil and blind chance. Then comes the proof of whether his work will endure, and the test of how well he led his people. * * * The final test of a leader is that he leaves behind him in other men the conviction and the will to carry on."

College Loans Help Students in New Orleans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, for the past 2 days the RECORD has included two articles in a newspaper series on the current federally financed student loans available at New Orleans universities and colleges. Today, I am pleased to include the third and last of these fine articles by Mr. Robert N. Kelso, a reporter for the New Orleans States-Item. Mr. Kelso relates in detail what New Orleans institutions of higher learning are doing through the National Defense Education Act to help young students to pursue a college education.

The third article follows:

LOANS HELP 1 STUDENT IN 10 THROUGH COLLEGES IN ORLEANS

(By Robert N. Kelso)

Federally financed loans are helping put about 1 student in 10 through college in New Orleans.

This program is authorized by the National Defense Education Act, which expires June 30, 1962. But indications are similar aid to needy and capable students will be continued.

President Kennedy has called for passage of a $5.7 billion aid to schools program, of which more than $500 million would be earmarked over a 5-year period for college scholarships.

The fate of this proposal will have a strong bearing on possible renewal of national defense student loans.

Aid to students in a Nation which has been jolted into putting a premium on brainpower seems certain to persist.

Spiraling costs of getting a college education will shut out thousands of capable youngsters unless they get financial help to continue their training.

Tuition costs are being boosted next fall at New Orleans' two largest universities. The flat fee at Tulane will jump from $990 to $1,200, and at Loyola from $600 to $700.

These amounts are only a starter, particularly for students who either reside on the campus or maintain residences of their own while attending school.

A male undergraduate at Tulane living on campus will have to spend some $2,275 for his tuition, university activiities fee, room, meals and books.

Living off campus, his tuition, university fee, and books alone will cost more than $1,400.

At Loyola, the average student living on campus will need $1,625 a year to meet fixed expenses. The off-campus student will need $825 for tuition, basic fees and books.

Additional expenses like clothes, laundry, spending money and incidentals add an undetermined, but substantial, amount to the student's education bill.

Six institutions in New Orleans have dispensed approximately $450,000 in national defense student loans this year to more than 900 of their students.

This roughs out to an average of $500 per student.

Tulane and Loyola may, and sometimes do, lend the full $1,000 a year authorized under the Federal loan program.

But other schools here set a general limit on the loan at either $500 or the cost of tuition.

The amount of money a student can expect to get from the national defense loan program is geared precisely to the amount he and his parents can afford to contribute.

This is calculated with some nicety by the institution from which he seeks a loan.

The school requires the prospective borrower to submit a detailed statement on his own and his parents' financial resources.

The question of how much a family should contribute toward college expenses has been worked out by the College Scholarship Service.

College Scholarship Service is an organization of more than 300 colleges and universities (Tulane is one of them) that distribute scholarships, jobs and loans to able students with financial need.

It has a number of other functions in the educational picture, but its main purpose is to act as a clearinghouse for the family financial information all participating institutions require of students seeking financial assistance.

Here are a couple of examples from a College Scholarship Service chart on what is considered a minimum of annual family support, from income, toward college expenses:

A family with two children with an income before taxes of $6,000 would contribute $680; a $6,000-income family with three children, $620, and with four children, $540.

A family with two children and a "before taxes" income of $9,000 would contribute $1140; with three children, $980, and with four children, $890.

The amounts expected are reduced if the family faces unusual financial difficulties or responsibilities, and when the student is commuting from college to his or her home.

In addition to its income, a family's liquid assets are also tapped for college expenses under College Scholarship Service procedure.

Assets are considered to include the family's cash savings, stocks, bonds, and other investments, one-half of its equity in a home or other real estate, one-half the loan value of its life insurance, and varying portions of holdings it may have in a small business or a farm.

In a manner weighed to give the family a fair shake, the College Scholarship Service would expect a family with one child and $6,000 in liquid assets to contribute $25 from its assets toward a year's college expenses.

With only $6,000 in assets and more than one child, the bite on assets would be zero.

In ascending scale geared to its assets, an average family with three dependent children would be expected to contribute annually:

With $8,000 assets, $55; $10,000, $125; $12,000, $200; $15,000, $305; $20,000, $615; $30,000, $1,310.

Most or all of a student's own savings, if he has no sizable assets, are expected to be applied to college expenses.

A student planning on a 4-year program with $1,000 of his own in savings would be expected to draw about $200 annually from his savings.

When all of these sources of income are tallied, the college computes the difference between this total and the cost of a year's attendance. That difference determines what is considered the student's financial need.

At many schools, Tulane among them, a thoroughgoing effort is made to provide the balance needed through scholarships, loans and part-time jobs.

Dr. Joseph E. Gordon, associate dean of admissions and loan administrator at Tulane, says a third of Tulane's 4,500 full-time students are getting financial help from one or more of these sources.

The Reverend Father Robert L. Boggs, dean of admissions and loan administrator, says about 100 Loyola students have gotten loans ranging from $319 to $1,000 this year.

"The majority of them are in the dental school," Father Boggs said, "but we have borrowers in every department."

Xavier University limits its loans under the program to $500 because of the number of applicants. It has lent out $40,000 to 101 students.

A Dillard University spokesman said more than 100 students there were getting varying amounts under the loan program, but declined to state the total lent or the spread between individual amounts borrowed.

At St. Mary's Dominican College, 21 students have borrowed $29,707 in Federal money this year. All but three of them, who sought bigger loans to help pay for their room and board, were limited to the $600 tuition charge.

College officials handling the loans here think they could use more Federal money than they're getting.

But $450,000 in 1 year isn't a meager contribution from Uncle Sam.

Tulane's Dr. Gordon, who is overseeing disbursement of the top amount allowed any one institution says there is some talk of raising the $250,000 Federal loan limit per school.

"At Tulane," Dr. Gordon said, "we haven't gotten a great many more applications than we've had money to loan.

"But tuition is going up next year, and every time that happens we find more students who have legitimate financial need.

"So far, I would say that any student denied a loan didn't get one because of academic qualifications rather than a lack of funds."

Father Boggs agreed that Loyola, thus far, has gotten enough loan money to take care of students with sufficient brain power but a shortage of money.

Whether the situation will work out as well next year with more students knocking on the loan-man's door, nobody is prepared to hazard a guess.

Railroad Mergers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the distinguished majority leader, the distinguished Member from Washington, and chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and Senator BURDICK, have recently directed attention to the need for proceeding with caution, in connection with proposed mergers of railroads.

With the ever-declining share of intercity ton-miles of freight traffic, which the railroads are transporting, and with the great decline in railroad passenger traffic, it may well be true that there is a surplus of railroad facilities, and in the light of the present financial plight of the industry, mergers are no doubt necessary. Authorities on the subject are generally agreed on that. There is serious disagreement, however, as to how mergers should be accomplished. The great railroad industry is too important to this Nation in time of peace as well as in wartime to approach railroad mergers on a piecemeal basis. They should be carefully planned to protect the public.

Mergers in the railroad industry are not an innovation; the great railroad systems of America today are the result of thousands of mergers of smaller railroads. I have no doubt that the public interest will be given full consideration by the Interstate Commerce Commission as proposed mergers are considered by that body. It is of great importance that the Commission do just that.

One of the country's great railroad executives, commenting upon the merger situation, in the annual report of his company, just a few days ago, had something to say about the public interest in these railroad mergers which I believe should be considered by everyone.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the statement of Mr. A. E. Perlman, president of the New York Central System, in his annual report, entitled "A Special Report on Railroad Mergers."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SPECIAL REPORT ON RAILROAD MERGERS

In recent months, there has been a flurry of merger activity ranging from proposals to actual accomplishment, within the railroad industry in the East, West, and South.

Historically, mergers are an old subject within the railroad industry, for nearly all of our present rail systems are but the end results of many mergers of smaller companies. This new interest in consolidation is a result of railroads moving to meet the challenges of adapting modern technology to our modern-day economy. Through sound mergers, the Nation's railroads can build stronger, healthier and more competitive rail networks.

The Central, itself a product of some 500 mergers, has a long history of favoring the merger philosophy. We still do. Our only qualification is that such mergers be in the public interest—for healthy, competitive real service is still the keystone to our transportation system and our economy.

For these reasons, the Central has engaged during the past few years in numerous merger discussions. In 1958, we studied such a consolidation with the Pennsylvania Railroad. This study was suspended because of our belief that merging the two largest lines in the East would so overbalance the remaining rail carriers that effective competition would be impossible.

Instead, the Central initiated three-way studies with the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad and the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway. It was, and is, our belief that a consolidation of these three roads, in addition to being to the best interest of each, is the only effective rail system that can be assembled in the East to meet the competition from the Pennsylvania Railroad's ever-growing rail empire.

However, the Chesapeake & Ohio chose to unilaterally seek control—not merger—of the Baltimore & Ohio through an exchange of stock. The Central, still hopeful of a three-way merger, also made an exchange of stock offer to B. & O., which our shareowners approved last October.

At the present time, the Central has become a substantial shareowner of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad. Through purchases, the Central and its affiliated interests now own in excess of 20 percent of the total outstanding B. & O. shares.

Within a few months, the Interstate Commerce Commission will be asked to rule upon the C. & O.'s plan to control the B. & O.

Our philosophy is to encourage carefully formulated, well-planned mergers designed in the interest of promoting and building an ever-improving rail system to the benefit of the public, the investors and owners, and the industry itself.

A piecemeal approach to mergers, haphazardly thrown together without regard to other than self-interest, or the aggrandizement of the stronger railroads, can do irreparable damage to our already weakened transportation system and, consequently, to the public and economy.

While we of the Central stand ready to work toward the three-way merger we have so often proposed, we stand equally ready to resist with every resource at our command, the C. & O.'s attempt at unilateral control of B. & O. and its detrimental consequences to the economy and the industry.

The choice is not ours to make. But we shall accept either course in full confidence of our ultimate success.

Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, education is important. The tax burden is almost unbearable. The following article is plain horsesense:

SUGGESTIONS GIVEN FOR MORE SCHOOLING

(By George W. Crane)

(College heads are notoriously poor businessmen, so you State legislators and members of the board of trustees must stop the needless demand for more taxes. Make the colleges use horsesense, and they can handle twice their present enrollment without a penny for new classrooms or additional faculty. Let's also stop panhandling from Uncle Sam for education.)

Case H-450: George G., aged 45, is a member of the Nebraska State Legislature.

"Dr. Crane," he asked me recently, "we are constantly being urged to appropriate more money for new buildings at our various State universities and teacher's colleges.

"I am very much in favor of education, and as much free schooling as we can offer, but we can't go on forever increasing our tax rates, even for schools and public welfare.

"So what is the solution?"

HORSESENSE IN COLLEGE

More horsesense on the part of our colleges.

Despite the widespread clamor that we shall have twice as many college students in 1975 as today, and many educators are sending up trial balloons to get legislatures favorably inclined toward bigger appropriations, let's face facts.

You legislators (and college boards of trustees) should just demand more American business efficiency on the part of the colleges before you grant them any more funds.

Our colleges can handle double their present enrollments and without an extra cent of appropriations, either for new classrooms or for any new teachers.

Read that sentence again for it is gospel truth.

All we need to do is schedule a second educational "shift," just as efficient factories run double (and often triple) shifts of workers.

Our present classrooms, microscopes and other lab equipment would handle not only double our present school enrollment, but if need be, we could run a third shift and handle triple the number.

College students are adults in physical and mental age, so they don't need be limited to grade school hours of 8 a.m. to 3 p.m.

Let the second shift start at 3 or 4 p.m., and run through 9 or 10 p.m.

"Yes, Dr. Crane," you may protest, "but what about the extra faculty members needed to handle that double enrollment?"

Again, use horsesense which has been ominously lacking on our college campuses for 300 years in America.

The typical college professor today handles an average of only 12 students, whereas each high school teacher handles 24.

Why shouldn't college profs work as hard as high school profs and thus raise that student-teacher ratio from 12:1 up to 24:1, where it easily could be?

Then the present college professors would be handling twice the present college enrollment, without adding to their number at all.

And that added number of tuitions per prof would permit a 50 percent jump all the way along the line in salaries and without 1 cent of new appropriations from our State legislatures.

The only new buildings needed to accomodate double our present college enrollments would be dormitories. And thousands of townsfolk still have vacant rooms available, which could easily be used for that purpose.

Fancy million-dollar-college dormitories don't raise the students' grades. You can rate just as high on exams by living in a rented room in a private home of the townfolk.

So let's stop this mad stampede toward ever-increasing taxes. You can do it easily by simply using American horsesense.

"The Sod-Busting Senator"—Milton Young, of North Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. CARLSON. Madam President, the farmers of our Nation, and particularly in the Midwestern and Northwestern sections of the United States, are fortunate to have as a Member of the U.S. Senate, Senator MILTON YOUNG, of North Dakota.

MILTON YOUNG knows agriculture, not only from experience as a farm operator, but also as a student of the problems of agriculture for many years. He is a recognized authority in the U.S. Senate in this field.

As a member of the U.S. Senate from the State of Kansas, it has been my privilege to have been associated with him in proposing and in having enacted legislation affecting all agriculture, and particularly wheat.

Kansas and North Dakota are the two leading wheat producing States in the Nation, and therefore, we have many mutual interests in the solving of the wheat problem.

The ever-increasing surplus of wheat is a problem that must have consideration by the Congress and Senator YOUNG will, I am sure, have great influence in writing this legislation.

The 1961 spring issue of the Co-op Grain Quarterly of the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, St. Paul, Minn., contains an article written by Lew Muenz, entitled "The Sod-Busting Senator," and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUT OF NORTH DAKOTA—THE SODBUSTING SENATOR

Nowhere in all the land are the furrows as long and as straight as they are in the wheat country of North Dakota. Mile after mile they flow each spring, in a dusky pattern that reaches across the earth to the horizon and beyond.

It has been thus ever since the sodbusting days of the homesteader and the bonanza farms that followed the opening of the upper Great Plains. And the furrows seemed even longer in the olden days. Often they were a mile in length and that meant a half hour of plodding for a team of four horses pulling a two-bottom plow. It was a lonely walk for the farmer or the farmer's son who held the reins. But it gave a fellow a chance to think and a time to dream, and a dream has carried many a farm boy from a furrow to lofty places—perhaps even to the Congress of the United States.

That's what happened to the Honorable MILTON R. YOUNG, the sodbusting Senator from North Dakota whose highly respected voice in the farm affairs of the Nation is a voice of experience.

Senator YOUNG, who has served in the Congress of the United States since 1945, is known throughout that body as "Mr. Wheat." The title is not unwarranted or lightly bestowed, for when it comes to a long and devoted record of service to agriculture, with particular emphasis on the welfare of the wheat producer, the Senator's record is second to none.

Not even in his own North Dakota, where this lanky, soft-voiced, immensely popular servant of the people has held some kind of a public position since the mid-1920's, do men always agree with Republican Senator MILTON REUBEN YOUNG. But they respect him, an applied virtue that in the affairs of men often transcends conformity. Politics in the land of the long furrow are spirited, and at times raucous. But opponents in his home State, as well as in Washington, have learned that you don't scare Senator YOUNG by hollering at him.

As a matter of record, the Senator got some of his most valuable background experience in public affairs back in the days of the great depression by out-hollering traveling men in the little town of Berlin in southeastern North Dakota near the farm where YOUNG was born on December 6, 1897.

"I became interested in politics about the mid-1920's but didn't become active until the late 1920's or early 1930's," he recalls. "I got my start in politics arguing with traveling men and other visitors with whom I came in contact on the streets of Berlin during the depression. Invariably their argument was that farmers would do all right if they would only diversify their operations. Actually, there were surpluses and low prices for every farm commodity in those days. There was no opportunity to switch to some other production to improve your economic situation, yet this was the propaganda with which many outside interests tried to pacify North Dakota in the depression days."

Transient debaters found it difficult to win a point against the young man whose logic came out of the very soil. YOUNG'S formal education was not extensive. It began in a one-room schoolhouse near his father's farm, about 3 miles from the Berlin townsite. Soon afterwards the one-room school was moved into the town of Berlin.

Berlin was the typical North Dakota country town, born of the farmers' need for a center of activities and a source of services which the farmers themselves could not supply.

Settled by sturdy folk, many from far-off lands, the very name of MILTON YOUNG'S birthplace is the out growth of an immigrant's memory of his Teutonic homeland.

Once started, the community gradually grew to fill, quite adequately, the expanding needs of the countryside's citizenry. One man built a two-story frame building and opened a grocery store in it. The next spring another store appeared. A blacksmith came and opened for business. Soon there was a hotel and restaurant; and even a drug dispenser set up a little shop. The bank was a brick building, strong and imposing.

The community was not what you would call rich. But some of the leading citizens were "well-fixed" and there was a comfortable feeling of solidity within the town.

MILTON finished grade school there, and in 1915 was graduated from high school in the larger town of LaMoure, about 11 miles away. After that came a brief stint at North Dakota Agricultural College at Fargo and a period at Graceland, a small college in the southern Iowa town of Lamoni.

He would have liked to continue his schooling. But the pull of the land was strong and, besides, young MILTON was in love.

In 1919 he married petite, blond Malinda Benson, a neighbor girl who looked almost diminutive as she stood beside her lanky bridegroom.

Malinda's parents were a sturdy Norwegian couple who had moved to North Dakota from Spring Grove, Minn., and started farming in 1888. Their farm was near Benson Corners, about 8 miles northwest of the village of Verona. This was near the farm of MILTON'S father, John, one of the best-known and most highly regarded farmers in that part of the State.

The elder Young was a good farmer, kindly, ambitious and wise. He was born at Reed's Landing, Minn., of German parents. With his wife, Rachel, a Swiss girl from Anoka, Minn., he went to North Dakota in 1881 and started farming that same year. MILTON often heard his father recall that to help finance his farming operations he hauled groceries by ox team from Jamestown to the inland community of Grand Rapids, near his farm and about 35 miles from the railroad. It was pleasant, in the warmth of a prairie summer, to loll in the wagon seat behind the plodding oxen, their cloven hoofs scuffing out a percussive rhythm for the meadowlark's flute. "You know I want your wheat to grow," is what the old folks said the meadowlark sang in his lilting eight-note call.

But in the winter, it was another story. Strong winds, icy and cruel, often whipped the snow into belly-deep drifts. Trails vanished under the dangerous white, and it took all the red-eyed cunning the oxen possessed to reach home.

John Young prospered in his business. He had started farming on section 1 in LaMoure County's Henrietta Township, about 3 miles from the town of Grand Rapids. Six years later he bought the south half-section 3 in the same township, and these acres today are called by the Young clan the old home farm. Soon the elder Young owned the entire section, and when the Northern Pacific Railroad established a branch line from Fargo to Edgeley in the early 1890's he opened a small land office. The site of this little office later became the town of Berlin.

Early in his farming operations, Mr. Young became active in inducing immigrants to come to North Dakota. This gave him further opportunity to expand his business of buying and selling land, and he finally quit active farming in 1909. But he continued in the land business, was an active partner in a farm machinery sales company, and joined with his oldest son (not the Senator) in an automobile sales agency. But always his major interest was in the land.

It wasn't always fair weather for John Young, however. He had made considerable money from the land he had purchased over the years, not a fortune but enough to be regardless as "well fixed." All of this went down the drain in the great depression, part of it when a local bank went to the wall at Forman, N. Dak. Those were the Dust Bowl

days, when for weks at a time a great ceiling of soil particles, cast into the air by the relentless winds, hung over all the plains. Men cursed as the earth died.

Out of that time comes a story about the elder Young—an anecdote which perhaps has had an effect on the way Senator MILTON YOUNG thinks. Certainly it is evidence of why neighbors held John Young in such esteem.

During the Dust Bowl time, landowners, particularly absentee owners and the large corporate firms which had vast holdings in the State, were making every possible effort to collect cash rentals from their tenants. Only a few could pay, however. Most of the cattle in the area had been sold to the Government, as had the hogs and most of the sheep. The few remaining head were being kept alive on high-priced hay, straw, and grain shipped in from other States where nature was being more benevolent. From these scanty sources, farmers were trying to scratch out a living—and an occasional dollar with which to pacify the landowners. The story about the elder Young is perhaps best told by the man who played an important part in it, a man named Thorfinnson who at the time was the Government extension agent in Sargent County.

"Mr. Young came into my office one day, in the depths of the drought, and asked if I knew any of his tenants," Thorfinnson recalls.

"You have three in Sargent County," the county agent replied, and Thorfinnson bristled as he envisiond another case of trying to extract the last penny from men already on relief.

"Probably you can help me then," said Young. "I'm remitting all my cash rent so that I can help these farmers get through the winter. And I've got one old codger who's too proud and ornery to take any help. So I want you to watch him, and if the going gets too rough you can let me know and maybe between us we can get him to take some help."

"I wept," says Thorfinnson.

That is some of the background out of which came North Dakota's sodbusting Senator. The Senator farmed through the depression, on "the old home place" which had been rented out from 1909 until 1919 when the newlyweds, Milton and Malinda, moved onto it to start farming on their own.

Like his father, the future Senator confined his operations mostly to small grain although most of the time he kept from 15 to 25 milk cows. And with the same restless urge to always be doing something that characterized his father, he specialized in doing custom threshing for his neighbors and for other farmers for miles around.

Milton's threshing rig was gas-powered. But his Dad had a steam-powered rig, headed by a big fire-eating boiler and engine on great wide wheels, as huge and as awesome as the blood-sweating behemoth of Holy Writ.

It was not strange that the young man who dreamed at the plow handle and enjoyed a verbal set-to about politics with a traveling man should also be fascinated by the big machines that were so colorful a part of farm life in those days. The annual threshing season was looked forward to eagerly by most farm boys, and their elders as well.

Childhood excitement began when the distant whistle heralded the approach of the threshing rig and its crew.

On that exciting day, a boy would watch agape as the overalled crew set up the rig in the farmyard or in the field and began the threshing from stacks or from bundle wagons. The red bandana around the neck of each itinerant crewman was the badge of adventure; and, oh, the status symbol that was the blue-and-white-striped peaked cap of the engineer.

To the boy, it was worth getting up early in the morning and staying up until he was dog tired. The noise was like music as the clattering separator sent a golden cascade of grain into wagons while straw flew high from the blower.

Spirits were high, too, as workers vied to outdo each other in feeding bundles into the great maw of the machine, or in carrying away the product of the harvest.

Most of all, though, a boy liked to watch the smooth powerful piston on the puffing engine—or the spinning governor that lifted its iron weights as the engine gained speed.

It was wonderful to be alive.

As late as 1945, MILTON YOUNG did some custom threshing back home during the fall congressional recess after he had been appointed to the Senate in March of that year. It was to help out some of his neighbors, for whom he had been threshing for years, when they were unable to buy or rent combines or otherwise get their crops threshed.

Today, all three of the Senator's sons—Duane, Wendell, and John—are active farmers, and they still help the neighbors at threshing time. Duane and Wendell are on "the old home place"; John, the youngest, has a farm about a mile west of Berlin.

Senator YOUNG's service as a public official started as a school board and township board member in the mid-1920's. In 1932 he was elected to the North Dakota House of Representatives, and in 1934 to the North Dakota Senate. His senate colleagues named him president pro tempore in 1941, and he became floor leader in 1943.

During the 1930's, the Berlin farmer-politician was chairman of various agricultural action groups established under the New Deal farm program and later was a member of what was known as the Wheat Allotment Board. Service in these groups proved to be mighty valuable experience for him as a member of the State legislature and in the U.S. Senate.

Senator YOUNG's appointment to the Senate perhaps was due in large measure to an early friendship with Fred G. Aandahl of North Dakota.

When MILTON YOUNG was president of the LaMoure County Corn-Hog Committee back in the 1930's, Aandahl was president of the same unit in neighboring Barnes County. The two also served together in the North Dakota Senate, and in the fall of 1944 YOUNG managed the political campaign which resulted in Aandahl's election as Governor of North Dakota.

In that same election, John Moses, the tall, white-maned former Governor of the State—one of the most popular men ever to win North Dakota's highest administrative office—defeated Senator Gerald P. Nye in a knockdown, dragout Senate race.

But Moses died shortly after taking office; and Governor Aandahl named YOUNG to fill the senatorial vacancy. North Dakotans reaffirmed Aandahl's choice at a special election on June 25, 1946, for the Senate term ending January 3, 1951. Then, Senator YOUNG, in a general election on November 7, 1950, was reelected to a full 6-year term. He repeated on November 6, 1956. As a measure of his popularity with North Dakota voters, the records show that in all these statewide elections, both primary and general, MILTON YOUNG lost only 1 country (1950) of the entire list of North Dakota's 53 counties. He was the only Republican candidate for the U.S. Senate in the 1956 general election who received a larger majority than did reelection candidate Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Senator YOUNG has been secretary of the Senate Republican conference since 1948. He is a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, where he is the second ranking Republican, and a member of the powerful Senate Committee on Appropriations, on which he sits as the third ranking Republican. He has been on the Agriculture Committee since 1945 and on the Appropriations Committee since 1947; and he has been serving as a member of the Select Committee on National Water Resources.

A visit to Senator YOUNG's Washington office is a flashback to the Plains. Photos of his beloved North Dakota adorn the walls, with pictures of old-fashioned smoke-belching steam threshing engines among the favored memorabilia.

That's something of the story of MILTON RUBEN YOUNG, the "Mr. Wheat" to whom Senators on both sides of the aisle listen with respect—important member of the most powerful lawmaking body in the world, a son of the soil, the sod busting Senator from North Dakota.

Why Probe Scurrilous Drivel?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Richmond Times-Dispatch of Monday, April 10, 1961:

WHY PROBE SCURRILOUS DRIVEL?

The Times-Dispatch was, we believe, the first newspaper in this area, and one of the first in the United States, to comment on the preposterous pronouncements of the founder of something called the John Birch Society, concerning President Eisenhower, and other public figures.

We raised an editorial eyebrow practically to the ceiling on August 9, 1960, over the incredible nonsense uttered by this man—Robert H. W. Welch Jr., a native North Carolinian and Harvard graduate who had led in establishing the society some 2 years previously.

Recently the John Birch Society has been much in the news, and there has been a great deal of comment in the press. Some of our liberal friends rushed to demand a congressional inquiry.

These demands grew out of such irrational declarations as that of Founder Welch that Mr. Eisenhower is a "dedicated, conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy," and that "treason" was the only word for some of his actions. Mr. Welch prides himself on being violently anti-Communist, and the society fights what it terms "pro-Communist" activities.

After a considerable amount of secrecy concerning the makeup of the society, and mysterious references to "cells," Mr. Welch himself has now asked for a congressional investigation. Furthermore, he has promised that neither he nor any other member of the organization will take the fifth amendment in such an inquiry—an impressive pronouncement.

But there is no occasion for any congressional inquiry at this time into the John Birch Society. Such horrendous drivel as its founder has been guilty of isn't worth an investigation.

Furthermore some of the liberals now say they see no occasion for an inquiry. Among these is Americans for Democratic Action.

However, it should not pass unnoticed that some of the very liberals who wanted to investigate the John Birch Society have been shuddering dolefully over the House Un-American Activities Committee, on the theory that it has been harassing honest patriots. These liberals blow their tops

when efforts are made by that committee to expose the Reds who have been boring into our Government as agents of the Communist conspiracy, but they wanted to mount an investigation of the John Birch Society on the basis of a few screwball pronouncements by its founder. (Since the House of Representatives voted recently, 412 to 6, in favor of increasing the appropriation of the Un-American Activities Committee, instead of abolishing it, the attitude of Congress seems obvious.)

As we say, there has been no showing that an investigation of the John Birch Society is called for. If the organization should ever do anything overtly dangerous, there will be plenty of time for a congressional probe.

Proposals to Transfer Silver Bullion From the U.S. Treasury to Private Users

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CHURCH
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, some time ago the Bunker Hill Co. circulated a letter which contains impressive arguments against the Treasury's present policies with respect to silver. Since Idaho ranks No. 1 in the Nation in silver production, and since the Treasury policies to which this letter refers seem to favor commercial users of silver at the expense of those who produce it, I have asked the Treasury to give me its comments on the criticisms of its policies which the letter contains. Meanwhile, I believe the letter is of special interest to all those who are concerned with the problems of the silver-mining industry, and I ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BUNKER HILL CO.,
San Francisco, Calif., March 15, 1961.

Hon. FRANK CHURCH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: There have been indications that proposals will be made to the 87th Congress that may have, as their ultimate purpose, the transfer to private hands of a substantial portion of the wealth now held by the U.S. Treasury in the form of silver bullion, the effect of which would be much the same as the present serious drain upon our gold reserves.

As you may know, by reason of coinage requirements and sales to private industries, the Treasury's formerly ample stock of so-called free silver (meaning the seigniourage on that acquired at prices below the monetary value of $1.29 per ounce) has dwindled from well over a billion ounces to about 125 million ounces, or approximately a 2-years' supply at the present rate of decrease. Whereas in 1958 practically the entire U.S. production of 35.7 million ounces was purchased by the Treasury under the Silver Purchase Act, at the present time almost no domestic silver whatsoever is being tendered to it—in fact the reverse is true—the Treasury is now a substantial seller of silver on balance.

What has brought about this abrupt reversal in the movement of silver? In 1 year's time the trend has changed from "into the Treasury" to "out of the Treasury." The reason is simple—the Treasury is selling silver at bargain prices. In the bullion market in London, the spot price of silver today is the equivalent of 92.9 cents an ounce and the futures price 93.6 cents an ounce, whereas the Treasury's inflexible selling price is 91 cents an ounce. In other words, the U.S. Treasury is deliberately selling off the wealth of this country for less than others are willing to pay for it elsewhere.

At the same time we are selling silver at bargain prices, our requirements for coinage purposes are mounting steadily due to the tremendous growth in machine vending and in the population. When used for coinage purposes, the free silver on hand at the Treasury becomes worth around $1.60 per ounce to it because of being combined with alloys. Thus the difference between coining the free silver stocks into money and selling it to consumers at 91 cents an ounce amounts to about 70 cents an ounce loss in value, or to put it another way, a giveaway of about 75 percent of the value of the silver sold.

Those who would plunder the Treasury raise specious argument that silver is no longer the standard of value anywhere in the world. The fact of the matter is that the consumption of silver, for coinage as well as industrial purposes is constantly rising worldwide in the face of a static supply situation, and were it not for the intervention of the U.S. Treasury in obligingly making up the deficiency, there would be a critical shortage in silver supplies today. It is this interference with the free play of supply vs. demand that prevents the increase in price which is so necessary to bring forth the additional production so sorely needed. Because silver is essentially a New World mineral, this unorthodox and costly interference with fundamental economic forces prevents the stimulation of mining in the severely depressed areas of this country and the new jobs this would create, and likewise works a hardship on our Latin American neighbors, where so much of the world's silver is normally mined. All this merely to maintain artificially low costs for the silver manufacturers and fabricators who are hardly in a depressed condition.

There is no possible justification for the policy which the U.S. Treasury has been following. The gratuity which is being handed those who do not need it is at the expense of those, here and abroad, who cannot afford the injury which is being done them. Furthermore, it is not, we believe, within the province of any democratic government to discriminate against any particular segment of industry, as in this case.

We therefore respectfully urge your mature consideration of any proposals which may have, as their ultimate objective, a subsidization of a type of business where relatively little risk is involved (the silver consumers) at the expense of the risk-takers (the mining industry), at the same time further sacrificing our dwindling reserves of precious metals badly needed to support our currency.

Sincerely yours,
D. L. FEATHERS,
Vice President-Secretary.

Condemnation Not Enough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, there is much talk about increasing tendencies toward the so-called welfare state. An editorial in the Daily Sentinel of Grand Junction, Colo., vividly expresses the need for community cooperation and individual responsibility in creating opportunities. The editorial follows:

CONDEMNATION NOT ENOUGH

It is easy to applaud condemnation of Federal aid; easy to take a stand against the welfare state. Millions do it daily. What most of them do not do is to accept the National, State, and civic responsibilities in the fields of economics, culture, and community life which will prevent the welfare state.

The welfare state is not imposed upon us from the top. It is instigated, advocated and supported from the bottom. This is a democracy, and we will not have a welfare state unless we want it.

A free and vigorous nation depends upon a vigorous economy in which all individuals face emergencies imaginatively and with a willingness to plan and to sacrifice the profit of the moment for the growth of the future. This is true whether the field is finance, education, religion, or health.

It is not a matter of charity. It is a matter of preserving or creating a climate in which opportunities are continually expanding. It is not enough to "be against" government dole. It is necessary also be vitally and emphatically for any community expansion, any new industry, any project which will improve and expand the area.

When this rich Nation slides into a welfare state the blame must fall upon the refusal of the total community to accept its total responsibilities. It must be considered to have grown up out of a home, community and national atmosphere which promoted it by neglecting the hard work and sense of obligation which keep a nation alive.

Pressures against Federal assistance, whether in the field of medical care, unemployment subsidies, or educational help, are not enough. Community cooperation to prevent the need of Federal aid and individual responsibility in preserving a healthy economy are far more important and in the long run the only effective weapons.

Unfair Tax Burdens on the Clay Tile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution by the City Council of East Liverpool, Ohio:

RESOLUTION 9

Resolution requesting the U.S. Congress for legislation eliminating unfair tax burdens on the clay tile industry

Whereas the manufacture of clay sewer pipe is one of this city's most important industries; and

Whereas it is in competition with the cement pipe industry which has been given depletion allowances under code, see 613 and the Tax Rate Extension Act of 1960 and rulings thereunder over and above those given to the manufacture of clay sewer pipe; and

Whereas this has added to the financial burden of the clay sewer pipe industry to meet the competition aforesaid resulting in possible industrial failure: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Council of the City of East Liverpool, State of Ohio:

SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby petitioned to change the income tax laws pertaining to the above-described inequity in order that competition between the two industries be restored on a just and equitable basis.

SEC. 2. That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to Representative WAYNE L. HAYS for presentation to the Congress of the United States and additional copies be forwarded to Senators LAUSCHE and YOUNG and to Hon. Arthur J. Goldberg, Secretary of Labor.

SEC. 3. That this resolution shall take effect and be in force from and after the earliest period allowed by law.

Passed this 3d day of April 1961.

CHARLES N. EDWARDS,
President of Council.

Attest:

OWEN D. KOUNTZ,
Clerk of Council.

Approved by the mayor this 5th day of April 1961.

BERT H. GOODBALLET,
Mayor.

The Greek Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE GRANT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Norman Meese, editor of the New Age and assistant to the Grand Commander of the Supreme Council, 33d degree of Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasonry Southern Jurisdiction, United States of America, in the April issue writes a timely article entitled "The Greek Way." I am sure that these wisely spoken words will interest all who are members of fraternities and sororities and many others who are interested in our colleges:

THE GREEK WAY

The precise nature of the spontaneous protest, staged by rioting students in San Francisco during the hearings by the House Un-American Activities Committee in May 1960 was made clear by the motion pictures taken there during the demonstration. That it was part of a worldwide Communist conspiracy operating on American soil by an enemy dedicated to the destruction of this Republic can hardly be questioned. This was substantiated in a report on the occurrence issued by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in his "Communist Target—Youth."

Many of our young people are being continually victimized and exploited by Communists, and Mr. Hoover points to the San Francisco riots as an example. In connection with this defiance of authority, however, it is worth noting that nowhere has the name of any fraternity or its members been mentioned as having taken part in this or any other antisocial student demonstration elsewhere.

Here is a trenchant lesson for those who have for years advocated the abolition of our college fraternities or the making of changes in their structure or composition that would be the equivalent of their destruction.

The Greek letter college fraternity has flourished because it meets certain well-defined needs of the students. They are an important influential part of the collegiate picture today. Because of their structure and setting they provide a substantial segment of the social control made necessary by a rapidly growing student body and the increasing complexity of the American cultural pattern. They serve in their own way, but within a more restricted framework, the same disciplinary purposes that the civic and service organizations serve in their own fields. They also share with these many of the same problems.

The exemplary aloofness of these Greek letter fraternities from the recurrent student disorders reported in our news media should constitute reasonable proof that they have a common interest in promoting those values upon which the life of this Republic depends. In addition to fostering fellowship and scholastic excellence, they look to the cultivation of self-discipline, honorable conduct, leadership, and self-reliance in a world in which these sterling virtues seem to be in eclipse. The fraternities serve a most useful and worthwhile purpose and should be supported and encouraged because of their obvious contribution to their social milieu.

World Economic Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following pamphlet written by Julius Stulman. The program outlined by Mr. Stulman touches upon a problem which I am sure we will all agree is of the utmost importance to our Nation:

WORLD ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT—A PROGRAM FOR UTILIZATION OF FULL CAPACITY PRODUCTION

FOREWORD

In every period of crisis, the expectancy runs high throughout the world that the idea and its time will meet. In our time, the urgency is great for ideas that will shed light on the way to solution of those crucial problems, which if they remain unsolved can precipitate mankind into catastrophe.

The new ideas which may generate bold, new policies and programs to ameliorate the human condition will not necessarily emerge from public offices, no matter how high these may be. This is not to say that our leading officials and their aids are without the knowledge, wisdom and creative intelligence to face problems of magnitude and advance their solutions. The point is, if there are others with creative insights who have something to say that might be important and useful, their thinking should be heard and appraised.

An example of this kind of thinking may be found in this monograph by Julius Stulman, "World Economic Development." It proposes an approach to hasten the economic development of needy areas through a program utilizing the full productive capacity of the United States and other producing nations. It is a program that has not yet been tried by us in the various undertakings we have underwritten to help new nations develop within a system of growth and freedom; but because it is fresh, compassionate and practical it deserves the attention of policymakers and is entitled to the benefit of public discussion. Only through such aeration can the idea be helped to meet its time.

Julius Stulman is a successful businessman with a greatly respected reputation in the lumber industry. He is founder of the World Institute Council, one of the founders of the Foundation for Integrative Education and publisher of Main Currents in Modern Thought, a magazine prized by scholars. The magazine's great virtue is that it provides a forum for the ideas of men who have something unconventional to say.

HENRY MARGENAU,
YALE UNIVERSITY, *New Haven, Conn.*

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Julius Stulman is a successful New York businessman who for over 25 years has been one of the major wholesale distributors of forest products in the United States. He heads the Stulman-Emrick Lumber Co. and its many affiliates throughout the country and the Lumber Exchange Terminal, the largest facility of its kind on the east coast.

In 1949 Mr. Stulman laid the basis for the establishment of the World Institute in a statement submitted to the members of the Foundation for Integrative Education. In this statement he proposed a bold, new approach to the solution of the onrushing, explosive problems of mankind in terms of ideas he first formulated in 1941. The integrative and synthesizing methodology of the World Institute has attracted the interest of policymakers, educators and social planners.

Mr. Stulman's thinking on public affairs has influenced many who help formulate public policy and action. Dr. Donald Faulkner of Western Reserve University in 1958 wrote to him, saying, "I have noticed so often analyses and recommendations which you propound becoming common discussion months later." In his book "Integration of Human Knowledge," Dr. Oliver L. Reiser, professor of philosophy at the University of Pittsburgh, pointed out that Mr. Stulman's "thinking about social problems has influenced my own at a number of points."

In 1951, at the request of Prime Minister Nehru, Mr. Stulman worked with the Indian Planning Commission on India's first 5-year program. His approach to the socio-economic problems of India was widely reported and discussed in the press of that country.

It is the author's thesis that only by integrating human knowledge and pooling the best talents available can a whole effort be made to solve our problems. Central to his thinking is the idea that the problems of every nation are inseparable from the total problem of mankind. This view is at the core of this monograph.

(By Julius Stulman)

Since 1945 the United States has spent approximately $75 billion on various foreign aid programs. This massive outpouring of capital helped revive the economies of Western Europe where, to begin with, the technological base was sturdy and contemporary. But it has not succeeded in catalyzing the dormant energies of the greater part of the world. In total balance, per capita standard of living, on a global basis, has hardly budged upward at all. Nor has the vast grants program fed back to the United States the kind of economic return that has lessened the toll of cyclical recessions or minimized the level of unemployment here. As a direct effect, it has contributed substantially to our gold imbalance. Moreover, the enormous expenditure has not succeeded in decreasing the effects of the Communist appeal in impoverished and uncommitted areas.

It is clear that the traditional foreign aid programs, even abetted by our own prospering allies, are inadequate to the larger purpose to which the American people and the free world must be attached. This purpose is no less than upgrading the impoverished peoples of the world to a level of decent living and to formulate the methods and means to make possible a progressive increase in well-being and freedom for everyone.

Large-scale handouts will not accomplish this purpose. The solution lies in the full utilization of natural and human resources, in the full employment of productive capacity, and in the stimulation of constant growth to ever higher levels of capacity and output.

Essential to any program conceived in such large terms is a view of mankind as a whole integrated economic unit, interdependent, growing in a process of taking and feeding back. A program based on such a view excludes the piecemeal palliative and calls instead for solutions that produce growth not only for recipient nations but donor nations as well.

In terms of the United States, such a program, to be creative, must also stimulate our own growth while it contributes to the development of deprived nations.

THE GAP BETWEEN FERTILITY AND PRODUCTION

Time worn methods, even though they flow from generous impulses, cannot meet the world's needs. The solemn fact is that the growth of population is faster than the rate of industrialization, posing a crisis that threatens equally the Western, the noncommitted and the Communist-dominated nations. Procreativity and longevity, already the causes of the gravest contemporary problems, can in the short term future reduce the major segment of mankind to a permanent condition of poverty.

At a 3 percent rate of annual increase from births and growing longevity, it takes only 23 years to double a population. The Ivory Coast has an annual increase of 5.3 percent, a rate that will double its population in under 20 years. The population of South America grew from 60.3 million in 1920 to 110.4 million or 83 percent in 1950. Mexico's population rose in 30 years from 19.2 million to 34.6 million.

The logic and logistics of the warfare between fertility and production are such that not even the richest nation can afford to ignore the impending danger of poverty. Between 1950 and 1959, the population of the United States rose from 151 million to 175 million, an increase of one-sixth in 9 years. Only increasing our production by more than the annual percentage of population increase can we secure jobs and livelihoods for our people. In view of technological improvements, permitting the creation of more goods by fewer people, our production increase must substantially exceed our population increase to supply ample levels of employment.

Clearly the only solution to the problem of population growth is an effort to outrun human fertility by human productivity. Produce or perish has become the imperative of nations.

For the American people, the imperative is to lead the way through a new effusion of idealism and new ideas. The mission falls to our lot because of our capacities and our unique know-how in the mastery and use of technological and managerial power. No other nation has the excess productive capacity and the wealth of skills that we have. Moreover, there are other untapped resources throughout the world that could be put to work if an adequate method of utilization were devised.

In accepting the commitment of leadership in the mission to transform a world half free and half slave into one of freedom for all, the American people will finally have a clear vision of a national goal in the latter part of the 20th century. To fulfill this commitment and regain thereby an unassailable stature of world leadership, we must begin now to mobilize our brainpower, resources, will, and ingenuity in what might be the last struggle of the human race for a full, safe, and free life.

International politics can no longer be viewed in the form of power relationships, but must now be concerned with profound socio-economic impulses driving all mankind.

The program proposed in these pages offers a breakthrough to a new method of rapidly increasing the world's rate of productivity under a growing system of freedom and without coercion. It outlines a process by which social, economic, and psychological needs of emerging nations can be creatively served.

The program outlines a method by which the United States can:

1. Achieve full maximum capacity production at declining costs.

2. Progressively increase its capacity.

3. Distribute to needy nations the difference between what we require for home consumption and trade and the full output of a rising capacity.

4. Provide the opportunity for other nations voluntarily to join by the same means this global economic mission to raise the standard of living of all people.

5. Increase the consumption and rapidly expand the technological development of emerging nations and help them to acquire the ability to pay for their own economic growth.

6. Progressively diminish the power of the Communist economic offensive, the allure of Communist slogans, and the effects of other doctrinaire propaganda.

7. Broaden and firm up the base of freedom by which men can find their true stature throughout the world.

FULL MAXIMUM CAPACITY PRODUCTION

In the light of the apparent needs of the world, including those of the United States, it is unimaginative and paradoxical that either industrial or agricultural production should continue to be restrained. Our schizophrenic farm program is torn between the alternatives of reducing productive acreage and of supporting farm prices, while at the same time accumulating stockpiles of many billions of dollars. To its credit, where the program has implemented oversea disposal, some results have been economically creative. As a result of barter arrangements, the U.S. Government has received, in exchange for food, minerals, fibers, and other raw materials with a heavy labor content from recipient countries. In other instances, where payment for American farm products has been made in local currencies, reserves of working capital have been set up for economic development. While national policy has cut back our agricultural capacity, surplusage nevertheless occurs and is used with wisdom by our Government in its program for impoverished areas.

Fundamentally, however, with half the world still starving the immorality of restraining food production should by now have created a strong sense of national guilt. The frustrations of a bad policy are felt by all of us. The American people basically want a better way to handle this problem, but as of now they have not been able to devise one. The promised food-for-peace crusade may alter this condition and liberate our farm policy from its inhibiting attachment to parity prices.

Our industrial output, which is consistently much lower than actual capacity will not have the benefit of a products-for-peace crusade and has no program supporting utilization of excess output. Production is maintained at levels determined by classical market conditions both here and abroad. There is certainly no extra stimulation to produce at maximum capacity.

Yet maximum capacity production offers the way out of a vast number of problems, not only in our commitment to needy nations but domestically as well.

Production at full capacity is feasible of attainment, but it requires an ability to override historic blockages which now tie production planning to traditional standards.

The method proposed in this program for full capacity output is a dual system of production, one cycle of which will be used to meet normal market requirements, the other cycle to be used for the requirements of needy nations.

In the first cycle, an enterprise participating in this program will maintain the necessary levels of production, within existing formal patterns of costing, to serve its traditional domestic and foreign markets. Standard accounting procedures will continue to be applied in this production cycle, in which overhead and other standard costs will be charged to the cost of production.

In the second cycle, the participating enterprise will assign its total excess capacity to produce products, stripped of the frills and trappings required for competition in normal markets, for distribution to underdeveloped areas. Such products are to be made to meet the psychological requirements of emerging nations, at a price they can meet, and at a profit to the company supplying them. Prices of products so destined for underdeveloped countries can be rolled back to include principally costs of direct labor and materials, and to exclude charges for general overhead, design, warehousing, selling, advertising, promotion, fancy packaging and like items. These charges can continue to be absorbed by the percentage of production earmarked to meet the demands of normal markets.

In addition to making products available at low cost to underdeveloped nations—in some instances as low as one-fifth of normal cost—this system will increase the profitability of any enterprise adopting it. A company, for example, producing at a given time 70 percent of rated capacity and which assigns the 30 percent unused capacity to production for needy nations will manage this share of its output at "bargain" costs enabling it to sell it at "bargain" prices with a true profit. Full capacity production, moreover, will make possible benefits in purchasing, labor utilization, plant efficiency and other elements which will beneficially affect the total cost of production.

Companies participating in this program should have agreements between management and labor which establish the conditions to insure the success of the program.

Appropriate safeguards can easily be erected against the dangers of a dual pricing system and the possiblities of black market operations. Products made for underdeveloped countries will be uniquely marked. A clear definition of eligibility should be made for the procurement of goods under this program. Proper policing can prevent the lower priced products from affecting normal market structures. India, for example, has a double pricing system for foods. Eligible families below a certain annual income level receive as proof of eligibility food cards entitling them to purchase food far below the free market prices. Those not eligible have to pay free market prices.

INCREASING OUR PRODUCTIVE CAPACITY

In addition to the need for producing at full capacity, the world's requirements are so enormous that a continuous increase in capacity is one of the imperative targets. To increase capacity requires a constant replacement of production equipment by the most technologically advanced substitutes.

Since the proposed program excludes enforced participation or any other form of coercion, attractive inducements must be set up to encourage enterprises to underwrite capital expenditures for new, advanced equipment. The tax structure should be revised permitting very rapid depreciation write-off of equipment used in production for underdeveloped countries. A governmental, or as will be seen later, an international pool of depreciated equipment should be established for delivery to under-

developed countries, as second-hand tools and equipment. Contributions to this pool by individual enterprises should be paid for under a schedule which will encourage replacements by the most advanced types of production machinery, so that our ability to produce quality goods in increasing capacity and at declining costs will be constantly enhanced. Such strong encouragement to technological progress can be an important contribution to freedom.

This process can result in other major benefits both to underdeveloped countries and to the people of the producing nations of the world. With respect to underdeveloped countries, tools and equipment for the erection of factory systems can become available in abundance. Production set up around such equipment will almost certainly be for home consumption exclusively, and because the equipment will not have the same productivity rate as the new, advanced types replacing it, it will not pose a competitive threat to the world's markets. Nevertheless, it will be the best available at the time of disposal and a challenge to the machine adaptability of the emerging peoples.

As for the economy of the United States and that of any other industrialized nation participating in this program, the large-scale replacement of existing equipment with new types will open the door wide to the latest in automation. It will increase productivity per man-hour; reduce unit costs; increase real wages, purchasing power and consumption at lower prices; and provide a strong underpinning for full employment. As the level of technology rises in underdeveloped countries, the process of machinery disposal through the equipment pool will include automated equipment, stimulating a constant turnover of capital equipment, toward ever advanced types. Eventually, as the machine-orientation of the emerging peoples increases, their own equipment will be replaced through this pool by automated equipment from level to level.

DISTRIBUTION AND PAYMENTS

As we conceive of this program as a "products and machinery for peace" crusade and as a method for our own continued growth, and, concerned as it is with the solution of mankind's gravest problem, it would be futile to bind it to traditional forms of international payments. The distribution of products and machinery to underdeveloped nations is not part of a grant-in-aid program proposing stop-gap solutions at random sore spots. It is a total, integrated program promising solutions in which the recipient underdeveloped nations, in the very act of receiving, will be catalyzing the advance of the industrialized nations to higher levels of technology.

In spite of its force for growth, the program, nevertheless, requires a practical approach to the question of payment. Neither the psychic reward of moral satisfaction nor the overriding benefit of minimizing a major cause of world strife is sufficient compensation if we are to insure human freedom and human dignity. The emerging peoples, however, cannot now pay for what they may receive and rightfully should have. Currently the underdeveloped nations are rich in manpower, potentially the most productive resource of all. Conversion of this resource into an increasingly productive force will provide the ultimate means of payment for products and equipment. The capability of paying from future earnings will increase as the industrialization impetus drives on. Even in the short term, increased productivity in farming, mining, and some industrial operations can produce net earnings out of which debts for the purchase of tools can be paid.

For the long term, there must be inherent in this program a persuasive faith in the desire and ultimate ability of the underdeveloped peoples to make good their debts. Supported by such a faith, a system of credits should be established that will enable needy nations to postpone payments for products and machinery in the form of labor and goods. To convert the promise of payment into current receipts it will be necessary to equip existing international banking institutions with an adequate revolving fund. For this fund, the present capital of the International Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the U.S. Export-Import Bank and the banking systems of Western Europe may well supply the means. Some of these institutions are not now using substantial parts of their resources. Added funds can be mobilized in the capital markets of the world if the institutions implementing the program continue to enjoy the confidence of financial communities. Moreover, funds earmarked for giveaway grants should be used to support this program.

It should be recalled that the wealth of the United States could never have been developed without massive investments in its future by the European financial community during the 19th century. These investments were based on confidence in the debtor's ability and readiness to honor obligations. They were made in the light of our natural resources and in the desire to make this Nation a trading partner, buying goods from Europe and selling its products in payment to the markets of the world. The relationship between the underdeveloped nations and the industrialized countries today cannot be very much different from the earlier relationship between the United States and its more advanced European partners. History will also record that the emerging nations helped the producing nations as the United States helped its European sponsors. Actually, the manpower and natural resources of the emerging nations offer the largest pool of production ingredients in the world, and they should be viewed as strong collateral for long-term credits.

The total program of industrial surplus sales to underdeveloped countries and consumers within them should be transacted by private sellers and buyers. The interference of government bureaucracies should be reduced to a minimum at the source of procurement as well as the place of destination. This does not mean an exclusion of government supervision. As in the disposal of U.S. farm surplus commodities, the problem of protecting growing normal sales against price destruction by surplus disposal must be solved.

The needy countries at the receiving end of this program can set up an exchange system in which consumer goods are traded with their own nationals for hours of labor contributed to natural resources exploitation, public works, educational institutions, and other construction projects. An underdeveloped country, for example, can purchase commodities under long-term credit made possible by this program. It can then sell these commodities to its people for their surplus hours of labor rated at prevailing wage scales.

By way of illustration, an item for which the country is charged $3, and in the normal markets sells for $12, may be exchanged for $6 worth of work assigned to a roadbuilding project, an assembly plant construction or comparable capital developments. In this manner, basic wealth accumulations can be built up. Let us say, a volume of goods for which the country is charged $1 million may be exchanged for $2 million worth of labor poured into a capital project. The gain in terms of national wealth is $3 million, together with a new capacity to produce goods or other values, and at the same time provide a capital base for continuing credit. On a large scale, this process can bring about rising levels of consumption and larger accumulations of capital. In the long term, the compounding of national wealth by this means will make possible repayment of the country's debt to the international credit agency.

While surplus labor hours can be used for public works, housing, and similar developments, they will also be available in volume for assignment to the erection of processing, assembly, and manufacturing plants built around the equipment sold from the machinery disposal pool. The formations set up around such equipment can be organized under credit systems devised in the recipient country. In all cases the principle is to transform the country's manpower resources into productive wealth.

A MULTILATERAL PROGRAM

While the United States has the potential in resources, know-how, and capital to carry a substantial burden of the program alone, rapid fulfillment of its material and moral aims can best be attained if all the industrialized nations participate. The program, therefore, proposes the organization of a central international body, within or outside the United Nations, to supervise its operations, set up the required structure of payments and credits, act as a central management counseling body and establish thorough research facilities.

Whether the program is wholly American or ideally international in sponsorship, its research adjuncts must be given high priority. Among their functions will be to research and design products that can be manufactured in excess capacities and that are acceptable to recipients in needy nations; to research the potentials in developing areas that can be encouraged by selected types of industrial equipment; to research local market needs, labor skills, natural resources, and other areas of potential wealth.

The central organization will also have to face up to the widespread lack of machine orientation in the emerging nations and establish training programs around works in progress or for installation in the planning stage. The rapid development of even marginal skills will make possible final assembly of many products produced in preliminary stages in the excess capacity of plants in the United States and elsewhere. Management know-how and the men who can teach it are exportable items and should be made available for assignment to needy nations as a basic phase of this program.

To preserve the free enterprise character of the program, the central organization should eventually be self-supporting, and although nonprofitmaking, it should earn its keep from income out of royalties on patents and developments, nominal commissions on the sales it engineers, and nominal fees for management services.

INCREASING CONSUMPTION AND INDUSTRIALIZATION OF NEEDY PEOPLES

Industrialized United States and Western Europe, in command now of extraordinary scientific resources and imminently capable of fully automated production, will in greater degree have to find expanding markets for their output. All producers, including the Soviet Union, are contending for all available markets in which to trade. The hope everywhere is that the vast underdeveloped populations will be converted rapidly into full consumers and therefore rich markets.

Currently per capita income in scores of underdeveloped nations is below $100 per annum. The explosive rate of population increases prevents current industrialization efforts to upgrade per capita income. Only rapidly increased productivity can raise the level of income and expand these nations into richer markets.

The proposed program essentially will achieve this end. Capital equipment, in the

quantities it envisions, put to use in extractive industries, public works, fabrication, and assembly, will hasten the process of technology, raise productivity and with it purchasing power. By exchanging labor hours contributed to the industrial buildup for commodities, people in underdeveloped countries will have the means to purchase products imported within this program from the surplus production of participating enterprises. These products, stripped to the core and redesigned if necessary to serve these people, will contribute to a rising standard of living. This is the beginning of the process of transforming underconsumers into full consumers, and the beginning of consumer education, an essential factor of market strength and healthy people.

As the process continues under this program, production tools, in increasing diversity, will be supplied by industrial nations by which emerging nations will manufacture the basic needs of their people. These tools will come out of the pool of depreciated equipment, adapted where necessary to local conditions. Again, in the normal process of development, this is the beginning of a large, advancing, maturing capital goods market.

NULLIFYING THE COMMUNIST OFFENSIVE

The principal strength of the Communist economic offensive and the allure of Marxist slogans derive largely from the grave deficits of capital throughout the underdeveloped world. Goaded by the historic imperative to industrialize, caught in the gap between productivity and procreation, and driven by nationalistic pride to be contemporary among nations, underdeveloped countries are the natural prey of the Communist offensive. Unless a nation is helped quickly to industrialize in freedom and in freedom to develop the capital wherewithal for growth, it can succumb easily to the promise of Communist slogans. The next step is a consolidation of economic power in a central government and the establishment of a system of duress in which power manipulates men, money and machines for its own aggrandizement and perpetuation.

In the long run, the imperative of history is produce or perish. In this generation, the imperative is to lead the underdeveloped nations in freedom to industrialization or watch them, or by one, fall into the Communist trap. The U.S.S.R. claims to have spent 9 billion rubles or $2,250 million on aid to Asian and African countries. William O. Douglas has characterized Soviet aid as having "no charity in it." He pointed out that every economic favor rendered in the form of loans at 2½ percent interest per annum had its political price. Russia, however, is also a have-not nation; it does not have the productive capacity and technological abundance to remake the world in the Soviet image. It cannot now, nor will it for a long time, have the ability to satisfy the needs of its own people.

There unquestionably obtains in Russia a great capacity of scientific and technical talents, but there is also a great incapacity in management. Russia—and this is evident as the momentum of its growth picks up—does not posses the managerial know-how, communication skills and technological orientation rapidly to change-over itself from a basic have-not nation to one of opulence. The U.S.S.R. tends to resist change and improvement and intellectually cannot adopt a method involving a process of change. No matter what it promises to the needy nations, without the power to produce and manage, it can only succeed in socializing poverty. If the resources of the United States and the free world are mobilized in a program as outlined, involving the full utilization of productive capacity, products and machinery could be sold to needy nations at a profit to us, not only at a price below the cost of production in the Soviet Union, but in quality and quantity the U.S.S.R. cannot equal. In the face of such strength, the Soviet boast to swamp us would be reduced to a whimper.

THE BASE OF FREEDOM

No program sponsored by the American people can ever enhance our stature or give us moral satisfaction unless it flourishes in freedom and extends the base of freedom to all people. The commitment to make the half-slave part of the world free, to extend the frontier of freedom to a new and distant horizon, is the American mission. The program based on full and growing capacity production has the means within it to begin the achievement of freedom and economic independence for deprived nations, and through its methods give the people of these nations the opportunity to raise their standards of living through productive labor, and through their own will and toil capitalize their growth and development. The feedback to us and other producing nations will be the way to our own new growth dimensions.

With inducements of self-interest, without coercion, and with methods that are humanly manageable, no people will choose to surrender their right to freedom if given the opportunity for a proud, dignified, and creative way of productive growth.

Hospital Care for Gold Star Mothers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include my statement before the Veterans' Affairs Committee in support of my bill, H.R. 699, to authorize the furnishing of hospital care at Veterans' Administration hospitals for Gold Star Mothers:

STATEMENT OF HON. THOMAS J. LANE, OF MASSACHUSETTS, IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 699, A BILL TO AUTHORIZE THE FURNISHING OF HOSPITAL CARE AT VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS FOR GOLD STAR MOTHERS, APRIL 10, 1961

Mr. Chairman, the Congress of the United States has been most thoughtful and generous, in legislating a wide range of benefits for veterans, and extending in part to their dependents.

The GI bill of rights that was enacted in 1944 was the most comprehensive program of its kind in human history. It recognized the special obligation of the Government "to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow, and his orphan."

In order to help the 16 million veterans who returned from World War II, in their adjustment to civilian life, we overlooked a need that would come for the mothers of those who gave their lives in defense of our country. Some of them were the beneficiaries of Government insurance. A few of them are on the pension rolls. But not one of them is entitled to hospital care at Veterans' Administration hospitals.

There are not many Gold Star Mothers of World War I living today. And the Gold Star Mothers of World War II are in their fifties. Their great need is for hospital care which is not provided for them under veterans' legislation in effect today.

To many Americans this is an unintentional but serious neglect of those to whom we owe so much. By example and instruction, these brave mothers raised their sons and daughters to be good citizens and to give their lives, if need be, in defense of our country and its freedoms.

I know the admirable character of these women. I saw some of them soon after they had received official notice that a son had been killed in action. In their grief they did not complain of the most difficult loss of all to bear.

The least we can do for them, in return for the sacrifice that they made, is to provide hospital and medical care in their time of need. It is not enough to honor them with words, on Memorial Day and Veterans' Day.

As a mark of our sincere gratitude and enduring respect, we should care for them when they need our assistance, in veterans' hospitals, where they would be treated and comforted and restored to health. Not because they claim it as a right, but because we want to help them who gave of their own flesh and blood to save us. In a Veterans' Administration hospital they would be cheered by visible evidence of our Government's consideration for them.

Last year, a mother in my district who had lost two sons on the battlefield in World War II, became gravely ill. She did not have any health insurance, or enough money to pay for private hospital care. Through the veterans' aid department of her community, we made arrangements to finance her hospital expenses until she passed away. But as this was a form of welfare, it was embarrassing to the pride of this poor woman and to those of us who tried to assist her.

For her service to the Nation, she deserved more than this.

In order to protect her during the emergency of sickness, I have introduced H.R. 699. To the extent that the furnishing of such care will not jeopardize the availability of facilities for the furnishing of hospital care to veterans it will authorize hospital care at Veterans' Administration facilities for Gold Star Mothers.

Textile Industry Must Have Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Fall River (Mass.) Herald-News of Monday, April 10, urging the necessity of curbing a rising tide of textile imports into the United States, to the detriment of American industry and labor:

NEED PROTECTION

The Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America has announced its intention to stop cutting Japanese fabrics on May 1. The boycott on Japanese goods is intended to put pressure on Japan to impose voluntary quotas on its exports of finished men's and boys' suits to this country. Whether it will be successful is questionable, but it certainly makes plain just how determined many Americans are to reverse the tide of imports flowing into this country.

Evidently the clothing workers are tired of Washington's dilatory and half-hearted

attitude toward what is one of the most pressing economical problems in the country today. By now the administration has heard management and labor, to say nothing of deputations from Congress, all expressing the same fear of the damaging effect these imports from abroad are having on our own industry. There is nothing new about the situation. It has been basically the same for the past 15 years. But it is getting rapidly worse, and its repercussions are being felt everywhere.

The problem it presents to the Government is complex. Washington does not wish to weaken its allies economically and thereby make them more susceptible to Communist blandishments. At the same time, it is keeping them strong at the expense of American taxpayers. The conflict of interests here is sharp, and in the end domestic industry will have to be preserved, or this Nation's own strength will be sapped.

The time is not far off when the administration will have to reappraise the situation, however agonizing that reappraisal may be. The action of the clothing workers should hasten that day.

A Program for Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to bring to the attention of the House the activity of a Michigan company that wants to aid the economy by a direct program of action by all business management. Mr. Clyde H. Reeme, president of the Udylite Corp. of Detroit, is to be commended for the following address he gave to members of Udylite management on April 10, 1961:

For practically a full year now, the headlines of the morning papers have made a poor side dish for your toast and coffee. You have read about the increasing rate of unemployment, the falling rate of national growth, about higher prices and lower profits, about regression and recession and other types of crises in our national economy. And if you are like any other member of business management, this talk disturbs you and makes you wonder a little bit as you make your way to work.

As men of management we have willingly accepted the leadership. We have willingly joined the ranks of men who, like ourselves, determine how business can best serve the needs of the people of this country. Now we are faced squarely with the question: What are we going to do about this deadly state of mind faced by our Nation and our business community?

One answer—and I believe a valid one—has come from a man on our own management team. Just a few days ago Chet Clark suggested to me a simple, yet purposeful program that will place the economic situation of ourselves, our company, and our country back in its proper perspective.

You may be apprehensive about spending your money on the new car you had planned to buy—on signing the mortgage for the new homestead you've been looking forward to having for years—on taking that trip that you'd really like for this year's vacation. You may comprehend all these apprehensions as evidence of some unspoken kind of insecurity about your own job.

Without realizing it, we have let ourselves—not only here at Udylite, but all throughout the country—be drawn into a situation from which it becomes harder and harder to extricate ourselves.

But let's look at it in another light. Because the purchases we postpone today mean fewer jobs in the industries we supply, fewer orders on our own order books, fewer jobs in our own plant, we are working ourselves deeper and deeper into more of the same kind of apprehension that started this cycle in the first place. It promises to rob us—our personal selves, our industry and our Nation—of vitality and confidence.

Obviously we don't want this kind of thing to happen. Nobody does. As men of management, it is our responsibility to shape the course of events. We exert the power we have earned to make things happen, not to permit things to happen to us. And the program resulting from Chet's suggestion offers a guide to solving today's particular problem.

What, then, am I asking of you business leaders here at Udylite, and all business leaders throughout the whole U.S. economy? Simply this: I am proposing that we start now the recovery program for the economy by our own action.

I am going to ask you to show your vitality and confidence by proceeding with those purchases you were planning on making * * * by buying the new car and appliance * * * by signing the mortgage * * * by taking the vacation. Pour the fruit of your labors back into the wealth of the Nation. Enjoy the benfits you deserve unhampered by an unholy specter of fear for the future.

This is the surest way of guaranteeing the security of your own job—which really may be what is haunting us all. By making jobs for others we make job security for ourselves. It is as simple as that, and it works as quickly as that.

We would like to see this program spread to your friends, to our suppliers, to the other industries here in Detroit and, in fact, throughout the entire Nation.

Take for our example, the contributions already made by other groups, and the sacrifices suffered by them during our national economic decline. Our own organized labor has already paid more than its share through lost jobs and lost wages, through reductions, even in jobless benefits in critical unemployment areas. Can we who do not feel the job pinch so quickly stand by while fellow employees return to their homes without work today?

We have seen time after time that we can plan for progress and achieve it. Sometimes it takes daring. Sometimes it takes no more than doing the job to be done today, with confident hope that we will achieve the awards of tomorrow.

I mentioned a second part to the program being proposed initially to you today. That is, to spread this gospel as far and as wide as you can. You will be interested to know that I am sending a copy of this talk with the Udylite plan for progress to the presidents of leading corporations in the country. In a covering letter there is a request that they encourage their own management teams to take the same action I am asking you.

Will you, then, convert others to it, and ask them to serve as missionaries as well? This includes your friends and neighbors, your grocer and milkman—anyone who has ears to listen to your voice. It is through concerted efforts on the part of all confident men in the country that this program can really succeed. And it is through the enthusiastic beginnings made by this group at Udylite here today that such a worthy program can get started.

Consider this program thoughtfully—seriously. Discuss it at home and with your fellow employees. Then act. Don't hesitate any longer. Get out and show your confidence with your purchasing power and revitalized objectives, letting your confidence rub off on every friend and acquaintance you know.

A Dormitory for Congressional Pages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to testify on April 11, 1961, before the Accounts Subcommittee of the House Administration Committee, in behalf of H.R. 1221, a bill to provide a residence for the pages of the Senate and the House of Representatives. I introduced this bill on January 3, 1961, and I commend to the attention of our colleagues my remarks before the subcommittee:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I want to thank you for this opportunity to give you my views on H.R. 1221, a bill to provide a residence for the pages of the Senate and House of Representatives under the supervision of a Capitol Pages' Residence Board.

The absence of a properly supervised dormitory or other suitable living quarters for the Capitol pages continues to be a serious problem which should have our prompt and careful attention. I have proposed that three Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and three Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker, form a Capitol Pages' Residence Board. This board is to be responsible for the maintenance and operation of a dormitory-type residence for the Capitol pages. Fees to be deducted from the salary of the pages at rates that would make the operation of the residence self-sustaining, so far as practicable, would be set by the board. In most cases, it is expected that these rates would be less than the rents now being paid for private housing. Construction is not contemplated at the present time and none of the appropriated funds will be used to purchase real property unless specifically authorized in the appropriation act. The board is authorized to accept voluntary donations for the purchase or construction of a residence.

Each page employed by the Senate or the House of Representatives would be required to reside at the pages' residence while Congress is in session and during all periods when he is entitled to receive compensation as a page, unless the board had approved alternative living arrangements. One or more persons with the necessary maturity and experience to provide the care and supervision these boys need would be appointed by the board.

This lack of any adequate housing for the Capitol pages is deplorable. It is almost unbelievable that these boys of high school age must seek living accommodations wherever they can in a city as big as Washington. Many of the pages must rent rooms or share apartments in various parts of the city, sometimes at exhorbitant rents. Only a fortunate few have relatives with whom they can live. The rest must do the best they can and often live under conditions where they run the risk of associating with persons of less than the most desirable character.

The page boys are still in their formative years. They must be between the ages of 14

and 17 in order to be eligible for appointment. Since they are appointed on a patronage basis by a Congressman or a U.S. Senator from their home State, many come from across the country.

Under the present conditions, they are, in effect, thrown out into the city without any protection or guidance after they arrive. They are allowed to come and go as they please without sustained supervision over and above that given by some of their landlords.

These boys are not mature enough to cope with city life under these conditions. The possible consequences have been amply demonstrated on two occasions in the past years. Only a year ago a street gang attacked four 16-year-old pages at Fifth and East Capitol Streets and stabbed one of the boys. Another page boy was attacked and brutally beaten near the Capitol the year before that. A similar tragedy or worse is liable to happen again unless proper housing and supervision is provided for these boys. The pages will continue to be vulnerable to such attacks until the situation is rectified.

Congress has furnished the Capitol pages a school in the Library of Congress which has an unusually good teaching staff that does an admirable job under difficult conditions. The physical plant of the Capitol Page School is limited. The necessarily irregular hours constitute another hardship. There is no way to provide organized or supervised study periods under present conditions.

It is equally essential that we in the Congress provide the Capitol pages with suitable living conditions, an inspiring rather than a degrading environment, and proper supervision. These things are as important to the healthy development of these young men as a good education. We have a special responsibility to give the Capitol pages the kind of academic and spiritual atmosphere we would like our own children to have away from home.

These boys have a rare opportunity to observe the workings of our Government. Their job here in the Capitol gives them an insight into governmental processes which they can get no other way. The Capitol pages can form a valuable nucleus for education and training in politics in the best sense of the word. If we give them a decent chance, they have an opportunity to become outstanding citizens and leaders of the future. But adequate housing facilities where they can eat, sleep, play, and study under proper supervision are essential to the achievement of this goal.

Congress has appropriated large amounts of money for our office and service needs in recent years. The least we can do for these fine boys, who provide a valuable service for our work, is to give them better living conditions. Their schedule is a demanding one which involves early hours for schoolwork and late hours when Congress works late.

We all share a common responsibility for the welfare of the Capitol pages whom we have brought here to serve us. Many bills have been introduced to provide the pages with a suitable residence in the last 10 years. The matter is already long overdue.

I first introduced a similar bill in the 85th Congress. It aroused considerable favorable comment. In the 86th Congress many Members joined me in urging enactment of the bill I then introduced.

I am happy that this committee has seen fit to order this hearing. I sincerely hope that this bill will receive your early and favorable consideration. Thank you for hearing me.

Legislation To Help Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEED
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the House Small Business Committee, today addressed the convention of the National Independent Dairies Association which is meeting here. As a member of that committee and chairman of its Subcommittee on Small Business Problems in the Dairy Industry, I think his remarks on "Legislative Proposals To Help Small Business" will be of interest to all of our colleagues. While Mr. PATMAN's remarks are particularly pertinent to the dairy industry, they also offer avenues of approach to help remedy the ills of other small independent business firms who need legislative aid to ease their burdens.

Under unanimous consent, I include his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS TO HELP SMALL BUSINESS

(Address by WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, chairman, Select Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives, National Independent Dairies Association, Washington, D.C., April 11, 1961)

It is pleasing to see and visit so many independent and small processors and distributors of dairy products. Indeed, it is surprising that so many of you have survived the rigors of trade practices and conditions to which you have been subjected.

Those of us who have served with the House Small Business Committee have learned much about your problems. Well do I remember the first hearings our Small Business Committee held regarding the problems in the dairy industry. We opened those hearings in Dallas on December 30, 1957. They produced some shocking evidence about how some large processors and distributors were selling milk at prices below cost with devastating effects on small business.

Since then our colleague and good friend, TOM STEED, of Oklahoma, has held hearings and made investigations in various parts of the country about the practice of selling dairy products at prices below cost. The work he has done has added substantially to the evidence we collected in our hearings at Dallas.

DISCRIMINATORY PRICING BY THE FIRMS HURT SMALL FIRMS

"You know better than I how the below-cost selling practices have increased your difficulties in your efforts to survive," he said: "Some of the larger firms do not experience the same difficulties.

This is true even though they engage in the practice of selling milk at prices below cost in some areas. They are able to do this by recouping their losses through the sale of milk at higher prices in other areas.

"Some of them are such large, conglomerate corporations that they are enabled to survive for some time even if they should make all of their sales of milk at prices below cost."

National Dairy Products Corp., (Sealtest) is not only the largest processor and distributor of dairy products, but its operations are widely diversified. Its total gross sales now approximate $1,600 million annually.

This large conglomerate corporation is engaged in the sale and distribution of many products. In one of its annual reports a few years ago to its stockholders it stated:

"We move ahead on our program to expand manufacturing and distributing facilities for our lines of cheese, salad dressings, cooking oils, margarine, confections, and other grocery products. A new cheese plant was started at Stockton, Ill. Construction also moved along on our new vegetable oil refinery at Champaign, Ill.

"We entered the glass container industry in the late summer of 1956, acquiring the Metro Glass Co. with plants in Jersey City, N.J., Washington, Pa., and Dolton, Ill. Metro is a supplier of containers to National Dairy, as well as to many other companies in the food, beverage, household products and cosmetics industries.

"In Mexico, we began to make and distribute cheese and salad products at a new plant in Monterrey.

"Products introduced during the year were orange juice, fresh fruit salad, jellies and preserves, a new line of flavored cheese spreads and a new whipped cream cheese.

"Our newly developed orange juice, packaged ready for use in quart paper containers, began to appear in grocery dairy cases under the Kraft brand. Derived from selected sweet ripe oranges, this is a reconstituted juice maintaining a constant, peak-of-season flavor. We also introduced Kraft fruit salad. The orange, grapefruit, pineapple and maraschino cherry sections going into these salads are processed and packed at our plant in Lakeland, Fla., where special care is taken to conserve all the natural fruit juices.

"We also expanded the company's business with a new Kraft line of jellies and preserves in a wide variety of flavors."

Its more recent reports to its stockholders have described in detail how this expansion into new product lines and into new markets has continued. Many of the plants this large nationwide corporation has acquired by buying out small and individual firms who had built goodwill in their respective sections of the country and on the products they had developed. Thus, some of these large firms have not only bought the facilities, but also, the businesses of many competitors.

According to testimony which has been presented to a subcommittee of the House Small Business Committee, the viewpoint has been expressed by representatives of at least one of these large processors and distributors that through the practice of making sales in particular areas at prices below cost, they can destroy competing small business firms and take over their business more cheaply than by going through the process of buying them out.

On May 14, 1960, a representative of small business complained to members of the House that the National Dairy Products Corp. (Sealtest) was selling dairy products in Kentucky at unreasonably low prices, and in that connection stated:

"The unreasonably low price at which these products are being sold would seem to be for the sole purpose of destroying competition, especially independent dairies such as ourselves. This can be very easily done by a large national concern such as Sealtest who operates in many different geographical localities and are able to finance and subsidize a price war against small dairies who sell in competition.

"By using these unfair competitive practices they would in effect force us out of business within 30 to 60 days. Therefore,

the urgency for action is of the utmost importance. We ask that you help us eliminate these unfair practices as quickly as possible."

This method of expanding business by making sales at prices below cost has been referred to as "advertising."

Not long ago the Committee on the Judiciary, in the course of hearings regarding monopoly power, heard a witness who had engaged in loss-leader selling. In the course of the testimony and with reference to that practice, he stated:

"What cheaper method of advertising is there if I advertise a commodity that cost me a dime for 5 cents and that customer comes into my store. And my only hope is he will buy something else from me."

The advertising characteristics and any misleading and deceptive effects incident thereto are not necessarily the worst aspects of making sales at prices below cost. Its deadly effect upon small and independent competitors of the loss-leader selling is one of its most dangerous characteristics.

EXISTING LAW IS INADEQUATE TO MEET THIS PROBLEM

Existing law has been interpreted as unusable by small businessmen in their effort to deal with the problem of selling at prices below cost. The Supreme Court of the United States on January 20, 1958, by a 5-to-4 decision held that section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act is not a part of the Federal "antitrust" laws, and therefore is not available for proceedings by persons injured as a result of things forbidden by the antitrust laws. The Court so held in the cases of *Nashville Milk Company* v. *Carnation Company* and *Safeway Stores, Inc.* v. *Vance*. The ruling by the Court in these cases means that under existing law, small and independent business concerns are not permitted to use section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act in proceedings against unlawful selling at unreasonably low prices—even at prices below cost—and even though those practices result in the creation of monopoly.

Section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act, as approved June 19, 1936, was authored by Senators Borah and Van Nuys. It became an amendment to the bills introduced by me and Senator Robinson. I did not discuss with Senators Borah and Van Nuys whether it was their intention to have their amendment apply as an amendment to the Federal antitrust laws.

However, I have made it clear on more than one occasion that the definition of antitrust laws as set forth in section 1 of the Clayton Act, should be amended so that there would be no question about section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act being embraced as a part of the antitrust laws. Indeed, on January 23, 1958, 3 days following the 5 to 4 decision by the Supreme Court in the cases to which I have referred, I introduced H.R. 10243 (85th Cong.) to accomplish that objective. On the same day, Senator SPARKMAN, chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, introduced a companion bill. Those bills were referred to the Committees on the Judiciary, as are all proposed amendments to the antitrust laws. However, no action was taken. Therefore, at the opening of the 86th Congress, we reintroduced bills for the same purpose. In the House, my bill was H.R. 212. The Judiciary Committee did not consider it. On January 3, 1961, I presented to the present 87th Congress an identical bill; it is H.R. 125. The Judiciary Committee has been asked to schedule hearings on it.

In the meantime, practices of selling at prices below cost, as I have explained, are continuing unabated.

SOMETHING MUST BE DONE TO HELP SMALL BUSINESS

Our investigations and hearings, and the reports made by other agencies and organizations, have made clear that action must be taken if we are to help small business survive and prosper.

Our report on Small Business Problems in the Dairy Industry concluded with a statement to that effect. Our committee recommended that new legislation be considered and enacted which would strengthen our laws against price discriminations, and provide for more expeditious processes under the law, and, thereby, provide small business firms with speedy and needed relief.

STATES HAVE TRIED TO HELP

Many of the States have enacted legislation to combat this practice of selling at prices below cost. The courts have upheld the State laws, but due to the fact that the law of any State does not reach beyond the State line, it can have no application to transactions in interstate commerce. The need for Federal legislation on the subject to fill this void is apparent.

BILLS HAVE BEEN INTRODUCED IN CONGRESS

The recommendations made in the House Small Business Committee report on small business problems in the dairy industry for new Federal legislation have been followed up. I, the Honorable TOM STEED, and the Honorable JAMES ROOSEVELT, have introduced a number of bills to help carry out those recommendations.

I introduced H.R. 11 and H.R. 124—bills to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act against discriminatory pricing practices, and H.R. 127 to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to make it unlawful to discriminate in price when the discriminatory prices include prices at unreasonably low levels and at levels below cost.

H.R. 127 has been referred to the Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives. I have requested the chairman of that committee to schedule hearings on it. There is hope for favorable consideration during this term of the Congress. Members of your association and representatives of small business organizations all over the country are expressing support for this legislation. We have just been informed that one such organization polled its members of more than 160,000, and that more than 70 percent of those who responded expressed their support for H.R. 127.

Also, I may say that there is strong support for H.R. 11 and H.R. 124, to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act. Those bills have been referred to the House Committee on the Judiciary. I have requested that hearings be held on them at an early date.

Our colleague and friend, Hon. TOM STEED, Democrat, of Oklahoma, introduced H.R. 1233. That bill would empower the Federal Trade Commission to enter temporary cease and desist orders in cases where during the pendency of prolonged litigation, the Commission would be enabled to stop destructive practices pending the completion of long, drawn out cases. We know that it is of little value to small business firms for the Federal Trade Commission to issue cease and desist orders years after the challenged practices have destroyed the complaining small business firms. That bill has been referred to the House Committee on Commerce, and the chairman, Hon. OREN HARRIS, has been asked to schedule hearings on it at an early date. We have much hope for this legislation because the 1960 Democratic platform contained a plank providing for it. Also, the recent report by Dean James M. Landis suggested legislation along this line.

On February 2, 1961, our colleague, Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat, of California, introduced H.R. 3798. That bill would amend the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, to strengthen independent competition by providing for a separation of some of the distributive functions from some of the processing functions. This would be a reversal of the trend to vertical integration of processing and distribution. The bill would make it unlawful for any meatpacker whose gross sales were more than $30 million during the preceding calendar year, or for any person engaged in the business of manufacturing or preparing livestock products for sale or shipment in commerce, or in wholesale marketing in commerce of meats, meat food products, livestock products, dairy products, poultry, poultry products, or eggs, whose gross sales were more than $30 million during the preceding calendar year, to engage in the business of selling at retail meats, meat food products, livestock products, dairy products, poultry, poultry products, or eggs.

This, naturally, brings up the question as to whether a large dairy processor, national in size, with gross sales of more than $30 million would be prohibited by the terms of this bill from distributing milk at retail to various homes throughout the cities where it operates. If unqualified, this question should be answered in the negative. In other words, this bill would not apply to large dairy processors as it would be large meatpackers.

The large dairy processors would be prohibited by the terms of the bill from selling dairy products at retail only in those situations where they were also engaged in the wholesale marketing of dairy products in commerce. Thus, you can readily see that the bill would apply to a large dairy processor only in those situations where it sought to compete with its customers by engaging in dual methods or systems of distribution.

Despite the provisions in this bill which would limit its application to large dairy processors and distributors, nevertheless, it would be expected to have a healthy effect in helping restore fair trade practices and conditions to the dairy industry. It would compel the large dairy processor and distributor to choose whether it would distribute at wholesale or distribute at retail. This choice would provide small business firms which distribute dairy products only at retail a better opportunity to compete with its larger competitors.

Representative ROOSEVELT's bill has been referred to the House Committee on Agriculture. Representatives of many small business firms are asking that hearings be held on it, but none have been scheduled as yet.

It is hoped that this discussion about small business problems in the dairy industry and the measures which are being taken to solve those problems have been of interest and value to you. I repeat that it has been a pleasure to participate in this meeting of yours and to visit with you on this occasion. Thank you.

Bataan and Corregidor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 9, we witnessed in this Capital City a ceremony that was both inspiring and uplifting. The District of Columbia named two streets, located near the Philippine Chancery, Bataan and Corregidor. Three remarkable speeches were made by Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Ambassador Carlos P. Romulo, and Commissioner Walter N. Tobriner, which should be called to the attention of the American people. The speech of Secretary Rusk is a tribute to the gal-

lantry of the Filipinos which we Americans should always remember. The speech of General Romulo describes eloquently the difficult position of the Philippines as a committed country under unrelenting attack by communism on the one hand and surrounded by neutralist countries on the other. I would like to quote the paragraph that has reference to this question because we Americans should realize the difficulties with which our Filipino friends have to contend:

And yet, I must say, that the new house of the Philippines is not yet as welded a structure as is your house of America. It is still a mosaic held together by new rivets of remarkable design, and all depends upon how seriously and how soon they can loosen. For we are under the shadow of a Communist nation of more than 600 million people and we are under unrelenting attack by the dangerous Communist subversive pattern of infiltration and subversion. We are at the same time surrounded by another 600 million fellow Asians who are uncommitted and our people see how they are wooed and courted by the two power blocs.

The American people must bear in mind the loyalty that our Filipino friends and allies have always shown to democracy. It is for this reason that the ceremony commemorating the fall of Bataan is really an American national day.

The last broadcast of the Voice of Freedom before Bataan surrendered was quoted by Minister Mauro Calingo of the Embassy, who was master of ceremonies.

In view of the importance of the three speeches delivered at Sunday's ceremonies, I, under unanimous consent, include them in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF SECRETARY RUSK COMMEMORATING BATAAN DAY, APRIL 9, 1961, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. Commissioner, Mr. Ambassador, Members of Congress, ladies, and gentlemen, it is not for me, an American, to match the golden voice of the Philippines we have just heard. Indeed, it would be fitting for us to spend our time in deep and silent contemplation about what it is we here commemorate.

Some 20 years and 4 months ago the waves of aggression swept through the peaceful Pacific—in the Philippines, in Hawaii, in southeast Asia. It was a war unwanted, unprovoked, and for which we were not prepared. Once again we learned that peace-loving peoples who neglect their arms can tempt the ambitious who make the mistake of confusing democracy's desire for peace with a willingness to submit. Our friends in the Philippines were moving rapidly toward the complete freedom which a free people in America had pledged to them in full measure. The land was bright with the promise of dreams about to be fulfilled.

But in those months of early 1942, freedom was hanging by the sheerest threads in Europe, the Middle East, and Asia. The human spirit was called upon to provide, in gallantry and courage, what slender arms could not accomplish. The final victory of freemen was assured by what was revealed on Bataan and Corregidor, by the Philippine and American men and women who fought with General MacArthur and General Wainwright. It was their splendor which gave the ring of true prophecy to the words, "I shall return." The enemy flag was finally hoisted on Corregidor but it was only occupied and not conquered. The courage of the regiments which were overcome there became the courage of individuals who continued the fight, singly, and in small groups. The war continued within the Philippines until MacArthur and his forces came ashore to link up with those who had been carrying the struggle to bring it to a prompt and victorious end. The march to Philippine freedom was then resumed and a great democracy arose from the consuming fires of those bitter years.

Today, Mr. Ambassador, the Filipino and American peoples are joined with us here in Washington. In every State of our Union are homes which shared with yours the glory and the suffering of Bataan and Corregidor. Both in your land and in ours the wounds of war will heal, for reconciliation is a great source of hope in the tragic story of man. But we shall not forget our comrades, and the personal friends, who reminded us that freedom is not cheap, but is for the strong in spirit.

Bataan and Corregidor make up another inspiring chapter in the history of freedom. It is a history not fully told, filled with great deeds by individuals and nations, who staked all they had on the hard choices which had to be made. Here was an entire people denying to mere power a privileged intrusion upon the dignity of man. Here might have been a judge, throwing his arm around a prisoner at the bar, saying to a despotic king that the king must do no wrong. In another place it was a writer or an orator who proclaimed at great hazard the simple truth that man was born to be free. Bataan and Corregidor are a part of the greatest story written by man, a story not yet finished, but a story which can have only one end because the nature of man will have it so.

It is a great privilege for me to be here today to speak for the President and for the people of the United States in sending our greetings to President Garcia and the people of the Philippines and to pay tribute to those we remember as we establish here in Washington a perpetual reminder of their gallantry in the naming of Bataan and Corregidor Streets.

ADDRESS BY GEN. CARLOS P. ROMULO, PHILIPPINE AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED STATES, AT THE CEREMONIES MARKING THE NAMING OF BATAAN AND CORREGIDOR STREETS NW., WASHINGTON, D.C., SUNDAY, APRIL 9, 1961

Your Excellencies, Mr. Secretary, Commissioner Tobriner, ladies and gentlemen, to name these two streets in this Capital City of the United States—Bataan and Corregidor—is to bring back to American conciousness the story of an epic that is part of the timeless pattern of history.

Nineteen years ago, Filipino and American soldiers fought side by side against a common enemy. The names Bataan and Corregidor conjured up the picture that those of us who were there and were fortunate to survive can never forget: of handsome, blond American lads—dead, in the foxholes or in the tunnel, and alongside them, also dead, handsome, black-haired Filipino lads, killed by the same enemy bomb, their blood freely intermingled in the sacred cause of freedom. Their bones now lie in Philippine soil, dust, and ashes, sacred earth—and who will dare sift that dust and those ashes, by race, for separate honor?

That is the meaning of Bataan and Corregidor. East and West met and fought together for the same ideal. It was a portent of things to come. For the first time, of their own free and positive choice, an Asian people rose, almost unanimously, to the defense of an Occidental power, not because America was white and Western, but because the United States never carried the mantle of imperialism with ease and despite initial errors, when your leaders saw our firm determination not to settle for less than our freedom, every step that you took was to implement the policy announced by William H. Taft: "The Philippines for the Filipinos."

In your one great adventure into colonialism, you retreated almost before you began. You came to the Philippines, you saw, but you did not conquer. Instead, you worked with us, and learned with us, and out of the relationship emerged your promise to help us achieve and assure our independence. That promise went through the purfication of fire 19 years ago. And in 1946 the promise was fulfilled.

What have we done in the Philippines since 1946 to be worthy of the sacrifices in Bataan and Corregidor? Something new has arisen in our country, something strong and fresh, something identifiably Filipino, and upon this we have built. Because we have a history of which we are proud, we opposed communism successfully. We fought for democracy and we had no hesitancy, despite its dangers, to choose the hard sinews of dignity, integrity and freedom—your side—against a gutless peace and the degradation of slavery implicity in a ruthless monolithic ideology that reduces everything to materialistic dialectics which is communism.

We now see a Philippine economic renaissance, where under the leadership of President Carlos P. Garcia, we won our fight against inflation; our international reserves have gone up to a new high level; we have refused to devalue our peso; we have partially decontrolled and will soon eliminate all exchange controls; we have achieved a favorable balance of trade; we have established more than 800 new industries; we produce more rice than we consume; we have improved the living standards of our masses; we have an uninhibited press, one of the freest in the world. All these we have accomplished under a system of free enterprise and we have not deviated from the truly democratic pattern. We are proud of our progress because it is a progress that shows the vitality of our devotion to constitutional government, the maturity of our political philosophy, and the stability of our political understanding.

And yet, I must say, that the new house of the Philippines is not yet as welded a structure as is your house of America. It is still a mosaic held together by new rivets of remarkable design, and all depends upon how seriously and how soon they can loosen. For we are under the shadow of a Communist nation of more than 600 million people and we are under unrelenting attack by the dangerous Communist subversive pattern of infiltration and subversion. We are at the same time surrounded by another 600 million fellow Asians who are uncommitted and our people see how they are wooed and courted by the two power blocs.

By our record these last 15 years since our independence we have shown we can achieve progress. But history tells us that societies change and achieve cohesion by fits and starts and in the process there may be ruptures or dislocations. Under the pressure of communism on one side and neutralism on the other, if the binding rivets of our house begin to loosen, to sustain it and keep it whole and unimpaired we must depend on the unity of our friendship, the comradeship of our alliance, and the victory to America that is Bataan and Corregidor, in the words of one of your great writers "the spirit of unswerving Filipino loyalty which is our creditor often enough in the past."

The men who died on Bataan and Corregidor offered that which was most precious to them—their own lives—on the altar of human freedom and human friendship. We who survive have an obligation to them that cries out to be repaid. We owe them the continuation of the battle. We owe them the never-ending pledge to carry on, that the Filipino-American friendship they sealed

in war with their blood we will not allow narrow self-interest or greed to weaken or undermine in peace.

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE WALTER N. TOBRINER, PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, ON THE OCCASION OF THE CEREMONY COMMEMORATING THE NAMING OF TWO STREETS, CORREGIDOR AND BATAAN, ON APRIL 9, 1961

Mr. Ambassador, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am honored to participate today in this special occasion dedicated to the memory of the heroic Philippine and American dead who gave their lives at Corregidor and Bataan.

Since the beginning of this century, when through the war with Spain our peoples first became acquainted, the people of the Philippines and the people of the United States have become steadfast friends. Our Governments have worked together to establish and to extend the blessings of democracy.

The war in the Pacific brought us closer. From the depths of despair at the fall of Corregidor and the death march on Bataan came a stronger common devotion to the cause of freedom, democracy and peace.

The sharing of struggle and sacrifice in the liberation of the Philippines bound in blood our peoples forever. The associations of the war years developed a deep, mutual understanding and appreciation which tends to grow progressively stronger with time.

The Philippines have become an example for people of other areas seeking their freedom. Bataan and Corregidor represent the ultimate victory of man's quest to determine his own destiny. At one time exemplars of humiliating defeat, they shine now in history as glorious victories of the spirit to be free.

Therefore, it is most fitting that in this Capital we should preserve those names perpetually as the names of streets, so that all who come here may be reminded that when, as at Corregidor and Bataan, valor and justice shall meet, freedom remains imperishable.

Nonprofit Firms Under Scrutiny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1961

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Science and Astronautics is conducting an investigation of numerous so-called private nonprofit organizations which operate as virtual adjuncts of Federal agencies.

Recently the New York Herald Tribune news service distributed to its syndicated news clientele throughout the country an article dealing with the committee's study of these comparatively little known, but tremendously important, private groups.

Under unanimous consent, I insert the article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

NONPROFIT FIRMS UNDER SCRUTINY—CONGRESS EYEING COSTLY R. & D. OPERATIONS

(By Joseph R. Slevin, Herald Tribune News Service)

A congressional committee is taking a long, hard look at the "nonprofit" organizations that do research jobs for the military and space agencies.

The nonprofit firms have been multiplying in recent years. Their rise has gone hand in hand with the missile and space boom.

The investigation is being run by the House Committee on Science and Astronautics. The congressional group is worrying about everything from outsized salaries to possible conflicts of interest.

All of the organizations under investigation work chiefly for the Federal Government, and most of them work exclusively for the Government.

"There are dozens of these companies," a committee source says. "Their contracts range from a few million dollars to many tens of millions of dollars."

FUNCTIONS OVERLAP

The nonprofit concerns ostensibly are research and development organizations, but they often provide technical direction and systems management for production operations that are carried on by profit-making corporations.

The committee still is asking questions instead of making charges. It is concentrating its initial investigation on about 12 nonprofit firms, giving them detailed questionnaires to answer.

The group plans to disclose its findings at public hearings in Washington during the late spring or early summer.

"There's no statutory control over these outfits and some of us think there ought to be," one source declares.

The nonprofit groups commonly operate under contracts that pay them their costs plus 15 percent.

"That hardly provides an incentive for efficient, low-cost operations," the same committee source said.

FORMER U.S. OFFICIALS

The congressional group is disturbed by evidence that some particularly juicy contracts have gone to firms that employ—or are run by—executives who have held high Government jobs in the agencies that awarded the contracts.

It's checking, too, into reports that the well-paid officials of nonprofit firms often hold even higher-paying jobs with profit-making corporations that have been given large subcontracts by the nonprofit company.

Many of the nonprofit companies are used as a device for paying scientists and technicians more than the Government can pay them.

Federal salaries are controlled by the Civil Service, and the Government frequently cannot get top experts to work for it at the Civil Service salary scale. But it can get the services of a reluctant expert by giving a research contract to an existing nonprofit firm that is set up just for the purpose.

SALARY DISCREPANCIES

Eight Government agencies are allowed to pay as much as $19,000 a year to key research people, and the National Aeronautics and Space Agency can pay $21,000 to 13 specialists, but most Government scientists can receive no more than $15,000, Committee Chairman Overton Brooks reported recently.

The Louisiana Democrat said a $15,000 Government scientist and a $40,000 scientist employed by a nonprofit organization both are paid by the Federal Government—one directly and the other indirectly.

"This practice is obviously a means of getting around the Civil Service pay scales," Brooks said. "I am not passing judgment upon the practice, but I question whether this is the solution to the problem of obtaining skilled personnel for the Government."

The Continued Need for REA Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech made by Walter H. Johnston, vice president, Association of Illinois Electric Cooperatives, Springfield, Ill., at a breakfast meeting with Illinois Members of Congress this morning. Mr. Johnston's remarks follow:

Today in rural America, over 97 percent of the farms and rural residences have the blessings of central station electricity. In Illinois, the figure is close to 99 percent.

From these facts some people might conclude that the job of rural electrification has been completed, and that there is no longer any need for REA loans. But these conclusions are erroneous. They would be comparable to assuming that since every child in America has a school available to him, that the job of education is over. Actually the opposite is true. The biggest problems of education lie ahead. And the same can be said of rural electrification.

In all of our estimates of the use of kilowatt-hours by rural electrics, we in the rural electric co-op business must readily admit that our guesses have most often been too conservative.

The rapid growth of the rural electric cooperatives has astonished us as much as it has any of the so-called experts. The experience of most cooperatives has shown in the past a doubling of the load every 5 to 7 years. So if we were to predicate the future growth solely on normal past experience, we could expect that the thousand rural electric cooperatives in the United States will be selling about 250 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity by the time the REA program is 50 years old, or in 1985.

Experts tell us that modern farms will then be averaging 40,000 to 50,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity per year. Presently, the rural electric systems in America have an input of about 29 billion kilowatt-hours. Thus you can understand that to meet the future power needs of rural America, the investment of considerable sums will be required. However, gross revenue from the sale of power by co-ops in 1985 is estimated to be around $3⅓ billion, thus insuring the funds to repay REA loans.

Now that is what future outlook was like until a few months ago. But, if the rural redevelopment program becomes a reality (and I wish here to credit our great Senator DOUGLAS as being one of its prime movers) and we believe it will, then the growth of rural electric cooperatives will be accelerated beyond our present most visionary estimates.

While rural electric cooperatives alone would not anticipate being able to meet all of the zooming demands for power that a rural redevelopment program would create, it should be obvious that by the nature of the location of rural electric systems in the heart of areas directly affected by redevelopment, that they will be called upon to play a primary role in this exciting new stage of restoring economic health to the rural sections of our Nation.

With the stimulus of a government program designed to attract industry to the rural areas that we have been serving for so many years, the demand on our co-op systems for electricity would be tremendous. Besides the power requirements of new

industries, cooperatives would be expected to supply the needs of the countless thousands of homeowners who would be attracted to the rural areas by the new economic opportunities.

Yet even without the stimulus of such a program as Senator DOUGLAS is sponsoring and which President Kennedy has endorsed so enthusiastically, it can be expected that more and more industries and more and more people will seek to locate in the uncluttered areas of the Nation which our rural electric systems serve.

To meet this challenge of restoring economic vigor to rural America, rural electric systems will need a source of low-cost loan funds and in greater quantities than ever before. And we believe the only practical source for this financing will be REA. But as always we shall accept the funds on a self-liquidating basis and we shall point to our enviable record of repayment as the guarantee of security for these loans.

It is quite logical to assume, I believe, that since we have been able to maintain a near-perfect loan repayment record during the formative years of our cooperatives when the pickings were slim and when much of the cream had already been skimmed, we should be even better financial risks in the years ahead.

The promising prospects for a rejuvenated rural America should add new loads to our lines and should increase the density of our areas substantially, thus strengthening our financial feasibility greatly beyond what it has been in the past.

I might mention here that so far REA has loaned $4.2 billion to 1,087 borrowers. Ninety-three percent of these loans went to cooperatives. So far our rural electrics have repaid a total of $1,372 million and this included $759 million in principal, $448 million in interest, and $165 million paid ahead of time on principal. Only two borrowers were overdue in payments as of February and the amount involved was $102,000.

One of the principal uses of REA loans in the future, we believe, will be for building co-op generating and transmission systems. As you know, the cost of these systems is sizable and that it is REA's policy to make them only when feasible.

A year ago three of our southern Illinois rural electric systems received a loan in the amount $25,800,000 to build their own power-plant and transmission grid.

We realize from our many years of negotiating with our power company suppliers that we have little control over our wholesale rates or over the conditions of service. We also realize that if we are to continue to be successful that we must utilize the same cost-saving techniques that the private power companies have employed so successfully for many years. Here I refer to interconnections.

Our cooperatives in Illinois are now aware that their lack of interconnections isolates them from the benefits of power exchange with Federal, municipal, and other sources.

In addition to the billions in loan funds that will be needed to accomplish some of the objectives that I have referred to, a considerable amount of additional financing will be necessary to bring telephones to rural America. At the present time only 70 percent of the farms in the United States have telephones and a large portion of these are not modern, automatic dial phones. Much remains to be done in the REA telephone program. And its future depends on a continuation of REA loans.

While the success of the rural electrification program is one of the brightest pages in the history of American agriculture, and while this success has been accomplished on a sound financial basis, it still cannot be overlooked that cooperatives are generally earning net margins that cannot be compared to those of private power companies.

It is, of course, a great credit to rural electric cooperatives that they have been able to do as well as they have financially in the thinly populated areas which they serve. The steady influx over the years of new industries and homeowners in rural areas, have benefited cooperatives financially and have increased their feasibility considerably.

However, rural electric systems in America are a long way from being able to borrow the huge sums of money they will need in the private money markets.

When you consider that the rural electric cooperatives of America have less than 20 percent member equity; that they are prohibited by law from serving towns of over 1,500 population, and that they must repay their REA loans with interest in contrast with the practice of the power companies which never liquidate their indebtedness but continue to float it in perpetuity, you realize that the only practical source of financing in the foreseeable future for rural electric cooperatives is the Rural Electrification Administration.

Moreover, it is doubtful that private sources of investment could be induced to risk their money in rural electric cooperatives when these cooperatives in most States have no guarantee of territory and have no status as regulated monopolies with a guaranteed rate of return.

It is unrealistic to believe that investors would prefer rural electric cooperatives to private power companies which enjoy the protection of territory and assured returns on investment. Moreover, the cost of borrowing money in the private market, even if we were unrealistic enough to assume all of the State objections did not exist, would be so high that many cooperatives and generation and transmission systems could no longer operate feasibly.

So just as in 1935, when 90 percent of the farm and rural residences were waiting for electricity and the administration and the Congress launched the REA program in recognition of the fact that rural America could be lighted only through low-cost government loans, the rural electrification program of today still faces great challenges. And if these future challenges are to be met successfully by our rural electric systems, then our co-ops must be able to rely on low-cost REA loans which have proved to be among the soundest investments in the welfare of the Nation that the Government has ever made.

Many-Sided Educator, Dr. Samuel Belkin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial as it appeared in the New York Times of March 27, 1961, concerning the president of Yeshiva University, Dr. Samuel Belkin:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 27, 1961]

MANY-SIDED EDUCATOR—SAMUEL BELKIN

The president of Yeshiva University likes to describe himself as "a rabbi who doesn't preach, a doctor who doesn't cure, and a professor who doesn't teach."

Dr. Samuel Belkin is also, more positively defined, a scholar, an amazing fundraiser and a dynamic administrator who usually lunches at his desk on nothing but many cups of black coffee, while smoking plenty of cigarettes. He praises the "blessing of the night" when he at last has the leisure for research in his special field, Hellenistic philosophy.

"His books have been written between 11 p.m. and 3 a.m.," an associate said. "They are the safety valve of an enormously busy man."

After an academic ceremony yesterday in which he conferred an honorary degree on Chief Justice Earl Warren, Dr. Belkin found time to discuss the Hellenistic period, when classical Greek and Jewish civilization blended while the barbaric threats that were to destroy the ancient world were already visible. "There are dangerous menaces also today, and they can destroy more than ever before," he remarked.

Dr. Belkin was speaking in his unadorned office where a personal reference library attests to the variety of his interests and preoccupations. A "Survey of Dentistry" is wedged between rabbinic literature and Aristotle.

INVITED TO ISRAEL

A little more than a year ago Dr. Belkin had his first meeting with another Jewish lover of Greek leters, Premier David Ben-Gurion of Israel. Witnesses of the encounter recall that the Premier was deeply impressed by his visit to Yeshiva University. He invited its president to Israel.

However, Dr. Belkin says, he has no immediate travel plans, because "all my work belongs to Yeshiva." Rather than further expansion of the university, he envisages its "strengthening, academically and in terms of physical facilities."

Running America's oldest and largest university under Jewish auspices is a complex and demanding job. From his apartment at 65 East 96th Street, Dr. Belkin rides at 9 a.m. every morning to the institution's main building at Amsterdam Avenue and West 86th Street. Almost every day he visits at least one outlying unit of the university, which is scattered over six sites.

The administrative work and the necessity of attending many formal functions prevent him from teaching, and this is his great regret.

BORN IN POLAND

Samuel Belkin (he has no middle name) was born in Swislicz, Poland, on December 12, 1911. As a boy 6 years old he watched with terror as the police, searching for "Communists," took away his father, a dreamy teacher of Hebrew. The father never returned, and all of Dr. Belkin's 11 brothers and sisters disappeared tragically before and during World War II.

Dr. Belkin was ordained a Rabbi at Radin when he was only 17. Soon afterward, in 1928, he came to America, an immigrant who spoke Polish, Yiddish and Hebrew, but no English.

With distant relatives scraping together the money for tuition, he was able to continue studying, and in 1924 won a Ph. D. from Brown University.

In 1935, Dr. Belkin joined the staff of Yeshiva, then a small institution, as an instructor in Greek. He became a full professor in 1940, and in 1943, when he was not yet 32 years old, was elected university president.

Since then, the enrollment of Yeshiva has increased from 850 to 5,000, its faculty from 94 to 1,200 and its annual budget from $444,000 to $4 million.

Dr. Belkin's wife is the former Selma Ehrlich, a granddaughter of the late Rabbi Bernard L. Lewenthal, who for many years was the dean of the rabbinate of Philadelphia. Their daughter, Linda, married Rabbi Ralph Schuchalter, and Dr. Belkin is twice a grandfather. A son, Salo Maurice, goes to private school.

On Saturdays Dr. Belkin attends congregation Kehilath Jeshurun, at 125 East 85th Street, to pray but not to preach. Despite his disclaimer, he does "teach," though—in his books. The latest of them, "In His Image" (Abelard-Schulman, 1959), is a compendium of Jewish philosophy. An inscribed copy was presented to Chief Justice Warren yesterday.

Assistant Secretary Kelly Reviews Interior Department Mineral Resources Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, we all received with great enthusiasm President Kennedy's message of February 23 on natural resources and have looked forward to its implementation. Among the first steps in this direction was an address by the new Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Mineral Resources, John M. Kelly, at a meeting of the Western Petroleum Refiners Association at San Antonio, Tex., on April 11, 1961.

Even though there are some individual statements which may require further examination, I commend this address to all Members and, under leave to extend my remarks, submit the full text for inclusion in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR JOHN M. KELLY AT MEETING OF WESTERN PETROLEUM REFINERS ASSOCIATION, SAN ANTONIO, TEX., APRIL 11, 1961

Several years ago, in addressing another oil industry group in Texas, a leading representative of the steel industry chose a term common to airline pilots—the phrase "a point of no return"—as the starting text of his remarks.

He related the disquieting feeling which came over him on a trip across the ocean when someone mentioned that the plane had passed the point of no return. It meant, he said, the plane was committed to continue onward, for good or ill. To turn back had become impractical, if not impossible.

He philosophized that individuals and nations also have their point of no return—a point where certain decisions and actions had irrevocably dictated the future.

To a large degree, this has happened in the United States and in the world. We live in a period of tremendous transformation in our national attitudes and our national institutions, as well as in a world in which two powerful ideologies stand opposed to one another.

In my lifetime and yours, there have been profound changes in the political, economic, and social institutions and attitudes of our Nation. The past is dead. And, it is an idle pastime to shed nostalgic tears for the good old days when the present forces upon us, in President Kennedy's words, "the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger."

Today, the leaders of industry and the leaders of government are bound together by mutual responsibility for the social, economic, and political impact of our individual actions on the affairs of our country and of our world. We in Government, and you in industry, must accept this responsibility—a responsibility which we must meet on common ground, side by side.

In his inaugural address, President Kennedy also uttered these now historic words, "Ask not what your country will do for you—ask what you can do for your country." A few days later, in his first message to the Congress, the President pledged his administration "* * * to a continuous encouragement of initiative, responsibility, and energy in serving the national interest."

These are times which demand far more than mere cooperation between Government and industry. In this troubled world, a world restless, changing, a world challenging old ideas and moving toward new horizons—in a world of this fabric, the United States must demonstrate that its economic system is efficient, that it is flexible, and that it is the servant not the master of a free people. Such demonstration demands, on the part of us all, an identity of purpose and a dedication to the common interest.

The petroleum industry is one of the key building blocks in the foundation of American economic strength. The industry is essential to the welfare and social progress of our Nation and the free world. We in the Kennedy administration know its importance, we recognize its complexities, and we respect the intelligence and ingenuity of those who direct it.

In looking realistically at the future, the petroleum industry itself must bury the shibboleths and totems of the past—the outworn creed that looks at cooperation with Government as a mutually antagonistic partnership, temporarily formed by expediency—at Government as an evil to be tolerated.

Government is inescapably involved in this industry, and this involvement—particularly in the Department in which I serve—will grow rather than diminish in the years ahead. The petroleum industry itself, on many counts, has actively sought this involvement as being in its own best interests. Conversely, it must willingly accept Government as a referee of the industry, as its shield in foreign affairs, and as the protector of the public interest.

We have a new administration in Washington, a new attitude toward national affairs, and a new dedication to the principle of mutual action in the best interests of the people. We have a Secretary of the Interior who personally maintains an open door and an open mind on the pressing subjects of natural resource development.

And his policy is also my policy in the field of mineral and fuel resource matters falling under my jurisdiction.

The door of my office—and the doors of those who work in the mineral and fuel bureaus of the Department—will always be open to your industry, to the coal industry, to the extractive industries, and last but foremost of all, to the public.

We want your ideas, we seek your counsel, and we value your suggestions. There will be times when we will not see eye to eye—when our views will not coincide. Responsible Government cannot let others make its decision by default, and this administration intends to renew and revitalize responsibility in Government.

There will be times when our views will be identical—and I hope this will be the rule—because that which is in the best interest of the American people is also in the best interest of American industry, whether it be oil or oysters.

In recent years, fuels programs have been hammered out behind locked doors. We in the Department of the Interior intend to reverse that trend. We actively seek greater public participation in Government, greater public awareness of the programs of Government and their impact on all aspects of American life.

We seek an active, participating citizenry from all walks of social and economic life which will work together without regard to personal interest but dedicated rather to the utilitarian principle of the greatest good for the greatest number.

In the area of our Nation's mineral resources, we face many problems—complex problems which were not made in a day and which will not be solved by a stroke of a pen or in a constant reassurance that we live in the best of all possible worlds.

In the metals and the nonmetallic mineral industries, we have—as in the petroleum industry—a mixed picture. A number of commodities have shown steady growth and radical progress has been made with respect to some of the newer metals.

It is, however, in the group of metals which in their own right are as essential to our economic well being as oil that serious difficulties have been encountered in recent years. I speak primarily of lead, zinc, and copper.

Lead and zinc have been subject to declining domestic production and increasing pressures from imports. The copper industry has been affected materially by events in distant parts of the world with resulting instability, although production has expanded. Speaking parenthetically, these generalizations should have a familiar ring to this audience.

These are pressing problems which require—and which will get—a substantial portion of my energies and the energies of my staff.

In coal, we have the problem of an underdeveloped, underused natural resource. Let me say, at this point, that underdevelopment of a vital natural resource is as abhorrent to true conservation as wasteful use.

The coal industry today has fewer employed miners than in the year 1890—the first year for which reliable statistics are available. Coal production declined drastically from 1947 to 1958, and, while minor gains were achieved in 1959 and 1960, the rate of activity is falling again in 1961.

We have a coal industry which cannot be allowed to decline, if it is expected to meet the greatly increased demands which would be placed upon it in time of national emergency. This is a disturbing situation—a situation to which the Department of the Interior will direct its efforts to alleviate.

In oil, we have almost a parallel situation. Current refinery capacity and current crude oil productive capacity in the United States, even after allowance for a "defense reserve," exceeds the consumptive capacity of the American people.

However, this is more closely defined as a current economic problem, as distinct from some of the more technological problems which stand in the way of a marked increase in coal consumption. No matter which economic crystal ball you look into, the picture is always the same: Progressively mounting petroleum requirements in the years ahead.

Here is the crux of the petroleum problem. Reserves of crude oil available to the people of the United States must be abundant, must be secure, and must be available on a reasonable economic basis.

In this regard, we are distressed by the 1960 showing in exploration and development. In 1960, the volume of new crude oil discovered in the United States was only slightly higher than in 1946. Furthermore, the addition to proven reserves by extension of known fields was the lowest in 10 years. It was only through an increase in natural gas liquids that total liquid hydrocarbon reserves made any advance over 1959 levels. Here also, the picture is not completely bright

because the discovery rate of natural gas liquids was also declining.

Although we have skirted them briefly, I think we can see a similarity in the various minerals problems of the Nation, a basic pattern of immediate abundance of resources, underdeveloped demand, and overdeveloped productive capacity.

These problems present a unique, tremendous challenge to American ingenuity, for we must show the world we have the maturity and vision to make our basic abundance a blessing, rather than a millstone around our economic necks.

Turning now to the more immediate matters of interest, Secretary Udall has pledged the Department of the Interior to a "new look" at the oil import program—the philosophy which underlies it, the machinery by which it operates, and the effectiveness of this machinery in meeting the objectives of the program.

This searching reappraisal for residual fuel oil has been completed. We feel that some of the earlier ineqities have been eliminated and that the residual portion of the program is more firmly based, more responsive to public policy, and more soundly geared to efficient supply and distribution.

We intend to give the crude oil portion of the program equal scrutiny in the weeks ahead. I can announce today that two public hearings have been scheduled—one in Washington on May 10 and 11, the other in Los Angeles on May 4.

We come now to the subject of another review—that of a congressional fuels study, a study of no little controversy in the petroleum industry.

President Kennedy and Secretary Udall have firmly endorsed a balanced, long-range fuels study which uses the test of the public good as its cardinal principle. In Secretary Udall's words, "We cannot in something as important as fuels and energy let policy be set by drift and default." For this reason, the administration is supporting legislation which provides for a thorough study in the national interest.

Let me say this: No one can dispute the right of the Congress of the United States to initiate such a study.

Let me also add this: Unthinking, blind opposition within the petroleum industry to an impartial, long-range study can easily leave the mistaken impression that the interests of the industry are somehow different than the interest of the Nation as a whole.

For these reasons, I am personally gratified that in recent weeks many responsible leaders within the petroleum industry have endorsed a national fuels study.

We have much to gain from a thorough look at where we have been, where we are, and where we are going. I, for one, would like to know the answers to some of the more searching questions, questions such as:

What public policies are necessary to insure an adequate, dependable fuel supply for the Nation in order to achieve a healthy, balanced development of the national economy?

Can our present Federal, State, and local laws and programs promote the public interest in the wise development of our fuel resources?

Finally, how can we define in specific terms what the public interest really is, when confronted with the technical, economic, and international problems entailed in fuel resources development and use?

President Kennedy, in his state of the Union message, cautioned our Nation that we "cannot escape our dangers—neither must we let them drive us into panic or narrow isolation."

He meant not only panic and narrow isolation in the more conventionally understood area of foreign affairs, but also panic and narrow isolation from ourselves and our society.

We are back on the frontier—but this frontier extends into space and time, inward into the scientific core of matter itself, and outward to the friendship and loyalty of all free men. We each have a part to play, a contribution to make to others, and to ourselves in the process. Time will not let us wait, nor can we shirk or avoid our mutual responsibility to a common goal and a common ideal.

This is not the decade—nor the century—for the soft look, or the soft compromise, or the soft way to a shaky security. It is instead a time for determination, for devotion, for daring.

This is the way America is going, and the oil industry will go with it—or be left behind. This industry has always accepted its challenges and performed with honor and credit in national emergency. This vigor, this vitality, must now become the daily watchword of an industry moving forward in the mainstream of American life and American purpose.

I thank you very much.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

A
A
A

B
B
B
B
B
B
B

B
B
B
B
C
C
C
C
C
C
C
C
C
C
C
C
C
D
D
D
D
E
E
E
E
F

F
G
G
G
H
H
H
H

H
H
H
H
H

J
J
J
J
K
K

K
K
L
L
L
L
M

M
M
M
M

M
M
M

M

M
M
M
M

M
N

P
P

Appendix

Senator Clark Presents Significant Message on Equal Job Opportunity to Second Annual Dinner of Charleston, W. Va., Mayor's Commission on Human Relations—1,000 Citizens in Attendance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the second annual dinner of the mayor's Commission on Human Relations of Charleston, W. Va., was held last night in the civil center of that city. It was my privilege to have been a participant in the program over which the Honorable John A. Shanklin, mayor of Charleston, presided as master of ceremonies, very abley assisted by the Honorable L. Leo Kohlbecker, chairman of the commission.

Mayor Shanklin is to be commended for his support of the commission, its dedicated chairman and fellow officers and members. I pay deserved tribute to them and to the churches, civic groups, lodges, labor unions, and organizations, as well as dozens of industrial and commercial firms which are subscribing cosponsors of the commission, the objective of which is "to strive for the elemination of discriminatory practices and policies in our community based solely upon race, creed, or national origin."

Appropriately representing the State of West Virginia at the significant event attended by approximately 1,000 citizens of Charleston interested in the promotion and development of better human relations was the distinguished Governor of West Virginia, the Honorable William Wallace Barron. In his effectively presented remarks, the Governor expressed the appreciation of his administration and West Virginians generally for the vital contribution the commission is making to improve human relations, not only in the State's capital city but over West Virginia as a whole as a consequence of its program, effort, and example.

Although our able colleague, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, the Honorable JOSEPH S. CLARK, was prevented from being present because of air traffic problems which stemmed from the inclement weather conditions which prevailed, he fulfilled his mission as guest speaker by delivering his address from Washington to his Charleston audience over a closed circuit telephonic connection with the Civic Center amplification system.

Mr. President, I am privileged to report that an understanding and attentive audience received Senator CLARK's forthright message with enthusiasm.

In introductory remarks, I spoke of our esteemed colleague as follows:

Senator CLARK is not one who reserves his concern for human relations for formal commissions and conferences, important as they are. After more than 2 years of serving in close association with him on the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I have come to know JOE CLARK as one whose every action is informed with respect for the individual and the desire and determination to eliminate the barriers which separate and divide men. It is this emphasis, as well as the high quality of intellectual discipline which he brings to the task, that earned Senator CLARK—within a single term in the Senate—national renown as a leader in the fields of human relations, civil liberties, and civil rights.

Prior to his service in the Senate, however, JOE CLARK had already made his commitment to human relations problems as mayor of Philadelphia from 1951 to 1956. The leadership and direction which he gave during those years to the mayor's Commission on Human Relations brought new meaning to Philadelphia's honorific title as "The City of Brotherly Love." Despite the complexities of having large and growing ethnic and racial minorities, Philadelphia, under the influence of the then Mayor CLARK, became a model for those cities which were seeking to relieve group tensions and improve the quality of human understanding.

Thus, we are signally honored indeed in having as our speaker one with such wide experience at the municipal as well as the national level. We are fortunate also in having one who represents that rare combination of the thoughtfulness of the scholar and the effectiveness of the practicing politician.

It gives me great pleasure, therefore, to introduce my good friend and our neighbor, a sincere liberal and true exponent of practical idealism and meaningful religion, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, the Honorable JOSEPH S. CLARK.

And, now, Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the address entitled "Equal Job Opportunity," prepared by the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania for the occasion.

There being no objection, the text of the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EQUAL JOB OPPORTUNITY

(Remarks of Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, of Pennsylvania, at the second annual banquet of the mayor's commission on human relations, Charleston, W. Va., April 12, 1961)

With my first 6-year term in the U.S. Senate over next year, I resolved at the beginning of this session of Congress not to speak outside Pennsylvania again until after my reelection campaign.

It took the combination of an invitation by my close and irresistible friend, JENNINGS RANDOLPH, to whom I am deeply indebted for many courtesies, and the occasion of the annual dinner of Charleston's Commission on Human Relations to make me break my resolution tonight. I do so with pleasure, honored by your invitation.

I have some familiarity with the essential, but largely thankless, work performed by your commission from my own experience as mayor of Philadelphia with our Commission on Human Relations.

The Philadelphia commission was created by the provisions of the city home rule charter in 1951.

The opening sentence of the charter preamble shows the high obligation felt by the framers to cleanse the city of discriminatory practices: "Grateful to God for the freedoms we enjoy," the preamble reads, "and desirous of establishing a form of improved municipal self-government in which all qualified citizens may participate equally without any distinction base based on race, we, the electors of Philadelphia, hereby adopt this 'Philadelphia home rule charter.' "

The charter provided for appointment of the human relations commission members by the mayor without the necessity for confirmation by city council. I chose the nine commission members, who serve without pay, to reflect as accurately as possible the various racial groups in the city.

On January 7, 1952, the commission assumed the powers and duties of the fair employment practice commission, established 3 years earlier, to administer the fair employment practice ordinance. Subsequently it was empowered to enforce a variety of State and local laws and ordinances concerning discrimination.

Early in 1952 we were extremely fortunate in being able to entice Mr. George Schermer from the Detroit area, who had had valuable experience in human relations work there, to be executive director. He is still serving as director of the commisison today.

The Philadelphia commission performs, as I am sure yours does, a wide variety of assignments. It is the commission's job to promote better racial relations in employment practices, public education and public housing, to organize community human relation councils throughout the city to foster better racial relations, to provide a 24-hour day "tension alert" to guard against and resolve intergroup incidents, to conduct leadership training in human relations, to coach Spanish-speaking minorities in citizenship rights and duties, and to provide public information about the problems of discrimination, segregation, and human relations in the area.

It is the first mentioned of these assignments—the promotion of equal job opportunity—that I will speak tonight: Developments in three different areas—the Philadelphia city government, the Federal executive and legislative branches—may be of interest to you.

Much of the work of the Philadelphia Human Relations Commission, which has a full time staff of 32 employees and a current operating budget of $230,000, has concentrated on fostering equal job opportunity in the firm belief that racial barriers in employment must be broken if the large Negro community in the city (now numbering more than half a million) is to enjoy the most basic rights and advantages of citizenship.

In the last 10 years the commission has investigated more than 2,000 complains of discrimination in employment, substantiated findings of discrimination in more than 500 cases and effected satisfactory adjustments without court action in almost all of the latter cases. Informal hearing procedures to resolve complaints of discrimination in employment have been highly successful.

Eeach year the commission formulates and adopts a specific list of annual program objectives to focus the group's limited resources on a selected number of problems and areas of concern. In a field as complex and indeterminate as intergroup relations, program objectives clearly must be as concrete, feasible and attainable as experience, judgment, money, and manpower will allow. Each year the commission tries to be a little more precise and realistic about what it attempts to accomplish. So far as I know it is the only intergroup agency in the Nation which makes this type of effort to design and specify its annual work plan in advance. If you haven't seen copies of the Philadelphia commission's yearly statement of goals, I hope you will contact Mr. Schermer, the commission's director, to see whether this plan could be usefully employed here.

Perhaps you would be interested in hearing the eight goals stated in the commission's 1961 program relating to fair employment practices:

1. Receive, investigate, and adjust all complaints of discrimination in employment under the Philadelphia city code; such adjustment to include affirmative measure to correct patterns of exclusion whether or not unlawful discrimination has been found.

2. Conduct periodic inspection of "help wanted" advertisements to assure compliance with laws and regulations thereto.

3. Conduct regular inspections of city work contracts to assure compliance under the standard antidiscrimination clause in such contracts.

4. Conduct regular inspections of those firms that are subject to either adjudicative or advisory orders from the commission.

5. Initiate inspections, conduct, and issue advisory findings and recommendations upon not less than 50 employer firms in addition to other investigations.

6. Continue negotiations and such other measures as are necessary to attain affirmative implementation of merit employment in the hotel and restaurant industry.

7. Continue investigations and negotiations of waterfront employment to remedy the alleged patterns of discrimination and segregated job assignments.

8. Initiate negotiations with, or investigation of the banking industry to promote and implement affirmative employment practices.

In these difficult assignments the commission has had the unqualified support of Mayor Richardson Dilworth. Last fall Mayor Dilworth called a meeting of the 80 top industrial leaders of the Philadelphia area and the hierarchy of the local chamber of commerce to urge them to expedite adoption of fair employment practices before commission findings and court adjudications were required. And, indeed, the progress made has been encouraging. Negro salesgirls and managers, seldom seen in the large commercial establishments a few years ago, are now a common and accepted sight in the downtown area.

But it is the city itself that has led the way. The city payroll, pitifully short of Negro employees just 10 years ago although the colored population of the city numbered almost 25 percent, now includes Negroes as department and division heads, assistant office chiefs, and, thanks to an open recruitment drive, personnel at all levels of employment.

Truely Philadelphia has seen a big change for the better in race relations in the last decade, but I am the first to acknowledge the long, long road ahead to attain the goal of equal employment opportunities for all based solely on merit, not on race.

You may have noticed in this morning's papers the story emanating from Philadelphia concerning the commission's report filed yesterday about the city's hotel and restaurant industry discriminating in the hiring and assigning of employees.

Nathan L. Edelstein, chairman of the commission, called the findings of the commission's investigations, which had extended over the last 13 months, "an indictment of an entire industry." "The report," he said, "is the most forceful and vital step we have ever taken."

Accused of discrimination in the report were 19 major hotels, 2 restaurant chains, 3 union locals and an association representing more than 50 restaurants.

It is entirely safe to assume that the Philadelphia Commission on Human Relations and the city government will bring every possible means of pressure on the industry to bring an end to the discriminatory practices found by the commission. In this work I know that the commission will have, as it has had in similar efforts in the past the invaluable assistance of voluntary civic agencies in the city, and particularly the fellowship commission groups who have worked long and hard and without compensation to foster the goal of equal job opportunity in the city of brotherly love.

II

Turning now to the Federal Government, the Nation's biggest employer, I am sure that all of you are aware of the courageous and far-reaching Executive actions to promote fair employment practices taken by the President to date.

By Executive order the President established a Committee on Equal Opportunity to fight racial discrimination in employment practices by the Federal Government and by private employers doing contract work for the Government. As he stated yesterday when he met with the Committee for the first time, the group's assignment is nothing less than "the permanent removal from government employment and work performed for the Government of every trace of discrimination because of race, creed, color or place of national origin. This is not only just in itself, it is one of the purposes for which we stand before the world."

In the sweeping Executive order the President armed the Committee, which started operations on April 5, under the chairmanship of Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, with a broad range of powers to enforce antidiscrimination policies, and designated the Labor Department with all of its widespread branch offices and factfinding facilities, to be the chief investigatory arm of the Committee. The keen interest of the Vice President is evidenced by a story out of Nashville in today's New York Times. Apparently Mr. JOHNSON met last weekend with a group of Negro leaders in Nashville, Tenn., in the presence of the State Governor, a known segregationist, to discuss job discrimination problems in the area. The group which came to the meeting, skeptical of the Vice President's views left with high praise for him.

The President's action will have a direct impact on the lives of thousands and perhaps millions of persons in this country in the days to come.

Every business doing work for the Federal Government either as a prime or a subcontractor will have to submit a statement when bidding for the work certifying that "all qualified applicants will receive consideration for employment without regard to race, creed, color, or national origin."

Labor unions are also affected by the Executive order. Although the Government does no contract business directly with unions and thus there are no direct sanctions applicable to unions provided in the order, the Committee is authorized to publicize union discriminatory practices at hearings and to take other steps to obtain union compliance with fair employment practices.

President Kennedy's directive, unlike the orders under which two antidiscrimination committees operating under the past administration which merely authorized the committees to receive complaints, contains a variety of sanctions. Conciliation discussions are mandatory at the start of each case, but if the employer fails to end an established discriminatory practice, any one of the following steps, among others, can be taken:

(1) Publication of the names of contractors or unions found to be in violation of the rules;

(2) Recommendation of suits by the Justice Department to enforce the nondiscrimination clauses in contracts. (Parenthetically, I might note that the Department has been empowered to bring such suits for the last several years, but has never done so.)

(3) Contracting agencies of the Government are forbidden to give any new business to companies that discriminate unless and until the companies demonstrate that their policies have changed;

(4) And, finally, termination of any contract because of job discrimination either by the Committee's own action or through contracting agencies of the Government.

The commission has already received 110 complaints of job discrimination, which are being processed. One investigation, of Lockheed Aircraft's Marietta, Ga., plant which does a great deal of contract work for the Government, has already been announced. In addition the Committee has asked each Government agency to name a civil rights officer to enforce nondiscriminatory employment practices within the agency. New contract forms are being distributed to the procurement agencies for immediate use.

West Virginia, like Pennsylvania, is not blessed with the abundance of Government contract work that California and Georgia boast. Still, there are contractors who do substantial Federal contract work and some Government agencies in the Charleston area.

I would think that your commission could perform an invaluable service in making President Kennedy's equal job opportunity order known to employers, employees and persons seeking employment in this area, so that the goals which the committee has been set up to serve can be expedited in every way possible. I am sure that the Committee office in Washington can provide the commission with all of the information needed to do this job, or that your congressional delegation can obtain this information for you.

III

But additional legislation is also needed, and the 1960 Democratic platform recognized this fact. It pledged that "the new Democratic administration will support Federal legislation establishing a Fair Employment Practices Commission to secure effectively for everyone the right to equal opportunity for employment."

Last September President Kennedy asked Congressman Celler of New York and me to prepare civil rights legislation, embodying the civil rights commitments of our party's platform for introduction in this session of Congress. We have carried out this assignment and drafted a series of civil rights bills, including an FEPC proposal, with the assistance and advice of the Department of Justice.

The need for Federal FEPC legislation is painfully evident. The 17 States which have such legislation on their books (and Pennsylvania since 1955 is one) are hopelessly hamstrung in obtaining adequate enforcement where interstate commerce is involved, as it is in such a large percentage of commercial employment situations. Thirty-three States with almost 80 million people are outside the coverage of any FEPC legislation today.

With unemployment in the United States at about 7 percent of the total labor force in February, nonwhite unemployment stood at a staggering 15 percent, a rate that would never be tolerated if it applied across the board. But this discrepancy is not limited to recessions. Unemployment among nonwhites runs just about double the rate for whites at all times according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Among the employed, the pattern of discrimination is less apparent, but no less real. In the occupational structure of our society, positions as managers, officials, executives and proprietors are held at 14 percent of all white male workers, but only 2 percent of all Negro male workers. Over 10 percent of all white male workers are in professional and technical occupations; less than 3 percent of all Negro male workers. Over 33 percent of all white female workers are in clerical occupations. Only 8 percent of all Negro female workers have gained access to clerical work.

The difference in wage rates is no less startling. The Department of Commerce reports that in 1957 the average wage or salary of a white person was $3,775; of a nonwhite $1,845. This deficiency in earnings for Negroes as a class is said to total a staggering $12 billion per year. Granting existing differences in educational opportunities and trained skills these statistics still establish a substantial differential based on racial prejudice.

The bill which Congressman Celler and I have drafted would make racial discrimination in hiring, promotion, and firing, an unfair labor practice for which administrative and ultimately judicial sanctions would be available. The proposed law, which would be administered by a 5-man Fair Employment Practices Commission, would apply to all employers, business or labor organizations, who are engaged in interstate commerce or operations affecting such commerce and employ more than 50 persons.

While the roadblocks to such legislation in the Congress under our archaic and undemocratic rules of procedure are substantial, we are hopeful that this bill will pass the 87th Congress before it finally adjourns in 1962. I am confident that these measures will ultimately have the all-out support of the administration. The only question is one of timing.

It was President Kennedy who stated last fall that "Freedom is indivisible, in all its aspects. To provide equal rights for all requires that we respect the liberties of speech and belief and assembly, guaranteed by the Constitution, and these liberties in turn are hollow mockeries unless they are maintained also by a decent economic life. Those who are unemployed, or too poor, uninformed, or too uneducated to enjoy their constitutional freedoms of choice, do not really possess those freedoms."

The unending task to insure the enjoyment of equal rights, including equal job opportunity, by all citizens of the United States is a goal worthy of the best efforts of all of us. If this high goal is to be achieved in our lifetimes or those of our children, the active efforts of all men of good will both in and out of government must be dedicated to the end. The work of your commission is designed to bring that goal closer to reality. I salute you in your all-important assignment and wish you every success.

President Kennedy Rightly Urges Creative Thinking by TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "President Rightly Urges Creative Thinking by TVA," which appeared in the Nashville Tennessean of March 29, last.

The editorial follows:

PRESIDENT RIGHTLY URGES CREATIVE THINKING BY TVA

If any member of the Tennessee Valley Authority Board of Directors had any doubts concerning what the President of the United States feels this independent agency's role is, Mr. Kennedy's latest letter should have dispelled those doubts.

The President wrote: "The TVA is in the business of resource development and I want to feel that in your future thinking on the continuing problems of the valley region, you will be giving thought to the problems which go beyond the production and sale of power.

"We need much creative thinking in this area and the TVA has stood in the past for original and bold thinking. This vigorous and imaginative momentum must be continued."

This was President Kennedy's reaction to the Board's decision to locate its newest steam plant on the Clinch River in east Tennessee. The President had suggested favorable consideration of a site in southeast Kentucky, a seriously depressed region with idle coal fields.

Never did President Kennedy presume to dictate policy decisions to TVA, an independent agency, and it is in keeping with this approach that he has termed the Board's steam plant decision the proper one. A difference in capital outlay of $30 million he deemed complete justification for selecting the Clinch River site.

Nevertheless, the reminder Mr. Kennedy has given the Board is one which was needed. Since TVA constructed its first steam plant at New Johnsonville, its underlying philosophy has seemed to shift slowly away from the emphasis on "the business of resource development." Its "production and sale of power" role, a legitimate one, has received increasing attention.

This newspaper has called attention to this situation. It has suggested that the slide rule is a magnificent instrument, but that it should not entirely replace TVA's department of vision and farsightedness. When TVA came to this valley it thought in terms of river navigation, flood control, recreation, forest protection, improved agricultural methods, and saving eroding soil, as well as cheap electrical energy.

It dreamed of lifting a region by the intelligent use of all its resources, not by the coldly efficient and economic development of power alone, necessary though this might be.

The regional problems are not the same today, of course. Industrial development has become a major need, and therefore an abundant supply of electrical energy remains a major concern. But recreational and navigational demands have also grown and the possibility of constructing tributary dams to meet these and other needs is worth exploring.

Facts Pave the Way to Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. John Crosby, columnist of the New York Herald Tribune, recently in one of his articles referred to the fight against the program "The Untouchables" in a manner which was interpreted as maligning persons of Italian origin. Representing as I do the 19th Congressional District in which there are a great number of persons of Italian origin who are contributing to the success of the great city of New York and to the development of our country, I can attest to the contributions made by this segment of our population.

I deplore the references by Mr. Crosby and believe that his statements are divisive. The Americans of Italian origin are aroused by this column, and an indication of the resentment of persons of Italian origin to the unfair references can be gleaned by an article published in the Il Progresso on Sunday, March 26, 1961. The resentment of the Italian-Americans has been manifested against the program "The Untouchables" by pickets, boycotts, and conciliatory conferences. The leading organizations in this fight to eliminate the unfair stereotyping of Americans of Italian origin were the Federation of the Italian-American Democratic Organizations of the State of New York, Inc., the Sons of Italy, the Columbian Association, and the National Italian-American League to Combat Defamation.

The column published by the Il Progresso sets forth the contributions by persons of Italian origin through the years, during the wars and defense of our country, and in the promotion of our economy and our country. This article answers fully any statements made by Mr. Crosby and any unfair inferences which might be derived from a reading of his article. The open letter to Mr. Crosby which was published on Sunday, March 26, 1961, follows. I am certain that the reading public will draw the proper conclusions after reading this open letter:

AN OPEN LETTER TO A COLUMNIST OF THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

DEAR JOHN CROSBY: In your column in the New York Herald Tribune, last Wednesday, you deplored the fact that an agreement was reached between the National Italian-American League to Combat Defamation and Desilu which produces "The Untouchables" on the basis of which future episodes of the television series would refrain from using Italian names for its fictional characters of hoodlums and delinquents. And you decry that "one more national group removes itself forcibly from the ranks of villainy." Of course your feelings are completely at variance with those of the great majority of Americans who resent the slurs on whole ethnic segments of the people who have caused "Abie" the merchant, "Paddy" the drunk, the dutchman "Schultz" and "Black Face" to be ban-

ished from the American scene and feel it is high time to do likewise with "Tony" the gangster.

Your statement "that it would be extremely difficult to write a history of organized crime in this country * * * without filling it almost exclusively with Italian names", is more indicative of prejudice than of accuracy. You offer no statistical proof of your wholly gratuitious assertion. Let us offer you the survey of the U.S. Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice, which indicates that the Federal prison population with Italian names is less than 3 percent. This means that 97 percent of all Federal prisoners are of ethnic origin other than Italian. This despite the fact that Americans of Italian origin constitute about 10 percent of the national population. You describe the use of Italianate names or Sicilianate types in "The Untouchables" as "one of the few admirable things" about it, thus revealing an instinctive approval of the very sore point which Desilu recognized and promised to remove in the interests of better intergroup relations to which you are obviously opposed.

And when finally you reluctantly concede that Italians have produced "Toscanini too" * * * it is apparent that you have not gasped the significance or import of our contribution to the greatness of America in every field of human endeavor since its discovery by Christopher Columbus. Yes, the history of our country, which was named for Americus Vespucci, is replete with Italians like Marco da Nizza, who explored what is Arizona today and Francesco Chino who laid the foundation for the great cattle industry in the Southwest; and Enrico Tonti, who founded the first trading post in Chicago and was one of the founders of the colony of Louisiana. And his brother Alfonso Tonti who helped Cadillac found the city of Detroit and Umberto Beltrami who discovered the sources of the Mississippi. And Filippo Mazzei, physician and counselor to Thomas Jefferson, who incorporated the philosophy of Mazzei in the Declaration of Independence with the immortal words "That all men are created free and equal."

And wasn't it an American patriot of Italian origin who made possible the victory of Gen. George Rogers Clark which enabled him to open up the great Northwest? Yes, it was Col. Francis Vigo who financed the expedition and also furnished the military information which brought about the defeat of the Indians in this crucial period in American history.

And it might interest you to know that in the Capitol in Washington 90 percent of the art work, frescos, paintings, sculptures are the work of Italian artists such as Costantino Brumidi, Joseph Franzoni, John Andrei. And even the silver dollar was designed by the Italian DeFrancisci.

In the field of science, how can we evaluate the contributions to America and the world, of the genius and wizardry of Marconi? What is the impact on history of Dr. Enrico Fermi, who made nuclear fission a reality? And Drs. Ghiorso and Rossi of the University of California who discovered element 100 used in the hydrogen bomb? And Dr. Failla who designed the world's largest radium therapy apparatus?

Great educators like Angelo Patri, considered America's greatest child psychologist; Dr. Rettagliata, president of the Illinois Institute of Technology; Dean Emeritus Cosenza, of Brooklyn College; Dr. Edward Mortola, president of Pace College; Mario Pei, world-renowned philologist, whom George Bernard Shaw cited as a master of the English language; Dr. Francis Verdi, professor of surgery at Yale University, have left an indelible imprint on the minds of American students.

Many great captains of industry contribute to the daily enrichment of the Nation. Men like Giannini, who founded the greatest bank in the world; the Vaccaros of Louisiana, and the DiGiorgios, the fruit kings of America; the Cuneo brothers, operators of the great printing establishment in the world; Amedeo Obici, who founded the Planters peanut empire; Crespi, the cotton king of Waco; Ross Siracusa, head of Admiral television; Martino, president of National Lead Co.; Salvatore Giordano, head of Fedders air conditioning; Riggio, who was president of the board of American Tobacco Co.; our own Pope brothers, of the Colonial Sand & Stone Co., and countless others.

And builders of roads, tunnels, airports, and skyscrapers, engineers and architects * * * men like the Gulls, DiNapoli, Rizzi, Corbetta, DelBalso, Paterno, Petrillo, Lou Perini, et al.

In the field of labor we have such outstanding leaders as Luigi Antonini, first vice president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union; August Bellanca, vice president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America; Howard Molisani, Vincent LaCapria, George Baldanzi.

And in the entertainment field: theater, movies, television, and night clubs we give you just a few of the outstanding personalities such as Alfred Drake, Don Ameche, Ann Bancroft, Perry Como, Frank Sinatra, Jimmy Durante, Frankie Laine, Dean Martin, Frank Capra, Vincent Minnelli, Anthony Franciosa, Connie Francis, Joni James, Tony Arden, Dennis James, Ernest Borgnine, and Guy Lombardo.

And in baseball men like DiMaggio, Berra, Rizzuto, Colavito. And in boxing the undefeated champion of champions, Rocky Marciano. And the All-America football hero of Navy's gallant squad, Bellino; the great Columbia Coach Lou Little and a host of others.

We have produced outstanding men in other fields: the food industry; vintners, restaurateurs, and politics where space will permit us, in passing, to mention men like Senator Pastore and Governor DiSalle of Ohio; Rosellini of Washington, Volpe of Massachusetts, and Notte of Rhode Island, and the incomparable Fiorello LaGuardia.

But we are proudest of our contribution to the defense of our country in all the wars America has fought. We recall the story of Francis Spinola, who though he denounced Lincoln's fratricidal war which divided the country, nevertheless formed a brigade of volunteers to defend the Republic. He was wounded in battle, leading his men, was given the Congressional Medal of Honor and was promoted to brigadier general by President Lincoln himself. Since then the number of our Medal of Honor winners has become legion.

These are the kind of Americans, Mr. Crosby, who—many millions strong—have made and are making their proud contribution to the greatness of America and who justly denounce discriminatory presentations such as "The Untouchables" for their distortion of the true image of the devoted American of Italian origin.

IL PROGRESSO ITALO-AMERICANO.

The John Birch Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. HARTKE. Madam President, much has been written and said recently about the John Birch Society. My good friend, Marsee Cox, the editor of the Terre Haute, Ind., Tribune, made a very candid analysis of the situation, I believe, in a recent editorial entitled "Doctrine of Hatred." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOCTRINE OF HATRED

Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, who has become known as the spokesman of Republican conservatism, is of two minds about the controversial John Birch Society. Recently he told newsmen that while he disagrees with its far-right theories he is "impressed by the type of people in it." They are, he thinks, "the kind we need in politics."

They are also either remarkably naive or reactionary in the nth degree. And in fairness it should be noted at once that though GOLDWATER is "impressed" by those attracted to the group he has specifically disavowed some of its more extreme contentions. Among these are the claims that ours is not a fit form of government with which to fight communism, that Communists have influenced Supreme Court decrees, that recent Presidents from Roosevelt through Eisenhower have been Communists or Communist tools, that Chief Justice Warren should be impeached, and so on.

The John Birch Society, founded by a wealthy retired candy maker named Robert Welch, poses a familiar dilemma. GOLDWATER expressed a common attitude when he said, "They are anti-Communist and I don't see how we can be against that." Of course no responsible American can be "against" anticommunism. But the question is: Should not Americans be against communism by being vigorously for the principles which have made this Nation a great citadel of freedom?

We say "Yes." We say being for those principles, and working actively to preserve and strengthen them, is far and away the most effective way to fight communism. That is something the members of the John Birch Society have yet to learn. The society's perverted appeal resorts to tactics of both communism and fascism. Whatever may be said of the people attracted to it, its doctrine of hatred is emphatically not the kind of doctrine we need in American politics.

Visit to Washington by Students and Chaperones From Metairie Park Country Day School, New Orleans, La.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL B. LONG
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, on April 12 it was my pleasure to have as my guests the senior class of the Metairie Park Country Day School. This fine institution, which is located in Metairie on the outskirts of New Orleans, has one of the loveliest settings of any school I have ever seen.

The school is dedicated to the pursuit of higher education and to the development of the kind of individual who will become a valuable citizen in this great country.

Every year, the senior class of the Metairie Park Country Day School visits our Nation's Capitol as part of its general educational program. I am particularly proud to have such an outstanding group of young Louisianians come to Washington and I look forward to their visit each year.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the names of the 27 students and 2 chaperones from the Metairie Park Country Day School in Metairie, La.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

METAIRIE PARK COUNTRY DAY SCHOOL, SENIOR CLASS

Thomas Coleman, Carolyn Coupland, Lynne Farwell, William Forrester, Ann Johnston, Guy Leefe, Karen Ludwig, Robert McClure, William Miller, Michael Norton, Carole Romano, Jane Rosenberg, Claude Schlesinger, Nancy Tousley, Ernst Wootten, David Grimm, Sharon Heath, Jane Henderson, Sherryl Jackson, Edna Miller, Paul Nelson, Suzanne Payzant, Walter Robinson, Donald Siegel, John Simonton, Howard Streiffer, Anne Taylor.

The chaperones: Mrs. James T. Stewart, Mr. George Bensabat.

Anniversary of Birth of John Hanson, President of the Continental Congress From 1781 to 1782

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, today marks the anniversary of the birth of John Hanson who served as President of the Continental Congress from 1781 to 1782. Born in Charles County, Md., in 1715, John Hanson is remembered as one of our country's great patriots.

He served nine terms in the Maryland House of Delegates and then went on to the State senate where he served from 1757–1773.

The Nation best remembers him as a Revolutionary leader, as one of the Founding Fathers of these United States, and as a signer of the Articles of Confederation.

My attention has been directed to an interesting article which appeared in the April 8 issue of the Mason City, Iowa, Globe-Gazette. It recounts the acceptance by the Congress of the bronze statue honoring John Hanson.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NOTED PATRIOT

From Charles Havlena, of Washington, D.C., a former Iowan and student of American history, the Globe-Gazette editor has received a reminder that April is the birthday-month of a great American, John Hanson, a Revolutionary leader and native of Maryland.

Hanson, whose birthday was April 13, hasn't received the recognition he deserves in history books, or at patriotic observances, Havlena maintains.

Hanson held the office of President of the Continental Congress for the 1-year term, 1781–82. As such he was 1 of 14 such Presidents in the period from 1774 to 1788, which included the Revolutionary War and the writing and adopting the Constitution of the United States.

Among these 14 Presidents of Congress the name of Hanson stands out, Havlena points out. His leadership in a critical time and his accomplishments in the face of many frustrations, places him as among America's great, the Washington scholar adds.

It was for this reason that the State of Maryland selected Hanson as one of the two most worthy patriots of that State to be honored with a bronze statue in Statuary Hall of the U.S. Capitol. The other was Charles Carroll.

Iowa has a special interest in this bronze statue. A distinguished Iowa Senator, Jonathan P. Dolliver of Fort Dodge, delivered the address accepting the Hanson statue in behalf of Congress January 31, 1903.

Another point of interest connects Mason City with the Havlenas. Mrs. Havlena will be remembered for her visit to this community last year to install the local club of Pilot International.

Water Resource Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT S. KERR
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, it has been a real treat for the people of Oklahoma to become acquainted with the new Southwestern Division Engineer of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Maj. Gen. Robert Flemming, Jr.

He recently appeared at a reception in his honor at Tulsa, Okla., and gave a "pep talk" which inspired the already enthusiastic Arkansas River Basin developers to even greater efforts. General Flemming said that we must use the full capabilities of the Corps of Engineers in the planning and constructing of the many feasible water development projects in our area. I fully concur in this belief, and I am heartened by the fact that the reaction from General Flemming's remarks has reached the White House. By his actions in recommending increased funds for our projects President Kennedy has shown that he is keenly aware of the need for and the benefits to be gained from complete development of the Arkansas River complex.

On Friday, April 7, 1961, General Flemming was the guest of the Oklahoma City Chamber of Commerce and he again provided the people of Oklahoma with a thought provoking address. Because I feel that his remarks will be of interest to the Members of Congress and others, I am requesting that the address of Major General Flemming be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF MAJ. GEN. ROBERT J. FLEMING, JR., DIVISION ENGINEER, U.S. ARMY ENGINEER DIVISION, SOUTHWESTERN, DALLAS, TEX. TO THE OKLAHOMA CITY FRIDAY FORUM, APRIL 7, 1961

In coming up today and talking to this audience on the subject of "Water Resource Development," I very frankly feel somewhat presumptuous. That feeling of presumption is caused by the fact that this is the home State of the greatest evangelist on the subject of water conservation and water resource development that this country and possibly the world has ever known. I refer, of course, to your senior Senator, Senator KERR. He knows infinitely more about this subject than I do. Having him in my audience makes me feel like a duffer playing a round of golf with Ben Hogan.

This afternoon I will not attempt to sell you on the necessity for water resources development in this country. To try to do that in Senator KERR's presence would be certainly overly presumptuous. Instead I am going to restrict my remarks to a very small aspect of the problem, but an aspect which I think is becoming more and more important, and soon, unless something is done about it, will surpass in importance all of the technical aspects of the problem. I refer to some of the brakes which have been placed on the formulation and presentation of public projects. It is my opinion, which I want to share with you today, that some of these brakes which were highly logical when first adopted are now beginning to operate to impede progress. This afternoon I am going to tee off on some phobias of mine which have developed from frustrations of long standing. I never have thought candor was a sin and I have frequently been accused of talking too much and too loud. This lack of vocal control has often led me to making extravagant statements and this afternoon I may make statements equally as extravagant With that introduction I want to emphasize that I am doing the talking, I am not repeating any party line, and I have neither requested no secured clearance on anything I say.

All public projects involve technical, economic, social, and political factors, and in using the word "Political" I am using it with a capital P and not the small p. Whether or not these projects are ever undertaken and carried into execution depends on the interplay of the factors in these four general fields. Of these four aspects, the technical, the economic, the social and the political, the technical and economic are fairly easy to set aside and analyze from a practical and finite viewpoint. The social and political are not capable of such precise and definitive measurement.

Now let's go back and think for just a minute about the two aspects, the technical and economic, which I said were susceptible of practical measurement. Engineering or technical laws or rules have been formulated over a period of years and to all intents and purposes are exact and measurable. In this respect, engineering or technology is a science. The modern theory of economics talks with the language of a science, but it does not meet any of the tests of a science. Its factors or quote laws unquote are not exact but are subject to interpretation and opinion. The point I wish to make to you today is that some of the ground rules of economic analysis which have been expounded to control the formulation and submission of public projects are not so much governed by the quote laws unquote of economics as they are conditioned upon a desire to influence the social and political aspects of the problem. That was a difficult statement to make; it will be more difficult to prove. But what I am trying to say is, that

we have now got things so cluttered up with sophisticated, elevated and evaluated jargon involved in the economic analysis of public projects that we can no longer use any common, ordinary horsesense. We have become so preoccupied with fiscal refinements that we can't properly or adequately evaluate human factors and social factors affecting a better life and a greater opportunity in the present; and, secondly, for the future.

Now what I have said about public projects in general applies particularly to public projects in the water resource development field. Compared to projects for highways, or schools, for example, water resource projects are more remote from the people they affect. Practically everyone drives an automobile now and nearly every family has children. If a highway develops potholes or if the accident rate rises it is fairly easy to show the automobile driver, who incidentally is a voter, of the need for a new highway, and if the schools are put on a double-shift basis it does not take much eloquence to convince the parents that more classrooms are needed. Water projects are a little bit different. It is much more difficult, and that's putting it mildly, to get the average citizen concerned about the dangers of salinity intrusion into fresh water acquifers and it is difficult to dramatize the problem of what we must do now to make water run out of a tap 20 or 25 years hence. All public projects must be carried into execution over opposition from four different sources. First, there is an intelligent and informed opposition which questions the wisdom of the solution and proposes reasonable alternatives. Second, there is an opposition, very vocal, from those whose own personal interests are adversely affected by the public interests involved in the proposed project. Third, there is an opposition which stems from the general apathy of the ignorant portions of the public toward anything outside of their own immediate concern, and fourth, and by far the most dangerous opposition is from the "let's don't do nothing" boys. These are sources of opposition to every public project, but the comparative remoteness of water resources projects as compared to highways and schools greatly increases the effectiveness of the opposition from the third and fourth sources. In other words, the opposition due to the apathy of the ignorant public and the reckless opposition of the "let's don't do nothing" boys are much heavier millstones around the neck of a water resources project than around the neck of other types of public projects. That fact of life is a tremendous occupational hazard to the proponent of water resources projects. The opposition we must overcome is often much more unreasonable and much more fanatical than that faced by our colleague who is trying to build public highways.

The Senate Select Committee on Water Resources, the Kerr committee, has just rendered a report, which has become a best seller, showing that the need for water will greatly outstrip our current pace in the development of resources. I don't think any knowledgeable person would challenge that statement and if he was so stupid as to do so it would be very easy to shoot him down. But now let's take a look at the actualities of the situation. In my Division of the Army Engineers which covers the great Southwest, we have what many people consider a progressive and large program in water resource development. Of the 11 similar divisions in the United States I anticipate that the southwestern division will be spending about a fourth of the money appropriated nationwide to the engineers for this water resource work during the next several years. But the program we now have in the works does not come anywhere near providing for the needs that are predicted. Our present program will do only a fair job of protecting the status quo against an expanding population. In my book, however, preserving the status quo is not being progressive, it does not start catching up with the future, it merely backs eventually into the past.

I said earlier that I thought that "laws of economics" were being used not entirely as a tool of analysis but to a great extent as an excuse for inaction. Having stated this indictment I will now amplify on it. In America we have two basic schools of thought: One progressive, one conservative. We don't have true black and white—there are many shades of grey in between. Basically, America is progressive and the average American seeks progress and change but because of our background in the American heritage and because of folk lores stemming from the era of the rugged individualist and of the pioneer who by his own efforts conquered the West we tend to value highly some basic conservative ideas. Among these is our distrust of big Government. We do not like Government interference and we instinctively distrust it and yet, as our life is becoming more and more complex, our Government is becoming bigger and bigger. That is the paradox. Our collective environment, our collective progress, our collective existence demands governmental action; our individual thought, our individual sentiment resists. It follows, I believe, that the more remote a public project is from its immediate effect on the mass of citizens, the more difficult it is for the proponent to overcome this innate distrust or resistance. Certainly it cannot be denied that this facet of American life, this distrust of Government by each of us, offers a very fertile opportunity for opponents of public projects to jump on them with cries of holy glee. Many projects to answer crying needs have been suspended for years because of this type of opposition. I could prove that statement by citing dramatic examples of terrific flood damages which could have been prevented by projects authorized and designed but never built because of violent opposition from the "let's don't do nothing" boys and apathy of the ignorant public.

My indictment on some of our economic rules which we must follow is that these had been adopted more for the real reason to impede expenditures from the Federal budget than to secure a legitimate economic analysis of the project.

I cannot prove that statement but I'll try to show you what I mean. In doing this I may oversimplify a very complex question. For example, let's consider a multipurpose reservoir project which involves flood control, power, water supply and navigation usages. In analyzing this project, it should be a relatively simple process to add up all the costs and then estimate all the benefits and compare them, but when certain economic ground rules result in costs being arbitrarily increased, and prevent counting obvious benefits, it often becomes difficult to come up with a benefit-cost ratio greater than unity. Let's consider one aspect of the estimate of costs. We figure the life of any multipurpose project as 50 years. This means that we amortize the investment over 50 years, adding the totals of initial cost, interest, operation and maintenance and all the other things, divide by 50 and this is the yearly cost. Also, in this 50-year life business, we must assume that all benefits terminate at the end of 50 years. Under this thesis, Texoma, which was built in the 1940's, will cease being an economic asset in the 1990's.

Now, let's contrast this method of thinking with the way the average person buys a house. He finances it over a period of 20 years. At the end of this period, he either owns the house or he may have refinanced it to extend his payment period, reducing his annual payments by this refinancing. But—he does not figure that all benefits from his ownership of the house cease at the end of his financing period. He figures on living in the house after he gets it paid for or, in other words, he anticipates receiving benefits beyond this period of amortization. This logical approach is denied us in analyzing water resource projects.

Now let's consider some of the benefit computations. Broadly speaking, the figure which can be used as the benefits for flood control purposes must be based upon the damage the project will prevent to existing—and I emphasize existing—property. Yet, every time we defend an area against devastating floods we provide a magnet for accelerated development. Yet—and again broadly speaking, we cannot include benefits for protecting future improvements attracted by the project. Stream flow regulation is another aspect in which our ground rules for assessing benefits are unduly restrictive. With the increase of population and urbanization, low flow regulation as prevention of pollution is becoming increasingly important. Yet the only benefit we can compute for low flow regulation of releases from one of our multi-purpose reservoirs is for the specific purpose of navigation. If the reservoir contributes to a navigation improvement downstream we can assess a navigation benefit. If it has no navigation aspects, but if it does regulate low flows to flush filth away from an urban area, we cannot claim benefits. As an illustration of this use, I can cite the situation in New Orleans several years ago, during a period of extreme drought. The flow down the Mississippi River had been reduced to the point that salt intrusion from the gulf 50 miles away was beginning to adversely affect New Orleans' water supply. This problem was solved and the salt intrusion was stopped by making controlled releases of fresh water from the Fort Peck Reservoir in northern Montana on the Missouri River. That was a great benefit for the people in New Orleans and yet under our economic ground rules it could not be counted as an asset for Fort Peck.

The situation on municipal and industrial water supply in multi-purpose reservoirs is much brighter due to the almost single-handed efforts of Senator KERR in getting this question straightened out and getting legislation passed in the Flood Control Act of 1958. But, when we get into the question of whether to install hydroelectric power the picture again gets most cloudy. The ground rules for economic analysis of power are so complicated that I know I don't understand them and I doubt very much if many others do. America now needs power and will need more power. It seems to me that if we get even close to a justifiable project, we should give it the benefit of the doubt and include the power installation.

At every one of these water resources projects, recreation has become big business. Someone has said we are now developing into a race of "aqua maniacs"; it is a fair statement that recreation is changing some of our habits of living. Yet—it is only recently that we have been able to consider recreation as a beneficial purpose of a project. And even now our ground rules for putting an entry on the asset side of the ledger are far from liberal. We are now building two reservoirs, Eufaula and Keystone, within commuting distance of Oklahoma City. I'll make a sizable bet that even before those reservoirs are completed, the sale of outboard motors, boats, trailers, fishing rods, lures and all the other gadgets that go along with modern recreation are going to reach astronomical heights in Oklahome City, and after they are completed, a sizable part of the population is going to take off by plane, by car and maybe even by foot as often as he can for those reservoirs. Yet, from an "economic analysis"

viewpoint, neither Eufaula nor Keystone have any recreational benefits.

So much for my detailing of the indictment of these ground rules as not presenting a true analysis. And now I would like to answer the question—"So what?" I think the rules should be modified and liberalized.

This opinion is undoubtedly shared by everybody involved in the formulation and defense of these water resource projects and is understandable. Frankly, our present restrictions on the analysis of these projects make any proponent extremely vulnerable to criticism—almost as vulnerable as a duck on the opening day of the season. It would certainly be a relief to feel we were in a protected sanctuary for a change. But much more important than any effect on our ruffled sensibilities, these restrictions are an offense against you. You people are the intelligent public, you eventually decide whether or not these public projects ever reach the execution stage. I submit that it is an offense against your judgment to present to you a picture which is distorted economically on the conservative side. Those of us who are knowledgeable in this water problem know that we must work at a fast pace to keep abreast of the present and that we are really going to have to raise our sights to advance into the future. In view of the tremendous changes we have seen in the last decade, any crystal ball, no matter how cloudy, will picture even more dramatic changes in the near future. To be overly liberal in developing our natural resources might be temporarily extravagant. But to be overly conservative now might be permanently tragic.

Distinguished, Retired Methodist Minister Calls for Support of President Kennedy's Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter received from the Reverend W. M. Cook, a distinguished, retired minister of Tennessee, a man advanced in years who has seen a lot of life and knows human nature and possesses wisdom. He has written to me an unusually frank and candid letter which I believe my colleagues will find of interest.

The letter follows:

SANTA FE, TENN., *April 11, 1961.*

DEAR JOE: I am Dr. Bill Cook's father and I knew your father well when I was on the Liberty Circuit of the Methodist Church, 1910–14. I am now a retired preacher, but I have not retired from my interest and support politically of what I believe in to advance the welfare of the common man, the farmer, the wage earner, public school education and the medical care of our aged, whose number have increased until the care of them is a national problem and a national responsibility. I know how hard pressed your two bodies of Congress are to bow to the demands of pressure groups. It takes statesmanship and courage of the nth degree to withstand selfish interests that are there to advance their own course—for example, the American Medical Association against care for the aged through the program tied to social security, which is the most sensible and workable plan advanced.

Doctors or rather the American Medical Association that dominates the entire medical fraternity down to the individual doctor and all our hospitals largely built by Federal support. Congress can fix the wages paid to workers but it must keep hands off of what doctors charge for their services, and insurance companies are pressing to advance their medical care policies, but I have not seen a policy issued that did not contain a clause giving the company the privilege to cancel it. Yesterday I was in the Maury County Hospital to visit an aged person, 80 years old, who told me that her company had canceled her policy.

Well, Joe, you may not know me but I am interested in you. Support President Kennedy, he has the goods.

Sincerely yours,

W. M. COOK.

Both New England and West Virginia Conditions Are Problems of the Nation and All Must Work in Unison for Their Solution, Senator Randolph Counsels in Letter to Boston Newspaper Editor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it was my privilege to have responded recently to an editorial in the Boston (Mass.) Herald which was entitled, "New England by Courtesy of West Virginia."

The editorial was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 7, 1961, on motion of the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. It had been inspired by an order issued by Secretary of the Interior Udall authorizing an increase of 100,000 barrels of foreign residual oil to be imported into the United States each day, and by certain expressed reactions to that order.

The editor of the Herald was sufficiently considerate of my right to make reply that he published in the March 26 issue of that important New England daily newspaper a substantial portion of the text of my March 10, 1961, letter in reply to his February 22, 1961, editorial.

Mr. President, in order to clarify my position and that of many of my fellow West Virginians, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the letter to which I have made reference.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., March 10, 1961.

EDITOR, THE BOSTON HERALD,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR SIR: On March 7, 1961, my esteemed colleague, Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, had printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an editorial from the Boston Herald of February 22, 1961, entitled "New England by Courtesy of West Virginia."

That editorial was inspired by an order issued by Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall authorizing an increase of 100,000 barrels of foreign residual oil to be imported into the United States each day, and by certain reaction to the order.

I deplore the provincialism and so-called intersectional rivalries which seem to have been engendered by the whole question of importation of residual oil. It is especially disheartening when the discord principally involves two regions of the United States—New England and the Appalachians—which are suffering heavily from persistent and chronic labor surplus.

Writing as a West Virginian and as a U.S. Senator representing that State, I must inform you that I do not concur with the sentence of your editorial which reads: "It seems that what happens to New England is of small concern to West Virginia."

I state with sincerity the belief that the problems of New England and those of West Virginia are problems of the Nation and that we must all work in unison for their solution. In support of this belief, I cite two examples:

In speaking today in the Senate as an advocate of the pending area redevelopment bill, I stated that I concur with the anti-pirating provision of the measure and added:

"Our concern for the proposed legislation is motivated by no desire to benefit the State of West Virginia by the losses of another State or region. Our experience with the ravages of unemployment had been too long and too severe for us to desire any part in extending the problem to others. And I emphatically add, in view of some of the recent unfortunate differences of opinion that have arisen between my section and another, that the assurances I have just expressed are offered with particualr reference to my honored colleagues from New England.

"As Secretary of Commerce Hodges said when he was Governor of North Carolina, 'the country is growing. We want whatever part we deserve of the expansions that you are going to have in this growing economy.'"

Then, too, ever since my election to the Senate in 1958, I have been a vigorous proponent of a national fuels policy—and I emphasize the world "national." It is my view that before a fuels policy national in scope and application can be formulated, there must be a thorough study made of our fuels and energy resources. Accordingly, I have been the principal sponsor of resolutions to create a congressional study committee. A number of Members of the U.S. House of Representatievs have shared these views, as have a majority of the Members of the U.S. Senate.

A few days ago, the House Committee on Rules rejected a resolution for the creation of a joint committee of the Congress, similar to one I had introduced in the Senate on January 9, 1961, with 54 Senators as cosponsors. But the House Rules Committee did report favorably a House resolution to create a House Select Committee on a National Fuels Study.

On March 2, I introduced in the Senate a new resolution which would create a special committee to be known as the Senate Special Committee on a National Fuels Study. Today, 63 Senators of both Parties and from all parts of the United States, are joined as cosponsors, 7 from New England.

That same day, in remarks in the Senate, I said:

"The House resolution does not embrace language which, I am informed, the 10 Senators from New England States, along with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], consider to be essential to a national fuels study agenda satisfactory to them. Accordingly, I have introduced the new Senate resolution."

And I stated the following to be a primary reason why I submitted the new resolution:

"A comprehensive national fuels study should embrace the so-called 'New England amendments,' proposed in the Senate by the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] on February 9, 1961, for himself, the nine other Senators of both parties from New England States, the Senator from New York, and the Senator from Wisconsin.

"The new Senate resolution I introduced embraces in full the language proposed by Senator PASTORE and his cosponsors, as properly should be the case. * * * With the so-called 'New England amendments' included, the agenda for the proposed committee is clearly in the national interest and definitely would take into account considerations relating to fuels and energy resource availability, production, and marketing, as well as consumer needs and interests.

"A thorough, factual, equitable, and impartial study of the Nation's fuel and energy resources is essential—and I underscore the admonition that such a study be impartial. I have never entertained any other concept of the mission of a committee entrusted with the responsibility to make a national fuels study."

I believe it is essential that we bring attention to bear upon all of the fuels and energy resource problems of all regions of the United States—including those problems which relate to the consumers.

We must study all fuels and evolve a policy embracing all of them, and of paramount concern must be the question of national defense posture and national security. This aspect is too often overlooked as we engage in day-by-day competitive commercial intercourse.

In the approach to every element of these grave problems, I certainly believe New England interests should be accorded courteous, thorough, and understanding consideration. I would hope that the same would be applied to the Appalachian region, including my home State of West Virginia.

I am optimistic that mutual solutions can be found, and in this connection I answer a question posed by your editorial.

My response is that New England should not be injured to help West Virginia.

But I add that neither should West Virginia be injured to help New England.

All are part of the Union, and in an economically healthy union there is strength.

Respectfully,

JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
U.S. Senator from West Virginia.

Migrant Farm Labor Problems and "Harvest of Shame"—VII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is the seventh in a series of articles presented in the public interest by the Palm Beach Post-Times to show the Members some of the progress being made in Florida to solve problems relating to migrant farm labor which were left out of the television presentation "Harvest of Shame." The omissions of all that has been, and is being, done in this field did a great injustice to the Floridians who have given their time and efforts to these problems over the years. It is hoped that by reading these articles and the ones to follow the Members and public will have a better understanding of this important matter:

[From the Palm Beach Post, Feb. 3, 1961]

LEGISLATION TO FORCE MIGRANTS FROM FARM LABOR MARKETS

"They do not have the strength to influence legislation. Perhaps we do."—Harvest of Shame.

Passage by Congress of legislation to regulate migrant labor conditions may mean the loss of work for many migrants.

That's the prediction of Walter Kautz, president of the Everglades Farm Bureau.

In a message to members of his group, Kautz said:

"Should the program 'Harvest of Shame' have the effect desired by its advocates, and farm labor legislation is forced down our necks, there is but one answer for survival—further mechanization of our farms to eliminate the need for as much hand labor as possible."

This will be necessary, Kautz said, because of the financial conditions of many farmers.

"We're not opposed to people being able to better their living conditions; we are opposed to legislation that will put the finishing touches to the cost-price squeeze that already has put many farmers out of business," he said.

The farm family unit already has disintegrated in many areas because of the cost-price squeeze, the president said.

Kautz said proper education—not legislation—is the answer to the troubles faced by migrant laborers.

"No one is opposed to better living conditions for farmworkers, migrating or otherwise," he said. "The proper answer isn't legislation but education."

"'No one is tied to farmwork. As an individual's level of education rises, there is a natural tendency for him to want to better his living conditions, and along with this, his ability to do so increases as he learns. That has been the American way from the very beginning."

Protection of the Freedoms We Cherish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. HARTKE. Madam President, Indiana's dynamic young Governor, Matthew E. Welsh, warned last week of the dangers to our freedom which exist in the manner in which we protect the very freedoms we cherish. Speaking to the Outstanding Young Man of the Year banquet of the Vincennes Junior Chamber of Commerce in Vincennes, Ind., Governor Welsh identified and described dangerous situations which are timely for our consideration. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the Governor's speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM AN ADDRESS TO BE DELIVERED BY GOV. MATTHEW E. WELSH AT THE OUTSTANDING MAN OF THE YEAR AWARDS BANQUET, SPONSORED BY THE VINCENNES JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AT VINCENNES UNIVERSITY, AT 7 P.M., TUESDAY, APRIL 4, 1961

A wise philosopher once said, "Those who do not remember the past are condemned to relive it." These words constitute a warning to all of us today, for there are forces and ideas abroad, and at home, that would have us trade our freedom for a sense of internal security, and our liberty for peace overseas.

Communism has taken over nation after nation that failed to recognize the danger of the Red conspiracy against freedom in time to protect itself. Apathy and ignorance proved the downfall of the now captive Communist states, far more than the threat of war from the outside or revolution from within.

This is a part of the pattern of the past we should remember or we too will be condemned to relive it.

But other nations fell under regimes equally destructive of individual freedom and equally cruel and barbaric, at least partially under the guise of protecting themselves from communism. Freedom was lost in the name of freedom, for the people did not recognize that the ends can never justify the means.

They failed to realize they could not sacrifice individual freedom to protect it, that they could not substitute fear and terror for justice in the name of security. They forgot that public discussion and freedom of speech cannot be replaced with a forced conformity, and still keep their own freedom.

There are those among us today who preach the dangerous doctrine that any means are just and any are proper that are directed at those they suspect of being Communists. In this too is the trap that has destroyed nations.

America must remain, as it is now, aware of the danger of communism as the major force today threatening the free world and the way of life Americans hold dear.

It is not the name we oppose, but it is the vicious, treacherous conspiracy perpetrated by Communists. It isn't the word we repudiate but what it stands for.

We cannot permit ourselves to become irrational zealots seeing our neighbors as Communists, treating differences of opinion as evidence of treason and conspiracy, and falling victim to fear, distrust, and bigotry that is just as destructive to American freedom.

The sowing of hate, the spreading of distrust, or the setting of group against group within our community or State is also a denial of true freedom and does the very damage to our American way of life that the Communists, for all their efforts, have not been able to achieve.

Those who set themselves as self-appointed judges and juries over their fellow men, those who would deny freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom to think and write are the enemies of freedom, whether they are Communists or call themselves something else.

Those who use the accusation of Communist against others with whom they disagree, those who seek to convince by threat and by slander instead of facts and persuasion, are dangerous to freedom and democracy.

America will strengthen its basic rights and freedom when we emphasize what we are for, more than what we are against. We will become stronger when we restore to a greater measure the right to disagree, the

right to discuss and argue, the right to advocate or be different, without the threat of slander.

Freedom is not an anemic and weak principle that must cringe in fear when put to the test. In freedom, in liberty, there is strength, not weakness; pride, not shame; and victory, not defeat. As we struggle against the major threat to freedom in the world, the godless, materialistic, Communist conspiracy, let us not fall victim to fear, suspicion, and denial of real freedom among ourselves.

For if we do, we will have lost the very rights we thought we were defending. If we lose freedom, if we lose liberty, we have lost all. Whether we lose it to a Communist conspiracy directed from abroad, or a conspiracy against freedom at home, the result is the same.

Freedom must be defended constantly from attacks from whatever source they may come.

Congressman Charles O. Porter Points Way to Congress in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, with the growing interest and importance of Latin America, I would like to call attention to an excellent recent book on this subject by former Representative Charles O. Porter of Oregon. His book, entitled "The Struggle for Democracy in Latin America," published by MacMillan and coauthored by Robert J. Alexander, has received many prominent and favorable reviews.

The leading article in the March 25 Saturday Review "Challenge In Latin America," describes Representative Porter's book as "excellent within its field and scope," and commends it for its earnestness of purpose, the objective, scientific outlook as well as its discipline in utterance and balance in judgment. This book has also been given favorable reviews by Malcolm Bauer, the able associate editor of the Oregonian, the largest daily newspaper in my State, and by Karl E. Meyer, an editorial writer for the Washington Post, and a recognized authority on Latin America.

I recommend Mr. Porter's book to my colleagues in the Congress, as well as to the general public, and I know that it will stimulate earnest thinking on this vitally important area of the world.

Representative Porter's book is in keeping with the pledge made by President Kennedy in his inaugural message when the President declared:

To our sister republics south of our border, we offer a special pledge—to convert our good words into good deeds, in a new alliance for progress, to assist free men and free governments in casting off the chains of poverty. But this peaceful revolution of hope cannot become the prey of hostile powers. Let all our neighbors know that we shall join with them to oppose aggression or subversion anywhere in the Americas. And let every other power know that this hemisphere intends to remain the master of its own house.

Mr. President, I believe that Representative Porter's book will help light the beacon for real progress in Latin America, and I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD the reviews that I have mentioned from the Oregonian, the Washington Post and Times Herald, and the Saturday Review.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sunday Oregonian, Apr. 2, 1961]

PORTER, COLLABORATOR WRITE OFF CASTRO AS BETRAYER

(By Malcolm Bauer)

Ex-Representative Charles O. Porter, who once looked upon Fidel Castro as a revolutionary hero, has confirmed his thorough disenchantment. The confirmation is in "The Struggle for Democracy in Latin America," (Macmillan, $4.50), in which Mr. Porter collaborated with Robert J. Alexander, an experienced writer on Latin American affairs.

Castro, the Porter-Alexander team charges, is "blowing out Cuba's brains" and has "probably passed the point of no return with respect to his tie-in with the Russian Communists." He is "the man who betrayed a great revolution," and they foresee for him the same fate as that which caught up with the man he overthrew, Batista.

But the burden of this slim book is criticism not of Castro but of U.S. policy in Latin America. The United States, the authors say, has been led by military and business interests to give unwarranted support to Latin American dictatorships, thereby earning the distrust of democratic elements.

"If the situation continues to deteriorate for many more years as it has in the last few," they warn, "it will not be long before any Latin American political leader who dares publicly to express friendship for the United States will be generally regarded by his fellow citizens much as the members of the Petain regime in France were regarded by most patriotic Frenchmen during World War II."

The Porter-Alexander prescription is threefold: "An abandonment of the attitude of taking Latin America for granted; a general position favoring democracy against dictatorship in the New World; and a program of real economic cooperation for the development of the Latin American nations."

Although some readers will believe the conclusions drawn are, in some cases, too extreme, this is a competent journalistic review of the principle events of the past few decades in Latin American affairs, with special emphasis on relationships between the United States and the lands south of the border. There is just one omission: There is no mention of Mr. Porter's considerable activity in United States-Latin American affairs during his service as a Congressman from Oregon.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Mar. 26, 1961]

"THE STRUCTURE FOR DEMOCRACY IN LATIN AMERICA," BY CHARLES O. PORTER AND ROBERT J. ALEXANDER (MACMILLAN, 215 PAGES, $4.50)

(By Karl E. Meyer)

It is not so much our ignorance as lack of interest that irritates Latin Americans in their dealings with the United States. Surely it is only a mild hyperbole to say that until recently even well-informed North Americans were more curious about the Egypt of the early Pharaohs than about events to the south.

Doubtless there have been many reasons for this massive indifference—the feeling that Latin America was a sleepy sideshow; the deadly cliches of Pan-Americanism, so freighted with complacency; the generally dreadful newspaper coverage of everything except earthquakes.

But I would venture that a further reason has been the lack of first-rate, nonscholarly books about the region. The last country-by-country survey with any style or spice was Gunther's "Inside Latin America"—and that was published in 1940.

The present volume is a commendable attempt to provide a primer for the layman. It is both broad in scope and straightforward, if a bit wooden, in style, and it has the added merit of useful surveys of political trends in 10 republics.

In viewpoint, it is what we would expect from former Representative Porter and Robert Alexander, a Rutgers scholar, two men known for their liberal convictions. The authors have some caustic and for the most part deserved criticism of past U.S. policy blunders: the medals for dictators, excessive identification with U.S. business interests and the inadequate, scattershot economic aid programs of years past.

But their central criticism is that in the absence of a real overall policy for Latin America, the State Department has been vulnerable to powerful pressure groups which have put this country into unwise and inconsistent positions.

Despite President Kennedy's fresh start, along lines that the authors would probably applaud, this basic problem remains. Even since the advent of Fidel Castro, there is nothing like an informed popular consensus on what needs to be done in Latin America. It is as if the Marshall plan had been proposed in a country that was only dimly aware that Europe existed.

For this reason, one hopes that more books like the present volume will be written, read and debated by those politicians and editors whose interest in Latin America is so lamentably underdeveloped.

[From the Saturday Review, Mar. 25, 1961]

CHALLENGE IN LATIN AMERICA

(By Salvador de Madariaga)

For a person alive to the dangerous state of world affairs, and therefore to the importance of preserving friendship and respect for the United States, a trip through Latin America is a strange experience. Wherever he goes he will be struck by a widespread and intense anti-American feeling, particularly among students and professors as well as the professional classes. It seems to me that the international situation is the very worst for such a situation to develop at the very doorstep of the United States; for we are witnessing a great movement toward political liberty and national independence on two other continents in circumstances which by no stretch of imagination can be said to contribute to a stable order. At such a time, the world can ill afford to set a third continent in turmoil.

We are everywhere seeing the forms of liberal democracy jeopardized. It is being twisted and tortured by foreign oppression in Communist-dominated countries, as in Eastern Europe, or by a homegrown form of oppression, as in Yugoslavia or in Spain; it is being exposed to the hazards of inexperience and of a more vigorous than intelligent nationalism, as in a number of newborn Asian and African nations. Disorder and confusion are the inevitable dust clouds in the wake of such agitated events, and disorder and confusion are as favorable to communism as they are injurious to liberal democracy.

The affairs of men are ruled by a kind of law of sociological gravity that forces them to fall toward chaos if not held at a certain level of order by an intelligent hand. This intelligent hand is what we call government.

It is plain that in a number of cases too high for the peace of mind of the world the hand that keeps the affairs of men from falling into chaos is neither strong nor intelligent enough to fulfill its task. It follows that in wide areas of the world, circumstances are being created that favor communism, since communism thrives on disorder and confusion while liberal democracy requires calm and the rule of the law.

Such being the general picture, we must look on the considerable progress made by communism in Latin America as a serious threat to our civilization, particularly as such progress is observable mostly among the intellectual classes. In the United States, one gathers the impression tha he intellectual is an oddity, a freak, at times a joke. His opinions are heard with polite deference and soon forgotten. As for his chances of a political career, they simply do not exist. A flavor of intellectuality has barred Adlai Stevenson from access to the White House, and one wonders whether Mr. Kennedy's success may not be due to the keen intelligence he devoted to hide his intellectuality (I am not saying "his intelligence") from his suspicious voters. The situation may be evolving. To be a Harvard professor is no longer a disqualification for becoming a member of the Presidential Cabinet; but to have published a book of poems might still be so.

In Latin America, however, a man may be writing poetry on Friday and become President or Minister of Foreign Affairs the following Sunday. Nor should one suppose that this phenomenon is limited to that form of power which derives from actual political functions. It cannot be doubted, for instance, that the high reputation which Pablo Neruda enjoys as a poet considerably enhances his power over Chilean public opinion as a Communist leader.

No more grievous mistake could therefore be made by the public opinion of the United States than to shrug its shoulders at the pro-Soviet and anti-American wave that is sweeping intellectual circles in Latin America. From the ranks of these pink professors, poets, doctors, and lawyers, the men will be recruited who will actually govern Latin America not merely 10 years hence, but maybe next year, maybe next month. The issue is immediate and urgent; and we must waste no time in facing it.

Two recently published books are relevant to what I am saying. One is entitled "The Struggle for Democracy in Latin America" (Macmillan, $4.50, 215 pp.), and is written by Charles Q. Porter and Robert J. Alexander, two names every well-informed Latin American has learned to trust and respect. The other, "Social Change in Latin America Today: Its Implications for United States Policy" (Carper, $5, 345 pages), is a collection of, six essays by as many distinguished American anthropologists. Each of these books is excellent within its field and scope. Both are examples of the best qualities one expects of serious American works: the bivalent knowledge, both of books and of men; the earnestness of purpose; the objective, scientific outlook; the discipline in utterance; the balance in judgment; the cautiousness in estimating present trends and future developments.

They fortunately differ in their approaches. The Porter-Alexander book is mainly political; the other mainly sociological and anthropological. The conclusions reached by both concerning American policy are, however, practically identical. There has been for years in Washington a regrettable lack of realization of the fundamentals of the situation south of the Mexican frontier.

The two chief failings of American policy, both books tell us, and rightly so, are too much subservience to American private—as distinct from public—interests, and an undeniable tendency to back dictatorships. Much more might perhaps be said on this score, but we should be grateful to the authors of these two books for having said as much. The 11th hour is striking and Mr. Kennedy may have to pack into the 12th much of the good will and intelligence that have been sadly missed for far too long in this field.

Despite the merits of the books, however, one may make a few critical observations. Representative Porter and Professor Alexander may be doing less than justice to the military when they write: "The armed forces (in Latin America) are probably the single, most serious impediment to the development of democracy." They themselves witness to the contrary in relating the fall of dictatorial regimes in Colombia and in Honduras. My own impression is that, in Argentina and Chile at any rate, the armed forces are today (and I stress the word) an efficient brake against any totalitarian stampede. I hope the authors appreciate my objectivity as a Spanish exile whose country is held gagged and chained by what is in fact a military totalitarian dictatorship.

May I also suggest that the Porter-Alexander "definition" of democracy is rather a description than a definition. "Democracy, as we understand it," they write, "consists basically of two things: the right of the majority of the adult population to choose their leaders; and the right of the minority to continue to function legally, to attempt to become a majority." That is a description that I of course accept. But as a definition I prefer one I once heard from the Belgian Socialist Senator de Brouckère: "Government by public opinion."

I do not put forward this alternative out of sheer pedantry, but because it leads me to my third line of criticism, this time covering both works. I refer to their somewhat negative attitude toward Spain and Spanish culture and history. It is too readily assumed that because the Latin American peoples were not ruled in the viceregal days by means of parliaments, there was no democracy then in the King of Spain's American realms. But a glance at the documents shows that the "realms beyond the seas" were ruled by public opinion to a considerable extent, and that a viceroy who tried to govern in defiance of public opinion risked riots and possibly his life.

I mention this fact because, to my deep regret, I find that both books repeat pseudo-facts or half facts which I have tried elsewhere to set right with the help of firsthand documents and, at times, of the works of first-rate American scholars in the field of Spain's history in America, such as Professor Hamilton for financial, and Prof. Irving Leonard for cultural affairs. One still has to read, in the Porter-Alexander book, that "Spain, Portugal, and France never forgot for one moment that the purpose of the colonies was to provide wealth for the mother country" (and similar statements appear in "Social Change"), when the facts are far from supporting such sweeping statements at all. There were no Spanish "colonies" in the New World, but kingdoms with autonomous governments, and the balance between the interests of the European and of the American kingdoms worked at times one way and at times another. How else could Latin America have remained, until the economically disastrous wars of emancipation, a rich congeries of communities whose common currency, solid gold pesos, was sought all over the earth as the world trade currency?

Migrant Farm Labor Problems and "Harvest of Shame"—VIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is the eighth in a series of articles presented in the public interest by the Palm Beach Post-Times to show the Members some of the progress being made in Florida to solve problems relating to migrant farm labor which were left out of the television presentation "Harvest of Shame." The omission of all that has been, and is being done in this field did a great injustice to the Floridians who have given their time and efforts to these problems over the years. It is hoped that by reading these articles and the ones to follow the Members and public will have a better understanding of this important matter:

[From the Palm Beach Post, Feb. 3, 1961]

SANITARY EDUCATION; CAMPS CLEAN, HEALTHY

"In New Jersey, a few miles from Princeton, is this labor camp. There are two water taps and two outhouses. Families live in one room, usually in one bed."—Harvest of Shame.

Palm Beach County maintains a ceaseless war to protect the health of its migrant workers by keeping camp sanitary.

Joseph Alvarez, who heads the migrant sanitation program for the board of health, has the assistance of one other man.

Their biggest problem? The education of migrants to understand the value of keeping homes, persons, and camps clean.

"Many of the migrants lack a sense of responsibility, and the problems at some camps are not necessarily the fault of the camp owners, although they are held responsible," Alvarez said.

Knowing they are here only temporarily, some migrants are careless about throwing garbage and trash around their housing, the sanitation officer said.

"We are concerned with poor environmental health conditions wherever they are found—not just in the migrant camps," Alvarez said. "But our job would be easier if the migrants would help."

There have been cases, he said, of migrants tearing out plumbing equipment and owners knowing nothing about it until it was found by the sanitarians.

The sanitarians try to teach the migrants it will be best for them to look after their own welfare rather than depend on the camp operators and sanitarians, Alvarez said.

The county now has 25 labor camps licensed to operate, Alvarez said, and other housing is under supervision of the Hotel and Restaurant Commission although it must comply with State laws regarding health.

The county has been aware of its problems, Alvarez said, and has set up a program during the last 3 years to evaluate its needs and correct unsatisfactory conditions.

All housing operators now are required to comply with the minimum health rules, he said, including provision for sewerage.

What happens if operators fail to meet regulations?

They are not licensed to operate.

The State places the burden of correcting conditions on the housing operator.

Investigators have found the same defects occurring repeatedly in the same or similar quarters. In each instance, the violation is reported to the owner or operator for correction.

However, both the occupants and the persons held responsible are interviewed in such cases.

State standards permit two to four men to be assigned to a room.

The facilities, however, must provide a central toilet, bath, and laundry. Central messhalls regularly are inspected.

The State reports the area is witnessing a gradual change in new construction from the roominghouse with one- and two-room units, central bath and toilet facilities to buildings with private toilets and baths in the unit.

"It has been observed that the builder who considers the comfort and convenience of his prospective tenants beyond the regulations is more often rewarded with fewer maintenance problems," the State board reported in "Migrant Project 1959."

Minnesota 4–H Radio Speaking Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two award-winning talks given by Phillip S. Schneiderman and Neal Nordeling at the Minnesota State 4–H radio speaking contest this year be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I commend these excellent speeches to the attention of my colleagues. The contestants Phillip Schneiderman and Neal Nordeling are to be congratulated.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND SIXTY-ONE RADIO SPEAKING CONTEST: HOW I CAN HELP PROMOTE WORLD PEACE

(By Phillip Schneiderman, West St. Louis County)

Victor Hugo once said, "There is a force greater than the force of armies. It is the force of an idea that has come into its time." The idea of peace has, after many centuries, come into its time, not as a desired ideal, but as an absolute necessity. I firmly believe this generation must lead the way in creating a structure of peace, built, not overnight, but brick by brick, testing each brick as we climb upward, and at last emerging, far removed from the dark shadows of the destructive forces now terrorizing the world.

My first brick would be laid in the home because the pattern of living with fellow humans must begin in childhood. Teamwork is a concept that must first be learned in the home. In the world of civic affairs men are finding that great accomplishments can come only through united effort. In a world where by virtue of the airplane no nation is more than a few hours' distance from any other, the people of the earth must learn to work together as a cooperative team. By international teamwork we can do much to eliminate man's enemies—hunger, disease, famine, and war. So, the parent who teaches teamwork is doing more than raising a well-adjusted child. He is helping to instill principles which will aid the child in being an intelligent citizen. Political strength, economic growth, and the security of the Nation demand personal development. A citizen who is underdeveloped physically, mentally, and morally is not an energizer, but a burden on society. Good education is a form of national defense. If I use my educational opportunities wisely, I will be taking the first steps toward becoming a developed citizen, and energizer.

My second brick would be a greatly expanded student exchange program. Many more foreign students should see that America is a country living its ideals instead of talking about them. I should like to be a living example of these ideals, and would welcome the opportunity to show a foreign student what my life is like.

A German boy observed in the Reader's Digest article "Let's Trade Teen-Age Citizens." "We usually think of America in terms of skyscrapers, Cadillacs, and gangsters. You can't realize how wrong you are until you see for yourself."

If you and I help, numerous foreign students will see a society in which men and women, families and communities, are realizing the good life—not in slogans, statistics, or propaganda, but actually in everyday living. World understanding is everybody's job and the best chance of obtaining it is through person-to-person association.

To make my ideals ring true, I must be more than aware of the prejudice I meet every day. I must try to gain personal understanding of minority groups and divergent opinions found in my own community. As President Kennedy has said, "We must practice what we preach in the Declaration of Independence, Constitution, and Bill of Rights. The world is watching."

My next brick is based on an observation often made by Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr. "People will not struggle for freedom unless they at least have enough physical strength to their fists up." Therefore, when we help people get rid of sickness, irrigate the deserts, drain the swamps, and increase the food supply, we are taking constructive actions for peace.

Because in the United States we live in a land of plenty, it is hard to visualize conditions elsewhere. So, the third brick is fighting famine, illiteracy, and poverty, and thus, indirectly, communism, which as Castro has said, "travels on empty bellies."

The tide of revolution, by the Castro revolt in Cuba, is part of a worldwide pattern. Because the doctrine of revolutionaries is to fight evil with evil, tyranny with war, fire with fire, and injustice with bloodshed, we must share not only economic and technical knowledge with South America, Asia, and Africa, but intellectual, moral, and spiritual knowledge. We must come together on a deeper basis than the exchange of goods and money To help in this development I can contribute to the Care program which is trying to improve the world's food supply. I can contribute to Radio Free Europe which is trying to win the minds of the people. I can contribute my time and effort as I am doing today to awaken my fellow citizens to the need for sharing rather than giving without thought. I can help further the idea that my privileges and rights are gained honestly only by trying to assume my responsibilities.

All nations now share the same vulnerability to surprise attack. My last brick would be to keep our Nation strong. We must realize that our private lives are interwoven with national interests. We would lose our privileges and liberties—many of us our lives—if this country, denied the strength it needs, lost the race with communism. We must remember that in a democracy sovereignty resides in the individual. You and I are America. You and I must be willing to subordinate our interests to national interests. Our efforts are the mortar that will cement these bricks.

The idea, the force, the direction for Americans in 1961 is found in St. Luke 12: 48—"For unto whomsover much is given, of him shall much be required."

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND SIXTY-ONE RADIO SPEAKING CONTEST: HOW I CAN HELP PROMOTE WORLD PEACE

(By Neal Nordling, Kittson County)

We live in a divided world—divided between East and West, between democracies and dictatorships, divided also between the well fed and the starving, between the educated and the illiterate. But one overriding hope unites all peoples. That is the hope of world peace.

In stunning one-two fashion, science plunged through two of nature's most challenging barriers. First the atom—in 1945 a new and terrifying instrument of death—was harnessed and put to work. Second, the inexorable pull of gravity was overcome, the conquest of space was launched. It began to seem quite plausible that man would himself soon ride free of his planet's gravity. It is unfortunate that despite the dawn of the space age and atomic age, we still have the new frontier of "inner space" to conquer. This is the inner space of our minds and this is the space that leads to world peace and security.

In discussing the conquest of inner space, I would like to consider the following: (1) Self-education, (2) education of our world at large, (3) food for peace, (4) student exchange, and (5) individual understanding and tolerance.

The first step on this ladder toward conquering this "inner space" would be to properly inform ourselves. Former President Eisenhower tells us that our American heritage is threatened as much by our own indifference as it is by the most powerful foreign threat. We've learned that a crisis anywhere in the world is not far from our own home. I can do my part by obtaining a broad education so that I might know how our Government and foreign policy operates. However, I must do more than just learn how it works, if I am to be well informed, I must also be well versed on current affairs.

The second step on this ladder might well find us concerned with the education of all peoples of the world. Statistics show that over 700 million men and women—nearly half the world's adults—cannot read or write any language. To aid the solving of such a problem requires cooperation of individuals everywhere. We can help stimulate political action through the strengthening of such organizations as the United Nations to help educate the world's illiterate people. I, and other individuals like me, can make known our opinions to legislators. I think our country can divert part of its foreign-aid-for-arms money to an aid fund for world education.

The third rung of our ladder indicates the growing need for such things as more food for peace—two-thirds of the world goes to bed hungry each night.

It is said that a drowning man will grasp at a straw. This is the case with many of these depressed peoples. This discontent breeds communism. Yet our bins burst with plenty. I can help share our abundance with our less fortunate brothers by giving my contribution to such organizations as CARE.

There is a much more direct approach and one which you and I can have a helping hand in. The fourth rung of our ladder is the exchange programs. These programs bring us the aspects of better understanding through people-to-people relationships. These are programs which will help break down the barriers between the East and

West and have been declared by former President Eisenhower to be the truest path to peace. Normally we think of other people when we deal in our own country but of foreign policy when we mention other countries. The exchange program seeks to have us deal with foreigners as other people, not by means of foreign policy. For example, when we think of China what do we see? Chiang Kai-shek and Formosa? Mao Tse-Tung and communism? Or 800 million Chinese people as individuals? These programs help foreign people see the real America and us to see the truth about them. As one German boy says, "We usually think of America in terms of skyscrapers, Cadillacs, and gangsters. Americans think of Germany in terms of Hitler and concentration camps. You can't realize how wrong you are until you see for yourself." Jane Addams of the famed Hull House further confirms this policy by her words, "One does good, if at all, with people, not to people." These programs I can help by contributing to a scholarship fund to help finance the exchange program and also I can take a student into my own home and help him learn about the real America. Since students of today are leaders of tomorrow, we must help them to know the truth. If we throw our pebble into the sea of understanding, there is no telling where the last small ripple will end.

The final rung of our ladder is individual understanding and tolerance. We must first give our talents in our own community before we can hope to spread our influence farther. Each of us must realize that hatred and prejudice wound our fellow men. Do I treat others as I would like to be treated in return? When we show respect and tolerance for the colored boy down the street, our brother and sister, our classmate and everybody—then we will be contributing to world peace. This is something everyone can and must do everyday. This takes but a little conscious effort yet how priceless it is.

As we reach the top of this ladder we will attain world peace. We have only stopped on the important rungs. After we become well informed, erase illiteracy, feed our hungry peoples, break down the barriers between the East and West through understanding and have individual understanding and tolerance for our brothers; such things as disarmament will evolve spontaneously because the causes will be removed. Professor Madagarada, political scientist at New York University, says that this hunger, illiteracy, and misunderstanding is the cause of a struggle of wills which results in arms races.

We must remember that we all have something to contribute. None of us is so poor that we do not have some gift and talent which added to the whole will make the sum total of a good world. "You and I." Those words hold the key. You and I, as individuals, are responsible for the successes and failures of our world. What we do, or fail to do, will add up to the strength or weakness of our world. God says: "For unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required." Have we done our share?

The Rewards of Voluntary Community Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, a constituent of mine, Mr. Arthur Murray Aibinder, of New York City, recently wrote to me describing the very wonderful work which he has done on behalf of children in the pediatric wards of New York City's hospitals. He describes his program as Operation Lollipop. I commend Mr. Aibinder for the fine work which he has done. I am happy today to call attention to a letter which he wrote to the editor of the Christian Science Monitor, urging that others participate in and benefit from volunteer work to help children in need.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the above-referred-to letter from Mr. Aibinder to the editor of the Christian Science Monitor. I hope that his sentiments as expressed in the lines of verse contained in this letter will inspire others to follow his very heartening example.

There being no objection, the letter to the editor was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VOLUNTEERS OF VITAL HELP

To the CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR:

Permit me to share my happiness with you. During my free time I do volunteer recreation work among shut-in children. With a checkerboard, a few children's riddles, and a smile we spend many hours of priceless enjoyment together. At times I feel it is wise to permit a child to win a game of checkers, at other times I just cannot beat them. By becoming the child's friend he forgets his problems for a while. He will talk of the pleasant dreams all children discuss. Financially, I receive nothing. Spiritually, I feel like a millionaire.

There are many areas where volunteers can serve. They can be of vital help regardless where they are assigned.

A person lives each and every day
Going about in his very own way
He may be dull, he may be smart
Yet, you hear the beating of his heart.

His face might be a very pleasant one
If not, think before you make fun
Keep this thought in mind, of it never depart
This person also has a heart.

He might belong to the majority, he might belong to the few
He might read the Old Testament, or he might read the New
No matter what he may base his religion upon
The heart still goes beating on.

He might be a very cheerful guy
Or he might have reason to cry
Which adds up to one little thing
We are all but a human being.

—ARTHUR MURRAY AIBINDER.

Judge Paul Moss: Texas Fighter for Good Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Judge Paul Moss, of Odessa, Tex., is one of the outstanding citizens of Texas. He has been in the forefront of the fight for good and honest government in Texas for more than 30 years.

His first political service in Texas was as Ector County campaign manager for the late beloved Attorney-General and Governor James V. Allred of Texas.

During the intervening more than 30 years he has continued active in his support of causes for good government in Texas, having served as a State District Judge for a term, in his active life as a successful rancher, lawyer, and civic leader.

Judge Moss, a native of the Great Smoky Mountain region of North Carolina, was one of the most influential Harry Truman leaders in Texas. He is my good friend upon whom I have long relied for advice. He is also a brother-in-law of our own colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina, the Honorable OLIN D. JOHNSTON. His charming wife has long been active in the Texas Federation of Music Clubs, is a past State president, and is now an officer of the National Federation of Music Clubs.

Mr. President, on Thursday, March 16, 1961, the Odessa American printed a short sketch about Judge Paul Moss under the caption, "Wandering Ended in Odessa; Moss Chose Friendly Town."

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in full in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WANDERING ENDED IN ODESSA—MOSS CHOSE FRIENDLY TOWN

(By Tracy Byers)

The country was dusty, the old car was dusty, the riders were dusty, and the faded roadside signpost, "Odessa" was dusty, too.

But after a wandering journey from Wyoming through Colorado, New Mexico and northern Texas, Paul Moss and his young son, William, looked at the sign with interest and Moss wrote in a book later: "One look told me that I had found what I was looking for."

He was 40 years old, an ex-schoolteacher and a lawyer, who had tried life in oilfield towns in Wyoming, in Denver, and still was looking for the promised land that he found in Odessa.

It was 35 years ago in August 1926. Odessa was a village with about 500 residents, but the friendliest people he had ever met. There were windmills everywhere and outside toilets.

"Somehow it seemed as if I had reached the promised land," he wrote later in his book, "Rough and Tumble," published in 1954.

Moss and his son pitched camp the first night in a tent on a vacant lot east of the post office. This began one of the epic tales of the Permian Basin oilfield.

There has been no greater contrast in the life of any citizen, reflected equally in the changes in Odessa during the ensuing 35 years.

Today Mr. and Mrs. Mosses' beautiful ranch home a few miles southwest of the city limits has been the scene of the annual convention of the Texas Federation of Music Clubs, of which Mrs. Moss is a past president. National officers also attended the convention. Mrs. Moss now is one of the national officers. The rambling ranch home of the Mosses' nestles in the center of 31 landscaped acres, reclaimed from once barren mesquite land.

Similarly through the years in Odessa hundreds of miles of paved streets have devel-

oped as the city grew to 80,000 residents; the 2-story red brick schoolhouse has disappeared and 30 schools now serve the city.

During the years Moss was the first city attorney and drew up the first city ordinances; he was president of the school board in 1929 and 1930; was on the board of a bank but later sold his stock; was the first Odessan to serve as judge of the 70th district court, when it served half a dozen nearby counties. He was a charter member of the Rotary Club and the Odessa Country Club.

I have never changed my opinion that Odessa has the friendliest, happiest people on earth," Moss said cheerfully.

"There has been one change through the years that seems important to me. A man used to need to be a jack-of-all-trades to get along well in the world. I think that now we have reached an age of specialization, where a man must follow one business and look after it carefully," Moss said.

Shortly after he arrived here, the first oil boom hit Odessa. "In 1927 I made about $14,000, half of it from my law business and half from commissions on selling oil leases," Moss said.

A few years ago he sold some oil rights on his home ranch to Union Oil Co. for many million dollars, still retaining all surface rights to the land that stretches from the western city limits of Odessa for about 12 miles west along U.S. Highway 80.

These oil rights valued at millions of dollars were on some 7,000 acres of land that he had bought at $9 an acre late in 1939, and also included about 5,000 acres purchased earlier near Duro, just west of Penwell.

In 1949 he bought some 10,000 acres at $9 an acre between U.S. Highway 80 and West 27th Street. He ultimately had some 30,000 acres stretching along both sides of Highway 80, some of it in a continuous strip from Odessa to Penwell.

Moss recalls cheerfully buying of his first home place ranch acreage. "Humble and other firms had drilled on the place to no avail. When I bought the 7,000 acres everyone said there was no oil south of the Texas & Pacific Railway tracks, where my land was located."

Moss found an independent driller and persuaded him to try drilling again and they brought in a gusher about a mile from the Humble dry hole * * * "I've been looking up ever since," Moss said cheerfully. "The oil game is the most fascinating thing I've ever gone into. It's much like a horse race—you never know what's going to come in next."

Most recently Moss figured in international news when some land he bought on the Isle of Pines was "liberated" by the Communist government of Cuba, which also "froze" money he had in the island bank.

"I've just written it all off," Moss said, without giving his personal version of the Castro government. But as an adopted Texan, who has learned to yearn for water, he mourns the loss of "one of the most beautiful springs in the world," which was on his island land.

Sale of approximately 250 oil wells on his home ranch in the Union Oil Co. deal was passed by nonchalantly—and he didn't recall the exact number of wells.

He explained this easily enough. Aside from the wells on his home ranch, he had interests of various kinds in oil development in some 14 other counties, and numbers of individual wells were not so important. He had 10,000 home ranch acres in production spotted at 10, 20 and 40-acre spacings.

It recalled a statement he made to this reporter a few years ago at income tax payment time, when Moss sighed in some surprise as he said, "Imagine a North Carolina farm boy who feels that his tax payments really will be a help to the government." That was at the time when oil production was booming.

When he said "North Carolina farm boy," he really meant it. His father was seriously ill when Paul was between 12 and 14 years of age, and the boy plowed the fields and sowed the crops, helped by his mother.

Moss was born March 27, 1886 in Clay County in the Great Smoky Mountain region of western North Carolina. His mother was from Rabun County in the Blue Ridge Mountain area of north Georgia. His father's people were originally from Virginia, but had settled in North Carolina, and part of the family moved to the beautiful valley of the Tusquitee River, adjoining the Hiawassee River in the high hills of Clay County.

Moss first attended Hiawassee College in north Georgia. He received his law degree from Valparaiso University in Indiana.

He married Tommye Leigh Atkinson of Atlanta, Ga., a native of Spartanburg, S.C. in 1919. She was with him in Greybull, Wyo. and in Denver, before he started his first trip to Odessa. She had gone home from Denver while he and their son, William, traveled around, looking for the ultimate family home.

Mrs. Moss's sister, Gladys, is married to U.S. Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, and occasionally visits here. After their arrival in Odessa, a daughter, Betty, was born to Mr. and Mrs. Moss and she now lives in Midland.

Moss's career has included being principal at the age of 20 of the school in Copperhill, Tenn. Then on a wintry night more than half the town, including the school, burned down. That was when he went to Valparaiso University to study law.

After graduating with honors from Valpariso, he headed west, touching in Casper, Wyo. during its oil boom, then going to Greybull, where he became city attorney.

Moss always had a yearning to move on, and he, Mrs. Moss and William left Greybull for Denver, where he stayed several years, before coming to Odessa.

Hearing of good hunting in the mountains of New Mexico, he went to Cloudcroft in 1935 and acquired a summer ranch home near Weed. The elevation of the present ranch house is 7,000 feet above sea level.

It was this summer home in the mountains that finally gave him his final anchor in Odessa. "It took me a long time to decide where to settle, but when I met Odessa and Texas I knew I had found my home," he said.

Visit to the U.S. Capitol by Louisiana High School Pupils

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL B. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, it was my pleasure on April 12 to have as my guests the senior class from University High School of Baton Rouge, La. Every year the senior class of this fine institution visits our Nation's Capitol as part of their general educational program.

University High is among the schools which maintain the highest scholastic standards in Louisiana and the chaperons and my two daughters attending school there inform me that the academic standards are higher now than they ever were. University High is part of the Louisiana State University College of Education and these students have the benefit of studying under some of the finest teachers in the State of Louisiana.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the names of the 57 students and 6 chaperons from University High School in Baton Rouge.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSITY HIGH SCHOOL, BATON ROUGE, LA.

Girls: Aggie Mullins, Peggy Powers, Ann Durrett, Sarah Brown, Lula Mae Hebert, Ree Smith, Ann Butler Bebe Taylor, Jan Hockaday, Merrill Faye Hines, Maggie Gerlicher, Topsy Dougherty, Janie McVea, Jackie Champagne, Mary Myers, Marilyn Pisa, Myra Cox, Caroline Spiller, Carol Guy, Lou Pace, Judy Kuehnle, Maureen Mitchell, Karen Carter, Carol Lynn Lowery, Mary Jo Kowaluzuk, Nancy Knight, Marcelle Martin, Marjorie Cox, Madelene Hubbs, Susan Owen, Lynn Meyer.

Boys: Kester Hawthorne, Richard Mason, Brother Hackett, Conley Juban, Steve Mendelson, Ted McMullan Gary Keyser, Philip Swire, Rudy Beard, McGee Grigsby, Roland Saurauge, Ken Jones, Richard Gill, Steve Carter, Bridger Eglin, Leon Lastrapes.

Chaperones: Mrs. George Cox, Mrs. E. Spiller, Mrs. M. Travis, Mrs. Kowalczuk, Dr. R. Gisby, Mr. Beeson.

Inflationary Trend of the Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. HARTKE. Madam President, the problem of inflation and prices has long been a concern of our Government. President Kennedy recently made a major statement expressing his concern over the inflationary trend of our economy and pointing out the value and virtue of full employment. The Evansville Courier commented editorially about the President's approach to these significant problems. I ask unanimous consent that these comments may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADMINISTRATION TACKLES INFLATION PROBLEM

The Kennedy administration came to grips for the first time last week with a persistent American problem—the question of inflation.

The problem has been with us ever since World War II. Presidents Truman and Eisenhower both pleaded for cooperation in bringing price stability. But as President Kennedy noted, "These exhortations have not had any great effect."

At present, the administration is also contemplating a voluntary program. The President told a manufacturers group last month that Government is "almost totally without direct and enforceable powers over prices

and wages freely set and bargained for. And this is as it should be."

The administration's effort is being made through an Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy, convened in Washington last week. The Committee has been charged with a study of a staggering list of topics, including wages, prices, collective bargaining, living standards, productivity, and world trade. The first subjects it will tackle are the effects of inflation on U.S. exports and the problems of automation.

The President has expressed extreme reluctance to intervene directly in wage disputes or industrial pricing policy. Nevertheless, recent statements indicate vigorous approaches on related problems.

One will be an attempt to limit the pressure of consumer demand on prices. In 1957–58, and again in the present recession, it has been startling to see sale of luxury items increasing while the pace of industrial output slackened. The administration hopes to turn more buying power to industrial goods by an income tax credit for investments.

Another will be an intensive effort to stimulate full production. Indiana University's Prof. Robert Turner, now a Kennedy adviser, noted in an Evansville speech some time ago that costs no longer go down when production declines. If output is small, each purchaser must pay a crushing share of plant, executive, and distribution costs. The President, apparently subscribing to this theory, has insisted on several occasions that full production can contribute to price stability.

Kennedy feels that full production can cut costs by modernization of American production machinery. At present, he says, the average age of factory equipment seems to be going up. New machinery can mean greater efficiency and, theoretically, a reduction in price.

He notes that more production will mean a bigger tax take for the Federal Government. In last month's speeech to the manufacturers, he indicated that the increase could amount to as much as $12 billion and declared that even after payment for all administration welfare programs, "this amount of revenue would still leave a substantial surplus—a surplus essential to defend our economy against inflation."

The administration approach to the problem of inflation then will be based on increased output and increased investment. It will also seek to keep labor-management pressures for higher prices and wages within reasonable limits, through continuing talks. The combined undertaking looks gigantic, but the goals are high on the list of virtually every American's hopes.

Angela Parisi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am saddened by the untimely passing of an outstanding American and Democrat, my good friend Angela R. Parisi. As one who had the pleasure of working closely with Angela Parisi, I can give testimony to the great loss which we have suffered. Angela's life was a tribute to all women as was her devotion to her children and family. The newspaper article which I now insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is a brief account of Angela Parisi's accomplishments:

ALBANY, March 20.—Angela R. Parisi, member of the workmen's compensation board and a leader in State Democratic Party activities, died of cancer tonight at the Albany Medical Center Hospital. She was 46 years old.

In private life she was the wife of Leo Louison, a New York lawyer. They lived at 811 Avenue R in Brooklyn.

In 1955, Miss Parisi, then vice chairman of the State Democratic Committee and head of its women's division, was appointed by Governor Harriman as chairman of the workmen's compensation board.

During the next 4 years, she presided over many administrative changes designed to meet criticism of the board's operations. She was also a close friend and frequent companion of Mrs. Harriman.

In 1959, Governor Rockefeller appointed Col. S. E. Beechhurst to succeed Miss Parisi as chairman. She continued as a member of the board; her term was to have expired at the end of the year.

Miss Parisi, a native of Brooklyn, attended St. Agnes Seminary, St. John's College in Brooklyn and the Brooklyn Law School. For a time she taught history and government at Marymount College, Tarrytown, N.Y., and in the Brooklyn College adult education program.

Entering the practice of law, she became a member of the firm of Parisi, Nemser & Louison in Brooklyn. She also was an assistant corporation counsel of the city, active both in litigation and in legislative affairs.

CAMPAIGNED FOR O'DWYER

At the same time, she pursued an active career in politics. She headed the Young Democratic Clubs' campaign for the election of William O'Dwyer as mayor in 1945, and was national secretary of the Young Democratic Clubs from 1947 to 1949. She served on the platform committee at the 1952 Democratic National Convention, and was vice chairman of the State committee and head of its women's division from 1949 to 1955.

Interviewed at the convention, she said "women are ostriches if they're not interested in politics."

"While their first interest should be home and the children," she added, "home and the children are not secure unless they can project themselves beyond it."

Miss Parisi served many community civic organizations in various posts, among them the Red Cross, the Italian Board of Guardians of the Brooklyn Catholic Charities, the Girl Scouts and the Diocesan Council of Catholic Women.

She was a past president of the Brooklyn Women's Bar Association and of the New York State Federation of Democratic Women's Clubs. She was also a member of the Women's Trade Union League and the American Committee on Italian Migration, among other organizations.

Besides her husband, she is survived by two sons, Neil and James; a sister, Mrs. Juliet Somma, and a brother, John Parisi.

Freedom of Expression Among Public Servants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIBORNE PELL

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an excellent editorial from the Foreign Service Journal, entitled "Daring and Dissent," of the April 1961 issue. It stresses the importance to our national interest and welfare of having foreign service officers who exercise both moral courage and independence of judgment in the writing of their political reports.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DARING AND DISSENT

The Foreign Service has special reason to be thankful for President Kennedy's statement, in his state of the Union message, that the new administration "recognizes the value of daring and dissent" among public servants. For the Department of State and the Foreign Service are, or should be, engaged in a continuous process of reevaluation of our foreign policies, and this process can be stultified if there is no freedom of expression within our organization.

Nobody who has been associated with the recent hammering-out of foreign policies in the Department of State will have come away feeling that there was any kind of enforced conformity. There are, and there should be, opposing viewpoints and sharp debates. But this has not always been the case. We are thinking of a time, for instance, when a dispatch from the field which advanced facts and arguments that did not square with established policy could be withdrawn from circulation within the Department.

There should be no more of this. Even if an officer is wrong, provided he is loyal and keeps his views within the official family, he has a right—indeed, he has a duty—to make his best thinking on a particular problem available to the Department of State. The Department, on its part, should protect the officer against having labels put on him by outsiders who may disagree with his political views. Unless this is done, only orthodox views will be ventilated, and our policy formulation process will suffer. We have seen this happen to the foreign services of other countries. We have reason to believe, for instance, that the rigidity of Stalin's foreign policy was due in no small measure to selective and narrowly doctrinaire reporting from the field and an unwillingness to entertain new ideas about the actual world that surrounded the Soviet Union.

The right to think daring and dissenting thoughts is not a license for foolishness and wrongheadedness, but it is a guarantee that nothing will be taken for granted. In politics, yesterday's truths are often tomorrow's falsehoods. Officers who expressed skepticism about Russia's cooperative intentions during World War II performed an invaluable function in the policy formulation process, even though their views did not coincide with official policy. Officers today who question other assumptions of the day may possibly perform a similarly valuable function.

If an officer is consistently wrong or foolish, that will be reflected in his efficiency reports and he will presumably not advance to positions of responsibility and should, in fact, be selected out. But unpopular ideas are not necessarily foolish, and officers are also rated, and rightly so, for the factor of courage. We must hope that they will be given credit for courage if they give voice to unpopular thoughts, so that there will be no premium on "getting along with others" when that only means conformity and unimaginativeness. The policy formulation process is badly served if only those ideas are entertained that happen to correspond with the prevailing climate of opinion.

Let there be, then, within the limits of loyal service to the United States, a free play of ideas in the Foreign Service. Such

a free play of ideas is only possible, however, if the President and the Secretary of State will actually defend those of their subordinates who may some day, with the benefit of hindsight, prove to have been wrong. In giving our best judgment we cannot always be right, particularly since politics involves constant change, and a judgment made 2 years ago may look foolish today even though it was quite reasonable at the time when it was made.

We are heartened by the President's response in his February 15 press conference to a reporter's question whether "any employee of our State Department was responsible for or had any part in advancing the Communist foothold in Cuba" and, if so, whether he would "take steps to remove them from office." The President replied: "I think that probably miscalculations were made by our country in assessing in Cuba, but I have no evidence that anyone did it out of any other motive but to serve the United States."

The Foreign Service consists not only of geniuses. We are fallible human beings, but we are less likely to give bad advice to those in positions of ultimate responsibility if we are free from inhibitions about the limits of what is "safe" to say. Let this be understood also by Congress, lest there be a new tendency to penalize those who have in good faith advocated the taking of risks. To our readers, we say: Speak up. Let there be "daring and dissent." The President himself has said that he greets healthy controversy as the hallmark of healthy change.

The National Bellamy Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAGE BELCHER
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, the National Bellamy Award was established in 1942 under the leadership of Miss Margarette S. Miller, of Portsmouth, Va. It was founded for the twofold purpose of giving recognition to the author of our national pledge of allegiance, Mr. Francis Bellamy, and of providing a stimulus to the teaching of patriotism and good citizenship in our public schools. Selected schools are invited to compete for the award by submitting a folio of materials in evidence of two things: the school's promotion of patriotism and good citizenship, and evidence of outstanding contributions made by the school's alumni. In 1957, Will Rogers High School in Tulsa, Okla., was selected to receive the 16th annual award, and holds the honor for its State for a 50-year period.

I am happy to present the address offered by Jon Miller, Rogers High School SCA president, to the 19th annual Bellamy Award presentation at Cony High School, Augusta, Maine, in 1960:

ADDRESS BY JON MILLER, SCA PRESIDENT, WILL ROGERS HIGH SCHOOL, TULSA, OKLA.

DAVID ELVIN. Now we have Jon Miller, student council president from Will Rogers High School, Tulsa, Okla. His school was given the 16th annual Bellamy Award in 1957. Jon has received the NRA expert rifleman award and is a member of the Will Rogers rifle team; he is secretary of the boys' glee club; a member of the Inter-City Student Council, and was a delegate to the Oklahoma White House Conference on Children and Youth this year.

JON MILLER. I am extremely proud to be in this wonderful school and in this beautiful city representing my State of Oklahoma, the city of Tulsa, and Will Rogers High School.

I am sure most of you have heard of the great American humorist, Will Rogers, for whom my school was named. "I never met a man I didn't like," was Will's most famous epigram. It was this epigram that Will used to melt the hearts of people east and west, causing the twain to meet. Will was not only a great humorist, but a great diplomat. No matter what a man's language, Will's smile had a way to unlock any foreign barrier. He also had a way with words, combined with a fine sense of humor. Once when Will was introduced to President Hoover he walked up to the President, shook his hand and said: "I didn't quite get the name."

As a school we are proud of Will Rogers and proud to have our cornerstone bear his name. We are equally proud of our school. Last week it was announced that 20 Rogers students had qualified as semifinalists for the national merit scholarship. This is quite a record for any school.

Will Rogers High School provides a wide variety of activities, designed to keep the minds of 2,400 students working to maintain the academic achievements which have made Rogers one of America's most highly regarded schools.

As a young State, only 53 years old, Oklahoma has produced many celebrities who have made her proud. Jim Thorpe, Warren Spahn, Mickey Mantle, some of our country's leading athletes; Patti Page, Dale Robertson, star of "Wells Fargo," and Anita Bryant, popular young singing star, a graduate of Will Rogers High School Class of 1958, are a few examples.

Oklahoma is also the home of the Five Civilized Tribes, and we are proud of our Indian lore.

From the city of Tulsa, the oil capitol of the world, and the colorful State of Oklahoma, and your Bellamy Award sister, Will Rogers High School, I present to you at Cony this official, authentic Indian peace pipe as a symbol of our friendship. I also have a copy of our school annual, the 1960 Lariat.

For your warm hospitality and the rewarding experience of being a part of this memorable event, may I express my deep gratitude. We trust that you will cherish the Bellamy Award as we have, and we extend our congratulations to you, the newest member of the Bellamy family.

Protection of President-elect Lincoln on His Journey to Washington in 1861

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. HARTKE. Madam President, Paul Hillsamer, the editor of the Marion, Ind., News Herald, has written a very interesting article about a little-known historical coincidence. It relates to the courage and determination of a New York City police superintendent, John Kennedy, and his efforts to protect President-elect Lincoln on his journey to Washington in 1861. I am sure the article which describes the exploits of the President's namesake, will be of interest to many persons. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Marion (Ind.) News-Herald, Mar. 31, 1961]

THE EDITOR SAYS

The national columnists all missed a chance for an unusual column about 5 weeks ago.

John Kennedy rode the same train on which Abraham Lincoln, on his way to his First Inauguration, secretly traveled from Philadelphia to Washington, D.C. Kennedy climbed aboard in New York. He was not a casual passenger. His interest was Lincoln's safety.

Lincoln did not know John Kennedy was on the train. John Kennedy did not know that Lincoln was a fellow-passenger.

But both men were on their way to Washington for the same purpose; to prevent the murder of Abraham Lincoln to southern sympathizers in Baltimore.

All of this occurred on the night of Washington's Birthday, February, 22, 1861. Here is the background.

At the time to take the oath of office as President drew near, Lincoln chose to travel from Springfield, Ill. to the Nation's Capital by train—and slowly, his desire was to let the people of various States get a look at him, to confer with the several Governors and to speak, when possible to the State Legislatures. The journey took 12 days. Lincoln's train left Springfield, Ill. on February, 11, 1861, one day before his 52d birthday.

As the Lincoln train zig-zagged around the country, Springfield to Lafayette, Ind., Lafayette to Indianapolis, to Cincinnati, Trenton, N.J., New York City and finally back to Philadelphia, there were persistant rumors that he would be shot in either New York City or Baltimore. The latter city was his last scheduled stop before Washington.

The President-elect discounted these stories and appeared in New York without incident. But when he entered his hotel in Philadelphia on February 21, a young private detective named Allan Pinkerton wrangled admission to his room. (Pinkerton later became quite famous and was never adverse to recalling that it was "he who saved Lincoln's life.")

Pinkerton had information of plots hatched in Baltimore which shook Lincoln and his bodyguard, Hill Lamon, far worse than the tales they had already ignored.

Pinkerton had been to Baltimore and had wormed his way into various traitor's confidence and kept a mighty good record of what they said.

Lincoln called in an Illinois politician named Judd. After long discussion, Lamon, Judd, and Pinkerton urged Lincoln to immediately proceed to Washington in disguise.

No, Lincoln said, that was out of the question. He had promised a speech at Independence Hall and, also, he was to speak to the Pennsylvania Legislature at Harrisburg the next day. He was not going to break those commitments.

The same evening Secretary of State W. H. Seward warned Lincoln of plotting in Baltimore. The Secretary considered the information so private that he sent it to Philadelphia by a courier, his son Fred Seward. Lincoln asked young Seward if he or his father knew of Allan Pinkerton's investigation. Fred Seward answered "No" but, in effect, told Lincoln, "That simply means it is really serious. If Father and Pinkerton obtained this information independently of one another * * *."

Lincoln did not sleep well that long night. Between festivities and appearances on February 22, Lamon, Judd, and Pinkerton were joined by Judge David Davis and A. K. McClure in urging the President-elect to slip secretly through Baltimore. The question of charges of cowardice and public ridicule were considered and rejected. Finally Lincoln said, "I will do it." After further discussion it was decided that Mrs. Lincoln and his sons should remain on the regular train.

Lincoln changed to a different suit and hat and bundled himself up in an old fashioned overcoat. He and Lamon left Harrisburg quietly. Back in Philadelphia, at 10 p.m., Pinkerton met the 2 tall men (6-4 and 6-2) at the Pennsylvania Railroad Station and (in a closed carriage) drove them to the P. W. & B. station. One of Pinkerton's female detectives had reserved two berths in a sleeping car for "her invalid brother and his attendant" and Lincoln and Lamon were installed in these quarters quietly and smoothly. Pinkerton went into the next car, as a casual passenger. Thus they left Philadelphia. The train entered New York swiftly and silently and headed for Baltimore.

At 3:30 p.m. the train entered Baltimore. After a couple routine stops, it finally pulled into Washington at 6 in the morning, February 23. A drunken passenger singing "Dixie" had annoyed Lamon exceedingly. Otherwise the trip had been quiet.

Now, John Kennedy.

This particular John Kennedy was a handsome New York Irishman who never learned the meaning of the word "fear." When he reached 21, he went on the New York police force. By 1861, his sparkling courage and bulldog determination in crisis after crisis had elevated him into an unusual position. He was superintendent of police for Mayor Wood of New York City, not only because of being a Democrat and Irish-Catholic but also strictly on merit.

Kennedy, like all good policemen, not only faced trouble when it came but also looked for trouble brewing. For a solid week he heard lurid tales of what Baltimore's secession-minded citizens intended to do to Abraham Lincoln. Highly intrigued, Kennedy sent a top New York detective named Bookstaver to Baltimore to size up the situation. Bookstaver reported back, "They mean it."

John Kennedy had a problem. Mayor Wood was not a Unionist. He was already talking of New York as a "free city," independent of both North and South. He was certainly not the man in whom to confide.

Superintendent Kennedy had an opinion of all Baltimore politicians and it was not a high one. He joined everyone on both sides in contempt for President Buchanan and his advisers. (For one example why * * * there was a saying, at that time, "Tell it in Washington at noon and it's common knowledge down South before supper time.")

So, Kennedy decided on February 22 to go to Washington himself. He planned to tell Gen. Winfield Scott and a couple Washington police officers whom he trusted that they had better rush some special protection to Baltimore before Lincoln arrived there, as scheduled, the afternoon of the 23d.

John Kennedy caught the Washington train from Philadelphia around midnight on the 22d and laid himself down on a berth. He catnapped with a loaded pistol at his side and a knife in his belt. This courageous Irishman knew very well that a man traveling in behalf of Abe Lincoln that night was in danger of his life. He left the train in Washington at 6 and carried his warnings to the proper people. But by evening he realized that his information was outdated; that not only was Lincoln in Washington, but he had been Kennedy's traveling companion, separated only by two railway cars, all the way from New York.

And, by one of history's quirks, another John Kennedy stood up in Washington, D.C. just 33 days less than 100 years later and took the same oath of office as did Abraham Lincoln on March 4, 1861, 9 days after his train glided into the Washington depot.

This John Kennedy of 1861 (John A. Kennedy) went on in his chosen career and lived and died a brave man. His name is still legendary in New York.

The wisdom of Lincoln's action was indicated on the afternoon of the 23d of February. The regular train, which he was supposed to be on, pulled into Baltimore and was met by a mob of 10,000. If he had any friends in the crowd, their voices were not audible. The Baltimore Sun reported that many men crowded the platform and jumped on the cars "like monkeys" and "as thick as a hive of bees." Most of them, in those free-wheeling days, were armed.

Lincoln was viciously criticized in the papers for "sneaking into Washington." There was one story that he wore a "military cloak," another that he wrapped his head, face and neck in "scotch plaid." The editorial uproar continued for months. Someone wrote a parody of "Yankee Doodle" and it enjoyed temporary popularity, especially in the South and border States.

"They went and got a special train
At midnight's solemn hour,
And in a cloak and scotch plaid shawl
He dodged from the slave-power.
Lanky Lincoln came to town,
In night and wind and rain, Sir!
Wrapped up in a coward's coat,
Upon a special train, Sir!"

Lamon later wrote that "Lincoln regretted the midnight trip." But all evidence is that only a fool would have risked meeting the Baltimore crowd.

An Illinois Congressman named Washburne almost got himself shot or badly beaten when Lincoln, Lamon and Pinkerton left the secret train at Washington. Waiting on the station platform for someone else, Washburne saw the three men and hastened up saying: "Lincoln! You can't play that game on me." Pinkerton reached for his pistol and Lamon doubled up his huge fist. Lincoln hastily intervened, saying, "Don't strike him. It's Washburne."

So, that's the story. To the writer, the great drama at this time is that a man named John Kennedy rode that train—his only object being the welfare of Abraham Lincoln—and just less than a century later another John Kennedy moved into the White House. Bits of irony such as this do not make history but they certainly make history more interesting.

Time for a New Look

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shelbyville, Ind., News of March 22, 1961:

TIME FOR A NEW LOOK

The United States has spent about $133 billion on foreign aid in the last 20 years.

The program had a two-fold purpose: First, it was to assist both our allies and former enemies in World War II in restoring their economies. The second purpose was to win the peace and stop the growth of communism.

The first part of the program has been successful. So successful, in fact, that today the American economy is in grave danger because of the low-wage competition from these countries that we have helped so much to rebuild with the tax of American wage earners.

With 80 percent of all taxes coming from people with incomes less than $10,000 per year, the American laboring man has borne the brunt of paying for the factories in foreign countries that now are driving him from his job here at home. It should be pointed out here for clarification that most tax revenue comes from those earning less than $10,000 per year simply because such people are in the vast majority. Those earning in higher figures are, of course, taxed even more heavily—but there are far fewer of them.

The total debt of the United States is now more than the combined debt of the rest of the world. Many of the countries whose economies have been rebuilt to a large extent with the tax dollars of Americans are now in a position to help other underdeveloped nations, and there has been some talk about this happening. Unfortunately for the American taxpayer, it has been mostly talk so far, with very little action.

Instead of cutting off the aid program to these countries which are frankly in a much better financial position than we are, our Government continues it year after year.

As to the second purpose of the foreign aid program—that of winning the peace and stopping communism—this appears to have been largely a failure.

For example, we have given India, which is supposed to be neutral, more than two and a quarter billion dollars. Yet India votes rather consistently against the United States in the United Nations. Tito, of Yugoslavia, who has stated frankly, "In any future war, we shall march shoulder to shoulder with Soviet Russia," has received almost the same amount—more than $2 billion.

Poland and Indonesia, both openly communistic, have received another billion and still are receiving yearly hundreds of millions of American tax dollars. Communism, which was supposed to be stopped by this fantastic outpouring of American money, has now extended its borders to within 90 miles of the coast of Florida.

To those critics who say that anyone who is opposed to foreign aid is hard-hearted and unconcerned about the rest of the world, may we pose just one question? If America permits herself to be spent into national bankruptcy—if we do not maintain our fiscal integrity here at home—how long will any nation on earth be able to remain free from communism?

Make no mistake about it—peaceful coexistence to the Communist means a gradual triumph of the worldwide conspiracy to end freedom. Spending America's financial strength to nothingness is the surest way of achieving that goal—all by peaceful means.

We do not say that all foreign aid should be stopped. But we do say that it is time for a new look at the whole foreign aid program—its size and scope, its past cost and its past successes and failures—and time to reduce it drastically to a basis of current realism.

Beneath the Cross

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to

insert into the RECORD, a poem entitled "Beneath the Cross," which is very timely and thought provoking. I commend it to the attention of all my colleagues and to the public generally.

The author of the poem is Giovanni Giuseppe Longo of Utica, N.Y. He wrote it at the conclusion of World War II, when he was serving in the U.S. Armed Forces. Mr. Longo is a native of Italy, where he was born in 1922 and came to this country at the age of two. The family settled in Utica, where he was raised and obtained his education. He studied at Utica College of Syracuse University until he entered military service in 1942.

From April 1943 to January 1946, Mr. Longo was stationed overseas, mostly on various islands in the Pacific. He was in the Signal Corps as a communications technician. He spent some time in Kobe, Japan, after the conclusion of the war and it was here that he wrote his poem. The tremendous destruction of this largest city of Japan by the constant bombings made such a deep and lasting impression on Longo that he began to set his thoughts down on paper in poetic form.

After he had completed writing the poem he felt that if it could be given wide distribution throughout the Nation, and possibly throughout the world, it might set other people to thinking about war and how to stem the tide of human destruction. Even if it does nothing more than just cause people to stop and think about this matter, the poem by Mr. Longo will have achieved its purpose and will have made a significant contribution to the welfare of humanity. It is for this reason that I am pleased to insert it into the RECORD:

BENEATH THE CROSS

(By Giovanni Giuseppe Longo)

We stand together thousands strong
And hearing, wonder, have we done wrong?
We are the boys who left our homes,
Gave our lives to win a throne.

The Throne of Peace, as it is called
Gave us strength to conquer all.
But now we hear the rumors roar
It's atomic energy which controls the floor.

Nations are ready to strike and fall
Because they fear an atomic war.
The atom's destructive, so they say,
If left unguarded day by day.

Nations unite, we cry below
The sparkling crosses "Row on Row."
Uncounted thousands lie at rest
In hopes we brought you happiness.

We must not feel we fell in vain
And wish that we could rise again;
Leave us here with our memories, gay,
With our job well done, and no dismay.

Instead of power, use your tongues
And let them blend to sound like one.
Bring peace and comfort to our souls
May God bless you as in days of old.

When atomic power is thrust aside
And nations heed each other's cries,
It's then our souls will lie at rest
For they will have found their happiness.

Hear our cries, you nations all,
While atomic energy controls the floor.
Do not forget what should be said
So your departed sons can lie to rest.

Miss Liberty Takes Another Bow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "Miss Liberty Takes Another Bow," from the Christian Science Monitor dated Tuesday, April 4, 1961:

MISS LIBERTY TAKES ANOTHER BOW—U.S. SWEETHEART HAS 35-FOOT WAISTLINE

(By Kelvin Wallace Coventry)

Happy birthday to America's No. 1 sweetheart.

Old-fashioned? Yes. She's never made a best-dressed list. She gives her age as 75-plus. Her complexion has been described as "harbor green," but she's still the pinup queen for "freedom fighters" the world over.

She's a buxom lass at 450,000 pounds. She has a 35-foot waistline and carries the torch for every new American. She knows what it means to be an immigrant—she was once one herself. She's the Statue of Liberty.

It was 75 years ago that France's gift to the United States chose to disclose her Mona Lisa beauty to the world. The date was October 28, 1886, a raw, wet day for thousands of shivering paraders.

Out in New York Harbor, Miss Liberty stood hidden in mist and the French flag. Flying every banner known to the sea, hundreds of boats, rafts, sailing ships completely surrounded Bedloe's Island, her pedestal.

THE UNVEILING

Some 300 feet above the water, standing in the torch, Auguste Bartholdi pulled the rope to remove the tricolor which shielded the face. As the veil was dropped, Liberty's face shone through the haze.

Then, said the New York Times, "a hundred Fourths of July broke loose." Tugs bellowed, whistles screamed, and naval guns roared. Miss Liberty had taken America by storm.

It was a crowning moment for Mr. Bartholdi, the Alsatian sculptor who had put together the 200 tons of hammered copper and steel. He dedicated more than 10 years of his life to the statue of "Liberty Enlightening the World."

Almost 900,000 visitors a year now take the short ferry trip from New York's Battery Park, nose out into busy harbor traffic, to pay their respects to Miss Liberty.

Suddenly, there she is rising from the sea in the morning sunshine. She towers above you—almost breathing, it seems.

SYMBOLISM EXPLAINED

There is symbolism in the design of the statue. She steps away from the broken shackles of tyranny at her feet. The tablet in the statue's left hand, its sentiments inscribed July 4, 1776, refers to the Declaration of Independence—telling all comers of the American ideal that "all men are created equal."

You enter the statue through the high walls of old Fort Wood. Once inside, visitors then have a choice of either an elevator ride or a 10-story hike up a stairway to the observation balcony. From here it's a tortuous 12-story climb to Miss Liberty's crown.

Looking out through a series of 25 windows, which are the jewels of the crown, you can get a better look at the tablet of law in the left hand. To the north you can see abandoned Ellis Island, gateway for more than 40 million immigrants.

The "welcome mat" Miss Liberty stands on, once known as Bedloe's Island, was also known as Great Oyster, Minissais, and Love. But the name Liberty Island was widely used in the 1880's when funds were being raised for the pedestal of the statue. Five years ago, Liberty Island became the official name again.

At the base of the statue a bronze tablet bears the famous Emma Lazarus sonnet, "The New Colossus," with its uplifting lines: "send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me; I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

Miss Liberty's last big birthday party, on October 28, 1956, was a whopper. Fort Jay, across the harbor, treated her like royalty with a 21-gun national salute. She was also given the gift of the American Museum of Immigration, still to be built at the base.

Care for the Aged: The Private Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday morning's Wall Street Journal there appeared an editorial on the subject of health needs of our aged and the advances that have been made in financing them through the medium of private health insurance programs. It also points to a need beyond that which these programs meet, the need to which the Congress should properly address its attention. I should like to put the editorial from the Wall Street Journal of April 12 in the RECORD at this point:

PROGRESS ON A PROBLEM

Caring for the ills and afflictions of the aged has always posed a problem for civilized societies, as it does for ours today. But admitting the existence of the problem is not the same thing as assuming that, unless the Federal Government bestirs itself, the problem will become progressively worse.

On the contrary, there's reason to be optimistic about the private response of our society. As Barron's magazine reports this week, "Perhaps the most notable development in health insurance in the past 5 years has been the extension of coverage to those 65 and over." According to the insurance industry, about 50 percent of Americans over 65 now have some form of health insurance.

Some 290 voluntary health-insuring organizations are now issuing hospital or surgical policies to the elderly, and in an expanding variety of policies available to everyone. Aware of the great potential of this 65-and-over market, aggressive companies are driving down policy costs to unprecedented levels, at least as cheap as any proposed Government insurance plan.

The actual response to voluntary insurance is a long way from the caricature of the elderly as a mass of medical indigents who must look to Washington for succor. And the response should grow as competition to meet their needs quickens.

To be sure, some elderly persons cannot afford any premium, however modest; the community must care for the truly needy as it traditionally has. But the needy few

should not be used as an excuse to throw the blanket of Federal welfare over everyone, especially when so many elderly Americans prefer to stand on their own feet.

Lt. Gen. Emerson C. Itschner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, last month marked the end of a military career of one of our country's most distinguished military officers, Lt. Gen. Emerson C. Itschner, Chief, Corps of Engineers. For many years, I have known and admired General Itschner and I have been extremely proud to boast that he is one of my constituents, maintaining his residence at Lakeside, Wash.

For nearly 37 years, General Itschner's contributions toward the development of civil and military projects under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers have been numerous and benefiting to our country. He was graduated from the U.S. Military Academy in 1924 and was commissioned as a second lieutenant. His early service consisted of a variety of interesting assignments including his service as a field engineer with the Alaskan Road Commission, a tour of duty as assistant professor of military science at the Missouri School of Mines and various assignments with engineer district offices throughout the Nation.

During the early part of World War I, he headed Air Force construction for the Engineers and had charge of construction supporting the invasion of Europe, including the initial reconstruction of the vital port of Cherbourg.

After World War II, General Itschner was assigned as Chief of Military Construction Operations and, later, served as district engineer in Seattle, Wash. When Korean hostilities broke out, he served overseas as engineer of I Corps, where he took part in the advance of the Yalu River and the subsequent withdrawal. He was awarded the Purple Heart for wounds received in combat in March 1951.

In October 1956 General Itschner was appointed Chief of Engineers—the youngest officer in more than a century to head this important Army branch. Among the numerous civil and military works which he directed during this period were the completion of the U.S. portion of the St. Lawrence Seaway; advancement of the Columbia, Missouri, and Arkansas River Basin developments; modernization of the Ohio River and Great Lakes navigation systems; construction of ICBM launching bases; and building Camp Century, the nuclear-powered research center under the snow on the Greenland Icecap.

The general has now accepted a position as a technical adviser on the Indus River project in Pakistan with a private engineering firm.

I know my colleagues join me in saying "Thanks for a job well done and Godspeed" to Lt. Gen. Emerson C. Itschner, U.S. Army, retired.

Our Struggling Contemporary Composers Need All the Official Backing They Can Get From the White House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of a music trade paper published in Germany, Musikhandel, makes much of the fact that President Kennedy recently failed to list a single composition by an American composer as among his favorites.

Former Vice President Richard Nixon, on the other hand, mentioned at least one American composition out of three as being among his favorites.

This prompted my dear friend Arthur A. Hauser, president of the Theodore Presser Co., of Bryn Mawr, Pa., to comment that—

Your interest in American music prompts me to believe that you share my annoyance at the foregoing statement (from Musikhandel). Richard Nixon mentioned at least one American composition out of three as being among his favorites. President Kennedy, however, mentioned none. International good will might have been served by his choice of music from various foreign countries, but on the other hand our struggling contemporary composers need all the official backing they can get, and if our President had mentioned at least one American composition, I am sure that his statement quoted in foreign countries might have helped our cause.

Perhaps President Kennedy is not familiar with American music. If this is the case, I am sure that our various musical societies will be only too happy to help him learn more about what is being done in America to improve our cultural standing among nations.

I include as part of my remarks the letter I have received from Mr. Hauser:

BRYN MAWR, PA., *April 10, 1961.*

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CARROLL: In the current issue of Musikhandel, which is a trade paper published in Germany, I noticed the following item:

"Präsident Kennedy erklärte bei einer Rundfrage folgende Werke als seine Lieblingskompositionen: "La Valse" von Ravel, "Der Nachmittag eines Fauns" von Debussy, die Ouverture "Benvenuto Cellini" von Berlioz, die Ballettmusik aus "Gounods Faust" und Szenen aus "Boris Godunow" von Mussorgsky.

"Sein Gegner Richard Nixon gab folgende Lieblingskompositionen an: das Musical "Oklahoma," Tschaikowskys "Schwanensee" und "Mexikanische Volkslieder."

Your interest in American music prompts me to believe that you share my annoyance at the foregoing statement. Richard Nixon mentioned at least one American composition out of three as being among his favorites. President Kennedy, however, mentioned none. International good will might have been served by his choice of music from various foreign countries, but on the other hand our struggling contemporary composers need all the official backing they can get and if our President had mentioned at least one American composition, I am sure that his statement quoted in foreign countries might have helped our cause.

Perhaps President Kennedy is not familiar with American music. If this is the case, I am sure that our various musical societies will be only too happy to help him learn more about what is being done in America to improve our cultural standing among nations.

With very kind personal wishes to you, I am,

Cordially yours,
THEODORE PRESSER CO.,
ARTHUR A. HAUSER,
President.

Neutral Communists?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the question of whether or not our position taken in regard to the Laos crisis represents appeasement or firmness and the further question of whether the Communists must be kept at sword's length or embraced with peaceful coexistence is naturally a subject of intense discussion. Chicago's American, in an editorial on Saturday, April 8—entitled "Neutral Communists?"—gave a practical analysis of this complex issue.

The editorial follows:

NEUTRAL COMMUNISTS?

We have an idea the policy agreed on by by President Kennedy and Prime Minister Macmillan will serve its immediate purpose, which is to prevent the low-grade civil war in Laos from blazing up into another Korea, but it is not likely to prevent a Communist takeover in Laos in the fairly near future.

At the Senate luncheon Thursday, Macmillan said he was optimistic that a Lao government in which Communists will be included can be truly neutral.

We can't imagine where Macmillan gets his supply of optimism. He doesn't get it from the history of governments in which Communists have been invited to participate, for these—in Poland, Czechoslovakia, mainland China, and elsewhere—have always evolved rapidly into all-out Communist governments. If Macmillan or Kennedy know any reason why the Russians would be inclined to keep the government in Laos neutral when they never have had any such impulse anywhere else, we would like to hear it.

The agreement between Kennedy and Macmillan means, apparently, that they hope they can find a way later on, through diplomacy, to keep the Communists from absorbing Laos, if they can manage to prevent the Communists from absorbing Laos by force of arms now.

It is a difficult undertaking, because the Communists are in a position to stall, and are stalling. The formula proposed to Russia by Britain, with United States approval, calls for a cease-fire, a truce team represent-

ing three nations to supervise it, and a meeting of 14 nations, including Red China, to shape a political agreement.

Russia has accepted the idea, but is delaying the cease-fire. And in the meanwhile Russia keeps supplying the Communist rebel force while it conquers more Lao territory. It will take a high quality of diplomacy on the western side to pin the Russians down and get the shooting stopped.

Wage Fight, Round 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excellent editorial from the Buffalo Evening News of March 30, 1961, relating to minimum wage legislation. I commend its wisdom and insight to the Members:

WAGE FIGHT, ROUND 1

In his last news conference, President Kennedy did his oversimplifying best to prod the House into passing his minimum wage bill intact. But he failed by 1 vote, 186 to 185. The House then went on to pass a slightly more conservative substitute, the Ayres-Kitchin bill. It was the President's first important defeat in a congressional roll call and the administration, obviously stung, evidently means to fight back in hopes that it can get the Senate to jam the Kennedy bill down the House's throat in conference.

Thus, the issue of Presidential prestige against House independence in some ways has come to overshadow the actual differences between the bill Mr. Kennedy wanted and the one the House passed.

Actually, the fight is over two main points, both of which were far more confused than clarified by the President's news conference remarks. The least significant point is what most of the political shouting is about: The House bill raises the minimum wage from $1 to $1.15 and hour; the Kennedy bill would do the same for this year, but would step it up to $1.25 by 1963. The President, who promised $1.25 all through the campaign and evidently feels that he still has to use that figure in all references to the minimum wage, had urged that Congress not begin at $1.25 but move up toward it only gradually. Most supporters of the $1.15 House bill would not be too upset if, in a final Senate-House compromise, the escalator to $1.25 in later years is added to the House bill.

The issue on which they will fight hardest for the language of the Ayres-Kitchin substitute bill—the real issue of substance between the two—is the yardstick for extending minimum-wage coverage. The Kennedy bill would bring under the Federal net virtually all retailers with a gross sales volume over $1 million a year. The Ayers-Kitchin bill, retaining the historic concept of interstate commerce, would leave purely local businesses to State regulation and cover only firms with five or more outlets in two or more States.

The House bill sponsors, in short, are fighting for a principle of limited Federal Government—although you would never guess it from the way the President characterized the issue in his news conference. "I find it difficult to understand," he said with asperity, "how anybody could object to paying somebody who works in a business which makes over $1 million a year $50 a week."

In the first place, Mr. President, we are not talking about businesses which "make over $1 million a year," but only about businesses with a gross sales volume that might. They may make practically nothing in the way of profits. And in the second place, the question is not whether anybody "objects" to paying a given minimum wage in such establishments. The question, rather, is How far does the long arm of Federal wage-hour authority reach into each community on an issue of this character? We think, and so does the House, that it will go far enough if it sticks only to those enterprises which, by some reasonable pretext, can be considered to be engaged in interstate commerce.

A Capital Budget: Its Meaning and Promise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that there be printed the following excellent memorandum on the concept of the capital budget. Legislative authorization for such a budget procedure would be provided by a bill introduced by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and companion bills which have been introduced in the House by my colleague from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] and myself:

A CAPITAL BUDGET: ITS MEANING AND PROMISE

IMPORTANCE OF THE BUDGET

(By Dewey Anderson)

The Government's budget is the most important and pervasive influence in the economic life of the Nation. For 1962 it expects to spend well over $83 billion which it collects or borrows. It is American business' biggest customer. It is likewise the biggest employer of labor. It either makes or stimulates more investment than any other source.

The expenditure of its funds develops more research and produces more innovations than all other efforts combined. Its moneys and programs are grouped under such expressive headings as:

	Fiscal 1962 (revised)	
	Millions	Percent
1. Major national security	$47,472	56.81
2. International affairs and finance	2,826	3.38
3. Commerce, housing, and space technology	3,814	4.56
4. Agriculture and agricultural resources	5,743	6.87
5. Natural resources	2,162	2.58
6. Labor and welfare	6,020	7.20
7. Veterans' services and benefits	5,301	6.34
8. Interest	8,693	10.40
9. General government	2,095	2.50
10. Allowance for contingencies	100	0.11
	84,226	100.75
Deduct interfund transactions	−667	−.75
Total	83,559	100.00

The Federal Government owes more money to more people than anybody. Its budget expects to pay interest totaling $8.7 billion in 1962. Its Treasury activities are the major determinant of the interest rates all borrowers will pay. Its general Government costs of some $2 billion a year provide for the legislative, judicial, and executive functions.

Many of the budget expenditures of the Government are made to render services to special groups or to defray the cost of current operations. These properly are a charge against current income, most of which is derived by taxation.

But there are two other groups of expenditures that have investment characteristics. One such class of expenditures is made to finance research and development, to develop a better trained and skilled labor force, or to increase the health and productivity of workers and efficiency of plant. Some among such expenditures yield a recognized profit and increase in wealth, part or all of which should belong to the Government which is responsible for the investment.

The other class of expenditures is for the purchase or improvement of physical assets such as forests and lands, dams, navigation facilities, parks and recreational centers, housing, urban renewal, water development, etc., whose costs can be determined and whose prospects are good for appreciation in value and profitable return over the period of their life. To budget such expenditures as current costs and chargeable against the taxpayers raises taxes unfairly, loses sight of their investment character and relieves future beneficiaries of their proper obligation to pay a just share of installation and operation.

The economic function of the budget is well expressed in the recent testimony of the present Budget Director before the Joint Economic Committee:

"The expenditures proposed are an important part of a national effort to close the gap between our actual and potential output and to achieve adequate economic growth. This is particularly true of capital expenditures of Government that are needed to reinforce private capital expenditures, and expenditures to improve the quality and productivity of our human resources. These expenditures are as essential to economic growth as are private investment outlays."

BUDGET REFORM

One main purpose of the budget is to give a picture of the costs of providing the services which have been voted by the peoples' representatives. This requires clear itemization of expenditures as related to services. The budget falls far short of telling this story.

Another important purpose of the budget is to give the public a clear picture of the state of the Nation's finances, as over against the needs which the Congress has agreed should be met, indicating what gap there may be between national income and outgo.

A third main purpose of the budget is to set forth in the message of the President, and the figures offered, the administration's conception of the size and character of the budget which it believes will maintain solvency, protect the Nation and insure the growth and development needed to use our manpower and resources effectively both for the short and long run.

Far from being viewed as a national housekeeping account as was true in the era before the World Wars, the budget is now widely accepted as a policymaking instrument. It moves in and out among the public and private transactions of the economy, providing capital, buying and selling goods and services, determining profits and making payments, stipulating by contract minimum wages, health, safety and employment practices, taxation, bookkeeping and reporting,

the renegotiation of excess profits, control of patents, and determination of the flow of raw materials and components. In these many fields, the budget itself acts as a silent partner with other agencies which are the active representatives of the Government.

The budget has become an aid to the President in laying down the levels of expenditure and amount and quality of services which each department or agency can present as its requests for funds from the Congress. In this way, it is actually a major force in determining the amount, kind and quality of Government services which will be allowed. Because of its technical knowledge and oversight, coupled with being a direct instrument of the President, in no small degree the budget is the epitome of Government itself. Every department head knows that his program depends on how convincingly he presents his case to the Bureau of the Budget, and that the Budget Director acts as the extended authority of the President.

How to prepare and present a readable and easily understood budget has long troubled experts in this field. For they are aware of the need to provide a clear and accurate statement of the Government's programs, their costs, the loans and income obtained to defray them. One worthwhile reform that should be initiated is a budget series in which each major section is presented separately in sufficient detail for the reader to know the program being budgeted and the funds required. Then, the overall budget could be expected to remain a summary rather than the dull technical treatise which the tremendous area covered requires it to be.

But the principal reform needed is to separate investment projects and expenditures from current operations.

THE CAPITAL BUDGET—MEANING OF THE DOUBLE BUDGET

There is altogether too easy acceptance among well motivated people inexperienced in budgetary matters of the desirability of a "capital budget." This stems from a well founded notion that investment and spending should be separated by with insufficient awareness of what that entails.

It is relatively easy to separate out such budget items as result in acquiring physical assets which have a measurable life and which may produce measurable results, such as a dam and hydroelectric installation. It is much more difficult to account for long-term investments in such projects as research, scientific training, health improvements, sanitation, etc. For while the expenditures can be measured the outcomes cannot.

It would be a major advance in budget modernization to apply the investment accounting approach to that group of expenditures which can be measured both in cost and return. Transactions on such capital accounts can be distinguished sharply from those which pertain to current revenues and expenses. They could be kept in separate books. Such a "double budget" system is accepted and notably successful in advanced countries like the Scandinavian nations. It is common practice among American business corporations as well.

The present practice is to combine all kinds of budgetary expenditures on one side of the ledger and on the other side all kinds of income. This permits for no true property account, no adequate calculation of depreciation of Government property, no segregation of debt to determine the precise location of Government obligations and the programs to which they relate, no division of Government earnings into sources and their relations to cost. So that present budgetary procedures is ill-suited to assist in the difficult task of formulating a rational long-range program of Government investment.

Probably a third of the present total of Government budget expenditures is for direct loans to farmers, business, public and private agencies, individuals, and foreign governments, and direct investment in Government-owned physical assets. Many of these expenditures are not a true levy on the taxpayer at all, for in time they are recovered and in some instances they yield substantial interest or profit, besides acting to upbuild the economy to produce more and larger taxable resources. The TVA loans are a good example. Reclamation, REA, and housing loans are others. The annual budget should not be loaded with such investment tiems, for they mislead the public and the taxpayers into a belief that they represent nonprofitable costs of Government operations and they unduly swell the budget totals.

If a third of the budget total is investment, and if the double or capital budget system were in force, then instead of a huge over $80 billion annual budget levy on the taxable wealth of the Nation we would be really talking about some $50 billion. Plus over $20 billion of investment made in furtherance of repayable projects which the peoples' representatives had determined were wise, desirable and in the national interest. Such a budget would be more palatable for the average taxpayer to swallow.

If, in addition, we could work out some modern means of financing Government repayable investments, such as revenue bonds probably coupled with a share of earnings, and RFC for governmental capital investments, or an interest rate which repays the cost to the Government of borrowing money, as is done with REA loans, then Government investments would be put on a sound footing and removed from the current operations budget paid for out of current taxation.

Such a method would be equitable. It offers the most promising ehance of a tax reduction of as much as a fourth or more. It should enable us to get on with the sizeable job of extending our national plant and equipment to meet the needs of this and oncoming generations through financing projects such as forest, land, park and recreational developments, flood control, water supply, housing, urban renewal, electric power, fertilizer production, commodity credit and storage, and so forth.

Under such a system we could finance much larger capital investment programs than a tax conscious Congress can afford to risk with their constitutents on any annual appropriation basis. We could obtain much more of the costs from the direct beneficiaries of these investment programs, as we should, for they have no real claim on the Treasury for gifts from the taxpayers.

Finally, there should be ready public acceptance and no real difficulty in getting congressional approval of this capital account procedure, for the business world is quite familiar with it. To bring the accounting practices of the Government more into line with private business would increase public understanding of Government finances. Hence, public participation in the formation of national policy would be materially advanced.

Legislative action would be required to accomplish the fullest beneficial results of a double or capital budget and current expense system. Some have suggested tying the plan to the Council of Economic Advisers, and to any Council of Resources Advisers that might be established. Both have a stake in this system of budgetmaking.

The advisers to the President would evaluate economic and resource conditions. They would determine the amount and character of capital and resources investments the Government should undertake to maintain the output of the Nation at a level which would use its resources wisely and its employable labor force fully and productively.

It would be advisable to have two budget time periods in mind in making up this investment budget of the Government. Namely, the year ahead for which Congress makes appropriations and a period, say of several years for which Congress could be expected to make authorizations. Thus congressional oversight and responsibility would be preserved and its role in making broad policies respecting the future strengthened. But in doing so Congress would have the benefit of sound advice backed up by the detailed studies of the Government agencies directly concerned and screened by the advisers of the President.

Adoption of the capital budget procedure will not perform magic. It will not make available immediately the substantial resources, nor build a solid resources base under the economy. But it will put the budget into truer perspective, showing the taxpayer more correctly what Government is costing him and what it is contributing to his welfare, what it is investing in his future and the future of the Nation. It is a very much needed reform in budgetary practice. It should be adopted in the beginning days of the new administration.

Feed Grain Program Figures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some information I have received in regard to the feed grain program:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., March 22, 1961.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
House of Representatives.

Dear CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letter of March 10, 1961, with enclosure on 1958-crop grain loans of $50,000 or more, in which you requested listings for the 1959 and 1960 crops and other pertinent information.

In response to your request for 1959-crop-year loan data, we have attached schedules entitled as follows: "1959 Crop Corn Price-Support Loans Made of $25,000 or More and Amount Repaid by Producer" and "1959 Crop Price-Support Commodity Loans of $25,000 or More by Producer," which also reflects repaid loans.

Similar information for 1960-crop-year grain loans, exclusive of corn, should be compiled and available for release by the end of May 1961, and information on corn loans by July 15, 1961. Copies of this material will be sent to you just as soon as it becomes available.

The only 1958 crop, individual producer loan repayment data, we deemed necessary to have the field offices compile and submit to Washington is contained in the attached schedule entitled "Ten Largest 1958-crop Price-Support Commodity Loans Made and Amount of Repayments on Feed Grains."

Concerning your inquiry related to storage cost, the producers pay the storage in advance for the first year their grain is under the loan program, usually by deduction from loans made to the producer. The cost to the farmer varies according to location and kind of grain. When grains are forfeited and delivered to Commodity Credit Corporation,

they become a part of CCC's inventory, and no separate computation of loss or gain is made with respect to collateral acquired from an individual loan. The cost of maintaining such an accounting system would be prohibitive.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES T. RALPH.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
COMMODITY STABILIZATION SERVICE,
Dallas, Tex., March 28, 1961.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington 25, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: We have your note from Gladewater, dated March 27, enclosing copy of a letter from Mr. A. P. McLachlan, Director, Commodity Stabilization Service, Commodity Office, New Orleans.

We presume your question is with respect to the storage payments made throughout the State of Texas and those specifically at Lufkin, Tex.

No storage or handling charges were paid in the fiscal year 1960 or in the first 6 months in the fiscal year 1961 to any facility located in Lufkin, Tex.

Storage and handling charges paid to facilities located throughout the State of Texas in the fiscal year 1960 and in the current fiscal year 1961 (through December 31, 1960) are as follows:

UGSA:	
1960	$74,324,053.32
1961	33,311,814.16
Rice:	
1960	1,024,367.00
1961	491,193.59
Peanuts:	
1960	236,817.54
1961	77,176.96
Total	109,465,422.67

Very truly yours,
C. H. MOSELEY, *Director.*
By TRUMAN J. CUNNINGHAM,
Acting Director.

Loans made, repaid, and collateral acquired on the 1959 crop of feed grain through Jan. 31, 1961 [1]

Commodity	Loans made				Repaid		Collateral acquired	
	Number of loans	Unit of measure	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount
Corn	273,027	Bushel	485,657,877	$527,370,871.76	68,605,992	$76,144,357.16	297,123,835	$323,646,109.12
Grain sorghum	49,573	Hundredweight	59,854,126	94,067,975.69	6,854,502	10,386,621.58	49,316,708	78,274,456.63
Barley	16,704	Bushel	35,102,469	25,099,588.09	22,168,019	16,279,386.05	4,157,777	2,801,813.14
Oats	4,834	do	7,934,568	3,734,795.67	7,858,599	3,698,970.92	60,317	28,833.83
Rye	823	do	915,902	796,181.02	318,683	273,866.91	597,219	524,310.27
Soybeans	53,900	do	45,320,782	82,135,936.46	41,467,387	75,258,797.93	3,828,703	6,829,106.83

[1] Loans on 1959 feed grain and soybean crops are still outstanding in the following amounts: Corn, $127,580,405.48; grain sorghum, $5,406,897.48; barley, $6,018,388.90; oats, $6,990.92; and soybeans, $48,031.70.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., March 1, 1961.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letter of February 17, asking questions about the emergency feed grain program recommended by the administration.

The administration is recommending this emergency program for two major reasons. These are: (1) the vital importance of the feed-livestock complex to our whole agricultural economy; and (2) the pressing need to bring to a halt the continuing increase in surplus stocks of feed grains which are already at very high levels, and, under existing programs, threaten to continue to increase.

The administration's recommendations constitute an emergency program for 1961. Early action is necessary if the program is to have the desired effect of reducing feed grain production this year. The short length of time available has prevented our giving the serious consideration that we think necessary before we could make a recommendation regarding marketing quotas for feed grains. Marketing quotas for commodities like feed grains where more than half of the production is used on the farm where it is produced present a number of serious problems. We intend to study a number of alternative ideas, including marketing quotas, in developing a longer range program for feed grains to be submitted later.

The number, the quantity, and the dollar amount of loans made on the 1959 crops of corn, grain sorghums, barley, oats, rye, and soybeans are as follows:

Commodity	Number of loans	Unit	Quantity	Amount
Corn	263,042	Bushel	470,377,031	$511,156,415.05
Grain sorghum	49,165	Hundredweight	59,263,436	93,181,912.29
Barley	16,140	Bushel	33,756,600	24,201,013.21
Oats	4,786	do	7,892,478	3,714,630.40
Rye	817	do	913,699	796,146.71
Soybeans	51,473	do	43,390,584	78,629,462.45

The dollar amount of loans made on 1959 crops of feed grains represents the initial outlay on price support for these commodities. Some of these loans were redeemed and the quantity of the commodities acquired by CCC was less than the amounts on which loans were made.

During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, the CCC disposed of feed grains and soybeans acquired in previous years' price-support operations. The realized losses on price-support operations and the costs of the commodity export program that were incurred on the feed grains and soybeans disposed of in the fiscal year 1960 were as follows:

Commodity	Realized loss, price support program, fiscal year 1960	Cost of commodity export program, fiscal year 1960
Corn and cornmeal	$181,952,000	$8,088,000
Grain sorghums	17,988,000	3,773,000
Barley	20,938,000	3,742,000
Oats	10,000	2,303,000
Rye	925,000	1,056,000
Soybeans	10,344,000	----------

In addition to the realized losses on commodities disposed of during fiscal year 1960, the Commodity Credit Corporation still had on hand at that time substantial stocks of several of these commodities. It may well be several years before disposition of these stocks is complete. In the meantime, additional charges such as storage and interest will continue to accumulate. Hence, it is quite likely that there will be additional losses incurred when these stocks are disposed of.

According to preliminary reports of the 1959 Census of Agriculture, 1,989,411 farms reported corn harvested for grain; 223,263 reported sorghum harvested for grain; 1,028,847 reported oats harvested; 290,160 reported barley harvested; and 499,143 reported soybeans harvested for beans. Many farms, of course, grow more than one of these commodities, and there is no information available on the extent of the duplication. The information given above on the number of loans made provides the information that is available on the number of farms obtaining price support. Here, again, a farm may obtain price support on more than one commodity, and there is no information available on the extent of the duplication.

We are enclosing a table which will provide you with preliminary information from the 1959 Census of Agriculture on the number of farms producing the various feed grains and soybeans by States. Just as with the United States figures, there is a certain amount of duplication here since some farms produce more than one of the commodities in question.

World supplies of high protein meals and vegetable oils are short, and the higher support price for soybeans will encourage increased production that can be used to meet current and future world needs. In addition, the higher support price for soybeans will encourage diversion of part of the feed grain acreage to soybeans.

The support price for cottonseed is required by law to be at a competitive relationship with soybeans. As in the past, price supports on cottonseed will be available to those producers who wish to take advantage of them.

As we stated in the announcement, the price support level for the 1961 crop of upland cotton was set after long and painstaking study and consultation with all parties concerned. Although the result is not wholly satisfactory to any single group involved, it is, in our judgment, the best decision that could be made in the light of the current legislative and economic conditions and alternatives.

Sincerely yours,

WILLARD W. COCHRANE,
Assistant to the Secretary.

Number of farms reporting harvested acres of specified commodities, by States, 1959

State	Harvested for grain		Harvested				State	Harvested for grain		Harvested			
	Corn	Grain sorghum	Oats	Barley	Rye	Soybeans for beans		Corn	Grain sorghum	Oats	Barley	Rye	Soybeans for beans
Maine	57		2,483	46	42		West Virginia	19,922		4,342	992	127	48
New Hampshire	69		75		14		North Carolina	142,678	6,074	29,130	7,074	2,680	25,665
Vermont	138		1,112		12		South Carolina	55,187	825	17,228	2,310	1,069	7,745
Massachusetts	373		91		78		Georgia	71,043	1,127	9,461	574	1,123	1,552
Rhode Island	42		9		21		Florida	9,064		373			414
Connecticut	365		96		84		Kentucky	99,195	2,311	4,528	4,850	1,214	4,286
New York	18,623		38,159	2,640	1,178	158	Tennessee	94,608	3,266	9,840	3,269	951	7,056
New Jersey	4,940		1,555	1,385	699	1,018	Alabama	83,756	1,173	3,182			2,048
Pennsylvania	64,127		53,354	15,335	2,845	773	Mississippi	90,762	585	4,088			9,634
Ohio	104,975		68,619	6,452	2,772	42,489	Arkansas	33,048	1,661	3,362	402		21,479
Indiana	99,253	773	48,685	4,909	5,991	60,526	Louisiana	32,686	232	1,714			3,651
Illinois	131,295	1,200	73,182	5,400	4,323	88,268	Oklahoma	11,601	17,074	15,092	13,850	2,372	1,652
Michigan	68,700		54,149	7,828	5,218	8,924	Texas	64,861	59,349	17,853	6,194	462	
Wisconsin	90,101		106,844	3,216	2,199	4,068	Montana	124		7,756	15,497	332	
Minnesota	103,995		107,204	16,990	2,854	57,865	Idaho	1,761		6,480	9,171	195	
Iowa	155,167	3,051	127,849	1,325	841	64,374	Wyoming	694	10	2,982	2,800	111	
Missouri	94,973	19,242	32,832	12,885	3,064	42,757	Colorado	7,242	3,886	5,143	10,688	1,294	
North Dakota	5,423	25	32,601	38,665	3,648	2,958	New Mexico	2,261	1,697	475	937	112	
South Dakota	30,261	4,138	33,006	9,907	2,364	3,913	Arizona	176	802	67	1,021	8	
Nebraska	70,120	31,338	38,367	10,937	5,004	5,232	Utah	401		2,460	7,579	73	
Kansas	39,223	59,661	31,560	26,676	5,251	11,927	Nevada	32		101	380	10	
Delaware	3,660		522	762	879	2,959	Washington	1,957		5,289	6,700	772	
Maryland	16,067		5,081	5,055	1,835	4,417	Oregon	1,483		5,782	8,560	616	
Virginia	60,636	585	11,543	9,170	2,319	9,809	California	2,286	2,516	1,135	7,638		

Source: Agricultural Marketing Service.

Compiled from Bureau of the Census preliminary State summaries of 1959 Census of Agriculture.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., March 28, 1961.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letter of March 14, requesting additional information on feed grains.

There are a number of situations in which it would be very helpful if additional statistical information were available; however, such additional information can only be obtained by the expenditure of time and money. In some cases, decisions have been made that the collection of additional statistical data would not justify the cost. It may be that, as new programs developed by this administration become effective, we will find it necessary to develop additional statistical information. Be that as it may, figures that exclude duplications on the number of farms that produce feed grains are not now available. The same comment applies to information on the number of farmers who receive price support loans on more than one commodity.

As you requested, we are enclosing a table giving information on loans made, loans paid, and the amount of the commodity acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The table includes information for the 1959 crops of feed grains and soybeans. The number of loans made is the best information available on the extent of participation in the loan program. Also enclosed is a table which presents information, by States, on the number, quantity, and amount of loans made on the 1959 crops of feed grains and soybeans.

Sincerely yours,

WILLARD W. COCHRANE,
Assistant to the Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., April 6, 1961.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: We received your note dated March 27 on the bottom of a copy of our letter to you dated March 22 regarding information that you had requested.

Enclosed is a table showing the number of loans and purchase agreements made under price supports for 1958, 1959, and 1960 crops of grain and oilseeds in the five States which you mentioned.

You requested the number of farmers who participated in price supports in these States during these years. The figures which we are giving you generally refer to the number of individual farmers, but in some instances price-support is extended through cooperatives or associations of producers. Also, some individual producers obtain more than one loan on a commodity, a separate one for each storage location, for example. Our records are not maintained to show the number of producers who obtain price-support through cooperatives or groups, who obtain more than one loan on a commodity or who obtain loans on more than one commodity. I am sure you recognize also, that farmers who do not directly participate in a price support program obtain benefits to the extent that the support price influences the market price for the commodity he sells.

We regret that we did not interpret your first request correctly and we hope the enclosed tabulation will serve your purpose.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES T. RALPH,
Assistant Secretary.

Number of loans and purchase agreements made under price supports for 1958, 1959, and 1960 crops of grains and oilseeds, in selected States

	Wheat	Corn	Barley	Oats	Sorghum grains	Rye	Soybeans	Flaxseed	Dry edible beans	Rice
Texas:										
1958	2,327	28	2,104	5,867	43,412	62	978		3	1,936
1959	5,553	69	33	127	16,397		19			1,700
1960	10,196	44	161	218	22,016	1	20			1,375
Oklahoma:										
1958	40,210	12	3,619	1,555	690	38	589			
1959	14,293	31	240	56	225	4	89			
1960	27,703	63	785	61	840		57			
California:										
1958	485	67	239	40	39	4		173	199	40
1959	365	67	114	1	9			4	37	35
1960	136	22	205		9				58	141
Iowa:										
1958	2,327	70,928	196	5,658	5,341	30	58,393	82		
1959	1,207	110,007	58	1,012	444	3	24,832	2		
1960	1,080	83,310	68	1,010	385	3	11,433	24		

Footnotes at end of table.

Number of loans and purchase agreements made under price supports for 1958, 1959, and 1960 crops of grains and oilseeds, in selected States—Continued

	Wheat	Corn	Barley	Oats	Sorghum grains	Rye	Soybeans	Flaxseed	Dry edible beans	Rice
Nebraska:										
1958	71,366	49,349	1,452	933	54,895	704	3,656	----------	510	----------
1959	45,789	49,255	511	101	15,011	99	622	----------	216	----------
1960	47,814	44,542	437	199	35,560	429	263	----------	114	----------
U.S. total:										
1958	499,054	223,580	70,873	47,442	194,969	11,980	169,512	29,467	6,332	4,114
1959	252,137	294,280	19,701	5,086	53,179	1,045	58,656	909	4,100	3,514
1960	316,332	242,300	28,515	10,097	107,733	4,185	27,248	5,727	5,062	2,891

Source: Grain Division, Commodity Stabilization Service, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., Mar. 31, 1961.

Loans made on 1959 crops of specific commodities, by States, through Jan. 31, 1961

State	Corn			Grain sorghum			Barley		
	Number	Quantity	Amount	Number	Quantity	Amount	Number	Quantity	Amount
		Bushels	*Dollars*		*Hundredweight*	*Dollars*		*Bushels*	*Dollars*
Alabama	181	172,675	205,183	1	1,156	1,838	1	1,236	1,001
Alaska							2	1,416	1,384
Arizona				42	271,542	462,300	21	666,745	581,371
Arkansas	21	47,543	55,588	7	15,514	26,486	5	7,416	5,166
California	66	466,336	587,323	9	40,414	76,883	113	5,484,282	4,815,119
Colorado	350	668,657	748,552	104	186,957	250,657	90	184,169	119,745
Connecticut									
Delaware	30	81,216	99,896						
Florida	11	8,906	10,342						
Georgia	296	412,278	479,303				2	3,363	2,788
Idaho	22	40,176	47,658				345	688,522	458,394
Illinois	35,189	80,183,284	90,634,795	1	342	499	2	3,616	2,677
Indiana	12,469	27,545,688	31,128,053	7	7,886	11,675	2	4,239	3,368
Iowa	102,478	68,241,513	78,671,648	407	276,463	425,006	45	41,021	33,354
Kansas	10,605	14,031,024	15,421,670	16,815	10,579,098	15,913,691	897	864,695	628,476
Kentucky							65	143,862	264,584
Louisiana	10	19,134	11,131				11	26,731	48,650
Maine	212	245,732	139,957						
Maryland									
Michigan	40	43,466	22,596	1	520	494	134	94,719	173,934
Minnesota	1,363	2,253,193	937,326	60	43,573	37,938	10,899	6,974,863	12,205,753
Mississippi	88	406,428	227,586				323	992,633	1,774,185
Missouri	24	24,047	12,601	6	1,942	1,839	3,858	4,076,200	7,497,143
Montana	26	40,621	16,829	26	53,300	38,628			
Nebraska	95	93,387	43,264	76	73,813	60,656	558	380,236	670,315
Nevada									
New Jersey							5	4,130	7,475
New Mexico							3	577	1,001
New York	26	39,355	23,214	2	1,140	1,185	1	789	1,420
North Carolina	61	93,669	50,655	3	547	585	39	43,796	78,768
North Dakota	747	983,916	980,487				7,523	10,480,451	7,230,671
Ohio	8,851	14,528,013	16,806,138				3	1,670	1,326
Oklahoma	29	62,142	71,968	219	274,666	394,480	236	263,386	189,742
Oregon	50	133,457	163,829				279	745,973	594,124
Pennsylvania	158	172,820	214,053				2	736	583
South Carolina	235	293,204	334,341				6	6,252	5,186
South Dakota	5,512	6,586,255	6,623,780	87	58,455	86,731	469	393,522	300,015
Tennessee	113	261,329	308,354	1	636	1,011			
Texas	68	136,792	163,036	16,323	36,330,200	58,374,951	33	51,661	38,890
Utah	1	443	554				55	85,388	57,999
Virginia	50	95,463	118,097				2	782	597
Washington	223	777,306	935,160	17	12,191	19,874	663	1,740,226	1,297,974
West Virginia	6	12,161	14,959						
Wisconsin	2,028	2,795,857	3,152,388				2	927	779
Wyoming	7	17,937	20,448				19	24,940	15,342
Total	273,027	485,657,877	527,370,872	49,573	59,854,126	94,067,976	16,704	35,102,469	25,099,588

State	Oats			Rye			Soybeans		
	Number	Quantity	Amount	Number	Quantity	Amount	Number	Quantity	Amount
		Bushels	*Dollars*		*Bushels*	*Dollars*		*Bushels*	*Dollars*
Alabama	9	14,136	8,111				15	33,097	58,669
Alaska	1	2,164	1,687						
Arizona									
Arkansas	28	83,581	46,556				755	2,147,350	3,940,640
California	1	839	520						
Colorado	3	5,383	2,799	10	20,105	19,004			
Connecticut							2	348	626
Delaware									
Florida									
Georgia	178	440,523	238,679	3	2,221	2,421	18	25,855	46,318
Idaho	48	143,330	67,809	8	11,126	9,651			
Illinois	36	50,480	25,316				8,170	7,958,449	15,025,304
Indiana	15	21,599	10,984				1,875	1,835,832	3,411,592
Iowa	985	1,077,154	515,736	3	1,850	1,737	23,521	17,270,610	30,968,449
Kansas	49	35,179	18,419	96	58,881	51,482	819	702,817	1,246,195
Kentucky	1,893	3,151,886	3,698,395	2	1,795	2,854	3	5,238	4,231
Louisiana	1	2,176	2,546						
Maine							1	366	322
Maryland	104	231,947	285,312						
Michigan	4,883	6,378,329	7,359,768				20	16,277	12,845
Minnesota	24,765	39,224,976	40,266,952	7	4,081	5,665	3,023	5,316,166	4,021,721
Mississippi	101	231,136	263,839	6	9,286	13,994			
Missouri	13,126	24,769,809	27,941,225	1,364	1,167,642	1,860,163	27	28,548	23,199
Montana							2,368	7,596,837	4,367,198
Nebraska	47,740	91,997,693	98,461,018	13,882	9,741,250	14,847,557	417	346,125	263,071
Nevada							1	3,396	2,513

Loans made on 1959 crops of specific commodities, by States, through Jan. 31, 1961—Continued

State	Oats			Rye			Soybeans		
	Number	Quantity	Amount	Number	Quantity	Amount	Number	Quantity	Amount
		Bushels	*Dollars*		*Bushels*	*Dollars*		*Bushels*	*Dollars*
New Jersey	45	103,448	129,317				1	502	427
New Mexico				287	861,872	1,270,970	4	2,909	2,198
New York	180	214,647	266,189				3	2,471	2,174
North Carolina	393	595,429	698,708	15	12,680	20,691	17	16,994	13,609
North Dakota	627	1,068,621	429,387	211	188,222	151,651	542	411,587	701,031
Ohio	48	55,508	30,083	1	673	660	1,547	1,377,718	2,552,437
Oklahoma	54	79,105	42,589	4	2,510	1,771	89	107,212	188,335
Oregon	22	105,344	57,836	16	13,405	13,260			
Pennsylvania	11	11,978	7,038				4	2,200	3,920
South Carolina	156	656,721	350,432	2	968	1,055	147	275,144	490,650
South Dakota	356	402,819	171,235	85	76,237	63,938	260	136,919	237,948
Tennessee							188	224,854	410,622
Texas	124	195,967	113,229				19	38,726	69,003
Utah	1	966	589						
Virginia							10	16,092	28,897
Washington	102	163,533	81,136	199	353,753	331,668			
West Virginia									
Wisconsin	22	37,085	17,633	1	301	286	23	17,456	32,072
Wyoming	13	23,519	11,534	10	10,815	8,271			
Total	4,834	7,934,568	3,734,796	823	915,902	798,181	53,900	45,320,782	82,135,936

Migrant Farm Labor Problems and "Harvest of Shame"—IX

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is the ninth in a series of articles presented in the public interest by the Palm Beach Post-Times to show the Members some of the progress being made in Florida to solve problems relating to migrant farm labor which were left out of the television presentation "Harvest of Shame." The omissions of all that has been, and is being done in this field did a great injustice to the Floridians who have given their time and efforts to these problems over the years. It is hoped that, by reading these articles and the ones to follow, the Members and public will have a better understanding of this important matter.

[From the Palm Beach Post-Times, Feb. 3, 1961]

BELLE GLADE RENTALS NOT AS HIGH AS $15

"The rent is $15 per week per room."—"Harvest of Shame."

There is no migrant housing for $15 per week per room in Belle Glade, according to the chamber of commerce.

An investigation committee organized by the chamber reported: "Most rates for one room do not average over $6 or $7 per week. Cheaper rates are charged for unfurnished rooms."

The rate for two rooms averages $9 or $10 with one-bedroom apartments scaling $11 to $12.50, the committee said, with the owners sometimes paying for electricity, water and garbage collection.

Housing is provided on a competitive basis, the chamber reported, and no instance was found in the community of migrant rooms bringing $15 per week.

The committee found small homes renting for $10 or $12 per week.

A survey last year showed 1,017 units with a value of $2,127,800 were completed during the preceding 5-year period.

This, the chamber said, included 166 buildings and provided 79 new homes, 33 duplex apartments, 20 apartment buildings and 69 rooming houses.

The quality of construction has improved, the chamber said, and contractors now mostly erect concrete-block buildings. Over 20 old buildings have been razed during the 5-year period, the chamber found.

Said the chamber:

"The housing authority, in a survey, identified some 90 former Negro tenants and over 40 white migrant families who have purchased their own homes in this area or nearby communities.

"This could not have been done without encouragement and concern for the migrants by local citizens and authorities. Is this not progress?"

Water Development in the Southwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HAYDEN
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Floyd E. Dominy, the Commissioner of Reclamation, delivered at the convention of the American Society of Civil Engineers, Phoenix, Ariz., April 12, 1961, on the subject of water development in the Southwest.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY FLOYD E. DOMINY, THE COMMISSIONER OF RECLAMATION, AT THE CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CIVIL ENGINEERS, PHOENIX, ARIZ., APRIL 12, 1961

It is a privilege for me to participate in the spring meeting of the American Society of Civil Engineers. It is also gratifying to see that your well-planned program for this convention reflects a growing national concern about our water resources and the need for research for their future development.

I was in Phoenix just a month ago with Secretary of the Interior Udall for the golden anniversary celebration of the Theodore Roosevelt Dam. This is a key structure of the Salt River project, and one of the first to be undertaken by the Bureau of Reclamation. If anyone should question the worth and indeed the necessity of reclamation development, they have only to look around this prosperous and growing Salt River Valley, for reassurance. Its economy and stability are predicated on the water and power supplied from the Salt River project.

When this convention ends, many of you will be making a tour to see Glen Canyon Dam which is under construction on the Colorado River upstream from the Grand Canyon. This structure will be the key to utilization of water in the four States of the Upper Colorado River Basin, Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, and New Mexico.

There is a startling contrast in the manner in which these two structures are designed and built, as there is in the manner of operation of the Salt River project and the Colorado River storage project and participating irrigation projects. The contrast reflects the changes and progress which have been accomplished in order to meet the demands of the times. But we are not through. We cannot afford to be static in our field.

My personal prediction is that the pressures and demands for an increased water supply in the years ahead will pose such a problem that we will, of necessity, move further and faster than we have ever dreamed of in the past. And what is the key to this future progress?

It is research—research into every phase of water development and use. We must seek constantly for new ideas, new concepts—a new and vigorous approach to the problems that lie ahead.

Need I say that the engineering profession must be out in front in this research if we are to succeed. President Kennedy has challenged us all in these words from his special message to the Congress on natural resources:

"This Nation has been and is now especially fortunate in the blessings (of natural resources) we have inherited. Our entire society rests upon—and is dependent upon—our water, our lands, our forests, and our minerals. Wise investments in a resources program today will return vast dividends tomorrow, and failure to act now may be opportunities lost forever. We cannot now ignore our country's need for future development. Our available water supply must be used to give maximum benefit for all purposes—hydroelectric power, irrigation and reclamation, navigation, recreation, health, home, and industry."

Now I challenge you to pick it up. Don't be afraid or hesitant to get out on cloud 9. Some of our present successfully operating reclamation projects would have been considered pure fantasy 50 years ago. I say plan for the future with vision and imagination, then apply the hard rules of

economics and engineering to turn those dreams into reality.

I note that your program includes technical papers on canal linings, watershed management, erosion and sedimentation, water quality, and many other subjects, all of high importance as we approach the challenges ahead. Discussion of these papers here, and publication by the society, will bring together much of the known information in the civil engineering fields and point the way to plan wisely for the future.

It is proper that a program such as you have developed for this meeting is being presented at this thriving metropolis in the heart of Arizona's Salt River Valley. As I mentioned a moment ago, if there is one spot in the country that dramatically illustrates the vital importance of water-resource engineering and development, it is here in the middle of a great desert area. Reclamation makes desert living a delight. But there is more to it than that. In 1900, Phoenix had a population of 5,544. The phenomenal growth to a flourishing city of about 450,000 has been tied directly to water development. I am proud to represent the Federal agency that has had the major role in water development in Arizona since 1903.

This prosperous area and the tremendous yields in agriculture this valley now harvests from its available water supply, is a source of great satisfaction to all of us. This area affords many people with a delightful place to enjoy their leisure time. However, we must face the hard fact that Arizona is now using all of its readily available surface and ground water supply.

For continued growth of Arizona, as for many other Western States—yes, and of the country as a whole—we must depend upon development of complex projects to deliver new supplies over long distances, upon pumping against higher and higher heads, and upon new and future techniques to assure that every drop of available water is used wisely and well. The success of this effort will depend in a large part upon research in the basic sciences and development of new techniques.

I am well aware of the difficulties involved in securing funds for research. The projects built by us are paid for by those benefiting from their construction. As a result, most of the research we have performed has been in relation to specific engineering and design problems related to specific irrigation projects. Only comparatively small sums have been available for research of a general nature.

Last year, however, for the first time, Congress recognized the far-reaching application of our research efforts and appropriated $300,000 of nonreimbursable funds to the Bureau for this purpose. About one-half of this sum was earmarked for the study of means of reducing reservoir evaporation; of this we have allocated $61,000 to colleges for investigating various phases of this research program.

As many of you know, evaporation takes a toll of 14 million precious acre-feet of water every year from large lakes and reservoirs in our arid 17 Western States. Recent research has demonstrated that a monolayer of the compound, hexadecanol, which spreads over a water surface to a thickness of one molecule, will materially reduce evaporation.

Scientists discovered in the laboratory that hexadecanol will reduce evaporation by as much as 70 percent. But we need much basic research and experimentation to determine whether a monolayer can be applied economically to a large body of water. I am glad to report that progress has been made in this direction in large-scale tests conducted at Lake Hefner, near Oklahoma City, and in tests conducted last summer on Lake Sahuaro, a few miles from us here in Phoenix.

These later tests were made with the help and cooperation of the Salt River Valley Water Users Association, the U.S. Geological Survey, the U.S. Department of Health, and the Arizona State Fish and Game Department. At Lake Hefner, we realized a 9-percent savings in evaporation losses and something more than this at Lake Sahuaro.

It is apparent that we still have a long way to go before we approach anything like the laboratory results. There are many factors which must be scientifically investigated before we will know just how economically and effectively we can reduce evaporation.

The problem of reducing evaporation is only one of many highly complex problems on which more and better engineering information is needed to conserve and economically utilize our water resources. More information on the evaporation studies at Sahuaro Lake will be presented by Quentin L. Florey, of our research laboratory staff, on Thursday morning, at 9 a.m.

Nonbeneficial consumptive use by large areas of phreatophyte growth in several river basins represents a tremendous waste of water and is in many instances encroaching upon dependable water supply for existing irrigation projects as well as threatening future irrigation development. Our usable water supplies can be increased by eradication of phreatophytes, but research is needed in the areas of hydrology, ecology, and in methods of eradication and control.

In your trip to Glen Canyon Dam you will see many rock bolts which have been used to support the rock around the tunnel inlets and in the canyon walls. Also, you will see structural steel shapes used to support the crown of the inclined spillway tunnel. At present the spacing of these rock bolts and supports is determined largely by experience and judgment. There is a need for improved methods of determining the amount of support necessary for safe tunnel excavation and for determining the existing state of pressure in rock.

The Bureau of Reclamation has made its knowledge available to the public on the design of small dams by means of a publication which is proving very popular. We also recognize that there is a need for fundamental information on the behavior of rock foundations of large dams, so that we can design these dams more precisely.

Soils are our most abundant—and one of our most important—engineering materials for dams, canal linings and structure foundations. The science of soils engineering is very young and much fundamental information is needed. While the Bureau can now design earth dams with the assurance that they will be safe and serviceable structures, our scientists report that there is still a great and prompt need for basic research in the engineering and chemical properties of soil.

For example: the surface chemistry of clay particles as related to the minerals of the soil; electrochemical processes of increasing the porosity and improving the drainage of soils; physical properties of soils as affected by absorbed water as well as pore pressure; and better methods for measuring the pore pressures in earth structures.

Lined irrigation canals are expensive. Yet, in unlined canals as much as 50 percent of the water is frequently lost by seepage en route to the farm. We need a soil sealant that could be economically applied either in a dry canal or without unwatering the canal to reduce this seepage. Of course, we are always looking for cheaper ways to line our canals to avoid waste in conveying the water from the reservoir or stream to its destination. P. W. Terrell, of the Bureau of Reclamation, will present a paper on low-cost canal lining on Thursday afternoon, in which he will discuss some of our efforts to develop such linings.

Bureau construction consists principally of moving earth and placing concrete. There is still disagreement among engineers regarding the fundamental concepts used in the design of reinforced concrete. Prof. Phil M. Ferguson, past president of the American Concrete Institute, and one of the recipients of a research award at this luncheon, I am sure could discuss the needs for research in concrete at some length.

On large dams, there appears to be disagreement in both the allowable stresses which can safely be used and in the method of computing these stresses. Research is necessary to reduce the uncertainties, so as to permit lower factors of safety and thereby achieve greater economy in construction. The International Commission on Large Dams is doing a great deal to provide a better understanding of the various practices used throughout the world.

There is a continuing need for improving concrete so that structures can be built cheaper and last longer. As an example we need a concrete that is more resistant to the sulfates often found in high concentrations in soils of our Western States.

Hydraulics is still an inexact science in many ways. Despite a long history of laboratory and field research, we know the coefficients derived from experience and tests of small lined canals cannot be used in the design of large lined canals. Field research is needed on flow in large canals to establish their characteristics and to explain this nonconformity of accepted relationships.

Erosion is a serious problem and basic information is required for a fuller understanding of energy dissipation in closed and open conveyances so that we can build erosion-free structures. Also our hydraulic engineers recognize that little is known of the basic hydromechanics of rotational flow as illustrated by eddy and vortex formations in the intakes of some of our hydraulic structures.

Sediment is still a problem and I speak for both the designers and operators of hydraulic structures. We do not fully understand fundamental principles of turbulence and other factors that may be involved in sediment transport and deposition in meandering streams and artificial channels. We do not know, nor can we always employ the best method for controlling sediment in our structures and reducing sediment in canals. We need to study the improvement in such devices as sluiceways, guidewalls, and vanes and vortex tubes in diversion structures, in order to reduce the maintenance cost of periodic sediment removal. Adequate knowledge of canal shape and alinement influences would permit designs that would provide minimum operational difficulties and reduce erosion of canal banks and formation of sandbars that cut down canal capacity.

Water rights in these western arid and semiarid areas are one of man's most valuable possessions. As our water supplies become more fully developed and the competition for an adequate supply grows, the problem of allocating water according to established rights and equitably distributing it during times of shortage, requires improvement in present water measurement methods and devices, and the development of new ones. More accurate devices are needed to enable better assessment of charges for water and encourage more judicious application by the user. Improvement in the accuracy of measuring devices will make possible wider distribution of the available water for greater crop production and reduce waste.

I have been speaking mainly of the problems with which the civil engineer is concerned. The Bureau of Reclamation's forces consist of an integrated team of engineers, agronomists, economists, etc., and hence we are also concerned with research in other fields which affect the civil engineer, such as the elimination of aquatic weeds which clog our canals and reduce the capacity planned by the designer.

The Bureau is vitally interested in the frugal application and most economic use possible of water in the growing of crops. We are cooperating with the Department of

Agriculture and State colleges on experimental farms in this study. If we are to get the most mileage possible from our irrigation water supplies we must know more about the optimum water requirements of different crops grown in different soils and in different climates.

As one of the principal Federal agencies generating and transmitting the energy generated from water in the West, we are constantly seeking ways and means which will permit more economical generation and transportation of electric power. There is also a wide demand for means of extending the life of the metal gates and conduits on irrigation projects. Research is required in protective coatings and cathodic protection of metals as well as to achieve improvement in construction materials which may extend the life and reduce maintenance costs of project works.

These are some of the areas where we know immediate research would be profitable. There are many more. Activities in the saline water conversion reesarch program, and to establish methods of limiting the pollution of our water and to provide for its reuse are being stepped up by the administration to make full use of these potential sources of supply.

To point up the critical needs for research which could most profitably be pursued and stimulate the interest of foundations and educational institutions, the Bureau of Reclamation is joining with the ASCE and Colorado State University, in sponsoring a research symposium. The first symposium is on basic research in civil engineering fields related to water resources, and will be held June 12–15, at the Colorado State University campus, at Fort Collins.

About 50 leading engineers and scientists will participate in this symposium. I am pleased to note that 2 of these 50, Prof. Phil M. Ferguson and Prof. David K. Todd, are recipients of research award sat this luncheon. Professor Fardum, who is chairman of the society's research committee, will lead one of the panels.

Secretary Udall, who comes from this important reclamation State has lived with the water problem in Arizona and is acutely aware of the importance that water conservation and resource development can have on an area. He has accepted the challenge charted by President Kennedy for resource development. To implement this program, he has directed and urged us all in the Department to take vigorous and aggressive actions toward development of the Nation's physical resources.

Now, we must look to you as engineers to apply your knowledge and all the skills and technical tools available to both extend our knowledge and provide technical leadership in the development of our Nation's water resource.

Again I challenge you to pick up the reins of leadership in this important phase of civil engineering. Working together with vision and imagination, we can meet the needs of the future successfully.

Michigan Halts Showings of Distorted Films

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 7, 1961]

MICHIGAN HALTS SHOWINGS OF DISTORTED FILMS

LANSING, MICH., April 6.—Public showings of two controversial films by the State police subversive activities squad were ordered discontinued today by Gov. John B. Swainson.

The films, "Operation Abolition" and "Communism on the Map," have been shown to four high schools in the State and a number of private groups by the State police unit.

Swanson said: "The films have been viewed by several members of my staff who confirm criticism that the films are inaccurate and distorted and thus harm, rather than advance, the purpose of an intelligent anti-Communist program."

The controversial "Operation Abolition" movie was prepared for the House Un-American Activities Committee and purports to be an accurate showing of student riots at a committee hearing last year in San Francisco.

"Communism on the Map" was produced by George S. Benson of Harding College, Searcy, Ark.

Soviet Space and Orbit Success on Orbiting Soviet Military Major Recognized as One of World's Greatest Scientific Achievements—President John F. Kennedy Promptly Sends Congratulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I wish to call to your attention, and to the attention of my other distinguished colleagues, a very timely and pertinent editorial appearing in the New York Times on Thursday, April 13, 1961:

KENNEDY PRAISES SOVIET SPACE FEAT—ALSO SAYS UNITED STATES WILL REMAIN BEHIND FOR SOME TIME

(By John W. Finney)

WASHINGTON, April 12.—President Kennedy congratulated the Soviet Union today on its outstanding technical accomplishment in sending the first man into space. He also told Americans that the United States would be behind in space for some time.

The Presidential congratulations were extended in a personal telegram to Soviet Premier Khrushchev and in a separate statement issued by the White House.

And, Mr. Speaker, in connection therewith, I would like to call attention also to a portion of a front page article in the same paper, which article was captioned "Kennedy Praises Soviet Space Feat."

THE FIRST COSMONAUT

The successful launching by Soviet scientists of a man into space and his safe return after orbiting the earth in 89 minutes will be hailed as one of the great advances in the story of man's age-old quest to tame the forces of nature. It marks the crowning achievement so far in space technology, and provides the most dramatic evidence of Soviet leadership in the field of powerful rocket engines.

But the success of Soviet space science must be recognized as much more than the triumph of the scientists of one nation. Viewed from the broad perspective of history, the successful launching of the first man in orbit is a triumph of the human mind and spirit regardless of geographic, political or ethnic boundaries. For the flight of young Yuri Gagarin is the culmination of a long story dating back hundreds of years, to which the minds of many men of many nations have greatly contributed. The modern chapter of the story began with the Englishman, Isaac Newton. Its most recent chaper was the contribution of the American rocket pioneer, Robert Goddard.

Orbiting a man is only a steppingstone toward orbiting a space station as a jumping-off point for trips to the moon and beyond. It marks the opening of the era of interplanetary travel and of discoveries beyond imagining.

These discoveries may provide us answers to fundamental questions man has been asking ever since he learned to think, such questions as how the universe began and whether or not it ever had a beginning; whether or not the laws governing the universe he observes also hold true for the vast as yet unseen universe beyond; whether the laws governing the universe today were the same a billion years ago, or whether they have been changing and are continuing to change.

They also may provide man answers to questions even more intimate to himself, questions about the origin of life, about its future, and its possible ending; whether life as it exists on earth is the only form of life that can possibly exist, or whether other forms of life even superior to ours exist on other planets in the vast cosmic spaces.

For the present, however, the Soviet accomplishment must be regarded as of political and psychological importance in giving the Soviet Union once again the "high ground" in world prestige. From the military point of view, the launching of the cosmonaut once again presents striking evidence that the Soviet Union possesses much more powerful rocket engines than the United States for the launching of intercontinental ballistic missiles.

What the Peace Corps Will Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, no proposal of the Government in recent years has so captured the imagination of the Nation as the President's proposal for the establishment of a Peace Corps. The Indianapolis Times editorially pointed out the realities that must be faced by the members. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Indianapolis Times, Apr. 2, 1961]

WHAT PEACE CORPS WILL NEED

R. Sargent Shriver, director of President Kennedy's embryo Peace Corps, has been overwhelmed with applicants for jobs—which suggests that some have a notion that there will be more glamor than crime in the assignments.

Quite the contrary, as Shriver has been trying to make clear.

The realities of the job now have been pictured by others—speaking from experience.

"You'll get sick" said Warren Schmidt, director of oversea activities for the 4–H Clubs. "You can't avoid health hazards in the villages. You can't, for instance, turn down a friendly cup of tea—no matter how dirty the cup. As you get closer to the grassroots, these dangers increase."

Harry Pollack of the AFL–CIO put the whole idea in perspective:

The Peace Corps, he said, "won't solve our problems in the Congo, Laos, or Cuba. You're not going to replace the American Ambassador where you're sent." The Peace Corps "won't instantly transform all the underdeveloped countries. It is a new technique in international relations, nothing more."

Dan Kurzman, our man in the Congo, told the story of Guy Humphreys, who first went to the Congo to establish a mission in 1948. Humphreys is 44 (all Peace Corps persons need not be youths) and is the only American now resident in Stanleyville.

Humphreys has been arrested a dozen times, threatened at gunpoint, robbed, and his wife has had to go home for treatment of a strange eye disease. Despite all this, he intends to stay the rest of his life, and comments, "things aren't really so bad here."

This man demonstrates the spirit, the savvy and the stay-with-it-ness the Peace Corps will need if it is to be of any use.

He is an example of what many Americans, under private auspices, have been doing in a manner President Kennedy now proposes to do in addition under government auspices.

Foreign Trade Economics and the U.S. Fish Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a reprint from the February 1961 issue of Pacific Fisherman entitled "Foreign Trade Economics and the U.S. Fish Business," by Mr. Richard Kulze, president of the American Seafood Distributors Association:

FOREIGN TRADE ECONOMICS AND THE U.S. FISH BUSINESS

(By Richard Kulze)

I think we can all see that the entire structure of international commerce is in the course of a basic transformation that is likely to produce a new type of trading world within the next 10 to 15 years.

For centures, trade has been conducted between and among national states, each with its independent commercial laws and practices; each exercising control over the movement of goods across its frontiers.

Eight years ago—with the formation of the European Coal and Steel Community—the Western World began a new movement toward regional trade blocs that appears to be picking up momentum almost daily. It has swept over Western Europe and Latin America and is even beginning to penetrate to the newly born African states.

Only two of the world's major industrial nations—the United States and Japan—now stand outside of some sort of actual or proposed regional trade group. This isolation is leading to a reevaluation of trade policy at the business and official levels in both nations. No longer do we have a brotherhood of nations, the familiar brotherly ties. Trade has become and is becoming a series of family affairs between groups of nations.

At present some 25 countries are spinning off from the Old World trade system and clustering into trade groupings. There's EEC (European Economic Community)—or the Common Market—covering 165 million people in France, Germany, Italy, Holland, Belgium, and Luxemburg. There's EFTS (the European Free Trade Association), and its 90 million people of Britain, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Switzerland, Austria, and Portugal. There is the South American bloc being worked on—108 million people of Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Paraguay, Peru, and Uruguay, and with Mexico's 32 million also taking part.

In Central America, the 10 million people of Guatemala, Honduras, El Salvador, Nicaragua, and Costa Rica are organizing their trade zone.

All of the groups vary in form but they are all built and are building around one principle—a customs union. Each country within a group undertakes gradual elimination of all tariff and trade restrictions from all other members of the same group. At the same time, however, existing tariffs will be maintained on imports from nonmember states. The end result is a free trade zone within which companies can sell to each other freely. Outsiders, including the United States can sell into the zone only over the existing tariff wall. The regional trade bloc idea will give tremendous impetus to economic expansion within the free trade zone. Those standing outside the zone will benefit by the amount of economic expansion which spills over as a result of the additional demand for imports from all over the world.

What touched off this movement toward trade blocs? Many things. There are those who say that exporting countries were disturbed at the reluctance of the United States with its vast market, to join OEC, the administrative arm of the General Agreement on Tariff and Trade; who feared the on-again, off-again trade decisions in our country and the reoccurring tides of protectionism which sweep the United States from time to time.

But the main theme behind the formation of trade blocs must be that industry activity can tap its full potential only if its producing facilities are assured broad markets, such as exists here among our 50 States.

The formation of the varying trade bloc will have effects on U.S. markets, both here and abroad, and on U.S. business and U.S. policy. At the coming 1960–61 GATT conference in Geneva, we—and the other GATT countries—will be negotiating for the first time with the Common Market as an entity and not as separate countries. It will behoove us to obtain the best possible concessions from that group to which the United States has always exported in substantial quantity.

The forming of these blocs comes at a time when the United States is striving to increase its exports, and in order to insure continuing exports to those countries which will be trading freely with their family countries, U.S. exporters must continue to show the ingenuity for which they are famed.

And other nonbloc countries may find themselves losing historic markets and may look harder at the U.S. market. As distributors, we may find that some of our historic suppliers abroad may find it easier to ship to their duty-free neighbors than over our tariff wall, and we may have to look harder for the supplies needed for the American consumer.

This is the irony of our position in the American fishing industry. While we are concerning ourselves with the lack of fishery supplies for the American consumer, bill after bill is pending to limit or otherwise restrict the importation of seafood products—almost every species.

We are still in the midst of the grandiose shrimp tariff-quota investigation, and distributor after distributor has told me of the difficulties in obtaining shrimp supplies. With our ever increasing population, our distributors are, and must be, continually on the lookout for world supplies of fishery products for our consumer.

As the postwar world has recovered, the economies of those countries have improved, and they have become competitors for the world fishery supplies in which we participate, as well as becoming bigger and better markets for U.S. exports. U.S. distributors of lobster tails, as an illustration, have seen examples of being outbid for supplies by European buyers. I think we will see more of this as the world economy progresses, particularly in the now underdeveloped countries. There are 1¼ billion people living in 100 non-Communist underdeveloped countries and territories. These 100 underdeveloped countries are a great new economic frontier. To industrialized countries, like the United States, their economic progress means larger export markets. Gross income in those countries grew 3 percent a year from 1950 to 1959, but with 200 million new mouths to feed in the 10-year span, the net income was about 1 percent. If those countries can lift their per capita incomes by only 1 percent more a year during the coming decade, they can well double their imports from the United States alone. A rising economy in those countries means prosperity, and prosperity anywhere on earth is America's trading opportunity.

To us in the fisheries, exports are a minor part of our trade; but to our country, it is our lifeblood. Our tremendous exports, exceeding imports by $3 billion, constitute the major reason why you and I are in business today. Only because of the role which our exports play in the U.S. economy have we been able to maintain a liberal trade policy in this country. Only because of our exports of cotton and tobacco and machinery—and the jobs and the revenue which those exports produce for our country—have we been able to stem the tide of restrictive import controls on tuna and trout and we hope, shrimp.

But despite the fact that our exports still exceed our imports by a healthy surplus, protectionism continues to exist, and we can expect to have it with us in the time to come. The United States imported more goods last year than ever before in our history—$15.2 billion worth. To those worried about foreign competition, the total is bound to appear ominous, for after all, only 9 years before, in 1950, U.S. imports came to a bare $8.9 billion. The gain seems enormous, but is it?

Imports tend to run in line with our Nation's overall business activity. As incomes rise, people buy more, and as production expands, manufacturers also need more materials.

The U. S. gross national product—this is the total output of goods and services—had increased to approximately $280 billion last year. And imports can logically be expected to go up as gross national production rises. But what is more startling than the uptrend

in imports is that we are buying relatively no more abroad now than we did back in 1950. Imports in both years represented 3.1 percent of our gross national product.

The real significance of recent import figures lies not so much in their absolute amount as in the type of goods coming in. Since the end of the war, there has been a fair shift in imports to finished products. The growing capacity and technological skills abroad have made those countries able to compete here with remarkable success. In 1950, almost 60 percent of our imports consisted of crude and semimanufactured materials. In 1959, that figure had declined to about 45 percent, with more than half of our imports consisting of finished products. We have had this shift to only a limited degree in our fishery imports.

If the trade pattern shifts, more complaints are bound to be voiced about foreign competition. But as I said earlier, prosperity abroad can only be achieved by an increased economy, a better standard of living, and increased industrialization. What else can we reasonably expect the other countries of the world to sell in our marketplace if not the products of their industry? And a significant fact not to be overlooked as the economy of the world progresses—the frequent cliche of low-cost foreign labor—as the standard of living betters abroad, their labor rates comes closer and closer in line with our wages.

I have mentioned some big figures as we discuss U.S. exports of $18 billion and U.S. imports of $15.2 billion. Let's try to relate these figures to our fish industry, in smaller figures and with regard to people. Take the case of shrimp imports and the pending legislation that seeks to restrict imports from over 50 countries. In the case of the major exporter, Mexico, with its 32 million population, every Mexican annually buys $27.30 worth of U.S. goods. Each American buys $2.61 worth of Mexican goods. Each citizen of Ecuador buys $11.67 from the United States, each American spends 32 cents a year on Ecuadorian merchandise. Each Panamanian spends $83.60 on American goods; each American buys 14 cents worth of merchandise from Panama each year. It is the same with the other shrimp exporting countries; each Colombian spends $13.57 a year on U.S. merchandise; our purchase from Colombia is $1.91. Each citizen of El Salvador spends $18.41 for U.S. goods; our purchase is 28 cents a year. Egypt's per capita purchase from the United States is $2.16 compared to our purchase worth 9 cents. Costa Rica, $37.90, compared to our 21 cents. Pakistan, $1.30, compared to our 15 cents. Iran, $4.37, compared to our 25 cents. Israel, $50.81, compared to our 10 cents. Chile, $20.88, compared to 73 cents. Japan, $9.06, compared to $3.87.

And let's look at the countries which export ground fish fillets and blocks to the United States. Canada is the largest exporter, and Canada buys $3½ billion worth of U.S. goods. Canada is our largest customer. Each Canadian buys $196.23 worth of U.S. goods per year; every American buys $15.37 worth of Canadian goods. Every Icelander spends $85.14 on U.S. goods while each American buys 6 cents worth of Icelandic goods. Every Norwegian spends $19.77 for U.S. merchandise compared to our purchase of 29 cents. Every Dane is a $17.31 customer of the United States, compared to our purchase of 48 cents.

And let's look at the countries exporting lobster tails to the United States. Australia, $19.37, compared to our purchase of 57 cents. New Zealand, $18.82, compared to 65 cents. Cuba, $83.61, compared to $2.97. South Africa, $17.23, compared to 54 cents.

Our latest tariff complaint is lodged against Peru because of its fish meal exports to the United States. Every Peruvian buys $16.33 worth of U.S. goods compared to our purchase of 74 cents worth of Peruvian merchandise.

These are figures which bring this matter of balance of trade into better focus for all of us. The $18 billion which we receive in the United States for our exports plays a very vital role in our prosperity. The owner or employee of an American business receiving import competition from abroad finds it hard to appreciate this—and while we disagree with him we can understand his views. This is what makes tariffs and trade such a personal matter. How do you think these large customers of the United States feel when our industries suggest tariff controls on their exports? How would you feel or what would you do if a supplier from whom you bought $15 worth of bread wanted to make it difficult for you to sell him 50 cents worth of milk? With our $3 billion export surplus, however, it is unbelievable that in this country we have proposals to restrict trade in tuna, shrimp, lobster tails, typewriters, textiles, and the myriad of proposals pending in our Congress.

A Meritorious Know Communism Recommendation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, when I was home in my congressional district during the Easter recess, a new citizens group to promote Americanism was announced. The name of this organization was the Seattle American Leadership Council. Among its organizers were such outstanding men as Wellwood E. Beall, senior vice president of the Boeing Airplane Co.; Chester Ramage, secretary of the King County Labor Council, and James M. Cain, an insurance executive long active in civic affairs. The mayor of Seattle, Gordon S. Clinton, headed the council as honorary chairman.

This was a citywide group dedicated to combating communism in the community, concerning itself with principles and not with individuals. The council program calls for stimulating all individuals in the city to a renewed dedication to principles as set forth in the Declaration of Independence and like it, would seek an understanding of the goals and methods of international communism and to constructive thought and action to defeat the total challenge of the Communist conspiracy.

To carry out its program the group has organized a speakers bureau and I am convinced an effective program of stimulating the people of Seattle toward obtaining knowledge about communism and Communist tactics will result.

I am recommending to the Seattle Leadership Council that it study the recent resolution adopted by the house of delegates of the American Bar Association which urges the legal profession and the public to mobilize public support for teachers and school officials who wish to strengthen their school curriculums in this area.

The American Bar News of March 15, 1961 contained an article telling of the action whereby the house of delegates went on record favoring the Nation's high schools and colleges providing adequate instruction in the techniques and objectives of communism, so young Americans would be better prepared to meet the challenge to our system of freedom under law.

Mr. Speaker, it has seemed to me a citizens group such as The Seattle American Leadership Council, in cooperation with members of the legal profession, can be most effective and avoid the often made charge of witch hunting by following the Bar Association resolution which calls first, for encouragement and support of school and college programs presenting adequate instruction in the history, doctrines, objectives and techniques of Communism, thereby instilling greater appreciation of freedom under law and the will to preserve that freedom; second, to insure the highest quality of instruction, that educational authorities be urged to provide appropriate training of instructors and the production of scholarly textbooks and professionally excellent teaching materials.

I firmly feel the need of a citizens drive to awaken our youth to the privileges of Americanism and the threat of international communism. In this connection I would like to quote from the bar association conference committee's report covering its "know communism" resolution. This report, with which I am 100 percent in agreement, reads as follows:

Public understanding and support for this educational program will be essential. It is to be hoped that our members and the State and local bar associations will assist in developing proper understanding and in mobilizing public support.

This program will be beset with many obstacles. There are even those who deem it treasonable to mention communism in the classroom. Pressures and emotions will be brought to play upon any textbooks and educational aids. There will be those who fear that a well-meaning program may itself become infiltrated or perverted. A great host of patriotic educators, with proper public support, can see that these pitfalls and obstacles are avoided or overcome.

Film Documentary on Riot Withdrawn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Los Angeles Mirror of March 3, 1961, relating why Lockheed missiles and space division has stopped showing the film "Operation Abolition":

FILM DOCUMENTARY ON RIOT WITHDRAWN

SUNNYVALE.—The Lockheed missiles and space division said Thursday it had stopped showing "Operation Abolition" because controversy over the film report of the San Francisco city hall student riot had de-

stroyed its value as a security education tool.

Lockheed had purchased a print of the film and used it in showings primarily intended for section security coordinators to alert them to the activity of identified Communists in the San Francisco area.

John Riffle, public information director, said Lockheed no longer will make available its "Operation Abolition" print to civic groups. Previously Lockheed required for such showings that a panel discussion including criticism be provided.

At employee showings Lockheed security officers advised that Lockheed neither supported nor opposed the House Committee on Un-American Activities. A collection of published criticism also was provided for study.

The 45-minute film was produced from newsreel film subpenaed by the House Committee on Un-American Activities from KRON and KPIX, San Francisco television stations. Fulton Lewis III, former committee staff aid, edited and narrated the film.

Critics of the committee and the film insist the movie gives a distorted picture of the college student protest against the committee's San Francisco hearing.

Committee spokesmen declare the film was edited only to make a cohesive film and eliminate duplication.

The film is marketed privately at $100 a copy by Washington Video Productions, Inc. George Johnson said his firm assembled the film's raw materials at its own expense as a business speculation.

Our Space Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the difficulty we face today is that the American people have been kept ignorant on national defense and at times even intentionally deceived.

In a dictatorship the people can be regimented into action. Not so with a democracy where the people will not budge unless they fully understand the facts. Without an enlightened American public, our country and the rest of the world is doomed.

Let us look back a bit. America went into World War II with the P–40 as our best fighter plane. The Jap Zero made mincemeat out of it. The P–40's we sent to England were not even uncrated. Our pilots used the English Spitfires instead. Although we started out wrong we had time to change our position.

In the next war this luxury will be denied to us. The enemy will strike immediately at the heart of our Nation with the devastating weapons they now have at their command. While we still have a retaliatory power in our Strategic Air Command—some experts say—if the Russians strike first, our retaliatory power will only be a postmortem force.

Let us remove the cloak of secrecy from the American people, as President Kennedy tried to do in his inaugural speech.

The facts will not frighten them. They will only make them mad and then we will get the proper action here in Washington. After all we are not fooling anybody—the Russians know more of our defense posture than some of our experts.

In order to properly alert our people, it may be necessary to have a full-scale congressional investigation. Since, however, Mr. James E. Webb, our new NASA Administrator, promised this morning at hearings before the House Science and Astronautics Committee that he will make an independent study of his own, therefore, such an investigation can be postponed—but not for long.

I want to see the country mobilized on a wartime basis, because we are at war. I want to see our schedules cut in half. I want to see what NASA says it is going to do in 10 years be done in 5. I want to see some firsts coming out of NASA such as a landing on the moon, which I know can be done if we go into immediate development of a solid fuel booster. Again I am told by experts that you cannot have such a program with a liquid booster because you cannot properly cloister such a booster to propel the huge payload necessary for such a project.

I was also assured by Mr. Webb that he is not just going to follow a program already established; that he will reexamine the projected 10-year program of NASA with the view of making constructive changes. With this kind of teamwork and with the energy and foresight of the Kennedy administration, I am confident that we can reach new frontiers first.

I want to assure the Members of the Congress that the members of the House Science and Astronautics Committee are alerted to the problem and will watch the program very carefully.

Our Social Security Program Plus Medical Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, today our social security taxes are 3 percent each upon employer and employee on a wage base of $4,800. Under present law this will increase to 4½ percent upon each by 1969.

The tax costs of a Federal medical care program cannot be estimated exactly. It could equal what the American people now spend voluntarily for medical care; namely, about $18 billion per year. This would make it necessary to double the 4½ percent social security tax now scheduled for 1969. That means both employee and employer would pay 9 percent upon a wage base of $4,800. The social security tax would then be 18 percent of the covered payroll.

Of course, these doubled social security taxes would be in addition to the present personal income taxes of the employee, so the taxload upon the worker would be about double his present taxload. Will this added taxload for a Federal medical care program be the proverbial straw that breaks the overloaded taxpaying camel's back?

In discussing this problem the Wall Street Journal on Monday, February 13, 1961, under the heading "Questions on a Modest Proposal," said:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 13, 1961]

QUESTIONS ON A MODEST PROPOSAL

When a man comes promising to do good for little children and to ease the sorrows of age, anyone who questions him is bound to sound a little like a skinflint who would take candy from babies and push his grandmother out in the cold.

If you think not so, watch what is going to happen to those in Congress bold enough to raise questions about President Kennedy's proposals to meet the urgent needs of the Nation's children and the haunting fears of old age that beset the rest of us. Against the emotional wind blown by such imagery, reason is a feeble reed.

Yet somebody had better ask the questions. It is not merely that hidden beneath the tinsel there are a good many prickly nettles; the promise itself is not at all what it seems. For that promise is not simply that society will try to improve its way of taking care of its indigent and helpless, with which aim no man would quarrel; but rather that by this program the Government is going to improve the medical care of all the people. That promise, it seems to us, is pure deceit.

It is going to take some very probing questions even to uncover the tangible nettles tucked away in this program. Offhand, we can recall no program of such magnitude ever being submitted to Congress without a single line in the President's message as to what its cost will be, now or ultimately.

There are, to be sure, some figures given on what the Government says it is going to tax the people initially, but even they are not exactly what they seem.

The President speaks of raising social security taxes by only one-quarter of 1 percent and of lifting the base of this tax to the first $5,000 of income, a seemingly trivial price to pay for such wonderful benefits. But this quarter of 1 percent is pyramided; under present law social security taxes are already scheduled to go to 3½ percent for every wage earner in 1963; to 4 percent in 1966; to 4½ percent in 1969. This new proposal is in addition thereto.

And of course in addition to this, there will be an equal amount levied, so the law phrases it, upon the employer, the implication here being that since the employer pays it, it's a gift to the wage earner. But slice this as you will, it means that upon the paycheck of every man affected there will be a payroll tax of more than 9 percent—this 9 percent, mind you, over and above all income taxes, where the lowest rate already is 20 percent.

But if this in itself is no trivial sum, it still offers only a glimpse at the actual cost of this program. It was not without reason that this question was lightly passed over in the President's message. Nobody knows. And the way this program is proposed, nobody can possibly know—neither the President, nor Congress, nor you who are going to pay for it.

Consider: The proposal is that after an initial deduction, which must not be less than $20, the Government will pay "all costs" for up to 90 days in the hospital "for a single spell of illness." Or "all costs" of nursing home facilities for 180 days. "All costs" in excess of $20 for outpatient diagnostic services. With such an unlimited commitment it is no wonder that Government statisticians haven't yet come up with a cost figure.

Not even the administration pretends the cost will be covered by the $1.5 billion which is supposed to be raised by the "extra" social security tax. And whatever that mysterious figure is now, it, too, is only a beginning. Already the age of the proposed beneficiaries has dropped from 68 to 65 in a bare six months; the period of benefits has been extended from earlier proposals; and some new benefits have been added. What would happen to the program, once started, is incalculable.

But if you want to get some idea of the upper reaches of this commitment which the Government would now undertake, you can do a little arithmetic with the President's own figures. He says there are 16 million people over 65. Half of them have medical costs of $700 or more a year. There is a liability here of over $5 billion, just counting the half with major medical problems.

But enough of these nettles. There is no use in even trying to grapple with the limitless cost-increases that lie in future changes in the law, or what this wholesale "send-the-bill-to-the-Government" program will do to future costs. No one can guess at the effect on hospitals from overcrowding when the Government pays most of the bill.

For the costs are not the only things that tarnish the bright promises, although these are staggering sums for the whole country to pay in order to take care of the few truly needy.

The President assures one and all that this "very modest proposal" is not "socialized medicine." It is not being paid for by the general taxpayer, he says; only by employers and employes, as if the taxpayers were somebody else. And it is not, so we are told, going to touch the private medical system of the country.

Yet here is a measure for the Government to take over the responsibility of medical care for all of us in age, indigent, and self-reliant alike. We would have no choice in the matter. So doing, Government takes on the responsibility to see that the money is spent as public funds; it cannot in duty pay out public funds to just any doctor or to just any hospital. Nor will it; the medical facilities for which Government pays Government funds must meet Government standards, and those standards may be medical, financial, social, or whatever the Government would make them.

To pretend that this will not alter, in a deep and fundamental way, the health, and medical system of the country is specious. We have no doubt that the few and needy will get better medical care than before. But the price of providing for the needy in this way is not to be measured only in billions of dollars, however many of them there may be, but in what the great apparatus of Government will do to the medical care of all the rest of the people in a country which has achieved—without Government—the highest medical standards of any country in the world.

If this is not socialized medicine, it is nothing. And the President himself promises that this modest program for old people is not an end but a beginning—a "foundation on which to build."

Somebody had better ask questions about what it is that is being built.

Threat of Too Much Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to insert in the RECORD the following editorial printed in the April 3, 1961, issue of Life Lines:

THREAT OF TOO MUCH GOVERNMENT

Government affects all of us in our daily lives, and we affect government, too—or we can if we will. The institutions of government are made by man, and man must bear the responsibility for what happens to those institutions. And today patriots throughout the land are gravely concerned about what has been happening to our American heritage of good government.

For the first 150 years of our existence as a nation, the American people, a free people under God, honored the universal truths embedded in our Constitution and built the most powerful, the most prosperous, the most freedom-conscious Nation on earth.

But then something happened. We began to abandon these truths. The old checks and balances so carefully woven into our Constitution were disregarded in the interest of expediency. Federal authority was extended far beyond the limits originally outlined in the Constitution. This process led to a preemption of the powers of the States and, in many cases, a preemption of the rights of the individual.

The original conception of a division of powers among Federal, State, and local government has corroded. Massive concentration of Federal powers has cancelled out the division of authority on which freedom historically has depended.

Centralization of government has taken government farther and farther away from the people. Government has become so remote that the American people no longer feel they own it—that government is their servant. This lessening of a sense of participation on the part of the people presents an open invitation to extravagance and waste, corruption and inefficiency.

We have seen how this invitation has been accepted.

Centralized government has reinforced itself by creating a vast network of commissions, bureaus, and agencies endowed with an unhealthy combination of legislative, executive, and judicial powers. These bureaucratic creations are manned by appointed officials, persons who have never been elected to their positions of power but who nevertheless can and do act as judge, jury, and prosecuting attorney in matters of great import. This is not only in violation of the principle of separate powers as set down in the Constitution, but it is also contrary to the basic principle that government should be only by consent of the governed.

The concentration of government has led to an unhealthy battle for power among the various branches of the Federal Government. Worst of all, the removal of government from the direct contact of the citizen gives rise to apathy, discouragement, disgust, and confusion among the people.

This has created a dangerous climate in America—a climate in which the antifreedom propaganda of the mistaken flourishes.

As government has grown to colossal proportions and as it has become remote, the American people have begun to lose interest in it. They have begun to give up hope of influencing a creation so large and powerful. They are not sufficiently interested to acquire the knowledge they need if they wish to hold government accountable.

Too many Americans are losing their self-reliance. They look to the all-powerful Federal Government as a source of solution for all their problems, and the more they ask, the more the perverters of our constitutional government respond with still bigger government. The road on which we travel is the road laid down for us by the mistaken. It is high time that we turn around and retrace our steps or else we shall be lost. The turnaround can come only through the informed efforts of patriots.

THE MISTAKEN KEEP PUSHING

The people in America who are in a position to know have warned repeatedly that Communist infiltration in the United States is increasing. They continue to warn that there are more Communist spies in the world today than ever before. Yet many Americans who are loyal to our country continue to be used by the mistaken.

We can be quite sure that the mistaken conspiracy has given its full support to efforts to cripple the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. These are the only two congressional groups which constantly expose to public view the conspiracy's operations within the United States. Thus they are a main target for the mistaken.

These groups have performed an especially valuable service in turning the spotlight on Communist agitation among young Americans. The danger to our young people is very real. Some of them on the west coast were led—or misled—into rioting against a hearing of the House committee in San Francisco last May. Riot charges against the demonstrators were dismissed by a local judge for what he called "practical reasons," but he has made it clear since then that his action did not mean he condoned what happened in San Francisco.

The judge said: "I very definitely agree with the view of FBI Director Hoover that the city hall riot on May 13 was instigated by Communist subversives."

They were out to ruin our young people and to ruin America as well. A national party leader recently commented that Communist youth must find common ground with church youth groups—not, of course, for religious reasons but for the use of their facilities.

Unfortunately some Americans "pooh-pooh" the menace of communism within our own country, pointing out that it is simply a "belief" or the dogma of a political party which happens to differ with our two big political parties. That idea is both naive and dangerous.

Communism is a worldwide conspiracy against human freedom and the dignity of man. The members of this conspiracy in the United States constitute a deadly danger to our future. To dismiss lightly the existence of the subversive threat to the United States is to deliberately commit national suicide.

We must face honestly the gravity of the situation. We must give it top priority in our thinking and in our actions. The basic foundation of our opposition to the mistaken doctrine is an informed public opinion and a dedicated public character. Time is growing short. In another few years the anti-freedom forces will take charge of the world unless they are stopped. We are going to have to stop them. And the first step is to gain as complete knowledge as can be had

of the nature of the conspiracy. This is the challenge faced today by every patriotic American.

If you were a member of a conspiracy set upon destroying America from within, what plan of action would you follow?

The most obvious answer in view of the nature of the problem, would be first of all to lull the people, the lawmakers, and the courts of this country into the belief that there is no serious subversive threat to freedom in our Nation and therefore no cause for worry or concern. Since the numerical strength of the conspiracy in the United States is comparatively small, the strategy would be to induce patriots to look the other way while the conspirators plotted their destruction. That is exactly the strategy being followed by those who seek to end freedom for all Americans.

Patriots must not be deceived. They must remember that the attack on freedom takes many guises. It is well for us to give our attention to some of the things that happen when personal rights come into conflict with what the mistaken call the public welfare. When individual freedom is lost to any man, the freedom of all men is threatened.

How can patriots work to maintain freedom in America?

First of all, we must march straight down the road of personal enterprise. We must have faith in a man's reliance upon himself. If we fall victim to the Federal Government's "free" this and "free" that, we cannot escape weakening ourselves in character—and the only end is serfdom and slavery.

It is important and necessary for patriots to keep steadfastly in mind the truth that the growth of big Federal Government must be checked if we are to survive as a nation of free individuals. It is important and necessary for every American to refuse to allow government at any level to do for him what he can and should do for himself. It is important and necessary that the power of the government not be centered in Washington, but instead be returned to the State capitals, the county seats, and the city halls of America and most of all to the individual American citizen.

It is not too late to save freedom if patriots will act with knowledge, with decisiveness, with firmness. There is work for all men and women who love freedom and who feel a deep-seated loyalty to America and all that America means.

There is work for you to do. You can encourage patriotism wherever you find it in evidence. You can join with other patriots to bring about the widest possible participation in public affairs. If you are the president of a corporation or the head of a business, you can poll your stockholders and associates to determine how many of them would be willing to participate fully and actively in public affairs.

You can further education in freedom's cause through your patriotic letters to newspapers. You can check to see that patriotic radio and television programs are being correctly carried in the newspaper time schedules. You can speak your praise to sponsors of such programs. You can help secure loyal Americans as speakers for luncheon clubs. You can work for a revival of patriotic songs and you can encourage the frequent and proper display of the American flag.

Never forget that the mistaken are on the job constantly. Patriots must be no less diligent. Our freedom is at stake. Western civilization is at stake. Our Christian way of life itself is at stake.

This is a time to sound the cry—"Patriots, unite."

We must arm ourselves with knowledge, we must regather our strength, and as united patriots we must draw near to the eternal truths on which our freedom is founded.

Guidelines for the Minimum Wage—Statement of Prof. Gottfried Haberler to the Senate Subcommittee on Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, one of the important issues that has been raised in this House in recent weeks is that of the minimum wage. I participated in the debate on this matter and, in connection with earlier discussion of it in the 86th Congress, testified before the House subcommittee studying it. At these time I tried to give a framework within which this body could view the minimum wage, keeping an economic perspective.

In the Senate subcommittee hearings on the minimum wage a similar statement has been made by Prof. Gottfried Haberler, Galen L. Stone, professor of international trade at Harvard University. Because of the importance of this economic framework in understanding the minimum wage and its effect in the society, I should like to place Professor Haberler's statement in the RECORD at this point:

GUIDELINES FOR THE MINIMUM WAGE

INTRODUCTION

I have been asked to submit a statement on the proposed minimum wage legislation to the Senate Subcommittee on Labor and am happy to comply with one reservation: I am not in a position to make quantitative-statistical analysis of the probable magnitude of the impact of the proposed increase in the minimum wage. But I am convinced that it is possible to reach definite conclusions concerning the direction of changes to be expected from an increase in minimum wages and hence on the advisability of the proposed legislation—conclusions which are solidly based on general considerations and broad economic facts and principles which are widely if not universally accepted by economists of different schools.

A RISE IN MINIMUM WAGES IS AN INFLATIONARY MEASURE

There can be no doubt, in my opinion, that a rise in minimum wages by 15 or 25 percent is a highly inflationary move. In industries and firms covered or proposed to be covered by the legislation, wages which are at the minimum level will be immediately raised by 15 percent or 25 percent. In the great majority of cases, this will either lead to price rises or to a reduction in employment.

Wages that are only a little higher than the present minimum will likewise go up with the same result on prices and/or employment, because employees will insist on the existing differentials between actual and minimum wages being maintained and employers will find it necessary to accede for the purpose of maintaining morale.

I understand that there exist a number of wage contracts which stipulate the preservation of existing differentials.

But even where no such explicit contractual obligations exist and where present wage rates are much higher than the legal minimum, there will be a natural tendency on the part of the unions to strive for the preservation of the existing wage differentials. We can therefore expect that a substantial rise in minimum wages will exert a strong upward pressure on the whole wage structure. This expectation, no doubt, is one of the most important reasons why unions so strongly endorse a rise in the legal minimum wage.

There may be isolated cases where employers will be able to improve productivity and thus to absorb part of the increase in cost caused by higher wages without raising prices in full proportion. It should be observed, however, that such improvements are going on all the time anyway. To assume that it should be possible to speed up the process of gradual improvement in productivity with the stroke of the pen by raising money wages so that a sharp wage rise need entail neither a rise in prices nor a fall in employment—such an assumption is entirely unrealistic; it is wishful thinking of the most dangerous and irresponsible kind.

WAGE INFLATION DOES NOT RAISE THE LEVEL OF REAL WAGES

It cannot be emphasized too strongly that a general rise in money wages and the resulting price rise cannot raise the general level of real wages, except to the minute extent to which it is possible to squeeze something out of the real income of fixed income receivers. This does not exclude that certain segments of employees where money wages for any reason whatever are adjusted more quickly than that of the great mass of the population can get a temporary benefit at the expense of the rest of the people before the general wage and price level has been fully adjusted. But it certainly is true for wage and salary earners in general that their real income cannot be increased by inflation.

THE DOUBLE DANGER OF INFLATION

A. The balance of payments

It should be commonplace to observe that at the present time any inflationary move is especially dangerous in view of the precarious position of our balance of payments.

It is often said that our inflation during the last 5 or 6 years had nothing to do with the deterioration in our balance of payments since 1958. It is true that our inflation during these years has not been very severe by historical standards or by comparison with inflation in many or most (not all) other countries. But the plain fact is that our "little" inflation has been too much for our balance in view of the fact that our industry is now subject to increased competition at home and abroad from the industrial countries in Western Europe and Japan, which with massive American assistance and aided by sound financial policies have staged a surprisingly quick and sustained recovery from the destructions of the war.

I cannot discuss here the whole complicated story of the balance of payments deficit and how we got into it. In lieu of such a discussion, I attach a copy of a paper of mine on "The Economics of International Markets" where the international payments problem is analyzed as well as the question of remedies.

B. Wage inflation, recovery from the recession and economic growth

The inflationary push resulting from the jacking up of money wages induced by the proposed rise in minimum wages would endanger not only our external balance but would also be a drag on and danger to the internal economic recovery and growth.

The American economy finds itself at present in a recession—in the last stage, it is hoped, of the fourth postwar recession. All sorts of measures have been taken or are under active consideration for the purpose of increasing overall expenditure and effective demand. It is to be expected that the

economy will soon resume its expansion which was interrupted by the recession around the middle of last year.

In view of the numerous programs of increased public expenditures on defense, health and welfare, education, urban renewal, etc., that are underway or under active consideration, there is no danger that the coming expansion will peter out at an early stage. The real danger is that it will again produce inflationary price rises. It should be remembered that the last business cycle upswing, which lasted from April 1958 to about June 1960, was damped down and shortened by measures that had to be taken to check inflationary psychology and price rises which had made their appearance early during the upswing.

It is often objected that the inflation was mild by historical standards and therefore did not warrant strong anti-inflationary financial measures.[1] The inflation issue cannot be fully discussed here. Let me simply say this: It is true the inflation was not severe by comparison with earlier peacetime business cycle upswings before or after the war. But what should not be overlooked is that the economy has become much more sensitive to inflation than it used to be for the simple reason that we have had chronic, though intermittent inflation for the last 27 years or so with no interruption of falling prices.

This heightened sensitivity to inflationary price rises still exists and we can be sure that inflationary psychology would be quickly revived if prices started to go up again at a somewhat accelerated rate. If we want a long and healthy period of expansion, we must avoid any unnecessary inflationary measures.

It is acknowledged also by modern Keynesian economists that sharp wage-rate changes in periods of economic expansion must adversely affect employment.

This is well brought out in the following passage in Prof. Alvin H. Hansen's authoritative book "A Guide to Keynes" (economic handbook series, edited by Prof. Seymour E. Harris, New York, 1953, p. 193):

"Money wage rates (wage units) tend to rise before full employment is reached owing to pressure from labor groups whenever profits rise. Such wage-rate changes are liable to be discontinuous—a succession of semicritical points. To the extent that this occurs the increase in aggregate demand is unnecessarily dissipated on higher prices with correspondingly less effect on output and employment. Insofar as marginal cost rises as output increases, some part of the increase in demand must be dissipated in higher prices. But if in addition money wage rates also rise, employment suffers as a result of the higher wages of the already employed workers."

Hansen speaks of wage rises due to pressure from labor groups. The same, of course, holds of wage increases decreed by law such as increases in legal minimum wages.

INCREASE IN LEVEL OF REAL WAGES NOT AFFECTED

I should like to emphasize once more as strongly as I can that nothing that is said in this statement or the attached paper contends or implies, or is meant to contend or imply, that the gradual rise in the level of real wage rates, which is going on in our economy over the years, has to be slowed down. All that is said is that money wage rates should not be pushed too fast. If that can be achieved, the balance-of-payments deficit will disappear and the coming expansion of the economy will be put on a healthy and more enduring basis. As a result, real hourly earnings and overall real national income will rise faster than if inflationary developments were permitted.

I conclude that the proposed rise in minimum wages is economically and socially unsound and Congress should reject it in the true interest of labor itself and of the economy as a whole.

[1] Another objection to anti-inflationary monetary and credit policy was to the effect that inflation was of a kind—cost push inflation—which allegedly makes it incurable by financial policies. But whatever its merits—I have serious objection to this line of reasoning which I need not elaborate at this point—this argument does not apply to the present problem, because the proposed hike of minimum wages does precisely constitute a cost push.

Reed College Student Council Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

REED COLLEGE STUDENT COUNCIL RESOLUTION ON THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

We, the Student Council of Reed College, call for the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities because of the vagueness of its authorizing resolution and because of its reprehensible activities: i.e., because of its means of investigation and its use of propaganda, and because the committee's investigations have destroyed numerous individuals and groups.

The Supreme Court of the United States has declared that a standing committee of the House or Senate of the Congress of the United States whose area of investigation is not clearly defined is unconstitutional (see *Watkins* v. *United States*). According to Mr. Justice Black of the Supreme Court, the House Committee on Un-American Activities' authorizing resolution, which defines its area of investigation, is ambiguous, and unclear (see dissent in *Barenblatt* v. *United States*). Therefore, in his opinion, the committee is unconstitutional.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities does not allow constitutional safeguards to witnesses. These safeguards are: (1) being informed in advance of the charges leveled against them; (2) being confronted with witnesses who testify against them, and subjecting them to cross examination; (3) the compulsory process of obtaining witnesses in their favor, and the right to be represented by counsel; (4) testifying at the hearings in their own defense.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities has endorsed the preparation of falsifications. For example, the committee has publicly endorsed the movie "Operation Abolition" which deals with the San Francisco hearings and surrounding events in May 1960. People present at the San Francisco hearings in May 1960, writers and journalists have branded the film as a gross distortion of the truth. Mr. William Wheeler, chief west coast investigator for the committee, has admitted in public debate that the film contains distortions.

Witnesses who have attempted to protect their constitutional rights before the House Committee on Un-American Activities have suffered disastrous consequences. Such people have lost their jobs. Some have been barred from social, recreational, and religious organizations. In the case of lawyers, professional reputations have been seriously damaged. The reputations of lawyers have often been impugned with those of their clients, when their clients were uncooperative witnesses before the committee.

The preceding resolution was approved by 89 percent of students voting in referendum in the Reed College student body.

When the Earthquakes Struck Chile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, a few months ago one of our sister republics in South America, the Republic of Chile, was struck by a natural disaster of appalling magnitude. A horrifying combination of earthquakes, tidal waves, volcanic eruptions, and landslides desolated an area almost as large as the whole of Great Britain. The response of the United States to the news of plight of the Chilean people ravaged by this catastrophe was immediate and unstinted, on both the private and public levels. A massive airlift was organized in a matter of hours, and within a few days over 1,000 tons of emergency supplies and more than 800 doctors, nurses, and other personnel were funneled into the disaster area.

The spontaneous sympathy of the United States for the stricken people, and the willingness and ability to translate it with remarkable speed into terms of concrete assistance, did much to repair and advance our friendly relations with Chile and with all of Latin America. The story of this effort and its results is one from which several lessons and a good deal of wisdom may be drawn to aid us in the development of our relations with our Latin American neighbors. It has been told with graphic detail and telling effect by James Winchester in a recent article in Latin American Report, condensed in the Reader's Digest. In the belief that this article will be of vital interest and great value to many of my colleagues, I have asked that it be printed here for their convenience:

WHEN THE EARTHQUAKES STRUCK CHILE
(By James H. Winchester)

Last Fourth of July, thousands of citizens of Valdivia, in southern Chile, stood in the raw, bone-chilling winter wind as the flags of the United States and Chile flew side by side and a Chilean army band played "The Star-Spangled Banner." Valdivia's mayor then addressed the city's guests of honor: four dungaree-clad soldiers of the U.S. Army. "We can never begin to show our appreciation to you and the people of the United States," he said. "You have moved into our hearts forever."

On the same day, at the U.S. Embassy in Santiago, Ambassador Walter Howe received a penciled letter which read simply: "Thanks. May God bless your country." Behind these expressions of good will and gratitude is a remarkable record of international humanitarianism and generosity.

It began before dawn in southern Chile on Saturday, May 21, 1960. A series of intense earthquakes, followed by tidal waves 24 feet high, volcanic eruptions and landslides, convulsed 90,000 square miles of the land, bringing death and ruin to an area almost as large as all of Great Britain. Within 4 days, the cities of Valdivia, Puerto Montt, Osorno and Concepción were ravaged. In the beautiful Chilean lake country, mountains crumbled, new lakes were formed; one 25-mile stretch of high ground dropped 1,000 feet. On the coast, many small communities were engulfed by the heaving ocean, and entire fishing fleets were lost with their crews. In the village of Castro, as the first tidal wave came in, the fishermen got into their boats with their families and put out to sea. The tremendous undertow pulled them to their deaths. At Ancud, people ran to higher ground to escape the tidal waves, only to be swept back into the ocean by landslides.

There was horror everywhere. At Puerto Montt a 6-year-old boy was buried in debris up to his neck. When he was dug out, rescuers found he was holding the bodies of two smaller brothers he had been trying to protect. In all, 2,000 died, 5,000 were injured, more than 50,000 homes were destroyed. A quarter of Chile's population of 7,500,000 was left suffering in cold and hunger. Property damage reached half a billion dollars.

As news of the disaster spread, international aid began to flow toward the stricken nation. First to arrive were the Argentines, with planes and trains loaded with clothing, food, medicines, doctors and nurses. Every other Latin-American country was close behind. Canada's extensive aid, sent by air, included a fully staffed field hospital. Through the Red Cross, 33 other nations dispatched planes, technicians, supplies and money. Private organizations, too, rallied to Chile's relief.

The United States responded with a massive effort. From May 26 to June 1, the U.S. Air Force sent 74 four-engine cargo planes to Chile, carrying 1,000 tons of emergency goods and 800 doctors, nurses and technicians. Included were two 400-bed Army field hospitals, a dozen jet helicopters, portable radio stations and water-purification units, tents, blankets, clothing, and rations. Beyond this, $4,500,000 in nongovernment aid came from the United States. President Eisenhower's emergency funds provided a quick, no-strings-attached $20 million relief loan.

The U.S. response was impressively swift. On Sunday evening, May 22, even as the quakes continued, Roberto Vergara, then Chile's Minister of Finance, Economy and Mines, had called on Ambassador Howe to ask, "Can you help us?" By Friday morning the first Military Air Transport Service Globemaster had unloaded its cargo of tents, blankets and emergency rations at hard-hit Puerto Montt, 500 miles south of Santiago. On its return flight to the capital, the plane evacuated 103 of the earthquake's injured. Only then, after 50 hours without sleep, did the crew go to bed.

A steady stream of cargo planes funneled into Chile from half a dozen U.S. bases, their crews and passengers gathered, for the most part, on 2 hours' notice or less. Capt. Tom Duff of Pittsburgh, Pa., a pilot, walked into the orderly room of MATS' 20th Air Transport Squadron at Dover, Del., to check out for a 2-week leave—and left for Chile 1½ hours later. "I was reading in bed when I was called," says Maj. Helen McCormick, an Army nurse with Fort Belvoir's 7th Field Hospital. "The same time the next night I was in Santiago, more than 5,000 miles away."

Puerto Montt had only a single, poorly paved unlighted 6,000-foot runway, and the radio in a DC–3 parked at one end of the strip served as the only navigational or landing aid in the area. But the huge Globemasters flew in the Army's 15th Field Hospital from Fort Bragg, N.C. The 7th Field Hospital had to go by train and truck from Santiago to Valdivia, a tortuous 72-hour trip. Two hours after arrival it was erected and operating. Where they hadn't brought along what was needed, Army personnel improvised. At Valdivia, a male nurse fashioned an incubator out of wire splints and plastic bags to save a premature baby.

Most welcome of the U.S. supplies were the two mobile water-purification units, each capable of handling 30,000 gallons a day. Their GI operators had them working within 4 hours after arriving at Puerto Montt and Valdivia.

The fact that the Americans pitched in to work was widely commented on by Chilean newspapers, radio, and TV. "You sent people, not just supplies," the Chileans said. They noted, too, the absence of any patronizing or offensively nationalistic attitude. A leading Valparaiso newsman, not always friendly to the United States in the past, marveled that the field hospital in Valdivia had no sign anywhere reading "U.S. Army." Chileans were amazed to see Negro and white medical troops living and working together in harmony. They were impressed, too, by the fact that U.S. officers and enlisted men worked shoulder-to-shoulder at every task.

Chile's man and woman in the street made clear how they felt. Taxicab drivers, shoeshine boys and storekeepers refused to let the visitors pay for anything. "It was 2 a.m. when we left Santiago to return home," says T. Sgt. Norman Hoffman, a MATS crewman from Dover, Del. "But the kitchenmen at our hotel insisted on getting up to cook us a hot breakfast. Neither they nor the hotel would take any money from us. And at the airport over 5,000 people came to see us off." On a train from the south, the passengers made up a collection to buy flowers for a group of U.S. medical technicians going back to Santiago.

The North Americans returned home with unqualified admiration for the Chileans—and their resourcefulness. "Señora Kathy Bulgarin de Lisboa, a schoolteacher, attached herself to our unit the day we arrived in Valdivia," reports Capt. Dale Wagoner, executive officer of the 7th Field Hospital. "She translated; she got us fuel; she wangled transportation. Her husband, a road engineer, came in with his men and built us roads. We couldn't have operated efficiently without her."

The four soldiers honored on the Fourth of July at Valdivia were the last U.S. personnel to depart. The hospitals, supplies and equipment were left behind as gifts.

Letters of thanks continue to pour into the U.S. Embassy in Santiago. "We've been criticized for the fact that though we always profess friendship for our Latin American neighbors, we've never been too quick to show it in concrete terms," say Ambassador Howe. "The airlift, and the caliber and attitude of those who accompanied it, have done more to cement United States-Chilean relations than anything we have ever done here."

"In many years of official visits and propaganda, the Americans didn't succeed in doing what they have now done in a few days," editorialized Santiago's La Libertad. Newspapers in many Latin American countries published enthusiastic reports and editorials.

The United States' ability, and spontaneous willingness, to respond quickly in this emergency was not lost on Latin American politicians, either. They had the opportunity to compare the U.S. action vividly with what Soviet Russia did. A week after the quakes struck, and after the U.S. Globemasters were arriving daily by the dozens, Russia announced that it, too, would send a relief plane from Moscow. One week after that the lone Russian plane finally arrived.

The United States has not yet got itself squared away "south of the border." But the Chilean airlift was a step in the right direction. The feeling is growing that the United States can be counted on to help its friends when the going is tough.

Soil Conservation in Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VERNON W. THOMSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I just received a communication from M. F. Schweers, State conservationist for the U.S. Soil Conservation Service in Wisconsin, to which was attached a copy of a letter he sent to the State's 360 soil conservation district supervisors acknowledging their 1960 annual reports.

Soil and water conservation is near and dear to my heart. One of the first soil conservation experiment stations in the country was established in my congressional district back in 1931. It is located on a picturesque bluff overlooking the city of La Crosse and the Mississippi River.

In June of 1933 a number of CCC camps were assigned to soil conservation work in southwestern Wisconsin. A majority of these were located in my congressional district.

In October, 1933, the Nation's first large scale soil and water conservation demonstration project was undertaken in the 92,000-acre Coon Creek watershed located southeast of La Crosse.

Wisconsin was one of the first States to pass a soil conservation district law. That was in 1937. Every county has since been created as a soil conservation district.

In 1942, I became a cooperator with the Richland County Soil Conservation District, shortly after the county became a district. We planned for and carried out a contour strip cropping system, including the needed fertility and rotation programs. We also did pasture renovation.

The first and only pilot flood control project in Wisconsin was located in my congressional district in 1953.

With the passage of Public Law 566, the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, in 1954, the Mill Creek watershed in my home soil conservation district was the first in the State to submit an application for planning assistance.

Conservationwise, we have a lot of firsts in my congressional district. I am proud of my record made by my constituents and I am equally proud of the advancement of the soil and water conservation program in the State as a whole.

Accordingly, I believe the letter Mr. Schweers sent to the supervisors detailing conservation progress and plans in

Wisconsin warrants inclusion in the RECORD.

The letter follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE,
Madison, Wis., March 30, 1961.

To: Soil conservation district supervisors.
From: M. F. Schweers, State conservationist.
Subject: Acknowledgment of your 1960 SCD annual reports.

The 1960 annual reports for your and the 70 other countywide soil conservation districts (SCD) of Wisconsin are the best ever. They are all very readable, readily understandable, and interestingly phrased. And, they were all in our office by March 15, a new record. Congratulations on both scores.

I enjoyed reviewing each and every one of these documents. It provided me with a nice résumé of accomplishments, problems and effected or proposed solutions, and plans for the future.

Each year your material is bound in eye-appealing covers and increased numbers of pictures are being employed to real advantage.

A BIT OF PHILOSOPHY

Quite a number of your reports contained some interesting quotes, some personal philosophies. So, it seems fitting to reproduce a few of these to set the stage for the remainder of this epistle.

"Being a hunter and fisherman and a lover of wildlife, I am interested in the preservation of God's handiwork in its natural state as He created it. One of the first steps is the conservation of soil and water and related resources. This can be done and has been done in our district by the people living on our farms who have participated in the soil conservation program and noted the benefits they, their neighbors, and friends have received."—Walter Diercks, chairman, Langlade County SCD governing body.

"We all love this great country of ours. We are proud of the freedom that it provides. Its greatness and strength are the envy of many nations. However, we must realize that only through the efforts of each one of us can we maintain that heritage. The farmer is important in food production. He has done a very efficient job in his field. In order to continue to provide all these nourishing elements, we must see that we have a soil that is well protected. Thus we have a great job. The Barron County soil conservation district is proud of its record in watching over the soil within its boundaries. We pledge the same effort in years to come."—George Webb, chairman.

"In simplest terms, there are two principal ways you measure progress of districts—first, by the effectiveness with which districts and their governing bodies function as responsible units of local, self-government and, second, by the measurable, physical accomplishments in applying soil, water, timber, and related practices and structures in the watersheds and on the lands of the country."—Statement by Wm. E. Richards, NASCD president, taken from the Door County SCD report.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

To a large degree we can measure the success of soil conservation districts by the amounts of conservation work planned for and applied on the land. We must never forget that it is our fine farm families who made all this possible, for they make the planning decisions and install the needed practices. What has been done is a tribute to their wisdom, foresight, and cooperativeness.

"Proud" is the word most of you used in expressing opinions on attainments made in your district during the past calendar year. And, these achievements were made in the face of inclement weather and unfavorable soil conditions. We wholeheartedly agree with your appraisals.

The following table shows 1960 and total conservation accomplishments made by Wisconsin farm families, with technical assistance from the Soil Conservation Service unless otherwise noted.

	Unit	1960 accomplishments	Total to date
NORMAL SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT OPERATIONS			
District cooperators	Number	2,215	40,062.0
Basic conservation plans	do	2,178	25,865.0
Revision of basic plans	do	[1] 466	
Soil surveys	Acre	[1] 644,220	14,067,676.0
Contour stripcropping	do	52,324	1,023,161.0
Contour farming	do	[1] 51,180	521,071.0
Field stripcropping	do	368	5,010.0
Wind stripcropping	do	3,693	37,495.0
Plow planting	do	[1] 1,148	2,548.0
Diversion construction	Mile	152	2,166.0
Terracing	do	120	4,106.0
Grassed waterways	Acre	1,253	15,042.0
Surface field ditches on existing cropland	Mile	458	7,112.0
Land smoothing	Acre	[1] 2,791	14,640.0
Tile drains in existing cropland	Mile	409	4,945.0
Bedding	Acre	49	1,775.0
Land clearing	do	1,429	13,752.0
Pasture renovation	do	29,390	313,287.0
Field windbreaks	Mile	63	967.0
Woodland protection	Acre	[1] 33,522	599,175.0
Tree planting [2]	do	[1] 16,860	90,572.0
Woodland improvement [2]	do	[1] 7,812	116,175.0
Fishpond treatment	Number	[1] 37	91.0
Hedgerow planting	Rod	18,301	194,831.0
Wetland development for wildlife	Acre	[1] 609	1,368.0
Wildlife area treatment	do	1,024	21,665.0
Wildlife area protection	do	[1] 6,461	45,671.0
Streambank protection	Mile	14	97.0
Erosion control structures	Number	[1] 348	1,652.0
Floodwater retarding structures	do	[1] 101	195.0
Pond construction	do	310	1,553.0
Stockwater development	do	[1] 146	431.0
Drainage structures	do	[1] 259	1,748.0
PUBLIC LAW 566 ACTIVITIES			
Planning:			
Applications received	do	[1] 11	28.0
Applications approved by State soil conservation committee	do	[1] 13	28.0
Work plans prepared	do	3	8.0
Operations:			
Approved for operations	do	3	8.0
Floodwater retarding structures	do	[3] 3	7.0
Grade stabilization structures	do	[4] 0	0
Channel improvement	Mile	0	1.4

[1] Items for which new records were established during the past year.
[2] The Wisconsin Conservation Department provided technical assistance on these measures.
[3] 3 other installations are about 90 percent complete.
[4] 6 structures merely require "finishing touches."

Yes, in reviewing the above table we will have to agree that 1960 production was very godd. In fact, last year might be considered as the best one we have ever had in the history of soil conservation district operations here in Wisconsin.

INTERAGENCY COOPERATION

Just about every one of your annual reports had something to say about the fine interagency cooperation that exists in your respective soil conservation districts. That is swell, that is the way it should be. In fact, without it the enviable production record established here in Wisconsin would not have been possible.

As a reminder of the specific responsibilities of the several contributing agencies, we refer to those you mentioned with their respective assignments as they pertain to SCD and related programs.

The Extension Service has the responsibility for educational activities. The State soil conservation committee approves Public Law 566 watershed applications for planning assistance and provides guidance to SCD governing bodies. The Soil Conservation Service gives technical help to soil conservation district cooperators in the development and application of farm conservation plans, and has the leadership for planning and installing Public Law 566 works of improvements.

The Wisconsin Conservation Department assists farmers on woodland and wildlife management. County agricultural stabilization and conservation committees provide cost sharing through the agricultural conservation program to accelerate the installation of soil and water conservation measures. The SCS fulfills specified technical responsibilities under this program. The Farmers Home Administration is a source of credit.

County ASC committees transferred more than $278,700 to the SCS in 1960 under ACP-SCS 5 percent agreements. Of this amount, the Service earned $236,500. This money was used to employ additional aids to take care of the increased workload resulting from this program.

OTHER COOPERATION

Most of your reports mention other sources of assistance to your district. Evidently the newspapers and radio and TV stations are cooperating exceedingly well. Teachers are doing a commendable job on youth education in soil and water conservation. County highway committees and commissioners are cited for their fine help. Many county boards are making appropriations to soil conservation districts.

Vocational agriculture instructors are interesting youngsters and farmers in the values of becoming SCD cooperators. Bankers' associations, civic and sportsmen's clubs, industry, are among the other groups contributing to your program, according to your reports.

SPECIAL PROJECTS AND EVENTS

During the past year every soil conservation district in Wisconsin completed a conservation needs inventory. These reports show present land use and the changes expected by 1975. They also point up the kinds and amounts of needed conservation practices.

Seven reports were printed in 1960. Most soil conservation districts plan a publication in 1961.

Seven 1-day area workships on conservation needs and zoning were sponsored throughout the State by the State soil conservation committee during late November and early December. These meetings were very much appreciated, so your reports indicate. As a result of these sessions and the availability of conservation needs information, several counties have started to develop land use plans.

Soil Stewardship Week was given a lot of special attention during 1960, so you state.

Sixteen soil conservation districts entered the 1959–60 Goodyear Awards program. The Marathon County SCD won first place in last year's event, with Waupaca coming in a close second.

Attendance at the 1960 version of Farm Progress Days was very good. Last year's affair was held at Marshfield, with land smoothing and forage harvesting being highlighted.

Some activity has been started on the dealer-district program. Farm equipment dealers are ready, willing, and able to help you supervisors. All they want is an invitation to one of your meetings to learn what you are doing and how they can help. Give it a try, won't you?

Last, and by no means least, is the State conservation speaking contest. Nearly 1,600 contestants participated in this activity last year. The entrants get better year by year, so it seems.

New agricultural buildings were constructed in the Polk and Green County soil conservation districts last year. These house all the agricultural agencies and provide a real convenience to the farmer.

STATE ASSOCIATION

Your 1960 annual meeting at Stevens Point was well attended and very interesting, according to your comments. We fully agree with your appraisal.

As a result of resolutions adopted at this session your president has been invited to attend all meetings of the State soil conservation committee and the Wisconsin Conservation Commission. Two bills have been introduced in the legislature. One has to do with adding the words "and water" after "soil" in the designation of soil conservation districts and State soil conservation committee. The other recommended a State appropriation for direct assistance to soil conservation districts.

I have had the pleasure of being one of four agency consultants who participate in meetings of the board of directors of your State association. I can't say enough nice things about this fine group of supervisors regarding their interest, their sincerity, their friendliness, and their enthusiasm in wanting to do everything possible to make Wisconsin's soil conservation district programs click. It's unfortunate that more supervisors can't see this group in action. It's stimulating, I assure you.

LOOKING FORWARD

Anticipating increased production in 1961 is the outlook expressed in most of your reports. We, too, are optimistic. Given the right kind of weather, the current calendar year could well surpass the best of the past.

We have letters from a number of districts asking for additional personnel to take care of expanding workloads. Under present circumstances we are able to satisfy only a limited number of requests. In analyzing total manpower needs against the amount available, you will have to make some decisions on a first-things-first basis. Like most any operation, you seemingly won't have time to accomplish everything you want to see done. Being a farmowner, I can speak with some authority on this subject.

As mentioned in previous years, having too much work is better than not enough. A situation like this presents a challenge and taxes our ingenuity to the utmost.

Thank you.

Our administrator, Don A. Williams, and my SCS associates here in Wisconsin join with me in expressing sincere appreciation for the many courtesies and favors you and your fellow supervisors have extended to us.

Sincerely yours,

MARV SCHWEERS,
State Conservationist.

Unemployment and the Impact of Automation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the the following report:

UNEMPLOYMENT AND THE IMPACT OF AUTOMATION

(The following report is the result of a survey made by Congressman ELMER J. HOLLAND, Democrat of Pennsylvania, on the subject of Unemployment and the Impact of Automation, as requested in November 1960, by Congressman ADAM C. POWELL, chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, of which Congressman HOLLAND is a member.)

As someone so aptly stated it just recently—"the only growth that can be noticed in America in the recent months, is the ever-increasing list of unemployed."

Our latest unofficial figures estimate approximately 6 million people out of work, and many more if we count workers on part time and those in jobs below their capacities.

We have been informed that during this decade—from 1960 to 1970—there will be an average of 1½ to 2 million graduating from high school each year and in 1965 this number will jump to about 3 million. Some, of course, will continue their education, but we know that over two-thirds of them cannot afford to atend our colleges and universities and will be seeking employment.

There are already 500,000 fewer full-time jobs in America today than there were 3 years ago—and fewer man-hours of work are being provided in the private sector of the economy than there were 8 years ago, although the labor force has increased 5½ million during this period.

By 1970 there will be 87 million Americans willing and able to work and, as President Kennedy said during his recent campaign, this means that we must create almost 30,000 new jobs every week for 10 years just to keep pace with this growth. Without a sharper rise in jobs, our unemployment problem could easily become a nightmare.

Fortune magazine, in its January 1961 issue, notes that "the vital task ahead is one of job creation, and the vital energizing currents here are national—not regional—in scope."

Every effort must be exerted to secure full employment and make full use of our talents and skills if we want to have full production and maintain an expanding economy.

In brief, then, Government participation and aid are essential if we are to find solutions to our unemployment problems, and find them we must if we want our way of life to continue and our free enterprise economy to survive.

Since 1953, each peak of the business cycle has found unemployment a little higher than at the previous peak. With each recession, there are more unemployed than in the previous one and our unemployment is widespread among those workers considered the most employable people in the labor force * * * experienced, non-casual-workers, between the ages of 25 and 55.

As a result of the research done on this subject, I have come to the conclusion that we need long-term planning if we do not want to continue periodic recurrences of the present situation.

Automation has entered our lives—and it is here to stay.

It is already remolding our economy as well as many of our institutions and whole new concepts and systems of management are going to have to be initiated if we are to cope with it.

The second half of the 20th century could—through the advance of technology—witness the creation of an economic paradise on earth, or, if not handled correctly, we could see the violent end to all civilization because of it.

With rational planning for a balanced economic and social growth I feel the challenges raised by automation can be met successfully.

In many cases it is quite difficult to pinpoint elimination of jobs due to automation. We have found that in numerous industries, the permanent reduction of the work force—due to technological changes—are apparently postponed until a general downturn permits layoffs which can then be blamed on national or international conditions. However, when recovery occurs, many are not called back to work.

When new mechanical or electronic devices are installed, assurances are given workers in many industries that they will not be hurt or fired. However, when they leave—due to retirement or resignation—no one is hired to deplace them.

It seems that one of the greatest problems with automation is not the worker who is fired, but the worker who is not hired.

Automation is already here in—

Steel: 250,000 workers today are doing the work of 500,000 of 12 years ago and, last June, General Electric announced that a pushbutton steel mill was on its way.

Autos: In a Ford plant in Cleveland, one unit does more than 500 different operations. Within 1 hour it turns out 100 engine blocks.

Coal: 400,000 coal miners of 10 years ago have been replaced by machinery and now 200,000 miners—who work only part time—produce sufficient coal.

Oil: A small group of men run a $40-million plant by remote control from a panel board.

Radio: Where 200 men were required to assemble 1,000 radios a day, the job can now be done by 2 men.

Telephone: At one New York City hotel, where automatic phone equipment was installed, 60 telephone operators lost their jobs.

Textile: One man—who used to operate 4 looms—today operates 30 looms.

Sheet-metal work: Today 4,400 workers produce the same amount it took 45,000 to produce in 1939.

Stores: Automatic devices take orders and fills them, reads cash register tapes at day's end, records that which is sold, the money taken in, the stock that needs to be replaced, takes paper money and makes change.

Banks: Automatic devices sort checks, debits and credits depositors' accounts and makes out monthly statements.

Government: Automatic devices audit 125 million social security accounts, scans in-

come tax returns for errors and unusually large deductions, aims and fires missiles, tracks space satellites, plays war games to lay out new strategies, sorts and handles mail, plots the course of storms, sends out weather maps over the Nation.

Airlines: Makes reservations, guides planes in blind takeoffs and in landings, keeps accounts.

Railroads: Controls the movement of trains, schedules freight and keeps accounts for railroads.

Cities: Turns lights on and off as needed, with electronic eyes that react to darkness, whether due to nightfall, early twilight, storms or other causes.

Manufacturing: Guides, with punched tape, tools that turn out parts for autos, planes, missiles, and other things at a fraction of the former cost; runs, by computer, steel rolling mills, oil refinery systems.

And, here are a few of the miracles of tomorrow that are due to come and for which we must prepare ourselves:

Help, by computer analysis, in the diagnosis of illness.

Provide pushbutton telephone service that will include home extensions for intercom systems.

Operate a pushbutton steel plant that will be completely automated—from taking the customers' orders to delivering the finished product (probably the one referred to by GE in the above statement).

Transmit written messages over great distances in a few seconds' time, through the U.S. postal service.

Operate fully automatic trains.

Translate foreign language conversations, or written works in a flash (some of this work is being done now, but one man is still needed to edit the translations; they expect to do away with the one-man job).

Whole plant automation is expected * * * a system of computers to automate the entire manufacturing process was demonstrated by IBM last June. The machine monitors all the basic functions of manufacturing—sales forecasting, materials planning, inventory management, plant scheduling and work dispatching, and evaluating the results.

A machine that types directly from dictation.

The economic, social, and political problems arising from our great technological developments in the days ahead will be even more difficult and complex than we now are experiencing.

Today we have on the average of 150,000 unemployed each month losing their unemployment compensation benefits and the only outlook at the moment is possibly an extension of these benefits for 13 more weeks * * * then they will have to go on the rolls of the public assistance departments of the various States.

When men and women—who are the sole support of their families lose their jobs and are told—at the age of 40—they are too old to be considered by other industries, the future is bleak; not only for them, but for their families. We must remember that the children of these families today must be prepared to be the leaders of our Nation tomorrow—and, if they are to be raised as wards of the State, their concept of our system of government and our economy will not be too enthusiastic.

These problems are of our own making. We must find answers to them. We must find ways to retrain these men, if necessary, so that they can support and educate their families and return to work as they want to do.

We are in a new world, with new challenges, and we need new thinking. We cannot afford to waste any more time.

This report, I know, merely scratches the surface of the present conditions and indicates why we are in our state of decline.

Much more can, and should, be divulged by holding public hearings and securing accurate figures of our unemployed and their prospects for the future.

This will be the job of the Holland Subcommittee on Unemployment and the Impact of Automation which will be in full operation very shortly.

Sources of material:

Reports submitted by international unions affiliated with the industries discussed in the report.

"Union Meets Automation," New York City Central Labor Council, AFL–CIO.

"Automation—Its Impact on Business and People," by Dr. Walter Buckingham.

"The Red Challenge to Technological Renewal in the West," by Robert McKinney.

Department of Labor Reports, U.S. Department of Labor.

"Manpower—Challenge of the 1960's," U.S. Department of Labor.

Special articles in New York Times, Washington Post, labor periodicals, management periodicals, innumerable magazines, and syndicated columnists in various newspapers.

RÉSUMÉ OF REPORTS SUBMITTED BY VARIOUS UNIONS ON THE SUBJECT OF UNEMPLOYMENT AND THE IMPACT OF AUTOMATION

Auto workers: 1947–60—production increased 50 percent, employment decreased 2.9 percent, sales increased 93.4 percent, production payroll increased 21.6 percent.

The first half of 1957 and 1960—employment decreased 3.2 percent, production increased 14.9 percent.

An estimated 160,000 unemployed auto workers in Detroit will never return to automobile factories due to automation.

Boilermakers, iron shipbuilders, blacksmiths, forgers, helpers: 1958–60—6½ percent unemployed. Construction Industry, man hours worked, down 41.2 percent. Boiler manufacturing and plate fabrication, man hours worked, down 41.2 percent. Forging industry, working only 27 percent. Railroad maintenance, employment down 49.5 percent.

Majority of any of these plants are working only 3-day week.

Brewery workers (flour, cereal, soft drink, and distillery): 1950–60, Employment decreased 25 percent due to mechanization and automation in the following industries: (a) Breweries, (b) Malt beverages (beer), (c) Distilled liquor, (d) Soft drinks, (e) Malt processing, (f) Yeast processing, (g) Cigar making.

Building and construction workers: 1959–60—Unemployed, 8 percent November 1960—16 percent December 1960.

(NOTE: Automation effect has not been calculated in figures as yet, however, prefabrication is being felt considerably in construction industry.)

Building services: 1945–60—Automatic elevators replaced 40,000 elevator operators. Commercial recreation: Bowling alleys automated eliminating pinball boys. Vending machines have replaced sales clerks.

Custodial work: Cleaning machines have replaced janitors and charwomen; dishwashing machines have replaced workers in hospitals, schools, institutions, hotels, etc.

(NOTE.—This report is from New York City only. National figures are being tabulated.

Chemical workers: 1953–60—Production increased 80 percent. Employment decreased by 13,000.

Clothing workers: Unemployment in this industry is seasonal. Cutting work is automated to some extent.

Communication workers: 1955–60—Telephone business increased 25 percent. Employment decreased 5.5 percent—33,000 jobs.

(NOTE.—Telephone calls increased 60 percent from 1946 to 1960.)

Electrical workers (IUE): Electrical machinery industry: 1953–60—Production and related worker employment is down 80,000 jobs. Production output is up 20 percent.

Electric lamp industry: 1950–59—Employment down 1,500 jobs; production up by 42 percent; productivity of worker up 52 percent.

(NOTE.—Westinghouse Electric Corp. makes a completely automated lampmaking machine—output is 32 million incandescent bulbs per year, raw material fed to machine and 100 feet later completed bulbs emerge. Machine inspects, rejects imperfect products, packs bulbs, boxes in cartons, conveys to trucks and boxcars for shipment.)

Radio and television industry: 1950–60—Wiring, soldering, and component assembly automated, with the result that 50,000 jobs eliminated.

Electrical workers (IBEW): Radio: 1953–60—Federal Communications Commission authorized 1,300 stations to operate automatically. Result, 3,900 jobs eliminated as each station has approximately three jobs per station.

Television: 1958–60—Loss of 25 percent of jobs due to automation.

Telephone industry: 1959–60—Elimination of 2,122 jobs.

Electric utilities industry: 1927–60—Annual kilowatt-hour output increased 850 percent; employment increased only 11 percent.

(NOTE.—Utility plants now double size and output with no increase in employment.)

Electronics: 1947–56—Output in United States increased 325 percent; employment increased 50 percent.

Longshoremen: Negotiated contract with provisions to set up mechanization and modernization fund, $5 million a year for 5½ years to be put into fund for retraining, relocating, providing severance pay for those replaced by machines or mechanization.

Mineworkers: Bituminous coal: 1950–60—production per miner increased 100 percent. 1937–57—45 million tons more coal produced annually with 50 percent less workers. Anthracite coal: 1930–60—Elimination of 80,000 jobs.

Oilworkers: 1947–57—Operating capacity increased from 5.3 to 8.4 million barrels daily; production workers eliminated from jobs, 10,000.

Office workers: 1955–60—25 percent of jobs eliminated due to electronic machines. NOTE.—It is estimated that within the next 5 years, 4 million more office and clerical jobs will be eliminated by automation.

Post office clerks: Automation entering this field—however, those now employed have been assured their jobs will not be eliminated but they will be "frozen" and upon their departure or resignation the jobs will not be filled by others.

Railway and steamship clerks: 1946–60—37.1 percent reduction in work force due to automation. Jobs were not filled when vacated by workers retiring or resigning.

Railroad workers: 1940–60—1,000,000 jobs eliminated. NOTE.—Southern Railroad example: Operates 6,200 miles of line. Has completely dieselized; has four automatic freight yards; has centralized traffic control system; has mechanization maintenance work; has smallest repair shops use technology; has office automation—programs accounting and statistical work on electronic computer. Saved $850,000 in first year.

1946–56—Increased gross business 6 percent; efficiency up 116 percent; profits rose from $19.5 to $40.5 million, 100 percent; employment dropped from 40,000 to 22,000, 45 percent.

Retail clerks: 1947–60—Output rose 150.8 percent; employment is practically all part-time, but not by preference. NOTE.—Automation has been felt here—wrapping and packing devices, meat cutting, vending machines, etc. Serve yourself supermarkets, 35 employees in warehouse replace 150 clerks. Elimination of independent stores.

Rubber workers (tire and tube): 1947–58—Produced 100 million tires yearly; employment reduced 30 percent—31,000 jobs, work hours reduced 29 percent.

Years 1958–59—Employment remained level, production increased 22 percent.

Seafarers (Maritime workers): 1952–60—Employment down 27,500; larger and faster ships with smaller crews. NOTE.—American owned or controlled vessels registered under foreign flags—purpose of this is to avoid American wages and working conditions, American taxes and safety standards.

Year 1946—65 percent of total cargo carried in U.S. ships.

Year 1959—9.1 percent of total cargo carried in U.S. ships.

Steelworkers: 1937–59—Employment down 18.5 percent, elimination of 95,000 jobs; productivity up 121.1 percent; ingot production increased 65 percent; steel shipments increased 80.9 percent.

In 1941, 20 men were required to produce 1 ton of steel.

In 1960, 12 men were required to produce 1 ton of steel.

(NOTE.—Today we have 125,000 steelworkers unemployed; those still working have averaged this year a 34-hour workweek.

Teamsters: Trucking: Due to the increased weight and size of the trucks, the productivity per driver has increased as larger loads can be carried and fewer trucks are used. Practice of "piggybacking" is cutting into employment of truck drivers for long-haul assignments. Outlook is for business to increase but additional jobs will not result from this increase.

Terminals: This section of industry is largely automated today in loading and unloading due to conveyors, hoisting devices, inclined tracks, preloaded carts, closed circuit TV, etc. Automated and electronic data processing is being used to handle billing and related activities, including inventory data. Payroll processing, maintenance of personnel records, maintenance and operating cost and control, preparation of various reports, etc.

Dairy: Automated machinery being used to large extent in all sized dairies. Ice cream plants, milk processing plants, frozen food, from raw products to finished boxing or bottling. Even automatic cleaning of pipelines at conclusion of operations.

Canning: Extensive use of automation in this industry. 1947–58—Output per manhour increased 40 percent; employment was decreased 12 percent.

(NOTE.—Actual figures have been difficult to obtain for this report as records have not been prepared as yet.)

Textile workers: 1947–59—Production jobs decreased 38 percent; production output increased 5 percent; productivity per manhour increased almost 70 percent.

United Electrical workers: 1953–60—Electrical manufacturing industry as a whole; employment down 10 percent; production up 20 percent.

1956–60—General Electric: Jobs lost, 40,566; sales increased $259.5 million.

Lamp division: Value of shipments increased 24 percent; hourly employment decreased 1,200.

Steam turbine generator parts division: Hourly employment decreased 16,802.

CCC 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of March 22, 1961, entitled "CCC 1961":

CCC 1961

If it is carefully limited to sawing away at the backlog of conservation projects now existing in the United States, the administration's proposed domestic youth corps program merits enactment this year.

Like the quite different new oversea Peace Corps, this revival of the 1930's Civilian Conservation Corps should be started on a modest scale. Its usefulness should be tested on such existing programs as soil and water conservation surveys and the Park Service's project 66 for improving national park facilities.

The approach proposed by the administration is—again like the Peace Corps—modeled directly on a bill submitted last year by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, the upper chamber's fountain of youthful ideas.

It's aim is twofold: both to speed conservation of national resources and to attack delinquency among jobless teenagers. Young boys from 17 to 19, mainly school dropouts, would be enlisted in the neo-CCC to serve for a year for token expense money, room and board. They would dig ditches, construct watercourse retaining walls, plant tree seedlings, assist in soil conservation efforts, and aid engineers and surveyors—instead of falling into gangs or dabbling in drugs and disillusion.

The value of what used to be called honest labor in the open air should never be underestimated. Cynics on this subject consist mainly of those who have never tried the outdoor life. Probably no better preventive of delinquency caused by sheer big-city boredom could be contrived.

The lawmakers will, of course, wish to make sure that provisions for an eventual 150,000-man corps are sufficiently flexible to permit decreases, preventing empire building and make-work projects in future years.

Tomorrow's Challenge in Water Pollution Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address entitled "Tomorrow's Challenge in Water Pollution Control," delivered before the 14th Purdue Industrial Wastes Conference held in Lafayette, Ind., on May 5, 1959, by Gordon E. McCallum, the distinguished and able Chief of the Division of Water Supply and Pollution Control, U.S. Public Health Service.

The rapid rate of urbanization in our modern society adds to existing problems and creates new ones in water pollution control. The last basic waste treatment process was developed in 1916, 45 years ago. What was considered as "complete" sewage treatment can hardly be so classed today when great quantities of foamy detergents and complex chemicals are daily spewed into our water supplies. Research is faced with a great and immediate challenge to provide the answers in this field.

On February 9, 1961, I joined Representative JOHN BLATNIK in introducing legislation which, if enacted, will help to overcome the 45-year lethargy of research and bring it into the struggle to clean up and conserve our water resources.

Mr. McCallum's address testifies to the long-range concern of the officials most immediately concerned with the administration of the water pollution control program. I congratulate him on the frankness of his appraisal, a characteristic which I find very refreshing and increasingly rare, and I commend his address to the consideration of my colleagues.

The address follows:

TOMORROW'S CHALLENGE IN WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

(By G. E. McCallum, Chief, Division of Water Pollution Control, Bureau of State Services, Public Health Service, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.)

I am grateful for the privilege of being with you today. It is always an honor to participate in the Purdue Industrial Wastes Conference and to have the opportunity of sharing our views with you and having yours in return. Today I am to discuss "Tomorrow's Challenge in Water Pollution."

My prognosis does not stem from experience as a researcher. Rather, it is a belief now voiced by some of our most experienced water pollution control administrators—men who have studied or witnessed the anachronistic development of water pollution control practices.

On every hand we see planning to meet tomorrow's needs. Business, welfare agencies, and government combine their capabilities for such things as supermarkets, superhighways, revamped schools, and modern hospitals. Such forward-looking philosophy has been expressed by one corporation's slogan, "Progress Is Our Most Important Product."

I wish I could look ahead to this conference some 20 years hence and hear some successor appraise the accuracy with which we predict tomorrow's challenge. Past experiences, right or wrong, may point the way.

Until perhaps about World War II we were largely concerned with pollution that caused public nuisances and waterborne diseases. We were also concerned with taste and odor problems in drinking water and with the destruction of fish by toxic substances and by oxygen depletion. Dilution often generously helped solve our problems—or at least allowed more time in which to develop solutions.

A review of the early progress in research and investigations of stream pollution reveals that the work was motivated by the need to find answers to immediate or anticipated problems. That great milestone reached in 1887 in the founding of the Lawrence Experiment Station, in which Mills and his coworkers, Drown, Hazen, and Sedgwick, demonstrated the biological nature of sewage treatment, is an outstanding example of an effort to meet a need. In the years that followed progress was rapid in the understanding of biological oxidation of wastes and their effects on receiving waters. The need for those studies was amply demonstrated by the speed with which their findings were put in practice.

Other needs resulted in more milestones. We might include among them the trickling filter and separate sludge digestion. Interestingly, perhaps, the last basic sewage treatment process to be developed was activated sludge in 1916.

Thus for 43 years no fundamentally new sewage treatment processes have been developed. Although many refinements in the art have been made and the effectiveness and capacity of treatment increased, the fundamental principles have remained the

same. We cannot deny that they have served, and served well, the purpose for which they were intended—treatment of municipal wastes of that era.

In the meantime we are being confronted by municipal wastes of a changing character and increasing amounts which are closing in on our dilution reserves.

Respecting the past as prologue, we find that many conditions which faced those early investigators were quite different from those of today. In 1900 only about one-third of the 75 million persons of this country lived in urban areas. Water use and production of wastes were corrsepondingly less. The character of municipal wastes was quite well understood and found to be amenable to the treatment developed. Most important, however, was the advantage of a favorable dilution factor which we are gradually losing. Significant to ponder is the realization that our municipal waste treatment processes are not necessarily devised to cope with all conditions today. What will an appraisal of their suitability reveal in 1980? Is it presumptuous to hope for a new breakthrough of the significance achieved by Mills, et al.

We all recognize that this need of a new milestone stems from the inevitable reuse of water. The reuse of waters in such rivers as the Ohio and the Miami is reported to be in excess of three times dependable low flow. Will our waste treatment practices be adequate to meet the high rate of turnover by 1980 when predicated total water use will exceed available supply by 100 billion gallons per day, and when a six-time reuse of many streams is projected?

The task of collecting, treating, and disposing of the wastes from today's metropolitan areas is already taxing the limits of our present knowledge. Problems of tomorrow's supercities stagger the imagination. Troublesome conditions prevail in waters below a growing number of our cities, even though "complete" treatment is employed. Chicago, Indianapolis, Columbus, and Dayton are reported to have experienced trouble.

It has been noted that under sustained conditions of low stream flow, the dilution factor available to these cities varied from 0.14 cubic feet per second per 1,000 population in Columbus, Ohio on the Scioto River, to 0.65 cubic feet per second per 1,000 population in Dayton on the Miami River. Population increases of 2 percent annually in these cities, as predicted, will further reduce dilution by 35–40 percent by 1980. Compare these dilution factors with the 4 cubic feet per second per 1,000 population often considered necessary for assimilation of primary effluent, or 0.6 cubic feet per second per 1,000 population for "completely" treated sewage whose B.O.D. has been reduced by 90 percent. Admittedly, this rule-of-thumb criterion is crude—but the warning it gives is ominous.

The Chicago Sanitary District, whose sewage system has been cited by the American Society of Civil Engineers as one of the seven wonders of modern engineering, is gravely concerned with the effects of its highly treated wastes. The effluents discharged to the Illinois waterway have a population equivalent of 1 million persons. Testimony has been presented before congressional committees that not only nuisance conditions, but health hazards, exist in the Illinois Waterway.

Each recent session of Congress has acted upon bills authorizing increased diversion of waters from Lake Michigan to the Illinois Waterway. H.R. 1 in the present Congress is the latest. Proponents of these bills contend that additional diversion is needed for dilution of Chicago's treated wastes. Several Great Lakes States are opposing diversion, even on a temporary basis for study purposes. They maintain that increased diversion would adversely affect shipping, hydroelectric power generation, and property values throughout the entire Great Lakes area.

Litigation on this issue is now pending in the U.S. Supreme Court.

This is but one example of like problems confronting water pollution control administrators. I select it simply because it is a situation with which I am somewhat familiar, not as a research man, but because of my position as a water pollution control administartor. Possibly I should apologize for using a personal experience, but personal experiences are those which have the most impact upon us. Each year my staff and I must do a great deal of work as technical consultants and witnesses at congressional hearings on legislation pertaining to this problem. Furthermore, we must collaborate with the Justice Department on the litigation in the Supreme Court.

What must be done about Chicago's treated sewage? Is more diversion to the Illinois Waterway the answer when so many witnesses contend this would be detrimental to other uses of the Great Lakes? Is dispersion of Chicago's treated sewage into Lake Michigan feasible, as has been proposed to both the Congress and the Supreme Court? What effect would this have on present water uses of Lake Michigan?

The Chicago situation is a classic example of the profound social, legal, technical and environmental difficulties which have evolved from a metropolitan waste disposal problem. We find ourselves indirectly involved not only in an interstate controversy, but one involving international relations, because of a difficult pollution problem. If we cannot treat wastes sufficiently to avoid nuisance conditions under our best, most modern practices today, how shall we meet the water needs of future generations?

I don't profess to have the answer to these problems. But, limiting our concern to tomorrow's municipal wastes, could we agree that one of our great challenges is the development of practical—and perhaps novel—methods of attaining higher degrees of waste purifications?

Perhaps we would do well to pause here for a moment to consider what we accomplish by today's complete sewage treatment and, possibly more revealing, what we do not accomplish. I would like to show a few slides based on information furnished the Public Health Service by the city of Chicago and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago. It is recognized that some of the material added to the water by municipal use and which is not removed by treatment, is not necessarily significant in the alleged pollution of the Illinois Waterway. Again, I should like to emphasize that this case is being used only as an example of what I consider to be a very great research need. Similar situations, of an even more serious nature, exist throughout the country.

I would like to point out just how good a job we are doing in our modern sewage treatment processes.

On the slides showing effectiveness of complete sewage treatment, the bar on the left (slide 1) and the one at the top (slides 3, 4, 5, 6, and 8) represent raw Lake Michigan water. The middle bars show raw sewage, and the third bar on each slide shows the treated effluent.

You will notice that several of the slides show figures in tons per day. We have been requested by congressional committees and other Federal agencies to present data on the Chicago problem in this manner. The flow on which these data are based is about 1.25 BGD, or 1,900 cubic feet per second.

SLIDE 1: DEGRADATION OF WATER QUALITY AFTER ONE MUNICIPAL USE EVEN AFTER COMPLETE SEWAGE TREATMENT

You will observe that one usage increases the solids from 170 to 654 parts per million—136 parts per million of which are removed by treatment—leaving 348 parts per million, or 1,787 tons of added impurities in the form of dissolved organic matter and minerals.

Sixty percent of the added solids is in the form of dissolved minerals—40 percent in the form of dissolved organic matter.

SLIDE 2: EFFECT OF MUNICIPAL USE OF WATER QUALITY—TOTAL SOLIDS

In one use, total solids are increased from 170 to 500 parts per million, which is the maximum recommended concentration in the Public Health Service drinking water standards.

SLIDE 3: NUTRIENTS REMAINING AFTER COMPLETE TREATMENT

Nutrients are increased by municipal water use from 0.35 parts per million to 7 parts per million and reduced to 5 parts per million by sewage treatment.

Thus, 2 to 30 tons a day of nitrates and phosphates are discharged in the effluent. These are reported to be a cause of trouble in this case.

One can only speculate what effects these amounts of nutrients would have if discharged to Lake Michigan.

SLIDE 4: ORGANICS REMAINING AFTER COMPLETE TREATMENT

Organic matter is increase from 0.5 part per million in the lake water to 223 parts per million in the treated sewage.

Of special interest is the high proportion of dissolved organic matter which is not removed by complete treatment. This represents an addition of more than 1,000 tons a day of pollutants to the receiving stream.

SLIDE 5: DETERGENTS REMAINING AFTER COMPLETE TREATMENT

Of the 223 parts per million of organic matter left in the treated sewage, we have been able to identify only 7 parts per million which are the detergents shown on this slide. This adds up to about 35 tons a day in the effluent.

SLIDE 6: MINERAL SALTS REMAINING AFTER COMPLETE TREATMENT

This slide shows that none of the dissolved mineral salts added to municipal water by use is removed by conventional sewage treatment. Two hundred and eighty-three parts per million, or 1,400 tons a day of mineral salts are discharged in the effluent.

SLIDE 7: EFFECT OF MUNICIPAL USE ON WATER QUALITY—CHLORIDES

Chlorides are increased from 6 to 90 parts per million by one municipal water use. This is of interest because three uses of this type would result in the 250 parts per million maximum concentration recommended in the Public Health Service drinking water standards.

SLIDE 8: BOD REMAINING AFTER "COMPLETE" TREATMENT

The BOD is increased from 1 parts per million to 125 parts per million through one municipal use, and is reduced by treatment to 18 parts per million. Thus some 100 tons per day of BOD are discharged in the effluent.

This 85 to 90 percent removal of BOD looks good when compared with what is accomplished with dissolved organic matter of dissolved minerals by treatment. And, this relatively high removal should look good because one of the major jobs a modern sewage treatment plant is designed to do is remove BOD. Nevertheless, according to testimony presented to the Congress, it is the BOD remaining in the effluent that is the primary cause of trouble in the Chicago situation.

The solution to the problem at Chicago is being sought through legislation and litigation. Would it not be solved better, however, by research to develop practical methods of attaining higher degrees of waste purifications?

Here in this room are represented the technical skills that must meet tomorrow's challenge in this field. The mysteries confronting us must be unraveled. This is not a responsibility to be taken lightly. It will require the best efforts of each of us.

Tax Deferment for Self-Employed Retirement Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, it is my intention and purpose to support H.R. 10, a bill which is designed to enable our fellow citizens who are self-employed to establish voluntary retirement plans. This legislation is designed to give the millions of citizens who work for themselves equal tax treatment with that enjoyed by the many millions of workers benefited by tax deferment on their pension plans.

This bill is not new in its purpose, although it incorporates several new features. For more than a decade similar legislation has been introduced and on two occasions has passed this House. Simply stated, the bill would permit the self-employed farmers, barbers, plumbers, druggists, and all the other types of small businessmen, to postpone the payment of income taxes on certain amounts set aside for retirement until they start drawing their pensions. Thus the self-employed worker would regain equal status with the some 20 million employees of corporations who today enjoy this tax advantage.

In addition to eliminating the unfair discrimination against the self-employed, the bill would greatly encourage the establishment of private pension funds which would supplement the Social Security program. At the very time this Nation considers proposals to aid retired people through medical care and increased social security benefits—requiring greatly increased expenditures of taxpayers' funds—this bill would offer an alternative or supplemental aid to the retired self-employed requiring no expenditure of Federal funds.

Mr. Speaker, many have written that the strength of our great country has its foundation on the solid American middleclass. The millions of citizens who are self-employed for the most part belong to this group and possess the qualities of courage, enterprise, and initiative so essential to the survival of our way of life. Today there are distinct indications of a tendency for individuals to seek government or corporate employment rather than small business or professional positions, often largely because of the retirement benefits not available to self-employed persons. I, therefore urge that this Congress act swiftly to remove this inequitable and discriminatory feature of our tax structure and encourage individual thrift and initiative.

Better Answers to Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the editorial section of the Christian Science Monitor, titled "Better Answers to Communism," dated April 4, 1961:

BETTER ANSWERS TO COMMUNISM

It is understandable that many individuals desire a more active, personal part in combating world communism. But current demands for congressional investigation of an organization whose leader has charged three American Presidents with being Red tools underscore again the pitfalls which beset the anti-Communist path.

J. Edgar Hoover, who probably knows as much as any American about fighting communism, recently stated that the "job of curtailing and containing communism is one for legally constituted authorities with the steadfast cooperation of every loyal citizen." The FBI chief does not deny the individual a role but he warns against reckless charges and vigilante action.

The FBI has made good use of citizens who as undercover agents under its specific directions infiltrated and exposed Communist groups. But Mr. Hoover knows how the work of professionals can be hampered by reckless charges. False tips can divert the trackers, and continued mistaken "wolf, wolf" alarms create apathy.

Alertness is urgently required. Too few Americans are awake to the real nature of this evil. But excessive fear breeds a rejection of democratic processes. It leads decent, honorable citizens to use dishonorable and authoritarian means to combat the evils they fear.

It too often fosters a totalitarian attitude which attacks everyone who will not fight communism in one prescribed way. It induces a self-defeating, self-righteous distrust and tearing down of men who lead freedom's cause in key sectors.

Indeed it would be easy to conclude that such damage to a healthy America was planned in Moscow. And some thoughtful moderates will contend that this radicalism of the right splits, discredits, and weakens the very forces in America which should be most effective in combating the opposite extreme—that which in the name of "liberalism" often appears to be "greasing the Communist skids" by moving toward submergence of individual and local interests in a paternalistic superstate.

But of course the best answer to either tendency will not be found in suspicion and hate. It lies rather in a greater understanding of and devotion to the religious ideals and constitutional concepts which give vitality to free societies. Exposure of mistakes is in order. But new negative denunciations are no cure for old.

The core of totalitarianism is disregard for the individual. The core of free societies is concern for the individual. This has its roots in religious teachings that man is the son of God. Persons who keep this distinction clear in their thought and action can indeed have an active and wisely effective part in combating communism.

Positive trust in divine guidance and protection should displace a conspiratorial distrust. Positive rededication to a religious sense of brotherhood should lessen concern with divisive organizational "fronts." More positive reliance on the spiritual force of truth, justice, and freedom (when exemplified) should ease obsessive fears of subversion.

Study of and appreciation for precious civil liberties and individual rights should be a more positive answer than either the maligning or misinterpretation of them. Active efforts to set up noble goals and to provide the equality of opportunity which will permit every individual to achieve his full potential is a more positive answer than any anticommunism which adopts totalitarian methods to fight totalitarianism.

James R. Hoffa Mounts a National Drive Against the Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the Meadville (Pa.)—where the main shops of the Erie Railroad are located—Tribune of April 10, 1961 carried an Associated Press report on the latest activities of James R. Hoffa who has urged his "1,700,000 union members to pepper their Congressmen with demands for support of legislation pending in the Senate that Hoffa said would stop the Interstate Commerce Commission from allowing special low rail rates to haul freight in competition with trucks."

According to Mr. Hoffa the ICC is allowing railroads to charge excessive rates for freight handled solely by the trains and then to put rates into effect in competition with trucking that are below the actual cost of operation.

The Associated Press reports that—

Hoffa urged Teamsters members to threaten Members of Congress with loss of political support if they oppose the pending legislation, and to form women's auxiliaries, enlist support of businessmen, carry on house-to-house campaigning, and be ready to make a march on Washington.

Mr. Hoffa is now concentrating a large part of his efforts in an attack against piggyback transportation, and Members of Congress. I am ready for him, and I think other Members should get ready, too, to repel this attack.

Bills have been introduced in the Congress which, if they become law, would result in the railroads being unable to compete for the transportation business, and thus assure the supremacy of those competing forms of transportation which have been so powerfully assisted by the Federal Government.

If these bills are adopted, the railroads will be left with only that part of the transportation business which other forms of transportation—such as the trucking industry now dominated by Mr. Hoffa—find unprofitable.

Clair M. Roddewig, president, Association of Western Railways, has pointed out that—

These newer modes of transportation are engaged in a campaign to force Congress to restore the competitive shelter which they have enjoyed since their birth.

Meanwhile they are continuing their efforts to intimidate the Interstate Commerce Commission, which has been extremely hesitant about loosening the competitive restraints on railroad transportation as clearly intended by the Transportation Act of 1958.

They have the support, too, of powerful allies who are the special beneficiaries of these newer forms of transportation, or whose selfish interests are otherwise identified with them. James Hoffa and his powerful Teamsters Union are in the front ranks.

It would appear that the competitors of the railroads have a great deal of confidence in their political strength, demanding, as they do, that Congress rescind a long and carefully considered policy that it adopted only a couple of years before.

The Federal Government is in the transportation business up to its neck, according to Mr. Roddewig who has said that—

Government owns the highways—a public investment of $150 billion in these transportation facilities.

Government owns the inland waterways—a public investment of more than $5 billion in these transportation facilities.

With Canada, the U.S. Government owns the St. Lawrence Seaway—an investment by this country, to date, of $131 million in this transportation facility.

Government owns the airports—a public investment of about $5 billion in these transportation facilities.

And this list could be extended considerably. It would include the Panama Canal; navigation aids for air and water transportation; harbor improvements; and so on.

How much money is involved: Who knows? Whatever the total, it is many times more than the investment of private capital in railroad rights-of-way, tracks, bridges, tunnels, signals, and the other roadway facilities of the railroads.

These roadway facilities used by railroad trains are comparable to—indeed, are the counterparts of—the roadway facilities owned by government at various levels, and used by the motor vehicles, barges, ships, and airplanes which are owned and operated by private interests in competition with the railroads.

The railroads and the privately owned pipelines are the only forms of transportation whose roadway facilities are not owned by the Government.

And it should be reasonably clear that unless the Government takes its feet off the necks of the railroads, it won't be long before the Government will own them too.

Mr. Roddewig makes out a convincing case for the railroads, and there is a very real danger that, unless a more realistic approach is taken to the problems of the railroads, they will, indeed, soon be owned by the Government.

Some wag has pointed out that one way for the Government to solve the railroad problem would be to turn their management over to James R. Hoffa.

If Hoffa were in the driver's seat, perhaps he and his friends and allies would change their views about the railroads being an outmoded form of transportation.

Perhaps Mr. Hoffa could even persuade the Federal Government to take the necessary steps to keep the railroad industry in this Nation alive.

Another proposal would be to lease the railroads to some European country and then to help that country out with mutual security funds.

In any event, and all levity aside, the railroad industry will not long survive with both James Hoffa and the Federal Government competing with each other to do this great industry in.

Mr. Speaker, the railroads are indispensable. They are the only form of transportation that can move anything anywhere, at anytime. They require less manpower and fuel per ton of freight moved than any other form of land transportation, and the unit costs go down as the volume of freight moved goes up.

This ability to reduce costs through volume, and to obtain volume through reduced charges, is to the advantage of both consumers and industry. Everyone will be deprived of these advantages by unwise regulations which tie the hands of the railroad industry and which prevent the railroad industry from competing with other forms of mass transportation.

I include as part of my remarks an article by Victor Riesel which was published in the Erie Morning News of April 10, 1961. It gives an important insight into the mind and activities of James Hoffa:

JIMMIE HOFFA MUST BE KNOWN BY THE COMPANY HE KEEPS

(By Victor Riesel)

WASHINGTON.—Jimmie Hoffa, who despite certain rumors is as mortal as the rest of us, should be known by the company he keeps, like the rest of us. For some years now his union has been going steady with the Pacific longshoremen led by Mr. Harry Bridges, who numbers among his friends and associates many of the Soviet's U.S.-hating global labor leaders. And that's an understatement.

Thus it is of intense interest to our citizenry that Harry Bridges, president of the West Coast Longshoremen's Union, flew from San Francisco to his convention in Honolulu on March 30—and just about the same time Teamsters' President Hoffa dispatched two of his own union's representatives to the Hawaiian convention of this union, long friendly to the Sino-Soviet bloc.

If the two representatives of Hoffa's union do their duty at the leftwing longshoremen's convention and return with official reports of the parley the small print should make interesting reading to Brother Hoffa.

It is, for example, the belief of Bridges and his high command that the Cuban revolution has increased that island's agricultural output, reduced unemployment and raised wages. Bridges & Co., also feel that if through the efforts of the United States the Cuban revolution fails, it will be a blow to the Cuban people.

It is Mr. Bridges' privilege to be sweet on Castro, golfer and revolutionist. But Mr. Hoffa has publicly in the past few years asked Bridges and the Pacific Coast longshoremen to be his partners in a national transportation federation—and a federation all of whose union contracts would expire on the same day. Is it therefore unreasonable to expect some comment from Hoffa on his friend's attitude towards Cuba? No compulsion mind you, just sort of a moral issue now.

Furthermore, Harry Bridges and his union officially are for trade with Peiping China—which is not exactly a benign growth in the troubled underbelly of Asia. What is Mr. Hoffa's attitude on that pro-China trade position taken by this union with which he is linked on the west coast?

Hoffa should look as closely at what happened during the weeklong convention there, not too far from Pearl Harbor, as he does at an employer's offer. The Teamsters chief would then observe that the Bridges leadership believes that U.S. economic and military aid to some of our Asiatic friends will create explosions in South Vietnam and South Korea. Likewise Hoffa will note mighty little criticism of Communist forces where the Sino-Soviet bloc is brinking close to global war.

What thinks Mr. Hoffa of all this?

And though there can be noted no harshness towards the Iron Curtain bloc, there was warning that the civil liberties of the United States are endangered by the actions of congressional leaders.

Of course there is no insinuation here that silence on Hoffa's part means conformity with his colleague in the Teamster-sponsored Conference of Transportation Unity. It is just that constant silence on Harry Bridges' political opinions and the editorial stands of Bridges' newspaper, The Dispatcher, appears to put Hoffa in an awkward position. There was, for example, not too long ago a double-page spread in the longshoremen's publication, which appeared to speak highly of present-day Hungary.

Hoffa might send right down to his expert research department. He will be told that on February 24, 1961, The Dispatcher ran a feature called "ILWU Members Take a Look at Hungary." This is a firsthand report of a group which arrived in Budapest August 6, 1960—some 6 months before the big feature was printed. There are many hard-working American truckdrivers who are of Hungarian descent. They might like to hear what Hoffa thinks of such a report which makes all things seem so peaceful in the land occupied by Chairman Khrushchev's tank divisions.

Public Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of legislation to expand and develop the public junior colleges, I was pleased to note that the American Association of School Administrators meeting in San Francisco, Calif., St. Louis, Mo., and Philadelphia, Pa., adopted, among others, a resolution urging the expansion and rapid development of 2-year public junior colleges. Under unanimous consent, I include this resolution in the Appendix of the RECORD.

RESOLUTION EXTENDING PUBLIC EDUCATION

As the economic, social, and technical aspects of our civilization become broader, deeper, and more complex, it becomes increasingly imperative that we both intensify the preparation of all citizens and extend the opportunities for additional education to increasing proportions of our total population. Recognizing the growing need for opportunities to pursue higher education and recognizing that universities and colleges may be relieved greatly by the community college, the American Association of School Administrators urges the continued expansion and rapid development of 2-year public junior colleges, community colleges, vocational and technical schools, or other similar public post-high-school educational opportunities, and further recommends that vigorous measures be taken to continue to improve the quality of existing programs.

Rural Areas Development Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, in 1955 a request was made for an appropriation of $15 million to be used in the rural development program. Under the rural development program submitted the main objectives were an increase of income for small farmers with efforts to be made in making the land provide a higher level of living. In addition, better management of timber resources on our farms was to be considered and the credit needs for small farmers was to receive immediate attention. Under the vocational training program plans were to be made for the acceleration of vocational training of our young people on the farms and better health services with improved nutrition was to be given every consideration. Pilot counties were designated in many States and the objectives of the program were fully carried out.

Every dollar expended in the rural development program under the original appropriation and in the small additional amounts which have been used in the Extension Service each year has produced untold benefits for our farmers. No State in our Union has received more benefits from this program than has the State of Kentucky. One of the low income counties in the Second Congressional District in Kentucky was selected as one of the three pilot counties for Kentucky. This county is Butler County and the impact of the rural development program is directly responsible for many improvements in this particular county. Accomplishments such as a new health unit, an increase in local employment, erection of three modern buildings on the main street of the county seat town, a new Post Office building, construction of new homes and business houses, improvement of roads and schools, erection of a building for use as a meeting place for the rural development group and improvements generally in living conditions on the farms in Butler County are tangible examples of the effectiveness of this program. The people of this county are convinced that the rural development program is the soundest approach yet devised to gaining long range economic development and growth in our rural towns and communities. These people understand that the program's effectiveness depends upon their continued interest. The success of the rural development program in this county is recognized throughout the State of Kentucky and, Mr. Speaker, the same could be said of many low income counties throughout our country today if we decided to continue the rural development program as originally planned.

Mr. Speaker, recently our new Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, established a Board for rural areas development and, at the same time, issued Memorandum No. 1448 which pertains to the rural areas development program.

As pointed out by the Secretary in his announcement, the rural areas development program, in order to be successful, must stimulate local initiative to develop more jobs, more efficient family farms, new skills for willing hands, and greater opportunity for the youth who must soon decide whether to stay in his home community or seek a job elsewhere. The rural development program was a successful program and this program, together with other programs, such as the small watershed projects and the FFA program have been successfully operated, and the experience gained from same should now give us the necessary incentive to operate a rural areas development program successfully.

I know that every Member of the House will be interested in reading the announcement and the memorandum incorporated herein.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith the announcement and memorandum referred to above:

SECRETARY FREEMAN ESTABLISHES BOARD FOR RURAL AREAS DEVELOPMENT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., March 21, 1961.

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman moved today to begin mobilizing the U.S. Department of Agriculture for maximum assistance to State and local groups in a broad program of rural area development.

He established a Rural Areas Development Board with membership from 11 departmental agencies and named John A. Baker, Director of Agricultural Credit Services, as chairman.

A Rural Areas Development staff was also created to serve the Board. It will be headed by John M. Lovorn, formerly of the Farmers Home Administration.

The Secretary said the new Board will be responsible for redirecting the programs of the Department so that they will be of greater help to farming communities and small towns attempting to develop means to earn more diversified income.

Major responsibilities of the new Rural Areas Development staff will include: Recommending areas for priority attention; reviewing departmental programs to assure that they are providing maximum help to local groups; maintaining liaison with other Federal Departments on the program; preparing inventories of service provided by the Department of Agriculture in program areas.

Secretary Freeman emphasized that, while the Board will initiate and coordinate the supporting programs of the Department, State and local leaders will be primarily responsible for initiating and carrying forward area programs and individual development projects to stimulate economic growth in rural areas.

"Through this program, the full resources of the Department will be directed toward the provision of tools for use of local development efforts to eliminate underemployment and the blight of chronic poverty in rural America," he said.

"We know that a program of this type will help promote new industries in areas where a factory is the breath of life to a whole county. It can mean developing a new market for old products and it can mean development of new products for new markets.

"But where today we have a few good examples of rural development we want a thousand success stories tomorrow. The Department will supply substantially expanded leadership and support to help farmers and small town residents and their organizations and local and State government units to convert desire into ambition, and hope into action.

"To be successful, this program should stimulate local initiative to develop more jobs, more efficient family farms, new skills for willing hands, and greater opportunity for the youth who must soon decide whether to stay in his home community or seek a job elsewhere.

"We intend to build this effort on the base of experience gained in such programs as rural electrification, development of cooperatives, farm credit, extension, FFA, small watershed projects, rural development, and other programs in soil, water, and forest improvement and conservation of natural and human resources."

The 11 agencies represented on the Rural Areas Development Board are: Agricultural Marketing Service, Agricultural Research Service, Commodity Stabilization Service, Economic Research Service, Farmers Home Administration, Farmer Cooperative Service, Federal Extension Service, Forest Service, Rural Electrification Administration, Soil Conservation Service, and Statistical Reporting Service.

RURAL AREAS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Memorandum No. 1448.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., March 21, 1961.

1. Objective: Underemployment in rural America is a serious problem. More than 35 percent of the farm families had incomes under $2,000 in 1959. The full resources of the Department of Agriculture must be directed toward the elimination of this serious low-income underemployment problem State and local authorities throughout the Nation are aware of this situation and are attempting to stimulate economic growth and income opportunities in areas of underemployment. All Department of Agriculture agencies must commit their resources toward the support of the State and local authorities in this work. The Department expects, through the means established in this memorandum, to assure needed assistance to local initiative, leadership and coordinated action in meeting the economic needs of rural areas, in keeping with the broad responsibilities of the Department.

2. Direction of rural areas development program: The Director of Agricultural Credit Services is hereby designated to supervise and direct the rural areas development program and to coordinate and focus the resources of the departmental agencies in their assistance to the State, local, private, community, Statewide organizations, farm organizations and interested individuals working toward the improvement of underemployed areas.

3. Rural areas development staff: In order to provide for effective departmental participation in this effort, a rural areas development staff is hereby established, under the general supervision and direction of the Director of Agricultural Credit Services. The duties of the rural areas development staff will be to—

(a) Recommend the delineation of development areas, on the basis of the economic subregional grouping of rural counties, for use by the Secretary in formally designating such areas.

(b) Maintain a continuous study to determine how programs of the Department can be (1) brought to bear on the particular problems in each designated rural development area, (2) assure that program agencies are giving effective technical assistance to private groups and local and State governments in formulating a comprehensive development program and are making their full resources available in supporting project plans for each designated area.

(c) Prepare for each designated development area a departmental rural area de-

velopment program inventory, consisting of an itemization of the services and programs, and proposed improvements thereof, currently provided by the Department. The inventory for each designated area shall be periodically revised as required by changing conditions.

(d) Maintain continuous liaison with appropriate departments and agencies of the executive branch to assure coordination of effort and utilization of all available resources in the total program.

(e) Prepare and publish current reports on local achievement and progress in formulating and implementing rural development programs in designated areas.

4. Rural Areas Development Board: There is hereby established, within the Department, a Rural Areas Development Board, whose function shall be to provide advisory aid to the Secretary and the Rural Areas Development staff in appraising and determining program needs, and to provide liaison with Department agencies in planning and carrying out a fully coordinated action program. Establishment of the Board is designed to assure effective participation by appropriate agencies and offices of the Department and application of all Departmental resources to implementation of the program. The Board will consist of representatives of the following agencies: Agricultural Marketing Service, Agricultural Research Service, Commodity Stabilization Service, Economic Research Service, Farmers Home Administration, Farmer Cooperative Service, Federal Extension Service, Forest Service, Rural Electrification Administration, Soil Conservation Service, and Statistical Reporting Service.

The head of each designated agency shall designate a responsible permanent representative to serve on the Rural Areas Development Board who will represent the interest and activity of his agency in the rural areas development program.

The Director of Agricultural Credit Services shall be the Chairman of the Board; the Director of the Rural Areas Development staff shall be the executive secretary.

Each agency represented on the Board shall develop operating policies and procedures for effectuating its part in providing services and technical assistance to private groups and State and local governmental agencies in moving ahead rapidly with the Rural Areas Development program. Agency plans for implementing their responsibilities in the program shall be presented to the Chairman of the Rural Areas Development Board for review and approval.

5. Agency and staff office cooperation: The Rural Area Development Board and staff shall draw upon other departmental agencies and staff offices for information and assistance needed in carrying out their responsibilities.

6. Local participation: Priority attention shall be given to requiring that initiation of activities under the Rural Areas Development program and maximum participation therein shall rest with citizens and organizations and groups of citizens and State and local governments and instrumentalities thereof in rural areas.

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary.

The Padre of the Americas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the House today was led in prayer by one who has justly earned the honor of being called "the padre of the Americas." The Reverened Dr. Joseph F. Thorning is the pastor of St. Joseph's-on-Carrollton Manor, a historic church in the Sixth Congressional District of Maryland. But Father Thorning ministers to a congregation that extends far beyond the geographical boundaries of his parish. His intimate knowledge of our Latin American neighbors has justified the respect in which he is held by his friends in both the Americas. It explains his presence in the House today in anticipation of Pan American Day.

Father Thorning's humanitarian interest in the welfare of our good neighbors reflects Thomas Jefferson's attitude toward Latin America when, as Secretary of State, he said:

Nor are we acting for ourselves, alone, but for the whole human race.

And I know that Father Thorning's interest in the affairs of Latin America is a reflection of his concern for the future of all mankind.

It is not often that a Member of this House can welcome a constituent of such distinction to participation in the proceedings of this body. I take a particular pride in extending that welcome to Father Thorning today, and thank him for the prayer that he has offered.

Military Survivors, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the State Legislature of California on March 23 adopted House Resolution 174, relative to an organization known as Military Survivors, Inc. The resolution which was introduced by Assemblymen Luckel, Schrade, Hegland, and Mills pays tribute to Military Survivors, Inc., and under unanimous consent I include the resolution as a portion of my remarks:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 174

Resolution relative to commending Military Survivors, Inc.

Whereas Military Survivors, Inc., is a nonprofit organization devoted to assisting the surviving dependents of U.S. Armed Forces personnel throughout the United States and in some outlying areas; and

Whereas the membership of Military Survivors, Inc., is composed of widows, retired service personnel, and other survivors of service personnel with a keen awareness of the problems and hardships confronting persons who have lost loved ones in military service; and

Whereas since its formation in August of 1955, Military Survivors, Inc., has by mail, telephone, and personal contacts helped hundreds of survivors of servicemen in all branches of the uniformed services; and

Whereas the organization has contributed to the passage of legislation substantially benefiting thousands of military survivors: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That Military Survivors Inc., is hereby commended for its fine work and accomplishments; and be it further

Resolved, That the members of this assembly pay tribute to the founders and members of Military Survivors, Inc., for their inspiring devotion to so worthy a cause; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly prepare and transmit a suitably prepared copy of this resolution to Military Survivors, Inc.

Secretary McNamara Shows Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, with permission to revise and extend my remarks I am placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent article entitled "McNamara Speeding Many Inquiries, Using Answers at Once To Strengthen Defenses." This article was written by Brig. Gen. Thomas R. Phillips, U.S. Army, retired, who is the military analyst of the Post-Dispatch in St. Louis. The article indicates that Secretary McNamara has an understanding of management techniques and is proceeding in a courageous way to bring about necessary improvements toward reorganization of the sprawling activities in the Department of Defense.

This is one of the most encouraging developments in recent years, since it must be apparent to everyone concerned that there must be a firm hand at the helm of the Department of Defense if we are to take the lead in the race with the Soviets upon which depends not only our security and safety but the solvency of our economy. I am particularly pleased that Secretary McNamara is using the authority at his disposal in eliminating unnecessary duplication and waste in supply and service functions in the defense agencies. . I congratulate him on his efforts and suggest that he be given full encouragement in his important work.

The article follows:

MCNAMARA SPEEDING MANY INQUIRIES, USING ANSWERS AT ONCE TO STRENGTHEN DEFENSES—ONE HUNDRED AND SIX QUESTIONS ALREADY SHOW RESULTS IN MISSILE SPEEDUP, INCREASED BOMBER ALERT, CENTRALIZED SPACE ACTIVITY, CLOSING OF EXCESS BASES

(By Brig. Gen. Thomas R. Phillips, U.S. Army, retired)

The 106 questions (there may be more by now) to which Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara has demanded answers with various close deadlines have the Pentagon staffs working nights to a degree not known since the Korean war.

Some of the answers have already been made public in the President's message on the defense budget. These come under the headings of "strengthening and protecting our startegic deterrent and defense, strengthening our ability to deter or confine limited war," and "savings made possible by progress."

Among the decisions were the acceleration of Polaris, Minuteman and Skybolt missile programs, provision for increased ground alert by bombers and the provisions of ad-

ditional funds for important existing satellite programs.

Hard questions and difficult decisions had to be made in the answers that resulted in the cancellation of two Titan squadrons in favor of more Minuteman missiles, the accelerated phaseout of the B–47 medium bomber, the elimination of the Snark missile, the cutback of the B–70 program to four prototypes and the cancellation of the nuclear-powered aircraft program.

Another answer to one of McNamara's questions was the directive issued March 6, placing almost full responsibility on the Air Force for military space activities. This had been the intent of a directive issued in September 1959 by former Secretary of Defense Neil H. McElroy, but his intent was being eroded by the Army and Navy efforts to develop their own often-competing space programs.

The controls prescribed by McElroy were inadequate. Now McNamara has tight control; no new space program can be funded unless it has been approved by the Director of Defense Research and Engineering and by either McNamara or his Under Secretary, Roswell L. Gilpatric.

The manner in which all services were letting their imaginations soar over space programs that were far beyond the state of the booster art, and many of which never could have succeeded under any circumstances, fully justified the tighter control prescribed in this answer to one of McNamara's questions. The savings that will be effected from this question and answer will amount to hundreds of millions of dollars.

Another answer, only the beginning of the answer to this question, resulted in the closing, announced March 30, of 52 excess defense installations in the United States and 21 overseas. Other announcements of this nature will follow as the investigation of the need for all of the 6,700 defense installations proceeds.

The monetary savings from the actions announced thus far are expected to amount to $220 million annually. Even more important, 21,000 military personnel will be released from these operations and will be made available for other duties. This was the reason that it was possible for the President to ask for an increase in military personnel of only 13,000 men.

McNamara hopes by further actions of this nature, and through combination of functions now performed in duplicate by the three services, to make it unnecessary to call for an increase in personnel strength of the armed services. He is confident, he remarked, that the United States can fulfill its military commitments with the 2,500,000 men in uniform it now maintains, if they are used effectively.

In answer to another question, the announcement was made March 31 that responsibility for military construction would be consolidated in 17 of 42 Army Engineer districts. Military construction is now being carried on by 31 engineer districts.

The reassignment of work loads is expected to result in the reduction of about 1,700 of the Corps of Engineers' 40,900 employees. At the same time all missile-site construction has been consolidated in one office under an Army engineer brigadier general who has been made subordinate to the Air Force.

The most recent answer to another of McNamara's questions was made with the announcement that the Department of the Army will be responsible for the establishment and management of a single geodetic and mapping program. For mapping and geodetic measurements by satellite, the Air Force will provide the launch vehicle and recover the payloads.

The Army will process the data and make the basic maps. From the basic maps the Air Force will make its aeronautical charts and the Navy will make its hydrographic charts insofar as these include land areas.

The Air Force will also be responsible for conduct of aerial mapping and geodetic systems requiring the service of manned high-performance aircraft. But these operations will be conducted in accordance with a schedule provided by the Army, which will process the raw data and photographs.

This directive will centralize under the Army all the processing and computation of raw data and photographs into maps. Some of the equipment used is extremely expensive. The directive will prevent the duplication of such facilities and the manpower that would be used if each service were to proceed to do the whole task by itself.

These decisions are arrived at in different ways. The directive giving the Air Force control of most military space operations was worked out outside the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The draft directive was supplied to the chairman and the three service secretaries for comment within 6 days.

The Navy objected violently to the directive, since it had started a large space program. The Navy program duplicated other Air Force, Army and National Aeronautics and Space Administration programs to some degree. And there was complaint that the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the service secretaries did not have enough time for study.

The answer to this complaint given by many observers in the Pentagon is that, if the many problems requiring solution in which there are service differences were given to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, they never would be solved.

If McNamara is going to accomplish anything to improve the efficiency of the Defense Department and the unified operation of services, these observers say, he is going about it in the only way possible. During the last 13 years, every previous secretary has been frustrated by one of the other services in attempting to carry out the idea of the unification legislation.

In the case of the assignment of mapping and geodetic responsibility to the Army, the problem was given to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, rather than a civilian committee, to find the answer. The directive issued is substantially as recommended by the Joint Chiefs. The Air Force objected strongly, but was overruled.

McNamara's 106 questions are the product of 2 lists of problems in the Pentagon that McNamara and Gilpatric believed needed corrective action or, at least, investigation.

Gilpatric calls the method a management tool. By formation of expert committees, or reference to the Joint Chiefs of Staff as a committee, he poses a problem that requires a solution. He sets a deadline for a reply and the reply must include a directive to put the answer into effect.

Dissents are given a hearing. All concerned have a chance to object or comment, but this process is not permitted to go on indefinitely. The discussions and changes are agreed on in a limited time.

The speed of action that McNamara insists on has the Pentagon gasping. There is little time for the plots and stratagem that individual services have used in the past to frustrate previous secretaries.

In organizational matters, a special management planning group under Solis Horowitz in the office of Defense Counsel Cyrus Vance is responsible. He has three not-too-senior officers, one from each service, each of whom is an expert in the organization of his service.

McNamara refers organization weaknesses to Vance for investigation. One of Horowitz's officers is assigned as action officer. He gathers information and makes a study. From this a report is prepared in collaboration with his colleagues.

This goes to McNamara for review. If he decides a change is indicated, the management group prepares the draft of a directive. This is the basis for obtaining the comments and criticism of the Chiefs of Staff, the Secretaries, and other agencies involved. After all this is reviewed by McNamara, and after further discussion by him with his military and civil advisers, the directive is issued, possibly after it has been modified in response to objections, as was the case with the military space order.

The Secretary of Defense has vast powers in the organization and operation of the Department of Defense. These were greatly increased by the Reorganization Act of 1958. McNamara is the first Secretary of Defense with the courage to use these powers to cut through the objections of special service interests and their allies in Congress.

In particular, the so-called McCormack-Curtis amendment is a grant of great authority. After many efforts in Congress to attempt to force the Defense Department to proceed with a reorganization of the supply and service functions that were overlapping had been frustrated, House Majority Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts, and Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, of Webster Groves, proposed legislation, which was adopted, that gave the Secretary of Defense an almost free hand in reorganizing supply and service activities.

The amendment seems rather innocuous on first reading, and that is the reason that it was accepted by Chairman CARL VINSON of the Armed Services Committee.

It reads, in part: "Whenever the Secretary of Defense determines that it will be advantageous to the Government in terms of effectiveness, economy, or efficiency, he shall provide for the carrying out of any supply or service activity common to more than one military department by a single agency or such other organizational entities as he deems appropriate."

According to an authentic Pentagon source, no major reorganizational changes are planned at present in the Defense Department. These large and difficult problems will be put off until late this year when the new Defense officials will be sure enough of their ground to make more far-reaching moves than those now in process. They will be the result of thorough study, will improve efficiency and effectiveness of the operations and will save money and personnel.

Jewish Women of Maryland Favor Kennedy Proposal for Federal Aid to Public Schools Only

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, in view of the nationwide interest in the request of President Kennedy for Federal aid for public schools, I believe that the resolution adopted by the Federation of Jewish Women's Organizations of Maryland will be of interest to all Members.

Therefore, under permission to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the Appendix a copy of this resolution, endorsing the administration's recommendations and opposing Federal aid to other than public schools:

RESOLUTION ON FEDERAL AID FOR EDUCATION

Whereas one of the basic principles upon which our democracy was founded is the separation of church and state; and

Whereas Federal aid to other than public education is a direct violation of that principle and can lead only to the detriment of the welfare of our country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Federation of Jewish Women's Organizations of Maryland, consisting of 71 constituent organizations and representing 30,000 women in convention assembled on Thursday, March 23, 1961, urges that the Members of the House of Representatives from the State of Maryland vote for the passages of H.R. 4970 and H.R. 5266; and be it

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Members of the House of Representatives from the State of Maryland, and the Senators from the State of Maryland.

Education Without Federal Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, at a recent Freedom Forum held in San Diego on January 20, 1961, one of the speakers was the distinguished president of Pepperdine College at Los Angeles, Mr. M. Norvel Young. Mr. Young's comments as an educator and patriot will be of great interest to my colleagues and I urge their thoughtful consideration of his remarks.

Under unanimous consent I include Mr. Young's speech as a portion of my remarks:

EDUCATION WITHOUT FEDERAL AID

(Remarks of Mr. M. Norvel Young, president, Pepperdine College, Los Angeles, to the Freedom Forum, San Diego, Calif., January 20, 1961)

What will education be profited if it gains billions of dollars in Federal aid and loses its own freedom? What should a teacher or a school give in exchange for its freedom? The history of 19 out of 21 notable civilizations studied by Arnold Toynbee points out that "they died from within and not by conquest from without." Great republics like those of Greece and Rome gradually exchanged their local freedom and its responibilities for more and more centralized control and its promised protection and aid. They became less and less free and finally they lost both freedom and aid.

Of course, this is not to minimize the tremendous needs of higher education and of education at the secondary and elementary levels. But must we take our educational problems to Washington for solution?

Here are some specific reasons why we believe in improving our educational process without Federal aid:

1. Basically Federal aid always means Federal control. As Justice Jackson stated in a Supreme Court decision regarding controls in agriculture: "It is hardly lack of due process for the Government to regulate that which it subsidizes."

There are, for example, 12 direct controls under the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and this is but a drop in the bucket of the amount of money and of the extent of controls which will be forthcoming in the decades ahead if we do not reverse the present trend. The National Defense Education Act definitely affects the curriculum and the emphasis of the schools which are aided. Moreover, the granting or withholding of large amounts of money has a way of influencing the thinking of the most resolute and independent administrator.

2. Federal aid is objectionable because it will reduce local and private responsibility for the education of our children and our young men and women at the college and university level. There is a kind of Parkinson's law that "interest diminishes as responsibility is removed." The primary responsibility for the education of our youth is upon the home. The family is still the basic unit of our society. The closer the education of our youth can be kept to the home, the longer we will preserve our freedom. The trend has already developed for the average American parent to take little or no responsibility for the normal education of his children. This, the average parent has come to believe, is instead a job solely for the "professionals." More responsibility is ultimately being transferred from the local school board and placed in the hands of the State. Ultimately, this trends toward removing responsibility from the State and placing it upon the Federal Government.

3. The prospect of Federal aid also undermines and deactivates interest in solving the problem at the local level. The White House Conference on Education in 1955 found that "no State represented has a demonstrated financial incapacity to build the schools it will need during the next 5 years." Approximately 230 of the more than 42,000 school districts in America have reached their bonded limit. Our citizens are taking responsibility at the local level and would do more with the proper public promotional effort and if the prospect of the Federal Government stepping in to assume these responsibilities were not an inducement to inaction at the local level. Between 1949–50 and 1959–60 there was an increase of 38 percent in school population and an increase of 124 percent in revenues raised for schools. Let us stimulate and encourage local and private responsibility rather than discourage it by saying to those citizens who are willing to sacrifice for their children's education: "You are foolish. Why don't you relax and let the Federal Government do this for you."

4. The last objection which I will mention, although certainly these are not the only ones which could be listed, is this: Federal aid will tend to break down our historic separation of public and privately supported education or it will further increase the disparity between the support of the two systems. I believe in the values of our dual system of education. We need the tax-supported and the voluntarily supported schools and colleges. They complement each other and serves as a check upon each other and help to assure our continuing freedom of speech, of religion, of education. The wide variety of educational opportunities possible under our dual system is calculated to serve us well in the changing world we face.

Federal aid which is restricted only to tax-supported schools will increase on individuals and corporations which are now voluntarily supporting both tax-supported and voluntarily supported schools. Private education needs more voluntary support and such support is growing. In 1960, corporate aid to education topped $150 million and it is growing rapidly. If this aid is restricted to tax-supported institutions it will add impetus to the present trend for more and more education to rely upon tax support.

The economic pressure upon private schools and colleges is tremendous today. What will it be in the decades ahead if Federal aid is granted in billions of dollars to those institutions which are willing to submit to Federal control?

Now let us turn to a few suggestions as to what can be done to help solve our problems in education without Federal aid.

1. Parents can become more concerned about the needs of schools in their own districts and take more interest in school board elections, in PTA work, in support of local or State bond issues. Businessmen need to be alerted to the importance of more support for teachers and proper housing for an expanding army of students.

School revenues have increased three times as fast as school population in the last decade and we have not begun to exert the influence which can be exerted to do a better job at the local level. If the same amount of time and effort were expended to stir up concern at the local level as has been spent to stir up pressure for Federal aid we would be showing much greater progress.

2. Much more voluntary support needs to be given by individuals and corporations and foundations. Irving S. Olds has expressed the growing conviction of more and more businessmen: "Unless American business recognizes and meets its obligation to higher education, it is not properly protecting the long-range interest of its stockholders, its employees and its customers." More and more corporations are recognizing the enlightened self-interest of voluntary corporate support of higher education.

The council for financial aid to education has done an outstanding job of stimulating concern for voluntary support to education. This type of activity could be multiplied with the wholehearted cooperation of teachers, parents, and professional leaders labor leaders as well as leaders in industry. There is more money in the stewardship of foundations than ever before. Bequests for education are at an alltime high. Surely we can step up this voluntary support. If any action is undertaken at the national level, why not let it be the encouragement of voluntary support by giving tax credit or tax exemption for larger gifts by corporations and for tuition paid by individuals.

3. If there are, as contended by some, those school districts that are too poor to do an adequate job of education, may we suggest that aid be given by a concerted effort on the part of foundations and corporations and possibly even by direct aid from wealthy districts or States. This may sound unrealistic, but Americans are spending millions for causes that are no more worthy. The proper promotion of an aid to underprivileged school districts could result in millions of dollars in support without Federal control. Many of the school districts which are not giving adequate support would take a searching new look if they realized that their needs were the concern of others. Many of them could do better if they would.

The best of educational opportunities for our American youth can be provided without sacrificing local control and responsibility, if we approach the challenge courageously and with dedication and determination.

Recently Pepperdine College rejected Federal loans available for the financing of dormitory construction and chose to meet the needs of the increased student body through the issuance of bonds sold through private channels. It did so because it hoped to encourage others to rely on their own resources and initiative rather than resort to the sometimes easier but infinitely more potentially hazardous route of Federal subsidization. Only such action directed toward the traditional American cause of self-reliance and independence can halt the present trend toward the proliferation of Federal control and supervision and pass intact our free institutions to succeeding generations.

The New Peril

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pine Bluff (Ark.) Commercial of April 1, 1961:

THE NEW PERIL

We have been trying to work up a proper degree of concern and indignation about the John Birch Society, and have not so far made the grade.

The society may well be the menace it is being painted to be. We remember a fellow who laughed at Joe McCarthy.

But the Republic has stood off the Soviet Union since 1945 and, with considerable help, whipped two sets of Fascists plus Mussolini's legions more or less simultaneously in the period immediately preceding.

It lived through the Know-Nothings, the Klan, the Silver Shirts, and the aforementioned McCarthy, and will, from all indications, also survive the Citizens Councils.

We are experienced, as a Nation, with crackpots and authoritarians. If the John Birch Society is not about the nearest to impotent of the lot, we are, as a newspaper, a good way wide of the mark.

It has been alleged that the John Birch Society is a hate group; hence dangerous. Certainly it is made up of people who know how to hate, and who enjoy the sport. But they are also, and more profoundly, people shaken to their being by fear.

Whether the founder (who girded for his present large responsibilities in his brother's candy factory) knows it or not, the John Birch Society is built upon the proposition that mankind is doomed, and that there is now time only for a desperate rearguard action.

The society is convinced that all forces of change are exclusively in the service of the Kremlin, and that they threaten the civilized world at every point of contact.

What we have here is a fellowship of fear. In its articles of faith, the society resembles nothing so much as one of those sects which have from time to time taken to the basement and sealed up the cracks around the door in the conviction that the world would end at 5:27 a.m. a week from Thursday.

Consider the men and things which the John Birchers or their founder have already conceded to the Communists: They include the President and his predecessor, the Supreme Court, the Nation's city managers, the urban renewal advocates, the proponents of fluoridation, the United Nations.

These people don't need condemnation. They need help.

They need, each of them, a quick course in American history, a heart-to-heart talk with a trustworthy friend and then, perhaps, a good, long rest.

The evidence is that John Birchism is incurable, but we can try.

Nor does John Birchism seem to us to be contagious. The presumption on which the organization has been viewed so generally with alarm is that it is a virus likely to infect innocent people.

All of the evidence we've seen indicates that the people already had the virus, and have simply gotten together to share its miseries.

We suppose that there may be people in meaningful numbers willing to take the oath of allegiance to an outfit which is willing to forfeit the American system of government for something the John Birchers call, quite gratuitously, the American way of life.

But we doubt that there are many men of sound mind willing to accept the collateral dictum that Dwight Eisenhower is a Communist.

To the extent that they have done anything, except to each other and themselves, the John Birchers seem to us to have performed a substantial public service.

They have alerted their fellow Americans to the existence on the far, far right of the political spectrum of people every bit as confused, troubled, and willing to be led around by the nose as their opposite numbers on the far, far left.

The society also has provided an interesting litmus test for some of our noisier politicians.

Senator EASTLAND, for example, has just spoken well of them.

Until they move beyond their present activities, which appear to consist pretty exclusively of whipping up each others' hysteria and of occasionally slandering men so eminent as to be substantially invulnerable to such attacks, we think the John Birchers more a nuisance than a peril.

If we must have people willing to believe in the things the society stands for, we may as well have the society.

The existence of such a group is bound to cut down on the number of Birchists running around unencumbered by the label, and thus likely to be mistaken for responsible citizens.

Peter Hofstra

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to report that the Holland-American community of New Jersey has lost a renowned leader. On Easter Sunday night, Peter Hofstra, a vice consul of the Netherlands, succumbed in his 75th year.

Migrating with his parents to the Paterson area, where he held successive jobs in his youth as a sweeper, delivery boy, and butcher boy, Mr. Hofstra studied law at New York Law School and was admitted to practice in 1915. In the span of almost one-half of a century, Attorney Hofstra built one of the most widely respected law firms in the State. Hofstra & Hofstra has represented several municipalities in Passaic and Bergen Counties and is counsel for many area banking institutions.

As vice consul of the Netherlands, Mr. Hofstra had served as official escort in New Jersey for Queen Wilhelmina and later Queen Juliana on their visits to the United States. In December of last year, Queen Juliana appointed Mr. Hofstra a member of the Order of Orange-Nassau for his dedicated service to the Netherlands.

Tall and erect, a veritable giant among men, Peter Hofstra is mourned by all who ever had the pleasure of making his acquaintance. He leaves surviving his devoted wife, the former Cora De Lazier; and two children, Peter R., like his father a member of the New Jersey bar; and Mrs. Alfred Fauver, who resides in Quincy, Mass.

The Role of SAC in the Aerospace Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DALE ALFORD
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, on March 16 I had the great good fortune to attend a luncheon given by the civic and business leaders of Little Rock and Pulaski County, Ark., marking the 15th anniversary of the Strategic Air Command. The principal speaker on this occasion was Lt. Gen. J. P. McConnell, commander of the Second Air Force, Barksdale AFB, La., and himself a native Arkansan.

General McConnell delivered an outstanding address, and under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a copy of this address in the RECORD:

THE ROLE OF SAC IN THE AEROSPACE AGE

It is always a pleasure for me to come back to my native State. And I was happy that I could accept the invitation to speak here today. The wild blue yonder I once dreamed about as an Arkansas youngster has expanded into the limitless reaches of space. That is why a new term was needed to properly designate the indivisible expanse embracing both the earth's atmosphere and the vast space beyond.

This new term is aerospace, and is readily understandable to you who are so close to Little Rock Air Force Base where preparations for the coming of the intercontinental Titan II ballistic missile are being made.

Since SAC's inventory of weapons includes both manned bombers and intercontinental missiles, it is today an aerospace force with a twofold mission. Although I'm sure you know what SAC's mission is, I want to state it briefly and simply so it can be easily kept in mind as we explore the complexities of its significance. In peacetime, our mission is to maintain an aerospace counterforce capable of deterring Communist aggression, and if this fails and war comes, to mount simultaneously nuclear retaliatory attacks against the enemy's war-making capability to the extent that he no longer has the capacity or even the will to wage war.

Although we state SAC's mission in two parts, it is in reality indivisible—indivisible in the same sense that air and space are indivisible and that the present and the future are indivisible.

SAC's mission cannot actually be partitioned into segments because if we did not possess the aerospace-nuclear capability of instant retaliation, stating a peacetime mission would be meaningless. Moreover, SAC's mission is an integral part of the overall United States Air Force mission, underlying which is the overriding purpose of helping to preserve world peace.

Since the most serious and immediate military threat to world peace is the Soviet's powerful aerospace capability, SAC's role as the long-range global aerospace force of this Nation assumes an ever-increasing significance.

I am sure that you who live so close to our personnel at Little Rock Air Force Base realize that SAC people are dedicated people. Our professional specialists, airmen and officers alike, are well aware of the grave responsibility entrusted to them.

Sometimes, unfortunately, some people misinterpret SAC's dedication. Indeed, some segments of public opinion believe that SAC promotes the manned bomber at the expense of the missile and the spectacular space vehicles that are yet to be.

More than anything else, I want to emphasize that SAC is dedicated to only one thing—its mission, not the manned bomber or any weapon.

The reason for this is clear when it is understood that weapon systems are tailored to the mission; the mission is not tailored to weapon systems.

As a matter of fact, SAC's mission has remained realtively unchanged since the command was established in 1946. During that time weapon systems have changed drastically because of the rapid technological progress that has marked the past decade or so. Our business was and is to prevent war from starting by maintaining a capability to mount nuclear retaliatory attacks that would destroy the enemy's war-making capability.

Modernizing our strike force has been a continuing function in the past and today we are integrating intercontinental ballistic missiles and airborne missiles into our inventory as rapidly as they become available to us.

A considerable portion of the SAC effort today is concerned with plans for the future when new types of aerospace hardware will augment the proven and reliable weapon systems, and replace some of those that will become obsolete.

However, in the understandable excitement over future possibilities, too many people seem to lose track of the fact that what we are going to have in the future does not contribute to today's deterrent force. This does not imply that there's no need to be concerned about the future, but it does point up the fact that today SAC's manned bombers—the B–47, B–52, and B–58—constitute the principal war-deterring weapon systems in the free world's arsenal. This doesn't mean that SAC's manned bombers are the only deterrent to a Soviet attack, but, in the words of Gen. Thomas S. Power, SAC's Commander in Chief, "There can be no doubt that, for the immediate future, they (SAC's manned bombers) will continue to contribute the major share to our deterrent posture. In fact, over 90 percent of the total firepower in the free world, as measured in TNT equivalents, is being carried in SAC bomb bays today."

This fact helps explain why we are so concerned with the protection of SAC's manned bomber strength. Whatever the future may bring, the survivability of SAC's deterrent strength must be one of our major concerns. In view of the Soviet's giant strides in modernizing its aerospace force, it is imperative to understand that a modern war would have to be fought with the force remaining after the first attack. If an enemy should succeed in knocking out the bulk of this Nation's military strength with a surprise attack, the best we could achieve would be only a token response in the way of retaliation.

Therefore, the key to maintaining an effective deterrent is survivability. So long as the would-be aggressor knows that he cannot possibly knock out our retaliatory punch with one sudden blow, he is likely to be deterred from starting a general war, or for that matter, even a limited war.

Another fact often overlooked by those who forecast the demise of aircraft is that just because today's aircraft will someday certainly be obsolete does not mean that tomorrow's aircraft will be obsolete tomorrow. For instance, plans for the future include providing some piloted aircraft which will reach altitudes called "space equivalent," as well as lower altitudes, that is traveling at altitudes from 10,000 feet to hundreds of miles beyond the earth's surface. Some will be, in effect, piloted recoverable missiles. Others will be manned bombers carrying air-launched ballistic missiles.

Thus, while the aircraft is no longer the only aerospace weapon system, radically advanced versions of it will be with us as far into the future as any military aerospace expert can see today.

The point I am making here is that the advent of missiles did not make the manned systems obsolete, either for the free world or the Communist world. The advent of missiles did indicate, however, the coming of the day when the emphasis will shift temporarily from manned to unmanned systems. For instance, the day is not too far distant when the missile badge will be as familiar sight in these parts as the pilot's wings are today. The construction work now going on in this part of Arkansas to support two Titan missiles squadrons is similar to that either started or scheduled to start at 19 other SAC localities.

Meanwhile, even though we are still in the early stages of phasing in the first generation of ballistic missiles, SAC and the Air Research and Development Command are well along in the program of developing a second generation missile, the Minuteman. A solid-propellent-type ballistic missile with intercontinental range, the Minuteman will give us a flexibility in our missile force that we do not now possess. Some of these missiles will be positioned in hardened underground sites scattered throughout the country while others will be mounted on specially built railroad cars which will move freely and continuously around rail networks. You'll probably recall that the Minuteman was successfully launched on its initial test at Cape Canaveral, Fla., a little more than a month ago. This was the first time that a U.S. missile had been tested as a complete structure on the initial full-scale launching. The success of this full-scale Minuteman launching was one of the most encouraging tests ever conducted by the Air Force.

Looking beyond the missile and advanced versions of manned aircraft, SAC's plans include a time when control of space may well mean a superior military position here on earth in a future war. In this connection, Gen. Thomas D. White, Air Force Chief of Staff, recently said: "Lacking specific guarantee that the benefits of space science and technology will be used solely for peaceful purposes, it is essential that we consider the application of this knowledge to our military capabilities. There is no dividing line between air and space and they must be considered as one medium—aerospace.

"Advancing technology will inevitably carry with it the opportunity for improved aerospace capabilities. Therefore, we must move steadily toward operations in space—not merely because it is there challenging us, but because it is vital to our Nation's security to do so."

Along this same line, General Power has said: "The conquest of space is more than a race for scientific firsts and national prestige. Whether we like it or not, it still is primarily a question of survival."

In my terms, this simply amplifies the age-old saying that the future belongs to those who prepare for it. Our future doesn't just happen; it is built on the foundations of today's efforts.

This country's military and civilian planners today are busily engaged in work on plans and programs for the future. All the military services, including the Air Force, are interested in vehicles that would give us better communications systems, better reconnaissance systems, and better navigational aids.

But whatever the future vehicles are made available to us, SAC, as a combat-ready organization today, must base its activities on what we have available to us today.

For example, how do we get our warning time today to insure that enough of our counterforce would survive an initial attack? In the case of a surprise attack by intercontinental missiles, we would have precious little, if any, warning time since they can travel 6,300 miles in about 30 minutes.

Against aircraft, however, this country and Canada have in operation an effective air defense system comprised of a network of radar equipment and facilities stationed in three lines across the North American Continent.

The first is the DEW, or Distant Early Warning line that extends from Alaska across the northern Canadian territory to Greenland. The second runs from ocean to ocean across mid-Canada. The third roughly coincides with the United States-Canadian border.

Tied in with an electronic computing system called SAGE for semiautomatic ground environment, this warning system is under the joint control of United States and Canadian forces. This joint command is the North American Air Defense organization which is more commonly known as Norad. Headquarters for Norad are at Ent AFB near Colorado Springs, Colo. It is comprised of American Air Force and Army units and Canadian military personnel. A closed television circuit as well as communication lines connect SAC and Norad headquarters.

This whole system is predicated on the indication that if the Soviets launched a surprise attack on us today, it would be primarily a manned bomber attack. Since SAC's global support facilities and centralized organization more than match the Soviet's manned strike capability, the assurance that Norad could give us sufficient warning time practically guarantees that SAC could get its alert force airborne before it could be attacked on the ground.

Thus we have reasonable assurance that a significant portion of SAC's strike force would survive a surprise attack. Moreover, the fact that portions of our force are maintained both on an around-the-clock 15 minute ground alert and on airborne alert is as well known to the Soviet Bloc as it is to you people here. All of this constitutes an effective deterrent for it assures survival of much of our manned bomber force.

As defense against the growing Soviet missile capability, this country has under construction today a warning system that will alert us of a Soviet attack by ballistic missiles. This system is called BMEWS—B-M-E-W-S—which is derived from its name, Ballistic Missile Early Warning System. It will give us the 15-minute warning time to which we are geared today with our ground-alert operation.

The first BMEWS station, located near Thule in Greenland, is now operational. A second station is programed for completion this year in Alaska, and the third and final one in England is expected to be ready sometime next year.

The BMEWS long-range radar warning station in Greenland was completed first because it covers the area that includes the most direct missile route from Soviet territory to this country.

But what are we doing now in the face of the possibility of a missile attack over the unprotected sides of the vast Arctic region? After thoroughly testing the airborne alert tactic, we recently got the go-ahead order to incorporate it in our daily, routine training exercises.

This means that we are now keeping a portion of our bombers in the air where they are invulnerable to a surprise attack. Gen-

eral Power recommended that the airborne alert be put into effect because a military commander always must assume he will have to operate under the worst possible conditions.

Airborne alert aircraft stay in the air until their replacements, other combat-ready bombers, are in a designated flight pattern. The bombers are refueled in the air by KC–135 tankers as often as necessary to insure the needed range and endurance. Ordinarily airborne alert missions last about 24 hours.

Flight plans have been worked out to provide maximum coverage of potential enemy targets. Each bomber on an airborne alert training mission flies a preplanned in-and-out pattern, dictated by fuel and range considerations. Today, airborne alert missions are part of the regular crew training program conducted by all SAC B–52 units such as the one stationed at Blytheville Air Force Base. These missions are flown under the most realistic simulated combat conditions.

Airborne bombers equipped with air-to-ground missiles will greatly enhance the value of our airborne alert. I refer here to the Hound Dog, a supersonic guided jet missile that is now coming into our inventory. The Hound Dog's carrier initially is the advanced B–52G that has demonstrated a capability to fly more than 9,000 miles without refueling.

And, sometime this year a still further advanced version, the B–52H, is scheduled to be delivered to SAC. Earlier models of the B–52 can be modified to carry the Hound Dog.

A B–52 carrying a pair of Hound Dogs with nuclear weapons in their warheads can fire the missiles many miles away from their targets. The Hound Dog has a jam-proof inertial navigation system which guides it with unerring accuracy. It is not a ballistic missile, its power source being an air-breathing jet engine. The missile-carrying B–52's will also have their full nuclear payload in their bomb bays. Thus, this bomber-missile combination might well use the Hound Dogs to destroy the enemy's defenses and then proceed on to drop additional bombs on other targets. Or, the bomber might use both the Hound Dogs and its internal bomb load on targets deep in enemy territory.

The evolution of the manned vehicle into an airborne missile-launching platform has other important considerations. We have in the early stages of development an air-launched ballistic missile called the Sky Bolt, which is in the 1,000-mile range class. Moreover, a few months ago SAC activated its first B–58 wing at Carswell Air Force Base in Fort Worth, Tex. This base is a 2d Air Force installation as will be the second base to get the B–58, Bunker Hill Air Force Base in Indiana.

The B–58 Hustler is the free world's first supersonic bomber. It can operate at twice the speed of sound at altitudes well above 50,000 feet. It can be refueled in flight and carries its nuclear payload in a pod suspended beneath the fuselage. In January this year, the B–58 set two new world speed records of 1,284 miles per hour, on a run of slightly over 621 statute miles and the other of 1,061 miles per hour on a run of over 1,242 miles.

Also, the Air Force has under development for SAC the B–70 bomber. This aircraft is designed to fly some 2,000 miles per hour. It will be capable of aerial refueling, will operate at altitudes above 70,000 feet, and in spite of its speed and size is being developed to use the runways that can accomodate today's B–52s. The B–70 will enhance our capabilities under our air-launched ballistic missile program.

I am sure that by now you have a better idea why SAC seems to be emphasizing the manned vehicle. In addition to the implications of the foregoing, I'd like to point out that manned aerospace vehicles can perform functions that missiles can't, such as seeking out and destroying moving targets; conducting surveillance, and making reconnaissance runs to assess the results or our bombing.

The emphasis we place on manned vehicles stems from these facts: They are the overwhelming bulk of the force today; they can do the job today; and in vastly improved forms, augmented by air-to-ground missiles, they will be an essential part of the force for as far ahead as we can see.

Let me say again: SAC is not wedded to its bombers. It is wedded to its mission; SAC will have manned bombers only so long as they are necessary to accomplish the mission. SAC has learned well the lessons of the past. We will be the first to discard the outmoded and adopt the new. But the bomber is not like the horse. The horse was used in war for thousands of years, and its capabilities did not change from start to finish. The bomber has been used in war for only about 44 years, and its capabilities are still improving fantastically. To discard it would be foolhardy.

And thus, dedication to mission will continue to be the driving and motivating force in the lives of SAC people. This is the force from which our motto, "Peace is our Profession," was derived. That motto will be valid just as long as SAC's mission is valid. And SAC's mission will be valid just as long as there are dedicated Communists running nations that possess aerospace capabilities on a par with that of the free world.

In my opinion, it behooves every American to stop and consider the grip that the communistic philosophy has on those who subscribe to it.

In this connection, I'll refer to a statement made recently by Congressman WALTER H. JUDD, of Minnesota. Speaking at the National War College, Mr. JUDD stated that ever since he had left China after serving as a missionary medical doctor before and during the early ascendency of Communism in that country, he has been a salesman for but one idea: Communists act like Communists. Explaining further, he said:

"The Chinese Communists do not act like Chinese. They were born Chinese * * * they speak Chinese * * * they look like Chinese * * * but they are not Chinese. They have rejected every value and principle of Chinese culture and thought. It is not possible to be a Communist and have any respect for the basic virtues and values of the Chinese civilization.

"Chinese Communists act like Communists. They are not Chinese patriots * * * they are part of a world revolution."

Having gained some first-hand experience among Chinese during and after World War II, I have been deeply concerned over the way communism has destroyed the basic virtues of Chinese civilization that I had known.

We must always keep in mind that the Communist objective, regardless of any easing of world tensions now and then, remains the same—conquest of the world. World domination is the goal of communism and because its adherents continue to proclaim it, the free world has had, I believe, ample strategic warning that its very survival is at stake as much in cold war as in a hot one.

So, while diplomats and statesmen struggle in the front lines of the cold war, the military might of this Nation must remain a true deterrent to a shooting war. SAC's role in this aerospace age is to maintain the strength that represents the bulk of the free world's deterrent against aggression.

In the light of this background, compare our Nation's policy of nonaggression with that of Communist nations. The United States has clearly stated its national policy—we will never strike the first blow in any war. On the other hand, the Soviets have an equally clearly announced policy of aggressive expansionist strategy. Moreover, both the Soviets and Communist China have announced to the world that their combined goal is the destruction of capitalism, or more specifically, the United States. And, of course, we know they are producing and developing aerospace weapons to support their ambitions.

Thus, a powerful aerospace military force with a high survivability factor becomes a vital instrument of U.S. national policy for deterring war, and at the same time allows us to speak from a posture of strength in world affairs.

The Air Force, in common with all our Armed Forces, is in being for only one purpose: to help preserve peace and guarantee the future of this country. SAC's role as the principal deterrent to general war is being performed by people who are dedicated to its mission, not to any one type of weapon. SAC has met and is meeting its responsibilities.

And I am confident that with the understanding and support of you and all who are neighbors in our other base communities, the Strategic Air Command together with our other Armed Forces will continue to fulfill the overall defense mission of this country.

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee, pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel duty-bound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I have re-

quested that the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 be printed in the Appendix of today's RECORD:

RIVERSIDE, R.I., *April 5, 1961.*
The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: It has been the policy of the American people to rally to the cause. This has been especially true when an aggressor nation has tried to subjugate other nations. This has happened many times in our present century and once again Russia is attempting (and accomplishing I might add) to subjugate practically all the Near and Middle East nations.

Before a third world war begins, not to mention countless revolutions, I think that something must be done to aid these subjugated nations. I believe that your Committee for Captive Nations (H. Res. 211) is just the thing. Only the Committee will rally to the cause in a peaceful manner. Let's not shed any blood where it is not necessary. Russia can be conquered without a war and I believe that the Committee for Captive Nations can contribute to it.

Very truly yours,
ELLEN ANN WHITAKER.

UKRAINIAN NATIONAL ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Jersey City, N.J., March 27, 1961.
The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Our 75,000 members have been informed in our official organ the "Svoboda" and our English language "The Ukrainian Weekly" of your introduction on March 8 of the resolution calling for the establishment of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. We wish to congratulate you on this stalwart action.

We Ukrainians have long advocated the recognition by the United States of the fact that captive nations behind the Iron Curtain are our potential allies in the cold war with the Kremlin. A Committee established to gather information concerning these captive nations would be advantageous to our Government in formulating policies and it would be a morale builder for all peoples behind the Iron Curtain who are struggling for their independence.

Our members were also heartened to learn of the support of various other Congressmen of your resolution and are currently urging their own Congressmen to lend you their support.

We, the executive committee of the Ukrainian National Association, wish you the heartiest success in your courageous undertaking.

Yours respectfully,
JOSEPH LESAWYER,
Vice President.
JAROSLAW PADOCH,
Secretary.
ROMAN SLOBODIAN,
Treasurer.

SHARON HILL, PA., *April 3, 1961.*
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: My personal friend Mr. Isakjan I. Narzikul, president of the Turkestanian-American Association, has informed me that you are sponsoring a resolution establishing a committee on the captive nations. Presumably this committee will develop facts regarding Soviet imperialism of the last 40 years. Armed with facts such a committee should be able to recommend courses of action for our legislative and administrative bodies.

It is my hope that such action will be to (1) maintain hope in the freedom-loving peoples who are today Soviet colonials and to (2) present to the entire world the facts of Soviet colonial-imperialist policy.

Many of us feel that our country has too long been on the defensive vis-a-vis the Communist world conspiracy. An intelligent well-planned offensive is desperately needed. Your resolution may be a first step in this direction.

Very truly yours,
JOHN M. MCLARNMON, Jr.

TURKESTANIAN-AMERICAN
ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Collingdale, Pa., April 3, 1961.
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: It has been my experience that many of my fellow U.S. citizens know nothing of Turkestan, its people or its potential as a force on the side of the freedom-loving peoples of the West.

Prior to its conquest in 1922 by the Communist imperialists, Turkestan was a free country. It is located in south central Asia, north of Afghanistan, extending roughly from the Caspian Sea to east of the Aral Sea. It was a country of approximately 16 million people of Turkic origin and devout Moslems in religious practice.

Since its conquest the Communists have conducted a relentless campaign to destroy Turkestan's literature, its cultural uniqueness and its strong love of freedom. The country has been partitioned into five Soviet Republics, many of its people have been driven to other parts of the Soviet Union and many Russians imported into it. It has been deprived by the Communists of almost all contact with the outside world.

One of the few avenues of contact that Turkestan did have was the Voice of America programs beamed to it. This was a regular channel of information from 1951 to 1953, and again from 1955 to 1958. Since 1958 the Communists have enjoyed an uncontested propaganda advantage in this large politically important country.

Many of us in the Turkestanian-American Association know that the Voice of America was listened to in Turkestan and we are convinced that broadcasts should be resumed. The United States will defeat the Communist conspiracy by taking the initiative at every point of weakness in the Soviet colonial empire. Turkestan is such a point.

The Turkestanian-American Association represents all Turkestanians in the United States. We are very pleased to see you introduce a resolution establishing a special committee on the captive nations. We support it wholeheartedly and hope you will persevere.

Sincerely yours,
ISAKJAN I. NARZIKUL,
President.

THE BALTIC NATIONS COMMITTEE
OF DETROIT, INC.,
Highland Park, Mich., March 28, 1961.
The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: On behalf of the Baltic Nations Committee of Detroit, I would like to express to you my deep appreciation and gratitude for introducing the bill H.R. 211 to create a Special House Committee on Captive Nations.

We certainly hope that this bill will be passed by the House of Representatives in the near future.

Sincerely yours,
SIGURDS RUDZITIS,
Chairman.

Automation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Machinist, newspaper of the International Association of Machinists, recently published a question and answer feature on automation. Entitled "Automation: The Revolution in Your Life," the article brings out many of the facets of automation which have been least understood by the public. The answers are based on studies by the IAM Research Department and IAM officers.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Unemployment and the Impact of Automation, I think the article is most timely, and should like to call the attention of all the members to the article which follows:

AUTOMATION: THE REVOLUTION IN YOUR LIFE

(These answers are based on studies by the research department of the International Association of Machinists and on the report of grand lodge officers to the 1960 IAM convention.)

Question. Why all this talk about automation? Isn't it just another step in the mechanization of our lives?

Answer. Automation is creating a revolution in our lives. The invention of machinery added power to our tools. In mechanized plants, machines replaced hand labor. The machines still needed operators. Automation, a word unknown less than 15 years ago, is the mechanization of thought. In an automated plant, machines operate the machines. Mechanization increased production a hundredfold over hand labor; automation increases production a thousandfold over mechanized labor.

Question. Does this mean push-button factories?

Answer. It can mean factories operating only with maintenance crews. There already are a few. More often automation means a big reduction in the need for machine operators. In some instances, automation also reduces the need for more highly skilled workers.

Question. Isn't automation most practical in the big plants?

Answer. Not necessarily. The great majority of all metalworking firms in the United States produce fewer than 25 items in each production run. Now, with the introduction of tape-controlled multi-purpose machine tools, these small shops can switch quickly from one run to another by simply switching tapes. One automated machine tool is the Milwaukee-Matic. According to its manufacturer, it "can interchange 31 different cutting tools and perform hundreds of operations in sequence without a touch from a machinist."

Question. What kind of operations can be automated?

Answer. Automated machinery can do bookkeeping, control inventory, make up payrolls and do other office work. There are machines now that see, hear, and feel. There are machiness that adjust to variable production conditions. There are machines that have memory units. There are automated machines that inspect the product they are turning out, reject substandard units and correct the errors they make. There are machines that change their own parts when they break down or wear out and lubricate

themselves. The U.S. Air Force has an electronic computer which is the key part of a machine which translates Russian printing into English. By the end of 1961, its capacity is expected to reach 2,400 words a minute.

Question. Aren't these machines too expensive to be practical?

Answer. Automated equipment soon pays for itself by the amount of manpower it replaces. Automated machines have reduced labor costs by as much as 75 to 90 percent. On one part, for example, the Boeing Airplane Co. reduced machine time from 25 hours to 1½ hours by automation.

Question. Does this mean a lot of layoffs?

Answer. It frequently means layoffs. In some cases it means that the employees will be transferred to other jobs, to other departments or to other plants. In other cases, it means layoffs in plants not automated that are unable to compete with automated plants. Usually, it means the loss of job opportunities for younger workers when employees are not replaced after they quit or retire.

Question. But, doesn't automation create more jobs?

Answer. Automation makes it possible to produce more with fewer employees. Between 1950 and 1960, factory production in the United States increased 43 percent; yet there were actually fewer production workers in factories in 1960 than 10 years earlier. In mining, production increased 26 percent; yet the number of employees declined 25 percent. On the railroads, employment declined 36 percent while rail traffic dropped only 5 percent. Unless demand for goods and services rises much more than it has, the jobs created by the introduction of automation will not make up for the jobs eliminated by automation.

Question. Are labor unions trying to block automation?

Answer. No. Most union members know that there cannot be a moratorium on technological change. Labor knows that there are tremendous needs in America. There are millions of families living on an un-American standard of living. Our country needs schools, hospitals, slum clearance, housing, and modern roads. And, we must maintain our military strength at a level that will deter aggression by the Soviet Union or any other world power. Labor does not seek to block automation; it does insist that management cannot be allowed to forget community problems and the personal hardships being created by rapid technological change.

Question. How can unions protect their members?

Answer. Through negotiations with management, unions can make sure that some of the savings on manpower are shared with employees through legitimate wage increases, shorter hours of work, and longer vacations. Many union contracts require management to give advance notice before the installation of new equipment so that changes in jobs and work schedules can be negotiated. Many union contracts give employees transfer rights, moving allowances, and retraining opportunities during working hours.

Question. But suppose a man is laid off?

Answer. Union contracts help to cushion the shock of unemployment by providing for severance pay, supplementary unemployment benefits, early retirement, and other provisions.

Question. Would a shorter workweek help?

Answer. Yes. Automation means greatly increased output per man-hour. We want and need this increased output. But we can't afford to have millions without jobs. A shorter workweek makes more sense than continued high unemployment. In many industries, the 32- or 35-hour workweek will have to come through national negotiations or national legislation. Any piecemeal approach will encourage some employers to run away, to move their plants out of the area or out of the country.

Question. Can't anything else be done?

Answer. The basic answer to the problems created by automation lies in the prosperity of our country. When business is booming, displaced men can find other jobs, and so can hundreds of thousands of young workers who are coming out of the schools every year. If we can get our economy moving ahead, automation will still create problems, but they will be more manageable.

Inez Lovelace Earns Title as "State Woman of the Year"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, there appeared on Sunday, March 26, in the Knoxville News-Sentinel a wonderful article about Miss Inez Lovelace, a native of my hometown of Union City, Tenn.

She has made such an outstanding record I feel that I should bring it to the attention of the Members of the Congress.

The article follows:

INEZ LOVELACE EARNS TITLE AS "STATE WOMAN OF THE YEAR"

(By Mary Anna Winegar)

Inez Lovelace is a lady who helped lead the entire State in progress in home economics.

Miss Lovelace, housing and home furnishings specialist for the Tennessee Agricultural Extension Service, was recently named State Woman of the Year by Progressive Farmer magazine. She's an expert in her field, and she understands fully the possibilities and needs of present-day home economics.

Miss Lovelace has been interested in home economics all her life. She was born in Union City, studied home economics at West Tennessee State College in Memphis, and earned her bachelor's and master's degrees in home economics at the University of Tennessee. She taught home economics at Union City High School and at Lincoln Memorial University in Harrogate.

COUNTY AGENT IN 1926

In 1926 she began her career in State home economics, when she was named Knox County's home demonstration agent. She became agent for Washington County in 1940, then came back to Knoxville in 1943 and was named home management specialist for the extension service.

A quick look at records of home economics progress in the State will prove Miss Lovelace's ability as a leader. During her first year as Knox County's home demonstration agent, the number of leaders used in girls' 4–H work tripled, the girls' 4–H enrollment increased from 100 girls in 18 clubs to 1,342 girls in 47 clubs and the number of home demonstration clubs doubled. She increased the number of activities of the home demonstration clubs and initiated the better homes tour. Knox County won national awards for 3 years under her leadership.

Washington County's record is similar.

SHE'S SEEN PROGRESS

As a homemaking specialist, Miss Lovelace has traveled throughout Tennessee about 3 weeks of each month, encouraging leaders, telling of improved homemaking techniques, conducting training schools and workshops, and helping the State's homemakers improve their homes.

She's a member of countless home economics associations. She spends much of her spare time in home economics activities: She likes to sew, makes hats, likes gardening, manages a house here and in Gatlinburg, refinishes furniture and works with crafts. She's active in her church, Cumberland Presbyterian, and has been vice president of the Altrusa class there. During vacations she travels; she's been through most of the United States and to Hawaii and Europe.

"I stay busy most of the time," she said.

Her career has been particularly satisfying, Miss Lovelace said. "I've stayed with this thing long enough to see people develop. I've seen 4–H girls grow into community leaders."

Here's home economics as Miss Lovelace sees it, its present and its future:

Home economics training, as always, is double-barreled: it trains for careers and for homemaking. The demand for trained home economists is increasing, too. Specialists are needed in many areas.

And training is needed more and more by the homemaker. She has to be so many things now—a manager, a child psychologist, a nutritionist, even an engineer, with her new appliances. There's just so much more to homemaking now than cooking and sewing.

BUSY AS GRANDMOTHER

Despite help from modern appliances, the housewife is just as busy as her grandmother was. She's a community leader. She has more leisure time, in which she is getting acquainted with her family. Homemaking isn't all drudgery now. The housewife has more choice in how she'll spend her time.

And of course, so many housewives are working. This calls for more managerial ability: She has to hold down a job and not let her family suffer.

The average homemaker today comes nearer being a partner with her husband. She understands the money situation and the whole family process of management. And she keeps up with what's going on in the world.

Modern canning and freezing methods and new appliances relieve the housewife of much of the cooking duties her mother had; but the art of cooking won't fade. I think women essentially like to work with food, experiment with recipes, cook for their families.

REQUIRED COURSE URGED

Faced with this many-sided role as housewife, girls in high school and college would do well to take some home economic courses, not matter what they're majoring in. "There are foods, textiles, interior decorating, sewing, child psychology. Probably every girl—and every boy, too—should take a little of it. It might be well to require a certain amount of it in school curriculums."

For the future, change is evident everywhere. Home economists are concentrating in these three areas:

1. Serving more individuals effectively: The extension service works well here, of course. Home economists are trying to reach people they haven't reached before. They're going to work with those people who aren't in an organized group (such as a home demonstration club): young homemakers, women who work, senior citizens.

Next year, for instance, they want to reach factory women. Rather than have meetings with them, the extension service will put up displays on homemaking. The displays will be in the factories where the women work and in beauty parlors and other places they frequent.

2. Research: There are, of course, many new products coming on the market. Research is being done on homemaking for handicapped persons—kitchens, clothing, appliances for handicapped homemakers. Under consideration is a national consumers' research department which would try to help the homemaker learn what products are available and which ones are best.

3. Strengthening education: Home economists want to make home economics education meet coming needs. Ways of family living are changing, and home economic training must change, too.

Bethesda Mailboxes Draw Attention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article taken from the Rock Hill (S.C.) Evening Herald on a project undertaken by the Bethesda community to improve their community by painting and repairing rural mailboxes. Mr. Jim Parker, of Rock Hill, S.C., the rural carrier in that area, has been working on this project for several years and I congratulate both the community leaders and Mr. Parker for their service:

BETHESDA MAILBOXES DRAW ATTENTION

(By Dean Wohlgemuth)

Chances are, a person driving down any road just about anywhere in the Nation, won't pay a bit of attention to any of the hundreds or even thousands of rural mailboxes he may pass.

That is, unless he happens to drive through York County, Bethesda community.

He still may not notice the mailboxes at first, but soon he will realize there is something different about mailboxes there. He starts to look closer, then begins to realize what it is—every mailbox is neatly painted, with red posts, white boxes, and blue lettering.

This contrasts with any other mailboxes he may have seen, which were unpainted, dilapidated, unsightly. Instead of hanging haphazardly atop a post which itself is an overexaggeration of the Leaning Tower of Pisa, Bethesda mailboxes are all in good repair, perched erect on a straight, sturdy post.

All this didn't just happen. The idea was born several months ago, when rural Mail Carrier Jim Parker, who delivers mail on Rock Hill, route 5, through Bethesda community, took a trip to the west coast.

Parker said he noticed that everywhere across the Nation, mailboxes were the same as those in York County, and on his own route. They needed an overhauling, for appearance sake.

Parker wrote to the Post Office Department district office in Atlanta, asking if something could be done about it. The office replied that improving the appearance of mailboxes was a good idea, if Parker could get a community or civic group to take it over as a project. They set forth only one condition—that the boxes themselves be painted white.

Parker went to work. He got the Bethesda Community Club interested, and they took over the project. They made arrangements with the State highway department to do the actual painting, and the club furnished the paint.

The job began about the first of the year. Now, of the approximately 135 mailboxes in the community, about 95 have already been painted. The remaining 35 will be done as soon as possible.

Members of the community club said that whenever necessary, the highway department is replacing posts.

The idea is now catching on in other areas. Parker says mailbox painting has begun to crop up along at least two other rural routes in the area, one a Rock Hill route, and one York route.

The Navy and Outer Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to insert into the RECORD a thought-provoking article by Spencer M. Beresford, entitled "Preface to Naval Strategy in Outer Space." The article was published in the March 1961 issue of U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings.

Mr. Beresford is counsel for the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, and is well-known to all members of the committee and to many other Members of Congress. He is a graduate of Harvard College and Harvard Law School and has served in the Navy during World War II. He was also a member of the faculty of the Naval Intelligence School at Anacostia, and is to this day a member of the Naval Reserve. Mr. Beresford is an authority on space law and is the author of many articles on this subject. As a member of the Science and Astronautics Committee I have found him extremely helpful and cooperative at all times.

His article reads as follows:

PREFACE TO NAVAL STRATEGY IN OUTER SPACE

(By Spencer M. Beresford)

The unresting progress of mankind causes continual change in the weapons; and with that must come a continual change in the manner of fighting."—ALFRED T. MAHAN.

Technology proceeds independently of international politics. It is the policy of the United States that "activities in space should be devoted to peaceful purposes." In the United Nations and elsewhere, the U.S. Government and many individual Americans have pressed for an international agreement on the legal control of outer space. Nevertheless, it must be recognized that these efforts may fail. Technology moves relentlessly forward. Prudence requires us, therefore, to plan and prepare for the possibility of space warfare.

Concern is intensified by the thought, which has occurred to many, that military space systems could tilt the balance in favor of offensive as against defensive operations. While it harbors no desires for foreign conquest, the United States is nevertheless interested in maintaining effective deterrent power and in being able to wage limited wars of defense. Will the emergence of military space systems impair our national abilities in either of these respects?

In the perspective of national strategy, space power can contribute greatly both to waging limited wars and to the deterrence of general war. It may seem surprising to speak of using space weapons in limited wars. In all probability, however, space warfare can be limited more readily than warfare on the surface, since it need not involve extensive casualties or property damage. Space power can also make important contributions to the strategy of deterrence. Its very diversity will complicate an adversary's decision to attack, by adding to his problems of intelligence, coordination and targeting. Thus a substantial capability for space warfare may tend to stabilize the strategic balance.

In the cold war, demonstrations of space capabilities will continue to influence world opinion and thereby the international position of the United States.

THE ROLE OF THE NAVY IN OUTER SPACE

From a technological standpoint, the age of space warfare is almost at hand.

What part will the Navy play in this new field? What advantages can it exploit? What problems must it face?

Space is recognized as a medium that holds great promise, and at the same time, great danger for the United States and the free world. The Navy has unparalleled capabilities, some actual and some potential, for exploiting this promise and for guarding against attendant dangers.

In the first place, it is generally understood that the military significance of space activities, at least for a long time to come, will depend on their relation to the earth's surface. For example, missiles and space vehicles must be launched, observed, controlled, and recovered by surface facilities and equipment. In addition, any military objective of space activities necessarily relates to the earth's surface (e.g., for observation, location, communication, or attack).

The Navy can control from and operate on about 72 percent of the earth's surface. That is the extent of the world's oceans and seas. In contrast, Soviet territory covers less than 5 percent of the earth's surface, and U.S. territory less than 2 percent. Naval operations over this vast area can continue for long periods without support. It is also the mission and function of the Navy to control and operate in the airspace above the oceans and seas.

On the high seas, including their depths and airspace, all nations enjoy complete freedom of passage. Elsewhere, foreign ships, aircraft, and missiles are not usually free to pass except by specific permission of the territorial state. For this reason, among others, test firings of long-range missiles, flights of manned space vehicles and the like are and doubtless will be conducted over international waters. In particular, operations at sea are necessary for search and recovery, as in Project Mercury, and for the observation of missiles and space vehicles, as by instrumentation ships of the Atlantic and Pacific Missile Ranges.

In the future, an increasing proportion of missiles and space vehicles will be launched at sea, for reasons of safety, security, reduced costs, easier logistics, and greater choice of launching site and direction. For example, sea launches of nuclear rockets will minimize surface contamination.

Other advantages result from scientific, technical, and operating experience found only in the Navy. For example, an artificial space environment most closely resembles a submarine environment. Naval experience in submarine operations and techniques can contribute substantially to the

development and use of manned space vehicles.

In wartime operations, an even more significant naval advantage than extensive coverage of the earth's surface would be the capability of naval forces for mobility and concealment. This advantage manifests itself most clearly in undersea operations. Surface forces also present targets of uncertain and changeable location, and can concentrate and launch attacks with missiles at unexpected times and places.

At the same time, naval astronautics must face a number of problems: the difficulty of launching missiles from moving platforms; the limitations (as to space, weight, and other factors) imposed by a seagoing environment; and the special requirements of antisubmarine and amphibious warfare.

On balance, however, it seems clear not only that space techniques can enable the Navy to carry out its present missions more effectively, but that the Navy enjoys important advantages for the conduct of operations in outer space. In time, the new naval capabilities that outer space accords may lead to new naval missions.

THE NATURE OF SPACE WARFARE

At the outbreak of World War II, the rocket as a weapon had been largely forgotten for more than a 100 years. It was used in that war, however, for many purposes. The infantry used it against tanks and aircraft. The Navy used it for barrage fire on landing beaches. Both Army and Navy air forces used it to attack ships and other aircraft. It was used most memorably by the Germans in the form of the V–2 for long-range strategic bombardment.

Since World War II, the accuracy of rocket fire—formerly its greatest weakness—has been radically improved, while its destructive power has increased many times. Internal and external guidance systems and the means of stabilization in flight have now been developed to the point where even ballistic missiles—which are guided at least in the sense of being pointed by their launching apparatus—are accurate enough for many military purposes. However, the technological development that has added most to the military value of the missile is the nuclear warhead. Missiles are fast becoming the principal means of delivering nuclear weapons.

It would be hazardous to say how soon we will find ourselves technologically in the age of space warfare. A reasonable guess is 5 to 10 years. For example, Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin, U.S. Army (retired), has written that "By 1965, missiles and satellites will have shrunk the world to such an extent that militarily the earth itself will be a [single] tactical theater." Still later, in 10 to 20 or 25 years, "true" space weapons will be in the hands of the armed services, bases will be established in outer space, and manned, maneuverable space vehicles will be able to cruise the cosmos.

Considering the time required for the evolution of new strategic and tactical doctrines, it is not too soon to examine the probable capabilities and limitations of space weapons and the general outlines of space strategy.

From a military point of view, the chief characteristics of space vehicles are high speed and altitude and long range and flight time. The immediate use of these characteristics is reconnaissance. High speed and altitude would facilitate surprise attack. Long range and flight time would lend themselves to freedom from support, including support by land and sea power.

The wartime use of outer space would probably differ from other forms of warfare in its objectives, its weapons, and its medium of operations. For some time to come, at least, its objectives would be more limited than those of land, naval, or even air warfare. At first, space systems would merely assist or complement armies, fleets, and air forces. Space weapons themselves, of course, would far surpass all other weapon of war in speed and range. In maneuverability, assuming an adequate source of energy, they would compare quite favorably with aircraft. In fact, they would enjoy all the military advantages of aircraft without some of their principal limitations (e.g., susceptibility to turbulent weather, low visibility, and icing). For example, controllable attack satellites would share the advantages now held by aircraft over ballistic missiles—particularly the ability to be recalled from their targets at the last moment. Orbiting spacecraft have no counterpart, moreover, other than forts on land, for endurance and self-sufficiency. Lastly, the medium of space operations—"the heavens' pathless way"—is even more uniform, featureless, and free from natural obstacles than are the oceans or the air. At certain altitudes, barriers such as the Van Allen radiation belts indeed exist; but these can probably be overcome without undue difficulty or loss of effectiveness.

Given such military characteristics, space weapons and techniques bid fair to convert into fact the prophecy of Gen. Thomas S. Power, U.S. Air Force, that "the present concept of three-dimensional warfare will eventually expand into what may be termed warfare in four dimensions, warfare in which the operational relationship between space and time will become the most critical factor."

SPACE POWER

In a paper on naval strategy, space power might be described as "the space arm of seapower." Historically, the tools by which the sea is controlled have varied greatly. They now include aircraft as well as ships. Why not satellites as well as submarines? On the other hand, in order to analyze how space power may affect campaigns at sea, space power must be considered partly in contradistinction to landpower and seapower. Giving it a new name may help us discern its strengths and limitations.

Seapower is traditionally defined as the ability of a nation to control transportation over the seas in wartime. It is certainly possible that space power, in like manner, may someday enable a nation to control wartime transportation in space itself. That day, however, is probably far distant. The transportation of cargoes and personnel through outer space is, and will probably remain for some time, too costly for general adoption. In the foreseeable future, outer space is likely to be important for military purposes, first, because of its effect on surface activities (including transport and communications) and, secondly, as an avenue of attack. In this respect, as in others, spacepower stands in much the same relation to airpower as airpower does to seapower.

The use of outer space as an avenue of attack may be compared to air strikes or the bombardment of land objectives from the sea. There is, however, an essential difference. Naval bombardment is only an incidental and relatively minor use of seapower. On the other hand, air strikes are a major function of airpower, and it seems almost certain that attacks on land or sea objectives will become a major function of spacepower.

At this point, it is well to recall that air power depends in large part on land and sea power. An airplane in a position to bomb a target is only the final link in a long chain of causation. Advanced airbases are often seized by armies. In turn, the armies may have been landed from ships. The planes themselves, their fuel, cargoes, crews, and supplies are often brought by ship to the forward areas. True, the dependence of air power on land and sea power, already much less than in the past, will doubtless be further lessened by the longer range and greater endurance of aircraft (e.g., those powered by nuclear engines). Yet the heavy expense of flying aircraft over great distances, compared with the cost of ocean transportation, is likely to ensure that local air superiority will still derive, in many cases, from land operations or command of the sea.

Space power, however, may prove to be more independent than air power. Even missiles of intermediate range reach a top speed of some 10,000 miles an hour. The maximum speed of long-range missiles (ICBM's) is 15,000 miles an hour or more. These speeds are of the same order of magnitude as orbital velocities at similar altitudes (about 18,000 miles an hour), which would permit a missile to strike any point on earth. The difference in cost between short and long ranges is thus far less for spacecraft than for aircraft, and the incentive to move missiles by land or sea into forward areas, rather than fire them the full distance, under their own power, is correspondingly reduced.

One advantage of very-long-range missiles is that they greatly increase the choice of launching sites and flight paths. A missile with a range of 9,000 nautical miles or so reaches near-orbital velocity; it can hit any point on earth from any other point, and (with the use of mobile launching sites) from any direction. The difficulty of defending against such a missile can be seen by considering the problem of detection. At present, each radar installation designed to detect ballistic missiles scans a rather narrow fixed sector in the direction of known or suspected launching sites. Missiles of very long range, if launched along suitable flight paths, could avoid detection by such installations.

Nevertheless, the savings to be made by launching missiles from advanced bases would be substantial, and would doubtless induce belligerent nations to transport some of the tools of space power by sea. In addition, distance will still be a major factor in strategy. The shorter the range, the more effective (and the cheaper) an attack from outer space would tend to be. At shorter ranges, missiles could be fired more accurately, and would allow less reaction time for detection and defensive action.

CONTROL OF OUTER SPACE

As a strategic concept, "control of space" refers to the ability to use outer space for one's own purposes and to deny its use to the enemy.

The concept of control has long been a commonplace of land warfare ("take the high ground and hold it"). Its extension to sea warfare by the British Navy brought about a revolution in naval strategy. The classic example is the command of the seas exercised by the British Grand Fleet in World War I. In air warfare, the concept of control has had a limited but still significant application. Local air superiority is recognized as essential to many kinds of military operations, and was a tenet of the German blitzkrieg doctrine. The air operations conducted out of Henderson Field on Guadalcanal provide an example from American experience.

What, then, is the application of the concept to space warfare? Presumably, it will be more limited to space warfare than it is to air warfare—if only because outer space is boundless, while airspace, although significantly three dimensional, ends at a relatively low altitude. The medium of outer space, or even that portion of it which lies immediately around the earth, is naturally less subject to military control than the land, the sea, or air.

At best, however, control of any medium is an ideal, a limit, a strategic working con-

cept. In practice, it is never fully attained—never complete in degree, nor unbounded in space or time. For example, commerce raiding and undersea warfare have usually been possible to an inferior naval power, such as Germany in both World Wars, however great the maritime control exercised by the dominant sea power.

Yet the temporary use of a limited portion of land or ocean surface has often been of great strategic or tactical value. The temporary use of airspace, in particular, is relatively valuable and easy to acquire. An example is the bombing of Tokyo by 16 Mitchell bombers from the carrier *Hornet* in April 1942, when the surrounding oceans and airspace were dominated by Japan. By extrapolation, it seems likely that the temporary use of portions of outer space (e.g., by the launching of long-range missiles) would be (1) still easier to acquire and (2) all that may be needed to inflict a damaging and perhaps decisive low.

On the other hand, in the present and immediately foreseeable state of space technology, the control of large portions of outer space, in the sense of denying their use to an enemy, may not be feasible at all. Because of their range, their altitude, and above all their speed, spacecraft will be very difficult indeed to detect and intercept. The fact that exclusive control of outer space may consequently not be feasible, even to a limited and temporary degree, calls for a rethinking of strategic concepts.

At present, all that can be done is to suggest approaches to the problem. Not only space technology but operational concepts themselves must be imagined and projected into the future.

The first step is to concentrate upon the critical portion of outer space. Initially, this is likely to be geocentric space—the space immediately around the earth, out to a distance of, say, one earth-radius from the surface. Geocentric space is that portion from which it would be most important to exclude an enemy. At present and for some time to come, as we have seen, the military value of space operations will depend upon the extent to which they can affect our own and enemy capabilities on the surface. Geocentric space is also that portion of outer space from which exclusion of an enemy would be practical.

Secondly, the history of naval warfare suggests that we should consider the value of bases and the possibility of controlling points and areas (or, rather, volumes) of convergence in outer space (e.g., along lines from the launching points to the probable targets of long-range missiles). Focal areas and terminal areas provide the parallel in naval strategy. Because they could not completely control all the seas, the British found it advantageous to establish bases and advanced positions, as, for example, at Gibraltar or with the concentration of the fleet at Scapa Flow during World War II.

The necessity of bases for the control of outer space was stated by Gen. Thomas D. White, U.S. Air Force, as follows: " * * * to control space we must not only be able to go through it with vehicles that travel from point to point, but we must be able to stay in space with human beings who can carry out jobs efficiently."

The military advantages of bases in outer space seem bound to attract the strategic planner. Operations at such a base would be virtually free from the difficulties presented by the earth's atmosphere (especially the reentry problem), weather, and gravitational field. From such a base, the earth could be kept under constant surveillance. Relatively little energy would be required to fire a missile earthward.

Artificial space bases (space stations) could serve many useful purposes, but might prove highly vulnerable unless equipped to detect and evade attack. They could be used, for example, as storage depots, staging or transfer points, and reconnaissance and missile-launching sites. On the other hand, they might prove at least as vulnerable as aircraft, since they would not be difficult to detect, and their positions in orbit could be determined accurately in advance. Manned spacecraft seem especially vulnerable if hit, although better able to take evasive action. It would be premature, however, to pass judgment now on the vulnerability of spacecraft or even satellites. Neither the physical conditions of outer space nor the future techniques of space flight are well enough known for anyone to say with certainty how vulnerable an artificial space base would be.

In contrast, large natural space bases such as the moon seem virtually indestructible, mainly because of their size. The military advantages of a moon base were elaborated by Brig. Gen. Homer Boushey, U.S. Air Force (then the Director of Advanced Technology), in a speech to the Aero Club of Washington, D.C., in January 1958. General Boushey concluded that the moon "represents the age-old military advantage of 'high ground.'" While this argument has since been questioned, criticism of its logic largely relates to the general or offensive use of a moon base and not to its value for defense (retaliation). There seems good reason to agree that exclusive possession of a moon base would increase the strategic deterrent by making it virtually impossible for a foreign country to destroy American retaliatory capacity by surprise attack. The point is emphasized by the fact that, in the near future, space weapons will probably add more to offensive than to defensive capabilities.

Thirdly, no more than a very partial and temporary control of outer space is necessary for reconnaissance—which has been called the first and most obvious military use of outer space. Like the moon base, reconnaissance from outer space could help correct the balance between offensive and defensive capabilities. It provides better means of defense against ballistic missiles and other space weapons. Later, it could itself become part of offensive weapon systems.

Space reconnaissance can be conducted by a variety of means—optical, photographic, radar, infrared, and electronic intercept. It seems impossible to specify any maximum altitude at which military photography could be carried out. Nevertheless, with available photographic equipment at satellite altitudes (more than 100 miles), about all that can be seen and identified are lines of communication, urban areas, large airfields, naval facilities, and industrial installations. Detailed target analysis is not yet practicable from photographs taken at such altitudes, nor is the detection of small military installations, such as missile sites. Missile firings, however, could be detected and located from even greater altitudes by nonphotographic means.

As a means of reconnaissance, space power could be viewed as merely an operational extension (though an important one) of land, sea, and air power. On the other hand, reconnaissance from outer space can cover incomparably greater areas of the earth's surface, and be maintained for longer periods, than any form of reconnaissance previously known. Satellite reconnaissance in particular permits the frequent repetition of the same view, providing verification and revealing movement and other changes.

In the future, space reconnaissance may be as easy and as useful for tactical as for strategic purposes. For example, the commander of an army or a fleet could launch reconnaissance satellites whenever the tactical situation required quick and accurate information on enemy forces and targets over a large area.

Many other military uses of outer space have been suggested, including navigation, communication, weather, and mapping satellites and interceptor spacecraft. All these will doubtless be developed in the fairly near future. It may be noted that none of them is apparently subject to such stringent altitude limitations as reconnaissance spacecraft.

Perhaps a word should be said about bombing from outerspace. It is hardly possible to approach the subject without plunging into controversy. Here again, however, final judgment would be premature.

Unlike the airplane, the spaceship cannot rely on gravity alone as a propellant for its bombs. Bombing from outerspace would involve imparting velocity to the bomb or missile (which would otherwise continue in orbit for example, along with its parent satellite). In comparison with alternative methods such as surface-to-surface or airborne delivery, therefore, large amounts of propellant may be needed, adding to the weight of the spacecraft and the cost of bombarding the target.

Nevertheless, it has been concluded on the basis of careful study that bombing from satellites and other spacecraft is technically feasible. If a fairly flat trajectory is allowed for descent, it is said, the propulsion requirements become quite acceptable. Many other questions must await a weapon system analysis and actual experiment—for example, vulnerability and reliability, costs (not only of the bombing satellites but of the whole supporting system), recoverability and the use of decoys and other means of cover and deception.

Whether bombing from spacecraft will be, in the future, either effective or available at reasonable cost will evidently depend upon the development of space technology.

The formidable military advantages of space power will be partly offset by new and perplexing problems. For example, the problem of distinguishing military spacecraft from scientific satellites, meteors, and other objects in outer space will give rise to a need for some means of investigation and identification. Such difficulties emphasize the value of vigorous research, development, and operational planning.

CONCLUSION

Historical precedent and strategic principle point to the wisdom of combining all arms of sea power—air and spacecraft as well as ships and submarines. The prospects and dangers of space warfare call for the constant development of new techniques and for a proper balance of forces. In the event of future wars, there is reason to believe, control of the seas and consequently final victory itself may fall to the nation that best combines space power with the older tools of war.

Port of Los Angeles: Long Beach Customhouse Should Be at the Harbor, Saving Amount of All Federal Taxes Payable by 10,000 Taxpayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, it takes 10,000 U.S. taxpayers who each pay $200 of their scant earnings in taxes to accumulate $2 million. Yet the U.S. Government now proposes to waste and

squander more than this amount of money by persisting in a stupid error in judgment. I am not advising that many taxpayers to go on strike, but I take this means of again pointing out to the Bureau of Customs and the General Services Administration a burden just plain sanity, let alone fiscal responsibility, places upon them. It is to place the customhouse for the twin ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach in the harbor area where it should be, not 22 miles inland where it should not be. The present plan is to include this facility in a Federal office building to be constructed in downtown Los Angeles at a cost in excess of $30 a square foot. Over $2 million of that cost will be incurred for appraisers warehouse space which could be built in the harbor area at an estimated cost of $5 a square foot. This and other wastes of taxpayers' money by reason of the misguided intentions of these mentioned Government agencies are detailed in the following editorial appearing in the Long Beach Independent-Press-Telegram on March 27:

HARBOR CUSTOMS HEADQUARTERS WOULD SAVE MAN-HOURS AND MONEY

We commend to the attention of the U.S. Bureau of Customs the action taken last week by its sister Federal agency, the Bureau of Land Management.

The Interior Department announced it was moving the Los Angeles office of the Bureau of Land Management to Riverside.

Bureau of Land Management Director Karl S. Landstrom said the move will place the Bureau's southern California headquarters on the doorstep of the lands and resources it administers. The decision to move, he said, was based on findings that the downtown Los Angeles location had created many hardships on both the public and the Bureau.

We suggest this action warrants serious attention by the new U.S. Commissioner of Customs, Philip Nichols, Jr., and by the Los Angeles District Collector of Customs due to be named shortly.

The Los Angeles customs headquarters are located in downtown Los Angeles. More than 90 percent of its revenues comes from goods entering through the ports of Long Beach and of Los Angeles. The customs headquarters is located 22 miles away from those ports.

Each year, the Bureau of Customs spends $50,000 to transport merchandise samples the 22 miles from the piers to the appraiser's store in downtown Los Angeles.

Every day, the customs dispatches eight examiners from downtown Los Angeles to the harbor area to examine merchandise that is too fragile or too bulky to be transported to the appraiser's store. The customs allows 1 hour travel time for these employees to reach the harbor area and another hour to return. Thus each of the eight employees loses 2 hours a day in transportation. This totals 16 manhours or 2 man-days each day lost in transportation.

The Los Angeles custom house is the only one in the Nation not located adjacent to the harbor area it serves.

Yet, the Bureau of Customs has proposed the Government spend more than $4 million to provide new customs quarters in a Federal building in the civic center.

Most of this customs space would be warehousing facilities for the appraiser's stores. Good warehouses have been built in the harbor area for $5 a square foot. But the customs proposes to construct a warehouse in the traffic-choked Los Angeles civic center at a cost in excess of $30 a square foot.

We propose that the new officials of the Bureau of Customs restudy this absurd scheme. We urge them to follow the splendid example of the Bureau of Land Management and to relocate the customhouse in the harbor where it belongs.

Sure it will cost some money to chop the customs facilities out of the federal building plans. The General Services Administration estimates it will cost about $150,000 to redraft the designs to eliminate customs from the federal building. But at a difference of, say, even $20 a square foot in construction costs between a harbor customs and a downtown customs, that $150,000 would save in excess of $2 million in taxpayers' money.

It may be an inconvenience for some customs employees and customhouse brokers to drive a little farther to work each morning—down to the harbor rather than to downtown Los Angeles. However, this inconvenience will be tempered by lighter traffic and ample parking space available in the harbor.

Some of these people may even want to relocate their families in the harbor area and get out of the Los Angeles smog.

In any event, the savings to the taxpayer and added convenience to the general public will more than compensate for any temporary inconvenience to a relatively few individuals.

Kill the Offensive Student Affidavit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I have long been distressed by the provision of the National Defense Education Act which requires applicants for student loans to sign a sweeping disclaimer of any affiliation or belief in movements to overthrow the Government of the United States. The affidavit of nonbelief singles out American college students in general, and those in need of financial support in particular, as special objects of official suspicion. The affidavit constitutes a gross insult and offense to many thousands of patriotic young Americans by capriciously bringing them under suspicion of disloyalty to the United States.

I have recently introduced a bill to eliminate the disclaimer affidavit, to which I hope the Congress will give prompt and favorable consideration.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a thoughtful and well-conceived editorial on this matter which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on April 11, 1961. The editorial entitled "Kill the Offensive Student Affidavit," follows:

KILL THE OFFENSIVE STUDENT AFFIDAVIT

That hotly debated affidavit requirement in the Federal student loan program more or less dropped out of the news last year, as the Nation's attention was claimed by two gentlemen named Nixon and Kennedy—one of whom, Mr. Kennedy, himself sponsored a Senate bill to eliminate it. But the requirement is still there (the Kennedy bill passed the Senate, then died in the House), and it remains as offensive as ever.

The present law requires an applicant for a student loan not only to swear allegiance to the United States, but also to sign a sweeping declaration that "he does not believe in, and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional means."

As a statement of pure belief, this goes far beyond a mere declaration of nonmembership in the Communist Party. It becomes a coercive intrusion by Government on the individual conscience.

The dispute has not been over the oath of allegiance, which most readily accept, but rather over the affidavit of nonbelief. From all the recipients of Federal aid, this singles out needy students as special objects of official suspicion. By extension, it reflects distrust on all the youth of America—though even J. Edgar Hoover would have trouble producing a 1961 documentary, "I Was a Teenage Communist."

More fundamentally, though the Federal Government is rightly concerned with its citizens' actions it has no business demanding to know their purely private beliefs as a condition of receiving Federal benefits. And it ought to keep its doctrinal fingers out of the academic pot.

The affidavit is silly and futile anyway, of course, because a real Communist would hardly balk at the mere signing of a false oath.

New York's Congressman JOHN V. LINDSAY has introduced a new bill to eliminate the requirement. The time for action is now, before another year's rush of applications brings another crisis of conscience to students and colleges alike. (More than 70 colleges and universities have protested the affidavit; many, including Yale, Harvard, and Princeton, have flatly refused to participate in the loan program because of it.)

The affidavit insults a whole generation. It invades the privacy of the mind in that one area—the college—which should be its supreme sanctuary. It grossly offends the Nation's educators. And it accomplishes nothing.

It's high time to throw it out, unmourned.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Apportionment of Seats in the House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN TABER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I herewith submit a copy of a letter by Prof. Walter F. Willcox, with reference to the apportionment of seats in the House of Representatives. This letter is addressed to the chairman of a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the House, and to my mind, is an important item to be considered:

ITHACA, N.Y., *March 27, 1961.*

Hon. JOHN TABER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TABER: I enclose a copy of a letter which I have just written to the chairman of the subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary, with the request that you will have it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and send me two copies of the issue containing it.

Yours respectfully,

W. F. WILLCOX.

MARCH 27, 1961.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LANE: Since 1900 Congress has used one or the other of two methods of apportioning seats in the House of Representatives among the States after a census; the method of major fractions was used after the censuses of 1910 and 1930 (after 1920 Congress for the only time in history did not apportion) and the method of equal proportions after the censuses of 1940 and 1950. The results of these methods differ usually by only one seat.

I write to you to give my reasons for thinking that, after the census of 1940, a seat was apportioned to Arkansas which should have gone to Michigan; after that of 1950, one was apportioned to Kansas which should have gone to California, and after that of 1960, the prospect is that Congress will apportion to New Hampshire a seat which, if the following argument is accepted, should go to Massachusetts.

The figures below give the evidence on which I base my conclusion:

Date of censuses	States involved	Seats involved	Population distribution	
1940	Arkansas and Michigan	24	6.471	12.529
1950	Kansas and California	36	5.491	30.509
1960	New Hamsphire and Massachusetts	14	1.476	12.524

Under the 1960 figures, either method would give New Hampshire and Massachusetts together 14 seats, but if their combined population, 5,755,499, is divided by 14 and the quotient, 411,107, divided into the population of each, the results are for New Hampshire 1.476 and for Massachusetts 12.524.

Do not these figures indicate that after the 1940 census, Michigan with a quotient of 12.529 had a stronger claim to the doubtful seat than Arkansas which had a quotient of only 6.471?

In the same way, after the 1950 census, it is my claim that California with a quotient of 30.509 should have received 31 seats instead of 30 and Kansas with a quotient of 5.491 should have received only 5 seats instead of the 6 allotted to it.

So, too, under the 1960 figures, Massachusetts is likely to receive only 12 seats, although its quotient of 12.524 would entitle it to 13, and New Hampshire with a quotient of 1.476 should receive only 1 instead of the 2 now likely to go to it.

Yours sincerely,

WALTER F. WILLCOX.

Welfare of the Domestic Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 14, 1961

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial column by Col. W. D. Workman of Columbia, S.C., a highly influential and respected newspaper columnist and author. The article entitled, "Industry in United States Hurt by Overseas Friends," has been printed in a number of newspapers in the Southeast, including the April 7, 1961, issue of the Greenville News of Greenville, S.C. Colonel Workman presents some important facts to show that something must be done—and very soon—to protect the welfare of our domestic textile industry and its many employees.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDUSTRY IN UNITED STATES HURT BY OVERSEA FRIENDS

(By W. D. Workman)

The United States today faces an American dilemma as formidable and as nearly insoluble as the dilemma of race relations which concerned Gunnar Myrdal in the 1940's.

The current problem arises out of the Nation's free trade policies. International affairs, now more important than ever, require that the United States maintain cordial trade relations with the friendly and neutral nations of the world. But those relations are becoming strained in the light of the undeniable damage being done to the Nation's domestic economy by foreign imports.

The damage is widespread, and is increasing. Hardly a day passes that Congress is not importuned by some State legislature or trade association to stop the inflow of foreign-made commodities ranging over such diverse fields as baseball gloves, bicycles, optics, musical recordings, barbed wire, nails, plywood, and a host of others.

Atop the list of aggrieved industries is textiles, which holds the No. 1 position for several reasons. In the first place, the Nation's textile industry stands among the top three nationally, in terms of numbers of workers employed and of total impact on our economy. Furthermore, according to a special Senate subcommittee report of 1959, the Department of Defense has ranked the textile industry second only to steel in terms of military essentiality.

The industry is active in 43 States, and employs more than 900,000 persons even after continued job losses in recent years. Its companion industry, apparel manufacturing, employs more than a million workers. If the two are regarded in combination, they give employment to one out of every eight factory workers in the land. Obviously, what hurts these industries must hurt the Nation.

And the industry is hurting—through no fault of its own. Technology has been a handmaiden to the textile industry, and no other manufacturing process in the country is more scientifically advanced or automatically operated. Research has been continuous and effective, and sales promotion has been equally stimulated.

Yet, despite everyy laborsaving device, research development, or new product use, large segments of the textile industry are now being driven to the wall. The villains of the piece are foreign imports, which are flooding into the United States in vast and growing numbers. These imported goods, manufactured at a fraction of the cost of American-made products, can undersell domestic production in every instance.

And, to make matters worse, many of the imports are of good quality and workmanship, thanks to America's postwar handouts of both money and know-how to foreign nations.

To cite just one example of the problem, a large finishing plant in the southeast is offered unfinished "gray goods" from Japan, delivered at the mill for an appreciable savings over the same grade of cotton textiles manufactured in an American mill only a dozen miles away from the finishing plant.

The difference lies in the fact that Japanese goods are manufactured at meager wage rates which are illegal in this country, and are made out of cotton (probably American) which can be bought by Japan on the world market at 8 cents a pound less than the same cotton would cost an American manufacturer.

The problem is further complicated by the fact that textile manufacturing is becoming universal throughout the world. Where once Japan posed the greatest threat to the United States, imports now are flooding in from such widely separated points as Hong Kong, Portugal, Pakistan, Egypt, France, India, and Spain. And since there are wide differentials of cost and price among these countries, it becomes virtually impossible to raise a tariff wall high enough to protect the domestic industry without shutting off all trade with many longtime friends of the United States.

Relief is now being sought by the textile industry—the fixing of quotas by country and by category of goods. Textile manufacturers realize the Nation's stake in world commerce, and they are willing to pay their share of the costs involved. What they do ask is a better set of rules for competition—along with an understanding of the close relation between the Nation's economic welfare and the national security.

The most hopeful note that textile men have gotten from the new administration actually came before the election. Back in August of last year, John F. Kennedy had this word of encouragement in a letter to South Carolina's Governor, Ernest F. Hollings, a spokesman for the industry:

"Imports of textile products, including apparel, should be within limits which will not endanger our own existing textile capacity and employment, and which will permit growth of the industry in reasonable relationship to the expansion of our overall economy."

The textile men hope these words have not been forgotten.

Proposal To Equalize Tax and Benefits in the Social Security System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Frank Dickinson of Bronxville, N.Y., has offered a proposal which would attempt to cure the present imbalance of tax burdens and benefits in the social security system. He points out that presently America's young taxpayers are footing the bill for social security recipients whose payments, in relation to benefits received, are minimal and urges that there be a graduated social security tax to help even out the amount of tax paid and benefits received. This proposal was the subject of a recent editorial in the New York Sunday News of April 2, 1961. I would like at this point to insert the Sunday News editorial on this subject in the RECORD at this point:

REJIGGERING SOCIAL SECURITY

If the Kennedy administration has its way, the current Congress will increase and extend assorted benefits under social security, particularly with regard to higher payments to widows of insured workers, optional earlier retirement for male workers, and easier qualifications for retirement.

The President wants to do this by small, across the board increases in the premiums paid by employers and employees. Those premiums now come to 3 percent paid by the employer and 3 percent by the worker on the first $4,800 of income.

These increased benefits may be advisable; we don't know. But an interesting article in a recent issue of the Journal of Insurance, by Frank G. Dickinson, questions the wisdom of charging all age groups the same premiums for their social security.

It doesn't seem fair, for one thing, to assess a man who enters the social security system at age 20 the same or increasing percentages for 45 years, while a worker at, say, age 60 will have to pay the flat premium for only 5 more years before he starts collecting.

This unfairness, Dickinson believes, will dawn on the younger age group sooner or later, and may trigger a serious tax rebellion which could wreck the social security system.

Why not, then, Dickinson suggests, rejigger the premium rates so that the under-32 group would pay less, the 32–49 group the same as now, and the group aged 50 and over a good deal more?

Under the Dickinson plan, the younger age group's rate would be cut to 1½ percent, the middle rate would stay at 3 percent, and the premiums paid by older persons would go up to 4½ percent. Further increases, contemplated by the social security law since it first took effect in 1937, would be made proportionately as time went on.

The effect, as Dickinson sees it, would be to bring social security closer to the principles on which sound insurance businesses operate, and to cut down the danger that benefits due under social security may sometime become so huge as to ruin or seriously impair the whole setup.

Without going overboard for the Dickinson proposals, we'll say we do think they should be carefully considered by everybody—particularly Members of Congress—interested in improving the social security system.

The Case for the B–70 in an Age of Missiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 14, 1961

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, in this crucial cold war, it is extremely encouraging to see the intense interest which has been given to President Kennedy's defense budget. Such extraordinary attention to our military preparedness should surely result in a program which will keep our Nation strong and secure, and it is my hope that all of our citizens, whether in the military or in civilian life, will continue to study and discuss the proposals which have been presented.

One of the most important items in President Kennedy's defense message concerns the future of the B–70 supersonic jet bomber.

An extremely thought-provoking and informative article on this subject was included in the April 17 issue of Newsweek magazine and I ask unanimous consent that this item, which was written by Gen. Carl Spaatz, former Air Force Chief of Staff, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CASE FOR THE B–70 IN AN AGE OF MISSILES

(One controversial economy of the Kennedy defense budget was a sharp cutback in the B–70 superbomber program. Newsweek's contributing editor on military affairs, Gen. Carl Spatz, former Air Force Chief of Staff, here states the risks he sees in this decision—and argues the case for the jet bombers.)

The revised military budget, as explained to a Senate committee last week by Secretary McNamara, is generally sensible and reassuring. However, it contains one serious flaw. This derives from the new administration's hesitancy about developing the B–70 supersonic jet bomber.

Chairman RICHARD RUSSELL of the Armed Services Committee, after listening to McNamara's defense of a small experimental appropriation for the B–70, expressed the opinion that the project should be dropped altogether or be brought to the production stage as soon as feasible. He indicated that he personally favored the latter course and thought that the committee would agree.

McNamara had argued that missiles would be capable of filling the Nation's need for strategic air strength by the time the B–70 could get into production. He had agreed that the scientific breakthroughs exploited by the B–70 should be developed experimentally but that quantity production of a new manned bomber should await further refinements.

In the meantime, he suggested, the present B–52, equipped with Skybolt missiles, would supplement the Nation's arsenal of missiles adequately.

This will doubtless be true if the Soviet Union is considerate enough to desist from developing and producing a B–70 of its own. But if the Russians should develop a 2,000-mile-an-hour plane with the characteristics of the B–70, our B–52's would be swept from the skies in any intercontinental war. And our missiles might or might not do the job. It is for this reason that the administration's course is so risky. If, on the other hand, the Soviet Union places sole reliance on guided missiles and we include the B–70 in our arsenal, we shall have an incalculable advantage. The thinking machine never will be invented that can substitute for the human mind in maneuvering an air vehicle. The Minuteman and the Polaris, much as we need them, can never be wholly satisfactory substitutes for manned aircraft.

The best missile will be next to useless without the up-to-the-minute reconnaissance only a manned plane can still supply today. Reconnaissance satellites can do only part of the job, at best, and will be vulnerable to attack by countersatellites in any war of the future.

As a bomber, too, the B–70 would have advantages over ballistic missiles. It could strike more rapidly because it could cruise the fringes of enemy territory and release its rockets a thousand miles or more from its targets. It could be recalled in flight and thus would have a safety factor missiles lack. It would be less vulnerable than any missile, even the Polaris, because it could maneuver in the limitless oceans of the air.

It would be as useful in nonatomic as well as atomic war. It could carry large payloads of conventional explosives. Missiles, by contrast, are next to useless unless armed with atomic warheads. Any investment we might make in the B–70 would not be wasted in the event of nuclear disarmament agreements.

The kind of slow and cautious development McNamara seems to have in mind will not be sufficient to give the B–70 a thorough test or to permit its full exploitation as an important component of our weapons system.

Back in 1937, the U.S. military command considered abolishing from its budget all funds for the development of the B–17. Fortunately, they decided against it. Without the B–17, the Second World War certainly would have been prolonged at a heavy cost in lives and treasure and might have been lost. We can only hope that the B–70 decision also will be reconsidered before it is too late.

Advertising Never Sold Them Anything

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, a few leading economists, in-

cluding Presidential adviser J. Kenneth Galbraith, have suggested that our standard of living is too high, and that we would be better off leading a simpler life. Galbraith in his book "The Affluent Society," is extremely critical of advertising and declares that it creates a bias in the mind of consumers in favor of private spending and against public spending.

An eloquent argument against this point of view appeared recently in an advertisement, prepared by Erwin Wasey, Ruthrauff & Ryan, Inc., advertising agency of Philadelphia.

It was published as a public service by the Philadelphia Daily News.

I ask unanimous consent to include this important and timely message in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a portion of my remarks:

HERE'S A FAMILY WHO CAN HONESTLY SAY: ADVERTISING NEVER SOLD THEM ANYTHING

The family lives in Russia. We are using them to illustrate a point.

Unlike most Americans, these people seldom see or hear any advertising. Only a few posters and handbills, random announcements in newspapers and magazines and, lately, some commercials on the government-run radio and television.

So, these people can honestly say advertising never sold them anything.

Advertising never "sold" them an automobile.

Advertising never "sold" them a telephone.

Advertising never "sold" them a dream house, color television, an FM radio, a hi-fi record player, frozen lobster, packaged soups, modern furniture, an electric mixer, power mower, air conditioning, automatic defrosting, home permanents, outboard motor, spinet piano, home workshop.

Some people might point out that life is much simpler in Russia than America. It is. And no wonder.

There are not nearly so many choices to make. Not nearly so many new things presented to people by manufacturers trying to serve them. Not nearly so many new things for people to want, because advertising helps show them how a product can make life easier, pleasanter, more worthwhile. Yes, and more dignified.

No automatic dishwasher ads tell human dishwashers how to get out of the kitchen faster.

No travel ads tell families they, too, can go South for the winter sun.

No cake mix ads. No ice cream ads. No automobile ads. No ads to rub it in that they haven't got much cake—or ice cream—or a car.

Now, let's imagine that suddenly all this is changed.

Let's imagine that advertising as Americans know it begins to urge Russian families to light their homes more efficiently, or join book clubs to read Plato or best sellers, or grow greener lawns or bigger chrysanthemums, or lay the tile on their own patios, or deep-wax their cars, or eat more delicious and healthful breakfasts, or have wine with dinner, or vote the Democratic ticket, or vote the Republican ticket, or dress smarter, or sleep under an electric blanket, or look prettier if you're a woman, or handsomer if you're a man, or sit down at the piano and surprise your friends, or drive across your country just for the fun of it.

We wonder if these people and the millions like them would say "No thanks. We prefer the simple life."

We'd like to suggest that the next time you read an ad or see a commercial you think of the Russian families to whom advertising has never sold a thing.

And that you look at that ad as an advertiser offering you a choice to do what you want with your dollars to satisfy your wants in your pattern of living.

It's as simple—and honest—as that.

Death of Louis P. Marciante

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 14, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the death of Louis P. Marciante in New Jersey last week has saddened his friends throughout the Nation. As president of the State federation of labor, Mr. Marciante made many lasting contributions to the labor movement in his home State and in the Nation. He worked during the long, difficult years when labor was first finding a foothold in our society. Later, he helped to develop new concepts and new responsibilities for labor.

An editorial in the Newark News of March 31 pays tribute to Mr. Marciante and sums up the reasons for his accomplishments to New Jersey and to labor. The editorial carefully points out that Mr. Marciante was often a critic, even of labor itself. But his criticism was the kind that brings growth and accomplishment. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

An editorial in the Trentonian, Trenton, N.J., of the same date also pays tribute to Mr. Marciante. It makes specific notice of his service to his community, including his work on the Trenton Board of Education. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Newark News, Mar. 31, 1961]

LOUIS P. MARCIANTE

It was Louis Marciante's destiny to lead the State federation of labor through a tempestuous era and all who knew him will agree he was the man for the job. In that quarter century labor's role grew more complex, just as industry and government grew more complex, and where other labor leaders of his generation were lost in the eddies, Mr. Marciante stayed in the main current of the labor movement.

His contribution to New Jersey's industrial growth was considerable. For behind his outspoken manner and aggressive championing of labor's cause in all areas, there was a moderation that gave balance to the federation's program and brought it closer to its goals.

Those who follow Louis Marciante as leaders of labor will do well to examine the course he steered. For as bluntly as he criticized legislatures, Governors and industrialists, he criticized labor itself. And when it came from him, labor listened—and benefited—as the record of that quarter century suggests.

[From the Trentonian, Trenton, N.J.]

LOUIS P. MARCIANTE

Louis P. Marciante was a labor leader of the old school but at the same time he was one who was blessed with the enlightened attitude that in order for labor to make progress, its leaders had to share the responsibilities of civic leadership.

Mr. Marciante, whose death occurred Thursday at age 62, was unrelenting in his effort to win the best that was attainable for members of organized labor, but his policies were not so unyielding that they failed to take into consideration the fact that labor relations is a two-way street. Thus he was consistently conscious of management's problems as well as labor's.

As he made his way up from the ranks to the highest positions of labor leadership and eventually the presidency of the New Jersey American Federation of Labor, Mr. Marciante also rose to prominence in civic and national affairs. He served Trenton for 12 years as a member of the board of education, and Presidents and Governors called upon him to carry out demanding assignments.

In all his activities, he was a rugged individualist who was motivated by strong and unswerving convictions. He was an outstanding pioneer in his chosen field, and as such organized labor owes a lot to him.

Rev. Thomas J. Tierney, of Quincy, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BURKE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday evening it was my privilege to attend a testimonial dinner in honor of Father Thomas J. Tierney, St. John's Church, Quincy, Mass. Father Tom, as he is affectionately known in Massachusetts, has dedicated his life to his fellowman. I will not try to elaborate at this time his many, many accomplishments. I would like to include in the RECORD a few of the highlights of his activities mentioned at the dinner by Chief Justice Paul C. Reardon, Massachusetts Superior Court, and the text of a citation presented to Father Tierney by Mr. Henry Bosworth, well-known newspaperman and writer for the Boston Traveler. An editorial that appeared in the Quincy Patriot Ledger is also included.

The fine example set by Father Thomas J. Tierney in his combination of religious teaching, civic action, and love for neighbor has made our community richer. I was proud to be present at this dinner and to be associated with the Right Reverend Stephen F. Moran, pastor of St. John's Church, Rabbi Jacob Mann, Beth Israel Synagogue, Rev. Chester A. Porteus, rector, Christ Episcopal Church, civic leaders, public officials and citizens from all walks of life who were in attendance.

The material mentioned follows:

TESTIMONIAL DINNER TENDERED TO REV. THOMAS J. TIERNEY, APRIL 9, 1961, SURF BALLROOM, NANTASKET

PROFILE OF REV. FATHER THOMAS J. TIERNEY, PRIEST, PATRIOT, HERO, HUMANITARIAN, LEADER—FRIEND

Born: Lowell, Mass., June 9, 1903, son of beloved John and Elizabeth McLaughlin Tierney.

Boyhood: Loved to chase fire engines.

Schools: Lowell High School, Boston College, St. John's Seminary.

Ordained: Holy Cross Cathedral, June 5, 1931, by William Cardinal O'Connell.

Assignment: Blessed Sacrament Church, Cambridge, June 1931.

Sideline: Chasing fire enignes.

Appointment: First archdiocesan fire department chaplain by Cardinal O'Connell, serving with Cambridge fire department.

Heroism: Rescued two children over aerial ladder from third floor burning building on Brookline Street, Cambridge, in 1941.

Gave conditional absolution and final rites to over 100 victims of Cocoanut Grove holocaust, 1942. Also directed and assisted in smashing windows and battering down interior partitions of ill-fated night club to provide more exits for trapped patrons. His action saved many lives.

Attempted to rescue six members of a family from blazing Brewster Street, Cambridge, home, 1948. All six members perished. Father Tierney helped recover bodies, was overcome from smoke inhalation and taken to hospital.

Patriotism: Presented special citation by President Franklin D. Roosevelt for bond selling rallies during World War II.

More recognition: Presented Kate Smith Award in 1948 for his heroic actions at the Cocoanut Grove and Cambridge fires.

Transfer: Assigned to St. John's Parish, Quincy, April 24, 1950. Cambridge's loss—Quincy's gain. A big gain.

Patient: Spent 6 weeks at Quincy City Hospital as patient shortly after his arrival in Quincy. During this time he became friends with doctors, nurses, attendants, and patients. Since then he has returned to the hospital every single day to visit and cheer patients of all races and creeds.

Sideline: Still chases fire engines. Appointed chaplain of Quincy fire and police departments.

More work: In 1952 became city parade director. First Christmas parade attracted only 5,000. Now draws over 100,000 each year.

Nonsectarian fire service: Rescued the Blessed Sacrament when fire gutted interior of Blessed Sacrament Church, Houghs Neck, July 29, 1955.

Manned hose with firefighters to stop flames in blaze at First Baptist Church, Wollaston, June 26, 1956.

Carried out sacred Jewish book Torah from Temple when fire broke out and threatened Quincy Jewish Community Center, April 27, 1959.

His day: Mayor Amelio Della Chiesa proclaimed October 3, 1960, "Father Tierney Day" in tribute to his "love for his fellowman."

His night: First Quincy Citizens Award presented him for outstanding public service, April 9, 1961.

His future: Continuing helping others—regardless of race, color, or creed.

(And, chasing fire engines.)

PROGRAM

Toastmaster: Frank E. Remick.

Invocation: Rabbi Jacob Mann, Beth Israel Synagogue.

Welcoming address: Raymond C. Warmington, general chairman.

Head table: Paul J. Cifrino, president, Quincy-South Shore Chamber of Commerce; Hon. Edward A. Crane, mayor, city of Cambridge; Dr. Joseph P. Leone, director, Quincy City Hosiptal; Chief William Ferrazzi, Quincy Police Department; Chief Thomas F. Gorman, Quincy Fire Department; Rt. Rev. Stephen F. Moran, pastor, St. John's Church; Hon. Paul C. Reardon, chief justice, Massachusetts Superior Court; Hon. James A. Burke, Congressman, 13th Congressional District.

Presentations: Col. Walter C. Fuller, commander, Quincy Veterans' Council; David Alexander, mayor; Amelio Della Chiesa; Henry Bosworth.

Benediction: Rev. Chester A. Porteus, rector, Christ Episcopal Church.

Committee: General chairman, Raymond C. Warmington; cochairmen, Larry Antonelli and Lester H. Glasser.

Steering committee: David G. Alexander, John Allegrini, Henry Bosworth, Lawrence S. Butler, Joseph Burke, Thomas R. Burke, Peter Cooke, Daniel V. Cremins, Robert Leo Eng, Walter C. Fuller, John M. Gillis, John A. Golden, Jr., Paul A.M. Hunt, Edward T. Lewis, John M. Lyons, Dr. Alfred V. Mahoney, James S. McCormack, James R. McIntyre, James J. Mullin, John T. Rohde, Dennis F. Ryan, Alexander Smith, John C. Walker, and John F. Wipfler.

Honorary chairmen: Rt. Rev. Stephen F. Moran, Rabbi Jacob Mann, Rev. Chester A. Porteus.

General committee: Gary Aluisy, Carl W. Anderson, George R. Andrews, Francis F. Anselmo, James D. Asher, Frank L. Avery, Hyman Asnes, Joseph C. Avitabile, Vincent Banco, Nicholas Barbadoro, Raymond F. Barrett, George S. Bennett, Francis X Bellotti, Fulvio L. Berini, Melville S. Berman, Fred Bergfors, Luigi Bolea, Everett J. Bracchi, Joseph E. Brett, Leslie M. Brierley, John H. Brownell, Vincent Buonfiglio, Arthur I. Burgess, Thomas S. Burgin, George G. Burke, James A. Burke, J. Clarence Canniff, Sidney S. Canter, Paul S. Carosi, Gordon D. Carr, Joseph P. Carroll, Richard Carroll, Walter H. Carroll, Louis S. Cassani, Thomas J. Cavanaugh, Robert Cherubini, Henry H. Chmielinski, Jr., Paul J. Cifrino, Ralph Chiminiello, John A. Chisholm, Clarence P. Churchill, Joseph S. Cipolla, Frank D. Coffman, Paul Coleman, Paul A. Coletti, James Collins, Adolph J. Concheri, J. C. Coppleman, Robert A. Curry, Matthew Cushing, Allan Curtis, Maurice J. Daley, William Daley, Leo Darr, Amelio A. Della Chiesa, William DeLargy, Arthur DePetro, Frank A. DeSilva, James Y. Deupree, Robert M. Deware, A. George DiAngelo, Russell L. DiMattio, Daniel Donaher, Henry Donaher, Jr., Jeremiah Donovan, Joseph Duffy, Ambrose Duggan, Francis Duggan, William C. Ellis, Kenneth P. Fallon, Jr., George C. Fay, William A. Ferrazzi, Arthur L. Fitzgerald, John P. Flavin, Herb Fontaine, Alfred L. Fontana, James F. Fostello, Harry Freeman, James T. Gartland, Gerald S. Gherardi, Umberto Giarrusso, Irvin B. Gifford, Everett Goodhue, Thomas F. Gorman, Dr. Paul A. Gossard, Joseph Goulding, Dominic A. Grazio, Joseph B. Grossman, Rubin A. Grossman, John F. Hallisey, Charles W. Hedges, John A. Hediund, Lawrence G. Henley, John R. Herbert, Paul Hurley, James D. Hutchinson, John E. Johnson, J. Henry Johnson, Lloyd C. Johnson, Stephen T. Keefe, Jr., J. Walter Kemp, Cornelius V. Keohane, George J. Kilduff, Delcevare King, Richard J. Koch, Edwin J. LaCroix, William B. Lamprey, Myron N. Lane, Percy N. Lane, Joseph J. LaRaia, Edward S. MacDonald, Robert L. Macomber, Thomas F. Maloney, Thomas M. Maloney, Dr. Edward S. Mann, L. Paul Marini, William J. Martin, Walter E. Martinson, Lawrence H. Mattie, Vincent A. McCabe, Francis X. McCauley, George B. McDonald, Joseph P. McDonough, James F. McCormick, Jr., James F. McConnigal, George A. McIntire, David S. McIntosh, Frank McKenzie, Paul A. McLaughlin, William H. McNeill, Ernest J. Montillio, John Morley, Thomas V. Morrissey, Judge James A. Mulhall, Joseph Nassano, John D. Noonan, Edward J. O'Brien, George E. O'Brien, Albert Oliverio, Henry F. Paquin, William A. Palmer, Jr., Harry Pavan, Nicholas A. Pepe, John J. Quinn, John J. Quinn, Joseph G. Ray, George Reardon, Judge Paul C. Reardon, Frank E. Remick, James F. Reynolds, Jr., Charles W. Riley, Russell S. Riley, J. Everett Robbie, Charles N. Ross, Leroy L. Rounseville, William Russell, Aldo M. Saluti, A. Mario Salvatore, Augustus E. Settimelli, Charles L. Shea, William J. Shea, Morris Silverman, Louis Simons, Harold H. Slate, John D. Smith, Walter L. Smith, John J. Sullivan, Joseph A. Sullivan, Heslip E. Sutherland, Martin C. Sweeney, Richard T. Sweeney, Olin A. Taylor, Dr. Charles H. Thorner, Gordon S. Troupe, Anthony J. Venna, William L. Villone, Michael T. Walsh, Alexander E. Warmington, Paul A. Waters, Chester J. Weeden, Alrick Weidman, Milton B. Wiggin, Edward Whittaker, George A. Yarrington, Daniel L. Young, James Zavatone.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHSETTS COMMENDING AND CONGRATULATING REV. THOMAS J. TIERNEY, CURATE OF ST. JOHN'S CHURCH IN THE CITY OF QUINCY

Whereas Rev. Thomas J. Tierney, curate of St. John's Church in the city of Quincy, has played a prominent and active part in the organizing civic parades and activities in the city of Quincy; and

Whereas in addition to his many and exacting duties as a curate, he has served with distinction as chaplain of the Quincy Fire Department and the Quincy City Hospital; and

Whereas he has exerted an inspiring influence in the community by his devoted and dedicated service to the city of Quincy and its inhabitants, far above and beyond the call of duty; and

Whereas in grateful recognition of his unselfish devotion to their welfare, his many friends, from all faiths and walks of life, are tendering him a public testimonial on the 9th day of April, 1961: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives hereby commends Rev. Thomas J. Tierney for his good works and extends its congratulations to him on the occasion of his testimonial and its best wishes for continued health, success and happiness; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded by the secretary to the commonwealth to Rev. Thomas J. Tierney.

Adopted.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

The above resolve was introduced by State Representative Joseph E. Brett, of Quincy, and passed unanimously by the Massachusetts House of Representatives.

DON'T QUIT

I

When things go wrong, as they sometimes will,
When the road you're trudging seems all uphill,
When the funds are low and the debts are high,
And you want to smile, but you have to sigh,
When care is pressing you down a bit—
Rest if you must, but don't you quit.

II

Life is queer with its twists and turns,
As every one of us sometimes learns,
And many a fellow turns about
When he might have won had he stuck it out.
Don't give up though the pace seems slow—
You may succeed with another blow.

III

Often the goal is nearer than
It seems to a faint and faltering man;
Often the struggler has given up
When he might have captured the victor's cup;
And he learned too late when the night came down,
How close he was to the golden crown.

IV

Success is failure turned inside out—
The silver tint of the clouds of doubt,
And you never can tell how close you are,
It may be near when it seems afar;
So stick to the fight when you're hardest hit,—
It's when things seem worst that you mustn't quit.

REMARKS OF CHIEF JUSTICE PAUL C. REARDON AT TESTIMONIAL DINNER TO THE REVEREND THOMAS J. TIERNEY AT NANTASKET, MASS., APRIL 9, 1961

It is indeed a long time since Father William Halley came to St. John's as its first priest in 1852 and since 1853 when Bishop Fitzpatrick dedicated the new church in the presence of Josiah Quincy, mayor of Boston, Charles Francis Adams, Minister to England during the Civil War, and George Tyler Bigelow, later chief justice of the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court, among others. It is also many years since 1872 when the church was enlarged and took on its present proportions. It is well for us who are its parishioners to remember that on all three occasions members of the community of the town of Quincy which was then, of course, largely non-Catholic, contributed money and assistance in other ways to the end that the new church and congregation might be off to a good beginning. We remember those contributions with gratitude and we like to think that over the years they have in a sense been repaid by the good works which our priests have performed in Quincy. Those who are older here may recall, for instance, Father Ambrose Roche, who served for a time on the Quincy School Committee. There were others in the long line of curates at St. John's who have earned the respect and affection not only of its people but also of the people of Quincy generally. But as I think back over my own time in the parish I can bring to mind beyond Father Tierney no curate who has so returned to the city and all its citizens regardless of their belief and in such full measure the kindness which was made manifest to the young church in its early days. I was born two doors from St. John's. I attended its parochial school, as have all of our children, and I have lived my entire life in the parish. In voicing my own pride in what Father Tierney has given I simply reflect those sentiments which I am certain all the parishioners of St. John's, whom I have the privilege to represent here, would want me to express in their behalf to you. You know him for his large contributions to Quincy in various ways. We know him and we love him as the diligent priest, the around-the-clock worker in our particular vineyard, the humane and wise counselor whose sermons ring with good sense carrying hope and cheer to the depressed, the assiduous visitor, to those who are housebound or bedridden, in truth the "comforter of the afflicted" and the "health of the sick." We admire him for what he is and what he has done and we are happy beyond words that you rather like him too. What better life can a man possibly lead and what riches can compare with that type of wealth which generates this evening's tribute?

In a prayer for generosity Ignatius Loyola wrote:

"Teach us, good Lord, to serve Thee as Thou deservest,
To give and not to count the cost,
To fight and not to heed the wounds,
To toil and not to seek for rest,
To labour and not ask for any reward
Save that of knowing that we do Thy will."

This is a touching expression of the motive which governs Father Tierney's life, and, aware of this, the people of St. John's desire through me to add their voice in saying to a beloved priest in the poet's words:

"When God go with you, priest of God,
For all is well, and shall be well."

TEXT OF CITATION PRESENTED BY HENRY BOSWORTH—CITATION IS A COMPANION AWARD WITH PLAQUE AND EXPLAINS THE PLAQUE

QUINCY CITIZENS AWARD TO REV. THOMAS J. TIERNEY, ST. JOHN'S CHURCH

In recognition of his many contributions to the many from all religions, fields of endeavor, and walks of life.

Since his ordination in 1931 as a humble and devoted servant of God, Father Tierney has given the one precious gift that all men possess but few men give: himself.

This gift he has given freely, unselfishly, and happily to one and all—all and one—regardless of race, color, or creed.

Since coming to Quincy April 24, 1950, he has made this historically, industrially, commercially, and residentially proud community humanely and civically wealthy by his presence.

He has spent countless hours of his own time comforting and cheering the sick at Quincy City Hospital in their hour of spiritual need.

As chaplain of the Quincy Police and Fire Departments he has suffered the ordeal of men battling cruel flames in bitter cold. He has aided those who fell in the line of duty and performed heroically himself in those challenging moments when a man is called upon to be a man.

As city parade director, many more hours have gone to spreading the fame of Quincy by bringing thousands and thousands of visitors to the city.

As parade director he has been a strong and true friend of the veteran. The fluttering flags, marching feet, blaring trumpets, and rolling drums serve as a stirring but solemn reminder of the sacrifices these men made for their country.

These are but a few of his deeds. He has done many more quietly and privately. Only he, God, and those many he has helped in many ways, share that knowledge.

Therefore, be it known that on this 9th day of April 1961, a Quincy Citizens Committee from all faiths and walks of life proudly presents to Rev. Thomas J. Tierney this award for outstanding public service.

But—perhaps the finest citation of all to exemplify this man are seven borrowed words—his favorite words:

"I must be about My Father's business."

[From the Quincy Patriot Ledger, Apr. 10, 1961]

FRUITFUL LABORS

The Reverend Thomas J. Tierney, of St. John's Church in Quincy has given sympathy, understanding, counsel, and good cheer to Quincy citizens of all denominations. As Congressman JAMES A. BURKE declared Sunday night, Father Tierney's goal has been to bring people closer together; what better evidence could there be of his success than the gathering of 1,100 people of all creeds and from all walks of life to honor him?

Another particularly appropriate comment came from Superior Court Chief Justice Paul C. Reardon, himself a parishioner of St. John's. Father Tierney, he pointed out, has been outstanding in his combination of religious teaching with effective civic action.

Many a Quincy City Hospital patient has been grateful for Father Tierney's visits. It is fitting, therefore, that the chief gift at Sunday night's testimonial should have been the furnishing in the hospital of a chaplain's room for all faiths.

Father Tierney has given freely of himself and has reaped abundant gratitude. We wish him many more years of fruitful labor.

Tribute to Senator Henry Dworshak of Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 14, 1961

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Twin Falls, Idaho, Times-News of March 23, 1961, commenting on the record of our colleague the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK].

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOOD DEAL OF MERIT

When Idaho's Senator HENRY DWORSHAK told the Appropriations Committee "it's time to face our own problems" he echoed the sentiments of many people across the Nation. He referred to the Federal Government's concern over foreign economic conditions, adding, "I think it is time that we wonder what is happening to the United States."

Senator DWORSHAK said he was sympathetic with needs of Africa, Asia, and Europe. Certainly in this atomic space age no one would suggest ignoring the world's problems to the extent of building some sort of maginot line along the seacoast. That would be foolhardy if not impossible during what amounts to a global conflict with communism.

The Idaho Senator pointed out, "We send hundreds of Americans abroad to devote months of time in devising ways to cut our tariffs, to give competitive advantage to people everywhere in the world and to create more problems at home." He added that unemployment, the plight of agriculture and the inability of American business to compete in world markets should be considered. "Still we are asked to provide more funds for activities devoted to further jeopardizing our markets."

Senator DWORSHAK has a point and a big one at that. Many people question the value of billions of dollars in foreign aid when one of the "rewards" of such generosity is the nickname of "Uncle Shylock." Americans aren't likely to forget soon the reception accorded Vice President Richard Nixon and his wife in South America when they were literally doused with spit from a Communist-inspired crowd.

Anti-American riots in Japan a few months ago forced cancellation of a visit by President Eisenhower. Signs reading "Go home Yankee" have been commonplace around the world. There are dozens of examples.

Communist inspired? Certainly. But what has happened to all the good will and gratitude that should be expected of billions and billions of dollars in U.S. aid poured into virtually every country on the face of the globe? Is it asking too much to expect a little appreciation in return? Perhaps it is, and maybe there is no greater truth than "You can't buy friends."

In that event, Senator DWORSHAK's statement is more impressive than ever. There is no doubt "it's time to face our own problems."

Senator DWORSHAK made one more statement that taxpayers everywhere should repeat time after time until it is burned into all minds.

"Regardless of false impression some people try to create, the U.S. Government has no bottomless money barrel. The Federal Government cannot spend one penny that it does not take from taxpayers."

Yes, that foreign aid and any domestic Federal aid comes right out of your pocket.

Reducing Its Punch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions we hear the critics of the Corps of Engineers talk long and loud relative to public works projects.

I enclose an editorial from the daily State Gazette, of Dyersburg, Tenn., relative to the wonderful project which the Congress approved and relative to the value and benefit of the Dyer County levee.

It is such a fine editorial I wanted to place it in the RECORD so others may have a change to read it.

The article follows:

REDUCING ITS PUNCH

In the first sizable test since its construction, Dyer Countians in the Mississippi River bottom area have learned the value of the levee.

During the recent rise the county had considerable floodwaters, but nothing compared to that which visited on the rich farming western section of the county of many years ago.

Stages reached on the U.S. Weather Bureau gage at Cairo several days ago would have meant many thousands of acres of land underwater and hundreds of residents of the flooded area evacuated in bygone days.

Most persons refer only to the disastrous 1937 flood in this area, but there have been many floods in Dyer County in other years when the crest at Cairo was considerably below that of 1937.

In the latter part of the 1920's long before the historical flood of 1937 and at other times prior to the "big flood," waters repeatedly covered the river bottom area in both early spring and June floods.

It was not unusual then for sizable boats to dock at Big Boy Junction, just beyond Finley, and for all routes to the Mississippi River to be closed. Apparently the levee has made such instances events which belong to the past.

Every sizable rise in the Mississippi at Cairo, with the water subsequently to pass this way, no longer means the inundation of thousands of acres of land and the evacuation of residents to be looked after by the Red Cross and other local agencies.

Even at Cairo the level of Mississippi River rises can be controlled to a great extent by dams on the tributaries which feed it. The Cumberland empties into the Tennessee, the Tennessee into the Ohio and the Ohio disgorges its floodwaters into the Mississippi at Cairo.

However, during high water situations these waters destined for the Mississippi eventually the gulf, passing along the Dyer County reach, controls by dams, straightening of channels of tributaries and levees have resulted in harnessing of the waters to an appreciable extent and floods which once had to be contended with no longer pack the destructive punch they once did.

Protest Against Certain Tax Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 14, 1961

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Kansas Turnpike Authority is an agency created by the Legislature of Kansas to construct and finance a turnpike consisting of 236 miles of highway. The Federal Government has designated a large portion of this highway as a part of our Interstate Federal System and its operation is dependent on revenues received from traffic. It is important that no action be taken by the Congress that will reduce travel or revenues received therefrom.

The Kansas Turnpike Authority adopted a resolution opposed to increased taxes that might reduce travel.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION, KANSAS TURNPIKE AUTHORITY

Whereas the Kansas Turnpike Authority is an agency created by the Legislature of the State of Kansas, and

Whereas said authority, pursuant to legislative authorization has constructed a turnpike extending 236 miles through the State of Kansas, and is now operating same, and

Whereas the construction of said turnpike was financed through the issuance of revenue bonds, the interest and principal to be paid from tolls received from operation of said turnpike, and

Whereas there is now issued an outstanding $155,968,000 of revenue bonds issued for the construction of said turnpike, and

Whereas a substantial portion of the revenues received from the operation of the turnpike must come from commercial traffic including the operation of trucks, buses, and other similar transportation agencies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Kansas Turnpike Authority, duly assembled in its regular meeting on the 27th day of March 1961, That said authority go on record as protesting any tax increases recommended to Congress to be imposed on diesel fuel, heavy trucks, tires, innertubes and tread rubber; be it further

Resolved, That the Kansas Turnpike Authority states that such increased taxes would materially reduce commercial traffic upon the Kansas Turnpike and any reduction in revenues would prejudice the interests of the revenue bondholders and the payment of interest and principal on said bond; be it further

Resolved, That the Kansas Turnpike Authority does hereby direct that a copy of this resolution be furnished to the appropriate congressional committees and does further direct that State Senator Donald S. Hults and the authority general manager, John Kirchner, appear in person before such committees to oppose such increase in taxation.

Approved this 27th day of March 1961.

KANSAS TURNPIKE AUTHORITY.

The Fabulous Miracle Mile: Los Angeles, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, in Los Angeles, Calif., there is a fabulous section known as the Miracle Mile. Thirty years ago Wilshire Boulevard along which the Miracle Mile was built was a narrow dirt road surrounded by open fields. Today this 1-mile area on Wilshire Boulevard is known throughout the world as a business and shopping center second to none. It is surrounded by the largest buying power on the west coast with 70,000 people within walking distance alone. And annual retail sales in this Fifth Avenue of the West exceed $239 million annually.

The fantastic development of the Miracle Mile in the short period of its history matches the unbelievable growth and expansion of Los Angeles itself.

The phenomenal development and expansion of the Miracle Mile and Wilshire Boulevard can be illustrated from a personal experience I had many years ago.

I recall on a beautiful sunny Sunday afternoon, Mrs. McDonough and I were driving out Wilshire Boulevard till we came to that part of the boulevard that had not yet been paved. It was just a narrow dirt road, and I stopped at a small lean-to real estate office to inquire about the cost of a lot fronting on Wilshire Boulevard. This was in the area of the Miracle Mile and the real estate agent showed me a lot with 100-foot front on Wilshire Boulevard priced at $1,750. If I had bought it, that lot would be worth more than $300,000 today.

There is perhaps no place in the world where the most unexpected and unanticipated things have occurred which have increased land values and made successful many business ventures that otherwise appeared to be total losses than in southern California.

There is no place in the world today where more people are trying to get to than Los Angeles, Calif. At the rate of 250,000 each year, people from all over the world are pouring into Los Angeles—uprooting themselves from old home surroundings to find a new way of life in a vibrant new community throbbing with industry and enthusiasm. New homes, new jobs, new recreation, and greater hope in the future.

Los Angeles is very conscious of its responsibilities to all these new residents and is providing all the necessary requirements to make life and living more pleasant and abundant for them. Yes, the thing about Los Angeles is that Los Angeles knows what it is about.

In his book "Fabulous Boulevard," Ralph Hancock describes the phenomenal development of Wilshire Boulevard and the Miracle Mile as follows:

Thirty years ago Wilshire Boulevard west of La Brea was a meandering dirt road flanked by barbed wire and barley fields. La Brea Avenue crossing at right angles was another dirt road, little more than a service road for the oil wells in the neighborhood. One could have bought either corner at this intersection for the price of an automobile today. The vast barren acreage of the Hancock ranch, the last of the old Rancho La Brea, spread north of Wilshire to the hills. The land lying to the south of the future boulevard was part of two old ranchos, Rodeo de las Aguas and Las Cienegas. There was not a residence or a building, except for an occasional ramshackle farmhouse, within a mile and the principal structure on Wilshire was a billboard with this advertisement on it: "Wilshire Boulevard Center—A. W. Ross, Development."

Today this same section of Wilshire is the busiest portion of the boulevard and known from coast to coast as the Miracle Mile.

Destiny—has picked Los Angeles to do a gargantuan job. Whether one ponders over the memories of the past or marvels at the wonders of the present, here, one realizes, moves the course of empire, its cross section a boulevard, its climax 1 mile in with a man-made miracle has occurred.

A. W. Ross was the original developer of the area known as the Miracle Mile, and originally sold the land in this area to investors as commercial property. In the late twenties, the campaign began to bring big merchants to the Miracle Mile, and soon leading merchants from downtown Los Angeles opened branch stores beginning with Desmond's, Silverwood's, and others which now include Phelphs-Terkel, Mullen & Bluett, the May Co., and Coulters, the oldest department store in Los Angeles.

The Miracle Mile expanded rapidly, and to again quote from Mr. Hancock's vivid account:

In 1948 came Ohrbach's, the Prudential Insurance Co., Carnation Milk, and others to build still larger buildings. The Prudential-Ohrbach building is one of the most extraordinary structures.

Today both sides of Wilshire Boulevard, from La Brea to Fairfax, a measured mile, are nearly solid with substantial brick, stone, and stucco buildings tenanted by modern shops, stores, and markets. Among the tenants and owners are practically all the national chains, marketing consumer goods—drugs, foods, variety items, women's wear, men's furnishings, shoes, specialties—as well as some of Los Angeles' largest department stores, Coulter's May Co., Ohrbach's.

This, then, is the Miracle Mile of Wilshire Boulevard, a section of the boulevard that is 6 miles west of the older downtown district and extending from La Brea to Fairfax Avenue. It was here that the decentralization of business started in Los Angeles. It is the geographical center of the purchasing power of Los Angeles; most of the oldest and best established stores in Los Angeles have chosen it, and the two largest financial institutions in the world have selected it also, the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. for its Parklabrea housing development and the Prudential Insurance Co. of America for its western home office. Thirty years ago it was a barren field. Twenty years ago the first big stores opened and the mile began to take on the air of a busy community. They call it the miracle of the Miracle Mile.

On March 23, the Miracle Mile became the site of a new landmark in the history of the progress of Los Angeles when the new Lee Tower Skyscraper, the tallest commercial building in Los Angeles and the city's first 22-story office building, was dedicated and formally opened.

I had the pleasure of attending the formal opening of the Lee Tower as principal speaker at this important event which was attended by most of the outstanding businessmen and community leaders in the southern California area.

The Lee Tower is an ultra-modern, blue-colored skyscraper of steel, concrete and glass with a helistop on the roof, a sky-view restaurant on the 22d floor, a rooftop recreation area for employees, and the most modern design throughout. It has been designated as the West's most outstanding commercial building, and was designed and built by the owners, W. Douglas Lee and D. Everett Lee.

This is the beginning of the skyscraper era in Los Angeles, and the Lee Tower is but the forerunner of many as Los Angeles grows toward the sky. Unlike New York, the skyscrapers of Los Angeles will not form dark canyons of stone and steel, but will be carefully planned and spaced so that the natural beauty of the city will be enhanced.

The fabulous development of the Miracle Mile is but a reflection of the fabulous and fantastic growth of Los Angeles itself. In Los Angeles we have passed through the cycles of primitive agriculture to the highest type of food production, the whole cycle of the motion picture production era to TV production, from the early exploration and production of petroleum to the highest type of gasoline refining, from modest production of metals to the massive production of iron, steel, and aluminum, from some of the early experiments in aircraft to the Nation's center of supersonic—B–70 and X–15—aircraft, and beyond this to the production of missiles and rockets including the F–1 million and a half pound thrust single rocket engine. Most of this has occurred and been accomplished within the past 40 years.

Los Angeles is a city of the future with its past only a brief preview of its future. No prediction for the future growth of Los Angeles can be too fantastic, no prophecy too difficult to fulfill. This city set like a jewel against a backdrop of lofty mountains with the blue waters of the Pacific as its western boundary will fulfill its destiny as one of the world's most important and enchanting cities.

There is nothing new to the new frontier. Los Angeles has been the new frontier of the Nation for the past 50 years.

The Eavesdropping and Wiretapping Problem Demands Attention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 14, 1961

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, New York State has led the Nation in its treatment of the ever-growing problem of electronic eavesdropping. Much of the progress which has been made in my State in dealing with this subject is the result of the work of the New York States Joint Legislative Committee on Privacy of Communications under the chairmanship of Assemblyman Anthony P. Savarese, Jr.

In a recent report this committee has again emphasized the importance of Federal legislation in the field of eavesdropping and wiretapping. The report contains an excellent analysis of the legal problems involved in this field and makes it clear that only Congress can remedy the present confused and illogical situation.

I was delighted to learn yesterday that the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary is to hold hearings on the subject of eavesdropping and wiretapping during the month of May. I know that when the conditions which now exist are thoroughly studied, there will be widespread agreement as to the necessity for prompt congressional action. At the present time literally hundreds of cases are in limbo as a result of the uncertain status of the law on wiretapping.

In anticipation of the hearings by the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, I believe it would be helpful to all Members of the Senate to have available the analysis of the New York State Joint Legislative Committee on the eavesdropping and wiretapping problem. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the relevant portion of the joint legislative committee's report be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PART I: EAVESDROPPING-WIRETAPPING

Many criminal offenders have gone unprosecuted in New York State as a result of the Federal determination that it is a crime to present wiretap evidence, as authorized by New York law. We cannot now determine how many, but the number is substantial.

In our 1960 report we noted that two major cases had come before the U.S. circuit court of appeals, in which the defendants sought injunctions against the admission of wiretap evidence obtained under authority of New York law. The injunctions were denied; but this decision was accompanied by

stern dicta. Circuit Judge Sterry R. Waterman said it would be "presumptuous to assume that any New York trial judge will acquiesce to the commission of a crime against the United States in his presence in his courtroom by a witness testifying under oath;" but he admonished the U.S. attorneys of New York that it would be "a most extraordinary affront to this court" if such a crime were committed and remained unprosecuted.

Consequently, the Nassau County court—reversing the standard New York practice—refused to receive wiretap testimony and directed acquittal, for lack of evidence, in the pending trial of John O'Rourke, vice president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, that union's most powerful leader in the East. This was a major racket prosecution. O'Rourke, with 14 others, was accused of using a fake union local to extort money from jukebox operators. He went free, but though much of the case was wrecked, five defendants were convicted and given substantial sentences.

The other wiretapping case before the circuit court was also unusual. Burton N. Pugach, a Bronx attorney, was accused of having conspired with three others to throw acid upon a young woman who had rejected him as a suitor. She was partially blinded and severely scarred. When arrested, Pugach was found in possession of an unauthorized gun. After successfully contesting a finding that he was insane, Pugach was tried for the gun offense and sent to jail for a year. While he was in custody, his attorney carried his wiretapping plea to the Supreme Court.

The Pugach plea was based on the finding of the Supreme Court, in the 1957 Benanti case, that New York's law enforcement wiretapping was in violation of Federal law. Pugach asked the Federal courts to forbid introduction of wiretap evidence against him, since it would cause him irreparable injury. Though he was granted a stay, his petition was denied.

The 7 to 2 majority opinion of the Supreme Court, rendered on February 27, 1961, was a single sentence affirming the decision of the courts below, and citing two cases of a decade ago. One, *Stefanelli* v. *Menard*, refused to enjoin the introduction of illegally obtained evidence because such interference with State trial procedures would result in "insupportable disruption." In the second case, *Schwartz* v. *Texas*, the Supreme Court had refused to reverse a conviction based on wiretapping evidence, since Texas then operated under the common law rule that competent evidence was admissible, even though illegally obtained. (It is under this doctrine that many New York convictions, based on wiretapping evidence, have been sustained.)

In a minority opinion Justice William O. Douglas, with the concurrence of Chief Justice Earl Warren, said the court should now overrule the Schwartz case and construe the Federal law against wiretapping evidence (sec. 605 of the Federal Communications Act) to bar use of wiretap evidence in State trials. He maintained it was illogical to permit such use when the disclosure of wiretapping had been construed as a crime. He cited a book which told of widespread police wiretapping in New York and criticized what he called "an avid taste for violating the law" on the part of New York police.

While voting with the majority to refuse the pretrial injunction sought by Pugach, Justice William J. Brennan, Jr., objected to the citation of the Schwartz case, indicating that he too was ready to overrule this doctrine, upon which rests much of the independence of our State judiciary. This disposition of three Supreme Court Justices makes very clear the pertinence of this committee's study of evidence rules, to be discussed in part I–A of this report.

"Wiretaps for State Trials Upheld by Supreme Court" was the newspaper headline on the Pugach decision, but it is apparent that this was oversimplification. Actually the decision did nothing to soften the spot on which Judge Waterman's dictum placed New York's judges and prosecutors. Of course, we cannot predict exactly what will happen at Pugach's imminent trial.

The bad situation as to New York wiretapping procedure, to which the foregoing litigation is incident, is something which can be really remedied only by action in the Congress, as this committee has emphasized before. Concerned as we have been, in this committee and this legislature, with protection of privacy and civil rights, we have always supported strongly the detection of crime through eavesdropping methods under proper regulation of the courts. We do not consider it necessary at this time to detail again our strong criticism of the vague inadequacy of the 31-word clause in the Federal Communications Act, which is the sole basis for the Federal court decisions. But we do reiterate our plea to Congress for definitive action.

Senator KENNETH B. KEATING of New York and our district attorneys have properly taken the leadership in seeking action in Congress. The State commission of investigation and this committee have emphasized the need.

Senator KEATING's bill was reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee in 1960, but died on the calendar. During the election year it was clearly impossible to obtain legislation, but it is not too much to hope that the new Congress will eventually take cognizance of New York's law enforcement plight. The new Attorney General's record is not one of hostility to wiretapping as carried on in New York under court authority. The contrary is true. We may hope that he will be more influential with Congress than previous Attorneys General have been.

We understand that Senator KEATING has become a member of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights and is pressing for action there on the Celler-Keating bill, which would validate New York procedure. This subcommittee, plagued by the incapacitating illness and death of previous chairmen, is now headed by Senator SAM J. ERVIN, JR., of North Carolina, and he has promised to give attention to this subject. This legislative committee can only hope for action, and stand ready to give its utmost support, as occasion may arise.

Because of this committee's continued concern with electronic eavesdropping, other than wiretapping, and our legislation requiring court orders for the law enforcement use of secret microphones, we note with interest another U.S. Supreme Court decision, rendered March 6, 1961, in the case of *Silverman* v. *U.S.*

In this the Court unanimously reversed a gambling conviction which had been obtained through an ingenious electronic eavesdropping device. District of Columbia police had inserted a metal spike into the wall of a row house used as a betting office; the spike made contact with a heating duct, which in effect became a huge microphone. The Court held that this physical intrusion, without a warrant, constituted a violation of the fourth amendment's guarantee against unreasonable search and seizure.

The Court had been asked to reconsider the entire subject of the constitutionality of electronic eavesdropping, but found it unnecessary to weigh such "large questions" now. Nor did it modify the Goldman decision of 1942, which held that it was not a violation of the fourth amendment to put a microphone against the wall of a house. The lower courts held that the intrusion of the spike, by perhaps five-sixteenths of an inch, was too trifling to establish a difference from the Goldman case.. The Supreme Court disagreed.

Justice Potter Stewart, for the unanimous Court, said that in previous cases "eavesdropping had not been accomplished by means of an unauthorized physical encroachment" but in this case the police had usurped part of the house, the heating system.

"This court has never held that a Federal officer may without warrant and without consent physically entrench into a man's office or home, there secretly observe or listen, and relate at the man's subsequent criminal trial what was seen and heard," wrote Justice Stewart.

"We find no occasion to reexamine Goldman here," he added, "but we decline to go beyond it, by even a fraction of an inch."

This decision may be of great importance in the piecemeal, inch-by-inch definition of our civil liberties which is gradually accomplished by judicial review.

The broad questions here involved have been given the utmost consideration by this committee and the legislature, in the passage of our New York laws prohibiting private eavesdropping and requiring a court order (i.e. warrant) for police use of electronic eavesdropping. This case gives new emphasis to our previous assertions that Congress, in this entire area, has abdicated its power and abandoned its duties to the courts.

New York State has pioneered in protecting its people from eavesdropping, whether by wiretap or secret microphone, and the Silverman case serves to emphasize that Congress has neglected its duty in this area. Comprehensive Federal legislation is much needed as to all electronic eavesdropping. This cannot be adequately dealt with by fraction-of-an-inch Supreme Court decisions.

Providing Home Loans for Veterans in Housing Credit Shortage Areas

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, no one has more admiration for the gentleman from Virginia, the chairman of the House Committee on Rules, than I, or for any member of the Committee on Appropriations than I, but I have this admiration for them not because of their committee position but because they are duly elected Members of the House of Representatives of the United States, the greatest deliberative body in the world.

Now you can take the Constitution of the United States and read it from cover to cover and you cannot find anywhere that the Founding Fathers said there should be an Appropriations Committee, as the debate on this rule would lead you to believe here. The Constitution tells how laws should be made and how money should be appropriated. Let us look at what the Constitution says. Article I, section 7, states:

All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with amendments as on other bills.

That is what the Constitution says. The House shall originate the revenue measures, not any committee of the House.

How about money to be drawn from the Treasury? Section I, article 9 provides:

No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law.

Note that the appropriations are to be made by law, not by the Appropriations Committee.

Who shall make the laws? Article VI of the Constitution states:

This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof * * * shall be the supreme law of the land.

Every bill that has been referred to by those who talk about back-door spending has been passed by the Congress, the duly elected representatives of the people. A part of that Congress are the members of the House Committee on Appropriations. If they do not like any bill that is being presented it is their prerogative and duty to stand here in the well of the House to oppose it and by their vote show their disapproval.

Congress in its wisdom decided that for good management we should have various committees in the House, but there is no committee of the House that is superior to the Congress itself. When Congress decides that there shall be a call upon the Treasury, that is the supreme law of the land. There is no veto power placed in any committee of the House or Senate. That is what the Founding Fathers said. If we want to change it, it is within our prerogatives, but until that times comes this bill is perfectly legitimate. There is nothing in it that is illegal. There is no back-door spending. It is spending by Congress as authorized by Congress, and should be approved.

The Economics of Hospital Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 14, 1961

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the April edition of the Progressive carries an article by a highly regarded writer on medical problems, Selig Greenberg, of the Providence, R.I., Journal and Evening Bulletin. It is an exceptionally clear presentation of the economics of hospital care. Mr. Greenberg expresses a view with which many of us in Congress have long been in sympathy, which is that what happens in medicine affects each and every American; therefore the business of medicine is the public's business.

I commend this article to everyone interested in a concise analysis of a rather complex problem, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CRISIS IN THE HOSPITALS

(By Selig Greenberg)

The Nation's hospitals—the outposts of our phenomenal medical progress—are now confronted with a profound crisis, at the very time they are advancing toward ever greater miracles of healing and lifesaving. Soaring hospital costs and hospitalization insurance rates have brought a rising tide of public concern, expressed in demands for greater efficiency in hospital operation, and for reforms in the prevailing patterns of health insurance. Across the country labor unions, business firms, citizens' groups, and public officials are calling for controls on skyrocketing costs, curbs on services which are either wholly unnecessary or could be furnished less expensively, and a more rational and coherent system that will get the most out of the medical care dollar. Increasingly, warnings are heard from responsible sources that the squeeze of spiraling costs may price voluntary insurance out of the market and force full Government control of our whole complex of health services.

There is probably no more explosive issue in the entire controversial field of medical economics than that of hospital costs. For it is here, more than in any other area of medical care, that the problems of the technological revolution in medicine are rapidly coming to a head.

Hospital services now not only account for the largest single portion of the Nation's health care bill, but they are at the heart of our system of medical practice. As medicine grows more intricate and its tools more elaborate, the trend inevitably is toward increasing concentration of medical services within the hospital. And it is the very triumphs of medicine which are catapulting costs. Nowhere is this more evident than in the hospitals, which have become a large-scale and complex business requiring the coordination of a great array of professional skills and huge capital investment in expensive facilities and equipment.

Basically, the crisis of hospital function and financing stems from the fact that we are both the beneficiaries and the victims of the remarkable progress of medicine which has brought us better health and longer life but also has enormously complicated the rendering of medical services and raised their costs. The resolution in medicine is far from over, and hospitals have yet to fulfill their growing potential. Further scientific advances will unavoidably mean still costlier diagnostic and treatment procedures, more elaborate, and expensive equipment, and an even greater need for technical personnel. A continued rise in hospital costs thus appears inescapable. So it is all the more vital to eliminate the waste, duplication, and lack of integrated planning now common in the hospital field. If there are ways of operating hospitals more efficiently and economically—as many authorities believe there are—the public certainly has the right to insist on getting full value at the lowest possible price consistent with high quality.

Good hospital care clearly cannot be produced cheaply. But if costs are to be kept within acceptable bounds and quality improved, we will need a much higher degree of self-discipline by the medical profession and a far greater readiness on the part of hospitals to yield some of the privileges of their cherished autonomy than have so far been evident. It is no exaggeration to say that the future of the organization of medical care and practice in the United States depends on the extent to which the doctors and the hospitals can be prevailed upon to recognize that their business is the public's business.

The statistics of rising hospital costs and utilization are instructive and sobering.

For a number of years, hospital room charges have been advancing at a much faster rate than any other item in the United States Department of Labor's consumer price index. The overall index, which is pegged at 100 for the 1947–49 period, had risen to 124.6 by the end of 1959. At that time the index for all medical care services put together stood at 150.8. But for hospital room rates it was 208.9.

In 1946, the average cost per patient-day in voluntary hospitals was $9.39. By 1959, it had jumped to $30.19, an increase of more than 220 percent. Nor is the end of the spiral anywhere in sight. Experts are generally agreed that hospital costs will continue to rise at the rate of 5 to 10 percent a year. A spokesman for the American Hospital Association has predicted that the average cost per patient-day may reach $50 by 1968.

Of equal importance in contributing to the steady climb of the Nation's hospital bill is the striking increase in the rate of hospitalization. Thirty years ago, 37 out of every 1,000 Americans were admitted to general hospitals in the course of a year. Since then the ratio of hospital admissions has zoomed to 124. A variety of factors has figured in this upward trend. For one thing, hospitals can do much more for the sick than they could two or three decades ago. Widespread insurance coverage has removed much of the economic deterrent to hospital care for those in the middle- and low-income groups. In the Nation's population there has been a steady increase in the numbers and in the proportion of older people, who have a higher incidence of chronic diseases requiring more frequent hospitalization. Many conditions of modern city living make for significantly higher hospital use than in rural areas. The large proportion of working wives means that often there is no one at home to take care of a sick husband or child. The high price of household or nursing help to care for the sick at home and the limited size of city apartments also force up the hospitalization rate.

The net effect of higher costs of hospital care and its much greater frequency has been a tripling of expenditures for hospital services in the United States in the past 15 years. Out of a total private medical care outlay of $18.3 billion in 1959, payments to hospitals were $5.5 billion, the biggest single share, and $500 million more than the amount paid to physicians. The latest available breakdown shows that 30 cents out of every medical care dollar now goes to hospitals, 27 cents to doctors, 26 cents for drugs and appliances, 11 cents to dentists, and the remaining 6 cents for other professional services.

There are many sound reasons for the continued rise in hospital operating costs. A U.S. Public Health Service official has summed them up with the cogent observation that "when we talk about the cost of medical care today as compared to the past, we're talking about the price of an electric washer-dryer compared to a washtub."

There is no ready solution for the costliness of new and more effective medical procedures, more elaborate surgery, and more potent drugs. Such dramatic advances as open-heart surgery, artificial kidneys, heart pacemaker units, cobalt radiation treatment, and radioisotopes to pinpoint internal abnormalities are restoring patients to health sooner and more completely, and, frequently,

are saving lives which otherwise would be lost. But some of these miraculous procedures are enormously expensive, requiring dozens of physicians and technicians for a single patient.

As productivity has gone up, industry has been able to shorten its work week. But hospitals cannot shorten their week. They must remain open 168 hours a week, 52 weeks a year. To keep pace with the standard 40-hour week in the community, hospitals have been forced to hire many new employees to fill each around-the-clock job. They also have been obliged to bring their lagging wage scales closer to those of private industry. While raising its wage level, industry has often managed to cut its labor costs through automation. But hospitals cannot substitute machines for people. On the contrary, as available life-saving services proliferate and newly developed equipment is constantly added, more rather than fewer people are required to operate them. In 1946 voluntary hospitals in the United States had, on the average, 156 employees for every 100 patients. By now the ratio of employees for each 100 patients has risen to 225. Whereas in the automobile industry wages currently account for only about one-third of production costs, payroll expenditures have shot up to 70 percent of hospital budgets.

New medical sophistication has made hospital care an accepted component of the average American's standard of living. The public learns quickly these days of new medical discoveries through the press, radio, and television. The more people learn about medical progress, the more they are likely to go to the hospital, where the latest advances can be most effectively applied. The rising standard of living also has brought a demand for more attractive hospital facilities. Hospitals are expected to match the comforts of motels by way of air conditioning, piped-in radio, perhaps television, and certainly window draperies. The new standards also call for a telephone at the bedside and some choice of menu. While the effect of these niceties on the patient's recovery is debatable, their effect on the hospital's unit costs is obvious.

Another element in the picture has been the sharp increase in new hospital construction throughout the country. This expansion has been, in general, a laudable development. Antiquated buildings have in many places been replaced, and additional bed space has been provided to keep pace with the forward march of medical science. But we have lagged in developing more economical facilities such as hospital outpatient clinics and adequate nursing and convalescent homes for chronic patients. Concentration upon the expansion of costly hospital bed capacity designed primarily for the acutely ill is wasteful. Competent opinion is that the more hospital beds are available, the greater is the tendency toward admissions for relatively trivial ailments and for longer-than-necessary stays, particularly when such abuse is encouraged by the benefit structure of hospitalization insurance.

The fact that patients now go home much sooner than they used to—the average length of hospital stay has been cut in the past 30 years from 15.3 to 7.8 days—is in itself far from an unmixed blessing.

The shorter stay means that more intensive treatment is concentrated within a shorter period of time, so that daily costs are higher. An additional cost factor in more rapid patient turnover is that chances are greater there will be vacant beds which have to be staffed but produce no income. One of the paradoxes of the hospital cost problem is that it is the result of both overuse and insufficient use of facilities. On the one hand, hospital beds are sometimes used needlessly for patients who could just as well be taken care of elsewhere at much lower cost. On the other hand, hospital facilities are not utilized as efficiently as they should be, with the result that about one bed out of four is usually empty, and in some institutions the average occupancy rate is even lower. Lower occupancy means a correspondingly heavier proportion of overhead in daily per-patient costs.

Much wider use of hospital services and their greater costliness have been reflected, inevitably, in steadily climbing hospitalization insurance rates. As Blue Cross and other plans throughout the country have repeatedly been forced to seek premium hikes, growing attention has been focused on the urgent need for eliminating hospital inefficiencies and needless use of expensive facilities. An important point to bear in mind is that hospital costs are no longer solely the concern of patients and their families. With the phenomenal spread of health insurance, which now covers more than two out of every three Americans, the hospital bill is being underwritten by the healthy as well as the sick. This means that the public is more and more looking upon hospital costs not only in terms of charges for services rendered but also in terms of the monthly cost of insurance.

Rate hearings before State insurance commissioners have increasingly provided a platform for the critics of hospital efficiency and of the effect which the present health insurance system has upon it.

Such hearings in New York, Pennsylvania, and a number of other States have produced charges that the prevailing insurance approach lays too much emphasis on hospitalization, ignoring possibilities for more economical treatment of many conditions in the doctor's office or in outpatient clinics; that Blue Cross—and Blue Shield, its companion surgical-medical insurance program—have builtin incentives for getting between hospital sheets merely to take advantage of insurance benefits; that hospitals could do considerably more than they have been doing to keep down their operating costs; that because of the general lack of overall community planning and integration in the hospital field there is duplication and overlapping of personnel, equipment, and services; that much of the present organization of hospital services, revolving around the doctor as a private entrepreneur, has become inefficient in the context of the growing complexity of medicine and must be drastically revamped to take advantage of opportunities for greater productivity and lower costs; and that the public is not adequately represented in the management of the voluntary hospitals and the insurance plans.

The adverse effect of health insurance, which now provides the greatest share of hospital income, in relaxing many of the pressures for economy in hospital operations is emphasized in the report of the commission on financing of hospital care. The commission, sponsored by the American Hospital Association and made up of a distinguished group of authorities, concluded after a lengthy study that the emergence of insurance as a major factor in medical economics has to some degree reduced, if not removed, incentives that would otherwise operate to encourage maintenance of hospital operating costs at the lowest level practicable.

The commission's report points out that prior to the extensive use of insurance, when people were required to pay the full bill directly to the hospital, there were natural economic restraints on costs and lower cost institutions providing services of equally good quality enjoyed a competitive advantage in attracting more patients. But with the introduction through insurance of a new element in the relationship between cost and use of services, the report says Blue Cross, as the intermediary between the purchaser of hospital care and the hospital, must inevitably assume some functions previously the direct responsibility of patient or hospital.

One of those holding that genuine economies can be made by hospitals without lessening quality of service, and that Blue Cross should insist on such economies instead of merely acting as a collection agency for the hospitals, is Francis R. Smith, Pennsylvania's dynamic State insurance commissioner.

Smith, who feels that his authority to pass on Blue Cross premium rates goes much further than the checking of actuarial tables and extends to the things which pyramid costs, has for several years been preaching the doctrine that neither the hospitals nor Blue Cross have done all they can and should to control such abuses as unnecessary admissions and excessively protracted stays and to put into effect other efficiency measures. And the commissioner has used his legal powers to enforce his views. In a series of trail-blazing decisions, he has ordered Blue Cross and the hospitals in Philadelphia and other cities to adopt certain economy measures before any further insurance rate boosts would be granted. Among the economy possibilities he has advocated are wider use of opportunities for outpatient diagnosis and treatment, tighter controls on the scheduling of admissions and discharges and on length of stay, better scheduling of medical procedures to avoid needless delays, more effective use of technicians and nurses, sharing of specialized equipment among hospitals, and greater standardization of supplies along with joint purchasing.

Considerable progress has been achieved in Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and other Pennsylvania communities under Smith's prodding during the past 2 years. Blue Cross plans have developed medical review teams to ferret out abuse of insurance contracts. They have expanded their coverage of diagnostic services and home nursing visits, in order to cut down hospitalization. Hospitals have organized medical utilization committees to check on needless admissions and excessive stays. They also are moving to achieve greater management efficiencies and to coordinate expansion through joint planning.

While hospitals are a big enterprise but not a business in the ordinary sense of that term, Smith said in a recent speech, "This does not mean that hospitals cannot be businesslike. More needs to be done in applying commonsense business practices and methods to hospitals—wherever they will apply."

Birch Society Must Be Exposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, in the recent controversy over the John Birch Society those who oppose its noxious doctrines have split into two camps. Those who favor exposing and opposing it vigorously instead of laughing at it have support from the Madison Capital Times. I include in the RECORD their recent editorial on the subject:

SHOULD THE BIRCH CULT BE IGNORED OR EXPOSED?

Attorney General Robert Kennedy recently said of the John Birch Society:

"I don't think anybody should really pay too much attention to them. I think they make no contribution to the fight against communism here in the United States and, in fact, I think if anything they are a hindrance. It seems to me it is an organization in the area of the humorous and I don't think so much attention should be taken."

We can agree that they make no contribution to the fight against communism. But we cannot agree that they should be ignored.

These people need to be exposed because they weaken our democratic fabric when it is in mortal combat with communism and, in that respect, they serve the cause of communism. They breed distrust of democracy.

They have members who are men of great wealth and influence in the country. Three former heads of the National Association of Manufacturers are members. A former head of the Internal Revenue Service is a member. Their governing council includes prominent industrialists across the country.

Their founder, Robert Welch, is a successful businessman, whose public speaking appearances are attracting capacity audiences. The membership of this organization has grown rapidly in the few years of its existence.

Its methods of operation—anonymous telephone calls and mail to public officials—are calculated to frighten timid officeholders with being smeared with the Communist label.

They are masters at exploiting the deep-rooted fear of communism among our people. Fear-ridden people believe a lot of ridiculous things. They might even believe that our last three Presidents were part of the Communist conspiracy, particularly if the charges are ignored. Remember what Hitler said about the "big lie."

There is only one way to deal with people like this—make them prove their charges. McCarthy was finished when he went before the country to try and prove his charges against the Army.

Recent Developments in Antitrust Enforcement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 14, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the speech delivered by Lee Loevinger, Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, U.S. Department of Justice, before the American Bar Association at Washington on April 7, 1961.

I am sure that all Senators will find the speech very informative. Mr. Loevinger is considered to be an outstanding authority in the field of antitrust law.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN ANTITRUST ENFORCEMENT

(Speech by Lee Loevinger to Antitrust Section, American Bar Association, Washington, D.C., April 7, 1961)

One year ago I appeared before this distinguished and elite group to deliver what was then expected to be a "swan song" with relation to my active antitrust participation. The curious surprises that fate has in store for us and the verity of Bobby Burns' sage observation on the plans of men and the lower animals could not be better illustrated than by the events that have happened to me since then. Indeed, the circumstances that have thus drastically affected my own life may well be relevant to the assigned topic of this speech which is "Recent Developments in Antitrust Enforcement."

The conventional approach to this topic is to review carefully and in detail the decisions of appellate courts that have been rendered since the last such discussion. This seems unnecessary on this occasion. All of you follow the development of antitrust law in the courts; and it would be futile and foolish to attempt to improve upon either the reporting service of Law Week, C.C.H., and the advance sheets, or the analyses and discussion available to you both in publications and in your own offices. It may be more relevant and important to indicate what I consider to be the most important development in antitrust, as in other law enforcement, during the past year.

The most important development in the enforcement of the antitrust laws since your last meeting has undoubtedly been the election of John F. Kennedy as President of the United States. This has resulted in the infusion of a new spirit of energy and dedication throughout the public service. Beyond this that historic event has brought to the highest levels of Government administration and law enforcement a new understanding and a firmer faith in the principles upon which antitrust is founded than there has previously been for many years.

This may most usefully be illustrated for you by suggesting some of my own views. Perhaps these may also serve to lay at rest a few ancient shibboleths of the antitrust bar. The first is the notion that violation of the antitrust laws, whether intentional or not, is merely a normal business risk and really quite respectable. This is related to the feeling that has heretofore been tacit but pervasive that it is inappropriate to have criminal sanctions in the antitrust laws, and that, in any event, these were to be applied only to corporations and not to individuals. In this view even deliberate violations of the antitrust laws were, at worst, venial offenses of no more moral significance than a parking ticket.

It may be hoped that the Philadelphia electric cases, for which the preceding administration of the Antitrust Division is to be given all due credit, have helped to dispel this misapprehension. In any event, it should now be clear that a deliberate or conscious violation of the antitrust laws is not a mere personal pecadillo or economic eccentricity, but a serious offense against society which is as immoral as any other act that injures many in order to profit a few. Conspiracy to violate the antitrust laws is economic racketeering which gains no respectability by virtue of the fact that the loot is secured by stealth rather than by force. Those who are apprehended in such acts are, and will be treated as, criminals and will personally be subjected to as severe a punishment as we can persuade the courts to impose.

In the second place, the Antitrust Division is not receptive to pleas for exceptions, exemptions or special treatment of any company or industry. We have been told frequently and are quite well aware that every industry and situation is unique, that every company is most exceptional and that every case is quite extraordinary. We are also well aware that Congress and the courts have repeatedly and emphatically declared that competition, rather than collusion or monopoly, shall be the basic rule of commerce. This rule springs from the conviction that competition is the counterpart and corollary of economic freedom, and that a free economy is necessarily a competitive economy. Therefore, in general we will oppose exceptions to or exemptions from the antitrust laws, sought by way of departmental policy or judicial rulings. When asked for comment on a legislative proposal for antitrust exemption, we will take a long, hard look. With exceptions already covered by existing laws, we have seen no persuasive case for compromising any antitrust principles in special cases.

That the necessity for complying with high standards of business conduct required by the moral principles inherent in our legal codes may sometimes cause concern to businessmen and lawyers is inevitable. This is not a difficulty unique to the antitrust laws. The temptation to get rich quickly by dishonest means abounds in private life. Some succumb, but we do not listen sympathetically to the plea that theft or embezzlement, for example, should be legalized because it is no difficult to acquire wealth by other means. While the antitrust laws are, in some respects, complex, they are also flexible and reasonable. The burden of proof resting on those who seek exceptions or exemptions is not borne by the showing that it is more profitable or convenient to have no such inhibiting standards of conduct.

In the third place, the argument that the laws are basically sound but that they must be made more acceptable to business by modifications to make them both more flexible and more certain is either disingenuous sophistry or compounded confusion. To seek both flexibility and certainty in the same laws is a logical contradiction. It is equivalent to a demand that we simultaneously institute both higher and lower prices for a commodity. It is easy enough to write laws that are certain in their operation. In the antitrust field, the per se violations are examples of rules that provide certainty. These could well be extended by either judicial or legislative adoption of more per se rules. Conversely, it is easy enough to write principles that are flexible. In the antitrust field the rule of reason is an example. But it should be clear to any reasonable man that a rule which is certain is, by virtue of that very fact, not flexible. A rule which is flexible cannot be certain in prospective application.

As applied to the interpretation of law, the demand for certainty and flexibility involves polar concepts which must be reconciled and compromised. The difficult task is to write a law which provides a reasonable certainty and a reasonable flexibility respecting a single subject matter. No doubt judgments may differ as to the precise balance between flexibility and certainty that is desirable in a given instance. There is no objective or absolute standard that can provide a clear determination of the proper balance between these competing considerations. However, it is futile and logically absurd to demand more of both flexibility and certainty from the same law at the same time.

The antitrust laws combine both flexibility and certainty to a degree that has been thought appropriate to their subject matter by several generations of legislators and judges. Perhaps they are imperfect; true perfection is probably beyond human attainment. Improvement may be possible; but it is possible only when the demand is for consistent objectives.

In the fourth place, aside from the inevitable compromise between flexibility and certainty, the antitrust laws themselves appear to me to embody a consistent conception and system. The argument is sometimes made that while the basic mandate of the antitrust laws is for competition, other parts of the laws, such as those against price discrimination, inhibit competition.

However, there is no inherent inconsistency between demanding competition and prescribing the rules by which it may be conducted. It is true that some antitrust laws forbid the use of certain competitive weapons and techniques. This does not, however, indicate that these laws require what their detractors derisively call "soft competition," or, indeed, that they are in any degree anticompetitive. There is no sport or contest conducted in civilized society without its rules. These rules invariably permit certain forms of rivalry and prohibit certain other types of action as means of winning the sport, game, or contest. Of course, there are always those who decry any limitation on the mayhem or bloodshed that is permitted by the prevailing rules of organized sport. The Marquis of Queensbury rules, I am informed, were once regarded as wholly destroying the noble sport of manly combat in the ring. There will always be those who proclaim that any new rule takes all the fun and most of the competition out of a game. However, civilized society lives by its laws, and competition within civilized society is always inhibited by authoritative standards of acceptable social behavior. Were it otherwise, we would not have civilization but anarchy, and life would be quite intolerable.

There may well be reasonable debate as to whether or not a particular rule is desirable in organized sports, other games or contests, or in application to the economy by the antitrust laws. However, such an issue cannot be determined by the dogmatic assertion that all regulatory rules are inconsistent with the basic principle of competition. It is not necessary to hit below the belt in order to fight as hard as you can. The rules that prescribe the mode and weapons of competition are not anticompetitive, but, on the contrary, are quite consistent with free and vigorous competition in a civilized society.

Finally, let me express my profound conviction that competition is neither incompatible with nor a limitation upon efficiency. Indeed, competition is likely to be the stimulus which engenders efficiency. It is significant that the greatest industrial and economic development has taken place in those countries which have had the greatest degree of economic freedom and competition. Although there is not the time to offer the evidence now, I believe that an analysis of history suggests that the antitrust laws have not only permitted but have substantially contributed to the tremendous economic and polititcal development of the United States. However, we must now bear in mind that the future is not foreordained; and that it will be determined not by our past history but by our present character and future conduct.

The great issue of this age is whether this Nation, or any nation, can achieve full economic development, the satisfaction of all material needs, and the provision of adequate economic opportunities for all, together with political and civil liberty. We believe that these goals are compatible, and that the method by which they will be achieved is by observance of the principles embodied in the antitrust laws. The diffusion of economic power and the freedom which engenders competition are expressions in the economic realm of the basic faith of our culture that the individual human spirit represents the highest social value. Thus, we in the Antitrust Division are and will be dedicated to the faith that liberty, equality, and prosperity are consistent social objectives. We are and will be devoted to the effort to achieve these goals by a vigorous and uncompromising enforcement of the laws prescribing competition as our basic economic condition that we may protect and preserve economic freedom in this country.

Hospital Ship "Hope"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, a privately sponsored humanitarian effort of the American people that has had altogether too little publicity in relation to its accomplishments is Project Hope.

Hope means Health Opportunity for People Everywhere. Its chief instrument is a floating medical training center, the SS *Hope I*, a 15,000-ton vessel owned and loaned by the U.S. Government. Primarily a teaching program, Project Hope combines both instruction and treatment in countries visited by SS *Hope I*.

Project Hope as a mercy mission is not a governmental operation. In fact, the Government does nothing more than lend the ship. It is a free expression of a free people. It should be encouraged, and, since it is financed by contributions from private individuals and groups, it deserves general public support.

An article on this subject by Charles J. Munzinger appeared on April 6 in the Oakland Bulletin, the Pompton Bulletin, the Riverdale Bulletin, and the Lincoln Park Herald.

The story of Project Hope follows:

HOSPITAL SHIP "HOPE"

(By Charles J. Munzinger)

The following is a brief background on Project Hope.

This is a privately sponsored program of help and relief to share our country's modern medical knowledge and skills with all those in need thruout the world. It is a floating medical training center for Southeast Asia, and is on loan from the U.S. Government.

Project Hope has the most modern medical equipment and supplies, together with training aids. This ship, formerly the SS *Consolation*, is a 15,00-ton vessel, with 230 beds, constructed during World War II.

The permanent medical staff on this vessel includes 15 physicians, two dentists, 25 nurses, and 30 auxilitary personnel. Volunteer teams of up to 35 physicians will be flown to the ship on a rotating basis for tours of 4 months. The medical staff includes top specialists in the key fields of medicine.

Hope is essentially a teaching program, although necessarily there will be treatment involved. American members of the medical staff will be assigned to work in small teams with their local counterparts. This will enable the American staff to pass along modern techniques and the latest medical knowledge under working conditions.

Part of the medical staff will work on shipboard; part will be in mobile units, on duty inland. They will work with specialists, nurses, midwives, and technicians. Training will also be conducted through classroom lectures and discussions, movies and film strips.

Teaching is stressed because this will enable Hope to have a more enduring effect on local health conditions, than would attempts at widespread treatment. Concentration on training will enable Hope to help upgrade the local medical staff in their ability to diagnose and treat. In this way, these people will in turn be able to teach others. Thus, Hope's impact will grow and spread.

The SS *Hope* will visit only those countries to which it has been invited by the local medical professions. It is just completing a 6 months stay at Indonesia. Vietnam will be next, for a stay of 4 months, after which *Hope* will return to the United States. Invitations have also been received from Korea, Okinawa and Pakistan.

Hope's program is geared to the specific needs of the countries visited. Activities are worked out in advance with local doctors. This will enable *Hope* to concentrate on the most serious and pressing problems of each country.

A recent study conducted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare shows that the construction costs of a 260-bed hospital total $5,720,000, while annual operating costs amount to $2,982,700, for a total of $8,702,700.

In comparison, the total cost of operating the 15,000-ton, 230-bed SS *Hope* as a medical training center and hospital will come to less than $3.5 million a year.

The funds to operate *Hope* are coming from private contributions, also from business, industry, labor unions, and other private groups and individual contributions. The government's only role in this endeavor is the loan of the hospital ship.

Support for Project *Hope* is widespread. It has been endorsed by the American Medical and Dental Associations, and many other medical agencies. It had the personal backing of ex-President Eisenhower and has the wholehearted support of President Kennedy.

The American President Lines are operating the SS *Hope* at cost. Drug and pharmaceutical companies of our country are supplying drugs and medicines when needed. The American petroleum industry has underwritten fuel costs to operate *Hope*. The Pure-Pak Division of Ex-Cell-O Corp. is sponsoring a major motion picture project to raise funds for *Hope*.

Poverty, disease and malnutrition are common in Southeast Asia. Millions of people there are caught up in a catastrophe—they have to produce to survive, but unhealthy men cannot produce.

Hope is an experiment in international cooperation. Hope's backers believe that better understanding among the people of the world can be achieved on a personal level, through friendship, the sharing of knowledge and helping others to help themselves.

Hope's medical staff will benefit greatly, in newfound knowledge. Information will flow both ways. The experience to be gained in diagnosis and treatment of tropical diseases couldn't be gained anywhere in the United States.

These people to people contacts can help form the basis of a lasting peace and understanding. Hope means—Health Opportunity for People Everywhere.

The need for Hope is great. In much of Southeast Asia, there just aren't enough doctors to go around. In Indonesia, there is one doctor for every 71,000 persons.

With such a condition, the medical men are so busy that they find it difficult to keep up with modern techniques and developments. This means they can't get away to the United States or Europe to gain advanced training.

Project Hope will, in effect, bring the medical school to these physicians.

Nurses aboard the good ship *Hope*, now on a training and teaching mission to the Republic of Indonesia, where the religion is chiefly Moslem, report that patients coming aboard the ship carry small compasses, to show them the direction of Mecca.

Project Hope is headed by Dr. William B. Walsh, heart specialist at Washington, D.C.

Hope is the major activity of the People to People Health Foundation, Inc., an outgrowth of ex-President Eisenhower's people to people suggestion in 1956.

The backers of Hope plan to build additional ships as funds become available.

Russia's Space Feat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 14, 1961

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, Maj. Alexander de Seversky, who for decades has been recognized as one of the world's foremost authorities on air and space power, has written a new book entitled, "America: Too Young To Die." In this excellent work he points out what we as a people must do to preserve our Republic and our way of life. He pulls no punches, as, for example:

In 1955, in an article in This Week, I wrote: "The whole military philosophy must be changed, or we shall forever trail the rest of the world not only in conventional aircraft, but in international ballistic missiles and even in manmade earth satellite development."

Two years later the Russians fired the first ballistic missile and put the world's first manmade satellite into orbit. They built the world's largest aircraft; they sent the first rocket to the moon and another around the moon.

How, to take one achievement, did Russia manage to put a satellite in space before we did? Was it because we lacked creative brans or technological know-how? Not at all. Our scientific and production capability can outperform the Soviets' any day in the week. We were beaten not so much by Russia as by the inevitable results of interservice rivalry, the refusal of the services to work together, the destructive efforts of each to prevent the others from getting ahead.

These words were written before the Russians orbited a man in space, but they are just as prophetic as if this had been accomplished prior to the writing.

Miss Doris Fleeson, writing in the Washington Evening Star, furnished the words that Major de Seversky did not use because of timing, and because I feel she so succinctly follows the major's arguments, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RED SPACE FEAT A U.S. SCANDAL—POLITICIANS ARE HELD AT FAULT IN FAILURE TO RESOLVE PROBLEMS AND PUSH PROGRAM

(By Doris Fleeson)

It is a national scandal that the Russians have been the first to shoot a man around the world in a spaceship and bring him back alive.

Responsible officials of the United States have known for years that the same feat could be achieved by this rich and powerful country. They had every reason to believe that it also could be and would be done by the Russians.

The politicians who must make the decisions on which the survival of the United States depends ducked. They lacked the determination to put an end to Pentagon competition over which service should make the space effort. In the end, they created still a fourth agency, NASA, which has still to get off the ground in any meaningful way, much less conquer space.

The politicians of the executive branch did not have the courage to demand the necessary funds from Congress. Members of Congress did not trust the American people to understand all that was involved and accept higher taxes if need be.

Thus the United States is still dawdling and falling behind in the space race, and all the propaganda in the world cannot hide the fact from any corner of the earth. It would be ludicrous if it were not tragic that politicians are tackling the job now who must begin with a space primer before they can speak even with least lustrous technicians who know the story.

Amid fanfare, astronauts are being trained who have already sold the publication rights to a story which can only be an anticlimax to the Russian triumph. Rarely has the cart been put before the horse on such a scale.

President Kennedy and his new administration must face up to the harsh fact that Russia performed first an epic feat which was possible but forsworn by the United States. The official attitude heretofore has been that it was all very fine but not really too important, and there will be great temptation to continue it.

At the very moment the Russians were orbiting their air force major, Members of Congress were complacently telling reporters that while the voters like President Kennedy much better than on election day, they don't really care about his program. Yet they admitted that the people are thinking about the problem of peace or war and are uneasy, if not apprehensive.

The net impression, however, is that Congress will have to be pushed by the President so that the political risks will be as much as possible all his.

Despite encouraging statements, there is deep gloom in scientific circles. They had hoped against their better judgment that somehow this country would encompass a space first.

The issue is not involved with present cessation of nuclear testing, the hard choice Mr. Kennedy may soon be called upon to review. The Russian feat may lead to cries for resumption of such tests, and many experienced people believe they should be resumed, but the space fiasco is not connected with it.

It may be true that Russia will have trouble with Red China and would like to call off the costly arms race. But in space today, it's ahead, way ahead.

Proposed Junior United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 14, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the excitement generated by the creation of a pilot Peace Corps has already unleashed a flood of other suggestions for constructive and very positive steps to world peace. A nationwide mood is growing; we now realize that to have a secure peace, we must work for it in every way we can.

On March 19, Mr. Herbert Sturz addressed the American Field Service annual meeting at Princeton, N.J., on ways youth can work for peace. Mr. Sturz is executive director of the Vera Foundation, a new nonprofit group dedicated "to seek and further equal protection of the laws for the indigent by research into neglected aspects of court procedures, law enforcement, and the nature of the crime." The foundation will share the results of its research with those who seek it, and the foundation will also "develop and apply programs for the furtherance of law, justice, and civil liberties in the United States."

Mr. Sturz, who has long actively been associated with youth, told the group at Princeton about several new proposals, including a Junior United Nations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, excerpts from his address.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

You have asked me to say a few words about how youth can work for peace. I am happy to do so. But to be honest, I can't see what I can tell the American field service.

There are young people right here who have taken part in the American abroad program. In staying with families in other countries, in getting acquainted with our world neighbors, you have shown that American youth can represent America abroad. In a way this is the germ of the Peace Corps idea. In fact, the American field service is still a long jump ahead of the Peace Corps, because you are bringing young people of the world to our shores. This is very important. America, too, must learn, must be receptive. Understanding and helpfulness is a two-way street.

There is no beginning and no end to the Peace Corps idea. No one knows exactly where it originated—certainly a number of fertile minds and forward-looking organizations contributed toward its formation. It's one of those ideas that when you hear it you know it's right. You just want to drop everything and work in the Peace Corps. This is dramatized by the overwhelming response to President Kennedy's proposal. One hundred thousand volunteers are expected in the first 6 months. Personally, I believe there will be more. Nor is this enthusiasm confined to youth. And this is the heart of the matter. Young people working for peace are not really separate from adults working for peace. We are all in the same boat, we all have the same fears and hopes. The hydrogen bomb will make no discrimination as to age any more than it will single out people by race, color, religion, or nationality.

Prof. Robert MacIver has said that he would like to abolish the term "juvenile delinquency" because it suggests that youthful offenders are in their own little private stew, that their offenses and their problems have no relation to the adult world, and the implication is that youth and adults have no mutual responsibilities. Well, I agree with Professor MacIver about the term "juvenile delinquency" and just so, I would like to abolish the distinction between young people working for peace and adults working for peace. Is there any distinction? If a young man is old enough to go abroad

as a soldier, perhaps to die, then surely he is old enough to take an equal part in the attempt to create a peaceful world. He is mature enough and wise enough and certainly energetic and enthusiastic enough to demonstrate to peoples in other nations the positive, creative, traits of his fellow Americans.

Those who doubt, who call the Peace Corps "a haven for draft dodgers," or as Representative FRANCES BOLTON said last week "a terrifying thing" should study the record of Great Britain's voluntary service overseas, an organization similar to the Peace Corps. Voluntary Service Overseas has been in existence for 2 years.

Its organizer, Abe Dickson, a UNESCO social worker, saw it as a release for the energy and idealism of young Englishmen. "People want to feel needed," he said. "But it's hard to get this feeling in affluent Western societies. You can't find it in Piccadilly or Times Square." What Dickson says is true. These young Britons—men and women—serve 1 year in underdeveloped countries. Though they receive only subsistence pay and live hard, they stick. Only 2 volunteers out of 165 have quit so far. Private schools, factories, and farms have contributed young people to the voluntary service. And these young people are doing a great job—repairing bicycles, running first aid clinics, delivering babies, mending canoes, teaching English and sewing, designing hotels, vaccinating cattle.

Finally, and at last, young people feel there is something they can do about the world. This is the big breakthrough. Hopelessness and helplessness, despair and cynicism, are left behind in a cloud of dust.

The Peace Corps sounds magnificent. Most Americans are optimistic about it. The response abroad has been, by and large very encouraging. The Peace Corps can work. It must be made to work. In order to make it work we must face the fact that there are problems. Perhaps the most serious problem is the danger of unilateral effort in a multilateral world. Already Russia has offered a few unkind comments on the Peace Corps. They view it as another plot to subvert the developing areas of the world to capitalism. If we let the Peace Corps remain a purely U.S. venture, we can predict, almost certainly, that it will become another area of competition—a new playing field in the cold war. In my opinion, the hazards can be circumvented by making our eventual goal the creation of a Peace Corps of member nations from the U.N.

According to Peace Corps Chief Sargent Shriver, our Peace Corps will make men and women available to U.N. agencies upon request. And President Kennedy is sympathetic to this approach. So, we shall see what comes of it.

WORLD ACADEMIES

I would like to tell you about another idea which is being considered by the President's advisers and which I think is pretty nearly as exciting as the Peace Corps. This is the creation of a series of world academies, again under the auspices of the United Nations. These academies would be set up in Asia, South America, and Africa. Each continent would have four academies—an Academy of Public Health, an Academy of Building Crafts, an Academy for Office Workers, an Academy of Agriculture.

We plan to staff these academies by drawing upon the faculties of leading universities of every country in the world. But the instructors don't necessarily have to have an academic background. For instance, I know two carpenters, marvelous craftsmen, the finest type of Americans, who would do a wonderful job abroad. One of the finest builders in the Princeton area would welcome a chance to share his knowledge and learn something from peoples abroad. There must be many such skilled persons who would be glad to give and to receive in this fashion. By establishing these academies on the home continent, the more powerful nations would demonstrate their genuine interest in the development of emerging peoples.

Allied to the Peace Corps and the world academies is the concept of a West Point of Medicine, here in the United States. As we all know, there is a need, in America and all over the world, for doctors and nurses. This need is already acute in the underprivileged countries and our own need will be sharpened as our population continues to explode. A West Point that turns out physicians and nurses. A School of Medicine and Nursing, supported by the Government, its trainees specializing in diseases prevalent among the emerging peoples. In return for their medical education, these young professionals would put in a 3-year tour of duty—their national service—in the developing areas of the world, again under the administration of the U.N. Upon completion of their national service, these doctors and nurses will go into private practice in the United States. This happens to be a rather clear example of the way foreign and domestic needs are bound up with one another.

Another exciting idea is one which Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS launched as a trial balloon in a speech to the National Student Association at Rutgers University a couple of weeks ago. The Senator proposed a junior U.N.—a U.N. conducted solely by the youth of the world. Its home base might be in New Delhi, Montevideo, or Accra. The delegates to the junior U.N. would attend sessions the year round. They would conduct study programs and debate key issues and pass resolutions. In the process, they will acquire skills and knowledge in economics, linguistics, diplomacy, and world government—and, as Senator WILLIAMS said, "A dozen other fields essential for understanding among peoples in this tense world of tragic misunderstanding."

This is an interesting idea which should be discussed. I hope somebody here has something to say about it. By the way, Senator WILLIAMS has been one of the early proponents of the Peace Corps. He probably knows as much as anyone in Washington about the mechanics of it.

I'm sure many of you have seen "Ballad of a Soldier"—the film Russia has sent over as part of a cultural exchange with the United States. What came through was Russia's abhorrence for war and its waste of human effort and life. As I got it, the movie was a call for peace. Llewelyn Thompson, our Ambassador to Moscow, believes Russia wants peace. So do our other top advisers on Soviet policy. There is no doubt that we, here in the United States, want peace. The Peace Corps is an expression of that longing and of the practical urge to do something about it.

U.S. Policy in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 14, 1961

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the April 6 and 12, 1961, issues of the News and Courier of Charleston, S.C., contain two editorials entitled "U.S. Promotes Revolution" and "U.S. Document Approving Revolution Was Written by Professor Schlesinger," respectively. I ask unanimous consent that both editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

These editorials raise some very serious questions about apparent U.S. policy to foment revolutions in Latin America. This new policy also concerns me very much and should concern every Member of this body.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the News and Courier, Apr. 6, 1961]

U.S. PROMOTES REVOLUTION

The Economic Council letter for April bears this headline: "Our State Department—Enemy of the American People." That is a grave accusation, but it is backed up by facts.

As the letter states: "Even the briefest study of events since 1934 will show that the State Department has nearly always taken a position helpful to the Soviet Union and against the interests of the United States."

One need not rehash the loss of China to the Communists or other tragic chapters in the history of the State Department. It is unnecessary to go beyond the events of the last week to find the State Department taking a position hurtful to the United States.

We refer to the State Department's most recent document on Red Cuba. The language in which the State Department promises to support revolution in Latin America will make patriotic U.S. citizens hang their heads in shame. Never before, to our knowledge, has the U.S. Government issued a state paper filled with radical cliches that have been culled from a leftist political magazine.

Yes, the State Department does support and approve revolution in Latin America, and in these words:

"It is the considered judgment of the Government of the United States of America that the Castro regime in Cuba offers a clear and present danger to the authentic and autonomous revolution of the Americas."

Who authorized unidentified policy planners in the State Department to publish a manifesto upholding revolution in this hemisphere? Who are the authors of this document? Are they the same men who supported Fidel Castro in the first place?

The document is full of false statements about how the Castro revolution started and succeeded. What's worse, it puts the United States on record as praising "positive programs initiated in the first month of the Castro regime." It specifically mentions "land reform." Congress should take note of that. Land reform in Cuba meant stealing hundreds of millions of dollars from U.S. citizens without a cent in payment.

The worst feature of the document is that it constitutes a political endorsement of Fidelistas among the Cuban exiles—Castro's old accomplices who got out of Cuba when they saw the ship was beginning to sink.

The State Department specifically lavishes praise on Jose Miro Cardona, head of the new ultraradical Revolutionary Council, as "a distinguished lawyer of Havanna." Actually he was distinguished as a political tool of Dictator Castro. The Department also praises Manuel Ray, head of the extremist People's Revolutionary Party, who wants confiscation of U.S. property to remain in force after Castro is removed.

Fantastic as it may seem to the average American, the U.S. State Department also praises Raul Chibas. Major Chibas was one of Castro's right-hand men. He presided over the firing squad executions in Havana, a bloody circus similar to Nazi and Soviet trials.

Men like this are the type the State Department hopes will gain power in Cuba. They are revolutionaries with blood on their hands. The Department sponsors revolution.

The News and Courier has received a letter from a distinguished anti-Communist Cuban patriot now in exile. Speaking of the Miro Cardona-Ray-Chibas group, he says:

"During the time they were members of the Castro government every human right was violated in Cuba. Castro stated repeatedly and in no uncertain terms that he did not intend to hold free elections and give the people the opportunity to freely and democratically choose a government. The economic measures approved were clearly Communist-inspired, and Castro's campaign of insults and vituperation against the United States was in full swing. I ask you: Can the people who shared the responsibilities of government with Castro when this was going on now lead the fight against communism and for democracy and good relations with the United States?"

That rhetorical statement is a fitting reply to the truth wisting of leftists in the State Department.

[From the News and Courier, Apr. 12, 1961]

U.S. DOCUMENT APPROVING REVOLUTION WAS WRITTEN BY PROFESSOR SCHLESINGER

Andrew Batcher, Assistant White House Press Secretary, yesterday told the News and Courier that there is great "accuracy" in a report that Prof. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Harvard historial now on President Kennedy's staff, drafted the State Department's document on Cuba issued April 3. In Mr. Hatcher's words, Professor Schlesinger was the moving spirit behind the document. It puts the United States on record as promoting revolution in this hemisphere.

This statement is an example of what responsible Americans have warned would happen if a coterie of leftwing intellectuals gained a foothold in the White House. The palace guard is usurping the functions of regular departments of Government.

What special competency has Professor Schlesinger for drafting a new U.S. policy toward Latin America, a policy which rejects Latin evolution and hails Latin revolution? Professor Schlesinger is a former official of Americans for Democratic Action, a leftwing pressure group. He made a hurried trip through several Latin countries after Mr. Kennedy's inauguration. On the basis of this flimsy preparation, he now has ghosted a document which may set off dynamite in several countries south of the border.

For years, the United States had a policy of helping backward Latin countries evolve peacefully and in good order. To that end, the United States has supplied these countries with economic advice and assistance. Professor Schlesinger now comes along and praises authentic and autonomous revolution in Latin America. He writes an official U.S. foreign policy paper which says revolutionists should keep lands confiscated from rightful owners.

Professor Scheslinger may have wormed his way into a position of power in the President's office, but he has no special writ to give the endorsement of the people of the United States to lawless, bloody revolution in Latin America. The President would do well to disavow Professor Schlesinger's statement before it causes the death of innocent people in Latin America and disruption of already precarious economies.

Providing Home Loans for Veterans in Housing Credit Shortage Areas

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5723) to extend the veterans' guaranteed and direct home loan program and to provide additional funds for the veterans' direct loan program.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, it might be interesting to have a little survey of what has happened to the veterans' housing program since its inception.

Since Congress passed the original Veterans' Administration Housing Authority, 5½ million men and women who served their country honorably have received loans under the conventional method. That is, the local lending institutions supplied the money and the Government guaranteed a portion of the loan. The amount involved in these transactions is approximately $50 billion.

With a potential liability of $50 billion, you might wonder what the experience has been. From the interest income on the sale of acquired properties by the Veterans' Administration, from the repayment by the veterans themselves, from the assets of the properties not sold, and considering them at their value at the time of acquisition and not at the time of making the loan, the net loss in this $50 billion program as of the 28th day of February 1961 was $15 million, which is three one-hundredths of 1 percent of the original invested principal. If there is any bill or any program that has ever proven its worth, I think this program has.

When the Congress found out there were many veterans who could not get loans because either there were no facilities in their area or the banks or lending institutions of the area would not make them, Congress in its wisdom passed the direct loan program. There are, as at the end of February 1961, 180,883 loans made in that program for approximately $1½ billion.

There are on the present list of the Veterans' Administration waiting for direct loans as of the 28th of February 30,115 applications. You may wonder why this additional amount of money is necessary. As the chairman of the committee stated, in the United States there are 3,072 counties. Under the laws that exist at the present time only 332 of the counties in the United States are ineligible for direct loans; in 267 counties they are partially ineligible, but in those approximately 600 counties more than two-thirds of the veterans of the United States live. In the remaining 2,473 counties veterans will be eligible for these direct loans.

It is remarkable that in the small number of counties where the large percentage of veterans live 37 percent of the veterans who are eligible for loans have applied and received them, but in the 2,473 counties where this bill will apply only 12 percent of the eligible veterans have received their loans to acquire their homes.

Let us look what has happened to this direct loan program since its inception. By the way, so that you may understand what happens pursuant to law passed by the Congress, the Veterans' Administrator goes to the Secretary of the Treasury and gives him an obligation in writing guaranteeing to repay that amount of money to the Treasury. He borrows it, and the obligation calls for the Veterans' Administrator to pay to the Federal Government the amount of interest that the Treasurer is required to pay on loans as of the date that money is borrowed. The Veterans' Administration loans the money in accordance with the law, and those loans have varied from 4, 4½, 4¾, and 5¼ percent interest. From that interest there has been an income of $199,824,155. Of that sum the Veterans' Administration has paid to the Treasury of the United States $120,289,184 interest on this money; its property management and sales expense has been $665,926; loan closing expense has been $3,865,303; liquidation expense has been $105,667, and charges against the reserve for losses are $654,308, or a total of expense and charge for losses of $125,580,388, or a net worth of this program as of February 20, 1956, of $74,243,767. This is a profit and will go to the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, this is one of the programs with which this Congress can look with pride, because while it has helped the citizens of this country, the American citizens, it has more than paid its way and will continue to do so. I certainly hope that this bill will be approved and that there will be no recommittal of it to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Strengths and Weaknesses in our School Systems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 14, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, educators of this Nation are doing their best to analyze the many strengths and relatively few weaknesses in our schools. Their self-analysis has already helped us to recognize that major

efforts are needed to provide the skills and knowledge needed and required in a nation faced with the challenge of new growth at home to help maintain its leadership abroad.

The American Economic Association recently declared that too many students in the United States have only limited understanding of economics; the association has decided to do battle against "economic illiteracy."

An editorial in the Atlantic City Press, Atlantic City, N.J., describes this effort and issues a wise word of caution. It asks the association to avoid "the blandishments of special pleaders and interest groups who may seek to use the new program as a device to disseminate their ideas." Objectivity, of course, should be one of the ground rules for any such educational effort. We need facts and we need fresh ideas, not warmed-over slogans or outmoded concepts. The Economic Education Task Force will perform a vital service if it can help us to understand the forces that strengthen or weaken our economy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Atlantic City Press, Mar. 15, 1961]

ECONOMIC ILLITERACY

Convinced that all too many students are emerging from our schools economic illiterates, the American Economic Association has appointed an economic education task force to deal with the situation.

They begin with the premise that too few students are exposed to economics, that many of those who are exposed get too little of it, and that much of the economic theory taught harks back 60 years ago or more.

There is little doubt that such shortcomings are the rule rather than the exception. A recent survey of college freshmen showed a majority held misconceptions about the simplest workings of the economic system.

In an earlier day this might not have been too important. Americans learned such economics as they needed as they rose in their occupations. But today, government decisions on economic affairs can make or break whole industries, permit or retard economic growth, and permit balance or create imbalance in the economy that affects the business cycle.

These actions are often largely in response to the notions and prejudices of the voters, and widespread economic illiteracy therefore becomes a serious factor in economic progress or the lack of it.

The task force members have vowed to gird themselves against the blandishments of special pleaders and interest groups who may seek to use the new program as a device to disseminate their ideas. They will do well to stand fast on this resolve.

A good grounding in the elements of the economy, and of the causes and effects involved in private and governmental actions is about all that can be introduced at the high school level. This by itself would represent an important forward stride in producing an intelligent work force and an informed electorate in the years to come.

In the past, voters who have believed that net profits represent 20 percent or more of the sales price of goods, that a rock-and-roll singer may legitimately earn half a million dollars a year, while a railroad president is overpaid at $50,000, and that government can guarantee full employment have had some serious effects on our progress.

A Reappraisal of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 14, 1961

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, at the 13th annual institute of international relations, held at Washburn University, Topeka, Kans., April 9, 1961, Alf M. Landon, a former Governor of Kansas, a former candidate for the Presidency on the Republican ticket, and a student of international affairs, delivered an outstanding address on the United Nations.

Mr. Landon in his address discussed the importance of the United Nations in world problems, and the dangers confronting this organization.

I ask unanimous consent that this address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A REAPPRAISAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

I speak tonight to focus attention to the facts in this momentous moment of world history. My final conclusions will be neither pessimistic, nor optimistic, since it is uncertain yet whether reason will prevail.

There have been incredibly dangerous developments in world affairs in the past few weeks. There has been a failure to make clear the true import of events and their long-term consequences. If anything, I am particularly dismayed by the opposite tendency, namely, the sugar-coating of deliberate optmism. In some cases, there has been downright concealment of important and deadly significant facts.

One of my major purposes tonight is to try, as fairly and objectively as possible, to reveal what the truth is and how all the elements of crisis revolve about and ultimately center on what I believe to be the most dangerous single conclusion, the potential death of the United Nations.

Let me first clarify certain technical administrative problems which are central to an understanding of the political processes of the United Nations. The U.N. is not, and I must emphasize this point, is not, an independent entity. It has no being and no reality outside of its membership and is entirely the dependency of its membership. In the same sense that a mirror reflects the face, so the U.N. is as strong or as weak, as good or as evil, as much a success or failure as the world it reflects.

But does the U.N. in reality reflect the world? Only the naive would believe that. Member nations are not equally powerful; member nations are not totally independent of political control and manipulation. What the world really is today, and the U.N. beautifully mirrors this, is that Communist power bloc which will act predictably on crucial issues according to the dictates of the Soviet. Of course, on minor matters, there are factions and differences. But don't let that confuse us. On all matters of substance, bloc discipline is enforced.

The Secretariat of the United Nations, and in particular, its chief executive officer, the Secretary-General, is the servant of the membership. No matter his personal convictions, he is bound by the language and the substance of the instructions of the membership. He is further bound, as we are tragically learning, by the willingness of the membership to obey their own directives—on all levels—including the financial one.

At this very moment, two international problems are most revealing—Laos and the Congo.

The history of Laos is a most distressing one. From the very inception, this problem was dealt with outside the United Nations and represented the bitter conclusion of the French collapse in what was then French Indochina.

At the meeting in Geneva of the Great Powers Conference, it was agreed that Laos would be constituted as a neutral state and that all participants to the Great Powers Convention would obey the conventional terms of neutrality. As I have already stated elsewhere, the United States as well as the Soviet Union disobeyed the Convention. And no matter how we attempt to justify this in terms of Chinese, Russian, and Vietnamese intervention, we did not take this case to the United Nations, but supplied arms and military personnel to a faction in Laos in contravention of the Geneva agreement.

In the face of the deepening crisis, we did not steadfastly rely on the United Nations, but on SEATO, a rather ineffectual structure, built by the late Secretary of State Dulles, a structure which has admittedly been of little value because of Britain's and France's indifference, amounting to negative policies. Even in the face of the devastating lesson of the Baghdad Pact, we still followed a course of reliance on a jerry-built power alliance. Furthermore, for 6 years, both SEATO's military and political values were hamstrung by the Eisenhower administration's lack of any positive, definite, and consistent policy in Laos.

In the final analysis, great harm can come from dealing with Laos as an independent problem. Because of its strategic position, it is a part of the whole world's fateful issues.

Despite sugar-coated official pronouncements, Britain, France, and the United States did not present a solid front in SEATO, nor with the United Nations policies in the Congo.

I now turn to the Congo—another key country—unable to defend itself against imperial Soviet control.

Prior to the eruption of the Congo crisis, Dag Hammarskjold had been carefully, skillfully and bravely attempting to strengthen the position of the United Nations so that it would best serve the smaller nations in the face of the East-West power struggle and make possible efficient, immediate action in the face of crisis. Hammarskjold had made great progress in his efforts, so that at the beginning of the Congo crisis, it was possible to field a United Nations army with speed and precision. But here the simmering, underground dangers suddenly burst to the fore. The United Nations blundered in administering policy in the Congo—blunders partially due to the improvisation necessary in the planning and administering of new and uncharted procedures.

The Soviet Union, which felt the time ripe for a major imperialistic move, felt itself frustrated and the stakes were big enough to make major battle. The stakes were and are the Continent of Africa. The Soviet Union waged its war on many grounds, but the most important ground was the United Nations itself.

It would first destroy the Secretariat and, by so doing, create anarchy within the United Nations itself. When the initial attack failed and Dag Hammarskjold refused to resign, the Soviet Union extended its attack by creating a precedent by refusing financial support.

Without money from the Soviet Union and its satellites, United Nations effort would be seriously hampered. The arbitrary withdrawal of troops by member states created

near panic in attempting to field a force large enough to cope with the most difficult situation. And finally, the various political factions in the Congo itself, seeing dissension and disunity in the United Nations proper, were encouraged to defy the United Nations, thereby creating increased economic and political instability which always favors Communist expansion.

In the face of the impudent and cynical Soviet junking operation other member states were handed a precedent for like action. Not until April 3d did Belgium agree to withdraw its military personnel from the Congo in compliance with U.N. resolutions.

The French have refused payment of their financial commitments to the Congo operation and, with the inadequate exceptions of Australia, Ireland, and the Netherlands, who have made only partial payment—the United States alone has paid the 1960 Congo assessment in full.

There has been much talk, at times of past crises, of the capacity of the United Nations to survive. It is my considered opinion that it is this crisis now which represents the great turning point—for it is this crisis which has produced general disobedience and not disobedience merely on the part of the imperialist Soviet bloc.

The League of Nations died in the face of the Italian invasion of Ethiopia—not simply because of unilateral disobedience on the part of Germany and Italy—but of general failure throughout the membership to provide support. No single nation of power and substance elected to go to the defense of the League in clear and certain terms.

At this moment the question of survival by the United Nations relies largely on American leadership. We are compelled to act both within and outside the United Nations to have its very existence. And our actions within and without must be consistent. In terms of our allies and all those areas of the world where the United States is central for aid and survival the United States must demand compliance with the charter of the United Nations. But it can do that only when it, too, complies with the charter.

And when it acts unilaterally, as in Laos, its political position and its moral position in support of the United Nations evaporates. If we don't value the maintenance of the United Nations as the only essential organism which breeds hope for peace we must then clearly face the alternative and the certain inevitability of war. No other organism, no other structure, no other mechanism exists which can act as well to inhibit "the seeds of destruction" leading to eventual general conflict.

Having presented a general background to this momentous crisis, let me deal with those elements which bring us closer to the heart of the problem. The best way is to cite opposing viewpoints and reveal the counterarguments. We all agree on certain basic matters, namely:

(1) The policy of the Soviet Union is clearly and by its own admission imperialistic. It will use all means at its disposal to secure world dominion.

(2) Even if there be no other choice, in the last analysis, the prospect of war is too dreadful to accept with a casual shrug of the shoulders.

(3) If there is any way, any way at all, to preserve freedom, the only condition appropriate to man and that makes life positively good, every effort must be made to find that way, without war.

(4) The only way that offers hope is the existence of a third force, a force capable of channeling, focusing, concentrating the power, the idealism, the will of peoples everywhere. That third force presently exists in the form of the United Nations.

Here are some recent countering positions:

The first of March, Paul Henri Spaak, a Belgian statesman of impressive stature, said that "the idea of a general war such as those of 1914–18 and 1938–45 could now be ruled out. Competition with the Communist East now is in the economic sphere. The test is taking place in Asia, Africa, and South America rather than in Europe."

Dr. Spaak went on to say that NATO and the new Organization for Economic Collective Development are the best reliance of the free world and the United Nations is ended. That is merely one variant on a position held by many, that the United Nations has failed. And there should be a return to out-and-out power bloc alliances.

In the first place, I cannot agree with Dr. Spaak's optimistic conclusion that a general war can now be ruled out, and his optimistic reliance on an empty shell like NATO and an untried organization like the OECD. While the United Nations is facing its greatest test, neither do I agree with him that it has been ineffective and is finished.

But far more important, at the heart of what Dr. Spaak proposes, is a return to tested methods, methods predicated on the certainty of general war, and not as he says the end of the possibility of general war. Power alliances are formed for purposes of mutual defense against aggression. They do not contain within themselves the ingredients for buffering antagonists. Two armed camps facing each other with no middle ground define the logical conclusions of their existence—ultimate conflict. And if the grounds for that conflict already exist, then the greater the need for a common meeting ground. Despite his vast experience, Dr. Spaak starts with a falses premise, a premise utterly out of accord with a rational world. His conclusions are consequently false.

Another argument gaining recent support calls for a withdrawal to our own shores, the "Fortress America" theory. This would mean turning the world over to imperial communism, an act of betrayal and almost inhuman surrender of our fellowmen. It would also hasten, rather than retard, war for with massive control by the Soviet Union of the resources of the world, attack would surely follow, an attack against a weakened and demoralized America fearfully awaiting the awful day.

Against the backdrop of the need for immediate decision, I propose the following as the necessary steps for reasonable men:

I emphatically believe President Kennedy and our Congress must make up their minds soon whether we are going to emphasize the key place of the United Nations in world affairs, as our President did in his inaugural address.

I have made it plain in every address I have made on international relations, that we must keep our Armed Forces and our military strength second to none. That involves our own defense, even though, like an umbrella in a storm, it covers others.

While keeping second to none in our armed strength, I believe we must concentrate on more support of the United Nations.

We really only started that policy last September. It must be continued to a greater degree than heretofore, because, as I have said, the United Nations, as a result of that policy, was steadily growing in responsibility and strength until the member nations failed to keep even their financial commitments.

There has been much talk that the United Nations, to be effective, would have to be equipped with a permanent international army to force peace on the world.

I do not believe that is wise.

It is hard for all peoples to break away from age-old customs, and believe, that international affairs and basic major conflicts can be ultimately settled only by armed force.

However, slowly and falteringly, homo sapiens is feeling his way to new rules, new methods, for avoiding that folly. I believe there are sound grounds for optimistic conclusions that, given persistent and consistent strong support by the major powers of truly peoples' governments, the United Nations can and will grow in strength and responsibility.

That is not to say that we're not testing fate by our policies in world affairs.

The incredible danger we face is whether Khrushchev and the Soviet, Mao and his Chinese echelons, are going to make the same mistake of Kaiser Wilhelm and his war lords, of Hitler and his Nazis, of Mussolini and his black shirts, in underestimating the latent power of the undisciplined peoples of popular governments like Britain, France, and America.

The Prussians, Nazis, and Fascists relied, and the Russian Soviet imperialists are relying on, the same erroneous basic principle. The Soviet believes that disciplined peoples can conquer the undisciplined peoples of true democracies, where, as in America, local labor unions attempt to establish their own foreign policy contrary to their Government's international trade agreements.

Khrushchev cries the free press does not understand him. So did Kaiser Wilhelm II, and Hitler.

Khrushchev and Mao keep pushing here and pushing there—testing the will and the determination of truly peoples' governments to stand their ground for their principles and their freedom. So did the Kaiser, and Hitler, and Mussolini.

All three made the great mistake of believing Great Britain and France were decadent and America "too proud to fight." Well, they got their answer in two world wars. However, Mao, and the Soviet, apparently are still not convinced that governments that permit organized pacifist demonstrations, unrestrained criticism and ridicule in all phases of national life, and are devoted to the rights of the individual, can and will do a better job in war, when the incentive is there, than their disciplined masses. They confuse willing-to-live-and-let-live policy, up to a point, with faint heart. Therein lies the danger of destruction of the world by a great nuclear war.

Khrushchev, a superb actor, or a superb statesman, and possibly both, has truly said no nation can win a third general nuclear war. Therefore, the imperial Soviets' policy is a methodical process, both economically and militarily, in brush wars involving internal conflict. Questions of internal conflict anywhere can quickly become a matter of unilateral action between two major powers and thus resolve themselves into a general war.

When the United Nations charter was adopted many people vowed that was the answer to war and peace. That reminds me of a conversation I had with an old hard-boiled Republican leader in the 65th Congress that enacted national prohibition.

He told me of a visit he had with several other leaders in the Congress who liked their nip. They talked about brilliant colleagues whose opportunity for great public service had been ruined by overindulgence in intoxicating liquors. They were willing to make the sacrifice of their own tastes in order to eliminate that evil.

When I was talking to him, he was disillusioned by the results. He said, "It never occurred to us that the law would not be obeyed."

And it never occurred to people who built too high hopes on the United Nations Charter as the complete answer to settling diffi-

culties by collective process instead of unilateral actions—that the U.N. would not be obeyed forthwith.

The United Nations is going through the same period of trial and error, of growth, that our Republic has gone through, that the British Commonwealth has gone through, that France has gone through, and Germany, and free country after free country.

Take Kansas for an illustration. Its trials and tribulations in the days of horrible brutality of bitter border warfare were born of the failure of the Missouri Compromise and the Kansas-Nebraska Act, and of leadership in both the North and the South, the follies of statesmen and of generals, which resulted in approximately 600,000 casualties on both sides in the Civil War.

And yet, 100 years later, we have not yet reached the solution of the basic principles of that war, or, for that matter, in the Bill of Rights adopted almost 200 years ago. That is, civil rights for all in this great country of ours.

Two groups represent the despair theme of Washburn's Institute of International Relations:

(1) The despair of negative thinking is expressed by the tinkling cymbals of pacifists who would supinely surrender to the tyranny of communism, or reach the same end by appeasement. This very principle of nonresistance is an invitation to the Soviet and Mao.

(2) The sounding brass thinking by those who believe another world war is inevitable.

I do not agree with such extreme positions. I believe that, in the basic interest of the world's mankind, our eagle must neither fold its wings nor yield to the natural impulse in combating danger. We must abandon our presence of mind and become—as it were—a cosmic vigilante committee.

The United Nations is neither the failure some claim—nor the shining forceful success that others expected. It is now facing its greatest test. Its survival is at stake, precipitated by the failure of all the member countries to pay their share of the Congo expenses, thus playing into the hands of Khrushchev and Mao.

If the U.N. is forced to depend on the United States to pay more than its share, in order to continue the United Nations policies in the Congo, the collective position of the United Nations in world affairs is drastically altered by being heavily dependent upon one nation for the financing of its Congo policies. To that extent its collective function is weakened.

Although the possibility of the most dreadful and destructive war in the history of mankind cannot be completely ruled out, the prospects of avoiding that holocaust will improve as the free peoples' governments learn to compose their divergent views and pool their strength by and through the United Nations.

The hope, the creative theme, is expressed by such meetings as this that grasp the fact that the days of self-dependence by a nation are gone forever.

This is a new day and we must adjust ourselves to fit the new rules of the world in which we live. That calls for omniactive leadership by men of determination, of insight, whose eyes are open to the necessity and opportunity of fighting for extended cooperation by and through strengthening the United Nations as the most effective agency for peace.

If it is impossible to present a firm and united position by the United Nations, for equity and justice in the world, I fear a great calamity may be in the making, with the United Nations fading away as did the League of Nations.

Housing for the Golden Years—Problems of the Aging and the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 14, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the national effort to meet the problems of the aging and the aged is progressing on many fronts. Slowly we are achieving nationwide recognition of the fact that we must exercise long-range ingenuity to assure our elderly citizens of adequate resources for at least a minimum of security and comfort.

One of the most pressing needs is adequate, specialized housing. In the Congress last year we recognized this need in several ways. President Kennedy and Mr. Weaver of the Housing and Home Finance Agency have made it clear this year that they want to take even more effective steps this year. Their leadership is welcome and timely; the need grows more obvious every day.

It was particularly heartening, therefore, to read an article written by reporter Andre Briod for the April 2 edition of the Newark (N.J.) Sunday News. Mr. Briod, who has written often about urban development programs in New Jersey, wrote in that article that "New Jersey's cities have taken the lead in the construction of a type of housing which is of growing importance in the overall dwelling supply picture—low-cost, low-rent housing for the elderly."

His report, I believe, gives a helpful summary of the action that can be taken by thoughtful housing officials in large cities and smaller towns. I ask unanimous consent to have the article entitled "Housing for the Golden Years" be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSING FOR THE GOLDEN YEARS—NEW JERSEY LEADS NATION IN PUBLIC UNITS SPECIFICALLY FOR THE ELDERLY

(By Andre Briod)

New Jersey's cities have taken the lead in the construction of a type of housing which is of growing importance in the overall dwelling supply picture—low-cost, low-rent housing for the elderly.

Efforts in this direction have marked this State as the Nation's leader in the field, according to Charles Plotkin, information officer of the Public Housing Administration's regional office in New York.

Figures compiled last month by the regional office show there were 25 separate low-cost housing projects for the elderly either under construction or completed in 17 New Jersey communities. This record, according to PHA estimates, approaches the combined progress to date in the States of Connecticut, New York, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Vermont, Maine, and New Hampshire.

While other States, both in the East and elsewhere in the country, are following New Jersey's lead in accelerating their elderly housing programs, the Garden State continues to gather momentum in the same effort. As of last month, there were another 25 unstarted projects on the books in New Jersey, and the start of construction was expected on most of them before the end of this year.

In all, 34 New Jersey municipalities are now involved in the program, to the extent that they either have started or completed projects or have definite plans for future construction of low-cost elderly housing. Others may be expected to follow in the future.

The State now has eight completed elderly housing projects, a category in which New Jersey also is the national leader. The completed projects, some of which come within larger public housing ventures which include a portion of apartments designed especially for elderly persons, are in Newark, Asbury Park, Long Branch, West New York, Hackensack, Paterson, Bayonne, and Guttenberg.

What marks housing for the elderly as different from low-cost public housing in general is the inclusion of features and accommodations directed specifically at the requirements of senior citizens, or according to PHA regulations, a family whose household head is over 65 years old.

While the accommodations which distinguish the units for the elderly vary from city to city and project to project, three major housing developments now under construction by the Newark Housing Authority, to provide a total of 500 apartments for the elderly, offer a good example of what makes housing for the elderly something special on today's housing market.

These special features are to be included in those apartments to accommodate the special needs of elderly persons:

Slip-resistant tiles in both kitchens and bathrooms.

Oversized medicine chests in bathrooms.

Slip-proof surfaces on bathtubs. The tubs themselves are to be built lower than normal to make them easier to enter and get out of.

Grab rails around the bathtubs to enable users to steady themselves.

Silent sanitary facilities to prevent the awakening of other persons in the apartment when they are used at night.

Lower than conventional closet shelves to make them easier to reach.

Wider than normal doors to permit the passage of wheelchairs.

Pilot lights on light switches so that the switches can be more easily located in the dark.

Electric ranges, for safety reasons, rather than the gas ranges with which other public housing apartments are equipped in Newark.

Oversized elevator in each building to accommodate wheelchairs.

In addition, at least one building at each project location is to contain space for the establishment of a medical clinic to serve the elderly tenants.

There also is to be space at each location for visiting nurse service and for recreation for the elderly tenants.

Medical and visiting nurse services would be provided independently, either by social agencies, private organizations, or by a public authority other than the housing authority.

While the "extras" for the accommodation of senior citizens to be found in the Newark projects are basically the same as those which mark those included in completed or planned projects elsewhere, there are variations from community to community in the special facilities offered. The differences depend partly on the cost limitations imposed by the Public Housing Administration.

Where land costs for the projects are low, more can be provided. Where land is expensive, fewer facilities are possible.

Just as the accommodations vary, so do the building styles. Newark, Asbury Park, Guttenberg, and West New York, for example, all have employed high-rise construction in their elderly housing developments. The recently opened Long Branch project, which houses 37 elderly families, is low-rise, garden-apartment-type construction.

While most builders, whether low rise or high rise, are conventional in design, there are some unusual examples of public housing architecture in the elderly housing program, such as the hexagonal apartment tower now under construction in New Brunswick. That structure is to contain 60 apartment units for the elderly.

The factor of land cost also has a direct influence on the type of design employed in the construction of the buildings. If land costs are high, buildings must be built higher so as to keep the average cost per apartment within the limits set by the PHA. If costs of land are low, low-rise construction may be possible.

Federal housing law presently imposes a limit of $2,500 per room on expenditures for construction of low-cost housing for the elderly. That limit is about $800 higher than the limit per room for general public housing construction, but it must be set above the general limit to permit the inclusion of the facilities which distinguish elderly housing from conventional public housing.

Units built particularly for the elderly often are included within larger projects which contain a portion of general public housing. This is true of six of the eight completed projects for the elderly now finished in New Jersey.

In Newark, for example, the public housing for senior citizens now occupied consists of 28 apartments within the 1,206 apartments which comprise the Stella Windsor Wright Homes, opened for occupancy last year.

The five Newark buildings which comprise the three elderly projects now under construction here are designed for occupancy by elderly persons only. Each of the projects, however, is located at the site of existing general public housing buildings. Two buildings for aged persons are being built at the site of the Stephen Crane Village, two are being constructed alongside the Otto Kretchmer Homes, and the fifth building is under construction at the Reverend William P. Hayes Homes site.

Only Asbury Park and Hackensack, among New Jersey's municipalities, have completed elderly housing as projects separate from general public housing.

Of the 50 projects completed, under construction, or planned in this State, only 22 contemplate units for elderly persons alone. Many of those 22 developments, including the 3 in Newark, are located or are to be built on the site of an already existing public housing development.

In the case of some of the other projects, where elderly housing is to be incorporated within a larger single public housing venture, that housing portion of the development is to be located within separate buildings exclusively for the use of elderly persons. An example of this is Newark's West Kinney Street public housing undertaking, planned as the biggest single public housing project in the State, for which a site has been carved and cleared out of the city's central ward.

Overall, that project will contain 1,680 units, of which 252 are to be for elderly persons. All 252 apartments for the elderly will be located within a single building in the nine-building complex which will comprise that development.

Public housing authorities believe that a limited mixing of general and elderly public housing, such as the assignment of one or more buildings within a larger project to elderly persons only, is desirable from the standpoint of the living conditions of the older tenants.

By being placed in separate buildings they are able to keep their closest associations with persons with whom they have most in common. At the same time, they are protected from the distractions of the faster, and sometimes noisier, pace of general public housing life. On the other hand, they are given the feeling that they are still part of the overall community and not isolated from the world around them. They are in a position to establish relationships beyond those of their elderly neighbors, but not forced to accept such associations.

Today there are thousands of elderly persons living in general public housing in New Jersey. For these tenants public housing has in most cases provided better homes than they could otherwise afford. As special units for the elderly are constructed, these aged citizens will have available to them still better living conditions at approximately the same rent levels.

At the same time, as conventional public housing apartments are vacated by those moving on to the elderly units, other persons, not eligible for residence in buildings for the elderly but eligible for public housing by reason of their limited incomes, will be able to move into low-rent units from the substandard private housing they now occupy.

In this way, the benefits of the new program to house low-income elderly persons will extend beyond those for whom the new housing is designed.

The overall program in New Jersey at present will bring the eventual completion of 3,650 new apartment units for the elderly, 419 of which are already built.

In addition to the completed buildings for the elderly, these communities currently have the following number of elderly units under construction:

Bayonne, 62; Camden, 164; Guttenberg, 24; Highland Park, 6; Hightstown, 4; Hoboken, 50; Irvington, 42; Newark, 746; New Brunswick, 60; Paterson, 192; Perth Amboy, 48; Phillipsburg, 36; Plainfield, 30; West New York, 24.

Another 838 uhits are planned for the following municipalities: Bridgeton, Boonton, Carteret, East Orange, Edison, Garfield, Glassboro, Elizabeth, Hightstown, Irvington, Long Branch, Lakewood, Morristown, Red Bank, Trenton, West New York, and Woodbridge.

Good Works in Labor Movement Seldom Heralded by Headlines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 14, 1961

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, my attention was called recently to an editorial which observed that the "majority of the labor movement, and leaders of industry are honest in their operation." I was pleased to read this editorial in the Morning News, a San Leandro, Calif., newspaper. Usually it is the sensational stories of corrupt practices that get play in the press.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME HARD FACTS ABOUT GOOD UNION OPERATIONS

Good works, unfortunately, are seldom heralded by headlines.

The newspapers save the big headlines for stories about gangsters moving into unions and for articles about billion dollar price rigging conspiracy by industrial giants.

These are examples, we like to believe, of the exceptions to the rule. The majority of the labor movement, and leaders of industry are honest in their operation.

This week the East Bay Labor Journal printed some hard facts about good unions. Declared the voice of the labor movement in Alameda County: "No union corruption is right. No business corruption is right."

Russell Crowell, president of the county central labor council, declared, "We must differentiate between the union in which an isolated union officer goes bad, and one permeated by corruption."

This is not to mean that the labor movement should try to gloss over the convincing evidence which the McClelland Committee has produced—of sweetheart contracts, gangster tieins, looting of treasuries, perversion of the legitimate ends and aims of unionism, denial of union democracy and intimidation and violence. A black eye on the labor movement—whether they are AFL–CIO or not—hurts all who carry union cards.

Crowell declares that "there are some unions whose leaders have forgotten how to lead." No union member or officer should forget that the union exists for the rank-and-file membership.

Alameda County is fortunate that both Crowell and Executive Secretary Robert S. Ash stress the need for responsible labor leaders. Labor leadership in the county has been a clean, vigorous movement with an outstanding record.

American-Jewish Committee Proposes Intergroup Relations Division in Department of Urban Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 14, 1961

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, for some time I have urged the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs in the executive branch. I am hopeful, now that the Reorganization Act has been passed, that such a Department will be established in the very near future.

Most of the people who have commented on the establishment of a Cabinet-level Department in this area, have suggested subdivisions following the present structure of the agencies under the Housing and Home Finance Administration. There would be subdivisions for urban renewal, public housing, community facilities, housing, air and water pollution and covering certain aspects of highway planning and construction.

The president of the American-Jewish Committee, Mr. Herbert B. Ehrmann, in a letter to the editor of the New York Times, has made a proposal which departs importantly from this scheme. Mr. Ehrmann suggests that one of the subdivisions of this new department be charged with the responsibility of dealing with problems affecting the relations of various groups within urban areas. At present there are many such agencies at the local level which seek to iron out and resolve problems between new groups and old groups in urban areas, particularly in connection with redevelopment undertakings.

The national division on intergroup relations in the Department of Urban Affairs would—and I quote from Mr. Ehrmann's letter—"act as a national service bureau for local, State, and regional intergroup relations agencies and work as well with small communities not having their own intergroup relations committees. A principal duty would be to serve as an information clearing center for both public and voluntary agencies in this field and provide consultative services."

Mr. President, this is an interesting and exciting proposal. Up to now it has received little attention. I commend Mr. Ehrmann for his excellent and thoughtful letter to the New York Times, and I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD in order that those interested in a Department of Urban Affairs may study this proposal.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL PARTICIPATION IN DEALING WITH HUMAN PROBLEMS ENVISAGED TO AID URBAN AREAS

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In his recent housing message President Kennedy indicated that he would propose a new Cabinet-rank Department on Housing and Urban Affairs. Since more than half of the country's population is now congregated in 168 metropolitan areas, the urgent need for such a Department is compelling clear.

However, there has long been a tendency to consider the situation of urban communities mainly in terms of such physical problems as housing, water, and air pollution, sewage disposal, urban renewal. Important as these matters are, it is hoped that the new Department will give equal consideration to the human problems which daily confront the 108 million urban dwellers of our Nation.

We are by now painfully aware of how crucial these problems can become at home and, especially sginificant these days, in terms of our high visibility to nations abroad. The range of these problems includes relations between groups of different racial and ethnic backgrounds, tensions arising from neighborhood changes, dislocation as a consequence of migration and population growth, and the general urban turmoil that is the chronic concommitant of overcrowding, deterioration, and abrasive encounters between newscomers and old residents.

GOVERNMENT'S ROLE

Many voluntary agencies such as the American Jewish Committee have long recognized the important contribution which government on all levels can make toward dealing with metropolitan human relations problems. Many States and communities, too, have given evidence of their concern for these human relations issues.

In some 70 communities, including Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, New York City, municipal committees on intergroup and human relations have been formed. Twenty States have similar bodies. Their work will be significantly encouraged and enhanced by the creation of an intergroup relations division within President Kennedy's proposed Department of Urban Affairs.

This division would act as a national service bureau for local, State and regional intergroup relations agencies and work as well with small communities not having their own intergroup relations committees. A principal duty would be to serve as an information clearing center for both public and voluntary agencies in this field and provide consultative services.

Fact-gathering and research programs would be among its important tasks, which would also include establishing training programs for professionals and volunteer workers who are urgently needed in the intergroup relations field.

CONTEMPLATED HELP

The 1960 Democratic platform, in fact, contemplated a Federal intergroup relations office "to help solve problems of discrimination in housing, education, employment, and community opportunities in general." The Republican platform pledged "the full use of the power, resources and leadership of the Federal Government" to the same end.

The tremendous prestige of the Federal Government would, of itself, give great impetus toward the effective resolution of some of these pressing problems. Further, it would be of incalculable value in communicating to the world at large our Nation's sincere and constructive interest in those human relations crises so strongly current today.

HERBERT B. EHRMANN,
President, the American-Jewish Committee.

NEW YORK, *March 22, 1961.*

The Vintage Years—Problems of Aged and Aging Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 14, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, Mr. R. O. Beckman has given his readers much information about the aging and aged citizens of this Nation in his column, "The Vintage Years." He has often described new innovations worthy of great study by everyone who is working to prevent waste of human resources, which so often occurs among the elderly citizens of our society.

His column of March 20, which appeared in the Newark Evening News and other newspapers, told of community centers for senior citizens sponsored in a relatively small number of cities and towns. He gives special credit to the Auto Workers Union for leading the way in this field under the direction of Charles E. Odell.

Mr. President, Mr. Beckman's column describes a spontaneous response to a problem affecting so many of our older citizens who often find, in their later years, that their idle hours have become very lonely hours.

I ask that the attached article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUTO WORKERS' UNION IS ACTIVE IN AID TO RETIRED

(By R. O. Beckman)

Community centers at which retired persons may gather for companionship and leisure time are becoming an important aspect of modern social life.

Hundreds of facilities throughout the country, open to persons of all ages, but primarily youth-centered, are sponsored by city recreation departments or by welfare, religious, or other voluntary organizations. Not more than 150 such centers, however have set aside special quarters for older persons and established intensive programs for that group.

One organization in particular has blazed the trail. The auto workers union appears to have been largely responsible during the past 5 years for setting up more senior day centers in some 70 American and Canadian cities than all other agencies at work in behalf of our older citizens. These drop-in centers, sponsored in whole or in part by the union, now operate from 3 to 5 days a week, are professionally staffed, and offer a diversified recreational, educational, and social service program.

This was brought about with the leadership of energetic Charles E. Odell, recruited by the union from the U.S. Department of Labor. Odell modestly denies such credit and insists the achievement is due to the cooperative effort of other public and voluntary agencies.

Of the senior day centers, 15 are in industrial centers in Michigan, 13 in New York and New Jersey, and others largely in Midwestern and Ontario communities. Many receive primary financial support from the union, with some assistance from the community. Other centers initiated by the union are directed by other community groups.

They welcome any older person regardless of former membership in any labor union. The only charge is a voluntary contribution of perhaps a dime when a snack or cup of coffee is enjoyed. In contrast to the attendance at most other community centers and golden age clubs, a majority of participants are men.

The centers are usually open Mondays through Fridays and offer a varied program including educational and cultural activities; social affairs, games, movies, and hobbies; visitation of the homebound; referrals and counseling on health and other personal retirement problems; discussions of community problems; and participation in civic and community service.

Members have an integral part in planning programs that interest them. Monthly calendars are distributed showing each day's events. Visits to the homebound result in supplying many services and needs. Craft activity at the centers embraces such service projects as making decorated flower pots, tray favors, toys and puzzles, and candy fire crackers for a children's hospital. Dramatic and orchestral groups are popular at some centers.

For workers not yet retired, and their wives, a five-session 2-hour series of preretirement training discussions is conducted. The course was developed with aid from the universities of Michigan and Chicago. It has helped prospective retirees answer questions as to what to do to be ready for the nonworking years.

Some other labor organizations are at work for their retired members but are more largely concerned with establishing health clinics for members and retirees or setting up residential homes for older members. None has been as active in senior day center activity as the autoworkers.

Appendix

Francis E. Walter Honored by Assembly of Captive European Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the text of the opening statement I made on Thursday, April 13, 1961, at the truly moving and most impressive ceremony of presentation of the honor scroll of the Assembly of Captive European Nations to our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, FRANCIS E. WALTER, chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality of the House Committee on the Judiciary. My remarks were as follows:

It is a signal achievement for an American legislator to be recognized by the international community of free men as a statesman and a great humanitarian.

FRANCIS E. WALTER was so recognized last year when, at Naples, Italy, he was unanimously elected to serve as president of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, an organization in which 30 nations of the free world banded together in the noble endeavor of providing new homes and—indeed—new lives for those who have had to flee from totalitarian persecution or from economic misery.

Today, again, the free leaders of nine countries behind the Iron Curtain—Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania—united in the Assembly of Captive European Nations recognized FRANCIS E. WALTER'S work as legislator, statesman, and humanitarian in paying him an exceptional tribute.

Our friend, Congressman WALTER, has, indeed, very early witnessed the worst aspects of human misery inflicted by godless, dictatorial rulers. He was one of the first Members of Congress to enter the liberated, infamous concentration camp at Dachau, right behind General Patton's tanks. He saw Hitler's victims, and he readily recognized the need for immediate assistance, and he did not just talk about it. He did something about it.

His subsequent work in Europe, particularly his extensive investigation of the displaced persons problem undertaken in 1949, resulted not only in legislation here in the Congress, but generated an international effort culminated in the erection of the successor to the International Refugee Organization, the Intergovernmental Committee in Geneva which refers to FRANCIS WALTER as its founding father.

Throughout the years, FRANCIS WALTER has served his country with distinction, great ability, and courage. He reflects credit not only upon his congressional district which he has served so loyally, but upon our Nation as a whole.

You people, representing the nine captive nations locked behind the Iron Curtain, have a great ally in Mr. WALTER. For he is aware, like you who have fled your homelands, that the vicious forces of atheistic communism are bent on world revolution, conquest, and enslavement of people.

I do not have to tell you who have fled, of the persecution that is being carried on by Communists—the immediate successors of Hitler in your homelands. This is ever present in the minds of all of us, and we must thank God that we have men and women of the caliber, spirit and determination of FRANCIS WALTER. There is no Member of Congress who more clearly understands the intents and purposes of communism, as well as the vicious, inhuman mind of the Communist, than does the man you have come to honor, FRANCIS E. WALTER, the great American statesman and humanitarian.

Presenting the honor scroll, the chairman of the Assembly of Captive European Nations, Mr. Vaclovas Sidzikauskas, former Ambassador of Lithuania to the Court of St. James's, made the following address:

Representative WALTER, Representative McCORMACK, Mr. Attorney General, ladies and gentlemen, this is a memorable occasion for the Assembly of Captive European Nations.

We have come here to pay homage to a man, whose achievements we are singularly endowed to appreciate. As refugees from Soviet imperialism, we have always been aware of Representative WALTER'S concern for the fate of those who fled tyrannical regimes and of the actions he has initiated to support them. As spokesmen for the freedom aspirations of our captive peoples, we have followed with admiration his determined struggle against Communist totalitarianism. And we are bound to state that in combining the qualities of a humanitarian, who aids the victims of a plague, and of a fighter, who sets out to repel and to eradicate the source of that plague, Representative WALTER has set an inspiring example.

Our age is oversatiated with high-sounding words and dazzling statistics. Yet those who have tasted the bitter bread of exile will never forget that Representative WALTER is the person who introduced and piloted through the Congress all immigration, displaced persons, and refugee legislation enacted since the end of World War II. Those who have experienced homelessness will never fail to grasp the full meaning of the facts that under legislation sponsored by Representative WALTER upward of 760,000 displaced persons and refugees entered the United States; that his creation, the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, has moved to new homes over 1 million emigrants from Europe of which over 450,000 were displaced persons and refugees.

In coming to grips with Communist imperialism, Representative WALTER went to the heart of its problem and to the roots of its danger. As chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, he explored not only the American offshoots of communism, but also initiated a widespread program of research on Soviet strategy and the captive countries. Several members of the assembly, including myself, had the privilege of being called to testify, as experts on communism, before the House Un-American Activities Committee. Our first-hand experiences were recorded and disseminated to the American people, before whose gates the same totalitarian enemy now stands poised.

The freedom cause of our captive nations has always been very close to Representative WALTER'S heart. He was and remains one of the most ardent supporters of the Captive Nations Week. He has shown deep understanding of the aims of the Assembly of Captive European Nations and we have benefited from his advice and support of our activities.

Recently, Representative WALTER has offered one of the most effective rebuttals of Soviet hypocritical charges of colonialism against the United States and brilliantly exposed the Soviet slogan of "peaceful coexistence." Yet his searching mind has also looked penetratingly into the ills besetting the West. Freemen everywhere should ponder his timely warning that: "The security of the West cannot be based solely on the strength of its armed forces or the size of its potential product and on its technical skill and progress. Defense does not mean just guns and tanks and planes. Defense means the strength of dedication and the awareness that ours are the most trying times that have ever faced this Republic and this Nation."

We fully agree that at this juncture of the contest between liberty and tyranny, the will to win is as, or even more, important than the accumulation of weapons. It is the will of the West to preserve and expand the area of freedom, combined with the will of the nations of east-central Europe to become free again, that offers the best guarantee of victory and of a true peace.

Representative WALTER'S forthright views and unflinching determination was bound to make him a target of hostile criticism from various quarters. One of the most conspicuously unjust instances of such criticism was the inference that he had opposed liberal legislation in the area of immigration. We, on the contrary, are both cognizant of Representative WALTER'S past contributions to broadminded and humanitarian immigration laws, and confident that he will propose new liberal legislation which will enable the eastern European refugees from communism to enter the United States.

One day the people of east-central Europe will be able to pay due honors to the free men who stood by them in their years of bondage. As we wait for this day to dawn, we present to Representative WALTER, as a token of our deep gratitude for his contribution to the fight for freedom and human dignity, this scroll which reads:

"To the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, Representative in the Congress of the United States of America from the 15th District of Pennsylvania—fighter and humanitarian—in recognition of his undaunted courage in fighting Communist encroachments upon the freedom of man and nations, of his humanitarianism and of his generosity of heart—evidenced in legislative actions and interna-

tional achievements on behalf of refugees from totalitarian oppression."

VACLOVAS SIDZIKAUSKAS,
Chairman.
STEFAN KORBONSKI,
Vice Chairman.
BRUTUS COSTE,
Secretary General.

The presentation ceremony was attended, among others, by the Attorney General of the United States, Hon. Robert F. Kennedy; chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, Mr. Celler; ranking minority member of the committee, Mr. McCulloch; members of the subcommittee of which Mr. Walter is the chairman, Messrs. Feighan, Chelf, and Poff; the Deputy Under Secretary of State, Hon. Roger W. Jones; the Assistant Secretary of State, Hon. Brooks Hays; the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, Gen. Joseph M. Swing; and a large group of officials from the Department of State and the Department of Justice active in refugee and immigration affairs.

Among the exiled European leaders who honored Mr. Walter were, in addition to the chairman, Mr. Sidzikauskas, Messrs. Stefan Korbonski, Poland, the last head of the Polish underground; Vasil Germenji, Albania; George M. Dimitrow, president of Bulgarian Peasant Party; Peter Zenkl, Czechoslovakia, former deputy Prime Minister and mayor of Prague; Ilmar Raamot, Estonia, member of Parliament; Ferenc Nagy, former Prime Minister of Hungary; Vilis Masens, Latvia, former diplomat; and Constantin Visoianu, Rumania, former Foreign Minister.

Also, there were representatives of the Christian Democratic Union of Central Europe, International Center of Free Trade Unions in Exile, International Peasant Union, Liberal Democratic Union of Central and Eastern Europe, and Socialist Union of Central and Eastern Europe.

Another Saginaw County Board of Education Opposes Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES HARVEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert in the RECORD the following letter I received from the Board of Education of the Frankenmuth School District. The Frankenmuth Board of Education is the second such Saginaw County board to oppose Federal aid to education. A few weeks ago the Saginaw Board of Education took a similar stand in proclaiming local school needs can best be resolved by local efforts. Here is the Frankenmuth letter, dated April 13, 1961:

Mr. JAMES HARVEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HARVEY: The MEA Legislation Division has asked local school boards to express their thinking on Federal support to education.

The Board of Education of the Frankenmuth School District wishes to be on record as opposed to further support to public education in any of the forms being currently considered by Congress.

JOHN G. ZIEGLER,
President.
ARNOLD C. NUECHTERLEIN,
Secretary.

Address by Hon. Frank T. Bow Before the National Society of Daughters of Founders and Patriots of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, Washington has been honored during the past week with the 63d annual general court of the National Society of Daughters of Founders and Patriots of America. I am pleased that Mrs. Charles A. Baker of Lima, Ohio, in the Fourth Congressional District has served with distinction as president of this society, and during the recent general court our colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], gave the address at the annual banquet.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include his address in the RECORD:

OUR HERITAGE

There is little reason for me to come here tonight if my purpose were to tell you the nature of our heritage.

The fact that you devote your energies to this organization demonstrates that you are acutely aware of that heritage.

You know, as I do, that our forefathers handed down to us the most noble experiment in government in all of the history of mankind; that it has its foundations in religious faith; that it was conceived and has been cherished and nurtured by self-reliant, courageous men and women who were willing to give their genius, their energy, even their lives to preserve it for future generations.

All of these things we know, and so, if there is a purpose for our meeting here, it is to consider how our generation is fulfilling the obligations laid upon us by those who went before. Have we been true and loyal guardians of our heritage? Do our children understand the heavy obligations we will pass on to them? As a matter of fact, will our children inherit? Will there be anything left?

I hope it may be true that my anxiety for the future of our Nation causes me to exaggerate the perils of our situation, but nothing that I read, or hear, or witness gives me reason for either comfort or satisfaction.

The first danger, it seems to me, lies here at home where I think our people are losing the qualities of self-reliance and responsibility that are so vital a part of our heritage. Without them, all else is lost.

The second danger lies in our attitude toward the enemies of freedom in other lands, and here I fear I detect a lack of courage and a willingness to compromise that could lead swiftly to disaster.

In the inaugural address that won acclaim both here and abroad, President Kennedy spoke these words: "And so, my fellow Americans, ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country."

That sentence struck a spark in the hearts of those listening. Unfortunately, the spark ignited no flame.

It is as though, for one fleeting moment, the new American President made contact with the self-reliance of our pioneer heritage. The people responded with a feeling of pride and courage as they recognized, perhaps only subconsciously, a basic statement of American faith. And then all was quiet. There was nothing to show for it. The opportunity was lost. No effort was made to build upon the moment when the President and the people shared their pride in America's heritage.

Before the day was out, the trade associations, the labor unions, the professional educators, the chambers of commerce, the unemployed in depressed areas, and pressure groups everywhere were preparing their demands upon the new Congress and the new administration.

And since that day there has come from the White House to Capitol Hill a steady stream of special messages proposing that the Government finance public schools, subsidize new industry in certain cities and States, guarantee the income of farmers by controlling their production, provide homes for millions of Americans, subsidize the States in at least a dozen new or enlarged programs of Federal aid.

In short, we have witnessed a complete reversal of the slogan of 90 days ago. We have a Federal Government eager to do things for citizens, and we have all too many citizens begging to have things done for them.

The Catholic bishops of America, in a historic statement last fall, had this to say:

"Although personal responsibility and initiative have been our national characteristics, explaining in large measure our country's progress in human welfare, yet pressures are growing for a constantly greater reliance on the collectivity rather than on the individual. An inordinate demand for benefits, most easily secured by the pressures of organization, has led an evergrowing number of our people to relinquish their rights and to abdicate their responsibilities. This concession creates a widening spiral of increasing demands and pressures, with a further infringement on personal freedom and responsibility. Intensive socialization can achieve mass benefits, but man and morality can be seriously hurt in the process."

As a Presbyterian, I wish that all of the social action committees of the various Protestant denominations could see as clearly the need for a careful balance between freedom and security, and speak as clearly against the automation of human beings and the steady loss of freedom that has characterized our recent history.

Attempts to maintain free government have failed time and again throughout history because people get tired of governing themselves.

Free governments have been tried and failed in ancient Greece and Rome, in modern Germany, in many other times and places, because the people grew tired of responsibility. They turned to government to do things for them, without pausing to consider what government might do to them. They never learned the lesson—either you run the government or the government runs you. Unable or unwilling to rely upon themselves, they sold themselves and their children's liberty to government.

The question now before us—perhaps it has already been answered—is whether we are going to follow the historic failures of other free peoples. Are we still able to make a choice?

If there are indications that we are forgetting our heritage on the domestic scene, what can we say about our conduct of foreign relations?

The first and most important obligation of our Government is to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity. We can do this only if we have convictions about what is right, convictions about how we should deal with other nations, and follow these convictions regardless of whether we are admired, fawned upon, on despised by friend or foe.

I am deeply concerned by the extent to which our activities are governed by thoughts of how other nations may react.

The most crucial issue in this area today involves the People's Republic of China.

Shortly before his death, John Foster Dulles made a statement on China that reflected his firm conviction on this subject. He said:

"Internationally, the Chinese Communist regime does not conform to the practices of civilized nations; does not live up to its international obligations; has not been peaceful in the past, and gives no evidence of being peaceful in the future. Its foreign policies are hostile to us and to our Asian allies. Under these circumstances, it would be folly for us to establish relations with the Chinese Communists which would enhance their ability to hurt us and our friends."

These words are as true now as they were when Mr. Dulles spoke them.

Here is an issue on which America and Americans have been right.

We know that the Communist rulers of China are tyrants who imposed themselves on the people in bloody revolution. We know they are enemies of human dignity, human liberty. We know they are aggressors seeking to expand their dominion over other people who now are free. We know that they despise religion, and we know that it is right for us to oppose them.

In the past we have not wavered from this position; there has been no appeasement; and there has been no war.

But suddenly there are suggestions from our highest officials that our policy is unrealistic; that our allies think we should relax our opposition to Red China; that we should abandon our ally, the true Government of free China, and arrange a plebiscite on control of Formosa. We are told that recognition of Red China would increase trade, reduce world tension. We are told that admission of Red China to the United Nations is inevitable.

Are we to turn our backs on our friends, ignore right and justice, admit inevitability of something we have successfully opposed for many, many years? Is this the nature of our American heritage?

If you think about it, you know that confidence, like fear, is contagious. Our heritage teaches us courage and confidence, the courage of our convictions, confidence that others will recognize their correctness.

Our heritage does not permit wavering, appeasement, catering to foreign opinion.

Our heritage does not permit us to stand before the world as an image of dismayed indecision.

If it is true that we are losing our heritage, what must we do to regain it?

It seems to me that we should start where the Founding Fathers began.

They ascribed the origins of our Republic to divine providence.

They recognized that the inalienable right of each freeman is a gift from God, which the State can neither curtail nor destroy.

During the deliberations that produced the Declaration of Independence, Benjamin Franklin suggested that each daily session open with prayer, and this is what he said at that time:

"I have lived a long time and the longer I live, the more convincing proof I see that God governs in the affairs of men; and if a sparrow cannot fall without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid? Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain who build it. Without His concurring aid, we shall proceed no better than the builders of Babel."

That statement can serve as our guide. The psalm shows us the way to restore our heritage, our faith.

Let us go out and tell our fellow citizens and our youngsters, that it is not the Government in Washington that gives them liberty—it is the Government that threatens liberty. Freedom is not a gift of government. Freedom is their heritage as God's children. They can enjoy it only so long as they guard it zealously, walking in the paths of righteousness, proud of their individual responsibilities, eager to discharge the obligations laid upon them by the faith of our fathers.

Writing in his epistles to the Romans, Paul said to the believers: "You know what hour it is. The night is far gone. It is full time now for you to wake from sleep."

This is our message to all Americans today. Wake from sleep. It is time. Ignore the dangers longer, and all will be lost.

Jobs for the Handicapped—A Community Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS BASS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following essay "Jobs for the Handicapped—A Community Challenge," which was written by a young constituent of mine, Miss Nancy Dee Meeks, of Dickson, Tenn. Miss Meeks is a most outstanding young lady—in addition to being a writer of note, she is an accomplished musician; and, just last week, she won the poetry reading contest sponsored by the National Forensic League in Clarksville, Tenn.

The following essay has won for Miss Meeks the honor of representing Tennessee in the forthcoming national essay contest, and I, therefore, feel that her literary efforts are worthy of the attention of the entire membership of the House:

JOBS FOR THE HANDICAPPED—A COMMUNITY CHALLENGE

(By Nancy Dee Meeks, Dickson High School, Dickson, Tenn.)

Close your eyes. Yes, close your eyes for just a moment. What did you see? Nothing? Darkness? Darkness—the absence of light. For a few seconds your life was enveloped in utter obsecurity. What if that obscurity had not been altered? What if you were to spend the remainder of your life under the domination of this darkness?

Be very still for just a moment. What do you hear? A bird singing? People chattering to one another? A typewriter clicking? Perfectly common American sounds, all of these; but what if you were never to hear any of these sounds again?

Look at your legs, your arms, hands, fingers. Perfect to the tiniest detail because of God's endowment to you. Yes, of course, you are thankful. You realize what important additions these gifts are to your independence; but what if you were suddenly deprived of all or some of these vital body members or senses? What if the darkness brought about by these informities should abruptly surround your life?

"Oh, but that's impossible," you say.

If this is your attitude, will you permit your thoughts to accompany me on a short trip down the road toward light—the light of understanding one of America's weightiest problems—her handicapped populace and what can be done for them.

For the first few steps of our journey toward greater understanding, let us determine exactly what a handicapped person is. Generally, handicapped persons can be divided into four main classes—the blind, the deaf and deaf mute, the crippled, and the mentally retarded.

Until approximately three centuries ago, such people were usually doomed to lead helpless lives. Because they were unable to earn a living, they were compelled to rely on their families or friends for support and care.

Although modern scientists have discovered means of curing many of these unfortunate people, they have found ways to make them independent to a great extent. The blind are taught to read, to walk about by themselves, and to work in special fields. The deaf are taught to receive messages; deaf mutes are trained to talk. Men with missing arms and legs are given new ones and are taught to use them. The limbs of paralysis victims are restored to use. Children with subnormal intelligence are given education schooling and are trained to work and live happily with people of normal intelligence. Humanity in general benefits from talents and skills which otherwise would have been lost to the world.

You see, not everyone has been idle. These facts show that not everyone has been content to shake his head sadly and then turn away, forgetting. Not everyone has allowed himself to be convinced that this distressing situation could never occur in his own private little world.

These facts prove that someone has become aware, interested, concerned, absorbed. Someone has felt a compulsion to answer the pleading cry for help, for opportunity, for confidence. Someone has accepted the challenge, the invitation to serve.

Let us walk a little farther down this summoning road of service. How does all of this pertain to us? How are we to be the means by which handicapped persons can secure honorable and profitable occupations—positions where they can fulfill a determined responsibility to use the help of others to help themselves? How are we to be the light by which these people can again see happiness? Finally, how are we to abandon our seats in the audience and become a part of the production—the production of a solution to this perplexity?

First, we must become aware. We must grasp the enormity of the situation and realize that it can be thwarted only by organization and cooperation. As we learn more, our interest must be converted to concern to the extent that we become absorbed in a desire for service, knowing that this problem is our responsibility; the answer lies in our hands.

We, as normal individuals, can serve through industry from the largest factory under the direction of a well-organized labor union down to the smallest independent business firm. We can serve through our representation in Congress. We can serve through veterans' groups, science foundations, churches, and local community organizations. We can serve.

Our Government is responsible for much aid given the handicapped. Through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare we support the United States Employment Service and the American Printing

House for the Blind. Congress created Gallaudet College in Washington, D.C., the world's only college for the deaf. It passed the Vocational Rehabilitation Act which is carried out by various National, State, and local community committees. The Library of Congress has a special department of books for the blind, and we observe National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, October 5–11. The U.S. Army, Navy, and Veterans' Administration are active in rehabilitation efforts. The Bell Sound Laboratories have made numerous contributions through new inventions. In addition to many hospitals and sanitariums, some other helpful organizations are: The National Foundation, which raises funds for poliomyelitis, arthritis, and birth defects; The American Foundation for the Blind; and the Seeing Eye Foundation.

Our road of service isn't an easy journey, for we must lead those less fortunate than ourselves so they can avoid stumbling over the rocks along the pathway or being misled by the larger obstructions. We must work hand in hand with these national foundations and committees to apply their labor in our own communities. There are numerous tasks, common to every community in America, which could be filled so willingly and so capably by the rehabilitated and the handicapped—jobs in the field of handicraft such as ceramics, knitting, crocheting, and weaving. Blind persons with keen hearing senses are expert piano tuners. Deaf persons can work on factory assembly lines unhampered by noise. Persons with useless legs are taught skills such as watch-repairing, and victims without hands or arms can learn to paint with brushes held between their teeth or toes. Hobbies can be converted to incomes, to new ways of life, to happiness.

We must give these people the support of our thoughts and our action. They seek not pity, but understanding—not charity, but a change. They crave a chance to lead a comparatively normal life in the pleasant surroundings of people who understand and appreciate them. They deserve a chance to gain sufficient independence to become self-supporting.

We must help them achieve this notable goal. We must see that doors are opened to them—doors which will reveal to their lives the light necessary for survival. We must show them that society needs them, their special talents, and their acquired skills. We must give them jobs because of their abilities, not their disabilities.

May we have a successful journey down the road toward light. May we eagerly accept the challenge offered us. May we reach our ultimate goal of showing the world that these people are no longer handicapped, but handi-capable. They are capable of serving our communities if we will only lead the way.

Lake Geneva, Wis., Public Elementary School Board Opposed to Federal Aid to Any School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the House will soon consider the Federal-aid-to-education proposals, I would like to insert in the RECORD the text of a telegram received from the Lake Geneva, Wis., Public Elementary School Board.

LAKE GENEVA, WIS., *April 13, 1961.*

HON. HENRY SCHADEBERG,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

At a meeting of the Lake Geneva public elementary school board, held on Tuesday, April 11, 1961, a lengthy discussion was held in regard to the Federal-aid-to-education program presently before Congress.

It was decided that the school districts have the responsibility of providing educational programs. Therefore they should and are obligated to provide the necessary funds for their programs.

We feel that the Federal Government should not assume any responsibility in this field and we unanimously adopted a resolution to inform you of our decision and request that you vote against any bill that would grant Federal funds to any school, public, private, or parochial.

UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 1,
LAKE GENEVA PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL,
FULLER BOUTELLE,
President, Board of Education.
E. A. TRAVER, *Treasurer.*
FRANK BULLOCK, *Clerk.*
W. S. HAMMERSLEY, *Director.*
Mrs. CLIFFORD GERBER,
Director.

The majority of people in the First Congressional District of Wisconsin are opposed to Federal interference in local school affairs.

Our Immigration Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CHELF
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD the text of an address made by my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. WALTER, at the "Consultation on Immigration Policy," held at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D.C., on April 13, 1961. Mr. WALTER's address is as follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, in looking at this fine and impressive gathering, I realize, of course, that you, ladies and gentlemen, are primarily interested in the humanitarian aspects of immigration.

I believe it to be my task, however, to propound to you a few thoughts and observations in behalf of those who, in assuming their seats in the Congress, have undertaken obligations and responsibilities toward the American Nation as a whole rather than toward specific groupings, or shadings of public opinion, as much as those segments of our citizenry may be deserving of respect for their motivations and activities.

Historically, migratory movements were prompted by the desire to find better living conditions, a desire ever present in the mind of every human being and, indeed, in the instinct of every living creature.

Migration—basically—was the search for a more suitable climate, or for more abundant food, or for a drier place upon which to erect a dwelling. Migration still is the same, allowing, of course, for some other desires generated by modern progress.

The free and unfettered stream of immigrants who founded a new nation on these shores had all of these, and one more desire—the search for freedom.

Thus, implicitly, the phenomenon of migration is a composite of economic, social, and political elements. It is the presence of these three elements in the problem of immigration that prompts sovereign nations to establish laws, rules and regulations determining the size of the foreign influx and discerning the quality of the migrant. It is the "how many" and "who" is coming that the law is concerned with. These two fundamental criteria rest at the base of immigration policies and laws of every country of the world, just as much as they constitute the two cornerstones of our laws.

It is not necessary, of course, to stress before this enlightened gathering that the economic, social and political conditions of the world are not static. They change and therefore immigration laws and policies governing the admission of immigrants must change.

If they were to remain frozen, no country would be equipped to cope with the changing aspects of the problem, the vital importance of which could probably be best illustrated by comparing it with the injection or infusion of foreign blood into the veins of a living creature.

What are the changes in the world's conditions that must fashion our judgment at this time?

It becomes gradually evident that in the second half of the 20th century immigration is no more a practical remedy for overpopulation of one country or another. Industrialization, technological progress and economic growth have made appraisals of economic conditions based on density of population completely inaccurate and as obsolete as a horse and buggy in jet age.

This conclusion is sustained by but one glance at what is occurring in the highly industrialized countries of Europe. Germany, overpopulated to a degree of actual crowding, imports hundreds of thousands of workers from Italy and Greece, in addition to providing employment to the refugees from the East, streaming in at the rate of approximately 1,000 per week.

The density of population of industrialized Belgium is the highest in the entire world but Belgium, similarly, imports additional workers. Demands for resettlement opportunities overseas, very vociferous in Holland up to about 2 years ago, have all but disappeared in that overpopulated country due to the exceedingly fast pace of its industrial development.

On the other side of the ledger, Spain could be called an almost empty country, but it strives to send great numbers of its citizens abroad due to lack of industrial progress. The differences between the economic structure of northern and southern Italy, with industries thriving in the north and modern economic development neglected in the south, further serve as a convincing illustration of the diminishing relationship between density of population and economic conditions.

Taking due notice of this development, the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration strives now to supply skilled or semiskilled manpower to the underdeveloped countries where such manpower is needed, rather than to continue the indiscriminate siphoning off of people from countries not so long ago described by the now obsolete, totally fallacious notion as overpopulated.

Another factor, a most important one, has recently entered into considerations of immigration policy: the universally growing birth rate.

Where do we, the United States, stand in this regard: Recently a Washington newspaper—not particularly friendly to me and my way of thinking—had this to say:

"If the population of the United States continues to grow at its present rate, the census takers in 2000 will count twice as many Americans as in 1960.

"In recent years we have been growing at an annual rate of 1.7 percent, faster than any industrialized country in Europe and faster than some underdeveloped nations such as India and Korea. Our rate of growth is now about the same as that of the 'exploding' world population."

It is by now agreed by everyone that the rate of our economic growth lags badly behind the rate of growth of our population. The number of unemployed attests to that, but what is more disturbing than unemployment created by temporary recessions or seasonal layoffs, is the occurrence which the economists call chronic unemployment.

Chronic unemployment stays with us even in periods of high productivity. It accompanies the population increase and it is attributed to deep-seated causes resulting from technological developments like automation, inadequate business growth rates, changes in international economic structure, and shifts in business location.

Remedies to this dangerous economic disease have been proposed, but it will take a long time before their effects become visible.

These considerations should not, I believe, serve to promote changes in the law designed to lock tight the doors to the United States. They must, however, prompt every responsible American to look at immigration problems with more caution and discernation than it was necessary some three of four decades ago. It should be obvious to anyone concerned with the national interest that our immigration policy must at this particular time be adjusted to our domestic, economic, and social problems with a considerably greater degree of precision than at any other time.

Certainly, the United States must remain a haven for the oppressed and persecuted. Certainly, the United States cannot deny its citizens and residents the right to be united with their families. Certainly, however, the United States cannot for political reasons—domestic or external—attempt to absorb into its bloodstream unmanageable and unassimilable quantities and qualities of immigrants. Nothing strikes me as more preposterous, than the proposals to increase our immigration quotas in proportion to the increase of our own population as shown by the decennial censuses.

It is my firm belief that using the existing law together with timely adjustments which, from time to time, are being incorporated into the basic statute, the United States is quite satisfactorily equipped to protect itself, and at the same time implement its responsibilities to the community of freemen.

Since the end of World War II and up to the present time, this country had continuously possessed in its hands legal instrumentality permitting the admission of a most generous fair share of refugees. Too many people overlook that fact.

Similarly, after removal by the present law of racial bars to immigration and naturalization and after the establishment of equitably determined nonquota categories of immigrants, our statutes compare most favorably with the laws of other countries; another often overlooked fact.

In further implementation of policies, which I attempted to outline to you, I introduced today in the House of Representatives a bill containing the following basic features:

1. In order to expedite and facilitate the reuniting of families, my bill establishes a "quota reserve" consisting of the annually unused quota numbers which will be allocated for the use of relatives of U.S. citizens and lawfully resident aliens. Every country of the world will have access to the quota reserve proportionate to the respective country's participation in the sum total of all annual quotas under 7,000.

2. Temporary laws providing for the entry of adopted children are proposed to be incorporated into the permanent code.

3. Waivers of inadmissibility, including inadmissibility due to affliction with tuberculosis, are to be made part of our permanent law and will be available to relatives of U.S. citizens and permanent residents of this country.

4. Veterans of the Korean hostilities will, under the bill, be accorded the same naturalization privileges as those enjoyed by naturalized veterans of World War I and World War II.

5. An improved procedure governing the admission of highly skilled immigrants will give the Secretaries of Defense; Agriculture; Commerce; and Health, Education, and Welfare, together with the Attorney General, the possibility to provide for the selection of the most desirable immigrants with a view toward serving the national interests in the field of defense, science, technology, public health, and cultural progress.

6. The increasing instances of abuse of our immigration laws have prompted me to propose to the Congress, in the same bill, several provisions designed to facilitate the expulsion of the racketeering elements, subversives and aliens who resort to fraud in obtaining entry and permanent residence in this country. Improved procedures and precise rules of evidence in judicial action bearing on immigration, deportation and naturalization are proposed in my bill to serve to correct laxities harmful to the national interest.

I am convinced that the country needs this legislation and I shall spare no effort to obtain its prompt enactment.

Pharmacist Writes From the Good Ship "Hope"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, of all our efforts to aid those who are less fortunate than ourselves, none has had so much success as Project Hope, a floating hospital and medical center which is truly performing medical miracles in the Far East.

The Virginia Pharmacist recently published an article about one of the men who is playing an active part in making Project Hope a success, which appears as follows:

PHARMACIST WRITES FROM THE GOOD SHIP "HOPE"

A young pharmacist has traveled halfway around the world to find the more he knows of the earth, the prouder he is to be an American.

"I have never had the values of my American heritage made so clear to me as out here working with Indonesian medical problems," says Charles Dickerson of Pontiac, Mich., one of the two pharmacists presently aboard the floating medical center SS *Hope*, currently waging the peace in the troubled waters off southeast Asia.

The *Hope*, whose initials stand for health opportunity for people everywhere, is supported by Americans in all walks of life. Members of the American Pharmaceutical Association have contributed over $7,000 in cash, reports Thomas A. Foster, chairman of the Project Hope Committee of the American Pharmaceutical Association.

Dickerson, who has been with the *Hope* since its arrival in Indonesia in October, has been responsible for the cataloging and stocking of the thousands of drug items carried aboard the vessel, in addition to his regular pharmaceutical duties.

The ship's primary mission is to teach Indonesian medical personnel to be better able to handle their own medical problems. Project Hope is not a giveaway program. It is an attempt to help the newly developing nations help themselves.

"It's been a long haul," Dickerson reported from Sumbawa, Indonesia, to Dr. William B. Walsh at Project Hope headquarters in Washington, D.C. "We're in pretty good shape now and I think we're going to lick our resupply problems."

The resupply problem of which Dickerson speaks is the staggering 8,000-mile supply line between the United States and the SS *Hope* over which pharmaceuticals and other medical supplies must travel.

A resupply system, Dickerson reports, has been set up by air between the United States and Indonesia, the first shipment by this method, a cargo of smallpox vaccine, arriving from Seattle, Wash., shortly after the *Hope* arrived in Djarkarta.

On the 15th of December the *Hope* received its next consignment of medical supplies, from the *President Taft* which left the items in Djarkarta to be transshipped to the *Hope* in eastern Indonesia.

"The next major resupply point," Dickerson added, "was Makassar in the Celebes in mid-January. Right now we're in the midst of an inventory of 2,000 expendable items—drugs, bandages, and so forth. When we finish with this we'll know exactly where we stand and can reorder stocks that are low.

"Our job in the *Hope's* pharmacy is to fill prescriptions from the doctors here for their patients on the ship," Dickerson stated. The two pharmacists are busiest at the end of each stay in a port when the *Hope* puts off sufficient drugs to insure continued treatment of the discharged patients.

American pharmaceutical companies have been generous with their donations to the hospital ship, which is supported by public contributions.

Off hours on the *Hope* have been few and far between for Dickerson, whose job keeps him on call every second night and whose working hours have probably totaled more than anyone on the ship except the captain. Nevertheless, he has been able to attend the receptions given the ship's staff by local medical authorities and take part in the tours to nearby points of interest sponsored by Indonesian civic groups.

What does he think of his work on the *Hope*? "It's terrific experience and something I wouldn't miss."

Federal Aid Fallacies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call the attention of my col-

leagues in the Congress to an excellent editorial appearing in the Salinas (Calif.) Californian of April 4, 1961, entitled "Federal Aid Fallacies":

[From the Salinas Californian, April 4, 1961]

EDITORIALS AND OPINIONS—FEDERAL AID FALLACIES

It shouldn't be necessary to restate and restate the many fallacies inherent in Federal aid to education, but since it obviously and urgently is necessary, we can think of no more succinct way of restating them than by quoting a San Francisco Chamber of Commerce resolution. The chamber's directors outlined their opposition to such aid as follows:

"States and localities are in the best position to determine and meet their responsibilities for public education.

"Federal aid to education is inevitably accompanied by undesirable Federal controls.

"Federal tax revenue allocated under such a program would not be 'free' money but would consist of funds taken out of the pockets of local taxpayers and reduced in effective amount by Government bureaucracy costs.

"States which have maintained a high tax rate in support of good school programs would be penalized in favor of States which have failed to do so."

To which all we need add is "Amen" and "CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, please copy."

House Resolution 211, Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286 to 3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I request that the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 be printed in the Appendix of today's RECORD:

CONNECTICUT COMMITTEE FOR FREEDOM OF CAPTIVE NATIONS,
Hartford, Conn., March 27, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD
U.S. Congress, House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We are very pleased to hear that you are pressing legislation to set up a special committee to deal with the problem of the captive nations. We urge you to continue your efforts until such a committee becomes a reality.

Our organization represents local branches of the Ukrainian Congress Committee, the Latvian Association of America, the Lithuanian American Council, the Estonian Society of America, and the Byelorussian American Association. The Hartford Hungarian Club is also affiliated with us as are various Polish, Armenian, and Georgian individuals. All of us support your bill.

We shall do everything to encourage local interest in your activities. Thank you for your efforts.

Cordially,
STEVE BOYCHUK, *Chairman.*

HEADQUARTERS,
NAVAL AIR TRAINING COMMAND,
U.S. NAVAL AIR STATION,
Pensacola, Fla., March 31, 1961.

MY DEAR MR. FLOOD: While reviewing the proceedings and debates which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 8, 1961, I read with considerable interest your very enlightening and informative remarks on the necessity of a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations.

As you mentioned, from the viewpoint of our own national security and on the question of war or peace, the vital importance of all the captive nations should be self-evident. I wholeheartedly support your resolution and feel sure that the challenge of your remarks will bring to our citizens the realization that here we have an excellent opportunity to move from the defensive to a strong offensive against the Communist conspiracy.

I was very much aware of the enthusiasm and success with which Captive Nations Week was conducted last year. I would like to know if it will be conducted again this year and if the new administration will endorse a strong policy in favor of this urgent and significant cause of freedom.

These matters are of considerable interest to me and to many of my friends. If reprints are available, I would appreciate it very much if you would send me three or four copies of your inspiring presentation.

Sincerely,
WILLIAM E. FLY,
Captain, U.S. Navy.

SCARSDALE, N.Y., *April 4, 1961.*

DEAR MR. FLOOD: It was recently brought to my attention that your recent proposal, House Resolution 211, concerns the establishment of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. In realizing the vital importance and necessity of such a committee as a valid instrument for letting the free world truly know the deceit and perfidy of Russia, I heartily endorse this resolution.

It is gratifying to know that the Senators from New York, and my Congressman, EDWIN B. DOOLEY, are supporting you in this worthwhile endeavor. Wishing you the successful passage of House Resolution 211, I remain,

Sincerely yours,
BRIAN M. DWYER.

DENVER, COLO., *March 28, 1961.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: All of our members would like to congratulate you on your introduction of the resolution calling for the establishment of a special permanent Committee on Captive Nations in Congress.

We believe that such a committee will be of great help in our Nation's policy against the Soviet Union. It will serve as a source of valuable information about many nations enslaved by Soviet Russia. We believe that those enslaved nations contain a destructive power which, in many aspects, is more dangerous to the Russian empire than atomic bombs.

Proper support of those enslaved nations, which constitute a majority of the Soviet Union's population, means a win in any kind of war with Soviet Russia.

We are writing to all of the Congressmen of our State asking them to support your resolution.

Respectfully yours,
KORNEL KRUPSKY,
President, Denver, Colo., Branch, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc.

AMERICAN COMMITTEE FOR THE INDEPENDENCE OF ARMENIA,
Boston, Mass., April 1, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Congressman from Pennsylvania,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Recently you took the occasion before the House to offer a resolution proposing formation of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations.

In our most recent session, this committee, representing more than 300,000 patriotic Armenian Americans, resolved that this letter be sent to you commending you for the important step you have taken, and assuring you of the wholehearted support of our organization in your vitally important work on behalf of the captive nations of the U.S.S.R. whose cause has been too significantly and too long neglected.

If there is anything at all that we may do to signify our full acceptance of the establishment of such a committee, please let us know.

Sincerely,
DR. JAMES H. TASHJIAN,
Executive Secretary.

WORCESTER, MASS., *April 6, 1961.*

CONGRESSMAN DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I support your action on House Resolution 211, and commend you for it.

Very truly yours,
DAVID G. SCANNELL.

A Tribute to the X–15

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. CORMAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, late last month, the Nation was given the news that the X–15 rocket-powered airplane had achieved a new altitude record of 32.12 miles over the desert of southern California. The news was exciting and

inspiring to all Americans who are concerned with our position in the space race with Russia. I would like to pay tribute here to the man who piloted the X–15 on this historymaking flight, Test Pilot Joe Walker, and to the scores of men who contributed to the construction, maintenance, and preparation of the X–15.

I would also like to call the attention of this House to a forthcoming project in the motion picture industry which will graphically demonstrate the immense labor that has gone into the X–15. On April 17, Essex Productions, headed by Mr. Frank Sinatra, will begin filming at Edwards Air Force Base in California a motion picture titled "X–15." It will, I believe, show the advances made by manned-rocket aircraft in the last 15 years.

The producers of this picture have worked with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Department of Defense, the Air Force, and North American Aviation, Inc., to assure that this picture will be accurate and will put this entire area of our defense into its proper perspective.

I hope my colleagues will join with me in wishing the men and women who will make this motion picture all the wisdom and inspiration that its subject deserves.

Salute To Maj. Gen. T. W. Parker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, as is stated in the editorial which follows, Maj. Gen. T. W. Parker, U.S. Army, is leaving his present assignment as commanding general, Fort Riley, in the 1st Infantry Division to join the Office of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

In my opinion, the editorial written by Mr. W. A. Colvin, editor of the Manhattan, Kans., Mercury, newspaper, very accurately describes the opinion of Kansans regarding the outstanding job done by Major General Parker.

I am happy to bring this editorial to the attention of my colleagues. I wholeheartedly endorse Mr. Colvin's comments.

SALUTE TO A GENERAL

Once again Fort Riley is sending a commanding general into new and higher positions of Army responsibility thus emphasizing the privilege and pleasure it is to have men of such capability in our community life.

The latest of the commanding generals to be rewarded for his years of exemplary service is Maj. Gen. T. W. Parker who has been commanding general of Fort Riley and the 1st Infantry Division for more than 2 years.

General Parker's new position which he will take in late June is one that is testimony to his outstanding ability as a general of the U.S. Army. When he leaves his command here he will join the Office of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in Washington in which capacity he will serve as special assistant to Gen. Lyman Lemnitzer, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It is one of the most responsible positions in the entire Army organization and in it General Parker will be assisting in many of the major—and perhaps fateful—decisions of our Nation's defense mechanisms.

In the tenure at Fort Riley, General Parker has won a host of new friends in the surrounding communities. We say new friends because General Parker was not a stranger to this area when he took over command in February 1959. He has previously served here as chief of staff to the 10th Infantry Division, returning as commanding general after service in Europe.

He and his gracious and lovely wife will be sorely missed when the time comes for their departure. But as in all such cases when a deserving man wins promotion to new responsibility there are always mixed emotions. A community to which they have endeared themselves and with which they have worked so cooperatively is always reluctant to give them up. There is always the joy, however, of seeing high-type individuals go on to new and bigger things, and we are delighted for General Parker that he is being accorded this recognition.

It is remarkable to think about how many former commanding generals of Fort Riley have gone from here to the top levels of Army administration and we congratulate General Parker for also having attained this deserved promotion.

The Army has picked exceedingly well and in the ensuing weeks before leaving Fort Riley, General Parker will find he has a host of sincere wellwishers who have no doubt of the great contributions he will make in his new assignment.

Lawrence and the Old Trails

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, April 10, a historical marker, entitled "Lawrence and the Old Trails," was dedicated at the Kansas Turnpike service area just 5 miles east of my hometown, Lawrence, Kans. Mr. F. W. Brinkerhoff, editor-publisher of the Pittsburgh (Kans.) Headlight-Sun, delivered the dedicatory speech. He stressed the key role played by the Lawrence area and the Kaw Valley in the development of Kansas and pointed out that right now—today—the multiple advantages of adequate water supply, labor of high character and intelligence, good social and living conditions, and school facilities combine to make a powerful appeal for industrial growth in the Kaw Valley. Under unanimous consent, I include here for the benefit of my colleagues in Congress the full text of Fred Brinkerhoff's speech dedicating the "Lawrence and Old Trails" historical marker, as reported in the Lawrence Daily Journal-World of April 10, 1961:

TEXT OF BRINKERHOFF SPEECH AT TURNPIKE MARKER EVENT

Lawrence needs no marker in history. Its place there has been conspicuous and secure for a century. In Kansas the marker can serve only as a reminder. In every community of the State, men and women have carried through their lives a deep affection for the old town where they spent galmorous years as they ascended and descended Mount Oread. The magnificant campus was scarcely more impressive than the stately old homes, the great trees, the landmarks that survived war and fire. Nor was the imprint deeper than the merger of culture and courage and substance that characterized the men and the women who founded Lawrence on a frontier as a citadel of the cause of human freedom, and who erected on such foundation a city that has faithfully marched forward with the times. Over there it stands with endless pride in its past and boundless faith in its future. That strangers who pass this way may know they are in the Kansas vicinity richest in history and near the city the centennial of which has a seniority of 7 years over the centennial of our statehood which we observe this year, this marker has been erected. In forceful simplicity and eloquent brevity the gorgeous story of Lawrence is here engraved.

There is greater need for the phrases honoring the old trails. Only the ancient records and maps and a few wagon tracks here and there that have not been eradicated by man and time and markers and monuments placed along the routes by patriotic groups and an occasional landmark alongside preserve for history the paths over which pioneers passed on their way to the Pacific Northwest and to the Southwest. After a start together they separated by necessity. The Oregon trail penetrated this vicinity and for 20 miles or so westward and a route near that utilized a century later by the turnpike engineers. The shorter but more famous Santa Fe trail headed more directly toward its destination and was 15 miles south of the Kansas River at this point. But both are honored by this marker.

This marker is more than a marker honoring Lawrence and the old trails. It memorializes the Kansas River and its valley. Before there was a Kansas Territory there was a Kansas River. From it that territory took its name which, of course, remained with statehood.

Here in the Kaw Valley a vast amount of the history of Kansas has been made—territory and State. Here major projects for the settlement of Kansas were started and carried on. Here raged the main struggle for control of the territory. Here were the homes of free State men. Here was Lawrence, the inevitable headquarters of the free State cause, and equally inevitable, the objective of raiding ruffians from Missouri. From the day of its start in 1854 to the August day 9 years later when Quantrill and his bushwhackers killed nearly 150 men there, Lawrence was the object of the concentrated hatred of the Missouri slave cause leaders and the ruffian forces they did not control and did not want to control. Here in the Kaw Valley the fraudulent elections were held. Here the tide turned finally and the free State cause was triumphant.

Up the valley a few miles Lecompton, also on the bank of the river, became the territorial capital and the headquarters of the proslavery forces. There the proslavery legislators, backed by the Federal Government with troops and judges and courts, worked in vain to bring in Kansas as a slave State.

Farther up the river was Topeka where the free State cause was strong and where the Topeka movement was based—the futile effort to take over the government of the territory and have Kansas admitted as a free State.

When Andrew H. Reeder, the first territorial Governor, arrived in Kansas, his office was set up in the fort at Leavenworth. But in a few weeks he moved over to the Kaw Valley—to Shawnee Mission by orders from Washington. Shortly afterward he ordered

the legislature to convene at Pawnee. Where was Pawnee? At the other end of the Kaw Valley—near Fort Riley, one of the three principal Kansas Army posts, or forts of the day—a mile or two from the river junction which creates the Kansas River and starts the valley. A stone building had been erected as a capital. The proslave, ruffian-elected legislature did not stay in Pawnee. But it adjourned to Shawnee Mission and stayed in the valley. The Pawnee building remains today, a priceless Kansas relic—the first capital of Kansas.

Four years later, to the month, the Wyandotte Convention, meeting in the Kaw Valley, with the river flowing nearby, wrote the constitution for the free State of Kansas.

Not all the early history of Kansas was made in the Kaw Valley. Osawatomie and John Brown wrote a tolerably interesting chapter or two. Linn County's contribution certainly was lurid enough to keep historians busy half a century. Fort Scott furnished a fair share. Atchison and Leavenworth were entitled to many pages. Other scattered sections and counties demonstrated activity. But the valley dominated the territory, a habit that was continued into statehood.

An inventory of the things the Kaw Valley acquired or achieved as statehood took effect reveals the enterprise, the ingenuity, the power or the luck of the valley.

Topeka was made the State capital.

The University of Kansas was established at Lawrence.

The agricultural college was set up at Manhattan.

Haskell Institute was located at Lawrence.

The State's hospital for the insane was built at Topeka.

Wyandotte became Kansas City, Kans., and the largest city of Kansas for 75 years.

It was not by accident that the Kaw Valley was the scene of such important territorial settlement. What happened was as natural as sunshine. The newcomers looked for water. The Kansas River had the water in plentiful supply. The New Englanders chose an open space on the high bank, with a nearby hill standing like a sentinel, as the spot for their town and Lawrence entered history. The Army authorities with marvelous foresight in regard to the distant future, set up Fort Riley as far West as they could go and be assured of water—there where two rivers which gathered their contents from vast prairie areas came together and surrendered their identities to make the Kaw. To the East 130 miles, the Kaw itself gave up its own identity as it delivered its burden into the Missouri. On its whole length the Kaw enticed town founders as its valley with its rich soil beckoned to farmers. And so the Kaw Valley moved early to take its place on the Kansas scene—in all phases of life—in public affairs, or politics, in the economy, in culture, in education, and in religion.

Today, a hundred years after the Kansas star was added to the flag, Kansans are still coming to the Kaw Valley for their laws, final decisions in their lawsuits, appointments to office and for political leadership. They are coming in large numbers to the valley for higher and professional education. But they have noted a change in the valley's appearance. They are finding great industrial plants where large groups of Kansans are employed. They note the expanded and expanding borders of the cities. The returns from the 1960 Federal census disclose that more than a fourth of the population of Kansas is supplied by the Kaw Valley. Two of the three so-called big cities of Kansas are in the valley. Their borders spread across the river. Three other valley cities—Lawrence, Manhattan, and Junction City—join with Kansas City and Topeka in accounting for more than 315,000 of the State's 2,178,000 population.

From the industrial plants of the Kaw Valley come products ranging from assembled motor cars to industrial chemical items, from processed meat to greeting cards and heavy tires and dozens of other items of commerce. Along the river are great powerplants supplying public, domestic and industrial needs. Lawrence, where major attention long was devoted to the University of Kansas, with more than minor attention given to a few industrial plants, has seen its population go from a place in the teen thousands to more than 32,000 as industrialists picked sites and erected manufacturing plants. Topeka which not very many years ago was aptly described as an overgrown county seat town with a population under 60,000 now has double 60,000 on its rolls. The other cities in lesser volume have shown the same inclination to grow.

Once again water has "sold" the Kaw Valley. Industries require a water supply. This added to other advantages for which there is no substitute—labor of high character and intelligence, good social and living conditions and school facilities—makes a powerful appeal for industrial growth. The valley cities are growing. Topeka amazes the most optimistic observers and makes enthusiasts of sturdy conservatives. Lawrence is pushing its borders so far beyond the original townsite that the most progressive citizens can scarcely keep up with the expansion. Persons here today who are by no means young may well expect to see an unbroken line of industrial plants along this river for long years noted chiefly for its floods and its contribution of Kaw River sand for constructive use.

It has happened in other river valleys. It not only can happen here but it is happening.

For a long time the small by comparison industries at points along the Kaw furnished products which had a market in Kansas and nearby. But today the things that flow from the Kaw Valley factories go far from Kansas. The world is a market for the factories of the Kaw Valley. It does not require the services of a skilled economist to disclose the advantages of this situation.

This great roadway uses the valley half the length of the valley. It streaks along the Kaw on one side most of the way and then crosses to try the other side but never more than a mile or two distant until finally it curves off to the southwest. Then it rushes to another beautiful and picturesque and romantic part fo Kansas, the Flint Hills region. Finally, as it prepares to finish its course, it enters another valley of Kansas, the valley of the Arkansas, and then quits as it started, in a valley. Strangers in Kansas thus are given in a few hours a panoramic view of Kansas today—cities and factories and pastures and ranches and fields and farms. And here at this spot they may read a vital bit of Kansas history.

Wheaties Next?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune April 16, stresses the fact that the President of the United States should have only one sponsor—the citizens of the United States.

THE PRESIDENT LET HIS SPONSORS DOWN

Mr. Kennedy may have performed a valuable service for the sponsors of last Tuesday night's television show, "J.F.K. No. 2." But the President of the United States let his sponsors—the American people—down.

The President justified his appearance under the aegis of a toothpaste company on the ground of the need for more communication "beyond the White House." No one disputes that need. But there are many, many methods of communication open to the President that are not flavored with toothpaste. After all, Mr. Kennedy does not have to imitate Abraham Lincoln, who opened the White House doors to almost anyone wishing to speak to him. He has access to the people through time on TV and radio, through space in the press, without making any concessions to commercialism and without holding open house.

The American President does not have the outward trappings of uniform and ceremonial that were once associated with high executive position. He does not need them. But there is a dignity of conduct that should—and almost always does—distinguish the men whom the American people have chosen as their constitutional leaders.

To maintain that dignity does not require stuffiness or any fake aura. But it does demand that the President abstain from actions whose propriety can be questioned by even friendly Senators of his own party—as Senator JACKSON questioned the propriety of Mr. Kennedy's broadcast; it does demand that he refrain from doing things that bring accusations of bad taste, of cheapening his office, of setting bad precedents, all of which sprang up in the wake of that performance.

Mr. Kennedy is new to the Presidency. In his immensely difficult task, with issues that are essentially and genuinely controversial confronting him at every hand, it is vitally important that he avoid unnecessary and gratuitous squabbles. One way would be to confine the sponsorship of his public utterances to those who have a first and overriding claim on his services: The citizens of the United States.

Foreign Buying of U.S. Scrap Blamed for Rising Scrap Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Keystone Employees' News:

FOREIGN BUYING OF U.S. SCRAP BLAMED FOR RISING SCRAP PRICES

Rapidly increasing scrap prices are cutting deeply into company profits, reports R. E. Sommer, president and general manager.

Iron Age magazine, a leading trade journal, last month reported scrap prices of $44 per ton compared with $35 to $37 per ton in mid-February.

"Scrap is our second-largest manufacturing cost, and sharp increases like these in scrap prices are sure to have an impact on our already thin profit margin," the president said. He called on all employees to help reduce waste and improve production in an attempt to offset this serious increase in material costs.

A major factor causing scrap prices to advance, according to Frank Little, director of purchases, is heavy buying by foreign steel

companies. The Japanese have contracted for 103 cargoes (shiploads) of scrap since January. These shipments total more than 1 million net tons. Germany, Belgium, and Italy are also big buyers of American scrap.

"The foreign buyers of U.S. scrap not only buy huge tonnages," Mr. Little commented, "but they also skim off the top grades of scrap available."

Mr. Little also pointed out that the impact of higher scrap prices is greater on semi-integrated steel companies like Keystone because they do not have blast furnaces with which to provide a lower cost "hot metal charge." Keystone is thus forced to buy the higher priced scrap.

Feasibility of Nuclear-Powered Flight Has Been Proven

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, contrary to the gloomy and pessimistic picture painted by some scientists not directly connected with the project, the future of nuclear-powered flight was bright before the recent cancellation of the aircraft nuclear-propulsion program. So much so, it is difficult to understand how the Pentagon chiefs could have made the decision to make a complete break with the program.

A few days before the fateful decision to cancel the aircraft project one of the contractors engaged in the nuclear propulsion program issued an interesting news release relating to progress made in research and development work.

The press release issued Wednesday, March 29, by the News Bureau, General Electric, Schenectady, N.Y., follows:

DALLAS, March 29.—Operation of the heat transfer reactor experiment No. 3 (HTRE 3), in which two turbojet engines were powered by a single nuclear reactor, has proved the feasibility of nuclear powered flight, a General Electric nuclear flight reactor expert said today.

Ben Blumberg, Jr., of the General Electric Aircraft Nuclear Propulsion Department (ANPD), Cincinnati, Ohio, told the American Nuclear Society that the HTRE 3, which operated for some 150 hours on the ground, is the "most sophisticated gas-cooled reactor design that has operated to date."

He said that a test program completed this year, "has proved that the system operated essentially as predicted. With the application of this experience, a much greater degree of confidence and objectivity will characterize future designs."

ANPD is developing a direct-air-cycle nuclear propulsion system for aircraft under contract with the U.S. Air Force and Atomic Energy Commission. Aircraft powered by nuclear propulsion systems will have almost unlimited range, thus making them ideal craft for patrol, reconnaissance, early missile warning, and attack. Because of their nuclear power system they will be able to fly at extremely low levels over long distances and thus avoid altitudes where modern defense systems are most effective.

Chemical powered planes must fly at high altitudes to operate efficiently.

Blumberg said that ANPD now is designing an advanced flight system which will be adaptable for flight propulsion, incorporating lessons learned from HTRE 3.

He explained that "it is generally thought that the power a reactor is capable of producing is limited by the permissible operating temperature of its components, but this is not necessarily true. The power capability varies almost directly with the quantity of working fluid used and in addition can vary a large amount with the design of the various components of the reactor. One of the most important components is made up of the fuel elements. In the design of the fuel elements, if the average power of each cartridge is made identical, the longitudinal power is adjusted to produce a near isothermal temperature and the heat flux from each ring at each longitudinal location is made equal, then the power capability of the fuel elements approaches a maximum."

In the HTRE 3, the fuel elements, made up of concentric metal rings with uranium fuel enclosed in the metal, "have operated satisfactorily at temperatures up to 1,900° F. for periods in excess of 100 hours and at temperatures up to 2,050° F. for periods in excess of 25 hours," Blumberg said.

He pointed out that the average power in each fuel cartridge was controlled to ±10% by varying the hydrogen content of the moderator and this system has indicated what is practical to expect in future reactor designs.

Studies for advanced systems indicated that with materials used in HTRE 3, "exit air temperatures of 1,500° to 1,650° F. are possible," Blumberg reported. "The exact air temperature would depend on the operating time desired, but for this range of temperature it is expected that the operating time would vary from 1,000 hours to 25 hours, respectively."

"In summary," he said, "the performance of HTRE 3 has demonstrated that a system using the same materials can be designed which would power a modern gas turbine powerplant. The reactor would have a size, pressure drop, and power capability compatible with flight requirements. We are now applying this experience to systems using advance materials that will give us even higher levels of performance. It is a generally accepted fact that with the technology now in hand, flight with nuclear power is possible and practicable."

Dangers of Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 17, 1961

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following letter, written to the New York Herald Tribune, by a former very distinguished Member of this House, the Honorable Hamilton Fish, is of considerable interest.

There are many of our people who have grave misgivings about this enterprise, known as the Peace Corps. After reading this letter one cannot help but feel that this scheme may turn out to be a Pandora's box and will once again prove the truth of the old saw: "That fools rush in, where angels fear to tread."

DANGERS OF PEACE CORPS

To the NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE:

The proposal of President Kennedy to establish by executive order a Peace Corps composed of young college trained volunteers to work in the undeveloped countries, instead of serving in our Armed Forces, has a humane and humanitarian appeal to the American people at first glance. It is, however, the essence of "do-goodism" or internationalism gone stark raving mad.

President Kennedy's motives, I am sure, are unselfish, idealistic and sincere and backed by the best intentions. But unfortunately he does not think the problem through or anticipate its disastrous reactions. The so-called Peace Corps has nothing to do with peace except for its camouflage name. It is an extremely dangerous project emanating from the minds of one-worlders who have completely failed to foresee its dire consequences.

The advent of young Americans into Africa or Latin America would automatically open the gates of darkest Africa and other undeveloped nations to highly trained and dedicated Communist agents. It would be playing directly into the hands of Moscow. This is what Soviet Russia has been preparing for during the past 15 years at its big propaganda universities, teaching Arabic, African dialects, Spanish, and Portuguese.

Instead of young college graduates Moscow would send skilled technicians who know the language and who would build roads, bridges, hospitals, schools and develop the natural resources and mines of the country.

The Peace Corps is part and parcel of the legacy left by Franklin Roosevelt. This interventionism has turned out to be a Frankenstein that has devoured our resources, wealth and consumed our taxes. In the beginning our financial help was necessary to contain communism in France, Germany, Italy, Japan, and England. Today these nations are prosperous and have little unemployment.

Every government in the world today is nationalistic except our own, which is internationalistic and continues to meddle and interfere in the internal affairs of sovereign nations and to hand out billions of dollars long after the emergency has passed. I am positive that if the American people, knowing the prodigious waste and misuse of these funds, could vote in a referendum the appropriations for foreign handouts would be reduced by one-half.

HAMILTON FISH.

NEW YORK.

What Really Happened?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the April 15 issue of the New York Herald Tribune indicates that the space flight of Major Gagarin could well have been fictional.

The article follows:

SPACE PUZZLES

How did Cosmonaut Yuri Gagarin come down to earth? How did he see earth during his flight? These questions have not been clarified, and reports from Soviet sources yesterday confused these points further.

RETURN TO EARTH

Soviet official announcement: "After having orbited the earth, a special brake installation was switched on and the cosmic ship started coming down in order to land in a special preset area of the Soviet Union."

The contradiction, according to Soviet reports yesterday: "Rudenko (a tractor driver) saw the landing of the spaceship. He said the cosmonaut parachuted down close to where he was." Tass also quoted scientist Gurovsky: "The astronaut came down smoothly in a glade near a field. Landing on both feet, without even tumbling, he walked up to the people who saw him first."

HOW DID HE SEE THE EARTH?

Spaceman Gagarin's own report: "From the spaceship satellite (110 to 188 miles above earth) one does not, of course, see as well as from an airplane, but very, very well all the same. The coasts of the continents, big rivers, were clearly distinguishable. It was possible to distinguish which was plowed land and which was meadow."

The contradiction: Soviet scientist A. A. Blagonravov was asked at Florence, Italy, yesterday, if Gagarin's space vehicle had windows or portholes. He said it had neither. Asked how Gagarin could "see," Blagonravov replied in English and without elaboration—"by radio." It was presumed he referred to television cameras that scanned the earth's surface, but the point was not made clear. Could it have been color television?

P.S.—MORE MYSTERIES

A book about Gagarin, published Wednesday—the day of his flight—went on sale in Moscow yesterday. It showed considerable preparation. Also ready for the festive crowds were Gagarin-pictured posters and souvenir postcards—and dishware.

Chemical Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I have noted with interest the work of Assemblyman Charles J. Conrad, of the California State Legislature. Of particular note are his efforts to bring into proper focus the importance of the work of the Chemical Corps in the defense of our Nation. I include herewith a copy of a resolution introduced by Mr. Conrad in the California Legislature, together with an article from the Sacramento Bee, of Sunday, February 26, on his work. I understand that the resolution has now passed both the House and Senate of the California Legislature and I consider this a very important development:

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE, ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 24—RELATIVE TO CHEMICAL WARFARE

Whereas the present balance of power in the world today makes the threat of localized war greater than the threat of nuclear war; and

Whereas there is a great possibility that the United States would suffer inestimable losses in such small conflicts; and

Whereas in these small conflicts it is exceedingly difficult to strike the enemy armed forces without also severely harming the civilian population, which may well include people friendly to our side; and

Whereas such conflicts may involve many of the under-developed countries of the world and as a result require the United States to feed the population and rebuild the economy of these countries; and

Whereas there is one form of warfare, known as chemical warfare, which can suppress a Communist advance without causing widespread loss of life and property; and

Whereas the scientists working in the field of chemical warfare have developed amazing chemical agents which cause temporary incapacity without causing dangerous or lasting effects; and

Whereas the United States is not a party to any major treaty which forbids the use of chemical warfare; and

Whereas the American public and many of its elected representatives know little about the science of chemical warfare and propagandists have given the false impression that chemical warfare is vicious and inhuman; and

Whereas recent world events may lead to an urgent need for utilizing this type of military operation and there is a strong possibility that the United States has not developed the science of chemical warfare to its greatest capacity; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States be urged to give serious consideration to the possibility of expanding the Chemical Warfare Corps, to take such steps as may be necessary to weld the Chemical Warfare Corps into an effective operating force, especially in the use of nonlethal gases, and to inform the American people as to the true value and the humane nature of the use of chemical agents in limited warfare; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Secretary of Defense, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

[From the Sacramento Bee, Feb. 26, 1961]

STATE SOLON URGES USE OF CHEMICAL WARFARE TO HALT RED-INCITED REVOLTS

Chemical warfare to stop uprisings such as those in the Congo?

According to Assemblyman Charles J. Conrad of Los Angeles County this is not as fantastic as it sounds and he wants congress to give serious consideration to the possibility.

Conrad, who was in the chemical corps during World War II, said scientists in the field of chemical warfare have developed amazing chemical agents which cause temporary incapacity without dangerous or lasting effects.

PLANS RESOLUTION

He reported he will introduce a resolution in the legislature tomorrow asking congress to study a plan to weld the army's chemical warfare corps into an "effective operating force, especially in the use of nonlethal gases, and to inform the American people as to the true value and the humane nature of the use of chemical agents in limited warfare."

Conrad contended this may be the answer in combatting Communist inspired uprisings throughout the world.

"Most authorities believe the Soviet Union, at least for the present," Conrad stated, "will not risk all-out nuclear war, especially if they can bleed America white over a period of years by instigating civil wars, riots, and other disturbances throughout the world.

UNPLEASANTNESS AHEAD

"In such actions the United States is faced with several unpleasant situations if we put down such insurrections by usual military operations.

"For one thing, the Communists traditionally attempt to foment what they call 'popular uprisings' where they can accuse America or the United Nations of 'imperialism.'

"Secondly, in such riots it is difficult and sometimes impossible to divide combatants from civilians or pro-Communists from anti-Communists where a nation, tribe or village is divided in its allegiance. Traditional weapons may inflict death on friend and foe alike.

"Finally, such warfare always results in devastation, leaving the people unable to care for themselves, making it necessary for us to feed them and even rebuild their economy at the expense of the American taxpayer.

"In contrast, use of advanced chemical warfare techniques is both efficient and humane. It puts down the riot or insurrection by rendering the agitators temporarily helpless, without causing death. The most that can happen to friendly individuals caught in the action is temporary incapacitation, from which they will recover. There is no damage to land, crops or industry and when order has been restored normal life may be resumed.

"This revolutionary type of warfare has been handicapped by bugaboos and scare stories left over from World War I. Communist propaganda links chemical warfare with the atomic bomb as inhuman weapons even though the Soviet Union has openly threatened to use both, including the deadly variety of poison gas.

"Many years ago the United States, with great foresight, refused to ratify the Geneva Convention outlawing chemical warfare, leaving us both legally and morally free to develop the modern concept of chemical warfare, namely its use to bring the enemy under control without causing death and destruction."

While the Wild Duck Flew

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Richmond (Va.) News-Leader of Thursday, April 13, 1961. In view of our recent setback in the space race—and in view of the adroitness with which the subject is handled by the News-Leader—I think further comment by me would be superfluous.

The editorial follows:

WHILE THE WILD DUCK FLEW

When the flash came early yesterday that the Soviets had put a man in orbit, the sharp edge of surprise had been pretty well dulled. Rumors of the impending flight had swept Europe over last weekend. On Tuesday, Gen. Thomas D. Write, Air Force Chief of Staff, trotted up to the Hill to prepare a Senate committee for the blow.

Then the bells rang in newsrooms around the world, and one of the great news stories of the century came pouring out of Moscow: Yuri Alekseyevich Gagarin, the "Wild Duck," had spun around the earth in 89 minutes at a height of more than 100 miles. He was the first man in space. And who had put him there?

"In this achievement, which will pass into history, are embodied the genius of the Soviet people and the powerful force of socialism. With a feeling of great joy and legitimate pride, the central committee of the Communist Party, the presidium of the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet, and the Soviet Government note that this new era in the progressive development of mankind has been opened by

our country—the country of victorious socialism.

"By the will of the working class, by the will of the people, and inspired by the party of Communists headed by Lenin, our country has turned into a most powerful Socialist state and reached unprecedented development of science and technology.

"Before the eyes of the whole world, the working class, the Soviet collective farm peasantry, and the Soviet intelligentsia—the whole Soviet people—demonstrate an unprecedented victory of science and technology."

Khrushchev's statement ran on for 1,500 words. While it was coming over the machine, a United Press International reporter began checking for reaction. He telephoned Yangley Airbase and got hold of Lt. Col. John Powers, press officer for the U.S. astronauts. The rest of the story follows:

"It's 3 o'clock in the morning, you jerk," Colonel Powers shouted into the phone.

The reporter suggested that Russia didn't put a man in space as a regular thing, and wondered whether Colonel Powers might be able to get the views of the American astronauts on the Russian success.

"If you're wanting something from us," the press officer snapped, "the answer is, We are all asleep."

O.K. Next editorial.

Aid to Soybean Farmers? "Please, No"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have expressed concern about the Department of Agriculture's unrealistic support price on soybeans.

The farmers who have been raising soybeans have been doing pretty well and they sought no Federal assistance in protecting their economy. The Department seems to have other ideas, however, and under the philosophy which now prevails in the Department, assistance is ladled out without much concern about what it might do to the market for a certain commodity.

Richard Wilson of the Cowles Publications has written an article for the Des Moines (Iowa) Register which supports the viewpoint I and many others have taken. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to bring this article to the attention of the Members. I am sure they will find it interesting reading:

AID TO SOYBEAN FARMERS? "PLEASE, NO"

(By Richard Wilson)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Government has its incomprehensible aspects sometimes when dealt with first hand. Representatives of a major economic group come to Washington. "Please," they say, "please don't help us any more. If you help us, you will hurt us," they add. And the story goes on: "We have straightened things out pretty well in our field and have done it ourselves. If you insist on helping us now you will upset everything." These are the producers of soybeans, a relatively new crop in the United States and a very important one. Henry A. Wallace was fascinated by soybeans, as he was at one time with many things indigenous to Manchuria.

As Secretary of Agriculture a generation ago he used to experiment with food products made of soybeans, gulping quantities of soybean milk at lunch. This product didn't catch on, but feeding soybean meal to livestock and using soybean oil for a variety of purposes caught on in a big way.

About 500,000 farmers raise soybeans. The estimated value of the crop at the end of 1960 was $1,115,432,000. Representatives of this billion-dollar-a-year business, the actual producers of it, pleaded with the Kennedy administration to leave them alone.

THEY REACTED WITH HORROR

They reacted with horror when Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, without consulting them, announced that the support price of soybans would be raised from $1.85 per bushel to $2.30 per bushel. This was a part of the Freeman corn reduction program. Evidently the idea was to get farmers to shift into soybeans from corn and other feed grains. Many farmers grow both corn and soybeans.

Soybean representatives grumbled that Roswell A. Garst, of Coon Rapids, Iowa, the immensely successful corn producer who has even charmed Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev, worked his way with Secretary Freeman on the corn program. Garst, it appeared, was willing to encourage producers to grow less corn and more soybeans.

In 1958, the soybean producers got the Eisenhower administration to reduce the support price for their product from $2.09 per bushel to $1.85. They were happy with the deal. Soybeans moved out of Government stocks at a profit to the Government. Producers captured and held the export market they want. On the domestic market, the price went up over $3 a bushel.

Why were they worried, then, when Freeman raised the support price to only $2.30? They were worried because that froze the situation, it took out the element of risk, producers could shift into soybeans knowing they would get $2.30. Foreign producers, looking at the floor under the U.S. price, could make their plans to undercut it.

FREEMAN THINKS CONTROL ESSENTIAL

The soybean producers, doing fine in the competitive climate of risk capitalism, did not want to be woven into the Government's control fabric. A delegation headed by Charles V. Simpson, president of the American Soybean Association, came to Washington and pleaded in vain with Secretary Freeman.

They told him the corn surplus would just be augmented by a soybean surplus and piled in on top of the $9 billion in surplus commodities already held by the Government.

Freeman thought otherwise. More soybean control was an essential ingredient in trying to get a 20-percent reduction in corn production.

So there it rests, with the Government insisting on helping the soybean producers if it kills them.

Congress Should Remove the Shackles From the Nation's Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, Congress should take immediate action to unshackle the railroads from burdensome ICC regulations. It is felt by many experts in the field of transportation that the unfavorable trends in railroad traffic, earnings, and employment will then reverse themselves.

At the 1960 level of economic activities, if railroads were able to regain as much as 50 percent share of intercity freight traffic, the added rail traffic at the present rate of productivity would make it possible for the roads to restore more than 90,000 railroad jobs. Still another 10,000 railroad jobs might be added if railroad participation in commercial intercity passenger traffic were increased to 35 percent of the total.

The shackles listed below constitute probably the greatest and most unjust burden ever imposed upon a major industry in the United States and represent serious handicaps to the Nation's railroads in their effort to remain solvent and maintain railroad jobs:

RAILROAD SHACKLES

1. Interest and other costs of capital for building or improving highways, inland waterways, and the Federal airways system of navigation and traffic control used by railroad competitors are borne by Government; capital costs for building and improving railroad lines are borne by railroads.

2. The publicly-owned "ways" used by railroad competitors are not subject to property or "ownership" taxes; railroad right-of-way is taxed in thousands of taxing jurisdictions throughout the United States.

3. Railroad competitors benefit from the use of signal and traffic control systems provided by Government; railroads must provide and pay taxes on their own signal and traffic control systems.

4. Hundreds of costly airports required by airlines in providing passenger service are provided, operated, and maintained by the Government; railroads must build, operate, and maintain their own stations and terminals.

5. Airports, being publicly-owned are tax-free; railroad stations and terminals not only are subject to local taxation, but in most taxing jurisdictions are taxed at a higher rate than other property subject to the same tax rates.

6. Railroad taxes are used to help build and maintain the publicly-provided "ways" of other carriers, but railroads use of public transportation facilities is either prohibited or severely restricted. Motor carriers may own and operate railroads and inland water carriers; inland water carriers may own and operate any form of transportation except airlines; and airlines may own and operate any form of transportation.

7. Besides the enormous advantage of using publicly-provided facilities, airlines have this enormous added advantage over railroads: They remain eligible for direct dollar subsidy from the Government and in fact, the smaller lines are receiving subsidy payments in ever-increasing amounts.

8. There are Government agencies for the promotion at every form of transportation, except railroads. For airlines, there is the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Aviation Agency, and the aviational promotional activities of the Department of Defense; for motor carriers, the Bureau of Public Roads and State highway departments; for inland carriers, the Army Corps of Engineers. (The Interstate Commerce Commission regulates railroads, but has no promotional function or authority.)

9. Federal tax laws assign unduly long depreciable lives to railroad plant and equipment with the result that funds are not recovered in time to take advantage of technological advances as they become available.

10. Before they may abandon unprofitable lines and facilities, the railroads must obtain approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission or State regulatory commission, or both. But railroad competitors, excepting only airlines, are free to abandon unprofitable facilities as desired.

11. Persons who wish to use railroads and other for-hire carriers for travel are penalized by having to pay the Government a tax amounting to 10 percent of the fare; there is no such tax on those who travel by private automobile, which now accounts for 90 percent of all U.S. travel.

12. Although railroads are 100 percent regulated by the Interstate Commerce Commission, their highway competition is only 33 percent regulated and their competition on inland waterways is only 10 percent regulated.

13. All carriers, except railroads, may transport commodities which they own or in which they have an interest; a railroad may transport nothing which it owns or has an interest in except timber, timber products, and commodities used in its business as a common carrier.

14. Numerous agricultural commodities, aggregating vast tonnages, are exempt from ICC regulation when they move by truck, but are subject to ICC regulation when they move by rail.

15. Bulk commodities moving on inland waterways are exempt from regulation when not more than three such commodities are carried in a single barge or tow, and it is estimated that virtually all bulk commodity traffic on inland waterways moves under this exemption. But bulk commodities, like all others, are fully regulated when they move by rail.

16. Railroads are subject to the long-and-short-haul clause of the Interstate Commerce Act; trucks are not.

A Letter From Home Opposing Extension of the 1-Cent Temporary Federal Gasoline Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, my constituent, Mr. Robert A. Cerwin, general manager of the Cer-tex Petroleum Co., of Burlington, Wis., has written persuasively for letting the temporary 1-cent Federal gasoline tax expire June 30, 1961. I commend his letter to the attention of the Members of this House:

CER-TEX PETROLEUM CO.,
Burlington, Wis.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: According to newspaper reports about President Kennedy's highway revenue proposal, the gasoline tax and highway-user taxes will be an important part of your job in Washington. Because this subject is of utmost importance to me, a jobber in the gasoline business, I thought I should present my views on the subject. For I believe that whatever action Congress takes will be most important to me, my customers, and to your constituents. It will be just as important to you and the Federal Government because we must sell our product to collect taxes for highways and other projects.

I am concerned about that gasoline tax which now totals 10 cents per gallon, 4 for the Federal Government and 6 for the State. I noticed that the President opposed allowing the temporary 1-cent Federal gas tax to expire on July 1, 1961, as promised by Congress back in October 1959. He said that we need the money to construct the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways.

Now, I object to his statement about "need." We already have plenty of money to build this national highway system if all the highway-user taxes were spent on highways and not diverted to the general fund. Too many people believe that continuation of the high gasoline tax is justified because all highway-user taxes are being spent on highways. This simply is not true. Today 40 percent of highway-user taxes are being diverted to the general fund. Therefore, it is not fair to request increases in highway-user taxes for highways when highway-user taxes are now being diverted from highway construction.

I understand that Congress in October 1959, determined to correct this situation by replacing this "temporary" 1-cent gas increase with some of the excise taxes on highway users now going into the general fund. This money would more than make up for the 1-cent gasoline tax. In other words, there would be plenty of money to continue the highway program on schedule and still allow the reduction in the Federal gasoline tax.

It is important in my business that the gasoline tax be reduced. Have you ever tried to sell a product that is being taxed 50 percent of its cost? That's what we are trying to do, and it is getting more difficult every day. Just think what our sales would be if we had no tax on our product.

That, of course, is not in the picture. We want to pay our share of the cost of building highways because motorists want good highways. But we shouldn't have to pay more than our share. We shouldn't have to pay all highway construction costs and also contribute to the general fund a sum of money based on the number of the miles we drive.

Highway user taxes hurt our business. When there is a chance to reduce them and still get the work done, we should do so. This is especially true since Congress—which included Senator Kennedy at the time—promised to do so.

Some people will ask, How shall we replace the money in the general fund? Well, it ought to be replaced by money from all taxpayers, not be just the highway user. The highway user, of course, pays all other taxes like everyone else.

I'm sure you are aware that the highway user is not the only one who benefits from the Interstate and Defense Highway System. Everyone benefits, even the millions who don't own cars. They want to be defended, too. The Defense Department which has set many of the highway construction standards so far has not paid one dime toward their construction. Remember the bridge episode? Millions of dollars had to be spent to change bridge structures for the Defense Department, yet that Department has not paid any part of the construction costs.

There are many reasons—many of them spelled out by President Kennedy in recent messages—why everyone, not only highway users, ought to contribute toward the Interstate and Defense Highway System.

In view of the above information it would appear to me that Congress ought, at least, to use all highway user taxes for highway construction before attempting to raise additional highway user taxes. Other general taxes should be paid by everyone, with no particular group singled out to pay more than his just share.

As a result of the facts set forth above, we urge you to vote to permit the 1-cent temporary gas tax to expire June 30, 1961, as promised by Congress in 1959.

Sincerely,

ROBERT A. CERWIN,
General Manager.

Basic American Principles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, that the American people are becoming more and more concerned over the departure of Federal Government administrative policies from basic American principles is a well-known fact. We read and hear continually of the increasing interest in the conservative cause. Incidentally, this terminology is, I believe, most unfortunate. Conservatives are concerned with the fact that as individuals we are rapidly losing or willingly giving away our individual liberties. At the time this Nation was founded the so-called conservatives of today would have been liberals.

A few days ago a young farmer from North Dakota and his family were in Washington. On their way back to North Dakota, this young man sat down to write the usual thank you letter for the normal courtesies which had been extended to the family by our office. Included with his thanks were some observations which I thought would be interesting to the Members of the House and which typify the thinking of a great many people with whom I come in contact.

Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to insert my remarks, together with a copy of the letter which is attached, in the Appendix of the RECORD:

BEDFORD, PA., *April 12, 1961.*

DEAR MR. SHORT: We Thompsons (all four of us) want to express again our appreciation of your kind courtesy shown us by yourself and your secretaries.

Tonight at the motel I had time to read your news releases and the copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It will come as no surprise to you that I agree 100 percent.

We know that the spiritual values and principles that founded this Nation are somehow wrapped up and included into our free-enterprise system. Destroy this system, and you have helped to destroy America.

When the free-enterprise system is functioning properly, it, of its own self, produces goods and more goods. It demands an expanding market at all times. This magic of our system, totalitarianism, socialism, communism cannot comprehend. The lack of Americans in not comprehending the magic of our system is the danger from within. We need more statements of truth like yours made in the Congress and in your news releases. And we know that the truth not only corrects the lie and the misrepresentation of facts, but it gives to us individually and collectively the spiritual strength we need to get our Nation back on the right track. America is waking up.

This struggle that is going on in Congress now domestically is as important as the cold

war. In fact if we (you and I) don't rededicate ourselves to basic American principles and fight for them and win, the other struggle is of small importance.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

WM. J. THOMPSON,
Post Office Box 41, Grafton, N. Dak.

Republican Imported Campaign Reached Such Extremes It Became an Affront to the People of St. Louis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an appraisal of the Republican National Committee's effort to high pressure voters in local communities in recent municipal elections. The appraisal follows:

GOP BIG CITY TEST FAILS BADLY IN ST. LOUIS

Democratic candidates were swept into office in State and local elections held last week in Missouri, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Texas. In all of these areas the party and its candidates continued to demonstrate their strength and appeal to the voters.

Democratic Mayor Tucker of St. Louis, who won reelection in 1957 by a record margin, easily defeated his opponent. Carrying all 28 of the city's wards, Mayor Tucker received 63 percent of the total vote with a majority of 41,428. In 14 of the 28 wards, he received more votes than in his record victory of 1957.

The victory in St. Louis is particularly noteworthy since Republican National Headquarters in Washington had sent a platoon of special workers to St. Louis as its first move in an all-out attempt to increase its strength in the large cities.

VICTORY IN MICHIGAN

In Michigan, also, Democrats continued to demonstrate widespread strength and support. Of nine statewide races, Democrats won seven and were ahead in an eighth. Support for the ticket throughout the State was evident. State Highway Commissioner John C. Mackie won a majority of the votes in both Wayne County and outstate—the first outstate majority for a Democrat in decades. His statewide victory margin was more than 200,000.

In Wisconsin's election for the Supreme Court, Circuit Judge Myron Gordon, a Democrat, defeated his Republican opponent, former Attorney General Stewart Honeck.

In the Texas primary for U.S. Senator, Democratic candidates polled 68.4 percent of the total vote. Senator WILLIAM A. BLAKLEY led the Democratic field. He will oppose Republican John G. Tower in the June 3 runoff.

Chairman Bailey analyzed the results this way:

"The Democratic victories in St. Louis and Michigan once again demonstrate that the Democratic Party has the support of the people. It also points up the fact that the Republican Party is not going to make inroads into the Democratic strength in urban areas while the Republican Party in Washington fights a fair increase in the minimum wage, opposes a House Rules Committee a chance to let Congress vote on the Kennedy program and carries on a continual battle against progressive legislation."

GOP REJECTED

"The Democratic victories in Michigan and St. Louis are the result of good candidates, good leadership, strong organization, and hard work, but they are also a rejection of the Republican Party and its negative stance.

"The vote in St. Louis is important nationally. It was supposed to be a testing ground to demonstrate that the Republican Party was losing in the cities not because its programs and candidates were rejected by the voters, but because the Republican organizational effort was weak. The Republicans said they would remedy that in St. Louis. They brought in a team of outside 'experts.' Money from outside St. Louis was poured into the Republican campaign. New 'gimmicks' were touted as the way to Republican victory. Strong efforts were made by the Republicans to inject racial issues extraneous to St. Louis into the election."

AFFRONT TO PEOPLE

"The result was accurately described by Mayor Raymond R. Tucker as a rebuke to the imported Republican campaign tactics of fear, misrepresentation, and negativism. The respected St. Louis Post-Dispatch said the Republican campaign reached 'such extremes that it has become an affront to the people of St. Louis. One reason for this, no doubt, is the participation of outsiders from Michigan and Washington who care nothing about St. Louis and are only here to seek a surprise victory which they hope would open the checkbooks of contributors to the 1962 congressional campaign. Their target is not only Mayor Tucker but President Kennedy.'

"The Republicans missed their targets and presumably they will try to find some new tactics for the next city contest. I sincerely hope they come up with a more wholesome campaign plan than they displayed in St. Louis."

Wheat Eaters Wanted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the Dodge City (Kans.) Daily Globe, of March 28, 1961, regarding the new wheat product, Redi-Wheat, being promoted by the Kansas Wheat Commission with a view to increasing the consumption of wheat.

The Daily Globe editorial reveals a fine understanding of the problem and a real desire to assist the wheat farmers and the Kansas Wheat Commission in reaching a practical solution to the problem of wheat surpluses.

[From the Dodge City Daily Globe, Mar. 28, 1961]

WHEAT EATERS WANTED

Those who have eaten Redi-Wheat, the new canned product being marketed here and elsewhere say it is very good. The food can be eaten as a cereal, in place of rice as a dinner item or in various combinations such as an ingredient of meat balls.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture is making an especially intensive drive to promote sale and consumption of the product in Wichita. Results are being watched with interest.

It is to be hoped that real results are achieved with Redi-Wheat. The great human-food grain crop is rich in nourishment and is palatable in its many forms.

It is rather tragic that two World Wars cut down per-capita consumption of wheat. The food was so valuable and important in both wars, that the public was urged to "eat less wheat" thereby conserving the available supply for military and other essential purposes. The records show that the self-sacrifice of civilians in the war periods accomplished what it was designed to do, but that when peace came, new eating habits made for smaller consumption per head.

The great wheat growing section of the Nation is primarily interested in a market for its top quality wheat. One of the best ways to increase that market would be to get Kansans and others to eat more of a very valuable food.

New Russian Dogma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in the first of a series of articles based on his recent conference with Nikita Khrushchev, the distinguished columnist, Walter Lippmann, has examined in a revealing and critical fashion some of the views and beliefs of the Russian leader.

Among other important insights, Mr. Lippmann suggests that Mr. Khrushchev now believes "that there can be international cooperation only if, in the administration as well as in the policymaking, the Soviet Union has a veto."

Such a belief certainly has great significance and far-reaching consequences for such vital areas of international relations and agreements as disarmament, nuclear testing, and the United Nations. Such a belief creates, in fact, a new dimension in our thinking concerning international cooperation.

I urge my colleagues to read Mr. Lippmann's fascinating account of his interview with Mr. Khrushchev:

TODAY AND TOMORROW—FIRST OF A SERIES
(By Walter Lippmann)

On this, our second visit, my wife and I were taken on a long journey by plane and auto to Mr. Khrushchev's country place in Sochi on the Black Sea. Before we left Moscow, accompanied by two interpreters and an official of the press department, there was much mystery about all the details of the coming visit, such as when and where we were to see the great man. In fact, as it turned out, he had no other appointments after half-past 11 in the morning when he met us in the pine woods near the entrance of his place. Eight hours later, a bit worn by much talk and two large meals, we insisted on leaving in order to go to bed.

I would not like to leave the impression that all 8 hours were devoted to great affairs of the world. Perhaps, all told, 3½ hours were spent in serious talk. The rest of the time went into the two prolonged meals at

which Mr. Khrushchev, who is on what appears to be a nonfattening diet, broke the rules, saying joyously that the doctor had gone to Moscow for a day or two. The talk was largely banter between Mr. Khrushchev and Mikoyan, who joined us for lunch, and the banter turned chiefly on Armenian food and Armenian wine and Armenian customs, which include the compulsion to drink all glasses to the end at each toast. Though we all drank a bit more than we wanted, Mikoyan chose to regard us as American ascetics who only sipped their wine. Finally Mr. Khrushchev took pity on us by providing a bowl into which we could pour the wine as fast as Mikoyan filled our glasses.

Between this heroic eating and drinking, we walked around the place, which is large, met Mr. Khrushchev's grandson and Mikoyan's granddaughter, inspected the new and very gadgety swimming pool, and, believe it or not, played badminton with Mr. Khrushchev.

In the serious talks, I might say that my wife made fairly full notes, I made a few jottings, but there was no transcript and the translation was done very ably by Mr. Victor M. Sukhodrev who is an official in the Foreign Ministry. It was understood that I was free to write what I liked when I had left Russia and to quote Mr. Khrushchev or not to quote him as seemed desirable. I shall set down my own understanding and interpretation of the most important and interesting points that he made.

For an opening I reminded him that we had last seen him in October 1958, nearly a year before his visit to the United States. Much has happened in these 2½ years and would he tell me what seemed to him the most important events for good or evil?

After a moment or two of hesitation, he replied that during this period the two main forces in the world—the capitalist and the Socialist—have concluded that it was useto "test" one another by military means. I took him to mean by "test" the backing of their politicial aims by the threat of war.

In contrast with 1958, when he professed to believe that the United States and Germany might attack him, he spoke with confidence that because of the growing strength of the Communist orbit, the threat of war from our side was dying down. As a result, the United States was abandoning the "Dulles doctrine" that the neutrality of small states is "immoral." He himself welcomed President Kennedy's proposals for a neutral Laos.

You think then, I asked him, that there has been a change in U.S. policy? To this he replied that while there were some signs of a change, as for example in Laos, it was not a radical change, as could be seen in the U.S. attitude toward disarmament. What, I asked him, is wrong with the U.S. attitude? We cannot see, he replied, that any change is imminent when the subject of disarmament is put in the hands of such a believer in armaments as Mr. McCloy. We think well of Mr. McCloy and during his time in Germany we had good relations with him. But asking him to deal with disarmament is a case of asking the goat to look after the cabbage patch.

I interjected the remark that the final decisions would be made by the President. But Mr. Khrushchev insisted that the forces behind the Kennedy administration he summed up in the one word "Rockefeller." The view that he is running the Kennedy administration will be news to Governor Rockefeller. I should add that Mr. Khrushchev considers me a Republican, which will be news to Mr. Nixon.

Then we got onto the subject of nuclear testing. He said that the Western Powers were not ready to conclude an agreement, and that this was shown, among other things, by the demand for 21 or perhaps 19 inspections a year. He had been led personally to believe that the West would be satisfied with about three symbolic inspections. Nineteen inspections, our present demand, were nothing but a demand for the right to conduct complete reconnaissance of the Soviet Union.

I asked him about his attitude toward underground testing. He replied that the U.S.S.R. has never done any underground testing and never will. I asked why? Because, he said, we do not see any value in small tactical atomic weapons. If it comes to war, we shall use only the biggest weapons. The smaller ones are very expensive and they can decide nothing. The fact that they are expensive doesn't bother you because you don't care what you spend and, what is more, many of your generals are connected with big business. But in the U.S.S.R. we have to economize, and tactical weapons are a waste.

I report this without having the technical expertise to comment on it.

Then he went on to say that the second reason why he had no great hopes of an agreement was that the French are now testing and are unlikely to sign the agreement. It is obvious, he said, that if the French are not in the agreement, they will do the testing for the Americans. To which, I said, and the Chinese will do the testing for you. He paused and then said that this was a fair remark. But, he added, while China is moving in the direction where she will be able to make tests, she is not yet able to make them. When the time comes that she can, there will be a new problem. We would like all states to sign a nuclear agreement.

Finally, he came to his third reason why an agreement may not be possible. It turns on the problem of the administrator of the agreement. Here, he was vehement and unqualified. He would never accept a single neutral administrator. Why? Because, he said, while there are neutral countries, there are no neutral men. You would not accept a Communist administrator and I cannot accept a non-Communist administrator. I will never entrust the security of the Soviet Union to any foreigner. We cannot have another Hammarskjold, no matter where he comes from among the neutral countries.

I found this enlightening. It was plain to me that here is a new dogma, that there are no neutral men. After all the Soviet Union had accepted Trygve Lie and Hammarskjold. The Soviet Government has now come to the conclusion that there can be no such thing as an impartial civil servant in this deeply divided world, and that the kind of political celibacy which the British theory of the civil service calls for is, in international affairs, a fiction. This new dogma has long consequences. It means that there can be international cooperation only if, in the administration as well as in the policymaking, the Soviet Union has a veto.

Our talk went on to Cuba, Iran, revolutionary movements in general, and finally to Germany. I shall report on these topics in subsequent articles.

What's the Story Behind OCDM?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mr. C. Y. Thomas, a resident of my district and chairman of the board of the Spencer Chemical Co. Mr. Thomas suggests a new look at the underlying concepts, as well as the methods of operation, of the OCDM. I call the Congress attention to his letter, because I think the situation which he mentions deserves considerable attention:

SPENCER CHEMICAL CO.,
Kansas City, Mo., April 12, 1961.

The Honorable ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: Several of us in our shop have been making a very careful and detailed study of civil defense, industrial plant protection, etc. for the past 2 months. It appears to me that OCDM is getting to be a resthome for a bunch of political hacks. In early March the new OCDM Chief, Mr. Ellis, in a story in the New York Times, stated that OCDM and its programs were completely inadequate. Two weeks later, at Louisville at an industrial civil defense conference, the same boondogglers were peddling the same old line.

This subject is so controversial that it deserves study of a committee composed of top-flight men from industry, from the sciences, and from government. I could make a speech on this subject many hours long and write you a many-page letter, but it can all be summarized by saying that there is so much boondoggling in civil defense and so much controversial thinking that the average person today thinks civil defense is for the birds. I am sure that no lawyer from New Orleans, after less than a month in office, could have any idea about the whole problem. Congress ought to investigate the whole subject and then appoint a committee of big names in whom the public has confidence to tell us what we should do about it.

Sincerely yours,

KIT.

The President's TV Appearance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence from the April 13, 1961, edition of the Washington Star. I include this article because it expresses my indignation better than I can myself at commercializing the White House and the Office of the President:

THE PRESIDENT'S TV APPEARANCE—DIGNITY OF THE OFFICE BELIEVED IMPAIRED BY COMMERCIAL ASPECTS OF PROGRAM

President Kennedy did Tuesday night on a television network what no other President of the United States has ever done—he participated in a program whose commercial sponsor urged the American people to buy its products. The cost of the time used was not contributed by the television company, but was paid for by a toothpaste manufacturer.

Many observers feel the dignity of the Presidency was impaired when Mr. Kennedy appeared in the role of a television performer in a prerecorded and rehearsed program.

Five times the hour-long show was interrupted for commercial advertising of a toothpaste and, in the final section of the film,

the President's picture was repeatedly used as a background for the presentation of the names of those who edited and produced the show—the television personnel of the program itself.

It will be argued that newspapers and other publications carry advertising matter alongside Presidential pronouncements, but, in rebuttal, it must be said that no story of White House news is interrupted in the middle of a news column while the reader is told in the same column about the merits of a particular toothpaste.

The show had to be rehearsed and prerecorded 2 weeks ago. The President sat at the table in the Cabinet room of the White House with a pile of photographs before him. As he held them up for the viewer to see, the broadcasting company flashed them in full length on the screen. Mr. Kennedy then discussed each of his Presidential assistants and also described the operations of his Cabinet. So the whole effect was that of a television show.

Up to now, a President's appearances on television have been confined to the showing of his unrehearsed press conferences or his public addresses or of pictures of spontaneous news events in which he happens to be participating. There has been a tacit understanding with the broadcasting companies that Presidential press conferences would not be commercially sponsored. No prearranged show has ever been put on with a President in the manner of the Tuesday night performance.

One wonders whether the other toothpaste companies are going to put on a television show in which the vast audience collected for a Presidential appearance will be made available to them to sell their wares.

Actually, the President did a good job, and the television ratings on his performance should be high. Indeed, he acted his dramatic role well, and so did Mrs. Kennedy, who followed him in the closing 15 minutes of the same program. In fact, it can be said that Mrs. Kennedy, with her calm and restrained manner, was the hit of the show.

Plainly a President and his wife have every right to appear on television or to contribute articles to printed publications, selecting those they want to favor with exclusive stories. It may sometimes be unwise politically to do so, but there's no practical argument against playing favorites, especially if it wins a plug needed perhaps for the next election. Thus, the National Broadcasting Co. commentator who narrated the program spoke of the reverses as well as the successes of the President in his first 82 days, but did insert a very nice plug for the Kennedy administration when he said:

"If you had to sum up in one word the general reaction to President Kennedy, it would have to be favorable. You could not say that Mr. Kennedy has electrified the country, but the public, from available evidence, approves of what he is doing, and appears to believe that, so far at least, he has been calm, competent and serious."

There was, to be sure, no financial compensation to President Kennedy in connection with the TV program. But would it be proper for a President to accept compensation and donate it to charity? It will be recalled that congressional hearings in 1937 revealed that Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, while in the White House, had made a contract in 1935 for 10 radio broadcasts for a total of approximately $30,000, which she had designated should go as contributions to charity. At first, the Treasury did not consider these payments to be taxable to her, but in 1942 ruled that they should be included in her personal income, subject to deductions for charitable contributions within the legally specified limits.

Back in the spring of 1933, the late Louis Howe, private secretary and press-relations officer at White House—in fact, the right-hand man of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt—appeared on a commercially sponsored radio program every Sunday night. It was said at the time that he received $1,500 weekly for his talks. The commercial sponsor was a public utility and oil company. It is estimated that Mr. Howe was paid a total of around $30,000 that year for his radio talks.

The basic question, of course, is whether a President or other high officials—whose salaries are paid by the taxpayers of the United States—should allow the prestige of their respective positions to be used to advertise any commercial product, even though they themselves receive no remuneration and do not accept any compensation whatsoever.

Advantages of the American Free Enterprise System Over Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, it is a real pleasure and privilege for me to call the attention of the House to the following outstanding essay by Mr. Curtiss L. Wikstrom, a junior in the Karlstad, Minn., high school. Mr. Wikstrom's essay, which recently was awarded first place in the 1961 Association of Physicians and Surgeon's essay contest in Minnesota, is both a tribute to himself and to many others of his generation and a testimony to the American free enterprise system. It is an example of the excellent work being done by today's young people, and bodes well for the future of this Nation.

The essay follows:

THE ADVANTAGES OF THE AMERICAN FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM OVER COMMUNISM

(By Curtiss L. Wikstrom)

Today over half of the people of the world are starving. Many top government officials in the Soviet Union are being removed from office because the supply of food does not meet the demand. Communist China is in deep famine. Refugees are pouring out from behind the Bamboo Curtain in greater numbers every day. The starvation in Africa is despairing. Men, women, and children everywhere scurry about in what is the last struggling effort of physical survival.

These are the startling effects of communism. These spots of human suffering are not being caused because of unnatural weather conditions or because of the lack of soil to grow this much needed food. The reason these areas are in distress is because the people live under a system that halts progress and industry.

The governments in all these areas illustrate communism from its most primitive form to its most up-to-date form. We can plainly see by these illustrations that planned economy has not improved the conditions of the world; it has only kept progress from advancing and taking care of the existing problems.

Communists contend that government should engage in economic planning. They believe that government should distribute the goods produced and each man should give according to his ability and receive according to his need. This principle is based on the false assumption that private saving is greed and the accumulation of wealth is selfishness.

The Communists overlook the fact that planned economy does not make a nation prosper; planned economy only has the effect of stifling a people's initiative and incentive to work, produce, and save.

The only thing communism achieves is the distribution of poverty and enslavement. To plan and control a man's life is to bind him and his potential abilities; and when he is bound mentally and physically, he is almost worthless in the advancement of progress.

Another fault of communism is its failure to recognize human value. In communistic countries a man is only part of the mass and is considered just as replaceable as a mechanical device. When a man is treated like a machine, however, he begins to act like a machine; he gives only what is required of him; he does not work to capacity because he knows he will not be benefited by it.

But while half of the world is held in bondage and starvation, the other half is experiencing a new and progressive economy led by the American system of free enterprise. Under our system of free enterprise we have amassed the greatest productive power the world has ever known. No planned economy has ever approached the achievements we have made under our system of free trade protected by a constitutional democracy.

The reason we have made such great progress is because here in America our Government has been limited. We go by the principle that though the people support the Government, the Government should not support the people. Government participation and support encourages the expectation of paternal care and weakens the character of an honest hardworking people.

Free enterprise creates a responsive, energetic, and responsible people. It gives them a quality that is not available when they cannot negotiate, bargain, plan, and construct as they believe right.

Opportunity is one of the greatest advantages of the free enterprise system. Only an individual knows his real ability; and if given the opportunity, he can put that ability to work.

Free competition is an advantage used by Americans to further progress and improvement. It draws out the best abilities of every competitor and give his customer the benefit of new and improved products.

Every American is given the chance to try, to succeed, and perhaps to fail. These things with the prospects of personal incentive drive him on to higher achievements. Success and personal incentive make him strive to do better, and the possibility of failing keeps him from slacking.

In the free enterprise system everyone receives an income proportional to the amount and kind of work he does. Each man is given the right to earn, save, trade, or sell private property, and he is protected from anyone's taking or sharing his property illegally or legally (such as is done in a communistic society where slackers can take advantage of honest laborers by sharing but not contributing). Lincoln said: "Property is desirable, is a positive good in the world. That some should be rich shows that others may become rich and hence is just encouragement to industry and enterprise. Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him work diligently to build one for himself, thus by example assuring that his own shall be safe from violence."

Unfortunately, Americans are up against the jujitsu tactics of those who want to destroy our strength by using that strength to destroy what is responsible for it. We must be constantly on guard against such things as welfare, Federal aid, and other socialistic measures.

Individual freedom and free enterprise have made this a modern world. Through

free enterprise people have risen from the depths of poverty and barbarism into a world where there is individual freedom and security. Now it is up to us to see that the world does not stray from the path that has been set before it and resort to the degrading policies of communism. The short period of free enterprise have given to the world more progress in the past 100 years than other systems have given the world since the beginning of time. If that powerful force is continued and spread throughout the world, we will fulfill the dream of mankind—liberty, peace, and security.

Some Facts About Federal Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the following informative article by Lyle C. Wilson appeared in the Long Island Daily Press, April 15. It sheds factual light on Federal aid to education:

[From the Long Island Daily Press, Apr. 15, 1961]

SCHOOLS AND TAXES: IS FEDERAL AID NECESSARY?

(By Lyle C. Wilson)

WASHINGTON.—The religious dispute now blazing around President Kennedy's $6.5 billion school aid program diverts attention from two questions that are closer to your kids and closer to your pocketbooks: Is Federal aid necessary at all? How shall the citizen-taxpayer know whether Federal school aid, is necessary or a wasteful, pressure-group steal?

Debate in Congress should inform the citizen-taxpayer. Dr. Ernest L. Wilkinson, president of Utah's Brigham Young University, comes up with some fodder for debate. Dr. Wilkinson is against Federal aid. He believes President Kennedy's $6.5 billion plan is both unnecessary and dangerous; dangerous to education and dangerous because it would increase the inflationary rotting of the U.S. dollar.

Dr. Wilkinson argues that States and local communities have built an average of 68,000 schoolrooms annually for the past 5 years whereas the administration estimates the annual need in the next 10 years to be only 61,000 new rooms; that enrollment increases in elementary and secondary schools will begin to decline within 2 years from the 44 percent hike in 1950–60. In 1960–70 the increase will be 20 to 22 percent. He said these 1960–70 figures cannot be challenged because the children already have been born.

Here are some more Wilkinson statistics which the taxpayers should demand be proven right or wrong to their satisfaction during congressional debate on school aid. If Dr. Wilkinson's figures are right, perhaps the administration bill is wrong:

Schoolteachers' salaries have increased in constant dollars by 106 percent in the past 30 years. Other State and local employees' salaries increased 58 percent and Federal civilian employees' salaries increased 73 percent in the same period.

School teachers' average salary increased from $3,126 in 1950–51 to $5,309 in 1960–61, 72.4 percent. The number of teachers paid less than $3,500 decreased from 62 percent in 1952–53 to 9.6 percent in 1960–61. Teachers paid $4,500 or more increased from 13 percent to 63 percent in the same period.

School expenditures for 1961 are estimated at $16.4 billion, up $1.2 billion over 1960 and up $9.9 billion over 1950–51, and increase of 153 percent.

School enrollments increased 43 percent in the past 20 years while school funds were increasing 185 percent in price adjusted dollars.

Dr. Wilkinson is a hardnosed conservative. There are his figures for some soft-nosed liberal to disprove. Dr. Wilkinson had this to say:

"As a taxpayer, the [Kennedy] proposal offends my sense of fiscal responsibility. As an educator, it offends my sense of moral integrity. As a lover of my country, I very much prefer that the future of my children be premised on the American philosophy of President Kennedy as proclaimed in his inaugural address when he said:

" 'Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country.' "

Administration Should Consider Full-Scale Development of Atomic Powered Airplane Under Nonmilitary Auspices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the April 6 issue of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

I am in thorough agreement with the suggestion in the Post-Dispatch editorial that the administration consider full-scale development of the atomic powered airplane under nonmilitary auspices.

This does not mean, however, that I agree with the blind judgment of Pentagon leaders who can see no military usefulness of a nuclear plane. But I do have the feeling that if America is to get the job done the administration will have to place it in hands of people more dedicated to the New Frontier.

The Post-Dispatch editorial follows:

HARD DECISIONS ON DEFENSE

Secretary of Defense McNamara, expounding the administration's defense budget for 6 hours before the Senate Armed Services Committee, appears to have made a strong impression on men who could be his most knowledgeable critics. Chairman RUSSELL praised him highly for his grasp of the defense problem after so short a time in office. Evidently he advanced persuasive arguments to counter misgivings among the Senators over administration plans to slow down the B–70 bomber program, the Zeus antimissile missile, and development of a nuclear aircraft.

A strong case can be made for each of these weapons as extra insurance for the future Defense Establishment. But each is tremendously costly, and the administration has a point when it argues that extremely valuable returns must be in prospect to justify such expenditures on top of outlays urgently needed for other, and more immediately effective, arms.

Mr. McNamara holds that technical feasibility of the Zeus missile is so doubtful that resources can be better expended on accelerating production of Polaris and Minuteman. In other words, he would stake our defense upon retaliatory power, in the hope that this would deter attack, rather than upon the defensive power to knock down missiles once the attack has been launched. Similarly he favors cutting back the 2,000-mile-an-hour B–70 bomber program because before this plane could be put into quantity production we would already possess a missile fleet expected to be less vulnerable to attack.

These are both hard decisions, and one can only hope that those who must take the responsibility for them have used sound judgment and the best technical knowledge. But what about virtual abandonment of the nuclear plane, which Representative MELVIN PRICE calls a "tragic error"? There may be a case for dropping it as a military project, and Mr. McNamara is quite right in questioning whether defense projects should be pursued solely for prestige value. But the administration needs to ask itself what its attitude toward a nuclear plane would be if the Russians should put one in the air 2 or 3 years hence. In such event, would not the Nation berate itself for permitting the Soviets to score another scientific victory like orbiting the first satellite?

It seems to us the administration ought to consider seriously a full-scale development of the nuclear plane under nonmilitary auspices, instead of letting the project go by default because the military can't use it.

Wasted Miracles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following recent editorial from the Iola Register. It has a good moral, and I am pleased to call it to the attention of my colleagues:

WASTED MIRACLES

The Russian man-in-space episode, however thoroughly expected, hits with a lot of impact.

"Around the world in 80 days." This man went around the world in 80 minutes. And came back alive, apparently without even a bruise.

There is no question that it is a tremendous human and scientific achievement, the forerunner of many others. Who can say how long it will be before every fancy that the space-fiction writers have been able to imagine will turn into actual fact?

There is no question either that Russia's stature as a leader in science and technology has been greatly enhanced throughout the world, and that ours has been lessened in proportion.

This was bound to happen. From the very first sputnik in 1957, Russia has been so far ahead in rocket booster power that for any other nation to catch up by 1961 was unthinkable.

But it is no more palatable on that account. The Ruskies put the first man in space. All we can do is give them credit.

Incidentally, the fact that the first sputnik was in October 1957—just 3½ years ago—is a reminder of the almost unbelievable pace of scientific advance these days. Miracles happen so fast we can barely comprehend one before another is upon us.

But I noticed in the Kansas City Times this morning, by pure coincidence, that the publisher of the Saturday Review in a speech at Jefferson City described our times

as "an age of wasted miracles." And it occurs to me that there could scarcely be a better label for this strange age in which we live.

We can defy the laws of gravity. We can turn man into a living satellite, whirling around the world in free orbit, then return him to his starting point in less than an hour and a half.

Surely this is a miracle.

But of what use is it so long as man can't live in amity with his neighbor across the street or a nation live in peace with its neighbor across the ocean?

What use is the miracle of a nuclear bomb which can burn with the heat of the sun and explode with the force of a thousand bolts of lightning if its only destiny is to destroy its makers?

"Wasted miracles." That's the age we live in.

And it's the age we will continue to live in until that final miracle of peace and good will among all mankind comes about.

Federal Aid to Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Des Moines (Iowa) Register of April 9, 1961, emphasizes some of the points which some of my colleagues and I have been saying about the controversy of Federal aid to education. One is on the matter of need and the other is Federal control. The editorial covers these points very well and under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to bring this editorial to the attention of the Members:

FEDERAL AID TO SCHOOLS

The argument about whether the Federal Government can or should provide low-cost loans to parochial schools is tending to divert attention from the major question of Federal aid to education.

Obviously the proposal for parochial school aid raises an important constitutional issue. But the major question is whether the school system, either public or private, should receive general support from the Federal Government.

Readers of this page must know that we have long favored increased spending from both public and private sources on all levels of education. With a rapidly expanding school population, it is obvious that more money will have to be spent for both buildings and salaries. But it is not clear that this money must come from the Federal Government.

There is evidence to suggest that the need for Federal aid has been exaggerated and the dangers minimized.

Two questions need to be explored. One is the matter of need. How many States are unable to finance satisfactory school systems? There is no indication that Iowa is financially unable to handle all of its primary and secondary school needs, although Iowa is not one of the richest States in per capita income. It is true that this State will have to spend more on education in the future, but Iowa will get more buildings for its tax dollars if the taxes are collected and spent here than if the Federal Government collects the money here and sends it back to the State.

We suspect that most of the other States, although admittedly not all of them, are also able to handle their own school problems.

The second question which needs exploring, and a much more important one, is whether Federal support of the school system will also mean Federal control. Despite many well-meant arguments to the contrary, it seems inescapable that if the Federal Government contributes substantial support to the school system, there inevitably will be Federal restrictions on how the money is spent. Indeed, there should be. No governmental body should spend taxpayers' money without supervision of how it is spent.

The realistic question is whether Federal control or Federal influence over education is desirable. It can be argued that this provides a way to raise educational standards, but the danger inherent in subjecting the educational system to centralized control outweighs this possible advantage.

It may be that the Federal Government is less likely to abuse educational freedom than some State legislatures or town school boards, but Federal control would be universal. The pressure groups that want to control the schools now are scattered and relatively ineffective in a diversely operated system.

There are sound arguments in favor of Federal aid for those few States whose per capita income is sharply below the national average. But this is not the type of Federal aid proposed by the administration. President Kennedy's program would furnish assistance to all States, rich and poor, both for teachers' salaries and for buildings.

The primary question is not whether aid should be provided for private schools as well as public. The primary question is whether the Federal Government should be providing aid of this type for either.

Federal Loans to Private Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks, I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent brief regarding the constitutionality of the enactment of legislation by the Congress providing for loans to elementary and secondary private schools, including parochial schools of all religious denominations.

This brief was prepared at my request by Charles S. Sullivan, Jr., an outstanding lawyer, former trial attorney and Special Assistant to the U.S. Attorney General, Department of Justice.

The brief is both exhaustive and comprehensive and indicates that such legislation would be well within the framework of constitutional limitations.

The submission of this legal dissertation is timely due to the tremendous need for the education of all our children in this country, in view of the present world crisis.

The brief follows:

APRIL 13, 1961.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Majority Leader, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: You ask me whether or not Congress is authorized, under law, to enact legislation providing for loans to elementary and secondary private educational institutions, including parochial schools of all religious denominations.

Two issues appear involved requiring consideration, in order to ascertain an answer to the question presented: (1) Whether the term "loan" constitutes support within the meaning of the law, and (2) Whether such an act would be violative of the U.S. Constitution.

I

A loan is the delivery of money, article or property to another for temporary use, with a promise, either express or implied, to return the same. The promise to repay the money or return the object borrowed is absolute, and such obligation continues to exist so long as whatever is involved remains in the custody or possession of the borrower. In C. J. S., vol. 54, page 656, it is defined as follows: "A loan is temporary, a temporary letting for a temporary use. It is essential that it be returnable. The borrower expressly or impliedly promises to return the thing lent. A loan implies an obligation to repay."

This same definition is also restated in *Rae* v. *Cameron* (114 P. 2d 1060 at 1062); *Northern Mining Corp.* v. *Trunz* (124 F 2d 14 at 17); and *Nicholas* v. *Fearson* (32 U.S. 103 at 109).

The case of *Beard* v. *Baxter* (258 Ill. App. 340 at 347), in defining a loan, made the following comment: "A loan implies a promise to repay, and the promise to repay is absolute."

The court of appeals (2d circuit), while speaking of a loan in the case of *In re Grand Union Co., N.Y.* (219 F. 2d 353 at 356) contains the identical statement quoted above in *Beard* v. *Baxter, supra,* and further says that the promise to repay must be unconditional and free of contingency if the transaction is to be construed as a loan.

"In its popular sense, a loan of money is understood to mean a transaction creating the customary relation of borrower and lender, in which the money is borrowed for a fixed time, and the borrower promises to repay the amount borrowed at a stated time, in the future, with the interest at a fixed rate" (*Bannock County* v. *Citizens Bank and Trust Company* (32 P. 2d 674)). (See also *Bankers Mortgage Company v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue* (114 F. 2d 130 at 131); *Alworth-Washburn Company* v. *Holvering* (67 F. 2d 694 at 696).)

The most concise and inclusive definition of a loan, containing all the conditions necessary for a transaction to come within the purview of the term, is expressed in the opinion of the court in *Milana* v. *Credit Discount Company* (163 P. 2d 869 at 871): "A loan, on the other hand, is the delivery of the sum of money to another under a contract to return at some future time an equivalent amount with or without an additional amount agreed upon for its use; and if such be the intent of the parties the transaction will be deemed a loan regardless of its form."

It is therefore obvious that money delivered by one to another under an agreement, either express or implied, to return the amount involved at a future date, constitutes a loan in the legal sense of the word notwithstanding whatever attempt might be made to construe the transaction otherwise.

"Support," on the other hand, in the financial sense of the word, is to supply funds for the maintenance of something for the purpose of continuing whatever may be involved (*Board of Commissioners of Logan County* v. *State* (254 P. 71)). It is the furnishing of funds for the sustenance and the means of continuing (Opinion of Justices (13 Fla. 687 at 689)).

The term neither includes nor embraces an understanding to return the money delivered, due to the very nature of its defi-

nitions, and the interpretation of the word placed upon it by both State and Federal courts (*Great Western Power Company* v. *Industrial Accident Commission* (218 P. 1069); *NLRB* v. *Valentine Sugars* (211 F. 2d 317); *Visser* v. *Nooksack* (207 P. 2d 205); *Paquin Ltd.* v. *Nestervelt* (106 A. 766); (Opinion of Justices, supra)). "Support" is a contribution to the one to whom it is given, and the term "contribution" for support is a common phrase found in the respective opinions of our courts (see *Great Western Power Company* v. *Industrial Accident Commission, supra*). "Taxes imposed upon the people by a local, State, or Federal Government are laws for the support of the particular Government."

It appears from the discussion in this opinion that "support" is the outright furnishing of funds or means to the recipient, unaccompanied by any agreement, express or implied, to return or repay the same.

In *State* v. *Blandson* (148 P. 28), the court in defining "support" stated that the term referred to "appropriations for current expenses, maintenance, upkeep, continuation of existing functions, as well as appropriations for such new buildings and conveniences as may be necessary to meet the needs and requirements of the State in relation to its existing institutions."

The two words are so distinguishable in their legal connotations that the vast difference was recognized by the court of appeals (5th circuit), in the case of *National Labor Relations Board* v. *Valentine Sugars, supra*, when it held that the loan of money for expenses by an officer of the company to an officer of the labor organization does not constitute "support."

According to the evidence in the above case, an employer loaned his car and money for expenses to the officers of a union to make a trip to a nearby city to consult with the regional officers of the Labor Board. The petitioners sought an order directing the employers to cease contributing to the support of the labor union, contending that the foregoing loan was, in reality, support and therefore in violation of the National Labor Relations Act. The court said in answer to this argument, on the facts just recited: "In the state of the record * * * these acts alone cannot fairly and justly support a finding that the independent (union) was supported or its administration interfered with as prohibited by the act * * *."

In view of the cases cited and the definitions of the words contained in the opinions of the respective courts, it may accurately be said in the language of *Milana* v. *Credit Discount Co., supra*, if money is delivered by one to another with an agreement, either express or implied, to return the amount at some future date, the transaction will be deemed a loan regardless of its form.

II

Would such an act violate the U.S. Constitution?

The 1st and 14th amendments become relevant to this inquiry, and necessitate an examination of the pertinent judicial opinions, in order to obtain the intent of the respective provisions. The applicable clause of the 1st amendment provides "Congress shall make no law respecting establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; * * *" and that of the 14th amendment states: "* * * No State shall make * * *, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the law. * * *"

At the outset of this discussion, it must be emphasized that all acts and statutes enacted by a legislative body are presumed to be lawful (*U.S.* v. *Di Re* (332 U.S. 581); *Davies Warehouse Co.* v. *Bowles* (321 U.S. 144); until held otherwise by the courts, *State* v. *Martin* (139 N.E. 282); *McPherson* v. *Blacker* (146 U.S. 1)); and no body or tribunal has the power to decisively declare an act of Congress to be illegal except the U.S. Supreme Court (*U.S.* v. *Reynolds* (235 U.S. 133); *Gelpcke* v. *Dubuque* (1 Wall. 175); *Pennekamp* v. *Florida* (328 U.S. 331, 11 Am. Jur. 740)).

This principle is, and always has been the law of the land since the ratification of the U.S. Constitution. Article 3, section 1, of the Constitution provides that "the judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court, and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish."

Section 2 of the same article provides, among other things, that "the judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States * * *."

The foregoing sections of article 3 leave no doubt as to which branch of Government is authorized to determine the legality of an act. The authors of the Constitution made their intentions abundantly clear, in the above clauses, that the jurisdiction for the determination of legal issues should be confined to the courts.

The U.S. Supreme Court has held, in several cases, that the 14th makes the prohibition of the 1st amendment applicable to State laws regarding the right of exercising the freedom of religion (*Cantwell* v. *Connecticut* (310 U.S. 296); *Jamison* v. *Texas* (318 U.S. 413); *Follett* v. *McCormick* (321 U.S. 573); *Marsh* v. *Alabama* (326 U.S. 501)); and in the case of *Everson* v. *Board of Education of Ewing TP et al.* (330 U.S. 1, at p. 15) said: "The broad meaning given the amendment by these earlier cases has been accepted by this Court in its decisions concerning an individual's religious freedom since the 14th amendment was interpreted to make the prohibitions of the 1st applicable to State action abridging religious freedom."

Thus the two amendments become interwoven in legal controversies such as the subject under discussion and must be considered together in order to reach an accurate conclusion.

It is well-established law that the first amendment of the Constitution had the same objective and intent to provide the same protection against governmental interference in religious liberty as the Virginia statute enacted on January 19, 1786. The relevant section of this act recites: "That no man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place, or ministry whatsoever * * *" (*Watson* v. *Jones* (13 Wall. 679); *Reynolds* v. *United States* (98 U.S. 145)).

Both Madison and Jefferson, who are the recognized leaders in the drafting and adoption of the Virginia statute of 1786, and the first amendment of the U.S. Constitution, intended the object of the statute and the amendment to be the same. It was held in the case of *Reynolds* v. *United States, supra*, that the provisions of the first amendment, in the drafting and adoption of which Madison and Jefferson played such leading roles, had the same objective and were intended to provide the same protection against governmental intrusion in religious liberty as the Virginia statute; and at page 164, the Court said: "In the words of Jefferson, the clause against establishment of religion by law was intended to erect 'a wall of separation between church and State.'" What was the actual meaning of Jefferson's declaration as quoted in the above case?

Taking into consideration the prevailing circumstances of that period in which Jefferson made the statement, it seems clear from his own conduct, he could not have intended that his words be construed in a strict literal sense. There is neither legal nor historical evidence of record revealing any objection by Jefferson to the requirement of taking an oath by a President-elect as a condition precedent to assuming that office, nor to any other public office requiring an oath, nor to the motto, "In God We Trust," imprinted on U.S. coins. At the time of his declaration, almost every colony imposed some type of tax on the people for church support, due to the existence of State religions. It is a historical fact that the people of Virginia, North Carolina, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, Maryland, and New Hampshire were compelled by law to contribute to the State in the form of taxes for the support of churches, clergymen and the construction of churches for the particular religious denomination favored by the respective States (see footnote 8, p. 10, *Everson* v. *Board of Education of Ewing TP et al., supra*). It was this existing condition that Jefferson and Madison so strenuously objected to, the abolition of which they desired and eventually realized by the passage of the Virginia statute and the adoption of the first amendment.

The Supreme Court has consistently sustained legislative appropriations enacted for the welfare of the people and the education of children. Even though the money derived from this particular type of legislation might pass to an institution under the operation and control of a certain religious denomination administering such service, it has been held to be within the legal confines of the taxing power of the State when imposed for a public purpose (*Bradford* v. *Roberts* (175 U.S. 291); *Cochran* v. *Louisiana Board of Education* (231 U.S. 370); *Quick Bear* v. *Leupp* (210 U.S. 50)). The Court has further ruled that a law does not have a private rather than a public purpose simply because tax money will be used to reimburse individuals for money they have spent in a manner which furthers a public program (*Everson* v. *Board of Education*, supra).

In the case of *Bradford* v. *Roberts*, supra, an attempt was made to enjoin the Federal Government from paying money to a Catholic hospital in Washington, D.C., contending that this constituted an establishment of religion in violation of the first amendment. Any person regardless of race, color or creed was admitted to the hospital who required treatment. The Court held that the hospital was a secular institution notwithstanding that all the members of the corporation were of a religious order of the Catholic faith. It was said in the course of the Court's opinion in reference to this hospital: "Although its individual members might all be members of a religious order of the Roman Catholic Church, this would not characterize the hospital as a religious or sectarian body."

Regardless of whether the policy of a legislative body meets the objections of a number of people, the courts will not interfere unless the legislation is in violation of the Constitution, and in the absence of such an offense, its policies are not reviewable by the judiciary. It was said by the Supreme Court in *United States* v. *Butler* (297 U.S. 1): "The policy of a legislative body is not subject to review where an act does not violate the Constitution" (see also *Williams* v. *Baltimore* (289 U.S. 36); *Wabash Valley Electric Co.* v. *Young* (287 U.S. 488); *Buchanan* v. *Warley* (245 U.S. 60)).

The fact that a statute might create a new political concept, necessitated by conditions of the times, does not detract from the power of Congress to enact such a law as evidenced by the Court's statement in *United States* v. *Union Pacific R.R. Co.* (160 U.S. 1): "In determining the validity of a statute the courts can consider only the legislative power to enact it, and if this power exists, it is their duty to give effect to the will of the legislature."

The problem of education for children in this country has been of great concern and is more so today, due to the great expansion in population. Both legislative bodies and the courts are agreed on this matter as may be seen from the comment of the Court in

Everson v. *Board of Education, supra,* in commenting on a remedial statute enacted by the New Jersey Legislature for the benefit of parochial scchoolchildren as well as those attending public schools. It was said in this case at page 7: "It is much too late to argue that legislation intended to facilitate the opportunity of children to get a secular education serves no public purposes (*Cochran* v. *Louisiana State Board of Education* (281 U.S. 370))."

As early as 1896, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Francis E. Leupp, decided to make a contract with a Roman Catholic organization for the education of children of the Sioux Tribe. The children were to receive their education at St. Francis Mission School on the Rosebud Indian Reservation in the State of South Dakota. The money was to be paid to the Bureau of Catholic Indian Missions. Action was brought by one Quick Bear, a member of the Tribe, to enjoin the execution of the contract on the ground that it was illegal (*Quick Bear* v. *Leupp,* supra). In dismissing the action, the Supreme Court made the following comment: "Some reference is made to the Constitution in respect to this contract with the Bureau of Catholic Indian Missions. It is not contended that it is unconstitutional, and it could not be."

It is obvious the money was to be spent by the Government for a public purpose since it was to be used to educate the Sioux children in accordance with the treaty signed by the United States and the Sioux Nation in 1868.

In the State of Louisiana, the textbooks, excluding religious books, are supplied to both public and parochial schoolchildren at the expense of the State. The law authorizing this expenditure has been tested in the U.S. Supreme Court as to whether it violated the Federal Constitution. It was held to be well within the framework of lawful limits of legislative power in the following words of the Court: "This legislation does not segregate private schools or their pupils as its beneficiaries, * * *. Its interest is education broadly; its method comprehensive. Individual interests are aided only as the common interest is safeguarded."

Answering the question whether this action by the State of Louisiana offended the 14th amendment, the Court continued: The 14th amendment did not strip the State of the power to meet problems previously left for individual solution" (*Davidson* v. *New Orleans,* (96 U.S. 97); *Barbier* v. *Connolly,* (113 U.S. 27); *Fallbrook Irrigation District Commission* v. *Bradley* (164 U.S. 112)).

In discussing the intent of the prohibition against the establishment of a religion by Congress, as provided in the first amendment, the Supreme Court said, in the majority opinion, in the case of *Everson* v. *Board of Education,* supra: "The 'establishment of religion' clause of the first amendment means at least this: Neither a State nor the Federal Government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, or prefer one religion over another. Neither can force nor influence a person to go to or to remain away from church against his will or force him to profess a belief or disbelief in any religion. No person can be punished for entertaining or professing religious beliefs or disbeliefs, for church attendance or nonattendance. No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion. Neither a State nor the Federal Government can, openly or secretly, participate in the affairs of any religious organizations or groups and vice versa. In the words of Jefferson, the clause against establishment of religion by law was intended to erect 'a wall of separation between Church and State.'"

Again "support" of any religious activity obtained by taxes levied upon the people is stressed, as it was by Jefferson, with the admonition that everyone must remain free in the choice of a religious belief, from interference by either the Federal or State Governments.

Query. Was it ever the intention of the authors of the U.S. Constitution to erect an impenetrable wall between church and state?

If the daily convening of Congress which is commenced with prayer, the payment of chaplains in the Armed Forces with Government funds, and many other instances in which the Government participates, in addition to the foregoing cases discussed, are a criteria, the answer, obviously, is in the negative.

Although the question presented has never been determined by the Supreme Court, the cases reviewed under the first issue clearly distinguish the difference between the legal connotations of the terms "loan" and "support," rendering each of the words incompatible with the other.

In answer to the second issue, based upon the conclusion in part I, and the material disclosed under part II, it would appear that a congressional act authorizing the Federal Government to issue loans to private schools, including parochial institutions, for the advancement of a secular education for the benefit of children, would be for a public purpose and well within the confines of constitutional limitations.

Respectfully submitted.

CHARLES S. SULLIVAN, Jr.

A Smalltown Banker Talks About Business Conditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHIL WEAVER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to call the attention of my colleagues a very interesting, penetrating discourse on business conditions of today by one of the best qualified men I know. Mr. Vincent E. Rossiter of Hartington, Nebr., is a banker and a businessman. He is also a close observer of the current economic scene and his thoughts along this line are therefore important.

Mr. Rossiter, perhaps more than most, speaks for the businessman whose livlihood is directly dependent upon our farmers—the smalltown businessmen who live in an agricultural area where commercial farming is the rule. His viewpoint is typically that of the Midwest where he has served his customers and the people of Hartington and surrounding area for so many years.

However, transplant Mr. Rossiter into almost any area whose economy is based, as is that of Nebraska, upon prosperous agriculture, and I think his words would be the same, his outlook identical.

Mr. Rossiter was recently interviewed by the magazine, U.S. News & World Report. I would like to include that interview at this point in the RECORD:

A SMALLTOWN BANKER LOOKS AT BUSINESS AT THE GRASSROOTS

(NOTE.—Vincent E. Rossiter is president of the Bank of Hartington, in Hartington, Nebr., a town of 1,650. Mr. Rossiter grew up in the banking business. His father kept the family bank open during depression days of the 1930's "by the skin of his teeth." Now 46, Mr. Rossiter describes himself as "just a little banker from Nebraska." He is a member of a special committee set up in 1960 by the Nebraska Legislature to look into research for new uses of farm products.)

Now that more and more economists are predicting a business recovery, how do things look to a country banker—a man who sees business at the grassroots? From his bank in Hartington, Nebr., Vincent E. Rossiter sees this picture: Farmers still cutting back, pulling their belts even tighter. Businessmen in farm neighborhoods hurt as reduced profits have to be spread thinner over their communities. In this exclusive interview, Mr. Rossiter measures the trends of the present and concludes that, unless there are basic changes in rural America, the recovery now predicted is going to run out of steam.

Question. Mr. Rossiter, how is business out in your part of the country?

Answer. It's stable and probably a little better than it was a year ago.

Question. Is there much optimism among farmers?

Answer. If there's any optimism, it's very reserved. Certainly they're feeling fairly good, because their volume and cash receipts have remained about the same compared to last year. If their net has dropped a little, most of them feel that this is only temporary.

Question. Do you mean the farmers are long-term optimists?

Answer. We're wishful by nature, I think, in the United States—always looking for that pot of gold at the end of the rainbow. Farmers are not different from the rest of us.

Question. Is the farm economy moving ahead or slipping behind in your part of the Midwest?

Answer. Our deposits have been relatively stable, and, of course, this is an indication of stability in the profit level of the community. However, on the other hand, our loans rise every year, on the average, which indicates that some people are covering their lack of income and lack of profit with borrowed money.

Question. If your deposits have made no gains in a period when the country has grown tremendously, is this a relative loss?

Answer. You're suggesting that we've got to run to stand still, if we are going to grow with the rest of the economy. Well, we haven't had any growth.

Question. Is that situation generally true of other banks in midwestern rural areas?

Answer. Yes. Theoretically, had the rural areas enjoyed the same expansion that has been enjoyed in other areas, every bank in the Middle West should be twice as big as it is—filled up with money that has been earned by its depositors. This has happened in some other areas in the United States.

Question. Are you losing farmers in your area?

Answer. Nebraska has lost fewer farmers in the past 10 years than any of the other States in the 10th Federal Reserve District, which includes Colorado, Kansas, Nebraska, Wyoming, and parts of Missouri, New Mexico, and Oklahoma. We've lost about 10 percent, and Cedar County, of which Hartington is the county seat, has had the least loss of any county in Nebraska.

So I feel we have a very stable farm economy in our particular area. But, in spite of this, of the 259 farmer property statements (records of assets and liabilities) that I took from September to December of 1960, only 7 had an increase in net worth. Less than 3 percent of my customers are showing any progress or gain.

Question. What type of farming area are you in?

Answer. We're right on the western edge of the Corn Belt. Our area is diversified—principally corn, hogs, and cattle—but we also have more milk cows in Cedar County than any other Nebraska county.

Question. What happened to the remainder of the 259 farmers from whom you took property statements?

Answer. Their losses ranged from $200 to $300 to the extreme of $4,000 to $5,000.

One of the exceptions to the trend was a man who had $100,000 worth of land, $20,000 worth of farm equipment, and $40,000 worth of livestock and grain. He showed an appreciation of $7,000 in his property statement. Now, that's less than 5 percent return on his $160,000 investment.

So this man got nothing for his depreciation. He had to write that off someplace else. He received no wages for himself or his two big boys or his willing wife who quite often helps him. He received nothing for his management.

Now, he's living and he's calling this interest on his investment "income," and he's not too unhappy. But he's smart enough not to buy the new equipment that he needs and would buy now—he told me $25,000 worth—until he can see something besides interest on his investment. He owed us only $7,000, so obviously he's not in any danger of going broke. He's not a little, inefficient farmer.

Another case I had was a farmer who also had off-the-farm income amounting to $12,000 last year, and a $4,000 appreciation on his property statement, which indicated he had socked $8,000 of his outside earnings into his farming operation.

Question. When you say these farmers are living off depreciation, do you mean that they're not putting aside enough money to maintain their farms and keep their investments up?

Answer. Yes. A good example is the young man who came in last November and said, "I'm going to have a sale." I said, "You're kidding. You've been going a little contrary to the general trend. You're going to have a half section of ground—320 acres—clear the first of January; aren't you?"

"Yes; I am."

"Lord, man, what better could you ask from an industry?"

He said, "Who are you kidding? You know how I got that half section of land."

"No," I said, "I don't know."

"Well, I bought the home place, a quarter section, from the folks, and I got it cheap. I had it paid for by 1950. Then I made a little more money in the early 1950s and I bought this other quarter for $16,000. Now, I'll have that paid for by the first of the year.

"But during this 15-year period I haven't spent a penny for improvements. It'll take $5,000 just to put new boards and new nails where the old ones fell off. I've worn out a complete set of farm equipment. I'll have to go to four-row equipment, where I was getting by with two-row, because my teenage boys have grown up and moved away. That will cost around $10,000.

"Now, should I go out and mortgage my farm again to finance $15,000 for improvements and equipment, or shall I sell out now, rent my farm and go into town and get into some kind of business? That way, I could eke out a living and let the farm take care of itself until times get better."

Question. What did he do?

Answer. He had a sale in February of this year. This is a 42-year-old farmer. His reasoning was that, if he stayed on the farm, bought the machinery and made the improvements, he would depreciate the whole thing again in 10 years while he paid off the loan on the land. He would again have a clear halfsection, with a set of wornout machinery and buildings that needed repair, and he'd be 52 years old. And they're having a little trouble getting jobs at 40.

Question. Who bought this man's land?

Answer. He didn't sell the land. He kept the land, and it's supposed to pay the taxes. It's leased to a nephew who is borrowing 10 milk cows from his dad. Dad will get half the cream check for the loan of the cows. By working for his dad, he bought a tractor. He'll borrow equipment from his dad and dad-in-law.

Now, this young fellow thinks he's going to farm this halfsection without borrowing any money. But it's hard to see how he's going to make ends meet, because he doesn't have enough invested, so he can't live off interest and he can't live off depreciation.

Question. And there's a hidden cost there in the use of this borrowed equipment—

Answer. Oh, definitely. And somebody's likely to lose part of his crop because, when harvest comes, there just wont be enough machinery to go around and get the job done in time.

Question. What's the effect of all this on Main Street? Are you having any business failures?

Answer. Well, yes and no. We've had no bankruptcies. We've lost an auto dealer since the first of the year. In an adjoining town, an implement dealer just locked his door one Saturday night and said, "I'm through." He left unfinished work in his shop and told them to come and get it and drag it out, that he was tired of repairing their damned machinery and carrying it on the books.

Every time we lose 10 or 12 farmers from our community, we lose the people who would spend the income to sustain one average-size, smalltown business—roughly $100,000.

Question. But aren't the remaining farmers running bigger farms and spending more money?

Answer. Well, no. They'll spend more money for operating costs, but 10 fewer farm families means 35 fewer people to buy shoes and groceries and overalls and shirts. This hurts a community.

I suppose we should number our business houses and say, "All right, No. 10, it's your turn—you're done. We don't have the money to sustain you any longer," and then put a stick of dynamite under him and blow him up—inventory, family, and all.

This sounds kind of violent and, of course, I don't mean it literally, because the loss of a town family, by whatever means, is just as damaging to a community as the loss of a farm family. I'm only trying to illustrate that this is the only way a community could keep the remaining businesses relatively prosperous, and still not add to the unemployment situation.

But instead of that, nobody knows who is supposed to go, so everybody stays, and we spread this smaller profit over the community just a little thinner, with the consequence that everybody is operating on less profit.

Question. Your bank seems to be doing fairly well. Didn't you do an extensive remodeling job recently?

Answer. We bankers have never had it so good. We're cleaning up because the farmers are coming in to borrow everything we've got to lend. I've got 150 new borrowers coming in—driven in by the low-price level in agriculture. It's increased our loan volume to a record high. Naturally, our income has gone up. If I didn't think it through, I could be real happy.

Question. What do you see when you think it through?

Answer. Well, you can't collect bank loans from people in an orderly manner unless they are earning a profit. I know that; I'm in the banking business. Loans in my own bank have increased every year on the average since 1951. My deposits have been relatively stable for 4 or 5 years.

And I watch my customers bring in their savings bonds and deposit them to their accounts—not earned income, but income earned in other periods—to stabilize my deposits. But I know that, ultimately, my deposits are going to decline, and, as they do, I'm going to curtail my correspondent accounts with city banks. As I do that, their loan ratios are going to go up out of proportion to what they are now. And, according to one economist, they're already at historically high levels.

Now, when the credit is eliminated in our economy, and if we haven't restored the earned income, we cannot sell the goods and we're going to have another depression.

We're dangerously close, in my opinion, to a point where, one of these days, I'm going to have somebody walk in with a $60,000 property statement and say, "Vince, I need $2,000." And I'm going to have to say, "I'm sorry. We're not loaning any money because we're not getting any back."

Now, this is going to happen in metropolitan areas before it happens in the rural areas, because of the natural conservatism in the rural areas and the more liquid position of the banks there. When it happens in the metropolitan areas, it won't make any difference how much money there is out in the country. We just won't be able to bail out the Nation, because the top 300 banks in the country—about 2 percent—control more than 50 percent of the total deposits of all banks.

What we've been doing in these recession periods is liquidating manufactured goods inventory to get the money back. The day we can't liquidate manufactured goods inventory out of these industrial and rural areas, and the money doesn't come back to the banks, then we're going to be in serious trouble.

Question. Are you saying that the country is headed for a farm-led and farm-fed depression?

Answer. The fact is that, for 10 years, we've been using the agricultural segment of the economy as a tail on the kite of the whole economy to stabilize it. We've been depressing farm prices to offset inflation in other areas.

The Joint Economic Committee of Congress made a study of this in 1956, when there was kind of an abrupt jump of the wholesale prices index. An economist in the Agriculture Department testified that, yes, they knew this was going on. They knew that they were offsetting a decline in farm prices with a rise in industrial goods, which was resulting in an approximate stability in the wholesale prices index. They called in William McChesney Martin of the Federal Reserve Board, and he said, "Yes," he knew that. They asked him if it would be inflationary if farm prices should rise. He said, "It's certainly something we don't want to contemplate."

As it is now, you've got a farm price level that's down here at around 89 or 90 percent of 1947–49 at wholesale, with an industrial-goods price level at 128 percent of the same base period.

So, you're giving the farmer a 70-cent dollar and telling him to buy a dollar's worth of goods, which he cannot do.

That 70-cent dollar is not only the farmer's income, it has to flow through these small-community businesses. They are nothing but the tool of distribution. They buy things from manufacturers, set them on the floor or the shelf, and sell them to farmers and to people in the community who are making their money working for the merchants who sell goods and services to farmers. We're all farmers.

You just can't get away from the fact that your farm income provides the reciprocal market for manufactured goods.

AFFECTED: A THIRD OF UNITED STATES

Question. Aren't you giving too much weight to the farm market in our economy? Agriculture accounts for a much smaller proportion of our national income today than it did two or three decades ago.

Answer. But what the economists overlook is the fact that a large percentage of business and industry still is dependent on the farm market. In the communities of 5,000 population and under, and on the farms surrounding these communities, you have 35 percent of the Nation's population, people earning their income directly and indirectly from agriculture: either directly, in the production of agricultural commodities—or indirectly, in the business of providing goods and services for agriculture. We have permitted this rural market to lag, behind while the balance of the economy has nearly doubled its income since the 1947–49 period.

Question. What do you think should be done?

Answer. It's utterly clear to me. It's a question of whether or not we want to purchase prosperity by restoring a parity of income in the agricultural rural areas. We can go on stimulating the overall economy by needling it, by advancing payments, by doing all the things that the administration is doing now. But, unless we restore this earned income in the farm economy, there won't be anything coming along behind the temporary improvement to sustain a real recovery.

We've knocked the socks off one segment of our economy. There's no way you can create another segment of business that will restore overall health to the national economy as rapidly as just bringing the income up to a parity level in agriculture.

Question. Would you do that by raising Government price supports?

Answer. That's right. This is the quickest way, and time is running out.

Question. A number of farm economists are predicting that increases in price supports for farm products and other actions taken by the Kennedy administration will increase net farm income by around a billion dollars this year. If they are right, will this solve the farmer's problem?

Answer. It can hardly solve the problem, for the simple reason that this billion or so of additional net income is less than 10 percent of the increase that farmers would have had if their net income had been growing in proportion with other segments of the national income. It may alleviate the situation a bit, but it certainly doesn't solve anything.

Question. Will this predicted increase in net income help rural businessmen?

Answer. It's bound to have some benefit up and down Main Street—a billion dollars is going to make some difference. But it's one of these "too little, too late" propositions. We're not moving fast enough in the right direction.

A WAY TO CUT SURPLUSES

Question. With price supports where they are, farmers now are producing too much. What happens if we raised supports to a higher level?

Answer. I think we'd have less trouble with surpluses. The fact is that, when farm prices have been highest, production has been lowest. And when prices are the lowest, production is greatest. The farmer reacts just like you would. If you weren't making enough money to support your family at the job you have, you'd be out on some moonlighting job, like driving a cab at night.

Now, the farmer hasn't got this opportunity. All he can do is expand production. So he plows up the brome-grass pasture where he had his beef cows and plants the land to grain, and goes to milking dairy cows, because it gives him a weekly income. They do everything—raise more chickens, produce more eggs, more everything—trying to maintain their income with increased production.

The midwestern farmer that I know has a built-in panic button which goes off when the grass begins to get green in the spring, right about now. He works furiously and without regard for the number of hours each day or each week, from planting time in the spring until harvest time in the fall—approximately 7 months of the year. Then, not by choice but because of the nature of his business, he relaxes through the winter months.

Even during this period of relaxation he has more, or less, chores to do every day, 7 days a week, in order to process the fruits of his harvest through livestock and poultry and into the marketplace. During the rush season he easily works as many hours, in 7 months, as does the average office worker or factory worker—to say nothing of the banker—in 12 months, at 40 hours per week. And then he works half as many hours more in the 5 winter months remaining.

If you raise the prices, let them get the banker off their back, you'll see the "relaxingest" bunch of people in this world, and they'll cut back production automatically.

Question. That would be subsidizing laziness then. You increase their income by letting them work less——

Answer. I don't consider a fair profit a subsidy, to agriculture or any other industry. The midwestern farmer, the farmer that I know, is working 1½ times as long as the average 40-hour-a-week laborer in industry, for considerably less money—for 75 cents an hour. They have to in order to sustain themselves, you see.

Question. Do you really think farmers will relax, if they can afford to?

Answer. Sure, I do. Let me illustrate what I mean. They enjoy recreation just like the rest of us, and they are willing to take the time and to pay the price when they can afford it.

The other day, a farmer came in and said to my vice president, "Edgar, I've got to pay my taxes."

Ed said, "How much are they?"

"Three hundred and sixty dollars—2 years' taxes."

Ed said, "You've waited 2 years. We better wait 6 months more and see if you're going to get a crop."

"No," he said, "I've got to get them paid today."

So we fixed him up for his taxes and said, "Now, tell us, what's the big rush?"

So he told us, "You know, I can't get my boat license unless I pay my taxes." The boat license was 8 bucks, and the fishing was awful good that day, and it had been for several weeks.

Question. Wouldn't it help if there were fewer farmers? Wouldn't that give the ones who are left a better income from a larger, more efficient operation?

Answer. Well, we've been moving them off the farms at a rapid rate. Theoretically, this should leave a bigger piece of the pie for those who are left. But the facts are that the people who are remaining and who have extended themselves to increase their size, by assuming the other man's land, in many cases are extending themselves beyond the limits of their credit. These people now are in the worst condition of any segment of agriculture. So size apparently isn't the answer.

If you are producing at a loss, the more you produce, the more you lose. This is happening to some farmers. For example, corn at a dollar a bushel is a loss item on the farm unless it can be turned into pork and beef and poultry and milk. And the poor devil who is grain farming now, according to U.S. Department of Agriculture figures, earned about 2 cents an hour for his trouble last year.

SQUEEZE ON FAMILY FARMS

Question. Aren't there some cases where consolidation of farms does produce a more economical operating unit?

Answer. Up to a point—up to the limits of the family labor. The minute you start hiring help, you becouse uneconomical again.

If you hire a man and pay him $2,400 a year, and you are earning a 20-percent margin of profit on your gross, then you have to have five times his salary—or $12,000—in increased gross income just to earn his wages. So, if it takes an extra quarter section to earn his wages, then you've got to go to an extra half section before you make any headway. So, you reach a point of diminishing returns here, after you've utilized your family labor. And family labor is the most efficient farm operation, bar none—because it's so cheap and readily available.

Question. Is it the corporate farm that makes the big leap? Is that what we're heading for?

Answer. That is where we will get the big leap. The family farmer isn't capable in most cases.

Question. Do corporate farms make money?

Answer. Well, you can get some idea from income tax figures put out by the Internal Revenue Service. I got them for 1957 and 1958.

At that time, a little more than a third of the farms owned and operated by individuals were paying no income tax. By comparison, 43 percent of the corporate farms were paying no income tax. Now, whether this is a matter of bookkeeping, or whether it reflects what is really going on in agriculture, I don't know.

Question. Of course, farmers have more tax loopholes than anybody else—

Answer. Oh, they have. But, even so, unless a farmer is paying income tax, he's going broke. He's just not able to sustain himself over the long haul. I've proved this in my own business.

Question. What is the wage for a hired hand in your area?

Answer. Around a dollar an hour for labor hired by the day. A full-time hired man gets $200 a month, or approximately $6 a day.

Question. And farmers aren't even able to afford that when their boys grow up and leave the farm?

Answer. That's right. The example is that man who decided to quit farming and rent his land. His two boys could go to town and get $50 or $60 a week working in a filling station or garage, and he couldn't afford to pay them that much. His next choice was to go to four-row equipment and do the job alone, or quit. So he quit.

Question. Couldn't he have gone ahead and bought the four-row equipment?

Answer. He could have, but he couldn't have paid for it at the profit level in farming today. That kind of equipment is clear out of line with the profit farmers are getting, and it's no trouble to see why. For example, from 1943 to 1952, farmers were getting around $1.42 a bushel for corn. During that period, the average wage in the manufacturing industry was $1.28 an hour.

Now, corn is selling in my hometown for 91 cents a bushel—this is No. 2 corn, and very little of our corn will grade that high. By comparison, the farmer is paying $2.32 for an hour's labor in industry.

So, that's how one side has gone up and the other has gone down, to put the farmer in distress. Maybe I should have called this young fellow who quit a coward. I'd like to challenge him and say, "Stay here and settle this thing instead of running." But he'd have been a damn fool to stay. I've got a lot of good customers who are foolish to remain on the farm at the prevailing profit level.

Question. Where do the people go when they leave the farm and the rural community?

Answer. Sioux City, Omaha, and points beyond. I've got four youngsters who are out of high school, and two out of college. One of them is working at Memphis, Tenn., for the Phi Mu fraternity. Another one is in California going to school. The third one is working for a bank in Sioux City. The fourth one is working in my bank. So I've managed to keep one out of four. This is a good average.

Question. Isn't this a transferring of wealth from one part of the country and one segment of the economy to another?

Answer. That's what it amounts to. We sustain the cost of raising the children and educating them, and then we export them. This is part of the reason why agricultural areas are retarded. We have the burdensome expense of producing a large part of the labor force for the rest of the economy, but have no way to recover our investment.

Of course, your people create wealth, so, as you lose people, you lose potential wealth. And this is what we're doing in Nebraska. There just is no way you can replace people; there is just no substitute for people.

IF THE THIRTIES ARE REPEATED

Question. If farmers are slipping as fast as you say they are, why aren't they more agitated?

Answer. Well, they're probably the most complacent people in the world—maybe the happiest, too; I don't know. They can cut back faster, farther, deeper, and they're not going to be agitated until Mr. Banker in the local community says, "I'm sorry, this is as far as we can go with you."

When it happens on a large scale, at the same time, then they are going to get the shotguns and the pitchforks out, and in my opinion, we'll see a recurrence of all the things that happened in the thirties, including the farm holiday, when milk was dumped in the road and a county judge was strung up over in Plymouth County in Iowa. They didn't quite hang the poor devil; they cut him down before it was too late.

"Old Man Rivers"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of the monthly national magazine the Officer, published by the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, refers briefly, but cogently, to the outstanding service being rendered this Nation in the field of national defense by one of the Members of this body.

We all respect and admire our colleague, the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS, of South Carolina.

All of us are concerned about the state of national defense. Each of us has a constitutional obligation to provide for national defense, and to help write legisislation prescribing regulations for the military services.

MENDEL RIVERS has been taking a lead in this field since he came to the House more than 20 years ago. He was a member of the former Naval Affairs Committee, and since its creation by statute, has been a senior member of the Armed Services Committee. He is one of the best informed citizens in the United States on the question of national defense.

All of us will join ROA, in its own dedicated assessment of national defense needs, in its recognition of MENDEL RIVERS.

He not only is a patriot, but a scholarly expert in the military field. He exemplifies the spirit of self-sacrifice which motivates all of the members of the Armed Services Committee in working day and night to make sure we have adequate military forces to protect this country, and thus to keep the peace.

Under unanimous consent, I include the editorial from the Officer magazine in the RECORD:

"OLD MAN RIVERS"

Everyone knows that MENDEL RIVERS is not an old man, but his manner of running the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Reserves is so deeply embedded in democratic processes, and so marked with his magnetic personality that we need to use the term to convey the affection in which he is held by those privileged to participate in deliberations with him.

Chairman RIVERS commended his committee's work on a stack of pending bills recently by announcing that his roundtable will be continued this year. He listened patiently to the formal presentations, and gave "all the time you want" to the freshman members who had searching questions to ask.

Then he squared away to rewrite the bills sentence by sentence. He told ROA's representatives to "come on up here and sit with the committee because we consider your views like ours when we get ready to decide these questions."

Congressman RIVERS is genuine, dedicated, and sincere. Coupled with the fact that he is one of the best informed men in the United States in his field, out of more than 20 years' service in officially dealing with the military, this makes him a great American in ROA's lexicon.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of April 15, 1961:

WASHINGTON REPORT BY CONGRESSMAN BRUCE ALGER, FIFTH DISTRICT, TEXAS

APRIL 15, 1961.

Two news item in the Nation's Capital this week involved my efforts to unite all forces in Congress and in the executive branch to get early approval and appropriation of funds for the Dallas Federal Center Building.

The first step was to challenge the statements attributed to the Speaker of the House, SAM RAYBURN, in a number of publications vowing political vengeance upon the people of Dallas County because they vote for me to represent them in Congress. In an exchange of letters, I asked the Speaker to confirm or deny the statements. You will note in the copies of the correspondence as reproduced on this page, he says such statements attributed to him are wholly untrue. Never to be forgotten is the fact that political reprisals or political and legislative intimidation with the taxpayers' money can never be prmitted or condoned in our society, for if so, at that moment our form of representative government would cease to exist, a far greater loss to all than any seeming temporary and expedient gain to a few.

Once we laid to rest the stories of political retaliation, and with congressional committees in session, there seemed to be no reason for further delay on the Dallas Federal Building. Therefore, at this time I have called upon the Speaker, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings of the House Committee on Public Works, and the Administrator of the General Services Administration to join me in bringing about the speedy approval of this project. This will mean better service, not only to the people of Dallas, but to all those of the great Southwest, and will benefit all our citizens through the saving of money to the taxpayers.

Because of the interest of Dallas people in this matter, I am reproducing all the correspondence involved in this newsletter.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 29, 1961.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
The Capitol,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Recently Newsweek magazine (the Periscope, p. 17, Mar. 20 issue) quoted you as follows:

"'If you want the House to do anything for Dallas, back someone else next time.' That's the blunt word Speaker SAM RAYBURN is sending Dallas influentials who supported BRUCE ALGER, the lone Republican in the Texas congressional delegation."

The National Review, page 5, March 4, under "At Home, Washington," says, "Speaker RAYBURN has told Dallas political leaders that unless they eliminate Mr. ALGER, not 1 cent of Federal money will go to the district."

Reprints of these articles are enclosed.

The implication of these statements goes to the heart of sound representative government, therefore, it is important that you confirm or deny these statements, at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely yours,

BRUCE ALGER.

THE SPEAKER'S ROOMS,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 31, 1961.

Hon. BRUCE ALGER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ALGER: When your letter of March 29, 1961, arrived this morning I telephoned its contents to Speaker RAYBURN in Bonham.

He asked me to advise you that he had already told Newsweek's Capitol correspondent, Sam Shaffer, that he had never made such a statement as is contained in the March 20 issue of Newsweek.

Furthermore, he categorically denies the statement attributed to him in the March 4 issue of the National Review.

Both of these statements attributed to the Speaker are untrue.

Sincerely yours,

D. B. HARDEMAN,
Research Assistant to the Speaker.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 11, 1961.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House, the Capitol, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Thank you for your prompt and forthright answer to my letter of March 29 concerning remarks attributed to you in certain publications.

It is good to know that we can continue to disagree politically but maintain mutual respect for the honesty and integrity of one another. Such respect is the solid foundation upon which our representative form of government is built. The people of Dallas County may now be certain that, although you and I will not always be in agreement on means, we both are dedicated to serving the people of our respective districts and the country as a whole.

In this spirit I now ask you to join me in doing all possible to end further delay in securing congressional reauthorization for the Federal Center Building in Dallas. Such a center will serve, not only the people of Dallas, but all those of Texas and the Southwest and at a tremendous saving to the taxpayers. This project, of course, was not my original proposition, but I have been glad to support it on merit alone and it is only on that basis, without regard to any political implication, that I seek your aid. I have asked the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings of the Committee on Public Works for early action and I hope you will be able to support my request.

Sincerely yours,

BRUCE ALGER.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 11, 1961.

Hon. ROBERT JONES,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Buildings, Public Works Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In reference to my correspondence with you in August 1960 and our previous conversations regarding reauthorization of the Federal Center Building for Dallas, Tex., I sincerely hope your committee can schedule early action so that appropriations may be provided in the new budget.

This project has been thoroughly investigated by congressional committees, the General Services Administration and the General Accounting Office. Opinion has been unanimous that the project is a worthy one, will make possible better service to the people of the Southwest, and will save money for the taxpayers. I ask that the committee consider these investigations and decide to approve the project on its merits.

If there is any doubt in the minds of committee members which may delay early action, then I ask that public hearings be scheduled as soon as possible to permit me and interested citizens of Dallas to present additional facts.

Thank you for your prompt consideration of this request.

Sincerely yours,

BRUCE ALGER.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 11, 1961.

Hon. JOHN L. MOORE,
Administrator of General Services, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MOORE: On December 11, 1959, the General Services Administration approved construction of a Federal Building for Dallas, Tex. The project had previously been authorized by Congress after investigation proved it to be sound and in the best interest of serving the people of the Southwest at a saving to the taxpayers.

In 1960 the Budget Bureau did not include the Dallas project for completion because of limited funds and the fact that approved projects were further along in planning at that time. It was understood by GSA, the Budget Bureau, and the Congress that the building would be included in the 1961 appropriation. However, this was not possible because, for reasons unknown to this office but alleged by many to be political, reauthorization of the project was not made. The stated reason for the failure was that it was to be held up pending the outcome of the investigation of site acquisition by the Government Activities Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee.

My investigation of the subcommittee activity and a debate on the floor of the House with the subcommittee chairman resulted in establishing a clean bill of health for the site acquisition, as substantiated by a GAO investigatory report of April 1960.

In view of these developments it is expected authorization will be obtained in this session of Congress and I hope GSA will support the project because of the advantages it will offer to the people of this area and the savings which will be made in Federal operations. I would appreciate your views.

With kind regard.

Sincerely yours,

BRUCE ALGER.

Why I'm a Democrat—Government for the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEM MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Speaker, recently, the San Francisco Examiner asked two leaders of each major political party to describe the reasons for their political allegiance. One of those selected to tell the Democratic story was Roger Kent, State central committee chairman. As one who has given unstintingly of his time and effort for many years, who has been a major factor in the resurgence of our party throughout the State, and one who has made an outstanding contribution to raising the standards of political activity, I am pleased to submit his statement as follows:

GOVERNMENT FOR THE PEOPLE

What does it mean to be a Democrat? It means believing that the United States is big enough, rich enough, and wise enough to assure every child a good education, every family a decent place to live, every worker a job at a fair wage (except for temporary unemployment—cushioned by insurance), every sick person good medical care, proper drugs and hospitalization, every old person a comfortable and dignified life. We won't tolerate hunger or discrimination.

In short, it means belonging to a party that cares and a party that will generate and activate new ideas and new solutions of new problems and old unsolved problems.

It means belief that the national parks, forests, and other public property of the United States must be protected for the public of this and coming generations. It means a concern for these lands, for their fish and wildlife and their natural beauty and for the people that will enjoy them that goes far beyond short-term financial profit for private individuals or the Government itself.

It means belief that when public resources are developed they should be developed for the benefit of the public and not for private profit.

It means defense of the Bill of Rights and all of it as the keystone of the greatest thing this great country has given us—our personal liberty. It means not being afraid of free speech and it means a firm stand to secure for persons accused of any crime the full measure of protection provided by the Constitution.

It means we implacably oppose the dictatorships of the right and left, but will defend the constitutional right of their misguided adherents to attempt to convert our people peacefully to their alien and objectionable philosophies. It means full confidence in the good sense of Americans.

It means devotion to competitive free enterprise and preservation and enlargement of opportunities for individuals. It means admiration for the accomplishments of big business and respect for its rights, but it also means a continuing supervision through the courts and regulatory agencies to prevent monopoly, price fixing, and exploitation of the public domain.

It means a policy that the regulatory agencies must be staffed not from the industry to be regulated, but by people who represent the public interest.

In foreign affairs, it means belonging to a party that has no strong isolationist bloc to be appeased by stupid statements for domestic consumption; a party with strong policies and soft words; a party that sees little sense in trading insults with the Russians, and much in firm but courteous negotiations.

It means appreciation of the immense difficulties of the new nations and programs to help them and to show them that they belong in the free world. It means, for instance, full approval of the Peace Corps to use the strength and idealism of our people in that effort.

In the area of national defense, it means we must have the best, even if that means we cannot meet the Russians at the border with a balanced budget.

It means that since Thomas Jefferson, we have trusted the judgment of an informed people and rejected the concept that a few know best what is good for the many.

To me, it means an enormous satisfaction in working with vigorous and intelligent people at every level of the party who believe in and support the things I believe in.

Schuylerville Woman Takes Issue With Murrow in Views on Migrant Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARLETON J. KING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an answer to Mr. Murrow's "Harvest of Shame" which was written by Mrs. Adelaide Bullard who, with her husband, runs a large farm in my district in upstate New York. They have always employed migrant labor. However, conditions at Bullard camp are far different from those shown by Mr. Murrow:

SCHUYLERVILLE WOMAN TAKES ISSUE WITH MURROW IN VIEWS ON MIGRANT LABOR

(By Adelaide Bullard)

(Edward R. Murrow's "Harvest of Shame"—now that it has been seen against his wishes in Britain—continues to stir controversy. The author of the following article takes a completely opposite view to Murrow's, telling some of the problems that employers of migrant labor face. She writes from the experience gained as an employer

of migrant labor on her own farm in upstate New York.)

SCHUYLERVILLE, March 27.—"Harvest of Shame," Edward R. Murrow's exposé on migrant labor, has now been shown in Britain, too. Unfortunately, Murrow, as Director of the U.S. Information Agency, had been unable to suppress it.

Since Murrow's November telecast, there has been a barrage of stories that migrant laborers are being ruthlessly exploited by callous employers.

On March 9, for example, Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS, of New Jersey, claimed repeatedly that children of migrant workers received no schooling.

On our farm in upstate New York we have run a labor camp for 18 years, employing many of the same workers during all that time. As soon as the families arrive in the spring, the schoolbus appears for the children.

They remain in school until it closes, then play, or do work according to their age level during the summer. In the fall the bus reappears and the children, all scrubbed and starched, go to school until early November when the apple harvest is finished and the workers return to Florida.

BECOME PERMANENT RESIDENTS

The school is happy with the extra money that the State pays per child, and the parents are sometimes so pleased with our desegregated school that they obtain jobs in this area and become permanent residents.

We have plowed several thousand dollars into a State-sponsored nursery school on our property. Neither Ed Murrow nor the Senator mentioned these schools. The infants and preschoolchildren are treated as well as our own, or better.

There are cribs, formulas, clean diapers, cod liver oil, fresh orange juice, and planned diets, with college trained young women as nurses. There is a storytelling hour, play hour, nap hour, and transportation to and from the camp. All this service costs the parents 50 cents a week.

Senator WILLIAMS told the Nation that migrants receive a dollar a day, and sometimes less, and about $900 a year.

Our workers receive from $10 to $20 a day, which in 5 months adds up to a lot more than $900—and this is apart from what they earn in the winter. Of course, when a man and wife both work this income is doubled.

Neither Mr. Murrow nor Senator WILLIAMS mentioned that housing, electric stoves, space heaters, wood, transportation to and from work, hot water, rain gear, and warm clothes in the fall are provided free.

FREQUENT PAYDAYS

To prevent workers from going on spending sprees, we pay our help twice or three times a week. This creates quite a social security tangle but, theoretically, insures an entire week's wages won't be spent on something foolish; liquor, for example. Binges and brawling are common among migrant workers. These are unpleasant facts, but facts just the same.

Our labor camp has everything the State laws demand, and more. Inspections are numerous, and time consuming. We have hot showers and laundry equipment, and recreation space. We supply electricity. We have a good baseball team, transported by us to Sunday games, uniformed by merchants in the village who vie for the camp trade.

There is a community house at the camp with jukebox and piano, plus facilities for short order diner type meals. Dances are held here and sometimes weddings.

It is quite true the people are crowded. When they arrive, three families move into one unit, leaving empty apartments on all sides. They insist on being crowded.

GOOD AND BAD TYPES

Some of the people are hard working. They spend no money on whisky or gambling, and drive much better cars than ours. Others sell their daughters to the bachelors for a night at a time, bring prostitutes who refuse to do fieldwork, lend money at usurers' rates, and draw knives when drunk.

We pay the people to empty their own garbage, which most of them toss out the door though their garbage pails are 2 feet away. When they leave in the fall we clean, paint, and repair their houses, inspecting the electric stoves, which they hardly use, preferring outdoor fires.

Sometimes the employers, not the employees, are the exploited ones. Then men come to our door night after night in the summer, breathing alcohol fumes, asking for $10 to send a sick aunt, or for the price of a ticket to Florida to see a dying father.

Another gimmick is for a pregnant woman who has made good money all summer to stay over late in the fall, then ask us for money to get the baby out of the hospital, where it is retained until payment.

We parley constantly with doctors, jailers, hospitals, and State troopers, bailing laborers out of trouble.

Whether they drive north in inspected trucks or in their own cars, the migrants telephone us collect from the same spots every spring—the Carolinas, Virginia, Delaware—asking for extra money for the trip we have already financed.

We always send it.

We can no longer afford all of them, receiving, as we do, the same price for apples that we received in 1929. We are cutting down on crops, and looking to automation for an answer.

The Constitution and What It Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, among the many splendid essays in the contest sponsored by the American Legion of Ohio, one of the finest was the work of Miss Donna Jean Kirkland, a senior at Lake High School in Hartville.

Miss Kirkland was winner in the Legion's district 10, comprising nine counties in east central Ohio.

Under leave to extend, I include her essay with my remarks:

THE CONSTITUTION AND WHAT IT MEANS

(By Donna Jean Kirkland)

The Constitution is one of the most masterful pieces of literature that has ever been written. Its words are not fancy, but its beauty lies in its meaning and what it represents. It represents the hopes and ideals of millions of people all living together in one vast but united country—united because of these common hopes and ideals.

It also represents freedom. In the Constitution our freedoms are listed as freedom of speech, religion, the press—freedom to assemble and to petition. But its meaning goes much deeper than its words. It means freedom to live as an individual, to have the same privileges as any other individual, and to have an equal voice in one's government.

In addition, the Constitution stands for security. This means that we can live without fear—without fear of labor camps and prisons and lies and unjust punishment. This does not mean we are free from injustice, for injustice can always creep in when men sit back unconcerned and let it. It means we have the power ourselves to destroy and prevent injustice.

Because of the Constitution, Americans don't have to answer to a dictator; they only answer to the moral and civil bounds they set up for themselves. We are our own masters and are not slaves to anyone on earth. Our strength is in our common bonds and sense of oneness with our fellow Americans—the spirit preserved by our forefathers and handed down through the ages incorporated in our Constitution. This is our great heritage.

The Constitution is the core of our civilization—our way of life. It's more than the basis of a government, it's the basis of a nation—a free nation and a strong nation.

Our Constitution has stood the test of time and the threat of foreign principles. It is no longer just a written document, but it is a living symbol of justice and peaceful coexistence. It is a radiant light in a world of darkness. It is a principle for tomorrow and the tomorrows that follow.

As long as it exists there is hope for man, but without it there is no hope, for man cannot live and grow as God intended when he is not free to express himself as an individual. Our Constitution alone has provided that freedom. It is an example for the world to follow.

What does the Constitution mean? It means all of this and more.

Troubleshooter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, the Boston (Mass.) Herald recently published an excellent editorial in which it called attention to the splendid manner in which Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON is performing his responsibilities in behalf of the people of the United States.

Under permission heretofore granted, I include the editorial as a part of these remarks:

TROUBLESHOOTER

Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, like his predecessor, is proving a handy man to have around.

His experience as Senate majority leader has given him a special touch with legislative matters. Although he ceased to be an insider when he became the Senate's presiding officer, he still knows what goes on on the Hill, and has already helped the President out of one scrape with the lawmakers (during the House rules fight).

This week the Texan is undertaking his first oversea assignment for the President. This, too, has evolved into something out of the ordinary.

The original purpose was to represent the United States at the celebration of Senegal's independence last Monday, but additional duties have been added. From Dakar the Vice President will fly to Geneva for a conference with Arthur Dean, the U.S. representative at the nuclear test ban negotiations, and then on to Paris for talks with U.S. Ambassador James M. Gavin and NATO commander, Gen. Lauris Norstad. Before coming home he will stop off in Spain to in-

spect U.S. bases on behalf of Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara.

This is quite a schedule for a man whose office has been described as "the most insignificant * * * that ever the invention of mancontrived." And it is apparently only the beginning.

The President has provided Mr. JOHNSON with a staff and a suite of offices in the old State Department building next to the White House. The Vice President is scheduled to head the Space Council, and he will be given other permanent assignments. Mr. Kennedy's preinauguration promise to "keep LYNDON JOHNSON happy (and busy) for the next 4 years" is being carried out.

This is good for Mr. JOHNSON and good for the country. The Vice Presidency is still an awkward office, neither wholly in the executive branch nor wholly in the legislative branch, but its potential is great. Mr. Eisenhower's practice of using the Vice President as an all-purpose troubleshooter has given Mr. Kennedy a valuable lead.

Troubleshooter JOHNSON is getting off to an even faster start than troubleshooter Nixon.

Suggested Restrictions on Bank Mergers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following letter written by Mr. Harry J. Harding, honorary president of the Independent Bankers Association on April 3, 1961, to the editor of American Banker. Mr. Harding's letter points out the urgent need for serious discussion of the bank merger problem. It is my hope that enough men in the banking business will concern themselves with this problem and suggest a solution to the Congress.

The letter follows:

APRIL 3, 1961.

To the EDITOR, AMERICAN BANKER,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: We read with a great deal of interest the item in the American Banker of March 28, headed "Robertson Joins Critics of Trend in Bank Mergers." This pleased us very much because our organization for many years has been advocating more stringent control of bank mergers so as to prevent the tendency to monopoly. We were able to have a number of amendments added to the bank merger bill which was enacted into law last year.

During the hearings on this legislation there were strong arguments advanced by the supervisory agencies that they needed a broad latitude in passing on applications for mergers. They outlined a number of situations where other factors might be of more importance than maintaining competition. The bill was passed giving them such broad discretionary authority.

While only the annual report of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System has been made available thus far, disclosing the attitude of the Department of Justice, and the basis for approval of the mergers by the Board, the report does show that the Department of Justice has in a number of situations warned of the danger of monopoly.

There is no question but that many bank mergers are designed merely for self-aggrandizement or for a quick profit, with the public need far in the background. If the tendency to follow this course is not checked we will have a concentration of control over banking that will practically mean the elimination of our American system of locally owned and controlled banks. But how can we restrict these monopolistic mergers? What criteria can we establish that will be reasonable, somewhat elastic, and yet prevent monopoly?

In a talk before the convention of the Independent Bankers Association at Miami Beach, Fla., in May 1957, I advanced for discussion an addition to the then proposed bank merger legislation that would establish some standards that could be followed by the supervisory agencies, as follows:

"No merger shall be approved under this act, in cities of 10,000 or less population, when the result will be two or less banks located in the city in which the merging bank is located; nor in cities of more than 10,000 population up to 25,000 population when the result will be three or less banks located in the city in which the merging bank is located; nor in cities of over 25,000 population to 100,000 population when the result will be four or less banks located in the city in which the merging bank is located; nor in cities of over 100,000 in population when the result will be five or less banks located in the city in which the merging bank is located. In each case, the population figures will be those of the last Federal census.

"Nor shall any merger be approved under this act when the result will be that the merging bank will hold more than 30 percent of the total banking deposits of the area in which the merging bank has offices.

"Let's kick this around for awhile. I don't want you to say you are for this or that you are opposed. I would like to have you think of the arguments both for and against such a proposal, so that we may carefully study and weigh them.

"You may feel that the criteria specified in this suggestion are not realistic, but can you think of better yardsticks than the ones suggested? Do you think that we ought to have any yardsticks other than the discretion of some Federal agency? Have you any reason to believe the Federal agencies would?

"The yardsticks I have suggested are no more arbitrary than the existing requirements as to the capital necessary for the establishment of a new bank, or of a merging bank. The prevention of undue concentration of banking control is just as much in the public interest as the limitations on the loans that a bank can make. As to the argument that mergers should be left to the discretion of a supervisory agency, this, in my opinion, could apply equally as well as to the capital requirements for a new bank.

"I know the supervisory agencies will immediately howl that the merger door must be kept open so that without hindrance they can merge a failing bank, a bank that is not properly managed, or a bank that is undercapitalized, with another good bank, regardless of its monopolistic tendencies.

"If such an emergency escape hatch needs to be kept open, that can be provided, of course, but I wonder if merging a weak bank is the one and only solution that the FDIC or any other supervisory agency can think of. If so, why do not the laws say something affirmatively giving the power to compel the merger of a bank under such circumstances, to the supervisory agencies? Or is this a method they themselves have seized upon without congressional sanction?

"You will note what we have proposed places no limitations on size, nor does it in any way hinder normal growth. It merely restricts cannibalism.

"Let's not say it can't be done, but rather ask ourselves, should this be done? I am convinced we must have a ceiling on concentration of control over banking or face destruction to our independent banking system."

Your publication at the time did editorialize on my suggestion and urged bankers to comment. However, no serious discussion ensued. We know some bankers want to absorb other banks and they would not be in favor. Others would like to keep the door open to merger in case they wanted to sell. Others just would not do anything to criticize any other banker. If we had been able to get the views of the supervisory agencies some light might have been shed on the problem, but we can hardly expect any agency to suggest restricting their powers.

I still believe the idea is worth kicking around. I wonder if your publication might not secure the views of some of the members of the Senate and the House Banking and Currency Committees. At all events something needs to be done, and quickly, either by implementing existing law or by obtaining recognition from the supervisory agencies that tendencies to monopoly should be frowned upon rather than encouraged.

Very truly yours,

HARRY J. HARDING,
Honorary President.

Personnel of Veterans Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to receive a letter commending a Government agency and its staff. I am sure my colleagues will be interested in the letter I received today from a constituent, Mr. Henry A. Hansen, of Baker, Oreg., praising the personnel of the veterans hospitals in Boise, Idaho, and in Portland, Oreg.

The letter follows:

BAKER, OREG., *April 13, 1961.*

Congressman AL ULLMAN,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ULLMAN: I would like to inform you as to the operating conditions that I have experienced and observed at the veterans hospitals.

The general public has a misconception regarding the functions of a VA hospital. They look at it as a last resort, or a place to send their relatives or friends after they have exhausted their resources and given up hope of recovery, and are under the impression that he will be a guinea pig for the medical profession. I was included in that category before I learned my lesson.

Last April I had trouble with a tooth and had it extracted. The wound would not heal, and after doctoring with it until August, my mouth and jaw were getting worse. Having exhausted all my resources, I decided to try the VA hospital.

I went to Boise, Idaho, last August, and after 5 days of tests and examinations I was informed that I had cancer, and that part of my lower jaw and sections of my mouth would have to be removed. The shock that you get when you know you have cancer, and that some of your head has to be chopped out is something that words cannot express. I was told that Portland had better equipment for my kind of operation, and that I would be sent there.

In Portland, after more than 2 weeks of tests and examinations by many doctors, supervised by Dr. Harvey Baker and Dr. George

M. Long, I was operated on August 25. They had to remove a few more glands, etc., in the neck, throat, mouth, and half the lower jaw, as was recommended in Boise.

This was the experience I went through to get the information that I want to convey to you. I do not believe that the President of the United States or even a four-star general could get any better treatment, care, and service than was given to me at these VA hospitals. Their testing and examinations were very thorough and left very little, if any, chance for a mistake. Every test and diagnosis by any instrument or doctor had to be verified by a specialist in the particular field that it appertained to.

The personnel connected with these hospitals I found were the very finest, from the top to the bottom. All very considerate and efficient, and the most amazing of all—everyone had a full day's work to do, and did it without any griping. I never saw anyone standing around with nothing to do. And the cooperation was something to see. A doctor would not hesitate to lend a helping hand to a hospital aid or a housekeeper. Everyone just seemed to have one thing in mind—to keep the patient happy and contented. And that's some job, especially with some of the patients who think the Government owes them a new set of brains and a million dollars. Sure there are students there—lots of them—but they have a tough job. They must assist and observe many times before they are allowed to go on their own; and then they have specialists watching them very closely to see that their work is perfect. And then they are questioned no end, to be sure that they themselves knew what they did.

Now the food. I have eaten in some of the best restaurants, and I have never seen any better cooking and preparing of food than I had in the VA hospital; and variety that should please anyone.

As for supplies and material, there is very little waste. I don't mean they are miserly with things. They use as much medicine and material as necessary, but they do not throw things in the waste basket that should go back on the shelf.

The operation and maintenance of the VA hospitals are conducted much more efficiently than most private businesses and institutions, and they are a great credit to the country. And the Government is getting more for its dollar and doing more good than any money they spend. What could be better than saving a man's life and putting him back with his family and on the job again. There is only one way he can ever repay that service and that is to be a better citizen, and his own conscience will force him to do that. And God knows we can stand some good citizens.

Mr. Congressman, I wish you would take some of your time and help this VA hospital situation. Many more hospitals are badly needed. They are all overcrowded. The Government could not spend money to any greater advantage. The need is not only for the present, but the future is going to demand it. And with all the money the Government spends, nowhere does it get more out of its dollar than investing it in VA hospitals. It's not only a great help to our veterans and the country in general, but all humanity will benefit.

My gratitude and thanks to Dr. Harvey Baker, Dr. George M. Long of Portland, and Dr. Helferty, and Dr. Hastings of Boise, and all the personnel of both hospitals.

One other thing, Mr. Congressman. If you are unable to do anything about aiding the VA hospitals, please try and get President Kennedy to find time to read this letter.

Thank you very kindly for anything you are able to do, I am,

Sincerely yours,

HENRY A. HANSEN.

Soviet Claim of Man in Space Needs Further Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am including with my remarks today a letter I have sent to the chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics urging an exhaustive investigation of Soviet Russia's claim that it has placed a man into space.

It is my earnest hope that the House committee will undertake such a study because as I have stated in my letter, it is indeed lamentable that the world is so willing to accept at face value every claim of the Soviet Union, when for the past 20 years we have seen conclusive proof that the Communists are masters of deception.

In my letter to the chairman, I cite the fact that Russia's chief delegate to a space-science symposium in Italy, A. A. Blagonravov, told the press that Major Gagarin's space capsule did not have any windows or portholes through which he could have seen the spectacular description of outer space which he gave after his alleged flight.

Professor Blagonravov has since retracted that statement, and several people have asked me if this retraction in any way alters my own views on this subject. It is my belief that the contrary is true, and Professor Blagonravov's retraction only fortifies my original suspicion of the whole Soviet claim. It stands to reason that if the top space scientist of Russia does not know whether Soviet space capsules have windows and portholes, then we indeed have the right to probe this entire Soviet claim to the fullest dimension.

As an aside, I might add that it appears rather strange to me that this top Soviet space scientist would be attending a seminar in Italy at this historic moment when the Soviets claim they have placed a man into space. We have a right to ask whether or not such a flight had in fact been made when the Soviet Union's top space scientist was not around to personally help supervise the operation.

Mr. Speaker, my letter to the chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics follows. I hope my colleagues will join me in the admonition that we Americans must go beyond the realm of normal assumption in accepting Soviet Russia's claims and will further join me in requesting this full-scale investigation of Russia's latest space claim:

APRIL 16, 1961.

HON. OVERTON BROOKS,
Chairman, Committee on Science and Astronautics, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: May I take this opportunity to suggest that the House Committee on Science and Astronautics immediately launch an exhaustive investigation into the merits of Soviet Russia's claim that it has launched a manned vehicle into space.

I make this request because as this entire story unfolds, more and more evidence begins to strongly suggest the possibility that the Soviet Union has again perpetrated a monumental hoax on the people of the world.

I should like to suggest that your committee seek the full cooperation of the executive branch of our Government, including a request to President Kennedy, that through diplomatic channels the President request the Soviet Union to permit an international team of experts to review all technical data involved in the Soviet claim before Russia's contention that it has successfully launched a manned spaceship is accepted.

There is sufficient precedence for such a request, particularly when we remember that in 1947, when the United States successfully exploded the first hydrogen bomb at Eniwetok, our country invited scientists from every nation in the world, including two from the Soviet Union, to witness this historic accomplishment.

It is not my purpose to in any way deflate the Soviet claim if it is true. But since the successful launching of a human being into space affects the future of the entire world, I believe it is the responsibility of some responsible branch of our Government to fully investigate this accomplishment before we accept it as a reality.

It is indeed lamentable that the world is so willing to accept at face value every claim of the Soviet Union, when for the past 20 years we have seen conclusive proof that the Communists are masters of deception. I, myself, during the past 20 years have made a thorough study of Communist techniques, and I am convinced that any claim made by the Soviets must be exhaustively examined before it can be given any credence.

It is my firm belief that the Soviets needed a spectacular propaganda vehicle to offset world attention from the demand made by President Kennedy and Prime Minister Macmillan for a cease-fire in Laos. I believe the Soviets also wanted to detract world attention from the visit of Chancellor Adenauer to this country; and so the decision to announce the successful launching of a man into space by the Soviets was made at this particular time.

I believe the American press and radio, with correspondents throughout the world, are doing an excellent job in helping piece together information which strongly suggests that the Soviet Union is indeed perpetrating a hoax in its claim.

It is my earnest hope that neither your committee nor anyone else is going to be detracted from this investigation by the fact that the press in this country has given such spectacular coverage to the Soviet claim. It must be remembered that the role of the American press is not to sit in judgment upon the veracity of claims made by world leaders, but merely to report them objectively. It would be a mistake to blame the press in any way for giving this story such wide coverage because, in fact, the press is merely carrying out its traditional assignment.

However, it would be a catastrophic mistake if responsible people in Government were to accept these Soviet claims at full face value. I believe it is the duty of your committee to explore the veracity of this Soviet claim in every conceivable way possible.

I should like to point out briefly some of the reasons why there are valid grounds to question the veracity of the Soviet claim.

You will recall that the first reports that the Soviets successfully launched a man into space began trickling out of Moscow on April 7. It is extremely significant to me that only a short time earlier the Soviet Union had removed all censorship on news dis-

patches emanating from Moscow. Obviously the Soviets wanted world journalists to report these carefully planted rumors as extensively as possible.

On April 11 the London Daily Worker ran a story which gave the first official color to rumors emanating from Moscow that an astronaut had been successfully launched by the Soviets. The Daily Worker's details, published 24 hours before the Soviet Union's announcement on April 12, differed relatively little from the official announcement.

It is my firm conviction that the Soviet Union had hoped to confirm the rumors probably on April 11, but were frustrated in their carefully laid plans when the U.S. National Aeronautics and Space Administration disclosed, following the London Daily Worker story, that American satellite tracking networks had not reported any recent space launchings by the Soviet Union. I believe this announcement by NASA threw a serious block into Russia's propaganda coup, and it is for this reason that apparently Moscow chose to ignore its official spokesman in London, the London Daily Worker, an hurriedly launched a vehicle into space Wednesday morning.

Space Pilot Gagarin's story seems to be full of significant contradictions. Major Gagarin was quoted extensively by Tass as describing what he had seen of the earth from his space vehicle, including the statement that he saw a blue rim separating the atmosphere of the earth from that of outer space. The talkative pilot told about seeing the cities and coastal boundaries, and even embellished his account with a strong plug for Russia's Sovetized collective farms.

But, according to the Associated Press reports from Florence, Italy, on April 14 Russia's chief delegate to a space-science symposium in Italy said the Soviet astronaut had no portholes or windows to look out of during his flight around the earth. A. A. Blagonravov, of the Soviet Academy of Science, was quoted by Associated Press newsmen as stating that Major Gagarin saw all these details of the earth by radio. Even assuming that by the word "radio" Blagonravov meant television, it is highly doubtful that the Soviets would place a color television camera into Gagarin's spaceship so that he could distinguish the various colors and brightness of the sun, which he so eloquently described in his interview.

The Soviet Union has released photographs of Gagarin allegedly leaving his spaceship; and in his own account, he told of how the reverse rockets went into operation to slow down the speed of his ship on his return to earth and said that he finally felt a thump which to him indicated that he was back on earth.

Yet, on April 14 the Associated Press reported from Moscow that a Soviet scientist and a tractor driver suggested that Gagarin left his space capsule at some point during his descent to earth and parachuted the rest of the way to the ground. The Associated Press, quoting a Tass News Agency story, quotes the Soviet scientist, Nikolai Gurovsky, as saying: "The astronaut came down smoothly in a glade near a field. Landing on both feet, even without tumbling, he walked up to the people who saw him first."

The AP story further quotes how a Soviet tractor driver, Ivan Rudenko, working near his field station saw the landing: "Rudenko saw well the landing of the space ship. He said the cosmonaut parachuted down close to where he was."

I do not question that Gagarin landed on the field, but he could have accomplished this sort of parachute jump from any Soviet airplane and not necessarily a space capsule.

Of particular interest in this AP dispatch is the statement that Tass admitted that the day before the landing a Soviet newsman visited the farm (where the capsule landed) and saw a field that had been plowed, presumably to soften the landing. The significance of this particular statement in suggesting further that the Soviet claims are a fraud is the fact that Western space experts have pointed out that an error of 1 yard per second in adjusting the space capsule speed as it returned to earth would have hurled the rocket 30 miles from the landing zone.

It is highly doubtful—or at least is subject to serious question—whether the Soviets or any other nation can develop a technique of premeasurement to pinpoint a landing of a space capsule within such narrow tolerances. We know that Soviet experiments with capsules in the Pacific have missed their mark by a much wider area than claimed in this latest Russian alleged accomplishment.

It is indeed most significant to me, and I trust will be sufficiently significant to you and your committee to justify this investigation, that the Soviet Union has showed the world only the most meager evidence to support its claim of placing a man into space. On the other hand, the entire world was permitted to view by television the heroic welcome given Major Gagarin in Moscow.

I believe the time has come when the free world must go beyond the scope of normal assumption in dealing with Soviet claims.

It is perfectly permissible for the Soviet Union to capitalize to the fullest on the propaganda value of such a claim, but I believe those of us in Congress, who have a responsibility to the American people, should make every effort to place these Soviet claims in their proper perspective.

In further support of my request that your committee undertake this investigation immediately, I should like to recall for you the conduct of the Soviet Union during the U–2 incident. You will recall that President Eisenhower went to Paris determined to deal firmly with the Soviet Union on the question of many problems involving world peace; and the Communists again, finding themselves in a hopeless situation of no retreat, staged a similar propaganda coup around the U–2 incident. That particular propaganda succeeded in wrecking the summit conference. I hope your committee will not permit this latest space revelation by the Soviets to wreck President Kennedy's efforts to bring a just solution to the Laotian crisis.

I am perfectly willing to give the Soviets all the recognition they deserve in scientific accomplishment, but I, as one Member of Congress, have no intention of letting the Communists deceive me, particularly when I am reminded of their long history of deception since the very founding of the Communist Party.

I trust you will order a complete investigation as quickly as possible.

Sincerely yours,

ROMAN C. PUCINSKI,
Member of Congress.

Business Under Suspicion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1961

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Wall Street Journal of April 14. It points up once more the fact that we have an Achilles heel and that it is well known and very vulnerable.

We seem to have a mania for apologizing for our successes and magnifying our failures. Of course, historically speaking, our greatest success has been in commerce and industry, so we now see an administration dedicated to making business the "whipping boy" and putting swarms of two-bit bureaucrats in charge of the whipping.

This of course is a splendid picture to hold up to the world, especially to the Soviet Union who never indulges in any such masochism, but proclaims always that everything is for the best in the Communist world:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 14, 1961]

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK—BUSINESS UNDER SUSPICION

The administration is losing no time making clear its attitude toward the business community—and in case anyone thought otherwise, it is not a friendly one.

Recent statements by high officials have far too freely tossed around terms like "corruption" and "economic racketeering," accompanied by assorted threats and warnings. A flock of indictments, like the new General Motors diesel locomotive one, is promised. At the same time Senator KEFAUVER, indefatigable in his efforts to discredit business, is trying to make hay out of the electrical price-fixing cases already disposed of in court after being exposed by the Eisenhower administration.

Now this newspaper happens to believe in the proper enforcement of the antitrust laws; it has no sympathy for price fixers or other business transgressors; and it certainly does not oppose congressional investigations as such. But all that is far different from a general Government attempt to cast suspicion on the whole business community. If that is what Washington is setting out to do, it is not a healthy matter for anyone, including Government.

It must be wondered what some of these people think American business is, anyway. Too often, in the past as well as in the present, they sound as though they thought that American prosperity, the envy of the world, just happened; either that or it was the creation of labor unions or of government.

But it didn't just happen. The free economic interaction of millions of individuals trying to make a living and better their living for themselves and their families is what created the prosperity. It is what has provided the capital investment for the workingman as a result of which he has no peer in the world.

Not least, it is this kind of economic activity—which is to say business—that supports and indeed makes possible the Government and its manifold projects, including the vital one of defense. What would Government be without Henry Ford's development of the assembly line?

So there is something distasteful about this sneering at business, for it amounts to sneering at the American people in general. Beyond that, Federal officials sometimes evidence no awareness of the developing and changing character of business over the years. Their conception of it seems pre-20th century if not prehistoric.

In an earlier era in this country the task of scratching a living was much tougher for everyone, at least in a physical sense. But as the economic structure developed shape and strength, a humanizing of the machine society developed with it. Today's business concerns are solicitous, to an extent unbelievable a hundred years ago, of the well-being of their employees and their communities; in a word, of the public good.

It is today's business concerns, moreover, which seek to extend the trend toward a one-class (meaning middle class) society by in-

viting employee ownership, among other ways. It is the union leaders who oppose this, who remain committed to the shibboleths of a class struggle of an outworn era.

The point is not, of course, that business should have a "friend" in the White House, as organized labor so long had. The point is that Government should understand what business is and try to foster business expansion not because it is business but because it is the national economy.

How in the world can a government talk seriously about promoting economic growth and at the same time indiscriminately attack, in word and deed, the business community which is the only source of economic growth we have?

No one reading the Democratic platform last summer would have any reason to expect a Democratic businessman's administration in Washington. But one might have expected in practice a little more realism, a little more maturity, about the facts of American economic life.

Shall We Put an End to the Nuclear Airplane?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services I have been troubled by the decision announced recently by the Department of Defense not to proceed with development of a nuclear-powered aircraft. I recognize that the technical problems in such a project are enormous. I recognize too that oftentimes our military leaders would prefer to have a weapon in the hand than one in the bush.

But can we really hope to make progress by taking counsel only of our fears? Can we really expect to move ahead in a highly technical and competitive world merely by reciting the difficulties that lie ahead? Was there any clear-cut military requirement for a nuclear submarine when Admiral Rickover was waging his uphill fight to develop that great craft, or was it only after the admiral proved that his ideas were indeed feasible that our military leaders recognized that there was not only a military requirement for a nuclear submarine but in a very real sense the nuclear submarine would actually give the Navy a new and vastly greater lease on life in a changing and up-to-date defense field?

Mr. Speaker, because of the sizable interest in nuclear aircraft in my home city of Schenectady, and because of the close connection between this project and the General Electric Co. whose home is located in Schenectady, I insert at this point an editorial which appeared in the Schenectady Gazette for April 14, 1941. The editorial follows:

NUCLEAR PLANE

Is it wise for the Defense Department to abandon the project for the nuclear-powered plane? The average citizen cannot say. On the one hand he hears the President say the project is too expensive and that the "possibility of achieving a militarily useful (nuclear) aircraft in the foreseeable future is still very remote." And there is the opinion of Defense Secretary McNamara that the military nuclear plane "would have little or no military value" because of its huge size, slow speed and radiation dangers.

On the other hand the citizen has the word of the developers of nuclear propulsion equipment, such as General Electric, that the nuclear plane is available not in the dim, distant future but in a relatively short time. In the opinion of Dr. Miles C. Leverett, president of the American Nuclear Society and manager of GE aircraft nuclear propulsion, the Russian "certainly are working" on such a plane and he believes they are "as far along as we are, or even farther."

General Electric contends that the administration is mistaken about the cost of development from this point on—provided there is no long delay. GE has offered to make the first experimental flight test of a nuclear-powered plane in 1963 for less than one-fifth of what the administration said it would cost.

If one of these days the Russians announce they have a workable nuclear-powered military or nonmilitary plane the U.S. Government perhaps will point to important differences in defense strategy between the two governments. Yet, if the lesson of sputnik has been learned, one doubts that Washington would dismiss it as of no importance, because it could be assumed that even if the Russian nuclear plane at first was huge, slow and had radiation dangers, the improvements that usually follow the development of a new craft or weapon would justify the initial effort.

The purpose of the administration seems to be to divert funds from a nuclear plane to other defense weapons, craft or methods with the idea of increasing the ability to fight limited wars. The citizen can only hope the administration's decision is wise.

In Defense of Innovators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLAN HAGEN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the RECORD four items of comment related to a subject currently agitating the country. The first is an article "In Defense of Innovators," written by Bernice Harrell Chipman for the February 13, 1961, issue of the Bakersfield Californian. The second is an April 11, 1961, editorial from the same newspaper. The third is an April 3, 1961, editorial of the Hanford Sentinel. The fourth is a comment from the February 1961, edition of the Standard Oiler, a trade publication of the Standard Oil Co. of California. The articles follow:

IN DEFENSE OF INNOVATORS
(By Bernice Harrell Chipman)

That people are funny has been fully established by a not-so-funny radio personality, and one of the characteristics which seems to me most funny—peculiar and disheartening is that of the closed mind, the mind that cannot, or will not, accept ideas or art forms differing from a pattern set by personality, predilection or environment.

There is something horrifying to these persons with their feet planted firmly in the past, in modern experiments in sound, color, and thought. They turn their backs on the new art, they leave the concert when the modern music is played, they cry heresy or communism in response to ideas to which they are unaccustomed. And they use that terrible cliche—I don't know anything about art—but I know what I like. Nothing could be more fallacious. True—they don't know anything about art—but they don't know what they like either, for they like only what is familiar, and take no opportunity to know or like anything else.

It is always enlightening to note that the innovators of yesterday are the conservatives of today. At the time of the Panama-Pacific Exposition in San Francisco in 1915, there was a room devoted to the modern art of that time, including "The Nude Descending the Stairs." It became known as the "Oh, My God-Room" from the exclamations of those who met its impact for the first time, yet many of these pictures would cause not even a ripple of excitement today. To see an exhibit of the 20th century moderns which aroused such arguments in art circles in their time, Manet, Cezanne, Renoir, Van Gogh, is to enjoy their light and beauty without comprehension of the carping of their contemporaries.

So we should give some thought to understanding what is being attempted by our own moderns, the as-yet-strange art forms—or lack of form, in painting and sculpture—and in music the dissonances and discords which are, perhaps, opening new areas of listening. We don't have to like them. We don't need to accept them just because the forms are new and different and break with our preconceived ideas, but we should for our own sake make an effort to know what the artist is trying to do, and to decide by how much he has met his own requirements.

It is only by experiment in any field that further dimensions are explored, and expanded or discarded. We can't listen to Bach, Brahms, and Beethoven all our lives, but they too were innovators in their time. Wagner was hooted and hated for dissonances which we now accept and acclaim as tuneful and melodic. An art which does not attempt to open new avenues of expression is dead, indeed.

And those who think all portraits should look like Sargents even though he was much criticized in his day, or like Whistler's Mother which was a break with contemporary portraiture, that all landscapes should look like Constable or, perhaps, Keith, that all music should sound like Chopin, or maybe, "America the Beautiful," and that all poetry should sound like Longfellow—these are the people who, in the field of ideas, fear each new concept, who would like to abolish the United Nations, who would make the United States an island isolated from the world, and who would ride backward with Senator GOLDWATER into a past that will never come again.

For some strange reason individuals following this pattern have some vague idea that they are upholding the American way of life, that way which was—and is—the greatest experiment of all time. Communism is our enemy, both without and within our country, but the closed mind is not its adversary as many who pride themselves on their ultraconservatism seem to think, but, on the contrary, its able ally and assistant, shutting out in its every attitude the wonderful possibilities of advancement through freedom to find new expressions, which is the real enemy of communistic ideology.

TOP G-MAN WARNS AGAINST HYSTERIA

Sensible advice has come to the American people from J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, regarding

the proper way in which to conduct themselves in the present period of confusion and doubt and involving the appearance of movements assertedly devoted to the extermination of communism on the domestic scene. Mr. Hoover, whose position as Chief of the leading Government investigating agency, is able to speak with authority on the subject.

Although the country, he says, is engaged in "a mortal struggle with world communism, it is time for both citizens and governmental authorities to confront this threat in a calm, realistic, rational, law-abiding manner." He reminds the people of America that this land, among other things, is "historically an impregnable force against tyranny," which reminds us that there must be recognition and rejection of any movement, whatever its nature, that has within it the seeds of tyranny and authoritarianism.

Mr. Hoover, observing that the Communists find it easy going in a country convulsed by fear, hysteria and confusion, warns against what he describes as "the danger of irresponsible counteraction by citizens who lend impetus to communism through inept attempts to fight this insidious menace."

Mindful of the present discussion regarding an organization much in the news, no doubt, Mr. Hoover points out that the Communist leader Lenin urged the exploitation of every rift that appeared among those who are opposed to the extension of this doctrine, and he notes that "there exists today in our land a vital rift which the Communists are exploiting. Unfortunately, this involves certain people across the country who engage in reckless charges against one another. The label Communist is too often indiscriminately attached to those whose views differ from the majority."

This warning is particularly appropriate at this time and coming from Mr. Hoover, a dedicated opponent of all un-Americanism, it is of vital importance.

Mr. Hoover also points out that the job of curtailing and containing communism is one for legally constituted authorities with the steadfast cooperation of every loyal citizen; this is neither the time for inaction nor vigilante action. He urges the people of this Nation to unite, understand our basic American heritage under law and face the Communist menace with deliberation, quiet courage and knowledge.

We commend Mr. Hoover's counsel to all who seek to preserve the American freedoms and oppose communism and other doctrines that thrive on bigotry, intolerance, ignorance, slander, and fear.

PARANOID FASCISM

The bright glare of publicity is the most effective antidote to such an outbreak of political disease in the United States as the John Birch Society seems to be.

Newspaper stories such as the series published in the Sentinel last week show the organization for what it is, a Fascist movement, pure and simple.

It is not the first time in this country that Fascist movements have been mounted. During the dark days of the thirties, when our national economy seemed to be in serious trouble, there were many who saw in authoritarian government the only salvation for the Nation. There were also many, in those days, who saw salvation at the other extreme, in the Russian experiment. Fortunately, for the country, neither of the extreme views prevailed.

The Birch Society has the marks of fascism. Its leader openly denounces the democratic process. He attempts to repudiate our national leaders, and tries to make the American people doubt the patriotism of such irreproachable men as former President Eisenhower, Richard Nixon, Chief Justice Earl Warren, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, and others, by saying they are Communists or tools of the Communists.

The Birch Society attempts to discredit our churches and religious leaders. It attacks the integrity of newspapers.

Its methods are the opposite of democratic. By organizing into tight cells controlled rigidly from the top, discouraging free speech, and urging the members to accuse and denounce fellow citizens without proof of wrongdoing of formal charge—by these methods and others the Birchers show their colors.

The founder of the movement, Robert Welch, realizes the danger of publicity to his movement. He has attempted to keep the organization secret and have its members operate clandestinely.

But secrecy is repugnant to the American people and the secrets of the Birchers are now public knowledge.

Thus informed, the American people will know the Birch group for what it is, and the Nation will not be fooled.

[From the Standard Oiler, Feb. 1961]

DISSENT? PARTY LINE

The tendency to confuse legitimate dissent on controversial issues with the Communist Party line is an ever-present danger in these critical times.

"Communism," says FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, "feeds on social ferment. On both the local and national levels, the Communist Party, U.S.A., is continually exploiting social, economic, and political grievances for its own tactical purposes.

"For this reason, the party line will frequently coincide with the views of many non-Communists on specific issues. We must not, therefore, indiscriminately label as Communists those whose opinions on a particular question may, on occasion, parallel the official party position. We must also guard against the tendency to characterize as Communists those who merely disagree with us or who advocate unorthodox or unpopular beliefs.

"When anyone is erroneously branded a Communist, it not only constitutes an injustice to the individual but also helps communism by diffusing the strength of the anti-Communist forces."

The Constitution and What It Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to offer in the RECORD the essay entitled "The Constitution and What It Means," by Paul Murphy, of Alliance, Ohio, one of the 12 winners in the American Legion essay contest for our State.

Paul, a junior science seminar student at Alliance High School, is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Charles Murphy, won this award in his first attempt at essay competition.

Reading this and other entries in this fine competition gives me faith that the young people of our country do understand and appreciate our constitutional system:

THE AMERICAN LEGION OF OHIO ESSAY CONTEST—THE CONSTITUTION AND WHAT IT MEANS

What does the Constitution of the United States mean? It means, to 180 million Americans, life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. It means to 50 different governments a ligament of national unity. And it is to millions of freedom searching people overseas a symbol of all that they hope and die for.

What is life? Life is the right to live and let live. It is freedom from fear of death at the hands of the government for unjust reasons.

What is liberty? It is the right to do as we please so long as we harm or injure no others while doing it. Our liberty is thoroughly and emphatically protected by the first 10 amendments, the Bill of Rights. In the Bill of Rights we are irrevocably given freedom of the press, of speech, of religion, of petition, and of assembly. We are free from unjust criminal prosecution and from cruel and unusual punishment. And we have a right to a trial by a jury and the right to keep and to bear arms.

What is the pursuit of happiness? In America it is the right to seek and enjoy fun, security, and contentment in any way that is not injurious to others. In some parts of the world this simple privilege is nonexistent.

Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, each is meaningless without the other two but combined they make our American way of life the envy of the entire world.

Why is national unity as is provided by the Constitution vital to the 50 States and people living in them? Let us look to history for the answer. During the weak years under the Articles of Confederation our country almost went the way of Latin America. Our great country almost broke up into 13 constantly bickering little countries which never could have reached the pinnacle of world power and leadership. Instead of being a world power as we are today, we, without our Constitution, would be today divided, poor, and politically insignificant. As Thomas Jefferson, the drafter of the immortal Declaration of Independence and our third President, said, "The Constitution is * * * the ark of our safety."

Why is the Constitution of the United States of America a symbol of all of those who yearn for freedom—of all that they hope someday to obtain? They who yearn for freedom have not only tasted oppression but have had to swallow it whole. When they look across the sea and see Americans happily and industriously working for their country and themselves they are even more desirous of freedom. It is plain to see that if given their free and unobstructed choice, men would always choose life in a free and democratic country rather than life in a country in which each individual is just another ant on the hill.

Americans have many reasons for giving thanks to God, but they should be especially thankful that He planted wisdom and judgment in the minds of the drafters of the Constitution of the United States of America.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I have received a communication from the members of the Illinois General Assembly enclosing a copy of House Joint Resolution 6, as adopted in the 72d General Assembly of the State of Illinois, relative

to Federal aid to education, especially allowing a tax deduction for all tuition, whether paid to a public or fully accredited college or university, and, in addition, allowing parents a tax deduction of $1,500 for each child or dependent they may send to any fully accredited college or university.

The resolution follows herewith:

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Springfield, April 12, 1961.

HON. ROLAND VICTOR LIBONATI,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LIBONATI: As authorized, I am enclosing herewith a copy of House Joint Resolution 6, as adopted in the 72d General Assembly of this State.

Sincerely,

CHARLES F. CARPENTIER,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF ILLINOIS, 72D GENERAL ASSEMBLY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 6

(Offered by Messrs. Burks, Noble W. Lee, Coulson, Dolezal, Clarke, Alsup, C. A. Walker, Finfgeld, Butler, Branson, Heiple, Conti, Jack Walker, Williams, Marek, Hoffelder, Fitzgerrell, Hoover, Hachmeister, Reum, McDevitt, Robinson, Hansen, Ralph T. Smith, Casey, Erienborn, Parkhurst, E. E. Dale, and Mrs. Dawson.)

Whereas it is undisputedly recognized that there is an urgent need to expand our schools and colleges, both public and private, to provide our exploding school-age population with the best possible education; and

Whereas private schools should be encouraged in their efforts to attract students in order to lighten the burden which will fall upon the taxpayer for the enormous expansion of State-supported schools and colleges; and

Whereas private schools and colleges should be allowed to compete on a more equal basis with tax-supported schools and colleges; and

Whereas the citizen who pays taxes to meet all or a large portion of the tuition for students who attend public schools and State universities is allowed to use such taxpayments as a deduction in reporting his Federal income tax but is denied such tax deduction for tuition paid private schools and colleges to which he may elect to send his children; and

Whereas the Federal Government is now considering some form of aid to education, and also the possibility of some tax relief to stimulate the national economy; and

Whereas by making all tuition a tax deduction, whether paid to a public or private school, the Congress would be providing an effective form of Federal aid to education without any risk of Federal control of education; without the diluting process of having such aid filtered through Washington; and would, at the same time, be providing a stimulant to the economy by this form of tax relief: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 72d General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the Senate concurring herein):

(1) That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact legislation allowing a tax deduction for all tuition, whether paid to a public, or fully accredited not-for-profit private school, or to any fully accredited college or university and, in addition, allowing parents a tax deduction of $1,500 for each child or dependent they may send to any fully accredited college or university.

(2) That this resolution does not constitute an approval of any other form of Federal aid to education.

(3) That suitable copies of this resolution be forwarded by the Secretary of State to the President of the United States and the Members of Congress from the State of Illinois.

Adopted by the house, March 7, 1961.

PAUL POWELL,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
CHAS F. KERVIN,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

Concurred in by the senate, March 22, 1961.

SAMUEL H. SHAPIRO,
President of the Senate,
EDWARD E. FERNANDES,
Secretary of the Senate.

Address by Chief Justice Earl Warren

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on March 26, 1961, Yeshiva University bestowed upon Chief Justice Earl Warren an honorary doctor of laws degree at an academic convocation.

I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the text of the address of the Chief Justice on that occasion:

ADDRESS BY CHIEF JUSTICE EARL WARREN AT CONVOCATION OF YESHIVA UNIVERSITY, MARCH 26, 1961

How pleasant it is in these turbulent times, when the news of the day pyramids one crisis upon another throughout the world, to join in a convocation of students and scholars who are searching for truth, and who subscribe to the principle that the welfare of our society and of the individuals in it depends upon the vigor and soundness of our moral and spiritual values. It is inspiring to celebrate the opening of still another decade of growth of a great university which is dedicated to that principle—for it is to that principle that our Nation owes its rise to greatness; and upon the preservation of that principle rest our hopes for the future.

There are far too many flaws in the pattern of our life to permit us to relax on the comfortable assumption that our progress is inevitable, without added effort or concentration of purpose on our part. Each day we are confronted with shocking evidence of departures from our moral and spiritual standards so extensive and in such responsible quarters as to undermine the respect in which we are held throughout the world. How we may rise above these deficiencies is the great present-day problem of our Nation. If we wish to stand before the world as a good nation as well as a great one, it must be accomplished through education, and education on the broadest possible base.

We have made great progress in the past, but our problem today is to continue to grow in moral and spiritual stature in a world which is increasingly blinded by cynicism and materialism and which too often makes a fetish of conformity. Our Nation has gained depth and maturity of judgment and has avoided the barrenness of conformity because we have nurtured within our society many priceless strains of thought, religion, tradition, and historical perspective. We have preserved within our national unity a rich variety of cultures—and they have given us intellectual and spiritual strength.

Our Nation is composed of many divergent ethnic groups and religious persuasions. It is our national purpose to live together in harmony and with a mutual understanding of each others aims and ambitions. And in this Nation there is no other city in which this divergence is more sympathetically preserved and its rich rewards more fully appreciated than in this great city of New York.

It is comforting to feel that the tenets of this university and the occasion of this convocation are in harmony with that purpose of our Nation and with the life of this great metropolitan area. They are in keeping, too, with the history and traditions of American education. Higher education in this country came into being very largely through the establishment of seminaries and colleges by various religious groups. The best of these religious educational institutions survived—some as small colleges, others as great universities encompassing all of the complex facets of modern higher education. In the aggregate, these colleges and universities of religious origin constitute the heart of our system of higher education—the leaven in the loaf of our intellectual bread.

State universities and colleges are latecomers in the field of higher education in this Nation. In the main public institutions of higher education are now little over a century old—and most of them were antedated by private colleges and universities by a century or even two.

Many state colleges and universities are truly great educational institutions, and perform a service which is essential to the welfare of our Nation. But these fine public institutions can only achieve their highest efficiency if they are compelled to meet the competition of private institutions, both secular and religious, where the pursuit of knowledge is wholly beyond the influence of Government.

Competition between public and private institutions of higher education does indeed exist; and it is desirable that it should. But this competition is a friendly rivalry which flows from each striving to achieve a higher level of excellence. This is a kind of competition which can never be cheapened by selfish or unworthy desires. Neither its means nor its ends can be tainted with evil. In the competition for excellence none who participate need fall by the wayside—all may take from the struggle added strength and dignity and usefulness—and these fruits will come in increasing abundance to both sides in direct proportion to the intensity of the competition between them.

The men and women who possess the vision to see the good that can come to our people from this fruitful competition, and who have the means and the generosity to make it possible by supporting our fine private colleges and universities, are entitled to our deepest thanks and to all of the personal satisfaction that flows from the performance of a truly worthy deed.

It is commonly asserted that America is on trial before the world. It is at least accurate to say that masses of men yet uncommitted are in the process of making a choice among systems of social organization, and that in every quarter of the world our system is being compared—in philosophy and in performance—with others which are antagonistic to it. If we care about the outcome of this comparison, if we are concerned with the choice which the new nations of the earth will make, then it is of the greatest importance to us that our institutions of higher education be dedicated to the unremitting pursuit of excellence.

If we are to be judged by the extent to which our Government functions effectively and in the interests of every individual in our Nation, then we must develop a degree of excellence among our political scientists and governmental leaders which will aid us in attaining that end. The present recruitment of scholars in the political science field by the National Government demonstrates

both that the need is real and that the leaders of our Government are aware of its existence.

If the unsolved social and economic problems of our country are to be considered the products of our system—as surely they will be—then nothing less than high excellence in analyzing these problems and searching out effective solutions can demonstrate the value of our institutions.

If the survival of our Nation is to depend upon the effectiveness of our defense, if national stature is to be measured by our success in the exploration of space, if we are to be judged on the basis of our accomplishments in pushing back the frontiers of knowledge in all of the fields of science vital to the comfort, health, and safety of man—surely then we must, through our schools, strive for a new excellence in all of the scientific disciplines.

If we really believe in a just and living God, then, in large part through the dedicated efforts of our educational institutions, we must achieve an excellence not yet achieved in spiritual power and in public and private morals, so that we may do worthily those things that will, in time, bring about peace through good will among the peoples of the world.

Much has been said by way of comparison of the number of engineers, the number of scientists, the number of sociologists and economists, the number of students of government, that are being educated in other nations of the world and in our own. Numbers are important—for the problem is vast. We must have enough trained men and women to solve the immediate problems and to develop the ultimate potential not only of our own Nation but also of other great areas of the earth.

Yet I wonder if it is not of far greater importance that we produce minds and hearts dedicated to the achievement of excellence—excellence in the natural and social sciences and in the realm of the spirit. If excellence becomes our preoccupation we can well afford to be optimistic about the outcome of any competition for the minds of men, for eventually the world will surely honor excellence wherever it appears.

Scores of nations even now emerging from conditions which sometimes approach the primeval are searching among the institutions and the ideals of older states for the pattern best suited to the basic needs of man. If we believe that man does have a soul which spurs him constantly to search for improvement and for truth, we can be confident that our striving after excellence will be heeded by peoples everywhere.

We will measure up to the responsibilities that history has imposed upon us only if we chart a course which makes freedom a living thing for every citizen of our land, and which gives to other nations of the world an abiding conviction of our devotion to peace with honor to all. The sure basis for success in this endeavor is the unremitting pursuit of excellence through institutions like your own. I wish you Godspeed in your efforts, and I promise you as your sufficient reward the deep satisfaction that flows from accomplishments in the interest of humankind.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Death of John A. Willo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, Slovak-Americans were saddened by the death on April 1 of John A. Willo of Youngstown, Ohio. Mr. Willo not only was a prominent and active member in the Slovenian community but had served as the law director of Youngstown. He was a founder and first president of the Slovak-American Political Federation and was named to many local, State, and national positions in Slovak organizations. All Ohio and especially our Slovenian community mourns his passing.

I ask unanimous consent that an article which appeared in the Falcon, the official organ of the Slovak Catholic Sokol be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHN A. WILLO, AMERICAN-SLOVAK FRATERNALIST, DIED

Attorney John A. Willo, 71, of 480 Wildwood Drive, Youngstown, Ohio, prominent Slovak-American fraternalist and former Youngstown law director, died April 1 at 2:25 a.m. in St. Elizabeth Hospital. He had been ill several years.

Attorney Willo, who had offices in the Union National Bank Building, had practiced law in Youngstown since graduating from Columbia Law School in 1914. He was one of the first Slovak lawyers in Youngstown and was a colorful member of Mayor William B. Spagnola's cabinet from 1940 to 1943.

Funeral services were held at 10:30 a.m. Tuesday at the Vaschak Funeral Home and 11 a.m. in SS. Cyril and Methodius Church. Members of the Mahoning County Bar Association met at 10:45 a.m. Tuesday at the church to attend services in a group.

A member of the city park and recreation commission for 2 years before his appointment as law director, Attorney Willo worked closely with the late park superintendent, Tommy Pemberton. As a youth he had played amateur baseball and basketball and helped organize one of the first Slovak teams.

At Columbia, Attorney Willo was one of the founders and first president of the Slovak-American Political Federation. In 1933 he was elected president of the Youngstown Solvak Society and later was named to various local, State, and National positions in Slovak organizations.

He was general counsel of the National Slovak Society 25 years and also president of the Ohio Fraternal Congress of the society, the Fraternal Society Law Association and the Mahoning Valley Assembly of the Slovak League of America. He served on the board of the National Fraternal Congress.

Attorney Willo was born March 25, 1890, in Youngstown, a son of Michael and Caroline Roth Willo. His father operated a Boardman Street boarding house which was a popular meeting place for immigrant Slovaks.

He attended St. Joseph School, Canisius Preparatory School, Holy Cross College, Georgetown University, and Columbia University.

At Holy Cross Attorney Willo was chosen grand marshal on "Holy Cross Night," the highest honor students could confer on one of their fellows. At Columbia, he was a founder and first dean of the Dwight Senate of Delta Theta Phi, a law fraternity.

During his early activity as a Slovak official, he traveled to many States to fight taxation planned against fraternal insurance organizations. The National Slovak Society is one of the oldest such groups in the country.

Attorney Willo also served as president of the Northeastern Ohio Chapter of Holy Cross Alumni and the Youngstown Bridge Club in the 1950's.

He was a member of Mahoning, Trumbull, State and National bar associations, the Elks Club, and SS. Cyril and Methodius Church, of which his father was a founder. He also belonged to the First Catholic Slovak Union, Pennsylvania Slovak Catholic Union, Zivena Beneficial Society, Protected Home Circle, Croatian Fraternal Union, Ukrainian National Aid Association and Slovak Gymnastic Union Sokol.

Attorney Willo leaves his wife, the former Veronica O'Brien of Boston, whom he married in 1912, and a sister, Mrs. Stephen J. Slifka of Youngstown, former supreme financial secretary of the First Catholic Slovak Ladies Union.

Migrant Farm Labor Problems and "Harvest of Shame"—X

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is the 10th in a series of articles presented in the public interest by the the Palm Beach Post-Times to show the Members some of the progress being made in Florida to solve problems relating to migrant farm labor which were left out of the television presentation "Harvest of Shame." The omissions of all that has been, and is being done in this field did a great injustice to the Floridians who have given their time and efforts to these problems over the years. It is hoped that by reading these articles and the ones to follow the Members and public will have a better understanding of this important matter:

[From the Palm Beach Post, Feb. 3, 1961]

GOODLETT INTERVIEWS MISPLACED IN TIME

"They sleep around the bars, and the grass, and the packinghouses around the lake area, in the parks. Any place they can find to sleep and rest for a few hours."—Chief Goodlett in "Harvest of Shame."

Belle Glade Police Chief Charles Goodlett regrets now that he went hunting last November 25 and missed the "Harvest of Shame" broadcast.

But the chief said other residents of the community who saw the show told him his statements made during the interview were distorted.

Interviewed at his office, Goodlett obviously didn't like the manner in which the film was presented.

The chief said he told David Lowe, who questioned him for the show, about certain conditions existing in the community when he took office 13 years ago.

Because of the shortage of housing at that time, he said, many migrants had no place to sleep and used the parks, the lake area, the packing houses and other areas.

"But the film made it appear that condition still prevails," Goodlett said. "Actually, it doesn't. There has been a great improvement in housing for the migrants, in schools and recreation."

Most migrants living in the city pay $7 or $8 a week for 2-room apartments, the chief said.

Goodlett said he was interviewed for 45 minutes. But persons who saw the show made it clear to him, he said, that all of the improvements he mentioned were edited out of the film.

"I have suggested the network make a second film from the portions that were deleted from the various interviews," he said wryly.

The chief said he still gets telephone calls, letters and postcards from persons in the north who saw the show and want to help.

"One woman called me and said she was ready to send a truckload of food," he said. "She couldn't understand why I didn't jump at the chance to ask her to send it on down. She thought all of our people were starving."

The officer said he finally told the caller CBS had spent months shooting the film and that portions of it were almost a year old when shown.

"Any conditions at that time would be changed by now," he said, "and I explained to her that the film didn't show a true picture of conditions here."

Goodlett showed a postcard from a South Carolina man who offered permanent employment to a family.

"But there's more to it than making jobs available," he said. "There is a need to inspire in these people a desire for self-improvement."

The chief, a native of Alabama, said he himself in the past has found permanent jobs for some migrants.

"Many of them say they want out of the migrant stream," he said, "but I found that when June rolled around they started getting that faraway look in their eyes, and pretty soon they were gone."

Others, though, he said, have found it possible to break out of the migrant stream when given the chance.

Belle Glade has made great progress in improving the living conditions of its migrants,

the chief said, and he cited the availability of two swimming pools during warmer weather.

"In the last 13 years, the city has made 50 years of progress," he said.

Goodlett said he and Lowe became good friends while the show was being filmed. "I liked him," he said.

"After he left, he used to call me about once a week," the chief continued. "But a funny thing—he hasn't called me since the broadcast."

Stevenson Emerges as Powerful Figure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article written by Mr. Roscoe Drummond, published in the Minneapolis Tribune of April 14, 1961, entitled "Stevenson Emerges as Powerful Figure," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article describes the splendid work which is being carried out by our Ambassador to the United Nations, Mr. Adlai Stevenson. It points out the high regard and respect in which Ambassador Stevenson is held by the members of the United Nations and, indeed, the outstanding job he is doing in behalf of American policies.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STEVENSON EMERGES AS POWERFUL FIGURE—HE IS EXERTING UNUSUALLY WIDE INFLUENCE IN THE STATE DEPARTMENT AND THE WHITE HOUSE

(By Roscoe Drummond)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—Viewed from both Washington and the United Nations, Ambassador Adlai Stevenson is emerging as a powerful figure in the Kennedy administration.

This does not mean that the President is not making the final decisions on policy. This does not mean that Secretary of State Dean Rusk is being detoured as Mr. Kennedy's principal adviser on foreign affairs.

It does mean that, on the basis of his experience, initiative, and political prestige at home and abroad, Stevenson is exerting unusually wide influence in the State Department and the White Hoouse.

Whatever coolness there may have been in the past, Stevenson and Mr. Kennedy are now establishing a good working relationship. As a consequence, the President's U.N. Ambassador is today at the center of policy formulation.

Every delegate here is under instruction from his Government. Stevenson is, too. But to a notable extent his recommendations shape his instructions. And beyond that his views on the widest range of foreign policy carry great weight in the top councils of the administration.

It was at Ambassador Stevenson's initiative that the United States for the first time voted with the Afro-Asian nations in their anticolonial resolution on Angola.

It was Stevenson, in part because of his long personal acquaintance with Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko, who was called upon to conduct the delicate and important negotiations for resuming the disarmament talks with the Russians.

When British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan was in Washington this past week to meet with President Kennedy, Stevenson took part as well as Secretary Rusk.

Mr. Kennedy needs Stevenson in his administration. The President, aware of his close election, wants to keep the support of Adlai's followers. In addition, Stevenson, through his wide travels, has gotten to know personally more world leaders than anyone in the administration, including the President. This is invaluable for his job as Ambassador at the United Nations. He also brings his gift of articulate speech to the United Nations, perhaps the best forum for Stevenson's talents.

All of these things give Stevenson a voice in cabinet deliberations and a degree of access and influence with the President which is exceptional.

Everything hasn't always gone well. Mr. Kennedy was annoyed no little when Ambassador Stevenson publicly guessed that the President would be glad to see Premier Khrushchev if he decided to come to the United Nations—this when the President did not want to give Khrushchev any encouragement to come. I am also told that Stevenson delivered two speeches, not before the United Nations, which had not been cleared by the State Department.

But these things were in the early period of the administration's takeover—and have not recurred. Rusk and Stevenson have worked together smoothly thus far.

In his job at the United Nations Stevenson is at many points doing things differently than did Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge. He is initiating breakfast, luncheon and dinner sessions with the heads of all the 99 delegations, sometimes including wives. For the first time Stevenson, as U.S. representative, let it be known that he would be available to meet with the caucus of the Afro-Asian nations on a common matter. They invited him at once.

There is one intriguing thread of sameness-plus-difference between the Governor and his predecessor. As U.N. Ambassador, Lodge was, to a degree, seeking to make his political reputation while Stevenson is seeking to conserve his political reputation.

It is premature to guess what Stevenson's record will look like when it takes fuller shape. But at this point he is proving a powerful advocate of U.S. policy within the United Nations and an influential spokesman for his own views within the Kennedy administration.

No More Baubles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, confronted by another Russian successful space-spectacular, Americans once again are going through a period of reexaminations in regard to our space effort. This morning the Washington Post carried an editorial entitled "No More Baubles" that, in my opinion, is a most thoughtful, well-balanced assessment of the predicament in which we find ourselves today. Under leave to extend my remarks, I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

NO MORE BAUBLES

In the face of all the publicity and praise the Soviet Union has been receiving for its man-in-space feat, statements about the better balance of American science are bound to appear defensive. Mr. Khrushchev and his colleagues have been exploiting Major Gagarin's flight by every means available, and with devastating effect in some parts of the world.

It is unquestionably true that the United States is far more advanced than the Soviet Union in the broad range of scientific endeavor, and this is probably also true of the meaningful aspects of space exploration. As Howard Simons wrote in this newspaper on Sunday, the Russians go in for splashy projects of propaganda and prestige value. The space vehicle in which Major Gagarin circled the earth appears to have been relatively unsophisticated in many aspects. But it is unnecessary to depreciate the Soviet achievement. The plain fact is that the effort succeeded.

This was possible because the Soviet Union, starting from a vastly more primitive base, has concentrated upon certain specific objectives. Soviet science is respectable in its own right; but the Communist leaders have understood well how to make their science serve a political as well as a scientific purpose. That political purpose, of course, has been to persuade people elsewhere that communism has an irresistible momentum and is the wave of the future.

In this there is an important lesson for the United States. There is no point in either belittling or bemoaning the Soviet man in space; we shall have a man of our own in space at the right moment, and a lot more too. But the utter failure in the past to consider the political importance of being first has been very costly to American prestige.

Enough has been said of the misjudgments. We all have made them. It would be altogether foolish now to stake all our money and effort on some showy project that did not hold real promise of scientific merit and advance. But it ought to be clear that henceforth a wise national policy must inevitably comprehend the potential political reaction as well as the scientific benefit from American programs. We ought at least to be spared any more comments like those which dismissed the first Soviet sputnik as a mere bauble.

Administration Responsibility for Coming Deficits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent article entitled "Kennedy Trying To Blame Eisenhower for Two Deficits," which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune, written by Mr. Joseph R. Slevin.

This article calls attention to the manner in which the Kennedy administration is trying to dodge their own responsibility for the coming deficits.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KENNEDY TRYING TO BLAME EISENHOWER FOR TWO DEFICITS

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

WASHINGTON, March 27.—President Kennedy is trying to blame a pair of coming budget deficits on former President Eisenhower, but his own budget figures tell a different story.

The Chief Executive hammered on the Eisenhower-deficit thesis in a special message that he sent to Congress on Friday and Budget Director David E. Bell said it all over again today.

Mr. Bell flatly told the Congressional Joint Economic Committee that the budget deficit now in prospect for fiscal 1962, which begins July 1, "will be the consequence of the overestimation of revenues and underestimation of expenditures" in Mr. Eisenhower's January budget.

Mr. Kennedy repeatedly took the same position Friday. "Should there be a deficit in 1962, it will be the consequence of the overestimation of revenues and underestimation of expenditures in the January budget, and not the result of new policies or programs proposed by this administration," he declared.

The troubling thing about the President's contention is that it just isn't so and constant repetition can only serve to mislead the public.

Mr. Kennedy has been making much of the critical dangers facing the country and of the importance of telling the people the straight, unvarnished facts.

It's a good policy and it's just as applicable to the budget as to any other Government activity.

The President is trying to make a political point and the most immediate consequence has been the submission of one of the most bizarre budget messages on record.

The bulk of the message is devoted to a strained exposition of Mr. Kennedy's claim that the fiscal 1961 and 1962 deficits are Mr. Eisenhower's and the message contains very few budget facts.

The President is afraid that he will be considered "fiscally irresponsible" and that is why he is going to such strenuous lengths to convince Congress and the voters that he is a true believer in sound financial policies and an honest dollar.

The administration now is forecasting that the Federal Government will have a $2,169 million deficit this year instead of the $79 million surplus that Mr. Eisenhower predicted in his January budget message.

Similarly, it is forecasting that the Government will post a $2,126 million deficit next year instead of the $1,468 million surplus that Mr. Eisenhower had predicted. And it has painted the lily by not including defense spending increases that are expected to lift next year's deficit above the $3 billion mark.

What Mr. Kennedy's detailed budget figures disclose is that his spending programs have greatly increased the dimensions of the 1961 and 1962 deficits.

Mr. Eisenhower did overestimate the size of tax collections this year and next and the former President did underestimate the amount that the Government will spend.

But the new Kennedy calculations show that the Government would have had only an $805 million deficit this year if Mr. Kennedy had held to Mr. Eisenhower's policies. Instead, he has proposed additional spending programs that will increase the deficit to $2,169 million.

And the official Kennedy arithmetic shows that the Government would have had only a $704 million deficit next year instead of a deficit of more than $3 billion if Mr. Kennedy had continued Mr. Eisenhower's policies.

But Mr. Kennedy chose to increase civilian and defense spending by several billion dollars. Those were Mr. Kennedy's decisions—not Mr. Eisenhower's.

High National Awards Presented Applied Physics Laboratory of the Johns Hopkins University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, we of the Fifth Congressional District of Maryland have for a long time recognized the important role that the Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory in Howard County has been playing in our national defense effort. We, therefore, were not surprised but were extremely gratified when the laboratory and members of the staff received three significant awards for outstanding contributions to Department of Defense research and development programs over the past few months.

In January, Dr. Frank T. McClure, chairman of the applied physich laboratory's research center, was the recipient of the first Invention Award to be made by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. It was for Dr. McClure's invention of the Satellite Doppler Navigation System.

A month later, Dr. Richard B. Kershner, supervisor of the space research and development program of the laboratory, was given the Navy's Distinguished Public Service Award for organizing and directing progress evaluation in the Polaris program conducted by the laboratory. The Distinguished Public Service Award is the highest recognition the Navy can give a citizen who is not an employee of the Department of Defense.

During the same ceremony, the applied physics laboratory was awarded the Navy's Certificate of Merit for outstanding service in the field of ballistic missile systems development and analysis. The citation said: "APL contributed immeasurably in achieving the first successful firing of the Polaris missile from a submerged submarine on July 20, 1960."

Dr. Kershner's citation noted that "because of his unremitting efforts, profound professional knowledge, and astute technical direction, the program of flight test analysis yielded essential information vital to the fleet ballistic missile system program."

It was the second time that Dr. Kershner had won the Distinguished Public Service Award. In 1958, he was similarly honored for his leadership in development of the Terrier missile as a fleet weapon. He presently has responsibility for developing the Transit navigational satellite system.

It was for the basic invention leading to the Transit system that Dr. McClure was honored by NASA.

The Transit system is based upon the ability to extract extremely accurate positional information from the measured Doppler shift of a satellite's transmitter during passage of the satellite over a tracking station or a ship's receiver. The shift is the measurement of the change of frequency of a radio signal transmitted from a satellite. This change of frequency is caused by the satellite's motion relative to a receiving or tracking station. Dr. McClure recommended study of the Doppler shift as the basis of a new method of navigation. He said that if man could accurately calculate the location of an orbiting vehicle by its Doppler shift, then the reverse must be true and that the location of a point on earth could be correctly established by analysis of the Doppler signal from a satellite.

When presenting the award to Dr. McClure, Dr. T. Keith Glennan, who was then NASA Administrator said: "This award is being made to you as an individual whose initiative and keen analytical insight were responsible for the undertaking of a development program that will have far-reaching benefits, the extent of which cannot yet be properly assessed."

In March, Dr. McClure was also honored by the Washington Chemical Association, a chapter of the American Chemical Society, which presented him its Hillebrand Award for work in solid rocket fuels and other fields.

The Certificate of Merit was the fourth such award won by the applied physics laboratory. It has received two Naval Ordnance Development Awards for contributions in the field of naval ordnance and the Department of Defense Reserve Award.

The first such honor was tendered the laboratory in 1945 by the Navy for the laboratory's wartime development of the proximity (VT) fuze. In 1958, five members of the staff, including the director, Dr. R. E. Gibson, received the Distinguished Public Service Award, and four were presented the Meritorious Public Service Citation for outstanding contributions to the research and development program of the Navy.

Besides the proximity fuze the laboratory provided the first ramjet engine, the Terrier, Talos, and Tartar missiles, and is now developing the Typhon weapons system. The Typhon is a completely automated missile firing system for global fleet operation. It is designed to provide the fleet with a defensive system with greatly extended range, accuracy, and target-handling capacity, capable of intercepting and knocking down both enemy aircraft and missiles, and for long-range bombardment of surface targets.

S. 901, the Marine Sciences Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Marine Digest, an outstanding maritime publication issued weekly at Seattle, Wash., recently editorialized on the need for enactment of S. 901, the proposed Marine Sciences and Research Act of 1961. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S PASS MARINE SCIENCES BILL

The Marine Digest before has asked for support for Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON'S national program of oceanographic research. We do not hesitate to ask for support again.

Hearings on the Magnuson marine science bill will be held next week before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Because of regional interest and benefits, the University of Washington will have three of its scientists testifying in support.

The University of Washington Fisheries Instrument Laboratory was closed last year for lack of funds after 4 years of internationally recognized technological achievement. Funds in the Marine Science bill would reactivate the program, and would also authorize support at the university for marine resources studies and specialized programs including research in marine radio biology, selective fish breeding and other programs now in progress.

The bill, simply described, provides funds and direction for a 10-year program which would cut down or remove the United States dangerous lag in oceanographic and marine science research. It is substantially the same bill passed by the Senate last year, but not acted upon by the House.

In the meantime, Senator MAGNUSON reports, Russia has further increased the gap between it and the United States in oceanographic ships, oceanwide research operations, and ocean-trained marine scientists and technicians.

Last year Russia launched four new research vessels, two of them over 3,600 tons and is building three more in the 6,000-ton class. The United States let contracts last year for only two research ships of about 1,500 tons each for completion in 1962.

This is just not enough when it comes to ocean equipment. The need has been well researched and documented by many, including Navy reports which show America 15 years behind in its need to replace obsolete small vessels in the present fleet. The Navy says the need for new ships requires a construction program that will see 25 years of shipbuilding done in 10 years.

The marine sciences bill will provide funds for this and for immediate long-term research bearing on fisheries conservation, underwater routes and ocean currents, marine food supplies, and mineral capabilities. These things have a bearing on our national military and economic survival.

Let's get the marine sciences bill passed this time.

What Next in Space?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very timely editorial which appeared in the Lynn (Mass.) Daily Evening Item for April 15, 1961:

WHAT NEXT IN SPACE?

Cold second thought on the achievement of the Russians in putting a man in space is beginning to place the matter in proper perspective.

The actual flight itself was a tremendous undertaking with overtones of courage, painstaking research and resourcefulness that merit only the highest praise. The news had dramatic impact of the highest order and Major Gagarin is entitled to all the glory and plaudits lavished upon him in Moscow. It would have been more satisfying to Americans, of course, if one of our own astronauts had been the first to pierce outer space, but that does not detract from our willingness to recognize the heoric achievement of the Russian flyer.

But in appraising the actual results produced by the flight there is less reason for unbridled enthusiasm. As one commentator put it, this might be a kind of technological tour de force and not much more.

What, actually, do we know about space today that we did not know a week ago except perhaps that a blue haze surrounds the globe?

We knew before that the Soviets possessed rockets of much larger thrust than ours. The flight demonstrated their ability to control these rockets and to solve the perplexing problems of direction and re-entry. It may be that the flight will make it possible for us to know much more than we do know about certain forces in space which affect our own planet, but is there any certainty of this or will it provide any more information that we already have from our own earth-bound observations?

The Russians, of course, have scored a tremendous psychological and propaganda victory. At the moment, their prestige is riding high, particularly among those nations easily impressed by dramatic coups.

But it should be remembered that while billions of dollars were being spent on the studies and research that eventually sent the Russian major into orbit, millions of Russians were living in hovels. And while the official announcement of the success of the flight had grandiose references to enduring peace and an end to the arms race, the Soviet delegate at Geneva suddenly reversed a concession he made in principle a week ago. After agreeing to an Anglo-American proposal for research into underground nuclear explosions, with full Russian participation, he suddenly did an about-face and withdrew his assent. The Russians apparently feel at the moment that they need make no concessions to anyone, anywhere.

A New Look at Agriculture—Address by Secretary of Agriculture Freeman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent address which was delivered by the Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, before the National Press Club, Washington, D.C., yesterday.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NEW LOOK AT AGRICULTURE

(Address by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman prepared for delivery at the National Press Club, Washington, D.C., April 17, 1961, 12:30 p.m.)

I especially appreciate this opportunity to urge you to take a new look at agriculture because you are leaders in the opinion field, and because I think that there is no economic problem in America today in which we find more faulty emphasis, more outmoded concepts, and less real understanding than we find in current public attitudes toward the nature, causes, and possible solution for our agricultural problem.

I believe that the achievement of an effective solution to that problem requires a much greater public understanding of the factors involved, a more widespread public recognition of the contribution farmers make to our American standard of living, and a more general realization of the implications for agriculture that are inherent in the scientific and technological progress that characterizes our times.

One of the most significant characteristics of our age is the fact that physical, scientific, and technological progress is far outrunning social, political, and economic change. No recent event has illustrated this fact more dramatically than last week's successful orbiting of a man around the earth. Scientific and technological progress made this achievement possible. But man does not yet know how to use this new power to orbit the earth. Governments of men do not yet know how to control the power that can send tons into space. They have developed no social instruments to control the scientific instruments that now boast such incredible precision that they can pinpoint targets on the other side of the earth. This social lag represents a dangerous gap, a gap that must be closed if men on earth are to have any hope for security against the destructive power that man himself has created.

But what has this to do with the price of peanuts? Or wheat, or milk, or feed grains—or the other specific problems with which the Secretary of Agriculture is immediately concerned?

Only this. There is an equally dangerous gap in agriculture. Technical and scientific progress has for outrun social and economic change in agriculture as well as in the conquest of space. The social lag represented by the gap between the abundance of food that we can produce and the extent of hunger that exists in spite of this potential for abundance may, in the long run, be far more significant than the gap in space.

True, it is less spectacular, less dramatic. But to men and women and children who are really hungry, bread and milk at hand is more important than a star in the sky. To billions of men and women throughout this world the higher standards of living that can be achieved if we properly use our capacity to produce are of more direct and personal concern than the discovery of other worlds.

It is the awesome responsibility of this generation to close the gap between scientific progress and social progress sufficiently to make our civilization secure. It is the tremendous responsibility of this Nation and this administration to exercise leadership toward closing this gap in every field—in space, in human rights, and in the task of making the abundance that we can produce available to satisfy human needs. It is the special responsibility of those of us in the field of agriculture to close the gap represented by our capacity to produce abundantly, on the one hand, and, on the other, our lack of the social and economic organization necessary to both manage and utilize that abundance.

It is in the light of this responsibility, as a part of our overall national responsibility, that this administration has developed its agricultural policies and programs and formulated the legislation that the President is today recommending to the Congress. We are now pressing forward vigorously with all our resources to achieve these programs, so that we may begin to close that gap without delay.

May I say quite frankly that I believe undue delay would be very serious—more serious than simply a postponement of the gains that we expect from the new program. In a real sense we are reaching the point of no return. Delay or postponement now could mean economic disaster. The time is running out.

We can neither ask nor expect an indefinite continuation of programs and policies under which the U.S. Government pays ever-increasing amounts for stockpiles of commodities that threaten to become ever more unmanageable. We can neither ask nor expect that the American farmer will continue to invest his capital, his labor, his skill, and his management ability for a material reward that is shockingly below the national average. Our farmers are the world's most efficient agricultural producers, and their products are the basic essentials of human life. For this efficient production of essential needs they must have an average capital investment, exclusive of the farm home, of $36,000. Yet they receive for their labor an average of about 81 cents an hour.

In achieving its prime purpose of production, American agriculture in this generation has reached a pinnacle of success. It has tripled its output per hour of labor in the past two decades, while industry's output has only doubled. Twenty years ago 1 farmer produced enough for 11 people; he now produces enough for 25.

Under our system of enterprise and initiative we expect that success will bring an appropriate reward. And this phenomenal success in agriculture has brought its reward. But the reward is to the American consumer, and not to the American farmer. The consumer in America works fewer hours to feed himself and his family than in any other country. He is able to buy a balanced and varied diet for approximately one-fifth of his take-home pay.

Contrast this with the consumer in other nations. A meal of beef, potatoes, cabbage, bread, butter, milk and fruit for four people can be bought by the average industrial worker in the United States for 1 hour's wages. In Germany and England that meal would take over 2 hours' work; in Austria, 4 hours; in France, 4½ hours; in Italy, over 5 hours.

These are facts the American public should acclaim, and for which they should pay tribute to the American farmer for his contribution to our standard of living. Let us give at least as much recognition to this as do our Communist opponents. I saw very little emphasis here on one item in last Friday's reports from Moscow that to me has real significance. In reporting on Russia's new space triumph the wire services quoted Khrushchev as saying, "The space flight must not detract the attention of the Soviet people from other targets, and these include catching up with the United States in the standard of living."

Gratifying as this is, I have already noted that the farmer has not reaped the reward of his success. Quite the contrary. Farm output was 19 percent higher in 1960 than in 1952, but realized net farm income was 19 percent lower. Incomes of farm families today are lower relative to the rest of our population than they have been at any time since the 1930's. During the years between 1952 and 1960 the cost of living exclusive of food rose 15 percent, while the cost of the typical market basket of food increased only 2 percent. During this time the marketing charges associated with that basket of food increased 17 percent, but the decline of 15 percent in farm prices accounts for the difference.

These facts illustrate that, for the farmer, productive success has paradoxically meant economic distress. And, as if to add insult to injury, the public attitude toward the farmer has come to reflect concepts of surpluses and subsidies rather than the regard we expect for ability, industry, efficiency, and successful productivity.

Such erroneous concepts and public attitudes must be changed if we are to get a farm program that meets today's needs before we reach that point of no return.

I should therefore like to note here some areas in which adequate public understanding is most essential.

I

I have already referred to the need for a recognition of the productive success of American agriculture and the extent of the contribution the farmer thereby makes to our high standards of living. Agriculture in America leads the way to a new age of abundance in mankind's most essential commodities, and as such has achieved a landmark in history more important to human health and happiness than last week's landmark in the conquest of space. This success is the direct result of amazing progress in agricultural science and technology and the farmers' ability to put that progress into practical use.

II

We need to recognize how this success, in itself, has resulted in economic distress in a society in which we have not yet learned how to live with abundance. Because we are so unaccustomed to an age of plenty, we have tried to apply economics of scarcity as we repeated the shibboleths and slogans and phrases that were a part of the "conventional wisdom" of the past, and they won't work. We need to know a little more about agricultural economics to reach a sound and constructive solution of the farm problem.

The public must understand that any realistic solution to the farm problem requires the adjustment of our agricultural abundance to current domestic and foreign needs and demands. We may, in fact we must, increase our utilization of farm products both at home and abroad, and several of the early actions of this administration have been directed toward that end. The doubling of our direct distribution of food to the needy, our pilot food stamp programs, and the expansion of our food-for-peace efforts illustrate the determination of this administration to use fully our abundance of food and fiber. But, even with an expansion of such programs to the greatest possible extent that is consistent with sound and humane ideas and policies, we will not be able, in the years immediately ahead, to expand consumption enough to absorb all of our potential agricultural productivity. Thus, we must adjust our abundance. An understanding of the problems of achieving this goal—as well as of the consequences of not achieving it—is essential to a sound approach to new legislation.

Both the problems and the consequences stem in a large measure from the inelasticity of the human stomach, and the resulting inelasticity of demand for food. A little too much in the way of food supplies leads to dramatic farm price declines—hence to a farm-income problem. And a little too little in the way of food supplies leads to skyrocketing food prices and a real income squeeze on consumers. This is the food problem so often encountered in wartime.

To cope with these problems in the past, we have imposed price ceilings in wartime, and we place floors under farm prices during periods of surplus. But neither of these measures in themselves effectively corrects the imbalance of supplies relative to the existing demand. Nor can the uncoordinated efforts of several million farm producers correct unbalanced supply situations. Farm price and income gyrations that have resulted in the past have alternately hurt both the consumer and the producer.

Chronically low farm prices in the 1950's did not induce the average farmer to contract production. On the contrary, the average producer increased his production substantially. Caught up in the technological revolution on the one hand, and rising production costs on the other, the average farmer tried to solve his income problem by increasing his output. He succeeded in increasing his output, but he did not succeed in increasing his income. Government price support operations in the great commodities of wheat, cotton, and feed grains held the prices of those commodities at support levels as the Government accumulated stocks. The new "third market," the Commodity Credit Corporation, acquired the 6 to 8 percent excess production each year, and held the farm price level some 20 to 40 percent above what it would have been with no programs.

No one liked the program of the late 1950's—the farmers, because it gave no hope for improved incomes; consumers, because it was wasteful and ineffective; and congressional leaders and taxpayers, because it was needlessly costly. It was a failure on all these counts because it did not and could not effectively adjust supplies. Supplies outran demand in the 1950's and pushed farm prices down to support levels and held them there.

Every responsible projection made for the 1960's suggests that unless we act supplies will continue to outdistance demand with the same chronic price-depressing effects.

Confronted with this prospect for the 1960's, we must now establish procedures and enact legislation to enable farmer producers to work together to adjust their production to the quantities we can use. The President is therefore proposing legislation that will provide the tools whereby they can adjust their supplies effectively whenever there is general agreement among them that such a course of action is desirable.

III

We need to recognize that all the farmer is asking for is equality of economic opportunity.

The farmer is the only basic producer in our economy who now has available to him no means by which he can adjust his production to demand, and who therefore has no effective means by which he can influence the economic rewards of his enterprise.

It is absurd, in any consideration of a farm program, to compare the farmer with the small corner merchant.

Perhaps there should be Government action for small business, but of a different nature for a different reason. But the farmer, as a basic producer and not a retailer, can be more accurately compared with other basic producers—such as, for example, the producers of steel. Government has given to such producers the instrument of incorporation, by which they can become large enough to effectively adjust their production to quantities that can be sold profitably.

Government has likewise given to labor the instrument of collective bargaining whereby millions of individual workers, who, as individuals, would be even more helpless than the farmers, can work together to achieve a fair return for their productive activity.

To achieve economic equality, therefore, we propose programs to provide farmers with the institutional machinery for coming together and developing supply adjustment programs, and with democratic methods for approving or rejecting such programs. We would specifically provide safeguards for consumers' interests in this process.

By enacting the proposed legislation the Congress would establish the ground rules

and guidelines under which supply adjustment programs would be developed and placed into operation. Then, whenever action is needed with regard to any commodity or group of related commodities, a committee of producers—including one consumer representative—would be selected to consult with the Secretary of Agriculture to develop and recommend a program of supply adjustment for that commodity. The Secretary would recommend a program based on these consultations. Only after such a program had been approved by the President, sanctioned by the Congress, and approved by a two-thirds vote of the producers themselves, would it become binding upon all farmers who choose to produce that commodity. The farmers who serve on these commodity advisory committees would be chosen from nominees designated by farmer-elected county committees and by farm organizations.

Thus, in return for the limitations to which farmers would conform only after they, themselves, had reached decisions by the accepted democratic method of voting on proposed programs—in return for these limitations the farmers would gain more real influence over the economic consequences of their farming enterprise, more real influence over their opportunity to earn fair incomes, than they have ever had, or can have, without such programs.

The new program would raise the level of the function and the responsibility of the Congress, and of the agricultural committees in Congress. As the new programs formulated under these proposals get underway, many of the powers that the Congress has now granted to the Secretary of Agriculture—powers to fix support levels, prescribe acreage allotments, establish marketing agreements and orders, and others—would require final approval by the Congress. This would add to the responsibilities of the Agriculture Committees in the Congress the function of careful review of each such program, many of which are now put into effect by order of the Secretary without any such review.

Thus, while the Congress would be relieved of the onerous burden of a detailed analysis of a multitude of separate proposals, commodity by commodity, season after season, under countless and fragmented pressures; it would have an increased responsibility for considering broad programs and policies in their entire implications, and for the continuing and final authority to determine what programs shall become the law of the land.

Under the procedures set forth in the proposed legislation programs could be developed to meet different needs and conditions by utilizing a variety of methods, many of which have already proved their usefulness. It would be the responsibility of the commodity advisory committee to adapt those methods to a program that would meet the needs of the farmers producing the commodity involved; and it would be the responsibility of the secretary of Agriculture to consider, in addition, various intercommodity relationships, potential effects on our economy as a whole, and the national welfare.

IV

For some commodities the adjustment of supply to demand could be effectively achieved by means of marketing quotas and allotments in terms of quantity as well as acreage. For some commodities programs of marketing orders and agreements could be formulated under which producers could develop research, promotion, higher standards, and quality control, as well as the effective adjustment of supply. Government cooperation in support of farm income could be by means of a variety of methods, but in all cases to be limited to instances where a supply adjustment program is in effect, after consultation with the appropriate advisory committee and after approval by the President and review by the Congress.

A final point that we need to understand to achieve a successful farm program is the extent to which the problems and performance of agriculture are inextricably interwoven with problems of domestic prosperity and economic growth and with those of achieving security and peace in the world.

I believe the American public is becoming increasingly aware of the importance of our agricultural abundance as an instrument in foreign policy. We are stepping up our programs for expanding the export of food and fiber, both for dollars and for foreign currency. We have launched a program to determine just what the world food deficit is. As we increase such efforts, and as we develop means, in cooperation with other countries, for the more effective use of greater quantities of agricultural exports, these new and increasing demands on American agriculture will have to be taken into account in the formulation of our agricultural programs at home. This is why an extension and strengthening of our food-for-peace program is an integral part of the agricultural legislation presented to the Congress today.

I have hopes that the American public is beginning to realize how essential a healthy agriculture is to the long-term soundness of our economy. Evidences of this, such as that reflected by the keen observations of the Nebraska banker interviewed in the last issue of the U.S. News & World Report, are encouraging. I am confident that when the nonfarm public fully understands how essential a healthy agricultural economy is to its own well-being we will get support from cities and towns, as well as from the farms, for the program we propose. And I am confident that, with the cooperation of American farmers, we can achieve an effective adjustment of our agricultural abundance within the framework of this legislation, and thus close the gap between our tremendous productive potential and our ability to manage and utilize it in the best interest of all. It will not be easy, but it can be done.

Migrant Farm Labor Problems and "Harvest of Shame"—XI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is the 11th in a series of articles presented in the public interest by the Palm Beach Post-Times to show the Members some of the progress being made in Florida to solve problems relating to migrant farm labor which were left out of the television presentation "Harvest of Shame." The omissions of all that has been, and is being done in this field did a great injustice to the Floridians who have given their time and efforts to these problems over the years. It is hoped that by reading these articles and the ones to follow the Members and public will have a better understanding of this important matter.

[From the Palm Beach Post, Feb. 3, 1961]

COUNTY MIGRANT CAMPS MUST MEET STRICT CODE

"I notice there is some straw over there. What is it for?"

"Well, that was the straw they brought for the people to sleep on."

"Well, weren't mattresses supplied here?"

"No. There used to be, but there ain't now."

"Mrs. Quigley, where is the water supply over here?"

"That's it right yonder."

"For how many people?"

"This, that and yonder. All uses the same."

"Where do you use the bathrooms? Where are the facilities?"

"Don't have one."—"Harvest of Shame."

Migrant housing varies greatly in Palm Beach County, and throughout Florida.

If there is a labor camp in the county which does not have a bathroom, or has only one outside faucet for the entire camp, the county health department's chief sanitarian, Joseph Alvarez, would like to know where it is.

If one did exist, it would be closed down.

The pattern of housing in the county is quite different on the coast and in the Glades.

In the coastal area, the expense has been borne by the farmer himself. Examples may be found in the Delray Beach area. And outside the county, examples may be found at Pompano Beach, Homestead, Fort Pierce, and other communities.

In the Glades area near Lake Okeechobee, farming is more extensive. More workers are employed. This has increased the demand for housing, and it has been provided in several ways.

At Pahokee, for example, the Federal Government has financed a 115-unit housing project for which the average monthly rent in 1959 was $39.59. The cost of the project was $1,295,000. Ground was broken in June 1957. Three other camps also are located there.

Belle Glade has two huge camps for the migrants. They were built by the Federal Government, later turned over to the Belle Glade Housing Authority.

Low-cost living quarters are provided both for bachelors and family units. Nurseries for children 2 to 6 are available, and recreation and parks are convenient.

Migrants pay 75 cents per day for each child left at the nursery at the Osceola Camp. This entitles them to supervised activities, a meal, two snacks and a nap.

The cost has been increased this year from 50 cents. Juian Griggs, staff workers of the Florida Christian Ministry of Migrants at the camp, said the increase has been mandated by a deficit under which the program operated in the past.

"During the last 10 years, the Church of the Brethren has spent $5,000 to make up the deficit," he said.

The entire migrant program has cost churches $50,000, he said.

In the two Belle Glade housing projects, rents range from $4 per week for a single room to $12.50 for a two-bedroom apartment. They are funished if the renters desire it, the chamber of commerce reports.

Elsewhere in Belle Glade, migrants may rent apartments, rooms or dwellings provided by private capital. Recently, several modern concrete block multiple-unit apartment buildings have been built.

Larry Royal, member of a family that provided some of this housing, said migrants like it and occupy about 30 percent of that available.

"We rent to some on a year-round basis," he said. "When they're not here, they pay a reduced rent to make sure their apartments will be ready for them when they return."

Higher Postal Rates Are Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, is it not worth a nickel to mail a letter to your old Aunt Hepsibah in California? Is it not worth 8 cents to fly a letter to Maine? These two questions have been raised and other comments have been made in an editorial supporting the Postmaster General's recommendation for postal increases in order to help reduce the annual $800 million deficit. This editorial appeared in the April 15, 1961, edition of the Cleveland, Ohio, Plain Dealer. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGHER POSTAL RATES ARE NEEDED

When the total U.S. postal deficit amounts to more than $800 million a year, Postmaster General J. Edward Day has every reason to seek to reduce this deficit, and every American ought to be willing to accept the requested rate increases in good spirit. The $741 million a year increase requested of Congress will not permit the postal service to break even, but it will cut down the loss to a great extent.

After all, where can you buy so much service for your money? Isn't it worth a nickel to mail a letter to your old Aunt Hepsibah in California? Isn't it worth 8 cents to fly a letter to Maine? Isn't it worth 4 cents to send a surface postcard or 6 cents to send a postcard by airmail?

It will be noted by those who study the new rates that books and publishers' second-class matter, which includes newspapers and magazines, are in for some sort of increase, for, according to the Associated Press, the proposal would increase the rates of "all other classes of mail." This, at any rate, should preclude the receipt of letters saying, "Naturally you're for higher postal rates—you won't be affected." To what extent we shall be affected we do not know at this moment, but we have said before—and we repeat: We are perfectly willing to pay any increase in postal rates the Government thinks we should pay.

Actually, the larger the newspaper, the smaller the percentage of its mail circulation. American Newspaper Publishers Association figures show that of papers over 100,000 circulation, only 5.7 percent of this circulation uses the mails, whereas in papers under 5,000 circulation, 28.2 percent goes through the mails.

Perhaps one reason Uncle Sam has been moderate in increasing mail rates for newspapers (outside of the perfectly obvious one that he thinks it valuable to have citizens well-informed) is that the newspapers, themselves, give him a lot of help, even though paying full rates for services not rendered. Some 83.3 percent of all copies of daily newspapers in second-class mail are sorted by the newspapers, arranged in sacks or packages by the newspapers, delivered to railroad stations or post offices by the newspapers, thus eliminating sorting or other handling by postal employees.

Since we too shall be affected, we can, in good conscience, applaud the Postmaster General's wise plan to put the Post Office Department on a more businesslike basis—and we hope Congress will give him what he asks.

Moral Principles Have To Be Revived

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. BATES
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Julius Szygowski, representative of the Polish Government in exile, has written a timely letter under the heading of "Moral Principles Have To Be Revived." I believe the cause of liberty will be strengthened by calling nationwide attention to this excellent document, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the following statement by Dr. Szygowski:

The disquieting turn of events upon the international arena makes it ever more urgent to reassess western policy with regard to Russia and her ruthless methods. The truth must be faced and the admission made that so far the behavior of the Western Powers towards Russia and her political aims has ben marked by vacillation and mistakes, even by moral shortcomings. As an outcome, public opinion has the deeply rooted impression that the Western World cannot cope with Russia and is defenseless against the progressive expansion of international communism.

The process which has brought about these pernicious consequences is not of recent origin.

It cannot be denied that many lofty ideals proclaimed by the Western Powers were abandoned. Many agreements for assuring the fate of minor nations were not honored, and many war aims were jettisoned.

All this took place gradually, until the Western World's moral position offered rather gloomy perspectives before the subjugated and other countries.

There is a small wonder that in this moral and political climate, Russian affirmations that the Western World will gradually be forced by pacific means to submit to the Communist world, superior to it in every field, are beginning to acquire an air of probability especially in the eyes of various masses of Asian and African populations.

On the other hand, the memory of various accomplished facts so detrimental to different nations lives forever in the minds of people and in the pages of history, serving us a warning not to believe in the words of those who once have broken them.

The elevated and equitable principles formulated for the postwar world in the Atlantic Charter and later incorporated within the Charter of the United Nations Organization remained only upon paper.

Soviet Russia understands well this moral weakness of the West and takes proper advantage of it. And so, Khrushchev's obvious aim is to undermine the authority and prestige of the governments, systems, and ideologies of the Western democracies. He tries to destroy this not only among the Western peoples, not only among the captive nations living in hope that the West will help to liberate them, but also among the people of the newly formed African and Asian state entities.

CASE OF POLAND

Lack of broadly conceived political vision, a decline in morality with regard to other countries and in the sense of obligation to honor agreements on the part of the West are nowhere more evident than in its attitude to Poland, its most loyal ally and holder of a prime key position in Europe.

The Ribbentrop-Molotov agreement of August 1939 for a new partition of Poland should have helped the West to see through Russia, while the latter's invasion of Poland on September 17 of the same year should have opened eyes to Russia's chief purpose, i.e., to the spreading of communism westwards.

Immediately after the Germans attacked her on June 22, 1941, and she had to seek salvation in Western aid, Russia was obliged to conclude agreement (signed on July 30 and December 4, 1941) with the Polish Government, then in London. She announced in this that the German-Soviet treaties for the partition of Poland (of 1939) were considered null and void.

Yet Russia did not for a single moment hold up efforts to undermine the Polish Republic from within and from without, nor cease to lay insistent claim to Poland's eastern provinces. The Western Powers failed at the time to assess the danger facing the whole democratic world, they gave Poland no proper support against Soviet designs, thus opening the way for the Communist westward drive.

It was in October 1943 that Great Britain, the United States, Russia, and China agreed under paragraph 6 of their security declaration drawn up at a conference in Moscow that a Soviet administration would take over Polish territories in measure as war operations proceeded. Here it must be stressed that the Polish Government in London, though an ally in good standing and obviously a party most directly affected, was neither invited to the conference nor informed of this decision.

On Stalin's demand and chiefly with the support of President F. D. Roosevelt, it was definitively decided at the Teheran Conference in November 1943—again without the knowledge of the allied Polish Government in London—that in the allocation of occupation zones, i.e., future spheres of influence, Russia's share would embrace all Poland and Hungary, a large part of Germany, and part of Austria.

It was only later, at the Yalta Conference held on 4–11 February, 1945, that formal agreement was reached between Great Britain, the United States, and the Soviet Union regarding the annexation of nearly half of Poland's territory by Russia who would also have absolute control over the rest of Poland.

It can be safely stated that most of the world perturbations and the menace to security in general undoubtedly stem from this hardly creditable transaction. It decisively helped to shift the balance of power between the two incompatible worlds in favor of the Russian communistic imperialism.

All this could have been avoided but not being so, the Western World had to pay dearly for the subsequent consequences.

KATYN WOOD MASSACRE

As mentioned before, Russia on July 30, 1941, declared the Ribbentrop-Molotov agreement of 1939 null and void and in the same time concluded the treaty with the Polish Government in London, whereby diplomatic relations were resumed. This, however, did not hinder Russia from continuing to prepare Communist administrative and military cadres which were to seize in a proper time all civil and military authority in Poland.

But after 21 months, Soviet Russia broke off (on April 26, 1943) relations with the Polish Government in London as a first step to securing a free hand. The pretext for this unusual step toward an ally in time of war was an exceedingly flimsy one: namely, Poland had requested an investigation into the massacre of several thousands of Polish officers in the Soviet Union, in Katyn Wood near Smolensk.

On April 15, 1943, the Polish Government applied to the International Committee of the Red Cross asking it to appoint a delegation to investigate the case on the spot.

Stalin thereupon wrote personal letters to President Roosevelt and to Mr. Churchill on April 21, 1943, accusing the Germans of this mass murder of Polish officers. The Western Powers ostensibly accepted the Soviet version and, judging by the documents published to date, refrained from alluding to this crime at any major international conference, at Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam, or on any latter occasion.

In the U.S. House of Representatives a resolution was passed on May 18, 1951, whereby a Committee for the Investigation of the Katyn Murder was set up with Hon. RAY J. MADDEN as chairman. Detailed evidence was collected and the committee filed its final report on December 22, 1952, with the following recommendations: (1) that the U.S. President issue instructions to the U.S. Delegate at the United Nations Organization to present the Katyn case to the General Assembly; (2) that the President request that the General Assembly seek action before the International Court of Justice against the U.S.S.R. for committing the massacre; and (3) that the President instruct the U.S. delegation to seek the establishment of a temporary U.N. Commission which would investigate mass murders and crimes against humanity.

Since then, however, nothing has been done. It can be safely stated that the attitude of the Western Powers with regard to the Katyn massacre does not reflect credit upon them nor raise their prestige.

The rupture of diplomatic relations with Poland, because Polish Government requested the International Red Cross to investigate the Katyn massacre, was deemed necessary by Stalin not only for the realization of his underhand plans against that country but also for his longer designs against the whole democratic world.

FOREIGN OCCUPATION OF POLAND

This whole unfriendly attitude of Western Powers toward Poland and disregard of the international law, allowed Stalin to realize his plans. In measure as Germans evacuated Polish soil before the advancing Soviet forces, Stalin handed over the civil administration of Poland to his stooge organization, the so-called "Polish Committee of National Liberation" very soon proclaimed as the government of the country. It cannot be too strongly stressed that this alleged government could not be and was not a Polish government in the legal and constitutional sense. It was nothing but a political tool in the hands of the Kremlin.

The German administration of rump Poland during the occupation (1939–45) was directed by a German governor-general in Cracow. Craftier Communist Russia has camouflaged her occupation of Poland by ruling through "the Government of the Polish People's Republic" in Warsaw but composed for the most part of Communist graduates of the Moscow school. Both systems, of course, can be regarded merely as the administrative organs of a foreign occupation. The only difference, that the German occupation never claimed to be anything else whilst that of the Russians is more skillfully and cunningly devised. Stalin succeeded even to obtain the respectability for his administration in Poland by assuring its legal status upon the international forum. And again, this success will be found to derive from the weakness and imprudence of the representative of Anglo-American policy at the Yalta Conference. Thus, Poland has been given, against her will, the status of a Russian satellite.

CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT OF POLAND—IN EXILE

In virtue of the Polish constitution and, hence, of the international law, there exists the legal and constitutional Polish Government (in exile) in London, England. It works and acts abroad for the reestablishment of Poland's freedom and independence. Realizing that in our times the liberation of Poland has to be based upon a broader scheme which would help other eastern-central European nations to regain their freedom, the Polish Government (in exile) deems that the following points obviously merit an examination: (The below described plan has been repeatedly presented to the Governments of Western democracies by the Polish Government in exile since October 1955; however there has been no favorable reaction at this time.)

1. It is an essential condition for security in Europe and (owing to this continent's key position) to the whole world to establish such a state of affairs that could eliminate or at least seriously hinder any direct clash of the war potentials. This could be attained by linking together the countries of Europe within a United States of Europe. Until nations of Europe become ripe for this, it is necessary to seek some intermediate solution.

2. The solution of this problem should be sought in the creation of a neutral zone between East and West. It would embrace countries neighboring with Russia and now subjected by her: Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Rumania. The setting up of such a neutral zone on sound political, economic and military foundations would produce a favorable basis for a durable arrangement of peaceful relations in Europe.

3. This neutral zone in east-central Europe should be created on the basis of an accord concluded on the one hand by all the member-countries as sovereign states, free of any foreign military occupation and foreign-imposed governments, and on the other hand, by all the powers interested in the maintenance of world peace. The countries of the neutral zone should bind themselves not to join any warlike blocs and not to conclude any military alliances with countries outside the neutral zone. The powers not belonging to the neutral zone and interested in maintaining world peace, including a united Germany and Soviet Russia, would jointly guarantee the frontiers of the neutral zone countries so that, in case of aggression from East or West, all the guarantors would automatically become the allies of the neutral-zone lands in defense against such an aggression. Such a situation would undoubtedly become an element arresting any kind of aggressive design from whichever direction it may come.

4. The neutral zone so conceived would not act as a barrier separating East from West, but would preeminently serve as an intermediary and liaison between them in the ideological, cultural and economic fields. Those member countries of the neutral zone who have for centuries past been so wronged by both Russia and Germany, would gradually lose memory of this painful past, the bitterness felt toward these neighbors would die out little by little and could in the future become transformed into a loyal international collaboration based on sincere, natural amity.

5. The relations between the member-states of the neutral zone in east-central Europe would best be based on a sui generis confederate agreement. Such a union of independent states, adequately armed for the defense of its neutrality and guaranteed by the other powers, would provide full assurance for the maintenance of peace in Europe and hence facilitate this in the whole world. Only under such conditions would the question of disarmament acquire current significance, and only then could the huge sums now uneconomically expanded be devoted to the good of humanity.

6. The problem of the unification of Germany can really be reduced to that of liberation of East Germany from Soviet occupation. Once such a zone of neutral countries is created between Russia and Germany, with East Germany west of this zone, unification of the two German republics would probably be immediate and automatic. Hence, it can be said that the problem of the unification of Germany is a function of the general problem of security.

7. In order to accomplish this, the Western Powers should regain the political initiative at all costs. Under the present circumstances, this could be achieved solely by presenting Russia with the demand for a far-reaching revision of the situation she has brought about by dint of violence, underhand methods and the violation of international agreements. Russia's acts to the plain detriment of the weaker nations should be disavowed and denounced forthwith. It is necessary firmly to demand the immediate and unconditional liberation of the captive nations, and the righting of all the wrongs inflicted upon them. But again at this point it should be cited that the Western democracies failed (a) to guarantee the existing frontiers between Germany and Poland (b) to initiate talks about the organization of eastern-central Europe, thus giving Mr. Khrushchev an opportunity to bring up these two problems at the U.N. General Assembly in September 1960 in such a way as to further his own interests. The hypocritical and brutal ideology of the Communist world should be countered by a clearly formulated, broadly conceived ideology based upon the moral principle of the truth that equal rights are due both to strong and to weak nations.

It is worthwhile to mention that the recent "14 points accord" of Gov. N. A. Rockefeller and Vice President Richard Nixon stressed the necessity "of leading and inspiring the formation in all great regions of the free world of confederations, large enough and strong enough to meet modern problems and challenges," and suggested that "we [the United States] should promptly lead toward the formation of such confederations in the North Atlantic Community and in the Western Hemisphere."

In applauding this idea, such remarks seem to be proper: the more precise and definite are the plans of the Western democracies, the greater the determination they show in the realization of these plans, the greater their pressure toward this end and the greater their solidarity in such action, the sooner and the more certainly will it be possible to establish a system of relations that will enable mankind to enter upon the road of lasting peaceful development, and assure Europe the possibility of real unification.

And this must be done—before it is too late. A two-power world can never be at peace.

The John Birch Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON R. YOUNG
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, one of the best editorials that has come to my attention with reference to Robert Welch and the John Birch Society is one appearing in the April 17 issue of Newsweek written by its contributing editor, Raymond Moley entitled "It Is Not Conservatism."

Mr. Moley present a powerful argument to every thinking American. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to

have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT IS NOT CONSERVATISM

(By Raymond Moley)

Five weeks ago I noted in this space the rapid growth of conservative groups on many college campuses. That manifestation of dissent from prevailing liberal thinking, together with the evidence that conservatism is growing among older people as well, is a wholesome sign. It offers a promise that our two-party system and our national elections will be real contests of opposing political philosophies. And the fact that so many young people are in the movement indicates that the coming generation realizes more than ever the burdens and debts which it will inherit from the altogether too spendthrift governments we have had since the war.

The perils that threaten this growth of conservatism will come, not from its liberal opposition but from those who in the name of conservatism would bring discredit by igniting passions against their neighbors, besmirching good Americans as friends and dupes of communism, and by adopting methods of organization which should be alien in this country. One such threat is the John Birch Society and the utterances and activities of its founder, Robert Welch, and some of the leaders in the group.

I have watched the growth of this society with the deepest regret and misgivings especially because so many sincere people have become members of it and risk their good names through association with its more radical spokesmen. Those who are devoted to sound conservative principles owe it to themselves and their true objectives to repudiate the John Birch Society and methods as I do here.

COMMUNISM AND CRIME

As I have noted the writings of Robert Welch over the past decade I have seen the transformation of a man who in the beginning spoke out against a certain blindness in our foreign policies to the real nature of the international Communist conspiracy and the danger embodied in the presence in our Government and society of elements of communism. Well before Welch appeared on the scene I advocated in this space and before a congressional committee the outlawing of the Communist party in the United States. That objective has substantially been accomplished although it must be recognized that elements of that conspiracy still lurk in our midst. It is the responsibility of our Government and indeed of all of us to expose and eliminate such elements by due process of law, just as we would deal with the criminally inclined elements of other sorts.

But opposition to communism as a criminal activity is not confined solely to conservatives. Individuals of all shades of ideology share the conservative's fear of communism. In fact, it was to a degree due to the warnings of American socialists that this Nation was sharply made aware of the danger. Because Norman Thomas and I agree that communism is our enemy at home and abroad does not make us ideological brothers.

UNFORTUNATE METHODS

The evidence is now before us through the enterprise of the press and the statements of Members of Congress that the John Birch Society has so concentrated its attention on communism and has become so vehement in its pursuit of that one issue that it has adopted methods and has made statements which must bring it into general disrepute. Specifically, Americans do not like the terms "monolithic" or "authoritarian" as applied to any American group or society. They resent loose and inaccurate name calling especially when applied to Presidents and other high officials who are charged by the people with responsibility for their protection. They don't like the idea of "infiltrating" various worthy organizations in our society.

I need not elaborate upon these facts. They were documented by Senator MILTON YOUNG of North Dakota in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 20.

For a good many years I have specified those mistaken policies of Government under the name liberal which tend to limit the liberty of the individual, weaken the fiber of America and its institutions, and endanger national solvency. A belief in dynamic growth through individual enterprise constitutes a true conservatism. It is endangered by those who assume the livery of conservatism, but adopt radical methods.

Peace Corps Relationship With the Selective Service System Explained by Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared on page 1 of the April 1961 issue of Selective Service, the official publication of the Selective Service System:

PEACE CORPS RELATIONSHIP WITH SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM EXPLAINED

(By Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director, Selective Service System)

The Peace Corps has been established by Executive order of the President. Legislation has been requested to continue this organization. The activities of the Peace Corps have been covered rather completely by the press, radio, and television. Its relationship with the Selective Service System has been indicated but a statement of this relationship seems advisable.

The Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, is flexible enough to provide deferment for members of the Peace Corps without amendment of any kind. In other words the relationship of the Selective Service System with registrants who become members of the Peace Corps can be handled administratively.

The power to defer registrants who perform functions in the national health, safety, or interest now exists. The establishment and operation of the Peace Corps is in the national interest. So the classification of registrants in the Peace Corps can be handled as any other registrant engaged in activities in the national health, safety, or interest. They will, of course, enjoy the right to appeal shared by all registrants of the Selective Service System.

These statements presuppose the continuance of the present situation of the United States in relations with other nations of the world.

The question has been raised as to the status of registrants who enroll in the Peace Corps, after their return from this assignment. This requires the assumption as to the situation of this Nation in the world, the age of the registrant when he returns, the physical condition of the registrant with reference to his acceptability for military service, his marital status, and the regulations which apply in existence at the time of his release from the Peace Corps, and whether or not the registrant on his return from service with the Peace Corps engages in an activity which permits him to be deferred in the national health, safety, or interest.

The fact that the registrant has been a member of the Peace Corps will not prevent him from qualifying for further deferment, the same as any other registrant who is engaged in activities vital to the national health, safety, or interest.

New Frontier of Freedom and Equality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a declaration by the American Religious Town Hall Meeting, Inc., calling on the President of the United States to proclaim a "new national frontier of freedom and equality," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the declaration was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A DECLARATION BY THE AMERICAN RELIGIOUS TOWN HALL MEETING, INC., CALLING ON THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO PROCLAIM A "NEW FRONTIER OF FREEDOM," A NATIONAL JUBILEE COMMEMORATING THE INALIENABLE RIGHTS OF ALL MEN DURING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF PRESIDENT LINCOLN'S EMANCIPATION PROCLAMATION

At this time when our liberal-democratic society is confronted by dangerous enemies abroad whose intention is to destroy our way of life and to dominate the course of human history, it well behooves America to look closely to the springs of her culture, to the sources of her liberty. Every society expresses its highest aspirations, its conception of civilized man and his destiny, and its hopes for the future, in the idealism of its founders. These goals, aspirations, hopes and ideals can be called the mystique of the society; ours has been boldly expressed in great documents, stirring orations and beautiful poetry that has warmed the hearts of millions. We all known only too well that it is difficult to realize all these social goals in actual practice; nonetheless, a society is judged by the gap that exists between the ideals of constitutional government it proclaims, and the political reality of everyday life. It is on this level that our enemies attack us in the forum of the world; they compare our lofty idealism with some of the sordid problems that mar our everyday life. It is to be noted also that they compare our problems, particularly the questions of civil equality and economic opportunity, with the idealism, that is, the mystiques of communism: They carefully avoid comparing the realities of social life in the United States of America with that of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Our liberal-democratic political idealism has been proclaimed for the world to hear by Franklin, Paine, Jefferson, Hamilton, Adams, Jackson, and a host of other statesmen and philosophers who assisted in the founding of the Republic. That mystique

was reaffirmed 100 years ago during the great crisis that threatened to destroy the Nation. On September 22, 1862, President Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation freeing the slaves from the bondage that had long been a glaring gap between the lofty idealism of America as the land of the free and the actual reality of everyday life in the young Republic. It is small wonder that in the great world beyond our shores Abraham Lincoln is the best known President of the 19th century; he was the man who reaffirmed our basic American belief in the equality of mankind and man's natural right to freedom.

In our own days, 100 years after Lincoln's stirring proclamation, there still exists a glaring gap between the political idealism we profess and the reality of American society. In defiance of clear and precise orders from the highest court in the land, a large segment of our population is still denied basic civil liberties and rights, thereby creating a scandal in the world and giving our enemies ammunition to use against us. Anyone who has traveled beyond our frontiers, well knows that the first question a foreigner asks about the United States of America deals with the problem of discrimination. And we do not need to travel abroad to know that we have a desperate need to strengthen our heritage and to bolster our self-respect as a nation by closing the gap between our lofty aspirations and the political reality that so humiliates us. Our national mystique is as lofty and noble as any ever conceived by any people, but we must live up to these ideals if we are to be true to our destiny.

The American Religious Town Hall of the Air represents a program of action committed to the proposition that Americans can best be educated to fulfill their responsibilities if they can have and hear free and frank discussions of the issues before the Nation. As an interreligious institution, including within its scope all facets of religious life in our land, the Religious Town Hall of the Air has brought to the radio and television audiences discussions of all sorts of religious, political, social, and economic issues, with emphasis upon the moral problems that are involved, and with ample opportunity for all points of view to ventilate opinions. We believe that in this program we are helping to strengthen the determination of our fellow citizens to defend and protect the ideals of civil and religious freedoms of our Nation. With this in mind we would like to suggest that it would be fitting for the Nation to pause for a review of the problems of equal rights for all citizens during the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation.

Therefore, we of the Religious Town Hall of the Air urge other Americans interested in maintaining the moral tone of our Nation to join us in an appeal to the President of the United States for the proclamation of a new national frontier of freedom and equality during the centenary of the Emancipation Proclamation. Let us join together to expel the remnants of intolerance, tyranny and oppression, and let us renew our faith in our national mystique that honors liberty, equality, and opportunity for all by declaring the period from July 4 to September 22, 1962 as a national jubilee commemorating the liberation of the inalienable rights of all men.

Bishop A. A. Leiske of the Seventh-day Adventist Church and President of the American Religious Town Hall Meeting, Inc.; Bishop T. Otto Nall, Minnesota Methodist Conference and Vice President of the American Religious Town Hall Meeting, Inc.; Donald G. Paterson, Secretary; Martin E. Kriesel, Treasurer; Jane P. Power; Violet G. Culbertson; James J. Daiglish; Doreen Wendland.

"Hope" Comes to Indonesia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I know many of my colleagues share my great personal interest in project Hope. Accordingly, I call their attention to the following article appearing in the San Francisco News-Call Bulletin on April 1, 1961:

"HOPE" COMES TO INDONESIA—NATIVES HAIL CHAPLAIN OF HOSPITAL SHIP

(By the Reverend William P. Anna, Jr., rector of Zion parish, diocese of Washington)

(The Reverend William P. Anna, Jr., an Episcopal priest, is Protestant chaplain aboard the steamship *Hope*. This San Francisco-based hospital ship, financed by public contributions and Government help, is spending a year in the South Seas. It treats native patients aboard and ashore; its staff teaches nurses and doctors. How the *Hope* has become a symbol of international hope is told in Father Anna's article.)

ABOARD SS "HOPE."—The first greeting I got in Indonesia was from a 10-year-old boy.

The *Hope* had been at sea almost 3 weeks out from Honolulu. It was Sunday. She was docking at Balikpappan in Borneo, during the 7 o'clock communion service.

After the service, I went ashore. As I stepped onto the dock, the boy came up. I greeted him in what I believed was idomatic Indonesian we had studied evenings on the voyage. "Salamat pagi," I said. "Good morning."

In very intelligible English, the lad replied: "Good morning, Pastor. Thank you very much. Welcome to Indonesia. We are glad to see you. We like to practice our American."

The language barrier, I discovered, is not at all impossible. Ours is studied in their high schools and universities, their second language.

Indonesian contains no conjugation or declensions. Man is "orang"; men, "orang-orang."

By the time we reached Djakarta, the ship's hospital was in order, ready for business.

Twenty nurses from the training center at Bandoeng were with us, and 30 other nurses are with us for 6 months. They will form the nucleus of the teaching staff for the new Ibu Sukarno Hospital in Djakarta, where a nursing academy will be established.

I went out to the theological seminary to talk with the student body. The faculty is American, Dutch, Filipino and Indonesian.

I learned quickly, I hope, never to preach to them nor lecture them. Just answer their questions. And the questions about the *Hope* and its purpose were sharp.

"Tell us about your church in America?" they asked. "Tell us about your home and family?" In the end, I told them almost every detail, even about our dogs.

"We like you," they said. "We like American people. We like America. We do not understand American policy."

I certainly learned more about Indonesia than I have been able to tell them about America.

The most unexpected call of the first half of our tour was Sumbawa, a primitive and sparsely populated island, but seemingly rich in resources.

We stopped in a well-protected anchorage to go ashore.

There is only one doctor on the whole island, a German from Stuttgart who came here after his retirement to spend the rest of his medical career working in a place that otherwise would be without a physician.

Our work was well organized. Soon the hospital was full. A clinic, set up ashore in a warehouse, operated at full capacity. Ninety-eight operations were performed by our surgeons in 2 weeks. A German surgeon aboard did a fantastic number of cataract operations, and for these he is especially well qualified.

The gratitude of one old man surpassed anything I have seen, and it was rather a symbol of what makes our medical project real.

He came on the first day. Constantly, he asked, "Am I next?" All he was praying for was to be able to see the outline of his family.

I was going down the aisle in the ward just before he was to go to the operating room. He pulled my shirt. "They say I am next," he said; and they rolled him off the cart, rejoicing.

The last day in Sumbawa they had a final reception and lunch for the staff.

There he was, standing at the edge of the crowd, and repeating again and again, "Thank you. Thank you. Thank you."

A Responsible Study To Advance Freedom Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the problem of alerting the American people to the significance of freedom and the danger of communism is far too important to be left to the crackpots.

The fact is that communism is on the march in the world. Freedom has been on the defensive. Too few Americans care deeply about freedom. The oppressive nature of communism is far too little understood.

For these reasons, it was heartening to read of a responsible and constructive attempt to meet this need. An article in a recent issue of the Milwaukee Journal reports on the efforts of a group sponsored by corporations, and several foundations, to do this. Educational and Federal Government leaders met and worked with this group.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPROVED STUDY OF REDS IS URGED—EDUCATORS, MILITARY CALL INSTRUCTION ON COMMUNISM SAFETY MEASURE FOR UNITED STATES

(By Edmund B. Lambeth)

CHICAGO, ILL.—An organized effort to expand and improve instruction about communism in the Nation's schools and colleges was urged Wednesday by more than 700 participants in a national military, industrial, and educational conference.

The participants approved a resolution which, although carefully worded, expressed an urgency that has characterized the 3 days of talks here on the struggle between communism and the free world.

The conference was a project of the Institute for American Strategy, a nonpartisan, privately managed organization financed by the contributions of more than 100 corporations and several foundations. Cooperating with the institute were the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and groups and individuals from industry, education, and Government.

MAIN NEED SPELLED OUT

The resolution said that the main need was to provide authoritative, competent, and objective advice on the adequacy of existing text, reference, and source materials for courses on communism on all educational levels.

The group refrained from making specific recommendations on courses. However, it said that "an examination of existing programs shows a compelling need to strengthen school curriculums."

Instrumental in preparing the resolution were William Yandell Elliott, Harvard University professor and former consultant to the State Department and National Security Council, and Msgr. William E. McManus, superintendent of schools of the Catholic archdiocese of Chicago. Monsignor McManus headed the conference's educational advisory committee and Elliott its program development committee.

TWO DANGERS CITED

The resolution urged that two dangers be avoided.

"First we must not be frightened into using the educational and political methods of the enemy. Second, we must not lose, in our concern with communism, the balance of science, the humanities, and the cultural traditions which is the true strength of freedom," the resolution said.

Stricken from the first draft was a recommendation that a specific organization with a board of directors be set up to promote improvement of courses on communism.

It was understood that the committees, after some disagreement, decided that such a step should come from educational groups themselves.

At the closing session, Elliott said: "This must grow out of the grassroots of the educational community itself, otherwise it will not be accepted."

In urging support for "realistic teaching of the history and policies of communism," the resolution declared: "This means protecting our constitutional system against false friends as well as open or covert enemies. It means assisting our youth as well as our mature citizens to detect and to protect themselves against extremists at both ends of the spectrum."

Elliott said he did not think that the conference's action should or would "give impetus to crackpots all over the country."

There were unresolved differences of opinion among the speakers at the conference but several broad themes were common to many of their remarks. Among them were:

Many Americans, including otherwise well informed community leaders, do not understand the scope and depth of the Communist effort around the world and they do not yet have the degree of understanding needed to respond effectively.

The United States must find a way to counteract, with its own message, the Soviet propaganda and cultural offensive aimed at convincing the uncommitted nations that communism is the shortcut answer to their problems.

Communists in this country have not made deep inroads in American education but their efforts to do so are continuing.

Individual responsibility and free choice must be increasingly emphasized in an era when they are being challenged by bigness in government, business, and labor.

More Americans should be able to articulate what they believe in and why.

Housing Loans Made Under Title V of the Housing Act of 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, farm housing loans made under title V of the Housing Act of 1949 are used to finance the construction, alteration, repair, or modernization of farm homes and service buildings. Since the program started in 1949, 44,000 families have received loans totaling $300 million.

There is an extensive and continuing need for this type of credit service to farmowners who are not in a position to improve their homes and farm buildings with their own resources or with a loan from a private or cooperative credit source. The farm housing program gives such families an opportunity to acquire an adequate home and necessary farm buildings by making available loans at favorable rates and terms. Farm housing loans bear 4 percent interest and may be repaid within periods up to 33 years.

The rate at which funds are being obligated and applications being received indicates the rate of obligation will increase substantially during the coming spring months. As of February 28, 1961, 4,189 loans, totaling $31,657,671, had been obligated. New obligations currently exceed $1 million a week and are soon expected to reach several million dollars a week. Applications on hand as of February 28, 1961, were close to 10,000, which is a third more than a year ago. Almost 1,500 applications were received during February and this number was 45 percent greater than the number received during February last year.

Farm housing loans are made throughout the rural areas of the United States. The loans provide farm families with an opportunity to acquire an adequate house and efficient service buildings. The credit extended also provides job opportunities for carpenters, electricians, and masons and increases the volume of business of building supply dealers and related service industries.

Most of the farm housing funds have been used for dwelling purposes. Last year, 70 percent of the funds was spent by borrowers for new dwellings and 10 percent for dwelling modernization and repair, such as adding a bath and sewage disposal system, central heating, and kitchen modernization. The remaining 20 percent was used for construction and modernization of farm service buildings and water systems.

The average cost of a new dwelling during the 1960 fiscal year was about $9,800. This represented an increase from about $8,000 4 years ago.

Study Finds Lag in U.S. Shipbuilding Methods—Modernization Is Necessary, Facts Need To Be Determined

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the New York Herald Tribune of March 18, 1961, carried an article by the financial writer, Allen M. Smythe, which refers to a recent informal study by our Navy officials of U.S. shipbuilding methods. Our Navy experts apparently concurred with the findings of an official British report on world shipbuilding which states that Germany, Japan and Sweden lead the world in shipbuilding techniques, with Holland and Norway close behind.

The writer quotes the pointed comment of Adm. Ralph K. James, Chief of the Bureau of Ships that, "plans for new war vessels require that American shipyards lead, not lag, in shipbuilding." Despite this fact, we witness a constant spiral in the cost of American warships—$109 million for a Polaris-type submarine and $285 million for an atomic aircraft carrier—due perhaps in part to the lag in shipbuilding technology.

It would not seem irrelevant to suggest, Mr. President, that the Defense Department, the Department of Commerce, and the Maritime Commission should investigate the accuracy of the official British report and determine the part that the lack of modernization of American shipyards has played in the mounting costs of our naval and commercial vessels.

In order that Members of this body may inform themselves more adequately on this problem, I ask unanimous consent that the Herald Tribune article be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STUDY FINDS UNITED STATES LAGGING IN SHIPBUILDING METHODS

(By Allen M. Smythe)

A recent informal study just completed by high Navy officials of American shipbuilding methods has revealed "a very disturbing" lack of the latest modern techniques that are needed to construct the future nuclear surface naval vessels and deep-diving submarines.

The Navy technical experts agree with a recent British official report that Germany, Japan and Sweden lead the world in modern shipbuilding methods. Norway and Holland are close behind.

The British report did not list the United States as being ahead in any category. However, the other countries are admitted to be

well in advance in equipment for metal-shaping, in welding equipment and in modern methods of ship construction.

ADMIRAL'S COMMENT

Adm. Ralph K. James, Chief of the Bureau of Ships, said: "I dislike to learn that the shipyards of smaller and less wealthy countries are ahead in metallurgical research, marine engineering, installed facilities and productivity. Plans for new war vessels require that American shipyards lead, not lag, in shipbuilding progress."

Other Navy officials revealed that for over a year the Navy has been urging private shipyards to modernize their plants in order to reduce costs and efficiently construct the latest designs of submarines and surface vessels.

Administration and congressional leaders have been concerned about the increasing costs of naval vessels—$109 million for a Polaris-type submarine and $285 million for an atomic aircraft carrier, for example.

The British report, issued by the Department of Scientific and Industrial Research, emphasized costs of commercial ship construction. It estimated the world production of ships during the next 5 years could fall to a quarter of the present level (8,300,000 tons) before it begins to recover.

LABOR COSTS CHEAPER

At a rough estimate, labor costs in 1959 were 20 percent cheaper in Germany and 45 percent cheaper in Japan, but 40 percent dearer in Sweden than in England. Sweden has been securing her share of the market because Swedish yards were able to offset higher labor and materiel costs against substantially higher productivity. The average time in months to build a ship in the period 1957 to 1959 were: Britain, 19; Germany, 10; Sweden, 9, and Japan, 8.

Against the background of excess shipbuilding capacity in the world, and the probable contraction in British shipyard production over the next few years, the report reaches these conclusions:

1. The world shipbuilding industry is facing a major and probably prolonged recession.

2. There is no indication that the United Kingdom shipbuilding industry has on balance any marked technical or economic advantage over its major foreign competitors, apart from its large home market.

3. The total effort at present devoted to research and development in the field of shipbuilding and marine propulsion is insufficient in relation to the serious problems now facing the industry.

4. In particular, almost no organized research has hitherto been applied to the industry's production and management problems with the object of increasing the productivity of labor and capital and reducing costs.

5. While adequate effort is probably being devoted to problems of hull resistance and propeller design, the development of propulsion installations is handicapped by the organizational structure of the industries producing propulsion units and auxiliaries, and in consequence by the insufficient use of available research facilities.

Many Navy officials believe these conclusions apply equally well to the U.S. shipbuilding industry.

Mexico: Our Troubled Neighbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, Newsday's Jack Altshul recently spent a month in Mexico. He has written an excellent account of his experiences and his analysis of the Mexican political scene in a series for Newsday, the Long Island publication. Sympathy for Castro is greater in Mexico than the United States likes to admit. U.S. policies have not kept up with the Mexican ambition for greater economic progress and national development. To combat the call for revolution from Moscow, the United States must press its case for peaceful evolution in vivid and forceful terms.

The program first enunciated by President Eisenhower and authorized in the act of Bogotá is an excellent beginning for a policy which I hope the present administration will practice as well as preach.

As former Ambassador to Mexico, Robert C. Hill, who distinguished himself on the football field as well as at the conference table, pointed out "We have to approach Latin America as partners not as masters." We must work out and carry out with them the programs which are necessary to raise the standards of living and literacy in Latin American nations.

Mr. President, in order that this perceptive analysis may come to the attention of a wide national audience and receive the careful study it deserves, I ask unanimous consent to have printed two articles by Jack Altshul in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEXICO: OUR TROUBLED NEIGHBOR

(Is Mexico ready to follow Cuba and become a trouble spot right at our border? Newsday's Jack Altshul spent a month touring our neighbor to the south, observing and speaking to people in all walks of life. Here is his report in this series of articles beginning today.)

(By Jack Altshul)

The setting might have been Moscow or Peiping or Havana. Gathered in conclave were several hundred hard core Communists and their sympathizers from farflung corners of the world. They billed themselves as a World Peace Congress, extolled Fidel Castrol and excoriated the United States. The time was 3 weeks ago. The place, Mexico City—capital of the nation that shares 1,600 miles of border with the United States.

It was no coincidence that the 5-day conference had selected Mexico as its locale. For the past year it has been the scene of anti-American demonstrations, an unusual series of leftist statements by Government leaders and a gigantic propaganda and espionage effort by the Soviet Union.

Such a conference poses the question:

Is Mexico becoming the soft underbelly of the United States in its fight against Soviet penetration of the Western Hemisphere?

A tour of the country can produce a picture as confusing as the complexities of Mexican political life, despite interviews and quiet chats with Government officials. American embassy representatives, businessmen of both countries, Communists, campesinos on agrarian reform farms, university students, and man-on-the-street types.

Their opinions ranged from forebodings that Mexico may follow Cuba into the Moscow camp to predictions that President Adolfo Lopez Mateos is leading his country on a continuing course of stability and prosperity that will make it impervious to Soviet blandishments.

MEXICANIZATION PUSHED

The most objective evaluation, shared by a number of U.S. Embassy attachés, is that most Mexicans fear and abhor Soviet-style communism but the country still remains vulnerable to its salesmen. The vulnerability exists because:

1. The private enterprise system that has sparked the last 15 years of Mexico's prosperous industrial revolution has suddenly run into roadblocks from an administration that feels it politically expedient to make concessions to the left.

2. Mexico's presently sound economic structure could collapse if the Government insists on injecting itself into the business picture.

3. Should this happen, the Soviet Union will have built up a fifth column that may be strong enough to exploit resulting chaotic conditions.

In the past year, American investments in Mexico have dropped sharply as the Government moved in to nationalize the light and power and movie industries, took over a number of businesses and pushed a program to force 'Mexicanization" (Mexican majority control) of all new companies. Three previous administrations had adopted a comparative handsoff policy toward the private enterprise system and it was during their tenure that the nation made its greatest economic advances.

The problem that will confront the still-to-be appointed U.S. Ambassador to Mexico is whether Lopez Mateos' policies signify the end of a 15-year-old mutual interest past—a pact most observers agree is largely responsible for Mexico's current prosperity.

Suspicions that this might be the case were aroused during 1960 because Lopez Mateos' veer toward increased state socialism coincided with stepped-up Soviet propaganda efforts selling the Castro revolution as the ideal for which Mexicans should strive.

There were other worrisome signs.

In August, Mexico University students staged two anti-American demonstrations in which they attempted to burn the American flag and stone the glass-fronted U.S. Embassy building on Mexico City's fashionable Paseo de la Reforma. The demonstrations capped off a long series of leftist statements from Government leaders. Congressional Leader Emilio Sanchez Piedras reaffirmed Mexico's solidarity with Cuba. President Lopez Mateos defined his administration's stand as being to the "extreme left within the constitution."

That Lopez Mateos' definition can be interpreted as a tipoff that he is ideologically sympathetic to communism is given little credence even in politically conservative quarters. Most observers believe he had to make the traditional obeisance to "izquierda" (the left) because there are powerful political leaders on that side of the fence who do not believe he is advancing fast enough the cause of Mexico's social revolution.

Chief among these is fellow-traveling Lazaro Cardenas, President of Mexico between 1934 and 1940 and the leading figure at the recently concluded "peace congress." Cardenas is retired from politics but many believe he would like to return and that he has been chafing for 20 years at the conservative direction taken by the three Presidents who succeeded him and preceded Lopez Mateos.

It was Cardenas who expropriated United States and British oil holdings in 1938, a historic move that gave him Lincolnesque stature among his people. It was also Cardenas who distributed more land among the peasants than any President before or since. And it is Cardenas, today, who sings the praises of Fidel Castro's Cuba and whose voice, observers feel, is forcing Lopez Mateos on an increasingly socialistic course. They regard, for instance, Lopez Mateos' nationalization of the light and power industry as an effort to undercut Cardenas and still his voice.

UNITED STATES IS DISTRUSTED

When the President announced on September 1 that he had purchased the foreign-owned Mexican Power & Light Co. to complete the nationalization of the electric industry, he declared a national holiday and watched schoolchildren march with yellow armbands that proclaimed "Electricity for the Mexicans."

Since then he has also nationalized the movie industry by purchasing the two leading movie chains in the country, and pushed the Mexicanization policy which makes it difficult for a foreign company to do business unless it gives up majority control to Mexican capital.

Both moves received mixed reaction. U.S. businessmen expressed nervousness and their jitters were reflected in a sharp dropoff of investments. It was rumored that one U.S. firm had canceled a $25 million industrial development. On the other hand, Mexicans generally saluted Lopez Mateos' policies if for no other reason than their president was showing his independence of the United States.

To the average Mexican, the United States presents an image of a rich, patronizing neighbor who swindled him out of most of his property and is still seeking to dominate him. There is some historical justification for the image. Through war and power politics the United States was able to acquire more than half of Mexico's territory between 1836 and 1948. It is hard for them to forget that Texas, New Mexico, Arizona and California once belonged to Mexico.

The Mexican also remembers that as recently as 1910, Americans owned nearly half the total wealth of Mexico and that even as liberal a President as Woodrow Wilson ordered American troops into Vera Cruz in 1917. Only 22 years ago a group of American oil men, in effect, disputed the Mexican Government's right to rule its own country.

What most Mexicans are unwilling to accept and what Lopez Mateos feels would be political suicide to concede is that there has been change in the breed of American businessmen from circa 1910 to those of today. It is not a popular concept in Mexico to give credit to the American capitalist who crossed the border with his know-how after World War II and sparked an industrial revolution that has brought the country its present prosperity.

It took an era of mutual interest with the United States for Mexico to lift itself up from an agrarian economy in which the overwhelming majority of its people lived on bare subsistence levels. The era really began in 1943 when the late President Roosevelt came to Monterrey for a meeting with Cardenas' successor, Manuel Avila Camacho. F.D.R. needed Mexican minerals for the war effort and he got it in exchange for an agreement to help rehabilitate the nation's broken-down railway system. He also agreed to finance a program for a highly expanded electropower capacity and to accelerate the development of certain basic industries.

This opened the door for the industrial revolution which followed World War II and hundreds of American companies started Mexican branches to take advantage of the emergence of a middle class and new-found buying power. The revolution went on through the conservative administrations of Luis Miguel Aleman and Adolfo Ruiz Cortines.

Today Mexico has reached its "takeoff stage." The capital, Mexico City, is a bustling metropolis of 5 million population, second only to New York in the Western Hemisphere. Monterrey and Guadalajara, the next two industrial giants, have trebled their population since 1940. Mexico can look back on its last 15 years as the most prosperous in its history and can count among its gains an increase of 5 times its national income and 10 times its production in manufacturing, oil, steel, and iron since 1940.

AMERICAN INVEST $1 BILLION

These giant steps, of course, were accomplished under a system of private enterprise aided substantially by investments from American companies that now have a stake in Mexico totaling well over $1 billion. Of the estimated 500 American companies doing business in Mexico today, almost 80 percent have come in since 1945.

But in less than 12 months the system that has bred prosperity is undergoing refinements of a nature that prompted even Mexican businessmen last November to openly question the Government's attitude toward private enterprise.

They received President Lopez Mateos' answer a month later when he told newsmen: "Private capital has been using skates and we are traveling by motorcycle. You can see anywhere you go that the works of the official sector are much more impressive than those of the private sector."

The President's glowing assessment of Government initiative is disputed in many quarters today by knowledgeable people who have been dealing with and in Mexico for years.

An American lawyer, who has been in Mexico for 42 years and whose friends are among the most powerful in the nation, said: "The President is talking rubbish when he brags about government enterprise. Every nationalization program has ended in dismal failure. The Federal railway system loses from 200 million to 600 million pesos a year, service is bad, sabotage frequent, and wrecks an almost daily occurrence. Carelessness is rampant and the Government's authority over workers to do a good job nonexistent. It always has to worry that regulatory measures will have a bad political reaction.

"The Government makes proud statements about the success of the oil industry since it was taken over by Cardenas in 1938. The fact of the matter is that 80 percent of Mexico's oil production is dependent on one field in Poza Rica, which was developed 40 years ago by private enterprise. It is showing signs of petering out and, since it is a coastal field, engineers are convinced that drills will hit salt water any time now.

"When they purchased the light and power companies, they did it by refusing to allow them to raise their rates by as much as 6 percent, although labor and other costs had risen many times more than that. Now that the Government owns it, they find that they'll have to raise the rates 50 percent and even then they won't have enough capital to keep going. Can you imagine the howl when the Mexican people finally get the bill?"

A high-ranking official in the administration of President Luis Miguel Aleman, under whom Mexico made its greatest postwar gains, is also disenchanted with the extent of government participation in private enterprises.

"There is a difference," he said, "between Mexico building highways, dams, and other projects for the public good and getting itself in businesses which it takes experts, not political ministers to run. The Government has taken over about 350 companies, which is a far cry from its original intention of confining itself to basic industry. What is basic about the movie industry for instance?"

The former officeholder lashed out, too, at what he termed "nepotism and venality" in the present administration.

As an example he points to the position now held by Mariano Lopez Mateos, the president's brother. "For 22 years, this man was a ticket-taker for the federal railway system. Now suddenly he is on his way to becoming a millionaire because he has been put in charge of the government warehouse and storage company that imports basic foodstuffs we don't grow in our own country. And he is only one example. Every time the government takes over a business, somebody close to the president gets a big job that would amount in your country to the presidency of a corporation."

An American businessman who came to Mexico only 3 years ago and has made a fortune admitted that the reason he has been successful is: "I found out you got to have the right kind of partners if you want to do business down here. My business is selling to the government. I have 16 associates in my firm. All of them are relatives or friends of government ministers."

While they hesitate to express it publicly, most American businessmen are gravely concerned about the policy of Mexicanization Lopez Mateos has been pushing for the past year. Although there is no formal law, foreign investors seeking to begin industries in 1960 found themselves stalled in obtaining government concessions for which they had come down in the first place. Even companies in business here for years found themselves subjected to Mexicanization pressures. One firm employing about 1,500 heard bluntly from a government minister that it ought to give up its majority control.

REFUSAL BROUGHT STRIKE

The company refused and found itself in the middle of a strike in which its workers demanded a 25-percent wage increase. In the past it had been able to appeal to the government for reasonable arbitration with the knowledge it had the power of settling strikes. But in this case the government kept hands off and the strike lasted for 5 months, the company finally capitulating to a 20-percent wage increase, although holding firm in resisting Mexicanization.

A troubled U.S. Embassy official said: "The combination of nationalization and Mexicanization is just too much for foreign investors to cope with and we're just not getting nearly as many calls from people who want to start new businesses as we used to. If Lopez Mateos continues succumbing to pressures from the left to nationalize and to pressures from his own businessmen who want to get in on the profits foreigners showed them were here, I'm afraid the whole bubble can burst."

If it does, the Communists are waiting to take over.

WANTED: NEW U.S. POLICY ON MEXICO

(This is the last of a series on our shaky relations with Mexico by Jack Altshul, who recently returned from a month-long tour of the country.)

The stadium at the University of Mexico was packed to its 100,000 capacity for a game of American-style football. The opponents were Mexico University and Mexico Polytechnical Institute, traditional rivals. One of the interested spectators was an old Dartmouth lineman, Robert C. Hill, then U.S. Ambassador to Mexico. He had expressed an interest in seeing how football is played south of the border and the rector of the university had invited him to occupy the box of honor—on the 50-yard line but fortified against thrown objects by a padlocked, wire-mesh cage.

Just before the kickoff a group of students snake danced up to the box with a football and asked the Ambassador if he would be willing to throw out the first ball. Hill went them one better. He offered to kickoff on the field. Horrified officials representing the Mexican Government and the school warned him against the gesture. They could not guarantee his safety, because on that

day in 1959 Fidel Castro was the hero of the university and Uncle Sam the villain.

Hill, a husky 6-footer, came out of the cage to a mingled reception of whistled catcalls and a few cheers for his courage. He made it down to the field unmolested and proceed to show the fans an American-type place kick, booting the ball 60 yards over the goal-line, a feat never before seen in the stadium. When he returned to his box, the stadium was on its feet according him a demonstration usually reserved for a historic performance by a matador.

Bob Hill went on to become one of the most popular emissaries Washington had ever sent down to Mexico City. He won this affection during a period when anti-Americanism was manifesting itself throughout Mexico and when Soviet-Cuba propaganda efforts were building a fire under the Mexican people.

An Eisenhower appointee, Hill resigned from office last November to successfully run for the legislature in his home State of New Hampshire. His successor has yet to be picked by President Kennedy.

I interviewed him recently in New York where he was on his way to make a speech in Texas on what this Government's policy should be toward Latin America. It was a few days before the announcement from the President that he was going to ask Congress to approve a multimillion-dollar program for Latin America along the lines of the Marshall Plan.

"There is no question that we need a policy toward Mexico and the rest of Latin America," Hill declared. "And there is no question that we haven't had one in 15 years. We have been practicing crisis diplomacy instead of long-range planning all over the world and now that we have a problem with Castro, Latin America is our crisis. This is in contrast to the Soviet Union which has a planned policy and follows it."

Hill brought up the football kickoff incident as an illustration of another weak point in our dealings with Latin American nations. "They respect strength, not vacillation. If I had sat by in a protected cage at the football game, I would have given 100,000 people the image of a frightened Uncle Sam. When I was lucky enough to get off a good kick, they respected me for it. Their whistles changed to cheers. I don't expect every ambassador to Latin America to be able to kick a football 60 yards, but we will never gain their respect unless our diplomats are willing to get down to the level of the people.

"Castro is definitely a danger to our continued peaceful relations with Latin America. They have traditional reasons for hating and fearing us and when one of their own can thumb his nose at us and get away with it, he has their sympathy. It is our job to show them that he can't get away with it. But we have to go a step further. We also have to approach Latin America as partners, not masters. Our diplomats can't run their embassies at cocktail parties for the privileged few of each nation."

Hill's sentiments are echoed in many quarters in Mexico City. One Government official, whose views do not always coincide with that of President Adolfo Lopez Mateos, told me frankly:

"The sooner your Government forgets the phrase, 'Monroe Doctrine,' the sooner it will gain the respect of many nations to your south. The United States must realize that it does not speak for all of the Western Hemisphere, that every nation wants a voice in hemispheric policy."

Other influential Mexicans told me that one of the reasons anti-American resentment has manifested itself since the ascension of Castro is that the Latin American nations have felt themselves neglected for 15 years. "When your late President Roosevelt was at the head of Government," one of them said, "he took a big interest in our problems—a mutual interest. But for the last 15 years, your Government has offered financial aid to every part of the world but in your own hemisphere."

A professor at the University of Mexico, who does not subscribe to the Communist and near-Communist leanings of many of his fellow faculty members, criticized the limitations of the American student-exchange program. "Less than 20 Mexican students received scholarships to America last year despite a thousand requests," he said.

From Moscow come offers of 500 scholarships to Latin America for their Freedom University in Prague. And from Moscow, too, comes an impressive program of catering to the intellectual in Latin America through the medium of cultural fairs, appearances by leading dancers and musicians, and sponsorship of trips. It is in this field that the United States has fallen down badly.

In Latin America today the race is between evolutions and revolution. From Moscow the message is that revolution is the answer. The United States, so far, has not kept pace in selling evolution.

Migrant Farm Labor Problems and "Harvest of Shame"—XII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is the 12th in a series of articles presented in the public interest by the Palm Beach Post-Times to show the Members some of the progress being made in Florida to solve problems relating to migrant farm labor which were left out of the television presentation "Harvest of Shame." The omissions of all that has been, and is being done, in this field did a great injustice to the Floridians who have given their time and efforts to these problems over the years. It is hoped that by reading these articles and the ones to follow the Members and public will have a better understanding of this important matter.

[From the Palm Beach Post, Feb. 3, 1961]

MIGRANT INCOME VARIES

"It is the story of men and women and children who work 136 days in the year and average $900 a year."—"Harvest of Shame."

The most informed estimates available in Palm Beach County is that migrant workers who winter here average better than 100 working days and around $700 in the half year they are here.

Frequently a family unit, with father, mother, and older children working can earn a good half-year income before moving north with the harvest.

In the Glades area, migrants can count on 7 to 9 months of employment if they want it, Belle Glade Police Chief Charles Goodlett has found.

"They may arrive in September to work on corn and beans and stay for the other crops," he said.

In the coastal area, the situation is a little different, according to the Florida State Employment Service.

Bob Douglas, who's been in close contact with the migrant picture for more than 10 years, said the State figures show the average migrant in the immediate vicinity works an average 4-day week and stays 22 weeks.

His earnings may range up to $700, Douglas said, depending on the crops, the individual, and the weather.

Pieceworkers—such as pickers—average about $450 on the coast, depending on the aforementioned factors, he said, but some have been found to make $9 per day.

The wife's income can be added to this as well as money earned by older children, he said.

"There are many things which determine the earnings," he said. "I've seen workers who decide they've made enough money for the day stop and wait 4 hours for a truck to haul them from the fields."

Many like the social life in the fields, he said, and spend much time in talking, playing cards, or eating around the chuck wagons.

Basically, he said, the migrants who work on the coast arrive about the middle of November and stay until May.

Tenth Anniversary of General MacArthur's Speech to a Joint Session of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today we mark the 10th anniversary of the historic occasion of Gen. Douglas MacArthur's speech to a joint session of the Congress. For it was on April 19, 1951, that this truly remarkable and dedicated American patriot delivered his magnificent address from the rostrum in this House where we now sit. It was not my privilege then to be a Member of this great body. However, I can well remember sitting by my radio and being stirred by the power and the poignance of this great man's gifted and lofty eloquence.

The passage of 10 years of time has merely served to asseverate the truth of General MacArthur's historic pronouncement. From his tremendous breadth of experience and knowledge he delivered a warning which was so prescient that it demands repeating in this hour. I quote from his speech of 10 years ago today a single paragraph:

There are some who for varying reasons would appease Red China. They are blind to history's clear lessons for history teaches with unmistakable emphasis that appeasement but begets new and bloodier wars. It points to no single instance where this end has justified that means, where appeasement has led to more than a sham peace. Like blackmail, it lays the basis for new and successively greater demands, until, as in blackmail, violence becomes the only other alternative.

This advice is just as salient and meaningful today as when it was uttered a decade ago. Indeed world events during this intervening period have proven its wisdom beyond peradventure of a doubt.

I sincerely hope that a new President and a new administration will re-read this speech of April 19, 1951, and ponder its message. We are all sincerely motivated by a wish for peace and the twin desire to accomplish a lessening of the present international tensions.

However, this should not obscure from us the fact that we cannot compromise with evil. We cannot recognize Red China as a peaceful member of the community of nations when her actions belie such recognition. We cannot and should not seat the Red Chinese in the United Nations to obfuscate and eventually destroy the work of that body.

This was, I believe essentially the advice that General MacArthur gave us 10 years ago today.

Blueprint of Death

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a column of April 17 by the gifted writer Ralph McGill, which recalls the mass murders committed by the Nazis be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

This column is not pleasant reading, but it is a potent reminder of the end results of a totalitarian system whether it be Fascist or Communist. It should serve to strengthen us in our determination to preserve our free and democratic society.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 17, 1961]

THE PASSING SCENE—EICHMANN TRIAL'S BIZARRE TONE

(By Ralph McGill)

To any of the reporters who covered sessions of the Nuremberg trials, the trial of Adolf Eichmann is bizarre only in the cloak-and-dagger details of the more than a decade of patient search for the man who was one of those responsible for the deaths of millions of men, women, and children.

The mind automatically rejects the word "millions." For most of us the word death conjures up a battlefield, which few have seen, or the death of a friend or one of the family in which as much of the reality of it as possible is obscured and diluted by the undertaker's arts.

BLUEPRINT OF DEATH

The blueprinted plan of death which Eichmann and others carried out as part of the Nazi philosophy of establishing a superrace is so massive an operation in murder that the mind cannot quite take it in.

"Millions? Millions? They killed millions?"

The answer is "Yes." They did. Millions.

No man who sat any time in the grim old courtroom at Nuremberg as the trial of the Nazi war criminals slowly, tediously unfolded will ever forget his experiences. Eichmann would have been there had he not escaped.

The witnesses came. Some were badly crippled from the fortunes inflicted. There were men and women who had fingers which looked like lumpy carrots. They had been broken and burned in efforts to extract information from them. Others were mutilated by experimental operations and tests of new surgical techniques which the Nazis hoped could be used on their wounded in the many military hospitals.

There were women there who had been hideously used. Some had the prison numbers tattooed on their arms. Many had been forced into soldiers' brothels.

The representatives of the super race were in the defendant's box—Goering, Hess, Speer, Schacht, Rosenberg, Streicher—22 of them. They did not look like supermen, sitting there in their prison clothing, their faces aging, the jowls of the fatter ones sagging; the faces of the thinner ones lined and masklike.

They heard the witnesses day in and out. Usually they were silent. Now and then one would whisper with another. Two managed to commit suicide—Robert Ley and Hermann Goering.

One could leave them and go to the courts trying the lesser criminals. I recall one such. He had been in charge of one of the lesser known concentration camps. He was charged with having killed more than 40,000 men, women, and children—Jews, Poles, and Balts. They put him on the stand.

"I did it," he sneered. "It was a fine life while it lasted. We had a great time. I have no remorse. We lost. Now it is over. Let us be done with this. I am guilty. Hang me."

They did. But one does not forget such a man.

There was another one. He had sent an estimated 20,000 to be executed. They had gone, of course, in daily groups. Many were marched into long ditches and made to lie face downward. Soldiers with automatic rifles walked along shooting into the bodies. The dirt was then scooped back into the ditch, and the fact that some were merely badly wounded and not dead did not concern them. It was not pleasant to hear the defendant say, "It was an order. What else was there to do?"

The stories of the larger camps are more familiar. The gas chambers went night and day—as did the crematories.

CAMPS OF DESPAIR

If one wearied of the trials one could go to the concentration camps made into rehabilitation centers. There, still skeleton-thin men, women, and children were waiting out their departure. There were children who would never know what became of their parents. There were husbands who would never know what had become of their wives or children; mothers who would never know where or how their husbands or children had died.

In the summer of 1959 those newspapermen who went to Moscow and Poland with the then Vice President Nixon went with Mr. Nixon as the Poles showed the graves of several thousands of persons taken into the forests outside Warsaw and shot down by the Nazi guards. (Eichmann was said to be one of those who planned it all.)

Anyone who had seen all that will oppose all the rest of his life any Fascist or Communist groups which seek to dilute American freedom by fanatic attacks on our courts, our Constitution, and our individual liberty.

Long Beach Federal Savings & Loan Case Bungling by Home Loan Bank Board Causes Distress to Many Innocent Parties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, this RECORD has carried many items in the past contributed by myself and other Members of Congress respecting the inept actions of the Home Loan Bank Board against the Long Beach Federal Savings & Loan Association.

Many years ago the Board seized this institution and finally had to restore it to its management when it turned out the seizure was unfounded and improper. Last year the Board again seized the institution. An investigation followed by the House Committee on Government Operations which concluded the Board acted improperly and the negotiations should be promptly made to restore the institution to its management. These negotiations have dragged on for approximately 10 months and still they have not been concluded. The Board's so-called conservator in charge of the institution's assets has been anything but conserving them. One of these assets is a loan on a large real estate development known as the Bellehurst tract in Orange County, Calif. Because of this trouble between the Board and the association's management not only has the company developing Bellehurst been stopped in the midst of its operations, but hundreds of persons who purchased homes there have been caused to suffer anxiety and loss. The following is typical of hundreds of letters I have received from these home buyers.

APRIL 12, 1961.

Re the Bellehurst development.
The Honorable CRAIG HOSMER,
House of Representatives, House Post Office, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The more than 250 families residing in the Bellehurst development of Buena Park, Calif., are seriously concerned with the loss in value of our homes. Our homes are now worth at least $10,000 less than the $30,000 to $40,000 we paid for them and continue to decline in value daily.

Sales stopped in August of 1960 when title to the area was apparently clouded by lawsuits brought by the trustees under the trust deeds covering the development. There has been no construction for almost 2 years since the Federal Home Loan Bank Board took control of the development. As a result we have been living in a blighted area of partially completed premium housing with continuing deterioration in appearance and declining sales prospects. All of this is destroying the value of our homes and seriously jeopardizing the millions of dollars of financing the Government has tied up in the development as the present managers of Long Beach Federal.

We understand that an agreement for continued financing and completion of the development between the developer and the Home Loan Bank Board and/or the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation was entered into early in December of 1960. Whether or not the old management of Long Beach Federal was a party we do not know, but we understand its consent may have been required in order to clear title so that financing could go forward. Apparently the agreement provided for close of escrow on March 31, but for some reason the escrow did not close and no extension of the closing date occurred. We say for "some reason" because there is apparently disagreement between the parties involved as to who is responsible for the delay.

We are not primarily concerned with who is to blame except insofar as investigation will result in concrete action to get this development underway again. Only in this way can our property values be protected and the area again made an attractive one for family living, thus assuring renewed sales potential. Certainly the Home Loan Bank Board and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation have a tremendous stake in protecting the millions of dollars already tied up here.

As homeowners we feel we are caught in the middle of the disputes between the Bank Board, the ousted Long Beach Federal management and the developer, in which we have no part but which have cost us individually and collectively many hundred thousands of dollars already. Unless something is done about this at once, we are faced with complete loss of our investment.

We hope you will apprise yourself of the facts of this situation and take active steps to see that the Federal agencies involved promptly proceed with a program which will reactivate the development.

Sincerely,

BELLEHURST COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION,
JOHN WALLER, *President*.

The Home Loan Bank Board was established by Congress to help people, not cause them grief and loss. It is high time the Board carried out the responsibility fixed on it by law and the obligations it owes to the people of the country which it is supposed to serve.

Scientific Successes of Soviets and the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in the wake of last week's news that the Soviet Union had made the first orbit of a man in space, much was heard in this country about the urgency to catch up with the Russian achievement. I recalled the observation of Henry Kissinger that, "Our period offers no prizes for having done rather well." This is true. But at the same time we must not lose sight of our own accomplishments. Many of these achievements have lacked the element of spectacle, yet their significance is far reaching. President Kennedy, I thought, said something last week that passed with little notice, but is worth repeating as an example of what I mean.

The President said that if we could produce fresh water from salt water at a cheap rate we would score a gain "which would really dwarf any other scientific accomplishment." We are working toward that goal and there is a good chance we will push toward it more rapidly.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Washington Post of April 16, by Howard Simons, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. It is a calm and clear interpretation of recent events.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET SURELY EXCELS US IN SHOW WINDOW—U.S. SCIENCE SUCCESSES UNSUNG

(By Howard Simons)

(Simons, a Washingtonian, has written on scientific subjects for magazines and other periodicals for several years.)

Not since the advent of John F. Kennedy, Jr., has a predictable event been so anticipated or prepublicized as the Russian man-in-space flight. Even though the Russian success came as no surprise, perhaps because of this Pavlovian conditioning, when the bell finally rang, the world drooled.

The impact of this latest Soviet space spectacular will be as great as the launching of Sputnik I was on October 4, 1957. It will reinforce Russia's apparent usurpation of world technological supremacy.

It will again raise cries in this country for review and revaluation of our own effort. It will suggest military implications, and it will heighten interest in man's step-by-step conquest of the heavens.

A PROPAGANDA BONUS

It would, of course, be a grievous error for American decisionmakers to downgrade the political and propaganda value of outer space spectaculars. The propaganda by-product of Sputnik I was not foreseen by either American or Russian planners. What began as an experiment for the recent International Geophysical Year has become a potent geopolitical weapon.

Certainly the peoples of emerging nations have been impressed with the Russian successes in outer space. These feats have been a dramatic advertisement for Russia to show that it has risen from backward agriculture to advanced technology in just a few decades.

There is no doubt that if the United States had launched the first earth satellite, the impact on the world would not have been as great as that achieved by the Russians; it would have been expected of us. Also lost on the peoples of the world are the subtleties of why the United States is lagging behind the Russians.

Few persons know or care that the United States made a decision to build smaller boosters because of its remarkable breakthrough in reducing the size of nuclear warheads, from the big fission affairs to the small fusion bombs.

At the time, it was a monetary decision. The United States could perfect intercontinental ballistic missiles cheaper than the Russians could. That was before both sides realized that outer space exploration would be a major ideological weapon.

CELESTIAL ARTILLERY

But the Russians' successful orbit of Maj. Yuri Gagarin in near-space also has heavy military implications. There can be little doubt that the Russians will soon be capable of launching a manned spaceship that can fire a rocket at a target on earth in much the same manner they launched a rocket from a satellite toward Venus February 12.

It would be an expensive weapon, however, and the Polaris nuclear submarine can do the same job with the same advantages—it is hard to detect and hard to destroy—at the proverbial half-the-price. Nonetheless, one cannot discount the psychological effects of a Russian orbiting the earth in a nuclear arsenal.

But to suggest that the Russian feat was "the greatest scientific achievement in the history of mankind," as did the British scientist Sir Bernard Lovel, is gilding the lily. President Kennedy gave it the proper emphasis when he congratulated the Russians on an "outstanding technological accomplishment."

This choice of terminology points up a continuing problem for American scientists, made sharper by space spectaculars: how to make clear in the public mind the great difference between science and its offspring, technology.

The United States has been outdone repeatedly in terms of propaganda by Russia's outer space feats. Yet it has not been second best in scientific achievement. On the contrary, it is an intriguing paradox of the so-called space race that American efforts receive less respect at home than in the Soviet Academy of Sciences.

Since Sputnik I, the boxscore reads: Soviet Union: 1 man in space, 11 Earth satellites, 2 shots around the Sun, and 1 to the Moon; United States: 37 Earth satellites, and 2 Sun orbiters. Yet, discovery for discovery, Russian achievements in outer space are no match for America's which include:

The first detection of trapped particles through the discovery and identification of the Van Allen radiation belts.

Satellite contributions to geodesy and celestial mechanics, including the theory that the earth is pear shaped.

Tiros cloud cover pictures which promise satellite weather forecasting.

Echo and Courier satellite communications experiments which will lead to a satellite-based communications system.

Transit satellite experiments for all-weather navigation.

GRANDSTANDING IS COSTLY

In fact, it has been a mystery to American space experts why the Russians have failed to exploit their capabilities scientifically. One observer says it may be that the Russians are using their dramatic space shots solely for propaganda purposes, with science as a poor hitchhiker, and then filling in the gaps with data from American findings in outer space.

For one thing, the Russians are running a very expensive program. One Pentagon official suggests that one reason why the Russians have been so sparing with their launchings is the enormous cost of sending up one of their 7-ton vehicles.

Some American scientists have expressed reservations about spending billions on outer space, particularly for a man in space. One is James R. Killian, Jr., President Eisenhower's first special assistant for science, who has said that he would rather see the huge sums spent on outer space used for earthly education instead.

Other scientists say that if the United States wants to catch the Russians purely for propaganda reasons, the terms should be spelled out just that way and the job done. But if the scientific elements of our outer space exploration are to be maintained, there is little essentially wrong with our past, present and future programs, in their view.

Of course, it would be impossible to update our own space efforts overnight. Space research and development are not the same as automobile production, where it is possible to order more cars off the assembly line within 24 hours.

Space scientists and engineers live in the future. They talk about and work on proj-

ects that will become reality 5 or 10 years hence. In the development of space hardware, time can rarely be compressed drastically even by the application of more money.

Despite the recent Russian success, there remains a strong body of opinion which shudders at the suggestion of a redirection of American efforts. These observers are convinced that over the long pull, America's scientifically oriented space effort will reap far more benefits and prestige than the Russian pyrotechnics.

The difference in what the two countries have been doing in space research tells much about a fundamentally different approach to scientific research in general.

From all available evidence, the Russians go in for massive assaults on specific scientific challenges, employing the same tactics in the laboratory that the Red Army used in World War II. American science, on the other hand, makes an across-the-board effort, seeking gains in many scientific areas, of which space exploration is only one.

It is encouraging that the promise of the American approach has not been lost on a number of scientists, Government leaders and, surprisingly perhaps, business leaders. In the fall of 1960, some 1,700 subscribers to the Harvard Business Review, mostly top management executives, were questioned about their attitudes toward the country's space program. A heavy majority favored space research over a tax cut.

Seventy-seven percent did not think we get propaganda value out of duplicating Russian research and did not think the space program should be reoriented for propaganda purposes. Sixty-six percent rejected the idea of spending several million dollars for a rapid, spectacular propaganda victory.

The United States has made significant research gains in physics, chemistry, biology and medicine. In medicine, for example, Russian contributions hardly bear comparison with America's. Here, it would seem, is a far more significant lag in prestige.

Just before he left Washington, T. Keith Glennan, the former administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, told a reporter: "I would be fearful if the worth of the United States were measured solely by our ability to put a man on the moon."

Student Unit Fights Coast Campus Bias

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, this last week I had the pleasure of meeting and making appointments for three Berkeley High School students visiting Washington as a result of winning awards for excellence in scholarship, creativity, and community service.

I would like to publicly commend the city of Berkeley and Berkeley High School for their efforts to identify and reward outstanding achievements in these fields. This is an important and exceptionally worthwhile program which is entirely consistent with our national goal of encouraging excellence.

One of the award winners, Kipp Dawson, initiated a program to overcome unofficial, but real prejudice in her high school. The Washington Post in a recent article reported on this program and I urge my colleagues to read about this encouraging and significant undertaking:

STUDENT UNIT FIGHTS COAST CAMPUS BIAS
(By Victoria Stone)

Students for Equality is the name of a small group of students in a large California high school who are trying to overcome prejudice in their midst.

The group started with the conviction of 15-year-old Kipp Dawson that "it's possible for people of different backgrounds to get together."

Kipp is one of three Berkeley High School students visiting Washington this week as a reward for excellence in scholarship, creativity and community service. The city of Berkeley paid their fares.

Kipp said the group is working to dissolve the cliques that make school segregation a fact, even if it is not the law for Berkeley High's 3,000 pupils. She calls it "self-imposed segregation."

Berkeley High, like the city itself, is a racial and national mixture of Orientals, Mexicans, Negroes, and both high and low-income whites. Until World War II, Kipp explained, the city was almost exclusively white. Kipp said she was not the first to notice that students were drawing their own color lines at school cafeteria tables, that class placement always seemed to isolate nonwhite pupils, and even that school counselors were discouraging Negro pupils from preparing for college.

A searing letter she wrote for the school newspaper last year brought her a nucleus of supporters that has grown to 50 pupils. Students for Equality concentrates on discussions, lectures and example-setting at school.

"We all went into it with deep prejudices," she confessed. A warehouse worker's daughter, Kipp said she used to be "tremendously bitter against anyone who came from the right side of the tracks."

Kipp and the other winners, Conal Boyce and David Gordan, called on District School Superintendent Carl F. Hansen yesterday for what proved a thought-provoking visit.

Hansen later told a press conference he was mildly envious of Berkeley's ability to honor its top students on public funds. "This would be a great thing to do in Washington," he said, but he doubted that the District would ever be able to afford it.

Hansen said he was impressed with young Conal's ability to compose a complete opera. He said a search for such extra-bright youngsters in city schools was worth exploring.

The District so far has not tried to single out exceptionally gifted pupils but it is "a field in which we ought to make a study," Hansen said.

What It Meant to Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article on the Battles of Concord and Lexington, as it appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on April 17, 1961:

WHAT IT MEANT TO THEM—PROPAGANDISTS OF THE DAY SAW THE BATTLES OF CONCORD AND LEXINGTON WITH DIFFERENT EYES FROM THOSE OF LATER POETS

The propagandist, 1775:

"Americans, forever bear in mind the Battle of Lexington—where British troops fired upon and killed a number of our countrymen. * * *

"Our deceased brethren, by their noble intrepid conduct, in helping to defeat the forces of an ungrateful tyrant, have endeared their memories to the present generation, who will transmit their names to posterity with the highest honor."—Massachusetts Spy.

The Poet 1836:

By the rude bridge that arched the flood,
Their flag to April's breeze unfurled,
Here once the embattled farmers stood,
And fired the shot heard round the world—
From "Concord Hymn," by Ralph Waldo Emerson.

THE BATTLE—APRIL 19, 1775

On the morning of April 20, 1775, a tall young man strode purposefully along the road from Boston to Worcester in His Majesty George III's Massachusetts Bay Colony. Isaiah Thomas was not alone on the road that day, for he continually met groups of men headed in the opposite direction, bearing arms.

These men were headed for Cambridge, there to join the colonial militia which was holding British forces at bay across the Charles River in Boston. Eager for news, they delayed the young stranger in his purposeful journey, seeking confirmation of the wild rumors that had spread quickly throughout the colony after the British marched on Lexington and Concord.

Isaiah Thomas unburdened his thoughts to these inland farmers, artisans, and shopkeepers, thoughts aboil over the events he had lived through during the previous day.

The sound of his name likely brought knowing grins, for though perhaps surprised at his youthfulness, they knew him as the printer of the Massachusetts Spy, a voice heard in behalf of liberty in many corners of Massachusetts and other colonies.

And after raising himself and his listeners to fighting pitch with his eyewitness report of the portentous clashes of April 19, he might have concluded, "Now I go to Worcester, whence my presses have preceded me; there to expose the iniquity of our oppressors so long as strength is left in me and paper can be procured."

PAPER INDEED SCARCE

Isaiah Thomas rode into Worcester on a horse procured for him along the way by a friend. He did indeed find that paper was hard to come by. After 2 weeks, with the help of John Hancock, he finally got some paper on which to print his first issue in Worcester of the "Massachusetts Spy"—May 3, 1775.

The issue was avidly read, passed along, reread, and reprinted, for it gave one of the most incendiary accounts to be found of the Battle of Lexington and Concord.

Propagandists like Thomas didn't see the event in poetic terms. Their accounts, in which events, names, and figures are consistent by their inconsistency, are designed to rouse, to incite, to precipitate revolt.

After an opening blast, calculated with its charge of British treachery and atrociousness to set colonists' blood boiling, Thomas picked up his account of the battles at the beginning.

REPORT REPRINTED

It is reproduced in part, here:

"A few days before the battle, the Grenadier and Light Infantry companies were all drafted from the several regiments in Bos-

ton, and put under the command of an officer, and it was observed that most of the transports and other boats were put together, and fitted for immediate service. This maneuver gave rise to a suspicion that some formidable expedition was intended by the soldiery.

"About 10 o'clock on the night of the 18th of April, the troops in Boston were discovered to be on the move in a very secret manner, and it was found they were embarking in boats at the bottom of the Common; expresses sat off immediately to alarm the country, that they might be on their guard.

"The body of the troops in the meantime, under the command of Lieutenant Colonel Smith had crossed the river, and landed at Phipp's farm: They immediately to the number of 1,000 proceeded to Lexington, 6 miles below Concord, with great silence: A company of militia, of about 80 men, mustered near the meetinghouse; the troops came in sight of them just before sunrise; the militia upon seeing the troops began to disperse; the troops then sat out upon the run, hallooing and huzzaing, and coming within a few rods of them, the commanding officer accosted the militia in words to this effect, 'Disperse you rebels.'

"SHOTS THEN FIRED

"Upon which the troops again huzzaed, and immediately one or two officers discharged their pistols, which were instantaneously followed by the firing of four or five of the soldiers, and then there seemed to be a general discharge from the whole body; it is to be noticed they fired upon our people as they were dispersing, agreeable to their command, and that we did not even return the fire: Eight of our men were killed and nine wounded.

"A little after this the troops renewed their march to Concord, where, when they arrived, they divided into parties, and went directly to several places where the province stores were deposited.

"Another party of the troops went and took possession of the Northbridge. About 150 provincials who mustered upon the alarm, coming toward the bridge, the troops fired upon them without ceremony, and killed two upon the spot.—(Thus did the troops of Britain's king fire first at 2 several times upon his loyal American subjects, and put a period to 10 lives before 1 gun was fired upon them.)—Our people then returned the fire, and obliged the troops to retreat, who were soon joined by their other parties, but finding they were still pursued, the whole body retreated back to Lexington, both provincials and troops firing as they went.

"During this time an express from the troops was sent to General Gage, who thereupon sent out a reinforcement of about 1,400 men (the British numbers are exaggerated throughout), under the command of Earle Piercy (Percy), with 2 field pieces. Upon the arrival of this reinforcement at Lexington, just as the retreating party had got there, they made a stand, picked up their dead and took all the carriages they could find and put their wounded thereon; others of them to their eternal disgrace be it spoken, were robbing and setting houses on fire, and discharging their cannon at the meetinghouse.

"The enemy having halted above an hour at Lexington, found it necessary to make a second retreat, carrying with them many of their dead and wounded. They continued their retreat from Lexington to Charlestown with great precipitation; our people continued the pursuit, firing till they got to Charlestown Neck (where they reached a little after sunset), over which the enemy passed, proceeded up Bunker's Hill, and the next day went into Boston under the protection of the Somerset man of war of 64 guns."

The Revolutionary War was begun.

THE SHOT RICOCHETS

(By Leon W. Lindsay, staff writer of the Christian Science Monitor)

Newspapers—especially Isaiah Thomas' Massachusetts Spy—played a significant role in rousing the colonists to battle pitch. But in 1775 the fastest means of communication was a good horse. And there were post riders as well as horses of proven endurance.

One of those post riders was to become known as the first man to take the news of the Battle of Lexington south—Israel Bissel.

Col. Joseph Palmer of Braintree, arriving in Watertown, April 20, the morning after the battle and grasping quickly its import, hastily scribbled a combined report and rallying cry, gave it to the veteran post rider, and told him to take it as far as Connecticut.

But Bissel went much farther than that: after shouting and showing his message through Connecticut, he rode into New York on Sunday, April 23. After throwing New Yorkers—and especially the Sons of Liberty—into a frenzy of speculation and activity, he crossed the Hudson and rode into the Jersey flats.

KEPT ON TO PHILADELPHIA

Bissel did not stop until he reached Philadelphia on April 25. He covered more than 400 furlong miles in something less than 6 days. From Philadelphia, his message was sent on south.

Charleston, S.C., received the report, say some authority, by way of the brigantine *Industry* on May 8. And in the southernmost of the English colonies, Georgia, it was sometime near the end of May before the news was heard—but it had lost none of its impact.

Dr. Joseph Warren, the famous commander in the Battle of Breed's Hill, prepared a circular on the battle on April 20 also—another report, but still in broad terms, with little detail—account was also sent hoofing down the coast.

A later, still more detailed account written by a committee of the Provincial Congress went out by special courier—with fresh men and horses waiting along the line to speed the official document all the way to Georgia.

FACTS SECONDARY

In all these accounts one purpose was paramount: arouse the colonies; the true facts of the battle were secondary.

Printers hastened to get out special broadsides on the event, and most newspapers carried accounts of the battle. These accounts contained the few facts available, bolstered by a good deal of speculation and rumor.

Though the news was, admittedly, slanted and colored—no colonist need have been ignorant or misinformed as to the essential happenings of April 19, 1775.

OPPOSING ACCOUNT RUSHED

The Boston Evening Post printed three lines on the battle the following Monday—the regular publication date. The paper was suspended after this issue and never reappeared.

Connecticut papers had accounts of the battle on Monday, too. Timothy Green of New London was so busy pursuing the cause of liberty he couldn't do justice to the clash—he got out only a half-sheet on it.

In New York, Hugh Gaine, a Tory printer, got out an account on Monday, the day after Bissel came riding in. Gaine's account was as biased in one direction as Isaiah Thomas' was in the other.

Philadelphia had a newspaper account of the battle a week after it happened, Wednesday, April 26. The Pennsylvania Packet got out a special supplement.

North Carolinians were reading of the exploits of the Minutemen, according to one authority, on May 7—a day before the *Industry* was supposed to have docked. And in Savannah, the Georgia Gazette had the story for its subscribers on May 31.

Back in Massachusetts, the Essex Gazette of Salem had one of the best accounts 5 days after the battle, and of course, there was the May 3 issue of the Massachusetts Spy.

WHO WAS ISAIAH THOMAS?

Isaiah Thomas grew with his country. In some ways his career is like that of the man he emulated, Benjamin Franklin—though Thomas started from a lower station in life.

When he was six, his widowed and impoverished mother had him apprenticed, in 1756, to a Boston printer and pamphleteer, Zechariah Fowle. He wasn't the first early American to be educated at the type case.

At 16 he, like Franklin, broke his contract and ran away to Halifax, Nova Scotia, where he was taken on by another printer. But his employer soon found he had to get rid of his ambitious helper, who was too brazen in his defiance of the Stamp Act.

After attempts to start a business in North Carolina, Thomas returned to Boston, where his former master welcomed him with no apparent ill-will, and together they began publishing the Massachusetts Spy. Soon Thomas bought out Fowle.

His first aim was to print a paper, not for the "gentle folk," but for the workingmen—an impartial journal with views of every color. Early attempts at impartiality were soon dropped. The Spy took on revolutionary tones and became one of the most important papers in America.

Though Thomas' paper has not had the historical notoriety of the Boston Gazette of Benjamin Edes and John Gill—which was the "official" mouthpiece for Samuel Adams and the Sons of Liberty, the Spy had its role, and played with at least as much histrionics, if with less adroitness.

The Spy—along with the Gazette—found Boston's British rule inhospitable, not to say dangerous, as a clash approached in 1775. With the help of friends, Thomas sent his printing equipment to Worcester a few days before the Battle of Lexington.

On the night of April 18, Thomas was one of the expresses who rode to spread the alarm that the British troops were crossing the Charles.

He was reported to have been with the militia in Lexington the next morning. As to his activities during the rest of that eventful day, no one, not even Thomas himself, seems to have left any account.

Thomas printed the Spy intermittently during the Revolution, but after the war he began to prosper. He set himself three objectives, and attained them before his passing in 1831: (1) compilation of a History of Printing in America (published first in 1810); (2) the collection of printings and artifacts having to do with America; (3) formation of a society to preserve Americana.

The American Antiquarian Society was founded by Thomas in 1812.

Yes, You Can Plant a Garden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL FINDLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States felt much better recently when they read in a bulletin from an office of the Department of Agriculture that it is still all right to plant a garden in the backyard.

The bulletin brought this response from Allan A. Seiler, editor of the Pike County Republican, Pittsfield, Ill., in a comment published April 5, 1961:

A clue to the degree of regimentation around the bend for the American farmer can perhaps be found in the latest news release of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committee of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

After explaining some of the current prohibitions and restrictions on production of grain and hay crops in 1961, the news release winds up with this encouraging note, "Home gardens can continue to be used to produce crops for home use."

When it comes under the heading of news to explain that the Federal Government has no objection to the planning of a home garden to produce food for home use, we have an illustration—with more clarity than might have been intended—of the degree to which we have become conditioned to governmental control.

Ambassador Pawley's Grave Revelation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which was published in the Brazil Herald on March 1. The article is in regard to one of Florida's outstanding citizens, a former Ambassador of the United States to Brazil and to Peru, and one of the most knowledgeable persons about Latin American affairs I know of—Mr. William D. Pawley.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMBASSADOR PAWLEY'S GRAVE REVELATION

(By Paul Vanorden Shaw)

Of all the noncareer diplomats sent to Brazil as chief of mission, William D. Pawley stands out for notable successes in Brazil itself and for his personal and professional impact on Brazilian-American relations. He served during the Gen. Gaspar Dutra regime, the first elected President after the fall of the Vargas' dictatorship and the first under the constitution of 1946, which replaced the semitotalitarian 1937 charter. Mr. Pawley, an affluent businessman, patriotic to the core, and possessing a broad and enlightened vision of Brazil and Brazilian-American relations, gained the respect of Brazil, and its people because he could see their point of view, and their needs. And, it was a failure to meet their needs which has led him to reveal at this time the real cause for that failure. A grave and sombre revelation which comes to prove a thesis we have set forth in these columns.

Former Ambassador Pawley in hearings of the Senate Committee on Internal Security last September, published only on February 20 of this year, minces no words in laying the blame for a failure which, in his opinion, caused "a deterioration of our relations with the Brazilian Government from which we have never to this day recovered," where it belongs.

We call attention to the fact that ex-Ambassador Pawley was testifying before an Internal, not External, Security Committee showing that failures in diplomatic relations do affect the internal security of the United States as well as its security in the world. Very briefly the story he told is this. The Brazilian Army bought 40,000 tons of wheat which were sorely needed in Brazil. Bureaucratic obstacles in the United States were raised to prevent the shipment. Sizing up the sumtotal situation very accurately Ambassador Pawley came to the conclusion that that shipment of wheat should come through at all costs. With his intimate contacts great ability and drive he obtained green lights from the President of the United States down the line. Having moved Heaven and earth in the United States to meet the Brazilian need he returned to report to President Dutra that all was well and the wheat would be received. "Quacada," as the Brazilian would say, nothing came. And this led to "severe questioning" by the President of Brazil who all but impugned the honesty of the U.S. Ambassador.

The explanation, according to Mr. Pawley, was the existence of "some people in junior positions in the U.S. Government who decide "what is good and what is not good for the United States." In other words not only the U.S. Ambassador but the U.S. President and other high officials of the United States were stymied to the point of jeopardizing the relations of the United States with Brazil by junior bureaucrats who formed "a panelinha," as the Brazilians, call it, which could make a travesty of the promises and words of the representatives of the United States to Brazil. The panelinha was a self-appointed cabal of junior officers which met weekly to approve or disapprove decisions by their hierarchical superiors.

This is far from the only case on record but has particular revelance just now there are signs that Washington, after the seemingly inevitable more talk and fact-finding, is determined to do something to improve Brazilian and Latin American relations with the United States. We have been insisting that the ablest U.S. ambassadors abroad cannot carry out their missions without complete and understanding support from Washington. Especially from the high-ups in the State Department and White House responsible for foreign policies and for specific decisions affecting foreign relations.

If "panelinhas" or cabals composed of junior officers systematically meet to accept or veto decisions by their chiefs and have the power to enforce their vetos then the situation is far worse than we had imagined. Although this happened many years ago, recent events make us believe that the danger of similar occurrences is not altogether past. It is utterly illogical to maintain a first class diplomatic corps if unauthorized junior pipsqueaks can make their will prevail over the decisions of their chiefs. Ex-Ambassador Pawley has rendered a real service by bringing this episode to light.

Deplorable Conditions in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, a prominent Maine businessman, Herman D. Sahagian, of Belgrade Lakes, Maine, recently made a trip, accompanied by his wife, to the Middle East, where both he and his wife were born.

Since their return, Mr. Sahagian has been asked by many groups to relate what he found in these countries. The following talk was given before the Rumford (Maine) Rotary Club on April 10. I recommend to my colleagues that they read this firsthand account by a man who is familiar with this section of the world, speaks their languages, and sees a situation that demands immediate correction:

I have returned home to Maine from a visit to the Middle East.

I was appalled at what I saw. Appalled that after the millions our Government has appropriated and sent to the nations of that section of the free world; so much poverty, misery and want should still exist.

I saw heart-rending scenes, scenes hard (if not impossible) for any American to even imagine, especially any American who knows how genuinely concerned our people are with the plight of the underprivileged nations of the world. A concern, manifestly proved by the enormous sums under point 4 program allocated and sent to those countries.

In Beyrouth I saw a "tin city" the abominable "La Flueve." La Flueve is the name of this camp or "tin city" which is situated about 6 miles outside of the capital city of Beyrouth. Beyrouth is the capital of Lebanon. La Flueve is the city of refugees—a city of tin huts—huts made of tin beaten out from discarded American petroleum cans. Dwellings, if we can term them as such, are unheated, unsanitary, and unfit for occupancy by either man or animal.

In Athens I saw children kicking through piles of refuse in the streets trying to salvage from the offal a scrap to eat.

In old Jerusalem, I saw a community of people, fugitives from the various political upheavals of recents events in the Middle East. These people exist in crowded, oppressive rooms provided for them through the charity of hard-pressed local churchmen. This community is a veritable teaming anthill of civilization.

In Aleppo and Damascus, I say 6-year old girls consigned to domestic service with wealthy families. This contracted arrangement exists so that they would not be a burden on their defeated, destitute parents, until they reach the age of 14 when they might legally be married. These things I saw.

I talked to these people, hundreds of them, and I learned how little America is understood and appreciated by them. I thought of the enormous sums we have sent to the countries of the Middle East; I found not one soul who could admit they had benefited one iota from our enormous expenditure of money, food, clothing, and other commodities. Indeed, it was news to them that America was at all interested in their plight.

One man said to me: "We hear so much of the great wealth of America, then we look around ourselves and see this poverty. This causes us to wonder if Americans are so selfish, so unfeeling, so blind. I am an anti-Communist by nature and inclination. I hate the Soviet. Can you blame us if, in our need, some day, we accept gladly the help being offered to us by the Soviet Union?

This, of course, pinpoints the dual nature of the tragedy of the Middle East—a tragedy of unutterable consequence—not only to the United States of America, but to the future of the free way of life in this world.

Our charitable nature must be based on a foundation of self-preservation if we are not only to aid the underprivileged of the world, but save them for the cause of freedom.

Although we are annually sending huge sums of money to the nations needing aid in the Middle East, we still find these sums are somehow neither aiding the lot of the impoverished people, nor winning friends for freedom and America.

I ask, in wonderment, how is it that our generosity is not reaping rewards, rewards in uplifting human dignity in strategic areas of the free world, rewards in raising our prestige as the champion of freedom worldwide, within a section of the world where, as it may very well prove true, the coming great and decisive struggle between freedom and tyranny may take place.

Gentlemen, if we, the American people, do not take effective steps to act now, we will lose the Middle East. We will lay it open to Soviet incursion and influence, and finally Soviet captivity.

Asia will be blocked off from us, hundreds of millions of people, who are by nature champions of freedom, will find themselves standing static in this moment of great world reawakening. They will find themselves under the control of the greatest despotism the world has ever known. All because they wanted to live in dignity, to find a square meal.

For let it be known that the Arab, the generic name given to that great family of people who dwell in the Middle East, cannot by nature become a Communist. The tradition of the Arab people makes communism, collectivism, social, and thought control completely unacceptable to them. The proud, nomadic traditions of the Arab people, rebel against that which is communism.

These people we must aid to better themselves. The alternative is disaster. They want to be our friends, yet they know nothing about us.

They say that they have heard about the segregation of our Negroes, yet they do not know that nowhere else in the history of mankind has a Negro been as free as he is today in the United States.

They speak of the millions of Wall Street, yet they know nothing of the tremendous sums collected and spent by Americans and their charitable organizations.

They say that we are clannish, that we do not share our wealth.

One parent told me: "If I had but $1 a week from America, I could keep my little daughter home, give her warm clothing and food."

I am not here to tell you what is wrong with our governmental aid program in the Middle East. I don't know what is wrong, but I do know that somehow the Federal sums allotted for aid, under point 4, are not reflecting themselves in bettering the living standard of the poor in the Middle East. In that section of the world one is either very rich or very poor. There is no middle class as we know it in America.

Gentlemen, I am here rather to sound an appeal, to utter a warning. I think it is time the American people establish methods of funneling money directly into the hands of those who need help the most in the Middle East. I think we ought not at this critical time to indulge in the luxury of a national debate on the subject of, "What Is Wrong With Our Point 4 Program?" I think rather that swift action on our part as private citizens, is of essence, and I call for the establishment of an organization of Americans of good will to collect funds and send those moneys to private agencies abroad entrusted with the distribution of that aid among the people, directly, with no middlemen.

We must get our mostest to the people the fastest, to use an expression made popular by the Confederate soldier, Forrest; and if the present system of extending aid to the vital section of the world is not effective, we must render it effective with characteristic American ingenuity and drive.

The stakes in the Middle East are high. The Soviet is playing its cards expertly; we are simply trumping our aces. This is a task for all Americans. It will mean further calls on our generosity; it will mean the establishment of a new private agency; it will mean a giant public effort; but for the future of America, of the peoples of the Middle East, and for freedom, we must succeed.

The Academy of Medicine of Cincinnati

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD D. CLANCY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, while this Congress inquires into the alleged shortcomings of medical care, it behooves us to remember that American doctors exemplify all that is best in the ancient profession. They are men who are skilled, selfless, and charitable. It should not surprise us that physicians are taking a greater collective part in the health and welfare of the community in which they serve. A case in point is the Academy of Medicine of Cincinnati. This century-old medical society sponsors a popular Sunday morning TV program, "Call the Doctor." And the public does just that. People by the hundreds telephone their symptoms, their anxieties, and their grievances to the station, and a doctor panel answers them straight from the shoulder. Here is a fine example of the medical profession responding to a public interest in the facts about total medical care which serves them so well today.

This same academy also took a forward-looking step on February 23, 1961, when representatives from medical, educational, and legal agencies in Cincinnati and Hamilton County were invited to a special meeting. The subject of the meeting: "How To Protect the Community From the Menace of Intoxicated Drivers."

The audience first saw a film, "The Silent Witness," which deals with police-administered tests for intoxication. Then they heard a panel consisting of a police officer, judge, and physician discuss the legality and medical effectiveness of such tests, and how they can help reduce the drunken driving problem in Cincinnati or any other community.

"The Silent Witness" was produced by the Wm. S. Merrell Co., a drug manufacturer established over 132 years ago in Cincinnati.

Merrell, as a public and professional service, produced "The Silent Witness" as one in a series of educational films dealing with new problems of medicine and the law. The series was made with the cooperation of the American Medical Association and American Bar Association.

The meeting was sponsored by the Academy of Medicine of Cincinnati and is a laudable example of physicians taking the lead in public service at a time when both medicine and the pharmaceutical industry are under fire. Let us be reminded of the "good men do."

Reuse of Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, for years the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], has been a campaigner for a national program of water resource development. He was the able chairman of the Select Committee on National Water Resources on which I had the privilege of serving. He has become something of an educator in this field, seeking to inform the American people about the water needs of the future. This is why he was asked to be the keynote speaker at the 8th annual National Watershed Congress, which convened Monday in Tucson, Ariz.

I ask unanimous consent that an account of his speech, which appeared in the New York Times, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REUSE OF WATER HELD IMPERATIVE—KERR CALLS ON HYDRONAUTS TO FIND WAYS TO REMOVE BOTH SALT AND POLLUTION

(By Bill Becker)

TUCSON, ARIZ., April 17.—By the year 2000 most Americans will be drinking water that is used three times or more, Senator ROBERT S. KERR said today.

The Oklahoma Democrat predicted that by then the United States would be using all its streams' flow, making reuse imperative throughout much of the Nation. He said that this would require methods of removing pollution so that water could "be used again not once, or twice, but perhaps several times."

The Senator called on "hydronauts of the New Frontier" to "crack the barriers" of stream pollution and desalting sea water. He referred to President Kennedy's statement that a breakthrough on salinity would dwarf achievements in space from the standpoint of the welfare of humanity.

Senator KERR was the keynote speaker at the eighth annual National Watershed Congress, which opend a 3-day session here today.

He predicted to newsmen that conversion of salt water into fresh water should be economically feasible within 5 to 8 years.

CITES GOVERNMENT TESTS

Preliminary tests at several Government-operated plants indicate that conversion costs can now be reduced to $1 a thousand gallons in a plant capable of treating 1 million gallons a day, the Senator said. He added the cost could be cut to 50 cents a thousand gallons at a 10-million-gallon-daily rate.

For normal drinking use, a 40-cent rate would be acceptable in most communities. For irrigation purposes, anything over 5 cents a thousand gallons would be considered too high.

Senator KERR forecast congressional passage of twin bills he is sponsoring to curb pollution and increase reservoirs for recreational use. The antipollution measure would authorize a 5-year research program to develop new methods of treating sewage.

The Nation is now using more than a third of all its streams' flow and will use two-thirds by 1980, he said. By 2000 "virtually complete storage of river flows" will be needed, as well as indefinite reuse in metropolitan areas, he said.

MORE SEWAGE IN WATER

The United States uses 300 billion gallons of water daily. New York City alone uses about 100 million gallons a day.

American cities now receive nearly twice as much sewage in their water supplies as was considered safe in 1955, a report to the Senate Committee on National Water Resources indicates. Senator KERR is chairman of the committee.

The National Watershed Congress comprises 27 organizations ranging through farm, forest, wildlife, and urban groups. Some 350 delegates from about 40 States are attending the meeting.

About 8,300 of the Nation's 12,000 watersheds are suited for multipurpose projects, Donald A. Williams, Administrator of the U.S. Soil Conservation Service, told the meeting. He said that the needed projects—for supply, flood control, and recreation—would affect nearly a billion acres, roughly half the Nation's land area.

Soliciting Made-Work Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN REIFEL
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, at a time when most economic indicators point to an upturn in the national economy, city officials across the country are being invited by the administration to submit lists of needed public works projects in their communities.

The inference is made clear to these officials: Here is a chance to get your hands on some more Federal money. It is an appealing prospect for the local officials, an opportunity to make civic improvements without asking the hard-pressed local citizenry for the money to pay for them.

Yet it would be the local citizenry that would end up paying the bill—only it would cost more by the time their dollars came back from Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the Federal Government participating in local projects which are vital to the welfare of the community, the State, and the Nation. But I have never heard that there is such a shortage of these projects that we have to go out looking for them.

The fallacy and dangers of soliciting made-work projects are pointed out in an editorial which appeared in the Sioux Falls, S. Dak., Argus-Leader of April 6, 1961. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

WHY ROB PETER TO PAY PAUL?

City governing boards throughout the Nation have been asked to compile lists of needed projects in their communities. President Kennedy seeks this information as a basis for the consideration of various public works in the event of the desirability of an accelerated program to provide employment.

All communities, including Sioux Falls, can present a substantial list of such projects. Our city commissioners have mentioned a few. But one wouldn't have to draw hard on his imagination to develop a list representing an expenditure of $10 million to $20 million. And all of the projects would have some merit.

Similarly it might be said that all householders could present substantial lists of what they might like to acquire if funds permitted.

There is, in truth, no end to the possibilities. But certain basic questions are involved. As we take more and more money away from the people through taxes, we reduce their ability to do what they might like to do in the way of home improvement and so forth. And certainly the better way to stimulate employment is through the normal and private avenues of spending.

The made-work proposal can in a sense become a method that works against its objectives. We learned that lesson in part in the thirties. Despite made-work of many kinds, the economy was beginning to crumble in the late thirties. The picture was changed basically only when we began to prepare for World War II.

Russ Lynch of Milwaukee Cited for Excellence in Conservation Reporting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article describing the national honor that has come to an outstanding Milwaukee newspaperman be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LYNCH CITED FOR ARTICLES—CONSERVATION HONOR

Russell G. Lynch, conservation writer for the Milwaukee Journal, placed second in the 1960 Thomas L. Stokes National Award competition for conservation and natural resources writers, it was announced Tuesday. Lynch was cited for his "year long articles on State and natural resources and conservation, preservation of fish and wildlife, parks, forests, water pollution, land use and resource teaching." He will receive a citation.

The first place award of $500 and a citation went to Associate Editor John F. Huth and Reporter Robert J. Drake of the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer.

The Stokes Award is given annually for outstanding writing on the development and conservation of natural resources. It is named after the late Thomas L. Stokes, a nationally syndicated columnist who wrote in that field.

Lynch also was cited for special commendation by the Stokes Award committee last year, when only a first place award was given.

Louis M. Lyons, curator of the Nieman Foundation and one of the judges, praised Lynch's "hard digging investigative articles on the problems of river development, pollution, flood protection, hazards of chemical controls, soil and water conservation—very able, factual articles and most effectively published in the Journal."

Ku Klux Klan Leader Picked Up—Warned by Police

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, on January 31, 1961, the House of Representatives voted on the question of increasing the size of the Rules Committee by adding three additional members, one Republican and two Democrats. Immediately, in my district in Louisiana, the reaction to such a vote became much discussed. Within a few days, on the night of February 8, as a matter of fact, some unknown individuals burned a large, 8-foot cross on the front lawn of my home in Shreveport, La. These individuals perhaps thought I would be at home on that occasion.

On April 6, in the afternoon, the police department in Shreveport questioned at length one, R. E. Davis, of Dallas, Tex., self-styled leader of the Ku Klux Klan.

Since the cross was burned on the lawn of my home in Shreveport in obvious protest to my vote in regard to the Rules Committee in the U.S. Congress, I think it is of interest to the Members to have available the account of the questioning of this KKK official, R. E. Davis, by the police chief of the city of Shreveport, Chief Harvey D. Teasley. With this in mind, I am presenting an article giving the details of the questioning, written by Jim Leslie, and appearing in the Shreveport Times on April 7, 1961:

KLAN LEADER PICKED UP—WARNED BY POLICE HERE

(By Jim Leslie)

The self-styled leader of the Ku Klux Klan was arrested here yesterday and questioned for 2 hours about his local activities and Shreveport crossburnings.

During the extensive questioning, he was strongly criticized by Police Chief Harvey D. Teasley.

The Klan official, R. E. Davis, of Dallas, was arrested at 4:45 p.m., as he was returning home after a 2-day visit to Bossier City. During much of this time, he was under surveillance by law officers and Shreveport Times newsmen. Capt. Coles Thomas arrested the Texas man in the 1000 block of Texas.

Davis told Teasley that the charter of the local KKK chapter has been revoked. He said he took the charter away from the local group because he became suspicious that some of its members were involved in the crossburning in front of U.S. Congressman OVERTON BROOKS' home in February.

Teasley denounced both Davis personally and the clandestine group that Davis purports to head as imperial grand wizard. And he warned the man that "Shreveport does not need this subversive organization."

Teasley, in his tongue lashing of Davis, said that the crossburning "disturbed the people of Shreveport and caused considerable concern."

The police chief warned Davis that the Klan would be treated as "we do all subversive organizations that degrade and demoralize people." And he added, "our investigation so far reveals that your organization is just like this."

Teasley told Davis that his investigation revealed that the Shreveport Klan had been

made up of "irresponsible people * * * debt beaters, liars, and drunkards."

The police chief told Davis that he had a copy of his long arrest record, which, the chief said, dates back for several years. Teasley also said that he had obtained information from Dallas "where your actions and activities disrupted the citizens council." "Because of that you're very unwelcome there," said Teasley.

Davis denied the criminal record, stating that "I've made a lot of enemies and the same ones that were after me there are after me here." Davis also said that he had never been convicted of any of the criminal charges.

When questioned about the cross burning in front of Representative BROOKS' home on February 8, Davis said that he did not know where he was on the night of the incident, although he admitted being interviewed by a Times reporter the day after the cross burning.

Davis said that he has taken "drastic measures" as a result of the cross burning. He said that he has evidence that tended to indicate that the Shreveport KKK chapter was responsible for the cross burning and "I was suspicious, but couldn't prove it."

Davis said that when he was unable to discover exactly which members of the local chapter were responsible, he revoked the charter of the entire chapter some 5 weeks ago.

Teasley asked Davis if Dr. Jerry Bristol, president of the National Organization of Whites, had anything to do with the cross burning.

"I asked Dr. Bristol about it and he told me that he positively didn't do it," Davis replied.

Then Teasley asked Davis if it wasn't Dr. Bristol's group that had its charter revoked and Davis replied, "I don't know just which one of the klaverns that he claimed to have been in."

Davis denied any connection between the Klan and now.

Teasley then started questioning Davis about his activities in the Shreveport area for the past 2 days.

(Two Klan meetings have been held in this area this week. The Bossier-Webster group met Tuesday night on Lake Bistineau and the Coushatta group met Wednesday night near Coushatta. Both meetings were known to law officers.)

Davis said that he was in this area to sit for a picture that was being painted of him in his "full dress" purple robe.

Davis spent most of the day yesterday with J. D. Swenson, Bossier City drycleaning establishment owner, and two other men, according to Teasley.

Teasley asked Davis what he was doing with Swenson. Davis said Swenson is a member of the citizens council and that he went to talk to Swenson because "I understand they had great success with a meeting in Bossier City recently."

HAD RECORDS

Davis also admitted, after being asked by Teasley, that there were members of the Shreveport KKK chapter with criminal records. He said that an investigation of the local chapter revealed "that we had men in our organization that should have been in the penitentiary."

He said he based his decision to revoke the local charter on a report given to him by the State board of governors.

Teasley also questioned Davis about the finances of the Klan. At one time Davis said that all he received was "donations to help pay my expenses" from the local chapters, but when pressed he said that he receives $3 per man after the State becomes "an organized State."

Davis said that there have to be 50 chapters in the State before it becomes an "organized State" and at present there are 35 chapters in Louisiana. Then after becoming an "organized State," Davis said he receives 72 cents per member per year.

Davis said that he also publishes a newspaper for Klan members and that the subscription rate is $2 a year.

He said that the Klan is a "charitable organization" and that its moneys are spent in "charitable ways." He cited as an example the helping of a "poor church." However, he added, "it has to be done so that you don't let your left hand know what your right is doing."

Klan activities in the Shreveport area first came to light on February 10, and after criticism by Caddo Sheriff J. Howell Flournoy, Shreveport Mayor Clyde E. Fant and other officials, the Caddo group began to fall apart.

Several high-ranking officers were kicked out.

But then the movement spread to the two parishes east of Caddo—Bossier and Webster.

Davis, continuing to make trips into the Shreveport area, met with Bossier Parish Klan leaders on a number of occasions and attended several meetings.

The Bossier-Webster group, following the patterns of the Klan in most sectors, held its meetings at a camp alongside a lake.

Most of the time, these gatherings have been held on the west side of Lake Bistineau, at a camp located on the north end of the lake.

A visit by Times newsmen showed this meeting place to be a white, concrete block building situated under a grove of pine trees.

The Bossier-Webster meetings, at which persons from Minden, Bossier City and Shreveport attended, have been held on Tuesday nights.

Last Tuesday, however, the meeting place was changed to another camp, located about a quarter of a mile away.

The place of the meetings, unlike many Klan gathering spots, can be seen from a number of surrounding fishing camps.

Members driving to the meeting from Bossier and Shreveport would go east on U.S. Highway 80, turn south on the road leading to Doyline, continue through Doyline on the Doyline-Minden road 4 miles, then turn right on a gravel road. This gravel road makes a turn and curves back onto the Doyline-Minden highway.

From Minden, those attending the Klan meets would simply drive west out the Doyline-Minden road and turn on the gravel road.

Our Man in London

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BYRNE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD the following article which appeared in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of April 10, 1961:

IN OUR TOWN

(By James Smart)

Our man in London: Advertisements began appearing on and off in the London Sunday Times a couple of months ago.

For a while they were a mystery to the city administration. Here's the solution: the ads were placed by Samuel Berger, Philadelphia builder who, with his brother Henry, has been responsible for several big developments and is one of the developers of the new Eastwick.

"I just thought it was a good gesture," said Berger, "and it might stimulate others to do the same.

"You know, there are two bills before Congress that are supposed to put out some loot to do this kind of thing."

Why didn't he sign his name?

"Why should I?" he said. "I'm not going to sell any houses in London, that's for sure. If I whet the appetite of a dozen people over there, I'll feel satisfied."

Sam Berger is a most patriotic, public-spirited individual who is interested in promoting good will and the virtues of America abroad. I am proud to count him among my good friends and he is to be congratulated for encouraging foreign tourists to visit the United States and particularly historic Philadelphia.

Columbus, Nebr., Looks Ahead to a U.S. Spaceman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, in case the administration is interested in what effect Russia's being first with a man in space has had on rural America, I would like to offer this news story from the April 17 issue of the Wall Street Journal. The story originates from what is one of the largest population centers in the Third Nebraska Congressional District, the city of Columbus. Columbus I might add, is well known in Nebraska as a fine progressive community that solved its problem of farm mechanization after World War II, by using its native wit, spitting on its hands and going to work.

GAGARIN AND COLUMBUS, NEBR.: VIGOROUS PRAIRIE TOWN LOOKS AHEAD TO A U.S. SPACEMAN

(By Edwin A. Roberts, Jr.)

COLUMBUS, NEBR.—Almost everyone in this vigorous prairie town has heard of Yuri Gagarin, and they admire his brave voyage in orbit around the earth. But there is quiet confidence that the United States will not be far behind—a confidence born, perhaps, of the town's own orbit here on earth and of what has been accomplished by the enterprise of its free citizens.

True, there is disappointment that the United States was not first. But Columbus, anyway knows what it is to be on top, to take a tumble, and to come back stronger than ever.

The town started in 1856 as a trading post on the Platte River, some 80 miles west of Omaha. It gradually grew into a nice prosperous farming town of about 7,000. Then farm automation hit after World War II and people were being laid off right and left; population dwindled fast. Town leaders decided to encourage the people to stop crying and do something constructive—to get out of farmwork if they were working at all, and into something else.

Walt Behlen, laid off from the cornfields by mechanization, became an inventor of improved farm equipment. He started with nothing and his company now does $14 to $16 million volume annually. He is the town's most famous success story, but there are dozens of others. And now Columbus is known through the Plains States as a little hub of technology for the farm. Population has climbed to 13,000.

EXUDE CONFIDENCE

"If Columbus can catch up, so can the country's scientists," says a pipe-smoking store owner. "We're doing all right with our missiles, and it won't be long before we show the Russians something. Funny thing about Americans—once they wake up they usually go to town. Some people don't believe that, but I do."

William Floyd is 45 years old and he has been principal of Columbus Senior High School for 6 years. In those years the number of students taking advanced science courses has almost trebled, and he attributes this to the effect of the East-West space race on the popular imagination. He thinks Gagarin's flight should be kept in perspective.

"I don't lie awake nights about it. Remember Russia has really concentrated on this project to the exclusion of many other fields of inquiry. The United States is well ahead in the overall picture, and in time we'll overtake the Communists in space exploration. It would be a mistake, I think, for the country to become alarmed because the first man to orbit the earth was a Russian.

"It's overall balance that counts, don't forget. Why we've had outstanding hurdlers from time to time and still had lousy track teams."

Columbus High is a sprawling buff-colored structure situated just north of U.S. Route 30, a major transcontinental highway. The school is 3 years old and impressively equipped. In one room, a laboratory, students not entirely unhappy about an interruption in their work gave a visitor their views about Gagarin's flight.

"I don't think of it as a space race," says Bert Aerni, an 18-year-old senior, as he throws aside his rubber apron. Bert, who wants to be an electrical engineer, adds, "It's all human achievement no matter who does it. The Russians will make propaganda gains, but I don't think we're very far behind them."

After a pause Bert says softly, "Even so, I guess I am disappointed we didn't do it first."

Anita Mueller, 17, a senior who plans to be a math teacher, isn't especially impressed with the Soviet feat. "Really," she remarks with a twinkle, "what's the difference between a man and a monkey?"

Back downtown Ben B. McNair, president of the Citizens Bank, leans back in his chair and rubs his chin. Mr. McNair, at 63, has been a banker all his life, but it was only 2 years ago that he helped found Citizens. The institution has grown rapidly and now has deposits exceeding $2 million. Mr. McNair doesn't think "we should be down on ourselves."

"The Government's going about this space business in a logical way," he says. "We're not shooting a man up there just for the sake of trying.

"The sad thing is that some foreign nations are so impressionable. When I was in Italy a while ago, some people over there told me communism has more to offer than democracy. They tried to support this notion by pointing to Russia's superior athletes. What sense does this make? But undoubtedly many people will be impressed in the same way by the Soviet space man."

The idea that many of the peoples of the world use vulnerable criteria in judging ideologies was echoed heatedly by Peter Haas, a young farm-equipment salesman.

"Answer me this, will you? Why should we get in a scientific vaudeville show with the Russians? So what if all the banana countries start doing a rain dance every time somebody shoots off a rocket. Sure, putting that guy up there was a great stunt, but does anybody doubt next year at this time we'll have guys doing the same thing? I'm tired of all this moaning and wailing."

But Alice Micek, a bookkeeper, was unwilling to pass off the Soviet success so lightly. "This is a serious setback for the United States. It will provide a lot of propaganda for the Reds. I think the Russians are ahead of us because we give away too many secrets. Television and newspapers report about our missiles in such detail, it's no wonder the Communists have the advantage. Now something should be done about it."

OTHER PROBLEMS

Joe Justice, an auto mechanic, doesn't see the sense of space experiments in the first place. "The Government is having a hell of a time making ends meet on earth without going someplace else," he declares.

Mike Kincaid, owner of KJSK, the local 1,000-watt radio station, believes interservice squabbling is still holding up the U.S. missile program. He thinks it's time we got busy and got a man up there too. And he's confident we will eventually outstrip the Russians in space.

Expressing similar confidence were three workers at the Behlen Manufacturing Co., a farmer and his helper who were repairing a corn crib, two housewives browsing in the J. C. Penney store, a pharmacist, and James Preston, manager of the Columbus Chamber of Commerce.

And if a casual traveler through the pleasant streets of Columbus, Nebr., can claim a total impression it must be that confidence in America's ability to cope with this challenge in space is both strong and deep.

It could be, of course, that Columbus, which found out how to make such a strong comeback itself, could be an exception. Or it could be that the climate that permitted the ingenuity of its citizens full play is not much different from the climate in Livermore, Calif., and Waterville, Maine.

The Constitution and What It Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, each year the American Legion of Ohio promotes as essay contest among the high school students in Ohio.

The subject assigned always has some connection with civic or governmental responsibility.

This year the subject assigned was "The Constitution and What It Means."

I am proud that the Fourth Congressional District of Ohio is represented among the 12 winners selected this year.

Miss Diana Dietrich of Laura, Ohio, is one of the ninth grade winners. Her prize winning essay is as follows:

THE CONSTITUTION AND WHAT IT MEANS

To fully develop your own character you must know your country's character. Therefore it is necessary to understand our Constitution of the United States. The Constitution of our country provides for the form of government, limits the Government's powers, and assures the rights and liberties of the citizens. First, let's consider the history of our Constitution.

The signing of the Declaration of Indepedence marked the birth of a new nation. In the period between the signing of the two documents, America had no centralized government. In 1778 the Articles of Confederation were drawn up by the Second Continental Congress. These articles left much to be desired. There was no President, Vice President, or Supreme Court. Congress could make laws, but had no means of enforcing them. In September 1786, commissioners from five States met at Annapolis. This important meeting soon led to the ratification of the Constitution by nine States on June 21, 1778. From this time on the Constitution became the supreme law of the United States. Many people agree this was the most important document made in our history.

What I like best about the Constitution is the soul and heart of it. Unless our Constitution satisfies the feelings of our heart, unless it feeds the human soul, unless it stirs our emotions, it cannot be regarded as an expression of the American spirit. The most precious expression, next to the Bible, is the Constitution. In the Bible we find our relationship to God. In the Constitution we find liberty, the next important thing in life. In studying the Constitution every American can say with pride: "When danger threatens my life and liberty neither the President nor Congress nor armies can enter and take away my life and liberty." The soul of the Constitution is in every paragraph. All the parts are mighty links that bind the people in an unbreakable chain of the Union.

You need not be a a scholar to understand the basic principle of the Constitution. Yes, it is important to know the laws and regulations, but not as much as knowing it gives the three God-given rights: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Let's consider the Preamble to the Constitution. We do not know from whose brain it came. It is a great voice of the people, giving expression to their souls' desire. Summed up, the Preamble declares that our forefathers sought union, justice, tranquality, safety, welfare, and liberty. You should read the Preamble again and again. As you read it, the words are most ardent hopes and the holiest feelings of the human heart.

Times does not wear down nor eat away the truths of the Constitution. War cannot overturn our liberty as long as Americans are worthy of their forefathers. Instead of fading with age, the glory of the Constitution will remain through the ages. May we guard our birthright and hand it down to our future generations as the "jewel of their soul."

The John Birch Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, an excellent editorial concerning the John Birch Society appeared in the Pine Bluff Commercial, a rather small daily newspaper in my State. I think that this editorial hits the nail on the head

about the significance of this group, and I hope that my colleagues in the Congress will take time to read it. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Pine Bluff Commercial, Apr. 1, 1961]

THE NEW PERIL

We have been trying to work up a proper degree of concern and indignation about the John Birch Society, and have not so far made the grade.

The society may well be the menace it is being painted to be. We remember a fellow who laughed at Joe McCarthy.

But the Republic has stood off the Soviet Union since 1945 and, with considerable help, whipped two sets of Fascists plus Mussolini's legions more or less simultaneously in the period immediately preceding.

It lived through the know-nothings, the Klan, the silver shirts, and the aforementioned McCarthy, and will, from all indications, also survive the citizens councils.

We are experienced, as a Nation, with crackpots and authoritarians. If the John Birch Society is not about the nearest to impotent of the lot we are, as a newspaper, a good way wide of the mark.

It has been alleged that the John Birch Society is a hate group, hence dangerous. Certainly it is made up of people who know how to hate, and who enjoy the sport. But they are also, and more profoundly, people shaken to their being by fear.

Whether the founder (who girded for his present large responsibilities in his brother's candy factory) knows it or not, the John Birch Society is built upon the proposition that mankind is doomed, and that there is now time only for a desperate rearguard action.

The society is convinced that all forces of change are exclusively in the service of the Kremlin, and that they threaten the civilized world at every point of contact.

What we have here is a fellowship of fear. In its articles of faith, the society resembles nothing so much as one of those sects which have from time to time taken to the basement and sealed up the cracks around the door in the conviction that the world would end at 5:27 a.m. a week from Thursday.

Consider the men and things which the John Birchers or their founder have already conceded to the Communists: They include the President and his predecessor; the Supreme Court; the Nation's city managers; the urban renewal advocates; the proponents of fluoridation; the United Nations.

These people don't need condemnation. They need help.

They need, each of them, a quick course in American history, a heart-to-heart talk with a trustworthy friend and then, perhaps, a good long rest.

The evidence is that John Birchism is incurable, but we can try.

Nor does John Birchism seem to us to be contagious. The presumption on which the organization has been viewed so generally with alarm, is that it is a virus likely to infect innocent people.

All of the evidence we've seen indicates that the people already had the virus, and have simply gotten together to share its miseries.

We suppose that there may be people in meaningful numbers willing to take the oath of allegiance to an outfit which is willing to forfeit the American system of Government for something the John Birchers call, quite gratuitously, "the American way of life."

But we doubt that there are many men of sound mind willing to accept the collateral dictum that Dwight Eisenhower is a Communist.

To the extent that they have done anything, except to each other and themselves, the John Birchers seem to us to have performed a substantial public service.

They have alerted their fellow Americans to the existence on the far, far right of the political spectrum of people every bit as confused, troubled and willing to be led around by the nose as their opposite numbers on the far, far left.

The society also has provided an interesting litmus test for some of our noisier politicians.

Senator EASTLAND, for example, has just spoken well of them.

Until they move beyond their present activities, which appear to consist pretty exclusively of whipping up each others' hysteria and of occasionally slandering men so eminent as to be substantially invulnerable to such attacks, we think the John Birchers more a nuisance than a peril.

If we must have people willing to believe in the things the society stands for, we may as well have the society.

The existence of such a group is bound to cut down on the number of Birchists running around unencumbered by the label, and thus likely to be mistaken for responsible citizens.

"Wisconsin Agriculturalist" Writer Ralph Yohe Describes Vocational Training Outlook for Rural Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the outstanding farm paper, the Wisconsin Agriculturalist, has been carrying a series of fine articles on the theme "Rural Education on Trial." They have been written by a distinguished Wisconsin farm writer, Mr. Ralph S. Yohe. The most recent two articles in this series describe recent developments in vocational schools and technical training.

Mr. Yohe notes that Wisconsin has one of the better vocational training programs in the Nation, established 50 years ago. Sixty-two cities in Wisconsin offer vocational and adult education courses. As of last year, well over 5,000 students were enrolled in these programs.

Mr. Yohe asks:

How does farm youth fit into this picture? Only 20 to 30 percent of the youth growing up on farms will be able to find good farming opportunities. This means that 70 to 80 percent must eventually find jobs in factories and offices.

Yet a smaller percentage of farm youth take training in the State's vocational schools than city youth.

The writer goes on to examine the reasons for this. He suggests in conclusion that vocational training schools be expanded and upgraded, to meet the needs of both city and rural young people. To better accomplish this he recommends that area vocational schools be established in various parts of the State.

In view of the great interest in vocational training that has arisen in connection with the area redevelopment bill, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Yohe's articles and the accompanying table be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW DO WE STAND WITH VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS?

(By Ralph S. Yoke)

Wisconsin has one of the better vocational training programs in the Nation. The Wisconsin Legislature established vocational and adult education in 1911—50 years ago.

The program was set up to furnish vocational and industrial training for people in the growing towns and cities of Wisconsin. At that time, there was little thought that such training might someday be desirable for rural youth.

"The growth of the schools has been correlated with the growth of the communities in which they exist; and as the communities have grown and expanded, greater demands have been placed upon the schools for broadened and more comprehensive service," says C. L. Greiber, director of the State board of vocational and adult education.

LAW ALLOWS AREAWIDE SCHOOLS

The original law set up the program as individual community activities. The courses are approved, the schools supervised and coordinated by the State board of vocational and adult education.

In 1955, the legislature passed a law to allow areawide vocational schools. Any county or area with 20,000 or more people can set up an area vocational school to meet their needs.

So far no such area schools have been established. Why?

Such schools must be built and run largely through local tax money. The areas that need them most are the least able to build and support them.

Most of the areas that are able to run and support vocational schools already have vocational schools in one or more of the cities.

Wisconsin's present vocational schools get most of their support from the local towns and cities where they are located. The State's vocational schools' income in 1960 came from: 75 percent, local property tax base; 4 percent, State funds; 3 percent, Federal Government; 7 percent, fees and tuition; 11 percent, other sources.

Last year the State's part of the $10 million for running vocational schools in Wisconsin amounted to $420,000. This year it will be upped to $1,785,000.

The Wisconsin program is quite in contrast to States like Connecticut, where vocational schools get nearly 100 percent of their help from the State.

The 62 vocational schools scattered over the State offer a variety of training—trade and business extension education, general adult education, training for apprentices, and instruction for high school age youth.

Wisconsin laws require youngsters to go to school until they are 16 or have graduated from high school. Where vocational training is available, youngsters under 16 who have graduated from grade school can take full-time vocational work instead of high school.

The law also requires that town and city youth from 16 to 18 who are not enrolled or have not graduated from high school must attend vocational school 1 day a week.

That is if there's a vocational school in the town or city where they live.

A very important part of the vocational school educational program is technical courses offered to young people who have graduated from high school. It is important because the Nation will need 40 percent more trained technical and professional workers in the next 10 years.

An impressive number of people are enrolled in the States vocational and adult schools. This includes apprentices, adults, continuation school students, and high school graduates—in night, part-time and full-time courses. Here's the total enrollment for the State:

1957–58, 132,746; 1957–59, 142,986.

The number is far less impressive, however, when we look at the number of high school graduates enrolled in vocational-technical training.

On February 15, 1959, 5,267 students were enrolled in full-time vocational technical courses designed for high school graduates.

On February 15, 1960, 5,319 students were enrolled in these courses. Most of them—4,323—were high school graduates.

In addition, some young people were enrolled in private or other public schools offering technical training.

Even so, the total is only a fraction of the number of students enrolled in various colleges and universities in the State.

ENOUGH PEOPLE AREN'T BEING TRAINED

Only a small percentage of the States high school graduates take full-time courses in vocational training. Yet it is one of the fields where our need for trained people is growing the most rapidly.

We have no figures on the percentage of rural youth enrolled in these full-time vocational technical training courses. But certainly it is only a small percentage of the total farm youth who will eventually seek jobs in factories and offices.

On February 15, 168 high school graduates, or those 18 years of age or older, were taking vocational courses half- to full-time at the Wausau Vocational School. Of this group, 102 were from the city, 66 from the surrounding county.

At Superior 209 were from town, 19 from the surrounding county. At Milwaukee 1,109 were from the city, 209 from the county.

At Madison 139 were from the city, 94 from the county. At Green Bay 166 were from the city, 75 from the county. And at Eau Claire 124 were from the city, 44 from the county.

Why don't more rural and urban youth take advantage of the technical vocational courses offered in vocational schools?

We'll try to answer this question in the next article.

YOUTH PASSING UP TECHNICAL TRAINING

(By Ralph S. Yohe)

Sixty-two cities throughout Wisconsin offer vocational and adult education. Twenty-eight of these schools offer full-time vocational technical courses at the high school graduate level.

Many of these schools are very good and well attended. The largest—Milwaukee—reports an attendance of more than 700, with a comprehensive vocational technical program carried on in 58 shops.

The chart below shows that the Nation's needs are greatest and most training is needed for professional and technical jobs.

On February 15, 1960, there were 5,319 students enrolled in vocational technical programs in the State's vocational schools.

This is an impressive number, but it is small compared to the large number of Wisconsin high school graduates who do not go on to college or other advanced training.

How does farm youth fit into this picture? Only 20 to 30 percent of the youth growing up on farms will be able to find good farming opportunities. This means that 70 to 80 percent must eventually find jobs in factories and offices.

The most opportunities are in fields requiring the most training

Occupation	Change in the Nation's needs 1955–65	Number of years of school completed by those in field, 1959 (years)
Professional and technical	37 percent more	16.2
Proprietors and managers	22 percent more	12.4
Clerical and sales	27 percent more	12.5
Skilled craftsmen	24 percent more	11.0
Semiskilled	22 percent more	9.9
Service workers	13 percent more	9.7
Unskilled laborers	3 percent less	8.6

ONLY A FEW FROM THE COUNTRY

Yet a smaller percentage of farm youth take training in the State's vocational schools than city youth. The map of Wisconsin shows the number of students attending the Madison vocational school from the various counties throughout the State (not shown here).

By far most vocational school students come from the city where the school is located. Only a small percentage comes from outside the county.

In view of the Nation's growing needs for technically trained people, why do not more farm youth in Wisconsin go to vocational schools for technical training? Fees are very low and many of the schools offer fine instruction.

There are probably many reasons, but some of the important ones are:

The vocational schools are run and are largely supported by taxes from the cities in which they are located. While students outside the city are welcomed, there is no great effort made to promote the school's program outside the city.

Most of the schools, with the largest variety of courses, are located in the more highly urbanized eastern part of the State. In northern and southwestern Wisconsin where there is great need among rural youth for such training, there are no vocational schools offering extensive courses.

Farm youth who wish to attend such courses must either travel long distances or live away from home.

Many student advisers in high schools fail to encourage or point out the advantages of taking additional training in vocational schools. Even excellent agricultural technical training is available in some of the vocational schools.

A general feeling that vocational technical training—"going to a trade school"—is a pretty poor second choice to going to college. We have an attitude that it's "college or nothing" in spite of the Nation's growing need for technically trained people and the fact that many technicians earn as good a living as many college graduates.

Area schools need to be established in those parts of the State where vocational education is not available at present.

If we are to get well-equipped and well-staffed vocational schools in these areas, it will mean that the State must bear a much heavier proportion of the cost of vocational training. The areas where new schools are needed are the least able to raise the taxes to support them.

The schools should be given more prestige by adopting a name more in line with the job they have to do. The term "vocational school" or "trade school" is hardly in keeping for the training needed for today's technician.

California calls its vocational training centers "technical junior colleges."

It is time that we get along with the serious job of expanding and upgrading our technical programs in our vocational school system. They must be designed to meet the needs of all our youth—both city and country.

This is not apt to come about so long as each community—regardless of its size or tax base—is forced to build and support its own vocational school.

What Kind of Revolution Are We Supposed To Be For?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I insert into the RECORD a timely article from the editorial section of the April 15 issue of the Saturday Evening Post, an article which establishes that there is an urgent need for the development of a proper perspective before we, as a country, can hope to go forward with a purposeful foreign policy:

WHAT KIND OF REVOLUTION ARE WE SUPPOSED TO BE FOR?

One way to gain unqualified approval with almost any group of Americans is to say, with a tolerant smile, "The United States must no longer be allied to the reactionary forces in the world but must participate in the revolution which is springing up everywhere, convincing the new elements that we share their hopes and aspirations." Recently Under Secretary of State Chester Bowles joined this chorus. He said that we must not be "linked with the forces of reaction and stagnation," but must participate in the effort to reform the world.

The only trouble with remarks like these is that, despite their acceptance in the best circles, they lack definition. They are loaded with emotion, but light on facts. For one thing, what are the forces of reaction and stagnation to which we are supposed to have been tied? For another, what are the forces of reform with which we are asked to identify ourselves? For a third, what are we supposed to do to be saved?

Well, we have had and, unless we are crazy, will continue to have relations with our European and Asiatic friends with whom we can hardly dispense in critical times like these. Just why countries like Great Britain, France, Nationalist China, Belgium, West Germany, Japan or Italy are supposed to be reactionary and stagnant is beyond us. Yes, some of them have, or have had, colonies in which, despite conflicts and errors, the people are generally better off than they were before the arrival of the imperialists. Would it be wise to become so outraged at discrimination at the white-imperialist country club that we throw over our friends and make our political bed with people who eat one another?

In respect to Cuba we tried to get right with the revolution and detach ourselves from the brutal tyrant Batista. Our reward is a Red satellite under Castro, who assures us that the "so-called free world will soon go down in defeat before the rising power of the Soviet Union."

Mr. Bowles agreed that "our international interests are incompatible with the global, long-range objectives of Soviet strategy." Unfortunately Soviet strategy is making good use of elements which describe themselves

as the forces of reform and revolution. They have made it appear to timed Americans that our "image" is so bad that, unless we get into the swing of things and picket our own embassies in revolutionary areas, we will lose the cold war.

Obviously we cannot hope to compete with the Communist conspirators in stirring up ruckuses. What we ought to do instead is look about a little, at least until we find out just what the genuine forces of reform are after. In many cases it will appear that all they want is to be as much like us as possible, to share our freedom and our economic progress. When the rioters and the bearded upstarts have shot their bolt—in Cuba, Japan or the Congo—it usually turns out that the Communist hell raisers did not have the box office which Moscow and its minions had claimed for them.

Thus in the case of Cuba thousands of exiles are now urging this country to "do something"—not to "ride, with the Castro revolution" but to get rid of it. In the Congo responsible elements form a confederation to deal with the Communist threat—but, instead of riding with their successful revolution against colonialism, we lend our planes to the United Nations to harass it. The effort to renew the outstanding charges of Soviet aggression in Hungary and to initiate proceedings against Communist genocide in Tibet did not rate so much as a debate in the United Nations, but the U.S. delegation voted to tell Portugal off for the way its African colony is administered. In Japan, after serious Red-inspired riots, the Diet ratified the treaty with the United States as if nothing had happened, and several student rioters, inspired by the Moral Rearmament movement, apologized to Jim Hagerty for mobbing him during his disastrous visit to Tokyo last year. What revolution should we have joined there?

What all this comes down to is the suggestion that, before talking about forces of stagnation and reaction versus the bright banners of progress and reform, it is important to decide which is which and where American interest in the struggle really lies.

Equality Claim Is Called Hoax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DALE ALFORD

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, I have just read a newspaper article in the Memphis Commercial Appeal which really touches at the core of the racial situation in the South. Under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to place a copy of this article in the RECORD.

The article follows:

NORTHERN BORN BUSINESSS FIGURE AND FORMER MEMPHIAN LAUNCHES NEW BROADSIDE AGAINST DESEGREGATION

(By Paul Flowers)

On the thesis that there is "no such thing as equality even between two leaves on the same bush—that this was not just a matter of difference, but of inferiority and superiority in terms of the value judgments of persons, communities, nations, and cultures, and that the heart of the matter as regards race lay in the area of heredity," Carlton Putnam has launched a new broadside against desegregation.

Mr. Putnam, well known in business circles in Memphis and the South through his service as president of Chicago & Southern Air Lines, and as chairman of the board of Delta Air Lines, is a self-admitted Yankee. In fact, his book's subtitle, "A Yankee View," spots his geographical origin. It is "Race and Reason," and comes from the Public Affairs Press, Washington, at $3.25.

In a biographical introduction, he mentions his New England heritage, with Israel Putnam, Washington's first major general, and Rufus Putnam, founder of the Ohio Colony, admittedly to establish his position as observer and commentator not influenced by Southern birth and environment.

To produce his argument, an admirably organized and competently documented piece of special pleading, he fell back on a liberal arts-scientific education at Princeton University, and a law degree from Columbia. With acceptable scholarship in gathering his materials, and creditable legalistic skill in marshalling his arguments, he presents a case that will be convincing to many.

HOPES TO STRENGTHEN THE SOUTHERN STAND

Moreover, it is his expressed hope frequently in the book, that his evidence and arguments may first strengthen the position of southerners who do not accept the doctrine of racial equality, and that, despite calculated censorship in the North, his conclusions may penetrate into areas where many already regard with misgivings the consequences of the Supreme Court's rulings.

Basically, Mr. Putnam's case rests on these points:

1. That the theory of equality of all races, as advanced by Franz Boaz and his successors in modern anthropology, is a hoax imposed often by force on scientists, both natural and social.

2. That the Supreme Court went far beyond the Constitution to arrive at the edict handed down in *Brown* v. *Board of Education*.

3. That to lift up the Negro race by law necessarily means that the white man will be pulled down, in the same proportion, in the scale of civilization and culture.

4. That social status has to be earned.

5. That the Negro race has not demonstrated, either in its homelands or in the New World, the initiative, aggressiveness, and resourcefulness which Mr. Putnam submits are the qualities which brought Northern European peoples from savagery to civilization.

ARTICLE IN MAGAZINE INSPIRED REBUTTAL

Soon after the Supreme Court's desegregation decision, Mr. Putnam read, in Life magazine, an article by Virginus Dabney, editor of the Richmond Times-Dispatch. Mr. Dabney had stated the southern viewpoint, and Life had replied to Mr. Dabney with "an editorial wholly lacking in perception and full of inept analogies, and abandoned principles."

This inspired Mr. Putnam to compose a letter to Life, and he sent a copy of the letter to Frank R. Ahlgren, editor of the Commercial Appeal, with whom he had associated in Memphis. The Commercial Appeal reprinted Mr. Putnam's letter and Mr. Dabney followed by reprinting it in the Richmond paper.

Followed then Mr. Putnam's letter to President Eisenhower, in which he said, in part:

"Throughout this controversy there has been frequent mention of the equality of man as a broad social objective. No proposition of recent years has been clouded by more loose thinking.

"The whole idea contradicts the basic tenet of the Christian and Jewish religions that status is earned through righteousness and is not an automatic matter. What is true of religion and righteousness is just as true of achievement in other fields. And what is true among individuals is just as true of averages among races."

Mr. Putnam concluded his letter to President Eisenhower with:

"What evolution was slowly and wisely achieving, revolution has now arrested, and the trail of bitterness will lead far."

LETTER TO PRESIDENT WIDELY REPRINTED

The letter was reprinted in many southern newspapers; a Birmingham committee, stimulated by Columnist John Temple Graves, raised money to reprint it as an advertisement in 18 northern and western papers, with total circulation of 7 millions. Eight newspapers, the Washington Post, the Los Angeles Times and Examiner, the Pittsburgh Press, the Indianapolis Star-News, the Newark Star-News, and the Buffalo News, refused to carry it even in an advertisement.

Five months later, in March 1959, Mr. Putnam wrote to Attorney General Rogers, as "nonadversary party to the proceedings (one presumed) to have represented the people of the United States." Herein, he wrote:

"It is my considered opinion that two generations of Americans have been victimized by a pseudo-scientific hoax in this field (anthropology), that this hoax is part of an equalitarian propaganda typical of the left-wing overdrift of our times, and that it will not stand an informed judicial test."

QUESTION HAS FLOURISHES OF ORATORICAL RHETORIC

Mr. Putnam, with a flourish of eloquence, repeated a question he had put to Clyde Kluckhorn, a Harvard anthropologist, concerning Negroes' contributions to culture:

"I was curious as to one poem equal to Milton's 'Paradise Lost,' one history equal to Gibbon's 'Decline and Fall,' one novel equal to Dickens' 'David Copperfield,' one playwright equal to Shakespeare, one philosopher equal to Aristotle, one medical discovery equal to Salk's polio vaccine, one military leader equal to Napoleon, one inventor equal to Edison, one physicist equal to Einstein, one pioneer equal to Columbus, one composer equal to Beethoven, one painter equal to Rembrandt."

The potential for adaptation to a culture is one of Mr. Putnam's points for argument. On this theme, he writes:

"The Negro race has various and valuable qualities. In those great attributes of the heart—sympathy and kindness—and in a sense of humor—the average Negro, taken as an individual, is fully on par with the average white. In certain skills the Negro ranks above the white. If I were lost in an African jungle my life might depend on the talents of a Negro. In other qualities of mind and character, qualities specially involved in our Western civilization, the full-blooded Negro is congenitally only partially adaptable. Hereafter, when I use such words as 'inferior,' 'backward' and 'unequal,' I use them in this limited sense only."

NEW BOOK CLAIMS EQUALITY A HOAX

Follows then a long chapter of questions, put by correspondents, and answers provided by the author, along the entire spectrum of the segregation-integration controversy. Mr. Putnam repeats his conviction that races are not equal, that the anthropological doctrine of equality is a hoax and a fraud, that the 14th amendment to the Constitution is unconstitutional, and that the South's best hope is to enlist support, against odds, in other parts of the country wherever observers, faced with harsh realities, may be more receptive to the southern, and Mr. Putnam's point of view, and all implications.

In his reply to one question, Mr. Putnam wrote:

"In forcing integration upon the South, the North is demanding that the South do what the North itself in similar circumstances would not do. It is an established fact that white people favor integration throughout the United States exactly in proportion as they do not need to practice it."

He concludes:

"Minority groups, coming to us for asylum out of centuries of failure in the struggle for freedom, clamored to dilute those values, but their voices only made more necessary our own recommitment. I could repeat: To alter the foundations upon which a house is built is a doubtful way of preserving it. Let us continue building, let us extend the foundations, but let us not change rock to sand."

California Meets Educational Challenges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to offer my colleagues excerpts from a speech delivered to the California Teachers Association and State Council of Education by the distinguished Governor of the State of California, Hon. Edmund G. Brown.

Governor Brown commends the teaching force of California for their great contribution to education, citing, for example, that California students led the Nation in scholarship awards and at the same time the State experienced a zooming population growth of school-age citizens.

For a few minutes I want to talk to you about what your State government is doing to meet our great challenges in education. By this, I don't mean the details of some of the controversial measures now before the legislature. I have been gone for about 10 days, and so much has been happening that I won't know what form many of them are taking until I return. There is so much flux and change in the legislative process, that I cannot properly give you a reading on the situation here today.

But I do want to tell you what the general philosophy of my administration has been in the field of education, and what we are trying to accomplish. For more than 2 years, we have insisted that our school programs move forward on all fronts.

We are proud of our unique chain of public schools. The elementary and high schools, and the junior colleges. Fourteen State colleges, with two more on the drawing boards. Our great university, with five campuses in being and three in the planning stages.

No part of the program has been neglected.

We must, first, supply the money, and we are doing so. Out of the total general fund budget of $1.7 billion, 60 percent is provided for education.

Let us put it another way. California spends more than $1 billion annually for education—more than the total budget in 43 of the other 49 States.

This is not a static thing. Over the last 2 years, we have provided a $50.3 million increase in State aid to local school districts—the first such increase since 1952.

During the current session of the legislature, we released nearly $30 million in State funds for school construction and site purchases; in excess of the increased monthly allocation of $12 million. This action is meant to help cut down double sessions in California, a steadily growing problem.

No one knows better than you how great are the problems posed by California's zooming growth. One measure of that problem is the number of students on half-day sessions. Here we have made real strides.

In the past year we have built more than 6,500 new classrooms and have reduced the number of elementary school pupils on half-day sessions by 20 percent. This record was achieved while our total public school enrollment was increasing by more than 170,000 pupils.

There can be no relaxing of effort. We have more than 3 million students in public school today and we will add another 2 million in the current decade alone.

The same challenge faces us in higher education, and we are meeting it head on. Last fall, we enrolled 203,000 full-time students in our public junior colleges, State colleges and the university. By 1970, we must provide space and equipment for more than 450,000 students.

During the coming fiscal year, we will provide for full-year operations of the Coordinating Council and the State College Board—a 44 percent increase in State scholarships—and nearly three-quarters of a million dollars for the new State colleges and university campuses, as well as a new medical school at San Diego.

In short, we are focusing the attention of State government on education in a manner without precedent in civilized history.

I emphasize that no licenses to luxury are being issued. If we are to justify new programs and new fiscal commitments, we must make certain that education and economy are not natural enemies.

This is the right time for me to pay tribute to the California Teachers Association, and the sense of responsibility you have consistently shown toward State government.

Of course, you recognize our pressing need to keep school programs abreast of growth. At the same time, you do not come to us and say: "Give us money—but don't worry about where it comes from."

We appreciate your responsible programs and the constructive way in which you help us find the answers to hard fiscal questions.

Our great schools are monuments to your wisdom. And every time a California taxpayer sees a new elementary or high school, a new State college, or a new university campus, he can feel proud that he has chosen to spend his money for this most worthy purpose.

At the same time, false economies have no place in a great system of public education.

I firmly believe that they are completely out of joint when they are made at your expense.

No other profession is asked to give so much for so little recompense.

I understand that the average teacher is 41 years old, has had 14 years of teaching experience, and 4½ years of college preparation.

In no other field will you find people with that experience and training making salaries at the teacher's level.

Great skills are demanded of you. The teacher must be a scholar, a specialist in people, and a decisionmaker as much as any corporation head or scientist.

Beyond this, you are asked to handle paperwork and clerical chores, collect money for various causes, take attendance, do stenographic work, and be constantly at the beck and call of your community.

Little time is given to advance your own knowledge, to prepare materials, to consult outside experts, to visit local resources for improving your preparation.

Gifted teachers receive no special recognition. And all teachers are asked to labor hard in the vineyard, sacrifice most current symbols of advancement, and teach our children the nonmaterial values of the spirit.

Somehow, you do the job. The record proves it. Last year, for example, California students led the Nation in scholarship awards following the National Merit Contest.

I believe all parts of our society must change the conditions which now prevail. We must do this out of simple justice—and out of our great need to attract more young people to the profession.

We must cut down on your petty tasks, pay the salaries you deserve, and seek other means of lightening your burden.

My new budget, for example, provides a small sum to expand the use of educational television. We expect further help through the Magnuson bill, now being considered by the Congress.

Certainly, educational television is no cure-all for our ills. But I believe you can use it to help lessen your teaching loads, and to increase the diversity and richness of education.

Turning to another projected program, I am asking for funds to help conserve human resources among our students.

Public education is no less a function of our society than public health.

If anyone proposed cutting down on public health expenditures, on the theory that a little typhus or polio wouldn't hurt our children much, we would react in shock.

We need the same sense of shock at the idea that we can't afford to educate our gifted children.

An estimated 68,000 California children have gifts and potential skills far above the average. If we allow them to lose interest in school and in themselves, priceless human resources go down the drain.

I have, therefore, asked for extra funds to a maximum of $250 a year for each of these children. The money would be used for special classes, facilities, and teachers to help develop their full potential.

We aren't trying to develop freaks. We plan no classes in third-grade Sanskrit. But we do want to foster a school atmosphere in which the high IQ is as valued as athletic skill, and where the general feeling is, "It's smart around here to do your schoolwork."

I also have asked consideration of a new program to assist children who are emotionally handicapped.

Steady progress is being made in other fields.

Curriculum improvements are going forward in ways you have recommended for many years. Science and mathematics enrollments are up. At the same time, you are successfully emphasizing the enduring values of the liberal arts.

So we can note accomplishment.

Yet the progress we are making would still be inadequate, without the new Federal leadership we have in Washington.

Everyone who believs in education must respond to the President's twin goals: a new standard of excellence in education, and the availability of such excellence to all who are willing and able to pursue it.

For public school construction and teachers' salaries, the President has recommended Federal grants of $2.2 billion over a 3-year period. The States would decide whether to use the grants for school construction, teachers' salaries, or both.

This recognition of national responsibility has long been lacking. Its absence has generated many of the problems we now face.

I want to emphasize this. No State and no nation in history has ever poured the money into public education that California is furnishing today.

Yet without Federal cooperation, the staggering future costs cannot be met.

Already we have the greatest school population in the Nation, and it is rising at a rapid rate.

Already we are pressing our resources to the limit. I, therefore, ask you to ponder this:

Under present building terms, the department of education estimates that more than $3.2 billion will be needed to house the increase in public school enrollment just during the current decade.

You are all knowledgeable men and women. You know it is right that education should have first priority on our public funds.

You know, too, that a dynamic State like California has other unmet needs. Without water development, our State would in great part revert to desert. Without essential programs of social welfare, social insurance and public health, we cannot keep our economy strong.

We must therefore establish the priorities, recognize that the State treasury is not a bottomless well, and support active programs of educational responsibility at all levels of government.

Now, I am not here to give you a partisan address. And I recognize that your own role is, very properly, nonpartisan.

But I emphasize this. The State and Federal administrations you now have are deeply concerned with meeting the needs of education and are acting on that concern.

I hope that you will seek and support administrations which reject the status quo, which do not bury their heads in the sand, and which insist on progress.

The spirit of regard for education now being shown in Washington is one which I have fostered for the past 2 years in Sacramento.

I am proud that this is an honest, progressive State—as I am proud of the foresight you have shown in your most important field.

Not for 1 minute do I forget that government's responsibility may be great, but yours is greater.

The President and the Governor can push your cause. The school board can set the salaries. The districts can levy the taxes. But in the final analysis, you exert the vigorous, lonely discipline. You do the job.

Without your leadership, the great halls of learning are hollow shells. And that is why General Garfield once said: "A pine bench with Mark Hopkins at one end of it and me at the other is a good enough college for me."

I pledge to you my continued recognition of your problems.

I know you will continue to instill regard for learning in California youth.

Continue, too, to discourage dropouts—the children caught in a terrible vacuum without a function, and with fewer jobs available to them every year. Remind them that three out of four unemployed have failed to finish high school. Remind them that after every recession, unemployment has still edged up—because jobs are increasingly scarce for those who lack skill and training in our complex age.

Certainly we ask a great deal of you.

From diverse materials, we ask you to fashion superior products. We ask you to tame the rebellious, embolden the timid, spur the laggard, sharpen the dull, and burnish the bright.

But we should also remind the public that schools can go only just so far.

Parents, and other parts of our society, have their own heavy obligation.

They must not make the teachers and schools the dumping ground for their worries about the H-bomb, and all other insecurities of our times.

I reject the fad for blaming teachers and schools for everything that goes wrong—from a misguided child to a misguided missile. This tendency is a sign of escapism and foolish immaturity.

As Governor, I will continue to do all in my power to help you fulfill great responsibilities—and meet great opportunities—in our times.

And meanwhile, let's not make a scapegoat out of education.

I congratulate you on what you are doing to build our State.

Yet I know that in your own handiwork, in the fruits of your labor, you find the deepest satisfaction.

In the words of Henry Adams, a teacher affects eternity, for he can never tell where his influence stops. Thank you.

Land Retirement Payment Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I received a telegram from one of my constituents advising me of a wire which he had sent to the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, protesting what appeared to be a rather flagrant inconsistency in county yield figures established in different counties immediately adjoining, for the purpose of arriving at land retirement payment rates under the provisions of the recently enacted feed grain bill. This party advised me that, in general, there seemed to be a differential of as much as 33⅓ percent between adjacent counties located in North Dakota and Minnesota and lying within the area of the Red River Valley of the North. Since the productivity of land and climatic conditions in the Red River Valley is identical, for all practical purposes, I could see no justification for any such differential between the adjoining counties. To verify the general information furnished me, I secured a report of the county yields which had been established in adjoining counties located on opposite sides of the Red River, and consequently being within the States of North Dakota or Minnesota. Here are the figures which I find the county agricultural stabilization committees intend to use in arriving at the rate of payment for corn land that is to be retired from production:

Grand Forks County in North Dakota, 32 bushels per acre; Polk County, immediately across the river in Minnesota, 41 bushels per acre; Traill County in North Dakota, 29.3 bushels per acre; Norman County, immediately across the river in Minnesota, 40 bushels per acre; Cass County in North Dakota, 29 bushels per acre; Clay County, immediately across the river in Minnesota, 39.2 bushels per acre; Richlands County in North Dakota, 32.7 bushels per acre; Wilkins County, immediately across the river in Minnesota, 36 bushels per acre.

To carry this a little further, since Richland County, N. Dak., is the corner county in our State adjoining both Minnesota and South Dakota, to find what the comparative yield figures in the adjoining South Dakota county would be, I checked and found that in Roberts County, S. Dak., which immediately adjoins Richland County, a yield figure of 40 bushels per acre had been established as compared to the 32.7 bushel yield for Richland County mentioned above.

Mr. Speaker, there seems no rhyme nor reason to this very substantial differentiation in yield figures being used in adjoining counties where the soil and climatic conditions are practically identical just because the counties happen to be located in different States. I have done my best to get in touch with somebody in the Department of Agriculture who would be in a position to explain or adjust this apparent discrepancy, but so far I have not been successful. I am inclined to believe that the Department of Agriculture has every intention of treating farmers equally insofar as it is possible under the provisions of any farm legislation with which the Department is charged with the responsibility of administration. I sincerely hope that the question that has apparently risen in the minds of the North Dakota farmers that this is administrative retribution being leveled against a State which did not support the present dministration in the last election, is not justified.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of the telegram received by me yesterday from Mr. Mark Andrews, a farmer of Mapleton, N. Dak.:

APRIL 17, 1961.

CONGRESSMAN DON SHORT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Have just sent the following wire to Orville Freeman: "Urgently request you take immediate action correcting grossly inadequate corn yield figures set for many North Dakota counties under your Federal feed-grain program. If such restrictive legislation must be enacted it is extremely important to our farmers and our State's economy that these yield potentials be fairly set. As just one example of the gross inequity of your yield assumptions: the Minnesota counties of Polk, Norman, and Clay have been set 33 percent higher than our adjacent counties of Grand Forks, Traill, and Cass. These six counties are all in the heart of the Red River Valley with land values and climate virtually identical. Any person with a farm background would know that a political boundary cannot change soils and growing seasons. Comments are being made that this is a retribution given North Dakota for voting against Kennedy. If this were true, it would be the shabbiest, most vindictive political trick ever pulled on the people of North Dakota and one they will not easily forget."

Regards,

MARK ANDREWS.

The 1960 Oscar Awards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. CORMAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, since I represent in this body much of the area which contains the American motion picture industry, Hollywood, it is with some pride and affection that I call attention to the annual Oscar Award ceremony. I am sure that many of my col-

leagues, along with the rest of the Nation, watched last night's telecast of the program staged for the 33d year by the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences.

This event represents one night each year when the American motion picture industry honors its artists and its craftsmen for their outstanding contributions.

It, too, is a night when the moviegoers of America pause to recognize the unique qualities of the motion picture—a medium that over the years has brought entertainment and enlightenment to countless millions at home and abroad.

I compliment the 1960 winners on their well-deserved awards. I salute Hollywood for demonstrating once again that true artistry in all its many forms—acting, directing, producing, writing—is prized above all else in the American motion picture. I should like, therefore, to enter the 1960 Oscar winners in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They are:

Best motion picture: "The Apartment" (Mirisch Co.)

Best leading actor: Bert Lancaster.

Best leading actress: Elizabeth Taylor.

Best supporting actor: Peter Ustinov.

Best supporting actress: Shirley Jones.

Best documentary features: The Horse With the Flying Tail," Walt Disney. Short Subjects, "Guiseppina," Lester A. Schoenfeld Films (British).

Best special effects: "The Time Machine," Metro Goldwyn Mayer, Gene Warren and Tim Baer.

Best costume design: black and white production—"The Facts of Life," United Artists, Edith Head and Edward Stevenson.

Best costume design, color production: "Sparticus," Universal-International, Valles and Bill Thomas.

Best score, musical picture: "Song Without End," Goetz-Vidor Pictures, Morris Stoloff, and Harry Sukman.

Best score, drama or comedy: "Exodus," Carlyle-Alpina S.A. Production, Ernest Gold.

Best song first used in an eligible picture: "Never on Sunday," from "Never on Sunday," Melinafilm Production, Lopert Pictures Corp. (Greek). Music and lyrics by Manos Hadjidakis.

Best directing: "The Apartment," Mirisch Co., Billy Wilder.

Best screenplay, based on material from another medium: "Elmer Gantry," Burt Lancaster-Richard Brooks Production, screenplay by Richard Brooks.

Best story and screenplay, written directly for the screen: "The Apartment," Mirisch Co., story and screenplay by Billy Wilder and I. A. L. Diamond.

Special honorary award: Gary Cooper.

Best film editing: "The Apartment," Mirisch Co., Daniel Mandell.

Special honorary juvenile award: Hayley Mills.

Best art direction, black and white: "The Apartment," Mirisch Co., Alexander Trauner. Set decoration: Edward G. Boyle.

Best art direction, color: "Spartacus," Byrna Productions, Alexander Golitzen and Eric Orbom. Set decorations: Russell A. Gausman and Julia Heron.

Best cinematography, black and white: "Sons and Lovers," Company of Artists, Freddie Francis.

Best cinematography, color: "Spartacus," Byrna Productions, Russell Metty.

Special Jean Hersholt Humanitarian Award: Producer Sol Lesser.

Best sound achievement: "The Alamo," Samuel Goldwyn sound department, Gordon E. Sawyer.

Special honorary award: Comedian Stan Laurel.

Best short subjects: cartoons, "Munro," Rembrandt Films, William L. Snyder, producer. Live action subjects, "Day of the Painter," Little Movies, Kingsley-Union Films, Ezra R. Baker, producer.

Best foreign language film: "The Virgin Spring," A. B. Svensk Filmindustri (Sweden).

Affection and Regard Accent a Homecoming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, a brilliant sun in cloudless skies, and thousands of enthusiastic Pennsylvanians welcomed Dwight and Mamie Eisenhower home yesterday.

Men and women from every walk of life lined the streets as the motorcade proceeded from the railroad station to the capitol in Harrisburg. The familiar "I like Ike" shouts were repeated over and over as the procession traveled along the route. The general must have realized he was not the entire center of attraction as he stood in his car and recognized the friendly welcome with his customary outstretched arms gesture. Riding in a closed car directly in back of him was Mrs. Eisenhower. When she was not immediately recognized the "Where's Mamie" chant was heard along the entire way.

Upon their arrival at the capitol the distinguished couple was greeted by a vast throng who came, not out of curiosity, but to show sincere appreciation and pay well deserved respect to a great American. Leaders from both political parties joined in praising this outstanding couple for a lifetime of unselfish devotion to, not only their own country, but to the entire world.

As the brief ceremonies ended and they departed for Gettysburg, the first place they could actually call home, the best wishes of all present went with them. If two people ever deserved to live their own lives after a half century of loyal and devoted service, Ike and Mamie are those people. Welcome home, and may the dreams you have had of this day become a pleasant reality and continue for many years.

A copy of Governor Lawrence's remarks on this occasion, and an editorial from Monday's Harrisburg Patriot, follow:

REMARKS OF GOV. DAVID L. LAWRENCE WELCOMING FORMER PRESIDENT DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER ON THE OCCASION OF THE PENNSYLVANIA HOMECOMING OF THE PRESIDENT AND MRS. EISENHOWER, CAPITOL PLAZA, HARRISBURG, PA., MONDAY, APRIL 17, 1961, 8:30 A.M.

There has never been any doubt in anyone's mind of the deep and abiding affection the American people feel for the patriot we honor here this morning.

Pennsylvanians were among the first to make that affection obvious. When the chant that America liked Ike began to roll across the land, Pennsylvania's citizens were in the frontline of the chorus.

Because of the great respect we have felt for him for so many years, we were delighted when President Eisenhower chose the gentle, rolling, pastoral beauty of central Pennsylvania's farm country for his home. Somehow it seem supremely fitting to us that the Cradle of Democracy should become the home of one of democracy's greatest defenders.

Pennsylvania has given roots to America's richest traditions of freedom and equality. The voice of liberty was first proclaimed to the world from the streets of Philadelphia. The terrible grandeur of our great struggle between the brothers of our own Nation found its supreme climax not far from the spot where President and Mrs. Eisenhower make their home today.

I know that General Eisenhower will find the people of Pennsylvania grateful for his presence here; their high regard for him has not diminished.

I speak for all the people of this State when I say that this welcome today here in Harrisburg is only a symbol of the great and overwhelming friendship which reaches out to the Eisenhower family from Pennsylvanians everywhere.

Now that the tragic consequences of war are laid aside; now that the bearer of arms has, at long last, come to a time of relative peace in his own life and his time; now that the grave responsibilities of the world's greatest office have been turned over to new hands and a new generation, he has earned the right to come home.

If I may interject one other thought, it is to reemphasize the importance to our Nation of the ease of transition between the administration headed by our fellow Pennsylvanian and that guided by President Kennedy. It was not only indicative to the world of democracy's ability to provide continuity of government but was a great tribute to the wisdom and the character of General Eisenhower and his associates.

I was talking to President Kennedy last Thursday and told him of this occasion today, and he asked me to convey his warmest respects to the Eisenhowers and to express once again his deep appreciation for the support which the general has given in the Laotian crisis.

Now all of us can look forward to many years of warm friendship with our respected neighbors who will be able to spend more time among us and this is precisely the way in which Pennsylvania thinks of Dwight Eisenhower and his gracious wife. They are neighbors; they are friends.

We cannot possibly pay a higher tribute to either of them than this.

It is one of the most pleasant duties I have ever had, to say to them, this morning—welcome home to Pennsylvania.

AFFECTION AND REGARD ACCENT A HOMECOMING

It was a full century ago when the last man came home to Pennsylvania from the Presidency of the United States. In those unhappy times James Buchanan's homecoming was not what it should have been. Neither was Mr. Buchanan's reputation. "Old Buck" was on the receiving end of far more brickbats than bouquets.

Today another man comes back to his home in Pennsylvania from the Presidency after a brief rest and vacation in sunnier climes. He returns home in far different circumstances than prevailed for "Old Buck" with his reputation enhanced.

The times are not what he and all of us wish they were. Crisis and turmoil prevail in so much of our unhappy and divided world. But so does freedom. And not the least of the reasons it does is because of what

this man did during the eight rough and rugged years he had to live with and had to cope with crisis, chaos, and never-ending challenge.

Now he can look out upon his people and the world from the peaceful and quiet vantage point of retirement. The massive responsibility that he knew for so long has been handed on to another American who, not too many days ago signed a bill restoring five-star general rank to Dwight David Eisenhower, speaking of the action as a reaffirmation in behalf of the American people of the "affection and regard" for him.

In the same spirit this morning Pennsylvanians—from the Governor to the most obscure of citizens—are welcoming Ike and Mamie Eisenhower home in the hope they will know the bright sunshine of happiness and peace throughout the years of retirement.

Today's little "welcome home" by their central Pennsylvania neighbors stands as but a symbolic token of the great affection and regard in which they are held by all people, everywhere in the world, who love freedom.

House Resolution 211, Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee, pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I request that the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 be printed in the Appendix of today's RECORD:

SPACETRONICS ASSOCIATES,
New York, N.Y., April 4, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: It has just been brought to my attention that you have introduced a House resolution for the formation of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

I am in complete accord with this resolution, and feel that it is a good step to implement the Captive Nations Week resolution of 1959. Moscow knows that the truth hurts. Therefore I also feel that the so-called Union of Soviet Socialist Republics should be exposed to the world as nothing but a conglomeration of captive nations. Once this becomes known on a worldwide basis I am sure the people of these captive nations and people outside them will be inclined to take various actions that will eventually contribute to the freedom of these captive Soviet Republics.

You have my full support for House Resolution 211. I am sure the Members of the House will not fail to accept so powerful a propaganda weapon as this resolution provides.

Sincerely,

RICHARD T. HANLEY,
Executive Director.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE
OF AMERICA,
Hammond, Ind., March 28, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, branch in Hammond, Ind., takes this opportunity to congratulate you for introducing the resolution calling for the establishment of a permanent Committee of Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This committee is needed badly. Soviet Union's goal is to rule the world, and we all know it, for we too live in the same world. Our enemy has weaknesses, and by knowing these weaknesses, lesser will be our battle.

A Committee on Captive Nations is a big step in the right direction. It would serve as an information center on the enslaved nations in the U.S.S.R. Our Government needs this information in making proper policies with respect to the captive nations. The committee's main function, however, would be to give the world and especially the American people the timely true picture of the inside of the Iron Curtain.

At this time we are also writing our Congressmen RAY J. MADDEN and C. A. HALLECK asking them to give their full support on this matter.

Sincerely,

ALEX ZALUCKYJ,
Secretary.

MARCH 29, 1961.

Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: I would like to express my approval of your recent bill dealing with the captive nations. I think the resolution for a permanent committee is an excellent idea.

I am sending a copy of this letter to the Representative from Florida, hoping that he will give it great support.

Sincerely,

Mrs. KATHRYN TALBERT.

ST. AUGUSTINE, FLA.

(Member St. Johns County Chapter of the Florida Coalition of Patriotic Societies.)

CHEVY CHASE, MD., *April 7, 1961.*

Hon. DANIEL FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: Recently, House Resolution 211, which you submitted to the House of Representatives on March 8, 1961, was brought to my attention. After studying the contents and meaning of the proposed bill, I am thoroughly convinced that a Special Committee on the Captive Nations is a vital necessity.

The establishment of a Captive Nations Week was a true advancement for the preservation and extension of free nations. The observance of Captive Nations Week in 1960 had very favorable results. The eyes of the people of the free nations were open, probably for the first time, with regard to their enslaved neighbors. It was clearly noticeable that Moscow feared that there might be even a greater awakening; but the results of this observance were insignificant when compared to those results which might be attained.

We are in what we call a cold war and the only way to fight it is with the plain, simple truth. If it is uncovered, truth can win the victory for us. Why prolong the war, when its duration can be brought to an abrupt end? Thus far our Nation has slept while Moscow has slandered us. Our biggest defense against this slander is to let the people of the world see the true Russia and her destructive goals.

The Captive Nations Week observance is the first step toward the freeing of the nations enslaved by Soviet imperialists. But why not make full use of this great weapon? The only way to do so is to set up a special committee on the captive nations. Only by such a commmittee could the full picture be represented; unless we fully open the eyes of the people of the world to this situation, the number of captive nations will be progressive instead of regressive, and we will take a further retreat in our position in the war in place of a victory.

In conclusion, I want to say once again that I am in complete favor of the proposed bill, House Resolution 211, and urge its passage.

Yours very truly,

THOMAS EDWARD DOLAN.

COSSACK REPRESENTATION IN EXILE,
Los Angeles, Calif., March 20, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Our organization wishes to express sincere congratulations on your introduction of the resolution for the establishment of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

The establishment of such a committee is of greatest importance. The problem of our times is the Soviet Union, where many nations and peoples are being held in slavery and despotism. These nations represent a constant weakness in the Soviet Union, due to their desire and eagerness to escape the Soviet Russian tyranny. We should take advantage of the knowledge of this weakness and work to augment it.

The Committee on Captive Nations would supply information and data on the various enslaved nations in the U.S.S.R. to the U.S. Government and its agencies, as well as to the world and mainly to the American people regarding the state of affairs behind the Iron Curtain. It would provide assistance to the Government in forming its policies with reference to the captive nations.

In writing to our Congressmen, Hon. GORDON MCDONOUGH and Hon. GLENNARD P.

LIPSCOMB, we hope for their full support of your resolution.

Respectfully,

VICTOR KARPUSCHKIN,
Chairman, Cossack Representation in Exile.

MANHASSET, N.Y., *April 3, 1961.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I was indeed pleased to learn that you had introduced House Resolution 211 in the Congress recenty. I have long been interested in the cause of the Captive Nations Committee and of Captive Nations Week. I hope to see the cause given permanent committee status within the framework of the legislature.

Mr. Lev Dobriansky has done a marvelous job in promoting the cause but so much more can be done under the new proposal. The State Department simply and obviously does not have the time to handle this great task as is should be handled. It is up to you, the representatives and voice of the people, to insure that every possible step is taken to overcome false Communist propaganda within these areas and replace fear with hope.

If something is not done now the already too long list of captive nations will expand.

I wish you the best of luck in making this proposed committee a reality. I speak for all of my associates who keep a close watch on the work of the Captive Nations Committee in congratulating you on your initiative thus far. I am,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM T. DAILEY, Jr.

ST. MICHAEL'S
UKRAINIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH,
Minneapolis, Minn., March 28, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Our parish, St. Michael's Ukrainian Orthodox Church in Minneapolis, Minn.—a church organization with over 1,000 people—wishes to congratulate you on your bold and farsighted move in introducing the resolution calling for the establishment of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

Needless to say, such a committee is long overdue. One of the greatest problems confronting our Nation today is the Soviet Union, a prison house of many nations and peoples. These nations, ever eager and wanting to escape Soviet Russian slavery and despotism, constitute a perennial weakness of the Soviet Union. Therefore, it is to our advantage to know these weaknesses, and work to multiply them.

A Committee on the Captive Nations would serve as a reservoir of information and data on the various enslaved nations in the U.S.S.R., which information could be made available to the U.S. Government and its various agencies. Its main function, however, would be to inform the American people and the world at large on the state of affairs behind the Iron Curtain and assist the Government in formulating its policies with respect to the captive nations.

We are writing to our Congressmen: A. H. QUIE, A. NELSEN, CLARK MACGREGOR, J. E. KARTH, W. H. JUDD, FRED MARSHALL, H. C. ANDERSEN, J. A. BLATNIK, and O. LANGEN, asking them to support your resolution.

Sincerely yours,

PARISH COMMITTEE,
KATHERINE SPASYK,
Recording Secretary.
Rt. Rev. Dr. WOLODYMYR LEWYTZKYJ,
Rector of the Parish.

SHARON HILL, PA., *April 3, 1961.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: It is my understanding that you have sponsored a resolution to establish a special committee on the captive nations. May I as an American citizen encourage you to keep on with this work. Prosecute it diligently and fully. It is most important to learn about the desire for freedom in the captive countries and to realize that many millions could use the proper kind of help and encouragement to gain the blessings of liberty for themselves.

A friend of mine, Mr. Isakjan I. Narzikul, formed a Turkestanian-American Association to help political refugees from Turkestan and other nearby countries of Turkish origin which are now under Soviet domination. I was one of some interested Americans who aided Mr. Narzikul to incorporate this association and we would be glad to cooperate with you in any way that you may see fit in this endeavor.

Please send us any information which you may judge helpful to keep us informed about your committee.

Very truly yours,

JOHN K. BROWN.

COSSACK AMERICAN
NATIONAL ALLIANCE, INC.,
Queens Village, N.Y., April 4, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Our organization takes the liberty of congratulating you on your valorous proposal for the introduction of the resolution for the establishment of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

The necessity for such a committee is extremely great. The Soviet Union, holding many nations and peoples in captivity, presents today the greatest problem for our Nation. Those enslaved nations, eager to escape the Soviet Russian tyranny and despotism, form eternal weak spots of the Soviet Union. It is of vital importance to us to know these weak spots and work to increase them.

A Committee on the Captive Nations would be the source of information and data on the enslaved nations in the U.S.S.R., information which would be made available to the U.S. Government. Its main purpose, however, would be to inform the American people, as well as other parts of the world regarding the situation behind the Iron Curtain, thus assisting the Government in expressing its policies with regard to the captive nations.

Hoping sincerely for a full support of your resolution, we are writing in this respect to our Congressman, Hon. LEONARD FARBSTEIN.

Respectfully,

COSSACK AMERICAN NATIONAL ALLIANCE, INC.,
G. L. JEREMENKO, *President.*

ASTORIA, N.Y., *April 5, 1961.*

Hon. DANIEL FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: As an international affairs major, I am keenly interested in America's affairs of state. I am especially interested in the nations under the domination of Russia and would like to relate to you that your House Resolution 211 is the best thing that has come up in Congress, regarding the dominated nations, in a long time.

I think that this bill will impress upon the American people the importance of Captive Nations Week and will also impress upon them the fact that we must take some action for the subjugated nations.

I sincerely hope that you will do all you possibly can to make sure that this bill will pass through Congress.

Sincerely yours,

BEVERLY A. YURASHUS.

TRENTON, N.J., *March 26, 1961.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Congratulations for introducing the resolution for the establishment of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations.

At the same time we shall ask our Congressman, Mr. THOMPSON, to support your resolution.

Very truly yours,

D. KUZYK, *Chairman.*

Young Americans for Freedom Speak Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, the Young Americans for Freedom is a comparatively new organization of young people who have interested themselves in the problems of government. This fine organization is doing much to promote sound, stable, and responsible Government in the United States at all levels.

I commend to the Members of the House the publication of this organization entitled "The New Guard." In its recent issue, it carries an article by William M. Schulze, a young man just 21 years of age and a senior at Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio. The article, entitled "HUAC and Its Enemies," follows:

HUAC AND ITS ENEMIES

(By William M. Schulz)

On the morning of January 2, 1961, as a sleepy Nation welcomed in the second day of a new year, some 200 bright-eyed college students arrived in Washington after a 5-hour bus ride from New York. Their purpose was simple: to demonstrate against the "witch hunting" House Un-American Activities Committee and to publicize Representative JIMMY ROOSEVELT'S move to abolish the congressional body.

The "students"—ranging in age from 16 to 50 plus—searched for Congressmen and swarmed over Capitol Hill. They picketed the White House and held a well-publicized rally at Washington's All Souls Unitarian Church. Student leaders held a smooth running press conference for reporters representing Washington's three dailies, the Nation's two wire services and a half-dozen news magazines. The reporters' questions were not unusual, neither were the answers.

DENY CP CONTROL

One student was asked about a report that the anti-HUAC group was Communist-con-

trolled. Jacob Rosen, 22, of New York, answered by terming the query absurd. The mustached youth declared the movement spontaneous and unrehearsed. It was merely a coincidence, he continued, if his position happened also to be held by the Communist Party, U.S.A.

What Rosen didn't bother to announce was that he is one of the Nation's leading young Communists, a ranking party member in the New York Metropolitan area. He did not bother to admit that his participation in "Operation Abolition" was ordered by the Communist Party hierarchy, that destruction of the House Un-American Activities Committee was considered the party's No. 1 aim.

Rosen's background is all the more interesting because of liberal assertions that the anticommittee drive is spearheaded by sincere young students with no partisan political axe to grind. Rosen was sucked into the party apparatus while still in his midteens. At the age of eighteen he had been chosen to hold a key role in the party-controlled American delegation to the 1957 Moscow Youth Festival. The New York Times reported:

"Jacob Rosen, of 606 West 174th Street, Manhattan, a junior at City College, went without sleep to keep things moving. He carried a U.S. flag at yesterday's opening, dipping it in salute to Nikita Khrushchev and other Soviet dignitaries at the Lenin Stadium."

It came as no surprise to the Nation's security agencies when Rosen was identified under oath last spring as one of the top young Communists on the Eastern coast. And it came as no surprise when the young New Yorker took the fifth amendment on his party activities.

Although he remained tight-lipped about his Communist ties, it is known that Rosen has been charged with organizing party activities among the young. He is vice president of the new Communist youth group, "Advance," and a leader in the New York chapter of "Youth Against the Un-American Committees."

Working closely with Rosen in the party is Joanne Grant, an attractive young Negro who doubles as correspondent for the red-lining National Guardian. She, too, was active in directing the Washington demonstrations.

Despite her youthful years, Miss Grant is an experienced party functionary. In 1959 Communist top brass gave her the all-important job of raising funds to send an American delegation to the Seventh World Youth Festival in Vienna. In that capacity she worked closely with Nicolai Burov, secretary of the Soviet mission to the United Nations.

VISITS RED CHINA

Miss Grant herself attended the Sixth World Youth Festival in Moscow 4 years ago. Following that visit she slipped behind the Bamboo Curtain in defiance of State Department orders and conferred with top-ranking Chinese leaders including Chou En-lai. She is one of the few Americans ever to have an audience with Mao Tse-tung.

Testimony before a congressional committee that Miss Grant was one of the leading young comrades in the United States. Given an opportunity to refute the allegations, Miss Grant repeatedly found refuge behind the fifth amendment. Both Jake Rosen and Joanne Grant took instructions at Washington from a tall distinguished looking gentleman by the name of Frank Wilkenson. Agitating against the committee was nothing new to Wilkenson. For the past several years he has crisscrossed the country directing what the Communist Party calls "Operation Abolition." Wilkenson just happened to be in San Francisco last spring when the committee scheduled hearings, and Director J. Edgar Hoover has singled him out as one of those responsible for the student riots that followed.

EXPERIENCED ORGANIZER

Like Rosen and Grant, Wilkenson is an identified Communist. Fingered under oath by FBI Undercover Agent Anita Schneider in 1956, Wilkenson has never bothered to deny the charge. He has refused to testify about his Communist activities on three separate occasions, and in 1958 won a contempt of Congress citation for his silence. Convicted, Wilkenson has managed thus far to evade a 1-year sentence to Federal prison by appealing the verdict all the way to the Supreme Court.

Wilkenson was field representative for a group which called itself the Citizens Committee To Preserve American Freedoms when the national Communist leadership decided to intensify its drive against the committee.

Perhaps because the Citizens Committee had been officially cited as a red front, a new group was founded with Wilkenson again field representative. The National Committee To Abolish the Un-American Activities Committee was formed last fall. Seven of its fifteen directors were identified Communists. Operating out of the old Citizens Committee headquarters at 617 Larchmont Boulevard in Los Angeles, Wilkenson traveled from coast to coast setting up new fronts, collecting funds, and instructing party members in anti-HUAC agitation.

Two months before the Washington demonstrations, Wilkenson met with Communist functionaries in a top secret New York rendezvous to map overall strategy. At that meeting, it was agreed that Wilkenson would have complete control over the Washington protests.

Wilkenson organized New York rallies, arranged for busses to transport students to Washington, coordinated the efforts of Red agents throughout the metropolitan area. He arrived in Washington early, setting up headquarters in the offices of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, a group labeled by Senate investigators as a red front.

The move to abolish HUAC, as expected, failed. It did not surprise Wilkenson and company. But Party chieftains considered the Washington demonstrations a complete success. Reams of anti-HUAC publicity had been won. Lagging party morale was given a shot in the arm.

Immediately after the defeat, comrade Wilkenson announced that his group would continue to agitate against the Committee. He declared full support for Congressman Roosevelt's new move to "slash to the bone" the HUAC appropriation. He then embarked on a tour of the Nation's college campuses. Despite a momentary setback, the Communist-directed drive to destroy the Nation's security apparatus continues on schedule.

Students may be duped into working with the Wilkensons and the Grants and the Rosens unless they avoid euphemisms and call a Communist a Communist and recognize a conspiracy as a conspiracy.

Just How Guilty Are the Electric Companies?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Philip Salisbury in Sales Management magazine of April 7, 1961:

JUST HOW GUILTY ARE THE ELECTRIC COMPANIES?

When one of the indicted General Electric officials said the other day that the trial and subsequent jail term had ended his usefulness to the company and that, accordingly, he was resigning, I was reminded it was about time to file a minority report on the trial.

There has been much editorial moralizing about the case of the identical bids. I am just as much in love with motherhood, just as strongly against sin, as the next one, but I feel strongly that justice may not have been served in the Philadelphia decision.

Let's face the facts. There are in many industries giant corporations that could destroy most or all of their competitors. Do you think for a moment that General Motors couldn't destroy every other auto manufacturer, with the possible exception of Ford, if it used its superior facilities and huge surplus to undercut the field? Does GM control only half of the production because that's all it could get? Certainly not. General Motors, United States Steel, General Electric are examples of companies that hold a price umbrella over their marginal competitors, not because they are humane, but because enlightened selfishness tells them that the Government surely would move in if they became larger in a relative sense and therefore more monopolistic. Isn't it ironic that they should be indicted for noncompetitive pricing when they most surely would be indicted if they used their power to slash prices?

The truth is that for generations the ordinary law of supply and demand has been shoved aside in this country. No matter how great the surplus of labor, under law an employer is compelled to pay the minimum wage. No matter how great the surplus of food, the farmer's wage is underwritten. So, as the Value Line Investment Survey points out, there is a large body of law and a long political and economic tradition that not only permits, but even requires, control over price fluctuations. Besides that, facts show that during the period of controlled prices in the electrical industry, prices went up considerably less than in comparable high-ticket metalworking or construction equipment fields. For these and other reasons too numerous to detail in this limited space, I think the electrical companies received sentences and tongue lashings they do not deserve. They did break a law, but the law should be updated.

United States Is Ahead in Most Sciences

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post of April 3, 1961:

UNITED STATES IS AHEAD IN MOST SCIENCES

(By Dr. John Turkevich)

The role of science is dominant in the future of nations and social and economic systems. That form of society will prevail that best integrates science into its structure, that makes science a vital part of its

defensive might, economic productivity, social well-being, intellectual activity, and spiritual aspirations.

The United States is superior to the Soviet Union in all major fields of science and technology but that of space.

For every excellent Soviet scientist, and they do have a number of outstanding ones, we in the United States have 10 as good or better.

Since 1941, 15 Americans received Nobel Prizes in physics. On the other hand only three Soviet physicists received the Nobel Prize. Only one has been honored in the Soviet Union for his work by election to the Soviet Academy. In chemistry we have nine awards in the last 20 years compared to one for the Soviets. In medicine the number is 18 Americans and no Russians in the last 20 years.

In the field of mathematics the Soviet contribution has been significant during the last half century. It has been along the lines of classical mathematics and has neglected such modern applied mathematics as information theory, operational research, theory of games, linear programing, cybernetics. In recent years many prominent Soviet mathematicians have started work in these fields.

In solid state physics, the work of the Bell Telephone Laboratories, the General Electric, Westinghouse, RCA Laboratories, and such university centers as California, Harvard, Illinois, and MIT have dominated the field that produced a revolution in electronics with transistors, photosurfaces, phosphors. The only field of excellence in the Soviet Union is that of thermoelectric devices which convert heat into electricity and electricity into cold.

In nuclear science the results of American scientists have been no less spectacular. It can be safely said that at the two Conferences on Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy at Geneva in 1955 and 1958 nothing basically important in nuclear science was learned from the Soviet contributions. We did learn that they had many fine scientists following diligently and ably the leads indicated by the West.

The structure of organic compounds and the mechanisms of their reactions are widely studied. The scientific activity of the Soviet Union in this field is not on as high a level as in the United States. However, in the field of physical chemistry, Soviet scientists have shown strength for three decades.

Biology and biochemistry is in a said state in the Soviet Union. Before World War II Soviet scientists were outstanding in the important field of genetics. Both the influence of Lysenko, and the injection of Communist Party dogma into a scientific discussion killed genetics as a science in the Soviet Union and raised havoc with the whole field of biology.

Yet biology is one of the most exciting branches of modern science. This is the science of proteins, vitamins, hormones, drugs, viruses, physiology, molecular anatomy, genetics, radiation damage. American scientists have been awarded Nobel Prize after Nobel Prize for this work, scientific journals are filled with elegant and decisive experiments, the physician's bag with disease-curing drugs.

In exploration we have reached the North Pole from the air, over the ice cover, and with our atomic submarines, below the ice. We thus realized one of Jules Verne's scientific fantasies. We have reached the bottom of the oceans. Soviet activity in exploration is significant but pales with respect to the American accomplishment.

On the other hand, one must grant a glorious paragraph in the history of scientific achievements to the Soviet space scientists. The first earth satellite, the first cosmic satellite, the first hit on the moon, the first photograph of the back side of the moon, the first launching of a cosmic satellite from a space station, the heaviest mass of satellite—these are the impressive Soviet attainments.

The greatest achievement of Soviet science is its integration within the totalitarian socialistic society. The challenge that faces the United States and the Western World is how to integrate modern science into our domestic capitalistic society.

Israel's "Bar Mitzvah"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, as I am sure many of our fellows in this Congress know, the State of Israel is celebrating the 13th year of its independence, its "Bar Mitzvah." It is my pleasure to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article from the New York Journal-American of April 14, 1961.

It is refreshing to be reminded that the beginnings of democracy are very often the same in our world, no matter where freemen come together in a community. It is new evidence of the advantages of a free society when we read of the fruits that Israel is reaping from the former desert. The article follows:

ISRAEL'S "BAR MITZVAH" RECALLS BIRTH OF UNITED STATES

(By Morris Morgenstern)

JERUSALEM, April 14.—The bitter iciness of Valley Forge and the scorching sands of the Negev Desert are more than 170 years and 6,000 miles apart. But the characteristics of the people who fashioned two luminous chapters in history—the birth of the United States and the establishment of Israel—are virtually identical.

A tenacious spirit a resolute belief in the dignity and equality of man and an unquenchable desire to live in freedom these were the qualities which helped mold a new nation in a new world, and a vibrant new state in the land of the ancients.

In the past 2 weeks I have marveled at the astounding progress the State of Israel has made in 13 short years.

The resourcefulness of its people its firm dedication to remain alive leave the beholder with a feeling of genuine exhilaration and a profound respect for these gallant Israelis.

SURROUNDED BY FOES

Israel's fierce resolve to sustain its independence—and its every existence—are brought into sharp focus when one considers that this tiny nation—approximately the size of New Jersey—is literally surrounded by antagonists.

The war-like leaders of Israel's enemies snort in outrage at the very mention of democracy's oasis in the Middle East, and have repeatedly vowed its destruction. But despite their terrifying pronouncements, I am certain that they, too, realize that Israel is here to stay.

The year 1961 marks Israel's "Bar mitzvah" its 13th anniversary. In Jewish tradition, a young man who attains his 13th birthday stands on the threshold of manhood. He is ready to assume the responsibilities which accompany adulthood, and self-reliance.

The carefree days of youth are supposedly at an end.

The analogy, however, is only superficial. Since its birth in 1948, Israel has recorded monumental achievements, and its plans for the future are breathtaking in scope.

During my travels here, I have met with a number of government officials and leaders in industry and commerce. The stark figures hardly indicate the enormous advances Israel has made in a number of vital areas.

Nevertheless, to give you an idea of Israel's progress, I would like to cite a few statistics, to help underline the accomplishments of this young country.

PRODUCE OWN FOOD

From 1951 to 1959, industrial production in Israel more than doubled, from $400 million to $950 million, and is expected to soar even higher within the next few years. In keeping with Israel's belief in self-reliance, the country now supplies more than 75 percent of its own food, and has increased the number of agricultural settlements from 290 in 1951 to nearly 800 today.

Through the years, as the nation has become more industrialized, exports have soared from $45 million in 1949, to an astonishing $350 million in 1960. From the Sea of Galilee in the north, to the city of Elath at its southernmost point, Israel continues to harvest miracles of productivity with the apparent ease of plucking a fig from a tree.

In recent weeks, the city of Jerusalem has become the focal point of international interest, as the trial of Adolf Eichmann has reawakened the horrible memories of the plague that was nazism. Outwardly the people are calm. They realize that the fate of one man—no matter how despicable his crimes—can never bring 6 million Jews back to life.

It is my feeling that the Israeli people fervently hope that Eichmann's trial will be a stern warning to the entire world that the barbaric spirit of Hitlerism must not rise again to menace freedom-loving people anywhere on the face of the earth.

Railroads Need Help Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, as one who depends entirely on the railroads for distant travel, and to some extent for intermediate journeys as well, I am becoming increasingly concerned over the plight of our railroads. The storms of last winter and the interruption of rail transit due to strikes have revealed how completely dependent we are on our railroads, particularly in the matter of suburban commuter service. And it serves no purpose to point out that when the railroads were riding high with little competition from any quarter they did little to develop and retain passenger good will.

In undertaking to create a healthier climate for the operation of the Nation's rail lines it must be strongly emphasized that the solution will not be found in imposing restrictive regulations on the other modes of transportation such as the airlines, river barges, and long-haul trucks. The railroads do have a legitimate complaint, however, when they

point to the extent to which their competitors have been subsidized and that distinguished columnist, Ray Tucker, in pointing out that the Union Station here in Washington was built by the railroads with their own funds and on which they pay almost $2 million in taxes each year, has this to say in his column on April 14, 1961:

A few miles away across the Potomac River is the National Airport. It was built by the Government at a cost of $32 million, and it pays no taxes at all. Southward, on the edge of Civil War battlefields in Virginia, the Dulles Airport is under construction at a cost to Uncle Sam of $101 million. It will pay no taxes. The airlines serving both fields compete with the railroads for cargo and passenger traffic.

The discrimination, together with other subsidized forms of competition—trucks, passenger cars and waterways like the St. Lawrence canal—helps to explain why the railroads face their most serious crisis in history, possibly wholesale bankruptcy or millions in Federal and State subsidies.

Indeed, there has been talk that nationalization is the only solution, despite its utter failure in England.

The railroads might also complain to Congress and the White House that they have been "overinvestigated," but with no remedy for their problems. Several agencies are now trying to diagnose and arrive at a cure—a Presidential Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and two congressional committees.

The crying need of the railroads today is relief from punitive taxes and restrictive regulations that serve no useful purpose other than to extend unearned competitive advantage to other forms of transportation. The elimination of the iniquitous transportation tax and a reduction in the real estate levies imposed at the local level would go a long way toward bringing needed relief. From there it should be a simple matter to allow the railroads to compete with other carriers at their levels and not to be bound by antiquated and archaic regulations, even though such regulations may have once been justified when there were no other adequate alternate means for the movement of materials and personnel.

Mr. Speaker, this matter is of vital urgency. We simply cannot survive as a nation without a healthy rail system. In time of national emergency there simply are not enough trucks, barges and airplanes to move the goods necessary to meet the demands such a situation would present. And we must be prepared to protect the railroads from the threat of misguided union leaders who are trying to outlaw the so-called piggybacking of trucks. Let us continue to control all forms of transportation since it is in the public interest to do so. But let us also see that the controls are uniform in their application to all carriers and that some relief is found for our primary transportation system which seems presently headed for a disaster that could prove comparable to that of losing a war.

San Francisco's Midtown Terrace Home Owners Association Commended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to your attention, and to the attention of my other distinguished colleagues two newspaper articles appearing in the San Francisco press summarizing an alarming incident that occurred in San Francisco when several young men discharged shots into the home of a Negro family living in the Twin Peaks district.

Shortly thereafter the neighbors of this family met, and through their homeowners association, the Midtown Terrace Home Owners Association, unanimously passed a resolution reaffirming the belief of the members of the neighborhood in the right of all persons to live there or anywhere without regard to race, color, or creed.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, I reflect the feeling of the overwhelming majority of San Franciscans in commending the members of the Midtown Terrace Association for their prompt and vigorous reaction to this vicious shooting by the passage of this heartening resolution.

The above-mentioned articles follow:

[From the San Francisco Examiner, Apr. 12, 1961]

NEIGHBORS PROTEST SHOTS AT NEGRO HOME

The Midtown Terrace Home Owners Association last night unanimously adopted a resolution expressing shock at the "cowardly and vicious" shooting into the home of a Negro family there Saturday night.

Ten shots were fired into the home of Elmo Ollison, a city maintenance worker, at 129 Marview Way. None of the five members of the family was injured.

The association, 160 strong, meeting at St. John's Armenian Church, 175 Olympia Street, resolved:

"By law, by San Francisco's tradition of tolerance, and by simple human decency, Mr. and Mrs. Ollison have the same right to live here and to raise their children here as anyone else.

"We welcome the Ollison as neighbors and we will support their rights to the fullest."

The association's board of directors had earlier passed the resolution for presentation to the full membership.

The association, the resolution added, "unequivocally affirms the right of all persons regardless of race, creed, or color to live in Midtown Terrace. We are shocked at the cowardly and vicious shooting into the home of Mr. and Mrs. Ollison."

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Apr. 12, 1961]

TWIN PEAKS HOME—NEIGHBORS BACK "BLASTED" NEGRO

Neighbors of the Negro family whose home on Twin Peaks was shot up last Saturday came to their defense yesterday as police continued to check into the case.

Last night, directors of the Midtown Terrace Home Owners' Association passed a unanimous resolution defending the family's rights and expressing shock at the incident. Some 160 persons attended the meeting and word of the vote was greeted with applause.

The shooting occurred in the early morning hours at the home of Elmo Ollison, 35-year-old laborer who works at the department of electricity.

Meanwhile, police said yesterday they have got some names of people who may have been involved.

"We think it was probably two people and we're checking leads. That's all I can say now," said Inspector Nathaniel Pedrini.

Ten .22-caliber slugs were fired at Ollison's garage, car and house at 129 Marview Way, located in a predominantly white neighborhood. A blast which police believe came from a shotgun and a .22-caliber rifle tore into the garage floor.

Neither Ollison, his wife, nor their children, aged 13, 10 and 3½, was injured.

In its resolution last night, the association said: "The Midtown Terrace Home Owners' Association affirms the right of all persons, regardless of race, color or creed to live in Midtown Terrace.

"We are shocked at the cowardly and vicious shooting into the home of Mr. and Mrs. Ollison. By law, by San Francisco's tradition of tolerance and by simple human decency, Mr. and Mrs. Ollison have the same right to live here as any one else.

"We welcome the Ollisons as neighbors and we will support their rights to the fullest."

Ollison, a mild-mannered man, took yesterday off to answer newsmen's questions and received expressions of sympathy from his white neighbors.

"Six or eight of them have dropped by and let us know we're welcome here," he said.

Ollison explained that he and his family had expected trouble when they moved into the mainly white Midtown Terrace 4 months ago.

There was none, he said, and after 2 months or so they thought they'd passed the hurdle.

"When this happened we were completely relaxed. We hadn't even considered the possibility of it."

Postage Stamp in Memory of Dr. Thomas Anthony Dooley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, under date of February 27, 1961, I introduced H.R. 4487, to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in memory of the late Dr. Thomas Anthony Dooley.

The great sacrifices made by Dr. Dooley received worldwide acclaim, and it seems such a little gesture on our part to carry out the provisions of H.R. 4887.

I am including herewith a letter from the Post Office Department in reply to my letter written to the Postmaster Gen-

eral on April 6, wherein I requested that he take this action. However, in light of his answer, the need of legislation is apparent. I can see little good in the issuance of such a stamp 25 years from now when the people of that day will perhaps have little interest in this matter. Therefore, I am once again asking the distinguished chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, the Honorable TOM MURRAY, to hold a hearing so that his committee can act upon and report the bill I have introduced, or any bill of a like nature.

I sincerely hope that action will be taken at this session.

The letter follows:

APRIL 12, 1961.

Hon. FRANK J. BECKER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKER: The Postmaster General has asked me to thank you for your letter of April 6 concerning the issuance of a commemorative stamp in memory of the late Dr. Thomas Dooley.

We recognize the many services rendered by Dr. Dooley but consideration cannot be given to the issuance of a commemorative stamp in his honor at this time. As you may be aware, it has been the policy of the Department not to honor an American citizen until at least 25 years after his death. Postmaster General Day is in accord with this stipulation, which is a provision of the Hall of Fame in New York, and is believed a proper one since there are many people whose "greatness" diminishes over the years.

The Department infrequently issues memorial stamps in honor of American officials who died in office, and it is in this category that the memorial stamps for the late Secretary of State Dulles and Senators Taft and George were issued in 1960.

We appreciate your interest in our philatelic program.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. KELLEHER,
Special Assistant to the Postmaster General.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, as debate nears on Federal aid to education legislation, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to an excellent statement in support of the administration's proposal by Mrs. Fred L. Bull, a distinguished Marylander and chairman of legislation for the National Congress of Parents and Teachers. Mrs. Bull's statement follows:

PTA POLICIES FOR EDUCATION LEGISLATION

Although it is understandable that we find a wide variety of opinions in an organization as large and as democratic as ours, we do have certain basic legislation policies, each of which must be approved by at least 30 of the 52 State PTA Congresses before it can be added to, or removed from, our national program. These previously adopted policies determine, at all times, our legislation action as a national organization. We can support only those specific bills that conform to these policies.

I shall mention only a few of these basic policies which relate to some of the proposed bills under discussion. We believe:

1. That our public school system should be maintained and strengthened to meet the ever-increasing demands of today's world.
2. That public education is a responsibility of government and requires action and financial support at all levels: local, State, and National.
3. That Federal support for education should go to publicly controlled tax-supported schools only.
4. That all Federal legislation for the support of education should include provisions to insure maximum local control.
5. That Federal funds be appropriated for the purpose of increasing educational opportunity among the States, with encouragement to the States to put forth their best efforts to equalize opportunities within their own boundaries.
6. That Federal funds be provided to augment State and local support for schools in federally impacted areas.

The policies were developed over a period of many years as problems in education became more acute and the need for Federal support become more apparent. In past years our national organization has supported many proposed education bills, such as those for emergency school construction which were rejected in previous years, and those which passed the House and Senate last year only to be held by the House Rules Committee. Our interest and concern continue as we note the many inadequacies in our school systems which rob children of the opportunity to develop their individual talents to the fullest. Each year's delay in the enactment of a good Federal support bill has compounded the problem and added greatly to the educational handicaps of countless boys and girls.

THE NEED GROWS

We parents who are so close to the schools are well aware of the mounting shortage of classrooms, the staggering number of teachers who do not meet the qualifications for certification, as well as many other urgent educational needs. According to the U.S. Office of Education there was a shortage of 142,000 classrooms last fall, almost 7,000 more than the shortage in the previous year. Some 685,000 children are on curtailed or half-day sessions. The National Education Association reports 93,917 teachers on emergency certificates; if we multiply that by 30 children (which is most conservative) it means that at least 2,817,510 children are being taught by such teachers. Think of it, and what this means to them and to the country, even when we recognize that some teachers on emergency certificates are very good teachers. It is equally shocking that there are still more than 25,000 one-teacher schools in the United States.

WE PROMISE SUPPORT

Among the proposals in certain Federal-support-for-education bills which have particular appeal to us are the following:

1. That assurance against Federal interference in schools is provided.
2. That Federal support be based on average daily attendance in public schools and personal income per public school pupil.
3. That a general program of aid be provided for all public schools, with additional aid to low income States, in order to equalize opportunity.
4. That State and local governments be required to maintain or increase their present support.
5. That Federal funds may be used for construction, salaries, additional teachers, or other purposes to improve education as each State might determine.
6. That a portion of each State's allotment would be available for special pilot, demonstration, and experimental projects in education.

We are very much interested in amendments to Public Laws 875 and 815, as proposed in H.R. 4970. A careful comparison of what this would mean to all the various States makes us wonder why the proposed reductions cannot be made more gradually. Such reductions seem a bit too sudden and too drastic especially for those States which have already compiled their budgets or will have done so before enactment. This would require them to call special budget sessions for readjustments or new levies. It would be most helpful to a great many States if these proposals could be adjusted upward.

Despite greater effort at the local and State levels, education needs have been accumulating for 3 decades and are at present greater than ever, and costs are higher. Like Alice in Wonderland, we have had to run faster and faster just to stay in the same place. Our members, as taxpayers, are willing to pay their fair share for quality education for their children. We are concerned not so much about the cost of providing a program of excellence as of the tremendously greater cost of not providing it.

Mr. Chairman, we recognize the outstanding ability and the sincerity of your committee. We are confident you will report out a good bill to which we can give our full support.

I thank you for the privilege of appearing before you today.

Improving Our Regulatory Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the problems of improving our regulatory agencies is a continuing one and a matter in which the Members of Congress are increasingly concerned. In this connection, Dean James M. Landis, the President's counsel and adviser on improvement of the regulatory agencies and administrative process, recently made an address at my alma mater, Vanderbilt University, in Nashville. I desire to have reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials following the address of Dean Landis' discussion of our regulatory agencies. The editorials are from the Nashville Tennessean, of April 14, last and the Nashville Banner, of April 15, last.

The editorials follow:

[From the Nashville Tennessean, Apr. 14, 1961]

PRESIDENT CALLS FOR REFORM WHERE NEED LONG EXISTED

In his message to Congress calling for a streamlining of regulatory agencies, Mr. Kennedy singled out the Federal Power Commission for the biggest overhaul—and with plenty of reason.

His adviser on the regulatory agencies, Mr. James M. Landis, charged in his report to the President some time ago that the Federal Power Commission was the "outstanding example of the breakdown of the administrative process."

In terms of foot dragging, solicitude for the natural gas industry, and a heavy case backlog, the Federal Power Commission represents much that has been wrong with all the regulatory agencies.

Mr. Kennedy noted the Federal Power Commission still hasn't ruled on 4,000 rate increases proposed by gas producers, and that 193 applications for pipeline construction were pending before it at the end of February 1961. Some $850 million in construction is involved here and the President is right when he says more prompt handling of these matters would help the employment picture. Neither industry nor the Nation is benefited by such delays.

This particular agency is something of a thorn in the side of the administration since its holdover Chairman, Mr. Jerome Kuykendall, refuses to resign. Mr. Kennedy wanted a Nashvillian, Mr. Joseph Swidler, to be Chairman, and we agree he should be.

By midyear, however the Commission will have a Democratic majority, and if Congress will—as there is pressing need for it to do—whip the regulatory agency setup into better shape, the Federal Power Commission should still be able to do its work despite the obstructionist Chairman Kuykendall.

President Kennedy views the regulatory agencies in their proper perspective when he says they "permeate every sphere and almost every activity of our national life * * * they are not merely regulatory but are designed to further the expansion of certain facets of our economy." And he is very much aware of their responsibility to the consuming public as his message indicated. The latter has often been the forgotten factor in regulation.

No facet of government is more in need of reform than these agencies, to which both the executive branch and Congress has paid too little attention.

It is safe to assume there will no longer be lacking any executive attention toward this headless "fourth branch of government." And if Congress will now level its sights on the problems of delay, of inadequate personnel, of lacking coordination among agencies, and other flaws, there will be re-created some of the high purpose for which these agencies were created in the first place.

[From the Nashville Banner, Apr. 15, 1961]

NEW DEALISH THICKET: NEEDED AGENCY OVERHAUL IS CONGRESS RESPONSIBILITY

On the matter of regulatory agencies—subject of President Kennedy's message to Congress Thursday—there will be general public agreement with the fact that an overhaul is needed. But more than that, and prior to it, a comprehensive study is essential, looking not only to efficiency, but to curtailment where excesses of bureaucracy inflict injury on Americans to whom all too many of these agencies accord "subject" status.

There are departmental operations that are valid and vital. There are subsidiary units created for useful functions. There are subalterns added through the years into a vast accumulation, some of them temporary in original designation, but perpetuated, and comprising a thicket of undergrowth which Government reorganizations to date have failed to weed out.

The mere replacement of top hands by the patronage turnover attending a change of administration will impart no cure.

In addressing himself to this big subject, Mr. Kennedy will do well to remember that the correction sought, if it is to be effective, entails a reversal of the direction his own element of political sponsorship has pursued since 1933. These were the exponents of big government under whose aegis the agencies mushroomed. By formal enactment, or by Executive order—usually in the name of "emergency"—they were brought into being.

Dr. James M. Landis, no stranger to Government during that mass incubation process, find fault with some of them—and, after a one-man task force look, supplied the surface fact sheet on which Mr. Kennedy bases his program for reform.

The Landis summary confined its criticism to a 10-year period involving two administrations, though, significantly, it was these same two Presidents (Truman and Eisenhower) who assigned the Hoover Commission to the task of study and recommendation. Point by point most of its recommendations have been submitted to Congress.

The Nation wants efficiency in the proper operations at all levels of government. It needs no reminder that the ponderous bureaucracy and many of the agencies in question had their beginning in the New Deal. It was in the orgy of that tenure that many of them arrogated to themselves the roles of judge, jury, prosecutor, and executioner.

Most lawmakers—excepting those who are of the big government persuasion—will agree in substance with the need for a new look at some of these operations. But they will recognize, too, that the responsibility for any revamping undertaken belongs to Congress. That is the lawmaking body; the agencies for the most part are created by law, and statutory changes will have to be by that process.

The thorough study proposed is in order. The overhaul it anticipates is mandatory.

The Dichotomy of Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, many manufacturing firms in my district are suffering from the competitive effect of imported goods. Some companies seek relief by moving their operations out of the country. In other cases they import parts, and so forth, to use in finished goods. The results are equally discouraging for the American worker. Mr. Arthur Tisch, president of the Special Wire Nail Manufacturers of America has called my attention to a recent column of George Sokolsky, which points out some of the dangers involved in this situation. This article merits the careful study of all who are concerned with adverse effect of increased imports on our American industries.

The letter and article follow:

Hon. HASTINGS KEITH,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KEITH: Although there may be no manufacturer of dry-cell batteries in your district, I feel sure that the subject matter covered in this column is pertinent to many of us. I wonder if you could have this column reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and call the Congress' attention to the closing paragraphs which I think are the most important in the entire column. As I have said many times, management is finding a way out of the dilemma by importing. It is the laborer who must suffer. The laborers' name are removed from two very important lists. One, the list of employed Americans and two, the list of customers.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR S. TISCH,
Director, Technical Sales President, Special Wire Nail Manufacturers of America.

BRIDGEWATER, MASS.

THESE DAYS: THE DICHOTOMY OF TRADE

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Every week, mail comes from some industry or some press agents dealing with the subject of imports. The concern is very profound. Certain American industries are convinced that they are being squeezed out of the American market by cheaper imported products. American workers are frightened.

Before World War I, when a free market existed, it was possible to fight unfair competition. Today, when governments determine the wages, hours of work, taxes, indirectly the prices of raw materials, when they subsidize enterprises by various devices, the markets of the world are no longer free and the danger to labor in a high-wage country is that jobs will be wiped out.

The storage battery manufacturers, who are in direct competition with Japanese, find that some Japanese batteries are sold at a lower price in the United States than in Japan.

The dry battery section of the National Electrical Manufacturers Association consists of seven companies which employ 8,000 Americans, and have an annual payroll of $35 million. This is not a very large number of workers, but they are widely scattered over the United States and their loss of employment would seriously affect many communities.

The transistor radio set has grown increasingly popular in the United States. Young people carry transistor radios with them to sports, games, and even to musical events. Having come into the market importantly in 1957, 3 years later, in 1960, the transistor portable radios sold against tube radios at the ratio of seven to one. Japanese manufacturers entered the American market immediately and can afford to underbid American manufacturers because of cheaper wages, lower taxes, and government subsidies in Japan.

The radio battery industry figures show this production (in millions):

	1959	1960	1961 (*estimate*)
United States	5.8	12.0	12.0
Japan	3.3	7.4	16.1

The basis for competition between American and Japanese radios is that the average American worker in this industry receives $2 an hour whereas a Japanese worker receives the equivalent of 30 cents an hour. Japanese No. 216 batteries cost in New York about 15 cents; American No. 216 batteries sell to distributors for about 70 cents. The argument that the American battery is superior and will last longer is not particularly pertinent as this is a price rather than a quality market.

The Japanese have to import not only raw materials but food. Their country being only about 20 percent arable, they have no alternative but to manufacture for export and they must have a market where there is no political opposition to them.

This then is the dilemma that faces both Japan and the United States. Japan's principal market is the United States, but everything that Japan exports to the United States in any quantity is manufactured in the United States.

The pressure of American labor for protection is becoming increasingly great. Instead of the industrialists demanding protection, they solve their problem by moving their plants abroad where wages and taxes are low. They, in effect, export jobs.

On the other hand, the labor unions are beginning to demand protection. The pressure can become a major political issue and therefore requires more than casual thought.

Jobs for the Handicapped—A Community Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, a great deal of justifiable concern has been attached to our national problem of unemployment and underemployment. Essentially, the problem is one of making full use of the skills and capacities of every American who wants to work. In this category are many men and women who have suffered physical impairments, who through special training and a determination to be productive are capable of holding down a gainful job.

The President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, and similar committees in the States, have spotlighted the need for employers to consider the value of the handicapped worker to their firms and to the community.

As a device for educating the public to the potential of many of our handicapped citizens, the President's Committee, in cooperation with Governor's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, recently sponsored essay contests, State and National, among young people. New Mexico is proud that its State winner won second place in the national competition. She is Miss Claire Marek, of 2429 Wisconsin, Northeast, Albuquerque. Claire is a student at Albuquerque High School.

I ask unanimous consent that her winning essay "Jobs for the Handicapped—A Community Challenge" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOBS FOR THE HANDICAPPED—A COMMUNITY CHALLENGE

(By Claire Marek)

"Pencils for sale," a feeble voice comes from the weatherbeaten face of the old man sitting against the store wall. His shabby clothes and dilapidated shoes and hat present a sharp contrast to the fashions on the models in the store window above him. Dark glasses over his eyes, an old tin cup in his hand, and a white cane lying beside him complete the picture. A shopper, dropping a few pennies in the tin cup, so few that it hardly makes a rattle, passes by and remarks, "Why can't they do something about that?" "They," an easy way of passing the responsibility onto that vague group into whose care "we" place all the problems and mistakes of the world. The "they" should be you, I and all of us in the community where the pencil man exists.

The pencil man is of the older generation. Much has been done for younger people with the same handicap. One seldom sees a middle-aged person in the pencil man's plight. Still—

A young man wheels himself into the huge room furnished with benches and tables on which various electronic equipment is placed. His eyes are bright and his excitement is quite evident, for this is his second day on the job. A man stops to say hello and chat a moment, but at another table, another man speaks to his boss, "Why can't that crippled guy work somewhere else? Why does he have to be near me? I can't do my job right 'cause he makes me nervous."

The Government and the State have done their part of the job well. The man is efficient because the Government has trained him. He has a job. However, the community has failed to complete the work started by the Government. The community must educate the average person about the ability and efficiency of the handicapped. Some prejudice has been torn down. Young children in school stand a better chance than ever of obtaining jobs; but.

A 5-year-old boy pauses as his instructor shapes her lips to form a vowel and places his chubby hand on her throat. She utters the sound again and again. Then she turns the boy to the mirror and places his hand on his own throat. He tries. The process is repeated until a satisfied smile appears on the face of the young woman. Then one appears on the face of the boy. Watching through a one-way window, a society matron comments: "This education is fine, and we expect to raise quite a sum in our fund drive, but what good will it all do? Will he ever really amount to anything?"

Progress has definitely been made with the handicapped. Each succeeding generation has a better chance, but these questions—"Why can't they do something about that?" "Why can't he work somewhere else?" "Will he ever really amount to anything?"—are asked frequently throughout the United States, and they reflect a broad area of Americans' opinions.

The Federal Government has done much to remedy such situations as that of the blind man selling pencils, in the form of special education programs and facilities for medical treatment. But this rehabilitation and education of the handicapped is worthless unless the community is educated to accept the rehabilitated as truly rehabilitated. Pamphlets can be sent out showing how everyone benefits when the handicapped are hired, for they may serve as contributing members of the community. This information acquaints the community with the efficiency of disabled persons, but does not erase the prejudice entirely. The old adage that "experience is the best teacher" holds true in this respect. The community must experiment with their handicapped by trying them and trusting them. It must be a community effort, for the people of a Minnesota town are not going to help a blind man in an Indiana town; the people of a small Texas city are not going to see that a crippled factory worker makes a "go" of his job, nor that his neighbors accept him; and the people of a Tennessee town are not going to arrange that a little deaf boy in Arizona has a job in 20 years. But, the people of each community can help the handicapped in their own town, and only by this "teamwork" can successful placement of the handicapped be attained.

Moreover, a job involves more than mere placement or position. A job for a handicapped person means being accepted by his fellow workers to the extent that they are able to concentrate on his abilities rather than his disabilities. Americans did not understand it when the Japanese rioters made Eisenhower cancel his trip to Japan. The handicapped person is in the same way puzzled when a job is refused him because of his disability. He wants a job and acceptance, not a job and avoidance.

The little boy working diligently trying to learn to speak, wants acceptance also. Right now, funds from the Government and some from the community are paying for his education. He appreciates this, and will appreciate it even more in 20 years, for it will mean his bread. But now and in the future, he will need more than bread. The friendliness of his community will mean the difference between a drab, lonely, and embittered life and a life of contentment and sharing in the community's privileges and responsibilities. Modern equipment and experienced teachers can fit him for meeting the outside world, but is the outside world a fit place for him?

This question and all the others that have been asked by pitying donators and charitable clubwomen can be answered only by the community. These questions are the challenge that faces each community today. The answer is community cooperation to do something about that blind man on the corner. The community must educate its members against prejudice so that the crippled factory worker is sought after and accepted for his abilities. Finally, the community can prepare its future citizens so that the deaf boy in the special school will some day "amount to something."

This, then, is the complete challenge—the hiring of the handicapped devoid of any prejudice. When this challenge is met, each community, each State, and finally the Nation will be a better place for everyone—able and disabled alike—to live.

The Family Farm: Definition Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the New Castle (Ind.) Courier-Times, Mar. 30, 1961]

THE FAMILY FARM: DEFINITION NEEDED AT THE OUTSET—95 PERCENT OF U.S. FARMS OPERATED BY SINGLE FAMILY

In President Kennedy's recent farm message to Congress, he reaffirmed the proposition that "the family farm should be protected and preserved as a basic American institution." The Wall Street Journal probably echoed the thoughts of many urbanites when it commented: "Now the reality is that time has outmoded the family farm, but it is nonetheless to be wrapped in the flag and, like Mount Vernon, to be preserved at all cost."

Depending on definition, the "family farm" may or may not be outmoded and inefficient. Some detractors might want to revise their opinions of the family farm if they studied one set of criteria—now widely accepted among agricultural economists—as to what constitutes such a unit.

If by "family farm" one is talking about 4 acres of submarginal land on which a family scratches out a mean existence, little justification can be found for its continued survival through Government handout. In actual practice, this kind of farm produces so little that Government price supports can add only a few dollars to its receipts, usually not enough to keep it in business.

But the modern definition of "family farm"—and the one substantially applied by the Farmers Home Administration in granting loans—is of a farm on which most of the management (not ownership) and most of the labor comes from the resident family. In actual percentage terms, the country's family farm, so defined, comprise about 95 percent of all farm units, and may be gaining slightly even as the total number of farms decline.

This seeming paradox is explained by an Agriculture Department economist in this way: Even though the actual number of farm units in the United States has dropped steadily since the end of World War II, greater mechanization has enabled farms which previously had to hire substantial outside labor to operate within the accepted definition of a "family farm." Moreover, reliable studies indicate that the cost per unit of production on a mechanized family farm of reasonable size compares favorably with costs on the larger and presumably more efficient "factory farm." Agricultural economists complain that "family farm" has become an emotive term which, lacking proper definition, sheds more heat than light on the issue of the Federal role in agriculture.

Howard Coughlin Speaks of Office Automation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the statement on office automation presented by Howard Coughlin, president of the Office Employees International Union, AFL–CIO, before the Subcommittee on Unemployment-Automation.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT ON OFFICE AUTOMATION PRESENTED BY HOWARD COUGHLIN, PRESIDENT OF THE OFFICE EMPLOYEES INTERNATIONAL UNION, AFL–CIO, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON UNEMPLOYMENT-AUTOMATION, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, MARCH 29, 1961

On October 18, 1955, I appeared before the Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report and discussed the effects of office automation at some length.

In again reading my testimony, I find that we were right in many of the things that we predicted but came to a conclusion which I now feel is no longer a solution to the problems resulting from the introduction of automative devices in offices.

In 1955, I stated that "computers in an office are going to be like bulldozers in the construction industry." I also said, "I do not subscribe to the point of view that dire things lie ahead. We have had automation in our factories for some years without disastrous results. I do believe, however, that there will be serious problems caused by the introduction of automation in offices. Many individuals who have spent their lives acquiring certain skills and have come to believe implicity in their own indispensability are in for a rude shock. They will see machines do in seconds, work that takes them days and weeks to accomplish. They will see machines replace the jobs they and their fellow workers have come to feel are their permanent niches in the office world. A lot of people will lose their jobs. A lot of individuals will be forced to acquire new skills. There will be many new responsibilities placed on the employers of our country."

In conclusion, I stated, "we call upon the employers in the United States to conform to the practices instituted in our organization for the protection of persons displaced from office positions as a result of the introduction of automation. We feel that responsible employers should, as a matter of policy, insure the transition to automation without hardship to the office-workers of America. We further urge employers to share with labor the gain in productivity resulting from automation."

Our prediction of things to come in the statement I presented to that committee was correct. My conclusion, however, which indicated that employers might insure the transition to automation without hardship to the officeworkers of America was incorrect.

In 1955 office and clerical employment was rising steadily. In fact clerical employment has been on the rise since the year 1900. There are approximately 24 million white-collar workers in our Nation today.

In 1955 we thought in terms of giant vacuum tube-type computers which required thousands of square feet of space to house. These machines also required air-conditioned, moistureproof surroundings. We felt that it would require several years for a company to change over from a manual-type clerical operation to the giant computers. The time involved, therefore, would give companies the opportunity to cut their clerical staffs through attrition rather than through layoffs.

We did not take into consideration the startling improvements that have already evolved in electronic data-processing machines. Solid state transistor-generated computers no larger than an office desk are already in process. These newer computers require little space, are much more reasonable in price and are available for medium and smaller businesses.

Computer centers are springing up throughout the Nation. These centers are eliminating small office staffs overnight. It is a simple matter for a small company to use the computer centers and, at the same time, guarantee secrecy of confidential company information. Automation magazine, in its March 1961 issue, announced that self-service computer centers are now a reality. A do-it-yourself computer center has been opened in Los Angeles by Computermat, Inc. It operates along the same lines as a laundromat. The client solves his own engineering and scientific problems with a minimum of instruction. If assistance is needed, there is an experienced staff to help the client in the preparation of programs and in machine operation. An extensive library of programs and subroutines is also available. An IBM 1620 system which uses decimal arithmetic was selected for use in the center.

The New York Times, in its March 15, 1961, edition, illustrated the use of two computer service centers in the financial district of the city. These two computer centers, maintained by IBM and RCA offer for a few all of the advantages of electronic data processing without requiring users to buy or rent computers or their related equipment.

While the giant security concerns have their own computer systems, an increasing number of smaller brokerage houses are using the facilities of service centers. All of the back office accounting for three brokerage concerns is accomplished at the IBM unit, known as the Service Bureau Corp. Each day at the close of trading, all information dealing with customer stock trades, commissions due, and other important data are forwarded to the center. The centers work all night and deliver to the users, before 8 a.m. the next day, complete records for all customers. Complete monthly statements for each customer are also prepared and sent to the brokerage concerns.

RCA's Electronics Systems Center at 45 Wall Street provides daily individual processing of trades, including calculations of commissions, transfer taxes, and net amounts in customers' accounts.

Fees for this work vary, depending upon the amount of work accomplished. Obviously, however, the firms using these centers find it more economical to operate in this way rather than to pay regular salaries, taxes, and fringe benefits for permanent employees.

A solid state digital computer has been designed for small- and medium-sized firms by Autonetics Division of North American Aviation, Inc. The machine called Recomp III has a 4,096-word magnetic disk memory and can handle more than 8,000 instructions. It has a list of 32 standard commands plus five optional floating point commands. Standard input and output is 10 characters per second by typewriter or paper tape punch. The computer's potential can be extended in accordance with the needs of the purchasing firm.

New companies geared to build smaller computers are springing up all over the Nation. All one has to do is check the day-by-day activities of the New York Stock Exchange to find that electronic companies are getting the greatest amount of attention from investors.

There are varied estimates as to the number of computers which will be in operation in the coming years. The Bureau of Labor Statistics stated that in 1959 an estimated 2,000 electronic computers of all sizes were being used for a variety of business, scientific, and engineering purposes by private companies and Government agencies. It has been conservatively estimated that electronic data processing machine sales have reached $500 million as compared to only $10 million in 1950. Conservative estimates bring this total to $2 billion in 1970.

Computer Sciences, Inc., estimates that 10,000 computer installations will be made in the year 1961. Based on studies made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), it is estimated that each computer will affect 140 jobs. It is, therefore, easily seen that in the year 1961, 1,400,000 workers will be affected by these new installations.

BLS has also indicated that 25 percent of the jobs affected will be eliminated. We, therefore, can anticipate that 350,000 white collar positions will be permanently abolished by virtue of computer installations in the year 1961.

We can reasonably expect that the number of computer installations will multiply at a rate in excess of 10,000 installations per year. If, for example, the increasing number of firms entering this field were able to double the number of installations in the year 1962, a minimum of 700,000 jobs would be abolished in that year in addition to the 350,000 which we estimate will be lost this year. This number will increase to gigantic proportions as additional installations are made.

We do not have any estimates of the effects of computer centers. In view of the fact that these centers can do the work of multiple firms at rates running from $25 per hour and up, I am sure that we can all agree that many additional hundreds of thousands of positions now held by white collar workers in small and medium sized firms will vanish from the American scene.

We have noted that some of the manufacturers of electronic data processing machines took issue with Congressman ELMER HOLLAND when he published an estimate which indicated that 4 million office and clerical jobs will be eliminated within the next 5 years through automation. While we can understand that some people may find it difficult to believe that 4 million clerical jobs can be eliminated within 5 years through automation, we do not believe that the manufacturers of computers are unaware of the serious results of large scale installations of computers.

Computers, however, are only a part of the problem of automation in the office. There are numerous automative devices other than computers which, over the next few years,

will eliminate many additional jobs. Some of these machines include the atuomatic sales clerk which can dispense as many as 36 varieties of merchandise and accept payment in return. These machines manufactured by Universal Match and Universal Controls will accept payment up to $5 and will give the customer the exact change due.

A major firm announced last fall that it has created, in effect, an automatic law clerk. This machine recently demonstrated to members of the American Bar Association performs 7 man-hours of legal research in a matter of minutes. In order to get the answers to a question involving tax exemptions, this brain analyzed 400 laws from 50 States and the District of Columbia. In less than 10 minutes, it had typed out all of the statutes and case citations and was beginning the full text of the material. While this machine is expensive and would cost $12,000 monthly if rented, it is also true that we can expect smaller and less expensive machines of similar capability in the foreseeable future.

Addressograph-Multigraph has a machine known as the optical code reader which electronically reads, punches, verifies, and totals numerical information imprinted on tabulating cards with Addressograph data recorders. Cards are punched at the rate of 180 per minute. This machine will eliminate the need for manual key punching.

IBM announced the development of a reading machine which scans entire typewritten pages at the rate of 1,800 words a minute and can automatically operate a teleprinter machine for long-distance transmission of messages. An electronic scanner is presently being used at the Atlantic City Electric Co. in New Jersey. It would take 24 keypunch clerks to do the work of this scanner.

Positions which were created by the giant computers have been eliminated by the smaller models. The use of magnetized tape is eliminating the need for key-punch operators. The use of microwaves will eliminate the need for those who punch magnetized tapes. In other words, the newer electronic machines are already doing away with jobs previously created by predecessor computers.

For example, most utilities use meter readers who forward information read from the commerical and private meters to the memory drum of the computer. It is now possible to eliminate the meter readers and have this information forwarded directly and automatically from the meter to the memory drum of the computer without use of humans.

It is also possible to have retail stores, through the use of electronic equipment, automatically notify their wholesalers or suppliers of depletion of items for sale through proper use of their cash registers, adapted to the particular electronic installations. This could eliminate salesmen, telephone order clerks and those regulating inventories.

Recently, we have learned that the David Sarnoff Research Center of RCA was working on a phonetic typewriter. This typewriter will automatically transcribe from the spoken word. At the present time, it uses a type of sound language similar to speedwriting. This machine puts down exactly what it hears and, therefore, is not orthodox in spelling. In accordance with an article published recently in the New York Times, the machine will transcribe the word "ultimate" as "ultimit" and the word "typewriter" as "tipriter." Just as in speedwriting, it is not difficult to understand the language used by the phonetic typewriter.

Two possibilities present themselves: (1) that through the use of such a machine, a new type of business language will result; or (2) the machine will be perfected to the extent that it will transcribe perfectly.

In commenting on RCA's request for a patent for the phonetic typewriter, the New York Times correspondent stated that the human secretary is safe in her job because the machine can't make coffee. We could add many other substantial reasons for the retention of the human secretary as opposed to the machine. However, we are sure that RCA is not spending its money in the development of this machine without purpose.

There is also experimentation in Kyoto University in Japan with the phonetic typewriter. It would appear from the translation of the material that we have received that the Japanese may well be ahead of RCA in the development of this educated typewriter. This machine, known as Sonotype is being perfected at Kyoto University in cooperation with the Ministry of Education and the Japan Electronics Co.

The Japanese stated that it eventually will be used for any language or dialect. While we are told that the phonetic typewriter has imperfections and is not ready for production, we believe that the committee should be aware that this machine, when perfected, can eliminate the jobs of 1,500,000 secretaries, stenographers, and typists.

I believe some of these examples can well indicate to you that we are facing something more than technological displacement of clerical workers.

We are facing a revolution in the office.

It is not possible for labor or industry to resolve the problems of wholesale displacement of office and clerical workers either unilaterally or bilaterally. This problem requires the active participation of the U.S. Government if we are going to avoid the possibility of millions of unemployed white-collar workers whose jobs have been permanently abolished.

Some optimists prefer to pass over this problem lightly, and point to the continuing increase in the numbers of clerical and kindred workers. They fail to point out, however, that the Bureau of Labor Statistics has found that the rate of increase in clerical and kindred workers in companies where electronic data processing existed is only 7 percent as compared to 15 percent in companies where such systems have not been installed.

These optimists also refuse to recognize the fact that the Bureau of Labor Statistics has found that 25 percent of the jobs affected by the installation of electronic data processing systems have been permanently abolished.

Our labor force is continuing to increase. High school and college graduates available for office and clerical work are also on the increase. The figures indicate that automation will soon curtail, if not eliminate, the positions sought by these newcomers to the labor market.

Worse still, our high schools and business colleges are continuing to prepare students for occupations in the business world which will cease to exist in the next few years.

It is easily seen, therefore, that the problem of displacement of office and clerical employees requires the study, planning and recommendations of organized labor, industry, and the Federal Government working together.

A Federal commission representing organized labor, industry and the Federal Government, after a complete study of the problems resulting from automation of the office, should have the power to make certain recommendations. These recommendations, along with others, should include:

1. Training and retraining centers through the unemployment insurance program.

2. Rehabilitation centers for those office and clerical employees advanced in age and not readily adaptable to the operation of automative devices.

3. Increased unemployment insurance payments and extended duration of time for receipt of such payments for those displaced by automation. We must recognize the difference between those temporarily laid off because of lack of work and those whose jobs have been permanently eliminated through automation.

Those office and clerical workers whose jobs have been permanently abolished due to automation represent a special problem and should receive special consideration. These people have not received secondary training for positions of a manual nature. It may be necessary to offer these people relocation in other cities in positions found by a Government agency. It may also be possible to have such individuals and their families moved from the city in which they are residing to the location of the new position; such expense to be paid through the unemployment insurance system.

Admittedly, it is better for the national economy to undertake payment of these expenses than to continue unemployment insurance payments or community relief subsidies indefinitely. This plan is in operation in Sweden and has proven successful.

4. Earlier retirement for women. Women now make up two-thirds of the white collar force. It is far more difficult for a woman in her forties or fifties to gain new employment than is true of a man.

5. Establishment of a shorter workweek. We believe this is inevitable, particularly in view of the greater productivity and increased profits resulting from the installation of automative equipment. We believe that a radical cut is inevitable in the working hours of office and clerical employees.

The House Committee on Education and Labor must concern itself with the fact that high schools, business schools, and colleges are continuing to train potential office and clerical employees in skills which are in the process of disappearing from the labor market.

Unless this is accomplished, we will find ourselves continuing to prepare people for long periods of unemployment rather than for the creative employment they seek.

In conclusion, I feel that a special tripartite Federal commission, representative of organized labor, industry, and the Government, should be appointed immediately to make a complete study of the problems resulting from the introduction of automative devices in the office.

This commission should report back to the House Committee on Education and Labor at the earliest possible date. Delay in taking action can be costly to the economy of the United States.

Freedom Shall Prevail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Grace Van Atta sponsored and conducted an Americanism essay contest in the Cincinnati public schools. Three outstanding Cincinnatians were judges of this contest; namely, Brady Black, executive editor of the Cincinnati Enquirer; Thomas Gephardt, editor of the editorial page of that paper; and Mr. Peter Grant, director of news for station WLW, the Crosley Broadcasting Co.

Mary Lyons Temple, of Cincinnati, Ohio, a student at our Western Hills High School, was adjudged the winner.

The purpose of the contest was to stimulate a greater interest and feeling of pride and appreciation for the American way of life; the ideals, customs and responsibilities of the American citizen.

Miss Temple's essay, "American Citizenship: What It Means to Me," is so outstanding that I feel it should be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The essay follows:

AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP: WHAT IT MEANS TO ME FREEDOM SHALL PREVAIL

(By Mary Lyons Temple)

Allow me to introduce myself. My name is George Washington. I served as Commander in Chief of the Continental Army during the Revolutionary War, and later, I became the first President of the United States. Now, I am here in America as a spectator to see what has become of the Nation which I helped to found.

I see all of the wondrous advances that have been made in industry and agriculture. Everywhere there are machines that run by themselves, lamps that shine without fire, and pictures that move and talk. I am greatly amazed by all of these things. I am shocked by the new language I find the people speaking—so like, and yet so unlike, that of my day. The clothes, too, are different from anything I could have imagined. Gigantic buildings loom everywhere, and people fly through the air above them like birds. Yet, I am able to understand these changes, for such progress is inevitable and, from what I can see, good. I would not want the people of America to stand still and not search for better things. No, it is not these material changes which frightens me and bewilders me; it is the change in the people themselves, in the way they feel toward their country.

There are now more than 180 million U.S. citizens, yet there seem to be no more, or perhaps not as many, true Americans as there were in my day. I hear the word "American" used as a synonym for "citizen of the United States." This is not right, for an American is someone who lives up to the demands of his citizenship. He takes an active interest in the affairs of his Government; he is proud of his country, and thankful to be a citizen of it.

He is eager to protect his rights and those of other citizens. He appreciates his great heritage as an American citizen. I have found few citizens of the United States today who could really be called Americans. The people of the United States, although they call themselves "Americans," have actually forgotten what it means to be a citizen. They have abandoned their sacred duties as citizens, and they have left their many privileges unguarded in a world where there is much danger of losing them.

The most tragic part of the lack of Americanism among "Americans" is that the people do not realize what is happening today. They think that they are good Americans because they say the "Pledge of Allegiance" at the opening of public gatherings, buy U.S. bonds, and can sing the first verse of "America." Undoubtedly, there are moments in every citizen's life when he feels pride and joy in being part of so great a Nation, but this is not enough. American citizens of the 20th century must be, as those of the 18th century were, true Americans every day.

I observe that on July the Fourth Americans celebrate with parties and firecrackers, but this is not really done in honor of, or in celebration of, American independence. It is done because the people of the United States want to have a good time. To be sure, there were many, many firecrackers on the Fourth of July in 1776, but they were a display of true rejoicing over the newly proclaimed independence of America. In 1776, the people knew what it meant to be free, for they had long been oppressed by British rule. On that first Fourth of July, Americans had good reason to celebrate, and they still do today. Citizens of the United States still have the same rights and responsibilities which they had in my day. They still have those rights given every citizen by the Constitution of the United States: to manage their own affairs; worship as they see fit; speak out on whatever they please; criticize the government; read and write freely; have a fair trial by an impartial jury; and, perhaps the most important, they have the right to govern themselves.

In 1787, I attended the Constitutional Convention where I helped to set down in writing these rights of the citizens. It never occurred to me then that in years to come these hard-won rights would simply be taken for granted. In my day, they were the most cherished possessions of the people; and they should be today. If the present attitude of American citizens toward their rights continues much longer, there will be tragic results. The rights, the very freedom, of the people will be lost gradually. Then these rights and freedoms will finally be appreciated, but it will be too late. The American people must learn now what it really means to be a citizen of the United States. They must know what their rights are so that they may protect them, and they must recognize their responsibilities so that they may carry them out. Then they will be true Americans.

Help Wheel Needy Ill of World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter of transmittal from Mrs. Paul Bedford, of Wilkes-Barre, with which she forwards a feature article on the international humanitarian work done by the Wheel Chair Club of Wilkes-Barre, of which she is the founder. The aforementioned article was written by Mr. Sheldon Wintermute, a staff writer, Sunday Independent, Wilkes-Barre, and appeared in that newspaper on December 11, 1960. It gives me great pleasure to include this material as part of my remarks today which is in addition to previous remarks that I had made in the RECORD on this truly outstanding and humanitarian enterprise. Mrs. Bedford is to be warmly congratulated on the success of the Wheel Chair Club which she founded 25 years ago. I am sure I reflect the wishes of many thousands when I say that we all fervently hope that her good works will be continued and sustained for many more wonderful years.

The letter and article follow:

THE WHEEL CHAIR CLUB, INC.,
Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Thank you for putting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article about our sending 300 wheelchairs around the world in 3 years.

We wish instead of that you had put the enclosed one in which CARE sent to the Sunday Independent, without our knowledge. It shows our work in action. We appreciate greatly what you did.

Sincerely,

GERTRUDE BEDFORD
Mrs. Paul Bedford.

HELP WHEEL NEEDY ILL OF WORLD—BEDFORD RESIDENCE HEADQUARTERS FOR UNIQUE PROJECT

(By Sheldon Wintermute)

It was 25 years ago and Christmas was just as close when a Wilkes-Barre woman, who 4 years ago rightfully was honored as a Distinguished Daughter of Pennsylvania, founded the Wheel Chair Club of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., which now is known to handicapped children throughout the world.

The founder, Mrs. Paul Bedford, of 96 West South Street, city, had only a small group to help her plot the course for this international humanitarian project.

It was only last week that five wheelchairs were delivered to the Franklin Delano Institute for Crippled Children at Bogotá Colombia, as a gift of the Wheel Chair Club of Wilkes-Barre, the headquarters of which is the study in Mrs. Bedford's West South Street residence where she resides with her husband, one of the most distinguished members of the Pennsylvania Bar Association.

The official presentation at the institute in the capital city of the South American republic was made by Richard W. Reuter of New York, executive director of CARE (Cooperative for American Relief Everywhere), who was visiting Bogotá as part of a tour of CARE missions in Latin America.

TRIED FOR SIZE

Mr. Reuter reported to Mrs. Bedford that the chairs immediately were tried for size by five little Colombian girls being treated at the institute for polio.

Another chair earlier this year was delivered to the Physical-Social Rehabilitation Organization in Bogotá, which serves the crippled and blind poor.

Colombia brings to nine the number of countries to which CARE has delivered wheelchairs on behalf of the Wilkes-Barre club.

The others are Hong Kong, India, Italy, Panama, Philippines, Turkey and Vietnam.

Mrs. Bedford and her tireless aids are working on reports that chairs are urgently needed for a children's hospital in Israel and a school for the disabled earthquake-stricken Chile.

The former Gertrude Vaughn, Mrs. Bedford was cited as a Distinguished Daughter of Pennsylvania in 1956 for outstanding contributions through personal service, effort and humanitarian work in the field of welfare.

When it started 25 years ago, the Wheel Chair Club was merely an outgrowth of the Friends of Shut-Ins Club. Today there are 27 active units around the country helping to provide wheelchairs and walkers to the needy ill in this country and abroad.

Nature and the Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD

an article entitled "Nature and Man: The Two Faces of Management," which appeared in the Audubon magazine May–June 1960:

NATURE AND MAN: THE TWO FACES OF MANAGEMENT

(By Daniel McKinley)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Dan McKinley is a teacher of biology at Salem College, Winston-Salem, N.C. In the summer of 1959, he was on the staff of the Audubon Camp of Connecticut, and for 2 years was a teaching fellow in biology at Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Maine. In a recent letter to us, he wrote: "I grew up in the Ozark area of southern Missouri, where I learned certain Thoreauvian truths about dolomite glades, sandstone barrens, and other wastelands. They were places of great charm and interest * * * not real wildernesses but without them life would have been different." Dan McKinley has worked as a naturalist in Missouri State parks, studied wildlife management under William H. Elder, a disciple of Aldo Leopold at the University of Missouri, and has worked on ecological problems in Alaska.)

The dourest prophet has at least a despairing hope that human nature can be changed enough to make man's life compatible with the order in nature. Something of the sort, without a resort to quackeries, has to be done.

The common question goes: Where is science taking us? Can it be that science is taking us, as the question implies, to some end that we have not elected? The two most frequent replies are not reassuring—the hell of nuclear war; or the dubious utopia of a manmade world powered by atomic energy.

Today's shoddy promise of utopia is not a pretty one, even if it works; and we do not yet know what to do with the leftovers from peaceful atomic fission. Inevitably we shall see nature molded more and more by the cankering stresses of overpopulation and undreamed-of increases in material demands. Individual freedom will perish in the totalitarianism necessary for the running of such a factory of human protoplasm.

I think it conceivable there is no solution to the looming catastrophe of too many people in so frail a world. Like the dragon's brood we threaten our world with hydrogen bombs, atomic fallout, earth movers, and simple overuse by billions of men whose blindness prevents them from recognizing the earth's fragility. Municipal airports, superhighways, and suburbias weigh heavily upon land that ought to lie exposed to rain and light and life. Earthly life may soon consist only of that in managed man and his tanks of algae stewing in the solar gardens of the future. Farming as a way of life, wildernesses, arctic tundra, national parks, wild animals, and plants—all of these things may be dreams before we know it.

Maybe, as I say, we cannot do anything. But how justified is this view for the managers and technicians who do alter the world? Are we an ignorant society so mobilized by taboos that we act, but cannot guide our actions? What do we know about the tangled web of effects woven by the changes we initiate? So far, perhaps because of "science," it has not mattered much to us. We are utopia bound. What are esthetics and ethics, or even the practicalities of soil poisoning, pollution, and the extinction of species? But the web tightens. Bacteria, green plants, and molds are among mankind's greatest friends. They are the result of an almost eternally long balance in nature that man can never duplicate, and one in which he was never remotely involved until quite recently. Yet aside from whooping cranes, platypuses, and moccasin flowers, all beneath contempt because they have no market value, we may also be endangering the willingness of just such impersonal facets of life as chlorophyll, penicillin, and nitrification to support us. We know little enough about the kind of world required for their fruitfulness. Man, an ignorant parasite, sucks up their bounty, and without them he is lost.

I am the sheepish owner of a hope that a world fit for unmanaged men may yet come out of it all. It is an agonizing hope. Coupled with that hope is the belief that in completely managed landscapes only a managed man can fit without going mad. For, as much as politics, religions, schools, and automobiles, freedom consists of spaciousness, natural beauty, and complexity, and the familiar challenge of the unknown. If we lose these things, how can they be legislated back into a world spilling over with people?

Yet, suburban developments, tomorrow's slums, sprawl listlessly over once lovely hills. A living topsoil is bulldozed away and its basement cemented over. People spew outward from decrepit metropolises, into which are driven ever more displaced people from the farm. Gadget-filled lives have been invested with so false a halo that one wonders if the gadgets are not the proffered carrot that precedes the slipping on of the halter.

Where does the emphasis on material social creations put a naturalist? This skeptic yet remembers country summers in Missouri: grasshopper symphonies not confined to a Saturday afternoon. Although strayed from Ozark hillsides of oak and hickory, he yearns not for lost youth but for the lonely call of a blue jay in the emptiness of an oak forest in midwinter; for katydids rasping out their lives in gleaming summer evenings; for the cyclic drone of a cicada in a locust year; for nighthawks booming their own delights over a limestone glade; or, above the comforts of fellow creatures, sunset silhouetting neither skyscraper, power pole, nor jet trail.

What I describe is not the antithesis of human society, but its proper setting.

I am told to ogle the progress of mankind. Join. Socialize. Have faith. Faith in what? Faith in man—man possessed of the Midas touch; man the remover—not the maker—of mountains. Man so in love with his own image that he cannot see or reflect or weigh; so open to the faults in his faiths and practices that he now endangers the future of his species. Will he—can he—continue to love his fellow men when men fall over each other's feet, as will probably happen unless some infinitely terrible disaster prevents that horrible end?

Wisdom, management, education are the echoes I hear, encapsulated in American thinking in the word "conservation." Conservation is at best a focal point of deep and creative thought; at worst, a brain-stopping little slogan beginning and ending with "Wise use." Smog, alpine meadows, moorland sheep, Chesapeake oysters, almost everything you can name, may any day begin to poison us with radioactivity very appreciably more than at present; soils whose fire ants have been eradicated may soon become our savings account with death; the whole African continent may lose its elemental charms to make way for a teeming society that will in its turn starve—the ultimate in drab memorials to our political vacuity. Are we so very wise?

So we manage. We become professional, steeped in techniques that override our philosophies, silenced by Government subsidy, smug from the conventionally measurable services we provide the public. In wildlife management, for instance, any fool who can legally carry a gun can now pay to have a coturnix quail turned loose in front of his gun, a sick trout dangled from his prebated hook, or for a shot at a goose from a blind that he did not build within the territory that was recently sanctuary to the goose. This is no nightmare of our overpopulated future. This is management—but considerably strayed from the philosophy of its great founders.

In a day when American population pressures are still modest enough, we find game management plying the techniques rather wildly in its efforts to provide more heads of shootable game for the increasing baggers of game. This usually means chopping down the beech trees, shooting off the horned owls, mountain lions, and wolves, and introducing exotic animals to fill nooks where native animals can no longer live. It means cultivation, fertilizers, poisons; it means the intercession of more and more grades of expertness between producers and consumers; it means the channeling of the sun's energy through a few manageable species of animals rather than through a bright array of wonderful forms as nature has always done it.

And then, education. Not the slow and costly provisioning of human minds with perceptiveness. That might accomplish something. But we must be dynamic and progressive: great buildings, to shut out the sunlight; expensive equipment, to magnify the cell and lose the organism that makes it meaningful; and eminent measureableness, so that we can point with pride; an out-doing of the Russians, that Government funds may flow. Application: technicans, salaries, degrees, departments, politics, rottenness.

Our knowledge is backfiring into our faces, and yet the pressure to accentuate the practical can hardly have begun. More than mere wise use is required. Technology's balm will not touch the source of our infection, part of which is technology itself. Yet obviously we do need wisdom, management, and education. But humility before the facts of nature—before the marvels of nature—must be our point of departure. This is no grovelling before what we do not understand, but a loving caution in using facts that we think we are thoroughly familiar with.

We are surely lost if all sciences cannot become more a conviction that we are "the wiser * * * for knowing that there is a minnow in the brook" (Thoreau). So wisdom begins with luck—in having the brook in the first place; and ends with human restraint in preserving the brook and in keeping it unpolluted enough that minnows can live in it. Without some feeling for the precedence of nature, we shall soon have neither brook nor minnow nor wisdom.

And the minnow's service to mankind is in its own being—maybe even in the number of scales in its lateral line—more than in any arbitrary scheme of values assigned to its use as food, as object of bounty, as destroyer of agricultural pests, as eliminator of weak or sick prey animals, as pet to be caged, or specimen to be idly maimed in a freshman biology class.

People have to get into the open air, have a look at life, and see how fare the neat laws that the laboratory gives them. Man today needs badly to cultivate his qualities of seer and thinker. Human life is potentially richer where all of life is richer. Without that richness, all our education will be vanity. Life has the roots of its richness in areas that man has left alone, often those areas that in the past have been economically useless. We are no longer a people with hoes nibbling at the landscape; useless bits of land are being remodeled nearer and nearer our own image, and lost to nature so long as our age of concrete endures.

Civilizations destroy the useless and the harmful in nature (with increasing success), put the rest under the halter, and place more and more of the individual man into the icebox. Nature, on the other hand, is liberating, elementally and not merely legally, freeing the eye with its multitude of forms and saving the mind by its offering of

alternatives to dictatorships of fad and fashion and decree. If we look deeply into relatively undisturbed nature, we have used the most precious gift of science; if we understand even superficially we have had science's greatest blessing. True science does not consist of quarterly reports and sure-fire returns.

But man is not merely a thinker. He is a biological organism. He requires appropriate natural surroundings for the play of his activities. One function of a spacious world where natural beauty and complexity have full sway would be not only in its food for man's thought, but also in its being food and a place of refuge for his body. People are hardly justified in having bodies, they derive so little good from them.

Perspective cannot altogether be taught; it has to be "discovered" by the individual. If men, in their leisure time are lured away from the social and intellectual opiates of cities, something has been accomplished. If, during that harried truancy, they gain a glimmer of understanding, a minor miracle has occurred. There is real danger that a whole generation of people will one day be reared away from contacts with wild nature. Something compulsive is needed to make at least a few people into a part of the country: Not for fresh air merely, but for benefits that the country nurse can never measure.

It is indeed hard to see how man can long maintain contact with nature in the years that face us. A kind of human management is needed. We must do the managing, with nature and man's place in it clearly in view. No kind of self-management is so much needed as population control. Without that, any appreciable amount of "nature" of any kind is out of the question. Consider the bad names, the crooked statistics, and the hoots of derision with which Thomas Robert Malthus is proved wrong these days, and you will see the task that looms ahead.

Society worship lies deep among our roots. Abstractions of nature in still life, in formal gardens, or regimented agriculture, are held up as not only substitutes for but even improvements upon nature. The sense of husbandry fostered by forestry, game management, or outdoor recreation means for some people that they are not liable to the same ethical strictures that ought to govern human activity in any field of nature. The feeling is deep that more basic laws of nature can be discovered in the laboratory than in the field or at the observational level, and that the resulting control over nature is the chief glory of man.

Many persons also insist that a peculiarly mystical and durable essence of humanity gets entombed in bronze, cast into marble, molded onto canvas, or enshrined in great buildings. They belittle the role of environment, not only in its symbolical function, but also its vital role in providing the largeness of bounty that makes leisure possible. Such people desire—or in practice, encourage, and make inevitable—a world smothered into humanized stability. Some of them desire—or overlook—the stabilization of humanity that must follow as man, cut off from distances, rain, and natural life, revolves in ever smaller orbits around allegedly precious bronzes, marbles, books, committees, laws, canvases, and services. What began as opportunities for masterly individual achievements will end in mass strangulation of the individual.

What I have tried to say in suggesting a reorientation of man in nature is that where money and man are put immoderately before the whole of nature, the margin of safety for man himself is narrowed. One day, he will be caught short. Due to the taint of folly in our wisdom, a rot of our own making will surely undermine the foundations of man's termite civilization.

Natural history is a point of view, not a science. That is its salvation, and the source of its services to man. Human social life is no mere substitute for it. It is not a matter of money. Here is something that we cannot apply. It receives few subsidies from government, and hardly gets lip-service from many biology departments in colleges and universities. Yet, its prerequisites are those that any inspired amateur can bring to it. One may just see and appreciate, although few persons operate on so exalted a plane.

The lessons of natural history for mankind are not negative. The festering homocentrism that now leads us to commit devastation toward both man and earth might possibly be alleviated by a love for nature that places man in perspective.

Love of nature is the supreme aim. The study of natural history, in the interest of that love, must be encouraged. Neither natural history nor naturalists, however, can be particularly dictated, legislated, or financed into existence. Uncontrolled nature is the mother of both of them.

The creation of naturalists, of individualists, is more difficult than the training of technicians. And less measurable. Perhaps colleges, geared to run on money from self-satisfied tycoons, and State universities, pacing in the dignified steps of politicians, are both poor places to expect any such impalpable, immaterially good thing to be fostered.

Natural history in some way needs to remain in a state of perpetual amateurishness. The living world we see has to be, in a way not now clear, kept natural and rich; the individual man, in a manner yet to be discovered and practiced, must be left to explore, learn, and experience, as with a compelling passion. Naturalists only grow in such remarkable surroundings; I suspect that in this peculiar independence from extreme social coddling, they reflect a quality that is basic to healthy human beings.

Rugged Individualism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. HALEY
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Lake Wales News, April 13, 1961, entitled "Rugged Individualism."

I call this editorial to the attention of my colleagues because the thoughts expressed therein are so typical of those often expressed by the so-called rugged individualist. This is a man who has taken advantage of practically every Federal program available to him and has benefited from them. Now he has reached the security in life where he can demand that other people should stand on their own feet "without expecting handouts from the Government and, in turn, us taxpayers."

The editorial follows:

RUGGED INDIVIDUALISM

A young man lived with his parents in a public housing development; attended public school, and participated in the free lunch program. He entered military service and upon discharge, retained his national service life insurance. He attended the State university and worked part-time at the State capitol to supplement funds provided by his GI education check. Upon graduation he married a public health nurse, bought a home with an FHA loan, and obtained an RFC loan to go into business.

Their baby was born in the city hospital. Wanting some farmland and a home for his parents, he bought a small ranch with the aid of the veterans land program. For his livestock he obtained emergency feed from the Government. Later he put part of his land in the soil bank and the payments he received soon paid for the ranch. His father and mother lived comfortably on the ranch with the help of their social security and old age assistance checks. REA lines supplied electricity; the government helped him clear his land; the County Agent showed him how to terrace it; and the government built him a fishpond.

He read books from the public library, and his banked money was insured by an agency of the Government. His child grew up; entered public school; ate free lunches; rode in a school bus; played in the municipal park, and swam in a public pool. The man owned an automobile, so he favored the Federal highway program. He signed a petition, seeking federal assistance in developing an industrial project to help the economy of his area; was the leader in a move to get a new Federal building and went to Washington with a group who asked the Government to build a great power dam costing millions, so the area could get cheaper electricity.

Then, one day, after hearing that the per capita income tax bill in 1959 averaged $251.49, for every man, woman and child in the Nation (over 177 million persons), he wrote his Congressman:

"I wish to protest these excesive governmental expenditures and attendant high taxes. I believe in rugged individualism. I think people should stand on their own feet without expecting handouts from the government and, in turn, us taxpayers. I am opposed to all socialistic trends, and I demand a return to the principles of our Constitution."

Protest by Polish-American Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the RECORD the protest of the executive committee of the Polish Peasant Party against the new act of violation of the Polish nation's will. The Honorable Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, chairman of the committee, is the former Prime Minister of Poland and is President of the International Peasant Union.

The above-mentioned protest follows:

PROTEST OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE POLISH PEASANT PARTY AGAINST THE NEW ACT OF VIOLATION OF THE POLISH NATION'S WILL

April 16, 1961, will go down as the day on which the Communists committed a new infamous act of violation of the Polish people's will by holding the so-called elections. The Polish nation was the first to take up arms, in 1939, against Hitler, who, after concluding an agreement with Stalin, started World War II by attacking Poland. Through a great loss of blood and property

the Poles confirmed their will and their right to national sovereignty, to civic freedom, and to a free choice of a system of government and national economy.

This was reaffirmed at the end of the war by representatives of the three Big Powers, the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union, who declared that Poland had the right to full independence, its own government, and determining its own political system through free and unhampered elections.

The nation's will and its right to self-determination were brutally violated by the Soviet Union and its agents during the 1946 referendum and the election of January 1947. Two memoranda and thick volumes quoting facts of various violations, beginning with arrests, obstructions, burning of whole villages by the Red Army and Secret Police, and ending with the murder of candidates of the only independent list of the Polish Peasant Party—were not only submitted to representatives of the Big Powers concerned, but they also constitute till this day, in the records of the United Nations and of all its democratic members, an indictment of the Soviet Union for the violation of the Polish nation's will in 1946–47 (84 percent of the Polish people voted in January 1947 for the independent list of the Polish Peasant Party) and remain a lasting evidence of the violation of international pledges by the Soviet Union.

The so-called election in 1952, along with the change of the constitution patterned after the Soviet model, was held in the Bolshevik style with only one list of candidates. The same kind of election, Soviet style, was held in February 1957, although in 1956, after the Poznan events, it was announced that the will of the people would be respected and the whole system liberalized. The worst of it is that, in 1957, on the eve of the election, Gomulka, who was afraid that the Polish people might boycott the election, threatened them with obliteration of Poland from the map of Europe, should they dare, when going to the polls, to strike off the names of the leading Communist candidates from the list.

In April 1961, when new nations in Africa and Asia are being granted the right to self-determination, which is recognized by the whole world, a new act of violation of the Polish people's right to determine their own system of government is taking place. There are no free elections for Poland. A nation with an over-1,000-year-long history of culture and statehood has been denied the right to determine its own system of government, national economy, and policy; and instead of an election a tragicomedy is being staged.

The tragedy is still greater when we consider the fact that the Polish people has not only been deprived of the right of self-determination, but that Polish citizens who do not belong to the Communist Party or its affiliations cannot nominate candidates they trust. In addition, they have been ordered to go to the polls and cast their vote for their enemies and for a system which destroys them and which they abhor.

Just like before Communist courts an innocent citizen has to confess uncommitted sins before receiving a death sentence, so in political life the citizen is ordered to vote for his enemy who is as hostile to him as to the majority of the nation; he must vote for the Communist system and the dictatorial rule of Moscow, which, having deprived Poland and other Iron Curtain countries of independence, is now planning to extend Communist dictatorship the world over.

The farce of the situation lies in the fact that in 1952 and 1957 the Polish citizens, who were forced to vote, cast into the ballot boxes ordinary pieces of paper with such shocking words that the Communist press said after the election that it was simply unbelievable that a citizen could write such obscenities on the ballot.

Under the new electoral system, scribbling on official ballots does not affect their validity. In other words one can write under the candidate's name on the official ballot the most insulting words and the ballot is still valid and is counted in favor of the Communist candidate.

As the Communists recognize only the dictatorial rule and treat the so-called elections as an instrument of forcing the citizens to cast their readymade ballots for the single Communist list of their oppressors—it is worthwhile to recall at this point their attitude toward elections in other countries.

A secret pamphlet written by a Czech Communist, which has been recently made public, says that the Communists in Western democracies must go to the polls and seek seats in their parliaments in order to destroy them subsequently from within.

An election was held recently in South Vietnam. There were three candidates for the Presidency and three for Vice President. The Communists staged attacks against individual leaders of the non-Communist parties and murdered them. Last year over 2,000 non-Communist leaders were killed. Most of them were peasants. They had been given land under the land reform and had no intention of joining the Communists. A few weeks before the election Communist bands attacked villages, murdered local leaders, and took away personal documents from the villagers to prevent them from going to the polls.

In this case the Communists not only conducted an open campaign against the elections, but also tried to prevent holding them by terrorist activities.

It is the general rule in the entire Soviet camp and also in Poland that an election is invalidated if less than 50 percent of those entitled to vote in an electoral district have cast their vote.

Last March, an election to national councils in U.S.S.R. was held. Instead of the usual 99.8 percent of the voters going to the polls, the voters abstained from voting in 18 districts in the Ukraine, in 6 districts in Kazakhstan, in 11 districts in Lithuania; thus, the required 50 percent of voters did not show up at the polls. These are the figures the Soviets admitted; but we do not really know how the things really were. But everyone who can read knows that the citizens availed themselves of this first opportunity to declare themselves against the Communist system by boycotting the election.

In 1946 Stalin told the Polish Communists in Moscow: we have determined the outcome of the 1947 election in Poland here, today. But what I want is that you do not rest content with merely adding votes. I want you to break the Polish people before the election, so that they go to the polls to vote for you.

The same thing has been done in Poland now. When the central committee of the Polish Workers Party discussed the question of election in Poland in October 1960, Gomulka ordered that the Polish people be broken before the election; in particular the opposition of the peasants and of the church should be overcome. This started the Communist campaign in Poland against the church and the peasantry. Hence the fear that the elections might be boycotted by the Poles and the linking of the elections to the parliament with those to regional councils.

Poles at home are mature enough and politically minded—so they do not need our advice from abroad in matters bearing on elections. After the past election, the Communists, enraged by the existence of the Mikolajczyk "remnants," quoted so many examples of national resistance against the so-called Communist election that no better methods of a bloodless opposition could ever be invented abroad.

There are some possibilities in the new electoral system, such as, for instance, of a mass boycott, so that the aforesaid 51 percent of the voters do not go to the polls; or to apply article 61, if one is forced to vote, and go to the voting booth and tear up the ballot into pieces so that the vote is counted against all the candidates on the list.

In the entire democratic world, an election in which a citizen has no right to nominate his own candidate and is obliged to vote for his enemy, is not considered a real election.

And that is why the most important thing is not the outcome of these Communist elections in Poland, since it is known that deputies or councilmen have been chosen by the Communists well in advance.

True, the Communist election system says that nominations can be made only by political, professional, and cooperative organizations, as well as by other societies of the working people. However, we know that no other party except the Communist Party, with its agencies, the United People's Party and the Democratic Party, can exist in Poland and have the right to nominate its candidates.

The same is true about other organizations. Already in 1957 and 1958, initial attempts by the peasant, socialist and boy-scout youth associations as well as by labor unions and agricultural associations to make themselves independent were thwarted by Communist terrorism.

The fact that Piasecki from the PAX had to pay larger taxes for a larger number of seats, or that Zawiejski-Kisielewski and Stoma—vestiges of the ZNAK, proclam the duty to vote—does not change the situation in the least. The fact is that the voters in Poland have only one Communist list to vote for and that they must go to the polls because the Communists fraudulently tell them that it is their civic duty to do so.

The citizen's duty is to vote only when he also has the right to nominate his own candidates. He has no duty to vote for his enemies.

The Polish Peasant Party published its independent lists in 1947, because, under the election law, 500 voters could submit their own list. The Communists arrested the Polish Peasant Party members and tortured them, even the women, by keeping them outdoors, behind barbed wires, in the winter cold, barefoot in icy water, and demanded that they withdraw their signatures, which they refused to do.

In 1952 and in 1957 there was no such rule, nor is there such a rule in 1961. Citizens have no right to submit their lists of candidates and therefore they are not obliged to vote for their enemies. The executive committee of the Polish Peasant Party, protesting against this new act of violation perpetrated by the Communists against the Polish people—will continue to insist that the international pledge be carried out in Poland, and that after the releasing of the Poles who have been deported to Russia and following the withdrawal of the Soviet forces from Poland, the freedom of the press and association be restored in Poland and that a truly democratic election under international control be held.

March Monthly Change Indexes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the attached predictions by Dr. John H. Hoagland result from his compilation of reports from purchasing agents.

It is interesting to note that the most recent statistics support Dr. Hoagland's prediction made in February that the recession had reached bottom and that the trend from there on in 1961 would be on the favorable side:

MARCH MONTHLY CHANGE INDEXES

(By Dr. John H. Hoagland)

The latest recession ended in February and the business upturn began in March. Order backlogs were bigger; new orders were larger; production was greater; employment declines were less; and, inventory liquidations were smaller in March than during many recent months.

These important business trends for March are shown in the accompanying charts of monthly change indexes developed from purchasing business surveys. Again, purchasing executives are providing early and accurate evidence of a turning point in the business cycle, as they have successfully done so many times in the past.

In March 1961, as in May 1958, many of these key indexes shifted from negative to positive, signifying a cessation in the business decline and the beginning of the business recovery.

The purchasing business surveys showed March business trends improving throughout the Nation, as well as in important industrial areas—such as New England, Detroit, Cleveland, Pittsburgh, and Chicago. Monthly change indexes for these areas all moved upward during March. The majority of these indexes now have turned positive, signifying increases over the preceding month. Those indexes which continue to be negative, indicating declines, all showed a March rate of decline less than that of February.

The late 1960–61 recession did prove to be one of the shortest and mildest in history. Inventory liquidation, caused by the imbalances of the 1959 steel strike, was a major factor in this latest recession. Purchasing executives, however, readjusted inventories sooner than in previous recessions, and this helped keep the recession short and mild.

A FORECAST

Forecasting business trends is always hazardous, but perhaps now is an appropriate time to discuss some probable developments of the coming months. The current business recovery should continue at least through the first half of 1962. The present low level of inventories should increase in the coming months due to increased demand for final products, lengthening leadtimes caused by slower vendor deliveries, and anticipated price increases. By the fourth quarter of 1961, a strong inventory accumulation stimulus will be provided by the threat of a steel strike in the summer of 1962. Inventory accumulations and other stimuli should raise business activities to new high levels in 1961 and 1962. Inflation will probably be a major problem in 1961 and 1962.

The next danger period for a business recession will be 1963. It is more casual than coincidental that each of the last three recessions occurred within a year after a major steel strike. The steel strike threat of 1962 is thus likely to cause a business recession in 1963. Although not generally recognized in business forecasting, the threats of major strikes exert considerable influence upon purchasing decisions which, in turn, determine many business trends. Purchasing executives exert an important influence on their firms' profits, and their combined actions produce a major impact on the business cycle. Fortunately, the business surveys of purchasing executives have provided some of the very best monthly data for analyzing and forecasting business cycles.

NATIONAL

For March, the National Business Survey Committee of NAPA reported increases occurring in both new orders and production. The March new order increase was greater than any month since January 1960; and, the production increase was larger than any month since February 1960. In 7 out of the 8 preceding months new orders had shown declines, and production cutbacks had been registered for 6 of the 8 preceding months.

Employment in the industries of the National Business Survey declined for the 13th consecutive month; but there was definite indication in March that a turning point in the rate of decline was reached in February 1961.

Inventory liquidations continued in March. In this last recession, however, the inventory monthly change index was one of the first to pass a turning point, for its low point was August 1960. In most previous recessions, inventory liquidations continued to increase until after reductions were made in other rates of decline. Thus, it is indicated that purchasing executives made inventory adjustments earlier in the 1960–61 recession than they had in many previous recessions.

Prices during March remained relatively stable for the third consecutive month, according to the National Business Survey.

With the business upturn now started, these monthly change indexes will undoubtedly show further rises in the coming months. A pattern quite similar to that of 1958 and 1959 may be the result.

NEW ENGLAND

New orders in the New England area showed a greater rate of improvement in March than during any month since January 1960. March was a sharp change from the preceding 6 months, during which time there were 5 months of declines.

Production improved at the greatest rate since July 1960. During the first 3 months of 1961, improvements were shown for 2 of these 3 months.

Employment increased somewhat in the New England area, showing a better performance than any time during the preceding 9 months.

Inventories of raw material were liquidated only slightly. The rate of liquidation was less than any month since April 1960. For the third consecutive month, work-in-process inventories showed an accumulation. Turning points in both of these indexes were reached in December 1960.

Prices increased slightly for the third consecutive month.

DETROIT

The business conditions index for Detroit rose sharply in March, similar to the rise in May 1958, at the end of the 1957–58 recession. This index was higher in March 1961 than during any month since February 1960. Improved automobile sales and pre-automobile strike activity have stimulated business activity in the Detroit area.

Employment declines in March were relatively minor and much less than they had been in late 1960.

Inventories continued to be liquidated by industries, as they have been for the past year.

Prices increased slightly.

CLEVELAND

New orders and production in the Cleveland area increased in March, after having declined somewhat in February and risen in January. Peak rates of decline occurred in both of these indexes in December.

Employment continued to decline, but the rate of decline was less than any of the preceding 6 months.

Inventories were liquidated further, but the rates of liquidation in 1961 were much less than those of late 1960.

Prices increased more than any month since August 1960.

Order backlogs, volume of business, and production all increased in March. This was the first month since January 1960, that any of these indexes registered noticeable strength.

Employment decline was less than any time time during the preceding 6 months.

Inventory liquidation continued, but at a lower rate than during the latter half of 1960. Vendors provided somewhat faster deliveries, with the rate of improvement being the lowest since November 1959.

CHICAGO

Order backlogs were increased in the Chicago area for the first time since December 1959. Production increased, after having declined for the 8 previous months. The employment and inventory declines were less than any month since June 1960. Most of these indexes reached their turning point in October 1960.

Vendor performance improved, with the rate of improvement being less than any month since January 1960.

Prices rose slightly.

PURCHASE POLICY INDEXES

The purchase policy indexes show purchasing executives were making some extensions in their forward commitments. The national indexes for capital expenditures, production materials, and M.R.O. supplies all turned up in March. Each of these indexes reached a turning point in November or December 1960. The regional purchase policy indexes show very little change in the New England and Detroit areas; but, some reductions were made in the Chicago area.

Jazz: A Potent Force for American Diplomacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, from the triumphs which have been scored by the jazz tours of Louis Armstrong, Dave Brubeck, and others, it is obvious that this native American musical form has a valid and important role to play in our cultural exchange programs.

Russ Wilson has been writing a regular jazz column in the Oakland Tribune for the last 5 years. This last year he was honored by a California young men's club for his "invaluable service in promoting jazz in California."

In a recent article, Mr. Wilson points out that Russia has made a bid to hear American jazz. I certainly agree with Mr. Wilson that we should test this invitation thoroughly and make full use of this potent force for American diplomacy. Under leave granted, I include the article, as follows:

REDS' BID FOR JAZZ SHOULD BE TESTED

(By Russ Wilson)

That outright appeal for jazz voiced in Moscow the other day by a distinguished Soviet musician gives our new administration its first opportunity to offer Russia a

chance to hear some of the greatest artists in this field—American jazzmen.

The bid for jazz was made by Leonid Utyosov, 65, whose popularity as an orchestra leader and singer has gained him the award, People's Artists of the Russian Federation. Even though this might equate with second lieutenant, it shows he's a man of some note.

Significantly, Utyosov's statement appeared in the official magazine of the Soviet Ministry of Culture. From all past evidence it seems sure the remarks were printed only after they'd been OK's by the Kremlin; that's the way things work in a dictatorship.

It might therefore be assumed that when Utyosov writes, "We need jazz; there is a demand for it; to make it a forbidden fruit is dangerous and interferes with the education of young people in musical taste" he is indicating a change in government policy which heretofore has opposed this musical form.

If this were not so one wonders why an official publication permitted Utyosov to assert: "Jazz is not a synonym for imperialism and the saxophone wasn't born of colonialism. * * * Good jazz is art and a bad symphony is not art," true though this is.

This Russian is no square; he cites a jazz historian as saying improvisation is the cornerstone of jazz and adds, "A man who has no talent can not improvise." He also discerningly points out that the roots of jazz "go not to bankers' safes but to poor Negro quarters." His ridiculous claim "that so-called Dixieland existed in Odessa before New Orleans" can be written off as party-line boasting—or as a sop that got his other remarks into print.

The important fact about the incident is that the United States has been given a wide open chance to offer jazz-hungry Russians a feast. As was reported here last November, President Kennedy is aware of the popularity of American jazz overseas and its high propaganda value.

Let's hope the wheels start turning. At the least we'll show up the Moscow bid as a phony. And if it should work out that we can send a first-rate jazz unit to Russia—say for example a big band led by Dizzy Gillespie—it will take care of business.

A Welcome Visitor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased and honored to be among the guests at the reception given by the Greek Ambassador for Prime Minister Caramanlis and his lovely wife this week.

As Representative of Lowell, Mass., the Athens of America, the experience was both rewarding and meaningful.

This distinguished visitor to our shores was given an open-armed editorial greeting by the Boston Globe, one which sums up the outstanding job Prime Minister Caramanlis has done for his country. Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert this editorial:

A WELCOME VISITOR

At the invitation of President Kennedy, Premier Constantine Caramanlis, of Greece, will come to the United States Monday. It will be the first visit to these shores by a prime minister of the great maritime nation whose civilization is one of the oldest in the world. It will be a happy visit; Greece today represents one of the clearest triumphs of U.S. foreign policy, so much under fire in recent years.

Greek recovery in the past decade is amazing. Threatened by economic anemia in the postwar years, the country was put on its feet by the Marshall plan. Chewed at by Communist guerrillas supplied by Iron Curtain neighbors, the nation was saved by the Truman doctrine, the heroism of the Government forces, and public pressure applied on the Communist countries through the United Nations. The U.N. denounced the rebel abduction of 20,000 Greek children; and condemned Bulgaria and Albania for assisting the Greek Communists.

With the defeat of the rebels Greece was able to contribute to the cause of freedom. She was one of 16 nations that sent military forces to the U.N. command in Korea. With the death of Stalin and the relaxation of cold war tensions, she was able to reestablish relations with once hostile neighbors. In 1951, with adjacent Turkey, Greece joined NATO.

From 1950 to 1955 the country built its fences at home and abroad. The domestic economy strengthened; the national income grew; merchant shipping increased. During these years, under the premiership of Marshal Alexander Papagos, a youthful Athenian lawyer, married to the niece of a former prime minister, began to distinguish himself. He was Constantine Caramanlis.

The new highways of Greece, familiar to the multiplying number of tourist, are a tribute to his industry. After serving as minister of labor, of transport, of social welfare and national defense, he became minister of public works in 1952. He still held the post when the marshal died, and King Paul turned to him to form the government. He assumed office October 6, 1955.

Since then, he has achieved a balanced budget, a stable currency, a sturdy credit, increased bank deposits, a 50 percent increase in the national economy, and has meanwhile held the cost of living to a 10-percent rise. In Norway in the same time, the cost of living has mounted 15 percent, and in France 30 percent. His 5-year development program is transforming the face of Greece; his foreign trade program is recovering and extending the markets lost in World War II.

Staunch ally of the United States, Greece stands today on a peak of economic achievement that may find the ancient country shaking off historic poverty and raising its living standard under free government to enviable levels. The prime minister is a welcome figure in the United States.

Four-Year House Terms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Gary (Ind.) Post Tribune reveals facts which, if followed through, would greatly improve the efficiency and functioning of our House of Representatives.

A House Member should have a breathing time between elections to devote to legislation and the many added duties saddled on congressional duties during the last 30 years.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the editorial, as follows:

FOUR-YEAR HOUSE TERMS

A Gallup poll shows a majority of the American voters would approve lengthening the term of U.S. Representatives from 2 to 4 years.

The majority is rather substantial, 51 percent in favor of the 4-year term as against only 34 percent opposed, with 15 percent expressing no opinion.

A good many students of government believe the change would be of benefit to the country. Its personal benefit to the legislators themselves of course would be considerable.

The 2-year term presumably makes Representatives more responsive to the will of the voters. Senators serve 6-year terms and thus will act primarily on the basis of their own judgment as issues develop. But House Members must go back to the people every 2 years for a fresh mandate.

Objection is made, however, that the House Members must give so much time to campaigning that they do not have enough to put in on their duties in Washington. In a sense, a Representative must start preparing for the next election just as soon as the ballots are counted on the last one.

This doesn't hold true for legislators in many southern districts, or for some in the North, where one of the major parties is in overwhelming strength. The result is to give such House Members greater authority in its deliberations.

Modern methods of travel should be easing the situation for many legislators. By jet plane, they can give considerable time to affairs back home, and yet not lose many days from their duties in Washington. Yet the result may be that they are expected to give more attention to their home districts, by reason of easier travel conditions, and thus really get no relief from the planes.

In many States, there is a trend toward reducing the number of 2-year offices. That has been done with county government in Indiana, for example. Only 16 of the 50 State Governors now serve 2-year terms; the others all get 4 years.

On the whole, Government probably would be better served if the House membership was elected every 4 years. It would mean a long wait to get rid of a bad Congressman, but it might make us more careful about getting good ones in the first place.

Will Peace Corps Be Too Young?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, Clark Mollenhoff, of Cowles Publications, who is well known for this Washington coverage, has been traveling abroad during the past year and has been submitting some interesting articles for the Des Moines (Iowa) Register and the Des Moines Tribune.

Recently he had some observations about the Peace Corps in which he raised the question about the age of the group to which this program is having its greatest appeal. I found some food for thought in these observations and I would like to share them with the Mem-

bers. We will be called upon one of these days to evaluate this program and we will find some guidelines for doing this in the article by Mr. Mollenhoff.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this article on the Peace Corps in the Appendix of the RECORD:

WILL PEACE CORPS BE TOO YOUNG

(By Clark R. Mollenhoff)

VIENNA AUSTRIA.—The recent return from the Congo of 10 members of an Austrian medical team demonstrates some of the problems the Kennedy Peace Corps may face in helping the primitive people of Africa.

The returning medics reported that the 60-member U.N. medical team that went to the Congo last fall has lost nearly all of its enthusiasm for Africa and that all but 5 members of the team are eager to come home. The group found it could not cope with the problem of protecting itself from malaria and other diseases.

TOO YOUNG TO SEND

The Austrian trade union supporters of the team have not lost their enthusiasm for helping Africans. But at least one of them, Kurt Prokop, is skeptical about sending people in their early twenties into Africa or other underdeveloped countries.

"Africa needs help but it must be from experienced people," Prokop said. "I would say they should be between the ages of 35 and 45—old enough to have had considerable experience but not too old to be able to withstand the physical work involved."

In the last several months this reporter has discussed the Kennedy Peace Corps with dozens of persons in the Middle East, Africa, and Europe, most of them people who have been on the scene trying to help Africans help themselves.

A NOBLE IDEA BUT—

Invariably they started their comments with praise of the noble idea of the Peace Corps. But the skepticism started when questions were asked about the age group that could be used most effectively.

Israel's Minister of Labor, Giora Josephthal, who has had years of experience in sending Israeli teams to Africa, is skeptical about sending pure idealists with no practical experience.

"They must have more than the theoretic experience they would get in college and they must be people who have worked long enough to develop the patience necessary to deal with Africans who tend to be extremely sensitive and even unreasonable," he said.

WHAT MISFIT COULD DO

"The Peace Corps is a fine idea but 1 bad selection can destroy the work of 10 good people," Austrian Minister of Social Administration Anton Proksch said.

"Absolutely not," was his reply when asked if it would be advisable to send people just out of college in the age range from 20 to 25.

These views were echoed by Government officials, trade-union officials, U.S. diplomatic officials and educators with experience in the areas involved. They were not conservatives with built-in reservations about such projects, but in many cases were people of a definite Socialist background.

All agree that there is need for thoughtful work in Africa to offset wel-financed Communist propaganda. But if the warnings of these experienced people were heeded, the whole concept of the Peace Corps work would be changed from a program made up of people in their twenties to one made up of men in their thirties or forties.

HOW WILL THEY LIVE?

In addition, there are a number of practical problems involving food and housing.

The initial idea was to require that the Americans live the day-to-day life of the African. This was to include eating African food and living in African housing.

"It would be impossible for Europeans or Americans to live in the African housing," commented Prokop. "But the program would be defeated before it started if the Americans were to live in a European housing area or off away from the Africans."

Cheaper hotels in the African sections would provide the most practical housing, but such hotels are available only in larger cities.

It would be possible to construct housing of a modest but modern type, but this would not be regarded as roughing it with the natives.

Even if the Peace Corps members get over all of the practical hurdles of age, housing, and health, how long will they be able to endure the hardships of primitive living without complaint when they see the pleasant accommodations provided for Americans attached to embassies in the European sections of African cities?

A Passion for Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Irving J. Fain, chairman of the Commission on Social Action of Reform Judaism, as it appeared in the April 1961 issue of American Judaism, which is the official publication of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations:

A PASSION FOR JUSTICE—ESTABLISHMENT OF THE FIRST JEWISH RELIGIOUS SOCIAL ACTION CENTER IN WASHINGTON REFLECTS THE CONCERN OF REFORM JUDAISM WITH APPLIED MORALITY

(The Emily R. and Kivie Kaplan Center for Religious Action will open this fall in Washington, D.C. The building will house the first social action center in that city established under the auspices of any branch of Judaism. The Washington office will strengthen the programs of the Commission on Social Action, joint body of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations and the Central Conference of American Rabbis, in response to an overwhelming mandate from the 1,000 reform Jewish leaders who attended the 45th General Assembly of the UAHC in Miami Beach, Fla., in November 1959. The Social Action Center will fight injustice by giving voice to the sentiments and translating into action the resolutions taken by the general assemblies of the UAHC and the conventions of the CCAR. The Commission on Social Action comprises, in addition to the UAHC and the CCAR, the following affiliated bodies in Reform Judaism: National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods, National Federal of Temple Brotherhoods, National Federation of Temple Youth, National Association of Temple Administrators, and National Association of Temple Educators. The Center for Religious Action also will serve as the headquarters for the Mid-Atlantic Council of the UAHC, serving Delaware, Maryland, North Carolina, Virginia, and the District of Columbia. In the following article, the chairman of the Social Action Commission of Reform Judaism tells why the center is being set up and what may be accomplished thereby:)

The passion for social justice, which had fired the prophets of ancient Israel, was rekindled by the founders of Reform Judaism. They cherished the faith that Judaism, as a way of life, must help to build a better world here on earth. They dared to believe—and to act on the belief—that Judaism had something vital to say to the great moral problems of society. They insisted that man is the copartner with God in ushering in His Kingdom of Justice here on earth. This divine discontent has helped to make American Judaism dynamic, modern, and relevant to the realities of a changing society. It has helped to make Reform Judaism a potent moral force in American life.

Historians of the future, in charting the dynamic growth of Reform Judaism in America, will list 1961 as a year of decision—a milestone in the life of the movement. For in 1961, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations established the Emily R. and Kivie Kaplan Center for Religious Action in the Nation's Capital to extend the social action program of Reform Judaism.

Concern for social ethics was expressed by the UAHC at every biennial from the beginning in 1873. Similarly, the CCAR spoke out repeatedly against racial, economic, social, and every other kind of injustice. In 1949, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations and the Central Conference of American Rabbis joined together to create a Joint Commission on Social Action to apply the ethical principles of Judaism to the urgent moral issues of the day. That commission has subsequently been enlarged to include the National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods, Brotherhoods, and Youth, as well as the National Association of Temple Educators and the National Assoication of Temple Administrators. Through intensive efforts, the Commisison on Social Action has stimulated the development of social committees in some 300 reform temples to translate the ethical principle of equality, justice, and peace into practice in the life of the community, the Nation, and the world. Such problems as housing, racial equality, interfaith relations, and juvenile delinquency have been dealt with by such committees.

And now this work has been enlarged and a long-nurtured vision has been realized. Made possible by a generous gift of Mr. Kivie Kaplan of Boston, the Washington center was authorized by the overwhelming decision of the delegates of the 1959 biennial assembly of the UAHC in Miami Beach after a long and comprehensive debate. The center will serve as the Washington arm of the national commission on social action, operating within the policies adopted by biennial assemblies of the UAHC and the conventions of the CCAR.

But historians of the future will also note that this major step—as with most milestones in the life of any living movement—was not taken without a measure of opposition and controversy.

Despite the overwhelming approval of the delegates at the UAHC biennial, a few congregations are vigorously exercising their legitimate right of dissent and are seeking to rally opposition to the Washington social action center.

Two congregations have appealed to other Reform synagogues to join them in protesting the acquisition of the center. They have contended that the UAHC is violating the autonomy of member congregations, in presuming to become the voice of Reform Judaism on public issues, and that the center may become a kind of religious lobby in Washington.

At this writing, the protesting congregations are seeking to win support for a special

biennial assembly of the UAHC to reconsider the Washington Center for Religious Action.

Inevitably, the Washington center has become a dramatic symbol of social action. Just as it has evoked enthusiastic commendations from most rabbis and lay leaders, it has also elicited the long-simmering opposition of those who feel that Judaism should not be concerned with social problems, that Reform Judaism should not take stands on such matters as racial segregation or war and peace, and that controversial issues should be avoided by religious institutions. Eyebrows were raised by the statements of the dissenting congregations in view of the obvious fact that the UAHC and the CCAR have historically adopted resolutions on social issues since the founding of these organizations. It was clear that many deeper questions of policy and personality must underlie the opposition to the Washington center, but one question at issue remains: Is it right to adopt a resolution on a social evil at a national convention—but wrong to implement that resolution through a Washington center?

At the same time, enthusiastic commendations have poured in to Judge Emil Baar, chairman of the UAHC board of trustees, from distinguished leaders of all faiths. Christian social action agencies with offices in Washington—including the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the (Protestant) Council of Churches and the Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice—have welcomed the forthcoming cooperation of the Center as a "significant contribution to the national welfare" which will "strengthen the efforts of all denominations and faiths as they join together for a finer nation and a more just and peaceful world." Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Governor Price Daniel of Texas, Rt. Rev. James A. Pike of California, and Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg are among the many prominent Americans who have warmly hailed the center as a "fine achievement" for Reform Judaism.

The center will serve the social action committee of UAHC congregations, federations, and regional councils, along with their sisterhoods, brotherhoods, youth groups, educators, and administrators. This service will range from informational materials about subjects best researched in Washington to suggestions regarding education which might be taken by local and regional social action committees. It will work closely and harmoniously with other Jewish bodies as well as with Christian social action agencies in the Nation's Capital.

Only a sterile movement, mired in its own platitudes, can avoid the clash of varied views. The price of progress in a healthy movement is honest controversy. It is so with the Union of American Hebrew Congregations—and has been so since Isaac Mayer Wise fashioned the UAHC out of 28 congregations in 1873. The years have rung with passionate controversy about ritual ceremonies, Palestine, the move of the UAHC from Cincinnati to New York, the American Jewish Conference, the 10-percent plan of dues payment and a host of other issues. These issues are fought out—sometimes painfully and stormily—and they are resolved in accordance with the democratic process.

And the Reform Jewish movement has gone from strength to strength.

Historians will thus judge the establishment of Reform Judaism's Center for Religious Action. They will also judge that, by that decision, Reform Judaism gave muscle to the ancient but timeless Jewish dream of a just and peaceful world. "It is not incumbent upon us to complete the task. But neither are we free to desist from it."

Burns Creek Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, a few supporters of the Burns Creek project in Idaho would have the Congress believe that everybody in Idaho is in favor of this power project, which is being called a reclamation project.

The following editorial from the North Side News of Jerome, Idaho, is a refreshing revelation that many in Idaho who believe in reclamation do not want this project.

The editorial is as follows:

[From the North Side News, Apr. 13, 1961]

IDAHO CAN MOVE AHEAD WITH RECLAMATION

As viewed from this corner, it is a pity that Idaho's reclamation goals have been placed in such an indefensible position as the Burns Creek project which is designed about 1½ percent for irrigation and 97 percent for public power. In the long run, pushing for such a government handout in the name of reclamation can only injure Idaho which has been developed under the exclusive and preferential privileges of the Reclamation Act.

Representative HALEY, of Florida, emphasized this very point in remarks on the floor last week with these words:

"Congress in its wisdom has put the 17 Western States in a very favored position at great cost to the other taxpayers of the Nation. There is going to come a time if you abuse this privilege which I think you are doing in this project (Burns Creek) when you will lose the preferential status. Do not forget that you are receiving huge subsidies in every respect and if you abuse this privilege, you are going to lose your favored position. You will bring it on yourselves by presenting to Congress projects that are not justified under the irrigation and reclamation laws of this Nation."

Other eastern Representatives attacked Burns Creek from similar viewpoints which should awaken the people of Idaho to a situation. Senator CHURCH admitted that unless this modest project is built cooperatives and municipalities might be forced to purchase supplementary power from private utilities. What a crime that would be. Some preferred customers exerting all the pressure for Burns Creek would have to pay for private power like the rest of us do. They want tax-free power at the expense of the U.S. taxpayer. A nice advantage if you can get it.

The Utah Power & Light has plans for two new coal-fed electrical plants. One in eastern Utah and another near Kemmerer, Wyo., both depressed economic areas. Approximately 500 coal miners at both plants would be employed. Eventually, 5,000 more consumers for Idaho farm produce just a hundred miles away. Without a Government handout to these depressed areas, Congress could stimulate industrial development on a legitimate, taxpaying basis. Does that make sense? Can you name a better method for the Kennedy administration to aid depressed areas without using a single tax dollar?

And then, maybe Idaho and its reclamation leaders could get back on the track. Build the simple $5 million reregulating dam below Palisades as originally planned instead of this $50 million power project. Let's survey our State for genuine reclamation. You do not see the people of the Colorado Basin holding back on account of the farm surpluses. They are going ahead as fast as Congress will let them in the development of new dams that will bring in more land for irrigation in spite of the farm situation. One reason is that by the time these projects are completed over a four-State area, there will be the need for more irrigated farmland.

What are we doing in Idaho for reclamation? Well, we have Burns Creek which won't even qualify. We have old, established tracts such as Richfield without enough water to get through a dry year. Wouldn't a supplementary reservoir on the upper Wood have saved carryover water for such a season? It was only a short time ago that Magic Reservoir spillways were overflowing for a month or more in the spring due to too much water.

What about the Guffy project on the lower Snake? We have literally hundreds of thousands of acres of the finest topsoil on the American Continent south, east, and west of Mountain Home. What is being done to develop it? The replenishment flow of the Snake River alone would take care of thousands of acres of new land if reclamation leaders would tie into such a project as that. The Fremont Dam in the upper Snake Basin has long been declared feasible and practical, but has anyone ever heard of this project?

The longer the Burns Creek project stands in its present form, the more wrath will Idaho stir in the Halls of Congress. We should not build dams to peg the prestige level of some of our politicians or a handful of preferred power users. We should build dams for Idaho that will develop new land and nurture the position this State by geography, climate and soil is best adapted—that of a breadbasket for the booming coastal States and the eastern consumer. That is the historical and basic southern Idaho story. We cannot change it.

A Journey to Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include another in a series of highly interesting and informative articles on Ireland written by the editor and publisher of the Wilkes-Barre Sunday Independent, Mr. Thomas Heffernan, this article having appeared in that newspaper on April 9, 1961. Mr. Heffernan wrote this series of articles following an extensive tour through Ireland last fall.

The indicated article follows:

A JOURNEY TO IRELAND

(By Tom Heffernan)

How would is seem if, about halfway down the first block of Wilkes-Barre's South Main Street there was a wide gate which opened into a courtyard in the midst of the South Main Street stores and about this courtyard were gathered the buildings which provide offices for the city government and perhaps the county government as well?

That's the way it is in Dublin—and in other towns on the other side of the water—and it groups things more conveniently.

Furthermore, since governmental buildings like city hall just about "kills a large segment of a central city block, this disadvantage also is avoided.

In the Irish capital, of course, some of the government buildings have been there for many, many centuries, with Chapel Royal, a feature of the section, having been built right into and made practically a part of famous Dublin Castle, which was built in the year 1100.

There is an incident in connection with Chapel Royal which appeals mightily to Irishmen, too.

Hung within are the portraits of all the Englishmen who served as viceroys to Ireland while the Emerald Isle was under British domination.

There was space for just so many, too.

And, as it happens, when the last space was filed the man who posed for the portrait turned out to be the last British viceroy to Ireland.

You can draw a moral or work up a bit of superstition as you desire.

SUPERMARKET PROVES IRISH HONESTY

Whether it means the average Irishman is more honest, we will not try to presume.

However, nearest thing we saw to a supermarket was in Dunne's store on Grafton Street in Dublin.

It had several big, double doors open to the sidewalk and most of the interior was occupied by a quite conventional type of store.

However, the full length of the lefthand wall was made up of canned goods and such on display in supermarket style, so no clerks were necessary and as in our American markets, you picked up what you wanted.

But where do you think were located the cashiers to whom you took the stuff to be checked and to be paid for? Right by the front door? No. At the extreme rear of the store.

With no one watching to make sure people weren't picking up stuff and walking right out the gaping front doors and hidden on the way by the crowds who filled the place.

Bet you could get away with nothing like that in the land of the free and the home of those who think that condition applies to everything that isn't nailed down.

RANDOM NOTES

The pub at the end of Lord Edward Street is named quite handsomely as Farrelly's Select Lounge. And instead of a sign out front announcing that there is TV inside the card announced "Telephone." Down a couple of blocks, in that baffling European manner, Lord Edward Street was Dame Street. The mailmen must have to be memory experts.

Irish girls are almost 100 percent modest but one and all will hike up their skirts to climb on a motorcycle. The name we know as Walsh was so often spelled "Walshe" and Eagen was "Egan" and Coughlin was "Coughlan." A mighty common name, on Irish business houses at least, was "Campion."

There are mighty few TV aerials in Dublin, none at all in Adare and one between Adare and Limerick. In answer to a question, "Lovely Adare" is about 45 minutes ride from Shannon Airport and it is impossible to imagine a better inn than Adare's Dunraven Arms.

A lot of advertising of coal is to be seen and one brightly lit one, showing a couple sitting before an open fire, read: "Donnelly's Cozyglo Coal." You can have a pocket full of British or Irish coins and still have little if they are those huge pennies, big as a half dollar. Towering Brigitte Bardot hairdos were common in Dublin and most of the girls wearing them were extremely short.

The fat sorrel we rode with the County Meath Hunt outside Dublin was the only hore we rode in Ireland that we coulld get on unassisted. It belonged to a chap named McGee and it was 15 hands 3 inches. Maybe we are prejudiced, but the school kids we saw—most carrying their books in bags which they wore on their backs like knapsacks—seemed as handsome a bunch as we ever had seen anyplace.

The waiter in the fine dining room of the Royal Hibernian did a fast turn by the headwaiter and, as he passed, smiled and said: "The All-America boy." But Donnybrook, where once the fairs were held that became famous for Irish fights, is now, we are assured, a most respectable neighborhood. It is, in fact, a pleasant residential suburb of Dublin. And the airline pilot seated on a stool at the Buttery bar in the hotel sought to interest two girls passing through by assuring them he was Irish as he said, "My name is Higgins." Actually, he was a most pleasant Dutchman.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE GIVES US PROBLEMS

Our stupidity with the various accents used by others who also speak the English language often becomes embarrassing—since we seem almost completely unable to understand any brand of English aside from that used in Luzerne County.

As a result, one day while we were out with the County Meath Hunt—over the beautiful County Meath country which was once "the seat of the Irish kings and the finest land in Ireland—the horse we rode had come in the same trailer as that of a lady member of the group.

To help us, she reminded us that we should look out for her at the end of the day and she would help us get to the proper place.

Some hours later, still trying to help, she came up to us at a moment when the hunt had checked to say what we understood to be that "The horse doctor would be at" a certain crossroad.

We were puzzled, asked her to repeat, understood her to say the same thing and then, trying not to be rude, asked why she was telling us about that.

After her next words we realized that what she was talking about was the "horse tractoh," not "horse doctoh" and by horse tractor she meant what we would call a horse trailer, hitched behind a car or truck.

It's a good thing we don't embarrass easily.

ZEBRA CROSSINGS IN IRELAND, TOO

Just as do England and Scotland, Ireland has its "zebra crossing" at which the pedestrian, crossing the street has the unquestioned right-of-way.

If a person on foot is hit using one of the zebra crossings to get across a street the motorist can only be wrong, no matter what the circumstances.

They are called zebra crossings because they are marked by stripes of white paint.

Kingston also has painted zebra crossings at points near Kingston Corners on Wyoming Avenue.

However, there is a great difference because, in Kingston, there are no provisions whatsoever for the safety of those using these crossing places so that they seem mostly to lull the users into an extremely false sense of security.

Would Award Scholarships for Ability, Financial Need Only

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the pleasure to discuss college scholarships and scholarship programs with Dr. Edward Sandberg, of the faculty of Wartburg College, Waverly, Iowa.

Dr. Sandberg's views are worthy of note and I hasten to call them to the attention of the Members, by including his statement on scholarships in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The statement follows:

[From the Waterloo Courier, July 8, 1960]

WOULD AWARD SCHOLARSHIPS FOR ABILITY, FINANCIAL NEED ONLY

(By Dr. Edwin Sandberg)

Of serious concern to parents and educators alike is the need for many more college scholarships for capable students who might not otherwise be able to attend college. Yet before more scholarships are made available, the gross abuses in the awarding of many of the scholarships now available must be eliminated. If such an attempt is successful, the study involved can help to establish a clear pattern for the endowment of future scholarships.

First in this study should be a careful consideration of the legitimacy of granting any scholarships at State institutions if these scholarships involve a remission of undergraduate fees at such schools.

It must be remembered that every citizen pays taxes to support such institutions in order to keep tuition and fees low, and that this in a sense means that every student at a State institution is on a scholarship. Further remission of fees hardly seems justified on the undergraduate level. Private scholarships are an entirely different matter as are scholarships on the graduate level where these institutions are often the exclusive ones offering advanced programs.

Second should be the decision to award scholarships only to those students who have a demonstrated financial need for such aid. Many scholarships today go to students who come from financially secure families certainly not in need of financial help. It must be remembered that every time such a scholarship is awarded the chances are that a student who may not have scored quite so high, but is of superior mental caliber, is denied the opportunity to attend a particular institution and must look elsewhere or not attend college at all.

There is something grossly dishonest about the practice of parents with adequate finances even encouraging their children to apply for scholarships, and it is absolutely immoral for such people to accept them if offered. Some institutions thrive on the practice of buying students through scholarships—a deceitful use of funds leading to the perversion of the independent spirit of youth and compounding the belief of conformist Americans that the world owes them everything. There is a clear design for a scholarship program which avoids this evil—

the national merit scholarships—for these honor outstanding students but base an award on the need of the individual.

Third, no scholarship should be awarded for other than academic reasons, for this is a very repudiation of the meaning of the word. Athletic scholarships, accordingly, should be given to athletes only when their academic abilities indicate that they can do successful work in college and can make a real contribution to society after graduation. The function of a college is to educate, not to provide entertainment for rabid fans and alumni.

A final consideration is that scholarship programs should not carry so many restrictions as to regions from which students come, areas in which they specialize, lodge affiliations of their fathers, church affiliation, and other narrow requirements. The United States desperately needs leaders in all fields today, and there is only one way in which scholarships can do an effective job in providing such leaders in larger numbers: the awarding of scholarships exclusively on the basis of academic ability and recognized financial need.

California Attorney General Warns of Subversion From Fanatics of the Radical Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Los Angeles Enterprise, Friday, April 7, 1961, in which Attorney General Stanley Mosk expresses views on subversion from the radical right:

ATTORNEY GENERAL MOSK WARNS OF SUBVERSION FROM FANATICS OF THE RADICAL RIGHT

Subversion from the radical right is as dangerous as subversion from the radical left, according to Attorney General Stanley Mosk.

"With Communist activity under close scrutiny by Federal, State, and local governmental agencies, a number of fanatical groups on the extreme right have been springing up in California and other parts of the Nation," the attorney general said. "They must be as closely checked as the Communists, for they are equally dangerous to orderly democracy.

"One of these groups has labeled the last three Presidents of the Uniteed States as willing tools of the Communist conspiracy. Others have impugned the integrity of churches, schools, and other agencies in our society. These scatter-gun attacks achieve no purpose other than to destroy confidence in traditional American institutions."

Attorney General Mosk suggested six tests to ascertain whether an organization is extremist and should be suspect by loyal Americans:

1. Does it attack schools and churches with blanket accusations?

2. Does it attack other traditional American institutions with wild, unsupported charges?

3. Does it label everyone un-American or subversive with whom it disagrees politically?

4. Does it try to rewrite modern history by blaming American statesmen for wars, communism, depressions, and all the other ills of the world?

5. Does it resort to crude pressure tactics by such means as anonymous phone-calling and letterwriting campaigns?

6. Do the spokesmen for the group appear more interested in the size of their money collections than in the principles they purport to espouse?

"Apply those six tests, and you will avoid entangling memberships with and contributions to, such groups as the American Nazi Party, the Communists, the Ku Klux Klan, the John Birch Society, the Cinema Educational Guild, the Moslems, and others of that type," the attorney general advised.

Stock Options: Unfair Tax Advantage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of our colleagues the following article written by Mr. J. A. Livingston which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on April 12, 1961. Mr. Livingston has here taken a jocular approach to what is a very serious problem. It is unfortunate that more publicity has not been centered on this situation. With direct reference to it I intend—within a short time—to introduce a bill which will eliminate the tax advantage which is now unfairly enjoyed by those corporate executives who have access to these options. The bill would make the profits received as a result of the options taxable as income rather than capital gains. The article follows:

HOW TO BUILD UTOPIA WITH STOCK OPTIONS

(By J. A. Livingston)

Contrite, unmitigated, unrepressed confession is ennobling medicine. You feel so superior to your fellow man afterward. That's why I herewith openly and self-consolably acknowledge error in churlishly opposing stock options.

Insistently have I clamored that they were a special form of largesse for executives to escape the burden of high-income taxes. Corporate commanders could get capital gains profits at virtually no risk and pay only 25 percent to the Federal Government.

I even went so far as to remonstrate with corporations which permitted fairy godmother committees to reduce the price of options when stocks declined. How wrong can you get?

On the golf course, if you miss a putt, it counts a stroke against you. Brashly and unsympathetically, I wanted to apply the same rule to executives. A broadminded, far-seeing person is responsible for my conversion—Troy M. Rodlun, a sales promotion man of Washington, D.C.

Give options to stockholders, he suggested to Transamerica Corp. He reasoned: If a company holds on to executives with options, the same sauce can be used on investors, too. The more I thought of this the more I felt it deserved extrapolation.

POLICEMAN'S INCENTIVE

Take the traffic policeman at the plant gate. He's a valued company helper. In the course of a year, he can save thousands of delivery minutes. At Christmas, maybe he gets a present. Every once in a while, someone will hand him tickets to a ball game.

Why not, instead, slip him a stock option? Think of the incentive to move those trucks into and out of the plant faster, and to hell with traffic that doesn't help the company.

But tie a string to the policeman's option. It can be exercised only while he's on the beat. Then he'll grant a suboption to the sergeant, who'll sub-sub it to the captain. Soon incentive will trickle up the whole police force. The company will own the commissioner.

Or, take the stockholder. No holder of a stock option likes to see a stock go down in price. And why do stocks go down? Because some impatient stockholder wants cash. By taking long faithful stockholders into the stock-option club, executives would reduce the floating supply of shares and help themselves to quicker profits on their own stock options.

FOR SUPPLIERS TOO

And let's reverse what happened at Chrysler. There, an executive owned stock in a company that sold door hinges to Chrysler. Why not, instead, give stock options to the door-hinge executives? To cash in on their options, they'd try to keep door-hinge prices down and quality up. In that way, they'd make more money on Chrysler than off Chrysler.

Options to customers would work far more persuasively than trading stamps. In a trice, quality control problems would vanish. Even if the product were a stinker, customers would continue to buy it rather than lose their options.

Options can be used as an incentive on Government officials. As an illustration, so long as stocks kept going up (never down) the chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers could get his pick of stock options out of a hat held by Keith Funston, president of the New York Stock Exchange.

And a group of major companies—United States Steel, Pennsylvania Railroad, the Ford Motor Co., and Consolidation Coal—would extend stock option privileges to the Secretary of Labor so long as wages didn't rise.

CUTTING THE TAX RATE

Options to the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee would depend on a decrease in the corporate tax rate. This is a sure winner, based on the time-tested Chinese laundry principle of no tickee, no washee.

Finally, a special stock option would be meted out to Lewis D. Gilbert, the self-dedicated stockholder, who upsets corporate presidents at annual meetings, to stay away.

I am so ardently converted to stock options that I want to make them as multitudinous as assignats in 18th century France. As I see it, what's good enough for executives of the Generals—Electric, Motors, and Dynamics—is good enough for stockholders, vendors, customers, policemen, et cetera. Adroitly used, Livingston's economic law can become the modern Gresham's law: stock options will drive out stock options.

Man-in-Space Stunt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the Russian man-in-space announcement is shrouded in mystery and has evoked

many questions, so far unanswered. David Lawrence, in his article which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on April 17, brings out some of the discrepancies in the reports that have come from the U.S.S.R.:

DID GAGARIN REALLY ORBIT EARTH?—SEVERAL DISCREPANCIES IN RED REPORTS LEAD TO DOUBTS BY WESTERN OBSERVERS

(By David Lawrence)

Was the Soviet man-in-space stunt, as announced officially from Moscow, a hoax? Granted that something went around the earth, was a man really in it, or did the astronaut merely make a separate flight similar to that which an American airman, Joseph Albert Walker, recently made in an X–15 rocket plane at an altitude of 32 miles?

These questions are being asked by scientists because there are some obvious discrepancies in the boastful account of his trip given by Major Gagarin.

First of all, Gagarin says he was over South America 11 minutes after he started. This couldn't be right, and the tracking data collected by Americans tells the story of his gross exaggeration.

Second, Gagarin says he came down by parachute. It is now being implied by a Russian scientist that the satellite may actually have glided to the earth.

Major Gagarin, in his interview, said:

"While flying over Soviet territory, I saw perfectly great squares of collective farms. It was possible to distinguish between plowed land and grassland."

The Russian major declared he saw all this through portholes, but it isn't clear whether this vehicle had portholes. In fact, Dr. Anatoli A. Blagonravov, a noted Russian scientist, interviewed at Rome at an international space symposium, said at first that there were no portholes in the ship but later declared there were "slits."

Can the human eye really see 200 miles away through portholes or "slits"? It might distinguish large formations such as the lines on the moon, but it seems incredible that Major Gagarin could have seen anything as relatively small as meadows or fields such as he described.

Christopher Shawcross, chairman of the British section of the International Institute of Space Law, is quoted in a Reuters dispatch from London as saying a protest had been launched with the International Aeronautical Federation in Paris against an attempt by the Moscow government to seek registration of the space flight as an altitude record for man. He said the published evidence of the flight was not credible.

Walter Sullivan, a science writer for the New York Times, says in an article published over the weekend:

"Three days after man's first space flight there are still several puzzles concerning the circumstances of the trip. They pertained to its timing, the presence or absence of portholes in the manned capsule and the manner in which the occupant returned to earth.

"The timetable issued in Moscow said the vehicle had reached the sky over South America within 15 minutes. However, there is no point in Soviet territory from which an orbiting vehicle could come close to South America in so short a time."

There's another mysterious aspect. The Daily Worker, a Communist newspaper in London, published an article on the flight before it was officially announced as having happened. The article spoke on April 7 of the flight as having already occurred when it wasn't announced or tracked by American observing stations as in orbit until 5 days later. The Communist newspaper revealed that the astronaut, son of a Soviet plane designer, was under medical care. Later on, Russian scientists in Moscow denied that the earlier flight had occurred.

The Soviets are past masters at deception. It could be that they did have a man in flight and that the stunt failed. Not to be denied their laurels, the Communists may have substituted the experience of one of their highflying airmen, who may have simulated the kind of altitude venture which the American Joseph Albert Walker, achieved with his X–15 rocket plane. The sensations experienced might well have been identical with those encountered by a man in orbit. After all, to go 32 miles into the air might bring exactly the same sensations and perhaps the same view of the earth, and even, perhaps, the same observation of meadows and fields, similar to those exultantly described by Major Gagarin.

It probably is true that the Russians sent a satellite around the earth in 90 minutes. America has done this too. It is also probably true that Major Gagarin went high into the air. But whether he traveled around the earth as claimed, or merely achieved a high altitude in the air remains an unsolved mystery.

Just why would the Russians concoct the story if it isn't entirely true? One answer is that the Communists have no morals—they regard lying as a legitimate device in national and international policies.

Just now it is important for Nikita Khrushchev to divert the attention of the Russian people from their hardships with an appeal to their national pride. History records that the Czars of another era also engaged in huge spectacles, parades and displays to impress the people and cause them to forget or put aside their woes.

The Communists have much to explain. Scientists throughout the world will remain curious. Science has a way of probing into such things. Already the Soviet Government has declined to make its data public. Secrecy is always the refuge of totalitarian governments which do not hesitate to try to fool not only their own people, but the whole world.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

The Polaris Fleet Ballistic Missile Weapon System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, a week ago last Sunday and Monday at the invitation of the Secretary of the Navy I had the pleasure to accompany several Members of this and the other body on a cruise aboard one of our new fleet ballistic missile submarines.

We boarded the U.S.S. *Theodore Roosevelt* at Cape Canaveral, Fla. and continued several miles out into the Atlantic. There we had demonstrated to us the amazing capability of this weapon system. We are indeed fortunate to have this fine submarine and crew on our side. Cmdr. O. H. Perry, the commanding officer, and his crew are outstanding in every respect.

At my request, the Navy liaison has furnished the following unclassified information, which has been cleared for release:

THE POLARIS FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE WEAPON SYSTEM

The U.S. Navy's fleet ballistic missile (FBM) weapon system, became an operational reality on November 15, 1960, when the nuclear-powered submarine U.S.S. *George Washington* (SSBN 598) left Charleston, S.C., to go on patrol with a full load of tactical Polaris missiles. On December 30, 1960, she was joined in her silent domain by the U.S.S. *Patrick Henry* (SSBN 599) also fully loaded with Polaris ballistic missiles. Four more Polaris-firing submarines will join the fleet during 1961: *Robert E. Lee* (SSBN 601), *Theodore Roosevelt* (SSBN 600), U.S.S. *Abraham Lincoln* (SSBN 602), and U.S.S. *Ethan Allen* (SSBN 608). The *Ethan Allen* will be the first of a larger and heavier class of FBM submarines.

THE SYSTEM

Besides the missile itself, the fleet ballistic missile weapon system includes nuclear-powered missile launching submarines, support facilities, and personnel. The system became operational more than 2 years ahead of the original schedule. All phases of the program were brought along in parallel and through interlocking channels designed to have each component ready at the target date.

The first launching of a Polaris test vehicle from a submerged submarine took place on July 20, 1960, about 30 miles at sea off Cape Canaveral, Fla., at 12:39 p.m. e.s.t. Less than 3 hours later, at 3:32 p.m. e.s.t., *George Washington* fired a second Polaris.

The Polaris weapon system development is being managed for the Navy by the Director of the Special Projects Office, Vice Adm. William F. Raborn, Jr. Assisting him is an imposing team of Navy missile experts, major industrial firms, and scientific leaders.

Operational ballistic missile submarines are under the control of the Commander in Chief, U.S. Atlantic Command who exercises his authority through the commander in chief, U.S. Atlantic Fleet and commander, Submarine Force, U.S. Atlantic Fleet.

The Special Projects Office will continue to manage the research and development programs for longer range versions of Polaris missiles, advanced versions of Polaris firing submarines and associated equipment.

THE CONCEPT

With almost unlimited cruising range and with endurance limited only by the crew, the FBM nuclear submarine is capable of extended submerged operation in the international waters of the world which comprise about 70 percent of the earth's surface. Free of the need to surface or extend a snorkel above the surface for continuous operation, FBM nuclear submarines will remain hidden by an oceanic curtain, their locations unknown to any potential enemy. The FBM submarines will at all times be under U.S. control. The Polaris missiles, powered by solid propellant, will be ready for launch within minutes of receiving the command without the need for long countdown. Mobile, hidden, ready for instant action (or carefully considered delayed action), the FBM system will provide the United States a powerful deterrent to those who might start a global war.

THE MISSILE

Polaris, named for the North Star, is a two-stage ballistic missile powered by solid fuel rocket motors and guided by a self-contained inerital guidance system independent of external commands or control. Propellant is basically a polyeurethane compound with light metal additives for higher specific impulse.

The 1,200 nautical (1,380 statute) mile range operational missile is designated Polaris A–1. It is about 28 feet long, about 4½ feet in diameter, and weighs about 30,000 pounds. Each motor exerts thrust through four nozzles in the motor base. Thrust vector (direction control) is exercised by devices called jetavators. Both motor cases are made of steel.

Flight tests of the second generation Polaris A–2 missile began on November 10, 1960. Polaris A–2 will have a range of 1,500 nautical (1,740 statute) miles. The second-stage motor is made of wound fiberglass, and the first stage motor is about 30 inches longer than on Polaris A–1. The solid propellant used in the longer range missile has a higher specific impulse than its predecessor. Polaris A–2 is expected to be operational by early 1962.

Future development of a Polaris A–3 will give the missile a 2,500 nautical mile range.

MISSILE GUIDANCE

The inertial guidance system used in Polaris is a refinement of earlier inertial systems and is the smallest in use in U.S. ballistic missiles. Using extremely precise gyroscopes, accelerometers and its own electronic computer, the guidance system puts the missile on correct course at the time of launch. Should the missile be moved off course by high winds or other effects, the guidance system automatically computes a new correct course and puts the missile on it. The guidance system also maintains the stability of the missile in pitch, yaw, and roll planes. At the precise instant required, the guidance system shuts off the rocket motors and triggers separation of the reentry body from the missile. The reentry body then follows a ballistic trajectory to the target.

THE FBM SUBMARINE

FBM submarines of the *George Washington* class are about 380 feet long with a beam of about 33 feet and displacement of about 5,900 tons. *Ethan Allen* class submarines will be about 410 feet long and displace about 6,900 tons. Both classes are driven by steam turbines powered by water-cooled nuclear reactors. Both classes carry 16 Polaris missiles stowed in 8 pairs of vertical launching tubes in the space immediately behind the sail. Each submarine has a 300-ton capacity air-conditioning plant. FBM submarines are also equipped with air scrubbers and precipitators to remove irritants from the air and maintain the proper balance of oxygen, nitrogen, and other atmospheric elements. Electrolytic oxygen generators under development will permit the submarine to manufacture its own oxygen from sea water.

NAVIGATION

Two positions must be known for success in missile launching: target and launcher. In the FBM system this puts great importance on navigation since the position of the launcher is the position of the ship and is continuously changing. Several methods complement each other in the FBM submarine to provide a very high order of accuracy in determining ship's position. Heart of the system is the ship's inertial navigation system (SINS), a complex system of gyroscopes and accelerometers which relates movement of the ship in all directions, ship speed through the water and over the ground, and true north to give a continuous report of ship position.

Each submarine has three SINS, each checking on the other. Systems similar to the SINS used in FBM submarines guided the *Nautilus* and *Skate* on their historic voyages beneath the polar ice in 1958 and, more recently, *Triton* on her 84-day underwater cruise around the world. The converted Mariner class cargo ship, U.S.S. *Compass Island* (EAG 153), serving as navigation test ship has steamed well over 100,000 miles in development tests of the submarine navigation system. A number of equipments are included in the submarine navigation system to provide an all weather capability of checking on the accuracy of SINS. These include both optical and electronic devices. All are highly automated.

FIRE CONTROL

The fire control system feeds coordinated information to the missile guidance system as to ship location, local vertical, true north, target location, and trajectory to be flown. Corrections are supplied until the instant of fire. The fire control mechanism can prepare missiles for launch at the rate of about one per minute.

COMMUNICATIONS

Radio communication with submerged submarines has been possible for a number of years. The systems used have been devised with special care to protect the locations of the submarine and leave the advantage of concealment unimpaired. Recent tests have again demonstrated that the Navy's worldwide communication system has the power and coverage necessary to exercise command of the always-submerged FBM submarines.

LAUNCHING

Polaris missiles are launched by an air ejection system which forces the missile from its launching tube and propels it up through the water to a point above the surface. At that point the rocket motor ignites and sends the missile on its way. The system takes advantage of the reliability and instantaneous ignition characteristics of solid propellant fuel used in Polaris. The result is increased safety for submarine and crew. Each launching tube has its own air supply and is independent of the other 15 tubes. Vital parts of each missile are accessible for inspection and maintenance even when loaded in the launching tubes and while the submarine is underway at sea.

PERSONNEL

Each FBM submarine has two crews, called Blue and Gold, of about 100 men and officers. The crews will alternate on the long patrols with the off-duty crew employed in training ashore at specially designed team training simulators.

TRAINING

The average precommissioning training period for FBM personnel is about 8 to 12 months. Initially training was conducted by the factories supplying the equipment, but the Navy now has its own training facilities. After pretraining in transistor theory, digital computing theory, Boolean logic, and electronic circuitry, FBM personnel get an intensive and extensive equipment training course. Maintenance instruction culminates in a course devoted to the functioning of the entire weapon system.

SUPPORTING FACILITIES

Support facilities include missile testing sites, naval shipyards, submarine tenders, an experimental test firing ship and a navigational test ship.

Chief testing site is the Atlantic Missile Range, Cape Canaveral, Fla. The Navy complex includes three launching pads, a missile assembly building, missile checkout building, engineering building, and associated supply and maintenance buildings and shops. Two of the launching pads are conventional flat pads and the third is the unique ship motion simulator which mounts a submarine-type launching tube in a 200-ton hydraulic device which can simulate all the motions of a ship at sea.

U.S.S. *Observation Island* (EAG 154) experimental missile test firing ship is based at Port Canaveral. The ship, a post-World War II Mariner class cargo ship modified extensively to serve as a firing test ship, has a complete submarine-type fire control, navigation, and launching system. The ship serves as both a floating launch complex for missile flight testing and as a working example of the kind of installation which could be placed aboard surface ships. *Observation Island* has served the additional role as floating school for training FBM submarine crews and will be the seagoing link between the Atlantic Missile Range and FBM submarines when they visit the cape for training with live test vehicles.

Flight tests of Polaris are conducted at Cape Canaveral. Other tests on various parts of the missile have been conducted at Point Mugu, Sacramento, San Francisco, and China Lake in California, at San Clemente Island off the California coast, and in Carderock and Cumberland, Md.

Among naval shipyards being equipped to meet the special requirements of the FBM submarines are Portsmouth, N.H., and Charleston, S.C.

A Naval Weapons Annex at the Naval Ammunition Depot, Charleston, has been commissioned to serve as a missile assembly and loading point. Here completed sections and subsystems of the missile, including motors, controls, guidance, etc., are being received from contractor plants, assembled, checked out and stored or loaded aboard FBM submarines.

The submarine tender U.S.S. *Proteus* (AS 19) has been commissioned and will be able to provide supplies, service, and all but major repairs to the FBM submarines. This includes supplying missiles and loading them into submarines. A second tender, yet unnamed, is under construction.

American Policy in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix an editorial entitled "The Blank Check." This editorial appeared in the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star, April 15, 1961.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BLANK CHECK

Not since the unlamented days of Dean Acheson have the Communists been given a blank check such as that written for them this week by President Kennedy.

The precise words from the President were, "There will not be under any conditions an intervention in Cuba by the U.S. Armed Forces."

There can be no higher U.S. authority to which Fidel Castro or Nikita Khrushchev might look for an explanation, or a softening, of this statement. Even Acheson spoke as Secretary of State when he committed the blunder which brought the Red invasion of Korea.

Try as we might, we could find no other comment by the President in his latest news conference which qualifies this bald statement. His words are plain, clear, and easily understandable. They were reported exactly and in the same context by reliable newsmen and news services who were at that conference.

Perhaps the full implication of what he said was not realized by the President, and has not yet been fully appreciated in official Washington. He said the United States will take no action with its Armed Forces in Cuba "under any conditions." Without changing the meaning or the context, the President's statement can be rephrased, "Regardless of what Castro, the Communists, or any other nation does in Cuba, the United States will not act to protect its interests."

Does the President mean that U.S. Marines will not defend the base at Guantanamo, even if the Castro-led Reds attack that American installation? Can Castro's air force, furnished with aircraft and weapons from behind the Communist Iron Curtain, attack U.S. Navy ships and planes without fear of attack?

Can Russia proceed to erect rocket bases in Cuba, unhindered by any action on our part? Will bland disregard of Cuban affairs be the official policy of this country henceforward in the Caribbean?

These are not idle or speculative questions. These are matters of direct concern to the United States in its relationship with Cuba, and with the allies Castro has chosen for the Cuban people. These questions do not deal with remote possibilities, but with pressing probabilities which can be turned into ugly realities on the shortest kind of notice.

Again, we must reemphasize what the President said. The United States will not intervene in Cuba "under any conditions." While he followed this statement with an involved commentary on various Cuban affairs, the heart of his position is that Cuba and its Red allies can do anything they like with impunity. The Armed Forces of the United States will not be used to check them, or to protect this country should action be required in Cuba.

This is the strangest kind of position for the President to take. Less than 3 weeks ago, he was discussing use of American Armed Forces in Laos, halfway around the globe from this country. Suddenly, he pledges the Reds immunity to the use of force "under any conditions" regardless of what they may choose to do only 90 scant miles away from the continental United States.

Is this the new Kennedy peace program? Is this unilateral disarmament in a specific area? What, pray tell, did the President really have in mind?

There was triumph in the councils of Fidel Castro and his Red conspirators when this statement was heard. Here is proof from the President that the Yanquis do not dare set foot in Cuba "under any conditions." This is what Fidel boasted of before, and will gloat about in the future.

It must be pointed out that the American people had to pay in blood, tears, and treasure when the Reds filled in the blank check handed them in Korea by Dean Acheson. Must we make the same kind of payment in Cuba?

Mounting Taxes in Pennsylvania Together With the Recent Proposal To Tax the Proceeds of Life Insurance Policies Are Regarded as Detrimental in Attracting New Industries and a Callous Disregard for Widows, Children, and Elderly Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it is a well-established fact that many Northern States and especially Pennsylvania have suffered from the competition for industrial expansion offered by other States whose guarantee of low taxes has proved to be no idle boast. Annually the flight of industry from tax-ridden States has proved a thorny problem to States like Pennsylvania whose industrial areas are to a great extent among the major distressed areas of the Nation.

The following editorial titled, "The Big Taxers," from the April 8, 1961, issue of the Altoona (Pa.) Mirror reveals the tax situation in Pennsylvania and the dismal future confronting the already overburdened taxpayers of the great Keystone State:

THE BIG TAXERS

Governor David L. Lawrence is making sure his administration will be long remembered by Pennsylvanians. It will be remem-

bered as 4 years in which State taxes were raised more than by any other administration in the history of the Commonwealth. It also will be remembered as the 4 years in which fewer people knew how the taxes were spent.

There isn't much that can be done about the Governor. He is an aged man, too old perhaps ever to be elected to another public office, so perhaps he need not care if the pension provisions that politicians have a way of devising for themselves are generous enough. There are, however, ways in which those who have voted for these tremendous tax increases can be remembered and dealt with by the voting public.

The 2-cent-per-gallon gasoline tax increase, the increase in the sales tax, the numerous other increases in State taxation during the Lawrence administration have been passed by the members of the Pennsylvania House and Senate. Isn't it about time the voters began to make a list of those who have voted for these raids on voters' pocketbooks and make a firm resolve never to put them in a place of public trust again?

Naturally it is a little disturbing to vote them out of office at local levels and then find them appointed to higher paying State jobs, but a change in administration at Harrisburg can solve a lot of that type of problem.

When Davy was running for office he promised time and time again that he would do something to restore jobs to those who were out of work in this State. He has done something about the lack of jobs all right—jobs have decreased month by month since the first 6 months he has been in office.

High taxes and the threat of even higher taxes yet to come have kept industries on the outside looking in. Despite the best efforts of communities, the help of a special branch of the State government known as PIDA and a number of other factors, the plain fact is the horses just are not drinking Pennsylvania water. Hundreds of prospects have been developed and interviewed, but relatively few have located here.

The newest plan to put life insurance payments into inheritance tax brackets is one that really will keep them out. Most owners of industry must carry sizable life insurance programs to keep the businesses they build up from being sold by the tax collector at the time of death. More often than not the bulk of the money in big life insurance programs goes to perpetuate the business and the jobs it provides by paying off the inheritance taxes on stock of which the owner died seised.

In smaller estates life insurance has been the safeguard of the widows and children. Tax it and you make the State a much less desirable place in which to live and work and do business.

The more business and industry are taxed and kept out of the State by high taxation and the more unemployment that develops from this situation, the higher the taxload becomes on those who are left at work and doing business. It seems quite probable that even sixth grade students could understand this situation. Why, then, is it so impossible for mature men, and especially those who seek and obtain public office to find it so hard to understand?

The Governor has been accused by many of his political foes as spending too much time outside the State. Perhaps he is just looking for a place to live in retirement that will leave for his heirs a little of the money he has collected as salary from the taxpayers of this State.

High tax States for a number of years have been losing a good percentage of their senior citizens of means to States where a more intelligent approach has been found in the matter of estate taxation. This robs the State of their guidance during some of the best years of their lives, it takes away revenues that would have been derived from a more reasonable tax approach and adds materially to the unemployment problems of the State, since many of these senior citizens of means are good employers and good customers during their golden years.

A tax on life insurance will cause quite an exodus of the older citizens of Pennsylvania who have other plans for their insurance benefits than keeping defeated politicians in high-paying State jobs. Establishing legal residence outside of Pennsylvania is not a complicated matter. It could develop into a serious situation for the Commonwealth.

Patriotic Principles of Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, last evening I had the pleasure of attending the national defense evening program of the 70th Continental Congress of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution at Constitution Hall. At this meeting Mrs. Wilson K. Barnes of Baltimore, Md., national chairman of the NSDAR's National Defense Committee, presented a very eloquent address calling for a return in this country to those patriotic principles of Americanism which have played such a vital role in making the United States the most enviable and the greatest nation in the world.

I know of no more patriotic, liberty-loving organization in this country than the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, and I commend the membership of this fine organization for its consistent stand in favor of preserving liberty and reawakening the American people to the importance of patriotism and sound government policies.

Mr. President, I feel that Mrs. Barnes' address of April 18, 1961, merits the attention of every Member of this body, every Member of the House, and every person in this country; I ask unanimous consent that her address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In bringing you the greetings of the national defense committee, I am mindful of those hundreds of devoted members of this committee throughout our country who are laboring against great odds to restore the spiritual and moral fiber of our people. We have been too busy while we concentrated on building skyscrapers, splitting the atom, and conquering space—to build men. We have ceased to build Americans.

Centuries ago man invented a power greater than nuclear energy—the power of government. Individual citizens can wield this power for their common good, or they can surrender it to the State for their ultimate enslavement. The pages of history tell us that self-government is the only safe repository of freedom and whenever the people have relinquished this power to the State, a nation has fallen.

Five thousand years of reaching out for full expression of human aspirations in a free society culminated in the American dream—the spiritually thwarted and politically oppressed who fled their homeland for this land of hope and opportunity placed security of liberty far above paternalistic protection of their property under tyranny. They held to the principle that man is created with God-given rights and corresponding responsibilities. Today, however, the ominous cloud of so-called world understanding begins to darken the horizon of our freedoms.

The problems which confront the American people are manifold. Legislation proposed in Congress and the State legislatures is fraught with peril to those who are determined to preserve the liberties provided in our Bill of Rights and Constitution, sealed with the blood of the men who fought in every war since the foundation of this country to save our American heritage for their children.

We must alert our fellow Americans to the dangers that confront us. Many still do not believe, in spite of the fact that the United States is ringed and riddled by Communist forces, that communism is the greatest menace our country faces today. Some have never heard of metropolitan government and the death it would bring to local governments elected by the people. Others are brainwashed by pamphlets and courses of study supplied for their enlightenment by organizations many of whose members use them as a front for socialism and who themselves are affiliated with Communist fronts.

There is perhaps only a little one person can do to alert our people to the fact that in 5 years' time or even less the takeover of our country by subversion may be complete. This catastrophe would be accelerated by current appeasement of the Communists and by proposals for complete disarmament which would ultimately abolish even the Military Academy at West Point and the Naval Academy at Annapolis. With our country's credit endangered by reckless expenditures of money both abroad and at home and by the undermining of our children's love of country by the advocates of world government, the ultimate purpose of the Communists to enslave our people is being rapidly accomplished.

It is no longer possible in most instances to bring the true facts of our danger to the public through the press, radio or television. It is, therefore, necessary to rely on private sources of information including such publications as U.S. News & World Report, Dan Smoot Reports, Human Events, National Review, Counterattack, Inform, the DAR Monthly Mailings, and similar publications to determine the truth of daily events. Not only do many newspapers not furnish accurate accounts of world happenings but our leaders in government service are being muzzled, their warnings silenced.

The greatest good that our country can do the free nations of the world is to be and remain strong, spiritually, militarily, and materially. Here, upon this soil, because of freedom from regulation, our ancestors carved out of the very wilderness itself, without foreign aid, a great empire built upon the principles of freedom, equality, and justice. Our Government was proclaimed to be a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, whose just powers were derived from the consent of the governed. This freedom, so dearly bought, was not won in a day but the lessons learned in its winning should be instilled in those who would claim the right to nationhood. Freedom cannot be bought; it must be earned.

Some persons have called the position of the national society, DAR isolationist. Have they ever considered that true isolationists are those persons, who, by their ill-con-

sidered plans, have alienated from this country the best friends it had? What has happened to Syngman Rhee and the many other rulers of countries friendly to the United States, who are now either refugees from their countries or are now frowned upon by the liberal element in this country? Has our foreign aid, so generously given to the point of almost bankruptcy, won this country any friends? What about the neutral nations—is our influence waxing or waning with them in the United Nations? What has happened to our former friends in South America? In the hour of crisis, in spite of our largess and desire to be all things to all people, America will stand alone as she very nearly does now and will do unless she returns to her faith in the principles of government which made her great.

Yes, it is easy to believe in world government. The human heart yearns for peace and surcease from the troubles that beset us. How wonderful it would be to wake up one morning and be told that war would be no more. That one could travel freely from one end of the world to the other. That the imprisoned nations of the earth were again free. That our children could plan their lives and all people everywhere fulfill their yearned-for aspirations. This promise was as nearly fulfilled as anywhere in the world in these United States, because our people knew the secret of freedom—a system of checks and balances, knowing well that that government is best which governs least. The character of a world government, represented today in essence by the United Nations, is reactionary—a return to absolutism and totalitarianism so abhorred by those who for generations have fled from the tyrannical governments of the Old World. There is nothing to check the absolute power of world government, its decrees, its judgments; its legislative acts are final. Nations such as Soviet Russia do not abide by United Nations decrees except when it suits them, but nations who live by moral standards seek to abide by its regulations. Thus, we have noted that the United States picked up the tabs for the international police force and is contributing large sums for the Congo.

Americans who understand the foundations upon which liberty was erected realize that a world order is the greatest enemy of individual freedom, not a means to achieve it. True freedom depends on local self-Government, on effective access of the people to their individual rights and not on a distant and powerful world Government. The heirs of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln know that society is improved by the individuals who compose it, not by forcing a program of social reform down its throat. True freedom cannot be reached by climbing the steps of the welfare state.

Within the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and Bill of Rights lies the greatness of our past and hope for the future. These great documents encompass the rules and regulations of human happiness. Americans should read and study them, understand and live by them. Let us declare our independence from a pseudophilanthropic Government. Let us recapture the knack of being Americans. Then our people will labor for what they want, experience a pride of accomplishment and feel a security which centralized social insurance cannot supply.

Fellow Americans, let us take up our responsibilities and rule, owing no debt of gratitude to a bureaucratic Government. Let us see that our Government obeys us.

Some people say it is controversial to be patriotic; if that is so, then we need more controversy in America. Some say it is sentimental to express love of country; then we need more sentimentality. Some say it is old fashioned to respect the American flag, and if that is true, we have a great need for more old-fashioned people in the United States.

The active enemies of freedom in our country probably number no more than 2 percent of the population. And yet, by constant, crafty effort, they have planted the idea far and wide that there is something a little funny about any outward show of patriotism.

We do not hear the national anthem and other patriotic songs on the air very often. We rarely witness mass recitals of the pledge of allegiance to the flag on occasions where nothing could be more appropriate. We do not find nearly enough patriotic programs on radio and television—although our adversaries have no difficulty in getting their ideas aired. We hear that some patriotic programs we have enjoyed in the past find there is no longer a place for them.

We are wrong—dead wrong—to let the active opponents frighten or ridicule us away from demonstrations of our patriotism. Every American should have a feeling of pride in his heart at any opportunity to tell the world how he feels about this land of the free.

This is the country, let us remember with deep gratitude that gave first consideration to the individuality of man, his hunger for freedom, his faith in himself and his God, and his desire for the expression of this divinely endowed impulse. It is a proud and joyful thing to be an American, and Americans should take pride and joy in expressing their patriotism.

Here is what we must say: "You shall not take our freedom away. Nor shall you, by mockery or deceit, cause us to hesitate to take the course of thinking right—talking right—for America."

Our ancestors produced a great Republic. Let us keep it.

Secretary Ribicoff on Highway Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, for several years now the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, first through the Special Subcommittee on Traffic Safety and now through the Subcommittee on Health and Safety, has been conducting a study of highway accidents, which account for nearly 40,000 deaths and more than 4 million injuries annually in the United States.

On April 17, in connection with hearings on H.R. 903 and H.R. 1341, bills relating to motor vehicle safety, the Subcommittee on Health and Safety heard a very interesting and constructive discussion of the highway safety problem by the Honorable Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. I wish to include this statement in the RECORD for the information of Members interested in this tremendously important problem. Secretary Ribicoff, who made a great contribution to highway safety as Governor of Connecticut, is one of the leading authorities in the country on this problem and I urge all who are working in this field to study his statement, which follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, thank you for inviting me to present the views of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on the subject of the Federal responsibility and capability to assist in reducing the tragic annual toll of highway accidents. On this subject, I am sure we shall find a high degree of unanimity of opinion between this committee and my Department.

The almost 40,000 needless deaths in highway accidents cause the loss each year of almost 1½ million man-years of productive activity. These losses drastically reduce the productive capacity of this Nation. While these deaths exact high costs, in both human and economic terms, they fade almost into insignificance when we consider the traffic injuries to over 4 million persons every year. A large percentage of these victims are in, or are approaching, the potentially most useful years of their lives. The sudden removal of this great number of people is a recurring and continuing disaster.

The accident prevention activities of the Department have largely been centered in the Public Health Service. However, other major bureaus of the Department have a very real interest in reducing the number of deaths and injuries from accidents.

For example, the interest of the Children's Bureau in accidental deaths and injuries is assured since accidents are the most important cause of death and disability in children. Much of the excellent services rendered by the fine staff of the Children's Bureau in saving the lives and improving the health of children are erased by motor vehicle accidents.

The Office of Vocational Rehabilitation has a significant stake in accident prevention. Many of their activities are devoted to attempts to partially compensate for permanent disabilities induced by traffic accidents.

The financial burdens of the Social Security Administration are magnified by the mounting welfare costs directly associated with unemployability because of auto accidents.

Fortunately, the nucleus of an accident prevention program (four people in all) was established in the Public Health Service in the early fifties.

For a number of years the rate of growth was small. In 1956 the budget for this activity was in the neighborhood of $50,000.

The first basic research grant for accident prevention was made in 1951.

In 1957 the Public Health Service, together with the American Public Health Association, and other professional groups began to see more clearly the responsibility of the Public Health Service, State, and local health agencies, physicians, and their professional allies in traffic accident prevention.

Recognition of this responsibility, once achieved, has resulted in strong support from Congress and the professional groups involved. For example, in fiscal year 1961, Congress added a million dollars to the appropriation for the activities of the Division of Accident Prevention.

At the same time a decision was made to transfer the administrative aspects of basic research grant management in the field of accident prevention to the Bureau of State Services. This responsibility has been delegated to the Division of Accident Prevention.

Expansion of accident prevention activities both in research and application has quickly followed.

The total staff of the Division of Accident Prevention now numbers 122. Of this total, 34 are engaged primarily in traffic accident prevention activities.

The number of basic research grants in accident prevention rose to a total of 33 in 1961, of which 23 were concerned with re-

search in various aspects of traffic accident prevention.

A few examples of current traffic accident prevention activities alone, conducted by the Public Health Service during 1961 will suffice to illustrate the broad scope and extreme complexity of this acute health and safety problem:

I. Application:

(1) A National Conference on Driving Simulation was held in California in February 1961. Jointly sponsored by the Automotive Safety Foundation and the Department of Commerce, it served to develop a consensus concerning the need for simulation devices.

(2) In Pittsburgh, Pa., in May 1961 a similar workshop on "alcohol and driving" will be held to bring together all available knowledge concerning the relationship of alcohol and traffic accidents. Cosponsored by the National Institute of Mental Health and the Division of Accident Prevention, five regional conferences of experts were held to prepare grist for the mill.

(3) The national seat belt campaign, jointly sponsored by the Public Health Service, American Medical Association, and National Safety Council, achieved its initial success when the five leading American manufacturers of automobiles agreed to install attachment points for front seat belts in 1962 models.

(4) The Connecticut accident prevention study, is making a notable contribution to the development of better scientific research methods in identifying the basic, underlying causes of traffic accidents.

It would be too time consuming to go into detail concerning many other traffic accident activities that have resulted from congressional action. A partial listing follows:

(a) Driving simulation feasibility studies.

(b) Films on seat belts.

(c) Participation in the action programs of the President's Committee for Traffic Safety and the National Safety Council.

(d) The development of cooperative activities between the State motor vehicle administrators, State health officers, and State medical societies through national and regional conferences.

(e) A saturation publicity program in Cleveland, Ohio, in cooperation with the Greater Cleveland Safety Council.

II. Research:

(1) Automotive crash injury research, $118,242.

(2) Experimental case studies of traffic accidents, $86,081.

(3) Causes of auto accidents of adolescent drivers, $30,782.

(4) Evaluating highway traffic safety motion pictures, $14,894.

(5) Accident inducing characteristics of motor vehicles, $84,953.

(6) Research on fatal highway collisions, $159,332.

(7) Safety devices for automotive vehicles, $15,111.

(8) Driving behavior and traffic accidents, $19,610.

(9) Human factors in traffic safety, $9,210.

In addition, there were several other research projects directly related to traffic accident prevention research, as well as several others of broader interest.

The greatest problem currently besetting the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Public Health Service, and the Division of Accident Prevention is making a determination of how best to allocate the personnel, funds, and other resources currently available in the face of what at times appear to be overwhelming demands.

The greatest asset to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in assuming its rapidly expanding role in traffic accident prevention has been the friendly, helpful, and always cooperative attitude exhibited by other Government agencies, with a longer history in traffic accident prevention; the National Safety Council; and other equally well-known voluntary and professional organizations.

Truly, the traffic accident prevention effort has been and, I am confident, will continue to be a genuinely cooperative and mutually stimulating operation.

WHAT THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE CAN DO IN ACCIDENT PREVENTION

Accidents and accidental injuries and deaths have been an integral part of living since the days of primitive man.

As long as man is fallible and human environments continue to provide accident hazards (as they always will) accidents undoubtedly will continue to plague us.

However, a nation which has succeeded in reducing so dramatically the threat of once widespread infectious diseases cannot in good faith reject the challenge to mobilize these same scientific resources to lower the currently large and for the most part unnecessary toll of accidental deaths and injuries.

Past efforts to render human environments less hazardous have not been without success. Such efforts have been particularly fruitful in the case of large industries. Efforts will continue unabated to improve the safety of the environment.

However in the past much less attention has been paid to the importance of human factors in accident causation—to the importance of physical (i.e., vision and hearing); psychological (i.e., moods); and physiological (i.e., drugs and alcohol) factors which so strongly affect people who drive automobiles. This is a phase of accident prevention the study of which is peculiarly fitted to the talents of physicians, public health workers, and their professional allies.

A much better understanding of these factors, based on sound research is essential if the control of accidents is ever to be placed on an effective and truly scientific basis. For example, it is obvious that some people can work, live, and play safely in environments containing many potential accident hazards. It is equally obvious that other people have an unduly large number of accidents in environments containing relatively few accident hazards.

Accident prevention, a complex problem, cannot be solved by the use of signs, placards, and post cards. This has been proven.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is taking the first steps along this research trail the end of which will be the production of lifesaving knowledge which can be applied in every city, town, and hamlet in this country.

RESEARCH

The Cornell crash injury research project in which the Public Health Service cooperated, serves as an excellent example of how research can translate basic research facts into an applicable system of knowledge.

Last month the application phase of this research project culminated in an agreement by the five leading American manufacturers of automobiles to install attachments for seat belts in the front seats of all cars sold in 1962.

Such researches are costly. They are time consuming. They require the recruitment of significant numbers of talented researchers who are dedicated to the accomplishment of a single purpose.

Similar applicable knowledge can be obtained through research involving a multiplicity of factors, both environmental and human, which are the basic causes of many of the 90,000-odd deaths from accidents each year.

The research grant program of the Public Health Service is expanding. As it expands, it will encompass an ever-broadening range of traffic accident research problems with equally applicable results.

Just a few selected examples of needed research will help to pin down this point:

(a) What are the minimum skills and abilities that are needed to safely operate a modern passenger car? No one knows. No one has attempted to find out in a systematic way.

(b) What effect do drugs, fatigue, and alcohol have on driving efficiency? There have been a lot of intelligent guesses but few, if any, truly objective determinations.

(c) Which, of the 250 identifiable psychological factors, contribute significantly to automobile accidents? No one knows. Several researchers have made a small beginning in researching small facets of this problem.

(d) Are elderly people being arbitrarily deprived of their driving privileges because of opinion rather than fact? No one can say definitely until basic research in this area is done.

The Public Health Service intends to pursue such research leads as these as rapidly as possible in order to build a foundation of fact for law enforcement.

Today the Public Health Service has no facilities for conducting intramural research in accident causation similar to the intramural research facilities that are available to other national research centers such as the National Institutes of Health. As soon as possible such facilities will be provided not only because of their stimulating effect on research efforts outside the Government, but also because of their training value for young men and women interested in a career in accident prevention research.

Oftentimes before basic research findings can be applied for the purpose of saving human lives an intermediate step is needed; namely, applied research. The breadth of the accident research problem, its depth and scope, suggest the necessity of greatly increasing the number and types of applied research projects which are so essential to the application of newly won basic knowledge.

There is the problem of attracting, and maturing, a growing number of highly qualified research workers in the field of accident prevention. A technique found very useful and productive by other Institutes has been their program of research fellowships. It is planned that accident prevention research fellowships will be provided to insure steady flow of qualified researchers into the ranks of those who dedicate their lives to finding the true causes of highway accidents.

SIMULATION

No discussion of research, no matter how brief, could be considered complete without at least passing mention of the need for the development of "simulation" devices as tools for research workers who wish to study the effect that human factors have on accident causation.

It is dangerous to experiment with drivers of automobiles in actual driving situations. Such a process is also extremely costly since a traffic accident only occurs about every 60,000 miles of travel. Therefore it is essential to support the developmental research required to permit the construction of several prototype simulators so that drivers can be studied under controlled conditions, in safe environments, thus avoiding the expensive nationwide epidemiological network that might otherwise be necessary (if it were feasible).

In addtion to supporting the construction of several prototypes of "true" simulators in which the driver has the illusion of almost complete reality, there also is a necessity to support the developmental research involved in producing "part-task" simulators which can produce valuable and needed information in such limited areas of driver interest

as vision, hearing, reflexes, etc. However, the validity of the research findings of "part-task' simulators can only be validated by checking out samples of their research findings on a "true" simulator.

At the recent workshop held in Santa Monica, Calif., on the subject of simulation (this conference was jointly sponsored by the Automotive Safety Foundation, Public Health Service, and the Bureau of Public Roads), there was a remarkable unanimity of opinion concerning the need for producing a faithful simulation of the driving situation just as the Armed Forces have found it necessary to produce a faithful simulation of flight experience using various models of planes, and the Navy with various types of submarines.

Since this group of experts in simulation and research have arrived at this conclusion, efforts will be extended to provide to researchers in the field of accident prevention the one tool that apparently is essential to unlocking so many of the hitherto inaccessible mysteries associated with traffic accident causation.

In brief, the Department will move rapidly to close the gap in applied technology between current research instrumentation and instrumentation that will take advantage of present technological knowledge, recently developed.

In no other way can progress toward the goal of identifying and properly evaluating the human factors involved in traffic accident causation be made so rapidly and effectively.

APPLICATION

Some facts are so obvious they long escape detection. This is particularly true of the fact that no matter how enlightening a research project may turn out to be, it remains of only academic interest until, through applied science, it is translated into a lifesaving potential.

Throughout the United States there are scattered concentrations of interest, skill, and ability that can be readily mobilized to fight the war on accidents if only a small contribution can be made available, in the form of project grants, to assist in the inauguration of unused plans and programs. Pump priming is badly needed. It is planned to seek methods whereby these interests and skills can be mobilized, particularly at the local level, in the next few years.

With a little help or boost, there are hospitals which can improve the training of their emergency squads; there are poison control centers which can conduct poison prevention programs; there is a tremendous latent interest in traffic accident prevention projects in many universities and schools throughout the Nation which can be activated if boostser shots are made available. A number of motor vehicle administrators, medical societies, and health departments are concerned and alarmed about the primitive status of driver licensing in their States and communities. They want to change this condition. With a little outside help they can bring about the changes that are needed. The Department plans to assist them in getting their long delayed plans underway.

The capabilities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, particularly the Public Health Service, to give professional advice to the many persons and agencies who daily seek answers to tough problems involving State or local traffic accident prevention will be increased rapidly. Each of these inquiries represents the nucleus of a community activity which, if properly nourished, can grow into a livesaving action program. Experts in traffic safety, many of whom are currently available to the Public Health Service as consultants, will be called on with much greater frequency to extend the capabilities of the Service in the general area of technical assistance and consultation, particularly on matters pertaining to cutting down the toll of highway deaths.

Finally, following the historical success of the Department of Agriculture, young men and women will be trained in the specialty of accident prevention; they will be assigned to State and local areas; there they will encourage and consult with local officials who wish to improve their State or local traffic accident prevention services.

These young men and women will need to be trained, but once trained they will vastly expand the ability of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to assist in the growth and development of local projects in accordance with the capabilities, interests, and circumstances inherent in local situations.

INFORMATION EXCHANGE

The growing number of projects in all phases of traffic safety in the United States and the mounting interest of the citizenry in this subject has created a deluge of incoming information concerning State and local activities. If this information is not scientifically collected, tabulated, analyzed, and made readily available for rapid dissemination to other interested groups, one of the most valuable weapons of the Department's traffic accident prevention program will have been neutralized.

Why should community B struggle through the developmental phases of a program or project which, if the experience of community A in conducting a similar project were readily available, could be avoided?

If a unique and successful method for motivating citizens to wear seat belts is developed in one community, is it not wasteful and foolhardy for other communities to repeat the same project in order to arrive at the same results?

A wealth of invaluable data already has been collected in the field of traffic accident prevention, both in the areas of research and application, by the Public Health Service. It is planned therefore to continue the development of better and more scientifically sound, effective, and economical methods of soliciting such valuable information, digesting it, and making it readily available to others who show an interest in kindred projects and activities.

A modern information exchange program can serve as the focal point of information gleaned from the experiences of State and local agencies and others.

This center will have the responsibility for producing audiovisual messages in modern garb that can convey even to the mildly interested knowledge that has been collected for educational purposes.

TRAINING

It is the plan of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to develop three types of training activities to produce an adequate number of physicians, public health workers, and members of allied professions to carry the growing burdens imposed by the complexities of modern traffic.

(1) Short courses and seminars will be held for the purpose of teaching newcomers the concepts, principles, and practices which are peculiar to this new branch of public health. These seminars are in great demand throughout the States and in many localities.

(2) Medium range courses of 4 to 8 months' duration will be held to train young men and women, and public health professionals as well, in accident prevention techniques. Such training courses (curriculums have already been contracted for) will provide the maturity in accident prevention required of staff members assigned to States and localities. These courses however, will also be available for the training of State and local sponsored trainees.

(3) Long-range training will be provided in increasing amounts in a growing number of schools of public health, medical schools, and other professional schools for the purpose of encouraging physicians, public health workers, engineers, nurses, and others to integrate accident prevention activities into their daily tasks wherever they may be located or employed.

Finally, it is planned to provide training grants to institutions to make it possible for more accident prevention materials and projects to be included in everyday teaching curriculums.

The Public Health Service is going to do its best to save lives.

Health Insurance for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the new Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Wilbur J. Cohen, addressed the Jacobi Medical Society here in Washington on Monday, April 17, last. I am advised that the cost will be $182.25, which is over the legal limit. I therefore ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the cost, the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEALTH INSURANCE FOR THE AGED

(By Wilbur J. Cohen, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare)

I greatly appreciate your invitation to discuss President Kennedy's program of health insurance for the aged and the factors underlying the development of this proposal.

"The health of our Nation is a key to its future—to its economic vitality, to the morale and efficiency of its citizens, to our success in achieving our goals and demonstrating to others the benefits of a free society." These are the opening words of the President's health message, delivered to the Congress on February 9.

The great challenges facing America in assuring the health of the people must be viewed within the broad scope of this overriding context. The President has recommended to the Congress a broad program aimed at getting good health care to people at the time they need it and under the best possible conditions.

Health insurance for the aged is, of course, a key part of the President's health program. But his other health proposals are also of major significance in the total effort to improve the health of the American people. These proposals would help to strengthen community services and facilities for better care, especially of the chronically ill and the aged; expand the Nation's capacity to train physicians and dentists; improve the health of children and youth; accelerate medical research; and control the pollution of our air and water resources.

Thus, the program recommended by the President provides for improving health care in four areas—health insurance, facilities, personnel, and research. I have been asked to address myself principally to the first of these proposals—prepaid health insurance for the aged.

The need to establish some public mechanism through which aged persons might find the means for meeting their health care requirements is universally accepted. A vast majority of our older people face a

situation not of their own making and over which they have little control. As people become older, millions find themselves confronted with the harassing fact of low income on one side and the worry if not the fact of greater need for medical services on the other. I am sure that you can all illustrate this from your own experiences. What the Federal Government has to do, of course, is to try to add all the individual cases together in order to arrive at a reasonable solution of how to accomplish the greatest good for the greatest number without undue strain on available resources.

Income data available on the aged vividly illustrate their limited financial ability. Different studies of this income may come up with somewhat different answers, depending upon the definitions used, but almost any one of these is likely to show that some 50 to 60 percent of all persons aged 65 and over have less than $1,000 in cash income during the year. Data from the Bureau of the Census, for example, show 55 percent of the aged with less than $1,000 income in 1959. Such data for individuals do not, of course, indicate how many persons the income must support, so that some wives dependent upon their husbands may be counted as having little or no income. However, less than one-fifth of all persons aged 65 or over are married women and many of the married couples have an income of less than $2,000 between them—so even if you allow for equal sharing by husband and wife there would be little change in the number with incomes of less than $1,000 a year.

Opponents of health insurance for the aged have quoted one particular survey made last year by two university men which showed a considerably more favorable income figure. However, this survey excluded from its sample all nonwhite persons and all persons receiving old age assistance, the very groups most likely to have the lowest incomes.

It is true, of course, that limiting the discussion to income does not present a complete picture. Older persons are more likely to have savings than are younger persons. In general, however, those with the lowest incomes are those least likely to have a nest egg set aside for a rainy day. Moreover, most of the savings of the aged are in the form of homes or life insurance and are, therefore, not readily available to meet the costs of medical care.

A Federal Reserve Board survey in 1959 showed that of the "spending units" headed by an elderly person, 29 percent had no bank accounts or savings bonds and 17 percent had less than $500. Those aged who live in the home of a younger relative—persons not generally very well off—are not even considered in these figures.

Coupled with this generally low income and poor financial position is the greater need of aged persons for medical care. National Health Survey data show that three-fourths of all aged persons not in institutions have one or more chronic conditions. Two out of every five aged persons have a chronic condition that prevents or limits their usual activity. About one out of every five aged is either confined to the house or has trouble getting around by himself. The health picture grows worse with increasing age. Among those 75 or older, for example, almost every third person is confined to the house or needs help getting around outside.

These increasing health needs lead, perforce, to an increased use of the various medical services. Aged people go to the hospital more often and stay longer than those at younger ages. As a result, older persons spend two to three times as many days in the hospital, on the average, as do younger persons—1,778 as compared with 764 days per 1,000 persons according to the national health survey data. And this survey does not include the hospitalization experience of persons who died during the survey year prior to the interview. Thus, the findings understate the actual situation, probably by a fair percentage.

Aged persons also see the physician more often than do younger persons, 6.8 as against 4.8 visits a year on the average.

This increased need for and use of medical services by the aged is reflected in expenditures for medical care. Persons aged 65 and over spend twice as much for medical care in a year as do persons under age 65, according to a health information foundation survey. This includes only the private expenditures of the noninstitutional population, leaving out the heavy costs for terminal illness among aged persons living alone. It also leaves out most of the cost of care in nursing homes, mental, or tuberculosis hospitals, and other institutions, which are usually publicly financed. Indeed, close to one-fifth of public expenditures for medical care are in behalf of aged persons, although they constitute less than one-tenth of the population.

Again, these average expenditures understate the magnitude of the problem facing many aged persons, owing to the erratic incidence of illness. They conceal wide variations, giving no indication of the very heavy financial burden that may be placed upon many individuals requiring hospitalization. A stay in a hospital usually means total medical costs will be high. A 1957 study of aged social security beneficiaries showed that at least one member of every fifth beneficiary couple was hospitalized during the year. For half of these couples with a hospitalized illness, total medical bills incurred were over $700, more than the cost of a modest food budget for the year. Average costs of hospitalization have been rising, of course, for a long time. In 1951, the average was $18 a day. Now it is about $32, and the end is not in sight. Again these averages do not tell the whole story. They can mean real hardship for many older people, especially those of low income in areas of above-average hospital costs.

To meet the costs of hospitalized illness, less than half the aged have health insurance of any sort and those who need it most to help pay their bills—the retired, those with low incomes, or those with major health problems—are the least likely to have it.

This distillation of life's varied problems into the depersonalization of statistics argues strongly for some action to assist aged persons in meeting the costs of health care.

MEETING THE NEED

All the data which we have and the personal experience which we gather point to an urgent need to protect our older citizens against the hardships of expensive illness. It is apparent that this need is not likely to be met solely by private insurance, since the heavy use of medical care services and facilities by aged persons would necessitate a premium which most could not afford from their limited incomes. As private means by themselves do not appear adequate to meet this need, public programs are necessary. As with other major economic hazards, prepaid basic protection against the high cost of illness in old age can—and in my opinion should—be provided through the national social insurance program.

The social insurance method would provide the means of spreading the cost of health services in old age over the working years. Under it, services to the aged would be provided in a way that preserves the dignity of the individual. Aged persons—including those with average and even above average income—constantly face the threat that costly medical care will wipe out their savings and force them after a lifetime of independence to seek aid from their children or from public or private charity. As the President said in his health message, the health insurance for the aged program will meet the needs of the millions of the aged who do not want charity, but whose entire financial base for security—and often that of their children—may be shattered by an extended hospital stay.

Programs relying upon a means test as a primary criteria for eligibility cannot effectively meet this need. By their very nature, they can become operative only after every other resource has been spent. They cannot provide the sense of security which attends the continuing assurance that the means of paying for needed health care is available whenever that care is required. The many, many aged persons barely able to provide the necessities of life for themselves do not want charity based on a means test. They will not get needed care under these conditions until care is forced upon them by a medical crisis. I take it for granted that we all feel that this is not the best method of dealing with this matter. We all believe, I am sure, that an aged person should be able to receive the care he needs irrespective of his financial resources and without being required to demonstrate complete poverty before the care is made available.

There is another basic reason why I favor providing health insurance for the aged as an addition to the existing social insurance program. Monthly benefits for retired workers and their families under this program are intended basically to serve as a partial replacement of the income lost owing to retirement. They provide a dependable basis on which retired persons can plan expenditures. However, it is impossible to know when serious illness will strike, so heavy medical care costs are unpredictable. They may easily be so great as to undermine the floor of protection established by the monthly cash benefits. They alone, among the expenditures which the aged face, may with unanticipated suddeness, destroy the financial security of an aged person, and effectively render the security afforded by the monthly benefits meaningless. The addition of health benefits to the cash retirement benefits under the social insurance system would do much to close this gap. It would enable people to take a long step toward preventing dependency by helping them remain self-reliant through their years of retirement.

The health insurance for the aged proposal calls for a well-rounded, yet modest, program of health services to be financed through the social security and railroad retirement systems. It, like the old-age survivors, and disability program now in effect, would not provide more than basic protection. It would provide payment for the cost of inpatient hospital care (after a deductible), skilled nursing home care after hospitalization, hospital outpatient diagnostic services (after a deductible), and visiting nurse and related home health services. It would do all this without changing or interfering with the way the individual gets his health care or the way the doctor or hospital provides it.

Since the heaviest medical financial burden falls upon aged persons requiring hospital care, we therefore have felt that the major costs of hospital care was the proper point of concentration in this insurance proposal. However, the proposal includes other benefits which would serve as less expensive substitutes for hospital care, and would assure that care given under the program would be geared to the level the doctor feels is appropriate to the patient's condition. Skilled nursing home services were included in order to assure that less expensive facilities than hospitals could be used for convalescence. Home health services would enable many older people to receive care in their own homes. Hospital outpatient diagnostic services would reduce the need for hospital admissions for diagnostic

purposes. It would also encourage beneficiaries to seek early diagnosis and treatment and thus enable them to avoid later hospital admission and perhaps an early death because of the advances of a detectable malady.

The services of the private physician are excluded from the bill. No service performed by a private physician at either home, office, or in the hospital, and no fee he charges for such services would be involved, covered, or affected.

As is the case with other social security benefits, the individual could build upon this basic social insurance protection and by his own means obtain protection against the cost of physicians' and dentists' services, drugs, and other health items not covered by the proposed legislation. The existence of the basic program would make it feasible for the individual to attempt realistically to obtain adequate health protection in old age. Just as old-age and survivors benefits under social security have been accompanied by a growth in supplementary pensions and life insurance, I would expect the insurance industry successfully to offer supplementary private health insurance to accompany health insurance under social security. In this way we can demonstrate, in these days of international competition, the vigor and strength and adaptability of our system and its ability through the cooperation of public and private agencies to provide a good way of life for older people.

Under the proposed program, some 14¼ million persons eligible for benefits under the social security and railroad retirement programs would be eligible for health benefits by the time the program got into full operation in 1963. The total number of persons 65 years of age and over at that time will exceed 17¾ million and may approach 18 million. Of those not covered, about one-quarter million former Federal Government employees will be entitled to health benefits at least equivalent in value to those proposed. More than half the remaining aged would be eligible for care in veterans' hospitals or under the public assistance program.

Just as in the area of income maintenance—old-age, dependency, and disability—public assistance is a resource when other means have failed. The State assistance program will be able to do a better job if the basic health needs of most people are met through social security and the States do not have to carry a large financial and administrative burden in meeting these needs.

Following enactment of the proposed health insurance program, the States, if they wished, could liberalize their income tests and otherwise work toward a more effective health care program for the few aged persons who would still need help in meeting their medical care costs. The medical assistance for the aged program, established in the Social Security Amendments of 1960, will still be needed. There will always be people with special needs that cannot be met through social insurance and other public and private pension plans and must, therefore, apply for public assistance.

HEALTH INSURANCE FOR THE AGED PROPOSAL

The administration-sponsored health insurance for the aged bill has been introduced in the Congress by Senator ANDERSON and Congressman KING. Under it, benefits would be available to all persons 65 and over who are receiving or who have applied for and are eligible to receive, social security or railroad retirement benefits.

The services provided would include:

(1) Inpatient hospital services for up to 90 days, with the program paying all costs in excess of a deductible to be paid by the patient of $10 a day for the first 9 days, but with a $20 minimum.

(2) Skilled nursing home services for up to 180 days immediately after discharge from a hospital.

(3) Outpatient hospital diagnostic services with a $20 deductible applied for each diagnostic study.

(4) Home health services of up to 240 home visits in a calendar year. These services would include intermittent nursing care, physical therapy, and part-time homemaker services.

Both inpatient hospital and skilled nursing home services would be subject to an overall limitation of 150 units of service during any benefit period, with 1 day of inpatient hospital services or 2 days of skilled nursing home care equal to one unit of service. A new benefit period would not begin until the beneficiary had been out of the hospital or skilled nursing home for 90 days. In operation, this unit of service limitation would mean that any beneficiary spending 60 days or less in the hospital would be entitled to 180 days in a skilled nursing home. However, any day beyond the 60th spent in a hospital would reduce the potential skilled nursing home benefit by 2 days. Thus, a beneficiary spending the full 90 days in the hospital would be entitled to a maximum of 120 days of skilled nursing home care.

The program would start with respect to inpatient hospital, outpatient hospital diagnostic, and home health services on October 1, 1962. Skilled nursing service benefits would begin on July 1, 1963.

Responsibility for administering the program would rest with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for social security beneficiaries and with the Railroad Retirement Board for railroad retirement annuitants. There would be an Advisory Council to advise the Secretary on policy matters in connection with program administration.

For a hospital, skilled nursing home, or home health agency to be eligible to enter a contract to participate in the program, it would be required to meet certain specified conditions set forth in the bill.

Essentially, these conditions are those generally accepted as being necessary for quality care.

In formulating the conditions for participation, the Secretary would consult with the States, with the Advisory Council, and with such accrediting bodies as the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals. In addition, a State could recommend to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare that higher conditions be established for providers of service in that State.

The bill sets forth certain basic requirements for participation in the program that I am sure you will agree are prerequisites to good hospital administration. A participating hospital would need to be licensed by the State, have 24-hour nursing service, maintain adequate medical records, have bylaws for staff physicians, and have a committee of physicians to review necessity for admissions, lengths of stay, and services provided. Similarly, participating nursing homes would need to be licensed, have medical policies established by physicians, maintain adequate medical records, provide 24-hour nursing service, and have a nursing facility utilization plan.

In applying these standards and in the program's relations with providers, we anticipate that considerable reliance would be placed on State agencies. State agencies would advise us whether individual hospitals, nursing homes, and home health agencies met the conditions for participation. The State agencies would also consult with the providers to assist them in improving their services and administrative operations.

This program would be financed by an increase in social security tax contributions of one-fourth of 1 percent each on employers and employees, and three-eighths of 1 percent on the self-employed, plus an increase in the maximum earnings subject to the tax from $4,800 to $5,000. These contributions would amply cover the cost of all the benefits to be provided and would keep the social security systems self-supporting.

EFFECT OF PROGRAM ON HOSPITALS AND DOCTORS

I would guess that as you have thought about this health insurance for the aged proposal, one question has been paramount: "What will be the effect of this program on my freedom to practice medicine and upon my relations with patients? What changes will it cause in hospital practices?"

First, let me underline what the President has already said about health insurance for the aged; namely, that it is not a program of socialized medicine. The prerogatives of doctors and patients would remain unchanged. The patient would choose his own doctor, who in turn would be absolutely unhindered in practicing his profession.

One argument that has been advanced is that the program would crowd the hospital beds with aged persons. We do believe that a program which relieves an aged person of the worry about cost and allows him to get hospital care when his physician recommends it would somewhat increase the use of hospitals by the aged. That this would happen is demonstrated by the fact that aged persons with private health insurance now use more days of hospital care on the average than those without such insurance. However, we believe that the utilization will tend to stabilize over time at little above the present use levels for the insured aged. This level seems reasonable in view of existing need. I have too great a respect for the integrity of doctors and hospital admission practices to believe that aged persons who do not require hospital care will be admitted to hospitals in very many instances.

It seems to me that a program which would lift unmanageable cost burdens from an aged patient needing hospital care would also be a relief to the physician, for he could hospitalize his patient when necessary without fear of the economic consequences to his patient. It would give added substance, it seems to me, to the freedom of doctor and patient together to choose the kind of care best suited to the patient's needs. This freedom of choice is inevitably compromised when an aged patient needs but cannot afford hospital care and is unwilling to plead pauperage to obtain it.

I believe that within the framework of our institutions we have the capacity and the material and human resources to assure a full life and a fair measure of happiness for more of our people. Twenty-six years ago, the initiation of the social security program established a basis for the relief of economic dependency. On signing the Social Security Act in 1935, President Franklin D. Roosevelt said, "This law represents a cornerstone in a structure which is now being built but is by no means complete." Health insurance for the aged is an urgently needed addition to this structure.

We're Winning the War Against Dope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I

wish to include the following report from the top Federal official in the fight against dope, the U.S. Commissioner of Narcotics, Harry J. Anslinger, as it was published in This Week magazine for April 16, 1961:

WE'RE WINNING THE WAR AGAINST DOPE

(By Harry J. Anslinger)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Americans can take heart in the good news that we are defeating the cruelest enemy we've ever faced: The murderous traffic in dope.

Parents in particular should be encouraged because their children are becoming increasingly safer from the vicious infection of drug addiction.

A 5-year survey just completed by the Federal Bureau of Narcotics shows we're achieving a major breakthrough in our all-out war with the peddlers of living death. Here are the key facts in the battle:

The overall number of new addicts—our best gage—is declining. At the end of 1960 it stood at 7,479, a drop of 1,858 from 1956.

Youthful addicts under 21, an alarming 12 percent of the 1956 total, were down to 3.9 percent of 1960; teenagers under 17 came to 148, or 0.3 percent.

Even with these exciting gains, however, I want to emphasize the gravity of the problem. This is especially true in New York and California—two problem areas which are running counter to the national percentage decrease. They alone have more than 60 percent of the 44,906 addicts reported to the Bureau from all over the United States in 1960. Possibly several thousand more have gone unreported.

These Americans are begging, borrowing, stealing, and murdering to buy $500 million worth of dope each year. This is a big challenge to our national welfare. But 30 years ago when the Federal Bureau of Narcotics was set up more than 1 American in 1,000 was an addict. Now the statistics are 1 in 4,000. So from the point of view of Federal law enforcement we are in a position to get our hands around the problem. Before we couldn't.

It hasn't been easy. Most important factor in our recent breakthrough has been the Narcotic Control Act passed by Congress in 1956. It provided for stiff prison sentences of 5 to 20 years for a first offense and 10 to 40 years for second convictions, plus appropriately heavy fines.

It warned the big interstate and international traffickers, like members of the Mafia, that now we could fight them in the only way they understood—by a long-term quarantine in prison. They became more cautious in their operations. As a result, the dope traffic that they control has slowed down and addiction with it.

VICTORY ON SEVERAL FRONTS

I am now able to report that where strict State and local laws have backed up the Federal law, and where tough judges have handed down maximum sentences, we've been able to pick up our agents and move elsewhere.

We've closed our offices completely in several States. Baltimore, which had a severe dope-traffic problem 5 years ago, lowered it by 50 percent. In Ohio juvenile addiction has virtually disappeared.

Seattle, Las Vegas, Washington, D.C., Miami, and Honolulu are other greatly improved spots. So are several areas in New England and in the South.

Significantly, we find a radically different situation in New York and California. At last reports, New York had 20,648 addicts, or 46 percent of the national total. California had 7,411 addicts and 16 percent. The reason for this, as I have testified before the Congress, is that these states have not adopted the more stringent enforcement laws imposing the heavier penalties adopted by the Federal government and most of the other states.

So obviously we're still in for a long fight. Few people know this hard fact better than the 280 agents of the Narcotics Bureau who in slightly more than five years have been responsible for the Federal prosecution of 8,000 cases.

D)PE FROM RED CHINA

Theirs is a cloak and dagger operation, and even wartime espionage holds no greater risks cr demands greater skills or imagination.

The biggest headache they have to contend with is the traffic in heroin, an opium derivative used by 93 percent of the addicts in the United States. The bulk originates in Red China and winds up in our west coast ports.

The rest of the supply gets its start in the Middle East and is smuggled into Atlantic seaboard ports, either directly or via Canada, Mexico or Cuba.

Our agents do a fantastic job working underground in cooperation with the police of other countries involved in the traffic (with the exception of Red China, of course). They intercept tremendous quantities of the dope before it gets started or while it is en route. Last year, for example, they seized in excess of $25 million, a wholesale price that is multiplied many times over before it ends up poisoning the addict.

But once the dope does slip through, our men forget all about their lives and safety in the effort to track it down. It may take a day or it may take a year, as it did in one case assigned to an agent—I'll call him Edwards—in San Francisco. And every day of that year he lived with the knowledge that discovery meant violent execution in traditional Chinese tong fashion—a hatchet in the back.

BREAKING THE SAN FRANCISCO RING

We had learned that several tongs, both in California and Oregon, had gone into the dope racket. To get the evidence, Agent Edwards first set himself up as a dope trafficker, one of a hundred different roles assumed by a narcotics agent.

Then he moved into a section of San Francisco where many of the suspected tong members lived. He began to frequent the same bars and restaurants they did, becoming friendly with several of them. He played his part to such perfection that they accepted him for what he said he was. They decided to invite him to one of their clandestine tong meetings.

That was the moment for which he had risked his life for a full year. As he sat there, he heard full details of the complete smuggling operation which, he discovered, was headed by an above-suspicion San Francisco haberdasher. Result: Our seizure both of a rich supply of heroin, and records of how it had been smuggled into the United States.

Although our agents get a number of tips from professional informants, they also possess a sixth sense of sorts that tells them when they are speaking to a trafficker. That was what led another of our undercover men to a surprise catch in Turkey.

It all started when Agent Denis arrived in Ankara and took a taxi from the airport to his hotel. He still can't explain why, but the driver, who spoke English fluently, excited his suspicions. So he casually remarked that he was in town to look for good merchandise. "What kind?" the driver asked him. "Heroin or good morphine base," Agent Denis replied without pulling any punches. The driver said, "I have friends."

He did indeed, and showed up at Denis' apartment with one of them and 30 pounds of opium. Denis managed to keep them waiting outside until the Turkish narcotics police—with whom he had a prearranged signal—arrived. They promptly arrested the taxi driver, but the second man took off with Denis right behind him.

"As I gained on him he turned into an alley," Denis told me. "When I was right behind him, I hit him on the back of his neck with the palm of my hand. He fell, turned around, and got up on his feet. As he did, he pulled a knife from his belt. I drew my gun and fired one shot at his feet. He dropped the knife and raised his hands. I held him there until the Turkish police caught up with us."

My files are filled with these casual, self-effacing reports. Our men come to us from a wide variety of professions—we have lawyers and wrestlers—and are given intensive training. But their courage and devotion to duty can't be taught.

WHAT WE MUST DO TO WIN

However, we need more than our agents to win the war against the trafficker. We have to cure the addict who has already become infected. That's the only way we'll be completely successful.

It's axiomatic that 1 addict makes 4 more, and 4 will make 16, a frightening progression.

The communities not only must provide facilities similar to the two Federal narcotic hospitals—one in Lexington, Ky., and the other in Fort Worth, Tex.—but must make their use mandatory for the addict, not optional.

I know hospital space is at a premium, but perhaps some of the old CCC camps could be reactivated and used for the purpose.

Senator JAVITS, of New York, is sponsoring a bill that would have the Government pay half the cost in cases where the State or city hospitalizes the addict. If his bill is passed, it should serve as an incentive to those communities that say they haven't got the money to treat the addict.

The poppy, symbol of sleep and death, was cultivated as long ago as 5000 B.C. Its menace won't be eliminated overnight. Meantime, I am happy to be able to make this interim report to the American public: Our stronger law and strict enforcement have enabled us to make real progress in beating the traffic in dope.

New York Centennial Observance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the first regiment to march out of New York on the way to answer President Lincoln's proclamation for troops to protect Washington left the city 100 years ago today. New York units fought at Gettysburg, Bull Run, Chancellorsville, and in other famous battles of the Civil War. One of New York's most famous units was the 7th Regiment, organized in 1826 and the possessor of an enviable reputation as the New York State Militia long before the Civil War. As the crack National Guard regiment of the Nation, it was a natural training school for officers and during the Civil War 660 of its members served in the Union Army. On this memorable anniversary, New York is proud to honor this great regiment.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD with my remarks the article by William J. Roehrenbeck entitled "The Day New York Went to War," which appeared in Today's Living, the Herald Tribune magazine, April 16.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DAY NEW YORK WENT TO WAR—THE SMART 7TH REGIMENT RALLIED THE UNION AS IT MARCHED OFF

(By William J. Roehrenbeck)

New York really went to war on April 19, 1861, when the 7th Regiment marched off to Washington. The previous week had been exciting, but slightly unreal. The news of the firing on Fort Sumter on Friday, the 12th, had come as a stunning and bewildering blow, and no one could quite believe that war had come at last. By Monday, New York, like all the other cities in the North, had worked itself into a frenzy of angry patriotism. President Lincoln's proclamation, calling for 75,000 troops to quell the insurrection and defend Washington, was applauded heartily. Recruiting offices were jammed. Opposition to the new Republican administration suddenly became highly unpopular, and irate patriots appeared at recalcitrant newspaper offices to demand that the flag be hung from the windows. Even Trinity Church, for the first time in history, flew the Stars and Stripes from the top of the steeple.

CURTAIN RAISERS ONLY

The 6th Massachusetts Regiment came through New York on the 18th, followed by the 8th Massachusetts on the morning of the 19th. The city gave them a rousing sendoff, but it was clearly holding back its real enthusiasm for the afternoon: Its own pet regiment, the New York 7th, was leaving then, and the whole town was ready to turn out and shout itself hoarse.

The 7th Regiment, New York State Militia, was in a class by itself among the volunteer military organizations of the day. There may have been one or two—in Richmond, or Philadelphia, or Boston—that could give it some competition. But none could drill quite so precisely; none could put on such a magnificent parade; none was quite so fashionable as the New York 7th. Over the years since its organization as a regiment in 1826 it had maintained high standards (despite the popular indifference to things military) and was now considered the model regiment of the Nation. Its members called themselves "The National Guards" in honor of Lafayette's famous Paris National Guard. Its ranks were filled with members of prominent New York families, who considered the regiment a most important social adjunct to New York City. Marshall Lefferts, its colonel, whose family had come over to New Netherlands in the 17th century, had already distinguished himself in the telegraph industry.

The 7th usually managed to acquire officers of the highest caliber. Like all other militia organizations, it elected its own officers. As the standards for admission to the regiment were high, it followed logically that the choice of officers was handled intelligently and that the results were excellent.

New York, for the most part, loved the 7th, and its reputation had spread throughout the East after a series of yearly excursions to other cities. Some citizens, however, had little use for it and called the militiamen "Old Greybacks." This was a result of the Astor Place riots in 1849, when a mob, goaded by American actor Edwin Forrest and sixth ward boss Isaiah Rynders, set on fire the theater in which English actor W. C. Macready (Forrest's rival) was performing. Astor Place was an area already ripe for riot, because slum clearance there threatened to dispossess and make homeless thousands of families. The 7th Regiment, called out to disperse the rioters, was forced to fire into them. Some citizens never forgot the incident and blamed the regiment.

When Sumter fell, the 7th was ready. As soon as Lincoln's proclamation was announced, Colonel Lefferts placed his regiment at the disposal of Gov. Edwin Morgan. The orders from the Governor came on April 17; the 7th was to proceed to Washington and report to the President. It was vitally important to get troops into Washington as quickly as possible, because Gen. Winfield Scott had only a few companies at his disposal to defend the city against a rebel attack.

Scott was familiar with the 7th Regiment. He didn't have much respect for volunteer troops generally, but he knew that the 7th was a well-equipped, well-disciplined unit, and he was eager to bring it to the Capital quickly. He probably realized also that the early mobilization of a regiment of such national prestige could have a deep influence on recruiting in other cities. Unlike most other militia units, the 7th was up to its full membership quota and didn't have to wait for recruits. In fact, hundreds were turned down during the 3 days preceding the 19th.

THE GRAND SENDOFF

At 3 p.m. on April 19 the regiment marched out of its armory at Tompkins Square and formed in Lafayette Place, filling the street all the way from Fourth to Eighth Streets. Meanwhile the city had gone mad with excitement. From Great Jones Street to Cortlands, Broadway was so packed with cheering citizens that the regiment could barely make its way through. Practically every building was draped with flags, and Maj. Robert Anderson, the Union commander at Fort Sumter, stood on a balcony at Prince Street and reviewed the troops.

At Broadway and Fulton Street was Matthew B. Brady, a former member of the regiment, who was destined to become the official photographer of the Civil War. He'd worked closely with Anthony & Scovill (the predecessors of Ansco) on the wet-plate process, and he was to spend considerable time photographing the 7th in Washington.

Eventually the troops managed to reach Cortlandt Street. Here they boarded the ferry to Jersey City, where again the whole town was out to greet them at the railroad terminal. It took 7 hours to get from Jersey City to Philadelphia because of the crowds that gathered along the railroad tracks. One of the men who marched with the regiment said later, "I think I didn't see a rod of ground without its man, from dusk till dawn, from the Hudson to the Delaware."

At Philadelphia they ran into two problems. First, it was impossible to go on by train to Washington. The 6th Massachusetts had been attacked by a mob on its way through Baltimore, and by now all the railroad bridges between Havre de Grace and Baltimore had been torn up by secessionists. Some other way was needed to reach Washington.

The second problem was less serious, but more annoying. Benjamin Butler, commanding general of the Massachusetts troops, was in Philadelphia, and he immediately started issuing orders to the New York 7th. Lefferts, whose regiment hadn't yet been mustered into Federal service, had no intention of letting New York troops be commanded by a Massachusetts brigadier whose commission was only a few days old—and questionably acquired at that. Butler wanted the 7th to move with the 8th Massachusetts to Perryville and there board a railroad ferry that would take them to Annapolis, thus bypassing Baltimore. Lefferts, who realized that the ferry was barely large enough to hold one regiment, refused. Issuing a draft on his own civilian firm, he chartered an old coastal steamer—the S.S. *Boston*—to take them down Delaware Bay and around the capes up to Annapolis. The *Boston* was much too small for the job, but the regiment was able to squeeze aboard, and they set sail from Philadelphia at 4:20 p.m. on Saturday, the 20th.

At dawn on Monday they reached Annapolis harbor. There they found the 8th Massachusetts crowded into the ferry boat *Maryland*, aground on a mud bank. Lefferts issued orders for the *Boston* to try towing her off, but the attempt was in vain. The 7th then landed in Annapolis, over the protests of the mayor and the governor of Maryland, and the 8th Massachusetts was taken ashore later by using the *Boston* as a landing vessel.

The problem now was how to get to Washington. Lefferts would need provisions and wagons to march across the hostile territory beyond Annapolis. These were impossible to obtain. By this time it had become evident that Annapolis was to become the key transportation center in the movement of troops from the North to Washington; the route through Baltimore was disrupted, and the rebels would probably be able to command the Potomac. The branch railroad between Annapolis and Annapolis Junction suddenly became highly important. It was now torn up, so it would have to be repaired. Once this line of communication was established, troops could be moved easily, as the railroad from the junction to Washington was in Union hands.

After much wrangling, Butler and Lefferts finally agreed that the New York and Massachusetts troops should cooperate in the attempt. Thus, at 2 a.m. on Wednesday, April 24, the advance guard of the regiment moved out through Annapolis for the 16-mile march to the junction. The next 24 hours proved to be a rugged experience for a group of week-old civilian soldiers. They alternately marched, replaced damaged rails, repaired rolling stock, rebuilt bridges, and served as flank guards throughout the next day and night. But they stuck to the job, and at 3 a.m. on Thursday they reached Annapolis Junction, where most of them fell into an exhausted sleep.

During all this time Washington was nervous and close to panic. It was now cut off completely from communications with the North. Everyone expected the rebel troops to appear momentarily and attack the Capital. And Scott had almost nothing to stop them with—just a few companies of regulars and the unreliable District militia. Some small Pennsylvania detachments and the battered 6th Massachusetts had come in, but this was hardly the relief of Washington. The 7th was needed badly, and at the moment of deepest gloom they arrived—12 noon on April 25. At the railroad depot they brushed off some of the Maryland mud from their natty gray uniforms, whitened their crossbelts, and paraded magnificently up Pennsylvania Avenue to the White House. The kid-glove regiment had been ordered to report to the President, and report they did—in style. Washington was relieved, and from that point on to the end of the war it was seldom in danger.

The rest of the 7th's term of service was anticlimactic. It was quartered in the Capitol Building for a few days, went into camp on Meridian Hill out on Washington's 14th Street, participated in the first crossing of Union troops into nearby Virginia, and helped build Fort Runyon on the other side of the Potomac. After 45 days of service the men were discharged with the praises of all Washington and New York ringing in their ears.

Teaching Credential Restored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the San Jose Mercury, Apr. 7, 1961]

STATE BOARD ORDERS RENEWAL—ERB PICKS UP HIS CREDENTIALS, TEACHING CREDENTIAL RESTORED

(By Harry Farrell, staff political writer)

SACRAMENTO.—Acting unanimously, the State board of education Thursday ordered immediate renewal of the teaching credential of former Camden High School driving instructor Tillman Erb.

The action followed by 1 day the filing of an attorney general's opinion that the credential could not be withheld because Erb invoked the fifth amendment last May before the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Similar action was taken in the comparable case of John W. Moss, former San Francisco City College teacher.

Immediately after the board's action, Erb stopped at the State department of education office and picked up the credential which restores his right to teach in the California public school system.

He said he has prospects of another bay area teaching job. Since his employment at Camden ended last year, he has been selling furniture.

The restoration of the credential, which had lapsed last June, does not signal Erb's reemployment by the Campbell Union High School District. Officials of the district have stated he was notified before his Un-American Activities testimony that he was not to be rehired for the current school year. He had not achieved tenure status.

Board of education member Raymond Daba of Atherton, who had delayed restoration of the credential a day in order to read Atty. Gen. Stanley Mosk's 30-page opinion, said Thursday he agreed with conclusions.

The renewal of Erb's right to teach reversed a recommendation made last December by State Hearing Officer Harold Furst, who held that the teacher's refusal to answer the committee's questions constituted unprofessional conduct.

Daba emphasized that nowhere, in the proceedings against Erb's credential, had the State introduced evidence questioning Erb's loyalty, character, or teaching ability.

Neither had the State asserted that he belonged to any subversive movement. The action was based, Daba said, only on Erb's refusal to answer the House committee's questions on possible Communist affiliation.

When he was before the committee in San Francisco, Erb offered to answer questions about himself if excused from informing on others, but the deal was rejected by the committee.

In his opinion Mosk said action against Erb's credential was improper without a hearing and a definite finding by his local school board that his conduct was unprofessional. No such finding was made.

Further Mosk said the State board of education itself, as opposed to the local board, could not make such a determination.

Judge C. W. Webb of Elgin, Tex., Was a Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, thousands of Texans were recently saddened by the death of Judge C. W. Webb of the town of Elgin, Bastrop County, which is located near Austin.

It was my privilege and pleasure to know Judge Webb for many years. He practiced law in partnership with his wife and his son Jack, both of whom are capable lawyers. His confidence, friendship and support have been one of my greatest treasures of public life for they were invaluable to me in both defeat and victory. His uniformly encouraging word and philosophy earned him the sobriquet of "the Abraham Lincoln of central Texas."

Columnist Anita Brewer, one of Texas' top-ranking newspaper writers, in her well-known column "Behind the Byline," wrote an exceptionally fine article concerning Judge Webb. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the column entitled "Behind the Byline," by Anita Brewer, from the January 11, 1961, Austin Statesman.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Austin Statesman, Jan. 11, 1961]

BEHIND THE BYLINE

(By Anita Brewer)

When Judge C. W. Webb, of Elkin, died last week, it was a front page story. The well-known and well-beloved man's death was important news.

But to Mrs. Mourine Amis, longtime friend of Judge and Mrs. Webb, the bare facts of his life—that he was dean of Bastrop County lawyers, that he had been a member of the school board, that he had participated in civic and church activities—did not reflect the essence of this great man, the personality that had been a guide and inspiration to many.

So Mrs. Amis, with her perceptive understanding, thought of the things amusing and inspirational which were so endearing about Judge Webb.

The judge was born with club feet, but he was never heard to complain nor did he consider himself handicapped.

He had never traveled very far from home, but he took great pride in having visited every county in Texas.

Judge Webb was a lifelong Democrat. He believed in party loyalty and could abide no party splinters to weaken the fiber of the organization. He considered himself a conservative liberal.

For 37 years he taught the John Wesley-C. W. Webb Bible Class at the First Methodist Church in Elgin. His Sunday sermonettes helped others to understand that God doesn't dwell just in a small box of a church, but that the Master is everywhere, every day.

Judge Webb for years was president of Cotton Stocking Row. It was the club members' responsibility to do as little work around the house as possible. One morning a report reached the president that a certain member was helping his wife wash. A committee was dispatched at once to check on this rumor. The committee found the wife drawing water and building a fire around the pot * * * her husband was still in bed. His membership in Cotton Stocking Row was intact.

He loved a good domino game and was one of the last of the great domino players and would brook no nonsense from the opposition.

Sunday at the Webbs was a memorable experience. After Sunday School and church, family and friends gathered around the large table. During World War II many lonesome, homesick soldiers stationed at Camp Swift shared the warm hospitality of the Webbs.

Judge Webb was an inveterate reader * * * the Bible, Shakespeare, Mark Twain, and the Austin American. Until just a few weeks ago he would ask for the daily paper and a cigar.

"May it please the highest court," asks Mrs. Amis, "when this kindly soul approaches the throne of grace, to wit * * * 'that he loved mercy, believed in and practiced justice, and walked humbly with his God' all of his days."

Needed: A Drive To Lower Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, there have been a number of little noticed comments in the press by leading Government figures urging a drive to lower prices. I think this is a terrific idea.

There is no question that hard work, energetic sales promotion, and diligent attention to cost cutting by individual firms and store owners would permit many prices in our economy to be lowered. Assuming that lower prices would stimulate sales, and I truly believe that they would, a decrease in prices would benefit consumers materially and would help our economy move faster.

Recent information to the fact that President Kennedy is going to appoint a Consumers Counsel led Mr. Joseph R. Slevin, national economics editor for the Herald Tribune, to urge that such a counsel be the administration's major force in launching what he terms "a drive for lower prices." The editors of a very influential upstate newspaper, the Warrensburg News, seized upon Mr. Slevin's suggestion and recently ran a hardhitting editorial calling for a campaign on price reduction. Such a campaign to lower prices would not be to the detriment or disadvantage of any group or individuals in our economy. Quite the contrary, such a campaign, spearheaded by the White House or by vigorous civic groups, would help step up our economy. It would assist our economy and our Nation as a whole.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of the article by Mr. Slevin and the above referred to editorial from the Warrensburg News. I also ask unanimous consent to include an article by the distinguished New York Times economic reporter, Mr. Richard E. Mooney, dealing with a recent statement by Federal Reserve Board Chairman, William McChesney Martin, in which he too calls for a concerted effort to lower prices as a means of "solving the Nation's economic problem."

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 2, 1961]

U.S. ECONOMIC FRONT—KEY ROLE TO BE PLAYED BY CONSUMERS' COUNSEL

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy is planning to appoint a special "consumers' counsel" and there will be more than one big job for the new adviser to do.

Naming a consumer spokesman will fulfill a campaign pledge that Mr. Kennedy made to a group of Bronx housewives just before election day. The job is being patterned after a post that Queensboro Community College Professor Persia Campbell held under former New York Governor Averell Harriman.

Many economists believe the most important immediate contribution a consumer's counsel could make would be to persuade the administration to launch a drive for lower prices. They argue that a price-cut campaign is the main ingredient that is missing from the administration's program to spark a vigorous business upturn.

There is no better way to spur consumer buying than to chop prices but the official barometers show that prices have been holding firm during the recession.

PRICE CUTS HELP ALL

Price reductions increase buying power and the happy thing is that they increase everyone's buying power—from Caroline Kennedy's to older workers living on social security.

Organized labor says the best way to boost buying power is to raise wages but that helps only one group of consumers.

Stockholders say the best solution is to increase dividends but that suffers from the same special interest limitations as a wage boost.

The administration is pressing for lower prices on one front. Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy is launching a number of anti-price-fixing suits in local communities.

But there is no concerted administration effort to push down prices.

There's nothing, for example, that matches the vigorous battle that the President has been waging to drive down long-term interest rates—the price of money. Mr. Kennedy believes that sticky money prices are a threat to recovery but he hasn't displayed equal concern about the prices of shoes, shirts, automobiles, refrigerators, and other merchandise.

Yet the President and his advisers are making a strenuous attempt to stimulate production by boosting buying demands.

They are trying to supply a large additional amount of demand by adding to Government spending.

ACTION IN CONGRESS

Congress has approved a $1 billion emergency unemployment compensation bill and the Senate and the House have passed different versions of a measure for helping depressed areas.

Mr. Kennedy is urging the lawmakers to enact social security, education, defense, and other measures that are designed to sluice more Federal money into the economy and he has ordered a speedup in Government procurement.

The President has endorsed yet another Government buying power stimulant in principle by promising that he will consider an antirecession tax cut next month if business activity fails to show signs of improving.

The classical method of stimulating demand and of increasing buying power is to cut prices. Former President Eisenhower suggested last January in his final economic report that lower prices would be helpful but the Kennedy administration hasn't chosen to bring the price weapon into play.

[From the New York Times]

HEAD OF RESERVE URGES PRICE CUTS TO RELIEVE SLUMP

(By Richard E. Mooney)

WASHINGTON, April 11.—The Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board made a strong appeal today for price reductions as a means of solving the Nation's economic problems.

"Throughout our country, we must not only increase our productivity but also pass some of the gains on to the consumer in the form of lower prices, rather than having all of it go exclusively to labor in higher wages or to management in higher profits," he said.

The Chairman, William McC. Martin, Jr., said that price cuts could stimulate buying demand that would "provide more jobs for those who are now unemployed, keep the economy moving to higher levels, and [provide] still greater job opportunities in the future."

SOME GAINS REPORTED

The Labor Department reported, meanwhile, a modest increase in the factory workweek and factory pay for March.

Mr. Martin spoke at the annual meeting of the Association of Reserve City Bankers at Boca Raton, Fla. Copies of his talk were made available here.

It was not the first time that a voice from Washington had been raised in favor of price cuts. It is a point that gets lost, however, in the debates most often heard here, over what the Government should or should not do. In the form presented, it is simply an exhortation. Neither Mr. Martin nor the Kennedy administration advocates price or wage controls.

[From the Warrensburg (N.Y.) News]

GOP MISSING THE BOAT ON PRICE REDUCTIONS

Joseph R. Slevin, national economics editor of the New York Herald Tribune, argues, as we do, for a national campaign to reduce prices. Noting that President Kennedy is planning to appoint a special consumers' counsel, he comments that "many economists believe the most important immediate contribution a consumers' counsel could make would be to persuade the administration to launch a drive for lower prices. They argue that a price-cut campaign is the main ingredient that campaign is the main ingredient that's missing from the administration's program to spark a vigorous upturn."

There is, he says, "no concerted effort to push down prices."

Republican Members of the Senate and the House are missing the boat when they fail to say on the floor that Mr. Slevin says so cogently here and what we said in our issue of March 16.

Progress in Building Complete Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have just read a very interesting and timely article concerning the problems of modern-day transportation which article was written by Mr. Morris Forgash, president of the United States Freight Co., and who is a renowned expert in the field of transportation. Mr. Forgash recently addressed the Syracuse Transportation Conference at Syracuse University on April 10, 1961. Under permission to extend my remarks I include the very informative article written by Mr. Forgash at this conference:

PROGRESS IN BUILDING COMPLETE TRANSPORTATION

(Remarks by Morris Forgash, president, U.S. Freight Co., at the Syracuse Transportation Conference, Syracuse University, April 10, 1961)

It is a pleasure and an honor for me to participate in this transportation conference which has been arranged as a preliminary to the 13th annual Salzberg Memorial Lecture. The brilliant and outstanding men who have consistently appeared on this program in the past have made this annual event a challenging and a noteworthy affair.

The spotlight is on the railroads today, but the fact that you have on the program such people as Jim Lyne, Dr. Williams, and me, is proof that the subject is not to be considered in a vacuum of self-analysis. Railroads are a very vital element of our national life, and it behooves us to candidly examine their current posture and critically analyze the direction in which they are going, but we must constantly keep in mind that our real objective is a strong transportation system, not merely a healthy railroad industry.

The significance of transportation to the culture, prosperity, and progress of people is nowhere better illustrated than here in Syracuse. The history of Syracuse, which can be traced back more than 300 years, is a veritable saga of American transportation. From Indian village to trading post—from giant salt-producing center to beautiful metropolis—the destiny of Syracuse has been shaped by transportation—Indian travois and packhorse, canalboat, and road wagon, railroad, motortruck, and airplane.

Syracuse is fortunately situated, transportationwise, but enterprise, not fortune, directs the course of events in transportation and it is a curious fact that among the many modes of transport which serve Syracuse today the coordination and means of interchange are not much better than existed between road and canal in the days when freight was transferred where Clinton Square now stands. True, we are at last beginning to make progress in the direction of complete transportation, but it has been a slow and painful process because of the resistance of apathy, atrophied thinking, and entrenched ideas.

The decade of the 1960's, which we have set within the scope of our sights for this conference, is the 14th decade of American railroading. In the last month of the year

1830, 'The Best Friend of Charleston," pride of the South Carolina Railroad, pulled the first train of cars ever drawn by a steam locomotive upon a track on the American continent. In the next several decades railroads literally mushroomed over the American landscape, and each road was built to its own specifications, with no thought of connection or completenes or interchange. The width of track ranged from 2 feet on the Brighton and Harrison to 6 feet on the Erie. The running and working parts of cars were equally individualistic.

Circumstances ultimately forced standardization of equipment and completeness of service among the various railroad systems, just as coordination and standardization will be forced upon our transportation systems today. The Civil War showed us the folly of having three widths of track between Chicago and New York. After many years of painful and costly process, we came to standard tracks and cars, and worked out the mechanics of interchange on the rail lines. We have been talking now for a long time about coordination and standardization of the 20th-century transportation plant, and we cannot afford to wait for a war to make up our minds that we must do something about it.

For more than half a century the railroad industry functioned without Federal regulation. In the words of the distinguished first Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Thomas M. Cooley, the railroads "were thus enabled to determine a great measure what rules should govern the transportation of persons and property; rules which intimately concerned the commercial, industrial, and social life of the people."

Then, on February 4, 1887—74 years ago—the act to regulate commerce was approved. The first report of the ICC is an interesting document. There were then an estimated 1,200 railroads, with about 138,000 miles of track. One hundred and eight railroads, operating more than 11,000 miles, were in receivership. The railroads were on the verge of destroying themselves, because they had lost the public confidence, largely because of widespread rebates, drawbacks, and special rates.

Nevertheless, it was not the purpose of the act to restrain or destroy competition. In their first report to Congress, the Commissioners, then five in number, said: "A study of the act to regulate commerce has satisfied the members of the Commission that it was intended in its passage to preserve for the people the benefits of competition as between the several transportation lines of the country." The Commissioners further said—and this is particularly important in the light of recent recommendations that have been urged upon Congress:

"It might possibly be within the competency of legislative power to prescribe for the several interstate railroads equal mileage rates for the whole country; but this, if endorsed, would put an end to competition as a factor in making rates, and to a very large extent deprive the great business centers of the country of their several natural advantages, and also of the benefit of expenditures made by them in creating for themselves new channels of trade."

That interpretation of the intent and meaning of the act has prevailed for three quarters of a century. It was, in effect, restated by Congress in the Transportation Act of 1958. It is still sound, and I am of the opinion that adherence to those first principles will result in rejection of recent recommendations for a statutory floor under competitive rates, and for severe restrictions on fourth section relief, as well as any other efforts to reverse what Congress did in 1958.

Moving down the corridor of time from the 1st to the 45th Annual Report of the Interstate Commerce Commission, we find the Commission again commenting about competition—this time a new and different kind of competition—that of the highway hauler whose superiority for certain tasks had been demonstrated by the First World War. In that report, filed in 1931, the Commission said that the railroads "have so many and so great inherent advantages of economy, particularly in the case of the longer hauls and the heavier traffic, that we cannot believe that they will not be able to withstand the competition of the motor trucks."

But, said the Commission, the "service must be provided which the shippers demand and require" and "it is probable that motor service may with advantage be used to supplement or to coordinate with the rail service." Means of making the necessary changes in service, such as "containers, demountable truck bodies, so-called railwagons, and changes in car types" were already appearing on the scene, the Commission pointed out. Finally, the Commission said that the old rate theories "often open a door to effective competition which might well be closed."

It is one of the inexplicable paradoxes of history that in the identical report in which the Commission made these wise and foresighted observations it referred to its decision in the Container case, rendered that same year, which rejected new pricing techniques for this new service, prescribed rates on the old classication basis, and dried up the very service which the Commission advocated for a period of almost 30 years.

When the Commission, in 1931, said that the railroads had many great inherent advantages in the longer hauls, and suggested that motor service might well be used to "supplement or coordinate" with such rail service, it had freshly concluded the most comprehensive investigation of motor service ever undertaken. The decision in this case, docket 18300, rendered in 1928, recommended Federal regulation of motor carriers. At that time the average length of haul of motortruck service ranged from about 20 to about 100 miles, depending on the territory involved. One large truck operator estimated, for the record, that the truckman's advantage over rail in ton-mile cost stopped at a point between 50 and 60 miles.

The kind of coordination the Commission then envisioned and advocated is the only kind that has any meaning—the joining of end-to-end services of differing modes of carriage so that each supplements and complements the other. Each mode must perform within the orbit dictated by its economic and services advantages. I think you will agree with me that this is a most descriptive and concise definition of the term "complete transportation."

It would not have been so formidable a task, back in 1931, to have worked out a plan of coordinated rail and motor service, given men in transportation with the will and the foresight to do so. Motor operations as they then existed were fully within the scope of their economic utility and ideally suited to complement rail service. But we let the golden opportunity pass for lack of initiative and imagination, and as motor service grew and lengthened out to be competitive with the rails for all distances, any idea of effective coordination became vastly more difficult to implement.

However, the picture has not changed to anything like the degree the public has been led to believe. We have long distance trucking, it is true, but it accounts for only a very small portion of the total service. The average motor common carrier haul per ton in 1959 was 273 miles. Although I have no official figures on the subject, I am confident that at least 90 percent of all intercity motor carrier movements in this country are for distances less than 500 miles.

Coordination or complete transportation based on the irrefutable economic facts that the railroads still are the most efficient medium for moving large quantities of freight over long distances, and that the trucks excel in the shorter hauls, can even now be achieved. In fact, it is being achieved on an increasing scale through the newer forms of piggybacking. But those who fear coordination of a type that will reflect the true economic advantages of the respective participants in any given joint haul have raised such a hue and cry that, to some who are not acquainted with the facts, the picture may seem to be one of contrived confusion.

Controversy and confusion are not limited to the area of piggybacking. The railroad industry, which has received a constantly declining share of the total traffic of the country over a period of 25 years or more—which has seen its employment cut exactly in half in just 30 years—stands accused of driving domestic water carriage to the wall, and of engaging in predatory and unfair raids on the traffic of motor carriers. It is time to examine the facts.

DO WE HAVE MORE SOLUTIONS THAN PROBLEMS IN TRANSPORTATION?

What is the problem in transportation? Certainly we won't find any solutions until we define the problem. We have a competitive struggle, yes, but competition is the essence of free enterprise in a democracy. If we ever eliminate competition we will destroy initiative. Could it be that we have mistaken competititve jockeying and jostling for more basic problems?

Let me take just a moment to recount how we came to be where we are today—using broad brush strokes. This is necessary for proper perspective and direction. In the 1930's competition of a lusty young motor carrier industry had a depressing effect on the railroad rate structure. Then came World War II which strained the resources of all carriers, and virtually destroyed intercoastal and coastwise shipping.

It is a monumental distortion of historical fact to charge either the railroads or the ICC with responsibility for the virtual disappearance of American coastal shipping. When the Government took over many vessels in this trade during World War II the industry was already sick. In the 10-year period immediately preceding the war the industry lost $8 million. The fleet of vessels was literally decimated by wartime activities. Many of the lines never resumed operations after the war. Those that did were beset by spiraling labor costs, incessant strikes, and astronomically mounting replacement and operating costs. Mr. Ralph E. Casey, president, American Merchant Marine Institute, summed the matter up very well in an address delivered in July 1959, before the annual convention of the International Longshoremen's Association at Miami Beach, when he said:

"You know, as well as I, that our once flourishing domestic trades are now dead. It is often said that this is the result of unfair treatment by the Interstate Commerce Commission. That may have played a part, but when they tell me it costs more to load a ship in New York and unload it in San Francisco than it does to bring it 5,000 miles around three coasts, including the transit of the Panama Canal, I question whether the Government is primarily to blame."

We should recognize the truth of what Mr. Casey said and should not require the competitors of the ship lines to subsidize them by holding an umbrella over their rates.

Now the railroads have ultimately heeded the repeated and long-continued admonitions of the regulatory agency and the Congress and are embarking on a vigorous pro-

gram of self-help. They have introduced not only new pricing techniques but new and improved services based on technological advancements and new ideas. They are reexamining their competitive posture up and down the line in an effort to recapture the traffic which they once indisputably enjoyed but which they lost to other modes of carriage.

The railroads were told to do these things as long ago as 1931 in the Commission's report to which I earlier referred. They were admonished by the Commission in some of the decisions in the ex parte rate cases to employ different ratemaking techniques. In its report in Ex parte No. 206, decided in 1957, the Commission told the railroads that "the time had probably come when consideration should be given to ways of increasing rates other than by means of horizontal increases." Congress bluntly told the railroads to improve their services and modernize their rate structure when it enacted the Transportation Act of 1958, and it made certain, by enacting section 15a(3), that in doing so they would not be required to hold a rate umbrella over their competitors. But when the railroads at last embarked on a determined program to arrest their declining position in the transportation picture the anguished cries of their competitors were heard across the land.

Again I say, "What is the problem?" Competition took traffic which the railroads once handled and which they perhaps thought, with a trace of complacency, they would always have. Is the problem now to prevent the railroads, by artificial barriers, from getting some of it back if they can do so through the exercise of their inherent advantages and a little initiative? I do not think so.

Congress thoroughly examined all facets of the transportation picture just 2 years ago. The responsible Senate committee heard evidence which now fills 2,300 printed pages in 4 volumes. The corresponding House committee held thorough but less exhaustive hearings. Weighing all the facts, the committees concluded and the Congress agreed, that the railroad industry was in need of immediate help in several directions.

Among the reasons for the plight of the railroads, the Senate committee found, were Government assistance to their competitors and overregulation of the railroads. But by all odds the most significant finding was that the railroads had not consistently been permitted to assert their inherent advantages in the making of rates. To correct that situation section 15a(3) was enacted.

The purpose of section 15a(3), as plainly stated in the Senate committee report on the 1958 act, was "to encourage competition in transportation." But the statement is insistently made, and repeated again and again: "Yes, Congress intended to insure greater freedom in ratemaking, but it did not intend to permit unfair or destructive competition." The statement is perfectly true, but what is it intended to prove? We must all agree that unfair and destructive competition is prohibited by the law. The Transportation Act of 1958 did not create the prohibition—it merely restated a provision of existing law. Is the repeated statement of the proposition now intended to imply that the ICC is ignoring or misconstruing a fundamental precept of the law, and, if so, that the courts will sustain the Commission in perpetrating unlawfulness? That would be a terrible indictment of our administrators and judges. Every decision on a controverted issue leaves a disgruntled litigant, and each of the basic modes of carriage has been disappointed with one or another of the Commission's decisions under section 15a(3), but the courts, not Congress, are where the issues should be reviewed.

The decisional process with regard to such factual situations as have arisen so far under section 15a(3) has not yet run its course, but there are insistent demands that the section be changed to fit this or that preconceived idea of what the final decisions ought to be. I suggest that Congress and the people knew very well what the policy of section 15a(3) was when it was enacted. The words of the statute are plain. They are reinforced by even plainer language in the committee reports. Only the Interstate Commerce Commission and the courts are vested with the legal authority to apply the language of the law to stated factual situations. We do not write our laws in sand, nor should we erase them with hysteria.

However well intended, I strongly believe that efforts to change the policy laid down by the Transportation Act of 1958 at this time are both premature and unwise. You are familiar with some of the specific proposals for statutory change. The Doyle report would place a statutory floor under competitive rates, based on a statistical formula, and establish "umbrella type" ratemaking by force of statute. S. 1197 would add a great many impossible complicating factors to the presently plain and simple provisions of section 15a(3), and hence would no doubt also result in statutory umbrella ratemaking.

These proposals would take us in exactly the opposite direction from the course we so carefully charted in 1958. In fact, they would reverse a policy to which, except for an unfortunate experience with the so-called recapture clause of 1920, we have adhered through the entire history of regulation—careful avoidance of ratemaking by legislative fiat. If we substitute statutory for regulatory ratemaking in the smallest area, it could spread dangerously and rapidly throughout all regulatory law.

Such proposals do not take account of the realities of today nor the potentialities of the future. If they were intended, for example, to aid the motor carriers someone has failed to calculate rightly. They could destroy the motor carrier industry. Ratemaking is not an exact science—it no longer follows a pattern—it reflects the terrific imbalance of traffic, particularly of manufactured products and products of the farm and the forest. The common carrier rate structure has been eroded by the cumulative effect of the contract carrier, the "gypsy" trucker, the "gray area" operator. Yet, we are told that we must be careful not to destroy traditional patterns of ratemaking—that we must protect the integrity of the rate structure. How can you destroy something that no longer exists?

To fill their vehicles and prevent costly empty movement—to meet the irresponsible rates of the unregulated carriers—to fulfill the demands of products that cannot possibly bear their full share of the transportation burden, the carriers make vast numbers of rates that will not meet any formula based on costs.

Statement No. 4–60, released by the ICC in September 1960 lists 80 commodities moving in rail carload service which do not defray out-of-pocket costs. A similar study would undoubtedly show a larger number moving at submarginal rates in motor service. We are not going to change the factors that cause these commodities to move at below-cost rates: What are we going to do—force the common carriers to give up the traffic, or give the first common carrier in the field squatters' rights by refusing to let anyone else meet his rates? I repeat that, whatever alternative we choose, the motor carrier industry may well be the first victim of any scheme of statutory ratemaking or inflexible rate floors. I am, personally, having a great deal of difficulty in visualizing or understanding how any standard of ratemaking in the form of legislative directives to the regulatory agencies can make due provision for these extenuating circumstances and conditions that a carrier encounters almost daily. I have extreme doubt that anyone can produce the appropriate legislative language free of confusion and devastating ambiguity.

Once we embark upon ratemaking by legislative fiat we will have put our feet upon a road that will lead to the ultimate stifling of initiative and stultification of progress. I respectfully commend these observations to the careful consideration of our lawmakers and all others who have a responsibility in the matter.

From what I have said so far you may have gained the impression that I am talking about roadblocks rather than progress in the building of complete transportation. What I have been trying to do is to clear away some of the confusion so as to arrive at a clear point of departure. And I will ask your indulgence for one more detour because it is important that we understand the factors bearing on the subject if we are to understand the subject itself.

GOOD ADMINISTRATION OF TRANSPORTATION LAW REQUIRES GOOD MEN—SOME WAYS TO SECURE AND KEEP THEM

Since 1940 the national transportation policy of the United States as applied to domestic surface carriers has been directed to three ends—the developing, coordinating, and preserving of a national transportation system, by various means, adequate to meet the needs of the commerce and defense of the Nation. We have entrusted the implementation of that policy to 11 men. Unfortunately, we could not vest them with magic wands by which to discharge their fateful task. Sometimes I am afraid we have not vested them with even the least of their due—our complete confidence. Lately I have been more apprehensive on that score.

As I said a little earlier, it has become a popular pastime to make the Commission a scapegoat for everything that is conceived to be wrong in transportation. We should always remember that so long as we adhere to our established principles of Government we must depend on these men who sit on the Commission to interpret and enforce the law, and if we so impair the standing of the agency as to make it impossible any longer to obtain the services of dedicated men of talent and integrity, we will have destroyed one of our greatest legacies. We will have sold our birthright for a mess of pottage. Maybe it has only an indirect bearing on my subject matter, but I ask you to consider for a few moments some matters relating to the ICC that I consider to be of vital importance.

I am reminded that the then Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, the Honorable Charles Evans Hughes, addressing a meeting of the Association of ICC Practitioners in 1930, said:

"I suppose that no agency of Government has more complicated problems than those which confront the Interstate Commerce Commission, and no intelligent student can fail to realize that the success of this endeavor in a sphere of the highest importance is to a very great extent the measure of our capacity for self-government."

Viewed in that light, to insure the success of the Interstate Commerce Commission in its mission becomes a personal and a demanding obligation of every citizen.

We have been extremely fortunate in the caliber of men who have been attracted to service on the Interstate Commerce Commission throughout its long history. It was Eastman who gave us his famous 12-point Primer on Administrative Tribunals just a few weeks before he died in 1944. The sixth

point has been more quoted than any other. It reads:

"The statutes which the tribunal administer should be well, simply, and carefully framed, but the personnel which does the administering is more important than the wording of the statute. *Good men can produce better results with a poor law than poor men can produce with a good law.*"

What has attracted and held the great men who have made careers of service on the ICC? There is an indefinable spark which kindles in men a desire for unselfish public service—we see it in the teaching profession, in the sciences, and in Government. Over and beyond that, however, is the fact that the high public esteem in which the ICC has traditionally been held has invested membership on the Commission with an aura of dignity like that surrounding the high courts, the National Legislature and the Cabinet posts. If that standing and dignity are lost, a great deal of the incentive to men of stature and dedication will disappear.

In view of the absolutely incalculable importance of the proper administration of our transportation laws, we should, instead of maligning and belaboring the Commission, immediately take steps to strengthen it—give it adequate and competent personnel—put it on a healthy financial diet—and insure its ability to continue to attract men of the highest order of intelligence and integrity. What steps can we take?

A good place to start is with the Commission's budget. James M. Landis recently said that "economic rigor, if not parsimony" has characterized the Budget Bureau's attitude towards the agencies for almost a decade. In the last couple of years a little more generosity has been evidenced, but still the budget of the ICC is ridiculously low considering the importance of its mission. Twenty million dollars to regulate an industry that bills us twenty billion a year for its services. Twenty-three hundred people to man an agency that employed twenty-six hundred in 1940. And since 1940 the Commission has acquired jurisdiction over two new agencies of transport—three parts have been added to the act—we have acquired two new States and added numerous new laws to the statutes which the Commission administers.

If the Commission, accustomed to a starvation diet for these many years, is too modest to ask for what it needs in the way of budget and staff, management consultants can be hired to advise Congress. Delays in the functioning of the administrative processes can cost the carriers and the public in a matter of days what we pay to run the ICC a whole year. Is that the way to run any business—or a Government agency?

We get back, of course, to the fact that that the essential ingredient of good administration is good administrators, and administrators are people—people with families and responsibilities. We should insure them of more adequate compensation and security. No board of directors of any corporation in America or the world makes more important or far-reaching decisions than the 11 members of the Interstate Commerce Commission. To attract the kind of men that you and I want on the Interstate Commerce Commission I suggest that a salary of $30,000 a year be provided. And with adequate salary should go a reasonable allowance to reimburse agency members for expenses necessarily incurred as an incidence of their position.

Tenure of office is more important than salary to men who value their independence. Until comparatively recent times the vast majority of appointees to the Commission quite evidently accepted the post as a career, and those who distinguished themselves, as a surprising number did, were insured of reappointment regardless of the political party in office. Aitchison set a record of service with 34 years and 9 months—then came Balthasar Meyer with 28 years, Eastman and Clements with 25, Mahaffie with 24, and a long list with 15 to 20 years of service. In contrast, all of the present members of the ICC have been appointed since 1953.

This is not something which reflects unfavorably on the current members of the Commission or on the administration, past or present, but it is a symptom which ought to be arrested before it becomes a chronic condition. How can we have any continuity of policy or attract men who seek public service as a calling, and not a stepping stone, unless we insure them a tenure of office that will permit them to plan ahead and relieve them of tension and pressures? We should provide a statutory term of office for members of the regulatory agencies of 10 years, and allow for reappointment up to the age of 65. Retirement pay should be adequate to insure that no ex-Commissioner would have to go out in industry and seek a job.

We are well aware of the constant pressures to which our agency members are subjected. Why not give them a little insulation against these forces by providing them with a tenure that will extend through two presidential terms and into a third?

Precedent is one of the most important facets of our system of jurisprudence. It gives stability to the law and inspires confidence in the people that they can proceed in a given manner without fear of reprisal. Continuity of service helps to insure stability of policy. One other way to insure such continuity and stability is to follow a custom that seems to have fallen into disuse in recent years of elevating career men to Commission membership when career men of stature and ability prove themselves worthy of such appointment.

Perhaps you may think I have unduly emphasized this point, but it is one of the most important issues in transportation today. Crisis has been developing around our independent agencies and, as Chief Justice Hughes said long ago, this is an area so vital to our well-being that its success will measure our capacity for self-government. I have been an advocate of a Department of Transportation for promotional activities and I am convinced that we will ultimately come to that, but the problem of the regulatory agencies is an entirely separate matter. They do not belong in an executive department. I have suggested three immediate steps that we should press for, and we can muster the strength to put them through if we really try. They are:

1. Sharply increase the budget of the ICC with authority and direction to hire the necessary personnel at all levels to get the job done, whether in safety, enforcement, or the decisional process.

2. Increase the salaries of the members of the Commission, and provide them with reasonable allowance and adequate retirement. I would also increase the salaries of the top-level career employees.

3. Provide for statutory tenure of 10 years, with authority to reappoint up to retirement age.

This may not be the complete answer to the problems revolving around our agencies which have given rise to tons of studies and reports in recent years, but it is something concrete. It is a good starting point.

CONTAINERIZATION, STANDARDIZATION AND SIMPLIFIED PRICING—KEYS TO COMPLETE TRANSPORTATION

I can think of no beter way to indicate to you why I have spent so much time leading up to what I shall make a very brief report on progress in building complete transportation—which boils down to progress in containerization and piggybacking—than to quote from the January 1961 issue of Fleet Owner, as follows:

"Month by month piggyback takes on more weight and size than a razorback hog in Arkansas. This consistent growth over the past 2 or 3 years is in spite of a tangled web of rate conditions, a tug-of-war for control between trucks and rails, and a wide range of nonstandard equipment. The reason's simple. Shippers like the lower mileage rates and the convenience."

This innovation in transportation that is growing like a razorback hog cannot be considered in a vacuum. I think, however, that I have discussed enough of the atmosphere in which it exists, now for a brief discussion of the containerization and piggyback movement without which complete transportation is unattainable.

In 1954, in a declaratory judgment proceeding before the ICC, the common carrier truckers vigorously pressed the position that the railroads could not haul highway trailers on flatcars without motor carrier certificates. The Commission brushed this aside, and said that the railroads not only could haul their own freight in their own trailers, but could haul the trailers of shippers, forwarders, and private carriers, but not those of common carrier motor carriers except under joint rates and divisions.

Unfortunately, in my view, the Commission, in its decision in the case I am referring to—and that was in 1954—strained the definition of "joint rates" beyond all recognition. It gave its blessing to a device that had been employed in a few places, whereby motor carriers forwarded their trailers over the rails rather than pulling them over the highways. This was called "substituted service," an apt term. The Commission said the motor carriers could not so forward their trailers, and pay the published rates of the railroads, but when the fiction of a "joint rate" was indulged, and the rate paid by the motor carrier was put in a contract labeled "division sheet," the same result was accomplished. The substituted service arrangements came to be known as plan I. When true joint rail-truck rates are entered into we have plan V.

Notice ought to be taken of the fact that the long-distance motor carriers are not satisfied with the two plans of piggybacking which the Commission has said are available to them—plans I and V. They seek authority to use published tariff rates of the railroads, of a type represented by plan III and IV which I will presently describe. Clearly, as the Commission has said, this would make them carriers and shippers at the same time—it would cause them to violate their permits which specify movements over the "roads, highways, streets, and ways by motor vehicle"—it would require rewriting the definition of a motor carrier and practically the whole of part II of the act. It might even raise constitutional questions.

Plan I—substituted service—has not prospered very well. It has nothing to recommend it to the shipper—he deals only with the motor carrier, pays the regular motor carrier rate, and if any economies accrue from the service they stick to the motor carriers' hands. It is not coordination but substitution.

Plan V piggybacking has had and continues to have a stormy career. As I said, it rests on a true joint-rate and through-route arrangement between railroads and motor carriers—the type contemplated by the statute. But not many such arrangements were ever entered into for the transportation of general freight. In the hauling of new automobiles plan V gained considerable headway, and caused a tremendous furor.

A year or so ago some of the railroads and automobile haulaway carriers—in most cases the short-haul motor carriers—began entering into arrangements for the hauling of new automobiles, in motor trailers loaded on flatcars. A flatcar would hold two such trailers with four or five automobiles each. This improved speed and efficiency and re-

duced costs and it was an eminently satisfactory arrangement to the railroads and motor carriers involved and to the man who pays the bill—the shipper. But it took some traffic from the long-distance automobile haul-away carriers and they cried that they were being driven out of business. A propaganda barrage of unrivaled proportions was mounted against plan V piggybacking, and it still continues.

Oddly enough, advancing technology rendered the original plan V operation practically obsolete before it ever got a good start. Now, instead of loading truck trailers on flatcars the railroads use, very largely, specially designed, lower-level flatcars fitted with trilevel racks which will accommodate 12 standard or 15 compact cars. This still could be termed "piggybacking" and still could rest on a joint rail-truck rate, but it is, in fact, something entirely new in transportation.

Now what crime have the railroads committed in thus initiating a new and complete transportation service? Why, according to widely publicized charges, they are hauling new automobiles at rates generally 50 percent or more under rates offered by the truck-away companies. Think of that. The transportation costs on 5 million new motor vehicles can conceivably be cut in half. What are we to do—ban this innovation which for the first time in 25 years holds forth the hope of halting the continuing upward spiral of freight rates?

But, says truck labor, if you don't stop this it will destroy the jobs of 15,000 truck employees. To this rail labor asks, would it be in order for 450,000 rail employees who have lost their jobs largely because of erosion of rail traffic to send condolences?

The truly phenomenal thing about this innovation which enables the railroads to slice the freight rates on automobiles in half is that it still is only 50 percent as efficient as it could and ought to be. Just as he always has in the case of the automobile haul-away service, the shipper is still required to buy a round-trip ticket for a one-way ride. The rail equipment, specialized like the motor equipment, has to deadhead back to origin after it delivers each payload. Why? For lack of an idea? No—for lack of initiative.

Equipment that will haul new automobiles in one direction and dry cargo—even liquid cargo—in the other, is already in actual production. Isn't it time that we started to give the poor, long-suffering shipper a break? Why not bring back to him what he consumes and uses in the same car that hauls away what he produces? Everybody will be the beneficiary.

Plans III and IV piggyback, under which shipper-owned trailers, or shipper-owned trailers and flatcars are hauled from ramp-to-ramp at a stated charge per flatcar movement, are now too well known and too well accepted to require detailed description. These plans, too, have come under attack in legal proceedings and by propaganda. The opposition reflects the competitive efficacy of the service.

By these plans the railroads found a way of bringing about coordination through the leverage of economics. By publishing a charge that reflects their own cost advantage for the movement of trailers on flatcars, they can and will make it uneconomical for the shipper to use his own trucks for the long haul. The rail and truck services then will seek their own level with a resultant combination of road and rail hauls that is tailored to shippers' needs, not carriers' convenience.

Piggybacking of the type represented by plans III and IV, and automobile hauling, represents the first break the shipper has had in a generation in the matter of freight charges. It constitutes the first simple answer to the equation into which the shipper resolves his transportation problems—time and price. The traffic manager views transportation as a link in the distribution chain and, since it is a very expensive link, he buys it with care. He no longer has to take the carriers' word for how much it costs to move his goods from factory to store—he can find out for himself and he will buy his own trucks if he is pushed too far.

But the railroads have not lost their inherent advantages as mass and distance haulers—they simply neglected to exploit them for a while and the parade of progress almost passed them by before they woke up to what was going on. The railroads can beat the private hauler's costs, and better his speeds. They have proved it by plans III and IV piggyback. There is no other development on the horizon that offers any hope of stemming the tide of private carriage. And the key to success of these plans in meeting private carriage is the simplified freight rate—so many dollars per movement—the same basis on which the shipper calculates his cost of doing it himself.

Piggyback service, once it got moving, developed with such startling suddenness that it is still beset by growing pains, not the least of which is the lack of standardization of equipment and method. The problems are being earnestly studied, and, while there will be a certain amount of obsolescence as we experiment or jump the gun without carefully analyzing the situation, in time uniformity will be achieved.

No transportation service in modern history has moved ahead so far so fast as piggybacking since its revival in 1954. In 1960 piggyback flatcar loadings were more than a third greater than in 1959—more than double what they were in 1958—five times greater than in 1955. This means that well over a half a million cars, loaded with more than a million trailers, were handled in 1960. Still accounting for only about 2 percent of all freight car loadings, it is obvious that if the present rate of growth continues piggyback loadings will account for a very substantial portion of rail service within a comparatively short time.

As a matter of fact, many railroad officials today admit that the fate of the boxcar as the predominant factor of rail transportation—a position it has held for more than a century—is sealed. It will not be good business to continue to buy boxcars from which the railroads obtain only 46 miles of service a day when flatcars in TOFC service average 175 miles a day and some perform up to 450 miles. It will be uneconomical to continue to move freight in boxcars with a 40-percent empty return ratio when that empty mileage can be cut in half, or more, by piggyback service.

An editorial in the Washington Post on March 21 of this year, dealing thoughtfully with the situation in transportation, said:

"The nub of the transport problem is rapid technological, urban and industrial growth and change. It is a problem of rapid adaptation, calling for the closest coordination of all types of common and private carriage."

The editorial does not tell us anything we did not already know, but it is something that should have been said sooner and more often. Industry simply moved away from the railheads. Plans III and IV piggyback are the first practical media the railroads have found for providing the off-track shipper a through service combining the flexibility of the truck with the speed and economy of the railroad.

The shipping public will demand more and more piggyback service—they will demand its speed, its low basic cost at a unit price, its nearly damage-free safety, its predictability and its convenience.

That is, very briefly, a report on progress in building complete transportation as it looks to me today. Rome was not built in a day, so we must have patience and perseverance. On the other hand, we are told that construction of the Tower of Babel stopped instantly when the people were caused to speak different languages. We must understand what we are talking about when we speak of coordination—it is not to be confused with substitution. We must make certain when we talk of transportation problems that we are not speaking simply of somebody's attempt to gain a competitive advantage, or slug a competitor. Our effort should be to produce the best possible transportation for the development of commerce and the defense of our Nation.

Progress in building complete transportation is being achieved despite great turmoil and uncertainty. It is being achieved because some people in transportation, and I am one of them, have faith that when all the shouting has died down we will emerge still holding fast to first principles. It is being achieved because competition is forcing change, stimulating new ideas, putting the spur to enterprise. It will continue so long as we adhere to the principles of regulation first established 74 years ago and consistently followed ever since—a maximum of competition with a minimum of control. Progress will stop when we abandon these principles of free enterprise, for when enterprise ceases to be free it is dead.

This is a time for cool heads and firm resistance to hysteria. Radical changes in basic transportation laws are being urged under the mantle of expediency. We are being importuned to bridle competition with the halter of legislative fiat. Our regulators are being assailed and maligned.

The call now is to statesmanship, in and out of Government. The regulation of transportation, no less than transportation itself, is at a crossroads. Let us remember the truth of what Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes said long ago—the success of this endeavor in a sphere of the highest importance is to a very great extent the measure of our capacity for self-government. The call is to you and to me, and we cannot afford to remain silent. Our destination is clearly indicated—let us march.

Abuse of the United States by the Castro Regime in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the following editorial entitled "How Castro Knifes Us His Dupes," which appeared in the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel, April 4, 1961.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel, Apr. 4, 1961]

HOW CASTRO KNIFES US HIS DUPES

How segments of American citizenship unwittingly, in most cases, were partly responsible for elevating Cuban Dictator Castro to be the power and menace that he is today to the entire Western Hemisphere, and how he continues to add amazing insult to injury by subjecting the United States to the most vicious abuse and vituperative of prop-

aganda was graphically portrayed over the Manion Forum Network nationwide radio program over the past weekend. This horrific, but most authentic revelation of how we were duped by Castro and are now being subjected to diabolic vilification as our reward, was presented to the American people by one who has witnessed the ramifications of the Castro regime at firsthand.

He is H. W. Balgooyen, executive vice president of the American & Foreign Power Co., Inc., which has for years been one of the largest and most constructive U.S. business investments in Cuba and other Latin American countries. Dr. Clarence Manion, director of the Manion Forum Network, on the basis of his own firsthand knowledge, pointed out in introducing Mr. Balgooyen how:

"In the Communist technique, when A robs B, the thing for A to do is to shout the big lie that B has robbed him. So it is that Castro, who has taken a billion dollars worth of property from American industry in Cuba continues to scream the lie that American capitalists have robbed the Cuban people. As a matter of fact, in Cuba and throughout all of Latin America, U.S. business firms have always paid the highest wages and the highest taxes. These companies also provide the best housing, living conditions, and fringe benefits for their employees that are to be had anywhere in the countries where they operate."

"What I have to say," said Balgooyen, "is partly about Cuban Dictator Castro and his ties with the international Communist conspiracy. It is partly about the United States' position in this hemisphere, which has been undermined by Communist propaganda and eroded by years of inattention and abdication of the responsibilities of leadership."

Mr. Balgooyen pertinently added that he was obliged to return an indictment against certain ultra-liberal or positively subversive molders of thought and public opinion, "who have fostered a moral and intellectual climate on which these tragic events could come to pass. He declared that:

"While many of our businessmen have been immersed in their business as usual, our politicians in their politics, as usual; and our intellectuals in their breast beating as usual, the international Communist conspiracy has established a beachhead in Cuba, and a highly organized and fantastically successful campaign of propaganda and subversion has been sweeping through Latin America. The highly-trained professional conspirators who are achieving these spectacular results have been aided and comforted by a pack of Marxist intellectuals in our own country, who bay in full cry with every foreign chorus of vituperation against the United States and against the system of enlightened and socially-responsible private enterprise which is both the inspiration and the practical expression of the American way of life."

Mr. Balgooyen documented chapter and verse how Castro has "completely betrayed his early supporters in Cuba's propertied classes, who lost all their possessions and were driven into prison and exile; has deliberately betrayed Cuban labor whose wages were slashed and whose leaders were liquidated and replaced by Communist stooges; has cynically betrayed the Cuban campesino, who was promised land of his own, but was given instead, a job as a slave laborer on a collective farm; has ruthlessly betrayed private investors whose properties were confiscated; and has heartlessly betrayed Cuba's God-fearing mothers and fathers whose children were indoctrinated in atheistic communism." And he cited how recently "the paean of hate that is spewed forth daily over the captive Cuban radio included the following message to President Kennedy:

"Open letter to an illiterate millionaire, Mr. John F. Kennedy. For some time now, we have been following your political trajectory in your attempt to replace that decrepit and stupid old man who answers to the name of Caesar Attila Eisenhower on the throne of the Yankee empire. We understand, Mr. Kennedy, that you must preach slimy lies; but what we cannot justify and approve, Ediot Mr. Kennedy, is that you use Cuba's name in your political maneuvers. You are nothing less, you imbecile, than a piece of the yoke that oppresses the U.S. people. As to the warning that our revolution will perish, we would like to have you come to Cuba so that we can hang you by your tongue."

We submit that should arouse anyone from his lethargy.

Dr. Philip Loven Elliott

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, April 14, 1961, North Carolina lost one of its most distinguished educators in the passing of Dr. Philip Loven Elliott. At the time of his death Dr. Elliott was President of Gardner-Webb College, an outstanding junior college in Boiling Springs, N.C.

The Shelby Daily Star and the Cleveland Times, newspapers published at Shelby, N.C., carried editorials on April 15 and April 18 with respect to the life, character, and public service of Dr. Elliott.

With the thought that my colleagues in the House would like to read these editorials and the story of Dr. Elliott's passing, which appeared in the Cleveland Times for April 18, I include them in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Cleveland Times, Apr. 18, 1961]

FINAL RITES CONDUCTED ON SUNDAY FOR PRESIDENT PHIL ELLIOTT OF G-W

Dr. Philip Lovin Elliott, for 18 years president of Gardner-Webb College and who would have retired at the end of the present school term, died suddenly Friday morning around 9 o'clock after suffering a heart attack at his desk in his college office. Classes at the college suspended until Monday morning.

Dr. Elliott had previously suffered a heart attack in 1954 and was away from Gardner-Webb for almost a year. He notified the board of trustees several months ago he was willing to retire if a successor could be found and it was announced just recently that he would be succeeded by Dr. E. Eugene Poston.

The beloved president guided Gardner-Webb through its greatest years of growth, having accepted his post in 1943 when the college had 71 students and 12 staff members with total assets of the college listed at around $300,000. A student body of 640 fills the campus today and the institution owns 36 buildings with total assets at close to $3 million.

Native of Wayside in Swain County, he was the son of the late Isaac Bartley and Rachel Jenkins Elliott. He was a graduate of Mars Hill and Wake Forest College from which he received his A.B. degree in 1919. He earned his master's degree at the University of North Carolina in 1925 and did graduate work at Johns Hopkins and Duke University. An honorary doctor of education degree was conferred upon him by Carson-Newman College in 1951 and an honorary LL.D. degree by Wake Forest College in 1959.

He was an ordained Baptist minister and had served as principal of Mitchell Collegiate Institute in 1919–20. At Mars Hill he was dean, vice president, and head of the English department from 1923 to 1930, later going to Western Carolina College at Cullowhee as head of its English department when called to Gardner-Webb.

Dr. Elliott was a member and past president of Shelby Rotary Club and among the positions he has held include: trustee of Southern Baptist Theological Seminary; president of the North Carolina College Conference in 1952; member of the Governor's commission on adult education in North Carolina member of the Governor's commission on interracial cooperation.

Surviving are his widow, Mrs. Etta Maurine Carringer Elliott; three daughters, Mrs. L. T. Oakes, of Roanoke Rapids; Mrs. Edward Grady, of New York City; Mrs. Geoffry Churchill, of Chapel Hill, and Philip L. Elliott, Jr., graduate student at the University of Georgia, and four grandchildren.

Funeral rites were conducted Sunday afternoon at 3 o'clock in Boiling Springs Baptist Church with the Rev. Max Linnens, pastor, officiating. The body lay in state for 1 hour prior to the services and burial was in Cleveland Memorial Park.

Officials from many educational institutions were in attendance for the funeral services.

[From the Shelby Daily Star, Apr. 15, 1961]

HE PRESSED ON TO A HIGH CALLING

If Dr. Phil Elliott could have chosen the place for his last few moments of physical existence on this terrestrial globe, chances are that it would have been at his desk in the institution he loved—Gardner-Webb College.

There, surrounded by the walls he had helped to build, within earshot of college officers, faculty and staff members, and not far from the students whose lives he sought to enrich through Christian education, Phil Elliott felt at home.

His last, full measure of devotion to the Baptist institution was expressed during the year when he offered to step down early and make the transition smoother for his successor as president. Again, he had placed the good of the institution above the personal interests of Phil Elliott.

Not many years ago a local businessman remarked about Dr. Elliott:

"He never gets enough for that college but that he always wants more."

But a friend nearby rejoined:

"True enough, but you can't deny he wants it in order to better educate your youngsters and others like them."

There were many facets to the abilities of Phil Elliott. He prided himself in being first of all a teacher, and he brought to that calling a background rich in scholarship. He was a successful educator, an accomplished orator, a dreamer who worked to make his dreams come true for Gardner-Webb College.

He was a man of high principle, steady in his faith and rockbound in his convictions. Yet, he was tolerant and compassionate, careful to respect the sincere views of others and jealous of freedom of belief and expression.

Phil Elliott's wants and needs were simple, and they were determined by a finely hued sense of values, a sure determination of what is important in life—family, friends, love, religious faith, education, introspection, nature.

As the officers, faculty, employees and students of Gardner-Webb say an earthbound goodby to their beloved president, it would be well for them to remember his words:

"This is no time to congratulate ourselves on past accomplishments when there is so much yet to be done. We must keep pace with the needs of our people, and like Alice in Wonderland, we must run as fast as we can merely to stay where we are."

Phil Elliott has run the good race. He has finished the course. He has accepted the prize.

[From the Cleveland Times, Apr. 18, 1961]

DR. PHILIP LOVIN ELLIOTT

Dr. Philip Lovin Elliott is dead.

In one of his final addresses to the student body at Gardner-Webb College he quoted these lines from Tennyson's "Ulysses":

"I am a part of all that I have met;
Yet all experience is an arch where through
Gleams that untraveled world whose margin fades
Forever and forever when I move."

Even though death was unexpected and came as a shock to Clevelanders, educators, students, and all who knew and loved Dr. Elliott, still ringing in the ears of faculty members are his recent farewell remarks: "We climbed the hill together * * *," as he quoted Robert Burns: "To me we haven't done all we've dreamed, as I come to the end of the official journey * * *"; "As we come to the end of these experiences together, they melt into a mosaic of beauty for me, like the rays of the sun and the clouds of a beautiful sunset * * *"; "I know a little bit of loneliness, disappointments, heartaches, hurts * * * and being on the brink * * *"; "I shall be watching you wherever I am. It is my hope that this institution, under God, with your dedication, scholarship, and devotion, will be dedicated to the production of human beings that shall be of value and have integrity."

Dr. Elliott was wise, noble, lovable. He stood for all that is good, and this goodness will live with the hundreds of young scholars and friends who knew a better way of life through him, not only at Gardner-Webb but at other educational institutions and communities which can boast of his leadership.

In the words of Gardner-Webb President-elect Dr. Eugene Poston, "The death of a Christian is never a tragedy. It is always a victory."

We, too, believe that this man who achieved so much for Gardner-Webb and lived an exemplary life, continues to be watching over those he loved so well and is praying for us.

His life indeed melted into a beautiful sunset.

Disabled Combat Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from a disabled American veteran calling attention to hardships he and other disabled veterans are suffering. I believe his letter should be read so that others may be informed of this unfortunate situation. The letter follows:

[Very urgent please]

APRIL 11, 1961.

The Honorable WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON,
House Veterans Affairs Committee.

DEAR SIR: Fifteen percent compensation increase, desperate appeal in behalf of aging, totally disabled combat veterans, the inadvertently forgotten men.

This is an urgent appeal for a humane economic existence for these men and their wives, by means of a liberal increase in compensation. Out of due respect for them, I ask your forbearance with its lengthy contents.

A vicious economic cycle has clamped a stranglehold on the miserable existence of these unfortunate people. The continued rise in living costs has long ago entirely erased the increased benefits they received in 1957. Everybody drawing money from the Federal Government received an increase in 1960, except our combat disabled veterans. The aging, totally disabled are economically worse off today than ever before. The rapidly soaring prosperity of our Nation has left them far behind, in the lowest one-third of all American families insofar as effective buying income is concerned. Only Congress can, and must help them, without any undue delay.

They exist on $248 a month. Aren't they entitled to live decently in their last years of life? I know you have always been one of their loyal friends. Won't you please do something for them now, by interceding with your Chairman TEAGUE for expeditious enactment into law of a liberal increase in compensation for them? Irrespective of which compensation bill your committee reports to the floor of the House, and as very specifically requested in the President's March 24 budget message to Congress, I very strongly urge that a 15-percent increase be justifiably and belatedly accorded totally disabled combat veterans. Nobody will ever accuse the Congress of being too generous for this worthy group.

I am their spokesman. You won't get letters from them, as they are resentful and disillusioned. As in the past 18 years, I visited many of their homes again last Christmas season, and found deplorable economic conditions everywhere. I assure you their plight is real. I am 100 percent for economy in Government, but never at their miserable expense. I know you agree with me. They only ask for the necessities of life, including medical care for their wives. Are they asking for too much, this minimum of existence?

They won't be with us very long. They have hope and faith in their country, and are worthy of your urgent and favorable action in their behalf. Please don't disillusion them, and thereby destroy their self-respect and human dignity.

Trusting you will favor me with some good news for them at your earliest convenience, and with all good wishes, please believe me.

Very respectfully,

PHILIP E. RICHARDS,
Disabled American Veterans.

Employment up in Port Angeles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the employment outlook in areas of my district is becoming brighter. This is particularly true in the Port Angeles, Wash., area where seasonal unemployment in logging and construction trades is a problem during the winter months. Now with spring upon us and with the possibility of increases in the price of timber products, the employment situation on the Olympic Peninsula is changing for the better.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose a story from the Port Angeles Evening News entitled "Work Picture Brighter." This story which appeared March 24, 1961, Mr. Speaker, indicates a firm economy and growing prosperity in the Northwest:

WORK PICTURE BRIGHTER

More than 230 workers in Clallam and Jefferson Counties were called back to work in February, Floyd J. Hill, manager of the Port Angeles office of the Washington State Employment Security Department reports.

And the future looks better. A survey recently completed by the local employment office in cooperation with 78 employers in Clallam and Jefferson Counties indicates that they expect to increase employment before the end of April this year. Most of the increase will occur in the lumber and wood products industry. The anticipated increases may be even greater still if the price of lumber, plywood and shingles improves sufficiently to permit additional expansion, Hill said.

Five contract construction firms were surveyed. They reported a 38.2 percent increase (from February) in employment anticipated in April, and a 55.9 percent increase anticipated in June. In other words, employment stood at 68 persons in February. Anticipated employment in April is 94 and anticipated employment in June is 106.

Twenty-two lumber and wood products and pulp and paper products firms sampled indicated a 3.5 percent increase in April and a 7.2 increase in June.

The number of State unemployment insurance claims filed in Clallam and Jefferson Counties decreased more than 15 percent between the week ending February 4 and the week ending March 4, Hill reports.

Most of the resulting employment expansion occurred in the lumber, logging and related wood products industries.

During the first 10 days in March, more than 100 workers had been called back to work—particularly in logging and construction activities.

Horace Godfrey Demonstrates Leadership in Farm Stabilization Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, in checking over the work done by the Department of Agriculture to launch the new feed grains program, I am impressed by the leadership demonstrated by Horace Godfrey, the new Administrator of the Commodity Stabilization Service.

Godfrey's effective performance during his first weeks in office is a matter of personal satisfaction and pride for me,

since he hails from the great State of North Carolina, he is a personal friend, and for many years he successfully directed our agricultural stabilization programs in North Carolina.

I have here a copy of some remarks made by Mr. Godfrey at the Atlanta area meeting on feed grains which point up his emphasis on local farmers' work and cooperation in operating successful farm programs. With the permission of the House I shall insert these remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

REMARKS BY HORACE GODFREY, ADMINISTRATOR, CSS, MADE AT THE ATLANTA AREA MEETING, MARCH 27, 1961

There are just a few things we want to say before we adjourn. To start this off, I would like all of the new State committeemen to stand up, if they will. I asked you to do that, because I wanted the rest of the group here to look at the new State committeemen. We have been attempting to do something here today primarily for them, although it applies also to the others, the older State committeemen that have been on for some time—and also to our State office employees.

We told you this morning at the very beginning that we think we set a record in getting this feed grain legislation signed last week, and getting it into the field and into operation. We started out with the meeting in Omaha on Thursday—then one in Denver on Friday, and now the one here today. Maybe we should have reversed the order of the meetings, because the earlier planting area is in the Southeast. But we felt that the kickoff should be in the heavy feed grain producing area.

We found in connection with these meetings, that there were two things that we needed to do—two things primarily. First, we needed to give our new State committeemen and our State office employees a little briefing on their part in connection with the overall activities of the Department of Agriculture, and let them see where they fit into the entire Department. And, second, we needed to give them sufficient information to kick off the feed grain program.

We started out this morning by trying to outline the activities of the Department of Agriculture. We followed that with an address by the Under Secretary, outlining to you some of your responsibilities and pointing out the fact that you are members of the official family of the Department of Agriculture, and that upon your shoulders rests a tremendous responsibility. He not only talked to State committeemen and State office employees, but he also talked to the others representing the Department of Agriculture here today.

Then, this afternoon, we have attempted to outline to you the provisions of the emergency feed grain legislation. We told you that we did not have all the answers, because the legislation was just passed into law last Wednesday afternoon. We started to work on it, of course, approximately 2 months ago. Many of you in the field started to work on it about 5 weeks ago, and much work has already been done. We have attempted to give you a few of the answers this afternoon as you raised them. We will be sending you additional information and additional answers as time goes by, but we felt that we could not wait until we had all of the answers to get into the field and get into operation.

As someone mentioned this morning, spring began a week ago today, and planting had already started in many areas. So, it was necessary that we get into the field with the information that we had, and then furnish you additional information—and maybe correct some that we have already furnished you—just as quickly as we possibly can. That's what we have attempted to do today.

I think that Secretary Murphy pointed out to you this morning, very effectively, that we believe this program will work. He also pointed out that he said, "We believe," because the final decision rests upon State committeemen and State office employees. With whatever program we give you out of the Washington office, or that the Congress gives you, the decision still rests with State committeemen and State office employees as to whether or not that program will be successful. Because upon you, upon your shoulders, rests the responsibility for generating or motivating county committeemen and county office employees. Unless the county committeemen and county office employees want the program to really work, then it will not work. But, if they want it to work, if you create in them a desire for the program to work, then it will be workable.

The statement was also made this morning, and I would like to reemphasize it, that this is our chance as farmers to convince the Congress, and our friends in the city that helped us get this legislation, that we can make a farm program work as far as feed grains are concerned. Now, those of us here in the Southeast know that a farm program can be made workable. We know that in the Southeast, because we have made a tobacco program work. I think we can say that we have made a peanut program work, and, for all practical purposes, we have made a cotton program work. But there is some doubt in a lot of peoples' minds throughout the United States as to whether or not a program can be made workable for feed grains. We believe it can be made workable. We believe we have a program now that will work for 1961, and upon your shoulders rests the responsibility of seeing that it works.

I said a lot of work had already been done. We are well pleased with what's been done in the field. We like the way you took hold of the instructions that we sent you about 5 weeks ago, and went out to the field and obtained the data from farmers. You really did an outstanding job in getting the data in from farmers. The way you went about it reminds me of the old days way back in 1933 and 1934 when we first started farm programs. But that is just the beginning.

We are now on the launching pad, so to speak, and whether or not we get off the ground depends upon you, because the job is yet in front of us. You as State committeemen and State office employees now must go back home—after tomorrow, after you finish your meeting here tomorrow—you must go back home and decide either before you leave here, or imemdiately after you reach home, what you are going to do to get this program into operation in your State, and in every county in your State.

What's necessary? Now, I can tell you that it will not operate by itself. You will not get participation by merely getting out a lot of material through the mail. You will not get participation by merely getting a lot of newspaper publicity. You will not get participation merely by having a lot of TV programs. That all helps, but it takes more than that. I could suggest many things for you to do, but I think the situation is going to be different in each State and possibly in each county within a State. I think you're going to have to use every means that you've ever used before and borrow a few that you haven't used before in order to get the participation that we want in this program.

Secretary Freeman said the other day in a press conference that this is more or less a "beg and pay" program. A "beg and pay" program. We're begging on the basis that this is an opportunity for farmers to show that they want a farm program, and we're paying in an effort to get the fullest participation possible. That's the way he put it. I say you're going to have to use every means that you've ever used before and then borrow some that you've never used.

I would suggest that you immediately decide how you're going about it, that you go back home and hold the necessary meetings of State people. Include your sister agencies within the Department of Agriculture, your allied State agencies of the Department of Agriculture, your fertilizer people, your farm-machinery people—in fact, everybody that's interested in agriculture. Sell them on the provisions of the program.

Then, just as soon as you finish your State meetings, I think you should immediately plan for district meetings and county meetings. I think, it's going to take a lot of meetings where you can have an opportunity to answer questions that are being raised by farmers and by others as to what does this program mean? How does it operate? You'll have to be in a position to answer those questions. You can't do that by merely sending out a piece of letter material. Now, this background information is good. The leaflets that we're going to furnish you are good, but that personal contact is the best means of getting participation.

Now, in your meetings with county people, in your meetings with your fieldmen that work with your county offices, let it be understood that you—as the State committees, and State administrative officers and program specialists—are expecting the fieldmen, county committees and county office employees to do everything within their power to explain the advantages of this program. You let it be understood without any doubt that you expect them from this day forth to have a positive attitude because the attitude of county office employees and State office employees will largely govern participation in the feed-grain program. We've seen evidences of that influence many times in the past. We have seen participation in ACP, for example, more than doubled in a county merely by changing the ACP clerk that contacted farmers in the county office. Merely by changing an attitude. And I say, from here on we must have a positive attitude on farm programs. We have no alternative.

Now, for those of you that are new State committeemen, let me give you just a little advice as to the ways and means of getting a positive attitude. I might say that throughout the Southeast the attitudes are a little bit different than they are in many areas of the country. I don't think you're going to have any difficulty in securing a positive attitude on the part of State office employees or on the part of county office employees. But, let me hasten to say that if you have any difficulty, if there are any individuals in a State office or in county offices that do not feel that they can adopt a positive attitude and attempt to work constructively for this program, then they should be honest enough with themselves and with us to disassociate themselves from the organization. Second, if they are not honest enough to do that, then it should be your responsibility, and it is your responsibility, to see that they find more compatible work outside.

Now let me go a little bit farther. There are employed in county ASC offices and State ASC offices many dedicated and loyal employees that have for several years been waiting an opportunity like this to help a farm program. Now, you new State committeemen can use the experience of these county employees—these State employees who are dedicated. We hope that you will rely upon them and use the knowledge and experience that they have.

I don't think you'll have any difficulty whatsoever in separating the employees that

are dedicated and have a positive attitude, and those that want to drift, or go back. And I think you have the responsibility to separate them. This is a responsibility to the general public, to the Secretary of Agriculture, and to the President. You have a responsibility now to see that farm programs which come under your supervision are made workable.

We are looking to you to carry out this responsibility. We know that you can do it. We know that it's inherent in every individual to want to do a good job. We know that every individual wants to be recognized for doing a good job. We know that in CSS we can do a good job. We are counting on you to do a good job. With that, let's get on with it. Thank you very much.

Deadly Suds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOFFMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the problem of water pollution is an evergrowing menace, not only to plant and fish life but to the reservoirs and filtering plants which prepare our water supply for human use and consumption.

The Daily Journal of Wheaton, Ill., is undertaking a project to inform its readers as to the growing seriousness of this problem. One source of concern in solving this problem is the elimination of the effects of using detergents. I commend to you the editorial which follows:

DEADLY SUDS

Cleaning the laundry isn't the only dirty work laid to tons and tons of household and industrial detergents used in every city, village and hamlet in the United States.

In recent months, newspaper accounts have told of conferences on this very real menace to several facets of our American way of life.

As far back as 1959 Arthur S. Flemming, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, said, "We may be confronted with a crisis of such gravity as to jeopardize the further growth and development of many areas of the country, and even the health of millions of people."

His successor, Abraham Ribicoff, recently told a House subcommittee in Washington that the waters of the Ohio River are used 3.7 times before reaching the Mississippi.

Ribicoff might have added that each time it is used, the water gets another charge of detergents, only a microscopic percentage of which is lost in passing from one municipal treatment plant to another.

In our State, foam on the Illinois River, as it passes Starved Rock, presents what appears to be whitecaps on the water. Closer inspection shows patches of foam at times 25 feet or more across.

Plumbers complain the insoluble elements eventually clog up drainpipes, while health department sanitarians deplore their use where household sewage depends upon septic fields for disposal.

The porosity of the soil is destroyed by the accumulation of the nonorganic particles.

The reservoirs of many cities depending upon rivers for their water supply have found as much as six parts per million of these cleansing agents in their drinking water.

In 1957 the first conclusive evidence in this country was published showing that detergents were destructive to aquatic life. Clarence Tarzwell, research engineer at the Robert A. Taft Engineering Center, Cincinnati, reported that detergents are toxic to fish in concentrations of four parts per million.

Three research scientists working with Tarzwell cited these facts from their studies. (1) Concentrations of syndets, synthetic detergents, in sewage from various cities have ranged from 4 to 45 parts per million; (2) a concentration of 3.5 parts per million killed 50 per cent of fish in a relatively short time.

The studies were made on five widely sold, packaged household detergent products.

The culprits in each of the cleaners were chemicals called alkyl benzene sulfonates. These are the same ingredients that get daddy's grimy overalls so "spanking clean," mom's clothes so antiseptic white—and which kill the fish in our rivers, kill the bacteria in our sewage treatment plants, create many allergies and rashes, ad infinitum.

The detergent first appeared on the American scene in 1934, but the real boom came as detergents became a war baby to take the place of the soluble fats and greases that went to war instead of into soap.

It is sometimes easy to condemn and deplore a condition, and do nothing about it. This has been done many times since detergents helped out the housewife during the war.

The Daily Journal believes the detergent manufacturers should take it unto themselves to eliminate this great nuisance.

Such publications as Journal of The American Water Works Association have published accounts of experimental research on development of organic detergents, which would dissolve.

One speaker at a national convention of soap manufacturers went so far as to exclaim that things were getting so bad they might even be compelled to return to the manufacture of soap.

We propose that the manufacturers of these products establish a fund, with contributions being supplied by the makers of these Frankensteins of the laundrytubs.

We urge that they put researchers to work to remely the havoc they have wrought, and have permitted to go unchecked for so many years.

Who Was in Orbit, Gagarin or Khrushchev?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, in any evaluation of our space accomplishments with relation to the unsupported claims of the Russians it is perhaps pertinent to note the depth of sheer demogogery reached recently by a certain columnist who undertook to place responsibility for our alleged defeat in space on former President Eisenhower.

In refutation of that charge a résumé of the sequence of events following the end of World War II is most revealing and it seems proper to point out that under the Democrats we allowed the Soviets to pick up, gratis, a wealth of scientific missile date captured by American troops in Germany. The real deterrent to a realistic program, however, was had in the outright refusal of the Democrats under Truman to appropriate money or authorize a forthright plan of space exploration.

By contrast the Republicans under Ike, in 7 years, closed the missile gap and gave the United States an actual scientific leadership in space exploration, if certain unauthenticated claims of the Russians are taken with the grain of salt they deserve. Be that as it may, in only one area—rocket thrust—are we behind the Soviets and we surrendered that advantage when the Democrats under Truman were sitting on their hands and doing nothing.

Apropos of the current situation, in discussing with a number of my constituents over the past weekend the Russian claim of having launched a man into space and brought him back without mishap I found most of them strongly skeptical of the Soviet's latest propaganda, their skepticism understandably being based on the known Russian reputation for skulduggery and duplicity.

In my conversations with my constituents I found them reflecting the doubts voiced by certain news media both here and abroad, which point up the obvious discrepencies in the Russian claims. For instance, the claim by Yuri Gagarin, the "cosmonaut", that he orbited the earth suspended on air within his vehicle runs counter to the accepted practice of strapping the astronaut to his seat to protect him from the violent impact of the initial blastoff. It was also noted that while Gagarin reported detailed earthly scenes as he flashed by a 18,000 miles per hour a noted Russian scientist claimed that the vehicle was without windows of any kind.

There is also the matter of timing and with the flight officially reported to have taken place on April 12 we wonder how the London Daily Worker had it taking place on April 7 when they gave out the word that the space traveler had circumnavigated the globe and had returned to earth suffering from acute shock. Failure of the tracking stations of our National Aeronautics and Space Administration to make contact even with the burned-out casing of the lofting rocket until several hours after the Russians reported the astronaut's return further indicates the unreliability of the reports.

The fact also remains that no tracking station outside of the Iron Curtain had advance word of the experiment and none reported catching the spacecraft while in orbit. All of which, coupled with the Soviets' record for fabrication, prompts most of the people with whom I have talked to reach the conclusion that this incident was probably designed to cover up previous failures, in which their space travelers may have lost their lives, and was staged as a face-saving device in anticipation of an American breakthrough at an early date.

In support of these reservations by people who are not inclined to accept unsupported Soviet claims, as so many col-

umnists and scientists seem inclined to do, I would like to underscore that portion of a Washington Evening Star editorial which puts forth these rather pointed questions:

Exactly where, for example is the place that should have a monument built on it as the site of the launching of Major Gagarin into orbit? And precisely where did he land in the U.S.S.R. after his single celestial circumnavigation of the globe? As for the spaceship that carried him on his history-making voyage, what does it look like? Why are there no clear photographs or verable descriptions of it? When will outsiders be vouchsafed the opportunity to inspect it, or at least to read detailed accounts of it? And how explain the fact that the Kremlin's spokesmen, even the "cosmonaut" himself, have been almost ostentatiously evasive in responding to these and similar queries? Is there something to hide? Does the furtiveness cover up facts that the world ought to know? Is a fraud involved here—or a military advance—that the Soviets are determined to keep under wraps?

And then my favorite columnist David Lawrence, in the same issue of the Evening Star, concludes with these pertinent observations:

Just why would the Russians concoct the story if it is not entirely true? One answer is that the Communists have no morals—they regard lying as a legitimate device in national and international policies.

Just now it is important for Nikita Khrushchev to divert the attention of the Russian people from their hardships with an appeal to their national pride. History records that the czars of another era also engaged in huge spectacles, parades, and displays to impress the people and cause them to forget or put aside their woes.

The Communists have much to explain. Scientists throughout the world will remain curious. Science has a way of probing into such things. Already the Soviet Government has declined to make its data public. Secrecy is always the refuge of totalitarian governments which do not hesitate to try to fool not only their own people, but the whole world.

The Futility of Depending Upon Good Faith of the Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, a recent column by Jim Bishop published in the Washington Evening Star on April 12 contains a valid assessment of the Soviet Union and of the futility of any policy which depends upon the good faith of the Communists. Mr. Bishop makes some thoughtful comments about Communist tactics in the world struggle and the success that they are achieving.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VISHINSKY MADE IT CLEAR
[By Jim Bishop, reporter]

The Soviet Union, as a phenomenon of the 20th century, will be the first to go down in history as a predatory nation with no honor. The Caesars, at their worst, had some. So did the Huns, the ancient Persians and, of course, the Greeks. The only nation that approaches the Soviets in lack of integrity is Adolf Hitler's Germany, but he lasted only 12 years.

The Russian Revolutionary Government has been in power 43 years. It grows stronger, not weaker, and its goal has remained fixed: Communist domination of the world. The Russian bear lumbers slowly across the snows of Time. Ahead, the Western Powers in their droshky toss the Bear a baby nation now and then to slow him down, but his appetite is insatiable.

He stops for a moment to kill and digest, but he moves on at a trot, never tiring, never frightened, always closing in. The ideology of the Soviet is godless intellect coupled with national aggrandizement. Whatever adds to the power of Russia is good for all.

The sun has set on all the major empires of the West, now it rises in the East. The Communists control a land mass from the Arctic Ocean to Malaya, from Anadyr Peninsula to Berlin—the Caesars of Rome never had an empire like that. It will grow bigger before it starts to shrink.

It was Andrei Vishinsky, prosecutor in the purge trials of 1934, who listened to an unhappy defendant confess that he had been friendly with the Germans because "our policy was to be friendly, at the time." Vishinsky chuckled. He shook his head as though such stupidity was beyond him. "Do you not know," he shouted, "that, no matter what the public policy of the moment, true socialism cannot live with any other system of government? The working class must establish governments in every nation. Has this not been the unfailing, unchanging policy of Marx and Lenin and Stalin?"

It has. Anyone who says that the West can negotiate with the East is naive. Negotiation in Laos, in Berlin, in Korea—anywhere in the world—must result in a Soviet advantage or there will be no agreement. The game, as the West plays it, is to see how cheaply the bear can be bought for a moment's peace.

The Russians fight with propaganda and economics. For a young nation, they use these well. They have beaten us so many times in the field of propoganda that now, when a new crisis develops, the world does not look to Washington for a solution; it turns to Moscow.

These are clever weapons, well honed, and they win battles without sacrificing Russian lives. The Soviets take a chunk of territory here, enslave a few million people there, win a concession somewhere else, and all the time they keep the world in such a chronic state of fright that the West spends more and more, trying to be ready.

The propaganda weapon may not kill us, but the economic one could. Our defense spending this year will come to 43 billions. Each American wage earner will owe $683 for missiles and planes and warships alone. This is an enormous sum for an average man to owe his Government each year. It will grow greater because the policy of the Soviet Government is to keep feinting the United States toward heavier armament while the Russians hold two keys: One to war; one to peace.

It is not necessary for them to put either one in the door of history. They can jangle them, and achieve notable results.

A thousand years from now, children will be studying the witless mistakes of the West in the 20th century. That is, if there are any children.

Migrant Farm Labor Problems and Harvest of Shame"—XIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is the 13th in a series of articles presented in the public interest by the Palm Beach Post-Times to show the members some of the progress being made in Florida to solve problems relating to migrant farm labor which were left out of the television presentation "Harvest of Shame." The omissions of all that has been, and is being done in this field did a great injustice to the Floridians who have given their time and efforts to these problems over the years. It is hoped that by reading these articles and the ones to follow the Members and public will have a better understanding of this important matter.

[From the Palm Beach Post, Feb. 3, 1961]

CLEAN, GOOD FOOD—NEW COASTAL MIGRANT CAMP

("In the survey of 21 States conducted by the national council of churches, the migrants themselves listed the evils of labor camp life—bad housing, flies, mosquitoes, dirty beds and mattresses, unsanitary toilets, lack of hot water for bathing."—Harvest of Shame)

The Palm Beach County Board of Health eyes with satisfaction a new 600-acre farm of American Foods, Inc., on Lantana Road west of Military Trail.

Joseph Alvarez, the board's chief sanitarian, points to the facility as a good example of the trend toward betterment of migrant labor health conditions in the area.

Inspecting the facility less than 2 weeks ago, Alvarez didn't hesitate to approve its licensing.

Jess Vielma, farm labor contractor, reported 180 men already are employed at the farm. Most are working on 140 acres of strawberries.

But the farm will employ considerably more, according to Archie J. Rutledge, vice president in charge of operations.

He estimated the figure will grow to 600 later this year.

The labor force includes domestic and imported labor.

Rutledge said his company, formerly Florida Mushroom Co., has invested more than $80,000 to provide proper living conditions for the men who will grow the crops of strawberries, cucumbers, bell peppers, watermelons and other items.

Much of the planting already has been accomplished.

The company has erected gleaming corrugated aluminum buildings for the labor force. Numerous jalousie windows provide for cross ventilation and light.

Barracks have been built on concrete slabs, which authorities have found easy to keep clean and sanitary. Double-decked bunks similar to that in some Army barracks have been provided.

Tasty food is served in a military-style mess hall. The dinner menu last Wednesday included fried chicken, green beans, potatoes, rice, coffee, and bread and butter.

"We provide three meals a day and serve hot lunches in the fields," Rutledge said.

For $12 per week, the migrant worker gets 21 meals, his living quarters, electricity,

and water for laundry and bathing, the vice president reported.

"Word about the camp is getting around," he said: "We don't expect any trouble in finding the labor we will need."

The company has provided a small canteen where workers may buy candy, cigarettes, tobacco, and soft drinks. A few items of clothing are stocked, and there is a jukebox.

How much do the men earn?

The hourly rate paid by American Foods is 65 cents, Rutledge said.

"We expect to provide a 9-hour day, 6 days a week," he added.

Vielma said the camp will be in operation this season until May, or perhaps longer.

To expand its operations, the company late last year issued $500,000 worth of stock. Its headquarters is in Miami. It has growing ventures at Delray Beach, Goulds, Immokalee, and Burgaw, N.C.

Rutledge was unable to estimate the cash value of the crops to be grown at the new farm.

"Our volume last year was over $2 million," he said.

The company has leased a plant formerly occupied by Strazzula Bros., near Lake Worth, and will use it for precooling of its crops before shipment.

The firm processes and markets as canned goods much of its production.

The Price of Federal Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL FINDLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the morning mail recently brought this notice:

The U.S. Department of Agriculture today, April 13, announced the fair and reasonable wage requirements for the 1961 crop of sugar beets in all producing regions. USDA officials stated that the wage rates of this determination are within the producer's ability to pay under the prospective price and production conditions for the 1961 crop.

Payment of wages not less than those set by the Secretary of Agriculture is a requirement that producers must meet to qualify for payments under the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

This notice is a clear example of the price we pay for Federal aid, be it in agriculture, education, or any other field. The Government does not aid without naming its terms. At first the terms may be simple. Sooner or later, strings are attached. In the case of aid to sugar producers, the strings are many and strong.

It all started innocently as a means of assuring dependable sugar supplies. Now Government runs the whole show with the U.S. consumer paying an artificially high price for every pound of sugar he buys off the grocery shelf.

Is that bad? It is if you are not producing sugar, but would like to. It is if you want freedom in managing and marketing your product, and in negotiating for wages. It is if you are a consumer and want a fair price for sugar you buy.

Organized labor is involved, too. When a country shifts from a free-enterprise economy to controls, many of the gains of collective bargaining are tossed aside, and the voice of labor is hushed. Wages are determined by Government edict.

The controls are acquired a little at a time. Suddenly, as in sugar, we realize the price of Federal aid, but there seems to be no escape. Tobacco growers are now so entangled in controls that the privilege to produce has a dollar value. It can be sold, traded, or inherited. When you buy an acre of tobacco land, you pay between $1,500 and $3,000 an acre for the right to grow tobacco.

Controls get built into business procedures and into the soil itself, so much so that even a gradual relaxation is complicated.

A Real Missile Gap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, too many times we are prone in our legislation to doctor the symptoms of the diseases rather than get to the causes thereof. The Wall Street Journal of Monday, March 27, 1961, had a revealing editorial on the real missile gap, which is so thought-provoking, it should be widely read:

A REAL MISSILE GAP

There seems to be doubt inside the Kennedy administration about whether this country faces a missile gap vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. But there can't be any doubt about the reality of the gap between planning and launching pad in construction of key missile bases—a gap which the Pentagon warns will remain despite urgent speedup orders.

Investigating the snail's pace of the base program, the Senate Government Operations Committee has found a fantastic loss of time through strikes, work stoppages and wildcat walkouts by union construction workers. Since July 1959, for example, 4 major missile bases have suffered 125 strikes, causing a loss of more than 100,000 man-days.

Trivial jurisdictional disputes and ludicrous grievances are often the cause of the base work stoppages. Union members are quick to strike these essential projects because, in contrast to civilian jobs, missile base construction must proceed on a top-priority schedule, and hang the overtime. Hence, a strike means a big payoff. Some skilled union craftsmen have pulled down as much as $1,000 a week catching up on work they refused to do at straight time.

Obviously, these delays weaken national security and could conceivably exact a catastrophic cost. The dollars-and-cents cost is already staggering. Indeed, some unions themselves are belatedly talking of self-restraint and adopting "no-strike" pledges.

The country is entitled to something more binding, such as tougher legal restraint on the secondary boycott and other union practices. Yet, amazingly, a bill introduced in Congress with strong administration backing would legalze secondary boycott picketing at "common situs" construction sites, thus inviting new delay and waste in the missile program.

The taxpayers have given unstintingly of their dollars to obtain the best possible defenses, and the administration plans to ask further sacrifices. Dollars won't be enough, however, so long as the unions are permitted to exploit the very real gap they have opened in this country's missile program.

Individual Americans Hold Key to Preservation of Freedoms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Evening Tribune of April 7, 1961:

INDIVIDUAL AMERICANS HOLD KEY TO PRESERVATION OF FREEDOMS

The key to the preservation of our freedoms lies in the understanding mind and patriotic hearts of individual Americans.

Not in fuzzy wishful thinking about the aim of communism.

Not in fainthearted unwillingness to meet its deadly challenge.

But in knowing where we stand, and why * * * what we must do, and how, individually and as a Nation blessed with a priceless heritage of liberty.

Let us get with it.

This theme ran ringingly through remarks of two eminent speakers in San Diego Tuesday.

One of them was former Vice President Richard Nixon.

The other was Carlos P. Romulo, Philippine Ambassador to the United States.

Said Nixon, in his call for direct involvement of every individual American in the great issues of our times:

"It is very easy to talk of freedom in the abstract and fail to recognize that it is impossible for any individual in a free country to sit on the sidelines. Whatever your politics may be it is the responsibility of people in your stations of life to provide leadership for our political institutions.

"The political bosses, to whom some want to leave government, are only as good as people like you. Only to the extent that you provide leadership can our possibilities for development be realized. Only in this way can you make the ideals you believe in prevail in this world."

Romulo, speaking at the sixth and last "Pillars of American Freedom" luncheon sponsored by the San Diego Kiwanis Club, gave three premises by which Americans should judge our Nation's actions in international affairs.

First, the United States is not imperialistic.

Second, the basic Communist objective is world domination.

Third, the United States is engaged in a life and death global struggle with the ruthless monolithic ideology that is communism.

These are valid yardsticks—borne out by the record, ours and the Communists'.

We neither sought nor accepted an inch of territory after emerging victorious with our allies from World War II. In fact, we shared our abundance with prostrate friend and foe alike.

At the same time the free world was opening the gates of independence to millions, the Soviet Union and Red China were

enslaving even more millions of once-free peoples.

Neither Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev nor Communist China's Chairman Mao Tse-tung have denied that the ultimate goal of the Communists is world domination. On the contrary, they boast of its inevitability.

These are the facts that we must face squarely and accept unflinchingly.

To do less is to fail our forefathers, to forfeit their legacy of liberty.

The Drive To Subvert Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, everywhere the focus these days is on youth. Much of the publicity, however, does not call attention to the strength, courage, enthusiasm, and constructive attitudes that almost every young American possesses. They know that they have the greatest of stakes in the results of the current ideological struggle, because they will live longest under its resulting regime.

The Communist knows this all too well and is constantly working to win by fair means or foul the minds and loyalty of youth to programs consistent with the Communist goals, usually not carrying the Communist label.

Recently an article appeared in Life Lines, published in Washington, D.C., that exposes this scheme and offers some suggestions. I think it deserves wide readership.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article entitled "Mistaken Continue Their Drive To Subvert Youth" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISTAKEN CONTINUE THEIR DRIVE TO SUBVERT YOUTH

The mistaken drive on youth, in America and around the world, continues. The freedom-haters have coldbloodedly determined to make every possible effort to turn the enthusiasm and vigor of young people to forwarding their own evil ends. They are using all the subtlety and craftiness in which they have long been trained to subvert youngsters in the United States, in Latin America, in Japan, in Europe.

The Un-American Activities Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives is much aware of the problem in this area. The committee is on the job, making studies and conducting hearings of Communist activities and propaganda among youth groups. Much information of value to fighters for freedom has been developed.

Committee Chairman FRANCIS E. WALTER has said:

"I know that this committee's investigation in this area will probably precipitate a barrage from the Communist press and from Communist sympathizers characterizing our work as an investigation of youth. The Communists know as well as we do that the overwhelming majority of the young people of this Nation are of unquestioned patriotism and dedication to all that is good and noble in our society. But by equating an investigation of Communist activities among youth with an investigation of youth itself the Communists and their sympathizers hope to becloud the issue.

"This, of course, is an old trick which the Communists repeatedly use. When this committee investigates Communist activities in defense plants, the smokescreen that the Communists use is that we are investigating organized labor. When we investigate Communist activities in an educational institution it is protested by the Communists that we are investigating education.

"I am sure that the overwhelming majority of Americans readily see through this fraud and it shall not dissuade us from our task."

One of the witnesses appearing before a recent hearing of the House Committee on Un-American Activities on Communist activities and propaganda among youth groups was Herbert A. Philbrick of Rye Beach, N.H. Mr. Philbrick, a former undercover agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation serving in the Communist Party, stated that youth has always occupied a top position as a target of the Communists. But, he said, the mistaken antifreedom forces recently have felt that they are in an especially favorable position for a new drive on young people.

Mr. Philbrick said that the overall purpose of Communist-front youth organizations is "to strengthen the position of the Soviet Union and to weaken the position of the United States, to break down if possible, the loyalties of young people, their respect, their regard for their own nation, their own country, their own background, their own heritage."

In discussing the role of a Communist-front organization as a transmission belt for Communist propaganda Mr. Philbrick stated:

"The Communists knew that perhaps very few of the young people would be vulnerable to direct appeals by the Communist Party itself.

"They knew, for example, that if a leaflet or a pamphlet were to be given to the young people and it was clearly and accurately labeled Communist Party, they might tend to disregard it or perhaps not to believe it. However, if they were to take the same propaganda written at Communist Party headquarters, take off the label 'Communist Party' and put on a new label, such as 'American Youth for Democracy,' this they hoped would sufficiently disguise the subversive propaganda and the material would be accepted. The Communists called these organizations transmission belts. That is not my term. That is their term."

Commenting on the doubletalk used by the mistaken forces in their efforts to penetrate youth groups, Mr. Philbrick testified:

"When the Communists, for example, speak of the sharp struggle for peace, democracy, and security, what they really mean, of course, is the struggle on the part of the Soviet Union to win, to be victorious over the free world. When they speak of the democratic movements of youth, they, of course, do not mean democratic movements. They mean a totalitarian movement.

"They say groups of youth interested in Marxist study and action have appeared in a number of cities among college students, teenagers, and other youth.

"When they talk about Marxist study groups, they mean, of course, Marxist indoctrination groups, and it is interesting to note that the Communists are here bragging that these Marxist indoctrination groups have been formed among college students, teenagers, and other young people."

Mr. Philbrick recognizes the fact that the overwhelming majority of American young people are loyal and patriotic. In his testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, he offered this advice:

"I would first of all, suggest that our loyal young people support this committee in its efforts to make the truth be known, because there is one thing that the Communist Party fears more than anything else and that is the truth. They know they cannot survive if the truth were known. Hence, it is important that this committee and other investigating committees constantly procure and obtain the truth and make known these facts about communism and Communist activity in our country. Therefore, young people should support the work of this committee and of the Congressmen who give so much of their time to it.

"Secondly, our young people should demand that their schools and colleges provide them with information about communism. This is not being done now. There are very few schools and colleges which have adequate courses concerning communism. This they should demand because it is impossible for them (or for anyone) to fight an enemy unless they know their enemy.

"Third, our young people should not only be aware of the great crisis that we are in today, the worldwide crisis, the threat that communism poses against all of the free peoples and all of the free world, but they should also diligently study, learn, and come to appreciate the wonderful heritage, the great things of value which we have to protect and defend in this country."

There is thrilling evidence that young America is rising to the challenge of mistaken propaganda. Recently a group of college students formed what they call Young Americans for Freedom. Their organizational statement in part said:

"We, as young conservatives, believe that foremost among the transcendent values is the individual's use of his God-given free will, whence derives his right to be free from the restrictions of arbitrary force; that liberty is indivisible, and that political freedom cannot long exist without economic freedom; that the purposes of government are to protect these freedoms through the preservation of internal order, the provision of national defense, and the administration of justice; that when government ventures beyond these rightful functions, it accumulates power which tends to diminish order and liberty."

This is an affirmative program. It suggests a course that America will do well to follow.

Textile Industry

SPEECH
OF
HON. VERNON W. THOMSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the distinguished Congressman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], for bringing to the attention of this body the tragic plight of the textile industry, and particularly the woolen and worsted manufacturers. He has at long last touched upon one of the very basic reasons for the so-called depressed areas and surplus labor communities in this Nation. In my district we not only produce wool in large quantities, but also have there located the only surviving woolen and worsted mill in the Middle West. While woolen and worsted mills are closing all over the Nation, last year alone 61 million yards of woolen fabrics were imported into the United States.

This is enough fabric to keep between 60 and 70 mills operating the year round. The well-being of American industry is vital to the economic health of this country and the prosperity of wage earners and business, but this industry, along with many others such as rubber, zinc, storage batteries, furs—to name a few in my district alone—can no longer compete successfully with low-wage imports which have become a clear and present danger to the industries mentioned and to our national security and welfare. These industries have modernized their plants, improved their efficiency, invested huge sums in their businesses, and now face economic ruin by the tremendous increase in imports at prices below the American manufacturers' costs. If we act now we can save these American industries, provide jobs and wages, reduce unemployment, and eliminate the need to appropriate money from the Federal Treasury as aid and redevelopment for labor surplus areas in this Nation. Huge sums for redevelopment provide relief for the effect of these imports, while action in this field will remove the cause, and I again commend my colleague from Georgia and his associates for their efforts in this field which is so basic to the welfare of America. I would like to associate myself with the purposes outlined so ably by Congressman VINSON.

Effects of Foreign Textile Importation in Wisconsin

SPEECH
OF
HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to briefly show some of the effects which the increase in foreign textile importation has had in my district, Wisconsin's First.

In 1950 the First District of Wisconsin had 13 manufacturers of textile products; today there are 9. In addition one of the remaining firms is sharply curtailing its employment. This happens to be one of the largest.

The areas which have been most effected are those which now are suffering from chronic unemployment. The basic problem of unemployment cannot be entirely contributed to the loss of some textile jobs. Nevertheless, the total loss of these facilities has, and will continue to have, a detrimental effect upon the economy of the areas deprived of these jobs. This loss is not only felt by those who have lost their means of livelihood. When an industry closes its doors every merchant who services these people suffers loss. The local tax rolls are depleted. In actuality, the general economic complexion of a community is caused to degenerate.

Another aspect of this force upon the industry of the district which I represent are the problems caused by diversification. One of the larger manufacturers in my district has told me he is going to purchase more and more of his uncut fabrics on the foreign market instead of producing it himself. He will proceed to make finished garments from this material. He now employs 200 people making uncut fabric, but if he makes finished products from his own material he cannot compete with foreign imports. Nearly all of these 200 people are skilled in the uncut fabric field. However, this skill will be of no value to them as this manufacturer changes the orientation of his operations. This individual says he is sorry this must come about, but to stay in business these moves must be made.

These people are caught in the infamous cost-price squeeze. They are being priced out of the market by the foreign imports. This merchandise is being manufactured in countries where U.S. foreign aid has been used to assist in the revitalization of industry. The money to support these programs has come from the taxes levied upon the incomes of the very people who now face unemployment. I feel it is the duty of the Government to protect and maintain our domestic market for these so very generous people.

This body is well aware of the many constructive proposals made to alleviate this unpardonable burden upon one segment of America's economy. I would like to add my voice to those of my distinguished colleagues urging remedial action as soon as possible.

Bloomington, Minn., Athletic Stadium

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK MacGREGOR
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, on Friday of this week the citizens of Minnesota, and especially those in the Twin Cities area of Minneapolis and St. Paul, will embark on a new adventure which I think is significant of the growing economic life of our State. During 1961 two new major league professional athletic teams are making their new home at one of the finest athletic stadiums in the country, at Bloomington, Minn.

The Minnesota Twins baseball team will play its opening home game Friday afternoon. The Minnesota Vikings football team will begin its play in Bloomington in the fall. We think these new ventures are appropriate additions to the rich recreational, educational, economic, and cultural life enjoyed in Minnesota for the past many years.

The suburbs of the Twin Cities are the fastest growing suburbs, in terms of the rate of growth, in the Nation. I invite the Congress and the Nation to note our growth, as symbolized by the coming of two major league athletic teams to our area during this year.

Unemployment: Federal Reserve Versus Council of Economic Advisers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a basic controversy as to the nature of our present unemployment and the proper means for combating it has become evident in the statements which have been made regarding this very important subject. A comment on this controversy, as it was recently presented before the Joint Economic Committee in its hearings on the state of the Nation's economy, appeared in an editorial "Showdown Ahead?" in the April 12 issue of the Journal of Commerce of New York. I would like to enter this editorial at this point in the RECORD:

SHOWDOWN AHEAD?

The administration's economist and the Federal Reserve Board may have sought to minimize the differences between them after their spokesmen testified before Congress last month on economic conditions, but their actions since give every indication that their basic disagreement is as strong as ever.

It had appeared in the first week of March that Dr. Walter Heller, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, and William McC. Martin, head of the Federal Reserve Board, had clashed in their opinions of what was needed to bring full-scale recovery after the economy started turning up. But immediately every effort was made to indicate that there was basic agreement—for both pointed out that there was enough basically wrong with the economy to require continued stimulation after business starts to pick up.

Yet no mention was made of the fact that they remained in basic conflict as to what means should be used to bring about this full recovery.

And what makes the situation even more arresting is that each of these men has since that time taken occasion to restate his own view of the conflict.

Dr. Heller's restatement of his basic position took place in an address to a press group in Washington a full 2 weeks after his testimony before Congress.

Simply, his position remained that the administration desires and plans to keep interest rates from rising again after business recovery get underway.

Instead of having interest rates turn around as soon as the recovery begins, the council chairman said, the administration wants the present rate structure to hold as long as unemployment continues high and the gap remains between potential and actual output of the economy. This, in essence, Dr. Heller restated his position that credit ease is needed to bring general economic recovery, and that this is a basic prerequisite to a lessening of the number of jobless.

Federal Reserve Board Chairman Martin also passed up his opportunity to let the whole matter of conflict drop. For he had his testimony before Congress reprinted in its entirety in the latest Federal Reserve Bulletin. Mr. Martin thus took the best means at his disposal to publicize the Board's feeling that the present unemployment is nothing easy money can help, but structural—caused by lack of training and need for relocation of the unemployed.

And in publishing the full reasons why the Board feels interest rates must be allowed to rise as the economy recovers rather than being kept low to fight a type of unemployment it can't cure, Mr. Martin is challenging the administration's concept that credit ease must be maintained as recovery progresses.

The willingness of both parties to restate their positions, even though they realize that it would be possible to assume a public posture of harmony, indicates how important each side holds its position to be.

It is thus hard to see how a showdown between the administration and the Federal Reserve can be avoided as the recovery develops, unless the administration beforehand takes basic steps to solve the structural unemployment problem.

Without doubt, the Federal Reserve realizes the truth of the administration's contention that easy credit and a general business recovery can do something to relieve joblessness. It just fears that if too much reliance is placed on credit ease to do a job it can't perform, the monetary authorities will cure only a small amount of the unemployment but at the price of a considerable amount of inflation.

Thus the administration has a chance to save face if it can induce Congress to help cure unemployment through specific actions, such as retraining, relocation, and measures to keep the very young out of the working force.

Otherwise it is apparent that a showdown with the Federal Reserve will be unavoidable. And that would have sharp unfavorable domestic and international consequences no matter which side won the battle.

The Constitution and What It Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DELBERT L. LATTA
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, each year the American Legion of Ohio promotes an essay contest among the high school students in Ohio.

The subject assigned was "The Constitution and What It Means." I am proud that the Fifth Congressional District of Ohio is represented among the 12 winners selected this year.

Mr. Hal Hanna of Bowling Green, Ohio, is one of the ninth grade winners. His prize winning essay is as follows:

THE CONSTITUTION AND WHAT IT MEANS
(By Hal Hanna)

The Constitution is a written plan for building a "government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived by the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic; a perfect union; established upon the principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity." It may be likened to a blueprint which architects draw.

This "blueprint" was drawn with great thought, prayer, patience, and compromise by dedicated, learned, and wise men who had risked their lives and fortunes for freedom. These architects, first of all, stated what they thought to be true purposes of a government: to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty.

To carry out these purposes, the architects planned a strong but limited central government. They described and stated all the powers of the national government, the powers and rights of the States, and the rights and freedoms of the individual citizen. The plain laid out the machinery for government with checks and balances to make sure no group could usurp power. It provided for government by law instead of by men. The written Constitution was the supreme law of the land. The architects allowed for careful and deliberate change, but they made the process of amendment difficult so as to avoid hasty and unwise changes.

After a workable form of government had been built, the architects of our Nation added "specifications" to the "blueprint" in the form of a Bill of Rights. These first 10 amendments guaranteed certain basic rights and freedoms for which people have worked and fought for many centuries. They include: freedom of religion, of speech, of the press, of assembly; the right to petition the Government for the redress of grievances; freedom from unreasonable search and seizure; the right to a fair trial by jury; just compensation for property taken for public use. Twelve other amendmens have been made since the Constitution's existence. One of them forbids slavery, and another gives women full voting rights.

Gladstone, a great English statesman, said, "The American Constitution is the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man." It has been a working blueprint for America for more than 172 years. It is the oldest written Constitution still in force in the world today and has been preserved only through great idealism and great human sacrifice.

We Americans today dare not take the Constitution and our free Government for granted. Its usefulness is being challenged. There are some who say it is out of date and they would impatiently toss it aside. Some are indifferent, neglectful, or cynical and so have no reverence or respect for a "welfare state." Some say life has become so complicated that we must submit to increase control by the Government. Communism threatens our free way of life at home and abroad. Farseeing as the early architects were, they alone cannot safeguard our Constitution and liberties. If neglected, they will slip from us or be changed by selfish, ambitious, or foolish men from within our own land or from foreign shores. We must be as vigilant in guarding and preserving our Constitution and Bill of Rights as were the founding architects who achieved them.

Let's Encourage Rather Than Discourage the Buying Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, reports from a variety of business sources indicate the recession low is past and the level of business is pointed upward. In fact, there are economic experts who insist that the 1960–61 recession will be the mildest in the postwar period.

It also appears now that while we may be plagued with spotty unemployment for quite some time, there will be a gradual pattern of expanded business activity and consumer buying in the months ahead. Recently one of the national magazines carried an article which forecast a boom year in 1962 and another year of high prosperity in 1963.

There is no question that many enterprising small business leaders were upset by the pessimistic reports of some of the top people in the Kennedy administration. The fact of the matter is that no economic slump is helped by casting a pall of gloom and doom upon the Nation's buying public. This statement by no means purports to minimize the plight of the unemployed nor the conditions which create serious personal problems for many of our people who are hit by business recessions.

Perhaps one of the best letters I received dealing with the problem of public confidence was written by Mrs. Lillian M. Baar, a local businesswoman, who had this to say in a letter also directed to President Kennedy, Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg, and our two Illinois Senators:

> Too much fear of recession is being thrown into the hearts of the American people with such overemphasized talk, and it doesn't help matters in America or our prestige abroad to hear so much of this talk. It is like a cancer; it grows and grows—and becomes worse.
>
> I have been in business for over 16 years and have been doing very well. Now buyers of homes are bringing in newspapers with quotes from the President and Mr. Goldberg saying there is a recession which may get worse and develop into a depression. So, many prospective buyers are saying that they will not buy at this time. Yet these people are qualified and are in a financial position to buy. In fact, in most cases, if they were to buy homes they would improve themselves, put more money into circulation and improve matters generally.
>
> Recently I spoke to a woman who a few months ago was going to purchase $2,000 worth of new furniture. When I visited her home recently, she didn't have the new furniture and when I asked her if the furniture company had delayed in delivery it, she simply told me that she had canceled her order because she had been reading about Mr. Goldberg predicting a possible depression.

I should like to quote the entire letter which my constituent wrote, but suffice it to say that this portion clearly illustrates the point of these remarks.

The very nature of some of the legislation which may be foisted upon the American people seems to create a lack of confidence in our free enterprise system—a lack of confidence which is funneled right down to the level of John Q. Public, whose consumer dollars keep the wheels in motion.

What this country needs more than anything else today is a shot in the arm of good, old-fashioned confidence. Favorable economic climates are more than often created by public confidence in the future of this great Nation of free enterprise. If we get into the spirit of talking positively rather than negatively, we will best serve the interest of all the people of this country and its institutions.

San Antonio Girl, 15 Years Old, Inspired To Write and Dedicate a Poem to 87th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, a group of 95 high school students from south Texas made the trip to Washington to attend the inaugural events.

One of these youngsters, Miss Carole Whitehead, a 15-year-old San Antonio high school student, was so impressed by the visit that she wrote a poem which she dedicated to the 87th Congress.

I ask unanimous consent to have the poem with the accompanying letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and poem were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAN ANTONIO, TEX.

DEAR SENATOR: In the month of January, I had the privilege to attend the inauguration of the President, accompanied by 94 other high-school students from south Texas.

The ceremony was so solemn and beautiful it brought tears to my eyes. I'll never forget that day as long as I live. It was so moving, I can't begin to tell you how it affected me.

There I was in the heart of America witnessing the workings of freedom and democracy. The things I saw would go down as historic events in the annals of history. Standing there in the snow on Capitol Hill, I realized and truly understood what America meant to me. The love I cherish for this country and the men who govern it is unparalleled to anything in my life. I am only 15 but if I live to be 1,000 that will be the most thrilling moment of my life.

I also recently completed "Profiles in Courage." That marvelous piece of literature combined with the inauguration absolutely overwhelmed me.

Perhaps this letter and explanation will help validate my reasons for writing this poem dedicated to the heart of America's democracy, the Congress of the United States.

Sincerely,

CAROLE WHITEHEAD.

AN HONOR SO RARE

(By Carole Whitehead, dedicated to the 87th Congress of the United States)

The goal that great men work to,
Great men of faith and virtue,
Is one that sets them off from all the rest.
These men of greatness honor
The work of our forefathers
And make their code of morals free from fear.

These men that we elect
Are men of intellect.
They represent the people the best they can.
No matter their ambition
They'll fight for freedom's mission
Should conflicts come between them and their duty.

Men like Norris, Webster, Houston,
On high hopes had built their future
To reach the highest honor in the Nation.
But they cast their hopes aside
And withstood the pressing tide
For they could not give up fighting for mankind.

Their duty lay before them
And they progressed up and onward,
But their lives as public servants had been harmed.
They well knew the consequences
For they had taken many chances
Throughout their lives as servants of the people.

These men of courage hold
Their freedom and the sword
Above all else including their desires.
The Nation sees and waits
And knows it's not all fate
That sees the country through its times of need.

Few men can claim the goal
That a fewer number hold.
But the men that hold this office can be proud
That they found the needed courage
Many evils to discourage
From corrupting the foundations of our freedom.

Not just any man can be
A leader of the free.
Each must look inside his heart and find the truth.
He must find the wine of honor
In his heart above all others.
He must keep in mind the foundries of our hopes.

Some men have held this office
And not fulfilled the promise
They swore to when they took the oath of office.
But the great have pledged their all
And more will follow—rise or fall.
So, hurry, gentlemen. America is waiting.

The Coming Din of Inequity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in order to assist the Members in a better understanding of the true nature and implications of the social security financing mechanism, I would like to include a series of statements written by Mr. Ray M. Peterson, vice president and associate actuary of the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States. Mr. Peterson has long been recognized as one of the Nation's outstanding actuaries and authorities on the social security system.

Following is the introduction to Mr. Peterson's articles on "The Coming Din of Inequity":

THE COMING DIN OF INEQUITY

(By Ray M. Peterson)

A great national debate is now in progress as to the issue of providing medical care and hospital benefits under the social security system. That debate can be pursued intelligently and wisely only if we understand the true nature and implications of the social security financing mechanism. Advocates of the social security approach assert that it is best because the social security financing mechanism is time tested and tried and proved. In my opinion this is not so. The social security financing mechanism has not yet met the test of time; its crucial tests still lie ahead. To argue otherwise either reveals an inaccurate or incomplete conception of the true nature of the social security financing mechanism or suggests a willful attempt to distort and misrepresent.

One purpose of this paper is to set the record straight by portraying an accurate picture of the financing mechanism as now operating and by exposing the distortion and misrepresentation, no matter what its origin. Another purpose, and the main one, is to show that there are excellent reasons for grave concern as to the probable ultimate effects of continued distortion and misrepresentation by interpreters of the Social Security Act, by statements of inadequately informed Members of Congress, and even by publications of the Social Security Administration itself.

Such concern arises because the public is being given the false impression that our social security program has many of the unique attributes of voluntary private insurance—attributes which the American people have come to value highly. When the American people ultimately come to know that the nature of our social security program is distinctly different, a rude awakening may well occur, one which could have important political and economic consequences. Will the youngsters of the future protest what the oldsters of this generation have voted for themselves? During the decade ahead, will we oldsters, as we seek to enjoy our social security benefits, hear a rising clamor of unfairness—a din of inequity? Let us examine the situation that is building up.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Here is some vital background information. In financing a national old-age pension program, there are possible two approaches as extremes—pay-as-you-go and full reserve—and an infinite number of combinations of the two.

Pay-as-you-go financing, as the term is used in the field of social insurance, means that the Government raises currently through taxes just enough funds to pay the cost of benefits currently due. No reserve is accumulated; no element of prepayment is involved; money is raised as and after payees become eligible to receive benefits. In this latter sense (i.e., relative to the time persons become eligible for benefits) pay-as-you-go is really a postpaid system of financing.

Full reserve financing, on the other hand, is a prepaid system of financing. All benefits are fully paid for or financed during the years prior to the time they are entered upon. Under full reserve financing, the dollar sum of all payments into the fund, together with the interest income earned from its investment, is sufficient to pay off all liabilities for guaranteed or promised benefits. No benefits are promised beyond what can be provided for—at any given point in time—by payments into the funds, plus interest earned.

Full reserve financing in the field of private insurance is the test of actuarial soundness, and it is the only concept of actuarial soundness with which the American people are generally familiar. The actuarial soundness of private insurance is assured by the use of insurance principles; any fiscal soundness (not actuarial) possessed by social insurance depends mainly on the taxing power of the Government. To call a social insurance program actuarially sound just because income balances outgo is to misuse the term.

Two other important points need to be made. One is that under voluntary private insurance the principle of individual equity is preserved; i.e., there is a direct relationship between contributions and benefits; one receives as insurance or annuity coverage precisely what one pays for. This is rarely the case under a social insurance pro-

gram. There a new concept, called social adequacy, prevails. As defined by R. A. Hohaus, in 1942: The measure of protection should be social adequacy for the insured and their families—that is, it should represent, as far as practicable, a basic layer of protection. Social adequacy usually makes it impractical to have individual equity for the insured in the sense of a mathematical quid pro quo return on account of the contributions made by or on behalf of the individual. A socially adequate benefit provides an income sufficient as basic protection against want and destitution, and, consequently, may be much more, or even much less, than an "equity" benefit.

TRUE NATURE OF SOCIAL SECURITY FINANCING

Now, let us establish the true nature of our social security financing mechanism. Evolving through a political process, there has been, beginning with the 1939 amendments, a continuing shift away from substantial individual equity toward social adequacy, and the financing method has become a mixture of full reserve financing and pay-as-you-go, with the latter far outweighing the former. All this has been clearly stated by the Chief Actuary of the Social Security Administration. With respect to the gradually emerging philosophy of benefits, the Chief Actuary said:

"The issues of underlying philosophy for an old-age benefit formula under the social insurance approach have been summed up in the expression individual equity versus social adequacy.' It was generally recognized that individual equity is of paramount importance in administering voluntary old-age insurance on a sound financial basis since each individual has the right to purchase insurance or not as he wishes. However, under a governmental social insurance plan, individual equity in the relationship of the individual's future benefit to his current contribution is not essential to financial soundness, since the individual has no choice as to being covered or as to his rate of benefits or contributions.

"The issue was resolved in the 1939 amendments by a major change in emphasis, as a result of which the old-age benefit formula is based largely on the adequacy concept—and thus to only a small extent on the equity concept."

Then, as to the financing method, he added:

"The principles upon which to base the financing of old-age and related benefits in a social insurance system have been discussed at great length both in this country and abroad.

"This debate was especially active early in the development of our old-age insurance system, when the size of the fund to be accumulated was a burning question. As is often the case in this country, the answer was arrived at through a pragmatic political process rather than through a theoretical philosophical process. And, as is also often the case, the pragmatic process has resulted in an answer which, to date at least, has worked out satisfactorily. Just as the benefit formula is a blend of equity and adequacy, with much greater emphasis on the latter, so is the financing method a blend of reserve and pay-as-you-go, with the latter having the greater weight."

Are these blends so bland as to blind us to blunders? There is grave danger of this.

Let us turn now to another authoritative source, which describes the pay-as-you-go nature of our financing method and shows that an individual's benefits are not financed by his own contributions but by the contributions of others. In an opinion handed down on June 20, 1960, the Supreme Court of the United States had this to say:

"The program is financed through a payroll tax levied on employees in covered employment, and on their employers. The tax proceeds are paid into the Treasury 'as internal revenue collections,' and each year an amount equal to the proceeds is appropriated to a trust fund, from which benefits and the expenses of the program are paid.

"Persons gainfully employed, and those who employ them, are taxed to permit the payment of benefits to the retired and disabled, and their dependents. Plainly the expectation is that many members of the present productive force will in turn become beneficiaries rather than supporters of the program. But each worker's benefits, though flowing from the contributions he made to the national economy while actively employed, are not dependent on the degree to which he was called upon to support the system by taxation."

In Great Britain, the national pension scheme was recently modified so as to bear considerable resemblance to ours both as to benefit formula and financing method. A recent British observer had this to say:

"The conservative scheme is dignified with the actuarial name 'assessmentism' (the cost of the pension is assessed annually and the contributions to pay them arranged accordingly), or in common parlance 'pay as you go'; the future pensioner is paying for existing pensions and will in turn have to trust to a future generation of taxpayers in his retirement.

"What is the employee's security in a state scheme? It accumulates no funds; the money he pays in goes out almost at once to pensioners; when he retires he will have to rely on the contributors and taxpayers, on the value of money, on the government, on the economic and social climate, and on world conditions which the government cannot control. If employees were told these things, would there be an overwhelming vote for state pensions? For 'pay as you go' they might read 'hope as you pay.' "

For the years 1956 through 1965, tax collections for old-age survivors, and disability insurance (OASDI) will total $115.1 billion and OASDI benefits and expenses will total $114.5 billion. These figures clearly show that we are now almost completely on a "pay as you go" or "hope as you pay" basis.

Anniversary of Warsaw Ghetto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, on April 19, 1961, I sent the following telegram to Jewish Labor Committee Workmen's Circle, Congress for Jewish Culture, on the occasion of a dinner to commemorate the Warsaw Ghetto uprising against the Nazis on April 19, 1943:

APRIL 18, 1961.

JEWISH LABOR COMMITTEE WORKMEN'S CIRCLE,
CONGRESS FOR JEWISH CULTURE,
New York, N.Y.

Message to antitotalitarian grouping to be read at meeting, Hotel Statler, April 19: "The brave and nameless heroes who displayed superhuman courage and the deepest love for human freedom by standing against the subhuman hordes of Nazis in Warsaw are as immortal as their deed. It is right that they should be honored at any time, but particularly now during the trial of a chief Nazi criminal, as a reminder of the inhuman acts against which the Warsaw heroes fought and as a warning that there shall never be another Nazi era nor another such sacrifice as the Warsaw ghetto annihilation. I salute the brave men among you who survived that costly freedom stand."

JAMES ROOSEVELT,
Member of Congress.

Savings-Loan Holding Units Buy Banks, Rent Offices, Build Homes—They Invest in Rivals' Stock, May Enter Insurance Field; Trend Arouses Criticism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article, which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on April 12, 1961, describes the expanding activities of a bank holding company. I feel that this article points out the need for immediate remedial legislation in this area. I have been working on a bill toward that purpose and I hope to have it ready for presentation to the Congress very shortly. I am pleased to commend the article to the attention of our colleagues:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 12, 1961]

SAVINGS-LOAN HOLDING UNITS BUY BANKS, RENT OFFICES, BUILD HOMES—THEY INVEST IN RIVALS' STOCK, MAY ENTER INSURANCE FIELD; TREND AROUSES CRITICISM

(By Mitchell Gordon, staff reporter of the Wall Street Journal)

Philip J. Matthew, energetic executive vice president of Empire Financial Corp., a Los Angeles-based savings and loan holding company, is currently in the Bahamas, where finishing touches are being put on a new bank Empire will open there officially next week. When that's done, Mr. Matthew plans to return to southern California to start a personal loan company and he hopes to acquire a casualty insurance company as well.

Says Mr. Matthew: "We intend to create a supermarket of finance—and we may get into other businesses besides."

Such activity reflects, admittedly to an extreme, the intense diversification effort now being made by an industry which until recently hardly knew what the word meant. Until a few years ago, only a small number of savings and loan units were set up as holding companies legally entitled to enter any business they pleased. The rest, some 6,200, were established as individual associations required by State and Federal laws to put most of their funds into mortgages on real property, mainly single family homes, or in municipal or Government bonds.

FEDERAL LIMITATION

Today, however, there are more than a dozen savings and loan holding companies in operation with better than 50 associations under their wings. A growing number of these companies are turning to other kinds of businesses even though the savings and loan field remains prosperous. The reason: Federal legislation enacted last year prevents holding companies from acquiring additional interests in savings and loan associations if they hold a 10 percent or greater interest in one such association. But the law says nothing about other activities the holding companies might pursue.

Consequently, the holding companies are speedily entering other fields. Trans-World Financial Co., another Los Angeles-based savings and loan holding company, expects to complete its first development of homes—61 are being built in all—in Northridge in the San Fernando Valley by the middle of June. Forty-two of the homes, which range in price from $30,000 to $35,000, already have been sold and the company may soon pick up 40 acres for an additional 80 to 100 homes, according to Louis J. Galen, Trans-World's 35-year-old president.

In Hawthorne, Calif., Hawthorne Financial Corp., also a savings and loan holding company, is negotiating for the purchase of the Pacific State Bank. The bank, which has a headquarters facility in Hawthorne and four branches elsewhere in the Los Angeles area, had assets of $20 million at the end of 1960. Cecil Garton, Hawthorne Financial's president, says his company hopes to have a string of at least four banks within the next year or two.

INTEREST IN BANK

Besides its new operation in the Bahamas, Empire Financial has an 88.25-percent interest in another bank, the Erie Bank of Erie, Colo.

Since it began operations about 2 years ago, Midwestern Financial Corp. of Boulder, Colo., has added to its string of three savings and loan associations the following diverse concerns: A mortgage loan company (which acts as an intermediary between mortgage lenders and borrowers), and an industrial bank (which makes installment loans to consumers and businesses) in Colorado, a real estate agency in Kansas and a land development company in Missouri.

Lytton Financial Corp. is considering erecting a multistory office building adjacent to its headquarters on Sunset Boulevard in Los Angeles and recently announced the acquisition of the Southland Co., a Beverly Hills mortgage loan outfit with a capitalization of $1.5 million.

At least one savings and loan holding company is delving into the investment business for its own account. An executive says the company so far has put more than $100,000 of spare cash into the common stocks of some of its holding company competitors and into certain insurance firms. He says the holding company realized a capital gain of "a penny or two a share" in 1960 and has a 20- to 30-percent paper (unrealized) profit on its portfolio at present.

Such activity on the part of the holding companies is kicking up considerable criticism from more conservative members of the industry, particularly by executives of savings and loan associations that are not affiliated with holding companies. These associations, owned by their savers, comprise about 90 percent of all the savings and loan institutions in the Nation. Says one such executive in reference to the holding companies: "These people are being allowed to do, indirectly as holding companies, what they're prohibited from doing directly as associations. Furthermore, if they get into trouble financially, some savers are going to be confused and pull out their money and that could have repercussions throughout the entire savings and loan field."

Holding company executives argue few savers know which holding companies own which associations since rarely do their names indicate any relationships. Furthermore, these officials declare, accounts in most savings and loan institutions are insured up to $10,000 each by an agency of the Federal Government and this in itself tends to assure stability. These executives also argue that State laws in the case of State-chartered associations and Federal laws in the case of federally chartered institutions prevent holding companies from raiding their associations, no matter how desperate their need for funds might become.

Critics of the holding companies' diversification also contend the companies are pushing too deeply into fields that are unrelated and perhaps even unfamiliar to savings and loan executives. If the holding companies can enter the homebuilding and office rental business, these critics argue, they might even get into manufacturing enterprises someday. Most opponents of the diversification trend hope for some sort of legislation that will limit the activities of the holding companies to areas traditionally associated with savings and loan institutions. But no such legislation has been introduced at the Federal or State level, so far at least.

Holding company officials take exception to the charge that they are entering unfamiliar fields. Mr. Galen of Trans-World Financial, for instance, notes he was a builder before he ever got into the savings and loan business and that anyway building isn't foreign to savings and loan associations. Federal law, he notes, permits federally chartered associations to invest up to 20 percent of their resources in raw land for development as they see fit. Mr. Galen says a number of individual associations have used this provision in the past to contract with builders to build and sell houses for them, with the associations carrying the mortgages.

Address by Congressman Walter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, on April 1 the Sertoma Club of Mesa, Ariz., was fortunate to be able to present as the speaker for an all-community and area meeting the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives. Congressman WALTER spoke on the subject about which he knows so much and feels so strongly—communism, and its threat to our way of life and the freedom of the world. His speech was so outstanding and so enthusiastically received by his audience that I am proud to share it with all the Members of the Congress:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN WALTER TO THE SERTOMA CLUB OF MESA, ARIZ.

It was with great pleasure that I accepted the invitation to address you men of the Mesa Sertoma Club who have dedicated yourselves to services to mankind. The goal of your organization is certainly most praiseworthy, one that is in the best tradition not only of our American heritage but of our entire Judeo-Christian civilization. It is also a goal which, if properly pursued in the context of today's developments, can perform an extraordinary service to mankind—because mankind today faces an extraordinary peril, one that it can meet only by extraordinary effort. This peril threatens the eclipse of freedom and the destruction of civilization which makes it possible for us to meet here today with the tremendous political, social, economic, and cultural advantages we enjoy—advantages far greater than those enjoyed by any other people in the past.

It is not necessary for me to spell out in detail the nature of the peril mankind faces. I am sure that recent and current developments in the Congo and Laos—and just 90 miles from our shores, in Cuba—have made that peril plainly evident to all thinking persons.

A recent report indicates that, in western Cuba, an installation has been completed which required hundreds of tons of portland cement. It is more than probable that this installation is a missile base. If so, it means that every single city in the United States is within a few minutes range—and I want to stress that, a few minutes range—of Soviet nuclear missiles.

In the light of these developments, what service can you perform for mankind and for your fellow American citizens? In the past, the Mesa Sertoma Club and Sertoma Clubs in all parts of the country have completed many worthwhile projects of assistance, in one form or another, to a variety of deserving organizations, agencies and individuals in the fields of medicine, education and social welfare, to name just a few—not only in the United States but abroad as well. To the best of your ability, you should certainly continue such undertakings which serve to make your community, your country and the world a better place to live in.

As worthwhile as these projects are, however, I believe that, today, all of us must do more because, if the threat we face is not defeated, your ability to perform the services you have rendered in the past will be taken away from you—completely. If it is not defeated, in place of freedom to serve you will have only the compulsion to slave, to serve a totalitarian, monolithic state that considers man no more than another kind of animal, a kind of rational cog in a political and economic machine.

What can you do? To answer that question you must first analyze the nature of our Government and how our Nation is geared to meet all challenges.

In our representative form of government we have four major weapons in meeting any problem, whether it is domestic communism, flood control, conservation or military defense. Our weapons are information or knowledge; legislation, that is, laws; prosecutive or law enforcement agencies, and finally—and most important of all—an alert, informed and active citizenry.

It is the function of the Congress and its committees to develop information on national problems through investigation, research and hearings, and to pass appropriate legislation, if it is needed, to cope with these problems. It is also its job to plug loopholes in existing laws and to oversee the operations of the executive branch.

Congressional committees, in the course of their hearings, perform a valuable and essential side function—that of informing the American people, who are the ultimate rulers of this land, about a problem and the issues involved in it.

This informing function is accomplished through the committee's published hearings and reports and also, of course, by press, magazine, radio, and TV coverage of committee proceedings.

For over 20 years the House of Representatives has relied upon the Committee on Un-American Activities to perform its vital legislative and informing functions in the field of countering Communist subversion—and the committee has done a creditable job in this field.

The committee's enemies claim that it has accomplished little in the way of legislation and that it has operated primarily to expose people. The truth is very much the opposite.

Independent studies made by the Library of Congress reveal that in the years 1941 to 1960, the Committee on Un-American Activities has made 96 separate and distinct legislative recommendations to the Congress. They reveal that 35 of these recommendations have been adopted by the Congress and are now a part of the law of this land which

is designed to protect you and the Nation from the destructive, subversive forces of communism.

These studies also reveal that 52 bills and 1 House resolution embodying recommendations of the committee were pending at the close of the last Congress, the 86th, and that 8 of these bills had been passed by the House, although the Senate did not act on them.

Again, these studies reveal that the executive branch of our Government has adopted 13 recommendations of the Committee on Un-American Activities which covered policy matters rather than legislation.

It is unsound, of course, to judge a congressional committee solely on the quantity of its legislative recommendations and the number of them enacted into law—just as it is unsound to judge an artist by the number, rather than the quality, of the works he produces. The facts I have cited, however—plus the findings of the courts on legislation which has resulted from committee recommendations—completely refute the charge that it has ignored its legislative function.

As far as its informing function is concerned, the many thousands of published pages of committee hearings, reports, consultations, and scholarly works—on numerous facets of communism—have been a vital service to the Congress, the executive branch, and to the American public. I believe I can say without fear of contradiction that there is no agency in the United States today that has provided the Government and the people with both the quantity and quality of information on communism that the Committee on Un-American Activities has.

Once legislation has been passed, it becames the duty of the executive branch to enforce it. This is where, in the field of Communist activities, the Federal Bureau of Investigation enters the picture as a branch of the Department of Justice. The Federal Bureau of Investigation operates under directives of the Attorney General of the United States, our country's chief law enforcement officer. It is his investigative arm.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation's job is to collect evidence that will make possible the trial and conviction of lawbreakers. Over the years, in the field of Communist subversion the Federal Bureau of Investigation, under its great Director, J. Edgar Hoover, has done a marvelous job of penetrating the Communist Party, keeping track of all its activities and the identity of its members. Numerous Communist Party leaders have been tried and convicted under the Smith Act—on evidence collected by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Others have been tried and convicted under our espionage laws, or, if diplomats, have been exposed and shipped back behind the Iron Curtain as persona non grata—all on the basis of evidence provided by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

It is most important that we remember, however, that most of the extensive information the Federal Bureau of Investigation collects on the operations of the Communist conspiracy in this country, for a number of good reasons, is kept absolutely secret. For the most part, it is never revealed to the public except in the case of a court trial.

Because the FBI is purely an investigating agency and has neither the legislative nor the informing function of a congressional committee, it, alone, cannot do a thorough job of protecting this country from communism.

I have heard some people criticize the Committeee on Un-American Activities because it has not "convicted" any Communists or spies lately. It is not the committee's job to do this. As I have just indicated, this is the work of the executive branch of the Government, the FBI, and the Department of Justice.

In some cases, in the course of its hearings, the committee has produced evidence that was later used in the courts to convict certain individuals. The most famous of these cases was that of Alger Hiss. There have been quite a few others. But when this happens, it is more or less an incidental development, on offshoot of the committee's primary function of holding hearings for legislative purposes.

Here, then, we have in a nutshell, the picture of how our Government is set up to meet the threat of internal communism:

The Congress, with the Committee on Un-American Activities playing a special role, develops information and legislation pertinent to the problem. The Department of Justice, with the FBI playing a special role, then develops the evidence to prosecute those who have broken the law—with the courts judging innocence or guilt.

Many people wrongly believe that this is all that needs to be done to defeat communism. They feel that they can relax and forget about the problem because appropriate governmental agencies are taking care of it. I am sorry to say that these people are wrong. The committee and the FBI have found Communists operating in every important phase of American life—in Government, in trade unions, in the moving-picture industry, radio and TV fields; in the theater, the publishing industry, the Armed Forces, the teaching, legal and medical professions. It is difficult to name an area, profession, trade, or industry that has not been infiltrated by the Red fifth column.

The most dangerous type of Communist activity is the day-to-day semiconcealed agitation and propaganda which is being carried out by this fifth column in the cities, towns, and villages across the country; in schools, colleges, and churches, in clubs and organizations of all kinds, in unions, in industry, and in the press.

This is the weapon with which the Communists have subverted other nations and weakened them for the kill. It is the weapon with which they can eventually destroy this Nation—if it is not wrenched from their hands.

Most important, this activity is not illegal. The FBI can do nothing about it—except to add to its bulging files the names of the individuals taking part in it.

What can the Committee on Un-American Activities do?

J. Edgar Hoover testified in February 1960, that the FBI then had 160 known or suspected Communist controlled and infiltrated groups under investigation. Party members in this country number many thousands and fellow travelers many, many thousands more.

Obviously, the Committee on Un-American Activities, in the course of each year, can investigate no more than a very small fraction of the activities of these groups and individuals.

This means that for the most part, as far as governmental agencies are concerned, most of the Communist Party's most dangerous operations are completely unimpeded.

Let me give you one example of how fateful these operations can be.

A new nationwide Communist front is set up. It establishes branches in many cities and towns. Its members start passing out propaganda and hold public meetings and rallies at which pro-Communist and concealed Communist speakers are featured. By a concerted campaign of deceptive propaganda and agitation, it induces many citizens in many communities to accept a position on some vital national question—such as that of nuclear weapons testing—which follows exactly the line of the Communist Party and of Moscow. It succeeds in getting many of these people to promote this position in letters to Members of Congress, the White House and the Department of State—and to sell their friends the idea that the United States should sign an agreement with the Soviet Union banning nuclear tests, even though Moscow will not permit adequate inspection of its territory so that we can be sure it is living up to the agreement.

Concerted nationwide activity along these lines—if not fought and exposed—could have disastrous effects, not only on our country's testing policy but, through it, on our very survival.

The Communist Party's extensive activity of this type, designed to gradually bring about Communist conquest of America, must be fought on the community level by Mr. and Mrs. America. It must be fought by businessmen, educators, clergymen, municipal officials, the press—people in every walk of life.

How can you fight it? Through letters to local newspapers; by countermeetings and rallies at which persons well-informed on Communist activities, startegy, and tactics are featured as speakers; by the issuance of effective counterpropaganda; by the exposure of the backgrounds of the Communist and pro-Communist agitators doing the conspiracy's work.

Because it is so difficult to obtain documentary evidence of Communist Party membership today—there has been no such thing as a card-carrying Communist since 1948—those who would fight the Communists must be better informed on national and international issues than ever before. When you cannot destroy the effectiveness of the Communist propagandist by revealing his subversive ties, you must then be able to meet and defeat him on the facts and issues of each case.

Communist front organizations are not the only danger. There are many other types of Communist-serving activity which the American people must fight:

A Hollywood producer hires a person who is a Communist to write the script of a film admirably suited to promotion of the Communist Party line. He may do so openly or in a sneaky, under-the-table manner, with the writer's true name concealed;

A respectable publishing firm releases a party-line book on some foreign country or on a vital foreign policy matter which is written by a man who is a member of the Communist Party and has extensive affiliations, over a period of many, many years, with Communist front organizations.

Again, there is nothing illegal about any of these activities. The FBI can do nothing about them and, in most cases, neither can the Committee on Un-American Activities. Yet each incident such as these—and there are many of them taking place all the time—is a battle or engagement in the continuing internal conflict the Communists are waging against the Untied States to weaken and destroy it as a free nation.

What are now the main goals of the Communist Party? What are the issues on which you must be particularly well-informed today if you want to be effective in fighting communism?

On January 20 the Communist Party's national secretary, Gus Hall, addressed a meeting of its national executive committee in New York City. He told the leaders of the conspiracy that, to promote world Communist victory, the new administration must be pressed to act in the following directions:

"1. To begin immediately to dismantle the whole system of camps.

"2. To end all squabbling and obstruction by our representatives and to reach agreement to abolish all nuclear testing now.

"3. To put an end to all policies of brinkmanship and the fomenting of increased world tensions. To * * * accept as our policy the outlook of peaceful coexistence."

(By this he means, of course, the abandonment of any resistance to Soviet aggression—such as in Laos.)

"4. To take up seriously the task of disarmament and to plan now for the use of

the billions being squandered on arms for houses, hospitals, schools, roads, and other social service and social welfare needs.

"5. To end the Dulles-Eisenhower era of war alliances and war pacts * * *."

(In other words, disband NATO, SEATO, and all other international, mutual defense agreements.)

After outlining these five key Communist goals, Hall said that the Communist fight for general, universal disarmament was "of special importance" and that the movement to ban nuclear tests and outlaw nuclear weapons was "of the most immediate importance" to the Kremlin and "must be pressed with the greatest vigor."

So here are the keys, immediate goals of the Kremlin and its fifth column in the United States. Not every one who believes in these goals is a Communist. But I would say that anyone who agrees with all or most of them had better do some rethinking and studying the facts and issues involved.

They may sound fine on the surface but you can be sure there is a joker in them somewhere. If not, Communists in all parts of the world, under Moscow's orders, would not be working day and night for them.

As you can readily see, neither the FBI nor the Committee on Un-American Activities can determine whether or not the United States will sign a nuclear test ban with the Soviet Union, and if so, what the provisions of that pact will be. They cannot decide whether this country will adopt a policy of universal disarmament, or whether it will begin dismantling its overseas bases. The vital question of U.S. policy in the face of Soviet aggression will be decided by neither of these agencies.

The same applies to the question of recognition of Red China, the abolition of compulsory ROTC, repeal of the Smith Act and the Internal Security Act, the abolition of the Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and numerous other matters which are the openly stated goals of the U.S. Communist Party and, therefore, of the Kremlin.

Each one of these questions—and they are all significant issues as far as the outcome of our battle for survival is concerned—will be decided largely by the average citizen and the views on them he makes known to the Congress, the White House, to the press and his fellow citizens.

The key battles in this war are being fought in the towns and villages of this country, in our schools and colleges, in the press, and in citizens associations and organizations of all kinds.

The people of this country, on the local level, can meet—and defeat—the traitors and their collaborators who are trying to sell America down the river. Morever, they must do it.

This country has never won any war without the all-out support of the great majority of its people. It is engaged in world war III at this moment. At the present time, within this country, we are in a nonmilitary phase of that war, but it is a war nevertheless, and the all-out support of the American people is needed if we are to win.

Many years ago Lenin wrote: "We must train men and women who will devote to the revolution, not merely their spare evenings, but the whole of their lives."

Communist success in training such men and women is the key reason for the tremendous power they wield today. Members of the various Communist Parties of the world comprise only a little more than 1 percent of the world's population—yet they completely rule one-third of the people of this globe and have extensive influence on millions of others. They have devoted to their cause not merely their spare evenings, but the whole of their lives.

Sixty years ago when Lenin wrote the words I have just quoted, he faced the challenge of converting the world to his philosophy and of destroying ours. Today, we are faced with a similar challenge. If we are to defeat the international Communist conspiracy so that our own way of life may endure, we must devote ourselves to our cause as wholly as the Communists have devoted themselves to theirs. There is no other way.

The Communists have thrown a challenge to the members of the Sertoma Clubs—as they have to all Americans. It is a challenge to your good citizenship, your loyalty and devotion to your country—and your true devotion to mankind. It is also a challenge which, I am sure, all of you will accept and on which you will not give ground until it has been totally defeated.

Politics and Social Security: A Dangerous Combination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on March 6 of this year I placed in the RECORD a speech which I had made entitled "Politics Can Destroy Social Security" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 87th Cong., 1st sess., pp. A1512–A1514). I believe that it is necessary to evaluate proposals made in the field of social security legislation with respect to the basic premise of my speech, that political tampering with our social security system can do it serious damage.

One aspect of this danger is cited in the report of a statement by Mr. Ray M. Peterson, vice president of Equitable Life Assurance Association, in the New York Times of Saturday, April 8. I would like to insert that report at this point in the RECORD:

ACTUARY HITS BILL ON MEDICAL CARE—FEARS FINANCING THROUGH SOCIAL SECURITY MIGHT PERIL INTERNAL PEACE

(By Russell Porter)

An insurance expert said yesterday that proposed financing of medical care for the aged through social security might eventually endanger the Nation's internal peace.

Ray M. Peterson, a leading actuary, said the proposal might lead to further costly expansion of the social security system that might have "important political and social consequences." Future generations might ultimately revolt against the cost to them of benefits that present older citizens voted to themselves, he suggested.

Mr. Peterson, a vice president of the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States, made these statements in an article in the current issue of the Journal of the American Medical Association. The article was released to the lay press yesterday.

The title of the article, "The Coming Din of Inequity," refers to a "rising clamor of unfairness" that Mr. Peterson predicted would be heard from younger generations unless social security was reorganized and unless medical care was kept out of it. The entire social security structure might collapse unless put on a sound basis, he warned.

AMA LEADING FIGHT

The AMA has led the fight against President Kennedy's program and other Democratic proposals in Congress to bring medical care under social security. The President sent Congress a message in February with a program to finance health benefits for 14,200,000 citizens 65 years old or over through higher social security payroll taxes.

Others have proposed greatly increased social security benefits and taxes in a broadly expanded program. Some critics have predicted that medical care for the aged would lead to a health insurance program for everybody with a tremendous tax burden.

Mr. Peterson said the various Democratic proposals for medical care for the aged now before Congress would add $15 billion to $30 billion to the permanent debt of the social security system. He charged that future generations would have to pay interest forever on this debt, which he estimated had grown from $150 billion in 1952 to $300 billion in 1958. If all current proposals to expand social security were enacted into law, he went on, they would raise the debt to more than $500 billion.

RUDE AWAKENING SEEN

Charging that the system had been officially misrepresented by likening it to private insurance, which he said sets up a full reserve to provide for benefits, he went on:

"When the American people ultimately come to know that the nature of our social security program is distinctly different, a rude awakening may well occur.

"Will the youngsters of the future protest what the oldsters of this generation have voted for themselves?"

He said older members of the social security system received large unearned benefits compared to their contributions, but "the pendulum swings the other way for the youngest members and all new entrants." He said they had to pick up the tab in the form of paying interest on the debt for unearned benefits paid to their elders.

Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill, 1962

SPEECH
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill H.R. 6345, the Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill, 1962.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD in connection with the Interior Department appropriation bill, 1962, I would like to say that I am pleased to have voted in favor of the Ryan amendment to that bill—the amendment which would, if it had passed, have prohibited the expenditure of Civil War Centennial funds appropriated by the Congress for the use of facilities in which individuals are segregated because of race, religion, or color, or for activities in which individuals are discriminated against for reason of race, religion or color. I am sorry that the amendment was voted down, but I am pleased that the Chairman of the Com-

mittee of the Whole House ruled that such an amendment was germane.

If segregation and discrimination did not exist, an amendment of this nature, naturally, would be unnecessary. Unfortunately, these practices do exist, and there is some evidence that they have existed in the activities of, and in the facilities used by, the Civil War Centennial Commission, a Commission whose real purpose is to commemorate the historic convulsion which, at the expense of many lives and great suffering, decided that America would be perpetuated as the land of equality of opportunity for all, regardless of race, religion or color.

As a Kansan I am particularly pleased to have had the opportunity to lend my support to the amendment. The Kansas Centennial Year and the Civil War Centennial Year come at the same time. A great deal of the history leading up to the admission of Kansas into the Union and the beginning of the conflict of 1861 are one and the same. Kansas was admitted to the Union just a few days before the war began. Abraham Lincoln raised the first 34-star flag, the flag with the star of Kansas, over Independence Hall in Philadelphia while en route to his inauguration here in Washington. Of course, Kansas stood with Lincoln and the Union and the idea that "all men are created equal." Many rivers ran red with the blood of Kansans who fought to insure the idea of equality of opportunity for all, and for me to vote "yes" on the Ryan amendment was consistent with those ideals for which my forebears fought and died, and those same ideals in which I firmly believe.

Minority Views on Social Security Amendments of 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, for the convenience of the Members who are interested in the actuarial soundness of the social security system, I herewith include as a part of my remarks the minority views on the report on H.R. 6027, the bill now before you:

VIII. MINORITY VIEWS

We believe in a soundly financed and equitably conceived system of social security that properly seeks to provide a basic floor of retirement and survivorship protection for the American people on a nondiscriminatory basis. The existing old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program falls considerably short of meeting these requirements.

We are opposed to a system of so-called social insurance that (1) discourages individual productivity, (2) impairs individual ability to achieve self-sufficiency, (3) illogically and arbitrarily differentiates among citizens in regard to benefit eligibility and amount, and (4) spends currently the savings of the present generation so that the commitments of the system to one generation will inevitably fall on succeeding generations in increasing magnitude. The present old-age survivors, and disability insurance program tragically possesses these shortcomings on every count and with seemingly unshakable firmness persists in their retention.

We are opposed to the enactment of H.R. 6027 because it seeks to enact a combination of illy conceived or inadequate modifications in a social security structure that urgently requires much more basic and sweeping reform to be acceptable and workable. There seems to us little merit or future in adding another room to a house built on sand.

We associate ourselves fully with the criticisms in the supplemental views by our Republican colleagues with respect to the proposal to reduce the possible retirement age for men to 62 years. We also tend to support the recommendations of our Republican colleagues to liberalize the retirement test and to end the present unconscionable discrimination against those present aged who through no fault of their own are precluded from a benefit entitlement even though their need is the greatest and even though they may have contributed as much to the OASI trust fund as many present beneficiaries. With respect to the proposed increase in certain dependent's benefits, we can see no reason or rationale for saying to a widow that she can have only 75 percent or 82½ percent or any other percent less than 100 percent of the amount paid to a retired man. We would support a proposal to equate the benefit entitlement between these two classes of beneficiaries.

We should frankly recognize that the present social security system is not insurance and we should end the cruel pretense of maintaining on the basis of an insurance concept that some citizens are deserving of higher benefits than others and some citizens are deserving of no benefits. It serves no useful purpose to characterize as insurance what is merely a statutory mechanism combining welfare and insurance characteristics which emerge as a hybrid that is not insurance and that provides welfare only on a hit-or-miss basis. This mechanism is essentially a device for taking the productivity of one group of our citizens to provide for the welfare of another group and these groups may or may not be of the same generation.

We support the portion of the supplemental views of our Republican colleagues expressed in regard to the tax schedule in existing law and proposed in this legislation necessary to finance the OASDI program. In commenting on the tax burden we stress the fact that the OASDI system has not met the critical test of time. We are told that the system will not mature until well into the 21st century. In the interim it is entirely possible that experience will prove the present tax schedule inadequate. We are perhaps not justified in assuming that future generations will acquiesce in tax burdens to which we are now so willing to commit them.

We also join in the supplemental views of our Republican colleagues with respect to concern over the willingness of the administration to utilize the OASDI program for pump-priming purposes. The fact that the administration did not recommend any comparable liberalization of the public assistance programs under the Social Security Act reveals a dangerous inclination to use the OASDI trust funds for fiscal policy purposes to pursue an objective that, if it is to be done at all, should be done through the Treasury general fund route.

Our reservations with respect to the existing social security program and the amendments proposed in H.R. 6027, aside from considerations of equity and fairness, are primarily directed to our serious doubts over the financial ability of the program to sustain itself in perpetuity. The assumptions on which the system is pronounced sound are inescapably predicated almost completely on economic and population forecasting. There is less reason to question the actuarial conclusions if the assumed economic and population forecasts are correct. Our concern is that these forecasts may prove to be at substantial variance with experience, with the result that the tremendous obligations already accumulated under the OASDI system will prove an intolerable burden.

The existing system is established on the principle that taxes will be imposed on future earned income of future workers to pay benefits obligations that have been previously incurred. The magnitude of these obligations can be demonstrated by an examination of certain actuarial data:

First, an employee with maximum taxable earnings since the program began in 1937 would have contributed, through December 31, 1960, a total of $1,290, so that the combined employer-employee taxes are $2,580. If such an individual reached age 65 on January 1, 1961, and had a wife the same age, the average total amount of benefits that would be paid out in this case would be about $31,200.

Secondly, a similar individual who qualifies for the minimum benefit could have contributed as little as $6.50 (by obtaining 13 quarters of coverage at the minimum rate of $50 of wages per quarter during the period 1937–49, when the contribution rate was 1 percent); in such case, the combined employer-employee taxes would be $13. The total amount of benefits that would be paid out, on the average, in such case (considering that the widow would receive the full minimum benefit under the present law of $33) would be about $9,100.

Thirdly, the total contributions that have been collected by the OASDI system since the inception of the program through 1960 amount to approximately $81.6 billion. The present value of future benefit obligations incurred with respect to existing beneficiaries is estimated at about $95 billion. This latter figure does not take into account the benefit obligations currently being developed for persons who have not as yet reached retirement age or died, or the total benefits paid since the inception of the program through 1960, amounting to $62.9 billion. The combined OASDI trust funds at the end of 1960 amounted to only $22.6 billion.

And, fourthly, the present unfunded obligations of the OASDI system are estimated to be approximately $300 billion on the assumption that no new workers enter the system but that only presently covered persons and their employers make contributions and acquire benefit rights.

These actuarial data give some meaning to the magnitude of the future obligations that have already been incurred under the social security program and suggest the compelling reasons why care must be exercised in the evaluation of the existing program and any proposed liberalizations thereof.

We favor a program that is sound in principle and in its financing features. We are opposed to imposing on future generations the obligations that we should be meeting for ourselves. For these reasons we are constrained to express our opposition to the favorable consideration of H.R. 6027.

NOAH M. MASON.
JAMES B. UTT.
BRUCE ALGER.

World Court Headed by Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following article from the Richmond (Ind.) Palladium-Item:

WORLD COURT HEADED BY COMMUNISTS

The International Court of Justice, usually referred to as the World Court, is a product of the United Nations.

Our readers will remember that the Congress last year was confronted with a strong group of Members who sought to have the Connally amendment repealed.

This amendment reserves to our Government the right to decide whether a case taken to the World Court involving the United States is purely a domestic issue or whether it involves international affairs.

As long as the United States can safeguard our internal matters from becoming entangled in world political issues we can prevent control over our affairs as they pertain to our domestic laws, principles, and practices.

But within our Congress and among our national leaders there are advocates of repealing the Connally amendment. Their campaign for repeal came close to winning in the last Congress. New attempts are expected in the current session.

It should be of interest to all of us that there now is a Soviet Communist judge as head of the 15-judge World Court. There also is a Communist judge from Poland among the world jurists.

While there are 15 judges, a majority of 9 judges can convene and make decisions. With nine judges considering a case, it takes only a majority of that nine to make a ruling. This means five judges out of the nine could decide an issue. Two of those judges would be known Communists.

If that issue involved our Panama Canal agreement, or the maintenance of our naval base at Guantanamo Bay in Cuba, we would have to accept the decision if our Connally amendment were to be repealed by the present Congress.

The Court also could rule that our tariff schedules were too high, or that our foreign aid to dozens of foreign countries should be increased, including greater aid to pro-Communist governments.

Such action by an international court would be final. Our United States Constitution would be no protection. No precedent would stand in the way of a World Court which itself would establish its own precedents for the future decisions of the Court.

There would be plenty of other countries outside of the big Communist countries which would be glad to take a slap at us if they, too, thought they could profit at our expense from a World Court decision.

The Connally amendment should, by all means, be retained. Our people and our Government should never open the way for international political crooks to rule us through a World Court supporting international dictatorship.

Social Security Conditioned Germany for Hitler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, as we are faced with demands by the administration to expand the social security system, it may be well for the Members to pause and note the following excerpt from the book "The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich," by that well-known correspondent, William L. Shirer. Mr. Shirer's comments on how social security conditioned the German mind to accept Hitler is most intriguing.

The excerpt follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY AND THE THIRD REICH

Bismarck put through between 1883 and 1889 a program for social security far beyond anything known in other countries. It included compulsory insurance for workers against old age, sickness, accident, and incapacity, and though organized by the state it was financed by employers and employees. It cannot be said that it stopped the rise of the Social Democrats or the trade unions, but it did have a profound effect on the working class in that it gradually made them value security over political freedom and caused them to see in the state, however conservative, a benefactor and a protector. Hitler took full advantage of this state of mind. In this, as in other matters, he learned much from Bismarck. "I studied Bismarck's socialist legislation," Hitler remarks in "Mein Kampf," "in its intention, struggle, and success."

An Analysis of Depressed Areas Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, April 10, the Wall Street Journal published a column by Paul Duke analyzing the politics and potential of the depressed areas legislation which this body has passed. Mr. Duke's treatment of the Congress acts is harsh, but I am sure we all recognize them as both fair and truthful. I should like to insert this column in the RECORD at this point:

DEPRESSED AREAS—AID LEGISLATION RAISES SKEPTICISM EVEN AMONG BACKERS

(By Paul Duke)

WASHINGTON.—Within the next couple of weeks an uncertain Congress will put the final legislative touches on an ambitious new Federal program that even some ardent supporters doubt will be able to accomplish its assigned task.

The bill, a major recommendation of the Kennedy administration, is designed to rehabilitate areas suffering from prolonged unemployment by funneling more than $400 million in Federal grants and loans into hard-hit regions of Pennsylvania, New York, West Virginia, Kentucky, Michigan, Illinois, and elsewhere.

Yet, even those who have fought hardest for the new program are skeptical of its potentialities. A Democrat from depression-ridden West Virginia is typical. "If anybody thinks this will solve the unemployment problem, he's crazy," the lawmaker declares.

If such a remark seems strange, it expresses perhaps the overriding contradiction of a new Federal program that is riddled with paradoxes. Consider: President Kennedy listed aid-to-depressed-areas as part of his antirecession program to pep up the economy quickly and put people back to work. Yet, Labor Secretary Goldberg and "liberal" Democratic sponsors in Congress don't regard the program as an antirecession device at all, but rather an attempt to revive communities over a period of years. "There's nothing (in it) that will put a man back to work tomorrow," says a House Democrat from Ohio.

Far from curing unemployment, many liberals who support the new program fear its chief impact may be merely to reshuffle unemployment geographically. That's because, despite alleged safeguards written into the bill, they're afraid the result may be to encourage the pirating of industry from one region of the country to another. "The Jolly Roger is flying at the masthead of this bill," gripes a New England Senator.

To win the votes of southern Democrats, a special provision was inserted in the bill to permit Federal aid for rural areas. Yet, almost no one thinks such a program is necessary because the Agriculture Department already has a rural development plan.

LOTS OF CAPACITY

Though the aid-to-depressed areas scheme is designed primarily to help medium-sized communities, such industrial giants as Detroit and Pittsburgh would also qualify for assistance in building new plants and for community face-lifting projects. Yet, their unemployment troubles stem more from unused rather than a lack of industrial capacity. "We've got more damned plant space in our State than we know what to do with," snaps a Michigan Democrat.

These, then, are just some of the more obvious difficulties involved in undertaking from Washington the job of invigorating local economies. The more subtle complexes can be enormous. Solutions that may seem logical on the surface can turn out to be illogical upon closer examination; actions to help can produce counteractions of harm.

Consider, for example, the plight of a major company that planned to move its plant from one area of a State to another. To soften the impact on the community it was leaving, the company decided on what it thought was a bold stroke—save the jobs of its 300 workers by taking them along. Not that simple, however. New employment opportunities were scarce in the community where the plant was relocating, and the influx of 300 new workers threatened to create bitter antagonism from the local citizenry.

If the program's chances of success are so doubtful, why then is it all but certain to become law? The answer is not unfamiliar in the realm of politics: It's hard to oppose extending a helping hand to the downtrodden, even if the gesture outdoes the accomplishment. Most liberals, when discussing aid to depressed areas, will echo the philosophy voiced by President Kennedy in his inaugural address: "If a free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich." But many of these same liberals, when pinned down on the potential effectiveness of the legislation, agree with one colleague who concedes that the chief value of this bill will be symbolic. Or, in the words of still another: "This is like the United Nations, the faith will greatly exceed the accomplishment."

To be sure, supporters of the depressed areas legislation see some solid good coming from the new multimillion dollar rehabilitation effort. The very passage of the legislation, they believe, will lend new encouragement and hope to scores of areas on the economic skids. In more practical terms, backers believe the program will genuinely help some areas which have been unable to attract industry because of a lack of lending funds.

In West Virginia, for example, a shortage of private credit is cited as a major adverse factor in the State's drive for new businesses. Proponents of the new legislation note that the Pennsylvania Industrial De-

velopment Authority has lent $17 million since its creation 5 years ago and this has accounted for 26,000 new factory jobs with payrolls of $93 million annually. If such a program can work at the State level, they ask, why can't it work on a bigger scale nationally?

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FORTY-SIX EMPLOYMENT ACT

Advocates claim that the Government already has a mandate to clear up pockets of depression under the 1946 Federal Employment Act which calls for policies promoting full employment in the United States. The longer Uncle Sam remains aloof, they contend, the more serious the blight becomes. Besides, the argument goes, the Government is losing potential tax revenue from economically depressed regions while Federal and State welfare and unemployment compensation payments mushroom.

Moreover, the plan's pushers envision it as the last barrier to a general public works program that would cost billions instead of millions. Commerce Secretary Hodges has already said that a new Public Works Administration will be necessary unless the economy snaps back soon and reduces the number of areas with substantial unemployment, now at 101.

Critics don't question the motives behind the new program, only its chances for success in easing unemployment. "This is one of the biggest phonies to come down the legislative pike in a long time," grumbles a Virginia conservative. What provokes him and others of like mind is that the program probably will take years to produce results, which may well be niggardly. For example, it has been estimated that only about 1 of every 17 unemployed workers in a depressed locality could hope to obtain a job as a direct result of the Federal help that's contemplated.

Most importantly, perhaps, many opponents think the program skirts the root problems of persistent unemployment. "It prescribes a painkiller without being concerned whether the pain is caused by an incurable cancer or a hangover," cracks a western GOP critic. Better, the foes say, to remove the 10-percent excise tax on automobiles to help stimulate car sales; or to launch a crash program to find new uses for coal; or to undertake a major job retraining program; or to reconsider trade policies.

Besides, the argument goes, factors other than favorable financing are frequently more important to business in choosing a plant location. What industry can overlook an area's transportation connections, the availability of raw materials, and the closeness of markets? Too, business is increasingly concerned about the character of the community—its schools, its recreational facilities, the quality of the work force. Some lawmakers suggest the Federal inducements will tend to attract only speculative and undesirable industries looking for windfall aid.

And, of course, it's pointed out that the Federal Government already is offering some area assistance through the Small Business Administration and the Community Facilities Loan Program. Moreover, 22 States now have privately financed development corporations to help in the obtaining of credit; Pennsylvania and nine other States have gone even further and set up State-supported credit corporations. New Hampshire and Maine have established public authorities for the construction of industrial parks.

PHILOSOPHICAL QUESTION

But even granting that economically stricken regions do need more help, there's the philosophical question of whether the job should fall to a special Federal program. And opponents pose these other questions: Should hard-hit communities be helped while others, only less slightly depressed, be denied assistance? What about the communities which aren't depressed but are earnestly trying to build up their economies and will face rougher competition in attracting new businesses? Should the Government favor some areas over others? Concludes a New England conservative: "This is a bad bill because it forces Uncle Sam to play favorites among his children." Possible upshot: Greater political pressure to enlarge the program to include more areas.

For all their self-doubts, supporters of the new depressed areas legislation tend to reject as exaggerated claims that the program eventually will expand significantly. "This is a rifle for a specific target," proclaims a Pennsylvania Democrat. "It was never meant to be anything else, and if properly administered, should not be anything else."

Nevertheless, friend and foe alike can pretty much agree on one basic conclusion: Even if the rifle does strike the target, it's not likely to penetrate deeply.

Migrant Farm Labor Problems and "Harvest of Shame"—XIV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is the 14th in a series of articles presented in the public interest by the Palm Beach Post-Times to show the Members some of the progress being made in Florida to solve problems relating to migrant farm labor which were left out of the television presentation "Harvest of Shame." The omissions of all that has been, and is being done in this field did a great injustice to the Floridians who have given their time and efforts to these problems over the years. It is hoped that by reading these articles and the ones to follow the Members and public will have a better understanding of this important matter:

[From the Palm Beach Post-Times, Feb. 3, 1961]

MIGRANT COLLEGE GRADS BUSY TEACHING OTHERS

"The U.S. Office of Education reports that the migratory workers have the highest rate of illiteracy in the country. Approximately 1 out of every 500 children whose parents are still migrant workers finished grade school. Approximately 1 out of every 5,000 ever finishes high school. And there is no case upon the record of the child of a migrant laborer ever receiving a college diploma."—"Harvest of Shame."

At Lake Shore High School and Lake Shore Elementary School in Belle Glade there are at least three degree-holding teachers who are former migrants.

And the parents of Mrs. Earline Hudson, Mrs. Delores White, and Mrs. Addie Pearl Hill still are engaged in the business of following the crops.

The three teachers agree that there are other degree-holding persons here whose parents were migrant laborers. Most are teachers. Examples? They point to the following:

Gerald C. Burke, Eddi Queen Oates, Helen Vereen, Ollis Davis, Jordan, John Mays, Willie Pyfrom, and his wife, Lenoir Lincoln, Eugene Lincoln, Doris Davis, Leola Miller, and Mary Elizabeth Thompson.

Mrs. Hill and Mrs. White said there are many others.

"It would take a while to list all of them," said Mrs. Hill apologetically. Can others break out of the migrant stream and go on to better lives?

"That's one of the first things I begin teaching them," said Mrs. Hill, a first grade instructor. "I tell them I myself once worked in the fields."

The bright and energetic little teacher said this frequently leads her into conversation, she said.

"Often they tell me of how much work members of their families have done, and then I tell them of my own experiences," she said.

Mrs. Hill said she constantly impresses on her pupils that they must let nothing interfere with their education if they want to follow a better line of employment than that of their parents.

"I'm preaching all the time to the children," she said. "It's the only way."

Mrs. Hill, a graduate of Bethune College at Daytona Beach, was one of four children. She and Mrs. White were classmates through high school at Belle Glade.

Mrs. White attended Florida A. & M.

The two come from families of workers, not crew leaders. Interest shown by their parents caused them to go on to higher education.

Their parents, they said, made arrangements for them to stay in Belle Glade for the full school year. But they joined their families and worked with them after school was out.

Mrs. White, a fourth grade teacher, agreed with Mrs. Hill and Mrs. Hudson that education is the answer to getting out of the migrant stream.

"Children now have a better chance than we did," said Mrs. Hill with obvious conviction.

Would adult migrants go to the trouble of improving their education if facilities were available?

Mrs. Hudson said most would find it impossible because of their working hours and the physical effort involved.

Mrs. White said it wouldn't work "unless they knew there would be jobs waiting at the end of the education."

"Then you'd have lots of them," she said.

Has the life of migrants shown any improvement here over recent years? "In the last 2 years, some of the migrants have started building homes in the Belle Glade area," Mrs. White said. "This is one of the most hopeful signs."

Mrs. White was one of nine children. Her parents bore the basic cost of financing her college education, but she helped both at school and on the farms during some of her summer vacation periods.

Smiling, she and Mrs. Hill recalled that some of those vacations were devoted to picking beans and harvesting potatoes.

Mrs. White was graduated in 1956 and reported immediately to school here. She has been here continuously since except for 14 months spent with her husband in Germany. She was married after college graduation.

Mrs. Hill is in her 4th year of teaching here.

Mrs. Hudson, a physical education instructor, stressed that although it might be difficult to break away from the farm labor, it is not impossible.

"If there's something you really want to do, regardless of where you are, you can find a way to do it," she said. "If they are determined enough, there is a possibility. They can find a way."

In her own case, Mrs. Hudson said, the chief difficulty in getting through college lay in the fact that the family income was not steady.

"During some months, there was no trouble," she said, "but in others, it was tough. The main thing is to have the desire."

Two other children in Mrs. Hudson's family began college but failed to graduate.

Mrs. Hudson is a daughter of Ed King, a crewleader seen on the Murrow show. She had her primary and secondary schooling in Belle Glade and attended Tuskegee University from 1953 to 1958.

During at least two summers while she was in college, Mrs. Hudson worked in the harvest fields, she said, and found other work during other summers.

Her education was interrupted for a year when she married just before entering the senior class. Her husband now is employed by a Fort Lauderdale bakery. They have one child.

Mrs. Hudson believes Palm Beach County education is being provided by "a good, competent staff."

But the education of children of migrant workers suffers because some of them are not here for more than 2 or 3 months of the school year, she said.

The three teachers are in accord that the interest of the parents is of paramount importance in kindling within children the desire for self-improvement.

They pointed out it was only through the sacrifice of their parents that they themselves had been able to go on to college.

Did Sanctions Against Trujillo Help the U.S.?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of April 1, 1961; a cogent comment on Dominican-United States relations:

DID THE SANCTIONS AGAINST TRUJILLO HELP THE U.S.A.?

(By Donald M. Dozer)

It is time to appraise the effects of the action taken against the Dominican Republic by the Foreign Ministers of the American nations at San José, Costa Rica, last August.

Last summer, at a time when the Castro revolution in Cuba was boiling furiously, the Inter-American Peace Committee, headed by U.S. Ambassador John C. Dreier, attributed the increase of tensions in the Caribbean to the "flagrant and widespread violations of human rights which have been committed and continue to be committed in the Dominican Republic."

Later a special Inter-American committee of five members, including Mr. Henry C. Reed for the United States, reported to the Foreign Ministers' meeting that Generalissimo Rafael Trujillo Molina, who has ruled the Dominican Republic for the past 30 years with dictatorial force and considerable brutality, had been implicated in an attempted assassination of President Betancourt of Venezuela. Thereupon, the foreign ministers, including the then Secretary of State Herter, emphatically condemned the Dominican Republic, called for a rupture of diplomatic relations with it, banned all trade with it in arms and implements of war of every kind and agreed to study the desirability of extending this boycott to other articles of trade.

The Inter-American system, for the first time since its establishment in 1889, outlawed a member. Several American governments, including the United States, broke relations with the Dominican Republic. In doing so at the behest of the Organization of American States, the State Department abandoned our previous diplomatic practice of not employing this drastic sanction except where the interest of the United States itself is definitely involved. The Eisenhower administration sought to deny the dicator's government a portion of the Cuban sugar quota that was due it under an act of Congress, but could not receive the necessary congressional authorization. Though it was forced by law to assign the sugar quota to the Dominican Republic, it nevertheless penalized that country by offering to pay 35 percent less a pound than we are paying other foreign suppliers of sugar.

What has all this done to America's position in the Caribbean? For one thing, Trujillo, whose cooperation with the United States in anti-Communist measures has been exemplary for a quarter of a century, has removed the ban on the Communist Party and now allows it to operate as the only legal opposition party in his country. He has temporarily withdrawn into the background of Dominican politics and is permitting the restoration of civil rights, many of which were denied by his regime. His newspapers and the powerful Radio Caribe are subscribing for the first time to Tass, the official Soviet press agency. A rapprochement between the Dominican Republic and Cuba is in the making. Politics has often made stranger bedfellows than Trujillo and Castro.

The choice at San José seemed to lie between the principle of nonintervention and the goal of representative democracy. The foreign ministers decided in favor of the latter, but in trying to impose an unfamiliar system upon the Dominican Republic they weakened the solidarity of the Americas and impaired our national defenses in the Caribbean, which have deteriorated to an alarming extent.

They did so at a time when Castro is making a squeeze play on our naval base at Guantánamo, when the United States has been forced by nationalists in the West Indies Federation to surrender five of the bases that we acquired in the destroyer-bases deal of 1940. Any compensating advantages to this country from going along with the OAS in this matter is difficult to detect.

Samuel Gompers on Compulsory Social Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the demand by those who profess to speak for labor in urging an ever greater expansion of the welfare state I would like to call attention to the following words of one of the most able leaders of labor of all time, Mr. Samuel Gompers. Perhaps it would be well for those who believe in the freedom of the individual to ponder his words on compulsory social insurance legislation:

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

Compulsory social insurance is in its essence undemocratic and it cannot remove or prevent poverty. The workers of America adhere to voluntary institutions in preference to compulsory systems, which are held to be not only impracticable, but a menace to their rights, welfare, and their liberty. Compulsory sickness insurance for workers is based upon the theory that they are unable to look after their own interests and the State must interpose its authority and wisdom and assume the relation of parent or guardian.—Samuel Gompers, January 22, 1917.

A Reappraisal of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, the following is a speech given by the Honorable Alf M. Landon at the 13th annual Institution of International Relations, Washburn University, Topeka, Kans., April 9, 1961. In view of the international situation, I think all Members of Congress will find Mr. Landon's comments of great interest. The speech follows:

A REAPPRAISAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

I speak tonight to focus attention to the facts in this momentous monument of world history. My final conclusions will be neither pessimistic—or optimistic—since it is uncertain yet whether reason will prevail.

There have been incredibly dangerous developments in world affairs in the past few weeks. There has been a failure to make clear the true import of events and their long term consequences. If anything, I am particularly dismayed by the opposite tendency—namely the sugarcoating of deliberate optimism. In some cases, there has been downright concealment of important and deadly significant facts.

One of my major purposes tonight is to try—as fairly and objectively as possible—to reveal what the truth is and how all the elements of crisis revolve about and ultimately center on what I believe to be the most dangerous single conclusion—the potential death of the United Nations.

Let me first clarify certain technical administrative problems which are central to an understanding of the political processes of the United Nations. The U.N. is not—and I must emphasize this point—is not—an independent entity. It has no being and no reality outside of its membership and is entirely the dependency of its membership. In the same sense that a mirror reflects the face—so the U.N. is as strong or as weak, as good or as evil, as much a success or failure as the world it reflects.

But does the U.N. in reality reflect the world? Only the naive would believe that. Member nations are not equally powerful; member nations are not totally independent of political control and manipulation. What the world really is today—and the U.N. beautifully mirrors this—is that Communist power bloc which will act predictably on crucial issues according to the dictates of the Soviet. Of course, on minor matters, there are factions and differences. But don't let that confuse us. On all matters of substance, bloc discipline is enforced.

The secretariat of the United Nations—and in particular, its chief executive officer, the Secretary-General, is the servant of the membership. No matter his personal convictions, he is bound by the language and the substance of the instructions of the membership. He is further bound, as we are tragically learning, by the willingness of the membership to obey their own directives—on all levels—including the financial one.

At this very moment, two international problems are most revealing—Laos and the Congo.

The history of Laos is a most distressing one. From the very inception, this problem was dealth with outside the United Nations and represented the bitter conclusion of the French collapse in what was then French Indochina.

At the meeting in Geneva of the great powers conference, it was agreed that Laos would be constituted as a neutral state and that all participants to the great powers convention would obey the conventional terms of neutrality. As I have already stated elsewhere—the United States as well as the Soviet Union disobeyed the convention. And no matter how we attempt to justify this in terms of Chinese, Russian, and Vietnamese intervention, we did not take this case to the United Nations, but supplied arms and military personnel to a faction in Laos in contravention of the Geneva agreement.

In the face of the deepening crisis—we did not steadfastly rely on the United Nations—but on SEATO—a rather ineffectual structure, built by late Secretary of State Dulles. A structure which has admittedly been of little value because of Britain's and France's indifference—amounting to negative policies. Even in the face of the devastating lesson of the Baghdad Pact, we still followed a course of reliance on a jerry-built power alliance. Furthermore, for 6 years, both SEATO's military and political values were hamstrung by the Eisenhower administration's lack of any positive, definite, and consistent policy in Laos.

In the final analysis—great harm can come from dealing with Laos as an independent problem. Because of its strategic position, it is a part of the whole world's fateful issues.

Despite sugar-coated official pronouncements—Britain, France, and the United States did not present a solid front in SEATO—nor with the United Nations policies in the Congo.

I now turn to the Congo—another key country—unable to defend itself against imperial Soviet control.

Prior to the eruption of the Congo crisis, Dag Hammarskjold had been carefully, skillfully and bravely attempting to strengthen the position of the United Nations so that it would best serve the smaller nations in the face of the East-West power struggle and make possible efficient, immediate action in the face of crisis. Hammarskjold had made great progress in his efforts—so that at the beginning of the Congo crisis—it was possible to field a United Nations army with speed and precision. But here the simmering, underground dangers suddenly burst to the fore. The United Nations blundered in administering policy in the Congo—blunders partially due to the improvision necessary in the planning and administering of new and uncharted procedures.

The Soviet Union, which felt the time ripe for a major imperialistic move, felt itself frustrated and the stakes were big enough to make major battle. The stakes were and are the continent of Africa. The Soviet Union waged its war on many grounds, but the most important ground was the United Nations itself.

It would first destroy the Secretariat and, by so doing, create anarchy within the United Nations itself. When the initial attack failed and Dag Hammarskjold refused to resign, the Soviet Union extended its attack by creating a precedent by refusing financial support.

Without money from the Soviet Union and its satellites, United Nations effort would be seriously hampered. The arbitrary withdrawal of troops by member states created near panic in attempting to field a force large enough to cope with the most difficult situation. And finally, the various political factions in the Congo itself, seeing dissension and disunity in the United Nations proper, were encouraged to defy the United Nations, thereby creating increased economic and political instability which always favors Communist expansion.

In the face of the impudent and cynical junking operation other member states were handed a precedent for like action. Not until April 3 did Belgium agree to withdraw its military personnel from the Congo in compliance with U.N. resolutions.

The French have refused payment of their financial commitments to the Congo operation and—with the inadequate exceptions of Australia, Ireland and the Netherlands, who have made only partial payment—the United States alone has paid the 1960 Congo assessment in full.

There has been much talk—at times of past crises—of the capacity of the United Nations to survive. It is my considered opinion that it is this crisis now which represents the great turning point—for it is this crisis which has produced general disobedience and not disobedience merely on the part of the imperialist Soviet bloc.

The League of Nations died in the face of the Italian invasion of Ethiopia—not simply because of unilateral disobedience on the part of Germany and Italy—but of general failure throughout the membership to provide support. No single nation of power and substance elected to go to the defense of the League in clear and certain terms.

At this moment the question of survival by the United Nations relies largely on American leadership. We are compelled to act both within and outside the United Nations to save its very existence. And our actions within and without must be consistent. In terms of our allies and all those areas of the world where the United States is central for aid and survival the United States must demand compliance with the Charter of the United Nations. But it can do that only when it, too, complies with the charter.

And when it acts unilaterally—as in Laos—its political position and its moral position in support of the United Nations evaporates. If we don't value the maintenance of the United Nations as the only essential organism which breeds hope for peace we must then clearly face the alternative and the certain inevitability of war. No other organism—no other structure—no other mechanism exists which can act as well to inhibit "the seeds of destruction" leading to eventual general conflict.

Having presented a general background to this momentous crisis, let me deal with those elements which bring us closer to the heart of the problem. The best way is to cite opposing viewpoints and reveal the counter arguments. We all agree on certain basic matters, namely:

1. The policy of the Soviet Union is clearly and by its own admission imperialistic. It will use all means at its disposal to secure world dominion.

2. Even if there be no other choice—in the last analysis, the prospect of war is too dreadful to accept with a casual shrug of the shoulders.

3. If there is any way—any way at all—to preserve freedom—the only condition appropriate to man and that makes life postively good—every effort must be made to find that way—without war.

4. The only way that offers hope is the existence of a third force—a force capable of channeling—focusing—concentrating the power—the idealism—the will of peoples everywhere. That third force presently exists in the form of the United Nations.

Here are some recent countering positions:

The first of March, Paul Henri Spaak—a Belgian statesman of impressive stature—said that "the idea of a general war such as those of 1914–18 and 1938–45 could now be ruled out. Competition with the Communist East now is in the economic sphere. The test is taking place in Asia—Africa and South America rather than in Europe."

Dr. Spaak went on to say that NATO and the new Organization for Economic Collective Development are the best reliance of the free world and the United Nations is ended.

That is merely one variant on a position held by many—that the United Nations has failed. And there should be a return to out-and-out power bloc alliances.

In the first place, I cannot agree with Dr. Spaak's optimistic conclusion that a general war can now be ruled out—and his optimistic reliance on an empty shell like NATO and an untried organization like the OECD. While the United Nations is facing tis greatest test—neither do I agree with him that it has been ineffective and is finished.

But far more important, at the heart of what Dr. Spaak proposes is a return to tested methods, mehtods predicated on the certainty of general war, and not, as he says the end of the possibility of general war. Power alliances are formed for purposes of mutual defense against aggression. They do not contain within themselves the ingredients for buffering antagonists. Two armed camps facing each other with no middle ground define the logical conclusions of their existence—ultimate conflict. And if the grounds for that conflict already exist, then the greater the need for a common meeting ground. Despite his vast experience, Dr. Spaak starts with a false premise, a premise utterly out of accord with a rational world. His conclusions are consequently false.

Another argument gaining recent support calls for a withdrawal to our own shores, the Fortress America theory. This would mean turning the world over to imperial communism, and act of betrayal and almost inhuman surrender of our fellow men. It would also hasten, rather than retard, war, for with massive control by the Soviet Union of the resources of the world, attack would surely follow, an attack against a weakened and demoralized America fearfully awaiting the awful day.

Against the background of the need for immediate decision, I propose the following as the necessary steps for reasonable men:

I emphatically believe President Kennedy and our Congress must make up their minds soon whether we are going to emphasize the key place of the United Nations in world affairs, as our President did in his inaugural address.

I have made it plain in every address I have made on international relations, that we must keep our armed forces and our military strength second to none. That involves our own defense, even though, like an umbrella in a storm, it covers others.

While keeping second to none in our armed strength, I believe we must concentrate on more support of the United Nations.

We really only started that policy last September. It must be continued to a greater degree than heretofore, because, as I have said, the United Nations, as a result of that policy, was steadily growing in responsibility and strength until the member nations failed to keep even their financial commitments.

There has been much talk that the United Nations—to be effective—would have to be

equipped with a permanent international army to force peace on the world.

I do not believe that is wise.

It is hard for all peoples to break away from age-old customs and believe that international affairs and basic major conflicts can be ultimately settled only by armed force.

However, slowly and falteringly, homosapiens is feeling his way to new rules, new methods, for avoiding that folly. I believe there are sound grounds for optimistic conclusions that, given persistent and consistent strong support by the major powers of truly peoples' government, the United Nations can and will grow in strength and responsibility.

That is not to say that we're not testing fate by our policies in world affairs.

The incredible danger we face is whether Khrushchev and the Soviet, Mao and his Chinese echelons, are going to make the same mistake of Kaiser Wilhelm and his war lords, of Hitler and his Nazis, of Mussolini and his Black Shirts, in underestimating the latent power of the undisciplined peoples of popular governments like Britain, France, and America.

The Prussians—Nazis and Fascists relied—and the Russian Soviet Imperialists are relying—on the same erroneous basic principle. The Soviet believes that disciplined peoples can conquer the undisciplined peoples of true democracies, where—as in America—local labor unions attempt to establish their own foreign policy contrary to their government's international trade agreements.

Khrushchev cries the free press does not understand him. So did Kaiser Wilhelm II and Hitler.

Khrushchev and Mao keep pushing here and pushing there—testing the will and the determination of truly peoples' governments to stand their ground for their principles and their freedom. So did Kaiser and Hitler and Mussolini.

All three made the great mistake of believing Great Britain and France were decadent and America "too proud to fight." Well, they got their answer in two world wars. However, Mao and the Soviet apparently are still not convinced that governments that permit organized pacifist demonstrations, unrestrained criticism and ridicule in all phases of national life, and are devoted to the rights of the individual, can and will do a better job in war when the incentive is there, than their disciplined masses. They confuse willing-to-live-and-let-live policy, up to a point, with faint heart. Therein lies the danger of destruction of the world by a great nuclear war.

Khrushchev, a superb actor or a superb statesman and possibly both, has truly said no nation can win a third general nuclear war. Therefore, the Imperial Soviets' policy is a methodical process, both economically and militarily, in brush wars involving internal conflict. Questions of internal conflict anywhere can quickly become a matter of unilateral action between two major powers and thus resolve themselves into a general war.

When the United Nations charter was adopted—many people vowed that was the answer to war and peace. That reminds me of a conversation I had with an old hard-boiled Republican leader in the 65th Congress that enacted national prohibition.

He told me of a visit he had with several other leaders in the Congress who liked their nip. They talked about brilliant colleagues whose opportunity for great public service had been ruined by overindulgence in intoxicating liquors. They were willing to make the sacrifice of their own tastes in order to eliminate that evil.

When I was talking to him, he was disillusioned by the results. He said, "It never occurred to us that the law would not be obeyed."

And it never occurred to people who built too high hopes on the United Nations Charter as the complete answer to settling difficulties by collective process instead of unilateral actions—that the U.N. would not be obeyed forthwith.

The United Nations is going through the same period of trial and error—of growth—that our Republic has gone through—that the British Commonwealth has gone through—that France has gone through—and Germany—and free country after free country.

Take Kansas for an illustration. Its trials and tribulations in the days of horrible brutality of bitter border warfare were born of the failure of the Missouri compromise and the Kansas-Nebraska Act—and of leadership in both the North and the South—the follies of statesmen and of generals—which resulted in approximately 600,000 casualties on both sides in the Civil War.

And yet—100 years later—we have not yet reached the solution of the basic principles of that war—or, for that matter, in the Bill of Rights adopted almost 200 years ago. That is, civil rights for all in this great country of ours.

Two groups represent the Despair theme of Washburn's Institute of International Relations:

1. The despair of negative thinking is expressed by the tinkling cymbals of pacifists who would supinely surrender to the tyranny of communism—or reach the same end by appeasement. This very principle of nonresistance is an invitation to the Soviet and Mao.

2. The sounding brass thinking by those who believe another world war is inevitable.

I do not agree with such extreme positions. I believe that—in the basic interest of the world's mankind—our eagle must neither fold its wings nor yield to the natural impulse in combating danger. We must not abandon our presence of mind and become—as it were—a cosmic vigilante committee.

The United Nations is neither the failure some claim—nor the shining forceful success that others expected. It is now facing its greatest test. Its survival is at stake, precipitated by the failure of all the member countries to pay their share of the Congo expenses—thus playing into the hands of Khrushchev and Mao.

If the U.N. is forced to depend on the United States to pay more than its share—in order to continue the United Nations policies in the Congo—the collective position of the United Nations in world affairs is drastically altered by being heavily dependent upon one nation for the financing of its Congo policies. To that extent its collective function is weakened.

Although the possibility of the most dreadful and destructive war in the history of mankind cannot be completely ruled out—the prospects of avoiding that holocaust will improve as the free people's governments learn to compose their divergent views and pool their strength by and through the United Nations.

The hope—the creative theme—is expressed by such meetings as this that grasp the fact that the days of self-dependence by a nation are gone forever.

This is a new day and we must adjust ourselves to fit the new rules of the world in which we live. That calls for omniactive leadership by men of determination—of insight—whose eyes are open to the necessity and opportunity of fighting for extended cooperation by and through strengthening the United Nations as the most effective agency for peace.

If it is impossible to present a firm and united position by the United Nations—for equity and justice in the world—I fear a great calamity may be in the making, with the United Nations fading away as did the League of Nations.

Minority Has Questioned the Unsoundness of the Social Security System Since Inception

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, since the very beginning of the program for old-age and survivors insurance, warnings have been sounded that such a program is of dubious constitutionality and that the basis upon which the program was financed is unsound.

In order that the older Members may refresh their memories and the newer Members may have the historical background of the minority views, I would like to include as part of my remarks minority views on the social security system beginning with House Report No. 615 of the 74th Congress:

THE COMPULSORY SOCIAL INSURANCE SYSTEM

The provisions we oppose will increase the cost of this system at its maturity by approximately $3,500 million a year and this amount when added to the huge and pyramiding cost of the other features of the program may well mean the difference between the success or breakdown of the system.

In our opinion, the purpose of compulsory social insurance is to provide a basic floor of economic protection for the individual and his family and in so doing to encourage and stimulate voluntary savings through personal initiative and ambition. It should not invade the field historically belonging to the individual.

We believe that such a form of compulsory social insurance which unnecessarily takes from the individual funds which he would invest or otherwise use for building his own security is incompatible with our free-enterprise system. Accordingly, we do not conceive it to be a proper function or responsibility of the Federal Government either to compensate individuals for all types of losses in earning capacity or to provide a scale of benefits which pay substantially higher amounts to those with higher income.

We believe further that if this vast program is to fulfill its social objectives, the most important factor is to restrict the burden of its pyramiding cost within an amount which the economy can bear. This is so because in the final analysis the basis of all security is a productive economy and the burden in any one year of the mounting cost of this program will have, in the main, to be paid for out of the production of the goods and services which the system seeks to distribute. In 20 years the payroll tax provided for in this bill will be 6.5 percent or a dollar cost based on present wage levels of over $8 billion a year in this one program alone. If this burden becomes too great, the system may well be repudiated by future generations, and if benefit payments are carried to extremes, the inevitable result of the companion tax burden will be a stifling of the incentive and ambition to produce.

Daniel A. Reed, Roy O. Woodruff, Thomas A. Jenkins, Richard M. Simpson, Robert W. Kean, Carl T. Curtis, Noah M. Mason, Thomas E. Martin, Hal Holmes, John W. Byrnes.

Minority views as expressed in House Rport No. 1300, 1st session, 81st Congress, in the report on the Social Security Act Amendments of 1949:

COMPULSORY OLD-AGE ANNUITIES

The bill is separated into several titles. Title II provides for compulsory old-age annuities, and title VIII provides the method by which the money is to be raised to meet the expense thereof.

The two titles are interdependent, and neither is of any consequence without the other. Neither of them has relation to any other substantive title of the bill. Neither is constitutional. Therein lies one of the reasons for our opposition to them.

The Federal Government has no power to impose this system upon private industry.

The best legal talent that the Attorney General's office and the brain trust could marshal has for weeks applied itself to the task of trying to bring these titles within constitutional limitations. Their best effort is only a plain circumvention. They have separated the proposition into two titles. This separation is a separation in words only. There is no separation in spirit or intent. These two titles must stand or fall together.

The learned brief submitted by the Attorney General's office contains in its summation the following, weak, apologetic language:

"There may also be taken into consideration the strong presumption which exists in favor of the constitutionality of an act of the Congress, in the light of which and of the foregoing discussion, it is reasonably safe to assume that the social security bill, if enacted into law, will probably be upheld as constitutional."

We also oppose these two titles because they would not in any way contribute to the relief of present economic conditions, and might in fact retard economic recovery.

The original bill contained a title providing for voluntary annuities. This was another attempt to place the Government in competition with private business. Under fire, this title has been omitted. It was closely akin to title II. In fact, it had one virtue that title II does not possess in that it was voluntary while title II is compulsory. These titles impose a crushing burden upon industry and upon labor. They establish a bureaucracy in the field of insurance in competition with private business.

The minority membership of the Ways and Means Committee have at no time offered any political or partisan opposition to the progress of this measure, but on the contrary have labored faithfully in an effort to produce a measure that would be constitutional and that would inure to the general welfare of all the people.

ALLEN T. TREADWAY.
ISAAC BACHARACH.
FRANK CROWTHER.
HAROLD KNUTSON.
DANIEL A. REED.
ROY O. WOODRUFF.
THOMAS A. JENKINS.

Excerpts from the minority views of CARL T. CURTIS, then a Member of the House, to the report on the Social Security Act Amendments of 1949:

MINORITY VIEWS

My dissent from the bill reported out does not stem from opposition to a liberalized social security program; instead it arises from the fact that the bill reported out fails in some major respect to do the very things a liberal and effective social security program should do.

The old-age and survivors insurance program is a grossly unsound and ineffective tool for the social security purposes it attempts to accomplish. Because it is so unsound and ineffective, I cannot agree that the mere extension of its coverage or a mere numerical revision of its benefit formula, such as the majority of the committee proposes, can bring about significant improvement. Instead, the very fundamentals of the program should be objectively reexamined, and to the extent that such reexamination indicates the need for drastic overhauling of the program, that overhauling should be done, even though it proves necessary to abandon completely those concepts on which the present program rests.

Social security funds are necessarily limited in amount, since they depend upon the amount of economic productivity in the Nation and the possibility of drawing off a portion of this productivity for social security purposes that is not too large to injure the Nation's economic health. Because of this limitation, it is of the utmost importance that these funds be distributed wisely.

On frequent occasions Congress has voted a very costly program, such as in the field of veterans' legislation or housing. There is an end to such programs. They do expire. There is no end to our social security program. It runs into perpetuity. We bind oncoming generations to pay untold billions of dollars not only 50 years from now, or 100 years from now, but so long as the Government of the United States stands. It is totally unmoral.

Let us permit our children and our grandchildren to decide how much per year they of their generation will pay for social security. We should not bind them by contract to pay untold billions each year, as the present system does. The right of self-government means not only freedom from kings, tyrants, and dictators, but it means freedom from the past.

Minority views to the report on the Social Security Amendments of 1954:

DISSENTING VIEWS ON H.R. 9366

The committee has the grave responsibility of framing social security legislation which will improve and maintain the system on a sound basis, compatible with its purpose and with our system of free enterprise.

Some of the hastily adopted amendments contained in H.R. 9366 are highly questionable and probably would not have been adopted upon mature consideration. The most important of these amendments, expanding the social security tax base from $3,600 to $4,200, are fundamentally wrong and have far-reaching implications. The inflated wage base proposals were adopted with a strong dissenting vote and mark a departure from the basic purpose and justification of social security—that of affording a basic floor of protection—and would directly impair both the ability and incentives of the individual to achieve security through the normal processes of free enterprise.

Private arrangements for security, in contrast with the sterile taxing and spending processes of social security, are an integral part of free enterprise and provide the funds for capital investment upon which our economic system is based. Private thrift and insurance purchases also provide a flexibility of protection adaptable to the particular needs of the particular family. This flexibility is impossible under social security. Furthermore, security privately achieved by voluntary action, as contrasted with unnecessary inflated compulsory social security, is compatible with our traditions and our way of life.

Thus, even though social security were in fact bought and paid for by the individual and his equities, typical of free enterprise, were preserved, it would violate our basic principles to extend its taxes and benefits beyond the levels required to meet its purpose of providing a minimum floor of protection against destitution.

The bill's provisions extending the system's taxes and benefits to earnings in excess of the present $3,600-per-year limit, manifestly raise the fundamental issue of whether we shall progressively depart from the original purpose of the system. The proposal assumes that the $4,200 man requires more compulsory, publicly provided protection that does the $3,600 man. The next step, already proposed and urged, is that of providing still greater Government protection for the $6,000 man than is provided for the $4,200 man. There is no stopping point when one accepts the philosophy of more and more compulsory reliance upon the State, with the corollary of less and less reliance by the individual upon his private voluntary arrangements.

These amendments are indefensible in our opinion. The proposed superbenefits for the high-income man are incompatible with the purpose of the system. Burdening other social security taxpayers with their payment shocks one's sense of equity.

The powerful drive for expanding the wage base and providing higher and higher benefits, and the lack of public understanding of the consequences of this action, place the committee and the Congress in a most difficult position—particularly in an election year.

But the inescapable fact is that younger people, including those not yet of voting age, and millions yet unborn, must largely support benefits for persons who retire in the next two or three decades. This situation places a special trusteeship on this committee and on the Congress. For not only the purpose of social security, but the welfare of our young people and their children, strictly limits the social security benefits which can be provided for the aged through taxation of the young. We must halt the constant increases in present and future benefits, and in the taxes required to support those benefits.

It is far from certain that the present tax schedule will support the presently scheduled benefits, and still less certain that the proposed increased taxes would support the increased benefits.

It is manifest, in any event, that the proposed wage base extension would provide an unwarranted increase in benefits of persons with high earnings, who least need social security protection. It is also manifest that the unwarranted increase in benefits—and for younger people the lifetime burden of the additional social security taxes—would adversely affect individuals and our economy and would be contrary to the general welfare.

FURTHER DISSENTING VIEWS OF MR. UTT

In addition to the foregoing minority report, I wish to state it is my fearful belief that the social security tax is fast shaping up to become a secondary graduated income tax upon wages and salaries, a tax which, when its full impact is felt, will shake our social security system to its very foundation.

Supplemental views to the report on the Social Security Amendments of 1955:

BASIC PROBLEMS

Cost: In order to finance the multibillion-dollar increase in benefits contained in this bill, a higher tax schedule is provided. An almost immediate increase to 2½ percent each on employees and employer, respectively, is provided effective January 1, 1956. Each of the subsequent periodic increases provided under existing law is also increased by one-half of 1 percent. As a result the ultimate tax rate projected under the bill, effective in 1975, is 9 percent shared equally by employees and their employers. The self-employment tax, applicable to professional individuals, will become 6¾ percent at that time.

As high as these future rates are, the rates themselves do not convey a complete picture of the true burden they involve. The tax on

wages is a tax on gross wages without any allowance for personal exemptions, dependents, or other deductions. The tax on self-employment income only permits certain business deductions, such as depreciation. It is, in effect, a tax on adjusted gross income. Therefore, unlike the income tax, the social security tax is not limited to net income. As a result, that tax, as a percentage of net income, is substantially higher than the actual rates would indicate. In fact, the eventual 6¾-percent rate on the self-employed would be the equivalent of a net income tax in the neighborhood of 20 percent and higher in many cases.

Let us take the example of a farmer with a net income from self-employment of $4,200 in 1975. Assuming that he has a wife and two children and uses the standard deduction, his Federal income tax under present rates, will be $276. His social security tax, on the other hand, will be $283.50. In this example, which is a completely average case, the social security tax, as a percentage of net taxable income, would be in excess of 20 percent. If the same individual had three children his income tax would be cut to $156 but his social security tax would still amount to $283.50. In such a case, the latter tax would be the equivalent of a net income tax of 36 percent. We again point out that this would be an ordinary case and not at all an unusual one.

It is estimated that in 1975 the total social security tax collections will approximate $20 billion annually, a colossal sum. Moreover, this estimate assumes continuation of existing wage levels and makes no allowance for the increase in those levels which past experience indicates will occur. The $20 billion estimate, is therefore, extremely conservative.

We are concerned over this fact, moreover, because by their very nature, the liberalizations contained in this bill will create demands for additional changes involving further costs.

We are further concerned over these ultimate costs because of the danger that they may eventually weaken or even destroy public acceptance of the social security system. A social insurance program cannot be expected to provide against all insurable risks. It must be designed to provide a basic protection at a cost within the reach of all, especially those in the lower income brackets who are most in need of that protection. Despite this fact, we are creating a scale of benefits which must be supported by a social security tax which, in the not too distant future, will be equal to and in many cases higher than the Federal income tax.

Finally, insofar as the cost of this program is concerned, we should take sober warning that, in our zeal to provide ever greater benefits and to provide against an ever wider area of need, we do not destroy the very system which we have created. We have succeeded in avoiding the full impact of the cost by shifting most of the burden to the future. At that time, the high tax rates may make it very difficult to retain the contributory principle which we believe so essential to the program. However, we would be deluding ourselves should we believe that the general revenue could be depended upon to support the system. We have already pointed out that, under the present schedule, social security tax collections in 1975 will amount to about $20 billion. If such a vast sum were financed through the individual income tax for example, it would necessitate approximately a 50-percent across-the-board increase in that already burdensome tax. These figures show clearly the magnitude of the problem we are so casually creating.

It is our earnest hope that the questions we have raised will lead thoughtful citizens everywhere to search for the answers. The social security system was created to give our people confidence and faith in their future. It should be above politics.

THOMAS A. JENKINS.
RICHARD M. SIMPSON.
ROBERT W. KEAN.
NOAH M. MASON.
JOHN W. BYRNES.
ANTONI N. SADLAK.
THOMAS B. CURTIS.

Brief excerpts from the committee report on the Social Security Amendments of 1958:

The old-age and survivors insurance benefit structure and the contribution schedule by which the benefits are financed have not been revised by the Congress since 1954. Since that date there have been significant increases in wages and prices; also, new cost estimates have shown an increase in the actuarial deficit of the program. In the light of these developments, it is imperative that the Congress take prompt action to assure that the program be kept both effective and actuarially sound.

The latest long-range cost estimates prepared by the Chief Actuary of the Social Security Administration show that the old-age and survivors insurance part of the program (as distinct from the disability part) is further out of actuarial balance than your committee considers it prudent for the program to be. When the last major changes were made in 1956 the estimates prepared at that time showed an expected long-range actuarial deficit for old-age and survivors insurance of two-tenths of 1 percent of payroll on an intermediate cost basis. More recent estimates show that the old-age and survivors insurance part of the program is now expected to be out of balance by fifty-seven one-hundredths of 1 percent of payroll. Your committee believes that a deficit of the size indicated by present cost estimates should not be permitted to continue.

Textiles Essential to National Defense

SPEECH
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KORNEGAY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to associate myself with the remarks of the speaker now in the well of the House and with the remarks of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN], and the remarks of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. I think they are to be commended for bringing this issue to the floor of the House this afternoon, and not only for this effort but for the effort they intend to put behind a program that may at least lead to a solution of this problem.

I listened with interest a moment ago after the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] yielded to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER] and was particularly interested in his reference to the competition that we are receiving in connection with products that go with our national pastime, the game of baseball.

A few days ago I inserted an editorial from the Sporting News, which is the bible of baseball in this country and the leading publication in the United States on sports, that commented on the competition of American producers in the sports field which they were receiving from Japanese imports. I was startled to find that as of the present time 40 percent of the equipment used and sold over the counter at retail in American stores for our own national game of baseball is now produced in Japan. So I think it is about time we become alarmed and alerted to this problem. It is serious and affects every section of the country.

I want to commend you gentlemen this afternoon for trying to forcefully bring this to the attention of the American public.

Mr. KORNEGAY. I thank the gentleman for his very timely and appropriate remarks.

Did Biased Reporters Cost Nixon the Election?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Human Events of April 7, 1961:

DID BIASED REPORTERS COST NIXON THE ELECTION?
(By Willard Edwards)

This is a report on some research since the election last November on a subject which has disturbed the newspaper world, although it has gained very little public notice.

To put the question simply—did a substantial portion of the American press sabotage Vice President Nixon in the Presidential campaign, thereby cheating the American public of its right to a fair and unbiased report of the Republican candidate's words and activities, and thereby helping him to lose the election?

I covered the Nixon campaign from the time of his nomination at Chicago in late July to election day, November 8. I heard every Nixon speech—hundreds of them—was present at all press conferences and traveled a total of 64,000 miles including the flights to Alaska and Hawaii.

After I returned to Washington November 9 and had a couple of days rest I reentered the civilized world and joined in the great Washington sport of explaining the election outcome.

I attended a number of gatherings of conservatives and here I first ran up against the complaint that Nixon had lost the election because he conducted a me-too campaign. He hadn't hit Kennedy hard enough. There were, of course, other reasons discussed but this one complaint has grown in volume until it has reached the peak of alleging that Nixon threw away a sure victory, just like

Dewey in 1948, through the soft and ineffectual nature of his campaign.

I was confounded by the complaints of Nixon's me-tooism. In arguments on the point, I would cite from speeches he made during the campaign.

Here are some of the things he called his opponent:

Dangerously irresponsible, reckless, utterly unfit to assume the duties of a President.

He lashed Kennedy for downgrading the United States and caught him in falsehoods. He accused him of aiding Communist propagandists. He called him a bare-faced liar, dangerous and dead wrong, a rash, impulsive, immature, inexperienced young man who wanted to use the White House for job-training. He said repeatedly—and these are his exact words—that Kennedy stood for wild spending, higher taxes, higher prices, seizure of industry, and raiding of the Treasury.

He also called Kennedy an ignoramus, a divider of America, one of Khrushchev's most helpful aids.

On the domestic side, he said that Kennedy's program would bring about ruinous inflation. He jabbed at Kennedy's wealth and charged him with attempting to buy the people's votes with their money—not his.

But when I mentioned these things, people looked at me blankly. "When did Nixon make these remarks?" they asked. They hadn't read them in the newspapers.

So I decided to do a little research and discover just what they had been reading. Since these were residents of Washington, D.C., I concentrated on the newspapers which are read in the Capital.

The task was enormous. A one-man survey could do little more than make a spot check. And yet, the results were significant. I began to understand why some supporters of Nixon grew indifferent as the campaign progressed.

First, let me make you acquainted with the atmosphere among the newspaper followers of the Republican candidate. Ninety percent of this press corps, which ranged between 50 and 100 at various periods in the campaign, were all-out supporters of Kennedy. They were not only opposed to Nixon, they were outspoken in their hatred and contempt of him.

This attitude was not concealed. It was loud and open. When Nixon was making a speech, there was a constant murmur of ridicule from many in the press rows just beneath the platform. It was an extraordinary hostility and I can recall no precedent for it in all the campaigns I have covered.

Their adulation of Kennedy was just as open. Most of them shifted back and forth between Nixon and Kennedy during the campaign. They regarded service with Kennedy as a lover regards a honeymoon and assignment to Nixon as a penalty—an enforced association with a discreditable character.

I have not drawn too strong a picture and I think the condition can best be described by telling an incident which occurred during Nixon's whistlestop tour in mid-October. On October 26, as the train was pulling out of Cincinnati, a stranger appeared in the press car where some 50 newsmen were present.

The man was introduced as Mario G. Remo, a New York department store executive, who had been serving as finance chairman of the Democratic National Committee's nationalities division.

Mr. Remo was a man of high standing in Democratic Party councils in New York City and his post was a very important one in the campaign.

He had decided to quit his job and switch over to Nixon. Leonard Hall, the Republican campaign chairman, regarded his decision as so important that he had asked Remo to join the Nixon train and explain his position to the big press group, thereby gaining the maximum publicity for what appeared to be a big political break for Nixon.

There was silence and a growing chill in the press car as Remo stated his reasons for resigning his Democratic post. He said he was alarmed about Kennedy's foreign policy and convinced that Kennedy, as President, would involve the United States in war within 2 years.

At this point one or two reporters raised a yell of "turncoat." There was a chorus of agreement and backs were turned on Remo. Although it was a good story, especially for New York newspapermen, only the two wire service reporters and a few others took notes and filed dispatches.

Mr. Remo was understandably puzzled. He had sacrificed his Democratic political career for patriotic reasons. He was quitting a winner for a loser because, by that time, it was evident to all that Kennedy was going to capture the New York metropolitan area where Remo made his home.

He now found himself treated as a cowardly deserter, a turncoat, a renegade, by the great majority of correspondents assigned to cover the Republican candidate.

I think I can assure you that if one of Nixon's top assistants had shown up on the Kennedy train to announce a switch of allegiance, he would have been greeted like the prodigal son and thousands of words in press dispatches would have been filed. Do you know where the Remo story showed up in a leading New York paper? On page 27—at the bottom—two paragraphs.

Here's another story to give you the flavor of the Nixon press corps. Toward the end of the campaign, a young reporter for a large eastern newspaper joined up. Older correspondents had covered Nixon to this point. Apparently the young man's editor had been a little dubious about his political faith and had made a checkup.

"He called up my wife the night before I left," the young man told his friends, "and he said he was a little worried that I might be brainwashed by Nixon. He asked her how I felt about the candidates."

Then, very proudly, "When she got through telling him about my feelings for Kennedy, he didn't have any more doubt about me."

This was regarded by his colleagues as a pretty funny story. None of them found it strange that an editor should regard an assignment to cover the Republican candidate somewhat like a mission into an enemy camp where his loyalty might be undermined. I feel pretty sure that this young reporter sent no stories on the Nixon campaign which might savor, in any manner, of "brainwashing" by Nixon. This state of affairs became so scandalous that just before the election, Editor and Publisher, a trade journal for the newspaper business, rather uneasily brought it out into the open. The article opened with a quotation from a story I had written which stated that most of the newspapermen covering Nixon were staging a premature victory celebration for Kennedy, the man they favored.

Then Editor and Publisher presented the findings of its own representatives. It carried interviews with a number of reporters. Here are some quotes:

"If the publishers only knew how emotionally involved some of their reporters are for Kennedy, there'd be some real pink-slipping going on."

This was a pertinent observation. A survey had shown that Nixon had the editorial support of more than 57.7 percent of the Nation's daily newspapers while Kennedy was supported by 16 percent. The remainder proclaimed themselves uncommitted.

It seems obvious that some newspapers, which endorsed Nixon, were publishing dispatches on his campaign written by reporters who regarded his possible election as a national calamity.

Here are what some other reporters said when interviewed by the trade journal:

"I've already cast my absentee ballot for Kennedy but I don't like the way the press covering Nixon reacted while watching the television debates. They kept saying things like 'give it to him, Jack.' I figure every guy deserves a fair shake."

Another: "The Democrats are relaxed and carefree and almost haphazard. When I was with Nixon I felt an oppressive suspicion of the press. They think newsmen are out to get Nixon and they may be right."

After the election was over, the New York Daily News brought the whole affair into the open with an editorial which created a stir in the newspaper world. It flatly stated that some reporters covering Nixon "sabotaged" Nixon and his cause with every dirty-pool device known to dirty-pool newspaper people—of whom, unhappily, there are still too many.

"They slanted their dispatches against the Republican candidate. They left out incidents and sidelights which might have been helpful to him. Editors shirked their duty by permitting these slanted, distorted, biased or downright false statements to be published as allegedly honest and factual news."

The editorial continued:

"The whole disgraceful performance was bad journalism, bad ethics and a breaking of faith with the readers of the newspapers we are talking about."

These were harsh words but I have yet to hear of any indignant rejoinder. When Sigma Delta Chi, professional journalistic society, staged its annual convention in New York City a few days later, it called upon Herbert Klein and Pierre Salinger, press secretaries for Nixon and Kennedy, to discuss the question of press fairness in the campaign.

This didn't disclose much. Klein suggested only that the society investigate charges that political reporters had been unfair to Nixon. He said the Vice President had received many complaints accusing newspapers, radio and television of biased coverage.

Salinger agreed that the majority of reporters covering the candidates apparently decided, as he put it, that Kennedy was the better candidate. He remarked, with gratification, that the great majority of newspapers were very fair to Kennedy—a decided understatement in my opinion.

Thus, there is no dispute that most of the correspondents were supporters of Kennedy. You will find no newspapermen, who had anything to do with the campaign, who will deny it. In fact, there has been a great deal of conversation—all private of course, in which misgivings were expressed and even a small amount of remorse in some instances. Nobody, however, seems ready to repent in public.

So now we come to the heart of the matter. Did some of these correspondents permit their partisanship to tinge their accounts of the Nixon campaign? Did their fierce conviction of Kennedy's superiority cause them to subordinate, even unconsciously, the Vice President's most telling attacks on their idol? Did their contempt and scorn for Nixon warp their news judgment so that they played up trivia and neglected major developments?

Well, even after 35 years in the business, I'm pretty naive about my fellow reporters. I'm also proud of my profession. If asked these questions during the campaign, I would have ridiculed the suggestion that these colleagues, almost all skilled veterans, did not keep in separate compartments their private views and their judgment of news values when they sat down to their typewriters.

I did not, of course, know what they were writing at that time. In the whirlwind of a campaign, you're lucky if you can keep up with what your own newspaper is printing. Now and then I picked up a newspaper which gave me an uneasy feeling. I saw leads on Nixon speeches which did not seem justified.

But it was only after I decided to do some research on selected newspapers that I realized what the New York Daily News was talking about when it charged sabotage and dirty-pool tactics.

I must emphasize again that this research was limited to a spot check of several newspapers which are widely read in Washington. A survey of this nature is no one-man job. An exhaustive investigation would require a big staff, well-financed, of the strictest impartiality, and with at least 6 months to do the job.

But my findings force me to this conclusion: There is at least a prima facie case for the charge that animosity for Nixon, concededly felt by most of the newspapermen covering him, did creep into dispatches. In an election as close as this one, the possibility certainly arises that this type of reporting may have affected the final result.

What did this research disclose? It revealed that a substantial portion of the newspaper reading public did not get what it was entitled to get—a full and fair account of the Vice President's words and actions in his campaign for the Presidency.

Time permits only a couple of samples here but I assure you they are typical. Let me describe to you how a major Nixon campaign speech in the very first week of his campaign in September was treated in one of our greatest metropolitan dailies.

On September 15, Nixon delivered a speech in St. Louis before the International Association of Machinists. The audience was hostile but he boldly accused Kennedy of submission to the dictates of organized labor and he just as boldly proclaimed his own independence of pressure from any group.

He quoted from a speech made by Kennedy in Detroit a few days earlier, describing Kennedy as having pledged himself to be for whatever labor was for, and against whatever labor was against. That kind of promising, he said, wasn't good for labor or America. A President ought not to be 100 percent for any group—labor, farm, or business—and ought not to set one group against another. For himself, he would play to no group, no class, no section.

It was a bold talk in the camp of the enemy. This was the Nixon whom a great many Americans had come to admire since his visit to Russia in 1959—the man who poked his finger into Khrushchev's paunch and told him he didn't know everything. Here was a tough-talking candidate, jabbing his opponent in one of his softest spots, and it certainly could not be described as a me-too speech.

How was the speech covered in the great newspaper to which I am referring? A first reading of its bulky columns seemed to indicate that the speech hadn't been reported at all.

True, there was a two-column story from St. Louis which referred to the speech but didn't quote from it. Instead, it carried about 1,000 words of quotes from the labor leaders who had heard it and described the scorn they felt.

This story led with the news that the machinists union, after listening to Nixon, had voted overwhelmingly to endorse Kennedy. Then followed the quotations from labor leaders. They agreed that Nixon had a smooth delivery but the very adroitness with which Mr. Nixon met their hostility had reinforced their feeling that he was still a "tricky Dick" and that both the country and labor would suffer if he won in November.

Some readers, at least, must have wanted to read the speech for themselves and thus savor its "tricky Dick" qualities.

To do this, they would have had to engage in a real hunt. They would finally have discovered, as I did, that there was a report on Nixon's St. Louis speech in that issue. It wasn't very long—about 400 words and paraphrased—and it was buried near the bottom of another story on page 20 telling of another speech made by Nixon in Roanoke, Va.

So, if you wanted to read what Nixon actually said in St. Louis, you had to read 500 words about the Roanoke speech, then you came upon this notation: Nixon spoke earlier in St. Louis.

The writer seized upon a statement Nixon had made at the very end of his labor speech—a polite assertion that, if elected, he would never close the doors of the White House to any group representative of a great segment of the American people.

"The Vice President promised that he would always have the door of the White House open to labor whether it supported him or not,"—that was the lead.

Nixon's sharp jab at Kennedy's Detroit speech emerged in translation this way: "By implication, he [Nixon] suggested that Senator Kennedy had abandoned the interests of all the people when he said in his Labor Day speech in Detroit * * *."

Nowhere in this brief account, even entombed as it was where very few readers would find it, was there a suggestion that the Republican candidate for President had made a major statement of his views on the pressures of organized labor and the vulnerability of Kennedy to such pressures. Nowhere was a hint of its toughness and forcefulness.

In fact, some of the labor delegates were themselves impressed. Sitting in the press section, I heard one delegate say to another rather grudgingly: "This guy talks straight, doesn't he?"

Instead of this, readers of this newspaper did indeed get an impression of me-tooism—Nixon would throw the White House open to labor, whether it supported him or not.

Or—you could take your choice—he was still "tricky Dick."

I found this pattern developed in a number of instances. Whenever Nixon intensified his attacks on Kennedy, he promptly became the "old Nixon" with the ugly connotations of that term built up over the years—the ruthless character assassin who had incurred the anger of Harry Truman by his unprincipled attacks upon the Democratic Party.

On another day, and in the very same newspaper, he would be depicted as exercising the "soft sell"—an equally repellent role in which he sought to ingratiate himself with voters by promoting the image of a lofty idealist. He was Uriah Heap one week and bloody Lord Jeffreys the next.

Here is another sample of the kind of reporting that dogged Nixon's footsteps during the campaign.

The Vice President had imposed upon himself a vow not to discuss the religious issue during the campaign. It was constantly pounded, of course, by the opposition. On October 24, the provocation was so great that press secretary Klein issued a statement which referred to a television broadcast by Bobby Kennedy, brother of the Democratic candidate.

Bobby had charged, among other things, that Republican headquarters in San Diego, Calif., was "openly issuing anti-Catholic literature."

Klein said he had checked this report and secured denials not only from Republican officials but from the Democratic chairman of San Diego County. If there was anti-Catholic literature in San Diego, no one had seen it. Klein suggested that the younger Kennedy had made a false charge to exploit the religious issue. Continuance of such tactics, he stated, might force Nixon himself to take cognizance of them.

This is how Klein's mild statement was handled by the correspondent for a large Midwest liberal newspaper:

"Vice President Richard M. Nixon has cleared the way for using the cruelest of all issues, religion, against Senator John F. Kennedy."

In the long story which followed, there was no mention of the denials by both Republican and Democratic leaders that anti-Catholic literature had been issued in San Diego.

But the story did say that the Vice President had revived memories of the "old Nixon" by the ominous warning that he might open up the Pandora's box of religion.

I submit that the total effect of such journalism was to confirm Nixon's opponent's in their conviction that he was a devious scoundrel and to convince many of his supporters that he was wavering back and forth in his campaign methods in an uncertain, indecisive manner. The net result was certainly not to win votes for him. In the opinion of some political authorities, it cost him thousands, perhaps hundreds of thousands of votes by producing an indifference or repugnance to him among many who would otherwise have voted for him.

These incidents are typical of a number discovered in what could only be a spot-check of some prominent newspapers. I can assure you they are not isolated instances.

Let me summarize:

First, the great majority of the newspapermen assigned to report the Nixon campaign were openly hostile to hm and openly favored Kennedy.

Second, a spot check of several newspapers disclosed evidence sufficient to raise a presumption that some of this animosity crept into dispatches, to the detriment of Nixon's candidacy.

Third, the case seems strong enough, at least, to be submitted to a jury—in this case, a research organization, of unquestioned standing and impartiality, with sufficient staff and funds to conduct an exhaustive survey.

Finally, the press itself should take the lead in providing such a survey.

Many reasons have been advanced for Nixon's loss to Kennedy by a small fraction of 1 percent. He faced a big Democratic superiority. He was opposed by big-city political machines who used the customary fraudulent methods to roll up tremendous majorities against him.

Some Republican leaders have opined that he should have hit harder. His performance during the television shows has been criticized. The factor of the religious issue in the campaign awaits definitive analysis.

If there was still another obstacle to his candidacy—slanted reporting which did not fully and fairly acquaint a portion of the voting public with his words and actions during the campaign—that condition demands exposure.

The people are entitled to it. The press itself is most vitally concerned. It faces an evil which threatens its honor and its proud estate.

The Fall of Bataan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, April 9 was the 19th anniversary of the fall of Bataan. In honor of that event the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia named two streets near

the Philippines Chancery, Bataan and Corregidor. In the official ceremony, Secretary of State Dean Rusk delivered the main address.

The names of these two streets in our Capital City recalled the deep and binding brotherhood between the people of the United States and of the Philippine Republic that was welded in the fire of war and quenched in the blood of heroes of American and Filipino descent who suffered and died together in that area.

It is also particularly appropriate that our country and our Capital should celebrate this day while the Republic of the Philippines is represented by the Honorable Carlos P. Romulo, its outstanding and distinguished Ambassador.

Not only is General Romulo remembered for his services in the Congress of the United States, but for his contribution in the long and difficult struggle against tyranny by our two peoples from 1941 to 1945. General Romulo during that time served as General MacArthur's aide-de-camp in Bataan, Corregidor, and in Australia and returned to the Philippines with the U.S. forces which landed in Leyte. General Romulo has continued to distinguish himself as a diplomat, scholar, and world statesman. In the United Nations his voice has been heard always on the side of freedom and on the side of the ancient and unbreakable friendship of the American and Filipino people.

General Romulo has never swerved from his friendship with the United States and by act and word has constantly enunciated the common ideals which we share so well with the Republic of the Philippines.

The fall of Bataan was regarded as a great victory by the Japanese Army but was in a more real sense a symbol of a victory of the human spirit. It was in reality the first step on a road traveled not only by the citizens of the Philippines but of the United States and other free nations to a world in which we hoped we would enjoy lasting peace and a sharing of our different backgrounds and origins in a common cause for liberty. The suffering and loss which followed the fall of Bataan proved to the people of the Philippines and the United States their common heritage and their need to rededicate and renew their devotion to freedom and the ideals of liberty and self-determination. In the words of that great statesman, Gen. Carlos Romulo:

> Bataan proved that the men of the west and the men of the east can face a common foe in absolute and unquestioned equality.
>
> That was the victory of Bataan. It sealed the bond of friendship between Filipinos and Americans—a bond already established through the long years that led up, before the war came, to the guarantee of national independence. As the long shadows of military defeat fell over those Filipino and American warriors in the tropical night in Bataan, the victory of the free spirit hovered overhead. It foretold the irreversible march of nationalism in Asia and Africa, the massive and exciting roster of nations that would quickly win their freedom in the years to follow—India, Pakistan, Burma, Ceylon, Indonesia, and all the others.

General Romulo had other great words to say on this day of mixed sadness and rejoicing:

> To us in the Philippines and to you here, Bataan is a symbol of the bond between us. Bataan is of the past; but the bond lives, and must never be shaken.
>
> So today, in 1961, we Filipinos and Americans recall the symbolism of Bataan—the spiritual victory that makes the military defeat look puny—and in the remembrance of that great moment in our common history we have the right to stand side by side through all the years to come, certain of the rightness of our case and the timelessness of our friendship.

It is for us now to remember and to carry with us, in all the days of the future, not only the ideals for which our two peoples suffered in the late war but also a firm remembrance of the warm friendship and good will which our steadfast friends in the Philippines share with us, which is so well exemplified by the great and distinguished representative of the Philippine Republic, the Honorable Carlos Romulo.

The Coming Din of Inequity—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, following is the second in a series of statements explaining the structural mechanism of the social security system written by Mr. Ray M. Peterson, an outstanding authority on social security:

A PERMANENT AND GROWING DEBT

(By Ray M. Peterson)

Now, let us return to the terms "individual equity" and "social adequacy." What is their significance? Individual equity, remember, equates contributions (or taxes, employee's and employer's combined) and benefits; the benefit is earned by the contribution. A socially adequate benefit, however, may be more or less than an equity benefit. The fact is that, for the vast majority of present members of the OASDI system, benefits will be much greater than an "equity" benefit. An income that meets social needs includes a large element of unearned benefit or unearned increment for most of the present members. But the pendulum swings the other way for the youngest members and for all new entrants. Social adequacy for some means individual inequity for others.

The decided swing away from substantial individual equity toward social adequacy which began with the 1939 amendments has been accelerated since 1939. This has been the result of deferring scheduled tax increases, extending coverage to new groups, and increasing benefits for both retired and nonretired groups without increasing the taxes with respect to them by an amount sufficient to cover the cost of their increased benefits.

One need not be an actuary to realize that if large classes of persons receive benefits of greater value than the taxes paid with respect to them, then somebody else must pick up the tab. The unearned benefits are in one sense a subsidy which the older generation has voted for itself, and in another sense a debt representing the present worth of the subsidy which that same generation has assigned to younger generations for service or payment. In view of section 1104 of the Social Security Act giving Congress "the right to alter, amend, or repeal any provision" of the act, this debt does not have the same legal character as the national debt represented by Government bond promises to pay, but if social security promises are to be honored, the debt is just as real as the national debt. The younger generations can either pay off the debt or they can settle for just paying the interest on it. Under the present system of self-support through payroll taxes, these are the only two choices seemingly open to them, short of congressional repeal.

But, is it that simple? Are there really two choices? The great emphasis on social adequacy has some very disturbing implications.

The first is the dawning realization that we have but one choice, and that choice is to pay the interest on the debt forever, since the debt is premanent. The only way the debt can be reduced is to have a given generation of workers build up a huge reserve fund (over and above present payments) solely for that purpose. To expect this to happen is to be politically and economically unrealistic. With no reserve fund in sight to reduce the debt, the burden being passed on to future generations is permanent. It is not something that will somehow work itself out, or go away; it is not an actuarial fantasy.

Second, not only is the debt permanent, but the burden being passed on to future generations is a growing one. Under the 1956 act, the debt arising out of the unearned increments was estimated to be $269 billion. This is the difference between (a) the present worth, $486 billion, of all future benefits and expenses for all persons then OASI members and (b) the sum of the present worth, $194 billion, of all future taxes with respect to such members and the trust fund, $23 billion. The corresponding present worth of unearned increments at the end of 1958 was $289 billion. Estimates of the writer, based on available data, show the debt growing from about $150 billion under the 1952 act to $200 billion under the 1954 act, and on to about $300 billion under the 1958 act. The 1960 act will produce some further increase.

Third—and most serious of all—because of this debt, employee and employer taxes with respect to the average new entrant will always exceed the value of the benefits such a new member will receive. The constant combined employer-employee tax rate estimated as sufficient to pay for all future benefits was 7 percent of taxable payrolls under the 1954 act. Of this, 4.6 percent was needed to support benefits for the average new entrant, and 2.4 percent was interest on a debt of about $200 billion. Under the 1958 act, such tax rate requirement was about 8.75 percent, of which 5.25 percent was needed for a new entrant and 3.5 percent for interest on a debt of about $300 billion. Under the 1954 act, the value of total new entrant taxes was 152 percent of the value of the benefits (7 divided by 4.6); under the 1958 act this became 166⅔ percent (8.75 divided by 5.25). There is no intrinsic reason why this percentage cannot exceed 200 percent. At this point, the average new employee, alone, more than pays his own way. Today, the average new self-employed person is paying 20 percent more than the value of his benefits. The taxes payable by and in respect of the new entrant must forever be greater in value than the value of the benefits that the new

member will receive. The price of social adequacy is perpetual individual inequity.

When the magnitude of this individual inequity becomes more fully understood, will a "din of inequity" arise? Will there be a demand for support from general revenues? Will there be a refusal to pay increased social security taxes? Will there be a demand for reduction of benefits? Will an employer ask a private insurance company whether he can obtain larger benefits for new employees with the same joint employer-employee contributions? If he should ask me, this is what I would have to say. "About 80 percent of joint employee-employer taxes involving your new employees is for old-age benefits for the employee, his wife or widow. The remaining 20 percent is for survivor and disability benefits before retirement. Depending upon the marital status and the sex of your new employees and the rate of earnings, this 80 percent of taxes would buy under an Equitable group annuity contract, at our present rates, 40 to 60 percent more in old-age benefits than are provided under the OASI system."

The foregoing situation would be further aggravated if more is added to this unearned-increment debt by deferral of scheduled tax increases and by benefit increases without fully compensating tax increases with respect to those receiving the benefits. This is to be expected because the 1958 advisory council on social security financing questioned whether the 1969 tax increase should go into effect, and benefits are almost certain to be increased by Congress.

TRSUT FUND VERSUS VALUE OF CURRENT BENEFITS

The shift in principle from individual equity to social adequacy and from "full reserve" emphasis to "pay as you go" financing is vividly reflected by the change in the relationship between the amount of the old age and survivors insurance (OASI) trust fund and the value of the benefits for persons currently on the benefit rolls (disability benefits and trust fund excluded). The following table shows, for example, that if taxes had ceased in 1950, the trust fund would have covered 113 percent of the benefits promised for the future for those then in receipt of payments; but if taxes should cease in 1965, it is estimated that only 20 percent of the benefits for those then on the rolls would be covered, with no provision for those not on the rolls.

Relation of trust fund to value of benefits in current payment status [1]

[In billions of dollars]

Year	Trust fund	Value of benefits	Ratio of (2) to (3)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1945	$7.12	$2.31	309
1950	13.72	12.10	113
1955	21.66	39.32	55
1960	20.15	88.28	23
1965	23.14	114.23	20

[1] Estimates based on (a) Annual Statistical Supplement, 1958, Social Security Bulletin; (b) "Present Values of OASI Benefits in Current Payment Status, 1940–1956," Actuarial Study No. 45, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Social Security Administration, Division of the Actuary; and (c) reference 6.

In the 20th annual report of the trustees of the OASDI funds, an estimate is made of the progress of the OASI trust fund "in the unlikely event of a sharp reduction in the level of economic activity during calendar years 1960–64, with a relatively high rate of unemployment during the entire period." Based on these estimates, the OASI trust fund would drop to only 10 percent of the value of benefits current in 1964.

EXPANSION BEYOND SOCIAL ADEQUACY

We have observed the growth of unearned increments and the departure from individual equity in the name of social adequacy. For a social insurance system established to provide only a minimum basic coverage as protecttion against want and destitution, this is fully justified. It is in harmony with the 1937 Supreme Court decision which declared the system constitutional as a welfare measure. The advocates of great expansion of social programs, however, have now dropped the adjective "social" and speak only of "adequacy." Here are proposals for departure from social adequacy to higher orders of "adequacy."

Prof. Wilbur Cohen, of the University of Michigan (now Assistant Secrtary of Health, Education, and Welfare), recently said we must develop a concept of "greater adequacy." Speaking of the 50–50 payroll tax financing, he said that there was no reason why it could not be 40–60, or have the Government make a substantial contribution.

Nelson H. Cruikshank, director of the AFL–CIO Department of Social Security, recently wrote:

"The proportion of present earnings that is represented by benefits on retirement must be materially increased for workers in the middle- and upper-income brackets. A worker with average wages in industry today receives only about 30 percent of his present earnings. In order to keep pace with the rising levels of living and to maintain confidence of the system on the part of those in the middle- and upper-wage ranges, he should receive 25 years from now, or sooner, at least 60 percent of his earnings on retirement."

(Based on a current average wage of $4,600, the primary amount is about 32 percent for an employee, and the total benefit for a married couple is 48 percent.)

These proposals go far beyond the concept of social adequacy. Their enactment could increase the permanent social security debt to more than one-half trillion dollars.

TRUE NATURE OF SOCIAL SECURITY RIGHTS

The true nature of social security rights has been well stated by the Solicitor General of the United States and by the Supreme Court of the United States.

Solicitor General: "Social security must be viewed as a welfare instrument to which legal concepts of 'insurance,' 'property,' 'vested rights,' 'annuities,' etc., can be applied only at the risk of a serious distortion of language. We are dealing with a social instrument by which public action, involving compulsion, is invoked to deal with the social problem—the lack of basic economic security of large segments of our society. An understanding of the difficult and changing problems of public policy arising out of attempts to eliminate individual or family insecurity on a national scale will be obscured by Procrustean efforts to force the social security program into the mold of inappropriate analogies."

Supreme Court: "The social security system may be accurately described as a form of social insurance, enacted pursuant to Congress power to 'spend money in aid of the "general welfare." * * * It is apparent that the noncontractual interest of an employee covered by the act cannot be soundly analogized to that of the holder of an annuity whose right to benefits are bottomed on his contractual premium payments.' "

Proposed Federal Courtroom, Oakland Main Post Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, as we consider S. 912, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members some data prepared for me by a highly reputable contractor and engineer that clearly refutes statements made by the Judicial Council in August 1958 about the cost of adapting facilities in the U.S. post office at Oakland, for use by an Oakland division of the northern California Federal District Court.

I would like to insert the findings of Mr. John F. Tulloch of Oakland, Calif., in this regard:

JOHN F. TULLOCH,
Oakland, Calif., February 24, 1961.
OAKLAND CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Oakland, Calif.
(Attention Mr. James Cowart).

GENTLEMEN: Our estimate for the proposed alterations to the center section of the present Oakland Main Post Office Building for a Federal court of original jurisdiction as discussed with Mr. James Cowart, Mr. Gilbert Calden, and Colonel Herrick, postmaster, is in the amount of approximately $40,420 as discussed with these gentlemen, as shown on our attached sketch No. 1, and as noted below.

We include in the above price the following work:

(1) Preparation of architectural design drawings and details including submittal for bids and negotiations of contract.

(2) Necessary demolition and removal work in removing present partitions in civil service examination area, cutting of new doors and stripping of present lighting system, installation of new partitioning for jury room complete with necessary millwork, finish hardware and trim as well as installing new entry doors to courtroom and to jurist's office.

(3) Modernization of entire area including jury room, jurist's office, and courtroom, approximately 3,750 square feet, with new acoustical tile ceiling glued on existing plaster ceiling, new vinyl tile floors and base, necessary patching of existing walls and complete paint job in jury room and courtroom and with hardwood paneling in jurist's office.

(4) Entire space to be air conditioned with air-conditioning equipment mounted on roof and supply and return ducts run into new diffusers in ceiling.

(5) Present lighting fixtures to be removed and new modern fluorescent lighting installed of 50-foot candle level with necessary switching and convenience outlets.

(6) Exterior windows facing on court to have new venetian blinds with plastic tapes and metal slats.

(7) Job to be cleaned up at conclusion and left in first-class condition subject to a 1-year guarantee.

We do not include in the above price jurist's bench or any furniture or draperies, but otherwise include everything necessary for a complete workmanlike job in accordance with all applicable codes.

This should be the information you need for your appropriation request and we are happy to supply it with the thought that this will improve the Government facilities available to our city. If further is necessary, please advise.

Very truly yours,

JOHN F. TULLOCH, INC.,
J. B. TULLOCH.

You Must Stand for Something or You Will Fall for Anything

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, a good teacher will not only impart knowledge, but also will do all in his or her power to get the student to think for himself. Such a teacher is Mrs. Nancy Arter, who teaches the fifth grade in Lincoln School in Prescott, Ariz.

One day Mrs. Arter wrote on the blackboard of her room the sentence "You must stand for something or you will fall for anything." The next day, she asked the pupils of her class to write interpretations of this sentence. I think the results are not only outstanding, but encouraging to persons who are concerned about the preservation of our American way of life. Therefore, it is a pleasure for me to share the answer of each pupil with the Members of the Congress:

This means to me that if you don't believe in some form of government enough to protect it, you will soon become involved in some other form of government you don't want to have anything to do with—Carole Cline.

I think that means that you must stand for what you want or you'll go for what somebody wants you to do. You must think over which party you want to be for, either Democrat or Republican. If you don't know which party you're for, a friend could talk you into being a Republican—Shelly Lyttle.

To me these words mean that if you don't believe in something you won't know which way is right. Then if someone tells you he is right you would believe him for you have never known which way is right—Susan Henson.

At this point it seems to me that there are only two great beliefs in life, communism and democracy. I live within the democratic law. I feel that someday there will be a great war between democracy and communism. When that day comes, if I still live on the face of the earth, I will stand up for democracy—Jill Goodell.

It means to me that you learn something that you know is right, so if someone who you know is wrong cannot lead you in the wrong way—Paul Martin.

You must stand for honesty, keep your pride. Say a man came to you and said, "Let's rob a bank." You must stand for something or you'll fall for anything. You must have the ability not to go and do what the crowd wants you to do. You must have the ability to say, "No."—Ronnie Seets.

You have to be "a somebody" or you will do almost anything. Try to have people respect you, follow the Golden Rule during your lifetime. If you let people talk you into things that you know are not right you're bound to get into trouble—Tom Ravey.

You must stand for something important or you'll fall for something not so important.—Irene Kinder.

I think that means you must stand for something such as the Republican or Democratic Party and what it says or you'll fall for anything, I think that means you'll fall for anything such as communism.—Celia Devereaux.

A Worthwhile Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, today will mark the presentation of the first major contribution to finance the publication, the Talking Lion, to be provided free of charge to thousands of blind citizens of Illinois. Soon many blind adults in my State will be able to read a recorded magazine especially written for them and transcribed for use on their talking-book machines.

This very worthwhile project is sponsored by the Lions Clubs of Illinois and founded by Don O. Nold, a longtime resident of my congressional district.

The Talking Lion will contain original writings in addition to specially selected items from well known published periodicals. The contents will be divided in six general classifications and a well-rounded assortment of interests will be presented in each issue. At present, plans call for four editions annually.

Section 1 will be devoted to items of general interest, including many informative messages concerning the special regulations of social security and income tax regulations, the work Lions Clubs are doing for the blind, news of public and private agencies offering services to the blind. Section 2 will be dedicated to women, with articles on fashions, homemaking, household hints, and child care. Men's interests will be the feature of section 3, with items on sports, hobbies, business, clothes.

Fiction will be the keynote of section 4, with short stories and poetry as material. Blind authors will have an opportunity to have some of their works published in this section. Section 5, nonfiction, will feature biographies, vignettes, verbal portraits, travelogues, essays. The final section, No. 6, will be a potpourri of assorted subjects, including letters to the editor, questions and answers wherein blind persons can seek answers to problems, book reviews of the latest talking book releases, editorials, commentary.

Mr. Nold states:

At present most of this information is not now available to blind persons in a form which they can read. The American Foundation for the Blind estimates that less than 8 percent of blind persons read braille, largely because most of them lose their sight at an advanced age. Except for radio or friends who read to them, there is no reading matter available which is especially designed for their use and which concerns itself with their problems and desires.

The Central Lions Club of Chicago has contributed $1,000 to this project and the Berwyn Lions Club has pledged $500 to the publication fund for 1961. The Stickney-Forest View Lions Club has also sent in a contribution and other clubs in district 1–A have shown an interest in participating in this project. Several personal contributions have been made by those interested in having blind residents of the State receive this aid. Needless to say, the corporation being formed to conduct this venture is one of a nonprofit nature.

This project is one that deserves wide commendation because it provides for a great need of our blind citizenry which is too often neglected or bypassed in the hubdub of our daily lives. It might well set an example for other groups and organizations to serve those among us who are deprived of sight and many of the benefits of self-education and entertainment which the rest of us enjoy. This will be made eminently clear to the representatives of some 92 Lions Clubs in the Chicagoland area who will witness the fund presentation ceremony this evening.

The Coming Din of Inequity—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, following is the final part of an article on the structure of the social security system prepared by Mr. Ray Peterson, a well-known and able actuary.

I urge all the Members to study these three insertions as a single unit in order that they may better understand the financial structure of the social security system and the built-in dangers which make it actuarially unsound:

INACCURATE PRIVATE INSURANCE PARALLELS

Space will permit only a few illustrations of statements which seek to liken social security to private insurance.

I. MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Congressman (now Senator) KEATING: [1] "It has always been my feeling that since social security is essentially an insurance system, there should be no limit on the amounts which beneficiaries can earn, and still receive benefits * * * it is my feeling the ceiling should be removed entirely."

Senator PROXMIRE: [2] "The fact is that this is an insurance system. This is a premium that he is paying. His employer is paying a part of the premium. It is entirely different from income tax. It is a benefit that comes back to him. He is buying something for himself."

Footnotes at end of speech.

Senator DOUGLAS: [3] "I'm in favor of eliminating completely the limit on earnings of OASI recipients. To require all those getting OASI payments to give up gainful employment is, in reality, attaching a condition to insurance which they themselves have bought."

Senator (now President) Kennedy [4] (campaign statement): "I believe, with Governor Rockefeller, that people should be able to save for the medical care of their retirement years in the same way that they set aside money for other needs—through the social security system. My health plan would extend to our older citizens a life policy of paid-up medical insurance. It would afford them hospital benefits, nursing home benefits and X-rays and laboratory tests on an outpatient basis.

"It would allow people to provide for the costs of their retirement while they work—so that their needs could be met in later years without burdening their children."

It is evident from the earlier analysis in this paper that the social security financing mechanism is not a savings system, that the granting of unearned increments creates a debt that employees and employers of the future must cope with in perpetuity, and the Supreme Court opinion makes clear that there would be no such document as a "life policy of paid-up medical insurance."

II. SOCIAL SECURITY OFFICIALS AND DEPARTMENT STATEMENTS

Robert M. Ball,[5] Deputy Director of the Bureau of OASI (in defense of the policy of fixing social security taxes without any initial income-bracket exemption): "The argument as used in the United States for such a policy under old-age insurance is that the contributions, though legally a tax, are a premium for social insurance benefits."

Charles M. Schottland [6] (formerly Social Security Commissioner): "Medical care for the aged can best be approached through the social insurance route. Nine out of ten persons reaching age 65 today are eligible for OASI benefits. They have paid for these benefits through a tax system which has been proved workable and financially sound."

"Insurance for You and Your Family" (1952): [7] "Your account number on your social security card identifies your old-age and survivors insurance account. Your card is the symbol of your insurance policy under the Federal social security law."

Social Security Administration release of November 1959: "Beginning January 1, 1950, 50 cents more social security tax on every $100 you earn (and 50 cents more from your employer) * * * provide monthly payments for you and your family at retirement, or when you are between age 50 and 65 and severely disabled."

III. WRITERS

Arthur Larson: [8] "Social security is a combination of old-age pensions, disability insurance, and life insurance. The premium for this combination of benefits is a payroll tax of 5 percent on your wages up to $4800 a year.

"Social security is based on the same principle as private insurance, with variations to accomplish its social purpose and to keep it inexpensive.

"Social security differs in important ways from commercial annuities and private life and disability insurance, but the general idea is the same. The idea is that contributions are made by you (and on your behalf by your employer), in return for which you get certain insured rights, including pensions and death benefits."

Wilbur J. Cohen: [9] "The proposal [social security financing mechanism] uses the tried and tested insurance method of payment for hospital and medical care with which millions of Americans of working age are familiar through Blue Cross and other private insurance."

Sidney Margolius [10] (referring to 1960 amendments): "You and your family ought to know your social security benefits as thoroughly as you know how much money you have in the bank. For that's what social security really is: money in the bank against the day you might lose your income because of disablement, death of the family breadwinner or old age."

It must be clear to all discerning readers that, in the light of our initial analysis, there is no foundation for these inaccurate parallels. Indeed, there is desperate need to dispel these self-mesmerizing, foggy concepts.

SOCIAL SECURITY FINANCING OF MEDICAL CARE

What happens when the social security financing mechanism is used for medical care benefits? Let us first recall that the proponents of the contributory old-age and survivors insurance system, led by Arthur Altmeyer, have always been axious to preserve the contributory principle; that is, no one receives cash benefits under that system unless he contributes for a minimum period of time. Even though contributions have been only token payments for hundreds of thousands of members, Congress has adhered to this principle. Now, with an entirely new type of proposed benefits, i.e., medical care, for which the present persons on the old-age payment rolls would pay nothing, this principle is thrown overboard; all present social security payees would be blanketed in. Also, millions of active workers and their employers would pay in taxes only a fraction of the cost of the benefits.

With no necessary applicaiton of the principle of social adequacy, another segment of unearned increment would be granted which would add to the permanent social security debt on which future generations and their employers would need to pay interest forever. A good guess would place this sum at $25 to $30 billion for the Forand bill, $15 to $20 billion for the Kennedy-Anderson bill, and around $30 billion for the McNamara bill. This would be only the start. The admitted political technique is a fragmentary approach: separate pieces of benefits are added from time to time. The McNamara bill had two steps in benefits and a two-step progression of taxes. Furthermore, most students, pro and con, believe that it will be virtually impossible to limit benefits to the aged. Such benefits will inevitably be extended to all ages. In this steady procession of developments, the principle of social adequacy—the idea of basic protection against want and destitution—is lost, with no replacing anchor of control to restrain expansion of so-called social insurance.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

What to do? The objective of the social insurance system should be clearly enunciated. It is imperative that the objective be to serve only the limited purpose of social adequacy, the recognition of society's obligation to provide basic minimum protection against want and destitution. The objective should be unequivocally declared by the Congress. As our society becomes more affluent, the relative role of social programs should diminish. The following measures are necessary to meet that objective:

1. No further increases in OASDI benefits should be enacted except those required to recognize changes in living costs for the aged. For this purpose, a special consumers' price index for the aged is needed and should be developed. Changes should be made only after careful consideration by Congress, and not automatically.

2. Congress should enact legislation that will provide tax incentives for all persons to save for their own old-age needs, including, in particular, funds dedicated to pay premiums for medical care insurance.

3. The self-supporting principle must be retained so that we do not lose its values of cost control and cost consciousness. If benefits are restricted to the social-adequacy level, pressure for support from general revenues can probably be successfully resisted.

4. To promote better public understanding of the nature of the financing method and of social security rights, a separate agency, similar in function to the Federal Trade Commission and State insurance departments, should be responsible for checking all statements and publications of the Social Security Administration for the purpose of disclosing to the public inaccurate and incomplete statements.

5. To promote better understanding of costs, congressional committees and other responsible persons not in Government should know, with respect to each proposed social security amendment under consideration, in addition to a single constant tax-rate requirement: (a) the tax-rate requirement for the average new entrant; (b) the present worth of the unearned increments for present members; and (c) the tax-rate requirement for the interest on the additional debt represented by such increments.

The adoption of these measures may be expected to have the following salutary effects:

1. As real wages increase, lower rates of social security taxes than those now in the law will suffice to support the present level of benefits; workers will have greater margins to save for their own old-age needs, and the wage-related feature of OAS I benefits will become less of a feature as more persons in the course of time will have the same flat benefit represented by the present maximum.

2. As the American people gain a better understanding of the nature of the social security system with the social objectives limited as herein stated, and of the differences between private and social insurance, changes of public acceptance of a certain measure of individual inequity for coming generations would be much improved.

3. As the following factors become effective it should become increasingly clear that provision of medical care benefits under the social security mechanism is unnecessary and unwise: (a) tax incentives to save for cash- and medical-care needs in old age; (b) the increasing capacity of present workers to save, as compared with the former capacity of the present aged; (c) the vigorous development of the Federal-State medical aid for aged program; and (d) the further evolution of voluntary private insurance.

Our social security system can be preserved only if we keep benefits within the limits of carefully defined social objectives. Abraham Epstein, a pioneer in the development of old age income programs, is reported to have said that social insurance is like a drug: a limited quantity can serve a vital need; an excessive quantity can be fatal.

If the recommended measures are not substantially adopted, but, instead, we attempt to finance cash benefits of greater adequacy and also full medical care benefits through the social security system on the self-supporting principle, and the system continues to be likened to private insurance, then surely a great din of inequity will be heard. The towering social security structure which we will have piously erected in the name of taking the burden of the old from the shoulders of the young will fall flat on our posterity.

Footnotes at end of speech.

[3] KEATING, K. B.: Statement, hearings before Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, 85th Cong., 2d sess. on all titles of Social Security Act, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1958, p. 1075.

[7] PROXMIRE, W.: Statement, hearings before Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, 85th Cong., 2d sess. on all titles of Social Security Act, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1958, p. 149.

[8] DOUGLAS, P. H.: Quoted in the Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 17, 1957, "The Reader Writes": "OASI Payments," letter from A. L. Dunn, New Orleans.

[9] Kennedy, J. F.: "You Asked Them: They've Answered: Medical Care for Aged," Daily News (New York), Nov. 4, 1960.

[10] Ball, R. M.: Statement made by Deputy Director of Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance of Social Security Administration to Prof. R. M. Clark, quoted in Economic Security for Aged in United States and Canada. Report prepared for Government of Canada, 1959.

[11] Schottland, C. M.: "Medical Care Through Social Security: What Lies Ahead?" Public Welfare, July, 1960.

[12] "Insurance for You and Your Family," Social Security Administration, 1952, p. 11.

[13] Larson, A.: "Know Your Social Security," revised edition, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959.

[14] Health and Social Security Task Force to President-elect Kennedy; Cohen, W. J., chairman, report, Jan. 10, 1961, unpublished.

[15] Margolius, S.: "New 'Security' Rules Aid Young and Old," Solidarity, Oct. 28, 1960, p. 9.

Bipartisan Efforts To Give Relief to Nation's Textile Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I want to give my strong support to the bipartisan efforts being made in the Congress to effectuate some relief by the administration for the Nation's textile industries. As the Representative of Maryland's Sixth Congressional District, I can speak out on the economic distress increasing foreign imports have caused in the manmade fiber industry. As many of my colleagues who have traveled through the Free State know, the city of Cumberland, Md., lies in the "narrows" of the Allegheny Mountains. With a population of 33,400 people the city depends on a diversified and healthy industry, and one of its mainstays is the Celanese Fiber Co. which produces such manmade fibers as acetate and triacetate.

As the Members of the House know, we have recently been informed that the Federal budget will operate at a deficit for this fiscal year of at least $2.2 billion and for next year nearly that amount again. With the increased spending for defense and other programs requested by the administration, we certainly must realize that this deficit will go even higher if all these programs are approved by the Congress. In the meantime, the Secretary of Labor has added 25 new industrial areas where substantial unemployment conditions exist, making a total of 101 such areas where unemployment is present or 6 percent or more of the work force is out of jobs. It would certainly seem proper to review whether it makes good sense to permit excessive quantities of foreign imports that destroy our own industries to continue at a time when conditions of deficit financing and unemployment exist at home.

Mr. Speaker, what are the economic facts in the manmade fiber industry? Currently, over 20 percent of the U.S. industrial capacity is idle. That is the first statistic.

Second. There is no adequate protection against those nations increasing their already growing imports to this country and thereby liquidating the domestic manmade fiber industry. If the excess capacity in those foreign nations were exported to the United States, the idle capacity at home would increase to 83 percent.

Third. In the last 11 years, foreign imports of manmade fibers to the United States increased by 440 percent.

Fourth. The labor costs of manmade fiber production workers in some foreign production centers make it economically questionable for our industry at home to be confronted with a constant upward trend in foreign imports. Average hourly wages are as follows:

Japan	$0.26
Italy	.62
West Germany	.78
United Kingdom	.54–$1
United States	2.76

Fifth. Imports of manmade fiber fabrics and apparel have also increased substantially. From 1957 to 1960, imports of manmade fiber fabrics increased by 194 percent, and imports of apparel and other manmade fiber products increased 137 percent.

Sixth. The domestic rayon staple fiber industry operated at a loss in 1960. This is a major segment of the manmade fiber industry. It foreshadows developments in the rest of the industry. Reductions in employment in the rayon staple fiber industry have brought the 1960 work force 30 percent below the 1957 level.

Mr. Speaker, these facts speak for themselves. Even though the industry expended 6.5 percent of its sales dollar last year in research, we can no longer claim a preemptive position for our technological advances in manmade textiles. We must continue certainly on a steady course in looking for the new advances in this technology, but we must not sacrifice to foreign imports the minimum economic status necessary to keep our industry's research laboratories operating. Production and sales of products are the prerequisite ingredients to vigorous research programs, and other industries at home in recent times have been washed down the drain by excessive and basically unfair important trade policies.

If the time should come when this Nation faced a world military conflict again, the essentiality of the textile and apparel industries to national security would be made apparent then, as it was apparent in World War II and the Korean conflict. In the event of such emergency, the manmade fiber industry—not dependent on production periods of natural fibers—alone presents the ability to meet urgent military requirements. The Soviet Union understands this fact of reality since it is now engaged in a crash program to catch up with the manmade fiber technology of the United States.

In view of the current conditions in this industry, Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in urging the President to study carefully the relief being requested from these foreign imports. Industry can again, as it has in the past, play the major role in ending current unemployment and deficit financing, too; it only requires an interested, sympathetic, and enlightened policy of its Government in Washington.

The President must, of course, examine this request in the light of the whole national welfare, including our diplomatic posture with our allies. He must consider the question as it bears upon existing commitments of the United States. Subject to these considerations, I hope that it will be possible for the President to grant this relief.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Senator Dodd, of Connecticut, Delivers Americanism Conference Speech at Annual American Legion Event in West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it was the privilege of our esteemed colleague, Senator THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut, and the Senator from West Virginia who now speaks, to have been invited to participate in the annual Americanism Conference of the West Virginia Department of the American Legion held in Fairmont, W. Va., April 15, 1961.

Senator DODD delivered the conference keynote address—a forthright and thought-provoking message which was declared by seniors among the active American Legion members in attendance to have been one of the most inspiring in the long series of the West Virginia department's annual lectures on Americanism. Adjutant Tommy Jones announced that he had arranged to have the address by Senator DODD broadcast by radio on stations throughout the State.

In being privileged to introduce our distinguished colleague, I said:

I am especially gratified to bring to you tonight a speaker who has developed high competency in areas that are particularly relevant to the theme of this conference.

As a citizen, as a practicing lawyer, as a legislator, and as the father of two charming daughters and four sons, our speaker, Senator THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut, has a very real investment in Americanism and in the problems of our achieving a more viable democracy.

His professional engagement in this field began with the conferring of his law degree at Yale University in 1933. In 1935 THOMAS DODD established and directed the national youth administration in Connecticut, thereby initiating a very deep commitment to juvenile problems and the development of our youth. This interest and responsibility he has carried with him to the present time, in which it guides his very able work as chairman of the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

In 1938 our speaker joined the Department of Justice, where he served with distinction until 1945 as special assistant to the Attorney General. In that year he was called from the Department of Justice to serve with Justice Jackson at the Nuremburg Trials for the War Crimes. During the remainder of 1945 and 1946 he acted as vice chairman of the board of review and executive trial counsel in the U.S. Chief of Counsel for the Prosecution of Axis Criminality, earning a Presidential Citation and the Medal of Freedom for the high service he rendered.

After several years of active practice in law, our guest returned to public service as a Member of the House of Representative in the 83d and 84th Congresses, and was elected to the Senate in 1958. Throughout a wide and varied practice of law, as a private practitioner, as a public servant, and as a legislator, the consistent thread of Senator DODD's career has been his high dedication to the principles of Americanism and his devotion to the task of making those principles secure.

It is with a keen awareness of the clarification which he can bring to the deliberations of this conference that I take pleasure in presenting the Honorable THOMAS J. DODD, a distinguished U.S. Senator from the State of Connecticut.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of Senator DODD's speech.

There being no objection the text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD, OF CONNECTICUT, BEFORE THE AMERICAN LEGION CONFERENCE, FAIRMONT, W. VA., APRIL 15, 1961

Distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is a great pleasure for me to be here with this group of American Legion members and their wives, who have contributed so much in the effort to inform the American people about the essential evil of communism and the threat it poses to freedom.

I am glad to be here in West Virginia for another reason. Thanks to the energetic and effective efforts of Senator RANDOLPH and Senator BYRD, I probably know more about the problems of West Virginia than those of any other State in the Union, excepting my own State of Connecticut. In Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, I have been fortunate to have a warm and wise friend, who is known and respected as one of the most eloquent and capable Members of the Senate.

I have been privileged to know Senator BOB BYRD for a long time and have served with him in the House and Senate. I have always regarded him as one of the most earnest and dedicated public servants in America. West Virginia can well be proud of its representation in the Senate. There is no State whose interests are more effectively or tirelessly represented.

The word "Americanism" has, I am afraid, been much misunderstood.

It has been abused by ultraconservative extremists who claim it as their peculiar property.

On the other hand, it has been unjustly vilified by the ultraliberal extremists, who equate it with bigotry and reaction.

Why there should be such confusion, I find difficult to understand. The meaning of "Americanism" should be plain enough.

"Americanism" means loyalty not merely to our country but to its traditions and to the moral values for which it stands.

It means dedication to the concepts of justice and tolerance and fairness that are enshrined in our Constitution.

But above all, it means dedication to the cause of human freedom—the kind of dedication to which Thomas Jefferson gave voice when he wrote the line: "I have sworn upon the altar of Almighty God eternal hostility to all forms of tyranny over the minds of men."

No American who is true to the traditions of his country could fail to be opposed to Nazi and Communist tyranny.

Americanism in our day and age does not mean simply opposition to communism. It means adherence to a positive set of values. Dedication to these values, however, automatically brings us into opposition to communism.

Whether they realize it or not, those "ultraliberals" who repudiate the word "Americanism" have in effect turned their backs on the American tradition.

By "ultraliberal" I mean those intellectuals, naive or softheaded, who refuse to believe that communism can be all evil; who insist that the Communists are like ourselves and that, if we are prepared to be reasonable, coexistence with them is possible; who close their eyes to all the massive evidence that communism is an international conspiracy committed to the destruction of freedom and religion; who cry "witchhunt" or "McCarthyism" at every effort to investigate Communist-front operations and Communist infiltration of Government positions; who are not pro-Communist, but react with far greater emotion against every manifestation of anticommunism than they ever seem capable of displaying against communism.

But the American tradition is equally betrayed by those ultraconservative extremists who pretend to speak in the name of Americanism, but who forget that fairness and moderation and justice are essential ingredients of our nationhood. The result is that these extremists of the right frequently take the stand that everyone who disagrees with them is either a Communist or a dupe of the Communists, that every political figure who has been guilty of an error in judgment or a policy that failed, is, ipso facto, a member of the Communist conspiracy.

In reply to the ultraliberal extremists, I say that there is a problem of Communist infiltration in government, a very real problem. It has been with us before and I am sure it will continue to be with us so long as the cold war exists. Let me review a few pertinent facts in this connection.

Alger Hiss, one of the top officers of the State Department and the secretary of the founding conference of the United Nations, was identified as a Communist agent and was convicted of perjury for denying that he turned over state secrets to Whittaker Chambers, a self-confessed Soviet agent.

Harry Dexter White, who, as the energetic assistant to Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau, in effect ran the American Treasury, has also been proved, beyond any reasonable doubt, to have been a Communist agent.

Frank Coe, one-time assistant to White, was compelled to resign as head of the International Monetary Fund when he claimed protection of the fifth amendment in refusing to reply to the question: "Are you a Communist agent?" Mr. Coe is today in Communist China.

Think of the implications of this: Communist agents have at different times directed the American Treasury, the International Monetary Fund, and one of the key offices in the U.S. State Department.

Those ultraliberals who charge that every investigation into the possibility of Communist infiltration or of Communist influ-

ence in government policy is a witch-hunt, are either wrongheaded, or blind, or worse.

But as bad as the ultraliberal extremists are those ultraconservative extremists who charge, for example, that President Eisenhower and the late Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and Mr. Allen Dulles were conscious members of the Communits conspiracy.

To accuse people like Presiednt Eisenhower and John Foster Dulles of being Communist agents is an affront to both decency and intelligence. It brings our leaders and our institutions into disrepute, it sows division, it makes it easier for the Communists and the ultraliberals to equate opposition to communism with political lunacy.

In the realm of foreign policy, Americanism means certain concrete things.

Above all, it means commitment to the principle of freedom for men and nations.

It means that we can never reconcile ourselves to the enslavement of hundreds of millions of people in Europe and in Asia by the most bestial despotism in history.

It means that we must seek, by every means short of war, to help these peoples recover their freedom.

It means that we must avoid all measures which might be construed as an acceptance of the permanence of these regimes.

It means an abiding faith in the triumph of good over evil and freedom over slavery.

It means that we must call a halt to the partial surrender and partial retreats that have characterized our foreign policy since Yalta and Tehran.

It means a willingness to fight, if fight we must, to protect our freedom and the freedom of other peoples.

It means the kind of courage and the kind of dedication our forebears had when they pledged their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor to the cause of freedom.

I know that I do not have to agitate or exhort the members of the American Legion on the subject of communism. But we must be frank in realizing that the viewpoint which we in this hall hold, is shared only by a minority in our own country and by a much smaller minority throughout the free world community.

With the exception of the fellow travelers and the ultraliberal extremists, the majority will agree with us that communism is inherently evil, that it has cost the lives of scores of millions of people, that it is militantly opposed to belief in God, that its totalitarian government violates all of man's God-given rights, that the leaders of communism have on frequent occasions proclaimed their intention of burying the free world.

But after admitting all these things our friends of the majority will turn around and say: "We have to be realistic. We cannot afford a nuclear war. Therefore we must seriously attempt to negotiate with the Communists, seriously strive to achieve coexistence with them."

This brief statement of position is, I am certain, an accurate characterization of the present attitude of the free world. But within these brief sentences there are so many grave fallacies that I sometimes wonder what has happened to the intelligence and sanity and morality of civilized men.

This position assumes that the essential differences between communism and freedom are negotiable. But while many minor and peripheral differences are negotiable, the essential difference between freedom and slavery is not.

It also assumes that the cold war is two-sided in origin, that if we abate our hostility, the Communists will abate theirs. But the cold war does not originate on our side; the hostility of the Communist world to the free world does not spring from anything we have done. The Kremlin is opposed to us because of what we are and what we believe. It seeks to destroy us—in fact I would say that it is under compulsion to destroy us—because we stand for the dignity of man and it stands for human enslavement; because we stand for freedom and it stands for the total subjugation of the rest of the world; because we stand for belief in God and in man's God-given rights, while the Kremlin denies these beliefs; because America is the one thing that stands in the way of global victory for the Kremlin.

Unless we are prepared to abandon belief in God and freedom and all the other virtues of our civilization, we will remain what we are. And so long as we remain what we are, communism will seek—must seek—to destroy us. Let us have no illusion on this score.

This quest for coexistence, where coexistence is not possible, represents an abandonment of the first of all moral and religious precepts: Thou shalt love thy brother as thyself. It also represents an abandonment of the moral foundation of the American revolution and American civilization. Whether they realize it or not, those who argue in favor of an entente with the Kremlin, are urging that, for the sake of preserving our own precious skins, we forget about the agony of the hundreds of millions of people enslaved by communism.

I say that we cannot forget about their agony. I say that if we declare peace with the tyrants, morally we are declaring war on their victims.

I say that we cannot defend freedom if we limit it to mean only our freedom.

I believe that in the long run we will protect ourselves best and defend freedom best if, together with Thomas Jefferson, we "swear upon the altar of Almighty God, eternal hostility to every form of tyranny over the minds of men."

I have repeated this quotation from Thomas Jefferson because I feel that it is something that every American should remind himself of every day of his life.

I say that the hesitant, compromising, coexistential foreign policy of recent years encourages aggression, endangers the peace, imperils our freedom, and every day erodes our own integrity.

I say that we can neither preserve the peace nor defend freedom, nor win the cold war unless, as the very first act, we commit ourselves to the universal triumph of the faith in God and freedom which is the very heart of our civilization and culture.

I say that this is the essence of Americanism in our time, that only thus can we defend our freedom, perpetrate the American tradition, and ultimately make the American dream available to peoples everywhere.

Rt. Rev. Theodore G. Kojis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 30, the Right Reverend Theodore G. Kojis, abbot of St. Andrews Benedictine Abbey of Cleveland, Ohio, will be honored by the entire Cleveland community on the occasion of his 25 years in the priesthood and his dedicated service to the Cleveland community.

The Right Reverend Abbot Theodore G. Kojis, O.S.B., of Cleveland, is a native of Slovakia. He came to this country as a 4-year-old in 1914. His family first settled in Milwaukee and later moved to a nearby town in Wisconsin. After completing his elementary education in St. Matthew's Parochial School, the future abbot of St. Andrew's Abbey enrolled in St. Procopius Academy in Lisle, Ill., in the fall of 1923. He obtained his high school diploma in 1927 and spent the next 2 years in St. Procopius College before entering the novitiate at St. John's Abbey in Collegeville, Minn., in the summer of 1929.

Abbot Kojis came to St. Andrew's Abbey in the summer of 1930. Besides teaching in the Benedictine High School, he studied at John Carroll University and St. Mary's Seminary. In 1934 he received his bachelor of arts degree from John Carroll University. He was ordained 2 years later on May 1 by Bishop Schrembs. Before preparing for preaching missions at Catholic University, he continued teaching for a number of years at Benedictine. Moreover, he served as prefect of the boarding-school students and procurator of the abbey.

At the time of his election as the second abbot of St. Andrew's Abbey on June 20, 1946, Abbot Kojis was the youngest Benedictine prelate of abbatial rank in the world. While in Europe for the general election of the abbot primate in the fall of 1947, he visited Slovakia. The hometown folks in his birthplace of Koseca gave their renowned son a warm welcome.

The abbot attended the International Eucharistic Congress in Barcelona, Spain, in 1952, and made a tour of Italy, Germany, France, England, and Ireland. He became acquainted with many Slovak refugees while on the continent. Giving aid to the needy Slovaks in exile has been one of the favorite charities of the abbot who has always shown a generous heart to his fellow countrymen now living in exile.

Despite his manifold duties as abbot of St. Andrew's and president of Benedictine High School, Abbot Kojis studied art at Western Reserve University and obtained his master's degree several years ago. He holds membership in the First Catholic Slovak Union, First Catholic Slovak Ladies' Union, Slovak Catholic Sokol, Pennsylvania Slovak Catholic Union, Slovak Catholic Federation, the Slovak League of America, and is a fourth degree member of the Knights of Columbus. The abbot has been honored with honorary offices in most of these organizations. Moreover, he is the president of the Slovak Institute here, and protector of the Slovak Catholic Center in Rome. In addition he is honorary president of the Slovak News Association.

The entire Cleveland community and the Nation is proud of the achievements of this distinguished citizen.

Address by Senator Robert S. Kerr

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the Wabash Valley Association is an organ-

ization dedicated to the control of the great water resources of the Wabash River and its tributaries. One of the high points of its 13-year history was the annual meeting held this year in Mount Carmel, Ill., on March 9, 1961, when they were addressed by my distinguished colleague and the champion of America's natural resources, Senator ROBERT S. KERR, of Oklahoma. I ask unanimous consent that the text of his inspiring speech on that occasion be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ROBERT S. KERR AT THE WABASH VALLEY ASSOCIATION, INC., ANNUAL MEETING, MOUNT CARMEL, ILL., MARCH 3, 1961

Thank you for the invitation to speak here today. I accepted it gladly. I realized it would give me an opportunity to meet more of the fine folks from the great States of Indiana and Illinois. It gives me an opportunity to talk on my favorite subject—water.

We in Oklahoma are deeply indebted to Indiana for a lifetime of service from one of your greatest sons. Elmer Thomas, born in Greencastle, became one of Oklahoma's great statesmen. We called him the tall Sycamore from the Wabash Valley. As Congressman and four-term U.S. Senator, he made a great contribution in developing an unparalleled program of soil and water conservation for Oklahoma. We build today on the foundation he helped to lay. If I can be of any help to your great Senator HARTKE and those who assist him in developing a conservation program for Indiana, it would be but a small payment on the debt I owe to your State because of what HARTKE does today and what Elmer Thomas did in other days.

As indicated by his message to Congress last week, it is apparent that our new President is keen on the development of natural resources and water conservation, in every sense that these broad terms embrace. Therefore, I think your water problems in the Wabash Valley will receive every consideration from the White House. I know—that due to the splendid efforts of VANCE HARTKE—your water problems will continue to receive favorable attention in the Senate of the United States.

The Wabash River, celebrated in song, story, and poetry, is more beautiful than it is long, stretching as it does only some 475 miles.

But the beautiful Wabash is like all rivers. It is a Jekyll and Hyde thing, gracing the countryside with its stately flow on the one hand and devastating it with flood torrents on the other. Unleashed it is appalling as it endangers and even tramples the 2½ million people in Illinois and Indiana who live in its basin of 33,000 square miles.

The Wabash River Valley with its fertile valley and its mighty volume of water are yours—your to neglect if you desire, or to use if you choose. Yours even if you permit its uncontrolled floods to destroy fertile land, vast agricultural crops, cities and towns with their homes, mills and factories, and human lives. Also, it is yours to control, chain, and harness, making it a mighty reservoir of stored water and the source of abundant resources, out of which to fashion vast farm production and unlimited industrial output.

I first saw a river prove itself both Jekyll and Hyde while I was Governor of Oklahoma. But it was my father who pointed out to me, when we were living in a log cabin in Indian territory, the importance of water. His words lived on with me—but I did not fully know their meaning until I saw one river valley in my State twice devastated by roaring floods, and once seared by burning drought in one short spring and summer season. Then did I fully realize the great truth he had taught me.

As a result of his teaching and that experience, my first bill in the U.S. Senate was one to set up the Arkansas-White and Red River Interagency Study and Planning Commission—a bill similar to which Senator HARTKE is pushing in the Congress for the Wabash.

In Oklahoma, we are now well along with our program. We have, for example, more completed watershed projects under the Soil Conservation Service than any other State on a comparable basis; we have more projects under construction, more authorized projects, more planned projects, more applications for planning, and more organized soil conservation districts.

Water is fast becoming a controlled asset in Oklahoma with vast recreational advantages which are almost as important to our State as flood control, power, and other features. For example, Oklahoma has more lakes and farm ponds than any other State in the Union except Minnesota. More than 8½ million tourists come each year to our lakes and reservoirs, to fish and boat, to water ski, and play. I believe that is as many as in your great Indiana, even though you have a million more people than we do.

And consider this: The one recreational area in the United States which for many years has attracted most visitors was not Yellowstone nor Yosemite—it was Lake Texoma, on the border of Oklahoma and Texas.

This is just one of the benefits that result when you control water, when you make it work for you instead of against you.

You may well ask—how come Oklahoma, a prairie State of rolling plains and oil, has all this water development? How can all this be possible?

Well, my friends, Oklahoma was fortunate indeed in her early days. We had a few—and there were only a few—men who had a dream of water for Oklahoma, water clean, water abundant, and water for power and recreation. We had men of vision—men who were crusaders for a cause—men who would not give up in the face of ridicule and opposition.

Their dreams are not yet complete, but certainly well on the way to a day of realization.

Ten years ago, these pioneer watermen (or as you say here, "river rats") were pressing the Congress for leadership and cooperation. They sought and got community backing. They hired experts. They raised money. They joined the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. They belonged to the National Reclamation Association. They joined hands with other water conservationists throughout the land. And Oklahoma moved.

You, too, have had a long, hard struggle in the Wabash. Ten years ago, I am reliably informed, the legislature of Indiana passed a resolution, which stated for all to hear, that Indiana could take care of her own water problems * * * that the development of her water resources was a local matter, that she neither wanted nor needed help or interference from the Federal level.

You and the forerunners of the Wabash Valley Association have certainly had a hard row to hoe. When Senator HARTKE was mayor of Evansville, for example, he must have been sadly reminded of that legislative action when floodwaters covered the city.

But his disappointment over that action—and yours as well—must be lessened in the knowledge that only a few days ago the legislator at Indiana passed a joint resolution asking the Congress to cooperate in the development of the Wabash.

I congratulate you that you and your leaders, such as Vance Hartke, Roy Dee, and George Gettinger, are now getting your message across. Neither you nor these men have lost heart. You know, and they know, that just because the Wabash is in bad shape today, it need not stay this way. As Senator HARTKE said last August, "I know that some Government agencies will say it cannot be done but it can be done." He knows that a very few letters in the alphabet make the difference between a "pork barrel project" in Indiana and a fine "foreign aid project" in India.

One of the great opportunities for water development in the Nation is here. The St. Lawrence Seaway is now operating at long last, and Indiana's participation in it makes it all the more valuable.

In many ways, Indiana and Illinois are going through the same problems we had earlier in Oklahoma, and unfortunately still have—though not to your extent. We have had—and still have—some stream pollution. I am sorry to say that formerly some oil operators, through ignorance and carelessness, contributed to that pollution. But today, they are among our most zealous advocates to clean up our Oklahoma streams and rivers.

Like you, we have streams which have been polluted by raw, untreated sewage. We have streams which have become silted, banks which have eroded, and streambeds that have become clogged with debris and flotsam.

Oklahoma has another common problem with your valley. There was a time in our history when the Arkansas-White and Red Rivers were plied by steamboats, when such a famous historic figure as Sam Houston looked out over our rivers and saw a veritable tide of boats and shipping.

Our water pioneers wanted navigation of our streams again. And we have been working toward it with a program of bank stabilization, planning programs for locks, and dredging, as well as the construction of reservoirs. We expect our plans will come to fruition for navigation by way of the Mississippi and Arkansas to eastern Oklahoma by 1970. I hope to see the day when boats and barges will again haul their cargoes to Oklahoma on controlled waterways.

But the streams and rivers in Oklahoma never played the part in our economy that yours have here in Illinois and Indiana. The Wabash floated many a craft that bound together your communities in a solidly flourishing economic unity.

Yes, this great stream that drains 70 percent of Indiana and 30 percent of Illinois is a prime example of man's neglect and misuse of a great national resource. But it will not long remain so.

The dynamic growth of your Wabash Valley Association indicates a tremendous growing interest in this famous river. In the 12 months of 1960, your membership has almost doubled. Your county chapters have tripled in number. You have sent your messengers to Washington to tell your story. You have held meetings that counted attendance from 45 counties in your two States. You have even dropped State designations and divided your basin into districts so that you propose remedial action with greater unity.

You have convinced your legislature that your future is bound and tied up with the cleanup and utilization of this great river.

You have set your goal as 10,000 members. You should have no trouble. Remind your people that the river at their back door in the last 12 years has 10 times threatened to wash away their homes. Remind them there have been almost three times as many floods in the last 12 years as there were in the 43 years before.

I would remind them of the time that the Wabash was a great water highway. I would remind them of the time that the Wabash was a stream, the mere sight of which inspired poets and songwriters—a stream where fish abounded and where an outing on

its waters was a never-to-be-forgotten time of beauty.

Remind them that today the Wabash suffers from the foul odor of neglect and untreated sewage, that even its indigenous inhabitants, the fish, have ceased to regard it as a suitable place to swim and propagate.

Yours is a giant education job. These facts must be presented time and time again, even though you, yourselves may be full of it up to the ears. You must tell your story so often and so well that not a single one of the more than 2 million people who live in this basin will be unaware of the potential of this glorious river.

In this educational program, you must enlist the support of every possible newspaperman, and his paper, and the support of the radio and TV people. With the economic shot in the arm that utilization of the Wabash can bring, the news media stand to gain as much as any part of the valley economy. There will be greater newspaper readership, more listeners for the radio, more viewers for the TV, and more advertising revenue for all. These people are your natural allies in this educational campaign. You must have their help.

And above all, you need the support of the other Members of the Congress from Illinois and Indiana to cooperate with Senator HARTKE in his interagency bill. This is a matter above partisan politics. Development of the Wabash is entitled to the support of the men who represent you.

Once you enlist the people in the Wabash Valley and have them thoroughly and completely with you, putting through the Hartke program will not be too difficult.

The Senator has carefully outlined the steps which must be taken. He has called for a jet-propelled program. He realizes the need for speed. You are already too far behind the States where water has for years been crucial and vital. With hard work you can catch up. You can be thankful that others have travelled the road before you. You can count on much help from many Members of the Congress who have had in their States the same problems you face here in Indiana and Illinois.

The Interagency Commission bill which Senator HARTKE has introduced will place the planning resources of all the Federal agencies involved directly at your disposal. Senator HARTKE's estimate of $271 million to complete all of the water projects in Indiana, most of which are in the Wabash Valley, is a relatively modest one. Speeding up surveys and studies is a reasonable request as well.

You are fortunate indeed that you have a dynamic power in the person of VANCE HARTKE. From his long experience as a leader and worker in his State, he has a great knowledge of the Wabash watershed. From his years as mayor of Evansville, he brings official experience with him to the U.S. Senate.

In these remarks I have dealt often with the progress made in Oklahoma in water development. From a firsthand viewpoint, I can tell you that water is going to be more and more an object of national attention.

During the 1957 drought, people in nearly 1,000 communities across the Nation had to cut down on their use of water. One of every seven persons in the United States even then suffered some kind of water shortage. In Dallas, water was sold for half a dollar a gallon—and the people queued up to buy it at the price. In Orange, N.J., people were subjected to fines for leaky faucets.

Droughts have periodically occurred throughout our history. We know they will occur again and again. We must move in time to store and save and protect our water supplies to take drought in our stride.

To meet this need a special committee was created in 1959 by the Senate. It was called the Select Committee on National Water Resources, and I was proud to serve as its chairman. Its membership numbered some of the leading water statesmen of our times. There were such men as CHAVEZ and ANDERSON of New Mexico, KUCHEL of California, ELLENDER of Louisiana, MAGNUSON of Washington, CASE of South Dakota, HART of Michigan, and MCGEE of Wyoming.

Our committee contacted the Governors of our 50 States. We held 26 hearings throughout the United States. We welcomed every private and public water expert who was willing to testify. We were in touch with local and county governments and their officials. We had the help of every Government agency interested in water, including the Bureau of Reclamation, Corps of Engineers, the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture, etc.

In short, we made the most exhaustive study of national water resources this country had ever seen. And we came up with some startling conclusions before our committee was disbanded early this year.

We learned, for example, that the water requirement of this Nation will double by 1984 and triple by the year 2000. We learned that local, State and the Federal governments will have to spend $60 billion or more by 2000 to keep up with the urgent demand for pure water.

We learned that this Nation might easily need more than the vast quantities of water in our streams and rivers, even though we use it over and over again. We learned that we must turn to other means of conserving and reclaiming water. We learned that water conversion plants to desalt the ocean would be part and parcel of our future way of life. We learned we might even have to use solar distillation methods. We learned that at the end of 1960, fresh water was being produced from saline or brackish water in at least 17 plants scattered throughout the world—on islands in the Persian Gulf, Aruba, Bermuda, and in Greeland, Italy, Latin America, and the United States.

Look at these facts in connection with our exploding population; 270 million by 1980, 350 million by the year 2000, and you better understand the great value and potential wealth in your vast volume of water in the Wabash Basin.

Already the pressing question of usable water supplies is influencing the location of vital industries in new areas. Along with favorable tax structures, favorable labor supplies, and suitable economic land areas, there is inevitably the question of water, its availability and abundance, for consumptive use, for transportation, for recreation.

When the Governor of Illinois about 10 days ago asked his legislature for funds to attract new industry to the southern part of his State where it is greatly needed, he realized that industry will be looking closely at the future availability of water in the Wabash Valley.

In fact, your eyes, and those of people far beyond, must be on the Wabash if you are to build a prosperous and stable future. The control and use of its water will determine the strength of your economy and the pattern of your living. Now for a moment let us gaze into this mirror of destiny.

Come with me and stand on the banks of the beautiful Wabash. The imagination soars as we mentally wander this legendary valley.

We see two phases of the river—what it is and what it can become. I see what it is and what it has been.

I know that it has overflowed its banks year after year—15 major floods since 1875. I know that drought also can bedevil this land, which is so often plagued by roaring floods. I know that 20 million acre-feet flow down the Wabash and into the Ohio every year, almost uncontrolled and unused—a treasure going to waste.

I look again, and I see a paradise of plenty in Indiana and Illinois.

I see a great market for the industries who would build in this valley of natural wealth. I see a growing population, a growing income, a growing capacity to produce for your children and future generations.

I see great barge tows taking out raw material—the beautiful limestone and bountiful coal, the products of the farm—such as corn and soybeans; an infinite variety of finished products of industry now in being and to be built.

I see other great barges coming up the river, bringing you, at more favorable freight cost, goods from all over the world.

I see a great area restored to a competitive basis. I see more and more of your people staying at home. I see new people coming to share in the development of this storied region. I see income rising, full opportunity to develop your basic resources of soil, water, and the infinite capacities of your people.

Such a bright new epoch looms over the horizon of the old Wabash. Already I have seen this drama being enacted in my homeland of the Arkansas Valley, and I know that with your association, with such capable leaders as Senator HARTKE and Roy Dee, there also will be a magical change in your valley. The legendary river will be chained and then harnessed and put to work. There will be the hum of better days and permanent prosperity. I can hear a new lilt to the old songs about the Wabash.

The Judgeship Bill of 1961

SPEECH

OF

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill S. 912 to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I support S. 912 as reported with an amendment on March 30, 1961, by the Committee on the Judiciary which provides for the appointment of an additional circuit and district judges. In the report submitted by the commitee to accompany S. 912, being Report No. 215, a document of 359 pages, containing a wealth of statistics which shows conclusively that the bill is justified and should be passed. At page 10 of the report starts the listing of the creation of the judgeships approved by the Judicial Conference on September 21–23, 1960, and then at page 11 appears a letter from Warren Olney III, director of the Judicial Conference of the United States addressed to the chairman of the Committee of the Judiciary under the date of Monday, March 13, 1961, when the Conference voted to recommend to the Congress the creation of additional judgeships in the several district. It was in this letter that was included one

additional judgeship for the western district of Missouri. At page 12 of the report is a letter from the Attorney General, Robert F. Kennedy, addressed to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee stating that the Department of Justice concurs in the action of the Judicial Conference and specifically mentions and includes one additional judge of the western district of Missouri. That same letter recommended the early enactment of legislation creating all judgeships approved by the Judicial Conference.

As Representative in Congress for the Fourth District of Missouri which is located and situated in western Missouri, I noted in the report at page 181 that there is a rather comprehensive description of the judicial business of the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Missouri which continues through and including page 189. It is not my purpose to review all of these facts and figures but it is noted that the chief judge is the Honorable Albert A. Ridge, who has occupied the bench since 1945 and a statement furnished by Judge Ridge came to our office which was also presented to the Judiciary committee for consideration when hearings were held on the bill. I think that it is important that there be preserved in the RECORD excerpts from this statement as follows:

The three judges who serve the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Missouri continue to have a civil caseload which is 40 percent above the average. The caseload per judgeship in this district at the close of the fiscal year 1960 was 218 private cases. I am not informed as to the location of all the additional judgeships your committee presently has under consideration; but the fact is, that the caseload per judge in this district exceeds the caseload in 14 of the districts for which the Judicial Conference has previously recommended additional judgeships. In other words, in but six districts in which additional judges have been recommended by the Judicial Conference does the caseload exceed that of the western district of Missouri.

On a comparative basis, the private caseload per judgeship in this district is thus established to be in excess of the caseload per judgeship nationally.

The median time interval for disposition of civil litigation pending in this court continues in excess of 11 months. With the number of cases commenced in this district exceeding the number of cases terminated, the only reasonable expectation is that such median time interval will continue to grow.

In considering the caseload of the judges in this district, it should be noted that, statistically, 91 condemnation cases were pending in this district as of December 31, 1960, with 670 tracts involved, as revealed in table C–10 of the second quarterly report ending December 31, 1960; also, that the judges in this district are constantly called upon to consider numerous habeas corpus proceedings by reason of the location of the Missouri State Penitentiary and the U.S. Medical Center for Federal Prisoners, at Springfield, Mo., being within this jurisdiction. During the first half of the fiscal year 1961, 39 habeas corpus proceedings were commenced in which the United States was named a defendant, and 10 such cases in which the warden of the Missouri State Penitentiary was named a party.

The western district of Missouri is not an average district, statistically or when human equations are considered. The location of the western district at Kansas City is in a metropolitan area of Jackson and Clay Counties, in Missouri, and Johnson and Wyandotte Counties, in Kansas. The homogeneous character of that area places the three divisions of court held in Kansas City, Mo., at the hub of business for a population of over 1 million persons, around 35 percent of whom travel via interstate commerce to work in this district.

As the 1960 report of the administrative office reflects, the statistical caseload per judgeship is enhanced in the 86 districts by reason of consideration given to metropolitan courts of the southern district of New York, the eastern district of Pennsylvania, the northern district of Illinois, and the southern district of California. Be that as it may, a study of the statistical data in the annual and quarterly reports of the administrative office will reveal that only in 20 other districts is the caseload exceeded as to cases pending and commenced, and that this district is 18th as to the number of cases terminated.

With the growth in population in the metropolitan area in Kansas City, Mo., and the continuously growing backlog of cases, there is no foreseeable shortening of the interval between filings and trial in this district, unless one additional judgeship is created for the western district of Missouri. A consideration of statistical reports of the business in the western district does not reflect that the three judges in this district do not take a full month's vacation, and that the trial of cases in this district occurs in each month of the year by one, if not all, of the three judges.

The above information as supplied by the chief judge at Kansas City constitutes a solid foundation which the Judiciary Committee acted upon when it reported out S. 912 which included one additional judgeship for the western district of Missouri.

During the course of action by the other body in the Congress and during the course of hearings before the Judiciary Committee, a respectable volume of mail has been received, all of which urged the passage of a bill which would include the additional judgeship for western Missouri.

In consideration of the showing by Judge Ridge and further from the presentation made in the report by the committee and from some personal knowledge concerning the average workload of the judges now sitting in this district, it is my conclusion that an additional judgeship in western Missouri is needed and for these reasons I support S. 912.

Address by Senator Wiley Over Wisconsin Radio Stations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on April 15, the 1961 shipping season opened for the St. Lawrence Seaway.

This is expected to be the most rewarding year in the history of the waterway.

The expansion of traffic through the seaway should, in my judgment, be a high priority target for the Great Lakes region and the Nation.

Why? Because this less expensive route to consumers around the world, if utilized to the maximum, offers a great opportunity for economic growth and progress.

Recently, I was privileged to outline some steps in which I believe we can reap maximum benefits from such expanded trade and commerce, as well as comment on other problems confronting us and the economy, in a radio broadcast over Wisconsin radio stations.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the broadcast printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF ADDRESS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, REPUBLICAN, OF WISCONSIN, OVER WISCONSIN RADIO STATIONS

Friends, the economic crisis in business confronting the country continues to be extremely serious. The rates of unemployment are far too high. Throughout Wisconsin, these total about 117,000, or over 7 percent of the labor force of 1,576,000. Lags in job-creating, economy-bolstering business and industry also have serious repercussions in the economy.

The unemployed and their families are suffering severe hardships;

Progress is retarded in the economy;

The loss of buying power is being felt by sales, services, and other enterprises;

Uncle Sam, too, feels the pinch in reduced revenue.

Fortunately, signs on the horizon are pointing to an upturn in the economy.

Although this won't be magically accomplished overnight, our task now is (1) to speed full recovery; (2) to get our jobless back to work; and (3) to learn a lesson from the setback and develop more effective machinery to curb such dips in the economic cycle in the future.

To guard against such setbacks in the future, also, we need to mobilize, and fully utilize the available economic potential.

During the past week, I was privileged to meet with civic, labor, business and other leaders in Wisconsin. The purpose was to take a new look at the situation and try to find new ideas for improving the economic outlook.

Working on the spot, these leaders have a firsthand knowledge of the situation. Consequently, they are in a good position to evaluate the economic factors and make recommendations for improving the outlook.

To an ever-larger degree, the Nation, in my judgment, needs to depend upon enlightened leadership in business and labor to find solutions to problems in the economy.

In these difficult times, particularly, we need real economic statesmanship.

Now, what can be done?

In Congress, legislation is being considered for improving the economic picture.

The State and local governments, also, could well speed up timetables for procurement and construction of public projects.

Business and industry—as economically feasible—could well move up plans for plants and operational expansion.

Communities can undertake self-help "bootstrap" operations to evaluate potential human and natural resources and better utilize these to bolster the economy to meet the needs of the people.

The creation of multicommunity cooperative programs for pooling of manpower and natural resources also can help to resolve problems and improve the economic outlook. The potentials of an area may be

neither local, nor State, but rather intercommunity, or interstate. Pooling such manpower or resources on an area or regional basis often can result in more effective programs.

We can establish a higher priority for Buy American policy in times of national economic distress.

We can encourage wise investments of private business and public funds and job-creating enterprises. The purpose would be to promote further economic recovery. Today, there are about $12 billion in financial savings by individuals; and $33 billion in corporate funds.

The total assets of life insurance companies amount to about $114 billion. One of the problems is to encourage the use of such funds in more productive investments.

We need a reexamination of our tax system also to provide encouragement and incentive for expansion of job-creating enterprises.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Now, I want to discuss with you one of the great, new opportunities to improve our economic life; that is, the St. Lawrence Seaway.

As a sponsor of the Wiley-Dondero law, authorizing U.S. improvement of the waterway, I am naturally deeply interested in its ability to better serve all of us, and the economy.

Since its completion in 1959, the seaway has experienced a promising expansion of trade and commerce.

Now, the 1961 shipping season is about to get underway and it is expected to be the most rewarding year of the history of the waterway.

True, the volume of traffic—until now—has been less than the more liberal "guesstimates."

All of us around the Great Lakes, including commercial, industrial, agricultural, civic and all other interests, have a deep interest in assuring maximum utilization of the seaway, however.

Why? First, because we, as taxpayers, have a $140 million investment in the project. The Seaway Corporation, designed to be self-supporting, will be able to pay off the debt by charging tolls only if there is an adequate traffic.

Second, there is economic advantage in fully utilizing the seaway, a less expensive trade route for traffic now flowing between Great Lakes and the ports of the world.

Third, we need to develop new markets for the products of our farms and factories. Unless this is done, we will miss a great opportunity; and also find our domestic economy seriously handicapped. Over the years, human ingenuity and technology have dramatically increased our productivity. As a result, the domestic economy, more and more, will not only be fully supplied, but, in some instances, glutted.

Consequently, we need to look for consumers elsewhere in the world. Today there are nearly 2 billion consumers outside the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. Except for a relatively few industrially advanced countries, they need literally everything.

This is a great potential if we develop the programs and policies to profitably supply such markets.

And, fourth, the seaway, defensewise, also plays a significant role in the transportation of vital materiel to and from the lakes region.

These, then, are a few of the reasons why we need to encourage cooperation among all Great Lakes States to fully utilize, and benefit from, the seaway.

Progress, however, has been sufficient to inspire optimism of new economic life, transfused through the seaway, for the Great Lakes region and America.

Now, what are some of the steps that need to be taken to reap maximum rewards? These include constructive efforts to—

Assure fast, smooth handling of shipping through the seaway itself, eliminating bottlenecks and expediting traffic;

Finish the job of deepening and improving the Great Lakes connecting channel, so that deepsea vessels can sail to all lake ports; at present rates of progress, it appears that the channels will be usable at a controlling depth of 27 feet by June 1962, the target date;

Expand promotion efforts to provide shipping, trade, and related interests with a better knowledge of advantages;

Speed up completion of port and harbor developme t projects, to enable ports to expeditiously handle available traffic and larger volumes of trade and commerce for the future;

Enlarge research efforts to find markets for the wide variety of products of the agricultural-industrial complex of the upper Midwest—the greatest in the world;

Undertake pilot studies on deicing to determine the feasibility of attempting to further extend the shipping season;

Find early, favorable solutions to problems arising out of pilotage, labor-management negotiations, and other situations; and

Encourage greater cooperation among Lake States in the development of trade and commerce.

In addition to these measures, there is a need for:

Carrying forward the kind of national trade policies that will encourage trade and commerce on the Great Lakes;

Establishment of "tie-ins" in road, rail, and air transportation; and

Encourage an ever-greater flow of traffic through the Great Lakes ports and the St. Lawrence Seaway—a less expensive route to destinations around the globe.

Maximum utilization of the seaway can prove to be a vital lifeline for improving the economic outlook.

OUTLOOK IN AGRICULTURE

Now, let's turn to another important aspect of our economy, agriculture.

To maintain balanced economic progress, we need to assure the farmer a proportionate share of the national income.

The objectives of a realistic program include—

Creation of a positive—not a negative—image of the American farmers' contribution to our economic progress.

Attempting to establish a relatively good supply-demand balance for production or consumption of farm commodities;

Finding better ways to utilize farm surpluses, plus reducing costs of storage, and using these invaluable resources as assets, not as economic millstones around the neck of the economy; and

Assuring the farmer of a fair share of our ever-growing income.

Today, there are about 7 million people working on farms. Sixteen million additional persons process and market farm products. Farm sales for cash total about $32 billion a year, twice that of total auto and truck sales. Farms also employ 10 times as many people as automobile manufacturing and 14 times as many as in steelmaking.

These highlights of the farm picture help to illustrate the significance of agriculture to the overall economy.

FARM PROGRAM

In the near future, the President is expected to propose legislation to Congress for a new farm program. As recommended in his message, a highlight involves recommendations for establishment of the National Farmer Advisory Committee system. The committees would be established to handle production and marketing programs for each commodity in which supply adjustment is required. The developed programs, involving controls over production and marketing, however, would not go into effect until approved by two-third of the producers.

The committees would make recommendations to the Secretary of Agriculture. If approved by the Secretary—and not vetoed by Congress within 60 days—the programs would go into action.

Personally, I have long felt that (a) the farmer should have a stronger voice in programs affecting his economic future; (b) that solution to the supply-demand imbalance of farm products can best be resolved on a commodity-by-commodity basis; and (c) that self-help as a principle should be encouraged—reducing the load on Uncle Sam.

However, there are serious questions to be resolved, including—

How much authority should be granted the committees and the Secretary of Agriculture in controlling production and marketing of farm products?

Can the farmers and their organizations, until now unable to agree on a national farm policy, develop acceptable plans for separate commodity programs?

How complex will be such a multicommodity program?

How much will it cost the taxpayer, and what effect will it have on consumers?

Congress, of course, will have to examine these recommendations very carefully. As yet, the farm message has not been followed up by proposals for legislation. It's expected, however, that this will come to Congress in the near future.

REVIEWING FEDERAL MILK ORDER SYSTEM

Recently, also, the President appointed a committee to make a special study of the Federal milk marketing order system, which offers a real opportunity to make a useful, much-needed study—one which I have long recommended. Over the years, dairymen in Wisconsin and throughout the Midwest have received far less for fluid milk than producers elsewhere in the country.

A view of the milk order system—I sincerely hope—would provide evidence to wipe out inequities in the system.

EXPANDING SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

Looking now at another program—of interest not only to farmers, but to the youth and parents of Wisconsin and America, we find that, regrettably, the national school lunch program is running out of money for the current year.

Consequently, the program is in danger of being cut back severely.

Over the years, the program—benefiting more than 13½ million students—has been (1) an important factor in maintaining the health of our youth, and (2) a significant outlet for surplus farm commodities. About 265,000 students in Wisconsin are enjoying and benefiting from lunches served in the schools.

Because of a shortage of funds, Gordon Gunderson, director of the school lunch program for Wisconsin regrettably found it necessary to inform participating schools that it would be necessary, on May 1, 1961, to cut back Federal reimbursement for lunches from 5 to 1½ cents per lunch. This serious curtailment would occur not only in Wisconsin but in other States throughout the Nation.

The history of the school lunch system, I believe, well justifies Federal support at the current level of reimbursement.

Consequently, I have introduced a bill to provide an additional $10 million supplemental appropriation for the current year.

Moreover, I shall urge Congress to take early and favorable action on such legislation.

CONCLUSION

This, then, is a brief look at some of the challenges and opportunities confronting Congress and the country.

As always, I welcome the opportunity to report to you.

As there is legislation of particular interest to you coming up in Congress in the days ahead, I shall be glad to hear from you.

Now, this is ALEC WILEY signing off.

Apparel Industry and Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the textile import situation is critical and needs our urgent attention. The following fact sheet concerning the apparel industry should awaken all of us:

FACT SHEET ON THE APPAREL INDUSTRY AND THE APPAREL IMPORT PROBLEM—INTRODUCTION

The term "apparel" refers to all forms of men's, women's, and children's garments, underwear and outerwear, including work clothing. The apparel industry uses all types of fibers; cotton, wool, and manmade fibers. This industry is the largest user of cotton textiles in the world.

EMPLOYMENT

The apparel industry employs 1.2 million workers. Add to this figure 900,000 persons employed in the basic textile industry, plus the workers in manmade fibers and those in other textile products lines, and the overall employment approaches 4 million. Thus, a major economic and social problem is aggravated by steadily rising imports.

GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION

The apparel industry is located in 43 States from coast to coast. There is some concentration along the Atlantic Seaboard because of nearness to the historic source of the basic supply of cotton. In recent years, however, the industry has spread across the Nation to get closer to its market.

SOME CHARACTERISTICS OF THE APPAREL INDUSTRY

This is essentially a small business operation. There are over 31,000 plants employing an average of 250 workers each. Only 30 factories employ more than 1,000 people.

The apparel industry is located, for the most part, in smaller communities. Usually, these factories are the major employers in the area and with their payrolls and purchases of local supplies and services are often the economic lifeblood of the community.

AUTOMATION AND MECHANIZATION

The apparel industry, because of its peculiarities, defies automation or mechanization. The basic machine is the sewing machine. Most labor is human. There are no machines in existence, nor on the drawing boards, that will put the cut parts of a shirt, slacks, or other garment together for stitching. This can only be done by people. Speeding up the machines would do little good, they still could be operated only as fast as the worker.

PAYROLLS

The annual payroll for apparel and allied products, but excluding footwear, is in excess of $3½ billion. (Statistical abstract of the United States, 1959).

FACTORY VALUE OF SHIPMENTS OF THE APPAREL INDUSTRY PRODUCTS

The value of apparel industry products at the factory level is $9.2 billion.

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES

As noted, the apparel industry does not require heavy expenditures on capital equipment. Most of its capital outlay is for textiles and labor.

PROFITS

The apparel industry averages 1 to 1.3 percent profits on sales. This is the second lowest profit ratio in the Nation.

STABILITY OF PRICES

The U.S. Department of Labor, BLS, reports on February 28, 1961: "Continuing the downtrend, average apparel prices dropped by 1.1 percent from December to January and accounted for the major share of the decline in the national Consumer Price Index. For January 1961 all items in the index were at 127.4 (1947–49=100). Apparel, except footwear, is at 101.1, the lowest figure in the index."

IMPORTS

The import figures for the six major apparel imports from Japan and Hong Kong only are:

	Japan	Hong Kong	Total
1958	5,112,000	3,176,000	8,288,000
1959	5,217,000	6,788,000	12,005,000
1960	5,026,000	9,760,000	14,786,000

(Note that under the voluntary quota arrangement with Japan exports have remained stable, while those from Hong Kong, without a quota, have soared.)

(For the impact of imports on jobs, payrolls, etc., see the table on the last page.)

The dollar value of the same six categories of imports from Japan and Hong Kong in relation to imports from all countries is:

	Imports	
	From Japan-Hong Kong only	From all countries
1958	$31,296,111	$40,083,235
1959	36,724,796	41,555,936
1960	65,190,108	80,594,091

THE FUTURE OF IMPORTS

Taking only a few items at random and comparing January 1961 imports with imports of the same items for January 1960, clearly indicate the trend.

[In dozens]

	January 1960		January 1961		Increase
	Japan	Hong Kong	Japan	Hong Kong	
Dress shirts	10,336	10,931	7,291	25,243	11,769
Sport shirts	25,574	16,718	24,222	25,106	7,036
Trousers, walking shorts	1,939	7,286	4,250	11,434	6,469
Playsuits, swimsuits, etc.	348	550	180	1,689	971
Brassieres	63,767	73,814	14,236	133,418	10,073

EXPORTS

The apparel industry has sought every possible means to boost its exports. In practically all foreign markets American producers are unable to meet the price competition of products from the Orient.

Fifty-five nations do not permit U.S. textiles or textile products to be shipped into their countries.

Despite these facts the industry has managed to keep exports about level for 1958–59 and showed a slight increase in 1960.

Exports to all countries of six major categories of cotton apparel only:

1958	$13,663,962
1959	13,226,743
1960	15,656,332

These exports will slide sharply in 1961 because a big share of these exports went to Cuba. Now, for reasons of national policy, this market is closed and exports will reflect this development this year.

The facts of the effect of excessive imports from low-wage areas are explicit.

The only equitable remedy, it seems to us, is country-by-country, category-by-category quotas. This seems fair to American producers, foreign manufacturers who gear production to the U.S. market and to the emerging nations which are certain to enter the textile and textile products fields with the U.S. market their primary outlet.

EXHIBIT C

Analysis of effect of imports, 1958 through 1960

	1958	1959	1960
Dozens imported from Japan and Hong Kong	8,288,000	12,005,000	14,786,000
Units	99,456,000	144,060,000	177,432,000
Direct labor man-hours lost	28,427,840	41,177,150	50,715,980
Direct labor man-days lost	3,553,480	5,147,144	6,339,498
Resultant direct labor disemployed [1]	14,214	20,589	23,358
Resultant indirect labor disemployed [2]	4,738	6,862	8,452
Total disemployment	18,952	27,451	31,810
Lost direct labor payroll [3]	$34,113,408	$49,412,580	$60,859,176
Lost indirect labor payroll [4]	18,952,000	27,448,000	33,808,000
Total payroll lost	53,065,408	76,860,580	94,667,176
Wholesale value of imports [5]	$207,200,000	$300,125,000	$369,650,000
Equivalent factories lost [6]	76	110	127

[1] Assuming 50 weeks per year production at 250 man-days per employee.
[2] Calculated at 1 indirect to 3 direct.
[3] Based on $1.20 per hour.
[4] Calculated at $2 per hour or $80 per week or $4,000 per year.
[5] Calculating average domestic wholesale price of $25 per dozen.
[6] Average 250 employees per factory.

Inter-American Development Bank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Dr. Pedro G. Beltran, Governor of the Bank for Peru. Dr. Beltran is also Prime Minister and Minister of Finance of Peru, and is one of the hemisphere's most farsighted and courageous statesmen.

I have just returned from the Conference which was held from April 10 through the 14th. I thought Dr. Beltran's address one of the finest that was given there. It represents the type of Latin American initiative necessary for implementation of the Act of Bogotá and the Alianza para Progreso. It is a stimulating and interesting statement, and I recommend it to my colleagues.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY THE GOVERNOR FOR PERU, DR. PEDRO G. BELTRAN, PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF FINANCE OF PERU, AT THE CLOSING SESSION, HELD ON APRIL 14, 1961

While enjoying the generous hospitality of the Brazilian people, we have found in this meeting of the Inter-American Development Bank many other motives of satisfaction: In the excellent speech of our President, Mr. Felipe Herrera, in which he showed the tremendous importance the Bank has for the present and future of this hemisphere. In the equally eloquent remarks of the delegates, and in the warmth and enthusiasm of the roundtable discussions; in short, in all our activities, in the very fact of meeting beside the beautiful Bay of Guanabara, we have been able to confirm the family spirit which inspires the governments of this hemisphere and the peoples they represent.

That is the way it ought to be. That is the way it is. The inter-American system has never been better described than when it has been called a family of nations. As in any family, the ties which unite our countries, our peoples, are ties of natural affection and of an inevitable common destiny. And as in any family, we find not only mutual respect but the duty to help one another.

The presence of one rich and powerful member, in our American community, could be a disadvantage and even a cause of irritation and estrangement but this would be true only if we lost sight of the family concept. Fortunately as we have seen in the words of President Kennedy, and in the deeds which accompany these words, and as Secretary Dillon has just confirmed in this room, the bigger and richer brother, moved by higher considerations of morality, and in accordance with the common interest, which includes self-interest, has extended his hand manfully and fraternally to his less fortunate and still growing brothers. In doing this he fulfills a family duty. He strengthens the hemispheric unity essential for the survival of the family as such, and for the survival of each member.

We of America are engaged in what we can call a task of bringing ourselves closer together. In terms of the hemisphere we are united in the close brotherhood inspired by our common history and geography, and by the clear ideals of liberty which we all share. And that same spirit of brotherhood must reign equally within each country. Thus, at the national level and not only at the continental level, the more prosperous must understand their obligations toward their less fortunate brothers. Those who have much must understand their fraternal and Christian duty toward those who have nothing. They must accept sacrifices and renounce privileges for the great task which awaits us with such terrible urgency and which consists in raising the standards of living of all the men and women of America.

That is the clear objective to which we aspire: To improve the way of life of the American, equip him for the battle of life, free him from the scourge of misery and the torture of ignorance, respecting his liberty and his dignities as a creature made in the image of God. We know well that for this objective, as Mr. Dillon has said, the stability of our economy is the cornerstone, a proper tool and certainly not the final goal in itself.

There is a false notion that we must choose between stability and development. As if stability were an obstacle to development or as if for unexplained reasons development required the instability of our economy. The truth is exactly the opposite. There are the countries of America which have been able to stabilize themselves financially through policies of austerity—difficult to apply, resisted by demagogery, sometimes poorly understood even by the people who benefit. But they have done this, not to stop at mere stability, but to lay the groundwork for sure and sound progress in direct benefit of the great majority.

But we could not seriously defend collaboration among countries of America, if the action of the United States, through the Inter-American Development Bank and other entities, represented a subsidy for an unbalanced budget, for financial anarchy, for political ineptitude, or especially for administrative corruption or slothfulness of the people.

We believe it is our obligation to put our houses in order and to dedicate ourselves to hard work. We believe in the necessity of freely elected governments, governments which respect liberty, governments which are honest, prudent and diligent, governments which are imbued with the idea of the common welfare. We believe in the protection of the law as the best and indispensable guarantee to encourage saving and investment of capital. We believe in economic stability as the only way to protect the peoples from the burden of continental rises in the cost of living. Exactly because we believe in all these things we believe also in Operation Pan American, conceived and expounded by Brazil, and in the Alianza para el Progreso proposed by President Kennedy.

For our countries of Latin America where the population increases so rapidly, where the production of goods and services does not always increase in the same proportion; where each year new useful jobs must be found for the increasing population; the question of progress is, literally, a question of life and death. We must face the double challenge of the growth of population and the general longing for a better life. Because if we do not meet this challenge, we shall certainly perish.

Progress, economic growth, expansion of wealth, industrialization, expansion of markets, substantial increase in buying power, whatever words you use, we all understand the concept. But we do not believe in the methods of the Pharaohs. We do not believe in their present-day counterpart, totalitarian methods, which consist in planning great works but with the sacrifice of millions of human beings and of several generations. Therefore we must think in terms of the human being of today, not as a figure of statistics but as a man of flesh and blood, who lives and breathes, who knows hunger, perhaps is attacked by sickness requiring medical attention, lacks schools, needs a roof over his head, and longs for a bit of land to work and to call his own and to be able to pass on to his children. The present living conditions of our peoples in many cases are terribly difficult. Therefore paralleling a plan of economic growth, we must carry forward without delay a bold and creative program of social betterment.

In view of such formidable and essential obligations, I must say that it seems to me frankly foolish for governments to use up their always insufficient resources in trying to take the place of private enterprise in economic activities which private individuals can carry out for the benefit of themselves and the community. On the other hand, it also would be absurd for a government to use public funds merely to help private businessmen to get rich. As I have already indicated private enterprise needs only the safeguards of law and a reasonable expectation of profit to develop itself and to contribute to the progress of the nation.

Private capital has a duty, moreover, to contribute to the acceleration of the development process by a policy of reinvestment in our countries. This policy, as our President, Felipe Herrera, has well said, will help to overcome the deficit in the rate of economic growth which is one of the most pressing problems which we have to face.

If we will do what must be done; that is to say if we will encourage and stimulate private investment, and if, on its part, private capital will recognize its duty to work for the good of the great masses of our population, this problem will be on its way to solution according to the capacity of each country and for the common good.

In my opinion, once a government has met such basic responsibilities as police protection, public administration, health services, education, and national defense, public funds should be used with the most scrupulous care for two purposes: in the economic field to carry out works which are indispensable for progress but cannot be executed by private enterprise because they involve too much risk or because there is no immediate profit, or because the benefits would be spread over a very long period of time.

And in the field of social progress, the government as servant of the common welfare, must think exclusively of the less fortunate, the dispossessed, who are everywhere the most numerous. And government must mobilize the energy of the nation for that vast cooperative effort which is the Alianza para el Progreso.

President Kennedy's proposal is without parallel in the magnitude and nobility of its aims and which is intended to satisfy the basic necessity of the peoples of this continent, bringing to them housing, jobs, land, health, and schooling.

Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the honor shown my country in selecting me to express, on behalf of all the delegations, our thanks for the many attentions received from the Government and people of Brazil which I do with all my heart.

As for myself, I take this opportunity on this day, which is by auspicious coincidence the Day of the Americas, to ratify publicly my faith as a citizen of the Americas, and as a democrat. I must say, with the utmost frankness, that the ideal and yearning for progress in our hemisphere cannot be represented even remotely by a revoltuion such as the Communist revolution which, to the regret of all, has now seized one of our countries; a revolution which represents the degrading spectacle, from a moral point of view of executions by firing squad without due trial, of imprisonment for indefinite terms; a spectacle of terror and despotism. From a material point of view it presents the spectacle of hardships, privations, and wage cuts.

Our forefathers did not rise up against colonial domination a century and a half ago merely to convert our countries into concentration camps of any hue whatever, be

they red, black, or yellow. In our American community we do not conceive of the individual as being at the service of the state or politics. On the contrary, we believe the state and politics to be instruments at the service of the individual. We do not see the individual as an abstraction but as a human being with a name and life of his own.

We cannot forget either the spiritual or the material side of man. This is the true Christian human spirit which animates our peoples. For us liberty is incomplete without economic welfare. But at the same time we reject the fallacious promise of economic welfare which not even the totalitarian regimes fulfill, and which begins by depriving us of our divine gift of liberty. Here also there is a false notion that we must choose between liberty and economic welfare. No; because liberty is not sufficient or authentic without welfare; and welfare is not possible and would be humiliating without liberty.

I confess that I am not only impressed, I am deeply moved by the success of our meetings, by the enthusiasm which I have observed here. At last we are busy with the task of today and with thought for tomorrow, and no longer with the sterile recriminations of yesterday suitable perhaps for a debate of historians but not for an assembly of economists. How small and how pointless seems the artificial bickering among our countries when we contemplate the great enterprise on which we have embarked.

I have the conviction that we still have time to take up and complete the work which the peoples of the Americas are awaiting. I also have the certainty that tomorrow would be too late. Happily, we all now have understood this. I have the conviction that in the Alianza para el Progreso the Inter-American Development Bank is going to be an increasingly useful tool. It already has made astonishing headway in a few short months thanks to its own resources and to the moral and intellectual qualities of our president, Felipe Herrera, and of the other executives.

At this time there can be no doubt of the fundamental role which the bank is playing to bring our countries together and to work united in the knowledge that we are all pursuing the same objective. Joint action based on the sincere spirit of solidarity among our peoples is the only secure base from which success can be achieved.

The fervent hope which should arise in all of us is that the family of American nations should continue united. In carrying out our common efforts for the common goods, the Inter-American Bank will be decisive in that the philosophy with which it is inspired transforms it into not merely a financial entity but rather a collective organism dedicated to the spiritual and material progress of Latin America.

Finally, I am convinced that nothing has contributed more to the cooperative spirit of this meeting than the friendly and charming atmosphere of Brazil, our sister nation, the colossus of South America, a country great also in its spirit, forged by civilization and democracy, warm in climate and cordial in heart, which is without doubt the most important.

Many thanks.

God Love You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, in view of the recent distress about Africa, the following article from Our Sunday Visitor by the Most Reverend Fulton J. Sheen is most pertinent:

GOD LOVE YOU

(By the Most Reverend Fulton J. Sheen)

Behind the minor political struggles in the Congo is the implacable war of the Communists against the church. Here are the inside facts of the Congo story:

Russia plans to "Sovietize" Central Africa.

For 2 years the Soviets gave Lumumba $400,000 a month to buy followers and provide them with cars.

Lumumba set up a Communist organization among his fellow tribesmen, the Batelca, making them believe he was the incarnation of his ancestors.

During the elections, Lumumba's troops destroyed most of the ballot boxes of the other candidates. But only 23 percent of the population voted because of their opposition to him; in other regions, 85 percent voted.

The plans for the Communist revolution in the Congo were prepared in Prague and in the first 3 months Lumumba carried out the first three points: 1. Organize mutiny in the army; 2. put the blame on the Belgians; 3. organize a terrorist regime.

The resentment of the Soviets against the death of Lumumba reveals their disappointment in not taking over the Congo. (The Soviets could astonish the world by telling their part in his death. Remember, Lumumba failed them.) But the Soviets have a substitute for Lumumba in Gizenga, the Communist dictator in Stanleyville who was educated in Moscow and Prague. Others are Kashauka, who visited Peiping, and Dayal who works under Communist orders.

The Communists have planted two advisers in Washington, both of whom were thrown out of Lovanium University in the Congo for their Communist activities.

Seventy percent of Leopoldville's population are unemployed. Communists have introduced moral degeneration to the youth of the city. Some 90 percent of the boys smoke hemp; immorality is encouraged; attendance at mass has declined to 10 percent of the men, 7 percent of the women.

Missionaries have been persecuted beyond description—priests mutilated, nuns tortured and ravished. Next week we will give you the full story of this religious persecution.

Hill-Burton Program Helping With Texas Hospital Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, all of us are keenly aware that one of the most important legislative issues before the Congress at this time is the President's sound proposal on health and hospital care for the aged.

For this reason, I think it is especially appropriate, while we are considering Federal action in this field, that we not only consider what needs to be done, but also what has been done.

I would like to call the attention of the Senate to the Hill-Burton Act, which has proven of tremendous national benefit to millions of Americans by helping provide for construction of needed hospital facilities.

If the Congress had not acted to extend financial assistance for hospital construction in areas of greatest need, the problem before us today would be even much more serious then it is.

So to those individuals and organizations which so strongly oppose President Kennedy's health care for the aged proposals on the basis that the Federal Government should leave the problem's solution up to the individual, or the local or State government, I say look at the success of the Hill-Burton program. It is a soumd example of Federal and State and local government cooperation to meet the needs of the people all levels of government serve.

Mr. President, recently Mr. Charles O. Bettinger wrote an excellent article on the Hill-Burton program for the March 1961 issue of the Texas Business Review. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled, "Hill-Burton Program Spurs Hospital Construction," by Mr. Bettinger.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HILL-BURTON PROGRAM SPURS HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION

(By Charles O. Bettinger)

The construction of new hospital accommodations did not keep pace with the growing populace and post World War II Texans and citizens of other States found themselves in dire need of additional medical facilities. Acting to remedy this situation, the Congress of the United States passed the Hill-Burton Act. The act was adopted as a measure to provide Federal assistance to those areas with the greatest need for supplementary hospitalization. Construction in Texas of more than $250 million in additional facilities under this plan alone is completed, under construction, or in the planning stages.

Although the maximum limit of Federal participation was set at 50 percent, the large number of applications requesting a portion of the Federal allocation to Texas forced the Government's share of expenditures down to only 34 percent since the institution of the program. However, some projects are still able to secure the maximum subsidy, depending upon the needs of the area and the type of hospitalization that is being considered.

Laurels must also go to the state department of health in Texas for a speedy job in developing the Texas plan which was necessary before Texas could get any allocation of Federal money. On the basis of surveys of existing medical care and equipment available, the Texas plan set forth all the requirements necessary to participate, established priority areas on the basis of needed facilities, and set all other regulations necessary for the smooth, nonpolitical operation of the Hill-Burton program under the direction of that State agency. In addition, this agency has administered and directed the activities of the program for almost 15 years at a cost which is now less than 1 percent of the total funds allocated. When the extensive supervision necessary for the proper operation of this program is taken into account, these administrative costs are indeed low.

Due to the strict construction requirements set forth in the Texas plan of the Hill-Burton program, Texas hospitals have also pushed the standards of their accommodations up to a peak in 1960. The state department of health has set specifications to control the sanitary aspects of the hospitals falling under this subsidy. The ventilation

system is one such example, and it must meet rigid requirements. For instance, the same air must not be circulated into the maternity ward and then into surgery.

Although this program has nothing to do with the operation of the hospital after it is opened, several administrative policies assist in getting the hospital off to a good start. The excellent sanitary precautions are but one of the minimum standards set up in the Texas plan. Other Board decisions as to the original allocation directly affect the working policies of the new hospital. For instance, two organizations with the same basic priority may not have an equal chance of getting an allocation if one group has included training facilities to help in staffing the new unit. The administration, therefore, can recognize good planning and amply reward that group with the allocation. Usually, however, the Federal funds available are distributed to as many applicants as possible thus lowering the percentage participation that is represented by the Government and encouraging much more construction.

Excluded under this act are private hospitals established for profit reasons. Also, until an amendment of the original law which made it possible for groups to borrow money and repay it to the Government, several organizations refused to accept Hill-Burton money because of certain moral objections to this use of Government money. However, some of these objections have been overcome with the amendment since the amount of assistance may be issued in the form of a loan rather than a subsidy. Certain other hospitals will not participate in the program due to the high standards and restrictions of the Texas plan. Others may go ahead and build a hospital unit without Federal assistance due to the low priority rating of the area where they are building.

Costs of hospital construction have continually risen until the average construction cost per bed in Texas is from $17,000 to $19,000. This figure represents the total costs of all equipment, designing, and other costs of the project. While this figure seems high, a comparison shows that Texas is one of the lowest States in the United States. As an example, it is not exceptional to find the cost per bed in California as high as $35,000. Another method of expressing relative costs is by the square foot which fall between $22 and $25 in Texas. Comparison with other States illustrate the fact that Texans are getting a bargain in hospital construction.

On the above map (not printed in RECORD), the density of projects by total cost is shown for projects constructed or planned under the Hill-Burton program. Houston and Harris County led in the dollar value of these projects with a total construction of over $37 million since the institution of the program. Other counties with over $10 million were Dallas, Tarrant, El Paso, Galveston, Nueces, Travis, and Bexar. This construction and future construction give each community a great stimulus to the industrial trade in the area. Other than the labor used to construct a hospital, the specialized nature of hospital construction requires tremendous quantities of plumbing equipment, ventilation supplies, and wall and floor finishes that can be cleaned and scrubbed easily. Supplying unusual building design features and special equipment can be especially beneficial to local dealers in the area of construction.

Two types of funds are available for the construction of new hospitals. The largest allocation goes to general hospitals or public health centers, and the funds thus allocated are called C-funds. The remaining classification consists of institutions such as diagnostic, rehabilitation, nursing, and chronic illness centers and receive G-funds. In 1960, G-funds accounted for 97 percent of construction under this program.

Some mention has been made of priority areas based on the need and the population in those areas. The first step in assigning classifications to these areas was to get a complete census of the facilities available all over the State. This count was expressed in the number of beds available. The second step was to determine the need of the areas expressed in comparable terms. This was accomplished by assigning an established number of beds needed for each 1,000 persons depending on density of population of the area, such as rural or metropolitan. Then the number of beds available is compared to the number needed, and that percent determines the priority classification of the area. There are four classifications ranging from A to D, with the A grouping having the range of 0 to 40 percent of available beds to needed beds. The D group with minimum priority ranges from 80 to 100 percent.

Estimated value of building authorized

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

Classification	January 1961	December 1960	January 1960	Percent change: January 1961 from December 1960	Percent change: January 1961 from January 1960
All permits	$103,200	$94,220	$95,057	+10	+9
New construction	92,436	84,740	85,120	+9	+9
Residential (housekeeping)	48,572	35,788	55,073	+36	−12
1-family dwellings	43,088	32,037	51,168	+34	−16
Multiple-family dwellings	5,484	3,751	3,905	+46	+40
Nonresidential buildings	43,864	48,952	30,047	−10	+46
Nonhousekeeping buildings (residential)	2,788	3,451	1,327	−10	−19
Amusement buildings	360	37	183	+873	+97
Churches	1,319	1,851	3,056	−29	−57
Industrial buildings	2,624	1,851	3,056	−29	−57
Garages (commercial and private)	445	208	310	+114	+44
Service stations	659	648	982	+2	−33
Hospitals and other institutions	13,171	834	1,096	+1,479	+1,102
Office-bank buildings	3,918	8,643	2,391	−55	+64
Works and utilities	2,390	6,339	2,130	−62	+12
Educational buildings	8,037	12,835	8,262	−37	−3
Stores and mercantile buildings	6,355	8,041	6,798	−21	−7
Other buildings and structures	1,799	856	8,840	+110	+114
Additions, alterations, and repairs	10,764	9,480	9,937	+14	+8

Source: Bureau of Business Research in cooperation with the Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce.

Leading the Hill-Burton projects in size in the calendar year of 1960 were the Scott and White Memorial Hospital in Temple, Tex., total $7,675,000, and the Galveston County Memorial Hospital with a value of $4 million. These two units alone were responsible for adding a total of 480 beds, which greatly alter the previous classifications of the areas involved. Total cost of hospitals receiving allocations in 1960 totaled $26,385,045 with the Government share of this bill amounting to $9,277,045, or 35 percent. Due to a 2-year limit on the allocations, work must be started on most of these projects in 1961.

Actual construction work started on hospital projects in 1960 is best evidenced by the number of authorizations to build during the year. Total authorizations amounted to over $37 million in 1960. This represented an impressive 56 percent increase from the previous year. January 1961 permits authorized exceeded $13 million to start the new year with a total which was more than one-third of all 1960 permits. Therefore, with just 2 more months like January, the 1960 total will be passed. With this rate of growth, Texas should soon catch up with its hospital needs.

While the Hill-Burton program has largely been responsible for much of the stimulated growth, hospital construction has progressed equally in other categories such as proprietary hospitals which numbered 219 of the total 556 listed by the American Hospital Association in 1959. Federal hospital care has also increased substantially in VA hospitals and on military bases since World War II.

Texans appear determined to use both the Federal program and private enterprise to meet the requirements of this State. With the spectacular start in 1961, this year may set a record for some time to come. Many of the 1960 Hill-Burton allocations will carry over into 1961. Long-range projections do not indicate a major slowdown of activity but, instead, show continued increases in Federal spending in this area. This should prove especially true if the liberal Democrats in Congress can get their proposed plan for Federal medical care for the aged passed. These plans make Federal money available through the social security tax for medical care of elderly people.

To sum up, hospital construction prospects in Texas are good. Another record-breaking year as well as excellent long-range prospects in this area of construction can be forecast.

Hill-Burton project allocations in Texas

[In thousands of dollars]

Fiscal year ending June 30—	C funds	G funds	Total allocations
1948	$4,828	0	$4,828
1949	4,864	0	4,864
1950	9,492	0	9,492
1951	5,359	0	5,359
1952	5,011	0	5,011
1953	4,641	0	4,641
1954	3,827	0	3,827
1955	4,476	$934	5,410
1956	5,437	962	6,399
1957	6,302	911	7,213
1958	6,140	935	7,075
1959	9,409	1,970	11,379
1960 [1]	8,962	229	9,191
Total	78,749	----------	84,691

[1] Allocation of 1960 Federal quota is not complete due to the 2-year life of the funds available.

Source: Texas State Department of Health, Division of Hospital Services.

Award to Miss Mary Lindsey Hoffler, of the Cradock High School, Portsmouth, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD remarks made by Miss Mary Lindsey Hoffler, of the Cradock High School, Portsmouth, Va., at ceremonies held at Augusta, Maine, in connection with the presentation of the National Bellamy Award to Cony High School.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISS MARY LINDSEY HOFFLER, SENIOR SCA REPRESENTATIVE, CRADOCK HIGH SCHOOL, PORTSMOUTH, VA.

DAVID ELVIN. Next we have Miss Mary Lindsey Hoffler, senior SCA representative at the Cradock High School, Portsmouth, Va. Her school received the second Bellamy award for the State of Virginia. Mary Lindsey is a member of the National Honor Society, is State vice president of the Student Virginia Education Association; was one of eight Virginia delegates to the White House Conference on Children and Youth, in Washington, D.C., in the spring; and this past summer was awarded the gold key for outstanding scholastic achievement at the National High School Institute, Northwestern University.

MARY LINDSEY HOFFLER. When you hear the letters C-H-S what do you think of? Cony High School—the building, the students, the fun? This morning I would like to tell you a little about my C-H-S—Cradock High School. These letters mean a great deal to me. The C stands for community, the H for school and State history, and the S the student body and its spirit.

Our school spirit has been created by students and teachers alike. Some schools only express themselves on the cheering line as they shout athletic teams on to victory. Our enthusiasm for all projects, through the full cooperation of student and teacher alike, brings the ultimate reward. Our teachers work tremendously hard to bring out and display the talents of all Cradock's students. Our vocational and work programs have in past years captured almost every State honor, our dramatics, future teachers, and SCA are known throughout Virginia.

Cradock is a nautical school in name and theme. We were named for Sir Christopher Cradock, an admiral in the British Navy during World War I, my community was originally a housing project for war workers. Cradock proper is laid out in the form of an anchor with the main streets forming the shaft, stock, and arms. The nautical theme was further carried out in the naming of its streets for such famous naval men as Farragut and John Paul Jones.

Therefore, it is not surprising that our school newspaper should be called the "Shipmate," our literary magazine, the "Log"; our yearbook, the "Admiral"; and our student handbook, the "Quartermaster." Our yearbook cover carries the admiral's stripes and stars, Cradock's own special stars and stripes.

You are all familiar with Virginia's history because it involved the beginning of our Nation. I understand that an exploring party of Englishmen sailed up to the site of Augusta in 1607. The date of the first permanent English settlement in Jamestown, Va., as you know, is 1607. Before coming here I was told that if I mentioned Jamestown, I had better stress the word permanent so as not to be confused with your own historical first.

Virginia, called "Mother of Presidents"—and rightly so because she has given birth to six "first men" of the Nation. Cradock High School has also earned this title. This year our students have held the offices of four presidencies in the State. We are mighty proud of our distributive education, diversified occupation, Future Teachers of America, and Student Cooperative Association State presidents.

The schools represented here today differ in many ways. We come from different parts of the country; the enrollment of the schools may be unusually large or small; the school buildings may be very old or comparatively new; and the students speak with different accents and inflections; but we have all been drawn together by one great occasion—the National Bellamy Award. I am glad to say: Cony High School—welcome to our Bellamy Award family.

David, I would like to present a copy of our 1960 yearbook, the "Admiral," for your school library from our student council, and as a permanent record of one of your proud sister schools.

Edward P. Halline of the Milwaukee Sentinel Tells Why America Must Triumph Over Tyrants Over the Human Spirit, Whether From Left or Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the man from Mars, landing on our shores, must think we have all gone "wacky." We are the inheritors of Leonardo and Shakespeare, Tolstoy and Beethoven, yet the art forms which seem to engross our people at the moment are a movie called "Operation Abolition" and a book called "The Politician" by the founder of the John Birch Society. America is better than this, and it is time we began to realize it.

Most welcome, therefore, is the astringent advice from the talented and honest dramatic critic of the Milwaukee Sentinel, Edward P. Halline, from last Sunday's edition:

A DIFFERENT APPROACH—FREE, BOLD MEN BRING LIGHT INTO DARK WORLD

(By Edward P. Halline)

The lights of civilization, dimmed during the Hitler onslaught and then darkened by the chilling fear spread by the coldblooded Communist empire, have gone on again in the Western World.

Men's minds are not in chains. Free enterprise is comparatively free for the necessary but uneasy cooperation between Government and private industry in the United States. A bold and fearless young President gives us new hope for stopping the Communist tide. His leadership in the world transcends politics, bitter quarrel over domestic policies, and the wait and see attitude of those who have not yet caught the spirit of confidence.

In Milwaukee, as in other great cities, practically all segments of our politico-economic body are cooperating in the rebuilding and reinvigoration of the city which has lived on praises for good government, law, and order and the scent of a fabled gemuetlichkeit. The lights are on aagin in Milwaukee. Great plans are being made for the future, and dreams are becoming realities.

The long needed Music Hall-Theater is just ahead. The few years before it is built are but weeks in this Rip Van Winkle of metropolitan cities.

The intensifying interest in music and theater is a sign of the ferment which needs but unity and organization to reach a new level. The press is free, debates over national policy are protected from the agents of a police state.

Always the potential foe of tyranny, the theater is widening the horizons of free men and exerting its right of inquiry, into our still imperfect civilization and culture. Culture implies growth and it cannot grow in darkened worlds. Great music, is stirring the hearts and bringing a greater glow to the spirit abroad in the land as never before.

Bach, Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, and Wagner are for freemen though Haydn and some of the other composers had to make private adjustments with their patron's antiquated beliefs and foibles, such as Haydn made with the demands of the Esterhazy family. When Haydn was free of them, he wrote his greatest music, notably the 12 last symphonies composed for enthusiastic British audiences.

Except in Soviet Russia where Communists have found a way to fetter their greatest composers, Western music stays free.

Is ours then the sick society, bloodless and decaying as the Communists and present day Fascists and their fellow Fascist travelers would have us believe? And who is sick? Francois Mauriac, the celebrated French writer who has discussed the problem of literary creation as seen in the light of a Catholic faith, said:

"I belong to a generation which believes in man and in Him of whom man is the unchallengeable witness."

"Freedom, not capitalism or communism, is the supreme issue in the world today. Yet the world is divided on what it means," says the Saturday Review. "To the underprivileged peoples—the majority of mankind—it means escape from tyranny or exploitation. But this is only its negative aspect. For the nations that have won their way to freedom, it is also responsibility, economic and social justice, and political security, discipline as well as a privilege."

But the weepers and wailers and the gnashers of extreme right-wing teeth continue their lamentations over the sickness of American civilization today and their own nostalgia for some remote era when the mob, that's you and I, groveled under the patriarchal lash of the oligarchs. These oligarchs, presumably men of means such as Texas oil billionaires and a few generals, would cure this Nation with the disciplinary measures of an army in war. Their captive intellectuals, voices of despair, keep in step. Their great foe is communism and they would turn this democratic Republic into a quasi-Communist police state in order to fight the enemy. They are like the Communists in methods, and in believing that the ends justify the means, that a vigilante society operated by lynch law from kangaroo courts is the way to crush freedom and dissent.

They would destroy the American Constitution in promising to save it from its foes.

Hitler, using the same terroristic methods in Germany, won the support of big industrialists and a good proportion of the masses by promising to save the nation from the Communists and the Jews.

The result was the Nazis got control and proceeded to enslave not only the people but the very industries they were supposedly saving. Communists propose to rescue the masses from slavery by seizing industry.

So it was complete government control in both countries, just a matter of which form of tyranny helped you more than the other.

Both groups wore masks of respectability in the communities. The current American neo-Nazis are utterly respectable, have influence in American politics and are extensively admired as strong men dedicated to preservation of American institutions, so they say. Most of the present day American Communists on exhibition are a seedy lot, but when the revolution comes they will have to step aside for the now respectable butchers from the Kremlin.

The neo-Nazis and the Communists are so much alike in their belief in an authoritarian state that it is not difficult at all for an avowed American Communist of the 1930's to recant and come up as a pillar of orthodoxy preaching ostensibly against communism but more against moderate conservatives and moderate liberals who dominate American politics today. It is easy to transfer their allegiance from one tyrant to another.

Even former President Eisenhower is denounced as a Communist stooge and a traitor to America. What they think of others slightly to the left of Eisenhower can well be imagined. And, of course, they would impeach Chief Justice Earl Warren because of the Supreme Court decision ordering integration. Naturally, they get the support of the diehard southern Senators who longed for the last century when Negroes were serfs, not even citizens but menials and happy in their lots until they got educated and uppity.

Robert Elliot Fitch, dean of California's Pacific School of Religion at Berkeley, has written a book, "Odyssey of the Self-Centered Self." Dr. Fitch was originally a Presbyterian, then a Congregationalist, an atheist, and a Socialist who supported Norman Thomas in 1932. Like others, he recanted and made the complete turnabout to the new orthodoxy. So his switch is not a surprise.

Dr. Fitch concentrates more on religion and psychology and perhaps does not seek to repeal every advance in the 20th century. But, as quoted in Time magazine, he is against atheism, agnosticism, romanticism, rationalism, humanism, positivism, extentialism, and cubism. He inveighs against such diverse men as the famous Rousseau, Schopenhauer, Walt Whitman, Kinsey, Adlai Stevenson, Aldous Huxley, Jack Parr, Caryl Chessman, Boris Pasternak, Charles Van Doren, Tennessee Williams, Francoise Sagan, Archibald MacLeish, Samuel Beckett, and James F. Powers. This is a typical bracketing by neo-Fascist minds.

They worship the false god of self, says Fitch. Man began with God, the only true faith, and finally wound up with the self. The self as deity pursued power as Faust did and pleasure as Don Juan did. The self is sick, says Fitch, looking through a small chink of his secure castle of orthodoxy to see a world which is poisoning itself with the venomous fumes of moral and mental bankruptcy.

Dr. Fitch, of course, surveys gloomily the hijinks and Bacchanalian revels of 20th-century man. He seems to have forgotten that he was a teenager once himself and that these outbursts of despair, of letting the morrow bring what it will of moral and mental anarchy itself, are encountered periodically throughout history.

And what is the world which Dr. Fitch does not see? We have been through two World Wars, a great depression, a frustrated Korean war and a cold war which may run to the end of the century. We are literally living under the gun as the Europeans have for centuries. Annihilation can be only a few minutes away. Yet Americans as a whole are taking it in their stride. They have bigger families despite imminent catastrophe. They are building more schools and sending through high school and college more children than ever. More and more are going to churches, more and more are searching for God. It is an explosive age where the sciences and technologies are fortunately outstripping the comprehension of most people.

All over the country the interest in good music has multiplied. People go to concerts to listen and not just to be seen there. The Metropolitan Opera, once the exhibitionistic ground for society, belongs to opera lovers who listen by the millions to its radio broadcasts. The sale of good records, complete operas, and symphonies of such towering masterpieces as Bach's "B Minor Mass" and the "Matthew Passion," is far above the puny driblets manufactured for a small audience of esthetes 30 and 40 years ago. Does that show sickness, Dr. Fitch?

The theater is free to pursue its inquiries into the relationship between God and man. We have seen Archibald MacLeish's "J.B.," a modern version of the great debate in the book of Job; Jean Anouilh's "The Lark," the story of Joan, as intensely moving as Shaw's "St. Joan," and this same French playwright's "Beckett," a vivid dramatization of the age-old struggle for power between the church and young ambitious kings like Henry II of England. We have seen Frederick Duerrenmett's "The Visit," where a whole community decays, and Tennessee Williams' plays about the dark miasmatic swamps where men and women decay. Duerenmett and Williams are not writers of shockers nor are they contributing to delinquency. They are scourges of God.

Who is sick? The answer is easy. Dr. Fitch and his phony prophets should get out of the light if they can't stand it and crawl back into their fever-stricken beds.

People-to-People Medical Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HIRAM L. FONG

OF HAWAII

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I invite the attention of my colleagues in the Senate to the observations of Dr. Mary A. Glover of Kailua, Hawaii, who recently served on the steamship *Hope I*.

The SS *Hope I* is a medical mercy ship transporting volunteer medical personnel to ports in the Far East and southeast Asia for the purpose of rendering medical assistance to the people there. It is a project of the People-to-People Health Foundation, Inc., and significantly, the letters H-O-P-E stands for health opportunity for people everywhere.

Through the work of the SS *Hope I*, a program of people-to-people diplomacy is effected. It demonstrates the American people's willingness to share their resources when and where needed.

Dr. Glover has written of her experiences and observations for the daily newspaper, the Honolulu Advertiser of March 12. I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Glover's news article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Honolulu, Hawaii, Advertiser, Mar. 12, 1961]

ISLE MEDIC FINDS "HOPE" EXIT HARD

(By Dr. Mary A. Glover)

(Dr. Mary A. Glover of Kailua returned last month from 4 months aboard the medical ship *Hope*, while it visited Indonesia to care for patients and teach new methods to local medical people. Project Hope is financed by gifts of the American people. In this story, Dr. Glover sums up her impressions of the time she served aboard the ship.)

After my experience on this project, for which I thank my patients, Dr. Dixie Soo, and the many of you who have contributed money and written encouraging letters, I will never be the same again.

I guess this is inevitable. Reading or hearing about life in a less privileged country cannot begin to give one a concept of what those hardships are like.

You have to see the patient faces of men and women with goiters so big they can hardly turn their heads. You have to walk up the dusty, worn trail with its betel nut and tuberculosis-spit stains.

You have to watch the stoop and then the straightening of the shoulders of the barefoot betjak driver when he sees that the price of rice in Djakarta has doubled in the past 8 months but his income is the same, with no way he can see to increase it.

You have to run your finger over the smooth surface of the beautiful wood carvings a white-haired craftsman has produced.

Singing alternate Indonesian and American songs in the back of a dusty pickup truck; trying to ignore the heavy ache of your muscles when you have slept 4 hours in 36, and are trying to start a transfusion on a desperately ill patient; surreptitiously watching the face of a young Indonesian nurse as she samples a bowl of poi and then eats it all.

These are very different pictures in very different moods, but they add up to something that brings a lump to the throat and sometimes a few tears to the eyes.

It was difficult to leave. I had the feeling that in many ways I was departing at the time when I could contribute the most.

It always seems to take a while to develop trust, respect, and friendships. This period had elapsed, and we and our Indonesian staff members were known quantities to each other.

Through the hours when all of us applied the best of our knowledge and ability to relieve suffering and save lives of other human beings, we saw in each other qualities we like and admire.

Indonesia is ideally suited to mutual projects for peace which have a well-equipped ship as a base. Communications and transportation are two of this country's major problems.

Naturally, in a pilot project, there is much that one learns and would do differently a next time.

For example, we felt that we had too brief a stay in some ports; we would have liked to follow the patients just a little longer after starting treatment.

In the three medical school ports we visited, several of us general practitioners began to realize that we might be of most help if we worked in the outlying hospitals and dispensaries rather than in the city hospital "polykliniks" where more doctors were available.

A large portion of the medical care in the outlying areas necessarily must be carried

out by only partially trained personnel, as one doctor cannot care for all the illnesses of 60,000 people. We can contribute greatly by teaching these nondoctors.

Although I am now back in Hawaii, the SS *Hope* is still in Indonesia, between Ambon and Kupang, Timor. On it are the 65 American medical staff members, approximately 35 Indonesian medical staff members, and 135 American crew.

They are providing proof that the "people to people" feeling of concern is not dependent upon politics or geography or race.

They can continue because enough of us in the United States believe that this is the firmest foundation for world peace, and are sending some of our money to prove it.

The address, by the way, is Hope, Post Office Box 9808, Washington, D.C.

The Great Tourist Bill Hoax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, for well over 14 years it has been my privilege to carry the responsibility for presenting and explaining to the House most of the legislation dealing with immigration problems.

I believe it is my duty now to advise the House that we may have to deal soon with legislation vitally affecting immigration and, in a broader context, bearing on vital national interests.

I have in mind the bill, S. 610, which passed the other body and is now pending before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, a bill purporting to promote tourist travel to the United States.

In my opinion, this legislation, if stripped of its verbiage, represents simply an attempt to have the Federal Treasury finance advertising and promotional activities of private transportation business, mostly the shipping lines and airlines.

In the Sunday magazine section of the New York Times of April 16, 1961, there appeared an article adorned with the name of the distinguished senior Senator from the State of Washington. Having read the article carefully and being fully aware of the Senator's sincerity as well as of his exceptional ability to express his views with clarity, precision, and ever-present realization of facts, I am inclined to believe that the article attributed to him has actually originated on Madison Avenue in New York City, rather than in the Senate Office Building.

I do not intend to contribute at this time to the amusement of the House by quoting the characteristic Madison Avenue "punch line" of the article, its opening paragraph, in which it is stated that Christopher Columbus would have been denied a tourist visa to the United States because he was born in Italy, was an indigent, and—believe-it-or-not—insane, says the article entitled "Columbus Couldn't Get a Visa."

The basic premise of this splendid example of promotional prose is the alleged fact that a foreign tourist who wishes to visit the United States is faced with insurmountable difficulties.

What are the facts?

According to the annual report of the Attorney General of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, there occurred a total number of 68.5 million—exactly 685,563,571—entries across the borders of the United States in that year. This number of entries includes U.S. citizens and aliens, immigrants and nonimmigrants, border crossers, seamen and airmen, and it includes, of course, multiple entries made by the same person.

However, excluding entries made by all seamen and airmen; excluding entries made by our neighbors coming from Canada and Mexico; excluding returning residents and foreign students returning to their studies; excluding persons entering without documents, the total number of entries was 1,406,134. Of this number 1,140,736 aliens entered the United States as nonimmigrants. Of this number 108,130 were visitors for business, while 671,075 were visitors for pleasure, or tourists. Exactly the type of tourists with which the Columbian article concerns itself.

According to the Attorney's General report, the number of visitors for pleasure, or tourists, is increasing year by year. Looking back over the last 5 years, this country played host to 399,704 tourists in 1956; 453,514 in 1957; 514,599 in 1958; 597,982 in 1959; and, as I said, 671,075 tourists in 1960. In addition to that, we had in 1960, 32,569 foreign government officials entering the United States; 119,291 alien travelers passing in transit; 35,415 students entering for the first time and a steadily increasing number of exchange visitors—25,233 in 1960—industrial trainees, temporary workers in the highly skilled category, and so forth.

I believe it would be safe to assume that somehow even Christopher Columbus could have squeezed himself into this flow of tourists.

If the difficulties in obtaining temporary visas were even partially as prohibitive as described by the Madison Avenue drum beaters mobilized by the shipping interests to press for the enactment of S. 610, it would hardly be possible to have those visas issued around the world at a steady pace of over 2,000 visitors' visas every day of the year.

But this is not all. The article attributed to the Senator from Washington goes on to stress further difficulties encountered by foreigners who desire to pay us a visit. This, according to the article, is a second wall erected around the United States by our immigration officers who are just mercilessly excluding visitors displaying a valid visa stamped into their passports. Let us have a look at this exclusion wall.

Out of 1,406,134 aliens entering the United States in 1960, 411 persons were excluded at the ports of entry. Is not that a terrifying proportion? Of the 411, only 53 came from Europe and only 7 from Asia, while 12 came from South America. One hundred and forty-two of those excluded attempted to enter from Cuba, 96 from Mexico, and 42 from Canada.

I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that I have to dwell further on the veracity of the article. Let me turn, however, to the administrative operations of our consulates.

The New York Times conducted, just a short while ago, a worldwide survey of the visa issuance operations. I wish to include at this point the reports carried by that newspaper in its issue of March 5, 1961:

FRENCHMEN ARE PLEASED

PARIS, March 4.—The U.S. consulate here is now able to issue nonimmigrant visas to French applicants in 30 minutes instead of the 8 to 10 days it used to take.

John R. Diggins, Jr., in charge of the visa section, described the new approach as follows:

"In the old days our system was geared to screening the 2 percent we didn't want. Now we're concentrating on making things as easy and pleasant as possible for the 98 percent who are welcome."

The French applicant simply turns over his passport and waits in a comfortable chair in the waiting room while the staff and the latest in electronic machines quickly process the application.

Before the visa is issued the tourist is interviewed for about 5 minutes on possible Communist affiliation, contagious diseases, and length of residence in France.

The officials in charge of interviewing applicants lean over backward to pose these questions in the least embarrassing way possible. They report that very few French tourists are disturbed by the questions.

LONDONERS GET QUICK ACTION

LONDON, March 4.—Consular officials at the U.S. Embassy in Grosvenor Square today began asking applicants for nonimmigrant visas only four simple questions.

The new short form is a further refinement of the simple visa procedure that has been in effect for more than a year at American consulates in Britain.

Its additional abbreviation was spurred by a directive received this week from the State Department that said, in effect: Make it as easy as possible to get a visa and still comply with the basic requirements of the law.

In the nonimmigrant (tourist and businessman) section of the consulate this afternoon there was a steady flow of applicants through the comfortably appointed waiting room in the new Embassy building.

It took only 10 to 20 minutes for each applicant to obtain a visa, provided he had proper photographs, a valid passport, and some sort of informal statement indicating that he intended to return to Britain after his visit.

It took Mr. and Mrs. E. G. Brooks, of Eastbourne, about 20 minutes to get their combined tourist and business visas.

The four questions asked were:

Does the applicant suffer from mental illness or a serious contagious disease; has he had a serious criminal conviction; has he ever been deported from the United States; is he a member or an affiliate of a Communist organization?

SWISS GET QUICK VISAS

GENEVA, March 4.—The receipt of instructions to simplify visa formalities and the speed with which Mme. Edouard Wurmser got her visa were a pure coincidence.

"My husband and I obtained our first visa a year ago and we have nothing but praise for the prompt and courteous service we

received at the U.S. consulate," Mme. Edouard Wurmser said.

"We found the questions we were asked to be a little unusual, but there was nothing objectionable about them," she said.

Consular officials here say they have been issuing visas without any delays for Swiss. Local travel agents confirmed that the processing had been rapid for several years.

Irish Find It Easy

DUBLIN, March 4.—This must be one of the most pleasant cities in Europe in which to obtain a tourist visa for the United States.

That was the impression formed after spending some time sitting among tourist applicants at the U.S. Embassy in Merrion Square.

Both the consul in charge and his secretary dealt with each applicant in helpful and friendly manner. No embarrassing questions were asked and, in fact, it was learned that only two applicants had been refused visas in the last 2 years. Those were for health reasons.

There has been no change in the procedure since President Kennedy assumed office. But the whole atmosphere of the visa section has become more relaxed and friendly without short-circuiting State Department regulations. Twelve hundred tourist visas were issued last year, compared with 900 in 1959.

German Tourist Surprised

BONN, GERMANY, March 4.—A would-be West German tourist in the United States consulate here today said:

"If I had known before that all I had to do was to fill out this little thing, I'd have applied for a visa long ago."

The "little thing" he referred to, the size of a playing card, was an application form asking for name, address, profession, date and place of birth, nationality, ethnic origin, marital status and passport details. The applicant had heard he would have to fill out a lengthy questionnaire.

This is a thing of the past, according to American consular officials here. It was used in what are described as "emergency cases," where the consular officer could not satisfy himself of the nature of the applicant's visit. But on March 1 all copies of the questionnaire were burned, consular officials said.

For a number of reasons, Bonn is not a typical visa office in West Germany. This is a comparatively small town and nearly everyone wanting to go to the United States is known to the Embassy. The average number of visa applications has been 100 monthly. The processing has been swift and competent.

Identity Cards in Belgium

BRUSSELS, BELGIUM, March 3.—Getting an American visa became easier for Belgians on February 13 when the State Department ruled that they could present identity cards in place of passports.

All Belgians are obliged to carry identity cards but not many every take the trouble to get passports.

This change of procedure, which seems to have been in the works for some time but which occurred soon after President Kennedy showed an interest in tourist travel from Europe, has impressed transport men. A typical comment was that of Robert H. Jerosch, director of Pan American World Airways in Belgium.

"This change in regulations is helpful to tourists," he said. "But I hear comments to the effect that Belgians think there is still too much redtape about traveling to the United States. As they put it: 'We let Americans come here without a visa so why shouldn't they let us visit them on the same basis?' "

The procedure for obtaining a visa takes about a half hour.

Usually the questions asked of an applicant are those on form FS 257, which are about the same as those asked on an automobile license application.

Form Dropped in Oslo

OSLO, NORWAY, March 4.—The consul here, Karl Ackerman, said that the order would have little practical effect here as it had been necessary to make only sparing use of the forms in granting visas to Norwegians. But he termed it the first concrete step by the Kennedy administration to speed the process.

The consul said that the applicant was required to read through a statement listing criminals, prostitutes, those affiliated with Communist organizations and the like as ineligible to receive visas. The applicant is then asked whether he is eligible, and his reply is under oath.

Greeks Are Special Problem

ATHENS, March 4.—The Greek immigration quota to the United States is limited to 308 persons yearly.

Owing to Greek population pressures and the fact that almost every Greek family has a member in the United States, more than 100,000 applications for emigration are on file. The result is that many Greeks try to obtain tourist visas and hope for a later change in status after arriving in the United States.

Well-known businessmen and convincingly bona fide tourists have been able to get a tourist visa within 24 hours or less. The average lag for other applicants is about 2 months.

Joseph B. Costanzo, U.S. Consul General here, said:

"We have to be most careful with tourist visas and establish beyond a doubt that the applicant has no reason whatever to abandon Greece."

He said that about 11,000 persons called at his office each month—twice as many as 5 years ago.

Visas Issued in an Hour

MEXICO CITY, March 4.—Even with the substitution of the short form, there is some opinion here whether the process has improved.

Under the long form a series of questions was posed calling for a "yes" or "no" answer. The questions were based on law 212a listing the restrictions for issuance of non-immigration visas.

This law specifies that persons are not eligible for such visas if they have been treated for instanity, have been narcotic addicts, have engaged in prostitution, vagrancy or a number of other things. Finally it was asked in the long form whether the applicant had ever belonged to a Communist organization.

If any of these questions had to be answered in the affirmative, it would require that the applicant bring the details to the attention of the visa official.

Now it is the responsibility of the examining consulate officials to decide whether the questions based on the law, which remains valid, should be asked verbally.

No oath in the issuance of nonimmigration visas has been necessary for more than a year.

Brazilians Must Give Color

RIO DE JANIERO, March 4.—The stress has been switched from security to public relations in granting visas to Brazilians, U.S. consular officials said today.

In Brazil, the question as to ethnic class usually has been answered as Latin and race as white or black. In Brazil anyone half white is classed as white.

Rio's Jornal do Commercio on February 7, published a story by its traveling correspondent, J. Barros de Morias, which said: "One of the things which cause a magnificent impression on a Brazilian traveling to the United States today is the readiness with which American consuls attend Brazilian nationals, thus disproving hostile propaganda spread by elements interested in creating unfriendly atmosphere for the sons of Uncle Sam.

"Naturally, any great nation has an obligation to prevent the entry of dangerous elements to its territory."

No Recent Change in Toyko

TOKYO, March 4.—The visa situation here has improved since formalities for obtaining visas were instituted last fall.

Before, it took at least 1 month for Japanese applicants to obtain U.S. visas. Local applicants can now get their visas in a week to 10 days. In some cases, visas have been granted in 2 days.

All of more than 10 applicants who were interviewed at the U.S. consulate here said that it was easier to get U.S. visas than they had been told by their friends who had gone through the formalities.

Goro Hasegawa, a business executive in Tokyo, said:

"A marked improvement has been made since I applied for my first American visa about 2 years ago. I have never been asked any embarrassing questions."

The elimination of oathtaking in obtaining a visa has been welcomed. Local applicants were not familiar with that custom.

Currency restrictions are still a major factor responsible for holding down the flow of Japanese tourists to the United States.

No changes have been made in procedure since January 20, so far as Japanese applicants are concerned.

Mr. Speaker, could the process of visa issuance to visitors be further simplified?

Having reviewed the regulations promulgated by the Department of State and personally observed the operations abroad, I do not believe that much could be further improved in a situation where a nonimmigrant visa to the United States is issued in 30 minutes flat, authorizing the holder to enter the United States an unlimited number of times within 4 years without practically anyone taking an additional look at him. Similarly, I do not believe that the application form establishing the visitor's identity and nationality on a card, size 2½ inches by 5 inches, could shrink much further.

Could visas for tourists be abolished altogether?

Certainly not, considering the fact that as of January 25, 1961, there was a worldwide total of almost 1 million—966,675—aliens who by registering at an American consulate have taken the affirmative step to indicate their desire to come to the United States and remain in this country permanently. Of this number, 253,183 are registered for immigration in Italy; 100,022 in Greece; 71,057 in Poland; 38,891 in Portugal; 135,630 in Yugoslavia; 23,433 in Jamaica; 14,833 in Spain, and so forth.

Considering this constant pressure upon our immigration quotas, how could this country forego one simple—and rather perfunctory—check on whether the tourist is not, in fact, an immigrant who desires to enter the United States in the guise of a nonimmigrant, while he

actually intends to evade the regulatory laws.

I would invite my colleagues of the House to review the files of the Committee on the Judiciary and see how many of the alleged tourists have private bills introduced in their behalf for the purpose of granting them permanent residence status. The Immigration and Naturalization Service would also, I am sure, be happy to indicate the number of tourists who, having entered the United States, fell in love with this wonderful country to the extent that they do not mind violating its laws by remaining here.

Having said all that, I wish to stress, Mr. Speaker, that the committee upon which the House has imposed the responsibility for handling immigration matters, have done all that is possible to encourage the Departments of State and Justice to facilitate the issuance of visas to bona fide tourists, businessmen, newspapermen, students, transit passengers, and others. Your committee has been responsible for legislation providing for a variety of waivers of excluding provisions in the case of visitors. Your committee has encouraged the administrators of the law to use the waivers and—naturally—to use good sense in granting them. Your committee has promoted the stationing of immigration officers abroad in order to expedite and facilitate the granting of waivers. Your committee is convinced that any further relaxation of these procedures would be detrimental to the best interest of the United States. Existing procedures, however, provide for fair, equitable, and speedy removal of the obstacles that a deserving alien visitor might be faced with.

What then is behind all the drum beating?

The answer is simple. Private travel agents, transportation, and hotel interests would like to obtain Federal funds, taxpayers' money, to pay for the printing of posters, pamphlets, and other publicity material promoting travel to the United States. That is all. There is nothing in the bill, S. 610, of substantive nature except the provision authorizing the financing of tourist propaganda. That, however, I submit, is the business of those who sell tickets, and rent rooms and cars and buses, who derive profit from tourist trade. That, I submit, is the business of hotelkeepers and travel agencies, airlines and shipping lines, the sole beneficiaries of S. 610.

Obviously, national economy would benefit if more Fords, Chevrolets, Chryslers, or Ramblers were sold abroad. However, how would this House look upon legislation providing for the utilization of Federal funds to pay for advertising in the newspapers and magazines of Europe, Asia, and South America of the splendid American cars? How would this House look upon legislation appropriating taxpayers' money for advertising abroad the blessings of nylon or of the soft or not-so-soft drinks manufactured in the United States?

Senate 610 would do precisely that for the tourist transportation interests.

Let me return once more to the Columbian article of last Sundays. It says there that when you walk along Fifth Avenue in New York—and Madison Avenue, too—you will see the splendid window displays of tourists offices maintained in this country by the governments of foreign countries like France, or Italy, or others. Certainly, but these governments are the owners of the airlines and the shipping lines which they advertise. They advertise their own business. They are not financing publicity for private business. This, I submit, is a difference which the article failed to notice.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that my able colleagues on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee will not be misled by the smart boys of Madison Avenue and that they will accord the Senate measure the same treatment they accorded its predecessor bill last year—sit on it.

Free World Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, twice in a few short years has Russia electrified the world with spectacular space conquests. These have captured not only the imagination but also the minds of men. Yet while they are remarkable scientific feats, they also pose political and military dangers for the free world. This threat, these dangers, will persist and bedevil us until the United States and its Allies catch up and surpass the Russian achievements in space.

Until then, we must rely on the great atomic defense systems in missiles and planes of the free world as well as on the great shield called NATO. What other practical alternatives have we at this time?

In this connection I invite attention to the public service editorial efforts appearing in leading newspapers throughout the free world in paid space from the pen of A. N. Spanel, founder of International Latex Corp., of Dover, Del. For 22 years this company has continued its tireless efforts on behalf of free-world unity and for over 10 years it has championed NATO as the shield and sword of the Western World.

Certainly this public-spirited business organization deserves the highest of praise, and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial by Mr. A. N. Spanel which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on Monday, April 17 be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BACK TO EARTH—THE TARGET IS THE WORLD

(By A. N. Spanel)

The hypnotist's pendulum, used by some practitioners of the art, forces the subject to focus his mind on the swinging device to the exclusion of everything else, until his will is paralyzed.

This has been roughly the Kremlin's technique, too. The pendulum swung by Khrushchev, as by Stalin before him, takes the form of a periodic crisis. The free world is so overwhelmed by an acute immediate danger in one spot that it is apt to forget the larger, continuous, and worldwide danger. This leaves the Communists free to operate everywhere else with a minimum of hindrance from our side.

RED HAND IS QUICKER THAN THE EYE

In varying measure, such penetration is taking place in several strategically located African and Asian countries. Without benefit of a real issue or crisis, the Red tourniquet is being tightened around these vital regions.

Free world statesmen have been too frantically occupied with fears, hopes, and debates around the crisis of the month to give more than cursory attention to these slower boring-from-within processes elsewhere.

As long as we deal with the fundamental challenge of world communism on a crisis-to-crisis basis, rather than on a systematic and continuous global scale, the hypnotist's pendulum will continue to work its Red magic. Africa, Asia and even Latin America will continue to be pilfered under our unseeing eyes in the pattern of pillage that has already enslaved a third of the human race.

These facts are especially pertinent today. NATO needs an immediate reappraisal of its role, its scope, its tools. For NATO, in the eyes of the Communist axis, is the symbol of free-world power in the aggregate.

NEED FOR NATO ENORMOUSLY ENHANCED

"The basic reasons which led to the signature of the North Atlantic Treaty in 1949," the NATO Council said in its communique after its anniversary session in Washington, "remain valid today." This is the understatement of the decade. Actually the threat to what remains of freedom on this planet is vastly greater than it was 10 years ago. The enemy's military might has been expanded year by year, and the conquest of China has given him colossal new potentials of penetration and intimidation. The role of NATO today is therefore far larger than anyone envisaged at its birth.

To play it effectively, NATO must be rapidly strengthened and expanded in terms of physical power, political and moral authority.

Though NATO is an Atlantic enterprise, the communique rightly stressed that the challenge is worldwide. The organization, as one writer put it, "is going to have to adopt a less Atlantic and more global look."

NATO urgently needs more power to protect more of the free world than its members had foreseen in the original concept of the alliance. Whatever the merits of the specific proposals along these lines by France under President de Gaulle, there is no doubt of the validity of the principle—the need, that is, for a realistic widening of the geographical commitments. The planned aggressions of Russia and China are our daily warnings that for the Communists, the target is the world.

Above all, what is called for is unity of the free world—not merely legalistic unity but a unity of spirit in a common dedication, unity in depth and in breadth.

TYRANNY AND TERROR UNITE THE COMMUNISTS

The Soviet bloc is a monolithic entity. The free allies are at best a loose collection of strong-willed individual countries and governments. In order to cope with the life-

and-death menace posed by the Red monolith, we have no alternative but to provide a voluntary unity to match. Only by pooling more of its resources, brains and skills and facing up to the need for sacrifice—including the sacrifice of some types of national sovereignty—can the free world hope to thwart the Soviet pattern of pillage.

In his splendid book, "What's Wrong With U.S. Foreign Policy," Mr. Cyrus L. Sulzberger cites the lessons of an alliance, some 2,500 years ago, resembling NATO. It was the first Delian League, in which Greek city-states led by Athens banded together for common defense against Persian aggression.

As fear of Persia receded, Mr. Sulzberger points out, the League's vitality ebbed. Its strength was also sapped by bickering and by an increasing tendency of Athens to ignore the will of lesser allies. On the basis of this ancient experience, Mr. Sulzberger concludes about NATO: "We must seek new methods to invigorate the psychological will to common effort."

Certainly there has been no decline of fear in our world. The tasks facing the free world are costly, long-lasting and exhausting. Fatigue and the human weakness for wishful thinking encourage illusions of easy solutions, of cures with unguents of good will bearing labels like "coexistence."

These debilitating delusions, feeding on our failure to see the pattern of the Communist menace in all its global varieties, must be overcome if freedom is to survive. An enormously invigorated and expanded NATO would be both symbol and substance of our commitment to victory.

The National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of the Congress the following excellent and timely speech delivered by Maj. Gen. Frank D. Pinckney, the adjutant general of South Carolina, on the occasion of the dedication of the Belton, S.C., Armory, April 2:

THE NATIONAL GUARD

Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to tell you, briefly, something about your National Guard and its mission. This outstanding unit, 116th Signal Company, which we have here in Belton, is one of over 5,000 Army and Air National Guard units located in over 2,500 cities and communities throughout this great country of ours. The National Guard is organized in every State and territory and the strength of its Army and Air Force units totals nearly a half million men.

These units are all organized in accordance with the plans prescribed by the Department of Defense and each has a definite mission in the overall defense of our country and consequently is an integral part of America's defense team.

Here in South Carolina we have 110 such units located in 76 cities and towns with a total strength in excess of 10,500 patriotic citizen soldiers. These young men, all volunteers, come from every walk of life—the farms, the mills, stores, offices, businesses of every kind. They are your neighbors, your friends, citizens of your community, your State, giving of their time to train in order to be ready to defend you, your loved ones, your communities and your country in the event of an attack or any emergency or national catastrophe.

They meet once a week to train. They sacrifice their annual vacations with their families in order to attend the summer field training periods—not to become seasoned soldiers with the urge to fight or kill, but citizen soldiers, able to protect themselves and to help preserve the peace. Furthermore, the lessons they learn in obedience, loyalty, preservation, protection of life and property, all add up to the development of better citizens and the creation of a keener sense of duty and responsibility to both State and Nation.

The existence of these military forces in this State is a highly important security factor. They are instantly available for either of their missions and yet due to the Federal support of arms, pay and equipment, they place a very small tax burden on the State.

The equipment which our guard units in South Carolina have today with which to train range from jeeps to jets, from rifles to radars, from machineguns to missile-firing artillery, with a total value in excess of $50 million. We receive each year in Federal funds to support our guard units over $8 million, of which better than 85 percent is spent within our State borders. This unit alone here in Belton brings into your community about $60,000 per year, a right sizable monthly payroll.

Where do all the funds come from? They come from the taxes you pay the Federal Government, but every tax dollar spent on the National Guard does double duty—it buys two vital bodies of organized manpower for the price of one. The military organization trained to defend our country in time of emergency and a local organization ready for immediate action if and when a disaster should strike.

The history of the National Guard is an integral part of the history of this great country in peace and in war. The National Guard, or militia as it was called then, was active when America was merely a series of small, struggling colonies. It has been utilized during every period of national emergency and has provided a State security force during the intervals between wars.

Let me briefly touch on the role of these citizen-soldiers since the founding of our country. Dressed in buckskins and armed with the old fintlock, they drove the Indians and Spaniards from our doorsteps in the Colonial Wars of 1670.

During the Revolutionary War, our militiamen, gallant sons of Carolina fought under the able leadership of other noble Carolinians, such as Christopher Gadsden, William Moultrie, Thomas Sumter and others. Of course, you all remember the deeds of Sergeant Jasper and Francis Marion of this period. During this era there came into being such militia units as the Beaufort Artillery, Charleston Light Infantry, Kershaw Guards, Volunteer Grenadiers, Charleston Artillery, German Fusilliers, and Irish Volunteers.

In the War of 1812 they responded to the call in resisting the English and French aggressions. It was during this early period that we find the beginning of other militia units such as the Volunteer Cadet Infantry, Independent Greens, Washington Rangers, Washington Light Infantry, and the Jackson Guards, later renamed the Sumter Guards.

It was the Mexican War of 1846–48 that gave birth to our famous Palmetto Regiment, the crest of which is worn honorably by guardsmen in our infantry units today, a regiment composed of the citizen soldiers of our State led by a distinguished South Carolinian, Pierce Mason Butler. It was this regiment that so ably and gallantly distinguished itself in several severe engagements in Mexico, and in particular at the gates of Mexico City itself. It was a lieutenant from this very regiment who scaled the walls of the city to place the Palmetto Flag thereon, thus this flag became the first American flag to fly over any part of Mexico City.

Then there are those chivalrous sons of Carolina who participated in that great struggle, the War Between the States, which centennial we celebrate this year. Time will not permit, nor is it necessary for me to dwell on the exploits of the South Carolina citizen soldiers of this period, for the pages of history are filled with deeds of valor and patriotism displayed by the noble sons of this great State.

Our citizen-soldiers again responded to the call in the Spanish-American War with such units as the Darlington Guards, Sumter Light Infantry, Edistor Rifles, Manning Guards and many others furnished elements during this short period.

Two regiments of infantry and a troop of cavalry from our Guard were sent to the Mexican border to protect our borders from the depredations of Mexican bandits in 1916.

This campaign was followed almost immediately by the first great war for democracy, the war that was intended to end all wars—World War I. It was during this great struggle that all our guardsmen experienced the hardships and perils of combat, many of them distinguishing themselves and thus bringing great honor and glory to our State.

Then, unfortunately came World War II wherein the guard was again called to defend our Nation's liberty and freedoms. Many men who served are still active in our guard today.

On the placque to the left of the entrance to this building are nine figures depicting these citizen-soldiers that I have referred to, dressed in the authentic uniform of each period.

So you see, our guardsmen, young men like we have here today and 10,000 others throughout our Palmetto State, have the responsibility to uphold and carry on in these established traditions—a heritage of shining examples of sacrifice and courage established by other patriotic sons of South Carolina in the cause of liberty, freedom and justice.

I have tried to point out the importance of maintaining a strong National Guard and the major role it occupies today as a part of our Nation's defense team, part of our power in being the great deterrent force that is so necessary to maintain in order to protect our freedoms, and too, the ideals and examples of patriotic service established by other citizen soldiers of our great State.

I would be amiss, though, in my remarks this afternoon if I failed to leave a word of caution to everyone present within this hall. I sincerely trust that you too will carry this message to your friends and your associates, for ladies and gentlemen, we are faced with a serious situation. We are engaged in a mortal conflict with communism. This conflict is an economic, political, spiritual, power struggle against crafty conniving, ruthless conspirators, proponents of world communism. This insidious enemy of ours, and of the balance of the free world, is employing a strategy of intrigue, infiltration and subversion never before practiced upon the human race. It endangers every segment of our society and threatens the complete annihilation of all the Christian principles upon which this Nation was founded. Call it the cold war, if you please, but hot or cold, the stakes are just as great, for the loss of this war would result in the loss of our freedoms, our liberties, and all that democracy represents, with the only alternative—slavery, dominated by communism.

Time is running out on our side. The next 10 years may prove to be the most momentous in human history. The Communists will try to exploit this period to disarm and divide the West by continuing their undermining and deceptive practices of subterfuge, with the accomplishment of this objective, then their entire effort will be directed towards the subjugation of America.

Yes, indeed, time is running out. It is not too late, though, provided that we all roll up our sleeves and get to work. We must develop the individual will to fight, to win, and to survive in this struggle if we expect to preserve and protect our freedoms and assure the future safety of our children.

Remember, freedom is taken too lightly by too many people. It is not inherent that we continue to enjoy freedom without some effort to maintain it on our part. Freedom must be loved, lived, sacrificed for, fought for, and sometimes died for.

During the past 60 years the insidious atheistic disciples of Communist principles and ideologies have seized one-quarter of the land area of the world and dominate nearly 1 billion people—approximately one-third of the world's population. They have taken over country after country in Europe and in Asia. They are causing the unrest in Africa; they have completely dominated Cuba and today are infiltrating into Central and South American countries, all getting closer and closer to the encirclement of America.

Despite these continuing Communist encroachments and the many articles appearing in our daily papers and magazines warning of these threats, there is unfortunately a disinclination to face up to the harsh reality that the basic aims and objectives of the Communist powers, which are to dominate the entire world, have not changed in the least degree.

People are prone to disregard the fact that we are faced today by an enemy, with agents in our midst, employing the same undermining methods and strategy which they have employed in other countries prior to their enslavement into the Communist orbit. They are without conscience or scruples, ardently intent upon the destruction of our democracy and the enslavement of our people.

The Communist would lead you to believe that the issue is between communism and capitalism, but ladies and gentlemen, the basic issue is between slavery or freedom. America is at the crossroads. If the expansion of communism continues unabated, not only must we face the cold hard fact that we will lose our freedoms but our children and their children will live or die in slavery.

We must be on the alert at all times. These Communists are smooth operators. They are crafty in the arts of conspiracy and deceit. They operate under many false fronts and participate in all phases of American life, duping unsuspecting and easily led individuals, so as to sway American public opinion in favor of Russian propaganda policies, thus softening our resistance.

Let me emphasize this point. Their main target today is the youth of our country—repeat—they are concentrating a major effort in attracting youth to the party and in warping their minds into believing that communism offers the world peace and security, while we are an aggressive, warlike nation, and capitalism cannot survive.

We, therefore, must not only awaken our people to the seriousness of the situation facing our country, but we must expose the fallacies and the nature of communism, while at the same time instill the values, traditions, and ideals of democracy and the American way of life.

These young guardsmen here and over 500,000 others throughout our land of the free and home of the brave are today's up-to-the-minute men, carrying on in the same tradition as the minutemen of 1776 when other periods of danger threatened our freedoms and our liberties. They are doing their part in helping to provide the defense forces so essential in this period of extraordinary danger, but maintaining a powerful military force, a strong National Guard, will not alone save us. The Communist termites are constantly at work trying to undermine our Government, our leaders, our society, our minds, our resistance, and thus we are faced with the grave danger of losing this conflict without a shot or a missile ever being fired. This is the Communist scheme, design, and strategy in which they have conquered country after country.

The threat with which we are faced today requires the combined effort, immediate attention, and urgent action of every able-bodied, red-blooded, patriotic American if we are to survive and preserve for our children the same opportunities, heritage, and true Christian principles of democracy which we inherited. There is a job for everyone. Think it over seriously, be always on the alert, and assume your share of these responsibilities, if you expect to continue enjoying your freedom.

Trained Men, National Resource

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fort Scott Tribune of April 17, 1961. This excellent and outstanding editorial is most challenging, and I respectfully call it to the attention of my colleagues—trusting that the thoughts presented in it will receive their most careful consideration:

TRAINED MEN, NATIONAL RESOURCE

The social scientists have been telling us for a long time that ours is an aging population, that even as our total numbers boom upward the proportion of elderly people among them is rising more sharply.

As has been well and often noted, this trend has many important effects on current and future American life, not the least being its impact on the makeup of the country's work force.

With the gradual coming of age of the persons born in the great baby boom of World War II and its aftermath, the expectation is there will be a flood of job demands.

Young people entering the labor market want not only jobs, but opportunities for advancement. For the most talented, the prospect of going all the way to the top must be held out. Without that, many companies and other enterprises could not hope to attract the needed people of ability.

To hold out that prospect, however, businesses often are compelled to institute automatic retirement plans for older workers, otherwise there would be no room for the rising new generation of employees.

Yet, while this has obvious fairness from the viewpoint of the younger people, it frequently works hardship on the older workers. To the extent that they must thereafter be supported by private or public pension, they are also an increasing burden on the economy and the National Treasury.

In many instances there is no escape from this, nor perhaps should there be. But it is tragic that in all too many cases the greatest cost is not in money but in the loss of a man's talent and experience.

All kinds of enterprises—and the country taken as a whole—build vast investments, in the broad sense of that term, in the individuals who comprise the work force. As they advance through life, many become virtual storehouses of skill and knowledge.

To cast them aside, to end their working days automatically and arbitrarily, is to create great waste both ecoonmically and spiritually.

For all its growing numbers, this Nation is not so heavily endowed for the colossal struggle with communism that it can afford to toss away its investment in trained, able people.

We should be trying to do everything imaginable to enlarge, not diminish our reservoir of skills and knowledge. We may need every drop in the great pool.

Reds Will Be Hard Bargainers in Laos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in Laos, the Reds are stalling on cease-fire negotiations. Basically, why?

To get an iron grip on as much land as possible—to enable them to be tough bargainers at any conference table.

Recently, I was privileged to review major aspects of the Lao situation in a broadcast over radio station WGN, Chicago.

I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY WARNS REDS WILL BE HARD BARGAINERS IN LAOS

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, senior Republican, Foreign Relations Committee, in a weekend broadcast over radio station WGN, Chicago, stressed the need for a "global alert" to halt the many-pronged offensive of the Communists. There follows the text of Senator WILEY's address:

"Today, the free world is faced with an ever-growing threat to its survival; namely, communism.

"Around the globe, an estimated 36 million Reds—operating in about 86 countries—are attempting to: (1) get a firmer grip on people under their domination; and (2) thrust forward to gain control of more lands and people.

"Tactically, they attempt to penetrate new lands through trade, student exchange, or other channels; agitate for rebellion; arm and train Communist forces to gain control of the country; and then establish it as a subsidiary branch of the world conspiracy.

"The ultimate objective—stated again and again from Lenin to Khrushchev—is world domination.

"Unfortunately, the Red offensive already has expanded to control of nearly 1 billion people and vast land, natural, military, industrial, human, and other resources.

"To combat these expansionist efforts, we need a more effective counteroffensive. In my judgment, this should include efforts to maintain a strong military deterrent to massive attack; strengthen our deterrent to war forces; challenge the Reds more quickly in areas where it is obvious they are committing aggression; improve and strengthen the U.N. and other international machinery for dealing with aggression; concentrate more on development of an effective program for penetrating the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. For example, we can no longer allow the Reds to contest for lands outside their orbit, but maintain Red-controlled areas as sacred territory.

"Also, we need to crystallize more effective plans for the triumph of freedom—both in Communist and non-Communist nations—and then devise techniques for accomplishing this objective.

"In the face of this gargantuan menace to freedom, the time has come to challenge the Reds for every foot of Communist-held territory—as well as to protect non-Communist lands from aggression. Unless we do this, the Reds—nibble by nibble—may ultimately gobble up the world.

"IS LAOS LOST?

"Regrettably, Laos stands as a dark example of Red aggression that threatens world peace. Again, we have witnessed Red strategy involving infiltration, agitation for rebellion, creation of a rebel force, supplying of arms and equipment by the Soviet Union, and attempts to take over the country.

"By military action, the Pathet Lao, supported by North Vietnamese troops and armed and equipped by the Soviet Union, have already taken over too much of the country.

"Mr. Khrushchev and his cohorts—by deliberately delaying negotiations—have enabled the Communist-supported rebels to gain and solidify control of more territory.

"Even though the Reds may negotiate, we can expect: That they are not likely to give up any territory under their control, and that they will demand greater voice in the overall policies in the country.

"As in Korea, Red China also has threatened to send troops—if the Western Powers deem it advisable to take military action to halt aggression. This is a dangerous thing. In limited warfare, the Red Chinese present a particular tough enemy. Why? With no respect for human life, they have no qualms about using military manpower—from a population of 650 million people—as cannon fodder in the cause of communism.

"Even if peace talks are carried out, negotiations with the Reds—firmly implanted by military action and backed by the Red Chinese and Soviet Governments—will be difficult.

"MAINTAINING A GLOBAL ALERT

"Although Laos is now a 'hot spot,' we also need to maintain a global alert.

"Tactically, the Reds conduct multipronged offensives. By stirring up trouble in one area, they attempt to divert attention away from other efforts to establish new beachheads on free world territory. Today, the critical areas include—in addition to Laos—the Congo, Cuba, Berlin, Latin America.

"Tomorrow, long-planned subversive efforts to plant the seeds of communism in other countries may explode into revolution—aided and abetted by the Reds.

"This, then, is the great challenge of our times.

"At no time in history has freedom faced such a grave, dangerous, powerful threat to its survival. By experience, we have learned the Communists are fanatically dedicated to world domination.

"The battle for freedom will not be won by wishful thinking—hoping that ultimately the Red ogre will 'go away.' Our task, then, is to mobilize the manpower and resources to defeat the enemy. The battlegrounds will be economic, social, ideological, as well as military. The great hope of the free world is that it possesses the ideas, ideals, respect for human dignity and promise of liberty—common aspirations of almost all of humanity—to enlist the majority of mankind on its side in the struggle.

"Only by a strong, dedicated effort, however, can we hope to win the struggle for survival and, ultimately, peace," Senator WILEY concluded.

United States Still Leads in Sponsoring the Dignity of Individual Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, before we are ready to sink completely into the depths of despair at the scientific progress of the Soviet Union, it may be well for us to ponder upon the thought expressed in the following article by William H. Stringer in Saturday's edition of the Christian Science Monitor. In the race to be the first in space, I hope we may never lose sight of the great strength in the moral concepts upon which this Nation was founded, the dignity and the freedom of man. In the final accounting this is the concept which will be victorious. No nation, nor group of nations, failing to recognize man's fundamental mission as a creature of God, can long endure:

LAUNCHING INDIVIDUAL MAN
(By William H. Stringer)

WASHINGTON.—The Soviet Union has successfully launched an astronaut into orbit. It hasn't done much yet about according individual man his proper place in the universe.

This is said in no sense of disparagement at a tremendous feat. The Soviet achievement in placing a man in orbit, and bringing him back safely to earth in 108 minutes, is the result of brilliant progress in a direct line. The United States won't achieve the same for many months.

But it does no harm occasionally to ponder what is the ultimate aim and end of mankind's forward endeavors. If the object is to permit individual man to attain his fullest potential and promise in creation, then the Soviets are only at the launching pad of this soaring into the limitless.

To be sure, Soviet mankind has progressed far from the peasant stage in terms of limited opportunity, limited modest creature comforts, and special favors for the opportunist and sometimes the gifted, in the past 40-odd years. But the space yet to be traveled is evident in the fact that people in some of the newest-freed countries of Asia-Africa enjoy more individual liberty than do citizens of the Soviet Union.

The very conspiracy of silence—the heavy hand of secrecy—which brooded over the Soviet man-in-orbit achievement discloses the Soviet sense of limitation. Three days before the actual Moscow announcement, rumors flew about: that a man was in space—had been brought back—was mentally disturbed.

In a democracy, however fumbling, the facts and the explanation would be out in a few hours. In the case of the Soviet Union we do not know yet whether there was an abortive attempt—the Soviets usually have more than one rocket on the ready in case of failure—or whether the early leak was simply a malfunctioning of the massive Soviet publicity apparatus.

For weeks the new series of nuclear-test-ban negotiations has dragged on at Geneva. The Soviets have done little but insist on a stymying, stalemating veto. They are still fearful about admitting international inspection teams freely into their closed society.

On his American tour, Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev was surprised at the numerous automobiles, hastening home at night to the housing developments. He said the Soviets soon would have lots of automobiles too, but—they would be for hire, like taxis. Obviously if the state rents out the car it can even control the citizen's joy riding.

Still, the Soviet people have achieved some widening of horizon. Their desire for the better things of life, including housing and consumer goods, has risen rapidly. The next generation of leadership beyond Mr. Khrushchev may have an intellect somewhat pried open by events. The West's policy should be to inject as many freedom-seeking ideas into the Soviet consciousness as possible, through cultural exchange and contacts.

But except in dialogs with some Soviet scientists, one seldom sees evidence that the Soviets are given to pondering such deep concerns as "man's duty to God and to his neighbor," though Britain's Prime Minister Harold Macmillan, when I interviewed him 2 years ago, stated his belief that "in 2 or 3 generations the people of the Soviet Union will be asking themselves these fundamental questions."

The U.S. performance in moving toward launching a man into space has not always been superb. It has been fragmented and delayed. The Soviets have shown how to mobilize all resources for a great state-directed enterprise, as President Kennedy told his press conference.

This is not the whole of life. A Warsaw Marxist philosopher recently remarked that communism stands to lose "the struggle for the mind of man" unless its philosophy faces the problem of the human individual and his destiny.

Indeed, what a commotion in Kremlin circles would be occasioned if Pravda should print, with approval, such a simple yet profound statement as this from the Rockefeller panel reports:

"The power of the democratic idea rests in the belief that only freemen can ever really understand this complex world. Only freemen can manage its complexity, and only freemen can have the opportunity for the spiritual, moral, and intellectual growth that our times require."

There is a shining rocket that Moscow hasn't launched yet.

Bolstering U.S. Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. WILEY, Mr. President, the economy of the Nation—despite serious prob-

lems, including too high unemployment—is now showing signs of an upturn.

Full recovery, however, cannot be accomplished by wishful thinking; rather, it requires effective, creative action.

Recently, the Milwaukee Sentinel published an informative article outlining some recommendations by Elmer L. Winter. The recommendations include a 10-point program by which businessmen can undertake action to combat the recession.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article, supplemented by a statement by myself on ways and means to bolster the economy, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITES TEN-POINT PLAN FOR ATTACK ON DIP

Businessmen were offered a 10-point antirecession program Wednesday by Elmer L. Winter, president of Manpower, Inc., Milwaukee-headquartered business service firm.

Winter declared businessmen can apply this program of stepped-up activity on a do-it-yourself basis, and that his own company will put it into effect immediately.

The program, which will be sent to over 5,000 major business leaders, was developed as the result of discussions at Manpower's recent 4-day sales convention here.

"Businessmen can, if they take individual initiative, materially aid in bringing about improved economic conditions which they desire," the Manpower president declared. "We should not rely solely on Government action to help bring us out of the recession.

"To prove that the company means to 'take its own medicine,' we are announcing a substantial budget increase in expenditures for advertising, sales promotion, and public relations; a plan for home office and branch office modernization, and the opening of three new offices a month."

Winter's 10-point program for business:

Expand all sales efforts, abandoning a wait-and-see attitude.

Expand research and development.

Step up advertising, public relations, and sales promotion.

Diversify product and service lines.

"Prepone" capital expenditures. Where plant modernization or equipment replacement is planned, but was postponed due to economic pressures, start these projects now, when availability of labor and money is more favorable.

Accelerate long-range investment and expansion.

Invest in educating tomorrow's experts. Supply scholarship and other financial needs of our institutions of higher learning.

Get into the export market.

Combat waste and extravagance.

Talk about positive factors and plans for action. Help spread attitudes that favor confidence. Back up your confidence with action which will help create employment and confidence.

SENATOR WILEY OUTLINES PROGRAM FOR BOLSTERING ECONOMY

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, Wisconsin, today outlined recommendations for bolstering the economy:

"Regrettably, the Nation and Wisconsin are still suffering the plagues of unemployment and business and industrial slowdowns.

"Nationally, the unemployed totals about 5½ million. In Wisconsin, also, there are still too many jobless—amounting to about 117,000, or over 7 percent of the total labor force.

"Throughout the economy, there are serious repercussions, including: severe hardships for the unemployed and their families; economic progress generally is retarded; entire communities of especially high unemployment suffer because of lack of buying power of the jobless; Uncle Sam, too, feels the pinch in reduced revenue, both from the unemployed, and the diminished income of business and industries.

"A successful effort to attain full economic recovery will require local, State, and national cooperation.

"What is being done in Congress?

"Currently, a number of measures are being considered to give a 'shot-in-the-arm' to the economy. These include: stepping up highway construction; expanding housing and home building; extension of unemployment compensation benefits for the jobless whose benefits have expired; special legislation for chronically depressed areas, and other measures.

"In addition, steps have been taken to advance payments to veterans of 1961 dividends on national life insurance policies, and speed up procurement and construction of our Federal agencies.

"The State and local governments, also, could well speed up timetables for procurement and construction of public projects.

"What else can be done?

"Business and industry—as economically feasible—could well move up plans for plants and operational expansion.

"Communities can undertake self-help 'bootstrap' operations to revaluate potential human and natural resources and better utilize these to bolster the economy to meet the needs of the people.

"The creation of multicommunity cooperative programs—for pooling of manpower and natural resources—also can help to resolve problems and improve the economic outlook. The potentials of an area may be neither local nor State, but rather intercommunity or interstate. Pooling such manpower or resources on an area or regional basis often can result in more effective programs.

"We can establish a higher priority for "Buy American" policy in times of national economic distress.

"We can encourage wise investments of private business and public funds and job-creating enterprises. The purpose would be to promote further economic recovery, as well as to 'pay off' economically. Today, there are about $12 billion in financial savings by individuals; $33 billion in corporate pension funds; the total assets of life insurance companies amount to about $114 billion. One of the problems is to encourage the use of such funds in more productive investments; we need a reexamination of our tax system also to provide encouragement and incentive for expansion of job-creating enterprises.

"Can we successfully meet the challenge?

"Yes. Historically, our free enterprise system—a product of American ingenuity—has proved successful in dealing with these and other problems. I believe that we can do it again.

"Today, however, we are faced not only with the task of providing economic health for our people in the country, but also of competing with a powerful Communist bloc which threatens to bury us—this means economically, as well as militarily.

"In the face of this threat, a strong, sound economy is essential, not only for domestic progress, but also for survival," Seneator WILEY concluded.

Clarence F. Pautzke, Commissioner of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, an appointment of importance to Alaska and to the Nation was made recently by this administration when Mr. Clarence F. Pautzke was designated as Commissioner of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior.

The resources of my State are many but historically its fishery and wildlife resources have been the backbone of our economy. Throughout the years Alaska was an incorporated territory of the United States. Administration of these resources vested in the Federal Government—a procedure without parallel in the history of the country. We in Alaska pleaded and petitioned that this be changed; we felt there was insufficient action at the Federal level with respect to conservation measures. Our cries fell on deaf ears. We watched our magnificent resources, particularly the fishery, dwindle at an alarming rate year by year. Finally with the coming of statehood administration of these resources was turned over to us and we are now faced with the task of restoration.

So we in Alaska are, indeed, fortunate in having Mr. Pautzke placed in a position with the Federal Government which will have the most to do in assisting us in our rehabilitation job. Mr. Pautzke has served for the past few months with our State department of fish and game and has had opportunity to learn and observe right on the scene that which needs to be done. Prior to coming to Alaska Mr. Pautzke was associated for many years with the Washington State Department of Game and Fisheries.

Alaskans would have been happy to have had Mr. Pautzke remain with the State government but we realize his Washington assignment will be even more rewarding.

The Pacific Fisherman noted its enthusiastic endorsement of Mr. Pautzke's new assignment in its lead editorial in the April 1961 issue. The editorial points out so clearly many of the qualifications which Mr. Pautzke brings to his new task that I ask that the editorial in full text be reproduced here.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Pacific Fisherman, April 1961]

PAUTZKE APPOINTMENT SEEN AS U.S. PLEDGE TO ALASKA

National interest in the fishery and wildlife resources of Alaska was confirmed late in March with the appointment of Clarence

F. Pautzke to the position of Commissioner of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

No action of the White House could more plainly demonstrate the Federal Government's intent to recognize its obligation to Alaska to continue its support of and participation in the rehabilitation of the fisheries which, through the territorial period of Alaska's history, were the responsibility of the U.S. Department of the Interior.

Now, to head its Fish and Wildlife Service, the Department of the Interior reaches out to Alaska and appoints the man who for a year has been Assistant Director of its Department of Fish and Game.

Far better than any other of the several competent individuals who were considered for the FAWS commissionership, Mr. Pautzke will bring to the office firsthand knowledge of the problems of Alaska's fisheries, of the State's needs in coping with those problems, and—most significant of all—an understanding of the value of Alaska's resources to the economy and future not only of the State but of the United States as a whole.

Again, Mr. Pautzke stands high above all others who were under consideration in the balance of his experience and background between commercial fisheries on the one hand and sport fisheries and wildlife on the other. The Federal Service has these two basic departments—and he is well qualified to have both under his supervision.

To his duties he brings approximately 25 years of background as chief fisheries biologist of the Washington Department of Game, where he became nationally known for his work in upbuilding steelhead runs and improving sport fishing by the eradication of coarse fish competitors and predators from sport fishing waters which they had ruined.

To this experience with game fish, and as a naturalist, he added 4 years of service as assistant director of the Washington Department of Fisheries; and then his service in Alaska.

Last summer, during the extraordinary run of red salmon to Bristol Bay, Mr. Pautzke was continuously in the field working with the ADF management team whose handling of the run won, and deserved, the highest praise. It was characteristic of the man that he was in fact only a member of the team, and saw to it that the prime credit went to those with whom he worked.

Mr. Pautzke can be counted upon to meet fully all the requirements of his high office, representing well the United States in matters pertaining to its fisheries and wildlife resources, whether they be in the direct authority of the States, in the national field, or in the international regions of sea and air.

In selecting Clarence Pautzke, an Alaskan, for this responsibility, the National Government would appear to be assuring Alaska that the United States recognizes its responsibilities to Alaskan fish and wildlife resources and will continue to support efforts at their rehabilitation, through the State itself, as well as on the high seas.

Dr. Thomas Dooley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER H. DOMINICK
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Speaker, there are now pending before the Congress at least three bills to authorize the awarding of the Congressional Medal of Honor to the late Dr. Thomas Dooley in recognition of his unselfish devotion to human service. Four pending resolutions also would authorize the striking of a gold medal in lasting memory of Dr. Dooley's service to humanity. I wish to state that I, too, support these worthwhile proposals. The memory of Dr. Dooley carved in the hearts of people everywhere is well stated in a letter I recently received, and which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

SISTERS OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE,
New York, N.Y., April 14, 1961.

Hon. PETER H. DOMINICK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In the last and present sessions of Congress, bills were introduced to commemorate the gallant and courageous young physician recently lost to us, Dr. Thomas Dooley. His magnificant accomplishments were the result of a challenge willingly accepted, when during naval duty he witnessed the plight of so many refugees fleeing the Communist aggressor. In answer to this challenge, he imposed upon himself a ruthless program of self-dedication to his fellow man. No one who learned of his tireless labors in the Far East, on the very threshhold of the Communist-infested world, could help but marvel at his determination, zeal, initiative, mercy, and compassion. He gave of himself with the recklessness of infatuation, even later when the prospect of an early death by cancer dogged his footsteps. We cannot afford to forget heroism of this kind.

I beg you to do what is in your power to bring these bills to an early acceptance, so that our Nation may pay tribute to one of its heroic and outstanding citizens.

May I hear favorably from you?

Thanking you.

Very sincerely,

SISTER M. LUCILLA.

Curb Is Needed on Rifle Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Springfield Union, Springfield, Mass., of April 18, 1961. The editorial urges hastening of a decision by the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization on the problem of the importing of surplus military rifles which are rejuvenated and sold in competition with American-made small arms. I have joined with other Congressmen from Massachusetts, New York, and Connecticut in urging a decision on this matter.

The editorial follows:

[From the Springfield Union, Apr. 18, 1961]

CURB IS NEEDED ON RIFLE IMPORTS

New England has long been the center of the American small firearms industry. Now, this industry, which plays a vital role in the region's economy, is threatened by an increasing number of imported surplus military rifles which are "sporterized" to sell for far less than the fine sporting guns manufactured by New England companies.

Over the past decade, hundreds of jobs have been lost because of this competition. Unless action is taken immediately to curb these imports, more workers will be laid off and another blow dealt to a suffering New England economy.

There is another important factor to consider. The arms manufacturers, particularly in Massachusetts and Connecticut, have been one of the mainstays of the Nation's defense. In every national emergency, the industry has provided the nucleus of manpower and engineering skill that made it possible for other industries to mass-produce rifles on a crash basis. The workers laid off by the industry because of the imports are workers with special skills in rifle-making.

For almost 2 years a petition for relief against such imports has been pending at the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. Imports numbered 232,000 in 1959. Since then they have increased to 360,000 a year—40 times the rate of 1955. At the same time, domestic production of small arms has dropped 32 percent.

The seriousness of the situation has led a bipartisan group of 15 Senators and Representatives from Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New York to petition the OCDM to put a limitation on these imports. Among the petitioners were Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Republican, Representative SILVIO O. CONTE, Republican, Representative EDWARD P. BOLAND, Democrat, and Senator BENJAMIN A. SMITH II, Democrat, all of Massachusetts.

The lawmakers assert that surplus imports make no defense contribution, have no defense capacity, contribute nothing to the economies of the exporting nations, and are not important in the nations' balance of payments. Moreover, they argue, surplus military rifles are not part of the normal channel of international trade.

We feel that the only contribution the imports make is to give people an opportunity to buy rifles for a few dollars. This contribution is far outweighed by the threat the imports pose to the New England economy.

One of the companies affected by the imports is Savage Arms Corp. of Westfield. Company officials have become so concerned they have asked employees to write letters supporting their Senators and Congressmen in the petition move.

The OCDM has delayed long enough. It should act immediately to control the flow of these imported rifles into this country.

Criticism of Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Adm. Hyman G. Rickover remains one of the most stimulating and challenging figures on the American education scene. His forthright criticism of the state of our education has unquestionably served a great purpose by bringing the entire issue to the forefront of public discussion.

A searching article on Admiral Rickover, written by James D. Koerner, appeared in the Saturday Review of April 15. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOVERS AND SHAPERS OF EDUCATION—ADMIRAL RICKOVER: GADFLY

(By James D. Koerner)

Professional educators may not have shared the general enthusiasm accorded the recent action of the Secretary of the Navy—taken at the personal instigation, it is said, of President Kennedy—in retaining Admiral Rickover on active duty beyond the Navy's normal retirement age. For in recent years Vice Adm. Hyman George Rickover, by virtue of his speeches and writings on education, has clearly dislodged Arthur Bestor as the most unloved figure in the eyes of America's educational administrators. They doubtless would like nothing better than to retire him to an obscure island served twice a year by a packet boat.

Even those inured to educational quarrels are often surprised by the venom with which professional educators are apt to deal with Rickover, whose role in education is now so charged with controversy and adhominem argument as to preclude anything like a dispassionate appraisal of him by schoolmen. Take, for example, the public labeling of Rickover, by a Columbia University Teachers College professor, as "a jackass." To many Americans, as well as to visitors from abroad, where Rickover is widely known and highly regarded, there is something more than incongruous in such "professional" behavior. All this is regrettable. Rickover's ideas, though hardly infallible, are interesting and substantial. They are also influential. While he may be anathema to many professionals, his book, "Education and Freedom," which has recently gone into a paperback edition, as well as his other writings, have attracted a large following among the public, the press, and teachers.

If to be a mover and a shaper of education is to bring a first-class mind to the study of this subject for a period of many years, to bring forth viable and original ideas for public discussion, to command a large national audience, to testify before congressional committees considering educational legislation, to create a large and unique educational operation of one's own (which Rickover has done in the schools of the naval reactor program, now enrolling nearly 2,000 students), and to recognize the exigencies of our national welfare and their total dependence upon education—and to speak without compromise to this point, knowing that misinterpretations, distortions, and personal calumnies will follow—if to do these things is to be a mover of American education, Rickover qualifies, whether or not one approves of him.

When asked about his reaction to the professionals' criticisms, Rickover replies: "I never try to answer these people or set the record straight. It's useless, and I haven't time."

It is plain enough that Rickover's manner of writing and speaking invites much of the hostility he encounters. His prose is forthright, blunt, exaggerated on occasions, even inflammatory. It reflects the nature of Rickover and of the job he thinks must be done in education. It may also reflect the fact that he has lived a long time with what one of his closest friends call "a pack of snarling wolves" harassing his every move.

Rickover's hands would seem to be rather full already (10 to 12 hours a day, 7 days a week) with his main job of directing the naval reactor program, the joint enterprise of the Navy and the Atomic Energy Commission that has been so magnificently successful. Why, then, did he embroil himself in the educational controversy?

To Rickover the answer is obvious: It is his duty, as it is that of every American in a position of leadership, to bring the facts of our critical situation to public attention; and that leads inexorably to education.

Central to everything Rickover feels about contemporary education is a passionate conviction that the West is only dimly aware, even after 15 cold war years, of the mortal challenge that confronts it from communism. The response of the free world must, in Rickover's view, be a total one. Thus he sees most problems, especially education, in relation to this ultimate one. Yet the response he sees us offering is chiefly one of apathy. The body politic seems to him fatally corpulent, awash in its own lard, consumer-conscious, pleasure-bent, sharing few worthy purposes, oblivious alike to its own sloth and to approaching disaster.

From this paramount theme, Rickover moves on to others, but always to return to the same concern: education. With an intensity that would warm the heart of Teddy Roosevelt or Gifford Pinchot, he points to the outrageous waste of our nonrenewable natural resources, and to the fact that when they are gone in only a few more years, a jaded consumer public will have to look to its scientists, perhaps with no luck, for substitutes; it will have to look, that is, to education. He points to the dangerously long lead times characteristic of American technology and to the highly unfavorable way in which they compare, and will compare, with Russia's; the only answer for the United States is education. He points to a myriad of ignoramuses that festoon our bureaucracies, that disguise stupidity with pomposity, and that hamstring vital enterprises in numberless ways because they are men without vision or appropriate training, because they are men who do not know, and do not know that they do not know; again, what other answer than education? He points to the conspicuous lack of leadership in high places, to the general fear of the innovator, the outsider, the nonconformist, to the absence of creative energy and original thought in major areas of our national life; the answer is education.

But not just any education. The education Rickover is talking about is as tough-minded and astringent as he himself is. Believing that men now use only a fraction of their intellectual capacities, he wants them trained to make far greater demands upon themselves. His is an education that would subordinate all other functions to the central one of developing the student's mind. It would do this, not by working comfortably within the student's presumed limitations and thus assuring him of success—a pedagogical principle that seems to Rickover as absurd as it is universal—but by a curriculum of basic subjects that goes well beyond the student's grasp, that he can never wholly master, that keeps him stretching and stretching, but that has a built-in system of incentives and rewards for partial success.

He would permit nothing to stand in the way of this kind of education for everybody, except the mentally defective, for it is only by this means that we can hope to raise the level of our national life in every area; and this is the job Rickover believes we must do if we are to survive as a free people. "The business of the school," he says, "can no longer be with social adjustment, emotional security, entertainment, or even with character. Such matters, if they are teachable, belong to the home, the church, or the family doctor. The school has the child only one-sixth of his waking hours in any calendar year. Therefore, let it concentrate on the job it alone can do: develop the intellectual equipment of every child to its maximum point, and let it never underestimate that point."

But what if the home and church and other agencies do not take on these responsibilities? Who will do so if not the school? When asked such questions, Rickover replies: "What if I am born lame, or blind? Or grow up with any of a thousand other handicaps that might come my way merely by being alive? Some problems, in this imperfect world, are still unsolved. The problem of ignorant or irresponsible parents, most of whom, by the way, have now been through our public schools themselves, may be one of them."

Rickover's own education began in Chicago, to which his father, a tailor, had immigrated early in the century. He graduated from the public schools with a decent, though far from ideal, educational foundation, and went to the Naval Academy in 1918, because it afforded him an education he could not otherwise have had. He did 2 years of graduate engineering work in 1927–28, earning a master's degree from Columbia. Between then and the Second World War, he served in various assignments as engineering officer and qualified submariner. During the war he rode herd—rather roughly, so they say—on civilian contractors of naval electronic equipment. In 1946 he spent a year in graduate work in nuclear physics and reactor engineering at Oak Ridge. He was instrumental in setting up the Oak Ridge School of Reactor Technology and in organizing the first course in nuclear engineering at MIT.

Rickover's interest in educational reform dates from about 1947, when he began the long search for technical personnel to join the reactor program. It was a frustrating search, not because he failed to find people with a thorough knowledge of the new fields in which he was working, which was only to be expected, but because of the far more serious failure to find men whose fundamental education and cast of mind were such as to allow them to contribute productively to a new and vital engineering adventure. He was looking for men equipped with what he believes a good educational system ought to provide the Nation in quantity: a restless, probing, critical intelligence of considerable precision operating from a base of solid knowledge of the fundamental fields. Finding few such minds among the thousands of young men he considered for the program, Rickover began to ask questions about our schools, and began a study of them that has occupied most of his spare time for the last dozen years.

In his analysis of American education and how it got where it is, Rickover puts the primary responsibility for its deficiencies where the professional educator is also wont to put it, squarely on the American public. Preoccupied with their creature comforts—so much at conflict with the vein of asceticism that runs through Rickover's make-up—being blessed with an incredibly rich continent to ravish and exploit, and finding that, unlike people in the Old World, they could make money and acquire prestige and power without much formal education, Americans naturally developed a culture based on these values. Where the professional educator failed, and continues to fail, is in offering the public nothing better, in having no more wisdom than the ordinary layman and exhibiting no intellectual leadership, in actively sharing and even encouraging the slovenliness of the public mind. The inevitable result, Rickover feels, is a pervasive educational hedonism that we wallow in today.

In constructing specific proposals for reform, Rickover often gets ideas from his study of European education. He believes we have no choice but to take cognizance of what other advanced nations, particularly Russia, are able to achieve in the basic fields (such as Russia's ability to get half its students through the ten-year school), and either match or surpass it. This is as obvious to Rickover as it is odious to professional educators, who, in his opinion, have deliberately enshrouded the whole subject

of European education in a fog of meaningless verbiage. "Again," he says heatedly, "they quibble and fulminate over trifles while refusing to face the main facts about where we stand in the international marketplace of brains."

On other important questions, Rickover feels, for example, that the greatest barrier to improvement now, aside from the professionals themselves, is the lack of national scholastic standards, which he would like to see established, even if only for voluntary use, in all the basic subjects and for two or three clearly defined levels of high school diplomas. With respect to the recommendations of James Bryant Conant, he feels that, although Conant has possibly done some good for the superior student, he is dead wrong on the comprehensive high school; for Rickover is convinced that its leveling influence socially, which Conant makes much of, is only superficial, while its leveling influence academically is deep and inescapable. On the question of humanistic education in relation to technical, his position is not as one-sided as is widely assumed. He would place great stress on English history, and foreign languages, and even, if possible, on classical studies, though he knows this would be hard to sell. "I have had much experience," he says, "with the narrow specialist that we often produce through our present system of education and am hardly interested in aggravating the situation. Besides, these are not two different kinds of education. The need is not for more of one or less of the other, at least not at the public school level, since together they make up the educational foundation needed by everyone in the present age; the need is for raising the level of every basic subject all along the line."

Everything that Rickover feels we must do in education depends ultimately on the teacher. He knows that the level of teacher candidates, of teacher education, and teacher performance in the classroom would have to go up almost vertically to bring into view the goals he is talking about. Knowing that such improvements are a matter of many years' work, he would make a start in this direction now by pegging the financial incentives of teaching so high, for demonstrated ability, that the ablest people could not afford not to teach. If this turned out to mean paying them more than truckdrivers, rock-'n'-roll singers, or bank presidents, so be it; he would take the money from almost anywhere, especially from the nonacademic expenditures of school systems, but even from the Defense Establishment if necessary.

Moreover, teachers, not administrators, would run education. Rickover reserves his greatest scorn for the ill-educated nonteaching school administrator, whom he finds both endemic and ubiquitous. Having studied the administrative mind in many settings, Rickover believes that its disabilities in education are inherent. It suffers by nature from all the inertia of entrenched orthodoxy and fear of change, is generally insulated from matters upon which it makes crucial decisions, is richly encrusted with many kinds of ignorance, and withal is perhaps the most expendable item in education. One feels that, if he could, Rickover would hitch school administrators to the *Nautilus* and tow them all out to sea, but he contents himself with recommending their displacement by practicing teachers.

In assessing Rickover's opinions on all these matters, one should not confuse vigor with dogmatism, for without a good deal of the former and little of the latter, Rickover could never have achieved what everyone assured him could never be achieved in nuclear power. He insists on his right to make educational judgments, to judge American schools by their results, and to criticize schoolmen, who are public officials paid out of taxes, when they botch their job. He will go right on making judgments, of course, and propounding ideas, for it is a duty he could not well put aside if he would. And it seems clear that an increasing audience, both public and professional, will listen to this rather austere and hopelessly inner-directed man, this Jeremiah whose lamentations preach greater personal responsibility, worthier aims, higher performance at every level, this unadjusted moralist who doesn't own a car, whose sartorial habits would be the despair of any Ivy League haberdasher, who isn't interested in money, who, in directing a crucial defense enterprise spending hundreds of millions of dollars, travels economy fare to save taxpayer dollars, who never accepts money for personal use from his speeches or writings but always assigns it to charities, usually those for children; who in short is a commanding if somewhat raucous voice of urgency and conscience in the land.

The University Presidency in Modern Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most tantalizing and challenging speeches to cross the academic horizon recently was given by Dr. Fred M. Hechinger, distinguished education editor of the New York Times. The occasion was the Founders' Day banquet in Boston honoring Dr. Harold C. Case on his 10th anniversary as president of Boston University.

Dr. Hechinger's address is well worth sharing with my colleagues. Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert it in the RECORD:

THE UNIVERSITY PRESIDENCY IN MODERN SOCIETY

(By Fred M. Hechinger)

"This may be one of the most important decades of the century. In it, the future trend of mankind on this planet may be determined. The decision is now being made, and the issue is whether the democratic societies have the will and the self-discipline, the creativity and the energy, necessary to do the things required to win for the world a full triumph of the way of independence and freedom."

Ladies and gentlemen, these are not my words, though I wish they were. These are the words of the man I am privileged to help honor tonight. President Case wrote them last year after his return from Africa. Their question and their challenge stand as urgently today, and we must find the answers and the strength to give the answers.

The time we live in is—gloriously perhaps, or perhaps tragically—a time of terrible decisions. Will we be strong enough? Perhaps, if we were less well off materially, perhaps if our society were less affluent and our lives less comfortable, it might in many ways be easier for us to rise to the occasion. It is easy, when you are well off, to think that a little charity is enough when sacrifice is really needed.

And yet—whether we admit it or not—hard and harsh demands confront us. If we fail, everything we cherish, including our comforts, will vanish. And so—it was never more obvious that today that our fate will in large measure be determined by the forcefulness and the honesty of our leadership.

Having said this, I have plainly stated tonight's theme: "The University Presidency in Modern Society." What is the university today, if not the heart and the brain of our efforts? If this had not been clear before last November, it ought to be self-evident now—even to the man in the street who has heard and told the jokes about (if you will pardon the reference) President Pusey's difficulty of competing with the job offers sent out by one of the members of his board of overseers.

Let's not make any mistake about it: the role of the universities in the life of our Nation is no joking matter—and if you look down the whole long roster, it is easy to see that this is not a Harvard monopoly. Perhaps the fact alone that the U.S. Government at present employs more Ph. D's than the 10 leading universities combined tells the most significant story.

Only a few years ago, it was still legitimate to argue whether or not the university ought to be part of the Nation's action programs. There were many who wanted to preserve and protect the academic oasis, or the ivory tower. There were some who thought that the small, preferably secluded ivy-covered campuses, by educating a privileged few, could give the country all the brainpower it needed, all the leadership it sought.

We know today that these are no longer even questions for debate. We know that the commitment of the universities to the Nation's and mankind's future is not an option but a duty. We know that all over the country the skyscrappers of learning will rise as, under President Case's stewardship, they are rising here in Boston.

And we are beginning to realize that, in order to mobilize our academic communities, we must look to academic leadership—and that means the college presidents.

The American people are rediscovering the meaning of, and the need for, leadership. The spectacle of leadership abused, first, by fascism and, then, by communism has misled the American public and even many of the politicians into believing that leadership itself is a dirty word. We have drifted, both in Government and in much of our institutional life, including the universities, into a substitution of Government by committee for Government through genuine leadership.

Recently and rightfully, there has been much criticism of so-called nonbooks, nonplays and, I might add, nonspeeches. These are the books, plays, and speeches which are written, not by authors but by reflectors of public demand. They are not art but artificial. They are not written but pasted up. To them we might add, in the same category but far more dangerous to our future, the nonleaders. Like the nonbooks, they are pasteups. Instead of having their eyes on the future, they have their ear to the ground.

"Committees can do a valuable job to provide facts and evidence—both essential to leadership. The democratic process of voting approval or disapproval needs no defense. But the essentials of leadership are in the courage and decisiveness to use the committees' facts, without hiding behind them, and to take action, without waiting for a vote. The leader worthy of the name acts bodly, with the mandate the voters have given him, and faces the voters boldly, on the basis of his action when his term is up.

"These rules apply to academic leadership as much as they do to politics. It is a misinterpretation of academic realities and of academic freedom to picture the college president as nothing more than a high-class beggar whose job it is to bring home the money while his faculty runs the show. He

is, or ought to be, the institution's leader both to the outside world and on his campus.

"Does that mean the college president tells his faculty what to teach, or how? This is as absurd a deduction as it would be to imply that the political leader tells people how to live or what to say and think. Quite to the contrary, one of the prime functions of the academic leader is to defend his teachers against any intrusion of their freedom to teach, to think, to write and to research. It was during the shameful period of McCarthyism that the academic leaders were put most effectively to the test—the test that separated the leaders from the nonleaders.

"But this does not imply that the college president should only be taken out of the mothballs when there is an attack from the outside to be fought off. The campus is constantly in need of leadership. It is a ludicrously sentimentalized picture that shows the academic community as a harmonious example of idyllic democracy. In fact, the groves of academe more often resemble nothing quite as much as the rank-conscious, backbiting, and protocol-minded life on any army post. One of the priorities of true academic leadership is to transform the atmosphere and the objectives from one of an intellectual barracks into a community of scholars."

Today, as never before, the college president must shape the future of the university. The demands and the offers come from many directions. The Government—from the Pentagon to the Treasury—needs the active cooperation of the universities. The foundations could not hope to accomplish their many vital missions, if they could not call on the researchers, the consultants, the teams, and the laboratories of the universities. Industry would be doomed to obsolescence, if the scholars could not feed the machines—in fact, give birth to them in the first place.

Amid all those demands, what could be more mistaken than the view of the college president as the beggar, hat-in-hand. In modern society, if the universities are to rise to the challenge, the presidential leadership must make it clear that society depends far more on the favors to be bestowed by the universities than vice versa. Today, the Federal Government spends well over a billion dollars in direct contracts—not grants—with the universities.

I repeat—these are not grants, even though they are often so misnamed. They are contracts for indispensable service rendered, and I am willing to guarantee that any industrial or profit-making organization (if it could carry out any of those contracts at all) would charge many times as much for its services. Can you imagine what an industrial organization would get for, say, a Los Alamos or the work produced by a university center of African studies?

It is time for the university presidents to make this unmistakably clear. It is time for them to leave no doubt in anyone's mind that their institutions are giving service, not asking for charity. It is time, too, that they stop giving the impression of being ready to grab whatever dollars might come their way. One of the basic functions of leadership is to make absolutely certain that the image of the institution it leads is enhanced, not cheapened.

This applies to the university presidents' relationship with foundations as much as it applies to Government contracts. In the past, there has been far too much groveling and bootlicking. One of the curses of weak leadership is lack of self-respect and lack of reliance in the strength of the institution. Naturally, that strength must be real. In the negotiations with foundations, the same principle applies as the one made famous, in diplomacy, by Dean Acheson: the negotiating must be done from "positions of strength."

This is not to imply that the foundations are the enemy camp. On the contrary: the foundations—to defend their own purposes and live up to their commitments—must rely heavily on the true quality of the universities with whom they deal. Their money is only as good as the use the university leadership makes of it. And this is why it is more vital than ever for that leadership to approach the foundations proudly, with bold plans and independent proposals.

The charge is often repeated that foundations frequently support insignificant schemes. If this is so, then the fault is with university leadership at least as much as with the foundations. It is the duty of the academic world to map out the roads to the future, not to dream up projects to get around foundation vice presidents. And it is the inescapable duty of college presidents to make certain that their departments and faculties are kept from being kept. Integrity must be both inspired and enforced by the man on top.

At the risk of sounding trite and conventional, I want to say that the university president's task is to be a "spokesman." By this I do not mean to say that he ought to be the kind of creature which modern society too often pictures as a "spokesman." Not the press agent. Not the man who reads a testimonial from a teleprompter. Not the booster nor the apologist. We have too much of all of those, and we have too many academic representatives who are not far from telling us that their college teaches good like a college should.

No—when I ask the college president to be a spokesman, I want him to speak for higher education—not for his institutional interest. I want him to help tell the country what, specifically, must be done if 10 years from now we must educate 6 million college students annually, instead of 3½ million now. I want him to debate the question of how to increase the annual production of only 9,000 Ph. D.'s—without lowering standards, indeed, probably by, at the same time, raising them. I want him to come to grips with the vital educational debates and controversies and not wait until they sneak up on an unsuspecting public.

It is almost impossible today to listen to an academic discussion without some reference to the great and fundamental problem of C. P. Snow's "Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution." My question is: Why was it necessary to rediscover Sir Charles—very late in the game, indeed—in order to get this devastatingly vital question on the national agenda? Where were the college presidents? This is the kind of question, this is the kind of search for solutions for which we should be able to look to the university presidents.

More than ever before, we must in the future look to the presidents to represent all of higher education, not fragments of it; not special interests but the future of mankind. They must not hide behind the excuse of institutional diversity; they must instead bring into focus the many facets of higher education to make it shine like a diamond rather than splinter into fragments like tinted glass.

These are harsh demands. I would not make them, if I did not hold the importance of the university presidency in high esteem. I would not dare to list these demands here tonight, were we not assembled to honor a man who has, in action, demonstrated what the presidency can be made to mean.

And with everything I have said so far, I have not even hinted at that new and terribly urgent dimension of the presidency: the university's relationship with the rest of the world.

The task of the university president is, or should be, clear. To begin with—before we even look at the active work to be accomplished abroad—here is a terribly urgent example of the need of leadership beyond the individual institutions. How can we stave off defeat and avoid self-destruction, unless the university presidents—as spokesmen of reason and enlightenment, yes, of simple self-preservation, too—will rally all their own colleagues across the Nation to wipe out that madness of racism at home which is certain to haunt and defeat us abroad. I am sufficiently aware of folly and ignorance in all of us to forgive the uneducated for their prejudice and bigotry. I cannot forgive, however, academic leaders, not even in the deepest South, for such ignorance. And I consider it the duty of the academic leadership, everywhere to make it their business to educate not only their own undergraduates but also their distant colleagues.

Only if they do so, will they have the hope to fulfill effectively the vast commitments which American universities now face all over the world. With nearly 40 countries now the recipients of American aid, directly with the International Cooperation Administration, the demand for excellence, service, and devotion has become a worldwide rather than a national challenge for American higher education. This makes the university presidency an office of supreme international importance and responsibility.

I prefaced what I tried to say tonight with President Case's own eloquent words. I should like now to let President Case supply the closing words as well. He wrote them after he saw the desperate need for compassion, understanding, and action on another continent last year. They tell what needs to be told—for the university presidency and for all of us who look to leadership:

"If we can discipline ourselves to do hard work in behalf of mankind's future, to act from principle, not out of the demands of expediency; if we can become known because of our absorption with people, not payola; with issues, not filibusters; then we can make an unprecedented contribution to the underdeveloped countries, and in the process, find our own quality of freedom."

The Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the eighth grade students of Our Lady of Sorrows School in South Orange, N.J., have decided not to wait until they are old enough to enlist in the Peace Corps. They are forming one of their own right now.

A United Press article in the April 17 issue of the Record (Hackensack, N.J.) describes this effort and the part that Representative HUGH ADDONIZIO has had in transmitting the good wishes of the President of the United States to this group.

Representative ADDONIZIO and the good students of Our Lady of Sorrows School are to be congratulated for their direct and immediate response to a people-to-people challenge. I ask unanimous consent to have the article entitled "South Orange Eighth Graders Form a Junior

Peace Corps" inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I also ask, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD a portion of a television transcript of April 2. Mr. Sargent Shriver, Director of the Peace Corps, had at that time some very interesting comments about a peace corps on the homefront, too.

There being no objection, the article and transcript were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTH ORANGE EIGHTH GRADERS FORM A JUNIOR PEACE CORPS—PAROCHIAL STUDENTS' PLAN HAS WON THE APPROVAL OF PRESIDENT

SOUTH ORANGE, April 17.—The eighth grade students of Our Lady of Sorrows School have come up with their own version of President Kennedy's Peace Corps—they plan to exchange correspondence with foreign students.

PRESIDENT'S BEST WISHES

The project, which they've tabbed a Junior Peace Corps, has already won the approval of the President himself. Representative HUGH ADDONIZIO Democrat, of New Jersey, this weekend relayed to the students and their faculty President Kennedy's best wishes.

"The President has asked me to thank you for your letter suggesting creation of a Junior Peace Corps composed of American schoolchildren who would exchange correspondence with students in other countries," the Congressman wrote.

"The President was very glad to hear of the interest expressed by your young constituents in furthering good relations abroad and sends his best wishes for the success of their project."

ADDONIZIO said the students, their teacher, Sister Martina, and their principal, Sister Eileen Cecilia, had submitted the letters to his office to be relayed to pen pals of similar age overseas.

ADDONIZIO said he had turned the letters over to Mrs. Martha Archer, chairman of the letterwriting committee of the people-to-people program at the World Affairs Center, University of Minnesota. The program is under the direction of the U.S. Information Agency.

The Congressman said Mrs. Archer will be glad to advise the students and help them get their project under way.

"The students and faculty of Our Lady of Sorrows School have performed an important service in helping focus attention on this means by which American schoolchildren may express goodwill to the other peoples of the world and increase mutual understanding in the Nation's efforts to establish an honorable, just and lasting peace," he added.

Senator WILLIAMS. Len Detlor, do you have a question?

LEN DETLOR. Yes, sir. Up to this point we've been considering the young people working abroad, and I was wondering if you could foresee any possibility of the Peace Corps people being used domestically, perhaps in a problem such as migrant labor.

Senator WILLIAMS. The President has suggested that this program of people-to-people assistance with knowledge, information on helping those who need help, could be adapted to some of our domestic problems and some of our domestic hardship. I can see it in the area of migrant labor particularly in the creation of social centers in areas where these folks come in—they're not accepted in the community, they live isolated lives in their very wretched camp towns, you see. There is nothing for them of a wholesome nature to enjoy. I could think of this as a real possibility. I believe Mr. Shriver has addressed himself to this suggesting however that it was not part of this Peace Corps. It is not your program, I mean, it's not being considered in your division, your department—is it?

Mr. SHRIVER. Not at this time. But the idea, I agree with Senator WILLIAMS, is a good idea and it is under study, I know. Perhaps something good will come out of it, and a definite plan. One thing is, and it would help to answer your question in a sense, because anybody who is willing to do that kind of work here, would be a very good person for the Peace Corps overseas. It would be a very good proof of the sincerity of their purpose.

Senator WILLIAMS. I wonder if I could ask a general question of our students. The first reaction as I saw it in about five or six college campuses to which I went after the President advanced this program, was magnificent. Young people responded. I know at Princeton, 230 seniors were recently asked about the Peace Corps. Eighty-four percent thought it was a fine idea and 20 percent indicated an interest in applying as volunteers in the Peace Corps. What has been the reaction at George Washington and at Smith and at American?

LEN DETLOR. I can answer for my school. I know that there are a great many students who are giving serious and detailed study to this program. They realize, I think, because of the great number of foreign students there that they have contact with, that this is not going to be a vacation and they have showed a real and serious consideration and almost a dedication to this idea.

Teenage Crime Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an important editorial which appeared in the Lawrence Sunday Sun, Lawrence, Mass., on April 16, 1961:

TEENAGE CRIME INCREASES

"Today, youthful criminality poses a critical threat to the future of our Nation. The destiny of America lies in the hands of our young people." These are the solemn words of the one man who should know this threat of serious danger, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover.

Speaking before the National Forum on Youth Crime, attended by Federal and State police from all over the Nation at New York City a few days ago, the head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation further revealed the startling information that teenagers account for one-half of the burglary and larceny arrests in the United States and nearly two-thirds for auto thefts. And their rate of participation in more serious crimes—assault, robbery, rape, and murder—is steadily rising.

Preoccupied with the pursuit of wealth and pleasures, parents seem to have lost touch with our basic traditions—work, discipline, duty, honor, and faith.

"If this Nation is to survive," warns Hoover, "we must enlighten and train our youngsters to revere more the spiritual concepts which are the real sinews of greatness."

Youths who participated in a panel discussion, following the talks, cited neighborhood environment and bad companionship as two major reasons for youth crime.

In Lawrence, as practically everywhere else, teenage vandalism and more serious crimes such as stealing cars, breaking and entering and robbery have increased greatly in recent years. The willful disregard for public property, damaging school and municipal buildings, city swimming pools, has been demonstrated many times by fractious, errant, irresponsible youngsters.

These acts later lead to more flagrant violations showing an avowed disregard for respect for the law and authority. This is what has been generally classified today as juvenile delinquency. Hoover says: "This is youthful criminality, refer to the gangs in larger cities who commit vicious acts of vandalism, wanton brutality and mounting savagery, which typify today's arrogant teenage gangs."

It presents a serious problem for parents, teachers, clergymen, and citizens in general how to combat this wave of crime and vandalism. Some say, more clubs like youth service centers, boys' clubs, promotion of more sports for youths all season around to get them off the streets * * * to absorb and liquidate their youthful enthusiasm and unbridled energies. This is the matter for service clubs and other agencies to consider and promote. Something must be done to curb the continuing growing teenage crime wave.

National Conference on State Parks Endorses President Kennedy's National Resources Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, during a recent meeting here in Washington, the officers and board of directors of the National Conference of State Parks approved President Kennedy's objectives as outlined to the Congress in his special message concerning "Our Natural Resources."

Mr. Frank D. Quinn, of Austin, who is chairman of the board of the National Conference on State Parks, and an official of the Texas State Parks Board, has called to my attention an excellent report on this group's meeting. It was written by Dora A. Padgett, executive secretary of the National Conference on State Parks, and was published in the March 1961 issue of Park Maintenance magazine. It is an excellent report on the work of this group and its interest and work in coordination with the national conservation efforts.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The National Conference on State Parks: Its History and Its Future," by Dora A. Padgett.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON STATE PARKS: ITS HISTORY, ITS FUTURE

(By Dora A. Padgett)

The National Conference on State Parks is the only national organization devoted exclusively to the promotion of State parks. Its purpose is to foster a broad, bold, nation-

wide movement for proper research, planning, acquistion, development, conservation, and use of State parks and related types of open spaces and nonurban recreation resources—both land and water.

These are accomplished by (1) cooperating with government and private agencies, (2) serving as a clearinghouse for information through publications, conferences, and other educational means, (3) developing professional leadership in the administration of State parks and related areas, and (4) encouraging interpretation of the country's scenic, scientific, and historical features—all to the end that every citizen shall appreciate the value of State parks, recreation areas, and open spaces.

The National Conference on State Parks was organized as a result of a meeting of conservation leaders at Des Moines, Iowa, called at the suggestion of Stephen T. Mather, then Director of the National Park Service. Mather recognized that national parks should be supplemented by State parks and he pledged the cooperation of the National Park Service in a variety of ways.

From the outset Mather, Judge John Barton Payne, Secretary of the Interior, and Col. Richard Lieber, director of the Indiana Department of Conservation, were in accord on the principal objectives of the conference. They guided the conference ship of state through the early years, on the principle that each State should preserve typical State scenery in reservations large enough to provide for their enjoyment by visitors without destruction of the features they were created to protect. To this, Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr., in his California State park survey of 1929, added that they should be sufficiently distinctive and notable to interest people from comparatively distant parts of the State to visit and use them; not merely good enough to attract people from the region in which they are situated and merely because of the absence of more interesting areas within easy reach.

Through the years the annual conferences have reflected the broadening vision of those engaged in State park work. The founders had set a goal above all others in the State park program of conserving natural scenery. However, the growing pressure for outdoor recreation was recognized and the conference has urged that there was a place also for large recreation areas under State management. This objective was recognized in Mr. Olmsted's 1950 report to the California State Park Commission recommending provision of State recreation facilities in relation to needs of the population.

The growth of State park areas is illustrated by statistics over the years. No State parks were reported in 1921 when the conference was established in 29 States. In 1959 there were more than 2,400 State parks, monuments, historic sites and other types of recreation areas throughout all States and used by more than 255 million visitors. Of course the conference is not solely responsible for this great expansion, but the men who have developed the state park systems have been the same men who have directed and supported the conference. It has been almost an interlocking directorate through which the State park officials in the several States have placed their ideas and experience in a common hopper from which State park practices and principles grew.

Officers and members of the board of directors throughout the years have been drawn from outstanding and distinguished park leaders from all over the United States. Judge John Barton Payne first headed the new organization and he was later succeeded by such outstanding conservationists as Stephen Mather, Maj. William A. Welch, Howard B. Bloomer, Col. Richard Lieber, Tom Wallace, Harold S. Wagner, Harold W. Lathrop, James F. Evans, Thomas W. Morse, Frank D. Quinn, Victor W. Flickinger, Charles A. DeTurk, Kenneth R. Cougill, William G. Wells, and currently, Arthur C. Elmer.

The conference established the office of chairman of the board to carry on with the president and other officers. Present officers are: Frank D. Quinn, chairman of the board; Arthur Elmer, president; Earl P. Hanson and John Vanderzicht, vice presidents; Ben H. Thompson, treasurer; and Mrs. Dora A. Padget, executive secretary. Those who have served as chairmen of the board are Colonel Lieber, Tom Wallace and Horace M. Albright.

During the first 7 years of the conference, Miss Beatrice M. Ward, later Mrs. Wilbur Nelson, served as executive secretary. Herbert Evison was executive secretary from 1929 to 1933. In 1935 the National Conference on State Parks asked the American Planning and Civic Association to act as a secretariat under a plan to share publications and simplify administration; however, to maintain its separate board of directors and hold separate annual meetings. The two organizations share headquarters at 901 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C. Miss Harlean James served as executive secretary under this cooperative arrangement until her retirement in 1959. Since 1959 Mrs. Dora A. Padgett has served as executive secretary under the same administrative setup.

The quarterly, Planning and Civic Comment, is the joint publication of the conference and the American Planning and Civic Association. It presents in each issue articles on State park subjects and general information concerning developments in the State park field.

Over the years the conference has issued a succession of valuable publications. In 1926 it issued a volume on "State Parks and Recreational Uses of State Forests in the United States," by Raymond Torrey; in 1928, a 448-page book on "State Recreation, Parks, Forests, and Game Preserves," by Beatrice Ward Nelson; and in 1930, a "State Park Anthology," edited by Herbert Evison. From 1927 to 1933 a magazine called State Recreation was issued. In 1935 Planning and Civic Comment became successor to that publication, combined with Civic Comment and City Planning. In 1942 the conference took over from the National Park Service the "Year Book on Park and Recreation Progress," issued every 2 or 3 years. The last issue was in 1955.

The chief publication of the conference at the present time is Park Practice, which has an international list of subscribers. This was first suggested at the annual meeting of the national conference on state parks held in Bastrop State Park, Tex., in 1950. The primary purpose was to furnish a means of exchanging information on design and construction of parks and recreation facilities at all levels of Government.

The program was initiated the following year under a Park Practice committee. At the biennial National Park Service conference held in Great Smoky Mountains National Park in 1955, Director Conrad L. Wirth entertained recommendations made by two working committees that some means be provided for making the benefits of experiences of park personnel available to all units of the national park system. The following week he concluded an agreement with the board of directors of the national conference on state park at its annual meeting held in Stowe, Vt., to cooperate in an expanded and enlarged Park Practice program.

In March 1956 National Park Service participation was effected by establishing a park practice section with Ira B. Lykes serving as chief. Under the new program, material is issued under three categories: design, drawings and photographs of park structures and facilities that have been constructed and proven successful; Guideline, material in text form on a variety of subjects such as policy and planning, administration, protection, development, interpretation, maintenance, and concessions; and Grist, an eight-page illustrated bi-monthly information letter aimed primarily at the field operating level and presenting proven labor and money-saving devices, tricks of the trade, and other appropriate information. Park Practice is a nonprofit, mutual program operated by park and recreation-area people for the benefit of park and recreation-area people.

Periodically special publications have been issued such as "Digest of Laws Relating to State Parks," $3; "Revenue Bonds for State Park and Recreation Area Development," $1; "Suggested Policy Statements for State Parks," 10 cents; and "Suggested Criteria for Evaluating Areas Proposed for Inclusion in the State Park Systems," 10 cents.

The proceedings of the 40 annual meetings have been published over the years, later incorporated in the "American Planning and Civic Annual" and sometimes as separate issues. For the past two years, the proceedings have been issued as a supplement to the December issue of the quarterly, "Planning and Civic Comment." These proceedings constitute a body of reference material on the subject and pending problems which have been important in conference activities, such as park standards of acquisition, State park methods of dealing with legislation, appropriations, maintenance, development and use, and the far-reaching results of committee research into the fields of policy statements relating to the development, use and operation of State parks.

Last year a special committee of the conference took a serious look at the job ahead for both the conference and the challenge to State parks growing out of the intense interest in outdoor recreation. As a result of deliberations, a new statement of object and objectives for the conference was adopted in 1960. The State park programs have a growing responsibility and opportunity to serve the recreational needs of the people of the United States. The conference, through its annual conferences and program, has conducted over the years an examination of State park methods and procedures which has had far-reaching results.

As the organization looks to the future, it proposes to enlarge its program. It will foster a broad national movement for research, planning, acquisition and development of State parks and related areas, with a strong program of public education through a central clearing house of information. The future role of the conference will emphasize the continued expansion of its program for a well-balanced organization of citizen and professional members to carry out its aims and to constantly reappraise its leadership and activities to keep pace with the rapid changes of the changing era in which we live.

Business Week's Bell Finds Excessive Taxes, Government Spending To Get Money in Circulation Ridiculous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, Elliott V. Bell, editor and publisher of Business Week, spoke recently before the Wine and Spirits Wholesalers' annual meeting in Honolulu, calling for a

reformation of America's tax system to meet the problems of unemployment and sustaining economic growth in America. I believe that Mr. Bell's remarks deserve the very close attention and study of every member of the Congress. They are not necessarily the final answer in that which is discussed, but they are the well presented thoughts of a man interested and knowing in the field of the American economy. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Bell's remarks at this point in the RECORD:

THE ECONOMIC OUTLOOK ON THE NEW FRONTIER

(An address by Elliott V. Bell, editor and publisher, Business Week magazine, before Wine and Spirits Wholesalers of America, Inc., Honolulu, Hawaii, April 19, 1961)

My purpose today is to examine with you the current state of business, the Kennedy administration as revealed in its first 3 months in office, and some of the major economic problems that will confront our Nation in the years immediately ahead.

We need not spend too much time on the current recession. It has been in progress for about a year. It has been exceedingly mild. It has followed, to a remarkable degree, the precise pattern that most experts foresaw from the start. It is now clear that we are already at, or very close to, the bottom of the downturn.

Signs of recovery are multiplying. Business has begun to reduce the rate at which inventories are being liquidated. Spending on new plant and equipment, which had been cut back $2½ billion in the past 12 months, is scheduled for at least a moderate improvement later this year.

Expenditures by Federal, State, and local governments are rising. All Government spending on goods and services, incidentally, this year will exceed $100 billion, which is equal to one-fifth of the value of all we produce. Construction is feeling the lift of spring. Good weather, after a rough winter, is bringing cheer to the hearts of auto dealers and producers of durable goods. The stock market, fulfilling its classic role of harbinger of things to come, has been forecasting, ever since the election, either a dramatic business recovery or a great inflation or both.

There are, of course, still many soft spots, but the plus signs exceed the minuses.

I think we can safely say the turn has come; recovery is underway. The big question, of course, is how vigorous and sustained a recovery it will be. On this point there is considerable difference of opinion.

At the first meeting, last month, of the President's Labor-Management Committee, President Kennedy told us he would not be surprised to see a recovery of business this summer but a continuation of 6 or 7 percent unemployment in the fall.

On the other hand some business and university economists—probably a minority at this point—think the recovery will be sharp, vigorous and sustained.

My own view is the recession will have clearly passed its turning point within the next month. By June the forces of recovery will be obvious to all; and by late autumn the revival will be vigorous with gross national product running at a rate of $520 billion or better, compared with a scant $500 billion in the first quarter. On the record, 1962 will almost certainly be the most prosperous year in our history thus far. For the moment let's leave it there, while we have a happy thought to hold.

But before we throw our hats in the air, it should be noted that the recession of 1960–61, even when it has ended, will leave behind a haunting legacy of doubt and worry.

The thing that has been really disturbing about this recession is that it followed so soon after the 1957–58 decline. We are apt to think of the business cycle as comprising a complete wave—from a peak of prosperity to a pit of recession and back to a new and even higher peak of prosperity. Indeed, our earlier postwar business cycles did have this neat, orderly and rather reassuring appearance. Not so the recessions of 1957–58 and 1960–61. These two were not only closely bunched together but were actually interdependent.

The fact is we never really achieved full recovery from the recession of 1958. Even in the most prosperous period of 1959 unemployment remained substantial. It is possible that we should think of the entire period extending from the middle of 1957 to the present as a period of quasi-depression analogous to, though happly much less severe than, the great depression of the 1930's when we had several up and down oscillations of the business curve but could not escape from the curse of massive unemployment.

The haunting question is: Do these recent years reflect merely the ending of the postwar era with its pent-up demands, inflated credit and inadequate productive capacity; or, are we witnessing a return of the dilemma of the prewar years when chronic unemployment persisted right up to the onset of war?

I want to return to this subject after a bit but first I should like you to look with me briefly at life on the New Frontier under the leadership of our young President from Harvard.

Mr. Kennedy has brought to Washington a surprisingly mixed, but on the whole, admirable team. He has put together a sort of coalition Cabinet, with the sensitive posts of Treasury and Defense going to Republicans. For Secretary of State, he picked Dean Rusk, a Rhodes scholar, quiet, scholarly, greatly respected by those who know him. Then he has bracketed the Secretary by two eminent Democratic politicians—Adlai Stevenson and Chester Bowles—each of whom was thought to have coveted the top job. Is this genius or expediency? For Secretary of Labor he picked the smartest labor lawyer in the country, Arthur Goldberg, whose pronouncements and actions since taking office have left some labor leaders a trifle baffled and caused others to call him the "Mr. Republican" of this administration.

Moving with the drive and energy of youth—in obvious contrast to the measured, energy-saving pace of his predecessor—Mr. Kennedy has made a strongly favorable impression on most people. In the course of a brief, highly unscientific taxicab poll I took in Washington recently, I learned that "everyone feels much better." "They feel like a lot of things that need to be done are going to get done."

That may not be very precise but it's important. Mr. Kennedy has had a salutary effect on public sentiment.

The remarkable thing is that thus far there is very little of a tangible character to support the widespread impression of bold, new action.

In fact, young President Kennedy has met the recession of 1961 almost precisely the way old President Eisenhower met the recession of 1958. There have been no dramatic or drastic measures. On both occasions the White House has turned a deaf ear to recommendations for a temporary tax cut. On both occasions the response was identical. Like Eisenhower, Kennedy said: "We'll wait until April to see whether things improve."

On both occasions April brought the wellnigh inevitable improvement, and a tax cut, whether or not it would have been a good idea earlier, had clearly become outdated by April. Meantime, the prospects are that spending will increase and deficits will rise, although there is as yet no sign that Mr. Kennedy will achieve in fiscal 1962 a deficit as large as the nearly $13 billion-one Mr. Eisenhower piled up in fiscal 1959.

Actually, Mr. Kennedy has turned out thus far to be very much of a conservative. He is obviously aware that the label of big spending and the threat of inflation are political liabilities especially dangerous to Democrats. So he has talked boldly but moved cautiously.

Here's how a Washington wit summed up the administration's performance thus far. He said it reminded him of that dazzling basketball team—the Harlem Globetrotters. The New Frontier team has been passing the ball forward, behind, sidewise and underneath—a brilliant display—but thus far nobody has scored a basket.

The cautious course the President has steered reflects, no doubt, his own normal inclination. It reflects also his appreciation of the fiscal conservatism of Congress, and a recognition that the narrow margin of his election gave him no sweeping or unchallengeable mandate.

Not all of his advisers have been quite happy with Mr. Kennedy's moves to stimulate recovery. One of the most distinguished of them, Prof. Paul Samuelson of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, has called the President's recovery program a "placebo program"—a pill that makes the patient think he is being treated although in fact the pill has nothing but a little sugar in it.

For the coming fiscal year, Mr. Kennedy has budgeted for only about $3 billion more than Mr. Eisenhower had planned. He is budgeting a deficit of only $2¾ billion.

Some of the President's brilliant young braintrusters are concerned whether deficit spending of such modest proportions will give the economy the forward lift they think it needs.

Certainly thus far, and prospectively for 1962, the President's program for stimulating recovery and growth is more modest and conservative than most people realize—a good deal more conservative than the stock market's ebullience would suggest.

Now, it may well be that the President, proceeding by political intuition, may turn out to have been a better—or at least a luckier—economist than his advisers. If this recovery should indeed prove vigorous, if it should carry the economy back to reasonably full employment faster than is now anticipated, then, of course, it will be all for the best not to have overstimulated the economy by rapid and massive increases in Government spending on the one hand, or sizable tax reductions on the other. Either course would tend to revive the inflationary pressures that are now suspended, and a renewal of inflation, or even fear of inflation, would aggravate our dangerous balance of payments position.

This brings me in one easy motion to the third phase of my talk—the interlocking complex of major economic problems which confront our Nation and for which thus far we have found no workable solution.

I have already mentioned one of these problems—the failure of our economy, even at the peak of the last recovery period, to provide enough jobs to employ our full labor force.

You know, there has been a fascinating paradox about the latest recession. Every month for the past year or more the total of employed persons has reached a record high for that month. Thus employment in January was the highest for any January in our history. The same was true of February, and March, and will, I have no doubt, be true for April, May, and June, and so on.

Yet, in each of these months of record high employment, unemployment also rose. The total by February had reached 5,700,000 workers, largest in number for almost 20 years. Moreover, many of these unemployed had been out of work for a long time and had exhausted their unemployment benefits.

Now, of course, some of this unemployment has been due to cyclical factors—the circumstance that we have been in a recession. But a good part appears to be due to what economists call "structural" factors.

Structural unemployment is just another name for what we used to call technological unemployment, except that it has a broader meaning. It means not merely the unemployment that results when, for example, a textile plant is fitted out with laborsaving machinery, and handworkers are displaced by automation. It also means what happens when the old textile plant in New England is abandoned, and the new automated plant is erected in North Carolina. It means what happens when homes and factories switch from coal to oil. Coal miners in West Virginia or Pennsylvania lose their jobs. Even if there are unfilled jobs elsewhere, the miners may not be able or willing to move away and learn new skills.

Several easy answers have been suggested for this problem. Certain labor leaders say: Just cut the working week from 40 hours to 30 hours—this will create more jobs overnight. Certain management men have an equally easy answer. Business, they say, has been forced to automate because of high labor costs. Just let labor agree to take a pay cut and there will be more jobs. Well you don't have to be a politician to figure that these "solutions" are not as simple as they sound.

This particular problem of structural unemployment is inextricably interlocked with others. There is, for example, the broad question of economic growth. There is also the question of whether American goods can remain competitive in the world market. Can we hold our own against the rebuilt, modern industry of Western Europe and Japan with their relatively cheap labor?

This brings us again to the tough nut of our balance of payments. For some years now the total payments that we make abroad—for goods and services, for travel, for investment, for military operations, and for foreign aid—have exceeded the payments foreigners make to us. In the years 1958, 1959, and 1960, we paid out $11 billion more than we took in. This situation became so alarming last year that people began to talk about possible devaluation of the dollar, and gold flowed out of the country in large amounts.

President Kennedy, it should be said, has shown himself acutely aware of the balance of payments problem. He gets high marks for making it perfectly clear both during the campaign and after taking office that he means to defend the integrity of the dollar at its present exchange rate with all the resources at his command.

Those resources are still very considerable. Including our gold stock and our rights to draw credit from the International Monetary Fund, they amount to some $22 billion.

The President's strong statements had an immediate effect in stopping the run on the dollar that had started last fall. Losses of gold diminished, and last month we began to regain a little gold.

We have a breathing spell—but we have as yet not solved the problem. We have merely gained a little time to try to find a way out of this and related problems—including technological change, structural unemployment, economic growth, high production costs, and inflation.

It is for this reason that the President has established the Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy on which I am privileged to serve.

It is, of course, too early to say whether the 21 members of this Committee will be able to make any important or practical contributions to the solution of this complex web of problems to which the President has asked us to address ourselves.

All of us will bring with us a certain freight of ideas, some of which I am sure we will have to throw into the sea before the long voyage is over. Accordingly, I should like the views I am about to give you to be regarded as preliminary and tentative, rather than hard and fast.

The President has set as his target a reduction in unemployment to not more than 4 percent of the labor force. This seems to me reasonable. It is a goal that should not put undue strain on the labor market, or tend to generate new inflationary wage-price spirals. It is also a rate that should permit some flexibility in our system and leave incentive for productive effort on the job. Reasonable as this goal is, we have not achieved it except momentarily since 1953.

The question of how much our unemployment is due to structural factors versus cyclical factors is fundamental to the problem of policy formulation and in no sense a merely academic question. The lag in job formation is, I believe, a consequence of both slow overall growth and rapid technological change. To deal with it we shall need several kinds of weapons in our arsenal.

I would be disposed to put primary emphasis on fiscal and monetary policies to insure that we have sufficient demand to keep our existing resources employed at relatively high rates. Because the balance-of-payments problem hampers the use of monetary policy on which we formerly relied as our main instrument, this means that more reliance must be put on fiscal policy in insuring that the economy operates at high and stable levels of employment—a condition that is essential to regaining a more rapid rate of growth.

"Fiscal policy" is a term that is often used and seldom defined. By it I mean all of the taxing, spending, and borrowing operations that the Government conducts—all of the ways in which the Federal establishment puts money into the national economy or takes money out of it.

I am impressed by the arguments advanced by a number of economists to show that the fiscal policy we have been following has created a "deflationary gap" that represents a constant drag on the economy. What this means in plain English is that our tax system is taking such a heavy bite out of total demand that economic recovery loses its drive before a condition of full employment can be achieved. It is estimated that if the country should achieve full production and employment the tax system would generate a surplus of something like $12 billion over present levels of expenditures. But the tax system is so oppressive that it keeps us from achieving full production. It nips off recovery short of the peak, as happened in 1960, and slows down the Nation's rate of growth.

In theory, there are two ways that this "deflationary gap" could be closed. One would be to cut taxes. The other would be to increase spending.

Some spending increases obviously are on the way. And this fact seems to have restrained President Kennedy from asking for any reduction in taxes at this time. I am inclined to agree that it is too late now for a temporary tax cut to aid recovery, but I hope this will not mean indefinite postponement of long-range tax legislation.

To achieve longrun growth and maximum utilization of our economic resources, I believe it is essential to undertake a thoroughgoing reform of our tax system, coupled with some reduction in the level of tax rates. And I believe that this task should be commenced at once, without waiting for the economy to go through another frustrating cycle of partial recovery, aborted boom, and recession.

It seems clear to me that it would be both unnecessary and unwise to try to close the deflationary gap by thrusting bigger and bigger spending programs at Congress. Let us spend what we must. But let us not put ourselves in the ridiculous position of spending simply to get back into circulation money that an unduly severe tax system has taken away from consumers and investors.

The problem of tax reform is not a new one. But it is an increasingly urgent one. It was a matter of much disappointment to me as a Republican that during 8 years in office my party did not even attempt such an overhaul. Now with the Democrats in control of both the executive and legislative branches, the task ought not to be shirked.

I realize that it is already too late in the current session to expect the Congress to produce a major reform bill (although I regret that this job was not given a high priority at the start of the new administration). Possibly we will have full recovery without action on the tax front. Frankly, I doubt it. I am concerned that without a tax cut and tax reform, we may see a repetition of the 1959–60 performance of the economy. And I believe that we can avoid it if the President and Congress will turn their most serious attention to this major national economic task. I believe it should have an absolutely top priority in the next session of Congress.

Aside from fiscal and monetary measures, there are a number of other things that we can do to promote economic growth and stability.

Consideration should be given, I think, to programs for increasing the mobility of the economy—that would lead available workers to the jobs that are opening up, and out of the job or industries or regions that are contracting.

The prime weapon in any such program must, of course, be education. Better education in our elementary and high schools, our colleges and universities, can spread the knowledge and skills that increase employment opportunities. Through education also the young people entering the labor market each year can be encouraged to seek employment in the service industries and elsewhere, where demand is increasing, instead of looking for work in a declining sector. Existing programs of on-the-job training in industry, apprentice training to give workers new skills, and graduate study programs both for training top new professionals and specialists, and for upgrading people who completed their academic work years ago are needed.

One thing is certain—we must not allow ourselves to get into the way of thinking of technological change as a hazard, or even as merely a problem to be coped with. On the contrary, paradoxical as it may seem, we need more, rather than less, of this accelerated scientific and technological progress in order to produce the faster economic growth we must have.

The discovery of new ideas, and the diffusion of those ideas throughout our system, is the most important source of growth we have. In this area lies the strength of our system. It is on our scientific, intellectual, and technological prowess and progress that the survival of our free political economy now depends.

I have been talking about our major problems largely from a domestic view, but implicit in all we say or do today is the struggle in which we are so deeply engaged between communism and the free world.

The capacity of any country to safeguard its own destiny and to influence nations and

events is dependent upon that country's strength and vigor. Only a country with a vigorous, growing political economy can be independent and give leadership to other countries.

In the affairs of nations as of men, there comes a time of supreme testing where failure can only lead on to ultimate decline and fall. We are facing such a test today and the outcome is by no means certain. Can free man working together in a free system successfully meet the challenge of a system just as tough, resourceful and scientifically skilled as our own, that is closely planned, disciplined and directed with the precise purpose of surpassing us?

If the confident "yes" we give to that question is to be achieved we shall have to improve our ways of working together and still competing with each other, of managing our affairs for the national good without sacrificing the individual's rights. We shall need to bring to these years of troubled peace the same dedication and resolve we achieved in war. For the truth is, of course, we are still at war—a war to assure the survival of all that makes life for us worthwhile.

Mass Transportation Vital to Our Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the transit facilities of our Nation are dwindling at precisely the time when we should be making plans for great increases in such facilities. At recent hearings, it was stated that more than 300 municipalities in the United States are now without transit facilities of any kind.

I am impressed, therefore, with the increasing interest now being displayed in this question, and I am gratified by the testimony given for the mass transit bill I introduced earlier this year. Two recent editorials give some indication of reaction in my home State. One is from the Camden Courier Post of April 10. The other is from the Paterson Morning Call of March 29. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorials printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Camden Courier Post, Apr. 10, 1961]

CONSIDERATION FOR MASS TRANSIT

Three days of hearings in Washington on a mass transit bill have, as New Jersey's Senator WILLIAMS observed, "conclusively documented" the need for action in this field.

What is being urged is a broader vision for long-range improvements in mass transportation, which would be coordinated with urban renewal, housing, and community facilities under a Department of Urban Affairs.

There is no question that urban and metropolitan regions of the country are becoming vastly more complicated. The transit bill sponsored by the Democratic Senator is directed, as he claims, as much toward searching for ways to avoid unnecessary transportation as for a search for more efficient rapid mass transportation.

In seeking to place the problem under a single department, WILLIAMS insists that for too long we have been dishing out Federal aid with a dozen different hands and "not a single hand knows what the other 11 hands are doing." This, naturally, leads to waste in public expenditures at all levels of government. Even encouragement of suburban development can compound the mass transportation problem, as WILLIAMS has noted. Coordination of programs seems necessary.

The transit bill, which provides a low-cost revolving loan fund of $250 million for facilities and equipment, as well as a $75-million matching grant program for demonstration projects and comprehensive mass transportation development, was given almost unanimous support during the 3 days of hearings.

In the case of Philadelphia, the bill could make Federal loans available for the purchase of cars and other equipment on commuter lines serving the city. It could make possible the building of the midcity underground hookup between the suburban lines of the Pennsylvania Railroad and the Reading Co.

Mayor Dilworth and James M. Symes, board chairman of the Pennsylvania, have argued Federal aid to mass transportation would spur more than $500 million in new construction in Philadelphia in the next decade, create hundreds of jobs and save a billion-dollar investment in railroad commuter service that is threatened with extinction.

How the proposed transit aid would affect the Camden and surrounding areas of south Jersey directly has not been made clear. Delaware River Port Authority officials proceeding with their plans for a high-speed rail link to Stratford, apparently feel the Federal plan would not materially alter that proposal.

Federal aid to transit could hold vast importance for the future, however. Dilworth already has declared that south Jersey counties must join with Philadelphia and its Pennsylvania suburbs in a regional transportation plan.

Dilworth warns that Philadelphia's transportation system will go downhill unless the city gets help from four surrounding Pennsylvania counties, plus Camden, Gloucester, and Burlington Counties.

The future role of bus companies in the transit picture also is unclear, but they, too, are proceeding with current plans. Public Service has added 10 new deluxe buses on its Haddon Avenue run through Collingswood, Haddon Township, and Haddonfield where the bus versus rail transit dispute still rages, but there probably isn't a chance in a hundred that the buses were added just to gain a talking point against the high-speed plan.

Regional thinking is the coming thing in planning to meet the transit crisis. For example, regional planning experts say now that the chronic ills of commuter rail service in the New Jersey-New York-Connecticut metropolitan region could be cured only by a tristate agency with Federal help. Metropolitan commuter railroads otherwise will continue to deteriorate, they say.

The Port of New York Authority, too, has come around to the point of agreeing to involve itself financially in commuter rail projects after having operated 40 years without doing so.

The projects would be over and above the proposed acquisition of the Hudson and Manhattan Railroad and its properties. The interstate agency, in bills prepared for the New Jersey and New York Legislatures, agrees to devote up to 10 percent of its $70 million general reserve fund annually hereafter to commuter rail improvements.

As the hearings in Washington have indicated clearly, the crying need is not for "panic solutions" but for new thinking about the very nature of transportation in our highly populated areas.

It becomes obvious that we can't superimpose a transit system on an obsolete city and its environs. We can't destroy and rebuild without taking mass transit into basic consideration, and we can't merely preserve what we have or modify old facilities if we have any hope at all of meeting the demands of the future in our metropolitan areas. Urban development must take into consideration the key role that transportation has in that development.

[From the Paterson Morning Call, Mar. 29, 1961]

SENATOR WILLIAMS' BILL—MASS TRANSPORTATION VITAL TO OUR FUTURE

We fully endorse the mass transportation bill which was introduced this year by U.S. Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, together with 18 of his Senate colleagues.

The subject of this vitally needed legislation, in the words of Senator WILLIAMS, "touches upon one of the most important nerve centers of our national, social, and economic life—the movement of people and goods in and around our urban and metropolitan areas."

Action is demanded in this session to keep alive dwindling transit facilities. Without assurance that commuter and goods transportation will continue, not only will this New York-New Jersey region face serious economic loss, but the Nation as a whole will suffer traffic strangulation and all the inconveniences flowing from want of means of adequate transit by bus or train.

To quote Gov. David Lawrence of Pennsylvania "Those of us who have public responsibility have a duty to be extra-sensitive to possible breakdown. We cannot let automobiles be built and sold without providing roads and parking spaces for them. We cannot let these same roads and parking spaces choke our urban areas. We cannot let our cities succumb to urban blight and crumble beneath the burden of overcrowding. We need a strong, firm, national program to get transportation in our cities moving again. We must have Federal legislation of the type now before you. We need the Williams urban mass transportation bill, and I urge that it be passed by Congress without delay."

It is noteworthy that Senator Williams sees the importance of enactment of his mass transportation bill to the many urban renewal programs throughout the country in the development of cities whose residents have opportunity of moving goods and commuting to their places of employment.

On this subject, the following observation is from a report of a series of discussions at a 3-week meeting of leading transportation experts sponsored last year by the National Academy of Sciences:

"The growth of metropolitan areas by irregular spreading of industries and homes from cities into the countryside—often at a rapid pace—makes the provision of adequate transportation for the newcomers as well as the older residents extremely difficult. On the other hand, the pattern of transportation facilities within the metropolitan area and its environs is itself a powerful level determining the form that urban expansion and change will take. Transportation then not only serves but helps to shape urban development."

The Williams bill has as its objective remedying the fast-worsening urban transportation crisis. It looks ahead. It recognizes that it is imperative to bring about an economic solution to a serious problem. It is must legislation and should receive every priority of action in Congress.

Federal Participation in the Encouragement of Performing and Visual Arts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the urgency of Federal participation in the encouragement of American culture is emphasized in the correspondence I have received from many parts of the country. Outside of the large metropolitan centers, a cultural desert often exists which is relieved only by a few small private cooperative and university groups. We are about the only major power whose Government makes no substantial effort to help the Nation's cultural treasure in the performing and visual arts.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD letters from the noted opera singer, Mimi Benzell; from Robert Ackart, member of the board of governors of the American Guild of Musical Artists; and from Delmar E. Solem, chairman, Department of Drama, University of Miami; also a report on Government aid for the theater in West Germany which appeared in the theater publication Back Stage, April 14.

There being no objection, the articles and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Back Stage, Apr. 14, 1961]

FORTY MILLION DOLLARS GOVERNMENT SUBSIDY BUILDS 100 NEW THEATERS IN GERMANY

The theater is flourishing in West Germany, where municipalities annually contribute the equivalent of $40 million in subsidies to help maintain their theaters. There are now 200 theaters in 100 West German cities.

While Senator JAVITS is unable to push through a bill in Congress calling for a measly $5 million to encourage culture throughout the 50 States, West Germany, using some of the billions in American aid poured into the country during the past 15 years, has built over 100 new theaters in the last 10 years.

While the Government spends billions subsidizing various industries, from airlines to steamships (it cost the U.S. taxpayer $150 million a year to subsidize the latter) it still refuses to acknowledge that American culture is worthy of support.

West Germany, however, recognizes the value of live theater and has embarked on a huge building campaign. The theater has always occupied a special place in Germany. The human condition, wherever it finds meaningful expression on the stage, is ultimately seen by a vast German audience (20 million in 1959) of all income levels.

Civic pride and the public's support maintain theaters. They play to full houses every evening 10 months in the year. Many of them have permanent acting groups which frequently visit each other's base for guest performances. Each theater alternates nightly the 10 to 12 different plays produced during the year.

Almost anyone in Germany is within 50 miles of a stage with the choice of the world's best dramatic literature. Admission prices are 15 cents (standees) to $2.40. Even the small city audience can expect to see a repertory ranging from the Greek playwrights to Shakespeare, Goethe to Pirandello, Lope de Vega to Sartre, Samuel Beckett to Brecht, O'Neill and Arthur Miller.

ROLE OF THEATERS INTENDANT

The 130 city and state theaters (apart from 70-odd stages operated privately) are autonomous. Each is under the direction of a generalintendant hired by the city or state on a 5-year contract. As executive producer, he selects the plays and retains complete freedom of artistic direction. His staff includes designers, directors, conductor, composer, and musicians, costumers, singers, ballet dancers, lighting experts, a play-reader and adapter, stage crews and theater employees—all of whom are in civil service.

BERLIN THEATERS

Of the 27 theaters in Berlin before the war only 3 came through unscathed. In West Berlin today (population 2,300,000) 8 theaters are playing again and a new opera house will open shortly.

MUENSTER THEATER

The 960-seat Municipal Theater in Muenster, completed in 1956, serves an urban area of 150,000. A university town with some light industry, it was 60 percent destroyed in the war. The theater was built around a remaining wall of the ancient, bombed-out Roemberger Hof. U.S. architect C. E. Kidder-Smith describes the theater as "one of Europe's very finest and unquestionably the most imaginative. The capacious and handsome public circulation areas, ideal for social promenading, are ablaze with light in the evening, producing a lively atmosphere to all who pass by outside." The theater accommodates opera, ballet, concerts, and drama.

GELSENKIRCHEN THEATERS

Pictured on the front page is one of the best examples of the importance of theaters in Germany. In Gelsenkirchen, a coal and steel city of 400,000 in the Ruhr Valley, the city completed its new theater late in 1959. The city contributed the $5 million construction cost. One-fourth of the annual $1,400,000 budget is recovered at the box office. The rest—$1 million—is paid by the city, the equivalent of 2½ percent of the entire city budget.

The threater has 2 stages, a 1,050-seat auditorium for drama, opera, and concerts, and a 450-seat studio for plays demanding more intimate milieu. Sixteen thousand regular subscribers, largely members of civic groups and cultural societies, patronize both theaters during the 10½-month season. Each entertainment has 20 performances. There is rarely an empty seat. Prices average 75 cents for plays.

The architects (Ruhnau, Rave, Deilmann & Von Hausen) have incorporated sculpture and paintings of British, French, and German artists into interiors and exteriors of the theaters.

Gelsenkirchen Theater is planned as integral part of landscape. Set in heart of industrial city, it is core of what eventually will be expansive cultural promenade with open-air cafes in forum style. Architecturally, it is built in a cube 225 feet wide, 60 feet high and 240 feet in depth. In dark night lighting it gives airy diaphonous quality. A six-story annex in rear, houses administration, staff and artistic direction. A twin six-story addition houses costume shops, rehearsal rooms. Carpentry and machine shops are under stage. Large rehearsal stage for drama and ballet is on top floor.

Abstract concrete relief in front measuring 65 by 10 feet, is work of British sculptor Robert Adams. Architect Ruhnau sees it as lending solid base to building, at same time serving as counterweight to all-glass facade.

The Gelsenkirchen Theater seats 1,050 on three levels in amphitheater style. Architects sought here to unify stage, proscenium and audience areas into one whole, bringing audience and performer into close contact with one another. Mobile stage dollies insure extremely rapid scenery changes. Main stage is 60 by 75 feet with wings each 50 by 50.

Flexibility is key concept of stage in Gelsenkirchen's little theater. As conventional proscenium, or peep-show theater, actor faces audience. As arena theater, stage is pushed forward and audience surrounds actors. In third phase, or total-theater, entire orchestra seating area becomes stage, with audience looking on from balconies.

While America continues to talk about the shrinking theater and the "Fabulous Invalid," in Germany, the legitimate theater is thriving, experimenting, forging ahead.

MANHASSET, N.Y., *April 5, 1961.*

Senator JACOB K. JAVITS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: I wish to congratulate you once again on your unfailing support of a greater participation by the Federal Government in the performing arts. As a performing artist who is actively engaged in bringing music and other form of culture to the people throughout the country and the world, I know I speak for many when I say that we are hopeful that your plan to establish a U.S. Arts Foundation will meet with the success that it deserves.

I, for one, shall be most happy to lend my support in whatever manner I can.

Most sincerely,

MIMI BENZELL.

UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI,
Coral Gables, Fla., April 17, 1961.

The Honorable JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: Thank you for sending me the copy of Senate bill 1250. After a cursory reading of the bill I want to express my satisfaction and the wholehearted endorsement for the U.S. Arts Foundation.

I am certain that this bill will mean a great deal to the welfare of the arts in the United States. I am also certain after having experienced a series of frustrations dealing with Latin American requests for visiting artists, that this bill will ultimately prove itself of international value.

My congratulations and my sincere hopes that S. 1250 be passed by the Senate and House and signed by the President.

If there is anything that I can do to assist you in this worthy enterprise feel free to call on me.

Sincerely yours,

DELMAR E. SOLEM,
Chairman, Department of Drama.

AMERICAN GUILD OF MUSICAL ARTISTS,
New York, N.Y., March 30, 1961.

Senator JACOB K. JAVITS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: The direction being taken by the present administration in Washington is indeed heartening to those of us concerned with the position of the American artist and the place of the performing arts in American life.

As a member of the Board of Governors of AGMA, I would like to congratulate you on your support of various arts bills, and particularly on your own bill to establish a U.S. Arts Foundation (S. 936).

I would like here to express my personal gratitude for the steps you are taking toward the enrichment of American cultural life.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT ACKART.

How To Catch Pneumonia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wall Street Journal of April 19, 1961:

HOW TO CATCH PNEUMONIA

In a good many families about the country, the past winter is likely to go down as the year of the deceptive cold. The pattern has been sick abed for a couple of days, back to the office with the cheerful feeling that all is over—and then suddenly the relapse.

As we can testify, a warning from the doctor doesn't do much good. We'll all do what he orders when the cough is heavy and the temperature high, but it's just plain human nature that the minute the aches seem less acute we lose patience with sage advice. Hospitals are populated by people whose downfall was, to put it simply, "up too soon."

This is a human foible not limited to the winter season or the personal sniffles. In fact, it can be seen cropping up this spring among those who have been worriedly watching the pulse of our economic ailments abroad.

Last fall and through the winter this country suffered something very near a crisis in its gold outflow. Officials of the incoming administration, as well as the departing one, went about with haggard faces. The President-elect was worried enough to issue a strong statement about our determination to take care of the ailing dollar, and once in office to propose strong prescriptions to cure it.

But the visitor who these days goes wandering about the corridors of Washington finds a different mood. To be sure, everybody agrees we still have a problem with our balance of payments. Yet the air now is one of almost cheery unconcern. After all, hasn't the gold outflow stopped? Hasn't the speculative fever on the world money markets subsided? The good old dollar is sound as a nut. So now we can relax, return to our accustomed ways and not be so hasty with unpleasant tasting medicines.

Thus there is renewed talk about easing money rates again, there is less restraint than a few months ago in plans for foreign governmental spending, and so on. Chairman Heller of the Council of Economic Advisers, for example, has noted that the absence of a net outflow of gold in the past few weeks now gives us a "cushion"; and elsewhere there are officials who will tell you that "the problem" is just about resolved.

Well, perhaps so. It is certainly true that the dollar is less ailing than it was. The strong assurances against devaluation by President Kennedy, the expressed willingness of the Germans to help us out, the fact that some other currencies (notably the pound sterling) have had their own troubles, all these things have contributed to easing the dollar's immediate pains.

But at the risk of being a killjoy, we think it worth noting that so far only the symptoms have been alleviated. The basic difficulty we face with the dollar is our unfavorable balance of payments; we are simply pouring out of the country more money than we take in.

This is a longstanding situation. The recent crisis that everyone speaks of did not come out of the blue; it flared up because in addition to the chronic drain on the dollar we suffered a speculative fever brought on by the drain of short-term money seeking higher interest rates abroad and by the uneasiness over how the new administration would act.

It is this extra pressure that has been relieved, and that relief has made the immediate aches subside. We are now in the position where we can see recovery ahead for the dollar if we will just practice a little healthy fiscal living.

We only delude ourselves, however, if we think the basic ailment is yet cured, and that we can resume again the regime that laid the dollar low in the first place. The Government itself has got to curb its own huge outpourings of dollars abroad; it has got to avoid the temptations of deficit-financed inflation, of an easy money policy, here at home. It has got to continue to recognize in all its economic policies that the international restraints are still operative.

To forget that is a sure way to worse trouble. For as any doctor can tell you, the relapse from a relatively mild case of the ague can be a whopping case of pneumonia.

War, Peace, or Armistice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the February 1961 issue of the Sudeten Bulletin, a central European review published monthly by the Sudeten German Archive, in Munich, Germany, contains an article entitled "War, Peace, or Armistice," which should be of interest to the Congress. This article was written by Dr. Hans-Christoph Seebohm, German Federal Minister of Transportation and president of the Sudeten German Expellee Association, Bonn, Germany. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR, PEACE, OR ARMISTICE

(By Dr. Hans-Christoph Seebohm)

Until well into the current century people were convinced that the political climate in which they were living was either war or peace, and that between the two—at best for a brief span—an armistice was possible which allowed time for negotiations for peace, i.e., a period of fluctuation with temporary occupation of certain areas and limitation of self-determination, all of which could at no time become permanent. For the end of each war meant, conjointly, that one of the participants was so severely smitten or even subjugated, that for the period of armistice, at least, and only for said period he was fully at the mercy of his opponent.

Seldom were negotiations for peace conducted while war was still in progress, as happened during the Thirty Years War or after the Russo-Japanese War, when the United States (1905) first successfully assumed its intercessory role among other nations of the world. As late as 1914 war was still solemnly declared. Since then wars have grown out of local conflicts so that their beginning can hardly be associated with a given date.

The Sino-Japanese War that touched off the Second World War in east Asia, began with the disputes over Manchuria many years before the battles of 1938 and 1939 in Europe. The military proceedings at the time of the Anschluss of Austria, before and during the annexation of the Sudetenland, during the establishment of the Protectorate, and with the Anschluss of Memelland, might just as well have unleashed World War II as the annexation of Danzig or Eastern Upper Silesia. The whole affair was the unraveling of a logical chain of events, at every link of which the outbreak of full-scale warfare had to be expected and feared. Finally, and without any conceivable need it exploded on the solution of the Danzig question, inconceivable because here an attempt was made by force, to attain a goal that could have been arrived at on the strength of sound legal claims, had there been but a measure of patience and restraint employed. Actually it triggered World War II which deprived the Czech people of its right of self-determination and forcibly imposed upon them a solution which they would have never chosen of their own free will. The same applies to Slovakia and the resulting territorial measures for Hungary, in the Balkans and the Baltic States: everywhere changes were dictated without regard for the international right of self-determination, creating situations by force instead of justice, even where large segments of the population were prepared to welcome these new conditions.

After World War I periods of armistice followed. These periods, due to the very lax attitude of the victorious powers, permitted in the areas of the conquered peoples, biased solutions of territorial problems motivated solely by force. An example is the founding of Czechoslovakia. The result was that subsequent peace treaties were actually unable to do more than recognize the situation created during the period of armistice. As a matter of fact the Paris peace treaties are, for that reason, not real treaties in the sense of those of Münster and Osnabrück in 1648 or the Peace of Rastatt in 1714, but primarily a crystallization of a situation, for the most part illegally created during the period of armistice. Even if they denied the human right of domicile in but limited areas, and even if, for individual border districts, they acknowledged the right of self-determination, by popular plebiscite, in vast regions of Europe they blacked out the right of self-determination by solutions based on force. In carrying out the treaties, the right of self-determination, promised in various plebiscites, Upper Silesia, for example, was once again perverted by force and replaced by the surrogate of the Geneva minority rights regulations. The fact that the Geneva minority rights provisions were constantly violated by coercion and thus made ineffectual, lay not only with political forces prone to solutions by violence but primarily in the fact, that within those measures the right of the individual to his homeland was inextricably bound up with the community right of the self-determination of peoples and ethnic groups, forming a ball of confusion incapable of being unraveled.

Hence the Paris treaties lack the attributes of genuine peace treaties but assume those of politically expanded, originally militarily conditioned armistice agreements. They could not make peace but only a status quo, i.e., finalize a situation, which purely coercive acts had established at the end of hostilities. They disregarded the right of self-determination just as it was disregarded in 1939, thus creating those imponderable but mighty impulses that led to a new explosion, because nothing had been settled justly, either

by the Paris treaties or by later decisions of the League of Nations or by the coercive solutions as manifested in the Polish treatment of Lithuania (Vilna) prior to 1938 and toward the free city of Danzig (Westerplatte) and above all in the Manchurian conflict.

WAR BUT NOT BY DECLARATION

Between the two World Wars, then, there was no real peace in the sense of the Treaty of Portsmouth (1906) between Japan and Russia. Thus in 1938–39 there was no old style declaration of war, of the kind that ended the peace in Europe in 1914. The declarations of 1939 made by the Western Powers to Germany did not start World War II but were simply the outcome of the war started against Poland, to the outbreak of which Russia's consent—given on August 23, 1939—decisively contributed and for which Germany paid with the surrender of the Baltic States and the right of self-determination of three peoples, the Estonians, Latvians and Lithuanians. Even America's entrance came after the attack on Pearl Harbor and without a declaration of war by the attacker, even as England's and France's entry after the attack on Poland.

It is no more than logical that this Second World War also ended by armistice. Whereas 40 years ago, however, there was still outward semblance of a peace treaty signed by both parties, and lasting on into the future, in 1945 the political finalization of the solutions forcibly created at the close of war and thereafter (e.g., Berlin) was effected by the biased treaty of Potsdam agreed on solely by the victorious powers. The Potsdam Agreement differs from the Paris treaties also by the fact that it not only denies the previously affirmed right of self-determination altogether, but tramples on the right to the homeland, a right grounded by international law in the treaties of Munster and Osnabruck in 1648, and sanctions expulsion from one's native soil.

Like St. Germain, Versailles, and Trianon, it accepted the status quo of settlement by coercion that took place during the period between the cessation of hostilities, over and beyond that, however, it made possible additional solutions by force, characterized by ruthless brutality, by an expansion of the forcibly attained status quo in east and central Europe.

It looks, then, as if it were our destiny, not to have to accept war and peace, but only a state of armistice as a condition of our political life. The 1959 Soviet draft of a so-called peace treaty contains nothing more than the desire to finalize the wrong done by and after the Potsdam Agreement, to retain as accepted the Soviet colonial realm in east and central Europe, created in part against the spirit of the Potsdam Agreement, and thereby to cement the status quo in central and east Europe so that any attempt to change it by negotiation can be branded as a form of aggression.

REAL SOVIET MOTIVES

The consequences of the Paris treaties in no way frighten the Soviets, for at the moment they feel quite secure, believing themselves capable of nipping in the bud any impulse of freedom and justice, not by recourse to an instrument like the Geneva League of Nations but with instruments of force that have been pushed to indescribable limits by means of technical developments. Whether they will always be able to do so, seems not too certain even in their own minds. For that reason they want a period in which to work out their power potential in order to conduct a fight on several fronts: in Europe, against China, and in the Arctic Sea. They also want to offer everything in the way of material aid to attract the underdeveloped countries in Asia and Africa and fully isolate the Anglo-Saxon bloc. Berlin, a symbol of freedom and justice which pricks their conscience and weakens their prestige in the eyes of the conquered peoples, is supposed, according to Soviet desires, to be absorbed by them before the other process begins. That is the only change in the status quo in their favor which they admitted before its finalization.

The West not only has to assume its moral responsibility toward Berlin in this struggle and seek a tolerable but certainly not lasting compromise for the Berliners. It should far rather remain aware that even the slightest weakening of its position in Europe will lower its prestige in the eyes of the underdeveloped countries, further buttress the Soviet position there, thus enabling a future defeat of the West in these decisive areas outside of Europe that are so important to us for the future.

The political forces of the West, still so fully influenced by the mental climate of the Paris treaties, are eagely grasping for a chance to assure further periods of armistice by acceptance of the unjust conditions in central and eastern Europe induced by and after Potsdam. They obviously are blind to coming dangers. They fail to recognize, too, that they are about to betray for a second time the right of self-determination of the peoples of central and east Europe, including the Germans, as the Germans did in 1939. Such a move can only cause them untold moral harm in their relationships with the underdeveloped countries.

Danny Kaye's Remarks Before the Annual Dinner Meeting of the USO National Council, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C., March 14, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, last month I had the privilege of attending the annual dinner of the National USO Council here in Washington, at which the internationally famous comedian and motion picture star, Danny Kaye, was the principal speaker.

Just this week I received a copy of his remarks, and since I remember them so vividly, I wanted to bring them to the attention of the Members.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that Danny Kaye's speech at the USO dinner appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

DANNY KAYE'S REMARKS BEFORE THE ANNUAL DINNER MEETING OF THE USO NATIONAL COUNCIL, MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 14, 1961

Ladies and gentlemen, lest you labor under the misapprehension that I am a man of extraordinary courage because I performed for the troops under a shelter of protecting aircraft, let me hasten to assure you that I would much rather face 18,000 soldiers—hostile or friendly—than be standing up here to talk for even 5 minutes.

I must say I am feeling an enormous range of emotions here this evening. I am torn. I am both delighted to be here, and at the same time I suffer from an enormous amount of discouragement. Because suddenly I have come to realize that all that glittered in the dim past, all the envy of youth and the resilience of youth, has suddenly disappeared.

There I was in the lobby today and a gentleman came over to me—he looked about 67—and he said, "Hi."

I said hello and he said, "We were together in Korea." He said, "I remember you were over there and you were entertaining the 7th Marine Division of the Marine Corps, and there were all these fellows on a hill, and the crowds, and boy I sure am glad to see you again. Well, if you'll excuse me now my ambulance is outside and I've gotta go."

Another man came by with a hearing aid and he said, "Weren't you the fellow who came to Japan in 1945?" I said yes, and suddenly the naked, bald truth assailed me with violent force.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are all a "hell-uva" lot older!

Well, maybe you're older, not me.

I am quite loath to assume the role of spokesman for the entertainment industry here tonight. It's usually a job that requires considerably more eloquence than I can represent. But I must say that in the last 20 years a tremendous contribution by people from all walks of life has been made to America in this very strange world of ours, and particularly in those areas of interest which your organization represents.

Some of us receive the kudos and the blessings because we have seen fit to travel overseas to afford some entertainment for our Armed Forces. I would merely like to tell you that the situation should be reversed. We receive acclaim and good wishes and heartfelt sympathy because we leave our families and our homes to travel in God-forsaken places to bring moments of pleasure to the Armed Forces overseas. I can only tell you that what people like myself have given has been returned a thousandfold. I can only tell you that the sympathy which we received should go to the thousands upon thousands of people who, although far less known than some of the stars that you have, have devoted their lives and their energies and their emotions to the USO cause. They are the ones who have shown much more dedication than some of us who get a great deal in return.

Twenty years have gone by since USO came into being, and memories become rosy in 20 years, rather faulty. The things we like to think about that have afforded us so much pleasure and joy and a feeling of great contribution have dimmed somewhat.

The USO used to be a great sign of people all banded together to make life easier for the boys overseas. It was a beacon—a light that reached all of us, you in your way, me in mine, thousands upon thousands of other people in theirs.

Twenty years have gone by and we run a terrible risk. We run the terrible risk in this so-called peace we are living in now of overlooking the boy who has been torn from his family and of rationalizing that "Isn't it a wonderful thing for a young man to be sent overseas at the age of 18 or 19?

"Isn't it great for him to go over now when he can learn and see the whole world unfold before him? Isn't it wonderful that nobody is shooting at him now? If I had a boy, by George, I would want him to go overseas because that's the place where a boy will really develop."

All true.

But how many of you are mothers and fathers who have taken your boy to the train—not because he's going overseas, but because he is going away to college? He is going perhaps to some northern corner of your State or the southern corner of your State, but there is the usual tearful farewell.

"My boy, my boy. Only yesterday I cradled him in my arms. Now he's a grown man and he's leaving me."

He's only going to be gone for a week, you know; he's coming home for the weekend.

With all the eagerness of a young man who might be leaving for an oversea duty station, your boy climbs on the train and heads for a strange new school only 40 or so miles from home. But suddenly, even that brief leavetaking assumes a heartrending kind of loneliness.

Now magnify that feeling a hundred times over and imagine a boy from Kansas or Georgia or Wisconsin who is sent to Korea or Japan or the Philippines. Not 40 miles away, but thousands of miles away. And suddenly, despite the so-called advantages of oversea service in developing mature adults, you realize that he is still being deprived of his family, that is, still saying goodbye to his home. Under much better circumstances than if he had to go out and engage in a hot war, true, but the same emotional insecurities exist. He is leaving his home, and he won't be coming back for a visit next weekend.

Over a period of 20 years, the USO has done an incredible job of remembering. Remembering that these boys have to be looked after, thought about, and taken care of. Not from the standpoint of any great physical need—the military takes care of their bodies very well—but rather from the point of view that it's vitally important that their links with home are always strong and secure.

Leo Durocher and I traveled together in a number of areas overseas. Boys there were delighted simply to see somebody they could discuss baseball with. They were delighted to see somebody they had seen on their movie screens back home. They were delighted to be able to sit down and talk about the weather in Texas, or speculate about the Dodgers and the fact they were having a tough year.

It could have been me who went, it could have been you, it could have been anybody—so long as that person represented the very vital link with home that is such an important factor in any boy's maturation.

Twenty years is a long time and I implore all of you now to remember that in time of crisis spirits run high of their own accord and sacrifices are made without stopping to think about oneself. But the moment the hostilities cease, in spite of the fact that, in order to continue to defend our country boys must be stationed throughout the world, there is suddenly a remarkable lack of that patriotic fire which is so evident in wartime.

And this is one thing you have to do in order to demonstrate what USO has done, is doing, will do—ever, ever continuing to remember. You have to keep on rekindling the fire.

Twenty years is a long time to remember, and I am justifiably proud of members of my profession who have stood by every single day, every single month, every single year. It's true that you continue to hear of Mr. Hope and Mr. Benny and Mr. Skelton—all the people whose names are familiar to you. But I would like you to remember also that there are thousands upon thousands of people who are not well known, and who have continued this work for 20 years.

I was talking to somebody at a press conference this afternoon and a newspaperwoman said to me, "Well, how do we go about getting people to remember?"

And I said you and others like you can do our country a great service through your newspapers and magazines and radio broadcasts by constantly reminding people that the USO is still functioning just as powerfully as it ever did before—that there are people ever ready, standing by to go and do their bit.

And I would like to say to you, ladies and gentlemen, that you have earned a great deal of respect and admiration because it is you who have kept the spirit of USO alive. I take a deep bow to you, because without the organizational spirit of people like you, who are really interested, we in the entertainment industry cannot properly do our part. And I say to you now—all you have to do is to designate where and how you need us, and I pledge to you—for my profession—we will respond to any command with a salute.

USO is a remarkable organization to keep alive.

So, why don't we grow old together? Continue this work together until we can't any more.

Wouldn't that be fun.

United States-China Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following speech was delivered before the Chinese Student Service Club of Washington, D.C. a few weeks ago by Dr. Stanley K. Hornbeck.

Dr. Hornbeck speaks as one having authority, especially on the question of the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu. As this matter is extremely timely at the present juncture in world affairs I am calling it to the attention of the Members of House.

UNITED STATES-CHINA POLICY

(Speech by Hon. Stanley K. Hornbeck, U.S. top specialist and veteran diplomat on Far Eastern Affairs, before the Chinese Student Service Club of Greater Washington, Washington, D.C.)

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I gave a talk in Cincinnati a few days ago. I covered a lot of ground and I talked on no less than 20 subjects. I am going to talk today about only three subjects and to focus on one. I am going to ask of you, when I finish, to ask questions.

I have been thinking about the fundamentals, when it comes to policy, particularly when it comes to foreign policy. What is the framework in which, the background against which and the foundation on which, the people and the Government of the United States make foreign policy? I shall say some things rather categorically, because there isn't time to elaborate.

I've come to the conclusion that to understand and usefully evaluate U.S. policy in regard to any given foreign countries or to any particular situations abroad, one should first take into account certain fundamentals in the political organization of the United States and the political feelings, believings and reasonings of most of our people, and then the overall and abiding problems with which this country has been and is confronted in the formulation and implementation of its overall foreign policy.

The United States is essentially and comparatively speaking a democracy. The people of this country have believed in and have tried to have freedom, liberty, self-determination and security. Our overall foreign policy has been and is a policy of defense. Our attitude was well expressed in the Monroe Doctrine. There we gave a warning against aggression and we declared that we ourselves would not engage in aggression. We addressed that to European powers; but it has applied in reference to the whole world. The concept was "live and let live." During the decade since 1914, we have been forced to enlarge upon the principle of live and let live and our efforts now include measures to help live; but our posture and our policy remains defensive. In terms of safeguarding our own security we realize that now to make ourselves secure, we must help toward making other peoples secure. So, objecting to procedures of aggression and now menace by aggressors, we support resistance to perpetrators of aggression. However, our thought is still "live and let live."

Lincoln spoke of freedom and of its survival. Wilson spoke of democracy and of making the world safe for it. Now in our overall policy, our first and greatest concern is that freedom and democracy not be destroyed. The essence of the conflict between the United States and the Communist world is that the Communists intend to conquer and toward that end, they are making war; we intend that we shall not be conquered and, along with us that other people shall not be conquered. The Communists are on the offensive and we are on the defensive.

I am constantly surprised at finding people who should know better who fail to discern the pitfalls of the current Soviet campaign of "coexistence," "competitive coexistence," and in particular "peaceful coexistence." Coexistence of course we have. Competitive coexistence we have. But peaceful coexistence we cannot have as long as Moscow and Peking persevere in their policy of conquering and we in ours of opposition and resistance. Moscow's talk of peaceful coexistence is a political opium. The purpose is to tranquilize us while they proceed with their plan and effort to conquer. The Communists need time. They need accumulation of weapons, including economic; and Chairman Khrushchev is playing for time. Peking is impatient. Both Mao and Khrushchev may be having troubles at home. In fact, we know they have some troubles, each of them, at home. But the Peking contention is more honest than the Moscow profession. Both Khrushchev and Mao know that to make the world safe for themselves and their systems, they must persevere in a common effort to enlarge the Communist domain. In other words, they have to go on trying to conquer. They know that communism has achieved its conquest so far, and that it exists, by procedures of aggression, and that for it and them to survive, they must work toward universal prevalence of their system. Both of them intend to bury their opponents. Their difference is that Mr. K. is affirming that big guns, big threats and cold war will suffice, whereas Mao contends these are not and will not be enough and there will have to be a hot war. Neither of them believes in peaceful coexistence. Their ideas, and in fact their definitions, of peace and peacefulness are different from our definitions. When they say "peace," they do not mean what we connote by that term, and in their concept coexistence cannot be permanent. For, when you bury an intended victim, you no longer coexist with him.

The Communists, since 1917, have buried politically one-third of the people of the world. The greatest of their victories is that which they have achieved in the conquest of the Chinese mainland. There, they have buried politically 600 million Chinese. There, they have declared most resoundingly their hostility to us and their intention to do us in. There, more than anywhere else except in Berlin, they show their purpose and ours to be in obvious conflict.

For 10 years now, there have been conflicts between Communist China and the

United States over various issues—among which, diplomatic recognition, seating in the United Nations, Korea, Formosa and the offshore islands. That one of those to which attention was drawn, unfortunately, in the course of our recent presidential campaign is that of Quemoy and Matsu, and the question of our interest and our policy regarding defense of those islands keeps bobbing up.

In that context we come upon the error in believing or affirming, or both, that the offshore islands are indefensible and worthless and that support by the United States of the Nationalist defense of those islands is of no use to us and is a disservice to the course of peace.

Those islands, the Quemoy and Matsu, are indeed small islands territorially and they have small populations. But they lie across the entrances to the harbor of Amoy and the harbor of Foochow. Amoy and Foochow are among the most important strategically and economically of China's ports. And they are the nearest to Formosa.

Whatever else, all of these offshore islands are part of the actual domain—legal, political and physical—of the National Government. Historically, they have been a part of China. The National Government's jurisdiction over them was gained by inheritance and has been continuous. That Government has not taken them away from the Communist domain on the mainland. It simply has held and defended them as part of what remains of its own erstwhile nationwide domain.

All of the Nationalist-held islands need to be considered in terms not of geography (place where) or of arithmetic (that is, size, number of population and economic values) but far more to the point, of their place in the struggle in China and in the global struggle in which freemen and men wishing to be free, are, along with us, on the defensive.

In all cases of testimony, the time when and the circumstances under which an affirmation has been or is made need to be taken into account. Capability is a matter of will plus military commitment. Value is a matter of tangibles plus intangibles. In the eyes of both of the Nationalists and the Communists, Quemoy and Matsu do have substantial values. In major part, possession of them weighs heavily in the calculations of the Nationalists for defending Formosa and those of the Communists for an attack on Formosa.

The purpose of the Communists to take Formosa can no longer be doubted, and in that context, the offshore islands serve, in the hands of the Nationalists, as an obstacle to the launching of an attack. Capture of them or transfer of them to the Communists would remove that obstacle, would enlarge the capabilities of their Amoy and Foochow bases and would serve for them as a staging point or forward bases for the attack. To the Nationalists, the loss of Quemoy and Matsu, whether by force of arms or by diplomatic pressure would be a terrific blow. In combination, it would bring the Communists nearer physically to Formosa and, far more important, it would be destructive to the morale of the defending armed forces on Formosa and the supporters overseas and around the world of the Nationalist cause. To the Communists, acquisition of Quemoy and Matsu would be highly encouraging. It would be helpful to them in connection with consolidating their position among the people who now live on the mainland and it would greatly facilitate carrying out their plans for conquest of Formosa and points further east, north, south, and west.

The offshore islands are thus important tangibly in terms of military strategy and they are very important intangibly in terms of psychological warfare.

By 1954, American policymaking opinion had arrived at a conclusion that support by the United States of China's National Government in the defense of Formosa was appropriate. This based on calculation of our own interest in the western Pacific, the idea being that we could not afford to let Formosa fall into the hands of the Communists. Prompted in part by a renewed assault by the Communist regime on the offshore islands, the U.S. Government negotiated in 1954 and concluded in early 1955, a treaty with the National Government, a mutual defense treaty, in which the United States became formally committed to support of the Nationalists in defense expressly of Formosa and the Pescadores. Then, in connection with this, the Congress expressly authorized the President in the event of an attack on the offshore islands and that a conclusion on his part the attack was preliminary to an attack on Formosa, to include support of the Nationalists in defense of the offshore islands.

When, in 1958, the Communists subjected the offshore islands to heavy bombardment, the United States gave the Nationalists defense substantial support. The Communists did not see fit to attempt an assault or make war on the United States. Since then the Communists have continued their bombarding of the islands and their loud proclaiming of their intention to take Formosa, and the Nationalists and the United States have continued their cooperation in measures for the strengthening of the defense establishments both on Formosa and on the offshore islands.

Let it not be the thought or be said that the support of defense of Formosa and the support of defense of Matsu are separate problems, or that they differ greatly as regards risk of war by the Communists on the United States. Let it rather be realized that the issue between the Communist China and the United States is more than a local issue, is in broad dimension that of Communist expansion by procedures of conquest and subjugation.

Fundamentally, we believe in the right of nations to self-determination and the right of law-abiding man and nations to freedom and security. Throughout our history, the people of the United States have been opposed in principles to policies and practices which have involved in effect denials of those rights and indulgence in procedures of aggression. Generally speaking, we have been opposed to imperialism because its practices have involved such denials and such results. In the Far East, we have opposed practices of aggression when directed against China, when directed against Japan, when manifested by relations between Japan and China and when manifested in Korea and in Indochina. In the World Wars and in the operations in Korea, our participation came of German, of Japanese, and of Russian imperialism and our opposition thereto.

Now, war between the United States and Communist China, if it were to come, would come not because of support by us of China's Nationalists' defense of Quemoy and Matsu or of Formosa, but because of, on the one hand, Communist perseverance in its policy and programs of expansion by procedures of aggression and, on the other hand, our perseverance and our opposition to such procedures. It would come perhaps in the guise of a local conflict but because of conflicting major purposes in a global struggle. The choice, then, for the United States, in regard to the defense of the offshore islands is not between a course involving risk of a Communist attack on us and a course not involving such risk. Risk of such attack is actual. We already have it.

None of us without warrant can predict that the Communist Chinese rulers will or will not sooner or later attack the United States. But all observers and discussants should make note of the fact that thus far, in their course of conquest, communism's strategists have chosen not to attack at points where there are both substantial defensive strength and obviously firm purpose to resist. Communists attack at points of weakness, not at points of strength.

What may be their next move can only be conjectured and what the United States may do if and when confronted with a new development can be surmised only in the light of what has been thought, said and done, first under the Truman administration and since then under the Eisenhower administration. It was President Truman who first declared, "I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free people who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or outside pressure." It was President Truman, in a Democratic administration, who 10 years ago placed the 7th Fleet in the Strait of Formosa.

They who think that there should be or will be a sudden change in the attitude and the policy that have developed as those of the United States in relation to the problem of keeping Formosa out of Communist hands may well be asked to consider the advice of Robert Frost: "Do not take down a fence without first knowing why it was put up."

I thank you.

The Occasion of the 60th Anniversary of the Washington County Free Library

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the free public library is a uniquely American institution. I say this not only because it was originated in America by Benjamin Franklin, but because of its entirely voluntary character. We may go to a library or we may stay home. When we go, we may browse until we find some book that fills our need for enlightenment or entertainment.

In this second half of the 20th century we are often preoccupied by that portion of organized knowledge which we call science. When we are daily confronted by either the military, diplomatic or propaganda effect of the scientific success of a powerful competitor, we naturally concentrate much of our intellectual effort on science. Aside from any competitive aspect, we know that we must excel in both pure and applied science if we are to attain the goals that we have set for ourselves.

The free public libraries of America can, however, fill a peculiarly valuable function in this highly charged atmosphere. They can, of course, be a tool for the continuing education of those who dedicate themselves to science.

But equally important, the free public library can provide a balance in our intellectual life. The people of America have access here to all the wealth and mellow splendor of the humanities. We

read history, biography, geography, the arts and the languages of the globe. And these are the areas of knowledge that are necessary to the wisdom and maturity to exploit and enjoy the victories of science.

The Washington County Free Library merits the praise that is being conferred upon it tonight. It has played and will continue to play a role in the community which is more significant than might be recognized by the casual observer.

For all that the Washington County Free Library offered the people that it serves, I wish it well upon the occasion of commencing its 70th year of service.

Let Us Not Fear Obstacles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein some recent excerpts from Andre Maurois which contain an interesting and realistic philosophy quite pertinent to some phases of contemporary American life.

Beset as we are these days by problems of all kinds, it is well for us to recognize that it is through work, faith, and hope that we will be able to solve the great problems of the present and the future, and we must never take a pessimistic attitude toward them, nor should we lack faith in our ability to do everything possible that has to be done to safeguard our precious liberties.

The article follows:

ANDRE MAUROIS SAYS: THERE IS NO EARTHLY PARADISE

There are people who naively believe they would be happier if they had lived in a Garden of Eden, free from all trouble. What an illusion. Trouble and struggle are an essential part of life. You could no more live without trouble of some kind than you could live without food.

If you bring up an animal in an asceptic atmosphere, you make it susceptible to all diseases. Should it be later sent into the wide world around, it would be unable to defend himself. To live is to fight. Who forgets that soon perishes. Laboratory rats can no more live outside the laboratory. A tame lion would die of starvation.

The same is true of men. Those who were brought up the hard way are the successful ones in later life. They develop a resistance to hardship of all sorts and a thick skin that will protect them.

A child who has been accustomed to think that everything will be done for him by indulgent parents and that pocket money is one of the rights of man, will become soft as butter. The day he will have to earn his life in the jungle of a large town, he will lack toughness and courage.

Alexander Fleming, the great scientist, inventor of penicillin, was a farmer's son, born in Scotland, who as a child used to walk every morning four miles to school under rain and snow. He used to say in later life that those early years had given him health and tenacity. Comfort softens men; strife strengthens them.

That does not mean children should be treated harshly; it means they should not be taught life is the Garden of Eden because that is not true. Tomorrow as yesterday, in spite of automation, nobody will succeed without work. And so much the better. For if, by some incredible miracle, the lives of men suddenly were easy and leisurely, then boredom would become unbearable and mental diseases would creep in from all sides.

Of course, there is a limit to the difficulties man can put up with, but a reasonable dose of worries does no harm to anyone. On the contrary. Let us not complain if we have a boss hard to please, an exacting husband or wife. Small quarrels, if not too frequent, are beneficial. They wake us up and compel us to reconsider the situation. To mount a fiery horse is more amusing than to drive a hack.

So let us not fear obstacles. Let us face them and jump them gaily. For human life is not the Garden of Eden; nor is it the valley of despondency; it is the sanctuary of work.

Resolution Honoring Kyle Palmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the California State Assembly on April 14 paid a richly deserved tribute to Mr. Kyle Palmer, who retired several months ago as political editor of the Los Angeles Times.

The Assembly honored Mr. Palmer through adopting by unanimous vote a resolution citing him as "deserving the highest commendation and congratulations for his truly significant contributions to public affairs." The measure had 68 coauthors from both political parties.

Kyle Palmer has won respect and admiration not only in Los Angeles and the State of California but throughout the Nation for his many years of conscientious public service. I heartily concur in the action taken by the State Assembly.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the resolution for inclusion in the RECORD:

Whereas, after many years as a correspondent and political writer with and since 1939 as political editor of the Los Angeles Times, Kyle Dulaney Palmer has retired from this active career; and

Whereas he has played a highly significant role in helping to mold public opinion through his writing and thus contributing to the policies of Government; and

Whereas, while a person who genuinely liked politics, Kyle Palmer has been on numerous occasions a no-holds-barred critic of the policies and performances of both major political parties and their leaders; and

Whereas his talents have been utilized for varying periods of time in such capacities as a public-relations adviser to the Motion Picture Producers' Association, as a war correspondent in World War II, and as a special escort for Japan's Crown Prince Akihito; and

Whereas Kyle Palmer's national stature as an influence and expert on the political scene is evidenced by his many articles appearing in nationally circulated magazines and as an editorial consultant for newspapers other than the Times: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That Kyle Dulaney Palmer is deserving the highest commendation and congratulations for his truly significant contributions to public affairs, and it is deemed most fitting that such recognition should come to such a man from the Assembly of the State of California, whose activities have long been one of the major sources of Kyle Palmer's interest.

Quiet Disciple of Principle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, Young Americans for Freedom, a national nonpartisan conservative youth organization, was founded in September of 1960. Since then it has quickly expanded and now represents more than 21,000 students and young people in 250 college and other chapters.

One of the founders of Young Americans for Freedom, who also serves on the board of directors, is George W. Gaines, 22, of New Iberia, La. George has served as a page in the 85th Congress and graduated from the Capitol Page School. Since then he has been active in politics and has studied at Tulane University.

In the April edition of New Guard, the official publication of Young Americans for Freedom, George has written an article concerning my colleague from Louisiana, Hon. HAROLD B. MCSWEEN. I would like to call this to the attention of the Members of the House.

The article follows:

QUIET DISCIPLE OF PRINCIPLE

(By George Gaines)

To farm-State Representatives the bill was most attractive. It breezed through Congress according to schedule: 60–27 in the Senate, 254–131 in the House. Ike promptly vetoed it, exercising that right for the first time in the Democratic 86th Congress.

With the help of 6 farm-bloc-minded Republicans, the Senate overrode the veto 64–29 with 2 votes to spare. By the time the burning issue reached the floor of the House, the pressure was enough to crack the House Chamber walls. HAROLD MCSWEEN, a member of the Agriculture Committee and a Congressman from a predominantly rural district, felt that pressure as much as, if not more than, anyone else.

As the House vote was tallied it became apparent it was going to be a real cliffhanger. At the end, the two-thirds needed to override the veto was short by 4 votes, 146–280. Among four Democrats who voted to sustain President Eisenhower's veto was freshman MCSWEEN.

"No," admitted the Louisiana legislator, "I didn't know how close it was going to be. And I had no idea that I would receive as much publicity as I did on the basis of that one vote. I certainly didn't vote 'Nay' to make the front pages. I just voted that way because the REA had been doing a good job under the present setup and I didn't see any reason why its administration should be changed."

McSWEEN attended Louisiana State University and received a LL.B. from that same university in 1950. Always interested in politics, he first ran for State office in 1956 for a post on the Louisiana State Board of Election. His opponent: Earl Long's sister. He won.

"I think I'm making progress," the young Democrat mused. "I'm picking up support as I go along, but frankly I don't know whether the trend of civilization is sympathetic to free government."

The Congressman, however, leaves little doubt where he stands. He has declared his intention to oppose Federal aid to education, the use of social security funds for aid to the aged, and the common situs picketing bill. Last year he publicly supported the Connally reservation.

His attention was called to a recent editorial in the New Orleans Times-Picayune which stated: "The real hope for maintaining conservative principles in the Nation lies mainly in congressional and State legislative contests and not necessarily in who fills the executive department."

"Yes," McSWEEN replied, "I agree with that generally. But the whole problem would be so much easier if conservatives would learn how to translate their theories into political power. Too much energy is wasted on unrealistic causes—like abolishing the U.N., or fluoridation, or impeaching Earl Warren. Too many conservatives don't want to talk about the minimum wage or social security.

"As for the 'coalition'," remarked the young Democrat, "I don't worry about it. The 'conservative coalition' in Congress reflects the people and nobody ever has to apologize for representing the people."

Intelligent, educated, purposeful, HAROLD B. McSWEEN goes quitely about his business of building support for his political philosophy. He is young and unperturbed about the possibility of defeat. There are many like him in the U.S. House of Representatives.

What's Wrong With Our Critics?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, since the quiz show scandal of 1958 there has been a clamor on the part of some Members of Congress and spokesmen of some special interest groups to impose controls and regulations over radio and television programing. As a former member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee I have conscientiously studied all proposals and proported justification for such control. The reasoning behind such proposals is that the airwaves are a part of the public domain and since the use of the airwaves can be obtained only by consent from the Federal Government, it logically follows that the program broadcast over these same airwaves are subject to regulation.

Every knowledgeable person concedes that the broad guidelines set out in the Federal Communications Commission Act of 1934 are in the public interest. Namely, that obscene language should not be broadcast, lotteries or games of chance not permitted, and that if broadcast facilities or time are made available to a political candidate the same consideration should also be made available to his opponent. Beyond this basic framework, the scheduling of daily and weekly programs has been historically left to the licensee and I have felt very strongly that the responsibility for this programing should remain with the licensee and not be controlled directly or indirectly by any Federal agency. This philosophy seemed to be generally accepted until recently. Since then there has been an increasing tendency on the part of the Federal Communications Commission to intervene into radio and television programing. I do not believe this intervention by the Federal Communications Commission is a result of pressure or influence from the viewing public. Rather, I believe it is a result of pressure from special interest groups and from some influence by a few Members of Congress both in the House and the Senate.

With the New Frontier came an increasing influence toward greater Federal control in every field of jurisdiction of the Federal Government. Nearly every proposal that has come to Capitol Hill from President Kennedy has reflected his philosophy that there should be increasing control by the Federal Government in virtually every field of our economy as well as public welfare. This philosophy has been further evidenced in this instance through statements made by the new Chairman of the Federal Communications, the Honorable Newton N. Minow. He frankly states, and I admire him for his frankness, that it is his belief that the Federal Communications Commission should become increasingly concerned with programing for broadcasts.

I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House an article by Max Wylie which appeared in a recent issue of Television Age. The introduction of Mr. Wylie that follows was also taken from the same publication. I hope every Member who is concerned over the control of programing for broadcasts will read the comment by Mr. Wylie. Although I am not in complete agreement with every position and statement contained in the article, I think he persuasively points out the absurdity of attempting to define what is in good taste, what is in the public interest, and what objectives should be established by any agency, committee or administrator attempting such regulation:

WHAT'S WRONG WITH OUR CRITICS?

(By Max Wylie)

(Mr. Wylie, novelist, playwright, scriptwriter, teacher, and lecturer, is perhaps best known in the television business for his book, "Clear Channels," which was, in his words, "a deliberate effort to answer all the misinformed criticism about television that has been circulated." A supervisor of TV programs, New York, for Lennen & Newell, Inc., he continues to feel that TV critics, "obliged to criticize stuff that wasn't intended to entertain them, miss the whole point: people who are looking at 'Gunslinger' never even heard of John Crosby." On these pages Television Age publishes excerpts from a rather lengthy lecture Mr. Wylie made on this very point at Pasadena City College early this year. The author is in a position to know the rights and wrongs of TV and of TV criticism. With CBS for many years, he was a writer, producer, script director and executive editor. A cofounder of the Columbia Workshop, Mr. Wylie has been associated with such programs as "Wide Wide World" and "Omnibus." Mr. Wylie began his career teaching the history of the English novel at India's Punjab University. After his first novel was published he moved to the writing staff of Time magazine and then to CBS. A new novel, "Never the Twain," based on his experiences in India, will be published next month.)

For educated people, Americans in the mass are quite uninformed.

If you were presented, for example, with an outline map that had these countries appearing on it—Austria, Bulgaria, England, France, Poland, Roumania, Spain, and Yugoslavia—could you put your finger correctly on each one? If you could, you're a very special person. The average is three out of eight. College graduates get only four out of eight. Twenty-three percent of us cannot get one single country right in an outline map. This is bad. But what is worse, for some years now our chief ally in the cold war with Russia has been, as you know, England. One American in every three does not know where England is and cannot point to where it is on an outline map.

This survey was made by the editor-in-chief of the Des Moines Register and Tribune.

I have some other revealing and depressing statistics before we get into the good news. What and how much do we read? We number 105 million adults, two-thirds of us have attended high school or college. In England those who have had formal schooling after the age of 15 are less than three percent. Now, if you rang a doorbell and asked an American if he were reading a book, any book at all, 21 percent of the Americans would say yes. If you did the same in England, 35 percent would be reading a book. Vance Packard, who doesn't seem to like anything that's going on, has reported that 30 percent can't remember reading any book ever.

Just in passing, I'm going to list the names of four books that we all read, books that we grew up on: "Heidi," "Black Beauty," "The Scarlet Pimpernel," "Swiss Family Robinson." No one can name the authors of any of those books.

Only 14 percent of our adult population can identify the following quote: "The world must be made safe for democracy." But 61 percent can remember who said, "Come up and see me sometime."

EVEN WORSE NEWS

I have worse news than this. Sixty-four percent of American adults do not know what Marconi invented; 75 percent cannot tell you what country the Parthenon is in. The above findings have recently been released by the Institute of Public Opinion, Princeton, N.J.

As we go on, it will be more and more apparent that television does not address itself to an audience that has seen, heard, and cherished all that is permanent and beautiful, or significant.

At the same time, to keep the discussion fair, are there not serious faults within the structure of the industry? And if there are, what are they and what are the remedies, if there are such?

I believe there are some faults. I have been an official of a network. I'm employed by an advertising agency. I don't feel that anyone is looking over my shoulder as I write this; I don't have any sense of editorial abridgement. I think that the following evils of television exist and are important. And that they should be acknowledged.

1. I believe top executives should see more of the finished product.

2. I believe top executives should read more of the finished product.

3. I believe that there are too many packagers who don't create anything.

4. I believe that lawyers who believe they are producers are an evil.

5. I believe that there is a problem of the independent producer, making good money but with a poor product, with no way to force him to improve it and himself unwilling to try.

6. Networks carry too much that they cannot sufficiently control or modify in terms of quality.

7. There is no effective machinery to stop poor stories at the source.

8. Advertising agencies can reject material only on grounds of taste or policy. They can never reject material because of its poverty of inspiration.

9. The subordinate position of the editor is calamitous. The fact that a script is a dreadful bore cannot keep it off the air if some producer wants it to go on. Sponsors, from time to time, find themselves paying heavily for entertainment of which they strongly disapproved.

The misunderstanding and mishandling of writers and writing—the average television executive's inability to understand writing, the basic materials upon which his whole empire stands—this, to me, is the most serious weakness in television today and the biggest waste.

In the same season when Fred Coe gave us the unforgettable excitement of "A Plot to Kill Stalin," and J. P. Miller's great story on alcoholism, "Days of Wine and Roses"; in the same season when Herb Brodkin gave us "In Lonely Expectation" and the unforgettable "Child of Our Time," and when John Houseman gave us Henry James' "Wings of the Dove," and Howard Brown's exciting "Seven Against the Wall," it's enough to make a sensitive man weep to think that for a lack of editorial control these "Playhouse 90" beauties and those impassioned human experiences are no more.

At the same time, you can't ram culture at people. You can't change anybody's background. Beauty can never be forced. It must be wooed like a woman. Yet critics assume that television can create a cultural epidemic that would, in fact, turn every American into a college graduate, poetry lover of art-gallery habitué overnight. Critics say that television should do this. Here is my answer:

RIGHT FOR RIGHT NOW

What television is doing right now is about right for right now. Television is changing all the tme. That's because we are changing all the time. Television will always be (as I feel radio was before it): an honest projection of what America is like, is interested in, is doing; what America wants to hear about, or object to, or support.

Here is an interesting illumination of American culture for those who insist that television is downgrading America's taste:

In the 66 years from 1895 to now, the top 15 bestsellers included 3 inspirational books, 2 cookbooks, 1 book on baby care, and 9 novels. The baby book, of course, is the one that you know, "Dr. Spock." You're familiar with two of the inspirational books. Dale Carnegie's "How To Win Friends" and Charles Sheldon's "In His Steps." Of the novels, "God's Little Acre" by Erskine Caldwell was a dirty book. "Peyton Place" was a dirty book. Those are two of the nine. The remaining seven novels among the bestsellers of the past 66 years were all written by the same man—and his name is Mickey Spillane.

Television critics hate to have to take this unhappy truth into account.

ENDLESS DIVERSIFICATION

Most of what will entertain a well-educated man can't be expected to entertain a poorly educated man. Most critics don't realize that there is an endless diversification between all of us—that most Americans fall between two extremes, and that, therefore, most of television's output and time is directed toward them.

There is nothing wrong with mediocrity if you are mediocre. Mediocrity is exactly right. Most TV critics never take this into account.

Moving now from the sociological to the practical and perhaps to the physical: most television is looked at when viewers have been active all day long and are tired. I don't believe this has ever been brought out before. Husbands who have been in offices and stores and garages; wives who have been banging around in a supermarket; kids who have been doing their homework or trying to avoid doing it. And when I say tired, I mean tired.

Why do television critics hate us so? Well, there are a good many reasons. Hating us makes better copy. They can't be caught. We can't retaliate. Hating television is fashionable. Destructive writing is a lot more fun to read. There's nothing dramatic about purity. There's nothing vivid about goodness. Most television critics, however, have to look at hundreds of hours of TV, very little of which was created for them. The critic doesn't react to it as a creation for the audience it is reaching. He wouldn't select it, yet he had to look at it and to comment on it. Of course he scorns it.

I'm going to quote a few things of John Crosby, a fellow I know well and like a great deal. He uncorked what I thought was his most absurd diatribe in McCall's magazine last November. An unthinking and irresponsible piece. Maybe he needed the money. At any rate, he said that the artistry of some of our best writers is smudged or blunted by interference from advertising agencies and sponsors. He has a solution for this. It is a program advisory board.

Who would be on the board? Herbert Hoover, Harry Truman, Pearl Buck, Mrs. Millicent McIntosh, Mary Lord, Walter Lippmann, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Nathan Pusey, Clare Booth Luce, William Benton, Leonard Bernstein, Adlai Stevenson, and Harry Sherman (chairman of the board of the Book-of-the-Month Club).

All I can say is that John Crosby has got to be kidding. If you ever got these people in the same room, some of them, and I can name them, would kill each other.

IMPRACTICAL ADVISERS

There is an almost militant piety about John Crosby that's beginning to amount to a psychiatric disorientation. There are other things the matter with his advisory board. Those people are too busy. They don't have 1,000 hours to spend—two or three hours a day for a full year—looking at television to see what the public is really getting. Mr. Crosby says they don't need it. How much time does he say they do need? "This matter can be taken care of two hours once a year," he says. And fix up television.

I would like to say that I think this is a little nutty.

Mr. Crosby is asking a lot of famous people who don't know anything about television programs to take charge of them. I know a few of these people. Just as an example, Leonard Bernstein would leave the room if Harry Truman ever approached the piano. Yet this is the very way Mr. Crosby would impose culture on us. His culture.

There have been a couple of published opinions as to what happens to a crash program in culture. I like the colloquial theory of Stanley Edgar Hyman, who has formulated what he calls the Law of Raspberry Jam: the wider you spread it, the thinner it gets.

Walter Lippmann, so continuously and flatteringly referred to by John Crosby as to suggest that the latter is getting a cut of his pay, has offered something as noble as Mr. Crosby's board of antiseptic celebrities. Instead of a board, Mr. Lippmann envisions (and I quote him) "one network for public service with a criterion not of what is popular but what is good."

That is a very devout sentence. Then he admits this would not attract the largest mass audience. However, he goes on, and I am again quoting him, "If it enlisted the great talents which are available in the industry but that are now throttled and frustrated by present policies, it might well attract an audience that would make up in influence what it lacked in numbers."

I'm interested in those "great talents" to which Mr. Lippmann refers—talents available in the industry but now "throttled and frustrated by present policy."

IMAGINARY TALENT POOL

I formally charge that Walter Lippmann in this matter of television does not know what he is talking about. And this is a very unfamiliar posture for him. I challenge him to name those talents now immobilized by these present policies. I will tell you what I I think. That he will never answer this, not because I am an unimportant person but because Walter Lippmann's talent pool is imaginary.

Mr. Crosby likes the idea of Mr. Lippmann's network. The present networks have "lost the Nation's top 5 percent on a cultural level," Mr. Crosby says, and these are the 5 percent of the people "who write all the books and plays that are worthwhile, who publish and edit all the newspapers, own most of the banks and industry, and largely run the country." The loss of this 5 percent, he says, "is a terrible one."

Now that is a very dangerous piece of journalism. His own copy would have benefited by some of the editing he claims is stifling television.

If it is true that television has lost all the men who own the banks, run American industry and largely run the country, how does Mr. Crosby reconcile that idiot sentence with the fact that these are the same men who sponsor television? These are the men who foot the bill for television and make it possible for people to get it for free.

EGGHEADED BUT CHEAP

This eggheaded network of Mr. Crosby's isn't to cost anything either. Because "it would take very little money." Mr. Crosby said that. This is his exact sentence. What does he propose specifically? "We would take the 47 existing educational stations and tie them together into a national network where 'Don Giovanni' the Mozart opera, could be heard without being interrupted by Mother's Day commercials," and again he says, "this would cost very little." One production of "Don Giovanni" would cost television $250,000 minimum. Does John Crosby know that? No. Does he care? No. Why not? Money's no problem. Why isn't it? Because it isn't his money. It's your money. For this national network will be subsidized. That means you will pay for it out of your income tax.

Now, may I comment on Mr. Crosby's charge that TV is creating juvenile delinquents? Violence of the most extreme kind, tortures of the most diabolical have the instant endorsement of Mr. Crosby's purity league the instant these villainies are committed by a sweating tenor in a pair of tight pants singing in French. That's quite all right because it's opera. But it's all wrong for these villainies to be committed in a pair of tight levis and in English because then it's a western.

Opera doesn't kid around with small, uninspired collisions like saloon fights and shoot-outs. Opera audiences are so used to violence they can sit through almost any suicide or stabbing and yawn or leave. Do you remember what happens in "Andrea

Chenier"? The guillotine? Or the floods and the collapsing buildings in "Gotterdaemmerung," or the boiling in oil in "La Juive," or being suffocated in "Othello," or entombed while still living in "Aida"? Do you remember how Rigoletto found his daughter? The condition she was in? Well, she had been stabbed a good deal and sewn up in a sack, and when Rigoletto found her, ready to be dumped in the river, she was still breathing. This little girl was almost as hard to kill as Rasputin.

Here is the point: A small percentage of the population of Europe and America enormously enjoys this kind of story, especially when it's embellished by great singing and a large orchestra. And it's called grand opera. Most people can't afford it in that form. Yet most people like that kind of story. On television the story of Don Giovanni will appear in such a series as "The Untouchables" or "Peter Gunn." "The Untouchables" and "Peter Gunn" will have a jazz background instead of a symphony orchestra. One is an opera, another is a western. Both belong in television. Any man who claims that the extent of his culture or the empyrean level he has attained makes it impossible for him to enjoy anything in television is either a hypocrite or an eccentric.

FOGGY CELESTIAL PLACES

One usually finds that these celestial attitudes are pretty foggy places, chilly too, with practically nobody around but Sacheverel Sitwell, Mr. Crosby himself peeking in at the window, Mr. Lippmann shuddering by the radiator, Robert Maynard Hutchens blowing on his fingers.

Madison Avenue is accused every day of violence. I'd like to spend a few minutes on violence. I want to set up a hypothetical person. Try to set aside your prejudice and remember your childhood. Let us set up an average man of 1920; let us say he was 20 in 1920. And let's see what he's read, heard, looked at, been required to memorize, in the course of a normal education.

Before he could read, he could recite 30 or 40 Mother Goose rhymes, in which he found an old man who wouldn't say his prayers, and, being a well-brought-up young fellow, he did the only thing that was possible—he took that old man by the left leg and threw him down the stairs. He saw a spider frighten Miss Muffet off her tuffet. He saw some babes who were lost in the woods. They sobbed and they cried and they lay down and died.

THE WORLD OF ALARMS

Learning to read fiction does not introduce our young fellow to the world that exists. It introduces him to the world of Poe and Hawthorne, Thomas Hardy, Ambrose Bierce, Jack London, Joseph Conrad, Wells, Kipling, Scott, and Dickens. The world of alarms and shipwreck, murder in the dark, of beheadings, trials, insanity, of grave-robbing, infidelity and cannibalism, war, thirst, and suicide.

When only 16, our young friend is obliged to memorize great sections of a story which, rephrased in today's vernacular, might read like this:

"Joe's girl, a gun moll, suspects that he's too soft for the killing he's got to undertake. So the next night she pours liquor into the victim's bodyguards and gets them drunk, takes their guns, gives them to Joe and tells him to go in and do the killings. Which he does. But the next night there's good reason to kill the gang leader's lieutenant. Joe is so scared that he pays a couple of local boys to do the job with clubs. By this time Joe keeps seeing the lieutenant in a hallucination. His nerves are shot. He decides that if he doesn't kill everybody in his way, they'll kill him. But the mob turns on him, kills him and, just to make sure, cuts off his entire head."

Now I paraphrase the story because I wish to conceal its authorship. Many of you already know what the story is. I consider it a story of violence. A yarn not far removed, in its main features, from the kind of thing for which we are being lambasted all over the networks. Nobody knows who wrote the story that I paraphrased. Some say Hollinshead, some say George Buchanan. It doesn't matter at all. What does matter is that an extremely versatile, busy-minded Englishman stumbled on it, was fascinated by it, rewrote it—and called it "Macbeth."

May I take a stage direction from something else? "She takes the staff in her mouth and guides it with her stumps and writes." Now who was she, and why did she do this? Well, she was Lavinia, and she couldn't speak because the men who had raped her didn't want the fact to be known, so they cut out her tongue. Just to make sure she couldn't write a report of what they had done, they chopped off her hands. This is "Titus Andronicus," of course. The date of this composition: 1592.

VIOLENCE FOREVERMORE

I want to mention an interesting note by George Lyman Kittridge. At the bottom of the page of the Shakespeare that I have, Kittridge notes that some readers feel "Titus Andronicus" was really too horrible even for Shakespeare. And he has written this: "Shakespeare was always prone to try experiments, and it would be strange if he had not written one out-and-out tragedy of blood when Thomas Kydd had shown him how powerfully such things appeal to playgoers." May I repeat those seven words: "how powerfully such things appeal to playgoers."

Here is television's point: violence, at all levels, has been with us a long time. And will continue. And should. There is no drama without it.

Blueprint for the Sixties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial from the New York Times of April 10, 1961. This expansion program planned on the part of the Yeshiva University is highly commendable and illustrates the initiative that is necessary for our people to raise the educational standards of America:

BLUEPRINT FOR THE SIXTIES

Private institutions of learning, especially in urban centers, are faced with difficult problems in meeting the expected doubling of college enrollment by 1970. For them, both the expansion of teaching staffs and the increasing of physical facilities are musts. In addition, considerable rebuilding will be required for existing facilities that soon will be outdated.

Because of this situation it is a pleasure to endorse the dynamic "Blueprint for the Sixties," of Yeshiva University, Amsterdam Avenue and 186th Street, New York 33. This is an ambitious development program which will seek to raise $30 million in the next 10 years for Yeshiva University and $27 million in the same period for Yeshiva's Albert Einstein College of Medicine.

Under one phase of the university's $30 million program there will be an expansion of facilities at the institution's main center on Washington Heights. A second phase calls for developing an entirely new campus as part of the Riverside-Amsterdam slum clearance project on the West Side. Generous gifts will enable Yeshiva University to carry out its ambitious plans to continue and expand its great service to the community.

The Pulse of a Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Miss Janet McHale, a student at Marymount High School in Arlington, Va., is one of our younger citizens. It will be several years before she is eligible to vote. Yet her eloquent appraisal of that American ideal which is at once an illusion and a reality is most inspiring.

In these days when it seems to be fashionable to ridicule America and Americans; when we, ourselves, seek some tangible image of perfection to display to the world, this young lady's clear faith in our history is reassuring indeed.

Miss McHale's trust in the principles of our particularly American democracy is unshakable. Her trust is based on the profound fact that our system has evolved by incorporating the very best of each of our ethnic groups, combining them, and calling them American. Miss McHale feels that a better political philosophy exists nowhere else on the face of the earth and she has the strength of character to say so.

I trust my colleagues will find, after reading this essay, that the slings and arrows of America's would-be detractors are not always reasons for wholesale despair. Our Founding Fathers had complete faith in the generations which would follow them. We owe them the serious obligation to have faith in ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, Miss McHale's essay follows. It is at once a tribute to her deep sense of patriotism and a reassuring reflection on the high academic standards pursued by the nuns and lay teachers at Marymount High School.

THE PULSE OF A NATION

(By Miss Janet McHale)

A fearful silence prevails. Some call it the silence before the storm. The day is July 4, the place, the emergency room of a metropolitan hospital. Sam Smith is on the operating table. The white-shrouded surgeon bowed in concentration is laboring in the silence to prevent a disastrous storm, one that will silence the dying man forever. The heads and hearts of the doctors and nurses are pounding in the deathlike vacuum, but their hands are skilled and steady. Their ears are tuned to but two sounds, the faint heartbeat of the critical patient and the force of his breath on the small plastic bag. Then comes the silence. No longer is heard the faint heartbeat or the pressure of warm breath. Panic begins to write its story on the faces of the people

working feverishly to save Sam's life. After a moment's hesitation, the surgeon opens the patient's chest and massages his heart until its reassuring beat slowly resumes. Due to his knowledge the storm after the silence does not destroy life and property but rather restores them.

On another July 4, another man named Sam was also in critical condition on a white table in Philadelphia. His name was Uncle Sam. The skilled men who were trained to save his life stood by anxiously and expectantly. They knew that the lives of millions depended upon the skill with which they used their instruments. Before that turning point of history came a silence, a silence that rocked the world. And the storm was kind. It showered its blessings on millions who felt and have felt the drops of freedom. The dying man and faint heartbeat were revived. Those statesmen and learned men, gathered in 1776, used their pens to write a declaration which gave a new life to America. The heart of this country began to pulse with life on that day and for 185 years its pulse beat has shaken the world.

But America has become more than just a declaration of freedom. In five generations, it has grown in body, spirit, and strength. America has produced a certain kind of human being and a certain type of mind. It has raised a nation of freedom loving individuals who never tire of boring the world with their praise of democracy. It has welcomed millions who have searched to find a land of real opportunity and chance and found that land on our shores. It has infused its ideals, spirit, and imagination into a world which in 1800 believed that the height of progress had already been reached. It has drawn masses who have broken away from old ties and old races to make a new world and a new race.

And what actually is the pulse of this Nation, America? It is its people. It is a combination of all religions, races, and nationalities which have contributed some of their heritage to the national product. In contributing, our ancestors have strengthened America for they realized this thought of Robert Frost, "Something we were withholding made us weak, until we found it was ourselves we were withholding from the land of living, and forthwith found salvation in surrender."

America is not a melting pot of lost identities. It is a mural made up of Americans who have kept their identities while contributing to their homeland. That mural of old, new, white, brown, and yellow pieces, built by people with a dream, is a picture of life in the United States. It is a picture of Hollywood glamor, of a small New England village, of the bustling streets of New York, and the ageless majesty of snow-covered Rockies. In it you can find Eskimos driving their dogs through a blizzard or Hawaiian native girls dancing under a palm tree at a luau. You can see a Georgia farmer looking with pride at his tobacco crop, a lumberjack in Oregon chopping down a giant redwood, or a model posing for the front cover of Vogue. There are the small-town grocery shops and the million-dollar shopping centers. You'll see a university with 15,000 students and the Humpty Dumpty Kindergarten around the corner from your house. You can find just about anything because this is a land where you can dare to be different. You can campaign for the candidate you wish to win an election and you can spend your lifetime studying butterflies. Because that decision is up to the individual, not the state or a dictator. America has grown into a land where there is initiative and imagination, the forces which have sustained the pulse of people and brought countless souls to our land.

You live in a country which is not something negative. It is positive. America is not a region, a locality, or a place. America is an atmosphere, an ideal, a vision. As our forefathers worked to give life to that vision, we must work to keep that pulse beat strong and steady. From day to day, our lives should keep on strengthening the ideal of democracy and reshaping it if the ideal is ever distorted. In the words of President John F. Kennedy:

"We dare not forget that we are heirs of that first revolution. Let the word go forth from this time and place that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans, unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this Nation has always been committed today, at home and around the world."

If we meet this challenge, it will be not only America for Americans, but Americans for America and America for the world. The pulse and heart of America will be signs of its surging life carrying hope and opportunity. It is a beat that must not stop, for if it stops there will be silence. And perhaps after the storm, none will be left to rekindle the life of our America.

An Eye for 6 Million Eyes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial on the trial of Adolf Eichmann, which appeared in the Boston Herald on April 18, 1961:

AN EYE FOR 6 MILLION EYES

The special court set up to try Adolf Eichmann has now solemnly affirmed its own competence, and the trial can proceed.

The court's ruling was a foregone conclusion, of course. This is not a judicial proceeding in the ordinary sense. It is a political trial. The prisoner's terrible guilt has already been proved out of his own mouth, out of the history of the ghastly era he helped to make. So what follows will be only a show.

Yet we cannot help feeling that the court would have done Israel and justice a good turn if it had had the fortitude to accept the defense's challenge and end the trial before it began.

Not that Eichmann should go free. He should, of course, be tried and punished for the monstrous things he has done. But he should be tried by an international tribunal, or by Argentina, where he was captured, or by Germany, where he committed his crimes. He should be tried anywhere, in fact, except in Israel, which claims that it alone has the right.

For Israel is conducting the Eichmann trial as an act of national and racial piety. The trial is a conscious and deliberate vindication of the 6 million Jewish people who died in Eichmann's extermination camps. It is both a demonstration that the Jewish people have not forgotten and a plea that the world should not forget. This is worthy. But is it wise?

Is it wise for a young nation, which is hopefully building a new life, to throw itself suddenly back into the past, to open old wounds, to live again the agonizing days when bitterness and hatred were the chief sustenance of Jewry in much of the world? Can Israel mount a posthumous attack on nazism without rousing general anti-German feelings which are harmful to relations with a democratic Germany now trying to make amends?

Israel, in little more than a decade of statehood, has won the admiration of the world for its progressiveness, its modernity, its forward look. The Eichmann case is at best a full stop, at worst a step backward.

What a magnificent gesture it would have been, if the Israelis, having discovered Eichmann's hiding place, had simply announced to the world, "Here is the hangman. We have found him for you. Let the proper authorities take over. We are busy with more important matters." Eichmann would have been tried. Germany, for one, would certainly have accepted the responsibility. And Tel Aviv need not have dirtied its hands.

It would still have been a magnificent gesture, if the Israeli court, having examined the pertinent law, had declined jurisdiction this week.

But it hasn't happened that way, and, human nature being what it is, probably couldn't have happened that way. Too many Israeli citizens suffered too many indignities, either personally or through their families, at the hands of Eichmann and his kind. They will have at least one eye for the many that have been destroyed.

We can only hope that Adolf Eichmann, in facing judgment at last, will not inflict another grievous wound on the Jewish people.

The Price You Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD C. BRUCE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the House to an editorial which appeared in the Indianapolis News concerning the income tax.

At a time when most of us have just completed filing our Federal taxes, this editorial, entitled "The Price You Pay" takes on special meaning.

Therefore, I wish to insert it in the RECORD today. It expresses my feelings quite well on the matter of confiscatory taxes. I am sure it also expresses the sentiments of the vast majority of my constituents in the 11th District of Indiana.

THE PRICE YOU PAY

Monday midnight is the deadline for paying your 1960 income tax. Chances are that you are just finishing a complicated wrangle with your tax form, and are groaning over the huge bite the Federal Government takes from your annual salary.

No matter where you stand in the income scale, the bite is substantial. In fact, unless your pay has skyrocketed in recent years, the Government's take may have left you worse off this year than ever before. Since 1939, Government's encroachment on personal income—through taxes and inflation—has more than doubled across the board.

For example, if you earned $3,000 a year in 1939, you would have to earn $7,270 a year now—just to have the same purchasing power.

If you made $5,000, your income now would have to be $12,510. And to equal the purchasing power of $10,000 in 1939 coin, you would have to be making $26,476.

In the past 20 years, Federal tax rates have shot out of sight. The average citizen now has to work more than 11 hours out of every week just to pay his taxes. And while the tax collector has taken more and more of your dollars, the upsurge in prices has reduced the buying power of those you have left. The dollar is now worth less than half of its 1939 value.

What is the reason for all this? The answer is simple: Government in the United States has become too big. It is engaging in wasteful spending at a rate of $80 billion a year; it is disbursing billions annually in foreign aid, and in vast programs of Federal handouts. It now proposes to subsidize whole cities and industries, under a so-called "depressed areas" bill.

All of this is advertised as coming from the "public sector." Proponents of big spending speak of their projects as if they were to be paid for out of some mythical checkbook in Washington, and will therefore cost nothing. What they ignore, and what is painfully apparent on income tax day, is that the "public sector" is you. There can be no spending on farms, depressed areas, Federal aid, foreign aid, or on anything else, unless the money is taken away from you, the taxpayer, first.

Take, as an example, the national debt, amounting to $285 billion. This obligation has been incurred by deficit spending. The Government had to borrow money because it was spending more than it took in. The spenders tell us not to worry about the debt, because we owe it to ourselves. But what are the facts? First of all, the debt has helped increase the volume of money and credit in the economy, without increasing the supply of goods. That is the cause of inflation. This obligation we owe to ourselves" is responsible for slicing in half the value of your dollars.

It is also responsible for increasing your tax burden. The interest on the debt amounts to $9 billion a year. This involves an annual tax bite of approximately $50 for every man, woman, and child in the United States. If you are an average wage earner, married with two children, you are paying $200 a year just for interest on this debt we owe to ourselves.

That is a sample of where the taxes you are paying are going. And if further spending programs are launched, and further deficits incurred, the problem is going to get worse instead of better.

Having paid your 1960 income tax, this would be a good time to make up your mind to correct this situation. If you are tired of turning over 20 percent, 30 percent, or more of your income to the bureaucracy in Washington, now is the time to do something about it. Why not throw your weight behind the effort to curtail new Federal spending programs? And, beyond that, why not enlist in the campaign to cut back, and ultimately to abolish, the Federal income tax? After all, it's your money they're spending.

The Hadassah and Henrietta Szold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, in the 327 years since the founding of Maryland, we of the Free State have been proud of the contributions to the development of the Nation which our sons and daughters have made.

The first colonists gave to the New World the basic principle of religious freedom. Charles Carroll, Samuel Chase, William Paca, and Thomas Stone are Marylanders whose names are forever hallowed as signators to the immortal Declaration of Independence. From the hills of Frederick County to the harbor of Baltimore came young Francis Scott Key, there to write the ballad of freedom, now heard all around the world, "The Star-Spangled Banner." To American jurisprudence, Maryland has presented Chief Justice Roger Brooke Taney, to education, Johns Hopkins and to the arts, George Peabody.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, Marylanders have always been dedicated to the establishment and development of those spiritual and material causes which make for a better world. However, we of the State from whence came the blue and the gray to fight for that which both considered just, are marking not only the centennary of that tragic struggle between the States.

Also, quite appropriately, the year 1961 marks the 100th anniversary of the ordination as a priest, of James Gibbons of Baltimore, commemorating in addition, the seventh anniversary of the elevation of this world famous Maryland churchman to the exalted position of becoming the first Roman Catholic Cardinal in the United States.

In that same year—1861, there was born in Baltimore, Henrietta Szold, daughter of Benjamin Szold, first Rabbi of the Oheb Shalom Congregation. It was 50 years ago, that the tremendous heart and brilliant mind of Henrietta Szold first recognized the need for the establishment of a program of health for all, regardless of race or religion, who resided in the then barren land of Palestine and contiguous territories.

This dedicated woman appealed to her fellow American women of Jewish faith for their personal as well as financial aid. Slowly but surely, her noble plan took root and more and more American Jewish women gave of their time in raising money and accumulating other materials needed to alleviate human suffering and disease among both Arabs and Jews in the Middle East.

The ideals and vision of Miss Szold resulted in the establishment of an organization of American Jewish women, known as Hadassah. Its sole purpose was to raise the standards of health and sanitation in Palestine.

Today, as it celebrates its golden jubilee, Hadassah has a membership of over 320,000 women, scattered throughout the 50 States of our Union. Under the leadership of Henrietta Szold and through the untiring, unceasing financial and other assistance of the American Hadassah organization, there arose in Palestine infant welfare centers, a nurses' training school, clinics, and eventually the first Hadassah hospital and medical center, which was built atop Mount Scopus, overlooking ancient Jerusalem. Some years ago, due to the vicissitudes of war and politics, the women of Hadassah were forced to abandon this center. Undaunted by this loss, they built a still greater project. In fact, the new hospital and medical center will start operations officially this year on June 6. This latest achievement by these noble women to the cause of international peace and understanding will probably become one of the greatest undertakings of its kind in all the world. Yes; this symbolic pillar of American good will in the ancient Holy Land of Israel may well be likened to our own great Statue of Liberty. Both offer the key of health and happiness to those who enter their sacred portals.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, may I point out that while these words present only a thumbnail sketch of Henrietta Szold and her living monument, Hadassah, the surface has not even been scratched. Nevertheless, the complete story of this organization of American Jewish women will not go unrecorded.

I am proud and privileged to announce that another outstanding Marylander, the nationally famous author, lecturer, and commentator, Ian Ross MacFarlane, of Baltimore, is now in the process of compiling an intimate history down to the most minute detail of the 50 years of sacrifice and progress by the women of Hadassah. No one is better qualified to prepare this manuscript than Mr. MacFarlane, for he was the first non-Jew to live and work as an actual member of the original Jewish agricultural colonies in Palestine. He has also lived long and intimately among the peoples and problems which have confronted the political, educational, and spiritual metamorphosis of the Jewish people from their days as colonists under the Palestine mandate to that of free citizens of the great new Republic of Israel.

We of Maryland welcome to our State's honor roll the ever-to-be-lamented and honored Henrietta Szold, and one of our modern contemporaries, Ian Ross MacFarlane.

Address of the Prime Minister of Greece, Constantine G. Caramanlis, National Press Club, April 19, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, as the first native American of Greek origin elected to the Congress of the United States, I felt a particular sense of pride on Tuesday, April 18, when the distinguished Prime Minister of Greece, the Honorable Constantine G. Caramanlis, addressed Members of the House of Representatives during his visit to our country this week.

Prime Minister Caramanlis was accompanied to the House by his lovely wife; by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Greece, the Honorable Evanghelos Averoff; by the distinguished Ambassador of Greece to the United States, the Honorable Alexis S. Liatis and Mrs. Liatis, as well as by other high officials of the Government of Greece.

Mr. Speaker, Greece, which gave the idea of democracy to the world, is today a valiant ally of the United States in maintaining democracy in the world.

I believe that the splendid address which I was privileged to hear Prime Minister Caramanlis deliver on April 19 to the National Press Club in Washington describes eloquently the contribution which the people of Greece are making to the security of free nations and the strength of free political institutions.

I am pleased at this point in the RECORD **to insert the text of the Prime Minister's address:**

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY THE PRIME MINISTER OF GREECE, CONSTANTINE G. CARAMANLIS, AT THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, APRIL 19, 1961

Mr. President and gentlemen, let me first thank you, Mr. President, for your warm words in introducing me.

I would like, gentlemen, to seize this opportunity to express through you my deepest gratitude to the American press and the American people for the feelings of sincere friendship and sympathy which, on the occasion of my visit, they have shown to Greece. I wish to assure you that the spontaneous response which I have met everywhere, and especially during my talks with your young and dynamic President, has been for me a source of inspiration and faith in the future of Greek-American relations.

The role of Greece has been decisive for the destinies of the free world. Lying, as she does, at the extreme southeastern point of Europe, at the crossroads of two worlds and three continents, Greece has always been a responsible factor of control of the great spiritual and military currents of history, whether from the West or the East.

VICTIM OF TOTALITARIANISM

In these circumstances it is natural that she should have sustained the full impact of the political and ideological conflict which has rocked and is still rocking our age. Greece, which had fought for freedom against fascism and nazism, became right after the war the object of repeated cruel armed attacks from still another totalitarian ideology—communism.

It is not perhaps a mere matter of chance that both these forms of totalitarianism were inflicted in that land where for the first time grew the concept of freedom and democracy. History repeats itself. It has been the historic fate of the people who first conceived the notions of balance and measure to find themselves always in the vanguard of the defense of democracy against all forms of extremism.

On the significance and consequences of the victorious Greek resistance I would like you to judge for yourselves. Imagine for a moment Greece under the heel of communism. Turkey would have been cut off, Italy outflanked. The independence of Yugoslavia would be at stake as she would have been submitted on three sides to Soviet influence. Finally, Soviet presence and dynamic intrusion into the eastern Mediterranean would have sealed off the fate of the entire vital area of the Middle East.

Instead of this, Greece is today a factor of peace and stability in the Balkans. Her membership in the North Atlantic Alliance insures the continuity of Western defense from the shores of the Atlantic to the shores of the Caucasus.

A GOOD NEIGHBOR

Our relations with Turkey—since the solution of the Cyprus problem—are excellent. In close and fruitful collaboration with Yugoslavia, Greece is showing in practice that the difference of social regimes is not an overwhelming obstacle to the peaceful relations between peoples.

Greece is showing that she regards peace in a positive sense and, that free of prejudice, she aims at maintaining good relations with all, subject to international law and obligations, the mutual respect of internal order and the independence of each country.

All this, naturally, has not been attained without a heavy toll of blood and property. At a time when more fortunate countries were actively tending the wounds of war, Greece alone was forced to carry out the fight. The cost has indeed been huge. I want to mention only that the losses of Greece in repelling Communist aggression exceeded the losses of the American Army in Korea, and that the material damage left in the wake of the Communist typhoon was larger even than the terrible devastation in my country during World War II.

GRATEFUL FOR AMERICAN AID

At this point I wish to stress how valuable and decisive was the help given by your great country. The Greek people are well aware of it and keep a sense of gratitude for the timely proclamation of the Truman doctrine and its effective application. Nevertheless, the Greek people also feel pride and satisfaction at having blocked the expansionist plans of communism. The Greek people know that although material help was received they had to fight it out. Unlike other parts of the world, in Greece the solution was definitive and victory complete. Greek blood alone paid the cost for such achievement.

It is easy to imagine the internal political and economic situation that confronted Greece when, in 1950, at the end of an almost uninterrupted 10-year war, she was finally able to direct her undivided attention to the work of peace. In an atmosphere of political instability and passion, with a shattered administrative machine, no means of communication, no funds, Greece not only had to tackle the tough job of actual survival but also had to create conditions for a normal development of the country in the future and for the prosperity of her people. It is to her credit that, equal to the circumstances, she applied herself wholeheartedly to the task of peaceful development and progress with the same enthusiasm and determination that she showed throughout the war. Thanks to a successful use of the economic and technical aid of the United States, and the untiring labor and the political sense of her people, Greece was able to overcome the difficulties of the first moment and enter for good on the road to economic development. The political stability of the last years, which Greece has known for the first time, permits us to envisage creatively and plan for the future of the country's economy. I do not wish to tire you with figures. However, I would omit an elementary duty if I did not mention some of the data illustrating the progress achieved.

ECONOMY IMPROVING

Thus, in the last 5 years, the per capita income of the population rose from $214 to $295. The merchant marine, which was almost wiped out during the war, now exceeds 5 million tons, while Greek ownership as a whole rates third in the world, right after the American and the British. Industrial production, including electric power, has increased by 41 percent as compared to 1955. Thanks to the policy of monetary stability, to which we unswervingly abide, trust in Greek currency was restored, deposits in banks increased, and conditions now prevail for more easy financing of the national economy.

Does all this mean that our economic problem is solved, or that there is no need of further international economic aid to Greece? The answer is that today, more than ever before, the continuation of such aid is necessary. There is no doubt that the economic situation has greatly improved. But this is an improvement as compared to the chaos inherited after the war, the occupation of the country, and the Communist-guerrilla war. Much has been achieved, but there is still much more to be done. What we have achieved must be made secure, the overall job must be completed. Were we not to finish the task, there would be the risk of endangering what has been so far achieved.

PROBLEMS AHEAD

We do not underestimate the existing difficulties. Nor do we overlook our lack in professional and technical development. For this reason precisely, my Government has drawn up and since last year has been applying a 5-year plan for economic development. Such planning is being attempted for the first time in Greece. It, therefore, has at the same time the value of a new start. The central idea of the plan is, through combined public and private investment, to insure conditions whereby the national income will reach a point beyond which a further rise can develop independently ($400 approximately per capita is our first objective), to eliminate unemployment and underemployment, and to make the Greek economy sound and internationally competitive. We aim at this result without deviating from the modern healthy principles of a liberal economy. The contribution of the State is limited to the essential sectors and our own and foreign spirit of enterprise is encouraged.

Many might perhaps think that the large goal set for ourselves is ambitious. We know that this does not lie outside reality. We are convinced that we shall not be left alone in our efforts, because we must not be alone.

Financing of our plan depends, to a considerable extent, on various foreign sources: regular air, loans, transfers of capital, etc. If these sources were to be cut off, our efforts would be endangered, and along with them, the fruits we have reaped so far with so much blood and toil.

Gentlemen, I would like you to know that in Greece at this time an experiment is being carried out, the results of which will have immediate repercussions in the whole area of the eastern Mediterranean and the Balkans.

If it is true that peace is a contest with peaceful arms, if we accept that international communism has not abandoned its aims but merely changed its methods, if finally we are convinced that it is the ardent desire of all people to be free, by whatever means, of the specter of poverty and privation, if all this is true, then we shall have to recognize that it is of the utmost political importance to prove that totalitarianism is not indispensable for the development of a poor economy. From the example of Greece will depend, in a large measure, the answer to the question of whether or not it is possible to seek prosperity in freedom and dignity.

I am sure that with the help of God and all of you the reply will be affirmative.

Did Yuri Do It—Or Is It a Hoax?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I suggested that the House Committee on Science and Astronautics

conduct an exhaustive investigation into Soviet Russia's claim that it launched a man into space.

My own investigation of this entire subject begins to indicate more and more that much remains to be disclosed by the Soviet Union before the world can accept the veracity of the Communists' assertion.

I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent article written by Peter Reich, aviation editor of Chicago's American, which I think makes a significant contribution to this entire subject.

Mr. Reich's rich experience in the entire field of space exploration is reflected in this article, in which he raises some pertinent questions which indeed justify the investigation which I proposed.

Mr. Reich's article follows:

DID YURI DO IT—OR IS IT A HOAX?

(By Peter Reich)

A week after the Soviets say Yuri Gagarin became history's first man in space, certain vital questions remain unanswered.

In some quarters this lack is interpreted as an indication that the "orbital flight" may have been the greatest hoax in history.

Yuri, say these quarters, never may have entered space.

You can make up your mind after considering apparent contradictions cited by space experts.

Report: Yuri said he could see the earth "very well" from orbit—"The shores on the continents, islands, important rivers, great water surfaces, wrinkles and localities were clearly distinguishable. I saw perfectly great squares of collective farms. It was possible to distinguish between plowed and grassland."

Fact 1: Photographs taken at great altitude indicate that very little can be determined on earth from the altitude (109 to 187 miles) at which Yuri supposedly rode.

Fact 2: A. A. Blagonravov of the Soviet Academy of Science, told newsmen in Florence, Italy, that Yuri's spacecraft had no windows or portholes. (Later at a news conference, Soviet scientists said some Soviet spaceships have windows.) When Blagonravov was pressed as to how Yuri could see from a windowless ship, the scientist said, "by radio."

Report: Yuri said he "floated" inside the spaceship due to zero gravity and that other objects floated around him. Yet he said he "ate and drank, and everything was like on earth."

Fact: Eating and drinking in the weightless state, American experts have demonstrated, are difficult. Liquids vaporize. Even when squeezed into the mouth from sealed containers, liquids tend to balloon, making swallowing difficult. Solids tend to float above one's soft palate, making one choke.

Report: Yuri was said to have been blasted off at nearly 25,000 miles per hour, then settled into orbit under 18,000 miles per hour.

Fact 1: An object shot into orbit enters orbit at close to its top speed.

Fact 2: The stresses of acceleration on a body attaining 25,000 miles per hour within 187 miles up and the few minutes that Yuri had, are tremendous. Yet Yuri made no mention of these awesome forces in his report. Not a word about how he was flattened, had difficulty breathing, or the like.

Report: Yuri said he sang the song "The Homeland Hears, the Homeland Knows" as he was coming down.

Fact: During the terrible period of reentry, when the deceleration forces are as bad (if not worse) that the acceleration forces on the upward flight, a human being would have a hard time singing. This writer experienced about 5½ g.'s (forces of gravity) in a jet fighter, and my chest felt as though it were caving in. Estimates are that during reentry, a spaceman coming back from orbit will experience from 10 to 20 g.'s—hardly a state in which to sing.

Report: Yuri said everything in the weightless state became easier to do.

Fact: All the American astronauts in training have reported that tasks in the weightless state become more difficult to perform. Humans tend to lose a frame of reference under zero g., scientists have determined.

Report: Tass, the official Soviet news agency, said "the cosmonaut landed by parachute." Tass did not say his vehicle returned by parachute, it said he landed this way.

Fact: Ejecting from a space capsule does not seem a reasonable way of returning from orbit, scientists believe. However, the Tass report may have been incomplete or garbled in translation.

These are the major discrepancies in the Soviet reports. To them must be added these curious facts:

The Soviets announced that their astronaut was in orbit at the time he was aloft. Why would they take this unnecessary chance? The hardest part of the flight—reentry and recovery—still was ahead.

The Russians hadn't told newsmen about the launching in advance. Why, then, would they risk the biggest fiasco in news history—a nonreturned, or dead, astronaut—with a premature announcement? It doesn't make sense.

Again, our administration in Washington has withheld usually available details on our tracking of a Soviet spacecraft this time. Why? Did we really track their manned satellite—or was there nothing to track?

BUILDUP AND LETDOWN

The big buildup preceding the Soviet announcement of their man in orbit was unusual, too. As was the subsequent letdown. The London Daily Worker, you'll recall, finally broke a story—which it attributed to private sources in Russia—to the effect that the son of a prominent Russian airplane designer had been shot into orbit.

Yet, when the astronaut finally was identified—a full day after the Worker broke its story—he turned out to be an unknown air force officer.

Is it possible that the son of the famed designer—a logical choice for history's first man in space—had been lost in space? Or that he had landed with his brains scrambled from the terrible stresses he had had to endure?

Is it possible that Yuri was palmed off as the first cosmonaut without ever having gone aloft?

Nor have any pictures of Yuri's space capsule been released. Nor any of Yuri inside the space capsule.

MONKEY'S FATE

Is it reasonable to assume that the real astronaut the Russians sent up suffered brain damage? Yes, indeed.

It is a well-kept secret that the first monkey—Gordo—that we sent into space in 1958 in the nose cone of a Jupiter missile was not simply lost at sea as reported.

And the monkey was dead long before the nose cone burned up, killed by the horrible strain imposed by the wild gyrations of his vehicle. He was, literally, shaken to death.

Something similar may have happened to a real Russian astronaut.

Why would the Russians—masters of propaganda—risk such a giant hoax?

They would have ample reason to take the chance.

Putting the first man in space is a tremendous propaganda victory.

The Russians are well aware that the United States stands on the threshold of putting a man in space—not into orbit, just 115 miles up, and back down. But, still, space.

The Russians desperately wanted their own cosmonaut up first. A first by the United States would have meant our country would have regained all the prestige we lost when the Russians put up the first manned satellite, Sputnik I.

The Soviets could not permit this to happen.

Did they gamble? Did they shoot a man up before they were really ready to do so? Did they fail to bring him back, or was he terribly hurt—and did word of a man-in-space launch leak out, so that the Russians had to produce a hale and hearty cosmonaut, even one who never had been in space, in order to cover their attempt?

We can't prove this is what happened.

But to those who know space flight and its problems, the hypothesis makes sense.

An American astronaut may yet be the first man to return safely from space.

H.R. 10, Voluntary Pension Plan for the Self-Employed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by J. E. McMahon, distinguished financial reporter for the New York Times and which appeared in the New York Times on Sunday, February 19, 1961:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 19, 1961]

PENSION BILL BACKED FOR SELF-EMPLOYED

(By J. E. McMahon)

Self-employed persons, who for many years have sought to obtain from Congress tax benefits for setting up their retirement programs similar to those extended to corporate employees, seem to have a better chance of attaining their goal this year, proponents of such legislation believe.

The latest bill for that purpose, H.R. 10, introduced in the House by Representative EUGENE J. KEOGH, Democrat, of Brooklyn, on January 3, is a much modified version of older bills. And it has been fashioned to meet some of the objections that proved stumbling blocks to the passage of such measures in previous years. It is because of these modifications and the more widespread support for self-employed pensioning, even by President Kennedy last year as a Senator, that backers of such legislation feel more confident of success this year.

The fact that the administration expects a budget deficit of $1 billion for the fiscal year ending on June 30 and possibly a $2 billion deficit in the next fiscal year could have a bearing on the outlook for the legislation. The loss of tax revenues has been one of the big obstacles to passage of such bills in other years.

On this matter, Representative KEOGH said last week that instead of an estimated loss of $365 million a year in revenues that the 1959 bill would have entailed, the new measure might result in a loss of $100 million to $150 million a year. Furthermore, he added, provisions of the new bill will cover some 17 million persons, instead of 9 million under the older measure.

While the 10 percent of earnings formula is retained in the 1961 bill, the amount that can be set aside by the self-employed for pensions is limited to $2,500 a year, compared with $7,500 under previous bills. Moreover, while the older bills were designed to cover only the employer, the new bill would cover also his employes, if "they are more than three in number."

A résumé of the new bill said that the "newest version of the Keogh bill—officially titled the Self-Employed Individuals Retirement Act—embraces a somewhat different approach than in prior Congresses. Instead of allowing the self-employed a limited tax deduction for amounts voluntarily set aside for their retirement either in restricted trusts or insurance or annuity policies, the present H.R. 10 adopts the general form of the Senate Finance Committee bill of the 86th Congress, which would have brought self-employed persons under existing legislation relating to non-discriminatory, tax-favored private retirement plans by allowing them to be treated as their own employers and employes."

It also was said that many important changes had been made in the new bill as compared with a Senate version. Among these were:

The elimination of all proposed restrictions on corporate pension plans covering so-called owner-employes.

The bill does not require a self-employed person to include his employes under the plan unless they are more than three in number, excluding part-time or seasonal employes.

The bill modifies the severe limitations of the Senate bill on the amount of contributions that can be made on behalf of owner-employes, that is, sole proprietors and partners having more than a 10 percent interest in the business.

The bill bases the self-employed individual's contribution on the amount of his "self-employment earnings" rather than on his "earned income" from the business.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Since the opening of the 87th Congress, seven bills have been introduced in the House to aid the self-employed with their pension problems. Three bills have been introduced in the Senate, with one by Senator GEORGE A. SMATHERS, Democrat, of Florida, receiving considerable attention. It differs significantly from the bills introduced in the House.

In reviewing the long history of such proposed legislation, Mr. KEOGH said last week that the first discussions on the subject took place in 1945 by a group of New York lawyers. Five years later the American Bar Association appointed a committee to look into the problem. The New York State Bar Association played a prominent role in this study, he said. In 1951, Mr. Keogh added, he introduced the first bill on the subject, with Daniel Reed, Republican, of New York, a cosponsor, Representative Thomas Jenkins, Republican, of Ohio, in later years was a cosponsor of the legislation with Mr. Keogh until 1958, when Representative Richard M. Simpson, Republican, of Pennsylvania, was cosponsor of the H.R. 10 bill.

In January 1960, in answer to an inquiry as to his position on the then Simpson-Keogh bill Senator John F. Kennedy, Democrat, of Massachusetts, said:

"I am myself disposed to support the type of provisions which are contained in the Simpson-Keogh bill. I personally feel that there has been ample testimony from many sources over a long period of time in both Houses and that it is time to take floor action on this legislation. * * * I hope that it will be acted upon favorably during this Congress."

When the self-employed pension bill was being considered by the House Ways and Means Committee in 1959, David A. Lindsay, Assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury, wrote that "the Treasury Department recognizes that present law does not give self-employed people tax treatment for their retirement savings comparable to that now accorded to employees covered by employer-financed pension plans * * *."

Representative KEOGH said last week that the present bill was much better than those introduced in the past and that he was encouraged by support in Congress from some of those who had opposed such legislation in the past.

Constitutional Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, this week an incisive speech, entitled "Constitutional Money," was made by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. It was made on the occasion of the 70th Continental Congress of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution. The full text of the speech follows:

CONSTITUTIONAL MONEY

(An address by WRIGHT PATMAN, First Congressional District of Texas, before the 70th Continental Congress of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, at Constitution Hall, Washington, D.C., April 19, 1961)

It is a solemn honor to address the 70th Continental Congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution. I know of no organization more dedicated to the principles of our Constitution than the Daughters of the American Revolution. Next to the Supreme Court of the United States, I know of no group which concerns itself more with these principles.

It is also a great pleasure, and a great challenge, to talk to women about money. You handle most of it; you control most of it; and you should know most about it.

What is money?

Different societies have at different times used many different things as money. These include: Sea shells, whales' teeth, boars' tusks, stones, feathers, bricks, coconuts, cocoa beans, iron rings, salt, beaver pelts, blankets, bronze axes, and wheels.

At one time, the natives of some of the islands of the South Pacific used great stone wheels as money; and in Ireland, during St. Patrick's time, they used slave girls as money.

Of course those were the days when the men handled all the money. It took a man to handle those great stone wheels.

In our own country, we have used such things as wampum, woodpecker scalps, beaver pelts, blankets, tobacco, whiskey, pepper, all kinds of script, and a variety of other things, real and imaginary.

Wampum, you know, was strings of beads made of clam shells. A Massachusetts law, enacted in 1637, fixed the value of black clam shells at twice the value of white clam shells, and it also fixed the exchange value with English money.

Wampum was, of course, the money of the native Indians and the first settlers adopted it because it was most convenient for trading with the Indians.

Wampum continued to be the chief currency of New York until as late as 1672. And as late as 1693, the ferry fare between New York and Brooklyn was still payable in wampum.

Since the Constitution was adopted, however, our principal money has been essentially the same as that in use today. This is a form of credit money. A small part of this is created by the Federal Government, but most of it is created by the private commercial banks. This form of money is both old and new. It is old in the sense that we inherited the method of money creation—by private bankers—from the goldsmith bankers who operated in western Europe in the 16th and 17th centuries. It is new in the sense that bitter experiences have from time to time forced the Nation to adopt improvements and safeguards, through new laws and banking regulations. To realize that the money system is in almost constant state of change, we need only note that the Federal Reserve Act, passed in 1913, has been amended at an average rate of two amendments per year.

The human experience with money suggests that no particular substance has been divinely chosen to be money; and no natural order designs and regulates money. Money is, in short, not wealth, but claims to wealth. Money is not a substance, but a social system sanctioned by tribal custom, law, or constitution.

A good money system is not only a mark of highly advanced and a highly productive society, a good money system is also essential to the development of such a society. Money functions as a free society's bookkeeping system—a system wherein each individual is credited for what he contributes to the society, and is debited for what he receives from the society. A good money system permits a free society to organize its economic efforts efficiently, and to devote a large part of its current efforts to building tools, plants, and know-how for production in the future.

You see, under a barter system we could not have any taxes, to speak of, so you can imagine how horrible that would be. People in my line of work would receive their pay in copies of speeches, old laws, and so on.

Since money is a social system, a nation must either design, improve, and manage its money system wisely or risk the consequences of disaster. The graveyard of history is littered with the bones of nations that neglected their money systems, or confused money with the nation's wealth.

You perhaps know that one of the theories as to what happened to the Roman Empire is that the Empire ran out of money. The Empire depended heavily on silver for money, and the belief is that certain of the Spanish mines which had supplied the silver ran dry. In any case, the record indicates that the Roman money system tended to break down, and there was a decline in trade and a general deterioration of both economic organization and political unity which paved the way for the ultimate fall.

It would be distressing to think that Western civilization entered into the dark ages—to emerge only after a thousand years—merely because a highly intelligent society mistook a particular metal, silver, as essential to producing and dividing wealth.

Despite the clear importance of our own money system and the public's stake in the way the Federal Government manages our money system, it appears that these are subjects on which the general public has been peculiarly ignorant or misinformed.

In 1787, John Adams wrote to Thomas Jefferson saying:

"All the perplexities, confusions, and distresses in America arise, not from defects in the Constitution or confederation, not from want of honor or virtue, so much as from downright ignorance of the nature of coin, credit, and circulation." [1]

Thomas Jefferson, of course, expressed some rather harsh views on the nature of the confusion, and he had a number of suggestions to make for improving the money system. I would hesitate to quote him, however, for fear some of our contemporary bankers might think I was applying some unflattering epithets to them. Jefferson would have placed what he called a Constitutional veto [2] on private banks creating money; and he was given to saying such things as "banking establishments are more dangerous than standing armies." [3]

Few of us would agree today that the banking system, as presently organized, is more dangerous than standing armies. On the other hand, a reasonably close examination of the Government's present way of managing the system discloses several practices which are very peculiar, and very costly to the taxpayers. There are also one or two aspects of this management which are such that prudent citizens would call them dangerous to our national survival.

The Articles of Confederation failed, as we know, largely for the reason that they gave the Continental Congress no money powers. Of course, the Continental Congress issued paper notes, called continentals. But in time these came not to be worth a continental, because the Continental Congress had no power to declare its money legal tender—that is, make it good for the payment of debts and taxes.

The continentals had to circulate in competition with the money of the individual States, which did have this power, as well as the power to tax, and the continental became worthless.

In drafting the Constitution, the Founding Fathers corrected this fatal deficiency. They placed all of the money powers and duties in the Federal Government and—specifically—in the Congress. I must observe that, although I am myself jealous of States' rights, the Constitution leaves no States' rights whatever in matters of issuing money, regulating the value of money, or in determining what shall be legal-tender money. These are all powers and duties of the Congress.

True, the Constitution speaks of Congress' having the power "to coin money" and regulate the value thereof. But it has long since been settled that our Founding Fathers were not so un-astute as to think that they could create a national sovereignty by giving the Federal Government control merely over the nickels, dimes, and quarters. This was settled by the Supreme Court in the Legal Tender cases of the 1870's and again in the Gold Clause cases of the 1930's.

What, then, has Congress done with its money powers?

The answer is that Congress has delegated these powers, in one way or another, and it has not always been vigilant to learn how these powers were being used after delegating them.

In the period between President Jackson's successful fight on the Second Bank of the United States and President Lincoln's administration, these powers were delegated, in effect, to the States. In truth, the money powers were used exclusively by private commercial banks, under such laws and regulations as the States care to impose. In this period, State banks issued bank notes, or what we call currency, or "folding" money. They also created money in the form of bank deposits, just as the commercial banks do today. But bank deposits, or "checkbook" money, was not then nearly so popular as it is today.

Before Jackson's time, the money powers were officially delegated, for the most part, to the exclusive use of a single, privately-owned bank. There were, however, a number of State banks operating then and issuing notes. Jackson's fight on the Second Bank of the United States was, of course, a fight against what he expected to become a private monopoly control of the money powers; and, as he saw the matter, it was better to have the money in the hands of free-wheeling, uncoordinated State banks than in the hands of a private monopoly.

President Lincoln's problems were of a different kind, and a much more difficult kind. By the time he took office the country was in need of a national currency—a system under which a dollar issued in one part of the country would be accepted as a dollar in any other part of the country. In order to have such a currency, it was necesary to have a single, national authority to regulate and safeguard the banks issuing the currency. More than this, President Lincoln took office at a time when the country was suffering from an acute money shortage. With the beginning of the war, hard money was moved to Europe, and the banks had to suspend specie payment. Added to all this, there was the tremendous problem of providing money to fight the war.

It was for these reasons that the national bank system was established. National banks are, of course, privately owned banks, but they are chartered by the Federal Government, and are under Federal law and regulation.

President Lincoln knew more about monetary principles of any President up until his time—and probably since. He had been a lifelong student of the subject and had made profound speeches on the matter as early as 1832, in his first race for the Illinois Legislature.

But, as you perhaps know, President Lincoln's views on money were quite similar to those of Thomas Jefferson, and these were not, I am afraid, very popular with the bankers of his day. He had some sort of idea that if the private banks could issue non-interest-bearing notes, so could the Federal Government.

In fact, early in his first term he did have the Government issue some non-interest-bearing notes—then called "greenbacks"—thus setting off one of the greatest furors of all times. Some $347 million of these greenbacks were issued before Congress was persuaded to put a stop to the matter.

Incidentally, some $305 million of these Lincoln notes are still in circulation today. If you happen to have in your pocket a bill which is labeled "United States Note," this is one of them.

Last year I wrote to the Treasury and asked them to tell me what the accrued interest cost to the taxpayers would have been if this $305 million had been issued in the usual way, as interest-bearing notes, paying interest at 5 percent. The Treasury wrote me that the accrued interest charge, at a rate of 5 percent, compounded semi-annually, would have been approximately $44 billion by last year. In other words, the accrued interest to date would have been 127 times the amount of the money which was issued.

President Lincoln succeeded in getting the National Bank Act passed, but it was on some terms not to his liking. The arrangement was this: The Government issued a special series of interest-bearing bonds which the national banks could acquire and use as the basis for issuing non-interest-bearing banknotes. In other words, the privately owned national banks received interest from the Government for the money they issued; and they also received interest on the loans and investments, including other Government bonds, which they acquired in exchange for the money they issued.

This system whereby the Government paid interest to the banks on bank reserves was dropped, however, with the passage of the Federal Reserve Act in 1913.

Under the new arrangement, the Federal Reserve creates whatever amount of reserves it wishes the private banks to have, without any interest-cost to the Government. In fact, in this process, the Federal Reserve itself acquires, from the open market, an amount of Government bonds equal to the amount of bank reserves it creates, and the interest payments on these bonds are returned to the Federal Treasury. The Federal Reserve pays its salaries and other operating expenses out of this interest income first, but most of the income goes back to the Treasury.

This does not mean that the private banks are no longer privileged to create any money. On the contrary, they still create most of the money. In the Federal Reserve Act, Congress delegated its money-creating powers in part to the Federal Reserve and in part to the private commercial banks. It also delegated to the Federal Reserve the responsibility for determining how the parts are divided—within wide limits specified in the law. At the present time, the Federal Reserve permits the member banks of the System to create about $10 for each dollar which the Federal Reserve creates in the form of bank reserves. The private banks may create money at this rate of 10 to 1 to make loans to business and consumers, or to invest in securities, including corporate securities and the securities of the Federal, State, and local governments.

As of George Washington's last birthday, the Federal Reserve had issued and outstanding $44 billion of money, $27 billion of which was in currency and $17 billion in bank reserves. In the process of issuing $44 billion in money, and also from interest on its investments, the Federal Reserve had acquired $49 billion of assets, including $27 billion of interest-paying U.S. Government securities.

The amount of money which the private commercial banks had created and outstanding was more than four times as large. Specifically, it was $204 billion, as compared to the Federal Reserve's $46 billion. And as compared to the Federal Reserve's ownership of $27 billion of U.S. Government securities, the private commercial banks owned $62 billion.

In one case, the interest paid on these securities goes back into the Federal Treasury, and in the other case the interest payments go into bank profits and thus come out of the taxpayers' pockets. In both cases, the securities have been acquired with money created for the purpose.

If any of you are not familiar with the way commercial banks create money, let me amplify a bit. Certainly you must have wondered where money comes from. We know it was not here when the first settlers arrived, and we know that the amount of money in existence increases almost every year. In fact, the money supply has increased over the years at approximately the same rate at which the production of goods and services has increased.

Today, only about 10 percent of the money available to business and consumers is in the form of coins and currency. The other 90 percent is in the form of deposits in the commercial banks—sometimes called "checkbook" money—which the commercial banks have created.

This is the way it is done:

When a commercial bank on Main Street or on Wall Street makes John Jones a loan

---

Footnote at end of speech.

of, say, $1,000, it does not take the thousand dollars out of my checking account or out of your checking account. It simply creates a credit of $1,000 in John Jones' checking account. This means that the money supply of the country is increased by $1,000. An additional $1,000 of money is available for spending—simply by writing of checks. When a private commercial bank buys a $1,000 Government bond, the same thing happens. The bank simply creates the money to buy the Government bond.

The fact that money is created in this way will come as a surprise to some people, particularly those who imagine that in the "good old days" every dollar was backed by a dollar's worth of gold. Yet this method of creating money is essentially the same as private bankers in the Western World have been using for several centuries. And at no time have these bankers, or those nations in which they have operated, had enough gold—or enough of any other single commodity—to redeem more than a small fraction of the money in circulation at the time.

In truth, in all these centuries, money has never been created against just gold. It has been created against pledges of all kinds of valuable assets. And we must agree, I think, that on the whole this has been a pretty good system. Certainly if we judge the system by the economic accomplishments—the production of real wealth in the Western nations—we cannot find another system which has performed as well. While we sometimes think that money should represent claims to an equal amount of gold, the fact is it must represent claims to all kinds of real wealth, which, in fact, our money does.

We still cling, however, to certain ancient ideas about gold, which it seems to me, are likely to get us into trouble. So far, there are no signs that the space age will make any very heavy requirements on gold. Yet, despite the fact that the governments of the Western nations have vast quantities of this metal stored away in underground vaults, they continue to buy up billions more, each year, and at a tremendously high price which we ourselves fix and maintain at an artificial level. In this process, the governments of the Western nations are buying Russian gold, which means that we are sending into Russia and Red China vast quantities of food and machinery which the slave world desperately needs, and cannot produce in sufficient quantities, in exchange for a metal which we do not need.

The indiscriminate way in which the Western World now handles its monetary reserves makes it inevitable that these reserves will be contaminated by Communist gold. The Communists feed this gold into the gray markets of Europe, and from there it infiltrates our banking system. I think we ought to reexamine this matter very thoughtfully and ask ourselves whether it is really wise policy for the Western World to continue subsidizing a buildup of Russia's and Red China's industrial and military capabilities. It may be that we and our allies ought to consider some step to sterilize our monetary gold, such as putting it in the safekeeping of the International Monetary Fund here in Washington. If this were done, then at least we would know we would have the gold in case some scientific or industrial need for it ever develops.

I hope, also, that here at home we can give some careful attention to our money system and continue to make improvements. Tremendous improvements have, of course, been made. In the so-called good old days of the 19th century, when some of us imagine we had a gold dollar, the money system was, in reality, a source of chronic disorder in the economic system. In those days there were periodic money panics, bank crises, wholesale bank failures, widespread bankruptcies, and severe depressions, all arising from malfunctioning of the money system. Fortunately, the American people have been intelligent enough to learn from experience and make improvements.

The establishment of the Federal Reserve System in 1914 has been, no doubt, our greatest single achievement in providing a good money system. But other improvements can be made, and there have been some backward steps in the years since the Federal Reserve Act was passed. New practices have grown up in the Federal Reserve and in the private banking system which were not intended by the Federal Reserve Act. Furthermore, Congress has amended this act a number of times, particularly in the early New Deal period, without, I am afraid, always fully understanding what was being done. If I might suggest for your consideration improvements which now might be made they would be these:

First, a change in the assignment of responsibility for determining what interest rates business and consumers must pay for the use of money.

When the Federal Reserve Act was passed, in 1913, the responsibility for determining interest rates was placed in the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. The Board members are what we might call the public members. They are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. They are appointed for long terms—14 years—and to keep his job a Board member is not dependent upon the wishes of the private bankers.

At the time the Federal Reserve Act was being worked out, some of the bankers felt that they should be on whatever board or committee was to determine interest rates. Carter Glass took a delegation of such bankers to see President Wilson on this very question. Carter Glass reports that President Wilson said to them that private bankers have no more right to be on a board or committee to help fix interest rates than the railroad owners have a right to be on the ICC, to help fix freight rates.

In the early 1930's, however, the act was amended in a way which shifted the practical powers of determining interest rates to a committee within the Federal Reserve System. This is the so-called Federal Open Market Committee and its membership includes not only the members of the Board, but also the Federal Reserve bank presidents. The Federal Reserve bank presidents are not selected by the President or the Congress or the general public. They are selected by the directors of the Federal Reserve banks, and these directors are elected by the private banks. In other words, the private banks now have representatives on the committee which determines interest rates, precisely contrary to President Wilson's intention and the intention of the original law. This seems to me a bad principle, although I say this without disrespect to any individual who has served as a Federal Reserve bank president.

Second, the original Federal Reserve Act was founded on the principle of an elastic money supply, to be automatically regulated. In other words, the money supply was to increase and decrease automatically with increases and decreases in economic activity. The amount of economic activity taking place was thus to determine the money supply. In recent years, however, Federal Reserve officials have been deliberately and consciously fixing and changing the money supply, in an effort to control the amount of economic activity taking place. It is my considered view that money used for this purpose is unconstitutional money. The Congress has never delegated to the Federal Reserve any authority to restrict or limit the volume of economic activity which may take place in this country.

Third, I would not go so far as Jefferson and Lincoln are said to have wanted to go, which was to have the Government create all the money. I believe that money created for private borrowers can best be created by private banks. A private lender, operating on profitmaking standards, is the best agency for discriminating between those persons who are to have credit and those who are not to have credit. On the other hand, I have great difficulty understanding why the Government should let the banks use its money-creating power, free of charge, to create money for the purpose of lending it to the Government at an interest charge.

This much seems clear: Since both the Federal Reserve and the private banks can create money with which to buy Government bonds, the Federal Reserve ought to buy a great deal more of these bonds and thus permit the private banks to buy correspondingly less of these bonds. The Federal Reserve can do this and still maintain the same money supply it would maintain anyway. In other words, the question of inflation does not enter into this suggestion one way or the other. The only question is whether or not billions of dollars of interest payments are taken out of the taxpayers' pockets each year and put into bank profits.

Fourth, the original Federal Reserve Act provided eligible paper as the means by which the private banks could obtain credit from the Federal Reserve. This meant that a private bank could obtain such credit only after it had used up its lending powers in extending credit to business, farmers, and other borrowers in the local community. But the act has also been amended on this point, also, so that now the banks can obtain Federal Reserve credit on Government bonds. The result, it seems to me, is that too many banks have become little more than Government bondholders and bond brokers. These banks are not using the privileges they have been given to help their local communities, which is the purpose for which the privileges were given.

Fifth, there is now taking place a tremendous wave of bank mergers and consolidations, and a tendency for banking to become monopolized. This is a dangerous trend. If the banking system becomes monopolized, this will surely lead to socialism or fascism.

Sixth, the Federal Reserve bank stock should be retired. The Federal Reserve is, I believe, the only Government agency in which private persons are permitted to own stock. In this case, the stock cannot be owned by just any private person; it is owned only by private banks. The banks do not own the Federal Reserve System; and they have no proprietary interest in the system whatever. They are, however, paid a yearly 6 percent interest on the money they have invested in the system; and this means that the system is paying out to the banks about $27 million a year in funds which would otherwise be returned to the Federal Treasury. This is a completely unnecessary expense to the taxpayers.

Finally, may I suggest, there should be more public interest in the money system and better understanding of what the Federal Government is doing in this field.

You know, it has long been popular for a Member of Congress to say that all he knows about money is that he doesn't have enough of it.

I have no doubt that if such a tremendously influential and public-spirited organization as the Daughters of the American Revolution should think well of the idea of more public interest and understanding, the result would, indeed, be more public interest and understanding, both in and out of Congress. I have no doubt that Congress would be willing to make a thorough study of the ways in which its constitutional powers and responsibilities are being used, and how these uses might be improved. The Federal Government spends billions investigating

the ocean floors, probing outer space, and so on. But it has been more than 50 years since we have had an official public study of our money system. Private corporations and foundations occasionally find it worthwhile to spend millions of dollars for monetary commissions set up to make private studies of this subject, which leads me to think the subject must be worthy of study in public bodies.

[1] Adams, Charles Francis, "The Works of John Adams," vol. 8, p. 447.
[2] Washington, H. A., "The Writings of Thomas Jefferson," vol. 7, pp. 64–65, Taylor & Maury, Washington, D.C., 1854.
[3] Ford, Paul I., "The Writings of Thomas Jefferson," vol. 10, p. 31.

Historic Remarks by Chief Justice Warren

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Pittsburgh Legal Journal:

REMARKS OF CHIEF JUSTICE EARL WARREN

On the occasion of the luncheon of Chancellor and Mrs. Edward H. Litchfield at the University of Pittsburgh on Wednesday afternoon, April 5, 1961, following the honors convocation, presentation of honor students, and the conferring of the honorary degree of doctor of civil laws upon the Chief Justice.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—We are indebted to Congressman JAMES G. FULTON for granting our request for a copy of the following notes which he made while attending the luncheon referred to above. Mr. FULTON, a member of the bar of Allegheny County and a newspaper publisher, told this editor that "The remarks of Chief Justice Warren are historic—and we living today in our rush and pressures often fail to realize history is being made now, just as it always has been made.")

The remarks of the Chief Justice were made in response to the introductory questions of Chancellor Edward H. Litchfield, inquiring on the point of bravery or courage in the preparing of decisions that profoundly affect basic rights under the U.S. Constitution. Chancellor Litchfield referred particularly to far-reaching questions of emotional content and human interest as well as prejudice, such as the segregation issue, which Chancellor Litchfield stated in the future could be referred to by historians as "the basic decision of the 20th century."

Chief Justice Warren responded: "That is the kind of question that any way you answer it, it is wrong. But that is our lot on the Supreme Court.

"Look at these young fine people today in what they are doing. These young people have no weaknesses that cannot be traced to us in the older generation.

"It takes less courage to make decisions upon issues that are emotional the farther the person making the decision gets away from the public itself.

"I have had personal experience in community responsibilities of many levels, district attorney, State attorney general, and Governor of California. I know how hard these necessary community decisions are to make when you are right at home, living among the people in the community.

"I want to say out of the depth of my heart, the greatest courage is necessary when issues are right on your doorstep, in the towns and communities where you live and work. As you remove yourself from those pressures, it takes less and less courage to make basic decisions on principles, even momentous as they might be.

"Our Court thought about the issue of desegregation a long time. Our Court was most conscious of the responsibility that was placed on the trial courts and the courts of appeal in this country, who had the original jurisdiction.

"When we on the U.S. Supreme Court made the decision in segregation cases that local courts should decide all the issues before these cases came to us—that put a great burden on the district judges, because of the localities where the cases arose and the community pressures upon these judges. As an example of this situation, a district judge in New Orleans had to meet a great responsibility under local and community pressures.

"Decision by the U.S. Supreme Court requires not one ounce more courage for decision than is required of any judge on any level in this land.

"We Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court are entitled to no sympathy for making final decisions on major issues. All we are entitled to is that we be given credit that we are doing the best we can to keep our American jurisprudence in the kind of order that the American people will know the law from one end of the land to the other, and that they will respect our decisions."

Foreign Textile Imports

SPEECH
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate my beloved and distinguished colleague from Georgia, the Honorable CARL VINSON, for his statement on the need for restrictions on foreign textile imports at this time. He has proposed a quota system, by country and category, and has explained why the President would be justified in using his powers under the national security provisions of the Trade Agreements Act to establish such a system.

It is significant that this proposal comes from one who has supported reciprocal trade legislation and is aware of the impact of our trade policy on foreign countries like Japan, which must export to live. I also have favored the reciprocal trade program and hope that it will be continued. But I agree with the gentleman from Georgia that if America is to foster the free world's economic growth, it is essential that American industries be healthy and growing, in order that we may aid the orderly industrial development of other free people.

It would be most ill advised to allow foreign textile imports to bring ruin to more of our own producers and thus worsen the present unfavorable trade balance in textiles, increase the drain on our gold, and hurt our economy when already it is showing certain structural weaknesses. My hope is for a strong, vigorous American economy enabling us not only to be good neighbors in the world trade community but to continue helping emerging nations find a better life for their people.

Justice Department Policies on Merger Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an Iron Age interview with Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, which appeared in the Iron Age magazine, April 13, 1961. In this interview the Attorney General presents his views on the enforcement of antimerger and antitrust laws. The article follows:

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT POLICIES ON MERGER LAWS

(Few matters are more vital to metalworking companies planning to merge, buy, or sell out than the attitude of the Justice Department toward such moves.

(In this straightforward interview, Attorney General Kennedy presents his views on the enforcement of antimerger and antitrust laws.)

(By E. C. Beaudet)

Question. Mr. Kennedy, the recent convictions involving the electrical manufacturing companies have focused attention on antitrust laws. Of course, prosecution of these cases originated under the previous administration. Will the present administration be less tough, or tougher on antitrust violations?

Answer. We expect to be extremely interested in merger, as well as price-fixing, violations of antitrust laws. The Celler-Kefauver Antimerger Act will be enforced vigorously. I don't care to compare administrations. I prefer to let the record speak for itself.

Question. More recently, you asked the Federal Trade Commission to find out if companies previously convicted of antitrust violations were living up to court orders. You also expressed hope of a new era of Justice Department-FTC cooperation. Can this be regarded as a warning to business of your intention to pursue a vigorous antitrust policy?

Answer. Yes. There are indications which lead us to believe that as many as 50 past defendants have not taken sufficient action to comply with court orders.

Question. Does this include past convictions in the merger area?

Answer. It does. We believe some companies may have retained stock interests in other companies which they were ordered to give up. We believe there is a need for a thorough reinvestigation of these and other past cases.

Question. What is the Justice Department's objective in enforcing antimerger laws?

Answer. Our purpose is to make sure that no enterprise has the chance to dominate or control an industry, or to start on a course that might lead in that direction. We plan

to prevent monopoly and, where necessary, undo monopoly control. Our main objective is to protect the American system of free enterprise.

We look upon our antitrust enforcement policies as being probusiness—to protect the businessman as well as the consumer.

Question. Do you view the steadily growing number of mergers as a threat to free enterprise?

Answer. Mergers in themselves do not represent a danger to free enterprise. We aim to protect the small and middle businessmen who, I believe, are the backbone of our economy. In some cases, mergers can help competition rather than affect it adversely.

Question. In what kind of cases?

Answer. Well, for example, take the case of two weak companies within an industry. They may not be able to make it alone against stronger competitors. By joining together they may become stronger themselves and bring about more competition in the industry.

Question. But what about the consumer? Might not mergers of large companies bring about more efficiency and as a result, lower prices?

Answer. Yes. Heavy concentration of economic power might be of temporary assistance to consumers. But there is no assurance that this would continue. If competition were not present, there's nothing to say that prices would not be raised arbitrarily in the future. This would then work against the consumer. Our job is to see that this is not allowed to happen.

Question. Do you plan to put more emphasis on opposing mergers whose chief aim is diversification?

Answer. Each case must be looked at individually. Any type of merger that lessens competition and tends to create monopolies will be scrutinized. In all aspects of antimerger enforcement, the Department of Justice will do what it is legally authorized to do.

Question. There have been many mergers in the metalworking industry and, undoubtedly, more will take place. Briefly how can companies best obtain clearances for proposed mergers?

Answer. By submitting, along with a clearance request to the Antitrust Division, as much pertinent information about the merger as possible. Also, by giving prompt and complete answers to questions the Antitrust Division might ask about the proposed merger.

Question. How long might companies expect to wait for approval or disapproval of the Antitrust Division?

Answer. This depends on how long it takes to secure all the information the Antitrust Division feels necessary to grant a clearance. After all the desired information is in, some expression of its view can be expected within 2 to 4 weeks. This, of course, depends on the workload of the Division at the time.

Question. It has been said that competitive information contained in premerger notifications has been leaked. Are greater safeguards needed?

Answer. As you know, the Department of Justice through its investigations receives a good deal of confidential information of all kinds. Most of it concerns individuals. We have much less adverse information about companies. But as best as we can tell, no confidential information regarding individuals, mergers, or anything else has been leaked from the Justice Department. Information like this occasionally does reach the public press from other sources.

Our attitude concerning the premerger notifications is that they are no one's business but the Justice Department's and the companies involved. This information will not be furnished to a company's competitor, or anyone else. I would terminate the employment of any Justice Department employee who gave out confidential information.

Question. What are some of the factors the Department of Justice considers in approving or disapproving premerger notifications?

Answer. There can be no fixed set of standards which would bring automatic approval or disapproval from the Antitrust Division. We are guided exclusively by antitrust laws. Generally, the main legal points revolve around the relative market positions of merging companies and, as far as can be seen, the probable effect of a proposed merger upon competition.

Question. What is your viewpoint on Senator KEFAUVER's bill making premerger notifications, under certain conditions, a matter of law?

Answer. In principle, I support it. However, I am not thoroughly familiar with all of its provisions.

Question. Suppose one company acquires another without first clearing the merger with the Department of Justice? Is there a time period after which the company can feel the acquisition won't be challenged?

Answer. Regardless of the time elapsed, there is no statute of limitations which bars the Justice Department from challenging a merger. Mergers will be challenged whenever we believe such action is in the public interest in line with the principles of the Celler-Kefauver Act.

Question. If a merger is found to be illegal, are the selling companies and their stockholders subject to any penalty?

Answer. Not ordinarily. The remedy for violation of the Celler-Kefauver Act is divestiture of stock and assets acquired illegally. The Du Pont-General Motors case now before the U.S. Supreme Court may bring forth some principles which point the way to potential remedies in these situations.

Question. How do you view the formation by competing companies of a new corporation to engage in activities related to those of the competitors?

Answer. Again, this depends on the particular case. I would like to point out, however, that by forming a common subsidiary, competing companies cannot do indirectly what they are forbidden by law to do directly. We are likely to inquire into such matters.

Certain special considerations, though, are involved with respect to foreign commerce. For example, under the Webb-Pomerene Act, competing companies can form an export association as long as they abide by the provisions of the act.

Question. Are American corporations bound by U.S. antitrust laws when they buy or merge with foreign companies?

Answer. Generally speaking American corporations are bound by U.S. antitrust laws regardless of the nationality of the companies they buy or merge with.

But the question is far more complex than this. Foreign mergers differ from domestic mergers because of their possible effect on the national welfare. Foreign trade and international policies must come first. Each case, however, is decided on its own merits.

Question. In the above two questions, does it make any difference if underdeveloped nations are involved?

Answer. That would be one of the factors that would have to be taken into consideration.

Question. We've heard a lot about the "failing company doctrine" which is said to permit mergers which otherwise might violate antitrust laws. Will you please explain what this means?

Answer. The failing company doctrine is a popular term for the principle which holds that a company, because of financial losses, might go out of business if it did not merge. In such a case the merger would not appear to have anticompetitive effects.

Keep in mind, however, that, just because a company is or has been losing money, this does not necessarily mean that it is a failing company, unless it is in bankruptcy or able to prove it is on the verge of it. Remember, also, that even though a company is a failing one, if the merger has anticompetitive effects, it cannot take place legally if another purchaser is available.

Question. Does the Department of Justice contemplate future antitrust actions against labor unions?

Answer. Where unions and management join together to kill competition or fix prices, we will prosecute. Action would be taken against both. We are looking into several cases of this kind right now.

Question. Presently, could action be taken against unions alone?

Answer. No. Under the law and court decisions there has to be a conspiracy between the two.

Question. Do you believe there is a need for legislation to curb monopolistic practices of labor unions and safeguard rights of union members?

Answer. Not at this time. The Landrum-Griffin bill was passed only in 1959. There should be more time to determine how effective its provisions will be.

Question. What about trade association memberships? Need companies be concerned about the risk of possible antitrust prosecution because of membership?

Answer. There's nothing wrong with companies within an industry getting together to promote the best interests of the industry and themselves. If they don't take part in illegal activities, there's nothing to be concerned about. If they meet to fix prices, or otherwise violate antitrust laws, that is another matter.

Question. But what about those companies which are unaware of or don't join in illegal activities within a trade association?

Answer. I doubt if there are many situations like this. Regardless, it is important that each company makes sure it knows what it is getting into.

Question. Mr. Kennedy, earlier, you said you looked upon antitrust enforcement policies as being probusiness. How might business help in carrying out these policies?

Answer. If business realizes that the Justice Department truly wants to be of assistance, there are several things it can do.

First of all, it must recognize that nothing hurts business competitors more than other competitors who get together to thwart competition, fix prices, or engage in other illegal activities.

Secondly, business should be more willing to assist the Justice Department in carrying out antitrust enforcement policies. We are here to help, but we have had little help from business.

When I was a member of the Senate subcommittee investigating rackets in the labor-management field, I was amazed at the unwillingness of business to help us and come forward with information. Businessmen seem willing to complain about unjust union practices but don't seem willing to do anything about them. Nor have I noticed that business groups, to any great degree, have expressed disapproval publicly of the recent price-fixing scandals.

This may come from the idea of minding one's own business. All too often, business' attitude is to let well enough alone if profits are good. However, business should make the Government aware of those instances where mergers are stifling an industry, where there is reason to suspect price fixing, or where management is joining with unions to freeze our competition.

I feel that business has a responsibility to its community, to its State and to its country. It should be willing to help its Government. If it's not going to help it, then business should stop complaining about it.

The Osteopathic Profession Celebrates a Notable Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, May 10, Mrs. Robert F. Wagner, wife of the mayor of the city of New York, will be host at a reception at Gracie Mansion honoring the New York State Osteopathic Society and the Osteopathic Society of the City of New York, two respected professional groups which have made notable contributions in easing suffering and combating disease.

I am privileged to serve as an honorary chairman of this significant event, which will be a highlight in the 52d anniversary celebration of the OSCNY. In this regard, I wish to express my personal felicitation to the society and its officials, Dr. Elias Kaggen, president; Dr. Max L. Kamen, president-elect; Dr. D. Leonard Vigderman, vice president; Dr. Harold E. Klinger, secretary; Dr. Viola Kruener, treasurer; Dr. John F. Conlon, sergeant at arms, and Dr. William D. Miller, Dr. David Bachrach and Dr. Aaron Weintraub, the board of directors.

In directing the activities of the OSCNY, these dedicated osteopathic physicians are performing a valuable service to the community. Through a series of public health forums, and related events, the society seeks to dramatically demonstrate the pressing need for proper health care.

The New York State Osteopathic Society, numbering hundreds of osteopathic physicians and surgeons throughout the State, has also devoted its energies in an effort to create widespread awareness of the need to maintain good health practices.

I should like to pay special tribute to the officials of the State society; Dr. William E. Kaufmann, of Syracuse, president; Dr. Francis J. Beall, Jr. of Syracuse, vice president; Dr. C. Fred Peckham, of Oswego, secretary; and Dr. C. Gorham Beckwith, of Hudson, treasurer; and its board of directors, comprised of Dr. Wendell F. Bizzozero, of Niagara Falls; Dr. Philip E. Greenman, of Kenmore, Dr. Alexander Levitt, of Brooklyn; Dr. Jacob G. Sheetz, of Brooklyn, and Dr. Hewett W. Strever, of Rochester.

I believe it is significant to note that the officials of these two societies, and the entire membership are firm in their belief that a physician's duty to the community does not end at his front door.

Countless osteopathic physicians and surgeons play a vigorous role in community activities, participating in the work of local clinics, serving as school physicians, and directing their talents in a variety of ways.

Serving with me as honorary chairmen of the May 10 reception at Gracie Mansion are a distinguished group of Americans, including Dr. Herman E. Hilleboe, New York State Health Commissioner, Congressmen Abraham J. Multer, Emanuel Celler, John J. Rooney, and Brooklyn Borough President John Cashmore. Also, New York State Assemblymen Alfred A. Lama, Max M. Turshen, Alfred D. Lerner, Irwin Brownstein, Aileen B. Ryan, State Senator Frank J. Pino, New York City Tax Commissioner Ross J. DiLorenzo, and New York State Comptroller Arthur Levitt.

In light of the important milestone being celebrated by the OSCNY, I would like to commend the following article, which appeared in the American Journal of Nursing, to my colleagues:

OSTEOPATHY

(By Dr. True B. Eveleth)

By establishing high educational standards, enforcing its strict code of ethics, and producing well-trained, dedicated physicians, the osteopathic profession has not only gained the acceptance of the American people but it has won the respect of individuals, groups, and agencies whose primary concern is quality health care.

Today osteopathic physicians work with and maintain representation in the Nation's major health agencies including the U.S. Public Health Service and the National Health Council. Under Federal laws, doctors of osteopathy and doctors of medicine have almost an identical status. Doctors of osteopathy, D.O.'s, serve as medical officers in the U.S. Public Health Service and the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration. They are eligible (by Federal law) for commission as medical officers in the Armed Forces. However, no such appointments have yet been made.

A goodly number also serve as examiners for insurance plans, as coroners, school and county physicians, on boards of medical examiners, State hospital licensing boards, and on State, county, and city boards of health.

Doctors of osteopathy are licensed to practice in all States. In most States and the District of Columbia, D.O.'s have unlimited privileges to practice medicine and surgery in all its branches.

However, 92 percent of the doctors of osteopathy practice in unlimited license States and many of those residing and practicing in limited license States hold an unlimited license in States other than where they are located.

Licensing boards, created by State legislatures, are composed of various types of practitioners. For example in Delaware, M.D.'s make up the entire board; in Ohio the board is a combination of D.O.'s and M.D.'s and in Kansas there are D.O.'s, M.D.'s, and chiropractors in the examining group.

The American Osteopathic Hospital Association is the official national membership organization of the hospitals, but the registration or approval program for these hospitals is maintained by the AOA through its committee on hospitals which is the osteopathic counterpart of the hospitals' and the medical profession's joint commission on hospital accreditation.

Approximately 400 osteopathic hospitals located in 22 States provide an estimated 14,000 hospital beds.

These hospitals are expanding rapidly through additions to existing facilities or through new construction. In 1954, Los Angeles County voters approved a bond issue of more than $9 million for a new 500-bed osteopathic hospital—a unit of Los Angeles County General Hospital dedicated last December. Numerous osteopathic hospitals have received large Federal grants-in-aid to assist in their construction.

Osteopathy continues as on of the only two recognized schools of medicine—not as a contestant and not as a separatist—but as a contributor of a valid medical concept. The profession's most important contribution to the health sciences is the recognition of the role of the musculoskeletal system as a factor in health and disease.

The osteopathic physician finds this recognition of the musculoskeletal system entirely consistent with other scientific approaches he learns as part of osteopathic education. Along with drugs, radiation, and surgery, he adds to the arsenal of medicine the use of manipulative therapy.

Independence implies responsibility. The osteopathic profession is quite aware of this basic fact. It knows it has a responsibility for high standards of accreditation of its hospitals and schools of osteopathic medicine, a responsibility for the ethical practices of its physicians and surgeons, and a continuous responsibility for the public health.

The profession has demonstrated its willingness to serve on the health team. It asks nothing more than equal recognition for its services and contributions to the American people and medical science.

A Tribute to the Cuban Patriots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues in the House will join with me in paying tribute to the small but gallant band of beleaguered Cuban patriots who seek the restoration of freedom for themselves and their fellow countrymen.

That the present effort has apparently failed in no way diminishes the gallantry of the attempt. Sometimes, unfortunately and understandably, impatience overrules sound military judgment, in this case resulting in precipitating the invasion effort prematurely.

However, let it be noted by freedom-loving people everywhere that the bell has tolled for the Bearded Butcher of the Caribbean and his ruthless Communists cohorts. The string is indeed running out for Fidel Castro and his atheistic pro-Communist totalitarian government.

Let this modern-day buccaneer take warning—the American people cannot and will not longer tolerate the establishment of this first Communist beachhead on the American Continent.

Speaking as one Member of the U.S. House of Representatives to the Cuban freedom defenders, let me say: Be not discouraged and be not of faint heart. The cause for which many of you have already given "the last full measure of devotion" is not lost and I promise you the people of the United States, in the American tradition, cannot forsake you. Freedom never dies; it lives forever in the hearts of God-fearing men of good faith.

Paraphrasing the words of the martyred Lincoln, "Your honored dead have not died in vain" and from these dead you will rededicate yourselves to

the cause of freedom until the last fanatical adherent of the Communist ideology is driven from your shores. Again I say, be of stout heart and by your courage you will shame those among us of faint heart, whose overly cautious counsel again recommends the policy of "too little and too late."

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members of this House to support positive action by the President, directed toward the overthrow of Fidel Castro and all he represents. Let us not again selfishly betray our Founding Fathers by denying aid to enslaved people, which to our everlasting shame was done in Hungary. We cannot afford to longer speak softly and carry a swagger stick. Fifty years ago American lives and property were sacred everywhere in the world and by our action in this crisis we can again alert the world that this Nation will not tolerate oppression and to all nations on earth let us say "We hope you will like us, but respect us you must."

Tenth Anniversary of Boston University's President, Harold C. Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, as an alumnus of Boston University and as a former law instructor at this great school, it is with a glow of affection and pride that I insert the following statement, issued by the university on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the presidency of Dr. Harold C. Case, who has contributed so mightily to my alma mater:

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF PRESIDENT HAROLD C. CASE AT BOSTON UNIVERSITY

Dr. Harold C. Case is now celebrating his 10th anniversary as president of Boston University. On March 1, 1951, he took charge of New England's largest institution for higher learning and accepted the inheritance, as well as the challenges, of the dynamic Daniel L. Marsh expansion era of university history.

Since then, his influence has accelerated the consolidation of the university's 15 schools and colleges on the centralized Charles River campus, has projected the imaginative $60 million long-range development program, and, most important, has raised Boston University's academic standards to new levels of excellence.

The greatest guarantee that President Case could never be forgotten at Boston University or for his impact upon higher education generally is not in the impressive array of new buildings, including the unfolding high-rise structures, that now or in the future will dominate the Charles. Rather it lies in the president's ability to attract first-class faculty and administrative talent to the fold. Salaries have risen to new high levels at Boston University and compare favorably to those on the most highly sought after campuses. Few faculties anywhere can boast the combination of talent, diversity and adventurous spirit that exists among the professors at Boston University.

Students are the principal beneficiaries of this but they, too, nurtured by improving and now rigorous admissions policies, are establishing their own brand of high standards.

In 1951, Boston University's scattered schools still sprawled throughout Back Bay and reached into Cambridge. Then moves came for the pioneer school of public relations and communications, the school of fine and applied arts, Sargent College, and the college of industrial technology into splendid quarters on the campus.

Twelve of the university's fifteen colleges are now located there, with two others scheduled to join them in the near future. One, the school of medicine, will remain between its affiliated hospitals, the Massachusetts Memorial Hospital and Boston City Hospital, in Boston's South End where a great medical center is rapidly being shaped. New and some beautifully renovated dormitories have arisen. Others are planned for the future.

Internally, the university has also been reorganized. The college of practical arts and letters was incorporated for business education into the college of business administration and for art education into the school of fine and applied arts. The college of general education became a division of the college of liberal arts, and the junior college, an impressive educational experiment, is now known as the college of basic studies.

Other significant achievements under Dr. Case were the establishment of the university's African studies program, the human relations center, and the pioneer law-medicine research institute. Recognizing the vital future of Africa, the African studies program was created in 1953 to contribute more profoundly to the knowledge of this fast-developing continent. It is recognized internationally for its accomplishments.

This coming September, a 6-year program for the training of physicians will be initiated jointly by the school of medicine and the college of liberal arts. The unified program will eliminate 2 full years from the traditional 8-year undergraduate and graduate education of the M.D. In addition to educating more doctors in less time, it will improve the quality of their education through the extensive use of personal and small group instruction, and other means.

The university acquired Boston University Field (formerly Braves Field), which is utilized as the center of its intercollegiate and intramural athletic program. The field is in the process of modernization, with a new stadium now completed. A full-sized, professional theater, serving as a workshop for dramatic arts students and a stage for their productions, was also established opposite Symphony Hall.

In another significant project, the university equipped a 20,000-watt student operated radio station, WBUR–FM, with a 50-mile broadcast radius.

Today Boston University is actually composed of 15 small to middle-sized colleges, with full-time enrollments in each college ranging from 100 to 2,160 students. The average full-time enrollment in each college is approximately 700, although there are more than 10,000 full-time students in the university and double that number on a part-time basis. In these schools and colleges more New England students are educated than in any other university. Furthermore, more than 800 foreign students from some 80 countries are receiving their education at Boston University. Every State in the Union is represented in the student body.

In 1958, for the first time, more new names of Boston University graduates appeared in "Who's Who" than the names of graduates from any other New England university or college.

The pace of development under Dr. Case is quickening. This coming spring groundbreaking is scheduled on the Charles River campus for a new $4,400,000 university union building. Then the new law center-education building, first of five highrise towers, will be built. A great central library is also in the planning stages. Scientific centers are being improved and rebuilt. Improved parking facilities, including a garage which will be constructed shortly, are also priority items on the university's agenda.

It is hard to divorce the institution from the man. Yet much must be added about Dr. Case himself in moments when he can break away from his laborious daily tasks at the university.

Last winter the president toured many countries in Africa in the interests of higher education, and today he pleads eloquently across the land for better educational exchanges and understanding between America and Africa. His voice has been influential and constant. Before this, as one of three New Englanders on President Eisenhower's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, Dr. Case was able to assist in alerting the Nation to the impending educational crisis, when the number of competently prepared students desiring to enter our colleges will more than double within the decade in the face of woefully inadequate funds, resources, and facilities.

Dr. Case is also chairman of the Massachusetts State advisory committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Last spring, Dr. Case went to Denver as a delegate to the Methodist Church's quadrennial general conference, and there he received national attention when he launched a strenuous drive, as the Associated Press reported it, to abolish segregation in the church wherever it still existed.

At the age of 58, President Case has many miles to go before he can close his desk at the university. As a result, the 10th anniversary of the Case era at Boston University has a happy connotation, both retrospectively and prospectively.

Relieve Impact of Cheap Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, not long ago I communicated with President Kennedy and his Cabinet Committee asking for relief for the textile industry and other industries feeling the impact of cheaply produced foreign goods.

I am pleased indeed that in response to these intercessions I have been advised by the White House that the President has directed his Cabinet Committee, appointed to look into these questions and report back to the President, to submit its recommendations as quickly as possible so that action can be taken, and I am very hopeful that favorable action may soon be taken.

In addition, the distinguished Secretary of Commerce, the Honorable Luther A. Hodges, Chairman of the Cabinet Committee to whom I also appealed, has assured me that his Committee must make its report to the President in the near future and in the interim will study

all measures of relief as thoroughly as possible.

As I have pointed out many times, cheaply produced foreign goods are undermining American industrial prosperity in many industries and causing widespread unemployment and depressed conditions.

This exceedingly dangerous situation has been allowed to drift altogether too long. Congress, as well as the executive branch, must accept full responsibility for the most unfortunate, deplorable conditions that have developed in our economy as the result of cheap, low-standard institutions of many kinds affecting many American industries. Some of our industries, like textiles, are truly facing extreme alternatives, indeed many textile mills have been forced to close their doors; more of them are facing liquidation.

This affliction has been spreading rapidly to many other industries, the list of which is very extensive and includes, steel, its fabricated products, rubber, shoes, plastics, woodworking and electronics to mention but a few. I am firmly convinced that unless this situation is dealt with soon by Congress, or by the executive department, or by both legislative and executive departments working together, that further, more aggravated, dire results will ensue.

Certainly there is no time to lose in pressing for remedial action, and I urge that nothing be left undone by every branch of Government involved to tackle this vexing and most serious problem with real vigor and a full determination to take action that will prevent the further depression and liquidation of American industries and unemployment of our fellow citizens.

U.S. Constitution, Connally Amendment, World Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I have noted with a great deal of pride the continuing efforts by members of the legal profession to uphold the basic tenets of our U.S. Constitution. Mr. E. F. W. Wildermuth, of the Queens County Bar Association, is deserving of commendation for his work in this direction. I am pleased to include in the RECORD at this time the text of an article written by Mr. Wildermuth and published in the April 1961 edition of the Queens Bar Bulletin. The article is entitled "Shall the United States of America Surrender to the World Court?"

Mr. Wildermuth has performed a distinct public service by alerting us to the real and imminent dangers of international infringement upon the sovereign powers of the United States.

Mr. Wildermuth is to be commended for his clear analysis of the dangers of submission to the World Court. The content of his critique is a powerful antidote for the forces who seek to weaken, stultify, and eventually destroy the noble purposes of the U.S. Constitution.

The text of the article follows:

SHALL THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA SURRENDER TO THE WORLD COURT?

(By E. F. W. Wildermuth)

In September 1796, George Washington, America's No. 1 patriot, implored Americans as follows:

"In one word, be a nation, be Americans, and be true to yourselves."

One hundred and thirty-one years later, on February 18, 1927, the joint conference of the commanders in chief of the five large veterans organizations, meeting in Washington, D.C., undoubtedly inspired by our first President's dedication to this Nation, expressed Americanism as follows:

"Americanism is an unfailing love of country; loyalty to its institutions and ideals; eagerness to defend it against all enemies; undivided allegiance to the flag; and a desire to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and posterity."

About one-third of a century later, at a recent conclave of American ecclesiastics, it was proclaimed, as reported by the Associated Press:

"The United States may soon have to subordinate its will to that of the United Nations. Citizens must be prepared to take it."

In further pursuit of the subordination of all Americans to the will of the U.N., it was admonished:

"We believe citizens should prepare themselves for such eventuality. It would not then be an undue shock to public opinion, since people would have a more mature view, better able to interpret democracy at work on a world scale, with the benefit as well as the risk that the extension of democracy always entails."

If these exhortations by clerics are not sheer euphemistic evasions, then the Ten Commandments already have been offered upon the sacrificial altar of international crucifixion. By the same token and for the same reason, it becomes crystal clear that a large segment of the American clergy is in dire need of guidance and deliverance from the influence which inspired such exhortations, made obviously in difiance of the praxeological knowledge with which all Americans are endowed in varying degrees. However, these gentlemen are not out of step with other advocates of world government, who likewise are without shame in proposing that Americans sacrifice their rights and freedoms as guaranteed by the Constitution and subordinate themselves to the will of the U.N.

Such behavior is incomprehensible. It eloquently evidences an urgent need for schooling in the American system of government contemplated by the Founding Fathers.

The civilization of this world (at the moment it seems highly uncivilized) is precisely what the schools have made it. Little of the shocking truth is generally known about our schools and colleges. For instance, it is apparent that a conspiracy of worldwide magnitude has long been at work against thorough courses in our own history, and especially constitutional history * * * the history of liberty.

The manifest indifferences of Americans to the constitutional doctrines of their country is appalling. The indefensible proposals and practices against the plainest limitations on power contained in the Constitution do not appear to evoke objection from any quarter, not even from the organized bar.

Is it not shocking that for more than a quarter of a century, no great debate on a constitutional subject has been heard in either House of Congress?

The principles of constitutional government are not outmoded as is proclaimed by the proponents and advocates of world government and by the profusion of anti-American propaganda which fouls the very air we breathe. These principles are as immutable as those of mathematics.

The constitutional system of the United States is the first that fallible man was able to formulate for the one purpose of controlling those in power and every American should know it as he knows the alphabet.

For more than several generations we have failed and neglected to indoctrinate each new generation with a knowledge of the superiority of the philosophy of the American system. We have also failed and neglected to combat alien dogma and propaganda designed to destroy constitutional government in the United States. The net result is that many Americans have been "taken in" with the false promises made by proponents of world government and a large number of Americans have been misled into believing that public officials and sundry self-certified persons are endowed with superior wisdom and knowledge at Washington and at the U.N. and will solve all the problems of the world, as well as the personal problems of all Americans.

The underminers of the Constitution have long been plying their nefarious occupation, and it is pertinent to recall Daniel Webster's warning that the constitutional system of the United States "is the last hope of the world."

The problems of Americans would be much simpler if the United States were predominantly populated by citizens motivated by the ideas and ideals which inspired the Founding Fathers and the countless other patriots who, at great personal sacrifice, contributed to the making of this Nation, at one time, the envy of the world.

It is probable that the law schools of this Nation are in a large measure at fault for the deafening silence on the part of the organized Bar while alien ideas are introduced in government in violation of the Constitution. Some years ago, the American Bar Association made a survey of the law schools in 25 of the leading universities and found that only 8 of them made a knowledge of the Constitution a requisite to a degree. This dearth of knowledge with respect to constitutional government persists, and there are times when it appears that both Americanism and the American system of government have become unfashionable in the United States and throughout the world.

THE CONNALLY RESERVATION

On July 25, 1946, Senate Resolution 196 was adopted. It provided for the unconditional acceptance by the United States of compulsory jurisdiction by the International Court of Justice, better known as the World Court.

Before becoming effective on August 14, 1946, by reason of President Truman's declaration for the United States accepting compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, a reservation was adopted which provided that the acceptance by the United States of jurisdiction by the World Court "shall not apply to disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the jurisdiction of the United States, as determined by the United States of America."

Having been offered by the then Senator Connally, of Texas, this reservation became known as the Connally reservation.

The proponents and advocates of world government are most unhappy with this extremely important protective reservation. Accordingly, they propose its repeal and so great is their pressure in this regard that they succeeded in obtaining a plank in the 1960 Democratic platform pledging repeal of the Connally reservation. Similar pressure groups are effectively active in the other major political party.

Briefly, the repeal of the Connally reservation will subject the United States irrevocably to the jurisdiction of the World Court in every matter with respect to which the World Court decides that it has jurisdiction.

The World Court, unlike courts in the American system of jurisprudence, is a court of first and final jurisdiction. There can be no appeal to a higher court from its determination that it has acquired jurisdiction and there can be no appeal to a higher court from its adjudication on the merits, no matter how corrupt, illogical, unlawful, or unjust may be such adjudication.

It is not generally known that the World Court is in no way bound or guided by any definite rules or system of law, such as the common law or the American system of constitutional law. The World Court is free to improvise and to make up its own rules and render any judgment its members agree on, as influenced by each judge's own peculiar legal concepts * * * and, as influenced by his national pride or interest. There are no juries in the World Court.

We have witnessed our own lifetime-appointed Supreme Court exercise absolute and unrestrained power; nullify acts of Congress; usurp legislative powers and apply its legislation to past transactions, not to mention its having decreed itself to be the supreme law of the land, the Constitution of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding * * * all with absolute impunity.

It will be recalled that in 1952, Chief Justice Vinson and Associate Justices Minton and Reed, in a dissenting opinion, held that the U.N. Charter superseded the U.S. Constitution when they voted to uphold President Truman's seizure of the Nation's steel industry, on the ground that the U.N. Charter obligated the United States to resist aggression in Korea and therefore authorized him to take any steps he deemed necessary in the prosecution of the war.

In view of this strange behavior by the dissenters, what guarantee do Americans have that a majority of the Supreme Court may not one day succeed in subordinating our Constitution to the U.N. Charter or to any other treaty? Also, if the dissenting opinion in the Steel Seizure case had been the majority opinion, is it likely that anyone would be free to publish this article or that you would be free to read it?

If we are powerless and helpless, as apparently we are, to prevent our Supreme Court from decreeing itself to be the supreme law of the land in defiance of the Constitution and attempting to subordinate the Constitution to the U.N. Charter, how can we assume or believe that the World Court will not decree, even in the face of the prohibition contained in the Connally reservation, that our Constitution is subordinate to the U.N. Charter?

Precisely, what could Americans do, short of war, to restore the sovereignty of the United States if the World Court decreed that the U.N. Charter, to which it owes its sole allegiance, supplanted and superseded the Constitution of the United States?

What guarantee do Americans have that the World Court judges from nations in which the people are denied free government, are not biased and prejudiced against American constitutional government?

The present World Court is composed of 15 members, selected and elected for terms of 9 years each by the U.N. General Assembly and the Security Council of the United Nations. Only 3 jurists are from common law countries; 4 are Latin Americans; 2 are from Moslem countries; 2 are Communists; one Chinese; and one each from Greece, France, and Norway. None of the nominees is subject to our Presidential, Senatorial or State Department approval. It is not required that they be lawyers or have judicial experience.

Recently, Dr. Philip C. Jessup, an American, was elected to the World Court by the U.N., to succeed Hon. Green Haywood Hackworth, who urged that he not be considered for reappointment.

Hon. John R. Pillion of Buffalo, a distinguished Member of the House of Representatives, sent telegrams to the President and the President-elect in an effort to bar Dr. Jessup's election, charging that his career "has consistently been one of appeasement, retreat and surrender to pro-Communist causes."

The New York Times expressed itself editorially on November 16, 1960, with respect to Dr. Jessup's selection for the World Court, as follows:

"It is hard to conceive of a better selection than that of Philip C. Jessup for the International Court of Justice at the Hague, made by vote of the United Nations General Assembly on Wednesday."

It will be recalled that Dr. Jessup testified as a character witness for Alger Hiss and that after Hiss was found guilty of perjury by a jury, in accordance with American jurisprudence, Dr. Jessup had "no reasons whatever to change his opinion about Hiss veracity, loyalty, and integrity."

Although other member nations of the U.N. have reservations similar to our Connally reservation, the promotors of world government have concentrated their attack on the United States and Americans. Quite obviously, those member nations are self-respecting sovereignties which refuse to permit meddling in their internal affairs by the World Court, and the advocates of world government consider it the better part of wisdom to refrain from attempting to stampede those nations into repealing their protective reservations.

No valid or substantial reason has been offered and none exists requiring the repeal of the Connally reservation. Its repeal would actually constitute an invitation to the World Court to meddle in our internal affairs and, having been invited, the invitation will be accepted at the first opportunity.

The repeal of the Connally reservation will vest the World Court with the sole power to finally determine that the United States is not blessed with domestic or internal matters and then it will be free to proceed with reckless abandon and malice to meddle in our internal affairs, at the whim and caprice of any member nation which chooses to hail the United States before the World Court under any pretext.

The World Court has no jurisdiction over the internal affairs of a member nation. Simple as this statement of fact sounds, it has no meaning until it is applied in a particular case. For example, France claims that shooting Algerians is solely an internal affair of France and Russia claims that shooting Hungarians is solely an internal affair of Russia. What is an internal affair? The answer, without the Connally reservation, would come only from the World Court. In 1950 our own State Department declared that there is no longer any real difference between domestic and foreign affairs.

The U.N. Charter fails to define "internal affairs" and the reason for this omission is manifest. No two nations can agree as to what constitutes "internal affairs." If there could be agreement, it is probable that the need for a World Court, as claimed by advocates of world government, would not exist.

In an apparent effort to coerce the United States into endowing the World Court with power and authority irrevocably to make those final decisions affecting Americans in all disputes or controversies with regard to matters pertaining to their domestic or internal interest and concern, the Connally reservation is damned as being "self-judging."

To so damn the Connally reservation is also unjustly to imply that evil self-interest prevents our performance of some inferred legal and moral duty to so empower the World Court.

If it be self-judging to take the precaution afforded by the Connally reservation, self-judging in this instance is a virtue to be preserved at all costs, as the last bastion of defense against those who would so use the Constitution as to make hostages of Americans.

Officials, sworn to uphold and defend the Constitution, but who fail to uphold their oaths of office by advocating and promoting the repeal of the Connally reservation or who, in any other manner, aid in the surrender of the United States to the irrevocable jurisdiction of the World Court, should be impeached and removed from their positions of public trust.

It is difficult to understand why any patriotic and loyal American would propose or advocate the irrevocable surrender of the United States to the unrestricted powers of the World Court, or even so much as suggest the repeal of the Connally reservation.

CONCLUSION

It appears that there is much room for the improvement of scholastic standards in the schools of the various States of this Nation and particularly with respect to education in matters pertaining to superiority of the philosophy of the American system of government.

Accordingly, it is proposed and urged that the organized bar, through the membership of its respective associations in the United States of America, promptly adopt resolutions urging the legislatures of their respective States to forthwith enact legislation requiring all schools from the seventh grade up, and all colleges and universities to give thorough courses in all subjects pertaining to constitutional government, and prohibiting a degree of graduation to all students until a rigid examination has been passed under appropriate and effective supervision; and urging Congress to retain the Connally reservation in its present form.

Last year the House adopted a joint resolution favoring repeal of the Connally reservation, which the author believes to be null and void and the House should be so informed.

If the organized bar in the United States of America does not promptly adopt and vigorously pursue its appropriate role of leadership in government, based upon constitutional principles, it will stand convicted by public opinion of having failed to justify its existence should the American system of government fail.

Gamble That May Pay Off

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEAL SMITH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, farmers in the livestock feed production areas of our Nation are demonstrating a constructive interest in the new feed

grains program that indicates the Congress took a big step in the right direction with its adoption.

In my home State of Iowa attendance at county and community meetings called for discussion of the program is reminiscent of the turnouts in early New Deal years. Long lines of producers, waiting their turns to sign up as participants, have become familiar sights at ASC offices.

The recognition that this program offers hope for the revival of the total economy in rural areas is evident from the fact that in some instances chambers of commerce are sponsoring explanation and question-and-answer sessions related to it.

While many newspaper and magazine articles on farmer reaction to the program emphasize its pocketbook appeal, my mail and conversations with farmers reveal other and perhaps even more significant reasons for participation intentions.

For example, some who see no immediate personal financial gain will participate because they are concerned by the regularly repeated assertions that "farmers really don't want a program" and wish to make it clear that continued cooperation of farmer and government is essential in bringing equality and stability to the agricultural economy. Still others will participate simply because they see the program as an avenue toward realistic, effective management of our abundant feed grain supplies.

Pointing out that "the Kennedy administration's first effort to crack the farm surplus problem is getting a lot of support from farmers," the April 24 issue of U.S. News & World Report carries the following on-the-scene report datelined Iowa Falls, Iowa:

GAMBLE THAT MAY PAY OFF—IN THE CORN BELT

(The Kennedy administration's first effort to crack the farm-surplus problem is getting a lot of support from farmers. They find it profitable to participate in the plan to retire some corn acreage from production and collect higher price supports on the rest. For Mr. Kennedy, a venture may be paying off.)

IOWA FALLS, IOWA.—Out here where the tall corn soon will be growing, Orville Freeman, President Kennedy's Secretary of Agriculture, is taking a big gamble.

Freeman and Kennedy are gambling on a new plan to get the Nation's increasing surplus of corn under control. The gamble is that they can induce at least half of the country's corngrowers to sign a contract to reduce the acreage planted to that crop.

The feel of the situation here in the Corn Belt is that the new administration has an excellent chance of winning its gamble. The reason for this outlook is that corn farmers are finding a strong pocketbook appeal in the Freeman-Kennedy proposal.

Not since the first years of the New Deal, back in the 1930's, have farmers shown as much interest in a Government program as in the one now presented. Hundreds turn out for meetings to discuss it. In almost every farm home, pencil and paper are out figuring the dollars-and-cents meaning—the result in terms of money in the bank—of what the Government is offering.

A staff member of U.S. News & World Report, on the ground, finds interest lively and growing throughout the Corn Belt States of Iowa, Illinois, and Indiana. A sample of what is happening elsewhere can be seen here in Hardin County in north-central Iowa.

THE SIGNUP

For days, the county Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation office (ASC) in Iowa Falls has been jammed. Farmers stream in for information, or to sign up, or both.

Usually the office opens at 8 a.m., but officials have been arriving as early as 7:30. Even then, they find a knot of farmers waiting. On good days, the line stretches half a block up the street.

Hundreds have attended evening meetings in schoolhouses and elsewhere. At these sessions, as you see in the accompanying pictures [not printed in the RECORD], they listen intently when the new program is outlined. Usually farmers tend to doze at evening meetings. But not at these. Too much is involved.

At the ASC office in Hamilton County, the crowd of waiting farmers sometimes reaches such size that each is given a number and waits in a big basement room. While waiting, he is asked to draw a map of his farm, to expedite later discussion of his situation.

WHY THEY JOIN

Farmers and officials talk of various reasons for joining in the program.

"It took the votes of a lot of city Congressmen to pass this program, so let's show them we appreciate it," says one official.

Some farmers talk of the urgency of reducing the corn surplus. But there is general agreement, among officials and farmers alike, that the principal inducement is financial.

In terms of dollars and cents, here is what the plan would do:

A farmer who reduces his corn acreage by 20 percent—as compared with his average of the last 2 years—is assured a support price based on a national average of $1.20 a bushel. This price varies from county to county depending on the freight rates. In Hardin County it is $1.14 a bushel.

For acreage taken out of production, the farmer receives a payment based on 50 percent of the average yield of the land retired. In Hardin County the average per acre will be $42.13.

If the farmer wishes, he may retire up to an additional 20 percent of his corn acreage. For this he receives 60 percent of the estimated yield of the land in terms of support prices. At this rate, the county average is $50.55 per acre.

The farmer who "stays out" may grow as much corn or other feed grain as he wishes. But there are no price supports for his output. He is at the mercy of the free market.

And, where the free market is concerned, the plan gives Mr. Freeman a tool for holding the price down—selling corn from the Government-held surplus. He is expected to keep the free-market price at about a dollar a bushel, low enough to make it more attractive for the farmer to sign up.

So pencils and adding machines have been busy as each farmer figured out what the plan would mean to his operation.

ONE FARMER'S FIGURES

An example is that of Don Williams, who owns 160 acres southeast of Williams, Iowa. He figures it this way:

His basic, 2-year average in corn is 73 acres. Under the program he may retire 40 percent of this, or 29.2 acres. In return, he would receive a Government payment of $1,401.01. To this he adds estimated receipts from the corn to be grown and from other crops. Then he subtracts $562—the cost of seed and fertilizer.

The final calculation shows an expected crop income of about $7,300 for Mr. Williams and his 160 acres.

If he stayed out of the program, Mr. Williams calculates that he would gross about $400 less from his crops. Meanwhile his expenses would be some $500 higher, because he would be seeding and fertilizing a larger acreage.

Thus, there is about $900 more in it for him if he enters the plan than if he stays out. Mr. Williams is signing up.

CREDITOR URGINGS

Talk to the men in rural communities who do business with the farmers, especially those who extend them credit, and you find another reason for the size of the sign-up.

For the most part, these men agree that the program will put more money in their farmer-customer's pockets. So, naturally, they too, are for it. Typically, Leo C. Jorgensen, president of the Citizens State Bank of Iowa Falls, says:

"We are certainly trying to encourage people to go into this program. We feel our customers need the money. It will take some of the pressure off their demands for credit for operating funds this spring, because they will get a payment on the land taken out of production."

In another county, an ASC official reports a grain-elevator operator is urging clients to enter the plan.

"Grain storage is only a part of his business," the ASC man says. "He sells seed, fertilizer and other things to farmers. He's been having trouble collecting his accounts."

A surprising number of livestock feeders—farmers who feed all or most of the corn they grow to cattle and hogs—appear to be ready to join the program. They, too, have been busy with pencil and paper.

WINNING PROGRAM?

The feed-grain program is the Kennedy administration's first effort to crack the expensive, perennial, and politically touchy, farm problem.

At the outset, Mr. Freeman found the Government holding some 2.7 billion bushels valued at about $4 billion. Another big corn crop was in prospect for 1961.

Original estimates were that if 50 to 60 percent of the corn farmers entered the program, it would be a success, save the Government $500 to $700 million, and cut the production of surplus feed grains by something like 10 percent.

Now, informed officials are expecting a 75-percent participation in the program in Iowa and 70 to 75 percent in Illinois, with similar figures from other areas.

As you travel through the corn belt, you sense a feeling of apprehension among farmers and rural businessmen. It appears to stem from the fact that it's becoming harder and harder for farmers to meet bills and replace machinery. And over all hangs the shadow of great and growing corn surpluses, pushing prices down, threatening to break livestock markets.

The new feed-grain program, in the minds of both farmers and businessmen, holds a promise of reversing the trends of recent years. In the main, they seem willing to give it a whirl in numbers that are turning out to be a surprise to many people.

I had previously sent a questionnaire to 12,000 bona fide Iowa farmers. Following are the results of the parts that can be computed mathematically:

(a) Do you favor passage of this legislation? Yes, 89 percent.

Farm Bureau members: yes, 88 percent.

National Farmers Organization members: yes, 95 percent.

Farmers Union members: yes, 100 percent.

No organization: yes, 89 percent.

More than one organization: yes, 98 percent.

A few had views that were not really either for or against.

(b) If this program becomes law, do you intend to comply for a 20-percent reduction? Yes, 73 percent. An additional 20 perecnt? Yes, 23 percent.

I also asked their planting intentions if no bill was passed as compared to their intentions if the House bill was passed and soybean supports were increased to $2.30. The following are my conclusions as a result of these questions and some followup interviews which were necessary to clarify the reasons behind their positions:

First. They intended to increase acreage of soybeans in the neighborhood of 10 percent.

Second. Almost none of this acreage was to be shifted from corn to soybeans. Almost all of this acreage would have been in meadow or oat land under normal rotation practices. They would have increased soybean acreage even if prices were still bad because they are so pinched for money that they must shift to a crop that will bring more income.

Third. Almost the only farmer who was not going to put in more corn was the one who had his farm completely in corn last year. I think they intended an average increase of 10 percent and perhaps even more.

Fourth. Under the new law they intend about an 11-percent decrease in corn acreage although the 73 percent that comply will decrease their acreage an average total of about 25 percent. The ones who are not complying are going to increase acreage and reduce the effectiveness.

Sister Mary Annunciata, R.S.M.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Flood and I lost a very dear friend last week with the passing of Sister Mary Annunciata, R.S.M. When Mrs. Flood attended College Misericordia, at Dallas, Pa., Sister Annunciata was the dean of that fine institution and it was during this period that Mrs. Flood came to know Sister Annunciata well as a teacher, friend, administrator, and counselor. This close friendship continued through the years that have intervened and it was with a heavy heart and great regret that we received the news of her passing.

Sister Annunciata was a lady of enormous ability. She did many things, and all of them well. As the editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader of Saturday, April 15, 1961, states:

Thousands of young men and women, many now parents and grandparents, were influenced by the high standard of intellectual and cultural achievement she insisted on in the conscientious discharge of her duties. Her interest in the students was not limited to the periods they came under her supervision, but continued after graduation as they took their places in the professions, government service, business, and the home. Evidence of the appreciation of her former pupils and others for the practical assistance she gave them beyond the call of duty was provided during her illness when she received more than 1,000 messages and scores of floral tributes and gifts.

Mrs. Flood and I concur wholeheartedly with those fine sentiments which accurately reflect the life of such a wonderful person. We who knew her are greatly saddened by her passing but we take comfort in the knowledge that her everlasting reward will be a happy and joyous one.

As a further extension of my remarks, I include the excellent editorial previously referred to from the Times-Leader:

SISTER MARY ANNUNCIATA

To a religious, death is not an end, but a beginning; not a misfortune, but a reward; not a cause for distress, but an experience to be accepted with equanimity, based on sublime faith and full compliance with the divine will. A dedicated woman like Sister Mary Annunciata, R.S.M., daughter of Mr. and Mrs. James Merrick, of Avoca, and niece of Msgr. J. J. Curran, late pastor of St. Mary's Church of the Immaculate Conception, Wilkes-Barre, obviously was no exception to the rule.

For almost a half century, Sister Annunciata, a doctor of philosophy and a leading educator in the community, held such important posts as supervisor of schools conducted by the Sisters of Mercy in the Roman Catholic diocese of Scranton, dean of College Misericordia at Dallas, and principal of St. Mary's High School, city. It would be difficult to place an accurate estimate on the value of her contribution to education and to the area by virtue of her service and activities, but it was considerable.

Thousands of young men and women, many now parents and grandparents, were influenced by the high standard of intellectual and cultural achievement she insisted on in the conscientious discharge of her duties. Her interest in the students was not limited to the periods they came under her supervision, but continued after graduation as they took their places in the professions, Government service, business, and the home.

Evidence of the appreciation of her former pupils and others for the practical assistance she gave them beyond the call of duty was provided during her illness when she received more than 1,000 messages and scores of floral tributes and gifts.

Endowed with a brilliant mind, exceptional administrative ability, and a seemingly inexhaustible supply of energy, she not only met the challenges of the five hectic decades through which she labored so successfully, but she appeared to have her finger on the pulse of education, so she was able to anticipate trends and formulate her plans accordingly. The progress Misericordia made during her administration, spanning 12 years in an executive capacity and 11 years as a member of the faculty, was an indication of the scope of her talents.

Sister Annunciata enhanced a family tradition of service to God and man, not only meeting her obligations under her vows in full, but serving as a stimulating example of zeal and unselfishness.

Finland—Nation of Integrity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, because of the large number of persons of Finnish descent living within my district, it was of particular interest to me to see the splendid special section which the New York Times issued recently under the title, "Finland—Nation of Integrity." The pictures and articles do a magnificent job of bringing a meaningful message about the freedom-loving country of Finland to the people of America.

I feel that this magazine supplement reflects very accurately both the progressive attitude and industry of the Finnish people. All of the articles were excellent and three of them were of special interest to me. They are entitled "Finland's Expanding Industrial Production," "Wood: Finland's Richest Natural Resource," and "Helsinki Trade Center." I request unanimous consent to have these short articles printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

FINLAND'S EXPANDING INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTION

Among the leading industries of Finland, the metalworking industry developed strongly during World War II, and during the postwar years. In the 1950's this industry continued to increase its exports. Finnish ships, paper machines, tractors, cables, and other metal products have become widely known both in the West and in the East. The metalworking industry has thus become Finland's biggest industrial employer. Of a total of approximately 380,000 regular industrial wage earners, the metalworking industry employs over 100,000.

Another expanding industrial branch is the textile industry which previously sold only to domestic consumers. Now Finnish textiles such as cotton, wool, and knitwear have conquered foreign markets and their high quality and beautiful design are well known in many countries and particularly in the United States.

Finland's vigorous industrialization and the consequent concentration of population in towns and densely populated areas has given an impetus to the rapid growth of the food industry. Today, Finland's big flour mills, bread, biscuits, macaroni, sweets, and other special food products come well up to modern international standards.

To complete the brief account of the present position of Finland's so-called home market industry it may be mentioned further that her glass and ceramic industries enjoy international fame especially in the fields of art glass and pottery, and in the last 15 years, her chemical industry has made great strides forward.

The future will call for greater efforts. Internally the question is to create employment for the age groups born after World War II. Another big task is to adapt modern methods to meet the severe external competition which is to be expected as the result of European economic integration.

Finland has taken her place among the industrial countries and her industry hopes that during the current decade it can go on increasing its contribution to domestic and international prosperity.

WOOD: FINLAND'S RICHEST NATURAL RESOURCE

Just as "beauty is in the eye of the beholder," the forest can conjure up a host of images for a variety of people. For the child, the forest will be the source of his next Christmas tree. A poet will see in it the cradle of his country's mythology; a soldier will view the forest as the place for military ambush; and a young married couple will go to the forest as the ideal site for a picnic.

But for the 4½ million people, who comprise the nation of Finland, the forest can have but one compelling and overriding meaning; it is the perennial and inexhaustible source of the nation's livelihood, their country's most versatile and useful natural resource. And, because over 70 percent of Finland's extensive terrain is heavily invested with growing forest land, Finns have grown accustomed to call it Finland's "green gold."

The "green gold" of Finland's forests is the single most important and enduring basis of the economy of the nation, otherwise deficient in some of the natural resources of modern industry. Three-quarters of the cash value of Finland's exports is based on forestry products, and these exports enable Finland to buy back from the rest of the world the raw goods, services, and materials which are needed for the full development of her highly diversified and modern economy. Thus, although the mechanical, engineering, industrial, textile, and other branches of Finnish economy are today making great strides, the wood processing industries continue to set the pace for the entire country.

Industrial exploitation of forest resources has followed two principal lines. Modern paper, pulp, and chemical production which today forms the principal export resources, is the junior industry and its antecedents run back only a century in Finnish development. Lumber production has a historical basis in the 16th century.

In both fields, Finland has achieved a world marketing position which is unique for a country which is physically remote from the highways of world trade. Finland's exports, at present, supply 12 percent of the world demand for coniferous sawn wood; 22 percent of world demand for plywood; 18 percent of world demand for newsprint and 9 percent of world demand for chemical wood pulp.

Since Europe is her principal market, Finland's forest products supply an even higher ratio of the total consumption of wood, paper, pulp in the European area.

By any accepted standard the Finnish industry is "big industry"—and is growing bigger. Within 3 years, the pulp and paper production capacity will increase by 45 percent. And expansion plans are already on the board for the ensuing decade. Finland's wood-processing industries have reached a level of technical development second to none in the world.

Consumption of paper products is continuously rising in the whole world but more particularly in western Europe. Because of ecological factors, high-quality Scandinavian production of these products, synchronized to western European demands, will ultimately become the major supplier of paper for Europe. But it is equally obvious that Finnish pulp and paper can also be exported to the United States, and to the Western Hemisphere, on the principle that a good product will always find a market.

HELSINKI TRADE FAIR CENTER

The Finnish Fair Association was founded in 1919, not long after Finland gained her independence, to promote trade by organizing fairs and exhibitions in this country. Since its first trade fair in 1920, the Finnish Fair has organized over 50 fairs and exhibitions, general as well as specialized ones. Prominent among the former are the quinquennial Finnish Industries Fairs, in which all branches of the country's industry participate. The latter include the smaller annual spring fairs, mainly devoted to certain branches of production, and several other special exhibitions.

Situated right in the center of Helsinki, the Finnish Fair has two permanent exhibition halls totalling 130,000 square feet in area, and makes use of a large outdoor site on which light temporary halls totalling up to 200,000 square feet in area can be erected when needed. Several foreign trade fairs, e.g. those of Western Germany, England, France, and Soviet Union, have also been held on the same premises. The first non-European country to exhibit here will be the United States of America, with its "America Today" exhibition scheduled for May 26–June 11, 1961.

A large number of Finnish industrial enterprises and organizations are themselves members of the Finnish Fair. For this reason it is natural that the Finnish Fair has also been entrusted with the arrangements for Finnish official participation in trade fairs and exhibitions abroad as well as for independent export exhibitions. Thus Finnish products have been exhibited in many countries throughout the world, such as the United States of America. This year's program includes Finland's participation in the Chicago International Trade Fair, for which some 4,000 square feet have been reserved.

The foreseen collaboration of Finland with the Outer Seven (EFTA) and especially the increasing interest that foreign countries have shown in Finnish markets has given rise to the question of organizing international exhibitions in Finland. In fact, the Finnish Fair is planning to hold the first event of this kind in 1962.

For What Avail—If Freedom Fail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DALE ALFORD
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon, at the convocation of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, Miss Sandra Smith, of Little Rock, Ark., the lovely daughter of Dr. and Mrs. John McCollough Smith, was named winner of the national essay contest sponsored by the DAR. As the winner, she received the National Good Citizen Award.

I commend her essay to the reading of Americans everywhere, and under leave to extend my remarks, I include this essay in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR WHAT AVAIL—IF FREEDOM FAIL

(By Sandra Smith)

"For what avail the plough or sail,
Or land or life, if freedom fail?"
—*Ralph Waldo Emerson, "Boston."*

Of what avail the strong wings of the eagle if he be not free to soar into the unknown? So be it with man. What matter if he have the heritage of Washington and Jefferson and a faultless democracy, if his individual freedoms disappear? What matter if ours be "the land of the free and the home of the brave" if our people witness the constant overpowering force of Government. Should this prevail, who would dare predict our Nation's future.

In order to preserve our freedoms, we should rededicate ourselves to the ideals for which our forefathers fought the Revolutionary War and about which Thomas Jefferson wrote in the Declaration of Independence—the ideals which emphasize the importance of the individual. Many people today feel that the Government should underwrite everything we do, but when a government, which ultimately is the people themselves, overshadows the power of the individual, then freedoms disappear. If America is to be free, we must individually feel a personal responsibility for her freedoms. We must have greater incentives to do necessary tasks ourselves rather than letting them be undertaken for us by the Government. We must develop appreciation for the value of work and a sense of pride in a job well done.

It is true that communism is a challenge to America's freedoms, but with more emphasis placed on individual worth this threat will fade. I have confidence in the American people and believe they will work to protect the precious freedoms established by their forefathers. Individuals made America, and only individuals can insure our American heritage. Emerson gave a watchword to posterity when he wrote: "For what avail—if freedom fail?"

Letter Relating to Present Operation of Public Law 78 in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MERWIN COAD
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks on March 30, of this year in connection with the introduction of my bill H.R. 6032, I stated that Public Law 78, originally enacted to meet Korean war needs, has created a program which feeds on poverty and unemployment in Mexico and increases poverty and unemployment at home. By means of this program approximately 316,000 Mexican braceros were imported for work on U.S. farms during 1960. In my study of the effects of this program I have uncovered case upon case of economic hardships in many of our rural areas which can be traced directly to the operation of this program.

At a time when the extension of Public Law 78 is again coming up for consideration, I introduced H.R. 6032, which if enacted would amend this law to provide, in connection with the employment of workers from Mexico, protection for the employment opportunities of agricultural workers in the United States. I believe that through the amendments contained in my bill there could be enacted into law a program which would go far toward the elimination of the serious moral, social, and economic conditions which hang over communities and entire counties like a shroud and grim reminder of the inexcusable neglect in this field of domestic policy. Mr. Speaker, I hope that all the Members take a few minutes of their time to read this letter to Secretary of Labor Goldberg from a small businessman which

tells of the disastrous impact the present operation of Public Law 78 has had in an agricultural community in California. The letter follows:

IMPERIAL BARGAIN STORE,
Brawley, Calif., April 1, 1961.

Mr. ARTHUR GOLDBERG,
Secretary of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GOLDBERG: I am an independent owner of a small clothing store located at 934 East Main Street, Brawley, Calif. I have been in business here for about 16 years and have worked very hard to build my establishment. A few years ago I tried to expand to other towns in the Imperial Valley in hopes of maintaining a sufficient volume of business to protect my hard-earned investment in this farming area. In the process during these past 5 years I have lost $40,000 to $50,000.

The solution for this peculiar economic situation which has caused this seems nowhere in sight for the merchants whether they be small or large, whether they be independent or chain. The plight of many businesses, which exist here in Imperial Valley, is very grave and should receive prompt attention in order that a solution can be found while still a little time remains. Many businesses have closed their doors and many will close unless prompt action is taken to correct the serious blow to our economy.

The economy of Imperial Valley is dependent on agriculture. During the last several years there has been an exodus of people who are dependent directly or indirectly on agriculture for employment. Many jobs have been eliminated by mechanization—others have been eliminated by a few large farming interests becoming larger and absorbing small farmers. I reluctantly admit that some of this is unavoidable—but the extremely serious blow to us merchants of Imperial Valley is the bracero program as it now stands—Public Law 78. The original intent of importing Mexican nationals was a very necessary action—but it has outlived its need. It has created a situation which is benefiting a few greatly to the detriment of many—which will spell financial disaster to those struggling to stay in business.

Regardless of the general feeling among many of our farming interests—there is a great and very serious need for merchants of an area to be prosperous. The many conveniences and necessities provided for a community from which the farming interests also benefit are to a considerable degree attained as a result of taxes derived from commercial investments within the city. Commercial investments cannot be attractive unless they provide a reasonably good return on the investments. A reasonably good return is not possible unless the occupants, namely merchants, prosper. The number of vacant buildings in the Imperial Valley is mute evidence of this fact.

The use of braceros has displaced many local American citizens who are very much in need of employment. In turn, we merchants are deprived of the business which would result from the use of employees who are permanent residents. These permanent residents have their families here and the local business establishments would benefit from the purchases of the entire family. Farm interests argue that local citizens would not do the work braceros would do. There are arguments, pro and con, on this point. We, by all means, should give our people an opportunity to prove that they can do the work. At the same time one must consider that the importation of workers from other nations—who displace the local American workers—creates a steady flow of dollars to their home countries. These dollars are sorely needed in the areas which provide them with this income. A very small percentage of the money they earn is spent here. The problem is even greater here in the Imperial Valley because we are only within one-half hour drive from the border town of Mexicali, Baja California, Mexico. In addition to this braceros are housed and boarded in the camps and charged $1.75 per day. This is deducted from their paychecks whether they eat at the camps or not. In some cases the men choose to eat in town or buy their own food, but board of $1.75 per day is still deducted from their checks. One only has to converse with some of the braceros to find that they are being exploited. Greater numbers are usually brought into this area than there is work available. The camp owners thus benefit in that the hours each bracero receives is generally sufficient only to cover their weekly board.

We should first be concerned about our local American citizens having the employment the agricultural interests could provide them to support their families. If all efforts to remove their bracero program fail—the least that should be done is to require that the braceros should not be allowed to cross the border for the duration of their contract and that they should be provided with free housing and allowed to board as they choose. This would tend to curb the flow of a certain percentage of the dollars from here and this will aid limitedly the economy of this area.

In my opinion, this is one of the most neglected parts of our Nation. I am sure this view is shared by many others. An impartial investigation of each and every business in the Imperial Valley—whether a barbershop, clothing store—whether large or small—chain or independent will prove this to be so.

An aid to the merchants of the area which would be timely and extremely beneficial—at least until a solution can be worked out—is to have a representative of the Small Business Administration come to the Imperial Valley to extend loans to business establishments. Many are in need of financial assistance which at times local banks are reluctant to extend for other than short periods of time.

It is no secret that farming interests have powerful lobbyists—which represent them and which they can well afford. We merchants cannot afford lobbyist representation and I appeal to you to investigate this condition which exists here in Imperial Valley for it is extremely serious.

Very truly yours,

ANDRU ROSE,
Proprietor.

The State of the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Wall Street Journal of April 19. It points out very clearly and truthfully the steady decline of the power and prestige of the Congress of the United States. This, of course, is true not only of the Congress here at home but of parliamentary governments all over the world. In fact, in the last 4 years six nations have had to withdraw, as members of the Inter-Parliamentary Union, for the very simple reason that they no longer had parliaments.

The executive branch of Government is taking over more and more, both at home and abroad, and the reason is simply because we of the legislative branch are giving up our responsibilities and duties. The fault is ours, not the Executive's. The article follows:

THE STATE OF THE CONGRESS—WITH EXECUTIVE STRONG, IT GROWS INCREASINGLY PAROCHIAL

(By Robert D. Novak)

WASHINGTON.—President John F. Kennedy undeniably has brought a sense of excitement and vitality to almost every official corner of this city with one notable exception—Capitol Hill.

By no means does the congressional lassitude stem from any unexpected turn of events. Rather, the Democratic majority is now tasting the bitter strain it well knew would accompany the sweet delight of once more dealing with a Democrat in the White House. For President Kennedy's emphatic desire to uplift the executive branch—as demonstrated by many of his early proposals and actions—is accentuating what has been a long-term erosion of legislative branch power, an erosion partially obscured during the past 6 years of Government divided between a Democratic Congress and Republican President.

As a result, the atmosphere hangs heavy in the halls of Congress. Lawmakers wade through Mr. Kennedy's avalanche of legislative proposals with lethargy and dreariness. Their top aides, who play such a large part in setting the tone of Congress, feel left out of the main stream of power.

To be sure, Congress is no Supreme Soviet serving as a handmaiden of the Kremlin's bureaucracy. Nor is it a British Parliament where legislative action is dictated by the Cabinet. Indeed, the lawmakers can be expected to constrict such key New Frontier leigslative proposals as Federal aid to education and minimum wage liberalization. Other measures, including Mr. Kennedy's priority request that medical care for the aged be financed via the social security system, may be rejected flatly. Congress is expected to slice away, as usual, at foreign aid spending requests. In fact, the casual reader of newspaper accounts reporting the fate of the Kennedy program on Capitol Hill might surmise that Congress is calling the tune in Washington today.

A NEGATIVE BASIS

Yet, this could be no further from the truth. For the congressional power, such as it is, evolves from the negative base of obstructionism rather than from a positive ability to initiate Government policy. During the Eisenhower era, the Democratic Congress set its own timetable for domestic legislation and generally kept its own counsel about what measures would be finally approved—although many of these measures eventually were scuttled by Presidential vetoes. Not so today; it is the White House that has the leading voice in determining the congressional program of action.

Mr. Kennedy's preference for executive branch dominance is reflected not only by his intrusion into day-to-day congressional processes on a scope never contemplated by Mr. Eisenhower, but, even more dramatically, in some of his legislative proposals. His recommendation that foreign economic aid be authorized on a long-term basis would strip from Congress its power of close annual review over much of the multibillion dollar program. The President's farm program would transfer the responsibility for writing agricultural legislation from Congress to the farmers themselves, working with the Agriculture Secretary.

Congress might well demur at such self-inflicted damage. But Mr. Kennedy can tear away at congressional authority in ways that do not require the sanction of Congress, most notably in his bid for White House suzerainty over the independent regulatory agencies.

The new administration's most significant impact on the balance of power between the executive and legislative branches, however, has not been so much a matter of accelerating congressional decline but of disclosing just how far the decline has progressed.

Although a few constitutional theorists still talk of coequal legislative and executive branches, the historical reality is that one branch almost always sits higher in its saddle than the other. Congressional supremacy was at its zenith from the end of the Civil War until the Cleveland administration; the executive ascendancy began around 1900 and a trio of dominant Presidents—the two Roosevelts and Woodrow Wilson—established precedents not easily wiped away.

But apart from personalities, the decline of congressional power has been roughly proportionate to greater U.S. involvement in world affairs and greater dangers of war. Not only does the Constitution vest primary responsibility for foreign affairs and defense in the Executive, but the complexities of present-day international politics and military preparedness have shrunk the secondary roles in these areas assigned to the lawmakers.

Now that the Presidency is back in Democratic hands, even the illusion of congressional power is fading. Mr. Kennedy's deft handling of news media means he can outshout Congress. And there isn't much shouting from the Democratic majority in Congress these days anyway—partly attributable to the honeymoon atmosphere usually prevailing at the outset of any administration, but a situation that Kennedy lieutenants hope can be extended through careful tending of cordial relations with Congress.

Mr. Eisenhower's cutback of B–70 bomber production brought screams of anguish from Capitol Hill; an almost identical position by Mr. Kennedy has generated only a few grumbles. Democratic civil rights champions who denounced Mr. Eisenhower for submitting inadequate civil rights legislation scarcely complain that Mr. Kennedy has drafted no bill at all. Many Democratic Congressmen are apprehensive over the President's forays into the regulatory agency field, but few say anything about it publicly.

WHITE HOUSE AGENTS

Lawmakers with carefully constructed reputations for independence now appear in the roles of White House agents. Oregon's Senator MORSE, who last year insisted that loans for parochial schools should be attached to any general aid-to-education program, has joined administration opposition to such a move. Senator MCNAMARA, of Michigan, who in the past opposed then-Senator Kennedy's tendency to compromise on labor legislation, has cooperated with the administration in twice watering down minimum-wage proposals this year and may agree to still more compromises.

When it comes to foreign relations, the growing inclination by Congress to leave decision making to the President even extends to the Republican minority. The most partisan GOP lawmaker, facing the confused tangle of contradictions that comprise Cuba and Laos, hesitates about challenging Mr. Kennedy's moves in an area that could mean war or peace—a sharp contrast to the Congress of 60 years ago.

Consider the current status of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, most prestigious of all committees. Senators still claw each other for a seat on the committee. But despite the efforts of its intellectually astute chairman, J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, the impact of the committee on the Nation's foreign policy remains in a state of steady decline.

"Our problem is ignorance," laments one unusally candid member of the committee. Backing up this admission was the committee's recent approach to the treaty for U.S. participation in the 20-nation Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development; initial suspicions about the treaty existed within the committee primarily because most members didn't bother to read it.

Thus, the committee's principal significance now lies in its potentiality for obstructionism. It can eviscerate a foreign aid program, refuse to ratify treaties and decline to confirm ambassadorial appointments. And so State Department officials cannot be blamed if they look upon the committee as a band of possible saboteurs to be pampered rather than as trusted counselors.

A SEQUESTERED WORLD

While Mr. Kennedy is fostering further executive branch inroads into congressional power, the lawmakers seem to respond by sinking deeper into parochialism. Plagued by requests from constitutents, Congressmen often are more concerned about the fate of a voter's pension check than cold war issues. Moreover, they often seem to live in a sequestered world virtually unintelligible to outsiders. When the Laotian crisis burst during the first of the current congressional sessions, the Senate Democratic caucus was otherwise engaged in esoteric contemplation of the makeup of the Senate Democratic policy committee—a group who functions are cloudy and whose importance is debatable.

Liberal-inclined students of government do not lament the decline of Congress, pointing to the "bad" government prevailing during the post-Civil War years of congressional supremacy. But conservatives yearn for a return to the ascendancy of Congress—minus the corruption, of course—on the assumption that Congress tends to be more conservative than the White House.

At any rate, no real resurgence in the power of Congress, be it liberal or conservative, seems possible in the foreseeable future. Rather, the record of Mr. Kennedy is only likely to further entrench executive dominance.

James Alfred Whalley, Fine American of Windber, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a permanent record of the good citizenship and outstanding civic dedication of a friendly man, James Alfred Whalley, of Windber, Pa., brother of my good friend, Congressman IRVING WHALLEY of Pennsylvania:

[From the Windber Era, Apr. 13, 1961]

J. A. WHALLEY, WELL-KNOWN CITIZEN, DIES

James Alfred "Alf" Whalley, one of the most widely known men in this coal-producing area, died at 3:30 p.m. Thursday, April 6, in Temple University Hospital, Philadelphia. Mr. Whalley had been a surgical patient there for approximately 4 weeks.

Mr. Whalley, 55, a resident of 702 11th Street, was chief clerk and personnel manager of the Berwind-White Coal Mining Co. In addition to those posts, he was assistant to the general manager in public relations work for various Berwind-White enterprises. Mr. Whalley was treasurer of the Windber Era.

Active in community work, Mr. Whalley was an honorary member and former secretary of Windber No. 1 Fire Company and a charter member and one of the organizers of Windber Council, Holmes Safety Association. He served as council secretary for many years.

Mr. Whalley, a resident of Windber since 1914, was a native of Barnesboro, Cambria County, where he was born December 7, 1905, son of the late James and Isabella Whalley.

He was married to the former Miss Margaret Goodhart, who survives, along with a son, Scott, at home. Other survivors are a brother, Representative J. IRVING WHALLEY, of the 18th Congressional District, and two sisters, Miss Mary Whalley and Mrs. James Fyfe, all of Windber.

Mr. Whalley's career with Berwind-White began on October 28, 1925, as a clerk. He became payroll clerk at No. 36 Mine in 1926 and 2 years later was transferred to the personnel office as mine superintendent clerk.

On April 29, 1943, Mr. Whalley enlisted in the U.S. Navy and after undergoing indoctrination at Sampson (N.Y.) Training Center was promoted to a specialist first class in classification work. He then was assigned to the Navy personnel processing center in Hollywood, Fla., and later to Fort Lauderdale, Fla.

Upon his honorable discharge from the Navy on January 1, 1946, Mr. Whalley returned to Berwind-White and in 1951 was named chief clerk and personnel manager.

According to Robert H. Seese, general manager of Berwind-White, Mr. Whalley personally knew every man hired by the coal firm since 1925, practically every one of them on a first-name basis. This was true even when the company employed as many as 4,000 men.

Mr. Whalley was noted for his intense personal interest in the welfare and well-being of the men who worked for Berwind-White and made it a point to see that employees or former employees received all benefits to which each was entitled. He aided the men in securing every available benefit, whether it was unemployment compensation, social security, insurance or any other possible help.

Mr. Whalley's fraternal affiliations included membership in Cambria Lodge 278, Free and Accepted Masons, and in Williamsport Consistory. He attended Windber Presbyterian Church.

Friends were received at the Meek Funeral Home, where services were conducted at 11 a.m. Monday, April 10. Officiating were Rev. Ray D. Gearing, pastor of Windber Presbyterian Church, and Rev. Carl S. Fisher, pastor of First Presbyterian Church, Johnstown.

Interment was in Grandview Cemetery, Johnstown.

[From the Windber Era, Apr. 13, 1961]

JAMES ALFRED WHALLEY

The untimely passing last Thursday of "Alf" Whalley will leave a void which never again may be filled in our community.

Our hearts are saddened because we have lost a friend—a very true and valuable friend in every good sence of the word. A resident of Windber since 1909, "Alf" spent his youth and adult life in doing things for people; trying to make them happy; trying in his own quiet, unassuming way to ease their burdens as best he could.

From the time he first joined the Berwind-White Coal Mining Co., as a clerk on October 28, 1925, "Alf" made it a point to know every man in the organization. And he did, even when Berwind-White employed as many as 4,000 men in its local operations.

He could greet practically each one of them by their first names.

But that was not all, for "Alf" also knew of their joys and sorrows; rejoiced with "his men" and their families in the former; was sympathetic, understanding, and helpful in the latter. He watched hundreds of youths he hired grow into manhood, marry, rear children, and, in many cases, hire those children when they, in turn, grew to youth and manhood.

When "Alf" Whalley, in March 1951, after World War II service with the U.S. Navy, became chief clerk and personnel manager for Berwind-White, he was happy—not so much for himself and his own family, but because he felt he could be of greater service and greater help to his "company family."

Such was the unique personality of "Alf" Whalley, whose touch of quiet humor often helped someone to travel a little easier over a rough spot; whose smile brought a little light into the darkness of unexpected gloom.

Miners work hard, play hard and usually band together against outsiders. Thus, it will be an everlasting tribute to the life of "Alf" Whalley that he had the confidence of those men; that he had their respect and, most of all, their affection.

It was typical of "Alf" Whalley that although he suffered great pain during the last 6 months of his life, very few persons knew of that fact.

And when, about 4 weeks before his passing, "Alf" went to a Philadelphia hospital for what he hoped would be only a checkup, his concern was not for his own well-being. He felt that he should be in Windber Hospital, where "Pete" and "Joe" and "Mike" could drop by and say "Hello."

"Alf" felt he was needed here.

It is certain that "Alf" Whalley will stay in Windber, in the minds and memories of the thousands of men with whom he came into contact; with the hundreds for whom he would see to it that their unemployment compensation, their insurance or their social security benefits were forthcoming; with the thousands who knew "Alf" Whalley and his personal, individual interest in each one of them.

To "Alf" Whalley's family, we extend our deep and sincere sympathy. Perhaps it will ease her sorrow a little to know that "Alf" Whalley will "live" in Windber for many, many years to come.

Israeli Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following tribute to Israel on the occasion of the 13th anniversary of its independence:

ISRAELI INDEPENDENCE DAY

On the 13th anniversary of its independence, Israel has proved that the experiment to create a national state has been a total success. For today Israel is truly a national state among the countries of the world. She has taken into her land the lost and homeless refugees of World War II. Her population has almost tripled since 1948, the year of her independence. Her land now supports over 2 million people. In order to build the land to meet the needs of her people, new social forms were developed and combined with the old. In addition to cultivation of private lands, communal agricultural villages were set up to meet the immediate needs of many families. There, the land is owned in common and the community provides for all the needs of its members. The moshav combines collective living with the capitalist system by providing small landholders with an economic community run by the state, the cooperative movement, and trade unions. Thus, there are various economic institutions to provide for the varied needs of the population.

Just as the Israeli people express their resourcefulness and originality in the development of economic institutions, so do they in their culture. Through books and 25 daily newspapers Israel seeks to explain itself and its purposes to the rest of the world. Through its renowned Philharmonic, its Hebrew University, its folk dances and music, and its archeological discoveries, such as the Dead Sea scrolls, we in the United States, and the other peoples of the world, have come to know and respect Israel and its accomplishments in these few years.

Importation of Foreign Textiles Into the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE GRANT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, it is well that the plight of our domestic textile industry, due to the growing amount of foreign textiles imported from low-wage countries, has been called to the attention of the membership of this body and of the entire Nation.

The problem is now in the hands of the President's Cabinet-level Textile Advisory Committee; and it is hoped that, when the Committee makes its report to the President, he will direct the effectuation of a plan which will result in the imposition of a fair level of quotas by country and by category. I sympathize with the President in his deliberation over this matter; and I am sure that whatever decision he makes it will, in his opinion, be for the best interest of this Nation. However, I feel sure, too, that if all the facts are before him, he will decide on the solution recommended by the Pastore subcommittee in the Senate; that is, that quotas be established by country and by category. Of all the solutions suggested, it seems that the implementation of this one offers the most satisfactory remedy for all concerned.

It would have been far easier several years ago to have made this decision; for since that time, imports have jumped and jumped because so many nations have found a dumping ground for their goods in the American markets. These nations will, therefore, be much more reluctant now to give up this profitable outlet. It is almost unbelievable that since the 1958 extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, cotton imports have increase by 1,400 percent to 14 million pounds; and cotton cloth imports have doubled just in the last year.

A few years ago we were concerned about the Japanese imports; and Japan, recognizing the serious problem created by its exports to this country, voluntarily limited them. However, seeing how easy it was to send in cheap goods, other nations have rushed in until today the condition has gone from bad to worse; and it is now imperative that remedial action be forthcoming. Either, action to control the amount of these imports must be taken; or textile plants over the Nation—I believe in 43 States—will have to close, thereby throwing countless men and women out of work, not to mention the drastic effects upon their families and indirectly our whole economy. One very direct and immediate effect will be more relief lines. The American worker does not want relief but wants a job through which he can earn a living for his family; neither does the American worker feel kind toward the situation when the job is denied him by reason of rapidly increasing imports.

My experience with this serious problem and its countless, adverse byproducts, so to speak, is a firsthand one. My district is composed of nine counties; and each county has one or more cotton mill or textile plant of one kind or another which manufactures pants, pajamas, underwear, shirts, gloves, and other wearing apparel. For several years now, these plants and mills have been suffering from these cheaply made imports, but more recently the pain has grown more acute. Every mail delivery to my office bring letters of deep concern—not only from the owners and employees of the plants and mills—but from businesses, civic organizations, and local citizens who are gravely concerned about the living standards of the employees and of the people who must depend on the purchasing power of such workers for the maintenance of their businesses. Yes, the repercussions are most damaging and are on an extensive scale. Not only is the problem of safeguarding the jobs and investments of Americans from these cheaply made foreign imports a problem in the South where it is true the textile industry plays such an important part in our economy, but as has been pointed out here on this floor by my colleagues from other sections of the country the problem is not a sectional one at all. It adversely affects almost every section of our great country. Of all the examples cited here of similar situations, it is more than obvious that a crisis has been created which threatens the heart of our national economy. In my own district, a continuation of this trend could have serious effects on local manufacturers, who would be forced to close their doors due to a lack of sales, some merchants would be forced out of business due to a lack of customers, people could lose their homes, and on and on go the drastic direct and indirect effects.

Considering the detriment to our national security standing and our national economy with its many victims due to the continued failure to restrict the sales of cheap, foreign-made imports in our country, it is high time for some hard and realistic decisions to be made.

Communism and the House Un-American Activities Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the Economic Council Papers recently had an excellent series of articles concerning communism and the House Un-American Activities Committee.

The first, volume XVI, No. 1, appeared February 15, 1961, and should be of interest to my colleagues:

[From the Economic Council Papers, Feb. 15, 1961]

COMMUNISM AND THE HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE

(By Robert B. Dresser)

PETITION BY BROWN UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

It was reported in the Journal of January 14 that 87 Brown University professors had signed a petition asking Congress to abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee.

The Bulletin of January 20 contained a letter to the editor by Norman D. MacLeod, criticizing this action. Mr. MacLeod is one of our leading citizens and is unusually well informed on public issues.

An editorial in the Bulletin of January 24, headed "Congress overplays hunt for un-American activities," states: "In our opinion, the Un-American Activities Committee is provoking a lot of unnecessary shouting and, therefore, has run out of a useful purpose for existing."

On January 27 the Bulletin published a letter from Wade Thompson, one of the professors who signed the petition, defending his action and criticizing Mr. MacLeod. I quote from this letter as follows: "Frankly, I abhor the House Un-American Activities Committee, and I don't give a hang whether the Communists like it or not.

* * * * *

"If the HUAC ever pokes its nose in Providence, I personally will be glad to demonstrate against it. And I dare anybody to call me a you-know-what."

The Bulletin of February 1 carried a news report from which I quote as follows:

"The president of Brown University today criticized recent defenders of the House Un-American Activities Committee as 'probably more dangerous than the Communists.'

"Dr. Barnaby C. Keeney, the president, speaking at a university convocation at Sayles Hall, said that such persons 'attack the very fabric of our Constitution and erode mutual trust and freedom of discussion upon which our society depends.'"

Several other letters on this subject have appeared in the Journal or Bulletin, some attacking and some defending the committee.

What are the merits of the controversy?

In my opinion, the House Un-American Activities Committee, from its inception in 1938, has performed a most valuable service and should be continued. It has conducted a great many investigations of communism, and has published numerous reports exposing to public view the subversive activities of Communists and fellow-travelers. It has published lists of subversive organizations and publications running into the hundreds. These reports have been invaluable in the fight against communism.

These subversive organizations, manned principally by non-Communists, who are unwittingly aiding the Communist cause, are commonly referred to as "Communist fronts."

STATEMENTS BY J. EDGAR HOOVER

Let me quote from J. Edgar Hoover's book, "Masters of Deceit" (pp. 228–229):

"Fronts probably represent the party's [Communist] most successful tactic in capturing non-Communist support. Like mass agitation and infiltration, fronts espouse the deceptive party line (hence the term 'front') while actually advancing the real party line. In this way the party is able to influence thousands of non-Communists, collect large sums of money, and reach the minds, pens, and tongues of many high-ranking and distinguished individuals. Moreover, fronts are excellent fields for party recruitment.

"A front is an organization which the Communists openly or secretly control.

* * * * *

"The party has operated hundreds of major fronts in practically every field of party agitation; 'peace,' civil rights, protection of the foreign-born, support for Smith Act 'victims,' abolition of H-bomb tests, exploitation of nationality and minority groups. Some are based on specific appeal, to teachers, writers, lawyers, labor, women, youth."

Quoting further from Mr. Hoover's book (pp. 194–195):

"A primary tactic of the Communist Party is to preserve the legal status of the party. Thus, any organization which has the duty to investigate or expose Communist activity is singled out for attack. For years the party has campaigned against the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, and the Senate Investigating Committee. The Department of Justice and the FBI have not been spared, and we have come to judge our effectiveness by the intensity of Communist attacks.

* * * * *

"Above the surface a gigantic propaganda and agitation campaign is in progress, a campaign that depends for success upon the support of non-Communists. Basic Communist strategy dictates that non-Communist hands, knowingly or unknowingly, under Communist guidance, must further the influence of the Communist world."

Quoting still further from Mr. Hoover's book (p. 93): "A tragedy of the past generation in the United States is that so many persons, including high-ranking statesmen, public officials, educators, ministers of the gospel, professional men, have been duped into helping communism. Communist leaders have proclaimed that communism must be partly built with non-Communist hands, and this, to a large extent, is true."

STATEMENT BY GEORGI DIMITROV

Georgi Dimitrov gave the following advice to the Lenin School of Political Warfare:

"As Soviet power grows, there will be a greater aversion to Communist parties everywhere. So we must practice the techniques of withdrawal. Never appear in the foreground; let our friends do the work. We must always remember that one sympathizer is generally worth more than a dozen militant Communists. A university professor, who without being a party member lends himself to the interests of the Soviet Union, is worth more than a hundred men with party cards. A writer of reputation, or a retired general, are worth more than 500 poor devils who don't know any better than to get themselves beaten up by the police. Every man has his value, his merit. The writer who, without being a party member, defends the Soviet Union, the union leader who is outside our ranks but defends Soviet international policy, is worth more than a thousand party members."

RECOGNITION OF RUSSIA IN 1933 AND ITS EFFECT

On November 17, 1933, President Franklin D. Roosevelt resumed diplomatic relations with Russia, ending a policy of nonrecognition which had prevailed since the overthrow of the Kerensky government in 1917.

This enabled Russia to bring into this country thousands of agents devoted to the job of undermining our government and our system of society, and enabling Russia to conquer the United States by peaceful means, if possible; otherwise by force of arms.

This has been but a part of a movement by Communist Russia to conquer the world.

STATEMENT FROM AMERICAN OPINION SCOREBOARD

Quoting from the magazine, American Opinion, for July-August and September 1960 (p. 2 of "The Scoreboard"): "Basic Communist strategy for conquest of the world, as laid out 35 years ago and relentlessly followed ever since, consisted of three steps: (1) Take eastern Europe; (2) next take the masses of Asia; (3) then take the rest of the world, including the United States. The Communists completed their first step in 1950; the second step is now at least three-fourths accomplished; and they have gone more than one-fourth of the way toward carrying out their third step. Which means that the Communists have now covered well over two-thirds of the total distance to their final goal of worldwide dominion. And the momentum and the speed of their progress ared steadily increasing."

AMERICAN PEOPLE UNAWARE OF COMMUNIST PERIL

Subjugation by Communist Russia is horrifying to contemplate. The great tragedy of the day is the fact that the great mass of the American people appear to be wholly unaware of the peril that confronts them. "Business as usual" is the rule, and little or no heed is given to the warnings of danger.

WARNINGS

Many warnings have been given the American people.

Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Philippine Ambassador to the United States since 1954, and a wise and loyal friend of this country, has uttered such a warning. In an article in the November issue of Reader's Digest, entitled "America, Wake Up!," an article which everyone should read, he says (pp. 49 and 55):

"America, wake up. Shake off the course of inaction that is giving the forces of evil the right of way in this world. Face up to the blunt fact that you are now engaged in a real war and that it must be fought and won. This is the only alternative to defeat by default.

* * * * *

"At its rate of growth since World War II, the universal Communist police state could come into being in our own lifetime.

* * * * *

"The only possible solution is to wage this protracted conflict twice as hard, twice as effectively, as the Communists are now waging it. We must embark on a massive offensive, turning every Communist trick and stratagem—from propaganda to infiltration—against our mortal enemy. This is the one and only way to win the struggle for survival."

Numerous other warnings have been given, including among others of recent date, warnings by (1) Allen W. Dulles, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, in the Reader's Digest of December 1960, (2) Charles Stevenson in the Reader's Digest of February 1961, (3) Senator THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut, Democratic vice chairman of the Senate's Internal Security Subcommittee, (4) the American Bar Association's Special Committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy, and

Objectives, (5) the House Un-American Activities Committee, (6) the Senate's Internal Security Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, and J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DODD

"The horrible thing is that there is a complete failure to comprehend the menace of communism even among many Members of Congress" (Reader's Digest of February 1961, p. 43).

REPORT OF AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION'S COMMITTEE

The American Bar Association's Special Committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy, and Objectives, in its report submitted to the House of Delegates in February 1959, said: "International communism will enslave the peoples of every nation of the free world—including the United States—unless they: Awaken from their apathy and their indifference to the dangers that exist and threaten.

* * * * *

"Remember that subversion—aided by treason and treachery of domestic citizens—has been the most successful tool and tactic of international communism in gaining control of now-enslaved nations or in weakening or dulling the resistance by those nations which remain free.

* * * * *

"Most persons who are informed on communism think our country now faces its greatest danger. The thesis of J. Edgar Hoover's new book, 'Masters of Deceit,' is: 'Communism is the major menace of our time. Today it threatens the very existence of our Western civilization.'

"In his speech to the 1957 National Convention of the American Legion, Mr. Hoover warned: 'To dismiss lightly the existence of the subversive threat in the United States is to deliberately commit national suicide. In some quarters we are surely doing just that.'

* * * * *

"The lawyer-author of the Gaither report to the President on national security recently told our Association: 'Our security is in unprecedented peril. * * * The ultimate objective of international communism is world domination, and the Soviet Union will pursue this objective ruthlessly and relentlessly, employing every possible political, economic, subversive, and military stratagem and tactic.'

* * * * *

"It is now an established fact that every institution, every force and every person actively engaged in the forefront of the defense of our country against the rising menace of communism becomes the target of attack and villification by Communists, Crypto-Communists, fellow-travelers, their stooges and innocent but beguiled persons.

* * * * *

"Notwithstanding some mistakes—fewer than generally charged—the service to our country by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and the House Un-American Activities Committee has been incalculable and worthy of far greater praise than has been accorded to them. The Communist and radical propaganda against these committees has never subsided.

* * * * *

"A substantial strength of communism in the United States is the number of non-Communist organizations and individuals who will collaborate with the Communists. For every Communist Party member, there may be 10 non-Communists who will do the work of the Communists.

"The Communists have had hundreds of fronts. In addition, they have 'fronts in front of the fronts.' Making use of their fellow travelers and dupes, plus their 'united front tactic,' the Communists boast they can have 50,000 letters on any issue sent to Capitol Hill or the White House inside of 72 hours.

"The greatest asset the Communists have at the present time is not the hydrogen bomb, certainly not Soviet satellites, but world ignorance of their tactics, strategy and objectives."

STUDENT RIOTS

The success of the Communist movement throughout the world is illustrated by the many student riots which they have been able to stage, including Bogota, Colombia, in 1948, Caracas, Venezuela, in 1958, LaPaz, Bolivia, in 1959, and finally Tokyo in May-June 1960. These were all anti-American.

Besides these there have been the student riots against the Government in Turkey, Havana, and elsewhere.

SAN FRANCISCO STUDENT RIOT

And despite the common belief that "It can't happen here," the Communists staged a student riot in San Francisco in May 1960 against the House Un-American Activities Committee, which was holding a hearing in the San Francisco City Hall. This is one of the most disgraceful episodes in American history.

J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, has prepared a report on the riot, which everyone should read. I quote from it the following:

"The successful Communist exploitation and manipulation of youth and student groups throughout the world today are a major challenge which free world forces must meet and defeat. Recent world events clearly reveal that world communism has launched a massive campaign to capture and maneuver youth and student groups.

"The vigor and vitality of such groups constitute an explosive force of immense proportions. Channeled into proper outlets, this force can accomplish immeasurable good for a peace-loving world. Manipulated into destructive channels, this force can create chaos.

* * * * *

"It has long been a basic tenet of Communist strategy to control for its own evil purposes the explosive force which youth represents. In the relentless struggle for world domination being waged by them, Communists are dedicated to the Leninist principle that 'youth will decide the issue of the entire struggle—both the student youth and, still more, the working-class youth.'

* * * * *

"The Communist attack on the HCUA (House Committee on Un-American Activities) in San Francisco was in line with a longstanding party aim to destroy not only the HCUA, but also the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and every other 'enemy' seeking to expose the threat which Communist activities represent to the internal security of this Nation. The party reaffirmed its dedication to this aim at its 17th national convention, held in New York City, December 1959, when it passed a so-called political resolution calling for activity to abolish the 'witch-hunting' HCUA and Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

"Thus, when the decision of the HCUA to hold hearings May 12–14, 1960, in San Francisco was announced, it was mandatory for Communists to implement the convention resolution by doing everything possible to disrupt the hearings as part of the overall aim to destroy the HCUA.

* * * * *

"The Communist Party, U.S.A., is elated with the success it enjoyed in attempting to make a fiasco of the HCUA San Francisco hearings, which, notwithstanding these attempts at disruption, did develop valuable and needed information concerning the strategy, tactics, and activities of the party in northern California.

* * * * *

"In short, the consensus in the Communist Party was that the riot was the best thing for the party that had occurred in years. Party leaders expressed the opinion that it was especially significant that the party had been able to enlist the support of so many people in all walks of life when the party, itself, was publicly under attack by the HCUA. The feeling was that not only had the party taken a major step toward its goal of abolishing the HCUA, but also it had taken a major step toward playing a greater role on the American scene.

* * * * *

"Throughout the world today, governments are toppling with stunning rapidity. Whether large or small, the role Communists are playing in these events must not be discounted. The growing strength of our Nation over the years has not proven a deterrent to relentless efforts on the part of the Communist Party, U.S.A., to destroy our security and prepare our Nation for a similar fate.

"Looking at the riots and chaos Communists have created in other countries, many Americans point to the strength of our Nation and say 'It can't happen here.' The Communist success in San Francisco in May, 1960, proves that it can happen here.

* * * * *

"It is the duty of all Americans to fully understand the true import of this threat to our heritage, to expose it, and to combat it with every weapon at our command."

MOVING PICTURE OF SAN FRANCISCO RIOT

Fortunately a moving picture of the San Francisco riot was taken.

The Associated Industries of Rhode Island has purchased a copy of the film, and is showing it throughout the State as a public service without charge. It has created such a sensation that there is a great demand for it on the part of various organizations and schools. The association has ordered another copy of the film.

It is an amazing and distressing spectacle.

COMMUNISTS' ATTEMPT TO DISCREDIT FILM

The Communists have been thoroughly frightened by the feeling that is being aroused against them throughout the country by the showing of this film, and they have tried in every way possible to discount the film and to get people to believe that it is not a true picture of what occurred. In this they have been to some extent successful. Various newspapers along the eastern seaboard have accepted this view and widely publicized it.

STATEMENT BY MAYOR OF SAN FRANCISCO

In order to meet this attempt by the Communists to deceive the public, a statement was obtained from the mayor of San Francisco, George Christopher. His office is located directly across the hall from the room in which the hearings of the Un-American Activities Committee were being held and he was an eyewitness to what occurred.

I quote from his statement as follows: "There has been quite some controversy as to the authenticity of the film of the House Un-American Activities Committee meeting in our city. While I believe the pictures of the demonstrators speak for themselves, perhaps a further explanation will be enlightening.

* * * * *

"If these people had not disrupted these meetings—if they had not challenged the police—if they had not violated the law, there would have been no need for police action. Known Communists—and I repeat this emphatically—known Communists were in the lead of this demonstration. The students were dupes who join some of these causes of agitation, believing it is an innocent and harmless expression of civil liberties, not realizing that while they are doing this they are at the same time violating

every precept of the liberties they profess to cherish.

* * * * *

"The pictures, I believe, speak for themselves. They are true. They are authentic. They tell the real story * * *."

HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE SHOULD BE CONTINUED

I submit that the evidence establishes beyond a reasonable doubt that the House Un-American Activities Committee has been, and still is, performing a most valuable service to the people of the United States, and that it should be continued, its activities expanded, and the funds needed for this purpose provided by Congress.

CONCLUSION

We are engaged today in the most serious war we have ever fought—a cold war though it may be—and we are losing the war. It is a struggle for our survival as a free Nation. In these circumstances, instead of attacking those who are trying to protect the country, all possible aid should be given to them.

It is no time for captious or petty criticism. It is no time "to fiddle while Rome is burning."

It is no time for people to stand on the sidelines and leave the job to a few. Every man, woman and child should be in this fight to the finish. The American people must wake up and take some part in this battle before it is too late.

What, it may be asked, can one do? There are two things, and only two: (1) work for the cause, and/or (2) contribute money, no matter how small the amount, to some organization that is fighting the battle for you. One should not be deterred by the belief that he can do very little. Each person should do what he can, however small. The power of such collective action would be irresistible.

Remember, this is your fight, and if it is lost it is your fault.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

The House Rules Committee Schedules Hearing on Kearns Gold Resolution for Tuesday, April 25, 1961, After 12-Year Wait—The Governments of Western Nations Are Buying Russian Gold, Which Means We Are Sending Into Russia and Red China Vast Quantities of Food and Machinery, According to Representative Wright Patman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the House Rules Committee, after a 12-year wait, has finally scheduled hearings on my House resolution creating a select committee to inspect the gold reserves at Fort Knox and in other Federal depositories.

I introduced this measure, House Resolution 21, in accordance with the views of numerous patriotic organizations, such as the Daughters of the American Revolution, which for a number of years has adopted resolutions on this subject.

The point I have been making is that the only officials who ever see our gold are appointed officials, and even some top appointed officials never see our actual gold reserves.

Former Treasury Secretary John Snyder once told me that he never had seen the gold supply at Fort Knox.

Under article 1, section 7 of the Constitution of the United States all revenue bills must originate in the House of Representatives.

The exact language is as follows:

All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with amendments as on other bills.

It is high time that the House of Representatives, which originates revenue bills, should have some responsibility in connection with our gold reserves on which our entire monetary system rests.

A select committee of the House of Representatives could very properly conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the monetary system of the United States, including the balance of payments, and the gold reserves of the United States in the Federal depositories at Fort Knox, Philadelphia, Denver, and elsewhere as they affect every citizen of the United States, and report its findings and recommendations to the House of Representatives. I shall amend my resolution to provide this study of our monetary system, and our balance of payments.

In an incisive speech last week before the 70th Continental Congress of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] declared that:

We still cling, however, to certain ancient ideas about gold, which it seems to me, are likely to get us into trouble. So far, there are no signs that the spage age will make any very heavy requirements on gold. Yet despite the fact that the governments of the Western nations have vast quantities of this metal stored away in underground vaults, they continue to buy up billions more, each year, and at a tremendously high price which we ourselves fix and maintain at an artificial level. In this process, the governments of the Western nations are buying Russian gold, which means that we are sending into Russia and Red China vast quantities of food and machinery which the slave world desperately needs, and cannot produce in sufficient quantities, in exchange for a metal which we do not need.

The indiscriminate way in which the Western World now handles its monetary reserves makes it inevitable that these reserves will be contaminated by Communist gold. The Communists feed this gold into the grey markets of Europe, and from there it infiltrates our banking system. I think we ought to reexamine this matter very thoughtfully and ask ourselves whether it is really wise policy for the Western World to continue subsdizing a buildup of Russia's and Red China's industrial and military capabilities. It may be that we and our allies ought to consider some step to sterilize our monetary gold, such as putting it in the safekeeping of the International Monetary Fund here in Washington. If this were done, then at least we would know we would have the gold in case some scientific or industrial need for it ever develops.

Finally, may I suggest there should be more public interest in the money system and better understanding of what the Federal Government is doing in this field.

You know, it has long been popular for a Member of Congress to say that all he knows about money is that he doesn't have enough of it.

I have no doubt that if such a tremendously influential and public-spirited organization as the Daughters of the American Revolution should think well of the idea of more public interest and understanding, the result would, indeed, be more public interest and understanding, both in and out of Congress. I have no doubt that Congress would be willing to make a thorough study of the ways in which its constitutional powers and responsibilities are being used, and how these uses might be improved. The Federal Government spends billions in investigating the ocean floors, probing outer space, and so on. But it has been more than 50 years since we have had an official public study of our money system. Private corporations and foundations occasionally find it worthwhile to spend millions of dollars for monetary commissions set up to make private studies of this subject, which leads me to think the subject must be worthy of study in public bodies.

I am pleased to be able to say at this time that a resolution was adopted by the 70th Continental Congress of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, in support of the study of the monetary system of the United States which was proposed by the able and distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] in his speech before them last week.

I include as part of my remarks the text of my measure, House Resolution 21, together with an amendment which I will offer to it at the hearings to be held by the Committee on Rules of the House of Representatives on Tuesday, April 25, 1961.

I also include as part of my remarks the texts of letters I have received from Maurice Stans, former Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, and from George M. Humphrey, former Secretary of the Treasury:

H. RES. 21

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives appoint a committee consisting of seven members of the majority and minority of the House of Representatives, one of which shall be chosen as chairman, to visit the Fort Knox gold reserve and any other places designated where gold deposits are held, to inspect and report to the Congress and the people of the United States their accurate findings on their visitation as to the actual amount of gold bullion, bars, and so forth, held in keeping there by the United States Government, pursuant to article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States.

AMENDMENT TO H. RES 21

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert the following: "That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of seven Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

"The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the monetary system of the United States, including the balance of payments, and the gold reserves of the United States in the Federal depositories at Fort Knox, Philadelphia, Denver and elsewhere, as they affect every citizen of the United States.

"For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized by the committee to hold hearings, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, or elsewhere, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary; except that neither the committee nor any subcommittee thereof may sit while the House is meeting unless special leave to sit shall have been obtained from the House. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the com-

mittee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

"The committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House."

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., January 16, 1961.

MY DEAR CARROLL: In your letter of January 7, 1961, you ask my evaluation of the two legislative proposals which you introduced in the House of Representatives on January 3, 1961.

H.R. 26 proposes the coinage of not less than $25 million in $10 gold pieces and not less than $25 million in $5 gold pieces, which would not constitute legal tender, and would establish limitations on personal holdings and penalties for exceeding those limitations. As you know, under our present international gold bullion standard, the dollar is maintained at a parity with gold. Reserves of gold are centralized and are available for use in the national interest. It is the general practice of leading countries to utilize their gold reserves for the settlement of international transactions and not to reduce the funds available for this purpose by releasing gold to their private citizens in exchange for money. A limited number of gold pieces, it has been argued, could lead to hoarding and possibly to speculation in so-called black markets.

House Resolution 21 proposes that a committee consisting of Members of the House of Representatives be appointed to visit Fort Knox and other gold depositories and report on the actual amount of gold held by the U.S. Government. No objection is apparent to such an undertaking if the Congress so desires. However, to determine and verify the amount of gold bullion would require the opening of vaults, removal of several thousands of tons of gold bullion, weighing each bar, drilling each bar for an assay sample to prove the degree of purity, and replacing the bars in the vault under seal. Such a process would be very arduous and time consuming.

You may recall that shortly after the present administration assumed office a quite similar audit was undertaken, on a sample basis, by representatives of the various agencies concerned. At Fort Knox, for example, 3 of 22 sealed gold compartments were opened, 88,000 gold bars were counted, about 9,000 bars were weighed, and 26 bars were assayed to determine the degree of fineness of the metal. The committee reported the contents of the three vaults to be as represented and expressed the opinion that an examination of the remaining vaults would result in a similar report with respect to their contents.

I am sure you will want also to get the views of the Treasury Department on these matters. My own personal views are that there is not sufficient reason to enact H.R. 26, but that if the Congress would feel more secure by the enactment of House Resolution 21, it would certainly not be objectionable.

Thank you for the good wishes conveyed in your letter. My best wishes to you, as well.

Sincerely yours,

MAURICE STANS, *Director.*

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., May 6, 1953.

Hon. CARROLL D. KEARNS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KEARNS: I have before me your letter of April 29, concerning the recent inventory of the gold in the various mint institutions. At the outset let me state that the gold was counted not only at Fort Knox, but at the other depositories as well.

After I was designated by President-elect Eisenhower to become Secretary of the Treasury, I met with Secretary Snyder, and one of the problems I discussed with him was the transfer of assets to the incoming administration. It was decided that a committee be appointed to review the procedures relative to safeguarding the assets and that such committee should prescribe the manner in which the inventory should be taken. This committee was composed of W. L. Hemingway, chairman of the executive committee of the Mercantile Trust Co., St. Louis; William Fulton Kutz, chairman of the board, the Pennsylvania Co., Philadelphia; Sidney B. Congdon, president, National City Bank of Cleveland, Cleveland; James L. Robertson, member, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, Washington.

The committee met in Washington and spent several days questioning officials relative to the procedures employed in accounting for and protection of the Government's gold, silver, and other assets. The committee then recommended that 10 percent of the compartments in all mint institutions be selected at random for a count of the gold assets and that 10 percent of the gold counted be weighed. Also, bars were to be selected at random for assaying. The committee recommended that this work be done under the supervision of a continuing committee consisting of four members: one to represent me, one to represent Secretary Snyder, and one to represent Mrs. Priest, the Treasurer, and one to represent the General Accounting Office. The General Accounting Office declined the committee arrangement for their representative because they wished to maintain their independent status. Therefore, during the inventorying process the General Accounting Office had representatives present, but they were acting on their own behalf and submitted separate reports on their observations.

Under the supervision of the continuing committee and with the General Accounting Office observing the inventory, the count was carried out and reports submitted stating that the assets were as stated in the Treasury accounts. Upon the basis of this inventory, I am satisfied that all the gold assets are as reported.

You asked to be informed of the amount of gold the Treasury has in its depositories throughout the Nation. Attached is a list of the depositories and the gold that they held on March 31, 1953. All the gold held in such depositories belongs to the U.S. Government. None of it belongs to foreign countries. Any gold held in the United States for foreign countries is held on earmarked account at the Federal Reserve Bank of New York and statistics covering such holdings are reported in total by the Federal Reserve Board in its monthly bulletin.

You speak of the routine check that was made at Fort Knox. From the above you can readily see that the inventory recently made was not in any manner routine. In this connection, I attach copies of three press releases dated January 9, January 31, and April 12, which go into more detail.

I appreciate very much your statement that I am doing an outstanding job. I also appreciate your offer of cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE M. HUMPHREY,
Secretary of the Treasury.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, in an unprecedented action the National Congress of Parents and Teachers gave full support to S. 1021.

As pointed out in a press release, this is the first time the organization has endorsed specific proposed legislation for Federal support of education.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire press release be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL CONGRESS URGES PTA'S TO BACK ADMINISTRATION BILLS ON EDUCATION AID

CHICAGO, ILL., April 18.—The National Congress of Parents and Teachers has called on its 47,000 local PTA's to urge their "full support" of the Kennedy administration's proposals for Federal aid to schools.

A special legislative memorandum to local PTA's cited H.R. 4970 and S. 1021, identical bills, as "moderate in both expense and approach" and noted that they would "give protection against Federal interference in the schools, provide additional aid to low-income States, and allow each State to decide for itself how the money will be spent." And they meet other policy requirements of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers. The memo also stresses the need for changes in titles II and III of the bills to provide more adequate funds for federally impacted areas. The memorandum was released by Mrs. Fred L. Bull, of Baltimore, Md., chairman of the National Congress committee on legislation.

As chairman of legislation, Mrs. Bull has also written President Kennedy and the Members of the U.S. Congress pointing out: "Our members, as taxpayers, are willing to pay their fair share of the cost of quality education for their children. They are truly concerned not so much about the high cost of providing a program of excellence as about the tremendously greater cost of not providing it."

Speaking today at national headquarters in Chicago, Mrs. James C. Parker, president of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, called attention to the plea for decisive action contained in her message in the April issue of the PTA magazine. She reiterated, "Probably no action we take in coming months will have more important consequences for our children and our country than our action on education legislation. It is incumbent upon each of us, as parents, teachers, and citizens to let our Senators and Representatives know our views."

In backing the administration's Federal aid bills, the legislative memorandum suggested that PTA members write to President Kennedy, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Abraham A. Ribicoff, U.S. Commissioner of Education Sterling M. McMurrin, and their own U.S. Congressmen and Senators.

While the National Congress of Parents and Teachers has long advocated legislation in support of education, this is its first specific recommendation for Federal assistance in the current session of the U.S. Congress.

Bar Mitzvah

SPEECH
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, today is Israel's 13th birthday. Born in the midst of turbulence and war this tiny nation proved to itself and to the world that it possessed the strength and determination to win its struggle for existence. Not only did it survive but it continued to thrive and prosper so that today it holds a respected position in the family of nations.

Recent statistics indicate the rapid rate of growth and progress that has been achieved since 1948:

[In thousands]

	1948	1960
Populations	790	2,128
Industrial production	(1)	$1,070,000
Exports	29,680	265,000
Imports	253,120	520,000
Agricultural production	24,700	183,000
Cultivated area	412	1,100
Irrigation (in acres)	62	340
Afforestation	13	64.5
Water usage (in cubic meters)	250,000	1,400,000

[1] Negligible.

In 1948, Israel's 4 ships carried a total of 14,000 tons. In 1960, a fleet of 53 ships handled 445,000 tons of cargo.

Elementary school education increased from 108,844 to 600,000 in this period. Arab students now number 42,700; in 1948 only 6,780 were enrolled. And Israel's teachers grew in numbers from 5,964 in 1948, to 22,400 in 1960.

Israel can be justly proud of this fine record.

The early years of Israel's life were not easy ones. She was faced with the dual task of creating a strong government and a stable economy while at the same time being forced to expend money and manpower in combating the opposition of the countries surrounding her who were hostile to the idea of her very presence in their midst. However, the spirit, dedication, and sacrifice of a people who from the beginning of their history have always faced a threat to their survival, never failed and their country took shape and developed.

As a result Israel enters adulthood confident in the achievement and advancement of her youth yet acutely aware that in the future as in the past there are difficulties that must be met and problems that must be solved before she can enjoy complete peace.

We in the United States have special reason to rejoice with Israel in celebrating her birthday. We were the first nation to recognize her independence in 1948 and we have continued to encourage her development and growth. Our faith and support have been justified for today Israel stands as an oasis of democracy in an area of tumult and chaos.

Oregon Leads Nation in Percentage Completion of Federal Interstate Highway System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mrs. NEUBERBER. Mr. President, it is indeed a pleasure to report that my State of Oregon has a greater percentage of its mileage under the Federal Interstate and Defense Highways rated adequate for present traffic and opened to daily traffic than any other State in the Union.

In Oregon, 58 percent of the interstate mileage is rated adequate for present standards and open to daily traffic, while nationally slightly more than 25 percent is now open to traffic, according to the Bureau of Public Roads of the Department of Commerce. Over 425 miles of interstate highways are open to daily use by motorists in Oregon, and another 132.5 miles are under construction, with work yet to come on the remaining 173.5 miles. Oregon also ranks fourth nationally in percentage of Interstate System completed to full interstate standards.

Oregon's lead in Interstate Highway completion has been done without toll roads.

I should like to invite the people of our Nation to come and visit Oregon, and use our modern highways and enjoy our scenic beauty, and our delightful summers. A friendly welcome is extended to all.

With a lead such as Oregon enjoys in its interstate highway system, I would like to pay special tribute to the Oregon State Highway Commission and its staff. Mr. M. K. McIver, of Portland, is the commission's able chairman, and the other members are Messrs. Kenneth N. Fridley, of Wasco, and Glenn L. Jackson, of Medford. Mr. W. C. Williams is the capable State highway engineer, who has done so much of the work and planning which has made possible Oregon's lead.

Mr. President, as I am sure everyone understands, good highways cost money, and the price tag for the interstate system as a whole, is $41 billion, and this figure is expected to increase. The system is financed on a sharing basis, with the Federal Government contributing 92 percent of the costs, and the States 8 percent. The Federal costs for the system will total $37 billion.

A special Federal highway trust fund has been established which is supported by special highway user taxes. Highway legislation, so far enacted, provides for about $25.5 billion of Federal funds. Additional funds are needed to make up the total contribution. This need can be met in several ways, by stretching out the entire program beyond the planned terminal date of 1972, increasing highway user taxes, direct appropriations from taxes, and borrowing, or by taking funds which now go into the general treasury from automotive excises, and applying them to the highway trust fund.

Mr. President, I am strongly opposed to stretching out the completion date of the Federal Interstate System beyond 1972. I believe that highway users should understand that the high taxes on gasoline, and other fuels, make possible our modern highway system.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article by Mr. W. C. "Dutch" Williams, from the April 1961 issue of the Oregon Motorist, in which Oregon's able State highway engineer describes the interstate system and its planning and financing. The Oregon Motorist is the official publication of the Oregon State Motor Association, and its editor is Mr. Sidney A. King. I also ask unanimous consent that a table, showing how the various States stand in the interstate highway program, which appeared in connection with Mr. Williams' article, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(By W. C. Williams)

Oregon's Interstate Highway System has a greater percentage of its mileage rated adequate for present traffic and opened to daily traffic than any other State in the Union, according to a recent U.S. Bureau of Public Roads report. In addition to this, Oregon ranks fourth nationally in the percentage of the system completed to full interstate standards, the report states.

A lead like this in the interstate program is not something that developed overnight, but actually had its beginnings in public and legislative foresight as early as 1950 in providing bonds for the building of modern freeways. When a 1956 act by Congress launched most States into building their first interstate highways, Oregon already had 71 miles of its system constructed to standards that were equal to interstate specifications. This was nearly 10 percent of the total mileage of the interstate system in the State.

PROGRAM WELL UNDERWAY

Due to financing provided by the 1956 act and subsequent highway acts, the end of 1960 saw 219 out of a total of 731 miles completed and found contractors at work on an additional 91 miles. It is anticipated that, during 1961, 48 of these 91 miles will be completed and opened to traffic.

It is estimated that new projects totaling $31,500,000 will be placed under contract this season. This will include work in the Grants Pass-Medford-Ashland areas, from Eugene to the Lane-Douglas County line, in the Portland area, east of The Dalles, between Celilo and Rufus, and between Baker and Huntington.

COMPLETION SET FOR 1972

Financially, Oregon had $21,800,000 in construction costs invested in the system at the time of the 1956 act and had upped this to $105 million at the end of 1960. Estimated costs of contracts to be let this year will raise this figure to $137 million, which, coupled with right-of-way costs of approximately $32 million, will find Oregon with $167 million worth of work completed out of a total of $634 million, which is the estimated cost of completing the entire system in this State.

Funds for interstate highways since 1956 have been shared between the State and Federal Government on a 92 percent Federal and 8 percent State basis. Based on funds being provided by Congress and barring unforeseen events such as strikes or serious cutbacks, the Interstate System should be completed by about 1972.

How States stand (adequate for present time)

State	Status	Percent open to traffic
Oregon	1	58.19
New York	2	54.44
Kansas	3	48.77
Connecticut	4	46.64
Arizona	5	44.30
Massachusetts	6	42.65
Washington	7	41.03
Pennsylvania	8	38.69
Oklahoma	9	38.19
Ohio	10	38.11
North Carolina	11	37.10
New Hampshire	12	36.76
Michigan	13	35.39
North Dakota	14	34.69
Maryland	15	34.01
Missouri	16	33.30
Maine	17	33.21
Wisconsin	18	32.27
Illinois	19	31.02
Iowa	20	30.08
Rhode Island	21	29.30
Texas	22	29.09
New Mexico	23	29.05
New Jersey	24	25.06
California	25	24.19
Colorado	26	24.12
Idaho	27	23.25
West Virginia	28	23.19
Indiana	29	22.10
South Carolina	30	18.55
South Dakota	31	17.09
Georgia	32	15.27
Virginia	33	15.01
Wyoming	34	13.62
Nevada	35	10.52
Kentucky	36	10.20
Hawaii	37	9.56
Minnesota	38	8.89
Delaware	39	8.64
Arkansas	40	8.40
Nebraska	41	8.40
Montana	42	7.85
Florida	43	7.75
Utah	44	7.42
Vermont	45	7.14
Alabama	46	6.81
Mississippi	47	6.37
Louisiana	48	6.12
District of Columbia	49	1.77
Tennessee	50	1.47

Private Peace Corps of the Paderewski Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, several days ago I mentioned the fine work that is already being done by many private organizations in the same area as the much-publicized Peace Corps. I believe that these programs deserve more attention than they have received in the past. They are already in operation, and, by all accounts, the work they are doing is of a high standard. I have already included in the RECORD material on the programs of the Creole Petroleum Co., Literacy village in India, Smith Kline & French Laboratories, and the American Association of Medical Colleges. Another group that has been active in this oversea work is the Paderewski Foundation of New York, which carries on educational and scientific work on four continents.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include an article on the Paderewski Foundation and its peace corps in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR PEACE CORPS

The cultural and educational work of our foundation extended during the Paderewski Centennial Year over four continents. For the first time Africa was included: the Arabic speaking scholar of Harvard University, Julius Szentendrey, was awarded a grant for study at the University of Cairo. East of Suez, Paderewski scholars are spread over a wide area, from the Irani, speaking Marek Antoni Wasilewski of Warsaw at the University of Teheran, to the Javanese speaking George Gomori of Oxford at the Gadjah Mada University of Jogjakarta, Indonesia. Other teachers and students on our foundation's fellowships and scholarships work in India, Burma, and Pakistan. Many of them have already mastered the local languages. Among the Paderewski scholars are citizens and residents of the United States, refugees from communism, and graduates of Polish universities. The last are now receiving special attention in view of the increased possibilty of cultural and educational exchanges with Poland. Several Polish scholars received grants for studies in Western Europe with emphasis on subjects neglected in Poland. Among them are Miss Halina Biedrzycka of Lublin Catholic University at St. Hilda's College, Oxford; Stanislaw Czuma of Cracow University and Miss Diana Pachlewska of Lublin Catholic University at the Sorbonne.

In the United States and Canada the Foundation continues its interest in the promotion of Polish and other Slavic studies, mainly through the University of Montreal. Students from Poland received educational travel grants within the United States to learn more about this country prior to their return home. In the field of music, Miss Camille Budarz of the Juilliard School received a travel grant to participate in the VI International Chopin Contest in Warsaw, and the winner of the V Contest, Mr. Adam Harasiewicz, performed at our Centennial Concert and was awarded our foundation's gold medal and financial grant.

Two new fellowships were already awarded this year. One went to Dr. Maria Dydynska of the University of Warshaw, now engaged in research work in the Department of Physiology, University College, London; the second went to Miss Krystyna Agnieszka Kowalska, also of the University of Warsaw. Miss Kowalska was an honor guest of the Government of India on the occasion of that country's tenth anniversary of independence in 1959, as the best oriental scholar in Poland. She has now been issued the Polish passport, and will soon be on her way to Visva Bharati University near Calcutta to participate in the Rabindranath Tagore Centennial observances.

The amount of $46,651 was spent by our foundation on educational and cultural assistance in 1960, as compared with $31,749.28 in 1959. We hope that this total will again be exceeded this year with the majority of grants for 1961, 1962 distributed in May and June.

Edward Zwolski of Lublin Catholic University wrote us as follows on August 30, 1960: "I am happy to inform you that I have just obtained the degree of doctor 'in Lettere' at the University of Rome after successfully defending my thesis entitled 'Remarks on the Political System of Argos' prepared under the guidance of Prof. M. Guarducci. My grade 110 with commendation is the highest attainable at this university. I take this opportunity to express my most cordial thanks to the Paderewski Foundation whose invaluable assistance enabled me to complete my studies."

Paderewski scholars in 15 countries and on 4 continents are performing a variety of useful functions in terms of their own education and future career, for the benefit of the less developed countries in which they teach and share their experience, and in promoting the idea of peace in freedom which is inseparably connected with every major aspect of our present-day life.

Ignacy Jan Paderewski was known and admired throughout the civilized world. Although born in Poland and particularly respected in the United States, his adopted country, he can never be associated exclusively with one nation. His life was spent in the service of great ideas and, following his inspiring example, the Paderewski Foundation devotes its entire energy and resources to the promotion of international understanding and cooperation.

Locations of Customshouses in the Large Coastal Cities of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the General Services Administration is planning to place a new customshouse for the twin ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach in the downtown Los Angeles Civic Center, 22 miles away from these ports. This proposal seems almost incredible. By way of comparison, here are the locations of the customshouses in the other large coastal cities of the United States:

Baltimore, Md.: Gay, Lombard, and Water Streets, about two blocks away from the basin and the municipal piers—in general vicinity of waterfront.

Boston, Mass.: 2 India Street, difficult to tell where it is located on this street, but India Street only runs a few blocks away from Boston Harbor—very near.

Bridgeport, Conn.: 120 Middle Street, up to two blocks from Pequonnock River, about seven-tenths of a mile from Long Island Sound.

Charleston, S.C.: 200 East Bay Street between Market and Gaillard Streets—on or one block from Cooper River—very near.

Galveston, Tex.: 17th Street and Avenue B, one or two blocks from Galveston Ship Channel—near.

Honolulu, Hawaii: 335 South King Street, two blocks from Honolulu Harbor.

Mobile, Ala.: St. Joseph and St. Louis Streets, four or five blocks—about one-fourth mile—from Mobile River. Blakely Island is between Mobile River and Mobile Bay—2 or 3 miles away, but relatively close.

New Orleans, La.: 423 Canal Street, about five or six blocks from the Mississippi River—pretty close.

New York, N.Y.: Bounded by Whitehall, Bridge, and State Streets, quite close Hudson River—about one-fifth mile—East River—about two blocks—and upper bay—about one-tenth mile—fairly close, but 6 or 8 miles from center of waterfront activity.

Norfolk, Va.: 101 East Main Street, street runs parallel about two blocks from Elizabeth River—Eastern Branch. Not on Chesapeake Bay.

Philadelphia, Pa.: Second and Chestnut Streets, about four blocks away from Delaware River—close to waterfront, but 7 or 8 miles from some centers of waterfront activity.

Portland, Maine: 312 Fore Street, runs parallel about one or two blocks from Portland Harbor.

Portland (Oreg.: 220 Northwest Eighth Avenue, five to eight blocks—less than three-tenths mile—away from Willamette River—downtown, probably 2 or 3 miles.

Providence, R.I.: 24 Weybosset Street; street no more than 3,000 feet from Providence River. If the customhouse is located at Weybosset and Custom House Streets, it is only about one block away.

San Diego, Calif.: State and F Streets, five or six blocks from San Diego Bay—downtown.

San Franciso, Calif.: Washington and Battery Streets, about three-tenths mile from San Francisco Bay—fairly close.

Savannah, Ga.: 1–3 East Bay Street. Bay Street runs parallel to Savannah River, about two to six blocks away—close to river.

Seattle, Wash.: Marion Street, First Avenue, and Madison Street, appears to be right on Elliott Bay, which is off Puget Sound.

Tampa, Fla.: Florida Avenue between Zack and Twiggs Streets, about four blocks from Hillsboro River, no more than about one-half mile from Hillsboro Bay, off Tampa Bay.

Wilmington, N.C.: Princess and Water Streets, on Cape Fear River—very close.

Israel's Birthday

SPEECH
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am thrilled to have the opportunity of joining with my good friend and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER], and with my other colleagues in paying tribute to the brave State of Israel on the occasion of its 13th birthday.

No nation in all the long roll of the years that are recorded in history has accomplished as much and against such odds in the same period of time as has Israel. It has conquered nature itself. It has planted trees to bring back to arid land its fertility. It has developed even the smallest of resources to great potentialities. It has set a pattern to all the countries in the Near East and in Africa, a pattern of what can be done when man is dedicated to his task and makes that which he has meet the objective of his dreams.

Today, we in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States send to the Government and to the people of the brave State of Israel expression of our deepest affection, our sincerest good wishes and our pledge of a never diminishing, but ever increasing support.

I have said that Israel in the brief period of its national sovereignty has brought fertility to arid acres and literally has made the desert bloom. Let me be specific. I have before me some figures that should be known to the American public.

Cotton was first introduced in Israel on a commercial scale only 7 years ago. This followed 2 or 3 years of intense experimentation. Today the cotton crops of Israel amount to over 5,000 tons and the value of the Israel cotton crop is about $4 million annually, and this does not include the cottonseed used by the oil industry. Cotton picking provides jobs for over 10,000 workers during the 2-month picking season.

Another important industrial crop is that of sugar. In Israel the soil was studied and it was treated so that sugar beets might be grown. Today sugar beets are being supplied to two factories with a capacity of 12,000 and 8,000 tons of sugar a year respectively.

Within the last few years the cultivation of peanuts, of tobacco, and of potatoes has grown tremendously. About 6,000 tons of peanuts are exported annually, and tobacco is grown in quality and in quantity sufficient to maintain a healthy and growing cigarette industry.

So I could go on endlessly. Everywhere in Israel there is the will to do, and the record of accomplishment is written in an economy ever growing stronger and in a political stability that never will be shaken.

What has been the contribution of Israel in the development of the Near East and of Africa? When I visited Africa last December I found everywhere reflections of Israel's contribution. In Ethiopia and in other countries there were missions of help supported by Israel, aid given to help these lands to higher plateaus, aid given by Israel from her own slender treasury. Perhaps the finest hotel in Africa, certainly the hotel most gloriously situated and with the best service, is the new hotel at Monrovia, the capital of Liberia. This hotel was built by money from Israel and it is being run today by Israel nationals.

Liberia is the oldest independent nation in Africa. It was settled years ago by American Negroes. Most of its people today are the descendants of the early American settlers or the descendants of African families into which these early Americans had intermarried. Liberia is very close to the hearts of the people of the United States. It has a future second to that of no country in Africa. As a friend and admirer of the brave State of Israel I was thrilled to learn and to see with my own eyes the contribution that Israel has made to the onward march of the Liberia so close to American hearts and American interests.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to close on a spiritual note. I do not know that it makes too much difference what is a man's religion if that religion is his approach to understanding with the infinite. In Israel are lands holy to the Jew, the Christian, and the Moslem. Israel is a Jewish state, but in its respect for the spirit of religion it has given protection and access to the places that mean so much to men and women of varying religions. Israel is not only an inspiration to all nations in a political and an economic sense, but also it is a pattern in the practice of tolerance and the building of a brotherhood of man.

Let us rejoice today that to the world has been given the brave State of Israel, and let us solemnly pledge to ourselves and to each other that never when Israel needs a friend will the United States be found wanting.

All-Federal Transmission System for Colorado River Storage Project Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. CARROLL
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. CARROLL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a letter and an attached resolution in regard to support for an all-Federal transmission system for the delivery of Colorado River storage project power.

There being no objection, the letter and the resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARKANSAS VALLEY G. & T., INC.,
Pueblo, Colo., April 17, 1961.

Senator JOHN A. CARROLL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CARROLL: Enclosed is a copy of a resolution passed at the annual meeting of members of our association in support of the all-Federal transmission system for the delivery of Colorado River storage project power.

We are looking forward to working with you in achieving this objective.

Very truly yours,
ARKANSAS VALLEY G. & T., INC.,
EDWARD GAITHER, *Manager.*

"Whereas the marketing of power from the Colorado River storage project over an all-Federal transmission grid is of the utmost importance to Arkansas Valley G. & T., Inc.; and

"Whereas only a Federal transmission system as recommended by the Department of Interior for the project insures project repayment, including full assistance to participating irrigation projects, delivery of power to preference customers in the defined marketing area at reasonable rates, and the maximum gain from interconnection of

project units and the storage project system with other Federal power systems of the area; and

"Whereas there is a vital need for a continuing program of Federal transmission line construction which will insure adequate capacity in place as project generation becomes available: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That Arkansas Valley G. & T., Inc., urge the Colorado congressional delegation and the Department of the Interior to do all things possible in order to secure adequate appropriations for the construction of an all-Federal transmission system for the delivery of Colorado River storage project power."

Textile Industry and Related Industries

SPEECH
OF
HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, a very serious problem in the State of Georgia and in my district is the gradual strangling of the textile, garment, and apparel industries. In our section, without Federal aid, we have established many small industries which have kept our people from living in a depressed area.

Recently, one of the outstanding activities which has saved the economy of a large segment of people in Wilkes County, Ga., had a blow. This was rendered by the Tariff Commission when it declined to give escape clause relief for domestic plastic rainwear producers who have been overwhelmed with imports from Japan. This industry, started in Washington, Ga., by Mr. Alfred Moses, president of Almar Rainwear Corp., has afforded employment and other opportunities for people who had left agricultural pursuits or who would have left Wilkes County and proceeded to add themselves to already highly populated areas, who would have been dislocated from their home communities and might have caused employment problems elsewhere. Mr. Moses stated that only because of diversification in the total business and by going into more expensive fabrics was his plant able to continue to operate as a successful venture. If the actual volume loss in plastic raincoats to domestic manufacturers brought on by imports were totaled up, the figure would be something fantastic.

During my campaign for Congress last summer I ran across a number of startling facts in respect to the small industries that are now the life blood of my district.

Near Elberton, Ga., in a small community which had always been a prosperous farming community, I visited a small, country, general merchandise store. I asked the owner how things were going and he said that because of soil bank activities, acreage limitations on cotton and other factors reducing farming activities, he had lost some trade but that a sewing plant had been established in the neighborhood and it had been a source of local payrolls from which his business had drawn profit. He said the plant across the road had recently slowed down and offered employment for only about three days in a week. He reached up on the line over the counter and took down a small boy's white knit shirt and he said, "I have this shirt and can sell it for $1." He showed me the label was from a country outside of the United States. He then reached over on the counter and showed me another boy's shirt comparable to the one already demonstrated and he said, "I cannot sell this shirt for less than $1.50 and make the same profit as I do on the first one." Then he stated that, surprisingly enough, the more expensive shirt was made across the road from him. His conclusion was also revealing. He said that the same people who worked on the shirt across the road were no different from other people and when they came in to buy items of clothing or other merchandise they bought the one that cost the least.

There is a similar sewing plant in Taliaferro County, Ga., which heretofore was one of our most prosperous farming counties. With the decline in agricultural output and acreage, this county has lost almost half of its population in the last 10 years. It has only one real industry in its confines and that is a branch of a garment plant that operates some 25 miles away. Because of competition from cheap foreign goods, this plant is also, in its parent office and in its branch in Taliaferro County, operating only part time.

These examples can be multiplied over and over again in the 10th District and are commencing to create a serious employment problem.

We have talked in the Congress recently about assisting depressed areas by granting a Federal subsidy of $300 million. In our efforts to assist the textile industry, we are not asking for any Federal outlay of money but merely for a chance for free enterprise to survive because of competitive methods which Americans cannot afford to meet. The reasons advanced for the ability of foreign-made goods to come on American markets at a cheaper price is the low cost of human labor which goes into the cost of the production of these competitive commodities. I would not advocate the reduction of our high standard of living and our high rate of wages so as to compete with substandard conditions and almost slavery conditions in foreign countries.

Therefore, it seems to me that the only remedy is for the Government of the United States, in its executive and legislative branches, to take a hand and provide some regulation in a field which has always been acknowledged as a field in which the Government should operate. We must act before it is too late and thousands of people are put out of work or must move for job opportunities. This is better than to plead later for a subsidy as a depressed area.

Nineteen Hundred and Sixty-one Marks the 150th Anniversary of the Establishment of the Williamsburg, Pa., Post Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, "The post office, with its everlasting energy, I look upon as a first measure of civilization."—Ralph Waldo Emerson.

The U.S. post office at Williamsburg, Blair County, Pa., will celebrate its 150th birthday this fall having been established in 1811 while the community was part of Huntingdon County. In 1846 Williamsburg became a part of Blair County when the latter was formed from sections of Huntingdon and Bedford Counties. The Williamsburg Post Office is the second oldest in Blair County, the Hollidaysburg Post Office having been established in 1805.

Since the establishment of the Williamsburg Post Office in 1811 the following postmasters held office:

POSTMASTERS AND DATES OF APPOINTMENT

William W. Harris, October 1, 1811.[1]
William Spear, February 7, 1814.
Samuel Roger, March 28, 1821.
George Davis, March 31, 1825.
Adolphus Patterson, December 23, 1826.
Philip Rees, June 1, 1841.
Joseph S. P. Harris, May 12, 1843.
Philip Rees, February 9, 1844.
Alexander W. Kenny, March 25, 1845.
John Gorley, June 10, 1846.
Joseph Baldridge, April 11, 1849.
William G. Murray, May 13, 1853.
James I. Fay, April 16, 1861.
William J. Spencer, May 4, 1861.
William A. Fluke, August 21, 1866.
Albert J. Weaver, May 4, 1869.
Alexander Rutledge, January 18, 1871.
Joseph F. Rutledge, August 7, 1877.
James Roller, May 17, 1880.
William M. Eichholtz, September 8, 1885.
Alexander Rutledge, July 12, 1889.
Mrs. Sarah Rutledge, December 15, 1891.
Charles A. Patterson, January 20, 1896.
Levi Sparr, October 29, 1900.
Samuel Sparr, January 16, 1906.
T. Dean Ross, July 23, 1909.
J. R. Detwiler, October 30, 1913.
James T. Patterson, June 21, 1922.
James R. Detwiler, March 5, 1934.
James K. Morrison, January 19, 1937.
John G. Butler, June 30, 1956.
Grace E. Miller, acting, June 30, 1959.
Ruth D. Grassmyer, acting, January 17, 1961.

Mr. Speaker, it has often been said that we take for granted many of the rights and privileges enjoyed under the American heritage of liberty and freedom. In this category may be included our seeming lack of appreciation for the finest postal service in the world. As a matter of fact very often it requires a

[1] Date of first return from the Deputy Postmaster to the Postmaster General.

Source: National Archives and Records Service, Washington, D.C.

special occasion such as the dedication of a new post office or the celebration of an anniversary such as is being observed this year by the Williamsburg, Pa., Post Office, to remind us in a telling manner of the phenomenal growth of the U.S. postal service and the fidelity and efficiency displayed by over 500,000 dedicated postal employees.

The sesquicentennial celebration of the Williamsburg, Pa., Post Office affords the opportunity of refreshing our memories by recalling the glorious history of progress achieved by the U.S. postal service which is older than our Nation.

While the original purpose of the postal system was to provide "the best means of establishing posts for conveying letters and intelligence through this continent"—Journals of the Continental Congress, May 27, 1775—the Post Office Department was ultimately enlarged to include several services. Among the more important developments of the postal service, in the order of their establishment or authorization, were: 1775, Benjamin Franklin, first Postmaster General; 1780, Samuel Osgood, first Postmaster General under the Constitution; 1806, first national post road started; 1813, navigable waters declared post roads; 1819, mail carried by steamship; 1938, railroads declared post roads; 1847, adhesive postage stamps introduced; 1855, registered mail; 1858, first street letterboxes; 1861, small parcels of merchandise mailed; 1864, railway mail service; 1864, money-order service; 1867, international money-order service; 1873, postal cards introduced; 1885, special delivery service; 1896, rural free delivery service; 1911, postal-savings system; 1913, parcel post including insurance and collect-on-delivery services; 1918, Government airmail service; 1924, day and night transcontinental airmail service; 1941, highway post offices; 1943, postal delivery zone system; 1945, revised postal note service; and 1955, certified mail.

Benjamin Franklin was appointed postmaster at Philadelphia in 1737 and Co-Deputy Postmaster General of the British Colonies in North America in 1753, and on July 26, 1775, became the first Postmaster General under the Continental Congress at an annual salary of $1,000. He is credited with laying the foundation for the development of the present U.S. postal system.

On September 26, 1789, when Samuel Osgood was appointed the first Postmaster General under the Constitution there were only 75 post offices and the revenues of the Department were around $38,000 annually. From that small beginning the postal service has developed into what is now the largest business in the world. During the fiscal year 1959, according to the 1960–61 edition of the U.S. Government Organization Manual, "the postal service employed more than 500,000 workers and has gross receipts in excess of $3 billion. There are 35,750 post offices in the United States."

In reviewing the early history of the postal service in Pennsylvania it is recorded that during the colonial era, postal service, owing to inadequate transportation facilities, developed slowly. A limited postal service was established by William Penn in 1683 between Philadelphia, Chester, Newcastle, and Trenton. The rates varied from 5 to 9 pence according to the distance, the time of arrival and departure of the mail was posted on the meeting house door. In 1693 the assembly passed a law establishing in Philadelphia a general post office for transmitting letters and packages to all the Colonies, to Europe, and to the West Indies. Andrew Hamilton, who organized the postal service, was authorized to receive postage on all letters conveyed by post. The rates for letters between Philadelphia and New York were 4½ pence; between Philadelphia and Hartford, 9 pence; between Philadelphia and Providence 12 pence; and between Philadelphia and Boston 15 pence. To any place within 80 miles of Philadelphia the rate was 4½ pence. No charge was made for receiving and sending public letters, and the post paid no toll passing over ferries within the province. The rate for all foreign letters was 2 pence. The Moravians established a weekly post between Bethlehem and Philadelphia in 1742. Stage coaches carried mail after the stage lines were established, but previous to that time mail was carried by horseback. A post route was begun between Philadelphia and Boston in 1772. In 1775 the Continental Congress established at Philadelphia a general post office for the Colonies.

In the summer of 1804, 1 year before the establishment of the Hollidaysburg, Pa., post office and 7 years before Williamsburg acquired its post office, the first stage service across the Allegheny Mountains in Pennsylvania was established with Pittsburgh as its terminus. The line was subsidized by the Federal Government, and by December of this same year, the stages ran twice a week, the trip from Philadelphia to Pittsburgh taking from 6 to 7 days.

The Postmaster General wrote to the citizens along the line, that he was "fully disposed to give every reasonable aid to the extension of the line of stages to and beyond Pittsburgh." No other stage lines to, or in, western Pennsylvania, appear to have been established until after 1812.

More than 100 years ago, letters were delivered by carriers in the cities and the larger towns, and postage was collected when delivery was made. Letter carriers, employed at such post offices as the Postmaster General directed, received 2 cents from each person to whom the letter was addressed and delivered. The present free city delivery service was established by act of Congress on January 3, 1887.

The introduction of rural delivery service in 1896, was one of the outstanding improvements in the postal system affecting the farmer and rural residents and those persons residing outside the established delivery service area. In 1945 there were 17 rural routes in Blair County, Pa., Williamsburg having 2 of the 17 routes.

When Blair County was established in 1846, there were 13 post offices within the borders of the county, Williamsburg, established in 1811, being among the lucky 13.

As we survey the constant growth of the U.S. postal system we are reminded that its progress is a fulfillment of Benjamin Franklin's idea that a postal service would unify the New World and aid in its growth.

The history of the U.S. postal service is replete with the names of famous Americans. The list includes George Washington, who personally surveyed many of the original post roads; Paul Revere was one of the first post riders; while William Cody, known as Buffalo Bill, was one of the early riders for the pony express, which began operation April 3, 1860, between St. Joseph, Mo., and Sacramento, Calif., in an effort to give faster mail transportation to and from the Pacific coast. These pony express riders used a total of 75 ponies and that first mail took 10½ days. The fastest time recorded by the pony express was 7 days and 17 hours to deliver the inaugural address of President Lincoln in 1861. The pony express was operated by a private company and not the Federal Government. It charged $5 for each half ounce letter but later reduced the rate to a dollar. In October 1861 the pony express went out of existence, closing one of the most colorful chapters in American history. Truly the pony express riders faced dangerous yet exciting experiences in their role as pioneers in today's faster communications system.

Although the speed of transporting mail has increased tremendously since the days of the post riders many of our smaller post offices still use manual sorting and distributing methods which are virtually identical to those used in Benjamin Franklin's time.

The many new post offices and improved handling facilities which have been added to our postal system under the program inaugurated by former Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield exemplify the way the Post Office Department is maintaining the fine traditions founded by Benjamin Franklin.

The official motto for the Post Office, "Neither snow, nor rain, nor heat, nor gloom of night, stays these couriers from swift completion of their appointed rounds" is still the creed of the modern mail service and is proof that the ideals of Benjamin Franklin have been emulated by succeeding postal administrators. The official motto is paraphrased by over 500,000 dedicated postal employees in the well-known slogan—"the mail must go through."

An oversea soldier during World War II paid tribute to the efficiency of the U.S. postal system when he penned these lines—

I can't say where I'll be next, but there's one thing I know, no matter where they send me, I'll be greeted by "Hello." Like a magic carpet it follows me on land or sea. The bugle will sound mail call and they'll pass it on to me.

There have been countless words of praise for the over half million persons comprising the dedicated army of postal employees. Even the often maligned

post office pen and inkwell have been defended by none other than Christopher Morley in his ode:

TO A POST OFFICE INKWELL

How many humble hearts have dipped in you and scrawled their manuscript.
Have shared their secrets, told their cares, their curious and quaint affairs.
Your pools of ink, your scratchy pen, have moved the lives of unborn men.
And watched young people, breathing hard, put heaven on a postal card.

In conclusion the sesquicentennial celebration of the Williamsburg, Pa. Post Office serves to focus attention on the following inscriptions for East and West Parrlions, Post Office, Washington, D.C., composed by Charles Norton Eliot and edited by Woodrow Wilson since the inscriptions summarize in capsule form the extensive role of the U.S. Postal System in domestic and international affairs:

Messenger of sympathy and love
Servant of parted friends
Consoler of the lonely
Bond of the scattered family
Enlarger of the common life
Carrier of news and knowledge
Instrument of trade and industry
Promoter of mutual acquaintance
Of peace and of good will
Among men and Nations.

American Textile Industry

SPEECH
OF
HON. ROY A. TAYLOR
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make known my interests in the American textile industry and indicate my support of its fight to overcome a dangerous and burdening import situation.

I am reliably advised that cotton-cloth imports in the United States in 1960 were more than twice those in 1959. This is alarming, particularly when it appears that our domestic textile output is being so curtailed by import influences as to make it now appear that filling our military needs in an emergency situation would be extremely difficult.

I have received numerous letters and telegrams in recent weeks from genuinely concerned textile and garment manufacturers in my congressional district urging me to assist in placing strong restrictions on textile imports.

I have met and discussed this crisis with other Members of the House of Representatives, and we are in agreement that action in some form is necessary and should be undertaken at the earliest possible date.

I am sincerely convinced that textile imports have created an intolerable competitive situation for our own American producers. There has been no abatement in the sharply rising levels of textile imports from low-wage foreign manufacturers. The domestic result, as we are all now seeing, has been widespread textile shutdowns and layoffs.

This trend must be halted, and I have assured my constituents and other Members of the North Carolina congressional delegation of my anxiousness to help remedy this unfortunate situation.

The trend in the textile industry has been vividly unmistakable. Not only is the import level at a record high, but the rate of increase is such that, if it continues unchecked, foreign production will ultimately destroy our domestic industry.

No one can honestly blame foreign manufacturers for attempting to corner as much of the American market as possible. They are businessmen, too, and are anxious to sell the articles they manufacture.

However, the situation in the textile realm is now close to being out of hand. The Japanese industry is pushing for larger quotas of textile exports to the United States to keep Hong Kong producers from overtaking them in the American market.

Our textile workers deem it most unfair to suffer unemployment and shorter hours while their foreign competitors are supplying so much of the American market.

I therefore wish to make clear my desire to see the import balance improved substantially and rapidly. The solution, I believe, is the establishment of import quotas by country and by category.

Commission to Russia To Verify Claim of Man in Space Is Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, several days ago, I read in the press and subsequently observed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a lengthy letter from my colleague, Hon. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, of the 11th District of Illinois. Since that time, I have received the original letter through the mail from Mr. PUCINSKI. It urges the Committee on Science and Astronautics to call upon the President to send a commission to Russia to verify the claim of sending a man in orbit around the earth and returning him safely.

Mr. Speaker, I answered my colleague promptly. Under leave to extend my remarks, I hereby include my reply for the attention of the Members of Congress:

APRIL 18, 1961.

Hon. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: I have read in the press that you have written a letter to me referring to the recent claims of the Russians that they have placed a man in orbit around the earth and have returned him safely to Soviet territory, as being a hoax. I have not yet received the letter. Pending its receipt, however, I invite you to give to me any and all information which you personally may have in reference to this alleged successful space flight, or to make accessible to the committee any information which you may have. I do not think, however, that we should rely on getting the cooperation of the Russians in this matter since they have denied us this cooperation in the past.

I do not know if the claims of the Soviets to have placed a man in orbit around the earth and to have returned him safely are true or are a hoax. It has been the judgment of many competent persons, however, that the Soviets have had this capability for some time. This ability has not been seriously questioned. Whether or not the alleged event was actually accomplished by the Soviets may be debatable. The important thing is that the Soviets have this capability and we do not have it.

Accordingly, I believe, therefore, that I should proceed on the assumption that the Russians' claim is correct, and try to fashion legislation which will place our country in the same position in the development of the art (or perhaps, superior, to it) as is Russia. Not to do so would tend to continue this country as other than a leader in space and could, in time, seriously jeopardize the security of this Nation.

Again, I suggest you give the Committee on Science and Astronautics, at the earliest possible instance, all available information you have, or have access to.

Sincerely yours,

OVERTON BROOKS,
Chairman.

Eastern Orthodox Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, on February 16, I introduced, with Senators KEATING and PELL, Senate Resolution 88, which would grant Eastern Orthodoxy recognition as a major faith in the United States. I would like to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I recently received from Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky, chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., in support of such recognition.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, INC.,
New York, N.Y., March 1, 1961.

The Honorable CLIFFORD P. CASE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: It was with great delight and satisfaction that we read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 16 your sponsorship of Senate Resolution 88, which calls for the designatiton of the Eastern Orthodox Church as a major faith in the United States. We take this opportunity to express to you and also to your cosponsors, Senators KEATING, of New York, and PELL, of Rhode Island, our heartiest appreciation and thanks for taking the initiative in this important and long overdue matter.

The membership of this committee is heavily represented by Americans of the Eastern Orthodox faith. Many of them who were born in Ukraine enjoy the freedom of practicing this faith here, while their counterparts in Ukraine have suffered the genocide of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church

which Khrushchev has perpetuated to this day. For our members of the Orthodox faith your resolution cannot but sharpen the contrast of religious freedom and recognition that exists between our Nation and Khrushchev's totalitarian Russian Empire.

This committee fully supports Senate Resolution 88 and endorses without qualification the essential reasons and points of explanation which you have offered in behalf of the passage of this resolution. We shall be happy, indeed, to lend our services in any way to further its prompt passage.

With warmest personal regards and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,
Georgetown University.

Notre Dame Club Names J. L. Rigali Man of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, it is with pride that the Italo-American community of metropolitan Chicago learned that one of its most distinguished citizens, Joseph L. Rigali, is being honored tonight by the Notre Dame Club of Chicago, as the Man of the Year. This most coveted award could not have been given to a more celebrated Chicagoan as alumnus of the university. Mr. Rigali represents one of the earliest pioneer families of the Chicago area. As an architect in the ecclesiastical adornments of art, both in plaster and stone—his work is expert and beautiful. His frescoes, arches, and pillared effects adorn hundreds of churches throughout the Nation. The sculpturing of statues, basins, religious pictures, and other objects, represent the finest art work in this field. The Rigali family, for generations, are renowned in their talents and masterful accomplishments in church architecture. They excel, also, in related fields of artistic objects and adornments.

We, the Congressmen of the Illinois delegation, congratulate our fellow Illinoisan, Joseph L. Rigali, and his family, in receiving this high award, and compliment the alumni of the Notre Dame Club of Chicago in his selection.

The Chicago Sun-Times, on Monday, April 24, noticed the event, as follows:

NOTRE DAME CLUB NAMES J. L. RIGALI MAN OF THE YEAR

Joseph L. Rigali of 120 Washington, Oak Park, has been named Man of the Year by the Notre Dame Club of Chicago.

He will receive the award at universal Notre Dame night Monday at the Ambassador West Hotel.

A 1926 architecture school graduate, Rigali played varsity end under Knute Rockne in the era of the Four Horsemen.

He is president of Daprato Studios, a church furnishings business at 766 West Adams.

He is a member of an all-Notre Dame family. His brother and three sons were graduated from the university and a fourth son is now a student.

Interdependence Key to Mutual Welfare of Canada and the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall discusses the necessity for continued harmonious relations between the United States and Canada in an article appearing in the spring 1961 issue of Inco, published by the International Nickel Co., Inc. Secretary Udall stresses the interdependence of the two countries in the field of raw material mineral resources. He urges close cooperation in resource development and elimination of trade barriers between the two countries.

I commend the Secretary for his article, and the International Nickel Co. for its publication of the Secretary's views. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Interdependence Key to Mutual Welfare of Canada and the United States," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERDEPENDENCE KEY TO MUTUAL WELFARE OF CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES

(By Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior)

During the past several years there has been, on both sides of the border, a welcomed upsurge of concern with United States-Canadian relations. This reflects both some genuine problems and some misunderstandings. Even more important, however, it is an encouraging recognition that our complex interdependence is no longer being taken for granted.

In the United States, this recognition owes a great deal to the historic mission to Canada undertaken by Representatives Brooks Hays and Frank Coffin in 1957. This report of my colleagues made a deep impression in Congress, as well as in the executive branch of our Government.

In the succeeding years some notable steps have been taken. A joint group was formed of Canadian parliamentarians and U.S. Members of Congress, which meets periodically to discuss matters of common interest. A permanent Subcommittee on Canada has been established in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and two joint committees composed of top United States and Canadian officials in the executive branch, one dealing with economic affairs and one with defense, now hold regular consultations.

In addition, a new private organization, the Canadian-American Committee, has been formed by business groups of both countries and is contributing an important series of research studies on economic issues. In these and in other ways, Canadians and Americans are evolving out of shared experience the institutions and traditions of a special kind of community.

Thus, the revolution in military technology has confronted us with the common threat of transpolar war. The cold war has challenged our common cultural and political heritage. As a result, our national security programs are more closely linked than ever before in a system of continental defense. From another aspect, the development of regional markets in Europe, and the prospect of other such regional groupings elsewhere have given new importance to our already strong economic ties. It is clear that United States and Canadian economic interdependence must continue to grow The future holds a prospect of continuing and expanding benefits to both countries if we are wise in fostering the growth of our unique community of interests.

The magnitude of this community, in economic terms, is measured in some familiar figures. The United States and Canada are each other's best trade customers. Canada takes 23.6 percent of all U.S. exports and, in turn, sells 61.4 percent of its exports to this country. In 1959, Canadians purchased almost $4 billion (U.S. currency) worth of goods of all kinds from the United States, while U.S. imports totaled about $2.9 billion (Canadian currency) from our northern neighbor.

Underlying the pattern of trade and investment is an important reality—the practical and natural factors that make the economies of the two countries complementary. Anyone who works, as I do, in the area of natural resources, must be particularly aware of these factors. They have been impressively documented in a recent study by the Canadian-American Committee on the Future of Industrial Raw Materials in North America.

By 1980, according to this study, United States and Canadian requirements for raw materials will double. Of 28 key industrial materials, the United States will be deficient in 22, Canada in 8. However, if the resources of the two countries are available to each other—as they naturally and practically should be—the deficits of each country could be reduced substantially.

For both the United States and Canada, pooling of resources in which one or the other is deficient would substantially reduce dependence on other sources of supply, a factor of critical importance to our common national security. Thus Canada can provide the bulk of vital U.S. nickel requirements, and important quantities of lumber and wood products, for example, while herself becoming a valuable customer for American coal and phosphate. Such facts, as the committee pointed out, emphasize "that underlying economic forces are likely to be working powerfully in the direction of greater economic interdependence within North America." They document the assertion by the United States-Canadian Interparliamentary Group of the "intimate and important relations between United States and Canadian production and markets for such commodities as lead and zinc, aluminum, copper, nickel, and uranium."

However important these relations are, and however great their benefits, they will not come automatically and they cannot be taken for granted. Our mutual welfare depends on a spirit of reciprocity and flexibility in adapting to changing circumstances. Generally, this means we must continue to build the institutions within which negotiations and adjustments can take place—institutions like the parliamentary and executive joint groups now functioning, and the countless private relationships on which the substance of our interdependence is founded.

In the area of my own special concern, it is essential that our two countries maintain the closest cooperation in resource development and use. United States and Canadian interests are not always identical. Yet the natural logic of interdependence requires continual recognition of the compelling factors that dictate cooperation.

The St. Lawrence Seaway and the planned joint development of the Columbia River Basin are dramatic examples of such cooperation. It must extend likewise to elimi-

nation of needless tariffs and other trade barriers, to resource planning and development, and to the many other areas in which the future benefits of United States-Canadian cooperation depend.

House Resolution 211, Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee, pages 3286 to 3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel duty-bound to disclose the thoughts and feeling of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I request that the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 be printed in the Appendix of today's RECORD.

POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, INC.,
WISCONSIN STATE CHAPTER,
Milwaukee, Wis., April 11, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: The Wisconsin Chapter of the Polish American Congress, representing a large segment of people of Polish descent living in Wisconsin, herewith wishes to congratulate you on your bold and farsighted move in introducing the resolution calling for the establishment of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. Needless to say, such a committee is long over due. One of the greatest problems confronting our Nation today is the Soviet Union, a prison house of many nations and peoples. These nations, ever eager and wanting to escape Soviet Russian slavery and despotism, constitute perennial weaknesses of the Soviet Union.

A Committee on the Captive Nations would serve as a reservoir of information and data on the various enslaved nations in the U.S.S.R., which information could be made available to the U.S. Government and its various agencies. Its main function, however, would be to inform the American people and the world at large on the state of affairs behind the Iron Curtain and assist the Government in formulating its policies with respect to the captive nations.

We are writing our Congressman CLEMENT ZABLOCKI asking him to support your resolution.

Respectfully yours,
EDMUND BANASIKOWSKI,
Chairman.
ROMAN KAMINSKI,
Chairman of Committee for Political Affairs.

ENGLEWOOD, N.J., *April 6, 1961.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: It has come to my attention that you have introduced a resolution creating a Special Committee on Captive Nations, including those within the Soviet Union itself. In my studies of Russian history, I have often wondered why more use was not made in our cold war and propaganda effort of the facts of the captive nations which are part of the Soviet Union. It seems to me that this area of historical fact, along with the Eastern European satellites, provides an opportunity for the United States to take some initiative in winning the cold war.

I would like to express my support for this measure as a constructive step in our struggle with communism.

Very truly yours,
CHARLES O. ROSSOTTI.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE
OF AMERICA, INC.,
New York, N.Y., April 12, 1961.

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
U.S. Congressman,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: On behalf of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, a nationwide American patriotic organization representing over 2 million American citizens of Ukrainian descent and background, we wish to extend to you our heartiest congratulations for the all-important and timely resolution which you introduced in the House of Representatives on March 8, 1961. Your efforts to establish in the House of Representatives a permanent Committee on Captive Nations has met with the unqualified approval and support of all our membership throughout the United States. The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, since its establishment in 1940, has been a stanch supporter of all such measures of our Congress and our Government which would tend to strengthen the hope and resistance of the enslaved and captive nations behind the Iron Curtain, and thus weaken the force and drive of Communist Russia for world conquest.

It is our considered opinion that your resolution is based on a rational and proper study of the conditions in the U.S.S.R., and conclusively indicates a proper approach to the problem of the Soviet Union, a prison house of many subjugated nations. Such a Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives would be permanently charged with the research and study of the problem of Soviet Russian colonialism and imperialism, and would be a veritable reservoir of unbiased data and information on the enslaved nations in the Soviet Russian prison house of nations. Such a committee would undoubtedly perform a unique task for the benefit of our Government and the free world at large.

We recall with regret that during the session of the XVth General Assembly of the United Nations last fall, our representatives missed many opportunities for tackling the problem of the captive nations held in slavery by Communist Russia, which could be attributed to the fact that our Government was not fully apprised of the situation behind the Iron Curtain. We are witnessing Communist Russia, the greatest colonial power in the world today, successfully hoodwinking the peoples of Africa and Asia by pursuing a spurious liberation policy. For that purpose the Russian Communists have organized the so-called Freedom University in Moscow, where they train hundreds of selected students from Africa, Asia, and Latin America in the art of sabotage, espionage, and Communist penetration.

The United States of America still remains the only hope of the enslaved nations and a true citadel of freedom, with adequate resources which enable it to establish such a committee. Your well-defined purpose and farsighted objective in having such a committee in the House of Representatives underscores a realistic approach to the problem of the Soviet Union. It gives assurance to the American people and to the peoples enslaved by Communist Russia that the United States is sincerely concerned about the captive nations, and the establishment of the Captive Nations Committee in our Congress would be undeniable proof that our desire to help the captive nations is not limited to verbal declarations only, but that we are doing something concrete to bring the liberation of our friends and allies behind the Iron Curtain a reality.

It is true that the Communist would violently denounce such a committee and would accuse you and the entire U.S. Congress of preparing an "aggressive war" against the U.S.S.R. This they are doing in the matter of the Taras Shevchenko statue bill, which was passed by the Congress last year. But the millions of ensalved Ukrainians are gratified and happy over the fact that the United States has recognized their greatest national poet and advocate of the freedom and independence of Ukraine. The same reaction will undoubtedly result from your resolution, and you could expect to be attacked and slandered by Moscow, but the millions of captive people will be eternally grateful for your farsighted and provident measure.

The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America which has 115 branches and member organizations in 38 States of the Union, pledges its full support to your noble initiative in the firm belief that such a Committee on Captive Nations would serve the best interests of the United States of America and the cause of universal freedom.

Respectfully yours,
MATTHEW STACHIW,
Secretary.
IGNATIUS BILLINSKY,
Secretary.

BOSTON, MASS., *April 8, 1961.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
U.S. House of Representatives,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Recently it came to my attention that you're planning to sponsor a bill for the establishment of a permanent committee of the House dealing with the problems of the captive nations.

Such a proposal I congratulate you for, as the problems of the captive nations must be brought to the attention of all Americans.

Trusting I may have the pleasure of hearing from you I remain,

Very truly yours,
SAMUEL RYDER.

JACKSON, MISS., *March 22, 1961.*
Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
U.S. Congress, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FLOOD: I am exercising my privilege of writing you with regard to the resolution which you recently submitted advocating the establishment in the House of Representatives of a special committee on the Captive Nations. I first became aware of the plight of these nations following the passage of the Captive Nations Week resolution in 1959. The more I contemplated this idea the more certain I became that the exposition of the truths and facts pertaining to the enslaved condition of these peoples was definitely a step in the right direction.

The sooner the citizens of our Nation are brought to realize the importance of these captive nations in forestalling a hot war and advancing the cause of world freedom the closer this country will be to victory in our cold war with Russia. It is a definite step toward the safeguarding of our liberty that we undertake a tireless study into the prevailing conditions in all the captive nations for the purpose of developing new ideas and approaches for securing victory in the cold war.

I have been very much pleased with the reactions and enthusiasm of my fellow workers and friends who I have consulted about their feelings regarding the captive nations. They are all very much in favor of bringing the facts concerning these countries before the Nation and the world. I think the great spirit shown during the observance of Captive Nations Week this past year and the two proclamations made by President Eisenhower are a valuable indication of the wholehearted support such a committee as you have proposed would receive. I sincerely hope President Kennedy will further the progress of this movement by making a proclamation this year in favor of Captive Nations Week.

I am writing another letter at this same time to Representative JOHN BELL WILLIAMS who represents me in this Fourth District in Mississippi. I hope that he will cooperate with you to the fullest in seeing this resolution through Congress and the establishment of the special committee on the Captive Nations as an integral part of the House of Representatives.

Wishing you deepest personal regards and the very greatest success, I am,

Sincerely,

JOE Y. DEHMER, JR.

BLOOMFIELD, CONN.,
March 20, 1961.

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
U.S. House of Representatives,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: It was with a great interest and a sense of gratitude that I read about your resolution of March 8, 1961, on the establishment of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations.

Please allow me to commend you on this stand for only concrete actions like yours offer reasons for hope. So far our policy toward the Soviet Union was analogous to a police department negotiating with and attempting to talk bandits into a better behavior.

To solicit more support for your resolution I am sending a copy of this to Senator THOMAS J. DODD.

Very truly yours,

JOHN CHERNYHA.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *April 8, 1961.*
Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: On behalf of the Hungarian Veterans' Fraternal Association, Milwaukee, Wis., group, I earnestly thank you for introducing your resolution in the House of Representatives for the establishment of a special permanent Committee on the Captive Nations in the Congress. Your resolution, if enacted, would at last prove that the Congress has some interest in the fate of the captive nations, and not only in their Moscow-controlled puppet governments.

The Captive Nations Committee would greatly benefit the legislative and administrative bodies of the United States in providing accurate and readily accessible information in all related matters. It would benefit the whole Nation, too, by exposing the true nature of communism—both highly needed and desirable activities.

As the president of the Milwaukee group of the Hungarian Veterans' Fraternal Association, I thank you again for introducing your resolution.

Very truly yours,

ZOLTAN AGHY,
President, Hungarian Veterans' Fraternal Association, Milwaukee Group.

HACKENSACK, N.J., *April 4, 1961.*
The Honorable DANIEL FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I would like to give my wholehearted approval for your House Resolution 211 and the subsequent establishment of the Special Committee for Captive Nations.

I think that it is time that the American people rally to the cause of the subjugated nations and I see that your bill is the first giant step in the right direction.

I sincerely hope that it will pass through Congress.

Very truly yours,

J. C. DIETSCHE.

THE MOUNT HOLYOKE NEWS,
South Hadley, Mass., April 8, 1961.
Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: I have read about the resolution to establish a special Committee on Captive Nations. I would like to express my support for this measure as a step toward improving our efforts in an area that has often been neglected, but one which should be exploited to the fullest in the cold war.

Very truly yours,

BARBARA JILL MARGULIES,
Editor.

MAYFIELD, PA., *April 9, 1961.*
The Honorable DANIEL FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have found out that you are proposing a bill to establish a committee to aid the captive nations.

I would like to say that I am in full favor of this bill and sincerely hope that it will go into effect, for I have relations in one of the subjugated nations, namely Poland, and I know that they need the help of the United States before Russian domination takes the country over completely. It is therefore necessary that this Committee for Captive Nations becomes an actuality.

Yours very truly,

MRS. WALTER KONISH.

Congressman Harry Sheppard Is Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the allocation of defense contracts our respected colleague from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] has a theory they should be placed on the basis of ability of the contractor to do the best job with the least cost. In commending him for this commonsense attitude the Long Beach Independent-Press-Telegram recently editorialized as follows:

REPRESENTATIVE SHEPPARD'S REFRESHING VIEW ON MILITARY CONTRACTS

New York politicians recently declared war on California defense manufacturers and pledged an all-out effort to channel more defense contracts into New York's depressed areas.

It is refreshing to hear the comment of Congressman HARRY R. SHEPPARD, of California, on the same subject. Representative SHEPPARD is chairman of the Armed Services Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee.

Although as sympathetic as anybody else with the problems of depressed areas, Congressman SHEPPARD stated that he thinks those areas should get relief, but that it should be handled as relief and plainly labeled as such. It should not be done at the possible sacrifice of efficient defense production.

Military productions must be allotted, not primarily on the basis of economic need in any particular area, he said, but on the basis of ability to do the most efficient job possible at the lowest cost to the public.

Naturally, if need and ability happen to coincide in a particular area, that area should get prime consideration for defense contracts.

However, the purpose of military production is not to relieve depressions or recessions, but to protect the national security.

Let's place the contracts where they can be filled swiftly and efficiently—in those areas that have the skilled manpower, the equipment, and the resources necessary to deliver the goods.

Congressman SHEPPARD is right. This is not a fit subject for regional squabbling. It is essentially a question of national survival.

The 13th Anniversary of the State of Israel

SPEECH
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my distinguished colleagues in commemorating the 13th anniversary of the State of Israel.

The birth of the State of Israel constituted the fulfillment of the aspirations of persons of Jewish faith and ancestry all over the world. They have dreamed of creating a state which would stand as a beacon of democracy, peace, and progress in an area of the world historically beset by strife and turmoil. In this sense, the establishment of the State of Israel marked the beginning of a new epoch in the history of the Middle East, the cradle of the spiritual heritage of the western civilization.

As we congratulate the State of Israel upon its 13th anniversary, we are mindful of the grave responsibilities and obligations which that country has assumed with its birth. By opening its doors to persons of Jewish faith and an-

cestry, by working hard with its limited resources and help provided by friends abroad, the State of Israel has achieved considerable material progress, and has provided the opportunity for a new life to many, many persons.

But in addition to converting the desert into a garden, the State of Israel has a larger responsibility to mankind itself—the responsibility to promote peace and amity in the Middle East, and to provide a living example of the vitality and endurance of free institutions. Herein lies its test and potentially its greatest contribution to the enlargement of the area of freedom and peace in our troubled world.

As we extend our best wishes to the State of Israel upon this important anniversary, we also wish to express our strong hope that the future may witness the resolution of the complex problems and attitudes which still divide the peoples of the Middle East, so that peace, progress, and freedom may continue to advance in that strategic and vital area of the world.

The American Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I believe the Members of the House of Representatives would be interested in an event I witnessed this past weekend, an event which demonstrated to me that Americanism, the free enterprise system and individual initiative are still very much alive in our country.

Stevens Point, Wis., is a city of 18,000 in the center of my congressional district and, incidentally, in the center of my State. One of the major business firms in Stevens Point is the Copps Co., a grocery wholesaler that sells to 70 retail grocery stores in the surrounding area who are members of the Independent Grocers' Alliance.

Several years ago the Copps Co. had severe growing pains. It had used all available space in its 50-year-old warehouse and office building in the center of the city. Financing a new and larger building offered many problems. The grocery business operates on a slender margin of profit, as you know. The company's financial needs of approximately three-quarters of a million dollars were too large for local bankers to meet, too small to interest the big lending institutions.

The Copps Co., led by President Gordon F. Copps and Executive Vice President Donald W. Copps, devised an imaginative and heartwarming way to raise the necessary capital. They offered long-term debentures, 10 years and 17 years, to their employees and families and even close friends. The debentures were attractive, since they paid 7 percent interest.

Within a few weeks, hundreds of men and women—very few of whom had ever bought a common stock or bond before—invested in the Copps Co. The two debenture offerings, totaling $500,000, were quickly subscribed.

And then an even more remarkable thing happened. The 70 customers of this grocery wholesaling firm, the retail food stores in 14 central and northern Wisconsin counties, heard about the debenture offers and asked if they could take part too.

Another offering was made, this time for $350,000. And it was subscribed within a very short time.

So this past weekend, the Copps Co. dedicated its new warehouse and held a grand opening for the general public, its employees and its customers.

Thousands of men, women and children visited this very modern food supply depot. First, they wanted to see the miracle of food distribution in action, because it is an exciting operation to watch. Second, they wanted to see what they had helped build—a warehouse and office that cost $650,000 to erect, another $200,000 to equip. This total of $850,000 was the amount of money that came out of savings accounts and sugar bowls to invest in the Copps Co.'s future.

The significance to me of this employee, customer, family and friend money-raising is that these people still believe in personal effort, in not going to the State or Federal Government to satisfy every need.

The management of this company, and its employees and customers, are self-reliant people. The company needed money not to survive but to grow. Its own people provided the funds. Its own people will share in the profits realized from this new warehouse and office.

This is the true and treasured American free enterprise system at work. I was very proud of the people in my district and I returned to Washington anxious to share this satisfying experience with you, Mr. Speaker, and with the Members of the House.

The Fryingpan-Arkansas Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. CARROLL
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. CARROLL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter, addressed to me, and an attached resolution. Both are in support of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project.

There being no objection, the letter and the resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARKANSAS VALLEY G. & T., INC.,
Pueblo, Colo., April 17, 1961.

Senator JOHN A. CARROLL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CARROLL: Enclosed is a copy of a resolution passed by the members of our association at annual meeting held March 29, 1961, in support of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project.

We know you agree that this is a worthwhile and needed project, and are looking forward to working with you in achieving its authorization.

Very truly yours,

ED GAITHER, *Manager.*

RESOLUTION

Whereas it appears that now is the time for all Colorado congressional Representatives to pull together to obtain the authorization of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project; and,

Whereas this association is directly affected by the proposed construction of said project which would enhance the economic development of the entire Arkansas River Valley: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Arkansas Valley G. & T. Inc., urge the Congress of the United States to authorize the Fryingpan-Arkansas project in Colorado, together with the necessary Federal transmission systems to provide the maximum in dependable electric service to the preference customers in the area.

I certify that this is a true excerpt from the minutes of the members' meeting held Wednesday, March 29, 1961, in Pueblo, Colo.

JAMES N. MYERS, *President.*

Progress in Building Complete Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, much has been written of late about adopting a transportation policy for our Government.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am happy to insert the following speech by Morris Forgash, president of the U.S. Freight Co., which contains more constructive ideas regarding our transportation system than any recent article which it has been my privilege to read:

PROGRESS IN BUILDING COMPLETE TRANSPORTATION

(By Morris Forgash, president, U.S. Freight Co.)

It is a pleasure and an honor for me to participate in this transportation conference which has been arranged as a preliminary to the 13th annual Salzberg Memorial Lecture. The brilliant and outstanding men who have consistently appeared on this program in the past have made this annual event a challenging and a noteworthy affair.

The spotlight is on the railroads today, but the fact that you have on the program such people as Jim Lyne, Dr. Williams, and me, is proof that the subject is not to be considered in a vacuum of self-analysis. Railroads are a very vital element of our national life, and it behooves us to candidly examine their current posture and critically analyze the direction in which they are going, but we must constantly keep in mind that our real objective is a strong transportation system, not merely a healthy railroad industry.

The significance of transportation to the culture, prosperity, and progress of people is nowhere better illustrated than here in

Syracuse. The history of Syracuse, which can be traced back more than 300 years, is a vertitable saga of American transportation. From Indian village to trading post—from giant salt-producing center to beautiful metropolis—the destiny of Syracuse has been shaped by transportation—Indian travois and packhorse, canalboat and road wagon, railroad, motortruck and airplane.

Syracuse is fortunately situated, transportationwise, but enterprise, not fortune, directs the course of events in transportation and it is a curious fact that among the many modes of transport which serve Syracuse today the coordination and means of interchange are not much better than existed between road and canal in the days when freight was transferred where Clinton Square now stands. True, we are at least beginning to make progress in the direction of complete transportation, but it has been a slow and painful process because of the resistance of apathy, atrophied thinking and entrenched ideas.

The decade of the 1960's which we have set within the scope of our sights for this conference, is the 14th decade of American railroading. In the last month of the year 1830, "The Best Friend of Charleston," pride of the South Carolina Railroad, pulled the first train of cars ever drawn by a steam locomotive upon a track on the American continent. In the next several decades railroads literally mushroomed over the American landscape, and each road was built to its own specifications, with no thought of connection or completeness or interchange. The width of track ranged from 2 feet on the Brighton and Harrison to 6 feet on the Erie. The running and working parts of cars were equally individualistic.

Circumstances ultimately forced standardization of equipment and completeness of service among the various railroad systems, just as coordination and standardization will be forced upon our transportation systems today. The Civil War showed us the folly of having three widths of track between Chicago and New York. After many years and by painful and costly process, we came to standard tracks and cars, and worked out the mechanics of interchange on the rail lines. We have been talking now for a long time about coordination and standardization of the 20th century transportation plant, and we cannot afford to wait for a war to make up our minds that we must do something about it.

For more than half a century the railroad industry functioned without Federal regulation. In the words of the distinguished first Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Thomas M. Cooley, the railroads "were thus enabled to determine in great measure what rules should govern the transportation of persons and property; rules which intimately concerned the commercial, industrial, and social life of the people."

Then, on February 4, 1887—74 years ago—the act to regulate commerce was approved. The first report of the ICC is an interesting document. There were then an estimated 1,200 railroads, with about 138,000 miles of track. One hundred and eight railroads, operating more than 11,000 miles, were in receivership. The railroads were on the verge of destroying themselves, because they had lost the public confidence, largely because of widespread rebates, drawbacks, and special rates.

Nevertheless, it was not the purpose of the act to restrain or destroy competition. In their first report to Congress, the Commissioners, then five in number, said: "A study of the act to regulate commerce has satisfied the members of the Commission that it was intended in its passage to preserve for the people the benefits of competition as between the several transportation lines of the country." The Commissioners further said—and this is particularly important in the light of recent recommendations that have been urged upon Congress:

"It might possibly be within the competency of legislative power to prescribe for the several interstate railroads equal mileage rates for the whole country; but this, if endorsed, would put an end to competition as a factor in making rates, and to a very large extent deprive the great business centers of the country of their several natural advantages, and also of the benefit of expenditures made by them in creating for themselves new channels of trade."

That interpretation of the intent and meaning of the act has prevailed for three-quarters of a century. It was, in effect, restated by Congress in the Transportation Act of 1958. It is still sound, and I am of the opinion that adherence to those first principles will result in rejection of recent recommendations for a statutory floor under competitive rates, and for severe restrictions on fourth section relief, as well as any other efforts to reverse what Congress did in 1958.

Moving down the corridor of time from the 1st to the 45th annual report of the Interstate Commerce Commission, we find the Commission again commenting about competition—this time a new and different kind of competition—that of the highway hauler whose superiority for certain tasks had been demonstrated by the First World War. In that report, filed in 1931, the Commission said that the railroads "have so many and so great inherent advantages of economy, particularly in the case of the longer hauls and the heavier traffic, that we cannot believe that they will not be able to withstand the competition of the motortrucks."

But, said the Commission, the "service must be provided which the shippers demand and require" and "It is probable that motor service may with advantage be used to supplement or to coordinate with the rail service." Means of making the necessary changes in service, such as "containers, demountable truck bodies, so-called railwagons, and changes in car types" were already appearing on the scene, the Commission pointed out. Finally, the Commission said that the old rate theories "often open a door to effective competition which might well be closed."

It is one of the inexplicable paradoxes of history that in the identical report in which the Commission made these wise and foresighted observations it referred to its decision in the Container case, rendered that same year, which rejected new pricing techniques for this new service, prescribed rates on the old classification basis, and dried up the very service which the Commission advocated for a period of almost 30 years.

When the Commission, in 1931, said that the railroads had many great inherent advantages in the longer hauls, and suggested that motor service might well be used to "supplement or coordinate" with such rail service, it had freshly concluded the most comprehensive investigation of motor service ever undertaken. The decision in this case, docket 18300, rendered in 1928, recommended Federal regulation of motor carriers. At that time the average length of haul of motortruck service ranged from about 20 to about 100 miles, depending on the territory involved. One large truck operator estimated, for the record, that the truckman's advantage over rail in ton-mile cost stopped at a point between 50 and 60 miles.

The kind of coordination the Commission then envisaged and advocated is the only kind that has any meaning—the joining of end-to-end services of differing modes of carriage so that each supplements and complements the other. Each mode must perform within the orbit dictated by its economic and services advantages. I think you will agree with me that this is a most descriptive and concise definition of the term "complete transportation."

It would not have been so formidable a task, back in 1931, to have worked out a plan of coordinated rail and motor service, given men in transportation with the will and the foresight to do so. Motor operations as they then existed were fully within the scope of their economic utility and ideally suited to complement rail service. But we let the golden opportunity pass for lack of initiative and imagination, and as motor service grew and lengthened out to be competitive with the rails for all distances, any idea of effective coordination became vastly more difficult to implement.

However, the picture has not changed to anything like the degree the public has been led to believe. We have long-distance trucking, it is true, but it accounts for only a very small portion of the total service. The average motor common carrier haul per ton in 1959 was 273 miles. Although I have no official figures on the subject, I am confident that at least 90 percent of all intercity motor carrier movements in this country are for distances less than 500 miles.

Coordination or complete transportation based on the irrefutable economic facts that the railroads still are the most efficient medium for moving large quantities of freight over long distances, and that the trucks excel in the shorter hauls, can even now be achieved. In fact, it is being achieved on an increasing scale through the newer forms of piggybacking. But those who fear coordination of a type that will reflect the true economic advantages of the respective participants in any given joint haul have raised such a hue and cry that, to some who are not acquainted with the facts, the picture may seem to be one of contrived confusion.

Controversy and confusion are not limited to the area of piggybacking. The railroad industry, which has received a constantly declining share of the total traffic of the country over a period of 25 years or more—which has seen its employment cut exactly in half in just 30 years—stands accused of driving domestic water carriage to the wall, and of engaging in predatory and unfair raids on the traffic of motor carriers. It is time to examine the facts.

DO WE HAVE MORE SOLUTIONS THAN PROBLEMS IN TRANSPORTATION?

What is the problem in transportation? Certainly we won't find any solutions until we define the problem. We have a competitive struggle, yes, but competition is the essence of free enterprise in a democracy. If we ever eliminate competition we will destroy initiative. Could it be that we have mistaken competitive jockeying and jostling for more basic problems?

Let me take just a moment to recount how we came to be where we are today—using broad brush strokes. This is necessary for proper perspective and direction. In the 1930's competition of a lusty young motor carrier industry had a depressing effect on the railroad rate structure. Then came World War II which strained the resources of all carriers, and virtually destroyed intercoastal and coastwise shipping.

It is a monumental distortion of historical fact to charge either the railroads or the I.C.C. with responsibility for the virtual disappearance of American coastal shipping. When the Government took over many vessels in this trade during World War II the industry was already sick. In the 10-year period immediately preceding the war the industry lost $8 million. The fleet of vessels was literally decimated by wartime activities. Many of the lines never resumed operations after the war. Those that did were beset by spiraling labor costs, incessant

strikes, and astronomically mounting replacement and operating costs. Mr. Ralph E. Casey, president, American Merchant Marine Institute, summed the matter up very well in an address delivered in July 1959, before the annual convention of the International Longshoremen's Association at Miami Beach, when he said:

"You know, as well as I that our once flourishing domestic trades are now dead. It is often said that this is the result of unfair treatment by the Interstate Commerce Commission. That may have played a part, but when they tell me it costs more to load a ship in New York and unload it in San Francisco than it does to bring it 5,000 miles around three coasts, including the transit of the Panama Canal, I question whether the Government is primarily to blame."

We should recognize the truth of what Mr. Casey said and should not require the competitors of the ship lines to subsidize them by holding an umbrella over their rates.

Now the railroads have ultimately heeded the repeated and long-continued admonitions of the regulatory agency and the Congress and are embarking on a vigorous program of self-help. They have introduced not only new pricing techniques but new and improved services based on technological advancements and new ideas. They are reexamining their competitive posture up and down the line in an effort to recapture the traffic which they once indisputably enjoyed but which they lost to other modes of carriage.

The railroads were told to do these things as long ago as 1931 in the Commission's report to which I earlier referred. They were admonished by the Commission in some of the decisions in the ex parte rate cases to employ different rate-making techniques. In its report in ex parte No. 206, decided in 1957, the Commission told the railroads that "the time had probably come when consideration should be given to ways of increasing rates other than by means of horizontal increases." Congress bluntly told the railroads to improve their services and modernize their rate structure when it enacted the Transportation Act of 1958, and it made certain, by enacting section 15a(3), that in doing so they would not be required to hold a rate umbrella over their competitors. But when the railroads at last embarked on a determined program to arrest their declining position in the transportation picture the anguished cries of their competitors were heard across the land.

Again I say, "What is the problem?" Competition took traffic which the railroads once handled and which they perhaps thought, with a trace of complacency, they would always have. Is the problem now to prevent the railroads, by artificial barriers, from getting some of it back if they can do so through the exercise of their inherent advantages and a little initiative? I do not think so.

Congress thoroughly examined all facets of the transportation picture just 2 years ago. The responsible Senate committee heard evidence which now fills 2,300 printed pages in four volumes. The corresponding House committee held thorough but less exhaustive hearings. Weighing all the facts, the committees concluded and the Congress agreed, that the railroad industry was in need of immediate help in several directions.

Among the reasons for the plight of the railroads, the Senate committee found, were Government assistance to their competitors and overregulation of the railroads. But by all odds the most significant finding was that the railroads had not consistently been permitted to assert their inherent advantages in the making of rates. To correct that situation section 15a(3) was enacted.

The purpose of section 15a(3), as plainly stated in the Senate committee report on the 1958 act, was "to encourage competition in transportation." But the statement is insistently made, and repeated again and again: "Yes, Congress intended to insure greater freedom in ratemaking, but it did not intend to permit unfair or destructive competition." The statement is perfectly true, but what is it intended to prove? We must all agree that unfair and destructive competition is prohibited by the law. The Transportation Act of 1958 did not create the prohibition—it merely restated a provision of existing law. Is the repeated statement of the proposition now intended to imply that the ICC is ignoring or misconstruing a fundamental precept of the law, and, if so, that the courts will sustain the Commission in perpetrating unlawfulness? That would be a terrible indictment of our administrators and judges. Every decision on a controverted issue leaves a disgruntled litigant, and each of the basic modes of carriage has been disappointed with one or another of the Commission's decisions under section 15a(3), but the courts, not Congress, are where the issues should be reviewed.

The decisional process with regard to such factual situations as have arisen so far under section 15a(3) has not yet run its course, but there are insistent demands that the section be changed to fit this or that preconceived idea of what the final decisions ought to be. I suggest that Congress and the people knew very well what the policy of section 15a(3) was when it was enacted. The words of the statute are plain. They are reinforced by even plainer language in the committee reports. Only the Interstate Commerce Commission and the courts are vested with the legal authority to apply the language of the law to stated factual situations. We do not write our laws in sand, nor should we erase them with hysteria.

However well intended, I strongly believe that efforts to change the policy laid down by the Transportation Act of 1958 at this time are both premature and unwise. You are familiar with some of the specific proposals for statutory change. The Doyle report would place a statutory floor under competitive rates, based on a statistical formula, and establish "umbrella type" ratemaking by force of statute. Bill S. 1197 would add a great many impossible complicating factors to the presently plain and simple provisions of section 15a(3), and hence would no doubt also result in statutory "umbrella" ratemaking.

These proposals would take us in exactly the opposite direction from the course we so carefully charted in 1958. In fact, they would reverse a policy to which, except for an unfortunate experience with the so-called recapture clause of 1920, we have adhered through the entire history of regulation—careful avoidance of ratemaking by legislative fiat. If we substitute statutory for regulatory ratemaking in the smallest area, it could spread dangerously and rapidly throughout all regulatory law.

Such proposals do not take account of the realities of today nor the potentialities of the future. If they were intended, for example, to aid the motor carriers someone has failed to calculate rightly. They could destroy the motor carrier industry. Ratemaking is not an exact science—it no longer follows a pattern—it reflects the terrific imbalance of traffic, particularly of manufactured products and products of the farm and the forest. The common carrier rate structure has been eroded by the cumulative effect of the contract carrier, the "gypsy" trucker, the "gray area" operator. Yet, we are told that we must be careful not to destroy traditional patterns of ratemaking—that we must protect the integrity of the rate structure. How can you destroy something that no longer exists?

To fill their vehicles and prevent costly empty movement; to meet the irresponsible rates of the unregulated carriers; to fulfill the demands of products that cannot possibly bear their full share of the transportation burden, the carriers make vast numbers of rates that will not meet any formula based on costs.

Statement numbered 4–60, released by the ICC in September 1960, lists 80 commodities moving in rail carload service which do not defray out-of-pocket costs. A similar study would undoubtedly show a larger number moving at submarginal rates in motor service. We are not going to change the factors that cause these commodities to move at below-cost rates: What are we going to do—force the common carriers to give up the traffic, or give the first common carrier in the field squatters' right by refusing to let anyone else meet his rates? I repeat that, whatever alternative we choose, the motor carrier industry may well be the first victim of any scheme of statutory ratemaking or inflexible rate floors. I am, personally, having a great deal of difficulty in visualizing or understanding how any standard of ratemaking in the form of legislative directives to the regulatory agencies can make due provision for these extenuating circumstances and conditions that a carrier encounters almost daily. I have extreme doubt that anyone can produce the appropriate legislative language free of confusion and devastating ambiguity.

Once we embark upon ratemaking by legislative fiat we will have put our feet upon a road that will lead to the ultimate stifling of initiative and stultification of progress. I respectfully commend these observations to the careful consideration of our lawmakers and all others who have a responsibility in the matter.

From what I have said so far you may have gained the impression that I am talking about "roadblocks" rather than "progress" in the building of complete transportation. What I have been trying to do is to clear away some of the confusion so as to arrive at a clear point of departure. And I will ask your indulgence for one more detour because it is important that we understand the factors bearing on the subject if we are to understand the subject itself.

GOOD ADMINISTRATION OF TRANSPORTATION LAW REQUIRES GOOD MEN—SOME WAYS TO SECURE AND KEEP THEM

Since 1940 the national transportation policy of the United States as applied to domestic surface carriers has been directed to three ends—the "developing, coordinating, and preserving" of a national transportation system, by various means, adequate to meet the needs of the commerce and defense of the Nation. We have entrusted the implementation of that policy to 11 men. Unfortunately, we could not vest them with magic wands by which to discharge their fateful task. Sometimes I am afraid we have not vested them with even the least of their due—our complete confidence. Lately I have been more apprehensive on that score.

As I said a little earlier, it has become a popular pastime to make the Commission a scapegoat for everything that is conceived to be wrong in transportation. We should always remember that so long as we adhere to our established principles of Government we must depend on these men who sit on the Commission to interpret and enforce the law, and if we so impair the standing of the agency as to make it impossible any longer to obtain the services of dedicated men of talent and integrity, we will have destroyed one of our greatest legacies. We

will have sold our birthright for a mess of pottage. Maybe it has only an indirect bearing on my subject matter, but I ask you to consider for a few moments some matters relating to the ICC that I consider to be of vital importance.

I am reminded that the then Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, the Honorable Charles Evans Hughes, addressing a meeting of the Association of ICC Practitioners in 1930, said:

"I suppose that no agency of Government has more complicated problems than those which confront the Interstate Commerce Commission, and no intelligent student can fail to realize that the success of this endeavor in a sphere of the highest importance is to a very great extent the measure of our capacity for self-government."

Viewed in that light, to insure the success of the Interstate Commerce Commission in its mission becomes a personal and a demanding obligation of every citizen.

We have been extremely fortunate in the caliber of men who have been attracted to service on the Interstate Commerce Commission throughout its long history. It was Eastman who gave us his famous 12-point Primer on Administrative Tribunals just a few weeks before he died in 1944. The sixth point has been more quoted than any other. It reads:

"The statutes which the tribunal administer should be well, simply, and carefully framed, but the personnal which does the administering is more important than the wording of the statute. Good men can produce better results with a poor law than poor men can produce with a good law."

What has attracted and held the great men who have made careers of service on the ICC? There is an indefinable spark which kindles in men a desire for unselfish public service—we see it in the teaching profession, in the sciences, and in government. Over and beyond that, however, is the fact that the high public esteem in which the ICC has traditionally been held has invested membership on the Commission with an aura of dignity like that surrounding the high Courts, the National Legislature and the Cabinet posts. If that standing and dignity are lost, a great deal of the incentive to men of stature and dedication will disappear.

In view of the absolutely incalculable importance of the proper administration of our transportation laws, we should, instead of maligning and belaboring the Commission, immediately take steps to strengthen it—give it adequate and competent personnel—put it on a healthy financial diet—and insure its ability to continue to attract men of the highest order of intelligence and integrity. What steps can we take?

A good place to start is with the Commission's budget. James M. Landis recently said that "ecenomic rigor, if not parsimony" has characterized the Budget Bureau's attitude toward the agencies for almost a decade. In the last couple of years a little more generosity has been evidenced, but still the budget of the ICC is ridiculously low considering the importance of its mission. Twenty million dollars to regulate in industry that bills us $20 billion a year for its services. Twenty-three hundred people to man an agency that employed 2,600 in 1940. And since 1940 the Commission has acquired jurisdiction over two new agencies of transport—three parts have been added to the act—we have acquired two new States and added numerous new laws to the statutes which the Commission administers.

If the Commission, accustomed to a starvation diet for these many years, is too modest to ask for what it needs in the way of budget and staff, management consultants can be hired to advise Congress. Delays in the functioning of the administrative processes can cost the carriers and the public in a matter of days what we pay to run the ICC a whole year. Is that the way to run any business—or a Government agency?

We get back, of course, to the fact that the essential ingredient of good administration is good administrators, and administrators are people—people with families and responsibilities. We should insure them of more adequate compensation and security. No board of directors of any corporation in America or the world makes more important or far-reaching decisions than the 11 members of the Interstate Commerce Commission. To attract the kind of men that you and I want on the Interstate Commerce Commission I suggest that a salary of $30,000 a year be provided. And with adequate salary should go a reasonable allowance to reimburse agency members for expenses necessarily incurred as an incidence of their position.

Tenure of office is more important than salary to men who value their independence. Until comparatively recent times the vast majority of appointees to the Commission quite evidently accepted the post as a career, and those who distinguished themselves, as a surprising number did, were insured of reappointment regardless of the political party in office. Aitchison set a record of service with 34 years and 9 months—then came Balthasar Meyer with 28 years, Eastman and Clements with 25, Mahaffie with 24, and a long list with 15 to 20 years of service. In contrast, all of the present members of the ICC have been appointed since 1953.

This is not something which reflects unfavorably on the current members of the Commission or on the administration, past or present, but it is a symptom which ought to be arrested before it becomes a chronic condition. How can we have any continuity of policy or attract men who seek public service as a calling, and not a stepping stone, unless we insure them a tenure of office that will permit them to plan ahead and relieve them of tension and pressures? We should provide a statutory term of office for members of the regulatory agencies of 10 years, and allow for reappointment up to the age of 65. Retirement pay should be adequate to insure that no ex-Commissioner would have to go out in industry and seek a job.

We are well aware of the constant pressures to which our agency members are subjected. Why not give them a little insulation against these forces by providing them with a tenure that will extend through two presidential terms and into a third?

Precedent is one of the most important facets of our system of jurisprudence. It gives stability to the law and inspires confidence in the people that they can proceed in a given manner without fear of reprisal. Continuity of service helps to insure stability of policy. One other way to insure such continuity and stability is to follow a custom that seems to have fallen into disuse in recent years of elevating career men to commission membership when career men of stature and ability prove themselves worthy of such appointment.

Perhaps you may think I have unduly emphasized this point, but it is one of the most important issues in transportation today. Crisis has been developing around our independent agencies and, as Chief Justice Hughes said long ago, this is an area so vital to our well-being that its success will measure our capacity for self-government. I have been an advocate of a Department of Transportation for promotional activities and I am convinced that we will ultimately come to that, but the problem of the regulatory agencies is an entirely separate matter. They do not belong in an Executive Department. I have suggested three immediate steps that we should press for, and we can muster the strength to put them through if we really try. They are:

1. Sharply increase the budget of the ICC with authority and direction to hire the necessary personnel at all levels to get the job done, whether in safety, enforcement, or the decisional process.

2. Increase the salaries of the members of the Commission, and provide them with a reasonable allowance and adequate retirement. I would also increase the salaries of the top-level career employees.

3. Provide for statutory tenure of 10 years, with authority to reappoint up to retirement age.

This may not be the complete answer to the problems revolving around our agencies which have given rise to tons of studies and reports in recent years, but it is something concrete. It is a good starting point.

CONTAINERIZATION, STANDARDIZATION, AND SIMPLIFIED PRICING—KEYS TO COMPLETE TRANSPORTATION

I can think of no better way to indicate to you why I have spent so much time leading up to what I shall make a very brief report on progress in building complete transportation—which boils down to progress in containerization and piggybacking—than to quote from the January 1961 issue of Fleet Owner, as follows:

"Month by month piggyback takes on more weight and size than a razorback hog in Arkansas. This consistent growth over the past 2 or 3 years is in spite of a tangled web of rate conditions, a tug-of-war for control between trucks and rails, and a wide range of nonstandard equipment. The reason's simple. Shippers like the lower mileage rates and the convenience."

This innovation in transportation that is growing like a razorback hog cannot be considered in a vacuum. I think, however, that I have discussed enough of the atmosphere in which it exists—now for a brief discussion of the containerization and piggyback movement without which compete transportation is unattainable.

In 1954, in a declaratory judgment proceeding before the ICC, the common carrier truckers vigorously pressed the position that the railroads could not haul highway trailers on flatcars without motor carrier certificates. The Commission brushed this aside, and said that the railroads not only could haul their own freight in their own trailers, but could haul the trailers of shippers, forwarders, and private carriers—but not those of common carrier motor carriers except under joint rates and divisions.

Unfortunately, in my view, the Commission, in its decision in the case I am referring to—and that was in 1954—strained the definition of joint rates beyond all recognition. It gave its blessing to a device that had been employed in a few places, whereby motor carriers forwarded their trailers over the rails rather than pulling them over the highways. This was called substituted service, an apt term. The Commission said the motor carriers could not so forward their trailers and pay the published rates of the railroads, but when the fiction of a joint rate was indulged, and the rate paid by the motor carrier was put in a contract labeled division sheet, the same result was accomplished. The substituted service arrangements came to be known as plan I. When true joint rail-truck rates are entered into we have plan V.

Notice ought to be taken of the fact that the long-distance motor carriers are not satisfied with the two plans of piggybacking which the Commission has said are available to them—plans I and V. They seek authority to use published tariff rates of the railroads, of a type represented by plan III and IV which I will presently describe. Clearly, as the Commission has said, this would make them carriers and shippers at the same time—it would cause them to violate their

permits which specify movements over the "roads, highways, streets, and ways by motor vehicle"—it would require rewriting the definition of a motor carrier and practically the whole of part II of the act. It might even raise constitutional questions.

Plan I—substituted service—has not prospered very well. It has nothing to recommend it to the shipper—he deals only with the motor carrier, pays the regular motor carrier rate, and if any economies accrue from the service they stick to the motor carriers' hands. It is not coordination but substitution.

Plan V piggybacking has had and continues to have a stormy career. As I said, it rests on a true joint-rate and through-route arrangement between railroads and motor carriers—the type contemplated by the statute. But not many such arrangements were ever entered into for the transportation of general freight. In the hauling of new automobiles plan V gained considerable headway, and caused a tremendous furor.

A year or so ago some of the railroads and automobile haulaway carriers—in most cases the short-haul motor carriers—began entering into arrangements for the hauling of new automobiles, in motor trailers loaded on flatcars. A flatcar would hold two such trailers with four or five automobiles each. This improved speed and efficiency and reduced costs and it was an eminently satisfactory arrangement to the railroads and motor carriers involved and to the man who pays the bill—the shipper. But it took some traffic from the long-distance automobile haul away carriers and they cried that they were being driven out of business. A propaganda barrage of unrivaled proportions was mounted against plan V piggybacking, and it still continues.

Oddly enough, advancing technology rendered the original plan V operation practically obsolete before it ever got a good start. Now, instead of loading truck trailers on flatcars the railroads use, very largely, specially designed, lower-level flatcars fitted with trilevel racks which will accommodate 12 standard or 15 compact cars. This still could be termed "piggybacking" and still could rest on a joint rail-truck rate, but it is, in fact, something entirely new in transportation.

Now what crime have the railroads committed in thus initiating a new and complete transportation service? Why, according to widely publicized charges, they are hauling new automobiles at rates generally 50 percent or more under rates offered by the truckaway companies. Think of that. The transportation costs on 5 million new motor vehicles can conceivably be cut in half. What are we to do—ban this innovation which for the first time in 25 years holds forth the hope of halting the continuing upward spiral of freight rates?

But, says truck labor, if you don't stop this it will destroy the jobs of 15,000 truck employees. To this rail labor asks, would it be in order for 450,000 rail employees who have lost their jobs largely because of erosion of rail traffic to send condolences?

The truly phenomenal thing about this innovation which enables the railroads to slice the freight rates on automobiles in half is that it still is only 50 percent as efficient as it could and ought to be. Just as he always has in the case of the automoble haul-away service, the shipper is still required to buy a roundtrip ticket for a one-way ride. The rail equipment, specialized like the motor equipment, has to deadhead back to origin after it delivers each payload. Why? For lack of an idea? No—for lack of initiative.

Equipment that will haul new automobiles in one direction and dry cargo—even liquid cargo—in the other, is already in actual production. Isn't it time that we started to give the poor, long-suffering shipper a break? Why not bring back to him what he consumes and uses in the same car that hauls away what he produces? Everybody will be the beneficiary.

Plans III and IV piggyback, under which shipper-owned trailers, or shipper-owned trailers and flatcars are hauled from ramp-to-ramp at a stated charge per flatcar movement, are now too well known and too well accepted to require detailed description. These plans, too, have come under attack in legal proceedings and by propaganda. The opposition reflects the competitive efficacy of the service.

By these plans the railroads found a way of bringing about coordination through the beverage of economics. By publishing a charge that reflects their own cost advantage for the movement of trailers on flatcars, they can and will make it uneconomical for the shipper to use his own trucks for the long haul. The rail and truck services then will seek their own level with a resultant combination of road-and-rail hauls that is tailored to shippers' needs, not carriers' convenience.

Piggybacking of the type represented by plans III and IV, and automobile hauling, represents the first break the shipper has had in a generation in the matter of freight charges. It constitutes the first simple answer to the equation into which the shipper resolves his transportation problems—time and price. The traffic manager views transportation as a link in the distribution chain and since it is a very expensive link, he buys it with care. He no longer has to take the carriers' word for how much it costs to move his goods from factory to store—he can find out for himself and he will buy his own trucks if he is pushed too far.

But the railroads have not lost their inherent advantages as mass and distance haulers—they simply neglected to exploit them for a while and the parade of progress almost passed them by before they woke up to what was going on. The railroads can beat the private hauler's costs, and better his speeds. They have proved it by plans III and IV piggyback. There is no other development on the horizon that offers any hope of stemming the tide of private carriage. And the key to success of these plans in meeting private carriage is the simplified freight rate—so many dollars per movement—the same basis on which the shipper calculates his cost of doing it himself.

Piggyback service, once it got moving, developed with such startling suddenness that it is still beset by growing pains, not the least of which is the lack of standardization of equipment and method. The problems are being earnestly studied, and, while there will be a certain amount of obsolescence as we experiment or jump the gun without carefully analyzing the situation, in time uniformity will be achieved.

No transportation service in modern history has moved ahead so far so fast as piggybacking since its revival in 1954. In 1960 piggyback flatcar loadings were more than a third greater than in 1959—more than double what they were in 1958—five times greater than in 1955. This means that well over a half a million cars, loaded with more than a million trailers, were handled in 1960. Still accounting for only about 2 percent of all freight car loadings, it is obvious that if the present rate of growth continues piggyback loadings will account for a very substantial portion of rail service within a comparatively short time.

As a matter of fact, many railroad officials today admit that the fate of the boxcar as the predominant factor of rail transportation—a position it has held for more than a century—is sealed. It will not be good business to continue to buy boxcars from which the railroads obtain only 46 miles of service a day when flatcars in TOFC service average 175 miles a day and some perform up to 450 miles. It will be uneconomical to continue to move freight in boxcars with a 40 percent empty return ratio when that empty milage can be cut in half, or more, by piggyback service.

An editorial in the Washington Post on March 21 of this year, dealing thoughtfully with the situation in transportation, said:

"The nub of the transport problem is rapid, technological, urban, and industrial growth and change. It is a problem of rapid adaptation, calling for the closest coordination of all types of common and private carriage."

The editorial does not tell us anything we did not already know, but it is something that should have been said sooner and more often. Industry simply moved away from the railheads. Plans III and IV piggyback are the first practical media the railroads have found for providing the off-track shipper a through service combining the flexibility of the truck with the speed and economy of the railroad.

The shipping public will demand more and more piggyback service—they will demand its speed, its low basic cost at a unit price, its nearly damage-free safety, its predictability and its convenience.

That is, very briefly, a report on progress in building complete transportation as it looks to me today. Rome was not built in a day, so we must have patience and perseverance. On the other hand, we are told that construction of the Tower of Babel stopped instantly when the people were caused to speak different languages. We must understand what we are talking about when we speak of coordination—it is not to be confused with substitution. We must make certain when we talk of transportation problems that we are not speaking simply of somebody's attempt to gain a competitive advantage, or slug a competitor. Our effort should be to produce the best possible transportation for the development of commerce and the defense of our Nation.

Progress in building complete transportation is being achieved despite great turmoil and uncertainty. It is being achieved because some people in transportation, and I am one of them, have faith that when all the shouting has died down we will emerge still holding fast to first principles. It is being achieved because competition is forcing change, stimulating new ideas, putting the spur to enterprise. It will continue so long as we adhere to the principles of regulation first established 74 years ago and consistently followed ever since—a maximum of competition with a minimum of control. Progress will stop when we abandon these principles of free enterprise, for when enterprise ceases to be free it is dead.

This is a time for cool heads and firm resistance to hysteria. Radical changes in basic transportation laws are being urged under the mantle of expediency. We are being importuned to bridle competition with the halter of legislative fiat. Our regulators are being assailed and maligned.

The call now is to statesmanship, in and out of Government. The regulation of transportation, no less than transportation itself, is at a crossroads. Let us remember the truth of what Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes said long ago—the success of this endeavor in a sphere of the highest importance is to a very great extent the measure of our capacity for self-government. The call is to you and to me, and we cannot afford to remain silent. Our destination is clearly indicated—let us march.

Tax Credit Proposal To Encourage Foreign Exports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the prevailing and understandable concern regarding Federal tax policies, foreign aid, competition for foreign markets, and related problems, I believe the House will be interested in a proposal for tax credit to encourage exports from the United States which has recently come to my attention.

This proposal originates with an able industrialist, Mr. Robert Abplanalp, president of the Precision Valve Corp., of Yonkers, N.Y.

Under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I include the résumé of Mr. Abplanalp's proposal which I commend to the consideration of my colleagues generally and to the members of the Committee on Ways and Means in particular:

PROPOSED TAX CREDIT TO ENCOURAGE EXPORT FROM THE UNITED STATES

In the postwar period, the U.S. program of foreign aid, supplemented by establishment or expansion of foreign production facilities by numerous U.S. enterprises, has helped to rebuild foreign industry. These factors, the native industry of the people, incentives to produce and export sponsored by foreign governments, etc., have resulted in such a dramatic recovery that foreign industry no longer requires aid. It has in fact become a formidable adversary to U.S. exporters.

Not only is it becoming increasingly difficult for U.S. industry to compete in the foreign market due to differentials in wage rates, overhead and tax rates, but foreign industry is increasingly finding markets for its production in the United States. Of even greater import is the fact that, at a time of considerable unemployment in the United States, American industry is turning increasingly to foreign production thus utilizing vast amounts of foreign produced raw materials and heavily tapping the foreign labor pools.

Clearly a return to high protective tariffs, restrictions on the establishment of foreign factories by U.S. industry or other regulative measures are not desirable, nor suggested. What should be sought are incentives to U.S. industry to increase dollar volume of exports through U.S. production. Should such an incentive at the same time not reduce tax income to the U.S. Government, nor call for direct subsidy, it is doubly desirable.

The plan proposed below provides the following advantages:

1. Encourages U.S. industry to expand its export programs while placing no restrictions on corporate choice of foreign against domestic manufacturing.

2. Insures direct increased employment of U.S. labor and use of U.S.-manufactured raw materials.

3. Costs the U.S. Government and taxpayers nothing in terms of loss of taxes now being collected or in the cost of any subsidy.

4. Promises, through increased domestic employment and production, to increase the amount of corporate and individual taxes collected.

5. Directly attacks the problem of outflow of gold and currency.

The proposed plan would provide a Federal income tax credit based on the increase in export sales of domestic manufacture. The calculation would be made as follows:

1. Determine increase in export sales by comparing export sales for the current fiscal year to average export sales for the 5 preceding years.

2. Obtain the percentage of increase in export sales to total sales (domestic and foreign) for the current fiscal year.

3. Apply this percentage to net taxable income for the current fiscal year. The resulting amount would be exempt from income tax.

For example, assume sales as follows:

	Export	Domestic	Total
1960	$500,000	$9,000,000	$9,500,000
1959	500,000	8,000,000	8,500,000
1958	500,000	8,000,000	8,500,000
1957	400,000	7,500,000	7,900,000
1956	600,000	7,000,000	7,600,000

Thus average export sales for 5 years would be $500,000.

Assume that in the 1961 fiscal year export sales are $1 million; domestic sales $9 million, giving a total of $10 million sales with an assumed net taxable income of $1,500,000.

1. Increase in export sales over previous 5-year average is $500,000.

2. Percentage of increase in export sales to gross sales: $500,000 of $10 million equals 5 percent.

3. Income exempt from tax: 5 percent of $1,500,000 equals $75,000.

Thus the tax saving would be 52 percent of $75,000 or $39,000.

It is thus seen that the tax so forgiven is based only on the income derived from increased exports. A corporation only benefits from an increased volume of dollar exports. Furthermore, unless exports continue to expand beyond the average level for the preceding 5 years, the exporter gains no continuing tax advantage.

In some situations, U.S. manufacturers may export at cost to gain a foothold in a foreign market, etc. In such cases, it might seem that a loss in Federal tax revenue might result. However, this does not follow since the "cost of goods sold" is composed mainly of wages paid and raw materials and components purchased from supplying companies. In the case of the former, the collection of personal income taxes comes into account and in the latter case, the profits of all the supplying companies are subject to regular business taxes and the increases in both types of collections will more than offset the exemption allowed the manufacturer-exporter. Furthermore, nonprofit operations would at best be temporary situations based only on gaining an eventual basis for doing profitable business.

It is expected that there would be little or no increased cost of enforcement on the above in the sense that normal audits by the Internal Revenue agencies could accurately determine the claims.

Recent proposals have been made for tax relief to U.S. corporations with foreign subsidiaries. The question arises as to whether (foreign subsidiaries or domestic production by American labor and our traditional American engineering and business efficiency) is in the best interest of our country. The fact is, that almost any manufacturing corporation operating anywhere leaves more wealth behind it than it can accumulate and take with it by payment of dividends or by actual liquidation.

Considering again the relationship of net profit to the gross dollar volume, the difference between the two being taxes paid to foreign governments, wages paid to foreign labor on which foreign governments again collect taxes, and costs paid to local foreign suppliers of raw materials, components, and services, all of which produce taxable income to support the local governments and distribute wealth to the working populations, it is understandable that the only situations which would really accrue dollar exchange wealth would be those in which net profits after foreign taxes are substantially greater than 50 percent of the total business transacted. These situations are practically nonexistent. Therefore, it seems almost idiotic to encourage domestic corporations to operate manufacturing subsidiaries abroad as opposed to the above which creates a dynamic incentive to permit merchandise made by American workers to take its proper position in world markets.

The Wrong Attitude on Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, South Dakota's distinguished editor of the Daily Argus Leader of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., Fred C. Christopherson, has written a thought-provoking editorial on the Peace Corps proposal. It points up emphatically the need for careful planning and clear thinking if the Peace Corps is to be an asset to America rather than a brood of ugly American ducklings.

To me, this editorial also underscores the essentiality of developing in America a Freedom Academy for the training of Americans serving our country overseas as the necessary prerequisite of any effective functions which can be undertaken by those who might be selected for duty in the Peace Corps.

I ask unanimous consent that the Christopherson editorial may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WRONG ATTITUDE ON PEACE CORPS

Somewhat strange was the attitude displayed by a group of college students last week in respect to requirements being set up for the Peace Corps.

The students were members of a National Students Association Committee to consider youth service abroad. At their meeting, held in Washington, they reviewed conditions surrounding the establishment of the Peace Corps and came up with two suggestions. One of these was opposition to any loyalty oath as a requirement for service in the Peace Corps and the other was that any security check on applicants by the FBI should be sharply limited.

It seems to us that the students who adopted this attitude disqualified themselves in so doing.

The objection to the loyalty oath may be regarded as incidental and perhaps a matter of slight importance.

But the objection to an exhaustive review by the FBI of the applicants is something else. Certainly the Government has every

right to know all it can find out about students who might seek to represent the Nation in the Peace Corps. It would be remiss in its responsibility, in truth, if it didn't insist on a careful scrutiny of all applicants.

The applicants must be screened for a variety of reasons. One is to check their poise and personalities as well as their tact, diplomacy and understanding. Another is to ascertain their understanding of the American way and their capacity to enunciate it. A third, and by no means the least important, is to block agents whose objective might be to destroy the value of the Peace Corps.

The failure of the committee members to recognize these valid points is sufficiently surprising to induce one to wonder about the basic concepts of those who participated.

Flint Blazes Trail With Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include the following article from the Christian Science Monitor, dated April 22, 1961, entitled "Flint Blazes Trail With Schools." The article describes the splendid educational program being carried on in Flint under the direction of the Mott Foundation. The account of the Flint program follows:

FLINT BLAZES TRAIL WITH SCHOOLS

(By Carl I. Brahce)

There is hope for a solution to the financial crisis in American education, without recourse to Federal aid. Such is the conviction of Frank J. Manley, director of the community school program in Flint, Mich., which operates with a substantial grant from the Mott Foundation, of which Charles Stewart Mott is chairman.

"Every community has a potential not even realized by its citizens" asserts the congenial director of the Mott program—Flint Board of Education. "When the doors of public schools are truly opened to the people, the benefits can hardly be imagined. We've been at it 25 years and we're just scratching the surface."

What happens when schools are used to their fullest potential? Education is strengthened in many ways, virtually in all ways, since this gives the taxpayers a "real interest in their schools," says Mr. Manley.

AFTER-SCHOOL ACTIVITIES

"More than 90,000 men, women, and children take part in a great variety of after-school activities during the average week in Flint. The daytime school enrollment is about 40,000. The results of parents, teenagers, adults of all ages returning to school has a beneficial effect in the classroom, teacher-parent relationships, neighborhoods—it's evidenced in the whole revitalized city of Flint."

Industrial Flint, where automobiles zip off the factory assembly lines, has cast off a smudgy, bawdy reputation for one of community pride and achievement. Cooperation is as real to Flint folk now as the sound of the noonday whistle. More than 200 citizens have contributed more than $18 million to build a magnificent college and cultural center—with a theater, art center, planetarium, public library, in addition to a growing community junior college and a branch of the University of Michigan.

A new municipal center, actions to improve the downtown area, and implementation of a master plan for the city point the way to continued growth and development.

INDUSTRY COOPERATES

Cooperation of local industry and businesses with the schools, city government, and agencies has promoted such educational developments as a basic economics program to help adults know more about their society, a successful physical well-being and safety program, a physical fitness program, and a police-counselor liaison team pioneering school-police teamwork to reduce juvenile crime.

Mr. Manley's leadership has inspired the dedication of many individuals who contribute their zeal to the improvement of the Flint community.

"Understanding," Mr. Manley points out, "is the shining hope for our educational system. We are constantly striving to achieve greater understanding among men."

He cites four barriers to this objective: Ignorance, indifference, inertia, and intolerance.

More than 1,000 classes in adult education offered in Flint help accomplish this objective, bringing citizens into the schools. Other classes are designed to improve knowledge and skills and to stimulate an informed public.

Here are teenagers deciding how to use their profit money from the teen club dance to benefit the school; families frolic in swimming pools, whirl around gymnasiums on roller skates, work together in arts and crafts classes. Neighbors share experiences in child study sessions, men's clubs, women's clubs; mothers don aprons to cook school breakfasts for visitors; fathers make teaching aids for classrooms, turn out to convert scrub areas into playground parks, plan school fairs and other community projects.

INTERNATIONAL GAMES

Community school directors, who are members of the school staffs, direct the after-school programs. They continue to serve each neighborhood community during the summer program that is climaxed with 5,000 contestants in the Flint Olympic games. Winners of the sport events vie with athletes from Hamilton, Ontario, in the international CANUSA (Canada-United States) games. This yearround use of the public schools draws overwhelming support from the Flint taxpayers.

During an industrial recession in 1957, voters approved by more than 80 percent a special levy of 2.5 mills to build new community schools. Included was a $4 million high school, now the busy center for a variety of activities. Like the other 41 community schools, this new southwestern community high school is designed with community-type facilities that not only serve the public during after-school hours, but also enrich the regular instructional program.

The Flint Board of Education now receives $1,200,000 of a $20 million budget from the Mott Foundation to provide pilot project funds and support the physical well-being program, adult education program, Mott Camp, and other programs benefiting the community.

RISK MONEY PROVIDED

Since the partnership of Frank J. Manley and industrialist Charles S. Mott began in 1935 to open school doors experimentally to help youth, the Mott Foundation has made possible many programs and improvements in the educational curriculum. Believed to be the only private foundation channeling funds through a board of education, the Mott Foundation has provided risk money until the projects prove successful and can be taken over by tax funds.

"The surprising thing to many is that the entire program could be supported by the average taxpayer for just 2 cents more a day," comments Mr. Manley.

"An average taxpayer with four children pays 24 cents daily, or about a penny a subject for school taxes. I ask you, where else can you get that value for a penny today?"

The extra cents add up to only $6 more a year the taxpayer would pay if the people absorbed the entire program now carried on with $1,200,000 of Mott Foundation funds.

SPECIAL BUILDING UNIT

Another financially bright picture is disclosed in regard to the extra community-type facilities designed into all Flint community schools. These community-type facilities include a large gymnasium auditorium, a community room, office facilities and in some cases, a branch library.

A man who has devoted many years to watching the figures of school construction costs suggested a special building unit that has revolutionized Flint schools.

He is Jack Barrett, former business manager for the school board. A methodical analyzer. Mr. Barrett heard about small buildings for use by early grades in a Texas community. The Flint Board of Education experimented with a primary unit in 1953 to house children in an outlying area.

ARCHITECTURE CONFORMS

"The response was so favorable by parents, teachers and students that more were built," explains Mr. Barrett. "Flint now has 101 primary units, for kindergarten, first, second, and third grades."

The highlight is that by using this practical and successful method of building, Flint has succeeded in providing facilities for the entire community without stretching the educational dollar.

"The primary units are built on individual lots three or four in an area, the architecture conforming to the homes in that location" says Mr. Barrett.

"They provide neighborhood schools close to the homes of young children, offer a homelike atmosphere freedom from the older children, and relief from the more formal routine necessary in a large school building."

The primary units, 28 feet by 40 feet or 1,120 square feet, are built at an average cost of $11,500. This is just about half the cost of a standard elementary school classroom.

GROSS AREAS COMPARED

"Although originally considered for sale as ranch houses when no longer needed as schools, not one unit has been sold in Flint. The construction relieves crowded schools and gives the school board time to determine long-range needs of a particular community before investing in a regular school," Mr. Barrett adds.

Using the gross area per pupil in a fixed class size of 30 pupils as a fair measuring comparison, Mr. Barrett determined that the average gross area per pupil in regular schools built in Michigan in 1958–59 was 62.4 feet.

In the community-type elementary schools constructed in Flint, the gross area per pupil in the main building is 76.8 square feet.

"However," Mr. Barrett says, "when the 67 primary units in the 11 areas served by these schools are included, the gross area per pupil drops to 62 square feet. This is slightly below the Michigan average for 1958–59." (Although Flint has 101 primary units, only 67 are in the areas served by the 11 new elementary schools.)

This has been the method used by the Flint Board of Education to provide community-type facilities at practically the same

cost paid in other cities for conventional school buildings.

Proud of the advances made in such curriculum areas as the talented child program, primary cycle intensives program, superintendent of schools Dr. Spencer W. Myers cites the financial backing of the schools by Flint citizens.

SURVEY UNDERTAKEN

"We have many forward-looking programs, and are working to make further improvements," Dr. Myers points out. "Because the people are involved closely with the schools, they know more about them and are more willing to provide financial support to our educational program."

Principals and teachers are now engaged in a survey to determine all ways the after-school activities program benefits or contributes to the regular classrom instruction.

Other communities are finding that they have resources to initiate community school programs. Towns such as Roseville, Mich., have cooperatively opened their school doors by spirited leadership, gaining financial support of the city council.

In "Developing Community Schools in Michigan," the community school committee of the Michigan Association of School Administrators describes developing programs in 10 communities.

The publication cites the department of public instruction's statement of philosophy: "This relationship between the community and the school that we support has come to be known as the community school concept. Through the development of the community school, education is seen as a continuing factor in the lives of the people as long as they live."

EDUCATORS VIEW PROGRAM

Educators and municipal leaders from more than 40 communities throughout the United States came to Flint in early April to view the Flint community school program.

The Third National Community School Clinic, held April 4–6, was cosponsored by the American Association of Public School Administrators, the American Association of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, and the Mott program of the Flint Board of Education.

More than 5,000 visitors a year now arrive in Flint for a firsthand look at the open-door policy that provides a hope that communities can support their schools without the philanthropy of a Mr. Mott in their town.

Davy Crockett's Widow Came to Texas To Live

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, almost every school boy and girl knows of the heroic fight to the death by Davy Crockett and other heroes of the Alamo. But not much has been written about other members of Crockett's family, especially his wife, Elizabeth Crockett.

David Crockett went from Tennessee to Texas in 1835 planning to acquire land, buid a home and send for his wife and family. But when he arrived in Texas, Crockett found that the Texans had revolted against Mexico; so he joined the army of independence and gave his life for the ideal of human liberty at the Alamo.

It was many months before Davy Crockett's wife, Elizabeth received word of his death. She remained in her native Tennessee for 18 years and then decided to go to the land where her husband had laid down his life. She made the trip to Texas by covered wagon in 1854 with her son, Robert, and his family. They resided in Ellis County and later in Johnson County—now Hood County—when the State of Texas granted free to Mrs. Crockett a league of land.

Mrs. Crockett died at age 82, in 1860 and her grave in the Acton, Tex., cemetery is marked by a monument erected by the State of Texas in 1913.

The Texas Parade of April 1961, published an excellent article written by Louise Cheney about Mrs. David Crockett. I ask unanimous consent to have the article, entitled "Davy Crockett's Widow" printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DAVY CROCKETT'S WIDOW

(By Louise Cheney)

(The wife he left behind in Tennessee came to Texas 18 years after Davy's death. A monument stands to her memory.)

Towering toward the wide Texas sky in the Acton Cemetery is a tall monument topped with the life-size statue of a famous pioneer woman, Elizabeth Crockett, wife of the immortal Davy who died for Texas freedom in the Alamo.

The beautiful and pathetic figure of the woman faces the west, one hand shading the eyes, in an attitude of patient waiting for the return of a husband who never came back.

The monument is of Texas granite and was sculptured in Italy. The statue atop the tall shaft resembles Elizabeth Crockett in detail as to features and poise. The State of Texas appropriated funds for the memorial in honor of David Crockett's widow in 1910. Sculptured in 1911, it was erected in 1913. Since the monument was placed in Acton, Elizabeth Crockett's grave has become a public shrine visited by great numbers of people annually. The word, "Crockett," stands in bold relief on the base of the monument. The granite slab covering Mrs. Crockett's grave carries the following words:

"Mrs. Elizabeth Crockett, wife of David Crockett. Born in Buncombe County, N.C., May 22, 1788; married to David Crockett in Lawrence County, Tenn., 1815; died in Johnson County, now Hood County, January 31, 1860. Age 82."

Buried alongside Elizabeth Crockett are her son, Robert Patton Crockett, who died in 1889, and his wife, Matilda Porter Crockett, who passed away in 1864.

When David Crockett left Tennessee for Texas in 1835 his intention was to acquire land, build a home, and send for his wife and family. But came the revolt of Texas against Mexican domination and Crockett joined the army of independence at Nacogdoches that same year. History records how heroically he gave his life in the defense of the Alamo. It was many months before Elizabeth Crockett learned that the husband for whom she was patiently waiting was dead. She remained in Tennessee for 18 years and then decided to go to the land for which Crockett had laid down his life. With her son, Robert, and his wife she made the long, hard trip via covered wagon in 1854. They first settled in Ellis County where they resided for 2 years. The State of Texas patented Mrs. Crockett a league of land in Johnson County (now Hood County). In 1856 the Crocketts moved to their new home where Robert built a log cabin in a group of liveoaks surrounded by hunny, sloping meadows near the Brazos River. He farmed the land for many years and also operated a wooden toll bridge over the river. The modern structure that spans the Brazos today at nearby Grandbury has been dedicated to his memory.

In the old pioneer cemetery at Acton where Elizabeth Crockett rests are a number of graves, dating back to the last century, which are built up of rock and covered with large coffin shaped slabs hewn from solid limestone. These slabs serve as headstones, for the inscriptions are chiseled upon them. These unique rock coffins are found in only one other cemetery in Texas, Old Rock Church, a short distance from nearby Bluff Dale.

Acton Cemetery is located a short distance south of the town of Acton in the eastern part of Hood County (a few miles east of Grandbury). To reach there follow U.S. Highway 377 west of Cresson, turn left at the large granite State marker, and drive south 4 miles. (Cresson is on the Fort Worth-Grandbury highway.)

Our Glorious Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include a poem by Mr. Philip C. Brown, of Fallbrook, Calif. Mr. Brown has dedicated his life to designing and painting flag designs. In a display of flags shown at the San Diego County Fair in 1959, our present 50-star flag was among his 30 designs. In this troubled world, I feel that it is time to place a new value on the flag and its meaning, and this original poem by Mr. Brown should cause us to pause and reflect:

OUR GLORIOUS FLAG

(By Philip C. Brown)

How beautiful against a cloud
To see our colors, flying proud;
Our glorious flag, majestic, grand,
Inspiring sight through all the land.
It stands for liberty, hard bought,
Justice for all, freedom of thought;
Calling for loyalty to truth and right
And equity, not rule of might.
We love this flag with thoughts sublime,
Not just today but for all time.
Of all the flags throughout the world
None has more beauty when unfurled.
And as we take a closer look,
"In God we trust," in Holy Book;
We thankful are through all our days
God's providence directs our ways.
But why, oh why, are there so few
Who own and fly their colors true?
Each home should boast a flag to fly
That, patriotism shall not die.
So fly the flag you call your own,
On every occasion make it known—
Here in this house find loyalty;
We're richer far than royalty.

Serving Country and City in Kansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, this is centennial year in my home State of Kansas, and many excellent articles have been written concerning our State, its history, growth, and development.

A very excellent article, written by Maurice Flagg, entitled "Serving Country and City in Kansas," appeared in the April issue of the Red Cross Journal. The article described many of the Red Cross activities that are carried on in our State.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SERVING COUNTRY AND CITY IN KANSAS

(By Maurice Flagg)

Kansas, as its centennial seal proclaims, is Midway, U.S.A., and has been since the troubled days 100 years ago when it became the first of the prairie territories to achieve statehood.

The wild west of folklore, movie, radio, and TV fame began in Kansas. All the trails of the Old West started in Kansas, crossed the State, or ended there—the Santa Fe, the California, the Oregon, the Gold Rush, the Chisholm, the pony express, and many others along which passed the people who opened up the West. The legendary towns—Abilene, Newton, Dodge City, Fort Riley, Fort Scott, Leavenworth, Hays, Great Bend, Medicine Lodge—are still there and very much alive; some, in fact, remain partly cow towns where only a little imagination is needed to reconstruct in mind's eye the old days.

But if your eye is for the romance and excitement of today, there is an up-to-date, booming Kansas of infinite variety and fascination to discover during the State's centennial year.

Cattle drives are now a thing of the past; today one man raises steer calves and sells them to another who grazes them to full growth and then sells them to a third who fattens them for the Nation's tables. Plenty of cowboys care for these cattle still, and the many summer rodeos throughout the State are perhaps the main social events for Kansans. The vast prairies—the home of a few Indians and millions of buffalo a hundred years ago—are now planted to mile upon rolling mile of green and golden wheat, and other grains. The skyscraper of virtually every Kansas town is the grain elevator, which may have only 2 bins or more than 200, but is always gleaming white and the most distinctive landmark in view. (Contrary to a widespread belief, Kansas is not flat. Most of the State rolls gently, like the ocean on a calm day. The eastern part of the State, however, is hilly and tree-grown. The greatest change from east to west across Kansas is the gradual disappearance of trees until on the high plains of the west there is only an occasional waterhole or creekside clump of cottonwoods to vary the vastness of earth and sky.)

There is far more going on in Kansas today, however, than agriculture. Wichita has long been one of the Nation's major aircraft building centers. Hutchinson lies atop vast, actively worked salt deposits. Hardly a week goes by without announcement of new oil or natural gas wells brought in; gleaming, futuristic appearing refineries have sprung up.

And, of course, the more there is to do, the more people come to work. The estimated population of Kansas when it entered the Union 100 years ago was 14,000; today, just over 2 million people live and work in the Sunflower State.

HIGH SCHOOL RED CROSS SERVICE

Service activities by high school Red Cross members are as varied as Kansans' interests and community needs. Members volunteer at hospitals, institutions, and in a host of Red Cross chapter services. Youth members are found increasingly on chapter boards and committees, speaking for their fellow youth members and planning with adult members greater opportunities for young people in community service through Red Cross. In school, Red Cross youth members create school chests, albums, records, and paintings. Also carried on in Kansas high school classes are many forms of carefully planned production—clothes and layettes for disaster victims, toys and stuffed animals for children, games and decorations for military and veterans hospital wards and recreation rooms.

IDEAS, IDEAS

The really significant story that high school Red Cross service in Kansas has for members throughout the country is in ideas. For Kansans are independent thinkers who are always turning a thing over to find whether there isn't a better way to do it. Many of their ideas and methods will be of interest to all councils, and some of them will be of special interest to rural high school members, whose unique problems in service program building are often insufficiently realized.

IDEAS FOR COUNCILS

Idea: Sedgwick and Saline County chapters are experimenting with a division of the rural areas into council districts so that the councils of two or more rural high schools within convenient distance of one another can work together on building and carrying out service projects in their respective schools. It's hoped that this plan will help overcome the common situation of the rural school that enrolls but gets little opportunity to serve because of its distance from the headquarters town.

Idea: In addition to regular meetings of the citywide council, presidents of individual school councils in Wichita now meet monthly with the Sedgwick County youth service director and citywide council officers to discuss problems and plan toward coordination of individual school activities. It's hoped that county school council presidents can attend meetings several times a year to bring city and county council activities closer together.

Idea: Labette County, in southeastern Kansas, plans to send county as well as city delegates to the training center held each summer at Wichita.

Idea: Members who attended the Sedgwick County chapter training center have formed themselves into a speakers bureau in the Shawnee County, Labette County, and Sedgwick County chapters. They present the story of Red Cross high school service in classrooms, assemblies, meetings of other youth groups, and meetings of adult organizations in the community. The Labette County member-speakers receive speech class credit for their presentations.

Idea: In Saline County schools, the student and Red Cross councils are one and the same. Service projects through Red Cross thus involve representatives of the entire school.

Idea: The Red Cross council at Wichita's Southeast High School goes to all the school clubs and asks whether they would like the council to arrange for each to serve the community as a group through Red Cross. Among the examples of results are chess club members who go as a group to play chess with hospital patients, medical careers club members serving as aides at the Wichita Regional Blood Center.

Southeast High council members also conceived the idea of making available to all students copies of the project checklist that routinely goes from chapter director to teacher-sponsors each fall for indication of projects to be undertaken during the year in individual schools. The Southwest High council asked students to check the projects they were interested in; those checking a project were then appointed to the committee responsible for carrying it out. This method of building a project and council organization involving large numbers of students has now spread to several other Wichita schools. (Southeast High presented Red Cross-interested students with special challenges. A vast school of over 2,000 students, it has no homerooms. Without the traditional base of council organization, member-leaders in the school had to find new ways of council building.)

Idea: West High School in Wichita features during its enrollment campaign a main-lobby booth at which interested students may sign up to serve on the Red Cross council. Result: The council has grown from 6 to 65 members in 2 years. The council divides itself into large working committees to direct and help carry out specific projects.

Idea: The council at Kapaun High in Wichita is made up of a representative from each club and organization in the school, with each group conducting its service projects through Red Cross.

Idea: In Shawnee County, proposed expenditures from the membership service fund are placed by school councils concerned before the countywide council and must receive the latters' approval.

Idea: The council president and vice president at Wichita's Sacred Heart Academy are required to have attended a training center.

Idea: All Kansas councils and adult leaders with whom the writer talked believe that the basic responsibility for Red Cross service in and through high schools lies with the council, with the teacher-sponsor serving as adult consultant.

SERVICE PROGRAM IDEAS

Idea: The group of 20 Salina High School students who serve as nurse's aids at Schilling Air Force Base Hospital meets each month at the home of a different member wit the hospital gray lady chairman and the hospital nurse sponsor to work out their volunteer service schedule for the coming month, discuss questions and problems, and socialize. (The group, by the way, is entirely made up of teenagers living on the base. Two a day work after school during the week and more serve on weekends; they serve in the women's and pediatrics sections. One of their special values to the hospital, said Chief Nurse Maj. Bernadine Armstrong, is in keeping everything running smoothly when the nurse shifts change.)

Idea: Councils of two junior highs in Parsons (Labette County) joined in planning and putting on a dance—semi-formal, 75 cents the couple, 50 cents stag—whose profit was applied to purchasing the more expensive items in a joint-project school chest.

Idea: At Wichita's Southeast High School, a record of Kansas folk songs is being cut with the narration in Spanish. Work began last year with a boy collecting the songs and a group working out the technical problems of taping the songs and cutting the record.

Idea: Being advanced in Sedgwick County is a disaster preparedness plan that has as its goal the training of two percent of every

high school's students in disaster service skills. All participants receive a general orientation to Red Cross and civil defense functions in disaster. Each then chooses a specialty—first aid, blood service, shelter assistance, canteen service, or disaster area survey work—and receives intensive training in the specialty. Friday afternoon training and practice sessions, as well as giving instruction in the phases of community disaster service, build school teams prepared to provide all phases in disaster emergency.

Idea: Key people at the Sedgwick County training center are the staff assistants—last summer, six of them from Wichita high schools. They serve as resources on chapter Red Cross services and the high school program. With the Sedgwick County chapterwide council, they were largely responsible for planning the center; during the weeklong center sessions, attended by delegates from throughout the State, they conducted alone a daily session on specifics of council and program building in addition to resource duties at other sessions. (The center also features certificate courses in first aid; water safety, and care of the sick and injured.)

Idea: The council at East High in Wichita planned, wrote, produced, and moderated a TV program on enrollment—its whys, hows, and importance to today's high school student.

Idea: The council at St. Mary's High in Wichita last year planned a Valentine's Day party at one of its "adopted" care homes with a difference. Members first surveyed patients' dietary restrictions, then planned, prepared, and served the refreshments around the findings.

Idea: 13 members of an accelerated science class at Wichita's Roosevelt Intermediate High served last year in the blood center laboratory as part of their classwork. Project was suggested by the teacher; details were worked out by the blood center director, youth service director, and the teacher together.

Class members first received a basic explanation of blood program work. A session followed in the laboratory during which health safeguards in laboratory work were pointed out. Members then undertook carefully supervised laboratory activities such as test tube numbering, bottle assembly, test sheet assembly, and washing glassware. During these assignments, they also observed the basic technical work of the lab. Two students a day worked from 8 to 9 a.m. during the week, and three worked 4 hours on Saturday morning.

Students performed no actual laboratory procedures. Asked whether she believed the project feasible for high school students, Chief Technologist Irene Griffith said that the junior high class had been a good choice for the experience because the group could be instructed within the lab's technical restrictions without losing interest.

Idea: Working to reestablish a youth service program, the Shawnee County chapter last summer carried out, as a demonstration of what young people can do, a 38-youth volunteer service program at the Kansas State Neurological Institute in Topeka. Volunteers came from six Topeka area high schools; a number of them were recruited in future nurses clubs.

Idea: Salina High School council members have furnished and supplied two first aid rooms in the school and are now working on a third.

GETTING THE WORD AROUND

Idea: Sedgwick County forms international art program contributions into exhibits that are displayed at schools and community centers during the course of a year. After the year of home display they are sent on for oversea school exhibit.

Idea: At Sacred Heart Academy in Wichita each new issue of the journal is read by council members and teaser announcements written and posted on every homeroom bulletin board. Each council representative is given time to talk in her homeroom about the new issue. Copies are available in the homeroom, the library, or the teacher-sponsor's office. Individual articles are posted on the school's main bulletin board.

Idea: Topeka High School members built and manned a homecoming day parade float emphasizing the unity of youth Red Cross service and schools and community. The camera club at the same school takes all Red Cross youth service pictures as part of its club credit work.

Idea: 10 council members in Labette County readied blood donor booklets for distribution to every student in the country to take home to parents.

NOTES ON PROGRAM BUILDING BY MEMBER-LEADERS

Martha Jane Wendel, Sacred Heart Academy, Wichita; president, chapterwide council; member, Project IV of international study visit program, summer 1960:

"The chapterwide council was the weakest link in an otherwise strong chain of student Red Cross activities and programs.

"Beginning early last summer the council officers met regularly with Miss Norma Gooden, chapter youth service director, to discuss plans for the 1960-61 council. The two major problems that had always hindered the council were student support and interest, and student participation.

"Several suggestions for improvement evolved from our executive meetings and training center:

"1. Delegates at our training center were given in detail the purpose, organization, and functions of a chapterwide council.

"2. Constructive programing and careful planning for council meetings were musts. The officers plan agendas.

"3. The members of the chapterwide council are planning projects that will involve the council as a group.

"4. We are organizing an executive council in which school council presidents will participate. It will provide an opportunity to meet with the director to discuss problems and share experience."

Margaret Weilert, Sacred Heart Academy, Wichita; council president:

"The idea of adopting care homes for the aged was completely new to Sacred Heart Academy council members. After introduction of the idea to the council, it was readily approved by faculty members and students. Through our chapter director, we obtained the names of various care homes in the city which could accept visitors.

"The visiting of the four homes we have adopted involves the work of several committees, one for each home. The committee chairmen are members of the school council. They, in turn, are responsible for contacting student visitors and adults to serve as chaperones, arranging transportation, and providing entertainment and refreshments.

"The satisfaction received by these visits is overwhelming—not only to the students who visit the homes but also to the people who are visited. Most important is the joy of the old people to know that youth love and respect them enough to want to make their often lonely lives a little happier."

Linda Beth Schlueter, West High School, Wichita; council president:

"Wichita High School West's council was a new one compared to others in the city, and had not been successful. Last year, however, a group of sophomores, who had not had a previous opportunity to belong to such a service group, proved interested in high school Red Cross service.

"One of our first and biggest problems was that of obtaining student participation in our projects. We discovered that if students were informed, they were much more likely to respond. How to inform them? Here are some of our ideas:

"Posters: During our enrollment week we plastered the walls of the school with posters. These posters not only stressed the importance of joining, giving, and volunteering, but also gave general information on the projects available.

"Bulletins: A daily bulletin is read to the students over the public address system. We used bulletins and skits to advertise Red Cross youth services.

"Assembly: After our posters and bulletins had been before the students about 3 days, we held an all-school assembly. Immediately after this, members canvassed the classrooms for donations and gave the students a chance to volunteer for service projects on checklists we distributed.

"We make sure our administrators are also well informed. At West we work through an assistant principal, who is in charge of activities. If he understands what, why, and how things are being done, he is usually completely in favor of them."

Tom Jackson, East High School, Wichita, vice president, school and chapterwide councils; delegate to 1960 White House Conference on Children and Youth:

"I am a motor service volunteer at our chapter house. During the summer the motor service chairman and I were talking about ways to save our chapter some money, and we hit on the idea of high school members coming down to the chapter house once a month to wash and wax all motor service cars and trucks. It sounded like a good idea so I took it to our director, who agreed. Then the real job came in—to convince the students. This was done through our council meetings. We made it a council project and set an open date for a convenient Saturday morning. We have presently had one car wash, which was a terrific success."

Ho Hum Hosannas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I have asked unanimous consent to include my nomination for the editorial of the week, from the columns of the Poughkeepsie Journal and the title is especially significant:

HO HUM HOSANNAS

Now that Senate and House have passed similar depressed areas bills and agreement is almost a formality, Washington discussions of the measure are strangely unenthusiastic.

Even friends of the measure are admitting that there aren't many new jobs in it, and that it will be quite a while, if ever, before any new jobs will develop. Few deny that the provision for aid to rural areas is unnecessary because the Agriculure Department already has a program in this field.

Some who voted for the bill concede that the emphasis on new plants is misplaced, because in many of the depressed areas satisfactory empty plants are abundant.

In sum, it appears that $400 million is to be spent just to show that Uncle Sam cares, even if the program itself won't help much, if at all.

A Great Man as Chief of the Army Engineers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article from the Mobile Press of Wednesday, April 19, 1961, regarding the appointment by President John F. Kennedy in naming a great man as Chief of the Army Engineers. I am enclosing this story and an editorial about the President's selecting General Wilson for the highest engineering position we have, and it is so gratifying. This article speaks for itself, but I wish everybody could know this great man who has served two stretches in Alabama as resident engineer. He has served practically all over this earth, and if the President and all of us had looked all over this earth, we could never have found a more capable man than our own Gen. "Weary" Wilson.

I remember in the long ago before Gen. Lewis A. Pick went to his reward that he told me that he considered the then Colonel Wilson one of the great engineers of this Nation. It is going to mean much to this administration and this entire Nation and the world to have this man as head of this great Army Engineers, one of the finest groups that has ever served this country since we have had a nation. There has never been one iota of scandal about the Army Engineers. They have done some of the most unusual and practically impossible projects on this earth. Now, after all the years and all the great men who have served in this capacity, now we get one of our own homefolks and you do not know how much the people everywhere I have talked to appreciate what President Kennedy did in appointing this great man to be Chief of the Army Engineers, and I think everybody will appreciate what our Mobile Press Register way down in our beloved Southland has had to say about General Wilson. I wish I could just tell everybody all I know about this man, his wonderful wife and his family. I have worked with him over a quarter of a century and I have never known a greater and a better man.

I remember a little saying that goes something like this:

JUST THINKING

Life is not a treadmill. Life is a beautiful and fascinating field of endeavor and enterprise, with inspiring horizons of newer and greater fields beckoning ever onward. Work and service are blessings to enrich one's life, and make it truly worth living. Blessed is the man who does his work joyfully.

Now, I believe that was by a great writer, Grenville Kleiser, and I found that little quote in Sunshine, a magazine of May 1961. Well, that just fits Gen. "Weary" Wilson, because he is blessed and he does do his work joyfully, and that is the way it should be.

I remember so many things so many great men had to say about the development of our waterways, and I am going to quote here some of them because it says here "The Importance of Waterways Stated by Voices of Wisdom," which is included in "Waterways of the United States," published by the National Association of River and Harbor Contractors. The first was our great President, George Washington, and I quote:

Prompted by actual observations, I could not help taking a more extensive view of the vast inland navigation possibilities of the United States, both from maps and the observations of others as well as myself. I could not but be struck with the immense extent and importance of it, and with the goodness of that providence which has dealt its forces to us in so profuse a hand. Would to God that we may have the wisdom and courage to improve them.

The next was by Abraham Lincoln, and I quote:

No commercial object of Government patronage can be so exclusively general as not to be of some peculiar local advantage; but, on the other hand, nothing is so local as not to be of some general advantage. The Navy, as I understand it, was established, and is maintained at great annual expense, partly for war, when war shall come, but partly also and perhaps chiefly, for protection of our commerce on the high seas. This latter object is, for all I can see, in principle the same as internal improvements. The driving of a pirate from the track of commerce on the broad ocean, and the removal of a snag from its more narrow path in the Mississippi River, cannot, I think, be distinguished in principle.

The next was by Theodore Roosevelt, and I quote:

The development of our inland waterways will have results far beyond the immediate gain to commerce. Deep channels along the Atlantic and Gulf coasts, and from the gulf to the Great Lakes, will have high value for the national defense. A channel is no deeper than its shallowest reach, and to improve rivers short of the point of effective navigability is a sheer waste of all costs. The improvement of our inland waterways can and should be made to pay for itself, so far as practicable, from the incidental proceeds from waterpower and other uses. Navigation should of course be free. But the greatest return will come from the increased commerce, growth, and prosperity of our people.

The next was by Herbert C. Hoover, and I quote:

Modern forms of development have made water carriage the cheapest of all transportation for many types of goods. With greater depths and with improvements in craft, it is possible to restore our waterways. Nor will this jeopardize the prosperity of our railways as some predict. Through the improvement of our waterways, it will be possible to distribute industry and population better, because waterways tend to place many towns and cities upon an equality in transportation.

And, last but not least, by our own President John F. Kennedy, who has done such a good job, and I quote:

Water is unquestionably one of the vital keys to our future security and survival, as well as to our well-being. If this Nation is to end the waste of our water resources, if we are to develop more fully the use of our water for economic growth and the needs of our exploding population, we should—without further delay—greatly accelerate our programs as regards conservation, transportation, power, flood control, and other aspects of our natural water resources.

Mr. Speaker, I agree, and I know you will, with every word that all of these great Presidents have had to say about the development of our waterways, from George Washington, our first President, down to the last President, the present President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

J.F.K. NAMES MOBILE MAN

WASHINGTON.—Maj. Gen. Walter King Wilson of Mobile was nominated by President Kennedy Tuesday to be Chief of Army Engineers. The President also nominated Wilson for the rank of lieutenant general.

Wilson is commanding general of the Engineer Center at Fort Belvoir, Va. He will succeed Lt. Gen. Emerson C. Itschner, who is retiring.

Wilson was the Mobile district engineer from June 1949, to September 1952, when he was named South Atlantic division engineer at Atlanta.

He is married to the former Miss Jeanne Herman of Tuscaloosa, Ala.

Wilson was born at Fort Barrancas, near Pensacola, Fla., in 1906. During his period as Mobile district engineer, the district office completed work on the Alatoona Dam, continued construction of the Jim Woodruff Dam, and started work on the Buford and Demopolis Dams.

[From the Mobile (Ala.) Press, Apr. 19, 1961]

WILSON'S SELECTION FOR HIGHEST ENGINEER POSITION IS GRATIFYING

Mobilians undoubtedly are in unanimous accord with action of President Kennedy in nominating Maj. Gen. Walter K. Wilson, Jr., to be Chief of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and for promotion to the rank of lieutenant general.

Local gratification, over the development stems from Mobilians' admiration for General Wilson and from their recognition of his outstanding ability. Moreover, since he owns a home here, and married Miss Jeanne Herman while she was a teacher at Leinkauf School, the general has very strong Mobile ties.

General Wilson served the Corps of Engineers twice at Mobile during his career. He came here first after graduating from West Point, and was district engineer here from June 1949 to October 1952.

Since leaving Mobile, he has served as division engineer of the south Atlantic division, with headquarters in Atlanta; division engineer of the Mediterranean division, where he did outstanding work in the construction of Air Force bases in north Africa; commanding general of the 18th Engineer Brigade, Fort Leonard Wood, Mo., and as Assistant Chief of Engineers for Military Construction.

The Wilson's home, to which the couple plan to retire when his Army career ends, is located in Spring Hill.

The general is widely known in Mobile as a result of the active role he played in civic and social life of the community while stationed here.

It will be a decided advantage to the Mobile district to have such a man in the Chief of Engineer's post, since he knows so intimately the conditions and the potential of this district.

A man of his ability, character, and long experience should have no difficulty winning approval by the Senate. It is inconceivable that the Nation could find a better man for the high post.

Crane Potests Seizure of Sea Water Booklets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have noted with deep concern an article in the Indianapolis Star, a newspaper published in the capital of my home State, that Federal food and drug inspectors have obtained court authority to seize pamphlets and newspaper articles.

I have seen where Federal drug agents in Ohio have on several occasions seized pamphlets and newspaper articles written by Dr. George W. Crane, a newspaper columnist of some stature.

The pamphlets, some containing reprints of Dr. Crane's newspaper column, were seized, according to the report, because they appeared on the same counter with a display of items such as sea water and salt, sold on the theory that some trace minerals might have an effect on various ailments. These items have no connection with Dr. Crane's column or business.

It was stated that had the pamphlets been on another counter or across the room they would not have been seized.

Mr. Speaker, I feel the medicinal value of sea water and sea salt to be of little concern to the gentlemen in this body. However, I do feel that freedom of the press is a matter to be closely considered by this or any other body.

If the Federal Government wants to take action against a product, such as sea salt or sea water, it should take action against the product and not against the literature. It should be instructed to keep its hands off printed matter or else we may some day see Federal agents confiscating newspapers, magazines, and other pieces of literature because they contain something with which an agency may not agree.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I wish to include in the RECORD the newspaper article written in the Indianapolis Star by Lester M. Hunt and a copy of Dr. Crane's column on the seizure of the literature:

[From the Indianapolis Star, Mar. 13, 1961]

CRANE PROTESTS SEIZURE OF SEA WATER BOOKLETS

(By Lester M. Hunt)

The right of Federal food and drug inspectors to seize pamphlets and newspaper articles was challenged sharply yesterday by Dr. George W. Crane as "a dictatorial invasion of the right of a free press."

Dr. Crane, whose column "The Worry Clinic" appears regularly in the Indianapolis Star, cited several high-handed actions of the Federal drug agents in Ohio.

In one case, the agents seized several copies of a Crane pamphlet containing two reprints of his columns and a discussion of medicinal value of sea water and sea salt.

The pamphlets, he reported, were impounded because they appeared on the same counter as the sea products.

"Had they been on another counter across the room, they would have been legal," Crane said. "In other words, the Federal bureaucrats attempt to tell people on what counter they can place published material.

"In one place, it is legal. In another place, it is illegal. I am very disturbed over these actions which, if not challenged, will lead to a suppression of all information that a Federal department decrees is to be withheld from the public."

The next step, he pointed out, could be the censorship of newspapers, magazines, and all forms of public information.

One instance Crane cited involved the proprietor of a children's shop in Ohio who became interested in the medicinal properties of sea salt and put some in as a sideline.

The local newspaper in an Ohio town wrote a feature story about it and the proprietor pasted it on her store window.

"The Federal drug inspectors tore it down," the columnist said.

A grocery store in Ohio had similar difficulties.

One Ohio man heard of the possibilities of sea water and drove to the Atlantic coast where he filled a couple of barrels and brought them home.

He transferred it to gallon jugs which he sold for $3.75 each. They were labeled "Sea water" with instructions to boil 10 minutes before using.

The drug agents dumped the whole supply, Crane said.

Defending their action, Wallace Janssen, Information Director for the Federal Drug Administration, said yesterday in Washington that when advertising matter specifying diseases which a product will affect is distributed in connection with a product it constitutes a label.

It does not matter whether the material is attached to the product or not, as long as it is used to promote the sale, Janssen said.

He added that if the product is sold with no claims as to its therapeutic value, there is nothing the FDA can do about it.

The Crane pamphlets mentioned cancer, baldness, epilepsy, allergy, arthritis and schizophrenia among 20 suggested deficiency ailments which might be helped by the 44 trace chemicals reportedly found in sea salt and sea water.

All the ailments are those for which no cures have been found, Janssen said.

Crane mentioned the interest of many physicians in the progress of biochemistry and reported instances where sufferers had obtained remarkable relief after the use of sea water.

But aside from his belief that the ocean chemicals may be of great benefit to health, Crane maintained the public should be permitted to analyze the claims pro and con and reach its own conclusions.

"To arbitrarily seize printed pamphlets and newspaper articles is a dangerous precedent which could lead to such abuses as always occur when dictators gain power," he said.

"The people have a right to know the latest thinking in the fields of health and medicine and this they cannot have if the Government tells them what they can read.

"It is logical to believe that many of these mysterious chemicals will provide a preventive to many of the diseases that now baffle science."

Crane pointed out that 60 years ago the American Medical Association brushed off sea water, claiming it had no benefit whatever.

But now, he added, iodine, one of the ingredients, has been found to prevent goiter and is included in common table salt while another, fluorine, has been found to stop tooth decay and has been added to the water supply of hundreds of cities.

Crane has made no claims of cure for the ingredients of salt water but has merely suggested their value in view of the relief some persons have found in their use.

His position is that certain of the ingredients have been proven valuable and that further research may disclose still more.

[From the Indianapolis Star, Mar. 13, 1961]

THE WORRY CLINIC

(By Dr. George W. Crane)

Case H-458: Vivian V., is a spunky Quaker housewife.

"Dr. Crane," she said, "my husband has been selling sea salt and has been showing people your newspaper booklet about the "Ocean's 44 Trace Chemicals."

"Now a bureaucrat is trying to embargo our salt on the ground that we have no right to show people that newspaper booklet.

"He says that the uneducated public cannot come to their own conclusions.

"So the Government must think for them. Isn't this brainwashing?

"Besides, any newspaper reader who can read your column and booklets must have enough gumption to think for himself.

"My third-grader son is now using a textbook by Dr. H. S. Zim, in which about 40 chemicals are mentioned as vital for good health.

"So I asked this bureaucrat if we could show customers that textbook. He said 'No.'

"How can bureaucrats deny us little people the use of newspaper materials or books in our business?"

"In our Republic," said the late Frank E. Gannett, "the Government should fear the people; not the people, the Government."

Last month I addressed the Indiana Academy of General Practice at Indianapolis, and those 500 family doctors were amazed that any bureaucrat would try to oppose the chemical laws of the Almighty.

God put 44 water-soluble chemicals in our blood.

Yet this bureaucrat says our Government "recognizes only 12."

Dr. James H. Shaw, famous Harvard biochemist, has identified 30 of these chemicals just in tooth enamel, dentine and bone.

But our Government "recognizes only 12."

More than 5,000 doctors have eagerly written for the newspaper booklet named below and many are testing sea salt and ocean water on patients.

They and other biochemists know there must have been some reason why God put 44 water-soluble chemicals in our blood.

Yet the Government "recognizes only 12."

Freedom of the press and free speech are in dire jeopardy when any bureaucrats can try to brainwash our citizens and deny average folks the right to pass newspapers or newspaper booklets around among their neighbors.

Newspapers are your best protection against creeping socialism and dictatorship.

Hitler's secret police also tried to squelch freedom of printed matter. That is the first step on the road to dictatorship, so beware.

Our Government bureaucrats have the billions of our taxes behind them to bankrupt little people when the latter do try to defend themselves in court.

A bureaucrat in Ohio thus dumped a farmer's sea water in a ditch and the farmer hadn't the money to fight this issue of free speech, for how could his limited funds compete with the billions in taxes behind bureaucrats? So your newspaper is the only sure defense average people have left in America.

To Secure a World of Prosperous and Peaceful Free Nations We Need the Cooperation of the German People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, the future prospects of a stabilized world of free nations of people enjoying a peaceful existence and higher standard of living depends upon the leadership and strength of our great country and other free nations. And one of the most important factors to achieve this objective is the problem of consolidating the great and creative energetic power and courage of the German people to this cause.

In connection with this I call your attention to the annual Sudeten German Day which is going to take place on Whitsuntide, May 20 to 22, 1961, in Cologne, Germany, with several hundreds of thousands participating, the principal speakers being German Chancellor Dr. Konrad Adenauer; German Federal Minister of Traffic, Dr. Ing. Hans-Christoph Seebohm who is the president of the Sudeten German National Union; and other members of the German Federal Government and Parliament.

The Sudeten German expellees, over 2 million of the total number of 13 million expellees and refugees from communism in West Germany, are going to reaffirm their dedication to the cause of freedom, democracy, and peace and their faith that, by peaceful means, the freedom of the enslaved peoples will be restored and their self-determination right returned to them in the future. In this faith the Sudeten German expellees feel united with the Ukrainians, Slovaks, Hungarians, Czechs, Poles, Balts, and all other peoples behind the Iron Curtain.

In the Sudeten bulletin, of volume 9, of January 1961, there appears an article by Anton F. Wuschek entitled "A Policy of Genocide," as follows:

A POLICY OF GENOCIDE
(By Anton F. Wuschek)

After the expulsion of the Sudeten Germans there remained approximately 170,000 to 200,000 Germans in the area that now embraces Czechoslovakia. Many of them are still residing in their old homes in the Sudetenland, others have been transferred to original Czech areas. Along with the Hungarian, Ukrainian, and Polish minorities in the C.S.S.R., the German element is one of the largest ethnic groups that do not belong to the official nation of the State of Czechs and Slovaks.

Little has been said of the existence of this German group within the past years. Not until last year did they become the subject of considerable discussion within Czechoslovak Communist Party circles, when, in connection with the introduction of the new Socialist constitution in the C.S.S.R. the new status of the ethnic minorities was decided on. Whereas the new constitution gives a minimum of cultural rights to the Ukrainian, Hungarian, and Polish minorities, it deprives the German minority every right to an autonomous group life. State President Antonin Novotny justified this fact with the statement that the German question was settled by the expulsion from their homes of some 3 million Sudeten Germans. The remaining Germans would thus no longer be considered as a minority.

The logic of this statement was by no means given unanimous approval. Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia (CPC), Bruno Köhler, took the opportunity to discuss the Sudeten German issue in detail in the official organ of the CPC Zivot strany (No. 16, 1960). Köhler justified the discrepancy in the minorities policy of the CPC with the remark, that according to the teachings of Leninism, a correct solution of the nationalities issue called for application of the principle of adjustment to the current political situations while giving consideration to the interests of communism.

During the first Czechoslovak Republic under Thomas Masaryk (1918–38) the Communists were the greatest proponents of a radical nationalities policy in the CSR, aimed at a destruction of the Czechoslovak State. The Communists with Köhler as their spokesman vehemently condemned the attitude of the German parties in the CSR that were seeking a federative solution of the nationalities question within the scope of the existing State. Köhler criticized this stand on Februray 1, 1931, in an article in Roter Vorwärts (Red Forward), which reads as follows:

"The national demagogy of all these (bourgeois German) parties climaxes in the demand for 'national self-administration and cultural autonomy' for the German people within the Czechoslovak State * * * National autonomy means the recognition of the Czechoslovak State * * * means rejection a priori of the self-determination right of the German people."

Just how much Communist policy sought at that time to make itself an advocate of the interests of the non-Czech ethnic groups in the CSR becomes evident from the address of the Secretary of the Communist International, Dimitri Z. Manuilskij, before the second regular congress of the CPC:

"Since the CPC recognizes the right of national self-determination, including separation from the State, and combats all attempts to keep national minorities within the framework of the present State structure by means of force, it is obligated to support the demands posed by national minorities against national suppression by every possible means."

But times have changed in the meanwhile and the interests of the Communist rulers in the C.S.S.R. are other than they were in Czechoslovakia during the period between the two world wars. The expulsion of the Sudeten Germans and the confiscation of their property were welcome conditions for complete communization of Czechoslovakia. Bruno Köhler even admits this himself when he writes, in the above-mentioned issue of Zivost strany:

"The transfer of the German minority, totalling millions, did not take place without difficulty, particularly for those affected by the shift. * * * The consistent and timely solution of the problem of the German minority proved to be especially advantageous during the glorious days of February 1948 when the workers concentrated all their energies on achieving victory over the reaction, on a victory that finally made the road free for the establishment of socialism in our country."

Today the CPC openly declares that the expulsion of the Sudeten Germans was a prerequisite for the victory of communism in the C.S.S.R. In order to retain the fruits of this victory, the Red regime in Prague resists with all its might every attempt of the Sudeten Germans and the West to revise the expulsion of the rightful inhabitants of the Sudetenland. In trying to make permanent the injustice, the small minority of Germans still living in the C.S.S.R. today—because the authorities deny them permission to emigrate—are disregarded entirely. Not only are they disregarded, but systematic attempts are being made to do away with them altogether. At this point there begins a policy of genocide, a crime against international law. By conscious and deliberate action the Czech state leaders are trying to uproot an entire ethnic group by surrounding them by conditions that make it impossible for them to cultivate and perpetuate their native tongue and cultural attributes.

Although international jurists may differ as to whether the expulsion of the Sudeten Germans as such, which took place in 1945–46, may be classified as genocide—although expulsion measures were aimed at destruction of the entire Sudeten group—there may well be unanimity of opinion as to the new measures in the C.S.S.R. with regard to the total extirpation of the German minority in the C.S.S.R., that this is planned and systematically organized genocide. Bruno Köhler already anticipates the outcome of this policy when, in the above-cited article, he writes:

"Due to the entirely different situation, the question of the German minority had to be solved entirely differently from that of the Magyar, Ukrainian, and Polish minority in the C.S.S.R. This difference is also evident in the formulation of the republic's new constitution, which legally crystallizes all the important social changes we have affected. The constitutional text can contain no stipulation as to something which no longer exists; namely, a German minority in the C.S.S.R."

Peace Corps Volunteers and the Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, in the April issue of the Selective Service System monthly bulletin, Selective Service, Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director, discusses the question of deferment from military service for those who wish to serve with the Peace Corps.

I believe that General Hershey's remarks will answer many of the questions that have been raised about the draft status of Peace Corps volunteers. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACE CORPS RELATIONSHIP WITH SSS EXPLAINED
(By Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey)

The Peace Corps has been established by Executive order of the President. Legislation has been requested to continue this organization. The activities of the Peace Corps have been covered rather completely by the press, radio, and television. Its relationship with the Selective Service System has been indicated but a statement of this relationship seems advisable.

The Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, is flexible enough to provide deferment for members of the Peace

Corps without amendment of any kind. In other words the relationship of the Selective Service System with registrants who become members of the Peace Corps can be handled administratively.

The power to defer registrants who perform functions in the national health, safety, or interest now exists. The establishment and operation of the Peace Corps is in the national interest. So the classification of registrants in the Peace Corps can be handled as any other registrant engaged in activities in the national health, safety, or interest. They will, of course, enjoy the right of appeal shared by all registrants of the Selective Service System.

These statements presuppose the continuance of the present situation of the United States in relations with other nations of the world.

The question has been raised as to the status of registrants who enroll in the Peace Corps, after their return from this assignment. This requires the assumption as to the situation of this Nation in the world, the age of the registrant when he returns, the physical condition of the registrant with reference to his acceptability for military service, his marital status, and the regulations which apply in existence at the time of his release from the Peace Corps, and whether or not the registrant on his return from service with the Peace Corps engages in an activity which permits him to be deferred in the national health, safety, or interest.

The fact that the registrant has been a member of the Peace Corps will not prevent him from qualifying for further deferment, the same as any other registrant who is engaged in activities vital to the national health, safety, or interest.

Cuba: Fidelismo Without Fidel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the current discussions of our policy toward Cuba, it is vital that we should not blunder into giving a new life to Castroism.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a perceptive editorial from South Carolina's most outspoken newspaper, which is commended for reading by all concerned with the formulation of U.S. policy.

The editorial follows:

FIDELISMO WITHOUT FIDEL

The United States should have nothing to do with an organization of Cuban exiles set up in New York last Wednesday under the name of the Revolutionary Council. It is headed by Dr. Miro Cardona, a former Premier of Cuba under Dictator Castro.

This new group, which the New York Times hails as "the equivalent of a unified provisional government" of Cuba, represents leftwing Cubans who want Fidelismo without Fidel.

If the United States backs Miro Cardona and his crowd, it will be acquiring another Cuban headache as bad as Fidel Castro.

The Revolutionary Council wants to continue the leftist revolution started by Castro. The new group represents a merger of the Democratic Revolutionary Front, a moderate organization, and the People's Revolutionary Movement, a group of revolutionary extremists.

It now appears that the extremists have won a victory over the moderates and that the leftists dominate the forces of the center. Nowhere in the new organization is there a place for Cuban conservatives, who are the true friends of the United States.

Head of the revolutionary movement of the people is Manuel Ray, former Minister of Public Works in the Castro government. Another revolution-of-the-people leader is Maj. Raul Chibas, one of Castro's closest associates from the beginning of the revolution.

Last November, the News and Courier warned that Chibas represented dangerous forces. This man was one of the leaders in Cuba throughout the period of the firing squad terror, confiscation of U.S. property and infiltration of Cuba by Communists. He is not to be trusted by the United States or by genuinely anti-Communist Cuban exiles.

The program announced by Miro Cardona is a charter for continuance of the leftist revolution in Cuba. It specifically endorses the so-called "agrarian reform," which means theft of private property. While a promise is made to pay for confiscated lands, it should be remembered that Castro also made such a promise. The fact is Cuba won't have funds to make indemnities at any time in the forseeable future.

The Revolutionary Council's program also states that the government "will definitely nationalize the public utilities of light and power, telephones, aqueducts, and railroads." In other words, one can be sure that this group, if it comes to power in Cuba, will carry on where Castro began.

This consolidation of authority by leftist Cuban exiles is a threat which the United States was recently warned against by Jose I. Rivero, editor in exile of Diario de la Marina, the great Havana newspaper. He warned that leftists in Washington will aid Cuban leftists in exile who want to continue the Castro revolution but without Fidel Castro, whose bad public relations have damaged the radical cause. Mr. Rivero specifically warned against "Fidelistas who have defected, who only yesterday were accomplices in the horrors of Castroism."

The United States should not raise a finger to aid former accomplices of Fidel Castro. Once they gain power they will turn on the American people. One terrible error was committed when Castro was recognized in the first place. The United States can't afford to give a new lease on life to the Fidelista revolution.

Watertown Daily Times Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, April 22, was the 100th anniversary of the Watertown Daily Times, the largest daily newspaper published in northern New York and one of the outstanding newspapers of the country. I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the Times, to its editor and publisher, John B. Johnson, and to its capable staff.

Although a paper of less than 50,000 circulation, the Watertown Times has a high sense of public purpose and responsibility. It is one of the few daily papers of any size read regularly by the State Department, and its editorials are frequently quoted by the Voice of America broadcasts overseas. Its fine reputation has extended to the offices of other Members of Congress and the Federal Government, although they do not have direct daily contact with the paper.

The Watertown Times established a full-time Washington bureau in the fall of 1951 to give its readers more news of developments in the Nation's Capital of particular importance to their area. It covers the State and national political conventions of both political parties. It has correspondents covering the Presidential campaign activities. The Times sent its Washington correspondent, Alan S. Emory, to Alaska in 1958 for firsthand reports on what the 49th State was really like. Is assigned Mr. Emory to cover former Vice President Nixon's trip to the Soviet Union and Poland in 1959.

In 1956, feeling that residents of the East did not sufficiently understand issues that stirred the people of the Western States, the Times ran a series of articles by its own correspondent on issues of particular significance to the West.

The Times and I do not always agree, but each respects the other's views, and the newspaper's coverage of the news is scrupulously fair. Its leadership in the battle to make a success of the St. Lawrence Seaway is an established fact.

I take great pleasure in saluting the Watertown Times on the occasion of its 100th birthday and wish to bring this event to the attention of my colleagues in Congress.

"We Don't Have Information; We Do Have Information"—The Department of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I herewith enclose letters that indicate certain information is not available:

TENNESSEE ASC STATE OFFICE,
Nashville, Tenn., April 11, 1961.
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington 25, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: We are inclosing herewith tabulations showing participation in the Commodity Credit Corporation loan programs for the years 1958, 1959, and 1960 for barley, corn, grain sorghum, oats, rye, soybeans, and wheat as requested in your letter of March 27, 1961.

We regret that information is not available to us which would show how many of these producers secured loans on more than one commodity. We hope that this information will be satisfactory and will meet your needs.

Very truly yours,

CARL FRY,
Chairman, ASC State Committee.

Tennessee

PARTICIPATION IN THE 1958 CCC LOAN PROGRAM

Commodity	Number producers participated	Amount loaned
Barley	0	0
Corn	58	$178,552
Grain sorghum	4	1,692
Oats	1	1,417
Rye	0	0
Soybeans	1,589	2,078,439
Wheat	166	194,001

PARTICIPATION IN THE 1959 CCC LOAN PROGRAM

Barley	0	0
Corn	113	$308,346
Grain sorghum	1	1,011
Oats	0	0
Rye	0	0
Soybeans	188	410,613
Wheat	370	481,688

PARTICIPATION IN THE 1960 CCC LOAN PROGRAM

Barley	1	$855
Corn	60	138,280
Grain sorghum	1	1,040
Oats	0	0
Rye	0	0
Soybeans	32	79,282
Wheat	213	336,272

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION COMMITTEE,
Syracuse, N.Y., April 14, 1961.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: Enclosed is the information requested concerning Commodity Credit Corporation loans made in New York State for 1958, 1959, and 1960 for barley, corn, grain sorghums, oats, rye, soybeans, and wheat.

You will note that wheat and corn are the important commodities in the State participating in Commodity Credit loan programs.

Without considerable research in county offices we are unable to answer your last question in regard to the number of farmers having two or more of these crops under loan. However, we feel sure the number of these cases would be very small in our State.

If further information is needed, please let us know.

BRYAN LEONARD,
State Administrative Officer for the New York ASC State Committee.

Commodity	Year	Producers participating	Total loaned
Barley	1958	21	$16,711
	1959	3	2,174
	1960	1	885
Corn	1958	134	157,917
	1959	180	266,188
	1960	132	169,128
Grain sorghums: None.			
Oats	1958	67	44,770
	1959	26	23,213
	1960	38	41,067
Rye	1958	16	10,927
	1959	2	1,185
	1960		
Soybeans	1958		
	1959	1	1,420
	1960		
Wheat	1958	1,180	1,999,051
	1959	989	1,564,303
	1960	1,027	1,605,188

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION COMMITTEE,
College Station, Tex., April 11, 1961.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: In compliance with the request contained in your letter dated March 27, 1961, listed below are the number of loans disbursed in Texas on 1958-, 1959-, and 1960-crop barley, corn, grain sorghums, oats, rye, soybeans, and wheat. Also listed are the quantities of these commodities placed under loan and the amounts of loans disbursed:

1958 CROP YEAR

Commodity	Number of loans	Quantity under loans	Amount of loans
Barley	2,094	[1] 2,285,544	$2,156,090
Corn	26	[1] 63,331	69,279
Grain sorghums	43,320	[2] 66,598,679	123,656,913
Oats	5,695	[1] 8,882,504	5,961,075
Rye	62	[1] 50,227	48,621
Soybeans	973	[1] 673,621	1,322,033
Wheat	20,027	[1] 43,480,461	80,676,289

1959 CROP YEAR

Barley	33	[1] 51,658	$38,891
Corn	68	[1] 136,786	163,019
Grain sorghums	16,308	[2] 36,222,198	214,392
Oats	124	[1] 195,967	113,217
Soybeans	19	[1] 38,724	68,997
Wheat	5,532	[1] 3,133,890	23,345,608

1960 CROP YEAR

Barley	159	[1] 261,119	$191,213
Corn	44	[1] 76,694	87,528
Grain sorghums	21,969	[2] 53,717,358	83,362,873
Oats	217	[1] 464,884	269,642
Soybeans	20	[1] 33,292	58,132
Wheat	10,185	[1] 29,764,335	53,383,820

[1] Bushels.
[2] Hundredweight.

We do not have a record of the number of producers who participated in the price support program, as distingiushed from the number of loans disbursed, or the number who obtained loans on more than one commodity. However, it is hoped that the above information will serve your purpose.

If additional information relative to the price support program is desired or if I can be of further service to you, please advise.

Very truly yours,

JACK BRADSHAW,
Acting State Administrative Officer.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURE STABALIZATION AND CONSERVATION COMMITTEE,
Columbia, Mo., April 11, 1961.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: This acknowledges your letter of March 27, 1961 requesting information on the participation in Commodity Credit Corporation loan programs for the years 1958, 1959, and 1960. We regret the delay in our reply which was occasioned by your letter having been inadvertently forwarded to the director of extension at the University of Missouri.

For your information we attach a listing showing the number of loans and the total amount loaned for each of the years and commodities requested. However, we regret that we are unable to furnish specific information regarding the number of farmers who participated in two, three, and four of these programs, respectively. Our accounting records are not maintained on an individual name basis and therefore, it would be virtually impossible for us to assemble this information. Our experience with these programs would, however, enable us to estimate that 30 percent of the producers participated in two programs, 10 percent participated in three programs and no more than 2 percent participated in four programs in each of the years 1958, 1959, and 1960.

We hope this information is what you desire; if we can be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely yours,

CLAUDE BOWLES,
State Administrative Officer.

	1960		1959		1958	
	Number of loans	Loan value	Number of loans	Loan value	Number of loans	Loan value
Barley	31	$26,720	27	$23,193	127	$104,935
Corn	10,923	23,836,596	13,122	27,935,857	5,884	13,117,597
Grain sorghums	1,617	1,790,984	1,364	1,860,116	6,881	8,410,186
Oats	24	12,422	24	12,951	83	58,982
Rye	7	3,456	6	1,836	19	15,524
Soybeans	2,065	4,072,977	3,858	7,497,077	9,539	20,316,496
Wheat	8,986	12,585,026	11,732	15,941,334	11,175	15,822,644
Total	23,653	42,328,581	30,133	53,272,004	33,708	57,846,364

Mr. Speaker, I herewith enclose statements that indicate the availability of information:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION COMMITTEE,
College Park, Md., April 19, 1961.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: Since furnishing the information pertaining to Maryland participation in price support programs for transmittal to you by Dr. Nystrom, we have received a letter from our area director on this subject, a copy of which is enclosed, and which we believe will be self-explanatory. However, if the Department in Washington should be unable to furnish the information you desire, please let us know.

We are returning the letter from Dr. Nystrom, together with attachments, as you requested in your note.

Sincerely yours,

DUDLEY C. AIST,
Administrative Officer, Maryland ASC State Office.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK IN AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS, STATE OF MARYLAND,
College Park, Md., April 13, 1961.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: I have your thermafax copy of letter addressed to directors concerning grain producers.

I am attaching a copy of letter with attached data received from Mr. Dudley C. Aist, of the Maryland ASC State office. I hope this gives you the information you need. If it does not, I shall be glad to have you write me further.

Very truly yours,
PAUL E. NYSTROM, *Director.*

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
COMMODITY STABILIZATION SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., April 12, 1961.

To: State administrative officers, northeast area.

From: Harris W. Soul, director, northeast area.

Subject: Requests for grain crop loan information.

It has come to our attention that Congressman BECKWORTH recently asked a number of States for information about grain crop loans in the past 3 years.

The information desired can be furnished by the Department in Washington so it will not be necessary for you to furnish it county by county.

COLLEGE PARK, MD.,
April 11, 1961.

Dr. PAUL E. NYSTROM
Director of Extension, Agriculture,
University of Maryland,
College Park, Md.

DEAR DR. NYSTROM: Attached is a tabulation which will give most of the information requested in Representative BECKWORTH's letter of March 27. The answers to the questions in the final paragraph of Representative BECKWORTH's letter could be obtained only by conducting a survey in each county in the State in which there was loan activity in any of the past 3 years.

Due to the urgency of the work in counties on the new feed-grain program it would be very difficult to conduct such a survey at this time, however, if he should still wish to get these figures we will conduct the survey and furnish the results to him after the feed-grain program has gotten underway. This would be in about a month or 6 weeks.

Very truly yours,
DUDLEY C. AIST,
Administrative Officer,
Maryland ASC State Office.

Participation in commodity loan programs in Maryland

	1958		1959		1960	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Barley		None		None	1	$7,175
Corn	53	$139,547	101	$278,584	88	316,545
Grain sorghum		None		None		None
Oats		None		None		None
Rye		None		None		None
Soybeans	4	6,826		None		None
Wheat	467	671,555	176	315,146	216	455,104

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK IN AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS, STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,
Clemson, S.C., April 19, 1961.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: Your request for information dated March 27, 1961, on participation of farmers in this State in the Commodity Credit Corporation loan program for several commodities, was referred to Mr. A. R. Crawford, acting State administrative officer, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committee, Columbia, S.C. Mr. Crawford advised me on the subject as follows:

"We have taken no action to obtain the information requested by Congressman BECKWORTH, since we have just received a letter from our Washington office advising that the information sought by the Congressman covers a number of States and will be furnished at the Washington level."

I trust that you have received through the Washington office of U.S. Department of Agriculture the information you desire.

Sincerely yours,
GEO. B. NUTT, *Director.*

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 20, 1961.

Mr. HARRIS W. SOULE,
Commodity Stabilization Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SOULE: Please note the enclosures.

I am sending you a copy of the letter dated March 27, 1961, that I sent each State Director.

Since you state specifically you can furnish the information, I want it immediately and I want all of the information for which I asked in connection with every State. Because you do state you have the information in Washington, I shall expect the information forthwith.

Please return.

Kind regards,
LINDLEY BECKWORTH.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 27, 1961.

DEAR DIRECTOR: For the years 1958, 1959, and 1960 I desire the following information:

How many barley producers participated in the Commodity Credit Corporation loan program? What was the total loaned in your State in each year?

How many corn producers participated in the Commodity Credit Corporation loan program? What was the total loaned in your State in each year?

How many grain sorghum producers participated in the Commodity Credit Corporation loan program? What was the total loaned in your State in each year?

How many oat producers participated in the Commodity Credit Corporation loan program? What was the total loaned in your State in each year?

How many rye producers participated in the Commodity Credit Corporation loan program? What was the total loaned in your State in each year?

How many soybean producers participated in the Commodity Credit Corporation loan program? What was the total loaned in your State in each year?

How many wheat producers participated in the Commodity Credit Corporation loan program? What was the total loaned in your State in each year?

How many farmers participated in the programs of two of these crops? How many farmers participated in the programs of three of these crops? How many farmers participated in the programs of four of these crops?

For this information I shall be grateful.

Regards,
LINDLEY BECKWORTH.

Mr. Speaker, I do hope to have the information soon.

John Francis Killea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE M. KILGORE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, the Lower Rio Grande Valley Chamber of Commerce of Weslaco, Tex., devotes considerable effort and energy to consistently bettering, on a local basis, the outstanding relations between the United States and Mexico. Because the valley recognizes devoted public servants in the foreign service are necessary to the implementation of our foreign relations, the chamber of commerce honored American Consul General John Francis Killea at Monterrey, Mexico, recently with a dinner at which time they presented him with a resolution of appreciation.

Since the resolution expresses so completely the gratification of the citizens of the Rio Grande Valley of Texas at the dedication of foreign service personnel, I would like to enter it in the RECORD for the information of all interested:

RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION FROM THE LOWER RIO GRANDE VALLEY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, ADDRESSED TO JOHN FRANCIS KILLEA, FOR DEVOTED AND DILIGENT WORK AS U.S. CONSUL-GENERAL STATIONED AT MONTERREY, NUEVO LEON, MEXICO

Whereas John Francis Killea is U.S. Consul-General stationed at Monterey, Nuevo Leon, Mexico; and the consular territory for which he is responsible covers most of the northeastern part of that nation; and

Whereas Mr. Killea has devoted himself to the diplomatic service of the United States with unremitting diligence toward furthering the interests of his fellow nationals; and

Whereas while keeping the welfare of the United States always foremost in his mind, he has at the same time won the high regard of the Mexican officials and people with whom he has dealt; and

Whereas Mr. Killea's understanding of the problems relating to international affairs has accrued to the benefit of the Lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Lower Rio Grande Valley Chamber of Commerce, That we extend forformally, on behalf of the entire organization, our sincere thanks and deep appreciation for his unselfish and valuable service to his Nation; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of State of the United States, with the recommendation that it be placed in the permanent files relating to John Francis Killea.

Adopted this 7th day of March A.D. 1961.

BARRY L. TRASK,
President.

Groton Points With Pride to Its Members of the Famous 6th

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the great Commonwealth of Massachusetts, steeped as it is in Revolutionary War history, is rich in its Civil War heritage as well. This is colorfully illustrated in a recent feature story in my hometown paper, the Lowell Sun. Shirley Foley has done a wonderful job in capturing the spirit of those exciting, tragic days a century ago. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting this article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Lowell Sun, Apr. 24, 1961]

GROTON POINTS WITH PRIDE TO ITS MEMBERS OF THE FAMOUS "6TH"

(By Shirley Foley)

GROTON.—One can almost hear the muffled sounds of "The Battle Hymn of the Republic" as he enters the Groton public library and is faced with the dramatic and historic relics of the Civil War which went on display this week as part of the town's celebration of National Library Week.

One sees among other things, a dilapidated leather dispatch case which may well have carried General Grant's orders to march on Vicksburg; tarnished medical instruments used aboard the Bohio by Dr. Giles Mosely Pease at New Orleans; and scores of muskets, battle sabres, and cannon balls used when "brother fought brother" in the fierce battles of Bull Run and Gettysburg.

As one examines these poignant reminders of a tragic era in the history of this Nation, his imagination is apt to run free as he recalls the events and episodes of the Civil War and the role these historic momentos might have played.

The exhibit, presented by the library committee under the chairmanship of Mrs. Steven Sabine of Farmers Row, utilizes the theme of the Civil War period since the centennial is currently being marked.

All items on exhibit belonged to early residents of Groton or to relatives and friends of families now residing there. Momentos have been loaned by citizens and organizations of the town and are valuable not only for their historical significance, but also because of the annecdotes connected with them which give a glimpse into the personal lives of those involved as well as the backstage drama of the war.

According to the history of Massachusetts, the 6th Regiment was the most famous organization called to the defense of the National Government. This was the first "to offer its services in the case of need; it was the first to shed its blood and give its lives, and it was the first command armed and equipped for active service to reach the national capital." Many representatives of the 6th were from Groton, and this fact is one of priceless historic value to the citizens of this town and one which gives them the enviable right to be recorded in the history of the country.

A dispatch case belonging to Lt. Col. Charles Hinchman, along with his discharge papers and letters he wrote to his father about the Battle of Chicamauga have been loaned by Richard Hinchman. There is an interesting sidelight attached to a Confederate coat Hinchman possessed. According to the story, the coat belonged to Colonel Russel, a Confederate soldier who was taken prisoner by Hinchman. After the war was over, the colonel wrote to Hinchman to tell him that in appreciation of the fine treatment he had received as a prisoner, he had named his horse "Hinchman."

Comdr. George Cary Sinclair, great grandfather of Dr. Helen Putman, resigned his commission in the U.S. Navy when Virginia joined the Confederacy, and was given the rank of commander in the Confederate States Navy. Among the items belonging to him on exhibit are his coat and the epaulets he wore. Also displayed are a silver creamer and sugar basin. According to the story, the silver was made for his ship but was never used. Commander Sinclair was in England overseeing the outfitting of his ship, the *Texas,* when the war ended.

One particular interesting item is a facsimile of Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation loaned by the Historical Society. The original was destroyed in the Chicago fire, and there are only 10 extant reproductions in the country today.

Another interesting reproduction is the letter of the century, one of the most famous letters of all times. This is the letter Lincoln wrote to Mrs. Bixby to tell her he was very sorry and deeply moved upon learning the news that her five sons had been killed in the war. This copy belonged to the great-great-grandfather of Norman B. Saunders.

The children in the public schools also participated in the exhibition by submitting essays and displays on some phase of the war. The four essay winners were Cindy Cable who wrote on "Clara Barton; "Teddy Wilkinson who wrote on "The Battle of Bull Run;" Fegina Cappeletti who wrote on "The Battle of Pea Ridge;" and John Ellis who entitled his essay, "Civil War Project."

There are many other Civil War items on display which graphically recall episodes dating from John Brown's historic raid on Harpers Ferry to General Lee's dramatic surrender at Appomattox, there, for the benefit of all townspeople.

Customs Facilities in Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach Should Be Placed at the Harbor Where They Belong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Customs District is the fastest growing customs district in the Nation. It collected $98,748,713 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960. Ninety percent or more of the district's collections come from the twin ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles, according to a foreign trade survey prepared by the Union Bank of Los Angeles. Imports through the twin ports have increased more than 600 percent since 1946.

Yet, importers and exporters shipping through the port of Los Angeles or the port of Long Beach are subject to delays and inconveniences found in no other port in the United States. The Los Angeles Customs District headquarters is located 22 miles from the harbor area, in the traffic-clogged center of Los Angeles. This means that importers and brokers have to break up shipments and send part of their merchandise 22 miles inland for examination and appraisal. This means paperwork has to be shuttled between the coustomhouse and the harbor by messenger and that customs personnel waste time in unnecessary travel.

New customs facilities have been proposed for Los Angeles. Now is the time to eliminate the 22-mile bottleneck, and to establish the Los Angeles Customhouse in the harbor it serves. Yet the General Services Administration and the Customs Service are planning to perpetuate these difficulties and retain the 22-mile bottleneck by placing the new customs facilities in a new Federal building planned for construction at the Civic Center, downtown Los Angeles. This erratic decision should be reversed. The customs facilities should be placed at the harbor where they belong not 22 miles away.

Western Rental Housing Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEM MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the excitement in this year's Western Rental Housing Conference was over condominium which is a relatively new development for homeownership in multiple-dwelling units. Because of the wide interest, and because of the need for information the speech of Jackson Moffett, vice president of the California Pacific Title Insurance Co. is reproduced here:

CONDOMINIUM

Theoretically, there should be no title insurance distinction between applications for insurance of fee interests of a portion of a described piece of real property, regardless of whether that portion be the southeast quarter of the lot or of a described quarter of the building located thereon.

It is a general principle of law that a building permanently fixed to the freehold becomes a part of it, belonging to the owner of the land on which it stands. (*Lycoming Eire Inc. Co.* v. *Haven,* 95 U.S. 252 and *Ingold* v. *Phoenix Assur. Co.,* 52 S.E. 2d 366.) Parts of a building, just as parts of the actual land, may be owned by different people in fee simple, as when an upper floor belongs to one person, and the lower floor to another (*McConnell* v. *Kibbe,* 33 Ill. 75) or separate rooms or even parts of rooms belong to different persons. (*White* v. *White,* 16 N.J.L. 202). A person who owns the entire estate in real property may sell and convey any part of it. It may be divided horizontally, perpendicularly, or in any manner according to the will of the owner, even to the extent of granting a freehold interest in a part of the building (6 AM Jur 443).

In the face of this principle that the building is a part of the land and that parts of that building may be owned by different people in fee simple, and since our policies have been drafted to insure the ownership of any adequately described portion of real property, we should have no hesitancy in insuring the fee title to an apartment conveyed by deed. We have nevertheless accepted requests for this type of insurance with some reluctance, and of those policies issued as a result of such requests, all have contained qualifications limiting the extent of the insurance granted.

Up to this time there seems to have been a reluctance on the part of the lenders and title companies to become involved in condominium because of the failure of the deed to correctly and clearly delineate the nature of the estate being granted, both as to the apartment unit, and to the common portions of the land and building. Now in order to overcome these weaknesses, let us for a moment consider the objections and their solutions.

The courts of our land have been extremely liberal in construing descriptions of real property conveyed by deed, requiring only that it be described with sufficient definiteness and certainly to locate it from other property.

Title insurers have added the further requirement that it not only be sufficient to stand up under legal attack but sufficient without aid of extrinsic evidence, to eliminate the possibility of litigation which might arise by reason of any patent ambiguity. Since neither the fractional part of a lot type description nor the metes and bounds type description lends itself well to the problem of clearly defining an apartment, e.g., on the second floor of a building, use must be made of a reference type description.

It is of course not necessary to the validity of a description that the deed itself set out a complete description of the apartment which is being conveyed. On the principle that that is certain which is capable of being made certain, the apartment is sufficiently described in the deed by reference for identification to a plat in which the apartment is sufficiently described to be identifiable. Such a reference has the effect of incorporating the plat into the description so that which is described will be transferred to the grantee.

Assume that the apartment is conveyed with a description such as:

"A certain apartment consisting of approximately 1,000 square feet, located in the Southeast quarter of the second floor of the building on lot 6, tract 1,000 of said county, now known as apartment No. 200, and so designated on the door of such apartment, and as said apartment is shown on that plat attached hereto and made a part of this deed."

If the attached plat clearly identifies the exact boundaries of the subject apartment, then that portion of the building which is intended to be conveyed has been described with sufficient definiteness to make that real property the proper subject of our title insurance.

The weakness of the description is that the perimeter line is the wall of the apartment. The doctrine that such walls are party walls can only be applicable to inside walls and, in addition, it is not advisable to convey to the purchasers an ownership in severalty of the part thereof which rests on his side of the line, with an easement of support from the other part.

It is the intention of the parties to share equally structural maintenance responsibilities and, consequently, the weakness of the description can be eliminated by requiring the plat to clearly delineate the perimeter line as the inside surface of all walls. Although any dividing wall would still be a party wall, the parties can own such wall as tenants in common, thereby eliminating the cross-easement problem.

Regardless of the sufficiency of the deed as to description and other essential elements, we do not believe insurance of a single apartment ownership is by itself either practical or advisable. Such apartment fee ownership should be acquired concurrently with an undivided factional interest as a tenant in common in the base land and all common portions of the apartment building (the fractional interest being determined by the number of units involved).

In the absence of such a concurrent acquisition of the tenancy in common estate, each of the rights and obligations necessary for the enjoyment of the apartments, such as easements of ingress and egress, for utilities, obligations of support and maintenance of the building and property, would have to be expressed contractually and through cross-easements in each of the deeds of conveyance themselves.

The result of a concurrent conveyance would be to create in each grantee an absolute fee ownership in the specified apartment, and an undivided fractional interest as a tenant in common of the base land and all portions of the building where mutual and shared uses and responsibilities are intended. Since, as a tenant in common, each owner may enjoy all of the common estate in the same manner as if he were the sole owner, subject only to similar rights of his other co-tenants (*Prairie Oil and Gas Co.* v. *Allen*, 2 Fed. 2d 566), the difficult problem of separately setting forth each of the required easements has been eliminated. Such rights are present as an incident of the tenance in common estate acquired.

Such a plan should be acceptable to a purchaser of such an apartment once he understands the incidents of a tenancy in common estate, and particularly since it would simplify his ability to sell or encumber the acquired interests. His right, as is the right of other cotenants to use the co- mon property, cannot be capricious or irresponsible. He must use it with the care of an ordinary prudent user of like property and, in the event of injury to the property, he cannot discharge himself of liability by showing that he used the same care that he uses on his separate property, unless that care is at least equal to the care of a prudent man. He may not alter or change the property to the injury of his cotenants and, since their possessory rights are equal, the burden of defraying necessary expenses incident to the common estate, such as repairs, taxes, etc., is one that devolves equally upon all the coowners in proportion of their respective interests (14 Am Jr. Cotenancy).

It is by this procedure of using a deed clearly defining the two distinct parcels and estates to be conveyed that we are now willing and prepared to insure individual units in a condominium. May I say also at this point, that certain lenders are now ready to make individual mortgage loans to condominium apartment purchasers based on an insured fee simple title for each apartment.

In closing, I feel that the condominium concept will open a vast and scarcely touched field to the builder-developer. It will help to satisfy the homeownership desire of a large portion of the public who, presently, because of land speculation, high building costs, and other economic factors are priced out of the market. I refer specifically to young married couples and retired people on a moderate fixed income. I believe the builder who undertakes condominium projects will be doing his community a real service, not only in providing far better land usage in high density areas, but in supplying the means to fulfill a tremendous ownership demand, be it in the $10,000 bracket or in the so-called ultra-luxury type running from $50,000 on up.

M. Stanton Evans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, for a while during his swift rising career M. Stanton Evans, who at 26 is editor of one of the Nation's important metropolitan dailies, worked in Washington for Human Events. He has made many friends in the Congress who sincerely respect his ability, integrity, and intelligence. They will be interested in regard the following article concerning him published in the April 1961, issue of the New Guard magazine:

PROFILES IN CONSERVATISM—MERCURY OF THE MIDWEST

(By Carol D. Bauman)

Twenty-six years ago, when Stan Evans was born, the country was in the throes of the great depression. And Stan, along with all the other boys and girls, was taught that the Great Emancipator was not Abraham Lincoln, but Franklin Delano Roosevelt; that the Declaration of Independence did not free us from tyranny, the New Deal did; that there was no national debt, it was owed to ourselves; and that democracy did not mean rule by the people, but government by decree.

M. Stanton Evans, editor, writer, speaker, agitator, and lover of liberty, somehow maintained a sense of incredulity throughout his education, even at Yale. At 26, he is a successful editor of one of the Nation's top metropolitan daily newspapers, the Indianapolis News.

His latest honor comes from the Headliners' Club, a national journalistic society, for consistently outstanding editorial pages.

He was similarly hailed for contributions to Americanism by the Freedoms Foundation, with two awards for editorial writing, one in 1959 and another in 1960. His first book, "Revolt on the Campus," is due for publication in the fall.

A fiery, volatile personality, Stan Evans has been one of the biggest drawing cards for campus forums in recent years. He reminds one of a modern Samuel Johnson, discussing philosophy with eager students far into the night over cups of black coffee. For instance, after an engagement at a large midwestern college, he and his adherents spent most of the night talking politics and world affairs with an admitted Communist. He has probably influenced more students in the field of conservative thinking than he knows, more through personal contact than by his persuasive writing and speaking.

He is best and most fondly remembered by his Washington friends for his 3 years as managing editor of Human Events, the Washington political newsletter which has been the birthplace of many a new career in conservative journalism.

FOUNDING MEMBER

As an undergraduate at Yale, he was a founding member of the Conservative Club, and edited its publication, the Independent. The Calliopean Society was revived in his senior year, and he was the first chairman in its modern form. It had flourished in the 19th century as a Yale debate club, and enjoyed a brief resurrection under William F. Buckley, Jr.

On his graduation from Yale in 1955, Evans made the choice between going with a large corporation, and "saving the coun-

try"—with the result that he plunged into a writing job with the Freeman a month after his graduation. After a short tour of duty as National Review's Louisville editor, Stan joined the staff of Human Events in August 1956.

His prodigious output of literature has graced the Individualist, which he formerly edited. In it he gently chided the National Student Association in an exposé of the student organization's leftist leanings by citing examples of the more obvious misspellings, errors in construction and incorrect syntax in its voluminous publications.

"One gets the idea that if these students spent less time big-wigging and more time studying, they would be making a far greater contribution to education," he wrote.

His wit comes through with distinguished clarity in the occasional book reviews he still does for National Review. Commenting on Marilyn Monroe by Maurice Zolotow, he wrote:

"The marriage of Arthur Miller and Marilyn Monroe was so odd a mixture of libido and liberalism that I have long believed it was invented at an editorial conference of the New York Post."

Though he has retired to the comparative quietude of the Indianapolis News editorial offices, Stan still thrives on the foibles of the opposition. One of his rules for discussing politics with a liberal is to confuse the issue by saying exactly what the liberal thinks the conservative thinks. On Senator McCarthy:

"Personally, I didn't like what McCarthy was trying to do, but I liked his methods." Or,

"I'm not against the principle of Federal Aid to Education, I just think too much education would be dangerous."

But happily for the people of Indianapolis, Stan uses direct, no-nonsense language in his editorials. He leaves no doubt about the issue at hand, and unfailingly supports his Libertarian viewpoint with facts, figures, and cases.

NEW BOOK

In his new book, "Revolt on the Campus," Stan studies the extent of the conservative movement among the Nation's youth. Of this purpose, he says:

"I hope to illustrate not only the scope and power of the conservative movement among young people, but to discuss as well the high intellectual quality of the students and other young people participating in it. The book will have something to say about the philosophical premises of the movement, as well as about its performance in the arena of practical politics.

"When I say the conservative movement is spreading, I don't mean to imply that the majority of the students are conservative. They are not. Most students, I think, are still indifferent to political matters. But the conservative element on the campus is now on the offensive; it is articulate, resourceful, aggressive. It represents the group which, in 15 or 20 years, will be assuming the seats of power in the United States. That is why, in my estimation, it authentically represents the future of the country."

And as one of the Nation's youngest editors, Stan Evans has already begun to assume some of that power and influence. He accepts his position humbly, however, and has not initiated any sweeping changes in News policy.

Eugene Pulliam, recipient of one of YAF's annual awards last month, and owner of the News, knows Stan Evans is a real find for his paper. A conservative, an intelligent (Phi Beta Kappa, cum laude) critic, and a remarkable journalist, Stan's qualities are so well fitted to Pulliam's purposes that he could not resist the desire to hand him the reins of the News, editorially speaking, and say "Godspeed."

Results of Poll Taken in the Sixth Congressional District of Washington State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I recently mailed questionnaires to 65,000 residents of my congressional district, which includes all of Pierce County and all of Kitsap County with the exception of Bainbridge Island. It contained six questions dealing with issues which the President discussed during the last campaign, and which are now pending before Congress.

The names of the individuals receiving the questionnaires were selected at random from lists which gave no indication of the political leanings of those people. The number of recipients and the number of returns were sufficiently large to give assurance that a good cross section opinion of my constituency would be obtained.

To date there has been a much better than average response, indicating an increased interest on the part of my people in the affairs of Government. I have received thus far responses from 18 percent of the people who received questionnaires. More returns are expected, of course, but a sufficient number have now been received to determine the general views of the people of my area. I am sure that their opinions will be of interest to the other Members of the House.

The results of the poll expressed in terms of percentages are as follows:

[In percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Should medical and hospital care for the elderly be provided through the Social Security Act under a plan calling for an increase in the payroll tax?	64	33	3
2. Do you favor legislation which would provide Federal financial assistance to depressed areas at a proposed cost of $390,000,000 per year?	55	33	12
3. Do you approve of Federal financial aid for—			
(a) School construction?	55	41	4
(b) Teachers' salaries?	28	65	7
4. Do you believe Congress should enact legislation increasing the minimum wage from $1 to $1.25 per hour and extending its coverage to include several million additional workers?	60	34	6
5. Do you favor new public housing legislation which is anticipated to cost in excess of $1,000,000,000 per year?	31	58	11

A Firsthand Report on Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the short-lived Cuban invasion certainly has not been pleasant news for the freedom-loving people of Cuba and the citizens of our own country—the gravity of the issue and the intense concern of our Nation has been shown by the President's series of top-level discussions with the leaders of both parties and by the bipartisan support which all have given the President.

Mr. Speaker, there is little doubt in my mind that a large contributing cause for the defeat of freedom forces in this instance was due to the lack of accurate intelligence information.

This story is an old one and has too often been the case. This was true in Suez, in Hungary, in Laos and certainly appears to be all too true in the case of Cuba.

Our intelligence operations, in my opinion, are ineffective—and a review or reappraisal has long been in order—in fact it is overdue. This review and study must be a thorough one and must spare no effort to pinpoint what is wrong with the CIA—and other intelligence operations—and then establish a more effective intelligence agency for our country and for freedom.

The President has acted wisely in recalling Gen. Maxwell Taylor to active duty and giving him a special assignment of making a survey of the organization and capacity of the United States to deal with subversion, counterespionage and guerrilla warfare. The Attorney General, Mr. Robert F. Kennedy, also has been asked by the President to work on this important reevaluation and study of CIA operations.

While our CIA seemingly cannot get the information on the extent of subversion going on in Cuba, visiting reports seem to be able to see and report the picture.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have reproduced in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from a report on the details and extent of the Communist takeover in Cuba as reported by Canadian newspaperman, Mr. Eric Greiger and also United States columnist, Mr. Drew Pearson. Excerpts from their articles follow:

A FIRSTHAND REPORT ON CUBA

(By Eric Geiger)

The young official in the Cuban ministry for external affairs shook his head vigorously.

"Anybody who says we are going Communist here is just repeating American propaganda," he said. That was in Havana 2 weeks before the counter-revolutionaries landed.

The same statement was made by more than a score of Government officials whom I questioned about Communist influence in Cuba on my trip there which ended a week before the anti-Castro effort.

And what they said was in complete contrast with what anybody could see there if he has a pair of good eyes.

You don't have to speak Spanish, and you need no guide to see the evidence of Communist infiltration and influence.

All you have to do is stroll through downtown Havana.

It can turn into a frightening experience.

Pictures of Lenin and Khrushchev were prominently displayed in Government-owned store windows; corner newsstands had racks filled with Soviet newspapers and magazines, and there are hundreds of posters proclaiming the friendship between the Cubans and the people of the U.S.S.R., Red China, and other Communist nations.

HAMMER AND SICKLE

The Red hammer and sickle emblem seemed to be almost as prevalent as the picture of bearded Fidel Castro.

Cigar stores were selling lighters with the Communist symbol painted on them, and small boys were running through the streets waving little red flags.

Even more material proof of Castro's close link with the Red world could be found in the waterfront section.

Hundreds of Russian-made military trucks were lined up on the docks, apparently just having been unloaded from ocean vessels.

Warehouse yards were filled to capacity with heavy pieces of all kinds of machinery, the abbreviation CCCP (Soviet Union) clearly visible on some of them.

Near the presidential palace, just off the famed Prada Boulevard, an entire city block has been taken over for a gigantic Communist Chinese exhibition. At night floodlights illuminated a huge sign on top of the building proclaiming the close bond of friendship between the people of Cuba and Communist China.

COMMUNISTS' WREATHS

Large wreaths, bearing the hammer and sickle, have been placed on most of the city's monuments. One such wreath, dedicated by the Communist Workers of Moscow, is at the base of the monument honoring Cuba's national hero, Jose Marti, who led the independence movement in the 19th century.

The ornate lobbies of the big luxury hotels—once the gathering places for international society—are now swarming with somber-looking technicians and "advisors" from Soviet Russia, Red China, North Korea and half a score of satellite countries.

Although none of them is wearing military uniform, many were giving themselves away as military men by their gait and manner.

And then there is the newly established Cuba Institute for the Friendship of All People, an organization whose Communist character is probably more obvious than that of most other Government agencies.

Headed by a young man who hasn't yet reached his 23d birthday the institute operates a luxury hotel for visiting Communists and members of Red front organizations. It maintains a fleet of gleaming U.S.-made limousines for special tours through the country and generally seems to be Cuba's link with Communist and left-wing groups all over the world.

During a 3-hour visit in the institute's big lobby I met a truly international crew of Communists and fellow travelers, all of whom proudly wearing a badge reading "invidado" (guest) which signifies their status as official guests of the Cuban Government.

Some were obviously mere freeloaders who were having a good time posing as sympathizers of the Castro regime, but most of them made no secret of their Communist beliefs.

INVASION OUTLOOK

The invasion of Cuba came as no surprise to the people of the island nation. It had been expected for weeks by Castro followers and foes alike.

When I left Havana a few days before the fuse was lit, the city seemed like a huge powder keg * * * ready to explode any moment.

The sprawling, historic Cuban capital which once attracted fun-loving tourists from all over the world had become a gigantic military camp, bristling with arms and filled with an atmosphere of imminent war * * * and fear.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 20, 1961]

AN ACCIDENTAL VISIT TO SOVIET CUBA

(By Drew Pearson)

To understand why invaders sought to bring the fight for freedom to a quick climax in Cuba, drop in at the Havana Airport. I did so the other day—by accident.

Because of an airline strike, I found myself on an island-hopping KLM plane taking the roundabout way from South America to Miami. The American consul in Maracaibo at first flatly refused to stamp my passport for transit through Havana, but after considerable soul-searching let me go.

The plane carried 30 Russian technicians, also en route to Havana. The Dutch stewardess told me that KLM had carried about 600 of them in the last 2 months. To avoid New York they took the long way around, south to Curacao, then north to Cuba, which has become a virtual Soviet base 90 miles off the cost of Florida.

The Russian passengers were crowded together in tourist class. When American officials travel, they go in private plane at the taxpayers' expense, or first class. One British passenger, riding first class, went forward and struck up a conversation.

"I say," he asked a Russian, "Why don't you dress better? Why do you fellows always look so frumpish?"

"It is true that we don't dress as well as you," was the reply, "but give us time. We have been concentrating on other things."

OTHER THINGS

At Kingston, Jamaica, a British immigration officer stuck his nose in the door to announce: "No passengers from Iron Curtain countries will be allowed to leave the plane."

The rest of us stretched our legs for 30 minutes.

But at Havana it was different. Here the Iron Curtain passengers were given special treatment. They were ushered into the passport office and health office, while the first-class, better-dressed British and Americans waited in line.

At the plane were three Cuban musicians, serenading all the passengers—the standard Castro reception for all incoming planes. The traditional free Bacardi cocktail was also available. Over the facade of the airport in large letters, however, was plastered this challenge to arriving Americans: "Free Cuba in America."

And all over the airport was the usual propaganda so familiar in Communist countries: "Work for your country, not for yourselves," Cubans were reminded. "Get back to the land," the No. 1 Communist of the cabinet, Che Guevara, asked, enlisting cane cutters for the sugar fields.

Most ticket counters for U.S. airlines were closed. Tourist traffic had evaporated. Few passengers were entering Havana, many leaving. Our Dutch plane was delayed 2 hours while Castro's customs inspectors searched the baggage of outgoing Cubans to make sure they took with them none of the articles made scarce by the American embargo—soap, needles, or dollars.

Security in the Havana airport was nil. Any American in transit could have wandered out of the airport to downtown Havana, with no questions asked.

A COMMUNIST BASE

From that brief visit to Havana, I got a feeling of pleasant, philosophical frustration. From other reliable sources who have been able to penetrate into the heart of Cuba, I learned the following:

More than 3,000 Russians, Czech, and Chinese advisers are in Cuba. They operate the oil refineries, advise on sweeping new formulas for Cuban education, give intensive training to the Cuban military. The Cuban army has the most modern arms which the huge Skoda factory in Czechoslovakia can turn out, many of them more up to date than those of the U.S. Army. Some 30,000 tons of Czech and Russian arms lie uncrated in Havana harbor.

About 300 Cuban pilots are also in Czechoslovakia being trained to fly MIG fighters. When they return they will be able to knock any Cuban refugee bombers that venture over Havana out of the sky.

Soviet-bloc cooperation with Cuba has been stepped up to a point where the island is rapidly becoming a bristling Communist military base—which was the reason for the decision of anti-Castro rebels to strike now before Castro grew stronger.

HAVANA-GO-ROUND

Fidel Castro now sleeps in his office, his bodyguard doubled. He is deathly afraid of assassination. His fears may not be unfounded * * * Castro takes more popularity polls of the Cuban people than Dr. Gallup does of an American election. He is constantly reading and worrying over the polls. His popularity has slipped from about 90 percent when he first took office to about 30 percent now * * * Castro will be a tough man to defeat in guerrilla warfare. He understands it. For instance, his troops occupy the high ground, not the valleys and the towns, as did Batista's troops. It's easy to raid down into the valleys, then escape to the hills. Castro's militia occupy the hills.

The School Boom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. HALEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, today, we hear much from people who advocate Federal aid to education. They tell us that Federal aid is necessary to provide for needed classrooms and adequate teachers salaries. There are many people who disagree with the proponents of Federal aid to education because they know that without Federal aid some 340,000 classrooms have been added in the past 5 years and over a 10-year period teachers salaries, according to the national average, have increased over 70 percent.

At this time, I wish to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Wednesday, April 19, 1961, issue of the Sarasota Herald-Tribune, which quotes facts and figures to buttress the conclusion "that it is hard to see any rational case for Federal educational grants-in-aid." Most interesting of these facts and figures is that at the going rate the States and local government can provide more classrooms within the next 10 years, without Federal aid, than the goal set by the White House Conference of 1955. The editorial follows:

THE SCHOOL BOOM

Without Federal aid, the public school system in the last 5 years added 340,000 schoolrooms, only 29,000 short of the goal set by the White House Conference of 1955. The goal for the next 10 years is 610,000 new classrooms. At the present rate, without Federal aid, 680,000 classrooms will be provided in the decade, exceeding new by 70,000.

Ten years ago, the national average of teachers' salaries was $3,126. It is now $5,389, an increase of 72.4 percent. All State expenditures for schools rose from $6.5 billion to $16.4 billion in the last 10 years. The 1970 forecast of $34 billion is not out of the reach of local authorities, whose bonds have found a ready market at rates lower than the Treasury commands.

These facts and figures were gathered by the Saturday Evening Post from the U.S. Office of Education and the Institute for Social Science Research, Washington. They buttress its conclusion that it is hard to see any rational case for Federal educational grants-in-aid.

Red River's Possibilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD B. McSWEEN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. McSWEEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Alexandria (La.) Daily Town Talk, Apr. 19, 1961]

RED RIVER'S POSSIBILITIES

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers will hold a public hearing in Alexandria Thursday to determine the need for and public sentiment in favor of a thorough study of Red River.

The proposed study would include bank stabilization, channel improvement for navigation, flood control, land conservation, recreational benefits, and water for industrial and commercial use.

This is the sort of comprehensive study that is long overdue. For more than 50 years there have been recommendations for a variety of projects looking toward greater utilization of Red River, but at no time has a survey been made to determine its potentialities and needed improvements covering all uses.

Considerable work has been done in the field of flood control, with the result that flooding along the Red is now negligible by comparison with a generation ago.

But little or nothing has been done to restore water navigation or to improve the quality of the water for industrial use—to name only two neglected areas.

A new wave of interest has been generated by the experiment of a Texas businessman who negotiated the Red at low water last year with a specially built barge and tug. As a result there is a growing number of people along the Red who think navigation on the waterway is feasible.

The need for additional supplies of water for industry and irrigation also has been pointed up in recent years, and threats in the last few days to such recreational areas as Buhlow and Hog lakes have created a new awareness of the need for bank stabilization work along the river.

Certain projects to improve Red River generally are obviously warranted because it is apparent the cost would be low compared with the results.

None can be undertaken, however, until a thorough study has been made to determine what is needed, how it can be accomplished, and what the benefit-to-cost ratio will be.

Accordingly, the Town Talk wholeheartedly supports the proposed comprehensive study of Red River and suggests that all interested individuals and agencies be represented at the hearing in Alexandria tomorrow to add their approval to the proposal.

Sukarno in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in extending the hand of welcome to President Sukarno of Indonesia, who arrived in Washington this morning. He has arrived at a time when sober thinking about our relations with the emerging nations of the world is essential, thinking which must be matched by a seriousness on the part of these nations as well.

Fortunately, President Sukarno is indeed in a sober mood, if we may judge by the speech which he delivered in Los Angeles on April 22 before the Council for World Affairs. I am inclined to believe that he is prepared to pay attention to any suggestions we are willing to make to assist in the solution of the problem of West New Guinea and other issues which face his country and the world. At the same time, he would naturally expect sober appraisal from us about the position which his government maintains on these issues.

In his Los Angeles speech, President Sukarno asked for the active sympathy and the active understanding of our Nation. He asserted that Indonesia understood and appreciated our philosophy, and had been inspired by it.

Coming as he does in this frame of mind, I trust that it will be possible for us to make an effort to learn and to understand the position of the new nations and to see how far we can succeed if we challenge them to demonstrate in practice that they are in fact committed to an active, while independent, foreign policy. Let us hope that we can at the same time give deep consideration to how far we can go in carrying out the sentiments expressed in the excellent editorial in the Washington Post this morning, which said:

There is a constructive opportunity, "to exert independent influence for a long-term solution that will comprehend Indonesian claims but also will protect the rights and autonomy of the Papuan people."

I join with the Washington Post in welcoming Dr. Sukarno and his colleagues with good wishes for a fruitful discussion. I urge my colleagues to read the following Post editorial:

SUKARNO IN WASHINGTON

President Sukarno arrives at a time of critical reappraisal in Washington. The Indonesian chief of state is no stranger to this country, but like other leaders he will want to sample the qualities of the new administration. He also will want to present his own views on such issues as West Irian, China, and policy in southeast Asia.

He will find the Kennedy administration taking a fresh look at the need for change in colonial areas, and eager to understand the attitudes and sensitivities of neutral countries. Relations between the United States and Indonesia have improved considerably from the low point of 3 years ago, thanks in part to the overhaul of certain mistaken American assumptions. But it would be unfortunate to conclude that the secret of good relations is automatic endorsement of the Indonesian position.

Thus on the question of West Irian, Netherlands Foreign Minister Luns learned on his recent visit that, American policy will not be merely a tail to the Dutch kite. But this country could not condone an Indonesian effort to seize West Irian. Rather, the constructive opportunity is to exert independent influence for a long-term solution that will comprehend Indonesian claims but also will protect the rights and autonomy of the Papuan people.

More important from a world standpoint is the problem of Communist advance in Asia and the measures needed to strengthen the independence and internal security of the Asian countries. Perhaps Dr. Sukarno has some ideas on this point. He and his colleagues will be welcomed with good wishes for fruitful discussion.

Israel's Birthday

SPEECH
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, it is a very high privilege indeed for me to join with my very able and distinguished friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER], in hailing the independence of Israel and extending my heartiest congratulations and best wishes for the future to this inspiring, young nation and its loyal people.

It is most significant that our own great Nation moved with greatest expedition to recognize the new Government of Israel once it was established. It is also both gratifying and satisfying to realize that since that time our Nation and the American people have solidly supported the aspirations of Israel for self-determination, independence, and membership in the society of free nations.

The whole world admires the tenacity of purpose, zeal, loyalty, and great ability which have marked the brief history of the illustrious nation of Israel. Its problems were many, complex, and extremely difficult. At a time when it was faced with welcoming and caring for large numbers of refugees from war-torn lands who had been driven from pillar to post, so to speak and sought escape from persecution and privation, Israel, with superb spirit of confidence, humanity, and generosity, successfully grappled, not only with these challenging problems, but also with a host of other govern-

mental, social, and economic difficulties entailed in setting up a new, sovereign nation.

The unquestionable zeal for independence and the fierce determination to set up a government for its own people which Israel exemplified, speedily won the admiration, unbounded sympathy, confidence, and support of freedom-loving nations throughout the world. There is a great and moving nobility about Israel's impressive experiences in setting up and implementing a government of its own. Through most bitter sacrifice and travail, its leaders and its loyal people unselfishly labored to achieve their noble ends, and in the intervening years have given truly an unprecedented example of what practical idealism, talented, inspired leadership and dedication can achieve when they are combined with devotion to principles of freedom, are sparked with an indomitable will and are conducted and implemented by highest ambition, purposeful initiative, hard, ungrudging work, and a never-say-die spirit.

The Jews of the world, and especially the Jews of America, who so doggedly and generously moved to support this great experiment in free government are entitled to greatest credit; first, for their heartwarming loyalty to their own people; secondly, for their almost incredible generosity, and finally, for the outstanding, spirited encouragement they have furnished to the gallant leaders and noble people of Israel, a people so determined to establish a homeland and sovereign government of their own where compassion for the afflicted might bind up the wounds of war and persecution and where freedom, in all its brightness and beneficent effects upon the human soul, might dwell.

I am sure that the spirit of dedication and unselfishness which has contributed so greatly to the establishment of Israel will continue to fire its magnificent people with zeal and high purpose, and enable this intrepid, young state to solve its problems and develop its free institutions under the guidance and protection of a constitutional system of government, founded on liberty and consecrated to human freedom. May the good Lord bestow his richest blessings upon the great nation and inspired people of Israel.

Welcome

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE M. KILGORE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, a great portion of the district I represent, the 15th District of Texas, borders our southern boundary.

The residents in my district operate their own good neighbor relations program very efficiently. One of the recent exhibitions of this border friendliness was an international spring fiesta held by the cities of McAllen, Tex., and Reynosa, Tamaulipas, Mexico, on March 2–5.

So that all can see the response such an event secured from the sister Republic, I am entering below a copy of a translation of a newspaper article which appeared in the March 4 issue of El Manana, the Reynosa, Mexico, daily newspaper:

WELCOME

We are celebrating and for a good reason. This day will visit us the most prominent citizens of the valley of Texas and our neighbor, McAllen, in a caravan of good will which we appreciate very much.

Mexico, with its traditional hospitality, opens its arms today, through Reynosa, window of our country, in order to welcome our neighbors, better said, our friends.

This embassy of friendship, we esteem with all truthfulness because we know that we are being visited by our sister city in the spirit of progress, and in the constant anxiety of cooperation because it serves as an example to other cities to follow the same pattern, to be each day better neighbors and better friends.

We will not be able to offer much during your visit because Reynosa is a young city in progress material, but in spite of our defective neighborhoods, we offer you a sincere heart, always open to benefit mankind; we open our arms because in them fit all men of good will and because we know that your visit will strengthen even more the spiritual and material ties that bind us since a long time ago.

We hope that you will enjoy your visit as much as we will enjoy having you visit us and if we cannot leave a pleasant impression with you as a result of our defective materials noticed by everyone, we do desire with all our hearts that you take the life memory that in Reynosa, you not only have a friend and neighbor, but a city that wants, as well as all North Americans, agreement between men, based upon the solid ground that establishes the successful progress of cities.

Welcome, friends from the valley of Texas; when you return home, we ask that you give our warm regards to all who could not be with us today and also the assurance that while they participate with us in the policy of good neighborhood, they will not find another friend more faithful than Reynosa and Mexico.

The Advantages of Building With Condominium

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEM MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the Associated Home Builders of the Greater East Bay are leading the way in an understanding of what condominium building is, and why it constitutes a step forward in better and cheaper housing under private enterprise for low-income families. I follow here with the speech of Lester Burdett, Jr., vice president of Alcan Pacific Co. at the Western Rental Housing Conference, a truly outstanding contribution to understanding of this new approach to housing:

The condominium law, established by the Romans in the sixth century, B.C., provided for joint sovereignty, or joint ownership, of property.

The law specifically provided for individual ownership of a given part of a communally held structure and land.

Under the condominium plan, housing has been built in Latin America, including Puerto Rico and, particularly, Brazil.

Condominium, however, differs from the cooperative procedure in that dwelling units can be sold, rented, or mortgaged by their owners independently. There is generally a requirement, however, that cotenants be given a priority.

In a cooperative, tenants pay their share of interest and amortization on a single blanket mortgage. In a condominium, there is a separate mortgage for each housing unit.

Before going into specific aspects of condominium, I would like to quote the definition given to these vertical subdivisions by the Congressional Committee which studied the Puerto Rican projects: "Condominium is the individual ownership of single units in a multiunit structure, with common ownership of halls, stairs, elevators, lobbies, driveways, etc. Condominium may be bought, sold, mortgaged, and are taxed separately. Each owner's property is liable only for his own mortgage debt. Another's default does not endanger his interests."

To better illustrate what we are dealing with let me review the three basic types of cooperative.

First. The traditional co-op where the owner purchases stock and is a shareholder in the entire project whether it be a high-rise building or a community of separated houses. Due to his stock interest, he has a corresponding vote in the management. The stock purchase generally entitles the stockholder to a long-term renewable proprietary lease. Hence his only real estate interest is a leasehold.

Second. The tenancy-in-common type of co-op wherein the purchaser by deed gets merely an undivided interest in the whole with the right to occupy a particular unit. For example, if there were 25 apartments, he would get a one-twenty-fifth interest in the whole, including common areas, parking facilities, utilities, etc.

Third. The condominium wherein the purchaser by deed gets a fee title to his unit and a joint ownership of the common areas and the ground underneath.

Mr. Moffett will more clearly define the property descriptions and what is meant by common areas. For our purposes let us consider that the owner has a fee title to his apartment or individual house. Incidentally, the condominium is used extensively in Latin American countries for commercial buildings. While visiting Mexico City recently I had the pleasure of discussing this type of commercial financing with both owners and developers and found enthusiastic approval on both sides.

What are the advantages of a condominium to a developer?

Anyone who has ever tried to put together a stock ownership cooperative in an area where the concept is not too well known will immediately recognize that the condominium is the answer to your prayers. About 18 months ago my company, Alcan Pacific Co., started to organize and plan a stock ownership co-op for senior citizens in Carmel Valley, Calif., known as Hacienda Carmel. There are 300 apartments with extensive community facilities on 40 acres of land. From the very outset I had educational, legal, and financing problems.

Let's look into these and see if the condominium may help to solve them. In the first place, with respect to the educational difficulties—starting with the planning commissions and the citizen's advisory commit-

tees under them—I discovered almost a total ignorance of any of the fundamentals of cooperative ownership. These good citizens were wary and, indeed, a little suspicious. Hence, it required months of explaining and illustrating what we were trying to do. Surprisingly enough, I discovered this same reaction among many lenders. Today, however, much of this education problem has been taken care of by the initiation and construction of a great number of stock ownership co-ops, at least in this northern California area. This program will necessarily inure to the advantage of those considering the condominium since you are offering them something much more attractive, but still the basic concept of community ownership and living.

The legal problems will still exist but perhaps will not be quite as complex since you may not be operating under the jurisdiction of the Corporations Commisisoner and the Security Exchange Commission. You will be selling real estate interests, something we are all accustomed to living with, rather than securities through securities brokers and agents, something we are not accustomed to working with. Incidentally, those of us who have worked with a stock ownership co-op not registered with the SEC and hence limited to offering within the State to bon fide residents, will have the door opened to interstate sales.

Financing: Here is perhaps the greatest advantage in the use of the condominium. Many lenders would not lend on a stock ownership co-op because of the foreclosure problems, i.e., foreclosing on the entire building or project because of the default of one or a small group of owners. The condominium eliminates this problem in that the units are individually owned in fee with an insured title. The lender therefore will be making a series of individual loans and the aforementioned foreclosure problem eliminated.

What are the advantages to the lender?

The advent of the condominium will open the door for lending institutions to a much broader field. Consider a rental apartment of 300 units—one loan perhaps of several million. This is beyond the legal capacity of many lenders. But these same lenders will be able to handle the smaller individual loans directly with the buyer.

What are the advantages to title companies?

Mr. Moffett will consider this matter, but suffice it to say here that the title companies should be happy to have 300 policies on this same apartment where in the past it would amount to only 1.

What are the advantages to the buyer?

In this area the condominium offers virtually the same tax and interest deduction benefits as other types of cooperatives. But your average buyer can understand and appreciate a fee title to his home a lot better and easier than he can a number of shares of stock in a corporation and long-term lease on his home.

To quote Jay McIver in his article in California Builder, November 1960, "Absence of mutual risk spells out the vital difference between the conventional stock corporation co-op, and homeownership in fee. The ever-present danger of default by one or more partners in the stock enterprise deters many buyers from taking the plunge into cooperative ownership. Still remembered vividly are the depression failures of the past. There is also an important psychological principal involved. Basically the stock corporation co-op is a rental concept. Psychologically it does not convey to its prospective shareholders any strong sense of individual homeownership."

What are some of the problems we can anticipate?

You can be sure there will be some difficulty with planning commissions, boards of supervisors, and perhaps with tax assessors. In the case of the latter they will be asked to levy and collect taxes on an apartment individually, rather than on the building. There doesn't appear to be any legal reason why this can't be done, at least in California. But local assessors may hesitate to assume this new concept and added workload without specific affirmative authority from the State legislature.

There may be temporary problems with lenders in some cases until the condominium is better understood and accepted locally and on a national level.

Will there be buyer education needed? Yes, of course, but I believe that by keeping this as simple as possible and not scaring the buyer with a lot of legal phraseology the newness will wear off and the general concept enthusiastically received.

Probably the greatest assist we are going to get in education and financing of the condominium is FHA authorization to insure loans on individual units in a condominium. The legislation has been drafted, hearings have been held on Capitol Hill, and there seems to be positive assurance that before this session of Congress is over FHA will have the necessary authority to insure these loans.

Some of the groups behind the move to obtain FHA insurance of condominium are NAHB, the National Real Estate Board, the State Home Builders Council, the California Real Estate Association, realtor groups and title insurance companies. I might add the names of two individuals to these groups: Mr. Don Stone of Stone & Schulte, and your own treasurer, John H. Tolan, Jr., of Barrett Homes Division of Barrett Construction Co.

This array of talent is actively working to obtain FHA insurance because of its impact on large scale financing of condominium. But what of conventional or private condominium financing? Is there any reason why it can't be done now without waiting for enabling legislation for FHA insurance? I say the answer is "No." If a title company is prepared to insure a fee simple deed on each apartment and a lending institution will make individual mortgage loans to prospective apartment purchasers, I see no obstacle to starting a condominium project now, providing construction money has been arranged.

In closing, I can't emphasize too strongly the need for education of public officials, lenders, title companies and the buying public in the overall condominium concept. A good public presentation on a national basis is mandatory. In this area the HHFA, FHA, and NAHB, and real estate boards can be of immeasurable help.

Anniversary of Israel's Independence

SPEECH
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, the people of Israel and all her friends in America and elsewhere are today celebrating the 13th anniversary of Israel's establishment as a free, independent, and democratic State. It was only yesterday, it seems, that we witnessed the historical events associated with the rebirth of Israel to statehood—and now we suddenly realize that 13 years have passed since then.

Whatever trepidation or concern we may have had in this country for the welfare of Israel when it was born 13 years ago in the face of armed aggression by its Arab neighbors, we know today that its survival is firmly rooted in the strength of its ever-growing population and in the unflagging support that Israel is getting from the multitude of friends it has in the United States.

In these 13 years Israel has demonstrated to the world not only its significance to the life of the Jewish people, but it has also provided a shining example of what a determined people can do when the love of freedom, the desire for national rebirth, and the instinct for social justice inspire its aims and its efforts. This Israel accomplished not by the force of arms, but by its advancement in the fields of agriculture, industry, science, education, and other phases of its national activity.

Today Israel enjoys the admiration and good will of many nations and millions of individuals the world over who value Israel's friendship and its achievements. I am particularly pleased that the Government and the people of the United States enjoy the most cordial relations with Israel and are cooperating in many spheres of human endeavor for the welfare of all mankind and the peace of the world. I am pleased to note also that President Kennedy has always shown a positive interest in Israel and that this will lead to greater cooperation between our two countries in the future.

On this great anniversary, I extend my best wishes to the people of Israel, to its capable leaders, and to the Jews of America who have a major share in Israel's success. May we all soon achieve lasting peace in the world, as is prophesied in the Bible.

Are We Ready?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday the House of Representatives again amended the Social Security Act; and while 400 Members of the House supported these amendments on a roll-call vote, I was 1 of the 14 Members opposing the bill, not because it did not incorporate some good features but because there were several objectionable ones to which I cannot subscribe.

In the first place, when life expectancy is increasing at the rate it is, I see no good grounds for cutting back or reducing the age of retirement as was done in this bill and wonder how long we can go on increasing taxes before reaching the point of diminishing return. The day of reckoning will come when those who want to promise the electorate an increased benefit every 2 years will have to face up to the facts of life.

Last Friday, April 21, my very good friend, Mr. Robert W. Leu himself a chartered life underwriter, delivered an address on social security to the Peoria Association of Life Underwriters in which he made some very cogent remarks which I believe deserve the serious consideration of not only you, my colleagues, but also the American public in general. Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include Mr. Leu's address in its entirety at this point in the RECORD:

TEXT OF AN ADDRESS ON SOCIAL SECURITY TO PEORIA ASSOCIATION OF LIFE UNDERWRITERS

(By Robert W. Leu)

Mr. Chairman, I consider it more of an honor to speak to my own local association than almost any other life insurance group I have addressed, for the Peoria Life Underwriters Association has produced some of the real leaders of the life insurance industry.

In the area of community service, also, we find a number of members of this association providing devoted leadership in a variety of worthwhile causes. This is, in truth, an association of which we can be, and should be, justly proud.

I am here today to ask the serious question "Are we ready?" to see that the social security program of our Federal Government is kept in its proper place in the American way of life.

To say that we have come a long way in 25 years of social security in these United States is perhaps the understatement of the year. We can hardly recognize the rather modest act of 1936 in terms of present day taxes and payments and yet I feel the same basic concepts should apply today as they did 25 years ago.

The social security system was designed in 1936 to pay monthly benefits to people who, because of age, could no longer support themselves by working. These payments were intended to be sufficient to provide the aged people in our society with a "floor of protection" against the hazard of old-age security.

In 1939 payments to survivors of family breadwinners who die prematurely were authorized.

Thus, the basic concept of social security was to assure, through a system of compulsory taxes and payments, a "floor of protection" for retired workers and survivors of family breadwinners.

Let us see what has happened to this basic floor of protection. When I entered the life insurance business 21 years ago the maximum survivor benefit under social security to a widow with 2 children was $65 per month. One of the great tragedies of our generation is that we have allowed inflation to erode the purchasing power of the dollar. Thus, we will have to agree the value of the dollar has depreciated approximately 55 percent since that time. Therefore, if our basic $65 figure is adjusted for inflation we find the figure should now be $144 per month.

But what is the maximum benefit today for a widow and two children? Two hundred and fifty-four dollars per month.

We must stand fast for the principle that social security should only funish a basic floor of protection; with individual, voluntary initiative relied upon to furnish the balance of the financial security.

But now who has arrived on the scene in our Nation's Capital to lead the welfare planners as the new Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare? None other than Prof. Wilbur J. Cohen from the University of Michigan, whom you will recall headed President Kennedy's so-called task force on health and security. Even though, as we have seen, benefits are now well above the original floor-of-protection level, Professor Cohen has repeatedly expressed the view since arriving in Washington that social security benefits should be increased another 40 to 50 percent—apart from adjustments that might be needed to offset any future inflation.

Now, my friends, are we ready to face the really big question?

Who pays for these social security benefits? We life insurance men, who represent the soundest financial institution yet created in the free enterprise system, need to remind the American people of one fundamental truth—Government cannot create anything. Let it be remembered that for every benefit paid there must be a tax to pay for that benefit.

It is most unfortunate that most of the discussions in Congress concerning social security relate only to the benefit side of the social security coin. We must insist that our representatives in Washington also examine the other side of the coin—the cost side.

Social security is not a one-way street. Therefore, discussions in Congress should give equal recognition to the heavy burden of tax as well as to benefit payments. The overwhelming majority of the citizens of the United States are not aware that present laws provide for the social security tax rate to rise to 9 percent by 1970. By that year social security tax collections will rise from the present $12 billion level to $21½ billion. We life underwriters need to remind the American people of the heavy social security tax which is already the law of the land.

If you will consult the actuaries at your home offices they will tell you that benefits for new employees, equal to social security benefits as they now stand, can be provided through private plans at a cost lower than the combined employer-employee taxes (9 percent beginning in 1970).

The present decade is often refererd to as the "soaring-sixties," although to date the business world has done very little soaring. By 1970 when Americans feel the full heat of social security taxes I suspect the next decade may well be known as the searing seventies.

I believe we life underwriters have another responsibility in helping our friends and neighbors to understand social security. Simply stated—"social security is not insurance." Over and over in the Halls of Congress the word "insurance" keeps cropping up in speeches and committee hearings on social security.

The truth is social security carries no "rights" to anything except what Congress may, from time to time, grant as benefits. The contributions to social security by both employee and employer are not "insurance premiums," they are a tax, pure and simple.

For the record, the Supreme Court, in a little noted decision on June 20, 1960, ruled finally on this question which has irked some of us insurance men for many years. Social security is not insurance, said the Court. You'll be interested to know that in a brief to the Supreme Court Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Flemming said social security "is not a federally administered insurance program." "The contribution exacted," he went on, "is a true tax. It is not comparable to an insurance premium."

Albert C. Adams of Philadelphia, past president of our National Association of Life Underwriters and chairman since 1952 of the association's social security committee, has long been a leader in the fight to insist that the Government stop the improper use of language in referring to the social security program, and he has redoubled his efforts in the light of the Supreme Court's clear decision.

"In the business community," he says, "truth in advertising is enforced to permit the public fairly to make up its collective mind as to the wisdom of patronizing the advertiser."

"In governmental matters, truth in advertising will likewise permit the public fairly to make up its mind as to the wisdom of retaining or expanding, or restricting existing legislation. It is as patently unfair for a governmental agency to expand on the basis of false and misleading advertising as it is for a business competitor to expand on the same sort of misrepresentations" concludes Mr. Adams.

There is no longer any excuse for Senators, Congressmen, or bureaucrats to speak so loosely as to refer to social security as insurance.

Our distinguished Representative in Congress, the Honorable ROBERT MICHEL, said to me just 2 weeks ago that he feels we life insurance men must take the lead in explaining the true picture of social security to the American people.

It seems to me this is an important and a grave responsibility. My fellow life underwriters, "are we ready?"

San Francisco Youth Association Celebrates Its 15th Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to your attention and to the attention of my fellow colleagues an article that appeared recently in the San Francisco News-Call Bulletin, relative to the 15th anniversary of the San Francisco Youth Association.

I have followed the activities of the San Francisco Youth Association for many years. I am well aware of the civic contributions made by the high school young people as delegates to the youth association, under the untiring guidance of its able executive director, Mr. Tom Rowe.

The San Francisco Youth Association is a citywide youth council, representing 26,000 high school students, with elected delegates from 47 high schools and youth-serving agencies. During its 15-year history the high school young people have carried out worthwhile projects of significance in the field of international understanding, as well as initiating projects for the civic betterment of San Francisco.

Among the projects undertaken in the field of foreign affairs has been a consistent support of the United Nations, the collection of textbooks and seeds for the Philippines, exchange of program materials with youth councils of southern Ceylon, Indonesia, and South Korea, and, active participation in the San Francisco-Osaka sister-city program.

During the past election, the San Francisco Youth Association initiated a project, entitled "Youth in Politics," and assisted in the recruitment of nearly 2,000 high school students who actively participated in the presidential campaign.

The former Presidents discussed in this article exemplifies the leadership potential to be found among the delegates to the San Francisco Youth Association.

But to commend the present delegates and their predecessors alone is to leave the reason for the success story of the San Francisco Youth Association but partly told. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I wish to note the members of the adult advisory council of the San Francisco Youth Association. I believe I may safely say their unselfish work on the council is but a reflection of their individual concern with civic betterment in San Francisco.

The present members are: Mrs. Harriett Alden, Mr. Emil Anderson, Mr. William Becker, Mrs. R. E. Brennan, Mrs. William Brinton, Mrs. Richard S. Cahn (secretary), Judge Melvyn I. Cronin, Mr. E. R. Duncan, Rev. John T. Foudy, Miss Ruth Franklin, Dr. Joseph Hill, Mr. Donald Hofdendahl, Mr. James Kearney, Mr. Daniel E. Koshland (co-chairman), Mrs. Harry Krytzer, Mrs. James Lang, Mrs. Robert Lauter, Miss Mary Lins, Mr. Carl Livingston, Jr., Mrs. Thomas Lynch, Mr. Ray Milton, Dr. James Morena, Mrs. Polly Mosby, Mr. Edgar Osgood, Mrs. Tony Patch, Mr. Melvin Peterson, Mr. Maurice Powers, Rev. James E. Prindeville, Mrs. A. Boyd Puccinelli, Rev. Francis Quinn, Mr. Earl Raab, Mr. Neville Rich, Sr., Robert John L. Roberts, Mr. Robert Simcock, Mrs. Ward Miller Smith, Mr. William Solari, Jr., Mr. Roy Sorenson, Mr. James Wyatt, Mr. Stephen Zellerbach (chairman), and Mr. Herman Zischke (treasurer).

Under leave heretofore granted, I include the following article from the San Francisco News-Call Bulletin:

YOUTH ASSOCIATION WELL REMEMBERED ON 15TH ANNIVERSARY

Ten to fifteen years ago, they were five teenagers—four boys and a girl—and they had one thing in common: Each was a president of the San Francisco Youth Association (SFYA).

Today they are: A minister in Pittsburg, Calif.; an administrative secretary in Geneva, Switzerland; a professor of medieval history at Bryn Mawr College; and two accountants in San Francisco.

And all remember with warmth their experiences in the youth association, which is celebrating its 15th anniversary during the coming week.

"A fine training ground," says the Reverend Richard Roe, the organization's first 1946 president, who is now minister of the Pittsburg Congregational Community Church.

"She mentions it frequently," says Mrs. W. B. Baquie, whose daughter, Sylvia, was 1949 SFYA president.

"Sylvia is in Geneva now, and we've half expected she'd start a similar youth organization over there."

The others—David Herlihy, 1947; John Schultz, 1948, and Robert Lovejoy, 1950—are equally enthusiastic.

"They are," says Tom Rowe, executive director of SYFA, "a fine group, a credit to the organization. There is definite relationship between the association and the caliber of its graduates."

The caliber, as indicated by an anniversary check of the first five presidents, is outstanding.

Reverend Roe, a George Washington High School student during his SFYA days, went on to the University of California and the Pacific School of Religion.

He met his wife, Gerri, while a student. They have three children. Two years ago the pair directed a Palo Alto college group in community work and last year did a similar job in Holland.

Herlihy, the Bryn Mawr professor, is a graduate of St. Ignatius High School who won a scholarship to the University of San Francisco. He earned his master's degree in history at Catholic University, and his doctorate at Yale—also on scholarships.

Widely known as an expert in medieval history, Herlihy has written extensively for historical journals, and spent a year in Italy on a Fulbright fellowship.

That's a fair match for the Guggenheim award his wife, the former Patricia McGahey, has received. She will take her own doctoral degree next month.

Miss Baquie, another George Washington alumnus, is strongly remembered by Rowe for her interest in world affairs during her SFYA days.

It flowered after her graduation from the University of California with a major in international relations. She served 2 years with a vitally important, but secret, Government agency; transferred to the United Nations and went to Geneva, and while in Switzerland became an executive of the Joint Distribution Committee engaged in the resettlement of Jewish refugees.

"Just last week," her mother reports, "Sylvia accepted the position of administrative secretary with an investment company in Geneva."

Schultz, a graduate of Sacred Heart High School, and Lovejoy, a former Mission high student, have had remarkably parallel careers in some respects.

Both were graduated from University of San Francisco, both saw Army service in this country, both are accountants, and both the father of two children.

Schultz, of 105 Forest Side Avenue, is with the Shell Chemical Corp. here, and is active in encouragement of music and the arts.

Lovejoy, of 3900 22d Street, is with Arthur Andersen and Co., has been a strong supporter of boys' clubs and is currently active in Republican county politics.

Basic Aims of the National Farmers Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's Capital played host to 2,500 Farmers Union members from across the country when the 59th annual meeting of the National Farmers Union was held here March 11–16. During that convention, the farm delegates approved a 1961 policy statement that includes the basic aims of this organization. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include those aims in the RECORD.

FARMERS UNION FOUNDED ON UNDERSTANDING OF GOD AND NATURE

The basic aims of National Farmers Union are founded on our understanding of God and nature. We live close to nature. Our livelihood depends on it and requires its understanding. Observation of nature compels respect for the dignity of the individual human being. We are convinced of the truth and rightness of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, its Bill of Rights and other amendments. We are opposed to the principles and practices of communism, fascism, and all other forms of dictatorship.

A. INHERENT HUMAN RIGHTS

All men are created equal, important in their own right, without distinction, or discrimination.

1. Freedom of expression: Freedom of thought, speech, radio, television, press, the secret ballot, religion, assembly to organize, and to petition the Government for redress of grievances must be expanded.

2. Equality of opportunity: Each person has a right to an equal opportunity to become educated, to choose his own way of living, to earn, spend, save, invest and own property, and to make his working and saving efforts and his property count for the benefit of himself and his family toward the attainment of their aspirations to the extent of his ability to do so without encroaching upon the equal opportunity of others.

3. Adequate standards: No person should be compelled by circumstances beyond his control to fall below an adequate standard of living.

B. THE FAMILY IS BASIC

The family unit of human society should be preserved and strengthened.

C. DEMOCRACY IS ESSENTIAL

It is our abiding determination to preserve and further improve the democratic nature of our governments. We believe in government by law, not by men outside the law. The inherent rights of man can be attained and protected only in a self-determining, self-restrained democracy. Government, the one cooperative endeavor embracing us all, is needed to protect the rights of expression, to insure equality of opportunity and to perform such service as can be performed more efficiently by people as a whole, rather than as individuals, cooperative business activities or other private groups.

1. Equal voice: Democracy should give each person an equal right to take part in making governmental decisions personally and through representatives of his own selection. All the people should have a voice in determining our laws and selecting the leaders of government under which they live. Each person is the best judge of his own best interests.

2. Responsive government: Democratic government is the only form of government through which the people by peaceful means can maintain freedom of expression and equality of opportunity. The checks and balances, the division of governmental powers, are necessary to the preservation of responsive representative government. By such means, we protect the rights of minorities, guard against the development of a totalitarian or despotic elite, and prevent the concentration of economic and political power in a few hands, thereby preserving the opportunity of our people to retain their rights and freedom.

3. Citizenship: We pledge the devotion of our energies and resources toward assuming the full citizenship responsibilities involved in the exercise of our democratic rights.

D. WORLD AFFAIRS AND U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

The foregoing principles have universal application; these are aims which reflect the aspirations of people everywhere. Farmers Union will continue to strive for the earliest possible attainment of a democratic world brotherhood of nations, operated on principles consistent with our Constitution and the Bill of Rights, living at peace with one another in a United Nations that derives its powers directly from the people of the world

and provides the basis and opportunity for constantly increased production and improved living standards. United States should in cooperation with other nations of the free world and within limits of our economic ability assist in expansion and strengthening of the productive capacity and living standards of people of other nations in ways that will help them move toward democratic forms of national government and ultimately a democratic world brotherhood of nations. Abundant U.S. food production can play a great, important and decisive role in the implementation of these policies.

E. EXPANDING ECONOMY OF ABUNDANCE

Continuously expanding national and world economies of ever greater abundance are essential to the improvement and extension of representative democracy and to the ultimate attainment of permanent world peace with justice.

F. THE LAND

The soil, water, forest, and other natural resources of the Nation should be used and conserved in a manner to pass these resources on undiminished to future generations.

G. FAMILY FARMING

Farm families on family farms are an essential balancing force in the social and political structure. They are vital to the stability of representative democratic government, to an efficient and productive economic system, and to a satisfying world society. On the family farm, the business and home are one. The family is owner of capital, borrower of funds and accumulator of savings, manager of home and business and the major source of labor. The child grows up with opportunity for well-rounded knowledge of nature, family, business and life. He learns the meaning of ownership and the security of a home. Grave danger to democratic institutions would result if we allow our entire population, including agriculture and small business, to become divided into separate groups of owners, managers, financiers, and workers.

H. PARITY FARM INCOME

Farm families have the right to earn and receive income from their work, management and property ownership equivalent to that earned and received by people in other walks of life from similar productive work and resources.

I. ENRICHED NEIGHBORHOODS AND COMMUNITIES

Successful rural family living depends upon the existence of strong rural neighborhoods and communities. To build these requires the development in rural areas of adequate cultural centers including: stronger churches and other religious centers; improved local governments; better schools; provisions for local discussion forums for all citizens; rural libraries and art centers and healthful rural recreation centers.

J. COOPERATIVES

Farm cooperatives and other patron-owned forms of private corporate business organizations are a stabilizing factor in our free enterprise society.

Cooperatives also play a uniquely significant role in maintenance and promotion of democratic processes.

We pledge our continued support for such cooperative business organizations in recognition of their important contribution toward the strengthening of the economic position of agriculture and other segments of our economy.

K. FARMERS UNION

Farm people need and have a right to set up and operate their own organizations to provide for themselves informational and educational services, to serve as a channel through which the right to petition government may be exercised and through which farmers can organize, develop and expand needed farmer-owned cooperative business institutions.

In this 60th year of National Farmers Union, each State, county and local union should make a concerted effort to expand and strengthen Farmers Union as the farmers' farm organization.

L. SUMMARY

We seek an agriculture of farm families on family farms, prosperous, efficient, masters of themselves, good stewards of the soil they till, standing on their own feet and seeking nothing of any man or government except a fair and equal chance to use their abilities to the fullest in their own behalf as useful members of a democratic society. We seek a like opportunity in life for our fellow man, both within our own country and in other lands. These aims can best be attained through combined individual and cooperative private action with and under programs of democratic government.

Is This the College for You?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, in the May issue of Ingenue magazine, there is an article focusing on Mills College. This college is a great educational institution with an outstanding faculty, and a very successful alumnae to attest to the quality of educational opportunities offered.

I am very proud of Mills College and I am pleased to incorporate this article in the RECORD for the interest of my colleagues:

IS THIS THE COLLEGE FOR YOU?

Where would you like to locate? There's a new enthusiasm among students to switch coasts when it comes to choosing a college. This gives them a chance to see and know the country as a whole. It gives each individual a sense of freedom and a pioneer feeling of exploration to be on her own far from home.

This college is close to a colorful, cosmopolitan and friendly city that offers an additional polish to the learning acquired in class. It is an amazing blend of healthy naturalness and genuine sophistication which makes for good development.

It began way back in 1852, as a young ladies' seminary and became one of our earliest women's colleges in 1885, under the guidance of its president, a Williams graduate, and his wife from Mount Holyoke.

What type of college? This women's college believes in stimulating female thinking to the best of its particular abilities and might be for you if you believe in a liberal education as a solid background for living, not particularly a means to a livelihood. It promises intellectual, not economic security, although there is no question that it pays off. With a predominantly masculine faculty, many of whom are noted scholars, musicians, artists, you are exposed to the most valuable sort of teaching. (Pierre Salinger and Dean Rusk, prominent in the Kennedy administration, are former faculty members.)

Do you want a small college? Here, friendliness and informality touches every aspect of college life. In small classes with lots of individual attention, you can feel that you are a growing person. In one of the 5 dormitories with about 120 girls, you easily find your place among groups of friends.

There are no cliques, no barriers to friendships. There are no sororities—no need for them. You get to know the faculty (1 professor to ever 12 students) and the student body, and feel close to all. Current enrollment: 691 undergraduates, 63 graduates. This college states, "Ours is not an education just for information or an education just for skills, but an education for insight, which presupposes both knowledge and skills but is more difficult." Think about this statement. It can be an inspiration.

Have you a talent, a field? Perhaps you're one of those lucky girls with a burning interest in science or an urge to write, dance, paint. Here you'll have a chance to dig deeply into your subject, and to use your knowledge creatively.

If you have no field as yet, the requirements will put you on your academic track. You can't fail to find your special subject by the time you have sampled the necessary courses—English, a foreign language, a fine arts course, a natural science, a course in the humanities and physical education. You'll find your way.

WHAT ABOUT DATES, FUN, SOCIAL LIFE

This small college is surrounded by nearby large universities and men's colleges. There are many introductory mixers, proms, play productions and such. There are coffee, library and dinner dates. There are events at the other colleges, and there are the endless possibilities for fun in a nearby city—everything from a cable car ride to an opening night at the opera.

Extra-curricular activities include tennis, riding, golf, swimming or skiing at the college's own chalet-type lodge in the High Sierras. You can join campus clubs with specialized sports, social and intellectual interests, work on the paper or participate in student government work. This is one of those rare instances where the government actually is of, by and for the student body.

DOES A BEAUTIFUL CAMPUS APPEAL?

This campus is a dream—136 acres, handsomely wooded, wonderfully landscaped. White buildings, many of Spanish stucco with red tile roofs, suit the setting to perfection. Paths are banked with "lush" shrubs and trees. Year round, it is a place of beauty in a moderate climate with brilliant skies and "winey" air.

WHAT ABOUT CLOTHES?

Simple. Cotton skirts and blouses by day in the warm weather of fall and spring; cardigans or jackets early or late in the day. Skirts and sweaters for day in cooler months. Slacks or shorts are worn in some labs and on picnics. A raincoat is a must. You should have dark, not too high heels for the city. (It's really hilly). You'll also want a hat for city and chapel wear. You'll need wool dresses for informal dates and Wednesday dinners, a short formal, and cocktail-type dresses for dances, fraternity parties and such. Oh yes, you'll need a white dress to celebrate Founder's Day, and other traditional events. Clue: Gals in this section of the country wear thin angora socks to match sweaters and roll them to the ankles above white bucks. Sloppiness is out. This in contrast to easterners who wear heavy white socks with their sneakers.

AND MONEY?

Since this is a small independent college for women, you may expect that expenses will not be small as in some State-supported universities. But there are many available scholarships worth investigating. The average basic resident student fees per year total $2,300. Students say that an allowance of $25 to $50 per month is usual.

"CAMPUSLANG"

"Bent twig"—a student with an alumna relative; "Hey Day"—a big campus cleanup day followed by picnic and stunts; "Zippers"—those old hands who introduce new students to college life; "Cap Hunt"—when sophomores try to find hidden freshman caps; "Midwinter Formal"—in a city ballroom or country club; "Spring Weekend"—the biggest social event of the year; "Pearl M"—the pearl set pin worn by seniors and graduates; "the Oval"—an open, tree-lined lawn.

Approves President Kennedy's Actions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON G. ROGERS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a telegram sent by James G. Patton, president, National Farmers Union to President Kennedy, which is as follows:

APRIL 21, 1961.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In behalf of the 750,000 Americans who belong to National Farmers Union I wish to thank you and congratulate you on speaking out as firmly as you did regarding the Cuban crisis. Your address before the American Society of Newspaper Editors is indeed a historic statement. You deserve the overwhelming support of the American people in this matter.

We fully appreciate your call for a sense of urgency. As you very well said, "The message of Cuba, of Laos, of the rising din of Communist voices in Asia and Latin America—these messages are all the same." As president of National Farmers Union I have seen this same message in many parts of the world where I have been. We wholeheartedly support you and will live daringly up to the challenge you have issued. We must move in every possible direction to halt and roll back the tide of worldwide totalitarian communism.

We, of course, agree that America must have a powerful shield of armament but this struggle will not be won with nuclear weapons, rockets and tanks. The struggle is going to be won, and I believe the free nations of the world will win it, in the rice paddies, the wheat fields, and in the hearts and minds of men.

The Cuban crisis should reassure you and all of us that we have been right in calling for all-out use of food for peace. We have been right for years in urging that everything possible be done to raise the standard of living and the hopes of the landless and starving people of the world. We are right in putting into action the Peace Corps, a reciprocal Peace Corps, a daring approach to land reform and all of the other economic and social devices which the majority of the people in the world who are underprivileged are seeking. We must, as you have very properly urged, move rapidly here at home to eliminate poverty, unemployment, and take those steps which will put into full production our human, industrial and natural resources so that America can adequately fulfill the role of leadership in leading the non-Communist world to victory over totalitarianism in Communist or in whatever form it may appear anywhere in the world.

You, Mr. President, are indeed a great leader in the most challenging period of mankind's history and we pledge to you our continuing, all-out effort, our support and loyalty in the titanic struggle for freedom and peace which you are waging.

Respectfully,

JAMES G. PATTON,
President, National Farmers Union.

In the Service of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the following bulletin should be of interest to every Member of this Congress:

IN THE SERVICE OF COMMUNISM

(The task of the people's army in the Soviet occupied zone—General Hoffmann the military confidant of Ulbricht)

We have been informed by sources in Berlin that the fifth anniversary of the national people's army was celebrated in the garrison towns of the Soviet occupied zone with parades, conferring of decorations and addresses, in which the soldiers were exhorted to "show their love for the workers' and peasants' power, as well as discipline and self-sacrifice, and at the same time to hate the enemies of the German people." By the "enemies of the German people"—and this was obvious from all the speeches that were made on this occasion—the Federal Republic was, in the first place, meant. Thus, the Minister of Defense Hoffmann, who was recently promoted to the rank of general, declared at a festive assembly held in the Friedrichstadt Palace in East Berlin: "In Europe the chief danger for the peace and security of the peoples emanates from the West German militarists. Obstinate and incorrigible as they are, Straub and Heusinger and their militarist fascist scum are constantly crying for revenge for the lost World War II."

Hoffmann talked about the "diabolical tradition of German militarism, which is being trained for a new aggression" and then stressed that the "national people's army" on the other hand, "personifies the good military traditions of the German people." In his order of the day, Hoffmann appealed to the people's army to continue "to fight for a constant readiness of action," and added that the troop units in 1960 "reached a new stage in their development."

It can be seen from Hoffmann's statements that the national people's army in his opinion has by no means reached the highest stage of perfection aimed at by the leaders of the SED Party; for there are still constant complaints about lack of discipline and political indifference on the part of the rank and file, whilst as far as the officers' corps is concerned, the leaders of the SED are to a certain extent afraid lest it might develop its position of power to a state within the state. In the meantime, the former officers of Hitler's army, who, after being retrained in the Antifa camps or in the National Committee of Free Germany, were taken over by the Soviet Zone army and in some cases were given key positions (as for instance the Generals Vinzenz Müller and Arno von Lenski), have been excluded again and to a large extent replaced by trustworthy old Communist and barricade fighters or veterans who have fought in Spain.

A striking representative of this new type of officer is the present Minister of Defense and Army General Hoffmann. By trade a mechanic, Hoffman, who is now 50 years old, has been an active member of the Communist Party since 1926; in 1935 he emigrated to the Soviet Union, where he became a Soviet subject and attended the Frunse Academy in Moscow; as political commissar of the 11th International Brigade he took part in the Spanish Civil War; he returned to Moscow in 1939, attended the comintern school there until 1943 and continued his military training. After the war Hoffmann was for a short time Ulbricht's personal assistant and was subsequently entrusted with the task of building up the Soviet Zone army, which was at first camouflaged under various names. In this capacity Hoffmann was the permanent representative of Zaisser in the state security service and in the chief administration of the people's police. In 1950 he was appointed inspector-general and head of the Chief Administration for Training, to which at that time the military units of the people's police belonged. In 1952 Hoffmann was promoted to lieutenant general of the garrisoned people's police, and at the beginning of 1956, when the national people's army was officially founded, he became commander in chief of the army and representative of the German Democratic Republic on the staff of the high command of the Warsaw Pact states. In July 1960 he was appointed Minister of National Defense of the German Democratic Republic as successor to Stroph, and on the recent occasion of the fifth anniversary of the national people's army he was promoted from lieutenant colonel to army general.

These personal data suffice to show that Hoffmann is obviously regarded by the Soviets and the SED chief, Ulbricht, as the surest guarantee that the tasks assigned to the Communist civil war army in divided Germany by the top political authorities will be carried out consistently. It was in this connection that the complete militarization of central Germany, in which the paramilitary units and various police organizations must also be included, was effected. Hence Hoffmann recently designated the units of the people's police, border police, and auxiliary police as the "other armed units in addition to the National People's Army." In the event of military attack on the Socialist camp, Hoffmann set the army the task of helping the working class and all peace-loving forces of West Germany to rid themselves of the rule of German militarism and of bringing about the victory of the policy of peace by setting up a truly democratic order in the west zones, too.

Very significantly Hoffmann added:

"Situations might arise in which the German Democratic Republic is forced to intervene in West Germany in order to insure that international treaties and the Potsdam agreement are observed."

Another important aim is the fostering of hatred against the Federal Republic which is systematically bred in the garrisons in the Soviet occupied zone. The official directives for the National People's Army, for instance, state:

"Every soldier of the German Democratic Republic must consciously fight for the workers' and peasants' power. He must know and hate his opponent and must be fully convinced that his own side will be victorious."

Again and again, Hoffmann stresses the inseparable ties between the army of the Soviet occupied zone and that of the Soviet

Union; at the beginning of the Korean war, for instance, he impressed on officers of the Soviet zone forces, which in those days were still camouflaged as garrisoned people's police, "We are not police but soldiers. When the time for action comes, we shall fight side by side with the Red army."

In connection with psychological military training and discipline, Hoffmann, strictly according to Lenin's doctrine, distinguishes between just and unjust wars, and, of course, it goes without saying that only the Communist East can conduct just wars, whereas the capitalistic West on principle only starts unjust wars. Hoffmann also stresses, "We Socialists do not oppose war in principle," and threaten to make short work of the pacifists if they should get active in the Communist sphere of influence. In order to increase the love of soldiering in the Soviet occupied zone, Hoffmann has since 1960 been voicing the theory that "Bonn is planning an atomic war against the German Democratic Republic," and bases his insistence on the necessity for the utmost military efforts on this theory. He is determined above all to foster hatred against the Federal Republic in order to create the preconditions for a state similar to civil war. The aim of these efforts is obvious, and Hoffmann, a Soviet subject, would be the last person to have any misgivings about carrying out the orders of his master.

The Need for a Federal Recreation Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has no single agency, bureau, office, division, or department which has as its primary responsibility the promotion and development of recreation opportunities for the people of our Nation.

Recreation services can be found in the Armed Forces, hospitals, industry, parks, private and voluntary agencies, public recreation, recreation education, religious organizations, rural, State, and other services and settings. Yet there is no one place in the United States where the combined progress of recreation can be focused, related, and used on a two-way street.

There are many, many recreational needs which are not being met today. The larger city needs research assistance on land standards, types of recreation structures, programing, financing, general administration, in the same way that the smaller community does—perhaps even to a greater degree. Master planning, personnel problems, program development, and land acquisition face the urban metropolitan region and the small communities. Every type of recreation service in every setting needs a central agency which can gather and disseminate information.

My bill H.R. 216 would establish a Federal Recreation Service in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I believe that such a service belongs in a Department that is mainly concerned with human needs and the general welfare of the people.

The use of recreation as a positive and preventive force in our time and the time to come depends on the passage of this legislation. Misuse or abuse of recreation is a problem of paramount importance today.

The Federal Recreation Service, created by this bill would provide an agency which would offer communities and organizations ready advice. It would be able to offer technical data for the improvement of existing and proposed recreation services in communities and agencies. The purpose of the bill can easily be carried out within the framework of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with relatively little expense.

The benefits derived from the establishment of such a service would be great for and with the many public and private agencies striving to improve recreation programs, leadership, and facilities throughout our Nation.

How To Fight Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding newspapers in the Fifth District of Massachusetts, the Woburn Times, has once again contributed a thoughtful editorial well worthy of the attention of the Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks, I now insert it in the RECORD:

HOW TO FIGHT COMMUNISM

Communism is for us a life or death challenge.

The fight against communism is not against bearded bomb tossers.

The fundamental point that we must all remember is that communism is both a movement of social protest and a conspiracy dedicated to world conquest.

Its social protest appeals to the victims of capitalist oppression and colonial exploitation. The oppression and exploitation are hard facts to millions who live in poverty and without education after their own sweat and their ancestors' toil enriched men who knew how to corner them and make them virtual slaves.

All the Communists can offer is promises, but the promises look good for they offer a better and happier life in a society dedicated to equality and justice.

The Communist conspiracy is a double threat of direct or military aggression, and the threat of subversion, or indirect aggression.

The intelligent attack on communism must be based on valid social doctrine and exposing and checking the Communist conspiratorial drive to power.

Russia poses itself to the underdeveloped nations as a great industrial power where all citizens are equal.

These things are enough for oppressed people. For if they can develop industry they will no longer be hungry or poorly clothed. If they get equality, they will have a freedom they have never before enjoyed.

While some Americans are satisfied that the former colonial peoples will have to develop through communism before they liberate themselves into what we know as Western Democracy, it is obvious to others that unless we observe strictly the tenets of social justice in dealing with these people, we are going to get nowhere with them.

As for the conspiracy toward world conquest, we must try to infiltrate every nation with our concepts of freedom, stirring up people to accept self-determination, blasting on our loudest loudspeaker whenever the Communists make a move.

As for segregation in this country, our greatest liability at the moment in our fight against communism, we have played the great American Symphony too long on just the white keys. Let's start using the black keys, too, and get some real melody and lilt in the tune.

The Constitution and What It Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an outstanding essay entitled "The Constitution and What It Means," by Robert French of Bellaire, Ohio. Robert, a ninth-grade student, was one of the winners in the essay contest sponscored by the American Legion of Ohio. His essay follows:

THE CONSTITUTION AND WHAT IT MEANS
(By Robert French)

The Constitution of the United States is a frame of our Government and the basis of all laws of the United States. It defines our rights and freedoms, and guarantees that other laws will not infringe upon these rights and freedoms. This Constitution is the supreme law of the United States.

The very existence of the U.S. Government is based on the Constitution. It outlines the plan of the U.S. Government, dividing it into three main branches: the legislative, the executive, and the judicial departments. The Constitution definitely outlines the organization and duties of each of these three departments which are organized in such a manner that each checks the other two. The Constitution makes provisions for new States to enter the Union and for foreign-born people to become citizens, thereby making the U.S. Government a democratic one. Thus, one might say that the Constitution is the frame of the U.S. Government.

The Constitution definitely states the powers of the government. It tells what the U.S. Government and the governments of the individual States may and may not do.

The 10th amendment states that the source of the powers not given to the Federal Government by the Constitution, and not prohibited to the State governments, rests in the citizens of the United States, who vote to select their representatives in the various branches of the Government. These elected representatives of the people of the United States have the power to pass laws in accordance with the Constitution; but the Constitution, itself, is the supreme law of the land.

The Constitution tells us our basic rights and freedoms in its main text, while some

of the amendments to the Constitution clarify and guarantee these rights and freedoms. Therefore, the Constitution is the declaration of rights and freedoms of Americans.

To me, a freshman in an Ohio high school, the Constitution is a great document which defines and outlines the Government of the United States, states my rights, and secures my freedoms. It provides a democratic plan as a foundation for our Government. It is something that I have inherited, a treasured gift from my ancestors. Thus, the Constitution, to me, is a symbol of our democracy.

The Constitution, in a broader concept, is more than a plan of our Government, a declaration of our rights, the supreme law of the land, or a symbol of our democracy. It is a great document giving us, the people of the United States, the responsibilities of justly governing ourselves and our fellow Americans. But not all Americans realize what the Constitution really implies and the importance of the obligations it imposes. The Constitution implies individual equality of opportunity; but not all Americans know equality of opportunities. To me this equality is a fact; to other people it is merely a dream, a symbol of hope. It is the obligation of the youth of America to make their dream a reality.

This is what the Constitution means.

B–70 Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, in these days of space age spectaculars, our scientists and engineers have considered that one of the areas in which the United States may well acquire a first is that of the supersonic airliner. But now, in the proposed cutback of the B–70 program, not only is our national security imperiled but also the timetable for America's first operational supersonic, commercial transport—which will grow out of the B–70 technology—is thereby moved back indefinitely.

In regard to national security, we could be assured that if our Armed Forces in certain situations might need a troop carrier able to travel 3,500 to 4,000 nautical miles in a couple of hours, the supersonic transport could supply this capability. The B–70, as a long-range bomber, could reach almost any point on earth and return at mach 3 speed. Supersonic airframe and engine technology, adapted to commercial air transport development, could uphold America's position as world leader in commercial aviation, could prove a boon to American industry, and could bring advances in science and technology that would pay off in economic growth and industrial progress.

The economic implications of a supersonic airliner are imposing. Today, fully 85 percent of the more than 5,000 airliners operated in the West are U.S. made. Exports of all types of aeronautical products have been running at an annual rate of $500 million. This is 12 percent of the total of all exported manufactured goods.

The economic lift to be gained from a supersonic airliner program would be considerable from a purely domestic standpoint. The aviation industry has the highest employment of any industry in the Nation. But the employment trend has been sharply down of late. Thus, manufacture of a major new product would be exceedingly helpful.

Almost a year ago, the Committee on Science and Astronautics of which I am chairman, held hearings on the status of the supersonic air transport program. As a result, the committee recommended that on the basis of national security and because of its close relationship to the commercial possibilities of supersonic travel, the complete B–70 development should be carried out.

The B–70 has been designed to compress time and distance far beyond anything of its type yet built, and I believe the research and development phase has progressed sufficiently so that added funds should go into a speedup of the program—not a cutback to the prototype phase. The development of new weapons systems requires such a long lead time that if we delay further, we may find that we have lost out to other nations. I believe in this instance we would be justified to take a calculated risk to push the B–70 program. I am among the first to recognize that these risks are expensive and money can we wasted. But when the security of our country is involved, when the program would not only have great military significance but infinite commercial possibilities as well, I feel it is necessary to take those risks and proceed with the development of this program with a sense of urgency.

A few weeks ago, the New York Times quoted Mr. Najeeb A. Halaby, new head of the Federal Aviation Agency, as saying in an address delivered to the Society of Automotive Engineers that there were "at least four cogent reasons for pushing the [supersonic airliner] project."

First, he said, it was important for the advancement of the technology of manned flight.

His second reason had to do with national security.

Third, he said, the Nation's prestige is involved. He warned that the United States was in danger of losing its traditional lead in aviation.

Mr. Halaby's fourth reason was economic. He said a fleet of supersonic planes would add to the Gross National Product by creating more jobs, by saving the time of executives, and by moving goods more quickly.

The B–70 and its sister, the commercial supersonic airliner, are too important to our national interest to be held back by insufficient funding.

The Knights of Columbus—The Good Right Arm of the Roman Catholic Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, during the Easter recess public officials are frequently invited to communion mass and breakfast. It was my pleasure on March 19, 1961, to attend the communion mass and breakfast of St. Luke's Council No. 438, Knights of Columbus, at St. Rita's Auditorium, Bronx, New York, N.Y. One of the principal speakers was James E. Foley, chairman of the New York Chapter, Knights of Columbus. His address was so inspiring that I believe that it merits a wider audience than the several hundred attendants. In his talk, Mr. Foley set forth the conditions which gave rise to the need of a Catholic lay society that today numbers over 1,300,000 in over 4,500 councils throughout 62 jurisdictions of the world. Mr. Foley detailed the development of the organization and its accomplishments. His speech follows:

ADDRESS BY JAMES E. FOLEY, CHAIRMAN OF NEW YORK CHAPTER, KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS, AT THE ANNUAL CORPORATE COMMUNION MASS AND BREAKFAST OF ST. LUKE'S COUNCIL NO. 438, KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS, AT ST. RITA'S AUDITORIUM, BRONX, NEW YORK, N.Y., MARCH 19, 1961

Mr. Toastmaster, William O'Malley; Rt. Rev. Msgr. P. F. Mackin; Rev. William P. Burke; Worthy Grand Knight Antony B. Caramele; distinguished guest of the morning, Maurice Fitzgerald; Hon. Alfred E. Santangelo; distinguished guests on the dais; officers and members of St. Luke's Council, its Columbiette unit, its Columbian squires; my brother knights and friends, at the outset may I extend my personal gratitude to the chairman and his committee for having extended to me the courtesy of participating in this, your outstanding Columbian activity of the year. At the same time may I, on behalf of the remaining 40 councils comprising the New York chapter jurisdiction, note the combined appreciation of our entire membership to the splendid cooperation that has been extended to the chapter officers by St. Luke's Council. Particular emphasis should be made of the accomplishments of your Worthy Grand Knight Anthony B. Caramele for his outstanding efforts as chairman of the chapter speaker's course. Under his wise and able administration, the speaker's course this year enrolled the greatest number of participants since its inception in 1918.

I am particularly pleased this morning to join with you in testimonializing Maurice Fitzgerald for his many years of unselfish devotion to the workings of this council. Certainly, Brother Fitzgerald is an example of the efforts that have been expended by those who have been members of our order for a longer period of time than we of the new generation, and who have through their concerted actions designed the foundation upon which this very tremendous Catholic

fraternal order has been developed. It is the hope of all of us that the Divine Lord will grant to Brother Fitzgerald many additional years of health that he may assist in guiding the course of our development to a greater future.

March 29 of this year will mark the 79th anniversary of the birth and origin of the Knights of Columbus. Indeed, as Father Michael J. McGivney and a small group of some 14 laymen gathered together at St. Mary's Parish in New Haven, Conn., at the institution of Bishop Lawrence S. McMahon of Hartford, Conn., little did they realize that at that time they were giving rise to a Catholic lay society that, today, numbers over 1,300,000 in over 4,500 councils throughout 62 jurisdictions of the world.

The original purpose in the formation of the Knights of Columbus was to provide a fraternal benefits society, to the Catholics of those days, which might in some measure assist them and the members of their families when sickness and other hardships struck the breadwinner of the family. Thus, it was that we sought a Catholic fraternal organization that was cosmopolitan in membership, American in nature, and Catholic in character, and that would give to Catholic men a conduit toward economic advantages.

That our society has satisfactorily achieved this purpose can be attested to by its many accomplishments of the past. The record is monumental and inspiring: In 1914 an endowment fund of $500,000 at the Catholic University of America was established; during World War I the K. of C. hut and the K. of C. slogan "Everyone Welcome—Everything Free" were famous throughout the fighting area, and gave rise to the idea of the USO in World War II; in 1924 the order contributed the funds necessary to combat the so-called Oregon School Law through the Supreme Court of the United States, which statute would have outlawed parochial education; in 1947 our Catholic advertisement program was instituted which has since drawn 4 million inquiries and has enlisted over 400,000 in our correspondence course of religious instruction; the order has microfilmed the Vatican library which is available to scholars and study groups at St. Louis University; and finally, through your generosity, the Campanile of the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception, known as the Knight's Tower and which stands some 316 feet in height, second only to St. Mark's in Venice, was constructed. These are but a few of our contributions to the moral, educational, and social background of our country and our church.

However, due to the changing nature of our times, and due likewise to the tremendous development that has been made in workmen's compensation, disability, and hospitalization insurance plans, the initial design for which we were incorporated has slowly and surely given way to a new purpose to which we must all, today, dedicate the spirit and direction of our lives.

This new direction is in the field of Catholic action. Throughout the last presidential election, much mention was made of the fact that the Communists were now only 90 miles from the shores of the United States. I assure you, my brother Knights, if it were not for the worldwide efforts of the Catholic Church in opposing this atheistic philosophy of communism, that distance might be much shorter. On many an occasion, our heirarchy has extended to us the flattering characterization as "the Strong Right Arm of the Catholic Church." This, we inherit from those of our brothers who preceded us in this order and who have made the way for us today.

Yes, we have inherited a tremendously vital Catholic fraternal organization. We have inherited a rich heritage and a fruitful organization, but with this we have likewise inherited the responsibilities and the obligations that are coincident with the honors of the order. To these, we must revitalize the efforts and the spirits of our lives. Much was likewise said in the recent presidential election of a decline in the prestige of the United States abroad. I say to you that over the period of the past several years, there has been in some localities and I will emphasize that of our own, a decline in the prestige of the Knights of Columbus. Its cause can be laid primarily to the apathy and complacency of our membership, and to Catholics in general, in participating or letting themselves be heard on any measure which affects their social and public welfare.

Should we not reinvigorate our philosophy; should we not develop a greater spirit of public-mindedness; should we not as Catholics and as members of this wonderful order participate and cooperate thoroughly in the functions of the supreme council, of the New York State Council of the Knights of Columbus, and the New York Chapter Knights of Columbus? Should we not reappraise our attitude, then I say to you that each of our councils would be nothing more than local social organizations which would act to deteriorate the foundation of our society.

So, brothers, let's take that which has been given to us from the past and, using it as the basis for future development and construction of a greater edifice of the future, let us combine our talents so that 10 or 15 years hence, as we refer to the Knights of Columbus we will not be reciting the vicarious developments of our brother knights, but rather that each of us will be able to take pride in pointing to what he has done to develop this new structure of the future. Let us take recognition of the zeal of others outside our religion in effectuating legislation designed to assist in the propagating of their beliefs.

Your Congressman SANTANGELO has presented to you this morning a synopsis of President Kennedy's Federal aid to education program. In this program, no mention is made of financial assistance to private or parochial schools. I urge that you follow your Congressman's advice and write to your Federal Representatives advising them that, while you are not opposed to Federal aid to education, you would be opposed to it in any form where financial assistance to private or parochial schools is omitted. This is but one of the many instances in which you as an active member of the Catholic lay apostolate can assist your community, your church, and yourself by concerted action. Many others can be mentioned to you but time does not permit.

So, on this happy occasion, if we are to leave with but one thought in mind, let that thought be that we will devote and develop ourselves to instituting and implementing our own individuality in the Catholic lay apostolate through the Knights of Columbus so that the wonderful image of the past will become a greater reflection of the future.

The State Starves the Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the following statement is attributed to Plato:

Democracy does not contain any force which will check the constant tendency to put more and more on the public payroll. The state is like a hive of bees in which the drones display, multiply, and starve the workers so the idlers will consume the food and the workers will perish.

Resolution Favoring Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter from Mr. Harvey Wood, superintendent of the Dimondale Area Schools, in my district:

DIMONDALE AREA SCHOOLS,
Dimondale, Mich., April 14, 1961.

Hon. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JOHANSEN: It has come to our attention through the Legislative Bureau of the Michigan Education Association that a Michigan school board recently had its resolution opposing Federal aid to education read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. We believe that this action may have given some Members of Congress the mistaken impression that this board was speaking for all or a majority of Michigan school boards. Since we do not subscribe to this point of view, nor do we believe it to be representative of the thinking of the majority of boards of education in this State, we are requesting that you introduce the following resolution of our board of education into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

"Mover by Fay, seconded by Baird, that the board of education of the Dimondale area schools, recognizing the need for increased support for education through Federal participation if our national objectives are to be attained, hereby endorses the concept of Federal aid to education. Carried."

The above motion was adopted at the regular meeting of April 10, 1961, and is on record in the official minutes of that meeting.

For the board of education:

HARVEY WOOD,
Superintendent.

I am, of course, happy to comply with the request of the board of education and Mr. Wood that the resolution of the board be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I unqualifiedly endorse and support the constitutional right of citizens or of any duly constituted governmental body to present its petitions and views to the Congress of the United States, including those instances, of which this is one, in which the views do not coincide with my own.

In response to a telephone inquiry to Mr. Wood, I am advised that the vote of the school board on this particular resolution was 4 to 3 in favor. I conclude therefrom that the sentiment of the board, either with regard to Federal aid to education or with regard to the board going on record in this manner, was something less than unanimous.

I believe one further comment is in order with respect to the statement made by Mr. Wood to the effect that introduction in the RECORD of a resolu-

tion opposing Federal aid to education on behalf of another Michigan school board "may have given some Members of Congress the mistaken impression that this board was speaking for all or a majority of Michgan school boards."

While I do not happen to have read this earlier extension in the RECORD, I am sure that no Member of this House is so naive as to believe that any single school board speaks for, or presumes to speak for, all or a majority of Michigan school boards.

I certainly do not presume to know what the thinking of the majority of boards of education in Michigan is on the issue, although Mr. Wood evidently believes that a majority of the boards of education of the State are not opposed to Federal aid to education. I notice that he cites no basis for his conclusion.

I made the point of inquiring of Mr. Wood as to whether the Dimondale board's action was unanimous, because I believe this is highly relevant to the whole matter.

I wish that on issues of this type, where there is a sharp cleavage of honest opinion, the practice of submitting minority views, which is an established procedure of the committees of this House, might also be followed by other governmental bodies. I believe it would contribute a great deal to the airing of opposing views at the grassroots.

I note with particular interest the obvious eagle-eye alertness of the legislative bureau of the Michigan Education Association in this matter. Of course, I do not deny the right of that organization to exhibit this type of interest and alertness.

At the same time I do not hesitate, in the face of either the Michigan Education Association activities, or the 4-to-3 vote of the Dimondale board of education, to reaffirm my own unqualified and vigorous opposition to the concept of Federal aid to education in general and to the specific program of Federal aid recommended by the present administration.

Msgr. George N. Habig

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the people of Canton, Ohio, suffered a severe loss last week with the passing of Msgr. George N. Habig, pastor of St. Peter's Catholic Church for the past 30 years. I am among the many who feel a deep sense of personal loss. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial tribute from the Canton Repository:

MSGR. GEORGE N. HABIG

There was a community opinion of Msgr. George N. Habig that had been held for years and was as well known to him as it was to all the rest of us who loved and respected him—that no pastor could have served his parish, his city, and his metropolitan area with more distinction and compassion.

Monsignor Habig was full of learning, honors in the Roman Catholic Church, and Christian devotion. But the quality that shone from him in more than 30 years here as pastor of St. Peter's Catholic Church was serene kindliness. He was the prototype of everything a religious preceptor should be. He was his own best living example of the benison of faith.

At the age of 70, it cannot be said that any man is being taken prematurely from his work. Monsignor Habig had done all his duties well. But his presence in Canton will be sorely missed. It will be a long generation before we shall see St. Peter's Church without thinking of the good pastor who guided it from 1930 until his death.

Associated Students, University of California, Berkeley, Calif., Executive Committee Endorses Peace Corps as Great Step Forward in America's Concept

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I call to your attention, and the attention of my other distinguished colleagues, a letter to me, dated April 4, 1961, from the president of the Associated Students, University of California, Berkeley, Calif., Mr. George H. Link, which enclosed a copy of a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Associated Students at the university in full support of the Peace Corps:

ASSOCIATED STUDENTS,
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
Berkeley, Calif., April 4, 1961.

DEAR SIR: Please find enclosed a copy of a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Associated Students of the University of California at Berkeley at its meeting of March 7, 1961. We hope that you will consider the position of the representative body of the students of the University of California.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,
GEORGE H. LINK,
President.

PEACE CORPS

Whereas the long proposed Point Four Youth Corps or Peace Corps is fast developing into a real institution under the Kennedy administration; and

Whereas such a Peace Corps would recruit young people to serve in technical capacities in developing countries, thus fulfilling the following objectives: (1) Oversea training to qualified persons who would otherwise be lost to international service, (2) skilled manpower for countries urgently in need of it, (3) development of a large-scale offensive by Americans to demonstrate our interest in and dependence upon the good will of "third area" countries; and

Whereas the present plan of organizing the corps to utilize both governmental and private agencies will enable it to draw upon private financial resources, to engage the service of skilled personnel existing in the private sector who might be unwilling to sever these ties, might be instrumental in preventing the problem of the corps being reacted to negatively as U.S. Government intervention, and will at the same time provide the central governmental coordination and financial subsidy necessary to make the corps effective on a large scale; and

Whereas the present plan of initiating the corps on a pilot basis will make it possible to find solutions to many of the essential questions which can only be solved in the field in the course of corps work, thus insuring the success of the corps when it is ultimately launched on a full-scale basis: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we, the undersigned 15 voting members of the executive committee of the Associated Students of the University of California, speaking as individuals and not claiming to represent the university or the student body as a whole, view the Peace Corps as a great step forward in America's concept of national defense and international relations and heartily endorse its creation as ordered by President Kennedy on March 1, 1961.

However, whereas the problem of draft exemption remains to be resolved; and

Whereas many graduating students who would be excellent Peace Corps material will feel that 3 years of service in an underdeveloped country would be time well spent, but would be unwilling to return from this service still liable to 2 years of active military service with the normal military reserve obligation still to follow; and

Whereas many students, especially those in fields requiring extended education, such as medicine, law, education, and engineering who would be particularly valuable to the corps, might be prohibited from participating due to the extended absence from a wage-earning capacity which the additional military obligations would impose; and

Whereas for maximum effectiveness, the method of selection, the training, and the service of corps participants must necessarily be of such a nature both quantitatively and qualitatively that it would be inherently protected from draft dodgers: Therefore be it further

Resolved, That we urge special consideration of a plan to exempt Peace Corps members who faithfully complete their tour of duty from peacetime active military service.

Ayes: Messrs. George H. Link, president; Don Alves, first vice president; Edward Germain, lower division representative; Roger Kauffman, men's representative; Dr. Armin Rappaport, faculty representative; Henry Schacht, alumni representative; Dean William Shepard, chancellor's representative; Larry Beyersdorf, Tom M. Jones, Dave Melander, Jerry Newfarmer, Brian Van Camp, Miss JoAnn Thebolt, representatives at large; Miss Dolores Robbins, second vice president.

Federal Court Judges

SPEECH
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

Federal court judges, their dates of birth and dates of appointment (with age at time of appointment), April 1961

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Justices	Date of birth	Date of appointment	Age at time of appointment	Justices	Date of birth	Date of appointment	Age at time of appointment
Earl Warren	Mar. 19, 1891	Oct. 2, 1953	62	Charles E. Whittaker	Feb. 22, 1901	Mar. 22, 1957	56
Hugo L. Black	Feb. 27, 1886	Aug. 18, 1937	51	Potter Stewart	Jan. 23, 1915	Oct. 14, 1958	43
Felix Frankfurter	Nov. 15, 1882	Jan. 20, 1939	57	Retired:			
William O. Douglas	Oct. 16, 1898	Apr. 15, 1939	41	Stanley Reed	Dec. 31, 1884	Jan. 27, 1938	54
Tom C. Clark	Sept. 23, 1899	Aug. 19, 1949	50	Harold H. Burton	June 22, 1888	Sept. 22, 1945	57
John M. Harlan	May 20, 1899	Mar. 17, 1955	56	Sherman Minton	Oct. 20, 1890	Oct. 5, 1949	59
William J. Brennan, Jr	Apr. 25, 1906	Oct. 15, 1956	50				

U.S. COURTS OF APPEALS (BY CIRCUIT)

Court and judge	Date of birth	Date of appointment	Age at time of appointment	Court and judge	Date of birth	Date of appointment	Age at time of appointment
District of Columbia circuit:				6th circuit:			
E. Barrett Prettyman	Aug. 23, 1891	Sept. 28, 1945	54	John D. Martin, Sr	May 4, 1883	Sept. 7, 1940	57
Henry W. Edgerton	Oct. 20, 1888	Dec. 15, 1937	49	Thomas F. McAllister	Mar. 4, 1896	May 22, 1941	45
Wilbur K. Miller	Oct. 9, 1892	Sept. 28, 1945	54	Shackelford Miller, Jr	Sept. 4, 1892	Dec. 11, 1945	53
David L. Bazelon	Sept. 3, 1909	Oct. 21, 1949	40	Lester L. Cecil	Nov. 21, 1893	July 18, 1959	66
Charles Fahy	Aug. 27, 1892	Oct. 21, 1949	57	Paul C. Weick	Aug. 25, 1899	Sept. 10, 1959	60
George T. Washington	June 24, 1908	Oct. 21, 1949	41	Clifford O'Sullivan	Dec. 8, 1897	Mar. 12, 1960	63
John A. Danaher	Jan. 9, 1899	Oct. 1, 1953	54	Senior judges:			
Walter M. Bastian	Nov. 16, 1891	Dec. 3, 1954	63	Charles C. Simons	May 21, 1876	Jan. 29, 1932	56
Warren E. Burger		Mar. 29, 1956		Florence E. Allen	Mar. 23, 1884	Mar. 21, 1934	50
1st circuit:				7th circuit:			
Peter Woodbury	Oct. 24, 1899	Feb. 25, 1941	42	F. Ryan Duffy	June 23, 1888	Feb. 2, 1949	61
John P. Hartigan	Dec. 29, 1887	Jan. 1, 1951	64	Elmer J. Schnackenberg	Aug. 22, 1889	May 5, 1949	65
Bailey Aldrich	Apr. 23, 1907	Sept. 10, 1959	52	John S. Hastings	1898	Aug. 26, 1957	59
Senior judge: [1] Calvert Magruder	Dec. 26, 1893	June 3, 1939	46	Win G. Knoch	May 24, 1895	Aug. 21, 1958	63
2d circuit:				Lathan Castle	Feb. 27, 1900	Apr. 30, 1959	59
Charles E. Clark	Dec. 9, 1889	Mar. 9, 1939	50	(Vacancy.)			
J. Edward Lumbard	Aug. 18, 1901	July 12, 1955	54	Senior judge: J. Earl Major	Jan. 5, 1887	Mar. 23, 1937	50
Sterry R. Waterman	1901	July 13, 1955	54	8th circuit:			
Leonard P. Moore	July 2, 1898	Sept. 6, 1957	59	Harvey M. Johnson	July 16, 1895	Oct. 14, 1940	45
Henry J. Friendly	July 3, 1903	Sept. 10, 1959	56	Charles J. Vogel	Sept. 20, 1898	Aug. 20, 1954	56
J. Joseph Smith	Jan. 25, 1904	Sept. 2, 1960	56	Martin D. Van Oosterhout	Oct. 10, 1900	Aug. 26, 1954	54
Senior judges:				Marion C. Matthes	1906	Mar. 12, 1958	52
Learned Hand	Jan. 27, 1872	Dec. 20, 1924	52	Harry A. Blackmun	Nov. 12, 1908	Sept. 21, 1959	51
Thomas W. Swan	Dec. 20, 1877	Dec. 26, 1926	49	(Vacancy.)			
Harrie B. Chase	Aug. 9, 1889	Jan. 31, 1926	37	(Vacancy.)			
Harold R. Medina	Feb. 16, 1888	June 23, 1951	63	Senior judges:			
Carroll C. Hincks	Nov. 30, 1889	Oct. 3, 1953	64	Seth Thomas	May 18, 1873	Dec. 2, 1935	62
3d circuit:				John B. Sanborn	Nov. 9, 1883	Jan. 23, 1932	49
John Biggs, Jr	Oct. 6, 1895	Feb. 16, 1937	42	Archibald K. Gardner	Dec. 3, 1867	May 23, 1929	62
Herbert F. Goodrich	July 29, 1889	May 10, 1940	51	Joseph W. Woodraugh	Aug. 29, 1873	Apr. 12, 1933	60
Gerald McLaughlin	1893	June 14, 1943	50	9th circuit:			
Harry E. Kalodner	Mar. 28, 1896	July 27, 1946	50	Richard H. Chambers	Nov. 7, 1906	Apr. 30, 1954	48
Austin L. Staley	Dec. 30, 1902	July 5, 1950	48	Stanley N. Barnes	May 1, 1900	Mar. 21, 1956	56
William Henry Hastie	Nov. 17, 1904	Oct. 21, 1949	45	Frederick G. Hamley	Oct. 24, 1903	July 2, 1956	53
Senior judges:				Oliver D. Hamlin, Jr	Nov. 30, 1892	Mar. 26, 1958	66
Albert B. Maris	Dec. 19, 1893	June 24, 1938	45	Gilbert H. Jertberg	Feb. 1, 1897	Aug. 21, 1958	61
Phillip Forman	Nov. 30, 1895	Sept. 10, 1959	64	Charles M. Merrill	Dec. 11, 1907	Sept. 21, 1959	52
4th circuit:				M. Oliver Koelsch	Mar. 5, 1912	Sept. 23, 1959	47
Simon E. Sobeloff	Mar. 3, 1893	July 18, 1956	63	(Vacancy.)			
Clement F. Haynsworth, Jr		Apr. 4, 1957		Senior judges:			
Herbert S. Boreman	Sept. 21, 1897	June 17, 1959	62	Clifton Mathews	Feb. 12, 1880	Mar. 23, 1935	55
Senior judges:				Homer T. Bone	Jan. 25, 1883	Apr. 1, 1944	61
Armistead M. Dobie	Apr. 15, 1881	Dec. 19, 1939	58	William E. Orr	Oct. 26, 1881	Sept. 28, 1945	64
Morris A. Soper	Jan. 23, 1873	May 6, 1931	58	William Healy	Sept. 10, 1881	June 21, 1937	56
5th circuit:				Albert Lee Stephens	Jan. 25, 1874	June 18, 1937	63
Joseph C. Hutcheson, Jr	Oct. 19, 1879	Jan. 26, 1931	52	Walter L. Pope	Jan. 26, 1889	June 21, 1937	56
Richard T. Rives	Jan. 15, 1895	May 3, 1951	56	10th circuit:			
Elbert Parr Tuttle	July 17, 1897	Aug. 4, 1954	57	Alfred P. Murrah	Oct. 27, 1904	Sept. 4, 1940	36
Ben F. Cameron	Dec. 14, 1890	Mar. 16, 1955	65	John C. Pickett	Sept. 3, 1896	Oct. 13, 1949	53
Warren L. Jones	July 2, 1895	Apr. 21, 1955	60	David T. Lewis	Apr. 25, 1912	June 5, 1956	44
John R. Brown	1909	Jan. 27, 1955	46	Jean S. Breitenstein	July 18, 1900	June 27, 1957	57
John Minor Wisdom	May 17, 1905	June 27, 1957	52	(Vacancy.)			
Senior judges:				Senior judges:			
Edwin R. Holmes		Mar. 20, 1936		Orie L. Phillips	Nov. 20, 1885	Apr. 29, 1929	44
Wayne G. Borah		Oct. 21, 1949		Walter A. Huxman	Feb. 16, 1887	May 23, 1939	52
				Sam G. Bratton	Aug. 19, 1888	June 1, 1933	45

[1] Senior judges are those who have retired from regular active service but are available for special judicial duties from time to time. (See Public Law 85-219, Aug. 29, 1957.)

U.S. EMERGENCY COURT OF APPEALS

Judge	Date of birth	Date of appointment	Age at time of appointment	Judge	Date of birth	Date of appointment	Age at time of appointment
Albert B. Maris	Dec. 19, 1893	June 24, 1938	45	Thomas F. McAllister	Mar. 4, 1896	May 22, 1941	45
Calvert Magruder	Dec. 26, 1893	June 3, 1938	43				

U.S. COURT OF CLAIMS

Sam E. Whitaker	Sept. 25, 1886	July 13, 1939	'53	Marvin Jones	Feb. 26, 1886	July 9, 1947	61
Joseph Warren Madden	Jan. 17, 1890	Jan. 7, 1941	51	James R. Durfee	Nov. 3, 1897	Apr. 22, 1960	63
Don N. Laramore	Dec. 22, 1 07	Mar. 17, 1954	47	Senior judge: Benjamin H. Littleton	Aug. 27, 1889	Nov. 6, 1929	40

Federal court judges, their dates of birth and dates of appointment (with age at time of appointment), April 1961—Continued

U.S. COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

Justices	Date of birth	Date of appointment	Age at time of appointment
Arthur M. Smith	Sept. 19, 1903	Apr. 30, 1959	56
Ambrose O'Connell	July 8, 1881	June 10, 1944	63
Eugene Worley	Oct. 10, 1908	Mar. 9, 1950	42
Giles S. Rich	1904	July 19, 1956	52
I. Jack Martin	July 18, 1908	Aug. 6, 1958	50
Senior judges:			
Joseph R. Jackson	Aug. 30, 1880	Dec. 14, 1937	57
Noble J. Johnson	Aug. 23, 1887	June 10, 1948	61
Webster J. Oliver	Jan. 14, 1888	June 24, 1940	52
Senior judges—Continued			
Charles D. Lawrence	Aug. 5, 1878	Feb. 22, 1943	65
Irvin C. Mollison	Dec. 24, 1898	Oct. 29, 1945	47
Jed Johnson	July 31, 1888	June 25, 1947	59
Paul P. Rae	June 15, 1899	June 22, 1948	49
Morgan Ford	Sept. 8, 1911	July 15, 1949	38
David John Wilson	Oct. 27, 1887	July 26, 1954	67
Mary H. Donlon	Aug. 25, 1893	Aug. 1, 1955	62
Scovel Richardson	Feb. 4, 1912	Apr. 8, 1957	45

U.S. DISTRICT COURTS

Court and judge	Date of birth	Date of appointment	Age at time of appointment
Alabama (northern):			
Seybourn H. Lynne	July 25, 1907	Jan. 3, 1946	39
Harlan Hobart Grooms	Nov. 7, 1900	Aug. 3, 1953	53
Alabama (middle): Frank M. Johnson, Jr.	1918	Oct. 22, 1955	37
Alabama (southern): Daniel H. Thomas	Aug. 25, 1906	Mar. 9, 1951	45
Alaska: Walter H. Hodge	1924	May 29, 1958	34
Arizona:			
Dave W. Ling	Jan. 22, 1890	June 3, 1936	46
James A. Walsh	Sept. 17, 1906	July 7, 1952	46
Arkansas (eastern):			
J. Smith Henley	May 18, 1917	Oct. 25, 1958	41
Gordon E. Young	Apr. 26, 1907	Sept. 10, 1959	52
Senior judge: Thomas C. Trimble		June 18, 1937	
Arkansas (western):			
John E. Miller	May 15, 1888	Mar. 12, 1941	53
J. Smith Henley	May 18, 1917	Oct. 25, 1958	41
Senior judge: Harry J. Lemley	Aug. 6, 1883	May 11, 1939	56
California (northern):			
Louis E. Goodman	Jan. 2, 1892	Dec. 24, 1942	50
George B. Harris	Aug. 16, 1901	July 9, 1946	45
Oliver J. Carter	Apr. 7, 1911	Sept. 27, 1950	39
Sherrill Halbert	Oct. 17, 1901	Aug. 26, 1954	53
Albert C. Wollenberg	June 13, 1900	May 19, 1958	58
Lloyd H. Burke	Apr. 1, 1916	July 23, 1958	42
William T. Sweigert	Nov. 13, 1900	Sept. 21, 1959	59
Senior judge: Michael J. Roche	July 21, 1878	Aug. 24, 1935	57
California (southern):			
Leon R. Yankwich	Sept. 25, 1880	do	47
Peirson M. Hall	July 31, 1894	July 3, 1942	48
William C. Mathes	Dec. 17, 1899	Oct. 17, 1945	46
Harry C. Westover	May 19, 1894	Oct. 18, 1949	55
James M. Carter	Mar. 11, 1904	do	45
William M. Byrne	July 10, 1896	Sept. 27, 1950	54
Ernest A. Tolin	Aug. 2, 1904	Oct. 30, 1951	47
Thurmond Clarke	June 29, 1902	Aug. 3, 1955	53
Fred Kunsel	June 2, 1901	Sept. 10, 1959	58
Myron D. Crocker	Sept. 4, 1915	Sept. 21, 1959	44
(Vacancy.)			
Senior judge: Jacob Weinberger	Jan. 4, 1882	Feb. 21, 1946	64
Canal Zone: Guthrie F. Crowe	July 24, 1910	July 3, 1952	42
Colorado:			
Alfred A. Arraj	Sept. 1, 1906	Aug. 6, 1957	51
Olin Hatfield Chilson	Nov. 22, 1903	Mar. 5, 1960	57
Connecticut:			
Robert P. Anderson	Mar. 27, 1906	Apr. 27, 1954	48
William H. Timbers	Sept. 5, 1915	Sept. 2, 1960	45
Delaware:			
Caleb M. Wright	1908	July 27, 1955	47
Caleb R. Layton III	July 4, 1907	Apr. 17, 1957	50
Edwin D. Steel, Jr.	May 7, 1904	Apr. 23, 1958	54
Senior judges:			
Richard S. Rodney	Oct. 10, 1882	July 31, 1946	64
Paul C. Leahy	Feb. 9, 1904	Jan. 14, 1942	38
District of Columbia:			
F. Dickinson Letts	Apr. 26, 1875	May 5, 1931	56
David A. Pine	Sept. 22, 1891	Mar. 20, 1940	49
Matthew F. McGuire	1899	Aug. 1, 1941	42
Alexander Holtzoff	Nov. 7, 1886	Sept. 28, 1945	59
Richmond B. Keech	Nov. 28, 1896	Oct. 14, 1946	50
Edward M. Curran	May 10, 1903	Oct. 16, 1948	43
Edward A. Tamm	Apr. 21, 1906	June 22, 1948	42
Charles F. McLaughlin	June 19, 1887	Oct. 21, 1949	62
Burnita S. Matthews	Dec. 28, 1894	do	55
Luther W. Youngdahl	May 29, 1896	Aug. 29, 1951	55
Joseph C. McGarraghy	Nov. 6, 1897	Mar. 28, 1957	60
John J. Sirica	Mar. 19, 1904	do	53
George L. Hart, Jr.	July 14, 1905	Aug. 29, 1958	53
Leonard P. Walsh	Mar. 3, 1904	Sept. 14, 1959	55
(Vacancy)			
Senior judges:			
Thomas Jennings Bailey	June 6, 1867	May 22, 1918	51
Henry A. Schweinhaut	Feb. 9, 1902	Dec. 19, 1944	42
Municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia:			
Andrew McCaughrin Hood	1900	July 7, 1942	42
Thomas D. Quinn		Nov. 1, 1951	
Senior judge: Nathan Cayton	Jan. 22, 1899	1942	43
Municipal court for the District of Columbia:			
Mary C. Barlow	1918	Mar. 3, 1950	32
Edward A. Board	Apr. 27, 1916	July 3, 1953	37
John H. Burnett	1896	July 17, 1956	60
Austin L. Fickling	1914	do	42
Andrew J. Howard, Jr.	1897	Nov. 2, 1950	53
Catherine B. Kelly	1917	Mar. 28, 1957	40
Milton S. Kronheim, Jr.	Oct. 5, 1911	Mar. 29, 1949	38
John J. Malloy	1905	Nov. 1, 1951	46
Godfrey L. Munter	1897	July 17, 1956	59
Frank H. Myers	Apr. 11, 1897	Feb. 13, 1948	51
George D. Neilson	1906	Apr. 29, 1940	34
Mildred E. Reeves	1900	July 3, 1953	53
Thomas C. Scalley	1898	Mar. 3, 1950	52
John Lewis Smith, Jr.	1912	Aug. 26, 1957	45
Harry L. Walker	1909	July 27, 1955	46
DeWitt S. Hyde		Sept. 14, 1959	
Senior judge: Armand W. Scott			
Florida (northern):			
George H. Carswell	Dec. 22, 1919	Apr. 10, 1958	39
George N. Whitehurst	May 18, 1891	Feb. 23, 1950	59
(Vacancy.)			
Senior judge: Dozier A. DeVane	Aug. 2, 1883	Apr. 22, 1943	60
Florida (southern):			
George W. Whitehurst	May 18, 1891	Feb. 23, 1950	59
Bryan Simpson	May 30, 1903	Sept. 26, 1950	47
Ernett C. Choate	May 21, 1891	July 20, 1954	63
Joseph P. Lieb	1901	Aug. 13, 1955	54
William A. McRae	Sept. 25, 1909	Mar. 8, 1961	52
Senior judge:			
John W. Holland	Sept. 30, 1883	June 1, 1936	53
William J. Barker	June 25, 1886	Feb. 5, 1940	56
Georgia (northern):			
Frank A. Hooper	Apr. 21, 1896	Oct. 21, 1949	53
William Boyd Sloan	July 9, 1895	Mar. 23, 1951	56
Georgia (middle):			
T. Hoyt Davis	July 4, 1892	Jan. 30, 1945	53
William A. Bootle	Aug. 19, 1902	May 20, 1954	52
Georgia (southern): Frank M. Scarlett	Jan. 9, 1891	Feb. 14, 1946	55
Guam: Eugene R. Gilmartin		Aug. 29, 1958	
Hawaii:			
C. Nils Tavares	Apr. 12, 1902	Oct. 13, 1960	58
(Vacancy.)			
Idaho:			
Chase A. Clark	Aug. 20, 1883	Mar. 10, 1943	60
Fred M. Taylor	Feb. 25, 1901	July 20, 1954	53
Illinois (northern):			
Michael L. Igee	Apr. 16, 1885	Nov. 21, 1938	53
William J. Campbell	Mar. 19, 1905	Oct. 10, 1940	35
J. Sam Perry	Nov. 30, 1896	Aug. 22, 1951	55
Julius J. Hoffman	July 7, 1895	May 14, 1953	58
Julius H. Miner	May 25, 1896	Feb. 27, 1958	62
(Vacancy.)			
(Vacancy.)			
Senior judge: Walter J. LaBay	1889	Mar. 31, 1944	55
Illinois (eastern):			
Casper Platt	June 6, 1892	Oct. 13, 1949	57
William G. Juergens	1904	June 22, 1956	52
Senior judge: Fred L. Wham	June 15, 1884	Mar. 1, 1927	43
Illinois (southern):			
Fred O. Mercer		June 19, 1956	
Omer Poos	Aug. 22, 1902	Aug. 21, 1958	56
Senior judge: Charles G. Briggle	Jan. 27, 1883	Jan. 25, 1932	49
Indiana (northern):			
Luther M. Swygert	Feb. 7, 1905	Oct. 16, 1943	38
Robert A. Grant	1905	Aug. 26, 1957	52
Indiana (southern):			
William E. Steckler	Oct. 18, 1913	Apr. 7, 1950	37
Cale J. Holder	Apr. 5, 1912	Aug. 6, 1954	42
Iowa (northern): Henry N. Graven	June 1, 1893	Mar. 24, 1944	51
Iowa (southern): Roy L. Stephenson	Mar. 14, 1917	May 31, 1960	43
Senior judge: Edwin R. Hicklin	1895	Aug. 16, 1957	62
Kansas:			
Delmas C. Hill	Oct. 9, 1906	Oct. 1, 1949	43
Arthur J. Stanley, Jr.	Mar. 21, 1901	July 7, 1958	57

Federal court judges, their dates of birth and dates of appointment (with age at time of appointment), April 1961—Continued

U.S. DISTRICT COURTS—Continued

Court and judge	Date of birth	Date of appointment	Age at time of appointment
Kentucky (eastern):			
H. Church Ford	July 28, 1884	Mar. 28, 1935	51
Mac Swinford	Dec. 23, 1899	Aug. 21, 1937	38
Kentucky (western):			
Roy M. Shelbourne	Nov. 12, 1890	Feb. 8, 1946	56
Henry L. Brooks	Dec. 9, 1905	Aug. 21, 1954	49
Louisiana (eastern):			
Herbert W. Christenberry	Dec. 11, 1897	Dec. 20, 1947	50
J. Skelly Wright	Jan. 14, 1911	Oct. 21, 1949	38
Louisiana (western):			
Ben C. Dawkins, Jr	Aug. 6, 1911	Aug. 3, 1953	42
Edwin F. Hunter, Jr	Feb. 18, 1911	Oct. 3, 1953	42
Senior judge: Benjamin C. Dawkins	July 19, 1881	May 5, 1924	43
Maine: Edward T. Gignoux	June 28, 1916	Aug. 26, 1957	41
Maryland:			
Roszel C. Thomsen	Aug. 17, 1900	May 12, 1954	54
R. Dorsey Watkins	Sept. 27, 1900	Aug. 12, 1955	55
Senior judge: W. Calvin Chesnut	June 27, 1873	May 9, 1931	58
Massachusetts:			
George C. Sweeney	July 23, 1895	Aug. 24, 1935	40
Francis J. W. Ford	Dec. 23, 1882	June 24, 1938	56
Charles E. Wyzanski, Jr	May 27, 1906	Dec. 19, 1941	35
Anthony Julian	Mar. 25, 1902	Sept. 10, 1959	57
Andrew A. Caffrey	Oct. 2, 1920	Oct. 13, 1960	40
Senior judge: William T. McCarthy	Dec. 5, 1885	Feb. 2, 1949	64
Michigan (eastern):			
Theodore Lavin	Feb. 18, 1897	July 27, 1946	49
Thomas P. Thornton	Mar. 8, 1898	Feb. 2, 1949	51
Ralph M. Freeman	May 5, 1902	June 10, 1954	52
Frederick W. Kaess	Dec. 1, 1910	July 6, 1960	50
John Feikens	Dec. 3, 1917	Oct. 13, 1960	43
Senior judges:			
Arthur F. Lederle	Nov. 25, 1887	Mar. 6, 1936	49
Frank A. Picard	Oct. 19, 1889	Feb. 23, 1939	50
Michigan (western):			
Raymond W. Starr	Aug. 24, 1888	July 25, 1946	58
W. Wallace Kent	May 1, 1916	June 10, 1954	38
Minnesota:			
Gunnar H. Nordbye	Feb. 4, 1888	Mar. 18, 1931	43
Robert C. Bell	Nov. 1, 1880	June 13, 1933	53
Dennis F. Donovan	Apr. 9, 1889	July 18, 1945	56
Edward J. Devitt	May 5, 1911	Dec. 10, 1954	43
Mississippi (northern):			
Claude F. Clayton	1909	Mar. 12, 1958	49
Senior judge: Allen Cox	Feb. 16, 1887	Mar. 2, 1929	42
Mississippi (southern): Sidney C. Mize	Mar. 7, 1888	Feb. 3, 1937	49
Missouri (eastern):			
George H. Moore	Jan. 20, 1878	May 29, 1935	57
Roy W. Harper	July 26, 1905	Aug. 7, 1947	42
Randolph H. Weber	Nov. 26, 1909	Mar. 14, 1957	48
Richard M. Duncan	Nov. 10, 1889	July 14, 1943	54
Missouri (western):			
Albert A. Ridge	Oct. 31, 1898	Apr. 7, 1945	47
R. Jasper Smith	1908	July 3, 1956	48
Richard M. Duncan	Nov. 10, 1889	July 14, 1943	54
Roy W. Harper	July 26, 1905	Aug. 7, 1947	42
Senior judge: Albert L. Reeves	Dec. 21, 1873	Jan. 24, 1923	50
Montana:			
William D. Murray	Nov. 20, 1908	May 9, 1949	41
William J. Jameson	1898	Mar. 28, 1957	59
Senior judge: Charles N. Pray		Feb. 8, 1924	
Nebraska:			
Richard E. Robinson	1903	July 3, 1956	53
Robert Van Pelt	1897	June 13, 1957	60
Senior judge: John W. Delehant	Sept. 3, 1890	Feb. 13, 1942	52
Nevada:			
John R. Ross	Mar. 1, 1899	May 15, 1954	55
Senior judge: Roger T. Foley	May 25, 1886	May 2, 1945	59
New Hampshire: Aloysius J. Conner	Apr. 13, 1895	Dec. 9, 1944	49
New Jersey:			
William F. Smith	Feb. 24, 1904	Feb. 15, 1941	37
Thomas F. Meaney	Sept. 6, 1888	July 3, 1942	54
Thomas M. Madden	Mar. 28, 1907	Oct. 25, 1945	38
Richard Hartshorne	Feb. 29, 1888	Oct. 20, 1951	63
Reynier J. Wortendyke, Jr	Mar. 22, 1895	June 8, 1955	60
Arthur S. Lane	Dec. 26, 1910	Aug. 30, 1960	50
(Vacancy.)			
New Mexico:			
Carl A. Hatch	Nov. 27, 1889	Jan. 21, 1949	60
Waldo H. Rogers	May 17, 1906	May 15, 1954	46
New York (northern):			
Stephen W. Brennan	1883	May 6, 1942	59
James T. Foley	July 9, 1910	Feb. 2, 1949	39
New York (southern):			
Sylvester J. Ryan	Sept. 10, 1896	Nov. 1, 1947	51
John F. X. McGohey	1894	Oct. 21, 1949	55
Irving R. Kaufman	June 24, 1910	do	39
Sidney Sugarman	Sept. 4, 1904	do	45
Edward Weinfeld	May 14, 1901	Aug. 5, 1950	49
Thomas F. Murphy	Dec. 3, 1905	July 2, 1951	46
Edward J. Dimock	Jan. 4, 1890	July 11, 1951	61
David N. Edelstein	Feb. 16, 1910	Nov. 1, 1951	41
Archie Owen Dawson	Oct. 9, 1898	Apr. 27, 1954	56
Alexander Bicks	Mar. 17, 1901	May 12, 1954	53
Edmund L. Palmieri	May 14, 1907	do	44
William B. Herlands	July 19, 1905	Aug. 12, 1955	50
John M. Cashin	Aug. 31, 1892	Aug. 17, 1955	63
Richard H. Levet	Jan. 24, 1894	Mar. 8, 1956	62
Gregory F. Noonan	Mar. 12, 1906	Oct. 21, 1949	43
Frederick Van Pelt Bryan	1904	June 19, 1956	52
Charles M. Metzner	Mar. 13, 1917	Sept. 10, 1959	42
Lloyd F. McMahon	Aug. 12, 1912	do	47
New York (southern)—Continued			
Senior judges:			
Vincent L. Leibell	Dec. 10, 1883	June 20, 1936	53
Edward A. Conger	1882	June 24, 1938	56
John C. Knox	Oct. 13, 1881	Apr. 12, 1918	37
Samuel H. Kaufman	Oct. 26, 1893	June 22, 1948	55
William Bondy	1871	Mar. 2, 1923	52
John W. Clancy		June 22, 1936	
New York (eastern):			
Matthew T. Abruzzo	Aug. 30, 1889	Feb. 15, 1936	47
Leo J. Rayfiel	Mar. 22, 1888	July 30, 1947	59
Walter Bruchhausen	May 29, 1892	May 8, 1953	61
Joseph C. Zavatt	1900	Aug. 7, 1957	57
John R. Bartels	Nov. 8, 1897	July 30, 1959	62
Jacob Mishler	Apr. 20, 1911	July 6, 1960	49
(Vacancy.)			
Senior judges:			
Clarence G. Galston	Apr. 18, 1876	Apr. 29, 1929	53
Mortimer W. Byers	May 28, 1877	Nov. 20, 1929	52
New York (western):			
Harold P. Burke	June 6, 1895	June 18, 1937	42
John O. Henderson	Nov. 13, 1909	Sept. 21, 1959	50
North Carolina (eastern): Algernon L. Butler.	Aug. 2, 1905	Aug. 31, 1959	54
North Carolina (middle): Edwin M. Stanley.	Mar. 9, 1909	Oct. 23, 1957	48
Senior judge: Johnson J. Hayes	Jan. 23, 1886	Apr. 6, 1927	41
North Carolina (western): Wilson Warlick.	Mar. 8, 1892	Feb. 2, 1949	48
North Dakota:			
George S. Register	Nov. 27, 1901	July 27, 1955	54
Ronald N. Davies	Dec. 11, 1904	do	51
Ohio (northern):			
Paul Jones	Nov. 4, 1880	Mar. 2, 1923	43
Frank L. Kloeb	June 16, 1890	Aug. 20, 1937	47
Charles J. McNamee	Dec. 5, 1890	Mar. 9, 1951	61
James C. Connell	Sept. 20, 1897	Aug. 10, 1954	57
Girard E. Kalbfleisch	Aug. 3, 1899	Sept. 21, 1959	60
Senior judge: Robert N. Wilkin	May 4, 1886	June 3, 1939	53
Ohio (southern):			
Mell G. Underwood	Jan. 30, 1892	Feb. 12, 1936	44
John H. Druffel	Feb. 6, 1886	Sept. 22, 1937	51
Carl A. Weinman	Jan. 27, 1903	Sept. 8, 1959	56
Oklahoma (northern):			
Royce H. Savage	Mar. 31, 1904	Oct. 1, 1940	36
William R. Wallace	Feb. 21, 1886	June 8, 1950	64
Oklahoma (eastern): Eugene Rice	do	Aug. 11, 1937	46
Oklahoma (western):			
Stephen S. Chandler	Sept. 13, 1899	May 13, 1943	44
Ross Rizley	July 5, 1892	Apr. 13, 1956	64
Oregon:			
Gus J. Solomon	Aug. 29, 1906	Oct. 21, 1949	43
Claude McCulloch	Jan. 14, 1888	Aug. 20, 1937	49
John F. Kilkenny		July 30, 1959	
Pennsylvania (eastern):			
J. Cullen Ganey	Apr. 22, 1899	June 19, 1940	41
Thomas J. Clary	Aug. 21, 1899	Oct. 21, 1949	50
Allan K. Grim	Oct. 15, 1904	do	45
John W. Lord, Jr	Dec. 19, 1901	May 20, 1954	53
Francis L. VanDusen	May 16, 1912	Aug. 1, 1955	43
C. William Kraft, Jr	Dec. 14, 1903	Aug. 12, 1955	52
Thomas C. Egan	1894	Aug. 26, 1957	63
Harold K. Wood	Oct. 26, 1901	Sept. 10, 1959	58
Senior judges:			
William H. Kirkpatrick	Oct. 2, 1885	Mar. 3, 1927	42
George A. Welsh	Aug. 9, 1878	May 20, 1932	54
Pennsylvania (middle):			
John W. Murphy	Apr. 26, 1902	May 27, 1946	44
Frederick V. Follmer	Dec. 13, 1885	Aug. 7, 1946	61
Pennsylvania (western):			
Wallace S. Gourley	Aug. 4, 1904	Nov. 29, 1945	41
Rabe F. Marsh	Apr. 26, 1905	June 8, 1950	45
Joseph P. Willson	Jan. 7, 1902	July 14, 1953	51
John L. Miller	Mar. 24, 1901	May 20, 1954	53
John W. McIlvaine	June 22, 1907	Aug. 1, 1955	48
Herbert P. Sorg		Aug. 1, 1955	
Puerto Rico: Clemente Ruiz Nazario	Nov. 23, 1896	Mar. 15, 1952	56
Rhode Island: Edward William Day	May 24, 1901	Nov. 10, 1953	52
South Carolina (eastern):			
George B. Timmerman	Mar. 28, 1881	Jan. 23, 1942	61
Ashton H. Williams	Aug. 15, 1891	July 3, 1952	61
Senior judge: J. Waties Waring	July 27, 1880	Jan. 23, 1942	62
South Carolina (western):			
Charles C. Wyche	July 7, 1885	Jan. 30, 1937	52
George B. Timmerman	Mar. 28, 1881	Jan. 23, 1942	61
South Dakota:			
George T. Mickelson	July 23, 1903	Dec. 9, 1953	50
Axel J. Beck	May 6, 1894	Mar. 4, 1958	64
Tennessee (eastern):			
Robert L. Taylor	Dec. 20, 1899	Nov. 2, 1949	50
(Vacancy.)			
Senior judge Leslie R. Darr	Nov. 8, 1886	June 2, 1939	53
Tennessee (middle): William E. Miller	Feb. 3, 1908	Mar. 16, 1955	47
Tennessee (western): Marion S. Boyd	1900	Sept. 27, 1940	40
Texas (northern):			
T. Whitfield Davidson	Sept. 23, 1876	Feb. 5, 1936	60
Joe B. Dooley	Dec. 13, 1889	July 9, 1947	58
Joe Ewing Estes	Oct. 24, 1903	Aug. 1, 1955	52
Senior judge: William H. Atwell	June 9, 1869	Jan. 9, 1923	54

Federal court judges, their dates of birth and dates of appointment (with age at time of appointment), April 1961—Continued

U.S. DISTRICT COURTS—Continued

Court and judge	Date of birth	Date of appointment	Age at time of appointment
Texas (southern):			
Allen B. Hannay	Feb. 14, 1892	Aug. 12, 1942	50
Ben C. Connally	Dec. 28, 1909	Oct. 13, 1949	40
Joe M. Ingraham	July 5, 1903	Aug. 6, 1954	51
(Vacancy.)			
Senior judge: Thomas M. Kennerly	Jan. 24, 1874	Feb. 7, 1931	57
Texas (eastern):			
Joe W. Sheehy	Oct. 21, 1910	June 8, 1951	41
Joe J. Fisher	Apr. 16, 1910	Sept. 10, 1959	49
Texas (western):			
Ben H. Rice, Jr.	Dec. 12, 1889	Sept. 28, 1945	56
Robert E. Thomason	May 30, 1879	June 5, 1947	68
Utah:			
Willis W. Ritter	Jan. 24, 1899	Oct. 21, 1949	50
A. Sherman Christenson	June 9, 1905	May 28, 1954	49
Vermont: Ernest W. Gibson	Mar. 6, 1901	Oct. 18, 1949	48
Virgin Islands: Walter A. Gordon	Oct. 10, 1894	Aug. 29, 1958	64
Virginia (eastern):			
Albert V. Bryan	July 23, 1899	June 5, 1947	48
Walter E. Hoffman	July 18, 1907	July 15, 1954	47
Oren R. Lewis			
Senior judge: Sterling Hutcheson	July 23, 1894	Feb. 10, 1944	50
Virginia (western):			
Ted Dalton	July 3, 1901	Aug. 13, 1959	58
(Vacancy.)			
Senior judges:			
Alfred D. Barksdale	July 17, 1892	Feb. 5, 1940	48
John Paul	Dec. 9, 1883	Jan. 14, 1932	49
Washington (eastern):			
William J. Lindberg	Dec. 17, 1904	Apr. 25, 1951	47
Charles L. Powell	Apr. 19, 1902	June 17, 1959	57
Senior judge: J. Stanley Webster	Feb. 22, 1877	Apr. 28, 1923	46
Washington (western):			
John C. Bowen	May 12, 1888	Mar. 20, 1934	46
George H. Boldt	Dec. 28, 1903	July 14, 1953	50
William J. Lindberg	Dec. 17, 1904	Apr. 25, 1951	47
West Virginia (northern):			
Harry E. Watkins	Nov. 6, 1898	Mar. 3, 1937	39
Charles E. Paul		Mar. 5, 1960	
West Virginia (southern):			
Harry E. Watkins	Nov. 6, 1898	Mar. 3, 1937	39
John A. Field, Jr	Mar. 22, 1910	Aug. 13, 1959	49
Wisconsin (eastern):			
Robert E. Tehan	1905	May 19, 1949	44
Kenneth P. Grubb	Sept. 14, 1895	June 16, 1955	60
Wisconsin (western): Patrick T. Stone	June 21, 1889	June 13, 1933	44
Wyoming: Ewing T. Kerr	Jan. 21, 1900	Oct. 22, 1955	55

Extinction via Imports?

SPEECH

OF

HON. RICHARD (DICK) ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. ICHORD of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to commend the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] and my colleagues for a very interesting and enlightening discussion on April 18 of the effect of imports upon the textile and apparel industries in the United States and to associate myself with the discussion.

The apparel industry is an important factor in the economy of the Eighth Congressional District of Missouri, and my concern of the disastrous effects upon the industry of imports is amplified by the fact that our lead mining industry is seriously depressed due to excessive importations of lead. I do hope that the action taken to save our textile and apparel industries will be stronger than the insignificant quota impositions that were used to assist the ailing lead mining industry. In the case of lead, the quotas came too late and were too liberal to materially aid the industry. This is attested to by the fact that imports are now providing almost 60 percent of the annual United States lead requirements.

I wholeheartedly agree with my colleagues that immediate action must be taken to avert the destruction of these 2 great industries employing 2,100,000 Americans. Our present trade policies can only lead to chaos; they must be altered.

Certainly, our foreign friends cannot validly object to a firm system of quotas that will assure our manufacturers of their fair and proper share of the market in view of the serious threat of extinction which our textile and apparel industries are facing.

I also hope that my colleagues are equally concerned over the deplorable conditions existing in our domestic mining industries.

Red Buildup in Laos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Cuba, Laos, South Vietnam, the Congo and other areas all have one thing in common—intense Communist subversive activity, intense Communist propaganda and ineffective counterefforts by the West, led by the United States. The following editorial entitled, "Red Buildup in Laos," from the Chicago Sun-Times of April 15, 1961, carries a practical, worthwhile analysis of the situation in Laos:

RED BUILDUP IN LAOS

After a period of crisis, the situation in Laos has been marking time. But the surface quiescence covers developments that are extremely disquieting.

For while Soviet Premier Khrushchev has been withholding his answer to British proposals for a cease-fire, Russia has accelerated its airlift of arms to the Pathet Lao rebels.

Only one conclusion can be drawn from this. Khrushchev is stalling. By the time a cease-fire is agreed upon in some form, he intends the Communist forces to be so strong no coalition or neutral government can stand up to them. Or the arms shipments can serve him equally as well in taking a tough bargaining position at the conference table.

The West's lack of clear information both as to current Russian activities in Laos, as well as Soviet intention was strikingly illustrated this week. Intelligence reports from abroad told of a tripling of the delivery of Russian arms to the Communist-held portion of the tiny kingdom. President Kennedy told newsmen, however, he believed the flow had remained fairly uniform. But the next day the U.S. State Department confirmed there has been an increase in the shipments since the fighting came to a standstill.

Thus, in the absence of positive Russian cooperation, the situation is moving back to the same grave atmosphere which marked Mr. Kennedy's call for a peaceful settlement last March 23.

The British proposal was for a three-stage Laos solution—a cease-fire, reactivation of an Indian-Canadian-Polish truce team, and the convening of a 14-nation conference to work out guarantees of the southeast Asia country's permanent neutrality.

Beyond acceptance in general terms, this has never been answered by Khrushchev, despite repeated British efforts to win an actual cease-fire agreement from him.

Doubtless, the reply is being reconciled between European Communist leaders and the Asian Communists, headed by Mao Tse-tung. It could be that Khrushchev finds—or pretends to find—difficulty in producing a reply reflecting his own professions of peaceful coexistence and the more belligerent attitude of Mao. Or the delay could simply be a prelude to raising more conditions, thus paving the way for gaining by negotiations what he cannot gain by force.

Meanwhile, the buildup of Communist strength goes on in a race against the advent of the monsoon season, due in the next few weeks. Thereafter, military operations in the usual sense by SEATO or anyone else will be impossible.

Communist bands will simply be free to roam the rugged countryside, well armed and equipped, establishing themselves in command networks and subjugating the population outside the main towns and villages. What happens at the conferences will make little difference to Laos under these circumstances.

In any event, until the Soviet dictator shows some signs of emerging from his mood of inscrutable truculence on the Lao question, it is unwise for the West to concede—as did President Kennedy and British Prime Minister Macmillan last week—that any future coalition government in the southeast Asia country must include Communist supporters. Such points might better be saved for the bargaining table. Advance indications are they will be needed.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of April 22, 1961:

The omnibus judgeship bill for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges passed 336 to 76. The final version was the Democrat bill proposing 70 new judgeships (10 circuit, 60 district; at present there are 68 circuit, 245 district judges). Earlier, amendments to limit the number of new judgeships, to 35 and 59, respectively, both Republican sponsored (I supported) were defeated by near party-line votes.

Background: The acute need for additional judgeships is unquestioned. The question was how many more? Last year the House Committees (Judiciary and Rules) unanimously approved 35 new judgeships, after the judicial conference recommended 54. This year the Senate approved 73 new seats. In between the Judicial Conference approved 59 and 69 respectively. The Senate held no hearings and the House held hearings only on the 59 after last year's study and approval of 35.

Arguments for the 70 new judgeships centered around the need and the judicial conference's latest recommendation of 69. Arguments against, centered around Judiciary Committee action which cut last year's recommendation from 54 to 35, so why now go beyond the latest recommendation, particularly without hearings in either House or Senate on the need for this number? To me the debate was a sad commentary on Members playing politics with the judgeships instead of putting merit and need first. Obviously, the 2-year delay in action by a Democrat-led Congress was solely a gamble on political grounds, awaiting the presidential election outcome, so that the new judgeships would be Democrat selected. As Mr. BROWN (Ohio) put it quoting the Rules Committee chairman: "We gambled on this judiciary bill and we won. We gambled on the results of the election and now we will name the judges." There it is plainly stated. For my part, I shall continue to vote on the merits of a bill, smart politics, whatever they may be, notwithstanding.

There are some interesting philosophical byproducts of this debate: (1) 35 judges, we clearly established by hearings and study, were needed, perhaps even more. But 70 have never been established as needed; (2) Members of Congress are even more vulnerable now to legitimate criticism because so many are attorneys and may well be looking hopefully toward appointment to the Federal bench; (3) we should not forget the increasing workload and shift of cases as Federal courts replace State courts in our continuing Federal centralization of our Government; (4) many Members were forced to vote against the bill (including myself) who are indeed for additional judgeships and have for years sponsored such legislation because of this political padding of the number; (5) the northern Democrats and southern Democrats coalesced to pass the bill. There was no coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats against it. Only Republicans, 76 of them, opposed the bill; (6) the President can appoint 89 judges (15 circuit and 74 district) now—all Democrats—a number not appointed by any of his 3 predecessors until 4 years in office. Last year President Eisenhower offered to select on a bipartisan basis 50 percent from either party as an incentive to stimulate Congress to act, but Democrat leadership refused to act despite the need.

The lessons of this bill were twofold; Congress is playing politics with the Federal judiciary and a heavily concentrated one-party political philosophy by Federal judges is a danger to our society.

Social security amendments of 1961 passed handily 400–14 (plus 3 paired against). The bill generally followed the Kennedy proposals: (1) increased minimum benefits from $33 to $40; (2) lowered men's retirement age to receive benefits from 65 to 62; (3) increased the widow's benefits from 75 to 82½ percent of the worker's retirement benefit; (4) lowered the qualifying work requirement from 1 quarter each 9 months worked to 1 quarter per year (years since 1950); (4) increased social security taxes one-eighth percent employer, one-eighth employee beginning in 1962.

Arguments for are self-evident: There is wider coverage and greater benefit offered for an almost gratuitous cost. Arguments against as expressed in minority views (MASON, Illinois, UTT, California, ALGER, Texas) include: (1) A closed or gag rule prescribed floor debate preventing amendments being considered (remember the Rules Committee fuss and the real danger should the committee change the rules of floor debate). (2) Social security is actuarily unsound because it shifts the cost (like a chain letter) to future generations—some $300 billion in present and future obligations of this program are "unfunded." Examples of why (a) For $13 paid in $9,100 can be received. (b) For the maximum amount paid in since social security started in 1937 of $2,580, a man and wife retiring this year can receive $31,200. (3) This bill considers social security as an antirecession, pump-priming device which it never was intended to be (Document 81, February 2, President's message). (4) Social security taxes are becoming a secondary graduated income tax scheduled to go up to 9¼ percent by 1969. As a first dollar tax there are no deductions so it hits modest incomes the hardest. Many will pay more social security tax than income tax. (5) This is not insurance. The Supreme Court justifies it only as welfare. It is a hoax and pretense to present it as insurance. It can be voted out. It is political.

Perhaps Sam Gompers, the father of labor unions, said it best: "Compulsory social insurance is in its essence undemocratic and it cannot remove or prevent poverty. The workers of America adhere to voluntary institutions in preference to compulsory systems, which are held to be not only impracticable, but a menace to their rights, welfare, and their liberty."

For my part, I refuse to vote increased costs which further imbalance an already dangerously imbalanced program. I predict the whole program will either collapse financially or will be voted out by later generations who refuse to pay the charge accounts the program is running up.

The basic faults of the program rest on (1) assumption of constantly increasing number of new entrants to the program, who will pay the taxes, always on high income—there dare not be a slowdown in population growth or a decline in pay scales or this program will fail to collect what must be paid out; (2) unforeseen factors earlier unknown include (a) people are living longer, so there are progressively more beneficiaries than anticipated at the outset, (b) Congress constantly increases coverage and benefits for political reasons, to please voters (always just before election every 2 years—this bill now being the exception).

Opposition in Congress is growing as the fallacies of the social security program are seen or suspected. Since my coming to Congress, opposition has increased from 2 (of which I was one) to 17 recorded votes. This number will grow. My hope is that we can correct the program before it collapses irreparably, leaving many older citizens without the promised security.

THE COMMUNIST CONSPIRACY—WORLDWIDE DOMINATION

Communism versus the United States: We are at war because the enemy is at war with us and intends to win either the cold war of subversion or a shooting war, limited or worldwide. These are the goals of the Communists who intend to bury us, literally, in victory at arms through violent revolution, if necessary, or figuratively by subversion and propaganda and/or forcing us to spend ourselves into bankruptcy. Communism, the worldwide conspiracy, headquarters in Moscow. Success has resulted in 43 years from murder, enslavement, lying, deceit, blackmail and refusal to honor contractual agreements. Now approximately half of the world is dominated by the Kremlin. Meanwhile fifth column activities go on in all the other nations above or underground, regardless of illegality. The U.N. has been used as a propaganda tool where Russia pays too little, controls too many votes, vetoes action, minipulates the Secretariat, and disregards both the charter and any agreements reached within the U.N.

The United States as the leader of the free world, on the contrary, abides by law and contracts. The United States has caused no world problems through conquest, has sought no new real estate nor enslavement of any people. The United States has tried to negotiate honorably any disagreements between nations through the U.N. The United States abides by the U.N. Charter and agreements. The United States has sought to provide leadership by example, and to help and to protect any nation maintaining or seeking freedom defined as the right to its own self-determination. The United States has even sought in good conscience to be understanding of and get along with the Russians. The United States has practiced peaceful coexistence. Military alliances with other nations are defensive only. Exchanges of all kinds—educational, cultural, trade and technology—even with the enemy, have characterized U.S. conduct. Foreign aid has been given to many nations to help each nation develop. Over the years since World War II's end (when we were militarily stronger than the entire world) the United States has been continuously losing strength relatively and the Communists have been gaining. U.S. successes at most have been a temporary halting or slowdown of communism's growth—half the world since 1917—962 million people and 10 nations engulfed since World War II. Today Cuba is in the balance, Laos is tottering, Africa is leaning. Tomorrow what other area or nation, and the day after, until what—the United States stands alone confronted by the entire world? Too late then will it be to enflame the enslaved people, who like Hungarians, are thoroughly crushed and unable to rise.

Let's look at the balance sheet (BARRY GOLDWATER, "Conscience of a Conservative," Soviet Menace, p. 86). The United States officially recognized the Communist Russian Government in 1933. United States has subsidized Socialist and Communist governments, dedicated enemies, and neutral governments, hardly U.S. friends, then or now. United States has lost at every negotiation by agreeing to negotiate matters not negotiable (example: agreeing to other nation's enslavement by Communists). United States has lost the propaganda battle through the U.N. at every turn, the exchange program has

brought Communist spies and dupes, peaceful coexistence as a practice by the U.N. has meant bowing to Russia's wishes because of the Russian world blackmail through the balance of terror, the threat of an atomic world war III.

So the United States has been weakened by the U.N. actions and by its own policies, another example of the latter being the self-imposed ban on testing of nuclear weapons. Tactical weapons for limited warfare are needed and tests are needed.

Our policies of peacefulness have led to the outright invasion of our hemisphere by the Communists in Cuba, 90 miles away, in violation of the Monroe Doctrine. The bill of particulars in Cuba reads like all the others. (1) U.S. citizens have been executed, (2) Cuba has expropriated over $1 billion of U.S. citizen's property, (3) the propaganda lies have well discredited the United States in the eyes of the word, despite U.S. hands-off policy, (4) the revolutionary forces are unquestionably tools of the Communists.

What are we going to do about Cuba and communism—assuming we still consider freedom paramount and believe in "Give me liberty or give me death." The agonizing reappraisal, so long overdue, will include the realization that the Communist menace will not be licked by local skirmishes in outlying countries. No; the trouble center is the Kremlin. To beat them, to win this struggle, the United States must: (1) realize we are at war and we must win; (2) take the offensive, no policy of drift or awaiting another new trouble area; (3) keep building our present military superiority—start nuclear testing and develop the tactical warfare nuclear weapons needed for limited warfare; (4) keep our economy strong—cut down welfare spending, stimulate free enterprise production by tax cuts; (5) be firm, tough, the self-recognized leader: Stipulate and make others conform to our standards, defined and defended as peace, freedom and justice, as against the Socialist and Communist domination of people, and their appraisal of and demand for other standards; (6) extend foreign aid only to anti-Communist friends on our terms, mainly as loans and technical assistance with self-matching effort from the recipient nations; (7) declare communism the outlaw of civilization; withdraw recognition of the Communist leaders as the government of the Russian people; refuse to do business with them or to make contracts that won't be honored, even as we refuse to recognize Red China, as a bandit nation; (8) encourage captive nations to revolt, being particularly careful on timing; (9) encourage expatriated people to liberate and regain their homeland (China, for example); (10) be prepared for armed conflict, knowing that all nations respect strength (particularly the bully)—talk tough, but be tough.

Only as we pursue a firm, clearly outlined course of U.S. self-imposed interest, as the free world's leader, can we hope to avoid world war III, and if it should come, God forbid, survive it while communism perishes.

Recalling Spengler's Forecast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in view of the importance of the problems of foreign affairs, I believe that the following editorial by Constantine Brown is deserving of the careful attention of the Members of Congress:

RECALLING SPENGLER'S FORECAST—40 YEARS AFTER, IT IS FOUND THE FATE OF WEST'S CIVILIZATION IS IN DANGER

(By Constantine Brown)

The diplomatic Pearl Harbor we suffered at the hands of the Communists in Cuba brings back to the minds of many the superpessimistic book the Decline of the West, written in 1914 by the German philosopher Oswald Spengler. All those who read the English translation in the early twenties described it as "so much intellectual posh." How could anybody in full possession of his faculties, it was asked, predict that Western Christian civilization, which had just emerged stronger than ever after the defeat of the Central Powers, was on the downgrade? After the various peace treaties had been concluded, the British, French, and Japanese empires were even more powerful than ever. Amferica, which had been aloof from foreign entanglements, had just joined, with her immense might, the concert of the world powers.

Yet today, some 40 years after the first English translation of Spengler's book, it appears that he was not as "cock-eyed" as many considered him in those days. The fate of the Western Christian civilization hangs in the balance. Through the blunders, lack of vision, and ill-placed optimism of its leaders, we have created a destructive, materialistic, atheistic force—the Soviet-Communist empires—which stand ready to engulf us. The U.S.S.R., which has survived exclusively with the assistance of the West, now has become an empire greater than those known in the past.

The Government of the United States, influenced by misguided idealists, tolerated and indirectly assisted the creation of the Chinese Communist Empire, which now has more than a fair chance of conquering the whole of Southeast Asia. The Chinese Communists under the able leadership of Mao Tse-tung were sold to the American people as "agrarian reformers." For the last 10 years the combined forces of the British Government and the American political sentimentalists have tried to have the barbarous Chinese regime accepted in the United Nations. Judging by recent reports from London concerning the conversations between President Kennedy and Prime Minister Macmillan, they are in a fair way of achieving the goal. The United Nations, which used to be the great club of peace-loving nations, is rapidly changing to a tool in the hands of international communism.

The West, and particularly the English-speaking countries, is endeavoring to stave off the decline of the West by placating the tigers by negotiations. Yet it has become obvious over the nearly half-century since communism established itself in Russia that negotiations are meaningless—unless they serve the purposes of the modern Attilas. President Eisenhower secured the Korean armistice with the Communists. It is true that there has been no fighting there since. But according to all informed observes the Korean puppets of Mao in the North are now in a fair way to swallow up the South by negotiations. Despite the firm assurances we hear from Washington, there is real concern that soon we may have another Berlin crisis in order to force another series of negotiations which would serve the objectives of the Communists. We are willing and ready to negotiate the Communist-fabricated and supported Lao crisis. And only the wishful thinkers or the ultranaive actually believe that we could save that kingdom from the Red clutches.

Beset with jealousies and lack of reciprocal understanding, the West even at this late and tragic hour believes that negotiations will save our civilization. The game as we have been playing it for the last 15 years is to see how cheaply the modern Huns can be bought for what may be only a moment of peace.

Remarks of the Honorable Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury at the Annual Meeting of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Statler-Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C., Friday, April 21, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a profound and informative address delivered on April 21, 1961, in Washington, D.C., at the annual meeting of the American Society of Newspaper Editors by the Honorable Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury of the United States:

It is a pleasure to be here and to share with you the Administration's thinking about some of the pressing economic problems that have a bearing upon our Nation's present and future well-being.

To begin with, I think one can fairly say that there is a substantial concensus in our country today on national economic goals:

We want a steadily expanding economy, based upon a strengthened system of free enterprise.

We want a rate of growth sufficient to give us an ever-rising standard of living and to provide jobs for all.

We want to assure the education of our youth and the health and security of those who are growing old.

We want an economy that can adequately provide for our national defense and furnish our fair share of the development needs of less fortunate peoples in Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

We want to accomplish all of this in an atmosphere of relative price stability.

Inevitably there will be differences among us over the means we should employ to achieve our objectives. But we must not permit such differences to obscure our basic agreement. We must recognize that unless all elements in our society work together, we cannot mobilize the massive effort required of our Nation in meeting the challenge of the sixties.

Before considering the fiscal and monetary policies we should follow to achieve our objectives, let us look briefly at ourselves as we are today:

We are a people who have built what is clearly the strongest and most advanced economy on earth. But, as recent experience demonstrates, we have not mastered the art of keeping our economy operating at the highest sustainable levels.

The recession from which we are now beginning to emerge has been relatively mild. For example, in terms of constant dollars which allow for inflation, gross national product is now only 2.2 percent below last year's peak, compared with a decline of 4.7 percent in the 1958 recession. Personal income and industrial production have also

fallen less than in previous postwar recessions.

However, before we take too much satisfaction from these figures, let us remember that they are relative. The absolute figures tell a far different story: Current unemployment, with 6.9 percent of our labor force out of work, approaches the worst days of the 1958 setback. A record number of our cities are classified as areas of substantial unemployment.

Why, in view of the relative mildness of the recession, do we have 5½ million people unemployed?

The answer is clear: We have not been producing at our full capacity for some years. Even last year, at the point of highest production in our history, our economy was operating well below its potential and we still had 5 percent of our labor force unemployed. We can and must do better in the future. Meanwhile, until we find ways to improve the overall performance of our economy, the extent of current unemployment demands prompt and forthright action by the Federal Government. President Kennedy has, therefore, taken a number of steps to speed recovery:

The annual veterans' dividend of $250 million, ordinarily paid out over the course of a year, was paid in full during March.

Tax refunds were speeded up and we are now $500 million ahead of last year's pace.

Government programs have been expedited by the prompt obligation of available funds.

Most important, a temporary unemployment compensation bill has been enacted.

These actions, together with increased defense spending that got underway last fall and reduced revenues stemming from the recession, have created a budgetary deficit of about $2 billion in the current fiscal year. Such a deficit is not a cause for alarm in times like these. On the contrary, it is a stimulus to recovery that can, and should, be readily offset by surpluses as prosperity returns.

Another deficit is in prospect for fiscal 1962: one of about $3 billion. This, too, will be entirely appropriate. The economy will require the stimulating effect of a modest deficit in the coming fiscal year if it is to move forward at an adequate pace.

The innate strength of our economy, the increase in Government outlays which I have mentioned, and the automatic action of the so-called built-in budgetary stabilizers, are apparently putting an end to the current recession. Looking backward we may well find that the turning point was reached early in March. But, unless we act energetically, recovery is likely to be sluggish, just as the decline was gradual and slow.

No matter what the pace of our recovery from the recession, there are major problems confronting us which must be solved if we are to realize our full economic potential. We must find ways first to achieve and then to maintain production at full capacity. We must insure employment for our steadily growing labor force. At the same time, we must preserve reasonable price stability.

If we balance these goals against our accomplishments, I think it obvious that new and forward looking governmental action is called for.

Excessive Federal spending is clearly undesirable. But our minimum national needs must be met. Let me cite those which merit highest priority:

First, after careful reexamination, the President has concluded that we must increase our defense expenditures in the coming fiscal year by 1½ percent, or about $650 million. Surely, no one can logically question our need or our capacity to spend whatever is required for our Nation's security.

Second, we are confronted by a shameful lag in education. More education will, of course, assure the flowering of our national culture. But, beyond this, we must recognize that education today lies at the very root of a nation's power and well-being. Without adequate education, we cannot hope to achieve the economic growth we desire. Our shortcomings in providing our citizens with education according to their needs and capacities is a blight upon our future. The problem has grown so large that an additional Federal contribution is clearly and urgently required.

Third, we must supply the ever-growing needs of our municipalities: slum clearance, improved transportation, modern sewage facilities, and increased water supply. These needs are placing an unbearable burden upon our larger cities.

We can and we must fulfill these needs. Fortunately, if our economy operates at full capacity, our present tax system can yield a surplus of several billion dollars. Our problem is not, therefore, how to raise additional revenues but to get our economy operating at higher levels. Moreover, in setting tax policy, our most difficult task is not obtaining more revenue but strengthening and modernizing our whole tax system so as to stimulate growth and improve equity. One of our major objectives is thorough-going tax reform. An extensive review is now under way and we expect to present concrete recommendations to the Congress next January.

In the meantime, there is one important tax reform that cannot wait: This is legislation to spur the modernization of our plant and equipment. It is an unpleasant fact that our plant equipment is growing older year by year. By contrast, thanks to more liberal investment incentives than are available under our laws, Western Europe and Japan are modernizing at a much faster rate. We must step up our rate of modernization if we are to maintain our Nation's competitive position. The installation of new and more efficient equipment is of prime importance in enabling us to meet foreign competition in the drive for export markets which are so essential to improving our balance of payments.

Since the installation of modern equipment means that labor can produce more, we must recognize that it may complicate the problem of unemployment. However, modernization will also increase jobs in the capital goods industries. Indeed, we estimate that the tax incentive President Kennedy has recommended should lead to an increase of from $2 to $3 billion a year in expenditures for plant and equipment. Some 250,000 new jobs would be required to provide this equipment. In addition, at least as many more people would find employment as an indirect result of these expenditures. Although major benefits to economic growth will accrue over the longer run, it is also clear that this tax incentive will have a substantial effect in speeding our recovery from recession. And, as our economy speeds up, increased consumer and business demand will expand the variety and volume of goods produced, thus creating new jobs to replace those eliminated by increased productivity. This is the way of future progress.

The legislation the President has requested is carefully designed to promote increased spending for modernization and expansion. Its enactment is necessary to speed full recovery and promote rapid grown thereafter. Initially, it will result in some loss of revenue. To compensate for this loss, he is asking that a number of serious tax defects be corrected:

First, expense accounts—an area where abuse has virtually become a national scandal. Tighter enforcement of the present law is not an adequate solution, for it would put an unacceptably heavy discretionary burden upon Government tax auditors. What is needed is a new and stricter legislative definition of allowable deductions. This is what we are asking.

Second, we are asking for withholding at the source of interest and dividends. Our best estimate is that about $3 billion of income from interest and dividends goes unreported every year. This situation is clearly unfair to all wage earners and, indeed, to the majority of taxpayers. We are asking that it be corrected by a workable withholding provision that, as in the case of wages, will collect at the source a substantial portion of the tax on interest and dividend income.

Third, we are asking for repeal of the 4-percent dividend credit. This credit was adopted in 1954 in an attempt to lighten the double taxation of dividend income. But, at only 4 percent, it has not served its purpose. Furthermore, it gives considerably greater benefit to those in the higher income brackets than to the vast majority of stockholders. This favoritism in the law is unhealthy and should be ended. The related $50 exemption should also be dropped.

Finally, we seek an end to tax provisions that encourage American business operations abroad through the use of tax havens. We also want to withdraw preferential tax treatment for American capital going into industrially advanced countries, for such treatment discriminates against the investment of capital at home. These changes will have a needed and favorable impact upon our basic balance-of-payments deficit. We are not, however, recommending changes in tax inducements for investment in underdeveloped countries which are an essential part of our overall program to help these countries grow.

I have briefly outlined our overall fiscal and budgetary thinking. I have also told you something of our plans for the immediate future as regards taxation.

Now, let me take up monetary policy. This is a field where we face an entirely new situation brought about by the recently achieved convertibility of foreign currencies. Convertibility permits owners of liquid funds to shift them freely from one world financial center to another in search of higher interest rates. Therefore, the extremely low short-term interest rates of previous recessions could have dangerous repercussions today. Short-term interest rates much below present levels might well touch off a renewed outflow of dollars that could imperil our balance of payments and the soundness of our dollar.

Nevertheless, we need low, long-term rates to stimulate borrowing for modernization, plant expansion, housing construction, and the like just as much today as in previous periods of recession. Accordingly, the administration is attempting to promote lower long-term interest rates without putting downward pressure on present short-term rates. For one thing, the Federal Reserve is now purchasing securities of all maturities, instead of restricting itself to short-term Treasury bills. For another, President Kennedy has taken direct action in the housing credit field which has helped to lower average mortgage rates by more than a quarter of 1 percent since the turn of the year.

Far more meaningful than interest rates, however, is the quantity of funds flowing into investments. Here, we see evidence of improvement in the mortgage credit area, where, although rates are still on the high side, availability of credit is no longer an inhibiting factor. We also see increasing evidence of growing municipal and corporate borrowing.

Finally, since the budgetary deficits that are presently envisioned are modest and bear no comparison to the deficit of 1959, monetary policy will remain free to act in support of business recovery. Therefore, the substantial increases in interest rates that characterized the 1958–59 period are not likely to recur this time.

To sum up:

Our policies—be they budgetary, tax, or monetary—should have one overriding goal: the promotion of a healthy rate of economic growth within a reasonable atmosphere of economic stability. We must meet the needs of the day in the fields of defense, education, housing, highway construction, urban development, and other essentials. Fortunately, we are in a position to meet them—this year, and the next, and in the long run—without undue strain on our economy.

We must overhaul our tax system to provide greater fairness and incentives for efficiency and growth, beginning with an investment incentive this year, and following with a basic overhaul next year.

We must maintain an interest rate structure conducive to the steady flow of funds into investment.

To achieve all these things will not be easy. But with determination and perseverance we should be able to attain our goals. In the process, we can look forward to a period of growth and prosperity during the sixties such as this Nation has never known.

Communism and the House Un-American Activities Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, this is the second in a series of articles by Robert B. Dresser, dealing with communism and the House Un-American Activities Committee.

It appeared in Economic Council Papers, volume XVI, No. 2, on March 1, 1961:

COMMUNISM AND THE HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE

(By Robert B. Dresser)

In November 1954 Senator William F. Knowland rose on the floor of the Senate and delivered a momentous and prophetic address. It was at a time when the question was being considered whether we should permit the Chinese Nationalists to bomb the mainland of Red China in order to prevent a Communist landing on the island of Quemoy, then and now in the Nationalists' possession.

Three out of five Joint Chiefs of Staff, including the Chairman, and also Secretary of State Dulles, recommended this move. President Eisenhower decided against it.

SENATOR KNOWLAND'S ADDRESS

In the course of his address Senator Knowland made the following statements:

"Are 'coexistence' and 'atomic stalemate' synonymous terms? If they are not, just what is the difference? Is the former merely an inevitable prelude to the latter? And what of our foreign policy and our defense policy when such an atomic stalemate takes place? Does not atomic stalemate mean inevitable Communist nibbling aggression, rather than peace in our time? How many years remain when we still have some initiative left? These are some of the basic questions before the Government and the people of the United States.

* * * * *

"The survival of this Republic and the possibility of a free world of freemen hangs in the balance.

"The civilizations that flourished and died in the past had opportunities for a limited period of time to change the course of history. Sooner or later, however, they passed the point of no return, and the decisions were no longer theirs to make.

"Coexistence and atomic stalemate will result in ultimate Communist victory. * * * We must face up to the fact that the Communist concept of 'peaceful coexistence' means that the United States or other free nations of the world will be allowed to exist only until communism is able to subvert them from within or destroy them by aggression from without.

"It is my belief that the Soviet Union is advancing the Trojan horse of coexistence only for the purpose of gaining sufficient time to accomplish what we may term 'atomic stalemate.' When would they hope to accomplish this objective? The target date is probably between 1957 and 1960.

* * * * *

"Let us examine the possibility then of even a troubled peace. It is more likely that at that point, when the free world has become paralyzed and immobilized by the realization that the United States and the Soviet Union could act and react one upon the other with overwhelming devastation, the men in the Kremlin will see their best opportunity to start with what for the want of a better term I will call Operation Nibbling, wherein they will seek to take over the peripheral nations bite by bite.

* * * * *

"Then they will start down through our smaller allies first to soften us up. These will not all be nibbled at once, but will be spaced out so that as each country passes behind the Iron Curtain, it will increase the despair of the other victims and the paralyses of the nations who might be willing to resist.

* * * * *

"Before our eyes the people of the United States would see nation after nation nibbled away and when the realization finally dawned that this policy would inevitably result in our country becoming a continental Dien Bien Phu in a Communist totalitarian world, the chances of our winning such a struggle would be so lessened and the Soviet world so extended that they then would be prepared for an all-out challenge to us wherein we would be allowed the choice to surrender or die.

* * * * *

"Time is running out and I would remind the Senate that in this day and age of the airplane and the atomic weapon, time is not necessarily on the side of the free world."

DR. GERHART NIEMEYER'S STATEMENT

The December 10, 1954 issue of David Lawrence's U.S. News & World Report contains an article by Dr. Gerhart Niemeyer, of Yale, entitled "1964—After 10 Years of Coexistence," in which strikingly similar views are expressed.

W. H. FERRY'S STATEMENT

On January 13, 1960, W. H. Ferry, the vice president of the Fund for the Republic, wrote a letter to the Santa Barbara News-Press, from which I quote as follows:

"When one says that war is unthinkable, it must be taken as a literal statement, i.e., nuclear war cannot be thought about. We have no vocabulary, no recourse to imagination sufficient to deal in logical terms with the prospect of 60 or 70 million American corpses, to say nothing about the carnage accompanying a nuclear attack, and to say nothing of the effects of radiation lingering over generations.

"Perhaps this is one reason why all current assessments of the impasse between Russia and the United States end up in the same sterile and hopeless formula: Arms and yet more arms.

* * * * *

"Suppose we were to go in the other direction? Suppose we were to junk all of our weapons of whatever kind? Suppose we were to tell the world that we are doing so because we are convinced that it is the only practical way out of the fateful dilemma in which all are caught?

"The best possible result of such a decision is * * * that Russia would follow our example * * *.

"The worst possible result is that Russia would instantly take advantage of our defenselessness to bomb the United States into radioactive rubble. In this case we would not be worse off than if we had engaged in a two-way war. All that would be lacking would be a regret among survivors that we had not had vengeance on our attackers. But this result seems wholly unlikely. It may better be supposed that Russia does not desire the extinction of the United States but its submission as a nation and great production center to communism.

"Another and more possible result then is that this country would be taken over by the Reds, commissars replacing our managers and mayors, legislators and union officials, broadcasters and publishers. * * * This is a desperate and repellent vision; and while I do not believe that this would be the outcome, it is necessary to accept it as a possibility if one is willing to argue that unilateral disarmament is the only practical policy for this country to adopt. Red domination of this and other free nations is at least thinkable. We can at least imagine it in all its hateful and dismal aspects, while we find the consequences of a nuclear, germ, and gas war unthinkable and unimaginable. We would survive as a nation with the greatest of traditions and with the unquenchable intention of demonstrating by argument and peaceable resistance the power of freedom and justice as man's best and only proper organizing principles.

"It might well take years or decades to regenerate freedom and justice. But we would have the chance to do so, a chance that by common agreement would not be vouchsafed us in the case of an all-out war which no nation could win. Should war come, the task would not be resisting or throwing off the hand of an oppressor by reasonable means; it would be the task of rebuilding civilization from barbarism and chaos.

* * * * *

"The alternatives are drastic and repugnant in the highest degree. But the important point is that there is an alternative to our present policy."

Here you have it—in the year 1960—precisely what Senator Knowland predicted in 1954.

The significant thing is that a prominent American, holding the position that Mr. Ferry holds, should be preaching this doctrine. This raises the question as to how many of our citizens share Mr. Ferry's views and whether their number will increase until they are sufficiently strong to force an acceptance of their views. May Heaven forbid.

WHAT HAVE THE AMERICAN PEOPLE BEEN DOING?

What have the American people been doing since Senator Knowland delivered his warning in 1954?

Have they been rooting out the Communists in their midst and putting their own house in order?

Broadly speaking, the answer is "No." Thousands, if not hundreds of thousands, of

our citizens have been duped or deceived by Communist propaganda, and have been unwittingly led to adopt ideas and programs of Communist origin, the effect of which has been to aid immeasurably the accomplishment of the Communist objective. The evidence of this is legion. It may be found in abundance in the reports of the Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, in the statements and writings of J. Edgar Hoover, the head of the FBI, and in the statements and writings of many others.

It is important to understand how the Communists operate.

TESTIMONY OF J. EDGAR HOOVER IN 1947

The following is an excerpt from the testimony of J. Edgar Hoover before the Committee on Un-American Activities on March 26, 1947:

"For the most part [Communist] front organizations assumed the character of either a mass or membership organization or a paper organization. Both solicited and used names of prominent persons. Literally hundreds of groups and organizations have either been infiltrated or organized primarily to accomplish the purposes of promoting the interests of the Soviet Union in the United States, the promotion of Soviet war and peace aims, the exploitation of Negroes in the United States, work among foreign-language groups, and to secure a favorable viewpoint toward the Communists in domestic, political, social, and economic issues.

"The first requisite for front organizations is an idealistic sounding title. Hundreds of such organizations have come into being and have gone out of existence when their true purposes have become known or exposed while others with high-sounding names are continually springing up."

SOVIET TWO-PRONGED THREAT

No informed person can be anything but gravely concerned at the Soviet threat. It is a two-pronged threat: (1) Destruction by force from without, and (2) the gaining by peaceful means of control from within. Naturally, Russia prefers the latter course, for it would give her control of the vast resources of this country intact.

Let no one think that this is a fantastic idea. Starting with a population of less than 200 million at the end of World War II, Russia has since rapidly expanded her influence in Europe and Asia until today she controls roughly 40 percent of the world's population and 25 percent of the earth's surface and this control continues to be rapidly expanding. The United States has approximately 6 percent of the world's population.

CONDITIONS IN UNITED STATES UNDER COMMUNISM

Speaking of the conditions in the United States under communism, J. Edgar Hoover states in his "Masters of Deceit":

"Under communism, a tiny minority, perhaps 10 to 20 men, would rule the United States. An open dictatorship called the dictatorship of the proletariat would be established. * * *

"The Constitution, and all our laws, would be abolished. If you owned productive property you would be arrested as an exploiter, hauled before a revolutionary court, and sentenced to a concentration camp—that is, if you convinced the 'judge' you were worth saving at all. All property used in production would be confiscated, thus leading ultimately to total communization, meaning state ownership. This confiscation would include your home, business, bank deposits, and related personal possessions. These would belong to everybody. You have no right to own them under the Communist scheme.

"The revolution would affect every man, woman, and child in America. Communists do not propose to remodel our government or retain any part of it. They would tear it to the ground, destroy all opposition, and then create a new government, an American province in the Soviet world empire. * * *

"All industry would be nationalized and farms taken away from their owners. A small businessman is just as guilty as a large businessman; both must be liquidated. Rents, profits, and insurance would be abolished. Countless occupations, termed by the Communists as useless and parasitic, would be ended. * * *

"Action would be drastic, immediate, and without appeal. An armed Red guard would enforce the orders of party henchmen. Hotels, country clubs, and swimming pools would be used for the benefit of 'workers,' meaning, in most cases, party bosses. The workingman in the mines, factories, and mills would be told to work certain hours for certain wages. Labor unions, as we know them, would be obliterated. All such organizations would be owned and operated by the Communist government, and no laborer would be permitted to organize a union or to strike against his government. * * *

"This picture of a Communist America is not overdrawn."

COMMUNIST ATROCITIES

Millions of Russians have been killed by their Communist masters and millions more sent to Siberia to work in slave-labor camps until death came to their relief.

In the Ukraine alone, during the 1937–38 purge, under the direction of Khrushchev, an estimated 400,000 were killed and terror gripped the whole population.

A second purge in 1943, also conducted by Khrushchev, "was if anything more bloody and more horrifying than the first."

And more recently we have the cruel slaughter of the Hungarian freedom fighters. "Our Ambassador in Moscow at the time asked Khrushchev what he would do to stop the blood flowing in Hungary. To which the master of the Kremlin replied: 'We will put in more troops and more troops until we have finished them.'" ("The Crimes of Khrushchev, Part I"—testimony before the House Un-American Activities Committee, Sept. 4, 1959, of Eugene Lyons, a senior editor of the Reader's Digest, former press correspondent stationed in Soviet Russia, student of international communism and biographer of Khrushchev.)

And this is the man who was invited to visit this country and who was entertained by President Eisenhower, and with whom a further summit conference with our present President appears to be under consideration.

Also, we should not forget the many millions liquidated in Communist China.

COMMUNIST AGREEMENT WORTHLESS

How long will it take the American people and their leaders to learn that the Communists never have kept, and never will keep, any agreement they make, unless it is to their advantage to do so?

The summit conferences are justified by our leaders as a means of easing international tension. However, the only tension is the tension created by Russia herself, and all she has to do is to desist from her skulduggery. A summit conference is not needed for this. The Russian purpose is not to compromise, but merely to exact further concessions from the West.

In Heaven's name, let's stop this nonsense.

COMMUNISM AN INTERNATIONAL CONSPIRACY

The Communists do not constitute a political party. They are a group of international gangsters and criminals of the most vicious type. To accomplish their objective they will lie, cheat, steal, and murder. Why can't the American people and their leaders understand this and act accordingly?

STATEMENT OF DMITRI MANUILSKI

In 1953, Dmitri Manuilski, a Soviet official and at one time the presiding officer of the United Nations Security Council, stated to the Lenin School of Political Warfare in Moscow:

"War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years. To win we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep. So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard-of concessions. The capitalistic countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clenched fist."

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION'S COMMITTEE REPORT

In its 1958 report to the association's house of delegates, the American Bar Association's special committee on Communist tactics, strategy, and objectives said:

"The Communists aim to keep us complacent until the choice is annihilation or surrender, at which time they confidently expect us to submit to a negotiated surrender."

This, of course, is the purpose of their policy of so-called peaceful coexistence—to lull us into a feeling of security until they are strong enough to take over.

DIFFICULT FOR AMERICAN PEOPLE TO BELIEVE

It is difficult for the American people to believe that these things are going on right in their midst—they are so foreign to anything that our training and past experience have taught us. And yet the evidence is overwhelming that these things are and have for some years been going on beneath the surface and that they are rapidly reaching a climax.

CONCLUSION

Are we as a people so dumb that we cannot be made to see? Are we so lazy and indifferent that we will not take the time to acquaint ourselves with the facts which involve our very survival? If so, we deserve the fate that will inevitably befall us.

Let me close with this quotation from a statement by America's Future:

"While Butcher Mikoyan charmed, Soviet fighters shot down an unarmed transport, lured off its course with 17 American boys. Six are dead. Eleven have vanished. Mikoyan swears the plane crashed. But a recording of the attacking pilots' crosstalk proves he lies.

"Congress screams and America boils at the callous brutality of this murder. Yet only 17 were involved. Meanwhile, every day 175 million Americans and hundreds of millions of other freedom-loving people are being led nearer to slavery or slaughter. They are being led there by the blind and stupid refusal of too many Americans, in and out of Government, to recognize Communist subversion and act to stop it. In schools and colleges, in Government, and labor unions, in communications and entertainment, even sometimes in business, we help the Communists undermine us. The murders, lies, insults, and diplomatic sideshows are only little incidents, planned diversions. They keep us from seeing the real threat.

"His head buried in sand, the ostrich sees no enemy and thinks there is no danger. How like the ostrich are we. The evidence

is all around us, but to see it and recognize it for what it is disturbs our dream of peace.

"It's up to you. For your own protection, will you look and listen? Will you know the enemy, understand his tactics, recognize his plans in operation, learn to anticipate his moves, stop giving him odds in this death struggle?"

Wisconsin Electric Co-op Celebrates Silver Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, just a year after REA celebrated its 25th birthday, Wisconsin Electric Cooperative—WEC—is observing its silver anniversary. This statewide organization of rural electric and rural telephone cooperatives has made a large and valuable contribution to the sound growth of the rural electrification movement in Wisconsin as well as setting a good, workable pattern for the organization and development of similar associations in other states.

Throughout the past 25 years, WEC has pioneered in many fields and has many "firsts" to its credit. In 1936, it started the first and only cooperative engineering service. Four years later, WEC began publishing the Wisconsin REA News, which was the first statewide rural electric co-op newspaper in the Nation and which remains a leader among REA publications. WEC was also the first statewide organization to merchandise line materials, a service which now has been expanded to cover 13 States.

When delegates from WEC's member co-ops assembled in Madison, Wis., last month for their silver anniversary meeting, they passed a series of resolutions that are in keeping with WEC's tradition of looking to the future. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a series of those resolutions in the RECORD:

RESOLUTIONS OF WISCONSIN ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE DELEGATES

RURAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Whereas the availability of low-cost energy in our rural areas can play a highly significant role in reversing out-migration population trends and bolstering and diversifying the economies of our rural areas; and

Whereas cooperatively-owned rural electric systems are the chief suppliers of electric service in rural areas where the need for an effective program of rural community development is greatest; and

Whereas by organizing the resources available in these areas, and organizing the leadership potential of our electric cooperatives, much can be accomplished to introduce new industry, consolidate and improve the standards of existing industry, improve the efficiency of farming and develop areawide community improvements programs; and

Whereas the potential of such a program can be greatly enhanced through the availability of low-interest loan funds as provided in legislation now being considered by the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we initiate rural community resource development programs in our service areas, that we direct WEC to develop the groundwork for a coordinated approach to such a program, and that we endorse S. 1 and H.R. 4569, which provides for a $100 million revolving fund for low-interest loan funds for rural development.

REA LOAN FUNDS

Whereas we fully endorse the sentiments expressed by the President of the United States, John F. Kennedy, in reference to the Rural Electrification Administration program that much remains to be accomplished in bolstering rural electric service and to correct conditions in rural telephone service; and

Whereas particularly in the field of securing long-range solutions to wholesale power requirements of REA borrowers, there is a critical need for low-interest loan funds to meet the long-range requirements of rural people; and

Whereas only one-third of the Nation's farms have modern telephone service, and the REA loan program is the most effective means whereby modern service can be brought to all of America's rural people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we respectfully request that the Congress appropriate an amount of loan and administrative funds for both the rural electric and telephone programs at a level adequate to meet all sound and feasible requirements of the program for the coming fiscal year.

REA TELEPHONE LOAN POLICY

Whereas in rural America today only one farmer in three enjoys modern telephone service and the greater portion of modern telephone service now available in rural areas has been achieved through the low interest loan program conducted by the Federal Government through the Rural Electrification Administration; and

Whereas despite the considerable progress achieved in this field through the REA loan program since 1949, the attainment of the full potential of this effort has been retarded and may forever be blocked by the language of the act and the administered policies of REA which actively promote and encourage the use of loan funds to rehabilitate small privately owned companies serving limited areas because, although this creates small pockets of modern service in a limited area, it destroys the feasibility of development of areawide subscriber-owned systems developed from a nucleus of several existent companies; and

Whereas the ready availability of REA financing to speculators interested in buying out small and underdeveloped companies results in lively competitive bidding which has resulted in inflated market prices, which are subsequently pumped into the investment costs to unnecessarily increase the cost of service; and

Whereas we feel as a matter of sound public policy, REA telephone and electric loans should be available only for the exclusive purpose of making modern service available to rural people at lowest possible cost, those policies which promote and encourage such speculation and inflated rates are contrary to the intent of Congress particularly when they serve as an obstacle to the achievement of areawide service; and

Whereas five out of every seven REA telephone borrowers are privately owned companies, and two out of every three loan dollars for telephone development go to private borrowers, that this policy is, in fact, developing limited, small islands of modern rural telephone service while actually retarding, if not emasculating, the potential for large-scale development: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge Congress to enact such changes in existing legislation to direct and permit REA to give first priority in its loan policy to areawide telephone development at the lowest possible cost consistent with good service; and be it further

Resolved, That a complete investigation be undertaken, reviewing all existent telephone loans with the objective of directing disallowal of any further low interest financing in instances where operations are being conducted in a manner where the objective of service to all rural people in an area is being subjugated to policies aimed at trafficking in the differential between REA interests rates and the permissable rate of return allowed by regulatory commissions on borrowed equity; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the Wisconsin Public Service Commission to limit permissable rates of return to give recognition to the low cost of REA borrowing so as to prevent speculative profit taking on REA financing.

TRIBUTE TO OUR DECEASED ASSOCIATES

Whereas the joy of gathering here this week at the silver anniversary annual meeting of the initial organization of Wisconsin Electric Cooperative as a central service agency for our membership is restrained by the tragic automobile accident last month which resulted in the untimely death of our first and recent president, H. O. Melby; of Vernon Electric Cooperative Treasurer Elmer Smith; and of Vernon Manager and Mrs. N. F. Leifer; and

Whereas over the years, Mr. Melby provided us with inspired leadership in the efforts of we rural people to organize ourselves to provide the highest concepts of rural service, and Mr. and Mrs. Leifer and Mr. Smith were loved by everyone for their devotion and achievements to this program; and

Whereas the unusually tragic accident which so abruptly brought to a halt the association of these beloved people with us has shocked us deeply and demonstrates the continuing challenge of developing new leadership ready to step into our ranks as they become thinned by sudden tragedy, as well as the attrition of the inevitability of death: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we spread on the minutes of this meeting our profound sense of deep loss at the sudden departure of these devoted associates, and that we wish to convey our great sympathy to their immediate families; and be it further

Resolved, That we wish to similarly express our sorrow in the deaths during the past year of former beloved associates and directors Ervin Starck, C. W. Miller, and Vernon Birong, and we want to express to their immediate families our high regard for them achieved during the years when they served WEC with distinction and devotion to our common objectives.

CONGRATULATIONS TO NORMAN M. CLAPP

Whereas we feel that the State of Wisconsin was singularly honored by the appointment by President John F. Kennedy of a native son of Wisconsin to the high post of Administrator of REA; and

Whereas we have great respect for the new Administrator Norman M. Clapp for his lifelong devotion to the principles and objectives of the REA program and have full confidence that he will serve in his post with distinction; and

Whereas we have always considered Norman M. Clapp as an outstanding friend and supporter of the REA program as a means of achieving significant improvements in the social and economic standards of our rural areas on the basis of his service as a member of the senatorial staff of the late U.S. Senator Robert M. La Follette and as a friendly and sympathetic publisher and editor of two newspapers in Wisconsin: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we extend our congratulations, our good wishes and cooperation to Norman M. Clapp in his administration of the REA program; and be it further

Resolved, That we express our gratitude to his predecessor, David A. Hamil, for his years of service to the REA program and want to convey to him our very best wishes for the future.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION RESEARCH

Whereas agriculture is the largest single industry and source of employment in the economy of the United States; and

Whereas the application of electric energy to agriculture constitutes the most effective single means available for improving efficiency, reducing operating costs, increasing quality and improving the standard of living of farm producers; and

Whereas there is a great need for increased facilities for intensifying research and broadening the areas of electrical applications in agriculture, but that this work has been drastically impeded both by inadequate funds committed to such research, and limited physical facilities for research; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States now has before it legislation which would authorize the construction of an Electrification Research Center proposed to be located in Minnesota which includes an appropriation of $2 million for construction and conduct of an expanded research program in farm electrification: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we convey to the Congress our respectful recommendation that this legislation be enacted into law.

ADMINISTRATION RESOURCE POLICY

Whereas the President of the United States has outlined to the Congress his basic resource policies, which include the following basic principles in respect to the marketing of power produced from publicly financed facilities: (1) Preference in power sales shall be given public agencies and cooperatives; (2) domestic and rural consumers shall have priority over other consumers in the disposal of power; (3) power shall be sold at the lowest possible rates consistent with sound business principles; (4) power disposal shall be such as to encourage widespread use and to prevent monopolization; and

Whereas the President reported that he had directed the Secretary of the Interior to develop plans for early interconnection of Department marketing agencies with adequate common carrier transmission lines, and to plan for further national cooperative pooling of electric power, both public and private; and to enlarge such pooling as now exists; and

Whereas the President has called for a broad new power policy under which the Nation's natural resources would be fully developed for maximum utilization; and

Whereas we fully agree with the recent public statement of the Secretary of Interior Stewart L. Udall, that "furnishing adequate low-cost power for homes, farms and industry is a matter of basic importance to the economic growth and defense of the Nation and is, therefore, a matter of governmental concern": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we heartily endorse the farsighted objectives of the President's resource policy to assure maximum development of our natural resources and to promote widespread use of electric energy at lowest possible cost as essential to the Nation's maximum economic development; and we further

Resolve, That we favor the inclusion of power generation as an integral part of multipurpose development wherever feasible as a basic and essential means of achieving maximum development of our natural resources.

ATOMIC POWER FOR RURAL AREAS

Be it resolved, That we respectfully request of the Atomic Energy Commission that it carry forward a greatly expanded program of development for nuclear reactors specifically designed to meet conditions of rural electric service; and be it further

Resolved, That we express our good wishes to one of our members, Rural Cooperative Power Association of Elk River, Minn., for complete success in its operations beginning this summer of a nuclear unit in conjunction with its conventional generating facilities.

REVOLVING FUND ON REA APPROPRIATIONS

Whereas through the availability of capital loans for the purpose of constructing rural electric and telephone facilities throughout the Nation, we are making rapid strides in achieving our objective of electric and telephone service to all rural people; and

Whereas all funds advanced for these purposes are being fully repaid with interest at no cost to the Nation's taxpayers, and are actually productive of many billions of dollars in new tax revenue to governmental units through new taxes paid and their productivity of greater efficiency, lower cost production, higher earning power and the $15 billion market they have created for electric appliances and wiring; and

Whereas the annual appropriation of funds for this purpose is actually a fully returnable investment by the Federal Government as these loans are fully liquidated under the most remarkable repayment record of any nationwide credit program in the Nation's history; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States is considering possible legislation which would provide for a capital budget under which fully repayable appropriations and self-liquidating investments would be earmarked as investments rather than expenditures; and

Whereas as an alternative to such a plan, the Congress is also considering a plan where all REA allocations of funds for rural electric and telephone loans would be set up as a revolving fund with repayments annually credited to the fund and requiring new appropriations only for those amounts where new allocations exceed repayments: now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we endorse the principle of the capital budget as a more realistic reflection of actual governmental expenditures; and be it further

Resolved, That we also endorse the principle of legislation which would establish with the Treasury of the United States a revolving fund of REA allocations and repayments with such repayments credited against total allocations in any given fiscal year.

JAMES SULLIVAN

Whereas James F. Jim Sullivan, as a member of the staff of Wisconsin Electric Cooperative for the past 14 years, has demonstrated great ability and devotion to the program of cooperative rural electrification; and

Whereas Jim's work successively as editor of the Wisconsin REA News, as assistant public relations director, as assistant to the general manager, as the originator and editor of the "Top o' the News Capsule" and as a speaker at a great many electric cooperative meetings throughout the country, has earned for him the respect and admiration of all those who have come to know him; and

Whereas Jim's knowledge of the REA program throughout the State and the Nation and his proven ability to further the interests of the rural peoples it serves has been recognized by his recent appointment as administrative assistant to REA Administrator Norman Clapp: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the delegates to WEC's 25th annual meeting, That we congratulate Jim on the recognition that he has received and Administrator Norman Clapp on his good fortune to obtain so able and devoted assistant. We wish Jim and his wife, Muriel, every success and happiness in Jim's new field, with the knowledge that what is WEC's immediate loss is the national REA program's gain. Another good Wisconsin product is being contributed to make the national REA program better and the lives of all peoples in the Nation affected by that program, enriched.

Too Much Money for Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, an editorial which appeared in the Blue Island (Ill.) Sun-Standard, one of the typically fine community newspapers in my district, contained a message of basic commonsense which all Members of Congress should read. For the benefit of my colleagues, I therefore place this article in the RECORD:

TOO MUCH MONEY FOR GOVERNMENT

One basic fact we must understand about our Government's reckless, profligate, sky-for-limit spending program is:

It coincides perfectly with the clearly enunciated Marxist theory that high taxes will surely destroy the private enterprise system. The United States is drifting toward a slashing tax system guaranteed to blast our traditional economy, which is rooted in individualism, and to leave in its place a mistaken form of serfdom.

A new economic theory has been conjured out of thin air and is getting serious attention in governmental circles. It claims to depend on national growth and expansion to lead the way out of financial troubles. It is one of those modern ideas which champions change for the sake of change, being ready to discard as old fashioned all of the time-tested ideas about taxes, balanced budgets, and national debt. It is claimed that, if the national economy is expertly managed along credit lines, it can go along indefinitely in the red.

This optimistic theory reared its head some years ago, when we faced real emergencies—depression, two World Wars, and the Korean "brushfire." No present emergency looms up to provide excuse for heavy domestic spending and continued deficit financing, save the ever-increasing bill for national defense, which could be met easily by decreasing needless domestic spending and ill advised foreign aid. Yet, there is enough contentious, mistaken stubbornness to argue that our Government need not count the billions; we can spend ourselves out of debt, stabilize Federal finances by a program of waste and, chief aim of some, let the spenders find favor with the multitude by handing out more and more gratuities.

Is this the path to national solvency? No. A few things—among them, honor, and honesty—do not become old fashioned, save among outcasts and criminals who have said goodby to integrity.

Modernism is a hoax. It is playing havoc with America. We must have more integrity, more decency, from the top right down to the bottom in government. Taxes as now levied spell theft from one, charity toward another, disaster for all.

Charity should be reserved for those who are dependent through no fault of their own; not for the indolent or the greedy. Too much charity kills incentive for the worker as well as the businessman. More

state aid, less incentive; more unrealistic share the wealth, less freedom; more centralized government, less America.

Already our people are staggering under a killing taxload. In addition to income and property taxes are the countless hidden taxes. The sardonic Khrushchev is waiting for U.S. prosperity to collapse. Unless we, as a nation, and as individuals, revert to sound economic practice, our Soviet foe will be rewarded for his patience.

No government $300 billion in debt can withstand a sudden letdown in commerce and survive. More than one kind of financial crisis could suddenly jolt us off our complacent acceptance of inflationary prosperity. Bankers know that we are doing business with 47-cent dollars and many of them are unhappy about it. Outrageous taxes, inflations, a break in the economic levee, then what?

One U.S. Senator said: "If I had to reduce all I have learned in 14 years in Congress, I could sum it up in these words: 'Please do not give your Government so much money.'"

Another high Government official said: "Everybody is overtaxed, and the middle class is being taxed out of existence." This realist spoke the truth. Please remember, in this connection, that the Soviets, to solidify their conquest of a subdued nation always—with routine and ruthless determination—proceed to liquidate the middle class, known to them the bourgeoisie. Is our Nation pursuing a like course?

Patriots can, if they will, stop these terrifying excesses, these mistaken concepts of justice. First, learn the pertinent facts. Study them with diligence. Pass them on to your associates; they will be surprisingly grateful, for our people want to know. Influential public opinion stems from such earnest beginnings.

How United States Confirmed Soviet Space Feat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, ever since April 12, when Russia announced the first successful attempt to orbit a man in space and return him safely to earth, the Committee on Science and Astronautics, and I as its chairman, have been deluged with communications calling this feat a "hoax" perpetrated by Russia.

In the New York Times of Sunday, April 23, Mr. John W. Finney, the New York Times reporter who writes so knowledgeably on space matters, gives an answer to these accusations. Because of the interest in this matter, I submit his article, entitled "How United States Confirmed Soviet Space Feat," for the attention of my colleagues:

HOW UNITED STATES CONFIRMED SOVIET SPACE FEAT

(By John W. Finney)

WASHINGTON, April 22.—At the annual convention here this week of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, an editor of a Texas newspaper arose to announce that some people down in Texas did not believe that the Soviet Union had actually put a man into space. The reaction of the Texans was sympotomatic of a flurry of widespread doubt seemingly stirred up by hurt national pride and deep-seated distrust of the Russians, about the authenticity of the Soviet feat.

The skeptics may find some solace in passing the Soviet accomplishment off as a hoax, but their doubt flies in the face not only of Soviet statements but also of every bit of evidence available to the American Government.

As Dr. Frank Press, a member of the President's Science Advisory Committee, told the doubting Texas editor, "there is no doubt in the minds of any knowledgeable person in this field that the Russians did what they said they did."

WHY SO CERTAIN

How could American officials be so sure that Maj. Yuri Alekseyevich Gagarin had indeed circled the earth in a space ship, as triumphantly announced by the Moscow radio in the early morning hours of April 12? Their certainty springs from the fact that through a combination of electronic and traditional cloak-and-dagger espionage the United States is able to keep a secret eye on Soviet space activities.

For several years the United States has maintained a global surveillance network to keep track of Soviet launchings. So effective is the system that the United States has had knowledge of every major Russian space shot in advance of the Moscow announcement as well as of missile launchings that were never announced.

In the maze of Government secrecy, no information is much more sensitive or secret than the electronic intelligence obtained by listening stations monitoring activities of the Soviet Union. On repeated occasions a public statement that the network exists or that it has monitored Soviet failures on the launching pad has provoked Presidentially ordered investigations into the source of the information.

The existence of the network, however, is now an established fact, well known to the Russians and alluded to by Government officials in their announcements that the United States had known in advance of a Soviet space launching or in their hints that the Soviet Union has had launching failures just as the United States has had.

FIRST CLUE

The first clue that a major Soviet space shot was impending came early in April when Soviet tracking ships were spotted taking up position in the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. Immediately, official Washington and the secret surveillance network was alerted.

As launching preparations began at the Soviet missile site at Tyura Tam, north of the Aral Sea, secret United States listening posts in the Middle East tuned in on the increasing volume of radio messages passing between the launching site and downrange tracking stations. The messages and their very volume told what was going on at the launching pad.

It is no secret to the Soviet Union any longer that its launching activities are being subjected to electronic eavesdropping by the United States. The Russians, however, might be surprised at the effectiveness of this form of electronic spying.

One report common within U.S. space circles is that the United States is able to follow every minute and final seconds in a Soviet countdown, and in fact, the countdown is marked on a blackboard in a U.S. monitoring station just as is presumably being done in the Soviet blockhouse at Tyura Tam. Probably the best testimonial to the effectiveness of this radio monitoring network is that at times the United States has been able to ascertain when the Soviet Union has encountered failures on the launching pad.

When the huge Soviet launching rocket rose above the horizon, long-range tracking radars in Turkey—and reportedly also in northern Iran and Pakistan—followed the spaceship in the initial leg of its journey. By the time the rocket had flashed eastward across Siberia, it came within range of another powerful U.S. radar located on Shemya in the Aleutian Islands.

A quick look at the Shemya tracking information showed that a satellite had been launched, rather than junst another long-range ballistic shot into the Pacific. Within seconds word of the satellite launching had been flashed to a command headquarters deep in the basement of the Pentagon and thence to White House officials.

Thus the White House press secretary, Pierre Salinger was able to announce shortly after Moscow radio made its 2 a.m. announcement that the United States had known in advance of the launching.

If the Soviet spaceship has continued circling the earth—instead of making just one orbit carrying it down across the Pacific, around the tip of South America and then back up across the Atlantic and Africa to the Soviet Union—it would have come under detection by other segments of the U.S. surveillance network.

SURVEILLANCE FENCE

Strung across the United States, from Georgia to California, is Spasur, the space surveillance fence developed and operated by the Navy. Any satellite passing through the fence's fanlike beams of radio signals sends back telltale radio echoes. Within a few passes, Spasur, and its electronic computer, in Dahlgren, Va., is able to tell the orbital path of the satellite. Using this information, Air Force radars, such as the Lincoln Laboratory's Millstone Hill radar in Westford, Mass., are able to lock onto the satellite and provide more precise information on its orbit and even its size.

From the information of the electronic surveillance network, therefore, it was conclusively established that a Soviet satellite had been launched early Wednesday morning last week. It was also because of this network that American officials could be so definite in dismissing the still unexplained series of reports that seeped out of Moscow about how a Soviet astronaut had been launched before April 12—reports, incidentally, that have contributed in their own way to the doubts about the Soviet achievement.

As U.S. officials pointed out, they would have known if a Soviet satellite had been launched and there was no evidence that any space ship was placed into orbit before the 5-ton vehicle of Major Gagarin.

But even if it was established that a Soviet satellite had gone into orbit, this still goes not answer the questions of how did the United States know that a Soviet astronaut was inside the space ship and that it was, in fact, Major Gagarin who stepped out of the satellite after a trip around the world.

Here the evidence becomes obscured in the most secret, clandestine channels of intelligence. One possible surce of confirmation may have come from monitoring the messages that, according to Soviet accounts, Major Gagarin sent back to earth during his trip. Or, from intelligence sources within the Soviet Union, the United States may have received information confirming the Soviet account.

GAGARIN MONITORED?

Officials will not say whether any of Major Gagarin's messages were monitored and for obvious reasons will not discuss what independent intelligence information may have been received from within the Soviet Union. All they will say is that the official con-

gratulations of President Kennedy were withheld until it was certain that the Soviet Union had indeed scored the historic first flight into space.

Ironically, the doubts about the Soviet feat have been kindled by the secrecy of the administration and of the Soviet Union. Under a new secrecy policy, the administration has withheld information, provided in the past, about the tracking of the Soviet shot and the spotting of the Soviet tracking ships. To complicate the confusion in the public mind, tracking information obtained by the military was not made available immediately to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, which had been designated as the official spokesman on Soviet space shots.

SOVIET EVASIVENESS

The Soviet Union, for its part, has contributed to the doubts by its evasiveness and contradictory accounts about certain circumstances of the flight. Still unresolved are such details as: Did the space ship have portholes for Major Gagarin to look out at the earth below, how was the space ship designed so as to resist the tremendous temperatures of reentering the earth's atmosphere, and how did the astronaut return to earth, in a parachute or inside the capsule?

The Soviet Union, which has traditionally been reluctant to describe the details of its space fights with the same openness as the United States, may never clear up these minor mysteries. But there is no mystery about whether Major Gagarin circled the earth. Every bit of evidence available to the United States confirms the feat and rules out the possibility of deception.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. MOELLER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, we have recently heard a great deal of talk concerning the crisis in the balance of international payments, that is to say in the gold flow out of the United States. Although at the moment the gold flow problem appears to be abating somewhat, it may again return to plague us. On the theory that all interested citizens have a right to be heard on this very difficult and perplexing question, I take pleasure in placing in the RECORD the thoughts of Mr. J. Keller Kirn, Sr., of Lancaster, Ohio, a student of this and related problems.

In addition, Mr. Kirn has favored me with a copy of a letter he has written to the editor of the Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch on the general subject of teaching communism in the schools. I am also including this letter in the RECORD in the hope that those with such proclivities will be deterred thereby.

The articles follow:

GOLD

Importing $100 million gold from England in 1907 stopped the panic. Each nation went its own way and made its financial policies subject always to the limitation that if it overextend itself, other nations would drain away its gold and force it to reverse its policies, without war. This illustrates how currency redeemable in gold coins stabilizes credit and halts inflation.

When Mr. Charles Henry, Lancaster, Ohio, paid $1.25 for his hair cut August 3, 1960, he said he remembered when he paid 10 cents for his hair cut. That was when we were on a gold standard. In other words we now have 8-cent-paper dollars not redeemable in gold coins, invested in U.S. bonds, deposited in banks, and in our hands. Increased prices wil increase our so-called income but further reduce our 8-cent-paper dollars not redeemable in gold coins, and reduce our pay checks.

Lancaster, Ohio's John Sherman, Secretary of the Treasury under President Hays, raised our 35-cent dollar to a 100-cent dollar with gold.

According to John Sherman's "Recollections of 40 Years in the House, Senate, and Cabinet," volume II, page 74, those opposed to restoring the gold standard and coinage for our use predicted "that resumption in gold and silver would be impossible on the then volume of paper money; that if it were attempted the desperadoes of Wall Street and the money kings of Europe would present greenbacks and take the gold as fast as it could be paid over the counter of the Treasury. Not a year rolled around until resumption came, and these Wall Street desperadoes and these money kings of Europe, instead of coming and demanding our gold in exchange for greenbacks, now bring their gold to us and want greenbacks for it. They don't want the gold at all and we can't put it on them. United States notes now travel the circuit of the world with undiminished honor, and be everywhere redeemed in coin."

When we were on the gold standard in 1920, our recession lasted only 1½ years and was followed by 7 years of real prosperity. We had a flexible wage scale that permitted immediate and adequate adjustments in accordance with changing conditions. Prices fell until buying resumed according to the law of supply and demand. We balanced the budget each year during that time. Franklin D. Roosevelt never balanced the budget.

We had more gold January 2, 1933, than on November 2, 1932, therefore there was no need to take us off the gold coin standard and there is no need to keep us off the gold coin standard. Neither our Nation nor any other nation has ever maintained a 100-percent gold coin reserve for convertibility of all nongold money, just as banks can't keep all of depositors money in banks and make loans.

Restore the gold coin standard at $35 per ounce of gold, nine-tenths fine, then recall our currency not redeemable in gold coins and replace it with currency redeemable in gold coins.

Standards must stand. Reducing the gold content of our dollar to raise the price of gold produced more dollars but not more gold, just as reducing a yard from 36 to 18 inches produces more yards but not more cloth.

Emulate Switzerland, at peace with neutrality as proclaimed by our President George Washington April 22, 1793, and prosperous with currency redeemable in gold coins, since 1815. Switzerland is not a U.N. member.

Constitutionally yours,
J. KELLER KIRN, Sr.

LANCASTER, OHIO.

[From the Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch, Apr. 14, 1961

LOOKS TO BIBLE AND CONSTITUTION IN DEFENDING AMERICAN PRINCIPLE

To the EDITOR:

Dr. Oswald Hoffman, speaker on the Lutheran Hour, March 12, 1961, stated that a man said: "We started with communism, why do we fight it now?"

Acts 2:44–45: "And all that believed were together, and had all things in common; and sold their possession and goods and parted them to all men, as every man had need."

Some would not work. 2 Thessalonnians 3: 10: "For even when we were with you, this we commanded you, that if any would not work neither should he eat." After that each man was given a piece of land to cultivate to feed himself and family. From that time, communism stopped and prosperity began.

Clyde Moore in his column stated: "Dr. Alexander Miekeljohn maintains that Communists should be allowed to teach. To be consistent, no doubt he would be opposed to quarantining a teacher with smallpox, as it would do the students good to learn first hand about the disease and decide for themselves whether or not that wanted it."

Instead of learning all about communism to fight it, learn all about our U.S. Constitution to defend it.

Do our citizens prefer to be governed by those whom they elect with laws made in pursuance of the Constitution or be ruled with rules made by the bureaucrats whom they did not elect?

U.S. court decisions are the law of the land, only when they are made in pursuance of the Constitution consisting of three branches, legislative, judicial, and executive. There is no fourth branch for Government ownership of operation of industries, as under socialism and communism.

William Penn said: "Men will either be governed by God or ruled by tyrants." With blessings come responsibilities. Parents demand that teachers and professors who try to destroy our "In God we trust" Constitution be fired now.

Abraham Lincoln said: "The Constitution was adopted to preserve our Government, not to act as a protecting screen for those who while claiming its privileges, seek to destroy it."

Emulate Switzerland, at peace with golden rule neutrality as proclaimed by President George Washington, April 22, 1793, and prosperous with currency redeemable in gold coins, since 1815. Switzerland is not a U.N. one-world member.

J. KELLER KIRN, Sr.

LANCASTER, OHIO.

There Are More Criminals in the United States Than There Are College Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. WATTS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to bring to the attention of the House the following article, written by the Honorable Keen Johnson, former Governor of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, former vice president of Reynolds Metals, Inc., and now back at his first and old love, writing editorials for the Richmond (Ky.) Daily Register. The following editorial appeared in the Register on April 11, 1961:

THERE ARE MORE CRIMINALS IN THE UNITED STATES THAN THERE ARE COLLEGE STUDENTS

An aggressive attack upon organized crime is proposed by Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy. Congress will be asked to enact a series of anticrime laws which it is believed would strengthen the Government, provide authority to run down racketeers and curb organized crime activities.

Attorney General Kennedy served as chief counsel of the congressional committee investigating racketeers in labor unions. As result of that experience he wrote a book, "The Enemy Within," in which he expressed deep concern about the steadily increasing crime activity. Now, as Attorney General, he urges laws that will curb interstate gambling rings, strengthen the Federal Firearms Act;

give more protection to witnesses cooperating with congressional investigators and make it more difficult for lawbreakers to cross State lines.

The steady increase of crime should cause us more concern than it does. We would probably have a better understanding of its seriousness if we understood what it is costing us as taxpayers.

J. Edgar Hoover, Chief of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, says: "Crime costs the U.S. taxpayers $28,500 a minute; $1,710,000 an hour."

There are three times as many criminals as college students. The criminals force us to spend each year 4⅔ as much on them as we spend on all forms of education, public and private.

Major crimes have increased 56 percent since 1950, four times the increase of our population. And Hoover predicts that there will be another 35 percent increase in crime in the next 10 years.

The increase of law violation, the steady sweep of crime is just as frightful in Madison County in Kentucky as it is throughout the Nation. It would be fortunate if we should become concerned about it here at home.

It is a strange anomaly that in this the most literate of all nations, where exists greater opportunity for living a life of rectitude, crime flourishes, criminals increase in number and in their sinister disregard of law.

The most disturbing thing about it is that we accept with complacency a situation that gradually gets worse. The effort of the Attorney General to make a vigorous attack on crime should be widely approved. There should be cooperation from Congress in enactment of anticrime laws that would help check lawlessness.

Second Thoughts on Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the value of study and deliberation often proves a sounder policy than snap judgments inspired by impetuous idealism. A recent editorial in the Chicago Daily News, entitled "Second Thoughts on Peace Corps," certainly deserves the attention of the Members of Congress:

SECOND THOUGHTS ON PEACE CORPS

The managers of the Peace Corps are having some sobering second thoughts. Bill Moyers, assistant to R. Sargent Shriver, the Director, accompanied Vice President Johnson to Africa. What he saw of native living conditions gave him the shudders and a new conception of the "very real problems" facing the project.

The idea of a corps of eager and dedicated young men and women on missions of light to the far corners of the earth caught the public imagination. College campuses buzzed with excitement.

Some of these young people may be merely leaping at what they imagine to be an exciting adventure. But most are motivated by genuine idealism.

If some of them saw it in terms of Steig's "dreams of glory," with themselves being cheered by adoring natives, that would be youth.

Moyers himself sounds as if he had never before visited—and certainly few of the Peace Corps applicants ever have seen—a village of mud huts, in which the family lives with the chickens and water buffalo and subsists on bread and onions. Even if the corpsmen did not shrink from this hardship of "living with the people," the health hazards would threaten Americans habituated to sanitary conditions.

The flies, the mosquitoes, the filth that he saw so alarmed Moyers that he has warned Shriver that it will be necessary to include a medical assistant and a public health expert with each of the American teams.

That begins a retreat from "living with the people." That prospect was never very real anyway, because anybody who eats three square meals a day is already set apart from most of the inhabitants of the areas that need help the most.

The search goes on for young people who combine a knowledge of Swahili, farming, road building and carpentry. But there is also a growing awareness that this is no business for amateurs.

Illinois Senate Resolution Supports U.S.S. "Arizona"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following joint resolution passed by the Illinois State Legislature:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Springfield, Ill., April 20, 1961.

Hon. PETER F. MACK, Jr.,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MACK: As authorized, I am enclosing herewith a copy of Senate Joint Resolution 13 as adopted in the 72d general assembly of this State.

Sincerely,
CHARLES F. CARPENTIER,
Secretary of State.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 13

Whereas the project to build a permanent memorial over the hull of the U.S.S. *Arizona*, sunk in the December 7, 1941, attack on Pearl Harbor and still containing the bodies of 1,102 servicemen entombed within it, is slowing because of lack of funds although the project is nearing completion; and

Whereas the Navy Club of the United States of America, one of the originators of the plan to enshrine the *Arizona* and its gallant dead as a memorial to all who died at Pearl Harber on the "day of infamy" in 1941, has been responsible together with the Pacific War Memorial Commission for raising $250,000 privately toward the $500,000 needed; and

Whereas the Hawaii Legislature has appropriated an additional $50,000 toward the memorial, leaving an additional $200,000 still needed; and

Whereas the completion of this memorial is in the interest of the Nation as a whole as a shrine to the men who gave their lives and as a symbol for future eternal vigilance: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 72d General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the House of Representatives concurring herein), That Congress is memorialized to appropriate the necessary $200,000 in additional funds so that the memorial over the U.S.S. *Arizona* may be completed at an early date as a national shrine for the men killed at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, and that suitable copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to the President of the United States and the Members of Congress from this State.

A Journey to Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include another in a series of articles on Ireland written by Mr. Thomas Heffernan, editor, Sunday Independent, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., this article having appeared in that newspaper on April 23, 1961.

Mr. Heffernan wrote this highly interesting and informative series on Ireland following an extensive trip through that country last fall.

The indicated article follows:

A JOURNEY TO IRELAND—IRISH GYPSIES CALLED TINKERS, AND THEY ARE NOT POPULAR

(By Tom Heffernan)

You don't hear much about gypsies in Wyoming Valley any more—those swarthy travelers whose background was so mysterious and who used to arouse neighborhoods by moving a whole caravan into an empty storeroom for the winter.

In Ireland they are still common, though not called gypsies very often and proving also to be of entirely different appearance.

In fact, they looked much like the regular Irish folk. But there the similarity ends and they definitely are not well liked.

We saw our first a short time after arriving at Shannon Airport and while being driven to our hotel in Adare, about 4:30 o'clock of a Saturday morning by the wonderful Paddy O'Toole of Shannon Travel.

ALL WAGONS THE SAME

It was as a man on a bicycle, going the same way we were, loomed up ahead of us in the headlight beam.

"There's a tinker," said Paddy, and we wanted to know how he knew.

"We just passed a wagon," Paddy explained and these wagons of the tinker and every one exactly like every other one and thus unmistakable.

They look as if a huge, straight-sided barrel had been mounted on wheels.

Then, told the story by the sound of Paddy's voice, we wondered why they were not liked.

It seems that, generally, they are not considered of any value to any community, careless, perhaps dirty, paying no taxes, supporting nothing but themselves, their honesty suspected and—getting closer to the Irish heart—to be watched in a horse trade.

A REAL EVIL

And like gypsies everywhere, they seem to go in for trading horses.

That some of the horses they acquire are believed to be shipped to the Continent for human consumption is one more thing the horse-loving Irish hold against them.

Naturally, as the common name of "Tinker" suggests, they also earn a bit here and there at mending jobs.

Seen along the roadside of an evening, huddled over a tiny fire on the steep shoulder of a road, having a crude dinner in the open they are far from a romantic lot of wanderers.

Instead, they look pretty pathetic.

IRISH FARMS ARE UNCLUTTERED

We are not one to find everything better in other countries—mostly because it isn't possible to do so.

Not in many cases.

However, there is a great difference between homes in marginal farm areas in Ireland and here in Luzerne County—and Luzerne County does not gain by the comparison.

In most local cases, as a drive in any direction will disclose, the local homes are apt to be marked first by an old automobile or two, in various stages of dismantling as the principal feature of the front or side yard.

Then, far too often, a lot of the rest of the land near the house will be marked with a pile of old bad springs, a tumbledown chicken coop, some piles of ashes and what-have-you.

NOTHING TO THROW AWAY

Not so in Ireland and it well may be that the Irish in these poorer farming areas cannot afford to throw things away.

Certainly it is true they never had an automobile—of any vintage—to let go to rust and ruin in the front yard.

Furthermore, with the houses usually built of stone or a stuccolike cement, the lack of paint is not so noticeable.

They may be poor and the cow barn may be too close to the house of the farmer's family to let the olfactory nerves get much of a rest, but you'll find no clutter of rubbish in piles around the house.

It might be added that the most common type of architecture—that of the Irish cottage—is good.

MOST FARMERS WELCOME HUNTS

The overwhelming majority of the Irish farmers have no objection to the hunts riding across their land.

As a matter of fact, with the places where the hunts are to meet are scheduled and made known well in advance, and something like a holiday air is met there quite often.

Many farmers and villagers turn out to watch and lots of them, keen about the sport, try to keep up as they can.

The youngsters run across the fields and as far as they are able.

Schoolchildren usually come out of the school buildings to watch as the hunt passes.

Farmers or their young people with horses often join in.

When a fox goes to ground, down into a hole, a crowd gathers in no time.

TWO RUGGED INDIVIDUALS

Twice, however, in the course of our hunting holiday in Ireland, we came upon land the owners of which denied permission to ride over.

In both cases it caused the hunt to scatter a bit as different routes were sought in the effort to keep up with the hounds.

And on one occasion, with Lord Hamilton—a handsome big fellow in his forties—was acting as master of the County Limerick hounds since Lord Daresbury had been called to London, the result of one farmer's attitude was that we were rather confined in a field.

We could not jump the fence without getting on forbidden land.

So Lord Hamilton turned to us to remark, quietly:

"We will now leave the field—through the gate."

Having had quite a few hours of what was for us hard riding and with many jumps, we had to give, as an honest answer:

"Perhaps that's something to be thankful for."

MISSED MEETING U.S. AMBASSADOR

We had the misfortune to miss meeting with former U.S. Ambassador to Ireland Scott McLeod—who was popular on the Emerald Isle.

Our original plan called for one week in Adare, County Limerick, and then a week in Dublin.

However, we liked Adare so well we hastened back, leaving on a Wednesday when Ambassador McLeod was not due to return from a trip to Geneva, Switzerland, the next day.

Both Mr. McLeod and his office—which we also missed visiting—most graciously gave us some service that was most helpful and thoroughly appreciated.

POLICEMAN IS CALLED GUARDA

Police in Ireland are known as civil guards and, when you speak to them, you call them what sounds mostly like guarda.

They are an impressive lot, according the respect to be found associated with police throughout Britain, and most accommodating.

The guarda really offers service and all of them make it a point to be specially easy with visitors.

However, be sure to have your driver's license with you if you intend to operate an automobile.

Power To Regulate Rests Better With the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Evening Herald, Rock Hill, S.C., April 18, 1961:

IN OUR OPINION: POWER TO REGULATE RESTS BETTER WITH THE CONGRESS

A battle seems to be shaping up between President Kennedy and the House Legislative Oversight Subcommittee for control of the Federal regulatory agencies.

The agencies were created by Congress. They include the Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC), the Federal Trade Commission (FTC), the Federal Power Commission (FPC), the Securities Exchange Commission (SEC) and other groups that regulate certain areas of our lives.

Congress reserved the right to oversee their operation after creating these agencies. Representative OREN HARRIS, Democrat of Arkansas, chairman of the subcommittee, is concerned over what appears to be the President's efforts to gain control of the agencies.

The chairman's concern is proper. The regulatory agencies can best serve the people with a minimum of political control.

Some people lean to the view that the regulatory agencies should regulate themselves, independent of both Congress and the White House. This offers the possibility of dictatorial action and seems inadvisable.

A reasonable amount of check against unlimited power seems the best course. And this power to check the power of regulation is better reserved to a continuing body of elected Representatives, rather than being given to one man, who may be gone in less than 4 years.

Speech by the Honorable William M. Tuck, Representative From the Fifth District of Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 23, the Commonwealth of Virginia officially marked the opening of the Civil War Centennial. The Honorable WILLIAM M. TUCK, who so ably represents the Fifth District of Virginia in the House of Representatives, delivered the address at the opening ceremony at the State capitol in Richmond.

Congressman TUCK has long been identified with those who cherish the ideals, traditions and heritage of our people and who are endeavoring manfully to impart to the present generation the importance of preserving liberty, freedom and the rights of our people and to prevent government by men and not by law.

Representative TUCK was introduced by the Honorable Charles T. Moses, president pro tempore of the Senate of Virginia. Senator Moses and I live in the same county and I am proud of the splendid work he is doing to preserve our way of life and the freedoms and privileges of our people.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the splendid address of the Honorable WILLIAM M. TUCK:

SPEECH BY HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK, REPRESENTATIVE, FIFTH DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA, SUNDAY, APRIL 23, 1961, CEREMONIES MARKING THE OPENING OF THE CIVIL WAR CENTENNIAL IN VIRGINIA

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen of the late Dr. Edwin Anderson Alderman, president of the University of Virginia, in his matchless address to a joint session of the Congress of the United States commemorating the life and services of Woodrow Wilson, adverted to the comments of an ancient Athenian. This individual had commended the fitness of the Athenian Public Memorial, but doubted the wisdom of any speech on such occasions. He declared that where men's deeds and actions have been great, they should be honored in deed only; that the standing and character should not depend upon the judgment and the words of one; that their virtues should not depend upon whether he spoke well or ill. While I know that what I say has no comparable value to the situation described by Dr. Alderman, nevertheless, I find myself incapable of employing words that would justly and accurately portray the scenes which obtained in Virginia a century ago, or to give appropriate expression to the sentiment which permeates the breast, or the thoughts which crowd upon the mind at this time.

We have met here today to open formally the Virginia Civil War Centennial anniversary. This occasion is a mere milestone on the road of time, a niche in the long corridors of history. But in the deeper sense of noble sentiment and high obligations to our Commonwealth and to our country, we are here to commemorate the soul-wrenching ordeal through which Virginia passed and from which, despite hardships and

handicaps, she emerged to take her proud place in the forefront of the sisterhood of American States.

Virginia had furnished much of the leadership which established the Union. Madison was named by the muse of history as the father of the Constitution, just as another great Virginian, George Washington, had been the Father of his Country. And Virginia herself was loved and respected, as she is today. She was then, as now, known as the "mother of States and of statesmen." And so she stood in those sorrowing days entrapped within a national disturbance of complex causes, a commonwealth of powerful prestige whose movement to one side or the other was fatefully awaited by all.

As Virginia waited, there was little hope of escape. Soon the decision must come, and 100 years ago it did come, from within the walls of this very building where we are gathered, from the assembled trustees of the will, the conscience and the power of Virginians everywhere.

To the broad southern mind, the election of Abraham Lincoln meant secession. They say no happiness in a Union presided over by him. The very waves of the deep southern discontent, and the northern discontent with the ways of the South, profoundly threatened the foundation of the Nation. As these waves beat against this State, Virginia was caught in the vortex of these angry emotions.

To the eternal and everlasting credit of the Virginians of a century ago, they exhausted every resource and explored and employed every honorable device to preserve the peace and save the Union short of fighting against the people of the South. None of the succeeding generations have had cause or reason to blush and no apologies to make. We can stand proudly in the confident knowledge that, upon the record established, our ancestors took a firm but conciliatory stand. Moral heroism, though less frequent and less acclaimed than physical courage, nevertheless is worthy to excite our highest admiration.

Because of the prominent part Virginia took in the conflict that followed, as well as the fact that so much of the actual warfare occurred on Virginia soil, her name is synonymous with the war. But let us never forget that Virginia did not start that war. At the very hour when Fort Sumter was under fire, an official Virginia committee was in Washington for a conference with Lincoln on his policy toward the South.

At that time Lincoln was not conciliatory, and his reply to the Virginians meant coercion, of which they could not approve. Distinguished historians have pointed out that it was not the firing at Fort Sumter, but it was the Lincoln proclamation calling for 75,000 troops that produced Virginia's ordinance of secession. On many occasions that impeccably honest and irreproachably correct citizen of Rockbridge County, Gov. John Letcher, destined to become Virginia's determined and much-loved war Governor, stated his and the position of Virginia to be that "he would resist the coercion of Virginia and to the adoption of such a policy of coercion whenever the attempt is made by either Northern or Southern States." Governor Letcher furthermore stated his position and that of Virginia which constituted the very crux of why the State adopted the resolution of secession: "I will regard an attempt to pass Federal troops across the territory of Virginia, for purpose of coercing a Southern seceding State, as an act of invasion, which should be met and repelled."

Virginia was in no mood to tear the Union asunder. In 1861, as in 1775, she labored long and arduously for peace and conciliation. She it was who sponsored a resolution in Congress creating a commission of one from each State in the Union to solve the differences.

The Governor of Virginia in November 1860, called a special session of the legislature to deal with the problem facing the Nation. This session of the general assembly passed a resolution calling for a convention, with the understanding that no action taken by the legislators would be binding upon the people of Virginia until they had a chance to vote on it.

The Virginia Legislature on January 19, 1861, passed a resolution calling for a peace convention in Washington. This resolution authorized the commissioners to confer with the President and with representatives from the seceded States in the hope that an atmosphere could be created whereby the seceded States might find it practicable to return to the Union. The aging and beloved ex-President, John Tyler, of Virginia, was commissioned to call on President Buchanan. Another distinguished Virginian, Judge John Robertson, was sent to South Carolina to urge against any action by that State which might result in war pending the peace conference. As a result of President Tyler's visit to President Buchanan, the latter requested Congress to leave the status quo undisturbed until Virginia had run her course in the cause of peace. South Carolina in the meantime agreed to take no action that would precipitate a conflict.

When the Virginia Convention met on February 13, the delegates to that convention put aside the business of passing an ordinance of secession and settled down to explore the possibilities of compromise. These are only a few among many other actions taken by Virginians of that period to avert this gory conflict, and the record of Virginia's attempts to reconcile the difference and to bring about compromise is long and need not be here repeated. Her efforts along these lines persisted until the very moment of the beginning of hostilities.

The inauguration of President Lincoln and his Executive order calling for troops to invade the South shook Virginia. The country was already at war when Virginia seceded. It was no longer a question af whether the State should go to war; it was simply a question of deciding with whom she would war.

On the 17th of April the secession convention passed an ordinance of secession subject to popular approval. Volunteers were summoned into the State service, and upon the 18th they descended upon the Harpers Ferry arsenal and captured arms, ammunition, and machinery.

Already the long shadow of Robert E. Lee was discernible. This gentleman shared the views of the Virginians of that day that every honorable effort should be made to avoid war. He was a colonel in the Regular Army. He had established a most creditable and distinguished record in the service.

Lee did not know for sure that Virginia had seceded until the morning of April 19, when he went into Alexandria on business and there read the news he had hoped he would never see: "Virginia had seceded." To his mind that meant the wreck of the Nation, the beginning of sorrows, the opening of a war that was certain to be long and full of horrors.

When other hopes had failed before this time, Lee told himself that secession could not become an accomplished fact until the voters of Virginia had passed on the ordinance of secession, as they had specifically reserved the right to do, but now Lee's judgment told him that war would not wait on a referendum. Virginia would certainly consider that her safety required the seizure of Federal depots within her borders. The Federal Government, on its part, would certainly take prompt action since the State just across the river from its Capital had left the Union.

As one of the senior field officers in Washington, he might be summoned at any hour to defend Washington by invading Virginia—which he could not do. Duty was plain. Their could be no holding back. The time had come. All the Lees had been Americans, but they had been Virginians first.

Dearly as Lee loved the Union, anxious as he was to see it preserved, he could not bear arms against Virginia, which had seceded and doubtless would join the South. Her action controled his own. He could not wait for the uncertain vote of the people when war was upon him. So after midnight on the 19th he sat down and wrote this letter, not more than 15 hours after he had received positive information that Virginia had joined the ranks of the seceded States:

ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA
(WASHINGTON CITY P.O.),
20 April 1861.

Hon. SIMON CAMERON,
Secty of War.

SIR: I have the honor to tender the resignation of my commission as Colonel of the 1st Regt. of Cavalry.

Very respty your obt servt,

R. E. LEE,
Col. 1st Cavly.

Lee sent in his resignation to General Scott on the 20th. In it he said: "Save in defense of my native State, I never desire again to draw my sword." That same day he received a communication from Judge John Robertson requesting in interview. It was set for the 21st. On the evening of the 21st a messenger arrived at Arlington mansion with a letter from Robertson. He apologized for his delay and—this was the important item—invited Lee, in the name of the Governor, to repair to Richmond for conference with the chief executive.

Lee realized, of course, that this meant participation in the defense of Virginia, but he did not hesitate a moment. In a few words he notified the Governor's representative that he would join him in Alexandria the next day in time to take the train for Richmond.

Dressed in civilian clothes and silk hat, Robert E. Lee departed from Arlington on the morning of April 22, never again to enter its friendly portals. If he heard a tall clock chime as he left the mansion door of his beloved Arlington, it was but to strike the beginning of his hour of growing greatness and glory.

No one knew better than Robert E. Lee, the trained soldier and the veteran of Mexico, the agonies that war would bring, although it is to be hoped that he was spared the prescience to know of the sorrows that would like sea billows roll during those 8 April days, as he passed along the road leading from Petersburg to Appomattox.

He was a man of simplicity and of superb dignity. He rode on before the crowd to the Spottswood Hotel at Eighth and Main Streets. A few hours later he was in conference with the Governor, who informed him that the general assembly had authorized the appointment of a commander of the military and naval forces of Virginia with the rank of major general.

The appointment was proffered, and that very night the convention unanimously approved the choice in an historic display of good commonsense. That night Lee carried to his hotel the heaviest burden borne by any man since George Washington, and next day he went to work at a simple office on Main Street—without so much as a clerk to help him.

On that same day 100 years ago and just before the noon hour struck, Lee climbed the hill leading to the Capitol. He was escorted by a committee from the convention and walked between the massive columns of the south portico of the Capitol to the old hall of the House of Delegates. Along the way he paused in the rotunda of the Capitol and gazed momentarily at Houdon's famous marble statue of Washington.

A few minutes later the doors opened and Lee stepped forward on to the convention floor, amid a hush of silence, before a multitude of admiring eyes. His father and other ancestors had been there many times before him.

The convention rose ecstatically to its feet. An escort by his side spoke out: "Mr. President, I have the honor to present to you and to the convention Major General Lee."

The members sat down. In measured tone, the chairman addressed the general at considerable length, formally apprising him of the actions of the convention. Faith and confidence were expressed in him as seldom they are in any individual in this doubting world. He was handed a scroll of faith and a commission of honor so demanding that it was obvious he would be expected to respond.

What he said was this: "Mr. President and gentleman of the convention:

"Profoundly impressed with the solemnity of the occasion, for which I must say I was not prepared, I accept the position assigned me by your partiality. I would have much preferred had your choice fallen on an abler man. Trusting in Almighty God, an approving conscience, and the aid of my fellow citizens, I devote myself to the service of my native State, in whose behalf alone will I ever again draw my sword."

We are here today to relive those precious memories of a century ago. We are here today because, thank God, we are not unmindful of the unexcelled heroism and valor of the men and women of the South on and off the battlefield. We cannot forget the sacrifices of our forefathers. We do not want to forget them. We shall prize and appreciate them as long as patriotism and love of country linger in the human breast. We must not fail to remember that history is prolog, that as the great Virginia patriot, Patrick Henry, said, we have no way of judging the future but by the past. The Civil War was an object lesson to us, a tragic reminder of the horrendous results which occur when men are driven to employ force as a means of solving their problems. We must look upon our tests today with the same spirit of sacrifice shown by our forefathers a century ago.

Today we hear of depressions and recessions. What we had in the South after the close of the Civil War was devastation. A mere depression or recession would have looked like a high form of relief. Hundreds of thousands of our men were killed or wounded, or otherwise incapacitated. Our manpower was thus depleted. Our homes, our cities, and our towns were in ashes. Our lands lay in waste, and our fields were impoverished. Our livestock was consumed or carried away. We were without tools and instruments with which to labor.

Our money was valueless. Our smokehouses were empty. Little children were starving. Vituperation and malediction laid like a pall over all the land. All that we had left and that was much, was the character of our people and the marrow in their bones. They did not subscribe to the something for nothing doctrine, so familiar to us today. They knew that worthy achievement comes only from service and sacrifice.

Without complaint, the returning Confederate soldier began to lay the foundations of a new order and a new civilization. Although Virginia lay prostrate and had been swept by a besom of desolation and destruction, the fields which ran red with the blood of our people in the spring were ripe with a teeming harvest in the fall.

They had no government to which to look, save the whim of martial tyrants. There was no Marshall plan. There were no Federal lending agencies, no Government relief programs, no veterans' benefits. The only Federal agency operating in the South was the Freedmen's Bureau, a rapacious corps of human vultures, with an eye on property that might be picked up at a fraction of its true value, or for no price at all. Though these facts and others not here related are to be deprecated, these statements are made in no tone of bitterness, for there were many in the North who wanted it otherwise, but who were powerless to mollify the wrath of the radicals. The situation presents a contrast in study between the attitude of the American Government toward its defeaed enemies of World War II and the attitude of the same Government toward defeated fellow Americans after the Civil War.

But it was from these ruins that Virginia and the other Southern States, without assistance, have grown to greatness. Today the eyes of the Nation and of the world are turning toward the South, which now definitely become economic opportunity No. 1. In the last decade the white population of the South rose by 22 percent. Factory employment jumped 31 percent, more than four times as fast as in other States. Cars and trucks, a sign of wealth and industry, increased by 68 percent, while the rest of the United States had a gain of only 47 percent. Personal income in the South increased 50 percent during the last 10 years, whereas the income in other States advanced by only 49 percent. The Virginia figures taken alone present even a better picture. This economic development and improvement has done much to enhance the cultural, educational, and civic status of our people.

We are not refighting the Civil War; we are restudying it. We hope to engage in this worthy endeavor with eyes undimmed by emotion and minds unclouded by prejudice or by passion. We hope to derive from this study inspiration left by the heroic men and women of the past, to bind ourselves in an undestructible unity through understanding of one another, and by so doing to form a united country that can face with confidence the constantly arising problems created by the new scientific and rapidly developing world. We are here today because we want to rededicate ourselves to the fundamental principles of liberty and freedom. We are doing so in order that we may show a devotion to the sound doctrines of government that safely guided the destinies of the Nation throughout its long and glorious history.

Many of the problems with which we are now confronted could easily be solved if only the country had leadership of the type provided the people of the South by Robert E. Lee during the tragic era that followed the war. The people of that generation would have frowned upon the faithless and perfidious promises so characteristic of some of the leaders of the present generation. They would have scorned men who promise one thing today and do another tomorrow. They would have looked with disdain upon the wastrels and squanderers who are as careless with our rights as with our money, and who swarm like locusts around our Nation's capital, and who consistently advocate spending more each year until the country is hanging on the cliff of financial irresponsibility.

If we could revive that spirit of patriotism, of self-reliance, of self-denial which existed during the days of the Civil War and the years that followed, we could restore fiscal sanity and sound government, and speedily discharge the national debt.

What is it that we want to gain from the Civil War and the great men like Robert E. Lee who participated in it? We want to gain freedom for ourselves and for our children from the harsh restrictions of a central government which have been needlessly and recklessly imposed. We need to gain self-reliance and to indulge in the practice of self-denial, the outstanding and inspiring examples, which Lee gave to his followers in the South during the terrible years of reconstruction.

After the war, Lee was the uncrowned leader of his people. He was disfranchised. He held no office, no commisison. His strength lay in his character, his faith and courage, the confidence of the South and the hope for his people that still lingered in his Christian heart. He consistently refused offers of worldly gain and preferred instead to share the miseries of his people. Like the gentleman and patriot he was, he clung to Virginia in her fallen fortunes. The life he lived is worthy of emulation on the part of us all.

In addition to the fact that he ranks among the foremost soldiers of all ages and all nations, he possessed remarkable private virtues. His life taught the futility of vain regret; that human virtue is superior to human calamity.

He was the champion of reason rather than passion. He pleaded for silence and patience as the true antidote to excitement and passion. He knew that hate could thrive only on ignorance. If there was an attempt to besmirch his name, he covered it with a cloak of charity.

He exemplified in the highest degree the virtues of modesty and simplicity and was always sustained by the strength of his religious faith.

Notoriety and applause were not only distasteful but even painful to him.

In every relation of life, he set the example of a devoutly religious man. It has been said that "he was as devout as Stonewall Jackson, with an added note of sweetness and light."

No man in all American history has had such a profound influence and control over the hearts and minds of man as did Lee during the harsh and trying years of reconstruction.

The illustrious historian, Dr. Freeman, in the last chapter of the last volume of his matchless "R. E. Lee," describes the tour Lee took through parts of the South in 1870 just before his passing. Throngs came out at every point causing him embarrassment over the profuse attention heaped upon him. At one of such stops, a tall, 13-year-old boy was seen to maneuver himself quietly through the crowds until at least he gained a place by the side of the great southern chieftain where he could look into his noble countenance. The name of that 13-year-old boy was Woodrow Wilson.

In conclusion, if there is one incident in the life of Robert E. Lee that should be selected to serve as a message to the young southerners and to succeeding generations whose parents stood in hushed awe with heads bowed at every hearthstone on that bleak day in October 1870, when his blameless life ebbed out, it was one that occurred on his last trip to northern Virginia, which he loved so dearly. So great was the admiration of the people for the southern leader that he was almost deified. A young mother handed her babe over to the arms of the great general and asked him to bless the child. He took the child before he realized the nature of the request, and then with some embarrassment, he returned it to the mother's arms with these words which come ringing down to us through the centuries past: "Teach him to deny himself. That is all."

Speaking for Thousands of Jobless

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I have on numerous occasions addressed the

House of Representatives in an effort to call attention to the severe economic conditions that have visited with our domestic textile industry as a consequence of free-flowing textile imports. I have, at the same time, introduced several pieces of legislation which are designed to effect a correction in this deplorable condition.

I am not alone in my concern. The tide of protests against too-liberal textile imports swells with each passing day, from whence I hope will come a wave of reason that will sweep the perplexing problem of textile imports from our American shores.

In this regard I enclose a pertinent article from the April 21 issue of the Bangor Daily News, a prominent Maine publication:

SPEAKING FOR THOUSANDS OF JOBLESS

The American textile industry finally got a hearing before Congress this week, and it presented strong arguments for stricter import quotas. Spokesmen for the industry in Maine and other textile regions showed that foreign competition is throwing thousands of men and women out of work and threatening the entire U.S. industry.

There was only one sour note. This came from the Committee for National Trade Policy which charged that "the injurious effect of textile imports has been exaggerated."

We invite members of the committee to visit Maine and talk with the 10,000 workers who have lost textile jobs in recent years. They also should look at the closed plants and mills, and those operating at a reduced pace because they can't sell their goods in competition with those produced by cheap foreign labor. They would find the same story in the textile States of the South.

Finally, they should listen to J. M. Cheatham, past president of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, who says the present trend imperils the U.S. textile industry and the jobs of 2 million workers.

Under present conditions, the American industry is operating under an unfair handicap. Wages of textile laborers in foreign countries runs as low as 10 percent of U.S. wages. Foreign manufacturers have the latest in equipment and technological know-how, thanks to a large degree to U.S. post-war aid. The setup is such that foreign firms can purchase U.S. cotton at 8 cents per pound less than American firms. The U.S. Government itself is responsible to a large extent for putting the U.S. industry at a disadvantage.

Now that southern Members of Congress have added their protests to those of Maine and other New England States, perhaps something will be done about a long overdue restriction on textile imports.

GSA and Customs Service Propose Hindrance to Development of Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach currently represent a capital investment of some $280 million. However, by 1970 the port of Long Beach alone will represent an investment of $300 million, and Los Angeles Harbor plans similar expansion. Yet, the General Services Administration has proposed that harbor development be held back by the dead hand of the past. It has proposed to institutionalize a 22-mile mistake at unnecessary cost to the Federal taxpayer by building multimillion-dollar customs headquarters into a new Federal office building in the traffic-choked, landlocked Los Angeles Civic Center.

Originally, customs headquarters were placed in central Los Angeles, 22 miles away from the harbor, because the two manmade harbors were then little more than mudflats and lacked many of the facilities necessary to commerce.

This is no longer true. The harbor area communities now number more than 1½ million residents. The harbor area is the hub between the two metropolitan areas of Los Angeles to the north and fast-growing Orange County to the east and south. All banking and commercial facilities necessary for foreign trade exist in the port cities.

No other harbor in the United States has its customshouse 22 miles away. Most are within a few blocks of the harbor. Construction of this absentee customhouse has been protested by port officials at both harbors, by shippers, by customs brokers, by Los Angeles County officials, by importers, and by a resolution unanimously passed by the California State Assembly.

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I request that the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

CARTHAGE, N.Y., *March 29, 1961.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I wish to extend you my encouragement and support for your sponsorship of House Resolution 211 which proposes the establishment of a Special House Committee for the Captive Nations. As a student of international affairs, I believe such a committee would be a sound weapon to employ against Russian suppression of these eastern European and central Asiatic peoples.

Although the censorship of the Iron Curtain keeps us unaware of the happenings in these countries, the infrequent news we do receive from them, such as the recent church-state conflict in Poland, gives us good reason to believe that the United States can do much to aid the cause of freedom in this area. The proposed committee would become a strong tool for fulfilling our and President Kennedy's hopes for the captive nations. As he has stated them: "Our best hope, and theirs, is rather in having more nations follow the example of Poland, Yugoslavia, and Finland in moving gradually, if cautiously, away from total Soviet political domination and in seeking greater economic independence as well. We can, however, help by offering the best possible concrete alternatives, by being prepared to take advantage of every opening to establish better relations with the West, by having ready various forms of economic aid to lessen their dependence upon the U.S.S.R. or China."

Respectfully,
DAVID C. SWARTZENTRUBER.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS
COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, INC.,
Bismarck, N. Dak., March 29, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Congressman, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: It gives us real pleasure to be able to note with pride and satisfaction in our newspapers that you have introduced a resolution in the U.S. House of Representatives, calling for establishment of a Permanent Captive Nations Committee.

Therefore, in behalf of our Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, State branch of North Dakota, and 25,000 Americans of Ukrainian descent living in this great State of ours, I wish to compliment you for your initiative and wholeheartedly congratulate you for your patriotism and farsighted move in introducing this resolution.

Such a committee is long overdue and your trailblazing courage manifested in the introduction of this resolution will do much toward exposing to the people of our country and to the whole free world, that the rule of Russian Communist tyranny in Moscow is a constant threat to freedom everywhere.

A committee on the captive nations would serve many good purposes. First of all this Committee would give moral support and courage to all forces which are fighting Communist enslavement. Also, the Committee would be able to collect true information and data on the various nations in the U.S.S.R., which later could be made available to our Government. The enslavement of the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R.

constitutes the veritable Achilles' heel of the Russian-Communist empire, and the constant and ceaseless aspirations to freedom and independence of these nations are a great deterrent to Russian aggression and expansion. This Committee should also pass information to the American people and to the free world that the U.S.S.R. is not one nation but a conglomerate of many various nations. And, therefore, a Committee of Captive Nations should assist our Government in formulating its policy with respect to the captive nations.

The present state of affairs in the world shows that the struggle between the Communist world and the free world is entering a critical phase. The constantly increasing threat of Russian Communist imperialism with the universally known objective of world domination, indicates the urgent necessity of more effective and dynamic policies with respect to the captive nations enumerated in Public Law 86–90, and initiative on the part of the free world, especially by the United States of America.

Our organization wishes to assure you, that we fully agree with the arguments and conclusions of your resolution and deem it a privilege to aline all our forces in support of it.

Therefore you will no doubt be pleased to hear that we are making a direct appeal to both of our Congressmen of North Dakota, to the Honorable DON L. SHORT and the Honorable HJALMER NYGAARD, asking them to support your resolution.

Respectfully yours,

DR. ANTHONY ZUKOWSKY,
President, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., State Branch of North Dakota.

RAVARINO & FRESCHI, INC.,
St. Louis, Mo.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: Congratulations on your submission of the House Resolution 211 for a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. It is gratifying to realize that this vitally important area may be given the attention which it necessitates.

A special committee such as this should make worthwhile advances in exposing the pseudobloc of Soviet Communists for what they really are. Unless we expect to fight the entire cold war ourselves, Soviet propaganda must be countered and a nationalism stirred in the captive nations.

If the people in these nations can be assisted peacefully to a strong enough resentment of Russian communism, desire for freedom, and hope of deliverance; Russia will be attacked in one of her most vulnerable spots.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. FRESCHI, Jr.

WALLINGFORD, CONN., *April 5, 1961.*

DEAR MR. FLOOD: Having read your present bill before the House Rules Committee, House Resolution No. 211 for the creation of a House Captive Nations Committee, I would like to express my full support.

It is only by taking a definite attitude toward the Communist-enslaved nations that our country can hope to be victor in the cold war. Moreover, there is a moral obligation for our country not to ignore these nations which have been deprived of their freedom. House Resolution No. 211 is a must, if liberty is to be preserved and tyranny overthrown.

Respectfully yours,

DANIEL F. ULBRICH.

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN UKRAINIANS,
New York, N.Y., March 29, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD
House Office Building
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Our organization, long active in helping Ukrainian immigrants to this great country to accustom to the new conditions in reliance on their own forces, is very happy to learn of your sponsorship of the resolution for the establishment of a Permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

We are writing our Congressman from the city of New York, the Honorable LEONARD FARBSTEIN, asking him to aid you in your resolution.

Faithfully yours,

ALEXANDER GLADYSHOVSKY,
Secretary.

BROOKLYN, N.Y., *April 9, 1961.*

Hon. DANIEL FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to congratulate you on the bill that you presented to Congress. Your House Resolution 211 is the best action that a Member of Congress has taken in a long time regarding the subjugated nations of the world.

I certainly do hope that this bill will go into effect, as it is desperately needed for both our sake and for the sake of the subjugated nations as well.

Once again congratulating you, and also thanking you for your interest in the Russian dominated nations and peoples, I remain,

Very truly yours,

MARGARET TODARO.

MARCH 25, 1961.

Congressman DANIEL FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It is encouraging to read that men like you realize the great potential of future allies in the captive nations such as Ukraine, Armenia, and so on, in the most cruel colonial empire in the world, the U.S.S.R.

I hope you continue to work to establish a congressional committee of the enslaved nations. We who love America and freedom are behind you.

God love you,

Mr. and Mrs. FRED BLEECH.

WARREN, PA.

BAYSIDE, N.Y., *April 4, 1961.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am very glad that something is planning to be done for the captive nations in addition to naming a week for them.

It is our duty as Americans to help subjugated nations regain their freedoms and to free them from the bonds of Russia.

Therefore, I am in favor of your House Resolution 211, which will establish a Committee for Captive Nations. I sincerely hope that the bill will pass through Congress for our sake in trying to maintain world freedom and peace and for the sake of the subgugated nations themselves.

Yours very truly,

WALTER J. HESS.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE
OF AMERICA, INC.,
Syracuse, N. Y., March 28, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: The Syracuse Branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America is very grateful to you for introducing the resolution asking for the establishment of a Permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

We consider that such a Committee on Captive Nations will be very helpful in informing the free world on conditions behind the Iron Curtain and in supplying our Government with all the information necessary to formulate its policies regarding the nations occupied by Soviet Russia.

At the same time we are petitioning Mr. RIEHLMAN, our Congressman, to support your resolution.

Respectfully yours,

MYRON SYDOROWYCH,
Chairman.

IWAN ROMANIUK,
Secretary.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FLOOD: I have lately read a copy of House Resolution 211 and do hereby give my full support to the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations. In these precarious times a committee of this sort would expose to the world the ruthlessness and hypocrisy of the Communist way of life. This committee will give the free world a chance to take the offensive after the United States and her allies for so many years have been on the defensive. You have my support, Mr. FLOOD and I hope to get my Congressman, my friends, and my neighbors to back the formation of this much-needed committee.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES L. SCHWAB.

QUEENS CHAPEL, R.I.

Revised Gettysburg Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CATHERINE MAY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the month of April, as all Americans well know, is income tax reporting month, and inasmuch as the President has recently sent to the Congress his income tax program, I feel it is apropos to insert under unanimous consent, the following reprint from the March 30, 1961, issue of the Othello (Wash.) Outlook in the RECORD. While very few taxpayers chuckle while filling out their tax reporting forms, the following may have the effect of lightening our feelings on the matter:

REVISED GETTYSBURG ADDRESS

One score and sixteen years ago our fathers brought forth upon this Nation a new tax, conceived in desperation and dedication to the proposition that all men are fair game.

Now we are engaged in a great mass of calculations, testing whether that taxpayer or any taxpayer so confused and so impoverished can long endure. We are met on Form 1040. We have come to dedicate a large portion of our income to a final resting place with those men who here spent theirs that they may spend our money.

It is altogether anguish and torture that we should do this. But in the legal sense we cannot evade—we cannot cheat—we cannot underestimate this tax. The collectors, clever and shy, who computed here have

gone far beyond our power to add or subtract.

Our creditors will little note nor long remember that we pay here, but the Bureau of Internal Revenue can never forget what we report here. It is for us, the taxpayers, rather to be devoted here to the tax return which the Government has thus far so nobly spent.

It is rather for us to be dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these vanishing dollars we take increased devotion to the few remaining; that we highly resolve that next year will not find us in a higher income tax bracket.

That this taxpayer, underpaid, shall figure out more deductions; and that taxation of the people, by the Congress, for the Government shall not cause solvency to perish.

Mandan, N. Dak., Opposes Rail Merger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, the Board of City Commissioners of the City of Mandan, N. Dak., have unanimously adopted a resolution opposing the pending application of the Great Northern, Northern Pacific, Burlington & Seattle, Portland & Spokane Railroads to merge into a gigantic single railroad of unprecedented size and economic power.

This resolution sets forth clearly the reasons why the city commissioners of Mandan are concerned about this development, and therefore, at the request of the commissioners, under unanimous consent I insert the full text of this resolution in the RECORD, together with these explanatory remarks:

Whereas the Northern Pacific Railway Co., the Great Northern Railway Co., the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railway Co., and the Seattle, Portland & Spokane Railway Co., are proposing to merge into a single company; and

Whereas such proposed merger would create a monopoly in transcontinental railroad service; and

Whereas such railroad companies now serve competing areas in this State and do not in any manner extend the services of either or any of them into new territories not already covered by extending its lines beyond the service areas in which they presently operate; and

Whereas the proposed merger would sharply reduce services and facilities in practically the southern half of this State; and

Whereas the proposed merger will result in loss of job opportunities, destroy property values, and seriously affect the economy of this area of the State, including the city of Mandan; and

Whereas the companies proposing to merge are in excellent financial shape and there is no economic justification for such mergers; and

Whereas the Northern Pacific Railway Co. was given public lands upon which to construct its railroad and was given many privileges not otherwise enjoyed by other industries, all of which make it imperative that it continue to provide good, competitive railroad service for this area of the State; and

Whereas the proposed merger would seriously impair the taxing abilities of the State and the various political subdivisions of this State and would jeopardize the continued operation of schools and other governmental units in this area, as well as seriously affect the entire economy of this area; and

Whereas the city of Mandan, in the county of Morton, and State of North Dakota, a municipal corporation, does not consider such merger to be in its best interest or in the best interest of its people or the people of this county and State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of City Commissioners of the City of Mondan, N. Dak., as follows:

1. That the city of Mandan opposes the proposed merger and submits that it is not in the best interest of this Nation, State, or city and that such merger would seriously impair the economic and social growth of this city and others and that, therefore, it is urged that the Interstate Commerce Commission disapprove such proposed merger and that the city of Mandan further urges the officers and shareholders of such companies from further pursuing any further effort to accomplish such merger.

2. That the city auditor is hereby authorized and directed to forward a certified copy of this resolution to the U.S. Senators and Representatives of this State; the Governor of the State of North Dakota; the members of the Interstate Commerce Commission; the Public Service Commission of the State of North Dakota; and the presidents of such railroad companies.

By order of the Board of City Commissioners of the City of Mandan, N. Dak.

JOHN HANDTMANN,
President.

Attest:

ARNOLD T. LIVDAHL,
City Auditor.

I, Arnold T. Livdahl, being the duly appointed, qualified, and acting city auditor in and for the city of Mandan, N. Dak., do hereby certify that the annexed resolution is a full, true, and correct copy and transcript of a resolution duly passed by the Board of City Commissioners of the City of Mandan at a regular meeting held at the city hall in said city of Mandan, N. Dak., on the 30th day of January 1961.

I further certify that such resolution was passed by a unanimous vote of all the members of the board of city commissioners and that said resolution was then spread upon the minutes of said meeting.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto placed my hand and the seal of the city of Mandan, N. Dak., on this 7th day of February 1961.

ARNOLD T. LIVDAHL,
City Auditor, City of Mandan, N. Dak.

Problems of the Domestic Textile Industry

SPEECH
OF
HON. ABNER W. SIBAL
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, numerous studies of the problems currently besetting the American textile industry have been made. All of them point out the fact that the time is now at hand for urgent action by the proper agencies of Government.

This industry, with the closely related apparel industry, employs more than 9 million persons in the United States. In wages and purchases, it pumps billions of dollars of revenue into our economy. In recent years, however, this industry has come under attack at home and abroad from the low-wage areas of the world.

American producers are unable to meet the competition of low wages and long hours from oriental countries. Under these conditions we face the loss of this essential industry. American workers and their employers do not ask for a protective shield behind which they can hide from the realities of world commerce. But they do ask and are entitled to have market conditions of fair competition. I am convinced that, given this, American ingenuity and resourcefulness can meet competition from anywhere in the world.

I am concerned that we, who are in a position to act, do not stand aside and in effect underwrite the ruin of thousands and thousands of jobs.

I urge most strongly that the Government establish country-by-country quotas for each commodity as recommended by the Senate subcommittee report "Problems of the Domestic Textile Industry."

Commemoration, Scholarly Effort, and Women of the Civil War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, during the Assembly of the Civil War Centennial Commission at Charleston, S.C., April 10 to 12, I had the distinct honor of being one of the speakers on the fine program which was presented there.

Since that occasion, I have had several requests to make my remarks public. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the speech I made at the assembly in the Appendix of the RECORD:

COMMEMORATION, SCHOLARLY EFFORT, AND WOMEN OF THE CIVIL WAR

(By Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL)

I bring you greetings from your own Capital in the District of Columbia—the finest and greatest capital in the world. There are many reasons for this and not the least of which is the fact that our Capitol Building is more of a symbol of freedom and hope for mankind everywhere than any other capital in the world.

Students of history and of our heritage know, also, that this is so because this Capital is the place where more moving and meaningful history has been made by reaping benefits for its people and for all people than any place else in the world.

Nehru, in his simple eloquence, told us in a joint session of Congress, 1949, I quote, "During the last 2 days, I have paid visits to the memorials of the great builders of this Nation—I have done so because they have long been enshrined in my heart and their example has inspired me as it has inspired innumerable countrymen of mine. These memorials are the real temples to which each generation must pay tribute and

in doing so catch something of the fire that burnt in the hearts of those who were the torchbearers of freedom not only for this country but for the world. For those who are truly great have a message that cannot be confined within the particular country but is for all the world."

This is a fine admonition and reminds us of our own heritage. It tells us that much can be learned from our own history. Certainly it suggests, too, what can come from a study of our own Civil War period with a proper and adequate commemoration of significant events of that period.

On the north and south entrances of the Archives Building in Washington are some interesting inscriptions. One of them reads, "What is past is prologue." This is true.

Another reads, "Study history." This is good advice.

On the south side one reads, "Eternal vigilence is the price of liberty." A necessary reminder.

On the other side of that entrance it reads, "The heritage of the past is the seed that brings forth the harvest of the future." This suggests that we revive and relive history.

We need to note these admonitions. I believe that is what we are doing in this commemoration. Let us do it well.

It is hoped that the National Commission can give adequate leadership and inspire, encourage, move, and use the best talents available everywhere. We need to do this in such a way as to assure that all of us on the National Commission and you and the organization you represent will carry out to the fullest the intent of the authors of this idea to commemorate that tragic but significant experience of 100 years ago. Some are suggesting this is a time for celebration. I feel that this is not a time for celebration; but it is a time for commemoration.

The Civil War Centennial Commission, headed by Gen. U. S. Grant III, the grandson of a great general and President, who himself is great, decided at the Commission's first meeting that the Civil War is something for us to commemorate and not to celebrate.

Further, I am sure historians everywhere agree this 4-year nationwide centennial of the Civil War emphatically should not be a celebration.

In my opinion, the events of 100 years ago are far too important to be debased by a carnival spirit or by a string of useless holidays. Just as those events were of supreme importance to our Nation then, so today they deserve to be properly commemorated by us.

But some people ask, What is it that we are commemorating? Sincere and earnest people sometimes ask: Why focus on a bloody war, on an era of bitterness? This is a fair question that deserves a fair answer.

One thing is certain: Those of us who serve on the Federal Civil War Centennial Commission have no thought of reviving the sadness, the anguish, the bitterness of 100 years ago, or of romanticizing a bygone era. The centennial is not a retreat to a shadowy, unreality of the past.

For all of us, and especially we who like to think of ourselves as historians and who, like myself, like to be with historians and for various reasons have a special interest in this, the most tragic experience of our heritage, are certain, too, that we need to read, study, pause, think, and reflect on our interesting and meaningful past so that we can learn again from the lives and lessons of our history.

This will lead us to testimonials, conclusions and ideas that went into the establishment of this great idea we call American. It will help us understand the problems of the struggling nations of the present in other parts of the world and it can be of immeasurable benefit to us as we seek to help ourselves by helping them with their problems in this difficult time.

If individually and collectively we do this well and thoroughly we will learn again to feel the spirit that carried the people we call our forefathers through grave difficulties in their search and fight for the right.

As we think of the millions who gave the last full measure, and we will be reminded of this often, we should remind ourselves of a thought expressed at Gettysburg 2 years ago by America's most beloved poet, historian, and private citizen—Carl Sandburg. I quote:

"We have heard that the dead hold in their clenched hands only that which they have given away. When men forget, if they ever knew, what is at the heart of that sentiment, and it is terribly sentimental, they are in danger of power being taken over by fantastic fools or beasts of prey or men hollow with echoes and vanities."

A proper commemoration can effectively bring this noble thought to mind in many ways. A celebration can talk about it but commemoration can make us feel this moving truth. We need very much right now to make people note the drama and feel more of our history.

We, the leaders of the free world, indeed lovers of liberty everywhere, need to reflect on and to understand the import of what a son of a Confederate veteran, a present day American statesman, said recently in Washington. The occasion was the reenactment of the first inauguration of Abraham Lincoln. SAM RAYBURN spoke during the introduction of that program and said:

"Prejudice, hate, agitation brought about the Civil War. I have always thought if it had not been for hotheads in the South and the inane and insane agitators of the North that Abraham Lincoln, by his justice, his fairness, his great statesmanship, would have prevented the Civil War which destroyed the flower of our young manhood in this country that at that time was so sorely needed.

"As a son of a Confederate soldier, who did what he thought was right, I say for him and for myself after that was over, he was proud that our great Union was preserved.

"The saddest thing that ever happened to the border States and the Southland was for an insane man to assassinate Lincoln. Lincoln was strong enough in the hearts and minds of the people in the North that he could have prevented, and would have prevented, some terrible things happening in some parts of our beloved country. But North, South, East, and West, we are proud indeed."

I say, Yes, we are happy and proud of our Nation and of the hope that it holds for better things for us and for the world. Commemorations like that reenactment attended by over 20,000 people and seen, heard, and read by many millions more is a moving experience that solemnizes and lauds the worthwhile things that need to be noted and forever remembered by us and by the world. Like an ancient psalmist, Lincoln reminds us: "We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies."

We will find from commemoration how necessary it is for all of us and not just part of us "to be eternally vigilant" and have deep convictions about the eternal verities of freedom. History tells us that in giving freedom to people we assure freedom for ourselves. In this way we were honored for what we gave and in giving we assured more security to ourselves. From those who fought and gave the last full measure in the battle 100 years ago we can learn from their example that death is not the worst of life, that defeat is not the worst of failure but that not to have tried to do our best at all times is real failure. Let us note that in their relentless trying to preserve this Union for us and forever they achieved one of the great successes in all recorded time.

Importantly and uppermost in our minds, too, must be the idea that the centennial should be a time of reflection for us. Reflection can be the beginning of wisdom. So let us learn as well as remember. Let the Centennial be the occasion for serious study of the war in all its complex phases—not only its technical aspects but its deeper meaning for us today.

To me, its deeper meaning is what it gave us as a Nation. Bitter, bloody, and tragic though it was, it yet made possible our unity today—a unity at once indivisible and marvelous—one that is not static but adaptable—a unity that gives cohesion and at the same time accommodates a vigorous diversity. To me this is the unity of a matured people who can remember the past while seeing the future. This is the unity that demands that we be the leader of the free world.

So, let us study this great chapter in our past and appropriate its wisdom and its heritage to today's problems. It is, after all, a heritage that comes to us from the men and women of both North and South, and one that all Americans proudly honor and cherish; people who possessed the cardinal virtues of true greatness: courage, wisdom, and goodness.

Goodness to love the right, wisdom to know the right, courage to do the right.

What can we do to assist the serious study of the Civil War? Well, we can search for documents, letters, diaries, photographs and newspapers of the period and then deposit these in our State libraries or historical societies. You are saying to yourselves, this is repetition, and I say, yes it is but this needs repeating often all across the United States.

We can establish scholarships and fellowships devoted to special studies by students in every age group where we now teach history and, in the institutions of higher learning, encourage real scholarly efforts in areas that have not been thoroughly researched and written about. Here it must be noted that it has already begun. The press, radio, and TV have started and already made some fine contributions. Catton, Nevins, Wiley are doing a great job but we don't have enough of them.

We can encourage our legislatures to appropriate funds that will enable our State archives departments to arrange, index and microfilm their documents bearing on the war. I was able to help some in Iowa recently, I am sure, by pointing out that the $40,000 that the commission was asking for this year, compared to the $225,000 that they approved for monuments at Vicksburg in the late 1800's when Iowa had less than one-eighth the population they now have, is pretty insignificant by comparison.

These are a few of the things all of us can do to help assure that the centennial will yield enduring contributions as well as bad oratory.

WOMEN OF THE CIVIL WAR

Then there is one vast and important area of the Civil War study that I hope will be undertaken which relates to the role of the women in that conflict. With the exception of the noble work done by Florence Nightengale, women never had anything to do in an organized way in a war before. In this war they were real heroines even though very little credit is given to them in the publications, books, and periodicals of this time.

Lincoln once said: "I am not accustomed to the use of language of eulogy. I have never studied the art of paying compliments to women; but I must say, that if all that has been said by orators and poets since the creation of the world in praise of women were applied to the women of America, it would not do them justice for their conduct during this war. I will close by saying, God bless the women of America."

Judging from the record we can say that Lincoln knew the value of the women's efforts during the war. But, it is very evident that students of that time and since didn't value or appreciate it.

To prove the neglect in this area, I offer, as exhibit A, Mark M. Boatner III's book "The Civil War Dictionary," as evidence to prove my point.

I preface my remarks by saying to you, first of all, that this book is a fine, complete, authoritative dictionary of the Civil War and ought to be available to all serious students and writers. What I have to say is not critical of the book, but rather, critical of the meager written record we have made of and for the women.

The flyleaf of the cover of this book proudly points to the 2,000 succinct biographical sketches in the book. I have recently read it and find that out of the 2,000 sketches, only 35 are about women. Much more evidence akin to this could be presented to prove my point.

May I just underscore this evidence by pointing out that there was a woman from Iowa who started that sanitary commission work there, and who, before the war ended, became one of the best known personalities of the war period. She was the first person in the whole United States to be officially assigned to a commission created by a legislature. She carried forward her responsibilities on the sanitation commission nobly.

She became concerned about the lack of proper diets for soldiers, talked to Stanton, Meigs, and Lincoln about it, and was named head of all the diet kitchens of the hospitals of the North. She was the author of the first book of recipes ever written for any army in history. She saw the great need to take care of orphans and started an orphans asylum association in Iowa in 1864. She talked to Lincoln about that and he endorsed the idea in his second inaugural address. She was a personal friend of many famous people in the District of Columbia, and especially close to the Grants, Julia and U. S.

Grant said she was one of the great heroines, if not the greatest heroine, of the war and, yet, she is not in Boatner's book, and no one except some people in Iowa knows I have been talking about Annie Wittenmyer. You don't know about her because no one ever wrote a good book about her.

And have you ever heard of that wonderful lady who established a home in Springfield, Mo., for orphans of both Confederate and Union veterans? Her name was Mary Whitney Phelps, and she was the wife of Gen. John S. Phelps.

There was another girl, a Richmond resident. She established a hospital on her own after the first battle of Bull Run. Later the Confederate Government took it over, and she was commissioned captain by President Davis, and became the only woman to receive a regular commission in the Confederacy. My, what relief she and her kind brought to thousands. To most of you the name, Sally Tompkins is new, isn't it?

Have you ever heard of Madame Turchin, the immigrant from Russia, symbol of foreign aid, who went with her husband, a colonel in the Union Army, and served as nurse and mother confessor to the regiment. And, once when her husband became ill, she took over and led the regiment into battle with confidence and poise and won the skirmish.

In the books by Ishbell Ross on the lives of Kate Chase, Rose Greenhow, Clara Barton, and Mrs. Jefferson Davis, we find excellent samples of what can be done to reveal the devotion, even though some were by intrigue, and the wholesome and sometimes almost unbelievable and thrilling influence women can have in difficult and challenging times.

In these books she has demonstrated, as others could if they were inspired to study as she has and do the exceptionally skillful job of investigating and fine writing, the spirit of the women. All of this could give us a new insight and a new and different angle from which to view and appreciate the Civil War.

So much more needs to be done for so many other women who have made significant, interesting, and worthwhile contributions in so many ways. People like Elizabeth Waring Duckett of Maryland; just the story of how she got to Lincoln and Stanton and others in behalf of her father and brother who were in prison and was able to get them out.

Then there is the mother of the 1st Tennessee Regiment, Mrs. Betsy Sullivan. We only know about her through searching the records and yet in some ways there was no greater inspiration than any regiment could receive than she furnished by her devotion to the solution of many problems for the average soldier.

The story of the girl who earned the title "The Florence Nightengale of the South," Mrs. Ella Trader, of Arkansas, is a thrilling one, too.

These are just a few examples that suggest areas that need research, study, reviving, and writing about.

A study and review of the life of Mrs. Jeb Stuart could be a very interesting and worthwhile contribution.

Yes, the histories of wars are records of the achievements of men, for the most part: The chroniclers have had to record that women, by their intrigues or their fatal gift of beauty, have been the cause of strifes innumerable; and it is confessed that they have inspired heroism and knightly deeds, but they have had small share in the actual conflicts. It has been their portion to suffer in silence at home, and to mourn the dead. For them it has been to hear of sufferings which they could not alleviate, to grieve or rejoice over results to which they had contributed only sympathy and prayers.

But, it was different in our conflict to save the Union. Other wars have furnished here and there a name which the world delights to repeat in terms of affection or admiration, of some woman who has broken through the rigidity of custom and been conspicuous either among armed men, like the Maid of Saragossa, or in the hospitals, like the heroine of Scutari. But, the Civil War furnished hundreds as intrepid as the one, and as philanthropically devoted as the other. Indeed, we may safely say that there was scarcely a loyal woman in the North or South who did not do something in aid of the cause—who did not contribute, of time, or labor, or money, to the comfort of the soldiers. No town was too remote from the scene of war to have its society of relief; and while the women sewed and knit, and made delicacies for the sick, and gathered stores, little girls, scarcely old enough to know what the charitable labor meant, went from house to house, collecting small sums of money, the fruitful energy of all keeping the storehouses and treasury of the sanitary commissions and comparable organizations full, and pouring a steady stream of beneficence down to the troops in the field.

Everywhere there were humble and unknown laborers. But there were others, fine and adventurous spirits, whom the glowing fire of patriotism urged to more noticeable efforts. There were those who followed their husbands and brothers to the field of battle and who went down into the very edge of the fight, to rescue the wounded, and cheer and comfort the dying with gentle ministrations; who labored in field and city hospitals, and on the dreadful hospital boats, where the severely wounded were received; who penetrated the lines of the enemy on dangerous missions; who organized great charities, and pushed on our sanitary enterprises; who were angels of mercy in a thousand terrible situations.

There are others who have illustrated, by their courage and address in times of danger, by their patience in suffering, and by adventures romantic and daring, some of the best qualities in our nature. Like the soldiers of the armies, they were from every rank in life, and they exhibited a like persistence, endurance, and faith.

There are many hundreds of women whose shining deeds have honored their country and, wherever they are known, the Nation holds them in equal honor with its brave men. But, they are not known.

The story of the war will never be fully or fairly written if the achievements of women in it remain untold. They do not figure in the official reports; they are not gazetted for deeds as gallant as ever were done; the names of thousands are unknown beyond the neighborhood where they live, or the hospitals where they loved to labor; yet there is no feature in the Civil War more creditable to us as a nation, none from its positive newness so well worthy of records of the U.S. Sanitary Commission, U.S. Christian Commission, the various State historical society records, the thousands of references to women's activity found in local publications of the time will make it easy for us to do something in this area that will give the women the credit that is their due.

In assuring this credit we will add to our own heritage and will be building on the gallant spirit of graciousness and tenderness toward women of that time that we know about but which never has been properly recognized in writing.

Now let me summarize very briefly by saying, again, that we must commemorate appropriately, adequately, and as completely as we can. We will do this better if we encourage and engage the very best of our scholarly efforts everywhere. When we do this we will have more, more accurate and more complete, historical literature of this very significant time in our history.

And, I reiterate, we must demonstrate our gallantry toward the gentler sex. This story is a thrilling one and will reflect great credit on the women from both sides of the Mason-Dixon line.

In addition, and in conclusion, it may be worthwhile at this point to suggest also that we can learn much from the lives of all the people, great and small, who served the cause of the people as they understood the demands of their time—for my purpose now I should like to refer to two of them.

One became great and immortal before and during the war and one during and after the war. Both left us needed sublime words and thoughts at the close of the tragedy which point to the goal and call us to the task.

Ninety-six years ago last March 4, one of them, Lincoln, left us words and suggestions about malice, charity, firmness, right and the task before us. Told us what to care for, what we should do, achieve and cherish for ourselves and for all nations.

Soon after that Robert E. Lee, seeking to serve against a united nation, left us some unforgettable words and then an incomparable example of unselfish citizenship.

Bruce Catton, in one of his great books, tells us of it in this way:

"Through the sheets of rain that fell on the morning of April 15, 1865, a Baptist minister living on the outskirts of Richmond caught sight of a man on a gray horse. His steed was bespattered with mud, and his head hung down as if worn by long traveling. The horseman himself sat his horse like a master; his face was ridged with self-respecting grief; his garments were worn in the service and stained with travel * * *." Robert E. Lee had returned at last from the wars.

Lee, a paroled prisoner, was indicted for treason but was never brought to trial; and on July 13 he applied for a Federal pardon, which was never granted. Courageous and resolute in war, Lee was never bitter in defeat. "The war being at an end * * *" he wrote in September 1865, "I believe it to be the duty of every one to unite in the restoration of the country, and the establishment of peace and harmony * * *."

That month he became president of Washington College in Lexington, Va., a position which he held for the 5 remaining years of his life. On the morning of October 12, 1870, the old warrior lay dying. His former opponent, Ulysses S. Grant, was in the White House; but Robert E. Lee was once more on the battlefield. "Strike the tent," he murmured as he died.

I'm loath to close but I must because there are others who also have important observations to make but it cannot be wrong for me to suggest that we, like our forefathers, must strive for a greater, more appropriate and devoted patriotism toward the self-same ideals that they gave to us through sacrifice and preserved for us through sacrifice. I know of no better way to develop this patriotic spirit in the hearts and minds of boys and girls and in the hearts and minds of all our citizens and liberty-loving people everywhere than by reviewing, rewriting, reliving and reviving the great American story and its magnificent struggle for freedom.

Good luck as together we do those things that will give assurance for a greater and finer America for ourselves, forever and for everyone.

Four-Year Term for Members of House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of Saturday, April 22, 1961, which sets forth a point of view with which I am sure many Members of the House concur. As the editorial points out, it is indeed very interesting that a majority of those questioned in a national poll favored a constitutional amendment to extend the term of Members from the present 2 years to 4 years.

The indicated editorial follows:

[From the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader, Apr. 22, 1961]

FOUR-YEAR TERM IN HOUSE

The idea that Members of the House of Representatives ought to be elected for 4-year instead of 2-year terms has long been advocated by many students of the American system of government. The basic argument advanced in favor of such a constitutional amendment is that the longer term would permit Congressmen to devote more of their time to their work and less to getting reelected every 2 years.

That argument, though it is not all that can be said on the subject, is a compelling one. And the proposal appears to be gaining popular favor. In a national poll, 51 percent of those questioned favored a constitutional amendment to make the House term 4 years. Only 34 percent of those questioned were opposed. This is an indication that public sentiment is moving in the right direction—toward giving House Members a 4-year term.

The principal argument against this is that the present 2-year term gives the voters a closer rein on its Representatives in the House. If they do not act in accordance with their constituents' wishes, they can be ousted in 2 years. That is an advantage of sorts.

This advantage is far outweighed, however, by the fact that having to run for reelection every 2 years puts enormous pressure on a Congressman. In a sense, he must run almost continually, and knowing that he can soon be whisked out of office may tempt him to vote for what is popular at the moment rather than on the basis of his honest convictions. Senators are entrusted with office for 6 years at a time. The House term should be increased to at least four.

Army Should Investigate Before Relieving General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include an editorial from the Hopewell News of Thursday, April 20. The editorial points out cogently the different treatment received by conservatives and liberals. It is shocking to see a vital part of the Federal Government discriminating against one of our generals simply because he is a conservative.

I commend the editor of the Hopewell News for bringing this matter to the attention of the public and I urge all of the Members of this body to carefully read the editorial which is as follows:

ARMY SHOULD INVESTIGATE BEFORE RELIEVING GENERAL

We think the Department of the Army made a mistake in relieving Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker of his command of the 24th Division in Germany "pending the outcome of an official investigation."

While the order did not name the John Birch Society by name Army officials acknowledged that the action was taken because of allegations that General Walker had been urging the views of that organization on the troops under his command.

Now the John Birch Society is a perfectly legal organization. It has not been cited for any reason. It has not even been investigated. Furthermore in this country a man is supposed to be held innocent until he is proved guilty.

In this case it is a little hard to know what the general could be proved guilty of. As we understand it the John Birch Society is very conservative. Just when has it become a crime to be a conservative in these United States? Just who abolishes the right of free speech?

We would lay a little bet that if General Walker had been accused of urging the views of some leftist, or pink organization we would never have heard a word about it. There is a large and growing number of so-called liberals, who Life Lines calls the "mistaken," who have been trying hard to make the word "conservative" a dirty word and the airing of conservative views a crime.

WELCH OFF BASE

Now we hold no brief whatsoever for this man Welch who founded the John Birch Society. Apparently he has strong and strange views, but that in itself is still not yet a crime in this country, and we understand that the society itself does not subscribe to the extreme views Mr. Welch has been alleged to hold. In fact, Mr. Welch has denied some of the statements attributed to him.

But, really, it does not matter just what the doctrines of the John Birch Society are, unless they are subversive, no man should be fired from his job and put under pressure, until after the investigation has been held and the full facts are known. All too often officials of our Government have protected leftwingers and pinks from the consequences of their actions and talk, when we thought it was downright subversive.

The main tenet of the John Birch Society, as we understand it, is a strong anti-Communist stand. Perhaps some of its other tenets, such as the abolition of the income tax, do not set well with officials in Washington who want to increase the tax burden on the American people to carry out their ideas of the all-powerful welfare state, but we do not see how they can object to anyone being strongly anti-Communist.

The international Communist conspiracy is our sworn enemy. It is trying by every means, by every hook and crook, to undermine and "bury" us. It's insidious propaganda is spreading in the United States. It had duped many innocent people into following its "line." It is weakening the will of the American people, while our welfare state is weakening our initiative and individual liberties.

INVESTIGATE NOW

We are not entirely familiar with the whole program of the John Birch Society, but its officers have been trying to get the Congress to investigate them. They have offered to come to Washington and answer any and all questions. Is not that a rather refreshing offer after all the hundreds and hundreds of people, some in high places, who have taken the fifth amendment when organizations to which they belong have been investigated by the Congress?

In view of what has happened to General Walker, we would strongly urge that the Congress go ahead and investigate the John Birch Society at once. Let's find out what all the shooting is about. But we have a real strong hunch it will once again be shown that all the so-called liberals and leftwingers are simply out to "get" anyone and everyone who can be labeled "conservative."

Well, we invite them down to Virginia. The woods are full of good, solid, substantial Virginia Democrats who glory in being called "conservative"; who stand foresquare for the American Constitution, the American flag, and are sworn enemies of anything and everything that is tinged with the poison of the international Communist conspiracy.

A Tribute to Credit Union Activities and Services of Mrs. Dyalthia Benson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in these days of loan sharks and amid the cries of various plans of credit through quick-

cash, check credit plan, instant money, tempting the average American to overspend, to run the risk of financial insecurity, insolvency, and bankruptcy it is comforting to read the true story of the financial situation in the typical farm and ranch community in the Southwest, Hereford, Tex., USA.

There are no loan sharks in that community because back in 1936 Dyalthia Benson came face to face with people and their money problems in her capacity as welfare worker. She helped organize the Hereford, Tex., Federal Credit Union to serve all residents within the county and the Hereford vicinity. Small loans were an exception with the two banks but the bankers encouraged Mrs. Benson's efforts. She has made thrift a byword by all who borrowed or invested. Although the bankers now have small loan departments they emphatically state that the community needs the credit union. The two banks, the savings and loan, and the credit union work very closely in financial and civic affairs and hold regular meetings with Mrs. Benson serving as chairman. This is a wonderful tribute to a dedicated American. Her story is the story of many dedicated men and women who have made the credit union movement a success throughout America.

A special tribute was paid to Mrs. Dyalthia Benson in an editorial written by Mr. Jimmie Gillentine in the Sunday Brand, Hereford, Tex., February 5, 1961.

With permission to revise and extend my remarks, I insert herewith the editorial written by Mr. Gillentine:

[From the Sunday Brand, Hereford, Tex., Feb. 5, 1961]

IT COULD HAPPEN ONLY IN AMERICA

Soaring to heights beyond any fairytale ever dreamed by Hans Christian Andersen is the story of an idea which took root in Hereford 24 years ago, and grew even faster than Jack's fabulous beanstalk.

The story centers around hard, cold cash. The guiding light and start of the performance is a generous woman with a gracious soul and a warm heart. The cast consists of ordinary, everyday people who need an occasional helping hand. The setting is a typical farm and ranch community of the Southwest, Hereford, Tex., U.S.A.

It all started back in 1936, when our heroine, Dyalthia Benson, came face to face with people and money problems in her capacity as welfare officer of Deaf Smith County. Always, it seemed, a bad circumstance might have been averted had a small loan been available somewhere along the line. Finally, Mrs. Benson organized the Hereford, Tex., Federal Credit Union in 1936 with an outlay of $125.44.

Just 24 years later, Horatio Alger would have found it difficult to believe the audited financial statement on December 31, 1960, when assets totaled $2,247,995.

Of equal importance to the manner in which the business has grown in the basic operation of the firm, created in the days when small loans were the exception with banks, and loan sharks were having their heyday in Texas. Thrift is a byword for all who borrow or invest, and Mrs. Benson is proud of the fact that the credit union now has 825 children among its depositors. She is also proud of the fact that the presidents of both Hereford banks were sufficiently interested to take part in the program at the annual meeting last December, because she wants the credit union to be supplemental to private enterprise.

Testifying to all of these things are a long list of teachers, clerks, janitors, farmhands, and even a few businessmen who have found assistance at the credit union down through the past quarter of a century. At least two of these people have been instrumental in organizing additional credit unions, when they moved to other communities.

These things speak well for the credit union, no doubt about that, but those who have seen the organization grow from the paltry $125.44 into a multimillion-dollar institution are more inclined to give credit where it is deserved, namely to Mrs. Benson. Without her interest, zeal, and ability, it would probably never have passed $1,000 in assets—and hundreds of people who today have a nest egg to fall back upon would be penniless and without credit.

Only in America could it happen. A dream, based on the Golden Rule, plus a few dollars, plenty of hard work, and a spark of ambition. Result: an outstanding institution which is setting a pattern for all America to follow.

Resolution of the Professional Men's Club of Rochester, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JESSICA McC. WEIS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD it is my privilege to include at this point the following resolution adopted recently by the Professional Men's Club of Rochester, N.Y.

The Professional Men's Club of Rochester is an Italian-American organization whose membership includes many of Rochester's leading business and professional men. This resolution expresses disapproval at what the club believes to be flagrant and widespread abuse and degradation of Italian-Americans by certain segments of the television industry and requests that action of a legislative nature be taken to establish a set of fair practices in the entertainment industry which would prohibit malignment of any national group:

PROFESSIONAL MEN'S CLUB, ROCHESTER, N.Y., RESOLUTION

Whereas the Professional Men's Club of Rochester, N.Y., is an Italian-American organization whose membership is composed of persons of Italian extraction, and who, by scholarly pursuits, have been awarded degrees in the fields of medicine, law, dentistry, pharmacy, engineering, or in the various other arts and sciences; and

Whereas Americans of Italian extraction have made significant contributions to the cultural, social, scientific, educational, economic, and political life of America; and

Whereas in the course of the daily practices and associations of such professions, businesses, pursuits, and vocations, there has been experienced a rising tide of resentment and indignation on the part of this general membership, as well as on the part of those thousands of Italian-Americans comprising their patients, clients, clientel, and associates, in and about the county of Monroe, N.Y.; and

Whereas this resentment has resulted primarily from the predominant and persistent portrayal, in scripts and typecasting by segments of the television industry, of persons of Italian nationality as gangsters, hoodlums, perpetrators of fraud, gamblers, prison inmates, and persons of unsavory morals and character: Now, therefore, it is hereby

Resolved—

1. That the Professional Men's Club of Rochester, N.Y., does hereby except to, disapprove, and condemn the flagrant and widespread abuse and degradation of the Italian-American public, by segments of the television industry, whether by design, indifference, or otherwise.

2. That the Professional Men's Club of Rochester, N.Y., hereby excepts to, disapproves, and condemns, as un-American, and therefore, contrary to any standards or concepts of fairness, morality, and decency, the unjust enrichment and capitalization upon such discriminatory and degrading portrayals of Italians, by segments of the television industry, under the guise of entertainment.

3. That the Professional Men's Club of Rochester, N.Y., proposes and suggests that the television industry and its affiliated networks conduct a reevaluation of their programing; also that there be considered the creation, amendment, or enforcement of codes of fair practices to eliminate and prevent the discriminatory, degrading, and abusive portrayals of persons of Italian descent, or of any other nationality, or minority group.

4. That the Professional Men's Club of Rochester, N.Y., place itself upon record as urging the enactment or promulgation, of remedial legislation, rules, or regulations on local, State and/or Federal levels to provide for the establishment and/or enforcement of laws pertaining to fair practices in the entertainment industry.

5. That the Professional Men's Club of Rochester, N.Y., hereby dedicates itself to the elimination and prevention of such unfair and un-American practices.

VINCENT FRANCIOSA NOLAN,
Resolution Committee Chairman.
JOSEPH A. TADDEO.
VINCENT J. DIRAIMO.
ROSS IMBURGIA, M.D.
Committee Members.

Federal Aid to Education—An Opening Wedge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, the heated and spirited public debate which we are currently experiencing on several issues involved in the question of Federal aid to education has tended to obscure a key question—is Federal aid necessary? If the increasing number of authorities are correct in their statements that States and local communities have built classrooms at a greater rate than the legislation would provide and have substantially increased teachers' salaries, then many of the advocates for Federal aid must have another motive in mind.

A recent editorial, found in the April 3, 1961, issue of the Williamsport, Pa., Sun-Gazette, clearly and cogently warns that the ultimate purpose—and certainly the necessary result—of Federal aid is Federal control.

I am pleased to call this excellent editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

AN ENTERING WEDGE

Beyond all doubt, proposed Federal aid to education has become one of the leading political issues of the day.

With much being said concerning the need for it, Dr. Russell Kirk, an authority on educational questions, is bound to draw fire when he argues "there is no financial necessity for Federal subsidies."

He says the Nation is growing rapidly enough that local and State taxes can absorb the educational load in the years between now and 1970.

Here is what Dr. Kirk told a New York audience a few days ago:

"What the zealots for Federal aid really desire is not simply more money but more power—great power. The present pretext of school construction and bonuses to teachers' salaries are intended merely as entering wedges: the first steps toward establishing a wholly centralized system of public instruction, directed by an important Washington bureaucracy."

These are blunt words. But we have learned from history and experience that once government enters into any sphere, no matter how modest the scale at the beginning, it demands and gets more and more power.

It should never be forgotten that he who pays the piper calls the tune.

Recreation Seeks a Place at the Water Table

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN KYL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of the Members an address entitled "Recreation Seeks a Place at the Water Table," by Francis W. Sargent, executive director of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, Washington, D.C., delivered before the Eighth National Watershed Congress, Tucson, Ariz., April 19, 1961:

Human existence depends upon water.

I am sure that you are even more keenly aware than I of the vital truth of these opening words of the report of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources. For the past 3 days you have been in one way or another considering the dependency of humanity on water. Indeed many of you have devoted a large part of your lives to this problem.

Today I would like to add to your burdens, to emphasize yet another facet of human existence which is dependent in large measure upon water—outdoor recreation.

First, I would like to strongly associate the cause of outdoor recreation with wise agricultural, industrial, and domestic use of water. Our economy is dependent upon water, and if we do not have a strong growing economy which provides its citizens with disposable income and leisure time, there can be little outdoor recreation—an important ingredient for the health and happiness of the American people.

Let's look at the role of water in outdoor recreation—it is great.

The recently published California Outdoor Recreation Plan reports that 60 percent of all outdoor recreation activity is water oriented. If this holds true for the rest of the Nation it means that 600,000 out of each of those millions of Americans who are seeking outdoor recreation today seek water.

And it means that at least 60 percent of the growing numbers of Americans who will be seeking recreation in the outdoors over the coming years will also seek water. In fact that percentage may even increase. Water oriented activities are apparently growing faster than others. And to further complicate the matter those activities which require great expanses of water seem to be gaining popularity most rapidly of all.

For example, it takes a lot of water for the 8 million recreational boats which the Outboard Boating Club reports are using our waterways today. Water skiers and powerboat enthusiastis require the use of enough acre-feet to satiate many other thirsty uses. A new reservoir these days fills with boats as it fills with water.

Almost all outdoor recreation activities become more attractive with the presence of water. The first campsite or picnic spot taken is always the one closest to the lake or the stream or in fact, the ocean.

Water is simply one of the most important factors to the outdoor family.

This importance of water to outdoor recreation is reflected in the study program of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission.

One study is devoted directly to the problems of water recreation. It is being carried out for us by the Geological Survey of the Department of the Interior and will consider such factors as access, planning of water projects, pollution abatement, conflicts in water use, and the relation of hydrology to reaction. There is a separate study considering the crucial problem of providing shoreline opportunities—opportunities that are perhaps becoming the most scarce commodity in outdoor recreation. Every day more of our fresh and salt water shorelines are being developed in one way or another and lost to the need of a growing population for a quiet beach, stream bank, or lake shore. This is one of the most critical areas for immediate effective action.

Another Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission study is considering the problems of providing fishing opportunities. It seeks to estimate in broad terms the existing supply and the probable kind, quality, and location of the fishing resources of the Nation for the next 40 years. And it will suggest alternative policies aimed at improving the adjustment of future supply to the anticipated demand.

In addition most of the other Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission projects are concerned with water because of its importance to the entire recreation complex. The national recreation survey of 16,000 households will provide the most extensive information yet compiled on the outdoor recreation habits and preferences of the American people. Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission's inventory of publicly designated recreation areas will give the Nation an idea of what resources we have to meet the demand which these habits and preferences reflect. These two studies are both very much concerned with water activities.

Our study program is now being completed, analyzed, and interpreted. The information it develops will, we hope, be of lasting value to all those concerned with water problems as well as outdoor recreation. The Commission will use the data developed in these studies as a base for its policy recommendations—essentially to say what we should do with the potential we have over the next 40 years to meet the demand Americans seeking outdoor recreation will generate.

The recommendations and the studies of the Commission will be reported to the President and the Congress on January 31 of next year. Congress recently authorized this 5-month extension from the reporting date established in the original Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission Act.

As our studies are not yet complete and as the Commission has not reached final agreement on its recommendations I cannot today report findings or conclusions. However, there are problems in the water field affecting recreation which have become abundantly clear in our studies, and I would like to share a few of them with you.

First, there are the traditional conflicts between outdoor recreation and other uses of water. Outdoor recreation does not consume water as some other uses do, but there are obviously some points where the needs of irrigation, power, navigation, water supply and industrial uses conflict with the needs of outdoor recreation.

One obvious example of this is the drawdown problem in reservoirs. If the shoreline is a vast expanse of mudflats, much of the potential for recreation on that lake is gone. If the lake is not drawn down to meet other needs it is not serving its purposes. Better coordination in planning and operation, carefully designed access points and midwater facilities can help in this area.

Second, and this may become an even more bitter controversy than the traditional one among different uses, are the conflicts among different outdoor recreation activities themselves. Water skiers and high speed boating enthusiasts cannot enjoy themselves in harmony and safety on the same area of water with swimmers or anglers. As the demand increases for recreational use of our limited water area this problem is going to rapidly grow worse.

Some areas have tried zoning—putting the water skiers in one area and the swimmers in another. Some have tried using alternate days for alternate activities and I understand that one lake in New Jersey has found it necessary to have a traffic cop out in the middle directing Sunday traffic.

Third is the problem of pollution abatement. Pollution is one of the great destroyers of outdoor recreation opportunities. This is one area where clear-cut action can, in effect, create new natural outdoor recreation opportunities.

As part of our study program we are seeking to find out just how much money is spent for outdoor recreation by all levels of government. In this study we went to some agencies not directly in the outdoor recreation business and asked them to estimate what proportion of their expenditures they felt benefited outdoor recreation. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare replied that it felt that every dollar it spent on water pollution control benefited recreation. Thus it well may be that in many areas the outdoor recreation benefits alone are sufficient reason for pollution abatement.

Fourth is the problem of access. There are actually a great many natural bodies of water in this country. Florida, for instance, has 16,000 lakes. Minnesota's license plates advertise that it has 10,000. These lakes are generally in public ownerhip and thus theoretically available for public enjoyment.

But in many cases access to the lake is blocked by a ring of private holdings, and the lake itself is thus appropriated to private use. Now this is a natural thing. Property owners on a lake would prefer that the lake not be crowded with weekend visitors from the city, but where waters are in public ownership, it seems apparent that public access must be provided.

This access problem is closely related to the role of the private sector of the economy—a role the Commission is convinced must be considered in meeting the demand

for outdoor recreation. Where feasible commercial enterprise can be encouraged to provide facilities.

In other cases where the land is primarily used for another purpose outdoor recreation may be an auxiliary use which returns a profit. We have grown to accept multiple use of our public lands. Perhaps this concept can be extended to private lands and bodies of water if suitable arrangements with the owners can be evolved. Farm ponds and small watershed improvements represent a considerable recreation resource. If means acceptable to both the private owners and the public can be worked out, these resources can help greatly to ease demand on other areas.

Another facet of the access issue is access to public water developments. Often hampered by inadequate planning, lack of authority and funds, our water resource development agencies have not been able to acquire enough land around reservoir sites to realize the optimum recreation benefit from the development. If this is not done early in the life of the project, the recreation opportunities may be lost or substantially reduced.

Finally, there is the problem of providing a place for recreation in water resource projects. There are only a limited number of sites in our Nation which will support water resources projects—whether they be large or small. And this limited number must serve all the needs of our people.

We have become accustomed to thinking of multipurpose projects, but too often recreation has not been a full party to the initial planning of such projects. Dr. Luther Gulick, of our advisory council, put it this way at our third joint meeting:

"Recreation is the orphan child and does not sit at the table when the menu is being planned and the dinner is served. We pick up the crumbs."

Outdoor recreation is now big business. While exact figures are difficult to assess Americans spent at least $5 billion in 1960 on water oriented outdoor recreation—boating, fishing, and swimming. This means that outdoor recreation has come of age. It's a major industry as well as a major activity.

It should be taken into the family and allowed to sit at the table when the meal is being planned and when it is served—but this may well mean that outdoor recreation should bear some of the family expenses, too. I do not believe that the millions of Americans seeking a place in the water will object if they have to pay an equitable fee for this privilege or if a reasonable part of their tax money is spent to provide it.

I realize that this homey little analogy leads directly into the middle of the benefit-cost ratio question—should outdoor recreation benefits be included in computing the benefits of projects. And this in turn raises one of the most difficult problems in this field—how do you realistically and equitably set a price on the benefits of outdoor recreation.

The Commission is considering this problem very carefully. In all candor I cannot promise that we shall come up with a completely satisfactory solution. The issue is extremely complex and there are far-reaching ramifications which require very careful study. The Commission has not reached any conclusions on this specific issue, but it is very much in their minds, and they will certainly recommend some action to the President and the Congress in this area next January.

But I can say that the Commission does feel strongly that outdoor recreation must be taken into the family as a full member in all natural resource planning. Long-range planning including recreation will lessen some of the earlier problems I mentioned. Conflicts among uses can be reduced. Conflicts among different recreation uses may be alleviated. The drive for pollution abatement can be bolstered.

This message to you today may not be an altogether pleasant one but it is a fact of life. Americans are demanding the use of water for outdoor recreation. They like the water. They want to sit by it, swim in it, fish in it, ski on it, and run their boats across it. And as there are more people with more money and leisure time to do these things the demand for recreation on water is going to increase.

Other uses, of course, will also be demanding more of our limited water supply. Therefore, it is imperative that all uses be considered fully in every action we take which affects water. Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission is convinced that outdoor recreation can work in harmony with the other members of the water-using family, but it is also convinced that it is time to consider outdoor recreation a full-fledged member of that family.

Ten Reasons Why Communism Is Winning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

TEN REASONS WHY COMMUNISM IS WINNING
(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

American defeats in Cuba and Laos are causing some surprise in Washington. True, President Kennedy predicted that things would get worse before they got better. But his advisers on world affairs have insisted on treating the Communist power conspiracy as if it consisted of normal governments with which the United States could do business. They have got their fingers burnt. It remains to be seen if they have yet learned why communism is winning.

Here are the important reasons:

1. Communists play to win. Communizing the planet is their overriding task. The West, including the United States, wants only to call the game off. It fails to admit that this is a real war which it can win only if it gives it No. 1 priority and stops considering it just another problem like smog or juvenile delinquency.

2. Communists believe fanatically in the triumph of their social system. Khrushchev "knows" that he can win without major war. Mao is willing to have a major war to win. Americans fear major war almost as much as they fear communism. Some westerners are impressed by Communist successes. Many are beginning to see previously unobserved "virtues" in communism. Western policy is based on a naive belief that given time communism will, if "unprovoked," go away or lose its will to win.

3. In Communist society the people are terrorized and brainwashed to the point where they support anything—look at Cuba. In the West, people must be convinced before they will act. Their leaders cannot convince them that the cold war is the outstanding fact of this century until they themselves understand it. So far three American Presidents have not so understood it.

4. Communist societies sacrifice everything—comfort, decency, ethics, individual freedom—to naked power. The U.S.S.R. almost equals the United States in weapons (and outstrips it in rockets and missiles) with less than half the total production. The United States permits stoppages in arms factories and constant wage and salary increases while refusing to match its enemies in weapons lest its "peace economy" suffer.

5. Despite Western talk about a coming split between Red Russia and Red China, all Communist countries act as a single team. In Cuba, Russian, Czechoslovakian, and Chinese advisers and experts (and pilots?) work happily together to insure Castro's victory. Western countries ignore President de Gaulle's plea for a common policy and oppose each other in places like Algeria, Guinea, Indonesia, and Laos.

6. Communist tactics are infinitely flexible. They ignore all principles save that of winning, offer every discontented individual the promise of exactly what he wants when communism has triumphed, practice one system here and another there, and back their unending subversion with unlimited funds. Westerners have no tactics except "nonprovocation."

7. Communists' strategy is exclusively offensive. They look for soft spots and attack wherever they find one. The West, through fear of war, remains strictly on the defensive. It provokes no uprisings in Communist countries, dares not denounce the U.S.S.R. as a colonialist empire, and prevents South Vietnamese from invading North Vietnam (as the northerners do the south).

8. Communists consider nonalinement (of former Western territories) the first step in communizing them. The United States urges weak non-Communist countries to become nonalined, regards them as well as it does faithful allies and tries to pretend that nonalinement is the best defense against Communist infiltration—despite shrieking refutations in Czechoslovakia, Laos, the Congo, etc.

9. To Communists, international agreements, including the United Nations Charter, are instruments of expansion. The Reds never stand in the way of armed intervention (as in Hungary) whenever it serves communism. To the West, keeping agreements comes before the protection of vital national interests.

10. Communists win against non-Communists in places like Laos and Cuba, largely because the few fanatics terrorize the others into fighting by making them more afraid of their bosses than of the enemy. Western morals do not permit certain excesses yet many westerners find excuses for excesses by Communists.

The reader can doubtless find other reasons why the West is losing.

Always a Doctor in the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by Mr. Lou Rauscher, staff writer, Sunday Independent, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., that was featured in that newspaper on April 23, 1961, and the subject of Mr. Rauscher's article was the Rogers family of Wilkes-Barre who have had a doctor in its family for the past 150 years. I found the article on

this distinguished family to be of great historical value and extremely interesting.

The indicated article follows:

FOUR GENERATIONS OF ROGERS FAMILY HAVE LISTED M.D.'S

(By Lou Rauscher)

There's been a doctor in the Rogers household for the past 150 years.

Lewis Leonidas Rogers III, is the fourth generation member of a local family physician cycle which extends back to his great grandfather, Joel Jackson Rogers.

Lewis III's grandfather was Lewis Leonidas Rogers, Jr., and his father was Lewis Leonidas Rogers, Jr. Both were physicians.

Joel Jackson Rogers, senior member of the family medical lineup, graduated from King's College in New York, now Columbia Medical School, and did his general practicing in the back mountain area.

He is remembered to this day for his trademark habit of answering calls with a distinctive shawl wrapped around his shoulders on cold days.

Joel Jackson Rogers in the mold of the physician of his time, ran his own drugstore and furnished his own prescriptions. He made his home in a colonial-type structure in Huntsville which ranks as a landmark of the area and which still stands today.

He died in 1913 and is remembered as one of the charter members of the Luzerne County Medical Society which celebrates its centennial this week.

PRACTICED IN KINGSTON

Joel Jackson's son, Lewis Leonidas Rogers, Sr., worked on the family farm during the summer and attended Jefferson Medical School. Graduating from there he became a general practitioner in Kingston with offices at 268 Wyoming Avenue, next to the Hoyt residence.

Lewis, Sr., was noted for his special herb tea prescriptions which he prepared in his office. He pursued his profession in the Kingston area for over 50 years, and was one of the founders of Nesbitt Hospital. Oldtimers still remember how he used to respond to home calls with a scrupulous dedication.

It's been said that, on a stormy night, Dr. Lewis Rogers, Sr., would forgo his horse and buggy and answer a call on foot. "He thought more of his horse than he did of himself," an admirer once said.

He was 72 years old when he died. A daughter is now living in Connecticut.

TOP X-RAY SPECIALIST

Lewis Rogers, Jr., after attending Wyoming Seminary and finishing at the University of Pennsylvania Medical School, developed into one of the area's top X-ray men.

Following his internship at Wilkes-Barre City Hospital, now the General, he practiced for a time from an office on East Northampton Street. After becoming an X-ray specialist, he moved to North Franklin Street, where he was to round out 28 years of serving the local population.

He served in the Army during World War I, being stationed at Camp Greenleaf, Ga. Attached to the hospital there, he became the first physician in Army medical history to operate an ambulance with a portable X-ray unit.

Returning to Wilkes-Barre after the war, Dr. Lewis Rogers, Jr., became president of the same county medical society which his grandfather had helped found.

Dr. Lewis Rogers, Jr., was only 50 years old when he died in 1940. He is survived by his wife, the former Elizabeth Seibel, sons Lewis Leonidas Rogers III, and John Seibel.

His widow maintains winter residence at 43 North Franklin Street, the same location as Lewis III's offices. Son John is a staff supervisor with Bell Telephone in New York.

KINGSTON HIGH PRODUCT

Rounding out the Rogers medical tradition is Lewis III. A graduate of Kingston High School, as was his father, Lewis III pursued his pre-med studies at the University of Pennsylvania and finished at Jefferson.

After interning at Wilkes-Barre General Hospital, he put in his residency at Robert Packer Hospital, Sayre. He entered the U.S. Army in 1943 and served in the Medical Corps until the end of World War II.

Returning to Wilkes-Barre in 1947, he set up his practice at its present location and now maintains a family residence in Carverton. He is married to the former Betty Whitenight of Kingston and they have four children, three of them girls. The children are Patricia, Deborah, Lewis IV, and Susan.

The family was in Washington during the week attending the convention of the Daughters of the American Revolution. Mrs. Rogers is a DAR member while two of the children belong to the CAR—Children of the American Revolution.

Just to prove that the medical tradition hasn't been limited to the Rogers side of the family, the present Dr. Rogers' grandmother, Mrs. Lewis Rogers, Sr., was a cousin of Dr. James Brooks, a Plains practitioner who still has a daughter living in Forty Fort.

OTHER DOCTORS TOO

Mrs. Lewis Rogers, Sr., also numbered Dr. pelatiah Brooks, Dr. Amos Barton, and Dr. Milton Barton among her relatives Dr. Brooks, an uncle of hers, was proud of his affiliation as a surgeon with the 44th Regiment of the New York State National Guard.

Dr. Amos Barton was a first cousin to Mrs. Lewis Rogers, Sr., and Dr. Milton Barton was his son. Both practiced for many years in Plains.

With this long line of doctors in the family, the obvious question is: Does Lewis Rogers IV intend to become a physician, too?

Members of the family say that the young man, presently attending Wyoming Seminary Day School, has a sister who seems more interested in the profession at this time.

As for what his intentions are: "All he talks about is that he wants to be a baseball pitcher."

Quiet Disciple of Principle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, Young Americans for Freedom, a national nonpartisan conservative youth organization, was founded in September of 1960. Since then it has quickly expanded and now represents more than 21,000 students and young people in 250 college and other chapters.

One of the founders of Young Americans for Freedom, who also serves on the board of directors, is George W. Gaines, 22, of New Iberia, La. George has served as a page in the 85th Congress and graduated from the Capitol Page School. Since then he has been active in politics and has studied at Tulane University.

In the April edition of New Guard, the official publication of Young Americans for Freedom, George has written an article concerning my colleague from Louisiana, Hon. HAROLD B. MCSWEEN. I would like to call this to the attention of the Members of the House.

The article follows:

QUIET DISCIPLE OF PRINCIPLE

(By George Gaines)

For the first time in 40 years, an independent Democrat is representing the Eighth Congressional District of Louisiana, long considered the baronial fief of the Longs.

"I'm the first non-Long man to hold this seat since it was created back in 1913."

In his calm thoughtful way, HAROLD B. MCSWEEN, Congressman from the Eighth District of Louisiana, was talking about politics in his office in Washington, D.C.

"I represent what you might call a welfare district—most of the people there are used to a Congressman who votes for every budget-busting bill that comes along. My task is to sell them the idea of responsible conservative government and do a good job of politicking at the same time."

HAROLD MCSWEEN is a tall man with thinning reddish hair. He is young for a southern Congressman, only 34. He was first elected to the House in 1958, succeeding Huey Long's brother, George, and ran for reelection last fall against the late Earl Long. MCSWEEN was defeated by the slim margin of 4,000 votes and upon the former Governor's death (only a few days after election day) was selected by Democratic county chairmen to replace "Uncle Earl."

QUITE A CAMPAIGN

"It was quite a campaign," recalled MCSWEEN. "Earl called me just about everything you can think of, including a conservative. I couldn't and I didn't try to outpromise him. I campaigned as a Representative who would resist centralization of power, hold down taxes, and prevent the Federal Government from getting into States' affairs."

But some men don't fight as hard for their convictions as HAROLD MCSWEEN, who attracted national headlines before he had been in the House of Representatives 4 months.

In April 1959, President Eisenhower stood on the edge of his first congressional defeat. At issue was S. 144, the Rural Electrification Administration bill, which would transfer power to approve or reject REA loans from the Agriculture Secretary to the director of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

To farm-State representatives the bill was most attractive. It breezed through Congress according to schedule: 60 to 27 in the Senate, 254 to 131 in the House. Ike promptly vetoed it, exercising that right for the first time in the Democratic 86th Congress.

With the help of six farm bloc-minded Republicans, the Senate overrode the veto 64 to 29 with 2 votes to spare. By the time the burning issue reached the floor of the House, the pressure was enough to crack the House Chamber walls. HAROLD MCSWEEN, a member of the Agriculture Committee and a Congressman from a predominantly rural district, felt that pressure as much as, if not more than, anyone else.

As the House vote was tallied it became apparent it was going to be a real cliffhanger. At the end, the two-thirds needed to override the veto was short by 4 votes, 146 to 280. Among four Democrats who voted to sustain President Eisenhower's veto was Freshman MCSWEEN.

"No," admitted the Louisiana legislator, "I didn't know how close it was going to be. And I had no idea that I would receive as much publicity as I did on the basis of that one vote. I certainly didn't vote 'nay' to make the front pages. I just voted that way because the REA had been doing a good job under the present setup and I didn't see any reason why its administration should be changed."

McSWEEN attended Louisiana State University and received an LL.B. from that same university in 1950. Always interested in politics, he first ran for State office in 1956 for a post on the Louisiana State Board of Election. His opponent: Earl Long's sister. He won.

"I think I'm making progress," the young Democrat mused. "I'm picking up support as I go along, but frankly I don't know whether the trend of civilization is sympathetic to free government."

The Congressman, however, leaves little doubt where he stands. He has declared his intention to oppose Federal aid to education, the use of social security funds for aid to the aged, and the common situs picketing bill. Last year he publicly supported the Connally reservation.

His attention was called to a recent editorial in the New Orleans Times-Picayune which stated: "The real hope for maintaining conservative principles in the Nation lies mainly in congressional and State legislative contests and not necessarily in who fills the executive department."

"Yes," McSWEEN replied, "I agree with that generally. But the whole problem would be so much easier if conservatives would learn how to translate their theories into political power. Too much energy is wasted on unrealistic causes—like abolishing the U.N., or fluoridation or impeaching Earl Warren. Too many conservatives don't want to talk about the minimum wage or social security.

"As for the 'coalition,'" remarked the young Democrat, "I don't worry about it. The 'conservative coalition' in Congress reflects the people and nobody ever has to apologize for representing the people."

Intelligent, educated, purposeful, HAROLD B. McSWEEN goes quietly about his business of building support for his political philosophy. He is young and unperturbed about the possibility of defeat. There are many like him in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Free Movement of Milk of High Sanitary Quality in Interstate Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a joint resolution of the State of Wisconsin relating to memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which will insure the free movement of milk of high sanitary quality in interstate commerce:

JOINT RESOLUTION 18, A

Joint resolution relating to memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which will insure the free movement of milk of high sanitary quality in interstate commerce

Whereas there is pending in the Congress of the United States a series of bills, H.R. 50 to H.R. 57 which provide for the free flowage in interstate commerce of milk of high sanitary requirements which must be met under the provisions of said bills; and

Whereas milk is the most important part of the diet for most people; it is our most perfect food, containing almost all of the essential elements for human growth, and is the principal food of infants, children, the aged, and infirm; and

Whereas more than one-half of our States are importers of milk and about the same number of States are exporters; and more than 13 million gallons of milk and cream are shipped interstate each day; and

Whereas this State has a tremendous stake in this industry, about 85 percent of its production of milk going into interstate commerce in one form or another, and milk production is one of the principal industries of this State; and

Whereas although the laws of our State require that milk and milk products must be produced under high sanitary conditions and result in sanitary, high grade products; and

Whereas importers of milk in the importer States have regulations for high sanitary quality by use of unnecessary requirements or other health regulations which result in a crazy-quilt pattern of milk sanitation regulation which duplicates inspection procedure in thousands of plants in the exporter States, thereby causing great unnecessary expense to a producer in meeting the different code requirements of his many customers; and

Whereas it is highly desirable to all the people that there only be Federal sanitation requirements, only one code, which must be complied with so as to insure the free, economical flow of milk in interstate commerce: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be urged to enact one of the before mentioned bills, or a similar bill, into law, thereby insuring that milk and milk products produced within Federal requirements will have free flowage in interstate commerce; and be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to each House of Congress, and each Wisconsin Member thereof.

W. P. KNOWLES,
President of the Senate.
LAWRENCE R. LARSEN,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
DAVID J. BLANCHARD,
Speaker of the Assembly.
ROBERT G. MAROTZ,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

Just Plain Jack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, this morning Mr. Pierre Salinger, President Kennedy's press secretary, in an interview over the Dave Garroway televison show made this statement:

What Washington needs is more humor.

Carrying out his idea, I wish to insert three additional columns by Art Hoppe, of the San Francisco Chronicle, on "Just Plain Jack":

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Feb. 26, 1961]

JUST PLAIN JACK BUILDS UP PIERRE

(By Art Hoppe)

Good morning, friends in televisionland. It's time once again for another episode of "Just Plain Jack," the typical success story of a typical American boy. With money.

As we join the rollicking heart-warming family in the big White House, Just Plain Jack is relaxing in the study doing one-handed pushups while writing Executive Order No. 10572 and dictating a speech. His aid and confidant, portly Pierre, enters, puffing a cigar.

Just Plain Jack: "Pierre, boy. How does this speech sound? 'We don't want a nation of spectators. We want a nation of participants in the vigorous life.'"

Pierre (shuddering): "Sounds great, chief, Absolutely great."

Just Plain Jack: "98, 99, 100." (He leaps to his feet and begins deep knee bends.) "Which reminds me, Pierre, I see Time describes you again as 'burly, belt-straining.' Throw me the medicine ball."

Pierre: "Could I roll it?"

Just Plain Jack: "Nonsense. We must move forward with vigor. Ready now. One, two, three, four."

Pierre (panting): "Chief, look out the window. The cops have taken their ball away and are chasing them off the lawn again."

Just Plain Jack: "Well, it's time they all got in here for the Cabinet meeting anyway. What's on the agenda today?"

Pierre (sighing with relief as he puts the medicine ball away): "Chin ups, Laos, Indian wresting, the Congo, 100-pound barbells, Berlin, and handstands. And, oh yes, you've been invited to attend the opening game of baseball season."

Just Plain Jack (chinning himself on the mantle): "Great. Do three laps around the grounds, Pierre. And about the game, which side am I playing on?"

Can Pierre do three laps? Will Washington win the opener? Is Adlai losing his paunch? Tune in next week, friends, for another episode. And in the meantime, as you go down the byways of life remember: nothing builds you up like just plain Jack.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Mar. 21, 1961]

JUST PLAIN JACK BECOMES A WHIG

(By Art Hoppe)

Good morning, friends in television land. It's time for another episode of "Just Plain Jack," the story of one typical American's struggle to lead a rich life. In spite of money. As we join them in the big white house, Just Plain Jack and the beautiful society girl he married are just entering his study.

Beautiful Society Girl: "Close your eyes, now. It's a surprise. I felt I ought to help you more in your work. I've been slaving on this night and day."

Just Plain Jack (ayes tightly shut and smiling expectantly): "Great, dear. I was afraid at first you hadn't quite captured the New Frontier spirit. We must move forward. With vigor."

Beautiful Society Girl: "There, now. Open wide. See? I've redone your whole study."

Just Plain Jack: "It's—uh—very interesting."

Beautiful Society Girl: "Silly, it's authentic. Every single thing in this room was made before 1802."

Just Plain Jack: "1802? Oh. Where's my easy chair?"

Beautiful Society Girl: "Silly, you sit here, see? On this authentic Jonathan Gostelowe ladder back chair. Comfy? Let me light the candle on this authentic cobbler's bench so you can see to read. There. I think if you slouch forward a little more, dear, the light will be just right."

Just Plain Jack: "It's awfully—uh—authentic."

Beautiful Society Girl: "And here. If you want to write another message to your friends up on the hill, you just climb up on this authentic William Savery stool, dip your authentic quill pen into this——"

Just Plain Jack (hesitantly): "You're a wonderful helpmate, dear. But I'm not sure 1802 exactly fits my image."

Beautiful Society Girl: "That's just it. I found all these treasures in the basement. Free. Don't you see? Economy. Tighten our belts. Ask not what your country——"

Just Plain Jack (brightening): "Economical, eh?"

Beautiful Society Girl: "Well, there is the refinishing. But they redid this authentic milking stool for only $783.22. And, of course, I did have to fly down to Florida a couple of times for conferences. And——"

Just Plain Jack: "$783.22?"

Beautiful Society Girl: "But just wait until I've finished the whole house. Every single thing in it will be authentic. Which reminds me, dear. Would you mind giving up shaving?"

Can this marriage be saved? If so, will muttonchop whiskers hurt Jack's image? Tune in again, friends. And in the meantime, as you go down the byways of life, remember: Nothing's more authentic than just plain Jack.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Apr. 4, 1961]

JUST PLAIN JACK OUTFOXES FOXES

Good morning, folks. It's time for another visit with Just Plain Jack. The true-to-life drama of the struggles of a young man with good looks, intelligence, money, and success to have fun.

(Music: "Ahunting We will Go.") As we join Just Plain Jack he is standing on the steps of his rustic weekend cabin, Glen Ora, hitching up his jodhpurs. The Beautiful Society Girl he married is beside him, nervously switching her riding boots with a crop.

Beautiful Society Girl (hesitantly): You really are determined to go again today, dear?"

Just Plain Jack: "Loved every minute of it yesterday. Brother Bobby and Brother Teddy did, too. The fox running this way and that, the baying of the hounds, the spectacular jumps. It's got touch football beat all hollow."

Beautiful Society Girl: "But, darling: You yourself said your mail was running 62 percent profox. And, remember, you wanted me to stop hunting because it was hurting your image. I guess I was a wee bit stubborn."

Just Plain Jack: "Nonsense. You were right to refuse. And I like your friends in the Hunt Club. They're great to talk politics with."

Beautiful Society Girl: "Yes. But I wish you wouldn't be quite so exuberant in talking about raising corporation taxes. And do we have to have all 35 Secret Service agents along today? They just don't fit in with the group. And the Sherman tank? Mrs. Vandastor's estate was a frightful mess."

Just Plain Jack: "Yes, but didn't Brother Bobby take the hedges well? And the way Teddy sailed over the water hazard. If I hadn't cleared that 6-foot fence I never would have beat them."

Beautiful Society Girl: "Yes, dear, but today I wish the three of you would use horses. It's——"

(Bobby and Teddy enter, each wearing Harvard sweatshirts, shorts, and track shoes.)

Just Plain Jack: "Hey, that's unfair, Wait'll I change."

Beautiful Society Girl (shuddering): "Never mind, dear. I've decided to give up fox hunting. Forever."

"Music: "Hearts and Flowers." Up and out.)

Will the Hunt Club be miffed? Are the Secret Service men sore? Tune in next week, folks. And in the meantime, as you go down the byways of life, remember: the best way to get a fox (or a mink) is with just plain "jack".

Lao Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, this story by Marguerite Higgins, which appeared this morning in the New York Herald Tribune, indicates what happens to a great and powerful country when indecision rules its policy:

UNITED STATES HAS LOST IN LAOS DESPITE THE CEASE-FIRE?

(By Marguerite Higgins)

WASHINGTON, April 24.—Even if the British-Russian cease-fire appeal to be issued tomorrow at last brings results in Laos, the United States will go to the international bargaining table at great disadvantage. The reason is the intensified Red offensive that threatens to swallow a crucial chunk of the beleaguered kingdom before peace talks can begin.

Announcement of the cease-fire appeal in Moscow and London said three documents had been released: The text of a joint Russo-British appeal for the cease-fire, addressed to the warring groups in Laos; a letter to Indian Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru to convoke the three-man supervisory commission; and invitations to 14 nations to a Lao Peace Conference in Geneva.

WILL REBELS STOP FIGHTING

In Washington today it remains a question as to whether the Soviet accession to a cease-fire appeal will result in an end to the fighting immediately or whether it is just another maneuver to stay SEATO's hand while the Communists fight on.

The test will come, according to high officials, in the days immediately after the joint cease-fire appeal has been made public and followed up by a similar appeal by the Royal Lao Government. If the Communist rebels ignore the appeal and press their ever more menacing 11th-hour offensive, the United States will have no choice but to look to the contingency plans for military intervention in Laos as already worked out with the SEATO allies, these officials said.

In any case the international balance sheet on Laos already shows heavy losses for the United States—losses that will plague its negotiators at the 14-nation peace conference to be held May 12 in Geneva if a verified cease-fire on the ground has been achieved.

For the Communist military successes on the ground achieved since December by troops supplied by Russia and led by an estimated thousand officers and technicians provided by North Vietnam have already gained possession of three northern provinces Phong Saly, Sam Neua, and Xien Khouang) plus possession of the crucial Plaine des Jarres and the critical road-junction supply center of Vang Vieng. Additionally, there are innumerable pockets of guerrilla activity which make a map of free Laos look in some areas like a series of polka dots.

The Communist rebels in Laos have continued to grind ahead in their artillery and infantry attacks, and the Russians have continued to fly a military airlift despite the fact that Kremlin diplomats agreed in principle in late March to the urgent, last-ditch, cease-fire appeal sent to them by Great Britain and despite a solemn warning that without a cease-fire Washington was ready to go in with force.

Have the Russians been deliberately stalling, talking soft in the Kremlin but carrying an even bigger and more successful military military stick in Laos? The answer here is almost unanimously yes. But there is also a virtually unanimous decision that—if this cease-fire move is virtually immediate and not phony—the United States and its allies had better try to make the best of a bad bargain in hope that the peace formula to be worked out at the Geneva conference can in fact achieve the Austrian-type neutrality for Laos that the Soviet Union has privately agreed to in negotiations with the British.

THE FUTURE FOR LAOS

Why should the Reds agree to an Austrian-type neutrality when they are doing so well militarily and have key chunks of the 12 Laotian provinces already in their hands?

Because, say American officials, the Kremlin knows that there is a point beyond which the United States cannot be pushed in Laos and that point is rapidly being reached.

The best alternative—and least likely—foreseen for the 14-nation Geneva Conference that will include Red China would be a return to the 1954 Geneva accords which called for Lao neutrality, pledged the rebels to cooperate with the central government and yield their military positions.

A COALITION REGIME

A more likely alternative officials conceded is a coalition government which would be headed by neutralist leader Prince Souvanna Phouma and which would have to include some top Communists.

The most undesirable alternative from the United States point of view would be a partition of the country because the Communists merely use the partition line as a jumping-off point for new aggression.

The biggest hope in Washington is that pressure from the neutralist members of the 14-nation conference will make it inexpedient for Russia to reject the offer of truly neutral Austrian-type Laos.

In giving the plus side of the balance sheet on Laos, the United States pleads the fact that a cease-fire will spare intervention in a war which nobody, including some of the Laotians themselves, seemed to have much stomach.

APPEAL TO NEUTRALISTS

Although the Communists took new territory while negotiations dragged on between the British and the Russians, the Kennedy administration feels its cautious approach, plus its acceptance of a neutral (as distinguished from pro-Western) Laos, won support from southeast Asian neutralists (such as India) and muted European criticism of America's alleged trigger-happy tactics.

From the beginning of the Lao crisis, both Britain and France—the two European allies involved in SEATO—have been most reluctant to see force used even in face of the rising Communist offensive. Although the French have been privately most adamant, the British have been publicly the most vocal.

BRITISH WON OVER

It is considered a major achievement in the Kennedy administration that the President's restraint eventually won the British round to agreeing (in the Key West meeting with Prime Minister Macmillan) to join in any intervention if worst came to worst and every reasonable negotiating avenue seemed closed.

Even when it became clear to Washington that the Soviets were stalling while the Communists were winning new victories in Laos, the British held to their optimism and insisted that the United States should not make a military move lest it upset the diplomatic applecart. Thus the day before Mr. Macmillan arrived April 4 in Washington for

his formal sessions with the President, an official British Foreign spokesman told a press briefing in Washington that he expected a favorable Soviet reply "possibly in 48 hours, anyway at the end of the week." The acceptable Soviet reply was not delivered until today, nearly 3 weeks later.

DIFFERENCE IN APPROACH

This illustrates the fundamental point of difference of approach to the Russians that has marked British and American attitudes in the Lao affair. For many senior Americans experienced in Russian ways felt that instead of making soft statements in the hopes of spurring the Reds on, this would have the opposite effect; the essential point, the Americans thought, was to take measures making clear to the Russians that this country had the will to take countermeasures if the stalling continued.

Federal Aid for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. W. D. Workman is a highly respected writer and columnist. I recommend this article to the attention of the country and the Congress:

SOME MISCONCEPTIONS ABOUT FEDERAL AID FOR EDUCATION

(By W. D. Workman)

"Federal aid without Federal control" is the spurious cry of these assorted educators, politicians, and do-gooders who wish Congress to dish out more money for schools, schoolchildren, and schoolteachers.

Yet without Federal control, there is grave doubt that mere financial assistance will do all those things the Federal-aiders want done. This column opposes Federal aid, with or without control, but it seeks as well to expose some of the addled preachments with which Federal aid is being sold.

Federal aid is, of necessity, a pattern of redistributing that portion of the Nation's wealth which the Federal Government thinks should be applied to education. This obviously involves taking (through the compulsion of taxes) from the rich to give to the poor. For the Government has no money of its own—and what it gives away it must first take away.

If the poorer States are to benefit, they must get back from Uncle Sam more money than he takes from them. By the same token, Uncle must take more from the richer States than he will return to them. The net result will be that some States will have more mony available for school purposes, while others will have less. Then arises the overriding question: Will this federally disgorged money be put to the improvement of schools?

Without Federal control, there can be no assurance that it will. With Federal control, there is the assumption that the bureaucrats in Washington, political and educational, know better how to improve our schools than do the persons on the scene.

True, congressional appropriations can be tied up with conditions as to how the money will be spent, but who can guarantee that the receipt of Federal funds will not mean the release of State and local funds for purposes other than education?

But let's assume that all Federal aid will be used for education, and that it will be in addition to school funds already being raised on State and local levels. What then?

A great deal of the criticism of American schools is directed at education in the teeming population centers of the Nation. These, mind you, are located in States where per capita income is high, where total wealth and taxable property are great, and which will lose rather than gain revenues under the redistribution device of Federal aid.

Is it reasonable to expect that a State or city now tolerates inferior schools will immediately correct them under a program of Federal aid? Can we expect them to do more for their schools when they have less money with which to do it? The only guarantee of improved conditions would be through the imposition of Federal control, assuming that the improvement must be to national standards. This would give the lie to the chant, "Federal aid without Federal control."

Federal aid without control would be ineffective. With Federal control, Federal aid inevitably would lead to nationalization of education, further erosion of local self-government, and mass conditioning of youthful minds according to uniform standards prescribed from Washington. Actually, this is precisely what is desired by more and more professional educators who yearn to take over the Nation's schools—lock, stock, and barrel.

This frightening state of affairs is evidenced on every hand. It is documented, with chapter and verse, in Roger A. Freeman's new book, "Taxes for the Schools." That work, a companion to his earlier "School Needs in the Decade Ahead," should be required reading for both the proponents and the opponents of Federal aid to education.

It is worth the price for one chapter alone, "Powers and Responsibilities in Education," a thought-provoking exploration of all facets of Federal aid, and of the trend of professional educators to grasp the reins of school authority through Federal aid.

On this particular score, Mr. Freeman has served posterity by puting down in permanent form Paul Woodring's paraphrase of the Clemenceau axiom:

"Just as war is too important to be left to the generals, education is too important to be left to the educators."

Salute to Africa

SPEECH
OF
HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to add a few words as a member of the Subcommittee on Africa consistent with the unanimously passed House Resolution 232:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that April 15, 1961, be recognized as African Freedom Day; and that we extend to the independent countries of Africa our congratulations and assure them of our continued good will.

The German philosopher, Immanuel Kant, wrote in his "Fundamental Principles of the Metaphysic of Morals":

Nothing can possibly be conceived in the world, or even out of it, which can be called good without qualification, except a good will.

I subscribe to his thesis that power, riches, honor, even happiness, "inspire pride, and often presumption, if there is not a good will to correct the influence of these on the mind, and with this also to rectify the whole principle of acting, and adapt it to its end."

My American heritage and my official position vouchsafe the purity and the sincerity of this expression of good wishes and honor. Should additional unmistakable proof be required, let it be found in my African descent.

In this effort to salute these 26 sovereign states of Africa, I am keenly conscious of every one of the 122 million individual citizens of those states, of their dreams of freedom, of their desire to live in the highest state of human dignity.

History attests the cost in blood of all revolutions whether they ended in frustrations or liberations. Some have always had to die that others might be free. It is a source of exceeding joy that during these last 8 years the world has witnessed so many gain so much in independence at no greater cost of human life. I regret the loss of any life, but surely all must concede that the carnage and chaos would have been infinitely worse had no good will existed as the number of African independent states rose from 3 in 1953, to 26 in 1961.

Staggering indeed are the needs and problems that confront each of these African states. They would defy any effort of mine to merely list them. But I suggest that they are all human problems, and therefore, soluble through the application of intelligence.

And we do see intelligence demonstrated in each of these several states as they seek to build sound economies and thriving industries. It is my anticipation and understanding Africa's hopes and efforts we will undergird our moral help and encouragement with material assistance in strict accordance with the protocol of free and independent states.

No expression of good will would suggest relieveing free man from the responsibilities of self-government though we know full well the hazards, intrigue, connivance, and duplicity, inherent therein. In the experiments, is to be found the substance of which great states and able statesmen are made.

New nations and new men making over and refashioning the old to meet the needs of the day and more in keeping with the excellence of the heart's desire, these I salute this day.

At the turn of the century there lived here in the United States a poet of African descent, Paul Lawrence Dunbar.

In the closing stanza of his "Ode to Ethiopia" he expressed a sentiment I here submit. I am confident that the word "Ethiopia," because of that nation's antiquity and continuing sovereignty, will be acceptable as quite applicable to all the independent countries of Africa we are saluting today:

Go on and up! Our souls and eyes
Shall follow thy continuous rise;
Our ears shall list their story
From bards who from thy root shall spring,
And proudly tune their lyres to sing
Of Ethiopia's glory.

Foreign Tax Havens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, America has faced a serious crisis during the past months because of the flow of gold from the United States. One of the causes for the unfavorable balance of payments is the large investments abroad by American interests. This is not necessarily a bad thing. But when American money flows out of the country to avoid taxes, that is another matter. Mr. Ed Kandlik, in an article appearing in the Washington Post, April 24, 1961, describes the way in which some tax-dodging funds operate. This is a serious matter and could destroy further the confidence of the people in the integrity of our tax system.

I commend to my congressional colleagues the article by Mr. Kandlik.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 24, 1961]

GLOBAL TRADE—BERMUDA NOW TAX SHELTER FOR BIG MUTUAL FUND

(By Ed Kandlik)

Foreign tax havens are no longer exclusive hideaways.

They are getting big entrances on Wall Street, La Salle Street, and in major Pacific coast markets.

The latest invitation for U.S. dollars to seek tax shelter abroad is found in offering of $25 million of United International Fund, Ltd. shares. This is a Bermuda corporation.

As such it may escape many of the taxes that would be levied if it were formed in the United States.

The two things foreign about United International Fund are the place of incorporation and the intention to invest 85 percent of its assets abroad.

The underwriters are in the United States. The group is headed by Kidder, Peabody & Co., Bache & Co., and Francis I. du Pont & Co.

The assets will be held by the Chase Manhattan Bank, New York.

Although Intercontinental Advisory Corp. Ltd., a Bermuda corporation, is being set up as investment adviser, the officials are principally Americans. Several principals in the new fund are associated with Waddell & Reed, distributor of United Funds.

"The fund is designed to afford certain tax advantages under existing laws to its U.S.-resident shareholders," the prospectus states.

In Bermuda the fund is subject to no income, capital gains or other tax, except for a $650 flat annual fee.

The fund will be subject to withholding taxes imposed by countries in which its income originates.

Operating as a foreign corporation it expects to be subject to only a 30 percent withholding tax on income received from the United States. No taxes would be payable on capital gains made in the United States.

United International Fund does not propose to pay cash dividends, which could become taxable income to United States residents. It intends to build a tax-free pile abroad through the medium of corporate gains and accumulated income.

From time to time the fund may pay stock dividends. Stockholders could sell these or sell their shares to cash their profits, paying only the 25 percent maximum capital gains tax.

Originally United International Fund is being set up as a closed-end fund but it will convert to an open-end mutual fund at the end of 3 months. Then shares will be redeemable at net assets value upon demand.

The initial offering is being made at a series of underwriting discounts ranging from 8.8 percent down to 2 percent on amounts of $500,000 or over. This same schedule of underwriting discounts will prevail after the conversion to an open-end mutual fund.

National Little League Baseball Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, our young people, dedicated to the highest ideals of citizenship and teamwork, sportsmanship and character, form the backbone of our country. Today more than a million boys in every corner of our Nation are developing these qualities through participation in the Little League Baseball program.

Representing as I do the congressional district which embraces the national headquarters of Little League Baseball, I am particularly proud to call to the attention of my colleagues the Presidental proclamation establishing "National Little League Baseball Week" in response to a concurrent resolution enacted by the 86th Congress:

THE WHITE HOUSE.

NATIONAL LITTLE LEAGUE BASEBALL WEEK

Whereas active participation by youth in appropriate physical activities contributes to their fitness and to the maintenance of our national vigor and vitality; and

Whereas little leagues in communities throughout the Nation have made it possible for thousands of young boys to take an active part in our national game of baseball; and

Whereas Little League baseball not only promotes the physical well-being of the players, but also instills into them the qualities of fairness, cooperation, and discipline—qualities which contribute to the development of good citizenship; and

Whereas the Congress, by House Concurrent Resolution 17, agreed to June 1, 1959, has requested the President to designate the week beginning the second Monday in June of each year as "National Little League Baseball Week," in recognition of the national and community benefits resulting from Little League activity: Now, therefore,

I, John F. Kennedy, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning the second Monday in June of 1961 and the week beginning the second Monday in June of each succeeding year as "National Little League Baseball Week."

And I invite the people of the United States to observe that week in schools, parks, athletic fields, and other suitable places with appropriate ceremonies and activities designed to emphasize the importance of the physical development of our Nation's youth.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 18th day of April, in the year of our Lord 1961, and of the independence of the United States of America the 185th.

[SEAL] JOHN F. KENNEDY.

By the President:

DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State.

Rural Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. MOELLER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have been most pleased to note the increased interest of the Department of Agriculture in the development of our rural areas. It has been most heartening to me. Secretary Freeman is to be congratulated for his initiative in reorganizing the present rural development program of the Department. He has appointed Mr. John A. Baker, Director of Agricultural Credit, as head of the Rural Areas Development Board and is hoping to be designated the responsibility for the rural aspects of the soon-to-be enacted depressed areas legislation. I certainly hope he is given this responsibility, for he has shown a capacity and interest in the program that should carry it to a successful conclusion.

My own district, the 10th Congressional of Ohio, is predominately rural in character and should benefit greatly from a vigorous redevelopment effort assisted by the Federal Government. I am happy that we are now taking a more than passing interest in the economic development of our vitally important rural areas, and I congratulate my colleagues for turning down the Republican-sponsored Widnall amendment to eliminate the rural development section from the House-passed version of the depressed areas bill.

In this connection, I would like to insert in the RECORD two excellent articles from recent editions of the Washington Post which describe and analyze this new effort to bring industrial development to the rural areas of our Nation. I commend them to all, and I hope that this new program will gain the publicity and support of every conscientious citizen.

The Washington Post articles follow:

RURAL INDUSTRY AGENCY IS FREEMAN OBJECTIVE

(By Julius Duscha)

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman is trying to turn his Department into an agency for rural industrial development.

Freeman is vigorously seeking the responsibility for administering the sections of the depressed areas bill that would affect rural areas.

He also is making plans to expand the existing rural development program which has been quietly underway in the Agriculture Department for almost 4 years.

The Secretary's efforts to include all aspects of rural life within his province could have far-reaching effects on cities as well as on the countryside.

COULD SLOW MOVEMENT

If substantial industry were brought to rural areas where farming is declining, the farm-to-city movement could be considerably slowed down.

This would mean that the urban problems of overcrowding, crime, and assimilation that have resulted from this migration would diminish.

The shaky economies of many small towns would be helped, too, by an influx of industry to the towns and the surrounding rural areas.

Freeman does not plan, however, to downgrade the importance of farming in rural America. Under his leadership the Department will continue to be a champion of farmers and farming.

What Freeman is doing is recognizing the facts of life in rural areas, where the mechanization of farming, the economic necessity for larger and larger farms and the lack of nearby industrial jobs drive more and more young men and women from farms to the cities.

The Secretary's immediate objective is a large share in the administration of the area redevelopment, or depressed areas, legislation.

Both the Senate and the House have passed redevelopment bills, and a congressional conference committee is trying to resolve differences between the two measures.

The legislation provides that administration of the $300 million loan program and the $89 million in grants provided by the legislation would be centered in the Commerce Department.

ONE HUNDRED MILLION DOLLARS IN LOANS

Freeman hopes that the rural development aspects of the legislation would be operated by the Agriculture Department.

A total of $100 million in loan authority would be used to attract industry to rural areas. A substantial part of the $100 million in loans provided for the improvement of water supplies, sewer systems, and other community facilities would also go to rural areas.

The Agriculture Department argues that its experience with the 4-year-old rural development program qualifies the Department for administering the rural parts of the depressed areas bill.

Nor is there any opposition from powerful farm State legislators on Capitol Hill to Agriculture Department administration of much of the depressed areas bill.

Freeman recently reorganized the present rural development program by establishing a Rural Areas Development Board under the chairmanship of John A. Baker, director of agricultural credit.

Operating on a budget of less than $1 million a year, the present program has concentrated on technical assistance to rural areas that are seeking industry.

RURAL INDUSTRY

Secretary Freeman's efforts to stimulate industrial development in rural areas have far-reaching possibilities. The immediate objective of this movement is to relieve underemployment of farmers, but if it is successful it can have a salutary effect on urban life as well.

A recent report showed that 45 out of every 100 farmer operators did some nonfarm work in 1959 and 36 percent of them earned more from their off-farm jobs than from the sale of agricultural products. Even so, a vast number are seeking new opportunities for part-time work off the farm, and aid for these people must be considered an important part of any general agricultural program. The stimulation of rural industries has been found to be the most effective and practical answer.

Cities have a direct interest in the movement because many of them are now being virtually overwhelmed with new population that they cannot readily absorb. Recent Census Bureau studies show that approximately 84 percent of the increase in the total population of the United States in the last 10 years was concentrated in cities of 50,000 or more and their surrounding areas. The movement is proceeding at a fantastic pace, with consequent overcrowding, transportation chaos, crime, and urban sprawl.

From the viewpoint of the Nation as well as that of the cities it would be desirable to slow down this frantic concentration of population in a relatively few large centers. A national policy of decentralizing industrial growth thus seems to be in order. The location of industrial plants in rural areas, where feasible, would serve the double purpose of relieving shaky economics of many small towns while easing the growth problems of the big cities.

The idea is not, of course, a new one. For some years the Department of Agriculture under Secretary Benson promoted the Rural Development program, and some 200 projects in 40 States are now underway. The present administration has modified the objectives somewhat and added the word "Areas" to the name, but the basic idea continues to be the location of more industry within reach of part-time farmers. Secretary Freeman would like to steer the agricultural end of the depressed-areas program in the same direction.

From these beginnings a new national policy may well emerge. As farms increase in size and still less manpower is needed to produce food, there are many advantages in taking factories to the country instead of luring more people into the large cities. Congress may well conclude that this is the only practical way of maintaining some degree of balance between rural and urban life in these changing times.

Role of Agriculture in Our National Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, the Kennedy administration should be given credit for clarifying, to a considerable degree, the role of agriculture in our national economy. Farmers have performed a magnificent service in supplying the food and fiber necessary for our population and our industry, and I believe the general public not familiar with agriculture has sometimes come to believe that farming is a highly subsidized operation and that the farmer as a class always has his hand out for any benefits which may be offered. This is not true, as I have pointed out on many occasions. Most farmers are only looking for a fair opportunity to make themselves a decent living in our tremendously complicated and competitive economy.

Sometimes some of the spokesmen for this administration have, I fear, left an erroneous picture with the general public in regard to what was happening to our farm population. It is sometimes inferred, perhaps unintentionally, that the independent farmer is fast disappearing from the scene and corporate-type farming operations are taking over the production of farm commodities. This is not true. The family-type farm seems to remain a predominant type of farm operation in this country. There is no indication of corporate-type or industrialized farm operation taking over.

Mr. Speaker, the May issue of Successful Farming contains an editorial by Dick Hanson, which I believe does an excellent job of clarifying what has happened to family farming operations. Mr. Hanson takes facts and figures from the 1959 agricultural census and also from a recent study by the USDA's Agricultural Research Service, which I believe factually refutes the proposition that the family-type farm is disappearing from the scene.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial will be included with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From Successful Farming, May 1961]

ACROSS THE EDITOR'S DESK

(By Dick Hanson)

The 1959 Census of Agriculture has heaped more fuel on an already smoldering question. The census shows fewer but larger farms in this country. And, this trend to fewer but larger farms will continue for some time in the future, apparently. To many people this trend means only one thing—family farms will eventually be gobbled up by a few giant operators who will then control agriculture.

To me, this line of thinking just doesn't hold water. Two factors will prevent a few from buying up the many. These factors are capital and labor. More and more colleges are studying the problem of optimum size of farm. What is the best, most economical size farm for the many different agricultural areas of the country? The size varies, of course. What may be the right size in Illinois would be far too small in Wyoming.

So far, the studies show that many of our present so-called family farms are already the right size to make optimum use of land, labor, and capital. In other words, there's no point in these farm getting any bigger.

A recent study by the USDA's Agricultural Research Service dispels some of the shadows hanging over the future of the family farm. Here are some of the findings in the report:

Family farms will be bigger and more highly specialized in 1975—and they will continue to dominate our Nation's agriculture.

Findings indicate that farmers will continue to step up adoption of laborsaving and output-increasing techniques. They will purchase additional equipment needed for more complete mechanization of crop production and livestock feeding operations. They will also hire more services, such as spraying, dusting, and fertilizing, and obtain more professional management assistance, including help in buying and selling livestock.

Dairy farms will continue to increase in size and decrease in number. Even so, the report states that dairying in 1975 will still be largely a family operated business. Average number of cows on family operated dairy farms may increase 25 to 30 percent by 1975. This is about the same percentage increase that occurred during the past 15 years.

Unit costs on a large-scale livestock farm are only 5 percent lower than such costs on a comparable one-man farm. In an Illinois survey optimum use of land, labor, and capital was found on farms of 260 to 339 acres.

In the Corn Belt, limited forage supplies will encourage some livestock farmers to expand hog production rather than beef production. Labor requirements, as well as capital and mangerial limitations, will prevent expansion to the 1,000 or more hogs that one man can raise. But 500 to 600 hogs per farm—compared to an average of 170 today—may be commonplace by 1975.

Family size feeding operations will continue to predominate in the Midwest because of the availability of farmgrown feeds and otherwise unmarketable operator and family labor.

I'm convinced that family farming, as we think of it, is going to be around for a long time. We'll need to make changes and use new methods in this highly competitive agricultural industry. But then, what growing industry doesn't?

Otsego County: One of America's Most Important Agricultural Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be the Representative in Congress of an area which is one of the most important agricultural areas in our country, Otsego County, N.Y. As an indication of the extent of agricultural activity in this great country, I include herewith an editorial from the Oneonta Star of April 19, 1961. This editorial appeared in the annual agricultural issue of this great newspaper and pays suitable tribute to the fine hard-working farmers of Otsego County who have been responsible for this extensive agricultural activity:

AGRICULTURE STILL OUR BIG INDUSTRY

Every Oneonta businessman knows that agriculture is this area's most important industry.

It will undoubtedly remain so, although like all other American industries, it is in a process of change.

The Bureau of the Census has just released its 1959 census of agriculture for Otsego County, which shows the current trend of change in this county.

There are fewer farms. The number of farms dropped from 2,823 to 2,391 between 1954 and 1959. That is a loss of actually only 313 farms, because the census points out that 119 of the difference lies in the change of definition of a farm.

But the farms that remain are bigger farms. True, in both years there were only 9 farms with 1,000 or more acres. But in 1959 there were 74 farms between 500 and 1,000 acres, compared with 63 5 years earlier. And there were only 103 farms of less than 10 acres, compared with 208 in 1954.

The census classed 1,934 farms as commercial. Of these, 65 had annual sales of $40,000 or more; 164 had sales of $20,000 to $39,999; 610 reported annual sales of $10,000 to $19,999; 645 farms had sales of $5,000 to $9,999. Only 370 farms had sales as low as $2,500, and only 80, sales below $2,500.

Otsego remains, and will continue to do so, predominantly a dairy county, but other agricultural enterprises are showing a sustained and important growth.

For example, in 1954, only 413,319 chickens, including broilers, were sold in Otsego County. But in 1959, sales of chickens were more than 1 million higher—a total of 1,476,316 sales reported. In 1954, Otsego farmers sold 3,698,365 eggs. Five years later, egg sales soared to 4,127,017.

Lesser farm enterprises also showed significant increases. Sheep and lamb sales rose slightly, nearly 4,000 more pounds of wool were produced, and although fewer farmers raised hogs for sale, they sold more hogs.

Otsego did not contribute materially to the Nation's biggest agricultural headache—the wheat surplus. Whereas in 1954, a total of 154 Otsego farms produced and sold 28,648 bushels of wheat; in 1959, only 46 farms produced wheat, and they sold only 5,032 bushels.

The census has a long list of equipment purchased by farmers, ranging from feeds and fertilizers to farm machinery and home freezers.

The cold figures of the census, however, do not reflect one of the most important aspects of area agriculture—the fact that we in Oneonta know the farmers of the area not only as good customers, but as good friends and good neighbors.

We on the Star hope that this Farmers Yearbook will reflect this newspaper's conviction that our farm readers are also our good friends and neighbors.

Textile Industry Must Be Safeguarded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I have said in the past that the American textile industry was somewhat in the predicament of a man drowning in a swimming pool. The management has carefully provided lifesaver rings for use in just such an emergency, but the lifeguard will not toss one to the distraught victim.

Floods of imported textile goods have had the domestic industry awash for some time. Congress has carefully provided safeguards in the law to help industries in such a condition. But in the past the administration had always declined to use the safeguards we have established.

The section 22 case of a year ago is a case in point. Congress wrote that section into the Agriculture Adjustment Act to provide relief against imports whenever it is found that they tend to render ineffective or materially interfere with the agricultural programs of the Federal Government.

We asked the Secretary of Agriculture last year to seek relief under this provision for cotton products. We had a precedent in a 1941 Tariff Commission decision on wheat and flour.

The Secretary looked into it and recommended that the President take some action. But when President Eisenhower requested an investigation, he coupled it with an implication that the Tariff Commission could impose no more than an 8-cent-a-pound fee on the cotton content of imported articles.

This in itself was a misinterpretation of the act passed by Congress. The section in the law was predicated on the assumption that the Tariff Commission would recommend the relief it deemed necessary when it was determined that imports materially interfered with the domestic cotton program. Certainly it was not the intent of Congress to limit the considerations involved in one of these cases, or to do anything prejudicial to full and complete relief where it is indicated.

We recall the results of that appeal. With President Eisenhower's restrictive statement as a guide, the Tariff Commission voted against the textile industry. They chose to wait and see if the drowning man in the swimming pool went under for the third time.

Following these developments last year, I stated that there was something of futility in the repeated efforts of those of us here interested and concerned with the textile import problem to keep providing laws, lifesaver rings, which were not used. I said then that maybe it was time we got a new lifeguard.

The American people, in their wisdom, chose a new leader in the great election of last November. I can tell you that a lot of us from textile areas sent up a mighty cheer when this happened. We did not expect the new President immediately to rearrange all the existing trade agreements to give the textile industry a choice position in the world market, but we did believe that we would finally get off the buckpassing merry-go-round, and be given a full, fair, impartial, and unprejudicial hearing of our problem.

We have not been disappointed in this belief. The new President, who, by the way, has fought this fight in Congress for his native Massachusetts textile mills, put the textile industry's problems right at the top of his work agenda.

He appointed as Secretary of Commerce the Honorable Luther Hodges, a man with a distinguished background in the textile industry. He was Governor of North Carolina, the largest textile-producing State in the Nation. I can report personally of Secretary Hodges' deep and abiding interest in the welfare of the American textile industry. Last week, I paid a visit to Secretary Hodges, and took with me Mr. Hugh M. Comer, the chairman of the board of Avondale Mills, the great textile industry in my native State. The Secretary was cordial, attentive, and showed that he was well aware of the situation of the textile industry. I notice in the recent issue of U.S. News & World Report, that Secretary Hodges believes that American textiles are harder hit by import problems than any other industry in this country at the moment.

President Kennedy further evidenced his immediate concern with the import problem by appointing a Cabinet Textile Committee, chaired by Secretary Hodges. This Committee is due to report very shortly, it is my understanding.

Along with others, I urged Secretary Hodges' committee to make recommendations in line with those of the Pastore

Textile Committee in the Senate, calling for a country-by-country, category-by-category quota system. This recommendation reflects the position held by leaders of all segments of the textile industry, regardless of fiber or product. It is the only fair and equitable way for American textiles to compete on the world market and in this country.

We are already grateful for the immediate attention of the new administration to this problem. We desperately hope that we will not be disappointed in the action taken on textile imports.

The domestic textile industry must be delivered from the death blow which continued unfair imports surely will bring. Since 1947, 838 textile mills have been forced to shut down, throwing out of work more than 200,000 employees. We must have protection now for the 925,000 textile workers in this country today, including some 38,000 in my State of Alabama, who realize that their very jobs and the economic welfare of their communities are at stake.

Interior Department Program for Lower Colorado River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity to inform all the Members of the House of the program announced by Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall in his approach to the solution of the multiple problems that have been with us along the lower Colorado River ever since the Parker Dam was constructed in the 1930's.

One of the most vexing problems, which has been of continuing concern to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of this body, is the presence of trespassers and squatters whose occupancy precludes development for public purposes. In addition to the loss of revenue to the Government from unauthorized use, law abiding citizens, following authorized procedures, have been denied rights of occupancy and entry on the lands. Those of us interested in respect for law and order therefore supported the move of the United States, in June 1959, to evict trespassers; this having been offered as the only way to restore governmental authority over the area.

Institution of further eviction proceedings has been halted and the Department of the Interior has now moved to try to work out the problems without forcefully evicting unlawful occupants now on the ground. However, regardless of whether proceedings have previously been instituted, occupants will be required to acknowledge Federal ownership and enter into agreements for use of the lands on a rental basis for a 2-year period during which the Department will be establishing permanent land-use patterns. Where proceedings have been started, such arrangements will form the basis for settlement of the litigation by the Department of Justice. In any event, no new occupancy will be permitted unless it is in accordance with the master plan, and new trespassers will be evicted.

I hope that the squatter trespassers agree to cooperate with the Secretary of the Interior. If they do, it will reestablish Federal control over the area and provide a peaceful solution to the difficulties that have plagued the area along the lower Colorado River these many years. We will have to wait and see; your Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will continue to be watchful of developments.

In the meantime, I congratulate our former colleague, Secretary Udall, on his efforts to find a statesmanlike solution. Under leave to extend my remarks, the complete text of the Department's announcement is inserted at this point in the RECORD:

COLORADO RIVER LAND USE AND TRESPASS PROGRAM ANNOUNCED

The Department of the Interior's plan for settling the troublesome problem of land use along the Colorado River from Davis Dam to the Mexican border was announced today by Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall.

Land along the river was withdrawn many years ago for reclamation purposes, but some of these lands have been occupied by unauthorized squatters who have used various lands for agricultural, recreational, business, and residential purposes.

"In formulating this plan," said the Secretary, "the Department has kept three considerations in sharp focus:

"1. The lands constitute property of the United States and Federal ownership must be recognized;

"2. The locations of the lands along the banks of the only great river in the great Southwest require their integration in any master land-use plan; and

"3. The public interest requires that the lands be administered for the benefit of all the people of the Nation."

Udall's announcement was in two parts: First, there will be established in Yuma, Ariz., effective May 1, a land-use office to supervise implementation of the plan, and, second, details of how the land will be put to use. The latter includes instructions on a transition plan under which the squatters who cooperate can continue to use the lands for a period of at least 2 years while the land-use plan is put into effect.

"Some of the Government-owned land along the Colorado," Udall said, "offers an opportunity to salvage a major national recreational and scenic asset." The land will be classified in four categories:

1. Areas suitable for national recreational development.
2. Areas suitable for national game refuges.
3. Areas suitable for State parks and recreational uses.
4. Areas which should remain under State game and fish agencies as refuges. (Most of the river is bounded by Arizona or California, but to the north, Nevada controls a sizable stretch.)

The Secretary stated that Federal ownership must be acknowledged by the squatters if they are to participate in the transition program.

Udall's plan for present users of the Federal lands—some 20,000 acres of which are devoted to agriculture—includes the following requirements:

1. The squatters will be expected to sign a disclaimer statement acknowledging Federal ownership.
2. Those who do so will be given permits to use the lands they now occupy for approximately 2 years, subject to acreage limitation in case of agricultural use, if they acknowledge Federal ownership and if they agree to pay reasonable rent for past and future use. They will acquire no interest in the land and no preferential treatment will be accorded them in the administration of the program.

"Our program," Udall said, "will restore Federal control and management and at the same time offer the squatters a reasonable course of action to close out their investments. If present unauthorized users refuse to cooperate, we will have no alternative but to commence summary court proceedings to evict and recover full damages for all past use."

Permits for continued occupancy will be offered to persons who were on the land before the date of this announcement (April 20, 1961). Any persons occupying Federal lands along the river subsequently will be evicted and prosecuted for trespass, Udall declared.

The Yuma office will be opened under general supervision of Graham Hollister of Genoa, Nev., Special Assistant to the Secretary. It will administer the permit system, conduct further land use studies, and advise the Secretary in determining the best use, from the public's standpoint, of each parcel of land in the affected area.

Thirteenth Anniversary of the Rebirth of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday the 13th anniversary of the birth of the State of Israel was observed in Independence Square, Philadelphia, by a great number of Philadelphians under the auspices of the Philadelphia Zionist Council and the city of Philadelphia. One of the speakers was the Lieutenant Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the Honorable John Morgan Davis. His talk so impressed the audience and Congressmen WILLIAM A. BARRETT and JAMES A. BYRNE, who attended in addition to myself that I include a copy of same for the benefit of all Members of the Congress:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE JOHN MORGAN DAVIS, LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR, 13TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE REBIRTH OF ISRAEL, APRIL 23, 1961

We gather here today, at the shrine of American independence, to celebrate the birthday of one of the world's newest democracies—the 13th anniversary of the rebirth of Israel.

Here where men declared that "all men are created equal, and are endowed by their Creator with inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness"—here, we come to recognize the reaching of the majority age of the Republic of Israel.

For Israel in this 13th year has come to its bar mitzvah, and has in actuality, reached the age of maturity.

And having done so, Israel becomes spotlighted during this year, and in the court at Jerusalem, shows to all the world—at this very moment—that it has indeed reached manhood in the community of nations.

How similar is the situation in this 13th year of independence for Israel, to our own 13th year as a nation—the first of the world's peoples to declare freedom and liberty before all the world.

For between the year of independence of this nation—between the hallowed Declaration at this very place, and our own 13th year—came revolution, war, and victory.

And in our 13th year, finally, in 1789, sprang forth, out of the minds and hearts of men, a foundation of law, a statement of purpose—the Constitution of the United States of America.

This was the culmination of 13 years of Valley Forge, Ticonderoga, Savannah, Brandywine, and Trenton—out of the Declaration had come turmoil and trial.

And out of turmoil and trial came the Constitution which stated:

"We the people of the United States—in order to form a more perfect union—establish justice."

Today in the spotlight of the world's glare, Israel—in its national manhood—establishes justice for all the world to see—establishes justice on behalf of the world's people—focuses the eye of mankind on the scales of justice in its dedicated effort to keep in men's mind a story of man's inhumanity to man.

Our own Constitution, founded on a Bill of Rights, weighed what had gone before in world governments and produced—in view of all the world—a document dedicated to provide the fundamental bases of man's humanity to man.

So, in a courtroom in Israel today, a young nation rivets the eyes of the world on the monstrous tragedy of men's recent past, in an attempt to insure that such inhumanity will never again take place in our world.

Although there is irony in the trial now taking place, it is an altogether fitting irony. Never before in the history of the civilized world has the magnificent concept of justice been held so high for mankind to look upon.

Never before has any government been so determined that justice shall be conducted fairly and without prejudice to the defense.

It will be impossible to erase the image of this trial from the memory of man.

Yet, remembering back through the years since Dachau and Buchenwald and Auschwitz, there is no more important page in history that man should rewrite. And Israel presents today, a rewriting of that history—no, rather a commentary on the history—a vividly true presentation of the facts of a time when men were inhumane to other men; when one man, or one people, or one nation, permitted genocide to be perpetrated.

Without this turning back of the pages of history; without this spotlighting of the horrible death of 6 million Jews and countless number of other peoples the world would little remember; it has already begun to forget.

It has been all too common in the years since nazidom's maniacal brigades ran rampant, to whitewash the actions of these horrible men.

Children have come of age in this decade who do not realize that a Nazi Germany existed. Instead of the harsh truth, we have seen, through popular novels and our photographic media, a blurred picture of military men who acted "on orders," and "noble leaders" who had no taste for the brutality, but who were forced to slaughter millions on orders from "someone higher up."

In the history of mankind; the history fashioned from the creation of man; the history which brought the exodus of the Jewish people out of the house of bondage—there was, is, and always will be, only one Higher Up.

And it is His moral law, given to Moses on Sinai, which commands in four strong words: "Thou shalt not kill."

And this law and nine others are the basis of the Judeo-Christian philosophy; the basis of our moral law; the basis on which the trial at Jerusalem must come to its final conclusion.

Israel is not seeking revenge upon one man or one group of men—or even one nation. This is not a question of revenge.

This is a matter of justice.

This is not even the payment of a debt.

For one life—created in the image of God—can never be fully paid.

The case in Jerusalem is the case against a political system utterly devoid in moral values; a system so amoral and brutal that it could accept the complete extermination of a people without any argument or equivocation.

At this time in the world's history—at this moment in the 13th year of Israel's freedom—the world sits in judgment upon itself in the courtroom at Jerusalem.

It is truly—this 13th year—a year of truth; a year of maturity; a year of emergence for the Republic of Israel.

It is, like our own 13th year, a year of national conscience—in 1789 as in 1961, America emerged to insure, through its Constitution, the rights, under God, of all men.

That year was, in our history, as in Israel's history, the year of emergence.

Both nations were created by those who sought a haven from persecution, and a free life in a new land.

A century and a half of history has seen peoples find freedom in this land; 13 years of history has seen peoples flock to the ancient land of milk and honey, to find freedom in Israel.

We take great pride in the fact that the first nation to recognize the independence of the infant Israel 13 years ago was the United States.

And during this infancy, more than 2 million people have found refuge in this haven of hope—Israel.

In all history—there has not been recorded a greater lesson in man's inhumanity to man as will be recorded in the courtroom at Jerusalem.

And in all history—there has never been recorded a greater lesson in charity—man's humanity to man—than has been recorded in Israel—for that young nation has accepted more homeless people in this short time than any other nation in world history.

We must never forget that Israel is the fount of human charity; that Israel was given to men by a benificent God; that Israel was chosen for His people, that Israel is dedicated to His way of life.

Israel, out of its ancient foundings, cannot be anything but charitable.

Israel, out of God's promise cannot be anything but just.

The land of Canaan was the result of God's promise.

The democracy of Israel is the result of man's genius.

Men only under God can achieve miracles, and in Israel, we have seen the miracle of man's genius, guided by the omnipotent hand of God.

A review of the past 13 years brings undeniable proof of God's handiwork on the earth of Israel.

And in this bar mitzvah, celebration of this great democracy, we stand shoulder to shoulder with this neighbor in the world's community, and extend a heartfelt "mazel."

May we foresee the day, in the not too distant future, when the world can be joyful as the result of the prophecy foretold in Israel that:

"They shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks. Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they know war any more."

This is the lesson we must learn during Israel's 13th year; and if it is learned, no bar mitzvah will ever have been so glorious.

The Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Senator TALMADGE for many years warned the country about the danger of uncontrolled, low wage, textile imports. The following are excerpts from the Senator's very excellent speech before the Atlanta Rotary Club on April 3:

EXCERPTS FROM A SPEECH BY SENATOR HERMAN TALMADGE, OF GEORGIA, TO THE ATLANTA ROTARY CLUB AND THE ATLANTA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE ON APRIL 3, 1961

As you know, for a period of more than 10 years now, I have been seeking corrective action to remedy the plight of the American textile industry.

Defense officials tell us that the textile industry is second only to steel in its importance to the security of our country. Yet, since the conclusion of World War II, we have seen more than 800 textile mills forced out of business in the United States, and more than 400,000 textile workers lose their jobs.

The wage scale in the United States—and in Georgia where we have about 100,000 people employed in the textile industry—is approximately 10 times what it is in Hong Kong, several times what it is in Indonesia and India, and far higher than it is in Portugal, France, and Italy. To compound that situation, a bale of cotton sells anywhere in the world for $42.50 less than it sells where it is grown in this country.

Now with odds such as that—where the wage scale is 10 to 1, and raw material is 8½ cents a pound cheaper—how can the American textile industry be expected to survive, particularly when we are welcoming the importation of competing products from other countries.

Some 5 years ago the textile industry of this country and allied countries were faced with competition primarily from the Japanese. And, let me say, it was the American taxpayers who rebuilt the Japanese textile industry with new equipment, and made it just as modern as it is anywhere in these United States.

When it became apparent that Congress otherwise would take action, the Japanese textile industry entered into a voluntary quota arrangement to limit the importation of Japanese textiles into the United States.

Since that time, however, competition has developed in Hong Kong, the Philippines, Indonesia, India, Portugal, Italy, and many other cheap-labor countries. It has become so severe that even the Japanese are being undercut. As a result they are now petitioning their government to increase the export quotas to the United States.

In recent years we have gone from a net exporter of textiles to a net importer. As I have noted some 400,000 jobs have been liquidated. There are only 900,000 jobs remaining in that industry in this country.

Senator PASTORE of Rhode Island, ably assisted by Senators THURMOND of South Carolina and COTTON of New Hampshire served as a special subcommittee of the Senate Com-

merce Committee to investigate this matter. They held hearings throughout the country and have submitted urgent recommendations for action to the Senate.

The only way the textile industry can survive in Georgia and in the United States will be through the imposition of some form of quotas limiting the amounts of all kind of textile products which can be shipped into this country.

Many people have said that we must have free trade. But I submit that there is no way that we can have free trade when our competitors' wage level is 10 percent of ours and their raw material cost is 8½ cents per pound lower. When Cordull Hull and Franklin D. Roosevelt devised the reciprocal trade policies which have been in existence since that time, it was their view then that we would export products we had in surplus and that would not import such products. Today's situation is far cry from that. We are importing more textiles into the United States of America than we are exporting. In many of the department stores here in Atlanta, Ga., you can find textiles imported from many countries and, in most instances, selling at retail cheaper than our own Georgia textile mills can manufacture them.

We have discussed this on the floor of the Senate. A House delegation with Congressmen VINSON as chairman called on the President a few days ago and a delegation from the Senate will meet with him in the not too distant future.

I have discussed this matter on several occasions with Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges. I have discussed it on two different occasions with the President of the United States. I am hopeful that we can get some affirmative action taken.

If we fail in that regard we will, in my judgment, see the complete liquidation of the textile industry in our country in the not too distant future.

Disturbing Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under the heading "Disturbing Proposal", an editorial appears in the April issue of the American Cattle Producer, the publication of the American National Cattlemen's Association, which I am sure reflects the sentiments of not only the vast majority of the cattle producers in this country, but the sentiments of a great many operating farmers.

To me, the President's farm message and the omnibus farm bill introduced in Congress last week contained some exceedingly disturbing proposals which seemed to stem from a belief that only through government intervention can all segments of our agricultural economy remain prosperous. I think the record refutes this assumption in that there are many agricultural commodities, including cattle, which are enjoying a rather satisfactory price relationship. Rather than leaving these commodities alone to enjoy their prosperity, this administration seems bent on extending Federal regulation to every farmer and every farm commodity. There are some problems that do exist in agriculture which need the immediate attention of Congress and the Department of Agriculture. It would seem only practical that the immediate attention of Congress should be given to dealing with these known problems that do exist rather than dealing with a piece of legislation which has so many indeterminate possibilities.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is unfortunate that this administration has seen fit to introduce legislation which serves more to disturb a large segment of our agriculture economy than to deal with problems that are known to exist in specific segments of agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include this editorial from the American Cattle Producer with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

DISTURBING PROPOSAL

A disturbing proposal in President John F. Kennedy's special farm message to Congress is one which calls for referendums under which a two-thirds vote of farmers could put a commodity under Federal controls.

Included in the proposals are production and marketing quotas which, as we have seen in the instances where they have already been used, readily become capital assets which are valuable and salable.

Once started, therefore, these quotas become permanent and hang over the commodity like a straitjacket, impeding any movement of an industry toward expansion or adjustment to changing times.

The administration's proposals would offer this program to any or all of the various agricultural commodities, including, of course, cattle.

Agriculture, like business, is continually adjusting itself to changing conditions. For instance, the recent census of agriculture shows that enormous adjustments have been taking place in recent years within the agricultural economy.

In 5 years, the number of farms counted by the census declined from 4.8 million to 3.7 million—down 1,078,774 farms. This was a 23 percent reduction. Even after allowing for the change in the census definition of a farm, the number still dropped by 846,912, or 17 percent.

And within these figures were many other important changes. The number of farms producing $10,000 or more of sales increased 211,053, or 36 percent. The number producing between $5,000 and $10,000 of sales declined 54,000, or 8 percent. The number of part time and residential farms went down 167,000, or 12 percent, and the number of uneconomic, inadequate, small farms producing less than $5,000 of sales (commercial farms, too small to support a family) went down 1,072,519—a 53-percent decrease.

Thus the most important of these adjustments is a significant increase of adequate and quite successful commercial farms and a sharp decrease in the number of inadequate units on which families cannot make a satisfactory living.

The truly depressed segment of agriculture is the 965,000 farms in the 1959 census that produced less than $5,000 of gross sales. They constitute agriculture's underprivileged, poverty-stricken families. But the fact still remains that 5 years earlier there were 2,037,740 such farms.

It seems almost tragic to ignore these adjustments within agriculture and while adjustments are so rapidly advancing to suggest that the more productive, commercial segment of agriculture should be brought under control in order to provide benefits primarily to the 1 million farm families on unproductive farms.

The President's farm message ignores these adjustments. It would move us in the direction of high-cost control, increased food prices to consumers, expanded bureaucracy to run the programs, and it would block many of the adjustments that have been going forward at an all-time record rate.

Perhaps least of all can the beef cattle industry afford to let itself be brought into such a program. In the past 20 years the production of beef has doubled. This has been accomplished through improvement in the product. The market has been responding by wanting more beef. The industry has been able to expand in recent years even with rising prices.

A quota system for beef output would be an inevitable brake on further expansion. Quotas on amounts of beef marketed would merely hand some of the market for beef over to other meats and thus be an unnecessary ceiling over the cattle industry.

And under the administration's proposal, any small but vocal group of producers could request the Secretary of Agriculture to develop a quota program for cattle production. When this would be put to referendum it could be people rather than cattle that would vote. The producer who sells a half-dozen head a year would have as much voice as the man who runs several hundred head.

Not only stockmen and farmers but the Nation as a whole should pause long and look hard before we make such a fundamental change in economic policy as is requested in the President's farm message.

Destiny of Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, one of our most urgent concerns is the destiny of Latin America. Robert B. Dresser, writing in Economic Council Papers, volume XVI, No. 3, March 15, 1961, makes some splendid points which should be of interest to all Americans:

COMMUNISM AND THE HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE—WE ARE LOSING THE COLD WAR

(By Robert B. Dresser)

Beginning with the loss of China to the Communists in 1949, the Communists have made steady gains in the Far East and the Middle East, and even in the Western Hemisphere where their stooge, Castro, helped to power by our own State Department, is now in complete control of Cuba, an island within 90 miles of the Florida coast. Communist control of Cuba constitutes a most serious threat to the safety of the United States.

How has this come about?

LETTER TO THE EDITOR BY ROBERT B. DRESSER DECEMBER 26, 1951

In December 1951 I wrote a letter to the editor of the Providence Journal, which was published in that paper on December 26, 1951, from which I quote as follows:

"DANGERS FROM WITHOUT

"On November 30, 1950, President Truman, in a statement to the public on the intervention of Communist China in Korea, said:

" 'If aggression is successful in Korea, we can expect it to spread through Asia and Europe to this hemisphere. We are fighting in Korea for our own national security and survival.'

• • • • •

"It is the opinion of many competent observers (1) that the key to the successful achievement of Russia's manifest objective of world conquest is China, and not Europe or any other area, (2) that Russian control of China located in the center of Asia, with its 450 million people, the greatest reservoir of manpower in the world, would undoubtedly lead in the end to Russian control of all Asia with one-half the world's population, and (3) that with Russia in complete control of Asia the subjugation of Western Europe would quickly follow, and the United States without allies of appreciable strength, would face the rest of the world alone with but little chance of survival.

"That this is the Russian view is abundantly clear. Why it should not have been ours is far from clear. For years we recognized the importance of maintaining the independence and territorial integrity of China and her friendship for us. We even fought World War II against Japan for this very purpose. Successful in that war, we proceeded upon its termination to relinquish the fruits of our victory and to turn control of China over to our arch enemy, Russia, an infinitely more dangerous foe than Japan.

"Six years ago William Z. Foster, head of the Communist Party in this country, said:

" 'The war in China is the key of all problems on the international front.'

"In his radio address to the American people on April 11, 1951, President Truman said:

" 'The attack on Korea was part of a greater plan for conquering all of Asia.' In the same address President Truman quoted a Communist officer in the Far East as saying, 'In order to successfully undertake the long-awaited world revolution, we must first unify Asia.' Mr. Truman then stated, 'That is what the Communist leaders are telling their people, and that is what they have been trying to do. They want to control all Asia from the Kremlin.'

"Could anything be plainer? Despite this clear evidence of Russian intention, our Government has pursued in Asia a policy of appeasement with Russia, and by its betrayal of Nationalist China has put in Russia's hands the means of conquering all Asia, which Russia regards as the first step toward achieving her ambition of world conquest.

"That Chiang and his Nationalist government were deliberately betrayed by our own Government and prevented from waging a successful fight against the Communists would seem to be conclusively established by the evidence.

"Even after the 80th Congress in the spring of 1948, sought to repair the damage done by the State Department's policy regarding Chiang by authorizing substantial aid to Nationalist China, including much-needed military arms and equipment, the shipments were held up so that they did not arrive in time to save Chiang. In the opinion of Vice Adm. Russell S. Berkey, Navy director of public information, expressed in a speech made on May 15, 1950, had they arrived on time, the Chinese Communists 'would still be north of the Great Wall.'

"It should be noted that what Chiang needed was not our men, but our guns and ammunition. He had the men.

"With China in friendly hands, there would have been no Korean War and the 100,000 casualties suffered by us to date (now 150,000) would not have occurred. These casualties, therefore, are the direct result of the betrayal of Chiang.

"The high-minded 'agrarian reformers,' as representatives of our State Department chose to call the Chinese Communists, whom our State Department favored, won the war and drove Chiang out of China. For the past year these agrarian reformers, acting under the orders of Moscow, have been killing our American boys by the thousands in Korea.

"Meantime, our Government, in concert with the United Nations, has placed important limitations on our military commanders in the field by prohibiting the bombing of Chinese Communist bases across the boundary in Manchuria, and by forbidding the use of the half million troops which Chiang has on the island of Formosa. This has led our commanders, or certain of them, at least, to state that with such limitations it will be impossible to end the war in Korea. Meanwhile, we continue to furnish 90 percent of the outside troops in Korea and to suffer 90 percent of the casualties.

"Despite this incredible mishandling (to put it mildly) of our foreign affairs, the men responsible for it are still in office and directing such affairs.

"Are we as a people content to let these men continue to manage our affairs? Are we content to let the senseless slaughter of our boys in Korea continue in a war we are forbidden to win? If not, Mr. Citizen, what are you going to do about it?

"ROBERT B. DRESSER."

ARTICLE IN AMERICAN LEGION MAGAZINE FOR MAY 1951

In an article published in the American Legion magazine for May 1951, under the title "Who is Letting Our GI's Down?", written after a tour of the battlelines in Korea, Erle Cocke, Jr., national commander of the American Legion, wrote as follows:

"Our present-day Benedict Arnolds may glibly argue that it is necessary to keep Chiang and his armies blockaded on Formosa, but these arguments make no sense to our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines who have to do the fighting and dying. They see in Chiang's vast armies a way of saving some of the 250 lives that are being needlessly sacrificed each week because certain furtive people expound that Chiang isn't the right sort of person, and, therefore, we cannot accept his aid. Our fighting men are not impressed by these false prophets because they haven't forgotten that these same people not long ago were lauding Mao's murdering hordes as 'agrarian reformers.'

"For the life of them—and 'life' is meant in a very literal sense—they can't understand why our State Department and the United Nations make it necessary for them to be slaughtered by red armies which swarm down on them from territory which our own heads of Government make sacrosanct.

"Agents of the Kremlin, sitting in the councils of the United Nations, in Washington and elsewhere, must laugh up their sleeves at our utter idiocy. But you may be sure that our GI's are not amused. They see the picture as clearly as the Soviet agents do, but, unlike our stateside leaders, they see the results of this criminal skulldruggery in the blood they shed and in the mangled corpses of their buddies.

"What they cannot understand, though, is the strange apathy of the people back home. As they listen to radio reports of what is happening thousands of miles to the east of them, they are puzzled. Isn't the American public aware of what is going on? Don't they realize that their sons and husbands and sweethearts are fighting a ruthless enemy who has them at a terrible disadvantage, thanks to stupid or traitorous advisers and inept diplomacy?"

STATEMENT OF SENATOR TAFT IN 1957

On June 25, 1952, Senator Robert A. Taft repeated his demand for allied air smashes against Chinese Communist bases in Manchuria, stating that "all through the Korean war, 2 years old today, targets in Chinese Manchuria have been out of bounds to allied airmen."

STATEMENT OF GENERAL CLARK IN 1957

On September 17, 1957, Gen. Mark W. Clark, president of The Citadel, the military college of South Carolina, and former allied commander in Korea, made an address at the American Legion's National Commander's Dinner in Atlantic City after receiving the Distinguished Service Medal. I quote from his address the following:

"Imagine in Korea where our airmen could go up to the Yalu River and there look down and across it—see bridges that we were unable to destroy; see airfields loaded with Mig 15's and see ammunition dumps and other kinds of storage places piled to the sky with paraphernalia designed by the Communists to kill our men. Their killers came across the river with these weapons of war and I was not permitted to take out those bridges. Certainly we should have done it. If I'd had the authority and they had let me, I would have bombed Manchuria and North China.

* * * * *

"Let's not fight another war like we fought in Korea with our hands tied behind our backs. May God forbid that we ever have to fight another war, but when the authorities of our country decide that to protect our vital interests, it is essential, then let's do it with every means that we've got at our disposal and we will win it fast."

WE LOST THE KOREAN WAR

We lost the Korean war, a war which it was so important for us to win and which we could so easily have wone, as every commander in the field and other competent critic, I believe, will testify.

Our winning the Korean war would have led to the downfall of the Communist regime in China, and would have changed completely the world situation in our favor.

CUBA

Cuba has become a Communist satellite within 90 miles of the Florida coast. To permit this condition to continue is to jeopardize the independence and safety of the United States.

It is difficult to understand why our Government has permitted this situation to develop. Is it possible that we are going to continue our policy of vacillation and appeasement to a point where Communist Russia will be so firmly entrenched that she cannot be driven from the island without a war with the Soviet Union?

We have before us the tragic case of China where, because of the incredible errors and blundering of our Government (to put it mildly), a country with 450 million people was turned over to Communist rule. As a direct result, the United States and the entire free world have been placed in a position of dire peril.

ARTICLE IN PROVIDENCE JOURNAL, SEPTEMBER 11, 1960

In the Providence Sunday Journal for September 11, 1960, there was a news article headed, "Two Senators Say State Department Aided Castro."

I quote from this article as follows:

"Two Democratic Senators said yesterday that 'unknown policy planners' in the State Department cleared the way for assumption of power in Cuba by the Fidel Castro regime. They said this handed the island over to the Communists.

* * * * *

"Earl E. T. Smith and Arthur Gardiner, former Ambassadors to Cuba, told the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security last month that State Department policies, and some U.S. newspapers, misguided U.S. public opinion about the situation preceding Castro's rise to power in Cuba.

"The testimony was made public yesterday by the subcommittee. Senators EASTLAND and DODD commented on it in a joint statement.

"They said Cuba, 'was handed to Castro and the Communists by a combination of

Americans in the same way that China was handed to the Communists.' They said unknown policy planners 'worked with pro-Castro elements in the American press to make Castro appear as Robin Hood.'

* * * * *

"The Senators said the testimony of the two former Ambassadors—both political appointees of President Eisenhower—demonstrate that American foreign policy is not made by top officials, but by 'unknown policy planners and memo makers who fill the Secretary's "in" basket.'

* * * * *

"The two Senators said that low level officials 'misguided American opinion' with the aid of the U.S. press."

STATEMENT OF DR. RUFO LOPEZ-FRESQUET

At a meeting in Sarasota, Fla., on January 17 of this year, Dr. Rufo Lopez-Frequet, the guest speaker, stated that Castro was a Communist from the beginning and that the decisions in Cuba at the present time are not made in Cuba but in Moscow. Dr. Lopez-Fresquet, a patriotic, well-educated Cuban, was former Minister of Finance for Castro. He fled to the United States when he found out that Castro was a Communist and was converting Cuba into a Soviet satellite.

PANAMA

Cuba is not the only danger spot in the Western Hemisphere. Another of equal importance is Panama.

On September 17, 1960, on the eve of Premier Khrushchev's arrival in this country, President Eisenhower ordered the flag of Panama to be flown with the flag of the United States in the Canal Zone.

Senator STYLES BRIDGES is quoted as having said that he was "surprised and deeply shocked" and that he saw "absolutely no valid reason" for the flag-flying order.

In the language of Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, in a statement issued September 21, 1960:

"It is a cowardly yielding on the part of the Executive to the pressure of mob rule in Panama comparable to hoisting the Soviet flag on U.S. territory. The ill-advised step, taken with the hope of placating Panamanian radicals, can only incite them to increase their demands.

* * * * *

"The Congress has been long aware of the fact that subversive influences are in control of important areas in our Department of State. It is the gradual growth and spread of this subversive influence that has alarmed the Congress.

* * * * *

"In this connection, we should recognize that an inexcusable policy of compromise and placation has made our Canal Zone the tinderbox of the Caribbean. We are dealing with a Soviet-organized plan for conquest of the Caribbean, which has the Panama Canal as its key objective. Such conquest by the Soviet would be but a prelude to their intended conquest of the United States.

* * * * *

"The congressional inquiries into subversive activities in the Department of State, which are now underway, should be pressed with increased vigor to the end that these influences may be identified and corrective actions taken by the Congress to repudiate the President's ill-advised action of surrender."

It should be noted that in 1903 the United States acquired by treaty exclusive sovereignty over the Canal Zone. This is a right which can be surrendered or modified only by renegotiation of the treaty and ratification by a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

MONROE DOCTRINE

In 1823 President James Monroe announced as a policy of the United States that we would regard as an unfriendly act dangerous to our peace and safety any attempt by a European power to oppress or control in any way any country in this hemisphere that had declared and maintained its independence. This meant that we would resist any such action. In the opinion of competent students of the subject, the Monroe Doctrine may properly be construed to include penetration and subversion.

RESOLUTION INTRODUCED IN CONGRESS

Last year a resolution was introduced in Congress stating that the United States would be "justified * * * in taking steps to forestall intervention, domination, control and colonization by international communism in the New World." The resolution was opposed by the State Department and as far as I am aware, no hearings were held upon it.

THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

In August, 1960, the United States broke off diplomatic relations with the Dominican Republic. The form of government we thought needed to be changed. It was a dictatorship under the control of one Trujillo, so we decided with a lot of Latin American countries that Trujillo must go. Incidentally, it happens Trujillo had some time ago severed diplomatic relations with Russia—the only head of a government in the Western Hemisphere, I believe, that has had the courage to do this. He was a friend of the United States and had never, I understand, caused us any trouble.

If we are successful in our undertaking, the chances are good that Trujillo will be succeeded by someone of the Castro type.

While we severed diplomatic relations with Trujillo, no thought was given to such action with respect to Castro. His government, you know, was not a dictatorship, but a democracy. And, of course, Russia and her satellite nations have a democratic form of government and therefore must be recognized.

How absurd can our Government get.

It was not until January 3 of this year that we broke off diplomatic relations with Castro.

HOUSE CLEANING IN STATE DEPARTMENT OVERDUE

Senator GEORGE A. SMATHERS, Democrat, of Florida, stated on January 9, 1961, that the State Department should be swept clean from top to bottom.

A very revealing book on this subject entitled, "Inside the State Department," has been written by Bryton Barron, a former member of the Department, and is well worth reading.

THREE-STAR EXTRA BROADCAST, OCTOBER 16, 1957

On October 16, 1957, Ray Henle in the Three-Star Extra radio broadcast said:

"Three-Star Extra feels that it should pass along to you this opinion, namely, that the international noose is tightening around our necks, and to all outward appearances nothing is being done to let us slip out.

"We are facing serious reversals in three important areas of the world—in the Far East, where no effective measures are being taken to overthrow the Chinese Communists; in the Middle East, where Russia, after centuries of trying, is on the verge of getting a firm, unshakable foothold; in Europe, where we are losing our battle to gain unification of Germany, with all that means to the strengthening of our European frontiers.

* * * * *

"But in Washington, no top official gives voice to an effective course of action and, indeed, powerful elements in the State Department advocate reaching an accommodation with the Communists on the three problems just mentioned.

"The very groups which now want an accommodation were in the forefront advocating, in the Far East, not to let MacArthur bring Red China to her knees, which could have been done in the Korean war, not to have a strong effective policy in the Middle East in order to keep the Russians out, not to force our way into Berlin during the airlife blockade. In each case, appeasement policies were advocated and adopted officially by our Government.

"The fruits of such appeasement now bring chickens home to roost. In our opinion, only the strongest leadership will get us out of our difficulties."

CONCLUSION

Yes, we are losing the cold war, and rapidly.

Meanwhile, we spend our time trying to destroy those who are seeking to save us from the Communists.

Does this make sense?

Bacone College Choir Charms Capitol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, some Members of this body, along with several hundred others who were passing by, enjoyed a rare treat on last Thursday afternoon, April 20. They had the pleasure of hearing Oklahoma's famous Bacone College Choir sing for the "Voice of America" on the Capitol steps.

The choir had not scheduled the "Voice of America" broadcast as a regular part of its annual nationwide tour, but cheerfully performed on very short notice in order to spread the word of the great work being done at Bacone College.

Founded in 1880 before Oklahoma was a State, Bacone was initially known as Indian University, and has always been primarily interested in the education of Indian youths. More than 40 different tribes from every corner of the United States, and from Mexico and Panama as well, are represented in its student body.

An accredited junior college sponsored by the American Baptist Home Mission Societies, Bacone sends its students to senior colleges and universities all over the United States. Its campus, on the outskirts of Muskogee, Okla., is one of the most beautiful in the southwest.

In its current tour, the college choir is singing in Missouri, Indiana, Ohio, West Virginia, Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Illinois, in addition to two scheduled appearances already completed in Washington, D.C. Directed by Miss Jeannine Rainwater and accompanied by Mrs. Dick West, the choir features a splendid range of selections, and is aided in its colorful presentation by dances performed by the Wauhillau Indian Club.

Because the list of members of the choir provides a splendid picture of the tribal and State representation in it, I am listing the names of the members who performed in Washington:

Judy Onon Anquoe, Onondaga, New York; Joe Brown Bennett, Seminole-Creek, California; Freeda Blair, Oklahoma; Louie Brown, Cherokee, Oklahoma; Tony Buck, Creek, Oklahoma;

John Clements, Cherokee, Oklahoma; Gilbert Cosen, Apache, Arizona; Johnny Edwards, Cherokee, Arkansas; Bernadine George, Onondaga, New York; Will Getz, Oklahoma; Jo Ann Gibson, Shoshone, Nevada; William Givens, Creek, Oklahoma; Kelly Haney, Seminole, Oklahoma; Mary Hill, Delaware-Shawnee, Oklahoma; Joanna Ketcher, Cherokee, Oklahoma; Lance Lujan, Kiowa-Taos, Kansas; Jeanette Mandel, Paiute, Nevada; Mary Jane Miles, Nez Perces, Idaho; Thelma Murr, Oklahoma; James Palmer, Seminole-Creek, Oklahoma; Jenelle Poemoceah, Comanche, Oklahoma; Barbara Richards, Oklahoma; Melva Richardson, Cherokee-Sapony-Tuskarora, North Carolina; Patti Richardson, Cherokee-Sapony-Tuskarora, North Carolina; Shari Skenandore, Oneida, Wisconsin; Robert Soontay, Kiowa-Apache, Oklahoma; Telma Thomas, Nez Perce, Idaho; Russell Tsoodle, Kiowa, Oklahoma; Sam Warnock, Oklahoma; Antonwine Warrior, Sac and Fox, Oklahoma; Arch Henry White, Shawnee, California; Clara White Hip, Crow, Montana; Lou Ella Whiteman, Crow, Montana; David Williams, Tonkawa-Kiowa, Oklahoma.

While it is obvious that Indians predominate in the choir, it is also apparent that five choir members are non-Indian students. In its rapidly growing student body of today, Bacone includes many students who belong to no Indian tribe but have been drawn to the beautiful Oklahoma college by its splendid curriculum and its rich tradition.

Almon C. Bacone, who founded the college 81 years ago, summed up its mission in these words:

A Christian school planted in the midst of a people becomes one of the most powerful agencies in the work of civilization.

Bacone College goes about its important job of advancing the work of civilization in this turbulent century, and the choir which it sends across the Nation is a splendid group of ambassadors.

Twenty Thousand Relatives Still To Be Reunited Under Public Law 363

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Remo Zuecca, a representative of Il Popolo Italiano in Philadelphia, which is the only independent weekly in both English and Italian with a national circulation, sent me the following article on immigration taken from the March–April issue of the ACIM Dispatch published by the American Committee on Italian Migration.

The article is excellent and confirms my contention that the Visa Office of the Department of State and our consular authorities in Italy and throughout the world are dragging their feet in administering the law and reuniting families here in America.

I urge my colleagues to carefully read this article and then take appropriate action:

TWENTY THOUSAND RELATIVES STILL TO BE REUNITED UNDER PUBLIC LAW 363

In the 17 months since the enactment of legislation that allowed the entry of some 30,000 Italians into the United States, only 9,684 have been reunited with their families here. This figure was announced by the U.S. Visa Office on March 15, 1961.

The bill, signed into law by President Eisenhower on September 22, 1959 (Public Law 86–363), was designed to assist in the reunion of parents and spouses, sons and daughters, brothers and sisters of American citizens who had filed registration for migration to the United States before December 31, 1953.

The passage of the law was hailed by the American Committee on Italian Migration as a major advance in its efforts to bring about the complete reunion of all family units.

Assurances were received months ago from the Department of State Visa Office that visa petitions of those eligible would be accelerated, and though there has been a slight step-up in the processing of applications, ACIM sincerely hopes that immediate action will be taken by the authorities to insure a quicker reunion of those families who have been patiently waiting for years, and who benefit by Public Law 363.

Address by Mr. Richard Kulze

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Mr. Richard Kulze, president of the American Seafood Distributors Association, entitled "Foreign Trade Today and the Future of the American Fishing Industry":

ADDRESS OF RICHARD KULZE, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN SEAFOOD DISTRIBUTORS ASSOCIATION AT ITS ANNUAL MEMBERSHIP MEETING, APRIL 15, 1961

The United States is on the verge of a historic change in its trade policy. We are either about to revert to a form of protectionism that we have not seen since Smoot-Hawley days, or—and I hope this is so—we are about to enter into a challenging program whereby this country can increase its exports abroad, preserve our domestic economy and our defense, and aid the free world. The status quo of U.S. trade policy can no longer be preserved in today's world; we must go one way or the other. It is vital to the country—and to us individually and as members of the fishing industry—that we choose the right way.

I need not emphasize to you those signs which point up the efforts of some who would lead us down the path of retreat to a high tariff wall. They have been highlighted in our newspapers: the U.S. balance of payments deficit, our gold loss, unemployment, threatened boycotts by labor against imported raw material. Of course these are not signs which indicate that the United States should head toward a protectionist policy. But they are new factors being used by those who favor high tariffs in an attempt to rush this country into a new and drastic trade policy.

Some 50 resolutions have been introduced in the 87th Congress which would declare it to be the sense of Congress that the United States should grant no further tariff reductions in the forthcoming GATT negotiations. Various bills have been introduced embodying the so-called flexible tariff principle, whereby some form of tariff adjustment is proposed based upon the difference between production costs here and abroad. Import labeling bills—pocket vetoed by President Eisenhower—have been reintroduced in this Congress. And individual commodity bills have been introduced providing for tariffs or quotas on bread, meat, iron ore, charcoal, plywood, chocolatas, and shrimp, among other items.

Our balance of payments deficit and the resultant gold drain are matters of grave concern to this country, even though the United States still has nearly one-half of the free world's monetary gold stock. Steps are being taken by our Government in an endeavor to better this situation, primarily by having the industrialized nations play a stronger role in foreign economic aid and free world defense programing, as well as continuing their relaxation of import restrictions that hinder broadened U.S. exports. But we cannot deny that the payments deficit has provided a strong vehicle for revival of protectionist thinking.

We can never emphasize enough that the payments deficit is the net difference of the funds that go out of this country—for imports, military installations abroad, U.S. tourists abroad, and foreign aid—and the funds that come to the United States—for our exports, foreign visitors, and income on foreign investments. It is not a trade deficit we are talking about, for we have had a healthy surplus of exports over imports for years and years, and in fact since 1894. In 1960, for example, our export trade exceeded import trade by roughly $4.7 billion, the third highest trade surplus of the decade.

There are those, however, who believe that so long as we have any deficit in our balance of payments, the remedy lies in trade restrictions and a decrease in our imports. So what really is at stake with those who seek to better our balance of payments situation by trade restrictions is not at all a trade deficit, but rather the magnitude of the trade surplus which could serve to cover in part the deficit in other payments categories. This is like saying that the Federal cigarette tax should pay the cost of operating the Department of the Interior; the payments deficit and the trade surplus are that unrelated.

On this new development of trade boycotts, because of unemployment, electrical workers in Chicago have threatened to boycott imports of Japanese radio, phonograph, and television parts. The Amalgamated Clothing Workers have threatened a boycott against Japanese fabrics to force the establishment of a quota on imported men's suits from Japan. Yet, imports of electronic parts amount to three-tenths of 1 percent of U.S. production, and imports of men's suits constitute two-tenths of 1 percent of American production. But this threat by certain labor groups to refuse to handle imported materials in the manufacturing process is an ominous development. If the threats become reality, it would have disasterous effect on the U.S. and world trade. Such boycotts would create a situation whereby U.S. trade policy would be determined by the unilateral and unofficial actions of particular segments of the population.

The payments deficit and unemployment are two serious problems for our country. Their cause is not imports, and their cure is not in import restrictions. This is no time for fear; this is a time for challenge. American industry did not become great by being sheltered; it achieved its greatness because of intelligence, pioneering spirit, research, new and imaginative ideas, and the one sure road to success—giving the consumer the best possible product for the best possible value.

This is a time of great challenge for U.S. industry and U.S. trade policy, particularly with the formation of trade blocs abroad, primarily in Europe. Over half of the U.S. exports go to 15 industrialized nations of the world, most of whom are members of trade blocs. These blocs, now mostly in the formative stage, are the groundwork for an economic system making possible the production and distribution efficiencies, the high wage rates, and the massive purchasing power which heretofore have been associated only with the United States.

Whether the United States will continue to maintain its large export volume with these countries depends upon which trade road we decide to take at this crucial intersection. A trade study group of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in a report issued last month said:

"American decisions regarding international trade can topple or strengthen the government of an undeveloped state, cleave or cement an international alliance, confound or contribute to Communist expansionism. It can raise or lower standards of life, increase or decrease job opportunities, make or break industries in places as far apart as Karachi and Chicago."

Not only is the direction we take vital in relation to maintaining our existing export market and vital in determining the role which our exports will play in the tremendous markets that will rapidly be created in the now underdeveloped countries, but it is vital in relation to your freedom, that of your children, and that of millions throughout the world, particularly because of the challenge posed by the trading tactics and techniques of the Communist bloc.

Today is the time that flexibility and resourcefulness are essential in our Nation's economic life. Instead, U.S. foreign trade policy has moved toward increasing rigidity. Up to now, we have not provided incentives for American producers to adjust to change. By legislation or administrative regulation, we have tightened the escape clause in the Trade Agreements Act, the Buy-American Act, and the Anti-Dumping Act.

Now is the time for a new import policy, one that rejects the concept that international trade should be largely an exchange of noncompeting surpluses. Our past thinking has tended to encourage the export of manufactured goods and the import of raw materials, but to discourage the export of capital equipment and the import of manufactured goods. And yet in 1960, 79 percent of what we sold abroad was manufactured or semimanufactured goods. Trade thrives when we exchange that which we make best for that which other nations make better than we.

The Trade Agreements Acts, under which we negotiate item-by-item tariff reductions under the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade, expires in 1962. A very basic change required in our trade policy, and which should be included in reenactment of that legislation, is a shift from item-by-item negotiations to an across-the-board method by which we would be offering to reduce national tariff averages by a given percentage over a given period of 3 to 5 years. This we must do, because the across-the-board approach is being used by the European trade blocs. Since one of our major concerns is maintaining our very sizable export trade with those countries, our negotiating effort must be in step with the pace and the approach those countries are following.

Such a proposal will not be well received by those who have apprehension at the ability of American industry to compete with countries that pay wages far lower than those earned by American labor. Yet as I mentioned before, U.S. exports of finished manufactures, produced by the highest wage industries in the world, have consistently been well in excess of U.S. imports of finished manufactures. Scores of American industries, big and little, consistently have been able to outsell Europeans in their home markets, as well as here in the U.S. market, and in third countries.

Given an equal chance in the world marketplace, most American consumer goods are well able to hold their own despite the wage gap. This is so because the ability to compete is determined not by national wage levels, but by total costs per unit of production. In comparing labor costs, the important standard is not wage rates but unit labor costs, which take into account not only wages, but also fringe benefits, volume of production, the number of workers required to put it out, and the amount of time it takes. Fringe benefits constitute a larger part of total labor costs in foreign countries than here. In some Western European countries, they run more than 40 percent of total labor costs. Capital, power, and raw materials are usually more expensive abroad than here. The wage gap seems to be narrowing. Labor costs per hour have risen more abroad since 1953 than here in the United States. Labor unions abroad are gaining strength and are beginning to push for higher wages.

The degree of displacement of American jobs by cheap foreign labor has been grossly exaggerated. Imports that are more or less competitive with U.S. production amount to about a fourth of our total imports. A study by the Library of Congress in combination with the Department of Labor in 1958 indicated that if all U.S. tariffs were suspended, the labor displacement that might result from such a free trade expansion of imports would range between 18,000 and 45,000 manufacturing workers. If this figure were doubled as a safety factor, it would represent less than half of 1 percent of our labor force.

Another figure is interesting: The peak total employment since 1948 in all industries in which the Tariff Commission has found serious injury under the escape clause was less than 150,000 workers. The lowest total employment in these industries since 1948 was slightly less than 100,000. If the apparent gross reduction in employment of about 50,000 is attributed solely to imports, without consideration to the effects of the recession, automation, and competition from other domestic products, the displacement is still a very, very small part of our total labor force. To those 50,000 who became unemployed, it was a very personal and harsh matter, for as we know, the national interest means different things to different people.

On the whole, however, American business has made and is making a successful response to foreign competition. How well American business faces up to the new competitive forces which have developed hinges on how well it applies the wide array of policies and methods at its disposal. The combined effect of foreign competition and high wage rates has forced most U.S. industries to find new and better ways of doing things. A major factor has been that cost of production and price policies have been subjected to meticulous reappraisal.

A second vital factor which must be included in the new U.S. trade policy is that of adjustment. Where we have injurious dislocation caused by imports, it should be promptly dealt with, in the first instance, by domestic economic policy, not through foreign trade machinery. Today the first step taken by any group alleging import injury is to restrict imports. The escape clause is in reality only an attempted evasion of the problem faced by the complaining parties, not a significant step toward its solution. The American economy needs a stimulus to adapt, not a relief or escape from the need to do so. Legislation that tells American producers that they would be protected against dislocation and hence against the need to adjust is bad economics and bad political science.

Thus, our Federal policy's response to the dislocating effects of imports should emphasize adjustment, rather than preservation of the status quo. If these dislocating problems are important enough to require Government assistance, they deserve the kind of assistance that assures success, not that which camouflages the real issue. Management inefficiencies are no reason for tariff assistance by the Government, nor should the Government be committed to the preservation of every industry or of its existing industrial structure.

A Federal adjustment program need not mean, and should not mean, greater Federal control over the economy, nor should it mean an uprooting of people from their home areas. A Federal adjustment program could include such measures as loans at low interest rates to finance new equipment with which to improve production of existing products or to embark on new lines of production. There could be special amortization privileges on equipment depreciation for tax purposes.

There could be tax breaks for research and development expenditures. There could be labor retraining programs. There could be technical assistance to local governments, labor, and industry. There could be stimulation of new investment in problem areas.

Only when these adjustment measures have been used as a matter of domestic economic policy, and have failed, should there be an approach to correcting the matter through our foreign trade policy. In effect, then, the Tariff Commission and trade restrictions should be the last step, and not the first.

In discussing these two major changes proposed for U.S. trade policy, I have not once specifically mentioned the American fishing industry. But the problems and the cures are as applicable to our industry as to any other. There is no room in today's economy for an industry that does not fit the pattern. Our foreign trade policy cannot be tailored to meet the needs of a handicraft industry any more than our national economy can. And our foreign trade policy cannot be tailored to meet the needs of a high-production-cost industry. We have a peculiar problem in our industry and we all know it: An unlimited number of vessels are fishing relatively stabilized resources and the unit cost of production is high. We will never meet our basic problem until we find the means of overcoming the many obstacles to putting the knowledge of our peculiar problem into practice. Otherwise, as they tone up their flabby marketing muscles, intensify their efforts to get out ahead of competition, and reduce the fat everywhere possible, the rest of American industry and the American economy will pass us by.

Labor Unions Invest in Real Estate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, mindful of the fact that existing welfare and pension funds are being outdistanced by the serious problem of spiraling inflation, union leaders are focusing their attention on a broad, new avenue of investment, real estate syndication.

From initial indications, it appears that millions of dollars each year will be invested in a myriad of sound, conservative syndications, ranging from commercial properties and apartment house developments, to hospitals and nursing homes.

Perhaps the prime factor in unions' consideration of syndications as an area of investment is the necessity to cover members' medical care and life insurance. The fact that the yield on syndications of often more than double that of bonds and savings banks has also served to spark widespread union interest.

This new avenue of investment was opened last fall, when the welfare fund of local 220 of the Food Packers, Cannery & Miscellaneous Workers Union, Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen of North America, invested in the Clinton Hill Associates syndication, in Brooklyn, N.Y.

The move was made after considerable and careful study. Approval was granted by the six trustees, representing employers and employees, and the general union membership voted approval of a $100,000 investment.

This action made an enormous impact among many unions. Shortly afterward, the welfare fund of Local 445, Waste Material Union, AFL–CIO, invested $75,000 in a 34-story office building at 575 Lexington Avenue, New York City.

Sydney V. Levy, syndicator of the two projects, who guided the unions on the investments, points out that many of the larger syndication firms have established special departments devoted exclusively to providing information and maintaining contact with labor's pension and welfare funds.

On the other hand, scores of major unions have been assigning their financial advisers and pension and welfare fund trustees to careful analysis of the many syndications available to them.

In pioneering this new area of investment for unions, Mr. Levy has displayed extreme foresight. He recently communicated with AFL–CIO President George Meany, and suggested that labor, within its department of investment, create a special advisory council to study real estate syndications, and provide information on a regular basis to the thousands of locals across the Nation.

By participating in various worthwhile real estate syndication projects, a vast partnership will be created between union members and other investors in the ownership of real estate throughout the country.

Administration Moves To Strengthen REA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, in a speech before the Western Farmers Electric Cooperative in Anadarko, Okla., on April 14, Rural Electrification Administrator Norman Clapp spelled out details of the administration's program for strengthening America's rural electric cooperative.

The program has two principal goals. First, it would guarantee a secure power supply for cooperatives through insistence on fair power supply contracts or the use of REA's generation and transmission authority to give the cooperatives their own supply. Second, it would link the development of rural power to the broad rural areas development program as an essential factor for creation of new industries. Mr. Clapp also issued another assurance that the question of interregional transmission ties would be fully explored by Federal agencies and the electric industry.

Meeting the demand for rural power is, as Mr. Clapp emphasized, one of our new frontiers and it is most reassuring to see the administration approach this frontier with imagination and above all the determination to preserve and develop the distinctive contribution of the REA and its cooperative borrowers.

I would like to share with my colleagues the April 14 address by Mr. Clapp, who is, I am happy to say, a resident of my own State of Wisconsin:

A SECURE SUPPLY OF POWER

(Remarks of Norman M. Clapp, REA Administrator, at annual meeting, Western Farmers Electric Cooperative, Anadarko, Okla., April 14, 1961)

I appreciate the opportunity to join you here in Anadarko, to meet so many of you for the first time, and to receive the benefit of your long experience with rural electrification. Western Farmers Electric Cooperative is a fine example of the dynamic results that can be obtained through the cooperative approach. You and other federated power cooperatives have proved beyond question that it is sound and feasible for distribution cooperatives to join together to meet a common need for more power and lower cost power.

You have built something here that is tremendously valuable, not only to your member cooperatives, and your consumers, but to our whole Nation. The cooperatives financed by REA have accomplished something more than the physical fact of producing power and delivering it to rural people. I refer to the way in which you did the job. You showed your fellow Americans that it is possible to give reliable electric service, while keeping the public interest paramount. You proved that you could enjoy the benefits of Federal financing, while retaining grassroots control of your cooperatives. The course you followed represents the middle road between commercial power companies, organized for profit, and Government ownership of power facilities. By taking this middle road, REA and its borrowers have made a distinctive contribution to the American economy. It is a contribution that is in the best democratic tradition, and it is a contribution which must be preserved at all cost.

From President Kennedy on down, this administration recognizes the importance of the REA mission. We are solidly behind the REA programs. We already have taken a firm position on a number of important issues affecting the conduct of our agency and the future of our borrowers:

Full and complete authority to make REA loans has been restored to the REA Administrator by Secretary Freeman.

We have made it clear that we oppose any change in the present 2-percent interest rate on REA loans.

President Kennedy, in order to make adequate loan funds available for both the electric and telephone programs, has revised the 1962 budget request to increase the amount of funds for REA lending purposes by $100 million.

In all these ways, and more, this administration is moving toward fulfillment of the President's pledge to "restore REA to its former role of preeminence—freeing it from constant concern over political interference, higher rates of interest, and budgetary starvation * * *."

On February 3, Secretary of Agriculture Freeman translated the President's mandate into a significant set of guiding principles governing the Department of Agriculture's policy toward the REA programs. I endorse these principles, and I assure you that this administration is going to speak as a single voice on matters concerning REA.

Last month, following my confirmation by the Senate as REA Administrator, I announced that we would give power supply problems top priority in the REA electric program. I said that we would make sure that an increasing power supply is developed to meet the rapidly rising demand for rural electricity.

Let me give you some idea of the magnitude of this demand. In 1960, the power requirements of REA-financed systems totaled 29 billion kilowatt-hours. REA power experts estimate that in 1970, these requirements will rise to 68.6 billion kilowatt-hours. In 1985, they say, the demand will climb to 196 billion kilowatt-hours. This is one of the new frontiers this administration is talking about, and we intend to meet it head on.

How are we going to do it?

We are going to pursue an aggressive policy leading toward more abundant power and lower cost power for all rural Americans.

You know that in the past, REA has approved generation and transmission loans under two general conditions:

When no adequate and dependable source of power is available in the area to meet the needs of the distribution system; or

When the rates offered by existing power sources would result in a higher cost of power to the system than the cost from facilities financed by REA.

Personally, I believe that there are many factors which need to be considered in making decisions on G. & T. loans. This whole question of power supply is too complex to be reduced to easy formulas or copybook maxims. With this in mind, we are discussing our power supply policies at REA to make sure they take into consideration all the factors which we believe are significant today.

We do not believe that it is enough to judge the desirability of new generation and transmission starts from the standpoints of

adequacy, dependability, and lower cost alone. We also must be sure that cooperatives enjoy a supply of power—now and in the years ahead—that will guarantee the cooperative device a permanent place in the American power industry. One way you can obtain this guarantee is through power supply contracts that are fair and are negotiated in good faith. The other way is by generating your own power, as you people here are doing. We intend to use our generation and transmission authority when our borrowers are unable to obtain the security they need through power contracts.

I think we have no choice but to apply this criterion—the security criterion. As long as cooperative across the Nation are under fire from commercial power suppliers, as long as there are tricky twists in wholesale power contracts, as long as territorial integrity is threatened, we are going to have to concern ourselves with the security aspects of each power supply proposal we receive. Will it guarantee the continued existence of the cooperative? It is not enough for a supplier to claim that it will not be undersold, if, at the same time, it remains in a position to pull the rug out from under a cooperative.

We all know some of the ways power suppliers have threatened the existence of cooperatives. There is a cooperative in a State adjoining Oklahoma which asked its power supplier for an additional 300 kilowatts to serve a new industrial load in its area. The company declined, saying that its transmission line didn't have enough capacity. You can guess what happened next. The supplier built a tap off the same transmission line to serve the new load itself.

There are many variations on this tiresome theme. Sometimes the supplier puts a dual rate clause in its contract with the cooperative. Sometimes it reserves the right to approve the rates a cooperative charges certain types of consumers. Sometimes companies deliberately underbid our borrowers to secure a big load, even at the risk of suffering a loss. In a few cases, suppliers have offered industries lower retail rates than their wholesale rates to cooperatives.

From this day forward, when an REA borrower negotiates with a wholesale power supplier we want to see a contract emerge from those negotiations which guarantees our borrower adequate power to serve all consumers within its service area at reasonable rates and also provide the necessary guarantees that these benefits cannot be withdrawn at the whim of an unfriendly supplier.

You can put us down on the record now as opposed to any power contracts which call for dual rates or any other type of limitation aimed at denying a cooperative any legitimate consumer. If a cooperative can't get a fair contract, and it asks REA for help, then we are going to have to take a look at the possibilities of generation.

We also pledge that you will be pressured into no more unwilling alliances with commercial power companies as long as this administration holds office.

The trouble with almost all these "partnership" arrangements is that they have tended to bring more benefits to the power companies involved than to the cooperative. Sometimes they seem to start well, but when the honeymoon is over the company gets unreasonable, starts telling the cooperative how to operate, and uses the marriage to apply a little unfair leverage to its partner. Too often the partnership also tends to restrict a cooperative's future planning.

From now on, when we receive a generation and transmission loan application from a cooperative, we are going to examine the proposal you people make on its own merits. We are not going to make you swallow any suicidal counter proposals. If REA makes you a G. & T. loan, we want you to be able to control the power supply without getting the OK from a so-called partner who doesn't share your ideals of low-cost service.

REA is going to be in the fight to help cooperatives maintain their territorial integrity. We know that protecting your territories is becoming a critical problem in many States, and we are going to assist you in solving these problems in every way possible.

We recognize the fact that an abundant supply of low-cost power will not be achieved by REA alone. This administration has stated that the development of natural resources in our Nation and the generation and transmission of electric power in federally owned facilities has had a direct and important impact on the rural electrification program. We favor strict enforcement of the public preference clause in power marketing for power generated at Federal plants.

Upon taking office, I announced that REA will explore, in conjunction with other agencies of the Government and the electric industry, the means and methods of interregional transmission ties so that surplus or secondary power of one area can be used in other areas of power shortage and so that the benefits of low-cost hydropower can be shared more widely by consumers generally.

As President Kennedy made clear in a preelection address at Billings, Mont., this administration wants Federal interties constructed to link power areas served by the big Federal hydro projects. We have an interest in this plan, for we are convinced that interties will help relieve peak load problems and make more electricity available to our borrowers in areas where they have been chronically short of power. The new Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Power, Kenneth Holum, has indicated a desire to work closely with REA and its representatives in planning for these interties.

These backbone Federal interties could well be the first important step toward a concept that has excited the enthusiasm of some Americans—and indignation of others—for a number of years. I refer to the idea of giant power, which envisions interconnecting all of the power pools in the Nation with giant transmission lines. If the idea still seems novel to some, let me say that the concept has no novelty in Europe, where the major industrial nations have enjoyed the benefits of widespread interconnection for years. If the concept continues to arouse protest in this country, it is because the present inefficient method of transmitting power, the lack of interties, has proved extremely profitable for a number of power companies.

We have a number of reasons for being so interested in giant power and the lower-cost power that we believe will result from such a nationwide transmission system. Late last month, Secretary Freeman established a Rural Areas Development Board, with membership from 11 Department of Agriculture agencies, including REA. John A. Baker, the Director of Agricultural Credit over both REA and the Farmers Home Administration, was named Chairman of the new Board.

The objective of rural areas development is to promote more off-the-farm employment for the unemployed and underemployed in agricultural areas today. In 1959, the amount of underemployment on our farms alone was equivalent to 1,400,000 unemployed workers.

Cheap abundant electric power is one of the major factors that can help attract the growth and development of new commerce and industry. You can have a good labor supply, you can have water and transportation, you can have communications—but high electric rates still can turn an industry away. When you have low-cost power—and plenty of it—you see miracles occur in an area. We need look no further than the area of the Tennessee Valley Authority for proof of that.

The REA approach, the cooperative approach, already has proved a sound approach in three different areas. You people proved that a rural cooperative can build lines and distribute electricity. Then you proved that rural cooperatives can join hands and generate and transmit their own power. More recently, the cooperative approach has been used to bring modern dial telephone service to more than 200 rural communities. One of the most successful of these is here in Oklahoma, at Kingfisher.

Now we are faced with new problems—underemployment and a short deal on the food and fiber dollar. I hope that REA and people like you will have a chance to pioneer at least one demonstration project to prove that the cooperative approach—the middle road—can be applied to creating new kinds of community enterprise.

In closing, let me thank your president, Doyle Pope, and his associates on the board of directors, for inviting me here today. Your very active officers and directors, and the aggressive leadership of Elbert Karns, have helped western farmers to keep growing bigger and better with each passing year. Also contributing to your cooperative's getting started and building a substantial system was the fact that you were able to work out contract arrangements with the Southwestern Power Administration, headed by Douglas Wright. All of you are to be congratulated on your achievements.

In all the matters that I have touched on today, and in any other matters affecting REA, I shall welcome your ideas, your counsel, your suggestions and your criticism. The tasks before us will require the best efforts of all of us.

Paying the U.N.'s Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the Hearst newspapers on April 16, 1961. Mr. Hearst points up what are certainly some serious problems—ones which we are all deeply concerned with. A particularly unfortunate situation is that concerning the United Nations:

EDITOR'S REPORT: WE'LL CATCH UP IN SPACE

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

Sad as it is to relate, the big news of the week—in fact of the century—was Russia's successful orbiting of a man in space.

Yuri Gagarin has become as familiar a name to us in April 1961 as Charles A. Lindbergh was to the Russians in May 1927.

By his solo flight across the Atlantic to Paris, Lindy opened up a whole new era in aviation. By his solo orbit around the world, Yuri has opened up a whole new era in space.

And a column like this, which tries to comment on the significance of the news, cannot ignore either the achievement or its implications.

A nation that has developed (1) the huge booster power to launch a 5-ton vehicle carrying a man and (2) the technological competence to bring him back in buoyant health must be credited with a tremendous breakthrough in the dawning of the new era.

But there is no reason for us to push the panic button. We will catch up. Of that I am certain.

In the first place we have not been caught this time with our space suits down as we were when the Russians put up their first sputnik October 4, 1957. That was a real shocker. The present exploit was expected; it was almost a sure thing.

After sputnik, the Eisenhower administration made a remarkable comeback both in missiles and space satellites. The effort will—I hope—be redoubled in the Kennedy administration. We have achieved at least a standoff in missiles. We have put up more satellites than the Russians, but while more sophisticated they have been much smaller.

The one area—and one only—where we are behind is in developing the big bang. We have gone in for fancy pistol shooting in space. The Russians have concentrated on high-powered artillery.

All this does not let us off from having fuddled and fumbled, and having lost vital time in failing to recognize soon enough the prestige-propaganda-military importance of big space vehicles, and the thrust to get them up.

I notice that Gagarin speaks with almost schoolboy awe of the Russian prophet of rocketry, Konstantin Tsiolkovski (1857–1935), who evolved some of the first theories of multistage missiles. In fact, Gagarin said he studied the works of the prophet in school.

We have our own scientist-prophet, Dr. Robert H. Goddard, who fired a liquid fuel rocket from the farm of a relative at Auburn, Mass., March 16, 1926, and whose findings were the groundwork for the German V–2 rockets at the end of World War II.

Our military men were not impressed in 1926 and the townspeople, thinking him a litle touched in the head, called him Dr. Moony—a nickname that has sardonic connotations now. As far as I can determine, the only publication that did take him seriously was the Hearst "American Weekly," then edited by the late and great Morrill G. Goddard—no relative—but an editor who was also a pioneer in his field.

This is water over the dam, but it illustrates the challenge that now faces us, and one we had better do our best to meet.

For it is only on a basis of strength in space that we can hope to get the Russians to negotiate seriously on the control of space or to take any serious interest in the U.N. Outer Space Committee, which ironically enough they themselves proposed.

Which reminds me of a better-than-usual quip of U.N. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson: "Now that the Soviet scientists have put a man into space and brought him back alive, I hope they will also help to bring the U.N. back alive."

Adlai's phrase is singularly appropriate, because there is serious danger, in my opinion, that the very life of the U.N. may in time be drained away by economic malnutrition.

Certainly the world organization is being subjected to steady starvation by refusal or neglect to pay dues and assessments. In the case of the Communist bloc this is a deliberate rule-or-ruin campaign.

But the Reds are not alone. There are fair weather friends of the U.N. like President de Gaulle of France and the chiefs of the Arab States. They pay only if U.N. actions fit their aims. The Arabs renege on assessments for UNEF, the U.N. force which is in the Gaza strip to prevent outbreak of Egyptian-Israeli shooting. De Gaulle has just announced he won't let French money be used for activities of the U.N., calling it a disorganization.

As if refusals to meet obligations were not enough, there are many nations which make token payments, pleading poverty. Our friends the Latin nations—18 of them now on a growing list—have been delinquent that way.

Call it a hunch if you wish, but my feeling is that—if the U.N. meets its end (and that's concededly a big "if")—it will be via the money-starvation route. I don't like to think of that possibility because I have been stanchly hopeful for the world organization from the start.

When the U.N. was formed back in 1945, many of my associates were skeptical. Although aware of my father's irreconcilable opposition to the League of Nations, I felt differently about the U.N. I shared the U.N.'s aspirations, no matter how dreamy or unattainable some of them may now seem.

But in time it might become quite another story with the American people. The Soviet has welched on at least $17 million it owes the U.N. (without counting 1961) although its assessed share is only 13.62 percent.

The United States not only pays a whopping 32.5 percent assessment, but in addition has picked up some 45 percent of the tab so far for the Congo operation. Plus writing off the costly job we did in airlifting U.N. troops to the Congo.

It is bad for the U.N. to have the United States become virtually a half shareholder. It opens the way to charges that we run the U.N.

Under such continuing circumstances, I am afraid, Americans could start wondering whether we need the U.N. and perhaps turn more in the direction of regional alliances.

Without the United States, the U.N. would be a hollow mockery.

With yesterday's developments the imminence of the Cuban patriots' revolt against Fidel Castro's Communist dictatorship, mentioned here last week, now seems to have gained substance. President Kennedy has considered it diplomatic to say that under no circumstances will U.S. Armed Forces get involved. He has also pledged that the United States won't allow our soil to be used as a takeoff for Cuban exiles to land a revolt force on their native island.

Let's hope this doesn't mean our Government is getting cold feet on the question of getting rid of Castro. In his successful campaign for the Presidency, Jack Kennedy attacked the previous administration for having done too little about Castro.

I believe our Government and our people should do everything necessary to help the Cuban people reclaim their revolution from Castro's Reds. And, disagreeing with the President, I still believe we should use U.S. forces if the Cubans can't handle the job themselves.

We'll be accused in any case of helping the eventual Cuban uprising against Castro.

Sure, some will contend that helping the Cubans oust Castro will embarrass our relations with other nations, perhaps some of our Latin friends who are blind to the peril to themselves.

The answer to them is that we'll be a lot worse than embarrassed if we let Castro go on building his Communist bridgehead off our coast. How can anybody—anywhere in the world—have confidence in our pledges to defend them against the Reds if we stand still while the Commies inhabit a nest just 90 miles away?

When and if the Russians cry "lie" to our pledge of nonaggression my answer is—the Reds respect liars, but never fools.

Senate Resolution 109

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to submit, for the attention of my colleagues, Senate Resolution 109, sent me from the Ancient Order of Hibernians, of the 21st District, Westmoreland County, Pa.:

SENATE RESOLUTION 109

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States that the maintenance of international peace and security requires settlement of the question of the unification of Ireland and that the people of all Ireland, including the people of Eire and the people of Northern Ireland, should have a free opportunity to express their will for union and that this be attained by an election of the people of all Ireland under the auspices of a United Nations Commission for Ireland, to be designated by the General Assembly pursuant to articles 11 and 35 of the charter, which shall establish the terms and conditions of such election.

(NOTE.—This has been reproduced and forwarded to members and units of our order for the purpose of their soliciting the support of their respective Congressmen and U.S. Senators for this resolution.)

JOHN F. GEOGHAN,
National Secretary,
Ancient Order of Hibernians in America.

Migrant Farm Labor Problems and "Harvest of Shame"—XV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is the 15th in a series of articles presented in the public interest by the Palm Beach Post-Times to show the Members some of the progress being made in Florida to solve problems relating to migrant farm labor which were left out of the television presentation "Harvest of Shame." The omissions of all that has been, and is being done in this field did a great injustice to the Floridians who have given their time and efforts to these problems over the years. It is hoped that by reading these articles and the ones to follow the Members and public will have a better understanding of this important matter:

NOT ALL BAD—CREW LEADERS

"Well, some of the crew leaders they are good. But the majority of them are bad. They are so bad that they are the worst they can be. They try to skin alive the migrants. They take every dime they make."—"Harvest of Shame."

"It seems to me that there are attempts being made to control or punish the migrant crew leader on the assumption that he is not a very desirable person. I would question that philosophy, very seriously."

The speaker was Robert Browning, a serious young man who was health educator in a 5-year migrant project which is one of the most concentrated and unusual sociological studies ever made in the United States.

Browning and others of the migrant project staff utilized crew leaders in one of the significant experiments made during the study.

"We felt that if crew leaders could be interested in passing on health information to members of their crews we could deal with some 500 individuals, rather than 10,000 to 15,000 individual migrants," Browning said.

Project personnel met with crew leaders at night for 2 years.

The crew leaders were volunteering their own time, with no possibility of financial gain, in an effort to learn how better to care for the workers in their crews.

"We had very good cooperation and very high attendance," Browning reported.

In a study of 60 migrants, selected by sampling techniques from five crews on the Eastern Shore of Maryland last summer, Browning discovered that half were involved in some sort of health and medical problem in a 2-week period.

In all but two of these cases, the migrant went to the crew leader, who was involved in some way in getting health and medical care.

Browning says he has heard of crew leaders who take advantage of migrants, but believes they are a small minority.

Work with crew leaders has been only one small phase of the 5-year migrant project, financed by the U.S. Children's Bureau and administered through the Florida State Board of Health.

Project personnel worked closely with other agencies, and occasionally with individual employers of migrants.

"We got cooperation whenever we felt the need for it, and wherever we asked for it," Browning said.

"Because of the existing desire in community agencies for teamwork, it has been possible to work with them toward achievement of desired goals," says a migrant project report.

"One of many examples that could be given is that of a 52-year-old woman who has been referred to vocational rehabilitation for physical restoration. She has no income and is not able to work at present. It is necessary for her physical condition to improve before she will be ready for recommended surgery.

"She receives a food allowance from from county welfare.

"She has special dietary needs, hence the amount she gets from the welfare department is supplemented by the migrant committee.

"The nutritionist helps her plan a medically approved diet.

"The migrant committee also pays this patient's rent. Thus, a voluntary group, by its flexible policy, prevents a farm laborer from suffering because of a gap in resources."

The migrant project has been of special interest in sociological studies because of the design of the study, which stresses throughout the importance of bringing the insights of several different scientific disciplines to bear on the problems of migrant workers.

The day-to-day project staff included a medical social supervisor, public health educator, public health nutritionist, two public health nurses, sanitarian, secretary and liaison worker.

Of particular interest is the role of the liaison worker, a person who is able to mix freely with the migrants on occasion going into the fields to work with them, and who is also trained well enough in the different scientific disciplines to be able to communicate freely with other staff members.

The project, which will be concluded this summer unless current plans for its being carried on for another term are successful, has demonstrated that public health activities can be carried on successfully within the migrant group.

It demonstrates that such generalizations as "you can't do anything with those people" are far from being true.

It also has demonstrated, in action, the genuine concern of the Public Health Service, and thus the country at large, in problems facing the migrant agricultural worker.

Space-Mapping Collegians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the people of Iowa are deeply proud of the role which the State University of Iowa has played in building instruments for our satellites and other space vehicles.

The importance of this work under the direction of Dr. James Van Allen has been reemphasized in an article which appears in the current issue of Transmission, a quarterly magazine published by the Northern Natural Gas Co.

Because I feel that all Members of Congress will be interested in the account of this work at the State University of Iowa, I am asking that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am happy to present this fine report:

SPACE-MAPPING COLLEGIANS

Bankers think it's true; farmers agree. Politicians won't argue the point.

Every plumber will swear by it. Housewives take it for granted. Boys in the street would bet their rusty jackknives on it.

Who, in fact, is naive enough to doubt the thing to get done right now is send men into space? Everybody in the country knows it—except, strangely, the scientists already exploring the great cosmos.

To them there is no race to space. Practical uses of their findings, startling as these may be to the rest of mankind, are of secondary import to the men of pure science.

Yet, because they are avidly inquisitive, space searchers have dropped the flag on a race with themselves, to discover what they can as fast as their curiosity compels them. Fortunately in the United States the runners have the legs, wind—and spurt—of youth.

One place to scout a galloping team of young space scholars is the State University of Iowa. Fifty collegians, some in their teens and early twenties, work there under the foremost specialist in his field.

The assignment: To build diminutive, dependable instruments which explore the vastness behind the wild blue yonder; and to log the facts which those instruments relay from their whirling trips above.

Prime mover of the project is Dr. James Van Allen, a native Iowan who lettered in research at Iowa Wesleyan College and SUI. He returned to Iowa City 10 years ago (at age 36) to head the school's department of physics and astronomy.

At their leader's side, pacing the complement of junior scientists, are faculty members who gained much of their own experience under his tutelage. His fame has spread so far as to attract student assistants from Korea, Bolivia, India, Argentina, Laos, Italy, Japan, and Formosa.

Dr. Van Allen's achievements, earned him the singular honor of having two space "oceans" bear his name. He discovered them * * * a feat declared the top accomplishment in space probes thus far.

These oceans, the Van Allen Belts, are bodies of radiation thousands of miles deep, almost enclosing the globe. At one time the belts were regarded as the worst hazard to space travel by earthlings. Happily now, they appear less of a threat, which can be countered by routine shielding of any manned ship.

Nevertheless work proceeds to follow the vagaries of the belts, trapped in this planet's magnetic field * * * yet bursting on occasion to fire the atmosphere with the glory of northern lights.

Iowa instruments went aloft on more than 100 International Geophysical Year space vehicles. Devices aboard Explorer satellites and Pioneer space probes detected, measured, and charted the radiation zones.

The past and future of radiation exploration have developed areas of stress and high purpose at both ends of the basement of SUI's 50-year old physics building. On one side is the rush to reduce signals, already garnered from space, to intelligible graphs, tabulations, and formulae. At the other end of the converted storage area is ceaseless development, testing, and assembling of equipment for future space rides.

Focal point of the reduction section is the radio tracking station tuned strictly now to coded reports from Explorer VII every time it comes over. The satellite went into orbit from Cape Canaveral on October 13, 1959. It was expected to talk for a year, but hasn't run down yet.

Since that date it has made more than 2,500 passes within range of the university—usually six a day. Its signals are taped each time. And the same vigilant procedure is followed at 17 other stations in such around-the-world spots as the West Indies, Chile, Hawaii, Germany, South Africa, Peru, England, Canada, Ecuador, and Australia.

Word from the celestial chatterer comes to earth like the strums of an eerie banjo, mixed generously with static. While the tones are recorded on magnetic tape they are decoded mechanically and inked on rolls of paper. Zigzag lines sketch the density of radiation through which the satellite is sailing.

Then comes the task of condensing the data to punch cards, already stacked a quarter of a million deep. Each card covers 10 seconds of the Explorer's voyage.

Although Explorer VII has been tracked just 18 months, the student recorders figure they are 7 years behind in digesting the information to a readable state. The process, once manual, has been speeded up by an automatic card-punching machine and two new giant computers.

Balancing the motion in the "reducing" section is the pace in the "producing" end of the business. In equally cramped quarters the student instrument builders have a crash program going.

They are working on more than a dozen separate satellite projects at one time. Three of these have approaching deadlines. The first one, slated for this spring, will carry the school's nickname, "Hawkeye."

The Hawkeye bundle will contain nine Iowa-made detectors: tiny Geiger counters, and transmitters assembled from transistors, diodes, resistors, and capacitors in the thousands. Designing the miniaturized packets and soldering the circuits with microscopic precision are merely the obvious steps in the task. Just as exacting is the choice of parts.

"In a piece of satellite equipment we look for the analog of a man who has such well-balanced perfection in his components that he will live to be 104," Dr. Van Allen has explained. "And we must be able to judge this state of perfection when he is only 1 year old."

Once the assembly is built and operative, it must prove its fitness for strenuous flight. The unit is shaken, slammed with sharp impacts, heated and frozen, subjected to every trial it is destined to encounter—even the noise of the rocket takeoff. After such harsh tests it must operate as accurately as before.

Dr. Van Allen satisfies his zest for knowledge with the certainty that these instru-

ments are more sensitive and reliable than a human being to supply the facts he wants.

Two years ago he tabbed man "a fabulous nuisance in space * * * not worth the cost of putting him up there and keeping him comfortable." He hasn't changed his mind.

When men venture safely into space, much credit must go to this modern-day pathfinder and his youthful, indefatigable proteges. But they won't be after the victory wreath for a race they didn't run.

Increase in Cost of Natural Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, neglect of the consumer by various agencies of the Federal Government has become far too common in recent years. This neglect is nowhere more conspicuous than in the manner in which natural gas rates have been permitted to get out of hand. Natural gas prices have risen by more than 40 percent since 1951, during which time the cost of retail goods on the average rose but 14 percent. Even more striking, since January 1958, through September 1960, the price of natural gas to the consumer has gone up 20 percent, whereas in the same period of less than 3 years, consumer prices generally have gone up less than 4 percent.

While a number of factors undoubtedly contribute to this soaring of the price of natural gas to the consumer, a major responsibility must rest on the doorstep of the Federal Power Commission. Its regulatory powers have been exercised in a dilatory fashion, and apparently with a flagrant disregard of the welfare of the ultimate consumer. Testimony before the House Committee on Legislative Oversight last spring revealed constant conferences, meetings, and other negotiations between individual commissioners of the Federal Power Commission and representatives of the various natural gas pipeline companies, but no comparable degree of contact between the commissioners and representatives of consumers of natural gas.

One of the practices of the Federal Power Commission, followed with disconcerting regularity, is that of permitting natural gas pipelines to put into effect a series of so-called temporary rate boosts, prior to final action by the Federal Power Commission. Pipelines which once were required to segregate funds collected as a result of these temporary rate increases and to hold them available for refund to consumers, are now permitted by the Federal Power Commission to use them as capital funds for expansion or similar purposes.

The number of rate increases which the major pipeline companies have promulgated, following one another in rapid succession, is quite impressive. The Tennessee Gas Transmission Co. has increased its rates six times since December 1951 and, in effect, only part of two of these rate increases have been disallowed. Since 1957 its rates have gone up by over a third. El Paso Natural Gas Co. has instituted three rate increase since the beginning of 1958, totaling about $67 million a year. United Gas Pipeline has raised its rates six times since April 1956 in an amount of $46 million annually, subject to final Federal Power Commission approval. Panhandle Eastern has put a rate increase of $22.4 million annually into effect as of September 1, 1958, which has still not been finally acted upon by the FPC. The Texas Eastern Transmission Corp. is collecting rate increases of $28 million since November 1957, still subject to refund.

These rate increases are being paid by the consumers while the Federal Power Commission is engaged in the lengthy process of deciding whether or not to allow them.

As one step, but, I believe, an important one, that will both tend to curb the number of rate increases and also prod the Federal Power Commission to act in a faster, more responsible manner, I introduced a bill recently, endorsed by the National Association of Railroad & Utility Commissioners, which would prohibit the FPC from allowing any change in rates of a natural gas pipeline company from going into effect while there is already a rate increase pending by such a company which has not been finally approved by the Commission. It is high time that this pyramiding of rate increases by natural gas pipelines is brought to a halt. It is high time that the Federal Power Commission act as a responsible efficient servant of the American consuming public.

Action Against Cuba Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, faced with the Cuban crisis, the natural reaction of all Americans is to unite behind our leaders, with President Kennedy at the helm.

Yet would it not be a tragic mistake if we thus gave up our precious right of independent judgment and through which we can benefit from past mistakes.

My own concern is heightened by the fiscally irresponsible $600,000 give away of tax money. That was the inter-American social and economic cooperation program passed by the House today where Congress was asked to vote money without justification of need to nations that may not be friendly in a showdown over Cuba.

Because of this bill, which is improper legislative activity, when this Nation should right now be moving against Castro, I place in the RECORD this editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune. It is high time that we took action against Castro, husband our resources, and learn who are our friends. This is no time to give aid to any who are not on our side and not willing to commit themselves. The editorial follows:

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune]

NO PUNCH, BUT NEAT FOOTWORK

No President ever got himself into a more embarrassing jam in faster time than John F. Kennedy over Cuba. And few Presidents have shown more adroit footwork in disarming the opposition. When one recalls the partisan, Democratic clamor that arose over the U–2 spy plane episode and the criticism to which Mr. Eisenhower was subjected, Republican forbearance has been remarkable.

The facts seeping out of Washington since the Cuban fiasco are to this effect: The Cuban rebel force was armed, trained, and financed by the United States. Mr. Kennedy was acquainted with the existence of the project before he was inaugurated. The responsibility of putting the operation in train was his alone.

That decision could only be reached on the basis of estimates provided by the Central Intelligence Agency. These were so mistaken as to be ludicrous. Very little consideration was given to the possibility of failure. The landing was flubbed from beginning to end. The rebel invaders were put ashore in a swamp, and Castro's forces were waiting to bag them. The dictator may have been tipped off in advance.

The landing party consisted of some 540 men, without air support or covering fire from naval guns. The enterprise proceeded in total disregard of the military axiom that no assault can hope to succeed unless all necessary power is concentrated on a given point. The result was complete failure, with the Communists having a field day reviling the United States.

It is only necessary to recall the Democratic outcry of "brinkmanship" against the late Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and the unrestrained criticism of President Eisenhower when the U–2 came down in Russia to appraise the vulnerability of Mr. Kennedy's position. Mr. Dulles never took the country over the brink, and the U–2 flights for 4 years provided much useful information.

Mr. Kennedy reacted rapidly. He covered the flop with a speech containing some tough talk before the American Society of Newspaper Editors, managing to enlist considerable sympathy and support.

He then arranged meetings with former President Eisenhower, former Vice President Nixon, Senator Goldwater, and Governor Rockefeller, to plant the implication that there was bipartisan responsibility for the disastrous results of an undertaking which could only be launched on his initiative. He recalled Gen. Maxwell Taylor from retirement to investigate the CIA and review deficiencies in guerrilla warfare methods.

Mr. Eisenhower, as a good soldier, was obliged to say that the man carrying responsibility for foreign affairs must be supported. Mr. Nixon, who had planned soon to make a series of speeches publicly appraising the Kennedy record to date, may have been left with the impression that national unity decreed discretion.

No American enjoys the discomfiture of his country and none will fail to stand fast against the abhorrent designs of the Communists. These facts are not altered by past Democratic attempts to make political capital at the expense of Mr. Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles. Mr. Kennedy is necessarily in charge if the peril mounts.

We were impressed by Mr. Kennedy's forthright statement in Washington. Probably to our Democratic friends' surprise we said that we liked what he said. We still do. But we think the time is rapidly approaching when Mr. Kennedy's strong words, blunt and forthright, must be backed by action just as blunt and forthright. As we are

sure the whole country feels, we are praying that he will be a man of action as well as a man of good speech.

Every administration makes mistakes. Every administration has its embarrassments. It does the country no good to harp on them. But neither does it do the country any good to continue to fumble the ball when you are playing a highly professional outfit such as Khrushchev puts on the field. It's an axiom of professional football that you can't afford many fumbles if you want to win.

Kansas Centennial World Food Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a concurrent resolution adopted by the Kansas State Legislature, extending an invitation for State, National, and international participation in the Kansas Centennial World Food Fair, which is to be held in Topeka, Kans., June 13–25, 1961:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 33

Concurrent resolution extending an invitation for State, National, and international participation in the Kansas Centennial World Food Fair

Whereas Kansas is recognized among the States of this Nation as a leading producer of wheat, has won the popular acclaim of "breadbasket of the world," is a major producer also of other grains, beef, poultry, dairy, and other food products; and

Whereas food production and food trade are common goals of all nations as sustainers of life and industry, benefiting the welfare of all peoples, and contributing to the cause for peace; and

Whereas Kansas is this year observing its centennial of statehood, inviting all its citizens and visitors to celebrate 100 years of achievement; and

Whereas it is most fitting that Kansas, "Midway U.S.A.," invite other countries and other States to join in displaying food and allied products in a large international marketplace provided for this purpose as a feature of the State's centennial celebration; and

Whereas the Kansas centennial world food fair has been certified by the U.S. Department of Commerce for temporary duty-free entry of foreign exhibits under the Trade Fair Act of 1959: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas (the Senate concurring therein), That Kansas extend the hand of welcome and friendship to the countries of the world and to the peoples of other States through the Kansas Centennial World Food Fair to be held at Mid-America Fairgrounds in Topeka, June 13 to June 25, 1961, as a recognized trade show and public exhibition; and be it further

Resolved, That Kansas citizens and organizations, cities, counties, and State, join together in supporting this means of displaying the productive resources of this great State, and the hospitality and friendship of its people; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be directed to send enrolled copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, U.S. Secretary of Commerce, U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, U.S. Secretary of State, embassies of foreign nations, to each member of the Kansas congressional delegation, and to the Governors of the other 49 States.

I hereby certify that the above concurrent resolution originated in the house, and was adopted by that body.

MARCH 20, 1961.

WILLIAM L. MITCHELL,
Speaker of the House.
A. E. ANDERSON,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Adopted by the senate April 4, 1961.

HAROLD H. CASE,
President of the Senate.
RALPH E. ZARKER,
Secretary of the Senate.

Are We Giving Up?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, there is no question but that communism poses a real threat to our way of life. The insidious character of this threat is pointed out in the following editorial from the Progress-Bulletin, a leading newspaper of the city of Pomona, Calif. Under unanimous consent I include this editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD:

ARE WE GIVING UP?

Communistic sentiment is spreading in this country with such amazing speed that it behooves us all to be frightened.

After watching the picture, "Communism on the Map," a prominent Pomona couple went home agreeing that it was time to get ready to live differently, for according to their opinion, we would be under Communist rule within 5 years.

Is it possible that such opinions are justified? Right here in our own valley some educators appear to go out of their way to criticize unmercilessly anybody that has a word to say against Communist activities. Five years ago, had these educators expressed such sentiments, they would have been thrown in jail or at least run out of town. Their statements would not have been tolerated in Pomona or any other city in the land.

Where is the appeal in communism that seems to arouse support right here in this country? Are Americans dissatisfied with their freedoms? Is it a lust for power? Are they craving for the power that the few secure in a dictatorial government? There are plenty of things to be dissatisfied with in this country, but are Americans ignorant of the fact that no other country in the world has such prosperity or gives its individual citizens such pleasurable living?

Recently Adm. H. B. Miller, a retired U.S. Naval officer who is now director of public relations of Pan American World Airways, made a talk before the Public Relations Society of America in which he gave some thought-provoking comments on the crises America is facing. His words were aimed primarily at the professionals making up the membership of the society, but they have significance for everyone who is concerned with the present world crises.

Admiral Miller told of a conversation he had with an American businessman while returning by air from West Berlin. They discused a multitude of world problems. These, the businessman felt, were deeply distressing. Yet he said, "Things could be worse. If Khrushchev weren't in power, we might have someone even more dangerous. Perhaps we ought to be grateful for small blessings."

This, said Admiral Miller, "revealed in terrifying starkness an all-too-familiar American point of view concerning, the challenge of communism." Things could be worse. What do these words mean? It seems to me that they represent an almost childlike desire to believe that this is a world which is not as menacing as surely we must know in our hearts it really is.

"Not for one moment do I believe that my companion and the people who often unconsciously echo him are willing to compromise honor. Unfortunately, however, they appear willing to pass beyond the bounds of reasonableness in yearning for a dream world that does not—and cannot—exist under present conditions." They are, in a sense, victims of their own feeling of good will for mankind. They think, consciously or otherwise, that if we make concessions in the name of peace, the Communists will do likewise.

Unhappily, the high strategists of communism have no intention whatsoever of doing that, for all of their diversionary tactics and their occasional use of seductive and honeyed words. Admiral Miller traces what has been going on in recent months—in Cuba, in Venezuela, and other Central and South American countries, in the Middle East, in Africa, and elsewhere. The pattern is always essentially the same—"riot, subversion and revolution." And, all too often, we are confused, we fail to orient ourselves with events, and we miss their tremendous and ominous significance.

One amazing part of all this is the rapidity with which it has happened. As Admiral Miller recalls, "43 years ago the Communists had nothing—nothing except an idea, a handful of leaders, and a devastated country." Now they control a third of mankind; they are undermining the will to resist of another third, and their drive for world domination continues at full speed.

What, then, has been our basic fault in dealing with this menace. Admiral Miller says this in the course of an extensive discussion: "Communism has provided the only case in the history of the United States with which we have attempted to deal by defensive measures. This is not the way in which we built our Nation. This is not the way we dealt with the Barbary pirates. This was not the objective of the Monroe Doctrine. This is not the way we spread our ideals to the Philippines, or to Liberia. We shall not preserve freedom in a threatened world by politely retreating rather than boldly challenging."

In sum, we must face and fully realize the hazards that confront us. We must move from the defensive to the offensive, to the positive approach. In a phrase, to quote him once more, we need to "breathe life, and vitality, and vigor, into the spiritual pride and heroic traditions that made America great."

Not Our Fight? We Can Lose It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, of the millions of words that have been written concerning what has happened and is happening with respect to the Communist takeover of Cuba and the position of the United States with reference

thereto, the lead editorial in the Cincinnati Enquirer of Thursday, April 20, 1961, states the case more clearly, more understandably and more effectively than anything I have heard or read. It has impressed me so much that I have sent a copy to the President. It is my feeling that every Member of the Congress before he makes up his mind as to what course we should follow with respect to the situation in Cuba should read this editorial:

NOT OUR FIGHT? WE CAN LOSE IT

These are blunt words. They are meant to be. The time has come for them.

The United States cannot afford to let Cuba's freedom fighters be overwhelmed by Russian MIG's, Czechoslovakian arms, and the skills of Red Chinese "technicians."

This is not a campaign that we ordered. We have no quarrel whatever with the admirable people of Cuba. We shed blood in helping them gain their freedom a scant half century ago. We have shared our commercial enterprises with them, been the best customer for their principal product. We stood silently by while a bearded clown expropriated—stole—countless millions of American investments.

We endured his insults. We listened in silence to the ridiculous mouthings of his Communist satrapy, at home and before the forums of the world.

We stood by and heard him denounce the Monroe Doctrine, which has been the basis of peace in this hemisphere for a century and a quarter.

We watched while he imported communism—and functioned as a ready escape-hatch for spies and traitors.

It was not our business—we said—to attempt the restoration of freedom to the Cuban people.

But certain things have been made our business.

Despite our denials, despite our disheartening disavowal of support for those who would unseat the small coterie of professional Communists now in control of Cuba, we are being charged in every corner of the globe with having provoked and conducted the almost pitiful invasion efforts.

We are getting the blame for this attempt at Cuban independence, whatever the facts may be. No attention whatever is being paid to our little set speeches, our notes.

The so-called uncommitted nations of the world—and many of our allies—are watching the beaches of Cuba. They are taking note as a dozen Mig's—piloted almost certainly by those Red "technicians"—are strafing and blasting away the ill-equipped forces of the tattered army of liberation.

We're worrying—in official quarters—about what may be said in the United Nations and elsewhere if we so much as crook a finger in behalf of the anti-Castroites.

We needn't.

In every corner of the world we're coming to be recognized as the paper tiger reviled by the Red Chinese.

The Red Chinese called us that, and laughed in the faces of our armistice representatives at Panmunjon.

How much harder will they laugh if the supposedly mighty Uncle Sam is frustrated on an island 90 miles from our shores—by the bluster of Communists 4,000 miles away.

Our President, with an army of maps, and all the Nation's radio and television systems in attendance, recently showed how important to our survival was a strip of jungle on the far side of the world, and demanded that Russia forthwith stop furnishing supplies and equipment to the aggressors. We watched. We listened. We agreed with him.

Nikita Khrushchev, it seems, was otherwise engaged. The supplying of the Communist forces in Laos has been stepped up—not stopped. By the time the conference table is reached—if it ever is—Laos will be lost.

This is the Khrushchev who now warns us not to send any supplies or help to the freedom fighters in Cuba.

Well, he told us not to help the freedom fighters in Hungary, and we didn't. All around the world he has been calling the tune—and we've been dancing.

But now it is very late.

By various estimates, between $30 and $50 million worth of military hardware has been shipped into Castro's Cuba.

If resolute action is not taken soon—if we continue to allow the debating society in the United Nations to obscure our national interests—Castro's Cuba will increase in importance as a mighty military base. It will be made into a launching pad for rockets aimed at America's heartland.

How long do you suppose it will take for the triumphant Communists to put the torch to the remnants of the Monroe Doctrine if the MIGs and the 80-ton tanks have the final word in Cuba? How many independent governments of any kind will remain in Central or South America a year or two hence? How many men in public life will dare stand by the side of the "paper tiger," against the devilishly crafty and cruel Communists?

How brightly will the flame of independence continue to burn in places much farther away from this onetime "arsenal of democracy?"

We said, long before it was popular to do so, that with the abdication of Cuba to Castro the Communists had established a beachhead 90 miles from our shores.

Now we say something must be done about it. Before it is too late. If it isn't too late already.

In the Nation—A Check on CIA That Worked Well

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, my continuing interest in the efficiency and adequacy of our intelligence activities prompts me to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Arthur Krock which appeared in the New York Times of April 25, 1961.

The article points out the renewed interest in the need for a Joint Congressional Committee on Intelligence Matters to evaluate and utilize all intelligence. Since this is my original resolution and as I have sponsored this resolution since 1953, I hope the new task study group appointed by President Kennedy will correct the shortcomings which prompted me to sponsor this resolution.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 25, 1961]

IN THE NATION—A CHECK ON CIA THAT WORKED WELL

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, April 24.—What the President has officially designated as "a Government-wide study of para-military operations within the Government" will be heavily concentrated on the Central Intelligence Agency, especially on its operating function that many observers think should not be allowed to an intelligence-collecting group. But in the course of the study the four distinguished persons the President appointed to conduct it may also find something of value in the record of a formal supervising committee for the agency that existed in its early period and is remembered as having worked well.

This committee was composed of three high officials—the Under Secretaries of State and Defense and the Director of the CIA. According to those familiar with the committee's history, it reviewed all proposed projects of the Agency, decided whether to approve or disapprove them, reported its judgments to the National Security Council and kept key members of Congress informally advised of CIA operations. One day a week was assigned to the review with whatever additional time was necessary for the reports to the NSC and at the Capitol necessary for the relays.

This check on CIA projects, and the informatory meetings with congressional leaders, must be assumed to have worked well because in this period the agency was not involved in any disastrous failure, such as that recently in the rebel landings in Cuba. Also, the recurrent moves in Congress for a CIA watchdog committee made no headway. Whether a formal supervisory group, constituted as was this previous Government committee, would have vetoed the concept or the timing of the disastrous Cuban adventure, or both, and advised the NSC and the President against it must remain forever in the impenetrable cloudland of speculation.

But some still in Washington believe that if a counterpart of the old committee had been in existence in the last few weeks, and with the same assignment of responsibility for the CIA, the faults of the concept and the timing of the anti-Castro landings would not have been approved, as they were, by all officials of the administration on the top level.

If this opinion is accepted as reasonable speculation, on the basis that the defects of the project would have been urged with the authority and prestige of two members, or even one, of an official supervising group of the CIA, then there is room for the further speculation that the President would have returned the project to the agency for more deliberation and repairs. And, since developments subsequent to the failure in Cuba at least suggest that no definite program was laid out for immediate and positive steps to be taken in event of the failure which occurred, it may be that this program would have been in readiness if a strong dissent had been registered in advance of the expedition by members of a CIA supervising committee.

REVIVAL OF CALL FOR A "WATCHDOG"

At any rate, an inspection of the committee's record would appear to commend itself to the four Presidential appointees to make the forthcoming study—Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Attorney General Kennedy, Admiral Burke and CIA Director Dulles. Findings should be highly pertinent to the expected renewal of proposals that the agency, like the Atomic Energy Commission, be supervised by a joint congressional committee. This relation of Congress to the AEC is established in law. And, though secrecy of projects and operations is as indispensable to the AEC as it is to the CIA, there has been only one congressional leak of any consequence at the expense of the Commission, and that was unimportant in consequences.

The vital element of secrecy in agency activities, however, has been successfully urged thus far against proposals that Congress assume to it a similar legal relation. Though a law to this effect was favored by

Gen. W. Bedell Smith when he was in charge of the CIA, Director Dulles has always opposed it. As a counterpart, he, as did General Smith, frequently briefs key Members of Congress. But this information process is not comparable to that of the AEC to the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy.

The old CIA supervising committee of three took the middle position and regularly though informally kept certain leaders of Congress generally informed. The new study group might profit by reviewing this period.

Hail to Italy and Its Great People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the 100th anniversary of the rebirth of the great and illustrious nation of Italy is an event that will be noted throughout the world with acclaim, enthusiasm, and gratitude.

The proclamation of Turin climaxed the rebirth of Italy under the constitutional rule of Victor Emmanuel the Second.

The great Italian philosopher and historian, Croce, observed that this event might more appropriately have been called a birth, because it was the first time in Italian history in which there was an Italian state with all and only its own people and molded by an idea.

Thus, Italy is no longer the Italy of the Romans, or the Italy of the middle ages, but the Italy of the Italians. But it would be quite impossible to try to separate modern Italy, and the Italy of the Italians, from the glorious ages of Italian history where high orders of civilization fluorished, where art, literature, science and culture were nurtured, where fundamental principles of government and law were originated and developed.

That the unification of Italy under the Risorgimento brought desirable independence, liberty and unity to this great historic nation cannot be doubted, and this movement and its happy consequences constitute valuable milestones in the progress of man toward self-determination and individual liberty.

It would be a colossal task, however, to try even to outline the glorious, momentous contributions of Italy and the Italian people to the enlightenment and high state of civilization which we of the Western World enjoy today.

It would be equally formidable to try to describe the enduring effects of the great, invaluable contributions in war and peace which leaders and people of Italian blood have made to America and its progress. The American people can be very thankful for the truly monumental contributions of past and present generations of Italian blood, especially those that relate to the building and development of this country, which, in all our States, and in thousands of communities throughout the land, are so patently visible, and evoke the gratitude of our people for the gallantry and spirit of sacrifice in war and the long-sustained loyalty, steadfastness, and enlightened leadership and work in peacetime of Italians and Italo-Americans, to develop the strength and promote the progress of our Nation.

Italy is bound to us by many ties of blood, of kinship, of religion, of common law, and culture. It is a loyal and dedicated ally in the struggle to preserve human freedom, an integral and vital part of the free world, the beloved native land of very many noble, devoted American citizens, whose children, like themselves, are increasingly and influentially a meaningful part of the American dream.

I am very proud indeed as a Member of this great legislative body who represents here many fine Americans of Italian blood to join in the tributes that are being paid to Italy on its 100th birthday. My own bonds with the Italian people are deep and very dear. From early boyhood the Italian people have been among my closest and warmest friends and I dearly cherish them. They have sustained and inspired me in ways I could never forget.

I am indeed honored to express my words of congratulations and best wishes to the Italian nation and its wonderful people, on the occasion of Italy's centennial, and I hope and pray that the great Italian nation will continue to grow, prosper, and flower as it has throughout history in the arts, culture, and enlightenment for which it is famous, and in the ways of prosperity and individual liberty so fittingly symbolized by and worthy of its unity and independence.

The Italian people fill an honored place in this Nation and in the world. Their talents, zeal, courage and humane warmth are qualities this Nation and the whole wide world urgently need.

Here in our own land we will continue to hold them close to our hearts, just as they hold others who have won their trust and affection.

I rejoice with Italy and the Italian people on its 100th birthday and pray God that this beautiful, great land and its cherished people may go forward in good health, ever-growing prosperity and happiness and very many happy returns of the day.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include a recent editorial entitled "Risorgimento Saluted," printed in the Worcester, Mass, Telegram Gazette, in the RECORD.

I thank the distinguished editor who wrote this brilliant piece for his inspiration and ideas:

RISORGIMENTO SALUTED

("If it were possible in political history to speak of masterpieces as we do in dealing with works of art, the process of Italy's independence, liberty and unity would deserve to be called the masterpiece of the liberal-national movements of the 19th century in Europe."—B. Croce, in his History of Europe of the XIX Century.)

One hundred years ago, Italy climaxed its "risorgimento," its "rebirth," with the proclamation in Turin, by the first Italian Parliament, of the Kingdom of Italy under the constitutional rule of Victor Emmanuel II.

Croce observed that it might more accurately have been called a sorgimento, a birth, because for the first time in all the ages there was born an Italian state "with all and only its own people, and molded by an idea." Italy, as Victor Emmanuel said, was no longer the Italy of the Romans or the Italy of the Middle Ages, but "the Italy of the Italians."

But whether a risorgimento or a sorgimento, Italy's unification under Victor Emmanuel was part of that same wave of humane enlightenment which swept Europe beginning in the 17th century and had its finest 18th century flowering in the American Revolution.

It is significant in this regard that the book "On Crimes and Punishments," by the Italian humanist Cesare Beccaria was read and annotated by Jefferson, who knew and spoke Italian, and was cited by John Adams in his defense of the English soldiers who were tried for the Boston massacre.

This year, we in America observe the centennial of a war in which our own national unity was preserved. It is therefore all the more fitting that we honor, also, the centennial of Italy's unity. A stanch free world ally—and the country of origin of so many fine Americans—deserves no less.

Promotion of Area Redevelopment in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I thought the Members would be interested in the interpretation of the area redevelopment legislation as outlined by Mr. Solomon Barkin, secretary-treasurer of the area employment expansion committee in New York:

PROMOTION OF AREA REDEVELOPMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

(By Solomon Barkin, address before the American Society for Public Administration, Apr. 6, 1961)

The United States is on the threshold of pursuing a completely new approach to the problem on area redevelopment. After a battle of some 10 years for establishing new machinery and resources to assist the depressed and underdeveloped areas in the United States, bills have been passed in both Houses of Congress, and an agreed measure will shortly be sent to the President for his signature. Unlike President Eisenhower, whose administration gave lip service to the ideal of helping distressed areas but was philosophically opposed to this undertaking, the present administration is committed to this program and has already initiated plans for the vigorous implementation of the resources made available under the new legislation. The area redevelopment bill will probably become law before the end of the month, and the new administrative organization will be launched immediately. The United States will then join the ranks of other highly developed nations in aiding all areas within its boundaries to share in national prosperity.

The opponents of this legislation have been the political and economic conservatives who have resisted all forms of Government stimulation of local enterprises. They have favored incentives to all business but not specific aids toward local economic

redevelopment. The formal spokesmen have been the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and hundreds of local chambers of commerce, and the National Association of Manufacturers. They have spoken glowingly of the need for community activity and interest.

But the record of the 14,000 local development groups sponsored and serviced in part by these chambers is regretfully uninspiring.

The skeptics of the proposed legislation have largely been the academicians. By digging into the past records of local development groups, State credit corporations and other local and private improvisations, they despairingly concluded that development is an arduous and perhaps futile undertaking. Having been reared in the atmosphere of academic reflection, they counseled an emphasis, if not exclusive preoccupation, on inducements and aids to stranded workers and families to move out of the depressed areas. To them, the new emphasis on development of local areas in order to bring jobs to the areas was untried and reflected extravagant optimism if it was not an outright absurdity. This skepticism was echoed even among some economists who have themselves participated enthusiastically in assisting foreign development programs sponsored by the American Government. They saw no parallel between the two types of activities.

OPPONENTS AND SKEPTICS BYPASSED BY EVENTS

To the opponents, the answer was quite evident. Continued high unemployment, waste, and underdevelopment were intolerable. Local efforts needed the stimulation, guidance, assistance and financial help from the Federal Government. To the skeptic the response was equally clear. Population and labor mobility were already of high order in this country. During the last few years, few areas with a true shortage had developed in this country. Moreover, the displacement from the rural areas was continuing at very high levels and would persist in being the country's most challenging social and economic problem of labor mobility for the next decade or two. Finally, the chapters of economic history written by billions of dollars of American aid in foreign underdeveloped and distressed countries provided promising texts for American domestic endeavors at redevelopment. The point 4 program for the American economy is aid and stimulation of our distressed and underdeveloped communities.

The new American program for area economic redevelopment differs markedly from that presently evident in the United States and in operation in the various European countries. It arises from the peculiar nature of the American governmental and economic system.

AMERICAN AREA REDEVELOPMENT DOES NOT BUILD ON LABOR OUTMIGRATION OR DIRECTED RELOCATION OF ENTERPRISES

Unlike the emphasis in Sweden in area redevelopment, and to a minor extent in England which is trying to relieve distressed and labor surplus areas through outmigration, the new act will place quite incidental stress upon this phase of the program. Provision is made for retraining the unemployed for new jobs and these retrainees may thereafter move out. But the objective is primarily to prepare people to work in the community. It seeks fundamentally to redevelop the existing area, to create new jobs in it, and to fit people to them.

One basic justification for this approach is that unemployment has been widespread since 1957. As noted, there are few areas with real labor shortage eagerly seeking to absorb labor surpluses of other districts. In contrast, the above two countries have had full employment economies and are eagerly looking for people to direct to the many labor shortage areas. Migration to these areas would, as expected by the leaders of these nations, also moderate the inflationary pressures by permitting higher total national output.

In England the aid to distressed areas has been actively tied in with the administration of the permits for new industrial and commercial construction. Intent on preventing overcrowding and overbuilt areas, the Government denied permits to companies which sought to expand in these proscripted areas. It compensated this deterrent with active inducements for relocation in depressed areas.

This approach is, of course, quite strange to the American system of administration and our philosophy of appropriate Federal activity.

The greater number of European programs provide financial aids and inducements for business to locate in specific depressed and underdeveloped areas. The aids consist of outright grants, tax exemptions, low interest rates, and subsidies. In most of these countries these special assists and guarantees supplement an already existing system of highly articulated programs designed to guide the flow of investments and to stimulate industrial development. This governmental program for stabilizing the economy and stimulating growth, through the control of private and public investments, has no doubt been carried furthest in Sweden, which also has the most advanced program for dealing with the problem of labor surpluses.

In nations where governments intimately control, guide, and tax business enterprises to stabilize the economic cycle and to direct their growth patterns, financial aids, and subsidies have helped to reallocate industries to areas designated for special development.

AMERICAN EMPHASIS ON REGIONAL, PHYSICAL, COMMUNITY, AND HUMAN REDEVELOPMENT RATHER THAN FINANCIAL INCENTIVES TO BUSINESS

In the United States we have in the course of the formulation of the current legislation, evolved a very different philosophy of the appropriate function of the Federal Government. The legislation contemplates no far-reaching assists to private industry to locate plants in the distressed areas. In fact, the new legislation specifically discourages movement of existing industry from one area to another. It has an explicit "antipirating" provision which denies aid for this purpose. Moreover, most States frown upon tax exemptions. Only the most underdeveloped areas have spoken of financing construction of new industrial and commercial structures. In the new legislation there are no Federal funds for these subsidies or grants.

The Federal Government will made credit available for such structures at lower rates of interest than are available in the commercial market. But it will be no less than that currently paid by the Federal Government, plus one-half of 1 percent for overhead costs or the 4⅜ percent for a 20-year loan. It is hoped that this differential in interest will be sufficient support to the major forms of aid. The primary contribution is, therefore, a lower interest rate to redevelop these areas.

Additional evidence that these programs for the construction of buildings are not the foundation of the new program is provided by the limited sums available; namely, $100 million for the 108 identified distressed labor markets, and another $100 million for the more than 600 rural counties which are likely to be classified immediately as redevelopment areas. Further credit to small private entrepreneurs continues to be available from the Small Business Administration. This agency has set its rate for small business in distressed areas at 4 percent.

The program of providing cheaper credit for industrial and commercial structures is designed primarily for the poorer areas, where funds are not now locally available and where the ultimate in local inducements have to be provided. Larger communities generally have funds to finance local projects. Moreover, the availability of these funds provides tangible evidence of the Federal Government's interest in the program and also are an assurance to the local community that if some pilot projects are necessary to start the redevelopment process, such cheaper credit will be available.

PURPOSE

The goal of the new legislation is not to force the location of industry in the depressed or underdeveloped areas, but to help improve the physical, communal, and human resources to enable them to share in the process of national economic growth. Their competitive position will thereby be improved by determining the line of long-range economic development and the strongest impulse for growth.

By rebuilding the physical surroundings and facilities in the community and upgrading the work population, these areas will be able to participate fully in the national economic advances. Their redevelopment will make the presently dormant or wasted social, private capital, and human resources available to the national growth process, and permit them to stimulate expansion in other areas. Their revival would also enable the Nation to reduce its minimal level of unemployment to below the 3-percent mark reached in the early fifties.

PROGRAMING GROWTH

The first emphasis in the new program of assistance to these areas should be a clear formulation of an economic program for redevelopment and growth. The Federal program will provide an immediate annual fund of $4.5 million for technical assistance to these areas for the preparation of programs. In addition, the distressed areas, regardless of size, will become eligible for assistance with funds for planning under the urban renewal law. The stress will, therefore, be upon helping the local areas diagnose their problems and future, and to formulate a rationale for their future economic growth.

Programing, therefore, becomes one of the key factors in the new area redevelopment movement. The importance of such plans is repeatedly noted in the prerequisite for supporting every submission for assistance with evidence that it will be consistent and conform with these plans. The individual projects will not be hit-or-miss undertakings; they must be blocks in the construction of a new economic pattern which will generate its own growth and expansion. Only through careful preliminary studies and programs will this objective be achieved.

PHYSICAL AND FACILITY REDEVELOPMENT

The second and very crucial provision is the aid to be provided for the physical redevelopment of distressed areas to make them better suited for economic redevelopment.

Throughout the testimony, the witnesses enumerated the barriers to local growth. Programs to remove these barriers could unleash a new vitality within the community; sewage systems, water pollution programs, waterworks, highways, and various community facilities considered essential to preparing the sites and areas for new industry.

These areas have generally lacked adequate public services. Their public expenditures had declined and services have been starved. Even if they were adequately maintained, they would often be insufficient for the newer industries looking for varied modern services. To attract employees of the more technologically advanced industries, there must

be good schools, libraries, cultural facilities, parks, recreation areas, and other similar opportunities. Communities must be made attractive and modern.

These improvements could not be easily undertaken by the depressed communities. Their low incomes and tax revenues acted as a brake on their growth. Another difficulty encountered in these communities is the absence of vacant land for expansion. The older useful land areas are occupied by slums or obsolete industrial and commercial properties. To allow for expansion, these would have to be removed. Present urban renewal laws also limit the development almost exclusively to residential purposes.

The most serious attention was, therefore, focused upon these provisions in the law. The act will provide for loans of $100 million for public facilities and in addition, most importantly, $75 million for grants to communities unable to finance the construction of such public facilities through loans. These sums will be available, in addition to the existing liberalized provisions, for financing community facilities in smaller areas under the Housing Act. In addition, the urban renewal provision of the Housing Act is being amended to permit the establishment or improvement of industrial plants and facilities in redevelopment areas. A serious bottleneck, the absence of vacant land in industrial areas, would thereby be removed.

It is also hoped that other agencies of the Federal Government will be helpful in this undertaking. Specifically, the forestry, highway, park, agricultural conservation, fuels and mineral programs and other public works agencies will be urged to focus specifically on these depressed communities, so that their cumulative impact might hasten the redevelopment plan.

UPGRADING HUMAN SKILLS

The third major part of this program is the provision for the retraining of people for the new occupations and the payment of subsistence grants for the training period, if these people had already exhausted their unemployment insurance benefits. The House bill provides $4.5 million annually for retraining and $10 million for retraining subsistence grants.

A RURAL REDEVELOPMENT PROGRAM NOW TO BE ROUNDED OUT

The outlook guiding the program is dramatically illustrated by the additions which the new legislation makes to the unfolding of the rural redevelopment program now being administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. This undertaking to help the low-income rural counties has been in operation since 1955. It has been meagerly financed and has depended upon voluntary local groups, colleges, and existing Federal agencies to assign personnel. Its primary achievement to date has been to establish redevelopment committees in over 100 counties. The second step has been to arrange for studies for the understanding of the local problems. Most groups ended their activity with these reports. But others ventured into more practical but modest undertakings to encourage some outlet for or processing of local agricultural products. The tangible results have been meager and the number of new employment opportunities is not impressive.

Now this venture can be reinvigorated. The committees can be revitalized and their horizons broadened. Their planning can become more venturesome. They now can see ahead of them, if needed, funds for the public facilities and credit for industrial and commercial structures, and also funds for retraining local labor resources.

ADMINISTRATION WILL EMPHASIZE PLANNING FOR SUCCESSFUL REDEVELOPMENT

As announced by the Secretary of Commerce, the new administration in the Department of Commerce will act as a leader in the implementation of this program. Its task is to stimulate the communities into action, proselytize the belief in redevelopment and help them in their planning. This is a truly cooperative endeavor, in which the Federal Government aids but does not substitute for local initiative. It is to assist areas in the preparation of the master economic plans which will guide their future program. The creation of the blueprints of growth will be their foremost responsibility.

Upon the completion and approval of this plan, the local groups will have to agree on specific projects which can then be submitted to operating agencies already in existence, for study and recommendations and finally for approval by the Secretary of Commerce. The Housing and Home Finance Agency will review the applications for credit for commercial and industrial structures and community facilities. The Urban Renewal Administration will cover the applications for land use for such renewal projects and for urban renewal planning. The Small Business Administration will deal with applications for financing projects of industrial development agencies. The Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare Departments will deal with the retraining programs. The Agricultural Department will handle the problems of rural communities. These project agencies will be coordinated and guided in their activities by policies and prescriptions set down by the Secretary of Commerce as the responsible head of this activity. In addition, the Secretary is directed to use the facilities and services of other departments, particularly idle or partially idle military installations.

CONCLUSION

The sponsors of the new legislation recognized that area redevelopment legislation is directed toward solving structural dislocations in the economy. Therefore, long-term programs of redevelopment and construction are necessary. The affected communities, industries, physical sites, and the persons involved have to be carefully rehabilitated and redirected in order to fit into the new industrial and economic environment. Merely providing inducements for industry to move into the area have proven inadequate if not largely unproductive. The task is to make the areas attractive to the newer industries seeking sites and areas for location. At times, the stigma of depression has to be removed or the evidence of locational advantages of the area have to be confirmed, and pilot industrial and commercial structures will have to be built to initiate the long-term economic upturn. But there is an underlying conviction that the goal is to create self-generating growth nucleuses and economic complexes which would feed their own growth process.

The major purpose of the legislation is to aid communities to initiate a local program of community physical and human redevelopment so that the capital and human resources may be preserved and utilized; and that the people in these communities will find the solution to their problems through careful study, diligent application, abundant investment and, where necessary, with the encouragement, advice, and the helping hand of the Federal Government.

The new program can make only a minor contribution to the efforts at bringing this Nation out of the depression. It is not designed to provide immediate aids to people in these communities. Other agencies will still retain this responsibility, though it will be helpful to the common effort if they coordinate these efforts with those undertaken for area redevelopment. Moreover, the actual economic prosperity of these communities will in large measure depend upon the realization of a high rate of national economic growth. Only as these areas begin to share substantially in the Nation's prosperity will they contribute significantly to the momentum of the overall growth itself.

Area redevelopment is a program for assuring the fullest participation of all areas in the national economy and the utilization of all human and natural resources, and capital in the promotion of the highest level of production, the standard of living, and employment in the United States. It is a long-term undertaking for maximum national prosperity.

A Century of MIT—A Dream Fulfilled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am anxious to extend to the president, teaching staff, student body, and alumni of the illustrious and world famous Massachusetts Institute of Technology my very heartiest congratulations upon the 100th anniversary of its establishment.

This institution started from very humble beginnings 100 years ago. As it grew through the years it changed its base of operations, first, from Summer Street and then, Back Bay, Boston, to the present extensive facilities on Memorial Drive, Cambridge, and it is continuing to grow, not only in physical plant, but in rapidly increasing usefulness to the Government, American industry and the scientific world.

So renowned have been the contributions of this great institution in the fields of engineering, technology, research, and development, science and industry, that I would not venture to try to evaluate the most beneficient and deeprooted impact it has exerted upon the growth and development of modern civilization.

The history of this truly great Massachusetts institution has, indeed, been a saga of accomplishment far beyond the wildest dreams of its founder, Dr. William Barton Rogers, a record of achievement so vital and crucial in many respects as to defy full analysis, a shining epic in shaping the life of men and affairs in the 20th century.

MIT has been an admirably organized team operation in the best sense of the word, and outstanding leadership, outstanding teachers, outstanding scientists, engineers and administrators have played effective roles in the work and expansion of this great scientific institution.

MIT has produced many great leaders who have taken their place in the topmost ranks of American educators, engineers, scientists, and businessmen. It

has reared generation after generation of the most valuable and useful technically trained experts. It has greatly benefited our economic system and industrial structure and has contributed inestimably to the Government both in war and peace in remarkable and fabulous ways through extending the horizons and boundaries of scientific knowledge and bringing it into play industrially and practically in implementing the miracles and marvels of the space age.

On MIT's 100th birthday many dignitaries of science and technology gathered from all corners of the earth to hail the occasion and to participate in the various programs of celebration and enlightening scientific discussion.

From Europe, the Near East and Asia and elsewhere outstanding scientists, political leaders and other great minds have come to celebrate the occasion. The distinguished Prime Minister of Great Britain, and the distinguished American Secretary of State, a notable member of the British Parliament and others joined in some of the programs.

The American people and Government entertain highest admiration and deepest gratitude for the magnificent contributions of MIT throughout the years.

It is my hope and prayer that these contributions will continue to grow, and that they will, as in the past, be directed toward the building of a greater, free, humane, scientific community in our great country and in the world, which in the space age will greatly help to bring the choicest blessings of peace, plenty, and happiness to mankind, and exalt the free spirit of man.

Import Quotas on Textile Imports: Brief Affirmative Statement

SPEECH
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I hope consideration will be given to imposing country by country, category by category quotas on textile imports. In my opinion the American textile industry finds itself in a critical position. Something must be done to improve the situation if the industry is to survive.

May I point out that imports of textiles have grown from about 73 percent of exports in 1954 to 170 percent of exports today. Meanwhile textile consumption has declined; cotton goods, to cite one example, from 30.9 pounds per capita in 1950 to 23.8 pounds in 1960.

As a result, 838 cotton textile mills were liquidated between 1947 and 1960. Unemployment in the textile industry resulting in large measure from import competition is estimated at 225,000.

Hourly earnings in textiles average about 30 percent under those of manufacturing workers in general, yet they cannot be increased because our textile industry already finds it impossible to compete with low-wage, modern industries from other countries in our domestic and in many foreign markets.

Textile industry profits continually range below the average for manufacturing as a whole. They were 3 percent lower in the third quarter of 1960.

Small wonder that we cannot compete when one realizes that in foreign countries our cotton can be purchased at 8 cents a pound advantage over our domestic mills.

Foreign nations are establishing textile industries geared not to their own markets, but to the lush American market. It is uneconomic and unfair even to them not to limit the quantity of textiles they can export to us. I say this because it is to the longrun advantage of such countries to establish industries which contribute more to their own development than to rely on industries which contribute only temporarily to solving their own economic problems.

Our textile industry ranks next to steel as essential for our defense. It is mandatory that we keep it strong.

It seems to me that import quotas would not be unfair. They would tend to equalize the position of our domestic textile industry in competition with those of other countries.

At present there is little incentive for increased investment and modernization in the industry. Research and development are falling behind. It is imperative that something must be done to remedy this situation.

Although other actions might be taken to alleviate the serious financial condition of our textile industry, the real solution is country by country, and category by category quotas on imports. My belief is that we should establish such quotas by country and by category.

The Cabinet Committee appointed to consider this problem has been studying the matter and it is hoped that action soon will be taken to help assist the textile industry. It seems to me that the remedy which I have suggested is the course that we should follow. There should not be a delay in adopting a country-by-country, category-by-category quota system in the textile field. This I am sure will be of benefit to all concerned.

Maj. Gen. R. L. Vittrup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL J. KILDAY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, for the past 20 months the Congress has been most fortunate in having Maj. Gen. R. L. Vittrup as Chief of the Army's Office of Legislative Liaison. The outstanding service rendered by General Vittrup have proved invaluable to the individual Members and committees of the House of Representatives in obtaining a clearer understanding of the roles, missions, and requirements of the Army. Also he has been of great assistance in providing answers to inquiries posed by our constituents concerning Army policies, procedures, and operation. I am sincerely sorry to see General Vittrup leave but I am pleased to note that on April 1, 1961, he was designated the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel where his distinctive capabilities will continue to be utilized by the Army and our country. I am also pleased to note that he received a well-deserved promotion to lieutenant general on the same date.

General Vittrup has had a truly outstanding career. He entered the U.S. Military Academy from Texas and graduated with the class of 1929. Prior to World War II, he served as an infantry company officer for 63 months, student and instructor at the infantry and tank school, student at the command and general staff college, and instructor at the U.S. Military Academy.

Shortly after Pearl Harbor, General Vittrup was assigned as Assistant Secretary of the Army General Staff. A short time later he became Assistant Secretary to the Joint and Combined Chiefs of Staff where he worked on the overall planning and operations of World War II. He also was the first Secretary of the Joint Strategic Survey Committee. In 1943 he was assigned to the Allied Force Headquarters, first in North Africa, and then in Italy. He participated in the planning and execution of the Allied invasion of Italy, southern France, and Germany during 1944 and 1945.

After the war General Vittrup progressed through a variety of assignments of ever increasing responsibility. In 1945, he was assigned to the Operations Division of the Army General Staff serving first as liaison officer between the War Department and the State Department and then as Chief of the Policy Section of the Strategic and Policy Group. During the later assignment he traveled about the Far East negotiating disposal of military materiel in the Western Pacific. Upon completion of his studies at the National War College in 1948, General Vittrup served as G3, U.S. Army Caribbean and Command of the 33d Infantry stationed in the Panama Canal Zone. After a tour as instructor at the Army War College he became Chief of the Army Section of the Joint U.S. Military Advisory Group in Greece. On his return to the United States, he served as Chief of the Operations Division, G3, Army General Staff from October 1953 to August 1955. In August 1955 he became Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff of Military Operations—International Affairs—and concurrently the U.S. Army Delegate to Inter-American Defense Board; the Permanent Joint Board of Defense-United States/Canada; and the Army member of the Mexican-United States Defense Commission and the Brazilian-United States Defense Commission. These duties provided a wealth of experience in worldwide Army operations and in international relations.

In 1956 General Vittrup became Commanding General of the 24th Infantry Division in Korea and subsequently

Chief of Staff of the Army Forces Far East, 8th Army. Then in 1957, he was designated Deputy Chief of Staff for Plans and Operations for the U.S. Army Pacific. While in this capacity he was sent to Indonesia to negotiate sale and delivery of certain military supplies and equipment to that country. In July 1959, General Vittrup left Hawaii to assume his duties as Chief of the Office of Legislative Liaison in which capacity he served with such distinction.

I know that all my colleagues in the House will join me in expressing our warm thanks to Lieutenant General Vittrup for his past services in our behalf and to wish him every success in his new assignment.

A Military Code of Ethics and a Step in the Right Direction by Secretary of Defense McNamara

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the directive of Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Robert S. McNamara, issued April 14, 1960, No. 1000.8, concerning the acceptance of gifts; use of Government facilities, and use of official representation funds, be printed in the RECORD.

I have long sought to see a code of ethics for guidance of officers and employees of the Department of Defense which would be enforced. As chairman of the Subcommittee for Special Investigations of the Committee on Armed Services of the House, I have conducted many inquiries into this general area.

Congress has been promised time and again that there would be a code of conduct set up; that action would be taken to curtail abuses; that direction would be given; and that there would be restored a standard of ethical values which could be clearly understood and enforced.

The standards contained in this directive reflect the Secretary's own personal high ethical standards. They are a decent set of rules by which the personal integrity and the official responsibility of members of his Department can live.

I am gratified at the spirit which prompts this directive. It follows soon upon the Secretary's assumption of office. I look forward, as I am sure do the Members of Congress and a waiting public, for the cure which it is intended to effect; and for the standard of personal integrity which it will create.

There is little time to be lost. Many excesses, in the past, have gone unchallenged and unpunished because there seemed to be a vacuum which personal standards did not always fill—sometimes at very high level.

Now there is a code of ethics.

I think, however, this code should be considered only as a beginning. Conscientious administration and observance will make it meaningful.

I congratulate the Secretary for this prompt and discerning action:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DIRECTIVE

(Subject: Acceptance of gifts; use of Government facilities, and use of official representation funds)

I. Purpose:

This directive sets forth standards of conduct for Defense personnel with respect to the acceptance of gifts, the use of Government facilities, property and manpower, and the use of official representation funds. Its provisions apply to all military personnel on active duty and to all civilian personnel.

II. Acceptance of gifts and use of Government property:

(A) Defense personnel shall not—

(1) Accept any gift, favor or hospitality for themselves or their families from any enterprise or person doing business or seeking to do business with the Department of Defense which might reasonably be interpreted by others as being of such nature that it could affect their impartiality;

(2) Personally use or permit the use by others of Government facilities, property, manpower or funds for other than official Government business.

(B) The tender of any gift, favor, or hospitality which might be considered to be in the nature of bribery shall be reported immediately through departmental procedures to the Department of Justice and the General Counsel of the Department of Defense. Any questions concerning what might be construed as bribery shall be resolved in favor of reporting the incident.

(C) Gifts from foreign governments shall be handled in accordance with DOD Directive 1005.3.

III. Official representation funds: Use of official representation funds shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of Defense, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, or the Secretaries of the military departments. Funds are to be utilized only for official entertainment to maintain the standing and prestige of the United States by extending official courtesies to certain officials and dignitaries of the United States and foreign countries.

IV. Use of Government facilities, property, and manpower:

(A) Government facilities, property, and manpower, such as stenographic and typing assistance, mimeograph services, and chauffeur services, shall be used only for official Government business.

(B) Special mission aircraft shall be used only for official purposes and such use shall be approved by the Secretary of Defense, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, the Secretaries of the military departments, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Chiefs of Staff, Army and Air Force, the Chief of Naval Operations, or the Commandant of the Marine Corps.

(C) Motor vehicles:

(1) Full-time assignment of official vehicles to officials of the Department of Defense at the seat of government shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of Defense or the Deputy Secretary of Defense. Full-time assignments at field installations will be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the military department concerned.

(2) Defense personnel authorized full-time use of official vehicles shall not use such vehicles for other than the actual performance of official duties. Vehicles authorized on a full-time basis shall not be reassigned to others not entitled to such use.

(3) Other administrative use of motor vehicles shall be authorized only when official transportation is essential to the successful operation of activities of the Government.

(4) Use of motor vehicles, whether authorized on a full-time or trip basis, is not authorized for the official concerned, members of his family, or others, for private business or personal social engagements. Questions with regard to the official nature of a particular use shall be resolved in favor of strict compliance with statutory restrictions.

V. Implemention: Two copies of instructions in implementation of this directive will be forwarded to the Secretary of Defense within 30 days after the effective date of this directive for approval prior to promulgation.

VI. Effective date: The provisions of this directive are effective immediately.

ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense.

The Honorable Virginia Duff, Lady Legislator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to include an article which appeared recently in the Dallas Morning News relative to Miss Virginia Duff, of Ferris, Tex. Miss Duff is a member of the Texas State Legislature since 1950. I have counted her as one of my close friends since that time, and it gives me great pleasure to be able to have these few words inserted in the RECORD.

The article follows:

OWNS ONE HERSELF—FERRIS' LADY LAWMAKER KNOWS FARM PROBLEMS

(By Eddie Hughes, News staff writer)

FERRIS, TEX.—A little lady lawmaker from Ellis County holds no fear of political rivals slinging mud at her.

In fact, Miss Virginia Duff, a State representative for 11 years, has a deep love for the soil.

And ever since she first decided to throw her bonnet in the political ring, she has been throwing male political opponents for a loss.

She estimates that she travels 4,000 miles a year around the county, talking with farmers so that she can better cope with all sorts of problems—real or imaginative—that face the residents of her district.

For this, and her straightforwardness in supporting or opposing bills that come before the Texas Legislature, the 40-year-old lady farmer and lawyer owns the respect of all her fellow representatives.

Miss Duff believes women are naturals for politics. She is one of three serving as representatives in the 57th legislature.

"Special groups hesitate to put pressure on women," she declares.

Miss Duff lives in a comfortable white home smack in the middle of her 50-acre farm west of Ferris, where she raises a yearly crop of cotton, wheat, and maize.

With a firsthand knowledge of farm problems she has served on many agriculture committees during her six terms and recently headed a study committee which proposed a closer state check upon local water projects.

She is fiercely proud of her great-great-grandfather, a pioneer who attended the first Texas Legislature and helped found Ellis County.

Miss Duff entered her first political race in 1950 for State representative of Ellis County. "I was elected on my 30th birthday, and my life's ambition was realized."

In that first try, she defeated two men—one in a runoff—then in her second go she beat another male. During one election, the citizens of Ferris gave her 93 percent of their votes.

In the 1960 election last spring, Miss Duff was opposed by four men. Three were eliminated in the regular election, and the remaining opponent was defeated in the runoff.

During her off moments—if there is such a thing—Miss Duff practices a little law in Ferris, digs a few potatoes at the family farm, and personally tries to answer some 100 letters a week from voters who regard their lady lawmakers as a 24-hour public servant.

The Dutch Need Our Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy is currently engaged in conversations with President Sukarno, of Indonesia. All of us are aware, I am sure, that these discussions include the disposition of West New Guinea.

The situation simply is that Dr. Sukarno wants the Netherlands to get out so that Indonesia can move in. Up to this point the United States has remained on the fence. Personally, I think it is about time that we stood by our friends, the Dutch.

The Dutch, we know, fought beside us in World War I and in World War II. And, because the United States was an ally of the Dutch during World War II, Dr. Sukarno has criticized us. He believes that we should have forced the Dutch to yield West New Guinea to Indonesia. Influenced by Marxism, he has also been motivated by the doctrine that a big capitalist power must of necessity be imperialist. However, the record shows that in the case of West New Guinea this is not true.

The Dutch spend $27 million each year to give West New Guinea its government. Their 10-year program has produced a largely native legislative council. The Dutch, because of this expense, is willing to leave this island, but they desire that the Papuans, the natives of West New Guinea, have a chance to determine their own fate. In fact, the Dutch welcomed a recent Malayan proposal to hand over this possession to a three-nation United Nations trusteeship, but Dr. Sukarno continues to block this move.

Mr. Speaker, I have been using the title "doctor" in my references to Sukarno. Well, he calls himself "doctor" on the strength of a degree in engineering at the University of Bandung. But, his engineering skills have never been in building bridges. It has been in crossing them.

The first major opportunity for Sukarno to cross a political bridge was in March 1943 when the Japanese promised Indonesia independence to gain his support. The Japanese made him president of an appointed council, which they were supposed to consult. Sukarno shortly went to Tokyo to thank Japan for this so-called step toward self-government. Meanwhile, Netherland soldiers, sailors, and airmen were bitterly engaged in a war of survival against the Japanese. Japan's esteem for this collaborator was shown when it decorated Sukarno with the Order of the Sacred Treasure for his wartime service.

Sukarno is regarded as an Asian uncommitted to either the Western democracies or the Communist bloc. He believes in dealing with both and with getting aid from any source. But, the similarity between Sukarno's conception of government and the Communist pattern has not been lost to observers. In fact, the Communists have performed the function of agitators and propagandists for Sukarno. This is surprising when one considers that he called on his people to put down a Communist revolt in 1948.

Sukarno, Mr. Speaker, stresses that "democracy is not merely government by the people; democracy is also government for the people." Perhaps this is why his government is infiltrated by Communists. Recently he banned four political parties including the pro-Western nationalist PIR. But, he allowed the Communist PKI and the Communist Murba to exist.

In January of this year, Gen. Abdul Haris Nasution, Indonesia's defense minister, went to Moscow and came back with $450 million in military aid after U.S.S.R. officials had publicly pledged themselves to help Indonesia take over West New Guinea.

The Netherlands want self-determination for the Papuans, who, by the way, are not Indonesian. The fate of West New Guinea was undecided by the Indonesian Treaty of 1949 because its people and problems are extraordinary. Sukarno claims it on the grounds that Indonesia is the legal heir of all the Dutch Indonesian possessions. This is a dubious claim, and although the Dutch are willing to go to the World Court to settle the dispute, Sukarno refuses this or any other logical solution.

What he wants is to distract the attention of his people away from the failure of his own government.

Mr. Speaker, Sukarno served Japan when we were at war with that country. He has been friendly wth the Communists and has openly accepted their aid. He has refused to accept the result of a plebiscite in West New Guinea, probably because he is afraid of the results. As long ago as 1950, two Papuan leaders, Nicolaas Jouwe and Markus Kasieppo, speaking for their countrymen, said they preferred to remain under the Dutch. The dominate attitude of Papuan leaders today—though sometimes critical—is loyal to the Dutch.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that President Kennedy does not encourage Sukarno's pretention and I hope we can be able to take a positive position on behalf of the Dutch. Also, Mr. Speaker, I am happy that Sukarno was not asked to address this Congress, for if he had been asked I, for one, would not have been present.

Committee on Consumer Interests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, this morning I had the pleasure of testifying before the House Rules Committee on behalf of my House Concurrent Resolution 15 and House Resolution 42. I would like to commend to the attention of our colleagues my remarks at that time:

STATEMENT OF ABRAHAM J. MULTER, DEMOCRAT OF NEW YORK, IN SUPPORT OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 15 AND HOUSE RESOLUTION 42, BEFORE THE HOUSE RULES COMMITTEE, APRIL 25, 1961

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for the opportunity to appear here this morning on behalf of House Concurrent Resolution 15 and House Resolution 42, which I introduced on January 3.

These resolutions are both designed to accomplish the same end, the protection of the interests of the consumer.

House Resolution 42 would provide for the creation of a select committee of the House to be composed of 15 Members appointed by the Speaker. House Concurrent Resolution 15 would provide for a joint committee composed of 7 Members of the House and 7 Members of the Senate. I have introduced measures similar to these in every Congress since the 83d.

A committee such as that proposed by either resolution would be impowered to investigate, conduct studies and report to the Congress on the status of the consumer in the American economy.

Many observers have often thought that strict regulation of the monetary policies affecting our economy would alone achieve economic stability and provide the consumer with adequate protection of his interests. We have seen the sad results of such narrow thinking in the inability of the American business community and the Federal Government to prevent either inflation or deflation. It has become obvious that many other factors must be dealt with to prevent inadequacies and imbalances which periodically occur.

It is generally recognized that the monetary and credit policy instruments of the Federal Reserve System played an important role in the efforts to make the impact of the 1954 recession easier to absorb. Similarly they performed this service in the inflationary movement of the 1955–57 period and in the recession of 1958. They did not, however, prevent these economic crises from occurring, nor did these policies in themselves correct the situations.

It appears clear that a full investigation is urgently needed of wages, prices, employment, and the other factors which affect the consumer if we are to avoid this continuing cycle of inflation-recession that we have experienced in the fifties.

Some of the tasks of a committee such as is called for in my resolution would be the

study of classical inflation and deflation caused by decreases in the effective supply of money and credit and an investigation of the effect of monopolistic or quasi-monopolistic practices on prices, production, and employment. We have seen exposed recently an aspect of this latter problem in the conviction for price fixing of officers and directors of some of our largest electrical manufacturing companies.

Other matters we would hope the proposed committee would study are the effect upon prices, profits, production, and employment of increases in wages, of government expenditures, taxation, monetary and debt management policies, and international influences.

From the consumer's viewpoint the prices charged for cost-of-living items such as food, fuel, and clothing, and the availability of these items, are of utmost importance and the special function of the committee would be to attempt to determine the variables which influence these aspects of the consumer interest.

The results of an investigation and study of these problems would immeasurably increase the effectiveness of the Federal Government and the business community in guiding us along a path of continuing prosperity and progrress.

I strongly urge this committee to favorably report either House Concurrent Resolution 15 or House Resolution 42, or in the alternative, my resolution, House Resolution 62, which would give to the Banking and Currency Committee jurisdiction over these problems, in which event that committee could conduct the necessary investigations and studies.

Big Little Town in Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago, a tornado struck the small town of Italy, Tex., located in my congressional district. I immediately wired the city council and the editor of the local newspaper advising of the President's disaster fund and how they could apply for assistance. The mayor replied to the effect that the Federal Government needed the money more than the town of Italy and that it should be applied to reducing the public debt.

The editor of the paper, Mr. Russell W. Bryant, wrote several editorials with respect to the courage of the people of Italy in turning down Federal assistance. I think they are to be commended and personally wish to pay my respects to the mayor, the Honorable Robert Windham.

[From the Italy (Tex.) News-Herald]

WERE WE SURPRISED

Naturally, city officials and the editor of this newspaper expected some attention for the community when the offer of Federal disaster funds was turned down, but no one could possibly have anticipated the tremendous nationwide response it touched off.

Telephone calls began coming in a few hours after the telegram was sent Congressman TEAGUE. Then telegrams, and then an avalanche of mail that caused the Italy post office to look like Christmas last Friday and Saturday mornings as they opened sack after sack of first-class mail. It was still coming in Wednesday of this week.

The expression of surprise on the face of Little Italy in the cartoon appearing on this page could not have been more accurately depicted had Harold Maples, the Fort Worth Star-Telegram artist who drew it, been here to see the faces of those who brought about the whole thing. The cartoon appeared in the Star-Telegram last Thursday morning.

The offer of aid was turned down in all sincerity because it had already been determined that, while total damage was high individual losses were relatively low and for the most part covered by insurance. It was felt that a disaster area designation would be of more harm than benefit.

There was absolutely no doubt about Italy being better off financially than the Federal Treasury because during the time the Federal debt has increased $30 billion, the city of Italy has increased services to its citizens, reduced the tax rate 25 cents on the $100 valuation, and created a surplus more than sufficient to retire all bonded indebtedness.

At the time of rejection it was not known whether the aid might amount to a few hundred dollars or several million. It now appears that there wasn't much turned down after all—except an opportunity for the Federal Government to send in bureaucrats to do a lot of dictating to us. The city might have gotten some money to repair the city hall. It is doubtful if 1 cent could have been obtained by private citizens. Little better is the offer of small business loans that were made available after rejection of the first offer. No loan will be approved for doing any more than rebuilding exactly like the original structure, except where building codes prohibit it.

The Federal Government has been working a cruel hoax on the people of this Nation. It takes their money through excessive taxes on the pretext of offering greater service, and then when aid is needed or wanted it is doled back in most meager amounts and under degrading conditions.

Congress might well send a committee to Italy to read the wonderful letters from all over this United States of America. (Many letters show carbon copies to the President and various Congressmen.) They would find that Americans, from 12-year-old youngsters to men and women whose writing is so quavery as to be almost illegible, are deeply concerned about Federal spending and Federal debt; that they have been fooled about just how much the Federal Government pretends to do for its people.

Italy has apparently not rejected nearly as much as it, and others throughout the country, thought. It has stirred the American people by its action, however, and—as so many expressed hope—may prove a turning point in Federal giveaway programs. Although Italy's action was not mentioned, there was a report this week of a Dallas veteran returning three compensation checks for a minor World War II disability to Congressman OLIN TEAGUE.

Regardless of what may have come to Italy under the Federal program, it appears we stand to gain more by turning it down. One company wrote that Italy will be considered in an upcoming plant expansion program, and two men were here the rest of the week to discuss locating a new plant here.

[From the Italy (Tex.) News-Herald]

CREDIT WHERE CREDIT IS DUE

On May 21, 1947, the citizens of Italy closed up shop, donned their work clothes, cleaned, scrubbed, and repainted their store fronts in their first "Good Neighbor Day"—an appellation given the event by the late Raymond Vanlandingham. Everybody helped everybody else without thought of credit, pay, or praise.

Sunday night this same spirit was again in evidence as they joined hands to lay plans for a gigantic cleanup of tornado damage.

Possibly some of the experience gained in that big publicity promotion 14 years ago was unconsciously applied to the present situation. Possibly it was just levelheaded leadership on the part of some who hold positions of leadership and others who do not.

Obviously, it is a physical impossibility for the News-Herald to learn the names of all who worked through the night Sunday and Monday and Tuesday—or who did not work—so names of local people are being eliminated from all accounts as much as possible. It is assumed that everyone did all they could do—it is known that some exceeded all reasonable expectations—and it is likewise assumed that those who were not observed shouldering their part of the load were either not seen or had good reason for not helping.

Some have received attention in out-of-town newspapers and on radio and television, while others who did equally as much, or more, went unrecognized. This is not due to self-seeking, but rather to having been at a given place at the time a reporter happened to be there. Some errors were made in giving credit—even as the News-Herald would make some if it tried to give credit where credit is due—but the News-Herald will not attempt to correct stories appearing in other papers.

Mayor Robert D. Windham has been extensively quoted, much to his embarrassment, and he has asked that it be explained it is the office being recognized and not he personally. The same holds true for the editor of this paper who has been contacted by newsmen acquaintances and used as a source of information.

An attempt will be made to list outside groups who have assisted, with the certainty that some will be omitted because they were not known to have been here or have been forgotten in all the confusion.

They are as follows: Constable Herschel Smith, of Avalon, who was able to pick up a radio plea for help and retransmit it to the sheriff's department in Waxahachie; the sheriff's department which was on the scene within 30 minutes after the tornado hit, accompanied by ambulances from the two Waxahachie funeral homes and the Ellis County Emergency Corps with its firetruck, power generator, portable lights, shortwave radio, and a wrecker unit; State highway patrol units; ambulances from Frost & Cleburne funeral homes; wreckers from a number of garages; Salvation Army personnel from Waxahachie, Corsicana, and Dallas, the latter setting up a canteen truck within an hour and a half; the Waxahachie National Guard unit with floodlights, portable generators, jeeps, walkie-talkie radios, guardsmen to patrol the streets, and a field kitchen that prepared and served breakfast about 5:30 a.m.; Hillsboro fire department emergency truck with fire extinguishers, portable generators, and floodlights; the American Red Cross, which set up emergency headquarters in the American Legion auditorium about midnight and had a canteen truck here Monday morning; all four county commissioners who furnished men, trucks, loaders, and cranes; State highway department men and trucks from Waxahachie and Ennis; city of Waco, with two trucks and six men; eight power company crews with full equipment, including two large generators; telephone and gas company crews.

Numerous communities radioed offers of help Sunday night but were told all was under control.

The News-Herald wishes it had the name of every person, local and out of town, who helped; the space in which to list them and their deeds. Many of these people worked without letup from the time the tornado hit

until darkness closed in Monday night. Many returned Tuesday morning for another full day, and again Wednesday.

May we say only that the most minute act of assistance is as highly appreciated as the most sacrificial, and that credit can only be given where due by each individual who knows what he did.

Smithsonian Institution's Hall of Coal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, today I have written to Dr. Leonard Carmichael, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, to request information on plans for the exhibits on coal, steel, and related industries at the new Museum of History and Technology.

Some time ago I received a press release from the National Coal Association calling attention of residents of mining communities to the need for tools and equipment to be displayed in the new Hall of Coal. I am interested in learning whether adequate material has been obtained by those in charge at Smithsonian; if not, Members of Congress from mining regions could undoubtedly perform an important service by giving publicity to the project.

The people of Pennsylvania have a basic interest in the proposed exhibits on coal, steel, and related industries. Our history is closely associated with the early use of the ironmaking process developed by William Kelly. Some of the earliest commercial coal mines in the United States were operated in Pennsylvania.

The exhibits at the Museum of History and Technology will give American and foreign visitors alike an opportunity to understand the outstanding advances that have taken place in these industries. The building can be one of the most effective media of pointing up the progressive nature of the U.S. coal and steel industries.

For some time coal has been accused of being a backward industry. Critics have found it convenient to blame many of the industry's problems on lack of foresight. The fact is that the coal industry has an outstanding record in improvement of productivity through research and technology. With the cooperation of a progressive union, the United Mine Workers of America, coal management has installed such highly mechanized mining processes that today coal is selling at the mine on an average of 26 cents per ton lower than the price a decade or more ago.

This is the information that needs to be brought to public attention. Coupled with data on coal reserves, it will serve to provide assurance of a continued energy supply for centuries to come. It will also notify visitors from abroad that America has a vast storehouse of energy that can be utilized either as an ingredient in the production of an enormous war machine or in the manufacture of materials that will contribute to a better life now and in the years to come.

After meeting with representatives of the Smithsonian Institution, I shall relay to Congress the information that I have obtained on the new Museum of History and Technology. I am certain that all my colleagues will want to have a progress report of this nature from time to time.

The Future of the Private College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CATHERINE MAY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, a crisis is developing in higher education where rising costs could quite easily force great numbers of deserving young people to forgo a college education. I have long felt that in an attempt to help solve this threat, serious consideration should be given to the allowance of a Federal income tax deduction or credit for tuition expenses paid for the college education of our children.

In this regard, I am favorably impressed with a recent article by Virgil C. Blum, S.J., associate professor of political science at Marquette University, which appeared in a recent issue of Our Sunday Visitor. Under unanimous consent, I ask that Father Blum's article be printed at this point in the RECORD:

THE FUTURE OF THE PRIVATE COLLEGE—IN THIS TIME OF CRISIS NEW METHODS OF FINANCING MUST BE DEVELOPED

(By Virgil C. Blum, S.J.)

You may be planning to send your son or daughter to a private college or university. There are strong indications, however, that you may not have the opportunity. In the years ahead many private institutions of higher education are likely to collapse financially; others will, as experts predict, boost their tuition by more than 100 percent and thus price themselves beyond your financial reach.

But the demise of our private college is not inevitable. Nor is a tuition level beyond your reach inevitable. Private institutions can be saved. But it is a task to which every citizen who believes in diversity in education, academic freedom in the pursuit of truth, free enterprise in education, and the best interests of the taxpayer must take a personal interest. In this time of crisis for education, new methods of financing private education must be found.

The rapid increase in the cost of classroom buildings, laboratories and operations is at the heart of the problem of financing private education. The problem cannot be solved simply by raising tuition. Such an approach might well aggravate the problem.

The private college, however, cannot fix the price of the product it is selling—education—on the basis of production costs. It does not operate in a free market. It operates in the context of a State-subsidized educational system. Under present conditions of high-cost education, the high public institutional discount rate of 80 to 90 percent on the full cost of education spells destruction for most private institutions.

This fact was underscored by Dr. Lawrence A. Kimpton, former chancellor of the University of Chicago, when he spoke of this destructive situation. "To put it in the crassest terms possible," he said, "it is hard to market a product at a fair price when down the street someone is giving it away."

Private colleges are like private grocery stores which, even while selling their products at a substantial loss, would be forced out of business by State-owned and operated supermarkets that sell their products at an 80- to 90-percent discount.

In such a competitive situation the private college cannot raise its tuition to meet necessary costs. If it does, it simply prices itself out of the education market. Some students, to be sure, will continue to attend private schools, even if they must borrow money to pay tuition.

But the typical student (and his parents) will not incur large debts to pay tuition when he can get a college education at the taxpayer's expense. The typical student will not borrow $1,000 or $1,500 a year to pay tuition when he can get an education "free."

The impact of the growing gap between tuition in public and private institutions is clearly demonstrated by the rapid shift of students from private to public institutions. As recently as 1950 more than 50 percent of our college students attended private institutions. Today it is less than 40 percent.

Experts predict that, if present trends continue, 80 percent of our students will be in tax-supported colleges and universities by 1970. The tuition-imbalance is one big reason why there are thousands of vacancies in private colleges while tax-supported institutions are asking for hundreds of millions of dollars to expand facilities.

It costs a minimum of $3,600 to supply classroom facilities for a student. Hence, it is in the taxpayer's interest that existing private school facilities be used to the fullest extent possible. This is not being done. A year ago there were 709 private colleges with fewer than 500 students each. Their average enrollment was only 226. It is a fair estimate that these colleges have available many hundreds of millions of dollars of unused facilities. In Wisconsin alone the private colleges have $17 million worth of unused space.

Why do students bypass small private colleges for large State institutions? Dean Martin Quanbeck, of Minnesota's Augsburg College, says that this preference "can be explained largely in terms of differences in quality, prestige, and tuition costs." Relatively high tuition costs are a deterrent to attendance at private colleges. Yet, it is precisely because tuition cannot begin to cover the full cost of quality education that many of our small colleges are short on quality and prestige.

Under present conditions the faculties of most private colleges are terribly underpaid and overworked. "What all this amounts to," said Dr. Barnaby Keeney, president of Brown University, "is that every student at almost every private college in the country is on a scholarship from the faculty, whether he needs one or not, indeed whether he wants one or not. This scholarship is paid by the faculty of the institution, out of their hides."

But it is true, nevertheless, that most parents cannot afford to pay a tuition that covers a greater portion of the full cost of education. For one thing, taxes are too high. And the larger the proportion of students in tax-supported institutions, the higher the taxes.

How then can private colleges and universities be saved and enabled to render a valuable service to American society? A number of proposals are now receiving serious consideration.

Direct Federal matching grants to public and private institutions for classroom buildings and laboratories are being proposed. Such direct grants would, however, be of little help to the vast majority of the Nation's 1,300 private institutions. Since additional students increase the operating deficit, private schools are reluctant to spend meager resources to match Federal funds to expand their facilities.

Some way must be found to increase the income of private schools for operating purposes. "Otherwise," predicts Dr. Louis T. Benezet, president of Colorado College, "we may expect to see the monumental construction of State university metropolises on the one hand and on the other the disappearance of most of the private colleges."

A Federal tax credit against tuition or fees deserves serious consideration. It would enable parents to pay a greater portion of the full cost of education, thus making higher tuition feasible. A 40-percent tax credit on a tuition of $1,000 would enable the taxpayer, parent or other, to claim a credit of $400 against his Federal income tax. If his income tax is $900, he pays only $500. If a parent sends his son to a State university where tuition is $200, he could claim a credit of $80.

There is nothing revolutionary about the tax credit. The Federal Government makes innumerable tax concessions to business and the professions to promote some particular aspects of the public interest.

If the tax credit would induce student attendance at private schools, it would result in substantial savings for the taxpayers. Since it costs the taxpayers from $1,600 to $2,000 a year per student in a State university (less in a State college), a tax credit of $400 to a parent who sends his son or daughter to a private institution would constitute a large saving in tax dollars.

It is sometimes objected that a tax credit would not greatly aid low income families. This is true. But it must be emphasized that with or without a tax credit these families cannot send their children to private colleges. They need scholarship help. The adoption of the tax credit plan would enable private colleges to give more scholarships to needy students. This would aid low income families. Moreover, an increasing number of States are adopting extensive scholarship programs, and the U.S. Office of Education has proposed an extensive Federal scholarship program.

In early December representatives of the major educational associations, meeting in Washington, adopted a package recommendation in support of Federal scholarships, Federal matching grants for classroom buildings and laboratories, and a tax credit plan. There was a feeling, however, that support of the tax credit plan would be controversial.

Although the major educational associations have repeatedly adopted resolutions supporting the tax-credit plan, State universities and land-grant colleges have in recent years publicly opposed the plan. The reason is not difficult to discover. Since all their in-State students enjoy a hidden tax-provided scholarship that covers most of the cost of their education, tuition is nominal. Hence the dollar value of a 40-percent tax credit to these students is not high. Consequently, public institutions, if they desired to absorb the tax-credit benefit by raising tuition by 40 percent, would receive less in increased tuition-income than private institutions.

Public institutions want direct Federal matching grants for capital construction, rather than tax credit. It seems to me, however, that the best interest of America, as well as the best interest of both public and private higher education, would be served by the adoption of both the matching grant proposal and the tax-credit proposal, together with a scholarship program with grants weighted in favor of the low income group.

Academic freedom, the need for diversity in education, equity and economy strongly urge the adoption of the 40-percent-tax-credit plan. Such a Federal program would enable parents to pay a greater portion of the full cost of education. This would enable private schools to raise their tuition substantially without pricing themselves out of business.

Almost 100 Days

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing and reading a lot about the first 100 days of the Kennedy administration. In the near future, a member of the Republican Party is scheduled to comment on the Kennedy administration's record to date.

I should like to insert in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post for April 20 entitled "3 Months of Kennedy," that I found to be most interesting reading. I came to the Congress with Mr. Kennedy, and as he steadily rose to the position which he now occupies today, I have had nothing but praise and admiration for him. I, like others, may not always agree with him, but no one can detract from the method in which he has handled himself, his display of determination, and his sincere dedication to his position, and more important, to his country:

THREE MONTHS OF KENNEDY

President Kennedy's address to the editors today will mark the completion of his first 3 months as Chief Executive. He has presented an impression to the country and to the world of broad intellectual grasp, poise, vigor, and quiet competence. But it is fair to say that this period has been occupied more with sizing up problems than with moving boldly to surmount them.

No doubt this was inevitable in the situation. The new President inherited a host of deferred decisions and neglected needs. Perhaps he also found that some issues did not seem so simple, once he was in the White House, as they had seemed when he was an aspirant to office.

Moreover, Mr. Kennedy was confronted with an exteremely delicate electoral balance. Not only was the popular vote in the presidential election last November very close; the divisions in Congress have proved to be much narrower than the superficial party statistics would indicate.

This factor alone makes Mr. Kennedy's situation very different from that which attended Franklin Roosevelt's first months in office. It was fashionable on the eve of the inauguration to predict a burst of activity similar to that of the Roosevelt 100 days. There is indeed something of the same intellectual ferment and creativity. But on deeper analysis the comparison was misleading.

In 1933 the country was at the bottom of a grim depression. Legislators and citizens were eager to grasp at any measure, including social innovation and experimentation, that might hold promise of some relief. In 1961 the country is, to be sure, in a recession; but it is fortunately miniscule by contrast with the great trauma of 28 years ago. There are ugly pockets of poverty and unemployment which worry some Americans and ought to worry more, but the major uncertainty probably concerns the country's position in the world. There are complaints of considerable complacency.

In foreign affairs Mr. Kennedy has made the most visible impact. His conferences with major allied leaders have gone well, and he has given impetus to a broader design for Atlantic unity. He has faced ugly reality in Laos. His willingness to accept a genuinely neutral government plus his determination to intervene militarily if necessary are essential to a stabilization. It is too soon to say whether his handling of the Cuban situation has been wise, but he has taken commendable initiative in Latin America generally. He has looked coolly at issues with the Soviet Union, assuring firmness but avoiding provocation.

His appointments have for the most part been highly meritorious. His changes in the structure and routine of the executive branch have shown that he intends to be his own chief of staff; but he also delegates authority to capable men. He has evidenced his intention to use Executive powers in the field of civil rights. He has placed notable emphasis upon flexibility in the Defense Establishment, though what happened to the missile gap remains something of a mystery.

In domestic legislative affairs the President's pace has been substantially slower. Members friendly to him won the fight on House rules at the beginning of the congressional session, but the big tests are still ahead. In most areas of concern from antirecession measures to housing, health, agriculture, and the overall national budget, Mr. Kennedy has proposed an essentially cautious program. It has been criticized by some as inadequate to stimulate revitalized economic growth. It may represent less what the President thinks desirable than what he thinks he can get.

No one is yet in an authoritative position to dispute this approach. Mr. Kennedy has the counsel of some able and experienced men in legislative affairs, including Vice President JOHNSON. Moreover, it probably is useful for the new President to demonstrate to the country that his approach is moderate rather than radical.

But it also is accurate to say that the country has not yet been called upon for the sacrifices that Mr. Kennedy envisaged during the campaign. The response to the Peace Corps has dramatized the willingness of Americans to identify themselves with a national cause. But the people can hardly respond to such needs unless they are asked.

The question is whether the President has talked directly to the people on enough occasions. Mr. Kennedy is an extraordinarily accessible Chief Executive, but his accessibility is seen more through reflection than through direct contact. Apart from his news conferences, which are difficult to focus despite his sense of command, he has not yet made major appeals to public opinion.

And here is something of the conundrum that confronted President Eisenhower. The Gallup Poll shows Mr. Kennedy having an even higher percentage of public approval in his initial months than his predecessor had. But how can this approval be translated into legislative support? Returning Congressmen report that their constituents applaud Mr. Kennedy but not his program. This reaction may be superficial, but the question remains how popularity can be used to influence congressional action.

Mr. Kennedy is said to view his task as partly one of education. There have been many suggestions for renewal of the fireside chat technique. Understandably the President may want to use any such devices sparingly so as not to waste his ammunition. The quintessential foreign aid appropriation,

or affairs in Cuba, may prompt him to additional action. The point he always must consider is that by delaying he runs the risk of not mustering public opinion in time to influence the results.

The President may well be a better judge of appropriate timing than some of the second-guessers. What has been seen of his performance so far displays a distinctive and in some ways dazzling style of operation. But much of the New Frontier, in domestic affairs at least, remains on the far horizon.

Castro's Cuba: A Revolution Betrayed?—An Article by Theodore Draper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, because of the unhappy events of recent days in Cuba, I should like to call to the attention of Members of Congress an extremely valuable article entitled "Castro's Cuba: A Revolution Betrayed?" by Theodore Draper, which was published in the March 27, 1961, issue of the New Leader.

Although the article is a more lengthy one than I like normally to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I believe it contains such a useful analysis of the rise of Fidel Castro and the way in which he has betrayed the revolution which he originally promised to the Cuban people that students of our relations with Cuba will consult it with advantage.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Mr. Draper is a distinguished authority on the Communist movement, and at this point I include a brief biographical sketch of him:

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Theodore Draper has spent the last 25 years as a journalist, historian, and editor who has specialized in international affairs and American foreign policy, with extended excursions into the history of the American labor movement in general and the American Communist movement in particular. He has worked in and written about France, Germany, Morocco, Haiti, Guatemala, Mexico, the Dominican Republic, Cuba, and other countries.

The author of four books, his first, "The Six Weeks' War—a study of the French defeat of 1940—appeared in 1944. His second, "The Battle of Germany," published in 1946, was the official history of the 84th Infantry Division, the unit with which he served in World War II. When the project on communism in American life was formed by the Fund for the Republic, Draper was asked to write the history of the Communist Party of the United States from its beginnings to 1945. His first volume in this series, "The Roots of American Communism," came out in 1957; the second, "American Communism and Soviet Russia," was issued in May of last year. He plans to start working on the third and final volume, dealing with the period 1930–45, next fall.

The article follows:

CASTRO'S CUBA: A REVOLUTION BETRAYED?

(By Theodore Draper)

Who is Fidel Castro? What is he? After 2 years in power, he still evades both his defenders and detractors. In the first months of his regime, Castro used to speak of "humanism," which he defined as "liberty with bread without terror"—hardly a political or social program. But after trying it out a few times, he dropped it in favor of even more ambiguous formulas. When he or his associates were asked what kind of society they were building or what it should be called, they usually answered that they were building "a reality, not a theory," or that they were interested "in deeds, not words," or that their revolution was "indigenously Cuban." Castro still refuses to be pinned down to anything more definite and, until he commits himself, the question officially remains open.

At a youth congress in Havana last August, however, Ernesto Guevara, Minister of Industry and former president of the National Bank of Cuba—whose bank notes are signed with his nickname, "Ché," nothing more—took a long step toward giving the regime an ideology and a name. Since Guevara is the ideological éminence gris of Castro's regime, he has a habit of saying today what Castro will say tomorrow. He said: "What is our ideology? If I were asked whether our revolution is Communist, I would define it as Marxist. Our revolution has discovered by its methods the paths that Marx pointed out." In "Notes for the Study of the Ideology of the Cuban Revolution," published last October in the magazine Verde Olivo, Guevara wrote: "The principal actors of this revolution had no coherent theoretical criteria; but it cannot be said that they were ignorant of the various concepts of history, society, economics and revolution which are being discussed in the world today." Then he declared: "We, practical revolutionaries, initiating our own struggle, simply fulfill laws foreseen by Marx the scientist."

These statements raise more intriguing questions than they pretend to answer. Did Guevara mean to imply that the ideology was Marxist but not Communist? Was it the Marxism of the Communists or some other Marxism? Did Fidel, Guevara and the others really come upon Marxism as if they were bright but naive children rediscovering the roundness of the earth? Could the laws of Marx the scientist, which have not been fulfilled anywhere else, be fulfilled in the little island of Cuba by those who did not know what they were doing until after they had done it?

Guevara's explanation obviously explains too little or too much. But Castro, Guevara, and other Cuban leaders have spoken much more freely and at far greater length to a chosen few who have become their foreign interpreters and apologists. This growing band, however, has not had an easy time of it, and has been forced to do much of the theorizing that the Cubans have refused to do for themselves. In time, every revolution has created its own mythology but, in this case, these foreign sympathizers, in lieu of embracing one readymade, have had to produce their own. Each of these sympathizers has made his own characteristic contribution to this mythology which, if nothing else, tells us what those who feel closest to Castro make of him. The situation is undoubtedly an oddity but, then, the Cuban revolution is an odd one.

1. THE MYTHMAKERS

One of the first and favorite myths has been that of Castro's peasant revolution.

It turned up in the articles written and interviews given by the French writers, Jean-Paul Sartre and Simone de Beauvoir, who spent March 1960 in Cuba. After the usual hectic round of short trips and long talks, Sartre wrote a series of 16 articles in France-soir. In one of them he related how he had informed the Cubans that, like the Chinese, they had made a peasant revolution. The Cuban reaction, he reported, was divided: the bearded ones (those who had fought in the mountains) agreed with him; the unbearded ones (those who had fought in the resistance movements in the cities) maintained that the peasants had fought little or badly and that the revolution had sprung from the cities.

Mme. de Beauvoir gave a somewhat different version in an interview in France Observateur. She said that the petty bourgeoisie had begun by stirring up the urban revolution while the peasants had held back; then, bit by bit, the peasants had joined in, the immediate interests of the victorious revolution had become those of the peasant class, and thus despite its origins, the urban revolution can be considered a peasant revolution.

As a full-fledged theory, however, the Cuban peasant revolution made its appearance in the book, "Cuba, Anatomy of a Revolution," by Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy, editors of the magazine, Monthly Review. After 3 weeks in Cuba, they were persuaded that the revolution had succeeded because the peasants as a class had actively joined the rebels and had become one with the revolutionary army. Fidel Castro appeared to them to be the embodiment of the revolutionary will and energy of the peasantry. As for the kind of system that this peasant revolution had brought forth, Huberman and Sweezy have no hesitation in answering: the new Cuba is a Socialist Cuba.

Six months later, they paid another 3-week visit to Cuba. By this time, the Castro regime had nationalized a large part of the Cuban economy. This development caused them to revise their previous estimate—the Cuban revolution was no longer essentially a peasant revolution because the working class had finally been swept into it. Castro himself had not yet reached the point of calling himself a Marxist, but the two visitors conferred on him the distinction of having arrived, by virtue of his own rich experience and sharp and fertile mind, at an unmistakably Marxist interpretation in a way that would have made Marx himself "proud to acknowledge him as a disciple." Despite Castro's modesty, however, they heard so much about a Socialist Cuba that it had become a commonplace, in contrast to their first trip, during which no one had spoken to them of Cuba as a Socialist country, and socialism was not even included among the revolution's ultimate goals.

And so, in the spring of 1960, a new path to socialism was discovered—a peasant revolution led by the middle-class son of a wealthy landowner. And in the fall of 1960, there was more certainty than ever of the Socialist revolution in Cuba because the working class had at last caught up with it.[1]

Other Castro sympathizers have gone farther. Paul Johnson of the British weekly, "New Statesman," took a quick look at Cuba and reported that Castro had come to power through a peasant revolution but governs through a genuine dictatorship of the proletariat, expressed through the arbitrary rule of one man. In the "New Republic" Prof. Samuel Schapiro, an American academic advocate for Castro, merely limited himself to commenting that "the heart of the revolution, the land reform program, is essentially Marxist." And C. Wright Mills of Columbia University, has made an anthology of all the things that Castro and his closest associates say of themselves, at least as of last August.

Professor Mills' recently published book, "Listen, Yankee," is a peculiarly useful and exasperating work. It purports to be the voice of the Cuban revolutionary, not that of its author. From the conversations I had in Cuba last April, I can testify that the Castro leaders talk much in the way Mills had recorded them. Sometimes the words in the book were so close to those I had heard

Footnotes at end of speech.

that I felt I knew the name of the source. To this extent, Mills had made himself the vehicle of the purest and most direct propaganda, unlike the others who talked to more or less the same people but passed on in their own name what they had been told. No one ever said "Listen, Yankee" or "Yankee this" and "Yankee that" to me, but except for this touch of artistic license, I consider these long monologues more or less authentic. Anyone who wants to get the Castro party line most nakedly can get it here.

Nevertheless, Mills has put his name to the book and in the last few pages gives the Castro case his personal endorsement. He says that he leaves it to the reader to agree or disagree with the points in it, as if there might be one non-Cuban reader in a hundred or a thousand with the necessary background. A reader has a right to expect that the author should do some work of his own beyond listening only to one side, and that a sociologist would at least be able to give a reasonably accurate report of the social structure of the country. The book as a whole is just as honest and dishonest as any unrelieved propaganda is likely to be, and if Mills merely sought to be a front man for the Castro propaganda machine, he has succeeded brilliantly. But is that all that should be expected of C. Wright Mills?

Mills' Cubans—one never knows where they end and he begins—are not altogether in agreement with Sweezy and Huberman. First, Mills tells what the revolution was not—"not a fight between peasants and landowners, or between wageworkers and capitalists—either Cuban or Yankee; nor was it a direct nationalist battle between Cubans and foreigners." It was "not an economically determined revolution—either in its origins or in its sources." Nor was it "a revolution by labor unions or wageworkers in the city, or by labor parties, or by anything like that." What was it then? The leaders were "young intellectuals and students from the University of Havana"—they are also called a few middle-class students and intellectuals—who made "a lot of false moves for a long time before some of their moves began to pay off." The revolution "really began" when, in one of these moves, "a handful of these young intellectuals really got together with the peasants."

Thus Mills' version contains no nonsense about a "peasant revolution"; it merely claims that the decisive forces in the insurrectionary period were the intellectuals and the peasants, with the former in total command. There is also no nonsense about the workers making the revolution; they are said to have joined in after the victory, and their "revolutionary consciousness" has allegedly been aroused only in recent months. At this point, however, mythology takes over and Mills also has the workers superseding the peasants as a revolutionary force. But the greatest nonsense is written about the middle class. The original "handful" of leaders admittedly came exclusively from that class. Nevertheless, the mythology requires that "the middle classes generally supported the revolution, at least in a passive way, during the insurrectionary period, although as a class they had little to do with making it." I take it this means that most members of the middle class supported the revolution passively or not at all.

Mills has also compiled a number of programmatic statements by Castro's group. There is still the old reluctance to be pinned down to anything definite, because a political system would hamper the leaders, because very few people care about it anyway, or because the very lack of a system proves that it is democratic. But this motif slides gently into another one: "We ourselves don't quite know what to call what we are building, and we don't care. It is, of course, socialism of a sort." Or, whatever the system is, the Cubans discovered it all by themselves: "Insofar as we are Marxist or leftist (or Communist, if you will) in our revolutionary development and thought, it is not due to any prior commitment in our ideology. It is because of our own development." Still later in the book, Castro's Cuba becomes "a dictatorship of, by and for the peasants and the workers of Cuba" or "a dictatorship of the people." Mills himself considers Castro's regime to be a revolutionary dictatorship of the peasants and workers of Cuba in which one man possesses virtually absolute power.

All these theories by Sartre and de Beauvoir, Huberman and Sweezy, Johnson and Schapiro, Mills' Cubans and Mills, cannot be true but they have one thing in common—they serve the purpose of concealing the fact that the Cuban revolution was essentially a middle-class revolution which has been used to destroy the middle class. And without understanding this apparent contradiction, very little can be understood of Castro's Cuba as a social system.

2. TERROR AND COUNTERTERROR

To begin with, what truth is there in Castro's "peasant revolution?" The 82 men under Castro who invaded Cuba from Mexico in December 1956 and the 12 who survived to fight in the mountainous Sierra Maestra at the eastern end of the island all came from the middle class. Castro himself was their ideal representative—son of a rich landowner, university graduate, lawyer. The guajiros, or peasants, in the mountains were utterly alien to most of them. But they had to win the confidence of the peasants to obtain food, to protect themselves from dictator Fulgencio Batista's spies and soldiers, to gain new recruits. As the months passed, the relations between them and the peasants took on a new dimension. The crying poverty, illiteracy, disease and primitivism of the outcast peasants appalled the young city-bred ex-students. Out of this experience, partly practical and partly emotional, came a determination to revolutionize Cuban society by raising the lowest and most neglected sector to a civilized level of well-being and human dignity.

But, for over a year, Castro's fighting force was so small that he did not expect to overthrow Batista from the mountains.[2] Victory was foreseen through the vastly larger resistance movement in the cities, overwhelmingly middle class in composition. This calculation was behind the ill-fated general strike of April 9, 1958.[3] It failed because the middle class could not carry off a general strike. Only the workers and trade unions could do so, and they refused mainly for two reasons: they were doing too well under Batista to take the risk, and the official Cuban Communists deliberately sabotaged the strike because they had not been consulted and no attempt was made to reach an agreement with them in advance. Without the key transport workers under Communist leadership, the strike was doomed. The national committee of the Communist Party, known since the last war as the Partido Socialista Popular, issued a statement (on April 12, 1958), a copy of which I have seen, blaming the fiasco on the "unilateral call" for the strike by the leadership of Castro's 26th of July movement in Havana under Faustino Pérez.[4]

In the mountains at this time, Mills was told, the armed men under Castro numbered only about 300. Four months later, in August 1958, the two columns commanded by Majors Guevara and Camilo Cienfuegos, entrusted with the mission of cutting the island in two, the biggest single rebel operation of the entire struggle, amounted, according to Guevara, to 220 men.[5] Sartre was informed that the total number of barbudos in all Cuba from beginning to end was only 3,000. Castro's fighting force was until the end so minute that it hardly deserves to be called an army, let alone a peasant army, and even the influx of the last 4 or 5 months failed to give it anything like a mass character. In any case, the character of an army is established by its leadership and cadres, which remained exclusively middle class throughout, and not by its common soldiers—or every army in the world would similarly be an army of the peasantry and proletariat.

How could such a small band defeat Batista's Army of over 40,000?

The answer is that it did not defeat Batista's Army in any military sense. It succeeded in making Batista destroy himself. Until the spring of 1958 life in most of Cuba went on much as usual. But the fiasco of the April strike forced Castro to change his tactics. Disappointed in his hopes of a mass uprising, he shifted over to full-scale guerrilla warfare—bombings, sabotage, hit-and-run raids. Batista's answer to the terror was counterterror. The Army and secret police struck back blindly, indiscriminately, senselessly. The students, blamed as the main troublemakers, were their chief victims. It became safer for young men to take to the hills than to walk in the streets. The orgy of murders, tortures, and brutalities sent tremors of fear and horror through the entire Cuban people and especially the middle-class parents of the middle-class students.

This universal revulsion in the last 6 months of Batista's rule penetrated and permeated his own army and made it incapable of carrying out the offensive which it launched in May against Castro's hideout. As Mills' book says, Batista's army "just evaporated." The engagements between the two sides were so few and inconclusive that Batista's abdication caught Castro by surprise. The real victor in this struggle was not Castro's peasant army but the entire Cuban people. The heaviest losses were suffered by the largely middle-class urban resistance movement, which secreted the political and psychological acids that ate into Batista's fighting force; Sartre was told that Batista's Army and police killed 1,000 barbudos in the last clashes in the mountains and 19,000 in the urban resistance movement.

Castro's guerrilla tactics, then, aimed not so much at defeating the enemy as at inducing him to lose his head, fight terror with counterterror on the largest possible scale, and make life intolerable for the ordinary citizen. These tactics can be employed by even a few hundred rebels, and they are now being applied against the democratic government of Romulo Betancourt in Venezuela. The same terror that Castro used against Batista is now being used against Castro. And Castro has responded with counterterror, just as Batista did.

3. THE PROMISED LAND

The struggle for power also helps to answer the question: Was the Cuban revolution "betrayed?" The answer obviously depends on what revolution one has in mind—the revolution that Castro promised before taking power, or the one he has made since taking power.

Huberman and Sweezy have written: "Fidel had made his promises and was determined to carry them out, faithfully and to the letter." But neither they, nor Mills, nor Sartre, ever say what these promises were. The oversight has been a necessary part of the mythology.

I have made a brief inventory of the promises, political and economic, made by Castro from his "History Will Absolve Me" speech (at his trial in 1953) to the end of 1958. These promises have already become so embarrassing that some of his literary champions have begun to rewrite history (after

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

less than 2 years) by avoiding all mention of them.[9]

Political

(a) Castro's 1953 speech predicted that the first revolutionary law would be restoration of the 1940 constitution and made an allusion to a "government of popular election."

(b) Castro's manifesto of July 1957, his first political declaration from the Sierra Maestra, contained a formal promise of general elections at the end of 1 year and an "absolute guarantee" of freedom of information, press, and all individual and political rights guaranteed by the 1940 constitution.

(c) Castro's letter of December 14, 1957, to the Cuban exiles upheld the prime duty of the post-Batista provisional government to hold general elections and the right of political parties, even during the provisional government to put forward programs, organize, and participate in the elections.

(d) In an article in Coronet magazine of February 1958, Castro wrote of fighting for a genuine representative government, truly honest, general elections within 12 months, full and untrammelled freedom of public information and all communication media, and reestablishment of all personal and political rights set forth in the 1940 constitution. The greatest irony is that he defended himself against the accusation "of plotting to replace military dictatorship with revolutionary dictatorship."

(e) In his answers to Jules Dubois of May 1958, Castro pledged full enforcement of the 1940 constitution and "a provisional government of entirely civilian character that will return the country to normality and hold general elections within a period of no more than 1 year."

(f) In the unity manifesto of July 1958, Castro agreed "to guide our nation, after the fall of the tyrant, to normality by instituting a brief provisional government that will lead the country to full constitutional and democratic procedures."

Economic

(a) In the 1953 speech, Castro supported grants of land to small planters and peasants, with indemnification to the former owners; the rights of workers to share in profits; a greater share of the cane crop to all planters; and confiscation of all illegally obtained property. His land reform advocated maximum holdings for agricultural enterprises and the distribution of remaining land to farming families; it also provided for encouragement of "agricultural cooperatives for the common use of costly equipment, cold storage plants, and a single professional technical direction in cultivation and breeding." In addition, the speech expressed the intention of nationalizing the electric and telephone companies.

(b) The manifesto of July 1957 defined the agrarian reform as distribution of barren lands, with prior indemnification, and conversion of sharecroppers and squatters into proprietors of the lands worked on.

(c) The Coronet article favored a land reform to give peasants clear title to the land, with "just compensation of expropriated owners." It declared that Castro had no plans for expropriating or nationalizing foreign investments and that he had suspended an earlier program to extend government ownership to public utilities. On nationalization, he wrote:

"I personally have come to feel that nationalization is, at best, a cumbersome instrument. It does not seem to make the state any stronger, yet it enfeebles private enterprise. Even more importantly, any attempt at wholesale nationalization would obviously hamper the principal point of our economic platform—industrialization at the fastest possible rate. For this purpose, foreign investments will always be welcome and secure here."

(d) In May 1958 he assured his biographer, Jules Dubois:

"Never has the 26th of July Movement talked about socializing or nationalizing the industries. This is simply stupid fear of our revolution. We have proclaimed from the first day that we fight for the full enforcement of the constitution of 1940, whose norms establish guarantees, rights, and obligations for all the elements that have a part in production. Comprised therein is free enterprise and invested capital as well as many other economic, civic, and political rights."

(e) The unity manifesto of July 1958, which was written by Castro, merely called for:

"A minimum governmental program that will guarantee the punishment of the guilty ones, the rights of the workers, the fulfillment of international commitments, public order, peace, freedom, as well as the economic, social, and political progress of the Cuban people."

Such were the promises that Fidel had made. The near-unanimity with which Castro's victory was accepted in January 1959 was the result not merely of his heroic struggle and glamorous beard but of the political consensus which he appeared to embody. This consensus had resulted from the democratic disappointments of 1944–52 and the Batista despotism of 1952–58. There was broad agreement that Cuba could never go back to the corrupt brand of democracy of the past, and the Cuban middle class was ready for deepgoing social and political reforms to make impossible another Prio Socarras and another Batista. Castro promised to restore Cuban democracy and make it work, not a direct or people's democracy but the one associated with the 1940 constitution which was so radical that much of it, especially the provision for agrarian reform, was never implemented.

It is, moreover, unthinkable that Castro could have won power if he had given the Cuban people the slightest forewarning of what he has presented them with—a wholly government-controlled press and all other means of communication, ridicule of elections, wholesale confiscation and socialization, cooperatives that are (as Huberman and Sweezy admit) virtually state farms, or a dictatorship of any kind, including that of the proletariat. It was precisely the kind of promises Castro made that enabled him to win the support of the overwhelming majority of the Cuban middle and other classes; a peasant revolution would hardly have been expressed in quite the same way.

The least that can be said, therefore, is that Castro promised one kind of revolution and made another. The revolution Castro promised was unquestionably betrayed.

4. THE SOCIOLOGICAL IMAGINATION

The Castro mythology tends to distort not only the original nature of the Cuban revolution but also the character of Cuban society.

Pages are written by Huberman and Sweezy about the peasantry, a single paragraph about the working class, and almost nothing about the middle class. Mills never seems to have made up his mind which Cubans were speaking through him. Judging by his own list of the Cubans who spoke to him, there was not a worker, and certainly not a peasant, in the lot. Without exception, his informants were middle-class intellectuals and professionals of the type in power. Sometimes he makes them speak in their own name; more often they masquerade as the most impoverished and miserable of Cuban peasants. They say, "We squatted on the edge of the road in our filthy huts," as if they were the "we" and as if this was typical of all Cubans. The average reader might imagine that Cuba was nothing but "a place of misery and filth, illiteracy and exploitation and sloth." This may be a triumph of propaganda but it is a travesty of sociology.

Cuba before Castro was, indeed, a country with serious social problems, but it was far from being a peasant country or even a typically "underdeveloped" one. Its population was more urban than rural: 57 percent in the urban areas and 43 percent in the rural, with the trend strongly in favor of the former (according to the Geografia de Cuba written by Antonio Núñez Jiménez, the present director of the Agrarian Reform Institute). The people dependent on agriculture for a living made up about 40 percent, and of these over one-quarter were classified as farmers and ranchers. In 1954, the national income was divided as follows: The sugar industry, agricultural, and industrial, 25 percent; other agriculture, 13 percent; other industry and commerce, 40 percent; everything else, 21 percent.

The standard of living, low by United States and West European standards, was comparatively high by Latin American; only three countries, Venezuela, Argentina, and Chile, rated above Cuba in per capita income; Cuba's was almost as high as Italy's and much higher than Japan's. Cuba ranked fifth in Latin America in manufacturing, behind Brazil, Argentina, Mexico, and Chile. Cuba had 1 automobile for every 39 inhabitants (in Argentina, 60; Mexico, 91; Brazil, 158), and 1 radio for every 5 inhabitants (second to Argentina, with 1 out of 3). Cuban tourists were able to spend more in the United States than American tourists spent in Cuba. After World War II, Cuban interests were strong enough to buy a substantial share of U.S.-owned sugar production which fell from 70 to 80 percent of the total at its high point in the 1930's to about 35 percent in 1958. Government encouragement of Cubanization would easily have cut the figure in half again in a short time under a post-Batista democratic regime.

I am not trying to suggest that Cuba's economy was a healthy one. It was precariously dependent on the fluctuations of a single crop, sugar, which accounted for more than 80 percent of Cuban exports and employed about a half-million workers for only 3 to 4 months a year. As the rates of illiteracy show—41.7 percent in the rural areas and only 11.6 percent in the urban areas—the social development of Cuba was shockingly unbalanced in favor of the cities and towns, and Castro's crusade for the peasantry has repaid the Cuban upper and middle classes for decades of indifference to the welfare of the land workers.

But this is not the same thing as implying (as Mills often does) that Cuba was nothing but a land of backward, illiterate, diseased, starving peasants. When he writes, "We speak Spanish, we are mainly rural, and we are poor," the first statement is undoubtedly correct, the second is demonstrably false, and the third is partly true. Cuba was one of the most middle-class countries in Latin America.

In effect, this mythology of the Cuban social structure makes Castro's victory inexplicable. If a handful of middle-class students and intellectuals had the active support of only a few hundred or even a few thousand peasants, without either the working or middle classes (as Mills maintains), the Batista regime would never have toppled. It was the desertion of the middle class, on which Batista's power was based, that caused his regime to disintegrate from within and his army to evaporate.

5. ECLIPSE OF A MOVEMENT

Castro's betrayal of the Cuban revolution has also taken another form.

Footnotes at end of speech.

When Batista fell, two movements entered into competition—Castro's 26th of July movement (named after the date of his first unsuccessful attempt in 1953) and the official Communist Party, the Partido Socialista Popular. The odds seemed to favor the former overwhelmingly. In his first victory address at Camp Liberty, Castro spoke of the popular sympathy and almost unanimous support of the Cuban youth which the 26th of July movement enjoyed, and he appeared to argue that there was no need for any other movement.

But a different fate soon awaited the 26th of July movement. The reason, as it was explained to Mme. de Beauvoir, is most revealing:

"The 26th of July movement, from which the revolution issued, had an apparatus, but a petty-bourgeois one, which could not follow the revolution in the radicalization that has been proceeding since the taking of power; it was not capable of going along with the advance of the agrarian reform. So it was permitted to fall away."

Mme. de Beauvoir passes on this information without the slightest indication that there might have been something unwholesome in this procedure. But apart from the justification for Castro's decision to eviscerate his own movement, she confirms the middle class character of that movement and Castro's political reason for condemning it to a nominal existence—the difference between its revolution and his.

Not so long ago also, there was no higher honor in Castro's Cuba than to belong to the rebel army. It was the chief basis of Castro's rule; army men actually ran the country through ostensibly civilian organizations, such as the Agrarian Reform Institute. When Huberman and Sweezy first visited Cuba last March, they reported that "from January 1, 1959, to this day the real power has always been in the revolutionary army, manned and nourished by as radical a social class as any in the world today"—the Cuban peasantry. But on their second visit 6 months later, they noted the relative eclipse of the rebel army and the officially inspired rise of the large, amorphous militia. Indeed, in their December 1960 article, they no longer refer to it as the rebel army; it had become the regular army. Instead of the "truly most remarkable relations of solidarity, trust, and understanding" between Castro and the army at the time of their book, they intimated that it had become a potential counterrevolutionary force, typical of Latin American "standing armies." Once the rebel army's peasant character had been its greatest glory; now it had apparently become a serious drawback. Bohemia Libre, the edition in exile of Cuba's most famous magazine, has gone so far as to say editorially that the rebel army "already does not exist." In any case, it has gone the way of the 26th of July movement.

The fate of David Salvador, the outstanding labor leader of the 26th of July movement, tells the same story. Before Batista fell, Salvador represented the underground group, Labor Unity, and coordinated the resistance within the working class. At a time when the official Cuban Communists opposed Castro as a putschist, Salvador believed in him and in the last period of Batista's rule went to jail for his underground activity. After the victory, he took over the leadership of the Cuban labor movement for the 26th of July movement and served as secretary general of the Cuban trade union federation. At its national congress in November 1959, however, Salvador's fortunes suddenly changed. The 26th of July movement would have scored an overwhelming victory over the Communists, if Fidel Castro himself had not unexpectedly appeared at the congress, berated the delegates for having given proof neither of prudence, nor of unity, nor of anything, and demanded, in effect, the installation of a triumvirate in the federation's leadership, including pro-Communist candidate, Jesús Soto. The real leader soon became Soto, not Salvador, whom the Communist organ, Hoy, began to attack openly for his strange attitude.

With his family, David Salvador was caught in November 1960 trying to escape from Cuba in a small boat, and he has again been cast into prison, this time by Batista's successor, Fidel Castro. The trade unions have lost even the bargaining power they had under Bastista; they have become propaganda appendages of the Ministry of Labor which makes all decisions on wages and conditions, Soviet style.

What does all this mean? In his own 26th of July movement, in the rebel army and in the labor movement, Castro has shunted aside the very ones who helped him in the struggle for power. He has done so, as Mme. de Beauvoir has hinted, because they were led to expect a different revolution from the one he is making. The 26th of July movement was sacrificed first because it was the embryo of a political party. It could grow into a full-fledged party or become an empty shell. The rebel army has never recovered from the shock of Castro's persecution of one of his closest former comrades-in-arms, Maj. Hubert Matos, who was sentenced to 20 years' imprisonment for having protested against the favoritism shown to Communists in the army. As Mills remarks in "Listen, Yankee," "that was the biggest blow."

The mass assemblies and amorphous militias now suit Castro's purposes better because they are so impersonal and anonymous. The individuals in the outdoor spectacles have a direct relationship only to Castro personally, not to each other. The demonstrations are as democratic as Hitler's Nuremberg rallies and Mussolini's balcony speeches once were.

The 26th of July movement and the rebel army were more than Castro's personal emanations; their members were bound by a cause for which they had fought and sacrificed together. That cause went back to a period before Castro's personal rule and to a revolution waged against personal rule. That Castro could not live with the 26th of July movement and the rebel army is more than faintly reminiscent of Stalin's need to abolish the Society of Old Bolsheviks.

6. THE TWO REVOLUTIONS

Lukewarm lemonade helped Jean-Paul Sartre to understand the nature of Castro's democracy.

One day, as he tells the story, Castro invited Mme. de Beauvoir and himself on an inspection tour of the Veradero Beach. Soon the party stopped at a little refreshment stand. Castro offered them some lemonade. He started to drink some himself, put down his glass, and said loudly: "It's lukewarm." Then the following dialogue ensued:

"Don't you have refrigerators?" Castro asked.

"Sure we do," the waitress said. "But they don't work."

"Have you reported it to your superior?"

"Of course, last week. And it isn't a big job," she added familiarly. "An electrician could do it in 2 hours of work."

"And no one has been ordered to make the repairs?"

She shrugged her shoulders. "You know how it is," she added.

And this is Sartre's comment on the scene:

"It was the first time that I understood—still somewhat vaguely—what I called the other day 'direct democracy.' Between the waitress and Castro, an immediate secret understanding (connivence) was established."

Castro was not yet satisfied. Sartre relates how Castro insisted on going over to the delinquent refrigerator and vainly tried to fix it himself. At length, Castro turned to the young waitress and muttered: "Tell your superiors that if they don't get busy on their problems, they will have problems with me."

One reads and wonders. Could it really be that this banal and somewhat embarrassing little scene convinced the famous and worldly French philosopher that Castro's Cuba was—not an ordinary kind of democracy but—a "direct democracy"? Involuntarily, my mind went back to some experiences in the Dominican Republic a few years ago. There, too, the Líder Máximo, who prefers being called El Jefe, liked to visit his domain, see his subjects personally and settle problems on the spot.[7] To my dismay, I discovered that there was much to be said for his regime in purely physical terms, that the peasants worshipped him, that he could have won honest elections quite as overwhelmingly as his fixed elections, and that the only ones who seemed disturbed were a few intellectuals and other dubious middle-class characters. It was easy to imagine the same scene played by El Jefe, the young waitress, lukewarm lemonade, and the refrigerator that wouldn't work, except perhaps that El Jefe, having had much more time, no longer permitted lukewarm lemonade under any circumstances. But the greatest blow of all came one day when I entered into a philosophical discussion with a leading official and asked whether El Jefe's unique system had a name. Gravely and courteously, he answered: "neodemocracy." I must have flushed in anger. If only they would leave democracy alone. If Generalissimo Rafael Leonidas Trujillo was the leader of a democracy, even a neodemocracy, who was not?

At bottom, all these neo and direct democracies rest on a simple proposition: that the leader and his people are one and indivisible. Hence they need no representative institutions, no elections, no loyal or disloyal opposition, no free or partially critical press, none of the rights and safeguards traditionally associated with a democracy.

The horror of this thinking is that it wipes out the lessons to be learned from the most desperate and tragic experiences of our time. If there is anything that should have burned itself into our consciousness, it is the excruciating evil of the popular despot, the beloved dictator, the mass leader. The connivance which Sartre imagined between Castro and the waitress existed between Hitler and a too large portion of the German people and between Trujillo and an even larger portion of the Dominican people. More horrible still is the fact that, with the whole modern machinery of propaganda at their disposal, the leaders can manufacture a reasonable facsimile of popular consent even if they may not have it to start out with. Is it necessary at this late date to recall these terrible lessons to Jean-Paul Sartre? Could he have survived the direct democracy that he recommends to the Cubans?

Castro's democracy poses awkward problems for all his apologists. Their argument runs: (a) Castro could win any election overwhelmingly and, therefore, (b) elections are unnecessary or harmful and, anyway, (c) all previous Cuban elections were crooked. Here, again, it seems necessary to recall the A B C of democracy to people who pride themselves on being the only real democrats. The democratic mandate is not one that once given cannot be revoked; it is of the essence of democratic consent that it must be periodically renewed. Most observers estimated Castro's popular support at 90 percent or more in January 1959, and at 75 percent or more a year later, but it may well be, as some claim, that the figure has been cut to 50 percent or less at the present time. It is no longer certain that he could win any election overwhelmingly or at all.

Footnotes at end of speech.

There have been three stages in Castro's attitude toward elections. First, he promised them. Then he said they were not immediately feasible. Now he ridicules them. In effect, he once said: "Cuba has never had an honest election and a truly free press. I will show Cuba how to have them." Now he says: "Cuba has never had an honest election and a truly free press. Therefore, Cuba has no right to have them under me." Here, in essence, are the two revolutions of Fidel Castro.

The problem of elections is evaded by the counteroffer of something even better. Huberman and Sweezy write: "What we do maintain is that the revolution itself gives the Government a far more democratic mandate than the freest of free elections ever could, and that it is the sacred duty of the Government to carry out the oft-announced platform of the revolution before it comes back to the people asking for either approval or further instructions." What revolution? What platform? The revolution to restore the constitution of 1940 and hold elections in 12 to 18 months? Or the revolution against the constitution and against elections for an indefinite period? How can the Government come back to the people for approval and further instructions when it has never once gone to them for approval or instructions?

The reference to the "oft-announced platform of the revolution" is simply incredible. Huberman and Sweezy might have been less tempted to make it if they had not successfully avoided stating that platform. They themselves tell a story which belies it. According to them, the first draft of the agrarian reform law contained no provision for cooperatives. All the revolutionaries around Castro believed that the peasants were not ready for them. The decision to have them was made by Castro alone against the better judgment of his closest advisers and adherents. By Huberman and Sweezy's own admission, then, Castro did not carry out the oft-announced platform of the revolution as anyone else had understood it in this key area; he carried out a basic revision of that platform to the surprise of everyone but Fidel Castro.[8]

But there is something even more deeply objectionable to this reasoning. It implies that anyone who claims to possess the true idea of the revolution confers on himself a more democratic mandate than any of the people, even in the freest of free elections, can give him. The next step—and revolutionists have taken it—is to say that it is democratic to make the revolution without the people or despite the people—in, of course, the people's interest. Out of such revolutions have invariably come the worst tyrannies.

7. SCAPEGOAT HISTORY

While some writers see everything but communism in Castro, others see nothing but communism. The most extreme version of this second school of thought may be found in the book, "Red Star Over Cuba," by Nathaniel Weyl. Weyl knew the international Communist movement from the inside during the 1930's—he has testified that he once belonged to the same American party unit as Alger Hiss—and he has also written a book on Mexico's agrarian reform under ex-President Lázaro Cárdenas. There is no indication, however, that he has had a personal knowledge of Cuba in the last 2 years or at any other time.

Much of Weyl's book is based on police and intelligence sources, such as the Batista regime's Bureau of the Repression of Communist Activities (BRAC). A lurid series of articles in a sensation-mongering New York tabloid is treated as if it were a serious historical source. The recklessness with which Weyl uses his materials, good, bad, and dubious, is matched by that of his views. These range from the conviction that Fidel Castro has been a trusted Soviet agent since 1948, when he was little more than 21 years old, to the imputation that Cuba was lost to communism by appeasement-oriented officials of the State Department. The implicit thesis of the book was stated by Senators JAMES EASTLAND, Democrat, of Mississippi and THOMAS DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, whom Weyl quotes: "Cuba was handed to Castro and the Communists by a combination of Americans in the same way that China was handed to the Communists." In effect, this is the extreme rightwing case against Castro and those who allegedly put him into power.

Weyl's methods hardly inspire confidence in his results. He makes some members of the State Department the butt of his indignation for having failed to accept the evidence that Castro has been a Communist and Soviet agent for a dozen years. But, for some reason, he fails to mention that Gen. C. P. Cabell, Deputy Director of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency, testified in November 1959, before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee (one of his favorite sources) that "we believe that Castro is not a member of the Communist Party, and does not consider himself to be a Communist." Presumably the CIA had gone to some trouble to find out all about Castro's past political allegiances and was less riddled than the State Department with appeasement-minded subordinates (Weyl's phrase for then Under Secretary Christian Herter, Assistant Secretary for Latin American Affairs, Roy R. Rubottom, and Director of the Caribbean Division William A. Wieland). The CIA may have been wrong, but its evaluation of the evidence certainly has a bearing on Weyl's case against members of the State Department with a similar view.

Weyl, however, cites the testimony before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee of Raphael Díaz Balart (Castro's former brother-in-law), who worked for Batista to the end. He writes that Díaz Balart gave "basically the same account" as that of Dr. Emilio Núñez Portuondo, Batista's former Prime Minister, who declared that "Fidel Castro subordinated himself to Communist Party discipline during his first year at the university (1945–46) and used his party name of Fidelio." Weyl then quotes those portions of Díaz Balart's testimony which indicate that Castro and the Communist students had had a very nice understanding about helping each other. But he does not quote Díaz Balart's direct assertion: "No, he was not in that moment a member. He was just in that moment an opportunist leader who wanted to promote himself." Basically, Díaz Balart gave anything but the same account as Núñez Portuondo.

Weyl also plays fast and loose in his references to Communist money allegedly put at Castro's disposal in the Sierra Maestra. He quotes from the articles by two newspapermen in the New York Daily News: "Once, said a man who was close to Fidel, Carlos Rafael Rodriguez, an active member of the Communist Party in Cuba, arrived with a dozen men loaded with money. It came to $800,000 and Fidel hugged him and shouted, 'Now we're ready to win the war.'" Thus Weyl quotes two newspapermen who quote "a man who was close to Fidel." But some 30 pages later, Weyl writes: "We have seen that Carlos Rafael Rodriguez, who was not only a member of the Political Bureau of the Cuban Communist Party, but its brains, went to the Sierra Maestra to bring Fidel Castro almost a million dollars." There is no doubt about Rafael Rodriguez' journey to the Sierra Maestra in June 1958—he readily admitted it to me when I talked to him last spring—but only a reader with a short memory would have seen that Rafael Rodriguez had brought Fidel Castro almost a million dollars. Perhaps he did, but the evidence is third-hand at best. Nevertheless, Weyl goes on to assert that "Fidel Castro's forces won primarily because they had almost unlimited supplies of money."

How much more complex Cuban politics can be than Weyl appears to make it may be gathered from his reference to Raúl Roa. Weyl writes that one of the Cuban Communist Party's "charter members and early leaders was Raúl Roa, whom Fidel Castro would later appoint Foreign Minister of Cuba." That is all. From this a reader might suppose that Roa was just another Communist functionary in Castro's entourage. But Roa has had a rather more varied political career. He wrote an article in Mexico in 1956 denouncing the crimes, disasters and outrages perpetrated by the Soviet invaders in Hungary. This article, together with other uncomplimentary references to communism, were reprinted in his book, "En Pie," issued by an official publishing house in Cuba in October 1959. The Communist leader, Blas Roca, in the official Communist organ, Hoy, of March 11, 1959, denounced Roa as a plattista—the historical equivalent of an "agent of American imperialism."[9] Yet Roa has become a servile spokesman of the communism and Soviet Union which he had many times condemned. He has never, however, completely won the trust of the Communists, one of whom has been put in as his under secretary.

Weyl also identifies Faustino Pérez as a Communist on the basis of Batista's sources. The official Cuban Communists have always blamed Pérez (the leader of the former Havana underground) for the failure of the April 1958 strike on the ground that he refused to make a deal with them. They took their revenge in November 1959 when he was ousted from Castro's government for protesting against the treatment of Maj. Hubert Matos. Weyl even cites a Cuban underground report that Matos worked for the Communists as early as 1957, without saying a word about the price Matos has paid for his anticommunism. Such blunders are inevitable in a book which accepts Batista's and Trujillo's sources uncritically. Communists, ex-Communists, non-Communists and opportunists are indiscriminately lumped together. Every bit of evidence that does not fit the book's thesis is ruthlessly suppressed or glossed over. All the hard problems of Castro's political developments are oversimplified and vulgarized.

Sometimes a reader of both the Mills and Weyl books might be hopelessly puzzled. Mills' Yankee is taunted with the question, "What did you do—about the weapons, for example, the Yankee government kept sending—and sending—and sending—to Batista?" But in Weyl's book, former Ambassador Earl E. T. Smith says of the U.S. decision to stop sending arms to Batista in March 1958, that "the psychological impact on the morale of the government was crippling." In his recent book, "Respuesta" (Reply), published in Mexico, Fulgencio Batista also complains bitterly against the harmful effect of the U.S. embargo on arms. A reader of Mills' book would never know that the arms had ever been cut off. A reader of Weyl's book would never know that the effect of the arms embargo was partially undone by the failure to withdraw the military mission.

Weyl's chief American scapegoat is Herbert L. Matthews of the New York Times. In February 1957, Matthews published three articles and photographs which proved that Castro was alive, and he vouched for his idealism, courage, and innocence of communism. The chief count against William Wieland seems to be that he advised the newly appointed Ambassador Smith to be briefed by Matthews before assuming his post. Rubottom's main misdeed appears to have been that he told a Senate subcommittee on De-

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

cember 31, 1958, the day before Batista's flight, that "there was no evidence of any organized Communist element within the Castro movement or that Senor Castro himself was under Communist influence." As if this were not trouble enough for Rubottom, he also stands accused of having been the protege of Dr. Milton Eisenhower, whom Weyl brushes off as "a well-intentioned, vaguely leftist, former New Deal bureaucrat."

Ambassador Smith's briefing by Matthews, which promises to become a minor cause celèbre in some circles of American politics, runs true to form in Weyl's book. On checking, I found that Ambassador Smith had testified: "I spent 6 weeks in Washington, approximately 4 days of each week, visiting various agencies and being briefed by the State Department and those whom the State Department designated." He also said that "in the course of 6 weeks I was briefed by numbers of people in the usual course as every Ambassador is briefed." One of these people, suggested by Wieland, was Matthews. Weyl converts this testimony to: "Ambassador Smith made the remarkable disclosure that Wieland sent him to none other than Herbert Matthews to get his briefing on Cuban affairs before departing for his post in Havana." Thus a briefing is transformed into his briefing, as if Matthews were the only one to brief Smith. And it is hard to understand what is remarkable about the recommendation of Matthews in May 1957, among many others, since at the time he was one of the very few Americans who had talked to Fidel Castro.

Some other testimony before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, which Weyl does not quote, might not have been irrelevant. According to Batista's commander in the Sierra Maestra area, Col. Ugalde Carrillo, his forces there numbered 6,000 to 7,000. He estimated Castro's men at 700 to 800. In addition, Batista's army contained more than 33,000 men elsewhere. This force of over 40,000 had for years obtained as much arms as it had wanted from the United States and elsewhere. The American Ambassador from 1953 to the middle of 1957, Arthur Gardner, was so pro-Batista that, as Mrs. Ruby Hart Phillips (the longtime New York Times correspondent in Havana) has written in her recent book, the dictator was embarrassed, because he thought that the Ambassador was overdoing it. Despite Matthews' remarkable briefing, Gardner's successor, Earl Smith, was so anti-Castro that his subordinates pleaded with him in vain to be less partisan. And despite Matthews' pro-Castro articles of February 1957, Castro's entire force 14 months later numbered only 300 (according to Mills) and at most 800 (according to Ugalde).

The forces at Batista's disposal were to the very end so superior in numbers and weapons that only a vast popular revulsion can account for Batista's debacle. Batista's chief of staff, Gen. Francisco Tabernilla, came much closer to the truth when he was asked whether the army could have successfully resisted Castro's march on Havana. "It could," he replied, "but not for a long time, because by that time, the people of Cuba were already against the regime of Batista, and there is no army, once the people get up in arms, that can suppress it."

Herbert Matthews has expressed his latest views in the "Hispanic American Report" (August 29, 1960, Stanford University). He has evidently been saddened by the development of Castro's regime into a dictatorship, without freedom, under the control of one man. He maintains: "Despite strong resemblances, it is not Marxism, communism, or fascism, but it is getting close to a totalitarian structure of some sort." Yet, even as Matthews wrote these words, Guevara was characterizing the Cuban revolution as implicitly Marxist. Matthews also continues to resist the evidence of Castro's deliberate policy of aid and comfort to the official Communists. For example, he declares that "Fidel played into their hands unwittingly from the beginning by allowing his 26th of July movement, which had made and won the revolution, to wither away. This left a vacuum into which the Reds naturally moved." Unwittingly? It was, as has been admitted, a coldblooded decision, no more unwitting than the more recent one to allow the rebel army to wither away. Unlike some pro-Castro apologists, however, Matthews does not pooh-pooh the possibility of Communist domination. On the contrary, he regards it as so far advanced that the point of no return does not seem far away. But in his anxiety to absolve Castro himself of the prime responsibility, he sometimes argues that Castro's pro-Communist policy was logical, sometimes that he blundered into it, and sometimes that he was pushed into it. In effect, Matthews' faith in Castro has dimmed but not died, and he is still capable of writing: "Paradoxical though it may seem, Americans should be praying that nothing happens to Fidel Castro. Any hope of changing the situation for the better lies with him."

8. WHOSE REVOLUTION?

On one thing Mills, Johnson, and Weyl almost agree. For Mills, Castro's regime is "a revolutionary dictatorship of the peasants and workers." For Johnson, it is a "genuine dictatorship of the proletariat." For Weyl, it is "a dictatorship of the proletariat." What can these long-suffering, ill-defined words mean in relation to Cuba today?

When I visited Cuba last spring, the Cabinet—a fair sampling of the top leadership—was made up of eight lawyers, three former students, two professors, one architect, one engineer and the like. Most of them still hold the same offices or have been replaced by people of the same type. Everyone attended a university (some in the United States), came from upper- or middle-class homes, and became or aspired to become a professional or intellectual. Not a single one represents in any conceivable sense the peasantry or proletariat, or owes his position to its organized strength or pressure. What they are they owe solely to Fidel Castro, and they are responsible to him alone. This much is recognized by Mills who flatly states that Castro possesses "virtually absolute power" in Cuba today. But where does that leave the "dictatorship of the peasants and workers?"

Reflecting on the situation as they saw it in the spring of 1960, Huberman and Sweezy gave the peasantry the decisive role in the victorious revolution, made Castro the "embodiment of the revolutionary will and energy of the peasantry," and extolled the Cuban peasantry as "perhaps one of the world's most deeply revolutionary classes" and "as radical a social class as any in the world today." Six months later they returned to Cuba and discovered that the peasantry had been superseded as the "most revolutionary class" by the working class and that the peasant manned and nourished rebel army had suffered a relative eclipse. They were delighted in the spring and they were enchanted in the fall; the peasant revolution was wonderful and the swift dispossession of the peasant revolution was even more so. But why the peasantry should have been superseded if it really was "as radical a social class as any in the world today," they do not try to explain. It is conceivable that the class which had really made the revolution, which the Lider Máximo embodied, and which was perhaps the most deeply revolutionary class in the world today, would permit itself to be pushed into the background without a word of protest or token of resistance? Is this the behavior of a class toward its revolution?

The process thus conjured up is clearly mythological. Those who gave the revolution to the peasantry could also take it away. The peasantry never had in its hands any of the levers of command of the revolution, before or after the victory. The revolution was made and always controlled by declassed sons and daughters of the middle class, first in the name of the entire people, then of the peasants, and now of the workers and peasants. At most the revolution is doing things for and to the peasants and workers. The good and evil in these things may be open to debate, but who decides these things and to what class they belong are not. For Marx, the notion that the peasants would have been the driving force of a socialistic revolution would have been simply unthinkable; the idea that the working class would have to be swept into a socialist revolution after it had been made by another class and as a mechanical result of nationalization from above, equally so.

The alleged role of the working class in this revolution is just as fanciful as that attributed to the peasantry. In December a few hundred authentic proletarians employed by the Cuban Electric Co. staged a protest march from union headquarters to the Presidential Palace. The rank and file was discontented because the new management of the nationalized electric company had cracked down on privileges long tolerated under the dictatorship and thereby had reduced its standard of living. The leadership, headed by an old 26th of July militant, was enraged because the central Trade Union Federation (now completely controlled by the Communists) had moved to oust it. The rebellion was quelled by the flight of the union leaders to foreign embassies and a long, angry speech by Prime Minister Castro. He admitted that a large part not only of the electric workers but of the mass of workers in general was confused. He scorned those who would exchange the right of the working class to govern and direct the country for a plate of lentils. At one point, he declared: "Do you know what is the first goal for which the working class should fight, the only goal for which a working class in a modern country should fight fundamentally? For the conquest of political power."

This speech was noteworthy for the political vocabulary employed for the first time by Castro, but it told much more about him than about the Cuban proletariat. Would it be necessary to exhort the proletariat to take power in a dictatorship of the proletariat? And if it followed his advice, would all the lawyers in Castro's government remain in power? Of all the dictatorships of the proletariat which have been bestowed on us in this century, Castro's is surely the least convincing.

Events have also dealt unkindly with Jean-Paul Sartre's clairvoyance. In the introduction (dated September 12, 1960) to the Brazilian editon of his series of articles on Cuba, he wrote: "No, if Cuba desires to separate from the Western bloc, it is not through the crazy ambition of linking itself to the Eastern bloc." He also communicated his certainty that its objective is not to strengthen one bloc to the detriment of the other. On December 10, Major Guevara was crazy enough to announce publicly in Moscow: "We wholeheartedly support the statement adopted by this conference [of 81 Communist parties]." It would be hard to imagine any way of linking Cuba more closely to the Eastern bloc or of strengthening that bloc to the detriment of the West than the wholehearted support of this statement.

The attitude of Paul Johnson in the New Statesman toward Latin America in general and Cuba in particular smacks of a peculiar

kind of anticolonial colonialism. For him, their basic economic problems cannot be solved through mere electoral victories, since effective legislation requires the assent of the armed forces. Therefore, only Fidelismo or communism—which he regards as natural enemies—remain as practical alternatives. In the case of Cuba, he seems to have cut the ground under his own argument, since the armed forces disappeared and the need for their assent vanished with them. The main theme of Castro's "History Will Absolve Me" speech of 1953 and of all his statements until he assumed power was that Cuba's social and economic problems could be solved within the framework of the constitution of 1940. But there was one thing the constitution excluded—the dictatorship of a Lider Máximo and his junta. The colonialists used to say that some peoples were not fit for anything but some form of imperialism. The anticolonial colonialists say that some peoples are not fit for anything but some form of totalitarianism.

In the end, one wonders how far such words as "socialism," "democracy," "Marxism," and "dictatorship of the proletariat" can be stretched. For some of Castro s admirers, they can be stretched to the point of meaninglessness.

Five years ago, for example, Huberman and Sweezy were shocked by Nikita Khrushchev's expose at the Soviet Communist Party's 20th Congress of his predecessor's vices. After a suitable period of reflection and repentance, they came up with a theory of Stalinism as "good ends with bad means." They explained that Stalinism "became the instrument of the advance to socialism" but, unhappily, "incorporated the methods of oriental despotism—murder, mendacity, duplicity, brutality, and above all arbitrariness." [10] This view of Stalinism has its roots in a certain conception of socialism. In this conception all that essentially matters is that the economy should be nationalized. The nationalizing state may be murderous, mendacious, guilty of duplicity, brutal and arbitrary, but it is still "socialist." And by separating the ends from the means, the political from the economic, what the state controls from who controls the state, socialism can be arrived at through oriental despotisms of pseudopeasant revolutions.

9. THE CUBAN VARIANT

Marxian socialism was predicated not merely on a nationalized economy but on the harmonious development of several factors. The achievement of economic democracy by the socialist revolution presupposed the achievement of political democracy by the bourgeois-democratic revolution. For this reason, the classical Marxists took political democracy for granted, as we no longer can, and they assumed that economic democracy would be built on it. They conceived of socialism as the culmination of capitalist development, without which the prerequisites of socialism—an advanced industrial economy and a preponderant, impoverished, class-conscious proletariat—could not be fulfilled.

History has not worked out that way. Where capitalism has been successful, the prerequsite of a preponderant, impoverished, class-conscious proletariat has not been fulfilled; and where capitalism has not been successful, the prerequsite of an advanced industrial economy has also not been fulfilled. Either the middle class has not been strong enough to achieve a viable capitalist economy or it has been strong enough to bar the way to a socialist economy.

This familiar dilemma of modern socialism has spawned all sorts of bastard and spurious socialisms. Instead of the proletariat, they issue out of the middle class, but of that portion in revolt against the failure of the middle class. These sons and daughters of the bourgeoisie gravitate irresistibly toward the ideology of socialism, but they can make use only of those aspects of socialism which conditions permit them to utilize. They cannot be faithful to the fundamental ideas of the socialist tradition—that the proletariat should liberate itself, that there are prerequisites of socialism, especially an advanced industrial economy, and that socialism must fulfill and complement political democracy.

But there is one aspect of socialism on which they can seize without delay or restraint. They can find in Marxism an ideological sanction for the unrestricted and unlimited use of the state to change the social order, and they can find in Leninism a sanction for their unrestricted and unlimited power over the state. In classical Marxism, the role of the socialist state was conditioned by the stage of development at which it was put into effect and by the class relationships which governed its realization. In this caricature of socialism, however, the only prerequisite that really matters is the seizure of power, no matter by whom, how, when, or where. Thus we live in a time not only of Cuban socialism but of Indonesian socialism and even of African socialism.

This phenomenon indicates that we are badly in need of new words to assume some of the burden that has been thrust on socialism. The order of development cannot be inverted—first the revolution, then the prerequisites of socialism—without resulting in a totally different kind of social order, alien to the letter and, infinitely more, to the spirit of socialism. These inverted revolutions from above belong to what, for want of a better word, we must call the Communist family of revolutions, which, in practice, serve to industrialize the peasantry rather than to liberate the proletariat. But even this family has grown so large and now covers so much ground that its name does not necessarily guarantee full understanding.

For about 30 years, the only communism was Russian communism and, in effect, communism was whatever the Russians said it was. Then, in 1948, came the Titoist variant—a small Communist state in rebellion against Russian domination—and, at the end of 1949, the Chinese variant—a Communist state so vast that it could rival Soviet Russia in power. But both the Yugoslav and Chinese Communist leaderships derived from a common source, the Comintern, which from 1919 to 1943 was tightly controlled by and wholly dependent on the Russian Communists. Thus far the line of decent was clear and direct.

Now a new branch of the family has begun to emerge. It is related to the national-revolutionary movements which the world Communist movement long before Khrushchev had recognized as a distinct force and with which it had sometimes collaborated and sometimes competed. As late as 1954, the Soviet press attacked Ghana's President Kwame Nkrumah and his party as a screen for British imperialism. Under Khrushchev, however, the pendulum has swung over to the outermost limits of collaboration. This policy, apparently one of the points at issue between the Russian and Chinese Communist parties, reflects the undeniable fact of the last few years that no Communist has been a match for Nkrumah in Ghana, Sékou Touré in Guinea, or Fidel Castro in Cuba. The local Communists were, therefore, advised to bide their time and achieve their goal in two stages instead of one. First the national-revolutionary movement could win power, then the Communists could win power in the national-revolutionary movements.

This strategy owes its success to a shrewd assessment of the national-revolutionary movements. They are far more capable than the Communists of achieving national unity against the common enemy. But the common enemy, not a social and political program, gives them their raison d'être. As a result, they are much more inspiring and effective, before taking power than they are afterward. Filling the political and social vacuum the day after the revolution gives the Communists greater opportunities than they had during the revolution. Above all, the nationalist leaders are usually men whose magnetic mass appeal is combined with intellectual fuzziness, adventurist temperaments, and insatiable egos. Their strong point makes them indispensable and their weak points vulnerable to the Communists. They serve the Communists only on condition that the Communists should appear to be serving them. Their political school was nothing like the Comintern, and they represent a variant still farther away from the Russian prototype than Marshal Tito or Mao Tse-tung.

This variant has gone farther in Cuba than anywhere else, though the story is far from finished there, too. For this reason, Fidel Castro has cast such a large shadow from such a small island.

The phenomenon of Fidel Castro has, as yet, received little serious study. His revolution may not be the one that he promised to make, but it is for all that a genuine revolution. It is related to other upheavals in countries with similar national and social resentments and inequalities. It cannot be dismissed as nothing more than a diabolical aberration because it is not what it claims to be. It belongs to a new type of system, neither capitalist nor socialist, that emerges where capitalism has not succeeded and socialism cannot succeed. In most pro- and anti-Castro propaganda, the revolution that brought him into power is so ruthlessly distorted that his entire political development begins and ends in fantasy. The serious student will seek answers to questions that the mythologists of "Left" and "Right" do not even ask. How could a revolution basically middle-class in nature be turned against that class? How could a revolution made without the official Communists and for the most part despite them become so intimately linked with them? How, in short, could Fidel Castro promise one revolution and make another, and what consequences flowed from this revolutionary schizophrenia?

The answers, as I have suggested, take us into territory that has been as yet hardly explored. For the Communists and the Fidelistas to meet, both had to travel some distance from their starting points. The Communists had to make up their minds that they could win power, not against Fidel but only through Fidel. In all probability, this decision was made after an internal struggle in the first half of 1958 between the old guard Stalinist leadership headed by the general secretary, Blas Roca, and a more flexible Khrushchevite group represented by the editor of the party organ, Carlos Rafael Rodriguez. Some competent observers believe that the deal was made in the Sierra Maestra before Castro took power and that all his moves have been determined by this pact. Others think that he went through a period of wavering and vacillation in the first months of his regime. In any case, his major decisions were made so secretively and within such a small group that even former members of his government profess to be uncertain of his commitments and motives.

The inner history of Castro's regime remains to be told. Its main lines, however, have become increasingly clear. Fidel Castro—as much demagog as idealist, as much adventurer as revolutionary, as much anarchist as Communist or anything else—was suddenly and unexpectedly catapulted into

Footnotes at end of speech.

power without a real party, a real army, or a real program. In the struggle for power, he had put forward no original economic or political ideas and had stayed well within the limits of traditional democratic reform and idiom in Cuba. He differed from Batista's other enemies chiefly in the tactics he was willing to employ, in his faith in armed struggle and his willingness to organize it. But once power came into his hands, he refused to permit anything that might lessen or restrict it. He would not tolerate the functioning of a government which was not the facade of his personal rule or of a party which might develop a life of its own. His power and his promises were from the first incompatible, and this contradiction forced him to seek a basis for his regime wholly at variance with that of the anti-Batista revolution. He did not have the disciplined and experienced cadres, the ideology, and the international support to switch revolutions in full view of the audience. Only the Cuban and Russian Communists could make them available to him. Having formerly collaborated with Batista (whose government once contained both Juan Marinello and Carlos Rafael Rodriguez), the Cuban Communists were easily capable of collaborating with Castro. The united front of Communists and Fidelistas is heading, as Guevara recently intimated in Moscow, toward a united party, and if it materializes, Fidel Castro will certainly go down in history not as the Líder Máximo of a new movement but as the Pied Piper of an old one. Still, as long as the Communists need him at least as much as he needs them, further surprises cannot be ruled out; Fidel's ego may give the Communists as much trouble as it has given many others.

When I returned from Cuba last spring, I wrote: "Castro once spoke of his revolution as 'liberty with bread and without terror.' If he continues to push too hard, too fast, and too far, Cuba may yet have more terror without either bread or liberty." [11] Unfortunately, my worst apprehensions have come true, and Fidel Castro has given Cuba not a national revolution but an international civil war.

---

[1] In their book, Huberman and Sweezy devote less than a page to the working class, compared to pages about the peasantry, and they vaguely suggest far more working-class support for the revolution before 1959 than was actually the case. In part of one sentence elsewhere in the book, however, they admit that growing support among urban workers came to Castro after he took power. In the subsequent article in the Monthly Review of December 1960, they imply the peculiar backwardness of the Cuban workers by writing that "the nationalizations of the summer and fall have swept the working class into the revolutionary process."

[2] Castro himself described his isolated and near-desperate situation in his letter of Dec. 31, 1957, to the so-called Council of Liberation: "For those who are fighting against an army incomparable in number and in arms, without any support during a whole year other than the dignity with which we are fighting for a cause which we love sincerely and the conviction that it is worth while to die for it, bitterly forgotten by fellow countrymen who, in spite of having all the ways and means, have systematically (not to say criminally) denied us their help." The entire document is contained in Jules Dubois' "Fidel Castro" (1959), to this date the best documentary source, though its pro-Castro bias has been regretted and repudiated by its author.

[3] Castro's manifesto of Mar. 12, 1958, reads in part: "2. That the strategy of the final stroke should be based on the general revolutionary strike, to be seconded by military action."

[4] Declaraciónes del P.S.P., 12 de abril de 1958.

[5] Verde Olivo, Oct. 8, 1960.

[6] Castro's pre-1959 promises are dealt with by Huberman and Sweezy in a peculiar way. Twelve-and-a-half pages of the 1953 speech are cited, but omitted is the five-point program on which he said the revolution was based. This program began: "The first revolutionary law would have restored sovereignty to the people and proclaimed the constitution of 1940 as the true supreme law of the state, until such time as the people should decide to modify it or to change it." The others provided for grants of land to small planters and peasants, with indemnification to the former owners; the right of workers to share in profits; a greater share of the cane crop to all planters; and confiscation of all illegally obtained property.

While the speech makes other important points, this is the only itemized program in it, and it is hard to see how its omission can be justified. The unity pact of July 1958 is handled in the same way. It contained three points: a common strategy, postwar normality, and a minimum governmental program. I have quoted the second point in full in the text. Huberman and Sweezy cite a paragraph in this unity pact which asked the United States to cease all military and other types of aid to Batista, but ignore the three-point program, which might have put Castro's promises in a somewhat different light.

Mills simply ignores the whole collection of Castro's prepower pledges.

[7] One of Castro's titles is also "El Jefe de la Revolución," as on the front page of the leading semiofficial newspaper, Revolución, December 16, 1960. The same issue contains two "lider máximo."

[8] The present-day Cuban cooperatives are usually traced back to Castro's "History Will Absolve Me" speech in 1953. A careful reading of the key passage in that speech hardly bears this out:

"A revolutionary government, after transferring the ownership of parcels of land to the 100,000 small farmers who today pay rent, would proceed to a definite solution of the land problem by, first, establishing as the constitution orders, a maximum acreage for each type of agricultural enterprise and acquiring the excess acreage by means of expropriation, recovering lands usurped from the state, filling in swamp and marsh lands, planting vast tracts and reserving zones for reforestation; second, distributing the remaining land among farming families with preference given to the largest ones, encouraging agricultural cooperatives for the common use of costly equipment, cold storage, and a uniform professional direction in cultivation and breeding, and, finally, to facilitate assistance, equipment, protection, and useful knowledge to the farming population" ("Pensamiento Político, Económico y Social de Fidel Castro," Editorial Lex, Havana, 1959, pp. 44–45).

I have purposely translated this passage in its literal form in order to give the reader a sense of where cooperatives belonged in the total scheme of Castro's 1953 agricultural policy. They obviously occupied a minor place in the general scheme; they were intended, in the traditional meaning of cooperatives, to service independent landowners. These 1953 cooperatives were clearly not the state farms of 1959. In addition, Castro seems to have dropped or rarely mentioned cooperatives after 1953.

The version of this passage in the Huberman-Sweezy book (p. 41) is taken from the official English translation of this speech, published by the Liberal Press, New York. For some reason, the phrase "for the common use of costly equipment, cold storage" was omitted from this translation, as a result of which the whole section on cooperatives is somewhat distorted. In 1953, Castro's "agrarian reform" meant what it has usually meant: land for landless peasants. But, then, Huberman and Sweezy discovered, via a translation, that Cuban peasants do not want their own land; they did not even understand the question of owning their own land "until it had been repeatedly rephrased and explained" (p. 116, note). Huberman and Sweezy add that this incident set them off on their entire interpretation of the Cuban revolution. If so, the Cuban peasants are truly unique, and no one apparently ever understood them before—certainly not Fidel Castro who put so much emphasis on giving them their own land in 1953 and after.

[9] Senator Orville H. Platt gave his name to the famous amendment which empowered the United States to intervene in Cuba; it was revoked in 1934. The Platt amendment was written into the Cuban Constitution as an appendix in 1901 and embodied in the United States-Cuban Treaty of 1903. Weyl manages in a single sentence (p. 55, note) to get Senator Platt's first name and the date of his amendment wrong—a curious feat for a student of Cuba.

[10] Monthly Review, July-August 1956, pp. 71–72.

[11] Theodore Draper, "The Runaway Revolution," "The Reporter," May 12, 1960.

Hon. A. R. Stout

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we have just finished in this body debate on the judgeship bill. I wish to insert in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the Wexahachie Daily Light which I feel sets forth my concept of a Federal judge. Like the editorial states, I personally feel that the Honorable A. R. Stout, present district judge for the 40th district of Texas. Judge Stout has been a friend of mine of long standing, and the following editorial is, indeed, a tribute to his abilities.

JUDGE STOUT MERITS APPOINTMENT

A Federal judgeship has become a position of increased importance, because of the ever increasing number of cases which come under the jurisdiction of the Federal courts. Soon two, and perhaps three, new Federal judges will be appointed to serve the northern district of Texas.

Citizens and lawyers alike are vitally interested that the imminent appointments to Federal judgeships be made with due regard to demonstrated competence on the bench, and our national leaders are to be commended for their public statements that competence, rather than politics, will control the appointments.

Competence on the bench requires a careful blending of scholarship in the law, experience as a trial judge, and a wide knowledge of human experience and human frailties which lead to lawsuits. These qualifications can only be attained by years of intelligent devotion to duty. Success in attaining the goal can only be judged by a man's accomplishments in the related fields of legal scholarship and trial experience.

In weighing competence, Ellis County can be proud that it offers a potential Federal district judge in the person of A. R. Stout

who satisfies the rigid requirements. His legal research, published works, and addresses at legal institutes have demonstrated his scholarly approach to the law, with due and proper regard for legal precedent. His 23 years as a trial judge have demonstrated his practical applications of law in an ever-changing era. But, most vital of all, his unquestioned integrity as a judge would maintain the high level of confidence which this country has always had in the fairness of its Federal courts.

Ellis County is right in urging that the said A. R. Stout be given foremost consideration for appointment as a Federal judge.

Holders of Prime Government Contracts Urged To Spread Work Out Among Small Firms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following address delivered by Hon. Irving Maness, Deputy Director of the Small Business Administration before the Small Business Symposium at Chicago on April 5.

Mr. Maness' remarks are cogent and contain advice that holders of prime contracts should heed:

ADDRESS BY IRVING MANESS, DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION FOR PROCUREMENT AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, BEFORE THE SMALL BUSINESS SYMPOSIUM, CHICAGO, ILL., APRIL 5, 1961

I am happy to be here in Chicago to take part in this important symposium. It is good for small and large business to get together for such a constructive purpose.

The SBA is very glad to participate in this meeting, bringing together as it does, small business concerns, high officials of the Air Force and Navy, political leaders and officials of the Flight Propulsion Division of the General Electric Co.

As you gentlemen know, the SBA is continuously interested in insuring that small business concerns obtain a fair share of the total Government purchases. The Small Business Act also enunciates this principle as the declared policy of the Congress. When one considers that the total Government procurement expenditures amount to $29 billion a year—that the U.S. Government is by far the largest single consumer of goods and services in our economy—then it readily becomes apparent that it is important for small firms to have an opportunity to share equitably in this continuing investment in our national security.

If I may be permitted to paraphrase Lincoln, "God must love small business, otherwise he would not have made so many of them." The fact of the matter is that about 96 percent of the business enterprises in our Nation are small and the maintenance of a healthy and vigorous small business community is essential to continued economic growth. While I do not believe that a business concern, small or large, should be dependent solely on Government contract work, I do subscribe to the premise that the continued welfare of our economy depends in keeping open the avenues of opportunity and competition for small business.

I shall tell you why I believe this. Small business has played a vital role as innovators in the development of new ideas, new products, and new processes. These are the elements that continuously stimulate economic development.

We in the SBA know, and the facts bear us out, that increased small business participation in Government procurement means more competition and more competition means better prices and improved quality.

Large business firms are very important to our economy and to the defense production program. No one, I think, would deny this. Defense procurement has shifted toward highly complex weapons and materiel which sometimes cannot be produced in their entirety by small business concerns. The trend is also toward the weapons system type of procurement, under which the prime contractor furnishes all the components for end items. These factors create a situation where the largest percentage of the dollar value of Government contracts go to large business concerns, and that is why the Congress has been concerned that the small firms be given a fair opportunity to share in the purchases and sales of the Federal Government. Many small business concerns do not have the opportunity to take on Government prime contract work. For them, the only possibility to participate in Government procurement is through the subcontract route.

The SBA believes in the type of cooperation that brings together the large prime contractor and the prospective small business subcontractor. In its subcontracting assistance program the Small Business Administration guides small business concerns in obtaining subcontract opportunities. Through its facilities the SBA is able to provide assistance to all parties at all levels. We are in a position to locate qualified small business concerns that can bid on specific items or services.

As part of this program, the Agency is contacting those prime contractors who have the largest Government contracts to arrange a cooperative program of subcontracting to small business concerns. Although some of the principal prime contractors contacted have not agreed to participate in such a program, 47 arrangements with primes have been concluded. These agreements are not limited to defense contracts, but include commercial production as well. All of these agreements are on a voluntary basis and additional informal arrangements are in effect with other prime contractors. We urgently hope that the SBA subcontracting program will be utilized more extensively because it can be of material assistance to large and small business and the Government procurement program.

The SBA is equally concerned in obtaining prime contract opportunities for small business concerns. SBA representatives continuously screen proposed purchases at the principal Government purchasing offices to set aside suitable procurements exclusively for small business bidding. The decision to set aside for small business all or part of a purchase, or class of purchases, is made jointly by the SBA and the purchasing agency.

Small firms that want to sell to the Government should obtain listing on all appropriate bidders lists in order to gain the opportunity to bid on purchases set aside for small business.

An important service of the SBA is that of referring prime contract opportunities to small firms. Under this program the SBA arranges with Government purchasing offices for its field offices to receive bid sets of many procurements which are susceptible to participation by small business concerns.

The SBA then notifies small business concerns which have come to it for assistance in selling to the Government, of the bidding opportunities suitable to their facilities. This service is provided until the firms have time to obtain placement on bidders lists of the procurement offices suggested by the SBA. Notices of future purchases are then received direct from the purchasing installations involved. This procedure enables the SBA to bring bidding opportunities to the attention of many small business concerns of which they otherwise would be unaware.

I have explained in some detail the programs developed by SBA to carry out its important assignment to help small firms gain a fair share of Government purchases and sales.

How effective have these programs been? From 1953 through December 1960, under this program small firms were awarded 105,559 Government contracts for slightly more than $4 billion.

But what is disturbing to the SBA, and to many Members of Congress as well, is that in the fiscal year 1960, for the first time, there was a decrease in the number and value of joint set-asides.

Even more significantly, the small business share of total military purchases of goods and services has been declining from 25.3 percent in 1954 to the low of 16.1 percent in fiscal year 1960. The loss amounts to a proportionate reduction of one-third in the small business share of defense work in the short space of 6 years.

So, it is apparent from these figures that although much has been accomplished, much remains to be done. I can assure you small business proprietors that we in the SBA are determined to make our procurement assistance program as effective as we possibly can.

In this we have the active support of President Kennedy who just recently issued instructions that small busineses, particularly in depressed areas, be given an opportunity to obtain a greater share of defense work.

President Kennedy has announced that his administration is going to try to increase by at least 10 percent the $3,440 million in military contracts allotted to small companies in the 1960 fiscal year.

Immediately upon taking office, our new SBA Administrator, John E. Horne, directed all SBA offices to concentrate their efforts on reducing the heavy backlog of business loan applications and to step up activities in Government procurement set-asides, giving priority to small firms seeking assistance in surplus labor areas.

In line with a Presidential directive, special action was ordered in surplus labor areas. The regional offices of SBA have been advised of the urgency of the situation and directed to give high priority to SBA activities in these areas.

The accelerated SBA program in labor surplus areas calls for the closest cooperation with procurement officers of other agencies to increase the number of procurement contracts for small business, to expand small business procurement set-asides and to secure additional prime subcontracting for small firms.

I can assure you that this much-needed cooperation is being obtained, and that the SBA is determined, in cooperation with other Government agencies, to increase the flow of Government contracts to qualified small firms.

Let me say, in closing, that symposiums such as this are of the highest value, and offer the strongest evidence that Government and business are natural allies. Our interests are closely intertwined.

This symposium, sponsored by General Electric's flight propulsion division, is a great forward step. I hope that in the months to come many other large firms follow this example. This teamwork between General Electric, the SBA, the various branches of the Armed Services and small business community in this great industrial area will, I am sure, pay great dividends.

For my part, I pledge that the SBA will work ceaselessly with and give full cooperation to all businesses, large and small, to the end that enterprising small producers will always have a chance to devote their ingenuity and their energies to helping build a stronger America.

Communists and Clergy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting editorial which appeared in the Pilot, Boston, Mass., on April 22, 1961, with reference to the book "Communism and the Churches," by Ralph Lord Roy:

COMMUNISTS AND CLERGY

Last year a very exceptional book was published which can still be read with great profit by thoughtful Americans. It was entitled "Communism and the Churches" and its author was Ralph Lord Roy. The aim of the study—almost 500 pages long—was to measure the involvement of the American churches in the Communist movement in this country and to weigh Communist influence in the religious area generally.

The topic is one that has at once a strange kind of fascination, since the two forces involved seem to be natural enemies. Communism is atheistic, materialistic, and antireligious; the churches by presupposition are concerned primarily with the spiritual life of man and his salvation. Between these two there is plainly an irreconcilable difference which makes anything like cooperation or long coexistence impossible. However, the fact is that a number of churchmen in America themselves joined the Communist Party, a larger number were plainly fellow travelers, and many more allowed themselves to be used unwittingly by the party for its own purposes. How explain all of this?

Mr. Roy in a very painstaking and patient way tells the story of these involvements, attempting to put each one into an appropriate context and striving to stay within the facts as they are known. It is possible to understand the "social gospel" and "social action" reasons why many fervent young ministers, for example, espoused leftwing causes which paraded under appeals to peace, democracy, social justice, civil rights, and human liberty. The Communists made adroit use of these appeals and, especially during the thirties, surrounded themselves with respectability in a manner that made deception easy.

It is possible to sift the evidence with objectivity and to discover certain patterns which expose the motives of those involved and the depth of their commitment. Mr. Roy suggests in summary, for example, that the number of Protestant ministers who actually joined the Communist Party may have been as small as 50 and certainly never more than 200. When one considers that there are half a million clergymen in the United States, this is a tiny percentage. But even for this group there must be an explanation and a careful study like this one helps us to understand the strange phenomenon of the churchman-Communist. More difficult to analyze was the very successful use of the front, where prominent names were carelessly given in support of the most dubious causes. Here some people were what are now called dupes, unwittingly taken in, others apparently knew the nature of the activity but still wished to be associated with it. Each person must be considered separately and his other actions weighed to get the full picture. Mr. Roy's book does this quietly, firmly, and without excitement.

We mention this study at this time because once again there are wild and inexact statements making the rounds on this subject. Although it is never possible to give precise figures on matters of this kind, it is possible to choose reasonable estimates based on the evidence. Everyone who likes to see a careful use of fact and evidence in a difficult and emotional context should read Mr. Roy's book and draw his own conclusions on its intelligence and fairmindedness. It will be hard to avoid the conclusion that his deductions are the final and valid ones in this case.

We may add a postscript which will be of special interest to Catholics. Although some Catholics in the labor movement were wooed, and even won, by the Communists the number was always minuscule. The clergy were apparently never involved in any way and the Catholic opposition to communism was always well known. This is not something about which we should feel superior but rather grateful to the church leadership which had so early diagnosed and condemned the ideology and tactics of the Communists.

Imports on Textiles and Apparels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have stood on this floor and expressed my opinion and the majority opinion of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to seek some relief for the domestic coal and glass producers of Pennsylvania and the rest of the country.

I would now like to speak in behalf of the apparel manufacturers of my district and of the State as a whole. As some of the basic industries of my district have been forced to go out of business due to unfair competition, other industries have come in to help take up the slack. One of these industries is the apparel manufacturing group. My district enjoys a happy relationship with the Phillips-Van Heusen Shirt Corp. and we hope and are working for a larger employment by this company and for similar companies.

I am no isolationist. I recognize that foreign trade is a positive instrument in the assistance in raising living standards of workers throughout the world. But this does not blind me to the scramble for American markets from countries where wages, including all possible fringe benefits, are only a fraction of American wage rates. We have recently voted an increase in the minimum wage from $1 to $1.15. The Senate has voted a similar proposal with escalators to $1.25 an hour.

One does not have to be a trained economist to understand that the American manufacturer who must pay a minimum of $1.15 an hour cannot compete with industries in the Orient that pay from 10 to 29 cents per hour.

Let me take a simple mathematical formula carefully prepared by one of the largest apparel manufacturers in the country who buys exclusively from American mills. His actual cost breakdown per dollar of sales is as follows:

Materials	$0.60
Labor and overhead	.35
Taxes	.03
Profit	0.02
Total	1.00

Foreign apparel manufacturers who operate in low-wage countries pay only a fraction of what the American manufacturer has to pay and that breakdown runs:

Materials	$0.51
Labor and overhead	.03
Taxes	.02
Profit	.02
Total	.58

How does this come about? The great discrepancy between the American and oriental costs of labor and overhead are obvious, but this is compounded by the fact that the foreign manufacturer can buy American cotton at a subsidy of from 6 to 8½ cents a pound, depending on quality. This is roughly a subsidy of 25 percent of the total cost of raw material for the foreign manufacturer.

What kind of a policy is this that subsidizes foreign manufacturers at the cost to American taxpayers and in the last analysis, exports jobs that rightfully belong to American workers?

This is no narrow concept. As a member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I have a deep and abiding interest in the National Defense Establishment. It is a matter of record that next to steel, apparel and textiles rank next in importance to national defense. This Nation cannot allow itself to slip into a position where it is dependent on foreign sources of supply for clothing and equipment for our Military Establishment. We know the disasters that befell Germany and Japan because they could not supply their armies with sufficient clothing.

I listened the other day to my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON], point out that 40 percent of the budget for Camp Lejeune, the base of the 2d Marine Division for the Atlantic Fleet, is for equipment and supplies classified in the category of textiles. Mr. HENDERSON said that this was not just a matter of clothing of all types, but the essentiality of web equipment for such things as cartridge belts, rifle slings, and the hundreds of other military items of which textiles are an essential component.

We must not simply cling to old ideas because at one time or another we thought they were right. They were right at the time we expressed them, but in this rapidly changing world we must be alert to change our ideas with the changing world. I make no plea, nor do the apparel and textile industries of my State make any plea, to ban or prohibit imports. We know this is

impossible in the world in which we live, but we are also fully aware that laissez faire in foreign trade is no more reliable than laissez faire economics in the domestic scene. Adjustments must be made.

Some of us would go further in adjustments in many respects than others, but we should not blink the fact that unless imports of apparel and textiles are controlled on a quota basis, country by country and category by category, we are only increasing the hard core unemployment problem that our country faces.

This is especially true for my State.

We have a hard-core unemployment problem in the bituminous and anthracite coalfields and in glass-producing districts. The specialist on unemployment from the Labor Department said the other day the danger is that hard-core unemployment will increase. He made it clear that the increase in hard-core unemployment came from the unskilled and semiskilled. The vast number of people in the apparel industry would qualify as semiskilled. If they are dumped on the heap of the unemployed because we fail to regulate imports which gobble their jobs, then we have failed in our duty.

Many areas of the country, and this is true in my State, are hard pressed to find tax money to keep our communities running at a high level.

Gentlemen, if we force industries to close and lose the corporate income, and at the same time create unemployment, which loses individual income, where are we heading? It is my opinion that you know.

Let us not be derelict in our duty.

Operation California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that many of our colleagues are very familiar with the excellent work being done by junior achievement programs throughout the country. By providing the necessary guidance and facilities, junior achievement makes possible a unique opportunity for young people to obtain a direct and personal understanding of the problems, procedures and rewards of business under the American free-enterprise system.

By operating their own junior achievement companies, under the auspices of a parent company, young people are introduced to the complexities of modern and highly competitive business. Accepting full responsibility for all aspects of business management, sales, distribution, production, cost control, and so forth, they learn by doing—not only the specific operations of business but the real value of developing the virtues of initiative, teamwork, reliability, hard work, and imagination.

Although my knowledge of individual junior achievement programs is limited, I can imagine no program anywhere in the country which surpasses that offered by Junior Achievement of Union County, Inc., in scope, numbers of young people participating, in the ambition and originality of its programs, and in the success of its operations. Credit for their outstanding record must go to the dozens of outstanding industrialists and businessmen who give so much of their time and experience to junior achievement and to J. Kenneth Roden, executive vice president of the Union County organization.

During the past junior achievement year, a special youth incentive program, called Operation California, was developed and executed. The winning participants are now enjoying the fruits of their achievements during a weeklong trip to California.

In order to acquaint our colleagues with the major features of this unusual and highly successful program, I include as a part of my remarks, first, the winning essay, entitled "Why I Believe in Our Free Enterprise System," submitted by William Christer of 702 Bayway Avenue, Elizabeth, as a part of Operation California, and an outline of the operations and objectives of Operation California prepared by Mr. Roden.

The essay and the outline follow:

JUNIOR ACHIEVEMENT
OF UNION COUNTY, INC.,
Elizabeth, N.J., September 12, 1960.

To: Junior Achievement Advisers.
From: J. Kenneth Roden, executive vice president.
Subject: Operation California.

Operation California is a three-pronged public relations, youth incentive, and youth educational project, planned, and developed by Junior Achievement of Union County, Inc. Pending final approval by the junior achievement board of directors, Operation California is tentatively scheduled for April 24 through April 29, 1961.

OBJECTIVES OF OPERATION CALIFORNIA

(1) To provide junior achievers and advisers with a positive, effective incentive program designed to stimulate a clear, complete understanding of the benefits and rewards of the American free enterprise system. The program will demonstrate that every individual, whether employee, manager, or community leader, must always be aware that the American way of life, the free enterprise system, depends upon personal initiative, creative thinking, responsible leadership, teamwork, and that each individual must carry his share of the load and discharge his responsibilities to the best of his ability. The program will further demonstrate that each individual's contribution, if properly utilized, will result in a profit to the individual, to the employer, to the community, and to the Nation; and that corporate profits will assure us of continued growth, prosperity and stability, all of which are more valuable and desirable than security through handout or a welfare state.

(2) To reverse the emphasis teenagers are placing on benefits and security in employment. Such attitudes contribute to a preference for a welfare state economy and fail to develop the full potential of the individual as an employee, manager, and community leader.

(3) To maintain the high standards of performance, productivity and prestige of the Junior Achievement program. Special emphasis will be placed on stimulating and developing personal initiative, creative thinking, responsible leadership, high attendance, punctuality on the individual and total company level, improved production techniques to result in reduction of operating costs, and aggressive and continuing safety programs.

(4) To expand the "learn by doing" principle of Junior Achievement. The experience of jet air transportation will demonstrate to the junior achievers how, under the free enterprise system, research and development in the transportation industry have aided overall industrial development by bringing all segments of the Nation closer together. We believe that this type of incentive program will develop in the achievers full understanding of the teamwork and responsible, cooperative leadership necessary to the continued growth and strength of the Nation and the individual.

(5) To demonstrate to junior achievers, parents, educators, and the community at large the degree of interest which local businessmen have in our young people. The program will demonstrate to the community that local business and industrial organizations are good neighbors, willing to help prepare young people for the day when they must accept responsibilities of business, professional and international leadership.

SUMMARY OF OPERATION CALIFORNIA

Operation California will be a 6-day project. A group of Achievers, accompanied by adult advisers, will be flown to California via American Airlines jet aircraft. The program during their stay in California contemplates visits to historical and educational cities, and visits to west-coast industries, including the motion picture studios. A meeting at Disneyland with Mr. Walt Disney is planned. Mr. Disney's accomplishments and contributions to education and this important industry are an excellent example of individual success under the free-enterprise system. Meetings with other prominent leaders in the motion picture industry are also being arranged. (These plans are presently in the discussion stage. The program and itinerary will be distributed by January 16, 1961.)

PLANNING BY ADVISERS

Operation California is an incentive program to encourage each Junior Achievement company, as well as each individual Junior Achiever, to maintain high standards in all phases of operations. Only Junior Achievement companies which meet or exceed the performance standards outlined below will qualify to nominate company members for participation in Operation California.

Advisers should prepare now to maintain standards in company operations which will assure that their companies will qualify, and also prepare to select outstanding Achievers for nomination to participate in Operation California.

PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

(1) Attendance: Each Junior Achievement company must maintain a monthly attendance rating of not less than 85 percent. In order to be counted present, each Achiever must have punched his timecard and reported to his company work area no later than 7 p.m. Attendance record sheets signed by the company secretary and an adviser must be turned in to the program director at the end of each company meeting. In the case of Merck, White Laboratories, Bristol-Myers, Lockheed, and Mineral Products which do not meet at the Elizabeth Business Center, attendance forms must be mailed to Junior Achievement headquarters in Elizabeth the day following the company meeting. Reports received by mail will be checked as to the time and date stamped on the envelope by the post office.

Achievers who fail to attend the first company meeting will be contacted by telephone. If the notice of the first meeting was received, and unless the achiever was ill, the absent achiever will be dropped from the company and a replacement assigned by Junior Achievement.

In the event of dropouts, and if the junior company wishes to maintain its total membership at its beginning number, replacements will be made by Junior Achievement up until December 1, 1960.

(2) Company meeting schedules: Each company must meet one night a week from 7 to 9 p.m. The first company meeting should be scheduled as soon as possible after Junior Achievement issues the membership list.

There will be no company meeting on November 24, Thanksgiving Day. Companies which wish to make up lost production and sales time may request an extra work night by contacting the program director.

There will be no official company meetings from December 23 through January 1. Regular company meetings will be held starting January 2, 1961. During this Christmas vacation period it is strongly recommended that advisers stress the need for achievers to continue to sell their products and to maintain high individual and company sales. This is also a period during which advisers can plan plant tours and other special events.

Official company meetings cannot be canceled because of special school events such as shows, athletic tournaments, etc., or for any operating reasons such as lack of raw materials, low production schedules, or other operating difficulties which reflect poor planning or lack of achiever interest.

In the event of extremely bad weather, cancellation of a company meeting must be cleared with Junior Achievement headquarters in Elizabeth.

(3) Production: The junior company must be in production not later than the fourth company meeting.

(4) Operating plan and budget: The company must submit to Junior Achievement headquarters not later than the eighth company meeting, a copy of its operating budget and profit plan which must provide for fixed company payments as outlined in the bulletin dated September 12, 1960, entitled "Operating Procedures—Fiscal Practices."

(5) Special credits for outstanding performance: Special consideration will be given to nominees of Junior Achievement companies which have shown evidence of outstanding performance in any of the following areas:

(a) Exceptional improvement in any phase of company performance, through increased efficiency, cost reduction programs, sales incentive plans, safety programs, 100 percent attendance, punctuality, good housekeeping, etc.

(b) Originality in any phase of company operations.

(c) Outstanding teamwork among company members.

(d) Unusually good management by company officers.

(6) Penalties: Although it is not anticipated that there will be any reason for imposing a penalty upon any junior achievement company for any reason, it must be emphasized that a severe penalty will be imposed upon a company in the event of an accident caused by carelessness or horseplay.

NOMINATION OF ACHIEVERS

Each Junior Achievement company which qualifies will have the privilege of nominating two members, one boy and one girl, for participation in Operation California. Consideration should be given only to outstanding achievers.

Advisers should take into consideration qualities of leadership, personal initiative, appearance, poise, ability to get along well with young people and with adults, Junior Achievement attendance, punctuality, attitude toward safety regulations, knowledge of Junior Achievement company operations, and general knowledge of the sponsoring company's operations.

Advisers must bear in mind that junior achievers who are selected to participate in Operation California will be good-will ambassadors of our industrial and educational community, and will be guests of California businessmen and governmental leaders.

SELECTION OF ACHIEVERS

Nominations will be made on a nomination form provided by Junior Achievement. Four signed copies must be returned to Junior Achievement headquarters prior to a deadline date which will be specified by Junior Achievement staff.

All nominees will be interviewed by a committee of Junior Achievement officials and a member of the Junior Achievers Association. They will be notified by Junior Achievement of the time and place of the interview.

Selection of achievers who will participate will be announced several weeks in advance of the trip dates. At that time arrangements will be made to obtain written permission of parents or guardians for those achievers who will make the trip to California.

TRANSPORTATION

Transportation to California will be arranged by Junior Achievement. Advisers will be requested to assist in making satisfactory arrangements for transportation of achievers to and from the Junior Achievement business center. The Elizabeth Daily Journal will furnish transportation to and from Idlewild Airport.

PREPARATION OF ACHIEVERS

If an achiever from your company is selected to participate in Operation California, you should take full responsibility for his or her preparation to participate actively in all phases of the program.

Remember: The impression our junior achievers make upon the press, the California officials, representatives of the motion picture industry, and other businessmen, will reflect upon Junior Achievement of Union County, upon our advisers, and upon our sponsoring industries.

The following points are essential. You will think of others.

(1) Be sure your achiever is thoroughly prepared to discuss the operation of his junior achievement company and, in a general way, his sponsoring company.

(2) Explain carefully to the achiever that he will be the guest of Californians, and will have a unique opportunity to leave with those he meets a fine impression of American youth.

(3) Review the questions which have been prepared for the guidance of the achievers.

(4) Impress upon the achiever that it is common courtesy to show a sincere interest in his host's community and activities. The achiever should ask questions.

(5) Explain the importance of good grooming. Advise the achiever to follow instructions which will be given to him in writing with regard to dress.

(6) Explain the importance of courtesy and punctuality. Ask the achiever to keep in mind that press, magazine, newsreel and television photographers and cameramen will be invited to take photographs throughout the trip. The achievers must remember that these men and women have a job to do and should help them by being cooperative, punctual and courteous.

INCENTIVE PROGRAM COMMITTEE

The committee in charge of the planning and execution of Operation California includes: William M. Bristol III, president, Bristol-Myers Products Division; John J. Conlon, vice-president, Phelps Dodge Copper Products Corp.; Harry Frank, publisher, Elizabeth Daily Journal; James L. Macwithey, president, American Publics Relations Association, New Jersey Chapter; G. Ross Murrell, manager, Esso Standard Division, Humble Oil & Refining Co.; J. Kenneth Roden, executive vice president, Junior Achievement of Union County, Inc.

As part of our youth incentive program, Operation California, each junior achiever was invited to submit an essay titled "Why I Believe in Our Free Enterprise System." The following is the essay which was awarded first place by the committee of judges. The winner was William Christer of 702 Bayway Avenue, Elizabeth, N.J. He is a junior at St. Mary's High School in Elizabeth and a member of Jay-Vern Co., the Junior Achievement company sponsored by S.E. & M. Vernon, Inc.

WHY I BELIEVE IN OUR FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

(By William Christer)

There is one outstanding reason why I firmly believe in our free enterprise system, it works. All we have to do is to look around, and we can see the advantages of our system everywhere, in the school, in the factory, and in the home. The people in the United States have the highest standard of living in the world. What is Russia's? Our Government does not control industry, and yet it is willing to help industry when it needs it. Our factories have no fear that if production doesn't go too well the Government will close down the factory and say: "Heads will roll." Socialism just doesn't work. It kills incentive, stifles initiative and destroys ambition. How can such a system hope to last? It can't. Socialism only intends to take over what our system has already created.

We Americans have never had it so good—but we can and will do better. Our system has developed us into the powerful and influential country that we are today. And yet, free enterprise is not stopping—it is constantly going forward, striving toward new and better goals. There is no doubt in my mind that we can achieve these goals—in time. We have not evolved to our present position overnight. It has taken many years and much hard work. Our forefathers were not afraid to work and certainly if there has been no change in this spirit of the American people, there is no limit to what we can do, to what we will do.

It makes no difference to us who believes and who doesn't believe in free enterprise. We know it works. It provides incentive, encourages initiative and spurs ambition. It has provided more benefits for more people than any other system yet devised by man, and it will for years to come, for as long as man's desire to better himself remains with us.

Business Ethics in 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech by Henry Ford II which was made before the Minneapolis Junior Chamber of Commerce on Thursday, April 20, 1960. I also include an editorial appearing in the Washington Post on April 21 be printed after the text of the speech.

Mr. Ford's speech on "Business Ethics in 1961" is a notable and responsible contribution to public understanding. It is refreshing in its honest approach to a solution for the problems of corporate violations of the various antitrust laws on price fixing, collusive bidding, and illegal marketing practices.

The speech and editorial follow:

BUSINESS ETHICS IN 1961

I want to speak this evening on a subject that I believe merits our immediate and serious attention.

Our American industrial system has long been one of the most outstanding accomplishments of our society. We started out as a pioneer people, fervently independent and individualistic, and we built an economic system to match. With time there came increasingly complexity in our society and certain excesses in our corporate behavior. Laws were passed and the untrammeled freedom of business action was restricted. On the whole, it was wisely restricted, so that America was able to enjoy the benefits of substantially free competition, risk capital and profit incentive without the social and human abuses that often attended early-day capitalism.

Because of its early excesses, as we all know, business fell under a cloud and for long years became the scapegoat for many of the Nation's problems, a whipping boy for most of its griefs. Chastened by antitrust laws, squeezed in the giant wringer of the great depression, and restricted by the emergence of huge and powerful labor unions, the American corporation painfully learned that it must assume responsibilities beyond its traditional function of making money for the stockholders.

It learned that, however legal and proper its actions, to act in terms of profit and loss alone was not quite good enough. Something more was required—a positive awareness of national goals and objectives, social as well as economic, and an effort to make its actions conform as much as possible with the prevailing tides of public opinion.

In the past 20 years there has been a material change in the whole outlook of our larger business enterprises, a change toward far greater social maturity and responsibility. Business today understands well how its actions may impinge not only on the lives of individuals but also upon the goals and the policies of our Nation both at home and abroad.

This maturing process did not take place in a vacuum. The business corporation is a mirror of society. It exists at the sufferance of society to serve the broad purposes of society. It reflects at most times the prevailing ethical, moral, and even cultural values of society. More particularly, it tends to reflect the values of the people at the top levels of management.

One of the many fascinating things about a business corporation is that—in its daily life, and not merely in the legal sense—it does take on many of the attributes of a person. It may have quite a distinct personality. It may be liked or hated with real emotion. It may be venal and greedy, negative and reactionary, pompous and self-righteous, just like some people; or it may be full of good will and a sense of public service, adventurous and confident, open and forthright—just like some other people. It may be corrupt, shady, and dishonest, like a few people; or honest and law abiding—to the best of its ability—like most people.

One thing that most corporations—like most people—cannot do is to succeed in creating the impression that they are something other than what they really are. No amount of false front will keep the real character of your company or mine from showing through.

Another important similarity between people and corporations is that both tend to behave as people expect them to behave. Though the business enterprise, like any person, must earn and deserve the respect of society, it too can be discouraged and disheartened by an atmosphere of constant hostility, suspicion, and criticism.

I am concerned, as I am sure many of you are, at a recent chain of events that could arouse broad popular distrust and that could revive old and wornout hostilities toward American business and industry. Too fast and too close together for comfort we have had a series of falls from grace involving some of our oldest and most respected business firms. As a director of one of the electrical goods manufacturers, and as the chief executive officer of an automotive manufacturing business, my concern is more than academic. In addition to price-fixing convictions in the one industry and conflict-of-interest charges in the other, congressional committees, in still other industries, have turned up evidence of widespread collusion between corrupt unions and equally corrupt management. Let me note that, whatever differences our company may have had with the UAW, we have developed a genuine respect for the determination of its leadership to keep it free of corruption.

It would indeed be a sad thing, if the good will and confidence that business has laboriously built up over the years should now be washed away at this very critical juncture in our history.

I am sure all responsible people would hate to see a return of that national pastime of the 1930's—business baiting—or for the matter, an outbreak of labor baiting or any other kind of divisive attacks on American solidarity.

We have vast national problems to solve at home and abroad, problems of chronic unemployment and economic breakthrough, problems of competing more effectively in world trade, problems of leading the free world in strengthening freedom and economic progress in vast continents being courted by international communism.

I think it may be no exaggeration to project the 1960's as the most critical and far-reaching 10 years in the history of the world. In such a decade, America needs more than ever before an atmosphere of mutual trust and confidence among such major elements of our society as industry, labor, and Government. Without that confidence, we will not only be far less effective in meeting the goals of our country, we will present to the world at large the image of a quarrelsome, divided and possibly corrupt society. World communism could not ask for a better gift than this.

When I say this, I am not suggesting for a moment that we should abandon the real benefits of vigorous competition. Neither am I suggesting that American businessmen—or unionists or farmers or any other element in our society—should suddenly play dead, that we should transform ourselves from a society of freemen to a country of docile followers. Freedom to compete, to differ, to dissent, to criticize, to urge change—these all are a cherished part of our heritage as Americans, of the values that we seek to defend against the onslaughts of communism. Most of the world, I believe, understands these basic things about our country, and multitudes of its people long for them. But there is a difference between the kind of earnest, healthy, rational debate that forwards America's interests—indeed, is essential to the workings of the American system—and the kind of internal warfare that can weaken it.

No doubt there are those who will say that it is neither necessary nor wise for us to wash our business linen in public, that by talking about these things we will draw attention to them and, by so doing foster the impression that things are much worse than they actually are.

I don't agree. I think what has happened has very grave implications for all of us in business. I believe we need to think very hard about what we can do, individually and collectively, to reduce the likelihood of such things continuing to happen. If they still should happen now and then—since sin has never been entirely eliminated—we need to think about how business can handle itself so as to minimize the unfavorable impressions that result. Of one thing I am sure, the confidence and faith of the American people in business—particularly in the big corporations that play so vital a role in our whole life—will not be strengthened by alibis, excuses, or counterrecriminations.

If we are to preserve the good name of our respective companies, we must be sure that management does everything reasonable in prudence and good sense to prevent such things happening, and takes swift and sure corrective action when the occasional misdeed does occur. At the very least, the top operating executives are responsible for establishing strong and explicit policies concerning the conduct of employees under the law and in conformance with high ethical standards.

These executives also are responsible for communicating these policies to their employees and making sure they are understood. Let me emphasize that this is not a simple or a routine matter. It must be carried out with the utmost thoroughness and intensity. Employees at all levels must be made to feel in their bones that their company's codes and policies mean exactly what they purport to mean.

Finally, it is the responsibility of the executives to punish swiftly and impartially violations of those policies at whatever level of the business they may occur. If they are firm in this, there will be far less danger that subordinate officials will apply their own standards of judgment and conduct in place of the company's.

In other words, it is the job of our corporate executives to keep their own houses in order. If and when they fail to do so, the house-cleaning job certainly will be put in less friendly hands.

I believe these recent happenings should alert outside directors to the need to be aware of the pertinent codes and policies of the companies on whose boards they sit. Normally, the outside director has only a broad picture of the business and cannot be completely familiar with the day-to-day operating details. But, when serious improprieties occur, all companies, whole industries and individuals, whether legally responsible or not, suffer the consequences of an inflamed and properly outraged public opinion.

Comforting as it may seem, and true as it may be, I'm afraid it is little use—for instance—to drag out the old bad-apple alibi to explain away things—the idea that there are always a few bad ones in every barrel. In my opinion, it is up to business to find the bad apples in the barrel, if there be any and clean them out before they contaminate the whole.

And it does even less good to yell foul and blame all our troubles on those so-and-so's in Washington, out to smear business all over again. Like all of you, I read the newspapers and I have recently read that the Kennedy administration is now showing its true colors and that the honeymoon with business is over, that the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy, of which I am a member, is a Trojan horse devised to impose wage and price controls on the economy.

I don't happen to believe this is true. Thus far, I have seen no reason to draw such a conclusion. President Kennedy in a talk to the National Industrial Conference

Board, said—and I certainly agree with him—that the revenues and the successes of his administration depend on business profits and business success, that far from being natural enemies, business and government are necessary allies. He pointed out that the 1960 drop of $6- to $7-billion in corporate profits cost the Government enough taxes to pay—and I quote the President—"the Federal share of all our antirecession, health, and education proposals for the next fiscal year, and still have enough left over to start closing what the Democrats and this administration used to call the missile gap."

The President also said this: "If business and Government are necessarily partners, what kind of partnership is it going to be? Will it be marked by mutual suspicion and recrimination, or by mutual understanding and fruitful collaboration?"

I, for one, don't believe America can afford the ludicrous spectacle of old-fashioned guerrilla warfare between business and Government; certainly not in this moment in history. We need all the energy we can muster to fight Communist economic aggression. Without ceasing to uphold the things we in business believe are right, we have got to learn to live in decent dignity and mutual respect with our Government.

There is really only one thing for top executives to do at such a time as this. That is to forget the alibis and the explanations and have the fortitude—the plain guts—to stand up and say: "This is our failure. We are chagrined and sorry. It will not happen again."

Since it has happened, I think that we now run a serious risk of having codes with sharp teeth imposed on business, not by chambers of commerce, or associations of manufacturers, but by a Federal legislature. Because such codes would further restrict the areas of free business action and decision, it is up to us in our various companies and industries to see to the establishment of our own formal principles of ethical practice, plus the effective means of selfpolicing those principles.

I recognize that no amount of law, no amount of written codes of ethics, or pius promise will take the place of a rigorous and unshakeable integrity in the total conduct and in the ideals of industrial management.

I do not agree that the time has come, or is likely ever to come, when a corporation should assume social or political or other nonbusiness roles. I believe business corporations will continue to serve society best as individual companies vie to achieve maximum long-range profitability consistent with the public interest.

Nor do I believe that industry should submit supinely to domination by the ideas of other groups in the society with which it may not concur.

Let me by specific. It is a fact well known to most businessmen and lawyers, but often not to laymen, that there are many areas of law, and particularly of antitrust and monopoly law, that it is highly difficult to be sure not to violate in the normal course of business.

Along with most businessmen, I believe that strong and effective antitrust law is essential, that it preserves competition and over the years has benefited all groups in our society, business included. But it is important that we understand that, in broad areas of action, the law is far from a clear guide.

As our General Counsel explains it, the Sherman Act, which has cast a long shadow over American industry for 70 years, has worked mainly as a kind of enabling legislation. It has allowed "judges—in the particular economic and social climate of their particular days—to apply the brakes to a course or trend of conduct that—in its context—looked unhealthful * * * antitrust laws in America are never in a state of being; they are constantly in a process of becoming. You can never close the book and say that now we know what we cannot do."

That is a lawyer's view. I could add that in numerous specific actions involving matters of pricing, dealer relations, acquisitions, or mergers, you simply can't expect to get in all cases a consensus from lawyers as to whether what you want to do is lawful or unlawful.

Business must often act in a legal no man's land, moving on the advice of counsel—if indeed it is aware of the need for counsel—and not knowing whether at some future time it may be found in violation of antitrust or other laws.

Through sheer excellence of performance, superiority of product, efficiency and aggressiveness a company may come to so dominate a market as to bring itself in violation of the law for monopolizing, under section 2 of the Sherman Act.

In industries where there are large complex sales organizations, distributors and franchised dealers you walk a constant legal tightrope. A few months ago Ford Motor Co. entered a plea of nolo contendere in an antitrust pricing case where, unfortunately, a subordinate district sales employee of ours did not realize that he had legal problems on his hands, and did not clear it with counsel. His was not the only fault. It was also the fault of our management for failing to communicate effectively with the field, for failing to instruct the field personnel fully on the details of proper conduct.

Unfortunately, whenever you are hailed into court, or asked to testify before a committee of Congress, the popular supposition is likely to be that you are up to no good, probably guilty of willful wrongdoing, and very possibly a bunch of crooks.

Great caution should be exercised by the courts, legislatures, and press, particularly in vague areas of antitrust and monopoly, to let it be understood that the mere fact that you are sued, investigated, or even indicted—or that Senator KEFAUVER's committee disagrees with how you price your products—that all this does not necessarily mean that you are crooked, unethical, or even wrong. A distinction should be made between the obviously criminal situation and that in which the court's purpose is to define, clarify, or correct a situation. Otherwise, irreparable harm may be done to ethical firms and their management acting, to the best of their understanding, within the law and in the best interests of stockholders and the public at large.

But in making this comment, I do not mean to offer business a loophole through which to escape the requirement to deal fairly and ethically.

There is one and only one way for business to keep its skirts clear; that is to insist that top management maintain the highest standards of integrity in all aspects of business operation.

Perhaps more than anything else, our integrity will be reflected in the products we offer. I believe today, more deeply than ever before, that the future of the company I represent, indeed of our whole industry, depends directly on our ability to produce products that perform exactly as we say they will perform, products that establish their own standards of integrity—of quality, durability, and dependability.

Indeed, gentlemen, all American industry will be judged before the court of world opinion on the basis of its success or failure in maintaining high integrity in its actions, its products, and its services. We live in a world that is bigger than our own world and must compete with products from all over the globe—many of them of the highest integrity of manufacturer. We must compete also with a way of life, an ideology, an imperialist system that seeks every opportunity to hold us and our economic way of life up to scorn.

Around the world, we are often described as a corporate society. If that is so, and if it is judged that the corporations are corrupt, then it will be assumed that the society itself is corrupt.

So I would like to suggest that all of us in business management take a new long look at ourselves and all our business practices. I suggest we look not only at the obvious areas of danger, where we may run afoul of the law, but also at those borderline areas of corporate action which might have unfortunate social consequences for our fellow man.

Morality is not just avoiding price fixing or conflict of interest. Obedience to the law is not enough. The law is negative. It tells us only what we must not do. As Crawford Greenewalt, president of DuPont, has suggested: "We in industry must be concerned more specifically with 'obedience to the unenforceable'—the things we do, not because they are required but because they are right. This strength is more potent and compelling than the law."

A corporation may be primarily a producer of goods, but it is more than just that; it is a small society within society, one with motivations, with rules and principles of its own. It is a purposeful organization that can and must give more than just money to those who serve it, and those it serves. It should reflect in its daily actions the principles and aspirations of our society in its finest tradition. If it does so, I have no fear for America's ability to stand strong and free before the world for long and good years to come.

NEW BUSINESS CONSCIENCE

Henry Ford II has laid down a stiff challenge to American business. Alarmed by the recent price-fixing convictions in the electrical-goods industry, the conflict-of-interest charges in the automobile industry and the congressional findings of "widespread collusion between corrupt unions and equally corrupt management," he has called upon corporate executives "to keep their own houses in order." His candid and hard-hitting address to the Minneapolis Junior Chamber of Commerce contains some of the best advice offered by a big-business spokesman in recent years.

Especially pointed was his call upon corporation heads to face the ugly consequences of laying morality on the shelf. "There is only one thing for top executives to do at such a time as this," he said. "That is to forget the alibis and the explanations and have the fortitude—the plain guts—to stand up and say: 'This is our failure. We are chagrined and sorry. It will not happen again.'"

In sharp contrast to Ralph Cordiner, head of the General Electric Co. who denied personal knowledge of the criminal conspiracy to which his company had pleaded guilty, Mr. Ford sees positive virtue in washing the dirty linen of business in public. Only in this way can industry in general be alerted to pitfalls and build within itself the necessary safeguards against crumbling ethical standards.

As a director of one of the electrical companies, Mr. Ford called upon "outside directors" to exercise a special vigilance to avoid the growth of corrupt practices in the companies on whose boards they sit. If this corrosion is to continue, all business will suffer, and extreme legislative remedies will be sought. The only safe course is for top executives and directors to insist, not merely on the avoidance of scandal and convictions in the courts, but on adherence to high standards of conduct because they are right.

Mr. Ford acknowledged that the antitrust laws are vague and that it is impossible to

know in advance whether some business practices are legal or illegal. Likewise he noted that some firms are unjustly maligned because of investigations or indictments for allegedly monopolistic practices that may have little substance. A distinction needs to be made between clearly criminal conduct and the correction of practices in the twilight zone of the Sherman Act.

This in no way restrains the thrust of Mr. Ford's argument for business management that can see social obligations as well as profits—that holds fast to a respected place in a free society. A new era of business-baiting or labor-baiting would be tragic, as Mr. Ford suggests. Even more tragic would be a disintegration of our free society because of crass misuse of free enterprise to serve the selfish ends of a few men who have lost their sense of values.

Can We Meet the Challenge?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished jury of awards of the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, Pa., has awarded for the second time its coveted George Washington Honor Medal and $100 to the Sacred Heart High School of Elizabeth, N.J.

Sacred Heart High School also won the award in 1959.

The 1960 award was made for the editorial which appeared in the school's paper, the Crier, entitled "Can We Meet the Challenge? Its author was Miss Mary C. Feehan, 749 Van Buren Avenue, Elizabeth, editor in chief of the school newspaper and salutatorian of the class of 1960. The award also honored Sacred Heart High School for its work in helping to encourage a better understanding of the American way of life in 1960.

Through the courtesy of Mr. George E. Stringfellow, of East Orange, N.J., secretary of the board of trustees of the Freedoms Foundation, a copy of the award-winning editorial has been made available to me. Because it is evidence of the encouragement Freedoms Foundation is offering young people to think through the significance of their heritage as American citizens, and because the editorial itself is an impressive example of the values and ideals motivating many of our younger people, I take special pleasure in calling the attention of our colleagues to Miss Feehan's excellent work.

Under leave to extend my remarks, the editorial follows:

CAN WE MEET THE CHALLENGE?

We, the class of 1960, shall join more than a million high school graduates on June 16. This is rightly called a commencement exercise, for so it is. Graduation marks the beginning of a brandnew chapter in our lives—a chapter in which we must put to use the education we have received.

We are blessed that we are living in a country where all men can receive the same education and have equal opportunity for success in life. There is no caste system here where only the wealthy are educated, nor is there anyone telling us how we shall use our education. It is ours to do with as we choose. Perhaps we shall further it and become scientists or teachers, or we may use it immediately and become members of the American "9-to-5 club."

Though education gives us the right to improve our condition in life, it also imposes a duty, a responsibility we should be proud to bear; namely, to preserve the freedoms of our country, making secure our American way of life. We may not have to sacrifice our lives to preserve these freedoms as did the heroes at Bull Run, Okinawa, and Pork Chop Ridge. However, in a time when our love for freedom is being challenged daily, and our President and his Cabinet are being insulted and ridiculed by our Communist enemy, we, the younger generation, possessing strong American ideals, must fight and fight hard in our own private way to prove to ourselves and the world that we are a nation under God, striving for liberty and justice for all men.

We are a nation under God. In Him lies our strongest weapon. If He should ever forsake us, we would be nothing; therefore, if for this reason alone, we must be true to our faith. If we are, we will be a moral people, and history has proved that a morally sound nation is a secure nation.

We have always been a nation loyal to traditions, and we must continue to be so. Traditions and customs are important to a nation for they instill patriotism in her people. Take our flag, for example. This demands respect for it is a symbol of America herself. Yet how many Americans today have the regard they should have for Old Glory? Lack of patriotism is a dangerous thing. Let us remind our indifferent fellow Americans of this.

America has always defended the individual dignity and freedom of man. The basic freedoms in our Bill of Rights insure our security, but we must not misinterpret the idea of security by demanding excessive benefits from our government or our employers. We seniors will be starting work soon. Let us not become part of the crowd who advocate strikes in order to obtain a coffee break, a Christmas bonus, or other fringe benefits.

There were no coffee breaks or 40-hour weeks on the blood-dyed fields of two World Wars and the Korean war where our freedoms were defended with lives, though dearly bought, these freedoms were not permanently insured. It is our turn to keep them intact. We may never be called upon to shed our blood, but we must support our Government, respect our country's leaders, love our flag and all that it symbolizes, be loyal and honest in our dealings with our fellow men, be ready to give rather than to receive. In this way we shall do our part to keep America a morally sound nation as well as a gloriously free nation.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Israel Independence Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an excellent editorial from April 20, 1961, issue of the Chelsea (Mass.) Record which deals with the 13th anniversary of the State of Israel:

ISRAEL INDEPENDENCE WEEK

Israel's Bar Mitzvah anniversary, this week, represents a coming of age in a world of unparalleled progress in the fields of economic and scientific development. In the space of 13 years, Israel has many achievements to her credit: the million immigrants who have arrived, the new factories, farms, and homes that have been built, and an expanding export trade. All this has been achieved without utilizing the full potentialities of the country. The people of Israel, as they recall the wanderings of their forefathers in the ancient wilderness, are keenly conscious of the fact that the Negev Desert, comprising one-half of Israel's area, is still largely a wilderness. This year, one of their most vital activities will be the establishment of industrial towns in the Negev.

American poet, Robert Frost, recently paid tribute to Israel's achievements in absorbing and integrating immigrants from many countries. Mr. Frost, who came to Israel as a guest of the Hebrew University, told the press that he was proud of America's interest and support of Israel. He said the world must be grateful there is such a place as Israel, a refuge for immigrants from many lands.

It is interesting to note that non-Jewish students from 22 countries on all continents are studying at the Hebrew University this year. Most students from Europe and the United States are studying the humanities, particularly in the fields related to the Bible, archaeology and history. African and Asian students are concentrating on medicine, agriculture and the natural sciences. In addition many of these students are taking time off from their studies to master the Hebrew language.

The State of Israel has an important contribution to make in the newly established Peace Corps will observe that to the emerging peoples, Israel is a valid example of a country which has made rapid progress in industrialization in freedom. It furnishes a demonstration of a successful democratic way of living.

The State of Israel has made important contributions of technical assistance. For example, an Israeli medical mission under the U.N. auspices was one of the first to enter the Congo after it achieved freedom. Israel has made these contributions despite the fact that she herself faces the difficulties of boycott and blockade under an uneasy armistice.

Despite the absence of a real peace, the world can be glad that there has been in that area a period of relative calm with freedom from disturbing border incidents. The free world will hope and work for the day when peace and good will will return to that region which is the cradle of civilization and religion.

Project Hope a Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. BATES
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, the prestige of America has been vastly improved all over Asia because of the medical mission provided by Project Hope, and it is my sincere hope that some day, the SS *Hope* will expand into a fleet of vessels bringing medical knowledge, supplies and service to people in many places throughout the world. Dr. William B. Walsh, president and founder of Project Hope has just issued a very interesting report for the first 6 months of its operation, and because of the national interest in this program, I am inserting same in the RECORD.

The report follows:

PROJECT HOPE PRESIDENT ANNOUNCES FIRST 6 MONTHS OUTSTANDING

"In its first 6 months of operation in the island nation of Indonesia the success of the SS *Hope I* has been outstanding," according to William B. Walsh, M.D., president and founder of Project Hope. The *Hope* vessel is the main vehicle of the nonprofit organization with headquarters here.

In making the 6-month report, Dr. Walsh noted that the vessel has made nine stops to help teach and train Indonesian medical personnel. American medical personnel have performed 600 operations and seen 16,000 patients, both aboard the gleaming white floating medical center and at shore-based facilities.

"One of the main purposes of the *Hope's* visit to Indonesia, and any other nation to which it will go in the future," Dr. Walsh said, "is to update the medical knowledge of the local people. In this respect, 800 classes, lectures, seminars, and meetings were held in the classrooms and lecture halls aboard the ship during this first 6 months.

"Interest in the vessel, its interior operation, and the American medical personnel has brought 30,000 shipboard visitors. A total of 4,687 diagnostic X-rays were made by the medical technicians."

Dr. Walsh noted that in the first few weeks of June the vessel will steam to Singapore from Indonesia's capital Djakarta for resupply and refitting and then it is tentatively scheduled to visit Saigon, South Vietnam's capital. The *Hope* will remain there for 2½ months before it returns to the United States to complete its successful first-year tour.

"Our expectations are that the *Hope* will leave San Francisco late next fall and steam again to one of the Asian or Southeast Asian nations which have invited us to visit," Dr. Walsh noted. "The *Hope* only visits those nations to which the government and the medical profession request it. Then, the entire tour of duty is scheduled by the local medical people, with the assistance of our medical operations department."

Besides Djakarta, the first and last Indonesian stop of the *Hope*, the ship has visited Surabaya, Bali, Sumbawa, Makassar, Ambon, Kupang, Ende, and Bima. The vessel is now serving at Lombok with Semarang the last stop before the scheduled return to Djakarta May 17, 1961.

The *Hope* is operated through the voluntary contributions of individual Americans, by donations from business and industry, labor, and interested organizations. Many of the Nation's largest firms have donated material and supplies, in addition to cash contributions, to help keep the ship in operation and to aid those people less fortunate than we at home, Dr. Walsh said.

"I want especially to commend those dedicated American doctors, nurses, dentists, pharmacists, and medical technicians who have left their practices and the comparative comfort of their homes and families to serve the mission of *Hope*. There is not enough praise anyone can give to these men and women and they deserve the commendation of their fellow Americans and their backing.

"It is the desire that with sufficient contributions we can send other floating *Hope* medical centers to Africa and South America, where the need for medical teaching and training is also as great as it is in Southeast Asia. There are additional Navy hospital ships in mothballs to serve our purposes," Dr. Walsh stated. "The *Hope* personnel have shown the people of Southeast Asia that the American people want to help them to help themselves.

"Project Hope is a success and, with the help of the American people," Dr. Walsh said, "will continue to bring medical diplomacy to all sections of the world."

Mervin P. Whitbeck

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, in this day of racing through the process of living, there are few men remaining who are known for a homey philosophy at the fireside, or a vigorous life close to nature, or a true brotherhood with their fellow man from all walks of life. Certainly I have known few. The following comments are appropriate to the memory of one such man, Mervin P. Whitbeck. His lasting contribution in the field of conservation to his lifelong home, the Berkshires of Massachusetts, is an example for us all. I was fortunate to know Merv Whitbeck and to be broadened in my outlook on life by him.

Mr. Speaker, I include the attached article by Theodore Giddings, from the Berkshire Eagle, Friday, April 21, 1961, in memory of Mervin P. Whitbeck:

[From the Berkshire Eagle, Apr. 21, 1961]

OUR BERKSHIRES—MERVIN P. WHITBECK

(By Theodore Giddings)

Although close friends knew that Mervin Philip Whitbeck, 55, of Mount Washington, had had a close brush with death while on the operating table last November at Deaconess Hospital in Boston, few, if any, were prepared for the shock of his untimely passing Monday afternoon. Many of them had chatted with him at the recent testimonial dinner for John E. Buckley, retired conservation officer, and had remarked that he seemed like his oldtime self again. If he wasn't feeling well, he certainly did a good job of concealing the fact.

Maybe that's not surprising, though, for Merv wasn't one for self-pity. He lived close to nature all his life and while deeply appreciative of its beauties and bounties he also knew firsthand of the cruelties and punishment that it can inflict. He could take the bitter with the sweet without yelling "foul" like some of the rest of us do.

Merv's knowledge of the outdoors and his skills as a woodsman, hunter, and trapper came in large measure from his father, the late Isaac Whitbeck. Ike, as he was widely known, established a wide reputation as a rattlesnake hunter and once received considerable publicity for catching one with a shoestring. However, his customary weapon was a pair of tongs with the pinching end covered with rubber to save bruising the necks of the reptiles. He caught many rattlers for Dr. R. L. Ditmars, curator of the Bronx Zoo, who sometimes joined him in the hunt.

Merv also was adept at capturing the rattlers but was inclined to soft-pedal this activity, especially in recent years. He would go out on a reptile hunt at the persuasion of a friend, or a friend of a friend, but didn't like to have these trips "written up" or headlined in the press. Poor publicity for Mount Washington, he felt, and gave the town an unwarranted reputation since the snake population is relatively small and limited mostly to certain areas.

Deer hunting comes first to mind when one thinks of Merv Whitbeck. The Whitbeck deer camp operated for years by Merv and his efficient wife, Vicky, has been one of the best in the East and certainly one of the most productive. No one knew better than Merv how to organize a deer hunt and, of course, his knowledge of the Mount Washington whitetail country was unsurpassed. He knew where to find the deer and the famous Whitbeck "drives" accounted for the outstanding success of the hunters in his camp season after season.

This isn't to infer that everyone in the camp got a deer. They didn't but they were seldom heard to complain. The general excellence of the camp, including the food, and, above all, the camaraderie of the hunters was its own reward for all who participated.

Gathered around the table of an evening at Merv's camp were men from all walks of life—doctors, lawyers, farmers, contractors, politicians, schoolteachers, businessmen, and just plain ordinary guys. In the swapping of stories specially of the day's hunt, no one added more to the enjoyment of the occasion than Merv. A master of the terse, clipped expression, he punctured more than one inflated ego but always in a good-natured way.

Don Stillman, late outdoor columnist for the New York Herald Tribune, and a friend of the Whitbeck family from boyhood, once referred to Ike Whitbeck as being as much a part of the Berkshire wilderness as "the shy deer, the drumming grouse, and the furtive fox." And the same could be said of Merv. He was a master of the coon and wildcat hunt and pursued these sports with his brothers, Russell, retired superintendent of Mount Everett Reservation, and Henry. For several seasons Russ and Merv bagged their limit of coon and sold the pelts to Beebe, the Canaan, Conn., dealer. Merv and Henry pursued wildcats, often on snowshoes, over the rugged mountain terrain more for the sport of it than for the $10 bounty. Their last kill, a 28-pound bobcat, was made about a week before Merv's unexpected death.

Mount Washington has lost part of its tradition in the passing of Merv Whitbeck. But the family is deeply rooted on the mountain, and it's not unreasonable to say that as long as there is a Mount Washington there will be a Whitbeck living on it. It is hoped that Vicky Whitbeck and son, Jim, will continue the deer camp. She has been the guiding genius for years of the camp operation, and he has been well-schooled by his dad in the know-how of the deer hunt.

Panama Canal: Craftsmen on the Locks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I quote a letter to the editor from "The Mail Box" of the Panama American, the well-known evening newspaper on the Isthmus:

THE MAIL BOX—CRAFTSMEN ON THE LOCKS

SIR: With the damage to the miter gates at Gatun locks, the Panama Canal Company's penny-pinching policies have started to catch up with it. This process will continue unless these policies are changed.

Before the penny-pinching policies were inaugurated, all U.S.-rate employees on the locks were skilled craftsmen. All had completed their apprenticeship, and many had years of background in their trade.

Along came some big brain with the idea that they were being paid too much for operating the mules. It is to be remembered that when not operating the mules, these craftsmen worked on the maintenance and inspection of the locks equipment.

So the big brains hired Tom, Dick, and Harry for less money, with the result that the skilled men were gradually reduced. The mule operators they have now, when not operating, sit on their tails doing nothing.

It seems to me that present Panama Canal policy is to add to the office and supervisory staffs at the expense of the skilled craftsmen. We only have to look around and see the population explosion of the office and administration staffs.

The Governor before last hired himself a public relations officer who has now hired himself an assistant and in the end no doubt will soon be a bureau chief like some of the others.

In the past when a man was appointed to a craftsman's job on the canal he had to produce his apprenticeship papers. That was strict policy. Now they hire any shade tree mechanic they can get especially if he is known by the right people. Not only do they hire him, but they then proceed to push him ahead.

They can say what they like, but the great engineering project which is the Panama Canal is not doing as well as it should. There must be a clean up, or there will be a bust up.

When the Panama Canal Company was formed it was stated that it should pay its way. There was nothing said about making the big profit that they now seem to want to clear every year.

In closing, I would like to ask what happened to the Booz, Allen, and Hamilton report?

CRAFTSMAN.

Critic at Large

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have championed the position of our Seneca Indians in their struggle to retain possession of their homelands on the Allegheny Reservation, instead of having this area flooded by construction of the Kinzua Dam. However, the Congress approved the construction of this dam under these unfortunate conditions.

A sensitive commentator on cultural developments of our society recently reviewed this situation in a newspaper column, entitled "Proposed Dam That Would Violate Treaty With the Senecas Poses Moral Question." Under unanimous consent I wish to have this column reprinted from the New York Times of April 21, 1961:

CRITIC AT LARGE—PROPOSED DAM THAT WOULD VIOLATE TREATY WITH THE SENECAS POSES MORAL QUESTION

(By Brooks Atkinson)

During the presidential campaign, the Democratic candidate made this statement about his Indian policy:

"There would be no change in treaty or contractual relationships without the consent of the tribes concerned." He also promised that his administration would "discharge its moral obligations to our first Americans."

But preparations carried forward from the previous administration are already far advanced to dishonor the treaty that George Washington's deputy, Timothy Pickering, signed on November 11, 1794, with the Senecas. Referring to certain lands in western New York and Pennsylvania, the deputy of our first President put the national seal to a promise that "the United States will never claim the same, nor disturb the Seneka Nation." "Never," the treaty said.

Next month, public hearings will be held by a House subcommittee on public works to consider the first major appropriation, $15 million, to build the Kinzua Dam on the Seneca Reservation. It would drown most of the lands the United States once promised that it would never claim. It would disturb about 800 Senecas by driving them from the lands their tribe has held for 167 years.

It would break a pledge made by the United States at a time when it needed the support of the Senecas against foreign enemies—very valuable in the War of 1812—and it would unilaterally scrap the oldest continuing treaty in the National Archives.

No one in the Government has faced the moral issue raised by this project. No one could without being ashamed. Numerous

public spirited organizations and individuals have protested to Members of Congress or to various departments of the Government. The replies have been uniformly bland. They say, as President Kennedy remarked on March 8 in reference to business of the last administration, that the courts have ruled that Congress has the legal right to break a treaty—something that no one has doubted. Since Congress has authorized the Kinzua Dam and started to make appropriations for it, the letters conclude that no branch of the Government has a right to stop it now.

Like a certain priest and likewise a Levite who left a man half dead on the road from Jerusalem to Jericho and passed by on the other side, so the various Government agencies pass by on the other side, hoping perhaps that no one will see them. For the moral question is one that no one dares face: Is the Kinzua Dam right or wrong? It is wrong.

In this shameful situation the Senecas have all the decency and goodwill on their side. They agree that a dam must be built in the Allegheny River to prevent floods in Pittsburgh and to conserve water. Acting on behalf of the Senecas, Dr. Arthur E. Morgan, a civil engineer with a long experience in flood control, has surveyed an area in western New York—called the Cattaraugus-Conewango project—which he believes will accomplish the same purpose more cheaply and effectively, using inferior lands, leaving the Senecas undisturbed and dislocating other people less ruthlessly.

He believed it would save the United States $100 million. He also believes that a Cattaraugus-Conewango Dam will have to be built in 25 years in any case.

The Senecas' request is modest. In a letter to President Kennedy, dated George Washington's Birthday, the President of the Seneca Nation of Indians, Basil Williams of Salamanca, N.Y., wrote:

"The Seneca Nation asks you, therefore, to make an independent investigation into the merits and comparative costs of the Kinzua Dam and Dr. Morgan's Cattaraugus-Conewango alternative, and that in the interim you direct that the work be halted on the authorized project."

When George Washington asked the Indians to meet with Timothy Pickering in Canandaigua, N.Y., to make a treaty, the Indians asked the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of Friends (Quakers) to send delegates to advise them. Four friends, two of whom kept journals, made the difficult journey, 8 days long, through much wild country, and participated in the long negotiations.

The Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of Friends is still in existence. At a meeting last Tuesday evening the members decided to undertake an emergency program to find some satisfactory solution to this episode in jobbery. The tradition of conscience is still alive among Friends.

Money Is Not Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. FORRESTER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, the April 18, 1961, issue of Christian Economics carries an article entitled "Money Is Not Education." The wisdom expressed in this article entitles it to a place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The article reads as follows:

MONEY IS NOT EDUCATION

The February number of the First National City Bank Monthly Letter of New York is authority for the statement that "more money has been spent on schools and schooling in the past 10 years than in the entire previous history of the United States."

Obviously, more money is not the answer to the educational problem. Few will agree that more progress has been made in sound education during the past 10 years than in former times. The prodigal outpouring of money has not accomplished its purpose, and there is little reason to believe that the enormously increased expenditures contemplated by the present administration, the NEA, and others, will achieve better results.

Less elaborate educational palaces, fewer frills, and more solid, character-building subjects in the curriculum, more local control and attention to the content of textbooks and the character, integrity, and dedication of teachers are the ways to move forward in education.

Inter-American Social and Economic Cooperation Program

SPEECH

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill H.R. 6518 making appropriations for the Inter-American social and economic cooperation program and the Chilean reconstruction and rehabilitation program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be considerable misapprehension that the clouds on today's international horizon amount merely to intransigence on the part of the Communist countries. A lot of people believe their obstructive tactics are vexing but that somehow they will diminish and disappear. One country after another swings away from our sphere of influence and example, but many people are serenely confident that, like a pendulum, things will soon swing back the other way. Riot, brutality, strife, and plunder are epidemic in many parts of the world around us, yet many regard them as things which just somehow happen and just somehow will stop happening.

The brutal truth is that these things are made to happen, trouble will not just go away and there is no pendulum swinging. There is war today just as surely as though bullets were flying and bombs were dropping. It is a nonmilitary war, yes, but a war for the domination of the world and the struggle is deadly. It is fought on many, many fronts. Until we realize we are fighting it, until we fight on those fronts and fight the war as a coordinated whole, with the same intensive national effort as we would fight hot war, we will lose, battle by battle, front by front, until all is lost.

Today we have before us a measure dealing with just one of the many fronts of the war. Had we been a little more alert, had we been able to conceive the nature and extent of the powers of aggression against us, we might have foreseen its development long ago.

As delegates came to the United States in 1945 to take part in discussions of the formation of the United Nations, many of them toured our country, speaking before many different groups of people. One theme was common among them all: the critical need for industrialization. The position of economic and political power of the United States at the end of the Second World War was clearly due to our industrial strength. It followed, then, or seemed to follow, that less developed countries which wanted to improve their economic positions could do so by becoming industrialized, and could become industrialized by loans or gifts from the United States of capital equipment.

Here was the first open indication that the peoples of the world sought a basic change to improve their lot. That many of these countries could begin by manufacturing or extracting raw materials which were in increasingly scarce supply may have been a logical point, and may have been a valid interpretation of the principle of international division of labor, but it was emotionally unsatisfying. Gradual growth from primitive economies to industrial societies by the long process of capital accumulation seemed too slow, difficult, and frustrating. Leapfrogging to positions achieved by the more advanced nations only through centuries of capital accumulation became the unrealistic aspiration.

In the years since 1945, we have followed a policy of international good fellowship and helpfulness. We started with the attempt to keep starving people from starving. We offered the Marshall plan. We have continued, sending, under the aegis of the International Cooperation Administration, our best technicians to advise and to help. We have lent money to help less developed nations to acquire the start toward industrialization. Yet, somehow, the tremendous sums of money—sums our great grandchildren will still be paying interest on—have not touched the heart of the situation.

THE BASIS OF DISCONTENT AMONG THE LESS WELL DEVELOPED ECONOMIES

The people of a large part of the world are have-nots. To an astonishing degree, they live at a bare subsistence level, lacking both the means of bettering their lot and the political liberties to influence their governments. They live in countries where there is virtually no middle class, but where a small part of the population lives in sybaritic splendor, and the larger part lives in squalid penury.

This regrettable difference between the rich and the poor seemed to be the nature of life until we developed broader and more complete methods of communication. But when the few radios in a primitive village began telling of the wider distribution of a suitable standard of living elsewhere, the have-not's for the first time had a mirror showing them their own nakedness. Of democracy

they knew little, but of hunger and sickness they knew much. And when they learned that others were not so hungry or so ill, they felt a grievance which they burned to express.

Now, our giving aid to countries in which the people are in extremely depressed condition has not always worked out to alleviate the condition of these people. Sometimes the profits of the small entrepreneurial group have been increased, and the people themselves have had no abatement of their exploitation. Pouring more money and more equipment into such countries merely increases the discontent which is the fuel of revolutions.

Throughout much of Latin America there are wide differences between wealth and poverty. Even in Mexico, which is becoming an economically advanced country, there are a good many million people living below the monetary economy, on the crumbs of subsistence they can find. In other areas the situation is equally difficult. People who live in desperation are not political theorists—they are actionists. They will follow whoever promises them consideration, help, and food.

HUNGRY PEOPLE AS A COMMUNIST PRESSURE POINT

Throughout the world, Communists hunt for desperate people to incite them to revolution. That they ultimately learn that they have been fooled and made catspaws of does not deter them from an early and enthusiastic response to incitement. Civil affairs in various of the Latin American countries are now beset with disorder. Communist infiltration has gone quite a way—so far in fact that it would be difficult to ban it by edict in several places. The most extreme case is that of Castro in Cuba. That Castro started out as a follower of communism we suspect but cannot prove. But now there is no doubt that the Cuban Government is Communist, and that it continues to be an irritant in international relations throughout all of Latin America. The Cuban situation illustrates the difficulties in which we find ourselves.

For many years, the people of the United States have had a deep affection for the people of Cuba. Conscious of oppression of the Cuban people by Spain, this country went to war with Spain to lift tyranny from Cuba. We could have made Cuba, a rich and fertile island not a hundred miles from our shores, a part of the United States, but instead, promised the people of Cuba their freedom, and after a number of years of tutoring in government and finance, withdrew. And in the years since that time, we have paid many, many millions of dollars to the Cuban people above the world price of sugar. In 1952, Batista seized power, and subjected Cuba to a harsh dictatorship without foreseeing the consequences. Substantial numbers of people in our country wished Fidel Castro luck in his attempt to free Cuba from this dictatorship, and I am confident that many of them did much more than wish.

Out of that background, Castro has stirred up "anti-Yanqui" sentiment as the fuel for revolutions throughout all Latin America. And he has established a beachhead for communism just a pleasure cruiser day's run from Florida.

Throughout Latin America and throughout the undeveloped and the less developed countries, we are involved in a propaganda war. Those who most freely attack us are those we have most tried to help. But many are unstable and hysterical because they are hungry and hopeless.

The proposal before us, made first by former President Eisenhower and reiterated by President Kennedy, for developmental assistance throughout Latin America in proportion to the degree to which the countries needing aid have bettered their own internal problems of social justice is possibly the most constructive step we have so far taken in our relations with our hemispheric neighbors. Yet its success is by no means guaranteed. We must wait to see how willing the people of wealth in those lands will be to open the way to greater prosperity to the less well situated—peon, unskilled worker, or landless nomad.

PROBLEM OF CAPITAL FORMATION

While we seem to be confronted with a conflict of propaganda, our real and basic difficulty is the age-old problem of capital formation. To some extent in Latin America, and to a very great extent in Africa, there is need for industrial growth to support existing populations. Outside aid can introduce some food, though rarely enough to support a population. It can introduce certain kinds of equipment. And though the food and the equipment may help, capital formation must still come from an excess of production over the immediate needs for consumption.

We may send big drilling equipment, and dredging equipment and scoops and other forms of diggers into a primitive country. We may send technical missions to train the native workers to use the equipment. But the native people must work the machines, and must somehow be supported by their own inadequate economy while they do so. Not until people living in undeveloped economies have learned to save, in the economic sense, can they expect any consequential or permanent improvement in their standards of living.

It is strange that even Canada, with whom we have had closer and friendlier relations than we have had with any other country, should now be feeling slightly antagonistic toward us. Much is made of the fact that our particular culture is likely to sweep over Canada, destroying the attitudes and folkways which are typically Canadian. Our radio programs are to be heard in Canada. Our magazines can be subscribed to in Canada. Our technical achievements can influence the thinking of technicians in Canada. It is true that these ills are due to proximity. But they make Canada something less than Canada for Canadians. And behind this fear of a cultural osmosis is a different fear: the fear of the domination of Canadian industry by investment from the United States. It must be remembered that when investment funds flow to Canada, they flow in response to the promise of higher return. And this higher return is a symptom of a scarcity of investment funds in Canada. What we may realize is that the 17,442,000 people in Canada are not forming capital as rapidly as the needs of Canada or the opportunities for investment in Canada would suggest.

Summing up this train of thought:

First. The major amount of instability among the less well-developed peoples of the world is due to the depressed state of the common people and their feeling of hopelessness in the face of the richness of the few wealthy men in their countries.

Second. This discontent is fanned, wherever possible, by alert Communists, who see their opportunities enhanced by revolution and discord.

Third. The development of a greater degree of social and economic equality and justice within the less well-developed countries will improve world peace.

Fourth. The long-term remedy, however, will be the increasing rate of capital formation among the have-not nations. It will be a very difficult achievement to stretch a bare subsistence living to allow saving for capital formation, yet that must be done, and any help we can give that results in such capital formation will be real and constructive help.

In relation to my opening remarks this summary leaves three points yet to be discussed: First, how far can we go in continued giving of aid abroad, second, does the inhibition against interference in internal affairs of other nations preclude us from conditioning aid on elimination of Communist influences, and, third, can we any longer afford to operate aid and other programs abroad on the present, uncoordinated basis?

WE CANNOT ACHIEVE CAPITAL FORMATION FOR OTHERS

How much foreign aid can we give? We have just stood a run on our gold supply, a run probably originating from a number of simultaneous causes. But it gave us a fearful premonition of what could happen if we carried our national economy without frugality. We have pushed our own economy to the point at which we shall have to suffer increasing inflation as we increase our welfare expenditures. It seems clear that we are going to increase our welfare expenditures, and that we shall suffer a continued and somewhat more rapid inflation. Thus, our foreign aid—of whatever kind it may be—will be given against the increasing costs of inflation. We can give a considerable amount of technical assistance. We can give articles and commodities which we have in surplus. And we can help our friends make expenditures which we should make on our own behalf if they did not make them. Possibly much of our military aid will fall into this classification.

But it is doubtful that we should or even can give the kind of blank check we gave soon after the Second World War. Large loans which will be spent throughout the world, and ultimately tend to reduce our gold reserve are to be avoided. The kind of technical help and the gift

of what amounts to "seed corn" will surely accomplish most in the long run to help our friends raise their standards of living.

STRINGS ON FOREIGN AID

Shall we continue to hand out hundreds of millions of dollars every year and have no real voice in what happens to those funds? The propaganda against making grants with strings attached is of Soviet origin. So is the much-vaunted idea of neutralism, the whole object of which has been to put strings on America's policies and to prevent us from making effective use of the aid funds that are appropriated. The time has come to stop fooling ourselves. Not a dollar of foreign aid ought to be spent for use by any government which tolerates Communist agents or intrigue of a political party with affiliations in Moscow or Peiping.

If the countries which we are to help will rid themselves of Communist influence, we can support them to a certain extent, but we must not be expected to do that job alone. The nations aided must show some positive signs of a capacity to establish and maintain their own independence and self-governing system.

In this connection a specific showdown in Latin America is due and it must come at once, particularly in connection with this program of developmental assistance. The Monroe Doctrine warned European governments in 1823 to stay out of this hemisphere. It is still a valid doctrine today. It applies whether attempts to establish influence in the Western Hemisphere are overt or covert. Implementation of the Monroe Doctrine in the administration of this program is as much a responsibility of our government as is armed resistance to an armed intervention which might be attempted by a European power in Latin America.

WE MUST COORDINATE OUR DEFENSE AGAINST COMMUNIST NONMILITARY AGGRESSION

The simple fact is that this Nation and its free world allies are engaged in war today. Because it is a nonmilitary war many people, even in high places fail to recognize its existence. Nonetheless it is as deadly serious a war as we have ever been in. The stakes run as high as national existence itself. It is a war into which the Soviets are pouring a vast portion of their national effort. It is a war which the Soviets are fighting with the same degree of planning, intelligent attention and command decision as they would fight hot war. It is a war which we on our side are fighting with piecemeal efforts, without coordination and without actually knowing we are fighting it. The aid programs, the propaganda efforts, the intelligence services, diplomatic machinery are not combined into one coordinated defensive effort. No attention whatever is given to incorporating these and other nonmilitary weapons available in free world arsenals into an organized offensive to win the war. At a later date I will make specific recommendations in these regards. I believe their need and wisdom will be so apparent they will be adopted. Otherwise I would not support the legislation for the Latin American development program or any other expenditure abroad. For unless we start doing all the things we must do to win, there is no sense in doing just a part of them. And, unless we do well all the things we must do, there is no sense in doing them at all.

Letter to the President from Cuban Refugees in Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure and privilege to call to the attention of the Members a letter directed to the President on February 27, by a group representative of the more than 60,000 Cuban refugees in my district in Florida.

This letter expresses the Cuban exiles' profound gratitude for the effective and helpful steps directed by the President to aid them in adjusting to their life in exile, here in our country.

The letter follows:

MIAMI, FLA., *February 27, 1961.*

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The undersigned, heads of all Cuban industrial and commercial associations that compose the economic section of the Cuban democratic revolutionary front, wish to express to Your Excellency their most heartfelt appreciation for your concern and sympathy for our countrymen in exile, as demonstrated by your appointment of Mr. Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, as your personal representative to study and handle the sad plight of the Cubans, who have had to flee their homeland due to the existing Communist terror.

Here in Miami, the high moral principles of your great country have been put into action in behalf of our fellow exiles by Mayor Robert King High.

Under his early leadership, the community of Miami accepted all the problems brought to it by our countrymen in exile in a generous and friendly spirit of brotherly love and esteem. The mayor has worked unceasingly to assist us and to demonstrate to all Latin America that the United States is the true defender of the oppressed and the world's bastion against international communism. He has demonstrated this in his deeds as well as his words. The mayor truly represents here the moral and practical leadership you are giving the United States.

As human beings we have had our moments of despair and hopelessness. But reinspired by your great leadership in Washington and Mayor High's great work in Miami we realize that we are not standing alone in our hour of need. When we hear words like those pronounced by you in your inaugural address and in your state of the Union message, we know that the American people realize that the Cuban situation is not merely Cuban, but the present line of defense for all democratic and freedom-loving peoples. Thanks be to the Almighty God.

The knowledge that your soft, courteous and restrained words backed by action, fortitude and determination, based on rock-solid principles, give us new hopes for the future; and gives us added strength to keep on our fight to death against international communism.

Your words and actions to help the Cubans are of tremendous significance to all the free world. They give the millions of non-Communist inhabitants of Communist dominated countries new hopes and strength that will increase their revolt against their oppressor.

Your words will also make the millions of inhabitants of countries, which the Communists are trying to control, aware of the fact that they will not be left alone to their fate, but that the United States will help them maintain the freedom to which they are entitled to by the grace of God.

May God give you all the strength necessary to be able to perform all your duties and to bear the heavy burden imposed on the shoulders of the President of the bastion of democracy and on which the free world has set its last hopes, the United States of America.

Respectfully yours,

Bankers Committee for the Economic Rehabilitation of Cuba, Miguel Diaz, President; Cuban Home Owners Association, Ing. Rafael Garcia Bango, President; Cuban Packer Association, Guillermo Fernández Quirch, President; Cuban Association of Match Manufacturers, Andrés Carrillo, President; Cuban Association of Poultry Products, Dr. Manuel Castillo President; Cuban Association of Producers & Foodstuff Distributors, Dr. Francisco Gurri, President; Cuban Association of Candy Manufacturers, Andrés Carrillo, President; Cuban Soap & Toilet Articles Manufacturers, Dr. José M. Cuba, President; Cuban Association of Potato Growers & Other Products, Pedro Valdés, President; Cuban Independent Sugar Manufacturers, George Fowler, President; Cuban Cigar & Cigarettes Manufacturers, Dr. Tulio Diaz Rivera, President; Cuban Association of Brokers & Insurance Companies, Gaspar Contreras, Jr., President; Cuban Association of Industrial & Agricultural Equipment, Manuel Menendez, President; Chamber of Commerce of the Republic of Cuba, Roberto Suero, President; Cuban Industrialist Association, Pedro Villoldo, President; Cuban Department Stores Association, Dr. Humberto Solfs, President; Committee for the Rehabilitation of the Tourist Trade, Adolfo Redolta, President; Cuban Independent Rice Growers, Julio Cadenas, President; Cuban Road Shippers Association, Agapito Amaro, President; Bus Commuter Service Association, Antonio Sánchez, President; Associated Contractors of Cuba, Ing. Antonio Tella, President; Associated Mortgage Creditors of Cuba, Adolfo Arenas, President; Cuban Laboratories & Drug Stores Owners Association, Oscar Luis Mestre, President; Road Passenger Service Association, Rodolfo González Gallardo, President; Cuban Lumbermen Association, Ramiro Fernández Moris, President; Associated Marine Agents Brokers & Ship Owners of Cuba, Jaime Villar, President.

Israel's Independence Day

SPEECH
OF
HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, on the 13th anniversary of Israel's Independence Day it is well to recall that for nearly 2,000 years Jews were practically banned from

their historic homeland prior to the rise of today's State of Israel. During all that time they lived in dispersion in all parts of the world. In the course of that long period, in their misery and suffering, in times of troubles and in the face of almost unending adversity, they all cherished the dream of returning to their own ancestral home. After nursing this noble idea fervently, after clinging to it firmly and resolutely, at last Jewish leaders saw the possibility of attaining their goal soon after the First World War.

When Palestine was placed under British mandate, the safety of Jews there was assured, and the gradual return of Jews to Palestine seemed guaranteed. Then utmost efforts were made, and Jews worked for the increase of the Jewish population there. In this task they were successful; during the interwar years the number of Jews in Palestine increased from about 80,000 to nearly 500,000. Thus a real beginning was made toward the creation of Israel. In May of 1948, when the British relinquished the mandate, the Jews in Palestine, numbering more than 650,000, pooled all their moral and material forces and proclaimed their independence.

Since then the new State of Israel has gone through many ordeals, and happily has come out of them physically stronger and morally unscathed. Today she is a powerful, dynamic, democratic force in the Middle East, a decisive force to be reckoned with in all Middle Eastern affairs. On the 13th anniversary of the birth of Israel we all wish its citizens peace, prosperity and happiness.

Economic Espionage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I enclose therewith an article appearing in Bulletin No. 45, 1961, which is one of the greatest of the anti-Communist periodicals of West Germany. It has to do with the Leipzig Trade Fair. On March 1, 1961, the following was part of an interview broadcast by the North German Broadcasting Corp., with a member of the Ministry for All-German Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, there is no length to which communism would not go to infiltrate the unsuspecting minds of any person anywhere on earth. One has only to travel to Germany and listen to the endless radio broadcasts from countless stations which carry on an everlasting program in the cause of communism. The voice of freedom and of democracy has only a few voices. The representative of the Ministry for All-German Affairs is one such voice.

The article follows:

BULLETIN No. 45, 1961—ECONOMIC ESPIONAGE

Leipzig as a center, methods of agent activity during the trade fair. On March 1, 1961, the North German Broadcasting Corp. relayed the following interview on the Leipzig Trade Fair with a member of the Ministry for All-German Affairs:

"Question. Dr. Zahn, you have been acquainted with conditions at the Leipzig Trade Fair for many years from your own personal experience. And you maintain that exhibitors and visitors who come to Leipzig from the Federal Republic can easily fall a victim to Soviet Zone economic espionage and also to the activity of political agents. On what do you base this view?

"Answer. The economic espionage consists in the fact that the people of the Leipzig Trade Fair Department are instructed to obtain as much information as possible about internal conditions in the firm in question, about production, manner of production, number of employees, size of the firm, etc., on the grounds that the order one intends giving is then decided accordingly. An economic business transaction is thus used as a bribe and in order to obtain information on matters which are actually beyond the scope of a normal business deal.

"Question. Are specially trained persons used for this purpose?

"Answer. The majority of them are trained. I would say that at least 70 to 75 percent of the competent persons in this case, even down to the shorthand typists, are nowadays instructed to engage in economic espionage—for that is what it is—as part of their work.

"Question. And they are therefore also members of the intelligence services of the Soviet Zone?

"Answer. The evening training courses which are held in the Leipzig Trade Fair Department for specially selected persons undoubtedly serve this purpose.

"Question. You also said that visitors to the trade fair may easily fall a victim to agent activity. On what do you base your opinion in this respect?

"Answer. The activity of the agents consists in the fact that they call on visitors and involve them in noncommittal conversation and then want to know this and that, and try to get a bit friendly with them in order to get information which is of interest to them from these visitors to the fair. On one occasion I ascertained—and I was also assured from another quarter that this is actually the case—that special accommodation fitted up with concealed listening-in appliances is given to guests who are of particular interest to the Soviet Zone, and that any conversation carried on in such rooms is promptly recorded on a sound tape.

"Question. That would mean that the staff in such places of accommodation also belong to the intelligence service and to the network of agents?

"Answer. That can be assumed for certain, for in my opinion, and I do not hesitate to say so, Leipzig today is the center of Soviet zone or East bloc espionage. One has to be particularly on one's guard if one goes to a night club; they are usually very crowded, and the Leipzig Trade Fair Department issues tickets in advance to ensure that visitors get a seat. These places are teeming with agents and persons in the pay of the intelligence service, who try to get information out of their victims when the latter are under the influence of alcohol.

"Question. Since you are an authority, as it were, on this subject, what advice would you give exhibitors and visitors to the Leipzig Trade Fair?

"Answer. I think every person who goes to the trade fair, whether as an exhibitor or as a visitor, should realize beforehand that he runs the danger of being approached by agents and spies there, and that he should behave accordingly. A word too little is better than a word too much."

Commendation for the Czech Newspaper Ceske Listy and Its Publisher, Mr. Milos Svoboda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it was my great privilege this morning to interview Mr. George Brada, of Munich, Germany, who is of Czech extraction and completely dedicated to the release of his beloved homeland from the tyranny of the Communist oppressor. Our conversation served to rekindle my sympathy for these valiant people and reminded me that we must be eternally vigilant if other free peoples are not to suffer a like fate.

Mr. Speaker, 11 years ago, in April 1945, the so-called Kosice program of the Czechoslovak National Front Government under the Communist Zdenek Fierlinger, now President of the Red Parliament in Prague, was proclaimed in Kosice, Slovakia.

The pattern of the Communist takeover in Czechoslovakia was the same as in all other countries, in which the Communists seized power through infiltration and subversion. The Special Report No. 8 of the Select Committee on Communist Aggression of the House of Representatives, headed by former Congressman Charles J. Kersten, of December 31, 1954, stated on pages 17 and 18—

It should be pointed out that the Communist advance in Czechoslovakia was greatly facilitated by the behavior of the non-Communist political parties and their leaders.

Especially the naive belief in the possibility of coexistence with the Communists, shared in different degrees by practically and Czech politicians, was responsible for the extreme ease with which the Communist Party took power in 1948. The signing of the Soviet-Czechoslovak agreement on December 12, 1943, and especially the proclamation of the Kosice program of April 5, 1945, opened the door for an unobstructed drive on the part of the Communists to seize full power in the country.

Far more fateful for the people (especially in Bohemia and Moravia) was the fact that they were misinformed by many fellow-traveling intellectuals by means of newspapers, books, and through all media of communication as to the real nature of communism, cleverly described for years even prior to World War II as undergoing an evolution toward a democratic, humanitarian ideology.

The apparently easy success of the Communists in the post World War II period in which a climate of confusion and ignorance is easily understood and should also serve as a strong warning to the still free nations of the world.

We have seen that the same pattern was used also in the take-over of China and, more recently, of Cuba. Indeed, the warnings of the Kersten committee are today more timely than ever. And in this connection praise belongs to the Czech exile newspaper Ceske Listy, published in Munich, Germany, by Mr. Milos Svoboda. Mr. Svoboda has been revealing the Communist tactics and bringing these facts to the attention of the Czech exiles and refugees and old Czech settlers in the free world. His newspaper should be commended and I hope that it will successfully continue its work and reveal the truth of the Communist tactics and serve thus not only the interests of the Czech people, but also those of all nations including the United States.

Any Real Gains in J.F.K. Tax Plan?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Journal Star:

ANY REAL GAINS IN J.F.K. TAX PLAN?

The Kennedy economic stimulus program, for which we held such high hopes, has turned out to be a disappointing dud.

In the proposal to quit grabbing off more than half of corporate profit where such moneys are used for expansion and new enterprise, the administration reveals that it is aware of the problem.

They seem to recognize that the notion that the excess profits tax would discourage profits and encourage business to spend those 48-cent dollars was a naive, professorial dream that ignored the facts of life.

What really happened, of course, was that to maintain its financial integrity and have a level of actual profit to serve its needs, business did not get more careless about profit, but worked all the harder to maintain the after taxes level by increasing their before taxes profits.

Instead of relaxing the pressure, the law has increased the squeeze on income dollars and intensified the fight for those dollars between the wage earner and the operators.

Part of the new program seems to recognize that experience and seeks to correct it in a way that will stimulate new enterprise and additional jobs.

But then they chicken out.

They balanced it out by negating the whole thing and proposing, at the same time, to put more pressure on via dividends.

It also, apparently, is based on the theory that increasing the taxes on dividends will cause business to put in less money for dividends and more for expansion.

That's the same mistake all over again and completely ignores the reality of human nature and the reality of business necessity.

In fact, of course, in order to maintain the level of "take home" return for investment, most business will respond with a new drive for more profits in order to absorb the tax and still have as much left over.

This is pretty simple human nature, and it is also an economic necessity.

Without a fair return for the use of money, material, machinery, tools, or any form of capital, it dries up. The business with a profit squeeze so tight it cannot accumulate money, cannot borrow money, and cannot attract investors is sunk.

So, of course, this proposal is a blow at small investors—the healthiest development on our economic scene.

In addition, the combination of a need for more profits to meet new dividend taxes, and the need for more profits to take advantage of the tax-free expansion feature, screws on a double pressure against such things as wage increases, and a double pressure on managements to find cheaper ways to operate—i.e., automation.

Thus, the something-for-everybody approach to the economic problem, actually seems to cancel itself out and would be more likely to make things worse than better.

Railroads—Truckers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Mr. Warren A. Colpo, of Cheektowaga, N.Y., I am pleased to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the following: (a) an article entitled "Railroads," taken from the April 14 issue of Time magazine; (b) a letter dated April 7 from Time to Mr. Colpo; (c) a letter dated April 18 from Mr. Colpo to Time.

[From Time, Apr. 14, 1961]

RAILROADS—HOT FIGHT WITH HOFFA

In the long and bitter battle between the railroads and the truckers, the railroads are making new gains by inducing their opponents to defect. Their weapon: piggybacking, the carrying of freight-loaded truck bodies on railroad flatcars. Truck piggyback service for general freight has doubled in 2 years, become the rails' most profitable single freight operation. Last week six of the biggest U.S. trucking firms joined in a new company to cooperate with the Erie-Lackawanna Railroad in building special piggyback terminals for general freight in Jersey City and Chicago.

All this has not gone unnoticed by Teamster boss James Riddle Hoffa, a general who does not like to see his troops being ridden out of town on a rail. Piggybacking, claims Hoffa, has already cost the jobs of 20,000 teamsters. To fight the rails, he is pushing a new tax on truckers, requiring them to pay $5 into the union's welfare or pension funds, beginning next year for every truck they piggyback. Hoffa has already signed the first such contract with Midwest truckers, is pressuring other truckers to sign up. He has also launched a full-scale public relations barrage against the railroads, hoping to stir up support for an amendment to the Interstate Commerce Act that would limit the rails' power to undercut freight charges on piggyback runs.

POLITE REBUTTAL

The rails have gone a step farther than piggybacking. They have developed their own 3-deck, 15-auto flatcars that are helping them win back a big slice of the new-car hauling business lost to truckers. Once, the railroads moved 75 percent of all new autos. But the truckers devised efficient trailers that undercut railroad charges, by 1959 had left the rails only 8 percent of the business. Now the rails are grabbing a bigger share by charging only half as much as truckers on long hauls. One reason: on a cross-country haul, each flatcar replaces at least three high-wage truckdrivers. By year's end, Ford expects to ship 35 percent of its cars by rail, Chrysler 40 percent, American Motors 50 percent, Studebaker 70 percent. General Motors, which has widely scattered plants close to markets, ships less by rail than the others.

Ford Motor Co., where the Teamsters stand to lose the most business, is being subjected to the biggest mail barrage emphasizing the number of drivers being thrown out of work. Ford answers with a form letter politely pointing out that the Teamsters originally threw railroad workers out of jobs when they took away the rails' auto-hauling business, assures complainants that trucks will continue to handle the majority of the volume of car shipments. On hauls of up to 300 miles, trucks are still more economical; but for anything longer, when drivers must be put up overnight, rails win hands down. Even Hoffa's $5 tax will not cut seriously into the savings on long hauls.

Hot war? The fight for auto freight may get rougher than words. The St. Louis-San Francisco Railroad, which developed the first three-level cars (Time, Oct. 24), has already run into some mysterious acts of sabotage. Acid dumped from highway overpasses ruined the paint jobs on one shipment of 29 autos and on another 150. The railroad had to pay $484,000 for the damage. Other railroads have had cars damaged by shotgun blast or peppered with rocks. To guard the shipments, Frisco's auto trains now carry an extra caboose and an extra crew.

TIME,
New York, April 7, 1961.

DEAR MR. COLPO: It is Time's view that piggybacking can be beneficial to everyone concerned: truckers, railroads, shippers, and the general public. Obviously, however, piggybacking as well as the whole general subject of rail and truck competition are complex and controversial matters. Time has examined aspects of this competition in the past and will continue to do so in the future, whenever developments in it are significant and newsworthy. In the meantime, we appreciated having your thoughtful presentation of some of the dangers inherent in the railroads' massive effort to improve their competitive position in the freight business. Excerpts from your letter were considered for publication, but unfortunately, lost out in the keen competition for space; of the hundreds of letters we receive each week, we have room in the column for only a handful. Thank you very much for letting us hear from you on a subject of great importance to the transportation industry and to the health of the economy.

Cordially yours,

ISABEL KOURI,
(For the Editors).

BUFFALO, N.Y., *April 18, 1961.*

ISABEL KOURI,
Time, Time and Life Building,
New York 20, N.Y.

DEAR MISS KOURI: In your anxiety to see Hoffa destroyed, you are rendered helpless to see the grim truth as attested to by the obvious facts. Your April 14 article infers that this is largely a battle between the railroads and Hoffa. The reader gains the impression that the conflict is one within the realm of "union busting" tactics, when in reality, it is a battle between two giant industries with Hoffa playing a comparatively minor role. Hoffa merely represents the workers in one of the two industries involved, but Time would have its readers believe otherwise. To Time, the thousands that face unemployment are not decent husbands, fathers, breadwinners, citizen taxpayers; they are rather, Hoffa henchmen, and they are about

to receive their just desserts along with Hoffa.

Re Ford's polite form letter: the contention that the truckers were the original cause of an equal loss of jobs on the railroads is nothing more than a patent lie. Even Time should be able to understand that a seven-man railroad crew is capable of moving the same amount of goods that would require 300 men using highway equipment. Along with Time, Ford contends, even before a congressional committee, that the reduced labor costs is a good thing insofar as the public welfare is concerned. But the fact is that Ford was and is still charging its dealers and the buying public for services that they are not receiving. Ford stated that it saved $40 million in 1960 by using rail, but the actual truth is that Ford profited this amount since Ford was and is charging over-the-highway rates while securing for Ford the savings afforded by the use of rail.

The public is therefore receiving a double-barreled dose of monopolistic practices. It is being charged for the services of an industry now largely nonexistent, while it must at the same time make up for the loss of taxes and employment heretofore offered by that industry.

I question the depth of your alleged investigation into the facts because the foregoing information is a matter of general knowledge within the industry, and I therefore fail to see the logic of your statement to me, that Time believes piggybacking to be a good think for all concerned.

Your April 14 article implies a certain delight over the fact that, thus far, six of the biggest trucking companies have been forced to defect to the railroads. The inference here is not that the jobs of still more thousands of decent Americans is imperiled, but rather that Hoffa and his "troops" are being ridden out of town on a rail. It seems to me that Time and other influential news sources have needlessly confused Hoffa with a truck-railroad situation; whereby the general public as well as our legislators have not had an opportunity to gain a true perspective of the overall situation.

In the resulting confusion, Ford, as well as other shippers, is busily engaged in bleeding every last penny from the public, all the while piously declaring that there at last is true competition with the transportation industry, and that the public welfare is at last being served.

Why won't Time leave Hoffa to the Attorney General, and go back to reporting the unvarnished truth to its readers? Why must it be necessary to destroy an entire industry in order to get at one man?

Sincerely yours,

WARREN A. COLPO.

Thirteenth Anniversary of Israel Independence

SPEECH

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, today we join with Israel in celebration of the 13th anniversary of her independence, a milestone in the history of human freedom. In 1947, under the leadership of the United States, the General Assembly of the United Nations resolved that there would be established in Palestine an Arab and a Jewish state. A few months later the National Council of the Jewish community in Palestine proclaimed the State of Israel. Since that day the people of Israel have stood forthright as an independent state, a full member of the United Nations.

The first task of the Israelis was to rebuild their country. They reclaimed the land, turning desert and swamp into green pastures. New cities were built; old ones expanded at a fantastic rate. Factories were built, and the standard of living of the citizens soared.

Having rejuvenated their own country, the people of Israel did not stop. Their assistance was then channeled to the less developed countries. As the United States and other countries had helped Israel in her hour of need, so Israel is now helping the new nations of Asia and Africa. This year 1,000 Asian and African students are expected to study in schools throughout Israel. More than 400 Israeli technical experts have been sent abroad. In Ghana, Israel contributed 40 percent of the capital necessary to establish the country's steamship line, the Black Star Line. Trained and experienced Israelis will run the line for 5 years, and then it will be turned over to the Ghanians. A similar procedure was followed with a construction firm and Israel has provided technical personnel for a Ghana nautical academy, and to teach civil engineering. Some of the other states which Israel has helped in similar ways are Burma, Liberia, the Congo, and Sierre Leone. It is this relationship between states—a mutual give and take—which strengthens self-sufficiency and independence, and which closes the door to Communist infiltration. I salute the people of Israel on this day of their independence.

Is Freedom a Frankenstein?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Plain Speaker of Hazleton, Pa., dated April 11, 1961.

[From the Plain Speaker, Hazleton, Pa., Apr. 11, 1961]

IS FREEDOM A FRANKENSTEIN?

Having seen the motion picture "Operation Abolition" produced for the House Committee on Un-American Activities, we find it difficult to comprehend the motive behind a resolution adopted by Wyoming Valley ministers asking for an "explanation."

The resolution asks that organizations showing the film make it clear that there are objections and goes on to point out that the film has no standard credits and its producers are not identified.

This point of criticism can be quickly judged. How many film credits can you recall from motion pictures you have seen?

"Operation Abolition" is a documentary film prepared for the House Committee on Un-American Activities which is headed by Congressman FRANCIS E. WALTER, Easton, whose district includes Carbon County.

The film was compiled from newsreel clips of the student riots which occurred in San Francisco in May 1960 when Walter's committee attempted to hold hearings on Communist subversion in the San Francisco area.

Since its release the film has been the subject of sniping from various sources, a situation which arouses the suspicion that an organized underhand effort is being made to discredit it and the committee.

Our advice to anyone questioning the authenticity of this film is simple: See it.

It is a simple matter for the producer of an acted-out documentary to slant his script in any way desired.

But "Operation Abolition" is not an acted film. It is a photographic account of what happened. It is a frightening example of how people can be duped into attempting to destroy the very basic freedoms the Communists have as their main target.

The disgraceful demonstrations at San Francisco were purported to show the objections of students to what they are presumed to believe are the unfair tactics of the committee.

What transpired at San Francisco is fully documented by the film. The actions of the Communist rabblerousers in making a shambles of the hearing are there for anyone to see.

Any religious group questioning the authenticity of this film would do well to review the remarks of six Protestant clergymen who were witnesses to the riots.

We would like to ask any critic of the committee how such complete and chaotic disregard for national, State, and city authority could be justified even by a really sincere objector.

We would like to ask what prompts the attacks on the Walter committee from sources which ordinarily do not make news as adherents or opponents of major public issues?

We think these attacks are part of a Communist-inspired effort to discredit the Walter committee.

We do not infer that groups such as the Wyoming Valley ministers are themselves supporting communism. We believe that many sincere-minded champions of American liberty are being misled by inaccurate information.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities was recently given a tremendous vote of confidence by Congress with only 6 dissenting votes to a resolution providing for its continuance.

It has been praised by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover who said its role 'in safeguarding our freedoms is well known to every patriotic citizen, and real Americans are not going to be fooled or misled by efforts to discredit its vital task."

But it is the target for abuse from Soviet Russia and the Communists. Apparently its work is beginning to hurt.

The fellow travelers and those blind to the Communist threat scream for the rights of the individual and cry persecution. They object to each and every probe of Communist infiltration on the grounds that the rights of individuals are being violated.

See "Operation Abolition" and decide for yourself whose rights were violated.

Take the case of the John Birch Society currently under fire. It is organized to fight communism and has enlisted some of the Nation's leading citizens as members. Now it is being assailed as Fascist and neo-Nazi. A favorite tactic of the Communists is to brand any opposition as dictatorial.

As a newspaper whose very existence depends on a free press we would be the first to champion the rights of free speech, free assembly and free thinking, and the other rights of our Constitution.

But we think it is time that the people of the United States wake up to the fact that our enemies are using these very rights as weapons to destroy us.

Is freedom to become a Frankenstein monster and destroy all that America stands for? Only the American people can decide.

Goodby America and Thank You Dr. Gargiulo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am privileged to include a farewell address made by Lt. Comdr. Herbert G. Karlsruher, Dental Corps, Chilean Navy, at the naval hospital, Philadelphia, Pa., prior to his departure to his native land of Chile.

I personally recommend his speech to the membership of the House because of its sincerity and because it clearly demonstrates our good neighbor policy.

Of course, Philadelphia is known as the City of Brotherly Love, but even more important is the fact that Captain Gargiulo, who is the Chief of the Dental Service at the Philadelphia Naval Hospital, and his staff acted far beyond the call of duty to welcome Dr. Karlsruher and his family to their temporary home:

MY DEAR FRIENDS: It is not easy for me to find the proper words to express my feelings at this moment. I wish I had attended some of those toastmasters meetings with Captain Bowman. But I hope that you will understand what I will say, because I mean every word of it.

When I came to this wonderful country of yours, I was not exactly happy. I had not asked to be sent here. We were just going into summer, the children were out of school and we had planned to spend the vacation in our country house.

But that was not my only reason for not being particularly happy to be sent to the United States.

I knew that I would have to live and work with strangers, not even knowing much of their language. And I didn't know how I would be received and accepted. Well, now I know that all my fears were unwarranted.

It is true, that instead of the wonderful Chilean summer, I had one of your worst winters, with below zero temperatures, winds of 60 miles and more, rain, sleet, storms and snow, lots of snow. But I enjoyed the winter, even those 30 inches or so of snow.

And what wonderful people I met here. Everyone, everywhere was friendly, helpful, and understanding. Very soon indeed, I began to feel at ease, not being the very stranger I had feared to be, and the naval hospital became a home for me here in Philadelphia.

Captain Gargiulo, Captain Bowman, Commander Guay, Dr. Hale, Dr. Besley, Dr. Loizeaux, Mrs. Matthews, Chief Lonergan, Samford, Raub, McClain, Beech, Elkins, Robertson, Green, Surotchak, Kennett, the whole family of the dental department made every possible effort to make my being among them as nice and pleasant as possible. I was invited to official and non-official parties, I was asked to many of their homes, I met their wives, their children, other members of their families, and also their pets. I was allowed to share their interests, their happiness, and sometimes even their troubles.

All this made me very happy and I thank you very, very much for it. And I do it also in the name of Mrs. Karlsruher, to whom all your kindness and friendship was extended when she came to join me some 6 weeks ago.

I had wonderful teachers among you. I will name only two: Capt. Edward Gargiulo, the surgeon, and Capt. John Bowman, the prosthodontist. What they taught me is far more than they themselves imagine. It is a preciously guarded treasure I am taking home with me, for which I would like to express my deepest gratitude, my own as well as that of the Chilean Navy.

But all the rest of you have been wonderful teachers too. Maybe you do not even realize it. While showing me things, odd and important things, while talking with me about hundreds of subjects, you taught me that the American people are much more than just the most advanced in science and knowledge and in power in the present days, but also the most human, tolerant, and friendly. And this, maybe, is the most important thing I am taking home with me, for it is the understanding between people, the respect which one nation has for the other, not because of military power, but because of the kind of its people, that we will have peace and a better world in which to live.

In a few more days I will be on my way home. I am leaving satisfied, happy, and sorrowful. Satisfied because I have the feeling that my mission here has been happily accomplished. Happy because I had such a wonderful, unforgettable time in this country, because I was allowed to share your homes, because I met so many fine people and because I made real and good friends among you.

But I am sad too, because I know that very likely I am not going to meet many of you again. But one never knows, and it is really a small world, especially in these days of jet planes and missiles. Every year several ships of your Navy call in Valparaiso. Maybe one of you will be on board. Commander Guay is probably the first I will meet again when his ship, the U.S.S. *Midway*, docks in my home city. I want all of you to know that you will always have a friend there waiting to welcome you, to take care of you, and whose home shall be yours.

Thank you again, my good friends, thank you for all and everything and God bless you.

HERBERT KARLSRUHER.

To Avoid It, Accept It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. FORRESTER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, the April 18, 1961, issue of Christian Economics carries an article entitled "To Avoid It, Accept It," which is so sound that it should appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This article reads as follows:

TO AVOID IT, ACCEPT IT

The press reports Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., special assistant to the President, as saying that the best security against communism is for the welfare state to provide food, clothing, shelter, education, and opportunity for the people. But that is communism. So Dr. Schlesinger would have us avoid communism by adopting it.

No state could make a serious attempt to provide all its people the goods and services involved in that program without controlling their education, activities, incomes, and the content of their minds.

Most people would make little effort of their own if the state were providing these things for them. Even the Soviet Union has not adopted so complete a program for the destruction of individual effort, initiative, and human personality.

Water Needs of the Nation From 1980 to 2000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, Oklahoma is fortunate to have in her senior Senator a man not only of great ability and experience, but vision, as well. Since first embarking on his long and distinguished career of public service, ROBERT S. KERR has been a powerful champion of the conservation and development of our Nation's natural resources. He has gained respect as an authority in the field of water resources development. He has spearheaded a national awakening of the importance of our resources. He has even authored a book entitled "Land, Wood, and Water."

On April 17, 1961, Senator KERR addressed the Eighth National Watershed Congress, an organization whose members have played an important role in the progress of the water development program. The Senator's remarks, "Water Needs of the Nation from 1980 to 2000," will be of interest to many of our colleagues, providing a clear-cut challenge which we cannot ignore.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert the following and commend it to the attention of all who are concerned with America's growth and prosperity:

WATER NEEDS OF THE NATION FROM 1980 TO 2000

(Speech by Senator ROBERT S. KERR, of Oklahoma, before the Eighth National Watershed Congress in Tucson, Ariz., April 17, 1961)

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, thank you for letting me come here and be the first speaker on your program. This bids fair to be a great congress. Considering the strength and vigor of the many organizations participating in it, I am tempted to say it promises to be the greatest congress I've ever attended. But I won't. Back in Washington we are having a Congress, the 87th, and it is composed of many fine fellows who knows theirs is going to be the greatest Congress ever. And, with the help of this Eighth Annual Watershed Congress, that Congress in session in Washington may well wind up deserving the fanciest superlatives you can think of. Certainly, this is an extremely important session of the National Congress insofar as our future water needs are concerned.

I realize the watershed congress has traditionally avoided direct action in its own name, preferring to accomplish the common aims of its member groups through the separate organizations participating in it. However, I hope the discussions and other features of this meeting will lead to positive action on many fronts aimed at the general

objective of solving the water problems we face in the next 20 to 40 years.

My subject is the water needs of the Nation in the period from 1980 to the year 2000. When considered with your general theme, "The Count-Down on Water," it strikes me as covering about the most important domestic issue the country faces insofar as its future economic growth and prosperity are concerned. This congress, and the organizations taking part in it, has been of great public service in this area in the past, and will, I am sure, contribute greatly in the future.

Arizona seems to me to be a most appropriate place to ponder just where we are in the count-down on water. Arizona, location of the pioneering reclamation project in the United States, the Salt River project, offers many object lessons for the student of water resources. Some of the lessons date back 1,800 years to the Hohokams, a prehistoric Indian tribe that first irrigated the Salt River Valley. Certainly, if we can find permanent solutions for the water problems of the arid regions of the Southwest, we can surmount the difficulties which will arise when water also grows short in the wetter areas of the Nation. Necessity is the mother of invention. Some of today's inventions for water-short lands will someday help the survival of areas where water at present is plentiful.

Arizona has had many heroes in the field of water development. Majestic, life-giving reservoirs, irrigation canals, and other facilities in this State serve as their monuments. One Arizona man, in particular, stands out, the Honorable CARL HAYDEN. We who have worked with Senator HAYDEN know well why his career, stretching all the way back to statehood in 1912, has brought him the unswerving support of his fellow citizens. We understand why the little Arizona schoolgirl, when asked to name the three separate branches of National Government, replied, "executive, judicial, and Senator HAYDEN."

Arizona also can be proud, along with members of this watershed congress, that President Kennedy named as his Secretary of Interior, the Honorable Stewart L. Udall. With Mr. Udall's genius in the Department of Interior, and Senator HAYDEN's leadership of the all-important Senate Appropriations Committee, not only Arizona but all of the Nation stands to benefit. Now—and I'm being facetious—if some of these benefits accrue to the benefit of my other distinguished colleague from Arizona, Senator GOLDWATER, I am sure Senator HAYDEN and other members of my political party will applaud the benefits despite any political reservations concerning the recipient thereof. Seriously, I have the highest personal regard for BARRY GOLDWATER and partisan political considerations must not interfere with the conservation of water and other natural resources. I hope my remarks prove the need for more bipartisan action.

Our future water needs must be considered in broad perspective. I am happy to see that your program this afternoon has the theme, "Multiple Use of Watersheds." The word "watershed" has different connotations for different people. In Webster, "watershed" is defined as the area draining into any given creek, stream, lake or river.

The "Countdown on Water" theme of this congress embodies a broader look at problems in which local watersheds are factors of varying importance. I solicit, therefore, your consideration of another concept—the basinwide interagency approach. This larger concept has been successful in my part of the country to a remarkable degree. It is interesting to note that it is gaining more and more support throughout the country. A recent publication of the U.S. Department of Agriculture points out that under Public Law 566, as amended by Public Law 1018, the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, Congress—the National Congress, that is—made it clear this law would be used, quote, "to supplement both our present soil and water conservation programs and our programs for development and flood protection of major river valleys."

In my home State, we are proud of the developments that are underway in the Arkansas, White, and Red River Basins. Oklahomans took the lead more than 20 years ago in establishing this approach. My first bill when I went to the U.S. Senate in 1949 created the Interagency Study Commission of these basins. This study covered 180 million acres, including all of Oklahoma and parts of Colorado, New Mexico, Kansas, Arkansas, Missouri, Texas, and Louisiana. President Truman, at the time, noted that for the first time there had been specifically recognized in such legislation the need for a broad-scale study of the multiple uses of the land and water resources of a river basin.

Since that mammoth study was completed, a coordinated system of land, wood, and water conservation has been under construction in the area. It has been labeled the "Kerr plan," a label that does injustice to a large number of inspired visionaries—starting with my dad—who taught me the value of land, wood, and water. I chose those magic words, "Land, Wood and Water," for the title of a book published last year, and I tried in the book to give credit to the many people who contributed to the dream which is fast becoming reality in Oklahoma.

My activities in this field also contributed to the publication of another book recently, a volume which the U.S. Government has made available in quantity, free, for those registered for this meeting. It is the report of the Select Committee on National Water Resources which the Senate created in 1959. This committee completed its work in January.

The committee was told repeatedly that any inquiry into the Nation's potential water supply necessarily required an appraisal of conservation programs affecting all of our natural resources. I hope that if you have not had a chance to study this report, you will pick up a copy while here.

The committee found that the Nation's water supply, in relation to demands, is shrinking rapidly. Withdrawals now are about 300 billion gallons daily. Based on medium projections of the population increase, by 1980 demands on the Nation's water resources will almost double, and they will more than triple by the year 2000. If, as the committee hoped, the Nation's growth rate is greater than the medium estimates, these increased demands for water will come upon us much faster. The committee assumed that the Nation's economy will continue to grow at the rate achieved in the past, and that there will be relatively little change in the present methods of water use—and water waste. The committee found five major categories of effort needed for meeting prospective demands on a long-range basis. I would like to recite these before I give you a few statistical details based on some charts taken from the committee report. The charts will support these general conclusions:

(1) We need to improve the regulation of streamflow through the construction of surface reservoirs and through better watershed management.

(2) We must improve the quality of our streams through more adequate pollution abatement. I prefer the term "water quality management" to pollution abatement, however.

(3) We must make better use of underground storage.

(4) More water-saving techniques must be developed in the fields of irrigation, sewage treatment, and substitution of air for water cooling should be encourage in areas of potential water shortage.

(5) Greater support must be given research programs leading to cheaper desalting methods, weather modification, or other methods of increasing natural water yield.

All of these objectives require planning now for action in the future. For this reason, I have relabeled a chart taken from page 7 of the committee report and enlarged it for your perusal. I have given the chart the label, "Why We Need More Planning Now," because it shows clearly that total withdrawals by the year 2000 will be fairly close to the total streamflow in the United States, exclusive of Alaska and Hawaii. As of 1954, the streamflow was about 1,100 billion gallons a day, and demands for withdrawals that year were about equal to 27 percent of streamflow. The withdrawals, you will note, are divided into consumptive and nonconsumptive uses, and the committee obtained a breakdown showing withdrawals for irrigation, municipal, industrial, and power cooling uses.

I want to point out also that the committee took into consideration water losses which may result in conservation practices for watershed improvement. This factor is shown at the opposite end of the bars illustrating the anticipated total withdrawals in 1980 and 2000.

The report of the committee points out that in addition to water to provide for consumptive uses or depletion, tremendous quantities of water will be needed in our flowing streams for hydroelectric power production, navigation, recreation, fish habitat, and pollution abatement—water quality management. Estimates of flow requirements for these purposes were obtained. In the second chart, it is assumed that if water requirements for navigation are met, and if water of adequate quality for fish life is maintained, the needs of recreation will be met.

This second chart, on streamflow uses, is lifted from page 10 of the committee's basic report. The most significant factor shown in it is the estimate of flows needed to maintain the water quality of our streams. No figure was available for the current dilution requirement for pollution abatement, either in 1954 or at present, but experts convinced the committee that vast quantities would be needed for this purpose in future years. The quantities shown as required for maintenance of water quality in 1980 and 2000 are projected on the basis that the desired quality will be achieved by the cheapest combination of waste treatment facilities and storage reservoirs to provide sustained flows for dilution of effluent.

With the construction of such reservoirs, there will be many opportunities to develop hydroelectric power, but since there are other sources of electric power, the quantities of flow needed for cleaning of water were assumed to be controlling.

I would like to come back to the pollution problem in a moment, but first let me show you a third chart, this one taken from the last of the 32 committee prints which were published to substantiate the committee's findings. These prints, incidentally, give in detail facts presented to the committee during its series of 26 hearings throughout the United States. More than 150,000 copies of the committee's report or prints have been sent so far to citizens requesting them.

I don't know whether you approve of the color scheme or not, but personally, I like this chart best of all. It forcefully shows how well we can meet our water problems in 1980 and 2000, based on the present outlook for the various water resource regions of the Nation. The Nation's water resources are not uniformly distributed, and full development of all of the available resources are needed before 1980 in the five regions at the bottom of the scale. These are the South Pacific which includes southern California, the upper Rio Grande and Pecos Rivers, the Colo-

rado River which includes most of Arizona plus the rest of the Colorado's watershed, the upper Missouri and the great basin area of Utah and Nevada. By the year 2000, full development will be needed in three other regions. I am confident that everyone here agrees with me that the comprehensive development of these areas must proceed with all possible speed.

This confidence in your understanding of the general problem prompts me to single out one particularly knotty problem, water quality management, for your earnest consideration.

Pollution is never a pleasant subject, particularly when we start discussing specific problems. Often, the specifics are hardly mentionable in polite company. The tragedy of the Potomac River fits this pattern to a degree. I have brought with me today a set of pictures furnished by the U.S. Public Health Service illustrating some of the problems of the Potomac where it flows past our National Capital.

In this first slide, we see rubbish stacked on the shores of this historic river upstream from the intakes that draw water into the District of Columbia Metropolitan Water District. This is a trash dump—a result of human carelessness and a lack of public understanding. The materials entering the stream from this dump are similar to those that would be emitted by a sewage pipe.

Slide No. 2: Here is another picture that is not pretty and not pleasant to look at. These are bubbles of scum filled with sewer gas rising from the bottom of Four Mile Run as it enters the Potomac River from Virginia. This gas is from decaying sewage solids that have settled on the bottom of Four Mile Run.

Slide No. 3: This is another picture of Four Mile Run a short distance above its joining with the Potomac. Blue-green algae are floating slowly downstream toward the historic grandeur of our Nation's Capital. Blue-green algae grows in polluted rivers and it decays and contributes to offensive odors.

Slide No. 4: Here is the outlet of Rock Creek sewer; normally a storm sewer but one of the major contributors to the pollution of the Potomac. After a heavy rain this huge pipe flushes tons of untreated sewage into the Potomac. The Public Health Service researcher who took this picture later analyzed the fish caught by the man standing on the bridge. He found the catfish had been feeding on sewage.

Slide No. 5: This is almost too repulsive to look at. It shows sewage solids floating in the Potomac River near our Nation's Capital. This horrible mess flows from the Rock Creek sewer.

Slide No. 6: This picture was taken a short distance below the Key Bridge which leads from the District of Columbia to Virginia just a few miles from the Capitol Building. The stuff floating on the water speaks indecently for itself.

The Potomac River, grossly contaminated by sewage, is far too typical in our Nation today. Man has perpetrated this enormous folly in every part of the country. One report to our committee advised that our cities are now receiving approximately twice as much pollutant from municipal sewage systems alone as was considered safe in 1955. Here are some slides showing other pollution problems, at random, across the Nation:

Slide No. 7: This shows blood pollution of the Jean Petit River in Arkansas caused by wastes from a small custom packing plant. Near this spot people were fishing for gar which had gathered in the area. These rough fish had been attracted by the wastes.

Slide No. 8: Here we have a scene that is far too common—showing raw sewage spilling into what would otherwise be a beautiful river. The picture was taken a few years ago at Idaho Falls where a municipal outfall discharged directly into the Snake River.

Slide No. 9: Here is evidence of industrial pollution on the Holston River, downstream from Kingsport, Tenn. Those slimy organisms grow only in water so foul nothing of value can survive in it.

Slide No. 10: Another example of industrial wastes, this time below an oil refinery in Arkansas. The oil has collected behind obstructions in the stream.

Slide No. 11: This may be destroying my buildup, but I couldn't show that series of pictures without providing some visual relief for you. Here is the way water ought to look. The picture was made at Big Falls on Henry's Fork of the Green River. The shocking pictures which preceded it more accurately, however, illustrate the peril of our position.

As I mentioned earlier, we must devote more and more of our streamflow resources in this country to pollution abatement, and to this end, I have offered legislation to the Congress this year which meets the need head on.

My proposal, Senate bill 120, also would increase Federal support for the construction of sewage disposal plants. It also would authorize an intensive 5-year program of research in developing new methods of treating sewage. We might as well face the brutal facts—we will have to achieve virtually complete storage of river flows in most of our country to meet the water needs of this century.

Most Americans will be drinking, cooking with, bathing in, and otherwise using secondhand or thirdhand water. This means water will have been used, and purified, and used again not once, or twice, but perhaps several times.

My bill would emphasize the responsibility of the Surgeon General in participating in planning reservoir capacity and releases of water where such capacity and releases might be used to aid in improving the quality of water for municipal and industrial uses, fish and wildlife, and other such purposes.

I was bitterly disappointed last year when President Eisenhower vetoed a clean water bill designed to expand a program launched in 1956. He actually rejected the advice of his own Health, Education, and Welfare Department. Since then, Public Health Service leaders have stated repeatedly our present laws are inadequate to keep up with the program. The Public Health Service told me last week the backlog of needed sewage facilities in this Nation is estimated at $1.9 billion.

Now, however, the prospects have brightened considerably for the passage and Presidential approval of legislation designed to strengthen this and other phases of our water resources program. I don't know what the weather has been like lately in Gettysburg, Pa., or Palm Springs, Calif., but I can tell you the political climate in Washington has improved tremendously. We expect our water quality management bill, as well as all other measures dealing with natural resources development, to fare much better. They certainly will if you watershed partisans really work.

During the past 8 years, we have been slowed down or stopped by an administration wedded to the "no new starts" theme. But President Kennedy in his special message on natural resources to the Congress stated: "Pollution of our country's rivers and streams has, as a result of our rapid population and industrial growth and change, reached alarming proportions. To meet all needs, domestic, agricultural, industrial, recreational, we shall have to use and reuse the same water, maintaining quality as well as quantity. In many areas of the country we need new sources of supply, but in all areas we must protect the supplies we have."

The President specifically referred to Senate bill 120 as a recommended approach to the problem.

In this same message, the President endorsed our interagency river basin concept for the development of our water resources.

Therefore, from this vantage point in Arizona, not far from the pioneering reclamation project on the Salt River, we can view our water resources picture with optimism despite the greatly increased needs of the coming decades.

As chairman of the Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee, I have frequently heard scientists refer in recent months to the long leadtimes required for development of rockets and space vehicles. Lack of leadtime is now costing us dearly in our efforts to match Soviet Russian exploits. Insofar as our water problems are concerned, we still have the leadtime to make the countdown entirely successful if we act with sufficient vigor.

Just a few days ago, President Kennedy clearly demonstrated his vision and imagination to press forward on this new frontier. Out of the flurry of excitement over the Russian penetration of space came a calm statement from the President putting the water problem into sharp focus.

President Kennedy pointed out that "democracy is more durable in the long run," saying he hoped that the United States would be first in other areas, first in achievements that will bring more long-range benefits to mankind.

And then, perceiving the romance and drama in the crusade for conservation, President Kennedy placed the scientific conquest of water problems on a par with the historic probe into space.

Specifically, he cited the effort of American scientists to find an inexpensive way to get fresh water from salt water and said that if this succeeds it "would really dwarf any other scientific accomplishments" from the standpoint of humanity's welfare.

This new accent on water problems gives us fresh hope and enthusiasm. Conservation has often been a hard and thankless battle. Now, the water man may be coming into his own. Water men and space men may be marching shoulder to shoulder in America's legions of honor.

And while we do honor and reward America's famed astronauts, let us fashion fitting citations of merit for the "hydronauts."

The "hydronauts" of the new frontier will crack the barriers of salinity control, complete conservation control and water quality control.

Then let these heroes of conservation be given due recognition by a thankful people and a grateful Government.

Miguel Ydigoras Fuentes: President of Guatemala

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in a statement to the House on March 13, 1961, I quoted an address by President Miguel Ydigoras Fuentes, of Guatemala, over the Manion Forum Network and commended the President for his effective repelling of an invasion of his country by forces of the international revolutionary conspiracy.

It is indeed a pleasure to quote his gracious acknowledgment, which follows:

MARCH 23, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: I wish to thank you very sincerely for your timed intervention at the U.S. House of Representatives and for your thoughtful courtesy of sending me a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with your statements to the House, in reference to my way of handling the unhappy problem of conquest of the Americas through subversions inspired and directed by the forces of international communism.

I feel indeed very gratified and much pleased to count among the good friends of Guatemala, such a distinguished member of the U.S. House of Representatives as you, and I make fervent vows for that friendship to flourish and for the democracy of our countries to remain firm and prevail ever for the sake of peace and prosperity of our American Continent.

With kindest regards,
Cordially yours,
MIGUEL YDIGORAS FUENTES,
President of Guatemala.

What Customs Brokers, Importers, Shippers, and Public Officials Say About Building a Customhouse 22 Miles Inland From the Harbor It Serves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Government is planning to build a customs house 22 miles from the harbor it serves. This is the truth, fantastic as it may seem. This is the customhouse for the twin ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach where the General Services Administration is planning construction at the downtown Los Angeles Civic Center, 22 miles inland. Here are samples of what customs brokers, importers, shippers, and public officials are saying about it:

Earl V. Sauls, vice president of Carmichael Forwarding Service & Custom House Brokers: "Locating the office of the Collector of Customs as well as the Appraiser of Merchandise in the contemplated new Federal Building at Temple Street and the Santa Ana Freeway would appear to be politically motivated. Relatively little customs bonded freight arrives in Los Angeles via motor truck. Los Angeles International Airport is closer to the harbor area, both by time and mileage, than it is to metropolitan Los Angeles. Admittedly, it would be expensive to move our office and staff to the harbor area. However, in the interest of efficiency, with lower cost of operation benefiting both the foreign trading public and the Government, we should ultimately gain thereby."

John P. Paralieu, terminal manager for Westfal-Larsen Co.: "It would save time and money for all of us if customs were located here. Now with customs headquarters in Los Angeles, 22 miles away, we face upward of 2 days' delay before we can get our cargo cleared for pickup by receivers."

U.S. Senator CLAIR ENGLE of California: "It's ridiculous to truck merchandise 22 miles from the harbor to a customhouse. They can make up their minds to get the customhouse where it ought to be, or not get any money for construction this year."

Resolution unanimously adopted by the California State Assembly: "The General Services Administration * * * is scheduled to begin construction of a customhouse at the Civic Center of Los Angeles. This will create great hardship and inconvenience for persons dealing with the Bureau of the Customs and employees of the Bureau of Customs." The resolution urged the construction of a customs office, appraisers' store and warehouse in the harbor area.

Los Angeles County Supervisor Burton W. Chace: "A new Federal customs headquarters should be mutually convenient to the port of Long Beach and the port of Los Angeles and located within the Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor area."

Los Angeles County Supervisor Frank G. Bonelli: "Downtown Los Angeles interests must reconcile themselves to locating the new customs headquarters in the harbor area where it belongs, or risk losing the entire $30 million Federal office building proposed for the Los Angeles Civic Center."

Edward Frank, president of Moreddi, Inc., one of the three largest importers of quality furniture in the United States: "Since our firm brings shipments into all the leading ports in the United States, we know that the location of a customhouse within the harbor area results in far more efficient handling and clearing of shipments. To the best of my knowledge, the customhouses in all of the leading ports of the United States are located within the immediate harbor area. Nearly all the importers in the Los Angeles area are located just as far from the Los Angeles Civic Center as from the port. I strongly feel that the port location for the customhouse would be much preferred over the civic center location."

John P. Davis, president of the Long Beach Board of Harbor Commissioners: "It is absurd to conceive of customs headquarters being located 22 miles away from the ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles. If this occurred in the port of New York, it could even be located in another State.

Illinois Endorses Study of Economics of Commercial Fisheries on Mississippi River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include the following letter I received from William T. Lodge, director, State of Illinois Department of Conservation:

STATE OF ILLINOIS
DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION,
Springfield, Ill., April 24, 1961.

Hon. MELVIN PRICE,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PRICE: The Upper Mississippi River Conservation Committee unanimously passed the following resolution at the annual meeting held in St. Louis, Mo., on January 10, 1961:

"It is moved that the Upper Mississippi River Conservation Committee request the proper administrative officer of each State and the Midwest Association of Conservation Commissioners to write to their Representatives in Congress stating the need of a study of the economics of the commercial fisheries of the Mississippi River and urge that they lend their support to the assignment of this study to the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries."

Official State Conservation Agencies of Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, Missouri, and Illinois are members of this organization. The Illinois Department of Conservation is wholeheartedly in favor of this joint resolution and ask your kind consideration and support.

Very truly yours,
WILLIAM T. LODGE,
Director.

None More Honorably Distinguished

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, there has only this week come to my attention an address delivered at the University of Virginia nearly a year ago by Rear Adm. Lamont Pugh, Surgeon General of the U.S. Navy from 1951 to 1955.

This address represents Admiral Pugh's speech of presentation apropos the dedication of two war memorial plaques commemorating 350 alumni of his alma mater who perished while serving in the Armed Forces of their Nation during World War II—321—and in the Korean war—29.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit this address for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

This desire stems from several stimuli: First, the literary quality of the offering; second, the cogency and timeliness of Admiral Pugh's remarks; and third, the author has honored the State of South Carolina by borrowing from two far-famed inscriptions that appear on monuments in my State. The first is incorporated in the opening sentence of the address, and while it is an original quotation from Milton's "Samson Agonistes," it appears on the tombstone of James Louis Pettigru, a distinguished South Carolina jurist, orator, statesman and patriot who was born at Abbeyville, S.C., May 10, 1789, and who died at Charleston March 9, 1863, and was buried there. Despite the fact that Mr. Pettigru's loyalties remained with the Union, he was held in highest esteem in Charleston. A copy of the classic Pettigru epitaph, Admiral Pugh informs me, was presented to him by Judge Lionel K. Legge of Charleston, Justice of the Supreme Court of South Carolina and a fellow member, with Admiral Pugh, of the Society of the Cincinnati.

The closing sentence of Admiral Pugh's tribute contains the opening lines of the inscription on the Confederate monument in front of the State capitol building in Columbia, S.C., and is certainly among the most beautiful

and most famous of all inscriptions of its kind in America.

COMMENTS BY REAR ADM. LAMONT PUGH, M.C., U.S. NAVY, RETIRED, APROPOS THE PRESENTATION OF TWO WAR MEMORIAL PLAQUES TO THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA, AT 9:30 A.M. SATURDAY, JUNE 11, 1960

Mr. President, ladies, and gentlemen, this is a solemn occasion, an occasion of serious import, but "nothing is here for tears, nothing to wail or knock the breast." Yet, one needs the habit of mental restraint and self control to contemplate and to comment upon the significance of observances of this kind uninfluenced by emotion.

The perpetuation of the memory and the honoring of war dead by one means, act, or device or another has, throughout the history of our country, been a highly cherished custom—in fact, something of a fetish and a faith—with us. It is therefore particularly fitting that we here take appropriate cognizance of the alumni of the University of Virginia who went out on the wings of their morning to keep their rendezvous with the destinies of war, and did not return.

The awfulness, the evil, the wastefulness, the senselessness of war has often and vigorously been decried in council halls, from pulpits, by pundits, and through editorial asseverations in the press of America. But, at the same time, in the absence of a more effective deterrent than has, as yet, been discovered, the apparent inevitability of war has also been recognized. Numerous definitive efforts have been made to establish some manner of an arrangement that would serve to prevent the wanton waste of life and of property by nations in armed conflict against each other.

Woodrow Wilson, an illustrious alumnus of this university, the 28th President of the United States, at the close of World War I, sought, through his League of Nations, to introduce a means of preventing future international conflicts. And, in an eulogy of Mr. Wilson, delivered before a combined assembly of the House of Representatives and of the Senate of the United States in Washington, D.C., Edwin Anderson Alderman, this university's first president, said, with reference to President Wilson's League of Nations endeavor, "If there was failure, it was humanity's failure." May I now simply say that humanity has continued to fail miserably in this exceedingly important regard.

Over 100 years ago Ralph Waldo Emerson observed, and I quote, "Our culture therefore must not omit the arming of the man. Let him hear in season that he is born into the state of war, and that the commonwealth and his own well-being require that he should not go dancing in the weeds of peace, but warned, self-collected and neither defying nor dreading the thunder, let him take both reputation and life in his hand, and with perfect urbanity dare the gibbet and the mob by the absolute truth of his speech and the rectitude of his behavior." Now, if there is in the world, an institution of learning where more emphasis has been placed upon the cogency of Mr. Emerson's observation—upon the virtue inherent in his cardinal attributes, truth and integrity of character—than at the University of Virginia, I just don't know where it could be found.

Deeply imbued with these qualities, many sons of the university have participated in every war in which their country has been engaged since their alma mater was born. And inasmuch as her administrative heads remain keenly mindful of the likelihood of a resumption of open warfare at any time, the university is continuing more than ever, through such instrumentalities as her ROTC programs, to train men for all of the branches of the Armed Forces of this Nation. Also various research projects in collaboration with the Department of Defense, have been and are being pursued here. And too, several members of each graduating class in medicine enter one or another of the armed services.

In his poem, "Man Making," Edwin Markham wrote:

We are blind until we see
That in the human plan,
Nothing is worth the making,
If it does not make the man.

Why build these States glorious,
If man unbuilded goes?
In vain we build the Nation
Unless the builder also grows.

The University of Virignia has, throughout its existence, closely and ceaselessly adherred to, and has strenuously applied the principles proclaimed by Markham. Thomas Jefferson had been a stanch exponent of the doctrine preached by Edwin Markham long before that poet was born.

So long as human nature remains what it is, and I see no prospect that this fundamental frailty, attribute, instinct, trait, call it what you will, is at all likely to change, war, it appears, will undoubtedly remain the sad lot of mankind.

The smoke that arose over Hiroshima and Nagasaki did not change human nature one iota.

So long as human nature continues as it has been throughout all of the centuries or milleniums since animals began walking upright as men, and acquired the mental faculty of thought, there will remain a need for military preparedness if we, as a nation, indeed if civilization as a whole, is to survive. This need was never more pressing than right now.

There would be little point in any attempt by me, however puny or prodigious, to eulogize the alumni of the university who have given "the last full measure of their devotion" to a cause or to causes their elected leaders have considered just causes. Some of them died in the flaming wreckage of airplanes, some on the field of battle, some of them "on dune and headland where" sank "the fire," some on and beneath the waters of the world, a few in hospitals and a few of natural diseases, of course. Some had been recognized for extraordinary valor. Some had been extraordinarily valorous, but, as is not uncommonly the case, their feats and degree of bravery were known but to God. Some were officers, some enlisted men, but they are equal now, or, in my humble opinion, as nearly so as men ever are. But to them all, certainly, one common denominator is applicable. They all wore the uniform of one of the armed services of this Nation. And I will submit, without reservation, that no man or woman may be more honorably distinguished than by being so attired. I have many times averred, and I repeat it now, that service in the armed forces of this Nation should be regarded as a privilege and not as a penalty, and if there be those in the rising generations who hold an attitude at variance with this, I would strongly recommend that they take account of themselves and trim their sails at a different angle. Disdain of the military uniform on the part of the citizens of any country, to me, bespeaks of decadence in that country. I would again borrow from the sagaciousness of Mr. Emerson who stated: "The true test of civilization is not the census, nor the size of cities, nor the crops; no, but the kind of man the country turns out."

It is to those who remain and who will come after those we primarily honor here that I would speak briefly this morning. I want to pay my personal respects to the parents, the widows, the children, and other relatives, the friends and former associates of these men. I want to voice to them all the sentiments of admiration, esteem, and gratitude that is owed these alumni, by the university, by the State of Virginia (and/or whatever may have been their native State), and by the Nation for their dedication to the proposition that truth, courage, and patriotism endure forever.

There has, since its inception, been a distinct atmosphere of ancient Greece or Athens about the University of Virginia, and it occurs to me that it would be appropriate for us at this time to harken back 450 years before Christ to Pericles, and to consider his admonition to the men of Athens. This is it: "I would have you day by day fix your eyes upon the greatness of your country, until you become filled with the love of her, and when you are impressed by the spectacle of her glory, reflect that it has been acquired by men and women who knew their duty and had the courage to do it."

Mr. President, it has been a splendid act on the part of the classes of 1943 and of 1948 to have had prepared and to have provided for permanent installation on the walls of the rotunda, an impressive bronze plaque bearing the names of the 321 alumni who perished while serving in the Armed Forces of their Nation during World War II. It is equally a gracious and generous act on the part of the Seven Society to prevent a similar plaque bearing the names of the 29 alumni of the university who gave their lives for freedom during the Korean war.

Speaking in behalf of the classes of 1943 and of 1948 and in behalf of the Seven Society, the philanthropic spirit of which society has for long been traditional here, it is to me, Mr. Shannon, a treasurable honor to be privileged to present to the University of Virginia, through you as its president, sir, these two estimable and smart plaques which together contain the names of 350 of the university's sons who "true to the instincts of their birth, faithful to the teachings of their fathers," and of Mr. Jefferson's school, "and constant in their love for their country, died in the performance of their duty."

Migrant Farm Labor Problems and "Harvest of Shame"—XVI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is the 16th in a series of articles presented in the public interest by the Palm Beach Post-Times to show the Members some of the progress being made in Florida to solve problems relating to migrant farm labor which were left out of the television presentation "Harvest of Shame." The omissions of all that has been, and is being done in this field did a great injustice to the Floridians who have given their time and efforts to these problems over the years. It is hoped that by reading these articles and the ones to follow the Members and public will have a better understanding of this important matter.

[From the Palm Beach Post, Feb. 3, 1961]

FLORIDA LAWS ARE EQUAL FOR ALL CHILDREN

"Most State child labor laws ignore farm children, and as far as the children of migrants are concerned, almost without exception, they leave school at the age of 16."—"Harvest of Shame."

Florida law makes no distinction between the children of residents and migrants.

Each group is governed by the same standards.

"The same educational opportunities are available to children of residents and migrants workers," according to Tom Bailey, State superintendent of public instruction.

"The influx of migrant children has created a tremendous problem for some counties to hire enough teachers during the middle of seasons—particularly in the smaller counties," he said. "But the counties are becoming familiar with the problem and are making adjustments."

Smaller counties don't have access to pools of teachers available for limited periods as do some of the larger counties, Bailey stressed.

The superintendent couldn't estimate the number of migrant children who leave school at 16.

"I don't think those figures are available," he said.

Clyde Harris, assistant superintendent of schools in Palm Beach County, agreed with Bailey.

Because the migrant families make frequent moves, Harris said school leaders have been unable to determine just how many drop out.

Florida has recognized the economic state of its migrant labor force and has made a provision not accorded to other nonresidents, Harris said.

"The law exempts the parents of these children from having to pay the school tuition fee demanded from other nonresidents." That fee is $50.

Furthermore, Harris said, Florida does not ignore the migratory children but requires them to attend school the same as permanent residents.

Herman Close and Ruth Ervin have been appointed special teachers to aid the Glades area children who show an inclination to drop out of school.

The two have found it possible in a large number of cases to persuade the youngsters to complete high school.

Girls are given special instruction in homemaking, boys in shopwork. All get special courses in reading and arithmetic as termination work.

A report compiled by Mrs. Margaret Mosley, supervisor of migrant education in the Glades area, and Mrs. J. R. Nutt, visiting teacher, shows Palm Beach County is facing up to its responsibility.

In May 1960, they said, white schools of their area had a total enrollment of 2,862, and 434 of those were migrant children.

Negro schools, they reported, had enrollment of 3,727, with 1,715 students being migrant.

"The schools of Palm Beach County have for many years welcomed migrant children into their classrooms. It is nationally recognized that migrant children go to school while they reside in Palm Beach County," Mrs. Mosley said.

The board of public instruction has been alert to the problems and educational needs of migrant children and has made heroic efforts to provide adequate schooling, she added.

What has been done locally to further the education of the migrant children? These are some of the things the report shows:

1. Two visiting teachers work between schools and homes to relieve conditions preventing children from attending classes.

"A greater portion of time is spent with migrant families," Mrs. Mosley said.

2. Generally, the children are enrolled in permanently organized schools and are integrated with resident children.

But the Hagan Road School in Delray Beach was built to serve the particular needs of non-English-speaking children, who know only Spanish. Additional teachers are employed to care for the increased enrollment during the harvest season.

3. Additional teachers are hired at the beginning of the school year to accommodate the larger number of children who enroll later.

4. Special services in speech improvement and remedial reading are provided, as well as psychological testing for exceptional children.

5. A supervisor of migrant education is employed to work with schools and community groups on educational probelms.

6. The county shared the cost of a national research program from 1954 to 1957 to learn ways to provide improved educational opportunities.

7. In-service training programs for teachers of migrant children have been provided by the county, and each course carries three semester hours of college credit.

8. The advisory committee for the education of migrant children has been created and meets regularly to study problems and provide solutions.

"As a result of the work of this committee, several worthwhile projects have been sponsored which have not only benefited migrant children but regular resident children also," Mrs. Mosley said.

An example? A mobile dental unit provides examinations and treatment. Civic groups contribute to pay the dentist's fee.

And a special junior high school program for children overage and in need of remedial instruction in basic subjects, homemaking, and industrial arts was provided.

9. Clothing, school supplies, and free lunches for the indigent are provided.

10. The migrant children are welcomed into classes in the same manner as permanent residents.

11. Spanish-speaking children are given status by their contributions in the elementary lessons.

12. Children are welcomed into extracurricular activities such as the safety patrol, athletics, 4-H Club, Junior Red Cross, Future Homemakers, and Future Farmers of America.

A Soviet Naval Goal: Satellite Seas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in an address to the House on January 16, 1961, I discussed the critical significance of the current agitations to increase the width of territorial seas and quoted an illuminating article by George Winder on the subject of "Communist Strategy and the High Seas," published in the December 1960 issue of American Opinion.

The question of territorial water widths, however, is not the only maritime problem presented by the world revolution conspiracy. Others are attempts to establish Soviet satellite seas through securing control of key points of access.

It was, therefore, with the greatest interest that I read in the April 1961 number of the U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings a highly informative article by Capt. Frank M. Murphy, which deals with that significant maritime objective.

Appraising the problems involved with the realism of the experienced and thoughtful professional naval officer, Captain Murphy's article reflects a degree of strategic insight that is refreshing to encounter. I commend it for study as a sequel to the previously mentioned Winder article by all concerned with the formulation of our maritime policy.

Accompanying the article is a biographical sketch of its author:

A graduate of the Georgetown University School of Foreign Service, Captain Murphy served on U.S.S. *Zane* (DMS–14) and was commanding officer of the U.S.S. *Chandler* (DMS–9) during World War II. Subsequently, he attended the General Line School at the U.S. Naval Academy and the Naval War College, Newport, R.I. Since 1953, he has done staff duty with Commander 6th Fleet Cin-CNELM, and Commander Carrier Division 18. He is at present attached to the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations.

The article follows:

A SOVIET NAVAL GOAL: SATELLITE SEAS

(By Capt. Frank M. Murphy, U.S. Navy)

"Freedom of navigation is an important objective of American foreign policy."—Cavendish W. Cannon.[1]

In our grave concern over the military subjugation of the satellite states, it is easy to overlook another dangerous and related Soviet objective—the establishment of satellite seas. Just as the Soviet Union is striving to cut off large non-Russian land areas from the free world, so is it aiming to make the Black Sea, the Baltic, and the Sea of Japan into Russian lakes.

The closing of these international highways would mean a blow to non-Communist economies, a lowering of morale in the restive satellites, and a strategic naval loss which would significantly alter our military posture.

THE DANUBE LESSON

We know what it means for all concerned when the Communists seize a land area. The lost personal liberties, the warped economies, and the increased military and political tensions need no elaboration here. Since the results of Soviet control of strategic waterways have received less attention, it will be instructive to view a laboratory case—the Danube River since World War II. For nearly a century (1856–1948), this great cultural and commercial artery was managed by an international commission. Under this arrangement, the Danube benefited the riparian states and the entire civilized world much as do the St. Lawrence Seaway and the Panama Canal. Once Soviet Russia became paramount in the Balkans, however, it ended the liberal and intelligent regulations and began a narrow, discriminatory rule of this important waterway.

Although the Soviet Union could not give its actions the force of legality, it did provide them with a screen of formality by going through the motions of an international conference at Belgrade in 1948. To this meeting, as chief Soviet delegate, came no less a personage than the Foreign Minister, Andrei Vishinsky. This was at once an indication of the importance which the Soviets attached to the Danube and an indication of the results which could be expected from the conference. The United States designated its Ambassador to Yugoslavia, Cavendish W. Cannon, as its principal delegate. The satellite regimes and Yugoslavia sent dutiful and well-rehearsed Communists. In refusing to adhere to the Soviet-drafted treaty, the U.S. representative said:

"The meetings of the conference have been characterized by Soviet dictation. The unhappy subservience of the Danubian peo-

---

[1] From a speech by Mr. Cannon, the U.S. Ambassador to Yugoslavia in Belgrade on Aug. 18, 1948, rejecting a Soviet-dictated treaty designed to restrict navigation on the Danube.

ples was never more clearly manifest than at this conference. The statements and voting of the representatives of the Danubian States reflected their lack of freedom of choice on matters of vital concern to their peoples."

During the same speech, Ambassador Cannon accurately predicted the fate of the formerly free Danube in these words:

"The actions of the Soviet delegation have made evident the determination of the Soviet Union to perpetuate its economic and political enslavement of the Danubian peoples. Its refusal to accept provisions assuring genuine freedom of commerce and nondiscrimination shows that it intends to maintain vested interests which it has established for its own benefit through extortion from governments imposed by force against the will of the peoples of its satellites."

The lesson then is clear. If the U.S.S.R. ever gains full control of an international sea, we can expect a repetition of the Danube story. With this admonitory experience in mind we should consider the significance of Soviet military and political actions relating to the Baltic, the Black Sea, and the Sea of Japan.

SOVIET TACTICS TO ACHIEVE NAVAL DOMINANCE

Russian Communist moves to achieve control of all three seas have ranged from direct military operations to subtle, almost concealed, diplomatic maneuvers. Underscoring the role of force in achieving domination of these seas are the Soviet attacks on U.S. planes, as well as those of other nations, made outside of territorial waters and in clear violation of international law. At the other end of the spectrum of Soviet instrumentalities are diplomatic chicanery and propaganda. Communist expressions such as "sea of peace" and Soviet-sponsored measures to extend territorial waters are best explained by a Kremlin drive to control three traditionally international water highways.

THE BALTIC

In the Baltic, the Soviet Navy has developed a strong fleet with supporting shore-based air. These naval forces operate from numerous excellent bases along the north, east, and south coasts from Finland to Germany. Many of these bases are sufficiently ice-free to be easily negotiable with the aid of icebreakers even under the severest conditions.

Most significantly, Russia shares naval power in the Baltic only with Sweden, whose navy, although vigorous and progressive, is not large. Germany's defeat in World War II created an inviting opening for the Soviets. And, as has become evident, the Communists are quick to fill a power vacuum, be it on land or sea.

The Soviets give no indication of being satisfied with their vastly improved military position in the Baltic. They continue to employ their international political machine to increase their relative strength by attempting to weaken their neighbors. In doing this, Moscow has shown its versatility and flexibility by skillfully alternating between the economic carrot of trade agreements and the propaganda stick of atomic threats. The Soviets have also made strident calls for "peace zones," on Communist terms, of course.

In 1957, the Soviet Foreign Office issued notes to Denmark and Norway, bluntly stating that they were inviting certain destruction if they accepted U.S. missiles on their soil. Free Germany received the same treatment with the addition of promises and threats regarding eventual reunification.

Parallel with the threatening notes, the Communists conducted a propaganda campaign aimed at pacifists and wishful thinkers. This campaign opened in December 1957, when the Polish Foreign Minister, Rapacki, called for a nuclear-free zone in central Europe. His plan, if carried out, would seriously weaken NATO and leave the Baltic open to Soviet exploitation.

Khrushchev has personally taken part in this propaganda campaign. Speaking in Riga, Latvia, on June 11, 1959, he proposed that Scandinavia and the Baltic be made a "zone free of atomic and rocket weapons." Incidentally, this offer to turn the Baltic into a Communist "sea of peace" followed soon after the concluding of a 2-year Danish-Soviet trade protocol.

Nine days after the Riga speech, on 20 July 1959, Khrushchev attempted to disquiet his neighbors by cancelling proposed visits to the Scandinavian countries. Because there exists in Scandinavia what Moscow terms an "anti-Soviet attitude," it is clear that the series of cynical and transparent actions by the U.S.S.R. has been correctly evaluated by the astute northern Europeans. These people have had long experience with the Russian Bear.

Russia may consider, however, that its programs have not failed completely, because our Scandinavian NATO allies have avoided the difficult questions which would be posed if atomic deterrents were located in their countries. In so doing they fail to achieve the maximum defense which their NATO membership could accord them. Thus the countries which are the northern bastion of NATO are resisting Soviet pressures, but the Baltic area remains in jeopardy since defenses there are weaker than they should be.

THE BLACK SEA AND THE EASTERN MEDITERRANEAN

The Black Sea, like the Baltic, occupies a position high on the Soviet list of military and political objectives. In comparing events relating to the Black Sea since World War II with those relating to the Baltic, one notices many striking parallels, along with a few interested differences.

A large naval construction program in the Black Sea has made Soviet Russia virtually the single naval power in this area. Having acquired Rumania and Bulgaria as satellites, the U.S.S.R. is in complete control of the western, northern, and eastern shores of the Black Sea. It is perhaps in a more dominant position here than in the Baltic.

Another similarity is that the entrance to the Black Sea is controlled by a NATO ally. Just as Denmark is astride the Öresund and the Belts, so is Turkey in direct control of the Bosporus and the Dardanelles. In the case of the Baltic, Denmark gains support from the strategic location of Free Germany and Norway; while to the south, Greece occupies a key position in relation to the Black Sea approaches and can support its NATO ally, Turkey.

Because Turkey and Greece are necessary for full control of the Black Sea they have been in the front lines of the cold war since it began. In fact, the quarrel between Russian communism and the free world was brought out into the open as a result of Soviet moves against the Turkish Straits. And cold war battlelines were drawn as a result of Soviet bloc support of the Greek guerrillas.

The pattern of Soviet diplomacy and propaganda on Black Sea matters has a familiar look when compared with that relating to the Baltic. Here again is the mixture of threatening notes and offers of "zones of peace." In fact, the timing of the Soviet notes and speeches leads to the conclusion that for the Russians, the Baltic and Black Seas are part of a single question.

There is one important difference among the many similarities. The U.S.S.R. views the Black Sea and the straits as an integral part of its drive into the eastern Mediterranean and the Middle East—a drive it has begun even before it has gained complete control of the Black Sea. To the Soviets, control of the Black Sea is the first step for achieving what appears to be their long-term goal of spreading into the Middle East. For this reason, the Soviets in June of 1959 included Italy, the Balkans, and the Adriatic in their proposal for a "peninsula of peace."

There is no reason to believe that Soviet Russia would be content if it achieved its goal of turning the Black Sea into a satellite lake. The recurring crises in the Middle East, the sale of submarines to Egypt, and the basing of submarines in Albania, all lead to the conclusion that the eastern Mediterranean would become the next body of water closed to all but "friendly" shipping and men-of-war.

The United States and its allies have stood firm in this area. Had we not done so, the Soviet Navy would now have bases on the straits and in Greece, and the U.S. Navy would never again have visited Turkish Black Sea ports or, for that matter, have operated in the eastern Mediterranean.

THE SEA OF JAPAN

It may seem like a radical change to leave the Baltic and Black Seas to discuss the Sea of Japan. From the Soviet point of view, however, no readjustment in thinking is necessary; all three seas are part of one objective. The Soviet aim of forming satellite seas is global. While the Soviets were scheming late in the last war to form satellite states and satellite seas in Europe, they were also taking measures to do the same thing in the Far East.

As a result of the Yalta agreements, the U.S.S.R. was off to a running start in the Far East at the end of World War II. In August of 1945, in accordance with those agreements, it occupied southern Sakhalin and the Kuriles. Thus the Sea of Okhotsk was largely closed off from the outside world. The U.S.S.R. was much more concerned, however, about the Sea of Japan.

Welcoming the postwar instabilities and military voids, the U.S.S.R. proceeded to develop its naval and other forces in the area at an accelerated pace. By 1950, it felt ready to have one of its puppets seize South Korea and thus gain control of the Sea of Japan. It was stopped, principally by American determination, from acquiring this neighboring sea and using it as a sure means for subjugating Japan, the principal industrial nation in Asia. With Japan as a satellite, the rest of Asia would have been unable to resist further Communist encroachments.

The global nature of Soviet naval policy is well illustrated by the Soviet-provoked incidents relating to the Sea of Japan. In this area, too, the Soviets have attacked American planes over international waters. Moreover, they have resorted to crude diplomatic intimidation of Japan, just as they have with our naval allies in Europe. For example, on May 15, 1958, the Soviet Union bluntly asked the Japanese Government if the United States were basing nuclear weapons in Japan. It was undoubtedly more than coincidence that the U.S.S.R. launched Sputnik III on this same date.

Such Soviet tactics may seem barbarous and clumsy to the civilized world of the second half of the 20th century. On the other hand, to the pragmatic leaders of Communist Russia, such measures may seem a good way to give reality to the name of the principal Soviet city on the Sea of Japan. In the Russian language "Vladivostok" means "ruler of the East." If we want more tangible evidence of Soviet intent, we can reflect on the Soviet statement of July 1957 that the vast bay leading to Vladivostok is closed.

TERRITORIAL WATERS AND SATELLITE SEAS

So far we have examined specific Soviet measures designed to restrict free world action in each of the three seas earmarked by the Communists for satellite status. Con-

currently with these actions, the Soviet Union has been conducting a cold war campaign which endangers all three seas and is therefore worthy of special attention. This campaign, which is both blatant and subtle, aims to increase the breadth of territorial waters from the traditional 3 miles to 12 miles. If the persistent Soviet efforts in this direction were ever successful, the world's naval and shipping powers would lose some of their advantage in relation to land powers. The American striking fleets could be placed under a legal ban by neutrals and others against operating in strategically important areas. If this ever happens, the Baltic, the Black Sea, and the Sea of Japan will all be a step closer to Danube status.

SOVIET NAVAL STRATEGY AND THE DRIVE FOR CLOSED SEAS

For the Soviet Navy, the neighboring seas are a constant frustration. For one thing, Western naval power has kept the Soviet fleet from spreading the Russian version of Marxism. To date, communism, an unnatural method of ordering man's life, has taken hold only in the presence of Sino-Soviet military force. This force is now being checked by a worldwide coalition of maritime powers, a coalition occasioned by Soviet aggression, centered around the United States, and based upon utilization of the worlds' oceans.

These facts take on great significance for the Soviet Navy, since the most tempting areas for Communist military expansion are related to bodies of water on which the free world maritime coalition can dispose overwhelming power. The Baltic Sea would be more vital to the Soviets for a westward military thrust than would the north European plain. The Black Sea and the eastern Mediterranean would have to be secure before the Russians could lunge into the Middle East. Japan is militarily secure behind its moat, particularly with the power of the 7th Fleet in the immediate background. Thus when Khrushchev speaks of the limited utility of cruisers, he is reflecting the frustrations of the Soviet Navy. It is true that Khrushchev's cruisers will be good for little more than diplomatic visits and salutes so long as the West maintains strong and balanced naval strength. If we lower our guard, however, the Soviet cruisers will be useful in spreading Russian communism.

Particularly troublesome to Soviet naval thinkers is the thin belt of land satellites in Europe insecurely anchored in the Baltic in the north and the Black Sea in the south. Since the satellites may be defined as a militarily occupied group of states lying between two international seas, they are in contact with the outside world through the ocean highways. As a result, they are certain to remain dissatisfied. Perhaps Soviet naval strategists sometimes reflect wryly on the words of a czar who laid the foundations of the modern Russian Navy. Peter the Great, when he founded St. Petersburg (Leningrad) in 1703 called it "a window into Europe." As long as the oppressed peoples of East Central Europe can gaze out the windows of free seas, they will have hope. The Soviet Navy has the task of closing those windows.

The bordering seas and their defenses are purely naval problems for the Soviet Union, since the Soviet Navy has a number of tasks which would normally fall to the army or another service in most countries. The long coasts of the Soviet Union are defended by naval coast artillery, naval infantry, and a naval air arm, in addition to naval forces afloat. These forces are large. In fact, in terms of manpower, the Soviets have the world's largest navy. Despite this large and growing naval strength, Soviet Navy planners know they are responsible for inadequately defended borders. The lessons of World War II have not been lost on these realistic men who fully appreciate that Western military power can be brought to bear in overwhelming force wherever there are oceans. They also appreciate the flexibility of naval power which can support a guerrilla force, a police action, or conventional land and air operations of whatever size.

Soviet naval strategy, then, is directed against the Western maritime coalition centered around the United States and its Navy. It also seeks control of the strategic straits and narrows leading into the neighboring seas. If the Soviet Navy could plant coast artillery, naval infantry, and units of the naval air arm in the vicinity of the Danish, Turkish, and Korean Straits, it would no longer have to defend the long coastlines of the Baltic, Black Sea, and Sea of Japan. With the resources thus freed, the Russian fleet could make a great impact in new areas, particularly on the high seas.

THE TASKS OF FREE WORLD NAVAL POWER AND DIPLOMACY

The principal free world naval undertaking in the three threatened seas should be to redress the military imbalance resulting from World War II. The defeat of Germany and Japan means that counterforces to Soviet expansion in the Baltic and the Sea of Japan have been greatly weakened. Soviet Russia is also relatively stronger in the Black Sea than before the war. To stabilize these areas, the Western World must give political and naval support to the free powers fronting these seas. Such support should include aid, training, and frequent naval visits.

Just as important, the free world should never surrender any of its inherent sea power advantages through ignorance or lack of interest. For example, we must be on guard when Soviet diplomacy, in an attempt to restrict freedom of the seas, speaks piously of the rights of riparian states. Such an approach in doubly specious for the Soviets. Since they militarily dominate many of the bordering states, they speak only for themselves. Any sea is of interest to the entire international community, especially maritime countries.

We enjoy a seapower advantage in these three international seas because of Western naval strength and because free world allies control the critical narrows in each case. We must never lose this advantage to Soviet bluffing. To do so would be to sacrifice our ability to project our national power to the shores of potential aggressors. It would also be a necessary step toward opening the great oceans as attack roads leading to the shores and cities of the United States.

The Late Honorable Edward J. Hart

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. CAHILL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join in tribute to the Honorable E. J. Hart, former Representative of the 14th Congressional District of the State of New Jersey.

I knew Mr. Hart as one of New Jersey's outstanding lawyers and most honored public servants. As a young lawyer, practicing in the southern end of the State, I came to know and respect Mr. Hart for his outstanding ability as an orator.

He was, during his service in Washington, one of the best known of all our representatives. His death is not only a great personal loss to his family but to all citizens of the State of New Jersey.

I express to his family my sincere sympathy and condolence.

A Layman Looks at the Survey of Dentistry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address entitled "A Layman Looks at the Survey of Dentistry." This address was delivered by me at the 38th annual session of the American Association of Dental Schools, Boston, Mass., on March 27, 1961:

A LAYMAN LOOKS AT THE SURVEY OF DENTISTRY

(By Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island)

H. G. Wells once declared that "human history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe." After reading the summary report issued by the Commission on the Survey of Dentistry, any thoughtful citizen will be made aware of how appropriately that statement may be applied to the future of dental health in this country. For one recurring theme in the commission's summary is the crucial importance of education to the solution of the most serious problems now confronting members of the dental profession and the public they serve.

The commission stresses again and again the extent to which sound solutions depend ultimately upon the Nation's ability to educate and to be educated, upon our knowing more and applying what we know with greater force and effectiveness. This is the theme in the discussions of manpower planning, research expansion, better utilization of available preventive measures, specialized care for the aged, and the many other topics covered in their broad-based report.

If the problems detailed by the commission had been totally unexpected, or if the burden of solving them had to be borne by any single group, we might well ask ourselves whether we have the time or the strength or the resources to assure a future of good dental health for the citizens of this country.

Fortunately, the task can be shared by many groups. Though the dental profession has both the right and the responsibility of leadership, the public, individually and through the medium of Government, also has its duty to support you in finding solutions and in making them work.

The problems demanding attention are not totally new. All of us here today have long known that a critical need exists for more dentists and for the schools in which to train them, for better utilization of auxiliary personnel, for intensified research, and for more effective health programs. Corrective action in all of these areas has been urged repeatedly by professional groups like the American Association of Dental Schools and the American Dental Association, by Government agencies like the Public Health Service, by interested laymen and Members of Congress like myself, and, most recently by the new President of the United States in his health message.

It does not detract from the importance of the commission's report to suggest that its

greatest value stems not so much from the newness of its basic findings as from the objectivity, candor, and practicality of its analyses and recommendations for action. What the commision has given us is a fresher viewpoint, a broader perspective. To consider our own problems from another's vantage point is always helpful, for often we need to be reassured that deep concern and long familiarity with the issues at hand have not blinded us to obvious solutions. Otherwise, there is always a danger of responses becoming automatic rather than thoughtful. A commission like this one, representing a variety of interests, is not likely to fall victim to such occupational hazards as dedicated nearsightedness or overactive reflexes. And since, despite the diversity of their professional backgrounds, the members have been able to reach what Dr. Adams, in his foreword, describes as a firm agreement on what needs to be done, the authority and importance of their report is even further enhanced.

I therefore find it of great significance that the commission's estimates of the seriousness of the dental manpower shortage not only substantiate what dental organizations and Government agencies have said before, but indicate that the shortage may be even greater than anticipated. In the first place, these new estimates remove any basis for denying, as some people have, that there is any manpower problem to overcome. In the second place, they assure those of us who have been deeply concerned about inadequate dentist ratios that we were right to be concerned, and that the steps we have already taken to offset them, have been well taken. We at least have gained a short headstart in the race against time.

If American dentists had not scored impressive gains in their own efficiency, if they had not begun to employ auxiliary personnel more extensively and with greater effectiveness, the manpower shortage would already be felt by the public, and critically felt. Increased efficiency, therefore, has momentarily cushioned us against the impact of shortage. But what of the future? The margin for improved efficiency is narrowing. There is a limit to the load the individual practitioner can bear. These are facts which cannot be ignored, for neither the times we live in nor the standards we live by are fixed and static.

The commission points out that currently only some 40 percent of the public are receiving anything approaching adequate dental care. This is neither as good as the country needs nor the best it can expect. In the 20th century, the entire conception of health and the health services has been changing. We look upon adequate health protection not as the special privilege of a fortunate few but as the right of all.

This modern viewpoint is reflected in the commission's concern about the Nation's manpower needs. Commission members see the future of dentistry as one of great growth and complexity, of increasing prestige and authority, and, by the same token, of greater responsibility. They see this responsibility as one which cannot be met by relying solely upon the achievement of higher technical proficiency in clinical procedures. The commission would have us realize that this Nation not only needs more schools and more dentists, it needs better schools and better dentists. We can be glad that a start has been made in this direction.

The comprehensive health program which President Kennedy has outlined in his recent message to the Congress includes specific recommendations for substantial Federal aid to education, and there are many congressional proposals which would make Federal funds available for the building of more schools and the training of more dentists. I myself have again introduced legislation providing wide-ranging support for dental and medical education. I have proposed that the Congress appropriate $100 million for the construction of new schools and $50 million for the expansion and modernization of existing schools. Passage of this bill will make it possible to produce the larger numbers of dentists so urgently needed.

I have proposed, in addition, two other measures which will not only bring us closer to the goal of more adequate supply but will also help us attain the higher standards of dental education which the commission envisions. The first of these is a scholarship bill which will permit you to fill the additional school spaces which will be created, and to fill them with applicants of greater intellectual stature. The second measure will provide operating grants to schools. Although this measure, too, includes an incentive for expanding enrollments, its real purpose is to provide schools with the funds needed to improve the quality of their instruction.

The commission has a great deal to say about the method and content of undergraduate dental training, and some of it is critical of things as they exist. I will not attempt to judge the worth of all the recommendations in the report. But many of the comments the commission makes are as applicable to other branches of education as they are to dentistry, and in this regard, I found in them a vigorous and stimulating challenge to habitual patterns of thought.

For I suggest to you that we in this country must become more constructively critical of our traditional approaches to education. We should ask some questions. Why do we teach what we teach? What is it we are educating for? And wherever we find that we are doing things just because they have always been done, we might ask whether we are educating for the 20th and 21st centuries or merely perpetuating the methods inherited from the 19th. Education, after all, is not a monument to the past; it is the architecture of the future.

If I read the report aright, the commission believes that in current dental education there is perhaps too much emphasis upon restorative dentistry, too little upon preventive. The commission assumes, and I certainly agree, that the dentist's responsibility extends far beyond the providing of treatment to the patient who knocks on his door and demands it. If this were all we expected from our dentists, restorative dentistry might be all they needed to know. But the dental profession also has a responsibility for seeing that the receipt of care more accurately reflects the actual need for it. Treating the patient who knocks on the door is only one in a progression of important activities in which the profession participates. Ideally, the first step in that progression is the development of methods for the prevention of disease itself. Therefore, if dentistry is indeed educating for the future, it should obviously be educating for research.

As the commission observes, "Of all avenues leading toward the prevention of dental disease, the one offering the most hope is research. One investigator, if he should discover a means of preventing or reducing periodontal disease, might do more for oral health than several thousand practitioners of restorative dentistry." Yet the commission finds little reason for satisfaction with the current status of dental research, although it acknowledges the substantial progress which has been made in recent years.

The Federal Government has played, and undoubtedly will continue to play, a major role in conducting and sponsoring dental research programs. I have always been deeply interested in this field, and I look upon the growth of the National Institute of Dental Research—incidentally, NIDR will soon move into its new building—and of its grants program in support of extramural activity as being among the notable contributions the Government has made to the advancement of health standards. I am glad to have had a part in making them possible. Yet I agree with the commission that while the Federal Government should increase its support of research, and I think it will, the Government cannot carry the burden alone. Financial support from other sources must be forthcoming.

There is, as you know, a codicil to the commission's recommendations for increased financial aid: the increase should be commensurate with the increase in available research personnel. Since, as the commission points out, the best source of researchers is the undergraduate student body, the availability of personnel depends to a very great extent upon the dental educator. Yet today, teachers do not have time to pursue research projects; students are given neither the scientific depth, nor the curriculum time, nor the intellectual stimulus to interest them in the field. The commission sees the result as a shortage so acute that "the recruitment for dental research is even more important than the recruitment for dental practice," and it urges the integration of research with teaching at the undergraduate level as a logical first step toward overcoming the shortage.

That stronger and better designed undergraduate programs will in time do much to strengthen the whole intricate structure of dental research in this country strikes me as a sound and practical observation. I therefore suggest that proposals which advocate Federal or private financial aid for talented undergraduate dental students who are interested in research and teaching careers deserve serious consideration from us all. At the same time, ways must be found to increase the scope and intensity and effectiveness of activity at the more advanced levels of dental research.

For the general public, these extended programs of research will have greatest meaning when preventive discoveries are given practical application in day-to-day life. And in view of the seriousness of the overall dental health problem, the Nation's failure to utilize fully the preventive techniques already at its disposal is nothing short of tragic.

Every leading health organization in the country, among them the American Dental Association, the American Medical Association, and the American Association of Dental Schools, has endorsed fluoridation. The Commission on the Survey of Dentistry therefore speaks for informed opinion when it states it is "totally unimpressed by the arguments advanced, usually by health and other faddists, that fluoridation is dangerous, immoral, unconstitutional, and unscriptural." Yet today, more than 10 years after the introduction of a simple procedure for the controlled fluoridation of public water supplies, something less than a fourth of the American people have access to the benefits that method provides. The public denies itself those benefits, and now the fluoridation of water supplies is not even pacing population growth. Evidently, the health and other faddists have lately been more successful in presenting their case to the public than the profluoridationists, though the latter have scientific fact on their side. Perhaps the difference is in the intensity of effort.

Let me quote some other statements from the Commission's report and, I warn you, quote them out of sequence:

"Although 37 percent—of some 750 dentists participating in an opinion survey—take part in fluoridation campaigns in their communities, only about 2 percent have been active as individuals in initiating these campaigns.

"Wide scale educational efforts must be undertaken to acquaint the American people with the importance of dental health and with means of attaining it.

"Education, in the dental health sense, has many facets ranging from campaigns on behalf of public health measures to hygiene instruction in primary school."

And, finally, there is the recommendation of the commission that "all public agencies, with the assistance of voluntary associations and professional societies, make greater efforts to promote water fluoridation and community topical fluoride programs."

As the commission recognizes, the possibility of making greater efforts will depend to a large degree upon the possibility of securing substantial grants for expansion of the State and local dental health programs needed to win widespread public support for fluoridation and other preventive measures. But important as they are, grants are not a substitute for incisive and coordinated action. They serve only as the foundation upon which better programs can be built.

I remarked earlier that the commission continually stresses how much depends upon our ability to educate and be educated, and upon our ability to use what we know with greater force. The fluoridation issue is a case in point. If they are to strengthen and intensify activities in support of fluoridation, public health agencies at the National, State, and local level must make sure that they employ their special resources and knowledge and practical experience to the very fullest extent. And their efforts, in turn, must be reinforced by the professional knowledge and prestige and influence of the private practitioner, working individually in his community and through his dental society. This kind of cooperation should produce an educational force persuasive and authoritative enough to offset the statements, however dramatic, of the small but vocal opposition.

Valuable though preventive measures like fluoridation are, I am sure the commission is right when it states that the achievement of dental health solely through the prevention of disease is far in the future, a fact which throws into relief the importance of what the commission calls "prevention of progression through treatment." And since people differ both in their ability to pay for care and even in their physical ability to seek it, the receipt of treatment cannot be left to chance. The commission makes a series of recommendations for reducing distance between dentist and patient which impress me as both imaginative and workable.

One of these, the incremental care program for school-age children, seems to me to be of particular value and importance. Beginning the first year with 6-year-olds and adding a new crop of them each year, the program would eventually cover all children through high school, and do so at a minimum of cost, for the care would begin in most cases before serious treatment problems have had a chance to develop. Since cost to the family would be based on the ability to pay, every child, regardless of financial status, would have a chance for a lifetime of good dental health. And that, eventually, should mean an impressive reduction in the accumulation of the Nation's unmet treatment needs. Therefore, though a program of this scope would undoubtedly require Federal and State aid in the form both of financial support and of participation by official health agencies, it would also represent a national asset.

Another group whose special needs for treatment deserve more thoughtful attention is the chronically ill and aged. The Public Health Service, for a number of years, has been conducting a series of studies designed to measure existing needs among these disadvantaged people. In cooperation with State and local dental societies and health departments, the Service has been experimenting also in the development of techniques and in the training of personnel to adapt traditional types of treatment to the special needs of people who are too infirm to visit the dentist in his office.

Some idea of the extent of the problem of caring for the homebound and institutionalized came out of a study recently completed in Kansas City. Four thousand nursing home patients, with an average age of 75, were examined; 88 percent were in need of care. If this measure of need holds true for all the population aged 75, then there are today some 4 million older people who require a service they are not likely to get unless a concerted effort is made to provide it. In less than 20 years, the figure will be 8 million. If we are to meet the special dental care needs of our growing population of older people, undergraduate training in dental geriatrics may well be a necessary addition to the modern dental school curriculum.

In efforts to narrow the gap between need and receipt of services, the greatest attention is perhaps being centered currently on the growth of various types of group prepaid dental care plans. Such plans may eventually have as great an impact upon dental care as hospital and medical coverages have had upon medical care. The recommendations of the Commission that the dental profession cooperate with industry, labor, and Government in experimentation with various approaches to group programs are therefore eminently sensible. Their suggestion that dental societies form service corporations to facilitate the development of group programs bears out the opinion of public health officers that this particular approach offers dentistry the best opportunity of assuring orderly growth and quality of care within the framework of group plans.

Even though many people disapprove in principle of group dental programs, cooperation in their design is still advisable. At least you must be prepared to face the changes they entail and to deal with them constructively. For it is much better to control circumstances than to be controlled by them.

Controlling circumstances becomes increasingly difficult as society becomes more complex. It requires infinitely more knowledge and patience. Today the members of all professions find themselves involved in activities which a few years ago did not even exist. And as activities increase, so do the demands upon professional skills and qualities of leadership.

Because this is true, laymen and professional men must meet together to discuss problems of mutual concern. And it becomes all the more necessary for us to accept the fact that we cannot limit our vision to the merely convenient or tailor the future by a pattern fitted only to the past. That is why it is so essential to realize that we must train more professional people, and that we must train them better. Perhaps we must even train a new breed of men—men of broader vision and greater scientific deapth than we have ever before known. Certainly in a field as essential as dentistry, we must, at the very least forgo the luxury of a narrow vocationalism in our educational processes.

To do what must be done will require the best that is in all of us—the willingness to try and the courage to fail. For much of what we must learn and teach can only be discovered by trial and error. If that is a painful process, it is also our greatest hope. As the great Oxford teacher E. R. Dodds once put it, "If the truth is beyond our grasp, the errors of tomorrow are still to be preferred to the errors of yesterday; for error in the sciences is only another name for the progressive approximation to truth."

Hoffa Leads Union in Fight To Amend Rule of Ratemaking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, on April 13, 1961, I called the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to a national drive against the railroads which James R. Hoffa is mounting.

The following article from the April 17, 1961, issue of Transport Topics, the national newspapers of the motor-freight carriers tells how Mr. Hoffa intends to carry out his program:

HOFFA LEADS UNION IN FIGHT TO AMEND RULE OF RATEMAKING

Teamster President James R. Hoffa last week touched off a massive campaign to urge Congress to enact S. 1197, a measure introduced by Senator ROBERT BARTLETT, of Alaska, to amend the Interstate Commerce Act.

The Bartlett bill is cosponsored by Senators A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, Oklahoma; NORRIS COTTON, of New Hampshire; VANCE HARTKE, of Indiana, and RALPH YARBOROUGH, of Texas. It would amend controversial section 15a (3) of the Interstate Commerce Act, which the trucking charges was an invitation to destructive rate-cutting now practiced by the railroads.

In a telephone network, Mr. Hoffa addressed 212 locals in 170 cities on the subject, urging the membership to write letters of protest to Congress. At the same time Senator MONRONEY appeared in a filmed interview, which was shown at all of the meetings.

The Teamster leader accused the Commission of misinterpreting "intentionally or otherwise" a law designed to make competition between trucks and the rails more realistic.

PROVISION CAUSING TROUBLE

The section of law, passed by Congress in 1958, which is causing all the legislative fireworks, says: "Rate of a carrier shall not be held up to a particular level to protect the traffic of any other mode of transportation."

The most severe effects of the 1958 law have been felt by the trucking industry in hauling new automobiles from assembly plants to distributors and dealers and by other specialized carriers.

Trucks formerly hauled more than 90 percent of such freight. This year, Ford Motor Co. alone expects to transport about a third of its new cars by railroad.

This substantial shift in auto hauling resulted from rates established by the railroads and approved by the ICC which were as much as 50 percent lower than motor carriers were charging.

"This misrepresentation," Mr. Hoffa charged, "will destroy the auto hauling companies, and the jobs of over 15,000 Teamster members unless the railroads and the ICC are stopped."

All five of the cosponsoring Senators of S. 1197 are members of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which has jurisdiction over the ICC. A companion bill has been introduced in the House (H.R. 5937) by Representative MORGAN MOULDER, of Missouri.

WIVES ASKED TO HELP

The second stage of the nationwide campaign will be establishing women's auxiliaries among the Teamster wives. A brochure explaining how to establish an auxiliary, and

how it can function in the campaign will be distributed.

Simultaneous with establishment of the auxiliaries, a series of congressional breakfasts will be held in Washington. Teamster members will come to the Capitol, and invite their Congressmen and Senators to breakfasts sponsored by the international union. At the breakfasts the congressional delegations will hear the Teamster members' case for the Bartlett bill.

Also part of the second stage, a massive letter-writing campaign has been undertaken by the entire 1.7 million Teamster members, urging support of the Bartlett bill. It is estimated that over 75,000 letters have been written to Congress and the ICC since January.

Senator Keating Delivers Important Address on Governmental Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, the junior Senator from New York, Mr. KEATING, recently delivered an interesting speech on the need for certain governmental reforms before the annual banquet of the Olean Chamber of Commerce. He outlined a concrete program for increasing congressional efficiency in the appropriation process and generally urged fresh initiatives to gear our Government to modern problems.

In view of his long crusade for efficiency in Government and his deep study of this field, Senator KEATING's remarks deserve wide circulation and study. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the text of his address before the Olean Chamber of Commerce be printed at this point in the RECORD.

REMARKS OF SENATOR KENNETH B. KEATING, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE ANNUAL BANQUET OF OLEAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, OLEAN, N.Y., APRIL 22, 1961

Mr. Chairman, members of the chamber of commerce, honored guests, it is a pleasure to be with you here tonight. I must say that during the recent basketball season I saw the Olean dateline quite often in the newspapers. It would appear that Tom Stith and his teammates were of great help to the chamber of commerce in putting Olean in the Nation's eye, and I'd like to state that as a western New Yorker, I was proud of the fine national record established by the St. Bonaventure team.

You are here today as citizens interested in government. There is nothing so valuable to a free society as people such as yourselves. A free government is people. When it ceases to be that—when it becomes bureaucrats and legislators, experts, and researchers operating in a self-made empire, then, it is in trouble.

As a Member of the Congress, I have always taken a deep interest in good government. Good government is not automatic. It requires constant vigilance.

It is founded on the greatness of the past and at the same time is willing to accept the dynamic challenges of the future. Good government, therefore, by definition, is both past and future. Let me elaborate for a moment on this point. As for the past, all of us recognize that the greatness of our Nation today depends very largely upon the preservation of individual initiative and incentives, which are so much a part of our free, competitive enterprise system.

While seeking to govern effectively, we recognize that the concentration of too many activities and of too much power in Washington—or anywhere else—tends to drain so huge a lump of every man's income away in taxes that his energies and initiative are depleted and eventually diminished altogether. We must remember that the coin of Government has two sides—spending and taxing.

But Government cannot be static and inflexible. We must be willing to expand the role of Government in those specific fields in which it is found to be necessary. We must strengthen existing Government programs where there is a clear need to do so.

This is the framework which I try to keep in mind. The Nation as a whole must make the great decisions as to what the Nation should do—what should be the size and scope of the activities of our Federal, State, and local Governments—how authority and responsibility should be related and equated.

To make these decisions, the public must be informed and articulate. There is much yet to be done in bringing the Government closer to the people. In this day and age of mass media, and the urban sprawl, we must renew and reinvigorate our efforts to make Government more understandable so that all Americans can appraise its actions and develop opinions on the major questions of our day.

The chamber of commerce is one of the organizations which is doing an important job in this field.

In this connection, let me touch upon a few questions that illustrate the point I have in mind. In doing so, I want to outline a program to gear our Government to 20th century problems and to promote efficiency in its operation.

First, there is the matter of the item veto. For many years, I have sponsored legislation to permit the President of the United States to veto items in appropriation bills without having to veto the entire bill.

In a nutshell, if we would provide the President with the power to veto items in an appropriation bill, that is the most effective single step we could take to eliminate waste and pork barreling and enable the Government of the United States to operate more economically and efficiently.

Many States have successfully provided their chief executives with this needed and constructive power of the purse. It is clear from their experience that the Federal Government and the taxpayers of America would benefit materially from the institution of the item veto.

This is a matter that should not be the exclusive concern of legislators.

It affects all of us—and every American should think of the item veto not as a vague phrase but as a step towards the better kind of government he wants. And if he has convictions, he shouldn't jingle them in his pocket, but put them on the line. So the next time you write a letter to a Congressman, may I suggest that instead of talking in negative generalities about wasteful spending in Government, you urge him affirmatively to support this constructive reform.

Secondly, there is the proposal, now in the form of a bill, of which I am a cosponsor, whereby a Joint Committee on the Budget would be established.

This committee would examine the budget as a whole, and not piecemeal. It would handle this important fiscal responsibility in an efficient, modern way, not with the horse-and-buggy methods of the past. This bill has wide support. It deserves the backing of responsible, savings-minded, efficiency-minded citizens.

In this same vital fiscal area, there is an urgent need for a broad and searching consideration of tax reforms. Here, too, is a problem that is the business of all Americans, not just the lawmakers.

One suggestion worthy of study in this field is the establishment of a Hoover-type commission to examine analytically the entire tax structure, and submit recommendations for changes geared to the times and designed to eliminate inequities. It is all right for people to have a passion for antiques—but our tax laws shouldn't be early American.

* * * * *

Many businessmen, like yourselves, will say that taxes are a bloodletting where a transfusion is needed. To pursue this subject a bit, as you are aware, more interest is being focused on taxation today than since—well, let me say, since the Boston Tea Party.

Recommendations run the gamut from sanity to extremism. Some groups are now calling for tax reforms that would abolish income tax completely, and return all Government business-type operations to the States.

Now, I agree with the school of thought that favors revision and modernization of our tax policies. I also recognize that there are certain Federal functions that can and should be turned over to local governments. But it is neither realistic nor practical to suggest the abolition of the Federal income tax.

Just as one example, how could we possibly achieve a posture of national defense and security in a world where power is not only the first requisite of safety but the indispensable requisite of survival? The argument for the fragmentation of national power—power based on Federal taxes—falls apart when we contemplate the alternative—a defense system geared to the days of the bow and arrow, not to the age of the hydrogen bomb.

Now, my third point is that we must cease to venerate the status quo. When we build automobiles we don't go on the principle that no improvements are possible on last year's model.

In Government, too often the ways of the past have been sanctified and perpetuated. Not only is last year's model still good, but even the last century's model in some cases. My own feeling is that we must constantly keep the door of our mind open to new concepts, new approaches, new directives. Not because change in itself is desirable, but because changes for the better are desirable—changes that will give us more efficiency-per-dollar, more achievement-per-effort.

I should like to cite an example. The suggestion has been advanced that a special session of the Congress be authorized for the sole purpose of studies, hearings and legislative action in the vital field of appropriations.

Such a session might take place in November and December of each year, prior, that is, to the opening of the regular session. Now such a proposal deserves serious consideration.

The business of appropriating sums in excess of $80 billion requires time, study, consultation, and deep reflection. At present this whole operation is done on a piecemeal basis, subject to the interruptions, the distractions, the emergencies that go hand in hand with a regular session of the Congress.

It is my conviction that more effective, more businesslike, and, not the least important, more money-saving general appropriations legislation would result from this special session proposal I have briefly outlined to you.

There is a fourth and final point I should like to make in this program of modernizing and vitalizing the operation of our Government. This point is embodied in another bill which I am sponsoring in the Senate. This measure is based on the premise that the more people know about the way Government operates, the better a Government operation we will have.

It calls for the establishment of a "know your Government" service whose sole function will be to break down the wall of secrecy that lies between the people and their Government. The idea is to make Government the living thing it ought to be, not the big anonymous, incomprehensible force that directs our lives from a central control system.

Too many of our citizens know only what they're obliged to do for the Government. They don't know that the Government is a two-way, not a one-way street—that it was created to serve the people, not to be their master. My contention is that we must do on the national scale what is so well done on the local scale—in cities like your own.

Your active, informed, alert citizenry is the greatest human resource that Olean possesses. You have a history here of thinking for yourselves, acting by yourselves—and economic adversity hasn't made you sit down and wait, but stand up and fight. For Washington is not the ultimate solution to every problem. It may assist, it may cooperate, but the prime mover must be the drive, the energy, the spirit of citizens like your own who don't just stare at difficulties but roll up their sleeves and go out and work to overcome those difficulties.

I want to make it clear that the four-point program I have discussed with you today is not just a matter of good housekeeping in government. It is, above all, a matter of strengthening the muscles of democracy—of better preparing us to withstand the tremendous challenge that free societies like our own are facing throughout the world today as communism mounts its silent and deadly offensive.

Too many Americans think that a fight doesn't begin until the bell rings—until a shot is fired—until the sirens go off.

The cold, hard fact is that a fight is going on right now—across the world, a struggle that we're in whether we like it or not—a titanic struggle that is not conventional war, where there is no blood, no thunder, but where our freedom can be put to death as surely as a bullet can kill or a bomb can destroy. That is why we Americans can no longer afford the luxury of apathy. That is why the way America is run is the personal business of all Americans, not the prerogative of an official few.

We face a foe that has a single purpose, the destruction of all freedom.

Against that diabolical resolve we must throw the full strength of our energies, the full dedication of our spirit. And in this connection, let me leave one final thought with you—a thought every one of us should burn into his heart and mind. History has recorded for us the many ways in which human freedom has died—gloriously, cravenly, forlornly, but the saddest, most ignominious death of all is when freedom dies in its sleep.

Bracero Program Defended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to an article by Richard Strout, staff correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, which appeared in the April 21, 1961, edition of that newspaper:

BRACERO PROGRAM DEFENDED

(By Richard Strout)

WASHINGTON.—There are fewer so-called wetbacks along the Mexican border of the United States today than there used to be. Many feel it is due to the bracero program.

The colorful wetbacks were the illicit immigrants from Mexico who came across the Rio Grande to work on U.S. farms.

Some controversy surrounds the program whose extension is being debated now in a House subcommittee on agriculture where Representative CHARLES M. TEAGUE, Republican, of California, is ranking Republican.

The bracero program, Mr. TEAGUE argues, has helped reduce wetbacks from around 1 million each year to about 30,000.

The braceros, Mr. TEAGUE, are properly transported, house, fed, and insured. Mexican and United States Government officials travel, throughout the areas of our country using braceros, to make certain the treaty provisions are followed to the letter. When they return to Mexico, in most cases at least, they are emissaries of goodwill for the United States."

"Why should we bring in workers from Mexico when we have 4 or 5 million unemployed persons in this country?" Mr. TEAGUE says the answer is that "not enough domestic Americans workers are willing to do hard farm labor."

In a statement he continues: "Several persons, with headquarters here in Washington, appeared before our subcommittee and stated that the bracero program should be abandoned. All of these people were well intentioned, and some of them were clergymen. They did demonstrate, however, an abysmal ignorance of the real situation.

"It is sometimes stated that the bracero program works only for the benefit of the large farmers. This simply is not true. There are two good reasons why it is not:

"1. Large farmers can afford to mechanize, and most small operators cannot.

"2. If our total domestic farm labor supply were not supplemented by the braceros, a shortage of available workers would surely develop.

Then, the large farmers could outbid the small ones for the labor, because the former could afford to take a financial loss for a year or two. On the other hand, the small operators would go bankrupt and would be forced out of business entirely. The larger farmers would be in a position to gamble that the subsequent drop in production would tend to force up farm prices (and consequently food prices) so that they could again make a living."

Where Has "Faith" in Our Foreign Giveaway Program Brought Us in the World?

SPEECH

OF

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill H.R. 6518 making appropriations for the inter-American social and economic cooperation program and the Chilean reconstruction and rehabilitation program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, we have passed in this Congress a bill that practically hands a half billion dollars to the State Department in the form of a blank check. We have told the State Department, in effect, "Here is a blank check. Spend it as you see fit."

Now, a half billion dollars may not mean much to some of the gentlemen in this assembly. It certainly does mean much to the taxpayers of this Nation, and especially to the taxpayers in my home State of Indiana.

We on the Appropriations Committee have tried diligently to learn of a definite program that exists for spending this money. We have sought to learn where about $106 million of soft money in the bill is going to be spent. We have tried to learn this to no avail.

We have been told by the State Department that we must back the bill "on faith." Time and again we have been told we "must have faith" that everything will come out all right and that the money will be spent wisely and properly.

I ask you, what kind of justification is that? It is about as sensible as giving $2 billion to the Corps of Engineers "on faith," hoping they will carry out the right flood control projects.

These mystery funds have been neither explained nor justified, yet we are asked to tell our constituents to "grin and bear it"—to "have faith."

What has faith gained us in the past? We have poured billions and billions of dollars down this foreign aid hole and what have we gained by it? Prestige? Friendship? Reciprocated faith in what the United States is trying to do? I think you will agree that the end result of all this aid has been enmity by those getting it, an ever-decreasing circle of friends and allies and a mounting national debt for ourselves.

I, for one, am against voting for these pigs in pokes. When we spend money from now on, I want to know where it is going, why it is being sent and what it is going to do when it gets there.

Our past experience at trying to win friends through dollars has been sad, indeed. I think we should stop playing the rich uncle, embark on a positive campaign of pro-Americanism and display to the world the image of a nation that believes in itself. We should display our intention to continue that direction regardless of minor setbacks. It is time we worried about American strength and prestige first and allow other countries a free and clear choice as to whether they want to join us or not.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY], indicated in debate on this bill that the 87th Congress was committed by the 86th Congress to this program. I should like to point out that the gentleman is incorrect. Every Member of the 87th Congress was elected in 1960. The commitments of the 86th Congress in no way bind the 87th Congress and the gentleman from Virginia knows it.

Similarly, each individual Member of this august body was sent here because his constituents hold him in high es-

teem. They expect him to seek answers, to probe for information and to get the facts on everything pertinent to the Nation's business.

If we are now individually and collectively to abdicate this position of responsibility, if we are to proceed on a hazy policy of "faith" in an unknown program, then we have violated our trust. Every one of us should resign and go back home and run for office again. It would be interesting to see how successful those of us who run on a platform of blind faith might be.

Memory of Molly Secure in Hearts of Peorians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert the following article from the April 23, 1961, issue of the Peoria Journal-Star. I am sure that the memory of Molly of radio's "Fibber McGee and Molly" will not only remain in the hearts and minds of Peorians, but with millions of their fans throughout the Nation:

Death has split the Peoria couple who became radio's king and queen, but Fibber McGee and Molly will live forever in the entertainment world's hall of fame.

For nearly 20 years Jim and Marian (Driscoll) Jordan enjoyed the heights of radio popularity, meantime amassing a fortune, with good clean comedy their only secret of success.

Show business and the millions of persons who were fans of Fibber and Molly mourned the passing April 7, in California, of Marian Jordan—born on Peoria's south side April 15, 1898—and extended sympathy to her husband, born November 16, 1896 in a farmhouse off Farmington Road.

Jim, the son of a farmer, and Marian, daughter of a coal miner, had been married 42 years. They met as teenagers while singing in the choir of St. John's Church, and have often said it was "love at first sight." They were married here August 31, 1918.

Even as youngsters Jim and Marian had their hearts set on show business as a career, and never lost sight of that goal. However, it was a long, hard struggle—frequently beset with seemingly insurmountable obstacles—before they reached it.

Marian was the youngest member of a family of nine boys and four girls born to Daniel and Anna (Carroll) Driscoll; Jim was one of a family of five boys and three girls born to James W. and Mary (Tighe) Jordan. Marian is survived by two brothers and a sister, living here. Jim has two brothers and two sisters living, but no close relatives here anymore.

Until they went into virtual retirement a few years ago, Jim and Marian had attracted weekly radio audiences up to the 40-million mark with their "Fibber McGee and Molly" show—a series that started in April of 1935. The comedy show had a distinctly American smalltown tang and was one the whole family could, and did, enjoy.

The local background on Jim and Marian, coming largely from her two brothers and her sister—Daniel Driscoll of 2818 W. Hayes Street, Carroll P. Driscoll, of 2923 West Augustana Avenue, and Mrs. Ellen Lord, 1024 North Flora Avenue—shows the close ties Fibber and Molly had with Peoria.

Jim attended St. Mark's grade school and Spalding Institute. In his spare time he studied voice. This study continued 4 years, during which time he was engaged in various jobs including that of wholesale drug clerk, mail carrier, washing machine salesman, and insurance agent. All the time he was going with Marian.

During these early years Jim sang in a local quartet and teamed up frequently with Marian as a harmony duo.

In September 1917 Jim decided to strike out and try to make the big time, going to Chicago and getting a job as tenor in vaudeville in an act known as "A Night With the Poets."

Marian, who had studied at the parochial schools and the Academy of Our Lady, appeared in many amateur theatricals and concerts. She had studied voice, violin, and piano, and later taught piano.

After a comparatively short time in Chicago Jim got lonesome for Marian and returned to Peoria. Five days after they were married, Jim, who had been turned down when he tried to enlist, was called by the Army. After training at a Georgia camp he was sent overseas to serve with the 122d Engineers.

Although he became seriously ill at St. Nazaire, Jordan refused to leave France and turned his entertaining talents to the morale division of the oversea army. He organized a troupe and toured the frontlines.

Once back in Peoria he got a job in a machine shop, but the lure of the entertainment world was too great for either Jim or Marian and they embarked on a vaudeville tour. A bit later they organized a concert tour, being part of an entertainment troupe. These tours lasted 4 years and took the Peoria couple to hundreds of tank towns, opera houses, and churches throughout the Middle West. They got tired of all this, called it quits.

The real break for Jim and Marian, although they didn't realize it at the time, came when they made a visit to Byron, one of Jim's brothers at Rogers Park in Chicago, and someone turned on the radio.

Jim listened, then said: "Marian and I can do better than that." It was when his brother jokingly bet him $10 that he couldn't that Jim accepted the challenge that started them on their way to fame and fortune.

In 1925 they had a satisfactory audition over WIBO, Chicago, and were hired for a song program. After the initial performance they were engaged for one of the first sponsored radio programs in the Middle West—receiving $10 a week as "The O'Henry Twins" sponsored by a candy bar firm.

It was their meeting with Don Quinn, erstwhile cartoonist and gag specialist, that led them up the golden path of radio. He recognized their talents and their potentiality as an outstanding team and continued as their writer all through the years that followed.

His first sketch for them, "Smack Out," concerned a folksy grocery store proprietor who was always smack out of everything except tall tales. This developed into a popular series and the Jordans appeared in this and in other sketches over NBC, as well as on children's programs.

Well on their way, the Jordans reached the top with the creation of Fibber McGee and Molly—which was given its original network airing 26 years ago this month. The series continued from that time until around 5 years ago, except during part of 1938 and 1939 when Marian's health caused its interruption for two seasons.

The show was a moderate success as a daytime feature, but when changed to one of the choicest night spots on the air—9:30 p.m. Tuesdays—it's popularity soared. The Jordans' fortunes rose and they built a home in Chicago—a far cry from one in which they had lived here in the 900 block First Avenue when they were first married.

When Marian became ill in 1938 the Jordans moved to California. There, they continued the show and also made three motion pictures over the next several years. After the Jordans went into semi-retirement, making only infrequent appearances on the marathon radio show, Monitor, a TV version of their Fibber McGee and Molly show with another cast proved a flop.

Costarring with Jim and Marian on their radio show over the years weer such favorites as Hal Peary, "Gildersleeve"; Cliff Arquette as "The Old Timer"; Bill Thompson as "Wallace Wimple"; Gale Gordon as "Mayor Latrivia," and Arthur Q. Bryan as "Doc Gamble."

Fibber, of course, was always the braggadocio, loving guy who told the gargantuan whoppers and cracked the corny jokes that evoked Molly's "'Taint funny McGee." And Molly did Grandma, the dolorous Mrs. Wearybottom, the exasperating Teeny, a neighbor's child, and other characters.

The locale of the show was the mythical 79 Wistful Vista, where a bong-bong of the door chimes would announce the arrival of the various personalities on the show. Fibber's junk-laden closet was the cause of much mirth as all its contents would be heard to spill on the floor whenever he yanked open the door.

Johnson's Wax sponsored the show, which paid the Jordans around $6,000 a week. They made considerably more in the years when they appeared in movies.

Her brother, Carroll, who with Mrs. Driscoll returned a few days ago from California where they attended Marian's funeral, said Jim wants to do some traveling and then wants to go back to work. He didn't say, however, just what he has in mind. He and Marian resided in an estate at Encino. He still owns property in Peoria.

Carroll tells some interesting things about Fibber and Molly, including the fact that "Fred Nitney," about whom Jim often quipped in the radio show, was a real person. Jim told Carroll that Nitney was an entertainer in the troupe he toured with many years ago.

At the end of that tour, Carroll revealed, Jim and Marian—unhappy at the prospect of returning to Peoria and probably losing all opportunity to break into the bigtime—even considered going to China.

Jordan had a sister and brother-in-law who were theatrical impressarios in that country and they wrote urging Jim and Marian to revive their concert company and bring it over.

The Jordans were just on the verge of taking this advice when they got a second letter telling them not to bring "the kids; you'll be traveling in a land where it will be difficult to secure fresh milk." The Jordans looked at their two then youngsters, Jim, Jr., and Kathryn (now Mrs. Victor Newcomer), and the Chinese tour was off.

Carroll revealed, also, that at one time his brother had visions of becoming a "Swiss bellringer." He said, incidentally, he and his wife still have Marian's violin in their home and probably would send it to Jim at some later date.

Danny, the other brother of Marian, likes to remember doing the Irish jig with her when we were kids, and Mrs. Lord also has many fond memories of her sister.

The Jordans visited Peoria several times, the last time 5 years ago.

One of their best friends in their younger days here was Paul Mehlenbeck, 62, of 220 North Western Avenue. He and Jordan were members of the old quartet which appeared at numerous functions in the pre-World War I days.

"Jim was our tenor, and a darned good one," Mehlenbeck recalls. Mehlenbeck, him-

self, gained a widespread reputation throughout the Midwest after the quartet broke up as the leader of his own orchestra for 19 years.

Mehlenbeck said his family and the Jordan family were very close and "I would class Jim and Marian as my very best friends; they were the kind of people one would certainly be proud to call his friends." The Mehlenbecks visited Jim and Marian at their beautiful Encino home a couple of years ago. Mehlenbeck said:

"Jim and Marian showed us a wonderful time and we were thrilled to see their estate. But they never changed; they were the same down-to-earth people that they were back in Peoria before they gained fame and fortune."

Customhouse 22 Miles From Harbor Is A Waste of Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, construction of a customs headquaters for the twin ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach in the Los Angeles Civic Center 22 miles away is an unnecessary waste of taxpayers' money. The GSA proposes to construct the custom house as part of a new 8-story Federal office building costing in excess of $30 million. Two floors, or approximately 150,000 square feet are to be devoted to customs facilities. Customs' cost of the new building has been estimated variously by Federal sources as from $4 million to $6 million. More than 100,000 square feet of this customs space are to be devoted to appraiser's store. The appraiser's store is essentially warehousing where merchandise samples are brought, examined and stored until they are picked by the importer.

This customs appraiser's warehousing in a multistory civic center building will thus cost the Federal Government more than $30 a square foot to construct.

By contrast, good private warehousing, including air-conditioned offices can be and has been built in the harbor area for as little as $5 a square foot. Location of the custom house in the harbor would save the taxpayer construction costs of at least $2 million. This is not the only price the Government pays for its 22-mile bottleneck.

Examiners packages have to be transported from the piers to the appraiser's store in central Los Angeles. This cartage costs the Government between $40,000 and $50,000 a year. Each day, eight appraisers are sent out from Los Angeles to inspect merchandise too delicate or too bulky to truck to the appraiser's store for examination. Travel time, as stated by former Acting Collector of Customs D. B. Strubinger, is 1 hour each way. Thus the eight appraisers, just in traveling to and from the harbor, lose a total of 16 hours, or 2 man-days each day.

Every transportation delay or problem that costs the Government money in attempting to administer customs at the harbor from a headquarters 22 miles inland, also costs the man in the importing or exporting business money. Importers complain that customs clearances that are a matter of hours in other ports frequently become a matter of days in Los Angeles and Long Beach harbors. Shipments frequently cannot be forwarded until the examiner's packages are returned from the appraiser's store. Similarly, if a cargo is taken off a ship after the appraiser's truck has made its visit to that pier, the merchandise must sit on the pier until the truck comes again the next day. Importers complain that damage to merchandise seems to occur most frequently to those packages which are transported to Los Angeles for examination. They do not blame this on the customs, but on 22-mile transportation and repackaging problems. Sometimes, customs forms—called entries—get misplaced by the messenger who once a day shuttles papers back and forth between Los Angeles and the port. That results in extra delay until the mistake is corrected and the messenger makes his next run.

The Influence of Communism on Government Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, here is the last in a series of articles by Robert B. Dresser concerning communism.

It appeared in Economic Council Paper, volume XVI, No. 4, April 1, 1961:

COMMUNISM AND THE HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE—THE INFLUENCE OF COMMUNISM ON GOVERNMENT POLICY

(By Robert B. Dresser)

Numerous investigations of communism and subversive activities have been made by committees of Congress and of the individual States during the past 40 or more years. A summary index of these investigations during the period from 1918 to 1956 has been printed by order of the U.S. Senate, dated July 23, 1956. The large number of such investigations is shown by the fact that the summary index contains 339 pages.

SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN DIES, MARCH 1948

In March 1948 Congressman Martin Dies, Democrat, of Texas, a courageous and much respected Member of Congress, made a most startling and revealing speech before the Southern Gas Association, at Galveston, Tex., on Communist activities in the United States. Congressman Dies was the first chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, originally known as the "Dies committee."

I quote from his speech as follows:

"Democracy and Christian civilization are more gravely menaced throughout the world today than ever before in history. At long last, many of our people realize that fact. Unfortunately, however, they realize it imperfectly and incompletely, and there are still millions of people in the United States who have no conception of the methods, tactics, and purposes of communism. All of us, however, must have some understanding of what has happened in the world about us.

* * * * *

"Only a few years ago, Russia was looked upon as a third-rate power. Today, all of us must concede that Russia is the most powerful country on earth. Now, how did that happen? I propose to answer that question.

* * * * *

"It all began in 1938. I was a member of the Immigration Committee and also a member of the Committee on Rules of the House of Representatives. I became intensely interested in Communist infiltration of labor unions, and in Government service. I decided the time was appropriate to investigate and expose Communists' activities in the United States. So I introduced a resolution and the Committee on Rules approved it and the House of Representatives, on May 26, 1938, established the committee.

"Immediately after the committee was established, I encountered strenuous opposition. When I went to the Committee on Accounts to secure an appropriation to finance the work of the committee, I found that the Democratic members were hostile to every suggestion that I made. They finally, upon instructions from the White House, reduced the requested budget from $100,000 to $25,000. I began the work with the paltry sum of $25,000.

"I telephoned the Attorney General of the United States and said, 'Mr. Attorney General, I want to secure the services of some competent and reliable investigators to assist me in this work.' He sent me two men. I received a telephone call, however, an anonymous call shortly before their arrival, telling me both men were members of the Communist Party. I never knew who gave me that valuable information, but I acted upon it.

"When they arrived, I began to question them. I put them through the third degree, in the presence of the entire committee, and finally they broke down and admitted that they were members of the Communist Party who worked for the Department of Justice.

* * * * *

"I announced through the press that I intended next morning to open hearings and give the American people the truth.

"I received a telephone call from President Roosevelt who asked me to come to the White House at 10 o'clock the next morning. I went to the White House. Senator Sheppard was there. Evidently the President thought Senator Sheppard might influence me. The President said to me, 'You know, Martin, I have been watching you for a long time. You have a promising future. You are an able speaker and a young man and I want vigorous, able, young men in the New Deal, and you can go a long way working with me.' He continued, 'You have got to be loyal to me. I can't work with men that I can't depend upon. You can't go through with this investigation.' And I said, 'Why can't I go through with it, Mr. President?' Of course, I was somewhat weakened, to tell the truth. It sounded awfully good to me, what he was telling me, and being human, I am not going to represent myself as any hero because I wasn't. I was just plain scared.

* * * * *

"Well, one thing led to another, and finally the President became somewhat impatient and angry with me, and he turned to Senator Sheppard and said, 'Senator, what are we going to do with Martin?' Senator Sheppard was a very genial, pleasant man and a good friend of mine. He said, 'I don't know. I knew his dad, and when one of these Dies makes up his mind to do something, he usually does it. I am afraid you are going to have trouble in persuading him not to do it.'

"Well, the interview lasted about 45 or 50 minutes, and finally, I looked at the watch and said, 'Mr. President, I have to go because the committee meets and I have to be there to open.'

* * * * *

"I recall for instance, that a man by the name of General Sevinsky, a very able young man who had served with Stalin for a long time, and had become disgusted with the brutality of the Communist practice and had fled to the United States. I discovered his whereabouts and went to see him. He told me an amazing story of what Stalin had told him a long time ago, about the plan to infiltrate the Balkan States, to build secret armies in every country, to spend millions of dollars for propaganda purposes. He told me the ultimate goal of Stalin was the conquest of Europe and then the conquest of the Americas.

"I said to him, 'Why don't you come to Washington and testify? The American people ought to have that information.' He said, 'Mr. Congressman, if I were to come to Washington and testify and if they discovered my identity, the OGPU which is now the NKVD, the secret army of the Politico Bureau, would assassinate me in 2 days.'

"I said, 'Surely they are not that powerful in the United States.' I was very skeptical about it. He said, 'Mr. Congressman, I was chief of the western division of the Soviet intelligence and I know that there isn't a country, there isn't an industry, there isn't a town of industrial importance that members of the OGPU are not there listening, getting and using information and transmitting it to the Soviet Union. They have their agents in the Embassies—even the Ambassadors do not know the members of the OGPU.'

"At any rate, I talked to him at some length and finally, upon the promise that I would protect him and conceal his identity, he agreed to testify.

"I called up the Secret Service and I said, 'I am undertaking a rather perilous thing. This man is fearful of his life.' I undertook to get a commitment from the Government that they would help me protect him, but the Government didn't want him to testify. He did testify. His name was not given then to the press. Within 2 weeks after his startling revelations, which predicted almost 100 percent accurately the progress the Kremlin has made within the last 2 years, within 2 weeks after his testimony, he was found shot in his hotel room in Washington, D.C., and not one arm was raised by the Federal Government to discover and apprehend the man or men responsible for his death.

"Another former agent of the Soviet Union, in New York, was persuaded to testify. Shortly after his testimony, he was found dead. They said it was a heart attack. I demanded another examination and discovered that he had been shot with a fine steel bullet through the eye which had entered his brain and brought about his death.

"Still another man who testified before our committee in Chicago was mysteriously run down by a hit-and-run driver.

"I say these things because my purpose is to show you upon this occasion what happened in the United States and which resulted in the sacrifice of the fruits of victory won by our boys on the battlefields. I am at a loss to understand why men in public affairs are not now clamoring for publication of the secret agreements made with Joseph Stalin by our Government. I have been amazed that people have received with such indifference and unconcern the startling revelation that all of the men who fought and died, died in vain because they were betrayed. And I shall show you here and now how they were betrayed.

* * * * *

"Yes, we continued, continued giving the American people the truth. Finally, we discovered that some 2,500 Communists, agents and stooges and servants and minions of a foreign dictator, were on the Government payroll, occupying in many instances key positions in the State Department, in the Justice Department, and in the Interior Department. So, I wrote to President Roosevelt and told him I wanted to see him about it, and he said, 'All right.'

"I went down to the White House. I said, 'Mr. President, we have got to do something about this. Here is a list of these people. We have raided the organization and we have their membership records. There can't be any doubt about it. If you understand the Communists as I understand them, you will know they are in the Government for one purpose and one purpose alone, and that is to steal the important Government secrets to transmit them to Moscow.'

"The President was furious. I was amazed at his anger. He said to me—he got to calling me Mr. Congressman—he had called me Martin before—he said, 'Mr. Congressman, you must see a bugaboo under every bed.' I said, 'No, I never look under the bed, Mr. President.' 'Well,' he said, 'I have never seen a man that had such ideas about this thing. There is nothing wrong with the Communists, some of the best friends I have got are Communists.' Mind you, that is a truthful account. He made that statement.

"I made that statement before the House soon after President Roosevelt made it and he did not deny it. Everything I tell you, I told to the Congress, and no one to this day has ever denied any statement I ever made.

* * * * *

"Well, the President refused to discharge the Communists and finally I went before the House and induced Congress to withhold appropriations to pay their salaries. The executive department then defied Congress and refused still to fire them. They were kept on the Government pay. Yes, they were on the Government payroll when we were working on the secret of the atomic bomb. And still there are people in America so dumb as to believe Stalin doesn't have the secret of the atomic bomb. How could he have kept from getting it with men in every department of the Government, influential men who wouldn't hesitate a moment to give that information to Stalin. They got it in Canada, didn't they, and Canada wasn't one-twentieth as well organized by Communists as the United States. We were taken in, lock, stock, and barrel, by Communist propaganda.

* * * * *

"I had a member of the Secret Service who worked in the White House give me reports every week on what happened in the White House. I knew that leading Communist agents had access to the White House, were going there and were using their influence to affect our domestic and foreign policy. Now, I know this is difficult for you to believe, but every bit of it is the truth. I am telling you these incidents so that you may have some faint idea of how thoroughly Stalin was able to dupe the United States of America.

* * * * *

"So, my fellow citizens, here was Moscow in full swing in the United States. They were influencing our domestic policy by preaching public ownership. They formed innumerable organizations which were lobbying actively in Washington for this purpose. Of course, they didn't say this was communism. They didn't say these organizations were controlled by Communists. These organizations were making inroads on the economic system of America, acquiring land, acquiring business, narrowing the field of competition, building up the monopoly of public power, which is as dangerous as monopoly in business, if not more dangerous. And Stalin was working on the foreign policy."

REPORT OF JENNER COMMITTEE, JULY 30, 1953

Probably the most comprehensive of the congressional investigations was one undertaken by the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the U.S. Senate. The report of this committee was dated July 30, 1953. It is a most important and revealing document. The committee was composed of eight Senators—five Republicans and three Democrats—and the chairman was Senator William E. Jenner, Republican, of Indiana. The report was unanimous.

The conclusions of the Committee were stated in the report as follows:

"1. The Soviet international organization has carried on a successful and important penetration of the U.S. Government and this penetration has not been fully exposed.

"2. This penetration has extended from the lower ranks to top-level policy and operating positions in our Government.

"3. The agents of this penetration have operated in accordance with a distinct design fashioned by their Soviet superiors.

"4. Members of this conspiracy helped to get each other into Government, helped each other to rise in Government and protected each other from exposure.

"5. The general pattern of this penetration was first into agencies concerned with economic recovery, then to warmaking agencies, then to agencies concerned with foreign policy and postwar planning, but always moving to the focal point of national concern.

"6. In general, the Communists who infiltrated our Government worked behind the scenes—guiding research and preparing memorandums on which basic American policies were set, writing speeches for Cabinet officers, influencing congressional investigations, drafting laws, manipulating administrative reorganizations—always serving the interest of their Soviet superiors.

"7. Thousands of diplomatic, political, military, scientific, and economic secrets of the United States have been stolen by Soviet agents in our Government and other persons closely connected with the Communists.

"8. Despite the fact that the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other security agencies had reported extensive information about this Communist penetration, little was done by the executive branch to interrupt the Soviet operatives in their ascent in Government until congressional committees brought forth to public light the facts of the conspiracy.

"9. Powerful groups and individuals within the executive branch were at work obstructing and weakening the effort to eliminate Soviet agents from positions in Government.

"10. Members of this conspiracy repeatedly swore to oaths denying Communist Party membership when seeking appointments, transfers, and promotions: and these falsifications have, in virtually every case, gone unpunished.

"11. The control that the American Communications Association, a Communist directed union, maintains over communication lines vital to the national defense poses a threat to the security of this country.

"12. Policies and programs laid down by members of the Soviet conspiracy are still in effect within our Government and constitute a continuing hazard to our national security."

Other investigations by congressional committees have resulted in similar conclusions.

STATEMENT OF J. EDGAR HOOVER, MARCH 26, 1947

In further support of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, let me quote

from a statement by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, before that committee on March 26, 1947:

"The aims and responsibilities of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Federal Bureau of Investigation are the same—the protection of the internal security of this Nation. The methods whereby this goal may be accomplished differ, however.

"I have always felt that the greatest contribution this committee could make is the public disclosure of the forces that menace America—Communist and Fascist. That is why the venom of the American Communist and the now defunct German-American Bund has been directed at this committee as it has also been directed at the Federal Bureau of Investigation. This committee renders a distinct service when it publicly reveals the diabolic machinations of sinister figures engaged in un-American activities."

CONCLUSION

1. Does it appear strange to anyone—

(a) That onr Government should permit an organized enemy to plot our destruction in our very midst?

(b) That we should continue to recognize the Government of the country that is directing such action?

(c) That we should continue our membership in an organization, the United Nations, which admits Russia and her satellite nations to membership, thereby providing a most effective means of infiltrating our country with agents engaged in spying and subversive activities?

There was a period from 1917 to 1933 when we refused to recognize the Russian Government. In November 1933, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, acting alone, without any supporting action on the part of Congress or the Senate, entered into an executive agreement with Maxim M. Litvinov, representing Russia, whereby American recognition was extended to Russia, thereby enabling Russia to bring into this country thousands of agents for the purposes of undermining our Government and our system of society.

2. Can there be any doubt about the importance of discovering and exposing to public view the scoundrels who are plotting our destruction?

3. If so, why in heaven's name does anyone wish to abolish the most effective agency we have for this purpose?

The Tangled Web

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee will soon deliberate over the changes in our tax law recommended in the President's tax message. We all know the tax burden is heavy and should be tightened; yet we continue to increase it, already this year by fuel, highway users', and social security tax increases.

Now come these new recommendations which seem only to scramble further an already complicated tax hierarchy of law. This study by the Wall Street Journal is a stimulating one in this connection from which we may all benefit.

THE TANGLED WEB

Ever since the publican appeared on the doorstep to exact the things that were Caesar's, we suppose men have attacked the prevailing tax system as inequitable.

President Kennedy is no exception. His long-range goal, he told Congress the other day, is a more equitable tax structure and a simpler tax law. That is surely a desirable destination, but it's hard to see how the first steps he now proposes lead there.

Take the urgent question of depreciation allowances on plant and machinery. Liberal depreciation gives foreigners a growing edge over American firms which must operate outmoded machinery because of outmoded depreciation rules. But instead of an across-the-board modernization of depreciation, Mr. Kennedy favors a selective and complicated formula that would affect industry most unequally.

Or consider the proposed remedies for tax inequities in the field of foreign investment. Within 2 years, oversea tax havens are to be wiped out. American firms operating foreign subsidiaries are to be stripped of tax deferral privileges and so compelled to repatriate profits that would otherwise be reinvested abroad.

But "tax havens" aren't bad everywhere, in the Kennedy view. In order to enhance the relative attraction of investment. Mr. Kennedy proposes continued tax deferral for firms operating in the developing economies—that is, the backward countries.

Is this a step toward tax equity? To penalize investment in Europe and reward it in India? In any case, is it realistic? Regardless of the special tax favor, capital isn't likely to rush into lands which offer little real incentive to foreign investment or which are openly hostile to it. And the whole approach of punishing private foreign investment is a dubious solution to the imbalance of U.S. international payments. Foreign investment, after all, is a means of oversea income to this country.

Tax reform of this sort deals with effects and leaves causes unconsidered. Capital seeking oversea havens and investment opportunity is, to a great extent, capital driven from these shores by domestic tax inequities and obstacles to profitable enterprise.

To be sure, the President is concerned with domestic tax inequity—as he sees it. In his opinion, the $50 tax credit on dividend income and the 4-percent credit above that sum are wholly inequitable. Because such credits are highly favorable to taxpayers in the upper income (above $10,000) group, he urges their elimination and imposition of a 20-percent withholding tax on all income from interest and dividends.

Dismissed in this soak-the-rich reasoning is the inequity of taxing dividends both as corporate and personal income. Cooperatives, ironically enough, are to have their income taxable either to themselves or to their patrons—not both.

Finally, the President's zeal for tax equity moves him to moral indignation over "expense account living." It is a matter of national concern, he declares, "affecting not only our public revenues, our sense of fairness, and our respect for the tax system, but our moral and business practices as well." Granted. Expense accounts are sometimes flagrantly abused. Having condemned and deplored, however, one should ask the pertinent question: Why?

Here again, misuse of expense accounts is an effect and not a cause. It is an attempt to thwart the arbitrary restrictions and oppressive levies of the Government. The fundamental immorality of the steeply progressive tax rates is reflected in the immoral means by which men try to evade them. And so long as men do not respect the tax "system," so long will they try to beat it.

Contradictory and inconsistent, confused and arbitrary, the tax laws are an open invitation to man's ingenuity. And nowhere is this made more plain than in the new inequities Mr. Kennedy would create in the name of stamping out inequity.

Perhaps the tax laws must be a tangled web of deception and inequity when called upon to yield upwards of some $80 billion in Federal revenue annually. The enormity of the Federal outlay is the clue to urgently needed reform. Only when extravagant Federal spending is sharply reduced will it be possible to reduce rates, and so achieve "a more equitable tax structure and a simpler tax law."

Aid to Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared on Sunday, April 23, 1961, in the Kansas City Kansan—one of the major metropolitan newspapers in midcontinent America—commenting upon the inter-American appropriation bill, 1961, which this House passed yesterday by an overwhelming margin. Included in the editorial is comment by President Deane W. Malott, of Cornell University, a Kansan and a personal friend of mine. The editorial and the comment speak for themselves, and as my vote yesterday indicates, I am in agreement. The article follows:

AID TO LATIN AMERICA

Although coldly received by Congress, the half-billion-dollar aid to Latin America bill was approved by the House Appropriations Committee. The Cuban situation no doubt has whipped up support for the big money bill, as proposed by President Kennedy. Cuba is not included; will get no money from this source. An additional $100 million is recommended for the aid of Chile, which was seriously hurt by earthquakes last year.

The appropriations probably will be made available speedily so that the United States will not be accused of faltering. Our commitments being what they are, there appears to be no course less than granting funds to our neighbors to the south, hopeful that our ministrations aren't too late.

A former Kansan, Deane W. Malott, now president of Cornell University, in an address in California more than a month ago made a strong plea for immediate aid, notwithstanding the great diversity of the 21 countries involved. Nowhere are our problems greater, our stakes so huge, he says.

"In this vast area that is patently within our zone of influence, that is allied with us in every physical way, we have frittered away a grand alliance and, with it, a glittering opportunity. It would have been tragic enough to have thrown this into the discard by intent; worse still, we have come close to letting it go by neglect, simply because we never understood Latin Americans nor they us. This has been an active force at work against us."

Continuing, Dr. Malott declares:

"This problem of militant communism already entrenched in the Western Hemis-

phere, probing, luring, vindictive and insidious, is more serious for the destiny of the United States than any other problem now before us. Unless America takes steps, and costly steps, through the expenditure of many a million of American dollars to improve the social, political and economic health and to help to correct the economic imbalance between the Northern and Southern Hemispheres, you can mark my words, all hope of economic and political solidarity will be gone forever and the Monroe Doctrine and all it has stood for for 150 years will be nothing but the dreams of a past history and a lost opportunity.

"Every knowledgeable person in the realm of Latin American affairs agrees that the only way to stave off the insidious infiltration of Communism is to help improve the all-around standards of these countries, and to help at once. This will be costly; it may be in part wasteful. To many of us further Federal expenditures are most unpalatable, but alternatives do not exist."

The United States-Soviet Space Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD an editorial from the magazine Business Week, issue of April 22, 1961, entitled "Can We Match the Soviets in Space?" The editorial takes a realistic look at the recent Soviet achievement in putting a man in space and concludes, very logically, that we are in a space race and that as a nation which in the past has thrived on competition we should take up the challenge.

The editorial is as follows:

CAN WE MATCH THE SOVIETS IN SPACE?

No one can accuse Washington of reacting hysterically to last week's news that Russia had put a man in space and returned him safely to earth. It took Moscow's historic announcement in stride—almost as if it considered defeat inevitable in our efforts to match the Russians in space spectaculars.

In a sense, this is no more than a realistic appraisal of the facts. For all the soundness of our space exploration program, there is little chance of outpacing the Russians for at least the next 3 to 4 years.

The reasons we are behind the Russians are clear enough. We started our space program later. And we still don't have rocket boosters sufficiently powerful to lob heavy payloads into outer space.

How we got into this situation is a matter of history dating back to decisions made shortly after World War II. At that time, we developed small, lightweight nuclear warheads that could be delivered on target by less powerful rockets. Russia followed a different course, largely out of expediency. Lagging in nuclear developments, it set out to design powerful rockets to launch missiles equipped with heavy, fairly crude warheads.

When Russia embarked on a space program, it took its military missiles off the shelf and used them to boost heavy satellites and man-in-space capsules into outer space. We entered the competition belatedly—after the jolt of sputnik. And when we did push forward with a space program in 1958, under the civilian-controlled National Aeronautics and Space Administration, we had to draw on our inventory of less powerful missiles.

Even so, we have scored significantly in space achievements. We can boast a clear lead over the Russians in gathering scientific data from communications, weather, and other types of satellites.

But we can't stage the impressive, prestige-building feats as the Russian can. And these have enormous impact on the minds of all people.

It's high time that this country took another look at its space program to see just where and how it can be speeded up. Big, new outlays of money won't make up for the original delays in starting and formulating our space program. But—in the opinion of some Government officials—small increases in the funds assigned to development of immensely powerful rockets and solid (as opposed to liquid) fuels would go a long way.

Beyond that, the administration should give the space program a sense of top-priority urgency rather than repeat, like a tired phonograph record, that our program is sound. While this country recognizes the scientific and commercial gains to be made in space, it grasps the psychological and political gains only after a sputnik or man-in-space success—and then soon forgets.

We are, like it or not, in competition with the Russians. Other peoples around the world see it that way. It is surely short-sighted for a country that has thrived in an atmosphere of competition to pretend that the space race does not exist.

"A" for Accomplishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the brighter accomplishments that we as a nation have had in our relations with the rest of the world, and one unfortunately whose merit and value is usually relegated to the back pages of our newspapers because it does not represent hot news, has been the educational exchange programs developed under the Fulbright and Smith-Mundt Acts.

Although the precise impact of these programs is difficult to gage in terms of better understanding, we can be sure that we as a nation will reap the fruits of this broad educational experience for years to come. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD an editorial, "'A' for Accomplishment," which appeared in the April 10 issue of the State Journal, Lansing, Mich., a newspaper which, in serving a community that includes one of the country's major universities, clearly understands and appreciates the purpose and importance of such programs.

The editorial follows:

"A" FOR ACCOMPLISHMENT

Back in the late 1940's the original Fulbright education exchange program was widely hailed as a promising step in improving international understanding.

Later this program was bound into the broader Smith-Mundt Act aimed at strengthening international cooperative relations. In this framework, this country's educational exchange has gone forward for more than a dozen years.

Now the original author, J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, proposes to expand these activities and draw them together with other, scattered exchange programs in the cultural field. He also wants to wipe out certain legal irritants that now and then have tended to hamper the effort.

Despite handicaps, educational exchange, backbone of the program, seems to have produced solid results.

Altogether, under the Smith-Mundt and Fulbright Acts, some 60,000 U.S. and foreign students, teachers, professors, specialists, and leaders (such as foreign parliamentarians) have benefited from studies and research here and abroad.

Those who have thought of the program as almost exclusively a student affair may be surprised to learn that grants have gone to 10,700 foreign leaders and specialists, while 1,700 U.S. specialists have gone abroad. Benefits also have been extended to nearly 5,000 foreign teachers and educators, and some 3,000 U.S. teachers.

Overall, two foreigners come here for study for every one American who goes abroad.

The Fulbright part of the program (excluding leaders and specialists) has been substantially financed through use of foreign currency accruing to us from sales of surplus war property and farm products.

Dollar amounts involved have steadily mounted, however, and the annual appropriation by Congress today is in the range of $25 million.

Senator FULBRIGHT puts no new price tag on his plan to unify and enlarge the whole exchange effort. He stresses an intent to make the programs work more effectively, attract higher caliber students and others, and thus add vitally needed enrichment to the cultural and educational life of both this Nation and its foreign friends.

Few Americans are likely to question these purposes or doubt the clear evidence of accomplishment up to now.

Expansion of Our Nation's System of Community Junior Colleges Is Essential in Our Educational Framework

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, as one vitally concerned with the expansion of our Nation's system of community junior colleges and as the sponsor of H.R. 16 to provide Federal assistance to the States in carrying out such a program, I was very pleased to read the following letter to the editor by a student at such an institution. It appeared in a recent issue of the East Oregonian, edited by my friend, J. W. Forrester, Jr., of Pendleton, Oreg., and it sets forth clearly some of the reasons for regarding community colleges as an aspect of our educational framework which deserves special encouragement and assistance:

DEAR SIR: At the present time I am attending Columbia Basin Junior College at Pasco, Wash. This, of course, does not qualify me as an expert on the subject of community colleges, but I believe it does give

me a basis on which to make a few comments concerning your editorial of March 31 dealing with the need for such institutions in Oregon.

First I would like to say I agree with your views 100 percent. Community colleges should be encouraged, and they very definitely can fill a unique and necessary place in education beyond the high school level.

Community colleges generally serve a threefold purpose: they provide lower division, college courses, courses for occupational competence, and general education for individual improvement.

As you have pointed out these institutions can do something for those students who do not want to attend 4-year colleges, and also for students who need to get their feet wet before deciding to continue on a 4-year curriculum. In addition to helping the individual this also provides a service to the 4-year institutions. As you know at several such institutions, in this State, upper classmen are required to live off campus due to the great influx of freshmen, and in addition must often limit acceptance of applications. The community college would alleviate this situation by providing facilities for freshman and sophomore work. An example is the State of Washington where there are approximately 10,000 students enrolled in community colleges. In California one such college has an enrollment of 40,000.

It is commendable that some school districts in this State are operating vocational-tech schools. The results of such education are vital to our economy. As we know some persons are not interested, for various reasons, in 4 years of adavnced academic study, but because of neglect due to lack of foresight we have failed to develop the vocational ability of these people.

The above has been concerned mainly with the young people of the State, but let's not forget that through community colleges opportunities for individual improvement and cultural development are provided to the general public. This in itself brings a deeper awareness of the world we live in.

I am sure that in the future community colleges will become not just important, but essential. If Oregon does not begin now it may find itself in the position where it must deny to many the opportunities for advanced training.

I graduated from Umatilla High School in 1958 and am a resident of Oregon.

Sincerely,

JAMES D. MCMILLIN,
ASB President, Columbia Basin College.
College.

Communism: Menace to Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a forthright statement by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, on a subject matter in which every American should be vitally interested. This special feature appeared in Our Sunday Visitor, the National Catholic Action Weekly, published on April 30, 1961, at Huntington, Ind.:

COMMUNISM: MENACE TO FREEDOM

Seldom does a day pass in our generation when news media are able to report current events which do not relate the web of deceit and terror spun by Communist oppression somewhere in the world. It is a known fact that the ultimate goal of communism is domination of the world. The blight of communism has already engulfed one-fourth of the land surface of the world, and one-third of the peoples of the earth presently live under its yoke of slavery. Members of the Communist conspiracy are relentlessly seeking to undermine the governments of those countries which yet remain free.

In order properly to combat communism, we must know what it is. It is a materialistic concept of thought and action which demands the total subjugation of every individual to the will of the state. It is an atheistic theory of government fostering the ultimate abolition of religion.

The code of communism embodies an "end justifies the means" explanation to all actions—there is no consideration given to the ethical conduct or moral values as we know them. And finally, it demands the complete domination of the world, openly advocating, if necessary, the overthrow of non-Communist nations through the use of force and violence.

Tragically, many Americans do not realize the seriousness of the Communist menace. The immediate threat within the boundaries of our Nation is the Communist Party, U.S.A., an integral part of the international Communist conspiracy. Its members are schooled in the use of the weapons of deceit and duplicity to enable them to fully exploit any situation which might arise. Anything which promotes communism and weakens its opponents is moral under the Communist code. There is no limitation.

We are all aware of the Communist influence exerted in the May 1960 riots in San Francisco, Calif., when a group of ideological innocents—most of them students—became the weapons used by an arm of the brutal Communist dictatorship in an action designed to disrupt the activities of a congressional committee. This was only one example of how a few Communist agitators, using mob psychology, were able to turn peaceful demonstrations into an ugly instrument furthering their cause. Their success in this one instance should be a clear warning to the citizens of our Nation that their paramount goal is the subversion of democracy.

To control such tactics, we must fully understand the true nature of the conspiracy and possess the ability to separate truth from propaganda. Exposure of the tactics of communisnm is a major weapon in destroying its ideological appeal. We must remember that the Communist Party line will coincide again and again with the view of many non-Communists on many specific issues. We must be eternally wary, therefore, not to place an indiscriminate label of "Communist" on those innocent individuals whose opinions on a particular question may parallel the announced official Communist position. This is one of their prime tactics since the creation of disunity arms them with a dangerous weapon.

Our answer to the problem confronting us is not limited simply to enlightening ourselves to the true nature and tactics of communism. We can actively participate in the fight by other means as well. Initially, we must know our Nation—its history, traditions, and heritage. The early settlers surmounted unbelievable odds in carving out this great American Republic which we know today. Much can be learned from the story of their raw courage and determination.

Thereafter, we should keep abreast of the events occurring throughout the world. Nothing is more discouraging to the subversive element than an enlightened citizen who actively participates in his government. Exercise your right to vote by electing representatives of integrity, and actively participate in civic programs promoting social improvement in your community.

Undoubtedly the most inspiring sight to the serpent of subversion is the dark cloud of public apathy which has engulfed so many of our citizens. Through indifference, they are unable to tell right from wrong and, what is worse, their lethargy weakens the moral armor which is so essential in repelling the false truths of communism. It is our responsibility to combat this disease wherever we see it. Indifference can be fatal when the survival of our Nation is at stake.

Lastly, we must attack bigotry and prejudice wherever they appear. We cannot allow them to exist since justice for all is the bulwark of freedom. Our cherished beliefs in the dignity and freedom of man are beacons of hope to the oppressed throughout the world. Let us rise to the challenge and protect our heritage of freedom.

General Electric

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article is the second in a series by Mr. T. K. Quinn. The first appeared in the RECORD on March 23. Because I feel that Mr. Quinn's articles are important in understanding the recent affair that resulted in the conviction of some of our top business people on price-fixing charges I commend to the attention of our colleagues Mr. Quinn's discussion, which appeared in the March 20 issue of the New Republic:

GENERAL ELECTRIC

(By T. K. Quinn)

(A former General Electric vice president who resigned "because of just such practices as those disclosed in the Philadelphia price collusion case" describes who runs the company.)

There is to be an election to determine whether the present chief officials of the General Electric Co. are to keep their jobs, despite the judgment in the Philadelphia price collusion case. Theoretically, the stockholders will make the decision. Will they, in fact? Not at all. It just doesn't work out that way. Stock ownership in General Electric, as in other giant corporations, is fragmentized and widely scattered. Most of the stockholders, in number, may not vote at all. The big blocks of General Electric stock that always make the annual meetings appear so farcical are held in huge private, insurance or pension trust funds, and to a lesser extent, in mutual funds. Who will vote this deciding stock interest on judgment day? Why, the trustees of these funds, of course. Who are they? Well, about 10 New York banks are the trustees for about three-fourths of it. They will make the decision.

If you want a diagramatic sketch of just how the machinery will work, here is a probable one: Mr. Sidney Weinberg, who sponsored Mr. R. J. Cordiner for his official position with General Electric, must first make up his mind on the relative chances. Sidney won't be too deeply concerned over the ethical questions involved. He's a smart, personally likeable, go-getting, dollar-directed, little man. President of the Wall Street banking firm of Goldman Sachs, he is also a director of General Electric, General

Foods Corp., Continental Can Co., Cluett Peabody & Co., General Cigar Co., B. F. Goodrich Co., Ford Motor Co., McKesson & Robbins, Inc., National Dairy Products Co., etc.

Mr. Weinberg will probably go to work on his banking friends in an effort to convince them that Mr. Cordiner was right when he said, "Nobody has been damaged," just before he announced elaborate plans to prevent future abuses, in a way that implied he knew nothing of the crimes for which several GE executives were jailed and fined. Some of the more responsible and public-spirited banking trustees will protest that the moral standing of the whole business community, and therefore the country, is at stake. They will agree with Judge Ganey that "General Electric and the others made a mockery of our free enterprise protestations," and provided opponents with another argument for more governmental controls and public representation in these quasi-public institutions.

The answer will be halfhearted, "Yes, but Chairman Cordiner discharged a number of the convicted GE executives, and he's trying, belatedly, to straighten things out." Chairman Cordiner did discharge several who were not close to him, and he accepted under fire, the resignation of the president, a Cordiner protege. But Vice President Edward Ginn was not dismissed. He was the big man in the affair, at $125,000 a year, who was in line for the presidency and close to Cordiner. After his jail sentence Mr. Ginn will resume his old position. He's too close to the throne to be cast off. Only the designation of a new chief officer in place of Cordiner would wipe the slate clean and eliminate Mr. Ginn, unless he will accept a payoff, which isn't likely. These things will not escape intelligent people, and General Electric will continue under its present cloud.

At this point the discussion will go to another level. Mr. Weinberg will probably say, "We're all in this together and must hang together or we'll hang separately"—an argument that often wins. He may not fail to remind the bankers of other confidential deals. There is always strong pressure to sit tight.

On the one side it will be contended that the dismissal of Mr. Cordiner would be an admission of guilt, which although believed by Judge Ganey to be true, and supported by the long record of General Electric antitrust violations through the years, was not technically proved in Philadelphia. On the other side, the argument will be advanced that people see through technicalities, that public opinion has been aroused and there is too much at stake to try to defend Cordiner. And what of the example which has been set and its effect on the hundreds of thousands of young men who aspire to be business executives?

In the end the deciding issue is not likely to be responsibility or morality. It will, in all probability, be decided like the collusive prices—a judgment based upon what the traffic will bear. Just how much will public opinion accept? A handful of trustees who altogether own less than 1 percent of the outstanding General Electric stock will decide. They are the ones who are really on trial.

Peace Corps—What It Takes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, James M. Johnston, religious editor of the Milwaukee Sentinel, has a very perceptive article on the Peace Corps in his recent regular column, "Chapter and Verse." In the thought that Members may wish to send this splendid article to young people who write concerning the Peace Corps, I include it herewith:

PEACE CORPS—WHAT IT TAKES

Their imaginations stirred by the prospect of oversea travel and working in some distant spot on the globe, church youths of high school age are showing avid interest in the Peace Corps, which hopes to begin recruiting among the 1961 college graduating classes, though Congress hasn't yet provided the funds.

One Milwaukeean exceptionally well advised about the corps is Robert Tehan Jr., home secretary to Representative REUSS, who is one of the authors of the plan. Tehan enlightened some youths and their elders this week in a U.N. seminar at Wesley Methodist Church.

For one thing, he made clear that service in the corps is for men and women, not boys and girls. Sure, they must be young (though 30 isn't too old) but they must be mature, as well.

Added Tehan:

"They must be thoroughly American and stand for all that American stands for. Imagine how terrible it would be to send a segregationist to Africa." From what Tehan said, however, it would seem the Peace Corpsmen would be expected to show their Americanism by actions, in helpful, friendly instruction, rather than by their words.

Teaching will be their primary responsibility. They will teach literacy, agriculture, health, sanitation, etc., for those seem to be the areas of greatest demand.

THEY'RE WILLING TO LEARN

Incidentally, missionaries report most inhabitants of these so called backward areas show a surprising mental capacity. Most are curious and willing to learn, and even the most illiterate tribesmen, missionaries say, can't be tripped up in arithmetic. They may be victims of a cultural lag, but certainly not stupidity.

Tehan said the cream of embryo doctors, medical technicians and teachers in the 1961 college classes will be screened for the first projects, which will consist of literacy and public health. Large scale engineering projects like dams, roads and powerplants will necessarily come later.

The first candidates will receive cram courses in the language, customs, economics and geography of the areas in which they'll serve, probably something like the training given young missionaries.

YOU CAN BE FIRED

Suppose the screening fails to show gaps of immaturity in the corpsman's character. Suppose he turns out to be a tippler, emotionally unstable, incorrigible, or unfit in other ways. Out he'll go, before he damages the entire project, his coworkers and the name of the United States. For that reason, the corpsmen will not be tied to a long contract.

"It's best if the corpsman is single," said Tehan. "The Government does not intend to provide transportation for a spouse, unless he or she, too, is a corpsman."

What about pay? That will be based not upon what the corpsman with his college degrees is worth, but on a minimum decent standard of living. Because he must be a helpful teacher and friend to the people he is serving, the United States cannot afford to let an economic gulf stand between teacher and pupil. Upon separation from the service, however, the corpsman will receive an allowance.

No Peace Corps will be sent to any country that doesn't want it. That may be difficult to determine, for the Government can frankly expect many an anti-American campaign against a project if it seems effective and steals thunder from the Communist promises. That, said Tehan, is a risk that we must take.

The early stages of the Peace Corps will be financed by mutual security funds, inasmuch as it hasn't yet passed Congress. Senators and Representatives are likely to take a long, long look at the program before they stamp their approval.

It would seem from this talk that much of the success of the corps depends upon the quality of its first class that goes out. The service is doomed unless it gets the best among young men and women. Somehow the interviewers must measure maturity, the "emotional quotient" along with the intelligence quotient.

So, son, if you're looking at the Peace Corps to satisfy your desire for travel and adventure, you'd be happier in other fields. The corps will require more than imagination and a flair for excitement.

But if you're really grown up, if your goal is service rather than adventure, if you can learn to like and help people of a vastly different background from your own, and get more of a thrill out of their progress than your own bank account or comfort—then, perhaps, the Peace Corps is for you.

A Test of Steadiness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very thoughtful article and one that is worthy of the serious thinking of the Members of Congress. The article appeared in the Christian Science Monitor, issue of April 25, 1961:

A TEST OF STEADINESS

We are confident that even a few days' time will place last week's Cuban events in better focus. President Kennedy has outlined a firm but steady course and we trust his unusual consultations with three top Republicans have confirmed him in it. For many excited and baffled people are talking of desperate measures.

The American people have had a triple shock. They were disappointed by the failure of the Cuban exile landings. But they were even more jolted by reports that their own Government, through the Central Intelligence Agency, was involved in a miserably managed fiasco. They also are dismayed to find some of their friends unable to distinguish between this operation and aggression.

Even in this mood we do not believe they will listen to urgent voices saying, "Since we have the penalty, why not take the prize? Since we are blamed for aggression, why not send in the marines?"

As the dust from the Las Villas beaches and hysterical headlines settles, answers to these questions will appear. The President has rightly reminded Americans that the use of their Armed Forces in an attack on Cuba would violate both their traditions and their treaty commitments.

Ever since Japan invaded Manchuria in 1931 a good part of world opinion has been trying to define and combat aggression. In the United Nations and elsewhere the nearest approach to agreement holds that invasion or attack by the armed forces of one nation against another is aggression. This was the

basis of the U.N. and the U.S. position on Korea, Hungary, and Suez. It has helped marshal moral sanctions against naked force.

For the United States to abandon this position now would be a disservice to itself and to the cause of peace.

In the U.N. debate it became clear that many people do recognize a difference between aggression and aid given to rebel exiles—regrettable as that may appear even to many Americans. In Latin America there is—despite outcries about intervention—an awareness that the marines have not landed.

If they had, the picture would be very different. Probably Senor Castro could not long withstand the full power of the United States—provided it was ruthlessly used. But at what cost? America would be remembered as the invader, not the nation which gave Cuba its independence. And the whole of Latin America would be embittered—ripe for a whole flock of Soviet-supported Castros. And what could the United States answer in the U.N.—except to try to dodge as the Soviet still does over Hungary?

The struggle in Cuba has only begun. Senor Castro is already following the Batista course, using terror and oppression which will turn the people against him. The exiles will at least infiltrate and sabotage. Economic problems harass his regime. Should he attempt to use force against the United States or any other nations, then greater force can be used against him.

Mr. Kennedy has indicated force could be a last resort. It is true that Communist infiltration and controls blur the usual tests of aggression. But there are better answers than American aggression. If Washington hopes to deal with communism anywhere by ideological and economic rather than military means, it should be able to do so in its own neighborhood.

Actually the main concern should be with Latin America. If the United States helps to promote the reforms which will forestall Castroism there, the dictator in Cuba should wither on the vine.

The Effects of Imports on the U.S. Economy With Special Reference to the 23d Congressional District of Illinois

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE E. SHIPLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, perhaps more than ever before, grave concern is being expressed throughout the land over the serious impact of imports on many American industries. In the decade from 1950 to 1960 merchandise imports have increased by more than 65 percent. While this increase during the decade has not been as large as the increase in exports or in gross national product, it has to a considerable extent been concentrated among certain products, with serious consequences to producers of the same or similar products here at home. I should like to refer specifically to four industries that are of particular importance to the people in my congressional district and that have been seriously affected by imports from abroad: leather footwear, petroleum, shirts, and machinery. I should like to deal with each of them in turn.

LEATHER FOOTWEAR

More than 2,500 people in my district are employed directly in the manufacture of leather footwear. This is an industry which has felt the full brunt of import competition. Imports of leather footwear increased from 22,278,000 pair a year in 1959 to 26,990,000 pair in 1960, an increase of 20 percent in a single year. The imports of nonrubber footwear have grown from slightly more than 1 percent of domestic porduction in 1954 to about 4.4 percent in 1960. The number of pairs of women's, misses', children's, and infants' leather shoes imported in 1959 was over 12 times as large as in 1954 and about 2½ times as large as in 1957, while for men's and boys' shoes the comparable figures were 8 times and 2 times. Detailed statistics for 1960 are not yet available in the Library of Congress. It should be noted however that U.S. production of shoes declined by 5.5 percent from 1959 to 1960, and that our exports dropped by 9 percent during the same period.

In December 1959 the Department of Commerce reported that it saw no indication of any halt in the increase of shoe imports; in fact, it stated:

> There is good reason to believe that shoe imports during 1960 will be 10 percent higher than in 1959.

About double this increase actually occurred. Standards and Poors Industry Surveys estimates that imports could reach 37 million pairs in 1961.

PETROLEUM

Petroleum imports, too, have made serious inroads on our local oil industry. My district has a good share of Illinois' 92 establishments engaged in the processing of petroleum and coal products.

Today the United States has an excess producing capacity of 3 million barrels daily, equal to about 40 percent of actual production. On the other hand, imports of petroleum and petroleum products increased from $829 million in 1954 to a peak of $1,636 million in 1958; in 1959 they totaled $1,529 million. In the years 1954–58 domestic production of crude petroleum rose only 4 percent.

Our oil industry has been in poor economic health since 1957. Between 1946 and 1957 demand increased by about 5 percent per year; in 1958 there was no increase. Since that time demand has risen about 3 percent per annum. Over the next decade demand will probably rise by only about 3 to 3½ percent per year, which means adjustment to a slower increase by our oil industry and an oversupply—with consequent lowered prices—until this adjustment is completed. It is estimated that oil demand during 1961 will increase only from 2 to 2.5 percent. Surpluses have also resulted from extensive drilling programs, from attempting to achieve self-sufficiency because of unsettled world conditions and because refiners tend to produce more oil than is necessary in order that they might reduce unit costs of production.

How can an industry which is operating below capacity but still with surplus production compete with a flood of imports? Naturally costs of production are higher when excess capacity is unused. Large surpluses abroad indicate that excessive imports might cause a break in U.S. crude oil prices. Estimates for 1961 production show little alleviation for this situation. It is true that the Government has an oil import control program, but there have been several increases in the quotas since they were set. On March 10, 1961, oil import quotas were increased to 461,427 barrels a day for the year beginning April 1, an increase of about 10 percent over the then current rate.

In my opinion, Alvin C. Hope, president of the Independent Petroleum Association, best pictured the situation when he pointed out that the price of crude oil had dropped to near the 1953 level while the price of finished steel has gone up to 37 percent since 1953; wages have increased 30 percent; oil field machinery has risen 26 percent and oil well casings costs have jumped 41 percent. Small wonder that oil finding activity has shown a marked decline.

Naturally this affects Illinois' oil industry. Our petroleum and coal products industry employs 16,625 persons. While it is true that we export petroleum products, fuels, lubricating oils, and so forth, we must import crude oils for the production of our exports. Our residual fuel oil must compete with that "dumped" on the America market at low prices. So long as high taxes, high wages and high costs of materials exist, our domestic industry is faced with an almost insuperable problem in competing with imports much of which are virtually dumped in our markets. Ever since the Suez crisis there has been a glut of crude oil which has naturally been accompanied with rapidly increasing supplies of residual fuel oil which has resulted in low prices and has not only affected our domestic oil industry unfavorably but has also had an injurious effect on our domestic coal industry.

SHIRT MANUFACTURES

Approximately 5,775 persons in Illinois apparel and related products industry worked for firms engaged in the manufacture of men's and boys' furnishings in 1956. Imports into the United States of men's and boys' shirts and nightwear totaled $6.9 million in 1956. In 1960 imports of men's and boys' shirts totaled $14.4 million. In 1959 the executive board of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America reported that imports of shirts had increased eightfold since 1954 most of the increase coming from the Far East. They continued to increase in 1960, although the rate of increase declined. This may sound like a small amount, but from March to September 1959 imports of cotton shirts from Hong Kong alone increased sixfold. With Japan we have set a quota on imports of cotton shirts at a level above 1 million dozen a year. The segment of Hong Kong producers agreeable to a quota have demanded a figure higher than that of Japan. Present estimates indicate that the ratio of imports from Japan and Hong Kong equals 12 percent of U.S. production. Fears have been expressed that Japanese and Hong

Kong quotas will be ineffective because other low-cost areas such as Formosa, Portugal, and Spain will immediately increase their exports to us. In 1958, 1.5 million dozen shirts were imported; the total for 1959 jumped to 2.41 million dozen.

Apparently we need a worldwide quota or some equalization of cost legislation to permit our shirt producers to compete with these low-cost foreign producers. The Clothing Workers' report I have cited above warned that many thousands of jobs in the textile industry are in jeopardy and I believe it.

MACHINERY

Traditionally, the United States is a heavy exporter of machinery. However, in recent years imports have been growing. In the single year between 1958 and 1959 they rose from $472 million to $656 million or by 39 percent. In the same period exports remained almost stable. One source has estimated that 35 to 40 percent of U.S. machine tool purchases come from abroad. Much of the increase is the result of more modern, lower cost foreign industries rebuilt since World War II, many of them with the financial and technical aid of the United States. One source estimates the cost of foreign machine tools at about 60 percent of American-made tools. Not only do their products come in as imports and compete with domestic industries but they also compete with our exporters in foreign markets. Temporarily, in 1960, our export business increased substantially because we were able to make much quicker delivery than our competitors. Small wonder, because we have been operating at only 60 percent of capacity with a small backlog of orders.

According to a study by the Department of Commerce, Illinois' share of U.S. exports of nonelectrical machinery is one-seventh of the national total. About 11 percent of the Nation's electrical machinery output is located in Illinois. Her machinery industry thus is affected by increased imports, such as 1959 witnessed in industrial, office and printing machinery and in electrical apparatus imports. Furthermore, our machinery industry is experiencing more and more difficulty in competing in world markets.

One pertinent example is the recent award of a contract to Mitsubishi Shoji Kaisha, Ltd., of Japan for a number of towing locomotives to be used in the Panama Canal Zone. It is true that the Japanese bid was well under the lowest American bid, that of the Plymouth, Ohio, Locomotive Works. Perhaps this is good business, but I quarrel with the idea that the Japanese were awarded the contract through fair and free competition. Our laws impose burdensome production costs upon business which, together with our high wages, makes the term "free and fair competition" a mockery.

Dun's Review has recently completed a survey of the effects of imports on our economy. Both the members of their president's panel—representing 175 of the Nation's leading companies—and a random selection of 300 small manufacturers expect more serious competition from foreign imports in the next 5 years.

Most of the panel members and the smaller companies polled believe that lower labor costs, less overhead, foreign government export subsidies, and low ocean freight rates account for the difference in costs. Many trace it primarily to lower wage costs although there is diversity of opinion here. I am sorry to say that close to 40 percent of the presidents of large corporations on the panel reported that they plan to launch more foreign operations: licensing arrangements, new plants and expanded facilities abroad, joint operations with oversea manufacturers, and purchase of foreign concerns. I do not know how many of these are located in Illinois nor how many—if any—are in my district, but I do know that this means the export of jobs from our borders and import competition. The smaller businesses must rely on increased efficiency, new products, automation, and greater production. The increase in imports of finished manufactures, which in 1950 constituted about 18 percent of total consumption imports, accounted for about 34 percent of import transactions in 1959. Together with semimanufactures they accounted for over half of U.S. imports by value. This is a grave portent for my congressional district and for the State of Illinois.

For all these reasons, I feel that concrete action should be taken immediately to alleviate the conditions in the boot and shoe industry, petroleum industry, the shirt industry, and the machinery industry.

Mass Transit Is the Lifeline of Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, the subject of mass transportation is of vital concern to our large cities and growing communities. A most interesting discussion of this problem is contained in an article written by E. H. Wolson, a consultant to management in mass passenger transportation and head of Brown Survey Corp., of Philadelphia, which has rendered service to mass passenger carriers, I am informed, for more than 70 years. The author's article, which is entitled "Mass Transit Is the Lifeline of Business," will be worthwhile reading, I believe, for all Members of Congress.

MASS TRANSIT IS THE LIFELINE OF BUSINESS

(By E. H. Wolson)

Recent developments in Congress resulting from hearings on Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey's urban transportation bill bring into national focus the need of long range projected planning for help for all public passenger carriers. In most areas of local commuter service there have been many evidences that private money to modernize and expand any system is unavailable. American business has been built on the basis of private enterprise, operated with reasonable return to those making the capital investment. Investors in transportation companies' stocks, in too many instances, have received little or no dividends. With this record before the public, it is generally almost impossible to secure private capital except at very high interest rates. Taking into consideration the high subsidies for railroads and other forms of transportation for a relatively few passengers the local privately owned carriers are being more than short changed with the very limited tax relief, granted in some areas but not as a national pattern.

Transit is a service available to all the public. The general public is not fully aware of the importance of transit, taking for granted that it is an expected service, the lack of which is brought sharply into focus by a sudden work stoppage or a public announcement by management of the abandonment of service. Yet the same consideration that is given to utilities such as the gas, electric, and telephone companies, with standby charges for services whether used or not, has never been available to transit. Since none of these forms of revenue have been provided for even though the services rendered contribute greatly to land development, increased income and tax values, certainly special consideration should be given and is more than merited. There is a reluctance by passenger carriers to file for increased fare rates because the public instinctively militantly opposes the granting of these increased rates. In order to supply the expanded service that is constantly being demanded, a service charge for the industry would eliminate many of these problems and sources of public opposition and disapproval.

Mass transit is the business lifeline carrying the bulk of the employed population to their places of occupation, schoolchildren to their schools, and the shopper to the shopping center. The living pattern in the last decade has changed drastically with shorter working hours. TV, with its impact, has changed the evening hours travel pattern. The offpeak and weekend transit use has dropped sharply. Local transit and commuter lines are burdened with heavy peak-hour loads and uneconomical operation of off-peak-hour runs. Most transit companies have peak-to-base ratios of from 3:1 to 5:1. This required heavy costs for equipment for peak use of 2 to 3 hours on working days. To create a more even traffic flow that would utilize equipment and manpower more equitably it would seem that the travel pattern can be changed further with the cooperation and interest of industry and civic governing bodies. One suggestion would be to change the opening hour of business offices to provide for spreading the peak hours of travel, such as having opening hours of business offices at 9:45 a.m. with a proportionate earlier closing, schools to open at 9:30 a.m., and retail establishments to open at 10 a.m. This would create a more even transit flow pattern contributing much needed relief in spreading heavy peaks to an even loading flow. Similar changes in closing hours should also be considered. As with many proposed changes, there will be areas of complaint. The pilot experiment in the intensely concentrated insurance area in New York City on early office opening now in operation is reported to be a satisfactory experience, with employees welcoming the earlier closing hour. In the well remembered gas shortage era during World War II, staggered working hours were proven workable and practical in industry and retail establishments. Schools can be brought into this program. Mercantile establishments would, without a doubt, welcome the change giving them the opportunity to open and close later to accommodate office workers

who would then be free to shop before the stores close.

The Williams bill has many recommendations for financing transit's rehabilitation and growth. This is an urgent program that should be implemented without long delays. Numerous engineering studies, made in every area of the country, are available. These are based on sound engineering plans that could be the basis for making funds available to operators at low interest rates.

The building of highways and freeways are important parts of the national program but can never serve alone the hearts of the metropolitan area by bringing in more cars to add to the center city traffic flow strangulation. Reserve lanes for mass transportation, with planned parking lots would also help give the service flexibility by making it more attractive. The speed of movement of the public carrier in reserved lanes would attract riders and will eliminate the need of much of the private vehicle flow into the center.

Every type of conveyance: Private automobile, bus, high speed transit and commuter railroad has its place in its sphere in the movement of people. The mass carrier has lost most of its appeal because of the lack of speed and in many instances the use of old equipment. The actual back bone of the public transportation system is the service that is rendered by the local carriers, whether operating under private ownership or an authority, that serve the centers of population.

Local carriers have been saddled with the ills of the past, namely: carrying students at highly reduced rates during peak hours with no subsidy from school boards to compensate for the differential in fares. School transportation is a sorely needed public service that cannot be denied, but the cost should be included in the overall school tax from which the carrier should be compensated for the service.

Transit management, in all its phases, have blueprinted modern plans for the expansion of lines and speed of service, realizing fully that they are public utilities. None of these plans can be successfully executed without public aid. This does not mean conversion to public ownership. On the whole private operation, as such, compared to public operation has proven to be more efficient and dollar conscious utilizing its equipment and manpower to the highest potential.

Transit aid is vital in every area. It is important that the operators, whether public or private, tell their story fully through the press and every other public medium, with particular emphasis on simplification of the message so that it can be clearly understood by the public and lawmaking bodies. There is no time like the present to again make mass passenger transit the lifeline of business.

Columbus Couldn't Get a Visa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD an article written by Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, of Washington, which appeared in the New York Times magazine on April 16. Senator MAGNUSON'S article, entitled "Columbus Couldn't Get a Visa," is an incisive and perceptive analysis of the problems encountered by foreign visitors to the United States and of the need for legislative remedy.

Senator MAGNUSON has made a major contribution toward the encouragement of a greatly increased flow of foreign visitors to the United States by piloting legislation for the establishment of a National Travel Service both last year and this year. No one can speak with greater authority on the question of foreign tourist travel to the United States than the Senator from Washington:

COLUMBUS COULDN'T GET A VISA—AND THEREIN LIES ONE OF THE CHIEF OBSTACLES TO MAKING THE UNITED STATES A WORLD TOURIST CENTER

(By Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, of Washington, chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee)

Because he was a recent indigent, insane (by contemporary standards) and born in Italy—a country whose immigration quota is heavily oversubscribed—Christopher Columbus could never have qualified for a U.S. tourist visa. Nevertheless, he was the first foreign visitor to these shores.

Since then, foreign visitors have made a remarkably profound contribution to our national advancement. Many of them have become effective ambassadors for us in their lands. Today, with tourist travel becoming an evermore potent economic force, the flow of tourists to this country has taken on new significance. Yet, with a thousand and one reasons for promoting the United States as a host nation, our Government has, until recently, displayed a towering indifference to its guests. Unlike almost every other country, we do nothing to atract the international traveler. There has been little or no official leadership in improving the quality, and minimizing the cost, of tourist facilities here. Our visa laws have had the effect of actually discouraging travel to this country. As a result, most of our foreign visitors today are, in reality, simply border-crosses, from Canada and Mexico.

Hundreds of thousands of newly prosperous Europeans, as well as our many South American and trans-Pacific friends, have yet to discover America as an attractive and rewarding vacation land. It is a sobernig truth that far more Europeans visit the Soviet Union every year than visit the United States. Of more immediate consequence is the fact that for every visitor from overseas (not counting those from Canada and Mexico), there are three or four American tourists who vacation abroad.

The current movement for a national tourist promotion program actually began when we in Congress awoke to the economic implications of this last statistic. Eighteen months ago the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce undertook a special study of America's declining position in international trade and its effect upon our continuing balance of payments deficits. Realizing that the strength of our export trade is the foundation upon which this country's economic leadership in the free world must be based, our committee concentrated its study on discovering where our sales abroad had faltered and why.

We proceeded down the list, commodity by commodity, and found part of the reason for our payments deficit in 1959 was the fact that the United States was buying more iron and steel, more passenger cars, more textile products from abroad than it sold abroad. Yet our net loss of dollars through the exchange of such products turned out to account for only a small fraction of the dramatically adverse tilt in the payments scale. Then we made the discovery that the greatest single imbalance arose not from an exchange of goods but from an exchange of people.

One needn't be an expert in international trade to know that a dollar spent for the purchase of foreign goods and services represents, in terms of outflow of currency, an import, whether it is spent in the United States or elsewhere. By the same token, an export occurs whenever and wherever a foreigner purchases American goods and services.

In 1960, Americans spent approximately $2.2 billion on travel abroad (not including payments to American carriers), making foreign tourism by far our largest single import. In contrast to this, the combined expenditures of foreigners who visited the United States—including residents of Canada and Mexico—were only one-half as much, placing tourism well down on the list of American exports.

As a result, the current imbalance between our tourist expenditures and tourist receipts is over $1.1 billion—nearly one-third of the entire balance of payments deficit.

Economic self-interest demands positive measures to help close this "travel gap." A prudent sense of international public relations dictates that this should be accomplished by increasing the number of foreigners who visit here—not, obviously, by abridging or inhibiting our own citizens' right to journey abroad.

Contrary to the situation which existed only a few years ago, rising prosperity in many foreign countries has put money in the pockets of would-be travelers, particularly in Western Europe. Travel restrictions imposed on them by their governments have been lifted or greatly relaxed. The potential market for travel to this country, therefore, is growing daily.

It was with such thoughts in mind that several of my Senate colleagues joined with me last year in offering legislation to rescue the foreign visitor from official oblivion by initiating this country's first real travel promotion and facilitation program. Adopted unanimously by the Senate, the bill was not acted upon by the House. A similar measure, Senate bill 610, was again enacted by the upper Chamber in February. At present, it is being considered by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

In his recent message to the Congress on the problem of the outflow of gold, President Kennedy called for immediate steps to plan a program based upon the major provisions of this proposed legislation. The President has also written to me personally in support of the measure which, he agrees, "will open up a long-neglected channel for improving international understanding, as well as help our payments problem."

I am now hopeful that our long endeavors to bring this program into being will soon begin to bear fruit. We must not assume, however, that the job of attracting and accommodating a greater number of foreign visitors can be done overnight, merely by the passage of this needed legislation. Whether the United States becomes an international tourist center depends squarely upon the continuing efforts and awareness of the American Government, the American travel industry, and the American people.

Why do we lag so far behind other nations in the field of foreign travel and what obstacles must be overcome? Contrary to a great deal of supposedly expert, and usually conflicting, opinion, I am convinced that there is no single answer to this question. In my judgment there are at least three major problem areas where positive action is required. It is these three areas toward which we have directed the pending legislation.

First is our total lack of promotional activity abroad. The United States is probably the only organized society on the face of the globe which does not purposefully advertise and promote its scenic, cultural, and recrea-

tional attractions. From Swaziland to Switzerland to Sweden, governments have long considered the attraction of outside visitors an important and legitimate function.

If the governments themselves did not so consider it, it was only because they could rely on a chamber of commerce which did. One need only stroll down Fifth Avenue, Piccadilly or the Via Veneto and observe the colorful and inviting window fronts of tourist bureaus representing countries in every corner of the world. In some capitals a nation's national travel office is often a bigger operation than the same country's local Embassy.

If a U.S. travel office is conspicuous by its absence in London, Rome, or Paris, the loss extends far beyond a question of prestige. Among other activities, these bureaus serve as points of distribution for local travel agents of pamphlets, guidebooks, and other promotional materials published by private and public tourist organizations in the home country.

Walk into any European travel agency and you will in all probability be able to find out the fee on the ski tow at Kitzbuehel, the price of a meal in some obscure Czechoslovak village, and everything you need to know for a trip to Uzbekistan. But chances are that the man behind the counter will not be able to tell you the train fare from New York to Chicago and has probably never even heard of Colorado Springs.

But this is only part of the promotional void.

A few pages away from the one you are now reading you will probably find at least one attractive advertisement beckoning you to some foreign land, inserted by the government-supported tourist office of that country. Nearly $10 million worth of such advertising is placed in American newspapers and magazines every year. Needless to say, the foreign press has yet to see its first U.S.-sponsored full-color spread portraying the gaiety of Mardi Gras in New Orleans, the excitement of an Iowa county fair, or the majestic beauty of Mount Rainier.

If there is any doubt travel advertising and related promotional activities produce results, all we need do is to look again at our own international travel statistics. Since 1953, the volume of foreign travel by own own citizens has exactly doubled. Our population has certainly not doubled in that period; our economy has not grown by anywhere near 100 percent, nor have the levels of disposable personal income. An increase of this order is obviously not the result of any lowering in travel costs.

There is, in short, very little that could explain such a phenomenal burgeoning of American travel abroad except the skillful and vigorous efforts of foreign governments and various international carriers, many of which are owned by these governments.

Aside from stimulating a broader long-term flow of visitors to this country, the program of oversea offices and paid advertising called for in Senate bill 610 would be invaluable in publicizing our two upcoming World's Fairs. The Federal Government has devoted many millions of dollars toward making the New York fair and Seattle's "Century 21" exposition truly international showcases. A failure to back up this investment with suitable promotion abroad would be short-sighted, to say the very least.

The second major factor inhibiting an inflow of tourists to the United States boils down to a question of geography—the thousands of miles that separate us from our principal markets for new tourists, plus the fact that the United States is itself a mighty big country. New jet aircraft have fortunately overcome these disadvantages so far as travel time is concerned. But the problem of travel costs remains as big a hurdle as ever.

If we are ever to coax our foreign friends into seeing San Francisco as well as the east coast, or to lure them to Yelowstone Park as well as to Miami Beach, something will have to be done to keep transportation fares, both to and within the United States, as low as possible.

One suggestion has been made which deserves particularly careful study: the adoption of a flat-rate, limited-period pass by domestic carriers for exclusive use by bona fide foreign tourists. Travel-conscious European nations have long offered this money-saving convenience to American guests in the form of the famous "Eurail pass."

So far as international fares are concerned, significant reductions are bound to come as the volume of two-way traffic increases. Developing a larger flow of foreign visitors will thus serve to benefit the pocketbooks of American travelers as well.

Finally, we come to the much-discussed problem of our visa requirements, the third principal stumbling block in the way of launching a realistic travel program and the best example of why I have called the foreign visitor today's "forgotten man." As a matter of fact, the law presumes he does not even exist.

Section 214(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act states that "Every alien shall be presumed to be an immigrant unless he establishes * * * that he is entitled to nonimmigrant status * * *." If the potential visitor happens to be young and single, or from a country whose U.S. immigration quota is oversubscribed, the task of convincing our officials that he (or she) is a bona fide nonimmigrant may be anything but easy. But even if he succeeds, he must then go on to pass all of the tests of admissibility—legal requirements which were designed with the immigrant, not the visitor, in mind.

How does this work out in practice?

If a Danish citizen, for example, wants to visit his brother in Minnesota, he must first travel to our embassy in Copenhagen, present his passport, submit photographs, show evidence of his visitor status, fill in the necessary forms and then proceed to satisfy our consul that he is not feebleminded, a drug addict, a polygamist, a criminal, a leper, a professional beggar, or a person liable to become a public charge or who has any immoral purpose in coming to the United States.

There are 31 separate categories of excludable aliens and the whole procedure may take anywhere from a day to a month.

Finally, with visa in hand, our Danish friend catches his plane, feeling like a Brooklyn schoolboy who has just wangled a ticket to the world series—until he arrives in New York. Then he discovers that this hard-won piece of paper is nothing more than a permit to apply for entry into the United States.

He must now take on a completely new branch of our bureaucracy, the Immigration and Nationalization Service, and satisfy them, too, of his honesty, morality, and financial resources. If he is lucky, the inspector stamps his passport "Admitted" and the ordeal is over.

But suppose insead that the brother in Minnesota decides on a trip to Denmark. The contrast is almost unbelievable. Never once does he see the inside of an embassy or consulate. The first Danish official he encounters is at the airport in Copenhagen, a pleasant fellow who stamps his passport "Welcome to Denmark" (in English, mind you), hands him an envelope wtih a souvenir medallion and a letter of greeting, and sends him on his way.

It is a demonstrable fact that the average Dane, Swiss, Bolivian, or Thai today finds it much easier to enter Communist Russia than to get within sight of the Statue of Liberty. For all our talk about the Iron Curtain, the unpleasant truth is that when it comes to international pleasure travel our own curtain of red tape can be far harder to penetrate than the Iron.

The Department of State is to be commended for its recent abolition of the so-called "long form" for visitors, thus clearing away some of this red tape. But that is only one step in the right direction. Further administrative improvements to expedite visa issuance can profitably be made, including fuller staffing of our consulates abroad.

It is probably also time to take a long new look at the law itself. I am constantly struck by the brevity of our statute on passport eligibility for Americans, which is only a few lines long, compared with the page after page of legal provisions applicable to friendly tourists. Surely it is just as damaging to the national interest (if not more so) to have American indigents, prostitutes, and so forth, displaying our flag abroad as it is to allow such persons into this country temporarily from abroad.

Yet we have never felt the necessity for placing endless restrictions on American tourists, and rightly so. Why, then, should our foreign visitors present such a different problem? Legislation looking toward a simplification of the law respecting foreign visitors has recently been introduced by two of my colleagues, Senator JACOB JAVITS and Representative JOHN LINDSAY, both of New York. These measures deserve our careful consideration.

Sensible administration of revised visa laws, plus reasonably lower transport costs, plus an adequate program of travel promotion abroad should result in a significantly increased stream of foreign visitors. But will we be prepared to receive them? More important than any other aspect of our national travel program is the care and attention we give to this question.

Unless we can gear our own tourist industry—an industry which in a way includes almost all of us—to an accommodation of the special requirements of new foreign guests, it might be better not to extend the invitation.

This means more and better packaged tours, solicitation and accommodation of specialized groups of travelers, an end to the notorious rudeness of baggage handlers and other service personnel at ports of entry, sight-seeing trips built around the needs and interests of foreign guests, civic and private hospitality clubs to meet and socialize with oversea travelers, more language proficiency on the part of sight-seeing, hotel and other key industry employees, and many, many other things. Above all, it means a general recognition of the importance of assuring that each traveler from abroad returns to his home with a higher opinion of America, her ideals, her institutions and her people.

The less than $5 million travel program which the President and we in the Senate have recommended may never completely close the travel gap. But it still adds up to a mighty inexpensive welcome mat for a Nation which prides itself on being a good neighbor.

A CIA Briefing by the New York Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of April 22, 1961, by the highly respected Latin American correspondent for the Times, Mr. Tad Szulc,

writing from Miami. It would seem that the only way Members of this body can get information on the activities of the virtually autonomous Central Intelligence Agency is from the press. Mr. Szulc has done a fine job with his informal and unclassified briefing on the Cuban situation, but it is hardly a substitute for regular reports to the Congress on the activities of the CIA. I only hope, Mr. Speaker, that recent events in Cuba will accelerate action on the proposals to require the intelligence agencies of the Government to report directly to authorized committees or a joint committee of the Congress.

The article follows:

CIA Is Accused by Bitter Rebels—Cubans Assert U.S. Agency Failed To Coordinate Drive and Ignored Warnings

(By Tad Szulc)

Miami, April 21.—Bitter Cuban rebels here were analyzing today the causes of the failure of their attack this week on the regime of Premier Fidel Castro.

With their political leadership battered and divided, and with the underground organizations in Cuba badly mauled, deep resentment is mounting against the United States, and especially the Central Intelligence Agency, over what is widely regarded here as monumental mismanagement.

As has been an open secret in Florida and Central America for months, the Central Intelligence Agency planned, coordinated and directed the operations that ended in the defeat on a beachhead in southern Cuba Wednesday.

Among the immediate questions arising here is what is to be done with more than 4,000 men of the rebel army who were not committed in the first attack and are now scattered about the Caribbean area. They were described as demoralized and disoriented.

Meanwhile, the recruiting centers have closed in Miami and officers and men, proclaiming their bitterness, are beginning to trickle back from the camps. There was a danger simply evaporate.

Cuban sentiment here is that it is up to the United States to handle the situation in Cuba directly.

A second question is whether and how the underground organizations can be rebuilt in the face of mass arrests all over Cuba and of the break in communications between them and the rebel centers in Florida.

From reports and opinions gathered among Cubans involved in this week's events, and from information available beforehand but kept confidential, the picture that emerges is one of military, political, intelligence and security failures.

The principal charge leveled at the Central Intelligence Agency by Cubans from numerous groups is that it precipitated the attack without adequate coordination with the underground and despite urgent warnings in recent weeks against such an attempt.

EXCLUSION IS CHARGED

The agency is also blamed for excluding from the operations several rebel groups—which include a number of experienced guerrilla officers—because of alleged favoritism for other factions for political reasons.

With such a lark of coordination, many rebels claim, the Central Intelligence Agency could not have expected to see the fulfillment of its intelligence estimates that a major internal uprising would follow the first landing. The entire operation was based on the assumption of a popular explosion against Premier Castro as soon as the landing materialized.

But, the rebels charge, the proper climate for such an uprising was not allowed to be established because of the Central Intelligence Agency's haste to produce the attack, using groups it particularly favored. These groups were components of the Democratic Revolutionary Front which belongs to the Cuban Revolutionary Council, the top rebel command, and the principal among them was the Movement of Revolutionary Recovery led by Capt. Manuel Artime, a 29-year-old officer.

According to almost unanimous reports, Captain Artime was the favorite of the Central Intelligence Agency and of the agent directing the field operation.

POLITICAL ISSUE BLAMED

According to these sources, Captain Artime and his group received most of the military equipment and financial assistance, including funds for the families of men in military camps.

The Peoples Revolutionary Movement, an organization that is directed by Manuel Ray, Dr. Castro's one-time Minister of Public Works, and that operated the most effective underground network in Cuba, is reported to have received no financial support and almost no equipment.

The Central Intelligence Agency, it was reported, began to deliver sabotage materiel to the Ray movement only in the last few weeks, when it joined with the Democratic Front to form the Revolutionary Council.

The alleged reason for the disapproval of the movement was its belief that Senor Ray's and his associates' political ideas were too radical.

The Central Intelligence Agency, it was reported, believed the Artime movement to be more conservative.

SPLINTER GROUPS FORMED

For personal and political reasons, a series of splinter groups developed within the movement led by Captain Artime. Late last year, he was beaten up in a Miami street by a group of his former associates.

Numerous officers, including several cofounders of the Movement of Revolutionary Recovery who has been Premier Castro's guerrilla captains in Sierre Maestra, split away. They attempted to form "free-lance" guerrilla organizations, hoping for U.S. aid in transporting them back to Cuba and equipping them with weapons and sabotage materiel.

What follows is a summary of the history of the Cuban rebel operation from the beginning of training in Guatemala, as described by qualified sources:

The rebel troops began to be trained in Guatemala under Central Intelligence Agency supervision about last May. The ranks of the revolutionary army swelled as the months went by, reaching strength in recent weeks as a mobilization order was issued by the Revolutionary Council.

The training took place in seven camps in the vicinity of the Pacific coast of Guatemala. The camps were at La Suiza, Helvetia, Trax, Champerico, Retalhuleau, San José Buenavisea, and Sayaxche.

A shrimp factory was established at Champerico to serve as a cover. Most of the other camps were made to look like ranches.

AIR BASE ESTABLISHED

An air base with a 4,500-foot landing strip was established at Retalbuleu, and the rebel air force was equipped with C–54 and C–46 transports, B–26 bombers and P–51 fighters, the latter obsolescent types.

The Cuban pilots were trained by at least seven U.S. pilots belonging to a F–104 jet fighter group.

When a group of foreign newsmen went to Retalbuleu in January to see for themselves that reports of a Cuban military buildup there were untrue, the pilots were ordered to hide in a shack.

The aircraft were used late last year and early this year to drop supplies for the anti-Castro guerrillas in the Escambray Mountains.

To facilitate operations, Cuban airmen painted Guatemalan and Cuban Air Force insignia on their planes or left them unmarked, depending on the missions.

When two B–26 bombers attacked air bases in Cuba last Saturday and one of the pilots who landed in Miami described himself as a defector from the Cuban Air Force, his picture, published in local newspapers, was promptly identified here as that of a Lieutenant Zuniga, a flyer from the Guatemalan camp. He has vanished.

The account given by qualified sources continued:

The bulk of the troops were trained for a conventional army, using tanks, mortars and bazookas. A U.S. Army colonel commanded the training.

Special guerrilla forces were trained at one or two of the camps, and some of the Cuban officers were sent to the U.S. Army's Jungle Warfare School in Panama.

A Filipino guerrilla specialist was in charge of some of the training. He was assisted by five or six instructors who are believed to be Slavs, perhaps Ukrainians, and who were assisted by interpreters.

However, Cuban officers complained that they were not receiving proper instruction and that the rocky terrain of western Guatemala taught no useful lessons for guerrilla action in the forest-covered mountains of Cuba.

In time, political problems and friction began to develop in the camps. Captain Artime was the center of many of the arguments as nervousness rose.

When the revolutionary council ordered a purge of men who were once supporters of the former dictator, Fulgencio Batista, Central Intelligence Agency agents were reported to be reluctant to give up trained personnel to satisfy political requirements.

Charges were constantly heard in Miami that Batista supporters held high positions in the camps. Ten days before the landings a gun battle was reported to have occurred in one of them.

CASTRO AGENTS INFORMED

That a landing was imminent this month was known to almost all Cubans in this area. This included at least 100 known Castro intelligence agents. Although local law enforcement agencies even had their photographs, Federal authorities made no visible effort to remove them.

As troops from Guatemala and from smaller camps in Louisiana and Florida began to get moved to jumpoff points in the Caribbean in the first week in April, the rebel leaders sounded urgent warnings against an invasion attempt.

They argued forcefully with Central Intelligence Agency agents and other U.S. authorities that any substantial landing should be preceded by a softening-up campaign of sabotage.

They also were insistent that a strategy of small multiple landings be used instead of a single thrust.

Early last week, however, the preparations for a landing went into high gear just as a major sabotage campaign began in Cuba. These last-minutes preparations were kept a secret from the underground organizations not favored by the Central Intelligence Agency.

AGENT HANDLED START

A top underground leader who went to New York last week for conferences with the Revolutionary Council was not informed of the plans. As he prepared to return to Cuba with a load of special explosives for the stepped-up sabotage campaign, a friend telephoned him that an invasion had begun.

In New York, the members of the Revolutionary Council, meeting at the Hotel Lexington, were spirited out through the backdoor by 10 Central Intelligence Agency agents Sunday afternoon and taken to secret spots to await the moment to land on the beachhead.

This report appears to contradict allegations made later that the landing Monday was merely intended as a supply operation.

There are reasons to believe that several of the council's members were not aware at that moment of what precisely was about to occur. Senor Ray was reported to be among those kept in the dark.

The invading force was reported to have jumped off, among other points, from the islands of Great Corn and Little Corn, off the coast of Nicaragua.

The islands belong to Nicaragua, but they have been 99-year leased to the United States since 1916.

As the rebels sailed toward the beachhead, several hundred trained anti-Castro fighters were being held back in Miami for no apparent reason.

They included about 150 men of the People's Revolutionary Movement, and about 400 men of another group.

For reasons that were not made clear, perhaps as many as 100 officers and men from the Guatemalan camps, including airmen, were brought to Miami several weeks ago and told to remain with friends, or at motels, each receiving $50 weekly.

One of the important criticisms of the landing operation was that it was not accompanied by broadcasts into Cuba urging the people to rise, and informing them who was leading the attack. This, it was stressed, left Cubans in a state of uncertainty and confusion, compounded by broadcasts by Radio Swan, a Central Intelligence Agency-operated propaganda station on Swan Island, claiming victories and uprisings that were not actually happening.

"People could not take chances on exposing themselves not knowing what was happening," a rebel leader here said.

Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the RECORD a sermon on the Peace Corps which the Reverend Ensworth Reisner preached in the First Methodist Church of Milwaukee. His thesis is that the 10th chapter of Matthew might well be a statement of the basic principles to guide the establishment of the Peace Corps:

PEACE CORPS

("If the house be worthy let your peace come upon it."—Matthew 10: 13.)

Behold a strange and wonderful thing has come about. A nation is about to send forth disciples who shall have power against unclean spirits, and to heal sickness, and to eliminate all manner of disease. These shall go forth and say to all the world, "The Kingdom of peace is at hand." These disciples have freely received the benefits of a great nation. They are to freely give. They are to have no salary, yet each will receive his meat for his work. Where there is worthiness and need in a house their peace is to rest upon it. And where there is no need, they are to depart. They are to be sent forth as sheep in the midst of wolves and must be wise as serpents yet harmless as doves. They should beware of men for they will receive much opposition. But they should not be anxious as to how they should respond or speak, for the responsibility is not theirs, it is the Spirit of God which speaks through them. Behold a nation is preparing to send forth disciples. And it is being called the Peace Corps.

The idea of the Peace Corps is rooted in a great American tradition which considers Americans to be "citizens of the world." This phrase was pronounced by such persons as Thomas Paine and John Paul Jones, the great naval hero of the Revolutionary War. Following the War of Independence, Jones extended his efforts to many other nations, including Russia, because he felt that freedom, independence and peace as pronounced in the American Declaration of Independence should be the heritage of people everywhere. As the mid-19th century approached, the burgeoning vitality of America again sent forth disciples thru many missionary societies and charged them with the responsibility of casting out unclean spirits and of healing the disease of peoples from the Hawaiian Islands to China, the Middle East, and Africa. These missionaries not only carried with them the religious sentiments of their particular churches but even more, preached and taught the Gospel of equal opportunity, of freedom, and of man's concern for man.

At the turn of the 20th century this same spirit of discipleship sent forth men and women not only as representatives of churches, but as disciples of the gospel of peace to proclaim the kingdom of good will among men. There were a thousand forms starting with the student volunteer movement under John R. Mott at the turn of the century, to world neighbors which sought to bring agricultural and village industry activities to depressed peoples. This wave of world conquest for peace and righteousness translated itself into the 14 points of Woodrow Wilson, the Charter of the United Nations, foreign aid, and the efforts of hundreds of private foundations. And now the Peace Corps.

The cynic can look at all these ventures and point to their failures, the sometimes attendant hypocrisy, the waste and presumptuousness of many efforts. But history will testify to the eventual effectiveness of these myriad approaches to discipleship.

Typical of these movements emanating from America are the origins of the Peace Corps idea. The seeds of the Peace Corps were planted by Christian pacifists who in the twenties and thirties contended that the only way to stop the waging of war was to wage peace. I attended a meeting of the Friends Service Committee, that group of Quakers and similarly minded persons, who planned work camps where young people would give their time living on a subsistence level to meet the needs of depressed peoples, especially in the slums of American cities. One of the first successful ventures in work camps was held in Dearborn, Mich., as the result of the efforts of the Reverend Mr. Owen Geer, a soldier in World War I who dedicated his life to pacifism in rejection of the failure of war to bring peace and democracy. Work camps developed all over America and extended to foreign shores. Dedicated young people donated everything from months to years in these projects.

Then came World War II. At the outset the pacifists devoted themselves to those wounded by war. They volunteered to enter war torn areas to care for the victims of evil. Their heroic efforts and sacrifice were so significant that the military authorities were afraid to permit this kind of work to become an alternative to military service. So their efforts were sharply curtailed during most of the war. However, the civilian public service camps and projects could not be completely throttled. These groups became human guinea pigs, worked in mental hospitals until the whole care for mental disease was transformed in America. One of the effects was a profound influence upon the thinking of General Hershey, who was and has remained the head of the Selective Service. General Hershey has been one of the main advocates of the Peace Corps.

Another root of this idea came as the result of the beginning of the World Neighbors organization when Mr. Con Dale, of Waukesha, and I prepared a thorough study which was presented to the International Administrations office in Washington, in which we proposed that the Government finance Peace Corps activity under the direction of voluntary services organizations; such as, World Neighbors and others. Some years ago I discussed this matter with Jim Hagerty, President Eisenhower's press secretary, and it received very favorable response from the President. However, neither World Neighbors nor other voluntary organizations were in a position to give the kind of direction which was needed.

At a meeting of the Milwaukee County Council of Churches Committee on International Relations at Plymouth Congregational Church, I proposed the idea to Congressman HENRY REUSS, who is a fraternity brother and longtime friend. Again I reiterated the idea one day when visiting him in Washington. Apparently the force of the suggestion was revivified in his mind while visiting some of our oversea establishments, and he tells in an article in the Christian Science Monitor of this latter incident. Senator HUMPHREY, through his activity in the old Epworth League of the Methodist Church, which has fostered some workcamps and had advocated young people working for peace in such projects, was also greatly influenced by these ideas. I called upon him in Washington some years ago with the suggestion of a Peace Corps. Undoubtedly there have been many others furthering this idea. Henry Hitt Crane of Detroit sent a letter to the President suggesting such activity to be conducted by our military personnel in oversea bases. Some of the military people have already endeavored, on an individual basis and even a regimental basis, to conduct projects in such places as Korea and elsewhere. Responding to these thoughts, part of the great American tradition, HENRY REUSS proposed a study bill in Congress. President Kennedy took it up in his campaign. And now there has been a response such as rarely before received.

There are two reasons for this response. First, it is part of the great American tradition, and second, it is in partial fulfillment of the directions of Jesus given to His disciples at the outset of His ministry. What Jesus taught was the fulfillment of the deepest instincts of human nature.

With the paraphrasing of a few words, the 10th chapter of Matthew might well be a statement of the basic principles to guide the establishment of the Peace Corps. Matthew first states the principles of His ministry in the Sermon on the Mount. None of these principles advocated the establishment of a church or other ecclesiastical organization. They were the universal statement of basic truths in man's relationship to man which would result in peace and good will among men. They applied to everyone, regardless of his religion, his race or his color. Then Jesus proceeded to demonstrate to His disciples the way in which He would put into effect this program of peace and good will among men. "Jesus went about all the cities and villages teaching in their synagogues and preaching the Gospel of the Kingdom and healing every sickness and every disease among the people."

But one man couldn't do it all, so He called His intimate group of 12 disciples and "gave them power against unclean spirits to cast them out and to heal all manner of sickness and all manner of disease." If this isn't the primary function of any Peace Corps, I don't know what is. Unclean spirits obviously include all those things which are against the social betterment of any people. All manner of sickness certainly would include sanitation, public health, as well as private concern for the physical disabilities arising from malnutrition, bacilli, and virii. Disease could certainly include all those condtions immediately affecting the freedom and well-being of human individuals. To attack these things is to attack some of the underlying causes of economic and social disease which creates bitterness and antagonism and leads to war.

Jesus directed the disciples to go to the lost sheep of the House of Israel first and carry out a program of education about the possibilities of peace and good will—or in the words of the Bible, "Preach the Kingdom of Heaven, saying it is at hand." Obviously the Peace Corps cannot eliminate all sickness, social and economic conditions, but they can give the people who are most susceptible, hope that such conditions of peace and good will are at hand. More than anything else the lost sheep of the earth need to have a realistic hope that peace and prosperity and opportunity are at hand, and this preaching or educational program can best be accomplished by the Peace Corps, by working for the betterment of the sick, the outcast, and those possessed of deplorable conditions.

Next Jesus gave the disciples the basic attitude they should assume. They were not to approach it from a "better than thou" point of view. They were rather paying off a debt they owed. "Freely ye have received, freely give." This is the reason why they were to receive no salary—neither the disciples nor the Peace Corpsmen. Neither silver nor gold nor brass will be provided for the purses. However, they will obtain subsistence commensurate with that received by other workmen. As Jesus stated it, "The workman is worthy of his meat"—but you're not to receive any profits. You've already received the profit by the many things that you have received. Americans who go into the Peace Corps have received their education, their training, their advantages in a prosperous and free Nation. They certainly dare not enter the Peace Corps for the sake of exploitation or profit.

The next thing Jesus made clear was that the disciples were to go where there was responsiveness and real need. "Wherever you go," He said, "Inquire who is worthy and abide there if the house be worthy let your peace come upon it, but if it be not worthy let your peace return to you and shake off the dust off your feet." It should be the policy of the Peace Corps to go to those people who are receptive and who are in need, who will receive education, assistance and sanitation, agriculture, household industries, and other self-help projects. There must be a conscious need upon the part of those who are to be assisted, for to force help upon an individual is to destroy the effectiveness of that help, just as it is to give help to those who don't really need it. Those who reject the gestures of good will and peace should be left alone—"shake off the dust of your feet," for if they persist in their refusal as Jesus said, "it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah in that day of judgment than for that city."

Next Jesus advised His disciples, "I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves. Be yet therefore wise as serpents and harmless as doves." There is no question but what the Peace Corps will be subjected to all manner of difficulties. It will have no authority except what it can win for itself. The Marines cannot stand back of it, and those who feed upon poverty, disease, will be bitter in their efforts to discredit those who are in the Peace Corps. Among some of the depressed people moneylenders get up to as high as 50 and 75 percent interest on short-term loans, and it may be to the benefit of exploited people to learn the advantages of a credit union.

Such will cause all kinds of scheming on the part of moneylenders. Sanitation projects may interfere with factories that pollute streams. And those who work for peace and good will among men have to expect a snake in the grass and fight him with harmless shrewdness, wise as a serpent but harmless as the dove. It may even mean that those who work for the Peace Corps will have trumped up charges leveled against them. They may be brought before governors and kings and accused of all sorts of things because they are Americans. But they should not be anxious if they follow the Spirit of God in their helpfulness and good will. For their testimony for the peace of the world is not merely their own responsibility but that of God who works through them. As Jesus stated it, "It is not ye that speak but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you."

I have no illusions about the Peace Corps alone bringing in the Kingdom of God any more than has the missionary movement brought heaven on earth. And certainly the Peace Corps has already been subjected to disillusioning doubts cast for political purposes. We can expect the Communists to try to invade it and discredit it. Perhaps more dangerous is the possibility that some of its leaders may try to substitute educational qualifications for the Spirit of God in the training program. It may hagridden with bureaucracy as is the tendency in all Government agencies. It should be expected that some Peace Corpsmen may prove traitors, but then one of the disciples of Jesus was a traitor, also.

These failures, these criticisms, these nibblings of the mice of cynicism are not too important. What is important is that we as a people and as individuals under God fulfill our heritage and carry on the great mission of the Kingdom of God. If we do this in our generation we will hand on the torch of peace and good will among men under the Spirit of God as a heritage for all the world.

Polio Vaccines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, with the approach of the polio season, it is of special interest to all Americans that this once deadly disease is almost conquered. Emphasis is now being placed on a variety of vaccines to do the job with greater ease and convenience. Progress in a field such as this is often of necessity slow to insure maximum safety. The following article, I feel, gives excellent expression and clarification to the progress in the battle against polio.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article, "What's Delaying the New Polio Vaccine?" from the April 1961 issue of Redbook magazine:

WHAT'S DELAYING THE NEW POLIO VACCINE?
(By Ruth and Edward Brecher)

In Cincinnati last spring 180,000 children swallowed a few drops apiece of the new Sabin "oral" polio vaccine. Throughout the rest of the year only one case of paralytic polio was reported in the city. That one case occurred in an unvaccinated man who had recently returned to Cincinnati from New York City and was probably infected before his return. In Hungary too, according to Dr. Albert S. Sabin, of the University of Cincinnati College of Medicine, who developed the Sabin vaccine, not a single case of paralytic polio was reported throughout that country during the July-August-September 1960 polio season following a nationwide oral-vaccine campaign.

Similar dramatic results have been reported with two other new oral polio vaccines—one developed by Dr. Hilary Koprowski, of the Wistar Institute in Philadelphia, and the other by Dr. Herald Cox, of Lederle Laboratories. Yet none of these vaccines is available now for general use in the United States—nor will they be available in time to prevent paralysis during the coming polio season. Why the delay? Equally important, what should young adults do right now, while waiting for an oral vaccine, to protect themselves and their children from paralytic polio this year? When Redbook sent us to find out we encountered several ugly accusations. The Russian newspaper Izvestia, for example, alleges that American vaccine manufacturers are delaying the new oral vaccines because they are making so much money on the Salk polio vaccine. Dr. Koprowski charges that his vaccine is being discriminated against. Dr. Sabin insists that polio could have been wiped out in the United States altogether this year if the U.S. Government, the National Foundation (March of Dimes) and vaccine manufacturers had pushed ahead at top speed with his vaccine last winter. In contrast to such accusations, here are the blunt facts as we have rounded them up from both official and well-informed unofficial sources. Here too is a sober, scientific evaluation of how the new oral polio vaccines are likely to affect you and your family. The familiar Salk vaccine is composed of polio viruses which have been killed by formaldehyde. It is one of the safest and most effective vaccines ever produced against any disease. It erects a barrier of antibodies in your bloodstream so that even though polio viruses subsequently enter your intestinal tract and multiply there, they cannot get past the antibody barrier to reach your nervous system and cause paralysis.

The new oral vaccines contain living viruses which have been weakened or tamed. These tamed viruses infect your intestinal tract after you swallow them and multiply there, creating an immunity not only to paralytic polio but also to further intestinal infections caused by polio viruses. If enough people achieve this intestinal type of immunity, it is expected, polio viruses will no longer be passed back and forth from person to person within a vaccinated community. The disease may thus be eradicated altogether.

Who is responsible for holding back the new live vaccines?

First, strike off the National Foundation from the list of suspected culprits. It has been continuously supporting Dr. Sabin's oral vaccine research since 1953 with more than $1 million in March of Dimes grants; and it has been financing research on the Sabin vaccine in other laboratories as well. This support is continuing.

Next, don't blame the vaccine manufacturers. At least four companies are planning to manufacture the Sabin vaccine, and because of the competitive advantage of being first on the market, all of them have an

incentive to move quickly. Two of the four are currently manufacturing the Salk vaccine, and may therefore have some slight incentive to go slow. But the other two companies have no Salk vaccine to sell. The company likely to be first with the Sabin vaccine (Lederle Laboratories) reports that it has already spent $11 million on oral vaccine research and an additional $2 million for a new oral vaccine plant and equipment. Since this investment will not begin to pay off until the Sabin vaccine is actually marketed, Lederle obviously will lose rather than profit by delay.

This leaves the U.S. Government at the head of the suspect list.

The Government agency responsible for deciding whether or not to license any new vaccine is the Division of Biologics Standards (DBS) of the National Institutes of Health, a unit of the U.S. Public Health Service. If a vaccine proves unsafe after licensing, the DBS gets the blame—and rightly so. It is your sentinel, posted by law to safeguard you and your children from unsafe vaccines and from overinflated vaccine claims.

The DBS has learned the hard way how important it is to be extra cautious. Back in 1955 it licensed the Salk vaccine in a hurry, at the urging of the National Foundation and others; polio was then on the rampage and no other preventive was available. The results were in general excellent, with many thousands of men, women and children saved from crippling or death. But a price was paid for haste; several bad batches of vaccine managed to slip thruogh an unnoticed loophole in the DBS regulations governing safety. As a result, 61 children who received vaccine from those batches came down with paralytic polio; others caught polio from them; several died.

The DBS regulations were immediately tightened up, and the Salk vaccine has been completely safe ever since. But DBS officials resolved to avoid a similar situation with oral polio vaccine if it was humanly possible.

Live-virus vaccines by their very nature require special safety precautions. If the Salk killed-virus vaccine were to be accidentally contaminated by some other viruses during manufacture, the formaldehyde which kills the tough polio viruses would no doubt kill the other viruses as well. A live-virus vaccine has no such built-in safeguard. Contaminating viruses may travel with the tame polio viruses into your body and produce disease. Such an incident actually occurred during World War II; serum hepatitis viruses got into a yellow fever vaccine and thousands of cases of serious, sometimes fatal, hepatitis followed among American soldiers and others all over the world.

Against this background of possible hazards, and knowing that an effective polio vaccine (the Salk vaccine) was already available throughout the United States, DBS officials and scientific advisers decided to proceed with what Dr. Roderick Murray, head of DBS, describes as "all deliberate speed." This policy turned out to be warranted. During field trials of the Cox and Sabin oral polio vaccines in 1960, something happened which emphasized again the need for caution—and which, in fact, resulted in putting the Cox vaccine out of the running.

In Dade County (Miami), Fla., 412,000 men, women, and children swallowed the Cox oral vaccine last spring. The vaccine proved effective, on the whole, but three young men a young woman, and a 2-year-old child came down with paralytic polio within 9 to 14 days after swallowing it; this is the length of time it takes polio viruses to produce illness. In West Berlin also a number of cases of paralysis were reported among 300,000 residents who took the Cox vaccine.

There is no proof that these cases were caused by the Cox vaccine. Some of them—or conceivably all of them—may have been due to polio viruses already present. But enough doubt was raised to eliminate the Cox vaccine as a candidate for immediate licensing.

No such doubts have been raised about the Sabin vaccine. Large-scale field trials have now been run in Cincinnati, Ohio, and Rochester, N.Y., and smaller trials in New York City, New Haven, Cleveland, Nashville, Houston, and New Orleans. The results have been excellent. The Polio Surveillance Unit of the U.S. Public Health Service reports not a single case of paralytic polio traceable to the vaccine. In other countries too the Sabin vaccine has been used on a large scale with success; Dr. Sabin estimates that by the end of 1960, 77 million people had taken his vaccine in the U.S.S.R. and an additional 23 million elsewhere.

Convinced by this vast and rapidly accumulating body of evidence, the DBS has now announced regulations under which companies planning to manufacture the Sabin vaccine will be licensed. These licensing requirements are very strict. Each batch of vaccine, for example, must be tested separately in living rabbits, guinea pigs, adult mice, baby mice, and human kidney cells grown in test tubes. Samples of each batch must also be injected directly into the muscles, spinal cords, and brains of a number of monkeys. No manufacturer will be permitted to sell his first batch until he has proved by tests on five successive batches that he is able to turn out a safe vaccine consistently.

Since meeting all these requirements will take time, the Sabin vaccine probably will not become available for general use until late 1961 or early 1962. As a result, we can be confident that when the first oral vaccine is finally licensed, it will be as safe as scientific precautions can possibly make it.

Dr. Sabin is not happy with the time schedule. He believes that the safety of his vaccine was proved more than a year ago and that it should have been licensed for general use last winter.

Dr. Koprowski is not happy either. He believes that his vaccine is as safe and effective as Dr. Sabin's and should be eligible for licensing along with it. He challenges the evidence which caused the DBS to conclude that the Sabin vaccine is safer than his.

Perhaps the DBS did err in one or both of these respects. If so, it erred in the direction of greater safety for the millions of people who will take the new vaccine.

How much good will the Sabin vaccine accomplish for you and your family when it does become available? Here are the answers given Redbook by public health officials who have no personal stake in either the Salk or the oral vaccines:

CERTAINTY OF PROTECTION

When Dr. Salk manufactured his own vaccine in his own laboratory, it successfully immunized an overwhelming majority of the people who received it. Later, when placed in large-scale commercial production, it was somewhat less effective. Dr. Sabin's vaccine is at present almost 100 percent effective in his own hands, and the experience to date suggests that it will prove to be highly effective protection when it is being commercially produced and distributed.

DURABILITY OF PROTECTION

A few years ago, widespread publicity claims were made that an oral vaccine would provide lifelong protection without a booster, instead of the merely temporary protection which the Salk vaccine was supposed to provide. As a matter of fact, the protection provided by the Salk vaccine—to the surprise of almost everybody except Dr. Jonas Salk himself—is providing remarkably durable. Children vaccinated during the 1954 National Foundation field trials, for example, still show a very low polio rate after 6 years. But no one can foretell whether this protection will continue through the years or will begin to taper off. Nor is there any way of telling now for how many years the Sabin vaccine's protection will last.

SPREAD OF PROTECTION

It used to be claimed that the "tamed" viruses in the oral vaccines would spread rapidly from vaccinated individuals to others. Thus by vaccinating part of a community you might immunize the rest willy-nilly. This claim has proved to be exaggerated. The tamed viruses often spread from a child to his brothers and sisters; they may even spread to his parents, friends, and neighbors. But you can't rely on this spread, and there is no practical way of knowing whether or not one child or adult has "caught" immunity from another. Even limited spread, however, is a point in favor of the Sabin vaccine.

ONE-DOSE PROTECTION

It used to be said that you would be able to swallow just one dose of an oral vaccine and forget all about polio forever. This claim is still occasionally made. But the Sabin vaccine is generally given in three separate doses spaced 4 to 6 weeks apart, and a fourth dose may prove advisable. One-dose protection is a possibility but not yet a reality.

Will an oral vaccine replace the Salk vaccine, or merely take its place as an alternative polio preventive? It is too early to tell. Some experts point out that the Salk vaccine can be combined with diptheria, tetanus and whooping cough vaccines in a single series of shots; when this is done, recent research indicates, both the Salk vaccine and the diptheria vaccine produce a higher level of immunity than either does when given alone. It is quite possible, accordingly, that many physicians will continue to use the polio-diptheria-tetanus-whooping cough combination shots for infants and young children even after the Sabin vaccine is on the market.

Despite the availability and high effectiveness of Salk vaccine, millions of people have failed to get their shots—because of the discomfort or the bother or simply because they do not fully appreciate the importance of protecting themselves and their children. For this reason severe polio epidemics continue to occur among the unvaccinated, as they did during 1960 in Providence, in Baltimore and in perhaps a dozen other American communities.

Public health officials hope that even before the Sabin oral vaccine is available, many of the unvaccinated will respond to the antipolio campaign and get their Salk injections. But because oral vaccine is so painless to take and easy to administer to large groups of people, they expect it to reach many millions who have not had their Salk shots. The Sabin vaccine provides protection more promptly than the Salk vaccine—fast enough so that it can be given to an entire community whenever one case occurs. By preventing intestinal polio infections, it will slow the spread of the polio virus from person to person and may thus stamp out polio altogether—as smallpox has been stamped out—within a reasonable period of time.

Meanwhile, polio will be with us again this summer and fall. The best way for you and your family to get protection this year is by completing your series of four Salk shots now.

What about next year? The two vaccines are completely compatible. After completing your Salk shots this year you can take the Sabin vaccine by mouth next year. The Salk shots will protect you from paralytic polio; the Sabin oral vaccine may raise the level of that protection and will, in addition, prevent you from being a polio "carrier" capable of infecting others.

The Youthful President Kennedy and the Youthfulness of the Biblical Joseph

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, Rabbi Israel H. Leventhal, who is the spiritual leader of the Brooklyn Jewish Center, one of the largest and most outstanding congregations in the United States, recently delivered a sermon which I now have the honor of inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The observations which Rabbi Leventhal makes concerning President Kennedy are most astute. I take great pride in the fact that the rabbi and many of the members of the congregation of the Brooklyn Jewish Center reside in the 10th Congressional District of New York which I have the honor to represent.

The sermon follows:

THE YOUTHFUL PRESIDENT KENNEDY AND THE YOUTHFULNESS OF THE BIBLICAL JOSEPH

(Excerpt of sermon preached by Rabbi Israel H. Levinthal on Sabbath Beshalach, January 28, 1961, on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of the Bar Mitzvah of the Rabbi)

It is now long after the presidential election, and most of us saw on the television or read about the impressive inauguration of our new President. Whether we are Republicans or Democrats, all of us, in the true American spirit, accept the verdict of the electorate and join in the fervent prayer that Heaven's blessing may accompany President Kennedy in all his paths of duty, and that he may succeed in strengthening the role of genuine democracy in our land and in bringing the world nearer to the goals of universal peace and human brotherhood.

It is the accepted rule for clergymen not to take an active part in political campaigns unless a great moral issue is at stake. Throughout my ministry I have adhered to this rule. Now, however, that the election is over, it is not out of place for a clergyman to comment on certain phases of the election campaign. In fact, immediately after the election, political commentators and editors, representing both parties, tried to analyze the election results and to offer reasons for the victory of the one candidate for and the defeat of the other. It is in this spirit that I permit myself to offer my comments on the subject in this Sabbath's sermon.

One of the things that struck me as strange in the recent campaign was the emphasis which the Republican leaders had placed upon Senator Kennedy's youth. I recall reading in the press that at the first meeting of the Republican Strategy Committee, immediately after the presidential nominations, it was unanimously decided to issue a directive to all Republican speakers that they should never refer to the Democratic nominee as Senator Kennedy but always as the young or youthful Senator Kennedy—implying of course that being young meant immaturity, inexperience, naivete.

That a man of 43 should be regarded as a youth was something that I could not comprehend. In our Jewish tradition, a lad of 13 is regarded as already mature for the performance of our religious duties. At 18, according to the rabbis, he is ready to marry and to assume the responsibilities of family life. At 30, a man is deemed to reach the height of physical vigor; and at 40, to attain the full strength of mind and understanding. In fact, in an interesting passage in our ancient rabbinic literature, there is a discussion on this very theme: Unto what age can a man be called a naar (a youth)? Rabbi Akiba said: Up to the age of 30; Rabbi Meir said: Up to 25; and Rabbi Samuel said: They are both wrong, only up to 20 years of age. To the Jewish mind it would be absolutely incomprehensible to speak of a man of 43 as young or as a youth.

Now what is wrong or bad in being young? It seems to me, as one who has already reached the age of the hoary head, that youth is one of man's greatest blessings and that youth offers a man great, creative opportunities. Lord Beaconsfield, from the richness of his experience, cried out: "We must be young to do great things." And William Hazlitt, the celebrated British critic, gave as his judgment that "Almost everything great has been achieved by youth." Allowing for exaggeration in these statements, we certainly cannot agree that being young is synonymous with immaturity, or that in itself, it makes one unfit for leadership. Furthermore, there is a difference of only 3 or 4 years between the ages of Kennedy and Nixon; and if at 43 one is young, and at 46 or 47 one is fully grown, the question arises: What year is the dividing line when one passes from youth to ripened age?

It is interesting to note that in this Sabbath's Scriptural reading there is a reference to the great Biblical character, Joseph. Four weeks ago we concluded the story of his dramatic life. We have been reading since then the story of the bondage of the Israelites in Egypt, and today the reading deals with the account of the exodus from Egypt and the passing of the Israelites through the Red Sea. But in the midst of today's portion we are again reminded of Joseph: "And Moses took the bones of Joseph with him."

Let us turn for a moment to the early phase of Joseph's life. You recall the story: how he was imprisoned in Egypt, how—while a prisoner—he interpreted correctly the dreams of Pharaoh's butler and baker. And now Pharaoh dreams a dream which no one can interpret for him. The butler reminds himself of his own dream while imprisoned and how Joseph's interpretation was fulfilled. He forgot the promise that he had made to Joseph that he would remember him and speak well of him to the Egyptian authorities; but now the opportunity was his to serve his master and to win his favor. And so he approaches Pharaoh and tells him of his own experience: "And there was with us naar ivri—a Hebrew youth who interpreted for us our dreams."

The rabbis were surprised that the butler referred to Joseph as a naar—a youth. The Bible itself tells us that he was 30 years old when he stook before Pharaoh—and how can one speak of a man of 30 as a naar? But the rabbis have a ready answer: the butler referred to him in a derogatory sense—K'shoteh—a foolish, immature, inexperienced lad—v'en raui ligdulah, unfit for position of greatness or leadership.

Pharaoh, however, at the first meeting with Joseph, immediately recognized his greatness, and appointed him to the high position of vice ruler of the realm. And the masses of Egypt also recognized his qualities of leadership, and they called him avrech—a strange word, which the rabbis translated as av b'chochmah v'rach b'shanim—"patriarch in wisdom and youthful in years." It was this combination which Joseph possessed—maturity in wisdom and youthfulness—not so much in years, but as one commentator notes, B'tiveo, and his nature, in spirit—that captivated the minds of the ruler and the masses of Egypt.

I have the feeling that what helped President Kennedy more than anything else was that millions of our citizens recognized in him this remarkable combination of av b'chochmah—rich maturity in wisdom and rach b'shanim, a youthfulness in his very nature and spirit. One may be old in years and yet be blessed with such youthfulness in spirit. Moses, the Bible tells us, was 80 years old when he undertook the difficult task of delivering his people from their Egyptian bondage. In our own day, we see Ben Gurion, at 74, yet blessed with the spirit of youth in directing the affairs of state in Israel.

As a matter of fact, the Bible often uses the term "naar" not in the sense of youth but in that of youthfulness, and thus refers to a number of the ancient heroes as naar, though they were advanced in years. "And Joshua, his servant, naar"—and the rabbis tell us that he was then 42 years of age. David speaks of "my son Solomon naar"—and again the rabbis tell us he was 43 years old. Speaking of the spies whom Joshua sent to investigate the city of Jericho, the rabbis tell us that they were Caleb and Pinchas, and that Caleb was then 78 years old. Yet the Bible speaks of them as naarim—youths, and the rabbis continue in their comment: "The Bible calls them youths, shehayu zerizim k'naarim, because they were as energetic, as enthusiastic, as zealous as young men." The Prophet Hosea, speaking of God's love for Israel, tells us: "ki naar Yisrael, v'ohavehu," usually translated, "When Israel was a youth, I loved him." I think the meaning of the verse is: "Because Israel is youthful, I loved him."

Though Israel is among the oldest of the world's peoples, it is today again revealing its spirit of youthfulness—its power of creativity in every field of human endeavor.

And this is what America, as well as the world at large, needs and craves for: the spirit which youth typifies—vigor, enthusiasm, adventure, and daring to translate into action the ripe wisdom and experience which a leader may possess. Such is the quality of leadership which the American people have recognized in President Kennedy, and which has won their hearts.

* * * * *

And now we can better understand the deeper meaning of our text in this Sabbath's scriptural lesson: "And Moses took the bones of Joseph with him." The rabbis were puzzled by this verse: mai immo, they ask, "Why did Moses have to carry the bones of Joseph with him?" Could he not have assigned other Jews to perform that task? Many are the interpretations which the sages offer. I think the answer is simple. Moses was quite old at the time—past 80 years of age. But he held on to the body of Joseph as a constant inspiration and challenge that he had to endeavor to retain the spirit of youthfulness which Joseph had typified. For he realized that once that spirit of youthfulness departed from him his power of leadership would also depart.

* * * * *

If I may be permitted, I should like to add a personal word. This Sabbath has a special significance for me: it is my Bar Mitzvah Sabbath. Many years have passed since that eventful day in my life—60 to be exact. I realize that I have long passed the stage of naar, of a youth. I have already passed the stages of ziknah and sevah—by which the rabbis designate one's 60th and 70th years. But, like Moses, I, too, symbolically speaking, want to cling to the bones of Joseph and to retain his spirit of naarut—of youthfulness—and to be zariz k'naar—to retain the zeal, the vigor, the enthusiasm of youth, so that for years to come you may be able to say: ki naar yisrael—for Israel is still young in spirit—and therefore I may continue to have your regard and your esteem.

* * * * *

And thus we offer a fervent prayer this Sabbath to our Heavenly Father, first, in

behalf of our new President—that he may ever be blessed with the gifts of av b'chochmah—maturity in wisdom—and of rach b'shanim—the spirit of youthfulness in years. And for myself and for all the older men and women in our congregation, I pray that we may be enabled to be zerazim k'naarim—active, vigorous, energetic like the young, so that we may continue to serve better our faith, our people, our beloved America, and all mankind.

The Touchdown Club of Washington, D.C., and the Olympics for the Deaf

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, recently I was privileged to attend a luncheon at the Statler Hotel sponsored by the Touchdown Club of Washington and I was extremely pleased to learn of its efforts and its interest in supporting various worthy causes and local charitable institutions. What started out some years ago as a luncheon group interested primarily in sports—hence, the origin of its name "Touchdown" as a symbol of football—has emerged into a large and respectable organization of many business and professional people who still retain a deep interest in sports.

Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON was the main speaker at the luncheon and, as usual, delivered an excellent address. John R. O'Brien, vice president of Hoffman Electronics Corp., was the general chairman at the luncheon, which was in the nature of a welcome to the new Washington Senators baseball team. Many Members of Congress plus a substantial number of the Touchdown Club's membership were present to greet the baseball team and to extend best wishes for a most successful season.

The president of the club is Andrew Davis, himself a well-known football player in his college days. Other officers of the club are George Neumann, vice president, and V. T. Curtis, secretary. The club's board of governors consists of the following: Clifford Battles, A. J. Bergman, E. R. Carr, James Castiglia, Walter Conway, John Cooney, Hugh Flynn, Thomas Hurney, James Johnson, Henry Krause, Al Lujack, Scott Morris, John R. O'Brien, Otis Printz, John Stapelton, and Charles Wilson.

In talking with some of its leaders, I was pleasantly surprised to learn of the Touchdown Club's activities in promoting sports in the interests of good will and cooperation. One club official, General Manager Al Fiorentino, told me: "The heart of our club lies in helping youngsters find themselves in team sports, which demand so much loyalty and so much sacrifice for a common goal." With a purpose of this kind, we can truly say that it is "a club with a heart."

Perhaps one of the most laudable endeavors undertaken by the Touchdown Club is its effort to help raise the necessary funds to send a group of athletes from Gallaudet College in Washington to compete in the 9th International Games for the Deaf—known as the Olympics for the Deaf—which are scheduled to be held this summer at Helsinki, Finland. These games are held every 4 years, the last time being in 1957 in Milan, Italy, where the United States was represented by 40 deaf athletes who scored 182 points in track and field, swimming, and tennis, and won the world championship in basketball.

At this year's Olympic Games for the Deaf at Helsinki, August 6 to 10, some 1,000 deaf athletes from 34 countries are expected to compete in track and field events, basketball, swimming, tennis, wrestling, gymnastics, soccer, cycling, and others. Women will participate in track and field, swimming, tennis, and other sports. The President of Finland will officially open the Games at the Olympic Stadium in Helsinki, which seats 80,000 people.

A substantial number of the athletes on the U.S. team will be made up of students from Gallaudet College in Washington, which is the only college in the world for the deaf. It is a private liberal arts college, established in 1864 by act of Congress. In order to cover the expenses of the Gallaudet squad at the Helsinki games, a sum of $50,000 is needed.

The Touchdown Club of Washington has undertaken the task of sponsoring agency in the effort to raise these funds. Judging by its record of achievement of the past in supporting worthy causes, there is no doubt in my mind that its effort will again prove successful. I want to take this opportunity of paying a well-deserved tribute to the officers and members of the Touchdown Club for assuming this responsibility. It is a noble deed which should be widely recognized.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to insert into the RECORD two brief articles from a pamphlet of the American Athletic Association of the Deaf in which are described the forthcoming games for the deaf at Helsinki and the results of the 1957 games at Milan.

The two articles read as follows:

NINTH WORLD GAMES FOR DEAF, HELSINKI, FINLAND, AUGUST 6 TO 10, 1961

The selection of Helsinki, Finland, as the scene for the 1961 International Games for the Deaf is both symbolic and unique. It is symbolic because it exemplifies the growth of the International Games for the Deaf as an all-encompassing international movement. It must be called unique since the "Deaf Olympic" games will take place in the White City of the North for the first time in the history of the games.

The Finns were to have been host to the sixth international games for the deaf at Helsinki in 1949. Unfortunately Russian planes blotted out all of the splendid Finnish physical setup, such as a stadium, arenas, etc., which had been built and readied for the 1942 Olympiad. Furthermore, the tedious process of restoring Finnish economy to its prewar level made it impossible for that country to sponsor such a gathering. Recognizing Finland's inability to play host, the CISS awarded the honor to the Danish clubs of the deaf, and they acted as host to the sixth international games for the deaf at Copenhagen in 1949.

Now Finland is ready and is inviting all the deaf in the world to the Ninth World Games for the Deaf, August 6 to 10, 1961.

The President of Finland will open the Ninth World Games for the Deaf on August 6 at the Olympic Stadium which will be the scene of all track and field events for both men and women plus the soccer finals. This stadium seating 80,000 was the scene of the memorable 15th Olympiad for the hearing in 1952.

Just a few hundred yards away is Olympic Park where both spectators and participants, seated in three sports arenas and the ultramodern swimming stadium, will watch the soccer preliminaries, swimming, water polo, tennis, and basketball events. The other events such as highway cycling, 25 kilometer marathon race, and shooting will be held in the environments of Helsinki and necessary conveyance will carry both spectators and participants to the sites of these events.

For the housing of some 1,000 deaf athletes, Olympic Village, located in Otaniemi and about nine kilometers west of Helsinki includes nine buildings, which during winter are inhabited by technical students. Athletes from each country will have an opportunity to mix freely with others, but each nation will have its own section of houses. Fine training and practice facilities are closely available for most of the games events, so there's no reason—except for amusement and sightseeing—for any athlete to leave home. And there is a good restaurant in the village, where 500 persons can have their meals at the same time. A Finnish sauna on the nearby seashore will undoubtedly prove an experience. It is interesting to note that this village housed the participants of the 1952 Olympic Games.

Tackling the tremendous task of staging the Ninth International Games for the Deaf is a national undertaking. The Finnish Government is contributing the cost of financing the games. The organizing committee, composed of several deaf leaders of Finland and hearing sports leaders, is directing the planning and preparation for the 1961 World Games for the Deaf.

Events for the Helsinki meet are track and field, swimming, basketball, wrestling, soccer, tennis, cycling, shooting, gymnastics, and ping pong.

RESULTS OF 1957 CISS GAMES AT MILAN, ITALY—U.S. ATHLETES WIN FIRST PLACE IN MEN'S TRACK AND FIELD MEET

(Yanks dazzle world cagers to grab international title; Americans receive 17 gold medals, 9 silver and 11 bronze awards; Germans top greatest games ever as records tumble.)

The 1957 Milan games already deserve on one count a special niche in International Games for the Deaf history.

The largest U.S. team ever to participate played a dominant role in making it history to be remembered.

And Russians participated in this meet for the first time since the first International Games for the Deaf were held in Paris in 1924.

As in the hearing Olympics, the CISS does not recognize the point system of all sports which decides one nation victor over another. Individual, rather than team performance, they hold, should be paramount. Consequently team standings quoted here are unofficial.

Twenty-five nations competed in the games, with a total of 635 athletes, while 11 other countries sent delegates as observers.

Everything was performed according to the hearing Olympics. There was a parade of nations in full dress and John Smith of Idaho, double winner of the 1953 games at Brussels, led the U.S. contingent by carrying the American colors.

The men's track and field meet developed into a dual meet between the United States and Russia. The United States took five firsts against seven for Russia, but we took first place with 147 points. Russia was runner-up with 121 points. The United States took five seconds and eight thirds, while Russia collected three seconds and three thirds.

This was for the male contestants only. With the women the Russians amassed 115 points, Germany secured 66 and Poland 42. All the United States got was one point from its sole feminine competitor. In this country the women (deaf women at least) do not go in for such sports.

Of 13 world's records and 3 games marks set by male performers during 6 days of fierce competition—sometimes under adverse conditions—Americans broke 3 global marks and tied one standard for this international classic. The Russians rewrote four world's records and shattered one games mark.

It was not surprising that the United States won the basketball championship for that is a favorite American sport. Playing outdoors and on a marble court, a new experience for them, the boys from Little Rock, 1957's AAAD champions and American standard-bearers, defeated Finland, 57-30, France, 51-12, Italy, 89-39, and Belgium, the 1953 champ, in the finals, 81-25.

Participating in only 4 sports, the United States did well with only 40 athletes. They won first place in men's track and field, first place in basketball, fifth place in swimming, and third place in mixed doubles tennis. In all, they won 17 gold medals, 9 silver and 11 bronze awards. Twenty-six of the 40 athletes got medals, and 31 scored points for Uncle Sam.

In the overall picture, taking into account all sports such as the rifle shooting, soccer, gymnastics, ping pong, cycling, etc., Germany led in the number of medals won, 24 gold, 9 silver and 16 bronze, a total of 49. Host Italy was next as it garnered a total of 38—5 gold, 14 silver and 19 bronze. The United States was third with 37 medals, while Russia was fourth with 31—13 gold, 11 silver and 7 bronze.

Airlines' "Overbooking"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on January 3, 1961, I introduced a bill, H.R. 1208, to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938.

The bill is designed to eliminate the practice of overbooking of passenger space reservations. I first introduced this measure in the 85th Congress.

Unfortunately the situation has not changed. This highly questionable practice is still going on. Since the airlines will not stop it themselves there must be remedial legislation.

The bill would provide protection for passengers by permitting them to bring a court action against the airline if they present themselves to board a plane for which they have confirmed reservations and the space is not available. Damages collectible would be an amount to cover actual losses, plus twice the amount of the fare paid or $100, whichever is greater, plus a reasonable attorney's fee and court costs.

If the passenger does not bring suit within 2 years the United States could bring the action against the airlines.

Those airlines which allow such shoddy practices have made this legislation necessary. As for the others they will probably benefit from it by an increase in business as a result of this additional guarantee to the passenger.

It is my hope that the Congress will act favorably on this measure in the near future.

Crisis in the Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an article written by Selig Greenberg in the April 1961 issue of the Progressive entitled "Crisis in the Hospitals":

CRISIS IN THE HOSPITALS

(By Selig Greenberg)

(This is the first of two articles on hospital costs by Selig Greenberg, writer on medical problems for the Providence, R.I., Journal and Evening Bulletin. Mr. Greenberg has twice been honored by the Lasker Foundation for his distinguished writing on medicine. He won the Associated Press Managing Editors Association Award for his series of articles on the problems of the aged.—THE EDITORS.)

The Nation's hospitals—the outposts of our phenomenal medical progress—are now confronted with a profound crisis, at the very time they are advancing toward ever greater miracles of healing and lifesaving. Soaring hospital costs and hospitalization insurance rates have brought a rising tide of public concern, expressed in demands for greater efficiency in hospital operation, and for reforms in the prevailing patterns of health insurance. Across the country labor unions, business firms, citizens' groups, and public officials are calling for controls on skyrocketing costs, curbs on services which are either wholly unnecessary or could be furnished less expensively, and a more rational and coherent system that will get the most out of the medical care dollar. Increasingly, warnings are heard from responsible sources that the squeeze of spiraling costs may price voluntary insurance out of the market and force full Government control of our whole complex of health services.

There is probably no more explosive issue in the entire controversial field of medical economics than that of hospital costs. For it is here, more than in any other area of medical care, that the problems of the technological revolution in medicine are rapidly coming to a head.

Hospital services now not only account for the largest single portion of the Nation's health care bill, but they are at the heart of our system of medical practice. As medicine grows more intricate and its tools more elaborate, the trend inevitably is toward increasing concentration of medical services within the hospital. And it is the very triumphs of medicine which are catapulting costs. Nowhere is this more evident than in the hospitals, which have become a large-scale and complex business requiring the coordination of a great array of professional skills and huge capital investment in expensive facilities and equipment.

Basically, the crisis of hospital function and financing stems from the fact that we are both the beneficiaries and the victims of the remarkable progress of medicine which has brought us better health and longer life but also has enormously complicated the rendering of medical services and raised their costs. The revolution in medicine is far from over, and hospitals have yet to fulfill their growing potential. Further scientific advances will unavoidably mean still costlier diagnostic and treatment procedures, more elaborate and expensive equipment, and an even greater need for technical personnel. A continued rise in hospital costs thus appears inescapable. So it is all the more vital to eliminate the waste, duplication, and lack of integrated planning now common in the hospital field. If there are ways of operating hospitals more efficiently and economically—as many authorities believe there are—the public certainly has the right to insist on getting full value at the lowest possible price consistent with high quality.

Good hospital care clearly cannot be produced cheaply. But if costs are to be kept within acceptable bounds and quality improved, we will need a much higher degree of self-discipline by the medical profession and a far greater readiness on the part of hospitals to yield some of the privileges of their cherished autonomy than have so far been evident. It is no exaggeration to say that the future of the organization of medical care and practice in the United States depends on the extent to which the doctors and the hospitals can be prevailed upon to recognize that their business is the public's business.

The statistics of rising hospital costs and utilization are instructive and sobering.

For a number of years, hospital room charges have been advancing at a much faster rate than any other item in the U.S. Department of Labor's Consumer Price Index. The overall index, which is pegged at 100 for the 1947–49 period, had risen to 124.6 by the end of 1959. At that time the index for all medical care services put together stood at 150.8. But for hospital room rates it was 208.9.

In 1946, the average cost per patient day in voluntary hospitals was $9.39. By 1959, it had jumped to $30.19, an increase of more than 220 percent. Nor is the end of the spiral anywhere in sight. Experts are generally agreed that hospital costs will continue to rise at the rate of 5 to 10 percent a year. A spokesman for the American Hospital Association has predicted that the average cost per patient day may reach $50 by 1968.

Of equal importance in contributing to the steady climb of the Nation's hospital bill is the striking increase in the rate of hospitalization. Thirty years ago, 37 out of every 1,000 Americans were admitted to general hospitals in the course of a year. Since then the ratio of hospital admissions has zoomed to 124. A variety of factors has figured in this upward trend. For one thing, hospitals can do much more for the sick than they could 2 or 3 decades ago. Widespread insurance coverage has removed much of the economic deterrent to hospital care for those in the middle and low-income groups. In the Nation's population there has been a steady increase in the numbers and in the proportion of older people, who have a higher incidence of chronic diseases requiring more frequent hospitalization. Many conditions of modern city living make for significantly higher hospital use than in rural areas. The large proportion of working wives means that often there is no one at home to take care of a sick husband or child. The high price of household or nurs-

ing help to care for the sick at home and the limited size of city apartments also force up the hospitalization rate.

The net effect of higher costs of hospital care and its much greater frequency has been a tripling of expenditures for hospital services in the United States in the past 15 years. Out of a total private medical care outlay of $18.3 billion in 1959, payments to hospitals were $5.5 billion, the biggest single share, and $500 million more than the amount paid to physicians. The latest available breakdown shows that 30 cents out of every medical care dollar now goes to hospitals, 27 cents to doctors, 26 cents for drugs and appliances, 11 cents to dentists, and the remaining 6 cents for other professional services.

There are many sound reasons for the continued rise in hospital operating costs. A U.S. Public Heatlh Service official has summed them up with the cogent observation that "when we talk about the cost of medical care today as compared to the past, we're talking about the price of an electric washer-dryer compared to a washtub."

There is no ready solution for the costliness of new and more effective medical procedures, more elaborate surgery, and more potent drugs. Such dramatic advances as open-heart surgery, artificial kidneys, heart pacemaker units, cobalt radiation treatment, and radioisotopes to pinpoint internal abnormalities are restoring patients to health sooner and more completely, and, frequently, are saving lives which otherwise would be lost. But some of these miraculous procedures are enormously expensive, requiring dozens of physicians and technicians for a single patient.

As productivity has gone up, industry has been able to shorten its workweek. But hospitals cannot shorten their week. They must remain open 168 hours a week, 52 weeks a year. To keep pace with the standard 40-hour week in the community, hospitals have been forced to hire many new employees to fill each around-the-clock job. They also have been obliged to bring their lagging wage scales closer to those of private industry. While raising its wage level, industry has often managed to cut its labor costs through automation. But hospitals cannot substitute machines for people. On the contrary, as available lifesaving services proliferate and newly developed equipment is constantly added, more rather than fewer people are required to operate them. In 1946 voluntary hospitals in the United States had, on the average, 156 employees for every 100 patients. By now the ratio of employees for each 100 patients has risen to 225. Whereas in the automobile industry wages currently account for only about one-third of production costs, payroll expenditures have shot up to 70 percent of hospital budgets.

New medical sophistication has made hospital care an accepted component of the average American's standard of living. The public learns quickly these days of new medical discoveries through the press, radio, and television. The more people learn about medical progress, the more they are likely to go to the hospital, where the latest advances can be most effectively applied. The rising standard of living also has brought a demand for more attractive hospital facilities. Hospitals are expected to match the comforts of motels by way of air conditioning, piped-in radio, perhaps television, and certainly window draperies. The new standards also call for a telephone at the bedside and some choice of menu. While the effect of these niceties on the patient's recovery is debatable, their effect on the hospital's unit costs is obvious.

Another element in the picture has been the sharp increase in new hospital construction throughout the country. This expansion has been, in general, a laudable development. Antiquated buildings have in many places been replaced, and additional bed space has been provided to keep pace with the forward march of medical science. But we have lagged in developing more economical facilities such as hospital outpatient clinics and adequate nursing and convalescent homes for chronic patients. Concentration upon the expansion of costly hospital bed capacity designed primarily for the acutely ill is wasteful. Competent opinion is that the more hospital beds are available, the greater is the tendency toward admissions for relatively trivial ailments and for longer-than-necessary stays, particularly when such abuse is encouraged by the benefit structure of hospitalization insurance.

The fact that patients now go home much sooner than they used to—the average length of hospital stay has been cut in the past 30 years from 15.3 to 7.8 days—is in itself far from an unmixed blessing.

The shorter stay means that more intensive treatment is concentrated within a shorter period of time, so that daily costs are higher. An additional cost factor in more rapid patient turnover is that chances are greater there will be vacant beds which have to be staffed but produce no income. One of the paradoxes of the hospital cost problem is that it is the result of both overuse and insufficient use of facilities. On the one hand, hospital beds are sometimes used needlessly for patients who could just as well be taken care of elsewhere at much lower cost. On the other hand, hospital facilities are not utilized as efficiently as they should be, with the result that about one bed out of four is usually empty, and in some institutions the average occupancy rate is even lower. Low occupancy means a correspondingly heavier proportion of overhead in daily per patient costs.

Much wider use of hospital services and their greater costliness have been reflected, inevitably, in steadily climbing hospitalization insurance rates. As Blue Cross and other plans throughout the country have repeatedly been forced to seek premium hikes, growing attention has been focused on the urgent need for eliminating hospital inefficiencies and needless use of expensive facilities. An important point to bear in mind is that hospital costs are no longer solely the concern of patients and their families. With the phenomenal spread of health insurance, which now covers more than two out of every three Americans, the hospital bill is being underwritten by the healthy as well as the sick. This means that the public is more and more looking upon hospital costs not only in terms of charges for services rendered but also in terms of the monthly cost of insurance.

Rate hearings before State insurance commissioners have increasingly provided a platform for the critics of hospital efficiency and of the effect which the present health insurance system has upon it.

Such hearings in New York, Pennsylvania, and a number of other States have produced charges that the prevailing insurance approach lays too much emphasis on hospitalization, ignoring possibilities for more economical treatment of many conditions in the doctor's office or in outpatient clinics; that Blue Cross—and Blue Shield, its companion surgical-medical insurance program—have built-in incentives for getting between hospital sheets merely to take advantage of insurance benefits; that hospitals could do considerably more than they have been doing to keep down their operating costs; that because of the general lack of overall community planning and integration in the hospital field there is duplication and overlapping of personnel, equipment, and services; that much of the present organization of hospital services, revolving around the doctor as a private entrepreneur, has become inefficient in the context of the growing complexity of medicine and must be drastically revamped to take advantage of opportunities for greater productivity and lower costs; and that the public is not adequately represented in the management of the voluntary hospitals and the insurance plans.

The adverse effect of health insurance, which now provides the greatest share of hospital income, in relaxing many of the pressure for economy in hospital operations is emphasized in the report of the Commission on Financing of Hospital Care. The commission, sponsored by the American Hospital Association and made up of a distinguished group of authorities, concluded after a lengthy study that the emergence of insurance as a major factor in medical economics has "to some degree reduced, if not removed, incentives that would otherwise operate to encourage maintenance of hospital operating costs at the lowest level practicable."

The commission's report points out that prior to the extensive use of insurance, when people were required to pay the full bill directly to the hospital, there were "natural economic restraints" on costs, and lower-cost institutions providing services of equally good quality enjoyed a competitive advantage in attracting more patients. But with the introduction through insurance of "a new element in the relationship between cost and use of services," the report says, Blue Cross, as "the intermediary between the purchaser of hospital care and the hospital, must inevitably assume some functions previously the direct responsibility of patient or hospital."

One of those holding that "genuine economies can be made by hospitals without lessening quality of service," and that Blue Cross should insist on such economies instead of merely acting as a collection agency for the hospitals, is Francis R. Smith, Pennsylvania's dynamic State insurance commissioner.

Smith, who feels that his authority to pass on Blue Cross premium rates goes much further than the checking of actuarial tables, and extends to the things which pyramid costs, has for several years been preaching the doctrine that neither the hospitals nor Blue Cross have done all they can and should to control such abuses as unnecessary admissions and excessively protracted stays, and to put into effect other efficiency measures. And the commissioner has used his legal powers to enforce his views. In a series of trail-blazing decisions, he has ordered Blue Cross, and the hospitals in Philadelphia, and other cities, to adopt certain economy measures before any further insurance rate boosts would be granted. Among the economy possibilities, he has advocated are wider use of opportunities for outpatient diagnosis and treatment, tighter controls on the scheduling of admissions and discharges, and on length of stay, better scheduling of medical procedures to avoid needless delays, more effective use of technicians and nurses, sharing of specialized equipment among hospitals, and greater standardization of supplies along with joint purchasing.

Considerable progress has been achieved in Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and other Pennsylvania communities under Smith's prodding during the past 2 years. Blue Cross plans have developed medical review teams to ferret out abuse of insurance contracts. They have expanded their coverage of diagnostic services and home nursing visits, in order to cut down hospitalization. Hospitals have organized medical utilization committees to check on needless admissions and excessive stays. They also are moving to achieve greater management efficiencies and to coordinate expansion through joint planning.

While hospitals are a big enterprise, but not a business in the ordinary sense of that term, Smith said in a recent speech, "This does not mean that hospitals cannot be businesslike. More needs to be done in applying commonsense business practices and methods to hospitals—wherever they will apply."

Appendix

Statement of Senator Clifford P. Case, of New Jersey, on the 26th Annual Convention of the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am delighted to report that the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America, one of our Nation's outstanding veterans' organizations, will be holding its national convention this year in Atlantic City, N.J. I can assure each of its members who are planning to attend a warm and sincere welcome from our Garden State.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement outlining the plans for this, their 26th annual convention at Atlantic City, N.J. Various sessions of the convention have been marked to be held in various parts of the city, culminating Saturday evening in a gala convention banquet and ball at the Ambassador Hotel, Atlantic City, N.J.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CLIFFORD P. CASE OF NEW JERSEY, ON THE 26TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The 26th annual convention of the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America will have many serious aspects, varied and interesting recreational events have been arranged for the members of the organization, their wives and families. On Tuesday preceding the convention there will be a visit to the Atlantic City races with a fashion show for the auxiliary members and friends. On Tuesday evening there will be a Catholic War Veterans night at the Atlantic City Steel Pier. On the evening of the following day there will be an informal social night which will be held at the Ambassador Hotel, Atlantic City, N.J., for all Catholic War Veteran members and families.

Throughout the week there will be other interesting activities and ceremonies including a Catholic War Veterans night at Convention Hall, Atlantic City, N.J., at the 22d showing of the Ice Capades on Thursday evening. On Saturday morning a parade will take place on the boardwalk from the convention headquarters to the convention hall where a Pontifical High Mass will be celebrated by His Excellency Celestine J. Damiano, Archbishop of Camden, N.J. The closing event of the weeklong gathering will be the convention ball and banquet on Saturday evening with special Catholic War Veterans candelight ceremonies and rituals.

The convention will see reports of progress made by this national veterans' group in the fields of Americanism, Catholic action, leadership, membership, veterans' affairs, and youth welfare.

At various times throughout the convention, prominent Americans are scheduled to address joint sessions of the Catholic War Veterans and its auxiliaries. These men, all outstanding in their particular field, will bring to the Catholic War Veterans and through them to all veterans and Americans messages on "National Security," "Veterans' Affairs," "International Relations," and other vital subjects.

The Catholic War Veterans of the United States came into existence in the year 1935 when it was founded by a former Army chaplain, the Right Reverend Monsignor Edward J. Higgins, LL. D., of Astoria, Long Island, N.Y. Recognizing a need for a militant veterans organization composed of Catholic men and women who served their country in time of war, Monsignor Higgins founded an organization that has grown throughout the years and now has posts in more than 40 States and in the words of its own constitution:

"To promote zeal and devotion for God, for country, and for home:

"(a) For God: to promote through aggressive organized Catholic action a greater love, honor, and service to God; an understanding and application of the teachings of Christ in our everyday life; recognizing the wisdom of the church in all matters of faith and morals.

"(b) For country: through a more vivid understanding of the Constitution of the United States of America and tarough active participation in the promotion of its ideals of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, develop a more zealous citizenship; to encourage morality in government, labor, management, economic, social, fraternal, and all other phases of American life; to combat aggressively the forces which tend to impair the efficiency and permanency of our free institutions.

"(c) For home: To promote the realization that the family is the basic unit of society; to aid in the development of an enlightened patriotic American youth; to assist all veterans and widows and dependents of deceased veterans.

"(d) These objectives are encouraged without regard to race, creed, or color."

Throughout its existence the Catholic War Veterans has been part of the fierce war of ideologies seeking to capture the minds of men. This organization has spotted and fought totalitarian and brutalitarian philosophies of both the right and left, and stood firm on the solid stand of freedom of the individual and personal independence of its citizens, under the law.

The Catholic War Veterans creed from the now-famous speech, "Catholicism and Americanism," of the late Archbishop John Ireland, of St. Paul, Minn., states:

"My religious faith is that of the Catholic Church—catholicism, integral and unalloyed—catholicism, unswerving and soul-swaying, the catholicism taught by the supreme chieftain of the Catholic Church, the Pope, the Bishop of Rome.

"My civil and political faith is that of the Republic of the United States of America—Americanism, purest and brightest, yielding in strength and loyalty to the Americanism of none other American, surpassed in spirit of obedience and sacrafice by that of none other citizens, none other soldier, sworn to uphold in peace and in war America's Star-Spangled Banner."

The Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America have received many commendations from agencies in Government, in business, in welfare and hospital work, in rehabilitation, in child guidance, in patriotic, fraternal, veteran, and religious spheres. It has the approbation of the present Pope, John XXIII, and all Popes from the date of the founding of the organization. It is recognized by the Veterans' Administration in the handling of cases before it.

It has been commended by every U.S. President in office since its inception and received accolades of a great many American statesmen.

Programs have included summer camps for youngsters, informative material exposing fascism, nazism, and the cancerous core of Communist propaganda, broadcasts and information bulletins on veteran benefits, support of youth groups, establishment of scholarships, fight for veterans' rights, and the spiritual comfort of our comrades, proper burial for veterans and care for their widows and dependents, exposure of intolerance, bigotry, and disloyalty, promotion of activities which tend to strengthen the moral fiber of the Nation and its people, and build a "greater spirit of faith and patriotism."

The current program of the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America is strictly positive. The Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America are not anti-anything; they are protagonists of right, truth, and justice. Their whole philosophy is based on the recognition of man's dignity and rendering "to God the things that are God's." They insist on the recognition of the moral basis, underlying all political, economic, and social themes.

Their emphasis lies in action. "It is better to light one candle than to curse the darkness." They feel that no program, no matter how magnificent, can be effective unless it is acted upon.

The less than three decades of Catholic War Veterans' existence have proved fruitful for our freedom. And the future of America is safe, when public-spirited, patriotic citizens who have fought for their Nation in war, continue to serve in peace.

The Catholic War Veterans is organized to serve the individual and the Nation. Size is not the measure of its service, its reputation, its loyalty, its faith or its spirit of fellowship.

As they celebrate that 26th anniversary milestone of their history, Catholic War Veterans take pride in their past—are confident of their future.

Watchdog of the Great Lakes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an edi-

torial from the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Press for April 25 entitled "Watchdog of the Great Lakes." This editorial points up the significance of H.R. 6626 introduced by Representative ROBERT GRIFFIN, of Michigan. I sincerely hope that this House shares with all of us from Michigan a deep concern for preserving the purity of the waters of the Great Lakes which serve in so many ways millions of people in the bordering States.

The editorial follows:

WATCHDOG OF THE GREAT LAKES

Representative ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, of Traverse City, appears to be making a name for himself in Congress as "Watchdog of the Great Lakes." He is now pushing a measure to bring these waters under the Oil Pollution Act of 1924 to prevent the dumping of oil wastes. This act now applies only to tidewaters.

This action follows his earlier interest in enforcement of regulations against refuse dumping by Great Lakes ships. The U.S. Public Health Service is warning all ship captains entering the St. Lawrence Seaway concerning these rules.

In these activities Representative GRIFFIN is seeking to control pollution of the lakes as much as possible to safeguard sources of drinking water, beaches and the waterway itself. In this he should have the support of all Great Lakes States, particularly his own, since Michigan has the longest shoreline of any of the States except Alaska and it is surrounded on three sides by these waters.

Pollution was a problem long before the seaway was opened. Now it is a greater problem than ever and in future years, as shipping gains with every season, it will be a vital matter to maintain the purity of the lakes as far as possible to preserve both recreational and economic advantages.

In earlier generations there was a tendency to consider Michigan's forests as inexhaustible. This complacency later led to a rude awakening. The same attitude concerning the preservation of Great Lakes waters could bring a similar reaction—too late.

Representing the heart of this great region, Representative GRIFFIN is admirably suited to be its conservation champion. He already has proven his determination to carry through—as in his labor reform battle of a year ago.

Investigation of Communist Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, a recent editorial from the Pilot, the archdiocesan newspaper in Boston, ably discusses the need for balance in the investigation of Communist activities.

The editorial points to the proper role of anti-Communist activity and comments upon the damage done to the cause of anticommunism by the excesses of zealots and amateurs in the field.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNBALANCED VIEW

The longer one lives the more it becomes plain that balance is the rarest and perhaps the most precious of the intellectual virtues. It is what our fathers used to call wisdom, the ability to see the whole picture, the comprehensive view. Just as a little learning is a dangerous thing, so also a high enthusiasm can upset the balance of the total reality and the end product is excess.

Our reflections on this subject are prompted by the rash of publicity which has been flooding the press and news media generally on Mr. Robert Welch and his Birch clubs. In a world as complex as ours, simplification can be a vice and sincerity is no excuse for exaggeration. Nothing discredits a good cause quicker than supporting it by misrepresentation. When we feed the cause of genuine anticommunism with overstatement, we err just as badly as those who nourish communism itself by understatement. The evidence available seems to indicate quite plainly that this movement, with all kinds of good intentions allowed, is unbalanced, excited, and definitely out of focus.

The lessons which can be profitably drawn from such an endeavor—a good thing gone wrong—are many and should not be lost on thoughtful observers. In protecting ourselves against communism, we should be careful that we do not fall into evils almost as bad. It is possible to escape the dogs only to perish in the swamp. Moreover we must remember that we cannot rewrite history; it is fatuous to speak of returning to the simplicity of earlier times or to suggest carrying out the responsibilities of present day government with the machinery of the 18th century. We live in a real world with real problems which we must meet realistically; there is no place for hysteria, exaggeration, accusation, or misrepresentation in an authentic anti-Communist effort.

Unfortunately, people of good will and even prestige who wish to give their support to a genuine anti-Communist movement in the United States have very little to turn to, and it is not to be wondered at if some of them are caught up by the promises of organizations like the Birch clubs. Clearly, we need a highly estimable group of American intellectuals who could be relied upon to speak and act with a balanced view on communism and at the same time supply materials for study groups of adults and young people on this subject. Such an effort could intelligently channel the human resources of our country in the kind of anticommunism which is most effective. It would expose Communist patterns of operation and educate in Communist techniques, but at the same time, and most important of all, it would seek to remove those social ills on which communism thrives.

The excesses of Mr. Welch will have served us well, even if obliquely, if they remind us of our responsibilities in combating communism intelligently and by the use of those means which do not betray the very principles we have set out to defend. Anticommunism should not be discredited by the misplaced enthusiasm of certain anti-Communists; it should be reformed into that institutional expression which embodies our own ideals and demonstrates their clear superiority over the claims of totalitarianism. Until we have done this, and it is not easy to do, we will continue to be exposed to the efforts of amateurs whose good intentions cannot redeem their repeated errors.

Miss Ellen Titus Is the Winner of the Schenectady Area Spelling Bee, Conducted by the Schenectady Union Star, and Comes to Washington Next Month for the National Spelling Bee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I have always been very much interested in spelling contests, not only because I remember taking part in them as a boy, but also because of the importance these days of spelling in providing a solid foundation for an effective education. On top of that, as all of us in this House are well aware, it is especially wonderful to win any contest that carries with it a trip to Washington.

For all these reasons I was most pleased the other day to learn of the success of one of my constituents, 13-year-old Ellen Titus, a student at Van Antwerp School in the town of Niskayuna in Schenectady County, in winning the Schenectady area spelling bee last week, conducted by one of the great family newspapers in my home city, the Schenectady Union Star. As a result of her victory, capped by spelling successfully the word "rescissible," Miss Titus comes to Washington next month to compete in the national spelling bee. I look forward to greeting her here and I wish her the very best of luck in this important championship contest.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include an article from the Schenectady Union Star of April 24, describing in detail the exciting sequence of Miss Titus' victory:

"RESCISSIBLE" IS THE WORD THAT WON FOR ELLEN TITUS

(By Ann S. Hamlen)

"Rescissible" is an uncommon word and an uncommonly tricky one to spell. Because she tackled it successfully, 13-year-old Ellen Titus, of Van Antwerp Junior High School, won the area championship in the 1961 Union-Star-sponsored Schenectady area spelling bee Saturday.

Her winning word means "capable of being rescinded."

Close to 900 spectators watched and applauded the 37 young experts who competed as finalists in a public spelldown at Union College Memorial Chapel. In addition to families, friends, classmates and teachers, the big, airy hall was well filled with persons who had no connection with the bee except a lively interest in an impressive display of skills and sportsmanship.

"INTERESTED OBSERVER"

One of the first to arrive, more than an hour early, was a man who said he was "just an interested observer."

Ellen, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Albert C. Titus, 2060 Grand Boulevard, won her laurels at the end of a 3-hour contest which was climaxed by a tense 45-minute duel with Patricia Reynolds of Draper Junior High School, 14-year-old daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Donald Reynolds, 791 Curry Road, Rotterdam. Both girls are eighth graders.

Both also are superior spellers. For minute after dramatic minute they fielded such challenges as "meningitis" (spelled correctly by Patricia) and "interlocutor" (mastered by Ellen). When the tournament ended, thunderous applause greeted winner and runner-up alike for a truly spectacular demonstration of achievement.

Steve Fitz of WSNY was announcer-pronouncer for the bee, which was broadcast as it took place over WSNY. Judges were Dr. William M. Murphy, Union College English professor, chairman; Miss Margaret Walsh, head of the Mont Pleasant High School English department; Miss Marguerite Bostwick, Mohonasen High School English department head; and Joseph Porter, English teacher at Schalmont High School.

Words for the spelldown were taken from "Words of the Champions" booklets distributed by the Union-Star to participating schools for study purposes, and from Webster's Unabridged Dictionary, second edition.

THIRTY-SEVEN FINALISTS

Each of the 37 finalists appearing on the chapel stage Saturday was a school champion speller. They were chosen from among approximately 6,200 seventh and eighth grade pupils in nearly 270 classes. Eight boys and twenty-nine girls made it to the finals.

Winning through to the 11th of 12 rounds was 13-year-old Anna Hood, a seventh grader at Duanesburg Central School, who placed third. Judith Smith, a 13-year-old eighth grader at Fort Plain Central School, placed fourth, and 12-year-old Gail Shaffer, a Gilboa-Conesville Central School seventh grader, earned fifth place.

Paper Mate inscribed two-tone pens were presented each school champion at the close of Saturday's bee. As runner-up, Patricia also earned a $25 U.S. saving bond, while to Ellen went a complete, current set of the Encyclopedia Britannica, the Britannica's World Language Dictionary, a Zenith all-transistor portable radio, and her choice of a Paper Mate inscribed Mark IV pen or desk set.

Ellen now will represent Schenectady and its neighboring communities as a finalist in the 34th Annual National Spelling Bee, sponsored by Scripps-Howard newspapers. She will leave Schenectady May 31 to join 72 youthful spelling champions for several days of a specially planned program that will include sightseeing and other events, in addition to the national bee finals.

Roy Swanigan, West Virginia Legislator, Overcomes Handicap To Enjoy Fruitful Life—Operates U.S. Senate Subway Car

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, with the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped meeting today and tomorrow in Washington, D.C., it is an appropriate occasion to call attention to one of the Senate subway car operators who has overcome a handicap and is taking an active part in public affairs.

I refer to Roy Swanigan of Fayetteville, W. Va., who is a member of the house of delegates of the West Virginia Legislature.

Today's editions of the Washington Evening Star contains an interesting column by George Kennedy, who writes as "The Rambler," and depicts the story of Mr. Swanigan in a most stimulating manner.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the newspaper column to which I have made reference.

There being no objection, the newspaper column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Evening Star, Apr. 27, 1961]

THE RAMBLER IS TAKEN FOR A RIDE

(By George Kennedy)

Roy Swanigan, a young-looking man with brown hair, good complexion and a soft voice—not of the Deep South but with the slightly higher note of the hill country—operates one of the cars on the new subway to the New Senate Office Building.

He is a member of the West Virginia Legislature.

"We had a 60-day meeting in January and February," he said yesterday. "We went all out. We increased taxes and expenditures by about $30 million. West Virgina must advance. We also ratified the amendment giving the citizens of the District the vote."

He began work on March 30 after the biennial session. There will be a short session, 30 days, in January 1962. He has already arranged to attend it on annual leave.

He has not yet decided whether he will stand again in the 1962 primary election.

He is from Fayetteville, southeast of Charleston the capital of the State. Fayetteville is near the New River which flows into the Kanawha. The capital is in the valley of the Kanawha which flows into the Ohio. Fayette County is Democratic. The four Democrats leading the primary are sure to be elected to the legislature.

He was one of the 18 candidates in last year's primary—the same one which was so decisive in the selection of the Democratic candidate for President. He was first among the 18. It was his initiation in politics.

He had applied for this job 2 years ago—before he ran for the State legislature. But there was no place for him then.

Senators JENNINGS RANDOLPH and ROBERT BYRD were very helpful and especially Representative CLEVELAND BAILEY, of Clarksburg.

Mr. Swanigan is very well qualified for the job. For years he was an electrician for the New River Coal Co. He operated a motor in the mines pulling a string of cars loaded with coal blasted from the face. Like all jobs in the mine, an electrician is a member of the United Mine Workers.

There was an accident in 1955. Roy Swanigan fell below the cars and his legs were mangled just below the knees.

He did not lose consciousness and he was able to give himself some first aid by improvising tourniquets.

Four months later he was back on the job with artificial legs.

When asked about it yesterday, he jumped out of the car and walked briskly up and down the platform.

He said, "The physical rehabilitation people say I'm one of the best walkers in their experience.

"I don't know about that but I do know this. I am the only double amputee in the United States who is a licensed airplane pilot."

He produced a card to prove it. That wasn't necessary. Something about Roy Swanigan is insistent that anything he says is so.

"I've been with the New River Coal Co. for about 20 years. They are pulling in their operations. As an electrician I had charge of the motors and the powerplant in one part of the mine.

"They told me my job would be over April 1 of this year. An electrician with seniority would be able to take care of the operation."

Roy Swanigan, who is 41, now lives in Falls Church at 1438 Patrick Henry Drive with his wife and two children, an 18-year-old son and a 15-year-old daughter.

This conversation was gleaned going back and forth between the Capitol and the New Senate Office Building.

At the latter end, a distinguished-looking, gray-haired man boarded.

"Hello, Senator," said Roy Swanigan.

The Senator cordially acknowledged the greeting. When he alighted at the Capitol end, Roy Swanigan got out a little book of pictures of the Senators.

"That's CARROLL of Colorado," he said. "I know about 55 of them now. I've only been here 6 weeks. I will know them all pretty soon."

Americans Very Concerned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I enclose an editorial from the Washington Daily News, Washington, N.C., which I think is most timely. I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the editor of this paper, Ashley Futtrell, for the clear and understandable manner in which he has pointed out the situation in Cuba and the obligation the Congress and the Government of the United States owe the people in an effort to prohibit the establishment of a communistic government on our eastern coast:

AMERICANS VERY CONCERNED

Americans in all walks of life have become vitally concerned with what is taking place in Cuba. This is not a sudden concern, but it has been one which has grown upon the people.

When Fidel Castro first came to power, Americans generally were content to sit back and pay scant attention to what was taking place at our back door step. Bit by bit, as Castro turned his island into a communistic fort, concern of rank and file Americans seemed to grow.

This concern has grown until today we wonder if the Kennedy administration is not somewhat behind the general feeling in the United States as to definite steps.

Ask the man on the street what he thinks we should do about Cuba, and he will express disgust and disdain at the situation. He will say immediately that we have put up long enough with Castro's actions, and that the time is past due for more concerted American action. President Kennedy minced no words last Thursday when he spoke before the editors of America. He told Russia America would tolerate no interference, and that for security reasons we could not allow Cuba to be a Communist satellite. That sounds most reasonable and Americans generally will stand behind the President in this crucial hour.

Americans do not want war. Somehow the feeling has existed for a long time that "we hope Castro will be overthrown by his own people." But how long must we keep hoping while Castro builds an ever stronger military camp there? With the help of

Russia, he can equip, train, and maintain quite a sizable force. And in all probability he is working toward that end right now—day and night.

For Russia to accuse America of fomenting the recent small invasion is to be expected. Russia says nothing about what she has given Cuba in the way of arms, guns, planes, tanks, and technical assistance. But she points the ugly finger at us and tells us "you are to blame," while at the same time trying to scare us off from any other help. We do not know how much help America has given to the Invasion. But it stands to reason that we have not given very much. After all any private in the U.S. Army knows full well that one division of American marines or soldiers, well trained, well equipped and with proper air support, could go into Cuba today and defeat Castro's army. And it could be accomplished quickly.

If we are in the business of offering wholesale help, then why has such a quick invasion failed? Surely it would not have failed if America had taken even a small part in the planning and execution of the invasion.

Within a matter of hours, America could take over Cuba now if she wished to do so. When charges are made, and when the defeat of the invading army is made to sound like an American defeat, it does give rise to serious thinking in this land of the free and home of the brave.

Americans today are vitally concerned, and they have a right to be.

U.S. Taxes Cost Hawaii $230 Million

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HIRAM L. FONG
OF HAWAII

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I read with great interest that Hawaii leads 10 other States in the Union in contributions to the Federal Treasury.

In a bylined story in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, veteran newsman Frank Hewlett has written a succinct article noting Hawaii's rank in the Internal Revenue Service Report of 1960.

Mr. Hewlett, who now heads the Star-Bulletin's Washington bureau, is a former United Press correspondent and was the last war correspondent to escape from Corregidor at the outbreak of World War II.

I ask unanimous consent that this news report published in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of April 21, 1961, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. TAXES COST US $230 MILLION

(By Frank Hewlett)

WASHINGTON, April 21.—Hawaii taxpayers shelled out $230 million to Uncle Sam last year for another record. It was $41 million more than in 1959.

A report issued today by the Internal Revenue Service shows Hawaii contributed more to the Federal Treasury in the calendar year 1960 than 10 of the States.

Furthermore, two Southern States which only a few years ago were far ahead of Hawaii are rapidly being overtaken by the 50th State.

Total internal revenue collections for Arkansas were $230 million and Mississippi $240 million compared with Hawaii's $230,589,000.

States with smaller Federal tax collections than Hawaii were Alaska, Nevada, Montana, Idaho, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wyoming, New Hampshire, Vermont, and Maine.

A breakdown of the tax collections by the Honolulu Internal Revenue Service office showed: Corporation income and profit taxes, $41,530,000; individual income and employees taxes, $176,102,000; gift, excise and other miscellaneous levies, $12,956,000.

Our Immigration Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD, the text of a letter sent by Mr. Edward F. L. Bruen, chairman of the committee on American citizenship of the New York County Lawyers Association, to the chairman of the subcommittee on immigration of that committee. Mr. Bruen's letter reads as follows:

NEW YORK COUNTY
LAWYERS ASSOCIATION,
COMMITTEE ON
AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP,
March 28, 1961.

SAMUEL PAIGE, Esq.,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Immigration, New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. PAIGE: As you know from time to time I send comments to the chairmen of the subcommittees which I think should be in the hands of the entire committee.

I am sure you understand that I do not wish to in any way limit the scope or direction of your work. The following is submitted merely as thought provoking background material for the questions which are likely to come before our members.

Our present immigration and nationality law is the act of a sovereign power which could, of course, keep out all persons who are not citizens of the United States and deport any already within the country merely on the ground that they are aliens. This power was derived by the Federal Government from the people of the individual States. During its early history our National Government like the colonial governments had encouraged immigration largely because of the sparcity of the population on a great continent.

With the need for immigration no longer a practical requisite for survival or rapid development, there still remains a belief that neither our country nor people of other lands seeking U.S. citizenship would be the gainer by barring further immigration. This belief is generally shared by the patriot and all men of good will. We are, however, with the rest of the world experiencing in the United States a population explosion which reliable authorities have estimated will bring our population past 200 million by 1970 and 230,800,000 by 1980. Without any increase from foreign lands, for these new citizens to be born here, we will have to greatly expand opportunities for gainful employment.

There are some few people who have apparently so far detached themselves from the realities of distressed or depressed areas, critical shortage of proper housing, hospital, medical, educational and training facilities as to urge that the United States should adopt a policy designed to drain off the excess population of certain other countries. History shows that migratory movements are not the correct answer to overpopulation. The solution lies within the control of the over-populated countries. For the United States such a task would prove useless. The sovereign ship of state can refuse to take on more passengers for the sake of the comfort of those already aboard. It may keep loading until the safety point is reached; it may ignore the safety limit or it may take on those calculated to scuttle it. Neither of these last courses would be permitted by one loading a lifeboat regardless of whether he was hoping for rescue himself or planning to go down with the mother ship. What is best for the United States may be best for the world also.

The patriot's faith that his country will be the gainer by never closing the barrier would not be matched by his intelligence if immigration should be open to all. Some standards must be met. Guesswork and emotionalism are not proper bases on which to rest a sound immigration policy. The present law, the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 163; 8 U.S.C. 1101) like most laws is not perfect. It is, however, an understandable standard for the open door. With this standard in effect well over 2 million, quota and nonquota, immigrants have been admitted to the United States during the last 8 years.

This law which like a tax law can never be popular in all quarters is based on the national origin quota system. The quotas are based upon the proportion of our people having a particular foreign national origin. If we look at the ethnological composition which has made our country the greatest on earth and enables us today to offer a better life to those of other lands, we can better understand the basic theory of this system. Our people have demonstrated that they can live together in comparative peace and harmony notwithstanding the fact that they originated in various proportions from different foreign countries. Similar proportions of quota immigration will not only tend to maintain our ethnological composition, but will promote a continuance of the peace and domestic harmony. While it is possible that our people could continue to live together in peace and harmony under different proportions of foreign national origins, no one can guarantee it, and only a few seem willing to risk it outside of the special interest and minority pressure groups who seem to be thinking largely in terms of the desire of the people they favor to immigrate, rather than the unbalance in people, economy, politics and other conditions it threatens.

There are advantages in having each quota computed under the identical formula. This mathematically fixes all quotas at one-sixth of 1 percent of each of our foreign national origin groups. No country knowing in advance what its quota, and that of all other countries will be from year to year, can offer just criticism. The fact that some foreign countries do not fill their quotas does no seem a valid argument for unbalancing the proportions further by admissions from countries whose quotas are oversubscribed. During the last 30 years Congress has consistently declined to accept this idea of jackpot, which would be a source of misunderstanding as a quasi-guarantee that the United States would receive immigrants to the total number of all the quotas. The basic reason for the failure of the "jackpot" bills in previous Congresses was that the scheme is based upon a misconception of the purposes of the quotas. Neither the quotas nor the total

thereof constitutes a number of immigrants the United States either needs or must have each year. They constitute the maximum number of quota immigrants we are presently prepared to receive from each country, whether we need them or not. On the other hand, there is no limit on the number of nonquota immigrants who may enter the United States annually, which is generally in excess of the volume of quota immigrants.

A strong theoretical case may be made for recomputing the quotas upon the basis of the various foreign national origins of the American people as shown by the census of 1960, instead of the 1920 census. The change would perhaps not be advisable in that there is serious question as to whether an increase in permissible volume of quota immigration is desirable. If the jackpot principle should also be applied, the increase could result in 1 million annually instead of the 2 million during the last 8 years. The only true nondiscrimination would be to give each country a quota numerically equal to or identical with that of every other, a system which no one advocates.

Like previous laws it characterizes citizens as native born and naturalized. The latter can lose his citizenship by reason of prolonged residence abroad while the former cannot. This has led to the hardly fair charge of second-class citizenship. A native-born citizen becomes such under our Constitution, which the people of the several States adopted at our national origin, by reason of birth whether he desires it or not. He therefore makes no promise regarding residence as a condition precedent to the acquisition of citizenship. An alien becomes a naturalized citizen on the understanding that he intends to reside permanently in the United States. A more valid charge of second-class citizenship can perhaps be made in that it permits the naturalized person not to agree to bear arms. Naturalized citizens should assume all the obligations of citizenship. Conscientious objectors should be granted exemption from combat military service without regard to naturalized or native-born status.

Another aspect of the act is that criticism with the interest of aliens in mind urges statutory appeal on visa applications. American consular officers abroad issue visas to those seeking entrance which administrative review of their decisions by the Secretary of State. The United States is the only country presently granting aliens access to its courts on a question of their right to enter the national territory upon arrival at a port of entry. It would seem only right that U.S. citizens who seek to enter foreign countries should be assured of receiving reciprocal rights by foreign countries by treaty if we are to give such statutory appeal to them.

Yours faithfully,

EDWARD F. L. BRUEN,
Chairman.

Kansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, many fine articles have been written about Kansas, as we celebrate our centennial year; but none has been more descriptive of the true picture of our State than an article written by John Bird, one of the editors of the Saturday Evening Post.

Mr. Bird is a native Kansan; and he grew up in the midwestern part of our State. His family is one of the old, established families of Kansas; and, with this background, he was able to write a most excellent article. In it he describes the great growth and development of our State, the wealth of its natural resources, its people, their cultural background and mannerisms, and the great part the State has assumed among all the States of the Nation.

Kansas was the first State in the Union to establish a program of rural medical care. This program was established in 1949, during my administration as Governor of Kansas; and its value has been demonstrated by the fact that every community in the State now has a doctor, and most of them have hospitals and clinics.

This program set the pattern for other States in our Nation. Much credit for the program goes to Dr. Franklin Murphy, who at that time was head of the Kansas Medical Center.

Kansas people have always been progressive in ideas and spirit. It is truly a great State.

Mr. President, notwithstanding the fact that the article is estimated by the printer to make two and two-thirds pages at the cost of $216, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS, MY KANSAS
(By John Bird)

For some reason, my old home State of Kansas long has reminded me of a weather-toughened old dame, prim and frugal in her daily life, but on occasion likely to kick up her skirts in a raffish cancan. This may be at considerable variance with the standard personification of the 34th State as a calm, clear-eyed pioneer mother, but so be it. The old girl is doing some fancy prancing right now, commemorating her 100th birthyear with extensive hurrah and pagentry involving bush-bearded pioneers, gun-slinging cowboys and sheriffs, whooping Indians, painted dance-hall girls and, of course, that flaming old anti-slavery fanatic, John Brown.

When I heard of these festivities, it seemed fitting that I should revisit my native State and wish her many happy returns. True, after growing up on her high plains, I had spent most of my adult years elsewhere. Kansas was still on her bony knees in dust and depression back in the thirties when, along with many other of her surplus offspring, I had fled to gentler climes—and a steady job. But being born a Jayhawker is an incurable disease. Even after long exile the symptoms recur in the form of niggling memories of the vast sweep of Kansas landscape, the magnificant color of her skies, the hoarse, insistent voice of her winds and, perhaps most of all, the inconsistency of her behavior.

This last trait has caused Kansas to be much misunderstood and even maligned by obtuse outsiders. But to the likes of me, it made her far more alluring than if she were completely predictable and respectable. For the Kansas I fondly remembered was as capricious as her volatile weather. Her attitudes seemed to reflect the varied human strains which shaped her into a State—stringy New England abolitionists, hell-for-leather cattlemen, stolid wheat bringers from the steppes of Russia, ascetic religious sects and even a few free-thinkers seeking room for their free thoughts. With equal facility and affection Kansas mothered blue-nosed reformers and gaudy sinners, farsighted educators and bumptious ignoramuses, courageous statesmen and barnlot politicians, writers of great wit and nasty backhouse scribblers, pioneers in medical science and monstrous quacks. Many had this in common: They were individualists; they stood out against the flat horizon.

And perhaps most endearing, my old Kansas has a wonderful sense of humor—a wry one, to be sure, for her life was not easy. Long ago her settlers learned that the great rectangle of earth that is Kansas—about 200 miles wide and 400 long, 82,276 square miles, larger than Ohio and Indiana together—could not be easily subdued, but must be taken essentially as she was, with her droughts, tornadoes and blizzards as well as with her bountiful years and incomparable autumns when the harvest-flavored air was a joyful tonic. Often there was no choice in Kansas but to cry or to laugh—and to the State's everlasting credit she produced more wisecracks than sob stories. I fondly remember the news dispatch of the midthirties from Great Bend, reporting the worst dust storm of years and commenting, "Lady Godiva could ride through the streets without even her horse seeing her."

Thus fortified with memories, I flew to Kansas, rented a car and covered a mere 1,200 miles of the State's 125,000 miles of roads—the main ones are as good as any in the Nation, wide, straight and fast, speed limit 70 miles per hour, except on the Kansas turnpike where it is 80 miles per hour and no dawdling. I headed west, first through the rolling Flint Hills in the eastern third of the State. Local residents are quick to point out that this 4 million acre meadow is one of the last large blocks of true prairie left in the United States. "Lots of tourists still think they are in Missouri when they see these grassy hills and wooded valleys," a friend at Lawrence complained. The rest of the State is not pool-table flat, despite the impression it gives, but a gently swelling plain rising to heights of more than 4,000 feet near the Colorado border.

Some things were blessedly the same. In central Kansas I dropped in on my 97-year-old mother-in-law at her old limestone farm home, standing like a fortress on the prairie. She came here as a bride 76 years ago and here raised 10 children—I got the 10th. She was taking a delicious-smelling roast out of the oven and didn't look a day over—well 80. She was particularly anxious to know whether young Mr. Kennedy would be able to stand up to that awful Mr. Khrushchev. I said time would tell. Farther west, out in Ellis County, I visited my mother, in her early eighties, at her Big Creek farm, which she has run in exactly her own way for many years. She looked fine and recently had been out in the barn lot, helping a small grandson break a colt. "Don't you make anything out of that," she warned. "We hand-raised that colt, and he is as gentle as a kitten."

But almost everything else I saw or heard gave testimony of a fast-moving transition. At her century mark the once-embattled Kansas has become a well-heeled, full-figured dowager, rather smugly proud of her financial solvency, political cleanliness, and widespread but rather bland culture. As one longtime reporter in Topeka, the fast-growing State capital, put it, "There's just not much excitement any more. We're a prosperous and pleasantly stagnant State. Even the college kids are reactionary these days. Our politics are so honest it's pitiful."

Kansas now has a comfortable, gadget-ridden way of life which, in the opinion of some close observers, has "leveled upward."

There are some pleasant surprises for the visitor such as the jewel-like art museum in the little town of Lindsborg, population 2,300. It was erected in the memory of Birger Sandzen, a bold painter, wood carver, and lithographer of Plains and Rocky Mountain scenes; a fine collection of his work is lovingly displayed here, along with that of other, mostly modern Kansas artists.

But at the same time there is a feeling that, from a creative standpoint, the State has become too standardized. Oscar S. Stauffer, Topeka, dean of Kansas publishers, told me. "We're turning out good newspapermen, but they aren't as electric as they once were." Kansas writers, poets, artists, and sculptors are busy and much respected—but they aren't very well rewarded. A surer road to financial prominence is a chain of elevators to store surplus wheat or a flock of productive oil leases.

Kansas is especially desirous that outsiders should appreciate her material progress. As I traveled and looked and talked with a variety of citizens, a definite party line emerged. It was an answer at last to the vitriolic editorial "What's the Matter With Kansas?" published in the Emporia Gazette, which started William Allen White on the road to fame. He wrote it in 1896 when colorful Populist rebels such as "Sockless" Jerry Simpson and Mary Elizabeth Lease were bellowing calamity and urging hungry farmers to raise less corn and more hell. That 1961 reply is: "There's nothing the matter with Kansas."

Much of the evidence on the landscape, in the towns and in the ledgers appears to support the boosters' views. The State's record of well-heeled stability, especially since World War II, is indeed impressive. Total personal income for the State's population, now 2,178,611, has been running around $4,500 million and is well diversified. "We have become an industrial State," John H. Sticher, executive director of the Kansas Industrial Development Commission, told me proudly. "Over the past 10 years the cumulative total of payrolls has exceeded the total of farm net income by almost a billion dollars."

Kansas is still highly farm-minded, even though, as sharp-tongued John P. (Jack) Harris, editor of the Hutchinson News, says, "The yearning for industry has become almost an hysteria." The large, square-cut farms and ranches which cover the State are marvels of productive power, backed with science and hard-won skill. The old Dust Bowl? That area long has been green and the harvests abundant. The gritty ghost of the black blizzards was exorcised for good, Kansans believe, when a dry spell just as serious as that of the midthirties gripped the State for 5 years, 1952–56. Production sagged, of course, but there was no disaster, no exodus of dispossessed. Today's farmers use soil-conservation methods, they have drought-resistant crops such as the amazingly productive new hybrid grain sorghums, and greatly expanded irrigation facilities—all of which soften the impact of drought.

Kansas productivity and affluence are as obvious as her billboards. For much of my journey I was within sight of one oilfield or another, where the knob-headed walking beams of the pumps nodded up and down to one another like amiable storks. Each nod puts money in Kansas pockets; she is fifth among States in oil output, pumping up around $350 million worth of the stuff a year. In the wide, broad-bottomed Kaw Valley—running from Kansas City, Kans., to Manhattan—is a new wave of settlers, housed in attractive modern plants—such notable immigrants as Du Pont's Cellophane, General Motors (Buick-Olds-Pontiac), Hallmark Cards, and Goodyear Rubber Co. Out on the high plains the land spreads out like a god's checkerboard; here are great squares of Kelly-green winter wheat which make her the Nation's No. 1 producer of bread grain. On the skyline—like medieval castles—rise huge new grain elevators, built to guard a peculiar treasure; they store a total of 741 million bushels of wheat, much of it surplus, more than the output of two of the State's bumper crops.

At Manhattan my alma mater, once called Kansas State College of Agriculture and Applied Science, now has been officially renamed Kansas State University, and I needed a guide to take me around the glittering, proliferated campus. When I was a student there in raccoon-coat-and-flapper days, the enrollment was around 2,500, and the native limestone buildings were spired and arched, ivy-covered and shadowy. Today there are 7,500 students; new laboratories, dormitories, classroom buildings, and auditoriums have swarmed up to the hills where we once hid out for interesting experiments with thumbed beer. The new architecture is flatly modern—horizontal lines, bright abstract decorations, great expanses of glass. My first impression of these slick surroundings—designed for the utmost in comfort, correct lighting, and mood of color—was not a generous one. Frankly, I thought, This is too damned good for college kids.

But then I realized that I was an antique. Today's academic facilities may be plush, but the students make better use of their opportunities than did my generation. "The quality of students has improved strikingly in recent years," President James McCain told me. "About 62 percent of them ranked in the upper half of their high-school graduating class. These youngsters who come off the farms and out of the small towns know that many of them can't go back. They are serious. They want to be well prepared to compete anywhere in the world."

The emphasis on education in Kansas is traditional. The pioneers from New England were literate folk who believed that knowledge sets men free. There are 42 State-accredited colleges and universities in Kansas, and as a rule the schools are distinctly "of the people"—they do far more than teach. They react to the State's needs with a multitude of programs and services.

One of the most striking results of this service concept is the "medical renaissance," which has given Kansas a fine rural-medical system—so effective that Dr. W. Clarke Wescoe, chancellor of the University of Kansas, at Lawrence, told me seriously, "I would rather be taken acutely ill in a small Kansas town than in the middle of New York City."

This wasn't always so. Right after World War II, Kansas medicine was "worse off than in the old horse-and-buggy days," I was told. Many communities had no physicians and were unable to attract them. The suggested solution came in 1948 from brilliant Dr. Franklin D. Murphy, then the young dean of the medical school and later to be chancellor of the university. The plan itself was direct enough: (1) The medical school should train more doctors, nurses and technicians; (2) the communities should themselves develop the medical facilities, clinics and hospitals which would attract young doctors; and (3) the medical school, State medical society and State board of health should provide refresher courses and postgraduating training to keep the rural doctors up to date.

The Murphy plan was adopted and financed by the Kansas Legislature in 1949. By 1957, claim Kansas medical authorities, every community in the State had a doctor and most had hospitals or clinics.

To get a sample of this community medical service I stopped at Quinter, a crossroads town of 800 out on the high plains. And here I found a beautifully designed, community-built, 30-bed hospital, staffed by three well-trained young physicians. The doctors, Carl C. Gunter, Herman W. Hiesterman, and Richard L. Penfold, proudly showed me around, pointing out large and sunny rooms with such refinements as piped-in oxygen over every bed, a well-equipped operating room, a modern delivery room, and a nursery with special equipment to keep premature babies under controlled temperature and humidity. Construction will start this spring on a new wing, a 38-bed nursing home for the aged and chronically ill. "Then we'll have the whole works," one of the doctors said.

These doctors chose to practice in Quinter because of their experience in an unusual preceptor program, under which every K.U. medical student must spend 6 weeks as an aid to a practicing physician in a small town. "I served a preceptorship here in 1950," Dr. Gunter told me. "Dr. Hiesterman and I had decided in medical school that we would practice together, and I persuaded him to come here. Dr. Penfold preceptored here in 1955 and liked it enough to come back."

"We're organized so that one of us can be away for advanced study at any time," Dr. Hiesterman added. He took a year, during 1957 and 1958, for a residency in surgery in Lincoln, Nebr., and Dr. Gunter took a year of study in surgery at a Portland, Oreg., hospital.

The three doctors are much in favor, also, of the circuit courses offered by traveling teams of doctors from the K.U. Medical Center. These are monthly sessions presented at strategic localities throughout the State. "The last one covered the recent advances in diagnosis and treatment of cancer," Dr. Gunter said. "It's a sort of a continual updating process."

The young doctors are enthusiastic about smalltown life. No time lost between home and work, no traffic jams, plenty of good hunting and fishing and no problem to go after it, they pointed out. But such proximity has its hazards. Late one night Dr. Gunter, who lives just half a block from the hospital, was called in an emergency. He jumped out of bed and took a shortcut through a neighbor's back yard—where he connected abruptly with a new clothesline the neighbor had installed. "I was in worse shape than the patient when I finally staggered into the hospital," he says.

Perhaps Kansas' greatest virtue, in the eyes of conservative Jayhawkers, is her habit of living comfortably within balanced budgets. "Fiscal sanity," former Gov. George Docking called it. Whitely Austin, young editor of the Salina Journal, couldn't resist nipping editorially that many voters "might believe that it has something to do with the outhouse."

Docking, a hard-shelled banker, was one of those political mavericks which Kansas occasionally produces, a Democratic Governor in a traditional Republican stronghold. He was first elected in 1955 and was much admired for his wizardry with balance sheets. He also qualified as an individualist of the old stripe—a headstrong man with an explosive temper and a knack for searing comment. "George would get up to speak before a large, influential group and couldn't resist verbally jabbing them in the eyes with a burnt stick," one of his friends told me. He told teachers that they were underworked and overpaid and newspaper editors that they were more interested in selling advertising than printing the news. He took a bitter dislike to Chancellor Murphy, one of the most popular men in the State, and when Murphy resigned from K.U. last year to accept the chancellorship of the University of California at Los Angeles, Docking was accused of hounding the educator out of the State. The voters turned against Docking when he ran for a third term last fall—but were happy about the fiscal sanity, which left a surplus of $28 million in State funds.

John Anderson, Jr., the Republican who succeeded Docking as Governor, is a milder mannered type who isn't likely to set the prairies aflame in any great crusade. He came whistling up the stairway at the State capitol to meet me for a Saturday appointment and chanted a few choruses of "Nothing's the Matter With Kansas." He is a handsome, smooth-featured man, looking even younger than his 43 years, and formerly was State attorney general. He emphasized that there are no political bosses in Kansas. "The people run the politics," he said. "There has been no really effective machine for at least 8 years, not since the Republicans got into a big fight between two factions. That's when Alf Landon, who had been the Republican leader, became sort of like an old bull kicked out of the herd by the younger ones. But in any case, Kansas is no place for strong political machines—if one is built up, the people are quick to reject it."

The big issue in Kansas, he told me, was industrial development. "We're losing population from the farms and gaining it in the towns. We need to get more industries and jobs to ease this transition. We have great inducements. We can offer a central location, fine transportation, an excellent water supply, a great supply of oil and natural gas for fuel and a good industrial climate. The people who come off our farms know how to work, and they're willing to work."

His plans for Kansas? Nothing startling. No major reforms. "As any other State, Kansas has to keep its government in tune with the changes in society itself."

Kansas does have some worries—the readjustment she faces isn't easy. But her leaders seem most concerned about the image—their term, not mine—which the State projects to the rest of the country. It may be significant, for example, that some doctors now speak of the "Dodge City syndrome"—meaning the foot and leg wounds suffered by youngsters who shoot themselves while practicing quick draws with a loaded six-gun. Western atmosphere may be good for tourist trade, but Kansas officials want it known that they wear late-model business suits as well as cowboy boots and 10-gallon hats.

"Seriously, one of our main drawbacks is the peculiar idea of Kansas that is held in the East," said Dr. James Surface, Kansas-born, Harvard-trained young dean of the Kansas University School of Business. "People back there, sometimes people in influential positions, are inclined to think of this State as rather primitive, still exclusively devoted to ranching and farming." We were talking in his ultramodern office in brandnew Summerfield Hall, which has more glass than an aquarium. He had been stressing the opportunity offered research-based industries by the scientific brainpower and extensive laboratory facilities available at Kansas institutions.

This problem of a poor first impression is no new one. From the earliest days, casual visitors have given my native land a bad press. The first white-skinned tourist to look down his nose at her was Francisco Vasquez de Coronado, governor of New Galicia, Mex., who came here searching for the allegedly golden Quivira. What he found so disgruntled him that he strangled his Indian guide and complained in his report. "These provinces * * * are a very small affair * * * not any gold, nor any metal at all." I'm glad that the greedy conquistador was thrown out of office when he returned to Mexico.

The Great Plains suffered more badmouthing after the Louisiana Purchase, when the Federal Government sent Capt. Zebulon M. Pike to inspect some of its new real estate. In 1806 he crossed what is now Kansas and noted: "These vast plains * * * may become in time as celebrated as the sandy deserts of Africa." Daniel Webster didn't help, either, when he spoke eloquently, but with typical Ivy League myopia, against western-development plans in 1824: "What do we want with this vast and worthless area, of this region of savages and wild beasts, of deserts and shifting sands and whirlwinds, of dust, of cactus and prairie dogs? I will never vote 1 cent to place the Pacific coast 1 inch nearer Boston."

That gives you an idea. The bloody struggle of Kansas to become a free State added to her reputation as a hard and nettlesome wench. She became a sort of mid-19th century Korea when a wavering Congress in 1854 backed away from the Missouri Compromise and left it up to the Territory of Kansas to settle the question of slavery for herself. Pro-slavery forces from Missouri swarmed into Kansas to terrorize free-soil settlers and to stuff ballot boxes. The abolitionists of New England organized the Emigrant Aid Society to send 20,000 free-State settlers a year to the territory. The area lapsed into anarchy and might well have fallen to the southern forces had not the fiery John Brown and other abolitionist zealots, such as James Montgomery and his Jayhawker guerrillas, forsaken the political niceties and turned to murderous retaliation. It wasn't until 1859 that a free constitution was ratified, and on January 29, 1861, President James Buchanan signed the bill admitting Kansas to the Union. By then the new State had enough New England settlers to mark it for generations with a stern Puritan conscience and, some say, more than a touch of Puritan hypocrisy.

Today certain Kansas scholars are more amused than perturbed by the warped impression their State casts on the TV screen, where some of her frontier marshals, sheriffs and badmen go through gallant, highly improbable maneuvers. Nyle H. Miller, the genial secretary of the Kansas State Historical Society, has been flooded with requests for information about them—even such fictional ones as Matt Dillon. He says, "These frontier lawmen certainly were a colorful lot, but they shouldn't be fitted with halos."

He points out, for example, that the much-televised Wyatt Earp actually was a lowly policeman in Wichita—and his most publicized fight there was with a fellow officer, for which he was fired and given a polite hint that he had better leave town or be jailed as a vagrant. In Dodge City Earp served as assistant or deputy marshal and during an out-of-office interim paid a small fine for clouting Frankie Bell, a dancehall girl, in the chops. Of James Butler (Wild Bill) Hickok, famous for his gunslinging in Abilene and Hays, Miller says, "his nickname should suggest that he was quicker on the trigger than he was in the head. At least once, in Abilene, he shot one of his own policemen."

The 1880 census of Dodge City lists the cane-carrying Bat Masterson as sharing a dwelling with Annie Ladue, 19, "concubine," while Bat's brother, Jim, then city marshal, was playing house with "Minnie Roberts, 16." Miller suggests, "Maybe that was the way they kept their eyes on juvenile delinquents." He also believes the TV producers are missing a good bet in Marshal Henry Brown, who pacified riproaring Caldwell, causing grateful citizens to present him with a gold-mounted Winchester rifle. A few days later a gang attempted to rob the bank at Medicine Lodge. One of the bandits was shot down—and turned out to be none other than good old Marshal Brown.

A key question in Kansas these days can be seen along the backroads where farmhouse after farmhouse stands abandoned, looking out dusty-eyed on a countryside that is largely empty of people. The farms have been mechanized, have consolidated into larger and fewer units. Kansas has been losing farms at the rate of 2,000 a year since the midthirties, now has about 115,000. The rural schools, community churches, and small villages—unfavored in the new scheme of things—have withered away. C. Peairs Wilson, dean of the school of agriculture at Kansas State, told me that farmers in the farm-management associations, sponsored by the university to encourage businesslike methods, now operate about 1,000 acres apiece.

How much bigger can farms get? "That depends on how much bigger machines can get," he said. "Also, on the limits of financing." Wilson pointed out that a 1,000-acre farm may easily require an investment of $200,000 for land alone. A young man with little capital hasn't much chance of starting for himself. "In fact, we may see the development of family farm corporations," he said, "both as a means of financing efficient-sized farm units and for transmitting the business intact from one generation to another." This had a peculiarly ironic ring for me, because back in the late twenties my father, the late John S. Bird of Hays, built up a system of large-scale, highly mechanized farms, operated under a corporate management, as a means of low-cost production of wheat. The farm politicians became alarmed by this efficient development, claiming it would "gobble up the land," and passed a law against farm corporations. Now there is talk of repealing that law.

On top of this technological revolution, Kansas agriculture has been plagued, in spades, with surplus crops, low prices and rising costs. Her gross farm income, divided about evenly between crops and livestock, has been running around $1,100 million a year—but the net farm income has been rising and falling like a roller coaster, with a downward trend. Where it ran in the $450 million to $500 million range in the early fifties, it was down to $411 million in 1960.

If Kansas farm leaders have any surefire answers to the farm problem, they didn't tell me. Consistently increasing crop yields have offset Government acreage-control programs. "We have learned how to produce," said Roy Freeland, secretary of the State board of agriculture. "Now the question is, Can we learn how to market it?"

The wheatgrowers of the State are trying to learn just that. In cooperation with growers in other wheat States they have set up a farmer-financed Great Plains Wheat Inc., headed by Clifford Hope, retired U.S. Congressman and longtime member of the House Agricultural Committee, and have set out on a worldwide market-development program. "Our aim is clear cut," said Hope. "It is to dispose of every possible bushel of wheat at home and abroad and to develop new uses and outlets." The growers have set up offices in many parts of the world, have sent teams of experts abroad to seek out new markets, have helped close soft-currency sales of surplus wheat to needy countries, have improved wheat grading and originated new wheat products and have undertaken nutrition programs to persuade Asiatic peoples, such as the Japanese, to develop a taste for wheat as well as rice. They can't measure results yet, but believe they are contributing to increased exports.

Nor is the industrial theme song without some sour notes. "Our eggs are still in too few baskets," Dean Surface puts it. "We have developed a huge aircraft industry, for example, but it's almost as up-and-down as our agriculture." And down in Wichita, a traffic-heavy city of 254,000, I saw what he meant. Here, thanks to several early birdmen such as Clyde Cessna and Walter Beech, Wichita-made aircraft are flown all over the world. For the past decade, well over half of the general type—private and executive—of airplanes produced in the United States

have rolled off the assembly lines of the Cessna and Beechcraft plants. "This business has doubled in the last 5 years, and we expect to beat this record in the next 5," said Dwane L. Wallace, the long, lean aeronautical engineer and onetime racing pilot who heads Cessna.

But the great Boeing Wichita plant, devoted to military aircraft, is feeling the effects of the shift away from manned bombing planes. Its work here on the eight-jet B–52H will be completed in mid-1962. Boeing's payroll, once at a peak of around 40,000, now is down to 20,000. Although Wichita has succeeded in attracting some new industry, such as a hotel-furniture manufacturer, the town is feeling a pinch as surplus aircraft workers look elsewhere for jobs.

In many ways Kansas is looking inward at her colorful past during this centennial year, but the younger generation of Jayhawkers have many close-at-hand evidences that they are part of an uneasy world. The message is writ in the immensity of the Kansas skies by the white contrails of the nuclear-bomb-carrying B–52's which take off from airbases in Kansas. It is seen in a new kind of "silo" being dug by the dozens in her flat, black soil, not to store feed for livestock, but as undeground nests for intercontinental ballistic missiles.

Nowhere is the irreversible march of the times more clearly symbolized than in the neat, reformed old cowtown of Abilene, where in 1910 young Dwight David Eisenhower, living on the wrong side of two sets of railroad tracks, wrote his Senator seeking an appointment to either Annapolis or West Point. Today that section of Abilene is much visited by people from all over the world. Not far from the old Eisenhower family home is a reconstruction of Old Abilene, a small but realistic reminder of days when herds of longhorns, up from Texas on the Chisholm Trail, met the railhead here, and the six-gun was the law. Next door to the white frame house where a future general and President grew up stands the monumental Eisenhower Museum, crammed with the personal mementoes of a Kansas boy who went a-soldiering.

"Fortunately, the Eisenhowers never threw anything away," said J. Earl Endacott, former Abilene schoolteacher and now executive director of the Eisenhower Foundation, which operates the museum. "Right now we're sorting out the deluge of material from the White House."

Across the street is being completed a huge new library to house the Eisenhower presidential papers and documents. But more poignantly expressive than these multimillion-dollar marble structures is the worn and frugal home, innocent of modern push-button conveniences, speaking simply but powerfully of the human values which produced one of the world leaders of our times.

As I got ready to say goodby to my old State, I realized more than ever that my newspaper friend in Topeka was right—the old rugged flavor had faded. In today's Kansas there would be no place for a Carrie Nation, who when jailed in Wichita for throwing rocks at a saloon picture of Cleopatra, buck-naked at the bath, declared, "You put me in here a cub, but I will go out a roaring lion, and I will make all hell howl"—and did. The puritanical influence has mellowed; prohibition, which Kansas pioneered in 1881, was repealed some years ago, and liquor stores are plentiful.

Even the Kansas newspapers, once noted for their crusading, independence, and earthiness, have toned down. True, I found the Emporia Gazette encouraging its readers to argue, sometimes in verse, about the odors wafted into new suburbs by large cattle-feeding yards. Other editors around the State were chuckling over "the cow-plop war." From my own tender years as a printer's devil on the Hays Daily News I recalled exciting occasions when irate subscribers, differing with the editor's mordant views, came storming into the office and threatened to whip him. He was, necessarily, a nimble man. But now—"The old fighting-newspaper tradition is largely dead," said Jack Harris. "Most editors are too interested in the business side these days, too conservative, too afraid to offend."

Another editor returned the compliment by saying, "You know, just about the time we think Jack is ready for some nice award, he goes off the reservation and kicks everybody in the teeth."

The real truth, it seems to me, is that Kansas really isn't in a fighting mood these days, having very little to fight about. And that lifts an old, old burden from my conscience. This thought came to me when I was leaving my old home town and drove past the public school where, in the fifth or sixth grade, we small fry were required to memorize a poem, "The Call of Kansas," which ran, in part:

Sweeter to me than the salt sea spray,
The fragance of summer rains;
Nearer my heart than these mighty hills
Are the windswept Kansas plains.

I had always felt a bit guilty—as had that poet—about leaving Kansas, as though deserting a battlefront in favor of some balmy shore. But now I know that the State is getting along very well indeed without me.

Quakers Buck Kinzua Dam, Stir Conscience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial that appeared in the Buffalo Courier-Express, Buffalo, N.Y., on April 25, 1961, regarding the Kinzua Dam project on the Allegheny River, which expresses my sentiments.

It is my fervent hope that this administration will take a hard look at this project:

QUAKERS BUCK KINZUA DAM, STIR CONSCIENCE

The Quakers, old and steadfast champions of the causes of the American Indians, have launched a last-ditch appeal to the Federal Government for an independent review of the Kinzua Dam project on the Allegheny River.

Entry of the Society of Friends—popularly known since Colonial times as the Quakers—into the effort to preserve for the Seneca Nation the tribal lands along the Allegheny may be specially effective. For in 1794, four Quakers from the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of Friends responded to an invitation from both the Senecas and the U.S. Government to participate in negotiating the Pickering Treaty, signed by President George Washington, under which the lands were set aside "forever" for the Senecas.

The Society of Friends thus has an historical association with the white man's obligation to the Indians which would be broken unilaterally if the Kinzua Dam is built without the Senecas' consent. It may be that President Kennedy will intervene to suspend the Kinzua project pending a review if the intervention by the Quakers stirs popular appreciation of the "sacred" nature of the pact entered into in 1794.

Over the weekend, the Indian Committee of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends designated Walter Taylor, national representative for the American Indian program of the American Friends Service Committee, to coordinate a new program designed to persuade the President and other Federal authorities to halt the Kinzua project. It was pointed out that Basil Williams, president of the Seneca Nation, has written to President Kennedy stating "we will abandon our opposition to the Kinzua Dam if and when it is shown by competent, objective evidence that a feasible alternative does not exist."

President Kennedy is confronted with many problems more grave than that of the Indians living along the Allegheny. But we submit that no U.S. obligation is more solemn or more demanding of his thoughtful attention as Chief Executive than the treaty of 1794 by which the Senecas assured a struggling new government of their support when they were being wooed by a foreign power to harass the United States.

These times and the intervention of the Society of Friends surely are auspicious in the Indians' behalf. Foreign powers again strive to destroy us. And entry of the Society of Friends into the Kinzua controversy should call to mind with a stab of conscience for every other honorable American a celebrated picture: Benjamin West's painting of William Penn, the Quaker, treating with the Indians for the peaceful settlement of the Colony of Pennsylvania. Unilateral abrogation of the 1794 treaty will mock all such recollection of our American heritage.

Beating Us With Federal Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, many of us are extremely interested in the legislation introduced by our colleague, Representative ROBERT GRIFFIN, concerning the operation of our Federal tax laws pertaining to certain municipal bonds.

The editor of the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Press comments on Mr. GRIFFIN's bill in an editorial of April 18 entitled "Beating Us With Federal Taxes." The bill is H.R. 6368, and under leave to extend my remarks I include the editorial:

[From the Grand Rapids Press, Apr. 18, 1961]

BEATING US WITH FEDERAL TAXES

Michigan and those other States that have been losing industries to the South can't do much about preventing communities in that part of the country from using local tax concessions to lure new industries. But they can do something about preventing Mississippi, Arkansas, Oklahoma, and other States from making it possible for new industries to beat the Federal income tax, and thus using this as an inducement for industries to relocate within their boundaries.

What Michigan and the other victims of this practice can do is support the bill introduced in Congress by Representative ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, of Traverse City. GRIFFIN'S bill is intended to prevent any industry from

deducting from its taxable income the rent it pays on an industrial plant financed by municipal bonds. The income from such bonds is not taxable under Federal law.

GRIFFIN, however, has rightly insisted that permitting communities to use their tax-free bonding powers to build factories for new industries is contrary to the intent of the law. "Such practices," he declares, "amount to cities selling out their income-tax-exemption privileges (on the bonds) to private corporations." It is not the cities that are escaping Federal taxation in such cases but private industries. These industries are competing with other industries that must pay the full income tax.

Actually what is happening is that those communities that do make it possible for industries to claim an income tax deduction for rent paid in such instances are forcing industries in other States to carry an undue proportion of the income tax load. Industries that do not have to pay the full income tax are able to sell at lower prices than their competitors in, for instance, Michigan. Our competing industries, therefore, are being squeezed by having to pay higher taxes and meet lower prices.

This is the second year that GRIFFIN has tried to close this tax loophole. Last year his proposal got through the House but was dropped when House and Senate conferees met to iron out differences in House and Senate bills. This year Michigan's Senators should see to it that a similar provision is made a part of the Senate bill; and they should be prepared to fight for its adoption.

Research on Health Effects of Air Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the Public Health Service made an announcement a few days ago that under air pollution legislation of the Federal Government now on the books a major research project has been undertaken in southern California, in which the University of Southern California and the Los Angeles Air Pollution Control District will jointly do research on the effects of air pollution from automobile exhausts on laboratory animals.

The Public Health Service announcement goes on to say that this study represents the largest research effort of its kind yet undertaken in the field of air pollution.

Mr. President, I commend the Public Health Service for undertaking this highly important research project under legislation we in the Congress fashioned. Meanwhile, I suggest the need for strengthening the hand of the Federal Government in the effort to cope with the problem of air pollution, because as time goes by, as has been thoroughly demonstrated in discussion after discussion in the U.S. Senate and across the country, the problem becomes more menacing and grows larger.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Public Health Service announcement be printed in its entirety in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A major research project is now underway which should add valuable information to what is known about the health effects of air pollution, the Public Health Service announced today.

The study is a joint project with the Los Angeles County Air Pollution Control District, and the University of Southern California to observe the effects on laboratory animals—mice, guinea pigs, and rabbits—of breathing the same air breathed by people in Los Angeles County. The contaminants of primary interest are those specifically associated with automobile exhaust—hydrocarbons, oxidant, carbon monoxide, oxides of nitrogen, and certain particulates.

While the test animals breathe the air at special sites located at varying distances from the heavily traveled throughways, a control group of similar animals will be living in purified air from which contaminants have been removed.

The study represents the largest research effort of its kind yet undertaken in the field of air pollution.

Commenting on the agreement today Dr. L. Otis Emik, Division of Air Pollution, Public Health Service, stated: "In this field of study we have long needed careful observations of the effects on laboratory animals of precisely the same exhaust contaminated air which people breathe. These observations may give us the opportunity to observe in animals, during short periods of time, effects which in human beings might take decades to occur."

Under the terms of the research contract, S. Smith Griswold, director, Los Angeles County Air Pollution Control District, will direct the establishment of 4 stations at which pollutants will be monitored and animals studied. The initial contract, at a cost of $152,000 will cover the establishment, operation, and maintenance of these stations until June 15, 1961.

The University of Southern California will furnish and operate facilities for housing the exposed and control animal colonies, on the grounds of the University Medical School and at sites provided by the Los Angeles County Air Pollution Control District. The work at the University of Southern California will be under the general direction of Dr. Leslie A. Chambers, director of the Allen Hancock Foundation. Members of the faculty of the Medical School who will participate include: Dr. Paul Kotin, assistant professor of pathology; Dr. Oscar J. Balchum, assistant professor of medicine; Dr. John Mehl, chairman of the department of biochemistry.

Transportation in Interstate Commerce of Alcoholic Beverage Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I have been advised and encouraged by the Carolina Christian Union, Jesse Seaver, president, to enter for the RECORD their stand in support of H.R. 2221.

This bill has been introduced by the Honorable Eugene Siler, of Kentucky. The purpose of the bill is "to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes."

I have personally received a list of 284 genuine signatures, all of which endorse the Siler bill. Most of the signers are of my constituency in the First Congressional District of North Carolina.

I take this opportunity to make known the stand of the Carolina Christian Union officially for the RECORD.

GSA Plans To Place a Customhouse in Sargasso Sea of Traffic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, more than two-thirds of the total land area of central Los Angeles is either roadway or parking lots. This is necessary—indeed, it is not enough—because of the dependence of Los Angeles on auto transportation. But many people believe the saturation point has just about been reached. Charles Luckman, the eminent architect, has suggested in a study that central Los Angeles may eventually strangle in its own traffic, with cars locked bumper to bumper and unable to move. Right now, during rush hours, this is not so far from reality.

Yet, the GSA has proposed to build a new customhouse and Federal office building, which would be the largest office building in Los Angeles, without making a provision for one single off-street parking space for private automobiles of employees or persons doing business in the building. The Southern California Architects Association has protested the building because of this lack of provision for parking. As a matter of fact, the new Federal building would not only add to parking congestion without contributing new facilities, it would actually subtract from parking facilities now in existence. The new Federal building is scheduled to occupy two blocks just off the Santa Ana Freeway. The entire area of one of those city blocks is now a parking lot. The importance of parking to central Los Angeles was underscored by S. S. Taylor, general manager of the Los Angeles Traffic Department, who recently declared:

> Unless an integrated transportation system operates inside the loop of freeways that will surround downtown Los Angeles in 1962, the freeways will destroy the city they were meant to serve. The traffic capacity of the freeways is dependent upon the accessibility and capacity of streets and parking spaces in the terminal areas. A freeway system without parking is like a railroad without a station. It is clogging at the entrances and exits that threaten these great arteries.

Yet the GSA proposes to build a customhouse in the Los Angeles Civic Center that has not merely inadequate, but no provision for offstreet parking. Fur-

ther, the customs service proposes to operate trucks in and out of this building with the further congestion they will cause on access roadways and on the freeways themselves.

There is a sensible solution. Build the Federal office building if it is really necessary, but separate customs headquarters from the building. Put the customs facilities in the harbor where they belong anyway. Use the space saved for parking.

One Hundredth Anniversary of Watertown, N.Y., Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on April 22, the Watertown Daily Times celebrated its 100th anniversary. The Times, which is the largest daily newspaper published in northern New York, has a national reputation as one of the outstanding newspapers in the country. That reputation is richly deserved. Its vigorous international and progressive viewpoint, enlightened approach to journalism, and long record of public service and leadership have made the Watertown Times indispensable to our New York State life. Its editorials have often been brilliant and statesmanlike documents of our times. I am happy to say also that the Times has an outstanding representative in Washington in Alan S. Emory, who has been its correspondent since 1951.

In bringing to the attention of the Senate the 100th birthday of the Watertown Times, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Times' anniversary edition, as well as letters from President Kennedy, Vice President Johnson, and Governor Rockefeller.

There being no objection, the editorial and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE HUNDRED YEARS OF THE TIMES

When the first daily newspaper, the Daily Reformer, was printed in Watertown on April 22, 1861, it editorially commended that, "We have reluctantly embarked in the enterprise of publishing a morning daily." That first editorial likened the paper to a merchant who must serve the customers what they desire. It further reasoned that, "Now in this time of national peril the people want the news hourly and will have it, if procurable, two or three times a day." Perhaps this was a somewhat hesitant launching of a new enterprise. Certainly that first day was not inaugurated in anything like the manner that new business is launched today. In fact, even the celebration of this newspaper's 100th birthday probably would not be understood by those who celebrated the first day of publication so quietly and perhaps without much enthusiasm.

The Reformer was almost 10 years old as a weekly before it became a daily. It continued for almost 10 years, known as the Reformer, before it became the Times, its name for the past 90 years. The reluctance to make a complete break with the past is demonstrated by the fact that even when the Reformer and Times continued as a daily, the Weekly Reformer was still printed for many years as an adjunct.

The news which the public was described as wanting hourly was that of the Civil War. Looking backward, one cannot help but give a certain amount of emphasis to that word "procurable," for the business of procuring the news in that day was principally that of a close reading of the mail and a reprinting of what other newspapers far away were printing as their news stories. The only original information and writing was in the editorial column, and even on occasion the editor found that he either lacked the time or the inspiration to write every day. That, however, was not a weakness of the first daily newspaper in Watertown. It was characteristic of all papers of the time. Just as perhaps today's characteristics are that there be the fullest kind of comment and the broadest kind of news coverage.

In that first editorial there was clearly a pledge "to respond faithfully to the high toned demands of an intelligent public for news and wholesome reading." That is the key to the 100-year longevity of this newspaper. For regardless of the editors, of which there have been quite a few, each tried to meet the demands of an intelligent public for news and wholesome reading.

This kind of ideal, together with the individual editor's interpretation, made this newspaper succeed. Its greatest success probably occurred between 1900 and 1930. For that was the period in which it competed with another daily, the Watertown Standard, a struggle that lasted through those prosperous decades. Most significantly the competition ended not in the depression of the thirties but in those months just before the Nation's economy began to falter. This was a newspaper battle that had gone on with bitterness and vindictiveness to the point that one adversary made his decision to sell out. This is not to recount the battles of that day, but there are at least three inheritances in 1961 from that period.

The first inheritance is city manager government for the city of Watertown, an issue that the Times fought for against the opposing newspaper. There is a municipal street lighting plant for Watertown, similarly the materialization of an issue that was fought and won by the Times. Finally, the third inheritance is the Times itself, and some of the material assets that this newspaper has added to this community.

Make no mistake about it, if that battle had not been won in August of 1929 by the Watertown Times, this newspaper probably would not be in existence today. It had no substantial resources as a result of the national prosperity that encompassed the country up to 1930. It possessed, however, a fierce desire for political and economic improvements for Watertown and northern New York. It did not possess economic connections. So had the depression begun with two newspapers in Watertown locked in harsh combat, the winner might well have been the Standard that did have access to financial resources. It had lost money, but the losses were made up for many years in an effort to beat the Times; editorially to contest the liberal political attitudes, whether in municipal affairs or State affairs.

Every so often there have been examples in history of idealism triumphing over economic realities. The moment sometimes is a fleeting one which must be prepared for and capitalized upon quickly and irrevocably. That moment did occur in the case of this newspaper's history when suddenly the financial backer of the Standard decided that further losses in a struggle against the Times were wasteful and unrealistic.

So this newspaper, 2 months before the official signal of world depression, became the sole daily newspaper in Watertown. But the responsbilities upon the Times in this new role were even greater in the eyes of its editor than the desirability of a restrictive consolidation. The Times immediately opened up its news columns. The editor concluded that the Times should meet all the newspaper needs of this community. Readers had to have the satisfaction that the Times was striving to be a better paper than the two that it succeeded.

Thus throughout the 1930's, in spite of the depression, the Times became a bigger and more complete paper with wider and wider circulation. It grew in the 1930's and that growth continued in the 1940's and the 1950's.

Part of the expansion was in radio, both here and in Massena; then came television, the Times owning the three stations. The culmination of 100 years is this new building with the printing press which just has been opened. That printing press is the first brand new printing press ever owned by this newspaper. And there is more to come in the construction of a second new building which will lead to the abandonment of the 100-year-old property on Arcade Street.

Today all these things have been possible through the vigor of this newspaper and the transfer of some of this vigor to its other enterprises. Yet the common ingredient throughout the growth and expansion of 100 years has been news which has been written and edited in an effort toward faithful response to the intelligent public.

This proper handling of news has resulted in the success of today. Future success will only depend upon the continuance of a faithful news response to the demands of an intelligent public.

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT,
Washington, March 11, 1961.

MR. JOHN B. JOHNSON,
Editor and Publisher, Watertown Daily Times, Watertown, N.Y.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: I understand that on April 22 the Watertown Daily Times will celebrate its centennial. I certainly want to add my greetings and to express my congratulations.

The Watertown Daily Times has long been recognized as an outstanding journal throughout our Nation. I know it must give you a great sense of satisfaction to look back upon so many years of achievement and service to the community and to the country.

Sincerely yours,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

STATE OF NEW YORK, EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Albany, April 17, 1961.

MR. JOHN B. JOHNSON,
Editor and Publisher, Watertown Daily Times, Watertown, N.Y.

DEAR JOHN: The 100th anniversary of the Watertown Daily Times, one of the outstanding newspapers of New York State is decidedly an event for enthusiastic celebration. One would like to have known Beman Brockway, who was already an editor of distinction and a State legislator when he went to Watertown in 1860 to join Lotus Ingalls and L. N. Stowell in the publication of the New York Weekly Reformer.

It took a lot of nerve to turn the Reformer into a daily paper at that time in the country's affairs, especially as Watertown, though starting to grow, had a population of but 6,000. One cannot resist a feeling of nostalgia over the fact that it was started with a capital of $700, $500 of which was borrowed.

The same qualities, with the 20th century complexion, were present when Harold B. Johnson of Gouverneur joined the staff of the Watertown Daily Times in 1904 after journalistic experience in Oregon and Montana.

When he joined the staff, the circulation was little more than 5,000. By the end of his regime it had risen to more than 40,000.

Today, under your able leadership as editor and publisher, the Times is forging steadily ahead to meet the increasing challenges and complexities of the sixties.

I am happy to join with your associates and colleagues in Watertown in saluting you and your able staff, and I hope and am confident that the Watertown Daily Times will score even greater successes in the second century of its history.

Sincerely,

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 4, 1961.

Mr. JOHN B. JOHNSON,
Editor and Publisher,
Watertown Daily Times,
Watertown, N.Y.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: I am delighted to learn that the Watertown Daily Times will celebrate its centennial on April 22.

The Watertown Daily Times has set an enviable record of community service throughout the years. It has taken a vigorous role in the clarification of both local and international issues, and it has earned a wide reputation not only in northern New York but throughout the country.

I want to extend to you and to all the members of the staff my warmest greetings on this occasion.

With all good wishes,

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

A Bill Worth Passing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an editorial appearing in the April 24, 1961 issue of the South Bend Tribune, of South Bend, Ind., entitled "A Bill Worth Passing":

A BILL WORTH PASSING

State and county wefare departments are watching with interest and understandably hoping that Congress will not turn a cold shoulder on a bill introduced by Representative WINFIELD K. DENTON, Democrat, of Evansville, Ind.

DENTON is proposing a Federal "runaway pappy" law that would authorize the Federal Bureau of Investigation to track down deserting fathers who cross State lines to escape support payments to their families.

Despite reciprocity agreements between States, welfare departments face no end of difficulties in forcing the "runaway pappies" to meet their family responsibilities. In the first place it is often difficult to find them. The FBI could lend valuable aid in this respect because its investigations are not hampered by State lines.

DENTON's bill proposes that any individual who, to avoid compliance with a support order, shall travel or move in interstate or foreign commerce from the State in which the proceedings have been instituted * * * shall be punished by a fine of not more than $2,500 or by imprisonment by not more than 3 years or both.

Wilmer Tolle, director of the St. Joseph County Department of Public Welfare, says the very existence of such a law would have great psychological value.

Noting that under the Dyer Act the FBI locates the thieves of stolen cars, Fred H. Steininger, Lake County welfare director, asks this pertinent question:

"Why should the FBI not be asked to locate deserting parents?" Answering his own question, he says, "Surely the crime of deserting a family and doing it with impunity by crossing a State line is much more serious than stealing an automobile and crossing a State line."

There is logic in that observation.

A law such as DENTON proposes has much to recommend it. It would be a sturdy club in the hands of welfare departments in their efforts to compel deserting fathers to meet their responsibilities to their families. Even if it were only moderately successful in achieving the ends for which it is intended it would be a boon to taxpayers who shoulder the burden the runaway fathers shed. Congress should be disposed to give the Denton bill careful consideration.

Prof. Arthur Burns Analyzes the Administration "Gap" Theory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, Arthur Burns, professor of economics at Columbia University and the president of the National Bureau of Economic Research, recently addressed the 10th Annual Conference of Business Economists at the University of Chicago. In his speech, Professor Burns comments on the "gap" or stagnation theory of economic analysis that has been put forward by the Kennedy administration's Council of Economic Advisers as an explanation of recent economic developments and guidelines for future economic policies. Because of the importance of this subject, I would like to insert this speech of Professor Burns at this point in the RECORD:

THE NEW STAGNATION THEORY AND OUR CURRENT ECONOMIC POLICIES

In discussing so large a topic as our current economic policies, one must make a choice. I have decided to concentrate less on the policies themselves than on their theoretical foundations. Policies are always based on some theory. What I shall chiefly try to do, therefore, is to examine the economic theory that underlies the major economic policies of the new administration.

This task has been made relatively easy by the policy statement submitted by the council of economic advisers to the joint economic committee on March 6.

The council's theory can perhaps be conveyed best by reading a few excerpts. According to the council, the American economy today is beset not only with a recession, but with persistent slack in production and employment, a slowdown in our rate of growth. Further, according to the council, economic recovery in 1961 is far more than a cyclical problem. It is also a problem of chronic slack in the economy—the growing gap between what we can produce and what we do produce. Especially since 1955, the gap has shown a distressing upward trend.

The essential point of this theory is that, quite apart from the recession, there is increasing slack in our economy; there is a growing disparity between actual and potential output; in short, America faces a problem of secular stagnation.

The Council informs us that "the problem of unused potential becomes continually more urgent." The gap between actual and potential output has not only been growing, but has become very large. The gap is said to have been $32 billion for 1960 as a whole. Using annual rates, the gap is estimated at $40 billion for the fourth quarter of 1960 and at $50 billion for the first quarter of 1961.

But what, it may be asked, is the large and growing gap due to? The basic reason, we are told, is that there has been a retardation of investment. The rate of increase in the stock of capital per worker has been declining. The average age of our stock of equipment has been rising. And there has not only been a retardation of investment in business plant and equipment, but public investment has also been inadequate—that is, investment in education, health, research, and development of natural resources.

It follows from the Council's analysis that if our actual output is to approximate our potential output, invesment in business plant and equipment will need to be substantially increased, and so also will public investment, especially investment in human beings.

Furthermore, if we proceed to increase both private and public investment sufficiently, our economic potential itself will rise more rapidly. According to the Council, the rate of advance that our economy now achieves when it operates at full employment is 3.5 percent per year. This rate will be higher if investment is carried out on a larger scale.

The theory that I have just sketched bears some resemblance to the Keynes-Hansen theory of secular stagnation, which dominated economic thought during the 1930's and 1940's.

Just as Hansen saw secular stagnation as he looked back in time, so the council now sees the recent past. And just as Hansen saw secular stagnation as our fate in the future, unless appropriate remedial measures were taken in time, so the council now sees the future.

Hansen, however, believed that private investment was bound to remain inadequate in view of the disappearance of the frontier, a declining rate of population growth, and a shift from capital-using to capital-saving innovations. Hence, he argued that it will be necessary to rely heavily on rising governmental expenditures if we are to escape a chronic condition of mass unemployment.

The council is far less pessimistic about the prospects for private enterprise and investment. Not only does the council argue that larger governmental spending can and will stimulate private investment, but the council also proposes that some of our tax laws be revised in the interest of creating greater incentives for private investment. In other words, the council seems to view the private economy as a dozing giant who, while not capable of realizing his potential through his own efforts, will come fully to life again and stay alive if the Government does its part by spending more and by revising some of the tax laws.

Clearly, the council's stagnation theory is gentler and less pessimistic than Hansen's. Indeed, it must be regarded as a gay and optimistic theory in the light of still older stagnation theories such as Friedrich Engels' or Thorstein Veblen's.

When Engels speculated about the future, he saw only the continuance of depression and the eventual breakdown of capitalism. And when Veblen turned to the future, he likewise saw chronic depression from which, to be sure, our people would be occasionally relieved but only through accidental developments.

The Council's diagnosis of the state of our economy, despite its stagnationist accent, has none of the morbid pessimism of earlier stagnation theories. A theory of secular stagnation such as the Council's therefore need not cause anxiety. Viewed coldly, it merely provides a warning. And the warning may be salutary if there is an empirical basis for the new theory. How substantial, then, is the evidence in its support? Let us turn to this question.

One piece of evidence cited by the Council is the progressive decline of business-cycle expansions in the postwar period. The expansion of 1949–53 lasted 45 months. The expansion of 1954–57 lasted 35 months. The expansion of 1958–60 lasted 25 months. In other words, successive upswings have been progressively shorter, and this is a symptom of noncyclical or secular slack.

In judging this evidence, it is necessary to recall that the expansion from 1949 to 1953 was dominated by the Korean war. This expansion might well have been shorter if the war had not lasted so long.

Historically, wartime expansions have always been exceptionally long. Indeed, the expansions of 1861–65, 1914–18, 1938–45, and 1949–53 are the longest business-cycle expansions that we have had.

Since the expansion of 1949–53 is clearly an abnormal case, it is best to put it aside. We are then left with the fact that the most recent business-cycle expansion was shorter than its immediate predecessor. There is nothing remarkable about this fact. Of itself it surely provides little reason to expect or to fear secular stagnation.

The Council cites, however, another piece of evidence; namely, unemployment was approximately 3 percent at the peak of business in 1953, but about 4 percent at the business-cycle peak in 1957, and about 5 percent at the business-cycle peak in 1960. This evidence seems to suggest that successive upswings are becoming weaker.

However, as I've just noted, the peak in 1953 was a wartime peak of activity. We then had an overtime economy. It seems more sensible to regard the 3-percent unemployment rate of 1953 as an exceptional case than to take it as a yardstick of economic performance.

This is as clear when we look back of 1953 as when we look forward, for the unemployment rate was about 4 percent at the business-cycle peak of 1948 just as it was 4 percent at the peak of 1957. Not only that, but the Council itself regards a 4 percent unemployment rate as signifying a condition of practically full employment.

It is true that the unemployment rate was appreciably higher in 1960 than in 1957. This comparison is entirely valid. But one instance of higher unemployment of itself gives fragile support to the generalization that successive upswings are becoming weaker or to the theory that the gap between actual and potential output has a distressing upward trend.

The Council presents still a third piece of evidence. This takes the form of a direct measurement of the gap between actual and potential output.

Quarterly figures of the gross national product, adjusted for changes in the price level, are taken as a measure of actual output. Potential output is then measured by a curve which starts at the level of the actual output in mid-1955. This curve moves forward in time at an annual rate of increase of 3½ percent, and it moves similarly back of 1955.

Why, it may be asked, does the curve depicting potential output start in the middle of 1955? The reason is that unemployment was then approximately 4 percent of the labor force, and the Council regards a 4 percent unemployment rate as a "reasonable target for full utilization of resources."

And why is this curve of potential output allowed to rise at an annual rate of 3½ percent? Because, we are told, this rate "represents the rate of advance of gross national product (corrected for price changes) that our economy now achieves when it operates at reasonably full employment."

Once the curves of actual and potential output are drawn, the gap between them is obtained by subtraction. It is this gap which is said to show a distressing upward trend, especially since 1955.

The first and perhaps the most important question raised by this arithmetical exercise is why the curve of potential output is passed through the middle of 1955.

True, the unemployment rate was about 4 percent in mid-1955 and actual output may therefore be taken as equal to potential output at that time. But the unemployment rate was about 4 percent also in the second quarter of 1947, in the second quarter of 1957, and in other scattered quarters of the postwar period. Any one of these quarters or dates could have served just as well as mid-1955 for the starting point of the 3½-percent curve of potential output.

The results, however, would have been very different. As the Council draws the 3½-percent curve, the gap between actual and potential output in 1960 comes out $32 billion. But if the curve had been started in the second quarter of 1957, when we also had a full-employment output by the Council's criterion, the gap would have been only $20 billion.

And if the curve had been started in the second quarter of 1947, when we likewise had a full-employment output, the gap would have vanished. In fact, we would then have to say that actual output in 1960 exceeded potential output by over $2 billion.

It is plain from these calculations that if we merely vary the starting point of the 3½-percent curve, and do so without departing from the Council's logic, we can easily draw a more encouraging picture of the recent past than the Council has drawn.

I have thus far followed the Council in assuming that our potential output has been growing at a 3½-percent annual rate. I do not question the plausibility of this figure, but neither would I question the plausibility of a somewhat lower or a somewhat higher figure. We must reckon with the uncomfortable fact that small differences in the growth rate are capable of making a very large difference in projections of national output.

The Council has not descibed the precise derivation of its 3½-percent growth rate. It seems clear, however, from what the Council does say that it did not use a method that is particularly appropriate on its own economic logic.

If it be assumed that a full-employment output exists when the unemployment rate is 4 percent, then every figure of the gross national product at times when unemployment is at this level must express a full-employment output. A curve linking such figures will then automatically show the rate at which real output advances when our economy operates at reasonably full employment.

Unhappily, however, numerous pairs of such figures can be found in the postwar period, and some pairs yield a growth rate of less than 3½ percent while others yield a higher rate.

Let me comment on one of the more decent calculations of this type. As previously noted, we had a 4 percent unemployment rate in the second quarter of 1947 and again exactly 10 years later. Between these two dates, our output grew at an average annual rate of 3.9 percent, which is higher than the growth rate of potential output estimated by the Council.

Let us now see what happens when this 3.9 percent curve is carried forward to 1960. At first blush, it might appear that the gap between actual and potential output would exceed the $32 billion figure computed by the Council. In fact, however, the gap turns out to be only $26 billion.

This illustrative calculation shows, once more, that it makes a good deal of difference whether the curve of potential output is started at one date or another. By starting the curve of potential output in the second quarter of 1957 instead of mid-1955, it is possible to convey, first, that the upward trend of the gap is smaller than the Council found, second, that the gap has lasted a shorter period, third, that all this is true despite the assumption of an appreciably higher growth rate of potential output than the Council estimated.

This concludes what I have to say about the Council's evidence in behalf of its theory. I hope that I have not left the impression that the new theory of secular stagnation is utterly without foundation. That would not be true. This theory is tied to some actual experience. But when the evidence is examined, it turns out to rest fundamentally on one fact, namely, that the business-cycle expansion of 1958–60 was exceptionally short and incomplete. When the expansion ended, our economy was still some distance from full employment.

I do not question the importance of this fact. Nor do I question its disturbing character. But I do question what inference can properly be drawn from this solitary fact.

I would urge two things. First, a theory which has such a slender foundation in experience must be viewed somewhat skeptically. Second, there is a better explanation of what happened between 1958 and 1960 than is offered by the neostagnation theory which of late has become quite fashionable.

Let us note, to begin with, that economic recovery proceeded very briskly until the spring of 1959. Between the first quarter of 1958 and the first quarter of 1959 the Nation's physical output rose by 8 percent. Between mid-1958 and April 1959 the rate of unemployment also fell sharply—from about 7½ to almost 5 percent.

But soon thereafter a sharp retardation of economic growth set in. The expansion of business activity terminated in May, having run its course in only 2 years and stopping at a time when the economy was still some distance from a full employment level.

Many factors undoubtedly contributed to the unsatisfactory character of the business-cycle expansion from 1958 to 1960, but I believe that three developments were decisive.

First of all, we had a violent shift in Federal finances. Between the first quarter of 1959 and the third quarter of 1959 the Federal cash deficit, allowing for seasonal factors, fell from an annual rate of $17 billion to $2 billion. By the second quarter of 1960, we were already operating with a surplus at an annual rate of $7 billion. Thus, in a period of little more than a year, we had a turnaround in Federal finances of about $24 billion.

This was undoubtedly one of the very sharpest shifts of Federal finance in our Nation's history.

Second, the fiscal restraint on general economic expansion was accompanied—indeed preceded—by a tightening of credit conditions.

By mid-1959 commercial banks were already in debt at the Federal Reserve to the

tune of $1 billion. The money supply stopped growing. Demand deposits diminished by nearly $4 billion between July 1959 and May 1960. Interest rates rose sharply, both on short-term and long-term loans. Indeed, long-term rates advanced faster than during a comparable stage of any business cycle during the past hundred years.

Still a third factor contributed significantly to the incompleteness of the expansion of 1958–60; namely, the protracted steel strike in the second half of 1959.

Anticipations of the strike first led to a sharp buildup of inventories and a boom psychology in the spring and early summer of 1959.

Once the strike came and continued to drag on, it caused both concern and confusion in the business community and led to some hesitation in placing orders for investment goods. The strike also led to some confusion in governmental circles and prevented early recognition, which otherwise might well have occurred, of the magnitude of the restraints that were being imposed by our Government on economic expansion.

And when the strike finally ended, many business concerns—having in the meantime had an extraordinary stimulus and opportunity to reexamine their inventory policies—proceeded to practice new economies in managing their inventories.

In all these ways the steel strike contributed to an early end of the expansion which commenced in the spring of 1958.

If this sketch of the background of the recession is anywhere near the mark, we must attribute the incompleteness of the expansion of 1958–60 partly to the steel strike but even more to our governmental policies of restraint.

To be sure, these policies were designed to prevent further inflation and to restore confidence, both at home and abroad, in the management of our national finances. I have no doubt that these policies were sound and even essential. But, as happened in the event, they were pushed with excessive vigor and they were not checked in time.

On my reading of recent history, the neostagnationist theory which is now being widely used to explain the incompleteness of the expansion of 1958–60 is, therefore, quite unconvincing. To be sure, our economy faltered, so to speak, prematurely. But the early onset of recession was due to special factors, to factors of a kind that need not be repeated, rather than to some permanent or growing weakness of our economy.

I have dwelt on two very different interpretations of economic developments in recent years. These interpretations necessarily have different policy implications.

On the basis of the Council's interpretation, and to use its own language, "we face a stubborn problem of chronic slack, and the road to full recovery is a long one."

On the basis of my interpretation, there is no chronic slack of our economy. The problem of recovery that we face is not very different from that which we faced in 1949 or in 1954 or in 1958. Full employment is not a remote possibility. On the contrary, it may well be reached some 15 or 18 months from now.

In view of its interpretation of recent history, the Council logically concludes that "the expansionary effects of Government programs will be welcome even if they occur well after the recession has been reversed."

I believe, on the other hand, that the mildness of the recent recession supports the thesis that the underlying forces of economic expansion are strong and that they have of late been only temporarily suppressed. I believe that signs of economic recovery are already here and are rapidly multiplying. In view of this fact and in view also of the substantial increases of Federal spending that were initiated in the closing months of the Eisenhower administration and the further increases that have been set in motion by President Kennedy, I think that we would be courting inflation and a gold crisis if we now arranged new governmental spending programs so that they would mature when the economy is already advancing without them.

If we accept the Council's view that "we face a stubborn problem of chronic slack," the distinction between governmental spending to spur recovery and governmental spending to spur long-term growth becomes unimportant, and the same might be said of the distinction between governmental spending to promote social welfare and spending to promote economoc growth.

On the other hand, if my diagnosis of the state of our economy is correct, these distinctions are vital. Thus, I would hold that improved medical care of the aged, however desirable it may be in the interests of human welfare, will do little or nothing to improve economic efficiency or to accelerate long-term growth, and that it is entirely misleading to favor better medical care of the aged, as is now being done, on the ground that it will also promote long-term growth.

Again, I would grant quickly that a liberalized social security program, such as President Kennedy advanced in his economic message to the Congress, would help to speed economic recovery. But I must go on and point out that the same can be said of any type of governmental deficit spending. Since the liberalization of the social security program is designed to be a permanent reform, rather than to serve merely as an antirecession aid, I think that it is a mistake to advance such a program in the guise of a recovery measure. The Congress should pass this legislation only after full deliberation indicates that it is likely to promote the national welfare in the long run, and not merely in the months immediately ahead.

Once again, on the basis of the Council's analysis of the state of our economy, the problem of accelerating economic growth requires that we undertake greater public and private investment expenditures. I would readily grant this general proposition. However, the problem of accelerating long-term economic growth is excessively simplified when we suppose that it will be resolved merely by greater investment outlays.

Once aggregate spending is sufficient to maintain full employment, the rate of economic growth must depend principally on the rate at which economic efficiency increases.

Efficiency and productivity are undoubtedly promoted by some types of investment, but they can also often be promoted without any additional outlays or even with reduced outlays. We need think only of the restrictive practices that abound in construction work, in railroading, in agriculture, and in many of our manufacturing concerns.

I think that if we seriously want to accelerate economic growth, we will need to remove many of these impediments to efficiency, whether they arise from careless business management, or from the coercive power of trade unions, or from governmental legislation itself.

I have tried in the course of my remarks to indicate how a difference in interpretation of recent economic developments will lead to some differences with regard to economic policy. But I want to guard against any exaggeration of these differences.

Let me say at once that I see considerable merit in many of the proposals that the President has advanced for dealing with the recession.

I applaud his vigorous efforts to speed tax refunds, to enlarge the distribution of surplus foodstuffs to the needy, to speed early payment of dividends on veterans life insurance, to accelerate governmental lending under existing programs, to speed procurement which has already been scheduled, and to accelerate construction work which is already underway.

I admire the President's appeal for prompt enactment of a temporary program for extending the duration of unemployment insurance benefits. The Congress has already acted favorably on this request and I hope that the Congress will go further and enact, as the President has recommended, a permanent unemployment insurance law for coping with recessions.

I also feel encouraged by the new administration's recognition of the need to revise some of our tax laws in the interest of stimulating private enterprise and investment. I look forward hopefully to legislation along these lines.

But while I find the greater part of the President's recovery program entirely congenial, I am unable—as I have already stated—to regard liberalized social security programs, even though spending on them can get underway promptly, as sound measures for dealing with a recession.

I also doubt the wisdom of proposing a substantial increase of the minimum wage at a time of recession. I do not regard a lifting of the minimum wage as a useful antirecession device, particularly at a time like the present when we are having a serious balance-of-payments problem.

Nor am I able to accept without some reservations the view that greater Federal investment in education, health, housing, research, and resource development is desirable in the interest of accelerating the Nation's long-term economic growth. I think that some of these types of expenditure may be justified on grounds of social welfare and that others may be justified on grounds of economic efficiency, but I fail to see how all of them can accelerate the Nation's long-term economic growth merely because we now call them investment.

Nor am I able to accept the view that new and larger governmental spending programs on education, health, housing, research, and resource development should be welcomed even if they materialize well after the recession has been reversed. This particular view rests precisely on the stagnationist theorizing that I have taken some pains to scrutinize this afternoon.

I have been forced by the nature of the topic on which you have invited me to speak to make some critical remarks on the economic thinking and policies of the new administration. But I also have found much to commend.

I deem it only proper to conclude by saying that the administration has avoided extreme economic views, that it has in no way shown hostility to business enterprise, and that the economic moves actually taken by the administration have been more prudent than some of its economic rhetoric has at times suggested.

A One-Man Corps in Peace and War—Most Reverend Quentin Olwell, C.P.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, much is being said, and we hope much will soon be done, to reconstitute our national im-

age and regenerate the spirit of sacrifice which moves us to greatness.

Among the model lives we would do well to emulate in this regard are those of the American missionaries of all faiths who have left their homeland and seek to serve the spiritual and temporal wants to others in every corner of the earth. They work with the sick and savage. They teach, labor, spend themselves freely in the service of God. We should never overlook the great contribution they also make as Americans for as they carry out their corporal works of mercy they also portray this country in the role of the good Samaritan. It might be said that 1 hour in 1 day of their lives is more lasting and effective in winning friends for our country than is a million dollars in foreign aid. For when they win a soul to God they release a captive from darkness, away from the threat of communism.

A true example of such endeavor is the life of Most Reverend Quentin Olwell, C.P. I have had the privilege of knowing Bishop Olwell and his family for many years. They are lifelong residents of Brooklyn, and I have been pleased to have them as neighbors in the 12th Congressional District, which I represent.

The life and works of Bishop Olwell in China in World War II, the privations and imprisonment he suffered at the hands of the Communists, his labors in the Philippines are all singular instances of courage, denial of self, leadership, and determination.

It is fitting that the church he serves has raised him to her hierarchy. The service he has performed for his country is beyond any temporal reward.

It is with pride and a sense of homage that I commend to my colleagues three articles which recently appeared in the Brooklyn Tablet describing the works of this servant of God and country—"A One-Man Corps in Peace and War."

The articles follow:

BROOKLYN-BORN PASSIONIST WILL BE CONSECRATED

MARBEL, PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.—Very Rev. Quentin Olwell, C.P., Brooklyn-born superior of the Passionist Fathers in the Philippines, will be consecrated here Tuesday, April 25, as the first vicar apostolic of the prelature nullius of Marbel and titular bishop of Tabraca, Africa.

The 4,000-square-mile prelature, which contains 300,000 people, two-thirds of them Catholic, is located on the Island of Mindanao, half way around the world and but 5 degrees above the equator. It was carved from the prelature nullius of Cotabato in January, at the same time that Father Quentin's elevation was announced by Pope John XXIII.

Archbishop Salvatore Siino, papal nuncio to the Philippines, will be the consecrating prelate. Coconsecrators will be Bishop Cuthbert M. O'Gara, C.P. exiled Bishop of Yuanling, China, and Bishop Gerard Mongeau, O.M.I., prelate nullius of Cotabato.

ARCHBISHOP MOLLOY'S CROZIER

Among Bishop Quentin's symbols of office will be a crozier formerly used by Archbishop Molloy and a pectoral cross which is the gift of the priests and people of the Passionists' Immaculate Conception parish, Jamaica, where the new prelate served in 1951.

Archbishop Molloy's crozier is a gift of the Brooklyn Diocese offered through the kindness of Very Rev. Msgr. James W. Asip, associate diocesan director of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith.

The motto on his coat of arms "Gloria Dei et Salus Animarum" (Glory to God and the Salvation of Souls) recalls Archbishop Molloy's motto "Salus Animarum Suprema Lex" (The Salvation of Souls is the Supreme Law").

Expected to be present at the consecration and Pontifical Mass are the new bishop's sister-in-law, Mrs. Evans G. (May) Olwell of 374 East 25th Street in Our Lady of Refuge Parish, Brooklyn; Very Rev. Cornelius Hazlett, C. P., provincial, and Rev. Linus Lombard, C.P., from the U.S. provincial headquarters in Union City, N.J., and Rev. Fidelis Connolly, C.P., an Air Force chaplain stationed in Japan.

Bishop Quentin's brother, who died August 2, 1957, was an outstanding Catholic layman who had served as head of Ozanam Conference, Society of St. Vincent de Paul, Columbus Council, Knight of Columbus Parkville Post, C.W.V., and Our Lady of Refuge parish Holy Name Society.

The bishop is an uncle of Evans G. Olwell, Jr., who lives with his wife and six children in Sea Cliff, L. I.; Mrs. John F. (Mary) Conroy of Marblehead, Mass., who also has six children; Mrs. Charles (Patricia) Montrie, Bethesda, Md., four children; Mrs. Benjamin (Antoinette) Conroy, Uvalde, Tex., three children; and Quentin Olwell of Brooklyn.

MOST REV. QUENTIN OLWELL: BROOKLYN'S PASSIONIST BISHOP FOR PHILIPPINES

(By Don Zirkel)

Father Quentin Olwell is credited with bringing about many significant improvements during his 28 years as a missionary in China, but he admits to failure in one minor detail he would like to have changed.

When his departure in 1951 was featured by the view of several unfriendly guns pointed at him, he could have said, "This is where I came in," because his arrival in 1923 had featured just as many unfriendly guns—and they weren't just pointing, they were shooting.

ST. CECILIA'S SCHOOL

Born Bertram Olwell November 4, 1898, the son of James and Ellen Evans Olwell, he grew up on Marcy Avenue and describes himself as a "charter member" of St. Cecilia's School, Greenpoint, because he was a member of its first graduation class.

He then moved to Staten Island, where he attended Port Richmond High School. He joined the Passionists at St. Joseph's Prep Seminary, Pittsburgh, was professed September 15, 1916, and ordained February 4, 1923, at St. Vincent's Abbey, Latrobe, Pa.

Father Quentin's first assignment was to China, where he labored until expelled by the Chinese Reds in May 1951.

During World War II, Father Quentin was of invaluable assistance to the American forces, having been credited with saving this country more than $5 million through his negotiations with the Chinese Government. He also devised a method of converting high octane gas for planes so that it could be used for army trucks and cars.

During the war he narrowly escaped death on many occasions when the Japanese bombed his mission. Once he was struck by shrapnel and suffered a concussion.

He speaks enthusiastically about the conduct of the American troops in China, declaring that their greatest contribution to friendship with the Chinese was their practice of the principle that the Chinese were their equals and not an inferior people. An estimated 40 percent of the 50,000 American troops in China were Catholics and their spiritual care was entrusted largely to missionaries.

In September 1949, a cable was received from Father Olwell, then superior of the Passionists in China, that the Yuanling Diocese had been occupied by the Communists.

Less than 2 years later—at that time vicar general of the diocese—he was sentenced to expulsion from Red China for counter-revolutionary and reactionary activities.

Specifically, he was accused of having asked the faithful to pray for the repose of the souls of two Catholics who had been executed by the regime as "bandits."

Before the expulsion of the Passionists, the Yuanling Diocese under the direction of Bishop Cuthbert O'Gara, C.P., included 12 central missions, catechuminates, grammar, high and trade schools, hospitals, dispensaries, orphanages and homes for the aged. It stretched across 16,000 square miles of rugged hills from which 5 million natives eked out a hard existence.

Erected as a prefecture apostolic March 13, 1925, it was confided to the American Passionists with headquarters at St. Michael's Monastery, Union City, N.J., where Bishop O'Gara is currently living in exile.

Father Quentin's career in China was such a success that he helped save a soul before he even reached his mission station. But let him tell it in his own words, as quoted from his first letter home, September 16, 1923:

"We arrived safely in Shanghai after a fire on board the boat, and after spending 26 hours in the worst typhoon that hit these waters from many a day. Three ships went down in it. We received the SOS from them but had all we could do to manage our own vessel.

"We took a fairly good size steamer up the Yang Tzye Kiang River, which got us in Hankow about the first of September. Then the fun began.

"From Hankow we were to go to Changteh, and from thence to our central mission Shenchowfu. Well we got on a Chinese launch to make the trip to Changteh.

"No doubt you have read about the bandits in China. They are in reality soldiers from another province. In their own cities and villages they are soldiers but in other places they are bandits, going about looting the people and taking whatever they can get their hands on, and if necessary killing to do so.

IN AN AMBUSH

"We got about a day's distance from our destinations when I realized what it felt like to be in the trenches and have the enemy shooting at you. We had sailed into an ambush of the bandits and they were using us as a target. We immediately stopped, turned the boat and made all haste back to Hankow. Thank God none of us were hit.

"The chief engineer of the boat was shot clean through. The bullet came through the door of his bunk, entered his left side and came out the right, and stopped in the wall. Father Dominic has the bullet.

"We set about using our first aid knowledge but to no avail; the poor man died in about 6 hours. We were rewarded, however, for the man was instructed and baptized before he died. Thus our loss of about $80 fare and the few hardships we had to put up with were nobly repaid, for what greater than to save an immortal soul?

"I seem to have the requirements needed for a missioner, that is the natural ones, God knows I fall down miserably on the others. The missionaries that I have met over here are real saints. No doubt you have read of how they suffer death most courageously. To meet them has been an inspiration to me. Don't begin to think that I shall suffer such things. God calls the giants for these tasks; I am only a pygmy."

SERVED IN JAMAICA

After arriving in and leaving China under gunpoint, Father Quentin served at Immaculate Conception Monastery, Jamaica, and as

pastor of St. Gabriel's Monastery Church, Boston.

But the call of the missions was too strong and in January 1958 he went back to his first love: not to the China mainland still closed by the Communist forces of occupation but to the mission recently entrusted to the American Passionists in the Philippines.

Father Quentin was superior of the group of nine Passionists (including Father Paschal Smith of Hollis) who took over the southern part of the Prelature Nullius of Cotabato on the island of Mindanao, with headquarters at Marbel.

Within 3 years the 200,000 Catholics there were being served so well by the Passionists, now numbering 21, that the Holy See established the Prelature Nullius of Marbel.

And to be first Prelate Nullius of Marbel, Pope John XXIII has called a giant—a man who the Holy Father, his Passionist confreres, his friends in Brooklyn, and his subjects in the Philippines firmly believe has all the requirements, natural and spiritual, to be a great mission bishop.

PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE: GROWTH OF CHURCH IN MARBEL

Half way across the world on the Philippine Island of Mindanao lies the Prelature Nullius of Marbel, which Bishop Quentin Olwell, C.P., will serve as vicar general after his consecration there April 25.

The prelature covers 4,000 square miles of the southern part of the province of Cotabato, and has a population of 300,000 people. The tip or toe of Marbel prelature is but 5 degrees above the equator on the Celebes Sea.

It is a land of high mountains and wide valleys with spreading farms and mahogany-rich forests. The region lies outside the path of the terrific typhoons that annually cause such destruction in other parts of the Philippine Archipelago. The climate is favorable.

Malayan settlers entered Cotabato Province centuries ago. In the latter part of the 15th century, the Sariph Kabungsuan of Arabia arrived with religious teachers and proselyted the Malayan immigrants into the worship of Allah. They thenceforth were known as Moors or Mores.

WAS MOSLEM STRONGHOLD

Less than 100 years ago, the Province of Cotabato was an independent sultanate, a Moslem stronghold. According to the 1952 Philippine Guidebook, there were no Catholics in Cotabato before World War I, and before 1939 there were scarcely a thousand Christians there.

After World War II, as a result of a government-sponsored program called the National Land Settlement Administration, tens of thousands of Filipinos were encouraged to uproot themselves from land-poor Huk-ridden provinces of the Republic and become homesteaders in the rich Koronadal Valley of southern Cotabato. The newcomers were mostly Catholic, and soon outnumbered the Mohammedans.

Missionary reinforcements were urgently needed, and the Holy See called upon the Possionist Fathers to take missions in southern Cotabato.

When the first band of Passionist missionairies, under the superiorship of Father Olwell, arrived in southern Cotabato at the beginning of lent in 1958, they entered among a people whose colonizing accomplishments rival those of the Pilgrim Fathers of American history.

Twenty years before, this region was a forest wilderness. Today, the success of these pioneers is a thing of admiration in the far-flung series of settlements that stretch inland to Marbel, the principal city. Here more than 250 population centers have literally, like Jack's beanstalk, sprung from the earth. There are 10 cities, 150 villages called "barrios," and 115 hamlets called "sitios." Over 200,000 of the 300,000 industrious natives who live in these new townsites and peaceful farms are Catholics.

MANY DIALECTS

One of the tasks that confront the missionary is the multiplicity of dialects. The immigrants coming from different parts of the Philippines are inclined to settle in groups according to the dialect. There are a variety of dialects even in the same parish. However, the English language is a great help, and since many of the young folk are learning English in the schools, the missionary can preach in English and be understood by a large number of people.

The Prelature Nullius of Marbel, which has been carved from the Prelature of Cotabato, is fortunate in possessing educational institutions on the college and high school level, called Notre Dame Schools, open to Catholic and Mohammedan alike. In fact, in some of them the Mohammedans outnumber the Catholics.

These schools were established by the intrepid and farseeing Prelate of Cotabata Bishop Mongeau and the Oblate Missionaries of Mary Immaculate. There are 2 small colleges, 10 high schools and elementary schools and some 4,000 students. They are staffed by the American Marist Brothers, the Filipina Sisters of two congregations, the Dominican Religious of St. Catherine of Siena and the Augustine Recollect Missionaries.

There are 10 parishes and many outmissions in the Prelature Nullius of Marbel, where 21 Passionist missionaries labor. The faithful in some 60 of the barrios have built on their own initiative simple chapels of nipa thatch. The missionaries visit these mass centers as often as possible, to instruct the people, administer the sacraments, validate marriages and baptize the children. There is also, aided by the Oblate Sisters of Notre Dame, a secular institute specializing in catechetical work in the villages.

The Oblate Fathers publish a Catholic weekly newspaper in Cotabato called the Mindanao Cross with a circulation of nearly 10,000. They also have a radio station which daily broadcasts the news and religious instruction, etc.

In preparation for the consecration of Bishop Olwell, much work has been done to the parish church which will now become the cathedral. The edifice had been built for practicality and not for beauty and the front had been described as giving the appearance of a gigantic American barn. Two bays have been added and a beautiful facade is under construction.

The future holds great promise for the welfare of the church in southern Cotabato. Under the leadership and inspiration of the new Prelate of Marbel, Bishop Quentin Olwell, C.P., and his zealous Passionist missionaries and untiring missionary sisters and brothers, there is every reason to hope for great things in this new Passionist mission halfway across the world.

A Clear Look at Politics and Politicians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable John M. Lupton, a State senator from Fairfield County, Conn., recently addressed the weekly Republican luncheon meeting in Hartford on the subject of "Politics and Politicians." I think his remarks are so pertinent and well put that I would like them reproduced in the RECORD:

A CLEAR LOOK AT POLITICS AND POLITICIANS

Mr. Chairman, our special guests today, my fellow Republicans, instead of a report on some of the legislation moving through the general assembly at this time, I would like to offer a change of pace as my contribution to these weekly luncheon talks. Instead of talking up a Republican achievement, or complaining about a Democratic failure, I would like to talk about some places where in the people's minds both political parties have shortcomings.

Most of us who have spent some years in politics talk among ourselves about how little the public appreciates us. We deplore the low esteem in which politics and politicians are held by most Americans. We know how honest and dedicated we are, but what's the matter with the people, why can't they see it?

It is easy to feel hurt and impatient and left out when we hear community leaders, who are not politicians, call for some aspect of public administration to be lifted above politics. I don't like the growing chorus singing the praises of nonpartisan government (whatever that is). But I think most of all I am worried by the way my fellow citizens too often walk off and leave their self-government. It doesn't interest them, they think it's a low-quality calling. The bare bottom truth of the matter is, they couldn't care less about politics and politicians.

Some of us who are in Government talked about this problem among ourselves. We found it easy to blame the public. It is easy to say that any man who doesn't participate in self-government is "spitting at a mirror," who only insults himself and his country.

It is easy to say these things, and we have said them. But is that the whole story? Have the American people been letting themselves and their country down by their refusal to support politics and politicians personally, or is it possible that politics and politicians of both parties have been letting the people down?

It is quite clear that there are places in which both parties are not answering the country's needs, large areas in which both Republicans and Democrats confuse bad politics with destiny. That's what I want to talk about today.

I believe, we in the two major parties are forgetting our duty to lead. Too often we seek our political opportunities in contests to find appetites to feed. This is not leadership. It is exploration. Like geologists with geiger counters we move among the people with our antenna way out seeking bonanzas of public interest. This is contrived democracy and cannot succeed because it is the product of groups and interests which do not see or care to see the total picture. This brings me again to the necessity for political leaders to lead. They alone are in position to take a clear look at what they are doing.

Subtly, possibly without our even realizing it, this failure of political leaders to lead, is the major reason why politics and politicians enjoy a low rating among the people. Divided among themselves, scarcely aware or interested in each other's problems, the people in various pressure groups are getting just about what they want out of legislators. The ease with which they are able to do this has not increased their respect for the people who take care of them.

I believe that there is a great responsibility of politics and the political parties

to answer simply, the needs of human dignity in every human being.

I know this is a spiritual area from which politics and political parties shy away—but this is my very point: as leaders of a Government whose very foundation is spiritual, can we afford to neglect the spirit of man?

If we do, can we be sure that what President Kennedy calls "our nonmilitary defenses" will not be damaged? I don't think we can be sure. Yet, for 25 years in America this is exactly what we have been doing and the affliction is growing.

This is a primary mistake in the area of public education, and public education is issue No. 1 in Connecticut State government.

Many of us here, most of us, in fact, because I have discussed this with most of you, have told me you were raised in what we fondly call "a flag-waving America." This was the era of rolled up sleeves, when America never won a debate and never lost a war, hot or cold. These were the days when schools taught civics, when our history books were an exciting parade of patriots, when the Fourth of July was a bigger day than the 15th of April. These were the days when we got the message of what America stands for, loud and clear—that it was the land of the individual, not the state. We were taught the "self-evident truths"—we considered them, we explored them, we were taught them. We believed them. They became a part of our character. The days I speak of were before God was objected to, when the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag was a renewal of faith in the country founded on His full approval of us because we believed and swore to defend His "blessings of liberty." This was before God and patriotism went out of fashion in our public schools.

Let's trace the political history of what I am talking about. First we took the reading of the Bible out of the public schools, so as not to offend. The salute to the flag and the pledge of allegiance have a remarkable history too. They were removed from many schools because a woman in Ohio won a court case which said she didn't have to have her children acknowledge any earthly authority. How could we let a thing like this happen?

What good is it if we give a nuclear physicist a fine education in his science and then find that he spends all of his spare time raising roses, playing chess or pursuing the hobby of cabinetmaking with no time whatsoever for public duty? What kind of a job is public education doing if businessmen can chase dollars from dawn until dusk and spend the rest of their time chasing golf balls or playing cards? These situations are typical which means the people are goofing off their political responsibility. Thus, hasn't our public school system failed in its primary purpose, that of education for citizenship? This is where the lack of moral leadership by our political parties has let the people down. After all, it is we who put the official stamp on the administration of the public schools. We establish the climate in which public education operates.

A second place where we in politics are failing to lead is in our handling of the people's money. There is a thing called across-the-board grants. Across-the-board appropriations where only specific funds for certain areas or individuals are needed is not only a waste of the people's money, it is demoralizing political pandering as opposed to political leadership. Isn't the belief of both parties, that across-the-board grants are the the only the people will go for—a damning admission of their lack of faith in human dignity? How do we know the people won't respond to leadership in this respect? Have we tried it lately? I think the people will respond nobly.

Possibly this two-party position which is timid about granting funds on the basis of need and strong on across-the-board spending is already suspected by the people. This is part of the public relations problem of politics.

This across-the-board thing, as we all know, operates in many areas of Government. The prime case these days is in Federal aid to education. If a few States need public money, apparently we are going to have to vote money for all States in order for the few to get it. If Mississippi needs the money but New York and Connecticut do not, then Mississippi should get the money and New York and Connecticut should not. Yet Connecticut and New York as well as Mississippi should be able to vote for the aid for Mississippi. Any other interpretation is not only wasteful, but immoral.

My third and final example of where we fail to lead is in our attitudes toward public assistance. For example, let's take a clear look at the sick and the aged in our hospitals and convalescent homes. Welfare as most of you know is our second highest cost in Connecticut. Last year it was about 25 percent of the general fund. The number of State-supported cases in nursing homes has risen at a fantastic rate over the past few years. In 1950, welfare patients comprised 25 percent of the total patients in chronic and convalescent hospitals in the State. By 1960, 57 percent of such patients were receiving State aid. Meanwhile, costs have tripled from $2.9 million in 1950 to $8.7 million last year.

By law, it seems we permit more and more grown children who have the ability to pay to shirk their personal responsibilities to provide for their parents and to pass this duty on to the State.

This is a dangerous trend, the direct opposite of basic American traditions of facing up to personal responsibility.

We in politics have a duty to apply a realistic yardstick of ability to pay in all public assistance situations. The present tendency to be overly generous hurts particularly the great number of our citizens who, although in modest circumstances, are nevertheless determined to pay their own bills and take care of their own.

The prime reason that our political leaders should lead is not just to restore the prestige of politics and politicians. That will be a desirable byproduct.

Nor should we undertake leadership only because it will free the people from the imprisonment of socializing taxation. It will do this too, because highly responsible individuals will cost our country far less per person. The urgent reason why our political leaders should lead is to direct our citizens forward once more to self-evident truths—to make them forget the worship of the consequences rather than the causes of our freedom.

I have not been describing a health political condition. What I have given is a partial description of what is actually happening. We are confronted with a conflict of misused political power as opposed to the way of life that was instilled in men wiser than we, and framed in the documents we live, and sometimes suffer by. These are the self-evident truths.

Bucktail Volunteers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, today marks the centennial anniversary of the embarkation on an historic venture of a group of patriotic Pennsylvanians known as the Bucktail Regiment. The House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has recently passed a resolution calling attention to the valiant efforts of these patriots; and I am proud to announce that our distinguished colleague, the Honorable LEON H. GAVIN, joins me in calling the resolution to the attention of the House:

Whereas on April 17, 1861, Thomas L. Kane, of Smethport, McKean County, Pa., issued a call by authority of Governor Curtin for volunteer rifles and marksmen "prepared to take up arms immediately, to support the Constitution of the United States and defend the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania"; and

Whereas James Landregan, while lounging in front of the Smethport headquarters, spied a deer hide hanging outside a butcher shop across the street. Noticing that the tail was somewhat larger than the average, he cut it off and stuck it in his hat, little dreaming that he was about to give an entire regiment its distinctive insignia. Thomas Kane thought that there could not be a more appropriate name for an outfit from the mountains of northern Pennsylvania since deer abounded upon every hillside. Kane decided immediately that it would be the "Bucktails"; and

Whereas volunteers from McKean, Elk, and Cameron Counties responded and converged upon the town of Driftwood, Cameron County, Pa., from where, on April 27, 1861, the Cameron County Rifles under the command of John A. Eldred, afterwards Company C Bucktails, mustered on June 1, 1861, mustered out June 11, 1864; the Elk County Rifles under the command of Capt. Thomas B. Winslow, afterwards Company G Bucktails, mustered in May 29, 1861, mustered out June 11, 1864; and the McKean County Rifles under the command of Capt. William T. Blanchard, afterwards Company I Bucktails, mustered in May 30, 1861, mustered out June 11, 1864; all under the leadership of Thomas L. Kane, afterwards commanding officer of the regiment and later a major general, embarked upon four rafts for Harrisburg, where they were mustered into the service of the State and formed the nucleus about which the Bucktail Regiment of the 13th Pennsylvania Reserve Corps, the 42d Pennsylvania Volunteers was organized, which, during the term of service, was almost continuously attached to the Army of the Potomac.

During their services, they participated and were engaged in the following campaigns and battles: Danesville, Mechanicsville, Haines Mills, New Market Cross Roads, Malvern Hill, Harrisonburg, Cross Keys, Catlett's Station, Groveton, Second Bull Run, South Mountain, Antietum, Fredericksburg, Gettysburg, Wilderness, Spottsylvania Court House, North Anna, and Bethesda Church; and

Whereas on April 27, 1908, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania caused to be erected at Driftwood an appropriate monument to the valor nad glory of this patriotic regiment; and

Whereas the Historical Societies of McKean, Elk, and Cameron Counties are meeting at Driftwood on April 27, 1961, to mark the centennial of the departure of this colorful outfit for enlistment in the service of their country; and

Whereas on May 30, 1961, the present veterans' organizations of McKean, Elk, and Cameron counties, together with descendants of this famous regiment, will gather at the Bucktail Monument at Driftwood to commemorate the centennial of the departure of these volunteer rifles and marksmen for the War Between the States: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, pays tribute to these valiant men who constituted the volunteer rifles and marksmen who became known as the Bucktails; and be it further

Resolved, That we commend the Historical Societies of McKean, Elk, and Cameron Counties and the veterans' organizations of said counties, for commemorating this centennial event, and for carrying on the spirit, the courage, the faith, and the patriotism of such worthy and hardy men; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Historical Societies of McKean, Elk, and Cameron Counties.

EDWIN W. THOMPKINS.
ALBERT W. JOHNSON.
WILLIAM F. RENWICK.

Federal Subsidies to Teachers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Monroe (Mich.) Evening News of April 18, 1961:

DO TEACHERS NEED FEDERAL SUBSIDIES?

A noted observer of the education scene, Russell Kirk, asked the above question in a recent article appearing in the National Review magazine. It is Mr. Kirk's contention that "in no other country are teachers better rewarded, relatively or absolutely" than in America. And then he offers some sobering figures for consideration.

Since 1930, the real income of teachers (in terms of purchasing power) has increased 106 percent," Mr. Kirk says. And he adds that during this same period the workload of the teacher has diminished through a reduction in the size of classes.

Advocating Federal aid to education to pay in part teachers' salaries, proponents contend that unless teachers' salaries are greatly increased the profession will be unable to recruit enough competent young people for public schools.

Between 1929 and 1956, in terms of 1956 dollars, the overall average of teachers in public schools had their salaries increased by $1,988.

Apparently, according to Mr. Kirk, this hasn't been too discouraging to those seeking a career in education. He says about 32 percent of all college graduates complete preparation for a teaching certificate—that is to say, about a third of all college graduates plan to become teachers. As further contradictory evidence of proponents' position, Mr. Kirk notes that in the last decade the number of certified teachers in the public school system has increased 57 percent. This can be compared with only a 12 percent increase for the same period of the overall American labor force.

Only national defense exceeds public education in expenditures taken from tax sources. Education accounts for some 15 percent of all Government tax revenues—public welfare gets 3.2 percent; law enforcement, 1.3 percent.

Throughout the history of our public education—including all the advances, new schools, greatly increased number of teachers, etc.—local communities and individual States have borne these costs. And of these costs, teachers' salaries have had the major share.

Skillful propagandists and zealous supporters of Federal aid to education have had much to say in support of their position. It is wholesome to see the other side of the coin as reviewed by a competent observer.

Resolution of Bar Association of State of Kansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, the Bar Association of the State of Kansas held its annual meeting in Wichita, Kans., on April 22, 1961. The executive council of the Bar Association of the State of Kansas and the general assembly passed unanimously the following resolution:

To the President of the United States, John F. Kennedy; the Honorable Robert F. Kennedy, Attorney General of the United States; the Honorable Byron White, Assistant Attorney General of the United States; the Honorable Bernard G. Segal, Chairman of the Committee on Federal Judiciary, American Bar Association; the Honorable Andrew F. Schoeppel, U.S. Senator from Kansas; the Honorable Frank Carlson, U.S. Senator from Kansas; the Honorable William Avery, the Honorable Robert F. Ellsworth, the Honorable Walter L. McVey, the Honorable Garner E. Shriver, the Honorable J. Floyd Breeding, the Honorable Robert Dole, U.S. Representatives from Kansas:

Whereas by virtue of the retirement of the Honorable Sam G. Bratton, chief judge of the 10th judicial circuit, there is now a vacancy to be filled in said 10th judicial circuit; and

Whereas if, as, and when the judgeship bill is enacted into law, there will be an additional judgeship created in the 10th judicial circuit; and

Whereas the State of Kansas has had no representation upon the 10th judicial circuit since the retirement of the Honorable Walter A. Huxman in 1957; and

Whereas it has been the practice within the 10th judicial circuit to rotate the appointment of judges so that if possible all States within the 10th judicial circuit are represented upon the court; and

Whereas there are now representatives upon the court from the States of Oklahoma, Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, and further, until the recent resignation of the chief judge, New Mexico has been represented, Kansas thus being the only State in the circuit not represented upon the bench; and

Whereas according to the previously recognized practice it is now Kansas turn for the appointment upon the bench of the 10th judicial circuit; and

Whereas the following figures show the population of the six States in the 10th judicial circuit for 1960, to wit:

Oklahoma	2,328,284
Kansas	2,178,611
Colorado	1,753,947
New Mexico	951,023
Utah	890,627
Wyoming	330,066

thus indicating from a population standpoint Kansas should be represented upon said court; and

Whereas the following tables indicate the work done in civil cases both in the district courts of the six States within the 10th judicial circuit and the appeals commenced in the 10th judicial circuit from the six States within the circuit, namely:

Source of appeals and original proceedings commenced in the U.S. courts of appeals, 10th circuit, during each of the fiscal years 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959, and 1960

	Fiscal year—				
	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960
10th circuit, total appeals	241	218	249	229	234
Colorado	46	28	35	36	35
Kansas	43	41	50	38	60
New Mexico	25	23	21	22	23
Oklahoma:					
Northern	23	13	24	13	13
Eastern	17	25	13	18	13
Western	40	32	24	47	39
Utah	22	14	31	17	18
Wyoming	11	12	9	11	6
The Tax Court of the United States	6	18	31	2	4
National Labor Relations Board	4	4	5	8	12
All other boards and commissions	4	4	4	8	9
Original proceedings	----	4	2	9	2

Total civil cases commenced and terminated in the U.S. district courts, 10th circuit, during the fiscal years 1958, 1959, and 1960

	Number of judges	Fiscal year 1958		Fiscal year 1959		Fiscal year 1960	
		Commenced	Terminated	Commenced	Terminated	Commenced	Terminated
10th circuit, total		3,008	2,833	2,581	2,664	2,819	2,587
Colorado	2	416	345	360	339	382	394
Kansas	2	940	880	954	948	969	899
New Mexico	2	409	320	273	341	311	280
Oklahoma:							
Northern	5	309	308	203	187	250	186
Eastern		196	216	154	167	170	143
Western		512	479	391	442	414	376
Utah	2	142	193	155	146	182	190
Wyoming	1	84	92	91	94	139	119

In summary, the figures show that Kansas has approximately twice as many cases in the circuit as Colorado, approximately 3 times as many as the State of New Mexico, approximately 3 times as many as the State of Utah, 10 times as many as the State of Wyoming, and approximately an equal number with the State of Oklahoma, all with no judicial representation upon the 10th judicial circuit now, nor in the last 4 years; and

Whereas the Bar Association of the State of Kansas feels that Kansas should be represented by a judge upon the 10th judicial circuit: Now, therefore

The executive council of the Bar Association of the State of Kansas in executive session and the Bar Association of the State of Kansas in its general session at its annual meeting at Wichita, Kans., this 22d day of April 1961, resolve:

(1) That the State of Kansas has not been represented upon the 10th judicial circuit for a period of more than 4 years;

(2) That all other States in said circuit are and have been represented during such period;

(3) That Kansas is entitled by virtue of the statistics set forth herein to representation upon the 10th judicial circuit;

(4) That by virtue of past practices in rotation of appointments within the 10th judicial circuit, Kansas is entitled to the next appointment to fill any vacancy upon the bench of said circuit;

(5) That the bench and bar of the State of Kansas respectfully and insistently request that the present vacancy upon the bench be filled by an appointment from the State of Kansas; that in the event it is not so filled, then that the next appointment to the bench either by virtue of the new court bill creating an additional judgeship or by a vacancy upon the court be filled from the State of Kansas; that it is the opinion of the bench and bar that Kansas is entitled to the first appointment made.

Passed unanimously by the executive council of the Bar Association of the State of Kansas in its annual executive meeting on April 19, 1961, and by the general assembly of the Bar Association of the State of Kansas in its annual meeting on April 22, 1961, at Wichita, Kans.

ALEXANDER M. FROMME,
President, Bar Association of the State of Kansas.

JOHN W. SHUART,
Executive Secretary.

Astoria's 150th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a celebration was held on March 25 in Astoria, Oreg., to commemorate the 150th anniversary of the founding of this important port city at the mouth of the Columbia River. The event, which I trust will mark Astoria's emergence into a new era of growth and prosperity, attracted many visitors, including Lord Astor, whose forebear founded the city in 1811 as an outpost of his great trading empire.

Establishment of Fort Astoria by John Jacob Astor 150 years ago marked the first permanent penetration of our western frontier under the American flag. A recent article in American Forests magazine by Don Carlos Miller, entitled "Astor Land," recalls the early origins of Astoria and details some of its many present-day attractions. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASTOR LAND
(By Don Carlos Miller)

Anyone hearing mention of Waldorf-Astoria immediately thinks of New York City and one of its most famous hotels. Few people associate the name with a remote section of Oregon wilderness. But it was in the Beaver State that a man from Waldorf, Germany, garnered the bulk of a huge fortune, of which he invested some $30 million in Manhattan Island real estate.

Yes, it was largely through his industry that Oregon became known as the Beaver State. While Abraham Lincoln was a small boy he was building a fur-trading empire throughout the West; he built Fort Astoria near the mouth of the Columbia River in 1811—that is, a party of his men did.

Thus, the name of John Jacob Astor is of prime importance in Oregon as well as in New York. Astoria still stands on the south bank of the mighty river, grown and modern but still filled with memories of its historic past. The Astor Column atop Coxcomb Hill in Astoria stands as a visible tribute to one of the great founders of America. Erected in 1926 to a height of 125 feet, the column contains a spiral staircase leading to an observation platform at its top from which tremendous views of the Columbia, the Pacific, and the forestland of the northwest can be viewed, a sight well worth the climb.

At the same time a 7-foot spiral frieze decorate the outer portions of the column. This frieze, the work of Italian sculptor A. Pusteria, depicts many of the historic events that led to the eventual settlement of the area.

However, John Jacob Astor was not the first important personage to exert his influence upon this great and trackless land. The famous Lewis and Clark expedition wintered here in 1805–06. Sent out by President Thomas Jefferson to explore the Oregon country, they sighted the Pacific on November 11, 1805. They constructed a pole fort 4 miles west of Astoria, a replica of which is now used as a museum and is open to the public. They called it Fort Clatsop because of their friendly relations with the Clatsop Indians. Here they waited out the winter in the hope of meeting a trading ship on the Columbia and obtaining fresh supplies. This they never accomplished, leaving a few days too soon.

During their stay they made salt from sea water at a cairn located in the present resort town Seaside, producing from three to four quarts of salt a day. Also, they killed 131 elk and 21 deer, as well as taking a large amount of blubber from a giant whale that was tossed up onto the shore by the stormy seas.

Even Lewis and Clark had their predecessors, there being Bruno Heceta in 1775, and Robert Gray in 1792 who sailed his ship, the *Columbia*, up the legendary river of the West that ran through the land the French trappers called Ouragon, meaning hurricane, probably because of the fierce storms in the Cascades. Then there were the Spanish galleons that haunted the coast for 250 years.

Here the knowledgeable fades into mystical tales of hidden treasure supposedly buried somewhere on Neahkahnie Mountain; these mingle with stories of the abode of Ekahni, the supreme god of the Kiil-a-mox people, which was on the same mountain. Many fortune hunters have dug here and reported finding strange items such as beeswax candles and Spanish coins. One of the latter, dated 1679, was exhibited for many years in the Nehalem Valley Bank. But if there ever was a treasure on Neahkahnie it is still there as far as anyone knows.

While this mountain rises only 1,710 feet it juts sharply upward from the sea and is higher than any other land for miles around, affording the hiker who is willing to climb the thousand feet above U.S. 101, which skirts its base well above the sea, a view of a vast and tumultuous domain of ocean, forest, and mountains.

Astoria is some 40 miles north of Neahkahnie and between the two lies a fabulous region of great ocean headlands, of wide sandy beaches that can scarcely be surpassed in any clime, of rivers and forests and quaint sea towns. Winters are not cold because of the warm Japanese Current that washes the shore, but rain is so common no one pays any attention to it. To see someone swimming in the rain is not strange at all. Summers are temperate with sunshine a fair share of the time.

Of the resorts, Seaside is by far the best known and offers about any accommodation possible, as well as the usual coastal carnival atmosphere. This is almost out of place along the 400-mile Oregon coast; it is a Seaside exclusive.

Fishing and clamming are common sports and the great salmon runs up the Columbia and lesser rivers in September bring thousands of visitors from all over the world. Commercial fishing is one of the chief industries of Astoria, as well as many of the other towns along this coast, and party boats may be hired at most ports.

While much of the best timber of the region has been cut, lumbering is still of great importance. Sawmills are numerous and many of these welcome visitors.

This area once contained the most dense forest of all Oregon, the State that still is the leading producer of lumber and has one-fourth of the available timber of the United States. Here new growth forests cover the mountains prettily, awaiting the day when they reach cutting size.

Near Cannon Beach a great forest burn with huge, gaunt trees stands as terrible evidence of what fire can do; this, while not scenic, is certainly thought provoking and should be included in any tour of this west Oregon region.

Many ships puting into the mouth of the Columbia have misjudged in fog and storm and run aground. Some of these stand starkly in the sands and may be visited when the tides are right. One of these, the Peter Iredale out of England, is a trademark of Fort Stevens State Park 7 miles west of Astoria.

Indeed it is a strange and interesting land, this region that John Jacob Astor, the Lewis and Clark expedition, and the countless nameless adventurers made known in the cities and hamlets of the East; it is hardly less fabulous than they led their fellow Americans to believe. And, while it is much changed from that day, it is one of the great adventure areas of America and will remain just that for many generations.

Authorization for Sale of Agricultural Commodities

SPEECH
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4728) to amend title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I have consistently favored the principle of disposal of commodities to the needy both here and broad. Until now this program has been used primarily for that purpose and, incidentally, to help build better international good will.

Under the present proposal, however, there is justification for only little more than one-half of the $2 billion requested. The balance of the amount is purely on an if-and-when basis.

It would look as if the new administration is attempting to convert this commodities disposal program into a giant, global, boondoggling operation.

Keep Raritan Arsenal Open

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, the decision by the administration to close down the Raritan Arsenal in New Jersey, thereby throwing out of work about 3,000 persons, is a matter which is of great concern not only to the community so severely affected but to the public at large.

The Raritan Arsenal came into being in 1917 and during all these years has served the Nation well. It is situated on the banks of the Raritan River where vessels can dock and carry supplies to different parts of the world and in times of war this Army post has played a very prominent part. In view of the fact that 9 percent of the total work force in this area is now unemployed, it is certainly a strange policy for the administration which is so concerned about unemployment and the relief of depressed areas to accentuate, at the same time, an area of depression and increase the distress.

The Daily Home News, of New Brunswick, N.J., which plays a prominent part in the life of this community has discussed this matter in various editorials which are factual and persuasive. I am pleased to have permission to insert three of them in connection with my remarks, as follows:

[From the Daily Home News, New Brunswick, N.J., Apr. 1, 1961]

KEEP RARITAN ARSENAL OPEN

We are glad to see a strong and swift mobilization of forces locally to resist the Defense Department's decision to close down Raritan Arsenal and to try to force a reconsideration of this decision.

The impact of the closing of Raritan Arsenal, even though the closing were spread over the full 3-year period indicated, would be a great economic blow to central New Jersey.

We deplore a decision which would throw a civilian staff of more than 2,500 persons out of their jobs here. We deplore a decision which would take a $15 million payroll out of this area. We deplore a decision which would cut off over $3,500,000 of Government materials purchases annually in the area.

Raritan Arsenal has served the Nation well, in war and in peace, since 1917. It has admirable rail and highway connections. It has a big reservoir of skilled workers. It is almost invaluable as a wartime military supply adjunct of the busy port of New York, funneling materials and equipment down the Raritan River and up the Arthur Kill to transocean shipping points.

It seems strange to the laymen that a Government installation which has served so well and on such a vast scale—there were 10,000 people working at Raritan Arsenal in World War II—should suddenly lose its military value and become "surplus." This seems particularly strange at a time when the cold war seems warming up and the international situation is at one of its most critical stages.

There are jobs to be protected in this matter. And there may well be the matter of national security affected too.

We are glad to see such strong support mobilized so quickly to keep the gates open at Raritan Arsenal and to keep this key defense operation functioning.

We are confident that if more key governmental, political and civil workers get into the campaign, Raritan Arsenal, with all that it represents to the area, can be kept here.

[From the Daily Home News, New Brunswick, N.J., Apr. 13, 1961]

DEVELOP SURPLUS LAND OF ARSENAL

As the move to persuade the Government to keep Raritan Arsenal open gains impetus, it would be wise for the area to take out an insurance policy against the possible closing of the arsenal, by persuading the Government to dispose of the valuable industrial land across Woodbridge Avenue from the arsenal.

If the Government has any merit in its contention that the arsenal itself is surplus today, certainly it must admit that this buffer acreage across Woodbridge Avenue is double surplus. This acreage is not used for arsenal purposes. It isn't even fenced in.

Edison Township has been trying without success to get this land sold and put on the tax rolls. The Government has been adamant. Now that the Government says the whole arsenal shebang is surplus, it must admit that this idle acreage is expendable.

By placing this land on the market immediately, the Government will show its good faith. And it will provide Edison Township with needed ratables, while at the same time cushioning the shock of any eventual closedown at the arsenal.

The idle acreage could be converted to industrial uses swiftly, and the jobs thereon might well be available to workers displaced by any eventual closing down of the arsenal.

We believe 100 percent that every effort should be made to keep Raritan Arsenal operating. At the same time it is the course of wisdom to be prepared for the worst. We can prepare in part—with Government cooperation—by pushing industrial development on the land opposite the arsenal.

[From the Daily Home News, New Brunswick, N.J., Apr. 21, 1961]

GOVERNMENT HASN'T PROVED ITS CASE

Despite the Pentagon official's statement that the order closing Raritan Arsenal is irrevocable, we think it's too early to accept that verdict as final.

The outburst of public indignation at the announced closing continues to gain impetus. The campaign of the arsenal workers is eloquent.

But beyond the emotional demonstrations, the facts which are being brought out tend more and more to suggest that the arsenal is a mighty useful enterprise. Certainly the vast printing and publications phases of the arsenal's work can be carried on here, with experienced personnel and modern equipment, as economically as elsewhere. And the move would be costly.

Certainly the arsenal's outstanding warehousing and shipping record belies any suggestion that the operation here is uneconomical.

We can see the missile argument. Maybe the arsenal is not big enough to store missiles safely; and we are not at all sure that the people of the area would like that kind of operation. But we cannot see any new development which suddenly makes heretofore efficient operation here inefficient, or heretofore economical operations here suddenly wasteful.

No one disputes the Government's right to close the Raritan Arsenal for logical reasons. But the Government must make its case plain. So far, it seems to us, the case of those who would keep the arsenal open seems the more convincing. The Government hasn't made its case yet.

A Bill To Establish a Federal Commission on Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill on establishing a Federal Commission on Taxation, for the purpose of making a thorough study of our whole Federal tax structure with the view of effecting necessary reforms.

I would like to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD my statement of reasons for introducing this measure:

THE HONORABLE DON L. SHORT, CONGRESSMAN FROM NORTH DAKOTA, URGES STATES BE GIVEN BACK THEIR TAXING PRIVILEGES—INTRODUCES BILL TO SET UP COMMISSION ON FEDERAL TAXATION TO STUDY NECESSARY TAX REFORMS

WASHINGTON, D.C.—In introducing legislation today which would provide for the establishment of a Commission on Federal Taxation, Congressman SHORT commented: "While I don't hold with setting up commissions for everything under the sun, here is a case where there is a definite need for one. Many of the Members of Congress find themselves in a situation where it is impossible to give adequate time and study to important tax reforms which are long overdue." SHORT stated it was his contention that "the creation of a Commission to go into all aspects of tax reforms and adjustments which would have a stimulating effect on our economy seems to me a most sensible approach, and would prove an assist to the hard-working Ways and Means Committee members, who have before it many important measures which are time consuming in themselves."

Congressman SHORT reiterated his belief that the Federal Government has assumed many of the prerogatives in the taxation field which would ordinarily fall to the States. "If our benevolent Uncle Sam will only give back to the people what is rightfully theirs, we can save a lot of this money that is lost in the shuffle back and forth between the States and the Federal Government. Our paternal Federal Government has in effect been patting the States on the heads as one would a child and saying, "Now if you will just leave everything to me, life will be much easier. Whoever thinks that is just kidding themselves."

"One of the first reforms that could be instituted is to eliminate the Federal excise taxes," SHORT suggested. "Here there is a field that the Federal Government has invaded. These wartime emergency taxes should and can be removed. It would stimulate our economy at a time when it is needed. Later, if the States find they need to avail themselves of this prerogative in order to furnish the services and privileges the public demands, then they have this area available for their use, and do not lose half of the dollars in transit." Congressman SHORT further asserted, "With the taxing reins back in the hands of the States, we can stay in the driver's seat insofar as aid to education, medical care to the aged, etc., are concerned. Control can stay where it should be—at home. It's part and parcel of local responsibilities."

Congressman SHORT went on to point out that "President Kennedy has indicated his belief that there is a need for tax revision, which, after all, is a legislative responsibility, in his tax message which has just come before the Congress. If he is sincere in this expressed belief, let him join in this move to set up this Commission, which should be bipartisan in nature, and urge a thorough, analytical study which can come up with recommendations for reforms; reforms which will permit our American businesses to flourish and grow—reforms which will stimulate and encourage the growth of our economy which seems to be in need of confidence right now—reforms which will allow us to hew to the line established by our Founding Fathers in a Constitution which has weathered the test of time and experience, a system based on the principle of freedom of opportunity which has made our country what it is today—the place on this earth where the individual, regardless of race or color or social or economic position, has the greatest opportunity to exercise his ability and ingenuity, and energy for the benefit of himself and his family, his fellow citizens and his country.

Address by Hon. Gordon Scherer, of Ohio, at the Seventh Annual National Military-Industrial and Educational Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an address by the Honorable GODRON SCHERER, of Ohio, delivered on April 12, 1961, at the Seventh Annual National Military-Industrial and Educational Conference, Sherman Hotel, Chicago, Ill.:

I feel certain that all of you were impressed by the film which you have just seen, "The Spy Next Door." It has given you, as well as the millions of Americans who have viewed it on television, a better understanding of the enemy we face: his flexible and deadly purpose, his cunning efficiency, the diabolical thoroughness of his spy apparatus, and his utter inhumanity and cruelty. The film has something important to tell all of us about how dangerous an enemy we face and how much we must do if we are to remain free.

"The Spy Next Door" ties in with the theme of this conference because it demonstrates how vital it is for all Americans to know their enemy better, to have a true grasp of the nature of the conspiracy behind the activities the film portrays—a conspiracy which has created the largest and possibly the most efficient espionage network the world has ever known; which maintains the largest standing army on the globe and, at the same time, the largest corps of political propagandists and agitators known to history—along with a fifth column in every free nation.

As you know, an attempt was made to censor this film. A nationwide protest forced its showing and defeated the effort to suppress the truth it conveys. I am sure that all of you, as believers in academic freedom and freedom of information generally, are glad that the suppression effort was defeated.

Because it was defeated the film, today, is still serving the American people. The Armstrong Cork Co. has made it available not only to this gathering but to many others—and will continue to do so as long as it is not used for commercial purposes. The State Department, the Atomic Energy Commission and the National War College have already used it to assist in the education and training of certain of their personnel.

One thing about the film which is not known, except to a few persons, is that this film is based to a considerable extent on information developed by the Committee on Un-American Activities. Six months before the film was shown, Jerry Ross, who wrote the script knew little about Soviet espionage. As part of his preparation for writing it, he visited the committee, and also the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, talked with its counsel, and was given various committee hearings and reports on the subject. As he has told the committee, "an appreciable amount" of his background material came from these publications. Those of you who have read all committee releases of the last few years undoubtedly saw in the film many familiar items, situations and techniques.

There is material for many more documentaries such as "The Spy Next Door" in the hearings and reports of the Committee—material on Communist directives and techniques for infiltrating our basic industries, our schools, churches, and professions—on Communist wrecking-of-freedom strategy and tactics in all walks of life.

The overwhelming majority of you, I am sure, do not believe that an agency which gives such information to the people, and is charged by the Congress with doing so, should be destroyed and vital data on Soviet espionage and many other aspects of communism thereby suppressed, any more than you believe "The Spy Next Door" should have been suppressed.

Yet, I must regretfully say that certain elements of a group in our society which is represented at this gathering has played, and is still playing, an unduly large role in the effort to suppress such information by bringing about the abolition of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Earlier this year large ads were published in the Washington Post and the New York Times, ads which made false charges against the committee and urged its abolition. Of the 327 persons who signed this ad, more than one-third, well over 100, were educators.

Last month the American Civil Liberties Union issued a statement signed by 250 professors from 79 colleges and universities, urging that the committee be abolished. Recently, a similar statement came out of Cornell University, signed by 52 professors. In January, 87 Brown University professors signed another statement to the same effect.

The committee's hearings in San Francisco last May were protested by several hundred professors from colleges in the vicinity of that city, even though the purpose of the hearings was to develop information on the leadership, activities, the strategy and tactics, of the important Northern California District of the Communist Party.

I may be old fashioned, but I believe that educators have a duty and an obligation to maintain, defend and strengthen any society, culture and government that gives them the freedom and the opportunity to search for truth, to teach, and entrusts to their care the education of its youth. Certainly, they have no right to use their position and their freedom to mislead youth and to assist in the destruction of that society, culture and government at the hands of a criminal international conspiracy which is a dedicated enemy of political, academic and intellectual freedom. For them to do so knowingly is intolerable. That some do it unwittingly is deplorable.

Just what are these professors up to? What are they trying to bring about?

I will tell you what will have been accomplished, with their help, if the committee is abolished.

They have charged over and over again that the committee has no useful purpose, that it has not fulfilled its primary function of recommending legislation in the area of its jurisdiction, that it has not even tried to live up to this obligation, but has merely sought to expose as un-American innocent persons whose ideas it does not like.

What is the truth?

Independent studies made by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress reveal that the committee has an impressive legislative record. They reveal that in the years 1941 to 1960 it made 96 separate and distinct legislative recommendations to the Congress, and that 35 of these recommendations have been adopted and are now a part of the body of law of this land which is designed to protect you and the Nation, along with the professors, from the subversive forces of communism.

These studies also reveal that 52 bills and 1 House resolution embodying recommendations made by the committee were pending at the close of the last Congress, the 86th, and that 8 of these bills had been passed by the House although the Senate did not act on them.

Again, these studies reveal that the executive branch of our Government has adopted 13 recommendations of the committee which covered policy matters rather than legislation.

As early as this is in the new Congress, the committee already has before it legislation on more than 30 separate matters.

Many people fail to understand that much legislation in the field of internal security which comes out of other committees is actually based on the work of the Committee on Un-American Activities. Many such bills are recommended by various other committees in every session of the Congress.

The Voorhies Act, or Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1940, has proved to be one of the most effective laws in protecting our country against Communist subversion. That law came out of the Judiciary Committee, yet it was based completely on the investigations and hearings of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

During the last few years the Communists have received a tremendous psuedo-legal assist in their propaganda and agitation campaign to undermine all efforts to uncover and curb their activities. This has been made possible by the fact that, over and over again, the Supreme Court has granted certiorari in contempt cases, even though no substantial new principle of law was at issue in any one of them. Each time a decision has been handed down in these cases, Justices Black and Douglas have delivered

minority, dissenting opinions which are in no way valid or binding. But they have been seized upon by the Communist Party and its fronts and also by some non-Communist newspapers and individuals, and have been repeated and publicized over and over again to create the false and dangerous belief in the minds of many persons that any investigation of communism is unconstitutional, a violation of the Bill of Rights.

To remedy this situation, the chairman of the committee, Mr. WALTER, recently introduced a bill which would require that five members of the Supreme Court must agree before the Court can grant certiorari in such cases. This bill, of course, has been referred to the Judiciary Committee, but it is based on the work and experience of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Let us go back now to the question asked a moment ago. What will they accomplish?

They will have achieved the destruction of the legislative agency that has done more than any other in the history of this country to protect our national security. This is a basic fact and truth that no amount of high-flown words uttered by them can conceal.

There is another thing they will have accomplished. Congressional committees have a vital informing function, associated with but not identical to, their legislative function. This is their duty to shed light, to bring out as much information as possible, on matters of vital national concern.

Without question, communism is such a matter or we would not be gathered here as we are today. I will not attempt to cover in detail the committee's record in this field, but over the years it has published many thousands of pages of hearings, reports, and scholarly works on this subject. I can say without fear of contradiction that there is no agency of Government that has given the Congress, the executive branch, and the people as much authoritative information on communism as has the Committee on Un-American Activities.

A few minutes ago, I mentioned the film "The Spy Next Door" and its writer, Mr. Jerry Ross. One of the committee publications he was given when he visited our offices was a report entitled "Patterns of Communist Espionage," published by the committee in January 1959 and ignored by some newspapers and treated snidely by others. But the State Department, the British and West German Governments, and the Military Assistance Institute, which trains our military attachés for service abroad, have all secured this report in quantity to use it in the training of their foreign service personnel. This is just one example of the service performed by the committee in carrying out its informing functions.

When the committee's enemies are not spreading falsehoods about its legislative record, they talk about its "methods." This is a timeworn tale, but still good for a ride in liberal journals and organizations.

What is the truth about the committee's methods?

Over 15 years ago, in 1945, the committee requested the Brookings Institution in Washington to prepare for it suggested standards for determining un-American activities, in conformity with the Constitution and the committee's enabling resolution. That study was prepared and the recommendations in it have been followed by the committee since that time.

The Committee on Un-American Activities was the first committee in the House to have published rules of procedure. In addition, it abided by those rules for a number of years before they were put in print.

In the 84th Congress, when the House Rules Committee was considering the authorization of one-man subcommittees, the counsel for the Committee on Un-American Activities appeared before that Committee and argued against this step so strongly, and effectively, that the idea was dropped.

Educators are supposed to search for truth. Have they done so in matters pertaining to the committee? Could they have done so and, at the same time, spread so many falsehoods about its legislative record and "methods"? I think the answer to the question is apparent.

Although polls reveal that the committee is overwhelmingly supported by the people in the grassroots of America, a considerable portion of the public is nevertheless misinformed about the committee on these issues. If this were not so, the type of criticism of the committee so frequently made in the press and on public platforms could not, and would not, be made half as often as it is. It is my belief that educators have a responsibility to get the truth across to the public in this area, instead of promoting the false and irresponsible criticisms that so many of them have.

When the American Bar Association urged, not long ago, that the techniques and objectives of communism be taught in our schools, it pointed out that such a program will be "beset with many obstacles."

Some of you may wonder why this should be so. Certainly, you say, we must know our enemy. The greater the number of people who truly understand communism, the greater the chance that freedom will be preserved and communism destroyed—just as, the more we teach about cancer and heart trouble and the more research we do on diseases, the greater the chance there will be of eliminating them.

I think I can safely say that the Committee on Un-American Activities gets more mail from people in all walks of life and in all parts of the country than any other committee on the Hill. For this reason, I have a pretty good idea of what many Americans are thinking on this and other subjects and can vouch for the soundness of the American Bar Association's observation.

Among those who really know communism and could be qualified as experts or authorities on the subject, there is a fear that many teachers just don't know enough about communism to give a realistic course on it and that much work must first be done teaching the teachers. They believe that there has been a failure here on the part of our educators, who are not now ready to do a job they should be able to do.

Some parents are afraid of the idea because they do not understand that what its advocates urge is, as Allen Dulles has said, the "realistic teaching of the history and policies of communism," with emphasis on the realistic. We certainly do not have in mind what could be called a pro-course on communism. We do not advocate the teaching of the noble-sounding claims of Communist propagandists, but rather the truth about Communist practices, its designs for world conquest, its strategy, tactics, crimes, complete immorality, hatred of freedom and other harsh realities about this tremendous power complex which threatens the world.

Among those who understand the type of course contemplated, a good number are wary of those who will do the teaching. They fear what will happen to their sons and daughters if they take a course in communism under certain professors. As the American Bar Association said: "There will be those who fear that a well-meaning program may itself become infiltrated or perverted."

This is not merely because of the statistics I gave earlier about the hundreds of professors who have urged that the Committee on Un-American Activities be abolished, though it is partly for that reason. Rather, it is primarily because it is unfortunately true that a check of the letterheads of the major Communist fronts of today and recent years reveals all too often that educators comprise one of the largest groups—and sometimes the largest group—supporting these organizations. The same is true of the numerous party-line and Soviet-serving statements released during the past two decades. Consistently, educators have been among the largest groups giving support to such documents.

In the spring and summer of 1959, the Committee on Un-American Activities planned hearings in California. Approximately 100 persons were subpenaed to testify in these hearings. Every one was a teacher or employee of an educational system. Eventually, the hearings were called off at the request of the California Teachers' Association, and the information developed by the committee was turned over to the local boards of education for action, also at the request of the teachers' association.

I do not have a complete record of what has happened since then, but I do know that some of the teachers concerned have resigned their positions rather than face an inquiry by their schoolboards; that others have been dismissed after a fair inquiry.

Last summer, at its annual convention, the American Federation of Teachers adopted a resolution urging the committee's abolition and making unfounded charges against it.

Mr. WALTER, the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities, immediately sent a telegram to the federation stating that facts in the hands of the committee contradicted the charges it had made. He invited, and challenged, the federation to present, under oath, evidence of the charges it had made against the committee.

Eight months have gone by since that telegram was sent. To date, no reply has been received. When challenged to substantiate its charges, the teacher group backed down, hoping, apparently, that the committee and everyone else would forget the matter. But the committee has not forgotten it, and I don't believe the American public has either.

What do you suppose the average American parent thinks of facts such as these? Do you wonder that, though they see the logic of teaching the truth about communism and even the need for it, they are wary of the implementation of such a program?

Isn't it natural that they see, and fear, the damage that can be done with the wrong teachers giving such a course?

Those of you in the teaching field may think I am being unduly critical of your profession. I am afraid, however, that many educators have too often been guilty of a rather cavalier attitude toward the people of this country and fuzzy about communism and the welfare of the Nation itself. If this were not so, could there be such strong and widespread feeling in our high school and college faculties against the committee?—which actually means against revealing the truth about homegrown treason, for that is what communism is. The contrast between the "teacher attitude" toward the committee and the attitude of the overwhelming majority of the American people, is one example of how completely out of tune with the public too many educators have been on some vital issues. I am convinced, too, that the fault is not the public's, but rather that of the educators.

Perhaps, for a change, some of our educators should give a little more thought to looking at the mote in their own eye. If they did so, I believe they would see quite a change in the public's attitude toward them.

In closing, I would like to say this: It has not been pleasant for me to say many of the things I have said today about a group that plays so vital a role in our national life and the survival of freedom. But,

though I wish the things I have spoken of did not exist, the fact is that they are all too real and I felt that I should speak of them.

Moreover, I choose this occasion to do so, because I thought it best that they be mentioned before those who are representative of the most responsible and informed element in the educational field, you teachers, professors, and administrators who are here today.

Like most Americans, I have complete faith in the great majority of educators in this country. Like other professions, however, yours is plagued by a vocal, irresponsible minority, which creates a very real public relations problem for all educators.

I think there is only one way you can solve this problem, by being equally vocal and by encouraging many more of your colleagues to be the same way. You must make it clear to the people of this country that this minority is not truly representative of the educational profession—by drowning out its voice with a much larger one.

I realize that, to most of you, teaching is your major interest. You are not anxious to become public agitators, to publicize your names on letterheads, in newspaper ads, and so on. But when Communists, fellow travelers and your irresponsible minority use these legitimate weapons to help to destroy freedom, why should you hesitate to use them to preserve freedom, to defend your country and its institutions?

Of late, the term "the silent generation" has frequently been applied to our youth. I am afraid that for too long, our educators, or at least the best and most responsible element among them, have been silent on too many vital issues, leaving the field of public policy, communism and security wide open to those within your ranks who are actually your enemies and the enemies of your profession.

Again, I urge you to speak up and to get as many of your colleagues as possible to do the same.

Other speakers at this conference have undoubtedly told you that it is very late in the game. They are certainly right. Nevertheless, it is most encouraging that this meeting is taking place, that so many educators who realize their responsibilities are attending it, and steps are being taken to give to the students of America the knowledge they need to preserve the freedoms their forefathers have handed down to them.

I would like to congratulate the sponsors of this conference and all those attending it. A few minutes ago, we saw one kind of "Spy Next Door." We must not forget that in many countries of the world where the people did not wake up until it was too late, there is for every single citizen a "Spy Next Door"— a spy to report his activities and words to "big brother," the totalitarian destroyer of academic freedom and all the freedoms we hold dear. This is a thought we must keep uppermost in our minds and make a guide to our actions—so that communism, the agency which creates such spies, will never dominate the American scene.

Judges and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, the American public will be appreciative of a nonpolitical approach when the administration makes its appointments of judges to fill the 70 new places on the Federal bench.

Surely this is an area where ability is the basic requirement and I commend the editorial that appeared in the New York Times on April 27 to the attention of my colleagues:

JUDGES AND POLITICS

The appointment of judges to fill the new places on the Federal bench is going to prove a test of the administration's capacity to put ability above politics—where that priority is most necessary. Attorney General Kennedy will take a large share of the praise, or blame, for the quality of the judges chosen.

Congress has set a poor example so far in putting politics in its rightful place. The Democratic majority in the last Congress would not approve any of the urgently needed additions to the Federal bench while a Republican was President. Then came the unseemly haste with which the Democratic-controlled Senate rushed through a bill to create 73 new judgeships after Mr. Kennedy took office. Since then the House has passed a measure to add 70 new places.

We doubt that as many as 70 new judges are actually needed. The Judicial Conference, top administration body of the Federal courts, had urged 59 before the Senate voted for 73, though the conference later upped the recommended figure to 69.

The appointments to fill these posts will be the object of far more public, and partisan, scrutiny than usual. Outstanding merit should be the chief if not the only requirement. And we assume that that test will not rule out all Republicans from the President's—and his brother's—lists.

Human Relations Goes to Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. CLARK. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by my colleague from Michigan [Mr. HART] for the March issue of the Committee Reporter, a publication of the American Jewish Committee. This article, entitled "Human Relations Goes to Washington," will be especially pertinent in the months ahead, as we work toward the development of a new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. Senator HART points out that there is need to plan for constructive programs of community relations designed to improve intergroup relations in our urban centers. As we attempt to improve the physical environment in our cities, which will contribute to greater family stability, to better health, to more effective education, then we also have the opportunity to improve the respect which all groups must all have for one another in order to build true communities.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HUMAN RELATIONS GOES TO WASHINGTON
(By Senator PHILIP A. HART, of Michigan)

Along with usual political promises, presidential campaigns have a way of generating an occasional new commitment to a new idea. This last campaign was no exception. The concept of a Department of Urban Affairs was just such an idea and there is good reason to believe it will soon come into being.

The almost fantastic accumulation of problems facing our cities is not, however, simply a matter of physical decay and technological change. These are enormous problems to be sure: housing, highways, schools, water, transportation, and the like. But continuing population growth, on the one hand, and population movement, on the other, have added a social dimension of equal significance.

Consider, for example, that we have become a nation predominantly of "big" cities; about 108 million or 60 percent of our citizens living in 168 standard metropolitan areas. This is a city-dwelling population larger than the national total in 1920. Not only has our farm population been dwindling from about 32 million to around 20 million during the period, but perhaps the most striking feature of this population shift has been the movement of more than two and a half million Negroes from the Old South to the urban orth and West in the decade between 1940 and 1950. This shift has continued into the sixties. Coupled with it is movement in the East of nearly a million Puerto Ricans from the island to the mainland, and in the West the movement of an estimated 2½ million more Spanish-speaking people from Mexico into the States.

Movements of these dimensions had their counterpart earlier in this century, of course, with the immigration waves from central and southern Europe. It was these masses, agrarian in background, limited in education, with their distinctive cultural language and religious differences, who had become the first victims of the urban slum. It was, in fact, by their strong backs, and with their caloused hands that our cities were built. The heightened intergroup tension before and after World War I, the spread of the Ku Klux Klan into the cities culminating in the mass parade of costumed marchers in broad daylight down Pennsylvania Avenue in the Nation's Capital, the intensity of religious hatred in the Al Smith campaign had characterized the problems of urban adjustment being experienced by the immigrant. In similar fashion, new problems arising out of race were to emerge in the cities as World War II got underway.

Problems growing out of religious differences have perhaps disappeared less than they have changed. The metamorphosis from street fights, rock throwing and vandalism, which characterized the economic fears and competitions between groups, to political factionalism and contests for power in the big-city political machines now has moved on to the suburban ramparts of the country club and the industrial or financial board of directors. Thus the problem of attaining full political participation, equal economic status and true social acceptance remains a continuing challenge to this day's city dweller of the second half of the 20th century, of whatever background, old and new alike.

While the facts demonstrated that there is no inherent relationship between poverty and group background, between illiteracy or dependency or crime and such identity, in making this point we have often failed to appreciate that group identity is a concomitant of such problems. We always make the point that racial or religious discriminations often have created a vicious circle forcing continued limitation on the minority group member who, because of lack of education or

status, is forced to remain dependent. But we have failed to emphasize and add that no attack on poverty or crime or slum housing or urban renewal can hope to be very effective without taking into account the factors of racial, religious, and ethnic group interests which are tied into them.

Fortunately, from experience during the past two decades, we know that both skills and knowledge can be developed to deal precisely with those aspects of urban life which have historically been the most explosive—the problems, tensions, and misunderstandings growing out of group differences. In these 20 years some 70 cities have created official committees or commissions on intergroup or human relations. Some 25 States have established such agencies and have organized informally under the Governors' committee on civil rights. Collectively, these units of government now appropriate approximately $5 million for advisory and regulatory services to assist these communities in dealing with these problems. If growth is a measure of success, then this idea is working. It has even found roots in the South with more and more communities setting up interracial study committees in the face of increasing pressure from the new student sit-in movement.

With the creation of a Federal Department of Urban Affairs, happily now at hand, perhaps at long last it will be possible to establish within it a Federal Intergroup Relations Service. Such a unit could function as a national service bureau for local, State, and regional intergroup relations agencies and could work with smaller communities not having their own intergroup relations committees. Perhaps this is what then-Senator Lyndon B. Johnson was reaching for as a concept when he proposed his Federal Community Relations Service. Such a Federal Intergroup Relations Service is consistent with the objectives contained in the Douglas bill for technical assistance in meeting the school desegregation crisis. It simply extends this idea into other issues and other areas. Such a unit could serve as an information clearing house for both public and voluntary intergroup relations agencies; it could provide badly needed consultative services. It could engage in fact gathering and stimulate research as well as providing help in establishing training programs for professional and volunteers in the field, including the sponsorship of pilot projects.

Federal concern with intergroup relations problems is not entirely a new concept. Appropriately, there are intergroup relations officers in the Housing and Home Finance Agency (HHFA), the agency most likely to become the nucleus for the new Urban Affairs Department. There are similar specialists in the Office of Education, the Post Office, the Defense Department, the Department of Labor. What is now needed, additionally, is a service that is directed toward the community.

Because of its strategic location within a Department of Urban Affairs, a national intergroup relations service would be able to cut across various functional areas all of which are manifest in urban problems. Such a service provides a challenging opportunity to bring to bear all the knowledge we have painfully obtained, all the experience and skills we have gained as part of our total attack on the problems of our cities. To fail to see this, to look upon the urban problem as physical and industrial and financial without some realization of this additional and critical aspect, the cities social existence would be short sighted indeed. If ever there was an illustration of what is meant by a "New Frontier" here is one and the opportunity for action is at hand.

NOTE.—Senator PHILIP A. HART, Democrat of Michigan, was elected to the U. S. Senate in 1959 following 4 years as Lieutenant Governor of Michigan. He is a member of the Senate Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency as well as the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure.

Germany's Contributions to Western Unity and Consolidation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the free world continues to rejoice over the tremendous political and economic postwar recovery of Western Germany under the inspiring leadership of Konrad Adenauer. The new Germany has come to be looked upon as one of the strongest bastions of freedom existing outside of the Western Hemisphere. In some respects of foreign policy, in fact, the support of West Germany of anti-Communist programs and policies has been much more closely similar to that of the United States than that of our valued friends in the British Isles.

For the further information of the Congress and the country, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent report on West German progress as provided by the Press and Information Office of the Federal Government.

There being no objection, the bulletin was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GERMANY'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE UNITY AND CONSOLIDATION OF THE WEST

(Activeness and efficiency of the Federal Republic in the frame of NATO, bulletin No. 12 of the Press and Information Office of the Federal Government)

At the beginning of 1961 Franz Josef Strauss, Federal Minister of Defense, held a speech before the Economic Club in New York, in which he declared amongst other things: Our main problem after the war was the mastering of a threatening ghost: the immense rate of unemployment; for there was a state, in which the economic circulation had been interrupted by the Iron Curtain, its vast agrarian surplus territories having been separated and ceded to Poland, a state whose remaining ground had been divided into four occupation areas, hermetically separated from each other. Moreover, all this happened in the same Germany, whose apparatus of production as well as transportation facilities were almost entirely destroyed, while a throng of expellees and refugees overflowed into the western zones of the country. We sat on a tiger, so to speak. For even the bayonets of the occupational forces would have been unable to keep in check the desperate and instigated masses. And moreover, how should we procure lodging and subsistence in this already destroyed country, the population of which had increased by 25 percent within a very short period?

Considering your own strong economy as well as the fact that your country, the United States, is not divided, just imagine what it would mean to you, if you would have to shelter, within a few years, 55 million refugees, deprived of their property, if you would have to incorporate the same in the economic situation and to procure them with homes. The above figure shows clearly the extent of the problem, of course with regard to America's state of affairs, however, please, do not forget the fact that the aforementioned throng of refugees reached such a degree that it would correspond to an immigration rate of 700,000 persons per year to the United States.

And even more drastic picture is obtained, if one starts from the principle that the U.S. economic unity of today would be partitioned as follows: twice the ninth part of the territory to be evacuated of its present population and surrendered to the U.S.S.R., i.e., the States of Washington, Oregon, California, Arizona, Nevada, Idaho, Montana, and Utah. Two further ninth parts of American ground to become a satellite state under Communist control and government, i.e., the States of New Mexico, Colorado, Wyoming, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas. Finally the remaing 5 ninth parts, separated from the ceded areas by an Iron Curtain, would be forced to shelter 40 million people, destitute of goods and homes, as well as to incorporate these in the economic life.

REPULSE OF COMMUNISM BY NONMILITARY MEANS

Owing to the courageous policy of the Adenauer government as well as to the diligence of the German population we finally succeeded in overcoming this problem in the Federal Republic. With it the first great repulse of bolshevism was gained in a fight with nonmilitary means, for, as is well known, wherever misery and chaos are predominant the professional revolutionaries are in clover. In the years between 1949 and 1960 we provided 6.5 million new places in the labor market, and from 1950 to 1960 we built 5.5 million homes and, year by year, we are paying 12.5 percent of our public revenue for welfare work.

We gratefully admit that the assistance of the United States of America as well as the change of policy on the part of the Western occupational forces has helped us to a considerable extent. That is the truth. And it should not be defined as an "economic miracle" but rather as a victory in the struggle against radicalism.

Sierra Leone Gains Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, today marks the entrance into full independence of a new West African nation—Sierra Leone. As one who has followed the steady progress of her people into freedom, I should like to extend my heartfelt congratulations to Prime Minister Sir Milton Margai and Sierra Leone's 2 million citizens.

Founded in 1787, the new nation enjoys strong historical ties with both the United States and Great Britain. Its capital—Freetown—was established to provide freed slaves a home of their own, while the beautiful "Mountains of the Lion" were chosen by the Anti-Slavery Society to settle a number of freed slaves from 18th-century England and America.

After World War II, Great Britain created a Protectorate Assembly, gradually increasing the measure of autonomy exercised by the Sierra Leone Government. Since May 1960 the Prime Minister and his cabinet have enjoyed a large degree of internal self-government. Our every good wish goes out to them for the successful discharge of their new responsibilities. Let us hope that the relationships between our two countries will proceed in ever greater friendship and understanding.

Under unanimous consent I include the following article:

SIERRA LEONE: INDEPENDENCE WITHOUT PAIN

(By Roy Lewis [1])

On April 27, 1961, a new West African nation will enter the stage of world affairs; it will replace South Africa as the 12th member of the British Commonwealth, and will probably become the 100th member of the United Nations. Sierra Leone's coming of age deserves special interest in the United States because its foundation in 1787 is interwoven with the skeins of American history. For the beautiful, thundery "Mountains of the Lion" off the flat mangrove-fringed coasts of West Africa were selected by the Anti-Slavery Society to settle a number of freed slaves from 18th-century England and America. Moreover, its mighty harbor, Freetown, was the base from which Her Majesty's frigates and gunboats intercepted the slave ships and eventually put down the trade.

LOCATION ENHANCES IMPORTANCE

Sierra Leone is a relatively small country by the standard of the independent African countries de l'expression anglaise, as the phrase now goes, but it is well up to the average of the states that have emerged from the break-up of the French colonial empire in Africa. It's population is over 2 million, about the same as its ex-French neighbor, Guinea, and rather larger than that of its other neighbor, Liberia, whose history is also closely associated with the slave trade and the first aspirations of African nationalism. Sierra Leone is smaller than either of its neighbors—about the size of the State of South Carolina; but because it is wedged between two States representing opposite ends of the African political spectrum, it is of some considerable political importance. Its harbor is the finest in West Africa, though the British never made it into the base that the French made of Dakar.

The past always lives to some extent in the present, and Sierra Leone's past cannot be forgotten in considering its potentialities. Though the colony dates from 1787, the country as a whole did not become a British possession until the 1890's, when a large area of the hinterland behind the colony area was declared a protectorate, and treaties were made with about 150 small chieftaincies, belonging to perhaps 20 major tribal and linguistic groupings.

This is important for several reasons. The small colony was, though rather poor, deeply anglicized. The creoles, though almost wholly African in blood (they had some admixture of English and West Indian ancestry), were detribalized, relatively prosperous, sophisticated, and educated. They thought of the tribal Africans as bush savages, and in return were called black Englishmen. The protectorate as such was administered separately from the colony until very recently; English common law and freehold prevailed in the colony, codified native customary law mainly in the protectorate, where land was communally owned and, ironically enough, some local domestic slavery persisted until 1928. For Sierra Leone to become a nation, this division has had to be overcome; the creoles, now only about 80,000 in number, had to become one with the natives and the tribes had to lose their separateness from each other (though this latter process is far from complete). In the past 60 years, the economic process has been one of opening up the interior and uncovering its wealth, both agricultural and mineral, for the good of the whole territory.

BOUNDARIES FIRM

Sierra Leone, physically, is a more soundly delineated area than many African states, for it is bounded by the sea and the crescent of mountains which form the headwaters of its own many fine rivers on the western side, and of the Niger which flows eastward. The country is a vast draining-board tilted toward the Atlantic, well-watered, hot, and so located that it can grow a great range of tropical produce in a varied climate at the junction of the true tropical forest belt and the savannah belt. Ethnically, it is not quite so self-contained, though only one major tribe—the Mende—overlaps largely into neighboring Liberia.

The protectorate was developed, outwards, from Freetown (and Bonthe, a now moribund port). It was slow work, because of the backwardness of the people by European standards, lack of communications, and the difficulty, at first, of finding any export crops; when palm produce became the territory's staple, the prohibition of land alienation left its cultivation entirely to the African chiefdoms, and this was not very efficient. Development was also retarded by World War I, and then by the depression; but in the 1930's, cobalt, diamonds, and iron ore were discovered, and the mining of these, together with the development of new tropical crops—swamp rice, cocoa, coffee, ginger, piassava, benniseed, etc.—began rapidly to transform the country, a process which received immense impetus after the war, when diamonds were found not to be confined to the single area, Kono, where they were first discovered, but all down the estuaries of the rivers that drain the country.

This rapid economic growth, though painful in many ways, transformed the country politically. First of all, it put wealth into the hands of the tribes of the hinterland, so that the creoles became, in many ways, the poor relations. Secondly, this wealth began to break up the bonds of tribalism, further undermining the foundations of chieftaincy which British rule was already transforming. Thirdly, in letting news, movement, and ideas flow in the protectorate, it spread the gospel of African nationalism—which at first was taken up by creole intellectuals, who became the first teachers of the tribesmen. A strong protectorate movement, headed by some of the chiefs, began to press for more responsible rule and for freedom—not merely from British control, but more particularly from "creole" privilege in Freetown and the colony area.

After World War II, Britain acknowledged the propriety of all this, and set up a protectorate assembly; the colony, like nearly all British colonies in the West Indies and elsewhere, had had a measure of popular representation from the nineteenth century. In the past decade, Sierra Leone's political history has been the usual British colonial one of a succession of constitutions, each more liberal than the last, paving the way steadily towards fully democratic institutions and independence, under the pressure of a nationalist party. But in Sierra Leone this has been complicated (as in Ghana it was not) by jealousies between the creole-ruled colony and the protectorate.

It is the signal triumph of the present Prime Minister, Sir Milton Margai, that in the building of the nationalist party (the Sierra Leone Peoples' Party), he has successfully brought together the majority of the creoles, the traditional chiefs, and the politically-conscious masses of the protectorate. His work of unification is an astonishing political feat, and it alone entitles "the doctor" (as he is affectionately called—he is, in fact, an Edinburgh-trained medical practitioner) to be described as father of his country. He is a Mende.

A UNITARY STATE

Sierra Leone has developed, under British tutelage, as a unitary country like Ghana, not a federal state on the Nigerian pattern. The creoles have retained, however, a certain advantage in representation, and the chiefs also have a reserved place in the assembly; if this is not an exact one-man one-vote equal-district type of representation on the Westminster model (and therefore much criticized by the young radicals), it in fact is not far off it, and takes account of historical factors that cannot yet be ignored.

In the final phase before independence, which has lasted since May 1960, the Governor has only had minimum reserved powers, and Sir Milton has run the country with a cabinet drawn from both the SLPP and the opposition factions. The existence of one small opposition group, not represented in the prevent government, preserves the essentials of a party system—so far at least. Parallel with this constitutional development has gone the steady "africanization" of the civil service, as fast as the growth of schools and higher education permitted. Sierra Leone's Fourah Bay University—the first institution of higher education in Africa—was founded as a college in 1824 by the Church Missionary Society and raised to full university status in 1960.

Economically, the country has done well, and is now fairly prosperous. Its annual budget is around $30 million; its exports from January to September 1960 were $51,849,076 and its imports, $53,189,480—a rapid increase since 1947. In addition to the minerals mentioned above, rutile has been discovered and is being worked, and bauxite is being investigated, but iron and diamonds remain the twin pillars of the state.

Unquestionably, Sierra Leone needs a great deal of development capital. The extension of its iron extraction industry from Marampa to Tonkolili was unduly delayed (in favor, ironically, of the development of Guinea's hematite ores), and much exploration needs to be done. It is vital that national wealth should expand if the needs of a growing population are to be accommodated, if creative work is to be provided for the young people flowing from the new schools, and if the expansion of education, health, and welfare services is to be sustained.

DIAMONDS BRING CHANGES

The great diamond boom has awakened Sierra Leone, once so sleepy, Victorian and conservative, fully into the modern world. Independence, which has ben achieved rapidly, yet with skill and a minimum of disturbances (there have been some), brings a new challenge.

Though in politicians such as his brother Albert Margai, Minister of Natural Resources, Foreign Minister John Karefa-Smart, Minister of Finance Muhammad Sanusi Mustapha, and a dozen others, Sir Milton has a good team, there is still a severe shortage of administrative talent. British expatriates, if in diminishing numbers, will be needed to serve the state for some time in the departments, and technicians may be needed from abroad in increasing numbers, despite the growing outturn of trained Africans from Fourah Bay and British and American universities.

In any analysis of the outlook for Sierra Leone, two dangers that it may be delicate

[1] Roy Lewis, formerly chief African correspondent of the London Economist, is the author of the definitive book on Sierra Leone, "Sierra Leone: A Modern Portrait" (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1954). Mr. Lewis has recently taken over as head of the Economist's Washington, D.C., office.

to mention ought to be faced. One is internal. The great diamond boom, and the vast smuggling racket that burgeoned from its mishandling in 1953–56, put immense wealth into the hands of the Lebanese and Syrian trading community. This community is not noted for its wisdom or public spirit, and is concerned to keep its gains less by wise entrepreneurship than by judicious influencing of local African leaders. These may not be wholly taken in; but the fact remains that, the British having egregiously failed to make the Lebanese community pay its full share of the tax burden, the Africans must now do so—or risk becoming puppets of an expatriate plutocracy. The Lebanese have performed a valuable role in the Sierra Leone economy—but today they risk becoming an object of jealousy and dislike as a barrier to African traders.

GUINEA WOULD INFLUENCE

The second danger is external, and is complementary to the first: Guinea has certainly every intention of exerting increasing influence on its neighbor, which it regards as very backward in terms of Africanism. Sierra Leone has free institutions—a British-type judiciary, a representative house with an opposition, a free (if inadequate) press, a western tradition more deeply rooted than in most parts of Africa. But is this enough? Young Sierra Leonians, educated abroad and sensitive of Africa's revolution, are restive and critical; since they will soon be in politics, the days of moderation may be numbered. The Soviets are concentrating their efforts in making Guinea a "show place." There will be a very direct rivalry and contrast between Guinea and Sierra Leone in the next few years, between the fruits of the democratic, liberal, British-colonial and Commonwealth method, and the authoritarian (though also African) method of Sekou Toure and his colleagues.

To sustain its sovereignty—including its small army and its new diplomatic establishment—Sierra Leone will need an expanding budget, and more external aid than the £7,500,000 which Britain gave it as a farewell present. What will take the place of the colonial development and welfare funds which now automatically cease? To pay for the heavy cost of economic, and social development—even now, barely 5 percent of the former protectorate people are literate, compared with 80 percent or so in the former colony—swift aid, in loans and technical assistance, are required. In my view, the most vital sectors are education—where the need is greatest for teachers and teacher training—and agriculture. Despite a good deal of agricultural progress, especially in mechanized swamp rice cultivation, the export potential is far from realized, while the many unsolved problems of keeping tropical land fertile cry for urgent investigation. A series of comprehensive studies has been made; what is now needed is men, organization, energy—and money.

SIERRA LEONE

Capital: Freetown (population 100,000).

Area: 27,924 square miles (colony, 256 square miles; protectorate, 26,669 square miles).

Population: 2,260,000 (mid-1958 estimate).

Official language: English (Mende is the principal local language in the south, and Temme in the north).

Imports, 1958: £23,950,000, chiefly manufactured goods, machinery, fuel oils, cement.

Exports, 1958: £19,600,000, chiefly diamonds, iron ore, palm kernels, coffee, cocoa, kola nuts.

Budget, 1959–60: revenue, £11,488,000; expenditures, £12,286,000.

Principal occupation: agriculture.

A Healthy Agriculture Is Necessary for a Healthy National Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, when Orville Freeman, our new Secretary of Agriculture, testified before the House Agriculture Committee on the new omnibus farm bill, he described the scope of the proposed measure. He also stressed the great need for this legislation in the interest of a healthy agriculture and a healthy national economy. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a portion of his statement in the RECORD.

SCOPE AND URGENCY OF NEW FARM LEGISLATION

In opening the discussion of the Agricultural Act of 1961, I should like to first, describe briefly the scope of the provisions encompassed in the bill as a whole; and second, emphasize the urgency of this legislation.

I. SCOPE

This bill encompasses several different program areas, but they are all essential parts of achieving the goal of the best possible utilization of our agricultural abundance to contribute to the national well-being under conditions that will enable farmers to achieve a fair income.

One part of the bill is directed toward greater consumption of farm products—toward expanding our exports and improving our programs to meet human needs and promote economic development in the emerging nations. This is an essential part of our agricultural program to adjust our agricultural abundance to meet the needs and conditions of our times. We need to expand our exports as well as our efforts to provide an adequate nutritional base for all Americans. And this expanded utilization of farm products must be taken into account in our plans for adjusting production to the quantities and kinds of agricultural products that we can use.

Another part of the bill relates to agricultural credit, and is directed toward enabling all our family farmers to benefit from the improvements contemplated in the farm program, to strengthen the position of family farmers, and to enable them to make their maximum contribution to the Nation's economic growth.

Still another part emphasizes the assurance that farmers' cooperatives will have the legal protection they need to grow and prosper in our modern economy, and by that growth to enable them to make a greater contribution to the economic well being of their members.

The longest portion of the bill, title 1, relates to supply adjustment and price stabilization. It provides the procedures and the machinery whereby farmers can work together, in cooperation with government, to adjust their production to modern needs and conditions; and thereby to achieve for themselves fair incomes, as they make available to consumers adequate supplies at fair prices.

We believe that all these program areas should be treated together as they are combined in this bill, for the failure to act affirmatively in any one of these areas is to cut away one important support of the total program for agriculture.

II. URGENCY

I believe that the early enactment of this legislation is imperative in the interest of farmers, consumers, taxpayers, and the economy as a whole. Its urgency is highlighted by several factors.

This legislation is urgent because the decline in farm income must be reversed

The decline in farm income in recent years need not be spelled out for members of this committee. You are well aware of the facts. But I assure you that it needs to be presented to others. Nothing has impressed me more, during my 3 months in this office, than the extent to which the nonfarm public is unaware of the critically low level of farm income. Emphasis on surplus and subsidy have clouded the true facts.

The annual per capita income of farm people averaged $966 in 1960—only 43 percent of the average of $2,282 received by the nonfarm population. This is a substantial drop from the 1947–49 period, in which the per capita annual income of farm people was about 58 percent of the per capita nonfarm income. Thus, the disparity in income has been increasing, at the expense of the producers of our most essential human needs, at the expense of those whose productive efficiency has made us the best fed people in the world.

Farmers' realized net income from farming in 1960 totaled $11.6 billion, which is a decline of 26 percent from the 1947–49 average. It is true that there are fewer farms today, and therefore the decline in net income per farm is not quite that much. But in 1960 the net income per farm from farming, after adjustment for price level changes, was 20 percent below the 1947–49 average.

	1947–49 average	1960	Percent change
Realized net income from farming (billion)	$15.7	$11.6	−26
Realized net farm income per farm (1960 dollars)	3,224	2,568	−20

These income declines result largely from a 12-percent reduction in average prices received by farmers from the 1947–49 average and a 20-percent rise in prices paid for items used in family living and in farm production. As the result, the parity ratio, which measures the relative price position of farmers, declined from 108 in 1947–49 to 80 in 1960—a drop of 26 percent.

	1947–49 average	1960	Percent change
Prices received by farmers (1910–14=100)	271	238	−12
Prices paid, interest, taxes, and wage rates (1910–14=100)	250	299	20
Parity ratio (1910–14=100)	108	80	−26

Income declines over the past decade have not been the same for all classes of farms. But net incomes in 1960 of representative commercial poultry farms in New Jersey, of representative wheat-fallow farms in the Pacific Northwest, of representative wheat-small grain-livestock farms in the northern plains, and representative cash grain farms in the Corn Belt, all were down to between 20 and 30 percent below the 1947–49 level.

In short, all income data indicates that farm incomes have declined in absolute terms during the 1950's, as other incomes were rising. Thus, in comparison with nonfarm incomes, the comparative position of farm incomes has worsened steadily. These declines have occurred even with the farm programs that have been in force. They are

not going to improve by talking and wishing. They are going to improve only as we take positive action to raise them. Any further delay would have serious consequences, not only to farmers, but to the rest of the economy.

This legislation is urgent in the interest of a healthy national economy

It should be self-evident that a stable, prosperous, and growing agricultural economy is absolutely essential to a stable, prosperous, and growing national economy. But, since this fact is not adequately recognized, I should like to review the contributions that a strong, growing agricultural economy can make to a growing national economy.

There is not an industry or a person in the United States who is not touched in some way by what happens in agriculture. A survey some 5 years ago showed that farmers and their families represented a market for $40 billion of purchases from the economy. Farm families buy the goods and services we all do as consumers. Farmers as business men buy the products of industry in order to produce. When farmers are prosperous—when their incomes grow along with incomes in the rest of the economy—the industries which service them benefit, and the workers employed in these industries benefit. Disadvantaged agriculture means disadvantaged industry and unemployment. For example, farmers spend some $2½ to $3 billion annually for tractors, motor vehicles, and farm machinery. Agriculture is a big market for these items. But agriculture hasn't grown in recent years and we all know that there is distressing unemployment in our key centers of the automobile industry today.

I could recite many facts on how important agriculture and our farm people are to our everyday economic activities: that farmers consume 320 million pounds of rubber, about 9 percent of the total amount of rubber used in the United States; that farmers purchase products involving 6½ million tons of finished steel; that farmers buy 45 million tons of chemical materials; that farmers buy 18 billion gallons of petroleum, more than is used by any other single industry; that farmers use more kilowatt hours of electricity than is used by Chicago, Detroit, Baltimore, and Houston combined.

The point I am making is that when agriculture hurts a lot of other people hurt—whether they live and work in the small rural communities or in the big manufacturing centers far removed from the farm production line. Farmers have a big potential for helping the Nation achieve a faster rate of economic growth and a higher rate of employment. But this will flow only from basic improvement on the farm.

The farm problem is closely related to the problem of unemployment. Workers released from agriculture by technological advances have not been able to find suitable employment in the nonfarm sector and there has been a damming up of labor with the consequent underemployment in agriculture. Next, the low gross returns received by agricultural producers have seriously restricted the market for machinery and equipment, lumber and construction supplies, and operating items such as gasoline, fertilizer, and pesticides. Finally, the low and inadequate net incomes earned by farm families has restricted the market for consumer durables and convenience goods and thus placed a brake upon the full production of these goods and services in the nonfarm sector.

These interindustry relations must be corrected and brought into balance as a means of contributing to overall economic development. We believe that the passage of the Agricultural Act of 1961 will make a significant contribution to the reestablishment of a set of economic relations between the farm and nonfarm sectors of the economy which will contribute to sustained economic growth.

Our New Secretary of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article on Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, which appeared in a recent issue of the Catholic Reporter, published in Kansas City, Mo., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

And may I say that this article about one of Minnesota's outstanding sons was written by another Minnesotan of whom we are also proud, Richard T. Greer, assistant librarian of the Senate Library.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(By Richard T. Greer)

"And I must say the Secretary of Agriculture is working overtime," said President Kennedy at his second press conference. In office only 9 days, Mr. Kennedy had discovered that Orville Lothrop Freeman, the 16th, the youngest and in some respects the unlikeliest Secretary of Agriculture, is a young man in a hurry.

The new administration is nearly 2 months old and the lights continue to burn brightly in the Independence Avenue office of the Agriculture Secretary long past midnight. For his is a formidable and perhaps the most thankless task of all those of the New Frontier.

The fact that he is not himself a farmer, is indeed city born and raised, and is a lawyer-politican suggests to some critics that he is hardly qualified for this most difficult of cabinet posts. But as a three-term Governor of one of the country's leading agricultural States, Orville Freeman is hardly a babe in the woods when it comes to agriculture and its problems.

He knows that the problems he has inherited from a harassed but proud predecessor are viewed by many old political hands as largely unsolvable. He has few illusions about the "mess" in agriculture. Yet he has grasped the reigns of command over the vast and bureaucratic Department of Agriculture with a zest which not a few Members of Congress have greeted with enthusiasm.

"As Secretary," Freeman has said, "I'm going to be selling agriculture." So far two fundamental judgments appear to underpin this salesmanship: the success of American agriculture, and the blessings of our agricultural abundance.

With regard to the first, he puts it this way: "We work less and less and less to eat better and better and better, and the most dramatic success story of the American economy and its productivity, the genius of organization and production, is agriculture * * * and yet somehow we have drifted off where we consider this is a great problem. It is a great success."

While the Nation eats better for less than any other people in the world, the former Minnesota Governor argues, the overwhelming number of farmers who make it possible barely make ends meet. Indeed, farmers have been subsidizing consumers, rather than the other way around.

The blessings of our abundance? "In agriculture, as in so many other things, we live in an age of abundance. Any nation that does not learn to use its abundance for the good of men will fail." He therefore will urge that more food be sent abroad to the world's needy, that other prosperous countries share this burden, that organizations such as the United Nations FAO participate more fully, and that existing machinery to carry on this task be strengthened and expanded.

One midwestern Senator, obviously pleased with these views, told his colleagues it was great to have, at long last, an Agriculture Secretary who believes in going to bat for the American farmer. And from a southerner: "I am happy to see someone come to Washington who makes it his No. 1 objective to try to help the farmers."

Actually, Ezra Taft Benson disagreed little with these Freeman principles. But it is also a well-known fact that though many American farmers agreed with Benson's approach to agriculture, they nevertheless thought he was on the other side—against the farmer. Freeman knows his farm policy proposals will never get off the ground without substantial support from farmers and their farm organizations. Thus he hopes to convince them early he's on their side.

For example, he contends that the American farmer has been the victim of unfair public criticism, among other reasons, because of governmental bookkeeping practices. Farmers are charged in the agriculture budget with a number of expenditures which by no means benefit them alone.

The costs of the school lunch program and Government purchase and distribution of food for the needy in this country should not be part of agriculture's budget. Nor should the costs of selling our surpluses abroad be borne by the American farmer, he points out, since the currencies received are subsequently turned over to other departments and agencies such as the State Department for the construction of embassies abroad or the Defense Department for the construction of military housing abroad.

Furthermore, loans made to, say, the Rural Electrification Administration are repaid in full with interest. Why lump them in with other expenditures? Other items, says Freeman, such as the annual $50 million subsidy to the American merchant marine and $20 million for the purchase of dairy products for the Defense Establishment are charged to agriculture. All in all, over $3 billion of the $6 billion Department budget are used for benefits that accrue to others than the farmer.

But there are tougher and more immediate problems that cry for solution—dwindling farm income, increasing Federal expenditures and mounting surpluses. "I don't come to Washington with all the answers," he remarked to a reporter upon his arrival in Washington. "For quite a while I want to do a lot of listening and not much talking."

In January he listened to the Tower of Babel views of the leading farm organizations at two conferences. He has been dutifully consulting farm-State members of Congress of both parties.

In many ways, Freeman is the exact opposite of Ezra Taft Benson. Unlike either Benson or his boss President Eisenhower—both of whom disdained politics—he is, like President Kennedy, first of all a politician. And unlike conservative Benson, the new Secretary is an unabashed liberal. The former's conservatism found expression in

his advocacy of a return to free-market policies. The latter's liberalism inclines him to use "governmental machinery wherever needed * * *, unhampered by either the worship of the free market or fear of subsidy."

Freeman's gerat-grandfather, Gus Johnson, came to Minnesota from Sweden in the middle of the 19th century. The frustrations of living with so many other Johnsons—getting the wrong mail or pay envelope—caused him to become a "freeman" in name as well as in fact. During his many statewide campaigns in Minnesota, candidate Freeman found it expedient to remind his Scandinavian audiences of this family ancestry.

The Agriculture Secretary was born in Minneapolis 42 years ago. As a student at the University of Minnesota during Franklin Roosevelt's second term, he shared with his new friend, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, the ferment and unrest of that period. He was president of the all-university council and a letterman on the famous Gopher football squads of those years. He received his bachelor's degree magna cum laude and also a Phi Beta Kappa key. "Even then," Senator HUMPHREY recalls, "Orville was a demon for work. He always had about four jobs, in addition to getting top grades in school."

HUMPHREY and Freeman became convinced that in political action lay the best hope to combat the depression. But the Democratic Party in Minnesota was an impotent third in the struggle for political office. Even the stronger Farmer-Labor Party had fallen on bad days. They decided a marriage of the two was the only road to political victory in the State. Their strategy was proved correct by the election of HUMPHREY to the U.S. Senate and, in time, Freeman's election to the Governor's chair.

Meantime the war came and Freeman was off to the Marines. In 1943 while leading a patrol on a South Pacific island, the left side of his face was shattered by an enemy sniper's bullet. For 8 months he lay in a hospital, his speech seriously impaired. A politician unable to speak passably is little better off than a pianist without an arm. But hard work and a Demosthenese-like determination ultimately paid off. Today he is a first rate public speaker.

After the war Freeman picked up his law degree and became assistant in charge of veterans' affairs to the mayor of Minneapolis—HUBERT H. HUMPHREY. He also served as HUMPHREY's Civil Service Commission chairman.

The now-merged Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party took on a decidedly left-wing complexion in the early postwar years. Progressives, Communists, and others of similar persuasions found in the Humphrey-Freeman team an implacable enemy. After 2 bloody years of political in-fighting, which provided a considerable education in the rough and tumble of political brawling, the undesirables were purged, yet the liberal complexion of the party was preserved.

Did Kennedy offer Freeman the Agriculture Secretary job first? Perhaps not, but if others turned it down because of the trials and frustrations suffered by Mr. Benson, who was Washington's favorite political target, Orville Freeman welcomed the challenge—and besides, he was out of work at the moment, for he had just suffered a sharp defeat in his try for an unprecedented fourth term as Governor of Minnesota.

He had some hesitancy about accepting, he recalls, but after considerable soul-searching and consultation with his wife and two teenage children, he decided he was "anxious to have the opportunity."

Freeman begins with an important advantage that Benson did not have for 6 of his 8 years in Washington. He has a friendly party in control of Congress where new farm policies ultimately must be approved.

Thus far his reception on Capitol Hill has been warm and perhaps even sympathetic. Many old-time members have been secretaries come and go, and they know full well the problems confronting this young man. Realists that they are, they are not lyrically hopeful that things will get better before they get worse. But they know, too, what astute political leadership can do, and they look with quiet expectation upon Orville Freeman.

A recent report prepared for the new administration by a special task force makes gloomy reading for Freeman and his advisers. Total farm output will continue to rise faster than consumption, surpluses will continue to accumulate in Government warehouses, and the yearly cost to the Government will continue to range from $2 to $4 billion, says the report.

Adjusting agricultural production to demand, it contends, will in the long run depend upon other than specific farm policies. It will depend largely upon "the achievement of a vigorous rate of growth for the rest of the economy and availability of nonfarm jobs."

That farmers in greater numbers are seeking nonfarm employment at a time when the national unemployment total rises alarmingly is verified by the recent 5-year farm census. In 1959, for example, 45 percent of all farmers did some off-farm work, and 3 out of 10 worked at off-farm jobs more than 100 days. Thus farm employment problems further aggravate the larger unemployment crises.

At the same time, the revolution in farm technology shows few signs of tapering off. During the past 5 years, according to the census report, "greater changes in farms and agriculture (have occurred) than for any other 5-year period recorded by a nationwide census."

To the task of grappling with these problems, Secretary Freeman brings some impressive assets. For one thing, he has, as even his critics concede, a first-rate mind. (A spokesman for the American Farm Bureau, the country's largest farm organization which is largely unsympathetic to the New Frontier, said Freeman was probably "the best of the men Kennedy could have chosen. He's not a meathead, that's for sure.")

As a former Governor, he also brings a record of genuine achievement in good government. Each of his six budgets was in balance, and though he increased State expenditures on all levels of education, welfare, and rehabilitation, he also raised the revenues to pay the bill.

And he brings to his new job a remarkable administrative ability. No scandal marred his administration. As Governor, he simultaneously raised wages of State employees and cut superfluous fat out of some State functions. Budget-minded Members of Congress are of course delighted to turn such talent loose in the Agriculture Department, which, like an iceberg, has on view in Washington a fraction of its total body.

A policy resolution of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference last year stressed the overriding need to preserve the basic family farm structure of American agriculture if the cultural, religious, and social values of the rural way of life are to survive. Freeman couldn't agree more. In Minnesota, his policies were designed to protect these farms rather than the larger corporate enterprises. However, he believes the family farm competes successfully in the majority of instances with what is called corporate farming.

What general approach to our agricultural problems will the new administration take? Though the President's farm message has not yet been sent to Congress (at this writing), some hint of its directions can be gleaned from the views of Willard W. Cochrane, currently Freeman's top adviser and former professor of agricultural economics at the University of Minnesota.

Cochrane's farm philosophy can be summed up in the term "managed abundance." In his words, it means this: "By supply control I mean the conscious adjustment of supply to demand, commodity by commodity, year after year, to yield prices in the market that have already been determined fair by some responsible agency."

Underlying this approach is the judgment that previous farm programs have failed to sustain reasonable prices and control surplus production. Our current surpluses are in wheat and feed grains. The wheat surplus we now have would satisfy domestic requirements for about 2½ years; other surplus grains equal about a half-year's production.

Freeman points out, however, there is no surplus of protein foods such as meats, oils and fats which must now be purchased on the open market by the Government for school lunch programs, welfare programs, and distribution to destitute families.

A similar situation of oversupply of some products and undersupply of others exists in the world market, he contends. But we dare not dump our grain surpluses on the world market without fear of disrupting the markets of friendly nations such as Canada. Yet many items not in oversupply here would sell readily on world markets, items such as nonfat dried milk.

The managed abundance approach would seek to cut surpluses not readily usable either domestically or in foreign markets and would foster greater production of those products in steady demand at home and abroad.

As a preliminary, the Agriculture Secretary has already set in motion a broad inventory of both domestic and world food and fiber needs. Presumably from this knowledge intelligent engineering of production in this country can be undertaken by the Government.

Can it be done without far more Federal control and direction than we have had in recent years? Will it not require infinitely varied and complex policies and programs? And will the farmer accept it, even with better prices for his products? What about the consumer? Critics argue that he is going to be saddled with higher prices at the food market with this kind of program. And lastly, what about Congress? Will it give such broad powers to the President and his Secretary of Agriculture?

At this point, only one thing seems clear, Orville L. Freeman will be walking an exceedingly thorny path this year and perhaps those to come.

Authorization for Sale of Agricultural Commodities

SPEECH

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4728) to amend title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, apropos the colloquy which just occurred, it came to my attention this week through having a caller on behalf of India regarding

India's desire to have us grant her a portion of our off-shore sugar allotment in the coming long-range sugar program. I told this very fine young man that I had always had none but the friendliest feelings for the great country of India. They are accepting our bounty. It is freely given in the form of the contract our chairman mentioned a few minutes ago concerning wheat. We are in the process of giving wheat to India in substantial quantities over an extended period of time. I had not known of this proposition the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] mentioned, that they turned right around and were buying planes from the Soviets. I would not imagine that we would give India a sugar quota, but it does seem to me that it is high time we in the Congress knew what is going on. I think we have every right in these negotiations to be called in, however, as I have heard it expressed a number of times in the past, it seems we are called in not at the beginning but only at the crash landings.

Israel's 13th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, April 20 marked the 13th anniversary of the birth of the State of Israel. The 13th year is highly significant in the tradition of the Hebrew people. It is on that birthday that a young lad enters on the threshold of maturity with concomitant charges of responsibility.

The growth of Israel toward this kind of symbolic maturity is reflected in the basic facts of Israel's economic life. Whereas in 1948 Israel had a population of 790,000, in 1960 its population was 2,128,000; industrial production hardly existed but in 1960 the figure was $1,070 million. So it is with exports, imports, agricultural production, irrigation, afforestation, water usage, and so forth. More specifically, exports in 1948 amounted to $29,680,000 and in 1960 amounted to $265 million; in 1948 there were only 412,000 acres of cultivated area and in 1960 there were 1,100,000 acres. Today Israel has a fleet of 53 ships which carries 445,000 tons of cargo as compared with the 4 ships she had in 1948, which carried a total of 14,000 tons. The number of Israeli teachers has quadrupled in the same period and its elementary school education has increased almost six times.

We must keep in mind that Israel's infancy was a cruel and troubled time. The barren soil, the absence of industry, the influx of immigrants, the war with the Arabs and the continued hostility of its neighbors were the heaviest of burdens to place in the path of a newborn. But the determination was there and the most important of all resources, men and women, whose daily lives were dedicated to the rearing of this infant without counting the cost of the individual's deprivations and sufferings.

It is little wonder then, that the little country of Israel has been watched with consuming interest by economists, social scientists and educators throughout the world. At its very beginnings there were few who believed that Israel would survive. There are now many who are studying to find the why of its survival.

Israel has become a factor in the rising nations of Africa. By that I mean not the mere establishment of trade relations but the serving of these nations by teaching them the use of methods and tools which have profited Israel herself. This has been done quietly and effectively and in the best tradition of international relations. And this has all been done within the framework of a working democracy. It is understandable then that the world, both hostile and friendly to Israel, marvels at the achievements of this nation only 13 years of age.

May 1 Proclaimed as Industry Day in Pennsylvania by Gov. David L. Lawrence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter, dated April 18, 1961, which I received from Mr. H. Thomas Hallowell, Jr., president of the Standard Pressed Steel Co. of Jenkintown, Pa., and regional vice president of the National Association of Manufacturers, with which he forwarded a copy of Governor Lawrence's proclamation designating May 1, 1961, as Industry Day in Pennsylvania, as well as additional material associated with that designation.

The indicated material follows:

STANDARD PRESSED STEEL CO.,
Jenkintown, Pa., April 18, 1961.

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: You will be interested to know that Gov. David L. Lawrence has proclaimed May 1, 1961, as Industry Day in Pennsylvania. A copy of the Governor's proclamation and other materials sent to press and publicity media in the State are enclosed for your further information.

Sole purpose of the observance of Industry Day, planned by the initial sponsoring organizations as an annual custom—is to call the attention of the public to industry's contribution to our American life, its qualities as a good neighbor in the community, and its potential for providing all people an ever-richer, fuller life.

We have had Labor Day on our national calendar since 1882. Unlike Labor Day, however, Industry Day is not planned as a holiday. It was conceived as a working celebration.

The selection of the date, May 1, for this observance and recognition is most appropriate, in my opinion, in that it is a perfect counterstrategem to the Communist observance on this day. The observance will also call to mind that the use of capital in the form of plants and tools, provided by savings, makes jobs which grow where an unfavorable climate does not exist, and in which we all have a part as citizens, management, labor, Government, and communities.

Because of the nearness of the date, Industry Day this year will be, of necessity, on a limited basis. But with the date now officially on the Commonwealth's calendar, plans are being formulated for a full-scale promotion of the May 1, 1962 observance, to include at local levels across the State, company-guided tours and open houses, complete newspaper, radio, and television coverage, display advertisements, displays of locally manufactured products in banks and store windows, and similar promotion, all pointing up the important role of industry in our daily life.

Sincerely yours,

H. THOMAS HALLOWELL, Jr.,
President, Regional Vice President, NAM.

PROCLAMATION—INDUSTRY DAY, MAY 1961

Whereas this Commonwealth's industries provide gainful employment for the largest single group of its citizens, and therefore constitute the State's primary economic resource; and

Whereas in this industrial State, it is industry through the teamwork of investors, management, and employees which provides the driving force to the Commonwealth's economy, and makes possible our high standard of living; and

Whereas the success of this Commonwealth's industrial community is in the widest public interest because it has a direct relationship to the personal welfare of all our citizens; and

Whereas a favorable industrial environment is essential to the expansion of existing industry and to the attraction of new industry to the State; and

Whereas the Commonwealth is constantly striving to improve the environment in which the industrial community operates and to increase the property of our State and raise the standard of living of all our citizens: *Now, therefore,* I, David L. Lawrence, Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, in cooperation with these efforts, do hereby set aside May 1, 1961, as Industry Day and respectfully request that the Commonwealth's industrial and business community, civic and fraternal organizations, educational institutions, and public and private communications media, share in the observance of these mutually beneficial objectives.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State, at the city of Harrisburg, this 23d day of March, in the year of our Lord, 1961, and of the Commonwealth the 158th.

DAVID L. LAWRENCE, *Governor.*

By the Governor:

———,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

HARRISBURG.—Gov. David L. Lawrence today set Monday, May 1 as Industry Day in Pennsylvania.

In a statement, the Governor said "Pennsylvania has long ranked as one of the world's great industrial areas. We are proud of our industrial heritage and the part our manufacturing plays in the Nation's overall economy.

"The latest McGraw-Hill report shows that Pennsylvania ranks third in the Nation in industrial building contracts for 1960, trailing only Texas and Ohio. Industrial construction totaled more than $176 million this past year.

"This shows, beyond doubt, that industry finds Pennsylvania's tax climate favorable for both location and expansion. Perhaps most important is the fact that this industrial construction includes projects undertaken by a wide variety of industries—ranging from the small, local firm to the best known of the Nation's manufacturing and distribution giants.

"Through the observance of Industry Day I hope that public attention will be drawn to the great economic and social contributions industries have made to the American way of life.

"I am, therefore, designating Monday, May 1, 1961 as Industry Day in Pennsylvania. I urge all industrial and community leaders to cooperate in planning appropriate local participation in this statewide event."

Pennsylvania manufacturing employs nearly 1½ million men and women who receive salary and wages aggregating approximately $7 billion.

Latest available statistics disclose that manufacturing industries of Pennsylvania produce over $26 billion worth of products per year. New capital invested by these industries in the State amount to over $690 million annually.

In addition, nonmanufacturing industry, of all types, contributes additional billions in payrolls and wealth to the State's total economy.

Industry Day in Pennsylvania was inaugurated and is cosponsored by the following organizations: The State department of commerce; Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce; Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association; National Association of Manufacturers; and the Pennsylvania Newspaper Publishers' Association.

William R. Davlin, secretary of the department of commerce, is chairman of the Industry Day in Pennsylvania Committee. Others serving on the committee are John H. Seeton, secretary of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association; Bernard S. Payne and James Coffey, regional managers of the National Association of Manufacturers; Arnold L. Edmonds, executive director of the Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce; and G. Richard Dew, general manager of the Pennsylvania Newspaper Publishers' Association.

INDUSTRY DAY IN PENNSYLVANIA—FACT SHEET

Date: Monday, May 1, 1961.

Sponsors: Department of Commerce, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce, National Association of Manufacturers, Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association, Pennsylvania Newspaper Publishers' Association.

Chairman: William R. Davlin, secretary of the Department of Commerce of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Purpose: To recognize and call public attention to the importance of industry's contribution to the American way of life and to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in particular; to its qualities as a good neighbor in the community; and to its potential for providing all people with an ever-richer, fuller life.

History: This is the first of Industry Days in Pennsylvania. Because of the proximity of the date, the promotion of the Industry Day Observance this year will be in a limited fashion. However, the sponsors plan to make Industry Day an annual event, with elaborate plans already being prepared for a full-scale observance for next year, May 1, 1962.

Beliefs: The Industry Day Committee in Pennsylvania believes that a favorable business climate is essential to the further expansion of the economy in the State, the creation of new products and additional jobs for our growing population, and the prosperity of our Commonwealth.

Theme: Pennsylvania Industry, through the teamwork of investigators, management, and employees, provides the driving force to the Commonwealth's economy.

Program: Pennsylvania companies and local chambers of commerce, and manufacturers' associations, can assist in planning local activities designed to tell industry's story to the public. State, county, and municipal statistics may be found in basic source books on the Pennsylvania economy. These include the "Industrial Directory of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania" and the "Statistical Abstract," both prepared by the Department of Internal Affairs. They can probably be found in your local library or chamber of commerce.

What chambers can do (with and through cooperation of local members):

Remind newspapers, other media of upcoming Industry Day date, urge coverage, assist in gathering local material, facts, figures, etc.

Urge retailers, department stores, banks, libraries to cooperate in observace of Industry Day by assisting in displays, drop-in ads, etc.

Cooperate by cosponsoring with other civic, service clubs luncheon or dinner honoring local industry for their contributions to the community.

Urge member industrial companies to hold open house and plant tours for public.

Devote an issue of chamber publication to Industry Day.

Recommend that schools promote essay contest among pupils as to "How Industry Contributes to the American Way of Life in Our Community."

Suggest to local clergy that sermon on Sunday prior to Industry Day, Monday, May 1, be devoted to "Industry and Its Place in Our Local Economy."

Suggest to company editors of member companies that editorials or articles be prepared in observance of Industry Day.

Suggest to local radio and TV stations the possibility of interview or panel programs using key opinion leaders and company executives.

Suggest to local civic, service, and women clubs that they devote program meeting the week of May 1 to observance of Industry Day, and be prepared to provide speaker(s) if it is requested.

Publicize Industry Day in company publication through articles, editorials, etc.

Use company bulletin boards to display letter (message) from management to fellow employees over official signature of company president.

Enclose letter, brochure, leaflet, etc., to fellow employees and their families in paycheck envelope.

Use Industry Day announcements over your public address system.

Cooperate with other industry in community or area in offering open-house tour of plants to local schoolchildren and public during Industry Day.

Assist, cooperate, with your local newspapers, radio and TV stations. Alert media that Industry Day will be May 1. Assist them in preparing ads, articles, suggest editorials.

Supply local figures and illustrations, etc.

Arrange an interview or panel discussion on Industry Day with local radio and TV stations for company executives in area.

Offer an Industry Day display to local libraries.

Arrange for Industry Day display with local bank, or department or retail store. Display should point up the importance of industry to that particular community.

Contact local manufacturing group or chamber of commerce for cooperation, suggestions, in initiating programs for your entire area.

Interest schoolchildren in writing essays "How Industry Contributes to the American Way of Life in Our Community."

Sponsor an Industry Day luncheon or dinner under your own company auspices, or combine with other local area companies, and invite key opinion and community leaders.

Nineteen Hundred and Sixty-one Essay Contest, State of Hawaii

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HIRAM L. FONG
OF HAWAII
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, this morning the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped opened its 2-day conference here. Winners of the 1961 National Essay Contest conducted by the President's Committee were to be awarded prizes at the opening session.

Hawaii's winner is a 16-year-old Kamehameha Boys' School student, Kimo Douglas of Honolulu. In his State-winning essay, Kimo pointed out community and agency programs to rehabilitate the physically handicapped so that they may become useful and purposeful citizens.

I was impressed with this youth's statement that the "rehabilitated individual is transformed from a tax liability to a position of tax support in the community."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Kimo Douglas' essay be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOBS FOR THE HANDICAPPED—A COMMUNITY CHALLENGE

Over 1,000 handicapped persons in Hawaii were successfully placed on jobs during 1960. Many of these were trained or completely retrained through rehabilitation. Best estimates indicate that there are approximately 60,000 handicapped persons in Hawaii who have need of such services according to the State vocational rehabilitation service. Greater efforts will have to be directed toward aiding the handicapped.

Hawaii is fortunate in having one of the finest rehabilitation centers in the United States. Community attention is being made to centralize rehabilitation services near the rehabilitation center of Hawaii so that more can be done for those who need help.

A visit to the rehabilitation center will prove the effectiveness of the rehabilitation operation from the standpoint of medicine, occupational therapy, and sincerity of the trainers of handicapped workers. Such a visit reveals beyond any question it is ability not disability that counts. Agencies cooperating with the rehabilitation center of Hawaii include the Oahu Health Council's rehabilitation committee; State department of health; medical doctors, especially bone specialists who treat a lot of handicapped workers; social service workers of various hospitals; and the State department of social services.

More public funds should be allotted to meet the challenge of rehabilitation. Every dollar spent in effecting rehabilitation of the disabled returns to the community a hundredfold when we consider that the rehabilitated individual is transformed from a

tax liability to a position of tax support in the community. Therefore, rehabilitation not only works for the benefit of the handicapped but also benefits society.

It is encouraging to know that the State employment service has trained personnel who specialize in placing handicapped workers. This agency works in close cooperation with the workmen's compensation service, the various hospitals, and the vocational rehabilitation service in placing handicapped workers.

A study of the reports covering activity of such handicapped workers indicate they are reliable, efficient and in many instances more suited to certain jobs than the average worker. Their attendance records, desire to learn, and their interest in proving ability counts, should indicate to the employer that it is good business to hire the handicapped. Many employers, both large and small, have found that handicapped workers have the ability to perform certain jobs better than other employees who are not handicapped. These jobs should be cataloged and employers encouraged to fill future vacancies by hiring handicapped people.

Each year the local branch of the President's Committee on the Employment of the Physically Handicapped makes every effort to solicit the cooperation of employers in hiring handicapped workers. It is interesting to note that awards made by this Committee to employers for hiring the handicapped range from the largest to some of the smallest employers in the State.

Rehabilitation in Hawaii is making good progress but is not too well understood by many persons who would become more interested if more adequate counseling was provided.

To the handicapped person, rehabilitation is a means by which a feeling of helplessness can be conquered in remaining capabilities developed to a maximum so that a place in society can be assured. This means of development is known as physical restoration. This, of course, is of importance in rehabilitation, but the measure of success depends on job placement. Such employment must be on the bases of skill and abilities equal to those of nonhandicapped workers. When the handicapped worker has reached the maximum in physical restoration, is satisfactorily placed on a job suitable to his ability, then rehabilitation has been successful. A proof of any rehabilitation program is revealed by successful job placement, this requires the greatest cooperation on the part of government services, employers, and the rehabilitee. Sometimes successful job placement requires alterations to working devices which will permit a handicapped person to operate standard machines and other equipment.

To summarize the vocational rehabilitation of handicapped persons is basically an economic problem. The goal of vocational rehabilitation is employment at wages equal to going rates for regular workers. Although rehabilitation records show and rehabilitation agencies publicize data showing that, properly selected, properly trained, and properly placed, the disabled worker does as well as the able-bodied person, there remains much to be done in this area in order that handicapped workers will be given equal opportunity to become successfully rehabilitated. Great care must be exercised in placing handicapped workers so that future records will continue to prove the value of hiring the handicapped.

Disabled workers successfully placed in industry will always be the best advertisement for hiring the handicapped. Teamwork by rehabilitation officials, doctors, placement specialist, and employers will be required to insure the success of this operation. Hawaiian industry and know-how together with our community support should prove equal to the challenge.

Privileged Treatment for High Income Lawbreakers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article from the New Republic of April 10, 1961. It is shameful that these men, who have cheated the American public out of millions of dollars, should receive special treatment at the hands of the law. They make a mockery of the principle of equality before the law:

WHO YOU ARE

The seven top-salaried executives jailed in the Government's antitrust case against the electrical equipment industry have been released from prison—all of the 30-day sentences having been reduced by Judge Ganey for good behavior. The last to depart, John M. Cook, a vice president of Cutler-Hammer, Inc., of Milwaukee, was also the last to begin his sentence; he had been granted a delay so that he could attend his daughter's engagement party. A newspaper reporter described his exit thus: "Andrew J. White, the prison warden and Mrs. White were waiting when Cook emerged from the cell block into the prison foyer. So was Joseph Swain, Cook's attorney. As Swain tried to help Cook with his bag and the warden stood next to him, it seemed as if a houseguest was departing. 'Thank you for all your courtesies and kindnesses,' Cook said quietly to Warden White. White clapped him gently on the back. 'It's been a pleasure,' he replied."

Mr. Cook is returning to his job with Cutler-Hammer; same salary, same authority.

The president of the Allen-Bradley Co. of Milwaukee got off easier. He was given a suspended sentence by Chief Judge Ganey because his wife was ill. Or Judge Ganey might have been touched by this defendant's candor: "No one attending the gatherings was so stupid he didn't know (the meetings) were in violation of the law. But this is the only way business can be run. It is free enterprise."

On the other side of the tracks it's a different story. Take the case of the international vice president of the textile workers, Boyd E. Payton. In 1960 he was sent to prison for allegedly conspiring to damage the strikebound Harriet & Henderson Cotton Mills. He was convicted largely on the testimony of one witness, who, according to the union, had been employed as an agent provocateur by the North Carolina State Bureau of Investigation. The witness' record showed arrests ranging from intoxication to impersonating a police officer, stealing a police car and assault with a deadly weapon. Furthermore, it was said that he had a grudge against the union for it had refused to take his discharge from the Fieldcrest mills to arbitration.

Payton's trial took place in military-held Henderson, N.C., with a special judge, a special prosecutor and a special jury drawn from a neighboring county. It was concluded in haste and Payton was given 10 years. One difference between Mr. Payton and the president of the Allen Bradley Co. of Milwaukee is that Mr. Loock confessed there had been a plot, that it was carried out, but he chalked it up to "free enterprise" and went free. Payton insisted upon his innocence and the fact that the dynamiting he was accused of plotting had never been carried out. This got him 10 years. There's another difference: Payton can't get his job back for 5 years after he comes out of prison because of the Landrum-Griffin Act.

A Railroad Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, my good friend Alexander F. Jones, executive editor of the Syracuse Herald-Journal, is a long-time leader in the American press, an "editor's editor." Casey Jones is well-known in Washington because of his long tour as managing editor of the Washington Post and later assistant to the publisher, where he won the respect of governmental officials and the whole Washington community.

Mr. Jones has written a constructive editorial on railroad consolidations and mergers, and I wish to call it to the attention of this body. Entitled "A Railroad Policy," it appeared in the April 11 edition of the Herald-Journal:

A RAILROAD POLICY

(By Alexander F. Jones)

One of these fine days the White House, the Congress, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the general public are going to take a good look at the bleak future facing American railroads and actually do something about one of the most alarming conditions facing our economy.

Many of our railroads with a long history of success are losing money today hand over fist.

Many of them are talking merger in an effort to eliminate duplication, to cut losses, and to bring about greater efficiency.

Here in New York the State is lending money to railroads to buy new equipment so commuter service into the metropolis can be maintained. So far as I am concerned, this is the first step towards nationalization.

Everywhere railroads are cutting passenger service, applying for permission to discontinue branch lines and uneconomic trains, both passenger and freight. As a result of the economy steps, equipment and service have deteriorated.

The inroads trucks have made on railroad freight revenue and automobiles and airlines have made on passenger travel are common knowledge and need no elaboration here.

Neither does the tax picture, which is admittedly prejudicial, for railroads are assessed to the hilt and airlines are subsidized and trucklines need only State licenses.

Railroad securities today do not have the attraction as good investments that they once had.

Altogether, American railroads appear to be dying on the vine, outmoded and passé.

The fact is, however, that American railroads are basically as vital in our economy today as they ever were.

Anyone disputing that statement has only to recall what happens in any community or area when a strike paralyzes rail service.

The commodities necessary to keep our wheels turning, steel, coal, oil, foods, and refrigerated items, still come to most communities by rail.

And in wartime our first line of both defense and offense is the railroad system.

Lack of equipment in the movement of men or material would be fatal. Everything must move like clockwork, or a serious jam occurs at port terminals.

Anyone who tries to minimize the basic part railroads play in our scheme of things would be on mighty thin ice.

Then what is the answer?

One answer is the evolution of natural mergers which would eliminate duplication of service.

A board of the best transportation minds in the country, the best financiers, the best equipment experts, the best port and lake traffic men should immediately initiate an overall study of American railroads not only in relation to each other, but also in regard to truck, air, lake and river competition.

There are real solid answers to all of our transportation and distribution problems if we would approach them from a national standpoint and stop listening to proponents of some branch, either rail, air, truck or water, peddling their respective wares.

It seems utterly ridiculous to me to have to sit here and watch Cyrus Eaton, the Cleveland industrialist, try to gobble the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad for his Chesapeake & Ohio system in the hope that if this merger is approved by the ICC he will be able to so cripple the New York Central system it will go into bankruptcy and be easy meat to swallow also.

Today the New York Central system has 61 connections and 98 common points with the B. & O. It has 45 connections and 67 common points with the C. & O. This tremendous duplication of facilities compares with a mere 17 connections and 23 common points between B. & O. and C. & O.

The New York Central wants a three-way merger with these railroads to eliminate duplication and to save millions of dollars.

Judging from the map it is a natural and understandable desire.

I see no reason why the ICC should be exclusively concerned with the plans of Mr. Eaton to pull off a Wall Street coup and add x number of millions to his treasury.

The question here is whether the merger is in the interest of the people and of a more efficient rail system.

Our interest in Syracuse is that a prosperous New York Central will be able to run more trains in and out of this city and give better service.

Wherever you look on a railroad map, competing lines are talking merger and consolidation.

The Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul and the Chicago & Northwestern are deep in a merger plan.

The Santa Fe and Union Pacific are contesting control of the Western Pacific.

There are several merger plans cooking among railroads centering in St. Louis.

Here in the East, the Pennsylvania line is deep in several studies.

It all emphasizes a need for a national policy that will not depend on Wall Street coups that smell more than a little of the Jay Gould, Jim Fisk days, and have little concern for the public welfare.

Missing the Mark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend to our colleagues for their consideration a thought-provoking editorial which appeared in the Wichita (Kans) Eagle on April 15, 1961. It is my feeling that this editorial provides good food for thought as we prepare to discuss new education proposals:

[From the Wichita Eagle, Apr. 15, 1961]

MISSING THE MARK

The administration is rolling up the heavy artillery in its fight for Federal aid to education; but some of the artillery is not aimed too accurately.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has issued figures showing that some of the strongest congressional opponents of the Kennedy school aid program have eagerly accepted Federal impacted areas aid. These Congressmen, the administration hints, should not trumpet their fears about Federal control of education while happily voting impacted areas aid for their districts.

The administration has a point. But it does not follow that these muzzled Congressmen are honorbound to vote for the Kennedy school aid bill. Wichita provides a case in point. Impacted area aid, given to school districts whose school population is swollen by nearby military or defense installations, provides about $1 million a year to the Wichita school system. The Kennedy program, while providing nationwide school aid, would sharply reduce impacted areas aid. Wichita, which would receive $650,000 under the Kennedy plan, would benefit little, and could even lose $350,000 a year if impacted areas aid were eliminated entirely.

Similar situations exist in the hundreds of school districts now receiving sizable impacted areas aid. The Congressmen representing those districts can surely be forgiven if they balk at cutting their own throats.

Praise for President's Message to Congress on Ethics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I applaud the President for his special message to the Congress of the United States on conflicts of interest. I have long taken the position that people must have confidence in their Government and a review of conflict of interest statutes convinces me that an up-to-date law covering ethics of all persons in public service is long overdue.

My only comment at this time, Mr. Speaker, is that regulations covering a standard of ethics and moral conduct should not be limited to those in the executive branch of Government. Congress should examine into the need for reform in our legislative branch of Government.

I was particularly gratified that the President should recognize the fact that you cannot legislate in every detail regarding the behavior of Federal officials and employees. I favor his establishing by Executive order a set of standards for those in Government service. The conclusion of the President that these standards can be maintained best by personal example of those in leadership appeals to me. Many Members of Congress, including myself, have introduced bills to improve the conduct of those in the legislative and executive branches. Now I trust we will get some action.

CWA President Beirne Backs the Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the most dynamic, progressive leaders in the labor movement is Joseph Beirne, president of the Communications Workers of America. Indicative of his wide range of interests is his recent article expressing enthusiasm and support for the Peace Corps. His intellectual insight into the corps, its purpose and goal, is to be commended.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Beirne's enlightening and inspirational article entitled "Peace Corps Exciting Opportunity for Dedicated, Committed Service," in the May 1961 CWA News be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the CWA News, May 1961]

OFF MY MIND—PEACE CORPS EXCITING OPPORTUNITY FOR DEDICATED, COMMITTED SERVICE

(By J. A. Beirne, CWA president)

The most exciting idea yet launched by the Kennedy administration is the Peace Corps. It has caught the imagination of the American people, and has won the admiration and respect of peoples throughout the free world.

What is it? Only the outlines are firm at this moment; there is much planning and thinking to be done. Yet the general scheme of things can be put into words.

America's Peace Corps calls for creation of a voluntary group of dedicated and committed young men and women who will serve the cause of freedom overseas under the most trying conditions. The goal is simply to help underdeveloped countries attain a better and fuller life. It will be, in the hopes of all of us, a real contribution to the cause of peace and human progress.

As we start this exciting and dynamic new program, we must recognize certain restrictions. There are to be no "ugly Americans" among the men and women of the Peace Corps, and (as the New York Times declared) they must not proceed "like Communist agents by stealth and subterfuge * * * they are not to become instruments of propaganda or ideological conflict, except of course, insofar as their aid and bearing give testimony to our ideals and purposes."

This tremendous new idea for making the world a better and safer place in which to live has aroused enthusiasm not only among the people of America—it has created a hustle and bustle even in the world of official bureaucracy.

On the fifth floor of an old building in downtown Washington there is a sense of purpose and mission, an air of dynamism, that hasn't been seen in the typical Government office for many years. It's the head-

quarters of the Peace Corps, and this inspiring project can truly be called an example of that other "idea," the New Frontier.

There are those among us who are afraid that the American fiber is weakening; that we are a nation without ideals or an ideology * * * and that if we don't do whatever it is they want us to do * * * the Communists will get us, or some other dreadful thing will happen.

Anyone who could witness the demonstration of spirit and bounce and moral strength in that old building where the Peace Corps is setting up shop, would feel, as I do, that the United States is as full of the spirit of serving others, as ever before.

It goes back to the spirit of those times when men gambled everything that was sacred to them, in order to bring justice into America. Out of that time in history came the American Revolution—and it is exciting to me, as I know it must be to you, to realize that President Kennedy has ignited the idea for all the world to see. It burns brightly today in Asia, in Africa, in Latin America * * * in all those places where injustice, and hunger, and wornout traditions are causing misery, not progress * * * war, rather than peace.

As you who have followed this Peace Corps idea in your newspapers know, this is a project that came up during the course of the last presidential campaign. And it got, I am told by people who should know, a tremendous response from all segments of the population. It was established early in his administration by President Kennedy, by means of an Executive order, pending congressional action to put it on a permanent basis.

The prime objective is to send to those areas that need them, some of our fellow citizens who have special skills and knowledge: craftsmen, teachers, farmers, builders, or whatever. They will live and work with the people of the country, and I mean the ordinary people, not the wealthy, not the landlords, not the highborn. They will be paid enough to sustain them, no more. Their service with the Peace Corps will not necessarily exempt them from service in the Armed Forces. They will receive no special privileges, no PX's or commissaries or motor pools or household servants.

They will go as the people of our country to the people of another country, openly, with no propaganda ax to grind, no religious doctrine, except that one basic doctrine, common to all faiths, love one another.

Certainly for those who serve in the Peace Corps it will not be an easy life. So many things which we take for granted, will be missing. The corner drugstore with its many comforts, the paved street, running water, electric lights, a telephone: somehow we assume everyone has these, that life without them would simply come to a halt. These will go out of the lives of the Peace Corps members.

Yet, in spite of the obvious hardships of such a life, in spite of the pitfalls and the very real personal risks, the young men and women of America are applying by the thousands because they respond to the American idea of commitment and dedication built into this noble enterprise.

People will be helped to read, to grow two bushels of wheat where only one grew before, to pipe water in from springs instead of bringing it in a pail, to dig their furrows across the hills instead of down them. We can tell others these things.

And it seems scarcely necessary to add that we will also learn things just as fundamental: how the rest of the world really lives, how it speaks, how it thinks, what lies on its mind and on its heart. We will learn how it is possible for life to go on without the things we call essential; yes, and how far wrong we are when we think we know all the answers to the ever-present questions of where did we come from, why are we here, where are we going.

Back in the last century one of the Russian czars fought for a window on the world for his country, a window through which his country could look out and through which the rest of the world could look in. In recent years we have seen that window closely shuttered with only an occasional window giving us and them a peep at each other.

In this country, it seems to me, the Peace Corps is our window on the world, another chance for us to look out, another chance for the rest of the world to look in. I hope it will never be shuttered. And I envy the young men and women who will make this exciting idea a reality.

Results of Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, during the 7 years I have served the 23d District of Ohio in the U.S. Congress, I have attempted to keep the closest possible contact with the individual thinking of the residents of this suburban Cleveland area. One of the highest income, high-intelligence districts in the Nation, its constituents are quick to respond to my regular newsletters, opinion polls, and annual traveling office meetings.

The opinion poll is mailed yearly to the home of every registered voter in the district—this year to 135,000 homes in all. The response is excellent, underscoring the interest these voters take in national affairs. This year nearly 25,000 returned the questionnaire, some 1,500 of them amplifying their views in additional letters on key issues. I know of no other district which shows such a high response to similar polls.

This year shows a few marked changes in opinion from past polls. There is an upsurge in favor of Federal aid to school construction, for example: only 35 percent favored it last year; 62.8 percent, this. The division on foreign aid remains nip and tuck, as in the past. One interesting point I have noted in the 1961 returns—citizen confusion on important legislation runs heavier than in the past, with a greater percentage of questions marked, "No opinion." This I feel is the result of increasingly complicated legislation, often obscured by fuzzy and contradictory statements from political leadership, the press and other news media.

I would like to emphasize, as I have in the past, that results of the poll are not used as political weather vanes for any votes I make in the House of Representatives. I am grateful for the outstanding response, and for the many letters accompanying the questionnaires. All are helpful to me in reaching my final decision on the issues.

Results of the poll follow:

[In percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
Do you favor—			
1. Federal aid to education to provide for—			
(a) School construction?	62.8	31.7	5.5
(b) Teachers' salaries?	32.6	59.5	7.9
(c) Aid to private and parochial schools?	18.9	74.9	6.2
2. Revising the electoral college system?	77.6	14.0	8.4
3. Federal Government assistance in relocating industries?	24.0	58.5	17.5
4. Minimum wage legislation—			
(a) Increasing present hourly rate of $1	57.6	32.9	9.5
(b) Extending coverage?	49.7	31.2	19.1
5. A mandatory program of medical care for the aged?	48.9	42.3	8.8
6. More liberal social security benefits?	55.1	35.8	9.1
7. Resuming nuclear testing if we cannot reach an agreement with Russia for adequate inspection?	75.7	14.4	9.9
8. Increasing postal rates to help reduce this year's estimated postal deficit of $900,000,000?	63.4	30.4	6.2
9. Easing trade restrictions with Iron Curtain countries?	29.7	56.9	13.4
10. Continuing the 1-cent "temporary" Federal gasoline tax to aid our highway construction program?	66.5	28.3	5.2
11. The administration's proposal for Federal aid to "depressed areas"?	55.2	31.7	13.1
12. Continuation of our foreign aid program?	44.4	42.7	12.9
13. Do you think the Peace Corps a good idea?	49.9	33.5	16.6
14. Abolishing the Un-American Activities Committee?	20.9	60.4	18.7

Freedom Flights to West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish to draw attention to the vast and increasing number of East Germans who are seeking refuge in the West German Republic. Such flights, especially when under conditions of extreme danger, bear testimony to the oppressions of life behind the Iron Curtain and the desire of those oppressed to live in freedom and to enjoy the opportunities of free peoples.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statistical summary of such flights as reported in the Press and Information Office Bulletin of the West German Federal Government.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ESCAPE FROM THE ZONE

(Memorandum in Bulletin No. 28 of the Press and Information Office of the Federal Government)

According to a report of the Federal Ministry for Expellees, Refugees and War Damages, 16,697 persons fled from the Soviet Zone to the Federal Republic in the course

of January 1961; i.e., 2,298 more than during December 1960. Two thousand three hundred and ninety-nine of these, that is 14.4 percent were juveniles of less than 24 years, 18 of them were members of the volkspolizei (people's police forces) and 45 members of military units of the SBZ.

In the course of 1960 the number of refugees from the Soviet Zone reached a total of 199,188 persons, among these were 31,424 juveniles of less than 24 years, 152 members of the volkspolizei and 555 members of the military units of the SBZ.

Employment of Physically Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, having served in World War II as a Marine and being a member of the Disabled American Veterans and the American Legion organizations in this country and knowing of the many problems that confront our disabled veterans and having a vital interest in their welfare and livelihood, I have read with considerable interest the fine address by Mr. Frank G. Wood, national director of employment relations for the Disabled American Veterans. Mr. Wood has had a long and distinguished career in serving our veterans. After serving in the Army of the United States, he became the national service officer for Disabled American Veterans in 1945. He served in that capacity until 1959 when he was appointed director of rehabilitation for the Department of California Disabled American Veterans. In 1960, National Commander William O. Cooper, of the Disabled American Veterans, appointed him national director of employment relations. Mr. Wood is a member of the Federal Advisory Council for the Bureau of Employment Security of the Department of Labor. He is a member of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped and is a member of the executive committee and the Disabled Veterans Committee of that body. Mr. Wood gave the following address to the Ohio Governor's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped. His remarks in this field are so significant that I feel that they are worthy of the attention of my colleagues and therefore deem it a privilege to insert his address in the RECORD:

AN ADDRESS BEFORE THE OHIO GOVERNOR'S COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

(By Frank G. Wood)

As the national director of employment relations for the Disabled American Veterans and as a member of the Executive Committee of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, I am very pleased to be with you today in giving recognition to the many young people of this State who have entered the essay contest. I am, of course, also highly honored to have been invited here to witness the presentation of awards to the five winners of the State essay contest.

The need for young people to understand the handicapped person as a fellow American with the same desires as the ablebodied is most important. The ideal of generating through education the cause of the handicapped will assure better understanding which will result in advances or solutions of these problems in generations to come.

The need of the handicapped to achieve the same dignity of man is as great as is this desire in the able-bodied person. Certainly, a program of this type which will alert our young people to this problem will assure us of continued study and the application of new ideas. To you ladies and gentlemen here today, the problem of the physically handicapped is real. You are certainly aware of the present-day situation by reason of your close association with the Governor's committee.

As we look upon the trends that are being shaped for the future of America, we cannot help but recognize that this program is going to assume more importance as time goes on.

The campaign for the Presidency in 1960 was unique in that the basic principle of the need for all of our people to assume leadership and to work together was the same as expressed by both candidates. It is, therefore, most important that we consider the physically handicapped person and his place in the economic philosophy of today. This philosophy demands a supreme effort that must be made to achieve the goals contained in the staggering challenges of today in science, in space, in medicine, and in the problems manifested by automation and its effects upon employment.

The American way of life, free enterprise, is pitted against the collectivism or socialism and the whole future of the free enterprise philosophy is on trial. That system which arrives first in reaching these goals may well win the greatest competitive struggle for man's mind, body, and soul that has been had since the beginning of time. To win this struggle, Americans must learn and practice the adhesive quality of togetherness which is the mobilization of all our people into a gigantic army. This army will be composed of management and labor of white-collar and blue-collar, of egghead and squarehead, of intellect and brawn and all of our people of all colors and religions, ablebodied and disabled.

It is absolutely necessary that this mobilization take place before we can meet the challenge of today and the future. This togetherness I speak of is not just an ideal but a proven fact. We need look no further back than the days of World War II. Surely, if we can mobilize our brains and our brawn into the task of creating the most devastating force known to mankind and to create the most destructive military machine in all human history, we can mobilize in peaceful pursuits with the same high degree of efficiency.

The talents of the handicapped person has an important role in this great struggle to be the first in arriving at the New Frontier or new horizon that is now within our view.

There is a growing recognition in government and labor that it is good business to hire the handicapped. His productive ability is higher than in nondisabled workers. He has a lower absentee record by which is meant that because of his disabilities, he is more caution minded. The fiction of the idea that the handicapped worker requires more absenteeism has been dispelled. We here today know the truth of these statements but we also know that more education is needed to spread the work of these truisms.

It is suggested that this can best be done through groups of persons acting as coordinators for the employment of the physically handicapped both in industry and in government. I would like to call your attention to the great effort made by the AFL–CIO plan which is in effect a coordinator plan to introduce handicapped persons into all phases of labor.

First, there is the plant policy which is established through collective bargaining. Here the plant and the union committee members work together in conducting a survey of the physical requirements necessary in all the operations of a plant. A training program is worked in coordination with placement so that when the handicapped person assumes his job, he has had an indoctrination course which will acquaint him with the job and with the specially adapted measures he must observe in connection with his disablement.

One of the biggest advancements in recognizing the problems of the handicapped has been made in modifying his job to meet the problems of the handicapped worker. Here ways and means are studied to make some slight alterations in machine control or duty assignment to enable the handicapped worker to perform the job.

These methods are the result of long study into these problems and both management and labor is to be commended in the great strides made in utilizing the abilities of the handicapped.

It has been said before but it is worth saying again, the remaining functions of the disabled are many times more acute than those of the nondisabled. For instance, the blinded person has a highly developed sense of touch that makes him specially suitable to certain operations requiring intricate hand movements.

While it is true that management and labor in private industry is doing much to place the handicapped person in employment suitable to his disability, it is equally true that government has likewise concerned itself with this problem. In the Federal Government, we have the coordinator for the physically handicapped program. Many State governments have the same type of program. Here we find that agencies select coordinators whose responsibilities are to place the handicapped person into civil service employment, which is commensurate with the disability.

Although it is true that great strides have been made in the overall program, we have not reached the stage where we can afford to be complacent. Much needs to be done, particularly in the education of the shop foreman or in the case of government, the supervisory level or leadman level. There are still many who harbor an antipathy toward physically handicapped people. The problem of employment of the physically handicapped is not only in the employment but equally in the underemployment of the handicapped person. Too often we find that industry and Government is being deprived of the full potential of the handicapped person because he is placed in a position where his full abilities cannot be used. Today Americans are facing up to the ideal that all persons regardless of race, creed, or color are entitled to equal opportunity.

We recognize that discrimination, in any form, defeats and is repugnant to the great purposes of Americanism. As the tide against discrimination mounts, it will sweep out that discrimination which exists against the handicapped. If we are to prove our case to the world, it must be so.

I, therefore, again emphasize how pleased I am to have been invited to this luncheon to join with you in celebrating another milestone in the education of the youth of this land toward the principle that disability does not mean inability. For every round peg there is a round hole. For every square peg, there is a square hole and for every disability there is compensatory ability.

Michigan Loses by Federal Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Adrian (Mich.) Telegram of April 24, 1961:

MICHIGAN LOSES BY FEDERAL AID

Michigan residents who favor President Kennedy's school aid proposal—and there are some—should think again. And this second-thinking should be applied to all Federal grants-in-aid. For Michigan is the loser in them.

Last year Michigan paid 4.66 percent of the internal revenue collections, being one of the higher paying States. But when Federal grants were allocated only 3.03 percent of the total handouts came to this State—34 States and the District of Columbia received relatively more than they paid in taxes; 16, including Michigan, received less.

These percentage figures were compiled by Tax Foundation, a nonpartisan and privately operated agency. Using the foundation's figures, Congressional Quarterly in an article presented on this page recently, came up with the fact that for every dollar Michigan contributes in Federal taxes toward grant-in-aid funds it gets back 65 cents. Or to put it another way for every dollar of Federal aid to Michigan we pay about $1.55.

The Kennedy school aid proposal allocates school money by a somewhat different formula than other Federal grants, but so far as Michigan is concerned the results are about the same. Michigan would be the loser. Under the Kennedy program, Michigan would receive $27,070,252, but the cost to Michigan of the $866 million Federal program would be $29,770,000. Michigan would be out of pocket $2,699,747. Some other States would be losers also, New York would pay in $91,-110,000 and get back $37,650,000.

Michigan is said by those supporting Federal school aid to need 10,762 more classrooms, and is rated as being the State with the second largest classroom shortage. New York is placed first with a deficit of 14,000 classrooms. Yet these States, declared to be at the top of the list in classroom needs, would be big losers under the aid program designed to help the States provide classrooms.

By and large, Michigan is doing as much as any State to enlarge its school plant. Every Michigan election finds school financing proposals on the ballots in some school district. On top of that the schools get the largest cut from State tax revenues.

Left on their own, Michigan residents will meet their school needs. They have been doing it and they will continue to do it. These extra classrooms will be constructed under the watchful eyes of residents of the school districts who feel it imperative that they get the greatest possible dollar for their money.

But under Federal aid they would be putting in far more dollars than they were getting back. This extra money would be going to States less diligent in meeting their school needs. Michigan would still be carrying the burden of providing its own school facilities. On top of that, tax money from Michigan would be going to schools in other States. There is no aid to Michigan under Federal school aid. The aid would go elsewhere and in part from Michigan tax dollars.

Report to Congress on Effect of Cabaret Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I was extremely gratified when the 86th Congress passed legislation in May 1960 reducing the Federal cabaret tax from 20 to 10 percent. It was also a source of great personal satisfaction, inasmuch as I was privileged to offer the first legislation to eliminate this discriminatory tax when I introduced H.R. 858 in the 85th Congress in January 1957.

My original bill called for complete elimination of this tax. However, compromise being a way of life in Washington, we were forced to settle for the 10-percent reduction previously mentioned.

In testifying on several occasions for this legislation, I repeatedly emphasized, as did other interested witnesses, that removal of this obnoxious tax would not result in any appreciable loss of tax revenue. Rather, there were reliable estimates to the effect that total repeal of the tax might well result in a substantial increase in the Treasury's revenue and at the same time materially benefit the unemployment problem.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in support of this statement, under leave to extend my remarks I include a letter which I received recently from Mr. Herman Kenin, president of the American Federation of Musicians, which in my judgment effectively substantiates our most optimistic forecasts. Furthermore, I believe it presents a compelling argument for total elimination of a tax which obviously defeats its own purpose:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF
MUSICIANS,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
New York, N.Y., April 5, 1961.

REPORT TO ALL MEMBERS OF THE 87TH CONGRESS ON EFFECT OF CABARET TAX REDUCTION ON EMPLOYMENT AND REVENUES

When the American Federation of Musicians urged upon previous Congresses a reduction of the so-called cabaret tax, our key premises were that the tax was discriminatory, that it destroy jobs, that net tax revenue loss by reduction would at most be negligible. We promised members of the 86th Congress that we would survey the effects of the tax reduction and report upon it. These are our findings:

Some 650 AFM locals scattered throughout the United States were requested to forward statistical reports to my office comparing cabaret-type engagements for the November, December, January 1960–61, quarter with the comparable similar months of a year earlier. Reports have been received from 426—approximately two-thirds—of our locals, including all the major population centers.

During the quarter, this partial return shows an increase of 8,715 engagement nights for professional musicians, a payroll of approximately $2,265,900. Projected over a year, this totals $9,063,600 in additional earnings for musicians—this, in the face of economic distress in many parts of the Nation. A projection of employment of associated employees (waiters, barmen, busboys)—on a basis of a conservative estimate by an independent research organization—that five and one-half to six others are employed for each musician, shows additional annual payroll of approximately $36 million.

This $45 million total—again estimated conservatively—should yield $4,500,000 a year or $1,125,000 per quarter in income tax increase. Offset against this is the difference in excise tax yield now against prior quarters. Previously the excise yield ran about $10 million per quarter. For the last available quarter reported, that ending December 31, 1960, the excise yield was $8,473,000, a difference since the halving of only $1,527,000. Deducting from this the $1,125,000 increase in income tax yield leaves only a $402,000 difference. This is exclusive of increased income taxes that can be expected to be paid by cabaret operators doing better business.

It is our considered opinion there has been no loss in tax revenues. It also is our considered finding, based upon the results accruing from the one-half reduction of this excise tax, that total repeal would benefit substantially the Treasury's revenues and the current widespread unemployment problem.

Knowing you to be busy as legislators, this report was confined to bare essentials. More complete details may be obtained from the enclosed reprint from the New York Times.

Very truly yours,

HERMAN KENIN,
President.

Proclamation by the Governor of Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to call to the attention of the Members a proclamation by the Governor of Florida designating April 30 of this year as Past Presidents' Day.

This day will be observed by all Floridians as a tribute to the past Presidents of our great Nation who shouldered the responsibilities of leading our country with honor and integrity.

In addition to the Governor's proclamation, city officials within our State plan to issue similar statements. The Governor's proclamation follows:

Whereas the Presidents of the United States have been men of great integrity, bringing to the post of Chief Executive the quality of leadership that has made our country admired and respected throughout the world; and

Whereas the achievements of our past Presidents have advanced the progress and development of our Nation, contributed to the general welfare and have led us to a position of world prominence; and

Whereas it is fitting that 1 day of each year be designated to honor those who have so ably led our Nation in peace and war; now therefore

I, Farris Bryant, by virtue of the authority vested in me as Governor of the State of Florida, do hereby proclaim April 30, 1961,

as Past President's Day in Florida, and urge all the citizens of Florida to consider the heavy responsibilities borne by our past Presidents and the sacrifices they have made in guiding the Nation.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State of Florida to be affixed at Tallahassee, the capital, this 20th day of April, A.D. 1961.

FARRIS BRYANT,
Governor.

Attest:

JAMES ADAMS,
Secretary of State.

Pennsylvania's 12th District of American Legion Opposes Admission of Red China to United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter of transmittal from Mr. Nello S. Carozzoni, 12th district commander, the American Legion of Pennsylvania, dated April 5, 1961, with which he forwarded a copy of a resolution adopted by his organization on March 26, 1961, which opposes the admission of Red China to the United Nations.

The indicated letter and resolution follow.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Wilkes-Barre, Pa., April 5, 1961.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: On behalf of my organization—the 12th District American Legion, Luzerne County, Department of Pennsylvania—I am forwarding a resolution which is self-explanatory.

It is the hope and desire of the delegates, who approved this resolution unanimously, to petition our President to give the resolution utmost consideration in the best interest of our Nation.

Respectfully yours,

NELLO S. CAROZZONI,
12th District Commander, the American Legion.

Whereas the 12th district, the American Legion, county of Luzerne, Pa., comprising a membership of some 12,000 veterans, understand a concerted effort is underway to have the United States recognize Red Communist China, and consent to have the so-called Chinese People's Republic admitted to the United Nations; and

Whereas the aforementioned members after a study of the compilation of facts such as: 33,000 U.S. fighting men killed in action in the Korean war, along with numerous others tortured, plus still others wounded, plus some 450 still presumed held prisoners in Chinese jails—with Chinese Reds as the guilty parties in the most of such cases, and finally the fact that we are still officially at war with Red China, thought President Eisenhower obtained an uneasy truce in 1953; Therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the members of the 12th district of the American Legion, Luzerne County, Pa., that for the United States to recognize Red China or consent to its admission into the United Nations would cause the United States to "lose face" all over the Far East and put a stamp of approval on all the wrongs committed by Red Communist China; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, Ambassador to the United States, Senators CLARK and SCOTT of Pennsylvania, and Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD.

The above resolution was approved and adopted at the regular monthly meeting of the 12th district, the American Legion, Luzerne County, Department of Pennsylvania, Sunday, March 26, 1961.

Respectfully submitted.

NELLO S. CAROZZONI,
12th District Commander, The American Legion.

National Employ the Physically Handicapped Committee of the Great 23d Congressional District, California, Awards U.S. Government Bonds to Five Winners in High School Essay Competition—City Officials, Newspaper Editor, Veterans' Leaders and Business Representatives Act as Judges at Compton, Calif.—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, heretofore having received unanimous consent so to do, I am pleased and consider it an honor to present to the attention of your own distinguished self and also that of other readers the text of a letter to me from Lillian M. Karnes, chairman, southeast district, National Employ the Physically Handicapped Committee, in the great 23d district, together with five winning essays by high school students, the subject of all of said essays being "Jobs for the Handicapped."

Mr. Speaker, my well-known and long-time interest in jobs for the handicapped makes it a special pleasure for me to produce the text of these five essays so as to make same available to all who read and, furthermore, Mr. Speaker, this matter of jobs for the handicapped extends over into the matter of two bills which have been filed in this Congress, to wit: the one by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, being S. 1365; and a corresponding bill filed in the House by me, to wit: H.R. 347. Both these bills are identical in text and ask this Congress to favorably consider issuing a charter to said Indoor Sports, this organization being made up entirely of American citizens, both youth and adult, who are considered permanently physically handicapped.

Mr. Speaker, one of the always anticipated occasions which Mrs. Doyle and I have when we are home in the great 23d district is to be annually invited guests of the Indoor Sports group at Los Amigos Hospital, Downey, Calif. At this great hospital the several dozen physically handicapped Indoor Sports have the advantage of a very worthy, unique, valuable rehabilitation shop and center where they place and invest their sincere desire and ambition to become rehabilitated so that they move forward in an independent, economic condition on their own.

It has been my experience, Mr. Speaker, on several occasions to be also present at an annual awards banquet and dinner at Compton, Calif., when awards similar to those herein mentioned are made and in visiting on such occasions, and other occasions, with the representatives of management who are present and who make it a part of their established policy to employ physically handicapped, I am advised by management itself that it finds the physically handicapped persons as almost always equally productive in their respective assignments in their respective shops and factories.

Mr. Speaker, I know that you and all the other Members of this great legislative body join with me in congratulating the winners of these awards of U.S. Government bonds. Also, that you join with me in congratulating the branch of the National Employ the Physically Handicapped Committee on again conducting this worthy essay contest.

Following is the essay winning first place and one of those winning $25 bonds. Part II of my remarks containing the remaining essays appear also in the RECORD for today.

LAKEWOOD, CALIF., *January 27, 1961.*

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DOYLE: We recently held our National Employ the Physically Handicapped Annual Essay Contest in the southeast district. Five high schools participated this year. The first prize—a $50 bond—went to a pupil at the Centennial Senior High School in Compton. A $25 bond will go to each of the other contestants of the schools that also won in turn. Arrangements are being made for me to shortly present them to the winners at these respective schools during their assembly. Mayor Del Clawson, of Compton; Jack Cleland, editor of the Herald American newspapers; Guy Warner, manager; and Daniel Quigg, VER of the Compton Department of Employment; Wayne Bowen, chairman of the local veterans' employment committee; and myself as chairman of the southeast district (Compton) Employ the Physically Handicapped Committee, helped to judge the essays. Cash for the prize bonds were provided by Veterans of Foreign Wars Post, No. 2089; American Legion Post, No. 152; Disabled American Veterans; May A. Carson Chapter, No. 32; all of Compton, World War I Barracks, Lynwood; and three members of our local employee the handicapped committee.

Miss Newman's essay has been sent to the Governor's committee to be judged on the State level for a $100 bond and a trip to the Capital. The winning essay on that level will go on to Washington, D.C., where its author will receive a $1,000 bond furnished by the National Disabled American Veterans with possible presentation being made by President Kennedy.

May our committee again ask your indulgence in placing these essays in the

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this year as you did in past years? It would be very much appreciated if you would do so.

Again our thanks for your help to our local National Employ the Handicapped Committee.

Sincerely yours,

LILLIAN M. KARNES,
Chairman, Southeast District—(Compton)—National Employ the Physically Handicapped Committee.

JOBS FOR THE HANDICAPPED—A COMMUNITY CHALLENGE

(By Constance Newman, Centennial Senior High School, Compton, Calif.)

Rocks crunching fragile bones, blood streaming from pierced arteries—this was the way medieval Europe treated its handicapped people.

Sparks flying, the crackling of blazing flames, a charred human mass among them—this was sometimes colonial America's treatment of handicapped persons who were looked upon as witches or devils because of appearance or actions deviating from the normal.

The sting of a whip, the crack of a gun shot—these marked our country's growth and expansion westward. This was life on the frontier. Excessive heat in the parching deserts and freezing winters in the Sierras were but a part of the hardships. The man who succeeded was the strongest. Here the handicapped could not survive. Since the beginning of time, society and the elements had seen to it that there was no extensive social problem insofar as handicapped people were concerned, for they could not survive the cruelty of man and nature.

As civilization came, the frontier life became less strenuous. Many handicapped people began to live longer lives. The frontier passed and with it its challenge. Other challenges took the place of the primitive ones. Foremost among these challenges is that of providing jobs for the handicapped.

Communities meet this challenge in different ways. The following is an example of a community and an individual who met this challenge and conquered it.

During World War II, many of our men were called to fight for our country. One of these was Tim who was 22 when he enlisted in the U.S. Army. Hating to leave his wife Helen and baby, but realizing his patriotic duty to his country, Tim enlisted. Like many of our men, Tim was injured in the war. Due to this back injury, he was told that he would never walk again. How could he support his family? This was a question that crossed his mind repeatedly. Now, he was like those whom he had once pitied. He was an excellent engineer, but would his handicap be accepted by his family and the community?

The success of his entire future depended on this acceptance.

He must try to prove himself capable. He was determined to do so.

When he returned home to his wife, he could see that he was being engulfed in a sea of pity. He needed encouragement and confidence. Why couldn't she understand and realize that he needed confidence and encouragement. Despite his handicap, Tim began to do things for himself. Helen realized that instead of pity, Tim wanted her admiration and support.

Having Helen's support, he knew that he would have the courage to apply for a job. Tim called for an interview at the California Employment Service. After the interview, he was sent to the Hanson Electronics Co. Would Mr. Hanson hire him or would he think that all jobs require strength rather than ability? Knowing that skill, however, is more important in many jobs, Mr. Hanson placed Tim on a 2-months' trial.

When Tim reported for work, he was placed in the mechanical engineering division. Mr. Hanson introduced him to the 20 workers in his division.

As Mr. Hanson introduced Tim, each of the workers stopped what they were doing and began to stare at Tim. They whispered among themselves. Tim actually heard one man say to another, "Does he actually think that he can hold a job with such a handicap?" Although it wasn't meant for Tim to hear, he had heard it. He felt terribly hurt, but still determined.

When he came to work the following day, he worked very earnestly and diligently. The others were astonished to see him doing so well.

Not only was his work done amazingly well that day, but for every day during his 2-months' trial. The workers of the entire mechanical division of the company wrote letters to the company's president, Mr. Hanson. One man described Tim as "an earnest and very intelligent worker who knows just what he wants from life and intends to get it."

Mr. Hanson called Tim into his office and congratulated him on his fine work. He said, "Tim, not only did the other workers praise your work to me, but your rate of absenteeism has been lower than that of the other workers. You have a permanent job here."

Tim was bursting with excitement. With his job, however, came the depressing thought that there were many other capable handicapped people in the community who had been denied jobs because they possessed a physical defect. How could he help them? He decided to talk to Mr. Hanson.

In his conversation with his employer, Tim pointed out that although 2,600,000 physically handicapped men and women had jobs, it has been estimated that each year in California alone 2,650 handicapped young men and women will need jobs. In 1959 there were 66,000 handicapped who had been rehabilitated and placed on jobs in California. The President's Committee for Employment of the Handicapped with the cooperation of the Governor's committee has done much to publicize the need for employing the handicapped.

"Let us form a local committee of which there are 42 already in the State of California to assist in this worthy work here. Let us help all the handicapped to know the valuable aid that can be given them through the State Office of Vocational Rehabilitation. Let us also arouse the attention of the good people of the community to the fact that our town has its share of the estimated 150,000 handicapped workers who need medical or psychiatric assistance as well as placement in a more fitting job. The hearts of our business men must be touched. Then they must weigh the facts and figures. The voice of the newspaper must be used.

"The national Government is doing its part to promote the employment of the handicapped. Many communities are following the lead of the National Government. Our community must also accept the challenge of finding jobs for the handicapped.

"Employers must make the employing of the physically handicapped people one of their major goals."

Working together, Tim and Mr. Hanson brought the attention of all the community to the needs of the handicapped. The town cooperated in holding an annual NEPH Week dinner which was attended by 125 people.

Thus did this community meet the challenge of finding jobs for the handicapped—through the efforts of dedicated people like Tim and Mr. Hanson.

Let there be no verbal stones thrown in our town at the handicapped; let no handicapped person be burned at the stake of public opinion; let the climate of our town be such that here all handicapped people will be non-handicapped workers.

JOBS FOR THE HANDICAPPED

(By Pat Brenden, Dominguez High School)

Man's basic needs have always included those of security, success, and happiness. The answer to this need has become the acception of some type of work. Since the handicapped are human beings this automatically becomes a necessity on that basis alone. These ungratified human needs can develop into a psychological problem which can be solved only by their admission to some field of work; for the handicapped person requires more than anyone to feel useful to his fellow man.

Through his deformity or injury, the rendered handicapped person suffers greatly. In his suffering he has come to know the real values of life, as few others can understand them. Realizing these values, he will strive to do anything which he feels will help him pay what he believes is his debt to mankind. Because he is working, for this reason he will try to do his very best; a trait which is lacking in many workers today.

The employer has almost positive insurance that he is obtaining a reliable and valuable worker. The small risk that is involved in hiring any worker, which is greatly reduced in this case, is well worth the employer's effort because he is giving one human life the chance to obtain his basic needs of security, success, and happiness as well as dignity and some measure of independence. The employer must also remember that in actuality no man is handicapped except in the eyes of the onlooker.

As proof of the success of the handicapped here in America, let us look first to Franklin D. Roosevelt who was crippled by polio in 1921. Instead of letting this depress him he rose to even greater heights; showing not only the ability of the handicapped to do great things, but, also, doing a great service to the American people by his strong leadership. Recognition should also be given to world-famous people such as Ludwig von Beethoven, whose wonderful music was given people all over the globe, even though at the time of his writing of the "Ninth Symphony" he was totally deaf; Lord Byron, whose poetry has contributed to the literary world, though he was lame in one foot; John Milton, blind writer of classic English poetry; and the more recent Connie Boswell, whose voice thrilled millions even after she was crippled; Alex Templeton, who contributed music to the world on his piano though blinded; and George Shearing, another blind pianist who brings us jazz today. Perhaps a handicapped person who has become a success and who is even closer to home is Mrs. Longbean, an English teacher at Dominguez High School.

What is more is the fact that the handicapped are a part of our society and, as such, a useful place must be found for them. We must accept them into our organization, for if we deny them the privilege and basic right they become a useless organ not only to this country but to themselves as well. Not only must society welcome the handicapped, but it becomes our duty to find a place for them. The employers, as leaders of this body, should feel that it is their responsibility to do what they can to help make our society a smoothly and humanely conducted group.

In welcoming these handicapped, we become unique among the nations of the world. In lesser nations than ours, those who are handicapped are sometimes tolerated, but are certainly not respected, nor are they considered productive human beings. Little does man realize that in these small ways we do our part to uphold the American way of life; these relatively small differences are what make America great and outstanding.

As American citizens who believe in the American ideal, we are obliged to do our part to uphold one of the founding principles which our Nation was established upon; that all men are created equal. This has

been interpreted as meaning that all men regardless of race, creed, religion, or color are equal with uniform rights. It is mandatory that we amend this definition to include every man, no matter what shape, form, or condition, having equal rights and opportunity. Let us not forget this great American ideal which also leads us to believe that since all men are created equal they must each be created for a purpose; and that God wants us to love and help our neighbor. Let our Nation and our society be a perfect model to all nations by showing that we believe that the handicapped are a functional and integral part of our American community.

Air Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, earlier this session I introduced S. 1187, on behalf of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] to amend the air pollution control law. That bill dealt directly with interstate air pollution. It did not deal with the particular problem of air polluted over a relatively small area by automobile exhausts.

On April 22, the Washington Post and Times Herald ran an editorial entitled "Bye, Bye, Blowby." It dealt with the attitude of Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Ribicoff, and his predecessor, Secretary Flemming, currently the president of the University of Oregon, toward the practicability of a simple device for destroying automotive crankcase fumes, and thereby reducing automotive air pollution.

The Post editorial indicates that both Secretaries have been enthusiastic about a factory-installed device that would cost about $5 and would control raw gasoline hydrocarbons. I share this enthusiasm.

The automobile industry now has the opportunity to clean its own tailpipe. It can take the initiative in cutting down what I have referred to as "garbage in the sky." Should the automobile industry fail to introduce this depolluting device on its 1962 models as standard equipment, Congress may feel impelled to require it on every car shipped in interstate commerce.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial to which I have referred appear at the conclusion of my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BYE, BYE, BLOWBY

Secretary Ribicoff of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, like his predecessor, Secretary Flemming, has taken a clear, strong stand on the practicability of a simple device for destroying crankcase fumes of the type called "blowby." Such a device is now available as factory installed optional equipment to buyers of new automobiles throughout the country. "It seems to me," said Secretary Ribicoff the other day, "that this method of reducing air pollution should be put into use as rapidly as practicable." And he added an unmistakable warning: "If the automobile industry does not make the device standard equipment, then legislation to require it should be considered."

We cannot escape a conclusion that the identical view expressed by two HEW Secretaries makes the attitude of the automobile industry seem unreasonably recalcitrant. The industry asserts that no clear need for the device has been demonstrated anywhere save in California and that it is willing therefore to do no more than make the device optional to any individual buyer—with installation to be done by dealers at approximately twice the cost of doing it on an assembly line.

The cost of the device, factory installed, is no more than about $5. It is effective in controlling a secondary source of automotive air pollution, the raw gasoline hydrocarbons that blow by the piston rings. To make this standard equipment would not raise the cost of a car appreciably; and it would indicate a consideration for the public's health and the public's comfort which the automobile makers can hardly afford to forgo.

Cuban Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, all loyal citizens of the United States were proud of the strong stand taken by our President last week in his speech to the American Society of Newspaper Editors in regard to Cuba and communism in the Western Hemisphere. We feel our true friends in Latin American will respond to vigorous leadership in Washington against communism.

Today the National Security Council is meeting to make a full reappraisal of our position toward Cuba and Communist activities in general, and it is my hope that a very strong and firm policy to be backed up by actions will be decided upon.

A complete economic boycott of Cuba should be instituted by the United States, then a meeting of the Organization of American States should be called to invoke first complete economic sanctions against Castro's government; second, diplomatic isolation of Castro's government; and, third, initiate action to form an inter-American force sufficient to prevent a continuation of communistic activity in this hemisphere.

One thing that should be done by the United States immediately, which has been under consideration for more than 1 year by our State Department although action along this line has been urged by many of us Members of Congress, is to stop Cuban imports into the United States. Does it make sense to buy Cuban products and supply Castro with American dollars to continue his domination of the Cuban people, when we have already cut off exports to Cuba, broken diplomatic relations, and stated in an official Government publication that there is no further doubt about Castro and his Communist police state in Cuba?

Just using one port in Florida as an example, in January of this year over 10 million pounds of agricultural products were received from Cuba. During February over 14 million pounds were imported. During March and April up to date, some 23 million pounds of produce have been imported from Cuba.

Aside from the fact that these products, which include pineapples, oranges, tomatoes, tobacco, cucumbers, and native vegetables, compete with the same produce grown in this country to the detriment of our domestic agricultural industry in many States in the Union, the Castro government is paid U.S. dollars for these products.

The time to act to stop these imports was over a year ago. But action was not taken. There can be no further excuses for delay and inaction. The President has spoken out publicly and the world is waiting to see what we will actually do now. Stopping these imports would be a logical first step, and one which should be taken immediately. Almost 50 million pounds of produce has been shipped into one port during the first 3½ months of this year alone.

I have introduced a resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States ban all imports from Cuba. This resolution should make it clear beyond doubt to the State Department that it is the wish of the American people that these imports be stopped. We stopped exports to Cuba long ago, we should complete the economic boycott by banning all imports also.

The resolution is House Concurrent Resolution 215, and is pending before the Ways and Means Committee. I urge every interested Member of the House to join with me in asking for an early hearing on this measure, and to again ask the State Department to act.

West Virginia University Team Wins National Intercollegiate Rifle Championship and Two Team Members Place First and Second in Individual Scoring

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the legend of the feud of the Hatfields and the McCoys in the hills of West Virginia no longer rates top billing in the recording of the prowess of the mountaineers with the rifle.

We proudly acclaim our new champions who achieved fame through pursuit of a peaceful and a thoroughly lawabiding utilization of their firearms.

In this instance I am proud to be privileged to call to the attention of my

colleagues the fact that the West Virginia University rifle team has won the 1961 national intercollegiate team rifle championship conducted under the auspices of the National Rifle Association of America.

Not only did the Mountaineer quartet of sharpshooters win the national team title, but its captain, Bruce A. Meredith, made it a sweep for West Virginia University by winning the national individual title with a score of 299 out of a possible 300. In second place was his teammate, Robert I. Davies with a score of 295.

I am sure West Virginians generally join in paying tribute to Bruce Meredith and Robert Davies, and to their teammates, Charles L. Rowan, who scored 289, and Robert I. Gosnell, who shot a 286 score. Their combined team score was 1,164 out of a possible 1,200 points.

Captain Bob Means, coach, and M. Sgt. Charles Haley, assistant coach, of the Army ROTC staff at West Virginia, were appropriately praised for their work with the rifle team by Col. W. E. Roberts, head of the Army ROTC program at the university.

Colonel Roberts pointed out that three of the four varsity rifle team members also fire on the university ROTC team.

I join him in his comment that "those concerned at the university are extremely happy and proud of this achievement," and I concur in his remark that this team championship "will go a long way toward encouraging even more success in the sport or rifle shooting."

Along with complimenting our West Virginia team for its success, I wish also to extend tribute to the women's team of the University of Alaska, winner of the coed rifle team national title with a score of 1,085 points.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the newspaper account of the national intercollegiate rifle competition as published in the April 25, 1961, editions of the Dominion-News, Morgantown, W. Va.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY NAMED NATIONAL RIFLE CHAMPION—MEREDITH IS RANKED TOP STAR

WASHINGTON.—West Virginia University won the 1961 national intercollegiate team rifle championship, the National Rifle Association of America announced Monday.

Bruce A. Meredith of the West Virginia team made it a sweep for the Mountaineer club by winning the national individual title.

The team score was 1,164 out of a possible 1,200 points, and Meredith scored 299 out of a possible 300.

The West Virginia victory broke a 6-year domination of the title by Western squads. It was the first win for West Virginia in the 33-year history of the contest, and Meredith's win was the first individual crown won by the school.

Meredith tied a record set by Robert E. Hickey, of Illinois College, in 1959. His victory came in the biggest field ever to shoot in the event—1,376 contestants. There were 295 college and university teams entered.

Other members of the West Virginia team and the scores are: Robert I. Davies, 294; Charles L. Rowan, 289; and Robert I. Gosnell, 286.

Following West Virginia in the top 10 teams were: Arizona State University, 1,154; Kansas State, 1,154; St. John's University, 1,152; University of California, 1,147; St. John's University No. 2 team, 1,145; City College of New York, 1,145; U.S. Naval Academy, 1,145; U.S. Coast Guard Academy, 1,144; and Oregon State College, 1960 defending champion, 1,141.

Second to 10th places in individual standing were: Davies, West Virginia, 295; Bill G. Davis, Kansas State, 293; Kenneth T. Wessels, St. John's, 292; David W. Kimes, University of California, 292; Robert T. Mellen, Jr., Ohio State, 292; John S. Watkins, University of Alaska, 291; Rowan, West Virginia, 291; Ronald J. Pellar, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 291; and Walter S. Draper, Northeastern, 291.

The women's team of the University of Alaska took the national coed rifle team with a score of 1,085, and Jean Linton, of Akron (Ohio) University was individual titlist with 285.

High ROTC team in the competition was Cornell University with 1,142, and high ROTC individual was Nicholas C. Steen, Michigan State, 292.

CHAMPS LAUDED BY COLONEL ROBERTS

Col. W. E. Roberts, head of the Army ROTC program at the university, last night hailed news of the varsity rifle team's national championship as a great step in advancement of the sport here.

"I confine my interest mainly to the ROTC team," he explained, "but I can't help but feel closely associated with those who participate on the varsity rifle team."

All but one member of the varsity team also fires on the ROTC team.

"Capt. Bob Means and Sgt. Charles Haley have done a fine job with the varsity," Colonel Roberts noted. "I think their men deserve the victory. It's a great tribute to them."

"Those concerned at the university will be extremely happy and proud of this achievement," he added. "It will go a long way toward encouraging even more success in rifle shooting here."

Secrecy in Government Wastes Time and Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the Ann Arbor (Mich.) News of April 24, 1961:

SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT WASTES TIME AND MONEY

"You can't find out what's going on in Washington," is one of the oldest complaints against the Federal Government. Several events since the inauguration provide a basis for the secrecy charges being made against the Kennedy administration. It is difficult to know which individuals are most to blame, but there can be no doubt that the charges have some justification.

This is a matter of prime concern to newsmen, of course, but it affects all citizens. Most taxpayers feel certain that money is wasted to some extent by the Government, but few seem to realize that economy would be easier to enforce if government had to operate more in the open.

Secrecy charges are coming from a variety of sources. Representative GEORGE MEADER has commented several times recently on the growing tendency toward needless secrecy in Washington. He is a member of the House foreign operations and monetary affairs subcommittee, which recently persuaded the President to overrule a secrecy order issued by Secretary of State Rusk. Before Rusk's order was withdrawn, however, the Soviet propaganda machine made use of it by ending direct censorship of news sent from the U.S.S.R.

Another example: The American Society of Newspaper Editors, which met last week in Washington, is studying a report which says neither Kennedy nor his administration has lived up to a promise of a freer flow of news. Prepared by Eugene S. Pulliam, managing editor of the Indianapolis News, the report says access to individual White House officials is freer than in the Eisenhower administrations, but tells of increased restrictions on news from the State and Defense Departments—which spend a major share of the Federal budget.

Also: Herbert G. Klein, formerly Richard M. Nixon's press secretary and now editor of the San Diego Union, has said flatly that the Kennedy administration curbs the free flow of news more than any other administration in this century. It may be said that this is only sour grapes from a man who wishes he were working in the White House, but there is no denying that Klein is in a position to know what he is talking about.

Rusk's order is only the best publicized of several events which have stymied the work of Washington newsmen in recent weeks. It grew out of a controversy that started in the last weeks of the Eisenhower administration. The subcommittee of which MEADER is a member asked Secretary of State Herter to furnish certain information regarding aid to Peru. Herter said the subcommittee lacked jurisdiction and Eisenhower supported him. Rusk similarly ordered State Department employees not to give the subcommittee information. MEADER and other subcommittee members complained to the press, and the resulting publicity led to withdrawal of the order.

It also led Senator JOHN A. CARROLL, of Colorado, to introduce a "freedom of information" bill (S. 1567), which would require Federal agencies to publish their rules and procedures, and would expand the definition of public documents. Its purpose is to restrict the tendency of bureaucrats in Federal agencies to stamp "secret" on material which has no bearing on national security. Senator CARROLL'S bill deserves wide support.

No one denies that there is a great deal of material which must be classified for security reasons. But there is also a natural tendency among employees at all levels of government, from townships up, to keep their activities from the public eye until they can present completed, dramatic programs. No one but the public, acting through legislators and the press, can discourage this tendency.

Missile Force for Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
OF ALASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, in the April 2 edition of Jessen's Weekly,

a newspaper published in Fairbanks, Alaska, an editorial appeared which I believe succinctly expresses the sentiments of many Alaskans who are concerned with the military vitality of this country. The editorial reminds us of the strategic role Alaska should play in the offensive capability of the U.S. military force. I wholeheartedly endorse the idea that Alaska's role in the defense of this country should not be restricted to "a bastion of mere defensive capability" but should be enlarged through the establishment of missile-launching facilities. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEDOM FIGHT NEEDS STRONG ALASKA

Electrifying events recently shattered the familiar patterns of alliance in the deliberations of the United Nations. Just as with the admission of Alaska and Hawaii into the Union, the United States struck another hard blow against colonialism, proving once again, the youthful vigor and idealism of our Republic.

Breaking with our traditional European friends, United Nations Ambassador Adlai Stevenson spoke up forthrightly for the ideals of freedom and independence for all peoples.

The question before the Security Council was a resolution to investigate Portuguese suppression in colonial Angola. The traditional Western bloc had all taken the position that the U.N. had "no jurisdiction."

It was then that Stevenson spoke, charting the course of the New Frontier along a route that had the familiar ring of early American history.

"I regret to find myself in disagreement," Stevenson said. "Angola is but a part of the overall picture of evolution on the African Continent. The views of the United States have not changed since Jefferson wrote: 'We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.'

"These words reflect, we believe, the basic principles which all governments would do well to observe and to implement with all of the energy at their command.

"The United States would be remiss in its duties as a friend of Portugal if it failed to express honestly its conviction that step-by-step planning within Portuguese territories and the acceleration thereof is now imperative for the successful advancement of all inhabitants under Portuguese administration—advancement, in brief, toward full self-determination."

Stevenson's performance on this, and the many other issues coming before the United Nations, are doing much to restore America's position of world leadership in the cause of freedom.

Here in Alaska, his words serve as an inspiration to those of us who read our history books in the veritable shadow of the Soviet Union.

An America dedicated to freedom for the enslaved peoples of the world must be a strong America. We are inclined to agree with the remarks made recently by Eielson AFB Commander Stephen Henry, that we are militarily "tending toward a fortress America."

And we must agree with the remarks made long ago by Gen. Billy Mitchell in regard to the strategic position of Alaska in world affairs.

Certainly if America is to speak with authority in the cause of a world free from enslavement, then it is axiomatic that Alaska must become more than a bastion of mere defensive capability.

General Armstrong spoke up forthrightly from Anchorage some time ago. He was speaking with deep conviction. Far away in Washington, his plea for retaliatory missile forces in Alaska fell on deaf ears.

Just as Adlai Stevenson spoke honestly and logically in the battle of words at the United Nations, so must the United States be able to speak with the military strength to give those words real meaning.

The time has come for the construction of a retaliatory missile force in Alaska. A warning system is not enough. Defensive missiles are not enough. The strategic location of this vast State makes it imperative that our military forces here be supplied with the tools to keep America strong.

Alaska is an integral part of the United States. It seems foolish to rely on the instability of leased bases in foreign lands, when Alaskan military leaders make pointed stress of the lack of offensive capability in this, the most strategically located of all the 50 States.

In casting aside an archaic portion of recent American foreign policy, the New Frontier has embarked upon a bold rededication to the ideas upon which this great Nation was built. Let us hope that, at the same time, the New Frontier can cast aside, along with archaic diplomacy, the archaic philosophy that has seen military expenditures too often in the past, spent in unlikely areas that happen to have significant representation in the Congress.

It is time too, for the Congress to take an overall look at the defense picture as it pertains to Alaska. Certainly, as far as Alaskans are concerned, we would be far safer to remain as a warning device for the rest of America. It would be far safer to watch missiles sailing over our heads toward the more heavily populated areas of America. With the limited offensive capabilities of the Alaskan military establishment in the Aerospace Age, it would be pointless for a potential aggressor to waste its offensive weapons on us.

But if the words of Thomas Jefferson, so eloquently restated by Adlai Stevenson, are to have full meaning in the world of today and tomorrow, then Alaskans must express their willingness to enter the target area of the timeworn adage that states, "The best defense is a good offense."

Certainly, a good offense dictates the utilization of Alaska to its full military potentialities. This utilization should be of primary concern to the citizens of all the States of the Union, of more concern than the involvement of payroll dollars, of more concern than the other benefits of military expenditures. For after all, the security of the individual citizen and the security of the free world speak more loudly than the materialism of the dollar if only we will stop and listen.

The Record of Ambassador Adlai Stevenson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, Roscoe Drummond has published in the New York Herald Tribune an interesting comment on the record being written in the United Nations by Ambassador Adlai Stevenson. I concur in his conclusions that Adlai Stevenson's great gift of articulate speech is well suited to this forum, and that he is proving a powerful advocate of U.S. policy within the United Nations. I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred may be printed with these remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follow:

EARLY GAFFES FORGOTTEN—STEVENSON CUTTING LARGE FIGURE

(By Roscoe Drummond)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—Viewed from both Washington and the United Nations, Ambassador Adlai Stevenson is emerging as a powerful figure in the Kennedy administration.

This does not mean that the President is not making the final decisions on policy. This does not mean that Secretary of State Dean Rusk is being detoured as Mr. Kennedy's principal adviser on foreign affairs.

It does mean that, on the basis of his experience, initiative and political prestige at home and abroad, Stevenson is exerting unusually wide influence in the State Department and the White House.

Whatever coolness there may have been in the past, Stevenson and Mr. Kennedy are now establishing a good working relationship. As a consequence, the President's U.N. ambassador is today at the center of policy formulation.

Every delegate here is under instructions from his government. Stevenson is, too. But to a notable extent, his recommendations shape his instructions. And beyond that, his views on the widest range of foreign policy carry great weight in the top councils of the administration.

It was at Ambassador Stevenson's initiative that the United States for the first time voted with the Afro-Asian nations in their colonial resolution on Angola. It was Stevenson, in part because of his long personal acquaintance with Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko, who was called upon to conduct the delicate and important negotiations for resuming the disarmament talks with the Russians.

When British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan was in Washington this past week to meet with President Kennedy, Stevenson took part as well as Secretary Rusk.

Mr. Kennedy needs Stevenson in his administration. The President, aware of his close election, wants to keep the support of Adlai's followers. In addition, Stevenson, through his wide travels, has gotten to know personally more world leaders than anyone else in the administration, including the President. This is invaluable for his job as Ambassador at the U.N. He also brings his gift of articulate speech to the U.N., perhaps the best forum for Stevenson's talents.

All of these things give Stevenson a voice in Cabinet deliberations and a degree of access and influence with the President which is exceptional. Yet everything hasn't always gone well.

Mr. Kennedy was annoyed no little when Stevenson guessed publicly that the President would be glad to see Premier Khrushchev if he decided to come to the U.N.—this when the President did not want to give Khrushchev any encouragement to come. I am also told that Stevenson delivered two speeches, not before the U.N., which had not been cleared by the State Department.

But these things were in the early period of the administration's takeover—and have not recurred. Rusk and Stevenson have worked together smoothly thus far.

In his job at the U.N., Stevenson is at many points doing things differently than did Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge. He is initiating breakfast, luncheon and dinner sessions with the heads of all the 99 delegations, sometimes including wives. For the first time, Stevenson as U.S. representative let it be known that he would be available to meet with the caucus of the Afro-Asian nations on a common matter. They invited him at once.

There is one intriguing thread of sameness-plus-difference between the governor and his predecessor. As U.N. Ambassador, Lodge was, to a degree, seeking to make his political reputation while Stevenson is seeking to conserve his political reputation.

It is premature to guess what Stevenson's record will look like when it takes fuller shape. But at this point he is proving a powerful advocate of U.S. policy within the U.N. and an influential spokesman for his own views within the Kennedy administration.

Lockheed Repudiates Erroneous Press Report Regarding Its Showing of the Film "Operation Abolition"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, on April 13, 1961, there was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the Los Angeles Mirror of March 3, 1961 "relating why Lockheed missiles and space division has stopped showing the film 'Operation Abolition.'"

Under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD two letters: the first dated March 27, 1961, which I addressed to Mr. Robert E. Gross, chief executive officer of the Lockheed Aircraft Corp., asking confirmation of the above mentioned press release; the second letter, dated April 15, 1961, received in reply from Mr. John E. Canaday, vice president of the company, in which he repudiates the "erroneous press report" regarding Lockheed's halting its showing of the film:

MARCH 27, 1961.

Mr. ROBERT E. GROSS,
Chief Executive Officer, Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Burbank, Calif.

DEAR MR. GROSS: I was somewhat surprised to read in the press that the raging controversy over "Operation Abolition" had caused Lockheed Missiles and Space Division to halt its showing of the film. I am somewhat at a loss to understand this, and am quite sure the release was, perhaps, unauthorized or at least garbled.

I am sure you are aware of the report made to our committee by Hon. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, on the subject of the riots in San Francisco and the fact that our committee made a report to the House concerning the legislative purpose for the production of the film. Both of these publications are enclosed for your information.

I would very much appreciate hearing from you as to whether or not the present comments are indeed accurate.

With very best regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Chairman.

LOCKHEED AIRCRAFT CORP.,
Burbank, Calif., April 5, 1961.

Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER,
House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WALTER: Mr. Robert E. Gross has asked that I investigate and reply to your March 27 letter. Evidently there has been a misunderstanding about Lockheed's position in regard to the film "Operation Abolition." We have no overall policy against its showing.

Lockheed acquired one print of the film for internal purposes. We have shown it to some of our security coordinators and others. It has been shown to the management clubs at two of our divisions. On a few occasions our print has been shown to outside groups. And we shall continue to lend our single print to such groups when the dates can be worked into the rather tight internal schedule.

I have recently seen the film and feel that it is an excellent documentary-type record of tactics used by the Communists and their supporters. We believe everyone should see it, especially parents who may not be aware of the dangerous influences their sons and daughters may encounter on college campus.

Occasions for showing the film either among our employees or to outside groups with our assistance are limited, however, both by propriety and the regulations and practices characteristic of large industrial firms and Government defense contractors. It would be inappropriate and contrary to longstanding practices, for example, to show the film to employees on the job. And it would be inappropriate for industrial firms like Lockheed to serve as a film distributing agency. Outside groups will have no difficulty in obtaining a print from the commercial film company that produced it and is distributing it.

It was a misimpression that grew out of one or two such occasions that led to the erroneous press report that we would no longer allow the film to be shown.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN E. CANADAY,
Vice President.

National Employ the Physically Handicapped Committee of the Great 23d Congressional District, Calif., Awards U.S. Government Bonds to Five Winners in High Schoool Essay Competition—City Officials, Newspaper Editor, Veterans' Leaders and Business Representatives Act as Judges at Compton, Calif.—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the following are the three remaining essays as hereinbefore described by me in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for this date and I call these essays to your attention and also to the attention of all readers thereof:

JOBS FOR THE HANDICAPPED—A COMMUNITY CHALLENGE

(By Sue Carter, Hollydale, Calif., Paramount High School)

Any bodily defect that is a disadvantage in normal activities is considered a physical handicap. Public attention has caused programs for the welfare of the handicapped to be concentrated on the more noticeable handicaps like loss of hearing, vision, or parts of the body, and crippling of the bones, joints and muscles. Other disabilities which seriously affect individuals are damage to the heart, veins, or kidneys; difficulties with the nervous system such as cerebral palsy, multiple sclerosis and epilepsy; respiratory ailments, including arrested tuberculosis, silicosis and asthma; diabetes; and speech defects.

Physical handicaps are usually due to accidents, diseases, birth injuries and defects in the development of the child before birth, but the causes of some handicaps are unknown. Rheumatic fever, which damages the heart, tuberculosis of the bones, which causes bone deformities, and infantile paralysis, which results in inability to use muscles, are common causes of crippling in children. Perhaps with the full use of modern medical knowledge 75 percent of all handicaps have been decreasing in recent years because of improved nutrition, prevention of disease and accidents, and better medical and obstetrical care. Many existing physical handicaps can be improved through physical therapy, surgery and other medical treatment, but there are many areas in the United States where such treatment is not available to everyone. In the case of handicaps due to illnesses that tend to reoccur, such as rheumatic fever and tuberculosis, proper health care can help to prevent additional damage. Research is being done by public and private agencies and by individuals in the prevention and treatment of physical handicaps.

Certain handicapped people for example the blind, the deaf and those with severe orthopedic crippling need specially trained instructors in order to have as good an education as other people. The present trend is to enable these people to have a normal home life and contacts with unhandicapped people while having special training. Most States provide boarding schools for blind and deaf children. People realize now that the training of blind and deaf children should be started in early infancy if they are to take advantage of schooling and in some localities there are classes for parents and public or private nursery schools for these children. Some schools provide job training for handicapped children and counseling to advise them concerning suitable occupations.

An ideal program for the physically handicapped, toward which both community and private agencies are working, consists in making available to all handicapped persons means of restoring as much use of their bodies as possible, helping them to develop their natural abilities, and enabling them to lead happy, normal lives as self-supporting, self-respecting members of the community. Such a program must include medical diagnosis and treatment, providing appliances such as hearing aids and artificial limbs, special public education for handicapped people, training for work and placement in a job suited to the abilities of the individual, recreation and counseling to help the individual with his personal problems.

Many corporations in many communities have developed programs for hiring disabled workers as a practical solution to their labor

shortages. Certain aircraft, automobile and farm equipment manufacturers have been most successful. The Federal Government, however, is probably the biggest single employer of the physically handicapped in the United States.

Educational programs based on numerous studies of experience in business and industry have helped to prove to industrial leaders, the general public and fellow employees the fact that the disabled worker is a satisfactory worker when he is properly placed. By job analysis a disabled person can be selected so that his handicap does not interfere with his job performance.

Contrary to popular opinion, experience in employing the handicapped during the war has shown that with careful placement in a suitable job, the handicapped person can be just as efficient as other workers and often has fewer absences and changes jobs less frequently. Education of the community in understanding the needs and abilities of the handicapped is a vital necessity in securing support for such programs.

JOBS FOR THE HANDICAPPED—A COMMUNITY CHALLENGE

(By Ken Perkins, Compton Senior High School, Compton, Calif.)

Ability. This is the keyword to success in our modern, industrial age. It is that substance which employers are constantly trying to find. It is the nucleus around which all successful enterprises revolve. In spite of all this, however, some of the greatest ability in the possession of mankind today is forced to remain idle because of a physical handicap.

The American people boast that in our country any person with ability can advance in his selected field of endeavor. In the great majority of cases, this is true, but in the case of a physically handicapped person, whose handicap in no way affects his capability in his job, this great boast semingly does not apply.

The rejection of physically handicapped people by American industry is not brought about by malintent, but rather by ignorance of the facts. If the employers of America knew the truth about physical handicaps, and were to consign to old wives' tales that have grown up about these handicaps to their proper sphere, this hire-the-handicapped campaign would not be necessary.

The industries of America owe it to themselves and to the public in general to take another look at this matter of job for the handicapped and to find out just what the truth is.

The facts now make it impossible for anyone to make the blanket statement that a handicap of any nature makes a person unfit for a job. A blind man in Peterborough, N.H., tests ball bearings (which are so small that nine would fit in an aspirin tablet) by the sense of touch. With this superdeveloped sense of touch, he is more capable of doing this work than a man with normal eyesight. August Renoir produced some of his finest paintings from a wheelchair. John Milton wrote some of his most beautiful poetry while blind. Even more astounding, Beethoven created some of his finest works after deafness had overtaken him.

No longer can anyone say that a handicapped person is a liability to his firm. There is a company in Long Island, N.Y., called Abilities, Inc., which is run by a man born without legs and is manned entirely by 200 disabled men. After the first year, its insurance rate went down 21 percent. A survey by the U.S. Labor Department has shown that handicapped workers are safer on the job, have better production records, and have no greater rate of absence than normal workers.

The Federal Government has realized the need for employment of handicapped people. Congress has set aside 1 week of the year as National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week. The Department of Labor has made surveys regarding this problem and is constantly encouraging the hiring of handicapped people.

Employing the handicapped is not just something to be done out of decency or charity. As the preceding has shown, it is also good business. But there is something more involved in it than just good business—something that makes it the concern of every American citizen who is conscious of his duties as an American. Perhaps the best way to convey this would be to quote President Eisenhower as he once spoke on the subject—

"In these demanding times, the labor force of our Nation is our most precious asset. Working shoulder to shoulder, the handicapped can add spirit and power to America as we seek to promote the strength of the whole free world."

It is not what the employer can do for the handicapped that is important, but rather what the handicapped can do for the employer and the whole Nation. The hiring of able, handicapped workers is a challenge to America which, in order to survive in this modern world, it cannot neglect.

JOBS FOR THE HANDICAPPED—A COMMUNITY CHALLENGE

(By Michelle Ruth Reynolds, Lynwood, Calif.)

There are in the United States today some 2 million handicapped people who, despite the loss of a limb or one of the senses, still possess skills, talents, knowledge, and the desire to work. But few of these people will be hired; most of them will continue to live in tax-supported hospitals or homes or off tax-paid pensions or benefits.

Yet, it is good sense to rehabilitate and hire these handicapped people. A survey conducted by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation showed that in 1 year the earnings of some 44,000 rehabilitated workers increased from $6,500,000 to $78 million, quite an increase in tax and spending money coming into the community.[1] Nor was that the only financial benefit. It costs $500 a year to support a handicapped person; only $300 to $500 to rehabilitate him.[2] The cost of supporting the people used in the survey for just 1 year meant the difference between their costing the community and their helping the community.

To a handicapped person, a job is the gateway to self-respect, the means of once again becoming an active worker. It is the difference between idleness and productiveness. It means that he is once again a useful member of society.

But all too often society rejects the rehabilitated. All to often doors are closed to the handicapped. Businessmen say, "I run a competetive organization. I'm afraid a handicapped person would not be able to do the work that would be expected of him."

Is this statement true? Are the handicapped a liability? No, as several highly successful firms who prefer the handicapped person have proven. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. and the Brown-Brockmeyer Co., of Ohio, hire deaf-mutes because they are not bothered by the noise of machinery or conversation. Marshall Field and Eastman Kodak employ heart patients. North American Aviation, Boeing Airplane, Bates Manufacturing, Otis Elevator, and the Radio Corp. of America all use blind persons in their factories and offices. The Caterpillar Tractor Co. hires amputees, as well as those who are deaf, blind, or mute.[3]

Most of these companies did not hire the handicapped out of pity, but because they know that the handicapped worker is actually a better worker, as was proven by the Western Electric Co. Western Electric ran a test using two groups of workers, one composed of disabled persons, the other of regular employees. At the end of a year, the handicapped proved superior in all four areas of study.[4] They had seven times less absentees, five times less labor turnover and accidents, and were outproducing the other group. One reason for this performance is that a disabled person is generally more conscientious, more careful, and more stable than the average man.

A handicap is not necessarily a hindrance to work. The Ford Motor Co. estimated that in their organization there were 2,637 jobs that could be done by a one-legged person, 670 a double amputee could handle, 715 a one-armed individual could perform, and 10 that the blind could do.[5] An analysis by the U.S. Civil Service Commission of 6,000 jobs disclosed that 3,500 of them could be performed by the handicapped as efficiently as by the able-bodied.[6]

These are the facts. The handicapped are able and willing to work. Must industry refuse them the opportunity? After fighting to overcome their handicap, must they also fight to overcome the prejudice of a society that is supposedly dedicated to the belief that all men are equals? This is the challenge given by the handicapped to the communities and the people of America: Give us jobs. Let us show that we can work as well and as hard as any other employee. Will the American community accept this challenge?

---

[1] Ray, Marie Beynon, "How To Conquer Your Handicaps," p. 120.
[2] Ibid., p. 121.
[3] Ibid., p. 283.
[4] Ibid., p. 285.
[5] Ibid., p. 286.
[6] Ibid., p. 287.

The Nation's Stake in Atomic Power—Address by Representative Holifield

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on Tuesday of this week, it was my privilege to hear, at San Antonio, Tex., an informed and stimulating address before the 18th annual convention of the American Public Power Association, by the able, diligent, dedicated CHET HOLIFIELD, Congressman from California, and chairman of the U.S. Congress Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Believing that the facts, information, and thoughts of Congressman HOLIFIELD worthy of wide dissemination over the country, and before the Congress and the Government, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD today, his address of April 25, 1961, before the 1961 annual convention of the

American Public Power Association, under the titled "The Nation's Stake in Atomic Power."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATION'S STAKE IN ATOMIC POWER

(Remarks by Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, of California)

I am sure that you gentlemen are aware that the subject on which I speak to you today is not as fashionable as it used to be. Atomic power has lost some of its glamour, and there may have been a corresponding decrease in general public interest.

My principal purpose in speaking to you today is to emphasize that the development of atomic power is no less important now than it was a few years ago, when the Sunday supplements were predicting an atomic power plant in every home and an atomic-powered automobile in every garage. These were fantasies born of ignorance, and it is well that they now are recognized as such.

However, I do foresee a time when many homes will be heated and mass transportation will be powered indirectly by atomic energy—not by individual atomic reactors, of course, but by electricity generated in huge nuclear power stations of several million kilowatts capacity and transmitted over great high-voltage regional grids for distribution to homes, farms and industrial establishments.

Just when this may occur and just what types of nuclear power plants will have been developed by that time, I would not venture to predict. But I am confident that this day will come.

The theme of my talk with you today is that we should hasten this day to the extent that we can by initiating a positive and effective program to develop atomic power plants that are safe, reliable, and economic. This program must include a strong public development effort because this is the only way, as I see it, that the public interest in this new source of energy can be protected.

Right now the importance of protecting the public interest in atomic power may not be too obvious. We generate most of our power from the fossil fuels—coal, oil, and gas—and the U.S. and the world reserves of these seem to be very large. However, this condition will not last forever.

There will come a day when we will foresee the end of our fossil fuel reserves if we do not start soon to tap additional sources of energy. In a careful study made last year, the Atomic Energy Commission concluded that within 40 years the world would be burning up annually above five times a much coal, oil, and gas as in 1958, and the people of the United States four times as much. The study predicted that if no other sources of energy were tapped, we would exhaust our fossil fuel reserves in about 90 years.[1]

Obviously, we cannot let this happen, nor should we allow this point even to be approached. Our fossil fuels will become increasingly valuable as sources of chemical raw materials, and the time may come when people will wonder why we were so wasteful as to burn them up.

The development of atomic power also can bring into our economy a new source of low-cost energy and help to restrain the steady upward march of the prices of the conventional fuels. We all know how the price of natural gas has been rising, despite reported large reserves. Our supplies of coal are far larger, yet I am told that coal prices have shown an upward trend averaging almost 1.5 percent per year compounded.

[1] It is recognized that estimates this far in the future in themselves involve major problems.

Low-cost atomic power, developed without delay, can help restrain this upward drift. If atomic power held back the average cost of fuel for powerplants by as much as one-twentieth of a cent per kilowatt-hour—one-half mill—the savings to the American consumers as of 1980 would amount to between $1½ and $2 billion per year, and the amount would increase each year thereafter.

Atomic energy will not have to supply a large percentage of our total power needs in order to be a restraining influence on fuel and energy. As a matter of fact the threat of atomic energy is already having an effect. As I understand it, the conventional fuel price situation in certain parts of Florida and California have been stabilized or lowered, as a result of proposals to build large-scale atomic powerplants in those areas.

But conventional fuel producers should have no fear that atomic power will supplant coal and oil and gas in the foreseeable future. All of you are familiar with the rapid growth in the consumption of electricity in this country. It doubles every 9 to 10 years. In 1958, power production in the United States was about six times what it was in 1935. If we continue the same rate of growth, total U.S. power production by 1980 will be five or six times what it was in 1958.

Even a small percentage of this large a power industry would be a great number of kilowatts. For example, if only 10 percent of our total generating capacity in 1980 were from atomic power plants, our atomic power capacity would probably equal or exceed the total generating capacity which the United States had in 1950—more than 80 million kilowatts.

This fantastic growth rate in the electric power industry, sustained for more than 50 years, and the fact that our reserves of coal, oil, and gas are not inexhaustible, make it clear that the vigorous development of atomic power will be of great importance to the American consumer.

However, this is a most difficult and complex undertaking. We have made progress in civilian atomic power development, but knotty problems remain to be overcome. There are such technical problems as the development of new metals and ceramics which will not fail under the unusual heat and radiation conditions in a reactor, and designing fuel elements which are both cheap and reliable. There is the problem of how to store large quantities of extremely radioactive waste materials for literally indefinite periods of time.

There are also stringent safety requirements to be met. The nature of the nuclear technology and the magnitude of the hazards require a much greater degree of technical competence and a far higher level of public responsibility by both Government and industry than have earlier industrial technologies. In the past, we have permitted industry to pollute our atmosphere and streams to a considerable extent, but any similar attitude is completely intolerable in the atomic energy industry.

The Atomic Energy Commission has maintained a good safety record, although it was unfortunately marred in January of this year by the fatal reactor accident in Idaho. It will be essential to maintain a good record as the industrial uses of atomic energy spread. This will require substantial research and training, and a sufficiently deliberate approach to widespread industrial utilization, to assure the needed competence and control.

In conjunction with unique technical and safety problems, the development of atomic power presents stubborn economic obstacles. Many utility and industry people said in 1954 that if private enterprise were unleashed by amending the Atomic Energy Act, it would rapidly develop economic atomic power.

However, economic atomic power has not been achieved. The first large private industry plant has been shut down for repairs most of the time since its startup last year. These repairs incidentally arise primarily from causes which are nonnuclear in their origin. Another large plant, the Consolidated Edison plant at Indian Point, N.Y., is estimated to cost more than twice as much as originally estimated. This can result in increased power costs to the consumers of the area of one sort or another.

The costs for the Shippingport pressurized water reactor—the only large Federal power reactor in operation—also are indicative. The capacity of this reactor is to be increased from 60,000 to 150,000 kilowatts equivalent by installation of a new and improved core. This will reduce fuel costs to one-third their present level. Even so, the new fuel cost will still be much too high to be economic.

The lack of achievement of economic atomic power should not discourage us. The problems are not more difficult now than they were in fact in 1954. And we have learned a great deal from our mistakes and successes since then.

Our slow progress, in my opinion, has been primarily due to the adoption by the Atomic Energy Commission in 1954 and 1955 of an ineffective approach to solving these complex technical and economic problems.

As you will recall, the former administration rushed through legislation in 1954 to place primary responsibility on private industry to develop atomic power. At the same time, this same administration proclaimed a grandiose international program of atoms for peace, whereby the peaceful atom was going to replace stockpiles of atomic weapons.

The chosen instrument to achieve economic power in the United States, and to promote atoms for peace abroad, was the so-called partnership approach. This method emphasized U.S. Federal financial participation, without any corresponding U.S. leadership or direction of the programs.

It became evident quite early in the period following the 1954 amendments that we needed greater U.S. leadership if the domestic and international atomic development programs were going to succeed. Together with Senator GORE, I sponsored a bill in 1955 and 1956, to initiate a Federal program of building developmental atomic powerplants.

Following introduction of these bills, and particularly during their consideration by the Joint Committee in public hearings and executive sessions in the spring of 1956, various improvements were made in the bills. Thus, under Chairman ANDERSON'S leadership, the bills authorized both large and small atomic reactors which would be prototype plants for experimental and demonstration purposes. The electric power produced would be absorbed at AEC installations, and thereby hopefully avoid the alleged public power issue.

These bills, as revised, were reported out unanimously by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. However, they still were not palatable to some important interests. Our proposals were denounced by Atomic Energy Commission Chairman Lewis Strauss, the private power companies, and others for advocating a wasteful crash program, aimed at nothing more than building a lot of uneconomic atomic power capacity. We were accused of proposing a useless kilowatt race with Russia and the United Kingdom, and of trying to socialize the power industry.

The fact is, of course, that we had no such purposes in mind. The bill was passed by the Senate and defeated in the House by only 12 votes despite the fact that the entire weight of the executive branch was thrown against us. Obviously, a good many other Members of Congress and people elsewhere thought the bill was well advised.

I review this history not for partisan reasons, but because of the effect on the atomic

power program of the defeat of the Gore-Holifield bill. We in the Joint Committee sponsored that bill because we knew that the development of economic and safe atomic powerplants was going to be a long, hard, and expensive job. We knew that the costs of development were far beyond the capacity of private industry, particularly since there were no prospects of early profits on investments. The bill therefore aimed at establishing a positive Federal construction program of developmental plants.

With the defeat of the Gore-Holifield bill, the so-called partnership approach became the dominant pattern for the construction of atomic powerplants. In my opinion, the decision to rely almost entirely upon the approach has delayed the development of atomic power and allowed the privately owned utilities to dominate a program largely financed with public funds.

It has taken at least 5 years to complete the first large plant under the "partnership" approach. This is the project sponsored by the Yankee Atomic Electric Co. The Dresden plant, sponsored by the Commonwealth Edison Co. was built outside the "partnership" program.

A number of other projects are underway and several are nearing completion, as you know. Four of these are under construction in partnership with local public power agencies and rural co-ops but not one is yet in operation. Even in these cases, where the Federal Government has financed the reactor, the rate of progress has been halting and uncertain.

The program has been equally slow in respect to the plants proposed by the private utility groups, where Federal funds are provided for research and development and fuel subsidies. A number have been canceled and others are seriously behind schedule.

Back in 1958, I tried to make some sense out of the partnership approach by advocating AEC leadership and technical direction of the program. This more aggressive approach was spelled out in a report prepared by the Joint Committee staff in August 1958, with the advice of a distinguished panel of consultants. The Joint Committee, as you know, sponsored several projects, including the Oak Ridge gas-cooled project and the Puerto Rico superheat project under this more aggressive approach. However, AEC has not followed through aggressively to carry out its other authorizations.

The "partnership" approach seems to have run its course, at least as the main vehicle for developmental plant construction. The last three projects have apparently been duds. AEC received no proposals at all from the private power companies on the 50-megawatt organic reactor. But it apparently won't build the project itself, as authorized in the 1961 law. On two water reactor projects offered to public power and co-op systems, AEC received proposals but was unable to conclude mutually satisfactory arrangements. One of the three projects has been canceled and the other two are in a state of suspense. Congress authorized all three for construction in 1959.

Although some worthwhile plants have been started and there has been technical progress in the past 6 years, the partnership approach has proved to be clumsy and cumbersome. As a supplement to a strong Federal program, it might have some merit.

It seems to me high time that the Atomic Energy Commission move ahead with the development, construction, and operation of a sequence of developmental projects aimed at achieving clearly defined technical objectives according to a reasonable definite schedule. As the first sign of a new and bolder spirit in the executive branch, President Kennedy's recent recommendation to convert the new production reactor at Hanford to a dual-purpose plant is extremely encouraging. A converted NPR would use the heat from the reactor, which otherwise would be wasted, to produce 650,000 to 750,000 kilowatts of electric power. It will be by far the world's largest power-producing reactor. This step makes me hopeful that the new leadership in AEC will move ahead with a positive Federal program.

Once we get the NPR generating facilities authorized, and ascertain which of AEC's currently authorized projects should go forward, I believe that AEC and the Joint Committee should have a little get-together to see where we go from here. The private power people, the co-ops, and yourselves, as well as the industrial equipment companies have a stake in the development of a more aggressive program. So do consumers everywhere.

I certainly would not preclude the construction of additional plants by the privately owned utilities which they believe are financially justified in undertaking, but the U.S. program should not be primarily dependent on such projects.

As for the municipal and rural co-op utilities, there may be opportunities for additional "second round" projects. However, the costs and economic uncertainties involved probably mean that a relatively limited number of your utilities can or should participate directly in these developmental plants.

During this developmental period, I suggest that you prepare for the future use of atomic power by planning now for interconnection of your public and co-op systems. The economics of atomic power favor large plants even more strongly than those of conventional plants, and it appears that nuclear plants usually will need to be outside the city limits. While you should remain interested in the development of small plants, there is no assurance that economic reactors of less than, perhaps, 50,000 kilowatts can be developed in the foreseeable future. The best way, it seems to me, to prepare for the use of atomic powerplants is to interconnect your public systems so that you can use larger generating units located away from population centers.

In my opinion, it is in your interest also to continue your support of a strong Federal atomic power program. Experience has taught that the most effective way to protect the interests of all consumers is to maintain a strong publicly owned segment in the power industry. Your utilities have been the historical "yardsticks," in many cases in conjunction with the Federal power systems. To continue to provide such a yardstick is one of your important public responsibilities.

In the case of atomic power, during this developmental period it seems to me the Federal Government must carry the main burden of assuring strong public agency participation because of the unusual costs and economic risks involved.

I believe that we do need an effective public effort in atomic power development in order to protect the public interest in this new source of energy. If the Federal role were confined mainly to providing subsidies and research funds, effective control over the rate of atomic power development and its price to the public would come to rest largely in the hands of the privately owned utilities and the large equipment manufacturers. Now I bear no hostility toward either. Both industries are essential and are performing most important functions, on the whole with a high degree of competence.

The fact is, however, that the private utilities are State franchised monopolies which are becoming ever larger and more powerful through mergers and combinations. Their past history is spotted with major instances of consumer exploitation, public progaganda, and the abuse of the great political power they wield as well-financed monopolies. State and Federal regulation have been only partially effective at best in restraining them.

A further factor affected by the lag in the atomic development program is the situation of our private atomic equipment companies. We have had a fairly healthy competitive situation with at least seven major equipment companies in the field of atomic power development. Because of the general overoptimism in the early days, and AEC's exhortations, these companies have tended to overcapitalize on private facilities in the atomic field. Now that the pickings are not so good, it is only Government contracts once again, which are primarily responsible for keeping this industry alive.

Moreover, unless a well-planned Federal directed and administrated program is established we can be sure that only the bigger and entrenched companies can remain in the atomic power development business. Various consolidations and dropouts have been taking place.

I would regret to see atomic equipment development end up with only one or two giants in the business.

We have had a vivid example of what happens when two corporate giants dominate the electrical equipment manufacturing and distributing industry. I speak of the shocking facts which were revealed in the recent indictments of 29 electrical equipment companies and the 45 individuals involved.

I was aware of some of these corporate price-fixing and collusive bidding practices as early as July 20, 1959, when I spoke in the House of Representatives on the TVA-Los Angeles Water and Power Department's purchase of large generating equipment from Swiss and English manufacturers. Westinghouse and the General Electric Co. raised such a hue and cry against these foreign companies which outbid them, that I decided to investigate the facts which were involved.

I proved that their failure to obtain the TVA and Los Angeles Water and Power business was based on managed prices and collusive bidding practices. As you know, my contention was proven by the Department of Justice in their antitrust suits. These suits were decided in the Federal courts and resulted in some very prominent corporation officials taking an enforced vacation in what is sometimes referred to as the "pokey."

Federal Judge Ganey fined the 45 individuals involved in the price-fixing conspiracy a total of $1,924,000. The judge labeled the case as "a shocking indictment of a vast section of our economy." The Justice Department called this case of massive conspiracy the biggest in antitrust history. Judge Ganey also vigorously denounced the conspirators by stating that their actions "flagrantly mocked the image of the economic system of free enterprise which we profess to the country, and destroyed the model which we offer today as a free world alternative to state control and eventual dictatorship."

I mention this case to emphasize the need for continuous objective evaluation of our so-called free enterprise system. It is only one example of our retreat from the principle of competition. Other great segments of business have, for all practical purposes, deserted the principle of real competition. We can point to similar situations in steel, rubber, chemicals, petroleum products, finance, and labor.

We have been told throughout the complete development of our economy that our progress has been based on the incentives of reward under competitive effort in a free enterprise system. But throughout the length and breadth of our land, we can see a pattern of monopoly, managed prices, regional distribution agreements, collusive agreements between great labor unions and their employers, and rigged collusive bid-

ding, gradually taking the place of competitive practices and procedures.

Profits no longer are based primarily on efficiency of production and distribution between real competitors. Profits depend too often upon the elimination of competition through various devices which I have described.

I am deeply concerned with this erosion of the competitive principles. If our system of competitive free enterprise is a valid one, and if it is to succeed in the world struggle against the Communist system of production, it must be allowed to function without crippling distortion. We will not be able to compete successfully with the Soviet system through operating a system that denies the transmission of its benefits to the consumer.

I say we cannot deny to our people the advantages and improvements in the productive and distributive processes of a free society which operates under the competitive principle and which is inevitably stifled when monopoly takes over.

We are in a desperate cold war struggle with the Soviets, not only for the minds, but for the markets and technologies of free and neutral nations. If we are to be crippled with the deadweight of monopoly, managed prices, limited production, and unjustified profits, we cannot win. We are doomed to failure.

In the field of atomic development, the problem therefore is not merely one of maintaining a competitive domestic atomic equipment industry, or of someday achieving economic atomic power on a business-as-usual basis. In many ways the world technological leadership of the United States is at stake. We cannot depend upon the controlled pace of monopolistic groups, dictated by their own limited interests, to maintain this technological leadership. We must provide for the leadership of the Federal Government in the current state of the development of this new energy resource, and insure the full participation of private, co-op, and public organizations in the atomic program for which the Federal taxpayer has contributed billions of dollars.

Omnibus Farm Bill Is in Keeping With American Experience and Tradition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman gave an excellent summary of the principles and programs of the proposed Agricultural Act of 1961 when he appeared before the House Agriculture Committee on April 24. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include excerpts from Secretary Freeman's testimony in the RECORD:

SIGNIFICANCE OF PRINCIPLES AND PROGRAMS OF THE NEW FARM BILL

The Agricultural Act of 1961 seeks to accomplish essential goals by means that are, on the one hand, in line with American experience and tradition, and, on the other, adapted to meet the conditions and demands of today.

The principle of adjusting abundance to current domestic and foreign needs is itself in the American tradition

This Nation, historically, has sought higher standards of living. It has sought to achieve plenty. In agriculture we have succeeded to a greater extent than in any other field. But we have never sought the waste—of both natural and human resources—that occurs when we produce what cannot be used. And so we seek, at one and the same time, in this legislation, to increase our utilization of farm products both at home and abroad and to adjust our productive abundance to those increased quantities. We are realistic enough to recognize that, even with an expansion of programs for increased consumption to the greatest possible extent that is consistent with sound and humane ideas and policies, we will not be able, in the years immediately ahead, to expand consumption enough to absorb all of our potential agricultural productivity. Thus, we must adjust our abundance.

The principle of equality of economic opportunity is basic to our philosophy, and this is all we are asking for the American farmer

The farmer is the only basic producer in our economy who now has available to him no means by which he can adjust his production to demand—and who, therefore, has no effective means by which he can influence the economic rewards of his enterprise.

It is absurd, in any consideration of a farm program, to compare the farmer with the small corner merchant.

Perhaps there should be Government action for small business, but of a different nature for a different reason. But the farmer, as a basic producer and not a retailer, can be more accurately compared with other basic producers—such as, for example, the producers of steel. Government has given to such producers the instrument of incorporation, by which they can become large enough to effectively adjust their production to quantities that can be sold profitably.

Government has likewise given to labor the instrument of collective bargaining whereby millions of individual workers—who, as individuals, would be even more helpless than the farmers—can work together to achieve a fair return for their productive activity.

To achieve economic equality, therefore, we propose programs to provide farmers with the insitutional machinery for coming together and developing supply adjustment programs, and with democratic methods for approving or rejecting such programs. We would specifically provide safeguards for consumers' interest in this process.

By enacting the proposed legislation, the Congress would establish the ground rules and guidelines under which supply adjustment programs would be developed and placed into operation. Then, whenever action is needed with regard to any commodity or group of related commodities, a committee of producers—including one consumer representative—would be selected to consult with the Secretary of Agriculture to develop and recommend a program of supply adjustment for that commodity. The Secretary would recommend a program based on these consultations. Only after such a program had been approved by the President, sanctioned by the Congress, and approved by a two-thirds vote of the producers themselves, would it become binding upon all farmers who choose to produce that commodity. The farmers who serve on these commodity advisory committees would be chosen from nominees designated by farmer-elected county committees and by farm organizations.

It is a part of the strength of this Nation to emphasize self-help and voluntary action

This principle is emphasized in the legislation here presented. I believe that the farmer advisory committees provided for in the bill will have an opportunity to exercise genuine leadership and develop economic statesmanship. They will be chosen because, taken together, they represent every group, segment, and interest that should be heard in the discussion and formulation of commodity programs, and they will therefore consider the broader implications of the policies they recommend. Charged with the responsibility of considering the interests of the farmers they represent, and facing public scrutiny and examination and approval by the Congress, they will, I am confident, once again demonstrate—as Americans have so often demonstrated—that the people themselves have the ability to consider the interest of the people as a whole. I have had experience with citizen committees and voluntary action. I know that members of these committees will recognize that they can "write their own ticket" only where the ticket is in the public interest and acceptable to all concerned.

The proposed legislation further recognizes the principle of self-help in its authorization of the expansion of marketing orders and agreements, as one important means available to farmers for developing and adjusting their industry. They give farm producers the opportunity to jointly plan their production in a manner designed to make abundant supplies of food available at reasonable prices, and yet to avoid the waste which results from excessive production.

Marketing quotas, product diversion, promotion, research, and quality control will provide many agricultural industries with the means of self-regulation. Marketing orders are truly a self-help program in that they are producer initiated, producer administered, and producer financed. And, since consumer interests are adequately protected, as required under the act, this self-help approach should be highly successful with respect to many commodities.

It is in the American tradition to seek to raise the economic level of all segments in our society

It is in this tradition that provisions for agricultural credit are incorporated in this bill.

A number of improvements in our supervised credit program are proposed, directed toward enabling all of our family farmers to benefit from the improvements contemplated in the farm program, toward strengthening the position of the family farmers, and toward enabling them to make their maximum contribution to the Nation's economic growth.

Under the proposed program the Farmers Home Administration could serve the full range of family farmers, including young farmers with farm background and training who are just starting out. It could do a far better job of helping farmers reorganize their farming operations and otherwise meet farm credit needs that are currently neglected. The administration of supervised farm credit would be simplified and improved. Farm management assistance would continue to be provided along with the loans, so that borrowers could get the maximum assistance out of every dollar borrowed. The Farmers Home Administration would continue to serve only those farmers who are unable to obtain sufficient credit from cooperative and private sources, and the legislation would in fact encourage an even greater use of credit from those sources.

Broadly speaking, the legislation would provide credit for financing farm adjustments, for enlarging and improving family farms, for acquiring farms, for making better use of water resources, for minimizing the risks in farming, for improving living conditions, and for financing modern production practices.

It is likewise in the American tradition to use our abudnance to meet human needs at home and abroad, and to utilize our abundance as an instrument for peace and freedom in the world

The provisions in the proposed legislation relating to agricultural trade development will enable us to step up our programs for expanding the export of food and fiber, both for dollars and for foreign currency. They will enable us to make more effective use of our food for peace.

The request for a 5-year extension is the key recommendation to make Public Law 480 a more forceful instrument in U.S. foreign relations. A long-term extension will give notice that the United States is prepared to give greater assurance of a continuing supply of agricultural commodities needed by emerging nations. Many of these countries are striving to promote economic growth through ambitious, long-term plans. A 5-year extension of Public Law 480 will permit the coordination of U.S. agricultural export programs with these development plans. It will also be an integral part of our Nation's plans to establish a national food policy and develop a world food budget—thus assuring our contribution to the world problem of more adequately feeding hungry people. As we increase our efforts for expanded utilization, and as we develop means—in cooperation with other countries—for the more effective use of greater quantities of agricultural exports, these new and increasing demands on American agriculture will have to be taken into account in the formulation of our agricultural programs at home. This is why an extension and strengthening of our food-for-peace program is an integral part of the Agricultural Act of 1961.

I believe that affirmative action by the Congress on the programs we present in the Agricultural Act of 1961 would set the stage and provide the tools by which (1) the farmers of this Nation, in cooperation with Government, can achieve incomes comparable, in terms of labor and capital and management skills invested, to those received by other Americans; (2) a healthy and increasingly efficient and productive agriculture will continue to provide an abundance of food and fiber at fair prices to the consumers; (3) better farm incomes and a sound farm economy will contribute to economic growth and national prosperity; (4) costs of the Federal Government can be expected to decline as programs get underway and become effective; and (5) we can achieve maximum utilization of our abundance to meet needs and promote freedom at home and abroad.

When the Poor Support the Rich

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Salt Lake Deseret News of April 21, 1961, entitled "When the Poor Support the Rich."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHEN THE POOR SUPPORT THE RICH

As the new emergency unemployment benefits go into effect this week, they offer another example of what so often goes wrong when Federal programs extend into such areas.

Theoretically, Federal aid of all kinds is intended to equalize burdens—that is, to help poorer States take care of problems they couldn't handle by themselves. Otherwise, it would be more economical and efficient for States to spend money directly on their needs rather than having their money make a round-trip to Washington with a slice taken out in the process to pay for Federal bureaucracy.

Well, let's see how that theory is working out in the emergency unemployment compensation program.

The program extends the period of unemployment payments to a maximum of 39 weeks instead of the 26 weeks covered previously. If a State is already offering coverage beyond 26 weeks (Utah had already covered 36 weeks of unemployment), the Federal Government reimburses the State under the new program.

The cost is to be paid by an additional payroll tax of 0.4 percent, to be imposed on all employers of four or more persons. The program—and the tax—is supposed to be temporary, extending only through 1963. Any assumption that it will disappear on schedule, however, would have to be based on an optimism not justified by past experience.

Anyway, here's the joker: In 41 States, including Utah, the tax payments will exceed the benefits received. The nine States where benefits will exceed payments are New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Alaska, Oregon, Kentucky, and West Virginia.

Of those 9, the Utah Foundation points out, 3 are among the top 10 States in per capita income, and 4 more are among the second 10 States in per capita income.

And so we have the curious phenomenon of poorer States subsidizing richer States through the agency of the Federal Government—an absurdity which is, unfortunately, not confined to this particular program.

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I request that the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

BROOKLINE, MASS., *April 7, 1961.*

Hon. DANIEL FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: I have read about your bill concerning the captive nations and am very happy that someone is taking a deep interest in the nations subjugated by Russia. I think it is high time that someone did.

I think that the committee for captive nations that you plan to establish will do a fine job for the cause of freedom and liberty throughout the world today. It will also enhance the prestige of the United States.

I do hope that this administration will see the value of your work and will work to see that the bill is passed.

Very truly yours,
MARCELLA A. KOZUCH.

UKRAINIAN-AMERICAN ASSOCIATION INC.,
Omaha, Nebr.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: The Ukrainian-American Association Inc., of Omaha, Nebr., wishes to congratulate you on your bold and far-sighted move in introducing the resolution calling for the establishment of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

This committee will not only serve as a reservoir of information and data on various enslaved nations in the U.S.S.R., but will also inform the American people and the world on the state of affairs behind the Iron Curtain. This no doubt will be of great help in assisting the U.S. Government in formulating its policies with respect to these enslaved nations.

Again we wish to emphasize our great pleasure in seeing this resolution introduced, and we also wish to commend you on your outstanding work in regard to this committee.

We are also writing our Congressmen from Nebraska and asking them for their support of this resolution.

Sincerely yours,
MRS. H. CZECHUT,
President.

ELMSFORD, N.Y.,
April 7, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. FLOOD: Please accept my congratulations on your introducing House Resolution 211 establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. This is a step toward a most worthy goal, that of ending the manmade inequalities that rob men of the chance to develop to the full what possibilities they have.

By making known to the world conditions existing in the captive nations, and by other valuable work to be done by your committee, you are challenging every one of us to work

to make every country a fairer place for all. We each have a part to play in making the brotherhood of man a reality and ending the scourge of war. We are all members of a human family with certain rights. Your committee will help build a foundation on which to build freedom, justice, and peace in the world. I am confident you will be successful. It is a worthwhile endeavor and you are to be congratulated on your work.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM T. SNYDER.

BRIARWOOD, LONG ISLAND,
April 3, 1961.

Congressman DANIEL FLOOD,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Your idea for setting up a permanent Committee on Captive Nations is comparable to a medicine for curing cancer. A great weakness in our foreign policy is lack of knowledge and information about the people the Russian Communists are whipping into line as they keep spreading their military power.

The free world keeps forgetting more and more that most of the people in the Soviet Union live under the Russian conquerors' heel and they are very unhappy. With proper and intelligent encouragement, this unhappiness can swell into a wave that will either destroy or, at least, neutralize communism's successes.

Your committee would provide the necessary information for intelligent action concerning the people who are captive but who long for freedom. May God help you in your gallant effort.

Most respectfully yours,

JOSEPH LESAWYER.

MARCH 29, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: The Ukrainian Congress Committee of Willimantic, Conn., wish to congratulate you on introducing the resolution calling for the establishment of a Permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. We agree that such a committee is long overdue. The Soviet Union is one of our greatest problems, master of many peoples of various nations. These nations are very eager to be free from such slavery. It would be a great advantage to us to know all the weaknesses of such an existance.

If such a committee were formed, and it must be, it would be a great source of information. Such a committee could help to prove to the U.S. Government and its people and to the people of the world, the great necessity and importance of their work for freedom.

A letter has been written to Connecticut's own Congressman KOWALSKI, informing him of our intentions and asking him to give this matter his greatest interest. Once again congratulations on your good work.

Respectfully yours,

MICHAEL PLESZ,
President, Ukrainian Congress Committee of Willimantic, Conn.

POUGHKEEPSIE, N.Y., *April 5, 1961.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Our heartiest congratulations to you in introducing the resolution for the establishment of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. It is our duty, and certainly to our advantage to know all that is possible about the nations held captive by Moscow. These nations, eager to throw off the hated Communist yoke, constitute the weaknesses of the Soviet Union.

A committee such as you proposed would enlighten America and the world as to the state of affairs behind the Iron Curtain. It would also serve as a source of information on the enslaved nations in the U.S.S.R., to assist the Government in formulating its policies with respect to these nations. We will certainly make every effort in urging our Congressman to support your resolution.

Sincerely,

STEPHAN BERNYK.

FAIRFIELD, CONN., *April 9, 1961.*

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I would like to congratulate you on the excellent work you have done in initiating the drive for the establishment of the Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

I certainly don't have to inform you of the seriousness in which we find ourselves—the almost daily reports of further setbacks by the free powers in the psychopolitical cold war. That is why I wholeheartedly support this attempt by you and many others to try to take the offensive in the cold war.

I give my complete support for the Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

Very truly yours,

JOHN J. RELIHAN, Jr.

COURTS OF OYER AND TERMINER
AND QUARTER SESSIONS OF THE PEACE,
Pittsburgh, Pa., April 19, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Congratulations on House Resolution 211 establishing a Special Committee on Captive Nations. This most worthy movement will encourage the hopes of those unfortunate enslaved people who are suffering under a brutal atheistic rule of Communism.

I also want to congratulate you on the excellent work you are doing for the people not only in your congressional district but also for the country at large. By this you are giving inspiration and hope to the unfortunate people who have lost their freedom.

With kindest regards and best wishes for your continued success, I am

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN H. SHENKEL,
Consultant, Americanism Committee, Department of Pennsylvania, The American Legion.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
April 5, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: As representatives of the named organizations, we wish to express our wholehearted support for the resolution you introduced in the House of Representatives, and we will urge our Congressmen from the State of Minnesota to vote for the establishment of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations in Congress.

We feel your proposal is very important to our Government, because it would constitute not only a source of complete and reliable information about the many nations enslaved by Moscow, but also would make the American people and the free people of the world realize that life in the U.S.S.R. is not as the Communist Party and the Soviet dictatorship would like the world to believe. The Committee on Captive Nations could, we think, present the truth about the peoples behind the Iron Curtain.

Your dedication, effort, and concern for the truth about the nature of Soviet tyranny and the lack of freedom of the people who must live under communism, deserves not only the support of our Congressmen, but of all the people of the United States.

Our sincere greetings,

WASYL FILONOWICH,
Chairman, Association of Ukrainian Veterans and Ukrainian Financial Committee.

VSEVOLOD RADCHENKO,
Secretary, Association of Ukrainian Veterans.

WOLODYMYR ROMANOWSKYJ,
Secretary, Ukrainian Financial Committee.

ANTON ROMANENKO,
Chairman, Ukrainian National Democratic Association.

PHILLIP PRODANCHUK,
Secretary, Ukrainian National Democratic Association.

GILMORE & CO.,
St. Louis, Mo., April 14, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have read House Resolution 211 and would like to congratulate you on your fine proposal. I have observed the various reactions to Captive Nations Week throughout the world and give my wholehearted approval for your most recent resolution.

I sincerely hope that you can muster the strength to insure its success in Congress.

Very truly yours,

LOUIS A. GILMORE.

Fordham Professor Comments on Electoral College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, a distinguished constituent of mine, Prof. James J. Flynn, chairman of the department of social studies of the Fordham University School of Business, recently commented on the issues underlying the present public controversy over the role of the electoral college. His speech is a thoughtful and reasoned analysis of this subject. It contains much which is worthy of our close attention.

While I personally am of the opinion that the electoral college has outlived its usefulness and should be abolished, I am happy today to invite attention to Professor Flynn's comments. Although he takes a somewhat different position, his statement is indeed an important contribution to the literature on this subject.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE DOOMED?

(By James J. Flynn, Ph. D.)

The major TV networks had scarcely switched off their electronic computers on the morning after election when from all

parts of the country came complaints against the electoral college. Every 4 years, the months after the presidential election, becomes open season on the machinery for choosing the Chief Executive.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD is the spearhead of the current attack on the electoral college. He argues that the college is antiquated and that only the popular vote should decide our choice for President and Vice President. This position, so soon after one of the closest elections in our history, only helps to confuse the issue for the average citizen.

The members of the Constitutional Convention in 1787 found the decision on the mode of choosing a President one of their most difficult. James Wilson, a delegate, stated it this way:

"The subject has greatly divided this House. It is in truth the most difficult of all on which we have to decide."

The final decision to permit the State legislatures to choose the method of picking their electors for the President and Vice President was based on the thesis that the right of appointment was not to be exclusively vested in the people.

What was the intention of the delegates to the Constitutional Convention in deciding on this method of electing a President? One suggestion is that they wanted to keep the people from all participation in choosing the Chief Executive. Another suggestion is that they wanted the electors to be completely free agents without any control by the people. The Founding Fathers would have denied both of these suggestions. James Madison constantly stated "the President is to be elected by the people." Edmund Randolph said "the electors must be elected by the people at large." Such statements clearly refute the view of those who argue that the Founding Fathers feared the people and distrusted their judgment.

It has never been quite understood that under the Constitution State legislatures have the uncontrolled and unrestricted power to fix the manner of appointing the presidential electors. With this great power at their disposal State legislatures have nevertheless, under a kind of moral persuasion, given up their prerogative of changing the present system. By the adoption of similar laws in each State there has developed a uniform method of appointment.

The method of choosing electors in present use is called the general ticket-plurality system. In the election just completed there were 537 electors to be voted on. The breakdown of the number is arrived at by assigning 100 electors to the States on the principle of equality, each State being entitled to 2. The remaining 437 electors (to be reduced to 435 as the result of the census of 1960) are distributed according to the principle of population, each State being assigned as many electors as it has Congressmen. To be elected a presidential candidate must capture a majority of the total electoral vote. In the election just completed an electoral vote of 269 was needed for a nominee's victory.

The Constitution says that electors may be chosen, "in such manner as the [State] legislature may direct." Under the present general ticket-plurality system a citizen enters his voting booth to choose a nominee for President. In fact he is voting for every elector to which his own State is entitled. For example, if you voted in New York State on November 8, you would have faced a voting machine listing the names of Kennedy-Johnson and Nixon-Lodge yet as you pulled the lever for either team you would have been voting, not for your candidates, but for a list of 45 electors previously approved by his political party.

As a result of this system the candidate who wins the largest popular vote in the State receives all of the electoral vote of that State. This makes possible the situation in which the candidate with the total popular vote of the country could lose the electoral vote and the election. An extreme example might be as follows:

State	Candidate A		Candidate B	
	Popular vote	Electoral vote	Popular vote	Electoral vote
	Thousands		*Thousands*	
Alabama	25	0	200	11
California	2,100	32	2,000	0
Massachusetts	1,100	16	1,000	0
Montana	90	0	100	4
New York	3,100	45	3,000	0
Ohio	1,000	0	2,000	25
Pennsylvania	1,000	0	2,000	32
North Carolina	80	0	700	14
Texas	600	32	400	0
Wisconsin	401	12	400	0
Total	9,496	137	11,800	86

The Constitution makes electors free agents who may vote for any qualified man or woman that they feel should be President and Vice President. Our Founding Fathers did not fully recognize the possibility of political parties and thought of the electors as free agents. This myth persists. For example, as late as 1952 in *Ray* v. *Blair* (343 U.S. 214.) the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that a California law requiring an elector to sign an affidavit to support the candidates nominated at the national conventions was unconstitutional. Custom and party pressure almost invariably make electoral delegations vote as a unit. The last exception to this occurred in Alabama in 1956 when 1 of the 11 Democratic electors did not cast his ballot for Stevenson.

Some of those who have agreed that the above system has outlived its usefulness refuse to support the thesis that some system not using the electoral college should be devised. A method called the single-member district system has been suggested as a more democratic way of choosing electors. In this method the candidate receiving the largest popular vote in each congressional district would get the electoral vote for that district. The candidate receiving the greatest popular vote in any given State would garner the two additional electoral votes for the State. For example:

NEW YORK

Candidate A:

Won 23 congressional districts—23 electoral votes.

Popular vote—3,240,600—2 electoral votes.

Total electoral votes: 25.

Candidate B:

Won 20 congressional districts—20 electoral votes.

Popular vote—2,301,306—No electoral votes.

Total electoral votes: 20.

While the single-member district system has gained some momentum, the most effective argument against it is that it would inevitably degenerate into a gerrymandering system. A gerrymander is an artificial arrangement of districts designed to give the political party making it (that is the party in power) a guarantee of electing its candidate to a representative or electoral body. With all the undemocratic overtones to "gerrymandering" it would seem that the single-member district system would be a weak solution to the electoral problem. However, it is generally agreed that this system is superior to the present general ticket-plurality system.

Following the election of 1948, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge and Congressman Edward Gossett introduced a resolution for a constitutional amendment. It was approved by the Senate, but later failed in the House. This resolution would have translated popular votes into electoral votes, and alloted a State's electoral quota among the candidates in proportion to the statewide popular votes polled. All that would be necessary to win would be a 40-percent plurality which would practically obviate the chance of an election being thrown into the House. This proposed amendment would have operated as follows:

NEW YORK

Present System:

Candidate A, 3,260,362—45 electoral votes.

Candidate B, 2,167,367—No electoral votes.

Lodge-Gossett resolution:

Candidate A, 3,260,987—22.6 electoral votes.

Candidate B, 1,999,999—22.4 electoral votes.

The strong argument against a change by means of the Lodge-Gossett resolution is that both State and National Legislatures presently overrepresent rural interests. The present electoral college system, conversely, is the only way to assure that presidential candidates will listen to the demands of urban majorities and minorities in America. The chief interest of southern sponsors of electoral reform is to diminish the alleged power of urban minorities, particularly the northern Negro, in national politics.

It is to be noted that all suggestions for change mentioned in this article are alike in that they modify the electoral college. If the change is to come it must be by amendment, for State reform is unlikely especially in the big industrial States. The same considerations of interest and pride, chiefly the increased weight accruing from an undecided block of electoral votes, which originally induced one after another of them to give up the earlier district system plan can be counted upon to frustrate any attempt, within their own boundaries, to revive it or anything resembling it.

One thing is certain. The elimination of the electoral college system is practically an impossibility. The use of the popular vote as the sole determinant is not practical. Our representative system is based on a compromise between population and regional needs.

From a practical point of view, since the polls closed on November 8 some Republican leaders thought that there should be a recount in 11 States. Some of these recounts were started. A recount in all 11 would have provoked considerable uncertainty and political passion.

But, if the Presidency depended on a majority of the popular vote in the entire Nation, we would then have a recount of the votes in all 50 States. This would open the door to extensive opportunities for fraud in every area where one party had decisive control of the election machinery.

The electoral college system, if it does nothing else, restricts the area of argument to a limited number of States. It does not put the whole country at the mercy of political machines determined to grab everything in sight.

No one really questions that the electoral college system is cumbersome and anachronostic. But it is still very much a question as to whether the change should be made now. The real issue has been posed by President John F. Kennedy: "If we are considering a radical shift in the balance of power in the United States, it should not be undertaken lightly." The cure is often worse than the disease.

The Ad Hoc Committee on Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on February 2, under leave to extend my remarks, I included in the RECORD an exchange of correspondence with the ad hoc committee, composed of Milwaukee, Wis., residents, who were critical of our Federal Government for its alleged failure to take any steps to seek peace in Laos.

The other day, I received another open letter from the ad hoc committee. In this letter, the committee has in effect urged the Government to give the Communists a free hand in Cuba.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to place in the RECORD the text of the ad hoc committee's letter, as well as my reply to them. The two letters follow.

AN OPEN LETTER

To President John F. Kennedy, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Ambassador Adlai Stevenson, Senators Alexander Wiley, William Proxmire, Congressmen Henry Reuss, Clement Zablocki, Robert Kastenmeier, editors of the Milwaukee Journal, and the Milwaukee Sentinel:

We strongly support the declaration of President John Kennedy at his news conference on April 12, 1961:

"There will not under any conditions be an intervention in Cuba by U.S. Armed Forces. This Government will do everything it possibly can, and I think it can meet its responsibilities, to make sure that there are no Americans involved in any action inside Cuba. I wish to make clear also, that we would be opposed to the use of our territory for mounting an offensive against any foreign government."

We affirm this stand because:

1. We see in armed invention the risk of world war III.

2. We do not wish to adopt the methods of the Soviet action in Hungary or the British-French action in Suez.

3. We have faith that there can be negotiated solutions to international disputes.

4. We believe that intervention would forfeit the confidence and friendship of the Central and South American Nations.

While many of us may look upon the Castro regime with disfavor, puzzlement, and disappointment, we are no less concerned with the folly of our Cuban policy which now causes the American people so much anguish. Now is the time for open discussion. It is our conviction that an informed public opinion will make its influence felt upon those who are in positions of leadership.

There are questions deserving serious and immediate attention. For example: (1) What are the minimum conditions for reestablishment of diplomatic relations with Cuba? (2) What should be our attitude toward social and economic upheavals in Central and South America? (3) In what specific ways does the social revolution in Cuba threaten the fundamental interests of the American people as a whole? (4) Is there anything in American policy toward Cuba which has contributed to her dependence on the Soviet bloc? (5) What are our obligations under the Charter of the Organization of American States?

We think that James Reston, political analyst of the New York Times, has clearly stated the principle involved:

"Everywhere in the world the United States is trying to defend or establish a simple overriding principle: That force shall not be used, directly or indirectly, to achieve political ends, and that all international disputes shall be settled by negotiation. This is the principle we are trying to sustain in Laos, where we are arguing against the shipment of Soviet arms for use against a government we support. This is the principle we supported even against the British and French in the Suez war. This is the principle we are trying to defend in the Congo, in Indonesia, in the Middle East, in Algeria, and in Berlin.

Surely that same principle applies in our relations with Cuba and the other Central and South American nations.

People striving for economic betterment, political freedom, and national independence, sometimes use methods we abhor or go to extremes we deem unwise. Even in such cases we must uphold the principle of nonintervention. Our claim to moral leadership demands it. Intervention points to disaster.

Sincerely yours,

The ad hoc committee: Rev. Roy Agte, W. Robert Brazelton, Louis Becker, Dr. Neal Billings, William Brown, Dr. Gladys Calbick, Dr. Martin Cohnstaedt, Wilma Ehrlich, Jack Eisendrath, Rev. Roger Eldridge, Dr. Hugo Engleman, Donald Esker, Mrs. Maxine Franz, Richard Franz, Wayne Gourley, Dr. Alan Grossberg, Mrs. Ruth Grossberg, Mrs. Leon M. Hamlet, Dr. Dorothea Harvey, Rev. Herbert J. Huebschmann, Edward Jamosky, Harvey Kitzman, Dr. David Luce, Dr. Willie Mae Gillis, Mrs. Virginia Parkman, Mrs. Louise W. Peck, Dr. Sidney M. Peck, Mrs. Annette Roberts, Mort Ryweck, Dr. Gordon Shipman, Dr. James W. Skelton, Rev. Kenneth L. Smith, Max Taglin, Mrs. Thelma Taglin, Corneff Taylor, Arthur Thrall, Nick Topping, Frieda Voigt, Rev. Lucius Walker, Theodore Warshafsky, Jack Weiner, John Werner, Rev. Herbert Zebarth, Leonard Zubrensky.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 26, 1961.

Dr. S. M. PECK,
Milwaukee, Wis.

DEAR DR. PECK: This will acknowledge your open letter of April 25, outlining your ad hoc committee's views on the situation in Cuba.

I have noted your views and I wish to reassure you that, as in the past, I will continue to support efforts made by our Government to resolve international problems through peaceful negotiation. However, we can only expect constructive results from such negotiations if we negotiate from a position of strength, not of weakness.

I must add that I am amazed at your committee's apparently unshakable faith in the peaceful intentions of the commies and their willingness to reach negotiated settlements. It would seem to me that your belief in the sincerity of Communist statements and pledges should be wearing thin. What do you find in the record of the past 15 years—and in the record of recent developments in Cuba, Laos, Vietnam, and other areas—to sustain your faith? I would be interested in receiving your reply.

There is one last comment that I would like to make: Apparently history has failed to persuade you about the true nature and the real objectives of communism. You are, of course, puzzled and disappointed with Castro; according to your letter, many members of your committee even look upon him with disfavor. But the last paragraph of your letter indicates to me that you still consider Mr. Castor, and others in his category as basically well-meaning agrarian reformers, social reformers, or political reformers who—on occasion—may go to extremes which you consider unwise. Your advice in those instances is that we should sit tight and do nothing.

I do not believe that we should try to run the affairs of any nation other than our own, or attempt to rule the world. At the same time, we should not sit back and watch the Communists swallow up the free world bit by bit until they accomplish their objective—world domination. As a free nation, as a responsible world power, and as leader in the free world, the United States has a responsibility to its neighbors which goes beyond sitting back and engaging in intellectually stimulating discussions, or in passing resolutions, or in composing open letters. I am confident that the vast majority of the American people are conscious of that responsibility and are determined to live up to it.

Yours sincerely,

CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
Congressman, Fourth District.

Lessons and Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, there are many dangers and lessons in the article here presented—Human Events, April 21, 1961:

GERMANY IGNORED ECONOMIST HELLER, AND PROSPERED

Imposing evidence has only recently come to light to show that leading New Deal economists, including Prof. Walter W. Heller, are capable of giving some mighty bad advice. This is important because Mr. Heller is now Chairman of President Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers.

The State Department has declassified a 1951 report in which Mr. Heller, Prof. Alvin Hansen, and several others solemnly warned that the German economy could not possibly improve without a thorough immersion in Keynesian-New Deal philosophy (reported in Human Events, Mar. 17, 1961). Events have proved that the forecast was silly.

The professors were members of a Marshall plan team whose mission was to tell the new German Government how to manage its economy. Their 400-page report, said to be largely the work of Mr. Heller, expressed the opinion that the German economy was bogged down on a sort of plateau and that proper measures must be taken if the possibilities [of further progress] are to be realized.

Fortunately for Germany, the Bonn government disregarded the report. In every important matter it kept on doing precisely what Mr. Heller and his colleagues said it should stop doing, and Germany has wound up better off than the report considered possible even if its recommendations had been followed.

The report said Germany would never achieve the necessary rate of industrial expansion if it continued to worry about inflation; that it should not confuse wartime inflation with the normal operations of peacetime credit; that it had an excessive concern for price stability; and that it was

overly timid in allowing the creation of new credit.

Germany has continued to guard against inflation (as successfully, in fact, as any industrial country) and has kept a tight rein on the expansion of credit.

The report called for easy money and said that a rate of interest high enough to stimulate any large volume of personal savings would seriously curtail investment.

Germany has kept a high rate of interest.

The report said that tax concessions granted to industry, such as depreciation allowances, were being abused and that in any case they represented only an expenditure of tax funds which would otherwise have been collected by the Government. Accordingly, the report said, a compulsory investment program would be more effective. Under the recommended program, all industries were to be assessed for the fund and the government was to distribute the money to industries where there was a crying need for expansion.

The Government did nothing of the kind.

The key bottleneck in German industrial expansion, the report said, was an inadequate supply of coal. It recommended vast Government programs for stimulating the production of coal.

Little was done along this line. Coal has become a drug on the market and the problem has been how to dispose of the surplus.

The report proclaimed that "the nostalgic hopes * * * looking toward a revival of the 19th century role of the capital market are doomed to disappointment. The capital market plays no such role in any modern country and there is no prospect that it will."

The capital market is still functioning much as it always did, here as in Germany, in spite of persistent attempts to dislodge it.

Finally, the report drew a distinction between Germany, squeezed between too great a demand for imports and not enough exports, and the United States, "where there has never been any fear of a squeeze or an external drain."

Today, having disregarded all of Mr. Heller's recommendations, Germany has turned the tables on us. It has built up an enormous trade surplus, accumulated nearly $8 billion in reserves, and the squeeze is on the United States—to such an extent, indeed, that we are begging Germany to help us out.

What actually happened just couldn't happen, according to Mr. Heller and others. They go on pretending that the United States must take the same medicine they prescribed for Germany even though Germany recovered precisely because it poured the nasty stuff down the drain.

Now, what are the dangers and lessons?

First. Danger: Security classification by the State Department which withholds information from our people.

Lesson: Public knowledge and discussion will show up the fallacies of regimented bureaucratic thinking, foreign to a free enterprise constitutional Government society.

Second. Danger: The gentleman whose views are so thoroughly discredited, Mr. Heller, is now the top economic adviser to the President.

Lesson: A President can surround himself with fuzzy thinkers.

Third. Danger: While Germany disregarded these fallacious economic theories, of no need to worry over inflation, easy money, Government aid to industry, misunderstanding the capital market, the United States is obviously following them, witness recent Presidential messages and legislation—the tax recommendations, area redevelopment bill, the housing message, and the like.

Lesson: Government regimentation, Federal bureaucratic planning, taxing, and control is no match for free private enterprise and people left alone by Government.

When will our people wake up to the dangers which our Nation faces and remember the lessons learned by our leaving the Old World, our revolution and formulation of our form of limited constitutional Government?

Confidence in Uncle Sam: Unlimited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, on Monday and Tuesday, April 24 and 25, 1961, Quimby Melton, Sr., publisher of the Griffin Daily News, Griffin, Ga., initiated a campaign entitled "Confidence in Uncle Sam: Unlimited." I personally endorse the thoughts of this patriotic American, and it is with personal pleasure that I include an editorial written by Mr. Melton, which appeared in the Griffin Daily News issue of Tuesday, April 15, 1961:

CONFIDENCE IN UNCLE SAM: UNLIMITED

The suggestion made Monday, in this column, that every family in Griffin and Spalding County show their confidence in Uncle Sam, by buying a U.S. savings bond, is beginning to "snowball." There are indications that this suggestion may catch on as a nationwide campaign.

Today, the city commission has issued a proclamation calling May a month for showing "Confidence in Uncle Sam: Unlimited." In this proclamation the city fathers urge everyone to buy a bond during the month of May. If every family in Spalding does this it will mean $150,000 they are investing in a fund to help preserve democracy and freedom in this Nation.

Numerous persons have called, not only locally, but several from out of the county, approving the plan. Today we are featuring the proclamation of the city commission in another story. Tomorrow we will comment on what folks are saying in support of this campaign.

It all started when we were impressed by the statement of President Kennedy, that he was determined that our freedoms should not be curtailed by communistic aggression.

We asked ourselves, "What can I do to help?" Then came up with this idea of buying a bond—taking stock, as it were, in the "Confidence in Uncle Sam Unlimited" organization.

To fill out the column today, we'll just recount a conversation with two men.

One, a businessman, said, "I'm going to buy a bond for each of my three grandchildren. I want to do my part to help guarantee that they never live under the rule of a totalitarian dictator."

The second man, a large property owner and a man who owns many gilt-edge stocks and bonds, said:

"I have never bought a Savings Bond. For I can earn more interest with my money by other investments. But this can be called a national emergency. I'm going to buy at least $1,000 worth of bonds, not as an investment, but as a contribution to my Government. I realize, looking at this from a hard-boiled business viewpoint, that if the Communists take over, all the property I own and all the stocks and bonds in my safety deposit box will not be worth a dime."

There you have two viewpoints.

The businessman, who wants to help guarantee that his grandchildren will enjoy the same freedoms as he enjoys; and the hard-boiled investor, who wants to guard the value of his property, stocks and bonds.

Few of us can buy $1,000 bonds—but each family can well afford to put $18.75 into one bond and have a part in saving this Nation of ours from Communist domination.

Come on Griffin and Spalding County—let's all buy bonds.

Another Try at Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, I applaud the leaders of the Democratic and Republican Parties for supporting President Kennedy's foreign policy at this crucial time. There can be only one foreign policy of the United States, and the President is solely responsible for its execution. Certainly history has shown that once a decision is made the people of this great democracy have never flinched from the consequences of that decision.

Past events, however, have also demonstrated that the American people do not have closed minds. They seek information and even welcome debate. They are eager to explore alternatives. They have faced up to war, but overwhelmingly they desire peace.

Because we are an intelligent people, I believe, Mr. Speaker, there is room and indeed a need for an objective appraisal of the Cuban situation.

The invasion of Cuba was a horrible fiasco. The American people join with those who grieve for the young Cubans, so uselessly sacrificed on the beaches of their beloved land. Furthermore, it is no secret that many Americans have lost confidence in those who conceived and led this unfortunate invasion. Most significantly, the American people are deeply disturbed by the terrible blow which the invasion debacle has dealt the prestige of the United States.

It matters little whether the United States did or did not finance, organize, and arm the invasion forces. The cold fact is that the world believes we did. And so, Mr. Speaker, we cannot escape the indictment that the failure of the anti-Castro counterrevolution was an American failure.

But why did the invasion fail?

As a military action, it was doomed to failure from the beginning because the invasion force was militarily inade-

quate. It was no match for the defending forces available to Castro.

The invasion failed also because it was ill conceived, poorly planned, and lacked necessary military capability. It is difficult to believe that the Pentagon was very pleased with the operations. I am inclined to think that our military leaders were skeptical onlookers, thoroughly amazed at the ineptness of amateurs playing at war. It would appear that on the American side, the invasion was encouraged essentially by a group of enthusiasts who really believed that Cubans by the thousands would leap to arms in support of the counterrevolution. They were wrong and our position must be reoriented.

But most important, the counterrevolution failed because it had no roots in the people of Cuba. It failed because it had no appeal for the farmer and the worker. It failed because it appealed mainly to the dispossessed—those who had and lost. Unfortunately, there were many, many more of those who had nothing and were promised much.

There is strong evidence today that the recent invasion of Cuba was only a probing action, that there will be other invasions of Cuba, supported and encouraged presumably by the United States.

Before we support other invasions of Cuba, let me caution the sponsors of future invasions to read carefully the lessons on revolution written by Che Guevara in his manual on guerilla fighting in the Castro uprising. Whatever Americans may think of Castro, he is nonetheless a living example of a success revolutionist. He understood and still thoroughly understands the Cuban farmer and worker. He won in Cuba, because he fanned the burning desire of the peons for land and reform. He has maintained himself in Cuba, because he fans the great pride of Cubans in Cuba and in themselves. Unless the architects of future invasions ignite a similar spark in the hearts of the Cuban farmers and workers or crush them outright with overwhelming military power, it is doubtful that these recent guerilla fighters will desert the Castro revolution.

So much for the invasion which failed.

We have also failed to starve Castro into submission. The sugar embargo has failed and so have our efforts to isolate Cuba. As a matter of fact, these efforts have aroused sympathies for the Cubans throughout South America and in many parts of the world. The great Yankee democracy is pictured as a heartless colossus crushing the little people of Cuba.

But why are we so overwrought about Cuba?

Historically, the United States has always feared the presence of an alien force on Cuba. In the Castro regime we have a hostile government which has accepted foreign military and economic assistance of great potential danger to the United States. Cuba is being built up not only as a hostile military base, but a stepping stone for international communism—a friendly door inviting Soviet penetration into this hemisphere. This we cannot permit. What frustrates us in Cuba is that we are unable to come to grips with the real culprit, the Soviet Union.

The United States has every right, under international law and under the inter-American treaty arrangements, to defend itself and the hemisphere from external attack, direct or indirect, whenever such an attack has occurred or is being prepared. It has no right, however, under international or domestic law, and no moral justification for taking action but pretending that it is not doing so.

Moreover, as long as the pretense exists, any such action must be covert, ineffective, and doomed to failure. We thereby compound cynicism with defeat.

Before we took action in Cuba or supported others, in so doing we should have ascertained whether we had full legal and moral justification for what we did. Our experts in international law know that frequently there is a legitimate conflict of legal principles which creates doubt as to our legal rights. However, we have the right and duty to apply those principles which sanction actions essential to protect ourselves and to oppose aggression if such a threat in fact exists. If the facts did not justify such action, we had no course but to withhold action.

We have always stood before the world as the defenders of international law. We therefore cannot afford to be vulnerable to a charge of violating it.

Nevertheless, the conclusion seems to be that we must destroy Castro and his regime. We could crush him with our military power like an elephant might crush a mouse, but we dare not. And so we have decided to sympathize with, support, and encourage a counterrevolution in Cuba.

In the light of this decision, other invasions of Cuba are coming. Who will be the invaders? Reliable sources have suggested that they will be Social Democrats. Each one of us will have his own views of what is a Social Democrat, but it is reasonable to assume that the United States will support Cuban patriots with liberal views. The invaders can be expected to support progressive social and land reform programs. The fundamental political objective of the invaders will be to reestablish freedom and democracy in Cuba.

The last invasion failed to communicate its objectives to the people of Cuba; and future invasions, I regret to observe, will have the same difficulties. For in a popularity contest in Cuba, Castro is the hero. It was Castro who seized the sugar lands. It was Castro who seized the banks and factories from foreigners and wealthy Cubans. It has been Castro who has seized the imagination of the Cuban people.

As Americans, we hope patriots will find a way to ignite the spark of desire for freedom which could destroy Castro, but I doubt that the peons and the bearded ones can really understand the noble intricacies of a social democratic counterrevolution. I must reluctantly conclude that in any future invasion as in the past one, they will remain loyal to Castro.

It has been reported that during the last invasion, great masses of people were armed and ready to fight off the invaders. Accordingly, if an invasion of Cuba by "Social Democrats" or any other group is to succeed, it seems quite certain that U. S. military forces will have to play a determining role. The invaders must be strong enough militarily to destroy sizable Castro forces on the beaches and in the interior. This will require the recruitment, training, and equipping of major rebel invasion units. It will require naval and air support. Bluntly, it will require at least limited military intervention by the United States. This course will lead us to horrible bloodshed and slaughter.

We might get some other South or Central American country or countries to do the recruiting, training, and equipping for us, but this is a doubtful expedient. It would certainly entail the possibility of the inherent danger that the countries of South America might choose up sides.

Is there then an alternative, or must we take the calculated risk of supporting with military power a counterrevolution against Cuba? There must be an alternative.

If negotiations, cease fire, and a neutralist government are preferable to war in Laos; if endless meetings and discussions on control of nuclear weapons are more acceptable than unilateral nuclear testing; if insults and abuse can be endured better in the United Nations than a clash in the Congo, then surely reason dictates, even though emotions cry otherwise, that the United States is big enough to talk to Cuba.

"It's too late for that now," the cry echoes every time negotiations are suggested.

Yet, if this is a sincere statement, then one ventures hopefully that there might have been a time in the past when the United States might have negotiated with Castro. And, if we could have negotiated in the past, then why not now? How will we know whether some acceptable rapprochement is not possible unless we try?

I am inclined to think that this country might well exercise a little restraint and patience with Cuba. Governments and regimes have come and gone in Central and South America. We have weathered storms before. Castro may be an unpleasant irritant, a thorn in our side, but I certainly hope no one believes Cuba is a serious challenge to the United States.

I suggest that:

First. The American people can accept the land reform program and the social and economic changes inaugurated in Cuba, providing the Government of Cuba will undertake to reimburse the original owners for the properties taken from them.

Second. The American people are ready to consider the reestablishment of normal trade and commercial relations between our two countries, and even to

offer economic aid to Cuba providing the Government of Cuba will cease its build-up of Soviet armaments in this hemisphere, and

Third. The American people are eager to extend the helping hand of a good neighbor and accept the Cuban people as full partners in the inter-American society of nations, providing the Government of Cuba will stop to serve as a base for Soviet penetration into this hemisphere.

I am suggesting that there is room for exploration of alternative accommodations. I am not suggesting, however, that this Nation can stand quietly by while Cuba builds up a base hostile to our way of life and dedicated to support Soviet Union penetration into this hemisphere. What I am saying is that we should give Castro one more opportunity to demonstrate to the world and to the United States that he is not a tool of Soviet subversion. If he is willing to do this, he has nothing to fear from the United States.

President Kennedy, in his inspirational inaugural address, addressed himself most eloquently to the problem which faces us today. He said:

> Finally, to those nations who would make themselves our adversary, we offer not a pledge but a request: that both sides begin anew the quest for peace, before the dark powers of destruction unleashed by science engulf all humanity in planned or accidental self-destruction.

The question then is, Should we make one more try to find an acceptable rapprochement with Cuba? If we succeed in this try, we will have demonstrated to the world our own greatness and a leadership truly worthy of the New Frontier. If we fail, then we will have shown the world that Castro is, in fact, a madman condemned to his own destruction.

Mr. Speaker, before we support another invasion of Cuba, an invasion which ultimately can be expected to involve our own military forces, let us pause to ponder the words of our great President:

> So let us begin anew—remembering on both sides that civility is not a sign of weakness, and sincerity is always subject to proof. Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate.

Liberalism Is American Tradition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to insert the following editorial by Mr. C. L. Dancey of the Peoria Journal Star in the Appendix of the RECORD:

LIBERALISM IS AMERICAN TRADITION

(By C. L. Dancey)

Dear anti-Communist friends, Sunday, we urged you not to hunt subversives, since that is a very difficult task even for professionals and is no place for us amateurs.

Today we'd like to talk about liberals, the people that we believe some of you confuse with the real enemy.

Liberals should not be confused with Communists. (The Reds aren't liberal at all.)

A genuine liberal has a liberal or generous and open-minded approach to all problems. He is opposed to prejudice or discrimination on the basis of race, religion, color, economic status, or social status.

He believes that every person involved in a crime is entitled to the benefit of the doubt until proven guilty by processes assuring him every right and safeguard under our great liberal Constitution. And he further believes that the convicted criminal should be treated with no thought of punishment but in a manner best calculated to salvage and rehabilitate that human being.

These are all noble sentiments.

You have no quarrel with liberals.

However, there are also some mixed up folks who call themselves liberals, usually loudly. And this is where the confusion comes in.

You might say they usually exhibit a violent underdog complex and a "McCarthy syndrome."

These are the folks not satisfied and not emotionally cut out to be liberals, so instead of no prejudice they specialize in reversing the historic prejudices.

They are usually violently prejudiced up the social or economic scale, instead of down. Sometimes, instead of maintaining an absence of prejudice and a liberal view even on matters of race and religion, they develop a passionate prejudice on behalf of minority groups against majorities.

(NOTE.—This is understandable, and in some circumstances commendable, but it certainly is not liberal.)

Finally some of them are so thin-skinned and jittery about their supposed liberal beliefs that they are scared to death they will be linked with Communist philosophies, so they strike out with passion and prejudice at the very idea of people being curious about Communist activities.

They are afraid of where it will lead, and history has given them some cause for this.

That's why they aren't the least bit liberal toward anti-Communists. The word knocks them off balance.

So remember that the liberal tradition is part of America from the days of the Founding Fathers, and is part of the true character of our Nation.

Be liberal yourselves. Study with objectivity, not emotion. Study with an open mind, not prejudice.

If you still have outspoken enemies, ignore those who are mixed up liberals. Don't confuse any special personal enemies with the great enemy of us all. Don't be distracted by jittery people.

The more you learn to know your enemy and his real nature, the less time you'll have to waste on these other folks.

C. L. Dancey.

A Realistic Approach to Our Educational Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, a joint resolution adopted by the 72d General Assembly of the State of Illinois might be of keen interest to the Members of the House deliberating on the proposed Federal aid-to-education legislation. It is interesting to note that the resolution was originally offered by 29 members of the Illinois Legislature who are closest to the problems in education in my State.

I submit that this resolution, as placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 17 by Congressman ROLAND LIBONATI, is a realistic approach to the real problem which faces the parents and taxpayers, not only in Illinois, but across the other 49 States.

Editorials Appearing in the VFW American Security Reporter for March 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I wish to call to your attention, and the attention of my other distinguished colleagues, two articles appearing in the March 1961, issues of the VFW American Security Reporter, published monthly by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, it is my own personal experience over a long term of years that the Veterans of Foreign Wars is one of several national organizations of distinguished veterans of wars in which the United States has been involved which is doing a vigorous and valiant and necessary patriotic service to the cause of our national security. The editorials follow:

COMMUNISTS ANNOUNCE OPEN WARFARE

The Communist Party, U.S.A., has now disclosed openly that destruction of the U.S. defense establishment is a major objective of its "peace policy."

General Secretary Gus Hall rolled out the broad outlines of the campaign at a meeting of the party's 60-member National Committee in New York January 20.

He said that Communists' biggest job in the immediate future is to agitate both inside and outside of established peace organizations to destroy public confidence in the U.S. defense establishment. He declared: "It is our task to reveal to every American that big business and big brass are today the chief force for war. We must make clear that their talk of defending freedom is a fraud."

Moreover, he said, Communists must step-up their work inside peace organizations and work to "widen the struggle for peace, to raise its level, to involve far greater numbers, to make it an issue in every community, every people's organization, every labor union, every church, every house, every street, every point of gathering of our people. It is imperative to bring everyone—men, women, youth and, yes, even children—into the struggle. The fight for peace is basic to the cause of progress and socialism."

He indicated that this would mean many more "mass marches, demonstrations, peace walks, picket lines, postcard campaigns, letters to Congressmen and Senators, delegations, meetings, and many others."

Further, he said, Communists should look toward the formation of a super peace organization "possibly of the type of the British Peace Council" which "is linked with peace movements in all other countries through its association with the World Council of Peace." (WPC has been cited as a Communist world front organization.)

An analysis of Gus Hall's lengthy policy statement shows that we can expect these main features of the attack:

They will charge that the system of U.S. oversea bases is "needless and useless for the defense of the United States and a waste of the taxpayers money."

They will praise the policy of peaceful coexistence, and propose plans "for the use of the billions being squandered on arms for houses, hospitals, schools, roads, and other social service and social welfare needs."

They will demand universal disarmament as a panacea to end the threat of war. And they will continue a day-to-day harassment of the "big brass" for stepping up the armaments race and for "provocative warlike moves" in regard to Cuba and other countries.

Above all they will carry on a running attack, charging that the "monopolies, the Pentagon, and their political henchmen are sacrificing the national interest, hurting our national prestige, degrading our democratic heritage, undermining the security and liberty of every American, and jeopardizing the very existence of the American people."

While this is going on inside the United States, similar campaigns will be launched in other countries of the free world. For this drive is worldwide. It is based upon an agreement made by 81 of the world's 87 Communist Parties in Moscow last fall, an agreement which Gus Hall quoted as his guide in launching such activities here.

Communists obviously are aiming to whip up public mob hysteria against the U.S. defense establishment both here and abroad, thus gain their real goals of weakening U.S. ability to defend herself and her allies against the rising tide of Communist "peaceful" aggression.

What can be done? Counteraction must take into account the fact that the vast majority of people in peace groups think of themselves as non-Communists and even as being opposed to Communist tyranny.

For this reason, counteraction must avoid attacks against individuals, and must avoid any blanket statements about a particular peace group or about the peace movement in general.

What veterans can do, however, is to inform fellow citizens in peace groups, in unions, in fraternal, women's and youth groups correctly and repeatedly on issues of vital importance to our national security.

All of the people in peace groups which Communist hope to exploit for their own ends must be made aware how Communists are working to use their idealistic views to speed the destruction of free institutions and the means to defend them.

Only by a constant flow of information on the role of the defense establishment in defending free institutions and in furthering man's hope to live in a world at peace can Communist agitation be counteracted and defeated.

What Communists are trying to do, in effect, is to use a chain forged in Moscow to harness American peace groups to haul the Communist chariot ahead. You have it in your power to break that chain.

HOW REDS ARE MOVING IN LATIN AMERICA

In an unimpressive building in Mexico City on March 5, Red Chinese Delegate Chou Erh-fu wound up a ringing speech that had been punctuated by shouted slogans of, "Long Live China" and "Long Live Mao Tse-tung."

The audience was made up mostly of Latin Americans, including a large delegation from Fidel Castro's Cuba, attending the Latin American Conference for National Sovereignty, Economic Emancipation and Peace.

The conference was called by former Mexican President Lazaro Cardenas, a 1959 visitor to Peiping and a top member of the Executive Bureau of the World Peace Council which is run by the Chinest and Soviet Communists.

As was expected, the meeting ended with a string of resolutions condemning alleged U.S. aggression in Cuba, seeking repeal of hemisphere treaties for mutual defense and cooperation, opposing U.S. military missions to Latin America, opposing all U.S. aid, and supporting efforts to "liberate" territories held by Western countries in Latin America.

The real importance of the meeting is the fact that it was held in the first place. It was at an Afro-Asian Solidarity Congress in Cairo in December 1957 that campaigns were launched which have brought us the Congo and the turbulence in Africa.

We can expect that the meeting in Mexico City means the launching of an intensified effort by Communists to create chaos in Latin America, to break up the unity of the Western Hemisphere, and to further isolate and weaken the United States.

Action to counter such a Communist campaign can be taken by trade unions, by other private organizations which have regular relationships with friends in Latin America. The most effective action, however, can only be taken throught the offices of the U.S. Government.

In the case of Africa there was a time lag of about 2 years between the Afro-Asian Solidarity Congress and the outbreak of chaos. There are some signs in Latin America that we might not have that much time left there in which to act.

The Dilemma of Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the April 3, 1961, issue of the New Republic. Mr. T. K. Quinn here concludes his enlightening discussion of the price-fixing case involving the electrical manufacturing companies. On March 23, 1961, and April 26, 1961, I inserted articles by Mr. Quinn on this same subject. The importance of the matter commends it to our attention:

THE DILEMMA OF BUSINESS

The decision, the jail sentences, the fines, and the disillusionment following the electrical machinery price collusion case in Philadelphia could mark the beginning of a new understanding of the economic and political issues involved if the actual conditions are frankly faced. This is much more vital than the passing, publicized settlements and new Federal lawsuits against the price fixers promised by the Attorney General.

We are obliged to begin, as Judge Ganey said in Philadelphia, with the conclusion that the chief officers of 21 corporations had guilty knowledge of "the vast conspiracy." After all, price control is a common practice in many industries. General Electric, the principal offender, has a long record of antitrust violations dating back 50 years. On an average of once every 2 years for half a century the company has had some governmental action brought against it. The policy of violation is well established. Similar indictments, although not so regular or quite so often, have been brought against such other giants as General Motors, Du Pont, A.T. & T., Westinghouse. There have been a number of convictions despite almost insurmountable obstacles the prosecution must overcome.

The plain fact is that the big corporations are caught in an impossible dilemma. On the one hand, they know from experience that unrestricted price competition is destructive and that if it actually prevailed markets could be disrupted, profits reduced or eliminated, and industrial instability result. They could, of course, crush smaller concerns because of their capital advantages but would in time be themselves broken up. When giants fight there is bloodshed.

Adam Smith is outdated in this modern age largely because fixed overhead has become a principal factor in total cost, and because corporations have swollen so big as to make our whole society dependent upon them. They simply refuse to take price chances wherever they can be avoided, often regardless of the law.

On the other hand, anything less than seemingly enthusiastic support of competition as a constructive force would be inevitably interpreted as an attack against free enterprise, so faithfully advocated and guarded by its honest believers and practitioners as well as by those who, being in positions of capital and market advantage, insist upon the license to charge and do as they please, free from all governmental interference or public controls of any kind, and regardless of inflation or any other harmful effects. What they really want are easy profits, assured, continuing and increasing.

So big business, preaching one thing and practicing its opposite, is obliged to pretend that it favors competition and the antitrust laws while it secretly opposes them, establishes uniform and administered prices, sets up barriers against the entry of new companies into its fields, stalls costly technological innovation and curtails production. Thus, otherwise respectable businessmen—the conforming bureaucrats in big corporations—become the carriers of misrepresentation and falsehoods and degrade themselves. They are victims of a dilemma most of them don't understand.

In about one-third of the national economy—an area that includes automobiles, steel, cigarettes, cement, oil products, chemicals, roofing materials, electric light bulbs and machinery—price competition has been eliminated by mutual understanding, legally or illegally, among the corporations represented. They have taken the position, in practice, that prices should be substantially uniform and profits so made secure.

Now, if the American public is ready to accept this condition then the only remaining question is who should fix the prices and what standards should be adopted. Shall we permit these and other private collusive interests themselves to decide what their "take" is to be? If so, then the laboring man should also be permitted to set his own wages.

Before pursuing this absurdity further, let us quickly say that obviously the public interest must come first, and it becomes the duty and responsibility of the people, acting through government, to set the prices which would otherwise be under private collusive control. The situation is not changed in the least by resorting to name calling—i.e. "socialism." We would simply be recogniz-

ing the conditions brought about by big business overreaching itself.

The Government need not interfere in that two-thirds of the economy where honest price competition prevails. Every business concern could have a choice between the acceptance of maximum prices set by the Government or prices set by competition without Government regulation. Antitrust laws would be more strictly enforced. Uniform prices would require standard wage patterns, and a Federal Price and Wage Board would have to be established to supervise the regulation, as was done during the last war.

The public would, in effect, be saying to the monopolists and oligopolists: "As long as you insist upon uniform or controlled prices, we insist upon refusing you the right to set them. We would rather not have Government intervene but you leave no alternative:"

Members of a Price and Wage Board would be selected with the same care as Justices of the Supreme Court. They would have to be high principled men more interested in service and honor than in accumulating material wealth. The Board would be a most important public body.

It becomes more apparent every day that powerful, giant, private corporations cannot safely continue to be treated as wholly private institutions. They have power over investment, output, employment, sales, and wage policies that substantially affect the markets in which they deal, and therefore all of us whose lives are conditioned by those markets. Moreover, they aspire to an ever-increasing role in our educational and political lives, as so much of the subsidized literature demonstrates. They have made a captive of competition in many industries and are more controlling than they are controlled.

Their preeminent positions might be tolerable as long as the public could believe the corporation officials were more or less unselfish, public spirited, unusual men of the highest integrity. But this illusion has been shattered by excessive salaries paid to quite ordinary executives, by the stock option racket, high prices and by illegal and unethical conduct.

The country will be a long time recovering from the shock of the Philadelphia price collusion verdict. It served to dramatize to the general public what only a relatively few have long known concerning the unsavory practices of big business. They are by no means limited to the companies or the disclosures in that one case. All of us have in some measure been morally hurt. But it will not have been in vain if we can now get on with the business of bringing the freebooters under public control and striking at the sources of the evil. Let us give more support to the Department of Justice and to the Senate and House Antitrust Committees under the able chairmanships of Representative CELLER, of New York, and Senator KEFAUVER, of Tennessee. These men have nobly struggled against handicaps that would have discouraged lesser men.

In addition to the establishment of a Price and Wage Board, we should now reconsider such proposals as public representation on the boards of directors of the biggest corporations, which by the very nature and size of their operations and ownership are quasi-public organizations. A tax on corporation profits graduated upward, instead of the present flat 52-percent tax, would discourage the trend toward even bigger private institutions, which is proceeding by leaps and bounds—and not for reasons of increased efficiency, as is so commonly misrepresented, but to secure more financial and marketing power. This undemocratic authority is bankrupting small business and has become so great that it threatens the continuance of our freedoms, especially when it becomes further concentrated as it is now in a handful of bankers acting as trustees for equity funds with controlling interests in all the giant corporations.

T. K. QUINN.

Speech of Mayor John J. Buckley, of Lawrence, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include the well prepared speech which was delivered at the annual installation banquet of the Julian Stopyra Post, Polish-American Veterans, on April 16, 1961, by the Honorable John J. Buckley, mayor of the city of Lawrence, Mass., and also member of the Governor's council, representing Essex County and part of Middlesex County, Mass. The speech received enthusiastic approbation to a degree which I consider justifies recording it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, since I know that Mayor Buckley is a fine after-dinner speaker and a very interesting and able orator:

SPEECH BY THE HONORABLE JOHN J. BUCKLEY, MAYOR OF THE CITY OF LAWRENCE, MASS., DELIVERED AT THE ANNUAL INSTALLATION BANQUET OF THE JULIAN STOPYRA POST, POLISH-AMERICAN VETERANS, LAWRENCE, MASS., APRIL 16, 1961

It is indeed an honor and a pleasure for me to join with you in this occasion of the joint installation of the officers of Julian Stopyra Post, Polish-American Veterans and its auxiliary.

It is both vital and commendable that a patriotic organization such as yours exists and takes such a deep interest in maintaining our hard won heritages.

We need active groups like the Polish-American Veterans in order to insure at no time can a certain nationalistic minority, even though unorganized, be dismissed as of no significance or consequence.

Basically, the true purposes of nationalistic organizations such as the Stopyra Post Veterans lie in their recognition of the human values of democratic freedom, dignity of the individual, and the guarantee and assurance of equal opportunity.

Although the waves of immigration from European shores have decreased in volume as compared to the years gone by, I think it is most praiseworthy that their sons and daughters, aware of their own particular role in American society, have continued to maintain a consistency of effort and unity in order to perpetuate the noble heritage of their nationalistic origin.

Thus, in the same sense, I, although of Irish extraction, share the same motivation, ideals, and purposes which have energized your activities since the founding of this post some years ago.

I would say that it is because of our mutual backgrounds and environment that we, like our immigrant forebears, embrace with loving devotion the ideals and the principles of the Constitution of the United States.

Recent political events have borne out the validity of my remarks. Only a few short weeks ago, we in this country witnessed the culmination of all the hopes, the dreams, and the aspirations of every immigrant, who upon descending the gangplank and setting foot upon the soil of the United States, felt within his or her heart that someday, despite the peasant origin, a descendant of theirs might gain the highest honor to be achieved by a natural-born citizen of these United States.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, President of the United States is only three generations removed from the same classification which identifies so many of us here today.

It was his great grandfather who sought the opportunity to better his lot by leaving his native Ireland much for the same desirable reasons which brought so many natives of Poland to this land of democratic freedom and opportunity.

The election of John Fitzgerald Kennedy as President of the United States is the fitting culmination of an Irishman's dream, and I am equally certain that his victory is a direct reaction of attitudes transformed into action by not only the Irish and the Poles but also by other nationalistic groups who by their collective efforts succeeded in making their influence felt in the selection of this "son of an Irish immigrant" as President.

I expect John F. Kennedy to be one of our greatest Presidents.

I believe that he will reflect in his official actions the compassion bred into him for the trials, tribulations, and difficulties experienced by all immigrants and their offspring who have made up the working class since the beginning of the industrial revolution in America.

Social progress in the true democratic sense as opposed to statism and communistic collectivism made its greatest advance in the early years of President Roosevelt's administration. The war intervened. I expect to see a resumption toward the goal of human betterment despite the financial obligations and national difficulties we face and have faced since the end of World War II.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy assumed the task of President of these United States under a similar set of circumstances which 100 years ago saw a nation divided. Today, it is not a nation but a world that is divided. The road which lies ahead for our new President will be long, hard, and arduous. It may well be that in the immediate years which lie ahead in the unending struggle for mankind to achieve its ultimate destiny, the geographical frontiers we know today will not move an inch beyond the Iron Curtain.

But I am certain that the frontiers of religious misunderstanding, the fears and bitterness of political and sectional animosities, the very ramparts of economic selfishness have already been breached by the turn of events which resulted in this victory for the common man.

So it is, that in a lesser geographical area, namely, the fifth councilor district, the contribution of the Polish spirit was a factor in placing me as an elected State official in the vanguard of the assault forces upon the new, conquerable frontiers of (1) housing for the elderly, (2) general urban renewal and obliteration of blighted areas, and (3) medical legislation and higher minimum wage laws.

Your continued assistance as a patriotic veterans organization is needed to achieve our national goals.

Five times in the last century, the Polish people have been ground under the heels of oppressors. Never in this long period of tragic history has the fighting Polish spirit faltered. Even today, that fighting spirit has caused the present communistic and atheistic masters to recognize and permit a lessening of the hardness so prevalent and existent in the countries under Red domination.

Why is this so?

Because the Polish spirit lives on, undaunted, in Poland and throughout the world. It is because for the period since the Julian Stopyra Post of Polish-American Veterans and its auxiliary has been founded, this spirit has been nourished by the courageous purpose of providing not only civic interest in the community at large but also by providing both spiritual and charitable assistance to kindred both at home and abroad.

In conclusion, just one more thought to leave with you.

We in the United States, a country founded in strength have always surged forward in times of stress and uncertainty. We shall reach these new frontiers which lie ahead. We shall overcome the stresses which beset our generations with the same high degree of courage displayed by our predecessors.

Many gains have been made. We shall hold this high ground. In such a spirit, I wish the Julian Stopyra Post, Polish-American Veterans and its auxiliary Godspeed.

Needed: A Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, in our foreign relations, I am ready and anxious to support our President, completely and vigorously. I ask only that the President advise our Nation as to what his foreign policy is. I recall that Senator Kennedy was extremely critical of President Eisenhower's foreign policy, but in the days since he himself has been President no clear-cut policy has come forth, and I am deeply troubled by the news on all sides. I bring to your attention two editorials that appeared in the Wall Street Journal on April 27 and an article by Carroll Kilpatrick that appeared, the same day, in the Washington Post:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 27, 1961]

THE COLD WORLD

The verbal beating the United States is taking around the world in the wake of the Cuban defeat ought to occasion some sober thinking, in Washington and in the country, about America's foreign relations.

There is no little irony in the situation in which we find ourselves. Fifteen years ago the United States proclaimed, with some fanfare, that it was forswearing isolationism forever. Yet today it is visibly being isolated to a considerable degree by the rest of the world.

Our enormous outpouring of aid, nearly $100 billion since the end of World War II, goes ignored or is greeted with cynicism. Our obvious concern for man's freedom is disbelieved. In Laos we try to help a people that apparently have little understanding of, or interest in, freedom. In Cuba we try to help a people dislodge a monstrous Communist tyranny, and get castigated for our pains. In Britain and elsewhere the tides of Communist-serving neutralism and pacifism run high.

At the same time the Communists get away with murder at the bar of world opinion. They hold hundreds of millions in slavery, they smash Hungary and Tibet; yet the Russians are fawned upon and the agitation increases to get the unspeakable Chinese Communists into the United Nations.

What is the matter with such a world?

One thing, plainly enough, is that clear political thinking is a rare commodity. That has always been true, but it is aggravated today by the emergence of scores of little nations that would merit no attention were it not for the Communist conspiracy and the forum the United Nations provides for the pompous.

An even more basic difficulty is that the concept of freedom itself is a difficult one for most of the world's peoples to grasp, let alone practice. The life of liberty in world history has been but a fitful and frail one. Most people have never experienced it; for political leaders it is infinitely easier to run a police state than a free society, and far more gratifying to their egos.

These fundamental circumstances—gullibility, ignorance of freedom, dictatorial ambitions—are made to order for the Communists. In a sense they are offering the world what most of the world knows best. They can portray the United States as just the opposite of what it is, and gain credence.

That kind of deceit is extremely difficult to combat, as President Kennedy is beginning to notice. The Communists can subvert peoples and governments against freedom, but it's a contradiction in terms to talk about subverting people to freedom.

Still, the United States has not been blameless in the distorted picture it has acquired in many places. We flipped too far and too fast from isolationism to internationalism. We assumed our new "role in the world" with an excess of zeal and an excess of sentimentality. We know that we have the world's true interests at heart and we supposed, naturally enough, the world would recognize it and be able to see the most obvious fact of our times—the Communist conspiracy to capture all nations.

Well, it didn't work that way. In trying to be kind to everyone, we too often seemed soft. We worried too much about what the world would think of this or that. We seemed to adopt the notion that war is the worst of evils when in fact it is not; a world in Communist chains is the worst.

In these observations perhaps lies a clue to a somewhat different direction of our national attitudes toward the world. We must realize, first, that we are being isolated not because our way of life is wrong but because most people just don't get it. We must do the things that are necessary in dealing with our vicious enemy without fretting unduly over the reaction in Africa or India.

That is not to advocate isolationism but simply an American foreign policy. It is to say that it is time we stopped running after the world; we had better start looking at its realistically from our own point of view. We should be willing to help, but only to the extent the world understands we are trying to stave off a dark age.

If we act with dignity and aloofness we may expect respect. Indeed, a certain amount of coldness in a cold world and a cold war might be the approach most likely to awaken other nations to an awareness of the true situation and the real perils.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 27, 1961]

OVEREAGER WOOING

As an example of how not to deal with those who make the world a cold place for opponents of communism, take the administration's red carpet treatment of Indonesia's visiting President Sukarno.

Following a 21-gun salute, President Kennedy hailed his guest as "a distinguished national leader, father of his country, and a leader in the world." That description was so extravagant that even Mr. Sukarno protested: "I am just a small mouthpiece of the Indonesian Nation."

He is indeed a spokesman. At home, Mr. Sukarno speaks for a guided democracy which amounts to a thorough-going socialist totalitarianism. Abroad, he speaks for the curious kind of noncommitment which is willfully blind to Communist aggression and hostile to every free world response. Naturally, he is sharply critical of the United States' support of Cubans trying to free their homeland from communism.

Of course, the United States cannot pretend that Mr. Sukarno doesn't exist. But it is surely permissible to wonder if we must be all this ardent in our wooing.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 27, 1961]

AIM IS TO ASSURE SUCCESS: KENNEDY ASKS BROTHER, SORENSEN TO HELP HIM OUT ON FOREIGN POLICY

(By Carroll Kilpatrick)

In the wake of the Cuban fiasco, President Kennedy has turned to two of his oldest and most trusted advisers and told them that in the future they must help him on foreign policy problems.

They are the President's brother, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, and Theodore C. Sorensen, special counsel to the President and chief ghostwriter.

Far more than telling these two men that they must help on foreign policy, which is the President's primary preoccupation these days, he seems to be saying that they must help him consider every foreign policy problem in terms of its effect on the President's own authority and prestige—as well as the Nation's.

Neither Robert Kennedy nor Sorensen has any special competence in the field of foreign policy. Indeed, they are amateurs in a field usually reserved for the experts.

But they have one qualification which the experts lack: they rose to their present positions of power with the President by looking at every issue in terms of his interest and advancement.

WORLD POSITION WEAKENED

Neither the President nor any of his advisers seems to have looked at the Cuban problem in those terms, and the failure in Cuba seriously damaged the Presidency itself. The President's own personal position before the world was weakened.

It is hard to explain why John F. Kennedy should make such a mistake. More than most Presidents he was thought to understand the essentials of Presidential power, the importance of success, and the necessity always to think in terms of the effect of actions on the high office he holds.

In a book published last year called "Presidential Power," Richard E. Neustadt, now a special assistant to Mr. Kennedy, wrote of two cases in which President Truman and President Eisenhower neglected to consider actions in terms of the effect on their power and prestige.

"The lesson of these cases is that when it comes to power, nobody is expert but the President; if he, too, acts as layman, it goes hard with him * * *.

"What occurred in these cases is what always tends to happen. While experts in all spheres except his own advised the President from where they sat, their judgments hid from him the need for personal prospective.

"NO BAD INTENT

"They did not take his own look for him (how could they?) but neither did their presentations prompt him to start looking. Presumably, there was in this no 'sabotage,' no bad intent. In neither instance is there much indication that advisers acted irresponsibly. Each seems to have performed his duty as he saw it; none sat where the President did * * *.

"Both [Presidents Truman and Eisenhower) were the victims of reliance upon issues and advisers to do more than any President can count on them to do—to clarify his stakes of personal power."

It would almost seem that Neustadt was writing about the Cuban failure—or the U–2 case—both of which occurred after his book was written.

And the President is said to believe that there was no "sabotage" or "irresponsibility" among his experts. He has taken the full responsibility on his own shoulders.

By all that he has said since last week, Mr. Kennedy seems to have taken this lesson to heart. He is obviously trying to recapture the position he held in the eyes of the world before the abortive landing on the Cuban coast.

NO CRITICISM SEEN

White House aides insist that in asking Robert Kennedy and Sorensen to concern themselves with foreign problems in addition to their other responsibilities no criticism is intended of any of the President's other advisers.

They will continue to assist him as in the past and to carry the same burdens.

When the President was forming his Cabinet it was apparent that he strongly felt the need to have his brother close at hand. He did not think he should be in the White House or have a Sherman Adams role. He made him Attorney General, and now he has made him much more.

Sorensen and the Attorney General were the chief assistants in the Kennedy presidential campaign. They proved that they were shrewd and tough men who could say "no." They demonstrated their ability to see issues and men in terms of the Kennedy needs and aspirations and success.

President of U.S. Chamber of Commerce Publicly Declares President Kennedy "Doesn't Have a Socialistic Bone in His Body" and Also Says "President Kennedy's Program Designed To Energize Weakening Economy"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, in the Los Angeles Times, February 3, 1961, I read a release which was in text as follows:

KENNEDY'S NO SOCIALIST, SAYS U.S. CHAMBER HEAD; PRESIDENT'S "PUMP PRIMING" MEASURES SEEN AS SPUR TO NATION'S LAGGING ECONOMY

Arthur (Red) Motley, president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and an outspoken apostle of free enterprise, said here Thursday that, while he may disapprove of some of President Kennedy's antirecession measures, he would hardly go so far as to call them socialistic.

"He [Kennedy] doesn't have a socialistic bone in his body," said Motley.

The red-haired chamber president, by turn critic and defender of the President, told a news conference in the Biltmore that he's convinced the administration's "pump priming" is designed to "energize" the country's sagging economy, not destroy it.

And, because, in my humble judgment, the direct quote in said newspaper by the President of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce should be specifically observed by as many Americans who really think as possible, I am pleased to present the text thereof. President Motley surely knows whereof he speaks about President Kennedy.

And, Mr. Speaker, please note what he says about President Kennedy's administration, its purposes and design.

The Feelings of an American Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues in the House, as well as others, the reading of a letter which has come to me and I have asked that it be printed in the RECORD. For the past several months, I have received letters of a similar nature but this letter is so expressive of all the others I deemed it wise to give it as much reading opportunity as possible:

Hon. FRANK J. BECKER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BECKER: I have often been tempted lately, with the trend of things as we face our New Frontier, to write to you and let you know how I feel and what I think of some of the silliness that is proposed. But after waiting a bit and cooling off, I realize how close you are to your people and, knowing that you represent a large majority of reasonable and generally conservative people, you indicate by the record that you are truly representing the wishes of most of us.

So, why pester you with letters? You have enough to answer without mine. Still, once in a while you should know that what you have been doing has the notice and the approval of your people. Of course I can speak only for myself and my family, but I hear only approval of your record in Congress amongst my friends.

But there comes a time when one gets just so fed up with what the New Frontier proposes, that one just has to let you know how they feel and what they think. Like most of your constitutents, I am just an average person, working for my living, earning about $7,800 before taxes. I have two children, one in high school and the other in college. I own my own home (no mortgage, thank goodness, I saved and paid it off) and pay some $650 yearly in local taxes—not to mention the Federal and State income tax bites. All of that, with college tuition (nondeductible), shaves it pretty closely, as you can well imagine. Through the years I've managed to save a bit above and beyond the reserve one needs in a savings bank and thus I have become a moderate investor in both A.T. & T. and LIL Co. stock.

Now we are getting close to the meat of this whole thing. No doubt you read of it, but I'd like to call it clearly to your attention. At Chicago, the opening game between the White Sox and the Senators drew 16,637 people. On the same day in Chicago, the A.T. & T. annual meeting drew 20,000. Total A.T. & T. shareholders exceed 1,910,000. As one newspaper put it, "When a stockholders meeting can outdraw a major league opening game, it seems to prove that people's capitalism is a genuine American phenomenon and not just a slogan."

Someone will have to get over to the President and the egghead breakfast club that only a minority of the stockholders belong to the champagne set—and I guess it will have to be you fellows in Congress. Stockholders, by and large, are investors without which the whole American economy will bog down. To keep on, through restrictive legislation and tax legislation to make such investment unattractive will only backfire on the Government in the long run. I have always honestly declared stock dividends and savings bank interest and I think that most people do. I believe that the present setup of having such dividend and interest payments reported to the Internal Revenue Service by the paying corporations is quite sufficient for them to check on the taxpayer's honesty and I believe that it is up to them to do so. I am opposed to any further "withholding at the source," believing what we already have is an infringement of our rights. I am opposed also to discontinuing the $50 exclusion and 4 percent credit on dividend income over that amount.

Now, I'd like to prove to you that I am small-time, that I have invested for additional income which is needed these days just to keep one's head above water and not for speculation: I own 74 shares of A.T. & T. and 19 of LIL Co., all purchased at much less than the presently inflated prices, and with no intention of selling for capital gain unless something happened to me or my family and there was no other alternative. And, the good Lord forbid, if I had to do this, isn't it enough that the Government would collect 25 percent of my profit as tax on capital gain? They would collect this amount on my foresight, my saving to invest, my attempt to provide for the future of myself and my family.

Please, Mr. BECKER, stay on our side.

Very truly yours,

_____.

I Believe in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, in this trying period in the history of our beloved Republic, expressions of faith in America are not as commonly voiced as are reports of her failures.

I was impressed by the following letter to the editor of the Utica Observer-Dispatch written by a resident of Utica, N.Y., who is a native of the Republic of Lebanon.

His love of country is self-evident from his eloquent statement of beliefs which I commend to the attention of the House:

To the EDITOR:

In spite of the Russian success in orbiting Yuri Gagarin around the world and in spite of words such as "complacent" and "lagging" in reference to our space program, my belief in our beloved United States remains firm because:

I believe in this bighearted country of ours and I believe in its destiny, as I have always believed in its glowing liberty and justice for which it stands.

I believe in our American Government, in its Constitution and in its flag as firmly as I have always believed in the versatility

and generosity of our people, whose limitless gifts and contributions to the human race of 3 billion people have surpassed the combined efforts of the Grecian, Roman and Phoenician Empires.

I believe in our family and in our youth who are fearless, daring, curious and intelligent, as firmly as I believe in their honesty, sincerity, fairplay and in their upbringing.

I believe that every time I see our American children, they seem to be saying to me: "Here we are, and in our veins runs the blood of our fathers who have dazzled all continents with so many achievements that people have long stopped talking about the 'Seven Wonders of the World.' "

I believe in our schools and in our teachers, collectively, who have profusely given us and the world great men and women in every field and branch of human endeavor.

I believe in our American ingenuity and creativity as I believe in our bridges, buildings, tunnels and other titanic feats, which became realities because the world, like Yuri Gagarin, had challenged us in saying, "They couldn't be done."

I believe we have been orbiting around the world with the innumerables, the immeasurables and the impossibles—zooming, darting and thunderously blazing with honor and glory on land, in the sea and in the air—and we shall continue to do so.

I firmly believe that our country's stockpiles of secret weapons are ready to earthquake every inch of the world with mass death and pulverization, if we are forced to fight.

I believe that Uncle Sam is a giant standing between heaven and earth, who could rule the world if it weren't for the heaven in his heart.

Oh, U.S.A., I know you. I believe you are as eternal as the Cedars of God in Lebanon, believe me.

PETER KHOURY.

J.F.K.: What a Difference 90 Days Make

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Journal Star to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

J.F.K.: WHAT A DIFFERENCE 90 DAYS MAKE

There was a striking picture on page 1 of Sunday's paper—two men strolling down a wooded path, talking in comradely, confidential fashion of the crisis in Cuba.

From the rear, it was a little hard to tell just who they were. We have the photographer's word for it, though, that they were President Kennedy and former President Eisenhower.

The mind's gears growl a little here as one attempts to put this in perspective. Would this be the same man who, as Candidate Kennedy, was so critical of the Eisenhower administration's handling of Cuba?

Well, apparently it is. For that matter, it's the same President Kennedy who, shortly before meeting with Mr. Eisenhower, met also with Richard Nixon and Senator Barry Goldwater to discuss the Cuban situation.

What a difference a few weeks in office—and a crisis—make. Who would have thought that Candidate Kennedy, so critical of Republican efforts where Cuba was concerned, would, as President Kennedy, confer with those same Republicans on the very subject where he cast doubts upon their capabilities.

Last week, sidestepping questions about the Cuban trouble, President Kennedy cryptically said: "Victory has a hundred fathers—defeat is an orphan."

He meant, evidently, that had rebel efforts against Fidel Castro succeeded last week, plenty of people—including both past and present administrations—would have been willing to share in the credit for its success.

But, instead, an orphaned infant named Defeat has been laid on the White House doorstep.

It must be acknowledged that President Kennedy is not ducking responsibility. He admits that as head of the U.S. Government he is responsible for the U.S. backing—to whatever degree it existed—of the rebel effort against Castro.

He is also finding out that the White House diplomatic nursery is a lonely place in the bleak hours. And he is willing—overlooking what he said as a candidate—to call upon some who have been there before, pacing the floor with earlier orphans named Defeat.

So what we are seeing is not a legal proceeding to establish paternity. Instead it is a family conference to discuss just what to do with the colicky babe.

Real Voice of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, since coming to Congress in 1949, I have read with interest and profit the columns of Mr. Constantine Brown which appear almost daily in the Washington Evening Star.

It is with regret that I note Mr. Brown is being assigned to Rome, Italy, for the next 2 years for his has been an effective voice on the Washington scene. I am pleased, however, that his columns will continue to appear in the Star and from his vantage point in Europe I am sure there will come much needed appraisals—fairly, clearly, and courageously written—of the involvements of the U.S. Government and thus the citizens of this country in the Middle East and Europe.

Constantine Brown, the veteran reporter and columnist, knows that the people and byways of America, not Washington, provide the true heart and soul of this Republic.

With his many friends and admirers, I wish Mr. Brown well during his sojourn in foreign lands, and I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD his column from the Star of the date of April 25, 1961, which follows:

In a few weeks this reporter will sail across the Atlantic and up the Mediterranean to Naples, and thence by train to Rome. For the next 2 years, the assignment will be to cover at first hand the extraordinary developments in Western Europe's almost miraculous recovery, political as well as economic, from the disaster of World War II.

And, of course, from the vantage point of the Italian capital, we will be close at hand to cover the next manifestations of militant communism's penetration of the Middle East and Africa.

Except for occasional trips to Europe, the Middle East, and Asia, this reporter has covered the Washington scene for more than 31 years. There comes a time when long concentration on the undoubtedly world significant but relatively small area between 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue and Capitol Hill induces, we think inevitably, too much concern with the impact of the U.S. political drama on international affairs. One loses, to some extent, the perspective needed for the balanced view.

Particularly these days, with events crowding each other for the attention of the world and so very much happening in parts of the political spectrum that only yesterday, in a sense, were colonial backwaters or decadent former empires, a closer affinity both physical and psychological is essential. This we are going to try to achieve.

On leaving our old "beat" for a while, however, it seems a few reflections might be in order. We would like to leave a few observations on the nature of things American today as they appear to a reporter on the point of leaving for a new environment and new perspectives. Here they are.

First of all, every American ought to know that the true voice of America is not in Washington, not in that fascinating stretch of American Government between the White House and the Hill. It is in the hearts and minds and throats of all Americans. It is in America's homes, its schools and universities and colleges, its Main Streets and city halls, its prairies and mountains, its churches and lodges, its baseball diamonds and picnic grounds. It is in America and in Americans all.

Our true ideologies are not necessarily truly expressed in Washington. Only a few of their trappings are visible here. They can be found on the family hearthside, on the kitchen range.

Freedom, as the Founding Fathers meant it to be, will never be preserved in the Nation's Capital. It will never be realized in its true nature through political parties, movements or programs that in their very nature are the antithesis of American freedom and integrity and self-reliance, the kind that made us the Nation we have become.

Young America seems to be sensing these facts, even after 30 years of indoctrination and familiarity with New Deals, with one-world diplomacy, with internationally minded compromiser diplomats and so-called statesmen who have been leading the Nation down the glory trail, in the wrong direction, for more than a generation.

Take a look at the map of the world as it is today. Indeed, in the light of most recent developments, take a look, if you can, at a map of the universe itself. Try to realize, as you look, that the reactionary concept of political, social, and economic life reflected in the growth of imperialist communism, erroneously labeled "revolutionary" but in truth a reversion to tyranny, albeit of a new type, has come to dominate much of the world and to threaten all of it.

America is manifested in its fundamental truths in people like the man who donated 16,000 copies of J. Edgar Hoover's "Masters of Deceit" to as many high school libraries. It is to be seen in the Freedom Library, with subscribers donating unselfishly that America may know the truth. If the wife of a bus driver contributes her little mite, so can you.

And the truth shall, in truth, make you free.

The Agricultural Situation Is a Many-Sided Thing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the urgent need for enactment of long-range and forward-looking farm legislation was emphasized by Agricultural Secretary Orville Freeman when he testified before the House Agriculture Committee April 24 on the proposed Agricultural Act of 1961. He cited the current technological explosion in agriculture and the magnitude of the storage problem as two of the reasons why this bill should be enacted into law as soon as possible. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include this portion of his testimony in the RECORD:

TECHNOLOGICAL EXPLOSION HAS INTENSIFIED THE FARM PROBLEM

THE URGENCY OF THIS LEGISLATION IS FURTHER EMPHASIZED BY THE CURRENT TECHNOLOGICAL EXPLOSION IN AGRICULTURE

The magnitude of the technological revolution in agriculture is too little recognized, and its consequences—in the present and for the future—are not sufficiently realized or understood.

Agricultural efficiency and productivity have advanced so rapidly during the past decade that agriculture has tripled its output per hour of labor while industry's output has only doubled. Output in agriculture increased much more rapidly than the commercial market increased. During the 1950's farm output increased by 28 percent while population increased only 19 percent. Since the domestic demand for food is tied closely to population changes this means that supplies have outrun demand. Supplies have pressed against population needs in the United States and given rise to a constant downward pressure on farm prices.

This increase in output has been accomplished with the use of only 2 percent more resources than were used 10 years ago. The composition of these resources has changed sharply, with about one-third less labor and 6 percent less cropland. But the use of machinery, fertilizers, pesticides, and other purchased inputs has risen sharply. Overall efficiency, in terms of output per unit of input has gone up by 25 percent. These changes in resource needs have had a sharp impact on declining farm employment, increased capital requirements, and the decreasing opportunity for young people to enter farming.

This technological revolution in agriculture has only just begun. Only a few of our farmers are using all of the new technology to the best advantage. Economists in the Department of Agriculture recently estimated that a population of 230 million people in 1975 could be provided better diets, and our export markets readily satisfied, from a crop acreage no larger than that in use just prior to the start of the Conservation Reserve program, simply by using presently-known methods of production on most farms. If all farm production in 1975 were to be carried on with only the best techniques in use in the late 1950's, not all of the cropland acreage now in use would be needed for food and fiber production.

* * * * *

It breaks down to this: If American farmers are given some assurance of relatively favorable prices and incomes in the 1960's, and if we provide a sound program for adjusting our production to that which can be used, we will have a highly productive and flexible agricultural plant—one capable of responding to any foreseeable food production emergency. This is the kind of an agriculture we want.

But, in the absence of such a program, results could be disastrous. What are the potential consequences?

Farmers could, in the absence of such a program, use their productive capacity indiscriminately. In that event, if support programs were continued, the burden on the Federal budget would become intolerable, and the stockpiles of surplus completely unmanageable. Or—and more likely—the public would refuse to continue such supports, and prices and incomes would be driven down so low that results could be catastrophic. Millions of farmers, their incomes depressed below subsistence level, would swell the ranks of the unemployed, would crowd already crowded areas of our cities, seeking jobs. And many of them would be neither trained for jobs or adjusted to city life. The economic problem would be complicated by the social problem.

This is not all. I should like to point out here how such a development would in the end be likely to add higher consumer food prices to its unfortunate results. Further decline in income for the family farm could lead to a corporate type agriculture controlled by outside capital. Hired labor would increasingly replace work done by the farm operator, and the costs of management, supervision and labor would go up. For one of the major reasons why the American family farm has become the most efficient agricultural producer in history is that the owner-operator is on hand, to do the work and to supervise the work. Neither collective farms nor large corporate landowners are able to mtach the efficiency that results.

If low incomes squeeze out all but a few corporate-type farms, there would doubtless result the kind of supply control that would result in high prices, without regard for the public interest, or the consumer interest, or interest in our programs to expand the use of food abroad in the interest of peace and economic progress.

We deplore the collectivization of farms in a part of the world, and we would encourage land reform in those other areas where huge landholdings have—like the Communist collective farms—proved so inferior to our family farm economy. How ironic it would be if we allowed that family farm economy, that has proved its superiority socially as well as economically, to be destroyed for want of the tools it needs to meet conditions of today.

The family farm in this Nation has reached a pinnacle of success in its primary function, the production of an abundance of food and fiber to meet human needs. It has made this abundance available to the consumers of this nation at a lower real cost than ever before in history. The consumer now spends about 20 percent of his disposable personal income for food, as compared with more than a fourth in 1947. The consumer in America works fewer hours to feed himself and his family than in any other country. The American public should pay tribute to the farmer for his contribution to our standard of living. Even Khrushchev pays that tribute. A little over a week ago he was quoted as saying that the Soviet triumph in space "must not detract the attention of the Soviet people from other targets, and these include catching up with the United States in the standard of living."

To insure our continued superiority in this field in which we have unquestioned leadership, we propose a program that will end the current paradox in which productive success has led to economic distress. This happens, in a large measure, because of the inelasticity of the human stomach, hence the inelasticity of the demand for food. A little too much in the way of food supplies leads to dramatic farm price declines—hence to a farm income problem. And a little too little in the way of food supplies leads to skyrocketing food prices and a real income squeeze on consumers—this is the food problem so often encountered in wartime.

* * * * *

In fact, paradoxical as it may seem, these gyrations and this instability can hurt both producer and consumer at the same time. The instability adds to the risk of farming, and risk always increases costs. And the uncertainties of economic ups and downs make for an inefficient use of the productive plant the farmer has, and which he must maintain whether prices are good or bad. This, too, increases costs.

This leads to my final point with regard to the technological explosion and its effect on both farmer and consumer. Only if we put into effect a program that succeeds in adjusting production to that which we can use and that at the same time provides a fair income for the farmer, only if we thus promote economic and price stability in agriculture, only then can continued technological improvements in production be expected to result in an eventual lowering of prices to consumers while maintaining farm incomes. Without such a program the farmer must pay the cost of risk, and of inefficient use of his productive plant, as I have described. Without it he must maintain greater financial liquidity than would otherwise be the case; he must pay more for credit; he is forced to use older and less efficient methods than he would otherwise use.

Supply adjustment programs that serve to reduce and minimize the extreme and uncertain price fluctuations in agriculture would reduce the costs borne by the farmer. They would mean a gain in production efficiency, and this in time would mean a reduction of the per unit cost of production. This would really set the stage for both the maintenance of farm incomes and an eventual orderly lowering of prices to consumers, consistent with the march of technological advance.

The urgency of this legislation is demanded by the magnitude of the storage problem.

The cost of the storage is so great that we cannot expect it to be long continued. This is an immediate and pressing burden. Eight years ago, agriculture's house was in order. Commodity carryovers were at reasonable levels. Producers had no burdensome surpluses hanging over their heads.

These were the quantities, held in public and private hands, of principal crops carried over into the marketing year of 1952–53:

Feed grains: 20.1 million tons which was 18 percent of the amount used in that year.

Wheat: 256 million bushels, or 26 percent of the amount used in that year.

Cotton: 2.8 million bales, or 22 percent of the amount used in that year.

The coming marketing year confronts us with a different picture:

Feed grain stocks will be around 84 million tons, or half of a year's needs. Over 85 percent will be Government owned or under CCC loans.

Wheat stocks next July 1 will amount to about 1½ billion bushels, or more than a year's expected domestic and export needs. About 90 percent will be under CCC loan or in CCC inventory. Cotton stocks, at 7½ million bales, largely in private hands, will be down

sharply from recent highs, but almost 3 times as large as in 1952.

The growth of feed grain and wheat stocks did not occur overnight.

Feed grain stocks have increased in every year since 1952, as a result of excessive production. Wheat stocks have increased in 6 years out of 9.

How can we convey the magnitude of the storage problem?

Taxpayers should know that Government costs of carrying and handling commodity stocks have risen from $238 million in fiscal 1953 to $1 billion in the current fiscal year. These costs include storage, transportation, and interest. The CCC investment in price support at the end of this fiscal year will be about $8.5 billion. Wheat and feed grains will account for 67 percent of this.

We must face the problem of working down these large stocks. As long as they exist, they pose a threat to markets and to price stability that extends beyond these commodities to the livestock industry.

We cannot reduce stocks as long as the supplies that come out of inventories are more than replaced from excess current production. Each recent year has added an average of 7 million tons of feed grains to stocks. Annual additions of wheat have been about 130 million bushels. We cannot expect to reduce CCC inventories until we have the legislation and programs that will effectively adjust production below total annual needs. This is a major goal of legislation here proposed.

More About the CIA From the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Post for Tuesday, April 25, 1961, by the able Washington columnist, Mr. William V. Shannon. I am bringing this item to the attention of my colleagues in another effort to point out that we are getting our information on this super secret organization only from the press. From the press we learn of the ineptness of the CIA in the Cuban invasion. We were given no advance notice that our Government was involved in the plan. Mr. Shannon's article again points up the need for this body to exercise some direct control over what has become something of an autonomy—an overseer of our foreign policy—inside the executive branch:

CIA KEPT ITS SECRET—EVEN FROM THE REBELS

(By William V. Shannon)

WASHINGTON, April 25.—The strange story of how the Central Intelligence Agency mismanaged last week's misadventure in Cuba can now be pieced.

According to information from exile Cuban sources which has been reluctantly confirmed by Administration officials, the leaders of the Cuban Revolutionary Council had no part in directing the actual military operation and no opportunity to coordinate with the Cuban underground.

The CIA held the six leading members of the Council incommunicado near an abandoned airfield somewhere in Florida while the "invasion" was underway. They were not permitted to join the rebel forces or speak in their own name. Statements were issued in their behalf of which they had no knowledge.

Only after it was clear the invasion was going to fail were they consulted by top-ranking U.S. officials.

HELD 3 DAYS

The story began on Sunday, April 15, when members of the revolutionary council in New York received word that they should go to Philadelphia. They were then flown from Philadelphia to an abandoned airbase somewhere in Florida. They were quartered in an old, rambling house in a deserted area. Armed guards were posted outside.

Provisional president Jose Miro Cardona, defense minister Antonio de Varona, and Manuel Ray were among the six civilian exile leaders kept incommunicado in this house for the next 3 days.

The reason for holding them in this fashion was apparently a desire on the part of U.S. intelligence officials to maintain tight security.

OFF GUARD

The Cuban exile leaders first heard of the invasion from radio news bulletins on Monday. The timing of the operation caught at least some of them off guard. It provided no opportunity to work out plans with the underground inside Cuba to set off sabotage and diversionary incidents. The coordinator of the Cuban underground had a few days earlier journeyed from the island to Miami in order to make such plans. The invasion caught him flatfooted and as a result, there was no sabotage or uprising. Some of the Cuban exiles blame the CIA for this failure. The CIA explanation is that it did not wholly trust the underground and chose not to rely upon it.

On Tuesday, the exile leaders were briefed on the military situation in Cuba by a U.S. Army colonel. They grew restive, clamored for more information, and demanded to be allowed to confer with their supporters.

At 1 a.m. Wednesday morning, Adolph A. Berle, coordinator of the State Department task force on Latin America, was routed from his bed in Washington by an urgent call from the White House and directed to fly to Florida. He was told the invasion seemed definitely to have failed. He arrived at the guarded house in Florida shortly after daybreak and spent the morning canvassing the situation with the Cuban exiles.

COMPLETE DISASTER

That afternoon, he flew with them back to Washington where the group met twice, once in the late afternoon and again early in the evening, with President Kennedy. The President meanwhile was working between conference on an entirely new draft of the speech he made the next day to the American Society of Newspaper editors. After conferring briefly with him a third time the next morning, the Cuban exiles were released from the CIA's protective custody and allowed to go their own ways.

The only member of the revolutionary council to participate in the invasion was Capt. Manuel Artime, the youthful ex-Castro follower whom the CIA had developed as a protege. He broadcast appeals to the Cubans to overthrow Castro, speaking from a ship off shore. This ship was subsequently sunk by Castro's planes and Artime's whereabouts are now unknown.

The landing itself was apparently a disaster from first to last. There was only one landing, not several. It took place on a mile-long strip of the coast of Cochinas Bay. Three roads lead inland but Castro's forces succeeded in blocking them all. The United States provided air cover against the attacks by propeller planes, not jets, used by Castro's air force. The rebels captured an airstrip near the coast, but the plan to use it to bring in supplies went wrong because Castro's men had rendered the strip useless by heaping mounds of gravel on the runway.

About 1,200 or 1,300 men were landed. More than one-third were captured by Castro's troops and most of the rest were killed. Castro's forces apparently did not fight with any great distinction but they had so many natural advantages of position and terrain they were able to crush the landings in less than 3 days. Very few, if any rebels made their escape to the Escambray Mountains.

FOUR BIG MISTAKES

The CIA is known sarcastically in Miami as the Cuban Invasion Authority. The more liberal wing of the Cuban exile movement is convinced the disaster took place because the CIA overestimated Castro's weakness, refused to cooperate wholeheartedly with the underground, put too much reliance on sheer military force—and then did not provide enough of that.

The Cuban exiles believe that the CIA's treatment of them during the invasion as so many puppets was the natural outcome of this basically contemptuous, paternalistic approach. U.S. officials deny that all of the Cuban complaints are justified but they concede that the CIA's attitude contributed heavily to the making of the fiasco.

Controversial Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I wish to call to your attention, and the attention of my other distinguished colleagues, an editorial appearing in the Christian Science Monitor on Wednesday, March 1, 1961, entitled "Controversial Committee":

CONTROVERSIAL COMMITTEE

The life of the House Un-American Activities Committee continues to be a stormy one. Riots have attended some of its hearings and new efforts have been launched in Congress to curb it. Yet a great many Americans feel its work is necessary to keep the Nation alert as to Communist infiltration. And the Supreme Court, in a narrowly split decision, has just upheld jail terms for two witnesses who refused to answer the committee's questions.

The chief significance of these cases is in their confirmation of the Barenblatt decision in 1959. That ruling signaled a halt in the Court's trend following the McCarthy era. In the Watkins case and some others it had castigated the abuse of investigating committees' power and set up stern limits. But then in the Barenblatt case and now in the Wilkinson and Barden cases, the Court has supported wide authority for such inquiries.

The majority, speaking through Mr. Justice Stewart, specifically declares it is making no judgment as to the wisdom of "the creation or continuance of this committee."

It sought rather to decide whether the committee was operating within the authority conferred by Congress. It said it found nothing to indicate that Congress intended to "immunize from interrogation all those (and there are many) who are opposed to the existence" of the committee.

These latest cases differed from several earlier ones mainly on this question of harassment or intimidation of critics. Mr. Justice Black in his dissent said that if the present trend continues:

"Government by consent will disappear, to be replaced by government by intimidation, because some people are afraid the country cannot survive unless Congress has the power to set aside the freedoms of the first amendment at will."

The defendants in these cases had not resorted to the fifth amendment but had relied on the first amendment in denying the committee's right to question them as to their political beliefs. The Court seems to be saying that the amendment affords no protection on that score as against the authority of Congress to investigate subversive activities.

From the start serious questions have dogged the committee. It has become far more circumspect in many of its operations since the Martin Dies and Parnell Thomas days. Yet courts have refused to uphold many of its contempt charges. And there have been cases of great injustice where its hearings have been used for unsupported accusations that harmed innocent persons. A film the committee has made is bitterly criticized as one-sided. College students have also raised the question of intimidation, protesting that even peaceful distribution of critical statements where the film was being shown brought arrest.

Committee supporters declare it is essential to turn a publicity spotlight on Reds and their sympathizers. They say that the FBI and the courts do only part of the necessary job when they spot and halt punishable acts, that the public must be alerted to resist subversion of opinion. If this function is to be added to the recognized one of investigation for legislative purposes, it must be safeguarded against political abuses. This watch should be maintained first by Congress. But it is well that many other patriotic Americans (including at least four High Court Justices) are also concerned to protect individual rights.

The U.S. Navy in the Antarctic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Navy has distinguished itself in the Antarctic in recent years, and has added to its laurels during the past year. Under the able direction of Rear Adm. David M. Tyree, our scientific project there has contributed substantially to the storehouse of scientific knowledge.

Admiral Tyree returned to Washington last week following a period of 6 months at his command post at the Naval Air Facility at McMurdo Sound. There on that almost inaccessible continent that has been icelocked for ages at the very bottom of the world, the admiral made the most of the Antarctic summer. At the McMurdo base, at the Byrd Station, and at the South Pole Station, all under his command, a record of vital construction and scientific research was achieved.

As the Antarctic winter got underway, the Navy was called upon to evacuate a sick Russian scientific observer from the Byrd Station, an inland and inaccessible scientific post. But to the U.S. Navy it proved not to be inaccessible. And a historic rescue was carried out.

As a recognition of Admiral Tyree's accomplishment in the Antarctic I include a message to the admiral from the Chief of Naval Operations, Adm Arleigh Burke. I share the sentiments contained in that message, which follows:

"As your ships and aircraft withdraw from Antarctica, all hands can have more than normal feeling of pride and accomplishment. Operations this year have been marked by great forward strides in Antarctic communications, preparation of the nuclear reactor site; completion of three major construction projects; a deep peneteration into the Bellinghausen Sea and increased utilization of C–130 aircraft. The long, hard Antarctic months endured by all in your party have made it possible for the United States to maintain its dominancy in scientific achievement and other peaceful pursuits in this area of increasing international importance; well done and welcome home to all hands."—Arleigh Burke.

U.S. NAVY PLANE MAKES HISTORIC FLIGHT TO ANTARCTICA TO EVACUATE SICK RUSSIAN

(From the New Haven Register, Apr. 14, 1961)

CHRISTCHURCH, NEW ZEALAND.—The Russians may hold a lead in space travel, but the Americans again have proved the validity of their claim as the world's greatest humanitarians.

For the first time in history, a U.S. Navy ski-equipped Hercules cargo plane risked a landing this week in near darkness on Antarctica's McMurdo Sound ice. Its mission: to evacuate a Soviet scientist requiring medical treatment from Byrd Station.

With the arrival of the Hercules at international airport here on Tuesday, the U.S. Navy successfully completed one of the longest mercy flights ever—6,300-mile round trip to isolated Byrd Station, deep in the heart of the white and frozen wastelands of Antarctica.

BALKED BY WEATHER

The long winter night and sudden, fierce storms always in the past have prevented ships and aircraft from landing at Antarctica at this time of the year.

As a result, scientists and Navy personnel now serving at the three chief U.S. bases in Antarctica, bade farewell to their supply ships in February and settled down to endure the cold and darkness which will last until September.

That, at least, was the plan until the Russian scientist, Leonid Kuperov, became ill. Kuperov, a physicist, was stationed at the Byrd base under an exchange agreement with the Soviet Union.

Facilities at the Byrd station were not considered adequate to treat him properly for 7 months until the relief planes arrived on their normal schedule in October. He is suffering from a duodenal ulcer.

DELAYED 5 DAYS

The record flight, which was the first an aircraft has ever made into Antarctica after March, was delayed for 5 days in Christchurch because of adverse flying weather at McMurdo Sound Naval Air Facility, major U.S. supply base on the icy continent.

The *Hercules* departed last Sunday morning, piloted by Comdr. L. E. Newcomer of Air Development Squadron 6 (VS–6). It arrived safely at McMurdo 8 hours later. After making final preparations and waiting favorable weather for a fast turnaround flight to Byrd station, the plane took off at 5:42 a.m. Monday.

On the flight were the Deep Freeze 1961 flight surgeon, Lt. Jack Potter, and Lt. Comdr. James Corley, a Russian linguist (Kuperov speaks only Russian).

The C–13 OBL *Hercules* covered the 917 miles to Byrd station in just under 3 hours, picked up Kuperov and returned to McMurdo, jumping-off place from Antarctica for New Zealand. With just a short stopover for refueling, the plane was again airborne on the last leg of its mission.

Upon arrival at Christchurch, Newcomer, and his crew were congratulated by Rear Adm. David M. Tyree, Operation Deep Freeze commander, who had delayed a scheduled departure for Washington, D.C., to oversee the rescue effort.

Kuperov was taken to the Christchurch Hospital for further observation, diagnosis, and treatment.

Preparation for the mercy flight meant a lot of extra work for the personnel stationed at McMurdo. To safeguard the aircraft, McMurdo's commanding officer, Navy Comdr. J. J. Brosnahan directed reinstallation of air navigational aids, ground control approach equipment, and preparation of a skiway on the ice over the Ross Sea.

The unscheduled rebuilding of a landing strip was necessary because the past summer's heat had broken up the ice over the water. Now, however, the seas are again solidly frozen, and a new field was quickly laid out.

Meteorologists carefully plotted weather reports received from the Antarctic stations of France, New Zealand, Argentina, Norway, Chile, Australia, Belgium, England, Russia, Japan, and the United States to give the most accurate forecasts possible for the history-making flight.

Meanwhile the U.S.S. *Staten Island*, already on weather duty between New Zealand and Antarctica, remained on her mid-ocean station to serve as a beacon for the Navy Hercules and to supply a steady flow of up-to-the-minute weather information.

The mission was accomplished at almost the last moment before total darkness overtakes McMurdo Sound Naval Air Facility on April 25 (6 months of night arrived at the South Pole Station on March 23).

This flight, however, was regarded by many of the airmen as the first step in ending the traditional winter isolation of the ice-age continent.

T. G. Masaryk and the Voice of Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following two articles. The first is from the December 20, 1960, issue of Chess Life and the second from the March 30, 1961, issue of the Calais (Maine) Advertiser:

[From Chess Life]

THE HEIGHT OF SOMETHING OR OTHER

(By Fred M. Wren)

Walter Muir, chess champion of Roanoke, Va., recently sent a move in a correspondence game to an opponent in Czechoslo-

vakia. The postcard happened to bear a U.S. postage stamp through which this country honored the 110th anniversary of the birth of the founder and first President of the Czechoslovak Republic, Thomas G. Masaryk. The card was returned to Muir, bearing notations in several languages that it was not admissible to Czechoslovakia. When Muir sent a second card, with another kind of stamp with less dangerous political connotations, it went through without difficulty. And the Communists call us stupid. Messrs. Pachman or Opocensky are offered equal space in Chess Life, if they care to explain or comment on this incident.

(If, after reading the preceding paragraph, you feel that you may have seen it somewhere before, you are probably right. It appeared on this page in the issue of September 20, 1960, and is reprinted now to set the scene and tempo for the following letter from Karel Opocensky, international master, international arbiter, and editor of the FIDE Quarterly, who wrote from Prague on Nov. 3, 1960:)

"In No. 2, volume 15 of Chess Life of September 20, 1960, I read the article 'The Height of Something or Other.'

"In this article, you ask Grand Master Pachman or myself to comment on the case outlined in the article. Since Grand Master Pachman is at present in Leipzig at the Chess Olympics, where he is defending the colours of his country, there remains just myself to reply:

"First, permit me to recall an era of the recent past. At that time the Czechoslovak people stood alongside the American people in the fight against Nazism. At that time, my wife and all my relatives died under the Gestapo ax. I consider that they laid down their lives in the fight for freedom, not only for the Czechoslovak people but for the Americans as well. And this circumstance justifies my answering you frankly.

"We will not argue on the significance of T. G. Masaryk. We probably hold different opinions. But this question is not the main issue of your article and has not, and cannot have, anything in common with my opinion on the whole affair. It is natural that at the time when the U.S. Government is conducting a cold war against all the Socialist countries in Europe, every method of dealings of American citizens with those of all the Socialist countries is of special import. And stamping the letter of Mr. Muir to the Czechoslovak chess player with a stamp bearing the picture of T. G. Masaryk must be considered as a rude political provocation and an attempt at political infiltration. And every such attempt, be it a stamp or transmissions of 'Voice of America' or any other act will find only one answer today and in the future, not admissible.

"But all the Czechoslovak chess players want to live in friendship with American chess players. Please take special notice of this. They want to play correspondence matches with them and exchange experiences and wish, from the bottom of their hearts, great success to American chess players, but only on the basis of mutual respect and mutual understanding. Permit me to present one example: This year your students achieved outstanding success when they won the world university teams championship. An ironical note is that they won this world championship in Leningrad, the city of Lenin, and won it in a contest sponsored by the Democratic Union of Students, which you consider Communist. But we rejoiced at your victory because in it we perceived the sound results of mutual competition even on a politically difficult basis, and we would like in the future to meet with American chess players again.

"I, personally, have been attentively following the development of your young, talented players, the work of Fischer and Lombardy, and your organizational work "Operation M," where you are trying to develop chess playing in the United States.

"I wish you much success as becomes the land of the chess tradition of Morphy, Pilsburry, Marshall, and others and also the land with the traditions of Abraham Lincoln and Benjamin Franklin."

In the last editorial which I shall have the pleasure of writing for Chess Life I should like to comment on the fourth paragraph of the letter quoted above. In the first three sentences the writer indicates that the name of T. G. Masaryk may be dismissed as being without significance, to the matter under discussion. The hell it can! Masaryk was to the Czechoslovak Republic what George Washington was to the United States—its founder and its first president. His name, therefore, belongs to history, and to the world. If the United States Government sees fit to issue a memorial stamp honoring the 110th anniversary of his birth, communications bearing the stamp should pass freely through the mails of any country in the International Postal Union. Reverting to the comparison with George Washington, I remind Master Opocensky and our other European readers that Washington led a successful revolutionary movement nearly 200 years ago, which resulted in thirteen colonies breaking away from the mother country, England, and in the formation of the United States of America. The Revolution was a bloody affair of 7 years duration, and England has never ceased to moan the loss of her American colonies. England has little reason to revere the name of Washington, who was—let's face it—a traitor to the British Crown. Or the names of Lafayette, or Pulaski or Von Steuben, to name only a few who contributed in such large measure to his success. Yet memorial stamps bearing the names and faces of these men have for years carried mail from the United States to and through every part of the British Commonwealth, without the slightest idea on the part of the American correspondents or of the British postal authorities of rude political provocation or attempt at political infiltration.

I well remember your beautiful city of Prague, Master Opocensky, and the friendly people who lived there in the early 1930's. As I remember it, several of the public squares contained statues of T. G. Masaryk, and I know there was a large one of Woodrow Wilson, through whose vision and efforts the ancient dream of a Czechoslovak Republic became reality. I remember that several of my Czech friends spoke with pride of the constant fight for freedom which their ancestors had made, of the unsuccessful Czech revolt which culminated in the famous battle of the White Mountain in 1620, and of the subsequent religious and political persecutions to which they had been subjected under Austro-Hungarian rule—now all happily ended with the establishment of responsible government, free elections, and religious and political freedom. Where are they now—the friends whom I cherished, and the institutions which they loved? Some of them undoubtedly perished along with your family in the hands of the Gestapo. But, since I have gone so far in my attempt at "political infiltration" I may as well go a bit further and remind you that Gestapo axes cut no deeper, nor more impersonally, nor more finally, than those of any other totalitarian police state. Some of the Czech friends mentioned have discovered the truth of that statement in the last seconds of their lives. I am happy to say that others have fled—over, or under, or through the Curtain—and are now living in various decadent capitalistic centers, where they may listen to "Voice of America" or "Voice of Moscow" with impunity, and after listening, decide for themselves—again with impunity—which one is the "Voice of Truth."

This brings to mind Big Brothers's Ministry of Truth in Orwell's "1984"—you should read it, Master Opocensky—the government bureau in which the book's hero labors daily. His work? Writing and rewriting history in terms of the whims and policies of Big Brother's administration; elimination of names and dates and photographs and all other references to events which Big Brother thinks best forgotten. It would appear that such a "Ministry of Truth" is now operating in Czechoslovakia, and that Masaryk's name and deeds have been expunged from the history of the country.

I share your wish, Master Opocensky, that the chess players of your country live in friendship with the chess players of my country. On behalf of the chess players of the United States I accept your congratulations on the achievements of our world champion student team, and thank you for your interest in the development of our young grandmasters, Fischer and Lombardy. We have the same admiration for the achievements of the great Czech players—no list of whom would be complete without your own name at or near the top. Your appreciation of the chess tradition of Morphy, Pillsbury, and Marshall is gratifying to all Americans. Your references to Abraham Lincoln and Benjamin Franklin—two controversial political figures in the light of historical research—prompt me to toss in your direction a quotation from each.

"As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master. This expresses my idea of democracy. Whatever differs from this, to the extent of the difference, is no democracy." (A. Lincoln.)

"They that can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety." (B. Franklin).

It is possible that these reactionary sentiments may result in the ejection of Lincoln and Franklin from the current Czechoslovak version of history. If such should be the case, I take comfort in the thought that they will nevertheless undoubtedly retain their proper places in world history, along with Masaryk, and Benes, and the many others whose names and whose ideas have proved distasteful to the Big Brother of today, but whose names and ideas may even survive those of Gottwald and Navotny.

[From the Calais Advertiser, Mar. 30, 1961]

It is probably no secret that Fred M. (Monte) Wren's columns "I See by the Papers" have attracted attention outside the confines of Washington County, and that what was written with the original intention of getting our readers in this area interested in and discussing current events has become required reading for some of the legislative solons in the 100th legislature in Augusta. That his literary work has received international recognition may interest friends in this area.

In December 1960, while editor of the U.S. Chess Federation's bimonthly newspaper Chess Life, he entered into an editorial controversy with one of Europe's best known chess masters and chess writers, Karel Opocensky of Czechoslovakia. The bone of contention was the action of Czechoslovak postal authorities in refusing to accept into their country mail posted in the United States bearing U.S. postage stamps honoring T. G. Masaryk, Czechoslovakia's first president. Mr. Wren commented on this incident of bureaucratic stupidity, and invited an explanation from any of the known Czech chess masters.

Karel Opocensky took up the challenge, and justified the Czech postal authorities by saying that sending mail to that country

with stamps bearing the picture of T. G. Masaryk must be regarded as a rude attempt at political infiltration comparable to our attempts to corrupt their people through "Voice of America" radio broadcasts.

Mr. Wren's reply to Mr. Opocensky has been referred to as a classic being a full page editorial in the December 20, 1960, issue of Chess Life. Last week he was informed that his editorial had been translated into several foreign languages, had been published in a New York Czech-language newspaper, and that the well-known "Radio Free Europe" wants to use the editorial verbatim in Czech, Polish, Russian translations for radio broadcasts beamed to the people behind the Iron Curtain.

National Brotherhood Award of the National Conferences of Christians and Jews to Barry Bingham, of Louisville, Ky.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BURKE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, during the recent observance of National Brotherhood Week, the National Conference of Christians and Jews conferred upon a distinguished Kentuckian, Mr. Barry Bingham, president and editor-in-chief of the Courier-Journal and the Louisville Times, its National Brotherhood Award as a tribute to his outstanding public and community service and the unparalleled contribution which he and Mrs. Bingham have made to a better understanding among people of all races and religions. I have had the privilege of knowing Barry Bingham for many years during which I have seen how well he exemplifies those admirable traits which the National Conference of Christians and Jews seeks to bring out in all men of whatever ethnic and religious backgrounds.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues the inspired message of the President set forth in his letter to the President of the National Conference of Christians and Jews endorsing the observance of National Brotherhood Week and the President's remarks in a film shown at the national brotherhood dinner this year. In addition I urge my colleagues to read the following letter written by the President to Mr. Bingham and the addresses given at the National Brotherhood Award dinner in Louisville, Ky., on February 23, 1961, by the Honorable Charles W. Morris and Senator Thruston B. Morton:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., February 14, 1961.

Dr. LEWIS WEBSTER JONES,
President, National Conference of Christians and Jews, New York, N.Y.

DEAR DR. JONES: I heartily endorse the suggestion of the National Conference of Christians and Jews that a period of time again be set aside for the observance of Brotherhood Week. In celebrating National Brotherhood Week we honor the human values upon which our country was established. As long as men fear or distrust one another because of race, religion, or ethnic origins, as long as any of the gates of opportunity are closed to the deserving, as long as there is unreasoning biogtry, instead of understanding and tolerance, our Nation will fall short of its full power and greatness.

Across the world new nations are struggling for survival and progress. These nations, composed of men of all colors and faiths, are looking for leadership and guidance in their effort to construct new societies. Only if we demonstrate that the freedom which we advocate is available to all our citizens will these new nations look to us for this guidance. Yet on the choices of these new nations hinge our own ultimate survival.

Thus brotherhood is not just a goal. It is a condition on which our way of life depends. The question for our time is not whether all men are brothers. That question has been answered by the God who placed us on this earth together. The question is whether we have the strength and the will to make brotherhood of man the guiding principle of our daily lives.

I therefore urge all Americans to join a nationwide observance of Brotherhood Week from February 19 to February 26, 1961.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President.

TEXT OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S FILMED MESSAGE

I have on many occasions taken part actively in dinners such as the one in which you are participating this evening and it is therefore a great pleasure to speak to you from the White House and to express my strong support for the work in which you are engaged.

These dinners are held and have been held for many years in order to place before us a goal to which this Nation has been dedicated since its earliest beginnings—the goal of men and women of different creeds, different races, different origins living together harmoniously and in brotherhood.

I know that there is a constant feeling that we fail to achieve our goals and in spite of the work of this organization and on the part of dedicated men and women across our country, that we still stand a good distance from the standard which was raised in the earliest days by our Founding Fathers and which has been the national goal ever since. I hope that no one in this room feels that disappointment. National progress has been made on a whole variety of fronts.

I want to congratulate, therefore, all of you on the work that has been done in other years. But I also want to suggest that we still have a good deal of distance to go, that the work in which we are engaged is more important than it ever was, not merely to us as individuals and as fellow Americans but as leaders of the free world and as strong believers in the future of our country and the things for which it stands.

We seek to lead the free world against an alien system but we cannot do so unless we ourselves match our actions to our words. We look for support and brotherhood to millions, hundreds of millions of Americans of different creeds, of different colors, who share our aspirations but sometimes are not convinced that we believe strongly in the doctrines that we preach. I believe we do. I believe as a nation we must be committed to these goals. I believe as a nation increasingly we will be, and I believe that when we eventually reach these goals it will have been due to the work of organizations such as yours.

I want to thank you on behalf of our country for the effort in which you are engaged. It is an effort to which all of us give, I hope, not only lipservice but also commitment. The brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God is a basic principle which has directed this Nation through many years and I am confident will direct it with increasing vigor in the years to come.

FEBRUARY 21, 1961.

Hon. BARRY BINGHAM,
The Louisville Courier-Journal,
Louisville, Ky.

DEAR BARRY: I am delighted to learn that on Thursday you will receive the National Brotherhood Award of the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

Your public and community service as well as your distinguished editorial career surely merit this recognition. I hope you will extend to all your friends and to your family my warmest wishes on this occasion.

With all best wishes,

Sincerely,

JOHN KENNEDY.

ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES W. MORRIS

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is my proud and pleasant privilege tonight to represent the National Conference of Christians and Jews in bestowing an honor long postponed and richly deserved.

As we all know, the American vocabulary is growing like Topsy. Words that Shakespeare never imagined—that Einstein never dreamed of—constantly crop up in the language—words like framework, finalize, in terms of, project, expertize, and now it has become increasingly popular, especially among psychiatrists, advertising men, educators and columnists to employ the word, "image." We read about the "father image," the "son image," et cetera, et cetera. Indeed, Senator MORTON, I seem to recall having read recently in the papers that a distinguished Kentuckian spoke about the Republican image. Now I'm not sure just what these learned people have in mind, but I am convinced that if there is one "image" around these parts that prevail over all others—if there is one name which—like that of Browning's Abou Ben Adhem—leads all the rest, then that image and that name is Barry Bingham.

It has been his prerogative and, at the same time, his burden to exercise a greater influence upon the minds and hearts of his fellow citizens, in Louisville and in Kentucky, than any other man I know. There are occasions, of course, when almost every one who reads the Courier-Journal or the Times, or who listens to, or watches WHAS, may find himself in disagreement with some official position, some editorial, some headline or comic strip or some other feature of the compound of communication which yet another Barry (Mike, by name, the erudite editor of the Kentucky Irish-American) likes to call "the monopoly press" (I confess to a compulsive aversion to Dick Tracy and David Lawrence). But this much we know—our man is forthright: he is not afraid to take a stand—often an originally unpopular stand—and stick by it (as Marse Henry Watterson was wont to say) in spite of hell and high water.

Behind this attitude there is simplicity, courage, and a profound and often prophetic understanding of human rights—a devotion to the kind of community, local, State and National, which symbolizes the dreams of our Founding Fathers—a community where every citizen, Christian or Jew, white or black, rich or poor, shall have a chance to make use, without let or hindrance, of the opportunities with which he has been endowed by his creator, for life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness—and to use these endowments, if you please, with dignity and self-respect.

Embellishing these qualities are modesty, humility and that rarest of gifts—a real sense of humor.

It is significant that this meeting should be held the day after the birthday of George Washington—who declared that our Government gives to bigotry no sanction (and) to persecution no assistance.

Barry Bingham typifies the highest and truest ideals of the organization which honors him this evening; and it is fitting and felicitous that he should receive this tribute.

Will Rogers used to say that all he knew was what he read in the papers. I think that applies to most of us here tonight—and most of us are impressed by the consistent dedication of the Bingham press to those rights which are guaranteed to all citizens by the first amendment: freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and the right of peaceful assembly and petition. If the news is occasionally a little oblique, thank God it is directed toward the attainment of these constitutional guarantees. Now add to this dedication a generous and sympathetic devotion to all good causes and a mature, even-tempered day-by-day crusade for a decent and progressive community—and you will understand why we pay this tribute to our guest of honor.

I would be both ungrateful and ungracious were I to fail to pay another tribute—a tribute to the lovely and brilliant lady who sits at his side. Mary Caperton Bingham became Protestant cochairman of the Louisville Chapter of the Conference of Christians and Jews when the chapter was in its formative stage. She—more than any other single individual—is responsible for its remarkable growth and success. She is a true aristocrat—because she has a profound sense of noblesse oblige—an understanding that social eminence, good fortune, wit and charm involve a grateful recognition of other people's rights.

And may I say to our honored guest that though providence has chosen you as an instrument for brotherhood and for good, and crowned you with rare and precious gifts—influence, a certain power, good looks, good health, a fine family, comfort, yes, affluence—your richest gift and your rarest possession is your gracious and charming wife.

And so, Barry Bingham, we tender to you this citation—you have deserved and received so many, from schools and colleges and foreign nations, from your country and your fellow publishers, your city and your State, that you may find no place to display it upon your walls or on your desk, but each of us here finds an immense gratification in taking part in this ceremony and vicariously your recognition will speed each of us on to greater dedication. The liberty of no nation can rise higher than its source—and that source is and must be the individual dignity and the general liberty of man.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR THRUSTON B. MORTON

During the national observance of Brotherhood Week, it is a high honor for me to speak at this dinner honoring one of Kentucky's most famous sons—a man well-deserving of his national award from the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

As editor in chief of our great Louisville newspapers, Barry Bingham long has been a tower in the encouragement of the ideals for which the National Conference works: enlightened tolerance—the application of reason and understanding to human conflicts which arise from the pits of prejudice and misguided emotions.

Barry has not limited his dedicated lifetime of public service to the editorial pages of his newspapers, either. In countless other activities, both here in Kentucky and on the national scene, he has pressed his basic goals with untiring dedication.

In politics, Barry and I sometimes have been on the same side of the fence—sometimes on opposite sides.

But even when we were on opposite sides, I do not believe that any basic conflict was created—it was simply a matter of us choosing a different means for the progress that we both want.

Unfortunately, this is not the situation with all people in America on opposite sides of a fence.

In many instances, both in individual and group situations, being on opposite sides of a fence—a racial fence, say, or a religious fence—has created sharp conflicts that leave deep scars unless they are mediated by the forces of moral and religious leadership.

Barry has been one of the country's leaders in mobilizing public support of these tempering forces, and it is for this work that he is being given the Brotherhood Award tonight.

But while our specific purpose tonight is to honor Barry, we really are saluting a great cause—of which he is one shining exponent.

This great cause is one to which this organization has devoted its creative energies since 1928, and for which Barry has done so much in our area and in the Nation.

The cause will end most of the world's troubles when it is achieved in full. It is understanding and tolerance, applied to bring about community unity.

The National Conference of Christians and Jews has worked long, hard, and successfully to alleviate the tensions that arise from religious and ethnic misundertandings. And these conflicts must be eliminated, for they are dangerous as well as morally wrong.

At home and abroad, Americans in the exciting decade of the 1960's face unprecedented dangers and unprecedented opportunities—both at the same time.

Americans are challenged in the 1960's to avoid the dangers while reaping the opportunities.

To do this we must face the challenges united—united in moral principle and united in moral purpose, no matter what different edifices or ceremonies we individually attend in our personal worship of God.

Nothing can defeat a morally united America—but a morally disunited America can never fulfill our historic promise of greatness. It is to this crucial unity that the work of the national conference is dedicated.

To a U.S. Senator, this is a somewhat unusual organization. It has no legislative goals. It does not lobby. It does not file lawsuits nor does it pressure legislators to enact special-interest laws.

This national conference is more of an educational group—though many concrete advances have been made.

The conference proceeds by mobilizing religious principles and bringing them to bear on problems which divide Americans.

One theme of President Kennedy's inaugural address seems to apply to the national conference's approach. While he was referring to foreign policy, a paraphrase of his thought is appropriate.

Let us concentrate, the President advised, on the things that unite us rather than the differences that divide us.

That's what the national conference does as it proceeds to rally religious principles that will spur civic actions solving community problems.

Our three great religious groups—Protestants, Catholics and Jews— differ in philosophy and procedure, of course. But through all of them run common strands of moral conviction that can, and do in the national conference, combine into a mighty educational force that is greater in power than the sum of the three.

While country-wide in its organizational structure, the national conference to my mind essentially is local in character. While it has general national and international goals, its most dramatic advances and its most penetrating work have been done on the local level—and this is one reason Barry should take much pride in his award tonight.

To share in the work of the national conference, a person is not asked to leave his home and community and strive elsewhere for one specific national goal. He is asked to enlist for the duration in the war against prejudice, intolerance and divisive misunderstanding in his own community.

In a phrase, a participant in this great organiaztion is summoned basically to follow the political advice Theodore Roosevelt gave excited partisans who wanted to help his cause but could not discern what to do.

TR's sound instruction was: "Do what you can, with what you have, where you are."

Here in Kentucky, this wise dictate was being followed when the local chapters rallied public opinion against religious and racial bigotry in elections; when you organized many human relations programs at our high schools and universities, and when you promoted National Brotherhood Week observances among schools and civic groups.

From such advances in Kentucky and in all the other States, the national conference is a dynamic part of America's effort to create a broad, national climate of moral unity from the Atlantic coast to Hawaii and Alaska.

And this we will need as we move into the challenges that lie ahead.

America, and indeed the entire free world, face from atheistic communism a dangerous challenge of monolithic thrust.

Divided in any basic way, we will not be able to muster the national response necessary to overcome this awesome challenge.

Divided in any basic way, we will not be able to develop at home that national consensus under which we can minimize political and economic differences and take bold, constructive action to make America even more solidly prosperous than in the past.

Divided in any basic way, America cannot agree on action to rid itself of those prejudices that sap the potential strength of the Nation.

Toward all of these goals, the national conference strives.

But in this organization the work is definitely not aimed at some compromises of expediency—in which social conflicts are merely swept under the rug with a "let's don't talk about it" policy.

More effectively than I can state, the deeper aim of the national conference was stated 2 years ago by your eminent president, Dr. Lewis Webster Jones.

Dr. Jones said this:

"Adjustment by itself is not an adequate social ideal. It can be barren and self-defeating. The religious view of man, on which the work of the NCCJ is based, assumes that man is responsible, as a free moral agent, for his own acts, and for the ethical climate of his own society. Something is required of him by adjustment. Conformity to corrupt practices, however general they may be or however successful, is simply wrong. Unless we recognize this fact, American civilization will not fulfill its promise. It will not even survive, nor deserve to survive."

If all of us, regardless of whether or not we are members of the national conference, can summon this spirit—when we are faced on a personal level with a situation of social conflict—such conflicts largely will pass out of our lives.

And when this happens, the reality for everyone will be those words in the salute to the flag which appear as a keynote phrase in so much of the national conference's literature:

"One Nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

That's what we're working for and the national conference, with such distinguished and energetic leaders as Barry Bingham, is in the forefront of the struggle.

I endorse your program. I praise your progress. I congratulate you for having the mature judgment to see the need for such enlightened work.

Wetlands Acquisition and Water Pollution Control Are on Wildlife Federation's Priority List

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, when delegates to the National Wildlife Federation's 25th annual convention met in Washington, D.C., last month, they adopted a series of resolutions that include a priority program on objectives of major conservation importance. That program lists two objectives on which I have already introduced legislation in the 87th Congress, namely, an expanded and strengthened water pollution control program and a crash program for the acquisition of waterfowl wetlands.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a portion of the Wildlife Federation's priority program in the RECORD:

FEDERATION'S PRIORITY PROGRAM

Be it resolved, the National Wildlife Federation, in 25th annual convention assembled, March 5, 1961, in Washington, D.C., hereby declares and affirms its endorsement of the following objectives deemed of major conservation importance:

Acquisition of waterfowl wetlands. In view of mounting competition for land and water areas, drainage, and other factors, it is believed that the next decade will be critical for the future survival of continental migratory waterfowl population. Unless adequate provision is made for the acquisition and preservation of suitable habitat especially vital nesting areas, throughout the North American Continent, flights of migratory waterfowl will dwindle to the point where they are of little or no interest to an important segment of the public. The National Wildlife Federation, therefore, proposed the immediate initiation and implementation of the following crash program: (a) that the U.S. Department of the Interior be authorized a $150 million advance loan, to be repaid with funds resulting from annual sales of migratory bird hunting (duck) stamps, from the U.S. Treasury for the acquisition of suitable waterfowl habitat while still available at reasonable cost; (b) that official State wildlife agencies be authorized advance loans, to be repaid from sources of income available to them, from the U.S. Treasury in the aggregate of $100 million for the acquisition of suitable waterfowl areas to supplement the Federal program; and (c) that the Government of the United States operating through appropriate channels or an international commission, arrange to grant adequate funds to official Canadian wildlife agencies, Federal or Provincial, for cooperative acquisition and preservation of suitable waterfowl nesting areas in that nation. The National Wildlife Federation also supports the principle that appropriate agencies of United States and State Governments should actively pursue every suitable means at their disposal to insure that the unlawful taking of migratory birds be reduced to a minimum throughout the entire North American Continent.

Establishment of public recreational areas: Recognizing that the expanding human population, enjoying more leisure time and improved modes of transportation, is making ever-increasing demands upon outdoor recreational resources, including fish and wildlife, it is believed essential that the establishment of adequate public recreational areas and facilities, particularly in the eastern part of the United States, be included as integral parts of all land-and-water resource planning on National, State and local levels. As the expansion of urban areas and extension of industrial areas, airports and highways, etc., create competition with recreational uses for many land and water areas, it is viewed as particularly urgent that those possessing exceptional qualities for fish and wildlife, boating, swimming, and scenic, historic, or educational appreciation be reserved for present and future public use.

Multiple use of public lands and waters: Now that multiple use is an official policy of the Government of the United States as relating to national forests, it is essential that the same principle be applied to public domain lands administered by the Department of the Interior and to public waters. Public domain lands should be managed equitably for outdoor recreation (including public access), range, timber, watershed protection, and fish and wildlife, as well as the development of mineral resources, without domination by any one or several user interests. Public waters should be managed for fish and wildlife and recreation as well as for domestic, municipal, stock water, irrigation, mining or industrial purposes. The United States should never surrender any right with regard to water which it presently has and the Federal Government must assert and maintain its right to reasonable use of water on all public properties for recreation and fish and wildlife; furthermore, project plans for impoundments financed by or with the use of Federal funds should include provisions for maintaining conservation or minimum pools or streamflows in the interest of fish and wildlife resources, and for developing other public recreational facilities, including access. It is recognized that all lands and waters are not suitable for all purposes; therefore, application of the multiple-use principle in a broad sense entails determination of optimum, or best, use in the public interest of specific areas.

Water pollution control: Since increasing demands are being made upon limited supplies, the necessary reuse of water makes pollution control a matter of vital concern to all Americans. Because State and local water pollution control agencies, with only limited resources available, have been and are unable to cope adequately with the overall national water pollution problem, it is viewed as urgent that the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1956 (Public Law 660) be strengthened to include: (a) increased Federal grants to municipalities for accelerated construction of waste treatment facilities; (b) extension of Federal water pollution law enforcement to navigable intrastate waters when invited by appropriate officials of the State so concerned or when local or State authorities are unable to eliminate pollution; (c) incentives which would stimulate adequate treatment of industrial wastes, including agricultural chemicals, and reduce siltation; and (d) upgrade the Federal water pollution control program within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, probably to the status of an office or administration, in keeping with its importance to the public.

Wilderness preservation: Public lands of the United States under jurisdiction of Federal agencies include areas of true wilderness which possess great educational, scientific and recreational capabilities for the public as well as watershed protection values. It is believed that these areas should be established as soon as possible in a National Wilderness Preservation System which provides for orderly procedures for the protection and addition, modification or deletion of particular areas.

Chemical pesticides: While it is necessary that agricultural and forestry losses caused by insects and pests be controlled, some chemicals now in use for this purpose result in extensive, longtime damage to wildlife population, fish and other aquatic organisms and threaten to contaminate public water supplies. It is believed that the public would benefit in many respects through the adoption of a Chemical Pesticides Coordination Act requiring any Federal agency conducting or contributing to a chemical pest control program consult on plans with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and appropriate State agencies prior to their initiation. Further, research should be expedited upon the development of selective, short-lived chemicals which would perform control functions without damage to other values, including wildlife, aquatic life and public water supplies.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

The House Rules Committee Can Speed an Investigation of the Adequacy of Existing Laws To Protect the Public From the Consequences of Undue Speculation by Favorably Reporting the Kearns Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, stock-market prices influence the personal expenditures of consumers, as well as the market for other investments such as Government bonds.

The New York Stock Exchange, taking note of recent heavy trading in securities, has warned the public against unsound investment practices. Keith Funston, president of the stock exchange, said on April 4, 1961 that—

There is disquieting evidence that some people have not yet discovered that it is impossible to get something for nothing, and they are attempting to make improper use of the facilities of the investment community.

Mr. Funston said, according to the New York Times of April 5, that the exchange had received reports indicating that some would-be investors were trying to buy shares of companies whose names they could not identify, whose products were unknown to them and whose prospects were highly uncertain.

A resolution which I have sponsored, House Joint Resolution 21, as amended, requests an investigation of the monetary and financial structure of the United States, by the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives.

The House Rules Committee can speed an investigation of the adequacy of existing laws to protect the public from the consequences of undue speculation by favorably reporting House Joint Resolution 21, as amended.

I include as part of my remarks a joint memorandum which my dear friend and colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] and I have issued. I also include, as part of my remarks, articles from the New York Times and the Washington (D.C.) Post and Times Herald, which underscore the need for the type of study and investigation my resolution, as amended, would provide:

APRIL 26, 1961.

JOINT MEMORANDUM TO CHAIRMAN HOWARD SMITH AND THE MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE RULES COMMITTEE

From: Representative ABRAHAM J. MULTER, Representative CARROLL D. KEARNS.

Subject: Resolutions calling for study of monetary system, etc.

1. I have for many years been urging the Banking and Currency Committee to undertake a study of our monetary and fiscal policy in all its facets.

Since 1952, I have been introducing resolutions directing the Banking and Currency Committee to make such a study. The resolution, House Resolution 21, as amended, by Congressman CARROLL D. KEARNS, also seeks such a study.

I join Mr. KEARNS in urging that a resolution be reported by the House Rules Committee, calling upon the Banking and Currency Committee to make such a study of our monetary system in all its aspects.

ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
Member of Congress.

2. Since testifying on April 25 on my House Resolution 21, as amended, my attention has been drawn to other resolutions calling for similar studies, and that the House Banking and Currency Committee has jurisdiction over the subject matter of my resolution.

I therefore suggest that my resolution be further amended to direct the House Banking and Currency Committee to undertake the complete study of our monetary system and report to the Congress its findings and recommendations.

From discussion with members of the House Banking and Currency Committee it is my view that they would welcome making such a study of our monetary system.

CARROLL D. KEARNS,
Member of Congress.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 5, 1961]

FUNSTON CAUTIONS PUBLIC ON RECKLESS INVESTMENTS—URGES CARE IN SELECTING STOCKS—SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION SEEKS STRICTER AD RULES

The New York Stock Exchange, taking note of recent heavy trading in securities, warned the public yesterday against unsound investment practices.

At the same time, the Securities and Exchange Commission proposed strict new regulations against deceptive or fraudulent advertising by investment advisers. The new rules would apply to 1,800 investment advisers licensed by the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Keith Funston, president of the stock exchange, said in regard to the activity in the stock market:

"There is disquieting evidence that some people have not yet discovered that it is impossible to get something for nothing, and they are attempting to make improper use of the facilities of the investment community."

Mr. Funston said the exchange had received reports indicating that some "would-be investors" were trying to buy shares of companies whose names they could not identify whose products were unknown to them and whose prospects were highly uncertain.

He urged investors to follow "time-tested guideposts" advocated by the exchange as a means to sound investment, including skepticism about tips.

The Securities and Exchange Commission's new rules were proposed under a law enacted last year. No date was announced as to when the new regulations would go into effect. Under them, advertisements would be prohibited from doing the following things:

Representing any "graph, chart, formula, method, system, or other device" as able to indicate when to buy or sell securities, "without disclosing, in close juxtaposition and with equal prominence, the limitations and difficulties" in using such techniques.

Containing testimonials about the investment adviser or his product.

Referring to an adviser's past recommendations, which may have been profitable.

Offering any service as free unless it is, in fact, entirely free and subject to no charges or obligations, direct or indirect.

The agency said other practices might have to be curbed, and it invited suggestions to be submitted by May 15.

The investment advisers licensed by the Securities and Exchange Commission sell advice on stocks and bonds in weekly letters to subscribers or in pamphlets, reports, analyses, and brochures. Their advertising is aimed at attracting buyers for this material.

A violation of Securities and Exchange Commission regulations can result in a $10,000 fine or 2 years in prison. Usually, however, the agency brings proceedings against violators, suspending, or revoking their licenses. It can also seek a court order enjoining illegal practices.

The president of the American Stock Exchange, Edward T. McCormick, endorsed the Securities and Exchange Commission program to stop indiscriminate investment recommendations. He added, however, that he did not think it unreasonable for persons assuming the risks inherent in the purchase of common stock to expect in the reasonably near future a dividend return of 5 percent on their investments.

Mr. Funston, in cautioning prospective investors, listed some of the guideposts for sound investing.

Investors, he said, should have well-defined objectives and should choose securities to meet these objectives. They should recognize that there are risks as well as rewards, and that stock prices go down as well as up.

He also advised investors to keep an emergency reserve for family needs, to get the facts from a member firm broker and not to invest on the basis of tips and rumors.

"There is no question that investors should exercise the same care in seeking securities as they would in purchasing a house, or a car or in making any other major investment," he said. He added that the recent market activity was a natural part of an expanding economy, and an overwhelming majority of investors are using the market place soundly.

Yesterday's warning against unsound investment practices was the exchange's second in 2 years.

In April 1959 an article by Mr. Funston, "A Word of Warning," was read on television in commercial time relinquished by the brokerage firm of Sutro Bros. & Co. The article was published in the exchange's monthly magazine and its message promoted by a $250,000 advertising campaign.

At that time, Mr. Funston said:

"It would be most unfortunate to have any part of our business reflect unsound or unreasoned transactions—whether it be based on tips or rumors, or concentrated in low-price issues merely because the price is low."

Wall Street observers have not been disturbed over the recent heavy volume of trading so much as they have been concerned by the soaring prices of many so-called glamour stocks. These are often cheap in price and represent the securities of new companies, especially in the electronics and missile fields. They are companies whose futures could be extremely disappointing, and investors—actually, speculators in these instances—could be financially hurt.

Trading on the New York Stock Exchange set a record in volume last month and in the first quarter of the year, exceeding even the trading of the crash year of 1929. Daily volume has climbed over the 5 million-share mark many times this year.

Yesterday, 7,080,000 shares changed hands. That was the largest volume since September 26, 1955, which was the first trading day after former President Dwight D. Eisenhower's heart attack, when 7,716,650 shares were traded.

Trading on the New York Stock Exchange has exceeded 7 million shares only 17 times—and 8 of those occasions were in 1929.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post and Times Herald, May 1, 1961]

OVER THE COUNTER AND INTO THE BLUE—BROKERS WARN OF FLAMBOYANT STOCK-BUYING

(By Frank C. Porter)

Six months ago, a construction laborer with muddy shoes and khaki work clothes walked into a Washington brokerage house, plunked down $25, and asked to open an account.

The chary broker tried to steer him into a safe and sound mutual fund, but his new customer would have none of it. He took successive flyers in a number of highly speculative local stocks—buying Servonics at 10 and selling at 18; National Research Associates at 1½ and selling at 4; and Nuclear Research Associates at 2¾, which he still holds and which is now selling for about 6.

For a total investment of $100, the construction worker now has paper profits of more than $1,000. Recently he breezed into the broker's office in a natty new blue suit and pearl grey vest. "What looks good today?" he asked.

The construction worker reflects a new wave of flamboyant stock speculation sweeping the country. As the contagion spreads, it invites invidous comparison with 1929 and worries overworked brokers and exchange officials, who realize a blowup in the securities market could give them a black eye and bring more stringent Federal regulation. As one of them puts it:

"When the house of ill repute is raided, everyone gets arrested."

Others describe it more delicately, but no less vehemently:

"The fact is that now the whole country is rapidly trying to get into the blue sky."—Walter K. Gutman, Stearns & Co., New York.

Some "would-be investors" are buying shares of companies "whose names they can't identify, whose products are unknown to them, and whose prospects are, at best, highly uncertain."—G. Keith Funston, president of the New York Stock Exchange.

"A colossal wave of greed is building up among uninformed people."—A. Dana Hodgdon, Hodgdon & Co., Washington.

"The over-the-counter market has become a veritable gambling arena which causes grave concern to those who lived through and survived similar phases."—Jacques Coe, Jacques Coe & Co., New York.

"Unfortunately, some people are going wild, like an 18-year-old boy who suddenly discovers that girls are wonderful."—Sidney B. Lurie, Josephthal & Co., New York.

"Today we have people buying stocks merely because the company's name has the word electronic or space or computer or automation or infrared or vending or cryogenics in it * * * They haven't the slightest idea what they're buying."—A partner in Johnston, Lemon & Co., Washington.

"Earnings are not cutting too much ice one way or the other right now. So many people are out after a fast buck these days they don't know what they're buying and don't seem to care."—Theodore R. White, Hornblower & Weeks, New York.

Others insist that trading in common stocks today is sound and orderly, that there is no concern for alarm. All agree, however, that there has never been such a period of broad public participation in the market.

In the first 3 months of this year, trading on the New York Stock Exchange topped 300 million shares—a record for any quarter in history. Daily volume on April 4 soared above 7 million shares, highest since former President Eisenhower suffered his heart attack in September 1955.

A New York Stock Exchange seat was sold last month for $225,000, the highest price in 28 years.

"Our business has been terrific. It's doubled just in the past month," reports Edgar B. Rouse, partner in Rouse, Brewer, Becker & Bryant, a large Washington brokerage house.

Clerks at member firms of the New York Stock Exchange have been working far into the night to clear up backlogs of orders on the busiest days. Many have to work Saturdays, sometimes Sundays as well. Partners at some of these houses have been regularly eating lunch at their desks and complaining that they rarely see their families any more. Switchboards become jammed and phone service slows.

As the volume rises, mistakes and delays multiply disproportionately. A customer who has ordered 10 shares of General Time may wind up with 100 shares of General Tire. Transfer agents have lagged as much as a week in the delivery of share certificates.

NOT A COMPLETE MEASURE

But while volume on the New York Stock Exchange, commonly called the Big Board, has been setting records since the turn of the year, it is not a complete measure of today's speculative activity.

Actually there are two stock markets. One comprises listed shares, those that are traded on the big board, the American Stock Exchange, and the various regional exchanges such as the Midwest, the Philadelphia-Baltimore, and the Pacific coast stock exchanges.

The other is the over-the-counter market, where vast numbers of unlisted securities are sold directly by dealers without the offices of an intermediary exchange.

While the New York Stock Exchange lists some 1,500 issues, and its smaller sister, the American, about 900, the common shares of some 50,000 other firms are sold in the over-the-counter market. New York Stock Exchange member firms employ about 28,000 registered representatives, the "customers men" who actually serve the individual investor. By contrast, nearly 100,000 registered representatives are listed by the National Association of Securities Dealers, the trade association which polices the over-the-counter market (many of the latter also work for stock exchange member firms).

How much business is done in the over-the-counter market? Nobody knows or is even willing to estimate it. But it is huge—probably several times the size of the volume on the exchange. The OTC market, about which little is known by the public, can be likened to the great bulk of an iceberg lying beneath the ocean's surface.

OTC MARKET BOOMS HERE

It is in this vast, less closely regulated market that today's wildest speculation is taking place. Shares listed by the exchanges are generally seasoned issues of well-known firms in mature industries. Although the OTC market has its own blue chips—American Express Co. or Weyerhauser Co., for example—it also includes thousands of untried fledgling firms, many with extremely romantic names, which permit the fledgling speculator's imagination to run riot.

Nowhere is this better illustrated than in Washington where a brisk over-the-counter market has developed in recent years to match the scores of exotic-sounding small research firms sprouting throughout the area and the growing appetite for stocks of Washington's relatively well-heeled population.

At the end of World War II there were possibly 2 dozen purely Washington companies with stock in the public's hands. Today the figure approaches 200, with more being added every month.

To meet the demand, new brokerage houses have sprung up at an amazing rate. Ten years ago, there were less than 30 in the metropolitan area, today there are just short of a hundred.

Although the bulk are firms of established integrity, the high-pressure tactics and questionable ethics of a few have caused alarm in the industry. Several have been closed down by the Securities and Exchange Commission in the past year.

Brokerage houses in the District of Columbia incidentally, are unregulated at the local level.

Public Power in Texas and in the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I have been requested to place in the RECORD the address I delivered before 18th annual national convention of the American Public Power Association at San Antonio, Tex., on April 24, 1961. I ask unanimous consent that my remarks on that occasion titled "Public Power in Texas and in the Nation" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD today.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC POWER IN TEXAS AND IN THE NATION

(Speech by U.S. Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, of Texas, at the 18th Annual National Convention of the American Public Power Association at the Granada Hotel in San Antonio, Tex., April 24, 1961)

Mr. President, members of the American Public Power Association, guests, it is a great pleasure to welcome the American Public Power Association to Texas, here to

the historic old San Antonio, where the American hero tradition reached its fullest flower. Here, 125 years ago, public duty even unto death was chosen voluntarily by every man of that heroic Alamo force. They set an example in time of peril that Americans today must be ready to emulate if we would keep our freedom secure. The spirit of Travis, Bowie, Bonham, and Crocket lives in the hearts of the people of Texas more securely than those stone walls of the Alamo which stand a stone's throw away from this hotel.

PUBLIC POWER IN TEXAS

In keeping with the spirit of her founders, Texas has a tradition of progresisve protection of the people in the field of public utility development. Under Texas' greatest Governor, James Stephen Hogg, the Texas Railroad Commission was created 70 years ago to regulate transportation abuses; along with Wisconsin, these were the first two States to create such public regulatory commissions. And U.S. Senator John H. Reagan from Texas, one of Texas' four greatest statesmen, was the author of the Interstate Commerce Act, creating the present Interstate Commission. Texas is proud of her old traditions and her great statesmen; they earned their place in history as you are earning yours, as open servants of the people, and not as covert agents of the people's opposition.

In keeping with its early tradition of public duty and welfare above private gain, our State has played an important part in public power since the early days. Texas also has had something to do with the founding and rapid growth of the American Public Power Association.

As you may know, Max Starcke, longtime general manager of the Lower Colorado River Aurthority, was one of the early leaders of your American Public Power Association board of directors along with the late E. F. Scattergood of Los Angeles, James D. Donovan of Kansas City and other American Public Power Association pioneers.

Although I can't claim having any part in the formation of American Public Power Association, I have had a keen working interest in public power since 1935, when I was appointed, in February of that year, by the late Gov. James V. Allred, to the original board of directors of the Lower Colorado River Authority of Texas, created to harness the Colorado River of Texas. One of the authority's principal purposes was to provide a low-cost power supply for municipal electric systems and rural electric co-ops. It was created even before the Rural Electrification Act of 1935 was passed.

As early as 1886, when there were only 30 municipal electric plants in the United States, there was a municipal plant in Texas. Unfortunately, the early records do not indicate just where all of those 30 plants were located.

But the first municipal plant in Texas that he know much about was set up in my home city of Austin in 1895. Greenville's plant was established in 1889, Brownsville's in 1907, Terrell's in 1908, and so on.

The city where you are holding your convention—San Antonio, Tex., mother city—has one of the newer municipal electric systems in Texas, but already it has established an outstanding record.

Texans formed their own electric systems for the same reason the people in hundreds of communities in other States decided to provide electric service to their residents: They were impatient to enjoy the full benefits of electricity, and no private companies were willing, at that time, to serve them adequately.

The result has been very similar to the situation which developed years later, when the rural electification program was established. The power companies couldn't see any profit in serving small, isolated communities and it was not until after the communities had taken the initiative and started their municipal plants that the potential growth of both the small cities, and their quantity of electric usage, began to impress the private companies. After the success of municipal electric plants was assured, the private companies were more than willing to buy them out and provide the necessary service.

In rural areas, private interests also wanted to go slowly in building lines, thus putting the responsibility on the rural people themselves to prove that they were good customers.

More than 30 of our State's municipal systems have been sold out over the years. A study by the Bureau of Municipal Research of the University of Texas reports that "at no time during the operating of municipal plants were they free from the attacks of private power companies." I suppose this statement would be true in any of the States of the Union. During the twenties, according to the study, many municipal systems were sold at several times their cost to power companies which put a high price on the nuisance value of these plants.

Fortunately, a contrary trend in Texas during the thirties, due at least in part to the creation of the Lower Colorado River Authority. Between 1939 and 1942, 17 municipalities started their own electric systems in order to distribute power from the Lower Colorado River Authority.

With the coming of the Lower Colorado River Authority, a source of low-cost wholesale power was opened up to residents of a 31,000-square-mile area centering around our capital city of Austin. More than 30 cities now buy all or part of their power supply from LCRA.

Low-cost power has been, in a sense, a bonus from the control of the Colorado River of Texas. This turbulent stream had a history of severe floods and alternating droughts, which would turn the stream into a mere trickle, insufficient to provide even enough drinking water for the communities along its banks.

The legislature of Texas in 1934, created the Lower Colorado River Authority as a State agency charged with controlling floods, conserving water for irrigation, creating power, and for other useful purposes, and protecting the watershed through prevention of erosion, and development of forests of the area.

This is a State public water and power development authority, based on the national TVA.

The authority has accomplished these purposes without levying any taxes and without direct appropriations for operation or construction by the State of Texas. Its water-control dams are financed through revenue bonds and its own revenues. Its multiple dams (six in all) on the Colorado River of Texas represent the finest power development in Texas.

I have recited this brief history of public power in Texas as a sort of prelude to your convention's theme—"A New Era for Public Power."

PUBLIC POWER IN THE NATION

Changes in the power industry during the past 10 years probably have been more rapid than during any comparable period in our history. But the next 10 years promise to bring even more dramatic changes in our methods of producing, transmitting, and distributing power, as well as a new surge in usage of electricity, some of it for appliances and electric servants which have not yet been invented.

On the policy side, great strides will be made during the coming years by an administration in Washington dedicated to moving ahead rapidly with the Federal power program and to stimulating what President Kennedy called in his message on natural resources "sustained heavy expansion by all power suppliers—public, cooperative, and private."

The President declared that if this Nation's power facilities are going to keep pace with the growth of our economy and national defense requirements "intensive effort" will be required by all segments of the power industry. Installed capacity should triple by 1980, he said, if we are to meet the needs of essential economic growth.

This is a great challenge to local public power systems. Tripling of capacity in less than 20 years is going to mean a big investment, larger and larger generating plants, and a greater degree of cooperation among the smaller utilities to make the most effective use of their generating plants.

The Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources has called for a vast new program of water-resource development to meet expected needs for water, and I am sure that Senator Moss, who was a member of that committee, will give you more details on that when he speaks at your meeting later this week.

However, it is significant that the President endorsed the select committee's report as "very excellent and timely" and urged the Bureau of the Budget to schedule "a progressive, orderly program of starting new projects to meet accumulated demands" in his resources message.

Obviously, the Federal Government can be expected to give dynamic leadership during public power's new era through resource development, extension and interconnection of the Federal transmission systems, and through devotion to the preference principle in the marketing of Federal power.

With the Federal program providing a strong base of low-cost power in many areas, what will be the future for public power in these areas and in those parts of the country where Federal power does not now exist?

SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Let us review for a moment the situation in the States of Missouri, Arkansas, Kansas, Oklahoma, and northeastern Texas, where the Southwestern Power Administration serves as marketing agency for Federal power.

I use Southwestern Power Association as an example both because it is important to Texas and because the local publicly owned electric utilities in the area are eager to share in the benefits of this Federal power supply.

Today, relatively little of this Federal power has found its way to the municipal electric utilities in the area, for a variety of reasons. In some cases, the municipalities themselves are just beginning to realize the enormity of the benefits which they can gain from tapping this great power source. In other instances, restrictive contracts already signed, plus roadblocks put in the way of an aggressive policy of transmission line construction, have not permitted the full benefits of Federal power to be realized.

What might be called the "golden age" of Southwestern Power Association lies just ahead—in the new era.

Here's a rundown on the additional power capacity scheduled for installation during the next few years:

Bull Shoals Dam, 90,000 kilowatts in 1961 and 90,000 kilowatts in 1963; Greers Ferry, 96,000 kilowatts in 1963; Dardanelle, 31,000 kilowatts in 1964, 62,000 kilowatts in 1965, and 31,000 kilowatts in 1966; Eufaula Dam, 90,000 kilowatts in 1964; McGee Band Dam—52,000 kilowatts in 1965; and Beaver Dam, 112,000 kilowatts in 1965.

Although not all of this will be firm energy, the quantities involved are substantial, and could have a tremendous impact upon the public power situation in the five-State area.

I am confident that the new administration will see to it that this power is sold to the municipalities and rural electric cooperatives of the area under a strict compliance with the preference provisions in Federal law. The President made clear his own adherence to this principle when he said in his resources message that the Federal power marketing laws "recognize the prior rights of the general public, consumer and taxpayer who have financed the development of these great national assets originally vested in them." The President's message emphasized that power disposal "shall be such as to encourage widespread use and to prevent monopolization."

In Southwestern Power Administration it may require extension of the Federal transmission system to make such a power policy work. I believe that this administration will not hesitate to request funds for such an extension if it appears necessary.

So, for the municipalities in Kansas which are exploring the possibilities of joining together to obtain Southwestern Power Administration power, this kind of national leadership can have real dollar-and-cents meaning.

SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

For communities in the southeast, the extension of the new Federal policy to the Southeastern Power Administration service area can mean lowcost power supply from the Hartwell, Walter George, and Barkley Dams, which will bring a combined total of more than 250,000 kilowatts on the line within the next 4 years. Aggressive planning for the marketing of the new power soon to become available, with Federal transmission lines where appropriate, can mean a larger flow of low-cost power to consumers who own their own electric systems.

The question of transmission comes up again and again in connection with the Federal power program, and I believe that in this field the previous administration has as poor a record as it has in the actual construction of multipurpose projects.

It is true that the "No new starts" policy shut off the flow of Federal power at the source. But it was the timid marketing policy, relying heavily on private utility lines, which has deprived the consumers served by many local public agencies of their share in the benefits of the Federal power program started under previous administrations.

There is ample evidence that the new administration is giving attention to the transmission line problem. Imaginative proposals for huge interregional interties such as the Pacific Northwest-Southwest intertie, under study by the Interior Department, give evidence that there is an appreciation in the administration of the power facts of life.

AMISTAD DAM AND PUBLIC POWER

A new development of interest to all of us is the impending construction of the giant Amistad Dam on the Rio Grande, in Texas and Mexico, above Del Rio. The issue of public power is the most important unsolved issue about that dam. Some private companies want the United States to build this great dam, but sell them the "falling water" for a song while the taxpayers pay the fiddler, on the theory that the Federal Government can't develop the power.

I regard this as 19th and not 20th century thinking. Your association members, the TVA, the LCRA, and the REA prove that a public authority can ably generate and distribute public power.

It is my hope that the Federal Government will develop the power on this great project. It would be a tragedy of Texas and the Nation if it is given to private power companies under the falling-water concept, as some are now trying to do.

The claim that it isn't feasible to develop pulbic power at Amistad Dam because there isn't enough demand for it, fails to take into account America's anticipated population growth to 235 million people by 1975. People are hunting the sun; the great migration into California, Arizona, and Florida will hit southwest Texas from San Antonio to El Paso when there is water and power available which Amistad Dam will furnish them. I charge you to work with all your might and main to keep both water and power from Amistad Dam in public hands.

PUBLIC POWER IN THE FUTURE

For my part, I have always supported and will continue to support a program of full development of our water resources. In addition, in the light of new development, we need sufficient Federal transmission of sufficiently high voltage to tie together some of our great Federal power systems and to make the most efficient use of the installed capacity of these systems. Where Federal lines are needed to carry this public power to the load centers of the publicly owned plants of municipalities and rural electric cooperatives, authorization of such lines and the appropriations needed to build them should be granted.

This support will come from me, not because I am against private business, but because this is the only way to get adequate public power distributed to the public agencies who need it to build a stronger America.

Some of the experts in the power field contend that the United States has fallen behind Western Europe and the Soviet Union in the construction of high-voltage transmission. While I am not such an expert, I am impressed by evidence that Western Europe is tied together in a huge power grid, greatly increasing the available supply of electricity. The special Senate subcommittee which visited electric power installations in Russia inspected a vast network of high-voltage transmission lines. Since private industry hasn't built such a network of transmission lines here, public power must again shoulder part of the job.

We need to get on with the job of bringing our transmission system up to date in preparation for the vast increase in power requirements which we can expect during the stirring sixties, or, to use your convention theme—the new era.

In this effort, of course, the individual utilities have a big part to play.

Already steps are being taken by some of you toward interconnection of your systems; proposals for joint power supply are underway. I am glad to see that you plan to devote an entire session to this subject tomorrow at your panel on "Joint Power Supply—Pattern for the New Era."

One of the best pictures of the new era that I know of was prepared by your own association for the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources.

The American Public Power Association pointed out in a detailed memorandum to the select committee that estimates of future power needs characteristically are too low. The official estimates of the Federal Power Commission have been worked over and revised periodically, as the actual use of electricity has far outstripped Federal Power Commission estimates.

In setting a high goal for itself, public power is bound to have a stimulating effect upon the economy as a whole. But its devotion to providing more power at lower cost to consumers, public power can help all American consumers both by doing a good job for its own consumer-owners and by needling the private power companies to do a better job.

While I haven't talked much of our friends of private power, not because I don't appreciate the vast importance of their 80 percent of the consumer market, but because I confidently expect the public power systems and rural electric cooperatives to lead the industry in experiments, venturesomeness, and new ideas, as we enter the new era of electrical abundance.

With 80 percent of the market they control, it seems to me private interests could find enough to do to prepare constantly for that expanding market, without wasting so much money on a propaganda campaign of distortion against our public power authorities.

Certainly, I don't question the need for both private and public power in this country, and I recognize that many of the private companies are doing a good job for their customers.

I do feel, however, that too many of the leading lights of private power have resisted change, have opposed a low-rate policy, have fought public power competition in an unfair manner, and generally have been about as enlightened as William McKinley.

In public power, the private companies have a challenge and they recognize it clearly, but their response is not to get out and sell electricity at competitive rates, which is right and proper. Their methods have been to destroy the opposition by political pressures, by propaganda, and by that highly regarded new science known as molding public opinion.

The time has come, I believe, when we should have a progressive effort by both private and public power to meet the great and growing electrical power needs of this Nation and the free world.

Today, with communism in Cuba just 90 miles from our shores, we have little time for fighting among ourselves for any reason. Today, with the crisis in Laos bringing us to the brink of a planetary war with the onrushing hordes of communism, we cannot afford to waste so much time in an effort to destroy one another here at home.

Demands of tomorrow in a vibrant, powerful expanding economy—our first line of defense against those who would wipe freedom from the earth—will dwarf the electric power requirements of the past.

We are heading into a 15-year period in history where it is predicted that our electrical power requirements will quadruple. It is estimated that by 1975, we will be using 2⅓ times as much power per worker in industry and about 2½ times as much electricity in the average home. The result is that by 1975 more than four times as much power will be consumed each year.

Mankind's progress in this age of science and technology does not depend alone on the success of our research scientists. It depends in greater degree on our ability as a people to accept change and to seize our opportunities for a better life for all men.

We stand near the threshold of a bright new world, where nuclear research may cure most dread diseases; where salt water may be made fresh so "the desert may bloom as the rose"; and where men may travel to the stars and bring back treasures more precious than Columbus and other explorers found in the New World.

There is a great challenge before us on President John F. Kennedy's New Frontier. It is a challenge not just for the few, but for the many; not just for the wise, but for the courageous; not just for those wealthy in bank accounts, but for those rich in compassion, hope and vision.

Some of the decisions before us will be more revolutionary and controversial than the public power program was in its beginning, and much more important to the destiny of man.

In the final analysis, we and our children will be called upon to decide whether America—as the torchbearer of world free-

dom—will practice the social justice freedom demands; whether as a people professing the Christian ethic, we will find it in our hearts to follow the gospel of "Brotherhood among men to feed the hungry and care for the ill"; whether as a people intelligently pursuing peace while zealously protecting the ideal of human liberty, we can find a way to endure in a world "half free and half slave."

These are some of the grave challenges before us on the New Frontier. But with Americans like you leaders in the public power field, leaders who have demonstrated vision linked with faith, I have no doubt we can meet these trials, and more, so long as we "do justly, love mercy and walk humbly with God."

The Inter-American Appropriation Bill

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6518) making appropriations for the inter-American social and economic cooperation program and the Chilean reconstruction and rehabilitation program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the House on last Tuesday passed and sent to the Senate H.R. 6518, the inter-American appropriation bill. I deeply regret that I could not give my support to that proposal.

I fully realize the seriousness of the present international situation and that it provides the backdrop for the administration's desire that H.R. 6518 pass without delay.

Nevertheless, I am unable to support this program because I do not believe that the solution to our present difficulties lies simply in the appropriating of large sums of money.

It seems to have become a tradition in our Federal Government to attempt to alleviate every international crisis with more Federal aid. Some have said that if the House failed to pass this inter-American appropriation bill the result would be a serious blow to our relations with Latin America. I understand that some Latin American countries, in looking forward to this newest bounty, have referred to it as "the Castro bonus."

It has been said by supporters of this program, that its passage would help achieve greater political solidarity within the Western Hemisphere. The fallacy of this argument has already been amply demonstrated. For in spite of the anticipated approval by the Congress of the full $600 million requested by the administration in H.R. 6518, only seven Latin American countries were sufficiently grateful to vote in the United Nations General Assembly recently in favor of the extremely moderate request that the Organization of American States bring about a peaceful settlement of the United States-Cuban difficulties. Thus even at this early stage in its development, it appears that this program, like all of our earlier efforts in Latin America, will fail to buy the United States any additional friends in the Western Hemisphere.

There is considerable doubt in my mind, as I am sure that there is in the minds of many of my colleagues, that the fruits of our generosity in projects like this are actually enjoyed by the people of the countries involved.

With the background of waste, misuse, and poor administration of funds that has been so prevalent in our foreign aid programs, you would have thought that the administration would have come before the Congress with a detailed set of plans for the expenditures to be utilized under this appropriation. However, instead the measure was railroaded through in the most slipshod manner conceivable. The remarks of the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee during the general debate certainly support this conclusion. If for no other reason than this, I could not have supported this bill.

I understand that many Members felt that the present critical international situation required that they act quickly. I am sure that every Member of this House wants to do whatever is possible to assist the President in alleviating the present crisis. However, I must warn you, my colleagues, that certain dangers, perhaps even more serious than the present ones, will arise if the House of Representatives continues the course of action it initiated on Tuesday when it approved an appropriation bill, involving $600 million, without even requiring that the administration present the Congress with specific plans for the employment of the funds involved.

Never before has the Congress so readily relinquished its fundamental right to demand from the Executive justifications for the amount appropriated. The House, by acting to present the administration with a blank check, as it did in this instance, opened the door for an untold number of future programs, whereby the Congress will again be asked to abdicate its responsibility for fiscal prudence.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I find it impossible to support the administration's program as stated in H.R. 6518, and I sincerely hope that the Senate will pay far greater heed to its responsibility than did the House on last Tuesday and refuse to reduce the appropriating process to a meaningless formality.

The Increase Came in 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL FINDLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, rising farm income has attracted much attention, but no one mentions that most of the increase came in 1960.

The seasonally adjusted annual rate of flow of farmers' realized net income went up from $10.2 billion from the first quarter of 1960 to $12.4 billion in the last quarter.

My reference is the Economic Research Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Broadcast Over Wisconsin Radio Stations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, over the weekend, I was privileged to review some of the major challenges confronting Wisconsin and the Nation in a broadcast over a network of Wisconsin radio stations, reflecting upon a number of issues now before us in Congress.

I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The problems confronting us, of course, are extremely difficult and complex. Consequently, the creation of solutions for such problems require the cooperation and dedication not only of our citizens, but also of our leaders in Government.

As of now, the major legislation approved by Congress includes:

Establishment of a 1-year experimental feed grains program, aimed at curbing surpluses of barley, corn, and other feed grains;

Extension of unemployment compensation benefits for jobless, whose benefits have expired;

Authorization to create a program for economic assistance to chronically depressed areas;

Legislation to create additional Federal judgeships for our overcrowded and overworked courts. (This measure has passed both Houses of Congress and is awaiting action by a Senate-House conference committee.)

And other measures.

However, there are a great many significant, and some controversial, issues yet to be considered at this midway mark in this Congress. These include:

Liberalization of the minmum wage laws;

Aid to education;

Expansion of the housing program;

How to finance the highway construction program;

Adoption of improved ways to meet the needs of our 16 million folks over 65;

Strengthening and, as possible, streamlining our defenses;

Stepping up our space program;

And other issues.

LEGISLATION OF SPECIAL INTEREST TO WISCONSIN

In addition, there are a number of pieces of legislation of special interest to Wisconsin.

These include:

Appropriations for port and harbor development, including projects at Milwaukee, Green Bay, Superior, Menomonie, and other ports along the Great Lakes;

Enactment of the Wiley bill, S. 1515, to provide supplemental funds to carry forward the school lunch program for the current fiscal year;

Extending the time for termination of Federal control over Wisconsin's Menomi-

nee Indians, to enable the tribe to get its economic house in order; and

Getting approval of funds for expansion of the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis.

These, then, are the highlights of the legislative workload ahead of us in Congress.

WORLD OUTLOOK

As Congress attempts to grapple with these and other problems of significance to progress in Wisconsin and the Nation, there exist ever-present and overhanging crises in world affairs.

Around the globe, the Communists are stirring up trouble, creating wars, sparking rebellions, attempting to overthrow existing governments, and engaging in a wide variety of espionage, sabotage, subversion, and other legal and illegal efforts to expand their influence and control. Today, there are an estimated 36 million Reds operating in about 50 countries, attempting to further the aims of world conquest by the Reds. Because the Red conspiracy is so widespread, it is difficult to predetermine when, or where, the next explosion—sparked by Red action—will occur in the world.

In spite of our difficult problems, however, we must not allow "curtains of gloom" to descend over the Nation; rather, freedom, in my judgment, will triumph if we are willing to make the necessary effort now to stop Red aggression and promote the cause of peace and freedom.

Overshadowing the activities of Congress then, and, yes, the world, is the Communist threat to world peace.

The creation of peace is still the great challenge. Questions remain:

Can we develop ways to accommodate, or at least negotiate, the great differences between the East and West? Can we stop the Reds without war?

Can we meet the great and growing demands of the billions of "have-not" people in the world for more of the good things of life?

These are grave and serious questions that need to be faced, and resolved, in our time. Ultimately, we must find realistic answers, if there is ever to be stability and peace.

REVIEW OF HOTSPOTS IN THE WORLD

Briefly, now, let's take a quick look at some of the "hotspots" around the world.

In Cuba, the Red-tinged Castro regime has become more firmly entrenched.

In Laos the Reds, though professing a desire for a cease-fire and negotiations for settlement of the difficulties, are continuing military operations to attempt to extend their control over more territory.

In the Congo, Mr. Khrushchev is still the No. 1 troublemaker.

In Berlin also there are recurring threats of Red action to create tension which would possibly result in war.

Overall, the Reds continue to build bonfires around the globe which threaten, if allowed to spread, to lead to a global conflagration.

Now, what can we do about it?

The free world, in my judgment, must soon develop more effective ways for combating Red expansionism, if we are to survive.

The balance of power, and of world opinion, for example, once was largely on the side of the Western nations. Now, this balance is teetering precariously.

If we are to defeat the Communists' aim of world conquest, then we need to adopt a stronger, nonmilitary offensive against the Communists. Among other things, this, in my judgment, should include—

First. Strengthening our information-spreading program to beat, not be beaten by, the Communist propaganda machine.

Second. Adopt more effective machinery against infiltrative penetrations, the fruits of which are being witnessed in Cuba and Laos.

Third. A sharper counteroffensive to penetrate the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, not leave this as untouchable territory for the Reds.

Fourth. Better tailored U.S. programs, such as the Latin American plan, to meet special needs in Asia, Africa, and elsewhere in the world; and

Fifth. Finally, undertake a more dynamic effort to present the efforts and objectives of U.S. policies to the people of the world.

In summary, the United States needs to adopt a stronger political, economic, social, and ideological counteroffensive against the Communists. By experience, we know that a so-called containment policy is obsolete and unworkable. For the most part, the result has been loss of more and more land and people until the Reds now control nearly a billion people and vast natural, manpower, industrial, scientific, and military resources.

Unless we are willing to dedicate the effort, manpower, and resources to stopping the Communists now, the survival of our way of life—indeed, of freedom itself—will be in serious jeopardy.

The Mexican Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, these are, to say the least, difficult times. Nevertheless, we must keep our sense of humor. It is the one great thing we have that the Russians lack.

The following article by Mr. George Dixon appeared in the Washington Post of April 27. It is certainly good for one hearty laugh, and that will do us all good. It is also reassuring to know that Mr. Dixon has not lost his sense of humor; some of us were beginning to fear he might be going political on us.

THE MEXICAN PEACE CORPS

(By George Dixon)

Mexicans who come into this country to lend us assistance with our agricultural problems resent being called braceros and wetbacks. I have thought of a sure fire way to assuage this resentment. Instead of referring to this contingent with approbrious names, let's call it the Mexican Peace Corps.

If you will look at it squarely and objectively you will see this group meets all the qualifications for enjoying such a title. It is already doing all the things our Peace Corps says it contemplates doing.

Members of the Mexican Peace Corps already are offering us assistance several points better than point 4. They have made themselves indispensable to our very existence. It is no exaggeration to state that our crops which require stoop labor couldn't be harvested without them.

The former braceros and wetbacks meet all the other requirements for Peace Corps membership. First of all, they're volunteers. They come willingly. Secondly, they go only where they're asked. Thirdly—and most importantly—they would be only too delighted to live like the natives.

They teach us agriculture, and give us technical assistance. They bring in their own technical know-how.

They are prepared to work with our natives—even if our natives won't work with them. They don't set themselves above us—even when they get to know us.

Before coming here they take cram courses in the rudiments of our language and try to improve themselves in our strange tongue while sojourning among us. In the words of their great leader, El Sar-hentry Shrivero: "Quiero hablar mas Ingles, caramba."

They strive at all times to improve our lot by setting us an example. They demonstrate the virtues of hard work, singleness of purpose, and devotion to duty. They teach us that a man should employ his strong arm, or bracero, to support his family.

Without the Mexican Peace Corps we would harvest no cotton, berries, or vegetables, because the only members of our native population who will be caught bending over are those with the Central Intelligence Agency. But the peace corpsmen have much more, mucho mas, to offer. They can if they will, teach us the Mexican way of life.

This is the most restful man has ever known. It is predicated on all the virtues we allege to hold dear.

The Mexican way of life, as brought to us by the dedicated missionaries of the Mexican Peace Corps, would help us cut down divorce, reduce the mortality rate from heart attacks, and practically outlaw ulcers. It would give us the siesta and the fiesta, instead of the sleeping pill and the cocktail ordeal.

Legs, Braces for Indonesians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, my attention was called recently to an article in the Pasadena Star-News about a young businessman who is a fine example of the many Americans who are giving their time, money and energies to help make the voyage of the SS *Hope* the great success that it has been in its maiden 5 months in Indonesia.

In mid-May, Mr. Jay Greene, president of the U.S. Manufacturing Co., of Glendale, Calif., will leave for Indonesia where he will work with doctors aboard the SS *Hope*, as well as ashore, in setting up rehabilitation centers for amputees. Mr. Greene's work in Indonesia will not only give hope and comfort to handicapped Indonesians but will help to solidify the friendship between this country and Indonesia. The story in the Star-News tells of Mr. Greene's dedicated efforts to help the handicapped. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Pasadena Star-News, Mar. 24, 1961]

A FREE SERVICE—LEGS, BRACES FOR INDONESIANS

(By Peggy Powell)

Jay Greene of La Canada has probably helped more amputees to walk again than any other person in the United States.

It's true he's become a wealthy man in the process but Greene is one of those rare

young businessmen who has a heart as expansive as his bank account.

Hundreds of the handicapped he is now helping will never pay him a cent.

Greene started 15 years ago with a $1,000 investment and has built his Glendale concern into the largest in the United States manufacturing artificial limbs and braces.

Through the Veterans' Administration, Green's company was asked to take charge of the SS *Hope's* rehabilitation program. Currently, one of his technicians, Charles Scott of La Canada, is in Jakarta making a survey of amputee needs.

When Scott returns with his report, Greene will then supply the equipment needed to help the handicapped of Indonesia.

Soon Greene and two of his technicians will leave for Jakarta, along with two doctors who are volunteering their services.

This five-man team will spend 3 months in Jakarta, instructing the Indonesians on how to make, fit and adjust the appliances and teaching amputees how to walk again.

Greene is paying the salaries and transportation costs of his technicians and is supplying all the equipment.

Toward the end of the trip, Greene will be joined by his wife, Margaret, and the two will travel back home togeteher.

The SS *Hope* is not the only charitable enterprise of this enterprising young man.

He has also made a very generous offer to members of the California Association of Highway Patrolmen. Any officer or member of his immedate family in need of an artificial limb or a brace will be supplied free of charge.

Furthermore, they will be given the advantage of technical advice from the UCLA Medical Center, with which Greene works closely in developing better equipment.

This is not a one-shot offer on Greene's part. It is a continuing thing because amputees require new appliances about every three years.

Greene is a modest man. He speaks reluctantly of his contributions. He prefers instead to talk about the people who have been helped.

"It's a very gratifying occupation," he said. "There's no thrill like seeing an amputee take his first step on two legs."

Dr. Oscar Fisher Blackwelder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH Q. ALEXANDER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, April 6, 1961, Dr. Oscar Fisher Blackwelder died. He grew up as a boy in my home county and I had the pleasure, after I came to Washington in 1953, of attending his church and getting to know him intimately. I considered him one of my best friends.

In paying tribute to Dr. Blackwelder, I would like to include an editorial from the Concord Tribune, Concord, N.C., of Thursday, April 20, 1961, which expresses my regard for his outstanding accomplishments, his wide scope of influence and his depth of character, better than any words I could choose. The editorial is as follows:

For two decades, 1933–53, Dr. Oscar F. Blackwelder, of Reformation Lutheran Church, was one of the city's clarion pulpit voices whose messages were heard throughout the country.

Since 1953 he suffered with an illness that steadily drained his strength and curtailed his public appearances, but during these trying twilight years, Dr. Blackwelder never lost his friendly spirit and gracious manner. He was made pastor emeritus of Reformation Church in 1953.

Those who knew and heard him at his peak will never forget the Lutheran pastor's gift of poetic expression and solid doctrinal content. Dr. Albert J. Shirkey of Mount Vernon Place Methodist Church said "for beauty of expression and intellectual and spiritual content, few preachers in America were his equal. He was in more constant demand across America than almost any other minister."

Dr. Blackwelder had a definite concept of his mission as a preacher. As Dr. Robert Van Deusen, Washington secretary, National Lutheran Council, said, he wanted to be "a voice rather than an echo; he wanted to shape the social conscience of the church."

When he came to Washington in 1933 from Christ Lutheran Church, Baltimore, the preacher told Dr. Joseph R. Sizoo, now George Washington University professor of religion, it was to "study and think and write and read. The seemingly limitless resources of the Library of Congress and contacts with Members of the Congress, among other items, served as an impetus to his inquiring mind and spirit."

As a man, Dr. Blackwelder had an ebullient personality that made the whole world kin. Dr. Edward Hughes Pruden, pastor of the First Baptist Church, called him "a warm hearted pastor, an inspiring Christian leader, and a wonderful friend." And Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld, spiritual leader of the Washington Hebrew Congregation, observed "He was a saintly man, ready to work together for the common good of the larger community."

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, a Presbyterian layman, summed it up by saying Dr. Blackwelder was "an outstanding religious leader who made splendid contributions to the welfare of not only his own community but also the Nation. His life, devoted to God and dedicated to the service of others, will long serve as an inspiration to all those who were privileged to come in contact with him."

Last Monday (April 10) Dr. Blackwelder was laid to rest at Roanoke, Va., where he went to college and served his first pastorate. His body will lie in the grave there but his spirit will long be present in Washington not only among those who knew him but among those who will know of him through them.

The Big Leak Is at Detroit—Chicago Diversion of Lake Michigan Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Illinois Members of the House and the senior Senator from Illinois have succeeded several times in securing congressional authorization for the diversion through the Chicago River of a small and controlled amount of additional Lake Michigan water.

The additional diversion was requested for a brief period to permit a study of Chicago and northern Illinois sanitation problems. Although the Congress twice approved our request, the Eisenhower administration vetoed it.

Opponents and critics of Chicago's diversion of lake water have claimed it is responsible for changes in the Great Lakes Basin. Agency studies of the causes of fluctuations in the lake levels are now in progress.

The Chicago Tribune, in an editorial of April 22, 1961, reports that Mr. Ivan W. Brunk of the Chicago office of the Weather Bureau has found, after several years of study, that Chicago diversion is not the cause of fluctuations in the lake levels. In a paper presented recently at a conference on Great Lakes research at the Universvity of Michigan, Mr. Brunk concluded that practically all of the drop in the lake level has been caused by natural and artificial downcutting of the outlet control system of Lake Huron. In other words, as the Tribune puts it, "the big leak is at Detroit, where water from Lake Huron flows through the St. Clair and Detroit Rivers into Lake Erie."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Tribune editorial, entitled "Where the Lake Water Goes," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE THE LAKE WATER GOES

We hope that the Michigan politicians who have been complaining about Chicago's diversion of lake water will read the latest study by Ivan W. Brunk of the Chicago office of the Weather Bureau.

Mr. Brunk has spent several years studying causes of changes in the levels of Lakes Michigan and Huron, which are really a single lake. The paper which he presented last week at a conference on Great Lakes research at the University of Michigan concludes that practically all of the drop in the lake level has been caused by natural and artificial downcutting of the outlet control system of Lake Huron.

In other words, the big leak is at Detroit, where water from Lake Huron flows through the St. Clair and Detroit Rivers into Lake Erie.

The flow through this channel is about 194,000 cubic feet per second, Mr. Brunk says, compared with 1,500 through the Chicago River.

More important than the actual rate of flow is the downcutting of the Detroit outlet. By this Mr. Brunk means the deepening of the channel by erosion and dredging. Erosion, he says, can be natural or can be caused by the wash of powerful propellers. Dredging has been done mainly to deepen the ship channel, and also in the commercial excavation of sand and gravel. As the outlet becomes lower, so does the lake level.

There is nothing new about this. The lake level has been subsiding for thousands of years. Geologists report that in the last 2,500 years, the level has dropped 16 feet—or about 8 inches a century. In the last 70 years—comparing 10-year averages in the 1880's and 1950's—the lake level has dropped 18 inches. Mr. Brunk has found that changes in the direction or rate of flow in the Chicago River have had no noticeable effect on the lake level. But it was in 1885, significantly, that large-scale dredging began in the Detroit Channel.

If the receding shoreline is as great a threat to Michigan as its politicians would have us believe, they should stop wasting

their time fussing about Chicago. They should consider instead building a weir across the Detroit Channel, thus narrowing the channel and substantially reducing the flow into Lake Erie. But this, of course, would bring protests from Ohio and New York.

The Greater Williamsport Community Arts Festival of 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was privileged to attend the ceremonies marking the opening of the weeklong Community Arts Festival in Williamsport, Pa. I consider this activity, under the outstanding leadership of Mr. Bernard C. Taylor, to be a highly significant adventure in community effort; and I am proud that the district which I represent has, within it, generated an idea which seems to me likely to grow up from the community and outward even into the area, and into the Nation. It is an idea of today, not possible in another era. Not possible, because the need was not apparent. But now, with leisure hours and a high standard of living as a challenge for the value of time, it is of significance to see people in a community getting together to dig out all the art organizations and activities contained in it and going further to bring authorities in each art field to it to help stimulate the growth of art in its area. It is a good thing to use leisure time in this way.

From an idea born of a need to bring industries into the city of Williamsport, the chamber of commerce searched the town for a person who could coordinate all art activity. There are an assortment of art groups involved, plus the public schools, churches, and organizations which as a policy have never done more than listen tolerantly to an artist speak. The art groups have set up the schedules for their day: Visual arts, music, dance, drama, crafts, literature, and architecture, photography, graphics, fashion designs. There are two leaders of each art, generally one from the local college, Lycoming, and one from the public schools or local art groups.

There is a workshop each morning, the service clubs have taken guest speakers at noon luncheons, and the women's associations have sponsored the speakers in the afternoons. These programs vary with dancing and demonstrations as a part of the whole. There are also dinners sponsored by clubs and the evenings are devoted to entertainment and the performing arts. To add excitement a beaux arts ball will be held.

The best part of the festival is watching artists work with sponsors. One hundred and thirty-five guides have been instructed by college professors in a capsule course of the arts. They will stand by at all the exhibits which are housed all over town: in the public library, the college, the hotel, and the banks. On the final Sunday, after a week of stimulation, there will be a garden arts show which has been held in the spring for a few years.

Already within the city, an orchestra has been organized that did not exist before though the musicians were there, the arts and crafts have had the stimulation of working up to standards. Artists have felt the stability of interest and enthusiasm from supporters who are businessmen, industrial men, ministers, clubwomen, workers, and school and college instructors. The industrial school has done the bulk of the building of easels and display panels. Very little money has been spent in display. The emphasis has been on the value of participating in art and absorbing its benefits.

This is the reason the movement for a concentrated showcase for the arts is a product of today, for the good people find for their time, and for a forward look into a productive, peaceful community.

Betty Beale Views Washington in the Spring

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, as the month of May brings the full and changing glory of spring to Washington, we pause to reflect on the unique charms of our gracious Capital City.

Such feelings doubtless stimulated Betty Beale, staff writer and nationally known columnist of the Washington Star, in writing the recent article in which she rhapsodized her continuing love affair with the city of Washington. We are indebted to Miss Beale for clothing in such expressive language the charm, the vitality, and the electric quality of life which Washington holds for so many of us.

I solicit the attention of my colleagues, and all who cherish beauty, to the poetic perceptions of Miss Beale and ask unanimous consent that this portion of her column in the Washington (D.C.) Star of Sunday, April 30, 1961, be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD:

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCLUSIVELY YOURS—ABOUT THE MAGIC OF WASHINGTON

(By Betty Beale)

The magic of spring now encompasses this city of ours that has its own brand of magic. Washington the fair, Washington the great, Washington the powerful, means many things to many men.

The quiet of foliage-filled midcity living; the rutless mentality of its citizens; the petaled loveliness of dogwood dappling the town like sunlight.

The whole town's love of history where history is made daily; the scope of fashionable addresses from the studio in the alley to the farm on the outskirts; the worldwide scope of its newspapers' page 1 news.

The celebrity-filled parties; the celebrity-filled Halls of Congress; the celebrity-filled press corps; the pride they all take in their Capital.

The 15-minute-by-car accessibility of every important place; the number of multiacre estates right in town; the compassionate figure of Lincoln watching over the city with his immortal spiritual strength.

The stimulating fluidity of the population; the incredible variety of bigtime interests in a smalltown atmosphere; the reassuring sturdiness of the Capitol dome; the quality of cultural equipment.

The southern neighborliness of friends and the nonpryingness of neighbors; the inclusion of all that is typical of America to make an untypical town; sunlights 12 months of the year; the weird enchantment of Islam's call to prayer floating out from the mosque.

The wonderful cleanliness known only to a factory-free city; the extraordinary informality of elegant Georgetown; the redbirds that fly into my garden to be fed the minute I step outside.

The extreme up-to-the-minuteness of the news discussed everywhere; conversation at social gatherings in a community where conversation is not a lost art; the cosmopolitan attitude of residents toward the most bizarre foreign dress.

The massive white majesty of the classical buildings; the grand avenues that radiate with Parisian formality from statue-filled parks; flag-draped embassies on significant days in history; the fascination of so much foreign soil and diplomatic life.

The number of VIPs waiting their turn in a reception line; the dearth of police escort sirens despite the abundance of big names; the very interested but dignified attitude of inhabitants toward Presidents of the United States.

The endless influx of the great; the endless vigil by the Tomb of the Unknown Soldiers; the ever-imposing dignity of Robert E. Lee's home gazing down from the banks of Virginia on the Capital of the Union.

The line of eager sightseers entering the White House; the multitude of private gardens owned by city dwellers; the sylvan rockfilled stream that winds through the city; the infinite number of handsome residences within its 69 square miles.

The 50 American flags that fly with the unison of Rockettes around the base of the Monument; the historical significance of all the Capital's preserved antiquity; the sleepy stillness of the old canal; the weeping cherry trees on the French Embassy lawn.

And above all, the continuous excitement of this nerve center of the free world.

This is Washington—to me.

Industry's Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shelbyville (Ind.) News of April 11, 1961:

[From the Shelbyville (Ind.) News, Apr. 11, 1961]

INDUSTRY'S PLAN

American industry's program to create more jobs quickly is now in the hands of Congress.

Senators, Congressmen, and other Government officials are considering the program offered to them by members of the National Association of Manufacturers.

We think it's a vitally important and interesting one.

The proposal to provide for new jobs states that just two major governmental actions are needed:

(1) Immediate tax-rate reform.

(2) Curbing of abuses of union power.

From NAM's executive vice president, Charles R. Sligh, Jr., came this view on new jobs:

"The vast majority of new jobs will have to be found in private industry.

"Industry, for its part, will not be satisfied until the only people who want to work and are out of jobs are those who are between jobs."

The program points out that jobs are created when private individuals are impelled, in the hope of making a profit, to undertake activities which involve the employment of others.

The NAM jobmaking report, entitled "Creating More Jobs—Now," sets forth what a business faces today when it considers expansion or the introduction of a new product.

"Expansion, new products, and new businesses involve risk. If you invest today, as always in the past, you risk all you invest.

"But today you are also assured that if you succeed, the Federal income tax rates will take 52 percent of corporate profits, and the unincorporated business will have to pay anywhere from 20 to 91 percent.

"It is no accident that new business has been slow to spring up and new jobs have failed to open in sufficient numbers under these conditions."

Mr. Sligh emphasized the necessity of tax rate reform in order to restore the incentive to invest.

He cited the Herlong-Baker tax rate reform bills which would gradually reduce all personal and corporate income taxes over a 5-year period, and recast the depreciation allowances as well. And he emphasized that legislative curbs on the abuse of union power could reestablish true collective bargaining.

The NAM program also called on the Government to avoid or defer action which would further hamper the job-creating process.

Among these are the proposed increase in the Federal minimum wage which would throw many out of work in marginal industries; increasing payroll taxes and thus further reducing profits from which job creation is financed, and giving aid to depressed areas, which would shift employment rather than create new jobs.

Aged People in Desperate Need of Medical Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Mr. A. L. Thomas, of Gonzales, Tex., dated April 26, 1961, which states the need of our elderly for medical aid with eloquent force. The letter is self-explanatory.

I ask unanimous consent to have this letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GUS THOMAS INSURANCE AGENCY,

Gonzales, Tex., April 26, 1961.

Re medical aid for the aged.

U.S. Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH,

Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: An elderly couple have been living near Gonzales, in utter poverty. A neighbor lady noted the other day that she had not seen them lately, so she went over to check on them.

She found the lady had been burned terribly several days earlier, and was just laying there suffering. She and her husband got her to town to the county doctor. He treated her and quickly used up the old man's $69, and sent her home to the shack, with no food, no medicine, not even an aspirin, and said she was all right.

The neighbor persuaded another doctor to look at the old lady; he threw up his hands, said she was dying and needed to be in a first-class hospital, such as at Galveston. He treated her, and is having her bandages changed daily, per the report.

The neighbors have gone to the county authorities, the Red Cross, the welfare, without getting any aid for the burned woman. Now, the neighbors are poor people too; they are feeding the couple, but they can't help the old woman in her misery. It is anticipated that she will die quickly and be out of her misery.

I make a few points for medical aid for the aged through social security. Charity will not get the job done; 51 percent of our citizens over 50 years of age are doing without medical care; the medical doctor's union (AMA) is not about to treat poor folks for free; we are spending untold millions of dollars treating previous members of the services for non-service-connected ailments; we are pouring untold millions into foreign aid, without buying one friend; we are running second in more than just space development. Time is running out.

Sincerely,

A. L. (GUS) THOMAS.

Resolutions of Essex County Commissioners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include several very interesting resolutions adopted by the Essex County Commissioners at Salem, Mass., at their recent meetings:

Whereas Richard Cardinal Cushing recently said, "When we hear murmurs of graft and bribery, or payoffs and grabs, we know that these charges are not the products of the imagination of fanciful people"; and

Whereas a serious deterioration in moral and ethical standards is reflected in many people generally; and

Whereas we believe that unless our governmental leaders, especially, are made to act according to principle and higher ethical standards, the very foundations of our democracy and freedom are threatened; and

Whereas we must preserve confidence in our county government; and

Whereas public opinion and vote reaction need to be stimulated by providing a simplified standard from which to judge our public officials; and

Whereas men in public life must give immediate and serious thought to the rising public demand for higher and better standards: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this day, March 21, 1961, the Essex County Commissioners endorse the following code of ethics for county officials and all public officials and urge its distribution and promulgation among all citizens of Essex County:

Code of ethics for Essex County officials and all public officials:

1. He will put loyalty to the highest moral principles and to country above party and persons, and uphold the honor and dignity of his office.

2. He will be a scrupulous trustee of all public funds, will not permit nor condone unjust enrichment of himself at the expense of the public, and will not accept expense money in excess of his actual expenses.

3. He will not promise his constituents improvements or public works that cannot reasonably be accomplished.

4. He will not take credit of any kind properly due someone else.

5. He will make no promises of any kind which compromise the duties of his office.

6. He will never accept for himself or his family favors or benefits that might influence the performance of his duties.

7. He will not make his office a means for employment of persons not qualified.

8. He will be consecrated to the consideration of economy in the interest of economic stability.

9. He will endeavor, in the performance of his duties, to expedite good Government and avoid delaying tactics.

10. He will avoid special concessions to lobbies detrimental to the public.

11. He will endeavor to awaken the apathetic and complacent to their responsibilities as citizens.

12. He will strive for clean, honest, and decent administration of public affairs with integrity as the keynote.

That the county commissioners of Essex County, Mass., congratulate President John F. Kennedy upon his inaugural address, which reaffirms every principle of our forefathers; had a real ring of realism, and delivered in a spirit attuned to our times, with a ringing challenge to the communistic world.

As a new generation looks upon the threatening state of the world in terms of opportunity, we extend to him our sincere best wishes and the fervent prayer that he display courage, judgment, integrity and dedication in retaining those human rights while preserving the values for which our forefathers fought.

That the county commissioners of Essex County commend President John F. Kennedy upon his forthright stand in his unswerving determination to keep Laos out of communistic hands.

We strongly and unreservedly support the goal of an independent neutral Laos, tied to no outside powers. We firmly believe it is the President's responsibility to establish foreign policy and our duty as Americans to support him.

We also back his decision that the United States has obligations under the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) in dealing with the Lao situation which must be met.

We unequivocally endorse the President's noble utterance, nobly delivered, that, "Every American will want his country to honor its obligations to the point that freedom and security of the free world and ourselves may be achieved."

That the County Commissioners of Essex County highly commend U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Adlai Stevenson upon his inspiring and forthright speech in the United Nations in reply to the Russian representative on the U.S. position on the Laos situation.

It was a message of hope, high purpose, and of resolution, which reaffirms every principle of our forefathers. It had a real ring of realism and displayed stamina of purpose. It meets the challenge of our time, and lets the world know that we face the threat not with dread and confusion, but with confidence and conviction, as America accepts the responsibility of the free world's leadership.

Soviet Anti-Semitism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, recently an excellent series appeared in the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle written by Rabbi Stuart Rosenberg of Toronto, formerly of Temple Beth El in Rochester. The series deals with anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union. From the author's own experience it is clear that the Jews in the Soviet Union live under the continual threat of religious, and even personal, persecution. Synagogues are closed; Jews are refused high level jobs; efforts are made systematically to eradicate the Jewish culture; books are no longer printed in Hebrew or Yiddish; and rabbis and other religious leaders are appointed by the state only after they have passed the requisite tests for political compliance and loyalty.

Soviet policy toward the Jewish people is a sham and a hypocrisy, as Rabbi Rosenberg has pointed out. I sought to have this question thoroughly discussed before the United Nations Economic and Social Council, but the administration did not see fit to press, so no action was taken.

Rabbi Rosenberg's informative articles follow.

I ask unanimous consent that Rabbi Rosenberg's informative articles be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM?—NO BIBLES, PRAYER BOOKS

(By Dr. S. E. Rosenberg)

The Soviet Union can land its spaceships on the moon, its sputniks can orbit the heavens but apparently it cannot produce a Jewish prayer book or a Hebrew Bible. According to Paul Anatolovich Dazhorozny, vice chairman of the Soviet Council of Religious Cults, no Hebrew Bible has been published under the Soviet regime because the Hebrew alphabet is strange and esoteric, difficult for printers in the state publishing houses.

Bibles and prayer books for all of Russia's religious denominations have been printed in recent years. But Russia's 3 million Jews apparently do not need these religious appurtenances. "If they want a Bible," added Mr. Dazhorozny, "they should ask for it. Since they haven't asked for it, we must assume that they don't need one." This was the answer I received from many Russian officials whom I interviewed, every time I pointed out the glaring discrepancies between official policy and actual practice, as regards religious privileges available to the Jewish community in Russia.

I can only conclude from what I observed that the Council of Religious Cults has closed down Jewish printing houses throughout the country as part of its plan to reduce Russia's Jews to spiritual and cultural poverty. My conclusion is based upon a detectivelike, cloak-and-dagger experience I had while trying to track down a Soviet-printed Jewish prayer book.

In the Moscow synagogue there is a single volume of a Jewish prayer book published by the Soviet Union in 1956. I had it in my hands and studied it for some time but was required to return it to its lone possessor. The nature of this prayer book and the sham it reflects soon became clear to me.

In 1956 the first and last official contingent of an American rabbinical delegation visited Russia. Upon their return, these rabbis protested publicly that in all of Russia, since the revolution, not a single Jewish prayer book was printed by the Soviet authorities. Apparently, in response to this pressure from the outside, the Soviets determined to erase this exposure of their cynical hpyocrisy—for Russia continues to proclaim its desire to help foster the religious life of all its believers regardless of sect or denomination.

Thus, not long after this visit, the first Soviet Jewish prayer book did appear under the general editorship of the late rabbi of Moscow, Rabbi Solomon Schlieffer. Some 4,000 to 5,000 copies were published and made available to a very limited number of Jews in the Soviet Union. Even of this small number of books, many were sent to other Iron Curtain coutries—for export—to serve as propaganda window dressing to other Jewish communities in Communist-dominated lands.

For 10 days I tried to acquire a copy of this book. I made appointments at midnight in dark alleys; I sought out supposed owners in secret places; I even held a copy in my hand for a moment in anticipation of receiving it as a gift. But all to no avail. Always at the last moment, this book was taken from my hands by frightened Jews who knew instinctively why it could not freely be given to a Western Jewish visitor.

It all seemed fantastically strange. At first I could not understand why a book of this kind could not be given away without tremendous fear of reprisal on the part of their own fellow Jews or government agents. When I sat with Dazhorozny I understood. As a lead question I asked how it was that the Soviet Council of Cults had published prayer books and Bibles for all of Russia's religious denominations except the Jews. He probably didn't realize that I had seen the book myself and was somewhat taken aback with my response to his suggestion that such a prayer book was indeed published in 1956.

"No, it was not," I told him. "That showpiece 'prayer book' is a photocopy of a prayer book printed in New York City by Hebrew Publishing Co. of America, a prayer book brought as a gift by American rabbis in 1956. What has happened," I challenged him, "to Russian printing presses? Why did you have to take a Jewish prayer book printed in America and photograph it? Perhaps, Hebrew type in Russia has been destroyed?"

It was then that he suggested how difficut an alphabet the Hebrew language possessed. But when I pressed on and reminded him that in 1960 the Koran printed in Russia in the Arabic language did not seem to be difficult, he became quite perturbed. He reached excitedly into the top drawer of his desk and pulled out a Jewish religious calendar, ostensibly "printed" a few months ago and distributed by his committee to Jewish synagogues.

He didn't know that I already had a copy of this in my possession and could tell him, much to his feigned amazement, that this calendar, too, was not printed, but photographed from a handwritten copy, undoubtedly prepared by some local Jewish scribe.

I have a deep fear that in the Soviet Union today, the land of enlightened and humanitarian culture, where all nationalities are free to foster their unique cultures, Jewish printing houses and type for Jewish books have actually been destroyed or hidden. Hitler burned books—Jewish books by the ton. I have an eerie feeling that the Soviets may be more clever. Have they, perhaps, avoided the need to burn Jewish books by the simple device of not printing them?

Soviet criminal codes provide special penalties for interference with the regular performance of religious worship and the law of the land prohibits the establishment of government regulations which would restrict or limit the freedom of conscience.

One wonders if the Soviets truly believe in the humane principles of their own constitutional guarantees. If they did, the spiritual hunger and the slow starvation of Jews robbed of Judaism and Jewish culture might not stare a visitor so plainly in the face.

SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM—JEWISH "CHIEFS" VENAL

(By Dr. S. E. Rosenberg)

I traveled some 5,000 miles to Russia to speak with my fellow Jews and to hear with my own ears what they had to say about their life in the Soviet Union. If I had to rely upon the Jewish chief of the synagogues and religious communities alone I would have spoken to none of them.

It seems clear that only those who have proved their unquestioned loyalty to the Soviet state can be elected to serve in positions of leadership in the Jewish community of Russia. Upon my arrival at these synagogues I was greeted at the door by these heads of communities. I was welcomed, even embraced, but then quickly moved off into a corner and reduced to a condition of incommunicado. If I tried to walk about the synagogue, to observe and possibly chat with some of the folks who were there, these Jewish officials walked with me.

If I had any doubts about the political functions of these lay religious heads of Jewish communities in Russia, they were quickly dissipated by one of their kind who, in response to my protestations over his annoying conduct, took me off to a private room, locked the door, and then proceeded to lecture me.

"Why should we even think of giving you free access to Jews here? You will abuse the privilege. We remember well what happened in 1956 when a delegation of American rabbis came to Moscow, Kiev, and Leningrad.

"What did they do when they returned to America? They maligned Russia. They composed articles for the capitalistic press about the conditions of Jews here. They said that we were persecuted as Jews. What an abominable falsehood. Have you seen Jews persecuted in Russia? This you cannot see here. Perhaps in the West where men exploit fellow men, where Jews and Negroes and other minorities are the vic-

tims of gross injustice—perhaps there, among your imperialists, you will find Jewish persecution. Not here."

Time and time again during the course of his tirade he pounded the table, pointing his finger at me, creating the impression that I had come with nothing more in mind than to tell lies about Russian Jewry.

This man claimed that he was no Communist, that he was only a humble self-sacrificing lay leader of the Jewish religious community and had only its interest at heart. Finally, I realized with whom I was talking for his unguarded answer to a simple question unlocked the amazing mystery. I merely asked how he came to be elected president of his community. His answer was a revelation. "There are free elections by the Jewish religious community. Of course," he added, "those elected must be acceptable to the government and its council of religious cults."

Here are a few choice answers to a number of specific questions I put to him:

Question. How is it that so many of the Jews whom I met expressed great interest in the possibility of leaving Russia and going to Israel?

Answer. This is not true. You are telling a lie. Don't try to fool me. The Jews of the Soviet Union are not going to Israel because they do not desire to go. What else is Israel but a puppet of the capitalist states doing the bidding of the United States and Britain? Zionism is supported by Western capitalists for their own filthy reasons.

Question. You seem so well dressed. Why are not the others also similarly attired?

Answer. I receive a fine pension, having worked as an engineer all my life. They, too, will be well off when their time for pension arrives. Economically, like all others here, the Jews of the Soviet Union are well off. Their coreligionists need have no fears about their material or their spiritual well-being.

Question. If this is so, why don't the Jews in the Soviet Union help other Jews in the world who are in need of help, as Western Jews have been doing freely for so many years?

Answer. If you mean by this that we Russian Jews should send our money to help the Jews in Israel, then I have already given you my answers. We shall not do it. American Jews help the Jews of Israel not because they are good or compassionate, but because they are forced to do the rotten work of American capitalists in supporting the Zionist imperialist state.

The existence of such hand-picked Jewish leaders who act as the spokesmen of their religious community is, in itself, eloquent testimony to the captive state of Jews within the Soviet Union. The spiritual stagnation which such purchaser leadership reflects can ultimately be more harmful to the religious and cultural conditions of Russian Jews than any overt or physical persecution.

ANTI-SEMITISM IN RUSSIA—JEWS CALLED VICTIMS OF COMMUNIST HYPOCRISY

(By Dr. Stuart E. Rosenberg)

What light does the current position of the Jews in the Soviet Union shed upon the general world situation?

Before coming to Russia I had read many of the reports on the Jewish situation. I was perplexed and saddened by the curious intensity of recent attacks upon Jews in the Soviet press and radio.

Yet I tried honestly to judge the Russians on their own merits, and waited to learn from them at first hand their interpretation of the facts.

The comments made to me by Mr. Kreshin and Mr. Sokolov, editors of the "Moscow News," fairly well, sum up the strange Russian interpretation:

When people in the West read what are labeled as attacks on Jews in the Soviet Union, they misunderstand the motivations and the reasons for such articles and statements. We, in fact, carry on a campaign not against the Jews, but against Judaism, as part of our basic Communist position, which sees religion as a reactionary force for evil in the world. When we write against certain ritual practices of the Jews, we are not attacking them as people, but rather on the basis of our belief in scientific atheism."

He reiterated his hope that liberal opinion in the world would understand the Russian position, and would appreciate the fact that calumnies against Jews did not reflect an antiminority prejudice, but was rather part of the Soviet Union's general attack upon religions, which they would very much like to uproot.

The attacks upon Jews in the Soviet Union and their mounting disabilities go far beyond antireligious measures alone.

Here is a little documentary list.

1. There are more than 100 Soviet nationalities in Russia, all of whom are granted the right to their own cultural institutions, their own schools and the use of their own language. The Soviet Union regards the Jewish people in Russia as members of the "Jewish nationality," and yet Jews are the only nationality in Russia which is deprived of any semblance of nationality rights.

Yiddish schools, Hebrew schools, instruction in Jewish cultural life, publications and Jewish theaters—all of these are prohibited.

2. All major religious groups in Russia are permitted to have national or regional ecclesiastical organizations, in order to maintain contact with their local constitutents all over the country. Only the Jews are prohibited from official contact with one another.

3. Churches and mosques throughout Russia continue to attract adherents, and in some communities religious buildings have been expanded and added to. This is not the case with Jews.

Russians distrust the Jews for they see in them a potentially disloyal element. Thus they aim to force the Jews into isolation from one another, by a continuing and relentless program of intimidation and hostility.

What can be done to help? And in helping to ameliorate the Jewish condition in Russia will we also be doing more than assisting the Jews alone?

The West must continue to expose Russian democratic hyprocrises on every occasion. Every public forum, every legal and just means must be utilized to publicize internal Russian autocraey and its cynicism toward its own peoples.

Far from being the defender of peace and the protector of helpless minorities, Russia must be exposed for her civilized barbarities, her hypocritical and cynical attitudes toward those who cannot defend themselves.

Letter to Douglas W. Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following letter which appeared in the Washington Daily News for April 26, 1961:

LETTER TO DOUGLAS W. JOHNSON

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: When you found in a Los Angeles street a bag containing $240,000 in unmarked bills, you had no thought except to get it to its rightful owner as fast as you could.

A lot of us thrilled at this evidence that old-fashioned honesty had not gone from this country, as some had feared.

Brink's, from whose armored car the package of money had flopped, gave you a reward of $10,000. You have just reiterated that you thought it was "nice of them." That's what the public thinks, too. For, like honesty, gratitude is a prime virtue.

But now we are concerned to hear that you have been made unhappy by people who write to you that you were a fool to return the money, and that your son, too, has been disturbed by kids saying his father was "dumb."

We are writing to tell you that we warmly admire you for what you did. We are sure that the persons who said you were a fool are only a very small fraction of the American people. We are sure we are speaking for millions who have not written you when we say that you did the only right thing.

You have done a fine thing. You have dramatized respect for private property, on which our national prosperity depends. You have exemplified human dignity. You have brought honor to yourself and your fellow men.

Spring Comes in the North

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, writing from Alaska for the Wall Street Journal, Ray J. Schrick in an article published in that newspaper on April 26 told about the big guessing game of the North—guessing when the ice will go out in the spring at Nenana on the Tanana River. Mr. Schrick treats of other subjects, too, in the article which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALASKANS BET $100,000 ON TIMING OF SPRING ICE BREAKUP IN RIVER—MANY PUSH FOR OTHER LEGAL GAMBLING TO AID STATE'S BUDGET BUT GOVERNOR BALKS

(By Ray J. Schrick)

NENANA, ALASKA.—Any day now, a five-legged stand frozen into the ice in the middle of the Tanana River here will begin floating downstream, as the ice thaws. The moving stand will gradually stretch taut a rope attached to it and the rope, in turn, will pull a pin from a stationary clock ashore. This will stop the clock, marking the exact moment the ice went out.

The breakup of ice will signify far more than the coming of spring to most of Alaska's 226,000 citizens. To the person or persons who guess correctly the precise minute the clock stops, there will be a big pot of prize money, possibly as much as $100,000. The explanation? The so-called Nenana ice pool is a lottery, one of unusual type and proportions.

This is one of the few legal gambling events still permitted in the once wide-open

North. Only Alaskan or Yukon residents are eligible to participate in the 44-year-old event, which in the past 10 years alone has dispensed over $1 million in prize money. However, the time may be coming when gambling activities are increased in the 49th State and made available to all comers. One reason: Many Alaskans believe the high costs of statehood can only be met by a return to the free gambling of gold rush days—with a tax on the gambling.

THE ONLY WAY TO PAY FOR STATEHOOD

"Men would rather gamble than pay taxes," declares 66-year-old Fred Muller of Nenana. Adds an Anchorage businessman: "I'm for legalized gambling. It's the only way to pay for statehood."

Such sentiments have been stimulated by the legislature's recent boosts in taxes on personal income, cigarettes, gasoline, auto licenses, and liquor. Among the factors boosting State spending is higher welfare outlays; at last report, 21.2 percent of the State's labor force was unemployed, compared with a national figure of 7.9 percent. The high unemployment rate stems in Alaska from sharp cutbacks in Federal military construction spending in the State.

Democratic Gov. William A. Egan and other top State leaders firmly oppose legalizing gambling. Attorney General Ralph Moody explains the opposition this way: "Organized gambling brings in an undesirable element. It doesn't contribute anything to the State." The State legislature in 1960 passed over the Governor's veto a bill to legalize church bingo and certain other noncommercial operations such as the Nenana ice pool, which actually had been conducted illegally down through the years, according to Attorney General Moody.

The Nenana lottery is operated by the Nenana Ice Classic Association, membership in which is made up of every resident over 21 in the town. A six-man board and a manager are elected by the association and sometimes hot political races develop for these offices.

As insurance against any claims of dishonesty, the town puts out in advance of the ice breakup a book about the size of the telephone directory of a major U.S. city. This book lists the names and time guesses of everyone who has plunked down $1 each for one or more lottery tickets. The book is distributed around the state.

YON CAN'T HOLD BACK THE ICE

"It's the squarest game there is," contends one Nenana resident. "You can't hold back the ice as you could a horse." The ice has gone out in the past anywhere from April 20 to May 16. Each year a few ticket buyers—last year 37—predict the ice will go on April 31, a date that doesn't exist.

As breakup time nears, a watchman stands by the clock 24 hours a day. Only the $2,000-a-year hired manager winds the clock; he also sets the clock daily. An electric clock once was used but fluctuations in the electric current in town raised questions as to the clock's accuracy.

As the ice begins to move, a rope from the ice to a shore tower sets off a siren so townspeople can flock to the shore. Then, as the ice structure gets around 100 feet downstream, a second rope pulls the pin from the clock.

If no one guesses the exact minute the clock stops, the two closest guesses on either side of the exact time share the pot.

Of the total proceeds from sale of the lottery tickets, $20,000 a year is set aside for wages of persons working on the operation and up to 5 percent can be deducted for charitable purposes (The town of Nenana has built a $50,000 civic building from proceeds in this category). One intangible asset: The free publicity Nenana gets for its efforts—publicity which, as one town official says proudly, "puts us on the map."

President Kennedy Signs Area Redevelopment Act—Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette Terms the Measure a Tribute to Democratic Concern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, when President Kennedy signed into law the Area Redevelopment Act earlier today, a long-past-due measure of assistance for depressed chronic labor surplus areas and underdeveloped nonurban areas became a reality.

Many communities which have been forced into economic decline by excessive unemployment will be stimulated by this act to take steps to improve their outlook and their stake in the future.

The Area Redevelopment Act will not, in itself, solve the problems of any section. But it will afford a means whereby numerous towns, cities,, and counties can act to help themselves. Nothing will flow to any community as a consequence of this measure unless its leaders and citizens demonstrate ability to plan and initiate positive programs calculated to revitalize its economy.

The incumbent President's predecessor had two opportunities—in 1958 and 1960—to sign area redevelopment legislation into law. On both occasions his actions were negative instead of positive.

For President Kennedy, the experience of affixing his signature to the 1961 act at a White House ceremony this morning doubtless was a most satisfying one. Along with the esteemed senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and other able Members of the Congress, the President, as a Member of the Senate, was a devoted apostle and stalwart proponent of aid for depressed area legislation. As a candidate for the Democratic nomination for President, Mr. Kennedy stated forthrightly his positive position concerning the need for such an act, and as his party's nominee he vigorously supported the Democratic national platform pledge to continue the battle for enactment of area redevelopment legislation.

But as gratifying as was the honor which came to President Kennedy in being privileged to perform the final action which gave this legislation the status of law, he very properly paid special tribute to our diligent and effective colleague, Senator DOUGLAS, and other Senate and House Members whose perseverence and devotion were applied to area redevelopment bills during sessions of the 85th, 86th, and this 87th Congress.

Those of us who have been afforded opoprtunity to work for this legislation were gratified to have been participants in the White House ceremony.

Mr. President, the Charleston Gazette, Charleston, W. Va., which has been a strong and consistent advocate of area redevelopment legislation, published an appropriate editorial in its April 28, 1961, editions. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AREA AID BILL A TRIBUTE TO DEMOCRATIC CONCERN

To those who argue that party labels mean very little, enactment of a bill to aid depressed areas this week should shake them out of their comfortable indifference to party politics.

On two occasions, a Republican President vetoed essentially the same bill, thus delaying aid to West Virginia and other States faced with pockets of chronic unemployment which defy State and local solutions. The overwhelming majority of Republicans in Congress also have opposed the bill over the past decade.

It took the election of a Democratic President, John F. Kennedy, and a Democratic Congress cooperating with him to assure its long overdue enactment. The bill is a tribute to the Democratic Party's pragmatic concern for people in trouble.

The tragedy is that Republican fear of trying something new—in the face of obvious need—delayed the bill's passage for so many years. This chronic, GOP standpatism has prolonged the agony of thousands of jobless citizens in West Virginia and the Nation.

President Kennedy, U.S. Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, the longtime champion and author of the depressed areas bill, and West Virginia's eight Congressmen deserve praise for their efforts in finally obtaining a national program for a national problem. By working for its passage, President Kennedy fulfilled one of his major campaign pledges to the people of West Virginia.

Now it's up to the governmental agencies and citizens of West Virginia to make immediate plans to take advantage of the bill's provisions. Valuable time already has been lost because of Republican short-sightedness. West Virginia can afford no more costly delays in building for a more prosperous future.

Depressing Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of April 28 says clearly and concisely what many of us felt when we voted against final passage of the so-called depressed areas bill.

How long are these barefaced raids on the U.S. Treasury going to continue? How long is it to be before Congress resumes its constitutional right and duty of the power of the purse? The answer seems to be, "Never."

DEPRESSING VICTORY

The final passage of the depressed areas measure is being hailed as a victory for President Kennedy, and of course it is, in the purely political sense. That is appropriate, for it is a purely political bill.

The public interest is another matter. We have here, in one untidy package, an impressive assortment of evils. No one seriously expects the bill to relieve unemployment or put so-called depressed areas on their feet. At the same time, its financing

provisions ought to give even politicians the horrors.

Out of the $451 million to be dished out over 4 years, $300 million will be dispensed without benefit of Congressional review. The Treasury will just sign for it—and then go out and borrow the money, as though the Government didn't have enough debt, deficits and inflationary potential. Apparently Congress just doesn't give a hoot any more about its once-prized power of the purse, at least not when it conflicts with the vision of all those millions pouring into selected Congressional districts.

Well, no one need have supposed the present Government would be anything but active on the ward-heel political level. Even so, nearly half a billion dollars is a stiff price for turning the general good into a depressed area.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, we in the United States have many close ties with Poland, which it is my pleasure to review each May on Polish Constitution Day. The provisions of the 1791 Constitution proved that the Polish people at the end of the 18th century sought a liberal government from the medieval feudal elements, just as we had sought and won our freedom in 1783. A historian has written of the Polish Constitution:

> Posterity * * * joins with the best contemporary opinion in deeming the Constitution of the 3d of May one of the greatest achievements in Polish history.

For this reason the Polish people have remained true to their ideals, first expressed in this Constitution no matter where they have moved in the world. Polish immigrants to this country brought with them their love of independence; Polish people helped settle our country and built its cities and towns. They have contributed to our music and our literature. They have brought to us all the elements of their society which it has been so difficult for them to maintain under Soviet domination. Thus, I take great pleasure in honoring them on this most important day in their history.

In the United States, wherever Americans of Polish descent live, in cities and towns from coast to coast, this holiday is observed with appropriate exercises throughout the month of May to pay tribute to the Polish nation and to remind fellow Americans that Poland was one of the first pioneers of liberalism in Europe.

It was on May 3 in 1791, barely 2 years after the adoption of its Constitution by the United States in 1789, that Poland without a bloody revolution or even without a disorder succeeded in reforming her public life and in eradicating her internal decline. But this great rebirth and assertion of democracy came to the Poles too late and did not forestall the third partition of Poland in 1795 by Russia, Prussia and Austria.

POLAND PIONEERED LIBERALISM IN EUROPE

The greatness of the May 3 Polish Constitution consisted in the fact that it eliminated with one stroke the most fundamental weaknesses of the Polish parliamentary and social system. The Poles raised this great moment in their history to the forefront of their tradition rather than any one of their anniversaries of glorious victories or heroic revolutions.

We Americans who have been reared in the principle given us as a birthright by the founders of our great Republic, the principle of the sovereignty of the people in the state, which is the primary postulate in the 1791 Polish Constitution, can see how this truism cut off the Poles and the Polish political tradition completely from both the Germans and the Russians, who have been reared in the principle of state, and not national, sovereignty.

The light of liberalism coming from Poland was then, as it has been throughout the years that followed and even unto today, a threat to tyranny and absolutism in Russia and Germany. In 1795 Russian and Prussian soldiers were sent to Poland to partition and rape her. In 1939 Russian and Prussian soldiers met again on Polish soil, as the absolute totalitarianism systems of naziism and communism again felt the danger of true liberalism coming from Poland just as in 1791.

In the Polish 3d of May Constitution this liberalism was formulated in these words:

> All power in civic society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

In Wilmington, Del., the Council of Polish Societies and Clubs in the State of Delaware will mark the adoption of Poland's first constitution on May 7.

Participating in the observance will be the Delaware division of the Polish-American Congress. The observance will be held at Modjeska Hall, in Wilmington.

Prominent Polish and American speakers will address the gathering. St. Hedwig's Choir and children of Polish Saturday morning classes will take part in the program, as will various officials of the city of Wilmington, and of New Castle County.

The Council of the Polish Societies and Clubs in the State of Delaware recently pointed out, in announcing the plans for May 7 that:

> During the past two centuries, Poland, which was the most powerful nation once, became partitioned four time; [has been] ravaged, despoiled, persecuted, and enslaved by greedy neighbors. No nation could suffer so much without leaving a deep scar.
>
> It is the hope and prayer of Polish people everywhere that a spirit of justice, understanding, and cooperation prevail among all the nations for a glorious and lasting peace on earth and good will among men.

The committee on arrangements for the May 7 observance of Poland's Constitution Day in Wilmington, Del., consists of Adam J. Rosiak, chairman; Joseph Falkowski, Ludwig Kopec, Frank J. Leski, Mrs. Frank J. Obara, and Mrs. Charles Kilczewski.

A Lesson for Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the experienced have much of value to give to the theorists and I offer to my colleagues the following article by Ruth Montgomery, as it appeared in the Long Island Press on April 28:

NIXON'S A GOOD POKER PLAYER, AND FAR FROM OUT OF THE GAME

(By Ruth Montgomery)

WASHINGTON.—Richard Milhous Nixon despite his Quaker upbringing learned to play poker well and profitably during World War II. This should be a warning to those who are ready to count him out of the national political arena.

The relaxed young man who is now going about the business of making a nongovernmental living for the first time in 19 years seems totally unware of the dire predictions that he is through.

He talks with the calm assurance of a leader who expects to lead. He speaks without rancor of the erstwhile Democratic rival who defeated him by the popular vote margin of only sixteen one-hundredths of 1 percent. He obviously respects his own judgment about foreign affairs, and comments on it without boasting.

He seems, in fact to be an extraordinarily well adjusted individual. In talking of the Cuban debacle, Nixon recalled the 3-hour session with Fidel Castro in his Senate office 2 years ago, and his immediate appraisal of the bearded Cuban leader as "a captive of communism."

With dispassion he commented that he was in the minority then, but that top officials at the State Department came around to his way of thinking in March of last year.

Nixon, who is a master in the art of timing, thinks and talks in the vernacular of the poker table. In speaking of our present day foreign policy, the Republican standard-bearer said it is important never to talk any bigger than we are prepared to act.

The biggest bluffer in a card game, he pointed out, is the one most likely to call your bluff, and Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev is a big bluffer.

The worst mistake for a poker player to make, he continued, is to throw in his hole card before it is necessary. The parallel with the abortive Cuban invasion was obvious, although he voiced no direct criticism of President Kennedy.

While the rebels were pouring into Cuban beaches, in the hope of liberating their homeland and inspiring others to defect, Kennedy and Secretary of State Dean Rusk were telling the world that the United States would not raise a finger to intervene.

This was the hole card that was turned up too soon. As a result, many Cubans were afraid to defect. By contrast, during the tense days and weeks of the Quemoy and Matsu crisis, President Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles carefully concealed the hole card. They left

doubt in the Communist mind as to what extent they would be willing to commit U.S. strength in the Formosa Straits. The Reds finally backed down.

Nixon suggested this analogy, even as he praised Kennedy for his courage in deciding to back the Cuban rebels. The mistake was in not being prepared to go all the way, if necessary to insure victory, when America's prestige had been so heavily committed.

It is out of character for Kennedy, who always plays politics to win, to settle for defeat in the much grimmer business of fighting guerrilla warfare with the Communists.

We are losing to the Reds in Cuba and Laos. We fear Communist coups in Iran and elsewhere. We have infuriated the Portuguese over Angola, and the Dutch over New Guinea. We are enmitizing old allies faster than we are creating new ones.

It is obvious that Nixon hopes Kennedy will find time, in the busy days ahead, to brush up on his poker game. He wants him to win for America.

A Policy on Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, much speculation, projection, and analysis has taken place during the last week concerning the recent Cuban fiasco and the role played by the United States.

While continued, exhaustive inquiry into the whys and wherefores of this lamentable operation is necessary, it is now time to turn our attention to the future; to determine what policy our country is to follow regarding Cuba.

The New York Times in a recent editorial has placed the problem confronting us in sharp perspective. The Times has wisely pointed out that—

The chief danger to the United States and the rest of Latin America is not Cuba by herself, but Cuba as a possible model for other revolutions, and Cuba as a base for the spread of anti-Yankee or communistic doctrines.

The Times goes on to emphasize a sound course of action which includes the defense of the security of the United States, but rightly places its emphasis on proving our support for the Latin American people's demands for social reform, and which proves that we ask partnership and cooperation, not subserviance.

I urge my colleagues to read this editorial carefully:

A POLICY ON CUBA

What next in Cuba? The Cuban exiles have been defeated militarily and the United States, which supported them, has suffered a political defeat. However, history is not like a boxing match or a baseball game. It flows like a river. The United States and Cuba are too much intertwined by history, geography, economics, and strategy to be separated. Cuba has been caught up in the vast storm of the cold war. All the forces unleashed by the Cuban revolution are still operating.

Therefore, something has to happen, and the instinct is to say; something has to be done. The first thing to recognize is that whatever is done should not be done hastily. There must be no repetition of the incredibly inefficient intelligence analysis of the Cuban situation which preceded last week's fiasco. To those who knew the situation in Cuba and knew the formidable strength of the leaders and their reigme, the outcome of such an invasion attempt was inevitable. And even had it succeeded, the CIA concept of putting in a rightwing government that would have been branded as a Yankee creation was dreadfully wrong. It is obvious that the first step must be to reorganize the personnel and methods of the Federal officials dealing with the Cuban problem today. Any policy, any action to be taken in the future must be based on an accurate assessment of the situation.

There are certain developments that would force the United States to act; and such action would be fully understood by the world at large. If the Russians, for instance, were to set up missile bases or move in with a dangerous degree of military support; if Americans were killed and the lives of the remaining Americans were jeopardized; if Premier Castro were to attack Guantanamo Bay or mount military invasions against his Caribbean neighbors—in such cases the United States would, of course, have to intervene directly, and presumably so would other members of the Organization of American States.

Barring such obviously dangerous, although unlikely, developments the United States should not intervene. Why not? The grave political consequences; the blow to the moral standards and principles by which we live and which are a source of strength in the cold war; the fact that armed intervention without the clearest provocation would reduce our policies to a crude contest in power politics; the loss of needed allies; the perilous international complications—these are the results that would flow from such armed intervention by the United States in Cuba.

Even more basic than our differences in economic system is our philosophic difference with the Communists; we believe in freedom and the rule of law among individuals and among nations. This is the essence of what America stands for in the world, and it is our greatest source of strength. We must preserve it.

The hegemony of the United States in the Western Hemisphere is threatened for the first time in a century. It can only be defended by a positive, creative policy, one that builds. Of course, we are strong enough to crush the Castro regime, but to do so by force would lose us far more than we could gain. It is hard to be patient under such provocation and defeat as we have experienced. Yet it is the mark of true strength to take both defeat and victory in one's stride.

The chief danger to the United States and the rest of Latin America is not Cuba by herself, but Cuba as a possible model for other revolutions, and Cuba as a base for the spread of anti-Yankee or communistic doctrines. How to counter the creeping subversion of the totalitarians is the great problem for the free world, as President Kennedy has recogniezd. It cannot be done by adopting their methods. That would be to surrender.

Defend the security of the United States. Continue by all legal means to encourage the anti-Batista, anti-Castro Cuban exiles in their determination to establish a free and democratic regime with social justice. They must not be abandoned.

Above all prove—by deeds not just words—that we are determined to support the demands for social reforms throughout Latin America; that we are not merely anti-Communist; that we will oppose rightwing, reactionary military dictatorships as we do leftwing, communistic dictatorships; that we ask partnership and cooperation, not subservience. This is the only kind of "intervention" that can permanently succeed in Latin America.

Forgotten Remedy for the Voteless Negro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the January 21, 1961 issue of the Nation. This excellent discussion of the 14th amendment to the Constitution is of particular importance to this body and should be of interest to us all:

FORGOTTEN REMEDY FOR THE VOTELESS NEGRO
(By Thomas I. Emerson and Arthur E. Bonfield)

In the current debate over methods of assuring the Negro in the South his right to vote, very little attention has been paid to section 2 of the 14th amendment. For many years major interest in this amendment has focused on section 1, which prohibits the States from denying to any person due process of law or equal protection of the laws. Not many people are aware that those who framed and adopted the 14th amendment viewed section 2, rather than section 1, as its most important provision.

Section 2 provides that representatives in Congress "shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed."

But (it continues) when the right to vote at any election (for Federal or State offices) is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being 21 years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens 21 years of age in such State.

In addition to section 2 an almost unknown statute, originally passed in 1872 and still on the books, contains the same requirement.

Neither the constitutional provision nor the statute has ever been successfully invoked to reduce the representation of any State in Congress. This failure to adhere to the plain language of our Constitution and law is a continuing national scandal. The matter is now of particular importance for two reasons.

In the first place, there is serious doubt that the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960, or indeed any legislation based upon judicial procedures, can effectively secure the Negro's right to vote. Thus three of the six members of the Civil Rights Commission, in the first report of that body, characterized proposals for amendment of existing laws as stopgap measures. They urged the adoption of a constitutional amendment eliminating all restrictions upon the right to vote except

age, residence and legal confinement. As will appear, this proposal seeks to accomplish by direct prohibition on the States what section 2 of the 14th amendment, if enforced, would accomplish indirectly through reduction of State representation.

Secondly, a new apportionment of House seats, based upon the 1960 census, will be made shortly now that Congress has convened. Hence the new administration will have to face squarely the question whether to enforce or continue to ignore the constitutional mandate.

An examination of the possibility of implementing section 2 of the 14th amendment would therefore seem to be in order.

In the reconstruction of the Union following the Civil War, the North was united on one question—the legal abolition of slavery. The 13th amendment, providing that "neither slavery nor involuntary servitude shall exist within the United States," was quickly ratified in 1865. On other issues there was bitter controversy.

One of these involved the political terms upon which the seceding States would be readmitted to the Union, and more particularly the relative strength of the Southern States in a reconstituted Congress. Prior to the war, southern representation in the House, under the original constitutional provision, was based upon counting a slave as three-fifths of a free person. The abolition of slavery would, therefore, result in additional southern representation in the House. The victorious North was unwilling to accept such an increase in southern power, particularly if based upon a disfranchised Negro population.

The issue of extending Federal protection to Negro voting also arose in other connections. There were many who strongly supported Federal guarantees on grounds of principle, that all citizens were entitled to the basic rights of citizenship, and as essential to giving the Negro a political base from which to achieve other civil rights. Republican politicians viewed the Negro vote as important in maintaining Republican control of the Federal Government. On the other hand, most of the Northern States did not themselves at this time extend the franchise to the Negro and the North was by no means fully committed to direct action on this issue.

The resolution of the problem was section 2, which was deemed the heart of the 14th amendment. Historians are in some disagreement as to whether the major purpose of this section was to reduce the power of the Southern States in the House or to secure, by the indirect method of reducing representation, the franchise to the Negro. Undoubtedly both considerations weighed heavily. In any event, it is entirely clear that section 2 was intended to establish, as a constitutional principle, that representation in the House should be based upon population reduced by the proportion of male citizens over 21 who were denied the franchise for reasons other than the narrow grounds specified.

The 14th amendment was ratified in 1868. Two years later, in 1870, the 15th amendment was adopted. Designed to protect the Negro's right of franchise directly, it provided that the right to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude."

Various questions as to the interpretion of section 2 have arisen, or would arise if effective implementation were attempted. The major ones will be noted briefly.

1. It has been contended that the 15th amendment, which directly prohibits a State from infringing the right to vote because of color or race, superseded and nullified the indirect penalties of reduced representation embodied in the 14th amendment.

Neither the language nor the legislative history of the later amendment supports this interpretation. The two provisions are entirely consistent, merely providing different sanctions for the same action on the part of the States. Indeed, the debate on the 14th amendment made clear that a direct prohibition would not necessarily solve the problem of indirect abridgment through property, literacy, or educational qualifications, which by their terms or by discriminatory administration effectively deny the franchise to the Negro. Subsequent history has fully vindicated the position of the framers of the 14th amendment.

2. The 19th amendment, prohibiting discrimination in voting on account of sex, has the effect of striking the word "male" from section 2 of the 14th.

3. The question of what constitutes a denial or abridgment of the right to vote is, in the main, free of ambiguity: The States may, without incurring any penalty, disqualify noncitizens, persons under 21 years of age, and persons engaged in rebellion or convicted of crime. The word "inhabitant" should probably be construed as including any bona fide resident of a State, regardless of the length of his residence. It can be argued, however, that a State residence requirement necessary for administrative purposes, say not over 6 months, ought not to be considered an abridgment of the right to vote.

All other disqualifications result in reduction of representation. These include disqualifications based upon race, color or national origin; property, literacy or educational tests; payment of poll taxes or other taxes; and the taking of loyalty oaths. They also include denial or abridgment through violence, intimidation, economic reprisal, or similar pressures.

Section 2 probably also requires a reduction in representation where the right to vote is abridged by serious malapportionment or gerrymandering of congressional election districts. This is a matter of considerable importance but involves complications we shall not attempt to unravel here.

4. Does section 2 apply where the infringement is not due to direct action of the State or State officials, but derives from the actions of private individuals or groups? This issue is of key importance. In many parts of the South the major reason for the lack of Negro voting is fear of reprisal. Indeed, it may be said that the whole system of racial discrimination in the South, especially since the Supreme Court's repudiation of the separate but equal doctrine, rests upon the use or threat of violence and economic pressure.

The argument that section 2 applies only where the right to vote is denied or abridged by direct State action is based mainly upon judicial interpretation of section 1 of the 14th amendment. The Supreme Court has consistently held that the protections of due process and equal protection in section 1 are available only as against action taken by the State. The same has been held of the 15th amendment. But this line of reasoning does not apply to section 2. In contradistinction to section 1 and the 15th amendment, section 2 is not expressly limited to State action. The fact that the other provisions are so worded, and section 2 is not, is persuasive that section 2 is intended to be applicable regardless of the source of the infringement. The whole purpose of section 2, as shown by its history, confirms this interpretation. Moreover, even if State action were required, a strong argument can be made that the State has an obligation which it cannot shirk to protect its citizens in the fundamental right to vote, and that failure to fulfill this obligation constitutes State action just as much as an affirmative abridgment by State officials.

5. Nothing in section 2 requires proof that the citizen has made an affirmative effort to register or vote. Statutory restrictions, discriminatory practices and intimidation constitute a denial or abridgement in and of themselves, whether or not any individual Negro has actually been refused the right upon demand.

6. The effect of section 2 is to reduce the representation of the State being penalized. It does not increase the number of Representatives to which other States are entitled.

7. Finally, the enforcement of section 2 results not only in reduction of representation in the House, but also in the number of Presidential electors to which the State is entitled. This follows from the fact that the Constitution grants to each State "a number of electors, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress."

Thus the implications of enforcing section 2 are far reaching. Yet all efforts to do so have thus far been unavailing. What are the chances that, under present circumstances, section 2 can now be enforced?

The Constitution does not specify what agency of government is to determine the allocation of Representatives to the States or to enforce the constitutional requirements. The procedure is now governed by legislation originally enacted in 1929. In its present form, this statute provides that within 1 week of the opening session of the Congress following the decennial census, the President shall transmit to Congress a statement showing the whole number of persons in each State (excluding Indians not taxed) as ascertained by the census, and "the number of Representatives to which each State would be entitled under an apportionment of the then existing number of Representatives by the method known as the method of equal proportions." It is then made the duty of the Clerk of the House of Representatives, within 15 days after receipt of the President's statement, to send to the executive of each State "a certificate of the number of Representatives to which such State is entitled."

Both the language and the legislative history of the statute indicate that the President's role was intended to be strictly mechanical. His function seems limited to applying the mathematical formula of "equal proportions" to the total population. While the matter deserves further consideration, the chances of section 2 being enforced through Presidential initiative seem somewhat remote.

Clearly Congress has the power to determine the apportionment of seats in the House by statute. Prior to 1929, it did so after each decennial census. Since then the matter has been governed by the general statute. Congress also could establish machinery for determining the number of disfranchised citizens in each State.

Ideally, therefore, Congress should assume the obligation of enforcing section 2 of the 14th amendment. Continued flouting of current legislative and judicial efforts to assure the right to vote may lead it to do so. Certainly advocates of civil rights should mount a fullscale effort to force Congress to honor the constitutional mandate. Yet, realistically, the prospects of immediate response are not favorable.

A third alternative lies in resort to the courts—the traditional American method of securing redress for infringement of constitutional rights. Here a number of legal obstacles must be overcome. These are mainly technical problems for the lawyers, which cannot be considered in detail in this article. But the two major problems may be briefly outlined.

The first involves the form of the lawsuit. Who should institute the action, against what officials, in what court? Two methods

of procedure hold promise of success. One is a suit, brought in the Federal District Court for the District of Columbia, to enjoin the Clerk of the House from certifying the number of Representatives to the States on any basis which did not conform to section 2 and the 1872 statute. Agents of Congress have in the past been successfully subjected to legal action. Such a proceeding should preferably be brought by a voter from a State in which the election laws and practices impose no restrictions disallowed by section 2, or by such a State itself. States suitable for the purpose include Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan and Nevada.

An action of this sort would have to be brought shortly before or after the President transmitted his statement to Congress under the 1929 law, and before the Clerk had issued his certificate. It would be available, therefore, only to rectify the initial apportionment made after the census. For present purposes, the suit would have had to be prepared and ready to file early this month.

A second procedure would be an injunction proceeding in a Federal district court instituted by a disfranchised citizen against the election officials of his State to enjoin them from holding an election for Representatives by congressional districts. This would be premised on the theory the the State was not entitled to the full number of Representatives allocated by the Clerk and therefore Representatives must be elected at large, rather than by districts.

This second procedure has the advantage that it can be brought at any time after the census has been taken and Representatives apportioned. It has the disadvantage that it would settle the issue only for the particular State involved. Separate suits would be necessary in each State where reduction of representation was sought.

Hence, it would seem that the first attempt at litigation should be by a suit against the Clerk of the House, brought as soon as possible. This could be followed by the second type of action where necessary to secure conformity with section 2 between apportionments.

The other major problem arises out of the doctrine of political questions. The court would be faced with the argument that the method of apportioning Representatives is a political matter to be decided by the legislative branch of the Government and not by the courts. In a case brought in Virginia in 1943, the lower Federal courts dismissed the proceeding on this ground, and the Supreme Court declined to review. Moreover, the Supreme Court itself has several times invoked the doctrine (over vigorous dissent) as a reason for refusing to interfere with malapportionment of congressional districts within a State.

It is impossible to review here the various considerations underlying the doctrine of political questions. Suffice it to say that powerful arguments can be urged against its application to constitutional issues of interstate apportionment, which by their very nature are not readily susceptible to solution by the legislative process. The task of persuading a majority of the Supreme Court to this view is by no means insuperable.

All these questions, and others not mentioned, make the litigation approach hazardous. But the chances of success appear sufficiently great to warrant an all-out effort to bring a court test.

This brings us to the final and perhaps the most troublesome question. How does one ascertain the number of citizens in each State whose rights are being denied or abridged within the meaning of section 2?

This problem must be solved whether enforcement of section 2 be sought through presidential, congressional or judicial action. And, realistically, success in securing enforcement depends in large measure upon formulating a fair, practical and reasonably objective technique for determining the amount of reduction.

If a legislative solution proves feasible, special machinery could be established for making the determination. Thus Congress could authorize the Bureau of the Census to gather information, or establish a legislative investigating commission (as has been suggested by Senator MCNAMARA), or delegate power to the Civil Rights Commission. On the other hand, if reliance must be placed upon Presidential or judicial action, the issue would have to be decided upon the basis of information already available.

In any event, the securing of reliable data poses a difficult problem. We suggest that the best available method, at least for present purposes, is to base the calculation upon a State-by-State comparison of the proportion of persons actually voting in each State to the total number of citizens over 21 in that State. This ratio is readily available; the number of citizens over 21 is supplied by the census, the number voting by election statistics. In any State where that proportion is below the national average it is reasonable to conclude that the disparity is largely due to denials or abridgments within the meaning of section 2.

Upon analysis, this test appears surprisingly reliable. It must be remembered that section 2 requires reduction of representation for the denial or abridgment of the voting rights of any adult citizen for any cause other than participation in rebellion or commission of crime. The former disqualification is not now relevant; and the latter would occur in only an insignificant number of cases and be relatively constant as among the different States. Residence requirements involve no great difficulty. Most States have a residence requirement of 1 year, and therefore this factor also is relatively constant. To the extent that it is desired to reduce representation on the basis of such requirements, a reasonably accurate calculation could be made from census figures.

The major difficulty, therefore, arises in attempting to take account of certain other factors which result in nonvoting but which cannot be considered a denial or abridgment. These are primarily illness, absence from the voting district on election day, and various forms of apathy. Illness and absence from the district, insofar as not rectified by absentee voting, probably do not vary much among the States. In any event, the number of votes involved would not be large enough to make a difference in result.

We are left, then, with the factor of apathy. There are obvious difficulties in attempting to ascertain the influence of this factor in any State. A reasonable approximation is all that can be expected or required.

It is not unreasonable to assume that apathy, or at least apathy unrelated to denials and abridgments, is fairly constant in the American population generally. There are, however, several methods by which a margin of safety can be allowed for possible variation from State to State. Thus, much apathy arises out of a one-party system. But this manifests itself largely in failure to vote in final elections rather than primaries. It is possible, then, to compensate for this aspect of apathy by calculating the number of voters in each State on the basis of either the final or the primary election, whichever is larger. Again, it is possible to make an arbitrary allowance for possible variations in apathy, or to calculate the national average of nonvoting in a way which makes such an allowance.

Data might be assembled showing the effect upon exercising the right to vote of income, education, population distribution and isolation, the political structure of the State, and other factors which might produce or reflect apathy. Where a correlation appeared, these factors could be taken into account. Such studies should be made. But even in their absence, the formula suggested above would seem to yield sufficiently reliable conclusions to establish a prima facie case.

Let us now consider the actual results of applying the test. By way of illustration, we take the figures on the number of citizens over 21 in each State from the 1950 census, the latest fully completed and available. Figures on the number of voters in each State are those for the 1952 Presidential election. These are chosen partly because that election was the first after the census, and partly because Eisenhower's candidacy in the South tended to offset the effects of the one-party system there. Available primary statistics indicate that, in all but two Southern States, the number voting in this election exceeded the primary vote that year.

Using the above figures, the national average of the proportion of persons actually voting to citizens over 21 is slightly over 65 percent. The ratio in the different States varies substantially. It ranges from 87 percent in Utah, to 24 percent in Alabama and Mississippi. But certain patterns emerge. The 11 Southern States are all at the bottom of the list, well below the national average. Two border States—Kentucky (57 percent), and Maryland (60 percent)—come next. Only two other States are below the national average—Arizona (62 percent), and Maine (64 percent). The others range above the average in varying degrees, but a cluster of 17 States occupies a middle bracket from 71 to 75 percent.

It will be seen from the above that, by including all the States in a general national average, the figure is substantially biased in favor of the Southern States.

The final calculation is made by reducing the representation of each State by the percentage by which that State is below the average. This calculation can be done in several ways, depending on the margin of error we wish to allow for possible variations in the apathy factor:

1. We may reduce representation only to the extent that the percentage of nonvoting in any State is 10 percent below the general national average. Thus Alabama, with a ratio of 24 percent of voters to citizens over 21, is 41 percent below the general national average, but its representation would be reduced by only 31 percent.

2. We may reduce representation by the exact percentage that any State falls below the general national average. On this basis Alabama's representation would be reduced by 41 percent. Since the general national average, as we have seen, is biased in favor of the Southern States, this method still allows for a margin of error.

3. We may reduce representation by the percentage that any State falls below the average of the 17 States which form the middle cluster. The average of these modal States is 73 percent and by this method Alabama would lose 49 percent of its Representatives.

The results in those States which would incur a reduction are set forth in the accompanying table.

The difficulties in implementing section 2 through congressional or judicial action are serious but not insurmountable. The chance of success is probably better than that of obtaining a constitutional amendment. With a new apportionment based on the 1960 census imminent, the time is now ripe for a renewed effort to make the Constitution mean what it says.

States which would lose representation if 14th amendment were enforced

State	Present number of representatives	Reduction on the basis of—		
		10 percent below general national average	General national average	Average of 17 model States
Alabama	9	3	4	4
Arkansas	6	1	2	2
Florida	8	0	1	1
Georgia	10	3	3	4
Kentucky	8	0	1	1
Louisiana [1]	8	1	2	3
Maryland	7	0	0	1
Mississippi [1]	6	2	2	3
North Carolina	12	0	1	2
Pennsylvania	30	0	0	2
South Carolina	6	2	2	3
Tennessee	9	1	2	3
Texas	22	2	4	6
Virginia	10	2	3	4
Total reductions		17	27	39

[1] Because 1952 primary statistics are not entirely reliable, no allowance has been made for higher primary voting in Louisiana and Mississippi. At most, adjustment for this factor would result in a reduction of 1 less representative in each column for those 2 States.

NOTE.—A fraction of 0.5 or over is counted as a whole number.

The Challenge of Change

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has spoken frequently and effectively for the liberal position in politics.

He has recently summarized the liberal position in an article, "The Challenge of Change," which he wrote for the Midwest Quarterly, a journal of contemporary thought published by Kansas State College, of Pittsburg, Kans. I ask unanimous consent that this article, appearing in the April 1961 issue, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF CHANGE

(By Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota)

Liberalism is not a doctrine, a dogma or a distinct philosophy. It is rather an attitude—and open approach to life and society characterized by flexibility and adaptability.

The American liberal cannot offer a precise definition of his political attitude. Indeed, he shuns the oversimplifications and catch phrases which are used so often to describe liberalism. He seeks to express his views clearly and eloquently, but he is at a disadvantage. He knows that any rigid statement on liberalism could be rendered obsolete in a short time by the fast sweep of world events.

The key word which may be applied to the liberal viewpoint is "change." The liberal understands that life is not static, that anything—from a plant to a government—must change, or it will die. He knows that a mind, or a nation, cannot endure as an active, productive instrument if it is guided by the status quo and allowed to slip into stagnation.

The liberal welcomes change. He seeks change not for its own sake, but as an inevitable force of life which must be captured and channeled toward the right direction. He is thus willing to experiment, to try the untested, to develop the new, to dare the impossible.

The liberal's willingness—yes, eagerness—for change is not just a restless yearning for activity. His goals are clear; his ideals are strong. He is not afraid to pursue them with all his energy.

The liberal American seeks a world of peace, dignity, security, and freedom for every individual. He pursues the goal of a world in which each human being enjoys full freedom to live and work as his conscience and talent direct him.

This full freedom means far more than the absence of political restraints. It means a democratic society and a minimum of control by government, of course. But full freedom is not just freedom from political or social interference in the lives of individuals.

Full freedom for an individual to pursue and achieve his potential means freedom from the basic and ancient enemies of mankind—hunger, poverty, disease, illiteracy, ignorance.

The liberal fully understands that a man is not really free if he is hungry. That man is a slave; his chains are as strong and confining as if they were made of steel. He cannot work, he cannot produce, he cannot create. His progress is checked, and he becomes the target of the agents of totalitarianism.

The same chains bind the man who is impoverished, or sick, or illiterate, or ignorant. In this modern world, this scientific age, tens of millions of men are so bound. Two-thirds of the world's peoples are undernourished today. Three-fourths of all human beings are illiterate.

The liberal does not ignore these facts. He looks beyond the comfort, security, and relative luxury of his own surroundings and is deeply concerned with the plight of his brothers.

This is one key element, I believe in the character of the American liberal. He does not detach himself from the basic problems of mankind, even though he is not directly affected by those problems. He is guided, I believe, by an instinct of humanitarianism and a sense of compassion. Other men who reject the label "liberal" may be humanitarian and compassionate. But the liberal's concern for others is deep, enduring, and personal.

The liberal does not examine the plight of masses of men elsewhere, throw up his hands in defeat, and say: "It's too big a problem. I and my country cannot solve the problems of hunger, poverty, and illiteracy everywhere." The liberal knows the problems of mankind are massive, but he is determined to seek solutions, to work for the progress of all men, and to sacrifice some of his own comforts to save the lives and minds of others. The liberal feels responsible.

He also has faith that no problem is too big or overwhelming. He sees the hunger of millions not as a problem, but as a challenge. And he sees the surplus of food in America not as a problem, but as an opportunity—an opportunity to utilize this Nation's agricultural abundance to feed the hungry of the world and move mankind a big step closer to full freedom.

The liberal is also a realist. He has faced the facts of human need and is well aware of the difficulties of meeting those needs. But he is determined to work toward his goals. He understands that a world of full freedom may not be secured in his lifetime, but he knows that unless he works for such a world, it will never become reality. The world, he says, cannot and will not stand still. If mankind does not progress toward its noblest goals, it will slide back further away from them.

A food for peace program, or any program developed by the United States, can and must stem from the hearts and the will of the American people. And, by necessity, it must be administered through their government. Every American shares a belief in representative government by law, but the conservative tends to believe that government should do as little as possible, that it should have little authority and responsibility.

The liberal believes that for a successful democracy, government initiative is fully as necessary as private enterprise—for a food for peace program or any other national effort. He believes that primarily through the vigorous use of the mechanics of government can we muster our resources with sufficient strength, speed, and purpose to survive as a free nation threatened by totalitarianism.

To many conservatives, "planning" becomes an unpleasant word when it is applied to any effort outside the household or corporation. But the liberal knows that purpose and planning are absolute essentials of public policy, as well as of private enterprise. He is convinced that if we are not willing to shape history ourselves, others will shape it for us.

The liberal believes that government is not in competition with any group in the Nation, that it is not just another special force within our society. He believes that our Government is the noble extension and voice of the whole American society. Thus, planning in our democracy is a creative act which must draw on the intelligence and skills of the Nation as a whole, and not simply on the bureaucracy of the Federal Government.

The liberal today is often criticized for advocating what conservatives label a "welfare state." I think it is useful to examine two quotations which help define the welfare state concept:

"The scheme of society for which we stand is the establishment and maintenance of a basic standard of life and labor below which a man or woman, however old or weak, shall not be allowed to fall. The food they receive, the prices they have to pay for basic necessities, the homes they live in, their employment must be the first care of the state, and must have priority over all other peacetime needs."

"I believe that the American people feel that our production is so great that we can afford to put a floor under the necessities of life—food, education, medical care, housing—so that every family may have available a minimum decent living."

The first quotation is from Winston Churchill. This second was spoken by the late Senator Robert A. Taft.

Planning—for a minimum decent living—does not mean dictation in a free society. It means cooperation and coordination. The liberal does not want big brother dictating what people must do. But the liberal argues that the challenges facing America can never be met without the vigorous participation of the Federal Government.

Today's liberal believes that conservative government cannot cope with the restless, endlessly changing world of the 20th century. In the field of foreign policy, the liberal accepts the fact that Government action dominates the international scene.

The liberal identifies with the need for leadership in a world of turmoil, conflict, and danger. He is willing to act as a leader, and to see his nation stand as the leader of the free world. He sees challenge and opportunity throughout the world, and moves to seize the initiative. The liberal has worked for and won progress in international organiza-

tions, more technical assistance, and more economic aid for the underdeveloped nations.

He does not rest on specific victory. He is forever seeking improvement and forever working for progress. He never takes his eye off the goal of a nation and world of prosperity, of peace, of brotherhood. Above all, the liberal recognizes that the means of achieving that goal must preserve the dignity, the freedom, and the self-respect of man, of the individual citizen.

Others who call themselves liberal may disagree with some of my comments, or place different emphasis on some elements of the liberal attitude. This is to be expected. President Franklin D. Roosevelt was asked once why liberals were so often divided, and conservatives generally united. He answered:

"There are many ways of going forward, but there is only one way of standing still."

Professors and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, those who read Mr. James Reston's article in the New York Times, will be especially interested in this practical editorial reply, which appeared recently in the New York Herald Tribune:

NO MORATORIUM, MR. RESTON

A moratorium on sniping at the professors might not be a bad idea, for if this brilliant young crowd falls, we might have to tolerate not only defeat but a spasm of anti-intellectualism as well.

This surprising suggestion was made by Mr. James Reston of the New York Times in concluding a column noting the sorrow of the Harvard hands who failed at their first great test as architects and engineers of foreign policy.

No one wishes to salt the wounds. None of us can escape sympathy for these "highly intelligent and sensitive men," as Mr. Reston calls them, who counseled the President on Cuba. This Nation has an obligation to understand the peril and support the President. Crisis has underscored the urgency of restraint and responsibility. We are all in this together.

But there is no need to impose on ourselves a holiday from public discussion and constructive public criticism of the conduct of government. While urging caution in the realm of national security, the President articulated an essential democratic truth at the publishers' convention:

"Without debate, without criticism, no administration can succeed—and no republic can survive."

Mr. Kennedy is surrounded by some highly intelligent scholars who, like the President himself, rode to power partly on the momentum of persistent criticism of past policies. We pray for their success, as does Mr. Reston. But we cannot see the logic of special immunities in an hour of error or misjudgment on the grounds that they are sensitive professors and not hardened practitioners of the art of politics. They are influential counselors of government, and should be treated as such.

If to hold them rigidly accountable (or "snipe" at them) would bring on a spasm of anti-intellectualism, then there must be something wrong with intellectualism in government. At best this would be a flimsy excuse to check debate.

Only by continuing the discussion, with maturity, balance and the public interest foremost, can we take out insurance against future tragedy.

There must be no moratorium (even if we accepted the curious argument about the spawning of anti-intellectualism), and we are amazed that an experienced newsman would put such an idea in print.

Pioneer California Defense Firm Celebrates 25th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement calling attention to the record of achievement of a defense firm located in the State of California.

The story of the Garrett Corp., of Los Angeles, which is this week celebrating its silver anniversary after 25 years in business is of significance because it illustrates the kind of pioneering in the fields of aircraft, missiles, and space which has taken place in California and today explains why so much of our national defense production is being done in the State of California.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Founded on May 21, 1936, with a handful of personnel headed by J. C. Garrett, who is still president, the organization today is composed of 8 divisions and 2 subsidiaries, employing 10,000 people in operations which span the world.

Originally formed to provide procurement and engineering services for the embryonic west coast aircraft industry, the company since then has become the leading developer and manufacturer of environmental control systems for aircraft, missiles, and space ships. Practically every American-built transport airplane and a preponderance of military planes now carry Garrett pressurization and air-conditioning equipment, plus numerous other components. The company's sales last year totaled $223,825,000 compared with $284,832 the year it started.

By very nature of its work in a business which had never existed before the company's establishment, it has made a long list of notable contributions to the science of aeronautics, and is currently well into a number of nuclear and solar space power projects. In addition, it has become an important economic asset both locally and nationally with highly substantial annual disbursements to about 3,500 to 4,000 small business and other firms from California to New England. It's payroll last year totaled $86,800,000.

The Garrett Corp. supplied the world's first successful environmental control system for a production aircraft when it pressurized and air-conditioned the historic Boeing B–29 bomber, without which its long over-water flights to raid Japan would have been impossible. The B–29 set a pattern for the Nation's postwar transports all of which henceforth were to be built for pressurization with Garrett the predominant supplier of equipment.

Garrett's capabilities in this field have continued to be recognized on up through the development of the jet transport and currently with its most advanced assignment, the air conditioning and pressurization of Project Mercury's earth-orbiting manned satellite.

In addition to its primary role in the area of environmental controls which are built by its two air research manufacturing divisions in Los Angeles and Phoenix, the Garrett Corp. also operates in several other directions.

Its air research industrial division is the leading manufacturer of power-boosting turbochargers for diesel engines. Its air cruisers division in Belmar, N.J., manufactures inflatable rubberized survival equipment including life rafts, aircraft escape slides, life preservers, and related products.

Garrett's air research aviation service division, at Los Angeles International Airport, is in the business of modification and maintenance of business and private aircraft. Three other divisions in the industrial and aircraft supply field include Garrett Supply, the original Garrett company; Airsupply-Aero Engineering Co., and Marwedel in San Francisco. Foreign operations are carried on by Garrett International, S.A., a subsidiary located in Geneva, Switzerland, and Garrett Manufacturing Ltd. in Toronto, Canada; and Garrett (Japan) Ltd. in Tokyo.

The company continues to expand its manufacturing facilities. It's air research division in Los Angeles this year opened a new 235,000-square-foot manufacturing facility in Torrance, Calif., on 66 acres. In Phoenix an additional 60,000-square-foot office-factory building was acquired on 24 acres adjacent to the air research division of Arizona. It was the second large plant acquisition at Phoenix in 2 years.

National Radio Month

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARLETON J. KING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, the month of May has been designated National Radio Month, and I feel it is appropriate on this occasion to consider the significant place radio has in our daily lives. As an indication of the industry's tremendous success, in 1960 radio ownership in the United States reached the record figure of 146 million sets, or 3 per family, with an additional 10 million sets in public places.

The radio has played an important role in the educational, business, philanthropic, and entertainment lives of our people. It serves as an integral part of our national defense system; as a crusader for civic betterment, and as an informational media to practically all of our citizens. The thousands of men and women employed as managers, announcers, newsmen, writers, salesmen, and technicians have made a major contribution toward the growth of the radio industry as well as the Nation's economy.

To symbolize National Radio Month, the National Association of Broadcasters has chosen as its theme "Radio: The Best Sound Around." In my opinion, this brief motto modestly conveys the high

fidelity in which the radio industry has fulfilled its responsibilities toward a better informed nation.

I wish to extend my heartiest congratulations and best wishes to all those skilled and devoted people in the radio industry on this splendid occasion.

The Art of Gentle Robbery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I wish to insert in the appendix of the RECORD the following editorial from a recent issue of the Chicago Tribune:

President Kennedy's tax message contains the same basic contradiction which has marked his program from the beginning: He wants to stimulate the business investment which is necessary to production and employment, but he wants to penalize those who provide this investment.

The repeal of the dividend credit and exemption would withdraw what small protection the investor now has against double taxation on the proceeds of his investment. They are taxed once as corporate profits, at the rate of 52 percent, and again when he receives them as dividends, at the rate which applies to his income bracket. It would be fairer, more effective in stimulating investment, and more in line with the practice in other industrial countries to extend this credit instead of seeking to eliminate it.

As for the proposal to slap a 20 percent withholding tax on all payments of dividends and interest, the only justifiable purpose is to smoke out tax evaders. But the withholding tax would apply to all payments, whether or not the recipient owed the tax. It is misleading of Mr. Kenendy to compare this to the withholding tax on wages and salaries, which, he says, has served us well. Nearly all wage earners file tax returns and pay taxes. The claiming of a refund is simply part of a job which has to be done anyway.

Dividends and interest payments, on the contrary, are received by millions of people who neither file tax returns nor owe any taxes. Among these are widows, pensioners, and small children. If a child earns $5 a year in interest on money saved through baby-sitting and odd jobs, $1 of it will be appropriated by the Government.

Don't worry, we are told, the child can apply for a refund. But who is going to perform the necessary paperwork to get back $1? Unless a substantial amount is involved, the money will be as good as stolen—and by the Government, at that.

Even if the recipient does apply for a refund, it will be slow in coming, and meanwhile he will be out the amount involved. The paperwork which this will cause will be enormous, and the amounts relatively small. Many potential investors will decide to put their money to other uses.

Congress would do well to think at least twice about the morality of a measure which, in effect, legalizes robbery on the part of the Government and teaches us that we are all considered guilty of cheating on our taxes unless we go to the trouble of proving ourselves innocent.

Kennedy Program Moves Toward Impoverished Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to insert an address delivered by Louis A. Rozzoni, president of the California Farm Bureau Federation, before the Commonwealth Club of California on April 14, 1961.

It is, in my opinion, a most apt and timely discussion of the continuing problems in connection with the farm program, currently again under consideration.

The address follows:

[From the Commonwealth, Apr. 24, 1961]

CALIFORNIA FARM BUREAU PRESIDENT LOUIS A. ROZZONI SAYS KENNEDY PROGRAM MOVES TOWARD IMPOVERISHED AGRICULTURE

Our farm problem is caused by a technological revolution in high production which started during World War I, and still is under way. Today, through increased yields and reduced input of manpower, each farmer produces food and fiber for 25 people. Before World War I it was seven people.

Higher taxes, higher interest, higher labor and equipment costs, have lowered net farm income.

For over 30 years, Government has tried to control the so-called basic commodities, beginning with wheat, and to this day wheat is our most serious problem.

For years Government programs have failed to distinguish between the commercial farms—which produce 90 percent of total output, earn the major portion of net income, and hold most of the proprietary assets—and the noncommercial holdings, many of which are little more than farm-living units.

COMMODITIES IN TROUBLE ARE THE CONTROLLED

Failure to make this distinction is largely responsible for failure to correct surplus crop production.

The farm commodities in trouble are those under close government control and subsidy.

In 1959, the total number of farms was 3,900,000 compared to 5,382,000 in 1950. This 10-year decrease of 27 percent occurred exclusively in submarginal farms—those selling less than $2,500 worth of farm products per year.

This gradual reduction in number of submarginal farms, which started two centuries ago, has helped the net income of those who left agriculture and of those remaining.

Valued in constant dollars, assets per farm advanced 82 percent between 1940 and 1960. Assets per farmworker doubled during the 20 years. Valued in 1960 dollars, farm assets per farmworker in 1960 averaged $21,300, considerably more than the average investment of $15,900 per employee in manufacturing in the same year.

BRANNAN PLAN, POAGE BILL "WARMED OVER"

The proposed Agricultural Enabling Act of 1961 is a warmed-over version of the Brannan plan for compensatory payments, and the Poage bill of 1960, both overwhelmingly rejected by past Congresses. The President's message gives no cost estimate and offers no proposals for specific commodities.

His plan would transfer the initiative in formulating farm policy from Congress to the Secretary of Agriculture working with producer-elected committees. Executive decisions would be submitted to producers by referendum and would be subject to congressional veto.

Mr. Kennedy emphasized the need for a commodity-by-commodity approach. The four basic changes proposed are:

1. Expand use of marketing orders to any commodity on a national or broad regional basis.

2. Allow marketing quotas to be applied to any commodity (if voted by producers) in terms of pounds, bushels, etc. Such quotas to be imposed separately or in combination with acreage limitations set by the Government.

3. Permit plans to tailor production to domestic and international demand by land retirement payments, price-support loans, Government purchases, diversion programs, production incentive payments, production controls and quotas and allotments, and export subsidies.

4. Authorize national advisory committees for each commodity and provide expenses. Advisory committee farm plans, subject to Secretary of Agriculture approval, would go to farmer referendum and would be submitted to Congress 60 days before going into effect. If Congress takes no action in the 60-day period, the plans would go into effect. (Referendums would require approval by two-thirds of the producers voting.)

CAN'T APPLY MARKETING ORDERS BROADSIDE

Marketing orders are devices by law to enable an industry group to influence the flow, quantity, or quality of a particular commodity moving to market. They work with reasonable success when applied to crops of limited production in restricted areas.

However, this same principle cannot be successfully applied to widely produced crops in varying production areas. No common denominator is equitable in all circumstances.

The proposal to set up marketing quotas by pounds or bushels is more direct control over what is marketed than acreage controls. It moves in the direction of an impoverished agriculture.

Perhaps the third proposal, to provide the full gambit of Government controls over production and the old idea of direct payments for compliance, is the most controversial. This brings up once again the Brannan plan and last year's Poage bill, overwhelmingly rejected.

WOULD MAKE FARM PRODUCTS VULNERABLE

This proposal contemplates programs to fix farm prices and control production on a commodity-by-commodity basis. Under strict production controls:

(a) Farm products would become vulnerable to increased competition from synthetics and other substitutes.

(b) Exports would become completely dependent on Government assistance.

(c) Resources displaced by individual commodity programs would soon force extension of controls to additional commodities until all are covered.

(d) Any resulting improvement in farm prices would soon be capitalized into the prices for farmland or marketing certificates.

Many people suspect that the administration plans to use the Agricultural Stabilization Committee machinery to select commodity committee members so that the Secretary of Agriculture will control the committee recommendations.

The commodity-by-commodity approach (let the farmers decide) sounds good. Who knows more about the problem?

But a quick second look discovers the fatal flaw: Would the farmer be really deciding for his own commodity, or for 250 and more commercially grown commodities? Can one commodity be isolated?

WHY CAN'T LABOR, BUSINESS DO LIKEWISE?

And if a farmer can write his own program, why can't the labor unions get the Secretary of Labor to do the same? Why can't the Secretary of Commerce do the same for industries?

Each commodity program would be unrelated to the others. This approach has already been proved wrong. Farmers take land made idle by controlled crops and put it in crops free from controls—thus helping to get themselves in trouble.

Even more critical is the danger of farmers being more easily regimented.

The President's farm program asks Congress to abdicate its responsibility. If Congress can give away its ability to legislate, then the very structure of constitutional government is in danger.

NEED NOT REPEAT MISTAKES

We need not repeat the mistakes of the past. We need not accept the theories of production and marketing controls as a solution to the farm problem. Farmers do have other choices.

We who have followed futile efforts to regulate production through political means have concluded that economic relations must be left to the automatic self-adjustment—imperfect though it may be—of supply and demand.

We in Farm Bureau have studied the effects of past legislation for years. A bill has been introduced to get at the heart of the farm problem by seeking correction of the causes for surplus wheat and feed grains. This bill (S. 1246) provides for—

1. A voluntary acreage retirement program for producers of all crops.

2. Retirement of a percentage of a farmer's total cropland as a condition of eligibility for price support on wheat, corn, grain, sorghum, rye, oats, barley, soybeans, and flax.

3. Adjustment payments in cash or in kind.

4. A national support level for wheat and corn.

We strongly believe it is time to simplify and reduce Federal farm controls rather than further complicate the present confused and ineffective programs with their excessive costs.

A big sales pitch is going to be made to sell the program to the farmers and to Congress. Farmers should not act hastily in response to emotional appeals or to salesmanship of agricultural stabilization and conservation committees.

Congress must reduce rather than increase the exemption from competition if we are to keep independent energy alive.

We are faced with the spectacle of a nation sincerely seeking democracy and economic justice through means which it fails to recognize as destructive of both.

Answers to written questions from floor:

Question by Milton L. Levy. Why can't we give our surpluses away?

Answer. Programs handled this way have raised more problems than they have solved in U.S. foreign relationships.

Question. Is there any one Government farm program that has ever worked anywhere in the long run?

Answer. I have not seen one. We look on the Government as a cow—something to milk but not to feed.

Question by J. A. Halliday. Can you tell us some reasons for large difference in prices farmers receive and charges by retail stores?

Answer. Look at what people want. We want the right kind of commodity, processed and packaged in a certain way, and it all costs money.

Question by Bedford Boyes. How can Federal farm aid help the marginal farmers, or must they go out of business?

Answer. We certainly have to provide a place for them, either at a properly efficient level of agriculture or help them go into other lines. Where is today the harnessmaker? The buggymaker? They served society well, but society changed its wants.

Question by R. McKenzie. Are the Kennedy programs more dangerous than those proposed by Wallace?

Answer. The Kennedy programs are made with the best intentions, I hope, but the President knows nothing about agriculture.

Forty Years of Service to God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include an editorial congratulating His Eminence, Richard Cardinal Cushing, on the occasion of his 40th anniversary of ordination to the holy priesthood. The editorial appeared in the Lawrence (Mass.) Sunday Sun on April 30, 1961:

FORTY YEARS OF SERVICE TO GOD

Congratulations to his Eminence, Richard Cardinal Cushing, who will celebrate his 40th anniversary of his ordination as a priest on Thursday, May 25.

Regardless of creed, people of Greater Lawrence greatly esteem and revere this great leader of the Catholic church in the archdiocese of Boston, for the innumerable works of charity and Christian brotherhood he has either led or been prominently and actively identified with in this State. As enduring monuments that will testify for generations to his marvelous accomplishments are new hospitals, new homes for the aged and infirm, new institutions for crippled and retarded children, better facilities for newborn babies and children; in fact there is not one age group that has been overlooked in his desire to provide the very best in medical, nursing, and professional care for all, and especially to provide for the poor and unfortunate brethren.

In Greater Lawrence we are all aware of his incomparable contribution in bringing about the construction of the Bon Secours Hospital, considered one of the finest in the country. Well known too is his aid to the great expansion of Merrimack College and St. Joseph's Church, his moral and financial support to Central Catholic High School, his participation in drives to build a new St. Mary's Convent, and his initiative in bringing new religious groups and orders to Methuen and Andover.

There isn't any large community in the archdiocese where his magic influence for new and improved hospitals, schools, and churches, and other institutions has not been felt.

His reputation for such marvelous accomplishments is known in Catholic circles all over the Nation, for his record is outstanding. The best wishes of the residents of Greater Lawrence are herewith extended to the Cardinal. May he be blessed by the Almighty with good health to carry on his Christian and charitable works for a long, long time.

James Fair, Jr., Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, nearly 1 year ago, James Fair, Jr., a resident of my disritct was arrested, charged with murder, tried without jury or defense counsel, and sentenced to death in Blakely, Ga., within a period of 3 days. This matter was brought to the attention of the Jersey Journal, a daily newspaper published in Jersey City, N.J., by the Bayonne Branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Mr. Eugene Farrell, editor of the Jersey Journal, immediately contacted me and urged that I intervene with Georgia authorities for the purpose of obtaining a full review of the speedy proceedings. I promptly went to Georgia where I conferred with Governor Vandiver, who thereupon caused a full review of the case and delayed execution.

The perceptive, honest, and completely objective reporting of the matter by the Jersey Journal focused public interest on the case. The Fair case was appealed to the Georgia Supreme Court which recently ordered a retrial.

This is an example of splendid and courageous public service by a very fine newspaper. I ask to have included in the RECORD the following article from the Jersey Journal which sets forth the part played not only by that newspaper but the others who sought a fair trial and full rights for Mr. Fair:

TWO LAWYERS ON CASE—RETRIAL FOR JAMES FAIR EXPECTED IN MID-JULY

(By Don Marshall)

James Fair, Jr., the 24-year-old Bayonne Negro whose death conviction was upset by the Georgia Supreme Court is not expected to get his new trial until mid-July, one of his lawyers said today.

The lawyer, C. B. King of Albany, Ga., explained that the Early County Superior Court, which is under the jurisdiction of the Pataula Judicial Circuit Court convenes twice each year under the terms of the circuit court.

The court regularly convenes starting on the third Monday in January and on the third Monday in July, King said.

"In the absence of legislation permitting a trial date to be set outside those two terms, it appears Fair will be tried in July," the Albany lawyer explained.

King added that it might be possible for the circuit court to convene in Early County for an "additional term" for the Fair trial if it considered the trial as a "recessed term" of the original or January term.

In a report Thursday, regarding the Georgia court's decision, it was erroneously reported that the series of Fair appeals in the courts were launched by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

The legal fight for a new trial for Fair was headed by Attorney Nathan Pearlman of 921 Bergen Avenue, Jersey City, who engaged the two Georgia lawyers, Donald L. Hollowell of Atlanta, Ga., and C. B. King, of Albany, Ga., to handle the defense in that stage.

Funds for the court battle were not provided by the NAACP but through two local

rallies for the James Fair Defense Fund and by the "Big Joe's Happiness Exchange," a radio program.

Fair was arrested, indicted, tried, convicted, and sentenced within 2 days in the Early County court in Blakely, the small town where he was charged with the murder of an 8-year-old Negro girl.

Fair's mother, Mrs. Alice Fair of 17 East 49th Street, and his lawyers, claim Fair was forced by the late Sheriff Sid Howell into admitting the rape-slaying of the little girl.

The defense also claims there is no written record of Fair's confession.

The defense claim that Fair's constitutional rights were violated because he was tried without jury and without a lawyer was upheld by the Georgia Supreme Court, whose seven members last Thursday unanimously upset the lower court's verdict on constitutional grounds.

The high court's decision is "much more sweeping and comprehensive" than any decision it has ever made, King believes.

"It amplifies Georgia law regarding constitutional rights to embrace the position taken by the Federal courts in regard to the rights of counsel for an accused person even when he is arraigned," said King.

ELEVEN-MONTH FIGHT WON NEW TRIAL FOR FAIR

(By Don Marshall)

James Fair, Jr., who was sentenced to death in Georgia last May 17, would not be alive today if not for the Jersey Journal's interest in assuring a proper trial, his family and friends in Bayonne, as well as many others, agree today.

"It's wonderful—all that you did to save my son's life," said Mrs. Alice Fair.

"May God reward you for your fight against such an injustice. Without your help Jimmy would have died in the electric chair many months ago."

For this paper's leading role in the case, the Bayonne branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, expressed its gratitude to Eugene Farrell, editor of the Jersey Journal, this way:

"Once again we can feel proud of the American way of life. On behalf of the Bayonne branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, we wish to sincerely thank you for a job well done with your journalism on the James Fair, Jr., case," the unit said in a letter signed by R. St. Clair Jackson, president, and Mrs. Dorothy Adams, secretary.

"We are assured that your sense of fair play and justice for all in the way you wrote day by day of the Fairs and the proceedings in the case helped in no small measure in securing for this boy a new trial.

"We are especially grateful to Don Marshall for his understanding and excellent work.

"May God bless you."

It was on May 25, 1960, that the Jersey Journal first broke the story that James Fair, Jr., had been sentenced to death on May 17 in Blakely, Ga., after reportedly admitting the rape-murder of 8-year-old Yvonne Holmes, also a Negro.

The newspaper was told of Fair's plight by Jackson, the local National Association for the Advancement of Colored People head.

A quick check with Bayonne Police Chief Cornelius J. Carroll showed his department had not been informed of the arrest by Georgia and that Fair had no local police record.

Another check with Sheriff Sid Howell in Blakely confirmed the report. Fair was arrested on Sunday and on Tuesday was indicted, tried, without a jury or lawyer, convicted and sentenced to die on June 17.

Disturbed by the speedy court proceedings, and what appeared to be a violation of the Bayonne Negro's constitutional rights. The Jersey Journal immediately threw its full support for an impartial review.

At no time did this paper express any opinion as to Fair's innocence or guilt. At all times the papers' campaign emphasized that its sole interest was in the constitutional right of a fellow American to a trial by jury with his own lawyer to plead his case.

While the presses of the Jersey Journal were rolling out the story of the Fair case that first day, Editor Farrell was talking to Rep. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER who then interceded with Georgia's Governor Ernest Vandiver.

At Gallagher's request, Vandiver the next day ordered an inquiry into the circuumstances of the conviction.

On May 26, the Jersey Journal's first Fair editorial asked:

"How can Georgia execute a man in less time than it takes defense counsel to study a case in our State?"

In that same issue, the Jersey Journal started the James Fair Defense Fund to be administered by the Bayonne National Association of Advanced Colored People, to help correct the injustice "to a neighbor."

With this paper's support, the James Fair Defense Fund had already been pledged $1,300 4 days later.

In June, the Jersey Journal asked Marine Lt. John Russell of Jersey City, then stationed in Albany, Ga., near Blakely to talk to Fair at the Early County jail.

We ran Russell's report on June 13 in which he said Fair waived a jury trial and court-appointed lawyer because he was "scared and I didn't fully understand what it was going to mean."

As Fair's attorneys began the legal processes to defend their client, in June Representative GALLAGHER informed the Jersey Journal he had received a "last minute" telephone call the day before Fair's scheduled execution and was told that a 60-day stay had been granted by Governor Vandiver.

In June this reporter was one of the speakers who addressed a Bayonne National Association for the Advancement of Colored People rally to raise funds for the defense. He described the Jersey Journal's interest in the case and promised to help continue the fight for a new trial.

In the 11 months since Fair's arrest and conviction, the Jersey Journal did not let up in its fight for justice for the Bayonne Negro, a Navy veteran and former Golden Gloves contender.

Since the first story in May this paper has run 60 stories on the case up to Saturday.

In addition, 10 editorials were published, all of them urging an act with calmness and tolerance.

At no time was the accused's guilt or innocence discussed—only Fair's constitutional rights.

More than 100 long-distance telephone calls were made to Georgia and other points by this reporter in seeking information on the case.

By telephone, this reporter kept in constant touch with the defense lawyers, Donald L. Hollowell in Atlanta, C. B. King in Albany, as well as with Nat Pearlman in Jersey City.

A large majority of the stories on Fair reported here were exclusive reports from key persons in the case whose viewpoints were all objectively reported.

In September, after 5 weeks of exhaustive detective work in and around Newark, this reporter tracked down Early Gilbert, whom Fair's lawyers had been seeking as a witness.

Gilbert, who was in Blakely with Fair at the time of the arrest and trial, astounded readers by declaring the Bayonne man could not have raped and killed little Yvonne.

He said he'd go to hell and back to prove it if given the chance. Gilbert said the Blakely police needed a goat and picked on Fair because he was a Negro from the North, and apparently a homeless drifter.

That view was confirmed by a number of persons in Blakely, white and Negro, to whom this reporter spoke by long-distance telephone.

All agreed anti-Negro prejudice played a major part in Fair's arrest and conviction.

"That rascal ought to burn as quick as he can," asserted the editor of a Blakely paper to this reporter.

It was the same editor who blasted this reporter by name in his paper as "one of the world's worst liars," and calling Fair supporters here "scalawag whites."

On October 10 the Jersey Journal broke exclusively the story of the heart attack death of Sheriff Sid Howell, who never produced a written confession from Fair.

On October 19, this paper told how the clerk of the Early County Court expressed prejudicial sentiment by saying, "I've got nothing to say to any reporters from any northern paper. You're not all writing the truth."

This paper has reported both sides of the Fair case with consistent objectivity.

When Mrs. Fair praised the warden of the Reidsville State Prison where her son awaited the electric chair, for his kind treatment, it was reported here that way.

All this was the manner in which the Jersey Journal stood up for justice for a man it had never met, had never heard of before last May.

THE JAMES FAIR CASE—IMPORTANT PRECEDENT

It is nearly a year since the Jersey Journal first told the story of James Fair, the young Bayonne Negro who had been sentenced to death in Georgia. At that time Fair had less than 5 weeks to live. Now, thanks to the campaign inaugurated then by the newspaper (in which we were joined later by many others) Fair will have a new trial—actually his first trial.

James Fair was sentenced to death in a proceeding involving just four people: himself, the sheriff who convinced him to plead guilty to murder, the court clerk, and the judge who sentenced him to die. There was no lawyer for his defense; the record shows he waived counsel. There was no jury. It was all proper under Georgia's law.

This newspaper did not think it proper, however, nad raised a protest. It argued that James Fair at home would not have been allowed to waive counsel, or plead guilty to a capital crime, or be convicted of murder without a jury. It argued that in spite of the legality, the proceeding did not satisfy James Fair's neighbors that he had been proved guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. At no time in the 11 months since has anyone argued that James Fair should not be punished, if guilty; the argument has been for a trial in the sense generally understood.

What may seem startling in the North where it always seems so easy to assume that no one in the South takes such things into consideration, this argument found great sympathy in Georgia's Governor Vandiver, after a plea by Congressman GALLAGHER, gave Fair a stay to provide time for him to appeal. The judge who sentenced him cooperated by keeping the way clear for the appeal. The Georgia Supreme Court heard the case and decided that no man should be sent to death by a proceeding of that form.

So, the fight for a complete trial for James Fair has brought a decision which should mean that never again can an accused person be sent to death in Georgia merely on his own admission and with no further exploration of defense.

What gives the decision an extra quality is that it is Georgia's own, reached by Georgians after an appeal to their sense of

what is right. On several occasions, while the outcome of its campaign for Fair still was in doubt, the Jersey Journal commended the attitude of the Georgia authorities. In the celebration over the decision which gives Fair his trial, this other basic point should not be overlooked: Georgia has reflected great credit upon itself by its action.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Newsletter of April 29, 1961:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

APRIL 29, 1961.

The Inter-American Social and Economic Cooperation program and the Chilean reconstruction and rehabilitation program involved $600 million in foreign aid and passed 350 to 82. Three hundred ninety-four million dollars go to the recently established Inter-American Development Bank for the creation of a revolving loan fund; $6 million to the Economic and Social Council of the Organization of American States (OAS); $100 million to the International Cooperation Administration (ICA) for health and education grants; and $100 million to Chile for earthquake damage. Five hundred million dollars came under attack (all except Chile aid) for these reasons, as stated in the debate:

(1) The administration refused to justify the need for the money, although the Foreign Affairs Committee had stipulated the delienation of detailed projects must precede any appropriation; (2) it was even contended that the end justifies the means (help South American countries, though no description of how or why the money is given); (3) we have been too quick and too free in giving away the wealth of America, and the time has come for reevaluation and substantial reduction; (4) State Department bureaucrats in foreign aid are arrogant, uninformed about the program, and inclined to hold the American public and the Congress in contempt; (5) by backdoor spending in foreign aid in this bill (i.e. spending without specific control by Congress), control of foreign aid programs will be lost; (6) we are without facts as to what projects will be started and what the ultimate cost will be. If we should take too many exceptions of this type, we would destroy our very form of government; (7) we have already given South American nations $6 billion in the last 12 years; these, and others.

Every citizen should be appalled, it seems to me, that the administration is demanding that Congress give up its traditional scrutiny of appropriations of money. Further, these programs will subsidize nations not sympathetic to us, indeed, who, in a showdown, will be sympathetic to Castro.

The aid to depressed areas conference report brought to the House a clear-cut issue—Should House Members permit the Senate to stipulate that this new experimental program should be taken out from under House Appropriations Committee scrutiny, getting money without yearly appropriations? It came as a shock to many Members to learn that the Chief Executive had done an about-face demanding this new type financing in the Senate-House conference eliminating House Members from the traditional guarding of the purse strings. A spirited debate resulted in a close vote in which loose fiscal policy supported by the administration won.

Public Law 480, a bill to permit an additional $2 billion authorization for sale of agricultural commodities, brought some more shockers to view. India is to receive $2.2 billion of food in 1960 and 1961. Yugoslavia has received $597 million, Poland $518 million, United Arab Republic, $332 million. A program originally intended as a temporary surplus food disposal measure has become the reason for surplus foods in perpetuity, all the while subsidizing our enemies, failing to convert neutrals, and alienating our friends—sort of an international public assistance program. The fiction of payment is kept alive by payment in local currency, money which we can't have but which is then spent on projects within the specific country approved by their government.

Now, put all these together: (1) Cuba has fallen to the Communists; (2) we approve $500 million aid to South American nations, friendly or not, relinquishing congressional control at Mr. Kennedy's insistence; (3) we start a brand new nationwide Federal aid program to local communities, for business establishments, community facilities, and individuals with Mr. Kennedy insisting and succeeding in getting Congress to give up control of the spending; (4) we authorize $2 billion more food giveaway to other nations, friends and foe alike, making a temporary program permanent.

My beliefs, in summary, are these: (1) Blockade Cuba economically to prevent further Castro buildup; (2) stop aid to enemies and neutrals, extend aid only to pledged friends in a manner which permits them to retain their own self-respect and to understand the United States who gives in self interest, protecting herself, her form of government and freedom and justice in the world; (3) keep the spending firmly in the hands of Congress as the Constitution stipulates; (4) quickly but carefully plan our freeing of Cuba from communism while the blockade prevents their buildup; (5) serve notice to the world that we will tolerate no foolishness, mainly Russian subversion.

The River Spurs Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Kansas City Star for Thursday, April 27, 1961. The editorial is consistent with some previous material that I have inserted regarding divergencies of opinion on how the waters of the Missouri River shall be used, and where. As an advocate of the Pick-Sloan concept, I wish to call this editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

THE RIVER SPURS INDUSTRY

The recent proposal of the upstream power interests to preempt the water of the Missouri River has brought an extensive reply from Congressmen of Missouri, Iowa, Kansas, and Nebraska. In a plea to President Kennedy they set forth in clear language the importance of using the Missouri according to the original Pick-Sloan concept.

The upstream groups insist that the water must be held in the reservoirs in order to insure adequate power production. But as the Congressmen make clear in their letter. "Surely, the Missouri River is a great national asset; and should not be utilized for one group or area." They point out that the eventual hydroelectric capacity of upstream reservoirs will be three times the total originally contemplated.

In a separate comment, Senator SYMINGTON recently declared: "The same magic that has thansformed the Ohio Valley into the industrial Ruhr of the Nation will work on the Missouri."

To reduce the flow of the Missouri would cast a shadow over the industrial development of the entire river valley.

No Liberals Heard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, David Lawrence's comments in the April 27 issue of the New York Herald Tribune, bring out an interesting contrast:

LIBERALS SILENCE IS NOTED ON PROBE OF ELECTRIC CASE

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, April 26.—Maybe it's unfortunate the executives of those electrical companies aren't Communist sympathizers or party members—for, if they were, they probably would have won the support of many of the so-called liberals and might not have been subjected to the current trial by publicity. There might even have been demonstrations in their behalf and a demand for the "abolition" of the subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee which is at present conducting the hearings.

For, basically, it might have been argued the electrical executives exercised only their right of freedom of assembly or freedom of association or freedom of speech and merely got together to indulge in freedom of conversation.

It will be noted that the witnesses from the electrical business who have testified thus far before Senator KEFAUVER's committee didn't take refuge in the fifth amendment. Nor did they condemn the committee for engaging in exposure for exposure's sake.

Not long ago the American Civil Liberties Union issued a fervent statement, signed by 250 college professors, denouncing a congressional committee for trying to substitute its investigations for trials and law-enforcement proceedings. The statement said:

"Not only teachers, but all Americans, we insist, must be free from trial by publicity—from what Mr. Justice Black has called exposure, obloquy and public scorn. We would be the first to concede that teachers have no greater rights than other citizens—just as they have no lesser rights."

But, strangely enough, hardly a voice has since been lifted in support of the men in the electrical business who are being made the object of considerable publicity through the Senate committee's public investigations.

Unpleasant, however, through it may be to the electrical companies' executives who

are testifying about the meetings at which prices were allegedly fixed, it is in the public interest for Congress to get all the facts from every individual who has any knowledge of the price-fixing process. The purpose of this, of course, is to learn how to write corrective legislation for the future.

LAWS CALLED UNCLEAR

For, unhappily, the antitrust laws are by no means clear, nor are the decisions in the court cases that have been tried over a long period of years models of simplicity. Senators this week asked some of the witnesses, for instance, if they knew they were violating antitrust laws, and one of the executives replied: "It had been so common and had gone on for so many years that we lost sight of that."

But the public gets from this the impression that violations were always willful, when actually there is little doubt that the fuzziness of the whole antitrust question has resulted in all sorts of individual interpretations as to where legality begins or ends.

Thus, for example, Is any meeting between businessmen to discuss industrial costs, such as wage rates and uniform charges in the whole employment field, illegal? If so, many a conference of the managements of several competing companies—induced by industry-wide negotiations with national labor unions—might possibly be construed as part of a conspiracy to fix sales prices.

Incidentally, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy has just made a speech to the American Management Association in which he is quoted as having said that the Department of Justice is concerned with collusion and conspiracy and not with prices as such. He added: "I can conceive of a number of different instances where you have identical pricing which wouldn't be illegal or improper."

The surrounding factors are proper subjects for examination by the Department of Justice in each case because, as Chief Justice Warren said in the Watkins case on June 17 ,1957, a congressional committee has certain limitations. He wrote in behalf of the majority of the Court: "Nor is the Congress a law enforcement or trial agency. These are functions of the executive and judicial departments of Government."

BASIC PURPOSE CITED

Unquestionably some individuals and companies will get some unfavorable publicity, but the underlying purpose of a congressional committee is to find out what happened so that new legislation or amendments to existing laws may be enacted. Painful as it may be to the persons who are pilloried in public, this is the best way Congress can learn what happens when ambiguously phrased laws and even more perplexing phrases of court decisions are proclaimed as the law of the land.

Only by thorough inquiry can the facts of antitrust and monopoly be fully exposed. The same holds true of laws affecting national security, subversion, or infiltration. Whatever mistakes the electrical companies' executives may have made, they didn't question the right of the committee to investigate, and they certainly didn't take the fifth amendment or the first amendment. Nor did they instigate college professors to demand the abolition of the committee. Nor did they encourage student demonstrations throughout the country. They just took it on the chin. And what they did may turn out to be in the interest of a clarification and perhaps strengthening of the antitrust laws, especially in the uncertain field of price fixing.

Responsible Young People Bring Credit to Themselves and Their Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, all too often today we hear of the troubles teenagers and young adults get themselves into, without taking note of the many accomplishments being made by the vast majority of these citizens of tomorrow. Mr. Mike Morgan, writing in the Miami Herald, recently outlined the activities of two former students of Fort Lauderdale High School who illustrate the plus side of the ledger in a convincing manner.

Mr. Morgan tells of the college accomplishments of Les Bromwell, of Fort Lauderdale, Fla. Les is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Howard R. Bromwell, friends of my family for many years. By his achievements this young man has paid tribute to the early training and understanding given him by his parents, and has brought great credit to them as well as to himself.

Mr. Morgan recounts that Les graduated from MIT with honors, and was able to stay in the upper 10 percent of his class while working an average of 40 hours a week at an outside job. His wife, the former Joan Taylor from Fort Lauderdale, assisted her husband and also presented him with two sons to go with his two university degrees—civil and chemical engineering.

These young people have demonstrated once again what dedication to purpose can accomplish, and I wish to insert the Morgan article here in the RECORD so that their experiences may inspire others who are willing to make sacrifices to secure a college education and prepare themselves and our country for a bright future:

THE STUDENT TOOK A WIFE

(By Mike Morgan)

In 1957 a 17-year-old Fort Lauderdale youth, Leslie G. Bromwell, set out as a freshman to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology equipped with an abundant share of enthusiasm and ambition that is part of the luggage of most college-bound freshmen.

Leslie, a graduate of Fort Lauderdale High School, set out upon his college career with an additional accessory not standard for most 17-year-old MIT freshmen—a 16-year-old wife. His wife, the former Joan Taylor, was also a Fort Lauderdale High graduate.

The couple was featured in a Herald story about freshmen taking their wives to college. Certainly readers must have pondered upon just how well a lad of this age would fare in a tough college like MIT when confronted with both classroom and household matters.

WITH HONORS

He fared very well, graduating with honors. His wife recently visited here to see both sets of parents, the H. R. Bromwells and Fred E. Taylors.

Reports Joan:

"Leslie was the first freshman at MIT to be a father and we now have two fine boys."

Les has recently received his bachelor of science degree in chemical engineering (he also has a degree in civil engineering) completing a 4-year course in 3½ years.

"He has been in the upper 10 percent of his class even though carrying an overloaded school schedule, and working an average of 40 hours a week on a job in a laboratory during his sophomore, junior, and senior years."

WANTS TO STAY

Leslie has been initiated into two honorary fraternities. Currently he is the youngest student in MIT's graduate school working for a doctorate in science. Leslie also is a member of the teaching and research staff of the undergraduate college.

It is his goal to stay on at MIT in research and attain professional rank some day.

Nor, in any catalog of this young man's accomplishments, should we ignore the important fact that, according to his admiring frau, he is not unskilled in the engineering of diapers and the other nonacademic duties incumbent upon any father of two little boys.

So that's the story 4 years later of what happened to one freshman who took his wife to college.

Faith in the Soil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert an article by Mr. John McCormally, associate editor of the Hutchinson News of Hutchinson, Kans. Mr. McCormally is a close family man, and like myself, is a firm believer in the family-sized farm. We have not lost faith in the soil:

MEMO FROM MAC: BOY WHO LOST FARM THRILLED TO BE BACK

(By John McCormally)

I had a black Angus-looking calf out of a Jersey cow that brought $8. I remember that. And then, I remember riding, numb from the February cold, on my tall mare, Lucy, inside the gray circle of men.

The smoke, from their cold breaths and their tobacco, rose over them. They stamped their feet on the frozen ground and talked indistinctly and looked at me without pity. Then one of them bid $50 for Lucy not, I'm sure, because he needed another horse but because he was the only one among them in that hopeless winter of 1936, who could afford to keep a horse he didn't need.

I took her back into the old weather-grayed barn, with its floor of hardened ancient manure, and tied her for the last time in her stall, where the soft hides of horses had rubbed the manger boards smooth as porcelain.

I went out and stood alone, against the side of the machine shed, and listened to the cruel chant of the auctioneer.

Finally, my father came out of the barn with his last team of long-legged, black mules. The harness creaked in the cold on

their coarse winter coats and they snorted against the tight pull of the lines. He drove them briskly around the yard, his pipe clenched tightly in his teeth, and his denim jacket with its worn blanket lining, flopping open.

WHAT IS IT LIKE?

There weren't more than two or three bidders and the team went finally for less than what he had paid for one of them. The small, cold crowd broke up and the buyers began to take what they had bought to their wagons or cars.

I went into the barn where my father had taken the mules; but I thought I heard him crying softly; so I ran out and down through the corral to be alone by the river.

I knew, with a 13-year-old boy's wisdom, that the best part of my life had ended. And I wondered despairingly what it would be like to be a town boy.

It is a quarter of a century, and so the sale day, and much that led up to it and made it necessary, is not remembered well. But some scenes you keep in mind forever.

F.D.R. BEAT LANDON

It was only a quarter of a century ago, in the winter of the year Roosevelt would beat Landon and the New Deal would be confirmed as a permanent part of American life. But whatever great things were to be done for agriculture, and to save the family farm, came a little late for us.

There was no Government agency yet to refinance your mortgage; or extend emergency loans or declare you a disaster victim because the river had come out four times in 1935 while the corn burned on the uplands.

You stood alone and when you could stand no more you fell alone and a day came when that worst of all possible things befell you. You "lost the farm." Not that the Government ignored you completely. You could move to town and go on WPA. Which is what you did.

Some say that that is good for a man; it makes him strong and self-sufficient and more appreciative of being an American. It is much better for a man than being nursed along, through the droughts and floods and out of the emergencies. Some say that. But I've never heard anyone say it who'd actually done it.

PIECE OF TIME

A quarter of a century is a good piece of time. Certainly in this century it is. And a farm boy whose horse has been sold out from under him, goes a long, long way before he ever gets back to the land and the rippling back of a horse again. But he never forgets.

And so now, at the coffee breaks or in the business conferences, when they say to me: "How's things out on the farm?" and I say, "Just fine," they don't hear any answer fully.

Seventeen acres isn't much of a farm, my father would say, and where it lays on the low divide between the Arkansas and the Cow Creek valleys above the city, the soil is sandy and the blow dirt humps in ugly piles along the fence rows and in the hedges.

The brome and sand love and bluestem haven't sprouted yet in the pasture half of it; but the crop half lies freshly disced, waiting for the drill. The garden plot was ready when the April warmth finally came; the chicken pen is going up and there's a promise to be kept to five anxious boys that by summertime, the horses will be there.

It is far different now than it was in those bleak, scary days a quarter century ago. The banker talks in an unfrightened, friendly way about your land now, as if bankers finally had decided that the land will stay there forever and that there will be no more of it and so it can only grow more valuable.

And everywhere, you find people whose job it is to keep you on your farm. The county agent has ideas for you and pamphlets, and actual demonstrations. The conservationist walks over your land and rubs the dirt between his thumb and finger, and eyes the drainage of it. At the ASC office, they spread the big aerial photograph out on the counter and find your little piece of earth with a pencil point, and hands you the forms to fill out.

A LITTLE STRANGE

It still seems a little strange to my townbred family; they can't get used to Successful Farming on the table, along with Time and Harpers and Foreign Affairs. They look at me suspiciously sometimes, as if I'd joined some mysterious cult, or had some rare disease diagnosed. And, of course, they won't be farmers, not really, until the first cold morning there is a cow to milk.

I can excuse it as a hobby. After all, a desk-bound worker needs some outdoor activity; when I say I shot 72 holes last Sunday, I mean postholes, but the toning up of muscles and toning down of tensions was the same. And it is good for a man inclined to fret futilely about Laos and Cuba, to worry instead why the potatoes haven't come up.

But it is more than that. Each evening when I go back to Donnybrook, and turn off the highway, between the stone pillars and under the two tall cottonwoods and past the Russian olives, it is with the satisfaction of a quarter-century journey at an end.

(We named it Donnybrook, not just to distinguish it from Willowbrook which is nearby, but because donnybrook is an Irish word which means a hell of a fight. "And that," said Peggy, "is what we'll have paying for it.")

No, Donnybrook is no hobby. It's an accomplishment. Not long ago, at the ASC office when my A–2 grass seeding program was approved. The woman slid the printed form across the counter to me and pointed to the line at the bottom of the page. I signed, and read with pride the small print below the dotted line. It said, there below my name:

"Signature of farmer."

Law Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, Law Day is not merely a reaction to the high festival of a rival culture, but is an expression of dedication to the rule of law. This day is significant as a recognition of the value of the system that we have inherited from past ages and which we build anew each day.

It is the daily need for rebuilding that I wish to note. The rule of law is paradoxical in its stability and the fact that it also has an ephemeral character. While generations of men have sustained the concept of the law through the ages, it could collapse overnight if its support is withdrawn.

And this support must come from many hands. If we ever depend upon one man to sustain the law for us, then the rule of law will end and a tyranny, however benevolent, will commence. I pledge myself, therefore, to join with the millions throughout the world, lawyers and laymen, Americans and allies, who are now renewing their determination that our grandchildren shall live under the rule of law and know the benefit of freedom.

Just a Few Hard Facts for All Good Unionists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, organized labor in Alameda County, Calif., has a consciousness of its responsibility and the place that it holds in today's society.

Under the able, aggressive, and intelligent leadership of Russell Crowell, president, and Robert S. Ash, executive secretary, the Central Labor Council, AFL–CIO, of Alameda County, has worked for clean, strong unionism.

The central labor council has faced facts and after cool, deliberate analysis has thrown its weight into the fight for honest unions; unions with integrity which command respect in their community.

Paul Williams, the able editor of the East Bay Labor Journal, of Oakland, Calif., the official publication of the Central Labor Council of Alameda County, has published a splendid editorial on "Just a Few Hard Facts for All Good Unionists."

This editorial appeared in the issue of February 24, 1961, and all sincerely interested in the future of organized labor should read it.

Here is the editorial:

JUST A FEW HARD FACTS FOR ALL GOOD UNIONISTS

Every union member—from the guy who joins because the union contract says he must to the top dog B.A.—should be concerned with the problem of gangsterism in unions.

No union corruption is right. No business corruption is right.

But we feel, Russell Crowell, president of our central labor council, hit the proverbial nail on the head at last week's labor council meeting.

He said:

"We must differentiate between the union in which an isolated union officer goes bad, and one permeated by corruption."

Some head-in-the-sand characters in the labor movement would ignore the unsavory records of some locals and some internationals.

We feel the labor movement cannot gloss over the convincing evidence the McClellan committee has produced—of sweetheart contracts, gangster tie-ins, looting of treasuries, perversion of the legitimate ends and aims of unionism, denial of union democracy, and intimidation and violence.

Some of these internationals and locals are inside the AFL–CIO and some aren't.

But, whether they are or aren't, union racketeering, gangsterism, and corruption are of concern to every American citizen who carries a union card.

The black eye a small minority has given the labor movement affects all of us.

A case in point is a recent statement by Senator McCLELLAN.

The McClellan hearings built up steam for the Landrum-Griffith law. This law put the clamps on the officials of dishonest unions. But it also put the clamps on honest unions. Thus, it hurts you and me.

This month, Senator McCLELLAN demanded still more restrictive legislation. He claimed "stronger laws are needed in some areas to protect working people who are members of some unions."

Such may be the case. But we are sure antiunion employers and lawmakers will clap their hands in glee.

To paraphrase President Crowell's words, the Landrum-Griffin law does not differentiate between clean unions and corrupt ones.

We hope President Crowell is right in predicting that gangsterism in unions will decline in the next 2 years. However, we hope it doesn't take a new Landrum-Griffin law to do it.

Another remark by President Crowell is also worth repeating. Crowell predicted the recession will make more members turn out for union meetings. We agree that this is fine.

But, as Crowell pointed out, there are some unions whose leaders "have forgotten how to lead." And, in these unions, greater membership participation will cause trouble.

No union member or officer should forget that the union exists for the rank-and-file membership.

Both President Crowell and Executive Secretary Robert S. Ash stressed the importance of electing friends of labor. This applies to everything from the board of education to the President of the United States.

Alameda County's clean, vigorous labor movement has an outstanding record in this respect.

Many labor councils and federations give lip service to the fact that gains over the bargaining table can be lost through antilabor ordinances, laws, and court rulings.

In Alameda County, we do something about it.

As a result, most of the county's legislators are friends of labor. Governor Brown and President Kennedy carried Alameda County by big margins.

The Cuban Affair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, here is a report on the Cuban fiasco, with the conclusions formed by Joseph Newman of the New York Herald Tribune. The article appeared in this morning's issue:

SEARCH FOR THE GUILTY IN THE CUBAN AFFAIR: THIS IS ONE VERDICT

(By Joseph Newman [1])

WASHINGTON, April 30.—President Kennedy's top foreign policy advisers, anxious to protect the United States from worldwide condemnation, watered down the battle plan for the invasion of Cuba to the point where it was virtually doomed to failure from the outset.

This is one of the major conclusions that emerge from questioning of American and Cuban participants in the abortive scheme to bring down the pro-Communist regime of Fidel Castro. They were interviewed in the three principal centers of the invasion operation—New York, Miami and Washington.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk is scheduled to appear tomorrow at a closed-door hearing of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Latin America to testify about the administration's handling of the Cuban invasion.

The committee also plans to hear Allen W. Dulles, director of the Central Intelligence Agency. Mr. Dulles originally was scheduled to testify tomorrow, but when it became known that Mr. Rusk would appear, the testimony of Mr. Dulles was put off "until a later time," possibly Tuesday.

The special investigation, now being undertaken by Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor at President Kennedy's request, is almost certain to reach this final conclusion: The military support provided by Washington was enough to compromise the United States in the eyes of the world, but it was too little to give the invading Cuba force a fair chance of overthrowing Castro.

The blame must fall in the first instance on the military-intelligence side (the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Central Intelligence Agency) as well as on the foreign policy advisers. These two groups entered into a compromise between military needs and international political considerations. The compromise resulted in failure.

President Kennedy, in the last analysis, acceded to the compromise, and he authorized the operation, in its crippled form, to proceed against heavy odds.

The plan to invade Cuba with a relatively insignificant force of 1,400 Cuban exiles was based on two broad assumptions: (1) control of the air to secure a beachhead, and (2) snowballing support from the Cuban people, once the invading force could demonstrate that its foothold was secure and that it was on the march.

These two prerequisites for success were severely impaired by restrictions insisted on by three of President Kennedy's chief foreign policy advisers—Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Under Secretary Chester Bowles, and Adlai E. Stevenson, American Ambassador to the United Nations.

Other key advisers—McGeorge Bundy, Walter W. Rostow, and Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.—apparently went along with these restrictions.

WHAT LACK OF AIR COVER MEANT

The circumstances are reliably reported to have been as follows:

The Cuban expeditionary force had a small fleet of cargo planes and B–26 bombers. It had no fighter protection for this fleet or for the beachhead, once established. President Kennedy refused to provide air cover, available from nearby Florida bases or from an American aircraft carrier which was cruising in the Caribbean.

In the absence of air cover, the only alternative on which the invasion plan could proceed was the total destruction of Castro's small air force. Intelligence services estimated the force consisted of 20 aircraft: 12 B–26 bombers, 5 British-built Sea Fury propeller-driven fighters, and 3 T–33 jet fighter-trainers.

The surprise dawn attack on Castro's principal airfields on April 15, just 2 days before the invasion force landed on the southern coast of Cuba, was intended to destroy the dictator's fighter-plane force. Rebel Cuban pilots who carried out the raids with their B–26 bombers reported after returning to their secret Caribbean bases that the operation had been completely successful. They took aerial photographs to support their contention.

But photographs are not always conclusive evidence and the strategic plan called for two more attacks on the Cuban airfields to provide absolute assurance that not a single one of Castro's fighter planes had survived to imperil the entire venture. These attacks by the B–26 bombers was to take place just before the dawn landings at Bahia de Cochinos (Bay of Pigs) on April 17.

They were vetoed by Rusk, Bowles, and Stevenson. The three men were alarmed by Castro's outcries following the first B–26 attack. Charges of aggression were leveled against the United States at a special meeting of the U.N. General Assembly only a few hours after the attack.

The three foreign policy advisers argued that additional attacks would make it impossible for them to uphold the official U.S. contention that this country was not a direct participant in the Cuban attack, and to answer charges that the United States was committing acts of aggression in violation of the United Nations Charter and provisions of the Organization of American States.

For the same reason the three vetoed two other important provisions of the original invasion plan. These called for a direct radio appeal to Cubans to rebel against Castro and the showering of the island republic with leaflets calling on the Cuban people to rise up in revolt.

The radio appeal was to be made by Jose Miro Cardona, head of the Cuban revolutionary council, and the leaflets were to be dropped by the rebel bombers.

By prior arrangement with the leaders of the anti-Castro underground, in Cuba, these were to serve as the twin signals for nationwide sabotage and the beginning of an uprising.

When these signals failed to appear, the underground leaders assumed that something had gone wrong and they were immobilized by uncertainty. Before they could even establish what had happened, Castro, by wholesale arrests in all the key population centers, was able to disarm them.

Forbidden by Washington to transmit the prerecorded revolutionary call by Dr. Miro Cardona, radio SWAN, situated on an island off Honduras and used by the rebels for propaganda warfare against the Castro regime, hastily substituted a message that said: "Alert! Alert! Look well at the rainbow. The first will rise very soon."

But this and the rest of the message proved meaningless to the underground leaders in Cuba. If anything, it meant that something had gone awry.

Much has been written about the failure of the Cuban people to revolt in support of the anti-Castro forces. The fact of the matter is that the landing operation never reached a point where the Cuban masses was put to a real choice between Castro and his enemies.

Contrary to widespread reports, the first part of the landing operation went off pretty much as planned, with the unloading only slightly slower than scheduled and the approach of Castro's ground forces and guns slightly faster than expected.

CASTRO PLANES APPEAR

What spread dismay and destruction was the appearance of a handful of fighter planes. The surprise bombings of April 15 had wiped out only two-thirds of Castro's air force. According to a rebel pilot who participated in the battle, five British-made Sea Furies and two American-made T–33 jet trainers survived. These were enough to decide the outcome of the contest and give Castro a smashing victory.

The fighters were able to prevent the rebel bombers from carrying out one of their principal missions: to destroy Castro's heavy Soviet tanks and artillery.

[1] The writer of this article—Joseph Newman—is the chief United Nations correspondent of the Herald Tribune, and was the author of this newspaper's recent series, "Cuba—S.S.R.?" which exposed the extent to which Castro has alined himself with the Communists. Newman was the Herald Tribune's roving Latin American correspondent for several years and before that was stationed in Moscow.

Having driven off the bombers the fighter planes secured control of the air and went about seeking two invasion ships with vital ammunition and radio communications equipment. Then they joined the heavy tanks in driving the invaders off the beachhead and into the surrounding swamps.

About 45 hours after the landing operation was initiated, Capt. Roberto San Roman, commander of the Cuban expeditionary force, sent an urgent appeal to Washington for air support. Unless this was forthcoming within a few hours, he reported, the entire operation would have to be abandoned. He spoke from a walkie-talkie to a ship which relayed his message.

Richard M. Bissell, Jr., Deputy Director of the CIA, alerted some of the key men in Washington. These advisers awoke President Kennedy at 2 a.m., April 19, and discussed the crisis for 2 hours. They argued in favor of fighter air support from the American aircraft carrier in the Caribbean in a last attempt to save the situation.

But it was too late. A naval communications snag developed and before anything could be done, even if there had been a disposition to do anything, it was all over. The invasion force was trapped in the swamps, and Castro had scored the greatest victory of his career.

Another desperate attempt to save the situation was made just before dawn of Thursday, April 20. Cargo planes and two B–26's tried to ferry fresh supplies to the beachhead, but were shot down.

The pilot who related part of this account was standing by at his base at 9 a.m. that day, ready to return to the beachhead. But before he could take off, word arrived that the last resistance had been snuffed out.

He survived to level this bitter attack against those responsible for the operation: "It was a crime to commit us to war in which we were denied the right to destroy the enemy fighter force and were denied fighters of our own so as to be able to defend ourselves."

Russian Flight Into Space: Triumph or Disgrace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith a letter from my constituent which places the achievement of the Russians in putting a man in space in its proper perspective:

LOS ALTOS, CALIF., *April 19, 1961.*

DEAR MR. GUBSER: Enclosed is a newspaper editorial which very well describes the sacrifices which have been required of the Russian people in order for their country to be first in space. Before we embark on any crash program to catch the Russians in space we should well consider the points brought out in this editorial.

No doubt there will be many who will propose panic-type programs to catch the Soviets. As for myself I want to know how much any of these crash programs will cost me in additional taxes per month. And more important yet I want to know how much more of my American freedom I must sacrifice, for I am not willing to become a slave to the state so that I can "catch up to the Soviets."

Those who tire of being second should bear in mind that we lead the entire world in liberty and justice and the dignity of the individual. One Soviet citizen has experienced a ride around the earth in space, yet no Soviet citizen has experienced the blessings that the least U.S. citizen has inherited as his inalienable right; namely, freedom. Let them try to catch us in this respect.

In the meantime let us maintain and exploit our advantage.

Very truly yours,

W. ASHLEY CHAPMAN.

[From the San Francisco News-Call Bulletin, Apr. 17, 1961]

RUSSIAN FLIGHT INTO SPACE: TRIUMPH OR DISGRACE?

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—Not by any means the greatest "feat" in world history, but in many respects the biggest disgrace—this is another way to look at the successful launching of a man into outer space by the Soviets.

Millions of human beings in Russia live six to a room in slums and in hovels, while millions of others work in slave-labor camps. Billions of dollars that should be expended to lift the living standards of a nation are spent instead for one of the most spectacular propaganda stunts of all times.

For what else is it? Is human life improved because a small vehicle travels in the sky at about the same distance from the earth as New York is from Wilmington or Baltimore? Was human life further advanced because in 1957 the first Sputnik sped around the earth in an hour and a half? Today the United States continues to have "sputniks" in orbit around the globe and the Russians have one. Has any human being felt any benefits from such stunts?

President Kennedy stated, in a nutshell, at his Wednesday press conference the simple truth about the Soviet's cruel disregard of human welfare as it concentrates on propaganda stunts. He said: "A dictatorship enjoys advantages in this kind of competition over a short period, by its ability to mobilize its resources for a specific purpose."

This is the real reason for the Soviet achievement in sending the first man into outer space. The United States could have done it even earlier if it had decided to take away from other necessary things the money to spend on space research. As it is, the people of the Soviet Union are deprived of the benefits of better living.

It is significant that one of the big rewards to the new "hero of the Soviet Union" is that he will be permitted to have a four-room apartment for himself, wife, and two children, instead of the two rooms he has heretofore been allotted.

In the not-far-distant future, the United States, too, will be sending a man around the world a couple hundred miles above ground. Someday also there'll be a flight to the moon and to other planets. But, as a practical matter, these stunts cost vast sums and the question is whether humanity can afford them.

The biggest achievement to look forward to is some way to talk to all the Russian people at one time and to persuade them to get rid of the dictatorship that terrifies the world and inflicts misery on human beings everywhere.

As for "discoveries," the biggest of all times is still that of Christopher Columbus, who found the land where freedom and liberty can flourish as it does today. Someday the Russian people, too, can enjoy the benefits of that same discovery.

To Those Who Are Afraid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Muncie Star of March 28, 1961:

TO THOSE WHO ARE AFRAID

Following our recent defense of the House Un-American Activities Committee, we received a letter from a college student who says he is a loyal American, but is afraid of this House committee:

"I am an American and I am afraid," he writes. "I am afraid that a committee such as HUAC would twist my words around to prove, or should I say to show evidence, that I hold undemocratic ideas. * * * Would I be able to speak against some part of the Government, say HUAC, without being called a Communist or a Communist dupe? Would I be presumed to be innocent, or would I have to prove my innocence by denouncing my beliefs or opinions?"

Apparently this student is indeed afraid. He was afraid to sign his name. He says he believes himself to be only one of many young citizens who have such fears.

How about it? Are his fears groundless? Or are they realistic?

Our student didn't explain the beliefs he holds which he thinks might bring him before the Un-American Activities Committee. So we don't know whether he really has reason to be afraid, or not.

Does the committee twist the words of a witness to create a false impression that the witness is disloyal? There's no way to prove this, either way. Let's say that sometimes it may happen. But far more often the witness himself twists and contorts his own words in efforts to avoid questions he does not want to answer.

Witnesses before this committee most often come into the headlines—and into trouble with the courts, loss of jobs and loss of reputation—over two kinds of questions. In one kind the committee is trying to get from the witness a flat statement as to whether he is loyal, or has been involved in subersive activities or connections. The other kind includes questions aimed at any knowledge the witness may have of other persons involved in activities with which the committee is concerned.

If a person is loyal, why should he fear or resent being asked if he is? If he has not engaged in subversive activities, or has done so only innocently and unwittingly, why should he be afraid to talk about that? If he is himself loyal, but knows persons of activities that may be subversive, does not his own loyalty compel him to disclose what he knows? A person sure of his own loyalty has no need to fear the questions of the Un-American Activities Committee.

But if a person knows himself to be disloyal, has knowingly joined disloyal groups or activities, then he has every reason to be afraid of the committee. The only way out we have to suggest is to make a clean breast of it and then set out to salvage himself.

Can a witness speak against the Government, against the committee itself, without being called a Communist or a Communist dupe? Well, that depends. If what he has to say follows the Communist line, he should be prepared to defend it vigorously

with some good solid American-type reasons. There are plenty of people who manage to criticize the Government, even the committee, without getting called Communist or Communist dupes.

We return to the student's letter.

"Would I even be allowed to say nothing," he asks, "without it being cause for a presumption of guilt?"

No. The Constitution guarantees your right to say nothing, where self-incrimination is involved. But all of the Constitution and all the world's moving essays on freedom of thought and all the eloquence of a master of courtroom defense cannot prevent other people from concluding that silence implies assent to the charges that have been made.

"I'd like to feel secure," he goes on, "in the knowledge that I can question and vote as I please, without fear of condemnation for my words."

He asks for a kind of security which is beyond human reach. You can have the first part. In America you can be secure in the right to question and to vote as you please. But you cannot escape the opinions of your fellows.

If you want to espouse and express views for which others will condemn you, then you simply must have the courage of your convictions with which to face their condemnation. The alternative is to keep your views to yourself, in which case neither the House committee nor anyone else is likely to question you about them.

If you choose to enter associations or activities which you feel must be secret, then you should prepare yourself to face the possibility of exposure, and its consequences. It is those who make this choice, in an area involving disloyalty to the United States, who have reason to fear the House Un-American Activities Committee. The rest of us have no need to be afraid.

Youth Fitness Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy and the Governors of several States including Gov. John Dempsey, of my own State of Connecticut, have proclaimed the period May 1–6 to be "Youth Fitness Week." Some pretty shocking reports have come from surveys of health conditions among our youth, and I am concerned at the apparent decline in the prowess of our athletes in sporting events including the failure of American participants to reach the heights of success to which we have been accustomed in the past at the Olympic games.

I think that Youth Fitness Week offers an opportunity to all of us to give consideration to the opportunities at our command to take steps immediately to improve the physical fitness of our youth for the advantages to be gained in the athletic and military endeavors and the general pursuits of health and life.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial on this subject published recently in the Newtown, Conn., Bee:

FITNESS FOR LIVING

The week of May 1–6 has been proclaimed "Youth Fitness Week." Official statements have been issued to that effect by the President of the United States and the Governors of many States, including Connecticut.

Governor Dempsey, in his statement, points to the fact that a welcome development of recent years is the increased attention which is being paid in this Nation to physical fitness." It seems to us, however, that in the case of very many people, the increased attention is coming in too little amount and much too late. President Kennedy stresses the need to combat the forces in our way of life which are making for the soft American.

The World Health Organization has defined health as a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity." This definition applies almost equally well to fitness. To be fit means that the individual is able to bring to situations and decisions in his life the very best of which he is capable in body, mind and spirit. He should be mentally, emotionally, socially, spiritually and physically prepared to meet the stress of living.

And yet today's society is filled with maladjusted individuals, both adults and children, who among their other difficulties, are at great disadvantage because they are physically unfit. A study of Connecticut youth was made by the Connecticut Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation in 1957–59, with appalling results.

Four out of ten of the children in the sample studied were overweight; two out of ten were underweight. More than half had dental defects. A quarter had abnormalities of vision. Thirty percent of the fifth-grade boys could not pull themselves up to a chinning bar even a single time. The scores of girls on some of the tests were also extremely low. When girls cannot sit up a single time from a horizontal position or throw a ball more than 25 feet something is lacking.

Physical fitness tests given for some time in the Newtown schools show the benefits which comes from the work being done locally in physical education. Perhaps some of our adults would not score as well if they were subjected to similar tests.

But whether in Newtown or any other community across the Nation, physical fitness is far more important to the individual than is generally realized. We should all understand that fitness for living is not a gift that we can buy for ourselves or anyone else. To acquire it requires that we work at it—and play at it too. Fortunate, indeed, are those who do so with eagerness.

The Truth Must Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the Senate begins its investigation into the dreadful Cuban fiasco and Ted Lewis, of the New York Daily News, has some interesting comments on this in today's edition:

CAPITAL CIRCUS

(By Ted Lewis)

WASHINGTON, April 30.—Due to pressures being applied by the Kennedy administration, the Senate inquiry which starts tomorrow into the Cuban invasion fiasco will probably be an abbreviated affair, held entirely behind closed doors.

This investigation by the Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs is one that President Kennedy knew could not be avoided. It had been hoped that it would be delayed. Every effort of the White House is now being bent toward restoring confidence in the administration's handling of foreign affairs in view of the Lao crisis.

The timing of the probe by Subcommittee Chairman WAYNE MORSE (Democrat, Oregon) is considered particularly unfortunate and Secretary of State Rusk, who will be the leadoff witness, is expected to make that clear when he appears tomorrow.

Any kind of an investigation undertaken by the Senate is significant. Seldom do Senate leaders give their blessing to an inquiry into affairs of an administration which is headed by a member of their own party. In the present case, however, MORSE received a firm go ahead, not only from Democratic Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, Montana, but from Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, Arkansas, chairman of the full Foreign Relations Committee.

The reason for the green light: most Senate Democrats were hopping mad that neither they nor their Republican colleagues were given a fill-in in advance of the Cuban invasion. Their advice was certainly not sought ahead of time, although Chairman FULBRIGHT, once tipped off as to what was in the wind, did register a personal protest—to no avail.

CRISIS DELAYS FULL-DRESS INQUIRY

Although they have cooled off since the Cuban event, neither FULBRIGHT, MORSE, nor MANSFIELD have any intention of calling off a full-fledged probe to determine what went wrong and the principal areas of responsibility for the fiasco. They have, however, agreed that such a thorough investigation should be delayed in view of the critical foreign situation. For this reason the present inquiry will be held in secret and will be pretty perfunctory.

An all-out Senate investigation is desired if for no other reason than to get to the bottom of the buckpassing, a fiasco in itself which seldom has been surpassed within the executive branch of Government.

While President Kennedy has accepted full responsibility, the furtive effort to pin the rap for the Cuban error somewhere else has been going on within the White House itself.

It cannot be denied that some of the President's own aids have been blaming other aids. The so-called Irish Mafia in the White House entourage consists of those advisers who were with the President when he was a Senator and carried the brunt of his political campaigns. They are inclined to put the finger for the Cuban mess on bad advice from some of the White House newcomers. Privately, they name foreign policy adviser McGeorge Bundy and such other Johnny-come-latelies as Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., and Walt Rostow.

POINTED AT DULLES AND THE CIA

One of the President's top advisers, who did not figure in this effort to split White House ranks, did, however, hold a background briefing in the immediate aftermath of the Cuban fiasco. He put his finger on Allen Dulles and his Central Intelligence Agency.

Why he thought Dulles was to blame was spelled out in considerable detail.

At some point in a thorough Senate probe it would be pertinent to have the testimony of these White House officials, who so far have been careful to talk only off the record and even then in very slippery fashion.

It would also be in the public interest to have Dulles speak his own piece. He has

seen to it that on a not-for-attribution basis plenty of background has been supplied in the interest of proving that the CIA actually did a whale of a job in Cuba and whatever went wrong was most certainly not because of bad intelligence or the fact that the CIA played ball only with a pet group of Cuban exiles.

SOME TRY TO BLAME THE PENTAGON

While Dulles has thus unqualifiedly defended the CIA operation, we are not breaking any confidence to report that exactly the opposite line has been taken by some of his subordinates.

These admit that there were certain CIA errors. They have made snide efforts to blame certain intelligence experts within their own ranks. Their favorite whipping boy has been Richard M. Bissell, Deputy CIA Director for plans. And there have been veiled cracks also at Robert A. Amory, Jr., Deputy Director for Intelligence.

As for the State Department, various officials have daintily tried to put part of the blame on the Pentagon, suggesting that our military should have known better than to believe the invasion operation could succeed in view of the few planes and ships that were available.

A wide-open Senate investigation would do a lot to clean the air of all these bitter instances of buckpassing. It would, of course, be too much to hope that the entire truth concerning the deplorable debacle can be brought out. But it would be interesting to know exactly what those from whom the President sought advice told him.

Kennedy knows, but it still is not clear whether Secretary of State Rusk interposed any objections—and if he did, were they emphatic or simply qualified?

And yet to be clarified is the stand, if any, that Under Secretary of State Chester Bowles took. An open Senate hearing with Dulles, Bowles, and Rusk speaking their pieces for public consumption would dispel the smog.

Our Orbiting Telescope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, April 28, the United States fired into orbit the world's first astronomical satellite—a space telescope, designed to unlock the mysteries of cosmic radiation. Scientists believe these rays may be the keys to information about the elements which make up the universe. So much emphasis is being given these days to the man-in-space program that our country's great scientific achievements are in danger of being overlooked, and the importance of this latest accomplishment may likewise go unnoticed. This importance is pointed out in an editorial in the Sunday Star of April 30 and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues. The editorial follows:

OUR ORBITING TELESCOPE

Although our latest space shot was less spectacular than orbiting a man around the earth, the scientific data which Explorer XI is expected to produce may prove to be invaluable in preparing future human explorers of space to cope with cosmic rays and other dangers outside the earth's atmosphere.

The tumbling telescope in the sky is designed to peer far into space without the hampering effects of the atmospheric curtain that blocks most of the cosmic particles hurled toward us by galacitic storms. The bombardment of gamma-ray particles—which resemble X-rays—could be a serious hazard for astronauts venturing toward the planets. The more we can learn about these mysterious rays and their orgin the better the chances of safeguarding man from them.

This new "eye in the sky" is not a telescope of the conventional type. It is a complex electronic device for detecting, measuring, and reporting on gamma and other radiations which may threaten man in his attempts to probe far out into space. The findings will be recorded at several earth stations as the satellite whirls around the globe at distances ranging from 300 to 750 miles outward.

Astronomers will watch the findings with special interest, since they may give some clues to the origin of the universe. Space radiation is associated with the birth of our own galaxy and with that of the other galaxies about which little now is known. Free of atmospheric interference, the electronic telescope should be able to see millions of miles into the spatial void.

Thus, far from being a stunt to capture world headlines, Explorer XI is a serious scientific undertaking of possibly vast importance to all nations, and especially to men who will be the pioneers in interplanetary travel.

Safe for Ideas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, in a free society, we have no room for those who would stifle the free flow of speech and interchange of ideas. Voltaire summed up the arguments for this premise when he said:

I would disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it.

Not too long ago, the State of California was faced with a controversy generated by a group trying to prevent a man from speaking on the Berkeley campus of the University of California because of his background.

This was an unfortunate issue, because on university campuses throughout the land, we are nurturing the minds of those who will be responsible for preserving our freedoms. I believe that Gov. Pat Brown, of California, and President Clark Kerr, of the University of California, eloquently replied to critics of the policy which did allow the controversial speaker to have a public campus platform. A comment on their remarks appeared as an editorial in the April 24, 1961, issue of the Washington Post and I am inserting it for the interest of the Members of this honorable body:

SAFE FOR IDEAS

The president of the University of California and the Governor of the Golden State have given what seem to us model statements of the importance of exposing students to controversy. A furor had arisen because a man convicted of contempt of Congress for refusal to answer questions about communism was invited to speak on the campus of Berkeley. Asked to intervene, Gov. Pat Brown, of California, refused, commenting: "Let the people say anything they want to. If they do anything criminal while they're speaking or after they're speaking, then they can be prosecuted." To this the university president, Dr. Clark Kerr, added: "The university is not engaged in making ideas safe for students; it is engaged in making students safe for ideas." This is an attitude which ought to hearten more timorous administrators, for it goes to the heart of a main purpose of education. If university training can't teach a student to be discreet and discriminating in his selection of ideas, artificial shielding won't help him.

Official Ridicules Civil Defense Alert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, during the recent civil defense exercises, a news story from my home city of Portland, Oreg., was called to my attention. It described the reaction of City Commissioner Stanley Earl, of Portland, to the exercise, and posed some questions which the commissioner raised as to the value of these aspects of the civil defense program. I ask unanimous consent that this news story, appearing in the Portland Oregonian for April 25, be printed at the end of these remarks, so that these questions may be brought to the attention of other Members of the House:

OFFICIAL RIDICULES CD ALERT

City Commissioner Stanley W. Earl has flatly refused to take part in OPAL 1961, the nationwide civil defense alert scheduled for Thursday. The exercise, he said, is "based on the bow and arrow."

In a letter filed Tuesday with City Auditor Ray Smith, Earl said this exercise was a "complete waste of time, money, and manpower."

"It is not based on the realities of 1961, and can only serve to lull the people into a false sense of security," Earl said.

He objected to the claim that there would be 48 hours, warning of an impending attack.

FIREPOWER NOTED

"This is simply not true. Polaris missiles have a range of 1,500 miles with about 3 minutes delivery time. An ICBM fired from the Soviet Union would require a little over 20 minutes to be on target, and yet here we are claiming we have 48 hours."

The first superbomb exploded by the United States in 1954, Earl said, was 1,000 times more powerful than the one dropped on Hiroshima. The 1954 bomb would smash a city flat over an area of 20 square miles and set fire to buildings over an area of 50 to 75 square miles.

Earl said this would create a fire storm so great that all oxygen would be used up in 4 hours. The radioactive fallout within an hour or two would contaminate up to 10,000 square miles with 20 times the radiation necessary to cause death.

"What I have described is a 1954 bomb," he said. "There are far more powerful ones in 1961, available to both the United States and to the Soviets."

Local civil defense officials, he pointed out, are on duty only from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday. Civil defense headquarters is closed from 5 p.m. to 8 a.m. and on Saturdays, Sundays and holidays.

"I am not a defeatist, but a realist," he said. "I do believe the people should be told exactly what they face and that realistic discussions should be engaged in by competent authorities beginning at the national level."

Commissioner Ormond R. Bean said Earl's statement was a fair one and wasn't so sure it represented a minority view. However, he said, "I don't feel that I am in a position to say the mayor isn't right (in supporting the local civil defense effort)."

PRESIDENT CALLS ALERT

Commissioner Mark A. Grayson, who is presiding over the city council in the absence of Mayor Terry D. Schrunk said that under the circumstances he would participate in the exercise. Schrunk is in Honolulu.

As a veteran of two wars, Grayson said, "I feel that any precautions at this time are better than none at all. The President has called this alert and we have been notified by the Governor. It behooves us to do something about it."

The President's Decision on Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, as we stand behind our President and await his leadership in the Cuban situation, Gould Lincoln writes an interesting article, which appeared in the Washington Star on April 27:

CURE FOR CASTROISM STILL ELUSIVE

(By Gould Lincoln)

The search for a scapegoat in the failure of the Cuban anti-Castro invasion may be interesting, and even valuable, but it is not going to settle the problem which a Communist Cuba presents. Eventually the United States, either with or without the support of the rest of the American Republics, will have to act to get rid of Fidel Castro and his government or resign itself to seeing world communism—with Soviet Russia in its forefront—move in a big way into the Western Hemisphere. Since the days of President Monroe the United States has been firm in its determination to prevent the encroachment of any European country upon the soil of the Western Hemisphere. Spain's grip on South and Central America was broken by the efforts of the peoples of these Latin American countries. And in 1898 the United States went to war with Spain and set Cuba free. It would be tragic, and probably fatal to our own freedom, to allow Russia to move in and take the dictatorial position which Spain once occupied in this Western Hemisphere.

How long can the United States—and the other American Republics—afford to wait before acting? The Monroe Doctrine, enunciated by the United States so long ago, and the Caracas agreement entered into by the American Republics in 1954, both pledging to prevent foreign advances into the Western Hemisphere, are solid grounds for action. President Kennedy has sought the support of the principal political leaders of this country, Republican and Democratic, in this crisis. These leaders, including former President Eisenhower, former Vice President Nixon, and Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller of New York, all Republicans, have said the President must be supported. What steps the President will decide upon are still to be revealed.

STOPS PARTISAN POLITICS

President Kennedy has assumed full responsibility for not preventing the ill-fated Cuban invasion by anti-Castro forces, trained and armed here in the United States and in other not-too-distant places. He has not sought to place the blame for U.S. policy in this respect on former President Eisenhower and his administration. He stepped promptly on his Secretary of the Interior, former Representative Udall, of Arizona, when Mr. Udall in a television broadcast commented that the plans for the invasion had been made in one administration (the Eisenhower administration) and then turned over to the Kennedy administration to be carried out. This was seized upon by several Republican spokesmen as a partisan political move on the part of a Kennedy Cabinet member. This is no time for partisan politics.

One reason for the failure of the anti-Castro Cuban invasion lay in the fact that there was no second line either of attack or defense. If there was one, it appears to have been abandoned. President Kennedy's error was his statement, made when Castro began screaming "invasion," that this country would not send military forces to intervene in Cuba. Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, Democratic whip of the Senate, following a breakfast of the Democratic congressional leaders with the President on Tuesday, is reported to have reiterated there will be no U.S. invasion of Cuba. Why should such assertions be made? Especially when it may turn out invasion is the only way in which to deal with this Communist menace in Cuba. Why give Castro and his Russian backers this assurance and so encourage them to strengthen the hold of Communist dictatorship in Cuba, militarily and otherwise?

PROPOSALS FOR ACTION

Meanwhile, various proposals of what to do about Cuba have been advanced. One is to cut off all trade between this country and Cuba—already almost entirely curtailed. A second is an economic blockade. A third, suggested by a Republican member of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa, is for an immediate meeting of the Latin American heads of government, in conjunction with representatives of this country, perhaps in Venezuela, to discuss the Cuban issue and to arrive at an agreement on what should be done. A fourth proposal came from Senator DODD, Democrat of Connecticut, who told the Senate there should be an immediate blockade of arms shipments from Soviet Russia to Castro's Cuba, and a stern warning that Soviet military aircraft will not be tolerated over Caribbean waters.

The Connecticut Senator said that if this country had given the Cuban Freedom Fighters the proper air support, their invasion of Cuba last week would have succeeded. He added: "I say we should have done so, and that we should be prepared to do so. We can no longer tolerate a situation in which a Quisling totalitarian regime, directed at the subversion of the entire Western Hemisphere, is able to maintain its hold over the Cuban people because of massive quantities of arms placed in its hands by the Kremlin."

Castro and the Communists in Cuba are, at the present, much more of a threat to the Latin American republics in the Caribbean and South America than they are to the United States—which Castro has not the force to attack. He might, indeed, be able by subversion and force of arms to overthrow some of those other governments and make possible Communist regimes, unless he is effectively checked. Eight of these Latin American countries have no diplomatic relations with the Castro government, six have broken such relations, two not having had such relations. The six which have broken off relations with Castro are the Dominican Republic, Guatemala, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Peru and Honduras. Haiti and Paraguay have not had such relations.

I Am the American Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the privilege of participating in the dedication ceremony of a branch post office in the Monmouth Shopping Center, Eatontown, Monmouth County, N.J.

On this occasion a brief speech was read by a young man named Edmund Labuda, Jr., who attends the Red Bank Catholic High School, Red Bank, N.J., being a member of the freshman class. Young Labuda's father is a member of the post office staff at Eatontown, N.J. He read his address in an impressive and dignified manner, and I am glad to have permission to have it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

I AM THE AMERICAN FLAG

Since the time of my birth many stories have been told about me. Now I feel it is my duty to tell you what I am and for what I stand.

Born during the Nation's infancy, I have grown with it, my stars increasing number as the country has grown in size. The domain over which I wave is now expanded until the sun on my flying now never sets.

I am not only an emblem showing the authority of the United States, indicating supremacy when flying over land, possession when flying over Government buildings, power when displayed by troops—I mean much more than that. I represent the ideals and traditions, the principles and institutions, the hopes and aspirations which constitute what is to mankind the greatest nation in the world, the American Nation.

Stirring are the stories of my stars and stripes. My 13 red and white stripes recall the history of that long, bitter 8-year struggle in which the Thirteen Colonies fought and stood side by side for freedom, exemplifying the principle that "In union there is strength."

Each of my stars tells the story of a great and sovereign State which has entered the Union.

Filled with significance are my colors of red, white, and blue into which have been woven the courage and strength of Americans.

The red in my stripes proclaims the courage that inspires men to face danger and to do what is right. The strength and courage of American manhood from the conquest of the wilderness by the pioneer through the Revolutionary War, the Civil War, Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, and in the Korean conflict has done more

than anything else to make the Nation over which I fly the greatest and most wonderful in the world.

My white stripes mark me as the emblem of the land of the free, the country in which the oppressed of the world may enjoy equality and liberty.

The blue in my field of stars stands for loyalty. It is the true blue. It tells the story of thousands of men and women who have been loyal to their country through suffering and hardships.

I signify the law of the land.

I stand for the Constitution of the United States.

I represent the Declaration of Independence, the birth certificate of the American Nation.

I stand for peace and goodwill among the nations of the world.

I control the strong, protect the weak, relieve suffering, and do all I can for the betterment of mankind.

I stand for tolerance toward men of all creeds and races.

I reflect the wealth and grandeur of this great land of opportunity.

I tell the story of the achievements and progress of the American people in art and science, culture and literature, inventions and commerce, transportation and industry.

I am the badge of the Nation's greatness and the emblem of its destiny.

I am whatever you make me, nothing more. I am your belief in yourself, your dream of what a people may become. I am fear and song, struggle and hope.

I am no more than what you believe me to be, and I am all you hope that I can be. I am the American flag.

Unanswered Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the following editorial appearing in the March 13, 1961, issue of the Chicago Tribune:

Mr. Kennedy announced at his latest news conference that the Government intended to put an extra $660 million into the purchase of quipment and supplies before the end of the fiscal year on June 30. This was represented as evidence of Washington's intention to pep up the economy and provide jobs.

The announcement prompted a reporter to inquire what had become of the sonorous statement in Mr. Kennedy's inauguration address, "Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country."

The questioner remarked that there had been considerable comment that the Kennedy program up to now has been designed to show what the Government can try to do for the people. He asked when the reverse might be expected to set in.

Mr. Kennedy's reply was not very responsive, but seemed to suggest that before the horse can support some of the extra weight to be assigned by the Government in the future, it must be fed up and returned to form.

Well, we think both the question and the answer avoided the real effects of the Kennedy administration program. It isn't so much what the Government can do for the people, or the people for the Government, as what the administration can do for the administration. This particular $660 million is being spent by the Government on itself. It will procure goods and services for the bureaucracy and will build up the sinews of big government. If there is primary benefit, it is to the political managers who run the operation.

So the phrasing, more appropriately, might have been: "Ask not what you can do for the Kennedy administration, for you aren't going to be consulted anyway."

The Will To Win

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, here is an interesting article on Laos, as written by Marguerite Higgins for the May 1 issue of the New York Herald Tribune:

WHO WON'T FIGHT?

(By Marguerite Higgins)

WASHINGTON.

"The Chinese won't fight."

It's hard, isn't it, to wrench the mind back to the pre-Korean, dust-settling days of China when the successive defeats sending Chiang Kai-shek to exile were explained away with such reasons as "the Chinese (meaning the non-Communist Chiang Kai-shek Chinese) won't fight"? Then came the day when the reasons for partitioning Vietnam included the charge that "the Vietnamese (those on our side, of course) won't fight." And now we are told that "the Lao won't fight."

But is it really true? And how does it come about that the only Asians that won't fight are the Asians on our side?

It's an important question, this issue of what Asian will or won't fight. The fighting capabilities of the Royal Lao Army, or rather the alleged lack of fighting capabilities, are being used by those who favor letting Laos go down the drain even if this inescapably does let every nation know that we shall not, after all, "pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, to assure the survival and success of liberty * * *", as President Kennedy put it 101 days ago.

And let every American know that if the bell tolls for Laos the bell will indeed be tolling for him in that it can well mean the beginning of the end of the West in Asia.

For, thanks to Laos (and contrary to popular myth), time has been our friend in southeast Asia. It has been the high mountains of Laos and its tangled jungles that have provided the buffer between Communist Red China and Communist-controlled North Vietnam and the crucial countries of the area and insured their geographical separation from direct military pressure and subversion.

Look at a map and one glance will show how the existence of a non-Communist Laos brought time—the vital time Malaya had to have in its own fight against Communist guerrillas; time for Burma to bring its own Communist Party into line; time for Thailand to build its army and resistance to the so-called free Thai movement being nurtured by Peiping-recruited exiles on Red Chinese soil; time for Cambodia to embark on a policy of neutralism and the geographical immunity that permitted Prince Sihanouk to practice it; and time for South Vietnam to pursue its gallant fight against the relentless Communist infiltration from the north and time through free elections to restore its good name in a world where the West is far more preoccupied with rapping those on its side than in considering what Communists do to the little people in places like North Vietnam and Red China.

Now, back to the fighting fronts. In Laos today a lot of towns are falling and victories being claimed in the name of Lao. The Communists would have us believe that the Buddha-loving Lao on our side let Buddha get in the way of fighting, but that the Buddha-loving Lao on the Communist side are military heroes.

Some Lao do, of course, fight and fight well (even those on our side) as this correspondent can attest after experiencing frontline combat conditions in Indochina with Lao and having also a basis of comparison in frontline combat conditions with Koreans and Chinese.

But no Lao, even be he a Communist, is going to change from an irregular guerrilla without anything bigger than burp gun into a skilled artilleryman (and the barrage against Muong Sai was a very model of destructive accuracy) in the short months since the Soviet December airlift first began providing these weapons in great numbers. The United States has been so busy tearing down the admitted exaggerations of the Royal Lao about Communist Vietminh battalions that it has failed to make clear to the world (or to itself?) the critical importance of the fact—and it is a fact—that Communist Vietminh officers counseled by Soviet advisers and aided by Vietminh and Soviet technicians have been firing the artillery and directing the Lao units in battle. There are about 1,000 non-Lao officers in active combat on the Red side.

And why, speaking of will to win, has the United States stood idly by and counted Soviet airlift airplanes instead of letting the Royal Lao army shoot them down? If a precedent is needed the Communists have shot down our planes in Laos.

Said a Lao official: "You belittle our courage. Yet every time we want to do something like shoot down a Soviet plane you say that this escalates the war.

When the Communists increase their artillery, when they openly show their Vietminh officers, then belatedly our side is permitted to take steps along the same line, only usually less. You Americans admit now they have 1,000 foreign soldiers fighting with them. But—because of world opinion—you refused until the 11th hour to even put the American advisers in uniform. World opinion inhibits you. It doesn't inhibit them. How could anybody win under these conditions?"

Is the John Birch Society a Menace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial written by Mr. William K. Shearer, publisher of the Oceanside-Carlsbad Banner in Oceanside, Calif. The editorial is entitled "Is the John Birch Society a Menace?" and is, I believe, the best exposé of the massive propaganda campaign launched against the John

Birch Society and its patriotic goals and objectives:

IS THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY A MENACE?

One thing the American people must remember is that communism and its advocates are diabolically clever enemies.

The Communists also know what is known by every person knowledgeable in elemental strategy, that the best defensive is a good offensive.

It is also a fact that, during the past year, the American people have become very much more alert to the menace of communism than they have been in recent times. There has been a unity among our people in opposition to communism which has been highly dangerous to the subversives and traitors in our midst.

To the Communists, a new offensive was necessary. It was imperative to their continued success that the American people be divided along a line other than the line of communism versus Americanism. A division along the latter line had left the Communists and their sympathizers and apologists in too small a minority for comfort.

For some time, the Communists and their dupes concentrated on attacking J. Edgar Hoover, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and the other governmental agencies exposing communism. Such attacks by the leftists went over with the American public like a lead balloon. The American people had become too well informed to accept subversive propaganda against the Un-American Activities Committee. The American people, so reasoned their enemies, must be divided for and against another group, a group not well known among the people, a group against whom unfounded suspicions could be stirred.

Such tactics are not new. Almost every religious group, for instance, has from time to time endured persecutions based on a misunderstanding by the public of the religious group's beliefs and practices. This applies equally to Protestants, Catholics, and Jews.

The Communists chose to divide Americans on the John Birch Society, a recently formed group dedicated to battling communism, and a group which, because it was little known, could be easily misrepresented to the public.

For weeks, now, the Communists and their apologists in the press, on the radio and television, and throughout society as a whole, have devoted countless amounts of space, time, and conversation to dividing America on the question of the John Birch Society. They have brought into camp with them a lot of good, respectable people whose Americanism goes about as deep as "I'm for me first."

The attacks on the society have centered around some intemperate language purportedly used by its founder in describing some past President; the society's opposition to the Supreme Court; and the group's restrictive membership. But regardless of the issues in the attack, regardless of the attack's object, the drive against the John Birch Society has done the job. It has divided Americans along a line contrary to the real issue. That real issue is communism versus American liberty. This new Communist-promoted division has taken our eyes off the ball.

Let us examine, briefly, the attacks on the John Birch Society.

First, there is the argument that the group's founder, Robert Welch, used intemperate language in describing three former Presidents of the United States. Such an argument cannot be very moving to any person familiar with American politics. Nothing worse is ever said about a President than what is said about him by the opposite party during a political campaign. Abraham Lincoln dismissed the attacks on him with the comment, "If I took time out of my busy schedule to answer every unkind thing that was ever said about me, my office would be closed for any other business."

Instead of passing off unjust criticism with the grace display by Lincoln, many modern officeholders have adopted the attitude that all officeholders are above criticism. Such a philosophy is ridiculous. The "divine right of kings" myth was exploded long ago.

To attack an organization because its leader intemperately described three successful politicians is absurd.

Second, the John Birch Society has been attacked because it has a restrictive membership. You may join only by invitation. To attack a group on this basis is equally absurd. How many other groups have memberships based on invitation only? To the best of this paper's knowledge, that is the criterion for membership in most service clubs, lodges, fraternal orders, and many other groups. Most churches require certain prerequisites of belief from persons before they are admitted to membership. In this regard, the Communist attack could have as easily been directed at the Rotary Club as at the John Birch Society.

Third, the John Birch Soicety has been attacked because it opposes our present Supreme Court. The cold hard fact of life is that the Supreme Court has done more to uplift communism, destroy our anti-Communist statutes, and cause racial disturbance and unrest than any other organ in our history. Opposition to the members of that court is a minimum requirement of any American in his demonstration of practical good sense on the subject of saving our Nation from communism.

Fourth, the John Birch Society has been attacked because of its methods. What are these methods? The principal method used by the society is letterwriting to Members of Congress, urging legislators to vote in the interest of their own country. Frankly, the intensity of the Communist assault on the society has given the banner an eyeopener as to the effectiveness of such letterwriting.

Now, if you still think the John Birch Society is the great menace, and that we should choose up sides as a Nation along this line, this paper must ask again, "What is the real menace to America?" Think for a moment.

Has the John Birch Society, through subversion and infiltration, taken over two-thirds of the world?

Has the John Birch Society enslaved millions of people anywhere on earth?

Has the John Birch Society starved multitudes to death in the Ukraine or elsewhere?

Has the John Birch Society taken away anybody's freedom anywhere in the world?

Has the John Birch Society seized a single government by violence and revolution?

Is the John Birch Society about to run us out of Cuba?

Is the John Birch Society about to involve us in a war in Laos?

Is the John Birch Society responsible for the civil war in the Congo?

Is the John Birch Society prepared to annihilate America in a nuclear war?

The answer to all these questions is "No." The John Birch Society is not responsible for these iniquities, but communism is. Now you tell the Banner where the real menace lies. You tell this paper along what line we ought to divide. It is along the line of Americanism versus communism, not along the line of some Americans for and some Americans against the John Birch Society.

The John Birch Society is hated by some because it has told the American people the truth about communism, and has provided an effective opposition group against America's real enemy. Its leaders are being persecuted because, like the prophets of old, they have spoken a truth too real for many people to accept.

The Banner is not very much moved by the so-called respectability of some of the opposition to the John Birch Society. Benedict Arnold was considered highly respectable and socially acceptable when he betrayed America during the Revolutionary War. It was Herod, not John the Baptist, who was socially respectable when the degenerate king beheaded the prophet 2,000 years ago.

As Americans, let us not be fooled by the Communists and the apologist press. Let us choose sides on the real issue, and divide along the real line.

A political cartoon once depicted a great black vulture saying, "Never mind the corruption; let's talk about foreign policy." This is the exact philosophy recommended by the Communists when they tell Americans to choose up sides on the question of the John Birch Society.

The Mexican Labor Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mrs. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, the House will soon be asked, once again, to extend the Mexican labor program under Public Law 78, for a period of 2 years. This program originally began at a time of extreme labor shortages in the agricultural labor field, but it has continued in spite of the very ample supply—in fact, oversupply—of domestic labor. There is every evidence that the availability of Mexican labor has had the effect of depressing labor standards among domestic workers, not only in the States where the braceros actually are employed, but in other States, such as my own State of Oregon, where the program has the secondary effect of substantially enlarging the surplus labor pool.

Farm workers in America, Mr. Speaker, are at the bottom of the economic ladder. I agree, not only with the present Secretary of Labor, but with his predecessor in President Eisenhower's Cabinet, that the Public Law 78 program should not be allowed to create further hardships for American labor. We have heard a good deal, from the opponents of minimum wage laws, about the bad effects of foreign competition upon our employment picture. Here is a case in which the immediate effect of the importation, not of foreign products, but of foreign workers themselves, could be halted, through the adoption of the administration's proposed amendments to Public Law 78.

The New York Times recently carried a story about Secretary Goldberg's fine statement in support of the bill which our able and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. COAD] has introduced, and which I, for one, would like to see adopted when Public Law 78 extension is before the House. The New York Times article says:

GOLDBERG FOR CUT IN MIGRANT LABOR—BACK MOVE TO RESTRICT USE OF MEXICAN FARM HANDS

WASHINGTON, April 23.—Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg declared today that

the law permitting Mexican farm laborers to come into the United States should be allowed to die unless it was changed to protect American workers from unfair competition.

He issued a statement in support of a bill by Representative MERWIN COAD, Democrat, of Iowa, providing changes in the law.

The arrangement between Mexico and the United States under which about 1 million Mexican farmworkers come into this country each year on a temporary basis will expire December 31, unless Congress extends it.

CITES DOMESTIC SLUMP

"It is my view and the view of the administration," Mr. Goldberg said today, "that the power and authority of the Government should not be used in a manner which tends to perpetuate or lower the already depressed economic condition of U.S. farmworkers.

"Evidence accumulated by the Department of Labor proves beyond doubt that the mass importation of Mexican labor has had, and is having, an adverse effect on the wages, working conditions and employment opportunities of U.S. farmworkers.

"At a time when unemployment is a major problem in the United States there can be no justification for continuing such a program unless action is taken to protect the interests of U.S. farm warkers."

In addition to protecting U.S. workers, Mr. Goldberg asserted, Mr. COAD's proposal would enable the Labor Department to administer the law "in a manner which is fair to all parties involved."

He suggested that with the changes the law should be extended for 2 years to December 31, 1963.

PROVISIONS FAVORED

Provisions favored by Mr. Goldberg included the following:

Before being eligible to employ Mexican workers growers would have to offer U.S. workers wages at least equivalent to average farm wages in the State.

Eligibility to employ Mexican workers would be restricted to employers who make reasonable efforts to attract U.S. workers by offering and actually providing conditions of employment equal to those required by law for Mexican workers.

Mexican workers would be confined to employment in seasonal and temporary jobs and to employment not involving the operation of or work on machinery, except in specific cases found necessary by the Secretary of Labor to avoid hardship.

Mr. Goldberg urged also that the Secretary of Labor be authorized to limit the number of foreign workers who may be employed by any employer to the extent necessary to assure active competition among growers for the services of the U.S. farmworkers.

Take a Lesson From Experience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, David Lawrence gives his views in an understanding article which appeared today in the New York Herald Tribune:

FIRMNESS CALLED ANTIDOTE FOR MESS IN WASHINGTON

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, April 30.—On the surface, it does look like there's another mess in Washington. But there's nothing really wrong here that wouldn't be cured by some consistency and firmness, plus a little more experience by President Kennedy.

Tens of thousands of words are poured out in Presidential messages. Task forces galore—composed of earnest-minded but often naive intellectuals—are running around here trying to spell out reforms in well-written phrases that read like the promise-all planks of the political platforms.

After 100 days in the White House, Mr. Kennedy himself, a well-meaning, conscientious young man, is finding out the hard way that National Government isn't so simple after all. He perhaps wishes he had not been so critical of the Eisenhower administration a few months ago and probably regrets the demagogery he put into those campaign speeches.

A TOUGH JOB

Nobody will deny that Mr. Kennedy has an almost superhuman job on his hands and needs every bit of sympathy and help that he can get. But he will not win cooperation by alibis attempting to shift responsibility to the press, nor by spending so much of his time at partisan political dinners or in conferences with political bosses while international crises in Laos, South Vietnam, and Cuba worry the American people.

The President's speech in New York last week urging the press to be cooperative was well intentioned, but it has very little to do with the mess that arose in the handling of the Cuban invasion. For the press, after all, has been indoctrinated during most of the last 8 years by congressional committee studies and hearings to believe that freedom of information is paramount and that everything must be made available to the public.

CONGRESSMEN LEAK NEWS

Members of Congress themselves have often given out military information they thought was important to the American people even though at the same time potential enemies of this country were unwittingly furnished some valuable data.

What is the remedy for this continuing deprecation of the United States? The first restraint will have to be imposed by Members of Congress and the politicians upon themselves. They had a field day a year ago over the U–2 incident, and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's partisans even went so far as to publish a detailed report on the U–2 affair—an obviously secret operation in the cold war. The formal report made joyful reading in Moscow.

The press, of course, will print what is visible or audible to people generally. Democratic Senators and Representatives who made speeches about our missile gap could not expect the press to refrain from publishing them—in fact, they sought such publicity even though it undermined the prestige of the United States at home and abroad.

PRESS RARELY AT FAULT

Rarely has any individual newspaper come up on its own with what might strictly be called military information that wasn't generally known.

Anyone who takes into account the large size of the Cuban exile group and the open operations of some of its leaders in Miami must realize that semipublic activities of this kind will be fully covered in the press and will be widely broadcast.

The Central Intelligence Agency is supposed to collect intelligence information, and it rarely makes anything available to the press. Whether it really knows what is going on abroad sometimes is difficult to establish, but nobody can quarrel with its desire for secrecy.

There is one important question to which the Kremlin wants the answer: Is the United States going to stand up for its rights and fight if necessary? To put it another way, is the real viewpoint of this Government expressed by the appeasers in our midst who go around telling the world we are licked on the issue of Red China's admission to the U.N., and might as well surrender? Defeatism of this kind does more harm than news stories of a dozen Cuban invasions. All that Moscow wants to know today is whether the United States is bluffing on Berlin or Laos or Cuba.

There was no doubt left by President Eisenhower that America would defend Formosa. It was made clear that we would defend Quemoy and Matsu under certain circumstances. Mr. Kennedy during the campaign last year did not help the cause by expressing opposition to a defense of Quemoy and Matsu. It was unwise then to broadcast such information to the Kremlin, because there was the possibility that, as President, Mr. Kennedy might face a decision on that very point. The press was not to blame for this dilemma, created to gain votes in a political campaign.

WHERE PRESS CAN'T HELP

All in all, the press can help the cause of the United States by voluntarily suppressing news of weapons or gadgets or the mobilization of ships or airplanes or armies unless such movements have been officially announced. But the press can't help much in suppressing news about the administration when so many spokesmen are available from day to day to hint at changes in foreign policy that amount to a weakening of the U.S. position.

Nor does it seem to make much sense for the State Department to hold—as it did last week—2 days of secret conferences with 250 American newspaper editors, including an off-the-record talk by President Kennedy himself, while a Communist newspaper man was present and took notes which doubtless were being read in the Kremlin within 24 hours.

PRESIDENT TOLD

The episode is explained as a mechanical error in making up the invitation list, and the President was advised about it before he began speaking, but it was then too late to do anything without creating an international incident.

Sooner or later the mess in Washington will have to be cleaned up. It will be done when the number of cooks now making the broth is reduced considerably and some firm decisions are made by the President himself that are consistently maintained by deeds as well as words.

New Life for Cologne

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, from the Sudeten Bulletin comes this word picture of the new life that has come from the shambles that only a few years ago was Cologne, Germany.

It is another tribute to the great industry and dedication of the German people and I am pleased to insert the article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

NEW LIFE FROM THE RUINS—COLOGNE

(By Erhard Krischke)

In 1950 Kempten, then Ansbach, Stuttgart, Frankfurt, Munich, and Nuremberg in turn played host to the Sudeten Germans at

their annual rally during the season of Pentecost. In 1961 the Rhine metropolis of Cologne will open its doors to the Sudetens convening for the 12th annual year, this time under the motto "Unity, Justice and Freedom."

A bustling cosmopolitan center with 775,000 inhabitants, Cologne today along with Hamburg and Munich, ranks third largest city in the West German Federal Republic; numerically it compares with San Francisco, Calif. Seventy-two percent destroyed during World War II, with the inner city reduced to a mere shambles, Cologne's population totaled but 40,000 souls in 1945. A sorely tried people found strength and encouragement, however, in the fact that the city's famous landmark, its cathedral, withstood the ravages of war. The Rhine River, city's main artery, was still pulsating. Conscious of their centuries-old tradition and filled with a zeal to rebuild their historic city, the burghers of Köln reshaped the city within a nation recovering its general health, to lend old dignity to its new contours.

Cologne was founded in A.D. 50, when the Roman Emperor Claudius, at the behest of his wife Agrippina, raised the settlement of the Germanic tribe of the Ubii to a veteran colony known as Colonia Claudia Ara Agrippinensis (CCAA). In the fifth century, there developed along with added strategic, economic, and cultural significance, the name "Colonia." The Roman tower, remnants of the original city wall, numerous excavations and above all the multiformed glasses in the Römisch-Germanische Museum in Cologne's old armory, remind one of the city's golden age that drew to a close with the coming of the Franks in A.D. 450.

In A.D. 313, when Christianity definitely asserted itself, Cologne was already recognized as a bishopric. When its geographically favorable location as point of intersection for European north-south and west-east lines of communication led to its choice as a temporary residence of the Franconian kings, Charlemagne raised the city to an archbishopric in the year 795. It is part of the tragic history of the city that it underwent a second period of destruction, this time by the Normans; in 881.

New life again sprang from the ruins, however, with circumspect and ambitious archbishops helping Cologne to rise to new heights in the Middle Ages, for ever since 953 they were not only spiritual dignitaries but secular lords of the town. Many of them became advisers to the German emperors and several became chancellors of the Reich. One of them worthy of note was Rainald von Dassel, whose meritorious acts include the transfer in 1164, during the reign of Emperor Barbarossa, of the remains of the Holy Three Kings from Milan to Cologne, causing Cologne to become second only to Rome as Europe's most frequented shrine. It attracted pilgrims and tradespeople and had a beneficial effect on the spiritual and mercantile life of the town. Still today the crowns of the three Magi, patron saints of the city, can be seen on Cologne's coat-of-arms.

With the rise in trade and prosperity the town grew in size and splendor. Religious gratitude coupled with worldly competition between the princes of the church and the townspeople for status plus visible power, led at this time to the building of numerous places of worship. Cologne became a city of churches, a "Rome of the North."

Cologne's proud public spirit during that era is reflected in the stand against its archbishop whose secular rule they called into question, and whose army they defeated near Worringen in 1288, so that the archbishops transferred residence to Bonn and Bruhl until the end of the 18th century. From there they still exercised a measure of influence on Cologne's fat, while the city itself was ruled by a patrician corporate body.

Cologne's membership in the Hanseatic League gave an unprecedented boost to its economic life, finally placing the city in the lead, as she expanded her trade relations from Sicily via Spain, Flanders, England as far as Novgorod in Russia. This mighty upswing was mirrored in secular structures: the majestic town hall tower (1407–14) and the festival hall known as Gürzenich (1437–44). In 1475 Emperor Frederick III raised Cologne to the status of free city of the Reich.

Intellectual life also flourished. In 1388 the University of Cologne was founded with its chairs of learning filled by the mystic Master Ekkehard, the learned Scottish monk Duns Scotus, St. Albertus Magnus, whose pupil was Thomas Aquinas.

Yet the powerful unfolding of art and learning was to come to a halt due to external circumstance. The discovery of America shifted trade to the Atlantic, weakening the importance of the Hanseatic League. The 30 Years' War, too, caused a break in trade relations between Cologne and England, a powerful economic relapse, despite the fact that Köln remained a free town of the Reich until the end of the 18th century. Finally the period of occupation by the French, lasting from 1794 to 1814, led to the closing of the university. It remained dormant until 1919 when, under its former Lord Mayor, Dr. Konrad Adenauer, present Chancellor, it was reinstituted.

In 1815 Cologne became Prussian. From then on, to the beginning of the 19th century, the city benefited by its growing industrialization. The development of the Rhine navigation and the building of West European railroad lines blessed it with greater favors. The central location of Cologne as an intersection point for commerce soon induced the establishment of important industries which, in turn, animated the capital market and raised the city to the leading bank and insurance center of West Germany. This trend was nourished and heightened after the First World War. Cologne's former prominence as a trade city was reflected in the Cologne Fair. These prewar conditions were likewise the natural prerequisites and points of contact for the rebuilding and rejuvenation of the city. Despite the destruction of 1945, the subterranean canal system and electric, gas and telephone networks remained by and large intact, facilitating the decision to begin anew.

It soon became evident that the resolve to start in again was a sound one. The proximity of raw materials industries and the Rhine River facilitated the manufacture of items such as machines, railroad cars, motor vehicles as well as the chemical and perfume industries (Eau de Cologne), foods and luxury items, large-scale trade, banking, and last but not least the insurance branch, so that one can truly speak of a continuation of old traditions.

In the reconstruction of the ravaged city courageous and original paths are being followed. It was a matter of course that old cultural monuments were restored, too. Contradiction in style were bound to occur, due to the proximity of old and new and it has given rise to ample criticism. Undisputed, however, are the beauty and technical practicability of Cologne's modern bridges. Five bridges connect the two shores of the Rhine, causing Cologne to be known as the city of bridges. Churches have likewise been restored since the Second War and today 50 new houses of worship in modern style bear witness to the town's spiritual tradition. The pretentious focal point of Cologne's cultural life is the recently constructed Grosse Haus, the opera. Last year the Photokina, a photographic and cinema fair of international proportion, celebrated its 10th anniversary in Cologne.

As tempting as it is to speak of Cologne in superlatives, an even more gracious intercessor for the city is King Carneval, where Rhenish zeal for living and Cologne's spirit of gaiety find expression, today as ever before, in wild merriment and revelry. That, too, has enticed tourists to its doors, and now not only the English can covet the honors for having discovered Cologne as a travelers' paradise, for the majority of its guests from abroad hail from the United States of America. In 1960 they were no less than 60,000. If signs do not receive, Cologne will continue in the years to come to beckon visitors from the four corners of the globe.

Mention the Boss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, Madison Avenue as been outdone at its own game. An incredible situation has come to light, as indicated in the following article by Victor Wilson, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on April 27, and in the editorial which appeared the following day in Long Island's Newsday:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 27, 1961]

DON'T FORGET TO MENTION THE BOSS

(By Victor Wilson)

WASHINGTON, April 26.—Word has gone to all 10 Cabinet officers and their top assistants that when making speeches or announcing projects, to mention President Kennedy's name early and often, it was confirmed today.

This applies from the No. 1 Cabinet member, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, right down to the Commissioner of Patents, the Census Bureau Director, and the Director of the Weather Bureau.

The idea is to create a national image of Mr. Kennedy as a man of "compassion," whose interest extends from a chap who lost his job on an auto assembly line, to the major domestic and foreign problems confronting the Nation.

Orders to build up President Kennedy were first revealed today by "Battle Line," a publication of the Republican National Committee.

It printed a copy of a memo on how to do so from Herbert W. Klotz, Special Assistant Secretary to Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges. The memo went to all top brass in the Department.

Questioned by the Herald Tribune, Mr. Klotz not only confirmed that he had signed and distributed the memo, but revealed that his counterparts in the other nine executive departments have passed or will pass the word along to the top people in their own departments.

Mr. Klotz defended the move as completely legitimate, but denounced the Republican National Committee for disclosing it.

"The Republicans must have damn little to write about," he commented. "News must be awfully scarce over there."

Here is the text of Mr. Klotz' memo to top officials in the Commerce Department:

At a White House meeting of Cabinet assistants, we have been advised again that speeches of Cabinet and sub-Cabinet officers do not contain sufficient reference to the President, and his personal interest in, and compassion with, the problems which face

the Nation. Liberal quotations from his speeches, past or present, should be used.

"The above was not deemed to be a reflection on the speeches delievered by Commerce Department officials, but was in the nature of a general comment on all executive departments.

"It is also to be kept in mind that, in making announcements of local projects, the President should be given a credit line in the lead paragraph.

"Attached are copies for offices and bureaus under your jurisdiction. Should you desire copies for others, please let us know."

Copies were attached to the memo for the acting commissioner of the Century 21 Exposition, to be held at Seattle, Wash., next year; the Director of the Department's field services; the Director of Personnel; the Maritime Administrator; the Weather Bureau Director; the Director of the Bureau of Foreign Commerce; the Director of the Office of International Trade; the Acting Administrator of the Business and Defense Services Administration; the Census Bureau Director; the Commissioner of Patents; and the Director of the National Bureau of Standards.

It could not be learned how Mr. Klotz' counterparts in the other nine departments are handling this problem—whether by memo, personal suggestion, or instruction. Mr. Klotz' contribution was dated April 12.

In talking about it today, Mr. Klotz said the idea came up at a periodic meeting of Cabinet officers' assistants at the White House sometime prior to that date. He couldn't remember who had the idea, but added that those present, representing all 10 departments, thought "it was a good idea."

"We are all proud of the President," he explained, "and feel that the people ought to know of the interest he takes in everybody, not just important people. We at Commerce feel that if a Commerce Department man is making a speech, say, in Cleveland, then he should find out first what the President had done for Cleveland, and mention it."

Mr. Kennedy, he went on, is an avid newspaper reader, and when he comes across an item about a person he can help, he picks up the telephone, and tries to get some action. He cited the case of Mr. Kennedy's reading that former President Eisenhower was not provided with sufficient office space and stationery after he left office. Mr. Kennedy called the General Services Administration, and that same day, Mr. Koltz said. General Eisenhower had more space than he could use.

Mr. Klotz also recalled that President Kennedy, reading that Ford Motor Co. had closed an assembly plant at Chester, Pa., urged the Commerce Department to try to create positions for those left jobless. This was done, at least in part, Mr. Klotz said, by inducing the Reynolds Metals Co. to take over the plant.

[From Newsday, Apr. 28, 1961]

IMAGE, SCHMIDMAGE

All our ribald comments about the Madison Avenue techniques of the Eisenhower administration, we now submit, were premature. The Kennedy administration has out-Madison-Avenued them all.

This revelation comes from a meeting of cabinet assistants, where Frederick G. Dutton, secretary to the Cabinet, told the hired hands that their bosses were not mentioning the President often enough in speeches, or underlining "his personal interest in, and compassion with, the problems that face the Nation."

The Kennedy administration is not too shy, as it is, but when the cult of the leader becomes an official policy, that's too much. It will be by acts rather than by speeches that President Kennedy develops an image—the word now heavily in use down Washington way. If he's compassionate, it won't remain a secret. If he's interested, the citizens will get the idea without heavy underlining.

Exactly how this bit of huckerstering was leaked to the Republican Party, which hastened it into print, is not very clear. The Republicans reprinted a memo circulated by Herbert W. Klotz, special assistant to the Secretary of Commerce. Probably we will have to wait a day or two until Special Assistant Klotz is plain Mr. Klotz once more.

Cardinal Scores Payoffs in Public Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to include therein an excerpt from a recent pastoral letter issued by Richard Cardinal Cushing, archbishop of Boston, charging that American moral life is in dangerous decline, and strongly condemning moral abuses in such areas of community life as politics, medicine, law, and the economy.

The letter was distributed to all parishes in the Boston diocese and is a tremendously valuable contribution to contemporary thought concerning the questions with which it so aptly deals.

The letter covers wide ground and is quite lengthy. The excerpt I am including in the RECORD deals with politics and for that reason is pertinent and timely for those of us engaged in government as well as all those who are interested in raising the levels of integrity, competency, and public spirit in the government and in the Nation.

Cardinal Cushing concluded his penetrating letter urging prayers for our country and its people, for our leaders and their decisions, that over every action will rest the protection of God's hand and in every heart the consciousness of his prayers.

I was so deeply impressed with this message that I felt that our membership and people generally throughout the Nation would be vitally interested in reading it and having the benefit of the views of a great American spiritual leader.

The message follows:

CARDINAL SCORES PAYOFFS IN PUBLIC LIFE

Man, called as we have seen to a truly supernatural life, must live and act always in the world in which he finds himself. Bearing a wounded human nature—despoiled by the sin of Adam—each one of us strives toward goodness only in the reliance on God's help. The divine assistance is never lacking, there is always "grace abounding," but our willingness to work with it is often less than it should be.

It is never enough for us merely to write our names large in favor of the high ideals of the Christian life unless at the same time we are prepared to put them to work in the marketplace of our everyday living. The Golden Rule has to be made to shine in dark places, and the Sermon on the Mount must be heard in the valleys of commotion.

For us there is no division between a human life and a Christian life, there is only one life in Christ. His word and His way must guide every action of ours whether we are at study or at prayer, at home or abroad, in leisure or at labor; there is simply no part of our lives from which He can be excluded.

With these truths to guide us let me emphasize some of the difficult areas in which the committed Christian at this moment faces serious challenges to his moral life. It is possible only to touch upon these topics, but my remarks may point in directions which will encourage individual reflection and promote fruitful self-analysis.

POLITICS

As we attempt to analyze the complex situation in which we carry on our individual and social activities, our attention must be turned first of all to the functions of government, where society finds its necessary structure and expression. In a democratic society government represents not merely the will of the people, but their ideals and their philosophy of life. When government loses its concern for the public good, and serves the selfish interests of individuals or groups rather than the needs of society as they are indicated in the deepest longings of the human soul, democracy itself is doomed to destruction.

To make democracy work, government must be everybody's business. We cannot expect to provide a wholesome social environment unless each of us assumes some responsibility for the right ordering of our government on every level, from the lowest to the highest.

When we are looking for a place to begin, I suggest that we think first of all our responsibilities as voting citizens. Political democracy recognizes in the members of society the right to take part in the procedure by which the officials of government are chosen. The weaknesses of political democracy are only too evident. Some serious students even present them as proofs of the insufficiency of the democratic system itself.

One cynical political philosopher has in fact expressed his disdain for democracy by observing that in an absolute monarchy only one person in the country can be dishonest and he keeps himself in power by compelling every one else to be honest. In a democracy, the philosopher continues, the thirst for power tempts large numbers of people to make use of dishonest means in its pursuit, with the result that the entire community is exposed to moral decay.

We probably react with indignation to this crudely realistic evaluation of the moral character of our people. Perhaps this will stir us to action. We should be aroused to the pressing need of purifying our democratic processes in their actual operation, and of submitting the exercise of our rights to the control of the principles of Christian morality. The right to vote entails the obligation to vote for those who are best fitted to serve the community, not for those from whom we hope to gain some selfish and purely personal advantage.

The private lives and personal qualifications of our public officials should reflect the serious concern of the people to have as leaders those who look to the welfare of the whole Nation. We demonstrate by our choice of public servants our consistent determination to be ruled by reason and morality rather than by power and intrigue.

When public officials are dishonest, they are false to the oath of office which an enduring Christian tradition requires them to pronounce. When public officials who have proved themselves to be dishonest are returned to office again and again, the voter emblazons before the world his own in-

difference to the moral law. This is a matter of gravest scandal. It is plain that the voting citizen in such a situation encourages the spread of corruption and is himself a kind of partner in crime.

CHARGES BASED ON SORDID REALITY

I cannot find language strong enough to bear the burden of moral judgment that must fall upon those individuals who poison politics with dishonesty and corruption. These are genuine subversies who turn to wickedness the good order of society. When we hear murmurs of graft, and bribery, of payoffs and grabs, we know that these charges are not the products of the imaginations of fanciful people; they take their source in a sordid reality which a decent society cannot afford to tolerate.

Whenever those who call themselves Christian are party to such dealings, they turn their back upon their name and heritage and scandalize those for whom they should especially give good example. There is no double standard possible here. One may not claim a blameless personal life, be a member of a truly Christian family, and at the same time tolerate or take part in those deals which misappropriate public funds or favor special interests for private gain. God does not allow us to keep a double bookkeeping; there will be one accounting and a just God will be our judge.

It is appalling to discover after each election that a large percentage of our population neglects to vote. It is more amazing and truly discouraging to discover that the reason for not voting is a lack of any sense of responsibility for the functioning of government. We would do well to be alarmed at the widespread apathy and indifference of those who do not vote in any election, but perhaps, we should be more alarmed by the selfish motivated preferences of many of those who do vote.

INDIFFERENT GOVERNMENTS

It must be insisted that governments which are indifferent to the ideals of moral rectitude do not serve the public good. When we speak of the public good, it should be remembered, we do not imply that the rights of the state prevail always over those of its individual members. Governments must acknowledge their subjection to the moral law. Civil law and civic action must be coordinated with the demands of decency and justice.

Unless both the leader in public life and the voter who places him there have a solid commitment to the demands of the moral law, the public good will degenerate into the private gain of gangsters who seek public power as thieves rather than as servants of their fellow men. I am sorry to say that our American scene has provided us with evidence to support this woeful declaration.

Any discussion of government must include consideration of political parties as they have developed in the history of our country. The American Constitution we know, makes no provision for political parties; yet the fact that they have been in existence from the very beginning indicates that they fill an indispensable part in the operation of our Government as the Constitution provides for it. In his farewell address, George Washington warned against the evils of factions; yet he agreed that it is only through the clash of opposing parties that the spirit of liberty can be vigorously preserved.

The basic problem of American political life in this connection is to identify the programs of political parties with the good of the total community. The evils that have developed in political affairs do no more than reflect, in great measure, the moral corruption of the people as a whole. The vast sums of money which must support our elections often comes from the people who hope to benefit by their outcome.

It is always to be feared, as it is sometimes demonstrated, that political parties have sold out to those who have helped to finance their success. Nor has it been possible up to the present to control the financial operations of political parties by effective legislation.

Until we recognize the moral deficiency which this situation implies, and the moral laxity which it encourages, our indignation at the presence of corruption in public life will be hypocritical. We shall be guilty before God of that self-deceit which does not destroy sin, but merely encourages it within the boundaries of manmade laws.

Ultimately a healthy political life under the American system depends on an intelligent and morally upright electorate. Unless the great majority of the people study political issues and candidates seriously and vote with discrimination, political parties will manage to conduct their campaigns without regard for the truth and to buy power with patronage without regard for the public good.

FAMILY

Truly sincere and patriotic Americans cannot fail to become alarmed at the rising scandal of family breakdown in our society since we know that the destruction of family life is the clearest sign of community decay. America is no longer an integrated society, especially in regard to sex and marriage behavior, as we could have claimed a century ago.

At that time all Americans held roughly the same set of basic values, defined marriage ideals in the same way, and consequently organized their political, economic, social and religious institutions in such a way as to support, or at least not to hinder, the achievement of these ideals.

Such a consensus is badly needed today. We must have a society which clearly defines the norms of conduct on the practical level, with respect shown to those who live according to such norms, with child rearing practices established in terms of a definite sexual code, and couples entering marriage knowing what is expected of them as partners and parents. Within such a society personal development is meaningful defined and the pursuit of happiness then achieves significance.

EXPLOITATION OF SEX ENCOURAGED

Blatant and vulgar exploitation of sex is encouraged in the press, entertainment, advertising, and much of our contemporary literature. The process by which one set of standards and patterns of conduct is strongly advocated in theory, and yet a contradictory set is tolerated and promoted in practice, gives rise to serious personal contradictions and tensions.

Consequently sex has come to preoccupy men's minds excessively, and has assumed an extravagant position in stable social life. A society which strongly emphasizes only the physical aspects of sex produces men and women who seek nothing more than personal gratification even in marriage, regarding one another as sexual objects rather than as persons.

The mutual development and fulfillment which should be one of the major personal rewards of marriage is in fact too seldom achieved. This failure has serious consequences, especially on our modern, isolated, domestic, conjugal family, which usually tends to place very great emphasis on companionship and the development of mutual affection.

While Americans in large numbers still believe that marriage should be monogamous and for life, our legal system renders only slight judicial support to family stability. It is no secret that divorce can be obtained by mutual consent, with uncontested divorces granted routinely.

Teaching youth that marriage is for life, when they see an open travesty of judicial procedure in contracts of marriage being easily dissolved, and the participants in collusion suffering no loss of prestige and status, creates serious scandal.

Another area of confusion pertaining to marriage is related to the definitions of goals of life. Modern American society offers no meaningful standards by which to judge success in life. Only material symbols are offered as guarantees of success. Men and women become so preoccupied with trying to keep up with or surpass others in material advantage that they completely overlook the possibilities for happiness in their immediate family relationships. Marrriage thus becomes little more than the conventional "base of operation" in an enduring competitive struggle.

The family has suffered devaluation because of our concentration on an even higher standard of living and because material symbols of success have blinded us to human values and personal development. This age must learn again that the pursuit of happiness becomes meaningless and indeed self-destrictuve unless it takes place in the framework of values based on the integral nature of man. We cannot accept man's claim to define his own relationship to his Creator. This is fundamentally opposed to the traditional belief that God rules creation through the natures of things and consequently that the divine plan can be discovered by studying these natures in their normal operations.

CONCLUSION

I have written at considerable length but it is clear that we have managed only to touch the surface of a vast and important subject. Certainly the small catalog we have made of those areas where lapses in public morality are prevalent is not intended to be exclusive; our attempt has been merely to supply examples that might suggest some of the perils that afflict our present American society.

To summarize what has been written: Christianity, once the center of gravity of our civilization, is today a peripheral activity. At work, in leisure, in political, social, sexual, educational, professional, and family interests, the mass of the modern community is almost without trace of Christian values. Christianity is external in our community; it is remote, detached, unrealized. The church has great institutions and good organizations but these represent partly an inheritance from the past and partly the energies of a minority within a minority. Christ's members are on the defensive in most places, on the decline in some, on the upgrade in only a few.

The problem is to renew the apostolic spirit. We, the church, must repenetrate the modern community from which we have been largely isolated. The community will not come to us. We must go to it, as Paul went and Xavier and Francis of Assisi. It is upon her well-educated children that she must depend for her mission in an age so enamored of ideas.

KNOWLEDGE HAS TO BE WON

This is the necessity which has produced the growing numbers of priests and laymen who no longer have confidence in the outmoded machinery of human organization within the church, are no longer content with the snug security that too often shuts Christians off from real knowledge of the forces at work in the communities of which they are members, but to which they seem alien. That knowledge has to be won in shops, offices, factories, forums, and marketplaces.

Therefore, the modern popes have called for a lay apostolate to serve in the factories, in the workrooms, theaters, newspaper offices, kitchens, camps, colleges, forums, and marketplaces of the world, to learn there and to teach there. This apostolate must be

for the most part the job of the laity. It must express itself much less in words than in Christian life, logically and loyally lived out.

Thus can the seed be planted anew within the present mass of humanity which has succeeded the ancient societies of Christendom. The Christian community must be reborn and regrown within the world community. Desocialized, the mass is straining toward some shape, some order. It must and will find organizations, good or evil. Its struggle toward coherence is part of the agony of our times. It accounts for our obsession with politics, with statism, with communism. For Christians the task is to bring to the struggling mass the Christian spirit which, informing it, may restore it in Christian order.

We have much dead timber in our organizations and much mere formalism in our habits of mind, especially in the habit which regards our chief task as being merly to conserve. The church is a dynamic, not a static institution. It is constantly losing ground or gaining. It cannot be frozen in set forms.

There are essentials of its life which the popes group under the phrase "the traditional rules of the church's public law." But beyond these there must always be innovation, invention, enterprise, new vision. The talent of which the Gospel speaks must always be traded and never buried in safe little places. It must be traded in the human world about us, in the places where we are and work, not merely in those where we meditate and pray. No Christian can escape the responsibility for influence on his generation. There can be no retreat from it, no ivory tower.

Even those who go to the higher life of prayer and contemplation still have this social responsibility. They praise God and pray for their generation. Those who stay in the world pray, too, but they also have the task of renewing in the world the Christian community.

It may be that some will draw the conclusion from the reading of these words that our times are so desolate, our problems so overwhelming, that even the stouthearted must become despondent. Such a mood is certainly an un-Christian one and allows to enter by the back door the very despair our Christian hope should dispell. I call upon our people to lift up their heads and hearts with this virtue of Christian hope which never ceases to recall how the providence of God hovers "over the bent world."

IMMENSE RESERVOIR AT HAND

We have at hand the immense reservoir of grace which is Christ's church from which we can draw a new vigor for the wavering spirit of man. God has not left us without resources in our struggle against our own inclinations to evil and the threats of the powers of darkness; the world on which we stand in judgment has itself already been judged as the Lord Himself reminded us. "Have confidence," He said, "for I have overcome the World." (John 17: 33.)

Just as our fathers spoke of "the promises of Christ" so we too repeat our prayers to be made worthy of the legacy left us by the Redeemer that we may use it in this life to His glory and for our salavation. The only fear we can allow ourselves is that "fear of the Lord" which the Scripture declares to be "the beginning of wisdom."

Not all the anxieties of a bewildered world, not all the machinations of evil men, not all the carelessness of those who are confused and wondering can ever separate us from the constant confidence that our faith places in the power of God to do good through man. To be fitting instruments of His divine purpose we must, however, put on Christ so that His divine light shines through us in this darkened world.

No one can predict for us what the years ahead will bring but we do not require much more than commonsense to realize that they will continue to be critical ones. I am not, however, pessimistic and I feel strongly that no true Christian has room for such a disposition.

The faith has done much more than survive the slings and arrows of earlier contests, it has in fact transformed both men and movements; its finest days have been those when wickedness seemed destined to triumph and goodness be dispersed. But in adversity God sends new vigor to His people and in the heat of contest, like steel, are our wills tempered. Let us be strong then in the faith and in the love of God and let us be full of the virtue of hope, so much neglected in our times and among our people. Let all men see in us the confidence that, when we make our ways God's way, His truth will prevail.

During this sacred season of Lent, a time of retreat and regeneration for the Church and its members, I urge your prayers for our country and its people, for our leaders and their decisions, that over every action will rest the protection of God's hand and in every heart the consciousness of His presence. We pray, too, that all may come to the full knowledge of His Son, the door of salvation for humankind. In Him we must find strength to lead us through the dark places and endurance for the long way.

Turn with me to Him and let us confess together our common infirmities, as at the same time we profess His dominion over us. We ask His blessing upon all men and nations and upon the Church through which He has called them to an eternal life with Him. We beg, too, for the intercession of the Mother of God and of all those heroes of holiness who rejoice in the presence of God that in our days we may take profit from their example and one day enjoy their reward. May God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, bless and be with us always.

Example by De Gaulle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial in the New York Daily News expresses the feeling of many of us about the example of General de Gaulle. It is heartening to see a patriot and a man of courage prove once again to the world that the great fundamental virtues can still win through to victory.

We salute and are thankful for France, and for her great son, Charles de Gaulle, for showing us an example of strength and brilliance in a world choked with apathy and mediocrity:

EXAMPLE BY DE GAULLE

French President Charles de Gaulle gave the free Western World a lift by cracking down the 4-day revolt of his Algerian Army, with hardly a shot fired. The insurrection leader, Gen. Maurice Challe, now faces a possible death sentence.

We'd say that France's grand old general, in addition to handling his own crisis properly and swiftly, offered his allies a striking example of how to win a bloodless victory.

Last Sunday, De Gaulle took his determined stand. He swore to use all means to safeguard the unity of his country. He obviously meant it, and the sudden silence from Algeria indicated that the mutineering generals there got the message.

Our congratulations to President de Gaulle on his handling of a tough situation, and we hope that official United States takes notice.

Party of Special Interests and the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, this is an unusual background story, written by Robert Allen and Paul Scott for the Long Island Press on April 26, regarding the party that calls itself "The Party of the People":

DEMS SOLICIT OIL INTERESTS

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—Interior Secretary Stewart Udall is going to surprising lengths to get contributions for the Democratic National Committee.

A well-known Washington representative of a leading oil company is telling colleagues in that field that Udall, as a long-standing friend, asked him to solicit them to buy $100-a-plate tickets for the national committee's May 27 dinner, to help pay off some $3 million in debts still remaining from the 1960 campaign.

Principal speaker at this fundraising affair will be President Kennedy.

Other notables slated to attend include Vice President JOHNSON, members of the Cabinet, among them Udall, Speaker SAM RAYBURN, and other congressional leaders.

John K. Evans, Washington representative of Asiatic Petroleum Co., a subsidiary of Shell Oil Corp., is spearheading Udall's unusual efforts to find $100-a-plate customers in that industry.

Three major agencies of the Interior Department are the Office of Oil and Gas, the Oil Import Administration that determines quotas, and the Office of Minerals Exploration, which conducts most of the Government's petroleum exploration research and development.

Selected by Udall as overall head of these agencies is Assistant Secretary John Kelly, former president of a New Mexico oil company.

Evans is soliciting these Democratic contributions in a form letter to around 60 of his oil colleagues. Copies of this letter are in the hands of startled members of the House, where Udall served several terms before being named to the Cabinet.

Among the Washington oil representatives who received Evans' letters are Kermit Roosevelt, Gulf Oil; Frank Rogers, Western Oil & Gas Association; John E. Cain, American Petroleum Institute; R. W. Crary, Standard Oil of California; H. D. Cole, Sun Oil; James V. Brown, National Petroleum Council; Harold L. Kennedy, A. C. F. Industries; J. T. Dickerson, Mid-Continental Oil & Gas Association.

Other oil firms represented on this list are Signal Oil, Texaco, American Oil, Phillips Petroleum, Independent Petroleum Association, Mobil Oil, Standard of New Jersey.

Full text of Evans' letter, with a notation that a copy was sent to Udall, is as follows:

"Secretary Udall, who happens to be a friend of long standing, has asked me as a personal favor to him to solicit the oil and gas industry in Washington in an effort to

help the Secretary dispose of his 'very sizable quota of tickets for the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner.'

"The dinner will be held on President Kennedy's birthday on May 27. Tickets are $100 per plate or $1,000 for a table of 10. It is being held at the National Guard Armory in Washington, D.C.

"The procedure that the Secretary has asked me to follow is to have all checks made payable to the Democratic National Committee, and if for some personal reason you do not wish to follow this suggestion, please contact me.

"Send your check to me together with a note indicating to whom and where you wish the tickets mailed. Thanks for your cooperation."

Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, militant Wisconsin liberal Democrat, vigorously opposed Assistant Secretary Kelly's confirmation on the ground "the oil industry is getting too strong a foothold inside the administration." But this opposition was unvailing and Kelly was overwhelmingly approved.

Since then, in letters to Wisconsin constituents, PROXMIRE has continued to assail Kelly's appointment and to charge the oil industry has undue control in the administration.

Do the Schools Need U.S. Government Aid?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the issue of Federal aid to education is everyman's problem and the following editorial by Harry T. Everingham from the Indianapolis News gets right to the facts of this matter:

Dr. A. C. G. writes:

"Are our public schools in such shape that the only solution is Federal aid? Is there a classroom shortage? Is there a teacher shortage? Have teachers' salaries lagged seriously behind? Has public spending on schools been niggardly? Who stands to benefit by Federal aid to education? Who is responsible for it?"

"Dear Dr. G.: Many of the facts you seek have just been uncovered by the citizens public expenditures survey, as follows:

"A classroom shortage? No, since the end of World War II we, the people, have built in all States, without Federal handouts, 680,000 classrooms. These are more than half of all in use today.

"A teacher shortage? Hardly, there are 47.6 percent more teachers now than in the 1949–50 period. The number of pupils also increased, but to a lesser degree—44.9 percent.

"Have teachers' salaries lagged? In the last 11 years teachers' salaries have increased by 99.8 percent—almost doubled—while the cost of living has increased only 23.6 percent, according to U.S. Consumer Price Index.

"Has public spending on schools been niggardly? It doesn't look so. Such spending increased from $5,800 million in 1949–50 to $15,500 million in 1959–60. This is a jump of 167.9 percent. In 1949 we spent $260.37 per pupil—now we spend $481.48.

"Who would stand to gain by Federal aid to teachers' salaries? The National Education Association has been the strongest lobby in Washington for Federal aid for schools. They know that with Federal aid will come Federal controls, placing them, as the main pressure group, in the driver's seat. Why do they want more power? The hierarchy of the NEA has gone on record as favoring socialism. Their executive head, Willard E. Givens, who retired January 1, 1952, is quoted in their published proceedings of the 72d annual meeting in Washington, D.C. (June 30, 1934) as saying:

"'A dying laissez-faire (free enterprise) must be completely destroyed and all of us, including the "owners," must be subjected to a large degree of social control. The credit agencies, the basic industries and utilities cannot be centrally planned and operated under private ownership. Hence [we] will support President Roosevelt in taking these over and operating them at full capacity as a unified national system in the interest of all the people.'

"Along with Federal aid to schools comes Federal dictation of our children's education under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Herbert Philbrick (former agent for the FBI who spent 9 years in the Communist Party) says that this Department of Health, Education, and Welfare employs fully one-third of the top echelon of Communist conspirators in this country. Another authority on communism, Dr. R. P. Oliver, University of Illinois, estimates that 75 to 80 percent of the responsible officers in this HEW Department are Communist conspirators. These are the people who will have control over our children's minds if the NEA manages to force Congress to allow Federal control of education through Federal aid to schools.

"No State is in great need of Federal aid. In fact, our Federal debt is already many times as high as the debts of all 50 States combined. So why should we allow Federal aid for schools and place our children's education under the control of the most extreme radicals in our Government?

"Who will be responsible for Federal aid to schools? You will—if you don't do something about it now. Call your friends and neighbors and ask them to call others to write Congress at once to block the passage of the bill for Federal aid for teachers' salaries."

Automation Outlook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial by Mr. Roger W. Bolz, publisher and editorial director of Automation magazine, which appeared in the April 1961 issue of Automation:

AUTOMATION OUTLOOK
(By Roger W. Bolz)

Much ado is being made in Government circles concerning unemployment and the possibility that automation could be a contributing factor. Eventually we must all face the fact that automation, like any economizing measure, is another means for keeping manufacturing costs in line. Every business must take in more money than it spends or it is finis.

The problem could be likened to the gas turbine cycle. Unless there is more horsepower developed at the power turbine wheel than is consumed by the compressor section, there is no usable output at the shaft. Such a design is a failure and the designer is a "flop." It is no different with a business. As the overhead costs of carrying on the business rise, efficiency overall must increase to maintain the same income-to-expense ratio in the face of competitive pressure on prices. Even though many highly successful businesses require expenditures almost as high as income, there is a margin and this is what counts.

Continually increasing taxes and wages create a heavy pressure to raise efficiency, and automation has become a must as a result. While making ominous sounds in the direction of automation activity in business, the Kennedy administration is creating a mammoth paradox by simultaneously advancing vast programs that will increase taxes and wages still more. As taxes and wages consume an increasing portion of manufacturing overhead, operating costs must be reduced or prices inflated. Strong competition today dictates the former, and an imperative advance into more automation.

There is no question that automation technology will eventually make possible the support of an advanced standard of living for everyone, but to avoid damaging upheavals there must be time to permit a gradual evolution.

It is unrealistic to harbor the idea that financial assistance in depressed areas and unemployment benefits alone will solve the complex problem of full employment in the years to come. There is need to revive the frontier spirit of early America among working people—the inquisitive, practical, restless, energetic, and inventive pioneering spirit. Opportunities are great and are increasing but seldom are they presented on a silver platter.

It is imperative that the American workman adjust to mobility, that he be inspired to initiative, and that he adapt and grow with technological change. He must become a vital and knowledgeable part of the industrial scene, not a bystander. No matter how attached the workman of old was to his job of trimming wicks, he himself helped mightily in ringing down the curtain on oil lamps. So it is today in the same degree. The standard of living is raised through technological advance—we cannot expect to enjoy its blessings and yet condemn it.

Let's hope we can approach these evolutionary industrial problems on a sound and rational basis. Surely in the face of evidently conflicting activities, it behooves every lawmaker to take a careful second look before any unnecessary additional problems are created.

Programs that result in higher taxes and wages may be like the sure cure for a transitory illness—operation successful but the patient died.

Bellamy Award Presentation Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, each year, one of the Nation's high schools is selected to receive the Bellamy Flag Award and represent its State in the Bellamy Flag Award family for a 50-year period. This significant award honors Francis Bellamy, who wrote the original "Pledge of Allegiance" to the flag of the United States of America in 1892.

The State of Maryland was selected to receive this award in 1953, and Annapolis High School holds it for our State. Last year, the honor went to the

State of Maine, and Cony High School in Augusta.

Representing Maryland at the award presentation was George Kramer, president of the student council of Annapolis High School. George is one of the school's most outstanding students. He is chairman of the Hi-Y social committee, a member of the junior classical league and the junior civitans. He spent 2 months last summer in Denmark, under the exchange program of the American Field Service.

Under unanimous consent I wish to include George Kramer's address delivered at the award presentation ceremonies last year in the RECORD at this point:

ADDRESS BY GEORGE KRAMER

Annapolis is often referred to as historic Annapolis. This name is apt, as much colonial history was made there. We are proud, justly, so I belive, of this history. There, in the old wooden statehouse, most of which is still in use today, George Washington resigned his commission as Commander in Chief of the American Army; there the Continental Congress held some of its meetings, and there our present State government meets annually to pass legislation of a more modern nature.

Today a visitor to Annapolis can still see many of the old colonial buildings, and it is practically impossible to traverse a main street in downtown Annapolis without passing several examples of colonial architecture. The homes of Francis Scott Key and Samuel Chase—one of Maryland's four signers of the Declaration of Independence—as well as many other houses are open to visitors at different times throughout the year.

Annapolis is the home of St. John's College, begun in 1696, and probably the third oldest college in the Nation. St. John's is known now for its nonelective liberal arts program inaugurated in 1937. Across King George Street from St. John's is the U.S. Naval Academy, an institution whose name has become synonymous with the name of the city Annapolis. Behind the great white wall which surrounds the Academy is to be found the crypt of John Paul Jones, our great naval hero, and Bancroft Hall, already the largest dormitory in the United States, to which is presently being added two additional wings.

Near the edge of Annapolis proper and overlooking much of the city is Annapolis High School. I shall try to tell you about the shining lights among the school's more recent accomplisments. Last year an Annapolis High School student held the post of president of the Southern Maryland Regional Association of Student Councils, and this year one of our students is vice president of that organization.

Last year also we participated for the first time in the American Field Service. As many of you may know, this is a program for the exchange of high school students who have completed their junior year. Foreign students live with American families and attend American schools for a year, and Americans live with their families abroad either during the summer months or during the school year. Last year a boy from Germany spent the schoolyear in Annapolis, and this year we have a boy from Argentina. Our students raise a good share of the money which makes the program possible.

Other progress made at Annapolis High School last year was the formation of an interclub council, an all-day exchange with student council representatives from area schools to study different high school governments, the formation of the position of school chaplain, and a general growth in the development and use of student council committees.

On behalf of Annapolis High School and the State of Maryland, I should like to congratulate Cony High School on receiving the Bellamy Award this year and present for your school library a copy of our yearbook, the Wake.

Park Commemorating Samuel Prescott Suggested to Concord Men's Group

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the Fifth District of Massachusetts is steeped in history. The first musket fired for freedom was sounded here. Mr. Howard W. Kent, of Concord, has done a tremendous amount of research on Revolutionary War activity in our district, and has come up with a fascinating account of the role played by Samuel Prescott in the famous midnight ride. Dr. Prescott is the forgotten man of this heroic episode, and it is with pleasure that I share with my colleagues the following article in the Concord Free Press:

PARK COMMEMORATING SAMUEL PRESCOTT SUGGESTED TO CONCORD MEN'S GROUP

CONCORD.—A proposal for a memorial park honoring Dr. Samuel Prescott, the young High Son of Liberty who warned the town of Concord that British troops were approaching on April 19, 1775, was aired before a Concord audience on April 7. Stating that we should raise this young hero of Concord into a position wherein he would join the other immortals of his time, Howard W. Kent suggested the park to a meeting of the Men's Club of the Trinitarian Congregational Church.

After recounting the incidents of April 18 and 19, 1775, and the part Sam Prescott played in them, Mr. Kent said, "It grieves me that there is not one commemoration here showing that the services of Dr. Prescott were appreciated or even recognized. All of the great and distinguished men of the Revolution have already been recognized. Through neglect, Dr. Samuel Prescott presents a splendid opportunity to do something that is appropriate."

SITE OFFERED

Dr. Prescott was born in the central portion of the much enlarged home at 67 Lexington Road, now owned by Dr. John J. Fallon. "Across the street," Mr. Kent said, "there is a vacant lot of about 10 acres, bounded by Lexington Road, Hawthorne Lane, the Mill Brook, and private property. This lot offers a splendid space for a memorial park in honor of this great young man of Concord."

Such a location, Mr. Kent went on, provides room for parking cars and buses; for a grove of evergreen trees, shrubbery, green grass and flowers. "Visitors—some 150,000 to 200,000 of them a year—would see something that they would always remember, something that we could all be proud of. In time, such a memorial would overcome the erroneous and tragic history of Longfellow."

SUPPLIES AT CONCORD

Mr. Kent opened his talk by recalling that in December 1774, the First Provincial Congress voted that military supplies be collected and deposited at Concord and Worcester for an army of 15,000 men. Mr. Kent than read a true copy of the order given Lt. Col. Francis Smith, 10th Regiment, on April 18, 1775, as taken from Gen. Thomas Gage's manuscripts, in which Colonel Smith was ordered to destroy these stores. Although Colonel Smith was instructed by General Gage not to plunder the inhabitants or hurt private property, he was ordered to destroy the guns, dump the supplies of gun powder and flour into the river, burn the tents, destroy any pork or beef and scatter the lead balls, throwing them by degrees into ponds, ditches, etc., but no quantity together, so that they may be recovered afterwards.

General Gage also ordered that the two bridges be secured.

Samuel Prescott overtook Paul Revere and William Dawes on the evening of April 18, 1775, when they were on the road between Lexington and Concord. The three reached an outpost of British soldiers at the location now in Lincoln of the Buttrick Ice Cream Stand where Revere and Dawes were captured.

"Escaping capture," Mr. Kent went on, "Samuel Prescott spurred his horse, jumped a stone wall, and made his way to the farmhouse of Sgt. Samuel Hartwell. Leaving Hartwell to alarm Lincoln, Prescott continued to Concord and at the courthouse he met Amos Melvin who rang the alarm bell about 2 a.m. Seeing that Concord was properly alarmed, Dr. Sam Prescott continued his mission farther into the countryside."

FIVE CRUCIAL HOURS

"The result of Prescott's getting to Concord at 2 o'clock in the morning, gave five very important and crucial hours for the men and women here to hide the supplies stored in the town," Mr. Kent continued. Quoting Lemuel Shattuck, "They were five big hours in the destinies of men and nations."

"I am convinced that Dr. Samuel Prescott was the most important man here in the affairs of April 19, 1775." Mr. Kent told his Concord audience. "I would like to recite a few hypothetical cases to substantiate my stand. Let us asume that Col. James Barrett was incapacitated on April 19. Does anyone think it would have made any difference in hiding the supplies? It certainly would not. And then again, let us asume that Maj. John Buttrick was incapacitated. He was a very important man; he led his men to the bridge and ordered them to return the fire of the British. Would it have made any difference at the bridge, if he had not served? Definitely not. There were others equally as competent and willing to lead the men to the bridge, and would have ordered the shooting in self defense."

Returning to the capture of Paul Revere in Lincoln, Mr. Kent called Samuel Prescott the "indispensable man." If he had been captured or killed, Mr. Kent went on, General Gage would have executed his intended surprise in Concord at 7 o'clock in the morning, and the supplies for the Provincial Army would have been destroyed.

Concluding his talk, Mr. Kent said, "We should raise this young hero from almost total confinement in obscurity. Dr. Samuel Prescott earned the right to immortality along with the other men of the day."

The Lampasas Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, we all know that the American system of competitive free enterprise is under attack today. Those whose policies would de-

stroy this system include the radical-liberals, the socialists, the free spenders, and the big government advocates.

The ultimate outcome of this struggle can depend upon the thinking of our young people. Among them are the leaders of tomorrow. Properly directed and aroused, the young people in our public schools today can make the difference between success and failure in this struggle.

With that thought in mind, in 1951 the school superintendents of Lampasas and Burnet, Tex., instituted a historic program, called Hill Country Project in Economic Understanding. Spearheaded by Mr. Harvey C. Ballew, superintendent of the Lampasas Schools, this project has caught on. It has attracted widespread attention. It is a success. It has been acclaimed far and wide.

Mr. Ballew, a dedicated believer in progress that moves within the framework of the competitive free enterprise system, is doing a magnificent job, and one which can well be emulated by others throughout the Nation.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the May 1, 1961 issue of the Dan Smoot Report, which follows:

THE LAMPASAS STORY

Lampasas is a picturesque town of about 5,000 people, in the beautiful hill country of central Texas. It is the county seat of Lampasas County where livestock, agriculture, and forestry are the principal industries. Burnet—county seat of adjoining Burnet County—is about the same kind of place.

In 1951, the school superintendents of these two central Texas counties started an Americanism program in their school systems. They called it the Hill County Project in Economic Understanding. They got the idea at a workshop which they had attended for 3 weeks at Austin.

They added to their regular curriculum a course for high school seniors called contemporary problems and issues, and they prescribed additional emphasis on Americanism in all social studies classes for juniors and seniors. But Mr. Harvey C. Ballew, superintendent of the Lampasas schools, was not satisfied with this approach. He felt it was too slow, limited, and general. Under Mr. Ballew's leadership, the name of the Americanism effort was changed to Cen-Tex Project.

Considerable study was directed toward finding a means of presenting concrete, meaningful Americanism instruction, not just to juniors and seniors in high schools, but to all public school students, in both primary and secondary schools, beginning with the first grade.

Teachers and school officials were encouraged to participate in study and planning sessions until they had decided upon eight basic Americanism principles, which they called the foundations of freedom. Superintendent Ballew says these eight basic principles are considered the undergirding or the very roots of the American way of life. They have become the handbook for teaching the Americanism freedom program in the Lampasas schools. They are emphasized in all classes for all public school students throughout the year.

Here are the eight basic principles:

1. We believe and trust in God, as we understand Him. Our forefathers left their home country that they might have freedoms in a new world. Freedom to place their trust in God was one of their primary purposes.

2. Importance of the individual. We teach that what each individual makes of himself determines what the world of tomorrow will be like. If the separate individual does not amount to much, little can be expected of the group, for nought plus nought will never equal anything but nought, however many million ciphers are added.

3. Freedom of the individual. The progress in America can be traced to the individual initiative, creativeness, and energy released through freedom of individual Americans. Freedom is the best climate for growth and perfection of the human personality. It is a law of nature that an individual develops in proportion to his efforts at solving his own problems. Freedom of the individual person to make his own choices and manage his own affairs (except where the freedom of other individuals is jeopardized) has been so fundamental in the growth of our Nation that many people believe that it is the great secret ingredient of the American success formula.

4. Dignity of work. This foundation principle has its origin in our Christian beliefs. From it come not only our material abundance, but also the rich individual satisfaction of doing difficult tasks well—mental as well as physical. The only way man has of satisfying his needs is through work; that is, applying energy to God-given resources.

5. Private ownership of property. From the Bill of Rights we get protection of our fifth, as well as our second and third, principles. In America, even before the drafting of the Constitution, there was the conviction that individuals are entitled to rewards commensurate with their contributions to society. Implicit in this proposition is the implication that they may retain their rewards or dispose of them as they choose. Private rewards (property) retained through thrift have created a vast reserve of private capital which has been used to expand and create job opportunities, improve and develop products, services, and processes, and to provide an ever rising standard of living. Property and freedom are inseparably connected; economic leveling is not economic progress.

If the ancient institution of private property is destroyed, liberty must go with it. Independence of action, freedom of criticism, and representative government are all possible only in a society founded upon private ownership. Conservatives value property for its own sake, of course, but they value it even more because without it all men are at the mercy of an omnipotent state—in short, they are slaves.

6. The profit motive. The profit motive is the inner drive which causes an individual to strive, to initiate, create, improve, produce, and serve in his own interest and that of his fellows. The profit motive is synonymous with hope of rewards. The hope of rewards is the stimulus of freemen, whereas compulsion and force motivate the slave.

7. Free competition. In a nation of free men, one finds in his search for rewards that others are seeking the same rewards. A man finds himself in competition with one or more of his fellows in seeking a job, in holding it, in being promoted, in making and selling a better product, in employing efficient workers, in getting the greatest rewards from savings, and in almost every phase of economic life. The element of competition causes us to work harder, to think more, to produce more, to improve, to invent, to expand; in short, to serve better and thus to progress as individuals and as a Nation.

8. Government as a protector, not a provider. The supreme law of the land, our Constitution with its Bill of Rights, grew out of the determination of the early builders to protect and bind together the primary foundations of our Republic, the dignity of the individual and his inalienable right to life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness. Our Government was built to the specifications of this law which consigned it to the role of servant, not master; protector, not provider. The Government does not give us our freedom; it protects us in our freedom. It does not owe us a living, but rather protects us in our freedom to earn a living.

A large, framed copy of these eight principles—the "Foundations of Freedom"—hangs in a conspicuous place in every Lampasas classroom.

During the school year, each grade selects a different "great man, great idea, and great document" for intensive study. One year, first-grade students studied George Washington as their great man; "Always tell the truth," as their great idea; and The Lord's Prayer as their great document. Benjamin Franklin, "Don't expect something for nothing," and "Poor Richard's Almanac" were the greats of another grade.

Superintendent Ballew says the Lampasas schools also study and teach, "the diametric differences between these American foundation principles and the tents of Marx, which were put down in the Communist Manifest in 1848, and now constitute the programs of socialization that are sweeping much of the world."

The annual climax of the Americanism program in the Lampasas schools comes each spring, during Texas Public School Week, when the mayor of Lampasas proclaims Freedom Foundation Week for his city. During this week, the whole community is intensively and enthusiastically involved in programs of celebrating, discussing, and paying homage to the great principles of freedom which built America.

The Americanism program of the Lampasas schools has received national recognition for its excellence. For example, in February 1960, the American Farm Bureau Federation (national headquarters in Chicago), after an extensive investigation, characterized the Lampasas program as, "an excellent example of how one area of our country has responded regarding the need of our public schools to establish a curricula which will help students to acquire a true concept of the basic principles and philosophy of the American system of self-government and the competitive system.

"It is the type of program that can be put in operation in every school in the Nation. It has already made great progress in the State of Texas."

Superintendent Ballew says that the teachers are due primary credit for the success of the Lampasas Americanism program. He feels that the dedication of the teachers results, in part, from the fact that the teachers themselves were involved in selecting the eight great principles which serve as the foundation stones of the entire program. Mr. Ballew says: "The teachers had to decide how to fit the teaching of these principles into their classwork.

"A series of three or four meetings per year are held, and outstanding people are brought in to talk to the teachers on some one of the basic principles or some threat to our way of life."

Though proud of the local, State, and National recognition which his Americanism program has earned, Mr. Ballew sums up what he regards as the real results of the program in these words: "But what's more important than all of these outward signs, is the intangible evidence of results in terms of students' and teachers' relations, as reflected in wonderful discipline, interest, enthusiasm, and practical applications of these principles. The teachers manage to weave the philosophy of these principles into whatever lesson they happen to be teaching, or relate them to the student's experience in or out of school. The students also seem to adhere to the principles, almost by second nature, in things they write or make."

Americanism in the Lampasas schools has also had a notable effect in the surrounding community. American Farm Bureau Federation representatives interviewed people throughout Lampasas County. They found that 17 out of every 20 persons interviewed were not only thoroughly familiar with the Americanism program in the schools, but unusually enthusiastic about it. For example, the interviewers quoted one variety store owner as saying: "I am a great sports fan—I love baseball, football, and basketball—I never miss a game; but if we had to do away with anything in the school, then I would do away with all of those before I would hamper the American heritage program."

American Farm Bureau Federation officials concluded that, "the fundamentals taught in the school were reflected in the philosophy of the total community."

A significant consequence of the Lampasas schools program is the inspiration it has given to officials of school systems in other areas. During the 1960–61 school year, a total of six Texas counties were involved in the Cen-Tex project, and a seventh was considering participation. But the idea had traveled beyond the limits of central Texas.

An Abiding Frontier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, at this time when freedom is being challenged on many fronts, it would be well for us to think again about our basic American concepts. We, who think so highly of freedom should be prepared, as were our forefathers, to defend it with "our lives, our property, and our sacred honor," without fear and without reservation. In the face of the Communist threat to the freedom of all mankind, we need a new birth of patriotism and adherence to those principles upon which this Nation was founded and through which we became great and powerful.

These truths are ably stated by the Honorable Dr. Stanley K. Hornbeck in an address before the midwinter assembly of the Holland Society of New York in February of this year. Besides his notable service as envoy to Holland, Dr. Hornbeck held high office under eight Secretaries of State. He was formerly Director of the State Department's Far Eastern Division. Widely traveled as diplomat and teacher, he has, since retirement, continuously studied and written on Eastern Asia and United States foreign policy. Dr. Hornbeck's address follows:

AN ABIDING FRONTIER — NATION'S HISTORIC COMMITMENT TO FREEDOM SEEN BASIS FOR OPPOSITION TOWARD COMMUNIST IMPERIALISM AND AGGRESSION

(By Dr. Stanley K. Hornbeck, U.S. Ambassador to the Netherlands, 1944–47)

To have a new frontier you must first have an old frontier, a base; and to have any frontier there must be a "this side" and a "that side." What is there on our side, of no matter what frontier, that is basic?

To understand U.S. policy in regard to any foreign country or region or to any particular situation abroad, one needs to be aware of and take into account certain foundamentals in the political history of the United States, in the feeling and believing and thinking of most of our people, and in the relationship in our system between those phenomena and official performance.

We, the people of the United States, are descended—most of us—from European stocks. We are heritors of ways of thinking and of living that evolved first in and among peoples long established in Western Europe. Our religious beliefs and many other of our concepts are rooted in the cultures that had developed "over there." Our ancestors, leaving there and coming here for one or other of many reasons, brought with them ideas which, in a climate of opportunity, have thrived luxuriantly. Here there has developed, more rapidly than there, emphasis on some of those ideas, plus variants.

Here there evolved the concepts of freedom and of independence that were first nationally formalized in the Declaration of Independence. Here our forebears broke with Europe politically and established a new state with a new allocation of sovereignty and a new pattern of political organization and functioning. But they did not shake off or lose their conceptual inheritance. They simply had developed it, and their descendants have kept on developing it, with gradually achieved modifications, alterations, changes.

A nation cannot escape its past, does not suddenly abandon its long-established and experienced ways of believing, of reasoning, and of acting. Some changes, yes. Reforms, yes. Revolutions, yes. Improvement or even deterioration, yes. But sudden and wholesale throwing off or taking on, no.

The United States is a republic. Its political way of life has become that of a democracy. Its Government is in structure and in operation an expression of the will of its people. Its officials are from and of the people, are given their authority by the people, and are imbued with and responsive to the Nation's concepts. Generally speaking, its people have believed and do believe in the existence of a divine authority, are guided religiously by what they take to be God-given ordinances, and are fully committed to the principles of personal freedom, national independence, and, for and among men and nations, law, equal rights, peaceful processes, justice, and security. Its policymakers function within that political framework and in that climate of belief and opinion.

In the realm of international relations, the first and most abiding concern of the people and Government of this country has been and is with problems of freedom, independence, and security. Our thought has been "live and let live." Our national attitude was given clear expression long ago in President Monroe's famous message. In that message the essence was a declaration of opposition on our part to international aggression. The reasoning was that aggression against our independent neighbors would be a menace to us; therefore, toward safeguarding our own "peace and safety" we should act toward safeguarding that of the said neighbors.

Expressly, then, in the event of such aggression, we would offer resistance thereto, and, objecting to aggression, we would abstain therefrom. On behalf of independence and security, our posture was that of defense and self-denial.

That concern, that thought, that reasoning, those purposes and that posture persist. There is, though, a difference: the threat now is greater; there now is no barrier such as there was then between it and us; and we have now much more to defend than we had then.

The facts of our national commitment to the principles of freedom and independence have in many instances produced for us dilemmas. Meaning, as they must, aversion on our part to procedures of conquest and to various of the practices inherent in "colonialism" and "imperialism," they have caused us to be torn between sympathy with the countries from which we variously came and sympathy with defenders of or aspirants to freedom and independence.

Overall and constantly, though, we have frowned upon what we have thought—rightly or wrongly—to be or to smack of denials of freedom or assaults on independence. And when it has come to showdowns, we have taken our stand on the side of opposition and resistance to what we have believed to be aggression. Basically this accounts for the positions we have taken in many matters initially and primarily of European and/or of Asian and/or of Latin American concern.

In the Far East, we have opposed practices of aggression when directed against China, when directed against Japan, later when manifested in relations between Japan and China, and most recently when manifested in Korea, in China, and in Indochina. In the World Wars and in Korea, our participation came of German, of Japanese and of Russian imperialism, manifested in aggression, and our opposition thereto. The discordance now between on the one hand the United States and on the other hand the Soviet Union and Communist China comes of Communist imperialism and our opposition to aggression.

Today, with would-be conquerors making war globally upon free men and free nations and freedom itself, we still are intent on the problems of independence and security. Our thought, nationally, still is "live and let live." Our reasoning still is that aggression by others against others is a menace to us. We offer opposition and we support resistance, but we still do not attack. Our posture is still defensive.

Now, though, and one cannot say it too often, the situation in world affairs is vastly more complicated, the attack upon freedom is more intense and more extensive, the danger to us and our frontiers is greater, and the problem of security is more critical and more difficult than ever before.

The essence of our concern with and in the conflict which the Communist world has forced upon the free world is: the Communist purpose and effort to conquer, manifested in resort to procedures of aggression in many forms and in many places, endangers us. And we, solicitous for our own independence and security and for that of other peoples, are opposing aggression and supporting resistance to it.

All the time, however, we are functioning as would be a boxer who performed with due respect for the Queensbury rules while his opponent, out to kill, uses fists, elbows, and feet, brass knuckles and loaded shoes, every weapon, every blow, and every trick conceivable. We are handicapped by our own principles, rules, and devices. We actually give aid to our opponents by giving aid to their affiliates, granting time out whenever they ask for it, and always giving them and their professions the benefit of the obvious doubts.

The latest official enunciation of our national solicitude and purpose is that which was uttered by President Kennedy in his inaugural address on January 20. In that address this new President gave expression to principles which have long prevailed in the formulation of our foreign policies. Three passages in particular are eloquently expressive:

"Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and success of liberty.

"To those new states whom we welcome to the ranks of the free, we pledge our word

that one form of colonial control shall not have passed away merely to be replaced by a far more iron tyranny.

"And let every other power know that this hemisphere intends to remain the master of its own house."

Ten days later, reporting on what we have and what we have not, this same new President warned that we must be alert to the menacing purposes of communism's leaders and must adequately oppose and resist aggression. He said: "Our greatest challenge is still the world that lies beyond the cold war—but the first great obstacle is still our relations with the Soviet Union and Communist China. We must never be lulled into believing that either power has yielded its ambition for world domination—ambitions which they forcefully restated only a short time ago. On the contrary, our task is to convince them that aggression and subversion will not be profitable routes to pursue to those ends."

Almost by instinct, we react with favor to evidence of commitment by others to those principles, and with disfavor to what seems to us to be disregard of them. Individually and collectively, we sympathize with and tend to side with those who seem to us to be struggling, even as did we, for freedom.

With these facts in mind, one has in hand, I believe, a key to the how and why of almost every approach that has been made by the United States to questions of substantial or critical import in the field of our foreign relations.

Try this key on the what and the why—all along the way—of our China policy. Try it in reference to the Philippines, and in reference to Indonesia. Try it reference to nonrecognition and to our opposition to admission of Red China to the United Nations. Try it in reference to Berlin and to Formosa and to Quemoy and Matsu.

Today, we are in the midst of, and we have become a major party in, a global conflict. In it, there are worldwide tensions and there is warfare. Of it, there could come a major war.

The choice for the United States is not between a course involving risk and a course not involving risk. Risk is already a constant; it resides in and flows from the fact that communism's rulers are intent on courses which involve aggression and that we are opposed to aggression in general and to their purposes and methods in particular.

What may be the Communist world's next moves can only be conjectured. And what, in the event of new developments, the President of the United States may decide to be appropriate, can be judged only in the light of what has been thought, said, and done in the past, especially during the year since World War II. In 1947, President Truman declared: "I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or outside pressures."

The Truman administration failed initially to apply that prescription in relations with and regarding China, but later lived up to it in opposition to Communist aggression in Korea—and in China. The Eisenhower administration carried on with it. Throughout the years since 1950, it has been our policy to oppose and to support resistance to Communist aggressions.

They who think that there should be or will be sudden changes in the attitude, the strategy and the tactics that have developed as those of the United States in relation to questions such as, for instance, those of keeping Berlin and Formosa out of Communist hands, may well be asked to look at the record, scan the frontier, and make careful note of the significant fact that thus far in their courses of conquest Communisms strategists seem to have chosen not to attack at points where there are present both substantial defensive strength and obviously firm purpose to resist.

There has been, over the years, on the part of some of our many sets, expression of objection to the import of the concluding part of Stephen Decatur's famous toast, the pledge, "Our country, right or wrong"; but there can be no doubt or differing about the expression of hope, "Our country, in her intercourse with foreign nations may she always be right!"

May I supplement that magnificent expression of a high hope with this: Our country. May we, her people, especially those of us upon whom we, by our democratic processes, confer authority,—may we keep her strong, may we always be well informed, be wise, be resolute and bold, in tenure, in defense and in propagation of the principles and practices of freedom, independence, and security.

Seventy New Judges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, we will be watching to see how well Robert Kennedy carries out his responsibility, as Attorney General, in choosing able men for the long-needed Federal judgeships. This article on the matter appears, April 30, in the Long Island Press:

BOB KENNEDY MUST FULFILL PROMISE ON BENCH APPOINTEES

(By Ruth Montgomery)

WASHINGTON.—Attorney General Robert Kennedy will soon be on the spot, as few of his predecessors have been, to make good on a solemn pledge.

The President's 35-year-old brother has promised to "pick the best possible person in terms of integrity, honesty, independence and skill" for the Federal bench.

Since such remarkable talents are fairly evenly divided between the two political parties, Bobby will have an enviable opportunity to prove his own veracity by making good on his pledge.

The matter is of acute importance, because President Kennedy is about to have the rare privilege of appointing close to a hundred new Federal judges. The Attorney General is historically the man who makes the selections for the President, and since Bobby was Jack's campaign manager, the eyes of the Nation will be watching to see that he does not dole them out as patronage plums.

A country boiled with indignation a generation ago, when President Franklin D. Roosevelt attempted to ram through his Court packing plan for the Supreme Court.

Some of his own top supporters in Congress broke with him over the scheme, which would have overbalanced the Court with Democratic Justices who agreed with Roosevelt's New Deal political philosophy. The plan was defeated, and F.D.R.'s subsequent attempts to purge his critics inflamed the Democratic Party for a decade.

Oddly enough, no similar public outcry is now being raised against the incredible maneuverings of the congressional Democrats to create some 70 new Federal judgeships. Those, together with normal vacancies will give the administration approximately 100 opportunities to rise above partisan politics this year.

The congressional behavior on the subject of Federal judgeships is one of the most blatant political operations of recent times.

For several years, President Eisenhower earnestly beseeched the Democratic-controlled Congress to vote 35 additional Federal judgeships. The need was obvious, but although the Senate Judiciary Committee favorably reported out the bill last year, Majority Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON partisanly refused to let the Senate take it up.

Because court calendars were so jammed, Ike even agreed to appoint half Democrats to the bench, if Congress would act, but nothing was done. JOHNSON was obviously playing politics with the judicial branch.

This year, with Kennedy in the White House and JOHNSON presiding over the Senate, the Democratic Congress suddenly rushed through a bill creating, not 35 but 70 to 73 new judgeships.

This was partisanship and vote swapping at its ugliest. Breaking tradition, the Democrats refused even to hold hearings on the need for 70 new judges. They simply rammed the bill through the Judiciary Committee on a straight party line vote.

Senator KENNETH KEATING, a high ranking Republican member of the committee, said of the stunt: "A crash program of judicial reform has been long overdue, but a crash program of political patronage is something Americans can do without."

Chairman EMANUEL CELLER of the House Judiciary Committee, who had helped to block action on Ike's bill last year, shamelessly told the House recently that he wants "the greater number of these judges, shall I say, to go as prizes to honest and good and faithful Democrats."

He was speaking, believe it or not, of a third and coequal branch of our Government. Keating and his New York colleague, Senator Jacob Javits, are meanwhile trying to take Bobby Kennedy at his promised word.

They have sent telegrams to all New York bar associations, requesting their veiws on the most qualified people, regardless of political bent, for the nine new judgeships in the New York area.

As soon as their recommendations are in, Keating and Javits will forward them to Robert and John F. Kennedy. The brothers must take it from there.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Appendix

The First Accusations That the United States Had Encouraged the Revolt of the French Generals in Algeria Were Printed in Soviet Newspapers and Broadcast by the Moscow Radio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1961

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the first accusations that the United States had encouraged the revolt of the French generals in Algeria were printed in Soviet newspapers and broadcast by the Moscow radio.

The New York Times reports this morning that—

Allen W. Dulles, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, checked with his subordinates and gave an unqualified guarantee that none of his agents had given any encouragement to the rebels in France, Spain, Algeria, or elsewhere.

After consulting Mr. Dulles, Secretary of State Dean Rusk assured the French Ambassador, Herve Alphand, last week that no U.S. representatives had been involved in any way with the rebels.

When the rumors persisted, he repeated this assurance yesterday to the Ambassador.

Today Mr. Dulles departed from his custom and issued a personal denial of reports that some of his officials had been involved.

We, and the world, were assured by Mr. Dulles that—

The reports in Pravda, Izvestia, and the French press are all without basis in fact.

In view of the continuing rumors it is my belief that the Congress must take steps to end them once and for all, and to give assurances to everyone concerned that the United States was not involved, nor were any of its agents involved, in the revolt of the French generals which fortunately collapsed.

I am convinced that the Congress can no longer shirk its responsibility to inform itself fully on intelligence matters.

On April 27 Senator EUGENE MCCARTHY introduced for himself and Senators ANDERSON, MORSE, CLARK, METCALF, BURDICK, BARTLETT, and MCNAMARA, and perhaps others, Senate Joint Resolution 77 to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence. In introducing the measure Senator MCCARTHY told his colleagues that—

The joint resolution is not, directly or indirectly, meant to express any criticism of this administration or of any past administration, but basically, to reflect what I consider to be a proper responsibility on the part of the Members of the U.S. Congress to accept responsibility in this field, to be informed, and to be involved when major policy decisions are called for.

And Senator MCCARTHY added the following incontrovertible point—

Under the Constitution, Congress is called upon to participate in a declaration of war. In modern times, war is not declared. Congress, therefore, has a continuing and very substantial responsibility for policy decisions with regard to the cold war or conducting foreign policy by any other means.

The measure introduced by Senator MCCARTHY is similar in purpose and substance to my own House Joint Resolution 250. I am in complete agreement with Senator MCCARTHY when he says that—

It is my hope the joint resolution will be considered and, in some form, adopted, so that the machinery and procedures which are the constitutional responsibility of Congress may be exercised.

I include here, as part of my remarks, two articles from the New York Times of May 2, 1961:

PARIS RUMORS ON CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY—DESPITE FIRM U.S. DENIALS, SPECULATION PERSISTS AGENCY AIDED ALGIERS REVOLT

(By Thomas F. Brady)

PARIS, May 1.—Now that the French mutiny of the generals may be a thing of the past, the question whether the United States helped save the day for President de Gaulle is perhaps less important than what is believed in France, in North Africa and elsewhere about the U.S. role in the events. Former Gen. Maurice Challe, leader of the mutiny, hoped for U.S. support and said so publicly, but President Kennedy quickly sent a message pledging full support to President de Gaulle.

Immediately after the collapse of the mutiny, President Kennedy publicly expressed his satisfaction and congratulated President de Gaulle. The position of the U.S. Government was never in doubt.

RUMORS WIDLY CIRCULATED

These facts have not, however, prevented the wide circulation, and at least partial acceptance here and in North Africa, of rumors that General Challe and his fellow mutineers had received specific encouragement from U.S. intelligence agents.

Emphatic official denials from U.S. authorities have not put a stop to the rumors.

No French official has denied them. French comment has been decidedly equivocal. At a news conference Saturday night in Algiers, Louis Joxe, French Minister for Algeria, said—

"I do not know whether foreign agents encouraged the insurrectional movement or whether those responsible for the coup profited from foreign subsidies. This sad affair among Frenchmen is enough, for the moment, to keep me busy. I have no reason to try to find out whether the insurgents received foreign aid."

SOURCE IS UNCERTAIN

The source of the rumors is difficult to determine. Some observers attribute them to Communists, others to the highest French authorities.

A dispatch to the Observer in London said yesterday that one reaction after the collapse, "at least in President de Gaulle's own entourage and perhaps inspired by him, is to blame the Americans. Repeated American denials that any American military or civilian officials encouraged General Challe's rebellion have not succeeded in preventing French official spokesmen from telling journalists there must have been some unofficial American backing."

The rumors, which include at least one written report circulating here, repeated speculation in the French press, a dispatch from Washington to the Tunisian weekly Afrique-Action and widespread speculation in leftwing circles, boil down to this:

President Kennedy is said to have reacted as he did because he had learned of encouragement to the mutineers by the Central Intelligence Agency, which is said to have become a reactionary state-within-a-state in the United States.

U.S. agents are said to have encouraged the mutiny either because they feared communism in the ranks of the Algerian Rebel National Liberation Front, with which President de Gaulle is expected to negotiate Algerian independence, or because they hoped to precipitate the downfall of President de Gaulle and thus eliminate, his opposition to integration of the forces of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

MEETINGS WITH AGENTS ALLEGED

U.S. sympathy for the movement is said to have begun as early as last December, when Jacques Soustelle, a former Governor General of Algeria and a foe of President de Gaulle's policies, was reported to have had lunch with Richard M. Bissell, Jr., a CIA official.

At a meeting in Madrid on April 12 or 13, a U.S. agent is said to have told Gen. Raoul Salan, one of the mutineers, that the United States would recognize a new government in France within 48 hours after its successful establishment if there were no attack on Tunisia or Morocco.

The speculation does not take cognizance of the fact that former General Challe spent nearly a year as a North Atlantic Treaty Organization commander at the Fontainebleau headquarters near here. He undoubtedly heard frequent and bitter criticism of President de Gaulle by allied officers who disagreed with his policies on NATO.

The possibility is cited that M. Challe was guilty of wishful thinking and believed the attitudes of the military leaders reflected the political thinking of the allied governments.

No matter what the source of the rumors may be, no matter how false they may be, their existence is a fact. The credence they have gained, despite U.S. denials, is considered a serious threat to French-United States relations and to the prestige of the United States among the Algerian nationalists and in north Africa, in general.

The equivocation with which French officials have treated the rumors has been regarded as a major factor in their propagation.

UNITED STATES IS CONCERNED BY PARIS RUMORS

(By Wallace Carroll)

WASHINGTON, May 1.—The U.S. Government is becoming concerned over the persistence of newspaper reports and rumors in France that someone from this country encouraged the April 24 meeting of French generals in Algeria.

The resulting suspicion and resentment among the French, it is feared here, may

damage French-United States relations at a crucial period and create an unfavorable atmosphere for the visit that President Kennedy is scheduled to make to Paris on May 30.

Mixed with concern is some irritation among high officials. This is caused by a belief that some French officials, far from discouraging the rumors of U.S. involvement in the revolt, have been fanning French suspicions.

SUPPORT OF DE GAULLE STRESSED

Officials at the White House, the State Department, the Defense Department, and the Central Intelligence Agency were emphatic today in stating that no officer, official, or agent of the United States had anything to do with the revolt.

If there has been one consistent line of policy in the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations, it was noted, it has been support for President de Gaulle in his efforts to settle the Algerian problem.

The news of the revolt, these officials recalled, was received with consternation in all departments and agencies in Washington.

The first accusations that the United States had encouraged the rebels were printed in Soviet newspapers and broadcast by the Moscow radio immediately after the outbreak of the revolt.

Then French newspapers, including the highly respected Le Monde, gave currency to rumors that U.S. agents had been in touch with the rebels and had promised them support.

In view of this, the White House and the State Department made inquiries of all departments and agencies that had officers or employees in France and north Africa.

Allen W. Dulles, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, checked with his subordinates and gave an unqualified guarantee that none of his agents had given any encouragement to the rebels in France, Spain, Algeria, or elsewhere.

After consulting Mr. Dulles, Secretary of State Dean Rusk assured the French Ambassador, Hervé Alphand, last week that no U.S. representatives had been involved in any way with the rebels.

When the rumors persisted, he repeated this assurance yesterday to the Ambassador.

DULLES ISSUES DENIAL

Today Mr. Dulles departed from his custom and issued a personal denial of reports that some of his officials had been involved.

"Any reports or allegations that the Central Intelligence Agency or any of its personnel had anything to do with the generals' revolt were completely false," he said.

"The reports in Pravda, Izvestia, and the French press are all without basis in fact."

Bits of fact have been used to buttress the reports in the French press. For example, it has been noted that officials of the Central Intelligence Agency had a luncheon meeting in Washington with Jacques Soustelle, a former member of the de Gaulle Government who is bitterly opposed to President de Gaulle's policy in Algeria.

U.S. officials said today that such a luncheon had been held, but on April 4, 1960, more than a year before the revolt. Moreover, they added, the lunch was arranged by an official of the French Embassy at the request of M. Soustelle. The Embassy official, they said, was present throughout the meeting. Thus, they declared there could have been no dark conspiracy.

Some officials believe that the rebel generals and their confederates started spreading the word well before the revolt that the United States favored their aims.

Reports to this effect reached the U.S. Government as long ago as last fall.

In November, French delegates at the meeting of the Sixth Pugwash Conference on Political and Scientific Affairs were reported to have asked American delegates about such a possibility.

According to these French delegates, certain anti-Gaullist generals were putting out the story that they were warmer supporters of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization than General de Gaulle. For this reason, these generals suggested, the United States was on their side.

Pierre Salinger, White House press secretary, left for Paris tonight to make preparations for news coverage of President Kennedy's visit.

He is aware of the efforts by the administration to assure the French that the accusations of U.S. meddling are without foundation. He may therefore talk with French officials about the persistence of the rumors.

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I request that the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

UPPER DARBY, PA., *April 11, 1961.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Congressman from Pennsylvania,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: You have indeed earned the deep respect and esteem of people, not only in our own State, but from all over our country, by your forthright courage in submitting a resolution (H. Res. 211) establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

You can be assured of our wholehearted support and the support of all we can reach to inform them of your resolution and urge them to write to their Representatives to get behind this important step to expose the real tragedy of the captive nations.

With prayers and fervent good wishes for the success of your resolution, we are,

Sincerely,

WALTER AND MARY FRIEDRICH.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS
COMMITTEE OF AMERICA,
Minneapolis, Minn., March 27, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: We read your resolution in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with great satisfaction and were pleased to see that you received fine support from your colleagues in the House of Representatives on March 8, 1961. Therefore, we congratulate you, sir, for your vigilance and the initiative you have taken in creating the Committee for the Captive Nations.

We sincere hope that you will be successful in obtaining very good results. We are behind you, sir, 100 percent.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM DOMBROWSKY,
President.
ANDREW F. AMERSLAV,
Public Relations Officer.

ALBANY, N.Y., *April 16, 1961.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FLOOD: It was heartening to learn that you have introduced in the House a resolution calling for the creation of a permanent committee to deal with the captive nations enslaved by Soviet Russia, with the thought of ultimately restoring them to freedom and independence. I am fully in accord with this resolution and will write to my own Congressman, Representative LEO W. O'BRIEN, to ask his support of the measure.

Very truly yours,

EDWARD MARGOSIAN.

PETZOLD MOTOR SALES CO.,
Detroit, Mich., April 14, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: My attention has been called to House Resolution 211 submitted by you on March 8, 1961.

May I compliment you most earnestly for the clear exposition you have made of a subject that should never be allowed to grow dormant as long as freemen shall live.

The insidious treachery of the communistic movement is deceit. Plain, bald, naked and outright deceit is their method of approach in their efforts to enslave the entire world.

It is my firm hope that Congress will adopt your resolution and establish the Special Committee on Captive Nations to keep alive the struggle for freedom of these unfortunate peoples.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS T. PETZOLD.

APRIL 15, 1961.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: With reference to House Resolution 211 to establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations, I believe this to be an unchallengeable method in combating Moscow in the cold war. It would expose to the people of the world the hidden and undesirable aspects of Soviet domination over these nations.

A Captive Nations Committee should be able to reveal the various internal problems the U.S.S.R. is fighting against to retain her "unity," and thereby place the increasing missile gap in second place behind the more important and practical economic gap.

As an American citizen I feel that the establishment of such a committee is actually a necessity. The recent Soviet man-in-space achievement will be blown up to fantastic proportions, not only to establish a false sense of security among these subjected peoples, but also to place democracy a far second in the race for world recognition.

Yours truly,

JOSEPH E. LINK.

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 18, 1961.*

Mr. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
U.S. Congress, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: Only today I have learned of your House Resolution 211 whereby you ask for the establishment of a committee which shall be known as the Special Committee on Captive Nations.

My whole family would like to express to you our most sincere gratitude for doing something which has to be done for the benefit of the people all over the world. And at the same time we offer our full assistance in realizing your resolution.

My son, who is getting the Ph.D. in Washington, D.C., my wife and myself are ready to participate fully in your very noble attempt to establish the Special Committee on Captive Nations.

With warmest regards,

Yours

MITAR PEJOVICH-PAIGE.

THE UKRAINIAN QUARTERLY,
New York, N.Y., April 13, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
U.S. Congressman, House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: As editor of the Ukrainian Bulletin and managing editor of the Ukrainian Quarterly, I should like to extend my warmest congratulations for the long-needed resolution you introduced in the House on March 8, 1961. Both the Quarterly and, in particular, the Bulletin have long fought for Western recognition of the plight of the captive nations. As the free voice of Ukraine, these publications are now heavily in your debt.

It was not too long ago that the Soviet prison of nations was regarded as a paradise. Before the last war the man in the street had never heard of the many nations that were the earlier victims of Soviet imperialism. Even today the terms "Russian" and "Soviet" are carelessly used interchangeably, thereby abetting the Soviet Union in its desperate need to be viewed as a monolith, and to conceal the fate of its imperialistic victims. It is our deepest conviction that had the West possessed knowledge and understanding of Eastern Europe at the time of the First World War, the Soviet menace would never have materialized.

Your farsighted resolution is a tremendous step in the right direction. To retain her own freedom, America must get to know the true nature of the enemy. A permanent committee which would train its sights on the Soviet Union and its hapless, imprisoned inmates cannot but dispel the longstanding, costly ignorance and misconceptions that have been of incalculable propagandistic aid to the Russians. The work of such a committee will sharpen the focus of our foreign policy, on the one hand; and, on the other, it will serve to boost the morale of the captive nations, the Soviet Achilles' heel, and our potential allies.

Attacks will doubtless be leveled against you and your supporting colleagues for "warmongering." But there cannot be danger for us in the truth that will be unearthed by the committee. The Soviet pose of "liberator" and "champion of the colonial peoples" will be exposed as the rankest sort of deceit it is for all to see. Thus it is not too much to say that the committee will advance the cause of freedom and peace in Africa, the Far East and South America.

Please be assured of our complete support in your efforts to realize this reservoir of truth on the problem of Soviet Russian colonialism and imperialism. The committee will serve not only the best interests of America, but of mankind everywhere.

Sincerely,

WALTER DUSHNYCK.

BAYSIDE, N.Y.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: In the past year I have become very interested in the attempt to establish the Captive Nations Committee in the House of Representatives. I want to congratulate you for your tireless effort in this respect and encourage you to continue your vigor for this worthwhile cause.

The number of subjugated nations is constantly increasing. Cuba may only be the first act of a long tragedy taking place in Latin America. The Congo, Laos, and other troubled areas are threatened by the same menace. The flame of their independent spirit must not be extinguished.

Furthermore, the countries which lost their freedom decades ago must not be forgotten. Their national spirit, and our recognition of that spirit, must be kept alive. For example, how many of us are aware of the 30 million Moslems behind the Iron Curtain? Certainly their minds have not surrendered to communism.

Finally, I believe it is entirely within the sphere of Congress to undertake such a study. There is a definite need for it. No one else is doing anything about it. It is not only the right, but the duty of the representatives of the American people to further the cause of freedom in the world by establishing the special Committee on the Captive Nations.

Sincerely,

ROBERT KIRK ADIKES.

BRONXVILLE, N.Y., *April 13, 1961.*

Hon. DANIEL FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: I have just received a copy of House Resolution 211 and was very happy to see that you had the vision and initiative to create the leadership in submitting it. I am behind this resolution all the way and sincerely hope that positive action will be taken to pass it.

I saw what transpired in 1959 with the captive nations resolution, and this will surely strengthen the present bill. Insight into the captive nations, especially in the U.S.S.R., is very important in these days of constant expectation. There is surely a need for an agency to study the captive nations, and your proposal for a Special Committee on the Captive Nations will lead to new recommendations and constructive action.

I would again like to congratulate you on your proposal and hope that other people will feel the same way as I do about the passage of the bill.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM W. RENNER, JR.

ELMHURST, N.Y., *April 10, 1961.*

Hon. DANIEL FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: It's due time that the American people were informed more deeply concerning the activities of Russia and the nations it dominates. It seems that the Russians know all about the problems in the United States (e.g., segregation, etc.), but we as Americans know nothing about the problems of the same nature existing in Russia or the satellite nations.

I believe that the Committee on Captive Nations, which you are planning to establish in House Resolution 211, will inform the American people of the existing problems in Russia today. It will also be an excellent means of propaganda for the United States.

I am, therefore, in earnest that this resolution will go into effect. Thank you very much.

Very truly yours,

MEYER GOLDMAN.

Tryon Palace Restoration, New Bern, N.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVID N. HENDERSON
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1961

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, on April 8, I was privileged to attend the dedication of the Maude Moore Latham Memorial Gardens at the Tryon Palace restoration in New Bern, N.C. Tryon Palace, the colonial capitol and the first State capitol of North Carolina was built 1767–70 and the restoration of this outstanding colonial edifice was brought about through the untiring efforts and munificence of Mrs. James Edwin Latham who was born in this eastern Carolina town and who later moved to Greensboro. I am justly proud that this significant restoration is located in the Third District of North Carolina which I have the honor to represent and I hope that the Members of this House will have the opportunity to visit Tryon Palace which is a living memorial to our great heritage which we are here to protect and develop. At the dedication the following tribute was paid to Mrs. Latham whose generosity was recognized by the Honorable Terry Sanford, Governor of the State of North Carolina:

TRIBUTE TO MRS. JAMES EDWIN LATHAM

The extensive restoration of Tryon Palace, the colonial capitol and the first State capitol of North Carolina, built 1767–70 at New Bern, was made possible by the generosity of an outstanding patriot and civic leader—the late Mrs. Maude Moore Latham, of Greensboro, wife of the late James Edwin Latham, prominent in diversified business and financial affairs.

A native of New Bern, Mrs. Latham dreamed during her childhood that perhaps someday she might see the historic building rise nobly again on its foundations. In her later work with hereditary and cultural societies and garden clubs, she frequently expressed her great pride in North Carolina's rich historical heritage and her deep desire that Tryon Palace be reconstructed.

This was the main theme of the book she helped prepare and finance in 1939 for the Garden Club of North Carolina: "Old Homes and Gardens of North Carolina."

On January 26, 1944, Mrs. Latham established the Maude Moore Latham Trust Fund of $100,000 for the palace restoration.

Promising to restore the beautiful structure, if the State would purchase the necessary land, she, together with Miss Gertrude Carraway, of New Bern, and others, succeeded in persuading the general assembly in 1945 to appropriate $150,000 and to authorize the gubernatorial appointment of a Tryon Palace Commission to supervise the erection and maintenance of the palace.

The State appropriated $77,000 additional for the property after Mrs. Latham had set up on April 26, 1949, a second trust fund of $150,000.

A handsome collection of antique furnishings, valued at $125,000, was given by Mrs. Latham on January 1, 1950, to the State of North Carolina for the restored palace.

So great was her interest in the project that following her death on April 8, 1951, it was learned that, in addition to her gifts of the two trusts and the collection of antiques, she had bequeathed the residue of her estate, then valued at over $1,250,000, to the Tryon Palace Commission to assure the complete restoration.

Through the able direction of her son-in-law, Mr. John A. Kellenberger, of Greensboro, finance officer and treasurer of the Tryon Palace Commission, the valuation of the trusts and bequest substantially increased not only to pay for the reconstruction of the famed capitol, its furnishings, the landscaping of the grounds, and the development of magnificent 18th century gardens, but also to purchase much more than twice as much property as that bought by the State, so that the restoration might include almost the entire original site.

The palace stands today, a living memorial to a woman of philanthropic spirit and broad vision—Maude Moore Latham.

Mrs. Latham often expressed her wish to restore the palace as a memorial to her son, Edward, who died at Fort Thomas, Ky., in 1918 during World War I in the service of his country.

All who visit the restoration owe an eternal debt of gratitude to Mrs. Latham; to her husband, through whose interest and financial encouragement she was enabled to carry out her plans; and to her daughter, Mrs. John A. Kellenberger, who, as chairman of the Tryon Palace Commission, is ably carrying on in the family tradition of dedicated zeal and public service.

Railroad Merger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1961

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, more and more, persons in the areas served by the New York Central System are becoming alarmed at the proposal whereby the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co. would take over the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. This has grave financial implications for the New York Central and for the passengers whose transportation to and from work depends upon the Central. It has grave implications for the tens of thousands of workers who earn their livelihoods as employees of the Central. It concerns the transportation system of the entire eastern section of the Nation.

Ten newspapers in New York State have carried an editorial which raises serious questions regarding this takeover. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call the text of the editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

OUR STAKE IN A RAIL MERGER

The national economy is something many prate knowingly about in bright generalities but rarely come to grips with until it enters their own front door.

It is a many-sided condition. It embraces exports and imports, gross national production and unemployment rates, bull and bear markets and the price of wheat in Kansas.

It is automation, handicrafts, labor and management, transportation, job stability, and moonlighting, short workweek and overtime, tangibles and intangibles, ponderables and imponderables.

And it is the proposal on which the Interstate Commerce Commission will open hearings June 19, the question of a merger of the financially imperiled Baltimore & Ohio Railroad and Chesapeake & Ohio system.

Intervening in this case is the New York Central Railroad, which serves us in Westchester, as well as being an irreplaceable contributor to commerce, business and industry in a vast segment of the Nation.

The railroad, as a prime mover of freight and heavy equipment, feeds our ports, links factories with raw materials and distributors. But, undercut by subsidized airlines, truck transport on the public highways, heavy taxes and burdensome operating costs, it is, in effect, bleeding to death. And it is in the light of this awesome circumstance that the merger proposal before the Interstate Commerce Commission concerns all of us.

The New York Central, which has opposed the combination of B. & O. and C. & O., wants to become a part of the merger, and gives a logical argument for it.

The days of robber barons are gone. Railroads are public utilities and must not be mere pawns in financial maneuvering. Mergers must be in the interest of the public, not merely a few greedy stock speculators, if the Nation's basic transit system is to survive with any real health and usefulness.

If the Central is frozen out of this merger, it will be set up as a prize to be plundered by the new organization, its freight pirated away, its joint tenancies destroyed and its prime sources of revenue ruined.

Not only that, but the port of New York, upon whose business the entire metropolitan area depends and which the Central vitally serves, can only deteriorate if its rail freight is spirited away to southern ports, which the C. & O.-B. & O. merger only too obviously would favor.

Westchester would suffer along with the rest of the port area, to say nothing of the crippling of our own economy if it were forced to rely on the service of a bankrupt railroad.

On the other hand, if the merger can be made a three-way move, more than $125 millions of savings for the three can be foreseen in economies permitted from merely an elimination of duplicating functions, New York Central experts declare.

The Central now has 61 connections and 98 common points with the B. & O. and 45 connections and 67 common points with the C. & O.

The B. & O. and C. & O. have 17 connections and 23 common points.

The New York Central envisages a regional rail system out of a three-way merger. From it could come operating savings, revenue increases, better and more realistic service to industry and the public, and a strengthening of the general economy.

But from a two-way merger, the isolated Central would be prey for such a raid on its revenues as could only be expected to drive it to bankruptcy—from which the speculators would rescue it at the expense of its present shareholders and employees.

In its consideration, the Interstate Commerce Commission must recognize the need for wide planning in the service and survival of our railroads—and if the Interstate Commerce Commission doesn't elect to do so, it seems to us the Congress and the administration should step into the situation.

The New York State newspapers which carried the editorial are: Herald Statesman, Yonkers; Daily Argus, Mount Vernon; Daily News, Tarrytown; Daily Times, Mamaroneck; Citizen Register, Ossining; Daily Item, Port Chester; Standard-Star, New Rochelle; Reporter Dispatch, White Plains; Evening Star, Peekskill; Journal News, Nyack.

How Cambridge Flunked the First Test

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1961

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following three articles: A very thoughtful article by Mr. James Reston, editor of the Washington bureau of the New York Times, titled "How Cambridge Flunked the First Test." Second, an editorial from the Saturday, April 29, issue of the New York Herald Tribune, titled "No Moratorium, Mr. Reston." Third, an editorial from the Washington Post of Friday, April 28, titled "Laos Down the Drain?"

HOW CAMBRIDGE FLUNKED THE FIRST TEST

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, April 27.—The saddest men in Washington these days are the intellectuals on the White House staff who helped deal with the Cuban issue: McGeorge Bundy, former dean of the faculty at Harvard; Walt Whitman Rostow of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., the Harvard historian.

These highly intelligent and sensitive men do not, of course, tell the President of the United States what to do, but Bundy and Rostow in particular were influential in the planning stage, and are now even more controversial here than when they first arrived.

Oddly, part of the policy miscalculation was due to a lack of precisely those qualities which the intellectuals were expected to bring to bear on major policy decisions.

The theory was that these men, above everything else, would be extremely thorough in their staff work and bring to the highest counsels of the Executive a sense of history. Yet they have left the impression that the Cuban decision was reached without adequate staff preparation, and without that larger perspective of history which places specific decisions in proper relation to the commitments and objectives of the Nation.

For example, even after the adventure had failed, another White House staff officer said that the possibilities and consequences of failure had never even been considered. Secretary of State Rusk did not bring his own Department's intelligence unit into the staff work. The State Department's policy planning staff was not consulted, nor was Adlai E. Stevenson until the very end, when Bundy went to New York and filled him in.

The President himself, of course, was responsible for establishing the system whereby the Cuban decision was reached in a series of informal meetings at the White House. Most of the Cabinet members of the National Security Council met in these meetings from time to time, but apparently there was very little independent evaluation of the data presented in these meetings and little effort made to bring into the discussions top officials who were known to be opposed to the whole exercise.

Charles Evans Hughes, former Chief Justice of the United States and former Secretary of State, once remarked to Mr. Justice Felix Frankfurter that he would never venture an opinion to a Secretary of State about what should be done on an important question of policy without first studying all the relevant documents over the preceding 6 months.

This is the point of all this. In the Cuban case a great many opinions were given freely by comparatively inexperienced and often tired men who had not read the documents or consulted with the officials who had—all this at a time when they were meeting a great many other responsibilities, and trying to play social lion in the evenings as well.

Accordingly, the intellectuals who arrived here as critics are now the objects of criticism themselves, and this was probably inevitable. Congress has always been skeptical of powerful officials in the White House, especially if they have brains. The State Department has been vaguely suspicious of another center of foreign policy power close to the President. And the President's political aids, who were with him on Capitol Hill before Harvard moved to Washington, have always been a little skeptical of the articulate new members of the official family.

Cuba has stirred all this up sooner than was expected. Despite all the efforts by the President to produce unity, there is a lot of muttering about "Bundy and Company" supporting their former Massachusetts Institute of Technology colleague, Richard M. Bissell, Jr., who made the CIA's intelligence estimate to the President, and tipping the balance of power that way.

Much of this is nonsense, for while Bundy favored the Cuban policy, Schlesinger had serious misgivings and expressed them. That, however, is the way it is in this city when things go wrong, especially when the men involved are themselves such articulate critics of the mistakes of past administrations.

One result of all this is that the political side of the White House staff will probably be strengthened in the future, with Theodore Sorensen, the President's closest associate before the election, taking a more important role in foreign policy discussions. Also, when Allen Dulles leaves the CIA, probably in the summer, the President may very well bring Attorney General Robert Kennedy into that post and if this happens, the balance of power in foreign policy discussions will certainly change.

Meanwhile a moratorium on sniping at the professors might not be a bad idea, for if this brilliant young crowd fails, we might have to tolerate not only defeat but a spasm of anti-intellectualism as well.

NO MORATORIUM, MR. RESTON

"A moratorium on sniping at the professors might not be a bad idea, for if this brilliant young crowd fails, we might have to tolerate not only defeat but a spasm of antiintellectualism as well."

This surprising suggestion was made by Mr. James Reston of the New York Times in concluding a column noting the sorrow of the Harvard hands who failed at their first great test as architects and engineers of foreign policy.

No one wishes to salt the wounds. None of us can escape sympathy for these highly intelligent and sensitive men, as Mr. Reston calls them, who counseled the President on Cuba. This Nation has an obligation to understand the peril and support the President. Crisis has underscored the urgency of restraint and responsibility. We are all in this together.

But there is no need to impose on ourselves a holiday from public discussion and constructive public criticism of the conduct of Government. While urging caution in the realm of national security, the President articulated an essential democratic truth at the publishers' convention:

"Without debate, without criticism, no administration can succeed—and no republic can survive."

Mr. Kennedy is surrounded by some highly intelligent scholars who, like the President himself, rode to power partly on the momentum of persistent criticism of past policies. We pray for their success, as does Mr. Reston. But we cannot see the logic of special immunities in an hour of error or misjudgment on the grounds that they are sensitive professors and not hardened practitioners of the art of politics. They are influential counselors of Government, and should be treated as such.

If to hold them rigidly accountable (or snipe at them) would bring on a spasm of anti-intellectualism, then there must be something wrong with intellectualism in Government. At best this would be a flimsy excuse to check debate.

Only by continuing the discussion, with maturity, balance, and the public interest foremost, can we take out insurance against future tragedy.

There must be no moratorium (even if we accepted the curious argument about the spawning of anti-intellectualism), and we are amazed that an experienced newsman would put such an idea in print.

LAOS DOWN THE DRAIN?

With the embarrassment of the United States over Cuba, it was to be expected that the Communists would be bolder than ever in their approach to Laos. The impossible demands voiced by Communist China are indicative of the technique. The stalling over the cease-fire has enabled the Pathet Lao, with Soviet help, virtually to engulf the country. And the United States and its allies face a crisis of the first magnitude.

In Laos the question now is whether military intervention would be too late to bring a stabilization. Policy mistakes and inadequacies have contributed to the problem, but it is further complicated by the blandness of the Royal Lao Army. It is difficult to save a country whose leaders and people are unprepared philosophically to defend themselves. Still, a prompt action, if there were allied agreement, might preserve the Mekong Valley.

For the larger threat to southeast Asia is the really ominous aspect to what is happening. Vietnam appears to be the real Communist objective, for which Laos is a funnel; and there the army and the populace are fighting desperately against the marauding Communist guerrillas. After Vietnam there are Cambodia, Thailand and even Malaya. How long can the absorption be permitted to go on?

Some very grim decisions impend. Southeast Asia may indeed be on the periphery of free world power. But unless the Communist push is halted—by social, economic and political as well as military strength—sooner or later the free world will be left with nothing but a heartland to defend.

Israel's Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 2, 1961

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, 13 years ago a new nation was born and has taken its place among the nations of the world. The nation is Israel which was formed as the result of United Nations action with the strong support of the United States.

The citizens of Israel are mostly Jewish immigrants from lands where that minority had been suppressed. Principally, of course, the people of Israel were survivors of the Nazi atrocities against the Jews all over Europe, atrocities in which millions perished and hundreds of thousands were left homeless at the end of World War II.

The civilized nations of the world took cognizance of this deplorable state of affairs and granted to this segment of the Jewish people, through United Nations recognition of Israel, the right to return to the land of their ancestors.

I find myself in the position where I can happily announce that Israel through the efforts of its hard-working people is developing into a model as a new state dedicated to reaffirming for its people the value of human dignity and the rewards of hard work and dedication to the ideals of freedom and democracy. With the formation of the Israeli State the United States has gained a friend in that all-important part of the world.

We salute Israel on the anniversary of its independence and we wish it the best of success in the fulfillments of its inspirations.

A Closer Look Needed?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 2, 1961

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot of April 26, 1961:

A CLOSER LOOK NEEDED?

One of Washington's more aggressive battlers against secrecy in the Federal Government's executive branch, Representative GEORGE MEADER, has served the administration notice that President Kennedy's no-secrecy-in-Government pledge will be invoked whenever Federal officials try to withhold pertinent information from Congress.

His efforts may be sorely needed just now.

MEADER said it was on instructions from the President that a State Department order forbidding International Cooperation Administration officials from testifying before a House Foreign Operations Subcommittee was rescinded.

The President's order, the Congressman declared, was in keeping with a pledge Mr. Kennedy made to Congress in his state of the Union message.

Commending the President for his "vigorous and forthright action," MEADER urged that the President's order be regarded by all Federal officials as governing their conduct in future instances. Representative JOHN E. MOSS, California Democrat, who is chairman of a House Subcommittee on Freedom of Information, praised MEADER for his role in combating secrecy and said his subcommittee will try to ensure that the President's pledge is, "in fact, the policy of this administration."

But information suppression troubles persist in Washington. Last week the American Society of Newspaper Editors' Freedom of Information Committee reported that despite newsmen's freer access to the White House itself they are finding it increasingly difficult to break through an Administration-imposed news ban. The committee's criticism was directed at the State and Defense Departments particularly.

Noting that the President, before and after his election, "was on record in writing as believing in freedom of information and in his duty to see that the people are informed," the editors declared:

"To date, neither he nor his administration has lived up to his promise."

The report also advised that Pierre Salinger, Kennedy's news secretary, has failed to answer nine questions put to him 2 months ago concerning specific instances of withholding news.

One correspondent who has covered Washington for almost 30 years said the news curtain at the Pentagon is the most impenetrable in his experience.

Newsmen say censorship has been extended to eliminate backgrounding sessions which are designed as a means of keeping reporters informed.

In March, Chairman Moss said to the President:

"During your campaign and since taking office you have spelled out a highly commendable access to information policy and I hope the subcommittee can help you put it into effect."

The editors' critical report may prompt the Moss committee to take another—perhaps a more penetrating—look at the administration's information program.

Hon. Edward J. Hart

SPEECH
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I have lost a treasured friend with the passing of our distinguished former colleague, the Honorable Edward J. Hart. The sadness I felt when Ed Hart retired voluntarily from this body in 1954 now is compounded manifold.

He had a public career of the highest order of fidelity and service. His New Jersey colleagues have reviewed it today with deserved regard and admiration. Let me add only a few words in testimony of the sense of privilege I felt in serving with Ed Hart in the House, and, particularly, on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries under his distinguished chairmanship. He was lavish with his friends in the sharing of the gifts with which he had been endowed—perception in the public interest, intellectual courage, commonsense, respect for his fellow man—and, I am sure, he regarded every colleague here as a friend.

During his tenure, he held rank as one of the great orators of the House, but it was not a vocal talent alone that commanded our attention. Ed Hart was a painstaking lawyer, and he applied his conscientious legal approach to every legislative problem with which he was confronted. When his judgment told him what was right, he took his stand and bolstered his natural powers of persuasion with sound logic as he sought approval, in committee and on the floor, of the legislative approaches he deemed most effective.

When Ed Hart retired from the House, we hoped that it would not mean his withdrawal from public life, the life of service to which he was so fully dedicated. We were delighted, therefore, when he agreed to contribute further of his wisdom as member, and later chairman, of the New Jersey Public Utilities Commission.

At this sad time, our particular sympathy goes out to Mrs. Hart, the devoted wife who shared the trials and satisfaction of our friend's varied and eminently useful career.

The Proposed Violation of States Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 2, 1961

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, habits, customs, obligations are much more effective than any civil rights program implemented by Federal laws. Custom is much more effective than any law because it polices itself. Laws are not particularly efficient. A law has little chance of being enforced if it does not have the approval and support of the majority of the people affected.

Any attempt to enforce a civil rights law upon 50 States that have different conditions, different customs, different social standards, and people with different personal consciences is simply an effort to indict, to arraign, to try a whole nation, a whole section, a whole State. It just cannot be done in a democracy; it can only be done under a dictator. Must we surrender our precious guaranteed States rights in order to establish a program of civil rights?

When the Federal Constitution was before the States for ratification, four of the States demanded guarantees that freedom of the press, of speech, and of religion would be a part of the Constitution. Nine of the States insisted that States rights be guaranteed. Thus the 10th amendment was made a part of the Bill of Rights so that the Federal Government would be restrained from ever interfering with the rights of the States under the Constitution.

The first nine amendments in the Bill of Rights deal with the rights of the people, God-given rights; the 10th amendment deals with the powers of the Federal Government. It limits those powers. It says, in effect, to the President, to the Supreme Court, and to the Congress: "You may do what the Constitution specifically says you may do, but you may do no more. Those powers that are not given you are either reserved to the States or they belong to the people."

That is what the 10th amendment spells out, and we must not forget it in our desire to establish civil rights.

Mr. Speaker, today the new administration has decided to interfere in Virginia and force upon one county in Virginia public school integration of races in spite of the 10th amendment to the Constitution.

David Lawrence in his U.S. News & World Report of May 8, 1961, discusses this proposed action quite thoroughly and convincingly. I am in full accord with the attitude of David Lawrence and, therefore, include his editorial, "Conformity by Coercion," in these remarks:

CONFORMITY BY COERCION
(By David Lawrence)

The Kennedy administration has let it be known that it doesn't need at this time any additional legislation to secure civil rights, and that the desired results can be achieved through executive orders and court decrees.

Without the specific sanction of a single law of Congress or a single provision of the Constitution, the administration took a significant step on April 26 when it intervened directly in a Federal court proceeding and demanded that the State of Virginia compel one county to open its public schools. If it failed to do so, then State funds were to be ordered withheld from all the public schools in the 97 other counties and 32 autonomous cities throughout the State.

This is a legalistic kind of blackmail.

The startling edict is that States must abandon any local-option system, and that counties and cities must give up their independence.

If this principle can be applied to schools, it can be made effective with respect to all other variations in law as between the counties in a given State.

Thus, in many States, some counties are urban and some are rural. Some select a board of supervisors which appoints an executive manager with broad powers, and some counties prefer that the Board itself exercise all administrative authority. If the theory that the Federal Government may dictate how State shall operate their subdivisions of government is valid, then the way is open to abolish the governments of cities or counties at will, or else to require them to obey not merely the wishes of the State legislature but the dictates of a Federal bureau in Washington.

There is nothing in the 14th amendment that says that all counties must have the same laws or the same systems of administration, and that a State may not make laws to suit local conditions.

But the Department of Justice, by the motion filed in Federal court, evidently reflects the President's desire, which is that a State must conform to the pattern laid down by the Federal Government.

What becomes, then, of the right of the people to run their own local governments—State, county, and city?

What becomes of the provision in the 10th amendment to the Constitution which says that all powers not delegated to the Federal Government by the Constitution itself, or prohibited by it to the States, are "reserved to the States respectively, or to the people"?

There is not a single word in the Constitution giving any right to the Federal Government to control the educational systems of the States. Nor is there a single provision that gives the Federal Government any power to compel the State legislatures to vote funds for a particular purpose.

We are being told, moreover, that Congress should aid the States with huge expenditures to construct more schoolbuildings, to pay higer salaries for teachers, and to make various grants for specific educational courses needed to assist our national defense program. Will this not enable the Federal Government to complete its usurpation of the whole educational process?

It has been vehemently denied by the sponsors of Federal aid to education that any such dictatorship will ever be exercised. Such denials, however, have a hollow sound now as we read that the Department of Justice, with the full approval of President Kennedy, has threatened a State legislature with reprisals in the form of court injunctions against 97 counties unless Virginia conforms to an edict of the Federal Government and forces one county to open its public schools.

The courts, to be sure, have the right to intervene whenever any Federal or State law is being violated. But, in this case, is any Federal or State statute being broken? The State of Virginia supplies State funds to the cities and counties. One county—acting under State law—has closed its public schools and gives aid to students directly to help cover tuition charges at private schools, whether segregated or integrated. This is the same system that the Congress has applied in the GI bill of rights and in other legislation. It provides freedom of choice for the parents.

But now the Department of Justice assumes the right to tell a State that, unless it coerces a county to conform to a Federal decree, all other counties in the State must be deprived of State school funds.

This is a form of retaliation which has no place in the American system of government. It savors of dictatorship and totalitarianism. The end never justifies the means when we are dealing with a written Constitution, especially since there is a method specifically prescribed therein whereby the people can amend that same Constitution.

The Kennedy administration may be commended for seeking to accomplish a worthy objective—to secure "civil rights" for all citizens—but it must be condemned for selecting, as a means of attaining such ends, a device that would take away from the States and counties the basic right to govern themselves.

A Tribute to Dr. Charles Munch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 2, 1961

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, it is with true sorrow and wonderful memories that I bring to the attention of the House the coming retirement of one of the greatest artists of the musical world. Dr. Charles Munch has been the conductor of the Boston Symphony Orchestra—one of the finest orchestras in existence—for 12 years. With the end of the 1962 season, at the age of 70, he will leave Boston. It will be the end of an era, for conductors of the quality of Dr. Munch are individuals who bring their interpretations to music, just as literature produces genius of approach to a theme. The Boston Symphony is known for conductors of this quality; they are essential to its greatness.

To rehearse the history of his career at this point would be total understatement, but it is appropriate to mention the honors he has achieved in Boston. Since he joined the Boston Symphony in 1950, it has won five New York Critics Circle Awards for new music introduced, nine Grand Prix du Disques, and the Medal of the Vienna Mozartgemeinde. He instituted the orchestra's open rehearsals and took it twice to Europe and once to Russia. It has toured in the Far East and Australia as well.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Boston's feelings about Dr. Munch as reflected in the following editorial from the Boston Globe of Saturday, April 22, 1961:

DR. MUNCH'S RETIREMENT

Has it been 13 years since Dr. Charles Munch came among us? Surely the perfect choice to succeed Serge Koussevitzky, he proved it by assuming his role as if he had been there forever. Yet he completely changed the sound of the Boston Symphony Orchestra, giving it a French sonority as strong in character has he.

Now it is announced he will retire at the end of the 1961–62 season still in command of his considerable powers. The city can look forward to future guest appearances.

Boston has much to thank him for, besides giving his all, he kept the orchestra at the top of form. The changeover to his successor is characteristic of the orderly methods of the orchestra's trustees. Viennese-born Erich Leinsdorf will bring a change again in style to the Nation's most magnificent instrument which continues fortunate in its conductors.

Tool Bank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 2, 1961

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the New York Herald Tribune there appeared on April 30 an article under the byline of Allen M. Smythe bearing the caption "Navy To Aid South American Yards."

The article says in part:

Navy plans to improve and modernize 16 shipyards in South America are in their final stage.

The shipyards will receive surplus machine tools, equipment, and machinery, much of which has been held in storage since World War II.

The equipment will be repaired, rehabilitated, and shipped to South America, using funds of the mutual aid program for those countries.

I have no quarrel, Mr. Speaker, with the basic aim of the Navy in this respect, but I do question whether the ultimate interests of the United States are best served by permitting the Navy on its own initiative to allocate surplus tools and machines in this manner. This is only a partial approach.

Rather, I would think that a study be made of all the available surpluses and a national integrated program be initiated.

It is with such a study in mind that I am preparing to introduce a bill establishing a tool bank to attain the greatest good for the greatest number.

I urge my colleagues to read the article which follows:

NAVY TO AID SOUTH AMERICAN YARDS
(By Allen M. Smythe)

Navy plans to improve and modernize 16 shipyards in South America are in their final stage. The shipyards will receive surplus machine tools, equipment and machinery, much of which has been held in storage since World War II. The equipment will be repaired, rehabilitated and shipped to South America using funds of the mutual aid program for those countries.

The original cost of the equipment plus the 10 to 15 percent additional cost for repair and shipping is about one-third the retail cost of new items for these shipyards, according to high Navy officials.

To check requirements and give technical advice, the Navy sent two shipyard equipment experts, Capt. William Seith and A. J. Weisbecker, to visit and study ports in South America. Federal officials state that shipyards there are used almost exclusively to repair small naval vessels, fishing and other commercial ships.

BRAZIL TO BENEFIT MOST

Brazil, with its long coastline, will be the chief beneficiary. Three shipyards in Rio de Janiero are scheduled to receive valuable machine tools. Equipment will also go to shipyards in Belem, Salvador, Natal, and Racife.

Chile has shipyards in Talcahuano and Punta Arenas that are due for considerable modernization. Bahia Blanca in Argentina will be reequipped.

Puerto Cabello in Venezuela, Calao, in Peru, Cartegena in Colombia, and Montevideo in Uruguay each have one shipyard that will receive aid in the program.

A modest number of surplus machine tools already have been shipped to Near and Far East countries for use in their shipyards. Greece and Turkey have been the largest recipients receiving several million dollars worth of Navy machine tools. Iran, Ethiopia, Vietnam, Korea, and the Philippines which have small navies also have received equipment under the military assistance program.

DISPOSAL PROGRAM

Recently the Secretary of the Navy determined the cost of maintaining and storing equipment was too costly and ordered a disposal program. Many of the Nation's allies need the equipment either because they are "dollar poor" or because their industrial potential has never been improved.

Rather than "dump" this equipment on the commercial market and realize only a small fraction of its value from surplus sales, it was reasoned that it would aid the United States if the shipbuilding capability and industrial ability of participants in the mutual security program were strengthened.

Naval officials point out that surplus equipment consists of many large machine tools that are no longer useful for our modern Navy. They are ideal for repair work for the small ships that ply South American waters.

Pentagon budgetary officials expect the new administrator to approve in next year's budget the authorization of $200 million to $250 million for the purchase of new equipment for naval shipyards. Much of this amount will be earmarked for special equipment and new processes to fabricate high tensile alloy steels for our nuclear-powered warships and deep-diving submarines.

Address by Hon. Frank J. Becker at Dedication of Army National Guard Armory, Freeport, Long Island, April 30, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 2, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to place in the RECORD the speech of my colleague and congressional neighbor, Hon. FRANK J. BECKER, delivered April 30, 1961, at Freeport, N.Y. It contains a message which should be read by all:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE FRANK J. BECKER, REPUBLICAN, THIRD DISTRICT, NEW YORK, DEDICATION OF ARMY NATIONAL GUARD ARMORY, FREEPORT, LONG ISLAND, APRIL 30, 1961

We are here today to dedicate an Army National Guard Armory—a symbol of our country's willingness to prepare itself to guard its life, its principles and its heritage.

But today I want to ask you to do more than help dedicate this building—to do more, even, than dedicate yourselves. The fact that you are active participants in this Guard unit is proof of your awareness of certain harsh but obvious facts of life. I want to ask you to listen carefully to what I have to say—and then join me in a very important mission—a drive to save our way of life.

It is no secret to any of us that world situations and tensions are grave. Every day the headlines scream of a new crisis—of a new outrage against humanity—of a new powder keg situation in the infant countries of Africa and Asia.

World situations have been grave before. In 1914, it was the Balkans, now Laos. In 1938, it was Czechoslovakia, now the Congo. But unlike 1914, unlike 1938, we cannot, even for a short while, withdraw behind the false security of an ocean barrier and say "It's the other fellow's problem—not ours."

Because it is our problem—unless we want to see our cherished ideals of democracy and freedom washed down the drain—unless we want to live as slaves in an atheistic, cruel tyranny of Communist control.

My friends, I am not asking you to prepare for war.

I am telling you we are at war now.

We are now—today—April 30, 1961—engaged in the greatest war civilization has ever known. It is a life and death struggle for survival. We fight more than men and machines. We fight a philosophy—insidious, evil, grasping, selfish, cruel, merciless—dedicated to the complete and total destruction of everything in which we believe.

Every day, a battle is fought somewhere. In the United Nations. In negotiations in Geneva. In Washington. In Moscow. This is war. We have an enemy more determined to destroy western civilization than all enemies since the beginning of time—put together.

We couldn't see the signs 20 years ago. We waited until American men had been slaughtered at Pearl Harbor before we mobilized the great American productivity into a fighting machine that triumphed for our beliefs.

But just because we waited 20 years ago doesn't mean we have to wait now. In fact, we cannot—we dare not—wait.

But I say to you today: We must make a choice. We as a country must decide: we want to preserve our system. We must make this strong desire for survival known to our leaders.

We must decide now to build up our resources—our armed might, our physical might, our moral might. We must win the battle for survival, for men's minds, for the peace of the world.

But such a program takes time, dedication—and money.

Cuba has proven one thing to us. We are up against a formidable enemy.

Why should the people of this country think that the leaders of our Government can expend money, effort, and thinking for welfare state programs and, at the same time, devote effort, thinking, and money to win the fight for survival.

We must decide which is more important to us—an increase in social security—or an all-out effort so assure national security.

We must decide which is more vital to us and our children—Federal aid to education or assurances that our children will continue to be educated in a free world.

We must decide whether we would rather have vast depressed areas aid—or the continued right to live in freedom.

Because I am convinced that we cannot equitably engage in both efforts without weakening ourselves.

No government, no matter how great it may be, can divide its efforts in such a manner as to keep the "business as usual" sign out and, at the same time, spend the money necessary to assure that we will have business as usual 50 years from now.

Today we spend more than 50 percent of our national revenue on defense. If more is necessary, let us spend more.

The Bible said it best. "For what doth it profiteth a man if he gaineth the world but suffereth the loss of his soul?"

What will it profit our country to spend vast amounts of money on a welfare state—if we lose the battle for survival.

First things must come first, and the first thing is survival of our country. Once that has been accomplished, only then can we turn to a realistic appraisal of all these Federal projects. Only then will we be sure that our people will live to enjoy any benefits.

I say to you that we must make this decision. I fear it is not being made for us by our leaders. We must convince them that we are aware of the dangers facing us. We must tell them that we are willing to sacrifice for the survival of our system.

It is true that there are votes in all welfare state programs, but such political expediency cannot and must not be permitted to interfere with our all-out efforts in the life and death struggle in which we are presently engaged.

And what good are votes if we lose the battle for our very lives? We must preserve our system if we are to enjoy it.

We must take our Federal budget and reappraise it. We must remain solvent. To do this, we must reduce expenditures in nonnecessary domestic fields.

We are in the fight now. In World War II we gladly sacrificed to build our defense and war effort. Why cannot we do the same now? If we do not do this, it may be too late.

The situation is more serious now than it was then. We must wake up to this fact. We must let it be known that we will not sacrifice our country, our way of life, for political expediency.

No coddled country can or will survive. The Roman Empire offered its citizens bread and circuses—that resulted in total destruction at the hands of the barbarians.

We did not start our country by being given massive handouts by a paternalistic Federal Government.

We did not start our country by preferring comfort to work—and we won't be able to keep our country if we think that way.

We started our country and built it because we cared more for the future of our children and their children than we did for our own material comfort. And the only way to keep our country and its principles is to go back to that group effort for survival.

Why can't we have both the welfare state and an all-out mobilization for survival? For two reasons: First, commonsense. It takes money to win a war. We cannot bankrupt our economy by huge spending in both fields, or we will have no economy left. The second reason: It takes individual determination and responsibility to arm philosophically, physically, and morally to beat communism. Welfare state programs tend to kill individual responsibility by putting all decision making and implementing in the hands of an impersonal bureaucratic Federal Government.

I am sure it will take us only a few seconds to decide which is more important. So, again I ask you to join with me in this determination to put first things first. To be more concerned with the survival of our cherished ideals than with temporary Federal benefits. To help convince our country's leaders that we will not be taken in. That we recognize political expediency when we see it, and that we prefer survival. This must be a bipartisan effort, my friends, and we must begin today.

Official Statement of Gov. John Dempsey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 2, 1961

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the official statement of the Governor of Connecticut, Hon. John Dempsey, with respect to Connecticut Fitness Week.

The statement, which acutely states and strongly supports President Kennedy's program, follows:

CONNECTICUT FITNESS WEEK—MAY 1-6, 1961

A welcome development of recent years is the increased attention which is being paid in this Nation to physical fitness.

President Kennedy has stated that the physical vigor of our citizens is one of our most precious resources, and that this resource plays an important role in our ability to meet the great and vital challenges confronting us.

The President also has taken notice of disturbing reports comparing the physical fitness of American youth with that of youths in other lands, and has said that we want our children to be participants in the vigorous life rather than a generation of spectators.

The broad importance of this subject is seen also in a statement of the American Medical Association that a true concept of fitness includes the mental, the moral, the social, and the emotional, as well as the physical.

The work of the Governor's committee on youth fitness, established in January 1960, recreation programs in many communities, and the physical education activity of our schools and many private organizations afford the young people of Connecticut many

opportunities to acquire and retain that degree of fitness needed for the full enjoyment of life.

To call attention to these programs and to urge that they be fully supported, the period from May 1 to 6 is being observed as Connecticut Fitness Week.

Connecticut is embarked on a broad program of growth for the future. Just as this program is important to the economy of our State, a program of fitness is important for every individual who will participate in and enjoy the benefits of Connecticut's future growth.

Let us make Connecticut Fitness Week an occasion to resolve that we will make our own fitness a matter of personal concern and support efforts to improve the fitness of all.

Big Lag Is Found in Farm Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 2, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Glenn Beck, the distinguished dean of agriculture at Kansas State University, in Manhattan, Kans., was in my office this morning, and we discussed the farm research lag. Dr. Beck pointed out that less than three-tenths of 1 percent of the gross agricultural income of Kansas is being spent for agriculture-oriented research, while the comparable figure in the industrial field is nearly 5 percent. In a field as important to the State as beef cattle—which account of nearly half the State's agricultural income—only six one-hundredths of the gross income is going into research. This includes not only research in production problems, but also marketing problems clear on down to the grocery store shelf. This is a problem that necessarily concerns not only beef growers and farmers generally, Mr. Speaker, but also taxpayers and consumers all over the Nation.

Speaking of the problems associated with some of our agricultural surplus, Dr. Beck said to me this morning:

We've researched our way into this problem—now let us research our way out of it.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with this overall situation, I want to draw the attention of my colleagues to a story that appeared in the New York Times on Sunday last:

BIG LAG IS FOUND IN FARM RESEARCH—LESS THAN 1 PERCENT OF INCOME IS SPENT FOR AGRICULTURE

WASHINGTON, April 29.—Agricultural research continues to move along at a horse-and-buggy pace in an age of automotive speed.

Less than 1 percent of agriculture's annual gross income is spent on research compared with more than 5 percent in the industrial field.

Some advocates of stronger farm research programs see a connection between the lag, accumulation of farm surpluses, and declining farm income.

Agriculture is being researched out of its markets, they say, citing synthetic fibers, plastics, detergents, and other new products that are being produced from nonagricultural raw materials.

At the present time, farm research is carried on almost wholly in publicly supported institutions such as the Agriculture Department's research service and cooperative State experiment stations. Officials estimate expenditures for such research do not exceed $500 million a year. This compares with more than $5 billion for business and industry.

This discrepancy is much greater in finding new uses for agricultural raw materials. Less than $20 million a year is spent on this. It is estimated that industry spends $3 billion a year looking for new uses and products for its raw materials.

Lagging farm research was the subject of a study made by a Presidential commission in a broadened program calling for 1957. It strongly recommended expenditure of at least $50 million a year in seeking new industrial uses for agriculture's surpluses.

At present, spending on agricultural research totals $158 million a year. It includes research in forestry, home economics, and veterinary medicine. It also covers research on the production of farm and forest products; the processing, distributing, and marketing of these products; the provision of materials, facilities, credit, and other requisites for these activities, and research relating to services to farm families, rural communities, missions of other public agencies, and to the general public.

Recently, an Agriculture Department committee made an evaluation of Government farm research. It concluded that the present program was too limited.

It found that facilities of the Department—mainly a research center at nearby Beltsville, Md.—and the State experiment stations were crowded and need modernizing.

"Inadequacy of facilities is a serious impediment to present research programs," it said in a report. "The situation must be corrected."

"Agricultural research requires personnel with skills in the same sciences that nonagricultural research needs. There is brisk competition for the best. Capable students must be inspired to pursue studies in the agriculture-related sciences and careers in agricultural research must be made rewarding enough to attract them," the report asserted.

A Court-Packing Measure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 2, 1961

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Adrian (Mich.) Daily Telegram of April 28, 1961:

A COURT-PACKING MEASURE

The House has now followed the lead of the Senate in authorizing more new Federal judgeships than are needed. The Senate's bill, passed a few weeks ago, calls for 73 new Federal judges; the House measure, passed last Thursday, calls for 70. The Kennedy administration had called for 59 and so had the American Bar Association.

There is no question that more judges are needed to cope with the backlog of cases building up in the Federal courts across the country. President Eisenhower tried unsuccessfully for 2 years to get more, but the Democratic Congress blocked him. It preferred to wait until a Democratic President could make the lifetime appointments.

Congressional leaders insisted on raising the ante, and their insistence not only gives weight to the Republican charge that the measure will dilute and cheapen the Federal judiciary but it does more. It supplies final and devastating proof that the Democratic leaders look on the judgeships as nothing but rewards for party electioneering.

Counting vacancies by death and retirement, the Kennedy administration will have an estimated 100 court vacancies to fill this year. It so happens that the Federal judiciary at present is about equally divided between Democrats and Republicans. Last year, in an effort to obtain the needed judgeships, the Eisenhower administration offered to divide the new appointments evenly between qualified Democrats and Republicans.

No such offer is coming from the Democratic camp now, and obviously no such even distribution is contemplated. Thus the new measure, when the slight House and Senate differences have been compromised as they surely will be, becomes an opportunity for court packing on a grand scale.

In all the circumstances, President Kennedy has a grave obligation to seek out the very best appointees available, even if some of them happen to be Republicans.

New York State Banking Department Disapproves Bank Holding Company Application

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 2, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on April 26, 1961, I entered my remarks in the RECORD expressing my concern over the setting up of phantom or intermediary banks as a means of obtaining control of the assets of existing banks by a bank holding company.

In that statement I referred to the proposed plan of the Bankers Trust Co. and the County Trust Co. of White Plains to form just such phantom banks. The New York State Banking Department has disapproved this plan, and I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following press release of that department dated April 13, 1961. New York State Superintendent of Banks G. Russell Clark is to be highly commended for his action:

BANKING BOARD DISAPPROVES BANKERS TRUST-COUNTY TRUST BANK HOLDING COMPANY APPLICATION

G. Russell Clark, New York State superintendent of banks and chairman of the banking board, announced that the banking board had disapproved the Bankers Trust-County Trust Bank holding company application.

Mr. Clark indicated that this decision was based on the board's view that the proposed formation would result in a bank holding company with a concentration of assets beyond limits consistent with effective competition within Westchester County; that it may result in a lessening of competition injurious to the interests of the public, and in a tendency toward monopoly in Westchester County. He pointed out that while

some added convenience to the public might result from approval of the application, its anticompetitive implications and the consequent adverse impact on the public interest weighed the balance toward disapproval.

Superintendent Clark stated that the basis for the banking board's action was the dominant position within Westchester which the proposed holding company would occupy (with 40–50 percent of Westchester's commercial banking services), in combination with the economic power and competitive advantages of a $3 billion New York City bank; that although County Trust now controls a similar propotion of Westchester's commercial banking business, the banking law, which is concerned with regulating the expansion of holding companies, refers to the size and asset concentration of a proposed holding company system, and not of any individual bank which is to be part thereof; that the proposed affiliation would largely cut off banks other than Bankers Trust from actual and potential correspondent relationships with County Trust, amounting to almost one-half of such commercial bank opportunities originating within Westchester; and that approval of the proposed application would result in a tendency toward monopoly over wholesale banking services within Westchester.

The superintendent of banks also noted that the influence that approval of this application would exercise on the future course of asset and market concentration in New York State banking could not be ignored; that if this proposal and a contemplated merger between a large New York City bank and the second largest Westechester bank were consummated, two major New York City banks would control between them about 75 percent of commercial banking assets and deposits and two-thirds of commercial bank branches in Westchester, and that the power to monopolize the Westchester banking market would be inherent in such a situation.

Attached is a copy of the recommendations made by the superintendent of banks to the banking board in accordance with the New York banking law, and which were accepted by the banking board.

NEW YORK STATE BANKING DEPARTMENT—RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SUPERINTENDENT OF BANKS TO THE BANKING BOARD (BANKING LAW, SEC. 142(1))

(Application of New York Holding Corp., pursuant to sec. 142(1)(a) and (f) of the banking law (a) to acquire all of the capital stock of Wall Street Trust Co., and of Main Street Trust Co.; and (b) to vote the stock of Wall Street Trust Co., in favor of the proposed merger of Bankers Trust Co. into Wall Street Trust Co.; and (c) to vote the stock of Main Street Trust Co. in favor of the proposed merger of the County Trust Co. into Main Street Trust Co.)

INTRODUCTION

New York Holding Corp. (a corporation organized under the laws of Delaware) has filed in this department (and concurrently with the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System) applications for prior approval of certain actions intended ultimately to result in the acquisition by the applicant of all the capital stock (except directors' qualifying shares) of the respective successors of Bankers Trust Co. and the County Trust Co. If these and certain other approvals are obtained, and appropriate corporate actions are taken, applicant would become a bank holding company under Article III-A of the New York Banking Law, and under the Federal Bank Holding Company Act of 1956.

Footnotes at end of speech.

The applicant requests prior approval of the banking board (1) to take action to become a bank holding company having two banking subsidiaries, each located in a banking district different from that in which the other is located (banking law, sec. 142(1)(a), and (2) to vote the stock of each such banking subsidiary in favor of merging into it another banking institution (banking law, sec. 142(1)(f).

As to action (1) above, the applicant proposes to acquire all the capital stock (except directors' qualifying shares) of Wall Street Trust Co., 16 Wall Street, New York City, and of Main Street Trust Co., 235 Main Street, White Plains, N.Y. These trust companies are not presently in existence. Organization certificates have been filed, however, for the approval of the superintendent and the banking board pursuant to banking law section 24. Action upon such certificates has been deferred pending banking board action on the present application.

As to the second action, the applicant proposes to vote the stock of Wall Street Trust Co. (if this board approves applicant's acquisition thereof) in favor of a merger of Bankers Trust Co. into Wall Street Trust Co., under the name Bankers Trust Co., the receiving institution to be a trust company with its principal office in the second banking district; and the applicant proposes to vote the stock of Main Street Trust Co. (if this board approves applicant's acquisition thereof) in favor of a merger of the County Trust Co. into Main Street Trust Co., under the name the County Trust Co., the receiving institution to be a trust company with its principal office in the third banking district.

Under the proposed plans of merger, those stockholders of Bankers Trust Co. and the County Trust Co.[2] voting in favor of the respective plans would receive the stock of the applicant (New York Holding Corp.) in exchange for their stock in Bankers Trust and County Trust. Dissenting stockholders would be entitled to cash for their bank stock, either by agreement or under judicial appraisal procedure, as provided by law (banking law, sec. 604).

Also incident to the overall plan, therefore, would be further applications to this Department, following appropriate corporate action, for approval of the mergers necessary to consummate the plan, and for approval of the banking offices to be maintained by the respective receiving institutions.

Some division in jurisdiction as between the superintendent and the banking board is involved in the series of applications under the plan. This circumstance creates no particular difficulty. Central to the plan is the intention of New York Holding Corp. ultimately to acquire and hold all the stock (except directors' qualifying shares) of the successors to Bankers Trust and County Trust, and therefore to become a bank holding company. Primary jurisdiction to approve or disapprove certain of the actions leading to such result rests in the banking board under banking law section 142(1)(a) and (f). The superintendent is required under the statute to submit the application together with his recommendations in regard thereto to the banking board.

This statement embodies such recommendations, and is submitted to the board together with the application and all papers, correspondence, and other information in my possession relating thereto.

STATUTORY CRITERIA

Article III–A of the banking law, as enacted by chapter 237 of the laws of 1960 (the Omnibus Banking Act), and reenacted by chapter 146 of the laws of 1961,[3] embodies a comprehensive statutory plan for this State's regulation and supervision of bank holding companies, their formation, and their expansion. Action which results in formation or expansion of a bank holding company is unlawful, except when such action is taken with the prior approval of the banking board; and in determining whether or not to grant its prior approval, the board is required to take into consideration the factors specified in the statute (banking law, sec. 142(1). The factors to be considered are:

(i) The declaration of policy contained in section 10 of the banking law, to the effect that the business of all banking organizations shall be supervised and regulated through the banking department in such manner—

(a) As to insure the safe and sound conduct of such business;

(b) To conserve their assets;

(c) To prevent hoarding of money;

(d) To eliminate unsound and destructive competition among such banking organizations;

(e) To maintain public confidence in such business; and

(f) To protect the public interest and the interests of depositors, creditors, shareholders and stockholders.

(ii) Whether the effect of the action for which approval is sought shall—

(a) Result in the formation of a bank holding company of a size or extent beyond limits consistent with adequate or sound banking and the preservation thereof; or

(b) Result in a concentration of assets beyond limits consistent with effective competition.

(iii) Whether such formation or acquisition may result in such a lessening of competition—

(a) As to be injurious to the interest of the public; or

(b) Tend toward monopoly.

(iv) Primarily, the public interest and the needs and convenience thereof.

Finally, the legislature in enacting chapter 237 of the Laws of 1960, and in reenacting its provisions (ch. 146 of the Laws of 1961) further declared this State's policy in respect of the structure of banking in New York:

"SECTION 1. Declaration of policy: The enactment of Federal law to regulate bank holding companies (Bank Holding Company Act of 1956) has made it necessary for the State of New York to review the structure of banking organizations operating in New York State. After full consideration of the complex issues involved it is hereby declared to be the policy of the State of New York that appropriate restrictions be imposed to prevent statewide control of banking by a few giant institutions; that no law or the administration of any such law should work a discrimination in favor of federally chartered banking institutions or against State chartered institutions; that the dual banking system be preserved; that competitive as well as banking factors be applied by supervisory authorities in approving or disapproving bank mergers, the operations of bank holding companies, acquisitions thereby or mergers or consolidations thereof; that no existing bank holding company be granted a statutory monopoly; that healthy and nondestructive competition be fostered among all types of banking organizations within natural economic and trade areas; that statutory home office protection for small unit banking organizations be preserved and extended; and that there be State supervision over the activities of bank holding companies and banking organizations for the purpose of assuring that the activities of such companies and organizations conform to the declared policy of the State in respect of banking."

Preliminary to discussion of the competitive and public interest criteria, it may be well to dispose of the section 10 factors incorporated by reference in section 142.

Banking factors

Section 10, declarative of this State's policy in the supervision and regulation of the business of banking organizations, enunciates several tests which are of doubtful significance here. Conservation of banking assets, prevention of hoarding, and maintenance of public confidence in the banking business do not present problems warranting discussion in the context of the proposal before the board. Nor would the interests of creditors of the two banking institutions be affected in any substantial way, whatever disposition may be made of the application.

The interests of stockholders of Bankers Trust and County Trust should, in the first instance, be determined by themselves. That opportunity they will have (should the board approve the present application) in voting as stockholders upon the proposed mergers of their respective institutions with the banks to be organized for that purpose (Wall Street Trust Co. and Main Street Trust Co.). Dissenting stockholders, as previously noted, would have the right to be paid for their stock and to resort to the courts for a determination of its value (banking law, sec. 604). The section 10 declaration that State supervision of banking is directed (among other objectives) toward protecting the interests of stockholders seems, therefore, mainly intended to promote the safe and sound general conduct of a bank's business. It is not intended primarily as a guide in acting upon specific applications, such as this, where the individual's own investment judgment is the primary index to his interest, and where other effective safeguards are afforded him. Thus, although the statute requires the board to take the stockholders' interests into account, I read this requirement as precluding approval only where the proposed action is so patently prejudicial to the interests of stockholders that it would be futile to submit it to their vote. I am satisfied that such is not the case here, and conclude that this application would have no such effect upon the stockholders' interests as would warrant this board's depriving them, under this factor, of the opportunity to decide for themselves where their interests lie.

Remaining for discussion are the other factors enumerated in section 10, namely, (1) "to insure the safe and sound conduct of such [banking] business," (2) "to eliminate unsound and destructive competition among such banking organizations," (3) to protect the "public interest," and (4) to protect "the interests of depositors."

1. Insuring the Safe and Sound Conduct of the Banking Business

The data submitted in support of the application, and this Department's familiarity with the affairs of Bankers Trust and County Trust, indicate that their business has been conducted safely and soundly, and that their prospects for continued safe and sound operations are excellent.

The applicant, the proposed bank holding company, has assets of $1,000, representing the proceeds of sale for organizational purposes of 1,000 shares of its authorized capital stock now outstanding. The plan contemplates that additional resources of substantial amount would be made available at a later date. The management and board of directors of applicant are drawn substantially from the present management and directors of Bankers Trust and County Trust, respectively. The records of these institutions amply reflect safe and sound management policies and a high degree of operational skill. It is reasonable to expect that their affairs, and those of the proposed bank holding company, would continue to be so conducted.

This factor is, in my opinion, not inconsistent with approval of the application.

2. Elimination of Unsound and Destructive Competition

Vigorous competition among banking institutions now exists in New York City and Westchester County. There is no evidence, however, that in New York City or in Westchester County, or in any combined New York City-Westchester market, unsound or destructive competition among commercial banks exists. Neither Bankers Trust nor County Trust appears to be suffering from competition of such an undesirable character as to bear upon the merits of the present application. Accordingly, this factor does not militate in favor of the application. The case might be otherwise where an institution suffered from destructive competition to such an extent that its financial soundness or stability were jeopardized, or its capacity to offer adequate banking services to the public materially reduced.

3. Protection of the Public Interest

Discussion of the public interest factor may be deferred until the final factor specified in section 142 is reached, requiring this board to consider "primarily, the public interest and the needs and convenience thereof."

4. Protection of the Interests of Depositors

Depositors in Bankers Trust and County Trust, in their capacity as such, should be little affected by the plan. Deposit services would be maintained by both banks as heretofore, and presumably expanded and improved; no branches are proposed to be closed by reason of the holding company affiliation; and service charges would remain substantially unchanged.

This factor appears to be of minor significance in reviewing the application.

5. Preventing Expansion of a Bank Holding Company to a Size or Extent Inconsistent With Adequate or Sound Banking[4]

As will appear from the subsequent discussion, the bank holding company which would result from approval of this application would be a large organization. Nevertheless, there is no substantial reason to believe that it would be too large to function in an adequate and sound manner insofar as its own operations are concerned. There are a number of banking organizations operating efficiently and soundly under centralized management which are as large or larger than New York Holding Corp. would be. There is also a bank holding company in this State which is nearly as large in terms of assets, and larger in number of banking offices, and which is soundly operated.

Accordingly, this factor is not inconsistent with approval of the application.

Competitive factors

This department has not had occasion heretofore to measure against the express language of section 142 any proposal of the magnitude of the present one. A brief review of recent legislative history may serve to illuminate such language.

In passing upon two important New York City bank merger applications in 1959, the superintendent applied to them, under the public interest factor of section 10, certain tests deriving essentially from antitrust law. Indeed, it was to codify all the considerations (including competitive) reviewed in connection with these mergers that this department recommended to the State legislature precisely the language now found in section 142(1).[5]

The foregoing is not intended to imply that the statutory tests and judicially promulgated doctrines of antitrust law are to be applied by the banking department in reviewing this or any other proposed bank holding company action, bank merger, or asset acquisition. This department is not the proper forum for adjudication of issues under the Federal antitrust laws. That responsibility lies elsewhere. In 1959 I had occasion to discuss antitrust doctrines as they relate to banking, in the following terms:

"At the threshold, it must be recognized that the impact of antitrust laws and policy upon the regulated banking industry differs materially (although no specific exemption from antitrust statutes is granted to banking) from their effect on business free of control by supervisory agencies. Indeed, much of the uncertainty that has characterized commentary in this area results from the seeming dichotomy created by the policy of free competition in open markets as fostered by the antitrust laws on the one hand and on the other hand by the conservatory practices imposed upon banks by regulatory legislation. There are those who would condition approvals of bank mergers upon a strict application of existing antitrust laws whether or not presently applicable to bank mergers. Such would be to ignore factors unique to banking which might warrant approval of a proposed merger under the previously enumerated [section 10] criteria. * * *

"Further, the public interest and the needs and convenience thereof must be considered, since the demands that our economy and international trade and finance impose upon commercial banking in certain areas of this State may not be adequately served by normal growth. This is not to say that in New York City the burdens placed upon commercial banks cannot be met at the present time by normal growth. In some areas of the State, however, a virtual monopoly may be the only economically feasible method of insuring to the public adequate access to banking services to which it has a right. On the other hand, the prevention of an undue concentration of banking assets in a few banks in certain areas of this State is necessary. In this connection the incidence of absorptions, mergers, and consolidations, with resultant increase in banking concentration within the past decade, nationally and in New York, must be noted."[6]

I read the standards enunciated in section 142 as a mandate to balance and apply both the so-called competitive factors and the so-called banking factors, in the light of an overriding concern with the interest, needs, and convenience of the public.

Some consideration should be given as well to the declaration of policy in chapter 237 of the laws of 1960.[7] The legislature's review of this State's banking policy was necessitated by enactment of the Federal Bank Holding Company Act of 1956. The State's policy, insofar as relevant to the present application, is—

(a) To prevent statewide control of banking by a few giant institutions;

(b) To require supervisory authorities to apply competitive as well as banking factors in approving or disapproving acquisitions by bank holding companies;

(c) To foster healthy and nondestructive competition among all types of banking organizations within natural economic and trade areas; and

(d) To assure conformance, through State supervision, to the banking policy so declared.

In pursuance of such policy, certain changes in the State's banking structure were authorized. The freeze on formation and expansion of bank holding companies was terminated, subject to State supervision and regulation of such activities. Branching and merger privileges of banking organizations were extended. More specifically, implicit in the statute is the recognition given to movements of population and business from cities to suburban areas, and the consequent need in such areas for expanded banking services, and for the vigorous competition in banking that is concomitant to economic growth.

Footnotes at end of speech.

The proposed formation of a new bank holding company to acquire Bankers Trust and County Trust requires assessment of the effects thereof upon competition.

Will such action result in a concentration of assets beyond limits consistent with effective competition?

May such action result in such a lessening of competition as to be injurious to the interest of the public?

May such action bring about a tendency toward monopoly?

To answer these questions requires analysis of the specific banking services performed by the two banks; the relevant market areas for each such service; and the effects upon competition inherent in the proposal. Ultimately, the board is to reach a judgment (balancing the competitive effects of the proposal against the public's need for banking services) as to whether approval or disapproval would best serve the interest, needs, and convenience of the public. In short, would the anticompetitive effects of the plan (if any) outweigh its benefits (if any) to the public?

THE BANKS INVOLVED

The County Trust Co. of White Plains, N.Y., is the largest bank in Westchester County. Its one-half billion dollars in resources constitute over 49 percent of all commercial bank assets in Westchester. It holds 49 percent of all individual, partnership and corporation demand deposits in the county, and carries on its books 40 percent of all business loans extended by commercial banks in Westchester, as well as 46 percent of all commercial bank consumer installment loans. The 40 offices of County Trust comprise 41 percent of all commercial bank offices in Westchester.

County Trust is basically a suburban retail bank. Its primary services are to residents of Westchester County and to businesses located in Westchester. It has engaged heavily in real-estate lending and servicing, primarily out of State, but it does not, on any substantial scale, serve national or international enterprises. The bulk of County Trust's deposits derives from Westchester residents and business firms. A substantial portion of such deposits is in savings accounts of individuals, nearly all of whom live in Westchester. Of total demand deposits held by County Trust, the bulk is those of individuals, partnerships, and corporations. In those instances where large firms of national or international stature maintain deposit accounts with County Trust, such accounts largely reflect the local activity of these firms in Westchester County.

Bankers Trust Co. is the sixth largest commercial bank in New York City. It holds some $3 billion in resources, constituting 8.1 percent of all commercial bank assets in New York City. Its 47 offices constitute 7.5 percent of all commercial bank offices in the city. It holds 8.9 percent of all individual, partnership and corporation demand deposits in the city, 9.8 percent of commercial bank business loans, and 6.6 percent of commercial bank consumer installment loans.

Bankers Trust is, in the main, a wholesale bank, serving large commercial, industrial, and financial firms, many of them of national and international standing. In recent years it has also been transacting a substantial volume of banking business which may be characterized as retail in character.

RELEVANT MARKET AREAS

It may be argued (and the applicant so asserts) that New York City and Westchester County together constitute an integrated economic area, or part of a larger banking market comprising New York City and its adjacent and nearby suburban counties. Some 40 percent of Westchester residents commute regularly to New York City, and some noncommuters (or their wives) may consider New York City banks as conveniently available. About 70 percent of Westchester residents live within 10 miles of New York City, and important business relationships exist involving the movement of goods and services between New York City and Westchester. Indeed, it may be further argued that the Omnibus Banking Act implies legislative recognition of a degree of economic integration as between New York City and Westchester County. The declaration of policy of the act speaks of fostering healthy and nondestructive banking competition within natural economic and trade areas. Such declaration is followed by provisions granting to certain banking organizations new branching and merger privileges across the New York City-Westchester County line. From this it may be inferred that the legislature regarded New York City and Westchester as part of natural economic and trade area.

Actually, however, for purposes of this application, a much more limited inference should reasonably be drawn from the action of the legislature in authorizing New York City banking institutions to branch into Westchester, and Westchester institutions into New York City. The legislature recognized, not that the two areas comprise an integrated market for bank services, but merely that many individuals, such as commuters, need banking services in both areas, which services can best be afforded through branching across the county line. The legislature might also have considered it advisable to stimulate competition in a largely suburban area, where the opportunity for growth of independent institutions may be relatively limited, by permitting branching from and to a large commercial city nearby, even though not in the same market area. Thus, while it is true that branching throughout an integrated market area is generally permitted, branching is not necessarily limited to such areas but may be permitted outside an integrated market area where special circumstances exist. Certainly, it cannot be inferred from the present branching provisions of the banking law that New York City and Westchester are within one market area for all purposes which are relevant to the present application.

With respect to certain important categories of banking services, Westchester is in fact a separate and distinct market area. Since over half of Westchester residents both work and live in Westchester,[8] and few of these would be likely to regard New York City banks as conveniently available alternatives for the banking services rendered by Westchester banks—Westchester County should be viewed as a banking market separate and distinct from New York City.

The banking department's analysis of relevant geographic market areas, by banking services, further reveals the existence of certain service lines for which the market is primarily local (i.e., countywide or even more closely restricted to a particular municipality and its environs, or to a neighborhood or section of a city or village). Such services, which County Trust renders to its depositors and customers at its 40 branches throughout Westchester County, include:

1. Business loans to small local enterprises.

2. Consumer installment loans. (The relevant market here should perhaps be even more circumscribed, i.e., to banks within convenient distances from the homes or places of business of potential borrowers.)

3. Savings deposits. (The comments in (2) above are applicable with respect to this service as well.)

4. Special checking accounts.

5. Regular checking accounts (individual and small business).

6. Small personal trusts.

Insofar as Westchester is a separate market area, it is clear that no substantial amount of competition for its local banking services exists as between Bankers Trust and County Trust. Accordingly, none would be eliminated by their affiliation. Certain other competitive implications relating to such local banking services must be carefully examined, however.

THE EFFECTS UPON BANKING COMPETITION OF THE SIZE, EXTENT, AND ASSET CONCENTRATION OF THE PROPOSED BANK HOLDING COMPANY

The statute (banking law, sec. 142(1)) cautions lest the formation of a bank holding company result in a concentration of assets beyond limits consistent with effective competition; the statute further directs consideration as to whether such action may result in such a lessening of competition as to be injurious to the interest of the public or tend toward monopoly; and finally the statute enjoins this board that its primary consideration be the interest and the needs and convenience of the public.

The size and extent of, and the assets to be held by the proposed bank holding company system would, in the first instance, reflect the combined size and extent and assets of Bankers Trust and County Trust, respectively. These have been briefly outlined in a preceding portion of this statement. The application and the banking department's own analysis mark out in considerable detail the magnitude and scope of the resources and operations of the two banks.

As a bank holding company the applicant would be, in terms of total resources, the largest such company in the State, with combined banking assets of over $3.5 billion. Marine Midland Corp., the second largest such company in New York, holds some $2.4 billion in banking assets. In terms of its 87 banking offices, the applicant would be second to Marine Midland Corp., whose subsidiary banks maintain 174 offices throughout New York State.

In the combined New York City-Westchester County area, the holding company's share (over $3.5 billion) of all commercial banking assets would constitute 9.1 percent of the total. Its share of commercial banking offices in such area would be 12 percent.

The figures relating to the New York City-Westchester area lose their significance, however, when it is considered that New York City's total commercial banking assets are nearly 40 times the size of Westchester's, and that there are 628 commercial bank offices in New York City, and only 96 in Westchester. Thus, even the acquisition by the applicant of Bankers Trust and all Westchester County commercial banks would have a relatively minor effect upon commercial bank asset and branch concentration in such combined area.

Much more significant is the effect of the proposal before the Board upon banking concentration within Westchester.

To the preeminent position already occupied by County Trust in Westchester commercial banking, the proposal would bring the added economic power and competitive advantages of affiliation with a New York City bank whose $3.1 billion in resources dwarfs the less than one-half billion dollars held by all nine remaining commercial banks in Westchester.

The strategic position of County Trust in Westchester is illustrated by the degree of its branch concentration in certain Westchester communities (commercial bank branches only):

White Plains: County Trust, six offices; others, three offices.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Mount Vernon: County Trust, four offices; others, two offices.

Larchmont: County Trust, two offices; others, one office.

Mamaroneck: County Trust, two offices; others, one office.

Port Chester: County Trust, two offices; others, one office.

North Tarrytown and Tarrytown, Irvington, Dobbs Ferry, Ardsley, Hastings-on-Hudson area: County Trust, one in each (total 5 offices); others, three offices.

In the specified communities, County Trust operates a total of 21 offices, its commercial bank competitors a total of 11.

To some extent, the conclusions to be reached here reflect the nature and mode of operation of bank holding companies. These organizations, as the applicant and other authorities[1] have pointed out, bring important advantages and render significant services to their affiliated banks. Bank holding companies provide to their subsidiaries the benefits of (1) additional capital funds, (2) centralized management, (3) technical assistance in bank operations, such as specialized lending services, purchasing, auditing, appraising, advertising, tax counseling, credit information, and underwriting of government and municipal securities. Moreover, the present applicant has drawn substantially all of its executive officers and directors from the present management and Boards of the banks it seeks to acquire. Thus, while not technically a merger, the formation or expansion of a bank holding company may have, as here, many of the practical implications of such transactions.

The aspects of bank holding company operation above mentioned, as well as others, are designed to lend financial strength, stability, and operational skills to institutions which, on their own, might lack the capacity to secure such advantages for themselves, to the detriment of the public they serve.

In the context of the present application, however, there is no evidence that either of the banks involved is in that position. Each is adequately capitalized, well-managed, and renders or has the capacity to render a full scale of needed banking services in the markets it now serves. The banking department recognizes that bringing additional banking services and additional banking competition into many areas of the State is highly desirable, is in the public interest, and is consistent with legislative intent and policy as enunciated through the omnibus banking act and in banking legislation which preceded such enactment. Such growth and extension of competition should be achieved in measured steps, however.

While it is conceded that some additional convenience and benefit may accrue to the public in Westchester were the proposal consummated, I do not regard this circumstance as sufficient to overcome the adverse competitive impact inherent in a consolidation of the resources of the largest commercial bank in Westchester—a bank roughly twice the size of its nearest competitor in that county—with the resources of a bank some six times the size, in assets, of all remaining Westchester commercial banks.

The only remotely comparable transaction in Westchester which may presently be envisioned is the proposed merger of the second largest commercial bank in Westchester with the second largest New York City bank.[2] This department, of course, has no jurisdiction over such proposed merger. I must take note, however, that were both the present proposal and the contemplated merger approved and consummated, some 75 percent of commercial banking assets, and two-thirds of commercial bank branches in Westchester would be held by but two institutions. It is not too much to say that the power to monopolize—to exclude actual or potential competition from a defined market—would be inherent in the combinations here referred to. Moreover, this department may not ignore the influence which its decision on the present application may exert upon the future course of asset and market concentration in the banking industry.

It could be argued that the two largest Westchester banks (County Trust and the National Bank of Westchester) presently control, between them, a similar proportion of Westchester assets, branches, and lines of commerce, and, therefore, no change in this respect would result from approval of both transactions. However, it should be pointed out that in referring to size (i.e., to size or extent and to concentration of assets) the banking law refers to the size of the proposed holding company system, not to the size of any individual bank which is to be a part thereof. Accordingly, it is the anticompetitive implications of the formation or expansion of a bank holding company which must be scrutinized. In this case, such action would result in an accretion of resources and facilities inconsistent with effective competition in the market area being reviewed, namely, Westchester County, and in many of the local communities therein.

One further comment is relevant here. Affiliation of County Trust with Bankers Trust would tend, to a substantial degree, if not completely, to cut off other banks in New York City and elsewhere from present and potential correspondent relationships with County Trust—ergo, from some one-half of such commercial banking opportunities originating in Westchester County. The presence in Westchester of branches of New York City banks would not be likely to offset appreciably such a result in the foreseeable future. The application indicates that Bankers Trust intends to provide to the Westchester customers of County Trust all of those specialized banking services for which, actually or potentially, other large commercial banks compete with Bankers Trust. It is reasonable to conclude, therefore, that affiliation between County Trust and Bankers Trust would result in at least a tendency toward monopoly in Westchester over wholesale banking services, foreign banking services, and the numerous other specialized banking skills of Bankers Trust which are described in the application.

THE PUBLIC INTEREST AND THE NEEDS AND CONVENIENCE THEREOF

In the final analysis, the public interest is the overriding factor to be considered. The public is entitled to banking services sufficient in quantity and quality to meet the demands of current and future economic growth. Where banking institutions are not providing such services, the banking department might regard such a circumstance as impelling approval of an action which, under different conditions, would warrant disapproval.

For example, where banking services by local banks in a particular market area are demonstrably inadequate, or incapable of satisfying or stimulating needed economic growth in the area, this department would look favorably upon the entry of a bank holding company, through acquisition of one of the local institutions, even though as a result of such action some decisive competitive advantages might accrue to the local bank being acquired, and to the holding company.

The present application describes in detail numerous additional services to be made available (in the event of affiliation of County Trust and Bankers Trust) to the residents of and business firms in Westchester. These include a broader range of personal and corporate trust services, research facilities, foreign department facilities, specialized lending and credit services, and other services not presently available at County Trust, or available on a limited basis or through correspondent relationships only.

It is difficult to appraise the significance of these services for the residents and business firms of Westchester. No information has been furnished as to the extent of the demand that may there exist for such services, or to what extent the demand that does exist is (or is not) being adequately served directly by Westchester banks, or through their correspondent relationships with other institutions. It is reasonable, nevertheless, to conclude that the affiliation would contribute to some extent to the convenience of residents of Westchester County. Granting this to be the case, the adverse competitive effects which may reasonably be anticipated from the proposed action outweigh the somewhat conjectural benefits thereof.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

My recommendation to the banking board is that the application be disapproved. Such recommendation is based upon the following conclusions:

1. The section 10 banking factors incorporated by reference in section 142(1) and the single banking factor of section 142(1) are either consistent with approval, or inapposite to this application. Such factors do not provide substantial affirmative support for approval. These factors are:

(a) Insuring the safe and sound conduct of the banking business.

(b) Elimination of unsound and destructive competition.

(c) Protection of the interests of depositors.

(d) Preventing expansion of a bank holding company to a size or extent inconsistent with adequate or sound banking.

2. The competitive factors of section 142 (1) are inconsistent with approval:

(a) The formation of the proposed bank holding company would result in a concentration of assets beyond limits consistent with effective competition (in Westchester County).

(b) Such formation may result in such a lessening of competition (in Westchester County) as to be injurious to the interests of the public.

(c) Such action may result in a tendency toward monopoly (in Westchester County).

3. Finally, the primary statutory factor for the board's consideration, the public interest and the needs and convenience thereof is, on balance, inconsistent with approval. While some added convenience to the public might result, in the event of approval, the anticompetitive implications of the proposed actions and the consequent adverse impact thereof on the public interest, weigh heavily toward disapproval.

Accordingly, I recommend to the banking board that the application of New York Holding Corp., to become a bank holding company under article III-A of the banking law, be disapproved.

Footnotes at end of speech.

[1] While the banking organizations directly involved in this application are organized, or are proposed to be organized, as trust companies under art. III of the banking law, for convenience they will frequently be referred to herein as banks or institutions.

[2] Hereinafter sometimes called Bankers Trust and County Trust, respectively.

[3] Ch. 237 of the Laws of 1960 was declared void by the New York Supreme Court, New York County, in a decision filed on Mar. 14, 1961, for certain technical procedural defects in its passage. Ch. 146 of the Laws of 1961, which became law on Mar. 17, 1961, reenacted the provisions of the earlier act, including art. III-A, and validated all actions taken pursuant to the provisions of

such earlier statute (ch. 146 of the Laws of 1961, sec. 16).

[4] The other banking factors discussed above are made relevant by the incorporation of sec. 10 into sec. 142(1). This banking factor (marked (5)) derives directly from factor (ii) of sec 142(1).

[5] Identical language, specifying the factors to be considered by the superintendent in passing on proposed bank mergers and asset acquisitions, was embodied in sec. 601(b).

[6] Memorandum of the superintendent, Chemical New York Trust Co. merger (1959).

[7] As reenacted by ch. 146 of the Laws of 1961.

[8] It is estimated that by 1985 the number and proportion of those who both live and work in Westchester will be further substantially increased (Regional Plan Association).

[9] E.g., Nadler & Bogen, "The Bank Holding Company" (1959).

[10] The National Bank of Westchester and the First National City Bank of New York.

Response on Behalf of Recipients of Partner in 4–H Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1961

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on far too few occasions, we take a moment to pay tribute to those who have dedicated themselves to encouraging and assisting our youth in meeting the problems of tomorrow.

It has come to my attention that one of my constituents, and a good friend, recently was presented with a citation for his outstanding service to youth. He is Mr. Merritt D. Hill, vice president of Ford Motor Co. and that firm's general manager in the Tractor and Implement Division in Birmingham, Mich.

In the presentation of this award as a partner in 4–H, Mr. Hill was praised for his continuous and dedicated assistance to 4–H and other youth programs; for his encouragement of business associates to give of themselves as well as their means in supporting youth work; for his assistance to rural young people in career exploration and for his share in his firm's sponsorship of the National 4–H Achievement Award program for many years.

I think that Mr. Hill's statements in acceptance of this award are important to all of us in our understanding of the aims and goals of the young people of our Nation.

His words follow:

RESPONSE ON BEHALF OF RECIPIENTS OF PARTNER IN 4–H AWARD

(By Merritt D. Hill, vice president, Ford Motor Co., and general manager, Tractor and Implement Division, Birmingham, Mich.)

Thank you, Administrator York, Mr. Secretary, fellow partners in 4–H, distinguished guests, friends of 4–H, and 4–H'ers. This is a tremendous experience for me, as I know it is for the other recipients of this award. Many is the time I have presented awards to 4–H'ers, and suddenly I know exactly how they feel.

I read yesterday in our local Birmingham, Mich., newspaper what the most important combinations of words are for strengthening our relationships with others.

The five most important words are: "We are proud of you." The four most important are: "What is your opinion?" The three most important: "If you please." The two most important: "Thank you." The one least important is: "I."

Today, the seven of us know just how meaningful those five words "We are proud of you" are.

And, for our part, we say with utmost sincerity and humility, the two most important words: "Thank you."

While we are thinking about meaningful words, it seems timely to mention the appropriateness of the name you have given to the award we have received—Partner in 4–H.

The closest relationship which exists in business organizations is a partnership. Because what I do commits my partner, and what he does commits me, a partnership demands the highest degree of respect for others and responsibility to them. Proper function of a partnership requires constant application of the Golden Rule.

Examining the word "partnership" still further, we find that a partnership cannot exist unless both parties make some kind of special contribution to it. It serves no purpose unless it is mutually beneficial to both parties.

For a moment, then, on behalf of the people whom you 4–H'ers have today named as partners, I'd like to suggest what some of the things are that each party is bringing to this partnership.

We, on this platform, have the responsibility to contribute to this partnership, at the very least, the benefit of our experience with business affairs, and with educational matters. You have a right to expect from us far more than this, however.

As I see it, we have the obligation to help instill in every one of you a sense of your great worth as individuals. You 4–H'ers are 2,300,000 strong, and your influence is already being felt around the world. Everything you are and do counts. "No man," Hemingway wrote, "is an island unto himself." The most disturbing thing I believe I have ever seen in print is the creed of an organization which says that "I, as an individual, am nothing." The greatest responsibility the senior members of your partnership have to you is to convince each of you that your personal character and integrity and ability are more important to the world's future than anything else.

Another thing we can do for this partnership is to offer you challenges, and no challenge was ever more clearly stated than your own 4–H motto—"Make the best, better!" It is our purpose to create within you a dissatisfaction with things as they are, and then help you learn how to do something about that dissatisfaction, not tell you what to do about it.

We owe to you also the responsibility of bringing to you an awareness of the problems and the opportunities which will face you as you reach adulthood. The underlying purpose of 4–H is to prepare you to meet life, and not accept it on its terms but change it. This will take courage and steadfastness of purpose. Already all of you in 4–H know the meaning of these words from your own experiences, but the strength of your resolve will be tested over and over again. We must show you by our example that right principles must never be compromised.

Now, what does this partnership with us require of you?

You have a duty to alert us to our responsibilities. 4–H would not exist if young people could not profit from a degree of guidance. It is a sad thing to see bunches of young people eager to have new experiences, motivated by the desire to prove their own personal worth to themselves and to each other, but channeling their energies into nonconstructive adventures. You need to open the communication avenues between yourselves and adults.

You must bring to this partnership your idealism and enthusiasm. You must believe, wholeheartedly, that it is within your power to make the best, better. And you must convey to us this belief. Apathy is a weapon much stronger than hostility. At least, when you express hostility to an idea you have in mind some other approach. If your attitude is "I don't care," this becomes contagious within your group.

Another obligation you owe to our partnership is a sense of appreciation for it. Whatever 4–H means to you, it can mean to others with whom you come in contact. Verbally expressing this appreciation, of course, is important, but living it is even more important—4–H has continuity because the older 4–H'ers convey to the younger ones their excitement and their knowledge. I am repeatedly impressed with the attitude of service to the organization which you older members show, and I can think of no finer way of showing appreciation. I include, even, the tangible expression of appreciation which today's ceremonies represent.

There is another responsibility you have to those who have gone into partnership with you. You owe it to us to help us keep our sense of values. In our competitive society, attainment of success measured by material possessions appears on the surface to be of supreme importance. It might be said that in your striving for blue ribbons in your 4–H projects you are succumbing to this same materialism. But when we examine the 4–H award system closely, we find in nearly every case that the award is not an end in itself, it merely opens up new vistas to the winners.

And as we talk to those who are runners-up, we find that the moment they got over their immediate disappointment, they knew that they had learned much of value from their experience. In requiring us, as adults, to understand this, you help us keep a much more realistic perspective toward our attainments and our disappointments.

While seven of us were singled out this morning to represent the partnership of adults and young people in 4–H, we know, and you should too, that the 4–H movement, itself, is a unique kind of partnership, with young men and women banding themselves together with educators, government people, business and industry representatives, and adult leaders. The relationships which develop through this partnership are of immense benefit to everyone who participates in your movement.

Through the catalytic action of you young people, we adults obtain better understanding of each other, heightened respect for the contributions all segments of our society make to the whole, and friendships which we will prize throughout our lives.

It is with deep humility that I accept this award on behalf of every adult who values so highly the opportunity you young people give us to be of service to you.

Thank you.

FRIENDS OF 4–H GENERAL ASSEMBLY, 31ST NATIONAL 4–H CONFERENCE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, APRIL 28, 1961

PROGRAM

Music, U.S. Marine Band.

Presiding, Jacqueline Richardson, West Virginia.

Thought for the day, 4–H delegates.

Pledge to American flag, Gary Wilson, Indiana.

Four-H Club pledge, Richard Alexander, Oklahoma.

Forward in 4–H, Hon. Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture.

Presentation of citations, Dr. E. T. York, Jr., Administrator, Federal Extension Service.

Citations read by G. H. Huffman, Federal Extension Service; W. W. Bauer, American Medical Association; Howard A. Dawson, National Education Association; Robert O. Glover, Atlantic Rural Exposition; Merritt D. Hill, Ford Motor Co.; N. C. McGowen, United Gas Corp.; Lucille Rea, Simplicity Pattern Co.; Edgar T. Savidge, American Bankers Association.

Response, Merritt D. Hill.

Presentation of original poster paintings, J. W. Shaver, Coats & Clark, Inc.

Music, U.S. Marine Band.

Panel, "New Understandings of Citizenship," Edward V. Pope and 4–H delegates.

Partners in 4-H

Dr. W. W. Bauer: For preparing extensive educational information and training materials to enrich health studies; for pioneering health education of the public by radio and television; for significant guidance in shifting the focus of 4–H health programs from "the best exhibit idea" to progress of individual boys and girls and to community service; and for valued counseling to many youth-serving groups, including the National 4–H Service Committee of which he was a member for many years.

Dr. Howard A. Dawson: For sustained effort in interpreting, championing, and guiding rural educational progress, including 4–H Club work, both in his native Arkansas and in the Nation; for strengthening school and community relationships in significant ways; for perserverance in helping underprivileged boys and girls receive the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that equip them for full citizenship; and particularly for many services to 4–F in his rural leadership field with the National Education Association.

Adm. Robert O. Glover: For personal attention and encouragement to 4–H youth who participate annually in the Atlantic rural exposition, of which he is executive vice president and operational head; for major assistance to youth of 22 States competing in the eastern U.S. 4–H tractor operators' contest at the exposition each year; and for valued aid to 4-H members of 8 States who take part in the exposition's annual poultry, livestock, and dairy judging.

Merritt D. Hill: For continuous and dedicated assistance to 4–H and other youth programs; for encouraging business associates to give of themselves as well as their means in supporting youth work; for assisting rural young people in career exploration; for serving as a trustee of the Michigan 4–H Foundation, and as a member of the National 4–H Service Committee; and for sharing enthusiastically in his company's sponsorship of the national 4–H achievement awards program for many years.

N. C. McGowen: For sustained support of 4–H Club work in Southern States, and a significant role in leadership development; for encouraging and promoting junior leadership activities particularly in Texas, Louisiana, and Mississippi; for arranging financing of more than 500 trips a year for 4–H members to attend State and national events emphasizing leadership; for unusual interest and helpfulness in junior fairs and livestock sales; and for contributing greatly to the progress and growth of the 4–H program in general.

Lucille Rea: For outstanding success in helping develop high standards of clothing work with women and girls; for keen understanding and appreciation of extension's objectives and policies in conducting youth programs; and for her personal efforts in furthering expansion of her company's services—including preparation of valuable teaching aids—to extension agents, 4–H Club members, and volunteer 4–H leaders.

Edgar T. Savidge: For zeal and skill in marshaling the forces of the agricultural committee of his organization—the American Bankers Association—to help young people through 4–H; for notable success in furthering both State and national participation of banks and bankers in 4–H program support; for advancing 4-H Club work through the National 4–H Foundation; and for longtime dedication to the ideals of youth and assistance to youth-serving agencies.

Commuter Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1961

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, for several years now the commuter railroads serving our large metropolitan areas have found it increasingly difficult to render the kind of service our expanding population wants and is entitled to have. The causes of the decline of the commuter railroads are many and complex—high taxes, losses of revenue to Government subsidized highway and air carriers, to name but two. And the solutions to the problems of the commuter lines have been equally varied, ranging all the way from Government ownership to complete discontinuance of this important service.

There have been a number of sound plans proposed. But none of these has been implemented. Instead we have stood idly by, watched our commuter railroad service decline, and have failed to offer a helping hand. Though the number of people flowing in and out of our metropolitan areas each day has increased tremendously since World War II, total annual rail commutation dropped 124 million from 1947 to 1957. Nowhere has this decline been more painfully evident than in the New York City area. Here the New York Central Railroad, one of the Nation's most important carriers, has alone lost 47.6 percent of its passengers since 1949.

At this time of crisis in our Nation's commuter railroads, a new threat to the continued operations of the New York Central has appeared in the form of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad's proposal for control of the Baltimore & Ohio railroads.

The New York Central has pointed out that this control, if approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission, would give the combined C. & O.–B. & O. Railroad a total of 185 points served in common with the New York Central. Not only is this kind of duplication wasteful, but it gives the combined system the ability to take freight traffic away from the New York Central and other railroads serving the area.

The New York Central notes:

The freight traffic most susceptible to raiding by the C. & O.–B. & O. provides the backbone of Central's revenues. These revenues make it possible to provide essential freight and passenger service over the entire New York Central system as well as the New York area commuter and terminal freight services. If these services are to be maintained, the New York Central must have the revenues to make them possible.

The New York Central today handles 60 percent of all southbound commuter traffic coming into New York City. This is a $14 million operation involving 3,500 employees who work on commuter traffic exclusively. A blow to this phase of the Central's operations would have serious economic consequences not only to the railroad itself, but to the 40,000 people per day who are provided with efficient, reasonably priced transportation in and out of the city.

There is a workable alternative to this potentially dangerous and harmful C. & O.–B. & O. merger scheme—

The Central has pointed out.

The logic of creating a strong, balanced, competitive two-system railroad service in the East is so obvious that B. & O. was publicly committed to the approach outlined here.

Detailed studies of the plan were well underway. Though far from completion, these studies indicated beyond a doubt that savings would result which would be of unprecedented benefit to the railroads concerned, their investors, their customers, their users, and to the public at large.

Then, abandoning the studies in the face of their promising outlook for all concerned, B. & O. entered on-again-off-again negotiations with C. & O. which resulted in the present situation.

In the light of the facts at hand, however, New York Central intends to pursue the objective of helping to create a healthy two-system eastern railroad structure in the public interest.

The Interstate Commerce Commission will commence its deliberations on the proposed C. & O.–B. & O. merger on June 18. Obviously, the Interstate Commerce Commission will not force the New York Central to further curtail its commuter operations by giving undue competitive advantages to the lines that wish to merge.

However, there is a more profound consideration to this proposed merger than profit and loss. That is, will it serve the long-range public interest?

For the past 40 years Congress has advocated a carefully planned, balanced and competitive railway system. We must ask ourselves which of the two alternatives will help the commuter—the two-way B. & O.–C. & O. merger, or the three-way New York Central–B. & O.–C. & O. merger. Which will serve not only the best interest of the stockholders, but the interests of all the traveling public?

No More Organizations Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, my good friend, Paul Harvey, is a very practical fellow. At times he is very blunt, but he never skirts an issue. He gets di-

rectly to the point. Recently, he had something to say about the joining of organizations, and he treated the subject as I have done so many times with my constituents. Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include the editorial at this point in the RECORD:

NO MORE ORGANIZATIONS NEEDED

(By Paul Harvey)

The John Birch Society is presently on the pan. Senator GOLDWATER doubts that there will be a thorough investigation of this organization, because "too many Members of Congress are members of it, and many who are not have prominent constituents who are."

I know nothing about the organization or its founder. The row, however, points up again the degrees of patriotism which have splintered our forces.

Whenever I hear from some aroused well-meaning somebody demanding to know, "What can I do?" I have always replied, "Influence those near you."

It seems to me we do not need more letterheads, more organizations, more contemporary prophets to do our thinking for us.

We need, desperately, to reinfiltrate the organizations which are in influential position, but whose influence has been diluted because its members are ignorant, apathetic, uninterested—or because they fail to be participant.

"Influence those near you." This is the technique which has won a hundred million new disciples to communism every year since the big war. They don't bother to create new organizations, societies. They infiltrate existing ones.

Genuinely patriotic Americans should be militant enough to be willing to do it the hard way. The uphill way. Not by running off and creating some new club of their own, but by recapturing the old ones.

The American Legion is a splendid example of an organization which has the experience, know-how, and ability to exercise tremendous influence over our national affairs and our international relations. But the American Legion is no more vigorous than its membership. The Legion is only as effective as its post-level participants.

The PTA, according to FBI Director Hoover, has been and is a top target for Red infiltration and contamination. Let's recapture that.

Unions, especially in the key industries, afford an important forum for any American who is willing to to stand up and be counted.

We don't need more organizations. I think, perhaps, we have too many organizations.

What we need is more participation by decent, dedicated, on-the-ball Americans in already established institutions.

A letter to the editor is construed as "unimportant" by most busy Americans. It's axiomatic that "the right people don't write."

The left does, and wields much influence by virtue of this tireless tirade.

Whatever the merits or demerits of the society presently under discussion, it is sad and somewhat frightening that Americans seek so desperately for leadership that they will flock to a lamb's horn, by whomever blown.

Yet if the established organization to which we belong does something not to our liking, we walk out and create a new one, further dissipating our energies and diluting our effectiveness.

Join a political organization or club in your community. Give copies of the Paul Harvey article to your friends and associates and get them into your political organization. Before long, your group will be determining its policies and endorsements.

A Sound Tax Purpose: To Boost the Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Kansas City Star, which speaks quite well for itself. The major point of criticism contained in the editorial about the President's tax proposals is the major point of criticism showing up in my mail—the cancellation of the $50 exemption and 4-percent credit on dividend taxes. I call this to the attention of my colleagues hoping that they, as I, will see inequity in this scheme, and will work to eliminate it:

A SOUND TAX PURPOSE: TO BOOST THE ECONOMY

President Kennedy has handed Congress quite a package of tax proposals. The goal—to stimulate the economy and create more jobs—is certainly desirable. But perhaps the most significant item lies in the suggestion of long-range tax reform with a 1962 target date. There is, here, the apparent recognition that income taxes at a confiscatory level have been a heavy drag on the whole economy. The Secretary of the Treasury has been directed to prepare a comprehensive tax reform program.

Secretary Dillon's ultimate recommendations and their fate in Congress will be of immense importance to the future of the Nation. But that is for next year, not this. We can imagine that yesterday's proposals were enough to overwhelm many lawmakers. Tax legislation is perhaps the most complicated field in which Congress does business. And the one most subject to political pressures.

Indeed, there was a measure of the politics and ideologies involved in one of Mr. Kennedy's suggestions. We refer to the plan to cancel the $50 exemption and 4-percent credit on dividend taxes. This was obviously a political gesture to appease those who, as throwbacks to the New Deal era, still regard taxation as a social equalizer.

We see no basis in equity for this particular change. Mr. Kennedy referred to the original purpose of the dividend credit as a partial offset to so-called double taxation. Partial, at best. Now he suggests that every dollar of dividends should be taxed twice. It is an unfair proposal that hardly jibes with the overall purpose of providing incentives for the economy.

In his other suggestions, the President appeared to be on more solid ground. We can see the merit in tightening up on expense account loopholes. The tax incentive for business to modernize and expand should, indeed, create jobs. It has become increasingly obvious that oversea investments, particularly in the industrial countries, have been costly to the Treasury. They have also contributed to the balance-of-payments deficit. Mr. Kennedy may be killing two birds with one stone here: Providing more revenue and easing the dollar imbalance.

But it is scarcely necessary to remind you that the details of all these proposals will be spelled out only when specific legislation is considered by Congress. Particularly in tax bills, the fine print is highly important. We can assume that when the fine print is seen, there will be cries of anguish from many quarters.

So the job checks to Congress, for the present, to determine what is fair and what is in the national interest. For the future, Secretary Dillon has the essential assignment of bringing some order and fairness out of a chaotic and confiscatory tax structure that has seriously retarded the Nation's growth. We hope next year will be a year of genuine reform on the tax front.

Fair Play for Cuba Committee, but Not for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1961

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, the invasion of Cuba by Cubans has brought adverse publicity upon the United States. It seems incredible that if the United States attempted to invade Cuba that we could not succeed in view of our military might. Fidel Castro is using his success as a propaganda weapon against the United States when he knows deep in his heart that the United States did not participate in the invasion. It seems that the failure of the invasion by a valiant group of Cubans was due to misinformation on two accounts—the desire of the Cuban people to revolt and the lack of arms of Castro to defend the Cuban invaders miscalculated and met with disastrous defeat to regroup their forces. Organizations in America are screaming for fair play for Cuba. We believe in the attitude of Stephen Decatur when he said, "Our country right or wrong, but our country."

A great mass of Americans still believe in his philosophy. One of them, who is not mislead by propaganda and is well-informed, sent a letter to the editor of the New York Times. I believe that his statement sets forth the perfidy of the Castro regime and the insincerity of Castro's propaganda statements.

The statement follows:

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

I presume that the members of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee are not completely informed when they castigate the U.S. Government and claim that it is intervening in the affairs of Cuba. Perhaps these few facts might enlighten them:

The members of the invading force were all Cubans. There were no Americans, as far as we know, fighting with them. On the other hand these Cuban patriots were met by Czechoslovakian flyers, who were in services of the Castro regime.

The Communist Government of Czechoslovakia and other Soviet satellites supplied Castro with some 30,000 tons of various arms and military equipment at an estimate cost of about $50 million. This is enough to arm 1 Cuban in every 30. Besides, Czechoslovak and Chinese technicians can be found all over Cuba.

If the committee wants to be fair, why does it not ask the United Nations to investigate the role Czechoslovakia and other Communist states are playing in the internal affairs of Cuba? And then it can judge whose ac-

tivities are illegal and immoral and which nations should stand condemned before the world tribunal.

ANDREW J. VALUCEK,
President, Czechoslovak National Council of America.

A Parliamentary Association for the American Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I have reintroduced a joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 389, expressing the sense of Congress that a Pan-American Parliamentary Association—PAPA—be established and authorizing the creation of such an association. This resolution has also been introduced in the Senate by the Senator from Florida, the Honorable GEORGE A. SMATHERS.

I feel that the establishment of such an organization is of paramount importance for the good relations within this hemisphere, which we all recognize to be in dire need of strengthening in these critical times.

All of us are well aware of the need to establish the greatest possible measure of understanding, harmony, and cooperation between the nations of the Western Hemisphere. Despite our good neighbor policy of the past quarter century, we know that much resentment and dissatisfaction with U.S. policy persists in Latin America. Demonstrations against the United States have occurred in the past in several of the capitals of our neighbors to the south; they are continuing to occur with a persistency which gives us food for thought that certain forces are stirring up these anti-U.S. demonstrations with a specific purpose in mind.

The administration has taken cognizance of the situation in Latin America, and has proposed a new good neighbor policy streamlined to meet the needs of the 1960's. This new program is a big step in the right direction. It has been universally acclaimed, both at home and abroad, as a logical move.

It is only a first step, however. There is no need to discuss in great detail the reasons for increasing and improving our relations with the Latin American nations. They are our closest neighbors. It is a well-known fact that we have taken them for granted for too long. It is regrettable that it took a Communist dictatorship only 90 miles from our own shores to awaken us to this fact.

The truth of the matter is that the Latin Americans desperately need our help in their efforts to attain a decent standard of living; in the exploration and exploitation of their natural resources; in their economic growth; in expanding their industry and improving their agriculture; and, most importantly, in giving them a feeling of national dignity and importance.

After first suggesting the creation of a Pan-American Parliamentary Association during the 85th Congress, I was privileged to visit several Latin American countries in late 1958. A full report of my visit there, as well as my views and findings, appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 12, 1959, pages A61–A64. The principle of my proposal was enthusiastically received by the leaders of many of our Latin American neighbors and by our own Department of State.

Briefly, the resolution being offered by Senator SMATHERS and myself calls for a 12-point program of mutual help and understanding to be furthered through the creation of PAPA. This program would accomplish the following:

First. Create better understanding and foster closer personal contact among the elected legislators of the American nations.

Second. Stimulate greater public knowledge of, and make more effective, the Organization of American States—OAS—and other agencies designed to promote the best interests of the American nations.

Third. Expand the educational and scientific exchange programs.

Fourth. Develop closer cultural relations throughout the hemisphere.

Fifth. Improve trade relations and reduce the barriers to trade between countries in the Western Hemisphere.

Sixth. Encourage large-scale tourism between the Americas.

Seventh. Help to provide relief in times of disaster and other emergencies.

Eighth. Seek means to dispose of surplus commodities of all sorts in the various countries in order to help their economies.

Ninth. Help to raise the standard of living throughout Latin America.

Tenth. Aid in the development of plans for the sound economic expansion of the Latin American countries, including U.S. public and private investment in their economic development.

Eleventh. Assist them in the modernization of their agricultural methods.

Twelfth. Seek solutions to other problems of common interest and concern to the countries of the Western Hemisphere.

Thus, the resolution would establish a Pan-American Parliamentary Association to help protect freedom in the Western Hemisphere, to create better understanding between the United States and Latin America, to encourage greater economic development, and to promote closer cultural relations.

The Parliamentarians would seek through public debate to find legislative means to bring economic stability to the member States. They would encourage and support democratic governments in giving free expression to the people and would utilize all efforts to expose Communist influences seeking to establish satellites within the Western Hemisphere.

This association would help strengthen the Organization of American States just as the NATO Parliamentary Conference is helping to strengthen the NATO organization. It would be another bulwark of freedom on this side of the Atlantic.

At a time when President Kennedy has enunciated a strong statement of U.S. policy in regard to the Cuban situation, the Parliamentary organization would seek to extend this declaration to all of the American states who are determined to remain free from communism.

The creation of such an inter-American body comprised of the elected representatives of the people would help to develop a positive and direct people-to-people approach in our relationship, treatment, and dealings with our neighbors of the Western Hemisphere.

The resolution proposes the creation of a parliamentary association, the membership of which is to be composed of elected representatives of the various member governments. PAPA would, therefore, necessarily bar the bemership of Castro's Cuba which has not had an election during the time in which that Communist dictator has been in power. I am convinced that if popularly elected representatives of the free nations of the Western Hemisphere could meet in person to discuss problems of mutual interest, much could be achieved in the way of better understanding and more harmonious relationships.

The joint resolution provides for U.S. participation in the proposed parliamentary organization and the appointment of 18 Members of Congress, from both parties, to represent the United States at conferences to be held annually or more often in the different hemispheric capitals.

We must stop taking Latin America for granted. Experience has demonstrated, within the past 2 years alone, that if we are to maintain the traditional friendship and solidarity between the nations of our hemisphere, we are going to have to foster these friendships by mutual understanding.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely believe that the joint resolution which I am proposing is the key to such understanding. Past experience should by now have made clear to us that we can no longer afford to put off until tomorrow what must be done today. I hope and trust that the idea of a Pan-American Parliamentary Association, as proposed in House Joint Resolution 389, will soon become a reality.

Archbishop Basaluga Benjamin—A Testimonial on the Occasion of the Dedication of a New Russian Orthodox Church in Monessen, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 2, 1961

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress, on May 7 of this year a new Russian Orthodox Church will be dedicated in Monessen, Pa., which has just been completed under the capable lead-

ership of Father Govrusik. This new church is a beautiful edifice and, while adding to the spiritual well-being of the community, it also enhances its cultural and esthetic values. Father Govrusik has been a civic as well as a spiritual leader in this community and, in his usual manner of self-effacement, he has turned this day of dedication and jubilation into a commendation ceremony in honor of His Eminence Archbishop Basaluga Benjamin. The principal speaker at this testimonial for Archbishop Benjamin will be the Metropolitan Leonte Turkovitch, supreme head of the Russian Orthodox Church of North America, South America, Hawaiian Islands, and Japan.

This testimonial is tendered to Archbishop Benjamin in consequence of his militant opposition to communism which was only matched by his zeal for his church and its members. This church has several million members in the United States with about 300,000 of them residing in our western Pennsylvania area. The archbishop was born in Oliphant, Pa., on January 11, 1887; he attended Russian Orthodox Theological Seminary in Minneapolis, Minn., and, after being ordained as a missionary priest in 1911, did missionary work in a number of States in the United States. He was consecrated bishop of the Pittsburgh diocese in 1933 and thereafter became vice chairman of the Metropolitan Council of Russian Orthodox Church. Archbishop Benjamin is the author of "The Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom." At the request of the U.S. Government he was made head of the Orthodox Church in Japan from 1946 to 1953. Since 1953 he has been the archbishop of western Pennsylvania and West Virginia.

This church has a long and eventful history in this hemisphere beginning with the Russian missionaries in Alaska, the establishment of an organized church there in 1794, and the successive stages of development on this continent until the consolidation of a more and more independent existence of the Russian Orthodox Church in America.

From its earliest days this church has been blessed with dedicated men of the character of Archbishop Benjamin. During the war, Archbishop Benjamin, with only 2 days' notice, left for Japan in 1946 and remained there until August 1953. Although Russian by ancestry, he has been internationally known for his work as an anti-Communist. The Saturday Evening Post of March 29, 1952, carried a very timely article upon this aspect of Russians fighting against Communists, and I quote this article:

SOME RUSSIANS ARE ON OUR SIDE: FIGHTING COMMUNISM IN JAPAN

Because of our preoccupation with communism we tend to regard Russian interest in the affairs of other countries as a wholly undesirable phenomenon. Nevertheless, paradoxical as it may seem, in at least one area we are encouraging Russian penetration as a means of checking the spread of communism.

At the close of the war with Japan, General MacArthur urged the American hierarchy of the Russian Orthodox Church in America, which is now headed by Metropolitan Leonty, to send a bishop to Japan as promptly as possible. His reason was that a bishop from the Moscow Communist-dominated branch of the Orthodox church—accompanied by 28 secretaries—was already clamoring for admission to Japan to take jurisdiction over the 33,000 Japanese communicants in the Russian church. The Japanese Orthodox Christians in alarm had pleaded with the occupation authorities that an American mission be sent. The American branch of the Russian Orthodox Church, with the assistance of the Federated Russian Orthodox clubs, a young people's group which has participated in Voice of America broadcasts to Russia, sent Bishop Benjamin, who still presides over the spiritual affairs of the Japanese faithful, except for a few parishes.

The Russian Orthodox mission has been active in Japan for more than 90 years, including those of the Russo-Japanese War, during which Orthodox priests and functionaries were permitted to carry on their work without molestation. At the outbreak of that conflict, Bishop Nicolai, who had established the first Japanese Orthodox mission, made it clear to the Japanese members that they should remain loyal to their own country, and he encouraged them to pray for a Japanese victory, although, of course, the bishop made it plain that he could not join them. He was severely criticized in Russia for this stand, but when the war was over, his church promoted him to an archbishopric as a reward for his tactful stand. Whatever may be the application of this to the concept of a God of Battles, it is possible that Archbishop Nicolai demonstrated even the greater power of a God above battles, who has regard for all men regardless of their conflicts and divisions.

In any event, the influence of the Orthodox church in Japan is still sufficiently important to make it the center of an interesting contest between East and West. The effort of the Moscow hierarchy to gain control of the Japanese churches is part of a global struggle. Moscow has already ordered home the Russian priests who formerly presided over the holy places in Palestine and replaced them with new clerics from Moscow. Similarly in the United States the exarch from Moscow regards Metropolitan Leonty's church, which refused to be taken over by Stalin, as a fraud.

The American orthodox group is accused by One Church, the exarch's house organ, of having deposed the Japanese head of the church, replacing him by an American-born bishop, who "still sits on the episcopal throne he usurped." Actually it was the Japanese who did the pushing.

The fact that this religious conflict, with political overtones, is raging among Russians in so many places underscores the stupidity of regarding all Russians as Communist aggressors and the suicidal folly of failing to capitalize to the full this and other deviations. It can hardly be emphasized enough that, unless we find allies inside the Iron Curtain, the odds in this global conflict are heavily against us.

Although my duties will keep me from attending this affair Sunday I will in spirit join with the thousands of citizens in my district who are joining together in this testimonial to a fine priest, a good citizen, a man of dignity and inspiration, a leader of his people, a champion of liberty, and a fighter against oppression.

And so, to Archbishop Benjamin, this Congress could well say this day, "Godspeed and well done, good and faithful servant."

More and More African Students Are Learning Our College Ways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, unless the new African nations succeed in building cadres of able administrators, technicians, teachers, and other professionals, it is most unlikely they will achieve genuine and enduring independence. The experience of African students in the United States, therefore, can have a decisive influence on relations between the African nations and the United States. I wish, therefore, to call to the attention of the Members an excellent report on African students in this country written by George W. Oakes and published in the Washington Star on Sunday, March 19, 1961.

In this article Mr. Oakes observes that while great numbers of students in Africa are favorably disposed toward the United States and are eager to study here, they first encounter many problems of selection and transportation. Once here, they must then acclimate themselves if they are to profit fully from residence here and be able to make maximum contributions to the development of their countries on their return.

The article follows:

MORE AND MORE AFRICAN STUDENTS ARE LEARNING OUR COLLEGE WAYS

(By George W. Oakes)

The driving urge for higher education has caused recently a rapidly increasing number of African students—particularly those from the many new independent nations—to seek places in American universities.

As a result, Government officials and university educators are developing new methods and exploring new ideas so that these students will get the most value from their educational experience in this country.

Some 1,500 African students from countries south of the Sahara are now attending colleges and universities in the United States. Most are from English-speaking lands although the number coming from areas dominated by French culture is rising. The great preponderance of all these students come under private auspices, although many others receive financial aid from either their own or our Government.

Though there are probably still about four times as many African students in Great Britain, the swing is now in our direction.

Kenya with about 570 students has the largest group, followed by Nigeria with 480.

As the growth in the number of African students has almost kept pace with the ardent enthusiasm of many Americans in and out of Government to bring more over here, two interesting programs now under way reveal different approaches to the question of how the problem should be handled.

ON DEVELOPING STABILITY

The major consideration in bringing the Africans must be to help them prepare themselves to fill a useful and constructive role in the development and stability of their own countries.

The east African airlift, now in its second year, is an example of a forced-draft opera-

tion, given great stimulus and publicity by the energetic 30-year-old Kenya student and labor leader, Tom Mboya, also a member of the legislative council. The first group of 82 east Africans, whose average age is 23, is currently taking undergraduate courses mostly for 4 years in 52 large and small colleges in this country. Though meagerly financed, they have managed to get by in part due to aid from the African-American Institute.

The powerful urge of east African students for an American college education is summed up by a popular description to which they all aspire—a "been to." That is, each student wants to have it said that he has "been to" the United States. Not satisfied with the method followed in large part by the Kenya Government of providing college training for a small elite, Mboya has whipped up the popular desire for an American education. Consequently, last fall the second airlift brought 289 east African students to 145 American colleges.

To raise funds Mboya resorted to such devices as going out to the tribal reserves and arranging for livestock—cattle, chickens, goats and sheep—contributed by the natives, to be sold at public auction.

The pressure for information about American colleges was so great that prospective students, unable to obtain guidance, used college reference material in the U.S. Information Service Library. They then wrote directly to the colleges seeking admission. Some were helped to obtain scholarship offers through the African-American Institute. But many arrived without adequate means of support. Applicants for the airlift were selected not so much on the basis of qualifications as on the theory that those who had the least need should receive the most funds because they probably had worked hardest for the opportunity.

THE AIRLIFT RESOURCEFULNESS

Although it may be argued that these hit-or-miss procedures are not likely to locate the right student in the right college, the initiative, resourcefulness and drive which the students showed in getting here on the airlift are the very qualities that not only help to keep them afloat while in the United States but also will be those needed to cope with problems in their native countries on their return.

Nevertheless, critics of the airlift point out that this rather indiscriminate method of selection of both student and college runs the risk that many students will not be properly placed. Quite a few colleges, they point out, admit foreign students who are either not adequately qualified for, nor will find their needs fulfilled by, many courses of study. In addition, there is the danger that too many African students coming to American universities will seriously reduce the number of quality students needed for the development of local universities.

Another and more careful selection process aimed at bringing quality African students to this country has been established through the cooperation of the Nigerian Government and a group of leading American universities under the direction of Harvard Director of Admissions David D. Henry. Under this pilot program 23 Nigerian students, chosen in the field by a joint committee of Nigerian educators and American university representatives, are now studying here on 4-year undergraduate scholarships provided by such institutions as Harvard, Yale, Princeton, University of Minnesota, Stanford, as well as women's colleges like Bryn Mawr and Smith, on the basis of one student per college.

This approach of trying to place the right student in the college and curriculum best suited to his requirements is now being expanded to enable up to 200 men and women from a large number of both English- and possibly French-speaking African countries to enter next fall and in the 3 succeeding years 85 American universities including a few Negro colleges like Howard University. Students will come from Nigeria, Kenya, Tanganyika, Nyasaland, Southern and possibly Northern Rhodesia, Ghana, the Congo, and former French areas. The universities are offering free scholarships while the International Cooperation Administration will provide maintenance funds. The African-American Institute will administer the program in the field through a $100,000 grant from the Carnegie Corp.

The universities, operating on the principle that outstanding students taking a carefully selected course of study in our better institutions of higher learning will make the most useful contribution to the growth of their own countries, are sending out American admissions officers to sit in with African educators as selection committees.

The State Department through its educational exchange program, and to a greater extent the International Cooperation Administration also have been actively engaged in bringing such Sahara African students to this country.

FUNDAMENTAL ROLE

The ICA, which has the most funds for this purpose, gears its choice of grantees to its various developmental projects in which education as well as technical training plays a fundamental role.

During the current cademic year the ICA has brought over about 100 students in a rapidly expanding operation which began 8 years ago. The Sudanese illustrate the type of program most of these students follow during a 2-year stay. All are enrolled as undergraduates in institutions such as Massachusetts State Teachers College, Williamsport (Pa.) Technical Institute, and Stout State College in Wisconsin. The students have been chosen by Sudan officials working with ICA representatives in the field. After completing their education here, they will return to instruct teachers in education, vocational, and technical training in the Sudan.

Last month the first group of 23 Congo students arived for at least 18 months university study in economics, education, and engineering to prepare them to asusme responsible posts at home as teachers or government officials. In order to benefit from our college courses, these students have been taking an intensive English-language course at Georgetown University. Also they are being taught to use library facilities and even take lecture notes because many have only had a high-school education.

CONSTRUCTIVE SUGGESTIONS

Those who have worked closely with African students here as well as in the countries from which the students come and who are particularly interested that the students should have a profitable experience in this country offer the following suggestions:

1. Concentrate on quality of students but also keep increasing the numbers. Encourage most of them to take the four-year undergraduate course to have time to absorb the American experience.

2. Provide better sources of information and more competent personnel in each of the countries to direct students to the college best suited to his needs. For example, education attaches might be established in each African country. It's not so important for Africans to attend the best universities as those that meet individual requirements. President Nkrumah, who attended Lincoln University, might not have benefitted more from Harvard even if he could have been admitted in the opinion of one experienced worker with African students. Many less prominent colleges offer satisfactory training.

3. Establish a clearing-house where colleges can check credentials of students who apply independently.

4. Keeping in mind the fact that colleges will be under mounting pressure for entrance by American students and therefore there will be more competition for scholarships supply increased amounts of U.S. Government aid for Africans.

5. In this country co-ordinate the government student operation in State Department and ICA. In Africa work more closely with governments of the countries because most students will probably become government employees on their return.

6. Improve arrangements in this country for reception and treatment of African students, perhaps through Government aid to universities to increase, upgrade and expand the rule of the foreign student adviser.

7. Finally, put less stress on indoctrinating the Africans with the American point of view and trying to turn them into good American students and instead make every effort to train them properly to assume important posts in their own countries.

The President's Executive Order on Identical Bids

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1961

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on April 25, 1961, President Kennedy issued Executive Order No. 10936 requiring that Federal agencies report to the Attorney General all instances of identical bidding. This is an extremely important action and once again demonstrates this administration's determination to create an environment encouraging competitive behavior in American business.

In an effort to insure that this procedure will become permanent public policy, I introduced H.R. 4570. On April 25, 1961, I testified before the Government Operations Committee in behalf of this bill.

I would like to attempt briefly to clarify one point in connection with the likely impact of publicizing identical bids. There seems to be a question on the part of some persons genuinely interested in encouraging competition as to whether the mere act of publicizing identical bids will be of any help in eliminating conspiracy. Is it not likely, some ask, that would-be conspirators will simply use other techniques to avoid competition? True, the point could be made that to expose identical bidding would merely drive some conspirators to other devices such as submitting a range of bids and rotating the low bidder. However, this expectation misses an all-important point. If firms use other more sophisticated techniques, they have to engage in overt actions to develop and implement them. More sophisticated methods are also more complicated methods. The chief reason conspirators so frequently use the identical bid method of implementing conspiracy is its great simplicity. When it is used, authorities may suspect collusion but they have difficulty finding evidence of it. And under our judicial process proof of collusion is needed, not just suspicion.

However, to carry on a conspiracy to rotate bids in a seemingly random fashion requires more or less continuous meetings, correspondence, or other direct communication. This is the stuff out of which proof is made. The electrical machinery case provides abundant evidence on this score. In other words, if more complicated methods of conspiracy are employed, detection will be easier for both the law enforcement agencies and the top corporate executives who really wish to keep their corporate houses free of conspiracy.

For the information of my colleagues, I have requested permission to extend my remarks to include Executive Order No. 10936, and my prepared testimony on H.R. 4570:

[From the Federal Register, Apr. 26, 1961]

EXECUTIVE ORDER 10936—REPORTS OF IDENTICAL BIDS

Whereas it is in the interest of the United States to obtain truly competitive bids in connection with its procurement and sale of property and services pursuant to public invitations for bids and the prevalence of identical bidding is harmful to the effective functioning of a system of competitive bids;

Whereas identical bidding may constitute evidence of the existence of conspiracies to monopolize or restrain trade or commerce; and

Whereas the collection and dissemination of information with regard to identical bids submitted to the Federal Government will discourage future submissions of such bids, aid in the enforcement of the antitrust laws and the maintenance of a competitive economy and serve to reduce the costs of the Government.

Now, therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in my by the Constitution and statutes, and as President of the United States, I hereby order and direct:

1. Whenever, in connection with a procurement of property or services exceeding $10,000 in total amount and made pursuant to an advertisement or other public invitation for bids, a department, agency, or instrumentality of the Government shall hereafter receive two or more bids (a) which are identical as to unit price or total amount, or (b) which, after giving effect to discounts and all other relevant factors, the department, agency, or instrumentality shall consider to be identical as to unit price or total amount, then such department, agency, or instrumentality shall make a report of the bid proceedings to the Attorney General not later than 20 days following the award. Whenever two or more bids of the nature described in clauses (a) and (b) hereof are received in bid proceedings which result for any reason in the rejection of all bids and the total value of the property or services bid upon is estimated by the department, agency, or instrumentality to be in excess of $10,000, it shall make a report of such proceedings to the Attorney General not later than 20 days following the rejection. Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this section, a report shall not be made of bid proceedings in which only foreign sources have participated and in connection with which delivery and performance is to take place outside the United States.

2. The reports required by section 1 shall be in a form prescribed by the Attorney General and shall include the following information or such other information as he may prescribe:

(a) The name and location of the particular component of the department, agency, or instrumentality which advertised for the bids;

(b) the amount and a description of the property or services for which bids were solicited, and the proposed date of delivery or performance;

(c) the date of opening of the bids; and

(d) the names and addresses of all bidders and as to the bid of each:

(1) the unit price and terms of discount, if any, together with a notation of the point of origin specified by the bidder and a statement whether freight and any other costs of transportation to the point of delivery are included or excluded; and

(2) in the case of an accepted bid identical, or considered to be identical, as to unit price or total amount with another, the method by which selected.

3. Whenever, in connection with a sale of property for more than $10,000 in total amount pursuant to an advertisement or other public invitation for bids, a department, agency, or instrumentality of the Government shall receive two or more bids, (a) which are identical as to unit price or total amount, or (b) which, after giving effect to all relevant factors, the department, agency, or instrumentality shall consider to be identical as to unit price or total amount, then such department, agency, or instrumentality shall make a report of the bid proceedings to the Attorney General not later than 20 days following the award to the purchaser. Whenever two or more bids of the nature described in clauses (a) and (b) hereof are received in bid proceedings which result for any reason in the rejection of all bids and the total sales value of the offered property is estimated by the department, agency, or instrumentality to be in excess of $10,000, it shall make a report of such proceedings to the Attorney General not later than 20 days following the rejection. The reports required by this section shall be in the form prescribed by the Attorney General and shall include information similar to that prescribed by section 2. Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this section, a report shall not be made of bid proceedings in which only foreign sources have participated and in connection with which delivery and performance is to take place outside the United States.

4. The Attorney General is granted authority to establish reasonable exemptions and variations from the requirements of section 1 or of section 3 from time to time based upon his experience in connection with this order, including authority to take the following actions: (a) Exclude any category of property or services from the reporting requirements of section 1 or of section 3; and (b) increase or decrease the $10,000 limit prescribed in section 1 or in section 3.

5. The Attorney General shall consult with the Secretary of Defense, the Administrator of General Services and the heads of such other departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Government as he may deem advisable for the purpose of obtaining information in a feasible manner with regard to identical bidding in publicly advertised procurement and sale proceedings completed by these departments, agencies, and instrumentalities during periods prior to the date of execution of this order. The Secretary of Defense, the Administrator of General Services, and the other heads of departments, agencies, or instrumentalities consulted by the Attorney General shall cause the submission of reports to him in respect to such categories of these proceedings and for such periods as may be agreed upon. The reports shall conform to the requirements of section 2.

6. The Attorney General shall formulate and put into effect procedures whereby State and local governments are invited to transmit reports to him of identical bids received by such governments similar to the reports required by sections 1, 3, and 5.

7. From time to time, as he shall find suitable, the Attorney General shall make a report to the President consolidating the information he has received pursuant to this order, and he shall transmit copies thereof to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. However, there shall be excluded from such report any information submited by a department, agency, or instrumentality of the Government which it has requested to be withheld for reasons of national security.

8. The principal purpose of this order is to make more effective the enforcement of the antitrust laws by insuring that the Attorney General has at his disposal all information which may tend to establish the presence of a conspiracy in restraint of trade and which may warrant further investigation with a view to preferring civil or criminal charges. In exercising the discretionary authority granted under the provisions of this order, the Attorney General shall be mindful of this purpose and shall exercise such authority in a manner which insures that programs of reporting and analysis hereunder shall not by their magnitude interfere with his enforcement of those laws but instead shall contribute thereto. The heads of the departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Government shall cooperate with and aid the Attorney General in analyzing the data reported to him and shall make available to him to the fullest extent possible any facilities they may have which would expedite that work. In particular, they should bring to his attention any further information which, in their judgment, may constitute additional evidence of collusion among Government contractors.

9. The heads of the departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Government are directed to give particular attention to compliance with the provisions of 41 U.S.C. section 252(d) and 10 U.S.C. section 2305(d) requiring referral to the Attorney General of bids received in an advertised procurement proceeding which appear to them to evidence a violation of the antitrust laws. It is to be noted that the bids which must be referred to the Attorney General under those statutes as evidencing collusion include, although they are not limited to, identical bids. Nothing in this order shall be construed to mean that a report submitted hereunder to the Attorney General in connection with identical bids evidencing collusion in a procurement proceeding shall constitute a referral satisfying the requirements of those statutes or of the regulations issued pursuant thereto. Similarly, nothing in this order shall be construed to mean that a report submitted hereunder in connection with identical bids evidencing collusion in a sale proceeding shall satisfy the requirements of 40 U.S.C. section 488 in certain cases, or of the regulations issued pursuant to that statute, that specified information be supplied to the Attorney General for his use in considering the applicability of the antitrust laws to the sale.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 24, 1961.*

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE WRIGHT PATMAN, OF TEXAS, BEFORE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, IN BEHALF OF H.R. 4570, APRIL 25, 1961

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before this committee in behalf of H.R. 4570 which I introduced on February 20, 1961.

It is a fundamental premise of a competitive economy that business units make pricing decisions independently of one another. To tolerate collective action and collusion is to encourage the cartelization of American industry. I am sure that few Americans want such an economy. It not only extorts consumers but eliminates the competitive stick which encourages firms to operate efficiently and in the public interest.

GOVERNMENT PURCHASES ARE BIG BUSINESS

I introduced H.R. 4570 in an effort to protect the public interest in governmental purchases. The various units of Federal, State, and local government purchase vast amounts of goods and services. Last year the Federal Government purchased goods and services amounting to about $53 billion; State and local governments purchased goods and services amounting to $14.8 billion and $32.5 billion, respectively. In many industries Government procurement represents a large share of total purchases. The economic indicators gotten out by the Joint Economic Committee with the help of the Council of Economic Advisers in the White House discloses every month the magnitude of Government purchases. I think you will see that from 20 to 22 percent of the gross national product is represented in the Federal, State, and local governments.

Many of these goods and services are purchased through the competitive bid procedure. This is as it should be because it offers all sellers an equal opportunity to compete for governmental purchases and it prevents discriminatory procedures by procurement agents.

Information made available under H.R. 4570 would prove helpful in the enforcement of existing consent decrees and orders, as well as provide valuable indications of additional areas of possible violation of the law.

LOCAL GOVERNMENTS POWERLESS

Local governments are especially powerless to handle the problem of conspiracy leading to identical bidding. Mr. Ralph S. Locker, Cleveland's director of law, discussed this problem in the December 1960 issue of the Journal of the Cleveland Bar Association. As he put it, "Collusive bidding practices are a real and ever-present problem facing local, State, and Federal governments. On the Federal or State levels, the governmental units have at their disposal a large body of comparative figures that focus attention on instances when collusion among the bidders is likely to be present. Local governmental subdivisions usually lack the necessary investigative staff to make them aware of collusion among bidders."

I recommend the reading of this entire article and I submit a copy for the committee's interest.

IDENTICAL BIDS WOULD BE REPORTED

H.R. 4570 is designed to get at the sorts of problems I have mentioned. The bill would amend section 302 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide for public information and publicity concerning instances where competitors submit identical bids to public agencies for the sale or purchase of supplies, equipment, or services. The bill in no way changes the present antitrust laws. Specific requirements of the bill are as follows:

First. It requires the Federal agencies to report to the Attorney General all instances of identical bidding—not just those instances where the head of the agency or his subordinate thinks the antitrust laws may have been violated.

Second. The bill would require the Attorney General to institute a procedure whereby it is made known to the State and local governments that they are invited to make similar reports to the Attorney General.

Third. The bill would require the Attorney General to make a consolidated report of all of these instances of identical bidding, and to submit such report quarterly to the President of the Senate of the United States and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The bill specifies the items of information to be reported.

It should be noted that when a public agency receives a batch of bids in which two or more of the bids are identical, it will then make a report giving the pertinent information for all the bids, not just those which are identical. It is well known that in some industries various firms submit bids to public agencies which are habitually and so inevitably identical in all details that the public agencies have set up lottery systems, such as putting the bidders' names in a rotary barrel, or into a hat, and drawing one at random. On the other hand, the competitors in the electric equipment manufacturers' case followed the not unusual practice of rotating the privilege of being low bidder on a particular bid, while the others all submitted identical bids.

Information which is to be reported includes, among other things, the names of the companies submitting the bids, the kind of equipment or supply for which the bid is submitted, the bid prices, and so on. The bill does not specify any date or any elapsed time within which the agencies must make their reports to the Attorney General. It is expected, of course, that these reports would be made promptly; and should some of the agencies become unreasonably laggard in submitting their reports, this fact will soon be revealed by the public report made by the Attorney General. Among the items to be reported are the date when the bids were opened and the name of the agency or bureau opening the bids.

The bill does not specify the form in which the Attorney General is to present his quarterly report. Rather, it leaves it up to the Attorney General to adopt a form which will present the information in a most orderly and useful way. I would imagine that the information would be arranged in such a way that all of the bids pertaining to a particular industry, or to a particular kind of commodity, would appear together in one section of the report. Further, I would hope that the report would be indexed to contain the names of all of the companies involved in the competitive bidding so that the reader can find from the index each and all of the instances in which a particular company has been involved in an identical bid situation.

Let me emphasize again that the bill does not amend any of the other antitrust laws. It does not provide any penalty for identical bids or make any presumption that such bids are illegal. It merely provides the public with information about the conduct of public business. In fact, the bill will require making public certain details about identical bidding which the public actually has a right to have in the case of all bids submitted to public agencies in pursuit of public business.

Since 1949 the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act has required the various Federal agencies to make a report to the Attorney General, giving the details of bids received under the advertised competitive bid procedure where in the opinion of the head of the agency there may have been a violation of the Federal antitrust laws. The Armed Forces Procurement Act of 1947 places a similar requirement on the heads of the defense agencies. But, of course, in practice purchases and contracts to purchase made by the defense agencies are made largely on the basis of negotiation, rather than on the basis of advertised competitive bidding.

Leaving the question of reporting or not reporting up to the various agencies, depending upon whether the department head thinks the antitrust laws may have been violated, naturally produces a law with some deficiencies. We may assume, I imagine, that only a fraction of the identical bids being received by the Federal agencies are ever reported to the Attorney General. In fact, I am told that in the first months after the law was passed, the various Federal departments flooded the Department of Justice with reports of identical bids. But as time went on and very little resulted, the departments largely quit making the reports.

IDENTICAL BIDDING WIDESPREAD

Even so, according to a study made by a university professor who is a noted expert in this field, the Department of Justice had received, by mid-1959, a total of no less than 10,000 reports on instances of identical bidding. This information comes from a paper by Prof. Vernon A. Mund, of the University of Washington, published in the Journal of Political Economy in April of 1960. I will insert Professor Mund's article at the end of my remarks, because it is most enlightening in several respects.

First, it contains a table, No. 1, which provides illustrations of identical bids received by the Federal departments. Second, and what is perhaps more useful, Professor Mund has also provided a table, No. 2, which gives similar information on competitive bids which are not identical.

So much has been said in recent times in defense of identical bidding that some of us may have overlooked the point that many busines competitors still manage to submit different bids in pursuit of a given piece of business, and give the public agencies an opportunity to purchase needed supplies and equipment at a low cost to the taxpayers.

Finally, Professor Mund's article should prove useful to the public procurement and antitrust enforcement agencies, as well as to the Federal courts. It provides some enlightened guidance on how to tell the difference between prices in a competitive market and prices which are artificially fixed or rigged.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION NEEDED

The executive branch of government recently has taken firm steps toward striking down conspiracy and price rigging. The electrical equipment case, of course, is only the most dramatic example.

Recently some leading American businessmen also have expressed similar concern over illegal and immoral business conduct. Mr. Henry Ford, II, chairman of the board, Ford Motor Co., last week articulated this viewpoint when he said: "It would indeed be a said thing if the good will and confidence that business has laboriously built up over the years should now be washed away at this very critical juncture in our history." He said further: "No doubt there are those who will say that it is neither necessary nor wise for us to wash our business linen in public, that by talking about these things we will draw attention to them and, by so doing, foster the impression that things are much worse than they actually are. I don't agree."

The executive branch of government has acted to prevent undesirable business conduct. Responsible business leaders also are suggesting that steps be taken to put its house in order. I think the Congress should, whenever possible, also provide the tools with which to work on this problem. I offer H.R. 4570 as one tool which I think will be useful for this purpose. It will supplement the enforcement of our antitrust laws. It will help Federal, State, and local governments develop and follow more informed procurement policies. Finally, it will focus public attention on this critical matter. An alert, informed public may well be one of the strongest deterrents to this abuse.

The New Frontier: Government by Press Agent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 2, 1961

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the following statements taken from the April 26 and May 1, 1961, issues of Battle Line:

THE NEW FRONTIER: GOVERNMENT BY PRESS AGENT

At White House orders, the entire Federal Government and all of its officials are being turned into a big personal publicity machine for President Kennedy—financed by the taxpayers, of course.

The President is to be given personal credit for everything the Government does, and a Kennedy compassion mill is to be established.

While the curtains of secrecy fall in front of newsmen at the Pentagon, State Department, and elsewhere, a special White House meeting on how to promote the name of John F. Kennedy was called earlier this month.

All Cabinet departments were there, and they first were scolded for not doing more to get the President's name in the papers.

Then they were lectured on how to do it, and these instructions are now being circulated throughout the Government as official orders.

Here is the Commerce Department's version, reproduced in its entirety:

"APRIL 12, 1961.

"Memorandum for: Under Secretary Gudeman, Under Secretary Martin, Assistant Secretary Burnstan, Assistant Secretary Price, General Counsel Giles, Executive Assistant Johnston, Special Assistant Ruder, Assistant to Under Secretary—John Stillman, Special Assistant Bookbinder, Special Assistant McClellan, Special Assistant Black.

"From: Herbert W. Klotz, special assistant to the Secretary.

"At a White House meeting of Cabinet assistants, we have been advised again that speeches of Cabinet and sub-Cabinet officers do not contain sufficient reference to the President and his personal interest in, and compassion with, the problems which face the Nation. Liberal quotations from his speeches, past or present, should be used.

"The above was not deemed to be a reflection on the speeches delivered by Commerce Department officials, but was in the nature of a general comment on all executive departments.

"It is also to be kept in mind that, in making announcements of local projects, the President should be given a credit line in the lead paragraph.

"Attached are copies for offices and bureaus under your jurisdiction. Should you desire copies for others, please let us know.

"cc: Acting Commissioner, Century 21 Exposition; Director of Field Services; Director of Personnel; Maritime Administrator; Director, Weather Bureau; Director, BFC; Director, OITF; Acting Administrator, BDSA; Director of Bureau of the Census; Commissioner of Patents; Director, National Bureau of Standards."

It is understandable that the administration should seek to divert attention from the recent disasters in foreign policy, and the glaring lack of public support for the Kennedy domestic program, but putting the entire Government to work creating a puffed-up publicity image of one man is unprecedented in American history.

Robert Kennedy is well established as "Little Brother" and this White House propaganda order seems designed to make the President a "Big Brother," as in George Orwell's novel, "1984."

One can imagine how press releases are going to sound from here on in:

"Because of his unbounding compassion, President John F. Kennedy—who said at New York on October 12 that 'America must move forward'—has approved release of $19.67 to finance the U.S. share of a refund of a toll highway overcharge, Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges, named to the Cabinet by a compassionate John F. Kennedy on November 25, 1960, announced today. Hodges praised the action as illustrative of the great compassion President John F. Kennedy has for those who must pay toll charges."

ANOTHER SECRET ORDER FOR J.F.K.'S PUBLICITY MACHINE

Another secret can now be released—President Kennedy wants to take full credit for all the public works done in the country.

Last week, Battle Line rent the veil of official censorship to reveal, through a confidential Commerce Department memo, that orders were out from the White House Government-wide to glorify the President in every lead paragraph of every official announcement.

Pierre Salinger, the White House press secretary, flatly denied this, saying it was "incorrect."

Now, Secretary of the Interior Udall, who never lets his mouth know what his left foot is doing, proves Salinger was 100 percent careless with the truth.

Complaining that credit for award of a contract on Yellowtail Dam, for which Congress appropriated funds, was almost lost, a memo from Udall's office states that the White House can make "considerable mileage" if it has 48 hours advance notice of "news developments within the Department of Interior."

This memo not only demonstrates how Salinger misleads the public and the press. It shows that, while tightly censoring legitimate news, a concerted attempt is being made to feed out propaganda to glorify President Kennedy.

The full text of this new "praise Kennedy" memo, signed by Udall's personal assistant, reads as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C., April 24, 1961.

To All Members of the Secretariat, and Mr. Floyd E. Dominy, Mr. Conrad L. Wirth, Mr. Karl S. Landstrom:

Occurrences in the past few days have made it quite clear that we are not following through satisfactorily on providing advance notice to the White House on news developments within the Department of Interior, particularly important contract awards.

The Yellowtail Dam contract award of $39 million got away through no fault of ours, but in view of what happened on the Florida contract indicates that we might have slipped up on Yellowtail as well, if someone else hadn't done it.

It is mandatory that we give the White House 48 hours' notice before we announce contracts of this sort. It is not enough to send a draft press release to Pierre Salinger's office. We must also notify Lawrence O'Brien. On the Florida matter, for example, a press release went to the White House Friday, but O'Brien's office was not notified, when considerable mileage could have been made by giving the White House a chance before the weekend of notifying interested Members of Congress.

Please, without fail, give this office an extra copy of any proposed news release covering announcements of this type at least 48 hours in advance, and we will see that they are delivered to Mr. O'Brien.

The Secretary has asked me to follow through on this.

ORREN BEATY,
Assistant to the Secretary.

Right Way To Intervene

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the passage by the House of Representatives of the administration's mutual security bill for Latin American aid has won the approval of one of the leading Pennsylvania newspapers.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include herewith an editorial from Monday's issue of the Harrisburg Patriot:

RIGHT WAY TO INTERVENE

Now that the House of Representatives has approved the $600 million requested by President Kennedy for a long-term aid program for Latin America, the Senate should take similar action with little delay.

This is part of the President's alliance for progress, designed to erase communism and violent revolution from the hemisphere by offering Latin America practical proof that democracy can do the job better than dictatorship.

The program isn't new. It was initiated last year by President Eisenhower. Its need was eloquently stated in 1958 by President Kubitschek of Brazil, one of the chief architects of the comprehensive inter-American social and economic plan envisaged in Operation Pan American.

The alliance for progress is spurred by the crisis in Cuba. The $600 million measure has been termed the "Castro bill."

Certainly the explosion in Cuba and the accompanying threat of Communist infiltration throughout Latin America dramatically illustrates the urgent need to get down to brass tacks and do something about our deteriorating southern neighborhood. When as determined an opponent of foreign aid as Representative PASSMAN, of Louisiana, concedes the necessity for the bill, the sands really must be running out.

Nevertheless it would be foolish to look upon this program merely as a move to spite and frustrate Castro and the Kremlin.

Latin America not only is our neighbor, it is among our best markets. It could become a showplace of democracy and a living proof that the cry of Yankee exploitation in Latin America is fraudulent.

A program of long-term assistance and cooperation would be necessary and right even if no Communist threat existed. While the Communists use unrest and upheaval to advance their cause, they didn't invent or create the conditions that have driven Latin Americans to the edge of despair.

Illiteracy averages 43 percent throughout Latin America. In parts it is as high as 90 percent. Life expectancy is 46 years. The average per capita income is $280 a year. In Guatemala, two-tenths of 1 percent of landowners own 40 percent of the farmland. Infant mortality is 110 per 1,000 live births.

Some 80 percent of the people live in substandard dwellings.

The United States, of course, has poured a great deal of aid into Latin America in the past. But, as Representative WALTER JUDD has pointed out:

"Some of it has not been too productive because some of those countries have not seen the necessity of making certain essential changes in their own laws, in their tax structures, in land tenure and in legal procedure without which, significant improvement is not possible."

President Kennedy has stressed the self-help theme in the alliance for progress. He has made clear that U.S. aid must be matched by Latin American efforts to ensure that the assistance benefits all the people instead of making the rich richer.

The United States, the President has said, does not oppose revolutions. It welcomes them. The long-term aid program for Latin America could channel the revolutions to the south of us along peaceful and constructive courses.

This is the only kind of intervention that can defeat despotism of the right and the left in our hemisphere decisively and lastingly.

Views of a Latin American Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD a very timely address by a distinguished Latin American statesman, Dr. Ezequiel Padilla, who was Minister of Foreign Affairs of Mexico during World War II. Dr. Padilla delivered this address in commemoration of the Day of the Americas before the Pan American Society of the United States on April 14, 1961, at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel in New York City.

In view of current developments and discussions in regard to Latin America and U.S. policy and plans concerning the Western Hemisphere, I believe that the views of a capable and experienced Latin American statesman should be of great value at this time. I commend Dr. Padilla's address to the attention of my colleagues:

ADDRESS OF DR. EZEQUIEL PADILLA

In 1942 I had the honor of addressing this same assembly, at that time deeply moved by the gravest news of the war. It was the romantic era of continental solidarity. I am now directing this message to an America, torn by disunion, gazing with alarm through fissures opened by conspiracy and discord, as the enemies of the loftiest aspirations of our continent penetrate like wolves in the night.

We must never forget that America belongs to Western Christian civilization. More than 150 years ago each one of our nations conquered through blood and fire its independence in order to dedicate it to liberty and to the preservation of the inalienable rights of man.

How different this tradition is from that of the Eastern nations. By a strange coincidence there appeared during the sixth century before Christ, Buddha, Confucius, and Lao-tse in the East, at the same time as the Ionic philosophers and the fraternity of Pythagoras in the West. In this bifurcation of destinies the Orient remained sterile in its millenial slavery without knowing how to grasp from the inspired pages of their teachers neither rules for the progress of its multitudes, nor the divine spark for the human soul. Terror darkened the history of Asia. Its uninterrupted current of historical events so full of cruelty, hunger, and tyranny explains why China, the oldest civilization of the world—notwithstanding that it had already conquered its independence—so easily surrendered to the communistic imperialism without God, without liberty and without spirit.

Western civilization, on the other hand, signifies an ascent toward dignity, toward law, toward God. In defiance of all storms, falling and rising again, it has safeguarded the heritages of Greece, Rome, the Renaissance, and the great revolutions of Europe and America. And today, during this great conflict in which definite responsibilities have been placed upon us, the triumph of the free world will represent the consecration of the highest values, not only of the Western soul, but of all mankind.

Many outstanding minds allow themselves to be deceived by the material progress of Russia and of China. They do not detect the true reality of our times. In Mexico City, in the depths of Africa; in the Nile or in Tokyo, modern technology is constructing marvelous buildings. Neither China nor Russia build anything as a whole which is superior to that being constructed by the United States, Canada, Japan, England, Italy, France, or Germany.

Material progress is not the exclusive patrimony of a system; it is the product of a new science; of the magic power which man has won over nature.

In the ideological conflict which we are now undergoing, the enigma is not who possesses the power to construct. Science has that power, and science is within the reach of all. The enigma to which man must reply is this: Who should be responsible for the handling of these constructive forces? The people or the tyrants? Democracy or dictatorship? Castro Ruz or the people of Cuba? The dignity of the spirit or the terror of bureaucracies?

It is said that Latin America is undermined by communism. And it is true. But among the Latin American peoples there is no communism; what we find is hunger, tyranny, and corruption. If each time these people rise to claim their rights they are going to be accused of communism, then we are getting off the road. It is evident that hunger, corruption, and tyranny are fertile fields in which to unleash chaos. For that reason we must speed up the march.

President Kennedy has launched a new pan-American economic policy and makes an appeal for the assistance of Latin America. Of course, the first contribution will be the acknowledgment that many errors have been committed.

After long neglecting Latin America, whose behavior during the last war was exemplary, the United States has been pouring substantial contributions upon the Latin American governments, contributions which were frequently ill used, were not dedicated to the salvation of their peoples, but to consolidate dictatorships and to create fantastic fortunes for leaders and privileged groups.

It is therefore urgent that the new economic policy be the direct ally of the new youth which each year emerges in increasingly alarming proportions, without opportunities for employment or available capital, anxious to create for itself independent and livable homes. Translated into action this means agrarian development, the construction of popular homes, the extension of credits to prepared youth; incentives for national and foreign investment of private capital, stimulus to inter-American trade, in order to achieve cordial economic interdependence, implemented with the resources of powerful international organizations.

Upon extending its cooperation, the United States would improve its moral position by not demanding selfish advantages, or strengthening monopolies repudiated by Latin America. There is one demand which the United States has the indisputable right to make and that is a cordial solidarity in the common defense of the continent. We ought to respect our international agreements. A straightforward alliance, free from duplicity, should be established.

We must awaken to the fact that the privations and the sufferings of the Latin American masses are not the products of a sick imagination. They represent dire realities. Their economic insecurity, their everyday heart-rendering misery demonstrated by mountains of sombre evidences, ask not for political opportunism, rather, for the deepest sincerity.

Latin America, divided within itself, thrashed by poverty, without capital, without technical assistance, has no other alternative but to fall a victim of Communist infiltration—as Cuba has fallen—in disorder, violence, chaos, and desolation; or the development of a surging, potent economy, of a just distribution of wealth through the cordial cooperation not only with the United States, but also with the inclusion of the wonderful nation of Canada.

Nothing obstructs our way if we are careful to avoid falling in the enemy's trap. There is a truth that no maneuver may tarnish.

In this crucial hour of humanity, the United States, as leader of the free world, defends at the tremendous cost of lives and wealth, the same cause of liberty and rights that our nations have defended in the course of our independent history. To live in dignity, to pray without fear at our own altars, to fight justice without surrendering to tyranny the treasure of our high spiritual values; this is the cause of our united democracies. It is the cause by which all our American peoples have fought and died. For this reason, for our Latin American nations in this hour of grave dangers, neutrality is not neutrality, it is an alliance with the enemy. The formidable Russian feat launching the first human traveler into space, which all the world applauds heartily, dramatizes even more the urgency to keep our continent united.

Surely, liberty is worth nothing without justice. We are at the beginning of a crusade which our countries have been dreaming of for centuries. But this crusade needs not only capital and science. It requires the decision of our countries to create, in a climate of liberty and righteousness, the fundamental conditions of material success in our economic policy. It is imperative that our nations carry out through their own efforts an improvement of institutional life toward a distributive justice and democratic rights. Some of our nations—and I would point to Mexico as a pioneer—are fighting resolutely for the achievement of social justice. But throughout great areas, our peoples are still living within an economy of landed gentry exploiting the workers with the pay of slaves. In some of our nations, large estates still exist as survivals of a feudal system.

In others industrialization is being developed not under the rules of the capitalism of the people, but with privileges which illustrate the unfair distribution of wealth. Usury as a rule smothers out the finest inspiration and best efforts of youth.

There exists only one economic system for obtaining social justice and creating abundance, and that is the increase of productivity. If this productivity is to depend upon private enterprise, then it must have an atmosphere of stimulation and safety; if private initiative is treated with arrogance and hostility, it cannot flourish. Neither will it be able to develop unless administrative corruption is rooted out.

Free enterprise is a guarantee of demo-

cratic liberties and of stimulus toward success in business. However, when private enterprise cannot or will not fulfill its economic mission, then the state must take over. And this is how democratic states sometimes assume a mixed system of economic action; but always under democratic control. The Communist system that destroys all the high values of life, has two guarantees against corruption: the suppression of private property, which hinders the accumulation of personal wealth, and the most severe punishment for incompetence. For these reasons, its material progress is great.

The only guarantee of the nations of the free world consists of the real freedom of the people to control the administrative life of the State. Where there are no liberties, as it occurs in some of our Latin American countries, state enterprise turns out to be irresponsible, and corruption, absolute. Daily the state acquires more power; the people, therefore, feel a daily need for additional strength.

For this reason, President Kennedy's economic plan of aid to other countries has revived hopes which are increasing in a rising tide of optimism. This plan rests on the principle of bringing the people out of poverty and on a rising conquest of democratic liberties—two profound desires of man and particularly of the Latin American nations. The President of Mexico said recently: "To be able to achieve the goals of social justice based on abundance and prosperity within a democratic society is a primary end of the people and of the state."

This collective action of the continent should be fulfilled with the magnitude in which the Marshall plan was carried out. In a decade, Europe emerged from a rubbish heap to attain economic grandeur. America cannot miss this example if united it resolves to construct a continent of well-being and liberties. A half-performed action will be a disillusion and a failure because then discontent and conspiracy shall win the race.

A real mystic of authentic American brotherhood must be created. We have to answer to the powerful world propaganda of communism, with deeds that win the minds and hearts of America. With a spirit disposed toward fraternity, since in spite of discrepancies we are a family of nations; with open arms extended to all our peoples, this policy shall rest on the self-determination and the sovereignty of each country. It is a movement of persuasion directed to the hearts of the peoples and to the responsibility of the statesmen. He who does not wish to unite his efforts and his enthusiasm in this luminous adventure shall withdraw without having anyone upbraid him, save his own conscience.

There will be disagreements; but this should not stop the move for liberation. Western civilization has advanced in this manner, by achieving goals. This crusade will be carried out by those nations which have faith in the free destiny of man, secure in the knowledge, as I stated 18 years ago in Rio de Janeiro, that "The constellations are formed with the march of the night."

Defense Before Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 2, 1961

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Robert S. McNamara, has taken a thoughtful and courageous stand. In his address before the Associated Press annual luncheon he announced that the changing requirements and demands of an unchallengeable National Military Establishment will necessarily cause frequent and large-scale shifts in Defense programing.

We all realize that these shifts will cause setbacks to certain enterprises, localities, and States. It is only natural that each of us will be interested in those shifts which most affect the people and areas with which we are best acquainted. It is only natural that our sympathies will be most aroused for the people with whom long and fond associations have fostered mutual respect and friendship. It is only natural that each of us has a great concern for the areas we call home. But at the same time we all acknowledge the even greater loyalty that we in Congress share equally with every American, the overriding loyalty of our Nation. In times as perilous as these all good citizens must applaud the forthright, honest decision of Secretary McNamara.

Simply stated, the Secretary has said:

The welfare and defense of our great country must come first and foremost with every American.

The distinguished lady from Maine, Senator SMITH, has already set an example in this regard which we can admire and emulate.

I believe it would benefit everyone to read the editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of April 26, 1961, which briefly covers this important aspect of Secretary McNamara's vital defense program. It is entitled "Defense Before Politics," and I wish to include it in the RECORD following these remarks:

DEFENSE BEFORE POLITICS

Defense Secretary McNamara had some pointed things to say at the Associated Press luncheon.

Defense programs, he said, are going to keep on changing—in fact, shifts will increase both in size and in frequency. As this happens some companies, some communities, some States, are going to be hit by loss of defense business or closing of military facilities. But "we cannot afford to modify these decisions to accommodate local or private interests, no matter how legitimate."

Taking note of local and private pressures, he warned that "our decisions, once taken, will not be subject to reversal, except for changes in the facts on which they were based originally."

This is tough, plain talk, and a sound policy. Whether it can be maintained depends partly on what kind of support the Secretary gets, from local editors no less than from local politicians.

A few weeks ago Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, of Maine, set a noteworthy example of putting the national interest first. Notified that a Snark base at Presque Isle, Maine, would be closed, she rose the same day on the Senate floor. "The far easier course for me to pursue politically," she said, "would be to demand that the outmoded Snark program be continued, so that the Presque Isle Air Force Base be kept operating, to aid the economy of the area and to avoid the impact and dislocation that its closing is bound to have on the economy of this area.

"But in all good conscience," she added, "I cannot do this, for this would simply be playing politics with our national security, our national defense, and our taxpayer's dollar."

Let Senator SMITH's latest declaration of conscience govern the conduct of her fellow Senators.

B'nai B'rith—A Vibrant Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 2, 1961

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, on April 20 many Congressmen expressed their congratulations and best wishes to the State of Israel on its 13th anniversary. Throughout our land many functions took place in which people of Jewish faith reaffirmed their loyalty to these United States and expressed their good will toward the State of Israel. Many organizations have continually worked for a better understanding between ethnic, racial and religious groups, and among the foremost is the B'nai B'rith. This organization, which is sensitive to discrimination and uses its legal talent and moral force to bring about the principles of equality promised us in our Declaration of Independence, is very active in my congressional district. It has always been a force for good.

On April 20 the induction of the newly elected officers of the Yorkville B'nai B'rith took place at the Hotel Croydon, New York City. Two of my dear friends were installed as officers. Max Feigin, my administrative assistant, was installed as president, and Philip Wagner, counsel of the Securities and Exchange Commission, was elected as first vice president. The remarks of Mr. Feigin are truly American in spirit and demonstrate a yearning of understanding of brotherhood which we in these parlous times seek. I believe that Mr. Feigin's acceptance speech upon his installation is timely and well worth reading. His speech follows:

ADDRESS OF MR. MAX FEIGIN

I am delighted at the opportunity of serving as president. I hope I shall not fail your expectations or my own. I do not intend to.

Yet the success of an organization does not depend alone upon the president. You as members cannot sit back and expect to be entertained or sit impatiently for a meeting to end in order to socialize. As members of B'nai B'rith you do not fulfill your obligations or your potentialities to help merely by paying dues—no matter how welcome that may be.

A president may perhaps inspire, or guide or lead, but membership too must reciprocate or sometimes even initiate such inspiration or guidance.

All of you have a wonderful opportunity, living and working in Yorkville, to bring members of our ethnic group into B'nai B'rith. The last few years have witnessed a large influx of Jewish people—both young and old—into our area. All of you ought to avail yourselves of this opportunity of reminding these newcomers of the need for B'nai B'rith, of the need for a common gathering of our people.

There is nothing basically wrong in making an appeal to persons of the Jewish faith to join together. This is not a repudiation

of the doctrine which I continually espouse that we are each our brothers keeper. We have a right to respect our traditions while respecting the traditions of others.

We have probably drawn closer together in the last two decades than at any other time in the history of the Jewish people, motivated by common fears, deeply touched by the suffering and heroism of Jewish people in other lands, and proud of the birth of a new republic.

There is nothing wrong in our sympathetic kinship with Israel—remembering however that as Americans our loyalties are first, last, and always with the United States of America.

For here in our country the Jewish people have advanced more rapidly on the social and economic scale than any other minority group in any place in the world.

This has been true not only because of our own capabilities, not only because of the American atmosphere of fair play and equality—despite the rabble rousers—but because we have clung tenaciously to group survival despite the great assimilative forces of American life, and as a group have fought for our rights as individuals.

In safeguarding our traditions and rights through organizations like B'nai B'rith we ought never to forget that other ethnic groups have not fared as well as we and that the Jewish traditions of sympathy and fairplay must extend to Negroes and Puerto Ricans and Catholics and all others.

What is remarkable in our country is that in the midst of so many tensions there should be so striking a measure of success in living together.

But the gains we have achieved—the gains that are yet to come—must be safeguarded through organizations like B'nai B'rith, for in safeguarding our rights as individuals we surely help the great American dream of equality of opportunity for everyone and the world dream of eternal peace.

I ask all of you therefore to join me in revitalizing our lodge—I ask you to join with me in participating in the many activities we plan.

I ask you to be a conscious and active member.

I shall do my part to the best of my ability.

Tribute to Retiring Publisher Arthur Hays Sulzberger and Editorial Page Editor Charles Merz, of the New York Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a great newspaper, the New York Times, on the occasion of a major change in its top executive command.

Arthur Hays Sulzberger has been a distinguished publisher of this distinguished newspaper and it is fitting that we take due notice of his major contribution to American journalism on the occasion of his retirement. I am pleased to note that Mr. Sulzberger will continue to serve as chairman of the board of the New York Times.

Mr. Sulzberger's successor as publisher is Mr. Orvil E. Dryfoos, who is president of the New York Times Co., and who has been with the Times since 1942. Mr. Dryfoos' outstanding career as a journalist guarantees that the high standards which have made the Times one of the world's great newspapers will be maintained.

I am also pleased to note that Mr. John B. Oakes, a member of the Times staff since 1946, has been appointed as editorial page editor. Mr. Oakes succeeds Charles Merz, editor since 1938, who now becomes editor emeritus.

I should like at this time, Mr. Speaker, to pay warm tribute to Arthur Hays Sulzberger and Charles Merz on the occasion of their retirement from distinguished careers in American journalism.

My heartiest congratulations go to their successors, Orvil E. Dryfoos and John B. Oakes, who can be counted upon to sustain the illustrious tradition of the New York Times.

The people of the 17th District of New York, and I as their Representative in Congress, take great pride in the New York Times as one of the great and authoritative newspapers of the world.

Politics a Key Factor in Defense Transfers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 2, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Kansas City Star of April 29. It hits a well-known nail on the head. I think my colleagues will be interested in it:

POLITICS A KEY FACTOR IN DEFENSE TRANSFERS

Now there is a striking illustration in Washington of the varying reactions to proposed shift in defense installations from one State to another.

Not a peep came from the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee when the Kennedy administration recently decided to move an important naval air unit from Olathe, Kans., to Glynco, Ga. Presumably, the committee chairman Representative CARL VINSON, was pleased by the plan. He hails from Georgia, the beneficiary of the proposed move. Moreover, VINSON is very much the leader of his State's delegation in the House, where he is the senior Member after Speaker SAM RAYBURN.

Because of his great power, VINSON was recently asked to intervene in a fight being made by another Democratic Congressman, Representative SIDNEY R. YATES, to keep the Army's food processing plant in Chicago. VINSON expressed his concern and asked the Secretary of the Army for a complete review of a decision to move the food plant to Natick, Mass.

There may be sound military reasons for moving the plant to Massachusetts, just as there might be for the transfer that would benefit Georgia. But a hint of politics can be detected in both cases. Massachusetts happens to be the home State of the House majority leader, Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, as well as of the President of the United States.

We have noticed that States in which a President is particularly interested seem to have unusual luck in getting defense contracts and military activities. Certainly western Missouri fared better when Harry S. Truman was in the White House. And Denver became a major production center for missiles after Mr. Eisenhower started spending his presidential vacations in the Colorado City.

These could be mere coincidences. But it is human nature for Government officials to try to please a President. We don't expect VINSON to challenge the decision that would take payrolls and contracts to Georgia at the expense of Olathe and Greater Kansas City. His intervention for Chicago is a political horse of another color.

Naval Blockade of Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 2, 1961

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, in my latest newsletter to my constituents I urged the imposition of a naval blockade of Cuba as the only effective method of preventing continued Soviet armaments from coming into the Western Hemisphere in violation of the Monroe Doctrine. Yesterday, I had the privilege of reading a thoughtful article in the U.S. News & World Report of May 8 which discussed this type of action in more detail, including both its advantages and its disadvantages.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the relevant portion of my newsletter, together with the text of the article from the U.S. News & World Report:

YOUR CONGRESSMAN, SAMUEL S. STRATTON, REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON, MAY 1, 1961

Cuban S.S.R.: Whatever may have been the setbacks resulting from the unsuccessful attempt of the Cuban rebels to establish a beachhead on the Castro-held mainland last week, there was at least one positive benefit, and that was the clear-cut revelation to the whole world of the complete conversion of Cuba into a Russian-dominated military base.

In fact, one of the major reasons for the failure of the ill-starred expedition appears to have been a lack of full information on the extent to which Cuba has been getting this Russian military equipment. Somehow, the pictures and stories of Soviet T-34 tanks on Cuban beaches and Russian Mig jet fighters strafing rebel troops has brought home to all of us the stark, blunt truth of what it means to have a Russian military base 90 miles away from home. Russian tanks and planes in Cuba jeopardize the security of the United States, violate the Monroe Doctrine, and threaten the security of every other Latin American republic.

Once the full extent of this Russian military penetration of Cuba was clear, President Kennedy announced we would take whatever action was appropriate to prevent this, even if we had to go it alone. But the Latin American republics who have been rather inclined to drag their feet on taking action against Castro also reacted swiftly last week by finally throwing Cuba off the Inter-American Defense Board. For years the United States had been trying to get these countries to exclude Castro's representative from secret military talks. But it took the

pictures of the Migs and the T-34 tanks to do the job. There is a new atmosphere of urgency in Washington this week. You can see it, for example, in the extensive efforts President Kennedy has made to enlist solid bipartisan support for his actions toward both Cuba and Laos, efforts, as I see it, which are being directed, by the way, toward support for future actions, not for those already past.

What the next move will be only time, of course, will tell. Personally, I think we ought to set up an immediate naval blockade of Cuba. We simply can't tolerate further Russian weapons, including the possibility of long-range nuclear missiles, being located in Cuba. Obviously, we can't stop them from coming in, however, just by talk. A naval blockade would be thoroughly in line with the Monroe Doctrine, would be a relatively simple operation to carry out, and would bring an abrupt end to Soviet penetration of our hemisphere.

[From U.S. News & World Report, May 8, 1961]

NEXT FOR CUBA: AN ARMS BLOCKADE?

Look at Castro now—cockier than ever, with arms and agents to threaten the Americas.

How can the United States act?

Blockade is one answer offered by experts. In it they see a way to isolate Cuba, stop infiltration, maybe finish Castro, too.

This is the question now facing President Kennedy: How to put a stop to the Soviet buildup in Cuba and to Communist infiltration of this hemisphere?

On April 25, the White House reported that a total embargo of remaining U.S. trade with Cuba was being considered. Its aim: To undermine further Cuba's economy, weaken Castro.

Another strategy—bolder and tougher—was also attracting notice in Washington: A naval and air blockade to cut Cuba off from the world, destroy Castro.

Blockade, in the view of military and civilian experts, could restore teeth to the Monroe Doctrine. It could halt a flood of Communist arms and strategic supplies now reaching Castro. It could stop Cuban reexport of guns and propaganda materials to South America. It would be the most severe reprisal, short of declared war, that the United States could invoke against Castro.

It is the strategy of blockade, therefore, that is suddenly at the center of attention of administration officials, Members of Congress, officers in the Pentagon. As a possible course of action, it also is the center of debate and is raising many questions. Among these questions:

WHAT WOULD A CUBA BLOCKADE TAKE?

Military experts say a tight naval blockade off Cuban ports and at the approaches to Cuban waters would require two naval task forces, each built around an aircraft carrier with a complement of about 100 planes and several destroyers.

The Navy, on April 25, announced it is is bringing back the carrier *Shangri-La* from the Mediterranean, increasing to four the number of attack carriers in the vicinity of Cuba. More than 36 other big Navy ships are no less than a day's sailing time away.

To round out the blockading force, submarines would be needed—to locate, identify and track approaching vessels. Land-based radar would help with this task. So would radar picket ships. A squadron of Navy jets and another of long-range patrol planes would add support to the carrier task forces.

Three requirements go with a blockade: It must be proclaimed; the blockading force must be powerful enough to enforce it; and it must be enforced without discrimination.

Once these conditions of international law are met, countries that try to run to blockade do so at their own risk. Blockade runners can be stopped—by gunfire, if necessary—searched and held, at least temporarily. They could be sent to U.S. ports for rulings whether cargo should be confiscated.

WHAT COULD A BLOCKADE ACCOMPLISH?

Plenty, say the experts. In a broad sense, it would reaffirm the Monroe Doctrine by opposing Communist interference in the Western Hemisphere. It could, by avoiding direct intervention, provide a short-of-war strategy to meet short-of-war infiltration.

Primary target would be shipments of tanks, guns, aviation gasoline and ammunition coming from Russia and Czechoslovakia. Shipments of arms from Western countries could similarly be seized as contraband. In a total blockade, action could also be taken against ships bringing in chemicals, oils, textiles, and even foodstuffs. At times, three ships a day from the Soviet bloc are unloading in Cuban ports. Castro's military machine and his economy could be squeezed as hard as the United States felt necessary to bring about his downfall.

To be totally effective, surface blockade must be acompanied by air blockade. Here, argument is heard. Some experts insist that all air traffic for Cuba would have to be diverted, forced to turn back or to land at designated friendly airfields. Those that pass U.S. ground checks could continue.

Other experts see this as risky business, creating danger of aerial duels and—if the Soviets wanted to press hard enough—the danger of war. These experts claim the risk is not worth it. They are convinced the Soviet bloc could not give substantial airlift support to Cuba, because of the long distances involved. They point out that, during the Berlin blockade, it cost the United States more than $200 million to airlift 1.2 million tons of supplies for short distances. A glance at a world map shows the limitations of a Soviet effort in the Caribbean.

WOULD THE UNITED STATES BE GOING IT ALONE?

Almost certainly, say the experts. They see no chance of either the United Nations or the Organization of American States lending approval to a peacetime blockade of a member state. Those who favor a blockade of Cuba are not deterred by this.

President Kennedy, as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, has the power to order the Navy into any action short of declared war, even though shots may be fired. Use of a carrier task force by President Eisenhower last November off Guatemala and Nicaragua was, in essence, a pacific blockade with orders to prevent the landing of armed forces and supplies from Cuba. Panama received similar U.S. naval help in 1959. In 1954, the Navy was alerted to search for a ship carrying arms to Guatemala.

BUT A PEACETIME BLOCKADE—IS THAT LEGAL?

A debate is now developing over just how far the United States can go in a blockade of Cuba, and stay within bounds of international law.

Basically, there are two kinds of blockade. One is the belligerent blockade that accompanies declared and open warfare. The United States has taken part in three major belligerent blockades—in the Civil War and in World Wars I and II. Belligerent blockades have been common in history and are governed by well-established "regulations."

Second type is the Pacific blockade, usually defined as a reprisal in time of peace, to block off trade. Pacific blockades are not recognized in a strict sense, but are accepted as acts against international delinquency. The British and French, for example, joined in establishing a Pacific blockade against the Dutch in 1831.

A Pacific blockade can be invoked without declaration of war, but some U.S. experts believe that any naval blockade without sanction of an international organization is an act of war. They say that it would depend entirely on how Cuba and Castro regard and interpret the action.

Main point that troubles the legalists is this: There is considerable doubt whether a Pacific blockade would give a clear right to stop any but Cuban and U.S. ships. The United States, for example, has argued in the past that a Pacific blockade cannot legally be applied against a third power. Under this interpretation. Soviet vessels must be allowed free access to Cuba if the United States is to pay strict regard to international law. This is important to those who want to make a blockade conform as closely as possible to precedent.

Others say this is a time to be practical and not legal. They see the situation boiling down to this: If the United States is determined to act first and argue later about the legal aspects, a blockade can be made effective.

The Ignored Remedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on May 1, 1961, I inserted in the RECORD an article entitled "Forgotten Remedy for the Voteless Negro," from the January 21, 1961, issue of the Nation. In the February 18 issue of the same publication the following comment appeared in the letters to the editor column. Assuming an interest on the part of our colleagues in the possible consequences of the enforcement of the discussed statute of 1872, I commend the item to the attention of our colleagues. It follows:

THE IGNORED STATUTE

DEAR SIRS: In the splendid article "Forgotten Remedy for the Voteless Negro" in your January 21 issue, the authors, Thomas I. Emerson and Arthur E. Bonfield, overlooked a very important matter. I made a study of the subject some 15 years ago; as a result, I suggested to Earl Warren, then Governor of California, that the State of California sue the State of South Carolina in the U.S. Supreme Court to have the number of Representatives of South Carolina reduced from six to one in conformity with the provisions of section 2 of the 14th amendment and the enforcing statute of 1872. At that time, it took 13 times as many electors to elect one Congressman in the State of Connecticut as it did in South Carolina, the two States having almost equal populations.

Messrs. Emerson and Bonfield, after quoting certain provisions of section 2 of the 14th amendment, say: "In addition to section 2 an almost unknown statute, originally framed in 1872 and still on the books, contains the same requirement." Later on they say: "Certainly advocates of civil rights should mount a full-scale effort to force Congress to honor the Constitutional mandate.

A close reading of section 2 of the 14th amendment and the statute of 1872 reveals that the former reduces the "basis of representation" and that the latter reduces the "representation" of any offending State, according to the same formula.

Congress has now power to change the basis of representation. It does have the power, and, indeed, the duty, to change the representation of an offending State in conformity with the mandate of section 2 of the 14th amendment. This Congress did by the

statute of 1872. Such was the sole purpose of that statute. In other words, Congress has honored the constitutional mandate.

It remains only for the courts, or a court, to apply and enforce the provisions of the statute. This no court can do unless and until proper action is brought before it for decision.

Congress has not failed to comply with this mandate. Nor has any court as yet failed to comply with it. The failure has been in a proper litigant instituting and forming a proper action in a court having jurisdiction.

There can be no doubt that the statute of 1872 is constitutional. Section 2 of the 14th amendment establishes its constitutionality, and Congress, by this statute, having expressly complied with the constitutional mandate, cannot, by implication, be said to have repealed that statute. That is, Congress cannot, by implication, withdraw its expressed compliance with that mandate. Indeed, it would seem that Congress cannot, even by expressed repeal, void the statute; that is, it cannot nullify its compliance with the mandate. To do so would be unconstitutional. Of course, Congress can enact further legislation in conformity with the mandate or, even without further legislation, the House of Representatives could enforce the statute of 1872.

Any action should be brought to apply and enforce the statute of 1872, not section 2 of the 14th amendment.

One other matter. The application and enforcement of this statute would benefit not only voteless Negro citizens, but voteless poor whites as well. There are more of the latter in the southern and border States than there are of the former, and this might very well turn the political complexion of the South from ultraconservative to mildly liberal and progressive. Not all at once, but in time, and in 3 years time can and does move very quickly.

WILLIAM F. CLEARY.

CHAPALA, JALISCO, MEXICO.

Military Personnel at California's Travis Air Force Base and Mather Air Force Base Commended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 2, 1961

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention and to the attention of our colleagues a recent letter I received from a friend of mine, Mr. A. B. Anderson, of Volcano, Calif., which details the quick and humanitarian actions rendered by our military personnel located at Travis Air Force Base and Mather Air Force Base.

I am convinced that the quiet, efficient, and, in a real sense, heroic deed described below is the rule rather than the exception. It demonstrates that the dedication we expect of our uniformed men in wartime is as well expended and offered by them in any time of emergency. It is to Maj. Gen. Russell L. Waldron, base commander, Headquarters Western Transport Air Force, Travis Air Force Base; Maj. John D. Travis, 13th Air Medical Transport Squadron, Travis Air Force Base; Brig. Gen. Norman L. Callish, base commander, Mather Air Force Base, and to the other personnel involved that we owe our highest praise.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the following letter:

JACKSON, CALIF., *April 12, 1961.*

Hon. JOHN F. SHELLEY,
Congressman, Fifth District, Calif., House of Representatives, Congress of the United States, Washington, D.C.

DEAR JACK: Because Travis Air Force Base and Mather Air Force Base are located in California, I want to inform you of an incident that is deserving of the highest commendation of the personnel involved.

A young 17-year-old married girl was critically burned with second- and third-degree burns over 70 percent of her body caused by a gasoline explosion and when brought to the Amador County Hospital there was little hope for her survival, as the hospital is not equipped to render the special care required in such cases.

I was contacted at 9:05 a.m. on April 5, 1961, by the chairman of the board of supervisors relative to the possibility of securing U.S. Air Force ambulance service to transport the patient to the John Sealy Hospital, Galveston, Tex., as this hospital has the facilities for treating such cases and the young girl is a resident of that State. After several contacts I finally was put in touch with Maj. John D. Travis, of the 13th Airo Medical Transport Squadron, Travis Air Force Base, and through him I was able to have this patient flown from Mather Field, Sacramento, Calif., to the hospital in Galveston, Tex., at 5 p.m. the same day.

The point I should like to bring out, JACK, is that every individual connected with this Air Force operation not only acted from a sense of duty, but from their hearts. Major Travis, after the situation was explained to him, took a personal burden upon himself to assure that this patient was moved as quickly as possible and kept in constant touch with me and the officials at Mather Field to expedite each step of the operation. The commanding officer of Mather Field sent an ambulance with an attendant to the hospital here to assist in this case. The next day Major Travis called me to inform me that the patient had arrived at her destination. In addition to the patient, transportation was furnished to her mother and her husband.

I have nothing but the highest praise for the U.S. Air Force, and especially Maj. John D. Travis, as I feel it was through him and his personal interest in this case that a life was saved.

While our U.S. Air Force is the finest in the world from a military standpoint, it also has its humanitarian side.

Sincerely,

A. B. ANDERSON.

Equality Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 2, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article from the February 4, 1961, issue of the Nation. The Reverend Martin Luther King here presents a lucid discussion and persuasive argument for the implementation of existing authority in helping the American Negro gain equality:

EQUALITY NOW

(By Martin Luther King, Jr.)

The new administration has the opportunity to be the first in one hundred years of American history to adopt a radically new approach to the question of civil rights. It must begin, however, with the firm conviction that the principle is no longer in doubt. The day is past for tolerating vicious and inhuman opposition on a subject which determines the lives of 20 million Americans. We are no longer discussing the wisdom of democracy over monarchism—and we would not permit hoodlum royalists to terrorize the streets of our major cities or the legislative halls of our States. We must decide that in a new era, there must be new thinking. If we fail to make this positive decision, an awakening world will conclude that we have become a fossil nation, morally and politically; and no floods of refrigerators, automobiles, or color TV sets will rejuvenate our image.

The second element in a new approach is the recognition by the Federal Government that it has sufficient power at its disposal to guide us through the changes ahead. The intolerably slow pace of civil rights is due at least as much to the limits which the Federal Government has imposed on its own actions as it is to the actions of the segregationist opposition.

If we examine the total of all judicial, executive and legislative acts of the past three decades and balance them against the sum needed to achieve fundamental change, two startling conclusions are inescapable. The first is the hopeless inadequacy of measures adopted—pitifully insufficient in scope and limited in conception. The second conclusion is even more disturbing. Federal action has been not only inadequate; viewed as a whole, it has also been self-nullifying. In 1954, the Supreme Court declared school segregation to be unconstitutional. Yet, since then Federal executive agencies and vast Federal legislative programs have given millions of dollars yearly to educational institutions which continue to violate the Supreme Court decision.

Further, the Federal Government collects taxes from all citizens, Negro and white, which it is constitutionally obligated to use for the benefit of all; yet, billions of these tax dollars have gone to support housing programs and hospital and airport construction in which discrimination is an open and notorious practice. Private firms which either totally exclude Negroes from the work force, or place them in discriminatory status, receive billions of dollars annually in Government contracts. The Federal Government permits elections and seats representatives in its legislative chambers in disregard of the fact that millions of Negro citizens have no vote. It directly employs millions in its various agencies and departments; yet its employment practices, especially in Southern States, are rife with discrimination.

These illustrations can be multiplied many times. The shocking fact is that while the Government moves sluggishly, and in patchwork fashion, to achieve equal rights for all citizens, in the daily conduct of its own massive economic and social activities it participates directly and indirectly in the denial of these rights. We must face the tragic fact that the Federal Government is the Nation's highest investor in segregation.

Therefore, a primary goal of a well-meaning administration should be a thorough examination of its own operations and the development of a rigorous program to wipe out immediately every vestige of Federal support and sponsorship of discrimination. Such a program would serve not only to attack the problem centrally, where results

can be produced, but collaterally to educate and influence the whole American populace, especially in the Deep South of massive resistance.. It would also be the first step in the evolution of Federal leadership to guide the entire Nation to its new democratic goals.

There is impressive precedent in recent history for massive governmental mobilization to create new conditions. As a consequence of economic crisis in the early thirties, the Federal Government, under the leadership of President Kennedy's party, undertook to change fundamental economic relationships. Every person in the Nation was affected. In a bewilderingly brief period, wages were regulated at new levels, unemployment insurance created, relief agencies set up, public works planned and executed. Regulatory legislation covering banking, the stock market, and money market was immediately enacted. Laws protecting trade-union organization were brought into being and administrative agencies to interpret and enforce the labor laws were created. Along with this broad assault on the depression went an educational campaign to facilitate the changes in public psychology requisite to the acceptance of such formidable alternatives to old thought patterns. The Nation which 5 years earlier viewed Federal intervention on any level as collectivism or socialism, in amazingly swift transition, supported the new role of Government as appropriate and justified.

These breathtaking, fundamental changes took place because a leadership emerged that was both determined and bold, that rejected inhibitions imposed by old traditions and habits. It utilized all agencies and organs of government in a massive drive to change a situation which imperiled the very existence of our society.

Viewed in this light, an administration with good will, sincerely besirious of eliminating discrimination from American life, could accomplish its goal by mobilizing the immense resources of the organs of government and throwing them into every area where the problem appears. There are at least three vital areas in which the President can work to bring about effective solutions.

First, there is the legislative area. The President could take the offensive, despite Southern opposition, by fighting for a really far-reaching legislative program. With resolute Presidential leadership, a majority in both Houses could be persuaded to pass meaningful laws. A determined majority-party leadership possesses the means to carry the reluctant along—and to hasten the end of the political careers, or the privileges, of those who prove unyielding. The influence the President can exert upon Congress when, with crusading zeal, he summons support from the Nation has been demonstrated more than once in the past.

An example of an area in which a vigorous President could significantly influence Congress is that of voter registration. The Civil Rights Commission has revealed that many Negro American citizens find it difficult, and often impossible, to vote. It went on to assert that these voting denials are accomplished through the creation of legal impediments, administrative obstacles and the fear of economic reprisal and physical harm. A truly decisive President would work passionately and unrelentingly to change these shameful conditions. He would take such a creative general proposal as that madé by the Civil Rights Commission of 1959 on Federal registrars to insure the right to vote, and would campaign on the Hill and across the Nation until Congress acted. He would also have the courage to insist that, in compliance with the 14th amendment, a State's representation in Congress be reduced in proportion to the number of citizens denied the right to vote because of race [see "Forgotten Remedy for the Voteless Negro," by Thomas I. Emerson and Arthur E. Bonfield, the Nation, January 21].

This approach would help us eliminate the defeatist psychology engendered by the alliance of Dixiecrats and Northern reactionaries in Congress. The same alliance, existing in even greater strength, failed in the past to stop legislation that altered patterns just as deeply imbedded in American mores as racial discrimination. It is leadership and determination that counts—and these have been lacking of recent years.

A second area in which the President can make a significant contribution toward the elimination of racial discrimination is that of moral persuasion. The President is the embodiment of the democratic personality of the Nation, both domestically and internationally. His own personal conduct influences and educates. If he were to make it known that he would not participate in any activities in which segregation exists, he would set a clear example for Americans everywhere, of every age, on a simple, easily understood level.

The calling of White House conferences of Negro and white leaders could be extremely useful. The President could serve the great purpose of opening the channels of communication between the races. Many white southerners who, for various reasons, fear to meet with Negro leaders in their own communities would participate unhesitatingly in a biracial conference called by the President.

It is appropriate to note here that, even in the hard core South, a small but growing number of whites are breaking with the old order. These people believe in the morality as well as the constitutionality of integration. Their still, small voices often go unheard amid the louder shouts of defiance, but they are active in the field. They often face problems of ostracism and isolation as a result of their stand. Their isolation and difficulties would be lessened if they were among the invitees to the White House to participate in a conference on desegregation.

No effort to list the President's opportunities to use the prestige of his office to further civil rights could be adequate; from fireside chats to appearances at major events, the list is endless. All that is needed at the outset is a firm resolve to make the Presidency a weapon for this democratic objective; the opportunities would then arise by themselves.

But beyond the legislative area and the employment of Presidential prestige, a weapon of overwhelming significance lies in the executive itself. It is no exaggeration to say that the President could give segregation its death blow through a stroke of the pen. The power inherent in Executive orders has never been exploited; its use in recent years has been microscopic in scope and timid in conception.

Historically, the executive has promulgated orders of extraordinary range and significance. The Emancipation Proclamation was an Executive order. The integration of the Armed Forces grew out of President Truman's Executive Order 8891. Executive orders could require the immediate end to all discrimination in any housing accommodations financed with Federal aid. Executive orders could prohibit any contractor dealing with any Federal agency from practicing discrimination in employment by requiring (a) cancellation of existing contracts, (b) and/or barring violators from bidding, (c) and/or calling in of Government loans of Federal funds extended to violators, (d) and/or requiring renegotiation of payment to exact financial penalties where violations appear after performance of a contract. With such effective penalties, enforcement of fair employment practices would become self-imposed by those enjoying billions of dollars in contracts with Federal agencies.

An Executive order could also bring an immediate end to the discriminatory employment policies of Federal agencies and departments. It is no secret that, despite statutes to the contrary, Negroes are almost totally excluded from skilled, clerical, and supervisory jobs in the Federal Government. A recent report of the President's Committee on Government Employment states "that there is discrimination in Federal employment is unquestionably true." A basic reason for this is that there have never been any sanctions imposed for violations of the law. In a real sense, a President can eliminate discrimination in Federal employment, just as it was eliminated in the military services, by setting up adequately staffed committees with authority to punish those who violate official Government policy from the inside.

We can easily see how an end to discriminatory practices in Federal agencies would have tremendous value in changing attitudes and behavior patterns. If, for instance, the law-enforcement personnel in the FBI were integrated, many persons who now defy Federal law might come under restraints from which they are presently free. If other law-enforcement agencies under the Treasury Department, such as the Internal Revenue Service, the Bureau of Narcotics, the Alcohol Tax Unit, the Secret Service, and Customs had an adequate number of field agents, investigators, and administrators who were Negro, there would be a greater respect for Negroes as well as the assurance that prejudicial behavior in these agencies toward citizens would cease.

Another area in which an Executive order can bring an end to a considerable amount of discrimination is that of health and hospitalization. Under the Hill-Burton Act, the Federal Government grants funds to the States for the construction of hospitals. Since this program began in 1948, more than $100 million a year has gone to the States in direct aid. The Government also makes grants to the States for mental health, maternal and child-care services, and for programs designed to control tuberculosis, cancer, and heart disease. In spite of this sizable Federal support, it is a known fact that most of the federally financed and approved health and hospitalization programs in the South are operated on a segregated basis. In many instances, the Southern Negroes are denied access to them altogether.

The President could wipe out these shameful conditions almost overnight by simply ordering his Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare not to approve grants to States whose plans authorize segregation or denial of service on the basis of race. This type of sanction would bring even the most recalcitrant southerners into line.

There is hardly any area in which Executive leadership is needed more than in housing. Here the Negro confronts the most tragic expression of discrimination; he is consigned to ghettos and overcrowded conditions. And here the North is as guilty as the South.

Unfortunately, the Federal Government has participated directly and indirectly in the perpetuation of housing discrimination. Through the Federal Housing Administration (FHA), the Public Housing Administration (PHA), Urban Renewal Administration (URA), and the Veterans' Administration loan program, the Federal Government makes possible most of the building programs in the United States. Since its creation in 1934, the FHA alone has insured more than $33 billion in mortgages involving millions of homes. As a result of PHA programs, more than 2 million people presently live in more than 2,000 low-rent housing projects in 44 States and the District of Columbia. The URA, which was established in 1954 to help cities eliminate slum and blighted areas, has approved projects in more

than 877 localities. The GI bill of rights authorizes the Veterans' Administration to make loans outright to veterans for the construction of homes. This program has become so extensive that there have been years in which 30 percent of all new urban dwelling units were built with the help of VA loan guarantees.

While most of these housing programs have antidiscrimination clauses, they have done little to end segregated housing. It is a known fact that FHA continues to finance private developers who openly proclaim that none of their homes will be sold to Negroes. The urban renewal program has, in many instances, served to accentuate, even to initiate, segregated neighborhoods. (Since a large percentage of the people to be relocated are Negroes, they are more than likely to be relocated in segregated areas.)

A President seriously concerned about this problem could direct the Housing Administrator to require all participants in Federal housing programs to agree to a policy of open occupancy. Such a policy could be enforced by (a) making it mandatory for all violators to be excluded from future participation in federally financed housing programs and (b) by including a provision in each contract giving the Government the right to declare the entire mortgage debt due and payable upon breach of the agreement.

These are merely illustrations of acts possible of multiplication in many other fields.

Executive policy could reshape the practices and programs of other agencies and departments whose activities affect the welfare of millions. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare could be directed to coordinate its resources to give special aid in those areas of the country where assistance might change local attitudes. The Department could give valuable assistance to local school boards without any additional legislative enactments.

The Department of Agriculture—which doubtless considers civil-rights issues as remote from its purview—could fruitfully reappraise its present operations with a view to taking certain steps that require no new legislative powers. The Department could be of tremendous assistance to Negro farmers who are now denied credit simply because of their desire to exercise their citizenship rights. To wipe out this kind of discrimination would be to transform the lives of hundreds of thousands of Negroes on the land. A department zealous to implement democratic ideals might become a source of security and help to struggling farmers rather than a symbol of hostility and discrimination on the Federal level.

A Justice Department that is imbued with a will to create justice has vast potential. The employment of powerful court orders, enforced by sizable numbers of Federal marshals, would restrain lawless elements now operating with inexcusable license. It should be remembered that in early American history it was the Federal marshal who restored law in frontier communities when local authority broke down.

In the opinion of many authorities Executive power, operating through the Attorney General, opens many hiterto untried avenues for Executive action in the field of school desegregation. There are existing laws under which the Attorney General could go into court and become a force in the current school struggles. Atrophy is not alone a medical phenomenon; it has its counterpart in social and political life. Long years of ignoring this area of law and Executive power have led, indeed, to atrophy; nothing is done, nothing is studied, though new situations arise constantly where existing laws could reasonably be utilized.

Space will not permit a spelling out of all the measures by which every Federal body could contribute to the enforcement of civil rights. This is the task of a master plan. Nor is it necessary to detail a legislative program, nor to list still unused powers inherent in the Judiciary. Justices J. Skelley Wright and W. A. Bootle, in Louisiana and Georgia, respectively, have given examples of the ability of a single Federal district judge to handle the unconstitutional maneuverings of State legislatures.

The purpose of this review is to emphasize that a recognition of the potentials of Federal power is a primary necessity if the fight for full racial equality is to be won. With it, however, must go another indispensable factor—the recognition by the Government of its moral obligation to solve the problem.

A recent visit to India revealed to me the vast opportunities open to a government determined to end discrimination. When it confronted the problem of centuries-old discrimination against the untouchables, India began its thinking at a point that we have not yet reached. Probing its moral responsibilities, it concluded that the country must atone for the immense injustices imposed upon the untouchables. It therefore made provision not alone for equality, but for special treatment to enable the victims of discrimination to leap the gap from backwardness to competence. Thus, millions of rupees are set aside each year to provide scholarships, financial grants, and special employment opportunities for the untouchables. To the argument that this is a new form of discrimination inflicted upon the majority population, the Indian people respond by saying that this is their way of atoning for the injustices and indignities heaped in the past upon their 70 million untouchable brothers.

Although discrimination has not yet been eliminated in India, the atmosphere there differs sharply from that in our country. In India, it is a crime punishable by imprisonment to practice discrimination against an untouchable. But even without this coercion, so successfully has the Government made the issue a matter of moral and ethical responsibility that no Government figure or political leader on any level would dare defend discriminatory practices. One could wish that we here in the United States had reached this level of morality.

To cordinate the widespread activities on the civil rights front, the President should appoint a Secretary of Integration. The appointee should be of the highest qualifications, free from partisan political obligations, imbued with the conviction that the Government of the most powerful nation on earth cannot lack the capacity to accomplish the rapid and complete solution to the problem of racial equality.

These proposals for Federal action do not obviate the necessity for the people themselves to act, of course. An administration of good faith can be strengthened immeasurably by determined popular action. This is the great value of the nonviolent direct-action movement that has engulfed the South. On the one hand, it gives large numbers of people a method of securing moral ends through moral means. On the other hand, it gives support and stimualtion of all those agencies which have the power to bring about meaningful change. Thousands of courageous students, sitting peacefully at lunch counters, can do more to arouse the administration to positive action than all of the verbal and written commentaries on governmental laxity put together.

When our Government determines to ally itself with those of its citizens who are crusading for their freedom within our borders, and lends the might of its resources creatively and unhesitatingly to the struggle, the blight of discrimination will begin rapidly to fade.

History has thrust upon the present administration an indescribably important destiny—to complete a process of democratization which our Nation has taken far too long to develop, but which is our most powerful weapon for earning world respect and emulation. How we deal with this crucial problem of racial discrimination will determine our moral health as individuals, our political health as a nation, our prestige as a leader of the free world. I can think of few better words for the guidance of the new administration than those which concluded the 1946 report of the President's Commission on Civil Rights: "The United States is not so strong, the final triumph of the democratic ideal not so inevitable that we can ignore what the world thinks of us or our record." These words are even more apt today than on the day they were written.

George E. Martin's Editorial Relative to Current Dual Rate Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 2, 1961

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, at this time I wish to bring to your attention and to the attention of my colleagues a thought-provoking editorial recently appearing in the Pacific Shipper relative to current dual rate legislation. I bring the thinking of George E. Martin, the distinguished editor and publisher of the Pacific Shipper, to the Members of Congress at the request of a number of individuals in San Francisco.

Under the able direction of George E. Martin, the Pacific Shipper enjoys a worldwide reputation as an authoritative and influential maritime publication. Because of this, Mr. Speaker, I am confident our colleagues will find this editorial stimulating reading:

EXTEND U.S. JURISPRUDENCE TO INTERNATIONAL COMMERCE?

The mistaken viewpoint of the Government (i.e., the Department of Justice and, possibly, Congress) toward the dual rate system in particular and oversea conferences in general is much the same, in some respects, as the attitude of many officeholders and politicians toward foreign trade. That is to say, they want to lay down the law, and that's that. They seem to think that international commerce can be treated as domestic commerce is treated.

Now the Government has the power to regulate domestic transport and does make a stab at it (whether successfully or not is not within the purview of this dissertation). Nothing comparable with respect to international trade or transport is possible. The United States cannot dictate to foreign-flag carriers except perhaps by denying them access to American ports, and if any such strategy were not circumvented by high-level diplomacy, its enforcement undoubtedly would bring retaliation that would hurt this country about as much as any other, and possibly more. Certainly it would calamitously disrupt world shipping. In any event, the likelihood is so remote that it may be taken as granted that the United States simply cannot dictate to the shipping of other nationals even to the etxent of their services to and from America.

In this partial vacuum of law, the steamship lines of all flags have to regulate them-

selves pretty much as they are able, and governmental interference, from whatever direction, is more apt to be hurtful than helpful. The United States goes about as far as custom will allow when it subsidizes U.S.-flag ships on certain of its most essential trade routes.

The steamship conference is the principal method of effecting self-regulation in oversea transport, and U.S. law recognizes the worth of conferences by exempting their members from the antitrust laws. No one pretends that the conference system is or has been perfect; (who thinks that Government regulation of internal transportation has been, either?). But it is a well-recognized fact that dual (contract/noncontract) rates have given oversea conferences their greatest stability and continuity. No doubt there have been instances of injustice, but nobody has yet come up with anything at once fairer and more effective.

Strangely enough, if the dual rate system were abolished (on the antitrust theory to which the United States adheres, whereas many other nations permit and even encourage cartels), the U.S.-flag carriers as a class would probably be the ones who would suffer the most. They have, by and large, and even in most cases after operating differential subsidies, the heaviest expenses. Indubitably they require consistently higher rates far more than does the shipping of some of the largest maritime powers—notably, and especially in the Pacific, the Japanese.

Yet the U.S. Government is the one that is pursuing the chimera of equal and uniform rates on international traffic, quite as though it had jurisdiction there. Perhaps it should leave these reforms to nations with greater maritime experience who might know better than to attempt them.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Gen. Douglas MacArthur—Soldier-Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the recent conference between President Kenney and Gen. Douglas MacArthur regarding the Cuban situation was in the best tradition of bipartisanship. Indeed, I could think of no better man than General MacArthur for the President to consult in this time of crisis. I recently made some remarks relative to the 10th anniversary of the general's historic speech before a joint session of Congress. I ask unanimous consent to have these remarks entitled "Gen. Douglas MacArthur, Soldier-Statesman," printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR, SOLDIER-STATESMAN

(Remarks by Hon. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, of Maryland)

Mr. President, it is with a great sense of pride for me to commemorate one of the greatest moments in the history of the United States, for it was 10 years ago today that a joint session of Congress had the honor of being addressed by Gen. Douglas MacArthur after his return from Korea.

As I reread this historic speech, it came to my mind that many truths which he expressed in his speech of April 19, 1951, could still apply to the world today. He said:

"The issues are global and so interlocked that to consider the problems of one sector, oblivious to those of another, is but to court disaster for the whole.

"While Asia is commonly referred to as the gateway to Europe, it is no less true that Europe is the gateway to Asia, and the broad influence of the one cannot fail to have its impact upon the other.

"There are those who claim our strength is inadequate to protect on both fronts—that we cannot divide our effort. I can think of no greater expression of defeatism. If a potential enemy can divide his strength on two fronts, it is for us to counter his effort.

"The Communist threat is a global one. Its successful advance in one sector threatens the destruction of every other sector. You cannot appease or otherwise surrender to communism in Asia without simultaneously undermining our efforts to halt its advance in Europe." [1]

We all know too well of the threat of war in Laos as well as the fact that two of the basic tenets of communism as stated by Stalin are "to take all necessary measures to strengthen the national liberation movement in the East," and "to spare no pains or means to assist the proletarian revolutions of the West." [2]

Gen. Douglas MacArthur's rendezvous with history was predetermined, as even his father served the United States in the Far East from the middle of the 19th century until his death; whereas General MacArthur began his service to his country in 1899 when he entered West Point and graduated as one of its most brilliant students—ranking with such great Americans as Robert E. Lee, John J. Pershing, and Jonathan Wainwright.[3]

His life has been one of self-discipline and duty to country. However, I believe, he can best be characterized by his own words when he says: "The man who will not defend his freedom does not deserve to be free." [4] General MacArthur has long been known to be a staunch advocate for a democratic form of government. He proved this is his dealings with the Japanese, for he was without a doubt one of the greatest ambassadors of the American way that we have ever had. No defeated nation had ever been in such a depressed state as Japan after the ordeal of having two atom bombs dropped on two of its major cities, yet Mr. Toshikazu Kase, a Japanese diplomat who accompanied Foreign Minister Shigemitsu as a member of the surrender party on the battleship *Missouri* said the following of the supreme commander:

"He is a man of peace. Never has the truth of the line 'peace has her victories no less renowned than war' been more eloquently demonstrated. He is a man of light. Radiantly, the gathered rays of his magnanimous soul embrace the earth, his footsteps paving the world with light. Is it not a piece of "rare good fortune, I asked myself, that a man of such caliber and character should have been designated as the supreme commander who will shape the destiny of Japan? In the dark hour of our despair and distress, a bright light is ushered in, in the very person of General MacArthur.

"I raised a question whether it would have been possible for us, had we been victorious, to embrace the vanquished with a similar magnanimity. Clearly, it would have been different. Returning from the audience, Shigemitsu told me that the Emperor nodded with a sigh in agreement. Indeed, a distance 'inexpressible by numbers that have name' separates us—America from Japan. After all, we were not beaten on the battlefield by dint of superior arms. We were defeated in the spiritual contest by virtue of a nobler ideal. The real issue was moral—beyond all the powers of algebra to compute.

"The day will come when recorded time, age on age, will seem but a point in retrospect. However, happen what may in the future, this big day on the *Missouri* will stand out as one of the brightest dates in history, with General MacArthur as a shining obelisk in the desert of human endeavor that marks a timeless march onward toward an enduring peace." [5]

We all know of the extreme effort General MacArthur placed on the rebuilding of Japan, and today well appreciate the success of his labors. However, he again led our forces as well as those of the United Nations in the war in Korea, and when victory was in sight was recalled from duty. On his return home, the Nation welcomed a man whom they loved dearly—a man whom all knew understood the Chinese better than anyone else, and he has proven this as only time can verify when he said:

"To understand the changes which now appear upon the Chinese mainland, one must understand the changes in Chinese character and culture over the past 50 years. China up to 50 years ago was completely nonhomogeneous, being compartmented into groups divided against each other. The war-making tendency was almost nonexistent, as they still followed the tenets of the Confucian ideal of pacifist culture. At the turn of the century, under the regime of Chan So Lin, efforts toward greater homogeneity produced the start of a nationalist urge. This was further and more successfully developed under the leadership of Chiang Kai-shek, but has been brought to its greatest fruition under the present regime, to the point that it has now taken on the character of a united nationalism of increasingly dominant aggressive tendencies. Through these past 50 years, the Chinese people have thus become militarized in their concepts and in their ideals. They now constitute excellent soldiers with competent staffs and commanders. This has produced a new and dominant power in Asia which for its own purposes is allied with Soviet Russia, but which in its own concepts and methods has become aggressively imperialistic with a lust for expansion and increased power normal to this type of imperialism. There is little of the ideological concept either one way or another in the Chinese makeup. The standard of living is so low and the capital accumulation has been so thoroughly dissipated by war that the masses are desperate and avid to follow any leadership which seems to promise the alleviation of local stringencies. I have from the beginning believed that the Chinese Communists' support of the North Koreans was the dominant one. Their interests are at present parallel to those of the Soviet, but I believe that the aggressiveness recently displayed not only in Korea, but also in Indochina and Tibet and pointing potentially toward the south, reflects predominantly the same lust for the expansion of power which has animated every would-be conqueror since the beginning of time." [6]

There is no question, I am sure, in the minds of any of my colleagues but that Red China is now as much a threat to the free world as Russia itself.

Therefore, with the Laotian crisis presently challenging us, I would like to draw again on this famous speech of April 19, 1951, when General MacArthur said:

"War's very object is victory—not prolonged indecision. In war, indeed, there can be no substitute for victory.

"There are some who for varying reasons would appease Red China. They are blind to history's clear lesson. For history teaches with unmistakable emphasis that appeasement but begets new and bloodier war. It points to no single instance where the end has justified that means—where appeasement has led to more than a sham peace. Like blackmail, it lays the basis for new and successively greater demands, until, as in blackmail, violence becomes the only other alternative. Why, my soldiers asked of me, surrender military advantages to an enemy in the field? I could not answer. Some may say to avoid spread of the conflict into an all-out war with China; others, to avoid Soviet intervention. Neither explanation seems valid. For China is already engaging with the maximum power it can commit and the Soviet will not necessarily mesh its actions with our moves. Like a cobra, any new enemy will more likely strike whenever

Footnotes at end of table.

it feels that the relativity in military or other potential is in its favor on a worldwide basis." [7]

Let us remember that in the spring of 1951, the United States had the power to make peace, as we alone among the nations of the world had advanced to such a great degree in the development of nuclear energy.

General MacArthur's experience has, as we all know, led him into varied fields of endeavor. His philosophy regarding our own domestic policy was quite clearly stated in a speech before the National Association of Manufacturers in 1954 in which he said:

"It is an unassailable truth, that the science of industry has become a major element in the science of war. The successful conduct of a military campaign now depends upon industrial supremacy. As a consequence, the armed forces of a Nation and its industrial power have become one and inseparable. The integration of the leadership of one into the leadership of the other is not only logical but inescapable. It has become indisputably clear that it is no longer the standing armies now in being, nor the naval and air forces which range freedom's vast frontiers, which stay the bloody specter of willful aggression, but rather a realistic appreciation of our massive potential of industrial power which is so capable of rapidly mounting the means to retaliate and to destroy. Industry has thus become the leavening influence in a world where war and the threat and fear of war would otherwise distort the minds of men and violently react upon the peaceful progress of the human race.

"In the mighty and almost limitless potential of American industry, the brilliance and rugged determination of its leaders; the skill, energy and patriotism of its workers—there has been welded an almost impregnable defense against the evil designs of any who would threaten the security of the American continent. It is indeed the most forceful and convincing argument yet evolved to restrain the irresponsibility of those who would recklessly bring down upon the good and peace-loving peoples of all the nations of the Earth the disaster of total war.

"Belabored by the Communists, their fellow travelers and the socialists, the capitalistic system has even been tacitly repudiated by some capitalists themselves. Succumbing to propaganda, they have wavered in their loyalty to a theory and a practice which has both served them well and built this Nation far beyond the wildest dreams of its architects. It has never failed to maximize the fruits of human energy and creative enterprise. It has never failed to provide the sinews for victory in war and has become now the one great hope in the struggle for peace. Was there ever greater hypocrisy than that which flows from those who castigate private capitalism as an evil to be renounced by human society, while avidly seeking to ensnare its benefits—those who regard American dollars as the panacea for all economic ills, while denouncing and condemning the source of such wealth—those who seek American goods, while scoffing at and deriding the very institutions by which these goods are produced?

"The past 20 years have witnessed an incessant encroachment upon the capitalistic system through the direction of our own public policy. This has left our free economy badly bruised and severely tried. The assault has taken various forms. For political expediency and even baser purposes, efforts have constantly been made by those in power or those seeking to be in power to provoke distrust and strife between industrial owners and industrial workers, between management and labor—to breach the community of purpose and effort which so logically must exist between these two great segments of our industrial economy. The effect of this has been to produce a sense of unrest and antagonism where a firm and confident alliance, built upon a mutuality of faith and understanding and a community of purpose, will not only serve the interests of both, but further the well-being of that third great economic segment, the consuming public.

"Another and yet more serious form of assault upon the capitalistic system has been the increasingly oppressive Government levies upon both capital and profit. The principle underlying such levies has not been to equalize the burden of meeting the legitimate costs of Government by a just and uniform assessment, but has followed instead a conspiratorial design, originally evolved by Karl Marx, to first weaken and then destroy the capitalistic system. Thus, many of our tax laws amount in practical effect to a series of graduated penalties upon the efficiency and the thrift which produces profit and accumulates capital—penalties which strike at the very roots of the incentive to labor, to create and to cheerfully accept the risks and hazards of enterprise in the traditional American pioneering spirit. If the capitalistic system—free enterprise—is to be preserved to the future generations of our people, the course of Government must now be sharply reoriented and America's industrial leadership must assume an invincible and uncompromising defense of that system. Only thereby may there be fostered and "preserved adequate inventive to encourage the thrift, the industry, and the adventure which brought our Nation to its present preeminence among all of the other nations of the earth and which alone can carry it forward in peace and security and progress." [8]

At this point it is well to note that General MacArthur has received the esteemed praise from many great Americans. John Gunther, the well-known author, in his book entitled "The Riddle of MacArthur" said: "He is that rare thing in the modern world, a genuinely high person. This is not put on. It is part of his marrow and essence * * *." [9]

My distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Georgia, Mr. RUSSELL, at the conclusion of 3 days of hearings thanked General MacArthur as follows:

"General MacArthur, I wish to state to you that the 3 days that you have been here with us are without parallel in my legislative experience.

"I have never seen a man subjected to such a barrage of questions in so many fields and so on many varied subjects.

"I marvel at your physical endurance. More than that, I have been profoundly impressed by the vastness of your patience and the thoroughness and the frankness with which you have answered all of the questions that have been propounded.

"We have certainly drawn freely on your vast reservoir of knowledge and experience, not only as a great military captain, but as a civilian administrator of 80 million people.

"We will continue to delve into this matter with the objective of discovering the facts and the truth in order that we may contribute to the workings of democracy, and to enable America to emerge from the very critical situation in which we find ourselves today, safe and secure, and supplying the world the leadership that is necessary to enable us to have the best place on earth to live." [10]

The love and honor the people of Japan felt for Gen. Douglas MacArthur was clearly shown during the summer of 1960 when they bestowed upon him Japan's highest decoration for a foreigner—the Grand Cordon of the Order of the Rising Sun with Paulownia Flowers. In the citation accompanying this award the Japanese expressed their gratitude by saying that General MacArthur gave "great contributions to the postwar reconstruction of Japan and to the development of the immense reservoir of good will that exists between our two nations today." [11] Upon receipt of this award from the Emperor, General MacArthur commented that he could recall "no parallel in history where a great nation has so distinguished its former enemy commander." [12] I am quite sure no such parallel exists and that the significance of the presentation of this award exemplifies the friendship the Japanese people have for the United States.

And even more recently, General MacArthur was rated as "in a class above other Allied commanders in any theater," [13] by Great Britain's top military analyst, Capt. B. H. Liddell Hart.

However, with all these accomplishments behind him and with the great praise bestowed upon him by his fellow man, it might be well for us here in the Congress of the United States to review the remarks of this great soldier statesman at the Founders Day ceremony at the University of Dallas when he said:

"I cite for example such phrases as 'the rate of our national growth,' 'the direction of our national purpose', or 'the promise of our new horizons'. Such slogans are but political jargon little understood by even the most informed of our people, and with issues so obscure as to have little in common with reality. They are 'catchcalls' designed to impress the votes of a bewildered and trusting populace. Their authors know or should know that the 'rate of our national growth' is dependent more than all else on the degree of freedom left for the uninhibited play of our individual initiative and creative energies; they know or should know that 'our national purpose' is simple and supportable by every American—the steady increase in our standard of life and adequate defense of that standard against all pressures at home or abroad; they know or they should know that the only 'new horizons' to which we should as a nation now aspire are not to our left or right but up—not horizontal but vertical—those which measure the well-being and happiness of all the people.

"And how, it might rightly be asked, would a statesman approach the problem, a solution of which directly concerns our 'rate of national growth', the direction of our 'national purpose' and the 'new horizons' of our life?

"He would seek the answer in the basic and immutable principles of the science of government, not in the temporary expediences of popularity and adulation under the guise of the art of government. He would see a violation of the fundamental laws of freedom in our insatiably expanding Federal bureaucracy with its growing controls over our daily lives. He would see that if we reduced the monetary cost of the Federal Government, thus curtailing its bureaucratic power, we would, first, advance our economic growth and consequent standard of living, by lowering the extreme burden of taxation which threatens to reduce us all to a form of involuntary servitude, thereby releasing for constructive purposes our presently suppressed initiative and creative energies; second, insure a sharp curtailment of the growing paternalism inherent in massive Central Government, thereby permitting us once again the freedom to determine the direction of our own lives and to remarshal our resources fully to exploit our opportunities; and third: provide us the chance to pass down to our progeny a solvent rather than a bankrupt nation."

Mr. President, it is imperative for us as the chosen representatives of this great Nation to dwell over the words of wisdom given so freely to us by this truly great American.

---

[1] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 97, pt. 3, 82d Cong., 1st sess., Apr. 19, 1951, p. 4123:

[2] Bouscaren, Anthony T., "Imperial Communism," Public Affairs Press, 1953, p. 13.

[8] Hunt, Frazier, "The Untold Story of Douglas MacArthur," Devin Adair Co., 1954, p. 32.

[9] Miller, Francis Trevelyan, "General Douglas MacArthur—Fighter for Freedom," John C. Winston Co., Chicago, 1942, p. 1.

[5] Whitney, Maj. Gen. Courtney, "MacArthur—His Rendezvous With History," Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1956, pp. 224–225.

[6] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, op. cit., p. 4124.

[7] Ibid., p. 4125.

[8] Whitney, Maj. Gen. Courtney, "MacArthur—His Rendezvous With History," op. cit., pp. 533–535.

[9] Gunther, John, "The Riddle of MacArthur," Harper & Bros., New York, 1950, p. 79.

[10] Military situation in the Far East, hearings before the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, 82d Cong., 1st sess., pt. 1, pp. 318–319.

[11] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 13, pt. 1, June 25, 1960, p. A5518.

[12] Ibid.

[13] U.S. News & World Report, Mar. 20, 1961, p. 28.

Notwithstanding All These Things—Speech Delivered by Hon. A. Boyd Campbell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I submit an outstanding and thought provoking address delivered by the Hon. A. Boyd Campbell, a resident and native Mississippian, and I might add with justifiable pride, a former schoolmate and longtime personal friend, at the annual banquet of the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce on Friday, April 21.

I sincerely believe that many readers of the RECORD will profit by the speech as did the good people of the great State of Virginia who were privileged to hear him.

The address follows:

NOTWITHSTANDING ALL THESE THINGS

I want to take advantage of the fact that I was allowed to choose my own subject by associating myself with you in a few of the preoccupations in which, I have reason to believe, we are currently and mutually engaged.

I shall mention only six of these preoccupations, apprehensions, anxieties, fears and/or frustrations. Call them what you will, they are our daily companions. They are: Politics and business, the Congo, Cuba, civil rights, and the bomb.

While they are not necessarily related, you may recognize a common thread that runs through the fabric of each—the thread of man's groping, inconclusive, and too frequently insincere efforts to govern himself.

Merely to catalog our preoccupations would be a futility. To put them in perspective might be a utility. If I succeed, even partially, our time will have been well spent. If I fail, you will be breaking even, because this speech is costing you nothing.

My qualifications for discussing such complex subjects are nonexistent. Therefore, I shall proceed to do so, starting with a fairly recent event.

POLITICS AND BUSINESS

A few months ago millions of Americans witnessed the spectacle of a nomination for the presidency of the United States being conducted in the atmosphere of a Roman circus. The tumult and the shouting, the moblike demonstrations, the blaming, the bragging and the braying, the lionizing of some of the most unsavory characters in the entertainment world, and the open-eyed gesticulating appeals to Deity to bless the proceedings—all combined to produce a feeling of disgust. Meanwhile, viewers silently questioned if there was not a better way to select a leader whose words and deeds would so greatly affect their lives.

Notwithstanding the repulsion of the performance, we know that if enough of us are convinced that the business of nominating a President is too serious to be a carnival, we can stop it. If we want to make the method dignified, and in conformity with the overwhelming responsibility of the office, we have the power to do so.

Following the conventions, came the campaign. Through modern transportation and communication, America became a community audience. We learned more about the problems of a free society and the diverse methods by which it was proposed to solve them than we had ever known before—and it was all to the good.

Party labels meant less; personalities and principles meant more. In the absorbing interest of political discussion, we did not lose sight of the overriding questions. Foremost among them were:

Who can best lead America through the increasingly complex maze of international crosscurrents?

Who can best redefine our national purpose?

Who can best interpret it to the emerging and uncommitted nations of the world?

Who can best meet the challenge of the mighty forces which would destroy us?

Finally, who can best lead us along that long, upward road to peace with honor?

The answers were not to be found in the fustian claptrap of either party platform. Rather, they were in the minds and hearts of Americans like ourselves, who formed their free and independent judgments.

Notwithstanding all these things, on Friday, January 20, we had a change of Government without revolution or bloodshed. Furthermore, in the great tradition of good sportsmanship, Americans of all creeds, races and parties wished our young President Godspeed as he assumed the awesome responsibility of our country's leadership in this atom-triggered world.

And so, we have a new team in Washington. Now we are being led into the sixties, and every step is fraught with danger, just as it was when our forebears moved into the sixties 100 years ago.

It seems appropriate to recall some words about the times, then and now:

"Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that Nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure."—Lincoln at Gettysburg.

These words are appropriate today, nearly 100 years later. We are still testing whether the Nation can endure.

The test, however, is not that fratricidal armed conflict. It is an external and internal struggle—against the most powerful tyranny that ever infested this planet—the Communist conspiracy. The contest will be a mortal one, and it will be decided in the sixties.

The test will determine if we Americans really believe in freedom. It will determine our commitment to the principles of our political system. It will determine what price we are willing to pay every day of every year to remain free.

I did not come here to be dramatic. I sincerely believe that I am speaking the truth when I say that our country is in the greatest danger in its history. The outcome will be determined, not necessarily in the horrors of nuclear explosions, but in the quiet, unwavering dedication of American men and women who will deeply resolve to meet the obligations that freedom imposes.

I propose to mention only one such obligation. It comes under the general definition of political participation. By that I mean, among other considerations:

Willingness to run for office.

Influencing other qualified people to do likewise, actively working for their election, helping to finance their campaigns, and standing by them after they are elected.

Keeping currently informed on public issues and abandoning forever the old canard that politics is for politicians and not for people—everyday people like ourselves.

We have too long taken our political processes for granted. It is a reproach to us that we do not vote. For too long we have been willing to let George do it—and, actually, George doesn't do it. The responsibilities of American citizenship are personal. They cannot be delegated.

For too long business people have shunned politics on the foolish theory that business should not be mixed with politics. I say to you that business and politics must mix, or we won't have any business.

Organized labor has set a pattern that does great credit to the labor movement. They keep their people informed; they keep them qualified to vote; and they get them to the polls.

I can only hope that American business will learn a lesson from American labor—and whether or not we agree on issues, we can agree on duties.

We in the Deep South, in my opinion, are peculiarly fortunate in the quality of our public servants. We are fortunate in that we are not boss-ridden, and that the incidence of graft and corruption is low.

We must keep it that way. We must return our best public officials to office. We must induce the best qualified people to offer for office and help them get elected. We must be better informed about our problems, foreign and domestic. Whether we like it or not, we are world citizens. The sooner we look this fact squarely in the face, the better it will be.

Notwithstanding the ominous challenge of the sixties, we will meet it if we try—and try hard.

THE CONGO

The frightening events in the Congo horrify us, but they do not mystify us. The mystery is that savages, whose lives have been ordered by the most primitive tribal customs, were expected to understand and assume the responsibilities of a democracy. We are told that many of them thought of freedom as a thing—a magic object which would be given to them. Once possessed, it would guarantee that all men would be rich and none would have to work.

While we have 3,000 years of culture back of us, are we that far ahead of these African primitives in our concepts of freedom? Let us not forget that we are only 3 generations removed from the dark period when 11 States of this Union were ruled and looted by newly enfranchised slaves, to whom freedom meant 40 acres and a mule and the license to preponderate their disfranchised former masters.

Let's take another look to see if we are 3,000 years ahead of the Congolese. They believe that freedom is a sort of heaven where everything will be done for them. We have only to examine the platforms of our two major political parties to find the same concept dressed up in polite palaver.

All of this political sham, economic heresy, and highly placed hypocrisy leaves the American people no opportunity to

register their choice between the liberal and conservative concepts of governmental policy.

Personally, I'd like to have such a choice and, in my opinion, there are thousands of unorganized Americans who feel exactly as I do.

Now let's get back to the Congo.

Notwithstanding the tragic debacle, it serves to remind us again that the veneer of civilization is very thin. From some of today's happenings in our own Southland we learn the same lesson. From the Congo we should learn again, and never forget that freedom is not a franchise nor is liberty a license to act without restraint where the rights of others are involved. Freedom is a spiritual quality which comes from God, and liberty without law is anarchy.

CUBA

Next, Cuba. What would you do? You know what we would have done a generation ago. The Marines would have landed; American lives and property would have been protected, and the situation would have been in hand.

We have been forced by circumstances not of our own making to discontinue diplomatic relations with a neighbor whose freedom was a gift from Uncle Sam.

We are subjected to daily insults from a bewiskered little Communist puppet who speaks with the voice of Castro but the words of Moscow.

While Cubans are lashed into a frenzy of hate, and the international thievery is rampant, we search for an answer and find none. We know that we will not take direct and effective police action, and we know why. It is because of a bear who walks like a man—or a man who walks like a bear. Either way he is a beast—an antichrist who holds in his powerful hands an instrument that could destroy civilization.

Notwithstanding the explosive Cuban situation, it may be that it took this to awaken us to the danger that lurks in all of Latin America. We must mightily resolve that the fire which is raging in Cuba shall be confined to that island.

CIVIL RIGHTS

We are deeply troubled in the South—so deeply that I wonder if you ever experience a feeling of treading a path that seems vaguely familiar, yet you know that you have never passed that way before? I do.

I sometimes have a sensation of walking in sorrow in the footsteps of my Confederate grandfathers. Step by step, they were drawn into the vortex of an overwhelming catastrophe which was not of their making, but from which there was no escape.

There is a striking and tragic parallel in the events of their day and ours. Today, as then, complex sociological and socioeconomic problems have become the hunting ground for political opportunists and professional do-gooders.

Civil rights has become a shibboleth around which a great political battle is being waged. As history repeats itself, a wall of resentment is being built. Human dignity is being offended by those who attempt to penalize one minority to befriend another.

We hear a lot about second-class citizenship from counterfeit sociological messiahs. I am not sure that I know what they are talking about—nor do they—but if second-class citizenship means what I think it does, it will never be abrogated by statute. First-class citizenship is a status that has to be earned. It cannot be attained by an act of Congress, a decision of the Supreme Court, or any other shortcut.

The doctrine of equal civil rights for all men, civilized and savage, saint and sinner, bond and free, is utterly false. It is the stuff on which tyrants feed and free economic and political systems are liquidated.

If we honestly examine this fallacy against the background of Congo and Cuba, we will come up with a more meaningful, more realistic maxim of "unequal civil rights." The unequality would apply to all men in proportion to their unequal capacities to function as citizens of a self-governing society.

Equal civil rights should be earned by learning well and practicing truly the principles of self-discipline, by a proper concept of freedom, and by correctly relating rights and duties.

The opportunity to attain the high privilege of equal civil rights should be open to all, and its achievement should be the reward of individual endeavor, understanding and maturing.

Notwithstanding the questionable motives of the heart-bleeding advocates of equal civil rights and their legislative and judicial victories, we must appraise them in the perspective of history. We must know that the problem is essentially sociological and not political. We must be steadfast, yet patient. We must, above all, maintain an attitude of good will toward those who sincerely disagree with us, and at all costs we must avoid the well-springs of bitterness, which can becloud our reason and shrivel our souls.

As we grapple with this problem, we should take courage from the knowledge that during the tragic era of Reconstruction, our grandparents wrestled with a similar one—a problem of gigantic proportions. They fought, as it were with bare hands, and they won. It is in our hands to prove whether we are worthy sons of so superb a generation.

THE BOMB

Probably the bomb is our most universal and most fearful preoccupation. We have lived with this fear so long that we have learned to bear it. We have learned so much of its awesome power that we no longer attempt to measure it. We simply accept it. In our deep consciousness we know that man has attained the capacity to destroy himself, and we gravely doubt if he has acquired the discipline to restrain himself. Thus, we have with us as a constant companion, the question, "Will the bomb be the end of man?"

I call upon Mississippi's Nobel prize winner, William Faulkner, to assist me with my last "Notwithstanding." He does so in these words:

"I decline to accept the end of man. It is easy enough to say that man is immortal simply because he will endure; that when the last ding-dong of doom has clanged and faded from the last worthless rock hanging tideless in the last red and dying evening, that even then there will still be one more sound: that of his puny, inexhaustible voice, still talking. I refuse to accept this. I believe that man will not merely endure. He will prevail. He is immortal not because he alone among creatures has an inexhaustible voice, but because he has a soul, a spirit capable of compassion, and sacrifice and endurance."

So there we have it—quite a formidable package of preoccupation: Politics and business, the Congo, Cuba, civil rights, and the atom bomb. Notwithstanding all these things, from them we can reappraise our priceless heritage of freedom and rededicate ourselves to its preservation.

In conclusion, I comment to you some magnificant lines from Henry Van Dyke, in which he referred to America as "the blessed land of room enongh where the air is full of sunlight and the flag is full of stars." Here in America the air is full of sunlight and the flag is full of stars—more stars than ever before.

Commerce and Transportation in the Metropolitan Area of Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, Mr. C. Darwin Stolzenbach, who has been nominated by the President to be Administrator of the newly created National Capital Transportation Agency, delivered an address to a combined meeting of the Montgomery County Chamber of Commerce and the Bethesda-Chevy Chase Chamber of Commerce.

In his address, Mr. Stolzenbach showed wisdom which augers well for the future of mass transportation and automobile transportation in the metropolitan area. Recognizing the need for citizen support throughout the area, Mr. Stolzenbach calls for the formation of a Citizen Advisory Committee to keep the Agency informed of the needs and wishes of the metropolitan area.

The address is worth the attention of all who are interested in the important work of providing adequate, convenient, and speedy access to the Nation's Capital.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Stolzenbach's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMERCE AND TRANSPORTATION IN THE METROPOLIS

I am pleased and honored to be here tonight. I want to tell you about one of the most long-sought, wanted, and needed undertakings in the Washington area, the National Capital Transportation Agency. I want to tell you about its past and its present. And I want to put its future up to you.

This agency is concerned with an improved transportation system for the National Capital region. Our focus of attention is on mass transit—that is, the movement of people in public conveyances.

In all this we do not look upon mass transit and the automobile as gladiators engaged in mortal combat. Rather, each complements the other. We must make suitable provision for both. Most of us are now auto riders. But many of us are also potential transit riders if the transit system will take us where we want to go quickly, conveniently, comfortably, and economically. And, the more people ride transit, the happier the motorist.

We are talking about a social organism made up of the counties of Arlington, Fairfax, Loudoun, and Prince William plus the cities of Alexandria and Falls Church in the sovereign State of Virginia, the counties of Montgomery and Prince Georges in the free State of Maryland, and the District of Columbia between, and of course the Government of the United States which has such a vital stake in this region.

In this social organism, as in a human being, the ills of one part affect the other parts—a fact that grows more apparent every time a new highway is opened, a new bus line is started, or a new company hires workers.

Everybody has a stake in this job, but nobody more than the businessman whose

business profits depends on the health of this regional being.

But how can these several counties and cities, two States, and the Federal district agree on a transportation plan and carry it out? Only one level of government can right now exercise the overall leadership required to start us on the road to a coordinated regional transportation system. This is the Federal Government. And that's why the National Capital Transportation Agency was born.

There is so much to be done. But a lot has already been done. The endorsement of a downtown subway by Congress, the Bureau of the Budget, the Washington newspapers, and many civic organizations, is a big step forward. Only a few years ago, anyone who suggested a subway for Washington would have been considered a dreamer. Now there is a widespread realization that a modern underground transportation system is possible and necessary, both to make that city an efficient nerve center for the Federal Government, and to bring the advantages of big-city living within the reach of everyone, city dweller and suburbanite alike.

A second major accomplishment is the tremendous amount of information that was gathered and analyzed in the 4-year mass transportation survey and, since then, by many governmental agencies. This information gives us a big jump on the job of coming up with a well-worked-out program for regional transportation that will stand up under critical inspection by congressional committees, bond underwriters, and John Q. Commuter.

A third accomplishment is steady progress on the construction of a regional freeway system, which simplifies the mass transportation job by reducing the task to realistic size. It also opens up the possibility that freeways and transit can share the same right-of-way along some routes. This can save us a lot of money.

A fourth important development is the growth, during the last 10 years, of governmental institutions of regional scope, capable of doing various parts of the total job. In addition to the National Capital Planning Commission and the National Capital Regional Planning Council, we now have the Washington Metropolitan Regional Conference, with members of each county and city governing body, and representatives from Congress and each State legislature. This organization has worked hard to promote regional solutions to regional problems, with special emphasis on the creation of regional arrangements for transportation. More recently the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission, established by an interstate compact, offers for the first time means of regulating transit service across the District line. Now our National Capital Transportation Agency has joined this roster of complementary, cooperating agencies.

The birth of the National Capital Transportation Agency was attended by cries of urgency from all sides. I'm sure you are all too aware of our growing traffic congestion. You know that it will take time to find the solution. You, here, know better than most people that the area will keep on growing, keep on changing. You know that the movement of people in great numbers is the very lifeblood of all of this growth and change in a healthy metropolitan region.

The mass transportation survey report of 1959 showed how big the problem is. It showed that we cannot rely on the federally financed highway system alone to do the job. It showed that the transportation pathways of a region are like the arteries of our regional man—they have a lot to do with his development.

The transportation survey showed that the several local jurisdictions have no way of getting together to pay the bill for the whole system. This adds up to the fact that if the system is to be truly regional we must have some form of organization responsive to these jurisdictions, and charged with developing a balanced system that will serve all parts of our regional man for the immediate benefit of each part of our regional man.

The National Capital Transportation Agency is a launching mechanism. It will create programs for the construction and operation of improved regional transit service. Programs that can actually be implemented when the county, State, and Federal Governments accept them. Programs giving a concrete picture of the costs and benefits of a balanced mass transportation system. Practical programs resulting from research and development, insuring that your transit system for this region uses all the knowledge that modern science and technology can produce.

What kind of program will the Agency come up with? Congress has directed us to do two kinds of jobs. First, the Agency is to develop a program for the expanded use of existing facilities and services, including the existing railroad lines as well as bus service. This might be called the short-run job. By making some major improvements in transit service in the near future, we can both help to make the region a better place for all of us to live in, and at the same time build up transit ridership to the levels needed to support some major new construction.

Second, the agency is to plan and to build a modern high-speed transit system, including subways in downtown Washington and high-speed service in the outer areas, along freeway rights-of-way where this is feasible. The mass transportation survey plan of 1959 proposed that this system take the form of several spokes extending from downtown Washington to the suburbs. Suburban transit stations would be served by local feeder bus lines and some of them would have good sized parking lots for people driving in from outlying areas and continuing their trip by transit.

Please don't think that this is only a dream. With approval of the authorities concerned, the National Capital Transportation Agency can and will actually begin construction and operation. This is not just another planning Agency. This is a doing Agency.

Congress has given us the seed money—by next year we expect over a million dollars. Congress intends clearly that this Agency will take the lead in developing mass transit for this region. Using the best experts we can find in every necessary field, we will bring up to date and extend the immensely valuable work begun in the mass transportation survey, we will develop specific working programs for transit, using existing routes and new routes. We will work with other agencies to improve traffic and the flow of people, and we will sponsor whatever research is needed to bring you the last word in an economic and efficient transportation system.

The law creating the National Capital Transportation Agency prescribes two steps by which we are to find the best way to manage these operations. First, we will prepare for the President of the United States by November 1962 recommendations on the organization and financing of this project. These will be handed to Congress. Second, the Congress has invited representatives of Maryland, Virginia, the District, and the Federal Government to begin meetings leading to an interstate compact to deal generally with regional problems, among them, transportation.

Now, how do the program of the Agency fit into regional plans? What control do the various jurisdictions have? What about financing—both capital and operating? Will there be operating deficits?

As to the first question, the law says our programs must be coordinated with the plans of the National Capital Planning Commission and the National Capital Regional Planning Council. In the near future these two agencies will present to the public a set of proposals for the growth of the region to the year 2000. We are now working closely with the Commission and the Council, and we will continue to do so.

On the second question, you probably know that this agency's programs must be submitted to the governing bodies of the local jurisdictions for comment and advice. We can count on this as one way of informing the public of our thinking. It certainly will stimulate public discussion of the Agency's plans. Also it will give us important guidance in adapting our programs to the desires of each community.

In addition, our plans must be submitted to private transit companies, the local transit labor unions, and any public regional organizations that may exist, again for advice and comment. Finally, before we can execute any part of the program, the Governors of Maryland and Virginia must approve those portions that affect their respective States. We hope that local governing bodies will use this opportunity to examine the way our programs will affect their own jurisdictions. We also hope this will develop further understanding of their part in the metropolis.

Over and above all this system of referrals and approvals, the agency will have the continuing advice of the Presidentially appointed Advisory Board. This Board will consist of five persons, including one from Maryland, one from Virginia, and one from the District. Also, we have the authority to create additional special advisory groups.

As to the question—where does the money come from—there are many possible answers.

An effectively designed and efficiently operated mass transportation system can be financed from a combination of two sources: user charges, and revenues from new economic and business values created by the system. The Congress has implied that Uncle Sam will assist in putting up some of the initial capital, but it has directed us to look at various possible financing methods and to recommend a solution no later than November 1962.

We hope you read us loud and clear when we say that we are not just another government bureau downtown making arbitrary decisions affecting you. While we will have, subject to approval of the authorities concerned, the power to proceed with the development of a mass transit system, we will actually treat the entire population of the region as our constituency. We strongly recognize the responsibility of the citizens of the rgeion—through their elected representatives—for reaching enough agreement on the main elements of a metropolitan transportation program so that we can go ahead with it as quickly as is physically possible.

You are all naturally concerned with how our activities will affect your business, now and in the future. Obviously when the time comes that we can present specific proposals for transit routes and stations you can then make your own individual evaluations. We will certainly give you this information as soon as it is humanly possible.

In the meanwhile I can point out some of the effects that you all might anticipate. One of the main results of an efficient mass transportation system will be to broaden the market areas and the availability of labor. Both of these effects can make for

better economic efficiency in the conduct of your business.

Furthermore, an effective transportation system can have another important influence on the regional economy—it can increase the attractiveness of the region to new industry, which in turn brings new sources of local purchasing power.

As our programs unfold one of the important things every businessmen will want to examine critically is the idea of locating near new transit stations. The old phrase, "transit creates value," popular among the promoters of trolley car lines in the early 20th century, still has considerable validity. More accurately it is not the transit that creates the values, but the concentration of large numbers of people in a small space. Transit does this, bringing many people into and out of a transit station each day.

In recent years decisions on new business locations have been increasingly determined by the automobile rather than by transit. Retailers have looked for locations near strategic highway intersections. They have taken pains to be sure their customers and employees have ample parking space.

Now, as the suburbs continue to grow, we are likely to see the pendulum swing part of the way back. In the inner suburban areas, which are already built up at fairly high densities, both the business groups and the local government may find real advantages in bringing good transit service into the main commercial areas. The retail center that can tap a growing body of transit riders, as well as people who can travel by foot from nearby apartments and office buildings, will show a larger volume of sales per square foot of land occupied than will a center depending exclusively upon automobile traffic, which requires large amounts of land for parking.

This not only helps the owner of commercial property to earn more on his investment, but it also opens up new profit possibilities for the retailer, as the size of his clientele grows. Also it enables the local government to realize a larger tax revenue.

While the large auto-oriented shopping center is surely here to stay, every retailer would do well to keep an eye on plans for new high-capacity transit routes. These may offer new potentials in some of the inner commercial areas where customer drawing power is now limited by lack of parking space. Even at the outlying shopping centers the possibilities for increasing patronage by improving transit service should not be overlooked.

Probably most important is the stimulus that rapid transit by shrinking travel distances will give to the growth of the suburbs. What we all want, I am sure, is the kind of transportation system that will make possible the sound growth of our region. By helping our region become more efficiently organized and more pleasant to live in, the improved transportation system will contribute to this objective.

Finally, the local governments and their planning commissions can help transit to create new values. There will be a big job of replanning and rebuilding to be done in the vicinity of the new transit stations. Such planning will be essential to the success of the transit system. It will be equally important to the local businessmen who will be waiting to tap the new concentrations of buying power at these locations.

We, in the National Capital Transportation Agency, will look to you for guidance in the development of our programs, and later for support in getting them approved. To help make all this come true, we intend to appoint as one of our advisory groups a committee comprising one representative from each chamber of commerce and board of trade in the region. Through this committee we will keep you informed of our progress, obtain your views on alternative proposals, and encourage you to make some of the necessary studies.

This is what I meant at the start of this talk when I said the future is up to you. Literally, you can help get the wheels rolling for all of us.

Rule of Law Requires Judicial Discipline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, it is fortunate that the right of freedom of speech, on any question, is protected by a constitutional provision that remains inviolate.

Our distinguished colleague, the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, has raised a very provocative question in his observations concerning the importance of requiring strict judicial discipline in the applications of the rule of law and its maintenance, essential to the protection of individual liberties and our republican form of government. He describes, pointedly, that reasonable adherence to the principles of law and judgments established in prior decisions of the courts is an absolute requirement of the rule of law.

He is to be admired for his frankness in his recognition of the rule of law, with its certainty of pronouncement, as opposed to the rule of men, which is subject to the influence of caprices, prejudices, and lack of mental discipline. He points out the steady erosion of the rule of law through the legalistic matrix of minority judicial opinions. Our colleague is positive in his criticism of these opinions. Certainly, he sets forth an indictment of the courts which, if true or not, merits study. His position in these matters is both interesting and challenging. Whether one agrees with his position or not, certainly, we must agree that the courts are not infallible. No one can disagree with his position as to the statement that judicial appointments are of such public interest that, under our democratic process, the appointment of qualified men to occupy high positions in the judiciary must be influenced by public opinion, if we are to make effective the rule of law and its guarantees to the protection of our individual rights; the administration of our institutions and the guarantees of our republican form of government. No legislation should be so rigid as to effect the reasonable discretion of the court.

The following article, from the Friday, April 28, 1961, issue of the Chicago Daily Law Bulletin, presents his views:

[From the Chicago Daily Law Bulletin, Apr. 28, 1961]

STARE DECISIS—RULE OF LAW REQUIRES JUDICIAL DISCIPLINE

(By Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER, chairman, House Committee on Un-American Activities)

Essential to the maintenance of individual liberties and our republican form of government is the rule of law. Indeed this is a basic feature of our society which distinguishes it from the totalitarian—the latter being the rule of men. The rule of law is an egalitarian principle of historic origin and necessity. A principle which declares the equality of men demands a rule of law, that is to say, standards of conduct of general and equal application. The rule of law is likewise a libertarian principle. Tyranny exists in a government of men who are bound by no standards except those of personal whim and prejudice. Accordingly, Alexander Hamilton noted: "It has been frequently remarked, with great propriety, that a voluminous code of laws is one of the inconveniences connected with the advantages of a free government." (Federalist, No. 78.)

I wish particularly to make an observation with reference to the application of the rule of law to the activities of the judiciary—notably the Supreme Court of the United States. Alexander Hamilton followed the above-quoted statement with this: "To avoid an arbitrary discretion in the courts, it is indispensable that they should be bound down by strict rules and precedents, which serve to define and point out their duty in every particular case that comes before them."

There is growing concern among a large number of lawyers, as we observe what appears to be a steady erosion of the rule of law within that body of justices, evident particularly in the opinions of the minority justices, namely, Warren, Black, Douglas, and Brennan. Hamilton was undoubtedly making references to the discipline of the common law, which in its wisdom teaches reasonable adherence to consistency and stare decisis. It is the apparent rejection of this discipline by that minority on the Court which is very properly a matter of comment.

Contempt of Congress cases involving the committee of which I am the chairman, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, have been particularly revealing, in the court's treatment of the first amendment privilege. For example, the dissenting opinions of Justices Black and Douglas in the *Viereck* case (318 U.S. 236) dealing with Nazi talk, endorsed a qualified privilege, whereas in the cases of Wilkinson and Braden, decided February 27, 1961, which dealt with Communist talk, the same justices joined by Warren and Brennan now pronounce an absolute privilege.

Reasonable adherence to principles of law and judgments established in prior decisions is a requirement of the rule of law, and plainly a demand of liberty and fairness. There must be some predictability in the law for those who must live by it and equal treatment to those who must come before the same tribunal—and indeed the same judges—for judgment. The doctrine of stare decisis is a recognition of the rule of law, with its certainty, as opposed to the rule of men, with their caprices and prejudices.

This points up another and related issue of equal importance in maintaining the rule of law. What kind of men are we selecting to administer the rule of law? If the rule of law is to be a reality, it is evident that our justices be men who accept its discipline—and men of mental balance and intellectual stability. It is therefore incumbent upon the bar to engage in determined political activity in the area of judicial appointments, to utilize the democratic process in the creation of public opinion, to assure the appointment of qualified men to occupy high stations—if we are to make effective the rule of law.

Policy for Growth—Address by the Secretary of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on Monday, April 24, 1961, I was among those who had the privilege of listening to a heartening and forceful address delivered by Hon. Luther H. Hodges before the National Press Club.

There has been no doubt in my mind at any time since the nomination of Governor Hodges to be Secretary of Commerce was confirmed that under his able leadership the Department is entering a new era and has a new concept of its responsibilities.

As Secretary Hodges expressed it in his address to the Washington press corps:

There is no place for a passive service department.

The new Secretary is a man of action, and he intends to get things done. Already he has taken effective steps to beef up our export trade, to recognize and strengthen the role of science and technology in our economy, to promote traffic safety, and to close the annual $1.1 billion travel gap.

As chairman of the Committee on Commerce, which has legislative jurisdiction over most of the activities of the Department of Commerce, I think I can assure Secretary Hodges of the committee's cooperation in his efforts to revitalize the Department and its role of strengthening our trade, both foreign and domestic, our transportation, and our technology in the national interest.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address entitled "Policy for Growth," delivered by Secretary of Commerce Hodges before the National Press Club on April 24, 1961, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLICY FOR GROWTH

(Address by Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges to the National Press Club, Washington, D.C., Monday, April 24, 1961)

I appreciate, President Cosgrove, your invitation to speak here today. I am just back from a 4-day trip to the Pacific Northwest where I met with trade groups and saw firsthand how a community and a region can help in promoting exports. Next week, I am off to Europe for 10 days to help sell American exports and do what I can to push forward our urgent program of export expansion and two-way international travel.

With all this moving around, it's a pleasure, as the visitor says, to be in Washington. And it's a particular honor and treat to be able to talk to you today.

Jefferson used to say that when a man assumes public office, he should consider himself as public property. I don't know how many of you are avid to claim me as a public possession, but I do know I feel a very real obligation to make myself as available as I can to the public, and mainly through you, the press.

Since February, as you're probably aware, I have been holding news conferences regularly every other Tuesday, and we have had other sessions as important stories came along. I intend to continue this practice and to see to it that in every way you have the broadest access possible to Commerce information. You and the public are entitled to know exactly what we are doing in the Department and, equally important, what we are not doing that we should do.

Incidentally, in case you haven't guessed it, I enjoy meeting the press. And I don't mind your questions, even the barbed ones. And I like your overall fairness and thank you for it.

Here today I would like to take these few minutes to talk about some things we seldom seem to get around to in press conferences. Specifically, I want to tell you a little of my thinking about the Commerce Department—what I see as its role in the economy, and what we are doing now, and hope to do, to make it a more vigorous and effective instrument for national growth.

To be frank, until last December I really had not thought much at all about Commerce, let alone the job of being its Secretary. Naturally, I took a part in the Kennedy campaign. My role, mainly, was to combat as best I could the religious issue and to say to my many conservative friends that the President, while progressive and imaginative, was very much a fiscal conservative and a sound-money man.

These things I did out of belief and loyalty. A Cabinet job, or any other post in Washington, was never discussed during the campaign. In fact, until the President called me in early December, the only future I was sure of was that I was going to be the ex-Governor of North Carolina.

Today, almost exactly 3 months after the inauguration, I am happily a part of the New Frontier, and I have seen enough of the Commerce Department to develop some fairly fixed views about the Department and its possible service. Today, I am going to talk mainly about two of these views.

First, although Commerce is the Government Department primarily concerned with business and industry, it is not a tool of industry, not its automatic spokesman. Its role is to serve business only as this serves the country. The interests of the Nation come first. You will never hear from me that this country should do this or that simply because business wants it. What is good for General Motors may, or may not, be good for the country.

In his own way, the President, I think, expressed this same attitude when he spoke to the National Industrial Conference Board early in February. As you may remember, he said that the hope and aim of this administration was an alliance with business in which both the public and private sectors of the economy would, by playing their proper roles, promote national growth.

Now, in my mind, an alliance prescribes a quite definite relationship—a joining together of independent parties to pursue common goals. From the standpoint of this administration, alliance means we will seek to understand the problems of business, and to assist in their solution. We will not harass or regulate it needlessly, but will work to promote its growth and prosperity.

By the same token, we as allies of business are not obliged to act in any way which runs counter to our own interests, which are those of the Nation. In short, this administration and we at Commerce are at once joined with business yet separate from it. We are its friend, but not its unquestioning servant; its sympathetic counselor, but not its conspirator. All of this, I am sure, business as a whole understands and commends.

A few weeks ago, you probably know, I made some suggestions to the Business Advisory Council, which led to certain changes in its organization and the opening up to the press of any meetings where Government officials speak. Now the reason I did this traces from what I have just described—my conviction that Commerce must act primarily for the country as a whole, not just one segment of it.

I have no reason to think that members of the advisory council ever gained advantage from, or misused, the information they got from Government officials at private meetings. But that's not the point. Whatever was told them officially by Government people should have been available to everyone—the rest of business and all the public.

The second conviction I have about the Commerce Department is this: whatever its role has been in the past, Commerce today must be an active stimulator of business, a goad to economic growth.

Within this Kennedy administration, pledged to a new vigor in American affairs, there is no place for a passive service department, one which acts only when asked. This is doubly true in the area of economic affairs where today there is not only need for immediate action, but for long-range stimulation of the economy so that it can fulfill its growth potential.

As Walter Heller, the President's economic counsel, has said, "economic recovery in 1961 is far more than a cyclical problem. It is also a problem of chronic slack in the economy—the growing gap between what we can produce and what we do produce."

Had we fulfilled even our available growth potential last year, we would have added about $500 per American household to our gross national product. This would have been almost twice the amount spent on public education by all the governments in the United States and about one and one-half times the total that went into new homes last year. With the extra output, upwards of 1.5 million of our unemployed workers would have jobs. Personal income would have been $20 billion higher than it was, and corporate profits $5 billion above their actual level.

All this could have been realized with available manpower, materials, and machines. The only missing element was the momentum to carry us forward.

This problem of momentum, of catching up with the potential of our domestic economy, exists over and beyond the temporary necessity for ridding ourselves of the recession. We are going to get out of this recession, of course. There are ample grounds now for confidence. But there is little likelihood we can restore momentum to the economy by the relatively simple measures needed to correct cyclical slides. To revive lagging growth requires something far more ambitious—a truly national effort by industry and government to improve technology, lower production and marketing costs, and devise new and superior products, all under conditions of price stability.

In my mind, the Department of Commerce must undertake a leading role in this effort. I feel it has both the ability and the obligation to make important contributions to the drive to achieve our economic potential. Indeed, except that it already has an official name, we might well call Commerce today the Department of Economic Progress. For its function, as I see it, is to help move this economy forward as rapidly as possible.

Now I am well aware of the reputation that Commerce has had over the years. The gentler phrases have referred to it as a departmental counterpart of the Smithsonian—a sort of Nation's attic of agencies—a sub-

sidized publishing house, or, as one of my predecessors implied, a woods littered with poison oak. I have even heard it suggested that since our main building is built over the Tiber Creek, this has inevitably produced a sogginess of atmosphere and a definite wetness to our statistics.

Even in North Carolina, some of my friends, after I was appointed, dredged up old cliches. One of them, who knew of my habit of jingling coins in my pocket when I get impatient, suggested that, at most, my pocket linings would last about 3 months.

Well, I haven't worn out the pockets yet. And the reason I haven't is that in these last few months I have seen a real mood of vitality take hold in Commerce, an eagerness to do more and to pick up responsibilities for economic growth. In fact, right now I sort of feel like "Cousin Ed" Murrow when he remarked about the young people in his agency. Ed said: "These young folks want to work until 2 a.m., and I find I must quit at 1 a.m."

All right, you say, what are you making out of this added drive. What exactly are you doing in substance to get this economy moving forward?

I think you already know a good bit about our program to increase American exports and create new markets for our goods. Today out of 300,000 or so manufacturing enterprises, only about 12,000 are actively exporting. We are trying to raise this small representation, to get more companies to take advantage of the potential for oversea sales. We have developed a complete export program, showing firms and especially smaller ones, just how they can enter the market abroad. And we are getting news of export opportunities to businessmen more quickly than was ever true in the past.

At the same time, we have stepped up efforts to broaden the oversea market for American goods and encourage new demand for our products. We have increased the number of our trade missions overseas; this year we plan to send 17 abroad, compared with 11 in 1960. We have also raised our participation in trade fairs, and have strengthened our commercial offices throughout the world. Further, we have plans for more permanent trade centers abroad. The first, as you know, opens in London in June.

Just in the past few weeks, Commerce and the State Departments started a series of meetings to determine what further assistance the Government should give to the companies that want to start factories overseas or invest in existing operations. We have in mind, particularly, the developing countries where some type of monetary guarantee against expropriation and startup costs may be required. While foreign investment does not return dollars immediately, as exports do, in the long run, such investments pay off.

In the field of travel, where there was a $1.1 billion gap last year, we are also moving ahead to stimulate business. We expect soon to have congressional sanction of the first program in history designed to promote travel to the United States.

Once the bill becomes law, we will establish travel information centers overseas and mount an energetic advertising and promotion campaign. In the meantime, we have started shipping abroad in a modest way travel information, materials, and posters for distribution to travel agencies, airlines, and others.

As you know, the assignment to administer the distressed areas program will shortly be lodged in Commerce. This will be a most important lever for growth in the American economy. The program is one of the keys to rebuilding and revitalizing this industrial soil of ours. It will have, I am sure, a marked impact on one of our most urgent problems, structural unemployment.

The President has asked for this new program. We intend to use it with incisiveness. We will try not to allow its administration to shift the burdens of economic difficulty from one community to another. We will help labor surplus areas, but we will act to the good of the total economy, rather than just its regional components.

I could go on about other efforts, but what I really want to single out today is our plans for science and technology. Research is perhaps the most important tool of all in spurring the economy toward full employment and prosperity. It alone holds the answer to new and superior products which will enable industry to command new markets here and abroad.

Whether you realize it or not, the Department of Commerce today represents the Nation's largest nonmilitary scientific capability. Within its walls are the research resources of the National Bureau of Standards, the Weather Bureau, the Bureau of the Census, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Maritime Administration, and the Bureau of Public Roads. The scientific work of these agencies touch much of the economy and they vitally and directly affect the national security.

We have asked Congress to strengthen the research role of Commerce by authorizing an Assistant Secretary of Science and Technology. Specifically, this new Secretary would be in charge of all the research functions carried out by the Department. But he would also work closely with industry, and particularly those which are lagging in their own research and development. Together with business, he would seek ways to increase and quicken their scientific efforts.

Let me cite just a few things we have in mind.

The Federal Government is now spending some $3 billion a year on public roads. Yet there has been relatively little spent for research in two crucial areas: safety and lower cost roads.

We pay a terrible price in traffic deaths, and we know roads can be made safer. How do we do it? How can we design and construct highways so that surface, route, access, and lighting all add up to a maximum safety factor? The answer, if it is to be found, lies in research.

Can a better, lower cost road be developed? A 5-percent reduction in construction cost would save some $150 million a year. And think of the savings in maintenance expense from a road that was really winterproof.

Another case, the Federal Government subsidizes our maritime fleet at a cost of some $350 million. It has been suggested that we may be subsidizing mediocrity. We ought to find out. The maritime industry and the Government together should undertake research to see if there aren't ways to reduce shipbuilding costs and operating costs which are now so badly out of line with those of foreign countries.

In the National Bureau of Standards all the standards and measurements used in the Nation are established. Today we have what is called a "measurement pinch." Our technology has progressed to such refined point that we have to find new methods of measuring things—temperature, pressure, space (both big space and infinitely small space). Without these methods we are deadended.

If we are to produce energy of millions of pounds of thrust, we must find efficient ways of measuring millions of pounds of thrust. If we are to produce interchangeable parts of tolerances of hundreds of thousandths of an inch, we must find easy ways of measuring hundreds of thousandths of inches. The National Bureau of Standards is the Nation's yardstick, and you can't produce goods without a yardstick.

The Patent Office, soon to celebrate its 125th anniversary, is the direct reflection of the state of the country's capacity to invent. And invention is our life blood. Right now we have a 3-year backlog in the Patent Office. A patent for a new complex data processing invention can take as long as 17 months to research. If our inventive genius is to flourish, it should not be subject to this kind of delay and frustration.

But entirely new techniques of automated search are needed to break this backlog. Literally a new language must be invented that can be used in electronic data processing machines. When we do invent it, I'll tell you one thing: We won't patent it, and add another 17 months to time lag.

In our Weather Bureau we are working with the new satellites for global weather observations. We are researching problems in weather alteration. A new project on tornado prediction and forecasting has just begun. Industrial traffic flow and inventory control will before long depend on extended forecasts from Commerce's Weather Bureau. It is so easy to visualize the losses in human life, crop damage, and retail close-outs that could be eliminated.

These functions need national support and national status, if we are to achieve the scientific progress that the pace of technology demands of us. Industry must have these scientific icebreakers to open the way to further growth and progress. And it must also have new programs designed specifically to advance productivity by grasping the gains offered by automation and atomic energy.

Now just one final word about Commerce and its role as a stimulator.

I have been much concerned lately by the black marks that business has been getting in the news. I mean, of course, the price-fixing scandals. The conspiracy in the electrical industry has shocked the Nation. And I am very much afraid that it is in for more shocks in the months ahead.

This collusion, this price-fixing is an unjustifiable thing. It should be exposed, punished, stamped out. We are right to treat for what it is, a bad blot on the record. But, and this is my point, we should not treat it for more than it is.

The real spirit of American business is not represented by these price fixers. The real spirit belongs to the thousands of businessmen who recognize their public responsibilities and who run their affairs honestly and ethically.

What I am most afraid of is that a handful of businessmen, who deserve public censure, may impair the good standing of all of business. If this should happen, the damage would be great—loss of public support, and worse yet, public faith.

I do not accept a passive role in this problem. I think the Commerce Department can and must help call attention to the principles of business conduct, which most businessmen observe and which all should.

After consultation with the President, I have asked a group of distinguished individuals to prepare for me what I hope may come to be a code of ethical practices for American business. My distinguished colleague, Secretary Goldberg, some years ago made a significant contribution to the American labor movement and all of the country when he developed labor's ethical codes. I hope, with the help of the people I have asked to suggest a set of standards, that I can make some similar contribution for business conduct.

I am confident that this administration, working with enlightened management and enlightened labor, can achieve in 1960's an era of record growth and prosperity. We can move far toward the elimination of poverty and unemployment and toward a fuller life for all our people.

The President is determined that the record of the sixties shall be one consistent with our potential. His economic program is both

farsighted and sound. We at Commerce will use our full resources to implement this program and to assist, entice, and prod business to achieve under it the kind of economic growth we must have to meet our national and international obligations.

Thank you for letting me come and talk with you.

Land-Grant Colleges: A Continuing Step Toward Education for All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following because I strongly believe in the benefits that can be derived from higher education for all of our qualified citizens. I appeared before the Select Subcommittee on Education on April 13, 1961, to speak in favor of H.R. 4386, which provides for continuing education programs stemming from colleges and universities. I hope my colleagues will find the remarks that follow of interest:

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE JAMES ROOSEVELT, OF CALIFORNIA, ON H.R. 4386, BEFORE THE SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, APRIL 13, 1961

Mr. Chairman, it is my great pleasure to appear before your committee and support the bill H.R. 4386, providing for continuing education programs stemming from colleges and universities.

As has been made clear, the purpose of this bill is to establish a publicly supported program of general education, to be operated by State universities and land-grant colleges.

I know of few greater challenges in the educational field than those sought to be met and fulfilled by the bill. Technical and social change is occurring in our time at an astonishing pace. Economic and social problems are becoming increasingly complex with the issue of automation adding its own fuel to this problem.

On the international scene we are witnessing as never before the greatest possible challenges to our democratic form of government. The effectiveness of our leadership in the years to come will be measured in part by the degree to which we solve our national problems; and the democratic manner in which these problems are met.

The growing importance of education and the changing relationship of government to education was clearly restated in the now famous school desegregation cases, decided May 17, 1954, in the following language by a unanimous Supreme Court:

"In approaching this problem we cannot turn the clock back to 1868 when the amendment was adopted, or even to 1896 when *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* was written. We must consider public education in the light of its full development and its present place in American life throughout the Nation. Only in this way can it be determined if segregation in public schools deprives these plaintiffs of the equal protection of the laws.

"Today, education is perhaps the most important function of State and local governments. Compulsory school-attendance laws and the great expenditures for education both demonstrate our recognition of the importance of education to our democratic society. It is required in the performance of our most basic public responsibilities, even service in the Armed Forces. It is the very foundation of good citizenship. Today it is a principal intrument in awakening the child to cultural values, in preparing him for later professional training, and in helping him to adjust normally to his environment. In these days, it is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity of an education. Such an opportunity, where the State has undertaken to provide it, is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms."

From the earliest days of the Republic the Federal Government has made grants of land or funds to States to assist them in carrying out certain services that are "clothed with a national interest."

One hundred years ago, Congress began its support of State land-grant colleges and universities. In the colonial days higher education in this country was available only in a few institutions, such as Harvard, Yale, and William and Mary. These institutions at different times were subject to varying degrees of public control, but were essentially private. After the Revolutionary War the States began to organize universities as publicly controlled institutions. They were not essentially different from the privately controlled ones which by that time had grown relatively strong and were setting the pace for the development of collegiate education throughout the country.

During the first half of the 19th century the two types of colleges and universities, publicly and privately controlled, developed side by side. Both were greatly influenced naturally by the European universities of which their leading professors were commonly products. But these European universities were organized to serve a society not predominantly democratic. University education was for the leisure classes, the government leaders, and members of the professions.

The American institutions, functioning in somewhat the same fashion, maintained chiefly the classical and professional curricula. They made only slight adaptations to the needs of a pioneer people. A study of such fields as agriculture and the mechanic arts was beneath their academic dignity.

The mild protest against this too exclusively classical type of college and university, grew into a widespread agitation by the middle of the 19th century. Agricultural societies in many States were insisting that there must be available colleges where agriculture could be studied. The already established colleges and universities remained largely uninfluenced, however, by this agitation. Hence, during the 1850's the Congress debated the issue and finally passed the Morrill Act of 1859. President Buchanan vetoed it essentially on the ground that it was in violation of the traditional policy of the Federal Government which had up to that time left the control of education to the States. In 1862 the Morrill Act was again passed and was signed by President Lincoln.

The fundamental purpose of the Morrill Act was to insure the development in each State of at least one college adapted to the educational needs of the agricultural and industrial classes. Without too much regard to the academic traditions which largely controlled the colleges and universities of the time, these new institutions to be known as land-grant colleges, were to afford a type of education which would foster the development of agriculture and the mechanic arts. Each State was left to decide whether this new college should be made a part of an already existing institution (commonly the State University) or whether it should be a completely separate institution. By the time 48 States were admitted into the Union, more than a score of them had developed both a State university and a land-grant college or university on separate campuses, usually under separate boards of control. A number of States which established separate land-grant institutions have in recent decades joined their State universities and their land-grant colleges or universities under single boards in their efforts to coordinate the programs of the two institutions in a given State. A few States, notably New York, New Jersey, Delaware, and Pennsylvania, utilize as land-grant institutions, universities with varying degrees of private control.

Thus has grown up a system of colleges and universities managed by each State but conforming to certain broad policy stipulations of Federal law. The Federal support contemplated in the initial Morrill Act was to be the income from public land (30,000 acres for each Representative and Senator in Congress or equivalent in scrip) made available in each State. The State was expected to contribute to the maintenance of its land-grant institution as well as to provide its buildings.

From this modest beginning the Federal Government has expanded its contributions to the land-grant colleges and universities. Recognizing the need for research as a basis for developing agriculture, the Congress passed the Hatch Act in 1887 setting up in the land-grant institutions the system of agricultural experiment stations. In 1890 the second Morrill Act was passed supplementing by direct appropriation the income from the land grants for instruction. In 1914 the Smith-Lever Act was passed establishing the system of cooperative extension services to bring the adults the benefits of current developments in the field of agriculture. Thus, over a period of little more than half a century these institutions, designed to foster a program of education suited to the needs of the agricultural and industrial classes, had been established on a foundation of research, and encompassed a program for both the youth of the campus and the adult population throughout the rural areas of the State.

Throughout the recent decades numerous acts have been passed expanding the scope and increasing the support of all three aspects of their programs—research, campus instruction, and extension education. Now in addition to the income from the original land grants the appropriations of Federal funds to aid the States in the maintenance of the land-grant institutions amount to more than $300 million annually.

These funds are distributed to the States on a variety of bases. Some funds go in equal amounts to all States, some to the States on the basis of their farm populations, etc. The funds for campus instruction are distributed and administered by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. The funds for experiment stations and extension education are distributed and administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

These land-grant institutions have broadened the base of higher education bringing it within the interest and attainment of vastly larger numbers of people than would otherwise have been reached. The whole realm of higher education in this country, and to a lesser degree even in some other countries, has been profoundly influenced by the developments of the land-grant colleges and universities in popularizing higher education. They have demonstrated the partnership of the Federal and State governments in the maintenance of a system of higher education which is designed to fulfill Federal, State, and local needs. They have spread widely the concept that higher education is something in which all the people have a stake. They have, therefore, a place of deep affection in the hearts of the people. They are growing in strength and influence with each passing decade.

As the committee knows, the present bill carries an annual basic appropriation of

$20,000 to each State. Additionally there is authorized the sum of $5 million to be divided among the several States on a population basis; with the securing of its share of funds of the latter amount being based upon the State providing equal matching sums.

This, Mr. Chairman, raises in my mind a very serious and pressing problem, to which I would respectfully like to direct the attention and study of this committee.

As I emphasized earlier, any discussion of Federal responsibility in the field of education necessitates a consideration of Federal responsibility in civil rights. I would like to conclude therefore with a discussion of the National Government's responsibility in insuring equality under the law in affording educational opportunity.

As I stated before Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Committee on the Judiciary on March 11, 1959, in support of the Civil Rights Act of 1959, I think we are all very much aware that the challenge in this fast-moving 20th century is to bring social progress up to scientific, technological, and material progress. This has always been, down through the centuries, the real and overriding challenge to mankind. And the grave internal and external pressures that face this Nation today further emphasize the need for perfecting our democratic institutions through a recognition that social progress—and certainly implementation of civil rights is part and parcel of such progress—is an indigenous ingredient in democratic concepts and institutions.

In the Morrill Act of 1890 the Congress included a clause requiring that land-grant colleges make no distinction of race or color in admission requirements. It was further provided that "no money shall be paid out under this act to any State or Territory for the support and maintenance of any college where a distinction of race or color is made in the admission of students, but the establishment and maintenance of such colleges separately for white and colored students shall be held to be a compliance with the provisions of this act if the funds received in such State or territory be equitably divided as hereinafter set forth." In consequence of this authorization, 17 of the States have maintained separate land-grant colleges for Negroes.

It is a sad commentary that a program adapted to meet the educational needs of the agricultural and industrial classes should have resulted in a greater disparity between and advantaged majority and a disadvantaged minority of our citizenry.

I feel therefore, Mr. Chairman, that it is a pertinent inquiry by this committee to examine this important matter for it appears to me that all land-grant institutions should open their resident instructions to all qualified students immediately. I should note, however, that some corrective action is now underway; and that through administration of these programs certain of these discrepancies can be rectified.

I am very grateful, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity of appearing before this distinguished committee and supporting a bill and a farsighted program which should provide educational benefits for all our citizens.

A National Lottery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of legislation to legalize a national lottery in the United States as a means of painlessly and voluntarily raising additional Government revenue; regulating and controlling the human urge to gamble; cutting off the underworld from this lucrative industry; reducing our mounting national debt; providing sorely needed tax relief for our American wage earners, I was happy to read that Walter Winchell, columnist for the New York Daily Mirror, supports my position on this disturbing and pressing human problem.

I would like the Members of Congress to read what Mr. Winchell wrote about gambling:

Eradicate gambling. Of course, gambling has always been easy to condemn and impossible to stop. The foregoing is not our opinion, but the judgment of human nature. The biography of humanity attests to the instinctive qualities of the take-a-risk urge. To a greater or lesser degree it has been prevalent in every era and nation. Gambling cannot be obliterated. It can only be legally controlled. Incidentally, those who deplore gambling as an evil which must be erased are reminded of the classic: "You would be surprised to learn how much some people have learned about prayer from playing poker."

Elks Flag Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, one of our great freedoms is our right to organize into civic, patriotic, and fraternal groups and to associate with our friends who share common interests. These lodges and clubs have made outstanding contributions to their communities and to the Nation.

One such organization is the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks. Some of us in the Senate are Elks; and those who are not, recognize, I believe, the leadership the Elks have given to many splendid activities, such as fine youth and old-age programs which extend well beyond their lodge doors.

Mr. H. Jankowski, who is Flag Day chairman for Milwaukee Lodge of Elks, No. 46, has written me regarding the Elks sponsorship of Flag Day programs which will be held this year by all lodges throughout the United States. I heartily commend this program, and ask unanimous consent to have the statement on the purposes of Elk's Flag Day printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELKS FLAG DAY

The purpose of this service is to honor our country's flag, to celebrate the anniversary of its birth, and to revere the achievements wrought beneath its folds. It is quite appropriate that such a service should be held by the Order of Elks, an organization that is distinctively American, intensely patriotic and without counterpart.

Our flag is at once a history, a declaration and a prophecy. It represents the American Nation as it was at its birth; it speaks for what it is today; and it holds the opportunity for the future to add other stars to the glorious constellation.

The Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks is the first and the only fraternal body to require formal observance of Flag Day. In July of 1908, the grand lodge of this order, at Dallas, Tex., then assembled, provided for the annual nationwide observance of Flag Day, by making it mandatory upon each subordinate lodge of the order.

This unique distinction as the originator of Flag Day is most becoming to the Order of Elks, and only loyal American citizens are eligible to join it, and it has no foreign affiliations. It has linked its destiny with that of its country and made this flag its symbol of dedication to God, to country, and to its fellow men.

Tribute to Carmine Bellino

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, Carmine S. Bellino of Elizabeth, N.J., has served his Nation in many ways: as a member of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, as an assistant to J. Edgar Hoover, as chief investigator of the Senate Rackets Committee. He now has the distinction of serving as a special consultant to President John F. Kennedy.

On April 23, 1,200 persons paid tribute to Mr. Bellino in his hometown. Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, who knows from firsthand experience about the abilities of Carmine Bellino, appeared at the testimonial dinner, in Newark, to salute this distinguished citizen of New Jersey.

The Journal, Elizabeth, N.J., described this tribute in an article on April 24 and an editorial on April 25. I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Elizabeth (N.J.) Journal, Apr. 24, 1961]

TWELVE HUNDRED SALUTE BELLINO, AID TO PRESIDENT

(Attorney General Robert Kennedy leads tribute to Elizabethan—cites his work with probers—Chief Executive sends good wishes)

Carmine S. Bellino, an Elizabeth native serving as special consultant to President John F. Kennedy, was honored last night by more than 1,200 persons, including Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy.

Several Members of Congress joined area resident, most of them from Elizabeth, to pay tribute to Mr. Bellino at a testimonial dinner in the Essex House, Newark.

Hundreds of congratulatory telegrams poured in from national figures, including President Kennedy, who wired, "I regret that I can't be with you. My warmest good wishes."

Attorney General Kennedy told the throng that "no name is going to rank higher than that of Carmine Bellino" when the history of committee investiagtions is written.

The Cabinet officer said the Elizabeth native, as chief investigator for the Senate

Rackets Committee, participated in 80 percent of all major investigations.

BROTHER "FEELS FORTUNATE"

"My brother, the President," the Attorney General added, "feels very fortunate to have Carmine Bellino by his side."

Attorney General Kennedy led the audience in a toast to Mr. Bellino's father, Frank Bellino, of 313 South Seventh Street; the memory of his mother, who died last year, and the honored guest and his wife, the former Miss Santina I. Novello, of Elizabeth.

Mr. Bellino's father was unable to attend because of illness, but sent a letter expressing his thanks to the committee which arranged the dinner. The honored guest's seven children were in the audience.

Mayor Steven J. Bercik lauded Mr. Bellino, who, he said, "has brought great credit to the city." He praised the President's special consultant for his "intelligence, integrity, courage and tenacity."

EARLY LIFE RECALLED

Salvatore J. Migliore of Union, dinner cochairman, traced Mr. Bellino's life, starting with their days as classmates at Continental School No. 3.

Mr. Migliore recalled the honored guest's activity as a member of the FBI and his rise to administrative assistant to J. Edgar Hoover, his work on various governmental committees and his appointment as special consultant to the President in January.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. James A. Caulfield, pastor of St. Jane de Chantal Church, Bethesda, Md., told the throng that Mr. Bellino is "a model father," "an appreciative husband," "a most dutiful son," and "a faithful friend."

"My tribute to Carmine Bellino," the clergyman asserted, "is in recognition of the sterling qualities he exemplifies as a member of my parish."

APPRECIATION EXPRESSED

Mr. Bellino, who also acts as an adviser to the director of the national budget, thanked the audience "from the bottom of my heart" for attending the affair.

At the start of his address, he used a greeting in Italian which drew a warm response.

Mr. Bellino recalled the names of various persons, including many Elizabeth residents, to whom he said he is indebted.

"I am grateful," the honored guest declared, "that President Kennedy gave me the opportunity to serve in his administration."

He praised his parents and his wife and said he has been "lucky" because of the people he met in his days in Elizabeth and throughout his career.

Mr. Bellino read a composition written for school by his oldest daughter, Mary Catherine, in which she praised Mrs. Bellino as a mother.

WELCOME BY O'HARA

Daniel J. O'Hara, an Elizabeth attorney who was general chairman of the dinner, welcomed the audience.

Frank J. Holmes, president of International Police Services Inc., Washington, and a former FBI colleague of Mr. Bellino, was toastmaster.

Union County Sheriff Ralph Oriscello, ticket chairman, presented a plaque to the honored guest "in recognition of dedicated experience in the service of his country."

Sheriff Oriscello told the President's special consultant that proceeds of the affair would be used to pay for a new desk and chair he has ordered for his Washington office.

Mr. Bellino also received a tape recorder on which the remarks of the evening's speakers were recorded.

HONORARY BAR MEMBER

Mr. Holmes announced that Mr. Bellino also has been given an honorary membership in the International Bar Association of Okinawa.

Elizabeth City Clerk Thomas P. Luchio presented Mr. Bellino with a guest register. Mrs. Rose Conforti presented flowers to Mrs. Bellino.

Rev. O. Dominic Battistello, S.D.B., pastor of St. Anthony's Church, where Mr. Bellino was active in various organizations, gave the invocation and closing prayer. Mrs. Edith Borello sang the national anthem.

Among those introduced to the throng were Mrs. Kennedy, Miss Angela Novello, an Elizabeth native who is secretary to the Attorney General; U.S. Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., of Westfield; U.S. Senator PAT MCNAMARA of Michigan.

CONGRESSMEN INTRODUCED

Representative Dominick V. Daniels, of Jersey City; Representative Peter Rodino, Jr., of Newark; Representative Alfred E. Santangelo, of New York; Dr. Vito V. Bellino, brother of the honored guest; and Rev. Daniel Power, S.J., of Georgetown University.

U.S. Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE of Rahway offered his congratulations to Mr. Bellino, but did not stay for dinner because of another engagement.

Telegrams of congratulations were received from U.S. Senators John L. McClellan, of Arkansas; Henry M. Jackson, of Washington; John O. Pastore, of Rhode Island, and Thomas J. Dodd, of Connecticut; and FBI Director Hoover.

Executive committee members for the dinner also included Recording Secretary Albert T. Caruso, Corresponding Secretary Joseph M. DeMarco; financial secretary, City Treasurer Joseph Manfredi, and Treasurer Michael Lapolla.

Ralph V. Mancini was chairman of arrangements. The general committee totaled about 50 persons.

TRIBUTE TO CARMINE BELLINO

As he reflects on the broad range of tributes paid to him in Newark on Sunday, Carmine S. Bellino must indeed be a happy man.

There was praise from the U.S. Attorney General, from U.S. Senators, from Congressmen, from priests, from officials of Elizabeth, his native city, and from the President himself.

At the other end of the scale were the felicitations of more than 1,200 of his friends and former neighbors, the hard-working, warm-hearted residents of the Peterstown section of Elizabeth.

The universal nature of Mr. Bellino's friendships is an index to universal nature of his character. He is active in his religion and the affairs of his community, devoted to his family and conscientious in his work.

Mr. Bellino, who has brought honor to his old neighborhood and to his native city, merits the honors accorded him by a wide assortment of fellow men.

Church and State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, in view of the current controversy over the proper relationship between the Federal Government and religious educational institutions, I find it encouraging when some educator comes forward with an enlightening explanation of this sensitive problem.

The following letter, printed in the New York Herald Tribune on Sunday, February 26, 1961, has come to my attention. The writer, Father Herbert J. Clancy, a professor of history at Fordham University, offers a crystal clear explanation of this so-called tangled issue. I hope the Members of Congress will take time out to read this letter which, I believe, throws a new light on this subject:

To the NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE:

The tireless assertions of so many well intentioned Americans that governmental aid to church colleges would be an abandonment of the principle of separation of church and state recalls a perceptive observation of Machiavelli. Alluding to the discourses of Savonarola he wrote: "Those ignorant of the subject find them perfect."

The oft-repeated statement about there being "a wall of separation between church and state" is derived from a letter that Thomas Jefferson wrote to the Baptists of Danbury, Conn., on January 1, 1802. It seems more than passing strange that those who quote this celebrated phrase keep wrenching it out of its historical context. What Jefferson wrote was: "Believing with you that religion is a matter which lies solely between man and his God, that he owes account to none other for his faith or his worship, that the legislative powers of Government reach actions only, and not opinions, I contemplate with sovereign reverence that act of the whole American people which declared that their legislature should make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, thus building a wall of separation between church and state."

The "act of the whole American people" that Jefferson refers to is of course the first amendment. He knew quite well what our Founding Fathers meant by the first article of the Bill of Rights. For in the debates preparatory to the adoption of the first amendment, Madison proposed a wording which read: "No religion shall be established by law, nor shall the equal rights of conscience be infringed." The Senate, wishing to improve on this version, suggested the following: "Congress shall make no law establishing articles of faith or a mode of worship." Finally, as the "Annals of Congress" for 1789 tell us, the Senate approved the final version: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion." At no time did Congress indicate a desire to prohibit itself from aiding religion on a nonpreferential basis. As Madison declared, the intention of the first amendment is that "Congress should not establish a religion and enforce the legal observance of it by law, nor compel men to worship God in any manner contrary to the conscience."

Knowing full well what the architects of our Constitution meant, our early Presidents acted on that knowledge. President Washington in 1789 sent a recommendation to Congress for the allocation of funds for religious education among the Indians. President Jefferson sent to Congress in 1803 a treaty which authorized the United States to give $700 to a Catholic priest working among the Indians, and $300 for the erection of a Catholic church. President Madison continued Jefferson's policy of payments to religious societies for services on Indian reservations.

In fine, a study of the "Annals of Congress" for the year 1789 shows conclusively that the founders of the American Republic did not seek to erect any absolute wall between church and state. On the contrary, they wished to foster all religions.

HERBERT J. CLANCY, S.J.,
Associate Professor of American History, Fordham University, New York.

Senator Ralph Yarborough, Addressing Joint Session of Texas Legislature, Urges Closer Cooperation Between State and National Legislative Bodies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK BROOKS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Legislature of the State of Texas recently passed a concurrent resolution honoring our distinguished senior U.S. Senator from Texas, the Honorable RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, and inviting him to address a joint session of the Texas house and senate.

Senator YARBOROUGH responded with a noteworthy speech eloquently urging closer coordination and cooperation between State and National legislative bodies in the interest of more efficient and responsible government by consent of the governed.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, the text of the aforementioned Texas Senate Concurrent Resolution 38, inviting Senator YARBOROUGH to speak, as well as the text of his stirring address upon that occasion:

There being no objection, the text of the concurrent resolution and the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the senior U.S. Senator from Texas will visit in Texas during the Easter holidays; and

Whereas this outstanding Texan has made many contributions to our great State as a citizen, judge, war veteran, and statesman; and

Whereas it is the desire of the Senate of Texas, the House of Representatives concurring, that the senior U.S. Senator from Texas be invited to address a joint session of the 57th legislature at 11 a.m. on April 6, 1961: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Senate of Texas (the House of Representatives concurring), That Hon. RALPH YARBOROUGH, senior U.S. Senator from Texas, be and he is hereby invited to address a joint session of the 57th legislature in the house of representatives at 11 a.m. on April 6, 1961; and

That an official copy of this resolution of invitation be forwarded to Senator YARBOROUGH by the secretary of the senate.

BEN RAMSEY,
President of the Senate.
JAMES A. TURMAN,
Speaker of the House.
CHARLES SCHNABEL,
Secretary of the Senate.

FEDERAL-STATE PARTNERSHIP

(Speech by U.S. Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, Democrat of Texas, before a joint session of the Texas Legislature at Austin, Thursday, April, 6, 1961, at 11 a.m.)

Mr. Speaker, Lieutenant Governor Ramsey, fellow legislators, friends, Texans, I am grateful to each and every one of you for this privilege of coming again as an invited guest before a joint session of the greatest legislature of the greatest State. I owe a real debt to the Texas Legislature because it was your action 4 years ago this month that turned thumbs down on a change of rules in the middle of the game, while I was engaged in a tough race against highly competent, experienced opposition.

While my service in the U.S. Senate is my first service as a member of a legislative body, I have served with the Texas Legislature in the past as an assistant attorney general under the late beloved James V. Allred, when I had a job during some sessions of drafting bills for some members of the legislature. Those were the depression years of the thirties and Chief Justice Bob Calvert, Judge Sarah Hughes, the late Judge Harry Graves, and Governor Coke Stevenson were among the many influential members here then.

And later your committees were uniformly courteous to me as I appeared before them on unpaid committees of the University of Texas exes, of the State bar, and on behalf of mental hygiene societies, and of the State permanent school fund. I appreciate all of those courtesies, and hope that I may practice some reciprocity when you come before committees of our Senate.

Three times in my life, gubernatorial appointments for State office were confirmed on my behalf by your Senate, even before my good friend Doyle Willis was there to plead my cause, as he has done so many times these past 8 years.

This is a body of influence; your House has produced two distinguished Speakers of the U.S. House of Representatives, Vice President John Nance Garner, and the present record-breaking Speaker, "Mr. SAM," "Mr. Democrat" himself, Speaker SAM RAYBURN. And this House was for years the training ground of its member Sam Johnson, father of the distinguished Vice President of the United States, LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

You trained the present Governor of Texas, his immediate predecessor in office, a number of U.S. Congressmen and the next Governor of Guam.

It is an honor to serve in a body so rich in accomplishments and traditions, but richer yet in its potential for the future, now on the verge of new hope for more meaningful service, engendered by the modest salary increases the people of Texas voted last fall.

While we speak nationally of new frontiers, here at home we have our own Texas frontiers, but so entwined are our destinies as a people with our dual Federal-State relationships, that some of the best government that we have evolved in America is partnership government, involving partnership action by the State and Federal legislative bodies.

Outstanding examples of cooperation are in highway building programs, old age pensions, medical care for the aged, vocational and rehabilitation programs, National Guard programs, care for the blind, public health, public education, game, wildlife, soil and water conservation, and many other programs jointly financed for many years now.

Even in a field of such seemingly unilateral action, joint and cooperative efforts are needed if any worthwhile advancement is to be made. This is illustrated by the Big Bend National Park, the only national park in Texas, which was first authorized by the Texas Legislature, and presented to the Federal Government by Texas, before the Congress would act. In that case the Texas Legislature boldly took the initiative, and Texas has a national park.

There is now pending a proposal for a greater national park in Texas, the Padre Island National Seashore Recreation Area. Those best versed nationally on these matters look at it as the No. 1 seashore in America.

PADRE ISLAND SEASHORE

Padre Island is 117 miles long and varies from about one-fourth mile to 3 miles in width. Our first project in Congress called for a full-length national seashore recreation area, less about 5 miles at each end for private development. Later we agreed to shorten the park area to 100 miles of the total length of 117 miles. Then, in order to win the unanimous support of the National Parks Advisory Board, without whose approval no national park project can be created under Federal law, we compromised again, and shortened the area to an 88-mile-long park, but only 85 miles long on the gulf side, leaving 32 miles of gulf beaches on Padre Island for private development, if we have the 88-mile-long park.

I have been working hard for a Texas-size national seashore recreation area on Padre Island for two main reasons. First, I'm convinced that the project will bring a many-million-dollar tourist bonanza to our State, and even more important, it will preserve as a recreation area for this and future generations of Americans, a part of our country's rapidly vanishing natural grandeur.

A Texas-size national seashore park, which would attract many hundreds of thousands of additional tourists to Texas within a few short years, is especially needed right now. Over the last 4 years, the number of tourists and the number of tourist dollars, coming to Texas, have declined steadily. Last year, only 8,600,000 tourists visited Texas, a decline of 1,700,000 out-of-State visitors since 1957. Based on the average amount of $45 each out-of-State visitor spends in Texas, the decline in tourist trade (just last year alone) amounted to a $144 million loss of business. This loss of tourist trade is something we can correct, and it seems clear that the best answer is a national seashore recreation area on Padre Island.

Up to the present, Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area in North Carolina is the only facility of its kind in our entire Nation. It was opened in 1955 and attracted 264,000 visitors that year. In the past 6 years, while we have had a costly decline in visitors to Texas, attendance at Cape Hatteras has doubled. Visitors to Cape Hatteras Seashore totaled 467,000 last year. If this trend continues annual attendance will reach 1 million visitors by 1965. This tremendous increase in tourist trade has boosted the economy of Dare County, N.C., where Cape Hatteras is located, to the point that residents last year enjoyed a 20-percent tax cut, a rare thing in any State or county.

Building a Padre Island National Seashore Area is a sound step toward attracting new tourist trade to Texas. The National Park Service wants to build a Texas-size, 88-mile seashore area on Padre Island. Department of Interior officials have proposed to spend upwards of $8 million to buy land and build roads, visitors centers and other improvements over the next 5 years. President Kennedy has urged Congress to pass enabling legislation. But there is strong competition for the limited dollars budgeted for conservation projects. Hearings already have been held on proposed seashore recreation projects for Point Reyes, Calif., and at Cape Cod in President Kennedy's home State in Massachusetts.

Discord among us Texans and with the National Park Service over size of the seashore area or where roads should be built might well result in our Padre Island project being delayed while other seashore projects are built on the east and west coasts. Such a project in California would help give that State an advantage in the competition for beachbound tourist business.

I believe it is time for all of us Texans to begin working together to build a Texas-size national seashore recreation area on Padre Island. The Texas Legislature led the way in the 1959 session with a bill authorizing a 50-mile park on the island and, paving the way now for an 88-mile-long authorization.

Some argue against this national seashore area, saying a Miami Beach type of development is needed instead. But, they are not alternatives. There is ample room for both.

In this regard, a reasonable review of the facts reflects that the 88-mile seashore plan leaves adequate land for private development. Based on the 7.1-square-mile resort area of Miami Beach, private developers on Padre Island would have the space to build three resort centers the approximate size of the Florida vacationland outside that part of the 117-mile-long island after an 88-mile seashore recreation area is established. The area for private development on Padre Island in Cameron County alone is about the same size as Miami Beach, where there are 397 hotels, 2,350 resort apartments and other improvements valued at a total of $404 million.

EDUCATION

Fellow legislators, while this park project is urgent, we face even greater urgencies in this dangerous world in which we live, half slave and half free. For generations we have enjoyed advantages over other nations because of our educational lead. By our system of public free schools, we have pulled ahead of other nations.

Now that lead is threatened. All the peoples and nations of this world now realize that education is the golden key that unlocks the door for social and economic as well as intellectual advancement. They have crash programs to catch up, to educate their people.

We have led the world in the past; our ability to lead it in the future depends upon our willingness to pay the price of education and leadership.

Today, we spend about 4 percent of our gross national product on education, while the Russian Communists spend about 12 percent of their annual gross national product for education.

Soviet Russia now has more than twice as many engineering and science students in college as we; they have almost twice as many science and engineering students in college as the entire free world.

In 1959, we licensed 8,000 medical doctors; Soviet Russia graduated 16,000. Of these Russian Communist medical graduates, 14,000 were for service in Russia, while 2,000 were trained in the languages, religions, customs, and mores of the underdeveloped peoples in the world, and were pledged to go and live with the people directly, in their native huts and habitations, in the underdeveloped nations. We are running on borrowed time.

In those countries we are living on the good will earned by American missionaries and other representatives in the past, but we must educate to meet the new threat, rising like a cloud on our horizon.

Admiral Rickover, developer of the atomic submarine, has said that, despite the fact that the Russians are ahead of us in missiles, he regards the greatest Soviet Russian threat to us as coming, not from missiles, but from the driving Russian educational system.

Here in Texas we have a woeful failure to give our young people a fair chance at a college education. Of all the young people in Texas between the ages of 18 and 21, only 31½ percent attend college, while in California 60 percent of all young people between 18 and 21 attend college; in Utah 64 percent, and in Massachusetts 53.3 percent.

Here in Texas we have the greatest quantum of natural resources and mineral wealth found in any 265,000 square miles of the earth's surface. Despite that wealth, the average annual per capita income of Texans (at a little over $1,900 per year) places Texas 32d among the States of the Nation (32d down from the top) in the average income of our people.

Furthermore, recent surveys have revealed that of all management jobs in Texas business and industry, 65 percent are held by persons educated in other States, and only 35 percent are educated in Texas. Veritably we are becoming the hewers of wood and the drawers of water for those educated elsewhere who come in to manage our patrimony and enjoy our birthright.

But the problem isn't limited to Texas. A very fine article in the Austin American yesterday (Apr. 5, 1961), by Lynn Poole of Johns Hopkins University, under the title "Rising Costs Will Bar College Doors to Youth," warns of the tragedy of America's greatest underdeveloped resource and asset, the brainpower of her youth. The article gives these results of a survey:

"Assume that you live on a street which contains 10 houses. Further assume that you and your nine neighbors all earn between $5,000 and $7,500 per year, and that you will have children in elementary school.

"Today, in 8 of the 10 houses on that street, parents are making plans for their children to attend college when the time comes in the years ahead. If you are making similar plans, your house is one of these eight.

"The sorry truth is, however, that children from only three of the houses on your street will ever see the inside of a building on a college campus. Parents in the other five houses who had been hoping to see their youngsters march off to college are doomed to disappointment.

"There is one overriding reason for these discouraging facts: money.

"A recent survey has uncovered some revealing facts with regard to the financing of higher education.

"Of parents earning $3,000 or less per year, 39 percent expect their children can go to college. Only 12 percent get there.

"Of parents who earn $10,000 or more 95 percent expect their offspring to attend college. In this group 65 percent do attend.

"In both cases, fewer children go than are expected to. However, the greatest disappointment comes in the middle income range—on your street of 10 houses.

"In the $5,000 to $7,500 group, 80 percent expect their children to go to college—28 percent actually go.

"The figures are slightly better for the group whose income ranges from $7,500 to $10,000. Ninety percent anticipate college for their children and more than 50 percent make it.

"Thus, it becomes quite clear, according to the report, that there is a correlation between parent's income and college for the children."

With the financial burden of a college education barring the door for half of all those whom we should be educating, we must find means to unlock this resource of talent and brainpower. One such means is the G.I. bill for the education of cold war veterans, which I am sponsoring in the Senate of the United States. It would furnish educational opportunities either college, high school, or on the job training, for 4¼ million veterans of the cold war, over 200,000 of them right here in Texas.

We have other educational programs pending in the U.S. Congress—cooperative programs, calling for partnership action by State and national legislative bodies, to give American youth, and ourselves, the thrust for the future that only education can give.

Dr. Arthur H. Moehlman, a leading authority on education, now serving on the faculty of the University of Texas, in discussing the need for meeting and expanding our educational system, in keeping with the educational awakening now going on, warned us:

"The cost will be very high because of the tremendous increase in population, because of the complex nature of our culture, because of the mandatory need for cooperation between school and community, and because of the speeded-up metabolism of human history, which can outrun man. We are creating a new world, but we find it difficult to visualize what is a better world. There is a vast warfare between our ethics and our knowledge, between human wisdom and cosmos-shaking mechanisms. However, if we can pay the price of searching for the good and noble life through democracy and universal education, history will not outrun us and we will play a wise and courageous role in our new world. If we can carry out our second educational awakening, universal education will continue to be the United States' greatest contribution to world culture."

Fellow legislators, the tasks, responsibilities and duties of meeting this challenge are yours, and mine. Some other branches of Government receive more favorable treatment from the press and other news media than we legislators. But we are the ones who meet the hard unpleasant duty of leaving the taxes to pay for this educational advance. The legislator lives in no sheltered world, such as the judiciary enjoy. How well we legislators face and discharge that duty, will be the measure of the freedom and security of us all.

The free world looks to us for leadership and guidance. Fellow legislators, I trust we will not fail our country and freedom. It is a part of the legislator's creed that he takes the gaff, does his duty, and advances freedom, learning, justice, and civilization. Thanks for this visit, and God bless you in this discharge of your duties.

Century 21 Exposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Seattle Post Intelligencer, editorially, gave a progress report on plans for our Century 21 Exposition last Friday, April 21.

Making this summation more important regarding steps taken to make this world fair a true report of the latest scientific and technological achievements to be shown to the entire world was the fact that just 1 year from last Friday, the exposition will open its gates.

So that Senators may know how the city of Seattle, the State of Washington, and the entire Pacific Northwest are moving ahead with the task of preparing this "jewel case exhibit of science," I ask unanimous consent that the Post Intelligencer editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

C–21 IS COMING STRONG

One year from today the world fair called Century 21 opens to the public.

Even oldtimers, accustomed to watching the west coast achieve big things against the odds, are astonished with the progress of the Century 21 exposition to date.

First of all, the $80 million project (exclusive of foreign exhibits) is on a solid

footing financially. Several of the buildings, including some of the largest structures are well along. Construction of the Nation's first monorail, from midtown to the exposition grounds, is underway. This has had the effect of alerting local citizens to the reality of Century 21.

That is a reality long since understood by people elsewhere. This 1962 world fair has the support of the United States, and Uncle Sam himself will be the largest exhibitor. Moreover, Century 21 is approved by the Bureau of International Expositions. It is the only world fair now projected in the United States to receive such endorsement by this board of 30 nations.

Thus foreign exposition experts, the Nation, and the State of Washington, are solidly behind Century 21. But, almost as important, all our neighbors this side of the Rocky Mountains have begun to recognize that Century 21 will reflect the energetic enterprise of the entire 11 Western States.

They see that this is not a Seattle fair or a Pacific Northwest fair, but a world fair whose roots and influence extend throughout the Far West and around the Pacific rim.

Such are some of the factors which led the region's hydroelectric utilities, both public and private, to combine on a complex exhibit in its own building. These are the reasons why wood cellulose companies, with worldwide markets, have pooled their imaginative resources toward a major exhibit. And why Pacific Telephone Northwest and General Electric were among the first major U.S. companies to sign up for sizable space. Nor will the presence of the Boeing Aircraft exhibit be a mere matter of propinquity.

Such companies want to identify themselves, properly enough, with the five worlds of the exposition: the world of Century 21, the world of commerce and industry, the world of science, the world of entertainment with its gay way, and the world of the arts.

While the response of business and industry is not discouraging at this stage of development, the absence thus far of certain major companies from the growing list of exhibitors is difficult to understand.

Among major companies at this moment conspicuous by their absence from the roster are, surprisingly, some which have found the Far West a lucrative market and whose future plans include expansion to serve this fastest growing population in the Nation.

It is the belief of the Post-Intelligencer that these companies simply have not yet grasped the scope and role of Century 21. Or perhaps have not considered that the exposition will draw the bulk of its attendance from the Far West and Midwestern States, just as 2 years later the world fair at New York will draw most of its spectators from the Atlantic seaboard.

We do know that at least a score of topmost companies are taking a second look at Century 21 and we are confident that their judgment will lead them westward and toward the warm welcome in which the Far West takes traditional pride.

Meanwhile it is up to us in Washington State to continue our support of Century 21 and of its officials who are doing such a splendid job.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Washington made reference to the Century 21 Exposition, but did not state what he was submitting for the RECORD.

Mr. MAGNUSON. An editorial published in the Seattle Post Intelligencer, relating to the exposition.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is the exposition now in progress?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Oh, no; it will start 1 year from now.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But it is in process of being developed?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Oh, yes. The Senator from Ohio, who took a great interest in the subject, may like to know that good progress is being made. The State contribution, made by the last legislature, was exactly what the State government had said it would be. The Senator is aware, of course, of the Federal contribution.

The exhibitors are rapidly falling into line. Approximately 30 nations will take part.

The science exhibit is progressing well. Ground has been broken for the Federal building. The other parts of the fair are rapidly underway. The State building is approximately 60 percent completed.

Dr. Athelstan Spelhaus will be the Federal Commissioner. The President submitted the nomination of Dr. Spilhaus to the Senate today. The exposition is making good progress and will be completed on schedule, 1 year from this week.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is the transportation line being constructed, or has that been abandoned?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; the construction of the monorail was begun 60 days ago. I happened to be at home and attended the ceremony which marked the construction of the monorail.

Now under construction is a tower which will be about 500 feet high, and in which there will be a restaurant. It will be a sort of Eiffel Tower.

The exposition is privately financed. The total investment to date is between $55 and $59 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How much has been contributed by the Federal Government?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Nine million dollars.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator from Washington.

Communist Tactics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, Bishop Fulton J. Sheen has often written of the evil that is implicit in ruthless Communist tactics. His column of April 20, which appeared in the Advocate, Newark, N.J., and other newspapers, explores this question still further and gives a specific example of Bishop Sheen's argument that organized savagery is the most devastating kind of savagery.

The first article in this series appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 20. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the second article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Advocate, April 20, 1961]

GOD LOVE YOU—COMMUNIST TACTICS

(By Bishop Fulton J. Sheen)

This is our second report on the Communist persecutions in the Congo.

At Kasongo, nine sisters were violently seized during the night, the arm of an aged sister broken when struck by a gun butt. Their veils, rosaries, and their crosses were taken. Stripped and ravished, they were forced to dance in bare feet on prison gravel and to shout slogans in favor of the Communist leaders.

One sister lost her mind; another, beaten because she refused to dance, can neither bend nor walk. Sisters who were not arrested were accused by Communist teachers of stealing 2 million francs from them.

Father Gerry of the White Fathers was beaten in the same prison from 5 in the evening until 2 in the morning. Some 18 other White Fathers and nine brothers were severely tortured.

One missionary writes: "We were forced to go about the prison on our knees saying, 'I killed Lumumba, the Christ of the Congo.'" And another: "We were all beaten with clubs; our hands were tied behind our backs and ropes passed between our legs. A soldier struck me on the head ordering, 'Say your mass.'"

The Communist technique is ever the same: accuse falsely, then arrest, then torture.

Do not say: "Oh! these Africans are only one stage removed from barbarism." That has nothing to do with the persecution. Were the Communist soldiers of Spain one generation removed from barbarism? Or the Chinese? Or the Polish or Hungarian governments?

It is not a primitive civilization but communism which accounts for modern savagery. If the Communists gained control in the United States it would be the Ph.D.'s in our universities who would torture the ambassadors of Christ, as they did in Hungary and Poland. The primitive people are only passive barbarians; the Communists are active barbarians.

Dismiss not the persecution by saying their bodies are black. The problem is: whence come black souls. The devil makes them, and he makes them out of white bodies as well as black bodies.

It would seem that we have almost forgotten there is a devil, that he is the invisible head of the mystical body of the anti-Christ with his visible head in Moscow, that he has not cloven hoofs but puts on the air of godliness and love of mankind, that his cohorts eat not with fingers but with knife and fork in the best hotels of America.

Questionnaire Returns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have recently completed the tabulation of the returns on my questionnaire, which was distributed throughout my district in mid-March. I was very gratified by the response I received. Almost 13 percent of the questionnaires were returned, and

many people took the time to add personal comments on items of special interest.

Because these views are representative of the thinking of the people of western South Dakota, I would like to insert in the RECORD the results of the tabulation together with some of the comments included in the questionnaire:

Questionnaire returns

	Percentage		
	Yes	No	Not certain
Do you favor—			
1. Increasing the minimum wage from $1 to $1.25 per hour and extending coverage to 4,300,000 additional workers?	31	59	10
2. Liberalization of our social security program including optional retirement for men at age 62, $10 increase in minimum monthly pensions, increase in widow's allowance, liberalized disability provisions, and less coverage to establish eligibility? An increase in payroll taxes of both employer and employee would be required to cover the over $1,000,000,000 annual cost	34	54	12
3. Medical care for the aged under the social security program not based on need, pushing the payroll tax to 10 percent by 1969, applicable only to those covered by social security? This program has been proposed rather than the State-administered program covering any needy person enacted by Congress last year	19	70	11
4. Establishing protective tariffs and quotas to enable our domestic production to successfully compete with low-cost foreign imports in order to protect industry, agriculture, and mineral interests and our gold reserves which are being seriously depleted as imports exceed exports?	75	13	12
5. The proposal to assist areas where chronic labor surpluses exist, resulting from industries forced out of business primarily because of foreign competition? The proposal would enable these areas to lure industries away from prosperous communities	33	57	10
6. A massive program for Government-owned public housing	7	69	24
7. Continuation of foreign economic aid at its present level of approximately $4,000,000,000 annually	20	56	24
Do you favor—Continued			
8. Expanding the aid to dependent children program to include children of unemployed parents	36	44	20
9. An increase in postal rates	37	51	12
10. Retaining gasoline tax at its present 4-cent level, shifting greater responsibility upon trucks for the Federal highway construction program	77	13	10
11. Abolition of the House Un-American Activities Committee	9	73	19
12. The general principle in agricultural legislation of—			
(a) Permitting the CCC to dispose of commodities on the open market at less than support price (cost to the Government)	27	43	30
(b) Payment by Government, either in cash or in kind, for further retirement of production acres on either a temporary or permanent basis	17	56	27

	Percentage
13. In the field of Federal aid to education, which do you prefer:	
(a) A $5,700,000,000 Federal aid to education program including school construction, teachers' salaries, college scholarships, etc., paid directly from the Federal Treasury, even though it will bring certain Federal control of the schools?	13
(b) As an alternative to direct Federal aid to education, legislation enabling the taxpayer to substract from his Federal income tax the amount he pays in local property taxes for school purposes up to $100, and to deduct from taxable income up to $2,000 per year for each child in college? This would enable school districts to finance their own operating costs by making additional tax levies without additional cost to the taxpayer	77

QUOTABLE QUOTAS FROM THE QUESTIONNAIRES

Social security. "How do they expect to get the additional unemployment benefits out of employers who no longer employ the unemployed?" "When this law went into effect, people had the idea that they would live a grand life in their old age and made no other provision for themselves. Now, with their pensions, they simply eek out the bare necessities."

Tax suggestions. "A double exemption allowance should be provided on the income tax return for a handicapped child or adult. It should include any person unable to hold a job due to a mental or physical handicap."

Tariffs. "We have been using nails manufactured in Holland since the steel strike. Labor got their pay raise but lost their market."

Gasoline tax. "The President's request on increased taxes for the highway system must have been prepared by the railroad lobby as its net effect is to torpedo the $5 billion trucking industry. It recommends that the trucking industry pay an amount equal to the net profit of the industry for 1960. Maybe Dr. Galbraith and Dr. Schlesinger were taught in Harvard that profits were not the incentive that made the free enterprise system successful in America" * * *. "An average truck running 100,000 miles would presently pay $800 in Federal fuel tax. An automobile running the same number of miles would pay about $266 in gasoline tax."

Agriculture. "If the CCC is permitted to sell at less than support price, it will put all small independent buyers and grain dealers out of business."

Un-American Activities Committee. "Do everything you can to strengthen the committee." "Increase the funds for the Un-American Activities Committee instead of reducing them." "We need greater protection against the Communist threat."

Spending. "This 'Giverment'." "In 83 years the Homestake Mine has produced three-fourth billion dollars in gold and the Government gives away that much every week." "You don't see many businesses still going that spend more than their income year after year." "Put a stop to back-door spending—there is already too much going out the front door unnecessarily."

Education. "Why do you try to make people believe that if we have Federal aid to education we must have Federal control of education?" "How can Congress take money from one group and give it to another without retaining control of how it shall be spent?" "I know firsthand that Federal aid means Federal control. Here the Government is telling them how to run the sewing course next year. We have always had an exceptional course here and now they are offering a little sewing and a little homemaking to comply with Government regulations." "Smith-Hughes now dictates the qualifications of teachers."

General. "Any government that can make you rich can also make you poor." "We people do not want handouts—we just want a fair chance. Let's make government good government and keep it businesslike. Let's not mortgage our freedom." "When you hurt a small man a little, you hurt him a lot." "The Communist and Socialist countries have centralized governments. America was built upon the foundation of the freedom of the individual. Mount Rushmore has space for the man who can keep it that way. Only four have qualified so far." "What is it when the government of a country taxes the products of the people's labor and dispenses those products back according to their needs? This is socialism and every government program seems headed in that direction." "After objecting to so many things being done, I feel that I should shed a little light on the other side. I am very grateful to be living in a country where the individual can state his convictions toward his government. I also believe that any good American citizen does not mind paying his fair share, and would pay taxes that were necessary for the operation of his country, but I also believe that a good citizen doesn't look to the government for a living and a handout for every little pinch in his business. I am a young man of 24 and certainly hope that I do not have to live the rest of my life in a welfare state."

Letter on Cuban Situation Written by Sheldon Z. Kaplan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, at this critical stage in inter-American relations, it is essential to have the views not only of qualified Government officials and of Members of Congress, but also of private citizens with knowledge and experience. Sheldon Z. Kaplan, who served with distinction for 8 years as staff consultant to the House Foreign Affairs Committee and also the Subcommittee on Latin America, is well known to the membership of this House as a topflight expert, in the true sense of the term, on foreign policy and Latin America. I commend to my colleagues the following letter which Mr.

Kaplan directed to the editor of the Washington Post and which skillfully puts the Cuban situation in proper perspective:

APRIL 21, 1961.

THE EDITOR,
Washington Post Newspaper,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: On several occasions in the past I have been tempted to communicate with you on certain points raised in your editorials with respect to U.S. policy toward Latin America. I did not succumb to that temptation on those occasions, but find that your editorial, "A Call to Duty," in your April 21, 1961 issue, impels me to try to set the issue of Cuba in proper and realistic perspective.

You state in that editorial, commenting on President Kennedy's message on Cuba to the American Society of Newspaper Editors, that "the President's lecture to the countries of Latin America was the weakest part of his message. The United States is not yet sufficiently identified with active movements for reform and social justice to make its concern about communism in Cuba altogether convincing. Here is the largest and most immediate challenge." You then go on to say in your editorial that the need also is for "simultaneous, cooperative effort in ideas and ideals to give our version of freedom more meaning to the landless peasant and disgruntled student."

Keeping in mind the objective of U.S. foreign policy toward Latin America so clearly enunciated by the President in his doctrine of alianza para progreso,[1] the portion of the President's talk on Cuba before the American Society of Editors which you find to be the weakest part of his message is indeed the strongest.

The question of intervention or nonintervention is not involved in the slightest. Intervention is an established fact—intervention in the hemisphere by international communism. Any action by the United States or Latin American countries to counter the impact of that intervention constitutes defense on behalf of the security of the Western Hemisphere. Further, it would constitute a removal of the greatest barrier to the achievement of the social and economic goals of alianza para progreso and to the identification of the United States "with active movements for reform and social justice," the absence of which identification you deplore. In the face of a triumphant international communism in Cuba, it is the very depth of naivete to imagine that this taste of success will be confined to the island of Cuba. As the strength and daring of international communism increases in the hemisphere, so does the opportunity for achievement of the economic and social goals referred to in your editorial diminish. Alianza would be limited to a few countries and progreso would be deliberately subverted by those who are more intensely devoted to spreading international communism than they are to a better life for our neighbors to the South.

While prior U.S. policy toward Latin America has been criticized for its disease of indifference to Latin America, and with justification, no real emphasis had been articulated on the role which our friends in Latin America must themselevs play as equal partners with us toward the common goal, until the declaration and enunciation of the Kennedy doctrine of alianza para progreso. In his message to the editors, the President has rightly pointed out that the threat of international communism is a threat to the security of the hemisphere. It is precisely because President Kennedy must realize the futility of attempting to implement his doctrine of alianza para progreso while international communism is permitted to spread, that he has sounded the call to duty to Latin America itself as well as to our own Nation. Only if that call to duty is heeded will progress and the freedom of the Americas be achieved. Our Nation is prepared to heed that call to protect its security. The peoples of Latin America can do no less if they are to protect their own.

The President is to be commended for exhibiting his own profile in courage and for his refusal to tolerate the views of those more zealous in preserving a doctrine of nonintervention against the spreading and consuming conflagration of international communism than they are in preserving and developing free institutions in the Western Hemisphere.

To expect a successful alianza para progreso in the social and economic sectors in the face of this spreading conflagration would be akin to a husband hoping to teach his wife to drive with a time bomb under the hood. This, to me, is the essence of President Kennedy's lecture, as you call it, to the countries of Latin America. It is, in fact, the backbone of his call to duty.

Respectfully yours,

SHELDON Z. KAPLAN,
Formerly Staff Consultant, House Foreign Affairs Committee and Its Subcommittee on Latin America.

[1] Alliance for progress.

Safe for Ideas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the editorial, "Safe for Ideas," from the Washington Post of April 24, 1961.

Mr. Speaker, I was so impressed by the statesmanlike comment of Gov. Pat Brown of my State of California and the wise remark of Dr. Clark Kerr, president of the University of California, regarding the appearance of a particular speaker on the campus at Berkeley that I feel this editorial should be called to the attention of my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 24, 1961]

SAFE FOR IDEAS

The president of the University of California and the Governor of the Golden State have given what seem to us model statements of the importance of exposing students to controversy. A furor had arisen because a man convicted of contempt of Congress for refusal to answer questions about communism was invited to speak on the campus at Berkeley. Asked to intervene, Gov. Pat Brown of California refused, commenting: "Let the people say anything they want to. If they do anything criminal while they're speaking or after they're speaking, then they can be prosecuted." To this the university president, Dr. Clark Kerr, added: "The university is not engaged in making ideas safe for students; it is engaged in making students safe for ideas." This is an attitude which ought to hearten more timorous administrators, for it goes to the heart of a main purpose of education. If university training can't teach a student to be discreet and discriminating in his selection of ideas, artificial shielding won't help him.

Water in the Economy of the Red River Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT S. KERR
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, one of the problems, often overlooked, we must face up to is water quality. Too often we think only in terms of quantity. My good friend, and a devoted servant of our Government, Gordon E. McCallum, Chief, Division of Water Supply and Pollution Control, Public Health Service, made a very fine talk to the 36th Annual Convention of the Red River Valley Association, Shreveport, La., on April 3.

I would like to share it with Senators, and therefore ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATER IN THE ECONOMY OF THE RED RIVER VALLEY

(By Gordon E. McCallum, Chief, Division of Water Supply and Pollution Control, Public Health Service, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington D.C.)

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Congress, members and distinguished guests of the Red River Valley Association, it gives me much pleasure to be here today and participate in your 36th annual convention.

As an association which has functioned for this many years, I would guess that there are some second-generation members among you here today. In 36 years you have certainly witnessed significant changes in the face of your Red River Valley. Great man-made lakes such as Texoma have come into existence. Crops and land use have changed. Cities have spread out. Oil fields have developed—to name just a few. Dedicated as this group is to the fivefold purpose of navigation, soil conservation, reforestation, irrigation, and recreation—I have no doubt that this association has led in bringing about these great changes. It goes without saying that your efforts have lifted the living standards of those who dwell in this great river basin.

Your presence here today is testimony of your dedication to the comprehensive development of river basins. It was because of your interest that the Public Health Service, some 4 years ago, came in as a partner in one aspect of that development. Most of you have heard reports on our Arkansas-Red River basin water quality conservation project. At the risk of telling you things you already know, I should like to say a word about this project.

In simple terms, the project seeks to run down the major sources of pollution—brines that are degrading millions of acre-feet of water each year. Then we hope to propose ways to cut off those sources—so the waters will be suitable for domestic, industrial, and agricultural uses. Some 40 million acre-feet of salt polluted water is now passing through the Arkansas-Red River Basin each year—wasted for many purposes. Made usable, these waters can spell the difference between an economic impairment and unprecedented progress.

Each of us is becoming more concerned over our resources. President Kennedy emphasized this in his natural resources message to the Congress. In relation to water

he said, "Pollution of our country's rivers and streams has—as a result of our rapid population and industrial growth and change—reached alarming proportions. To meet all needs—domestic, agricultural, industrial, recreational—we shall have to use and reuse the same water, maintaining quality as well as quantity. In many areas of the country we need new sources of supply—but in all areas we must protect the supplies we have."

Each of us is also aware of what conservation and development have already meant to this part of the country. Population counts are of interest. The national growth in population the past decade was 18.5 percent. Texas was well above this national average with a 24.2-percent gain. Louisiana showed a 21.4 percent increase, Oklahoma about a 5-percent gain, while Arkansas experienced no gain. What do you suppose the figures would have been without the water resource developments this area has witnessed during the 1950's?

Now, let us take a look at how these States fared in another area. The U.S. per capita income gain was 45.3 percent in the same 10-year period. Arkansas per capita income increased 65 percent; Louisiana, 45 percent; Oklahoma, 58 percent; and Texas, 42 percent. Can anyone deny that resource development was largely responsible? How much more will water development pay off for these four States in the future?

The well-remembered drought years pointed up the importance of good water supplies to the people of the Arkansas-Red River Basins. Many a city had to go exploring for new sources when old, dependable water supplies ran out. Too often, if they located water, they found it of unsuitable quality. For, once the minerals—sodium chloride and calcium sulfate or gypsum—enter a stream, neither conventional treatment processes nor the natural purification phenomena of the stream itself—have any effect. The minerals become permanent additions to the water—impairing its use henceforth. Such is the plight of the city of Shreveport here on the banks of the Red. Altogether, the people of the Arkansas-Red River Basins became extremely water conscious during the drought of the early fifties.

So, we found a favorable reception when we initiated our water quality conservation project on July 1, 1957. We started it as a small pollution investigation of these two interstate rivers. But soon it became apparent that here was no ordinary problem. Tremendous benefits would accrue if we could isolate the sources of the brine and gypsum pollutants and keep these minerals out of the waters they were despoiling. It was then—and is today—a project unique in the whole country. It might be said—seldom if ever—has so little bad water spoiled so much good water.

Cities like Wichita Falls, Oklahoma City, and Tulsa, which have already had to go long distances for municipal water supplies, to meet current needs, can certainly benefit if we achieve our project objectives. Wichita Falls is planning now to go 20 miles downstream on the Little Wichita for a new source of water supply, while the Wichita River flows in salty abundance right through the heart of the city.

Similarly, Oklahoma City recently impounded a new reservoir more than 100 miles distant. The nearby Cimarron and Canadian Rivers were not considered as sources of water supply because of their high chlorides. The Arkansas River flows through the city of Tulsa, untapped as a source of municipal water supply, for the same reason.

Step No. 1 in our project was to get the facts. Where were the objectionable brines originating? How extensive was the whole problem? Could anything be done about it? If so, would it be economically feasible? As we marshaled the facts, they confirmed what we hoped might be the case—there was a comparatively small amount of contamination damaging a very large amount of water, which made it appear feasible to try to do something about it.

The principal sources of the chlorides are natural brine outcrops and oilfield production. Stream flows were insufficient to adequately and continuously dilute the natural brine flows by controlled releases of relatively good water. Manmade sources of brine (the oilfields) account for some 20 percent of the chloride in the entire Arkansas-Red River Basins. In some tributary basins, however, this source accounts for as much as 50 percent.

A 64-station stream quality network has been established—37 in the Arkansas River, 27 in the Red. Continuous recording conductivity equipment has been installed at these stations to provide a continuous index of mineral quality. Stations located above and below all major salt sources and key monitoring points on major tributaries. The conductivity records will be used to compute salt loads.

We know that an average of some 10,000 tons of salt each day are released from natural sources alone in the two basins—2,500 in the Red and 7,500 in the Arkansas. Studies by the U.S. Geological Survey disclose that large salt deposits underlie the salt source areas at depths of 200 feet or less. The ground water dissolves some of the salt and returns to the surface as springs or salt plains.

One of our most interesting study points is the Great Salt Plains (10,000 acres) in northwest Oklahoma. This has long been a tourist attraction and a popular fishing and wildfowl area. A Federal game refuge and one of the large Corps of Engineer impoundments are located there. While the lake is a major recreation center, the water is unsuited for most other uses. Other salt plains within the Arkansas-Red River Basins vary from several acres to this largest of 10,000 acres. The brine springs vary from less than 1-gallon-per-minute to 5-cubic-feet-per-second flow.

A spring at Estilline, Tex., which is tributary to the Prairie Dog Town Fork of Red River, is one of the largest contributors of salt water in this basin. It is in an active oil field where salt water injection is practiced by the operating companies. The flow of this spring varies between 5 and 6 cubic feet per second. The spring is issuing from a large chimneylike hole in a rather sizable flood plain. A skindiver employed by the U.S. Bureau of Mines recently explored the chimney to a depth of 150 feet. At that point, the water apparently was coming in from a horizontal direction.

During the time we have worked on this project, suggestions for control of the natural salt sources have been numerous and have come from all over the country. In general, they can be classified into these broad categories: (1) Subsurface disposal, (2) permanent storage or retention, (3) interception and elimination or suppression of brine recharge water, (4) transport to a nondamaging site such as the Gulf of Mexico, and (5) industrial utilization. I am sure that General Flemming will mention some of the Corps of Engineer plans tomorrow.

Geological explorations are going forward at all of the salt locations, and some 35 wells have been drilled at the 12 natural salt springs or seepage areas from which we have taken core samples. One method which may show considerable promise for obtaining information on the hydrostatic head is that of pumping the springs and computing the rates of recovery and attempting to project them to a point of no flow.

We are now ready to construct, for experimental purposes, an injection well at one or two locations in the Upper Red River. Such a test well will yield valuable information on injection possibilities at depths of 4,500 feet to 8,000 feet, for which there is practically no information now in existence.

We have begun a study to ascertain the financial benefits which will result from the water quality improvement we are seeking. Both major basins lie in a relatively sparsely populated area—but with many untapped resources. There is, however, already a need—especially during periods of low stream flow—for additional municipal water supplies. There have been many inquiries as to the availability of industrial water supplies as well as irrigation possibilities. In nearly all cases, both of these streams and their tributaries have been rejected or have been used sparingly and then only in dire emergencies. Along with the great resources for industrial development, it seems that improvement in water quality at a reasonable cost is a must to place this area in a favored competitive position with other portions of the Southwest and of the Nation. Think what an additional 25 or 30 million acre-feet of fresh water would mean to your industrial development by the year 2000.

Senator KERR of Oklahoma voiced extreme optimism in this direction recently when, as chairman of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources, he made the committee's final report. Speaking of the Arkansas-White-Red River Basins plan adopted in 1949, Senator KERR said:

"The committee report clearly shows that without this Federal-State cooperative program millions of acres in the Upper Arkansas-Red Basins would have been in real trouble by the year 2000. The pinch already would have been felt in many parts, but for the soil-and-water program now underway.

"Our area already has done much of that which the committee recommended, and others will thus study it as a model and a pattern of performance. We are proud of our efforts both for water supply and water quality.

"Thanks to the cooperation between Federal agencies promoted by the interagency setup, this area has a bright outlook for controlling the natural pollution of water which has been a major problem. The Public Health Service and the Corps of Army Engineers are well on the way to developing a solution for the elimination of the natural salt pollution from the Arkansas-Red Rivers."

Up to this point we are pleased with our findings from the Arkansas-Red River water quality conservation project. Certainly the cooperation of citizen groups like yours, together with the interest and support of the great statesmen you people have sent to the Congress, has been our greatest reward—which we truly appreciate. The newspaper coverage in this area, as the work has progressed, has been invaluable in keeping the public informed—and I might add has been most kind to us.

You may be interested in the inquiries we get about this project. They come from all over the country and even from foreign visitors. Our work is checked on by such publications as the Wall Street Journal.

When the Public Health Service has been able to recommend corrective measures—our major role would essentially be ended on this project according to our original plans. It would then seem that other Federal agencies, such as the Corps of Engineers, the States, and local groups who are especially qualified in the field of construction, are best suited to carry out corrective measures. We will, of course, always be ready to help in any way we can.

It occurs to me that you may be interested in some of the legislation being introduced in the Congress on water pollution. More than 30 bills have been introduced in the Congress this year dealing with water pol-

lution. In general, they would extend the several authorities already written into the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1956. Some of them contain provisions for the use of federally constructed reservoirs to augment low flow in streams. Senator KERR—a stanch supporter of this philosophy—included such a provision in his bill—S. 120.

Senator LONG of Louisiana has introduced a bill—S. 1475—which would provide for this type of streamflow regulation by releasing water from Federal reservoirs and other impoundments. The amount of waters to be released would be approved by the Congress upon recommendation of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service. The Surgeon General would first consult Federal, State, interstate and local agencies and other interests involved, and would base his recommendations on expert hydrologic, economic and water quality data. Senator LONG's bill specifically states, "Such water releases shall not be a substitute for adequate treatment or other methods of controlling waste at the source."

I am told that the people of the Red River Valley have sometimes been called "the salt of the earth." And this expression has nothing whatever to do with the type of salt we have been discussing. It is a complimentary term intended to signify a dependable, courageous, and enterprising people.

These qualities have been well demonstrated by you. I have no doubt that the economic future of the Red River Valley is in good hands—and I wish you well in all that you undertake.

Thank you.

Area Redevelopment Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, although I favor the concept of proper legislation providing Government assistance to areas of chronic underemployment, I object to provisions of this conference report which allow financing of the program directly from the Treasury.

I voted for S. 1 on March 29. In that version the bill called for regular financing of the program through congressional appropriation. This was the administration proposal. It is the method which is the accepted practice and it is the method which meets all the requirements of logic and governmental responsibility. It is the method which I believe the people of this country want used, especially in programs such as this which are entirely new. The process of financing Government programs through congressional appropriations was set up for a specific purpose and has served well. We should not deliberately depart from it in a substantial program such as this without having a clear mandate to do so. I do not think we have such a mandate.

The House of Representatives is charged with the responsibility of balancing the Government's income with expenditures. If we abdicate that responsibility we are turning over unreasonable and unnecessary authority to the executive branch.

Under the method of financing provided for in this conference report, an executive agency can borrow funds from the Treasury, which then must sell Government bonds on the open market. These funds are not authorized by the Appropriations Committee and are not reflected in the budget, but they do become a part of the national debt. The result is that we engage in even greater deficit spending than the people of this country can know of.

The greater public debt then has the effect of weakening the very economy we are striving here to strengthen. We are defeating ourselves by providing stimulation for the economies of certain depressed areas while at the same time creating conditions for weakening of the dollar and an unstable general economy.

In this critical time of worldwide struggle of which the economic phase is an important part, it is vital that we maintain the financial solvency and fiscal responsibility which this country has enjoyed during the past 8 years. This conference report on the Area Redevelopment Act is one step along the way to financial chaos. I support a responsible area redevelopment program but I cannot put my stamp of approval on irregular and irresponsible financing provisions.

Steelmark Month in the Upper Ohio Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on May 1, the cities of Wierton and Steubenville held official ceremonies inaugurating the month of May as Steelmark Month in the upper Ohio Valley. Due to the pressure of Senate business, I was unable to participate in this significant event. However, it is a project which, in my judgment, deserves wide notice as a community experiment in implementing the spirit of the New Frontiers.

In a letter from the Weirton Steel Co. which sets forth the program and purposes of Steelmark Month, Mr. Martin F. Fahey, legal administrator of the industrial relations department of Weirton Steel Co., stated:

Forty cities will participate in Steelmark Month and 19 mayors recently attended a meeting here and issued proclamations declaring the month of May to be Steelmark Month. Every chamber of commerce in the six counties comprising the upper Ohio Valley is actively and vigorously participating, and every Retail Merchants Bureau in every city in the six counties is also enthusiastically supporting this program.

In addition * * * at least 25 mayors representing the key cities in the upper Ohio Valley will participate in the activities on May 1, all feeling that Steelmark Month is vitally necessary to the well-being of the people of their respective cities.

Mr. President, in the interest of bringing to wider attention Steelmark Month as an outstanding example of community enterprise and initiative, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD my letter on the event dated April 24 and my followup telegram of May 1.

There being no objection, the letter and telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 24, 1961.

Mr. JOHN A. JONES,
Director of Public Relations, Weirton Steel Co., Weirton, W. Va.

DEAR JOHN: With reference to my conversations with you and Mr. Martin Fahey last Thursday, I would very much like to participate in your official inaugural ceremonies for Steelmark Month on May 1. However, in view of the mounting pressure of Senate business, I would consider it most unlikely that I will be able to absent myself from the Senate that day.

In the event that I will not be able to join you in the ceremonies, I hope that you will not think it presumptuous of me to take this occasion to extend a message in keeping with the general purpose of the event.

It is gratifying to learn of this effort by Weirton Steel and the communities of the upper Ohio Valley to implement at a grassroots level the spirit of President Kennedy's inaugural message.

The management personnel of Weirton Steel are particularly to be commended for their role in assuming the leadership of Steelmark Month. This is the kind of effective industrial and community relations work which is responsible for the vital place that Weirton Steel occupies in the life of the upper Ohio Valley.

Steelmark Month represents also the kind of initiative and enterprise which have brought the Ohio Valley itself into a position of prominence in the industrial and economic life of America. It is worth noting, in this respect, that no matter how dynamic and forward looking our leadership at the national level, no program of national goals will be achieved if these goals are not embraced and carried forth by the actions of individual men and women at the community level.

No industry has more clearly exemplified the dynamism and vigor of America than has the steel industry. In developing new uses for steel and new techniques for its production, the men and women who make the steel for America have also made their industry the bedrock and foundation of American industrial, economic and military strength.

The efforts of the men and women in the American steel industry have brought America to the highest per capita annual production of steel in the world—1,300 pounds of steel per year for every person in the United States, as compared to 9 pounds per year in India. And in the wake of this outstanding achievement, we have virtually eliminated from our society the conditions of poverty and dire need.

Yet the remarkable increase in productivity in the steel industry, as well as many other industries, has not been unaccompanied by new problems. We are faced with a continued growth in our labor force at the same time that automation and mechanization displace manpower. These processes are already well advanced in the coal and steel industries, with the end not yet in sight.

Therefore, in addition to the very worthy immediate goals of Steelmark Month, I would hope that the joint efforts and the relationships between industrial business, labor, and civic leaders established in this

enterprise will be carried forth into further planning for the future. For in order to meet the displacement that is destined to occur in many industries, we must begin now to plan for an orderly process of readjustment, in discovering new regional resources and sources of employment, in planning for vocational retraining, and in extending the range and variety of industry-community relationships over the entire field where their interests and purposes are joined.

In this respect, Steelmark Month may come to have a wider and a continuing beneficient effect upon the economic life of the upper Ohio Valley region.

With my firmest hopes for the success of your project and with warm personal regards, I am,

Sincerely,

JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

MAY 1, 1961.

Mr. JOHN A. JONES,
Director of Public Relations,
Weirton Steel Co.,
Weirton, W. Va.:

Senate business here prevents my participation in your important ceremonies today. President Kennedy has asked me to be present for signing of area redevelopment bill at White House at 11 a.m. A conference committee of Senate and House of which I am a member will meet at 2 p.m. in an effort to finalize amendments to Fair Labor Standards Act. Please know of my sincere congratulations and I trust my letter of April 24 commending your effective industrial and community effort will be a further indication of my appreciation of the value of your Steelmark Month. If convenient please extend my best wishes to all those who are in attendance.

JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
U.S. Senator.

Witness Contradicts Red Probers' Riot Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the Associated Press—San Francisco—article from the Washington Post of April 21, 1961, giving an account of a key witness in the city hall riot trial who contradicted House Un-American Activities Committee accounts of violence at the committee's hearings last May.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 21, 1961]

WITNESS CONTRADICTS RED PROBERS' RIOT STORY

SAN FRANCISCO, April 20.—A key witness in the city hall riot trial yesterday contradicted House Un-American Activities Committee accounts of violence at the committee's hearings here last May.

Under defense cross-examination, Patrolman Ralph E. Schaumleffel acknowledged fire hoses had been turned on student demonstrators before he encountered Robert E. Meisenbach.

Meisenbach, 23, University of California senior, is being tried on a charge of assault with a deadly weapon. He is accused of beating Schaumleffel on the head with the officer's nightstick.

The House committee's accounts were contained in a printed report by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover and in the narration of the committee-sponsored film report called "Operation Abolition." They declared the nightstick attack on the officer "touched off the flame of violence."

Jack Berman, defense attorney, drew Schaumleffel's agreement on the time of his struggle with Meisenbach by producing a series of news photographs.

All showed the tall, bespectacled student far in the rear of the crowd of demonstrators in the rotunda outside the city hall hearing room. They showed Meisenbach backed against a pillar before the police turned on the hoses, while the water streamed on the crowd, and after the water was turned off.

Regardless of timing, Schaumleffel insisted he grappled with Meisenbach on the floor after the student had struck him on the back of the head with the nightstick.

Schaumleffel gave his direct testimony in a crisp 30 minutes of questioning by Walter E. Giubbini, assistant district attorney.

Schaumleffel declared he was hit and kicked by Meisenbach and by several others in the crowd before he was able to subdue Meisenbach, with the aid of other officers, and handcuff him.

The picture showed Schaumleffel standing over Meisenbach with five other officers ringed closely around.

Berman declared Meisenbach had been frightened by seeing police beat other students and was trying to leave the scene when he was tackled and seized by Schaumleffel.

American Medical Association Survey of Federal Expenditures in the Health Field, Fiscal Year 1961—Summary I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the American Medical Association has prepared a report on the funds which have been appropriated by the Congress for activities of the Federal Government in the field of health. It is not exhaustive, as the introductory remarks appearing below will indicate. It does, however, show what steps the Government is taking in this area and the very constructive role which it is playing in connection with our private health system to produce for America the best in medical service for all our people.

The report follows:

FEDERAL MEDICAL-HEALTH APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL 1961—(JULY 1, 1960, TO JUNE 30, 1961)

The following report details the medical-health activities of Federal agencies, Government employees' health programs and the Federal contribution in this field to the District of Columbia. The total appropriation to carry out these activities is $3,756,363,311. This sum is $549,141,295 more than was appropriated for fiscal 1960. Approximately 60 percent of the increase went to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Of the $324,946,011 increase in appropriations for that agency, $160 million went to the National Institutes of Health. Another 20 percent of the increase, or $114 million, results from the implementation of the new Federal employees health insurance program. The remainder is composed of increases in appropriations to other agencies and of newly reported programs. For the first time, appropriations for the Veterans' Administration's health activities passed the $1 billion figure.

The report attempts to identfy all programs, describing their purpose and comparing their appropriations for the present fiscal year with those of the preceding year. No attempt is made to evaluate the programs—to rate them good, bad, indifferent, as wasteful or invaluable. It is a factual study based on close scrutiny of appropriations acts passed by the Congress and on information supplied by program and fiscal officers in the various departments and agencies. The association appreciates the wholehearted cooperation given by these individuals.

Because most appropriations acts do not earmark funds for medical activities and because the bookkeeping practices used by some agencies make it impossible to ascertain complete information on the costs of medical activities, the use of estimates in some cases is necessary. Where these situations prevail, an attempt has been made to point them out. Not included in the report are the administrative expenses of such loan programs as the Small Business Administration which makes loans for the construction of medical facilities; the college housing program under which loans for the construction of intern and nurse housing are made; or the National Defense Education Act under which loans are made to medical students and other paramedical personnel. Because of inability to separate the medical from the enforcement activities, the appropriation for the Bureau of Narcotics is not included. Further, the report does not show the effect of the recent pay raise granted to Federal employees. The necessary funds to meet these expenses will be provided by supplemental appropriations by the 87th Congress.

On the final page is listed in table form payments made to persons because of disability through programs financed entirely or in part by the Federal Government. Such beneficiaries total 7,006,130, an increase of 836,130 over last year. Money expected to be paid them totals $5,731,596,000, an increase of $664,474,000 over last year.

Medical-health budgets of Federal departments, agencies, and commissions for this fiscal year

	Fiscal 1961	Fiscal 1960	Page
Department of Health, Education and Welfare	$1,598,356,536	$1,273,410,525	3-11
Veterans' Administration	1,015,389,000	948,529,500	11-12
Department of Defense	803,462,100	788,597,000	13
Federal Employees Health Insurance	114,000,000		14
Department of State	86,874,700	81,066,510	14-16
Atomic Energy Commission	57,500,000	52,150,000	16
National Science Foundation	29,250,000	24,400,000	17
Federal Employees Health Programs	12,200,000	11,500,000	17
Department of Labor	10,596,000	9,624,660	17
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	7,451,000	2,751,300	17
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization	5,255,900	1,432,000	18
Canal Zone Government	4,460,800	4,306,200	18
District of Columbia	2,800,000	2,200,000	18
Federal Aviation Agency	2,764,000	1,765,600	19
Department of Justice	2,520,000	2,218,000	19
Federal Trade Commission	1,900,000	1,600,000	19

Medical-health budgets of Federal departments, agencies, and commissions for this fiscal year—Continued

	Fiscal 1961	Fiscal 1960	Page
Department of Commerce	$846,100	$992,300	19
Civil Service Commission	425,400	405,806	20
Department of Interior	265,500	230,000	20
Office of the Attending Physician to Congress	27,275	23,615	20
National Advisory Committee to Selective Service	19,000	19,000	20
Total	3,756,363,311	3,207,222,016	

Payments to individuals because of disability through programs in which the U.S. Government participates (fiscal year ending June 30, 1961)

(Small groups of Federal retirees' plans not listed; administrative cost of programs omitted)

Program	Estimated beneficiaries	Approximate payments
Veterans' benefits:		
(a) Service-connected disability	[1] 2,419,000	$2,052,000,000
(b) Non-service-connected disabilities	[2] 1,827,000	1,627,000,000
Military retirement, permanent and temporary disability	87,030	235,021,000
Federal employees compensation (these programs fully financed by United States)	27,000	27,375,000
Public assistance (public assistance financed 59 percent United States and 41 percent States and localities; civil service, 50 percent United States and 50 percent employees):		
(a) Aid to needy permanently and totally disabled	361,700	[3] 290,000,000
(b) Dependent children aid (incapacitated father segment)	[4] 768,400	[4] 272,300,000
(c) Aid to the blind	108,000	[5] 94,900,000
Disability annuity payments to civil service retirees	110,000	165,000,000
Social security—OASI disability (these programs financed by social security tax):		
(a) Disabled workers [6]	[7] 567,000	566,000,000
(b) Childhood disability benefits [8]	[7] 127,000	70,000,000
(c) Dependents of disabled workers	[7] 358,000	125,000,000
Railroad retirement disability (a and b financed 50 percent by employers, 50 percent employees; c financed entirely by employers):		
(a) Permanent disability for regular job	36,000	49,000,000
(b) Permanent disability for all employment	70,000	96,000,000
(c) Temporary disability	140,000	62,000,000
Total	[9] 7,006,130	5,731,596,000

[1] 390,000 dependents in this total; program will be decreasing as beneficiaries die.
[2] 734,000 dependents in this total; program is increasing.
[3] $160,600,000 of this total is provided from U.S. funds. In addition, administrative cost of program is about $36,700,000; U.S. share is $18,300,000.
[4] Provided to 202,000 families, $161,000,000 of benefits is Federal. In addition, administrative cost of program is about $30,000,000; U.S. share is $15,000,000.
[5] U.S. contribution to program is $45,300,000. In addition, administrative costs of program are about $8,300,000; U.S. share is $3,800,000.
[6] Most of 200,000 increase in disabled over last year will result from elimination of age 50 requirement.
[7] Beneficiaries as of June 30, 1961.
[8] Eligibility based on disability incurred before age 18.
[9] No adjustment made for payments to 1 individual through more than 1 program.

Human Progress and Economic Brotherhood—Address by Ray R. Eppert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday, it was my high privilege to listen to a very fine address by Ray R. Eppert, national chairman of the Invest-in-America Week, and president of the Burroughs Corp. In the address he expressed thoughts which every American should consider, particularly at a time when we are so much concerned with many foreign problems. It is generally conceded that we should also give more thought to our domestic problems and the necessity to keep our economy sound.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HUMAN PROGRESS AND ECONOMIC BROTHERHOOD

(An address by Ray R. Eppert, national chairman, Invest-in-America Week, president, Burroughs Corp.)

It is a very real privilege for me to participate in Invest-in-America Week. Its purpose, as you know, is to spotlight the essential role of investment capital in our country and the great opportunity each citizen enjoys because of our individual freedom to invest in America's future growth.

Let me be specific, using a business enterprise as an analogy. The record of this business is the greatest success story ever written.

This company's bylaws were established in 1787. It has an unbroken dividend record, and has paid to its stockholders very much larger dividends than any similar enterprise in the world. While it has been in business many years it has always remained a young, forward-looking, dynamic enterprise.

It has constantly improved its products through research and development. In the last 15 years this R. & D. has risen from $2 billion to $13½ billion.

In the last 60 years, this company has increased its volume from $79 billion per year to $503 billion. Its customers have grown to 180 million, and its number of employees to 66 million.

That is a good record for the 173 years this business has been in existence. But what about the future? Where will it be in 1970, less than 10 short years from now?

New products will flow in an ever-increasing stream as research and development rises to a forecasted annual rate of $25 billion. Instead of 66 million employees, the business will have 80 million. The number of customers will increase from 180 million to 214 million. This particular business is getting eight new customers every minute of every hour of every day.

The volume of business in this decade will rise from $503 billion to $770 billion. Dividends to the stockholders will not only be maintained but greatly increased during this period.

Does that sound like a good business in which to invest?

The name of this company, of course, is the United States of America and its economic activity is made possible by voluntary capital invested by the customers who in turn receive the dividends from this most successful enterprise in the history of mankind.

Never has this subject been as important as it is at the present moment. It becomes increasingly clear that upon the economic strength of the United States depends the future for not only of Americans but of freemen everywhere.

Investing in America is tantamount to, and essential to, the continuation of our economic growth which has made the strength of America the strength of the free world. It means, quite simply, putting our dollars to work to maintain the flow of capital which is the lifeblood of our free enterprise system.

It means a continuing higher standard of living for our citizens * * * those same citizens who do the investing. It means the jobs which we must create for a million young men and women who enter our work force each year * * * at an average investment of approximately $17,000 per job or an annual total new job investment of $17 billion. It means the new and better tools and machines for an urgently needed increase in productivity.

And in our role of leader of the free world against the opposing ideology of Communist nations, investing in America—our economic growth—has taken on direct worldwide importance.

We have readily recognized the military implications of the Communist ambition for world domination. To forestall that threat, we have devoted a large part of our vast economic resources to building up a deterrent military force.

We have emphasized that our military security program is a defense program, and we are greatly concerned about a quick reaction time if attacked, and the means which will insure our adequate retaliation. Not being the aggressor we have little latitude of action other than to counter our opponents' moves.

We have allowed ourselves to be less concerned over the economic implications of the conflict, but the brutal fact is that we are today actively engaged in an undeclared war on the economic front which is potentially as dangerous as nuclear warheads; the difference is only that between quick destruction and slow strangulation, or perhaps the difference is whether the end of our way of life would come in our own time or our children's time.

The Communists have openly boasted that they will outproduce us and outtrade us to show the world, and especially those uncommitted peoples of the underdeveloped nations, that the methods of communism are more effective than the processes of free enterprise in providing the material necessities of life. To date they have had enough sense not to say when they expect to reach this capability and I think we can be certain Khrushchev hopes we won't call his economic bluff.

We should welcome this challenge because this is a war in which we have no logical reason, no reasonable logic, for taking a defensive posture. This is a cold war which we can unapologetically and deliberately fan into a hot war. There is a need for an economic NATO dedicated to offense, not defense. the free world can and should and must take the initiative, and the United States should be leading the attack.

Investing in America, then, not only provides the better life for our own people but generates the firepower necessary for leadership in this all-out economic offensive which we must wage if we are to preserve individual freedoms. Who can criticize our motives in a hot war waged to raise the living standards of the world?

In this economic offensive, the key battlegrounds are those underdeveloped nations of Asia, Africa and Latin America where per-

haps two-thirds of all humanity are still living in poverty, illness, and ignorance. It is a tragic fact that in this latter half of the 20th century, probably half of mankind is permanently hungry.

With our imaginations fired by the nearing conquest of space, we talk a great deal about our giant strides of progress—including the Soviets' accomplishment 3 weeks ago in bringing a man back from orbit—but we must always remember that what is ultimately achieved by man in space can be measured only by the benefits derived therefrom by men on earth—3 billion of them.

It must be obvious that there is little we can do toward lasting peace and prosperity—the ultimate goal of human progress—as long as so much of humanity is waging a daily struggle for minimum existence. That very situation gives communism its greatest weapon and poses to the free world its greatest danger.

Next to averting nuclear war, there is no problem facing us today more important than raising the living standards, improving the economies, of this restive, unhappy majority of the human race. Human progress can never be complete until the brotherhood of man has been extended to include economic brotherhood.

This is a conclusion based upon realism, not idealism.

In Asia, in Africa, in Latin America, there is an insistent demand for benefits of civilization which will not be denied. It is a demand which we Americans must heed not only because of the Communist alternative, not only because of our humanitarian instincts to help the suffering, but also for the very compelling reason of our national self-interest.

Our self-interest lies in expanding world trade, for the basic reason that our productive capacity has become greater than our own requirements. To keep our economy growing at the desired levels I mentioned earlier, we must have new markets, and the underdeveloped nations are our greatest potential. Unless we raise their standards so they can become better customers, our own standards are in very great danger of declining.

In recent years, these countries, despite their pitifully small starting bases, have averaged an economic growth of only 3 percent a year which has been largely offset by an average population growth of 2 percent a year. Since the annual per capita income is on the order of $100, the actual increase has been only about $1 a year per person.

Certainly the most modest goal we can envision for economic brotherhood is to step up this per capita gain another 1 percent, another $1, a year. Yet one reputable study has calculated that such a modest achievement would mean that by 1970 these peoples could be buying $14 billion forth of our exports a year.

In business, overproduction creates excess inventories which in turn necessitate layoffs, and then we have an economic bump in the road. In some underdeveloped countries the population inventory makes the development job extremely difficult. It is encouraging to note that some of these countries are officially recognizing that economic betterment must be predicated upon balanced inventories.

The problem in an economic offensive is to provide investment capital, the same kind of capital we are talking about for our own needs in Invest-in-America. The amount of capital required can of course be estimated only in the roughest terms, but one of the more conservative estimates sets it at approximately $450 billion to secure an additional 1 to 2 percent annual gain per capita during the next decade. It has been assumed that they could raise 85 percent of this need themselves from the sale of their goods on the world market. This leaves a deficit of around $7 billion which, during the initial period at least, would have to come from outside sources which presently are providing about half that amount. Thus there is a need for $3 to $4 billion more capital a year and that, remember, is for purely minimal results.

From what free world sources can they get this money?

Should it be direct foreign aid from the United States and our allies? Present commitments, especially in view of defense and domestic needs, are already heavy and further increases in direct government-to-government economic assistance will, it must be assumed, be modest in relation to the total need.

What about the international and national lending organizations? These sources have been and are being very helpful to underdeveloped nations but even with recent additions and expansions they are not capitalized on a scale to take up more than part of the slack.

Can private enterprise help? With the high level of business activity throughout the free world and the resulting competitive situation, this would appear to be the best hope for attracting capital into the rich potential of underdeveloped countries. Unfortunately, there are obstacles, some of them exasperating. In some have-not nations, nationalism has reached such a pitch that, desperate as they are for capital, they regard outside investment as imperialism.

To each of these outside capital sources, then, there are drawbacks. Probably none of them can provide the needed amount alone: combined, there is a serious question whether enough can be raised.

To me, this all adds up to one conclusion: if we are going to help these poorer countries and thereby keep them out of the Communist orbit, alleviate their suffering and help our own economy, we can reach our objective only through greater emphasis upon world trade. This must be a primary weapon in our economic offensive.

I remind you that the amount of investment capital needed by these nations from outside sources depends to a very large extent upon how much of their own investment capital they can accumulate. In the estimate I have been using, it was assumed that they would provide 85 percent of their own capital out of the sale of their own exports. If their export sales should fall below expectations, they would need even more outside capital. Conversely, if their export sales can be increased, they will need less outside capital.

Most of the underdeveloped nations are underdeveloped not because they lack resources but because they are dependent upon single product or single crop economies. They have been aptly described as "rich lands inhabited by poor people."

In the final analysis, the pace of their economic development must depend upon how successfully they are incorporated into the world market. The commercial nations, most importantly including the United States, are their markets and must assume responsibility for an expanding world trade which will permit the less commercial countries to earn their own way so they can become buyers as well as sellers and thus make their own contributions to a growing world market.

It is an economic truism that no nation can achieve its maximum economic growth except in an expanding market. The more the world economy can be expanded, the more prosperous all nations can become. Our own need is not for a bigger piece of the pie but for a bigger pie.

I have said that economic brotherhood would be a necessity even if it were not for the Communist challenge. Communism has not created the problem but it has increased greatly the urgency of the solution. History may record that communism's greatest contribution, perhaps its only contribution, to mankind was that it spurred the free world into greater efforts in spreading the benefits of civilization.

Or history may record that communism won out because the free world did not respond soon enough and vigorously enough to the vital economic aspect of the cold war.

To us, it is difficult to understand why people of underdeveloped nations, most of them newly won to political independence, should hesitate in their choice between communism and democracy. Why choose a still-experimental system which depends upon the individual's subservience to the state when we can offer a proved system rooted in the concept of the state's subservience to the individual? How can there be room for doubt between economic betterment with freedom and economic betterment at the cost of freedom?

The Ambassador from India gave a succinct answer last year in a speech before the Economic Club of Detroit. He pointed out that men have two needs, the need for bread and the need for liberty. In the richer societies such as ours, the need for bread has been satisfied and our overpowering need is for human liberty. In India and the rest of the underdeveloped world, the need for bread has not been met.

"In these circumstances"—and here I am quoting the Ambassador—"it would not be at all surprising if the people of these countries were to rate the material needs for life higher than the nonmaterial values of human liberty. If there is a system which they think can rapidly get them out of misery, it would not be surprising if they were to agree to a deprivation of their human liberties in order to rapidly improve their material status."

This is how the underprivileged peoples see their problems, according to one of their own spokesmen. Bread first, then liberty. Economic betterment must precede, or at least accompany, the promotion of democratic ideals and principles. Before we can win the war for men's minds, we must win the battle of their stomachs.

I believe that we can win that battle and the war despite the widespread belief that communism can, at a cost, produce faster economic results than democracy in an underdeveloped society. I believe that premise is based upon qualifications which are decisive in our favor.

Admittedly, certain advantages lie with the Communist method—not necessarily because it is Communist but because it is totalitarian, with all the regimentation of energies and resources which totalitarianism can enforce at whatever price to its own people.

Thus, as first in Russian and now in Red China, the people can be used as a slave labor force whose production is almost entirely confiscated to provide the reinvestment capital essential to economic growth. National production rises with relative rapidity but the workers realize little of the benefits of their labor until national objectives have been met. Sooner or later what may appear to be an initial advantage is lost because the state must begin to share its productivity with the people, thus slowing its reinvestment rate.

Under free enterprise methods, less of the production can be immediately reinvested because more of it is siphoned off for the current benefit of the workers. The people gain the advantages of economic growth as it occurs—not after it has reached a dictated, state-controlled level.

There are, then, two important qualifications to the speed of Communist methods.

First, the Communist lead holds only over a sprint distance; over the longer range, democracy accelerates while communism decelerates.

Second, the temporary Communist lead is in national productive power. Quick results are for the state, not the individual, and it is the individual in the underdeveloped world who needs and wants bread.

In the kind of economic results we are after, it is the democratic method, not communism, which has the advantage. It is an advantage which we can press to victory if we will work to make our foreign aid as effective as possible; if we pursue a policy of enlightened international cooperation; and if we encourage greater world trade and foreign investment.

I have mentioned the cost involved in achieving victory for the peoples of the world. Let us never forget the cost involved if we fail.

The world is being offered a fateful choice; progressive chaos or economic brotherhood.

The choice will depend in large part upon how well we continue to invest in America. And what a prime investment it is because if America's future growth is not assured, what is there to be certain about in this uncertain world?

If the free world has a well-conceived battle plan, and if our collective economic firepower is coordinated and directed on the right targets in an all-out offensive, the great issue in the world can be settled. Final victory must be achieved on the economic front. There is no acceptable alternative.

Public Stake in Railroad Merger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MILLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to call to the attention of the House of Representatives an editorial which appeared in the April 30, 1961, edition of the Buffalo Courier Express. The article follows:

[From the Buffalo Courier Express, Apr. 30, 1961]

PUBLIC STAKE IN RAILROAD MERGER

If railroads, with the blessing of the Interstate Commerce Commission, go about solving their economic ills by mergers, the people of every region served by one or more railroad systems ought to pay close attention to merger proposals.

This is because one merger may put the system or systems serving them down the economic drain. And down the drain also may go the region's chances of competing on even ground with other marketing areas to and from which goods are shipped by rail.

We make the point in support of the New York Central's insistence that if there is to be a merger of the Chesapeake & Ohio with the Baltimore & Ohio, the New York Central ought to be included in the merger.

Whether or not the New York Central is right in claiming the three-road merger would be "a step toward the creation of a healthy eastern railroad economy," we very clearly see that the interests of New York State shippers and travelers would be damaged badly if the Interstate Commerce Commission allowed the C. & O. and B. & O. to merge without inclusion of the NYC.

Because of the geographic layout of properties now owned and operated separately by the three railroads in several Eastern States, the New York Central obviously would be the sufferer if the other two were allowed to merge and together become a competitor of the isolated NYC.

New York State interests are peculiarly tied in with the future of the New York Central because from east to west across the State, it alone serves a statewide clientele. Its deterioration, which might be brought about by a merger excluding it, would be a loss in several ways both to the State at large and to the individual communities in which it pays taxes as a property owner. For years the NYC has been the city of Buffalo's biggest taxpayer.

The Interstate Commerce Commission will conduct a hearing in Washington June 19 on the proposed C. & O.-B. & O. merger. The New York Central has petitioned to intervene. The public stake in arranging the affairs of privately owned and operated facilities seldom is as evident as it is in this case. Since a public agency, the ICC, is to make the determination, it behooves all interests in this region to support the New York Central's position before the ICC in every conceivable way.

American Medical Association Survey of Federal Health Expenses—HEW Division of Hospital Facilities and NIH—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the following is the second part of a series on the report prepared by the American Medical Association on funds which have been appropriated by Congress for activities of the Federal Government in the field of health:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

This year	$1,598,356,536
Last year	1,273,410,525

Division of hospital facilities	$187,875,000
Last year	187,850,000

This division administers the Federal aspects of both the original and expanded Hill-Burton programs. In 1958 Congress enacted legislation which authorizes loans in lieu of grants for any of the eligible projects under the entire program. Since 1946 the Federal contribution through June 30, 1960, amounts to $1,384,831,857; when the sponsors' share is included, the total is $4,467,542,872 (these figures are for both the original and the expanded program). Total appropriations are divided into the following four categories:

Hill-Burton original program	$150,000,000
Last year	150,000,000

This appropriation, allotted to the States on the basis of population and per capita income, assists in the financing of new hospitals and related health facilities construction under the original Hill-Burton program. To June 30, 1960, Federal funds have partially financed approximately 4,319 projects, including 199,922 hospital beds, 925 public health centers, 24 State health laboratories and approximately 155 nurses' homes and training facilities.

Medical facilities—Categorical program	$35,000,000
Last year	35,000,000

These funds are allotted to the States on a population-per capita-income formula for new construction in the following four categories: $7,500,000 for hospitals for the chronically ill and impaired; $7,500,000 for diagnostic centers, or diagnostic and treatment centers; $10 million for nursing homes; and $10 million for rehabilitation facilities. As under the original program, the Federal share may range from one-third to two-thirds of the total project cost. As of June 30, 1960, a total of 880 projects had been approved, divided among the 4 categories as follows: facilities for chronically ill, 128; diagnostic-treatment centers, 349; nursing homes, 248; and rehabilitation facilities, 155.

Hill-Burton administrative expenses	$1,675,000
Last year	1,650,000

This appropriation is used for administration, including salaries and expenses for the hospital survey and construction program for the Federal headquarters and for eight regional Federal offices.

Research	$1,200,000
Last year	1,200,000

These funds are used for research, experiments, and demonstrations on utilization of hospital services, facilities, and resources. The bulk of the money is assigned as grants to States, universities, hospitals, hospital associations, professional associations, and community organizations and a small amount for direct research by the U.S. Public Health Service.

National Institutes of Health	$560,000,000
Last year	400,000,000
National Cancer Institute	111,000,000
Last year	91,257,000

About 57 percent of this appropriation is earmarked for grants to non-Federal individual investigators and private institutions for research and training. Almost 20 percent will be used to support contracts with the pharmaceutical and chemical industries in research on chemotherapeutic agents for the treatment of cancer. The States receive $3,500,000 for cancer control work, and $1,500,000 will be used for demonstration of the application of new control knowledge through grants to private nonprofit agencies and institutions and community hospitals and health departments; $6 million will provide professional and technical assistance to public and private institutions engaged in prevention, diagnosis, and treatment among individuals and large population groups (cytology activities) and environmental cancer activities and $700,000 will be used for planning of a cancer research building. The balance is for direct research operations, including salaries, supplies, and this Institute's share in the cost of operating the Bethesda (Md.) Clinical Center and related auxiliary services.

National Heart Institute	$86,900,000
Last year	62,237,000

Grants to non-Federal individual investigators and public and private institutions for research and training take about 80 percent of the appropriation; $3,500,000 is allocated to States for heart disease control. Approximately $2,370,000 is for technical assistance to States. The balance is for direct research operations, including salaries, supplies, and this Institute's share in the cost of operating the Bethesda (Md.) Clinical Center and related auxiliary services.

Mental Health Institute	$100,900,000
Last year	68,090,000

Approximately 75 percent of this appropriation is apportioned for research and training through grants to individual investigators and public and private institu-

tions. Under the research program, funds will be utilized for basic drug research, establishing of clinical centers for evaluation of new drugs, developing of a psychopharmacology training program and new methods of treating mental illness. Among the traineeship programs are research fellowships and psychiatric training for GP's. The sum of $6 million is allocated to the States for community mental health services. About $2,780,000 will be used for technical assistance to States; $5,139,000 of this appropriation will be used for construction of a combined mental health-neurology research facility. The remainder is for direct research operations, including salaries, supplies, and this Institute's share in the cost of operating the Bethesda Clinical Center and related auxiliary services.

Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases Institute	$61,200,000
Last year	46,862,000

Grants to public and private investigators for research and training total 80 percent of this appropriation. Studies include diseases such as arthritis, cystic fibrosis, diabetes, gout, rheumatism and gastrointestinal disorders. The balance is for direct research operations, including salaries, supplies and this Institute's share in the cost of operating the Bethesda Clinical Center and related auxiliary services.

Neurological Diseases and Blindness Institute	$56,600,000
Last year	41,487,000

Grants to public and private investigators and institutions for research and training total 70 percent of this appropriation. Studies include cerebral palsy, muscular dystrophy, multiple sclerosis, Parkinson's disease, epilepsy and conditions causing blindness and deafness; $7 million of this appropriation will be used for construction of a combined mental health-neurology research facility. This remainder is for direct research operations, including salaries, supplies, and this Institute's share in the cost of operating the clinical center and related auxiliary services.

Allergy and Infectious Diseases Institute	$44,000,000
Last year	34,054,000

Research grants to public and private investigators for research and training amount to 80 percent of this appropriation. Research activities in staphylococcal disease, upper respiratory infections, cystic fibrosis, basic immunology, tropical diseases and vaccine development is supported by this Institute. $750,000 would be used for payment to the Gorgas Memorial Institute for operating and maintaining the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory and for construction and equipping facilities. The balance is for direct research operations, including salaries, supplies and this Institute's share in the cost of operating the clinical center and related auxiliary services.

Dental Health Institute	$15,500,000
Last year	10,019,000

Grants to public and private investigators for research and training total about 65 percent of this appropriation. For technical assistance to States and for coordination and development of dental resources $2,100,000 will be used. The remainder is for direct research at Bethesda, review and approval of grants, administrative expenses, and for support of the clinical center.

General research and services— National Institutes of Health	$83,900,000
Last year	45,994,000

These funds are administered by the Division of General Medical Sciences of the National Institutes of Health, with practically all funds being expended for research and training grants and fellowships, with the exception of $2,970,000 for control of biologics, which activity is under the Division of Biologics Standards. Research supported by this Institute includes experimental embryology, cell biology, genetics, fetal and endrocrine physiology. The balance goes toward administrative expenses relating to grants.

(NOTE.—Included in the 1961 appropriations for the National Institutes of Health are the following amounts for special programs: $20 million for regional clinical research centers, both general and categorical; $7 million for primate centers; and $2 million for career research professorships. Public Law 86–798 (86th Cong.) authorizes the setting-aside of a uniform percentage (up to a maximum of 15 percent of amounts provided for research grants to be used as grants-in-aid to public or nonprofit universities, hospitals, laboratories, and other institutions for the general support of their research and research training programs. At the time National Institutes of Health appropriations were considered, Public Law 86–798 had not been enacted. Since the Appropriation Committees have not had an opportunity to discuss the application of the law, no funds have been allocated for this purpose in this appropriation.)

Progress in North Little Rock, Ark.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, an interesting article concerning the progress being made in North Little Rock, Ark., under the leadership of Mayor William F. Laman, appeared in the April issue of Arkansas Municipalities.

This article points out the things which can be done to improve a city's public facilities under dynamic and aggressive leadership. North Little Rock is really on the move. In only a few years the face of the city has been transformed. I hope that leaders in cities throughout the country will take note of what can be accomplished when civic leaders are willing to think and act big. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD for the enlightment of my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTH LITTLE ROCK—"PLEDGED TO PROGRESS"—PLANNING FOR THE FUTURE

"If you want to see a horrible example of an unplanned city, come to North Little Rock," said Mayor William F. "Casey" Laman, speaking at the annual meeting of the Arkansas Municipal League, but he was quick to add that in order to see it you would have to come soon for the development programs, planned and underway, would within a very short space of time completely change the face and character of the second largest city in Arkansas.

The story behind this statement is probably one of the greatest success stories in recent Arkansas history. It is a story of a man with vision and purpose and the ability to see his city as it might be; a man who could communicate his ideas to the people and provide the dynamic leadership necessary to completely change the attitude of a community.

For many years North Little Rock had prided itself in being a city without bonded indebtedness, but in point of fact, as was pointed out it was also a city without many of the basic facilities and services required by citizens in this day and age. In the first year of his administration Mayor Laman very candidly pointed out the deficiencies, portrayed potential, and explained how the city could acquire the needed facilities.

REORGANIZATION OF CITY DEPARTMENTS

The first major change was a partial reorganization of city departments, particularly those concerned with finance and purchasing. Strict accounting of all revenues and purchases was introduced, and a program of municipal services was prepared and correlated with anticipated revenues. The city can now tell the exact balance within its budget and can account for ever purchase at the end of each working day.

Typical of the change in departmental organization and service policies is the street program which in a period of less than 3 years has accomplished the building of 1,000 blocks of permanent street paving. Mayor Laman found that in the past the funds available for street paving had been devoted to maintaining substandard streets and that no progress was being made in the building of streets in the older part of the city. He called in experts to examine the street problem and to recommend a program where money could be put into permanent streets and maintenance costs could be reduced to a minimum. The solution appeared to be the use of soil cement base with black-top surface. Using this procedure the city has within a period of less than 3 years laid permanent streets on 68 percent of previously unpaved streets.

Tests which have been made on these streets show that they are increasing in strength each year, have a life expectancy of 30 years or more, and will be maintenance free for at least 15 years. Some idea of the boldness of this street-paving program can be gained from the fact that in the 50 years prior to 1958 the city, with its general revenue and street turnback funds, had been able to build only 35 blocks of permanent streets.

Through these reorganizations and because of his personal drive, the mayor had been able to bring about dramatic changes in the services rendered; but working within the strict financial limitations imposed on cities in Arkansas, and overwhelmed by the accumulation of problems brought about by half a century of neglect, he was forced to seek other means for constructing the much-needed public buildings and overhauling of the basic city services.

CITY'S NEEDS ANALYZED—AN INVENTORY

The analysis of city needs showed that many of the city buildings were antiquated and totally unsuited for their purpose. Indeed the Pulaski County grand jury had twice condemned the city's jail. The police department of some 80 men was housed in an area designed for a police force of 20 men. There was a need for new fire stations to provide adequate protection in all parts of the city. The public health center was located in a converted house which was sadly lacking in space, arrangement, and facilities despite the valiant efforts of a dedicated staff to provide the very best in health service. The library was housed in a 2-story frame house with no parking. The electrical distribution system was grossly overloaded, and the privately owned water system antiquated.

The city owned a 1,500-acre park which it had been unable to develop, and along the river banks of the Arkansas River, in

what is the front window of the city, squatters had created a slum on lands a large portion of which the city owned. These were but a few on the long list of improvements needed. Despite all of the reorganization, strict policing of purchases, and other changes, it was totally impossible for the city to finance these improvements with current revenues. Other means had to be sought.

CITIZENS APPROVE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

Just prior to his election in 1957, the people of North Little Rock had voted a 2-mill ad valorem tax for a $750,000 bond issue for the construction of a city hospital. Once again Mayor Laman took the cause to the people and proposed two revenue bond issues, one for $2,100,000 to overhaul the electric system (of which $393,000 was to be spent on lighting major thoroughfares) and a second issue of $4,857,500 to purchase and overhaul the water-supply system. These bond issues were passed by an overwhelming majority.

The mayor waited only long enough to carry out the administrative duties connected with the successful bond issues before he again went to the people to ask for a $1,100,000 bond issue for capital improvements requiring a 2-mill ad valorem tax. Under this bond issue $390,000 was set aside for the purchase of sites and construction of buildings for a new central fire station and two out stations; $275,000 for a police and courts building; $200,000 for a library $85,000 for a health center, and $150,000 for park improvements. So successful had been the mayor's explanation of the city's needs that the community as a whole campaigned for the new issue. We saw insurance men campaigning for new fire stations although the new stations would reduce the fire insurance rates. The chamber of commerce, which had often been thought as a very conservative group, campaigned so vigorously and effectively for the improvements that their work was eventually recognized by the national chamber of commerce and won for them a coveted award for civic responsibility.

The citizens by again voting an overwhelming majority in favor of the bond issue made it crystal clear that not only did they approve of the city government's policy but demanded the facilities for their city. Here was a case of where an erroneous assumption had been made that the people would go without rather than bear the tax burden, but in actual fact the people had not been given a choice and when eventually allowed to express their opinions made it known in no uncertain terms that they wanted North Little Rock to become a well-balanced community providing all of the facilities for a well-rounded life.

FACE LIFTING BEGINS

With the moneys provided under the bond issue, the work of face lifting has progressed at a very rapid pace. On the electrical system the job of converting from 4,160 volts transmission lines to 13,000 volts is now 50 percent complete. This work has been carried out under the direction of F. D. Jarvis, who is manager of the North Little Rock Electric Department. His program has produced a complete inventory of equipment, lines, and poles throughout the entire system. Working with his senior engineer draftsman, Irl Moreland, a complete study has been made of the existing distribution system so that loads can be balanced, transformers and substations used more efficiently, and lines and equipment installed to care for present needs and future expansion. Estimating and designing for future loads is not an easy matter, particularly in a city growing as rapidly as North Little Rock; for not only do you have to estimate population growth but you also have to consider many new uses to which electricity is put in the home and in the factory. Between 1949 and 1960 the demand in North Little Rock zoomed from 6,700 kilowatts to 30,600 kilowatts, an increase of five times, which is way above national average. On the street lighting program some 50 percent of the 24 miles of major highways are now illuminated by mercury vapor lights.

Under the waterworks bond issue the water distribution system had been acquired by the city and set up under an independent commission, with J. H. Montgomery as manager. The commission's program of overhauling and expansion of the waterlines has now been underway for over a year with spectacular results. The capital improvements bond issue in itself created another venture for the city. Whereas, initially the new buildings had been considered simply as replacements for inadequate facilities, it soon became apparent that the police and courts building, library, and health center formed a nucleus of a civic center and that in due course other new civic buildings would be needed. Mayor Laman called in Planning Consultant Gerald J. McLindon, to assist him in the selection of a site for the proposed civic center, and plans are now prepared for present and proposed developments covering some five city blocks to house all of the public buildings to be erected in the next 25 years. The plan calls for modern structures set in landscaped malls, with small courtyards, reflecting pools, and quiet areas. Parking spaces have been allowed to take care of all anticipated needs. The civic center is located at the junction of interstate freeways which radiate out into all sections of the city. In what was a year ago a slum area, there is now a rising police and courts building. The library will be under construction within a matter of weeks and the health center will be started before fall. Two of the fire stations have already been completed, and the new central fire station will be under construction early next month.

The money voted for park improvements has been used in developing portions of the 1,500 acre Burns Park, providing pavilions, play equipment, ball diamonds, and new roadways. But a very substantial part of the money was used in developing community and neighborhood parks close to the major residential concentrations. Mayor Laman has said that he wants to see a park within a half mile of every home in North Little Rock and equipped to provide recreation for children of all ages. His philosophy on recreation and youth programs is well known and often quoted. "I would much rather spend money providing facilities for the useful outlet of youthful energy than have to spend the money for police and court work rounding up juvenile delinquents."

Along the river front 120 slum shacks have been bulldozed off and the riverside park created. A new roadway, pavilions, a comfort station, picnic areas, and flower beds will soon fill the city's front window, and on the seawall, which had supported cardboard shacks, a mural will be painted depicting the progress in Arkansas.

These bond issues have already borne great fruits for the community, not only do we have these needed facilities, but they have also drawn people to North Little Rock. Only last month a new 16-lot subdivision was completely sold out in one day without any advertising campaign. The Kohler Co. of Wisconsin has announced the opening of a big plant. The director of a large motel chain, in announcing the building of a million-dollar structure said that never in all of his business contacts had he experienced the cooperation or enthusiasm from a city or a mayor equal to that shown in North Little Rock. Each day brings forward new plans and new investments. A regional shopping center, two department stores, talk of a farmers' market, new subdivisions, all of these things because one man had vision and courage and pointed the way for the citizens.

FUTURE PLANS

But what has been accomplished is only a beginning. Mayor Laman waits only long enough for one of his programs to get underway before plunging into the next. At this time he is working on the purchase of a 5,300-acre industrial tract, and a $3,500,000 sewerage project and is searching for ways and means of solving the storm drainage problem which has plagued the city from the day of its creation. The mayor, the city council, and the people are indeed the epitomy of the city's slogan "Pledged to Progress" but even this slogan is used as a measure of accomplishment. Becoming concerned with the amount of substandard and slum housing within the city, Mayor Laman has said, "We cannot say we are a city pledged to progress and at the same time sweep our problems under the rug." Declaring war on slums, he continued, "There is something wrong with our society when some of our children don't have bathtubs and one of the biggest problems with others is where they are going to park their cars at the high school." Under such great leadership and encouraged by the fantastic rate of change, the people of North Little Rock are firmly convinced that they and their children will realize the full potential of the city and will in course of time become the first city in the State.

Migratory Farmworker Problems in New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, many growers are interested in and truly concerned about the lot of our migratory workers. Many are sincerely trying to improve the conditions of the workers, who help them each year to plant, pick, and harvest their crops. Throughout my work on the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, of which I have the honor to be chairman, I have called the attention of the Senate and the public to this kind of concern, wherever I have found it to exist. Only recently, this kind of constructive endeavor was noted in an article which appeared in the New York Times on April 28 entitled, "Migrant Workers Arrive in New Jersey." The article gives an excellent account of the efforts which have been made to improve the living and working conditions of our Puerto Rican migratory workers in Glassboro, N.J. It was with no little interest and pride that I noted the splendid progress which has been made in my home State.

The article points out that contracts between worker and grower guarantee a minimum of 80 cents an hour, and at least 160 hours of work for every 4 weeks. The article also notes that last year the average pay for the Glassboro workers was $44.60 a week. Some workers manage to accumulate as much as $1,000 during the season, a considerable sum by Puerto Rican farm labor standards.

Positive evidence that living conditions of migratory workers can be adequate is clearly exemplified on one farm where 14 men live in a large, white-painted cinderblock building. The building is equipped with a television set, kitchen facilities including electric refrigerator, double decker beds, two toilets and a shower with hot water. Of his workers, the owner says, I don't know what we'd do without them.

Because the article explains the origins of the Glassboro program, and because it shows that constructive thinking and planning can accomplish real progress, I ask unanimous consent that the article be included in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. President, I would also like to ask unanimous consent to have included in the Appendix of the RECORD a series of three articles on other progress being made in this area. The author, Eleanor G. Collie, has written often on migratory workers on New Jersey farms. Her understanding of the problems and progress in this area is demonstrated again in this series, which appeared in the Camden (N.J.) Courier-Post on April 24, 25, and 26.

There being no objection the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 28, 1961]

MIGRANT WORKERS ARRIVE IN JERSEY—VANGUARD OF 7,000 FLIES IN FROM PUERTO RICO TO HARVEST THE CROP

(By Clarence Dean)

MILLVILLE, N.J., April 27.—A white and silver Trans Caribbean airplane cut through gathering thunderclouds and touched down at the municipal airport here. A dozen Millville residents had gathered in the dusk to watch the transport arrive.

It was bringing in from Puerto Rico some of the first of the seasonal labor on which New Jersey's agricultural industry becomes increasingly dependent.

The 105 who alighted from the chartered flight were the vanguard of 7,000 who will harvest this year's crops—asparagus, blueberries, cucumbers, tomatoes, onions, string beans, peaches and, finally, apples and sweet potatoes.

The asparagus season began this week. It will continue through June. There are 29,000 acres to be harvested in Gloucester, Salem, and Cumberland Counties, an asparagus-growing area second only to California. Sixty percent of the crop will be canned or frozen, the balance sold on the fresh-produce market in the East.

A SEASONAL TRIP

Most of the Puerto Ricans who come here for the harvest are agricultural workers at home. The season on the coffee, sugar, and banana plantations ends about this time, and, without jobs in the United States, they would be unemployed until early next year.

With their Latin temperament, they are, nevertheless, diffident, shy people on the whole, born to the primitive, rustic life of the island's mountainous interior.

They came down the gangway from the big plane tonight, eyes alive with wonder and despite their ages—from 19 through 45—looking like excited youngsters on their first trip to the city.

Buses were waiting to take them the 22 miles to a reception center in Glassboro and a dinner of pork chops, rice, beans and strong Caribbean coffee. Here they would sleep for the night and leave in the morning for the farms to which they had been assigned.

Prior to World War II, the south Jersey farmers obtained their seasonal help mostly from below the Mason and Dixon line which actually cuts through lower New Jersey.

QUEST FOR WORKERS

But after the war, job opportunities for Negroes became more numerous and summer workers grew increasingly hard to find.

In 1946, the Glassboro Service Association, a farmers' cooperative, experimented with recruiting temporary labor in Puerto Rico.

The move was so successful that 3 years later, the Garden State Service Cooperative Association was formed to expand the work. It serves 10 farmer groups, the largest of which is the Glassboro association, with 1,400 members. Garden State recruits for farms in Delaware, New York and Pennsylvania as well as New Jersey.

The operation is carried on in cooperation with the Puerto Rican Department of Labor. Garden State interviewers begin recruiting workers on the island in early spring, and the men come here on a contract basis.

The contracts, individually signed, guarantee a minimum of 80 cents an hour and at least 160 hours of work every 4 weeks. Housing accommodations and cooking facilities also are provided.

The men buy their own food and pay the chartered-plane fare of $50.15 to New Jersey. The fare may be paid in installments. They must also pay their way home at the end of the season.

Many earn more than the minimum, especially those who are on piecework. The average pay for the Glassboro workers last year was $44.60 a week. Some workers manage to accumulate as much as $1,000 during the season, a considerable sum by Puerto Rican farm labor standards.

The men are under no obligation to return to Puerto Rico in the fall, but Garden State officials estimate that 70 percent do. Most of them are married or have strong family ties on the island.

The living accommodations on the farms are subject to approval by the New Jersey Bureau of Migrant Labor. They vary in quality, but, on the whole, are superior to the migrants' housing on their island.

At the farm of J. Ellison Haines on Salem Pike in Mickleton, for example, 14 men are living in a white-painted cinder block building some 20 feet wide by 40 feet long.

It has a television set, kitchen facilities including an electric refrigerator, double-decker beds, two toilets and a shower with hot water.

Mr. Haines' farm—where there are ninety acres of asparagus to be harvested between now and the end of the season in late June—provides an example of the relationship that has grown up between the workers and the South Jersey farmers.

For 8 years, Mr. Haines has been employing Puerto Ricans. Some of the same men return to his farm each season by mutual agreement, a common practice.

A Quaker, erect in stature, with clear gray eyes and quiet voice, Mr. Haines says simply: "I don't know what we'd do without them."

Marianas Sotomayor, a smiling, stocky man 36 years old, for three summers has left his wife and boy in Adjuntas to work for Mr. Haines. "He is a good man," Mr. Sotomayor says. "He is a good farmer. We like him."

The language barrier is an increasing diminishing problem on the South Jersey farms. The employers have picked up a smattering of Spanish, and the workers a similar amount of English, and they seem to make themselves understood on both sides.

For emergency problems—such as a serious misunderstanding of orders or a personal dispute—the Glassboro service keeps seven radio cars geographically deployed, and a call for assistance quickly brings a field representative with an interpreter.

[From the Camden (N.J.) Courier-Post, Apr. 24, 1961]

SHOW HOW IT'S DONE IN UNITED STATES—GOAL OF MIGRANT OFFICE

(By Eleanor G. Collie)

Names of Government agencies are sometimes no longer than the objectives of the agencies to which they are attached.

A case in point is the Bureau of Employment, Security Migration Division, Department of Labor, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

The regional office of this agency, at 433 Arch Street, has as its ultimate objective going out of business, according to Anthony Vega, regional director.

"We want to do our job so well and thoroughly that our services will no longer be required," Vega said.

SERVES FOUR STATES

But the migrant office won't be hanging up an out of business sign for some time to come because of a continuing stream of Puerto Ricans coming into four States, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Delaware, served by the regional office.

William Muniz, who doubles as Vega's deputy and is responsible for services to Puerto Ricans in south Jersey, reported that approximately 20,000 of his countrymen are in the area and require services available at the regional office.

"We're here to tell our people how to do what, like everybody else does it," Vega said, "when they earn this then we'll go out of business."

Vega's regional responsibilities include supervision of the Camden office and suboffices in Keysport and Hamburg, Pa.

EXPANDED SERVICES

Established to provide services for agricultural contract workers brought in annually to work on south Jersey farms, the Camden office became a regional headquarters in 1960 and expanded its services to include advisory assistance to Puerto Ricans who elect to live here permanently.

In general, Vega said, three service programs are available to Puerto Ricans and groups and agencies working with Puerto Ricans.

"We have an agricultural program, a community relations program, and an educational program, developed and supervised by trained personnel."

Requirements for field workers include "college training and experience in social work, community organization, education, and labor relations; and of course, our men must speak both English and Spanish," Vega said.

EMPHASIZES SELF-HELP

Muniz supervises the agricultural program; Lionel Jiminez and Gabriel Koll, working out of the Camden office, supervise respectively the community service and educational programs.

"In each of our programs," Vega said, "the accent is on our people helping themselves" in adjusting to the community and industrial pattern in south Jersey.

Calling his organization "a multidiscipline government agency," Vega said, "we work with churches, health groups, civic and municipal agencies, educators, labor, and agricultural associations to find collective cooperative solutions to social problems involving newly arrived Puerto Ricans."

In following articles, details of the three service programs cited by Vega will be reviewed.

[From the Camden (N.J.) Courier-Post, Apr. 25, 1961]

PUERTO RICAN AGENCY AIDS MIGRANTS WHO WANT TO HELP THEMSELVES

(By Eleanor G. Collie)

When representatives of the Puerto Rican Department of Labor in Camden talk of their educational service program, they are not referring to compulsory classroom attendance.

They're discussing self and group education for Puerto Ricans in expediting the adjustment to the south Jersey socioeconomic pattern.

The program, outlined by Anthony Vega, regional director, is fairly standard in the 11 regional offices in the United States.

Joseph Monserrat, chief of the migration division of the Puerto Rican employment service in the middle Atlantic States, is responsible for all programs.

AID AVAILABLE

Vega said, "in all migrant division offices, personnel are available to assist Puerto Ricans in group organization, conducting leadership courses, and in holding meetings."

Emphasizing that his staff neither initiates nor insist that their countrymen organize groups, Vega said, "But if they want to themselves, we're here to help if they call on us.

"For example, there is in Camden a committee of Puerto Rican affairs. This committee is in no way responsible to us nor connected with us, but we work with them occationally when we are specifically invited to do so.

HELPING THEMSELVES

"The committee of Puerto Rican affairs is a group of people helping themselves and that's the way we like it.

"You could say this office strives to be a resource for all types of guidance for Puerto Ricans wanting to become a normal part of a community."

Vega cited the New Jersey Council of Puerto Rican Organizations as an outstanding example of "people helping themselves."

Composed of 42 civic, social and self-help member groups, the council and Rutgers University will hold a conference on Puerto Rican affairs May 7 in Newark.

The theme of the conference, which will be addressed by educators and representatives from social schools and labor, is "Accomplishments and Goals of the Puerto Rican Community of New Jersey."

CONSULTANTS TO PROJECTS

Time has been allotted for discussions on housing, employment, health and discrimination.

Migrant division personnel are merely consultants cooperating in the project proposed by Rutgers University and enthusiastically accepted by the Puerto Rican council.

This type of project is an example of the program Vega means when he discusses "education."

Through its regional offices, the Puerto Rican department of labor contributes to the assimilation of its island people into a cosmopolitan society.

Migrant division offices in the States exist to serve both the Puerto Rican who comes into the area and the communities within the area.

"When the assimilation is accomplished," Vega said, "our offices can be closed."

[From the Camden (N.J.) Courier-Post, Apr. 26, 1961]

PUERTO RICAN LABOR DEPARTMENT SERVES MIGRANT AND COMMUNITY

(By Eleanor G. Collie)

Puerto Rico's department of labor serves its citizens who come to south Jersey to live and work.

Through the regional office in Camden, the Puerto Rican labor department provides both trained personnel and action programs to assist the Spanish-speaking migrants in adjusting to their new environment.

Anthony Vega, regional director, provided details for three general programs in agricultural, community service and education assistance.

Vega said "we work with farm laborers and growers. We have four men in the field who visit farms to assist the employer as well as the employee in working out problems that might adversely influence the effectiveness of the worker."

CHECK CONTRACT WORK

"Along with representatives of the State employment service and farm associations, our fieldworkers check to make sure that contracts are being honored."

"We work with the farmers in telling the non-English speaking workers how the farmers want their jobs done."

Summing up the agricultural program Vega said, "In a multitude of ways we try to assist both the growers and the agricultural workers."

Problems are referred to Ralph Sanchez, regional program director, by individual workers and growers and by the Glassboro Service Association.

COMMUNITY SERVICE

Turning to the community service program, Vega reported that his staff works closely with various groups including churches, schools and labor unions.

He said, "Church representatives frequently come to us for guidance on setting up programs that will attract and involve Puerto Ricans living in the neighborhood of the church.

"We have obtained and have available approved testing material appropriate to the newcomer which schools have used to determine class placement of children, their intelligence level and cultural potential."

The educational service program is broad in its application. Vega said, "Education is bilateral, it works both ways."

WORKS BOTH WAYS

Implying that communities accepting Puerto Ricans as well as newly arrived Puerto Ricans themselves need to be oriented, Vega said, "When we're invited we address civic groups and discuss the social, cultural and economic backgrounds of our countrymen, and we suggest ways and methods by which the groups and the Puerto Ricans can work cooperatively.

"We serve as interpreters between labor groups and Puerto Ricans and explain the one to the other.

"This service is mainly in cities such as Camden where the distinction between the seasonal migrant worker and the settled urban Puerto Rican is most obvious."

In the concluding article, the Puerto Rican educational program, which is in effect a reaffirmation of the idea of the Puerto Ricans helping themselves, will be reviewed.

American Medical Association Survey of Federal Health Expenses—HEW Miscellaneous—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the following is the third part of a series on the report prepared by the American Medical Association on funds which have been appropriated by Congress for activities of the Federal Government in the field of health:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Grants for construction of research facilities $30,000,000
Last year 30,000,000

These funds are available for planning and construction of research facilities. To be eligible for grants, the applicant must be a public or nonprofit institution determined by the Surgeon General, after consultation with the National Advisory Council on Health Research Facilities, to be competent to engage in the type of research for which the facility is to be constructed. This is the fifth year of this program's operation.

Scientific activities overseas, new $3,707,000

This appropriation provides for the purchase of United States owned local currencies in foreign countries for the conduct of medical research activities in those countries under the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480), as amended.

Water pollution control $45,000,000
Last year 45,000,000

The Federal Government makes grants for the construction of waste treatment plants. Although $45 million was appropriated for fiscal 1960 and 1961, the funds allocated to the States each year will be based on the $50 million authorized in the basic legislation.

Hospital and medical care $55,213,000
Last year 51,600,000

These funds are used for operational costs and maintenance of Public Health Service hospitals and health services in caring for American seamen, Coast Guard, and Public Health Service personnel and their dependents, Federal employees injured at work, leprosy patients, and narcotic addicts, and includes studies in the development and coordination of nursing resources. It also includes $1,200,000 for payments to Hawaii for care of patients suffering from leprosy and $6,550,000 for nurse training grants. Also included in $421,000 for the Division of Nursing Resources which administers the professional nurse traineeship program and conducts research and provides consultation on nursing education and services. Not shown in the appropriation is approximately $5,536,000 additional income, principally from other Federal agencies for reimbursable services.

Indian health activities and facilities $57,990,000
Last year 50,287,000

The Public Health Service is responsible for the health of American Indians and Alaskan natives (Eskimos, etc.). The total is broken down as follows: hospital care in Indian hospitals, $29,195,000; contract patient care, $9,028,000; field health services, $8,622,000; program direction, $1,431,000; and modernization of hospitals and construction of facilities, $9,714,000. In addition, the Indian health activities of the Public Health Service will receive approximately $750,000 as reimbursements from other governmental agencies for services rendered in Public Health Service facilities.

Assistance to States—General $27,120,000
Last year 24,497,000

A total of $17 million will be available as grants to States in support of State and local general public health activities. These grants must be matched 1 State dollar for

every Federal dollar. The remainder will be available as follows: $5,690,000 to provide technical assistance, consulting services to States, expenses of the National Office of Vital Statistics, international health activities, demonstrations, training activities, and operational expenses; $2 million for grants to schools or direct traineeship awards to individuals for training of professonal public health personnel; $1 million for grants to schools of public health; and $1,430,000 (authorized by Public Law 86–720, 86th Cong.) for project grants for graduate public health training.

Environment health $27,640,000
Last year 15,640,000

This program is made up of six activities as follows: air pollution control, $5,921,000; water supply and water pollution control, $9,892,000; radiological health activities, $6,719,000; milk, food, and general sanitation activities, $1,855,000; occupational health activities, $1,877,000; and accident prevention activities, $1,376,000.

Tuberculosis control $6,430,000
Last year 6,452,000

Grants to States for diagnostic and treatment clinics, mass case-finding and follow-up services account for $4 million, all of which has to be matched equally by the States. The remainder is for direct operations of Public Health Service.

Communicable disease activities $14,116,000
Last year 13,415,000

This appropriation is used for direct activities of the PHS Communicable Disease Center at Atlanta, Ga. (and its affiliated operations), and for the Arctic Health Research Center in Anchorage, Alaska. The Communicable Disease Center carries on studies in epidemiology, furnishes laboratory diagnostic services, and sponsors special projects to assist States. The Arctic Health Research Center conducts studies on health problems in low temperature areas. Of the total of $5,700,000 for control of venereal disease, $2,400,000 goes for direct grants to States for venereal disease detection, treatment, and control on a special-need basis. Most of the remainder is spent for technical assistance to the States, including funds to pay 351 Federal employees, the majority of whom are assigned to State health departments.

Office of the Surgeon General $6,900,000
Last year 5,816,000

For administrative expenses of this Office, including all housekeeping services, evaluation of public health needs, and personnel training. Included also is approximately $2,156,725 for administration of the National Health Survey Act authorized by Public Law 652 (84th Cong.),

Foreign quarantine activities $4,931,000
Last year 4,685,800

This service operates 319 medical quarantine stations on borders of the United States. It also operates 23 medical examination stations on foreign soil for the examination of aliens seeking visas to enter the United States. Inspections are made of all seagoing vessels and aircraft entering the United States. It is estimated that the service will examine more than 3,150,000 aliens in this country and 165,000 abroad.

National Library of Medicine, operating expenses $1,662,000
Last year 1,566,000

Under Public Law 940 (84th Cong.), the Armed Forces Medical Library was renamed the National Library of Medicine and transferred to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. A new structure has been authorized to house the Library and $6,950,000 in construction funds was appropriated for 1959. The new Library is now under construction on the southeast corner of the NIH reservation at Bethesda.

Buildings and facilities, PHS ..... (new) .. $3,470,000

This appropriation would be divided as follows: $600,000 to survey and acquire a site for quartering animals and for construction of additional office, laboratory, and service space at the Communicable Disease Center at Atlanta; $785,000 for planning for an environmental health center; and $2,085,000 for construction of research and other facilities for National Institutes of Health, the bulk of which would be for equipping and renovating of animal quarters, a permanent animal research building for the addiction center at Lexington, Ky., and for initial development of facilities for large animals on the site purchased with funds provided in 1960.

Reimbursable health programs for other governmental agencies $691,000
Last year 623,000

This represents the cost of services expected to be advanced to Public Health Service by other governmental agencies for establishing and operating on-the-job clinics. Public Health Service deals largely with Washington, D.C., personnel; whereas, 90 percent of the total number of Government's employees are located outside the Washington area.

St. Elizabeths Hospital $26,380,000
Last year 18,817,725

St. Elizabeths provides treatment for several classes of mentally ill persons, including those residing in the District of Columbia, beneficiaries of the Veterans' Administration, beneficiaries of Public Health Service, insane persons charged with or convicted of crimes in U.S. courts (including the court of the District of Columbia), certain American citizens found insane in Canada, the Panama Canal Zone and the Virgin Islands, certain foreign service personnel, and members of the military services admitted to the hospital prior to July 16, 1946. Congress appropriated $4,491,000 to this institution for operational expenses, $345,000 for major repairs, and $4,994,000 for construction of new buildings or expansion of present buildings. Reimbursements from other agencies will approximate $16,550,000. This hospital has an average daily patient load of 7,000.

Freedmen's Hospital $3,294,600
Last year 3,190,000

This institution with an average patient load of 326, plus 36 new-borns is a medical teaching facility and general hospital. Its patients are chiefly drawn from the District of Columbia and the adjoining area. The hospital is utilized for training of interns and residents, many of whom are graduates of Howard University, and it has a nurses' training school. A total of $5,050,515 is authorized for operating costs. All in excess of $3,294,600 (appropriated for fiscal 1961) are expected reimbursements from charges made to patients and payments made by the District of Columbia and other Federal agencies and from the counties surrounding Washington who utilize these facilities for welfare patients. Some supervisory functions over this program are vested in the Public Health Service.

Howard University $1,481,000
Last year 1,296,000

This university is jointly supported by congressional appropriations and private funds and offers instruction in ten schools and colleges, including colleges of medicine, dentistry, and pharmacy. This year the university's total operational budget is in excess of $9,300,000. Of this amount, the Federal Government will contribute $5,490,000 toward operational expenses, $225,000 for plans for construction, and $1,433,000 for completion of a home economics building and power plant facilities. The combined budgets for the colleges of medicine, dentistry and pharmacy will require approximately 24.9 percent of the university's budget for educational and general expense. The entire student body of the university for 1960–61 will be approximately 6,778. There are 385 students enrolled in the college of medicine, 336 in the college of dentistry, and 169 in the college of pharmacy. The Federal contribution for direct current operations in the colleges of medicine, dentistry and pharmacy is estimated to be $1,481,000 for 1961.

Bureau of Public Assistance, medical payments $350,000,000
Last year 254,000,000

Out of a total budget of approximately $3½ billion (Federal, State and local funds) for categorical public assistance payments, officials of the Social Security Administration estimate that approximately $675 million or about 19 percent is now being devoted for medical and health needs of categorical assistance recipients this fiscal year. About $585 million will be paid to vendors of medical care, such as physicians, hospitals, pharmacists, nursing homes, etc., and about $90 million directly to recipients to enable them to meet their medical care needs. The Federal share of combined medical payments to vendors and to recipients will be about $350 million. Reflected in the increase are funds for the expanded old age assistance medical care program and the medical assistance for the aged program under Public Law 86–778, the Social Security Amendments of 1960.

Children's Bureau $39,110,000
Last year 34,420,000

Operating under the Social Security Administration, the Children's Bureau administers grants to States for maternal and child health, and crippled children's and child welfare services. This year grant money totals $51,833,000 divided as follows: $18,167,000 for maternal and child health work; $20 million for crippled children's services; and $13,666,000 for child welfare services. However, this last item has no medical significance and, therefore, it is not reflected in the total of $39,110,000. One-half of the Federal funds for maternal and child health and crippled children's services is required to be matched dollar for dollar by the States. In addition, the Children's Bureau has $2,360,000 to finance investigating and reporting activities and to administer all investigating and reporting activities and to administer all the grants. About 40 percent of this amount is chargeable to the health and related activities of the Children's Bureau which include administration of grants for maternal and child health and crippled children's services and consultative services to State agencies and other public and voluntary agencies and organizations engaged in the provision of maternal and child health services.

Office of Vocational Rehabilitation $73,501,000
Last year 66,338,000

Grants to the States (same as Hill-Burton formula) are provided for: (a) Support of basic rehabilitation services, including medical examinations, surgical, and therapeutic treatment, hospitalization, prostheses, occupational tools, and aids, vending stands, rehabilitation facilities, vocational training, and funds for maintenance, $54,700,000; and (b) extension and improvement of State

programs, $1,500,000. Appropriations for research and training are divided as follows: (a) Special grants to States or nonprofit organizations for projects designed to expand the rehabilitation program (2–1 Federal-States matching), $8,074,000; and (b) for training of rehabilitation personnel, including physicians, therapists, psychologists, counselors, medical, and psychiatric social workers, $7,206,000. In addition, $2,021,000 is available for Federal administration costs.

Rehabilitation activities overseas (new)---------- $930,000

This appropriation provides for the purchase, mainly from the Treasury, of U.S.-owned local currencies of foreign countries for the conduct of research and training in rehabilitation in those countries under the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480), as amended.

Food and Drug Administration_ $19,654,000
Last year---------- 15,512,000

Of the total, $18,052,000 will be used for the enforcement of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act which includes: The inspection of manufacturers and examination of samples of all foods, drugs and cosmetics in interstate commerce to see that they are safe, pure, honestly labeled and packaged, and bear adequate warnings and directions for use; combating medical, nutritional and mechanical quackery through court actions; premarketing safety clearance of new drugs and food additives; requiring appropriate labeling of household products containing hazardous ingredients; pretesting of all color additives. $1,602,000 will be used to certify the strength, purity and other requisites of certain antibiotic drugs and their derivatives, insulin and its derivatives, the establishment of tolerances for pesticide chemicals on raw agricultural products, and certification of batches and establishment of tolerances for all colors used in or on food, drugs and cosmetics.

U.S. Office of Education_____ $4,000,000
Last year---------- 4,000,000

For a number of years the Office of Education has been making grants to States chiefly for vocational education. During the last fiscal year approximately $4 million was made available as grants to aid the States in the training of practical nurses. For this year, the Office of Education has available approximately $34 million for grants to States, of which $4 million is again earmarked for the practical nurse training program.

Federal surplus property donation program, approximate___ $47,260,936
Last year---------- 38,405,000

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has authority to make donations of personal property and transfer of real property declared surplus by Federal agencies for health needs. In the case of real property, conditional title is vested in the transferee and then after a number of years of utilization of the property in accordance with imposed conditions the property can become absolutely vested. Recipients of personal property may be medical institutions, health centers, hospitals and clinics. Eligible donees of real property may be any institutions organized for health purposes, including those engaging in medical research. It is difficult to determine the exact value of property donated and transferred since accounting is on the basis of acquisition cost. Last year approximately $40,066,069 of personal property (acquisition cost) was allocated for health purposes. During the same period, approximately $23,355,370 of real property (acquisition cost) was transferred with a fair market value of $7,194,867. It is expected that the level of donations and transfers for the current fiscal year will be in line or slightly in excess of last year's totals.

The Captive Nations and the Freedom of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Assembly of Captive European Nations is made up of representatives of the democratic and anti-Communist forces in the nations of central and Eastern Europe which have been taken over by the Russian Communists and which are conducted as satellites of the Soviet Union. The Assembly comprises distinguished exiles from Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania. Some of these men were once in coalition governments with the Communists and discovered how faithless and brutal the latter are in their relentless drive for power.

The Assembly has prepared an excellent memorandum on the "Captive Nations and the Freedom of Europe," and I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from it, together with this statement, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CAPTIVE NATIONS AND THE FREEDOM OF EUROPE

(A memorandum)

The Assembly of Captive European Nations considers itself in duty bound to reaffirm, at this time of searching reassessment of American foreign policy, its conviction that Europe is and will remain in the decisive arena in the global struggle between freedom and Communist totalitarianism; that the people of Eastern Europe are in a position to play, both as a factor of deterrence, and, if deterrence failed, as allies of the free nations, a very significant role in this struggle; that a lasting and secure peace will remain beyond reach as long as Soviet power is poised in the geographical center of Europe, and that to serve both the immediate and longer term requirements of a free Europe, it is incumbent upon the Western Powers to demonstrate by words and deeds their vital stake in the freedom of the eastern half of Europe and their unswerving resolve to help the captive peoples recover the exercise of their right of self-determination.

The subjugation of nine, once free and independent European nations by Soviet Russia constitutes a legal and moral issue solidly founded on the war-time and post-war agreements to which both the Western Powers and the Soviet Union were parties, as well as on the now universally recognized right of self-determination. Its major political consequences has been the failure to establish in Europe a dependable and durable peace, that is, a peace with freedom and justice. In the considered judgment of the Assembly, failure to recognize the vital importance of Eastern Europe and to pursue policies designed to link effectively the struggle for the preservation of freedom and for the recovery of freedom in Europe would have most serious consequences. It would make it extremely difficult, if not impossible, for the United States "to steer a course between the Scylla of universal annihilation and the Charybdis of universal enslavement" which, in the expressive words of an American statesman, is the basic requirement of U.S. foreign policy in the sixties. The assembly, therefore, feels enjoined (i) to examine the currently most widespread Western views on, and policies with respect to, the captive countries; (ii) to submit its own views on the present stake of the Western Powers in the captive nations, and (iii) to suggest measures apt to promote the common interests of the free nations and their silent allies in Eastern Europe.

I

Any attempt to bring into discussion the problem of the freedom and independence of the captive nations of central and eastern Europe has lately been hurting itself against the theory that the situation in Europe was now stabilized—economically, politically, and militarily, and it could only be changed, one way or the other, at the price of a major war, that is, at a price unacceptable to both sides. The arena of contest between the forces of freedom and communism, continues the theory, has moved to the so-called uncommitted nations of Asia and Africa. These nations hold the balance of power. With Latin America, they constitute the only active fronts and, therefore, claim the undivided attention of the Western Powers. However desirable it would be to have in central and eastern Europe truly independent nations, under freely elected governments, this can no longer be a practical goal of Western policy. To pretend otherwise would mean engaging in the irresponsible action of inciting people to futile uprisings. The best the West can do for the captive nations, concludes the theory, is to preserve the hope in their ultimate delivery by refusing to give formal sanction to the political status quo in Europe and to help them improve their lot under the present dispensations by practical measures—designed to foster evolution toward more internal freedom and less subordination to Soviet Russia. This theory does not resist a closer examination.

The argument of a fully stabilized European situation is not borne out by the facts. The countries of Western Europe have achieved indeed a very high degree of internal political stability and a remarkable economic growth and prosperity. They failed, however, to develop the third essential element of strength: adequate military power. During the many years of American nuclear supremacy their security was practically absolute. But their continued dependence on the strategic nuclear deterrent renders them increasingly vulnerable to Soviet intimidation and blackmail.

There can be little doubt that the Soviet rulers are not only intent upon changing the situation in Europe to their advantage, but also believe they can accomplish this without the mortal risks involved for them in a major war. The basic premise of Soviet political strategy toward Western Europe is that the Soviet advances in nuclear striking power have or are about to neutralize the strategic nuclear power of the United States. As a consequence of such neutralization, the balance of power in Europe is shifting to the overwhelming advantage of the Soviet Union, whose ground forces will acquire a new freedom of action. In the words of a report prepared last year for the Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S. Senate by a Columbia-Harvard research group: "With the strategic nuclear weapons neutralized, Soviet superi-

ority in other forms of military power becomes of greater significance, both militarily and politically. This superiority of military power in the various categories would mean not necessarily that the Soviet leadership would choose to attack, but that it could bring about political changes in one part of the world or another without having to attack. As Mr. Khrushchev sees it, what remains is for the Western nations to be realistic about adjusting their positions abroad to a weaker power relationship." This interpretation of Soviet policies fully tallies with the forward strategy set forth with ostentatious confidence in the statement issued last December in Moscow following the conference of 81 Communist parties and in the speech delivered on January 6, 1961, by Nikita Khrushchev. It is, furthermore, confirmed by the renewed emphasis placed in the communique issued on March 30, 1961, following the Moscow meeting of the rulers of the countries of the so-called Warsaw Pact on the urgent necessity of concluding a peace treaty with "both German states" and on converting West Berlin into a "demilitarized free city."

The arena of contest has indeed been broadened. In 1955 it was extended to Africa. In 1959 Latin America, too, became an active front. But geography, experience, skill, population and resources make Europe the major target of Soviet efforts and, therefore, the principal front. Communist victories in other continents may help Soviet strategy in Europe. But such victories would not be necessarily decisive, whereas failure of the forces of freedom to make a stand in Europe will seal the fate of at least Africa and the Middle East. The uncommitted nations are and will remain in the foreseeable future so weak that they will mirror rather than determine the balance of power. It is in Europe, therefore, that the balance of power can be disrupted with decisive consequences.

The argument that the freedom of the captive countries can no longer be a practical goal of Western policy overlooks an essential factor. As long as the strategic nuclear deterrent was unquestionably effective, the captive countries may have been of little strategic interest for the West. However, with the increasing neutralization of the strategic deterrence and the ensuing effort to build up an alternative deterrence, the captive countries become a potentially vital element of Western European security. Whether the Soviet rulers must or not reckon in their strategic calculations with a high coefficient of risk in the captive countries, which lie athwart their lines of communication, may make, in the coming years, all the difference between acceptable and unacceptable risks for the Soviet Union, that is, between effective deterrence or no deterrence at all.

Soviet diplomacy persistently seeks to wrest from the Western Powers the express or at least tacit admission that the political status quo in East-Central Europe is permanent. In turn, Soviet propaganda tirelessly strives to convince the respective peoples that the world balance of power has tipped decisively in favor of the Communist camp. Both efforts prove that the Soviet rulers are aware of their vulnerability in the captive area and are intent upon promoting there a spirit of hopelessness, leading to passivity and resignation. For this alone would permit them to discount the likelihood of active resistance in all circumstances.

It follows, that in order to mobilize all the forces which are needed to counter effectively the effort of Soviet Russia to change the situation in Europe in her favor, by means of pressures, intimidation and blackmail rather than war, the Western Powers must commit themselves, in turn, to the purpose of changing the status quo in their own favor. To this end, they must pursue unremittingly and consistently, policies aimed at extending the area of freedom in Europe. The fear that such a commitment and policy would stir up undue expectations in the captive countries and might eventually lead to futile uprisings appears at present entirely unwarranted. After the tragic experience of the Hungarian revolution, neither statements of purposes, even if confirmed by political and diplomatic actions, nor the most inflammatory kind of propaganda can bring any of the captive peoples to the boiling point. The best a Western policy of active concern can accomplish is to keep them at a simmering point, that is, with hope in eventual delivery and confidence in the West alive. Uprisings and revolutions on the Hungarian pattern appear today conceivable only if Soviet military power were neutralized, as a result of an internal crisis in the Soviet Union, or effectively engaged by Western forces (in the event of an open Soviet aggression). Still, the possibility of violent popular outbreaks, born of sheer despair, cannot be entirely discounted.

A policy that would avoid a commitment to the clear goal of freedom and independence for the nations of East-Central Europe and would aim, instead, at fostering ameliorations under the present dispensations could hardly bring into accord the interest of the free and the captive nations. By its standoffish cautiousness, such a policy could not fail to undermine the spirit of resistance in the captive lands and, with it, squander away a deterrent factor of vital significance for the survival of freedom in any part of Europe. This is not to say that the captive peoples would not welcome a less repressive internal regime, less subordination to Soviet Russia, some economic amelioration and more contacts and cultural exchanges with the West. It means, however, that nations deeply rooted in history, as are the captive nations, will never settle for such marginal gains at the price of their inalienable rights.

In practical terms, the main question is whether even at the price of sacrificing the goal of full freedom and independence, Western policy could generate or only stimulate an evolution towards more, though limited, freedom and independence. In other words, the question is whether the Yugoslav or Polish situations represent patterns that could be duplicaed elsewhere.

Titoism was the product of a unique combination of geographical and historical factors. These factors have all along been lacking in the other captive countries. Since the Hungarian revolution, which has shown to all satellite rulers the risk of finding themselves face to face with their own people, none of those rulers even dreams of letting himself be weaned away from Moscow—the only dependable source of his power and privileges.

As for the so-called Polish pattern of a less repressive, more tolerable internal regime, three main factors combined in 1956 to bring it about: (1) the Soviet fear of an international conflict at a time when the balance of power was distinctly favorable to the United States; (2) the internal tensions in the Soviet Union, due to the then still unresolved struggle for power in the Kremlin and the ensuing impairment of the decisionmaking process, and, most important of all (3) the pressure of the Polish people and the resulting fear of an explosion that would spread to the whole captive area. All these factors have lost their effectiveness since 1956. The balance of power is now more favorable to the Soviets. The struggle for supreme power in the Soviet Communist Party was won by Khrushchev, and the captive nations were discouraged both by the fate of the Hungarian revolution and by the general trend of Western policies. Events have since demonstrated that, for the Communists, the Polish October was a mere tactical retreat at a time when concessions remained the only way to avoid an explosion. In the years which have lapsed since 1956, most of the gains made by the Polish people have been gradually nibbled away. The process is still in progress against mute but stubborn popular resistance, and it goes hand in hand with an increasingly repressive trend all over Eastern Europe.

It would appear, therefore, that the outlook for duplicating the so-called Yugoslav pattern is practically nil. As regards the so-called Polish pattern, it could conceivably be repeated in circumstances comparable to those prevailing in Poland, in October 1956. But since pressure from below was one of the main factors at that time, it can hardly be imagined how this can be generated by a Western policy of friendliness toward the Communist regimes. This applies, of course, to the concept of economic aid, the only exception being Poland where such aid may contribute to slowing down the process of gradual retreat from the gains of October 1956.

II

The assembly of captive European nations holds that the captive nations of Europe are of vital significance to the United States and its allies on at least four counts:

1. They are an essential part of the alternative deterrent the West is endeavoring to create in Europe.

2. Their issue can help the West in establishing a balance of pressures in negotiations, in United Nations debates and in the propaganda war.

3. They enable the West effectively to undermine the claim that the emancipation of colonial peoples is a Western rout confirming the inevitability of the worldwide victory of communism.

4. They represent the key to a strong and self-reliant Europe and thus to a dependable peace.

III

A program of measures designed to stimulate hope and faith in the captive countries can only fulfill the previously listed immediate and long-range purposes if the present image of an irresistible Soviet momentum is replaced by the impression that the tide has turned, or is about to turn in favor of the West. This can be accomplished only by a measurable, territorial advance of freedom against communism anywhere in the world. There is a further condition of success for such a program. It should not appear motivated by either generosity or selfish interest. It should rather suggest that the free world has come to realize the strength of the bonds of mutual interest between the two parts of Europe; it is fully aware of its vital stake in the freedom and independence of the east-central European nations and is, therefore, prepared both as a matter of principle and self-interest, to do something about it.

Specifically, in the view of the Assembly of Captive European Nations the morale of the captive peoples of Central and Eastern Europe and their faith in the West will be sustained, the long and short-term interest of both free and captive nations served and a useful balance of pressures established if the Government of the United States of America were to—

1. Reaffirm the validity of the wartime and postwar legal commitments and pledges with respect to Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Rumania, and its continued determination to seek the observance of these obligations by all concerned;

2. Insist firmly in any diplomatic parleys or conferences on European problems with the rulers of the Soviet on the withdrawal of Soviet armed forces and agents from the territories of the above nine captive countries, as well as on the holding in these

countries of free elections under international supervision.

3. Inscribe on the agenda of the United Nations General Assembly the question of the denial of self-determination to the above nine captive countries and press for a debate and investigation of this charge.

4. Work out with the European partners of the United States in the summit conferences and promote by all appropriate means a plan for an overall European settlement based on the principle of self-determination.

5. Insist on the inclusion of the Hungarian question on the agenda of each yearly session of the United Nations General Assembly, and propose, regardless of the prospects of such proposals being adopted, (a) the rejection of the credentials issued by the Kadar regime, and (b) measures of enforcement.

6. Promote a worldwide movement against Soviet colonialism.

There are other practical measures and attitudes which could be taken to good avail for the same ends. Among these the following may be worthy of consideration:

(a) To downgrade the present diplomatic missions to the satellite governments.

(b) To desist from actions and moves which give respectability to the satellite regimes and compound the effect of past acts of recognition.

(c) To challenge in the United Nations on all appropriate occasions the qualification of the satellite delegates to speak on human rights and expose systematically the record of denial of human rights in their respective countries.

(d) To call for a United Nations investigation of conditions in prisons and forced labor camps in the captive countries, as well as for the release of all prisoners detained because of their convictions or past political affiliations.

(e) Invigorate radio propaganda to Eastern Europe.

(f) Seek full reciprocity in all cultural exchange programs, and warn American participants against letting themselves be exploited for political propaganda purposes by the Communist rulers or their agents.

(g) To call for the abolition of the almost prohibitive restrictions imposed by the satellite regimes on the sending of individual food, medicine, and clothing packages from the free world to relatives and friends in the captive countries.

(h) To sustain the organizations established in the free world for the purpose of voicing the political aspirations of the captive nations, and preserving their cultural heritage.

IV

The Assembly of Captive European Nations believes that the struggle to prevent any further extension of Soviet power in Europe and in other parts of the world cannot be separated from the struggle for the recovery of freedom wherever it has been suppressed by communism. Denying to the Soviet Union external successes is in itself productive of internal stresses. It gives the lie to the Soviet claim about the inevitability of the worldwide victory of communism and is thereby a powerful antidote to resignation and apathy among those held captive. Carrying the struggle to the enemy-controlled territory is apt to deliver a serious blow to the most important weapon of communism against the free world and particularly against the politically unstable, economically and socially underdeveloped and militarily feeble countries; the impression that communism is irresistibly moving toward its goal.

Against an enemy irrevocably committed to one world, his own, there is no safeguard in a search for mere survival by means of accommodations and static defense. The way to survival is a firm commitment to a paramount purpose—a world of freedom under law, a dynamic, worldwide challenge of communism.

Latin American Aid

SPEECH
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6518) making appropriations for the inter-American social and economic cooperation program and the Chilean reconstruction and rehabilitation program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, let me compliment the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] for his usual masterful presentation on the Latin American assistance program. His able analysis of foreign aid bills is always most helpful and his remarks today, as usual, provide wise guidance for the House.

There is no question that an effective program of aid to Latin America, despite the many widely scattered contributions we have made in the past, is long overdue, one that is specifically designed to assist our friends in this part of the world.

Attention has been directed to lack of full information from the agencies concerned about the scope and extent of specific projects to justify the appropriations requested in this bill. In this respect, Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct the attention of my colleagues and those agency officials concerned to a most worthy project which deserves the type of assistance we seek to provide in the Latin American assistance program.

I speak of the recently instituted Ciudad de los Niños or Boys Town, at San José, in the friendly, neighboring Republic of Costa Rica.

To my mind, this project is particularly deserving of assistance because it appears to fit quite naturally within the framework of the program outlined recently by the President for Inter-American cooperation.

Ciudad de los Niños is only a few months old and already it has taken to its care 64 Costa Rican boys, ranging from 12 to 18 years of age, orphans or the victims of broken homes and, some, graduates of reformatories.

It is the purpose of this institution, much as with our well known and famed Boys Town in Nebraska, not only to harbor such unfortunate boys, but to impart to them the essential education and training they need to become useful citizens.

I am advised that Ciudad de los Niños has the official sanction of the Government of Costa Rica and that a special Costa Rican commemorative stamp has been issued to signalize its establishment. I am also informed that need for such an institution is so great that plans are already underway for the establishment within the near future of a physical plant capable of taking care of 2,000 boys. At this time, work is proceeding on the erection of housing facilities to accommodate 150 boys by the first of next year.

Notice of this activity has come to my attention through friends of the Assumption Fathers who have been entrusted with the development and direction of Ciudad de los Niños. This most versatile and enterprising order of Catholic priests, founded over 100 years ago in France, carriers on a wide variety of activities, largely in the field of education, throughout the world, including that unique educational institution in this country, Assumption College, located in Worcester, Mass.

Many young men from my district attend Assumption, which is especially dedicated to the liberal arts, to French and religious culture, and to international relations. Over the years, like many others, I have respected and admired the magnificent works of the Assumption Fathers and many of us in this House will long remember the truly heroic work of this dedicated order in rebuilding, as a preparatory school, their combined preparatory school and college facilities which were devastated by the Worcester tornado of June 1953. Now the Assumption Fathers have established a fine, new Assumption College campus, also in Worcester, devoted entirely to the college department.

Ciudad de los Niños is a practical, humane undertaking of the Assumption Fathers which could well have a strong and favorable impact on our international relations. It is an undertaking which offers this Nation a fine opportunity to lend a timely helping hand in the true spirit of inter-American good neighbor cooperation. It is my understanding that, in order to keep pace with the opportunities it has to accomplish good, Ciudad de los Niños is urgently in need of long-term financing which would permit it to go ahead with the building of an adequate physical plant. I hope that under the regulations worked out by the Inter-American Development Bank that deserving projects like this will receive just and sympathetic consideration of their needs.

It would appear that here at Ciudad de los Niños we have a pilot venture which should be encouraged by those agencies responsible for the development of the Latin American aid program. What could more aptly portray to our fellow American Republics the deep humanitarian motives of the United States of America than to extend to a particularly unfortunate segment of the youth of Costa Rica the friendly hand of friendship within the spirit of the President's cooperative program?

The long-term benefits of such a gesture can readily be seen. They are eloquently expressed by an Assumption father, a product of Assumption College, newly assigned to Ciudad de los Niños who writes to a good friend:

We are convinced that our Boys' Town, once developed, will be a very strong deterrent to Communist infiltration here in Costa Rica and in due time throughout Central America. The time is more than ripe for our kind of work. What we are doing now for 64 boys will, God willing, be done later for hundreds, and ultimately for thousands.

Mr. Chairman, it is my hope that appropriate agencies of our Government will have the imagination to take the initiative when a worthwhile opportunity of this kind comes along and make Ciudad de los Niños a monument to the sincerity of our words and of our motives. Let Ciudad de los Niños become a showplace of democracy in America and fruitful realization of what the Latin American aid program can accomplish.

American Medical Association Survey of Federal Health Expenditures—VA and DOD—IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the following is the fourth part of a series on the report prepared by the American Medical Association on funds which have been appropriated by Congress for activities of the Federal Government in the field of health:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

(This year, $1,015,389,000; last year, $948,529,500).

Inpatient care in veterans' administration hospitals	$766,445,000
Last year	751,440,000

Veterans' administration's largest single medical expenditure covers inpatient care in 171 veterans' administration hospitals and provides for an estimated 121,456 beds. At present veterans' administration reports an estimated daily patient load of 111,600, approximately 92 percent of bed capacity. The appropriation includes salaries of physicians and other personnel, medical rehabilitation of veterans, dietetic and nursing services, social services and special services, such as recreation and transportation of veterans.

Outpatient care	$86,481,000
Last year	83,866,000

The bulk of this appropriation is for outpatient care in about 100 veterans' administration clinics. The remainder is planned for fees to physicians ($8,965,000) and dentists ($937,000) under the hometown care program.

Modernization and replacement construction	$70,441,000
Last year	26,676,000

This amount is for work on existing units where costs exceed $300,000 per project and equipment for new units. The money is available until expended (see "Alterations and improvements" item for small projects).

Domiciliary care	$35,341,000
Last year	34,172,000

Domiciliary care is being provided in 18 VA facilities for about 16,850 veterans who, while incapacitated for employment, are not in need of full hospital care. VA also makes payments to 33 State veterans homes with a daily patient load of approximately 9,750. Payments this fiscal year are estimated at $6,513,000. Under Public Law 86–625 (86th Cong.) Federal contributions to these homes will be raised from a maximum of $700 to $912 a year per patient.

Medical research	$22,500,000
Last year	18,344,000

For research, mostly in VA hospitals. The breakdown: general medical and surgical research, $14,700,000; atomic medical research, $3,250,000; prosthetics testing, $1 million; neuropsychiatric, $2,450,000; tuberculosis, $900,000; other, $200,000.

Contract hospitalization	$15,235,000
Last year	15,277,000

This appropriation finances an average daily patient load of 3,050 veterans in Federal hospitals other than VA and in State and municipal hospitals. Patients in Federal non-VA hospitals are estimated at 1,407 and in non-Federal hospitals, 1,643. Mental cases make up the largest single category of contract cases.

Medical administration	$8,896,000
Last year	8,177,000

To operate the Veterans' Administration Department of Medicine and Surgery in the central office and the seven area medical offices; included are salaries, travel, and like expenses.

Alterations, improvements, and repairs	$4,559,000
Last year	4,983,000

For alteration, improvements and repairs to VA clinics and domiciliaries (costing less than $300,000 per project).

Supply depot operations	$2,500,000
Last year	2,263,500

For maintaining and operating supply depots handling the purchase, shipping and storage of medical supplies and equipment used by the Department of Medicine and Surgery.

Medical care—Philippine veterans	$1,500,000
Last year	2,000,000

Until 1963 the United States will contribute for the medical care of Philippine veterans.

Medical education and training	$1,491,000
Last year	1,331,000

For VA training programs for physicians and other VA personnel in medical specialties and auxiliary services.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

This year, $803,462,100, last year, $788,597,000.

Air Force medical services, approximately	$363,442,000
Last year	339,761,000

The estimate for fiscal 1961 includes $239,657,000 for the operation and maintenance of medical treatment facilities. This figure includes estimated expenses in connection with hospitalization, outpatient care, ancillary services, administrative support, and other medical services, including preventive medicine, veterinary, aeromedical evacuation, dental, physiological training, industrial health, medical training, payments to other Federal and nonfederal agencies for care provided Air Force active duty and retired personnel. Included are military salaries which constitute the largest portion of expenses. For the dependents' medical care program, the Air Force expects to spend in fiscal 1961 $30,185,000. Major repairs and construction of medical facilities is estimated at $26,833,000. This figure includes amounts appropriated for fiscal 1960 which have not yet been obligated. Other medical expenses are estimated at $66,767,000 and will be used to pay military students, and for medical printing and medical education, operation of staff functions at major air commands, subcommands, and the Office of the Surgeon General. This sum also include military salaries.

Army medical services, approximately	$261,000,000
Last year	262,000,000

The estimated cost includes expenses normally associated with the operation of military hospitals and dispensaries, military and civilian salaries, medical supplies and equipment, utilities, communications, transportation travel subsistence, maintenance and repair of buildings and grounds, expenses for construction, dependent medical care, medical education and training, medical research and preventive medicine.

Navy medical services, approximately	$178,884,000
Last year	186,824,000

The above estimate is broken down in the following manner; Military pay, $62 million, maintenance and operation of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery activities, $38,600,000; medical care nonnaval facilities, $14 million; medicare, $22,500,000; care of the dead, $1,100,000; alteration or renovation, $1,500,000; other costs, $9,900,000; new construction $500,000; research $5,484,000; reimbursements, $23,300,000. Not included in the above figures is the cost of operation of medical facilities not under the control of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery nor the salaries of military and civilian medical personnel at activities not under the management control of the BuMed or the military medical personnel attached to ships, fleet operating units and the Fleet Marine Force. These expenses are borne by the Bureau responsible for funding these activities.

Office Assistant Secretary of Defense—health and medical, approximately	$136,100
Last year	120,000

For salaries, travel, and administration of this office, and for travel expenses and consultant fees for the Defense Department Civilian Health and Medical Advisory Council.

Cuba as a Satellite

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there appeared in this morning's Washington Post an editorial entitled "Cuba as a Satellite." I think all of us can afford to read the editorial and profit from the same. I am sure we recognize the danger of Cuba, which is 90 miles away from our shores, becoming a satellite. We are not sure, but we have good reason to believe that several hundred Cubans are training to handle the airplanes that Castro hopes will be forthcoming from Russia.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed following my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CUBA AS A SATELLITE

Any lingering doubts elsewhere about the complete Communist orientation of Cuba ought to be resolved by Fidel Castro's May Day harangue. The Cuban dictator has made it plain that his regime is an enthusiastic satellite—perhaps even more slavish than Mr. Khrushchev, for tactical reasons, might want. Dr. Castro's total repudiation of the elections he promised when he came to power and his renewed attacks upon the Catholic Church are links in the chain. It would be monstrous to think that these fetters represent the wish of the Cuban people.

All the same, Secretary Rusk's assurance that the United States has no plans for armed intervention in Cuba is a welcome indication that the administration has regained its balance. After the inglorious end of the invasion 2 weeks ago, American military action against Castro now would vastly compound the damage. That is one of the consequences of the initial failure. In present circumstances an attempt to expunge the menace by armed force would be prohibitively costly to this country's standing.

Mr. Rusk's testimony that the abortive invasion was a Cuban decision, however, will strike some persons at less than candid. Obviously Cubans carried out the landings. But the anti-Castro Cubans seem to have had relatively little voice in the planning and execution of the enterprise. No purpose is served by appearing to blame the anti-Communist Cubans for a fiasco that was in essence a piece of sad mismanagement by the United States.

At the same time, we think that former President Eisenhower has taken the right approach in advising against a "witch hunt" over the Cuban affair. It is altogether too evident that there were major miscalculations. It is essential that the administration and the country learn from them. But somewhat the same considerations are involved now as applied after the U–2 debacle a year ago. At that time the Senate Foreign Relations Committee conducted a highly responsible investigation that avoided needless turmoil.

Individual or agency accountability in the Cuban affair may exist. At best, however, an ex parte judgment can comprehend only a partial view; no one on the outside can know all the factors that went into recommendations and decisions. Much more important than pinpointing the blame is to institute changes in procedure and machinery so as to guard against such aberrations in the future.

Meanwhile the emphasis ought to be on isolating Castro. Even though this country's prestige in the hemisphere may have been injured temporarily by the Cuban flop, perhaps the net effect will still be that of catharsis—particularly if the United States moves quickly to give substance to its promises of economic help for self-help in promoting orderly change in Latin America. Castro himself is helping to promote an awakening. Until recently there was a tendency in some areas to dismiss the alaruma about communism in Cuba as mere opposition to the reforms of a romantic revolutionary. But Castro's contempt for elections and his direct affirmation of ties to Moscow may have a different effect.

This, in turn, ought to bring more willingness on the part of other countries to enforce collective sanctions against the Castro regime—as has just been done in the exclusion of Cuba from the Inter-American Defense Board. A collective embargo, to be sure, would not have the same appeal to advocates of direct action as a military intervention or a blockade (which would be difficult to enforce); and it must be conceded that the Communist hold on Cuba is likely to increase. But in view of the humilitation of the last fortnight, the first objective now ought to be to encourage broader understanding of the Communist enclave in Cuba and the dangers it presents.

Then, if Castro attempts to export subversion, it will be much easier to crack down with collective approval.

American Policy in the Near East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the recent exchange of fire between the Syrians and Israeli once again points to the festering sore in the Middle East. I am sure that we would all agree that it is the desire of all Americans to promote and establish peaceful and friendly relations between Israel and her neighbors in this most strategic part of the world.

With this thought in mind, it is well to give careful consideration to the statement of policy adopted by the American Israel Public Affairs Committee Conference held March 19 and 20. This organization's burning desire is to advance an Arab-Israel peace through a realistic approach to the many problems involved.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the committee, entitled "American Policy in the Near East" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN POLICY IN THE NEAR EAST

(A statement adopted by the American Israel Public Affairs Committee and submitted to the Department of State on March 20, 1961)

The American Israel Public Affairs Committee believes that the American people, gravely concerned over the hostilities which divide mankind and threaten its survival, have been heartened by the courageous and vigorous leadership of President John F. Kennedy.

We join with our fellow Americans in the determination to support the firm words uttered by President Kennedy in the hour of his inauguration: "Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, in order to assure the survival and the success of liberty."

The new administration is now reviewing American foreign policy in all parts of the world. The American Israel Public Affairs Committee hopes that this reappraisal will insure a firm policy in the Near East which will deter aggression, promote peace and economic development, and strengthen freedom.

We offer our support to the administration in the implementation of policies which will serve these objectives.

Since World War II, the United States has befriended Israel and the Arab States and has helped them to raise the standards of living of their peoples.

The United States should continue to seek the friendship of these governments and encourage them to resolve their conflicts and befriend each other. In this process, however, our Government cannot be neutral between those who are for aggression and those who are for peace.

Neither the United Nations nor the United States has been able to induce the Arab States to terminate the state of war which they have maintained against Israel for 13 years in defiance of the United Nation's 1947 Partition Resolution and in violation of the United Nations Charter. That state of war is deplorable, dangerous and a tragic waste of human and material resources.

Arab leaders use hatred for Israel as their badge of patriotism in the internal struggle for leadership in the Arab world. The massive military, economic and political support they receive from the Soviet bloc bolsters their ambition for military superiority and encourages their hope for victory. They wage a propaganda offensive to shift the blame and consequences for the Arab-Israel conflict to Israel in order to alienate other nations from Israel, disengage the West from vital moral and security commitments, reduce Western aid to Israel and ultimately isolate her.

FOR DIRECT NEGOTIATIONS

An Arab-Israel peace is a fundamental goal of U.S. policy in the Near East and our Government must continue a sustained effort to work for it, recognizing that peace can be attained only by direct negotiations between the Arab States and Israel.

Israel has repeatedly offered to negotiate directly with the Arab States. There is no reason why such direct negotiations should be indefinitely deferred. The United States should not be restrained by fear that working for peace will provoke Arab resentment. The Arab States can be induced to abandon their negative position only if our country and the U.N. are unswerving in the determination to outlaw the Arab war against Israel.

President Kennedy referred to the overriding world conflict in his inaugural address. His words are applicable to the Near East: "So let us begin anew—remembering on both sides that stability is not a sign of weakness, and sincerity is always subject to proof. Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate."

We also recall, with satisfaction, President Kennedy's statement of August 25, 1960, that the United States must make it "crystal clear" that "we will act promptly and decisively against any nation in the Middle East which attacks its neighbor." The President deplored that neither Arabs nor Israelis "know exactly where we stand or exactly what we mean." We look forward to a new and positive statement that the United States will take decisive action to resist aggression in the Near East from whatever source.

THE BALANCE OF STRENGTH

Israel stands alone; she belongs to no defense system; no treaty automatically brings allies to her defense. While Israel's neighbors have been supplied with weapons from Communist sources, our Government has not provided grant military aid to Israel, and she has been compelled to expend large sums to purchase arms to defend herself. In the interests of world peace we favor disarmament in the Near East, under effective mutual inspection. As long as Israel is menaced by Soviet weapons in the hands of the Arab states, however, our Government and other Western allies must be viligant to guarantee that the arms balance is maintained. This is indispensable to preserve stability in the Near East and to prevent an outbreak of hostilities.

THE ECONOMICAL WAR

The Arab boycott and blockade must be ended. In May 1960, Congress by an amendment to the Mutual Security Act, reaffirmed the U.S. position in favor of freedom of navigation in international waterways and economic cooperation between nations and in opposition to boycotts, blockades, and restriction in the use of international waterways. This amendment armed the administration with an authoritative statement of American policy on these issues.

President-elect Kennedy declared on August 25, 1960: "If America's word to the world is to have any meaning, if the decisions and resolutions of the United Nations are to be binding on all parties, if the mutual security amendment which I cosponsored with Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS is to have meaning, if the clear, thoughtful language of the Democratic platform is to have meaning—the influence of this Nation and other maritime powers must be brought to bear on a just solution that removes all discrimination from the Suez Canal."

The administration should make it clear that the United States will not concur in the blacklisting of American shippers or other businessmen who trade with Israel.

The United States should implement the position affirmed by the Congress in the amendment to the Mutual Security Appropriations Act of 1959, which expressed opposition to discrimination by recipients of American aid against Americans on grounds of race or religion.

CONTINUED ECONOMIC AID

The United States must assist the new nations who make effective use of our aid to combat poverty and to help their peoples to a better life.

The United States should continue economic aid to the peoples of Israel, the Arab States and other countries in the Near East.

Economic assistance to Israel has helped her resettle hundreds of thousands of Jewish refugees, develop her skills and resources and stimulate her impressive rate of agricultural and industrial growth. American aid to Israel has been used prudently and should be maintained.

Our Government respects the right of of every nation to be independent in the conduct of foreign policy. But a distinction must be made between genuine neutrals and those who don the mask of neutralism to exploit world conflicts to enhance their power. Our Government should avoid lavishing aid on those who abuse our assistance to undermine our policies and alienate friends and who engage in power politics.

THE ARAB REFUGEES

The only realistic solution to the problem of the Arab refugees is their resettlement in Arab countries where there is need, land and opportunity. Major refugee problems have been resolved in the past by resettlement—never by repatriation.

Arab leaders persistently refuse to cooperate in any resettlement program. Instead, they demand that Israel repatriate the refugees who were the victims of their own 1948 aggression.

The Arab States base their demand for repatriation on a U.N. resolution adopted in December 1948 which they themselves opposed because it called upon "the governments and authorities concerned to seek agreement by negotiations conducted with a view toward the final settlement of all questions outstanding between them."

The United Nations resolution clearly intended that any repatriation of Arab refugees to Israel should be dealt with within the context of Arab-Israel peace negotiations. But Arab leaders ignore the U.N. call for peace. They invoke only one paragraph of that resolution (par. 11), deliberately disregarding the resolution's explicit qualification that returning refugees be prepared to "live at peace with their neighbors." The Arab claim to repatriation has been invalidated because they have persisted in a proclaimed war which contravenes that resolution and has rendered it obsolete. In the U.N. refugee centers, the Arab refugees are being taught to hate Israel, and Arab propaganda calls for paramilitary formations in preparation for the invasion of Israel.

It is contended by some that if only Israel would permit the refugees a free choice between repatriation and compensation, very few would choose repatriation; once having achieved satisfaction of their political claim, they would no longer reject resettlement. This is a reckless contention and a disservice to the refugees themselves. It merely encourages Arab leaders in their opposition to resettlement.

It should be noted that Israel has repeatedly declared its readiness to pay compensation for abandoned Arab property. More than 200,000 Arabs, some of them former refugees admitted under the family reunification plan, are now citizens of Israel.

No nation can risk an influx of people who come with inbred hostility, rather than as loyal settlers. In a similar situation, in 1780, the U.S. Congress rejected British pressure to readmit refugees who had left as enemies of America's struggle for independence.

Since 1948, Israel has welcomed a million Jewish immigrants. Half of them came from Arab countries in Asia and North Africa—about as many as the actual number of Arabs who 13 years ago left what is now Israel. It would be both logical and fair for the Arab States to resettle the Arab refugees in their territories. They have vast underpopulated space, opportunity and a need for people.

Our Government owes full support to every measure which compassionately speeds the day when the refugees can become productive citizens leading useful lives among their own people.

The mandate of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency should be extended. Some progress has been made. Refugees who are trained and who acquire skills have found work. The majority of the refugees who still receive UNRWA rations no longer reside in UN refugee centers. UNRWA should increasingly emphasize rehabilitation rather than relief—by training people to work, encouraging them to become citizens in the countries in which they reside and stimulating resettlement.

Congress should continue to appropriate adequate funds for the maintenance of the refugees, stressing public works, self-help and settlement. Larger aid should be granted to those nations which cooperate in projects for refugee absorption.

A BIPARTISAN POLICY

It is a source of deep satisfaction that the United States actively helped Israel, in bipartisan accord, during the administrations of both President Harry Truman and President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

We believe that the views expressed herein are shared by the majority of the American people. They were reflected in the platform statements adopted at the 1960 national conventions.

The Democratic platform said: "In the Middle East we will work for guarantees to insure independence for all states. We will encourage direct Arab-Israel peace negotiations; th resettlement of Arab refugees in lands where there is room and opportunity for them; and end to boycotts and blockades; the unrestricted use of the Suez Conal by all nations.

"We urge continued economic assistant to Israel and the Arab peoples to help them raise their living stndards. We pledge our best efforts for peace in the Middle East by seeking to prevent an arms race while guarding against the dangers of a military imbalance resulting from Soviet arms shipments.

"Protection of the rights of American citizens to travel, to pursue lawful trade and to engage in other lawful activities abroad without distinction as to race or religion is a cardinal function of the national sovereignty. We will oppose any international agreement or treaty which by its terms or practices differentiates among American citizens on grounds of race or religion."

The Republican platform said: "In the Middle East, we shall continue to support the integrity and independence of all the states of that area including Israel and the Arab States.

"With specific reference to Israel and the Arab nations, we urge them to undertake negotiations for a mutually acceptable settlemen of the causes of tension between them. We pledge continued efforts: to eliminate the obstacles to a lasting peace in the area, including the human problem of the Arab refugees; to seek an end to transit and trade restrictions, blockades and boycotts; to secure freedom of navigation in international waterways, the cessation of discrimination against Americans on the basis of religious beliefs, and an end to the wasteful and dangerous arms race and to the threat of an arms imbalance in the area."

We are confident that the new administration and Congress will carry out their bipartisan commitments.

Needed Now: A Joint Committee on the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith for the consideration of my colleagues as well as the tax-burdened citizens of this country a very timely article, which appeared in the April edition of Tax Review, by the Honorable JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, our highly esteemed colleague and senior Senator from the State of Arkansas.

Senator MCCLELLAN points out in a very logical and forceful manner the need for a Joint Committee on the Budget to be set up within the Congress and responsible to the Congress. He very appropriately calls attention to the fact that the existing Bureau of the Budget is the agent of and responsible to the President. Further, that the Congress, which has the responsibility under the Constitution to appropriate funds, is more or less at the mercy of the executive department. This for the reason that the hearings before the Appropriation Committees of the Congress are virtually ex parte. The witnesses from the various departments of Government are largely, if not exclusively, from the executive branch, who present and attempt to justify the Presidential budget.

What the Congress, I repeat, responsible for spending the tax money, needs is a staff responsible to the Congress. The billl sponsored by Senator MCCLELLAN in the Senate and a similar bill

sponsored by me in the House would provide the Appropriations Committees particularly and the Congress generally with an adequate staff of its own.

Senator MCCLELLAN has succeeded in having his bill passed by the Senate in two previous Congresses. The House Committee on Rules cleared my bill for floor consideration in 1953. But the House itself turned down its consideration by some 16 votes. Both Senator MCCLELLAN and I have reintroduced our bills, and I am very much in hopes that this much needed legislation can be passed at this session of the Congress. Certainly, with a national debt in excess of $290 billion and prospects of an additional deficit this year of $5 or more billion and possibly more next year, something should be done to get our fiscal house in order.

Senator MCCLELLAN'S article follows:

One of the most serious problems confronting the Nation today is the maintenance of national solvency in the face of ever-growing demands on the Federal Government for programs and services, coupled with the necessity of meeting the national defense requirements of the cold war and the atomic age. Our national expenditures budget has grown from $66 billion in fiscal year 1956 to $80.7 billion in 1961, and the probability of an $84.2 billion expenditures budget for fiscal year 1962.

Nor is the end in sight. The Congress is being bombarded constantly by demands for new or expanded programs in social welfare, education, agriculture, housing and other fields.

Breaking the fiscal year 1962 expenditures requests down by functions, we find that $48 billion is requested for major national security; $2.8 billion for international affairs and finance; commerce, housing and space technology, $3.8 billion; agriculture and agricultural resources $5.7 billion; natural resources, $2.1 billion; labor and welfare, $6 billion; veterans services and benefits, $5.3 billion; interest, $8.6 billion; and general government, $2 billion.

While the President is clearly authorized to propose, it is equally clear that the responsibility to dispose rests with the Congress. Of this there can be no doubt. In fact, one of the most important responsibilities which the Founding Fathers, in their wisdom, vested in the Congress of the United States was the control over appropriations.

Article I, section 9, clause 7 of the Constitution of the United States provides, in part, that "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law * * *."

From the formation of our Government down to the present time, it has been clearly understood and accepted that this clause vested exclusively in the Congress the right to grant supplies of money to the various branches of the Federal Government, and to designate the purpose for which the money shall be used.

Perhaps an examination of the magnitude of this responsibility, in terms of the work it entails, will serve further to demonstrate its tremendous importance. Early in January of each year, the President submits the Federal budget to the Congress. It is usually a large document, running in excess of 1,000 pages, representing a full year of work on the part of the agencies and departments of the Government, as well as the Bureau of the Budget. The material contained in the Federal budget has been developed and assembled by a vast number of persons in the departments and agencies, reviewed and reorganized by each department and agency, and finally reviewed, revised and finalized by the Bureau of the Budget where some 450 persons are involved in the preparation and submission of the final document. In addition, in the Washington headquarters area alone, a total of some 2,000 persons in executive branch departments and agencies are involved in the preparation of the budget each year.

In addition to the Federal budget itself, a tremendous amount of detailed information is supplied in written form to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, and presented orally at hearings which last for several months and cover thousands of typed and printed pages. Finally, when the requests are reduced to the form of legislative proposals, there are usually between 12 and 15 appropriations bills running many pages and containing thousands of separate items.

Over a period of 12 years, together with other Members of Congress, I have been seriously concerned over the manner in which the Congress handles its appropriations responsibilities. As I have studied congressional procedures for handling appropriations, I have become convinced that there are serious deficiencies in these procedures; and it is absolutely vital that we take steps immediately not only to remedy them but also to improve the surveillance exercised by the Congress over the expenditure of public funds.

Both the Senate and House Appropriations Committees perform their functions through subcommittees which deal with the appropriations requests of one or more departments and agencies. Hearings on budget requests are held by these subcommittees beginning sometime in January or early February and continue until their work is completed. Subcommittee recommendations are submitted to the full Appropriations Committee in each House and final action is then taken by the respective committees. All along the line the procedure is duplicated in both Houses, in that following hearings by House subcommittees, identical hearings are held by Senate subcommittees, although in the Senate emphasis is often placed by departmental representatives on restoring items which were deleted by the House.

TAXPAYER NOT REPRESENTED

The usual procedure followed by the Appropriations Committees is for witnesses representing executive branch departments and agencies to appear before a subcommittee, usually accompanied by a corps of technical experts from that agency, as well as from the Bureau of the Budget. The entire proceeding is virtually ex parte in nature, and these witnesses represent exclusively the point of view of the executive branch of the Government. Since it is their duty, as executive branch officials, to support all of the budget items contained in the President's budget, it becomes their function and responsibility to demonstrate, both by oral and written justifications, that the amounts requested are absolutely necessary. For the most part, these requests are supported by elaborate justifications and exhibits, based upon extensive agency research and by the testimony of technical experts who have devoted many years to the fields in which they have been working.

Unlike hearings on substantive legislation, where witnesses appear in support of or in opposition to pending bills, at appropriations hearings, testimony from the public, except on certain public works projects, is rarely, if ever, received. In a great majority of the proceedings before the subcommittees, no witnesses are present to represent the taxpayer, and the only manner in which the public interest can receive the consideration and protection it deserves with respect to either the purpose for which the funds are sought or their need or adequacy, is through careful scrutiny of the requests and justification by the few staff members who are assigned to handle each of the appropriation bills, and by members of the Appropriations Committees. Other Members of Congress who do not serve on the Appropriations Committees must, and generally do, rely largely on the recommendations of these committees when final action on appropriations measures is taken on the floor of each House.

Unfortunately, members of the Senate and House Appropriations Committees are so heavily burdened by other legislative duties and responsibilities that they are unable personally to give adequate attention to each budget item. Equally important, however, is the fact that they do not have adequate facilities to obtain the information necessary to enable them to pass judgment on the necessity for the funds requested. Because the Congress is not adequately equipped to carry out its vital fiscal responsibilities, many millions of dollars have been appropriated in excess of actual requirements of the Federal Government. These excesses have, in turn, added to the large recurring deficits which must be passed on to already overburdened taxpayers.

Examining the results of a survey made by the Committee on Government Operations on the activities of the Senate in the 84th Congress, we found that, exclusive of sessions called for the purpose of marking up appropriation bills, the Senate Committee on Appropriations held some 300 open hearings consuming approximately 825 hours. In addition, at least 30 executive sessions were held to consider other matters pertaining to the functions of the committee, involving some 67 hours. In summary, the Senate Committee on Appropriations, in the 84th Congress, held a total of 330 meetings and consumed an estimated 900 hours on appropriations measures alone.

As a further illustration of the tremendous workload, the Senate Appropriations Committee, during the 84th Congress, had a regular standing subcommittee for each of the 12 major appropriations bills. Each member of the committee had a minimum of four subcommittee assignments, with some members serving on as many as six subcommittees. On many occasions there were two or three hearings in progress simultaneously and members sometimes found it necessary to attend one hearing for a limited time and then to participate, insofar as time permitted, in other hearings of subcommittees on which they served.

Aside from an overburdened staff, members of the Appropriations Committees are forced to rely upon two major sources of information: (1) the testimony of representatives of the executive branch who formulate the programs and present them in a light most favorable to their requests; and who tell us only as little or as much as they desire to disclose; and (2) information media, such as newspapers, periodicals, books, and radio and television programs. Of course, some Members of Congress have additional sources of information, such as members of their own office staffs, interested groups, confidential informers, or reliable friends who work in executive branch agencies.

This picture raises dramatically, in my judgment, the question of whether this is the way for the Congress of the United States to obtain information necessary to enable it to formulate the considered judgment which is its constitutional responsibility and which is so vital if it is to carry out its obligation to the American people.

MUST DEVELOP MACHINERY

The answer to the question is clearly and emphatically "No." It is not the way. If the Congress is to discharge its responsibilities with respect to the expenditure of public funds, it must develop the necessary machinery as well as adequate procedures. Only then will the Congress have the facts and

background information necessary to enable it to act judiciously on requests for funds from executive branch agencies and departments. This machinery must be designed so as to enable the Congress to analyze more thoroughly and screen more effectively spending requests.

I propose to accomplish this vital objective by the establishment of a Joint Committee on the Budget, composed of an equal number of members from the Senate and House Appropriations Committee, staffed on a nonpolitical basis by outstanding experts and technicians. Such a joint committee would provide the Appropriations Committees with the same kind of expert staff facilities and technical information as the Bureau of the Budget provides for the executive branch.

Ample precedent for this proposal is found in the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, established by the Congress more than 30 years ago, which is composed of members of the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Finance Committee of the Senate. These committees work together through this joint committee, using a trained, technical staff to enable it to obtain the facts and information needed for tax legislation. It seems obvious that it is just as important that the Appropriations Committees, which must pass on the expenditures of public funds, work together cooperatively through a joint committee with a trained professional staff to safeguard the revenues raised by taxation.

The proposed Joint Committee on the Budget would be required to inform itself with respect to all aspects of the annual budget of the departments and agencies of the Government, to examine all expenditure reports, and to investigate the details of Federal operations. Assisted by a nonpolitical staff of technical experts, the Joint Committee's functions would include, on a year-round basis, analyses of and reports on the details of program operations, a review of the administration of authorized programs and functions, and the compilation of data on agency activities and their conformity to or deviation from legislative authority. Although this information would be primarily for the use of the Appropriations Committees, it would be available to all other committees and to all Members of Congress.

WOULD BE "WATCHDOG"

The joint committee would also be required to utilize fully information emanating from the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, to consider the President's messages on the state of the Union and the Economic Report, and from all other sources as to estimated revenues and changing economic conditions, in order that a well-considered fiscal program may be devised to hold expenditures to a minimum in relation to anticipated Federal revenues. In addition, it would have investigative powers, and would be authorized to report on and recommend appropriate legislative changes to standing committees in order to eliminate wasteful practices, correct deviations from programs authorized by Congress, and effect cutbacks in such programs when consistent with essential requirements of Government and the national security.

In other words, this joint committee and its staff would work continuously, analyzing and screening the budget, checking on department and agency expenditures and determining where waste and extravagance exist, so that appropriations for succeeding years may be reduced or denied entirely where such action is warranted. It would serve as a congressional watchdog to do the work, obtain the facts and furnish the Congress with the information it needs to enable it to make cuts in appropriations where they can and should be made in the interest of governmental efficiency and economy.

The proposal to create a Joint Committee on the Budget has been studied carefully for more than 10 years by the Senate Committee on Government Operations, on which it is my privilege to serve as chairman. During the 82d, 83d, 84th, and 85th Congresses, the measure was approved by the Senate, the last three times without dissent. Unfortunately, the House of Representatives has not seen fit to take favorable action. I have reintroduced the bill in the 87th Congress (S. 529), together with 66 other Senators, and we are hopeful that a majority of Members of the House of Representatives will support it. Because of the continuing interest in the financial procedures of the Federal Government, in general, and in this proposal in particular, at my direction, the staff of the Committee on Government Operations has prepared a comprehensive study and analysis of existing and proposed legislation relative to fiscal management, published in the 87th Congress as Senate Document No. 11, "Financial Management in the Federal Government." Readers who are interested in further particulars concerning the joint committee proposal will find in that document a complete legislative history of the proposal, as well as an analysis of its background and major provisions.

Based upon my many years of study and consideration, it is my firm and sincere conviction that the establishment of a Joint Committee on the Budget, clothed with the authority and duties I have proposed, and staffed with nonpolitical experts and technicians, will equip the Congress with adequate machinery to enable it to carry out its constitutional responsibilities. It will enable the legislative branch to examine carefully every item of proposed expenditure so that appropriations may be limited to no more than is actually required to provide the funds which are essential to the successful operation of the Government.

I am firmly convinced that the adoption of this measure will do much to remedy existing deficiencies in procedures relative to the appropriation and expenditure of public funds, and that it constitutes a positive approach to the elimination of extravagance, waste, and needless or excessive appropriations. Finally, I believe that in the face of ever-mounting spending pressures and ever-increasing budgets, it is essential to the welfare of the Nation that this proposal be enacted into law without delay.

Time for Words Has Passed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the American public is awake to the perilous times in which we live and is ready to support courageous and effective leadership. However, we have yet to see such leadership demonstrated by the new administration. We have yet to see any of that spirit called for by the President in his inaugural address—"of not what you get from your country, but how best you can serve."

What good will be accomplished by huge new Government spending proposals, by new fringe benefits, by greater profits and shorten hours, if the Communist challenge to our free system is not firmly met and overcome?

In the Washington Post of May 3, 1961, Roscoe Drummond has crystallized public opinion, as I have found it at home and throughout the country. His article follows:

WAR CALLED PEACE: TIME FOR WORDS HAS PASSED

In the wake of Castro's repulse of the Cuban freedom fighters, Khrushchev's wrecking of the test-ban talks by demanding a veto over inspection, and, now, the Communists' near conquest of Laos, President Kennedy is certainly saying enough about averting the worst.

But he isn't doing enough.

It is my conviction that the time for words has passed, that the moment is at hand when it is not enough to say what needs to be done—but to do what needs to be done before it is too late.

It is my conviction that the time has come when the American Government and the American people must act on the reality that we are not at peace, but at war, though a different and more difficult kind of war than we have ever faced; that, as the Overstreets have put it, we are in a war called peace and that there is nothing peaceful about it.

At this stage we are losing, not winning—and we are not yet strong enough to win.

It is my conviction that we will continue to lose this war called peace as long as we try to conduct it on a basis of business as usual, politics as usual and defense as usual.

Referring to the Communist tactics of infiltration, subversion, intimidation, and guerilla warfare—in Cuba, Laos, South Vietnam, Iran, and in the Congo—President Kennedy declared that "no war every posed a greater threat to our security."

But if no war ever posed a greater threat, is the President proposing measures equal to this threat?

In New York last week President Kennedy declared that "every new piece of information, every fresh event, have deepened my conviction that the survival of our civilization is at stake—and the hour is late."

But is the President yet calling on the Nation to do all it would do when its very life is at stake and the hour late?

While President Kennedy is rightly telling the country the worst, is he adequately providing for it?

I do not find that he is.

For example, the new administration saw the great need to expand our limited-war capability, fully appreciated that over-reliance on massive retaliation might deter a nuclear war while losing every vulnerable nation in Asia. The President spoke out lucidly for this need. Secretary McNamara agreed. But when the new defense budget is carried into effect, it won't add much more than 5,000 men to our limited war capability.

Only power to defend the free world will counter Communist power to eat up the free world and this miniscule addition to our military strength, far from deterring the Communists, will only persuade them that we really mean to do nothing.

On the President's declared convictions that our very civilization is at stake, that the hour is late, that never has a greater threat confronted us than this war called peace—nothing that the administration is yet doing to provide for it is anywhere near equal to the peril.

Why?

He has been given a clue in his statement that the Nation's greatest adversary is not the Russians but our own unwillingness to do what must be done.

There is truth in this but it is a dangerous half-truth. I am convinced that the whole

truth is that the American people will respond galvanically, not to Presidential words, but only to Presidential action—by adding not a puny 5,000 but 500,000 men, if necessary, to our limited-war forces, by expanding radically our capacity to meet unconventional aggression with unconventional means. This would mean accepting a degree of national mobilization to provide a doctrinal change in our defense strategy and thus to enlarge our means to wage successfully this war called peace.

I believe that the country is anxiously waiting for the President to act in a way equal to the urgency of his own words.

Use State Government Know-How in Our Foreign Assistance Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in the April issue of Current magazine, a short article appears in which Mr. William B. Dale and Mr. David C. Fulton propose the use of our State government know-how in dealing with the problems of technical assistance to foreign nations whose size, population, and economies more nearly parallel those of our States than our National Government. I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues and would like, at this point in the RECORD, to introduce this article:

USE STATE GOVERNMENT KNOW-HOW

(By William B. Dale and David C. Fulton)

(Two staff members of the Stanford Research Institute contend that State governments and institutions within the United States are a neglected resource for development aid to the new nations.)

Many State and local institutions are already actively involved in the development process both locally and abroad. But the State institutional framework as such has not been tapped.

Most new African nations have areas, populations, and economies which, from the standpoint of size, if nothing else, bear far closer relationship to States within the United States than they do the United States as a whole. Like some individual States, their economies are relatively simple, depending on only a few crops, resources or industries. Their road systems are only beginning to take form; their communications complexes are embryonic. They are struggling to make their school systems into an instrument of progress. These are all problems in which our States and communities have had direct experience on a scale which is meaningful to the new countries—and their experience covers a great many other fields as well.

In virtually all of these countries, the problems match those of State governments more closely than they do those of the Federal Government. Thus, we suggest that logical twin relationships might be formed between the government of an underdeveloped nation and a State government in the United States to provide contact and help on a sustained and continuing basis. Such relationships might be financed in part by Federal grants to the States, with perhaps some public and private contributions from within the States themselves.

State-to-foreign arrangements would provide an umbrella under which a network of further relationships could be established. For instance, cooperative arrangements could be worked out between colleges and universities involving the exchange of persons and the teaching of languages. U.S. newspapers and radio stations in the relevant States could cover activities in the cooperating areas abroad. As relationships developed, it might be possible to involve private manufacturers and financing institutions as well, in a manner that would go beyond their ordinary business arrangements, while not inhibiting those of firms from other States.

Our problems with the new African nations are well known. We are feared. They find us big, impersonal, and sometimes overpowering. Their attitudes—a matter of vital importance to the United States—are frequently uncertain, ambivalent, defiant. But suppose that a new African nation, let us say Senegal, for example, could form a special relationship with one State—perhaps Nebraska. And suppose, over a 2- or 3-year period that, as a result of aid activities, Senegal's progress became a matter of quite personal concern to the people of the State of Nebraska. The result might well be warm feelings for Nebraska and, by implication, for the entire United States. The other side of the coin, of course, is that a deeper involvement of Nebraska and other States in the oversea development process could contribute to an increased understanding and appreciation at home of U.S. aid programs—and indeed of foreign policy problems generally.

Nebraska could send a mission of experts to Senegal. Its university could undertake a program of cooperation with theirs. Eventually, perhaps, its companies might be interested in Senegal's industrial development, at least to the point of helping in practical training programs and in corresponding with particular businesses in Senegal to suggest how problems could be approached. The State Development Commission could set up an exchange of ideas and experience on how to attract, encourage, and support industry (perhaps learning something in the process). Communities in Nebraska could "adopt" communities in Senegal, and take a special interest in their problems, their people, their progress. This kind of cooperation could extend across the whole spectrum of development needs, involving all kinds of institutions.

This is intended to be no more than the germ of an idea, but we think it is worth further development' ("Do the States Have a Role To Play in Foreign Aid?" memorandum, January 1961).

Space Metal Breakthrough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL R. KING
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Dayton (Ohio) Journal Herald of April 27, 1961:

SPACE METAL BREAKTHROUGH—CONVERTING PROCESS FOR INGOTS TO AID REENTRY PROBLEM

What is described as a significant step in the development of a process of converting ingots of certain metals at high temperatures for aerospace vehicles has been accomplished at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base.

The metallurgical advance is the result of 2 years of work by a team of Harvey Aluminum Co. research engineers and the Materials Center at the Aeronautical Systems Division.

Roy Tombaugh, resident project engineer for Harvey Aluminum, explained that the new process makes possible conversion of molybdenum-tungsten alloy ingots into components for aerospace vehicles.

The conversion has been accomplished at 4,125° F. through a reusable die coated with zerconium oxide (zerconia).

"The breakthrough helps reduce costs substantially and makes possible fabrication by a reduction to practice of advanced metal concepts," the Harvey Co. announced.

Production of structural materials to withstand high temperatures required in missile and rocket work has been one of the major engineering problems in these new fields.

"The technical accomplishment is expected to increase the utilization of refractory metals—particularly molybdenum, columbium, tantalum, tungsten, and their alloys—in missiles, rockets, hypersonic aircraft and satellites.

"Refractory metals are necessary because of re-entry heat problems and in structural applications where the metal must maintain its useful strength at temperatures above 2,000° F.," the company explained.

Giving Protocol Meaning—New Strength in the Office of Protocol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in the State Department, directly under the Under Secretary of State, there exists a little understood, yet important adjunct to our foreign policy. I refer to the Office of the Chief of Protocol, currently held by Angier Biddle Duke.

Too often, the Chief of Protocol is envisioned as the President's representative at white-tie parties and fancy diplomatic receptions. His responsibility is thought of as merely requiring that Ambassador A is recognized as being senior in rank to Ambassador B, and treated accordingly. Fortunately, Mr. Duke is bringing a broader concept of this job to the office he holds.

Mr. Duke has taken into his jurisdiction many of the personal problems that the representatives of other nations, particularly the new nations of Africa, face on being accredited to the United States. Problems such as decent housing, schooling, vacations, and trips around the country are only some that have crossed Mr. Duke's desk.

His quick response to the insult to the Chargé d'Affaires of Sierra Leone at a restaurant in Pennsylvania and the understanding with which he came to the assistance of several young African students when they had been picked up for demonstrating on the death of Patrice

Lumumba augur well for the sensible and sensitive handling of these minute yet important problems.

About 2 weeks ago, Mrs. Eleanor Israel of New York was sworn in as a special assistant to Mr. Duke to work on housing problems. Mrs. Israel has had an outstanding career as a leader in the resolution of social problems. In a quiet, yet effective manner, she has attained many significant goals. In the ceremony swearing in Mrs. Israel, Mr. Duke said, "She will not receive all the recognition she will deserve because the nature of her job requires that she be efficient while being unobtrusive."

On April 22, the Washington Post reprinted an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal discussing the job of the Chief of Protocol of the State Department. I ask unanimous consent that it appear with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GIVING PROTOCOL MEANING

The traditional job of the Chief of Protocol of the State Department has been one of assuring that foreign diplomats and dignitaries are dealt with on the basis of rank and seniority. He sees that they are properly greeted upon arrival—whether at airports or receptions—and given proper sendoffs. He is in charge of the social and diplomatic amenities. Protocol, as the French expert said, "is the code of international politeness."

Angier Biddle Duke, new Chief of Protocol, wants to expand the duties of his office. He suggests that his staff help diplomats get their children placed in schools, help plan their vacations, and trips about the country and help them meet their neighbors.

But he wants to take over a much more important problem, too. It is that of seeing to it that African diplomats are properly treated. In the past many have run into racial discrimination in Washington and around the country. They have had difficulty finding housing, entering places of recreation, getting served in hotels, and restaurants, finding office space. This, of course, is harmful to American foreign policy—and shameful in view of our democratic professions.

If Duke succeeds in getting the asignment he wants, and solves its problems, he will not only raise the level of his office but will serve the best interests of our foreign policy.

Immigration Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIBORNE PELL
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, as a firm proponent of liberalized immigration policies and as a member of the Board of Directors of the American Immigration and Citizenship Conference, I congratulate my esteemed colleague and friend, Senator PHILLIP HART, on the speech he delivered before the annual conference of that organization on March 24.

Senator HART's remarks were succinct and frank. He rightly emphasized the desirability of making clear to the American public the relationship between our immigration legislation and our prestige abroad.

Mr. President, it is indeed important to our foreign policy that the ideals of the dignity and brotherhood of mankind be incorporated in our immigration laws. We must share those blessings which our heritage has bestowed upon us.

In his speech Senator HART has allied himself with that very type of imaginative, forward thinking leadership which must lead our country in these times of crisis. It has clearly never been so important for the United States to stand as a symbol of truly democratic thought and action throughout the world.

It is a genuine pleasure for me to ask unanimous consent that Senator HART'S address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR PHILIP A. HART, OF MICHIGAN, AT A CONFERENCE HELD BY THE AMERICAN IMMIGRATION AND CITIZENSHIP CONFERENCE: HOTEL PLAZA, NEW YORK, N.Y., MARCH 24, 1961

The President, in his message to your conference, again has expressed his abiding belief that we must constantly strive toward the day when our immigration and refugee programs will reflect our highest principles of fair play, humanitarianism, and equality.

All of you who work so faithfully in organizations and through such groups as the Immigration and Citizenship Conference are aware of the President's earlier writings and legislative achievements. It is my hope that we are entering a period when significant steps can be taken, both in and out of Congress, to achieve some of the priority goals you have sought.

The signs are encouraging. The obnoxious questionnaire has been rescinded, and we no longer thus insult the visitor to our shore. The recognition of continuing departmental responsibility for the welfare of those who arrive homeless on our shores is equally significant. This I would add, does not detract from nor lessen the need for, the excellent work being done by the many voluntary agencies so skilled in post-arrival adjustments and assistance. The new study of alien fingerprinting requirements also reflects a changing tenor of the times and is, I believe, another good omen.

Your meetings today have recognized the importance of a renewed effort in developing immigration and refugee policies responsive to this new decade and now tiny world. This has been called by some the decade of decision. The President said a few days ago in his foreign aid message, a "decade for development." Perhaps it is not out of order to suggest that for all concerned with the challenges of our immigration policy, this could well be the decade of dedication.

It would be my hope that ingenuity, flexibility, and imagination could be the hallmarks with which you as an organization, along with the executive and legislative leaders, would approach the job ahead. Defeat is inevitable only if we become rigid and step beyond the realm of the possible. There are important executive policy and reorganization steps that can be taken. There are governmental and nongovernmental ways through which the public can be educated on policy objectives. And one by one it should be possible to make the legislative changes necessary to bring our goals closer.

It would be helpful if the primary energies of all could be directed not to debates on procedures and strategy, but to educating and informing the public and the public's representatives on the basic policy questions. The questions and debates over short legislative steps versus long steps, omnibus bills versus multibill approaches are not the keys to success.

In my book the real key is to make clear the full impact on U.S. foreign policy of our immigration policies—our national origins approach to screening individuals. President Kennedy made this point very clear in his message to this Congress. A major recognition of the importance of immigration and refugee policy to foreign policy was made in the 1960 Democratic Party platform under a section entitled: "The Instruments of Foreign Policy." This section included the pledge to "eliminate discrimination and to enable members of scattered families abroad to be united with relatives." Here, in very personal terms, is described the full impact of immigration policy on our foreign relations. Let us increase enormously the number of Americans who think immediately in just this way whenever the phrase "immigration policy" is heard or seen.

Everyone recognizes that the challenges of emerging nations are tremendous. Let us not be further hampered in our efforts to join with them in free world endeavors by the embarrassment of taking no action to move forcibly against the kind of national policy discrimination we know today under our immigration quota system.

What are the congressional prospects? Well, I am sure that in 1956 no one would have made a serious bet that Congress would have passed two significant civil rights laws before 1960. We must not look too closely at the roadblocks of the past in assessing the possibilities of the future.

Finally, and this is the reason I was invited to make these few remarks I am sure, the tentative plans of the Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees are probably of interest to you.

The chairman of the subcommittee is new to the intricacies of this field. The subcommittee has a modest budget with which to initiate our work. Yet I hope that within the next year or two the subcommittee can evolve a program which will give members of the Senate Judiciary Committee and the Senate background studies and hearings on such subjects as:

What we have learned from our current experiences with the Cuban refugees, and our Nation having been the first stop of those seeking asylum from tyranny;

World refugee and escapee facts and policies within the jurisdictional scope of the subcommittee's resolution and charter.

U.S. experience gained from participation in the World Refugee Year.

And if staff time and funds permit, I would hope to collect some experiences of those most familiar with the success or lack of success we have had in assimilating, training and resettling the homeless of the world under the program of the last 15 years.

Your hospitality and warmth in inviting a neophyte to address you is deeply appreciated. If objectives sought in immigation reform are achieved in the months and years ahead, you will be largely responsible. If the Refugee and Escapee Subcommittee makes a small contribution to fairly and equitably assess the many ramifications of this subject, it will be as a result of the support and cooperation of all of you. The pledge I make you is simply a desire to be helpful, cooperative, and available to all as I attempt to perform my duties in the Senate.

American Medical Association Survey of Federal Health Expenditures—State—V

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the following is the fifth part of a series on the report prepared by the American Medical Association on funds which have been appropriated by Congress for activities of the Federal Government in the field of health:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

This year	$86,874,700
Last year	81,068,510
International Cooperation Administration	52,857,000
Last year	48,615,000

The unilateral activities of the United States in the field of health are, in the main, carried out by the International Cooperation Administration of the Department of State. This agency, through cooperatively financed programs, is helping 45 countries at their request to improve their health and living conditions. Other programs are carried out by the Department of State itself or through multilateral organizations, such as the U.N. or PAHO. The total appropriations for the International Cooperation Administration are carried out in the following programs.

Malaria eradication program, approximate	$29,500,000
Last year	27,011,000

The Mutual Security Act amendments of the 86th Congress, 2d session, continued the authorization for U.S. participation in a worldwide malaria eradication program; $29,500,000 will be allocated by International Cooperation Administration to 45 countries for this purpose.

Cooperative health programs—other than malaria—approximate	$21,512,000
Last year	21,554,000

The United States, through cooperatively financed programs, is helping countries, at ther request, to improve their health and living conditions. The broad range of health projects falls into the fields of (1) epidemic and infectious diseases (trachoma, smallpox, typhoid), (2) environmental sanitation (safe water systems and sewage disposal), (3) development of rural health services and facilities (health centers, hospitals, clinics, laboratories), (4) training of personnel both locally and in the United States, (5) the establishment and development of basic health training institutions (schools of nursing, schools of public health, schools of medicine).

American Research Hospital for Children in Poland (new)	$1,500,000

Under the provisions of section 400(c) of the Mutual Security Act, the President is authorized to use foreign currencies for assistance in the construction of hospitals abroad. The Mutual Security Appropriations Act (Public Law 86-704) provides $1,500,000, which is to be used to purchase foreign currencies for the construction of the American Research Hospital for Children at Krakow, Poland. The program will be supervised by the International Cooperation Administration through an agreement with an organization known as the Committee for Research Hospital for Children in Poland.

American University at Beirut (newly reported)	$295,000

The United States, through the International Cooperation Administration, under an agreement with the American University at Beirut, sponsors a number of students at the various schools in the university. The cost to the United States is based on both direct and indirect costs per student. Currently the United States is sponsoring 85 sudents at the university's school of public health for an estimated cost of $225,000, 15 students at the school of nursing at an approximate cost of $30,000, and 25 students at the school of pharmacy for approximately $40,000.

Atoms-for-peace program	$50,000
Last year	50,000

Congress appropriated for fiscal 1961, $1,500,000 to carry out the program authorized by section 419 of the Mutual Security Act. It is estimated that $50,000 of the total will be used in the health field. While the allocations have not been programed, funds could be expended for such things as training of foreign technicians in the United States in the use of radioisotopes, the equipping of laboratories, or the supplying of units, such as those used in cobalt therapy, to facilities in foreign countries.

United Nations Children's Fund	$12,000,000
Last year	12,000,000

There are 87 contributing governments and territories. The U.S. proposed contribution to the fund for calendar year 1961 is $12 million. The fund is aiding 371 health and medical projects in 104 territories and benefiting over 55 million children and mothers. In 1959 (latest available figures) more than 14 million children were vaccinated against tuberculosis; 35 million persons were protected with DDT against malaria; some 2,500,000 children and mothers were treated for yaws; 2 million children were treated for tracoma and related eye diseases; 800,000 were under treatment for leprosy; and 7 million mothers and children received daily milk rations.

U.N. relief activities for Palestine refugees, approximately	$2,721,000
Last year	2,721,000

The United States contributes 70 percent of the funds for the United Nations relief activities for the 550,000 Palestine refugees in camps in Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, and Gaza. For calendar 1961, the U.S. contribution will be $23 million of which $6.5 million will be in kind. The $2,721,000 will provide all types of health care needed by the refugees.

World Health Organization, approximately	11,215,510
Last year	11,215,510

The budget for WHO for calendar year 1961 is estimated at $18,920,520 of which the United States will contribute $5,999,700 (31.71 percent). WHO sponsors health projects in most areas of the world, with particular emphasis given to underdeveloped nations; 88 percent of its budget is allocated to operating programs, 9 percent to administration, and 3 percent to conferences and meetings. It is anticipated that the U.N. expanded program of technical assistance will allocate an estimated $5,500,000 for 1961 to WHO for technical assistance not financed by WHO's regular budget. The United States will contribute 40 percent of this total or $2,200,000. In addition, the United States will contribute the following sums for other WHO programs: $4 million for malaria eradication, $500,000 for medical research, and $175,000 for the development of safe water programs.

Pan American Health Organization, approximately	$4,727,000
Last year	4,840,000

The budget for PAHO for calendar year 1961 is estimated at $4,700,000 of which the United States will contribute $3,102,000 (66 percent). PAHO sponsors health programs in the Western Hemisphere and serves as the regional office of WHO in the Americas. In addition, the United States will contribute the following sums to other PAHO programs: $1,500,000 for malaria eradication, and $125,000 for community water supplies.

Health program for overseas employees	$1,695,000
Last year	1,675,000

The Department of State furnishes health care to 13,000 overseas employees (the majority of whom work for other agencies) and approximately 18,000 of their dependents. In the case of dependents, the Government pays for hospital and surgical care only after the first $35 of expense incurred for a single illness. Care is not provided for obstetrics or for disease or injury which results from the individual's willful misconduct. In most cases, U.S. military and Public Health Service medical facilities are utilized. The above total does not include salaries of physicians, nurses and technicians, and administrative staff in Washington nor the salaries, allowances and travel expenses to and from posts. The Department maintains a medical officer at 14 foreign posts. Eleven of these also have at least one nurse and three employ lab technicians. Health rooms are serviced by nurses in 15 other posts. All medical personnel are American citizens.

The Plight of the Baltic States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the attached article "The Plight of the Baltic States," by Kenneth V. Lottich, inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PLIGHT OF THE BALTIC STATES
(By Kenneth V. Lottich)

If one were callous enough to disregard the lives and fortunes of the 6 million inhabitants of Estonia, Lithuania, and Latvia, it might be said that at long last the U.S.S.R. has solved the Baltic question.

This phrase, an item of history, has been in existence for several millenniums and the problem suggested an issue among the empires of Europe for an even longer duration. Although, as we have said, people must never go unheeded, the geography of the Baltic States has been the most significant contributing factor in the development of this question and the Baltic States predicament.

A quick glimpse at the map shows the dismal plight of northern East Central Europe. Finland (although currently outside the Iron Curtain) has been shorn of geopolitical significance, her borders pulled back from Leningrad and the Barents Sea, her very existence as an independent nation placed in grave jeopardy by the reptilian maneuvers

of Moscow. Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania were annexed by the Soviet Union in 1940; their coastline had become a necessity for the submarine pens of the Russian bear rapidly learning to swim under water; their perimeter islands a site for the Soviet missile bases that threaten Western Europe. "Most important is the fact that the (Russian) Baltic fleet has come out of its mousetrap in the innermost corner of the Gulf of Finland into the drillground of the open Baltic Sea." [1]

The seizure of Kaliningrad (Koenigsberg), in former German East Prussia (which was split between the Kremlin and its Polish satrapy), plus Poland and the littoral of the German Democratic Republic, completed this Soviet advance on the great northern sea of Europe. Weishar calls this sweep "the greatest geopolitical trump to be played by Russia in the last century." [2]

Although the absorption of the Baltic States proper (Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania) has never been recognized by the United States, Britain, France, and the West in general, possession—in this case, at least—represents considerably more than the usual nine points in law. The area involved comprises 67,000 square miles—approximately the size of the American State of Washington—with a population three times as great.

Properly speaking, Finland and Sweden likewise are Baltic countries yet the Baltic question is most frequently discussed in terms of Livonia, i.e., the recently (but presently Communist-held) countries, Estonia and Latvia.

Nonetheless the Baltic question is not solely a national issue, despite the fact that Baltic nationalisms are involved. It is international and in many ways must be considered as significant as the problem of the landlocked areas in east-central Europe directly to the south.

Specifically, the Baltic question "refers rather to the role which the eastern Baltic region played in world affairs. It reflects the influence which this area exercised upon the development of the surrounding great powers." [3] Kirchner, a historian of the Baltic, alleges that "during 4,000 years of historical knowledge, the Baltic provinces have been equaled in importance by but few regions: Mesopotamia, Egypt, Sicily, the Rhine Valley, and perhaps two or three others—all of them at the junction of great communication lines between east and west or between north and south." [4]

To put this theme another way: The very land itself, the geographical, political, and cultural potentialities of this naturally-favored situation, appears to be the controlling factor. There are indications, it is true, that the Latgalians and Semgalians, Baltic people in the legitimate sense, and the Cours, Livs, and Estonians (Finno-Ugrian), who settled this maritime province as early as the fourth and fifth centuries,[5] were influential in its social, economic, and political development; nevertheless, rather uniquely, it is the situation, the land and its potential, that seemingly dominate the historical mission of the Baltic States.

Thus the favored position of their realm has become the tragedy of the peoples of this eastern Baltic coastland. Their geographic position a focus of envy, brief periods of independence have been largely overshadowed by long epochs of vassalage.

Livonia's most recent period began with the post-World War I independence championed by President Wilson at Versailles. Estonia and Latvia, along with Lithuania, continued as sovereign states for two decades up to the second Russian attack on their liberty in 1940. Nazi occupation from 1941 to 1944 and so-called liberation by Moscow have placed the peoples of these Baltic States under many perils and it is well known that the people's democracies set up by the Marxists rest only on Russian bayonets.

Indeed Baltic nationalism, in the modern sense of the word, may be said to have flowered in the 20th century; in its original form (in the passive assumption of some elements of cultural homogeneity) it may be over 1,000 years old. Nonetheless, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania (along with Finland and Poland) were the only nationalities subject to czarist rule that were able to break away from the Kremlin. Joseph Stalin himself, the Marxists' No. 2 troubleshooter, failed dismally in his attempt to gain the Baltic republics for bolshevism, an episode which he spent a third of a century trying to forget.

Twenty years of freedom, however, came to an end with the beginning of World War II on September 1, 1939. Actually independence had been earmarked for destruction a few days prior when Molotov and Von Ribbentrop signed the Soviet-Nazi pact of friendship and nonaggression of August 23. A secret protocol placed Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Bessarabia in Soviet Russia's sphere of influence. Plans likewise were made on August 28 for the "fourth partition" of Poland, an event which was to signal the death knell of small nations in East Central Europe.

September and October saw "mutual assistance" pacts forced upon the three Baltic States. On trumped up charges the following June 14, Molotov presented the Lithuanian Government with an ultimatum demanding free admission of the Soviet Army and the establishment of a new government friendly to the U.S.S.R. and willing to execute the mutual assistance treaty honestly. Within a couple of days Estonia and Latvia had also had their turn to cooperate.

The creation of the new "friendly" governments ended the phase of military occupation, or rather continued it even more rigorously under another from. Under the tutelage of three Russian commissars puppet regimes quickly came into being. On July 14 and 15 elections of "people's parliaments" were held in each state. Franchise laws having been corrupted, only one slate, that of the so-called Union of Working People, was approved. The events of this dreadful day have been reported as follows:

"In Estonia and Latvia a group of patriotic citizens had attempted to present to the voters a list of independent candidates * * * such action was immediately suppressed by the government and the initiators were arrested * * * a great many citizens abstained from voting. (Yet the day after the elections it was announced that 92.8 of the voters had cast their ballots for the single pro-Communist slate in Estonia, 97.6 in Latvia, and 99.19 in Lithuania." [6])

Of course this result should not have been surprising. As an actual instance, but highly significant in revealing the mentality of the Marxist masters, the following conversation between Deputy Prime Minister Professor V. Kreve-Mickevicius of the Lithuanian People's Government and Molotov, held in Moscow on July 2, 1940, excels in frankness: Molotov—"You must take a good look at reality and understand that in the future small nations will have to disappear. Your Lithuania along with the other Baltic nations, including Finland, will have to join the glorious family of the Soviet Union. Lithuania cannot remain an exception. You would be doing the most intelligent thing if you would accept without any hesitation the leadership of the Communist Party which is determined to effect the unification of all Europe and the application of the new order." [7] Apparently the Reds combined the tactics of Adolf Hitler and Peter the Great.

Horrible events in the subjugation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania are related by Endel Kareda as, for example, the terrors of the night of June 14, 1941. In Lithuania a total of 30,485 persons seized and deported, is substantiated by police and railroad documents, including "freight lists" of human cargo indicating car numbers, capacity, and destinations. In Latvia and Estonia "the MVD raided thousands of homes during the night, ordered men, women, and children out of bed, gave them 10 to 30 minutes to pack a few belongings, bundled them into lorries and took them to railway stations where cattle cars with barred windows waited. Hundreds of children and old people died even before the trains crossed the frontier on their way to Northern Russia, and the wastes of Siberia." [8] The following figures representing executions in 1 year of Soviet occupation, based upon evidence found in the hundreds of mass graves, shock the sensibilities: Estonia, 62,729; Latvia, 64,250; Lithuania, 65,000.[9]

As late as 1960, in order to cover their own atrocities, the Soviets continued to broadcast claims that "authorities in Communist Estonia have uncovered evidence showing Nazis slaughtered 3,000 Czech and German citizens near Tallinn in 1942–43." [10] Obviously, such communications are part and parcel of Stalin's attempt to place the responsibility for the Katyn Forest massacres on German forces, an imputation that was rejected almost universally by the West.

Through its Polish satellite the Kremlin currently raises the specter of German despoilment of East Europe and the "danger" of revanchism through "West Prussian" and other "revisionist" associations. Again to obscure her own role in the rape of the Baltic countries—and speaking through her Warsaw mouthpiece—Moscow cries: "Poland, like all other peace-loving countries, sees in German designs of revenge a danger not only to herself but to the peace of the world." [11]

William L. Shirer, an American war correspondent and commentator, in an interesting analysis of the background of World War II, suggests that Stalin outsmarted himself in the Molotov-Von Ribbentrop pact, another reason for Russian recourse to German damnation. Trapped by his own lack of logic, the great marshal allowed the German army to sweep the West and then initiate a one-front war in the East. Shirer thinks that the German generals would never have permitted a war which promised from the outset two main fronts; that Hitler's government would have toppled had he attempted to force this. Thus Stalin's promise of immobility was the real cause of Hitler's overconfidence.[12]

On the other hand, had Stalin from the first merely gambled on the ruin of Germany and the reconstitution of the German and Slavic East under the Communist banner, he stands as second only to Lenin as a master strategist—although one willing to take survival risks of the type currently attributed to Mao-tse-tung's Red China.

The Russian attempt to shift the blame for the devastation of East Europe on Germany is not their only control device for securing conformity by the satellites. Deportation by the Marxists is anything but a forgotten expedient. Weishar reports that "In its craving for expansion the Kremlin is not satisfied to hold the southern Baltic coast (in addition to the Baltic states proper) and place it in the hands of its satraps. Together with the military occupation and political subjugation went an ethnic change of vast proportions: the German Baltic coast from Memel to the mouth of the Oder was denationalized. The Baltic peoples constitute an uncommonly high percentage of the inmates of the Siberian slave labor camps. The Finns, too, were expelled from the Karelian Isthmus after the war's end and their land annexed to the Soviet Union, which also swallowed a considerable

Footnotes at end of speech.

strip of the north coast of the Gulf of Finland." [13]

Because of the strength of Roman Catholicism in the eastern Baltic States, the Communists from the first have endeavored to wean the population from their religious moorings. Heavy taxation was imposed on all churches in the newly acquired territory and excessive rents charged for the use of dwellings which formerly belonged to the church and were domiciled by clerics. Education suffered too. It is well known that, in Lithuania, the Catholic faculties of theology and Catholic high schools were closed; only one of Lithuania's four seminaries was allowed to function and the number of students eventually reduced; religious services in the Army, hospitals, asylums, and prisons were stopped; religious teaching in the schools was forbidden and this portion of instruction replaced by lessons on Marxist materialism.[14]

At the same time 11 of Latvia's 110 Catholic priests were arrested, tortured, and finally either executed or deported. In Lithuania 60 out of 800 suffered a similar fate. Apparently the Soviet overlords believed that the liquidation of 10 percent of the Baltic clerics would intimidate the population. It did not. Therefore, during the first year of the second occupation, 33 Catholic priests in Latvia and 350 in Lithuania were transported or killed, raising the proportion to close to one-third.[15]

Yet not all of the clergy in the Baltic were attacked. For example, Archbishop Antonius Springovics remained at Riga, on orders from Rome, during the entire first occupation. While he personally was not molested, he was powerless to prevent either the arrest, torture, or liquidation of his priests or the deportation of the Latvian population, a maneuver calculated by the Communists to cause him loss of prestige and indirectly weaken the power of the Church itself.

When the Russians returned (after the German invasion) in May 1945, the archbishop was, at first, in keeping with the much propagandized policy of religious freedom, shown suitable consideration. Then, toward the end of the year, he was invited by the Kremlin to remove to Moscow, where, as "metropolitan of the Roman Catholics in the Soviet Union," he could "wield a larger power." Upon his indignant refusal the Communists showed their other face. Although it is not yet established whether of his own free will or on Marxist orders, in 1947 Archbishop Springovics withdrew to a tiny domicile well beyond the Riga city limits.[16]

We can unquestionably assume that the exercise of religious rites in the Baltic, in addition to the spiritual comfort achieved, serves also as a reiteration of the feeling of common nationality, as opposed to the folk activity fostered in the political sphere by the Red regime. Nor is religion the sole mode of expression available. The habitants can show a common spirit in many ways that are passive rather than active. For instance, it is reported that on January 18 (1951) the Communist Rahva Hääl (Tallinn) revealed that the department of cinematography (which owns all of the nationalized cinemas) ended 1950 with a considerable deficit, because of the drop in cinema attendance." [17]) Good reason for the public not to attend is suggested by the fact that all films have Russian sound-tracks and, naturally, the Estonians do not care to speak Russian; furthermore, it is alleged that the cinema fare is so heavily loaded with Soviet propaganda that the pictures are boring in the first place.

A little later, on February 21, 1952, the Secretary-General of the Latvian Communist Party is revealed as whining that "the people's minds are much influenced by capitalist relics. Bourgeois nationalism makes itself felt in all walks of life; class alien elements spread corrupt reactionary theories and encourage the inclination to private property in the kolkhozes." [18]

Then there is the Estonian youth problem, a phenomenon that is plaguing Moscow itself. From London the comment comes that "On March 26–28 in Tallinn at a plenary session of the Central Committee of the Estonian Communist Party, its secretary, Comrade Lentsman, and the secretary of the Komsomol, Comrade Pomazkin, stated that the political education of the workers and young people left much to be desired. Local party organizations," he said, "paid no attention to the Communist education of the masses." [19]

The parallel between the expansionist policies of czarist Russia and those of the current Red regime, both at the Kremlin level and as working in the satellites, is too visible to require much comment. Dr. Rudolf von Lodgman has recently restated this truth in pertinent fashion: "It is not the first time in history that Eastern peoples have reached out to conquer Europe. Huns, Magyars, Mongols, and Islam, in turn, have been a threat; today Bolshevism, emanating from Moscow, would execute if possible the testament of Peter the Great." [20]

Throughout history the Baltic States have served as a pivot or axis. This is the real meaning of the Baltic question. Presently the Soviet masters in playing up the rimland characteristics of this land perhaps consider it only a buffer. At any rate the inhabitants of these unfortunate countries must suffer expulsion and frequently death merely for having been born in one of the most strategic and significant spots on earth.

Dr. Kurt Rabl, an expert on international law, cites the legal basis for such action through an illustration particularly appropriate to these Baltic regions.

Expulsion or resettlement has been, in recent years, applied (among other circumstances) to "Persons who, within a state of which they are citizens, are also resident there, but by the authority of that state are deported to other localities of the interior for reasons of 'public order and security' or for reasons of economic planning.

"That applies to the politically or socially 'undesirable' Estonians, Letts, Lithuanians, and Ukrainians; it has also been the case of certain Mohammedan Caucasian peoples, and also to the Japanese living on the Pacific coast of the United States who, under the impact of the outbreak of Japanese-American hostilities (Pearl Harbor) at the turn of 1942–43, were deported to barren regions of the Rocky Mountains and interned in guarded camps." [21]

In fairness it should be pointed out that while Dr. Rabl exposes the rationalization of these events, he views the acts themselves as violations of the spirit of international law.

What steps have the Western democracies taken to remedy the situation in east Europe, especially in the Baltic States? In 1951 the Voice of America enlarged its program to include broadcasts to these Soviet-enslaved peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania in their native languages. In 1953 the Congress of the United States created a Select Congressional Committee on Communist Aggression. This committee compiled a huge quantity of evidence concerning the annexation and subsequent Marxist atrocities in the Baltic countries. This was published in 1953–54.

John Foster Dulles, late Secretary of State of the United States, revealed the attitude of many citizens of the West regarding the captivity of the Baltic States: "The United States, for its part, maintains (only the diplomatic recognition it extended in 1922 to the Baltic nations). The captive peoples should know that they are not forgotten; that we are not prepared to seek illusory safety ourselves by a bargain with their masters."

---

[1] Richard Weishar, "Red Water in the Baltic Sea" (Sudeten Bulletin, Munich, vol. VII, No. 11 (November 1959), pp. 225–228.

[2] Ibid., p. 225.

[3] Walther Kirchner, "The Rise of the Baltic Question" (Newark, Delaware: University of Delaware Press, 1954), p. 2.

[4] Ibid., p. 4.

[5] Alfred Bihlmans, "Latvia in the Making" (Riga, 1925), p. 8; Walters "Le Peuple Letton" (Riga, 1926), pp. 47, 86. As quoted in Kirchner, op cit., p. 4.

[6] Arvid Schwabe, "The Baltic States," ch. 5 in Stephen D. Kertesz (ed.), "The Fate of East Central Europe" (Notre Dame, Ind.; University of Notre Dame Press, 1956), p. 109. See the entire chapter for later developments including the Nazi occupation and second Soviet seizure.

[7] "Third Interim Report of the Select Committee on Communist Aggression," 83d Cong. of the United States, 2d sess., Washington, 1954, pp. 341–344.

[8] "The Technique of Economic Societisation," as quoted in John Alexander Swettenham, "The Tragedy of the Baltic States, A Report Compiled from Official Documents and Eyewitnesses' Reports" (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1954), pp. 159 ff.

[9] Swettenham, op. cit., p. 141.

[10] Associated Press (London), Sept. 10, 1960; refer also to "Russ 'Explain' Pact with Nazis," AP (London), July 24, 1960.

[11] Roman Nurowski, "Heirs of the Third Reich, Zachodnia Agencja Prasowa" (Warsaw), September 1960 (6–12), pp. 5–9; see also D. Derlatka, "Slow-Witted Pupils," idem, pp. 2–4; and "Irredentism and Provovation" (Warsaw: Z.A.P., July 1960), 72 pp.

[12] "The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich" (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1960), p. 542. See also documentary detail of the Molotov-Von Ribbentrop pact, pp. 538–541.

[13] Weishar, op. cit., p. 226.

[14] Listowel, Judith, Countess of, "Luxury Tax on Churches, East Europe and Soviet Russia" (London), vol. VII, No. 327 (Apr. 19, 1951), pp. 11–14.

[15] Loc. cit.

[16] Listowel, op. cit., p. 14.

[17] "East Europe and Soviet Russia," vol. VII, No. 322 (Mar. 8, 1951), p. 23.

[18] "East Europe and Soviet Russia," vol. VIII, No. 367 (Feb. 21, 1952), pp. 17–18.

[19] "East Europe and Soviet Russia," vol. VIII, No. 377 (May 1, 1952), p. 17; for a good discussion of Moscow's problem with the stilyagi and "jet-set," Russian equivalents of zootsuiters, Teddy boys, beatniks, and other adolescent delinquents see "Conflict Between the Generations," pt. I, "Soviet Survey, an Analysis of Cultural Trends in the U.S.S.R.," No. 12, February 1957, pp. 1–7.

[20] "Tug of War for Europe," Sudeten Bulletin, vol. VII, No. 11 (November 1959), pp. 217–219.

[21] "Mass Expulsions and International Law," Sudeten Bulletin, vol. VIII, Nos. 8 and 9 (August–September 1960), pp. 207–212.

Wilderness Should Be Realistic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Second District of Washington State

which I represent is concerned with the various aspects of wilderness as much if not more than comparable districts throughout the United States.

The people in my district believe in the principle of multiple use so that our national forests can serve all by producing areas for recreation, grazing and timber production. I believe an editorial produced in the Everett, Wash., Daily Herald, April 29, 1961, reflects the thinking of the majority of those I represent. This editorial points out that wilderness areas must be realistic and should be preserved for multiple use of benefit to all:

AS WE SEE IT—PRESERVE WILDERNESS AREAS FOR BENEFIT OF ALL PEOPLE

Wilderness areas are not foreign to this community nor to western Washington; so the recent address of Supreme Court Justice William Douglas held much interest to us.

Justice Douglas' veneration for Mother Nature demands universal respect. His sociological views have found their way into his contributions to many decisions of the High Court and other expressions have brought him considerable criticism, some of it justified.

Justice Douglas' address to the Wilderness Conference of the Sierra Club in San Francisco obviously was devoted to the subject for which the conference was organized. It was natural for him to find something in common between nature and the Constitution of the United States.

"The American Bill of Rights implies that every child should have the opportunity to grow up in a place where there are lakes, woods, and mysteries of the wilderness," he asserted.

We have been projecting the same thought for years.

Justice Douglas also found room in nature to make a comparison between a free society and communism.

"The distinctive quality of a free society," he said, "the thing that makes us different from the Russians, is recognition of the rights of man, and that must include his right to enjoy the wilderness."

Efforts of eastern naturalists, however, to allocate additional huge areas of the Northwest have met with disfavor here. Recreationists and industrialists were more than satisfied with the methods under which these areas were supervised by the Forest Service and could see no outstanding reason to change the sharing of their administration.

Wilderness areas are fine but they must be realistic.

The allotment of these areas must be compatible with the future of our major wood-using industries and the livelihood of the many thousands of Washington State residents to whom they give employment.

Justice Douglas believes that the New Frontier is the preservation of "the remaining islands of wilderness." He is so right, if he means their preservation for a multiple use of benefit to all.

Report From Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DURWARD G. HALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I ask unanimous consent to include in the record my "Report From Washington," because of its bearing on the current crisis.

Something took place in Washington this past week which shows the gravity of the international situation in which the United States now finds itself. As the Nation's Capital, Washington, was of course, involved in the civil defense air raid warning test, conducted throughout the Nation to test our communications, and the Conelrad warning network.

As one might expect, Washington probably has the most comprehensive air raid warning system in the Nation, and when the sirens started howling here the noise was loud enough to drown out an Ozark family reunion complete with hoedown back in our beloved Missouri hills. But what stands out in my mind, is that many persons who complacently missed all the newspaper, radio, and TV publicity on the test; actually thought a real attack was underway and that the missiles were on the way.

Their fears, real or fancied, are perhaps the clearest indication of the seriousness of the international crisis now facing our country.

Indeed, events are happening so swiftly that one crisis comes along while a previous one is still on the front pages. And so, in rapid succession, we have had the Russian manned space flight, or at least the claims thereof, the Cuban fiasco, the Algerian revolt, and the Communist military success and deceit in Laos.

The President has met over three times within the last week with the National Security Council; and reports indicate that consideration is being given, not to how to save Laos, but to how to lose it gracefully.

It is impossible to disguise the magnitude of the defeat which the United States and our allies have suffered in Laos, Cuba, and world prestige.

While we have issued "strong words," the Communists have been countering with "strong deeds." On one hand, the Communist rebels have been dangling a cease-fire agreement in front of our officials like a Yo-yo, and each time we have grasped, the string has been pulled, tantalizingly, just beyond our reach. With the other hand, the Communist rebels have been taking over territory so swiftly that we virtualy have nothing left to bargain for.

The Communists now control the northern half of Laos. A month ago they controlled only one-third. The price of a cease-fire is likely to be Communist domination of any so-called neutralist government which is set up. If this occurs, Laos seems certain to be converted into a major base for Communist operations against neighboring South Vietnam. If this comes to pass, the fall of southeast Asia to the Communists is at best, only a matter of time, as Laos, Vietnam, Malaya, and Thailand complete the pincers movement, and lays bare and unprotected Burma and India.

Just as in a game of chess, one move in the field of international power politics can have a drastic effect on the next move. And so it is, that what has happened in Cuba has affected not only Cuba, but every other place where we are at grips with Russia, in the so-called cold war. Having inflicted a setback of major proportions in our own backyard, the Communists are now using that opportunity to apply pressure in every other part of the world. As soon as, and if, the Lao crisis is over, we may expect new pressures to be applied on Berlin, in South Vietnam, and any other place where we are vulnerable, even Korea, again.

Having reached this incredible situation in the short space of only a few months, there are strong rumors in Washington that some drastic changes are about to take place in the executive branch of our Government.

There is much to indicate that Government by "professors and theorists" is about to be abandoned. U.S. News & World Report magazine points out that the new administration brought in a wide range of top-level "professors," noted for their theories about how the United States and the world should be run. The theories ranged from how to deal with Russian Dictator Khrushchev to how White House operations could be made to work more efficiently. Today, little more than 3 months later, doubts have begun to rise, even among the President's aids. Experience, in a brief time, has clashed sharply with theory. Nothing has happened, as the professors theorized, it should happen. And so, the magazine concludes, the "professors" will now lose some of their influence because their neatly reasoned ideas about Khrushchev and the world have not worked out, in practice. Words, which have been superabundant in this administration—over 150 white papers and messages, so far—are likely to be reduced somewhat in number. Actions, when taken, will be based less on snap judgment, and more on conference.

The question facing Washington, and the Nation, is whether there is still time to act, and how to draw the line.

American Medical Association Survey of Federal Health Expenditures—Miscellaneous—VI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the following is the last of six parts of a series on a report prepared by the American Medical Association on funds which have been appropriated by Congress for activities of the Federal Government in the field of health:

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

This year, $57,500,000; last year, $52,150,000.

The above sum will be spent by the Atomic Energy Commission's biology and medicine research program and its training, education, and information activities in the following manner: cancer research, $4,783,000; other

medical research, $14,975,000; biological research, $17,293,000; environmental sciences research, $8,641,000; radiological physics (including biophysics research), dosimetry and instrumentation, $4,935,000; support for distribution of radioisotopes, $250,000; miscellaneous, $3,323,000; and training and education activities in nuclear energy as related to the life sciences, $3,300,000.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM

This year, $114 million, new program.

Under the terms of Public Law 86–382, the Federal agencies, as employers, are authorized to provide health insurance benefits for their employees and their dependents. The employee has the right to select one of the following types of insurance plans: service benefits such as offered by Blue Cross-Blue Shield; an idemnnity program offered by commercial insurance companies; programs offered by employee organizations; or comprehensive health plans such as the health insurance program. Under the law, the Federal Government will contribute a specific amount, depending on the employee's marital status; 1,738,828 employees have elected to participate in the program. Over 3 million of their dependents will also be covered. For fiscal 1961, the program is expected to cost $300 million with the Federal Government contributing $114 million. While the law anticipated the Federal Government paying half the cost of the program, it authorized two options under the service and indemnity programs under which the employee, if he selected the high option, would pay the difference. Eighty-one percent of employees chose the high option. Early studies indicate that employees selected plans in the following percentages: service plans, 54 percent; idemnity, 27 percent; employee organization plans, 13 percent; and comprehensive plans, 6 percent.

(NOTE.—The program for already retired Federal employees provided in Public Law 86–724 is not included in the above. This program will become effective on July 1, 1961.)

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

This year, $29,250,000; last year, $27,400,000.

The foundation's overall budget for fiscal year 1961 is $175,800,000. The sum of $26,450,000 is earmarked for grants for research in the biological and medical sciences. $2,800,000 is available for support of specialized biological facilities. The foundation provides support for basic scientific research, for training and education in the sciences through fellowships and programs to improve science teaching, and programs to improve exchange of scientific information.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES HEALTH PROGRAMS

This year, $12,200,000; last year, $11,500,000.

This program is available to all Federal civilian workers and provides limited services through health clinics. They are operated by Federal agencies which employ 300 or more persons in any one area. Services include treatment for on-the-job illness and physical examinations for employment and preventive health measures.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

This year, $10,596,000; last year, $9,624,660.

Bureau of Employees' Compensation	$9,500,000
Last year	8,702,130

An estimated 2,400,000 Federal workers are eligible under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act for medical and hospital care, rehabilitation services, disability and death payments, funeral and burial expenses. For treatment of employees by private doctors and hospitalization in private facilities, the Labor Department has set aside $7,700,000 this fiscal year ($786,000 more than was spent for this purpose in 1960), and for similar services in Federal hospitals and clinics, $1,800,000.

Bureau of Labor Standards	$1,096,000
Last year	922,530

For promotion of industrial safety, the Bureau plans to obligate $1,096,000. The Bureau develops standards for hazardous occupations, assists the States in accident prevention programs and gives safety training to State and union personnel. In addition, it carries out a program of promoting and enforcing safety in the maritime industry under the Longshoremen's Act.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

This year	$7,450,000
Last year	2,751,300

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration was established in 1958 to provide civilian control of aeronautic and space activities, other than the development of weapons systems. As with many agencies, funds are not earmarked specifically for medical activities. The figure for fiscal 1960 is actual expenditures and figures for fiscal 1961 are estimates. Medical activities are divided into two categories: inhouse activities and contractual activities. Estimates for inhouse activities include $174,000 for the agency's health program; and $1 million for research in human factors and life sciences (pilot performance). The agency contracts with other government agencies, universities and private industry for research in flight medicine and biology as follows: biotechnology, $1 million; biomedical experiments in extra terrestrial environments, $2 million; space medical and behavior sciences, $1 million; and space biology, $1 million; Project Mercury (man in space): personnel equipment for space flight, $787,000 and tolerance studies, $490,000.

OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

This year	$5,255,900
Last year	1,432,000

The total budget for the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization is $60,125,000. Funds for health activities are estimated at $5,255,900 broken down as follows: salaries and expenses, $512,900; Federal medical stockpiling, $3,650,000; Federal matching contributions for medical supplies and equipment for State agencies, $100,000; and $993,000 for Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization activities to be carried out by the Public Health Service (includes $180,000 for the medical education for national defense program). Most of the increase over last year results from inclusion of medical stockpile management and maintenance costs in this year's estimate.

CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

This year	$4,460,800
Last year	4,306,200

Estimated expenditures for fiscal year 1961 for operation of Canal Zone Government hospitals and clinics and public health activities are $7,908,400. Expenditures for operation of hospitals and clinics are estimated to be $6,832,300 and revenue is estimated at $3,384,700. Four hospitals are operated by the Health Bureau of the Canal Zone Government and have 1,010 beds available daily, as follows: Gorgas Hospital, 440; Coco Solo Hospital, 150; Corozal Hospital, 300; and Palo Seco Leprosarium, 120. In addition there are two dental clinics, one district medical clinic, and six public health centers. Expenditures for public health activities, which include the Division of Sanitation, Health Director's Office, Division of Veterinary Medicine, Division of Preventive Medicine and Quarantine, and general governmental expenses applicable to the Health Bureau are estimated at $1,076,100, with revenue estimated at $62,900. All reimbursements are returned to the U.S. Treasury together with payments by the Panama Canal Company for the remaining net cost of the Canal Zone Government.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

This year	$2,800,000
Last year	2,200,000

Congress appropriates approximately 12 percent of the annual budget of the District of Columbia. The Public Health Department budget for 1960 is $37,700,000. Of this sum $14.2 million will be used to provide care for residents of the District at St. Elizabeths Hospital; therefore, this amount is included in the report under that institution. Twelve percent of the balance, or $2,800,000 can therefore be considered as the estimated Federal contribution for health and medical activities in the District of Columbia.

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCIES

This year, $2,764,000; last year, $1,765,600.

Funds included in the Federal Aviation Agency appropriations this fiscal year for the flight safety program are divided as follows: $1,395,800 for salaries, administrative expenses, and extramural research effort at headquarters; $348,100 for salaries and administrative expenses in regional offices; $851,000 for the Aeromedical Research Laboratory at Oklahoma City; $169,100 for Georgetown University Clinical Research Laboratory. Nine full-time medical officers in the field supervise the periodic physical examinations required of commercial and private pilots. Federal Aviation Agency now has 3,504 aviation medical examiners in the United States and overseas. A total of 272,800 examinations were made last year and it is expected that this number will increase to 275,000 this year. For this service, pilots pay examining physicians directly.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

This year, $2,520,000; last year, $2,218,000.

The figure represents the Bureau of Prisons estimate of the cost of medical and dental services for approximately 23,000 prisoners in 31 Federal penal institutions. The bulk (about $2,370,000) goes to commissioned officers of the Public Health Service assigned to the prisons and to related civil service personnel for services that include medical, surgical, psychiatric, pychological, nursing, and dental treatment. Approximately $150,000 is earmarked for fees to 250 consultants in various medical specialties.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

This year, $1,900,000; last year, $1,600,000.

Federal Trade Commission is charged by Congress with safeguarding the life and health of the public through the prevention of false advertising of products. The above sum represents 23 percent of the Commission's total budget of $8,010,500 and will be used for research, testing, and compliance operations in the field of food, drugs, cosmetics, and devices.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

This year, $846,100; last year, $992,300.

The National Bureau of Standards performs tests and engages in developmental research on its own initiative and at the request of others. The Bureau will expend $280,100 of its own money this year as follows: radiation research, $243,500; audiometric calibrations research, $18,600; dental materials research, $18,000. In addition, the Bureau will receive $566,000 from other agencies, divided as follows: radiation research, $252,300; air pollution research, $90,000; audiometric instrument testing, $48,500; dental materials research, $85,000; development and production of C–14 labeled carbohydrates, $45,000; development of methods for automatic manipulation of elec-

trocardiograms, $37,200; and cardiovascular equipment and development, $8,000.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

This year	$425,400
Last year	405,806

The Commission's total budget for fiscal 1961 is approximately $19,405,000, out of which about 2.2 percent goes to the medical function for salaries of 8 medical officers in Washington, D.C., and 11 medical officers in the regional offices, plus clerical assistance in both the central and regional offices.

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

This year	$265,500
Last year	230,000

The Bureau of Mines, operating within the Department of the Interior, has a total appropriation of $6,457,000 for health and safety activities for this fiscal year. Identifiable health programs and expenditures are as follows: $71,500 for respirator approval testing and research, $53,000 for research on dust and approval testing drill dust collectors; $100,000 for environmental surveys in metal mines; and $41,000 for health and safety inspections in uranium mines.

OFFICE OF THE ATTENDING PHYSICIAN OF CONGRESS

This year	$27,275
Last year	23,615

The attending physician of Congress provides outpatient care for Members of the House and Senate and their staffs. Funds voted by Congress are for medical supplies, equipment, and contingent expenses ($16,545) and for a technical assistant to the attending physician ($10,730). The office is filled by a medical officer of the U.S. Navy. Sole occupant of the post has been Rear Adm. George W. Calver. Compensation of Dr. Calver, his assisting physicians and enlisted corpsmen are paid from Navy funds.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO SELECTIVE SERVICE

This year	$19,000
Last year	19,000

Congress provided the $19,000 appropriation for a skeleton staff and for expenses of national advisory committee operations, plus nominal expenses of State committees which are now on a stand-by basis. The National Advisory Committee has the responsibility of advising Selective Service on deferment policies for physicians in residences, teaching positions, essential laboratory and clinical research and persons deemed necessary to protect civilian health at a time when draft calls are being made. The State and territorial committees assist the national committee when their services are required.

The Life of the Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HIRAM L. FONG
OF HAWAII
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, Mark Twain once described Hawaii as "the loveliest fleet of islands anchored in any ocean."

Our beautiful beaches, majestic green-clad mountains, our fertile, peaceful valleys, our vast canyons and slumbering and active volcanoes, our colorful, fragrant flowers and balmy climate have earned for Hawaii the most appropriate name of "Paradise of the Pacific."

Our natural and historic wonders attract several hundred thousand visitors to our shores each year, as well as provide recreation and spiritual refreshment for those of us fortunate to live on these Pacific Islands.

But, like many of our sister States who also possess marvelous natural scienic and recreational resources, Hawaii is confronted with the imperative need to take steps to preserve in perpetuity for all our people these wonders of nature and to perpetuate the Polynesian culture which we have inherited.

I am pleased that our Federal Governernment is taking an increasing interest in protecting our Nation's recreational, park, seashore, and wilderness for the enjoyment of generations to come. My own State of Hawaii, too, is more and more concerned about preserving our natural and cultural heritage. Civic groups long have labored in this cause.

In the April 1961 publication of one of these groups, the Sierra Club, is an eloquent plea by Walter S. Horchler to perpetuate the life of the land. Because it expresses vividly and concisely the dilemma Hawaii faces of expanding civilization and shrinking unspoiled areas, a problem common to many States, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAWAII NEEDS A STATE PARK SYSTEM TO HELP PRESERVE THE LIFE OF THE LAND

(By Walter S. Horchler)

"He aupuni palapala ko'u;
Aia i ka lani ke akua;
O ke kanaka pono ola ko'u kanaka,
Ua mau ke ea o ka aina i ka pono."

"My kingdom is a kingdom of knowledge;
Its god is in heaven;
The righteous man is my man.
The life of the land is perpetuated by righteousness."

When King Kamehameha III pronounced these words at his installation as ruler of the Sandwich Islands in 1843, he could have hardly foreseen the tremendous changes which were to bring economic revolution and commercial exploitation of unbelievable proportions to his island paradise in little over a hundred years. Today this motto still stands on the official seal of the 50th State, and the promotion of the million-dollar resort industry has done an outstanding job of perpetuating an elusive picture in the minds of millions of a vanishing way of life, which still sparkles from advertising posters and picture postcards.

The land of Aloha teems with prosperity, the like of which it has never seen before; concrete towers mushroom out of taro patches, blacktop highways creep steadily over the green hills like gigantic spiderwebs and tourist limousines, packed to the brim, speed across the islands.

Is this the "life of the land," which the righteous monarch had in mind? Is it the life of the land which more than a quarter-million visitors come to see? Is it our unavoidable prospect to see the last vestiges of the blue-green slopes disappear under subdivisions, or the swallowing-up of the emerald beaches by continuous lines of hotel lanais?

Attempts to save "Old Hawaii" have been made in many forms and at various times, ever since the turn of the century, when the islands became the territory of Uncle Sam.

In the forefront of these efforts have been the Outdoor Circle, founded in 1911, whose main goal is the preservation of the island's beauty, the Hawaiian Historical Society, and the many civic organizations with mainly Hawaiian membership, who are still predominantly concerned with the protection and perpetuation of Hawaiian lore and customs.

All these sincere endeavors have not been able to forestall a continually faster disintegration of the sociocultural values and scenic-esthetic qualities of the land, which more and more must be visually superimposed on the actual vista presented to the paying customer of today. Must we accept as inescapable progress that every scenic viewpoint, if turned into dollars, will raise Hawaii's economy? Is it too late, after 150 years of indoctrination in the value of this dollar, to do some more missionary work with ideals, which are just as much a part of the American way of life? Is it too late to foster understanding and appreciation for the preservation of the land?

Hawaii stands at the crossroads today. It can scuttle all the impractical ideas, which promote the setting aside of the fabulous and dramatic palis (cliffs) and beaches, its historic shrines, which overlook its mystic gorges, and it can give an unparalleled commercial exploitation the run of the country. These interests have not been idle, but privately or officially have already earmarked almost every accessible sandbeach for resort projects, and bulldozers are cutting into the red earth at every turn of the road. So-called tourist promotion is planning cable cars to the top of Diamond Head and chairlifts leading up gorges for close views of majestic waterfalls.

Yet there is still time to decide that preservation and wise conservation of Hawaii's superlative scenic and recreational resources is equal partner in maintaining the islands as the paradise of the Pacific. Wilderness areas of magnificent quality are at stake, which in their geological and topographical aspects are rarely equalled anywhere in America and where flora and fauna constitute an important outdoor laboratory. Other extremely significant areas of historic as well as scenic interest are hard pressed by encroachment and need immediate protection.

A blueprint is at hand in a comprehensive report by the new State planning office, setting forth the "musts" in scenic and historic values which should be protected and saved for the benefit of all. It indicates the procedures which alone can bring about an effective program, by giving a formula for a State park system patterned after national park system standards.

The broad aims of this plan have been welcomed warmly by civic groups and leading citizens, and the administration and legislature have professed support for the program. But a major hurdle remains—the acceptance of the required land acquisition program. It seems vain, of course, to make grand gestures without accepting this basic requirement. Neither has there been general awareness that such a program can only succeed with appropriate leadership backed by skilled professional help. No parks organization which can tackle this job efficiently has been established.

Great strides have been made in the nationwide recognition of the need to preserve "America the Beautiful"—not in the least by the concentrated efforts of the men and women in the Sierra Club and in other like-minded organizations. Achievement has come about by education of large segments of the people and their government leaders who now sense the natural val-

ues which are our God-given heritage and which are indispensable to the spiritual life of the Nation. These treasures can never be measured in monetary terms.

Are the scenic glories of the 50th State worth the concern of all of us? Many think so; for they are priceless natural assets of the Nation just like the Sierra, the Cascades and the Rockies. Hawaii needs our help today, to awaken the spirit of true conservation, to lift its sights to the irreplacable treasures of its matchless scenery.

A new missionary goal of outsanding caliber for us in the Sierra Club: we all have a stake in Hawaii to be sure that, "The life of the land is perpetuated by righteousness." That is the order of the day. Aloha Hawaii.

Opposition to Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the preambles and resolutions adopted by the Petersburg, Va., School Board and an editorial from the Petersburg Progress-Index in opposition to Federal aid to education.

There being no objection, the resolution and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PREAMBLES AND RESOLUTIONS PASSED BY THE PETERSBURG SCHOOL BOARD OF THE CITY OF PETERSBURG, VA., AT ITS REGULAR MEETING HELD ON APRIL 5, 1961

Whereas the Federal revenues have been inadequate to meet Federal expenditures in 26 out of the last 30 years; and

Whereas Federal aid to education does not represent a new source of revenue; and

Whereas, three-fourths of all personal income goes to wage earners, the cost of Federal aid to education will not be borne by the rich and large corporations as the public is led to believe; and

Whereas the Federal Government now takes 64 percent of all public revenue and will have to demand more if it attempts financial support of public education; and

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has in effect ruled on several occasions that the Federal Government can regulate that which it subsidizes; and

Whereas Federal involvement in public education is contrary to the 10th amendment to the Constitution of the United States which provides that "powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people"; and

Whereas financial dependence on the Federal Government for support of public education will at best reduce local control over our public educational system: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the School Board of the City of Petersburg, Va., publicly announce that it is opposed to Federal aid to education and does feel that such assistance is not needed; and be it further

Resolved, That this board pronounce its opposition to any movement which will give the Federal Government one scintilla of control over any local school system and any attempt to standardize or to destroy the flexibility of public education throughout the local school divisions or districts in the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these preambles and resolutions be furnished to the Senators and Members of the House who represent the Commonwealth of Virginia and its political subdivisions in the Congress of the United States of America.

[From the Progress-Index, Apr. 7, 1961]

IF OTHERS WILL DO LIKEWISE

The Petersburg School Board did a good day's work when it adopted a strong resolution in opposition to Federal aid for education. We hope it reaches all the proper persons and makes the impression which it deserves.

The resolution, offered by the board's chairman, is a cogent statement of the case against Federal aid to education.

No less significant than the reasons cited is the fact that a school board has taken such action. Other boards may have done so, but we are not aware of the instances.

Rather, there is a strong tendency on the part of persons and groups directly concerned with the field of education to endorse the idea, either with enthusiasm or with professed reluctance.

One explanation seems to be that such persons and organizations, mindful of school needs and discouraged over the prospect of seeing them financed by other means, finally succumb to the argument. As far as the effect is concerned, the supposedly reluctant endorsements are just as influential—perhaps more so—as those which come from sources which would welcome Federal aid and the inevitably accompanying Federal control. Yet such endorsements have been made so frequently as to cause some to wonder whether, in opposing Federal aid to education, they are not serving principle at too dear a price.

Against this background, it is good to have the resolution from the Petersburg School Board taking account of the Federal Government's ability to provide such aid, the prospect of higher Federal taxes to make it possible, the certainty of regulation in the event of aid, and the all important fact that Federal involvement in education would be in violation of the provision of the 10th amendment that powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively or the people.

Let us hope that other school boards in the land will take similar action. That could make a real difference in national thinking on the issue.

National Farmers Union Favors Omnibus Farm Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on May 1, Gilbert Rohde, president of the Wisconsin Farmers Union, testified before the House Agriculture Committee in behalf of the National Farmers Union, which favors enactment of the proposed Agricultural Act of 1961. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include Mr. Rohde's testimony in the RECORD:

DILEMMA OF AGRICULTURE ILLUSTRATES NEED FOR COMPREHENSIVE FARM LEGISLATION

At the outset, may I say that we support the Cooley-Ellender bill, H.R. 6400. I was tremendously impressed with the statement made by the chairman of this committee when he introduced H.R. 6400 on April 18. The chairman's keen insight into the problems that affect the agricultural industry were well documented in his statement, and we heartily agree with his closing remark that the farm problem is everybody's problem.

During the course of these hearings, Secretary Freeman and experts from the Department of Agriculture have testified concerning the mechanics of the proposed Agricultural Act of 1961. I will not presume to enlarge upon the excellent analysis already submitted by the Secretary, except to applaud and endorse his eloquent declaration in behalf of family farming.

DECLARATION OF POLICY

The declaration of policy in the Agricultural Act of 1961 sums up the present-day dilemma of agriculture and shows just cause as to the need for the development of a comprehesive, procedural bill under which farmers can devise programs for a wide range of the commodities they produce.

The declaration of policy, for the first time in the history of our Nation, also attempts to summarize the overall aims, aspirations and goals of farm families as related to the development of an overall farm program to meet their needs in this era of abundance.

National Farmers Union is an organization of family farmers. We believe in the family farm pattern of agriculture. The keystone of a free progressive democratic national society, as well as of a strong rural America, is the efficient, economically adequate and prosperous owner-operated family farm.

Delegates to our national convention meeting in Washington in March of this year defined the "family farm" as "an agricultural production unit using land and other capital investment that can be efficiently operated by one or more typical farm operator families who provide the management, take the economic risk and do most of the work required to operate the unit."

The basic aims of our organization are closely related to the policies of Government at Federal, State, and local levels that contribute to the economic betterment of farm families on the land. Well known to this committee, Farmers Union vigorously supports those programs and policies which are consistent with our objectives and we just as vigorously oppose those programs and policies which detract from our goal.

One reason we are supporting H.R. 6400 is that we believe it is based on family farming and would help achieve our goals for family farmers.

I believe and hope that what this committee desires most of all from farm organization representatives like myself is a sounding of grassroots reaction to the provisions of this farm bill. It is to this area that this formal statement will be directed.

DISPELLING MYTHS

Two years ago, the National Planning Association issued an excellent pamphlet entitled "Myths About Farming" in which the association's agriculture committee attempted to set the record straight on many misconceptions held by both city people and farmers about farming. Secretary Freeman has likewise concentrated much of his early efforts on getting the real facts of American agriculture before the public.

The matter of mythmaking, unfortunately extends even into the legislative process—at times influencing the character, direction, and acceptance of farm legislation. More specifically, let us consider some of the

myths that have been manufactured concerning the provisions contained under the five subtitles included under title I.

In respect to the establishment of farm advisory committees, some newspapers, magazines, and even farm groups have attempted to question the competence that bona fide farmers can bring to the realm of farm policy formulation. Their effectiveness has been discounted, and the myth has been created that the Secretary of Agriculture will be the sole policymaker. We believe this to be an unwarranted and unsupported criticism of the proposed legislation.

First of all, illustrations of the effectiveness of farm committees at the policy level are easy to find. Producer committees have worked effectively in marketing order programs and in bargaining associations. Farmer-elected ASC committees have demonstrated the practicality of placing more responsibility on farmers themselves in the administration of their farm programs. Any decisions on farm policy must be closely identified with the thinking of the people most vitally concerned.

Incidentally, we do not fear these various committees as competitors—we welcome them as useful parts of the democratic process in America.

Secondly, in many respects the Secretary would have less power under this bill than he has under existing legislation. Without intending to advocate less power in that important office, let me point out that the Secretary can now set any support level up to 90 percent of parity—or no support level—for all but a few of the commodities grown in the United States. This power was possessed constantly by the preceding Secretary, and the new Secretary exercised it just recently when he increased the supports under soybeans.

But under the proposal being criticized he would establish an advisory committee, submit the recommended program to Congress for 60 days of review and then submit it to a referendum in which two-thirds of the producers would have to approve the proposal.

It seems to us that this procedure recommended by the Administration is accepting less authority in the executive branch, rather than seizing the awful powers attributed to it by some critics.

MARKETING ORDERS (TITLE I, SUBTITLE B)

The amendments to the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1937 (1) expand the coverage of this act to additional commodities; (2) remove present limitations on area coverage of a marketing order; (3) authorize individual producer allotments and national orders subject to consultation with national farmer advisory committees, approval by the President and Congress, and subsequent to congressional action, producer approval in a referendum; and (4) other provisions for wider latitude in the application of marketing orders.

Marketing orders are a means to the establishing of a do-it-yourself approach for producers in managing supply and in strengthening bargaining power as it relates to price and income. These orders have made it possible for thousands of independent operators in milk and in a number of fruit and vegetable commodities to organize and to regulate themselves to bring stability and orderly marketing conditions to their farm operations.

In respect to the establishment of marketing orders (subtitle B), the myth has been circulated that marketing order programs would regiment farmers under brutal Government controls. This was the case in Wisconsin a year ago when 11 farm organizations supported enabling legislation to permit farmers to establish State marketing order programs. The scarewords of the opposing minority narrowly defeated the measure despite the wide support farmers gave the proposed legislation.

That farmers have faith in such self-help programs has been proven time and again. This year, dairy farmers throughout Wisconsin are seeking the extension of Federal milk marketing orders to areas not now covered. Farmers who have witnessed State and Federal marketing order programs working successfully are going to continue to press for their extension and expansion. The national and regional orders provided for in this bill appear to be a logical outgrowth of this demand.

The expansion of coverage of marketing orders gives greater flexibility in the Agricultural Marketing Act and would provide farmers with another tool for the development of economically sound marketing programs.

Under the subtitle, farmers would develop their programs through advisory committees and vote democratically, by commodity groups, to decide upon use.

In the case of national orders, or orders involving quotas, Congress would review the program prior to submission to producer referendum.

The expanded use of marketing orders is consistent with the program adopted by delegates to our recent national convention here in Washington and we believe the expanded use of marketing orders will afford producers the opportunity for economic betterment and a better life.

MARKETING QUOTAS

Subtitle C of the bill, dealing with marketing quotas, is in our opinion one of the most vital sections of the bill. This portion of the measure spells out the principal mechanism to be available for managing farm production. Yet the myth persists that farmers want nothing to do with allotments and quotas.

Wheat, cotton, peanut, rice, and tobacco growers have repeatedly voted for quotas in producer referendums. Dairy farmers in the Pure Milk Association, which supplies 90 percent of the milk going into the huge Chicago milkshed, recently agreed overwhelmingly to accept marketing quotas.

Farmers realize that they cannot have both fair prices and unlimited production. Given reasonable alternatives, such as the feed grain program offers, farmers can be counted upon to tailor their supply to existing demand. False slogans such as "freedom to plant" have fallen with a dull thud on the Nation's farmlands.

It is, we believe, the intent of the drafters of this comprehensive measure that a system of national marketing orders will produce the desirable price and income effects to raise farm income substantially closer to that enjoyed by the nonfarm segment of the economy. Subtitle D, "Price Stabilization," makes it clear, however, that the present program of price supports will be retained and enlarged to insure farmers greater income protection.

This brings us to the myth that says farmers are fed up with Government "dole" and want only to be returned to the price adjustments of the free market. This myth is a favorite among processor and middleman groups, but farmers have more grey matter than to buy this one. The road to the so-called free market is the road to bankruptcy for most family farmers.

A USDA study released last year substantiates this view. The study shows that if price supports and production limitations were removed, farm prices, with the 1959 level as a base, by 1965 would drop 50 percent for wheat, 34 percent for oats and cotton, 28 percent for corn, 24 percent for cattle, 23 percent for hogs, 16 percent for eggs and 12 percent for milk. Such drastic price drops would return the farm economy to the depths of the thirties. No thinking farmer wants this.

Another myth in the making is that Congress, under this bill, will delegate its powers over farm legislation to the executive branch of the Government. The presence in the measure of subtitle E, "Congressional Review," we believe disproves this contention. The fact that farm programs will not originate in the agriculture committees of either House will not detract from an objective study of any farm proposal or discourage debate. The veto power retained by Congress will be an effective check on the executive branch.

The farm programs that are finally approved under this new approach will, if anything, have had closer congressional scrutiny than is sometimes the case now. The bill relieves Congress of much of the tedious research and paper work without in any way weakening the representative process.

In conclusion, we wish to emphasize that title I is an enabling provision. It merely authorizes the use of economic tools which farmers as individual operators lack. The fundamental question is this: It is reasonable for farmers to seek the tools which will give them more bargaining power in the market place? If we want to maintain our traditional type of agriculture consisting of millions of family units, we must be willing to give farmers greater management over supply and price.

The whole structure of this farm legislation is based upon the belief that preserving the family farm is in the public interest. If we now refuse the farmer these bargaining devices, we will in effect encourage the advent of corporate agriculture. If this comes to pass, it will be the consumer who will be seeking relief and assistance in our legislative halls and not the farmer.

One Hundredth Anniversary of John Wanamaker, Philadelphia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, April 7, 1961, it was my privilege to attend the Poor Richard Club dinner marking the 100th anniversary of the John Wanamaker Philadelphia store. The occasion was a great milestone in the history of the City of Brotherly Love and was truly symbolic of our national progress since the bitter divisions that led to the Civil War soon after John Wanamaker Philadelphia was founded a century ago.

A distinguished leader in American commerce and civic affairs, Mr. Richard C. Bond, president of John Wanamaker, Philadelphia, was the principal speaker at the 100th anniversary dinner. His remarks hold great significance for all of us as they recall the early struggles of our forefathers who contributed so much to building the vigorous and ever-progressive economy that is the lifeblood of America. It is truly a most heartening and encouraging message at this time, when we face powerful adverse forces and seemingly insoluble problems on both international and domestic fronts.

I earnestly commend to the attention of Congress Mr. Bond's excellent and timely address, which follows:

REMARKS BY RICHARD C. BOND, POOR RICHARD CLUB DINNER FOR THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF JOHN WANAMAKER, PHILADELPHIA

Mr. Morgan, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, needless to say, John and I feel greatly honored and privileged to receive this citation and we know that everyone here realizes that we accept it symbolically for the more than 100,000 employees who have loyally served the great John Wanamaker store over the last 100 years.

It seems very fitting to us, too, that this award should come from Philadelphia's leading advertising group and one of America's better known organizations, the Poor Richard Club. For while Mr. Wanamaker was known as the Merchant Prince, in my judgment he was an even greater advertising and public relations man.

Believe me, he has set a most difficult, if not impossible merchandising and advertising pace for his successors to follow. The assignment could be compared with asking our present day statesmen to measure up to Thomas Jefferson, Abe Lincoln, and our own Ben Franklin all rolled into one. To begin with, the fact that out of his first day's receipt of $24.63, $24 of it went right back into the next day's advertising, speaks for itself. I am sure that the Inquirer, the Bulletin, and the Daily News would appreciate this percentage today but I don't think our controller, Mr. Dooley, would.

Mr. Wanamaker's store soon became famed worldwide as an institution of beauty and quality, built on service and wide selection. His pioneering firsts in merchandising and advertising became legend. Just to mention a few.

The first store to recognize the importance of a one-price store.

The first store to run a full page ad.

The first store to advertise complete satisfaction or your money back.

The first store to copyright advertisements.

The first store to hold storewide sales events.

The first store to use electricity—but let me quote from the papers of that day—"Light blazed in the display windows. 'That building's gonna blow up', people screamed, cowering half a block away. The scene was Wanamaker's big department store in Philadelphia—the time, Christmas 1878. For the first time anywhere, a store was lit by electricity and it caused so much excitement that Sunday papers actually demanded police protection for the public so they wouldn't be burned up inside the new-fangled store."

The first store in which Bell telephones were installed.

The first store to open foreign offices, to open a basement store as well as antique galleries.

The first store to forecast the weather in its ads.

The first store to dramatically departmentalize itself with each department having the objective of being the best specialty shop in the area.

The first store to see the importance of publicity in promotion through the installation of the world famous eagle and the world's largest organ and having the President of the United States, President Taft, dedicate the store on opening day.

In fact, to sum up, General Grant was to say on a visit to the store in 1877—"It takes far more generalship to organize and advertise a business like this than it does to run an army."

In addition, Mr. Wanamaker was a tremendous power in the civic and community life of Philadelphia, being the moving force behind most of the worthwhile projects of his day. In fact, he was to become known as the Mr. Philadelphia of his era.

Now over the years, we at the store have tried to keep pace with this great dynamo and while in many cases we have not measured up to his standards, I do believe that through capitalizing on the great vision and heritage he left us, such as continuing to use the Eagle as a meeting place, the overall beauty of the store, using the organ for entertainment, the Muncasky paintings for beauty and art, we have carried on in his tradition. Speaking of the paintings, to show how ingenious Mr. Wanamaker was, he apparently was somewhat hard up for cash when he purchased the paintings and decided that before he showed them in the store, he would send them around the country exhibiting them in various cities with an admission price of 25 cents. After a year's tour, he had paid for the paintings and we have had the benefit of them all these years.

In addition, I do believe our recent court displays, such as the Cathedral, the Fountains and coming up, a 60-foot birthday cake made of steel, with candles 9 feet in height—our rebuilding and renovation program going on continuously and expansion program in the suburbs—the fact that 300,000 people used our auditorium for civic purposes last year and that presently we have a 100-year history of photographs in the auditorium loaned to us by Life, Time, and Fortune that are treasures indeed—as well as a display tieup with the Ford Motor Co. featuring the cars of the past, the present and the future, is in the same image tradition—that the Philadelphia orchestra, the Mormon Tabernacle Choir, almost every well-known sports and entertainment figure has made a personal appearance here—the fact that we are going to announce in June a John Wanamaker Sports Award for the athlete who has contributed the most to Philadelphia in the past year—that our institutional advertising, one such ad being a full page from our Pet Shop advertising a live elephant reduced from $7,995 to $3,995 with a 25 cents extra gift wrap charge, which incidentally made the front pages of 93 papers throughout the country—are just some of the things we believe would be the apples of his eyes. In fact, these are the very things we believe are largely responsible for our corporation going over the $100 million mark within the last several years.

Further, by imitating a winner, some of us, like his great-grandson, John, for instance, have moved out into the civic world of Philadelphia, helping wherever we can to build a better city on the grounds that what is good for Philadelphia is good for John Wanamaker. We believe the day is gone forever when the retailer, the manufacturer, or the banker can limit his interest to just the technique of his immediate job. In his own self interest, he has a duty to participate in his community's civic affairs. This is not to say that the modern businessman must become a starry-eyed do-gooder. We like the old saying about duty which reads, "nothing is properly one's duty but what is also one's interest." Our responsibilities were set forth, we believe, over 2,000 years ago by the great Greek philosopher, Aristotle, when he said: "One citizen differs from another, but the salvation of the community is the common business of them all."

In fact, there has been so much of this civic work going on by some of our executives, that many have asked: Who is tending the store? Certainly it couldn't be Bond or Wanamaker. Well, now I will let you in on a little secret. I would like to introduce our officers who really do run the store.

Financial: Mr. Prendergast, Mr. Dooley, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Berry, Mr. Deakin.

Merchandising: Mr. Foreman, Mr. Chance, Mr. Rudolph, Mr. Siegel, Mr. Sipe, Mr. Van Camp, Mr. Howe, Mr. Harrison, Mr. Boone.

Advertising: Mr. Yost, Mr. Wyatt, Mr. Wetherill.

Branch stores: Mr. Taylor, Mr. Price, Miss Webb, Mr. Hagerstrom, Mr. Wilson.

Operations: Mr. Funk.

Personnel: Mr. McMullin.

Now everyone in this room has, at sometime or another, been the beneficiary in this life of much good. For example, we are the beneficiaries tonight of a very thoughtful citation. In fact, if you analyze it, all we have has come to us from others. What we do, then, when we participate in civic efforts or help to build a great store, should not be looked upon as a duty. It is merely repaying to society a small portion of what society has already given us. It would seem fitting to close with a quotation on this subject from Ben Franklin.

He once expressed to a friend his conception of a thoughtful deed, such as the Poor Richard Club is making to John Wanamaker tonight. He said: "For my part, when I am employed in serving or helping others, I do not look upon myself as offering favors, but rather as paying debts. I have received, he said many kindnesses from men to whom I shall never have the opportunity to make the least direct return. Those kindnesses of men I can only return to their fellowmen and so, let good offices go round and round for mankind is all of a family."

On this note, let us again thank you for this very kind and thoughtful citation.

Omaha's Evening World-Herald Praises Nebraska's Courageous Men Beermann and Martin for Social Security Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in its lead editorial of April 25, the Omaha Evening World-Herald analyzed this country's social security program and this House's recent 399 to 14 vote for certain extensions of that program. It noted with pride the dissenting votes of its State's two freshman Congressmen— Mr. MARTIN and Mr. BEERMANN—and with alarm the unfortunate ignoring of certain very basic considerations which must be faced in dealing with the social security program. I, too, have dealt with the points the World-Herald discusses; my discussion of them appears in a speech, "Politics Can Destroy Social Security," which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at pages A1512–1514 this year.

I should like, at this point, to place the Omaha Evening World-Herald's editorial in the RECORD:

COURAGEOUS MEN

It took courage for two Nebraska Congressmen, RALPH BEERMANN and DAVE MARTIN, to vote against the Kennedy social security program. Social security has become a sacred cow among politicians, as the House vote of 399 to 14 demonstrated.

The benefits are called insurance, but even the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has said that old-age and survivors insurance, although it uses the word, is in no sense a federally administered insurance program.

The "contributions" are not premiums. They are a "tax." And here again we are quoting the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Finally, the social security taxes, which are paid into the general fund of the U.S. Treasury like any other taxes, would not come close to building an adequate reserve even if used for that purpose.

Some actuaries say that obligations incurred but not provided for—and these do not include the currently proposed additions—amount to upward of $500 billion.

Presumably some of those "unfunded obligations" will have to be an outright gift from the Treasury, which means that social security is in part, at least, simply another handout in the name of welfare, but more fraudulent than most because its participants are led to believe they are paying for what they will get.

Franklin Roosevelt observed, when the Social Security Act was passed, that by making contributions, even though they might not be sufficient, beneficiaries would feel they had a legal, moral and political right to collect.

"With those taxes in there," Henry Hazlitt quoted F.D.R. as saying, "no damn politician can ever scrap my social security program."

Not many politicians, damned or otherwise, have dared to try. The social security insurance myth has become so firmly established that any honest attempt to inject actuarial principles and provide any resemblance to an insured pension program never gets to first base. And any effort to strain the hypocrisy out of social security and turn it into a forthright Federal handout paid by an annual appropriation by Congress would seem doomed to failure.

Social security has become one of the untouchable verities along with home, flag, and mother.

So when two Nebraska Congressmen dare to raise the voice of reason, dare to talk about social security as it really is, and dare to vote against its extension, they display uncommon courage.

Their action compliments the voters of their districts, because it indicates the two Congressmen believe their constituents also know the truth about social security, and will back them up.

Statement of the Czechoslovak National Council of America Regarding Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Czechoslovak National Council of America with headquarters in Chicago, speaks for many American citizens of Czechoslovak descent who are dedicated to resisting communism everywhere in the world and to the cause of Czechoslovak freedom.

These citizens viewed with great distress Cuban Premier Castro's use of Czechoslovakian equipment and personnel to defeat the Cuban Freedom Fighters. On April 20, this group officially informed President Kennedy of its feelings in this matter and pledged its support of President Kennedy's leadership.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the April 20 telegram sent by the Czechoslovak National Council of America to the President of the United States be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD along with these remarks.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 20, 1961.

President JOHN F. KENNEDY,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

Czechoslovak National Council of America, speaking on behalf of countless American citizens of Czechoslovak descent, wishes respectfully to inform you of the following:

We welcome the words of determination and courage which you have spoken this day on the Cuban situation. We pledge ourselves wholeheartedly to any effort you may decide upon in the defense of our hemisphere against the establishment of a Communist bridgehead. We applaud your statement and share your opinion that the Soviet Government has no moral right to lecture us on intervention, especially since the U.S. Government has given no support to the Cuban freedom fighters.

Soviet accusations of U.S. intervention to the contrary, we believe that massive support in equipment and personnel given to Fidel Castro by Communist governments constitutes a form of indirect intervention which deserves condemnation by the United Nations and justifies energetic action by members of the Organization of American States in collective defense of the security of our hemisphere.

As American citizens of Czechoslovak descent we deplore specifically the presence in Cuba of Czechoslovak equipment and personnel on the side of Fidel Castro. We wish to assure you with utmost emphasis that this fact does in no way reflect the political beliefs of the Czechoslovak people. In full knowledge of their true feelings we bear witness to the fact that the overwhelming majority of Czechs and Slovaks, though not able to speak freely, are unequivocably dedicated to the principles of freedom and democracy and are opposed to the intervention in Cuba by their Commnnist puppet government.

Just as we Americans of Czechoslovak descent, so do the people of Czechoslovakia wish to see the United States under your enlightened guidance assume leadership of the entire free world in a bold action geared not only to the containment of communism but in keeping with the ultimate goal, the liberation of captive nations everywhere.

CZECHOSLOVAK NATIONAL COUNCIL OF AMERICA,
ANDREW VALUSEK,
President.
VLASTA VRAZ,
Executive Vice President.
FRANCIS SCHWARZENBERG,
Chairman, Political Committee.

Official Secrecy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to an excellent editorial appearing in the Monterey (Calif.) Peninsula Herald of April 28, 1961, entitled "Official Secrecy":

OFFICIAL SECRECY

President Kennedy yesterday asked the country's newspapers to cooperate in an increase of governmental secrecy.

He said that we are living in a virtual state of war in which a considerable amount of secrecy is essential to safeguard national security.

"I am asking the members of the newspaper profession and industry in this country to reexamine their own obligations—to consider the degree and the nature of the present danger—and to heed the duty of self-restraint which that danger imposes upon us all," he said.

We agree that it is essential that military secrets be guarded from potential enemies. We go beyond that. For purposes of effective propaganda we think it would be a good idea to curtail the ballyhoo in this country about what we expect to do in the future, etc., etc.

We doubt, however, that the President has directed his appeal to the right place in addressing the country's newspapers. The newspapers, after all, merely reflect the situation that exists in official quarters. We believe that his advice could more appropriately be given to his own administration.

We have a publicity-mad officialdom in this country, with rival services and departments employing huge staffs of publicists to plug their side, to get credit, to get their names into papers, etc.

The White House itself under President Kennedy has engaged in a press-agentry worthy of Ringling Bros.-Barnum & Bailey combined shows.

As recently as April 12, the following directive was sent to all Federal departments:

"At a White House meeting of Cabinet assistants, we have been advised again that the speeches of Cabinet and sub-Cabinet officers do not contain sufficient reference to the President and his personal interest in, and compassion with, the problems which face the Nation. Liberal quotations from his speeches, past or present, should be used.

"It is also to be kept in mind that, in making announcements of local projects, the President should be given a credit line in the lead paragraph."

In such a mad scramble for publicity it isn't surprising that confidential information may sometimes be given out.

And when rival services are seeking funds from Congress, statements to support that service may be made without regard for their general effect.

Some of Mr. Kennedy's own campaign statements were criticized for undermining U.S. prestige abroad.

Contradictory statements by some of his Cabinet officers have scarcely helped the the United States in the international field. We don't think it helps our cause when the President has to revise and correct the remarks of his Secretary of Defense.

The fact is that the Kennedy administration is just about the gabbiest in history.

There is always the possibility, too, that suppression of news in the interest of national security may in reality be carried on simply to avoid legitimate political criticism.

During World War II military censorship frequently went beyond the requirements of military security. It was used for political purposes and for covering up mistakes.

In that conflict we know of no authenticated case in which information published in the press caused the life of a single soldier or the loss of a single ship or battle. But there were plenty of cases where official mistakes—some of them inexcusable—cost heavily.

President Roosevelt's ill-considered insistence on unconditional surrender probably cost thousands of lives.

Soviet spies did not wrest our atomic bomb secrets from us by reading of them in the

newspapers. They got them by going much closer to the source, aided by the negligence of the Truman administration.

And with hundreds of governmental officials talking their heads off today, we doubt that Soviet spies are relying much on newspapers for their information. Some of the Washington cocktail parties attended by officials probably yield far more secret information of value.

We are sure that the newspapers of the country will cooperate fully in all legitimate efforts to halt the spread of information that is properly secret or confidential.

The question, it seems to us, is whether President Kennedy can get similar cooperation from his own administration.

Federal Funds and State Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by David Lawrence which appeared in the Washington Star of April 28, 1961:

FEDERAL FUNDS AND STATE SCHOOLS—U.S. DEMAND IN VIRGINIA CASE FEARED AS BLOW TO EDUCATION AID PLAN

(By David Lawrence)

President Kennedy may have dealt a fatal blow to the movement to obtain money from the Federal Government to subsidize public schools. He has just demanded that the legislature of a sovereign State—Virginia—be compelled to take punitive action against a single county for failing to open its schools or else abandon the whole public-school system throughout the State. In view of this development, will Congress now take a chance and appropriate money that gives a bureau in Washington potential power over the operation of the public schools throughout the United States?

To tell a State how it must appropriate its funds, how it shall set up its own system of education, and what steps it must take to satisfy the Federal Government's demands is unprecedented in American history. Yet this, in effect, is the authority sought by the Department of Justice, with the approval of the President, in applying to a Federal court for an order against the State of Virginia.

The step is far-reaching. It could mean that in the future the Federal Government could even tell a State it must have a uniform system of government applying to every county or city. It so happens that the State of Virginia permits its counties and independent cities to adopt, as they choose, various forms of executive management or control by boards of supervisors elected by the people. But, under the theory just applied by the U.S. Department of Justice, the counties and municipalities would not be permitted to have their own forms of local government, but would have to adopt a system uniform throughout the State. If any county or city deviated, it would be in danger of being compelled to accept an order of the Federal Government in Washington served upon the State through the courts.

This doctrine is, of course, based upon the concept of the 14th amendment which the Supreme Court of the United States proclaimed in its desegregation decisions in 1954. The point was made then that equal protection of the laws means equal application of State laws to children attending public schools. But there is nothing in the 14th amendment or anywhere else in the Constitution which says the Federal Government may tell a State it cannot provide funds to keep its public schools open in 97 counties and 32 independent cities because a single county happens to close such schools. This is an obvious form of punitive action that can readily be repeated by an Executive order directing any State which accepts Federal funds to operate all its schools according to standards laid down by a Federal bureau.

For months now, the lobbyists for Federal aid to education and the politicians who hope to get votes through promised increases in teachers' salaries have been denying that any form of Federal control of education would be involved in current proposals for financial aid to State schools. But now it turns out that, without any specific right granted through existing law, an executive order could be issued—or a court decree sought by direct intervention of the Federal Government—telling a State how to run its educational system.

The Federal Government is demanding not only that a State reopen public schools in a particular county but that it shall stop State and county tuition grants for the use of parents who send their children to private schools and cease to pay from State funds for the "maintenance and operation of public schools anywhere in Virginia" as long as the public schools in one county are closed.

This can only mean that the Federal Government now feels it can interfere in any tuition grants, fellowships, scholarships or other forms of aid if it doesn't like the way the States operate such educational programs. It is certainly something novel for the Federal Government to tell State legislatures how to spend their money.

It will be contended that the Supreme Court has not as yet ruled on the new demand of the Department of Justice for dictatorial powers over education in the States. But it may be taken for granted that the lawyers at the Department have blazed a new trail and probably have found new devices satisfactory to them whereby the end will justify the means.

If the Federal Government can tell the State of Virginia that it cannot provide funds for its public schools unless it makes every county and city conform to a pattern approved by the Federal Government, then constitutional government, as it has been known since the founding of the Republic, will indeed have vanished. Government by executive order or court decree will have supplanted acts of Congress and the laws of 50 State legislatures.

Archbishop Lucey, of San Antonio, Makes Eloquent Plea That "Poor in Latin America May Live Like Human Beings"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, at a special mass for the 3-day Inter-American Conference sponsored by the Texas Federation of Women's Clubs in commemoration of Pan American Day, His Excellency, the Archbishop Robert E. Lucey made a stirring plea for the poor and needy of Latin America.

In this time of great need for better understanding of the problems facing the people of Latin America, I believe Archbishop Lucey's message is of special importance. To call it to the attention of all Members of the Congress, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent article entitled "Archbishop Pleads for Latin American Social Order," from the April 21, 1961, issue of the Alamo Messenger.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Alamo Messenger, Apr. 21, 1961]

ARCHBISHOP PLEADS FOR LATIN AMERICAN SOCIAL ORDER

A plea to men of power and prestige in Latin America "to create a just social order in which the poor and the needy may live like human beings," was voiced in San Fernando Cathedral last Sunday by Archbishop Robert E. Lucey.

The archbishop expressed his appeal in a sermon delivered at a special mass for the 3-day Inter-American Conference sponsored by the Texas Federation of Women's Clubs in commemoration of Pan American Day.

Among those present at the mass were Milton Barall, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Bureau of Inter-American Affairs, State Department, who represented President Kennedy; Dr. Manuel Mendez G., Vice Minister of Government and Justice of the Republic of Panama; Ricardo Cucalon, Chief of Protocol of Republic of Panama; Consul General Angela Munoz Lew, also of Panama; officers of the women's clubs; Mayor and Mrs. J. Edwin Kuykendall; and military officers from 17 Latin American nations.

"The American people," the archbishop declared, "have always been generous and they have assisted many nations with large grants of money, food, and medicine. Through the Marshall plan we put several European nations on their feet and saved them from the slavery of communism. We have also sent expert technicians to various Latin American countries to give leadership in the fields of engineering and agriculture. But it is now apparent that we should strengthen the economies of those nations and over a period of years help them to help themselves.

"Prudence, caution, and good will must be employed in this operation. The Latin Americans are not asking for charity. The governments of the republics south of the border recognize that industries must be established to raise standards of living; employment must be provided for the working people; housing must be improved; schools and hospitals are needed in many places.

"Our Government and our people will consider it a privilege to assist the Latin-American republics to give a happier and a better life to millions of citizens who are our neighbors and our friends. But if this program is to succeed people of great wealth in those countries must share their blessings with their fellow countrymen who are becoming restless and who will not much longer patiently endure the poverty and the wretchedness to which they have been condemned.

"Historically, men who possessed great fortunes have sometimes been blind and deaf; blind to the frightful poverty of their fellowmen and deaf to the cries of anguish that rose from the impoverished masses of the people. In many parts of the world a spirit of revolution is obvious among the peasants and the exploited workers. Wealthy families in Latin America should recognize and practice the principles of social justice which are a part of their Christian heritage.

"Time is running out. Men of power and prestige must begin now to create a just social order in which the poor and needy may live like human beings in decent and frugal comfort. Otherwise, rioting, and violence may destroy both the men of wealth and their property.

"When our program of cooperation in Latin America gets under way we must proceed with great prudence and caution to the end that we should really help our Latin-American neighbors and not solidify and make permanent the present wretched social order in which there is great wealth on one side and unspeakable poverty on the other. That is not the way to treat our brethren in Latin America.

"If our reputation south of the border and all the way down to the Argentine has not always been good perhaps we should pause to give that problem serious consideration. Our businessmen should never forget that natural resources in Latin America and everywhere were given by God for all the people. It is certainly arrogant to establish commercial operations in a foreign country in order to exploit for selfish gain either the people or the resources of that nation. This sort of thing does not create good neighbors."

"'Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called children of God,'" concluded the archbishop. "We should work and pray for peace not only in the sense of avoiding armed conflict but also that we should learn to treat the citizens of other countries with honor, with respect, and with friendship for only thus shall we be worthy of the blessings of peace."

De Gaulle's Verbal Blast at U.N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in view of the crises we face in many parts of the world and seem unable to solve, it is important to note the firmness with which General de Gaulle handled the rebellion which broke out in Algeria agains the French Government.

Since President Kennedy's first major trip in the field of personal diplomacy will take place late this month when he visits Paris, it is well for us to praise the position that General de Gaulle maintains in his attitude towards the United Nations and international diplomacy.

In the Washington Evening Star of Tuesday, May 2, the column written by Constantine Brown is a thoughtful commentary on the thinking of the great French statesman:

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., May 2, 1961]

DE GAULLE'S VERBAL BLAST AT U.N.—CRITICISM OF COMPROMISE AND OF SOVIET USE OF WORLD GROUP CALLED A SERVICE

(By Constantine Brown)

The Western World, indeed the whole non-Communist world, owes a great debt of gratitude to French President Charles de Gaulle for speaking the simple truth.

Statesmen in every nation have an understandable habit of circumlocution. They beat about the bush on every occasion, play coyly with words, avoid directness as a habit. Unfortunately, often the direct and unvarnished truth would serve their purposes better, and almost always it would certainly serve the world better.

But General de Gaulle, no mere amateur himself when it comes to the proper use of the well-chosen phrase, disdains to hide his real views behind a facade of verbiage. When the matter at hand is significant enough, and when the real story needs telling, the man who has been described as the conscience of France speaks out.

It should have come as no surprise when General de Gaulle turned the full force of his Gallic verbal guns on the faltering United Nations recently. The great man who lost patience with the ridiculous bickering and ineffectual splinterization of the French Fourth Republic's National Assembly could hardly be expected to admire the shifty maneuvering and sometimes dangerous compromises indulged in by the General Assembly of the United Nations and by the Security Council.

In the De Gaulle view, the entire structure of the United Nations needs to be rebuilt, just as he himself rebuilt the tottering structure of the French Government and ended the long years of vacillation, of indecisiveness, of inability to function that afflicted the Fourth Republic.

The timing of the French President's remarks on the United Nations was in itself significant. They were made at a press conference in the Elysee Palace only 3 days after the White House had announced that President Kennedy was to visit Paris.

There could be little doubt that, in making his very sharp and discerning comments on the U.N. and on the nature and organization and effectiveness of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, General de Gaulle was putting his youthful guest-to-be on notice. The two subjects are certain to be a very important part of the Paris talks, and General de Gaulle is not considered likely to back away from the stand he has taken.

At the U.N., said General de Gaulle, the Assembly has taken unto itself the powers and functions that are supposed to be exercised by the Security Council. As a result, he said, the Security Council has disintegrated, and the Assembly now interferes in matters that the U.N. Charter was specifically drawn up to check. "The Assembly * * * can deliberate on everything and anything," the general observed.

And that deliberating, the Frenchman went on, amounts to "scandalous and tumultuous sessions where it is impossible to organize objective debate and which are filled with invective delivered by the Communists and their allies. The U.N. has brought to the Congo its own global incoherence."

France, he went on, would have no part of this chaos. General de Gaulle was not threatening French withdrawal from the U.N. or its allied bodies. But he specifically declared that France would have nothing to do, with either money or men, in U.N. ventures such as that currently under way, with dubious evidence of success, in the troubled Congo.

"Under these conditions, France does not see how we can take any other attitude toward the United Nations—or the Disunited Nations—than that of the greatest reserve."

There we have the crux of the matter. The U.N. has more and more been functioning as an expensive propaganda sounding board for international communism, and for the so-called neutralist nations that are constantly being used to pull Communist chestnuts out of the global fire.

It took the great Frenchman to speak the plain truth.

Medical Care Under Social Security: A Program That Would Undermine America's Quality Health Care System for Her People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the opportunity of addressing the annual meeting of the Connecticut State Medical Society at Hamden, Conn. At that time I spoke on the proposal which had been made that we put a program for medical care for the aged in our social security system. This would result in a significant, and most unfortunate, fall in the quality of medical care which Americans now enjoy. An answer in perpetuity for a need that is temporary and being met better every day could well cost Americans, aged and not, the quality medical care which we have become accustomed to.

I would like to place this speech in the RECORD at this point:

THE MEDICAL COLD WAR—WHAT IS YOUR IQ ON THE MEDICAL CARE CONTROVERSY?

(Speech of Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri; senior Republican House Member, Joint Economic Committee, member of Ways and Means Committee, South St. Louis, St. Louis County, Mo., before the annual meeting of the Connecticut State Medical Society, April 27, 1961, Hamden, Conn.)

There is much misinformation, misunderstanding, propaganda and outright falsehoods abroad concerning the real facts regarding medical care legislation pending before this Congress. News stories, radio and TV programs, and, even many officials are guilty of speaking from the hip without having examined into the facts. The proponents of government compulsory health insurance pretend to be experts, which they are not, in all fields in which they urge a government takeover of both industry and the professions. They are hard at work disguising the true facts by parading before the public's eye drawings, pictures and cartoons of people in distress while claiming that the solution to all of these ills, aches and pains can be supplied through "free" government-supplied food, housing, unemployment checks and medical services. Doesn't it seem strange that the only two committees of this Congress charged with the responsibility of considering health care legislation, after examining the facts, hearing testimony and meeting in extended executive sessions have voted down by a ratio of at least two to one the compulsory government programs presented them. Let me provide you with some of the pertinent information upon which these decisions have been made. A majority of the members of both the House Ways and Means Committee and Senate Finance Committee are agreed that with all of the voluntary, local, State and Federal medical programs available to our population, including the recently enacted legislation now popularly known as the Mills-Kerr bill, every person in the United States is possessed of either the ways or the means for securing proper medical care. Admittedly, for a small percentage of our population there is now and

has been in the past difficulty in meeting the cost of prolonged and expensive illnesses. The appropriate reference committees of Congress which have considered this problem over the past several years have, in their reports, indicated that more than 70 percent of the total population and over 50 percent of the aged possess health insurance. Moreover the quality of insurance protection is and has been improving rapidly. One example of the improvement in this field is the recent action by your State's legislature, the Connecticut General Assembly. It has given approval to a plan by which Connecticut insurance companies can join together in providing health insurance for the aged. This is a truly significant step forward. We know that cancellation of health insurance because of age has been nearly eliminated. Some of this improvement possibly has come in the bright light generated by congressional hearings.

We know that the quality of medical care in the United States under our system is the best in the world, whether the individual purchases health care voluntarily or receives it from one of the levels of government without having any agency impose a compulsory health tax upon him. We know that this kind of a system guarantees a higher quality of medical care than is being delivered to the population in all other parts of the world under compulsory systems—compulsory in the tax sense, and compulsory in the sense that the tax is paid whether the individual uses the system or not, and compulsory in the sense that the providers of care report to government authority and deliver the kind of care which is prescribed by government rather than by the doctor. We know that in no nation other than our own does any similar population group live longer and have less incidence of disease than do Americans. We know that in every civilized nation in the world except in the United States there exists a system of government or socialized medicine. It is no accident that by comparison we excel all these systems in the quality of medical care which is available to our population. We know that 30 years ago our medical students—in fact, medical students from all sections of the world—flocked to the medical centers of Europe for their education. This was before the day that governmental medicine systems came to these former great medical centers. Today medical students the world over, including Western Europe, travel, not to Eprope, but, rather to the United States. In every nation in the world except our own, the ratio of doctors to population is on the decline, with all of the adverse implications that such a decline has upon all the population. The ratio of physicians per patient in the United States is remaining steady at about one physician to 750 of population despite our population explosion. Reports from abroad indicate that fewer sons of physicians in foreign countries are following their father's footsteps in the medical profession. Because few young men are attracted to the medical profession in Great Britain and because many are coming to the United States, the ratio of physicians to population which was 1 to 877 in 1947 decreased to 1 to 1,149 by 1957, indicates loss in quality.

Even in Canada, which has a compulsory tax-supported system which involves only hospitalization, there is a loss of physicians to the United States in excess of 200 per year.

If we need further proof of the great number of foreign-trained physicians who have recently come to America, make a trip to a hospital and there talk to some of the 12,000 and more foreign-graduated physicians who are interning and serving residencies in our hospitals, it makes a trip to the hospital have the enchantment of a visit to 100 foreign countries. And a goodly majority of these foreign-trained doctors, you will learn, have applied for U.S. citizenship.

On the technique side of medicine, difficult and advanced treatment and surgery has become so highly developed in the United States that daily one reads in the newspaper of collections being made to rush some person to the United States for open heart surgery or for treatment of some difficult condition or disease.

Would the United States continue to have the quality lead in medicine if we were to move from our present programs of free enterprise medicine, sprinkled with our compassionate Government-supplied programs which we have for our indigent sick? Isn't it time that each of us take the trouble to really inspect our own communities to learn who it is in our area are not receiving the best quality medical care in the world?

A few of my colleagues in Congress tell me about heart-rending letters which they receive from their constituents under great hardship because of medical expenses and yet, if they will take the trouble to follow through on any one of these few letters received, if they will call upon a local official or a close personal physician friend to look into the complaint, in 999 cases out of 1,000 it will be found that the constituent is eligible to apply for voluntary health insurance, or that one of the programs established by some level of Government will, if that person should present himself, supply the needed medical services either without cost or at a cost which can be afforded by either the constituent or his family. Is this true in New Haven? Is this true in Connecticut? It is true in St. Louis. It is true in Missouri.

Thus far I have indicated the highlights of what I have found to be the case as pertains to quality of medical care and availability of service for all of our population. Next I wish to allude to a few statistics which apply to costs under the system of medical care which we follow in America as compared to the costs of programs under other countries' compulsory-type health care systems. Too few people are aware that under our system we are expending $25.2 billion annually to bring health services to our population. Private care costs in the most recent year available, 1959, according to reliable Federal statistics, reach a total of $18.965 billion, while all levels of Government expended an additional $6.23 billion. Private care expenditures breakdown as follows: $4.998 billion for physicians' charges, $5.514 billion for hospital charges, $3.604 billion for drugs, $1.963 million for dentists, $1.185 billion for appliances, $542 million for nurses, therapists, osteopaths, chiropractors, etc., $220 million for nursing homes.

The proponents of national compulsory health insurance would have us add to our present $80 billion Federal budget a large part of the cost of medical care which is now being borne independently of Government. If they would but check a few of the other countries, they would find this additional tax load would be but a beginning of the ultimate tax increase Congress would have to vote if we imitated the foreign systems. I made this statement because it is the history of Government health programs that the medical care expenditures spiral upward when Government takes over. This is because once the tax is imposed and the benefits are free, the benefits will be excessively used. Let me give you several examples.

The Province of Saskatchewan, which is immediately to the north of North Dakota, is a Province of people who look and act like our own. Should you cross the boundary from North Dakota into Saskatchewan, there would be few indications that you are not still in the United States. Prior to 1947, when Saskatchewan began their free hospitalization for the aged experiment, people over 65, on the average, utilized hospitals 2½ days per year. This was the same utilization rate for the United States for that same age group at that time and still is. However, after 13 years, the average person over 65 in Saskatchewan was found to be using a hospital bed 8 days per year. Just imagine what would happen to the $25.2 billion total expenditure for medical care here in the United States should we adopt such a system.

I am in possession of a letter from Great Britain which indicates that the average hospital stay for the total population because of hospitalization for medical illnesses averages 27.6 days and that the average stay in the surgical departments averages 13.4 days, whereas in the United States our average stay for medical cases is 10.3 days and our average stay for surgical cases is 7.5 days. The information on the U.S. experience comes from the U.S. National Health Survey Reports. Imagine, if you will, the increase in taxes we would have to vote, not to provide needed health services, but, rather, to satisfy the demands of a population which can get this extra care free. And if any person has in mind attempting to answer this argument with the statement that what I have pointed out only indicates that people don't get enough hospitalization, let me erase such a thought by repeating what I have said earlier. Our population lives longer, we have less incidence of disease than any of these other countries, because of our top quality preventive and curative medical care and the high standards of living which our people enjoy. The Blue Cross program directors would do well to inaugurate $25 or $50 deductible policies to offer to their policyholders. They would find that the premium they would have to charge would be so much lower because of the elimination of abuse resulting from this simple discipline that the deductible policies would outsell the "first dollar of cost" policies.

Under our system of free enterprise medical care, we know that on the average, every 2 years, since 1930, we have added a new 4-year medical school so that now we have a total of 83. We know that our medical school graduates in 1940 totaled 3,745, and that last June our medical schools graduated 7,081, and that next year the rate will be correspondingly up. We know that our rate of hospital and other medical facility construction under free enterprise and our form of Government exceeds that of the rest of the world. In Great Britain, bludgeoned by the high cost of their medical program, only one new hospital was built in the first 10 years of their socialized medicine program, thus indicating that government did sacrifice quality by permitting obsolescence and deterioration of their hospitals and health facilities.

The majority of the Congressmen who serve on the committees which have studied this legislation sincerely believe that if Congress should enact legislation to cover any segment of our society, whether that segment be the aged or the young, we will have established a principle which will yield to coverage of the total population. We know this by the experience of every foreign country, because none of them have stopped with coverage of a single age group without going the full route of coverage for the entire population. Indeed there is no logic to limiting health care by the age of a person. If the U.S. Congress should imitate these foreign medical systems, we will be inviting the skyrocketing cost phenomena which have happened in all of the foreign countries. The $25.2 billion which is being expended today by our people for medical care will double or even triple if the experience of other countries proves the rule. And the increased money instead of being carefully spent under the discipline the indi-

vidual person exercises over his or her own personal budget will be scattered and wasted. It will damage the effectiveness we derive from the expenditure of less funds.

Many people say, but let's do something. My answer is look what we have done in our society and are continuing to do. Government can help some, but the essential program must remain in the private sector. Last year in Congress we passed a supplementary program for the aged with low incomes, not so much out of necessity as out of a desire to be doubly sure that cost should not bar any person in our society from receiving adequate health care. It is the Mills-Kerr bill, which many States are implementing. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, early this week said that more than half of the State legislatures had either enacted or were poised to enact legislation providing funds to match the Federal contributions so that all those persons in need, not as falsely stated "on relief" who are in a position to pay all of their living expenses, but not all their medical care, will be assisted in that area. The viciousness with which some of the promoters of the social security approach to health care for the aged have attacked this act by calling it degrading and an insult to the older people, is astounding. Their reaction suggests anger at having a social problem upon which they were relying to provide the beginning of their program for socialized medicine.

I call attention to a report which I shall put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD next week along with this speech. It lists over $3.75 billion annually being spent under the auspices of the Federal Government in programs in which it is actively engaged and it reveals also that an additional $5.731 billion is being paid out under Federal programs on account of health and disability to more than 7 million beneficiaries. Realize, however, when you go through this list, that none of these programs is of a compulsory nature, such as would be a program financed under the social security system. Study, too, the provisions of the Mills-Kerr legislation which was enacted last Congress, and realize, if you will, that 25 States will have implemented this program before adjournment time in the State legislatures in this calendar year. I shall also put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from a British medical official which reveals several facets showing weaknesses in the British medical program. This letter shows me just enough to want Congress to inquire further into that program and the programs of several other of the foreign countries which have experimented with compulsory health systems. Because I have such a curiosity and because I believe the American people can benefit from the experience of these countries, I am urging my chairman, the Honorable WILBUR MILLS, suggesting that we consider at the next committee meeting the feasibility and advisability of sending a delegation to make an objective study and to report on the advantages and disadvantages of government medicine before this Congress again considers the enactment of such a program for our population.

Finally, I want to call attention to a letter I received from Joseph P. Clark, president, St. Louis Labor Council, AFL–CIO, in which he asked me if I would help vote out of committee a compulsory Federal health care bill tied to the social security system, even though I opposed this approach.

I replied by pointing out that many times I have voted measures out of committee to which I was opposed if I felt the committee had done a study job which was sufficient to enable the House to come to intelligent decisions on the policy matters involved. This has not been done. In this letter I asked for some reciprocity on the part of the national labor leaders who, in camera, decided several years ago to try to enact into law a compulsory Federal health care program tied to the social security program. I asked them through my letter to Mr. Clark to listen in an unprejudiced way to the facts and arguments that I and others have advanced in support of what we believe is the most effective way to meet the problem of health care for the aged and why we feel the compulsory Federal approach will badly damage and in no sense help to solve this important social problem.

Regrettably there has never been an appeal to reason on the part of the promoters of compulsory, Federal health care legislation from the beginning of their campaign to the presesnt. The promotion has been an appeal to emotion not to reason. It carries with it a viciousness of attacking the motives of those who will not bow to their will that is foreign to honest public debate and not conducive to reaching an intelligent solution to the social problem. This matter became so serious last year that on May 2 I took the floor of the House to deliver an address entitled "Lobbying and Reporting: The Future of Representative Government in the United States." I was happy, Vital Speech of the Day selected this speech as one they republished. This speech needs to be read by all Americans, not just in relation to this issue and the rotten propaganda and political pressure techniques it embraces, but in relation to all legislative promotions going on in the United States today. As I speak there are paid teams going around my congressional district ignorant of the issues involved in the problem of health care for the aged but intent on one thing alone, to appeal to the emotionalism of my people and break my will to judge legislation on the basis of reason and true humanity.

In the speech, Mr. Speaker, I made reference to letters from a union official and my reply to him. I should like to place these in the RECORD. Finally, Mr. Speaker, I should like to place in the RECORD the letter from the British medical official to which I referred:

ST. LOUIS LABOR COUNCIL,
St. Louis, Mo., March 29, 1961.

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
Congressman, Clayton, Mo.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Under date of March 20, I addressed a communication to you relating to the King-Anderson bill H.R. 4222 and S. 909 which are health bills for the aged as an extension of the social security system.

I asked for your position on this legislation and further urged that even if you don't agree with the purposes of the program that you should vote to report the bill out for consideration by the House of Representatives. You made your position clear in your recent vote to enlarge the Rules Committee by stating that you didn't believe that any committee should hold up legislation and not permit the entire Congress to have an opportunity to pass judgment. I am hoping that you will follow the same principle on this important legislation.

An early reply will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH P. CLARK, *President.*

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 14, 1961.

Mr. JOSEPH P. CLARK,
President, St. Louis Labor Council, AFL–CIO, St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR MR. CLARK: Thank you for your letter of March 30, 1961. I certainly shall give serious consideration to the King-Anderson bill relating to health care for the aged if the Ways and Means Committee ever calls it up for consideration. This I have no control over. The agenda are by practice and I believe by rights under the control of the chairman and his 15 to 10 majority.

I say this although I am strongly opposed to tying health care for the aged to the social security system. In my judgment, for the reasons I have advanced in many speeches on the floor of the House and to the general public in person, on radio and TV, this would seriously damage the health care program in our society for all of us, including the older people, and we have the greatest health care program existing in any society, past or present.

Indeed, it has been the very success of our health care program that has brought about the very serious problems that our older people are faced with in this area. It has been the success of the health care program, not its failure, which has kept our older people with us 10 years longer than they or anyone had anticipated.

This should be a blessing to us and to them and I am satisfied it can be if we will approach the problem with care, and on the basis of appealing to knowledge and good reason rathar than appealing to prejudice and unwarranted charges that those who do not agree with our approach are either (a) unconcerned about the aged or (b) socialists.

Perhaps someone can come forward with facts or arguments that have not yet been presented to me to demonstrate that my judgment is in error. That is why I say I will give serious consideration to the King-Anderson bill.

Cannot there be some reciprocity in this? Cannot you and the top labor leaders who for several years now have taken a fixed position on this serious problem give serious consideration to what I have been trying to point out? Indeed, if I am right and you are wrong, you will both damage the old people and all of us and solve nothing. If I am right and you are wrong, the programs I have advocated—some of which are now law—will enable us to solve this problem.

Congressman Forand has refused to debate me publicly on this issue. Walter Reuther refused to appear on a TV program to debate the matter with me. Senator McNamara has declined to debate me, so has Congressman Machrowicz, Senator McCarthy, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Ribicoff (although in this instance I feel there is good reason why a Cabinet Secretary should not appear on the same forum to debate a Congressman). In fact, no one seems interested in examining the facts and arguments I have adduced in respect to this important issue.

Yes, I would vote a bill out of committee for floor debate even though I opposed the bill. I have done this many times. I am perfectly willing to have my facts and arguments tested in any fair forum. I wish a few others—particularly those in opposition to my views—had the same attitude toward the need for fair debate.

Sincerely,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

BRITISH MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,
London, February 10, 1961.

DEAR SIR: Dr. Lord wrote to me on the 23d of January seeking some information in connection with a study being undertaken into the cost of medical care for the aged, in conjunction with the American Medical Association. I am afraid that in a number of instances the information which Dr. Lord was seeking is just not available, but I set out below such data as I can:

1. Average length of stay in hospital, in days: nonteaching hospitals, 1959; medical departments, 27.6; surgical departments, 13.4.

2. The same figure for persons over 65 years is, nonteaching hospitals, 144.8; London teaching hospitals, 138.8; Provincial

teaching hospitals, 153.8 (chronic sick and geriatric departments).

3. Weekly cost of beds in acute hospitals is nonteaching hospitals, £25 16s. 7d.; teaching hospitals, London, £36 9s. 7d.; teaching hospitals, provinces, £30 4s. 11d.

4. The hospital cost per day of persons over 65 is not available.

5. The cost of the National Health Service per head of population is £13 0s. 0d.

6. The medical care cost per person over 65 is not available.

7. The ratio of doctors per population in 1957 (the latest figure available) is 1:1,149.

8. The ratio of doctors per population 10 years ago—1947—was 1:877.

I hope that the above information will be of some assistance to you.

Yours faithfully,

WALTER HEDGECOCK,
Deputy Secretary.

Wheat Sales to the Indian Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, Mr. Terence McDonald, vice president of American Flours, Inc., of Newton, Kans., is on leave and is working on a 2-year assignment as grain and milling technician with Wheat Associates' office at New Delhi, India. This office is operated jointly by Great Plains Wheat, Inc., and its sister organization in the Pacific Northwest, Western Wheat Associates.

Mr. McDonald has made a study of wheat sales to the Indian Government, under Public Law 480, and has written a very excellent article on it.

In this article Mr. McDonald stresses the importance of wheat as a major element in our foreign policy and the building of good will among the people of India.

I am confident this same situation prevails in many other countries on the globe where we are using our surplus farm commodities for promoting good international relations.

There is little doubt that many millions of people would have starved to death had it not been for wheat sales. As recently as 1952, 1½ million to 3 million people died in India because of a lack of an estimated 300,000 tons of cereal.

There is little doubt that the U.S. sales of wheat have been a major element in our foreign policy which have obtained more good will for the United States than many times the amount of money spent in other ways.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be made a part of these remarks and printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

None of you would ever use the word "surplus" in reference to wheat if you had the opportunity of visiting the countries of the Far East and seeing the millions of people who are undernourished. We can certainly be thankful for the abundant supplies of food in America and we should do everything possible to make the most practical use and to conserve our resources. In India, the increase in population each year is equal to the entire population of Australia (which is larger than India.) Here is another way to look at the situation. It takes over one million tons of food (37 million bushels) to feed the annual increase in population. Or, to increase the daily caloric intake 23 calories, it would require an additional million tons. The present diet is recognized officially as being deficient in terms of total calorie intake, as well as unbalanced in terms of calorie source. Present figures estimate an average of 2,000 calories per day, however a survey indicated that 25 percent of the people consume less than the average and many get only 1,000 to 1,500 a day.

Wheat sales under Public Law 480 have convinced Indian government officials of United States' good will. There is little doubt that many millions of people would have starved to death had it not been for these wheat sales. As recent as 1952, 1½ to 3 million people died in India for an estimated lack of only 300,000 tons of cereals of approximately one tenth of the wheat we are shipping annually to India. There is little doubt that U.S. sales of wheat have been a major element in our foreign policy and have obtained more good will for the United States than many times that amount of money spent in other ways. Evidence that money spent for military purposes does not always bring good results can be seen by riots in Turkey, Korea, etc.

India offers excellent prospects for increased consumption of wheat. About half of the population is already familiar with wheat products in one form or another and consumption would increase if the requisite purchasing power were available and the price relationship with alternate grains favorable. A large millet-eating population now accepts wheat, and many tell us that people in rice areas will take wheat foods for one meal now that they have become accustomed to wheat products.

There is much criticism of U.S. wheat in India. It stems from a preference for white wheat for chaptatis, and from the foreign materials and dockage. The Indian Government buys all of the wheat coming to India on a bid basis, and we have hopes that the Government will specify lower limits of dockage and foreign material since it soon will be possible to issue certificates showing these combined grading factors.

As one travels throughout the world, it becomes increasingly evident that there is little effort to promote U.S. wheat by anyone except the organizations sponsored by the wheat growers. This is not a criticism of the grain trade, but only a statement of fact. You probably realize the amount of salesmanship that would be put forward if all of the farm tractor manufacturers had one dealer and he carried all makes of tractors. It would certainly be "take your choice and pay your money" with little effort to influence you unless there was more profit margin in one brand or another. It is the same with the international grain firms. Their interest is in making money, and rightfully so, and it makes little difference whether they sell United States, Canadian, or Australian wheat. Recently there are indications that some are beginning to push the sale of U.S. wheat, and we are hopeful that it will continue to grow.

We have found oversea personnel of the various U.S. Government agencies to be competent and dedicated to their work, even though living under conditions that are not at all attractive at times and at considerable personal discomfort compared to their living at home in the United States. Naturally there are conflicts of personality, but by and large the United States is well represented and is making friends with local populations through these "ambassadors."

It seems the biggest criticism by the U.S. public (especially businessmen) is directed toward the cost of storage, export subsidy, and "subsidies to the farmer." I feel the farmers should not have the burden of reserve stocks themselves, but the cost should be borne by all citizens. One has only to see the cost of not having adequate storage here in India to realize that present costs of storage in the United States are not unreasonable. The usual practice is for the farmer to pay double the sale price of wheat at harvest to obtain seed wheat. It is also well to realize that U.S. business does very little trade with underdeveloped countries and two-way trade begins only when they develop their own resources. Wheat under Public Law 480 programs has been a large contributor toward overall economic improvement in many countries.

So, let us take a look at the overall results of our wheat programs: benefits to U.S. foreign policy, development of wheat markets as well as for U.S. manufactured articles, stabilization of U.S. wheat markets, maintenance of production facilities, prevention of starvation to millions, and numerous other benefits. Of these, the Christian humanitarian satisfaction of having shared your abundance with less fortunate human beings is probably the most important of all. After looking at these benefits, it becomes apparent that wheat sold under Public Law 480 for foreign currency as payment is a good program.

The Blurred Vision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy visited the great city of Chicago last Friday evening to address a political fund raising banquet sponsored by the Daley machine of Cook County. Although he did not allude to the vote frauds perpetrated by that group on November 8, 1960, he had intended to discuss the New Frontier domestic program.

An editorial in the Chicago Tribune of Monday, May 1, entitled "The Blurred Vision," gave the people of the Chicago area pertinent information on the President's undelivered address. Because of the interest that we all maintain in President Kennedy's statements, I submit the Tribune résumé for the information of the Members:

THE BLURRED VISION

The speech delivered in Chicago, Friday night by President Kennedy, was not the speech prepared for delivery and widely distributed in advance. The speech Mr. Kennedy actually gave largely centered on the Communist threat, with only incidental mention of the New Frontier domestic program. The speech which the President tossed away was, nevertheless, interesting as it provided an authentic insight into Mr. Kennedy's economic views, and, as such, it is subject to comment.

The unspoken speech purported to be an outline of Mr. Kennedy's vision of America. That vision was one of total Government planning, prescription, and direction. The President listed an endless catalog of things he thought ought to be done, or which, if attended to, might be desirable. And all of them were to be done by Government.

Reverting to his campaign theme of

getting America moving again, Mr. Kennedy's original text stated that he would like to think of the Democratic return to the White House as the time when the United States began to move forward.

The trouble with oversimplified theses is that they overlook too much. Mr. Kennedy's thesis overlooked the very apparent fact that this country has been steadily moving forward since the time of the first settlements. As for its progress during the 8 preceding years, when the Republicans held executive responsibility, the facts and figures were cited by Mr. Eisenhower in his state of the Union message last January.

They were impressive and hardly suggested that the country had been on dead center. Gross product up 25 percent over 1952, family income up 15 percent over that year, runaway inflation hobbled—these were among the accomplishments. And Mr. Eisenhower's parting counsel was that one of the best things Government could do was to assure free rein to the energy and talent of every American.

From Mr. Kennedy's draft text, it was plain that this was not his approach. He complained of our own unwillingness to do what must be done, and if there was any doubt about who was to do these things which must be done, his reference to a dozen messages, covering almost every activity of Government, cleared up that point. He, supported by the power of Government, was taking charge.

Mr. Kennedy conceded that this flurry of legislative proposals—hundreds of new bills have poured forth from departments and agencies—had tended to blur the vision which he was offering. But it is not the rush of activity that betrays the blurred vision. The fact is that blurred vision accounts for the helter-skelter activity of the administration.

The blur arises from the notion that it is only by Government action that an America can be built which will fulfill its own promise of greatness. This country has always moved most purposefully when the creative resources of the people were not hampered by central planning, when freedom of choice through the expressed preferences of the marketplace determined direction, when Washington know-it-alls got out of the way.

What Mr. Kennedy intends, as he wrote in his draft, and as his whole program attests, is just the reverse of this. The product is not to be a welfare state, but a state with meaningful compassion—one of those distinctions which doesn't define much of anything.

We have always distrusted the doctrine of perfectibility as it pertains either to men or to nations, especially when it is to be achieved through political techniques applied by wide screen social draftsmen. The trouble with the process is that nobody is left any incentive but the politicians, and, when that is so, it is difficult to get people to bestir themselves to move anywhere, despite all of the tugging and hauling of the Government.

Long-Range Farm Bill Definite Step Toward Parity Income for Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD the testimony given May 1 by Edwin Christianson, president of the Minnesota Farmers Union, on the overall farm bill before the House Agriculture Committee:

STATEMENT OF MINNESOTA FARMERS UNION PRESIDENT

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, we commend you for the attention directed to the needs of farmers in past years. We know that you have always sought to provide whatever legislative authority our Secretaries of Agriculture have asked for if it opened the way for farmers to improve prices and incomes. We appreciate this evidence of concern and interest on the part of the committee and we appreciate this opportunity to appear before you at this time of economic crisis in agriculture.

The decline in the net income of farmers since 1951 (when the parity ratio stayed consistently over 100) and the more than $20 billion loss in net income to producers since that time illustrates in realistic and understandable terms the extent to which agriculture has gone through an economic wringer. We know that you are familiar with the overall economic setback in agriculture and the disastrous effect that abandonment of farm programs would have upon farm families.

In our opinion, the proposed Agricultural Act of 1961 is a step in the right direction toward correcting this.

The policy declaration at the start of the bill sets forth some much-needed and significant goals. Particularly important are:

"(a) Afford farmers the opportunity to achieve parity of income with other economic groups by providing them with the means necessary to adjust their agricultural output to requirements and to develop markets for their products.

"(b) Enable farmers, under accepted democratic methods and through cooperation with, and assistance by, the Government, to participate more directly and effectively in the determination of agricultural policies and in formulation and administration of programs to effectuate such policies.

"(c) Authorize the utilization of such additional and varied price and income stabilization methods as will best protect the prices and incomes of farmers."

In evaluating the provisions of the bill, it seems to us the important question in each instance is whether the particular provision will tend to help attain the policy goals which are spelled out in the declaration of policy.

Generally speaking, the proposed Agricultural Act of 1961 is an enabling act type of legislation, permitting more commodities to come under marketing order or marketing quota programs, and providing some clarification and recodification of existing authority.

The actions which have been taken so far this year by the administration and the Congress have been very helpful. These have been valuable first steps, but they are first steps and only that.

The price support increases on milk, corn and the other feed grains, soybeans, flax, and other commodities will certainly be of help this year in lessening the cost-price squeeze on farmers.

The efforts to provide more adequate operating credit are helpful, as are the provisions for advance payments on storage fees and the advance payments on the diverted acres in the feed grain program.

It is estimated that the improvement in total net farm income for this year may be as much as 10 percent above 1960. But at best, this will still leave farmers far short of a price and income level representing a fair return upon investment and labor.

The actions of Congress and the administration so far this year will help tide farmers over—which is important in itself—but it must be followed by some dramatic improvements in 1962. Otherwise, all that has been accomplished is to move up to a plateau somewhat better than that which existed the past year, but not enough better to put farmers on an economic footing where they have some prospect of survival.

The purpose of the 1961 feed grain bill and administrative action taken, increasing price supports, was to help tide farmers over, but the purpose of the long-range legislation must not be simply to buy time, but to make definite and substantial steps toward parity prices and income.

There is a tremendous urgency for action which will improve farm prices and income. Simple passage of this bill will not, of course, result in an automatic increase in the price level of any commodity—the increase will have to await whatever action may be initiated pursuant to the provisions of this legislation.

Passage of the bill would undoubtedly bring some early recommendations for programs for wheat and feed grains for 1962.

We urge the immediate use of title I authority of the bill, reducing the time of getting additional programs into operation in order that producers may avail themselves of the assistance provided by the act at the earliest possible time.

We feel that these objectives of H.R. 6400 merit approval by the committee:

1. Retention of parity of income as the goal and the basis for programs to be developed.

2. Opportunity for the family farm pattern of agriculture to strengthen and to continue to be the basic pattern in American agriculture.

3. Opportunity for producers to have a voice in development of quota and price stabilization programs.

4. Opportunity to institute a variety of programs to meet the varying needs of different commodities.

5. Retention of present programs until such time as producers initiate their own programs.

6. Expansion of consumption of food by needy and low-income consumers both here and abroad.

7. Administration of programs in such a way as to reduce costs substantially over current expenditures, and

8. Provision for extension of marketing order and marketing quota programs to more commodities, as desired by producers; and expansion of marketing orders, where desired, to regional or national scope.

NATIONAL FARMER ADVISORY COMMITTEES (TITLE I, SUBTITLE A)

Farm program recommendations and development would begin with farmers themselves under the provisions of this subtitle.

The selection of nominees to the advisory committees by elected county committeemen and by general and commodity farm organizations assures the availability of committee members who understand the needs of the producers they will represent. We believe that the knowledge that comes from firsthand work with farmers and their problems is an essential element in the makeup of these advisory committees, and we agree fully with the condition that 60 percent of the gross income of such members comes from farming operations.

We understand that the Secretary of Agriculture will select one-third of the members of advisory committees from nominees named by general and commodity farm organizations. We approve this provision, and on behalf of National Farmers Union let the record show that we will cooperate fully with the Secretary when he requests nominees from among the members of our organization.

MARKETING QUOTAS (TITLE I, SUBTITLE C)

The productive capacity on farms today has given farmers a greater understanding of the need for more control over production and marketing of their produce. We concur fully with the enabling provisions of the bill that would extend to all farmers the opportunity to devise programs to more effectively manage their production. We point out that the producers of an agricultural commodity would come under this subtitle only if the procedures followed under subtitle E of the bill are used. In our judgment this is a completely realistic way to involve coverage of other agricultural commodities under this subtitle.

Moreover, we believe that the procedures outlined in the bill would result in programs which comply with the peculiar needs of a particular commodity or a group of related commodities. This is true because of the latitude which would be provided for extending the right to use marketing quotas. In this connection, Farmers Union, supports marketing quotas expressed in either acreage or in units of production, if producers approve.

Under this subtitle, authority is provided for the institution of quotas for up to 3 years. We believe this extension of quota periods to be practical.

PRICE STABILIZATION (TITLE I, SUBTITLE D)

We approve of the wide latitude given the Secretary in methods of supporting commodities in addition to existing authority to use loans and purchases. National Farmers Union supports broadening legislation to include compensatory payments. There are certain commodities, such as perishable farm products, for which the only practical means for supporting prices is through compensatory payments. We believe, moreover, that this may be a more satisfactory means of dealing with some commodities which are moving into export where our fair share of the export market is currently dependent upon export subsidies.

However, we strongly recommend the elimination of the limitation of 90 percent of the parity price on the support that may be provided under this subtitle. We believe that such a limitation is inconsistent with the objective of full parity of income for agriculture.

We strongly endorse the authority granted to the Secretary in this subtitle which would limit compensatory payments to the proportion of farm production which would reflect a family farm operation. This would do two things: (1) It expresses rightly, we believe, the interest and concern of Congress in strengthening the family farm pattern of agriculture, and (2) it would be a safeguard insofar as costs of such programs are concerned.

We concur with the provision of the bill which would continue the price support program then in operation if Congress should disapprove a program submitted by the President.

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW (TITLE I, SUBTITLE E)

Mr. Chairman, in closing we want to assure you that we recognize full well that one Congress may not commit another Congress on any matter—on farm programs or otherwise. Moreover, we in Farmers Union have always looked to the Congress for resolving the differences that exist between farm organizations over agricultural policy. We know Congress to have the final authority and we would not have it any other way.

We have great respect for this committee. You have demonstrated over the years your interest in the welfare of both farmers and consumers and the farm laws which you have drafted stand as a monument to this interest.

We are confident that you will continue to serve the national interest in the decisions that you will make concerning the Cooley-Ellender bill.

It is our hope that this committee will complete hearings on all parts of the bill as expeditiously as possible in order to assure consideration by the Congress at an early date.

Advice for the Legal Profession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the April issue of the American Bar Association Journal contains a very interesting article by Sol M. Linowitz, Esq., of Rochester, N.Y. In this article Mr. Linowitz gives his answer to this question from a law student:

What would you say are the most important things for me to learn in order to be sure I will be a good lawyer?

Mr. Linowitz' advice is not for would-be lawyers alone. His sage and inspiring words contain a message for all who are privileged to me members of the legal profession.

Mr. President, I know that Mr. Linowitz' article will be of interest to many Members and I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME AVUNCULAR WORDS FOR WOULD-BE LAWYERS

(By Sol M. Linowitz)

Recently I received a letter from a law student at one of our great law schools. He asked me a simple question: "What would you say are the most important things for me to learn in order to be sure I will be a good lawyer?" I have been thinking a good deal about that question and about how to answer it most meaningfully and helpfully.

Here are the things I would tell him:

In the first place, I would say to the young man that a good lawyer must be a truly cultured person—one who is familiar with what has been thought, felt, and written in the past. I would emphasize that our basic legal canons—such as freedom of speech, of press, of religion—are not merely jural but fundamental concepts which can be properly understood only in the historical perspective of man's long battle for liberty in different times and in many places. And that the real meaning of legal rights and constitutional guarantees can be truely grasped only if one first appreciates the ancient roots of our freedoms and the relevance of yesterday to today. John Stuart Mill said it well: "Men are men before they are lawyers or physicians or manufacturers; and if you make them capable and sensible men, they will make themselves capable and sensible lawyers and physicians."

Secondly, I would stress the vital importance of human relations. For human relations is the stuff of which law is made. We are, true enough, a nation of laws and not of men; and yet our laws are made by men, are administered by men, are applied to men. No lawyer worth his salt can practice his calling impersonally. If he is to be a lawyer in the real and deep sense of the word, he must concern himself with people and with those things which hold people together or drive them apart. He must know what makes people tick. He must know how to work with those he must serve. On the wall of Cornell's Willard Straight Hall is the line from Terence: Nihil humani a me alienum—"Nothing human is foreign unto me." This is and must be part of the creed of the law student preparing himself for his profession.

Third, I would implore the law student to raise his eyes from his desk and casebooks and see his role in terms of the world about him. I would ask him to recognize that what is happening in areas of the world far removed is in these critical times vitally related to his profession. For mankind has never known a more urgent challenge than the one which faces us now—to try to fashion a world of peace through law at the very moment when powerful nations now have it in their power completely to destroy civilization. The lawyer has a key role to play in the development of a world of law. And the law student must understand that part of his responsibility will be to help in bringing about a peaceful world and to play his part in the efforts to find a way by which men may live together rather than die together.

Fourth, I would tell him he must be prepared to stand up courageously in defense of those principles of law and justice which are at the heart of our calling. The true law student has to feel in his bones a respect for our judicial procedures—he must know deep within him that the way we do things in this country is fundamental to our thinking and talking about freedom and justice; he must understand that the way we proceed after truth, the way we reach an objective by weighing and measuring and accepting and rejecting in order to determine what is true and what is not, the way of making up one's mind with fairness and objectivity and always with respect for our basic presumptions of innocence and integrity—all these are essential parts of our basic strengths and keystones of our heritage. For our American legal procedures stand not only for a right to freedom and justice but for a way to freedom and justice.

HONEST MEN MUST NOT ALWAYS REMAIN SILENT

The law student must, therefore, understand that bad things cannot be justified in the name of high purpose without damaging and ultimately destroying that purpose. He must know that there are times when honest men must not remain silent; and that lawyers above all others must show a constant willingness to stand up and speak truth in the bright light rather than cower half hidden and silent in the shadows.

Fifth, I would ask the law student to learn the right way to lose as well as the right way to win, how to accept defeat with grace after a case has been fairly tried and decided. William James once said that our civic genius as a people was "the trained and disciplined good temper toward the other side when it fairly wins its inning." In these days of payola, payoff, of deceitful claims, of shady compromises, of win by hook or crook, the lawyer must stand resolutely for fairplay. For the whole dignity of the law depends on the recognition that justice will be done if the ground rules of our system are followed. Tinkering with our courts, tampering with our legal procedures can bring our machinery of justice to a grinding halt. Again and again the point must be made to our law student: It is far, far better to lose fairly than to win meanly.

I would recall one episode in our history which puts it in a way I shall never forget: At his first inauguration, Lincoln arose to take his oath of office and looked about for a place to put his hat. Behind him on the platform was Stephen Douglas—the man who had disagreed violently with Lincoln on some vital issues and who had fought and lost to Lincoln in the bitter campaign for the presidency. And it was Douglas, Carl

Sandburg tells us, who reached forward and held Lincoln's hat all during the ceremony.

There is the symbol I would offer our law student of how nobly to confront defeat after a fair fight: Abraham Lincoln's hat in Stephen Douglas' hands.

WHAT LAWYERS SHOULD NOT BE

Finally, I would ask the law student to approach his calling with a sincere humility. This is what I would like to say to him and the other students in our law schools: It may be that you are entering the practice of law because you feel it is a comfortable way to make a good living; because it is a pleasant and not too demanding calling; or because it is a profession which brings with it certain recognition and entitles you to certain privileges. To those among you who are becoming lawyers for these reasons I would make one very sincere and solemn plea: Please don't enter the practice of law. We have too many like you already. We have too many who consider the law in terms of what they can get out of it rather than what they can put into it. We have too many who measure their achievements in terms of the marketplace and who look upon their license as affording them opportunities for gain rather than challenges to responsibility.

To those of you, however, who look upon the law as a great and exciting profession which stands for championing of the right and adherence to great principles—as one which at a pivotal moment in world history affords unprecedented challenge, opportunity, and obligation—to you I would say "welcome" warmly and with enthusiasm and in these words of Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes:

If a man has the soul of Sancho Panza, the world to him will be Sancho Panza's world; but if he has the soul of an idealist, he will make—I do not say find—his world ideal. Of course, the law is not the place for the artist or the poet. The law is the calling of thinkers. But to those who believe with me that not the least godlike of man's activities is the large survey of causes, that to know is not less than to feel, I say—and I say no longer with any doubt—that a man may live greatly in the law as well as elsewhere; that there as well as elsewhere his thought may find its unity in an infinite perspective: that there as well as elsewhere he may wreak himself upon life, may drink the bitter cup of heroism, may wear his heart out after the unattainable.

Law Day Address of Representative Burr P. Harrison of Virginia, Before Richmond, Va., Bar Association, May 1, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a speech of my esteemed friend and colleague the Honorable BURR P. HARRISON, of Winchester, Va., Representative of the Seventh Congressional District of Virginia. Mr. HARRISON delivered his brilliant and learned address before the bar association of my native city of Richmond, Va., on May 1, in observance of Law Day. His timely remarks should be read and heeded by every citizen of our Republic:

LAW DAY ADDRESS OF REPRESENTATIVE BURR P. HARRISON, OF VIRGINIA, BEFORE RICHMOND, VA., BAR ASSOCIATION, MAY 1, 1961

Throughout America today many gatherings commemorate the sublimity of our system of constitutional law. Most of these assemblies will hear a worthier speaker than you, but no orator anywhere will address this subject in a happier atmosphere than I. We meet here in Richmond where Patrick Henry defied the tyranny of British lawlessness and asserted his demand for liberty or death; here in Richmond where was enacted Thomas Jefferson's Virginia Statute of Religious Freedom; here in Richmond which witnessed the Virginia Convention of 1788, probably the outstanding group of intellectual giants ever to meet in one assembly, who subjected the provisions of our Constitution to its most penetrating and exhaustive debate; here in Richmond from whence as a member of this bar went John Marshall to expound that Constitution and to assure it the vibrancy of life and the virtue of justice, and, finally, here in Richmond, where sits the Virginia Supreme Court of Appeals, one court left in this land which restricts its doings to the problems of the forum and scorns to engage in the political controversies which belong on the Hustings, one court left in this land that holds that plain words have plain meanings and rejects the philosophy of Humpty-Dumpty that a "word means what I choose it to mean—no more and no less," one court left in this land whose members do not, and have no occasion to, engage in degrading wrangles as to which of them has degraded the court. Thank God there is one such court left in this land.

Our purpose today is to compare our system of law with the tyranny that bears the name of law wherever the Red Fascists of communism hold sway. It is time that, with absolute candor and no reservation, we should contrast all our strengths and weaknesses, our opportunities and our vulnerabilities, with those of our deadly enemies. Events of the last 10 days have brought us understanding, as never before, of the dire peril in which we stand. The daily march of momentous episodes carry us to the full realization that the sword which can plunge our own individual children into slavery or destruction hangs over their head by a single thread.

In a balance between our system of constitutional law and theirs of terror and oppression, the scales weigh heavily in our favor. Under honest administration, our law is the servant of the people; under theirs, the people are the servants of the law. Ours derives its just powers from the consent of the governed; theirs is maintained by subjugation and suppression. Theirs is tyranny under the law of terror; ours is liberty under the law of self-government.

We cannot lose this struggle if we are faithful to the principles of our law. Our strength will be as the strength of 10 and we will be the strong man to run the race. Communism's brutality and despotism is the soft underbelly which makes it vulnerable. If our country adheres to its constitutional government, we may walk through the valley of the shadow of death and fear no evil.

It is in the cancerous erosion of representative government that our peril lies. The paring away of our system of law, a little at a time, in imitation of totalitarian methods, is folly that leads to destruction. If our people have become so complacent and so effete that they permit our system of constitutional law to be whittled away by those who have sworn to defend it, we will lose this struggle with communism—and what's more, we will deserve to lose it.

Under the methodical arrangement of the parts of our law, the sole power to make law is in legislatures, which are quite as responsible for the public welfare as executives and judges. Yet, for years, the American people have permitted the lawmaking power vested in the legislatures of the several States to be siphoned off to Washington. During this same time, the power of the elected representatives in Washington has been subverted to bureaucracy and the judiciary. The balance of power is in imbalance, and the liberties of the people suffer as a consequence.

In no area is legislative responsibility more cynosural than in the power over the public purse. More and more over the years, State legislatures are required to appropriate in accordance with formulas developed by Washington bureaucracy. This goes on while elected representatives in the Congress delegate increasing control of public funds to a civil service over which neither the people, nor the Congress, nor, actually, the President, has effective control.

On Wednesday of last week, the Government of the United States moved dramatically to invade further the power of the people's representatives over the public purse and to subjugate the expenditure of public money to the notions of nonelected strangers in Washington, D.C. Tiny is the county of Prince Edward, but great is the principle that its people have the right to be taxed only by their representatives, a right inestimable to them and formidable to tyrants only.

The 14th amendment was designed as a shield to protect the individual from the State. In the tiny county of Prince Edward, we shall learn whether it will become a sword to strike down local self-government.

With reference to that part of their effort devoted to the closing of all Virginia schools until Prince Edward does their will, the actions of these nonelected Washington officials in by-passing the Virginia Supreme Court of Appeals is, in some respects, the most insulting of all. It is basic that the laws of no State shall be found to be administered contrary to the Federal Constitution until passed upon by the legitimate interpreter of State laws, the State supreme court. There must be somebody in the Department of Justice with sufficient legal training to find the case of *Harrison* v. *Day* in volume 200 of the Virginia Reports, where the obligation of the State with respect to public education is clearly set forth.

The action in Prince Edward, though ruthless, is not an isolated incident. It forms a pattern. It finds its counterpart in the decision of Federal judiciary to substitute its judgment for that of the discount committees of banks and to compel banks to release their money after judges have looked into the minds of money lenders and have found that credit was denied on account of political activity and not because of credit risk. It has its counterpart in the action of Federal judiciary in compelling a renewal of an ended contract when one of the parties did not want to renew the contract. It has its counterpart in the action of Federal judiciary in forbidding the lawful assembly of parents to discuss the educational problems of their children. It has its counterpart in the action of Federal judiciary in decreeing that when Congress said a closed shop shall be illegal, Congress meant a closed shop shall be legal; that when Congress said shop foremen may not be organized, Congress meant shop foremen may be organized. It has its counterpart in countless bureaucratic and judicial performances done without sanction of law and maintained by fiat which on one occasion was backed by militray force.

All this is the beginning of despotism and, unchecked, leads to absolute despotism. It

is an interesting coincidence that the menace of communism has grown as the virility of our self-government has declined. As we weaken our system of checks and balances; as we eclipse the powers of elected representatives of the people; as we move away from the spirit of constitutional law, we dissipate a powerful weapon in the arsenal of democracy and move toward the day of annihilation and destruction.

Faces Death To Save Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to place in the RECORD the story of how Mrs. Charles Miller, 945 Third Street, Eau Claire, Wis., risked her life to save a young neighbor boy from drowning in the icy waters of the Chippewa River. The article about her heroic act appeared in the Eau Claire Leader, Eau Claire, Wis.:

WOMAN RESCUES BOY FROM RIVER

The life of an 8-year-old Eau Claire boy was saved Saturday afternoon by a heroic young mother of four who jumped, half slid and half fell down a 70-foot bank and swam out 15 feet in the Chippewa River to reach the unconscious lad.

Lloyd Lium, son of Mr. and Mrs. Robert Lium, 829 Fifth Street, was floating face down in the icy water when he was reached by Mrs. Charles Miller, 30, of 945 Third Street. He fell off the steep bank into the river at the rear of the Miller home, near the junction of Third Street and Truax Boulevard.

Mrs. Miller swam to shore with the lad but was unable to climb out as the water is 10 to 15 feet deep right at the shoreline. She managed to grasp a rock lying partly under water, and hold the boy's face above water.

Her daughter, Patty, 9, was at the top of the bank and Mrs. Miller told her to run to the H and H grocery, 854 Third Street, a block away, and have them call for help.

After Patty ran to get help, Mrs. Miller spotted a speedboat towing a water skier. She called for help but they sped past. On the return run, the skier, Gary Kruger, 17, North Shore Drive, heard her calls.

He motioned to the two men in the boat and they headed for Mrs. Miller and the boy. Kruger dropped off his skis by Mrs. Miller and helped her hold the boy until the boat could be turned. She was cold and nearing exhaustion when he arrived to help.

In the boat were Orville and Orvie Frank, twin brothers who live at 402 First Avenue. They pulled the boy, Mrs. Miller and Kruger into the boat. They then sped up the river to the Riverview boat landing where they got into Kruger's car and rushed to Luther Hospital.

Lium, a chunky, freckle-faced lad, was admitted to the hospital for observation. He suffered numerous scratches and bruises.

Mrs. Miller refused treatment and was taken home by Kruger and the Franks. She also suffered numerous scratches and bruises to her arms, legs and face.

The Eau Claire police and fire departments were called at 2:49 p.m. but when they arrived Mrs. Miller and the boy had been pulled from the river and were on their way up the river.

Mrs. Miller, who is not much bigger than the red-haired Lium boy, said she was out taking clothes from the line when she heard her son, Chuck, 8, call for help.

She said Lloyd had come to their house Saturday to play with Chuck. The two boys were playing by the bank when Lloyd tripped and fell over the bank.

Police said it is almost a straight drop of about 65 to 70 feet to the river. One foot from the bank and the water is over your head, police reported.

Mrs. Miller ran through heavy brush to the bank. She said she looked over and could see Lloyd's bright jacket in the river. He was floating face down about 15 feet from shore.

Somehow she jumped, slid and scrambled down the brush-covered bank to the river, dove in and swam to the boy. When she got to him he didn't move.

She towed him to the shore and when she got his face out of water he began to cry and spit up water. Mrs. Miller saw the boat coming down the river toward the dam and called for help. When they failed to see her she said her heart just sank.

Kruger, however, spotted her when the boat had swung around and began towing him back up the river.

Mrs. Miller, who classes herself as "not too good a swimmer," said she and her husband moved to Eau Claire in September from St. Cloud. Besides Chuck and Patty there is a daughter, Kathy, 7, and a son, Mike, 16 months.

When asked what she thought of when she jumped and slid down the bank, Mrs. Miller said she couldn't remember much about going down. She added she didn't hesitate about going down because she has children of her own and knew how the boy's parents would have felt.

She said she must have been in the water about 5 minutes and it was "really cold." It was after she returned home from the hospital when she realized she lost a pair of shoes during the rescue.

Sgt. Arthur Neuser, a veteran of 24 years with the police department, reported it was one of the most heroic rescues he has ever seen. "It took a lot of nerve to do what she did and most people would have thought twice before trying to get down that bank," he added.

Other police officers at the scene took a look at the bank and just shook their heads in admiration of Mrs. Miller's feat. When asked how she felt, Mrs. Miller was typical of most women when she replied, "much better after having a good hot bath."

She reported that residents in the area have long been concerned about that portion of the riverbank. "Last year they talked about putting up a fence," she reported.

She added that her husband and a group of other fathers are going to the city council meeting Tuesday evening and ask the city to put up a fence along the bank. "Perhaps a near tragedy like this will help the city to act quickly in constructing a fence," she said.

Remarks of Hon. Paul A. Fino, of New York, at Dedication of Bluttal Building at the Kingsbridge Heights Jewish Center in the Bronx

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB H. GILBERT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, my dear friend and colleague, Congressman PAUL A. FINO, was recently a guest speaker at the Kingsbridge Heights Jewish Center in the Bronx. Congressman FINO's remarks were delivered on the occasion of the dedication of the Bluttal Building of the center which ceremonies were held on Sunday, March 19, 1961.

I am privileged to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full text of Congressman FINO's speech:

Mr. Chairman, Rabbi Miller, Mrs. Bluttal, members of the center, distinguished guests, and ladies and gentlemen, today is a proud and special day for Kingsbridge Heights, and I am honored to be here among you. When Mr. Moskowitz kindly invited me to attend this event, he described the 3 years of effort which this community building represents, as a labor of love. I can well believe that it has been a labor of love. The idea for facilities like these, in this location, is a splendid one. And the only thing better than that good idea is the structure itself. This community building, in my judgment, is a magnificent and impressive one.

Beauty and utility seem to be found in close company more and more often these days. This is true of many of the implements and gadgets we use around our homes, and it is becoming more and more the case with many of the buildings we live and work in. Sometimes I think many of the Government buildings in Washington were built on the theory that utility and beauty are enemies, and that if you try to achieve one of these two aims, you might as well forget the other. I can report that utility generally came out on top.

On the other hand, here in New York, it seems to me, we have had several delightful examples in the last few years of structures, many of them office buildings, in which usefulness and attractive design are combined. This community building, which your efforts have put here, is a happy illustration of trend.

I haven't been inside this center yet, but from without it seems to have a welcome aspect. In my imagination, I can already picture the meetings which will be taking place here, the banquets that will be held, the plans made, and the work that will be done, the festive occasions that will be celebrated, and the possibilities that exist there for quiet conversation, reading, reflection and relaxation.

The American Jewish Year Book informs me that this fine community center is one of approximately 350 Jewish community centers in the United States. In 1947 these organizations had a combined membership of 458,000 and today it is well over 600,000. These figures seem dry in print, but in the light of what I have seen here today, they take on vitality and significance. Beyond those community centers which are already up and in operation, there are several more in the building stage and in the planning stage. These facts are testimony that our developing communities need these centers, and that these needs are being met in a lively and energetic way. This community building in Kingsbridge Heights is going to be good for this neighborhood and city. It is also a blessing, I feel confident, to the Nation at large. By putting your structure here you have brought many benefits to this neighborhood. You have, first of all, put a new luster on the very word "neighborhood." Your building is going to be a place where neighbors and friends can pursue common interests and solve mutual problems together.

Sometimes I think the reason we hear so much about togetherness these days is that there is so little of it left anymore. Why is this? Partly because we have solved some of our more immediate problems of food and shelter. Maybe there is less in the way

of family activities together because of rapid transportation and commuting. Father no longer lives and works in the same locality. He spends a third of his life at work, a third at home, and a third on the train or bus or in the taxicab or car. Maybe television is the villain—maybe that is why we see each other less often. In any event, with this building you have created, there is a good chance that Kingsbridge Heights is somewhat closer to our idea of a neighborhood with all the pleasant connotations which that word suggests.

The Bronx needs space for recreation and relaxation, that is certain, and you have provided it. This new and spotless structure should be taking on a lived-in look very quickly. That is all to the good. That is the way it is supposed to look. Activities in this building will be an indication of how much this building is needed and evidence that we need more community buildings like it. Not only does your fine community building help this neighborhood and community, it is also a feather in the cap of the whole United States. I have one thing in mind when I make this assertion.

The way in which you have helped the United States at large is simply this. You have demonstrated the idea that there is a necessary partnership between Government, on the one hand, and private efforts on the other. Government can accomplish much when broad-scale action is required. But often in the area of human needs, what is required is a local, neighborhood, tailor-made response to a specific problem. This is the type of response your new community building represents. You have put your minds and energies into it, and, of course, your hearts. By doing so, as I said before, you have made a gift to the whole country.

In closing, may I say in your own language, "Mozeltov."

Other Kinds of Price Fixing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article, which I commend to the attention of our colleagues, is from the April 24, 1961, issue of the New Republic. Professor Barber brings to light and comments on other forms that price fixing may and does take within our economic system and seemingly within the law. The author's analysis of the oligopolistic industries is directly to the point and the alternatives it offers deserve attention:

OTHER KINDS OF PRICE FIXING
(By Richard J. Barber)

Almost as the seven individual defendants in the price collusion case tried in Philadelphia were being released from prison, the Department of Justice filed a $12 million damage suit against the electrical equipment manufacturers, charging that as a result of the bid-rigging conspiracy the Government had paid prices up to 66 percent higher than otherwise would have prevailed. In the months ahead several other damage suits will be initiated by private utilities and various units of local and State government. Attorney General Robert Kennedy has announced that his Department will step up its activity in respect to price fixing—and organized crime. And President Kennedy reportedly will issue soon an Executive order, directing that all identical contract bids received by Federal agencies be reported to the Justice Department.

Up to now the Government has been concerned largely with the conspiratorial forms of price fixing, typified by the electrical equipment litigation as an instance of overt collusion among a group of alleged competitors. Thousands of other similar examples could be found, involving almost every conceivable product, ranging from autos, gasoline, toys, and diapers, to tranquilizers, soft drinks, and live lobsters. One feature, though, does distinguish the electrical goods case from the typical price-fixing conspiracy: it was one of the few occasions in which large corporations were apprehended and successfully prosecuted. Usually only the smaller firms are caught: the gasoline service station operators in Lake County, Ind.; the lobstermen in Maine; the installers of auto replacement glass. For it is not just the giant firm that dislikes competition. The desire to eliminate rivalry, the quest of the quiet life is equally as intense in the corner druggist and service station operator. To say that in that portion of the economy where the markets contain a large number of fairly small sellers "honest price competition prevails," as T. K. Quinn has said, is only partly correct, for competition can be effectively restricted in industries characterized by a fairly large number of sellers without conspiring. For example, as a result of retailer pressure, 45 States have enacted fair trade laws, which permit manufacturers to control resale prices. These laws can have precisely the same effect as direct collusion between the competing retailers. Still another device for eliminating price rivalry is the trade association. By collecting data on output, sales, inventories, and the actual prices at which sales are being made, and furnishing this promptly to its members, the association provides exactly the information needed by knowledgeable competitors for determining the going price. Conformance then is more likely to be the rule than the exception. Yet this kind of trade association activity is generally accepted as being within the law. As long as this view remains in force (and certainly it deserves serious reconsideration), considerable price uniformity will exist, without actual collusion.

In the oligopolistic industries, those in which a very small number of producers are dominant, price competition can be eliminated without collusion, and even without recourse to trade association. (This doesn't mean that these industries do not have trade associations, but only that the associations do not perform the same function here as in the industries with a larger relative number of firms.) Where there are, say, three companies producing most of the industry's output (automobiles, for example), the condition, once nicely described as spontaneous coordination, will invariably be present: each seller knows that it both affects and is affected by the market choices of its rivals. If seller X establishes a significantly lower price than what has prevailed, its share of the market will increase markedly; its rivals, Y and Z, can thus be expected to match X's newly announced price. Whatever gain X might originally have anticipated by cutting its price is lost. Under these circumstances, it doesn't take long for the parties, independently, to price in a uniform fashion—reserving their rivalry for other outlets (such as product design and advertising). This hypothesis is confirmed by a look at auto pricing. For 1961 the manufacturers' suggested retail prices of the full-size, six-cylinder models varied by only $6 among the big three: the Chevrolet was the highest at $2,316; the Plymouth the lowest at $2,310; the Ford, $2,311. This is representative of the usual situation. In 1956, Ford initially announced an average price increase on its 1957 models of 2.9 percent. Two weeks later General Motors increased its 1957 model prices by an average of 6.1 percent. A week later Ford revised its prices upward, to match almost dollar for dollar the comparable GM prices.

What is true of autos is also true of most other major industries; one recent survey, by Harvard professors Carl Kaysen and Donald Turner, shows that in more than two-thirds of some 150 manufacturing industries, at least a third of the output was produced by eight or fewer firms. In over a third of the total number of industries, eight or fewer firms accounted for over half the output. And even this does not give the full picture, for in a number of vital markets the degree of concentration is significantly higher—in autos (with GM and Ford together accounting for about 75 percent of domestic new car registrations), in tin cans, cigarettes, distilled liquors, synthetic fibers and photographic equipment. Mr. Quinn indeed understated the case when he said that a third of the economy is characterized by oligopolistic markets.

In the oligopolistic industries, then, competition is virtually eliminated, yet the bogeyman of overt collusion is absent. Confronted by this immensely serious problem what can be done to protect the public? Mr. Quinn would establish a Price and Wage Board, with authority to fix prices and wages. Whether regulation of this sort is feasible and desirable, and can be confined to the oligopolistic sector without ultimate extension to the remainder of the economy, raises a number of important questions.

More pertinent to this discussion, however, Mr. Quinn's proposal seemingly rests on either or both of two implicit assumptions, neither of which, in my view, is tenable: First, that the corporations of the size found in the oligopolistic industries are inevitable, or technologically essential; second, that there is no way to restore competition to these markets—that there is not now, and cannot be, an effective procedure for disaggregating the dominant firms and creating a larger number of firms of efficient scale and roughly equal size. I disagree with both of these assumptions.

First, the available evidence strongly suggests that in most of the oligopolistic industries a firm, to be efficient, does not need to be as big as the existing leaders. Again, take automobile production. In 1959, the Chevrolet and Ford divisions of their respective parent organizations each produced more than 1.4 million passenger vehicles. Yet authoritative analysts, both in the academic community and within the industry itself (in the person of George Romney, the president of American Motors), estimate that minimum production costs can be achieved by a manufacturer with annual capacity of as few as 300,000 units. There is similar evidence to demonstrate that no necessary correlation exists between large firm size and research performance. Witness in this connection the relatively greater progressiveness of small and medium-size steel companies—such as Armco and National—than the industry leader, United States Steel. What we really have in this country are numerous giant corporations representing aggregations of capital considerably larger than required for efficiency. Plants or corporate divisions, individually capable of attaining minimum costs, have simply been collected into massive financial empires whose existence is not inevitable, and is indeed detrimental to the functioning of the economy.

Second, means can be found for increasing the number of firms in those markets now accurately described as oligopolistic, though whether we have these means at this moment is open to doubt. In their interpretation of the Sherman Act, our oldest and most important Federal antitrust stat-

ute, the courts in the past several years have placed increased emphasis on the power held by a group of firms to control the market, as an index of violation. But in the most pertinent case, that involving the three dominant cigarette manufacturers, the evidence permitted the inference that the companies had actually conspired, in the traditional sense. Thus, in directing a suit, say, against the auto producers, the Government might have to establish the existence of a conspiracy. And this would be difficult, for, as noted earlier, oligopolists need not conspire to eliminate competition. The Sherman Act, therefore, may not be adequate to cope with the problem. Perhaps section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act is a more potent instrument (at least one decision suggests this) and under its chairman, Paul Rand Dixon, the FTC may endeavor to explore the outer reaches of that statute.

A simpler approach would disregard the question of conspiracy altogether. Attention would be directed to the actual degree of market concentration. Thus, if four or fewer firms accounted for 60 to 70 percent of total sales in a given market, they would become targets for reorganization automatically. While firms might seek to justify their position, by showing, for instance, that their scale of operation is essential for maximum efficiency, in most instances there would probably be no adequate defense. The next step would call for a division of the firms' assets, looking to the creation of as many new, independent entities as would be consistent with optimum efficiency. In the auto industry, this might lead to the creation of as many as 20 firms, of approximately equal size. What the Securities and Exchange Commission has done in relation to public utility holding companies is illustrative.

If the present oligopolistic markets can be made significantly more competitive, without loss of operating and innovating economies, why should we assume, as Mr. Quinn apparently does, that the only solution is wage and price regulation? I would prefer to rest my case on the competitive system rather than on price regulation or, for that matter, on some variety of syndicalism. Hopefully the new administration will turn its spotlight on the oligopolies, and not confine its attention to cases involving overt collusion. A competitive order demands that we prosecute price-fixers and begin a program of industrial deconcentration.

The Bullet the Reds Fear Most

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks, I would like to bring to the attention of the House a perceptive and enlightening article on the Nation's only supersonic bomber, the B–58 Hustler. The article, "The Bullet the Reds Fear Most," appeared in the April 23 issue of the New York Mirror magazine. Mr. James Winchester, the author of the article, does the country a great service by his vivid and accurate description of the power, speed and adaptability of the most advanced manned bomber in the Nation's air arsenal.

The arguments by some that all manned bombers are obsolete is thoroughly refuted by Mr. Winchester's sharp portrayal of the recordbreaking performances of this manned missile, not only because of its invaluable military striking capacity but because of the opportunity its development holds for tomorrow's civilian supersonic airliner.

Let me suggest that not only Members of the Congress but those in the executive branch charged with the grave responsibility of determining our country's military needs, thoroughly and carefully read this penetrating article. For if provision is not made for continued production of this bomber, we could find ourselves without the manned bomber force so envied and feared by the Soviets today. We must suffer with our missile gap; let us not knowingly instigate a bomber gap.

The above-mentioned article follows:

THE BULLET THE REDS FEAR MOST
(By James H. Winchester)

Often called the plane the Reds fear most, America's newest and fastest bomber is on sky patrol. It is the supersonic B–58 Hustler, a needle-nosed, sweptback delta-wing killer.

Not only can this fantastic aircraft penetrate to targets in the enemy heartland while flying at great altitudes—more than 60,000 feet—and at speeds of more than twice that of sound (better than 1,400 miles an hour) but it can also make bomb runs at treetop levels, where search radar is blind.

Just recently, a B–58—which is being merged into the arsenal of the U.S. Air Force's Strategic Air Command this year—hedgehopped 1,400 miles across four States at 700 miles per hour, never more than 500 feet off the ground, sometimes as low as 200 feet.

"We were traveling a little faster than a .45 caliber pistol bullets," reports B. A. Erickson, a civilian test pilot from Convair, the plane's builder, who made the flight. "No wonder people on the ground had trouble recognizing what we were."

Early in 1961, a three-man Air Force crew from SAC's 43d Bombardment Wing, at Carswell Air Force Base in Texas, the only field in the Nation where B–58s are now stationed, streaked their four-jet Hustler around a 1,000-kilometer course over the California-Arizona desert at an average 1,284.73 miles an hour to set three new world speed records, taking two of them away from the Soviet Union. The maximum ground speed on this record-breaking flight was a blistering 1,430 miles an hour.

For their achievement, the bomber's three-man crew, headed by the pilot, Maj. Harold Confer, of McCook, Nebr., was awarded the 1961 Thompson Trophy, given annually for outstanding airspeed accomplishments.

Until the 2,000 mile-an-hour B–70 bomber, now being built, becomes operational in the late 1960s, the B–58 will remain the U.S. Air Force's only supersonic bomber. It is the Strategic Air Command's reply to those who have been saying that intercontinental missiles are making the manned bomber obsolete. The SAC doctrine is that a blend of manned bombers and missiles will be needed indefinitely.

In addition, this new supersonic bomber has a vital potential civilian role—to break the trail for a supersonic airliner. A B–58 supersonic transport, says Convair, would be available for civilian use within 3 to 5 years. This would be long before any other supersonic commercial plane could be put into operation.

In paving the way for tomorrow's supersonic airliner—capable of flying coast to coast in under 3 hours—the B–58 would be doing what the B–52 jet bomber did in blazing the way for the introduction of its civilian counterpart, today's widely used Boeing 707 transport.

The B–58 is like nothing less than a manned missile. There is almost nothing traditional about it. It is unconventional in speed, in size, in its accomplishments and techniques. In one giant step, for instance, the B–58 has achieved a greater speed increase over the fastest previous strategic bomber than was reached in the preceding 50 years of aircraft design and manufacture.

But it is more than just a new Air Force bomber that can fly at twice the speed of sound. The B–58 dramatically reverses a recent trend toward larger and larger manned planes. It is designed around a minimum size concept, an important part of which is a disposable armament pod carried beneath its slender fuselage.

This pod is dropped after the bombs—either nuclear or conventional, have been let go—and obviates the necessity of hauling the empty compartment back to home base. There are other uses for this pod, too—for fuel to extend range, to carry cameras for reconnaissance or for electronic countermeasure equipment.

It takes only three men to crew the B–58, compared with the six needed to fly a B–52.

In designing the B–58, engineers incorporated hundreds of devices which make the plane almost automatic in its operation. Some of the magic black boxes, included in the Hustler, house electronic countermeasures that make it practically impossible for enemy radar to determine the plane's position; gunnery that automatically locks on and fires at an attacking interceptor; and automatic air-conditioning gear.

The air conditioning in itself is incredibly engineered. There's enough equipment aboard the aircraft to service about 15 average-sized 2-bedroom homes. Electronic devices, as well as the three crewmen aboard, are all kept in a constant 75-degree F. temperature; whether the B–58 is flying in the tropics or over the North Pole, and at speeds which produce air friction that heats leading edges of the wing and parts of the exterior skin to about 300 degrees F.

No wonder the Russians are having nightmares over the Hustler. It's America's new big stick.

Proposed Regulations for Ads of Investment Advisers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article from the Wall Street Journal of April 5, 1961, and the correspondence following it.

It is heartening to observe this activity on the part of the Securities and Exchange Commission and I think they are to be commended for promulgating the proposed rules. It is my sincere hope that after the serious consideration of my suggestions they also will be incorporated in the new regulations.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 5, 1961]

SEC WOULD BAR CERTAIN ADS ON INVESTMENT ADVICE—IT SEEKS TO HALT TESTIMONIALS, REFERENCE TO PAST ADVICE, ADS FOR GRAPHS, FORMULAS—COVERS ADVISERS, COUNSELORS

WASHINGTON.—The Securities and Exchange Commission proposed new rules to

curb alleged fraudulent and deceptive advertising by companies and individuals who sell or collect a fee for investment advice.

The new rules apply to advertising by an estimated 1,600 so-called investment advisers registered with the SEC, and to anyone, whether registered or not, who collects a fee for counseling investors about when to buy and sell what securities.

Thus, the SEC crackdown would also affect individuals and concerns that call themselves investment "counselors," broker-dealers that collect special fees for investment advice when the advice is not incidental to the purchase or sale of securities, and stock market chartists advertising charts, graphs, formulas or other statistical devices as aids to securities buying or selling.

The agency listed some examples of ads it thinks ought to be illegal. One recently in a New York newspaper promoted an "extraordinary special situation report on an overlooked industry group" in which "we expect stock prices to double and triple." A direct-mail ad said, "If you had acted on our advice not too many months ago you could have turned $1,000 into $2,137 in just 68 days." A newspaper ad said there were "opportunities in warants" for investors "interested in making $1 do the work of $100 or $1,000 in a rising market."

The SEC proposed rules to define certain investment adviser ads as fraudulent, deceptive, or manipulative. It would prohibit advertising testimonials and would forbid calling attention to past recommendations. Such ads "are misleading by their very nature," the SEC said, because they emphasize only the recommendations that turned out well.

Advisers couldn't run ads offering to sell any graph, formula, or other device that tells an investor when to buy or sell stocks. They could not describe a report, analysis, or other service as free "unless it is in fact entirely free and subject to no conditions or obligations." A final catchall rule makes unlawful any ad that "contains any untrue statement of a material fact or is otherwise false or misleading."

The Commission set May 15 as the deadline for investment advisers and anyone else interested to file comments; all regulatory agencies are required by Congress to follow that procedure in adopting new rules. After the comments are in, the SEC may make changes and then probably will fix an effective date.

The rules would implement an amendment Congress passed last September to the 1940 Investment Advisers Act. That act made it unlawful for investment advisers to engage in fraudulent or deceptive practices. But the SEC has never brought action against an adviser for advertising his own abilities falsely, because the law was too vague.

Last year's amendment expanded the SEC's regulatory authority, including the power to define wrongful advertising in its rules, and gave the agency a range of enforcement tools; it can suspend or revoke an erring adviser's registration, probably putting him out of business, or it can go to court for an injunction or to prosecute. Maximum penalties a court can give an adviser guilty of violating SEC rules: A $10,000 fine or 2 years in jail or both.

The SEC said the advertising rules are only the first step in its campaign to tighten up the regulation of investment advisers. Another rule under study would state what books and records an adviser must keep. The 1960 amendment gives the Commission the power to inspect such books and records.

An SEC official said the rules were not proposed until now, even though the amendment was passed last September, because the Commission "has too many other things to do and not enough staff help to do them. We're simply taking first things first."

APRIL 15, 1961.

Hon. ORVAL L. DUBOIS,
Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I was indeed pleased to note the publicity attendant upon the activity of your agency to regulate the advertisements of financial consultants and advisers.

I will be pleased to receive a copy of your proposed new rules.

It has occurred to me that there should be a rule requiring all persons giving this kind of advice, and particularly brokers who are buying and selling securities, to furnish in writing full information concerning those securities which they own whenever they give any advice with reference to the purchase or sale thereof. I think that in every such instance they should be required to state the details as to the date of acquisition, quantity and price paid, and then also be required to give advance notice of their intention to dispose of such securities whenever they have given advice as to the purchase thereof.

If your proposed new rules do not cover these items, I would appreciate having your reaction as to the advisability thereof.

Sincerely yours,

ABRAHAM J. MULTER.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., April 24, 1961.

The Honorable ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
The House of Representatives,
The Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MULTER: Your letter of April 15, 1961 to Mr. Orval DuBois, has been referred to me for reply. Pursuant to your request I am happy to enclose a copy of Investment Advisers Act Release No. 113 announcing the Commission's proposal to adopt rule 206(4)(1) to prohibit certain advertisements by investment advisers as fraudulent, deceptive or manipulative within the meaning of the Investment Advisers Act.

You suggest that there should be a rule requiring all persons giving investment advice to furnish written information concerning their own transactions in the securities they recommend. You propose that when they give advice as to the purchase of particular securities they be required to state the date of their own acquisitions, the amount purchased, and the price paid; and that they should also be required to give advance notice of their intention to dispose of such securities.

As release No. 113 points out, the Commission has accelerated its regulatory program since the amendment of the Investment Advisers Act in September 1960, and one important phase of this program involves a study of the acts and practices of investment advisers which may be considered to be fraudulent, deceptive, or manipulative, with a view to adopting rules and regulations designed to prevent such acts and practices.

The problem to which you refer is one of those being studied. Certainly a person who has the obligations of a fiduciary should not be permitted to engage in activities which may conflict with his obligation of undivided loyalty to his customer or client; and where he has any position in a security being recommended, or has engaged in any activities which might affect the price or bear upon the objectivity of his recommendation, all material facts with respect thereto should have to be disclosed. The problem is a complex one, however, and just what conditions should be made applicable in these particular situations must be given careful thought.

Your suggestion is greatly appreciated. You may be sure it will be given serious consideration.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP A. LOOMIS, JR.,
Director.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C.

(Investment Advisers Act of 1940, release No. 113)

NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULE TO PROHIBIT CERTAIN ADVERTISEMENTS BY INVESTMENT ADVISERS AS FRADULENT, DECEPTIVE OR MANIPULATIVE UDER THE INVESTMENT ADVISERS ACT OF 1940

Notice is hereby given that the Securities and Exchange Commission has under consideration a proposal to adopt rule 206(4)(1) defining certain advertisements by investment advisers to be fraudulent, deceptive or manipulative active within the meaning of section 206(4) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940.

Since the adoption of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, section 206 of the act has made it unlawful for registered investment advisers to engage in fraudulent or deceptive activities. The effectiveness of these provisions were limited, however, because the Commission did not have the power to define specific activities to be fraudulent or deceptive.

In September 1960 the act was amended in many important respects. Section 206 was made applicable to all investment advisers whether registered or not. In addition, a new subsection (4) of section 206 prohibits any investment adviser from engaging in any act, practice or course of business which is fraudulent, deceptive, or manipulative and gives the Commission the power, by rules and regulations, to decline and to prescribe means reasonably designed to prevent such acts, practices and courses of business.

Since the amendment of the act the Commission has accelerated its regulatory program with respect to investment advisers. One important phase of this program involves a study of the acts and practices of investment advisers which may be considered to be fraudulent, deceptive, or manipulative, with a view to adopting rules and regulations designed to prevent such acts and practices. The present proposal is the first step in implementing this phase of the program.

The proposed rule 206(4)(1) would prohibit an investment adviser from publishing or circulating; or from causing any other person to publish or circulate, any advertisement which the rule defines to be fraudulent, deceptive, or manipulative.

In considering the specific provisions of the rule several important considerations should be borne in mind. Investment advisers are genefally required to adhere to a stricter standard of conduct than that applicable to ordinary merchants, securities are intricate merchandise, and clients or prospective clients of investment advisers are frequently unskilled and unsophisticated in investment matters. Since it is to such persons that a substantial amount of investment advisory advertising is directed, the proposed rule is intended to implement the statutory mandate by foreclosing the use of practices which have a tendency to mislead or deceive such persons.

The first subparagraph of the proposed rule would prohibit advertisements containing testimonials of any kind concerning the investment adviser or any advise, analysis, report or other service rendered by the investment adviser. Subparagraph (2) would prohibit the use of advertisements which call attention to past recommendations of the investment adviser which were or would

have been profitable to any person. Such advertisements are misleading because by their very nature they emphasize the comments and activities favorable to the investment adviser and ignore those which are unfavorable.

Subparagraph (3) would prohibit an investment adviser from using an advertisement which represents, directly or indirectly, that any graph, chart, formula, method, system or other device being offered can in and of itself be used to determine which securities to buy or sell, or when to buy or sell them. This same subparagraph would also prohibit an advertisement which represents that any such graph, chart, etc., being offered will enable or assist any person to make his own decisions as to which securities to buy or sell or when to buy or sell them without fully disclosing the limitations and difficulties with respect to its use.

Subparagraph (4) of the rule would prohibit an advertisement from representing that any report, analysis, or other service will be obtained free or without charge unless it is in fact entirely free and subject to no conditions or obligations.

Subparagraph (5) contains a more general provision to make it unlawful for an investment adviser to use any advertisement if it contains any untrue statement of a material fact, or is otherwise false or misleading.

It has been suggested that there are many other areas in which it may be appropriate to adopt rules defining certain practices to be fraudulent, deceptive or manipulative. As pointed out above, the Commission has power not only to define such acts or practices, but also to adopt rules designed to prevent them.

Section 204 of the act, as amended, gives the Commission the power to require investment advisers subject to registration to maintain books and records prescribed by the Commission and to inspect such books and records. The Commission has published, in Investment Advisers Act Release No. 111, its proposed rule to prescribe the books and records to be maintained. Its inspection program should furnish valuable information indicating some areas which might be the subject of regulation to prevent fraudulent, deceptive or manipulative practices. However, the Commission would like to have the suggestions of all informed persons (including those engaged in business as investment advisers, and those who have employed the services of such advisers in any capacity) concerning other rules and regulations which might be adopted to prevent such practices.

The text of proposed rule 206(4)(1) discussed above, defining certain advertisements as fraudulent, deceptive, or manipulative, is as follows:

PROPOSED RULE 206(4)(1)

(a) It shall constitute a fraudulent, deceptive, or manipulative act, practice or course of business within the meaning of section 206(4) of the act, for any investment adviser, directly or indirectly, to publish, circulate, or distribute any advertisement—

1. which refers, directly or indirectly, to any testimonial of any kind concerning the investment adviser or concerning any advice, analysis, report, or other service rendered by such investment adviser; or

2. which refers, directly or indirectly, to past recommendations of such investment adviser which were or would have been profitable to any person; or

3. which represents, directly or indirectly, that any graph, chart, formula, method, system, or other device being offered can in and of itself be used to determine which securities to buy or sell, or when to buy or sell them; or which represents, directly or indirectly, that any graph, chart, formula, method, system, or other device being offered will enable or assist any person to make his own decisions as to which securities to buy or sell, or when to buy or sell them, without fully disclosing, in close juxtaposition and with equal prominence, the limitations and difficulties with respect to its use; or

4. Which contains any statement to the effect that any report, analysis, or other service will be furnished free or without charge, unless such report, analysis or other service actually is or will be furnished entirely free and without any condition or obligation, directly or indirectly; or

5. Which contains any untrue statement of a material fact, or which is otherwise false or misleading.

(b) For the purposes of this rule the term "advertisement" shall include any notice, circular, letter or other communication, written or oral, which offers (1) any analysis, report, or publication, or (2) any graph, chart, formula, method, system or other device intended to be used in connection with making any determination as to when to buy or sell any security, or which security to buy to sell, or (3) any other investment advisory service.

All interested persons are invited to submit their views and comments on proposed rule 206(4)(1) and their suggestions with respect to other rules which should be adopted to prevent fraudulent, deceptive or manipulative acts or practices, on or before May 15, 1961. All such communications will be available for public inspection.

By the Commission:

ORVAL L. DUBOIS, *Secretary.*

Review of the Conscience of a Conservative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, there has recently come to my attention a review of Senator GOLDWATER's book, "The Conscience of a Conservative," prepared by Jerry Cullum. Jerry, who is 14, is in the ninth grade of the Sanford public schools, Sanford, Fla.

I feel that this is a splendid paper showing the kind of thinking by the younger generation which should be encouraged. I ask unanimous consent to have this review printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REVIEW OF "THE CONSCIENCE OF A CONSERVATIVE"

(By Jerry W. Cullum)

"The Conscience of a Conservative," by the Honorable Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, is one of the most refreshing books to appear on the political scene in years. After huge amount of empty oratory and vague phrases such as "you never had it so good" and "America must move forward", at last there appears a politician who tells exactly why he believes his system is the more practical.

Basically, Senator GOLDWATER's purpose is to show why he believes liberalism impracgan taking over those "powers reserved to the States or to the people." One cannot help but gather from the record that the liberals have been greatly responsible for this.

One case is the Federal Government's interference into the field of agriculture. Here, and in many other cases, the liberals have made all manner of ridiculous interpretations of the law to make their program constitutional. For example, since farm controls were excused on the grounds that they came under interstate commerce, a farmer was fined for planting wheat that was consumed on his own farm. It was reasoned that had he not produced the wheat, he might have purchased it from someone else, and that purchase might have affected the price of wheat transported interstate.

Although the Senator examines Federal expansion in detail, he also moves into another danger to our society—the corruption and growth of the labor unions. It is noted that so-called "liberals" calling for all types of new legislation have been tolerant of and even friendly toward the union monopolies. (Witness the political platform of one of our political parties.) Senator GOLDWATER calls for lovers of freedom to battle to curb the power of these huge organizations.

One other subject is covered by the Senator—foreign policy. He asks one important question about foreign aid—what good has it done? In many cases, none at all. He calls for the termination of the aid that actually causes our prestige to decline, and also calls for private investment in the underdeveloped nations. In another chapter, he points out that negotiations with the Communists can only lead to further defeat for the Western World.

But the Senator does not simply outline the problems. He also offers solutions. The primary responsibility, he says, rests with the American people. They must first see that men are elected to office who have the courage and conviction to return this country to the Constitution. When the Federal Government begins to withdraw its controls of business and its vast welfare programs, the responsibility for the handling of these affairs will once more rest with the States and the people, which is as it should be. When the Government stops making futile attempts to coexist with communism, and begins an active fight in all fields against it, our prestige, and if not that, certainly our self-respect, will begin to rise once more.

This, in much abbreviated form, is his argument. Although I cannot do this noble work justice in such limited space, I would like to state my own feelings on the subject: If this is conservatism, God grant us more conservatives.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

A Cogent View on Our Highway Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLEM MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Speaker, of all the witnesses appearing before the Ways and Means Committee to testify on the Federal highway program, none was more convincing than that of State Senator Randolph Collier, of California. His statement was a cogent and lucid explanation of the issues presented. Senator Collier knows whereof he speaks. California could produce no more knowledgeable witness on this subject. As chairman of the senate committee on transportation he has assumed a great share of the responsibility for our farflung highway system. It is with this experience in mind, Mr. Speaker, that I request his statement be printed below:

The facts necessary to make a full appraisal of the impact of the President's recent proposal regarding financing of the Federal highway program are not yet at hand, at least out in California. However, we are confident that we can set forth certain preliminary observations clearly indicating that the suggested heavy taxes on commercial vehicles will have serious consequences for the State's economy in general, and its trucking industry in particular.

First, it should be noted that California's highway users presently make a substantial contribution to the highway programs of other States. California's users pay about 9.7 percent of the taxes used to finance the Federal highway programs, while the State receives back about 8.7 percent of Federal aid for all eligible highways systems. In light of the current magnitudes a single percent is a figure of real import. Thus, California's taxpayments into the highway trust fund, are reaching about $305 million while its aids, at best, will level off at about $265 million a year. It might be noted here that the most recent inventory of interstate highway needs reduces California's share about one-half of 1 percent (from 10.162 to 9.656 percent), which means a loss of about $11 million a year under current authorizations.[1] While this shift is acceptable under the rules of the game which California has supported, a transfer of some $40 million of capital out of the State's economy is not to be considered lightly. There are limits to the extent of redistribution or equalization that can be assumed without serious internal consequences.

It is only fair to note that California is presently faced with enormous local road and street needs that have been verified by careful engineering study, but for which no adequate financing is in sight from any source—Federal, State, or local.

[1] California receives a little less than 5.8 percent of apportionments for primary, secondary, and urban Federal-aid highways.

It should be noted also that, under the present Federal highway tax structure, California's share of total user taxpayments is expected to climb consistently (though its share of aid will not), simply because motor vehicle use in California is expected to rise more rapidly than in the country as a whole. (For example, California highway travel is estimated to rise 2.65 times between 1956 and 1976 as compared with 1.93 times for the Nation.) Thus, without any change in the Federal user tax structure California user payments will rise, from well under 10 percent to at least 13 percent of the total in the later years of the program.

However, the immediately disturbing feature is the current proposal to shift more of the emphasis in the Federal tax structure to heavy commercial vehicles. Our concern is grounded in the fact that the West, California in particular, has such large proportions of the heavy vehicle fleets, especially of the diesel rigs and large freight combinations. For example, it is estimated that California accounts for about 14 percent of the diesel fuel used on the Nation's highways. Thus, we currently pay about 14 percent of diesel taxes as against about 9.5 percent of gasoline taxes. Even if a high differential rate could be justified (and about this we have reservations in regard to the Federal highway program), Californians would have reason for real concern.

We also have reason to be concerned about heavy license or use taxes on large vehicles. While accurate data on vehicle sizes for the individual states are not available, we may note that the Pacific Coast has about 15.7 percent of all freight combinations as against only 13 percent of all motor vehicles. However, the really astonishing fact is that the Pacific Coast has over 45 percent of all combinations in the country having five axles and more. Clearly, all proposals to tax heavy vehicles more proportionately than they are taxed now singles out the West, California in particular, for a disproportionate tax increase to support the Federal highway program.[2]

Our rough preliminary estimate is that Californians would contribute about $12 million more a year under current proposals to concentrate on truck taxes than they would under either an "across-the-board" or a simple fuel tax increase.[3] In other words, the transfer of capital out of California for highways will increase to more than $50 million a year in the immediate future; and the figure will grow substantially over the years.

Now, if heavier taxes on commercial vehicles to support the Federal highway program could be clearly justified, we would have less firm grounds for complaint. But the plain fact is that legitimate questions may be asked about the current tax proposals.

We are rather surprised that positive findings can be made about the truckers' share before the results of the $27 million Illinois test road have been made available for analysis. We are rather surprised at the proposed diesel tax differential of 75 percent when no study, to our knowledge, has ever demonstrated need for such a high differential to equalize diesel and gasoline tax payments. In this connection, we might note that only seven States now have diesel tax differentials and in only two is the differential as high as 50 percent. In California, the gasoline tax rate is 6 cents as against 7 cents for diesel fuel, a differential of 16⅔ percent.

But the more basic question we would raise involves the extent of responsibility of heavy commercial vehicles for urban highways, especially the urban portions of the Interstate System.

On a nationwide basis about 45 percent of the interstate need is in cities. In recent years more than 38 percent of Federal aid for all highway systems went into urban areas. Now, if we would be honest and forthright we would be forced to admit that this interstate need is not caused primarily by interstate or even by long-distance travel. And, of course, it is not caused by commercial vehicle movements. The plain fact is that urban interstate highways are being built to accommodate a portion of the peak-hour demands of commuters. That the President recognizes this essential truth seems to be indicated in his highway message which was quoted in the press, as follows:

"It has always struck me as ironic that so many of our citizens—so ingenious in quickly devising ways of ending almost every minor irritation—would so readily tolerate every morning and evening the incredible congestion of our antiquated highways that take a heavy toll in automotive costs and depreciation, to say nothing of human nerves and tempers."

The clear inference is that the Federal highway program is expected to provide relief for the peak-hour congestion problem. In view of this enlightened statement, it strikes us as ironic to make offhand implications about the responsibility of heavy commercial vehicles—at least for the urban part of the problem. One is entitled to ask how much of the cost of peak-hour congestion should be attributed to commercial vehicles. After all, more than two-thirds of the Federal highway program is devoted to the Interstate system, of which more than 40 percent of the cost is in the cities.

It would be instructive to know what part heavy vehicles play in the main traffic streams during the commuter rushes. Our own observations are that heavy vehicles operations are not major considerations in the design capacity of city freeways; unfortunately adequate data on this matter are not available. It is interesting to note, however, that an estimate of travel by the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads showed that trucks and combinations accounted for about 15 percent of all travel on urban interstate highways in 1957; but the figure for combinations alone was less than 5 percent. And, of course, percentages during peak hours would be very much less.

Another look at the data shows that trucks and combinations ran up only 4.6 percent of their total mileage on the urban portions of the Interstate System. Actually, almost 85 percent of all truck and combination travel takes place entirely off the Interstate System. The fact to remember is that user taxes, whether Federal or State, are appli-

[2] More than two-thirds of the truck-trailer combinations and over half of the tractor-semitrailer-trailers are in the Pacific division, which has only 16 percent of the total registration of truck combinations. Third Progress Report of the Highway Cost Allocation Study, 1959, p. 12.

[3] Based on the assumption that $300 million more a year is to be raised.

cable regardless of where the travel takes place; this fact should not be ignored in appraisal of the burden and equity of highway user charges.

We feel rather sensitive about distribution of user tax burdens in California because we have given much attention to the problem. We also feel strongly about the urban situation because California has been a leader among the States in attempting to meet metropolitan congestion problems. This is illustrated by the fact that more than 70 percent of our interstate needs is in urban areas. In fact, according to our most recent estimate our two big metropolitan areas (the bay area and the Los Angeles-San Diego complex) account for about 75 percent of our total interstate needs (an urban area figure much higher than the national proportion). Now, we happen to know that these areas have a very much smaller proportion of heavy vehicles than 75 percent. In fact, their proportions of commercial vehicles, especially the larger ones, are considerably smaller than their proportions of ordinary passenger cars, a circumstance which suggests caution in assessing costs of urban facilities against commercial vehicles without appraisal of all the facts.[4]

Actually, much of our trucking industry in California operates in areas far remote from interstate highways, not only from the urban portions but from the rural segments as well. As one example, we might cite the logging industry in the Redwood Empire, which operates many huge diesel rigs, nons of which ever gets near an interstate highway.

It occurs to us that it will be uneconomic as well as inequitable to single out the trucking industry for differentially higher Federal user tax burdens. At the least, there should be a much better demonstration of their responsibility for Federal highway costs, especially in urban areas, than anything we have yet seen. We believe there is a strong presumption against taking dollars from California's trucking industry, and hence from its economy, in order to build interstate commuter routes in Boston, St. Louis, New Orleans, or Denver—or even in Los Angeles or San Francisco for that matter.

In the final analysis, we must recognize that the more centralized our highway financing becomes, the more approximate and crude will be our highway-user tax programs. The chasm between tax payments and highway expenditures becomes almost too wide to bridge at the Federal level. It is our considered view that the problem of achieving reasonable balance between tax burdens of commercial vehicles and ordinary passenger cars can be worked out with more precision and equity at the State level. Federal highway-user taxes would best be imposed on a broad base.

---

[4] For example, only 28.7 percent of California's for-hire motor vehicles are situated in Los Angeles County, as compared with more than 40 percent of the passenger cars.

The Real Estate Investment Trust Act and Its Potential for Urban Renewal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, last year the Congress enacted legislation providing a new method of taxing real estate investment trust, which distribute 90 percent of their income annually to their beneficiaries.

My attention has been invited to a recent address by John C. Williamson, director of the department of governmental relations, National Association of Real Estate Boards, before the sixth annual conference on urban renewal of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials on the subject of the Real Estate Investment Trust Act and its potential for urban renewal.

Under unanimous consent I include this address in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT TRUST ACT AND ITS POTENTIAL FOR URBAN RENEWAL

(Address by John C. Williamson, director, department of governmental relations, National Association of Real Estate Boards, before the Sixth Annual Conference on Urban Renewal, National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, Pittsburgh, Pa., April 18, 1961)

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I want to thank you for this opportunity to discuss one phase of this tremendous problem of financing urban renewal by private developers.

The National Association of Real Estate Boards and the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials share a common goal in the field of urban renewal. If you were to look closely at the basis for our differences, and there are differences if you compare our recent respective statements before the Senate Housing Subcommittee, you will find that the magnitude of these differences is inversely proportionate to the role of private enterprise in the field of urban renewal.

Notwithstanding some of our critics, the realtors accept the concept of urban renewal capital grants by the Federal Government. However, we cling zealously to the philosophy which ran through this program during its consideration by the Congress and its ultimate acceptance by the business community—that is, that private enterprise would play a predominant role in the redevelopment of urban renewal areas. Accordingly, the realtors have supported the various financing mechanisms in the law today which are designed to assist private enterprise to fill this role.

If you were to read the testimony of the chairman of the realtors' Washington committee before the Senate Housing Subcommittee last week, you would have noted that he expressed some concern over provisions in the bill which would vest in local redevelopment agencies, as well as local public housing authorities, the means to engage directly in the redevelopment of urban renewal areas.

That is why the subject of private financing for private redevelopers in the urban renewal process is so important to us. We must assist in the development of concrete solutions directed at the great problems of urban renewal.

One of these great problems is money.

The problem is one of money that doesn't sojourn too long away from the pocket of the developer. Reflect for a moment on the developers with whom you have personally been in contact during the past years. Do you know any who didn't want to get his money out of a project as soon as possible; that is, if he were one of the rare ones who had any money in the project in the first place.

The problem, as we view it, is to contrive some financing mechanism which would attract the money of the nonspohisticated investor who would be content with a yield which has characterized real estate investment certainly during the post-World War II period. I say "nonsophisticated investor" to exclude the more sophisticated type which spelled the success of the real estate syndicate in some of our metropolitan areas. He needs and is getting the high yield on prime income producing properties. For urban renewal, particularly, we need the small investor who does not have the means for the large investment needed to buy into a syndicate nor require the inordinately high yield as a prerequisite to investment.

To find the answer we went back into the early 20th and late 19th century and dusted off a device which had made tremendous contributions to the development of many of our large cities during the last century, the real estate investment trust or, as it is known sometimes, the "Massachusetts trust" because of its history and development in that State.

Unfortunately, the real estate investment trust went into oblivion in the early thirties, cut down, so to speak, as it stood on the threshold of a new era, an era which saw the beginning of the Federal Home Loan Bank System, the Federal Housing Administration, the beginning of America's 20th century revolution in home ownership and urban development.

The real estate investment trust at that time was an unincorporated association which held real estate for investment and distributed the proceeds to its investors or shareholders. Such trusts were not subject to the Federal corporate tax and were therefore able to pass through maximum income to the beneficial owners.

However, there were many unincorporated associations at that time which were not content to obtain passive income for their beneficiaries. These started to engage in more active operations. Soon the matter reached the U.S. Supreme Court which proceeded to knock down the passive trusts along with the active trusts. The Court said in effect that if an unincorporated association had certain indicia of a corporation, such as continuity of life and centralized management, the association would be taxable as a corporation.

A few years later, in the late 1930's, the "mutuals," the funds which hold stocks and bonds, fought back, and Congress exempted them from the corporate tax so long as their income was passive and they distributed 90 percent of their income annually to the shareholders.

It was not until the early 1950's that the organized real estate industry, led by a few hardy Massachusetts trusts which had managed to survive the corporate tax, decided to fight back. It found a champion in Congressman EUGENE KEOGH, Democrat of New York, who not only sponsored the legislation but fought for it consistently until its enactment. His ally and colleague in the effort was the late Congressman Dick Simpson, Republican of Pennsylvania, who time and time again sought a kindlier reception for this bill by the Treasury.

It took almost 7 years to convince the Treasury and the Congress that the "passive" real estate investment trust should also be exempt from the corporate tax under the "conduit" theory—that is, where the trust is merely the conduit through which money passes from the property to the investor.

During the legislative activity on this bill, which became law last September, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator conveyed to the Treasury Department the view that the trust could become the weapon for pooling the savings of small investors for urban renewal. At that time, you will recall, the Budget Bureau was doling out FNMA special assistance funds with an "eyedropper," and the housing agency officials were scrambling for the magic word which would bring private enterprise into urban renewal without the bait of FNMA special

assistance, which, although you may disagree, is nevertheless a form of direct lending.

Now as to the specifics of this new device.

First, I must warn you that this is a most complicated measure, and I am forced to limit my remarks to its essential elements. This satisfies my own limited knowledge and also feeds the ennui with which all mortals must contend in meeting the challenges of the late afternoon.

Under the act, real estate investment trusts are defined as unincoporated trusts or associations which (1) are managed by one or more trustees, (2) have transferable shares of beneficial interest, (3) are a type of organization which would be taxed as an ordinary domestic corporation in the abscence of the new law. This means that the trust or association must have the indicia of the corporation; continuity of life, limitation of personal liability, transferability of shares, etc.

To emphasize the objective of the bill to encourage the pooling of small savings, the Congress provided that the beneficial ownership must be held by 100 or more persons and that 5 or less persons may not directly or indirectly own more than 50 percent of the trust. The trustees or managers of the trust must elect to be taxed as a real estate investment trust and the trust may not hold any property primarily for sale to customers in the ordinary course of its trade or business.

It doesn't make any difference that property has not been sold after it has been held "primarily for sale * * * in the ordinary course of * * * trade or business." The essence is in the manner in which it is held. Frequency of sales and purchases, for example, is evidence of "holding property" as a dealer.

A realtor who organizes a trust could arrange for one or more of the investors (three would be preferable) to be trustees, and these should be individuals with experience in real estate.

The trustees are those whose faces will be turned toward the public. They must inspire confidence in the investing public or the trust will be left "holding the bag" of unmarketable shares.

These trusts will be required to file a registration statement and prospectus (which becomes in essence the contract between the shareholders and the trust) with the Securities and Exchange Commission if the offering is to be made in interstate commerce. Interstate commerce has a very broad meaning; i.e., the shares are offered to more than 25 persons presumes interstate commerce; the trust uses the mails; shares are sold (even without knowledge of the trust) by a shareholder to another outside the State. Intrastate offerings have a very fragile basis, and trusts should contemplate registration with SEC under the Securities Act of 1933.

On April 11 the Securities and Exchange Commission issued a new form which set forth the requirements of real estate investment trusts, syndicates, and other incorporated or unincorporated groups making public offerings of securities, and who are primarily concerned with holding real estate for investment. The reason for the new form was to satisfy the requirements for adequate disclosure—the SEC wants to make sure that the investing public will be able to make an informed judgment, on the basis of complete disclosure as to the promoters, the investment policies to be pursued, self-dealing, etc.

Our association welcomed these rather strict disclosure requirements because many of our people have long memories, memories which go back to the disaster of the late twenties when an uninformed public lost millions in nonexistent real estate equities and guaranteed mortgage certificates which guaranteed only disillusionment.

We visualize such real estate investment trusts being organized in a community to provide the equity capital for redevelopment of an urban renewal area, provided the trust will be able to acquire the land for multipurpose use. For example, the relatively low yield on an FHA-insured multifamily project would have to be balanced with the higher yield on a shopping center or other commercial and light industrial facilities.

Let us take this thing through a few of the required steps.

The redevelopment agency in city A is soon going to have cleared land ready for private redevelopment pursuant to an approved urban renewal plan. The plan provides for multifamily projects and a shopping center. A realtor, builder and banker organize a real estate investment trust for the purpose of negotiating for the acquisition of the property for redevelopment.

Because of the reputation of the participants in the community, and because of the opportunities to be afforded the small investor to own a part of the redeveloped area, the redevelopmfent agency negotiates for the sale or long-term lease of the land to the trust, provided that by a certain date the trust's offering has cleared the Securities and Exchange Commission and the offering has been underwritten by reputable underwriters.

The trust files a registration statement with the SEC for an offering of 500,000 shares at $5 a share. The registration statement discloses all the information necessary for the investor to make an informed judgment, including copies of the trust instrument, trustee regulations, contracts for the purchase of the land, contracts for the construction, FHA commitments, leases to the tenants, management contracts, contracts with the underwriter, and so forth. Much of the information contained in the registration statement is included in a prospectus which will be disseminated to prospective investors and which represents essentially the contract between the trust and the shareholder. An underwriter will either take the entire issue, or will try to sell it on what is known as a best-effort basis.

Assume the trust's entire offering is underwritten and this makes available $2.5 million. By a provision in the trust instrument, the money is to be invested in Government bonds which are liquidated as money is needed for construction, etc.

The trust properties will of course be mortgaged, the multifamily projects probably by FHA. Mortgaging the properties will permit the high leverage which will make the $2.5 million do the work of four or five times that much.

Once the projects are completed, the trust, in order to obtain the tax exemption, must contract out the management of the properties to an independent contractor. Several rules are set forth in the act to make sure that the trust's income is passive—that is, that it does not engage in the active business of managing real estate.

We are hopeful that a trustee, who is experienced in the field of real estate management, may also be the independent contractor who manages the trust properties so long as the trustee does not own more than a 35-percent interest in the trust. This 35-percent rule is contained in the act and is designed to reflect arm's-length transactions between the trust and the independent contractor. Unfortunately, the Internal Revenue Service in its proposed regulations is attempting to rewrite the law so that a trustee may not be an officer or have a proprietary interest in the management firm. We are hopeful that the IRS will recede from this position, because the result would deprive realtor-managers of the great incentive in promoting the development of a real estate investment trust.

There are other provisions and pitfalls in the act which, unless the trustees are very careful, might jeopardize the trust's tax exemption. This in effect reduces the beneficiaries' yield by 52 percent. For example, the trust may not own more than a 10 percent interest in any tenant. Because the trust, under the attribution rules of the Internal Revenue Code, is deemed to own the interest of its shareholders, rents may be disqualified for tax exemption. That is why it is most important for the trust to be advised of the interest of any of its shareholders in the tenants' enterprises.

If the trust distributes at least 90 percent of its income annually to its shareholders, the trust will be exempt from the corporate tax to the extent of the income so distributed. The income retained by the trust is taxable. The income received by the shareholders is taxable, unless the income represents a return of capital. This "return of capital" comes into being because of the depreciation rules. It is possible, therefore, during the early years of a project, to find that a substantial portion of the return will be tax free due to the accelerated depreciation which may be taken on new construction.

The trust must in its prospectus advise the investing public that tax exemption will come only after 75 percent of the income of the trust is derived from real estate sources. Consequently, the trust may not qualify as a real estate investment trust under the Tax Code until after the projects, whether they be apartments or shopping centers, are completed and in substantial occupancy. Thus we have a built-in incentive for the trust to get on with the job of redevelopment.

Suppose an investor wants to get his money out quickly. Is there a market for such shares? If not, what happens to the investor; is he frozen in?

These are examples of some of the questions which will plague the promoter. These trusts will be closed-end trusts in that they will make a single offering for a specific amount, and the shareholders will not have the right to insist that the trust redeem the shares on demand. Obviously, such a right of redemption just wouldn't work. The trust would have to fix the value of the shares every day. Imagine doing this on income-producing real estate.

The lack of the right of redemption must be made very clear to the investor, and every prospectus which I have read states this in unmistakable language. However, the trusts generally reserve the right to repurchase the shares, and most trusts will have part of their assets in liquid form so that it could be available for redemption. The act permits 25 percent of the trust's assets to be in cash, government securities, stocks and bonds, and other non-real-estate investments.

However, we believe that in time these trust shares will develop local markets, and ultimately, regional and national markets. Today, the Real Estate Investment Trust of America, which holds properties in 18 States, has its shares quoted on the American exchange.

Now, what is the present status of the Real Estate Investment Trusts Act? The wheels of progress grind slowly, and this act is no exception.

The Internal Revenue Service is considering the recommendations and arguments directed last month at its tentative regulations for such trusts.

While about eight real estate investment trusts have filed registration statements with the SEC, and two are already in business, there is enough uncertainty about the IRS regulations to deter trusts from going ahead with their organization at this time. Then there is the new SEC form which was just distributed and concerning which the

SEC has invited comments on or before May 8.

Again, some of the States have not been too responsive in amending State law to permit the formation of such trusts. For example, I was recently advised that the pending Texas enabling statute would limit a trust's operations to a single county. While this might suit the purposes of urban renewal, it does unduly restrict the trust's ability to diversify its investments as well as tap out-of-State sources.

The California Corporations Commissioner wants the shareholders to have the power of approving, rejecting, or canceling a management contract. The Internal Revenue Service insists that for the trust to be passive and obtain the tax exemption, the trustees must have absolute control over the management contract. So, if the IRS insists on its position—and I believe it should—then the real estate investment trust will not function in California, unless the State corporations commissioner relents.

The Federal Housing Administration has amended its regulations to permit real estate investment trusts to be eligible mortgagors.

There is legislation pending before the Congress to authorize federally chartered savings and loan associations to invest in shares issued by real estate investment trusts organized to participate in urban renewal.

A national association of real estate investment funds has been organized, principally by realtors, and has as its object the development of a code of ethics for promoters of such trusts.

Our own association has organized a committee on real estate investment trusts which met with SEC officials last December and urged that the agency adopt strict rules of adequate disclosure so that the investing public will be able to make an informed judgment.

I hope that in time we will find a real estate investment trust in each community, directing its efforts, its money and its talents toward urban renewal. I know that this will give rise to as many problems as it purports to cure. Urban renewal has arrived—it no longer requires the hardy trail blazer who must enter, with his money, where prudence fears to tread. More often than not, developers compete with each other for this or that parcel of land. The cooperative groups want their share, as certainly do the local public housing authorities, the speculative builder, and the industrial entrepreneur.

As you are pulled hither and yon by the divers interests who sincerely believe that the urban renewal objectives are met best in their product, consider the entity, the real investment trust, which will represent the savings and interest of hundreds of persons in the community. This would make meaningful the desired objective of urban renewal by the community and for the community.

When you go back home, round up a few of your city's businessmen who are interested in urban renewal. You will find some of them in real estate, building, and banking circles, an ideal combination to set up a real estate investment trust.

I hope that you will encourage the development of such trusts so that not just a few, but hundreds of people in your community will own the new urban areas which, as a result of your efforts, will grace the cities of tomorrow.

The Citizen and His Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Alex McCullough, vice president of the South Carolina National Bank, Greenville, S.C., made a very excellent address to the annual congressional dinner of the South Carolina State Chamber of Commerce here at the Statler in Washington. Mr. McCullough's timely speech will be of interest to the entire Congress and to the country:

It has been my pleasure to enjoy a rather close relationship to government from three different viewpoints: as a newspaperman, as an employee of both State and Federal Governments, and now as the officer of a bank.

Citizens who have not served in government often are impatient with the general slowness of its processes. On other occasions—when the results obtained are not satisfactory to individual desires—government is condemned for failing to be more deliberate in its consideration of problems. Although those critics of governmental processes are sometimes right on both charges, they cannot accurately indict government on either count without implicating themselves.

Government is the creation and instrument of the citizens of this country. Its strengths and its weaknesses are qualities and characteristics of the citizens themselves, reflected in their laws, their representatives, and their machinery of government.

Government was not created for the individual, but for the general good.

When individuals or special groups want something or want something done, they complain if government moves slowly. When they don't want somebody else to get something or don't want something more favorable to others to be done, they object to the speed which the machinery of government seems to acquire.

Citizens outside of government find it extremely difficult to be fair and objective when they want something or when they oppose something strongly. Citizens in government—elected, appointed, and employed—experience the same difficulty of being objective. Requests, demands, and pressures from individuals and groups of divergent views and interests make it impossible to please everyone on any issue.

Good citizens and nongovernmental organizations have the responsibility and obligation of knowing the facts and then asking Government only for those things in the general good within the limits of constitutional authority.

Unfortunately, all requests to Government are not reasonable. Many are solely for the selfish gains of special groups and individuals. Regrettably, many such proposals originate in Government.

Therefore, it becomes the duty of fair and objective officeholders to decide their positions on any issue based on the facts and the law, as best they understand them, without fear or favor.

This prescription for citizens and their representatives is simple. However, its use, both inside and outside of Government, has never been unanimous.

If every issue coming before the Congress could be classified as right or wrong, there would be only one remaining problem. That would be who would decide whether any issue were right or wrong. Since the issues cannot be classified as right or wrong, we won't pursue that point.

Quite often the objectives of opposing sides are nearly the same, but the best way to obtain the desired results is the question requiring a Solomon. Surely, a prime illustration of this point is the widely-different proposals for sustaining and expanding the national economy. This is not to say that all the proposals meet the test of being fair and objective; but, certainly, no one fails to agree that growth is desirable. The disagreement arises over the exercise of governmental powers and the speed with which they are exercised.

An additional problem which citizens and their representatives face in most issues is the matter of personalities. Ours was designed to be a government of law and not of men, but men designed the Government, men are running it, and men are supporting it. The element of conflicting personalities cannot be eliminated.

This makes it essential for all of us to place principles above persons—to seek what is right and reasonable regardless of appealing or conflicting personal relationships. Perhaps it is in the area of personalities that the greatest trouble lies. None of us forget past experience and all of us react to experience long after a particular issue has been decided. At all levels of Government, and in international relations, history shows that personalities have frequently overshadowed principles with disastrous results.

For the general good it is important that each issue stand on its own bottom and that we avoid letting personalities become issues. Thus, it is vital for those being represented and those who represent to avoid predeterminations until all the evidence has been examined on every issue. The practical application of such objectivity may be slightly more difficult than my saying it, but worth striving for and keeping as a constant goal.

The day-to-day details of Government which beset the Members of the House and Senate cannot be visualized by those unfamiliar with congressional operations. Duties and responsibilities imposed by the Constitution and by statutes comprise more obligations than any Member can perform without expert assistance. The growth of our Government to its present state of bureaucracy forces our Senators and Representatives, not only to deliberate and legislate, but, also, to serve as auditors on the activities of the 10 executive departments and the multitude of independent agencies.

The Constitution, in article I, section 8, specified 18 powers of Congress. A few other powers were stated in other articles in reference to special subjects. Limitations on the powers of Congress were listed in section 9, in the Bill of Rights, and in several other references.

But, in all their wisdom, the authors of the Constitution did not imagine the bureaucracy of today. The result has been an almost overpowering burden on the Congress, collectively, and upon the Members, individually, with their assistants.

Citizens who feel that consistency is not a virtue of their Representatives, and that inconsistency is characteristic, should apply the same measure to their own conduct in relations with their Congressmen.

The citizen who believes certain principles apply to Government generally—economy for example—should be consistent enough to have the rule applied in his home State as well as in the other 49. A Member of Congress cannot vote "No" on all general ex-

penditures and "Yes" on those beneficial to his own State.

Members of the Congress represent all the people of all the States—political friend and political foe. They cannot escape that responsibility.

Someone has said that "the test of a man's true character is what he would do if he knew it would never be found out." I believe an even sterner test of character is faced each year by the Members of Congress who know that everyone who wants to do so will find out how they voted. No matter how many times a Congressman pleases his constituents, it is the time he displeases them that they seem to remember longest.

I am sure that the eight members of South Carolina's delegation in Washington are aware of the scrutiny which constituents apply to congressional activity. Yea-and-nay votes are noted with favor or disfavor, according to the issue; significance is sometimes found in absences or paired voting.

Those of you whose votes have not consistently coincided with the thinking of chambers of commerce and their businessmen members have received negative reactions, expressed with no uncertainty. But from my own knowledge of letters from home, I must admit that sometimes we businessmen find it easier to complain, and are not quick enough with our praise.

We also spend too little time telling our elected representatives about what we see as the why or why not of a particular piece of legislation. We fail to orient the issue to its effect on our businesses, our communities, the economy of the State. We forget that such facts, if agreed to by members of the South Carolina delegation, can be used in turn by them to influence the attitudes of Senators and Representatives from other States.

Even more time-consuming and often more difficult than legislation are the innumerable "personal services" which have become a part of the Congressman's daily routine throughout the year. The average citizen, and even those who deal with such matters regularly, expect their Congressman's assistance in solving the maze of bureaucratic regulations which they deal with at times. Government has become so big that a citizen without at least an introduction by his Congressman feels insignificant before a bureaucrat. This should not be true and often there is no basis for such a feeling. Nevertheless, proper attention has to be given to the constituent who appeals to his Senator or Representative. Then the propriety of his actions must be considered by the Congressman.

Probably most of those present are familiar with these problems, but what can we do about them?

No one can presume to advise the Members of Congress on their obligations and responsibilities. That is the "long way which they must tread alone" once they have assumed public office.

Neither can any individual or group set the standards for all others. None has a monopoly on facts or wisdom.

However, there are practices which might be better employed by citizens and their Representatives alike to attain greater mutual understanding in dealing with the complicated problems of government.

In all inter-relations, citizens and Members of Congress should first consider:

1. Is it necessary?
2. It is for the general good?
3. Is it fair to all?
4. Can it be done without the power of Government?

We citizen voters back home appreciate the obvious desire of our representatives to keep us informed. You do this through your news releases, your weekly reports to the public, through your individual communications.

On the other hand, it is our responsibility to tell you what we think about current legislative issues such as the minimum wage, aid to education, liberalizing social security, aid for depressed areas, tax reform and secondary boycotts. It is up to us to properly reflect our preference for doing ourselves, in our own way, those things which the minions of liberal bureaucracy would choose to do for us.

Those questions cannot be answered without communication. Communication is not simply the expression of one person's ideas to another. Real communication goes farther than a one-way message.

Government needs more two-way exchanges of facts and ideas to obtain real communication between people and their representatives.

Communication means sharing, and interchange of thoughts and opinions, and finally, making common to all the vital considerations involved in any issue.

Better communication means the people and their representatives would both be better informed. Thus, better communication means better legislation.

Our objective must be constantly to strengthen our communications in the interest of better government for better citizens. We cannot escape the joint responsibility which all of us have.

We cannot disdain our mutual responsibility for South Carolina's economic progress. We at home must be imaginative and resourceful, and you in Washington must be ever-mindful of the deterrent effect of Federal encroachment.

We can do this if businessmen and legislators work together, understand the thinking of each other—remembering always that the constituent wants to be represented, and the legislator wants to represent.

Annual Assemblage of State Civil Defense Directors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech which I delivered today at the annual meeting of the National Association of State Civil Defense Directors held in the auditorium of the National Guard Memorial Building.

SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN MELVIN PRICE, OF EAST ST. LOUIS, ILL., PRESENTED AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE NATONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE CIVIL DEFENSE DIRECTORS, WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 3, 1961

INTRODUCTION

It is a pleasure and a privilege to speak to this annual assemblage of State civil defense directors. I appreciate very much the opportunity you have given me to discuss some of the issues facing our country at this critical juncture in world affairs.

Recent events in Cuba and the highly sensitive developments in Laos, coupled with the stalled weapons test ban negotiations at Geneva, have brought to the American people a deeper appreciation of the continuing Communist threat to the security of our Nation. The thin veil of Communist peace and friendship, so cleverly worn in earlier times, has been replaced by the naked threat of thermonuclear devastation.

This is a grave and sobering matter. Its portent is so grim, in fact, that many refuse to contemplate its true meaning. Others, impressed by the enormity of the threat, are unable to devote rational thought to various possibilities of reducing the threat. For whatever reason, too many have failed to consider the total requirements of national security, nonmilitary as well as military.

As advocates of nonmilitary defense preparedness, I'm sure you and I share a common view on the importance of achieving a balanced active and passive defense program. Beyond that, I'm not so sure we will find ourselves in complete agreement on how we should proceed to improve the passive defense part of our security effort.

It is an unfortunate fact that the concern and the conviction which we share as to the need for a high level of nonmilitary defense, or civil defense, preparedness has not been matched on the part of the general public. Nor, in my opinion, have our military leaders exhibited an appreciation of the essential requirements of civilian preparedness in the event of large-scale military conflict. But there are some signs of change. People are beginning to ask important questions. The military are beginning to reexamine established doctrine. For the first time, we are beginning to ponder the simple question: What happens if all our efforts to deter war are frustrated, either by accident or by a calculated Soviet attack on the United States.

I have an idea that some constructive changes are in the wind at the Federal level of our Government. First, let me say that President Kennedy has been discerning in his choice of a man to pilot the nonmilitary defense program in the years ahead. Frank B. Ellis is a man of intelligence and drive. He has distinguished himself in New Orleans civic affairs and is a standout lawyer and businessman. He attacks problems with determination and diligence. From what I have seen since his appointment, Mr. Ellis has breathed new life into civil emergency planning. I am hopeful that his performance will attract additional talent and new resources to the urgent task of building a realistic nonmilitary defense program for our country. And I'm sure he looks to the members of this audience for valuable support and assistance in this undertaking.

It is not my purpose to second-guess the experts, including Mr. Ellis. But I do have some ideas which I should like to present for your consideration. I do so with the hope that they may be a constructive influence in the formulation of programs and policies equal to the requirements of national survival.

CIVIL DEFENSE AND DETERRENCE

To begin with, let's talk about this word "deterrent." I know of no word which has assumed a more prominent spot in the jargon of military expertise. Advocates of all kinds of deterrents—air, sea, ground forces, and missiles—abound in the services and, I might add, in the Congress. They all have a good case to make for particular projects, and each is motivated by a strong patriotic impulse. It is a pity that the budgetary pie is just so big.

But with it all, we hear only muted voices in defense of home preparedness, and a few strident voices determined to discredit the concept itself.

There is nothing wrong with the concept. On the contrary there is everything right and necessary about civil defense and defense mobilization. Anybody who measures deterrence solely by the strength of our reprisal force has overlooked a danger which could be fatal. A potential enemy ready to accept heavy losses in exchange for a quick victory cannot be discounted. It has happened before. It could happen again. This is particularly relevant in view of our avowed national policy, consistent with our ethical

and moral convictions, of never striking the first blow.

In plain fact, we must show the entire world that we can, and will survive such a blow, that loss of life will be kept to a minimum and major components of our industrial complex will remain viable.

It seems to me that such a posture is essential to protect our own society and our freedom, as well as discharging the obligations of leadership in the community of free nations.

CIVIL DEFENSE EXPENDITURES

And how much do we spend on this mission? With billions poured into military defense—and I do not downgrade these expenditures—we have put nickels and dimes into home defense. Each American paid $230 this year to maintain a modern Military Establishment. Mutual security cost each of us $25. Such burdens must be carried in these turbulent times. But I submit that the 34 cents per capita, which we currently spend for civil defense, is grossly inadequate. It does not, and cannot assure protection for our people, our plants, and our free institutions.

GAPS IN CIVIL DEFENSE PREPAREDNESS

I am certain you get reminders of the voids we must fill as you wrestle with local problems in your daily routine. I think you know, for example, that the construction of family fallout shelters has not reached epidemic proportions in the communities you serve. To be sure, such construction is rare enough to warrant space in most local newspapers. It is certainly not commonplace.

Also, I am sure you view with some apprehension the failure of Governments—Federal, State, and city—to provide shelter in new construction and to modify existing buildings for that purpose. And you wonder, I suppose, how you can be expected to persuade both individuals and industry to make such preparations when Government itself shows no awareness of the need.

I think you are concerned also, by the obvious weakness of our warning system. I am told that nearly half the major cities of the United States do not have adequate warning devices. And even with sirens in every principal target area we have not accounted for the millions of people who live outside the major metropolitan areas. There are pressing needs for increased medical stockpiles, for a more effective radiological defense system, for realistic resource planning and postattack recovery capabilities.

The requirements for an effective and well-coordinated civil defense are seemingly endless, but they are not really endless. They just seem so. The problem looms so large because we have been nibbling at it, and grudgingly at best.

I shall not try to assign blame for this state of unpreparedness. Perhaps it is traceable to the whirlwind surge of events and the eruption of science. In a span of 15 years we have witnessed a revolution in weapons technology of unprecedented magnitude. The lumbering 200-mile-an-hour aircraft and the TNT blockbusters of World War II have been replaced by high-speed aircraft and missiles capable of hitting any part of the world with fantastic destructiveness.

I am aware that shortcomings in nonmilitary defense cannot be attributed entirely to those charged with the conduct of our nonmilitary defense program.

I realize this program has been conducted within the limits of overall national policy, and seemingly in context with the prevailing climate of public opinion. It is natural that a society steeped in the ways of peace, comfortable in its unmatched prosperity, and traditionally optimistic, would find it difficult to address itself to the hard tasks of survival in the nuclear age.

Moreover, no official—no matter how dedicated—and no agency can operate an effective program in the absence of the necessary legislative authority and full executive branch support. The Congress itself must accept at least part of the blame for not taking the initiative and demanding that greater effort be devoted to our nonmilitary defense program.

OUTMODED LEGISLATION

I think it is important to understand that our present civil defense program has been severely handicapped from its inception by a grossly defective statutory base. Its enabling legislation, Public Law 920, is an unfortunate legacy of World War II. It was outmoded at the time of enactment in 1950, some 5 years after the development of the atomic bomb. More than a decade of weapons technology has rendered it completely obsolete.

The fundamental defect of that statute is its basic premise that civil defense is primarily a responsibility of the States and localities. That premise colors every major provision of the statute and was not changed by the amendments of 1958, Public Law 606. Those amendments did change the wording of the policy declaration and some of the restrictions on Federal action were removed but those alterations did not go to the heart of the problem.

In my view we need more in the way of basic legislation than any amendments to Public Law 920 can accomplish. We need to establish a completely new legislative framework which acknowledges that nonmilitary defense is primarily a Federal responsibility and which conceives this responsibility in the broader context of total national security preparedness.

It should be clear that a bomb falling on East St. Louis, for example, would not be an attack simply upon that city, but it would be an attack upon the United States. All of the resources of our Nation should be available not only to deter an attack on our cities but also to help minimize the destructiveness of such an attack and assist in a post-attack recovery effort.

This is too large a task for our States and localities to handle on an individual basis. It is a national problem, and it must be dealt with on a national scale.

Some 4 years ago I introduced a legislative proposal, designated H.R. 4219, which would have repealed Public Law 920 and would have provided the necessary statutory authority for the creation of a national master plan for nonmilitary defense. The key features of this proposal were: A clear statement of primary Federal responsibility; an important supporting role for the States and localities; and recognition of the key measure of shelter protection against the blast, thermal, and radiation effects of nuclear weapons.

LACK OF A NATIONAL MASTER PLAN

The type of national plan of action I am speaking of would conceive of nonmilitary defense as embracing the total complex of activities, other than military, required to prepare our people and our economy against the effects of possible war, to survive and emerge from the ashes of attack, to maintain the continuity of Government and essential production, to proceed toward partial recovery, and then toward full resumption of peacetime pursuits.

In short, the action plan for nonmilitary defense must embrace the broad sweep of civilian activities which must be joined with the military for preparedness, defense, and recovery. It must be a blueprint for survival, and it must not sidestep direct and explicit assignment of responsibility.

We do not at this time have such a plan. It is true that more than 2 years ago the OCDM announced its so-called national plan for civil defense and defense mobilization, and since that time annex upon annex has poured forth from Washington. That plan, which is still in effect, is a good statement of the many functions involved in the nonmilitary defense task, but it is in no sense a plan for action. Its theme is one of suggestion. It does assign broad responsibilities to various sectors of our society, but it provides no yardstick against which the performance of assigned responsibilities can be measured. Matched against an enormous need, the plan's directives are at best exhortations. The vital link between broad planning and concrete action is missing.

IMMEDIATE REQUIREMENTS

Aside from the broad requirements which I have mentioned, there are certain specific things which need to be undertaken immediately.

First, if our State and local authorities and individual families are to carry out substantial efforts in support of our national program we shall need strong Federal leadership and example. We must demonstrate that we are serious at the Federal level before we can expect cooperation at other levels. In concrete terms, this means that we must not only provide incentives for the construction of fallout shielding throughout the Nation but we must also build such protection into our Federal buildings. It means that we must not only encourage the protection of State and local resources, but we must also take steps to protect existing Federal resources. In these and other ways we can convince our people of the seriousness of the problem we face.

Once our people are convinced that we propose to go beyond the paper-planning programs of the past, I am convinced that the resources and public support required for the full development and implementation of a realistic nonmilitary defense effort will be forthcoming.

A moment ago I said that I sense a change in the wind. I believe there is a changing general attitude toward nonmilitary defense in this country. I think the opportunity is here for us to press forward for the first time toward a serious nonmilitary defense effort. It remains now for us to set ourselves to the task.

I know of President Kennedy's personal concern for the type of protection this effort can achieve for our people and our resources. With his leadership, and under the vigorous and imaginative direction of Frank Ellis at the Federal level, I believe it is now possible to move forward at all levels to build a program of nonmilitary preparedness equal to the enormous threat we now face.

This Guerrilla Business—The Need for a Reevaluation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, Stewart Alsop, in an article appearing in today's Washington Post, has made a strong case for President Kennedy's recent decision to reexamine the theory and practice of guerrilla warfare, and to prepare ourselves in this field.

Mr. Alsop has clearly pointed out the danger to the free world of continued operation under a double standard, and

the requirements which must be met if a guerrilla movement is to be effective.

This is a timely and penetrating article and I urge my colleagues to give it their close attention.

THIS GUERRILLA BUSINESS

(By Stewart Alsop)

What has been happening in Laos, and what threatens soon to happen in Vietnam, repeats a grim pattern. The pattern can be reduced into a simple formula. With Communist support, a guerrilla movement grows until it becomes stronger than the military forces of the country. The Communists then take control, confronting this country with the choice between intervening militarily in a situation where all the odds favor the Communists, or abandoning another nation to communism.

Since the last war, this sequence of events has occurred in North Indochina, in Cuba, and in China itself, with Laos and Vietnam next on the Communists' list. Even where a Communist-supported guerrilla movement has failed, as in Greece, Burma, Malaya, and the Philippines, a very high price has been exacted. In Malaya, to cite one example, a guerrilla force which never numbered more than a few thousand tied down 80,000 British troops for 10 years.

This is enough to suggest why President Kennedy has asked Gen. Maxwell Taylor to reexamine the theory and practice of guerilla warfare. The reexamination is long overdue. No sensible man doubts that sending American forces into Cuba or Laos or some other peripheral country is, to put it mildly, intensely undesirable. But does this mean that all the peripheral countries are to be conquered by indirection, until there is nothing left but an enfeebled Western Europe and a beleaguered North America?

The eventual answer to that question would appear to be yes—so long as we accept what this reporter's brother, writing from Vietnam, recently called the double standard. Under the double standard the Communists are at liberty to arm, supply, and support by all means short of actual invasion any Communist guerilla movement on non-Communist territory. But any attempt by our side to support a resistance movement in Communist territory is an act of war, and must be ruled out.

Surely it is clear that we cannot possibly win the game under such rules, and indeed that we must lose the game in the end. Must we play under such rules?

The answer depends in part on the peculiar nature of guerilla warfare. This reporter had a brief experience in the French Maquis (where he carefully followed Mao Tse-tung's rule that "guerrillas should be as cautious as virgins") and has been fascinated with the subject of guerrilla warfare ever since. A good deal of thought and study suggests that three requirements must be met if a guerrilla movement is to be effective.

First, it must have popular support. In his brilliant treatise on guerrilla warfare (which President Kennedy recently read) Mao Tse-tung wrote: "Guerrillas are like fish, and the people are the water in which the fish swim. If the temperature of the water is right, the fish multiply and flourish."

The temperature of the water is in part controlled by the second and third requirements. The second requirement is that guerrillas must have support from without, if necessary overt and massive, as in the Soviet airlift to Laos. The third is that the guerrillas, and finally the great majority of the people, must be convinced that the guerrillas will win.

The available evidence clearly suggests that there are many places within the Communist empire where the temperature of the water could be right. And it is not true that guerrillas cannot operate against a totalitarian state—Hitler's secret police did not go in for slaps on the wrist, nor for that matter did Batista's. The really difficult requirements for an open society to meet are the second and third.

Where the press is free and the opposition vocal, it is a very tricky business to support a resistance movement in a foreign country. And it is above all difficult for a democratic government to provide a foreign resistance movement with that certainty of victory which finally determines the "temperature of the water."

For our side, the only substitute for the Communists' "doctrine of historical inevitability" is precisely the opposite of the course we chose in Cuba. It is a firm and believable pledge that the whole power of the United States will be used if necessary to prevent the destruction of an American-supported resistance movement.

As this suggests, we ought to recognize that this guerilla business is not a gimmick, or a cheap substitute for national power. If President Kennedy decides to change the rules of the game, a most violent reaction can be expected. For on this subject the nerves of the Communist leaders have always been raw. "We must dread these guerilla tendencies," Lenin shouted in 1919 when there were guerilla uprisings in the Ukraine. "We must dread them like fire or they will leap to our destruction." But while recognizing the dangers of changing the rules of the game, we ought also to recognize that, if the rules are not changed, we shall lose the game in the end.

Crisis in the Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the second of two articles written by Selig Greenberg of the Providence Journal-Bulletin dealing with hospital costs:

CRISIS IN THE HOSPITALS

(By Selig Greenberg)

(This is the second of two articles on hospital costs by Selig Greenberg, writer on medical problems for the Providence, R.I., Journal and Evening Bulletin. Mr. Greenberg has twice been honored by the Lasker Foundation for his distinguished writing on medicine. He won the Associated Press Managing Editors Association Award for his series of articles on the problems of the aged.—The Editors.)

Any searching appraisal of the problem of high hospital costs, which in the past decade have soared at more than four times the rate of the general cost of living, must take into consideration three salient factors.

First and foremost in the picture is the key role played by the medical profession in the functioning of hospitals and in the pyramiding of their costs. Closely related to this is the traditional autonomy, sometimes verging on anarchy, of the voluntary hospitals. Having grown at random rather than by design, these hospitals operate without any effective public controls and continue to expand in a hit-or-miss fashion that frequently makes for wasteful duplication of facilities and services. Further aggravating the situation is the prevailing pattern of health insurance with its built-in incentives toward overuse of hospitalization because of inadequate coverage of diagnostic and treatment procedures on a much more economical outpatient basis.

The combination of these three factors now all too often results in costs which are higher than they should be. There is no getting away from the fact that the kind of medical care made possible by the spectacular progress of medicine is inherently expensive. So it is all the more vital that vested interests should not be allowed to stand in the way of providing good care at the lowest practicable cost.

Organized medicine's party line has long been that the doctors themselves are in no way responsible for mounting hospital charges and that the steady upward spiral is due primarily to the growing intricacy of medical care and to the "hotel" aspect of hospitals, especially their rising labor costs. This is vigorously disputed in two recent study reports in New Jersey and New York. Both studies support the conclusion that the alarming inflation of hospital and medical costs is in significant measure the result of such uncontrolled practices by the doctors as diagnostic admissions to hospitals under the guise of therapy, the countenancing of unnecessarily protracted hospital stays, the indulgence of patients' demands for needles and expensive drugs and sometimes even the performance of unnecessary surgery.

A New Jersey State commission named to investigate the justification for the latest rate increase sought by Blue Cross has reported that an exhaustive analysis "leads one to the inescapable conclusion that medical influences, as they are exerted by doctors individually, in staff and through their professional bodies, are five times as great a factor in the increase in hospital costs as all the other influences the hospitals have to encounter in their services. If a way is to be found to check the rise in hospital costs, the most fruitful line of inquiry would appear to be in the field of medical costs. This seems to be an endeavor which is not within the power of the hospitals but rather must be left to the medical profession."

In New York, where there has been much griping about a succession of Blue Cross premium boosts, the report of a 2-year study by the Columbia University School of Public Health and Administrative Medicine has recommended coordinated hospital planning and far-reaching changes in the health insurance contract structure as essential steps for meeting the challenge of skyrocketing costs.

Among the measures advocated by the Columbia study group to combat unnecessary and overly long hospitalization are insurance coverage of ambulatory diagnostic services and nursing home care, the development of effective mechanisms for reviewing hospital admissions and checking on length of stay, and the expansion of hospital outpatient facilities in order to reduce the use of costly services designed for the acutely ill. The Columbia report, moreover, recognizes that the implementation of these and other economy moves depends on basic organizational reforms in the health insurance and hospital fields. It therefore proposes greater representation of consumer interests on Blue Cross governing boards and development of a State master plan for hospital expansion.

Under domination by hospital trustees and the medical profession, Blue Cross has become little more than a collection agency for the hospitals. It is doubtful whether it can be made to move vigorously toward greater cost consciousness and coverage of a broader range of services without a strong infusion of the consumer point of view. The same holds true of the hospitals, which are not only inhibited by the archaic piecework approach of the present organization of medical practice but often operate without

regard to overall community needs and duplicate expensive facilities and services in a race for prestige or because of competitive pressures by their medical staffs.

A step in the right direction urged in the Columbia report is the establishment of a central State agency, with a subsidiary chain of regional planning councils, to review and license all new hospital construction in order to assure a more orderly and efficient pattern of expansion.

The public builds the voluntary hospitals and supports them—by paying hospital bills and Blue Cross premiums, through taxes and through philanthropy. But it is the doctors who, in large measure, call the tune on how the hospitals are run and what their costs are.

Major components of the hospital cost picture are the frequency of hospitalization, the average length of stay, and the quantity used of so-called ancillary services—such as various diagnostic tests, drugs, and medical and surgical supplies. Doctors control all of these cost factors, which determine the level of Blue Cross premiums. It is the attending physician and no one else who decides if the patient should be sent to the hospital in the first place. It is he alone who determines how long the patient should stay. It is he who decides what the patient should get by way of nursing care, medication, laboratory work, diet, and other services. Physicians play the dominant role in determining the character of hospital facilities needed.

A crucial point to bear in mind is that the people who have the biggest say about hospital matters are for the most part not hospital employees at all. They are private businessmen who use publicly provided facilities for their own business. Medicine is probably the only profession whose practitioners are furnished with workshops at public expense. With the steadily growing complexity of medical science, no physician is now able to provide all of the elaborate and expensive diagnostic and treatment tools he needs for his patients. So the community has pooled its resources in hospitals to furnish the required equipment for the physicians. It is estimated that the average member of a hospital medical staff is being provided, free of charge, with a capital investment of about $70,000. He has the free use of an organization whose maintenance, on the average, costs about $7,500 per bed a year.

Legally, doctors are subject to the authority of the hospital's lay board of trustees, but in actual practice the board's control over them is often highly tenuous. The trustees appoint members of the medical staff after review of their professional qualifications and also name the chiefs of the various services. Within the broad policies laid down by the board, the physicians have their own mechanisms for self-government and self-discipline. The organized medical staff usually performs many functions which make for better medical service. In the better hospitals, the organized staff has contributed materially to raising the level of medical practice by enforcing higher standards. But in many hospitals, particularly the smaller ones, staff controls are weak.

The full impact of the doctor's dominant position in the hospital becomes clearer when it is viewed within the context of the setting in which he operates. Not only are institutional controls over the physician's hospital practice inadequate but the prevailing form of health insurance is wide open to abuse. The temptation to put the profit motive above efficiency is thus often irresistible in view of the doctor's status as a private entrepreneur in competition with his colleagues.

With the revolution in the science and economics of medicine and the mounting concentration of medical services within the hospital, there is an urgent need for a thorough reexamination of physician-hospital relationships. Expert opinion is that the teamwork of group practice within hospitals would greatly increase efficiency and cut overhead costs. There are equal economy possibilities in wider use of hospital outpatient facilities. But the medical profession resists both of these developments as an infringement upon its cherished prerogative to charge what the traffic will bear.

From the standpoint of economy, it would be logical to have a cooperative arrangement among hospitals in the same community for a sharing of functions, so that each institution would specialize in doing the things it can do most effectively and efficiently. The trouble, however, is that no leverage now exists to force decisions in the public interest rather than the interest of the individual hospital and its staff. Substantial savings could be achieved if the handling of complex cases requiring highly specialized skills and elaborate equipment were confined to one or two hospitals, instead of letting every hospital do almost everything. This is particularly true of such intricate procedures as eye, brain, or cardiac surgery. But logic runs into two big roadblocks—the separative interests of hospitals and restrictive hospital staff policies.

Hospital managements are sometimes more interested in the perpetuation and growth of their own institutions than in a balanced health care program. They often suffer from an "edifice complex," pushing for more and bigger buildings and for every new piece of equipment invented, or they are pushed in that direction by their medical staffs.

An even more serious obstacle to a better organization of hospital services is the prevailing staff system. Many doctors have an appointment on the staff of only one or, at the most, two hospitals, and some physicians have no hospital privileges at all. If a doctor were to send a patient to a hospital where he is not on the staff, he would have to turn him over for treatment to another physician who is on the staff there. And in doing so, he would stand a good chance of losing the patient altogether. The result is that the doctor is eager to send his patients to the place where he is on the staff, regardless of whether or not there is sufficient demand at that hospital for the kind of procedures involved to enable efficient use of the necessary equipment and personnel.

The ideal solution would be some system of reciprocal staff privileges to allow doctors to treat their patients in any hospital. But this is easier said than done. There are barriers of professional competition and the strong feeling that anything smacking of an open staff, under which all doctors are granted hospital privileges, would have a disastrous effect on the quality of care.

Theoretically, hospital staff appointments are made purely on the basis of professional qualifications. In practice, however, pecuniary motivations, professional jealousies, and personal prejudices frequently figure in the picture. Staff appointments are sometimes controlled by cliques of established specialties determined to preserve their monopoly and to keep out potential competitors. At other times physicians have been kept off hospital staffs not because of any doubt regarding their professional competence but because they were affiliated with group practice insurance programs or because they were otherwise unorthodox in their views on medical economics. Lack of medical society membership is in itself an automatic bar to hospital privileges.

For a variety of reasons, a considerable number of doctors, mostly general practitioners, are excluded from hospital staffs and thereby relegated to a sort of second-class practice. Since it is extremely difficult these days for a physician to practice up-to-date medicine without the team approach and professional stimulation provided by a hospital affiliation, the question inevitably arises as to why doctors who are not good enough for staff appointments should be allowed to practice at all.

"To keep medical costs within reason," Dr. Basil MacLean, former president of the Blue Cross Association, has said, "we must keep the patient vertical whenever possible. Once we put him between sheets, the bill begins to get out of hand."

Unfortunately, this is precisely what not uncommonly happens under the health insurance programs now generally in effect. Because they are reimbursed only for bed care and not for less expensive ambulatory services, Blue Cross subscribers sometimes resort to needless hospitalization in order to qualify for insurance benefits. Such abuse requires collusion by physicians, since no patient can be admitted to a hospital without a doctor's approval. There is reason to believe that doctors sometimes yield to the whim of patients who want a rest in a hospital at the expense of Blue Cross or hospitalize people because they feel they will be more certain to collect their own bills if insurance covers part of the costs.

"What often runs up cost," one authority has said, "are hospital admissions for procedures that can be just as effectively and much more economically done on an outpatient basis, stays which could be shortened if the preliminary workup were done before and not after the patient is put to bed, excessive use of laboratory tests and X-ray examinations, and lack of sufficient controls to make sure that costly drugs are discontinued promptly when the need for them is over.

Some doctors hospitalize patients for minor surgery or medical care that could be easily rendered in the office. When it comes to laboratory and X-ray studies paid for wholly or in part by insurance, some practicing physicians and many interns and residents shoot the works in the hope that one or two of the tests will make the diagnosis.

While there is considerable disagreement about the extent of improper use of hospitalization, several studies have come up with the conclusion that about 20 percent of hospital patients need not be there at all and could be cared for adequately in outpatient clinics or in nursing and convalescent homes. A large-scale survey made some time ago by the Michigan State Medical Society showed that nearly 1 out of every 5 days spent in hospitals by Blue Cross subscribers was "unnecessary to the recovery, safety, or reasonable comfort of the patient." A study of patients staying 30 days or longer in four Boston hospitals disclosed that 42 percent of these patients, most of them elderly people, did not require continuing active treatment.

Significant is the experience of the Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York (HIP), one of the Nation's largest group practice prepayment programs. HIP covers its members for virtually the whole gamut of medical services, except hospitalization, for which they must take out Blue Cross insurance. A highly interesting feature of this arrangement is that HIP subscribers go to the hospital about one-fifth less often than other Blue Cross members in New York. The reasons for this are fairly clear. HIP patients receive preventive services which sometimes curb incipient disease before it becomes serious. They have the diagnostic work done without extra charge in the plan's own medical centers before they are admitted to hospitals. They are insured for unlimited nursing service in the home and, therefore, are able to go home earlier. And since HIP doctors are paid a fixed annual fee for each subscriber, there is no possible incentive for unnecessary surgery.

Even more striking is a comparison of the hospitalization experiences of California

members of the United Steelworkers of America who are covered by Blue Cross and of members of the same union who are insured by the Kaiser Foundation comprehensive health plan in that State. The union recently reported that its members in California had 1,032 days of hospital care a year for every 1,000 subscribers under Blue Cross as against only 570 per 1,000 under the Kaiser program. The reasons appear to be the same as those figuring in the lower HIP hospitalization rate.

A difference of even a decimal point in the frequency of hospital admissions and in average length of hospital stay can play hob with Blue Cross finances. In my own small State of Rhode Island, an increase of about one-fourth of a day in the average length of hospital stay boosted Blue Cross payments in 1959 by more than $450,000. The Philadelphia Blue Cross estimates that it would save $3 million a year if the average stay of its hospitalized subscribers could be cut by half a day.

Yet to be fully explored is still another area of potential savings by tailoring hospital facilities to the degree of the patient's illness. Valuable lessons are sure to be learned from experiments along this line now underway in a number of hospitals throughout the country. Among the new approaches under study are special self-care units for convalescing patients or for those who are admitted chiefly for diagnostic tests and who can manage without many of the services needed by the acutely ill.

Far too many elderly chronic patients who primarily need custodial rather than professional care are now occupying expensive general hospital beds. Much of this waste could be eliminated with the provision of adequate nursing home facilities.

People are increasingly asking questions about hospital charges and doctors' fees. As costs keep on climbing, they are no longer satisfied with the past assurance that hospitals are nonprofit institutions devoted to the public interest and that nothing can be done to reverse the upward cost trend. They want concrete evidence of concerted efforts to provide up-to-date services at the lowest possible price. They also are demanding more comprehensive insurance coverage for better protection against the financial hazards of illness.

Competent opinion is that the private practice of medicine and the present system of voluntary hospitals are doomed unless health insurance can be made a tool for keeping costs within reasonable bounds instead of the stimulant for inflation it now often is, unless wasteful hospital practices are corrected, and unless insurance can be provided at a price most people can afford. All of this is admittedly a pretty tall order. But the alternative, many authorities are convinced, is a complete Government takeover. This has already happened in most civilized countries in the world. It can happen here, too.

Mr. Robert Riggs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. WATTS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to bring to the attention of the House the distinguished career of one of the Nation's outstanding representatives of the fourth estate.

I speak of the Washington correspondent for the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, the president of Washington's famed and exclusive Gridiron Club, and the well known political analyst, Mr. Robert Riggs.

A native of Joplin, Mo., Mr. Riggs is a graduate of the journalism school of the State university there. He began his newspaper career in Madison, Wis., with the Associated Press in 1927, and after some experience on the Milwaukee Journal he joined the staff of the Courier-Journal in 1929 as assistant State editor. Through hard work, diligence, and a natural talent which soon manifested itself, he eventually became assistant managing editor, a position he held until 1942 when he came to the Courier-Journal's Washington bureau as correspondent.

Recently elected to his first term as president of the Gridiron Club, Bob Riggs is known through Washington; throughout Kentucky, where he has long been known as a brilliant journalist; and throughout the Nation, where the Courier Journal has for many years been regarded as one of the finest exemples of a working newspaper.

The respect and admiration of his colleagues in the press, a notably competitive industry in which praise is hard come by, is indicative of the acute perception and keen insight into every aspect of the newspaper business which characterizes Bob Riggs. That same insight and perception, when applied to legislative affairs with a talent for separating the wheat from the chaff and simplifying the most complicated legislation into readable and understandable prose, has made Bob Riggs an invaluable asset to every member of the Kentucky delegation. From his first job with the AP in Wisconsin, Bob's talent for seeing into the working mind of an official personality—as evidenced in the chapter he contributed on LYNDON JOHNSON to Eric Sevareid's "Candidates of 1960"—has been praised by his colleagues and his readers.

It is my pleasure to point out Bob Riggs' achievements to this distinguished body, and my privilege to know him. It is my earnest hope that he will continue in a career which has brought pride and glory to his lovely family and his many admiring friends and has been an invaluable asset to the press of America in general and that of Kentucky in particular.

National Radio Month

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, radio has come to have such a significant and pervasive role in our lives today that we tend to take it for granted.

We are likely to forget that it has grown to its present proportions in a few short decades.

A few remember the old crystal sets they made with copper wire, peanut butter cartons, and a crystal.

Today the radio is a necessity to the farmer and the rural resident. More than 99 percent of all farm homes have a radio and 79 percent have two or more in use.

There is an amusing story told about radio that might give point to the importance of this medium.

It concerns an old Indian brave who achieved wide local fame in his community with his excellent weather predictions. He was consulted by everyone. But one day he was cross and irritable and upset because he could not answer when asked what the weather would be. When he was asked why, he replied, truthfully enough, that a tube in his radio set had gone out.

Radio has, indeed, become the workhorse of agricultural communications bringing news and information as soon as it is available.

Millions of us share, too, the great religious music broadcast throughout the years, and at Easter and at Christmastime, as well as the inspiring messages which are delivered by our leading clergymen of many faiths.

Radio and its sister medium, television, bring music and other programs of the highest cultural level to the family fireside.

We must welcome with deep appreciation the educational radio and television fare and work to have more of such programs broadcast on what is undoubtedly one of the greatest educational mediums in the world today.

No longer is the farmer, his wife, and his children the forgotten people of our era, removed by the barriers of time and distance, from the cultural riches of our civilization.

They share with city folk at the same time and with the same means the rewarding things of life.

Radio thus united us as a people, and constantly knits up the seamless garment of our common aims and aspirations.

And now as we face up to the realities of the space age it will be radio and telecommunications that we will depend on to keep us well-informed hour by hour.

Address by Hon. Frederick C. Belen, Assistant Postmaster General, Bureau of Operations, Marking 100th Anniversary of John Wanamaker, Philadelphia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, in my judgment it was most appropriate that an outstanding representative of the Federal Government attended and took part in the ceremonies in honor of the 100th anniversary of John Wanamaker, Philadelphia, during the Poor

Richard Club dinner in Philadelphia on April 7 of this year.

Assistant Postmaster General Frederick C. Belen, who directs the giant Postal Bureau of Operations, presented one of the finest, most informative, and most enjoyable addresses it has been my pleasure to hear. I share with other Members considerable pride in Mr. Belen's very well received remarks, since he is one of our very own—having served as chief counsel and staff director of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee from the time the committee was created until he accepted his present sub-Cabinet post earlier this year.

I believe that Mr. Belen's remarks, which are included at this point in the RECORD, will be of great interest to the Members:

SPEECH BY FREDERICK C. BELEN, ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL, BUREAU OF OPERATIONS, 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRST JOHN WANAMAKER STORE BEFORE THE POOR RICHARD CLUB, PHILADELPHIA, PA., APRIL 7, 1961

I have the opportunity tonight not only to honor a famous Postmaster General, but to bring you a message concerning the postal service in its past, its present, and its future.

Any recollection of the past of the postal service would be meaningless without considering the Philadelphia story that was contributed to the postal service by John Wanamaker in his days as Postmaster General of the United States.

Any consideration of the present and future of the postal service would be meaningless without the contributions of your distinguished Congresswoman, KATHRYN GRANAHAN, who is chairman of the Postal Operations Subcommittee of the House of Representatives.

Any consideration of the future of the postal service would be hollow without a realistic look at the fiscal responsibility necessitated by our present postal problems.

As a Democrat, I was warned by your fine Irish wit John Finnegan that the Poor Richard Club was not named for those who lost their shirts betting on Richard in the last election. I can attribute this sort of joke to Finnegan since he is now in Florida.

But it is a privilege to be here tonight with a group of people, many of whom are associated with our biggest customers, our large mailers, and provide the stimulating atmosphere of differing political views.

In many ways we speak the same language, the language of communications in its broadest sense. I know, as do you, that the basis of the American system of communications, so efficiently handled in its many free enterprise aspects, must always be our American Postal Service.

I have been very much impressed with the way you Philadelphians here have demonstrated your affection for the man who founded one of your greatest institutions.

As have each of you, I have thought back to the days of John Wanamaker in considering appropriate remarks to do him honor this evening. Every day in the office of the Postmaster General the influence of your community on our Postal Service is brought home forcibly to me.

In addition to the picture of President Kennedy, the Postmaster General has five famed portraits in his Washington office. One, of course, is the first Postmaster General, Philadelphia's Ben Franklin. A second shows William C. Barry, Postmaster General under Andrew Jackson and first head of the Postal Service to be a member of the Cabinet. A third is of Adlai Stevenson, first Assistant Postmaster General under President Cleveland. A fourth depicts perhaps our most famous Democratic Postmaster General, Jim Farley.

Mr. Day's fifth portrait bears a brass plate identifying Ben Harrison's Postmaster General, John Wanamaker.

Invariably, in that atmosphere, I cannot help but wonder what John Wanamaker would say to an audience such as this tonight. With his respect for the place of the postal service in American business and industry, I think John Wanamaker would say something like this: "A $900 million deficit. For heaven's sake what are you doing about that?" And I believe he would add, "If I had run my store that way, you wouldn't be listening to any speeches on its 100th anniversary."

Let's look at the postal service today as John Wanamaker might. We speak of a gap between our revenues and our expenditures which is approaching $900 million annually on a budget just short of $4½ billion.

Since we deal in the movement of letters, you might call it our missive gap.

No merchant, no businessman, no Postmaster General, past or present, would look on this situation as anything short of a serious financial problem.

The administration of President Kennedy looks at it exactly that way. The President believes, as do we, that we must face up to hard facts and do it now. The President has made the decision that his administration will generally adopt a budget presented last January by his predecessor. This decision means that we are preparing for the President a request for postal rate increases in the amount of $831 million. This is some $12 million short of the recommended increases which we inherited from the previous administration.

We also believe that the past few years have adequately demonstrated that we can't solve the postal deficit by slogans or fanfare.

Advertisers, large and small, comprise our biggest group of customers. We are the largest outlet for advertising in America today. More than half of all advertising moves to prospective customers through the mails maintaining a $12 billion industry. We recognize that our advertising develops a high standard of living which hinges, in large part, upon that industry and our service to it.

Products valued at $29 billion annually come to the attention of their customers by direct mail advertising. In cities and on rural routes, catalogs stimulate a continuing flow of business for our largest retail establishments. A large part of all American business develops through the advertising and news content of newspapers and magazines.

You can see, when we speak of business mail, we really talk about the basic lines of communications which tie together our entire economy. As you, our biggest customers, utilize us as your biggest outlet, you share with us the responsibility for answering questions that John Wanamaker would pose and which this administration, with equal vigor, must present to the more than 60 million taxpayers who bear the burden of the postal deficit.

I said earlier that we prefer the term "gap" between revenues and expenditures. We have chosen this term deliberately. It implies the possibility of solution from two directions. In our case, the raising of revenues can and will be paralleled by the reduction of costs.

We must look to our customers, particularly our biggest customers, to help us bridge this gap from both those directions. I expect you to ask: "Will these continuing rounds of proposed postal increases ever cease?" My answer to you is that much depends on how closely you can and will work with us in closing the gap from the side of cost reduction.

Let me give you some substantial examples: We are powerless to reduce the peak load period between 5 and 8 p.m. every day. But you can do something about it. We are powerless to predict the variety of sizes and shapes and destinations of mail as we open each mail bag. But you can do something about it. We are powerless to anticipate the times or the dates of large mailings of advertising matter. But you know this well in advance. We must maintain mechanical equipment to handle peak loads though it is out of use many hours of the day. But you could not permit this kind of inefficiency in your own offices.

I am saying, in effect, that much of the answer to cutting costs lies in your own mailroom and in our group cooperation with you in anticipating peak loads, in spreading throughout the day the mailing of your business letters, in anticipating with careful judgment your largest mailing and in programing your mail to make the most efficient use of our facilities to our mutual benefit.

Let me give you one example. Downtown Manhattan normally posted 300,000 pieces of mail into the post office at 2:30 p.m. and dumped 6 million at 5:30. Now, thanks to a cooperative program between the post office and the largest New York office buildings, the 2:30 mail pickup handles 3 million pieces and the cost of handling the mails in New York has dropped $1 million a year.

Our experts in mail movement and your mail rooms have the potential, together, of producing the most spectacular cost reduction in the history of the postal service.

This I submit, must be the basis for any long-range cessation of spiraling mail costs.

There is another big area where the cooperation of business and the Post Office Department can put the breaks on rising costs.

Recently, the Postmaster General invited American industrial, engineering, and research talent to take up the challenge of developing practical equipment to speed mail movement. It is our generally held belief that we need mail processing equipment which would be as much at home in the mail rooms of our large customers as on the work floors of our post offices. This would be a second link in the cooperative cost reductions that will close the gap between income and outgo in the postal service.

Both these challenges I would like to leave with you tonight along with an appreciation of the hard realities which necessitate a revenue increase now.

The President has not chosen the easy road of platitude and preachments but rather the realistic road of fiscal responsibility and sound forceful leadership in Government. This applies to the postal deficit as it does to the defense budget, the crisis in Laos and each other aspect of American life today.

The American people have responded, and responded gratefully to such leadership.

I am confident that the business community and our customers will respond with equal realism, understanding and appreciation to leadership toward a sound fiscal policy in the postal service represented by recommendations which are now being prepared for a postal rate increase.

I am fully aware that my message to you bears little of the humor and gaiety which this occasion might call for. It has instead comprised the hard realities of the immediate future as reflected in the need for more postal revenue. I have brought this message because I believe that John Wanamaker would have done the same.

I will ask you as Philadelphians and rightful admirers of Postmaster General Wanamaker to put yourselves in my position for the foreseeable future when I will be making daily visits to the office of Postmaster General Day. Repeatedly, I will be reminded of this message which I believe John Wanamaker would have wanted presented to you. And now having delivered that message, I

feel confident that the portrait of John Wanamaker will expect me to mentally report "General, I delivered your message to Philadelphia."

The Economic Outlook on the New Frontier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Elliott V. Bell, editor and publisher of Business Week magazine and chairman of the executive committee of McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., gave a most thought-provoking address on April 19, 1961, before the 18th annual meeting of the Wine and Spirits Wholesalers of America, Inc., at the Princess Kaiulani Meeting House in Honolulu, Hawaii. Mr. Bell was educated at Columbia University and holds several honorary degrees. He is director of eight corporations and a trustee of eight other organizations including the Brookings Institution and the Committee for Economic Development. He is a member of the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy.

I would like to share this thought-provoking address of Mr. Bell with my colleagues:

THE ECONOMIC OUTLOOK ON THE NEW FRONTIER

(By Elliott V. Bell)

My purpose today is to examine with you the current state of business, the Kennedy administration as revealed in its first 3 months in office, and some of the major economic problems that will confront our Nation in the years immediately ahead.

We need not spend too much time on the current recession. It has been in progress for about a year. It has been exceedingly mild. It has followed, to a remarkable degree, the precise pattern that most experts foresaw from the start. It is now clear that we are already at, or very close to, the bottom of the downturn.

Signs of recovery are multiplying. Business has begun to reduce the rate at which inventories are being liquidated. Spending on new plant and equipment, which had been cut back $2½ billion in the past 12 months, is scheduled for at least a moderate improvement later this year.

Expenditures by Federal, State, and local governments are rising. All Government spending on goods and services, incidentally, this year will exceed $100 billion, which is equal to one-fifth of the value of all we produce. Construction is feeling the lift of spring. Good weather, after a rough winter, is bringing cheer to the hearts of auto dealers and producers of durable goods. The stock market, fulfilling its classic role of harbinger of things to come, has been forecasting, ever since the election, either a dramatic business recovery or a great inflation or both.

There are, of course, still many soft spots, but the plus signs exceed the minuses.

I think we can safely say the turn has come; recovery is underway. The big question, of course, is how vigorous and sustained a recovery it will be. On this point, there is considerable difference of opinion.

At the first meeting, last month, of the President's Labor-Management Committee, President Kennedy told us he would not be surprised to see a recovery of business this summer but a continuation of 6 or 7 percent unemployment in the fall.

On the other hand, some business and university economists—probably a minority at this point—think the recovery will be sharp, vigorous and sustained.

My own view is the recession will have clearly passed its turning point within the next month. By June, the forces of recovery will be obvious to all; and by late autumn the revival will be vigorous with gross national product running at a rate of $520 billion or better, compared with a scant $500 billion in the first quarter. On the record 1962 will almost certainly be the most prosperous year in our history thus far. For the moment let's leave it there, while we have a happy thought to hold.

But before we throw our hats in the air, it should be noted that the recession of 1960–61, even when it has ended, will leave behind a haunting legacy of doubt and worry.

The thing that has been really disturbing about this recession is that it followed so soon after the 1957-58 decline. We are apt to think of the business cycle as comprising a complete wave—from a peak of prosperity to a pit of recession and back to a new and even higher peak of prosperity. Indeed, our earlier postwar business cycles did have this neat, orderly and rather reassuring appearance. Not so the recessions of 1957–58 and 1960–61. These two were not only closely bunched together but were actually interdependent.

The fact is we never really achieved full recovery from the recession of 1958. Even in the most prosperous period of 1959 unemployment remained substantial. It is possible that we should think of the entire period extending from the middle of 1957 to the present as a period of quasi-depression analogous to, though happily much less severe than, the great depression of the 1930's when we had several up and down oscillations of the business curve but could not escape from the curse of massive unemployment.

The haunting question is, do these recent years reflect merely the ending of the postwar era with its pent-up demands, inflated credit and inadequate productive capacity; or, are we witnessing a return of the dilemma of the prewar years when chronic unemployment persisted right up to the onset of war?

I want to return to this subject after a bit but first I should like you to look with me briefly at life on the New Frontier under the leadership of our young President from Harvard.

Mr. Kennedy has brought to Washington a surprisingly mixed, but on the whole, admirable team. He has put together a sort of coalition cabinet, with the sensitive posts of Treasury and Defense going to Republicans. For Secretary of State, he picked Dean Rusk, a Rhodes scholar, quiet, scholarly, greatly respected by those who know him. Then he has bracketed the Secretary by two eminent Democratic politicians—Adlai Stevenson and Chester Bowles—each of whom was thought to have coveted the top job. Is this genius or expediency? For Secretary of Labor he picked the smartest labor lawyer in the country, Arthur Goldberg, whose pronouncements and actions since taking office have left some labor leaders a trifle baffled and caused others to call him the "Mr. Republican" of this administration.

Moving with the drive and energy of youth—in obvious contrast to the measured, energy-saving pace of his predecessor—Mr. Kennedy has made a strongly favorable impression on most people. In the course of a brief, highly unscientific taxicab poll I took in Washington recently, I learned that everyone feels much better. They feel like a lot of things that need to be done are going to get done.

That may not be very precise but it is important. Mr. Kennedy has had a salutary effect on public sentiment.

The remarkable thing is that thus far there is very little of a tangible character to support the widespread impression of bold, new action.

In fact, young President Kennedy has met the recession of 1961 almost precisely the way old President Eisenhower met the recession of 1958. There have been no dramatic or drastic measures. On both occasions the White House has turned a deaf ear to recommendations for a temporary tax cut. On both occasions the response was identical. Like Eisenhower, Kennedy said: "We'll wait until April to see whether things improve."

On both occasions April brought the wellnigh inevitable improvement and a tax cut whether or not it would have been a good idea earlier had clearly become outdated by April. Meantime, the prospects are that spending will increase and deficits will rise, although there is as yet, no sign that Mr. Kennedy will achieve in fiscal 1962 a deficit as large as the nearly $13 billion one Mr. Eisenhower piled up in fiscal 1959.

Actually, Mr. Kennedy has turned out thus far to be very much of a conservative. He is obviously aware that the label of big spending and the threat of inflation are political liabilities especially dangerous to Democrats. So he has talked boldly but moved cautiously.

Here's how a Washington wit summed up the administration's performance thus far. He said it reminded him of that dazzling basketball team—the Harlem Globetrotters. The New Frontier team has been passing the ball forward, behind, sidewise and underneath—a brilliant display—but thus far nobody has scored a basket.

The cautious course the President has steered reflects, no doubt, his own normal inclination. It reflects also his appreciation of the fiscal conservatism of Congress, and a recognition that the narrow margin of his election gave him no sweeping or unchallengeable mandate.

Not all of his advisers have been quite happy with Mr. Kennedy's moves to stimulate recovery. One of the most distinguished of them, Prof. Paul Samuelson of MIT, has called the President's recovery program a "placebo program,"—a pill that makes the patient think he is being treated although in fact the pill has nothing but a little sugar in it.

For the coming fiscal year, Mr. Kennedy has budgeted for only about $3 billion more than Mr. Eisenhower had planned. He is budgeting a deficit of only $2¾ billion.

Some of the President's brilliant young braintrusters are concerned whether deficit spending of such modest proportions will give the economy the forward lift they think it needs.

Certainly thus far, and prospectively for 1962, the President's program for stimulating recovery and growth is more modest and conservative than most people realize—a good deal more conservative than the stock market's ebullience would suggest.

Now, it may well be that the President, proceeding by political intuition, may turn out to have been a better—or at least a luckier—economist than his advisers. If this recovery should indeed prove vigorous, if it should carry the economy back to reasonable full employment faster than is now anticipated then, of course, it will be all for the best not to have overstimulated the economy by rapid and massive increases in Government spending on the one hand, or sizable tax reductions on the other. Either course would tend to revise the inflationary pressures that are now suspended, and a renewal of inflation, or even fear of inflation,

would aggravate our dangerous balance of payments position.

This brings me in one easy motion to the third phase of my talk—the interlocking complex of major economic problems which confront our Nation and for which thus far we have found no workable solution.

I have already mentioned one of these problems—the failure of our economy, even at the peak of the last recovery period, to provide enough jobs to employ our full labor force.

You know there has been a fascinating paradox about the latest recession. Every month for the past year or more the total of employed persons has reached a record high for that month. Thus employment in January was the highest for any January in our history. The same was true of February and March, and will, I have no doubt be true for April, May, and June, and so on.

Yet, in each of these months of record high employment, unemployment also rose. workers, largest in number for almost 20 years. Moreover, many of these unemployed had been out of work for a long time and had exhausted their unemployment benefits.

Now, of course, some of this unemployment has been due to cyclical factors—the circumstance that we have been in a recession. But a good part appears to be due to what economists call structural factors.

Structural unemployment is just another name for what we used to call technological unemployment except that it has a broader meaning. It means not merely the unemployment that results when, for example, a textile plant is fitted out with labor-saving machinery and handworkers are displaced by automation. It also means what happens when the old textile plant in New England is abandoned and the new automated plant is erected in North Carolina. It means what happens when homes and factories switch from coal to oil. Coal miners in West Virginia or Pennsylvania lose their jobs. Even if there are unfilled jobs elsewhere, the miners may not be able or willing to move away and learn new skills.

Several easy answers have been suggested for this problem. Certain labor leaders say: Just cut the working week from 40 hours to 30 hours—this will create more jobs overnight. Certain management men have an equally easy answer. Business, they say, has been forced to automate because of high labor costs. Just let labor agree to take a pay cut and there will be more jobs. Well you don't have to be a politician to figure that these solutions are not as simple as they sound.

This particular problem of structural unemployment is inextricably interlocked with others. There is, for example, the broad question of economic growth. There is also the question of whether American goods can remain competitive in the world market. Can we hold our own against the rebuilt, modern industry of Western Europe and Japan with their relatively cheap labor?

This brings us again to the tough nut of our balance of payments. For some years now the total payments that we make abroad—for goods and services, for travel, for investment, for military operation, and for foreign aid—have exceeded the payments foreigners make to us. In the years 1958, 1959, and 1960, we paid out $11 billion more than we took in. This situation became so alarming last year that people began to talk about a possible devaluation of the dollar and gold flowed out of the country in large amounts.

President Kennedy, it should be said, has shown himself acutely aware of the balance-of-payments problem. He gets high marks for making it perfectly clear both during the campaign and after taking office that he means to defend the integrity of the dollar at its present exchange rate with all the resources at his command.

Those resources are still very considerable. Including our gold stock and our rights to draw credit from the International Monetary Fund, they amount to some $22 billion.

The President's strong statements had an immediate effect in stopping the run on the dollar that had started last fall. Losses of gold diminished, and last month we began to regain a little gold.

We have a breathing spell—but we have as yet not solved the problem. We have merely gained a little time to try to find a way out of this and related problems—including technological change, structural unemployment, economic growth, high production costs, and inflation.

It is for this reason that the President has established the Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy on which I am privileged to serve.

It is, of course, too early to say whether the 21 members of this Committee will be able to make any important or practical contributions to the solution of this complex web of problems to which the President has asked us to address ourselves.

All of us will bring with us a certain freight of ideas, some of which, I am sure, we will have to throw into the sea before the long voyage is over. Accordingly, I should like the views I am about to give you to be regarded as preliminary and tentative, rather than hard and fast.

The President has set as his target a reduction in unemployment to not more than 4 percent of the labor force. This seems to me reasonable. It is a goal that should not put undue strain on the labor market, or tend to generate new inflationary wage-price spirals. It is also a rate that should permit some flexibility in our system and leave incentive for productive effort on the job. Reasonable as this goal is, we have not achieved it except momentarily since 1953.

The question of how much our unemployment is due to structural factors versus cyclical factors is fundamental to the problem of policy formulation and in no sense a merely academic question. The lag in job formation is, I believe, a consequence of both slow overall growth and rapid technological change. To deal with it we shall need several kinds of weapons in our arsenal.

I would be disposed to put primary emphasis on fiscal and monetary policies to insure that we have sufficient demand to keep our existing resources employed at relatively high rates. Because the balance of payments problem hampers the use of monetary policy on which we formerly relied as our main instrument, this means that more reliance must be put on fiscal policy in insuring that the economy operates at high and stable levels of employment—a condition that is essential to regaining a more rapid rate of growth.

"Fiscal policy" is a term that is often used and seldom defined. By it I mean all of the taxing, spending and borrowing operations that the Government conducts—all of the ways in which the Federal Establishment puts money into the national economy or takes money out of it.

I am impressed by the arguments advanced by a number of economists to show that the fiscal policy we have been following has created a deflationary gap that represents a constant drag on the economy. What this means in plain English is that our tax system is taking such a heavy bite out of total demand that economic recovery loses its drive before a condition of full employment can be achieved. It is estimated that if the country should achieve full production and employment, the tax system would generate a surplus of something like $12 billion over present levels of expenditures. But the tax system is so oppressive that it keeps us from achieving full production. It nips off recovery short of the peak, as happened in 1960, and slows down the Nation's rate of growth.

In theory, there are two ways that this deflationary gap could be closed. One would be to cut taxes. The other would be to increase spending.

Some spending increases obviously are on the way. And this fact seems to have restrained President Kennedy from asking for any reduction in taxes at this time. I am inclined to agree that it is too late now for a temporary tax cut to aid recovery; but I hope this will not mean indefinite postponement of long-range tax legislation.

To achieve longrun growth and maximum utilization of our economic resources, I believe it is essential to undertake a thoroughgoing reform of our tax system, coupled with some reduction in the level of tax rates. And I believe that this task should be commenced at once, without waiting for the economy to go through another frustrating cycle of partial recovery, aborted boom, and recession.

It seems clear to me that it would be both unnecessary and unwise to try to close the deflationary gap by thrusting bigger and bigger spending programs at Congress. Let us spend what we must. But let us not put ourselves in the ridiculous position of spending simply to get back into circulation money that an unduly severe tax system has taken away from consumers and investors.

The problem of tax reform is not a new one. But it is an increasingly urgent one. It was a matter of much disappointment to me as a Republican that during 8 years in office, my party did not even attempt such an overhaul. Now with the Democrats in control of both the executive and legislative branches, the task ought not to be shirked.

I realize that it is already too late in the current session to expect the Congress to produce a major reform bill (although I regret that this job was not given a high priority at the start of the new administration). Possibly we will have full recovery without action on the tax front. Frankly, I doubt it. I am concerned that without a tax cut and tax reform, we may see a repetition of the 1959–60 performance of the economy. And I believe that we can avoid it if the President and Congress will turn their most serious attention to this major national economic task. I believe it should have an absolutely top priority in the next session of Congress.

Aside from fiscal and monetary measures, there are a number of other things that we can do to promote economic growth and stability.

Consideration should be given, I think, to programs for increasing the mobility of the economy—that would lead available workers to the jobs that are opening up and out of the job or industries or regions that are contracting.

The prime weapon in any such program must, of course, be education. Better education in our elementary and high schools, our colleges and universities, can spread the knowledge and skills that increase employment opportunities. Through education also, the young people entering the labor market each year can be encouraged to seek employment in the service industries and elsewhere where demand is increasing instead of looking for work in a declining sector. Existing programs of on-the-job training in industry, apprentice training to give workers new skills, and graduate study programs both for training top new professionals and specialists, and for upgrading people who completed their academic work years ago are needed.

One thing is certain, we must not allow ourselves to get into the way of thinking

of technological change as a hazard, or even as merely a problem to be coped with. On the contrary, paradoxical as it may seem, we need more rather than less of this accelerated scientific and technological progress in order to produce the faster economic growth we must have.

The discovery of new ideas, and the diffusion of those ideas throughout our system is the most important source of growth we have. In this area lies the strength of our system. It is on our scientific, intellectual and technological prowess and progress that the survival of our free political economy now depends.

I have been talking about our major problems largely from a domestic view, but implicit in all we say or do today is the struggle in which we are so deeply engaged between communism and the free world.

The capacity of any country to safeguard its own destiny and to influence nations and events is dependent upon that country's strength and vigor. Only a country with a vigorous, growing political economy can be independent and give leadership to other countries.

In the affairs of nations as of men there comes a time of supreme testing where failure can only lead on to ultimate decline and fall. We are facing such a test today and the outcome is by no means certain. Can free men working together in a free system successfully meet the challenge of a system just as tough, resourceful and scientifically skilled as our own, that is closely planned, disciplined and directed with the precise purpose of surpassing us?

If the confident "yes" we give to that question is to be achieved, we shall have to improve our ways of working together and still competing with each other, of managing our affairs for the national good without sacrificing the individual's rights. We shall need to bring to these years of troubled peace the same dedication and resolve we achieved in war. For the truth is, of course, we are still at war—a war to assure the survival of all that makes life for us worthwhile.

Spreading the Word About America's Dairyland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Walt Brovald, who edits and publishes the Cadott Sentinel at Cadott, Wis., has long advocated spreading the word about Wisconsin's top dairy products by erecting nonprofit dairy bars at the major points of entry into the State. In an editorial in his paper, Mr. Brovald tells of the encouragement he has received for his proposal from Wisconsin's Governor, Gaylord Nelson. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include this editorial in the RECORD:

GOOD NEWS

We recently wrote to Governor Nelson, advancing the cause of our long-standing proposal that we erect nonprofit dairy bars at major points of entry to our State, where tourists could be treated to glasses of ice-cold milk and chesse samples as a fitting introduction, and welcome, to America's Dairyland

We suggested to the Governor that incorporation of such dairy bars with his own proposal for tourist information centers would seem a natural thing.

His reply to our letter cheered us, and we were happy to note that he himself listed the opportunities for dairy promotion among others in connection with his information centers when he released details of his proposal recently.

He also forwarded our letter to the conservation department, which will operate the information centers under terms of the Governor's generally well-received proposal, and last week we got further encouragement in a letter from a WCD official.

If the information centers become a reality, and we make them dairy product promotion centers as well, we will surely help to spread the name and fame of "America's Dairyland" across the land.

And any means we can use to increase the liking for and consumption of our wonderful State dairy products cannot help but mean additional benefits for our dairying industry, which remains our No. 1 business.

Shallow Good Will

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we will soon be debating the annual foreign good will appropriation, better known as foreign aid, by which we make a blundering gesture to purchase the good will of nations throughout the world. Chicago's American, in an editorial on April 22, 1961, entitled, "Shallow Good Will," points out some of the human problems involved in international good will:

SHALLOW GOOD WILL

The actual value of good will gestures by the United States toward Communist-leaning countries can be judged by the experience of the University of Michigan symphonic band in Egypt.

The band, on a good will mission for the State Department, was sending the customers with "The Stars and Stripes Forever" in Cairo a few days ago, but the music suddenly began to sound sour to Egyptian ears when the Cuban rebels landed and sailed into the Castro forces.

This, said the Egyptian Government, was a United States aggression against Cuba, so there was no official good will for the 94 Michigan students who had come to cultivate good will with music.

A concert at Cairo University was canceled, and so was one scheduled for Alexandria. The U.S. Embassy was notified that the Egyptian Government did not consider it safe for the young musicians to appear in concerts.

The students, having received only the friendliest treatment from people in Egypt, didn't believe anybody really was dangerously mad at them. They offered to risk it, but they were denied the chance.

Good will touring for the United States does seem to be a chancy enterprise. You must always have your steel helmet handy, in case your listeners read something in their papers that they don't like. We wonder if it's worth the trouble.

A Ready Answer to Opponents of Medical Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the propaganda parade is on. I suggest that a ready answer to the opponents of medical care for the aged will be found in the following article by Gilbert A. Harrison which appeared in the New Republic of April 17, 1961:

WARD-HEALERS OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

(By Gilbert A. Harrison)

The American Medical Association may succeed in frightening the Congress away from financing medical care for the aged through the social security system, but no amount of AMA propaganda can frighten away some elementary facts to which the President's program is addressed. For example, of 15.3 million individuals 65 and over who were not in institutions in 1959, 55 percent had an annual income of less than $1,000. Twenty-three percent $1,000 to $2,000, and 9 percent $2,000 to $3,000. Only 13 percent had incomes of $3,000 or more. And these figures include those still working. And in the case of married couples, some of the income which is attributed to the husband goes for support of his wife, who may be under 65. Of 6.2 million families where the head of the family was 65 years of age or more, half had an income of less than $2,830; one-fourth less than $1,620 a year. More startling; of 3.6 million aged persons who live alone or with persons other than relatives, half had incomes of less than $1,010; four-fifths less than $2,000.

How do they get by, even if they get through the year without a day's illness? The answer is that many barely do. The Bureau of Labor Statistics in a study of 20 large cities in the autumn of 1959 concluded that a retired couple in reasonably good health for their age, requiring no unusual medical or other services, and keeping house by themselves in a small rented unit could get along modestly but adequately on a budget ranging from the minimum of $2,390 in Houston, Tex., to $3,110 in Chicago. This, remember, is premised on no unusual demand for medical care. Even so, this absolute minimum in a great many cases is higher than the actual income of aged couples. The BLS also estimated that a person of 65 or over who lives alone could get by, modestly but adequately, with from $1,410 to $1,835 in the 20 cities studied. But the actual median income for single persons in this age bracket living in these cities was only $1,140 in 1959.

Couldn't they fall back on their savings? Some could. But a Federal Reserve Board survey of consumer finances in 1959 found that of some 8 million "spending units" (in families the head of which was 65 years or more) 29 percent had no liquid assets (i.e., bank accounts or savings bonds), 17 percent had $1 to $500 in reserve, 21 percent had $500 to $2,000. And of the aged whose income was under $3,000 a year (70 percent of the total), 47 percent had less than $200 in liquid assets; 44 percent had assets of $500 or more.

From such statistics it is apparent that the affluent society is not the society of a very great many old folks. And when we read the medical statistics, moreover, we are

reading about the aged who do enter hospitals, who see their physicians. We don't know how much suffering, how much neglect is endured privately, with little or no treatment.

We are sure, however, that the number of days spent in a general hospital annually is two to three times as large on an average for persons 65 and over as for younger persons. A national health survey study in 1957–58 found that of those discharged from general hospitals after a short stay, those of 65 or over spent 1,778 days in the hospital (per 1,000 persons) as compared with 764 days (per 1,000 persons) for those under 65. The average length of hospitalization for the aged was 14.7 days; for those under 65, 7.8 days.

But in addition to using general hospitals more frequently and for longer periods than younger persons, the aged make special demands on nursing homes and other institutions which keep patients for more than a week or a month. They likewise need more of the doctors' time. An aged person on an average has 6.8 doctor visits a year. The number for the rest of the population is 4.8. In those families with less than $2,000 a year income (as surveyed from July 1957 to June 1959), 48 percent of the aged members of the family had some chronic condition which limited their activity; the average number of days spent in bed was 16.5 a year. And in families whose income was $7,000 or more, 37 percent of the aged had some chronic illness; the average number of bed disability days was 10.8 per year.

Nor is the picture complete yet. Usually a doctor's fee is higher for a house call than for an office visit, which helps explain a statement by the Health Information Foundation that "private outlays for physicians in behalf of persons 65 or over averaged almost twice as much per person per year (in 1957–58) as for persons under 65—$55 and $29, respectively."

We also know, from information compiled by the Health Information Foundation, that the aged spend over twice as much per person for total medical care in a year as others. (This is what is spent by individuals—not what should be spent. And it does not include the heavy cost of terminal illnesses among those who live alone, or the cost of care for the aged in nursing homes or mental or tubercular hospitals.) For the years 1957–58, the average private expenditure for medical care of those 65 and over was $177; for those under 65, $86.

But even these averages are misleading: They give no true picture of the heavy financial burden of an illness that requires hospitalization. For example, of elderly people who were not married but who were entitled to old age, survivors, and disability insurance benefits in 1957, more than one in seven spent some time in a hospital, nursing home, or other institution, and the median medical costs amounted to $600 for all such beneficiaries. This figure is higher today, for since 1957 the rates for all medical care items have gone up by 14 percent, and rates for hospital rooms have risen by 22 percent. Among the beneficiaries who spent some time in a general hospital during 1957, only 57 percent of those who were married and 38 percent of those nonmarried were able to meet all their medical bills by themselves (over and above any cost met by insurance). Of the rest, some went into debt, a sizable number received help from relatives or other outsiders.

Many of the aged have, of course, some medical insurance. About half of the OASDI beneficiaries who entered a general hospital some time during 1957 had a part of their medical bill paid by insurance. But in many instances the insurance was inadequate; and for some who were insured against hospitalization, either the specific illness was excluded from coverage or the general hospital stay was too short (or the deductible too large) for the insurance to go into effect. Thus, of the aged OASDI beneficiaries who were insured and who went to a hospital during 1957, 16 percent of the couples had no portion of their year's total medical costs met by insurance; and 57 percent found that their insurance covered less than one-half of their total medical bills. Less than half (46 percent) of the aged have insurance against hospitalization costs (compared with 69 percent of the population under 65).

Furthermore, those most likely to suffer the most hardship—the retired, those with low incomes or with major chronic health problems—are least likely to have the advantage of any health insurance coverage. Many private insurance organizations will not even enroll persons 65 or over. To illustrate, as of early 1960, only about two-fifths of the Blue Cross plans accepted initial nongroup enrollment from persons over 65. A study by the National Opinion Research Information Foundation shows that, as of 4 years ago, of those older persons who wanted coverage, 34 percent couldn't afford it and 16 percent had been refused insurance or had it canceled.

THE KENNEDY PROGRAM

How has the administration responded to these facts? It has recommended that some, but not all, of the cost of medical care for older people be financed by contributions to the social security system. The proposal is described this way by the Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Wilbur J. Cohen (confirmed by the Senate last week by one vote): "[It] would make it possible for the people of this country during their working years to provide for their health needs in their old age. Like the present social security benefits, health insurance protection would be provided as a right that is earned through work." Care would not be free or be a handout. The plan "is based upon a recognition that expensive illness only too often forces the aged after a lifetime of independence to become dependent upon their children or to submit to the humiliation of inquiry into their personal affairs. The health insurance proposal, like the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program now in effect, would not provide more than basic protection. It would provide payment for the cost of inpatient hospital care (after a deductible), skilled nursing home convalescence after hospitalization, hospital outpatient diagnostic services (after a deductible), and visiting nurse and related health services. The prerogatives of doctors and patients would remain unchanged. The patient would choose his own doctor, who in turn would be absolutely unhindered in practicing his profession."

Specifically, patients would be entitled to 90 days of inpatient hospital care for a single spell of illness at a minimum charge of $20 and a maximum charge of $90. But at no extra cost, the patient would be entitled to another 180 days of skilled nursing home care, and hospital outpatient clinic diagnostic services would be available for all costs exceeding the first $20 for each diagnostic study. Finally, the aged who benefit from this program could have as many as 240 home health care visits in a calendar year. Some 14¼ million persons (out of a total of 17¾ million 65 or over) would be eligible for benefits as of January 1963.

Who pays the bill? The program would be financed entirely by an increase in social security tax contributions of one-fourth of 1 percent each for employers and employees, and three-eighths of 1 percent for self-employed persons, both to be effective as of January 1, 1963. Individual earnings subject to the tax would be raised from $4,800 to $5,000 effective the first of January 1962.

Despite AMA propaganda this can be fairly termed a modest program; it leaves out, for example, any payment from the insurance fund to patients for their physicians' fees, except in very special instances. The patient would have full responsibility for picking his own doctor and his hospital.

But the trade association of the doctors does not see it this way; it sees revolution. The AMA is fighting back with every resource at its command. Last year, the AMA acknowledged spending $72,634.76 on lobbying activities in Washington, but one can be sure that that represents only a fraction of what was spent or will be spent in 1961. Already, members of the House Ways and Means Committee are receiving considerable mail—"most of it running against the bill and coming from doctors and their organizations"—but Congress ain't seen nothin' yet. Beginning the middle of this month, the attack will start in earnest.

The AMA strategy was carefully outlined at a confidential get-together of the association's high command on March 18 and 19 in Chicago. At this meeting, from which reporters were barred, those present were given a complete rundown on the Members of the Senate and House in terms of their likely positions on the President's medical care program. The meeting was told that if the "undecided" vote breaks evenly, the AMA will have the President licked.

PSYCHOLOGICAL WARFARE

This private session was devoted primarily to a discussion of propaganda tactics. A Senator who a year ago had personally assured some of his colleagues that if only they would go along with his very limited medical program (which the Congress adopted) he would be on their side in 1961, made an off-the-record speech in which he said that it was now or never, and that if they could kill medical care to the aged through social security in 1961, it would probably stay dead.

When someone raised the question of whether it was really accurate to call the President's program socialized medicine, he was advised that the AMA's public relations experts had studied this very carefully and found that this is the label best guaranteed to raise the voters' blood pressure.

The AMA breakdown of how the Congress will divide is probably as accurate as any count in advance can be. The odds at present are against Mr. Kennedy. Those Democrats the President needs most in this fight are either on the other side or on the fence. He is getting no help from the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee.

Quite a variety of propaganda items was previewed in Chicago to be seen later by millions of Americans. There is a "Digest of Information"—eight pages, single-spaced—giving the AMA's arguments against the President's plan. There is a six-page, single-spaced "Selected Statistics Concerning Medical Economics," designed to prove that Americans receive "the finest care of any nation." A special report was given at Chicago by the women's auxiliary to the AMA, outlining what ladies can do: "inform each Member as to the danger of a compulsory medical care program based on a social security tax. This is socialized medicine."

Texts of a canned talk for delivery at community meetings arranged by auxiliary members have been distributed. Specific lobbying instructions are being supplied: "Since each auxiliary member is a voter in her own right it is suggested that the individual letters which the auxiliary members write to Congressmen should be written on the member's own stationery in longhand or typed and signed in her own name rather than that of her husband."

Chicago strategists were also told that headquarters will supply, in quantity, a special edition of the AMA News entirely de-

voted to this issue. In a red-bordered box on the front page of the News, the AMA speaks directly to doctors: "The medical profession bears the threat of this attack, and physicians can't afford to close their eyes and hope that when they open them again the whole unhappy business will have disappeared. They may awaken to the fact of Government medicine. If they are socialized their patients will be socialized as well. Physicians, individually and collectively, must wrest the initiative from the labor leaders and others who are determined to destroy free medicine. * * *"

The AMA has prepared an instruction sheet for district and county medical societies which recommends that: "Physician members must write and initiate a great number of individual letters to the Congress from their own membership and from friends in other organizations." Detailed suggestions are given on how the local medical society can unite "the allied health, professional, and business groups in your community."

They are then told to contact dentists, pharmacists, the farm bureau, chambers of commerce, junior chambers of commerce, manufacturing groups, retailers, local businessmen, etc. And in capital letters doctors are reminded that "the volume of letters and the diversity of interest of the people writing them is the important thing. Personal letters—no form letters. Telephone calls, telegrams, and personal visits are also important. Be sure," they are reminded, that "the Congressman's name is spelled correctly and the letter is properly addressed."

ALONGSIDE LIFE AND HOLIDAY

Not only do most physicians have a Representative and two Senators, however; they have patients. And for them, there is a leaflet entitled (in red) "Socialized Medicine and You," to be placed in the doctors' waiting rooms, alongside Life and Holiday. It is "an open letter to my patients," and begins: "The time has come for all of us to stand and be counted on the question of socialized medicine." In large type we read "Your freedom is at stake." The patient is told that if he agrees "that preserving the freedoms of medical service is vital, then write to your Senators and Congressmen. Join me in telling them that socialized medicine is not for us."

And that's not all. The AMA has special handouts for editorial writers, reprints from Nation's Business, the Wall Street Journal, the Saturday Evening Post, the Chicago Sun-Times, the Chicago Tribune, the Richmond Times-Dispatch. There is also a sample letter to editorial writers for the doctors to copy and mail. There is a communications kit with ad mats for local newspapers. Space is left at the bottom of each ad for the signature of the particular medical society. One is entitled "Socialized Medicine and You," and can be ordered by number from the AMA, Post Office Box 5037, Chicago, Ill. Five sample 1-minute radio or television scripts are likewise available. Simplicity is stressed: "This is [doctor's name]. As a practicing physician, I believe that any American (young or old) who needs medical care should get it. That's why I favor the program of medical aid for the aged enacted in the Kerr-Mills law. (Pause.) But some people don't want this law to succeed. They propose a compulsory program of medical services to the aged covered by social security—regardless of need. To me this represents socialized medicine for the elderly—with Federal control abridging the patient's freedom to choose his doctor, compromising the privacy of the doctor-patient relationship. (Pause.) For more facts, ask your family doctor for the pamphlet titled 'Medical Aid for the Aged.'"

On April 19, a full-page advertisement will appear in 29 major newspapers. The reasons given in that ad for rejecting the President's program are interesting: "As Americans—not simply as physicians—we are deeply concerned about the dangers of socialized medicine. The Socialist Party itself calls it socialized medicine. And we believe they have a more expert knowledge of socialist definitions than do those who describe the social security approach as 'just a method of financing aid for the aged.'"

This compulsory health care program adds up to nothing more than socialized medicine—controlled by a bureau of the Federal Government, paid for by increased social security taxes, burdening both present and future generations. Confined at first to the aged, it would inevitably be expanded to cover all Americans.

"Moreover, when the Federal Government enters the privacy of the examination room—controlling both standards of practice and choice of practitioner—the cost includes loss of freedom. Your doctor's freedom to treat you in an individual way. Your freedom to choose your own doctor. When the physician is socialized his patient is socialized as well." (The AMA will also underwrite "a solid FM radio campaign [to] supplement our national advertising in the metropolitan dailies—reaching millions of citizens whose intelligent support is so essential to us.")

Doctors may order mats of these full-page ads in different sizes and schedule them for local publication to tie in with the national advertising. A second advertisement entitled "Socialized Medicine and You" is ready to go at a later date * * * "if necessary." One-, two-, and three-column mats carrying the AMA's message are available "that can be fitted into the advertisements of pharmacists and other interested retailers." One warns that a Forand-type bill would endanger "one of the basic principles of our responsibility to you. This is a principle expressed in the physician's pledge—'I will hold in confidence all that my patient confides in me'."

None of this is true; none of it is relevant to providing adequate medical care for older people, who are not for the most part getting it and cannot get it through charity or private insurance plans; the references to "compulsion" is a fradulent. For what ails so many of the aged is being compelled to endure illness without proper treatment, or to be dependent on charity or on younger members of a family which is struggling itself to keep ahead of the bill collector.

Mr. Speaker, the full-page ad referred to in the article has already appeared in newspapers across the country.

The inspired letters, as sugested by AMA are arriving.

I intend to answer the stereotyped mail with a copy of this item.

Research Activities in the Field of Dry Edible Beans Flatulence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a copy of a resolution adopted by the Michigan State Legislature concerning the problem of flatulence in beans. The bean producers of my State, along with those of all other States, are extremely interested in expanded research on flatulence in beans presently being conducted by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

This research is of great importance to the bean industry and to those farmers who produce beans for market.

The resolution follows:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 24

Concurrent resolution petitioning the Congress of the United States to accelerate and expand research activities in the field of dry edible beans flatulence

Whereas the State of Michigan has produced an average of better than 5 million hundredweight of beans annually for the past 5 years, which has contributed over $33 million each year to the economy of Michigan and the United States; and

Whereas 5 million hundredweight is approximately one and one-half million in excess of our customary domestic requirements because of an inherent problem of flatulence in beans; and

Whereas a large potential market for increased consumption of beans exists providing the flatulence can be eliminated; and

Whereas increased utilization of Michigan beans would increase the economy of Michigan and the United States; and

Whereas beans are already playing a large role in feeding the hungry and destitute in distressed areas of the United States and will play an important part in the Food for Peace program, which is an integral part of the foreign relations of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be urged to expand and accelerate the research on flatulence presently being conducted in the United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this concurrent resolution be sent to the Honorable Orville Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture of the United States; the U.S. Senators from Michigan, Senators MCNAMARA and HART; and Michigan Members of the House of Representatives.

Adopted by the senate April 5, 1961.

Adopted by the house April 21, 1961.

FRED I. CHASE,
Secretary of the Senate.

NORMAN E. PHILLES,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Administration Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the Kennedy administration is developing a distinct, if not impressive, personality and the following article by Ted Lewis, which appeared this morning in the Washington Daily News, is typical of the incidents that have developed in recent weeks:

(By Ted Lewis)

WASHINGTON, May 2.—Just when the once exciting Kennedy administration was getting a little dull and stodgy, the Washington

scene has been enlivened by the exposure of some stumblebums among the President's appointees to high office.

The prize for top dimwit among the energetic characters in the new generation Government will, of course, have to wait a full disclosure of all the deplorable facts in the Cuban invasion fiasco.

But on a tentative award basis, the prize can now go hands down to Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall, Arizona's gift to the Kennedy entourage. The crewcut, cocky Udall first flipped his lid last week by brazenly blaming the Eisenhower administration for the Cuban debacle.

He has now compounded that political faux pas—which embarrassed the White House—by a display of stupid overzeal in the sale of $100-a-plate tickets to a Democratic Party fundraising dinner.

We will take his word for it that he only solicited one member of the gas and oil lobby—an "old friend"—but as any smart Democratic Party politician will tell you, the damage has been wrought. It will be hard to erase the impression that Udall's aim was to tap the pockets of the oil and gas industry millionaires generally.

Whether Udall will be the first of Kennedy's official family to go is uncertain at this point. He is, however, considered most likely to fade away, although there are increasing reports that before the year is out some big changes will be made. Even Secretary of State Dean Rusk figures in the "agonizing reappraisal" because of what didn't happen in Cuba and there are reports that the oldest Cabinet member, 63-year-old Commerce Secretary Luther Hodges was tagged first at the White House as the Cabinet member most likely not to succeed.

The harsh fact that the once-smooth Kennedy machine has developed squeaks is probably the most significant development of the so-called first 100 days in office.

There have been not only errors in judgment in the Cabinet but in the Harvard brain trust sector of the White House advisory staff and even among the once dependable public relations advisers. White House Press Secretary Pierre Salinger has been at swords points with White House correspondents from the beginning. It is generally acknowledged that the President has gotten press breaks despite Salinger, not because of him.

ADMINISTRATION'S BIG FEAR IS LOSS OF ITS SPARKLE

What probably disturbs the new administration most in connection with the unexpected personnel troubles is that it is in danger of losing its sparkle. A young President, particularly one with a host of youthful men about him, was confidently expected to generate a feeling of excitement, of a forward-moving administration bent on getting things done with electrifying ease.

The opinion that the administration is becoming dull, if not stodgy, is rather widespread here. In part, this is due to the fact the President has become "overexposed," and by that is not meant overexposure of his personality but overexposure of his ideas.

There is admitted unhappiness over the number of messages he has sent to Congress. He has set a Presidential record of 21 messages to Congress in less than 4 months. Unfortunately, most of them have been pretty dull reading. They have been too long and lacking in that personal sparkle the President is capable of extracting when he has time to sit down and coin phrases and compose fluid sentences.

His ghost writers have been overworked because the President has been tied up with cold war problems. As a result, their compositions have by and large been sorry stuff, heavyhanded and soporific.

TED SORENSEN'S HAND SORELY MISSING FROM SPEECHES

All this is no basic reflection on chief speech writer Theodore Sorensen or others in the ghostwriting stable like Dick Goodwin, Mike Feldman, and Lee White.

Sorensen's fine hand has been missing from most of these endeavors because the President found he had other and more important tasks for Sorensen to tackle—policy problems in particular. The others in the stable are admittedly capable of turning out a well-rounded speech or message to Congress, but need time. And around the White House these days there is plenty of bustle but no time for reflection on a well-turned and snappy phrase.

Kennedy's personnel problems are actually much more complex than the simple one of whether the right man has been found for the right job. There are some grounds for believing that failure to have the right man on the job was at the root of the Cuban fiasco.

The man chosen weeks ago to fill the pivotal post of Deputy Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs was U. Alexis Johnson, a smart career operative. Unfortunately, Johnson was not in Washington during the appraisals of the Cuban situation.

WITH JOHNSON, THINGS MIGHT HAVE BEEN DIFFERENT

Had Johnson been able to give his attention to the Cuban problem, the decision might well have been different. His post is one in which all phases of a policy decision are scrutinized. It has always been a key post in the Department, one which Robert D. Murphy filled for years and which enabled him to take deserved credit for putting into effect many a cold-war-policy maneuver—always at the right place and at the right time.

Where was Johnson when his services and opinions were so vitally needed here? As an expert on Asia, he was in the Far East making arrangements for the recent SEATO conference in Bangkok and for organizing the U.S. stand on Laos.

In hindsight, it would have been far better to have had Johnson here.

Albert L. Colloms: Spanish Amnesty Advocate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter to the editor of the New York Times, published March 1, 1961, by Albert L. Colloms, a respected constituent of mine, and a New York Times editorial of March 3, 1961, commenting upon the condition of civil liberties in Spain with reference to 6,000 political prisoners. Mr. Colloms is now forming a committee to call upon Spain to grant amnesty to the political prisoners.

Mr. Speaker, I also include a column written for the New York Post of Wednesday, March 22, 1961, by Mr. Joseph Wershba, entitled "It Takes Tough Idealism To Soften Up a Dictator."

I commend these items to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 1, 1961]

SPAIN'S PRISONERS—SUPPORT FOR AMNESTY FOR REGIME'S POLITICAL OPPONENTS URGED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

During November 1960, an international commission of five lawyers made a personal, on-the-spot investigation of civil liberties, due process, and the situation of the political prisoners in Spain. The investigation made a story meriting front-page treatment in a number of important newspapers throughout Europe. Even ABC of Madrid thought it important enough to run stories for almost 2 weeks.

As the U.S. member of that Commission, which included Richard Turner of London, Angel Bustelo of Mendoza, Argentina; Jorge Jiles of Chile, and José Sancho Miajares of Caracas, Venezuela, I feel that it is time for the appalling situation of the political prisoners and exiles of Spain to be presented to the conscience of the people of the United States.

Six thousand Spanish men and women are imprisoned there. They are of all political persuasions and of none. Their sole crime is differing with the administration.

Many are subjected to outrageous sentences of 20 years or more. Many have been tortured. All have been convicted with so blatant a disregard of due process that the courageous lawyers of Spain are in the forefront of the fight for amnesty within Spain.

BACKING FOR MOVEMENT

Indeed, leading figures in all Western Europe have joined in this movement, motivated by humanity and decency. Personages in the forefront of intellectual life, in the labor movement, in finance, in the professions and the arts are active in committees of their respective countries and are devoting their efforts to amnesty for Spanish political prisoners and exiles.

In Latin America too, this movement is widespread and deep-rooted. I have just returned from Montevideo, where the second Latin American congress for amnesty for the political prisoners of Spain and Portugal was concluded.

Some 480 delegates of 9 countries, representing 270 organizations, were in attendance. Four thousand greetings were received in the 3 days of the conference. The delegates were representative of the best of South America. There were political leaders, some officially representing their governments, political groups were represented, as were intellectuals, workers, professionals, business men, labor leaders and Catholic orders.

A West European conference will be held in Paris in the spring which will be attended by delegates from every country in Western Europe.

It can only be that the present inaction of the people of our country is the result of lack of information. The American people are too sympathetic to be silent about the political prisoners in Spain once they know the real facts of the situation.

ALBERT L. COLLOMS.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 3, 1961]

PRISONERS IN SPAIN

The letter from Albert Colloms printed on this page March 1 and dealing with political prisoners in Spain was a call to the conscience of all of us. Mr. Colloms was the American member of an international commission of lawyers who made an on-the-spot investigation of civil liberties, due process, and political prisoners in Franco Spain.

Among their findings was that 6,000 Spanish men and women are in prison because they disagree with the regime. Many are

serving sentences of 20 years or more, wrote Mr. Colloms, and "many have been tortured."

The facts speak for themselves. They are deserving of earnest consideration for two special reasons. One is that Franco Spain is a military ally of the United States. We signed a treaty—the 1953 Pact of Madrid—with Spain with the understanding, as Secretary of State Dean Acheson put it at the time, that Spain would make "substantial advances in such directions as increased civil liberties." The other reason is that international expressions of concern might help to bring about an amnesty for these unfortunate political prisoners.

[From the New York Post, Mar. 22, 1961]

IT TAKES TOUGH IDEALISM TO SOFTEN UP A DICTATOR

(By Joseph Wershba)

Albert L. Colloms is a gentle and whimsical 57-year-old New York lawyer who normally specializes in dry-as-dust real estate and banking. He was on his way back from legal business in Israel last November when he stopped off in Paris. Someone asked him if he'd like to go to Spain. Life hasn't been the same since for Colloms.

"Previously," he says, "I knew very little about what was really going on in Spain. Sure, I'd heard things were not too good, there were repressions, people were tossed in jail for opening their mouths. But I didn't realize till I talked with Spaniards themselves what a widespread movement there is, calling on Franco to grant amnesty to 6,000 political prisoners."

As a result, Colloms—with offices at 342 Madison Avenue—is now forming an amnesty committee of prominent Americans. "The Ministry of Justice man in Madrid told us there are no political prisoners in Spanish jails," Colloms recalls. "He says they're in for 'crimes against the state.' Well," Colloms observes with a smile, "that's a definition that's hard to beat."

Colloms has become something of an international incident. He's been denounced front page by the controlled Franco press and the Spanish Ambassador in Washington has found it necessary to deny his charges—both signs of the Franco government's extreme sensitivity to world opinion.

On his trip to Madrid last fall, Colloms was accompanied by four lawyers. They talked with families, studied reports by Spanish lawyers, examined indictments and sentences. Colloms' conclusions:

"There are 6,000 political prisoners in Spain. They range from a small number of Communists to a small number of Falangists. Sixty to ninety are still in from the Civil War, over 20 years ago. Two thousand are charged with the sole crime of having been collateral to that war—a family connection, for instance. The rest—the vast majority—are Free Masons, monarchists, unionists, farmers, Socialists, anarchists, syndicalists, students—and people with absolutely no politics at all.

"Their sole crime is that they differed with the administration. And all of them have been convicted with so blatant a disregard of due process that the courageous lawyers within Spain have taken the lead in this fight for amnesty.

"And that's what has to be emphasized," Colloms declares. "It's the Spaniards themselves who are leading the fight—from street cleaner to law professor, they've signed petitions.

"Franco is no humanitarian. He won't grant amnesty out of the goodness of his heart. But he'll do it if it's expedient—if there's enough pressure.

"This movement for amnesty is basically humanitarian," says Colloms, now on his way to Paris for a Western Europe amnesty conference later this month. "That's how I got into it and that's why I want to see an American committee formed. I don't think anyone in Spain likes Franco, but neither do I think he's on the way out. That's the business of the Spanish people—not outsiders. As long as he can keep his government going, he's going to stay in.

"I get the feeling that Spain is a police state. But there's no revolutionary feeling against Franco. You've got three generations in Spain today. The younger generation doesn't know the country once had democracy. The oldest generation doesn't have the push to do anything about it. And the middle generation remembers the horror and the slaughter of the civil war.

"They don't want any more bloodshed. They still tell you stories of how 250 people at one time would be lined up in front of a ditch and machinegunned. Both sides did it. And they still go wild remembering when Franco let the Moors loose; the Moors just tore people limb from limb.

"But while we have no right to tell the Spanish people what to do, I think we ought to speak up for simple decency. Since I got into this thing, I found out we have a 1953 military treaty with Spain, with the understanding that Spain would make substantial advances in such directions as increased civil liberities. Well," says Colloms, "the least we can do is make Franco live up to his treaty commitments."

Colloms, born in Denver, March 10, 1904, grew up in Connecticut, attended Yale and took his degree from Yale Law in 1927. He was with the U.S. Housing Authority from 1938 to 1940, and was in charge of OPA enforcement for consumer goods in metropolitan New York from 1941 to 1945. He and his wife live on Manhattan's West Side. His son Michael, 23, is studying at UCLA for his Ph. D. in chemistry.

Colloms doesn't recall having more than a passing interest in Spanish affairs. "I'm sure I sympathized with the Loyalists in the Civil War," he says, "and I hope I contributed to some milk fund campaign. But I was long out of college when it happened. It didn't stir me as much as it did the young people in the 1930's."

He is a stirred man now.

Dan Ryan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow that I call to the attention of my colleagues the death on April 8, 1961, of one of the great leaders in the civic as well as the political life of the city of Chicago, Daniel Ryan, president of the Board of Commissioners of Cook County.

Mr. Ryan was first elected to the county board in 1923 when he succeeded his father, Daniel Ryan, Sr., who had been president of the board. He served for 34 years as a member, the last 7 years of which he served as president. He also served as chairman of the roads and bridges committee, and for 10 years as chairman of the finance committee.

In these capacities he was instrumental in the establishment of a system of superhighways that now serves the Chicago area; the modernization of the Cook County Hospital and Nurses Home and its research arm, the Hektoen Institute; and also the expansion and protection of the forest preserve district of Cook County.

Mr. Ryan was one of the most powerful Democratic leaders in Illinois and was a close friend of the Honorable Richard J. Daley, mayor of the city of Chicago, and one of his most trusted advisers.

He had a multitude of friends in all walks of life and his many kind and charitable deeds, though he did not seek to publicize them, were well known throughout Chicago.

The sermon given by Archbishop William E. Cousins, of Milwaukee, a close personal friend of many years, at the Holy Name Cathedral, epitomizes Mr. Ryan's philosophy of life. I should like to quote a part of this sermon:

Mr. Ryan practiced to the fullest Christ's admonition to "render, therefore, to Caesar the things that are Caesar's; and to God the things that are God's."

He rendered to Caesar the things that were Caesar's; he rendered to the Government he served a complete, humble, and full allegiance. And he rendered to God the things that were God's in his personal, family, and public life.

Mrs. Murphy and I join his many friends in extending our deepest sympathy and our prayers to his gracious wife, Ruby, his son Daniel III, and the other members of his family.

A Matter of Realism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

[From the Shelbyville (Ind.) News, May 1, 1961]

A MATTER OF REALISM

From time to time in the past we have pointed out that no nation in all history has even approached the generosity of the United States in its relations with the rest of the world. We also have pointed out that our generosity seems to have gained us little in our standing with much of the world. On the contrary, it seems to have purchased us less respect and less stature in the global scheme of things.

The latter fact is brought home to us most forcefully by the verbal beating our country is taking in many places throughout the world in the wake of the Cuban invasion fiasco. This matter alone is enough to convince any sober American that something has been grossly wrong with our foreign relations for a long, long, time.

It is stark fact that our tremendous outpouring of aid—amounting to almost $100 billion since the end of World War II—is either being ignored altogether or is met with cynicism.

While our concern for mankind's freedom should be obvious, it actually is disbelieved in many countries. Most current examples of this fact are Laos and Cuba. In Laos, we

attempt to help people who apparently have little understanding of, or interest in, freedom. And in Cuba we try to aid a people to dislodge a Communist tyranny—and get castigated for our efforts. At the same time, in Great Britain, India, and elsewhere, the tides of Communist-serving neutralism and pacifism run high.

Strangely to us, at the same time the Reds get away with fantastic crime at the bar of world opinion. While they hold hundreds of millions in virtual slavery, and smash the freedom attempts of such innocents as the people of Tibet and Hungary, the Russians are fawned upon. That is not all—the Chinese Communists, whose deeds in assuming and holding power are unspeakable crimes, are seeking admission to the United Nations, and there is much agitation among some of our so-called friends to get them there.

In trying to be kind to everyone, we too often have seemed soft. It appears that we have worried too much about what the world would think of this or that, and as a result we have drifted almost aimlessly into a web that could turn out to be our own destruction.

Perhaps we must realize, first of all, that we are being isolated—not because our way of life is wrong, but because most people just don't understand it. We must do the things that are necessary in dealing with our deadly enemy without worrying unduly over what the reaction may be in Africa, India, or elsewhere. This not to advocate isolationism, but simply to advocate an American foreign policy. It is to say that it is time that we stopped running after the world—that it is time that we started looking at it realistically from our own viewpoint.

We should be willing to help, but only to the extent that the world understands we are attempting to stave off another dark age.

We may expect respect if we act with dignity and aloofness. It is entirely possible that in a cold world and a cold war a certain amount of calculated coldness might be the approach most likely to awaken other countries to a new and true awareness of the real perils as they exist.

Of Law and Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the contrast between the Communist celebration of May Day and the American counterpart, the celebration of Law Day, is vividly portrayed in an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times on Monday, May 1. I submit it for the RECORD as most worthy of study:

OF LAW AND LIBERTY

In Moscow, May 1 is the day for parading military might, a day for Soviet muscle flexing.

In America, May Day, 1961, brings the fourth annual celebration of Law Day—a day set aside to glorify a much different kind of power. In the words of the American Bar Association, originator along with local bar groups of Law Day, the purpose of the U.S. observance is to cultivate respect for the law, remind citizens of their heritage of freedom and encourage rededication to the ideals of equality and justice under law.

The contrast speaks for itself.

It is hoped that Americans today will not only review the freedoms that are inherent under the U.S. rule of law, but also ponder the responsibilities that go hand in hand with these freedoms.

In this connection, we suggest as worthy of contemplation these words by a revered Federal judge, Learned Hand, spoken before more than 1 million Americans on May 21, 1944, in New York's Central Park:

"Liberty lies in the hearts of men and women. When it dies there, no constitution, no law, no court can save it. No constitution, no law, no court can even do much to help it. * * * The spirit of liberty is the spirit which seeks to understand the minds of other men and women. The spirit of liberty is the spirit which weighs their interests alongside its own without bias. The spirit of liberty remembers that not even a sparrow falls to earth unheeded. The spirit of liberty is the spirit of Him who, near 2,000 years ago, taught mankind that lesson it has never learned, but has never quite forgotten; that there may be a kingdom where the least shall be heard and considered side by side with the greatest."

West Germany Also Has Its Communist Fronts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Un-American Activities, of which I am a member, has often said that the strategy and tactics of the Communist apparatus follow the same pattern the world over.

The bulletin of the Press Office in Bonn, West Germany, contains significant information about the work and activities of Communist-front organizations in that country. It will be of interest to the Members of the Congress to note the striking similarities in the patterns followed by the Communists in Germany and in the United States.

The translation of the article in bulletin No. 30, 1961, follows:

COMMUNIST-CAMOUFLAGED AND AUXILIARY ORGANIZATIONS

During question time in the German Bundestag on February 10, 1961, the Federal Minister of the Interior, Dr. Gerhard Schröder, with the approval of the Federal Minister for All-German Affairs, gave the following answer to the question put by Bundestag Deputy Müller-Hermann, "Is the Federal Government in a position to give a survey up to date of the Communist-camouflaged and auxiliary organizations and their means of publication?"

In the 31st plenary session on June 13, 1958, I gave the House the names of a number of Communist-camouflaged and auxiliary organizations, as well as of certain neutralist and nationalist circles that are pro-Communist. I mentioned in particular: The World Peace Council, the Peace Committee of the Federal Republic of Germany, the West German Women's Peace Movement, the Union of Persons Persecuted by the Nazi Regime (VVN), the Fédération Internationale des Résistants (FIR), the League of Germans (BDD), the German Club 1954, the Democratic Cultural League of Germany (DKBD), the Frankish Circle, the Campaign Community Against Atomic Armament of the Federal Republic of Germany, and the Permanent Congress of All Opponents of Atomic Armament of the Federal Republic of Germany.

Further organizations of this type can be added to this list. I should like to mention the following: The Schwelmer Circle, the Union of Independent Socialists, the German Youth Ring, and the Working Association "Happy Holidays for All Children," and certain concentration camp associations (Auschwitz, Buchenwald, etc.).

I also wish to refer to those organizations with the aid of which communism would like to establish a platform in order to gain a foothold again in the parliaments of the Federal Republic, of the Länder and the communities, and in this way exercise influence on the political life of the Federal Republic. On the Federal level there is the German Peace Union. On the Länder level there are, above all, the German Democratic Union in the Saar, the Democratic Voters' Union in North Rhine-Westphalia, and the Union for Peace and Social Security in Baden-Württemberg.

In quoting this data I have confined myself to those organizations which have developed a greater activity and are frequently mentioned in public. This survey is therefore not exhaustive.

In addition, there are also a number of Communist camouflaged periodicals and papers. By these I mean organs which, without openly professing communism, circulate or propagate trends and aims of Communist policy without any criticism. These Communist camouflaged periodicals or papers include, in particular, the following: Die Andere Zeitung (the Other Paper); Blätter für deutsche und internationale Politik (News of German and International Politics), sponsored by the German Club 1954; Blick in die Zeit (View of the Times), a weekly, sponsored by the Peace Committee of the Federal Republic of Germany; Deutsche Volkszeitung (German People's Paper) and Deutsche Woche (German Weekly), organs sponsored by the League of Germans; Konkret (Concrete), a students' paper; Elan (Elan), a youth periodical; Socialistische Korrespondenz (Socialist News); Die Tat (Action), the organ of the VVN; Münchener Vertriebenen-Echo (Munich Expelees' Echo), sponsored by the West German Refugees' Congress; and Dat Blinkfüer (the Lighthouse), a weekly published in Hamburg.

Tanks and Propaganda Only Dim Poland's Flame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. BATES
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, rumbling tanks and Soviet propaganda will never extinguish the flame of freedom in Poland, and it is fitting on this day, the 170th anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day, that we should renew our pledge to her people—a pledge to assist in the restoration of her independence and return to the Western family of nations.

I know that it is the constant prayer of thousands of my constituents in the sixth Massachusetts District of Polish

extraction, that their native country will soon be free from its present oppressive yoke.

A champion of human rights, Poland has never been totally crushed because of her indomitable character and creative vitality based on mental, moral and spiritual vigor. The Pole abhors the despot, the tyrant, and the dictator. Men who undertook the task of guiding the Polish nation on the path of social progress, belonged to the most enlightened brains of the 18th-century Poland, and they fought and died for freedom.

Great names and lasting achievements in Polish history speak for themselves and the contributions of great leaders in government, music, arts and sciences bring visions of a great heritage left to mankind.

We are, for vital reason, seriously concerned with the present fate of our Polish friends, even though changing world events may dim our view as we watch communistic developments in Laos, Cuba, and other parts of the globe. Sealed off behind the Iron Curtain, millions of Polish people are virtually imprisoned in their homeland, and there, they enjoy precious few of the freedoms for which they and their forebears fought so gallantly and courageously.

As we cherish our own glorious birthright, let us join with these valiant people in commemorating the inception of their liberty and pledge our help in the realization of their proper place among free nations.

The Polish Government is Communist—but its people are not.

Rumbling tanks and the steady drone of Soviet propaganda notwithstanding, Poland's flame of freedom shines brightly and her march toward independence is certain to succeed.

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I request that the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

MARCH 30, 1961.

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: The Ukrainian Congress Committee Branch of Cohoes, N.Y., wishes to congratulate you upon introducing a resolution calling for the establishment of a special permanent Committee on Captive Nations in Congress. Such a committee has long been needed, since the prisoners behind the Iron Curtain have always been eager and wanting to escape from tyrannical hands. To know about the Soviet Union's weaknesses and conditions will be a great advantage to the free anti-Communist world.

The suggested Committee on the Captive Nations would supply the American people and the Western World with information concerning the affairs behind the Iron Curtain. It would also help our Government in formulating its policies toward the Soviet captive nations.

We are writing to our New York State district Congressman O'BRIEN, to uphold your resolution.

Respectfully yours,
THE UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE,
BRANCH OF COHOES,
STEPHAN HAWRYSHKO,
President.
JULIAN BACHYNSKY,
Secretary.

BYELORUSSIAN-AMERICAN
ASSOCIATION, INC.,
NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
Brooklyn, N.Y., April 20, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: On behalf of the Byelorussian-American Association I wish to express sincere congratulations on your introduction of the resolution for the establishment of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

The Soviet Union's goal is to dominate the world, and the Americans should know it, because Soviet Russia has become a great imperialist peril which threatens all free nations and particularly our country, the United States of America.

Your resolution to create a committee is a great step in the right direction. It would serve as an information center on the enslaved peoples in the U.S.S.R. Our Government needs this information in making proper policies with respect to the captive nations and with respect to the security of the United States.

I am also enclosing a copy of the resolution adopted at the mass meeting commemorating the 43d anniversary of Byelorussian independence on March 26, 1961, at Biltmore Hotel in New York, in which support is given to your resolution.

With personal regards and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,
CONSTANT MIERLAK,
National President.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE
OF AMERICA, INC.,
BRANCH IN MINNEAPOLIS,
April 14, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: The Minneapolis Branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America wishes to congratulate you on your bold and farsighted move in introducing the resolution calling for the establishment of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

The Soviet Union poses the greatest threat to the United States as well as to the entire free world. It will be of tremendous help for the various agencies of the U.S. Government to be aware of the conditions that prevail in the captive nations under the Soviet tyrannical rule. These nations are ever eager to overthrow their tyrant and in this respect constitute a perennial weakness of the Soviet Union.

The committee would be of great help in informing the people of the world of the state of affairs behind the Iron Curtain and, therefore it would be a powerful tool for combating worldwide Russian propaganda.

We are writing our Congressmen from Minnesota, asking them to support your resolution.

Respectfully yours,
HILARY PAPIZ,
Branch Secretary.

APRIL 21, 1961.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: I am writing to commend you on your understanding and foresight of the true intentions of Communist tyranny.

Your resolution to create a permanent Captive Nations Committee would indeed give hope to the subjugated peoples under communism, and awaken and enlighten Americans to the atrocities committed against the human race by the hand of Russian imperialism.

Sincerely yours,
ANNA BUCZYNSKI.

APRIL 10, 1961.

MY DEAR MR. FLOOD: Our organization, the West Easton, Pa. Branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, wishes to congratulate you on your courageous and sagacious move in introducing the resolution for the establishment of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

Our organization will endeavor to convince other groups and organizations to write and commend you on your resolution.

We are writing Congressman FRANCIS E. WALTER asking him to support your resolution.

Respectfully yours,
MICHAEL KOLODRUB,
PETER MILANSWRKE,
(For the organization).

APRIL 11, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I, Father Nazarewycz, and the members of my parish would like to congratulate you on your introduction of a resolution calling for a permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. One of the greatest problems facing this Nation is the Soviet Union, a prison to many nations and peoples. These nations, eager to escape Soviet Russian slavery and despotism, constitute

deep weaknesses for the Soviet Union. It is to our advantage to know and multiply such weaknesses.

A Committee on Captive Nations could serve as a fountain of information and data on various enslaved nations in the U.S.S.R. Such information would be made available to U.S. Government and its agencies. Its main function would be to inform the American people and the world at large on affairs behind the Iron Curtain and assist the Government in formulating its policies with respect to the captive nations.

We have informed our own Congressman, Mr. KOWALSKI, and asked him to support your resolution.

We sincerely hope and pray for this resolution to be passed. May the dear Lord in Heaven guide you in your magnificent work.

Very sincerely yours,

Rev. Father ANDRIJ NAZAREWYCZ.

MARCH 29, 1961.

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Our organization, the Ukrainian National Association, St. Paul branch, wishes to congratulate you on your bold and farsighted move in introducing the resolution calling for the establishment of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. Needless to say, such a committee is long overdue. One of the greatest problems confronting our Nation today is the Soviet Union, a prison house of many nations and peoples.

We are very grateful for your initiative and hope that every one of our State Congressmen will have the same view and make all possible effort in helping to establish such a permanent committee.

We are writing our Congressmen in the State of Minnesota asking them to support your resolution.

Very sincerely yours,

B. GAMOTA,
President of UNA, Branch in St. Paul, Minn.

BYELORUSSIAN-AMERICAN ASSOCIATION, INC.,
NEW YORK BRANCH,
Brooklyn, N.Y., April 21, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: All of our members would like to congratulate you on your introduction of the resolution for the establishment of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

We believe that such committee will be of great help in our Nation's policy against the Soviet Union. It also will serve as an information center about many nations enslaved by Soviet Russia. We believe that those enslaved peoples contain a destructive power and are more dangerous to the Russian empire than atomic bombs.

We certainly hope that this bill will be passed by the House of Representatives in the near future.

Respectfully yours,

BAZYL SCECKA,
Secretary.

UKRAINIAN STUDENT
ORGANIZATION OF MICHNOWSKY,
PHILADELPHIA BRANCH,
April 16, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: The Ukrainian Student Organization of Michnowsky which represents a vast number of university students in America wishes to express its sincere congratulations on your resolution calling for the establishment of a Captive Nations Committee in the House of Representatives.

We wholly support your resolution and firmly believe that such a Committee on Captive Nations in the U.S. Congress would serve the intellectual ends of all the freedom-loving students of the world.

BOHDAN KULCHYCKY, *President.*

ORGANIZATION FOR THE DEFENSE
OF FOUR FREEDOMS FOR UKRAINE, INC.,
New York, N.Y., April 14, 1961.

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: The Organization for the Defense of Four Freedoms for Ukraine, which represents thousands of American citizens of Ukrainian origin, and which embraces 32 branches throughout the United States, wishes to convey to you its heartiest congratulations on your resolution calling for the establishment of a Captive Nations Committee in the House of Representatives. Our organization is dedicated to the preservation of the freedom and independence of the United States, and is deeply concerned with the struggle of the captive nations for the restoration of their freedom and independence, which was destroyed and subverted by Communist Russia during the past four decades.

We are wholly in support of your resolution on the captive nations because we are convinced that the establishment of such a committee would constitute a powerful force for the cause of freedom. It would indicate that the United States is earnestly and seriously concerned with the plight of the captive and enslaved nations behind the Iron Curtain.

Despite the fact that the U.S.S.R. is systematically attacking the United States and its allies and is making steady progress in such countries as Laos, the Congo, and Cuba, the United States is shying away from the issue of Russian colonialism and imperialism, either because it is not aware of the existence of the vast Soviet Russian slave empire, or because of an ill-advised policy of "not to get tough with Moscow." Two years ago, when Khrushchev was making gigantic propaganda successes with the Moslem peoples in Asia and Africa, the Voice of America decided to eliminate the Uzbek-language broadcasts from its services, under the pretext that the VOA was unable to secure an adequate number of transmitters. Such examples of a gross neglect of the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. could be cited in many instances.

It is therefore our sincere belief that your initiative and your resolution are dictated by your profound knowledge of the issues at stake. Such a Committee on Captive Nations would become a font of unbiased knowledge and information on each captive nation behind the Iron Curtain. It could make expert and factual analyses on the plight of the captive nations in the Soviet Russian slave empire and then make them available to the executive agencies of our Government. Such a committee is long overdue and you are to be commended for your wisdom and your appreciation of this paramount issue of the captive nations.

Our organization pledges its full and unqualified support of your measure in Congress and will urge other U.S. Congressmen to support your resolution. We believe that your step in establishing such a Committee on Captive Nations in the U.S. Congress would meet with the approval and support of all the freedom-loving peoples of the world, as it would convince them that the United States is fully determined to protect the freedom of all the nations of the world. Also, it would give concrete evidence that it has not abandoned the captive nations behind the Iron Curtain, but is doing everything short of war to bring about their final liberation from Russian Communist tyranny and enslavement.

ORGANIZATION FOR THE DEFENSE OF
FOUR FREEDOMS FOR UKRAINE,
EUGENE LOSINSKY, *President.*
STEPHEN HALAMAY, *Secretary.*

A Railroad's Contribution to Forestry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Warren T. White contributed greatly to the development of the pulp and paper industry in the South. Dr. White is a graduate of Clemson College, Clemson, S.C., where he received a scroll of honor for distinguished service and an honorary doctor of science degree. The following address was made by Dr. White to the fifth World Forestry Congress held in Seattle, Wash., last fall and attended by 2,000 people from 71 countries throughout the world:

A RAILROAD'S CONTRIBUTION TO FORESTRY

(By Warren T. White, assistant vice president, Seaboard Air Line Railroad)

In the late 1920's the Seaboard Air Line Railroad, one of the principal lines serving the southeastern portion of the United States, intensified its efforts toward building up the industrial economy of the territory served with the view to increasing rail tonnage for its lines.

Careful studies pointed to the conclusion that the greatest potential for the production of increased tonnage lay in the forest resources of the six Southeastern States served by the railroad. Originally, the southeastern part of the United States was one of the finest timber areas in the world. The region was covered with magnificent stands of virgin pine and various types of fine hardwoods extending from the Atlantic Seaboard to the Appalachian Mountain range on the west.

A large portion of the Seaboard system was originally constructed to serve logging and sawmill operations in the Southeast. During the latter part of the 19th century and the first two decades of the 20th century large and extensive sawmill operations characterized the principal developments in the area, producing lumber in enormous quantities from the virgin stands of timber for markets in this country and abroad. For the most part, the mills pursued a cut-out and get-out policy, with no definite plans or efforts by the owners for perpetuating the future growth of the forests. In many instances uncontrolled fires added to the destruction of the forests.

By the end of the second decade of the 20th century most of the virgin timber had been cut and the large sawmills were forced to close down, leaving lumbering operations in large measure to small mills of the portable type. Numerous instances could be cited throughout the southeastern territory where prosperous towns and communities, based on extensive sawmill operations, were left without payrolls or means of support with the closing of lumbering operations incident to the exhaustion of virgin timber supply.

Studies made by Seaboard's industrial department and other interested agencies indicated a highly favorable opportunity for the development of the pulp and paper industry in the Southeast. Basically, it was recognized that the inherent forest resources of the area consisted of fast growing species of timber, fertile soils, ample rainfall and long growing seasons. With adequate fire protection, southern pines were known to reach pulpwood size in from 15 to 20 years and in some instances in even a shorter period of time.

Intensive efforts were made by Seaboard's industrial department, as well as by other organizations and individuals, to promote pulp and paper manufacture in the Southeast. At about this time Dr. Charles H. Herty, famous scientist and humanitarian, demonstrated in his laboratory at Savannah, Ga., that southern pine could be utilized in the production of paper other than kraft or sulphate, and indeed that southern wood could be profitably utilized in the making of various grades of fine paper, rayon, cellophane and kindred products.

Until the mid-1930's the country's main sources of supply for pulp and paper were the Scandinavian countries, Canada, and the northern part of the United States. Although a few kraft or sulfate mills were in operation in the South—a small plant having been built at Roanoke Rapids, N.C., as early as 1909—the pulp and paper potential of the region had scracely been scratched.

In view of this situation, and as a result of intensive promotional efforts, a wave of construction of pulp and paper mills began in the South in 1935. In the short period from 1935 to 1940, 15 large mills were built in the Southeast, most of which were on Seaboard rails. Developments in the industry have continued apace and today a total of 63 pulp and paper mills are operating in the region from Virginia southward to Texas. Total investment by the industry

Until the mid-1930's the country's main mated at more than $5 billion. The annual production of mills in the South now exceeds 12 million tons of paper and board, with expenditures for pulpwood alone running to almost one-half billion dollars.

Prior to the coming of pulp and paper to the South there was relatively little demand for second growth timber. Fires ravaged the forests year in and year out and progress in forestry was slow and discouraging. The U.S. Forest Service and State forest agencies had for many years conducted intelligent, energetic and persistent programs for the elimination of forest fires, for the reforestation of denuded areas and for the promotion of sound forestry practices generally, but there simply was lacking the demand for the timber, and results from these efforts were, in the main, disappointing. As recently as 25 years ago, second growth pine timber could be purchased on a stumpage basis for as low as 50 cents a cord. With markets provided by pulp and paper mills for pulpwood, the stumpage price per cord today will run to $5 and upwards, depending on the location.

The past two decades have witnessed a sharp increase in the drain upon the woodlands of the South, with every indication pointing to even greater demands for timber in the future. In addition to new demands created by pulp and paper mills, timber is being required in increasing amounts for such industries as plywood, veneers, furniture, poles, piling, and lumber.

Seaboard's program for developing the forest potential of the territory served has not been confined to the location of pulp and paper mills. In 1936 a forestry division was organized within the industrial department to work with wood-using industries, State forest agencies, the U.S. Forest Service, farmers and landowners generally in the promotion of sound forestry practices to the end that a continuing supply of timber might be available for all future needs.

It became obvious from the beginning that the problem was one of education, of getting across to landowners generally, and particularly to the small farmowner, that timberlands can be operated profitably on a sustained yield basis.

The Seaboard's first move in its newly launched educational program was the operation of a conservation special train, which was something of a schoolhouse on wheels, and which toured the Southeast for 6 straight weeks in 1942. The U.S. Forest Service, which has been of inestimable assistance to the railroad's program from its inception, was called upon for assistance, and the cooperation of State agencies was likewise enlisted. The conservation special made frequent stops throughout the Southeast, carrying visual demonstrations of the value of fire prevention and other sound forestry measures. The interest and cooperation of Governors, mayors, and other public officials were enlisted. The conservation special was visited by more than 50,000 people.

Another phase of the railroad's forestry work is the holding of forestry demonstrations at strategic points throughout the territory. These functions are scheduled only after exhaustive preparation extending over a period of many weeks, and are participated in by representatives of the U.S. Forest Services, State forest agencies, soil conservation service, vocational agriculture departments, wood-using industries, local businessmen and other interested agencies and individuals. These demonstrations illustrate all phases of sound forestry practices and wood utilization. Scores of these programs have been carried out at strategic points throughout the Southeast during the past two decades with attendance in many instances running to more than 1,000 for a single meeting. It is noteworthy that in every case where these wood utilization programs were conducted there resulted a marked increase in the production and shipment of pulpwood and other forest products from the surrounding areas. Additionally, these demonstrations have resulted in an upsurge of interest on the part of landowners in instituting improved forest practices.

Total forest acreage in the six Southeastern States amounts to 113 million acres, or a little more than 60 percent of the total land area. Farm woodlands, with small ownerships predominating, comprise 57 percent of the timber holdings. There are more than 800,000 such small ownerships in the area.

To engage the active interest and participation of these numerous small owners in instituting sound forestry measures is an educational problem of the first order. Pulp and paper companies and other large owners of timberland have inaugurated their own programs for forestry improvement under the direction of trained foresters. Obviously, the problem of the small farmowner is considerably different.

To meet this situation Seaboard started an educational program with the farm youth of the Southeast some 16 years ago, a movement which has achieved profound results. One phase of the farm youth program involved the inauguration of forestry contests in the various States served by the railroad in which cash prizes ranging from first, second, and third to fourth are awarded to winners under rules set up by the Seaboard's general forestry agent in conjunction with State forest agencies and Future Farmers of America. In addition to the giving of cash prizes to the winning youths, cash prizes are also awarded to the teachers of vocational agriculture in the classes from which top winning youths are selected.

In this program more than 85,000 youths are reached directly every year. The top winners in these forestry contests are taken to Kansas City each fall to the national convention of the Future Farmers of America where the winning youths appear before civic and business organizations to tell of their individual projects and how they have learned the lessons of sound forestry. These appearances before civil groups and other organizations have recently been extended to include other important cities.

The railroad's program includes the publication of a forestry bulletin—the first of its kind in the country—carrying to a readership of 100,000 regular messages on forest conservation subjects.

Interest in forestry in the Southeast was never greater than at the present time. The economic value of the forests to the region can scarcely be exaggerated. The problem of future timber supply continues to be one of education. In a recent address before the American Pulp & Paper Association in New York City, Dr. Richard E. McArdle, Chief, U.S. Forest Service, pointed up the vital aspects of future timber supply in saying:

"I am not predicting a timber famine. I am talking about an adequate supply. It means a conscious effort, however. The decisions you make in the sixties will be irretrievable.

"You are entering a decade of decision as to our long-range timber supplies. Don't let these decisions be made for you by default. Take positive action."

Notwithstanding the marked progress achieved in forestry during the past two decades, it is the opinion of competent authorities that the South realizes only a fraction of its potential in the growing of timber. The U.S. Forest Service has estimated that within the next two decades the country's demand for forest products will be twice that of today. Only with the general adoption of intensive and sound forestry measures can this demand be met. It is the Seaboard's objective through its forestry program to contribute to the fullest possible extent toward the achievement of this goal.

Khrushchev Looks at Neutrals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we can often learn through the remarks of statesmen throughout the world, even a butcher turned statesman such as Nikita Khrushchev. The Chicago Daily News of April 24, 1961, contained a most penetrating editorial entitled "Khrushchev Looks at Neutrals," which I hope will be noticed especially by our misguided eggheads in the State Department:

KHRUSHCHEV LOOKS AT NEUTRALS

"There are no neutral men." This comment by Nikita Khrushchev, dropped in the course of a talk with Walter Lippmann, explains a great deal about current Russian diplomacy. It also raises a great deal of doubt that any agreement at all can be reached with Russia.

It explains why Khrushchev has demanded a tripartite committee to direct the United Nations Secretariat, and why a similar demand for a council of three is one factor

blocking the nuclear test ban talks at Geneva.

Whether Khrushchev has just reached this conclusion or whether he now, for the first time, feels strong enough to bring it out in the open, we have no way of knowing.

Until last year, Russia concurred in supporting a neutral at the head of the U.N. operations, despite some complaining. The demand for a three-headed monstrosity did not arise in the test ban negotiations until this spring.

In each case, Khrushchev proposed that one representative be picked by the West and one by the Communist bloc, and that the third represent neutral nations. But if there are no neutral men, the proposal becomes a meaningless smokescreen.

The neutral representative, according to Khrushchev, would automatically favor one side or the other and hence become a potentially dangerous partisan. He, too, would have to be neutralized, and Khrushchev has a method for accomplishing it.

His way would be to require unanimous approval of every measure before it could become effective. In short, a lone Russian negative vote would be a veto paralyzing any action of which Russia disapproved.

The idea that "anyone who is not for me is against me" is not exactly new in the world. It crops up everywhere—in labor disputes, in baseball umpiring, and court cases.

But at some point in disputes of any kind it becomes essential to have arbitrators able to see both sides. Khrushchev would seem to rule out any kind of meaningful abritration on the international scene.

It is ironic that this Khrushchev doctrine should emerge just when the Kennedy administration has taken a different policy turn on neutrality. The present tendency in Washington is to regard neutrals with much less suspicion than when John Foster Dulles held sway.

But if the only neutralist acceptable to Khrushchev is to be one he knows to be neutral on his side, some revival of our own suspicions may be in order.

Freeport, Tex., Pilot Plant for Sea Water Conversion Could Prove To Be of International Importance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, there is an old proverb which warns that "when you are thristy it is too late to start thinking about digging a well."

As a nation we are not yet generally thirsty for water, but we can seee the day not far off when we must have additional water.

Today we are consuming 60 percent of the Nation's fresh water and over 1,000 cities and communities in recent summers have had serious water shortages. At the present rate of increase in consumer consumption, America will be using 90 percent of all presently available fresh water by 1975.

A one-family house of four people uses 550 gallons of water a day; it takes 37 gallons of water to produce one slice of bread, and 3,700 gallons of water to produce 1 pound of beef.

Our scientists tell us that the real answer, the key to a bold new advance in human achievement, lies in learning how to economically convert sea water into fresh water.

If America can be the first to develop a cheap way to give the arid areas of the world fresh water from salt or brackish water, it will mean invaluable prestige for the forces of democracy. Water which would make the deserts blossom as the rose, would mean food for the hungry millions, and it would dwarf most other technological achievements of recent decades.

Texans are proud that a pilot sea water conversion plant in Freeport, Tex., is scheduled to be dedicated sometime next month. Mr. Frank Carey, Associated Press science writer, recently wrote a highly informative article on the saline water conversion program.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Mr. Carey's article, which was published in the April 16, 1961, issue of the Abilene, Tex., Reporter-News under the heading "Ways of Converting Salt Water Get Special Study."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Abilene Reporter-News, Apr. 16, 1961]

FREEPORT PLANT IS FIRST—WAYS OF CONVERTING SALT WATER GET SPECIAL STUDY

(By Frank Carey)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—It's as simple as H_2O: The United States is running out of water. Realizing that, scientists have for years been talking about converting the oceans to fresh water. But now they're not just talking. They're doing something about it.)

WASHINGTON.—President John F. Kennedy, an old PT boat commander and sometime yachtsman, wants to use the seas to meet a growing national problem.

The Kennedy administration has pledged itself to redouble the Nation's efforts to achieve the long-sought breakthrough in converting the ocean's salt waters to fresh.

Since 1952, the Government has had a formal program aimed at economically converting saline water.

Officials of the Interior Department's Office of Saline Water say sensational breakthroughs have yet to be achieved—and that none are foreseen for at least the next few years. They add, though, that progress has been, and is being, made despite a research and development budget which is just about the same as that earmarked for running the Washington zoo.

The Office soon will put into operation at Freeport, Tex., the first of five big demonstration plants planned for various parts of the country. The plants are to produce the first big-league data on the cost of different conversion processes. At the same time they will add nearly 3 million gallons daily to the country's water supply.

These plants cost about $6 million in all. Still more promising ideas are cropping up in laboratories.

It's in this setting that President Kennedy has promised new action and has urged Congress to double appropriations for saline water research and construction.

Impending shortages are such, says a new report by the Senate's Select Committee on National Water Resources, that the Nation may be in real trouble by 1980 unless prompt action is taken. But a report issued by the House Science and Astronautics Committee says the danger may arise by 1970 or before.

The Senate committee puts the figures this way: The United States now uses about 300 billion gallons of water a day—enough to cover Rhode Island with more than a foot of water—out of some 1,100 billion gallons available in streamflow. The demand is expected to nearly double in 20 years, and triple by 2000.

The House committee says only about 50 percent of the water supply is usable, so that in 1980, only about 515 billion gallons a day will be available, against at least 600 billions gallons required.

INCREASED EFFORTS ASKED

President Kennedy plunged into the troubled waters in a special message to Congress calling for increased efforts to conserve and develop all the Nation's natural resources—including water.

He also has asked the National Academy of Sciences to evaluate present research of all the Nation's natural resources.

Authority also is sought for the office to build perhaps five more big plants in addition to those already scheduled for Freeport, San Diego, Calif.; Roswell, N. Mex.; Webster, S. Dak.; and Wrightsville Beach, N.C.; Hawaii and Key West, Fla., are reportedly among sites under consideration.

The just completed plant at Freeport, uses a form of distillation, a modern variation of the age-old process of boiling water. It's expected to produce at least 1 million gallons of fresh water daily at a cost of $1 per 1,000 gallons.

That cost is far higher than the 25 to 40 cents which most municipalities charge for water from conventional sources. But, the Office of Saline Water says its engineers figure that if the Freeport plant, or one like it, were increased to a capacity of 15 million gallons a day, the price would drop to 50 cents. And this would make it economically attractive to places like Key West which already pay $1 or more.

Even in the present plant, they say, the cost ultimately may turn out to be 70 cents instead of a dollar—provided some recent developments at a pilot plant that eliminate distillation-slowing chemicals work out on a large scale.

Officials stress, however, it's not really valid to make comparisons with present rates for conventional fresh water. They maintain that saline conversion costs are going to look better and better as the population keeps growing, costs of conventional water plants go up, and natural water supplies get slimmer.

The plant being built at San Diego, scheduled for completion this summer, will employ another form of distillation known as the flash process. It's also supposed to turn out 1 million gallons a day at $1 per 1,000 gallons.

Still another type of distillation plant at Roswell, N. Mex., will convert brackish water to fresh at an anticipated rate of at least 250,000 gallons a day starting sometime next year.

Let's Woo Castro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the following article in today's Wall Street

Journal by William Henry Chamberlin shows some of the feelings of students at Harvard on Cuba. Because of the great number of Harvard alumni in positions of power and influence in the administration, the article is especially appropriate:

LET'S WOO CASTRO—SHENANIGANS AT OLD HARVARD WHERE YESTERDAY'S IDOLS TODAY ARE TUMBLED

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.—Harvard University, which provided so much of the brainpower for the Kennedy administration, has also become a main center of protest against and dissent from the administration's Cuban policy.

A be-nice-to-Castro movement has acquired momentum under the leadership of some Harvard professors and with the support of a small but vociferous minority of Harvard students. A recent meeting in one of the larger university classrooms attracted an audience of 300 to 400 which roared applause for "no intervention" speeches by H. Stuart Hughes, professor of history, and Nadav Safran, assistant professor of government. The meeting sent 127 protesting telegrams to Washington and voted in favor of a resolution calling for a reversal of "the present drift toward American military intervention in Cuba."

The idea developed in the rather lengthy 4-point resolution and in the addresses at the meeting was that, if the United States would only be nice to Castro and restore diplomatic and trade relations, the bearded Cuban dictator would detach himself from the Soviet bloc, and all would live happily ever afterward.

PICKING HOLES

A distinct Harvard versus Harvard attitude developed during the meeting. One of the speakers, Mr. Safran, devoted most of his address to trying to pick holes in the American white paper on Cuba, commonly attributed to ex-Harvard historian and professor, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. References to an illustrious historian, who was accused of having lost his objectivity when he left the halls of Harvard for the corrupting influence of Washington in general and the Pentagon and the CIA, in particular, drew bursts of knowing derisive laughter.

Mr. Schlesinger once wrote a book entitled "The Vital Center" and now seems to find himself in that spot. His name would scarcely arouse cheers at a meeting of Goldwater Republicans; but some, at least, of his Harvard former colleagues and students regard him as a traitor to the liberal cause because he dealt harshly with the Communist affiliations of the Castro regime in the white paper.

Professor Hughes, a grandson of the former Chief Justice, an advocate of nuclear disarmament, even on a unilateral basis, called for "a few resounding resignations," beginning with Adlai Stevenson, whom he mourned as "a great American who has been reduced to the level of a shyster lawyer pleading a bad case." Hughes also professed sympathy with such ex-Harvard professors-ambassadors as John K. Galbraith in India and Edwin O. Reischauer in Japan, declaring that the President had pulled the rug from under them and made them look like "utter fools" before they had fairly started on their diplomatic tasks.

While Safran concentrated on attacking the accuracy of the white paper and minimizing the Communist affiliations of the influential leaders of the Castro regime, Hughes took the line that it is necessary to live with distasteful foreign governments. He cited the British adjustment to Nasser after Suez, DeGaulle's willingness to come to terms with the Algerian nationalists, and Soviet acceptance as a neighbor of Turkey, anti-Communist and heavily supplied with American military equipment.

This meeting was the climax of a campaign marked by editorials and letters to the university daily newspaper, the Harvard Crimson, which, in the opinion of conservative Harvard alumni, is apt to justify its name. Barrington Moore, Jr., lecturer in sociology, expressed the view that the American-supported landing in Cuba "places the United States squarely in the position of an ancient regime trying to put down by force a revolutionary government seeking to raise the material position of a people who were in substantial measure victims of past American policies."

MR. MOORE'S SUMMATION

Mr. Moore forsakes the traditional restraint of academic language and ends: "Are we not at the point where one should cease mincing words in the alas so frequently graceless minuendo of academic debate, and say simply and brutally, this stinks?"

There is no indication that a majority, or even a large minority, of Harvard faculty and students have been caught up with the idea that Castro could be successfully appeased.

However, some of the arguments that are being used in supporting the pseudo-sophisticated idea of weaning Castro from the Communists suggest that another white paper might be in order.

For instance, it is generally believed among the dissenters from the Eisenhower-Kennedy policy that Castro was driven to make deals with the Soviet Union by the cancellation of the preferential sugar quota and the U.S. embargo on much Cuban trade. But this puts the cart before the horse. It was only after Castro had made large commercial and munitions deals with the Communist powers, confiscated almost all American property in Cuba and placed himself aggressively in the Communist camp that measures of economic reprisal were applied, perhaps a little belatedly.

For the sake of dissenters who are open-minded and of American and world public opinion, a detailed, documented survey of United States-Cuban relations since Castro came into power would be very desirable. The case for the proposition that Castro's commitment to the Communist cause was too strong to be shaken by anything the United States might have done would only be strengthened by a full factual record.

And this might help to decide some wavering minds in Latin America, if not here at Harvard.

The Democratic Party's Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I submit herewith a thoughtful letter from my constituent, Mr. Henry U. Chace.

Since the first and last paragraphs of the letter are personal, I have deleted them.

The letter follows:

Hon. CHARLES S. GUBSER,
Representative in Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GUBSER: The news of the past few days indicates that we are entering into a very dangerous period that could very easily mean war. It is certainly true that we cannot long permit a Communist state to exist 90 miles from the Florida coast even if it means military intervention. No matter what we do we cannot make friends of the so-called neutralist nations but at least we can command universal respect for protecting our own security and the democratic foundations of our country and in fact the entire hemisphere. President Kennedy should have everyone's support in pursuit of his aims to prevent any further incursion in this hemisphere of Communist power or influence, but from the point of view of the Republican Party and particularly of conservative Republicans, with reservations. The welfare state legislation now flooding both Houses of Congress according to your newsletter received yesterday, is just as dangerous to our freedom and liberty at home as the importation of communism is from abroad. These measures are a part and continuation of an insidious erosion process to our liberties guaranteed to us under the Constitution that has been proceeding ever since the first Roosevelt (F.D.R.) administration, and if not checked in the very near future will successfully accomplish the abolishment of freedom and liberty at home just as surely as would a takeover by communism from abroad. This is the eternal paradox with which the Democratic Party is faced—to fight communism abroad but create socialism at home. So I say it is entirely inconsistent and Republicans should fight for a consistent policy of freedom and liberty on all fronts. This, I know you intend to do with all your strength but can't the Republican Members of Congress use the paradox to help defeat this infernal socialist legislation. I just can't see how or why American families should be asked to send their sons to fight for liberty, freedom, and the American way of life when we are destroying these very things at home.

Of course the Democrat pat answer is that these measures are for the benefit of all citizens and our retort is that they won't work. Witness 30 years of agricultural controls and farm legislation which simply cannot work in an otherwise free economy and which has resulted in such an awful mess that 8 years of Republican rule couldn't untangle it. The tortured Supreme Court decisions supporting such legislation must inevitably be reversed by another Court at some future time, not too distant I hope if we are ever to return to constitutional Government. In fact the history of the Court itself indicates that this will be done in the future if we do not lose our freedom first. Many of the great minds of the past have commented on this subject in their writings, including John Adams the second President and Thomas Jefferson the third in one of his letters to George Washington.

Adams had this to say in his defense of John Hancock who was a large colonial merchant and shipper when he had violated one of the British laws against the importation of tax free rum from the West Indies. "My client, Mr. Hancock, never voted for it and he never voted for any man to make such a law for him". In England a bill could not become law without the consent of the people. The authors of the act acknowledged this, then got round the point by declaring for consent by construction, by interpretation rather than by vote—a virtual consent. This Adams argued, "is deluding men with shadows instead of substance. Construction has made treason where the law made none. Whenever we leave principles and clear, positive laws, and wander after constructions, we get too far from fact and truth and nature. We are lost in the wild regions of imagination and possibility, where arbitrary power sits upon her brazen throne and governs with an iron scepter" In the light of this statement you can draw

your own conclusions about some of the Supreme Court decisions of the last 30 years. Of course Adams, in later years was a federalist and therefore a member of the party which supported a loose construction of the Constitution. John Marshall as the First Supreme Court Chief Justice supported some of the early legislation including the act creating the Bank of the United States which was a very loose construction decision. Still, in later years the charter of the Bank was allowed to lapse and was not renewed, as by that time it was obvious to most people that the power granted to Congress under the Constitution to coin money and regulate the value thereof did not extend to an actual participation in the banking business in direct competition with private citizens.

Thomas Jefferson had this to say in a letter to Washington concerning various legislative powers granted to the Congress under the Constitution: "The Congress is empowered to lay taxes to provide for the general welfare of the United States; that is to say, to lay taxes for the purpose of providing for the general welfare. For the laying of taxes is the power, and the general welfare the purpose for which the power is to be exercised. They are not to lay taxes ad libitum for any purpose they please, but only to pay debts or provide for the welfare of the Union. In like manner, they are not to do anything they please to provide for the general welfare, but only to lay taxes for that purpose. To consider the latter phrase, not as describing the purpose of the first, but as giving a distinct and independent power to do any act they please, which might be for the good of the Union, would render all the preceding and subsequent enumerations of power completely useless. It would reduce the whole instrument to a single phrase: that of instituting a Congress with power to do whatever would be for the good of the United States; and as they would be the sole judges of good and evil it would also be a power to do whatever evil they please.

"I consider the foundation of the Constitution as laid on this ground that all powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States or to the people."

Very truly yours,

HENRY U. CHACE.

LOS ALTOS, CALIF.

Washington Post Warns of Fear of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, our incomparable system of Government by consent of the governed will work only so long as we retain our basic freedoms of speech, press, religion, and the other guarantees of liberty.

We know that whenever and wherever they can, informed men will be free men. Ignorance and secrecy are the greatest threats to free society.

Believing this, I was strongly impressed with the lead editorial in this morning's Washington Post, which begins:

The saddest consequence of a month of adversity is that some Americans have been led to question the very validity of our free institutions. Some wonder, for example, why reporters should be allowed at Cape Canaveral during the launching of an astronaut. Suppose there is a mishap, they ask, why should the United States humiliate itself in public? Isn't it preferable to follow the quiet examples of publicity only for success?

The Post editorial then goes on with a penetrating analysis of the situation, pointing out:

Ultimately, this country's greatest resource is precisely the fact that its achievements, as well as its failures, are subjected to public scrutiny. Thus we can glory in our victories, and profit from our setbacks.

More than ever, it is imperative to reassert our faith in the utility as well as the morality of freedom. Lincoln: Our defense is the spirit which prized liberty as the heritage of all men in all lands everywhere.

To assure that Americans across the Nation will have the opportunity to consider this excellent editorial, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the aforementioned editorial, entitled "The Fear of Freedom" from the May 4, 1961, issue of the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 4, 1961]

THE FEAR OF FREEDOM

The saddest consequence of a month of adversity is that some Americans have been led to question the very validity of our free institutions. Some wonder, for example, why reporters should be allowed at Cape Canaveral during the launching of the astronaut. Suppose there is a mishap, they ask, why should the United States humiliate itself in public? Isn't it preferable to follow the Soviet example of publicity only for success?

Let us suppose that President Kennedy were indeed persuaded to take a leaf from Mr. Khrushchev's propaganda book and place a curtain of censorship around the launching. Would the country be better off if a simple press release were handed out announcing that a man had been placed in space, and that some day the Government might tell more about it? Would the Voice of America resound more persuasively in telling the world of an experiment conducted in secrecy and confirmed by White House subalterns?

Or would we be in the position in which the Soviet Union now finds itself? Major Gagarin's feat has been robbed of some of its luster by persistent rumors that others have preceded him, with less fortunate results. There is a Gresham's law in Soviet propaganda. The lies cheapen the truth, dissolve the barrier between fact and wishful fiction, and foster cynicism.

The effect on Russian life is described in a timely article in the current Harper's by Richard Pipes, a member of Harvard's Russian Research Center. In the absence of a free press, Dr. Pipes remarks, the Soviet citizen is "profoundly skeptical" of government claims.

Statistics have been so atrociously manipulated for the past 40 years that they are widely ignored—much as we in this country discount advertising claims.

Many people, especially the more sophisticated, even question Soviet achievements in rocketry and space exploration.

Ultimately, this country's greatest resource is precisely the fact that its achievements—as well as its failures—are subjected to public scrutiny. Thus we can glory in our victories, and profit from our setbacks. If our astronaut succeeds in his mission, there will be no skepticism about our claim. If the experiment fails, the President will find an aroused public opinion to support greater efforts in the race.

Furthermore, the fact that we are trailing the Soviet Union has created a popular interest that cannot be ignored by either the press or the Government. Indeed, agencies of Government have whetted this interest—and did not the Government encourage the astronauts to sell the tales of their adventures? If the administration remained silent, there would be a loss of confidence in both the press and the Government—and a feeling that concealment was protecting the incompetent or masking a disaster.

More than ever, it is imperative to reassert our faith in the utility as well as the morality of freedom. As Lincoln recognized a century ago, our ultimate security does not rest in "our frowning battlements, our bristling seacoasts, our Army and our Navy." Instead, contended Lincoln: "Our defense is in the spirit which prized liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands everywhere. Destroy this spirit and you have planted the seeds of despotism at your own door." And the first seed of despotism is to deny the people the information that is essential to giving their Government the credit as well as the criticism it may deserve.

Federal Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal said about Federal spending and Federal control, and here is an editorial, as it appeared in the Wheeling Intelligencer on April 24, that is sensible and factual:

[From the Wheeling Intelligencer, Apr. 24, 1961]

INEVITABLE: CONTROL FOLLOWS PURSE STRINGS WHETHER IN MEDICAL AID TO AGED OR SUPPORT OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Secretary Ribicoff, accusing the American Medical Association of misrepresenting the administration's medical care for the aged plan, dismisses as "completely without basis," the warning that its adoption would constitute a step toward socialized medicine.

This has become the theme song of the administration's new campaign for support of a program which threatens to bog down in Congress, an effort of which Mr. Ribicoff appears to have assumed leadership. He hammered on this point in an address before the American Society of Newspaper Editors as he has in several others recently accusing the AMA of "trying to make a hobgoblin, out of a sound and constructive plan designed to remove one of the major causes of economic misery in old age—the frightful costs of illness."

Pointing out that "under the President's bill every person has the right to choose his own doctor and his own hospital, that every doctor will treat his own patient exactly as he does now," Mr. Ribicoff added that doctors must know "the simple fact that this legislation has nothing whatever to do with doctors' bills."

It would be interesting to know, then, inasmuch as it seems to be assumed the medical profession is entirely selfish in its viewpoint, why it is opposing the bill.

The truth, of course, is that Mr. Ribicoff's disclaimer has no more substance than the

equally vehement assertion of those who support the President's aid to the schools bill, including Mr. Ribicoff, that its adoption would not mean Federal interference in school affairs.

Control follows the purse strings. When Congress appropriates money from the tax payments of all of the people to be distributed among lesser units of Government, it lays down the conditions under which this money may be used. It not only has the right and disposition to do this, but the public responsibility to do so. Any Congressman who would vote money to be passed down to a State or a county or a school district or a municipality to be used in whatever way the officials of these units saw fit to spend it, would be unworthy of the position he occupies. No Congress ever has or can be expected to pursue such an irresponsible course. There are and must be strings to Federal grants. And these strings, whatever lipservice to local independence accompanies their attachment, lead back to Washington. It cannot be and should not be otherwise. So if we accept the principle of Federal assistance in support of our schools we must accept the corollary of Federal dictation.

Similarly, when Congress writes into law an all-embrasive, compulsory system of medical care support by incorporating it into the social security system and imposing taxes specifically to finance it, we are deluding ourselves when we see it in none of the characteristics of socialized medicine.

Federal intrusion might appear minimal at first in both cases, but once the course has been set we are blind indeed if we cannot see the ultimate destination.

Governor Rockefeller's Comment on Tax Advantages to Holders of Stock Options

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I have today received from Governor Rockefeller together with a statement which he attaches thereto.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NEW YORK,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Albany, May 1, 1961.

DEAR SENATOR GORE: Thank you for your telegram. Enclosed is the text of the remarks to which you refer.

As I believe you will agree, no "rebuke" or "reprimand" was intended or implied.

Sincerely,

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.

EXCERPT FROM GOVERNOR ROCKEFELLER'S REMARKS AT DEDICATION OF IBM RESEARCH CENTER YORKTOWN, N.Y., APRIL 25, 1961

Stimulation of economic growth has been the central focus of my administration as Governor of the State of New York. An example of the kind of step that I have been trying to take in this State was an act to amend the tax law in relation to employees' stock options, and I'd like to read to you from my message that I made in connection with this last year:

"In passing this bill with but one dissenting vote, the legislature has recognized, as do I, the great significance of employee stock options as an incentive in attracting top-flight management to New York corporations. It is well recognized today that one of the greatest problems of business is to obtain first-grade managerial and executive talent. Businesses weigh this factor heavily in deciding where to locate or expand.

"We cannot expect to induce new industry to locate here, or to encourage existing industry to expand here unless we provide a tax framework reasonably calculated to maintain incentives.

"This expansion of business is essential to creating increased job opportunities in this State."

End quote from my statement of April 24, 1959. I read by the press that a certain southern Senator is advising us in New York State what we ought to do. Maybe he is a little worried about the competition up here in trying to attract some industry away from New York State. But I'd like to say that the results have been increasingly encouraging, here in the State, of this program of encouraging the climate for economic growth.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am sure that Governor Rockefeller intended no patronizing remark when, speaking in New York, he referred to me as "a certain southern Senator." Therefore I shall not, when speaking in Tennessee, refer to him as "a certain Yankee Governor."

I should like to comment for a brief moment on Governor Rockefeller's statement with respect to the New York law, which provides tax advantages to holders of stock options. His statement refers to "employees' stock options." However, the very next paragraph deals with options held by corporation executives. Usually options granted to employees differ greatly from the options granted to the officers and key personnel. It was to restricted stock options and tax favoritism accorded them to which I had addressed my remarks.

Social Security Amendments of 1961

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
April 20, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6027) to improve benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program by increasing the minimum benefits and aged widow's benefits and by making additional persons eligible for benefits under the program, and for other purposes.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, because of my constant interest and efforts to improve the Social Security Act during my congressional career I rise in support of H.R. 6027 as reported by the House Committee on Ways and Means.

While it is true the pending legislation does not accomplish many hoped for objectives its provisions contain needed improvements to existing law and provide for increases in benefits that will prove helpful to those eligible for them.

Despite the desire for greater liberalization of the Social Security Act it must be borne in mind that Congress is faced with the problem of safeguarding the financial condition of the Social Security fund in considering amendments that extend coverage, liberalize eligibility requirements and increase present benefits. In this connection H.R. 6027 provides for limited liberalization of the present law and increasing benefits the cost of which will be financed by an increase beginning in 1962 of the contribution rates of one-eighth of 1 percent each for employees and employers and by three-sixteenths of 1 percent for the self-employed.

During my congressional career I have advocated reducing the eligibility age to 60 years on an optional basis and have introduced legislation on the subject in the present and in previous Congresses. It is gratifying, therefore, that H.R. 6027 provides optional retirement for male employees at age 62 even though benefits are reduced to 80 percent of benefits accruable at age 65. While I would prefer full retirement benefits at age 62 it is realized that the cost factor had to be taken into consideration in computing the total cost of H.R. 6027.

In considering retirement for men at age 62 it should be kept in mind that such a provision is not mandatory but optional. It has been estimated that the group covered by this optional retirement numbers 560,000. This provision will prove helpful to persons whose health does not permit their employment yet they are unable to meet the exacting requirements for disability benefits under the current provisions of the Social Security Act. Many persons in this category are forced in their economic misery to wait until they reach age 65 to qualify for benefits under the existing law. Therefore, optional retirement at age 62 will prove an economic blessing.

It is a source of regret that it was not possible to secure action this year on revising the requirements for disability benefits. It is evident that such a revision should be made and I am hopeful that consideration will be given to what I consider a compelling problem.

While the House Committee on Ways and Means found it not feasible at this time to further liberalize the income ceiling for retired persons, I am hopeful that consideration can be given the subject at the first opportunity. It is of particular interest that benefits will be increased under the provisions of H.R. 6027 for aged widow's, widower's, and parent's benefits from 75 to 82½ percent of the worker's retirement benefits which according to House Report No. 216 represents a 10-percent increase in benefits for these people. The particular provision will affect a total of 1,525,000 persons.

The increase in the widow's benefit is timely and sorely needed. The average benefit for an aged widow is $57.80 while a retired worker without dependents receives $70. H.R. 6027 would increase the average widow's benefit to $64.

Among the 4,420,000 people to benefit by the provisions of H.R. 6027, 2,175,000 will benefit by the increase of the minimum benefit from $33 to $40 monthly.

Another provision of H.R. 6027 changes the insured status requirement from 1 out of 3 quarters which is required under existing law, to 1 out of 4 elapsed quarters after 1950. This provision will make eligible 160,000 more people than are presently eligible for benefits.

Since my congressional district in Pennsylvania, from a percentage standpoint, has one of the largest railroad populations in the Nation, the effect of H.R. 6027 on persons retired under the Railroad Retirement Act is of great importance. Briefly, beneficiaries under the Railroad Retirement Act will be affected by H.R. 6027 as follows: 156,000 will receive $13 million in added benefits during the first year the revised schedule is in effect. In addition, over 140,000 survivor beneficiaries, mostly aged widows, will receive an average monthly increase of $7. Their additional benefits in the first 12 months will total about $12 million. Finally, the increase in the minimum primary insurance amounts from $33 to $40, and providing optional retirement for men at age 62 will represent $1.4 million in benefits for 15,500 former railroad workers.

As stated previously, we are conscious of the fact that the House Committee on Ways and Means was confronted with the cost factor in considering proposed amendments to the Social Security Act. It is my opinion that H.R. 6027 represents the best possible result that could be achieved and at the same time keep the increase of payroll taxes to a minimum. Therefore, I am in favor of the enactment of H.R. 6027, as I feel the increase in benefits for beneficiaries under the Social Security and Railroad Retirement Acts is badly needed and will at least to some degree prove helpful in the face of rising prices and the evils of inflation.

Legislative History of Bill of Rights of Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, almost 2 years ago the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 was enacted. In many respects this legislation is supplementary to the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947.

The enforcement responsibility was divided between the National Labor Relations Board and the Department of Labor, depending on the type of action required. It is proper for the agencies of Government having enforcement responsibilities to prepare legislative histories of the pertinent statutes.

Title I of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 is captioned the "Bill of Rights." By its very nature, no agency of the Government has enforcement responsibility since action under this title must be initiated in court by individual union members. For this reason, until now there has been no legislative history prepared.

To obtain maximum effectiveness, it is extremely important that rank-and-file union members and their counsel are informed adequately concerning their rights under this title. Congress intended to place within the grasp of these union members the legal means to preserve their rights and, obviously, they will be able to accomplish this better, if they are better informed.

Mr. Stuart Rothman, general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, has prepared a legislative history of this "Bill of Rights," which is title I of the act. In so doing, Mr. Rothman has performed a valuable public service. In order that the study may be made available to interested attorneys and union members, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in its entirety in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with the index which accompanies it.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the printing of the article in the RECORD will require 3¼ pages at a cost of $263.25. Notwithstanding that, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF THE "BILL OF RIGHTS" FOR UNION MEMBERS

(By Stuart Rothman)

INTRODUCTION

The Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure (Landrum-Griffin) Act of 1959 guarantees certain rights of union members in title I, entitled "Bill of Rights of Members of Labor Organizations."

Immediately upon the passage of the act by Congress, the Office of the General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) commenced the collection and preparation for publication of the documents and debates which constitute the legislative history of the act. The two-volume legislative history that was published by this agency in 1959 [1] indexed by topic and section only that part of the legislative materials relating to the title VII amendments; with few exceptions, the indexes do not cover materials relating to titles I through VI of the act.

Title I, the so-called bill of rights of union members, is not administered by any Federal department or agency; it is enforceable by civil suits instituted by aggrieved union members. In view of this lack of an administrative agency to which the public may look for interpretation of title I—coupled with the absence of any published legislative history of the title—it was considered that the publication of a topical and sectional index, with page references to the NLRB's legislative history, would be a service to the public and particularly to those affected by the title. Such an index has been prepared and is appended hereto.

[1] "Legislative History of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959."

It is rare for any important piece of legislation to be written in such clear, unambiguous language that resort to legislative history is not necessary, or at least appropriate, to determine what the language was intended to mean. In this respect, the bill of rights of union members is no exception.

I. PRELEGISLATIVE ORIGINS OF THE BILL OF RIGHTS

Although, strictly speaking, the legislative history of the bill of rights begins with the consideration of labor reform bills by Congress in 1959, this history is more meaningful if reference is made not only to prior congressional activity in the field, but also to noncongressional consideration and discussion of similar proposals.

Therefore, it may not be too much to say that the 1959 bill of rights was conceived as long ago as 1943. It was in that year that the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) published an 86-page pamphlet, entitled "Democracy in Trade Unions," which embodied the results of a survey by the ACLU's Committee on Trade Union Democracy.

The committee recommended a bill of rights for union members which was basically concerned with guaranteeing the right to membership in a union, the right of democratic participation in the conduct of the union, the right to protection against arbitrary disciplinary proceedings, and the right to fair and equal treatment as to placement in jobs controlled by the union.

During the 1947 House Labor Committee hearings on proposed amendments to the National Labor Relations (Wagner) Act, the ACLU submitted a bill of rights as a draft amendment to that act. The proposed amendment was primarily intended to assure "open" unions, regular and fair elections, full accounting of union funds, and protection of union members in their exercise of free speech in opposition to union leadership. Enforcement was to have been vested in the NLRB, which would have been empowered to revoke or condition certifications and to make unfair labor practice findings on the basis of charges brought by union members or applicants for membership.

After the first disclosures of improper union activities by the McClellan committee and related investigations, the AFL–CIO executive council in 1956 and 1957 adopted several "codes of ethical practices," the sixth of which dealt with "union democratic practices."

The ACLU adopted a new bill of rights on March 21, 1958, to comport with its new thinking with regard to problems which had arisen after its 1952 report. Section I of that bill of rights specifically set forth the right of union members freely to speak, publish, and assemble. In terms of the Landrum-Griffin Act, section I of the ACLU's bill of rights bore a close resemblance to section 101(a)(2) of the act, although the ACLU provision was more detailed. Similarly, section VI of the ACLU's bill of rights, relating to due process within the union, appears to have foreshadowed section 101(a)(5) of the act, although the ACLU provision was considerably more detailed than either section 101(a)(5) as finally enacted or the longer versions of that section which were originally proposed by Senator MCCLELLAN. Other sections of the ACLU's bill of rights, dealing with equal treatment by the union and with the right of members to vote and participate in meetings, likewise presaged provisions finally enacted in section 101(a)(1) of the act.

II. LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF THE BILL OF RIGHTS

The McClellan committee investigations provided the impetus for the enactment of title I. Without these investigations it seems extremely doubtful that there would have been compelling pressure in Congress for any type of legislation relating to internal union

affairs. In March of 1958, the committee made five interim recommendations, one of which was for legislation to insure union democracy.

To carry out the McClellan recommendations, Senator Kennedy introduced S. 3974, the Kennedy-Ives bill, which was reported out by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare after extensive hearings on that bill and related bills. The Kennedy-Ives bill, however, did not deal with any of the major topics eventually embraced by title I of the Landrum-Griffin Act, and Senator GOLDWATER called attention to this in his minority views. Referring to the most recent ACLU report on the need for a union bill of rights, he criticized the Kennedy-Ives bill for failing to deal with such matters as freedom of speech and press, equal treatment of members, and union disciplinary proceedings.

Senator GOLDWATER's chief bill contained a separate title dealing with "democratic rights of union members and employees" (note the addition of "employees," i.e., nonmembers), the enforcement of which was to be almost completely entrusted to the NLRB.

When the Kennedy-Ives bill passed the Senate but failed to get past the House in 1958, the legislative wheels started rolling again in January 1959, with a new—but similar—labor reform bill known as the Kennedy-Ervin bill. This is the bill which, after complex legislative maneuvers, eventtually became the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosing Act of 1959.

A. General history of title I

After subcommittee hearings on the Kennedy-Ervin bill and related bills had been closed in early 1959, Senator MCCLELLAN introduced a new and comprehensive bill which included a title I entitled "Rights to Be Guaranteed in Charters of Labor Organizations." The first part of this title dealt with "basic rights" of union members and was, for all practical purposes, the forerunner of the finally enacted bill of rights, although the McClellan version was somewhat longer and more detailed than the final legislation.

In his appearance before the subcommittee, Senator MCCLELLAN stated his belief that every union seeking representation or complaint rights under the National Labor Relations Act, as well as tax exemption, should comply with basic minimum standards set by Congress. These proposed standards, it should be noted, were not limited to protection of the specified basic rights, but extended to other provisions of title I of his bill which covered union elections, certain union funds, union meetings and conventions, and related matters dealt with in other titles of the final act. Also, it is noteworthy that the bill required union charters to contain these various guarantees, a sweeping provision that was finally watered down to a provision merely making inconsistent charter provisions "of no force or effect."

On April 14, the Senate Labor Committee reported out S. 1555 as its version of the proposed labor reform bill, but the basic rights section was not included and the committee majority report implicitly rejected such extensive guarantees of individual rights and intrusions into the internal affairs of unions. The minority, comprising only Senators GOLDWATER and DIRKSEN, protested that the bill did nothing to guarantee certain rights proposed by the ACLU—freedom of speech, press, and assembly; equal treatment of members; and due process in union disciplinary proceedings. The minority implied that it would press further for inclusion of such provisions, but subsequent events made this unnecessary.

During the Senate's consideration of S. 1555, Senator MCCLELLAN offered his "Bill of Rights" as an amendment thereto. This amendment was substantially similar to Title I of his original bill. The chief objection to the amendment, as stated by Senator Kennedy, was that the protection of the rights covered by the amendments were better left to existing State laws, to the Taft-Hartley Act, and to S. 1555. Senator Kennedy also argued that the provision for enforcement by the Secretary of Labor was inconsistent with the elimination of the scheme for Federal enforcement from the civil rights bill. Senator MCCLELLAN replied that the States would be ousted from jurisdiction by the principle of Federal preemption. His amendment was twice approved by a one-vote margin on April 22.

Two days later the Kuchel substitute amendment, a so-called compromise prepared by a group of nine Senators, was introduced and easily passed on April 25. Its main points of difference from the original McClellan proposals were:

1. The substitution of private civil suits for those filed by the Secretary of Labor;

2. The addition of language specifying the ways in which members have equal rights within the labor organization;

3. The addition of qualifying language, making a member's participation privileges in union affairs subject to reasonable union rules and regulations, and of similar language as to the handling of union meetings and members' rights of speech and assembly, thus presumably permitting the union to guard against antiunion activities within the union;

4. Transfer of the provisions relating to the right of candidates for office to inspect membership lists out of the bill of rights and into title IV, dealing with elections; and

5. The addition of a restriction on employer participation in civil suits, apparently intended to prevent union members from "fronting" for employers.

The bill of rights provided in the Senate-passed bill was evaluated and criticized by witnesses appearing before the House committee, which had been holding hearings on labor reform proposals for some time before the Senate passed its bill. As a result, the bill reported out by the House committee on July 23 contained several important modifications of the Senate bill:

1. The term "equal rights" was retitled "rights of [union] members," and these rights were further made "subject to reasonable qualifications uniformly imposed."

2. The section on "Freedom From Arbitrary Financial Exactions" was renamed "Dues, Initiation Fees, and Assessments," and the section was revised.

3. The House bill eliminated from the "Protection of the Right to Sue" section the 6-month time limit imposed by the Senate bill on a union's right to require a member to exhaust "reasonable" internal union procedures before resorting to court action, but a similar limitation was written into section 102 (which provides for private suits to enforce all section 101 rights).

4. The House bill provided that procedural safeguards, such as the requirements of a fair hearing on written charges, would come into play after a member was fined, suspended, or otherwise disciplined (rather than as prerequisites to such disciplinary action), thus preserving the union's right to act summarily against wrongdoing officers or members.

5. The House bill eliminated the criminal sanctions provided by the Senate bill.

After some debate—which throws almost no light on the legislative history of the bill of rights from the House point of view—the House substituted the Landrum-Griffin bill for the House committee bill and passed it on August 14. With respect to the bill of rights, the Landrum-Griffin bill was substantially the same as the original Senate bill, except that it:

1. Adopted the House committee's version of the section on dues, fees, and assessments;

2. Modified the Senate provision for a time limit on union-compelled exhaustion of internal union remedies prior to suit by an aggrieved member, by reducing this limit from 6 to 4 months—presumably to permit resort to the NLRB if necessary;

3. Provided for criminal sanctions, but placed them in the catchall category of title VI, and limited their application to cases involving interference with members' rights by force and violence, or threats thereof;

4. Adopted the House committee's action in transferring to title I the paragraph relating to the unions' obligation to furnish copies of bargaining contracts (and in adopting this action freed the unions from criminal sanctions, in favor of civil enforcement by the Secretary of Labor); and

5. Eliminated from the bill's definition of the term "member," or "member in good standing," a person who had merely "tendered" the lawful requirements for union membership, thereby preserving a union's authority to determine who should be admitted to membership.

The conference report bill adopted the House version of title I in toto. This bill was enacted without change by the Senate on September 3, and by the House on September 4.

1. Section 101(a)(1)—Equal Rights

As originally introduced by Senator MCCLELLAN in his bill and repeated in his "amendment" (which passed by one vote), this section did not spell out in any detail the "equal rights and privileges" to be protected, except that they were to include "identical voting rights and equal protection of the union's rules and regulations"; there was no stated thought of preserving the union's right to make and enforce reasonable rules and regulations. The Kuchel compromise amendment, offered 3 days later, was identical with the provision as finally enacted, including the union's right as to rules and regulations. Senator KUCHEL made no explanation of the choice of rights and privileges set forth, but he did state that the McClellan provision was considered too broad, and that such equal rights as were not specified in the new paragraph were not being thereby taken away from members unless a Federal court determined that it was reasonable for the union to curtail such rights.

Several other Senators, including Senator Kennedy, stated for the legislative history that the enumeration of certain rights was not intended to have the effect of excluding other rights.

After the Kuchel version had been passed by the Senate, section 101(a)(1) was criticized by Senator GOLDWATER, on the ground that it was not sufficiently broad, and by Senator MORSE, on the theory that it unduly projected the "Federal Government" (apparently referring to the courts) into matters already handled by State courts under existing law.

2. Section 101(a)(2)—Freedom of Speech and Assembly

In its first legislative forms (the McClellan bill and amendment), section 101(a)(2) was broken down into two separate subsections dealing, respectively, with free speech and free assembly, both being more far reaching than was the final version. Not only were the detailed provisions which preserved the union's right to reasonable rules absent in the McClellan versions, but also there was included a broad freedom of members from "penalty, discipline, or interference of any kind." The freedom of speech and assembly provisions aroused considerable interest on the Senate floor only after the introduction of the Kuchel amendment, in which section 101(a)(2) emerged substan-

tially as finally enacted. Senator GOLDWATER expressed grave misgivings concerning the retention of the "reasonable rules" proviso because it would preserve the union's right to limit members' rights merely by constitutional or rules provisions. In rebuttal, Senator KUCHEL stated for the legislative history that this was not the intention of his group. When Senator GOLDWATER proposed an amendment having the effect of removing the proviso, several Senators opposed his proposal, and the matter was eventually resolved by deleting six words from the proviso.

3. Section 101(a)(3)—Dues, Fees, Assessments

The expression of legislative intent as to this section was almost nil, despite its length and its potential importance in the practical operation of union membership rules. Senator MCCLELLAN's first version was very brief (in direct contrast with the other subsections, which started out their legislative history by being long and general) and made no mention of intraunion procedures.

Senator MCCLELLAN's amended version was considerably expanded over his original one-sentence provision and foreshadowed section 101(a)(3) as finally enacted.

The Kuchel amendment retained and slightly rephrased the detailed procedures contained in the McClellan version, and eliminated the curb on initiation fees.

4. Section 101(a)(4)—Right To Sue

Both of Senator MCCLELLAN's versions of this clause were somewhat similar to the final one, except that they provided a 3-month limitation on the exhaustion of internal procedures and did not contain the interested employer proviso. Senator JAVITS raised the question whether any time period was necessary, to which Senator MCCLELLAN replied that he did not care what period was specified, provided that it was a definite one and was not so long that a union could obstruct the rights of its members.

At this point, the possible interplay of section 10(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which requires the filing of a charge within 6 months of an alleged unfair labor practice, had not been raised. The Kuchel amendment provided a 6-month period, but no explanation was offered and there was no discussion of this provision before its adoption by the Senate.

The House committee modified section 101(a)(4) by deleting the 6-month provision, but the same effect was apparently intended to be accomplished by the inclusion of a similar 6-month clause in the civil enforcement provisions of section 102, which is applicable to all rights. The committee also extended the scope of the employer proviso to prohibit any interference or attempts to interfere with a union's internal affairs.

The very first point discussed by Representative LANDRUM, in introducing the Landrum-Griffin bill as a substitute for the committee bill, was the exhaustion of remedies. The committee bill would have required available remedies to be exhausted before a suit could be filed, provided that the process did not extend as long as 6 months; the Landrum-Griffin bill would have allowed a member to seek immediate court redress after 4 months, in the words of Representative LANDRUM, "without the further delaying and dilatory route of exhausting union procedures," thereby providing "effective and timely relief." Representative GRIFFIN'S analysis of the bill pointed out that the 4-month substitute for the Senate provision was designed to preclude possible loss of the right to file a charge with the NLRB. Opponents of a time limit spoke against it on the ground that common law and union procedures, including appeals to national or international bodies at their conventions, should not be disturbed. Congressman MCCORMACK declared that protection of access to the NLRB was not necessary because the doctrine of exhaustion of internal remedies was not applicable to NLRB proceedings. The House eventually passed section 101(a)(4) in the form proposed by the Landrum-Griffin bill.

5. Section 101(a)(5)—Disciplinary Action

* * * Both of the McClellan proposals on safeguarding against improper disciplinary action were aimed at the same objective as the final law. However, they were considerably more detailed and provided more safeguards, such as more exhaustive internal procedures and the opportunity for independent final review by an outside tribunal. What Senator KUCHEL called cumbersome and unnecessary language therein was pared down greatly by the corresponding provision of his substitute amendment which became section 101(a)(5). * * * The conference report and chief conferees all made clear that section 101(a)(5) was not intended to apply to suspension of a union member's status as an officer of the union.

APPENDIX A.—*Sectional index to the legislative history of the "bill of rights"*

Section	Subject matter	Page [1]
101(a)	Bill of rights in general:	
	Senate debate	1229(2), 1239(3), 1259(2–3), 1294(2–3).
	House debate	1566(3), 1572(2–3) (civil rights), 1623(1–2), 1630(2), 1645(3), 1648(2)–51(1) (civil rights).
	Appendixes	1750(2–3), 1751(1–2), 1770(1–2), 1779(3), 1781(3)–82(1).
101(a)(1)	Equal rights:	
	Act	4.
	Bills	176, 268, 518, 603, 628, 696, 875.
	Senate committee	466, 948–949.
	House committee	765, 787, 853–854.
	Conference	935.
	Senate debate	1102(1), 1103(1), 1230(2), 1231(3)–32(1), 1232(3), 1234(3), 1270(2), 1280(2), 1294(3), 1414(2–3).
	House debate	1467(3), 1473, 1495(2–3), 1520(1), 1572(3), 1575(1–2), 1583(3), 1599(3)–1600(1), 1601(2), 1612(3)–13(1), 1615(1), 1632(2), 1661(3)–62(1), 1694(1), 1709(3).
	Appendixes	1819(3)–20(1), 1824(1–2), 1844(2).
	"Reasonable rules and regulations"	1231(3), 1234(1–3), 1294(3), 1414(2–3), 1495(2–3), 1572(3), 1575(2), 1612(3)–13(1).
	Rights not enumerated	1232(3)–33(1), 1280(2), 1575(2), 1599(3)–1600(1).
	Civil rights	1572(2–3), 1648(2)–51(1).
101(a)(2)	Freedom of speech and assembly:	
	Act	4.
	Bills	175–76, 268–69, 518–19, 601–03, 628–29, 696–97, 875.
	Senate committee	466, 949.
	House committee	765, 787, 853–54.
	Conference	935.
	Senate debate	1102(1), 1103(1)–04(1), 1220(3), 1230(2–3), 1232(1), 1234(1)–36(3), 1237(3)–38(1), 1239(1), 1270(2–3), 1273(2)–75(2), 1280(2), 1294(3), 1414(2–3).
	House debate	1467(3), 1473, 1495(3), 1520(1), 1575(2), 1583(3), 1615(1), 1694(1–2), 1709(3).
	Appendixes	1774(1), 1820(1), 1824(3), 1844(2).
	"Reasonable rules": (See also entries on "Reasonable rules and regulations" under 101(a)(1).)	1234(2)–36(2), 1280(2), 1575(2).
	Free speech, particularly outside union meetings.	1230(2–3), 1234(2), 1270(2–3), 1280(2), 1495(3), 1824(3), 1844(2).
101(a)(3)	Dues, initiation fees, and assessments:	
	Act	4.
	Bills	176, 269, 519–20, 603–04, 629–30, 697–98, 876.
	Senate committee	949.
	House committee	765, 787–88, 853–54.
	Conference	935.
	Senate debate	1102(1–2), 1104(1), 1220(3)–21(1), 1232(1), 1238(2), 1294(3), 1323(3), 1326(3), 1357(3).
	House debate	1467(3), 1473, 1495(3)–96(1), 1520(1), 1575(2), 1583(3)–84(1), 1615(1), 1694(2), 1709(3).
	Appendixes	1774(1–2), 1824(2–3), 1844(2).
	Exemption for federations	1323(3), 1326(3).
	Dues	1294(3).
	Initiation fees	1238(2).
101(a)(4)	Protection of right to sue:	
	Act	4–5.
	Bills	62–63, 269–70, 375–76, 520, 604, 630–31, 698–99, 877.
	Senate committee	417, 949.
	House committee	765, 788.
	Conference	935.
	Senate debate	1102(2), 1104(1–2), 1105(1), 1106(1–2) 1110(3), 1221(1), 1232(1–2), 1236(3)–37(3), 1259(3), 1270(2, 3), 1280(2–3), 1294(3)–95(1), 1323(3), 1326(3), 1357(3), 1376(2), 1414(3), 1432(3).
	House debate	1467(3), 1473, 1496(1), 1518(1), 1520(1), 1566(3)–67(1), 1572(3)–73(2), 1575(2–3), 1584(1), 1600(1–3), 1601(1, 2), 1613 (1–3), 1615(1), 1630(2), 1632(2), 1666(1), 1666(3)–67(2), 1694(2), 1709(3), 1712(1).
	Appendixes	1772(3), 1773(2), 1774(1), 1777(2), 1779(3), 1811(2–3), 1820(1), 1841(1), 1844(3).
	Exhaustion of remedies and time period therefor.	1232(2), 1270(2, 3), 1280(2–3), 1294(3)–95(1), 1357(3), 1414(3), 1432(3), 1496(1), 1520(1), 1566(3)–67(1), 1572(3)–73(2), 1600(1), 1613(2–3), 1667(1), 1811(2–3), 1844(3).
	"Interested employer" proviso	1236(3)–37(3), 1600(2–3), 1601(2), 1811(3), 1844(3).
	Relation to NLRA	1270(2, 3), 1280(2–3), 1432(3), 1520(1), 1566(3)–67(1), 1667(2), 1811(3), 1844(3).

Footnotes at end of table.

APPENDIX A.—*Sectional index to the legislative history of the "bill of rights"*—Continued

Section	Subject matter	Page [1]
101(a)(5)	Safeguards against disciplinary action:	
	Act	5.
	Bills	177–81, 270, 520–21, 604–05, 631, 699–700, 878.
	Senate committee	466, 949.
	House committee	765, 788, 853–854.
	Conference	935.
	Senate debate	1102(2), 1103(2–3), 1104(2–3), 1221(1), 1232(2), 1259(3), 1270(3), 1280(3), 1295(1), 1323(3), 1326(3), 1414(3)–15(1), 1433(1).
	House debate	1467(3), 1473, 1496(1–2), 1520(1), 1573(2–3), 1575(3), 1584(1), 1600(3), 1601(2), 1613(1), 1613(2–3), 1615(1), 1666(1), 1667(2)–68(1), 1694(2), 1709(3).
	Appendixes	1774(2), 1844(3).
	Suspension of officers	935, 1295(1), 1414(3)–15(1), 1433(1), 1573(2–3), 1667(3)–68(1).
102	Remedies:	
	Act	5.
	Bills [2]	521, 631–32, 700–01, 879–80.
	Senate committee	949–50.
	Remedies—Continued	
	House committee	765, 788–89, 853–54.
	Conference	935.
	Senate debate	1102(2–3), 1104(3)–05(1), 1108(3)–19(1) passim, 1221(1), 1223(3)–24(1), 1232(2–3), 1233(3), 1238(3), 1280(3)–81(2), 1294(3), 1323(3), 1326(3), 1357(3), 1415(1).
	House debate	1496(2–3), 1520(1), 1584(1–2), 1600(3)–01(3), 1615(1), 1647(1), 1668(1–2), 1694(3).
	Appendixes	1774(1), 1824(3).
103	Retention of existing rights:	
	Act	5.
	Bills	108, 521, 632, 701.
	Senate committee	950.
	House committee	789, 880.
	Senate debate	1221(1), 1233(1–2), 1234(3), 1259(3), 1415(1–2).
	House debate	1520(2), 1521(3), 1536(1), 1584(2), 1615(1), 1624(1), 1627(1), 1647(1), 1694(3).
	Appendixes	1845(1).

[1] The page references in this index are to the pagination in "Legislative History of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959." The numbers in parentheses, which follow most of the page references, indicate the appropriate column in the page cited.

[2] References to the broad remedies (civil and criminal) which were provided in the earlier bills as part of omnibus enforcement sections are omitted. References to pertinent debate thereon are included below, however.

Let's Put Some of the Blame Where It Belongs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Congress passed a minimum-wage bill. It has been my contention that the most rabid proponents of this legislation have very little interest in those receiving a low wage. Their interest lies in using the increase in the minimum as a pry to raise those in the higher brackets. This, inevitably, will lead to another spiral of inflation.

Is not it about time we get around to demanding at least a minimum amount of effort from those receiving a maximum amount of pay?

Charges and counter charges have been made regarding our position in the space program. If we are in second place as some suggest and others deny, the reason for any controversy apparently can be traced to those who place self above country. If, in one particular instance, there have been 109 strikes in a 4½-year period, while we are in competition with those who do not condone strikes, it becomes rather obvious why a question of superiority should ever have been raised.

In order that the general public might become better acquainted with additional facts, I submit an editorial appearing in the May 3 issue of the Wall Street Journal as must reading.

The editorial follows:

FEATHERBED IN SPACE

As the United States tries to catch up with the Soviet man-in-space feat, the scandalous story of how union selfishness slows this country's space efforts continues to unfold in Washington.

Hearings before the Senate Investigations Subcommittee, said Chairman MCCLELLAN, have produced "evidence beyond any reasonable doubt" that unions at Cape Canaveral use strikes and work stoppages as blackmail to obtain fantastic overtime pay. In 4½ years, 109 strikes and uncounted slowdowns have occurred at the cape missile site. Making up for lost time has brought weekly paychecks of $600 and up for union workers.

Even at that outrageously inflated wage, some workers aren't delivering an honest day's work. The output of union electricians and other building trades workers at the cape, said contractors, was the lowest they had ever encountered. As a result, one technician testified, the U.S. man-in-space project has been delayed many months.

Unions at Cape Canaveral and other strike-plagued missile sites loudly protest their patriotism and promise self-policing. Meantime, they are lobbying hard for another safeguard for their featherbed. Under the administration-backed, common situs bill pending in Congress, strikes to enforce a secondary boycott at missile sites would be legalized.

Such selfish actions speak louder than any promise of self-restraint. And they help explain Senator MCCLELLAN'S indignant proposal that unions blackmailing the Nation's missile program be outlawed and stripped of their collective bargaining rights.

That is a harsh remedy. But at least it ought to alert the Nation to where union profiteering is putting the country's space program.

Post Office Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, as every Member of this body is aware, Congress has devoted much time and attention to the Nation's postal establishment.

One of the most vexatious problems occurs with respect to the proper relationship between revenue and expense.

The present chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the ranking minority member, the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], have each devoted a great deal of time and thought to the development of a permanent solution to the problem.

It was thought that the Postal Policy Act of 1958 went far in that direction. However, as we all know, that act has not been applied as intended.

I have in my hand an article by the distinguished columnist, Holmes Alexander, which appeared in the Charleston, S.C., News and Courier. This column discusses the problem in a direct and lucid manner. I think it so well presented by this outstanding columnist that I should like to make it available for everyone to read.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be inserted in the RECORD following these remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POST OFFICE PROBLEMS

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—You might find little connection between the Caribbean and the Post Office except that both are taken for granted until there's trouble. Even Lady Chatterley does not keep the Post Office newsy for very long. Only the most dedicated public servants in and out of Congress give the necessary attention to this unrewarding subject.

Postmaster General J. Edward Day, a very personable Los Angeles import, has marched to Capitol Hill for congressional hearings. He has issued the all-too-annual statements about improving service and cutting costs. It sounds depressingly familiar. Yet there is some hope that this may be the year when Government will close one of the less sensational gaps—the one between promise and performance in this executive department which is closer than any other to our everyday lives.

The promise, made many times in various governmental branches, is best summarized in the 1960 Democratic platform upon which President Kennedy was nominated and elected. The Democrats said concerning the Post Office:

"We pledge ourselves to separate the public service costs from those to be borne by the users of the mail."

Most Americans don't know it, but the sale of stamps comes fairly close to paying for mail service. In a letter of last April 14, Mr. Day showed that first-class mail is 99.7 percent covered by revenue, and that airmail is 106.3 percent covered.

Losses seem to occur in second- and third-class mail, but these are often due to hidden factors of public service.

Among other users, the American Newspaper Publishers Association wants to pay 100 percent of just costs, scorning any subsidy. The ANPA's postal committee, headed by Ralph Nicholson of the Dothan (Ala.) Eagle, has tried again with the new Postmaster General (without much encouragement so far) to put across the distinction which is made in the Democratic platform. It is also made in the Postal Policy Act of 1958, which takes the line that strictly public services should be paid for out of general funds from the Treasury and not charged to "any user or class of users" of the mail.

The post office was founded by the Continental Congress to promote unity, education, culture, and business in addition to general correspondence. The service concept has grown until the post office does a huge number of odd jobs for the FBI, Immigration Service, Census Bureau, Civil Service, as well as for individuals (such as below-cost registering of mail) and for groups (such as introducing commemorative stamps).

A Citizen' Advisory Council in the Eisenhower period showed a typical year in which the public service items cost $392 million, while to so-called deficit was $362 million—the giveaway being greater than the shortage.

Some of the less obvious public services often escape notice. The Democratic assumption is that a citizen who lives deep in a canyon or in some crossroads hamlet is just as important to his Government as the metropolitan. He has a right to get and send his mail—but some of the small fourth-class post offices cost from 5 to 10 times more to maintain than the revenue they earn.

The post office should not become a strictly pay-as-you-go revenue unit. Of all Federal agencies, only Internal Revenue and Customs actually "earn" money. But a few hardworking Senators, such as JOHNSTON, Democrat, of South Carolina, and CARLSON, Republican, of Kansas, have tried for years to bring about bookkeeping which shows where the money goes. The public service should be under one heading—actual mail delivery under another heading.

Only with this knowledge before the public will it be possible to get Congress and the administration to set realistic rates for the stamps and other charges to the users of the mail.

Senator JOHNSTON wrote in January to Mr. Day that "assuming a (post office) deficit of approximately $900 million, I would urge at least $300 million set aside as public service and so presented to the Congress."

But bright ideas, in practical matters, have hard going in this town.

Harry Rosenbaum Is Selected To Get Americanism Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABNER W. SIBAL
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, it is with the greatest pride and pleasure that I include an article from the Bridgeport Sunday Herald of Sunday, April 23, concerning Mr. Harry Rosenbaum, publisher of the Stamford Shopper, Stamford, Conn.:

HARRY ROSENBAUM IS SELECTED TO GET AMERICANISM AWARD

Harry Rosenbaum, publisher of the Stamford Shopper, is often honored as a local prophet, but he steps into distinguished national company Saturday night when he receives the annual Americanism Award of the Connecticut Valley Council of B'nai B'rith.

The distinguished company sharing the annual award in previous years includes former Governor Abraham A. Ribicoff, now Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; former Governor Chester Bowles, now Assistant Secretary of State; Mayor Richard Lee of New Haven; Albert N. Jorgensen, president of the University of Connecticut, and Judge Samuel Mellitz of the Supreme Court of Errors.

A large delegation from the Stamford lodge and chapter of B'nai B'rith will be in Loch Sheldrake, N.Y., for the presentation to Rosenbaum, a feature of the 3-day annual conference of the Connecticut valley council, April 28 to 30.

Rosenbaum is profiled in the current issue of B'nai B'rith Times, which relates:

"Harry's ambitions, his unceasing concern has been in matters of social welfare, the contributions he has made in this area over the years warrant the highest praise.

"It is not a new song we sing: His selection as Stamford's 'Man of the Year' in 1958 proved that his work had been highly esteemed throughout the city. A lovely silver-bound Bible, gracing the living room table, is reminiscent of the Mayor's respect.

"Harry is a tireless soldier in a never-ending battle for social justice, good government, and aid to the less fortunate.

"Harry has been earning his livelihood through the publication of a unique little newspaper, the idea of which he conceived years ago.

"Mainly carrying advertisements by local merchants, shoppers' columns and the more recent Shoppertunities pages, the Stamford Shopper & Weekly Mail publishes historical reports about the region, and is an informative source of cultural events of the town.

"Harry claims that his engineering studies taught him a good deal about newspaper layout, and the flair for the written and spoken word seems to come just naturally. Many meetings have been embellished by his wise and witty comments, and his shrewd observations when serving as master of ceremonies are enjoyed by many a group.

"Foremost among his interests in civic improvements ranks the Family and Children's Service of Stamford, a nonsectarian family counseling and adoption agency whose board he serves on, and had presided over for three terms.

"To give of his advice there is a 'tremendously gratifying experience' because 'I have seen it help people,' Harry observes.

"He was president of the Stamford Jewish Center in 1948–50, has been identified with Community Chest and United Fund campaigns for many years, has served on the board of the Stamford community council; he is a member of the mayor's coordinating committee, and chairman of the urban renewal committee of the citizens action council.

"He has helped his Jewish brethren abroad by being consistently in the forefront of United Jewish Appeal drives, has chaired Israel Bond sales, and is proud to be a member of the National Council of American Friends of Hebrew University. In B'nai B'rith he is a regional member of the Anti-Defamation League.

"What, then, created such sensitivity to the plight of others in our age of callousness? It was a difficult childhood Harry experienced, yet suffused with the protection of parental love.

"Paralysis struck his father when Harry was 3 years old. The invalid, two older sisters, and a younger brother were cared for by a pint-sized mother who courageously persisted in conducting the family's umbrella manufacturing business, often working half the night.

At the time when the Yiddish Theater flourished on the East Side, the repair trade meant additional income, and Aunt Belka was there, waiting, on rainy nights. Known as the Queen of Christie Street, she had a patient ear for the tales and woes of her neighbors, and her example probably more than anything else, influenced Harry in his development.

"'Jews Without Money,' a book by Michael Gold, gives a description of this era, and, among other figures, his parents, too, are described.

"At Harry's Bar Mitzvah, the Torah was brought to the house for his father's sake, since he was founder of the synagogue.

"Graduating from high school, Harry worked in the family business. Evenings he took courses in engineering at Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute, and later, accounting at New York University. He knew Addie, whom he met on a fraternity outing, for 5 years before they were married in 1928.

"A sports fan all his life, he played baseball, basketball and was especially fond of tennis until a tactful hint for slowing down was given by Addie's gift of a set of golf clubs on his 50th birthday.

"Together, the two have visited Israel several times, inquisitive of the country's progress, and impressed by social legislation. Tourism then not being as popular as it is today. Harry delighted in showing his pictures to audiences up and down Connecticut Valley.

"Addie is the commuter in the family. She has been teaching at an elementary school in Harlem for the past 32 years.

"At their home in Glenbrook, hand-built bookshelves, family pictures, and numerous citations line the walls of the upstairs den. An impressive array of Judaica in the library off the cozy living room gives Addie cause to whisper in our ear that a dozen books would be bought before he'd indulge in a new suit of clothes.

"Publication of a Book of Psalms was a labor of love for Harry when the 50th anniversary of Congregation Agudath Sholom furnished a suitable occasion for employing his talents. Besides, it netted the synagogue a tidy sum.

"The anecdotes he tells, the 'Harry Golden' chuckles he creates, make the world a friendlier one. He has helped to illuminate some of the darker corners with a candle of his compassion.

"We take special pride when one of our own members is so highly honored."

Centennials of Bayonne and Linden, N.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, New Jersey has more than 560 municipalities, each with a deep pride in its history. Some of our communities date back to colonial days; oth-

ers are comparatively recent divisions of old townships and former unincorporated areas.

No matter how young or old these communities are, each has its own record of achievement, its own tradition, its own hopes and plans for future development. We are fortunate in New Jersey to have such rich variety.

Two cities, Bayonne in Hudson County and Linden in Union County, are now ready to celebrate their centennial observances. The pride that residents of those communities feel for their home cities has been captured in two editorials, one in the Jersey Journal of April 18 and one in the Elizabeth Journal of April 19. The accomplishments of those cities are described in heartfelt salutes to each community.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Jersey Journal, Mar. 18, 1961]

BAYONNE'S CENTENNIAL

Hudson County and New Jersey join in congratulating Bayonne on the 100th anniversary of its incorporation as a city.

The Peninsula community long has played a vital role in the county, State, and Nation. From Revolutionary days to the present, Bayonne industry and commerce have forged vital links to State and National trade that have contributed materially to Hudson's prosperity.

Bayonne today is the home of world giants of industry and the Bayonne Naval Supply Base which have given it a worldwide reputation.

Modern Bayonne can boast of miles of attractive residential streets and business areas, an excellent school system, and a well-rounded society composed of people of varied national and religious backgrounds, living in harmony. All work shoulder to shoulder to make the city a better place in which to work and live. Today, Bayonne is a finer city because of this kind of teamwork.

The hardy pioneers who settled in the southern part of Hudson County laid the groundwork for a fine American community. At great sacrifice they clung dearly to the deep-rooted aspirations that brought them to this new land. In the decades that followed, their successes were marked by the same spirit—a spirit that helped Bayonne prosper through the years.

Today Bayonne takes its place among other American communities that have passed the 100th milestone. Behind it the Peninsula City leaves many stirring chapters of Americana; before it lies a future that can be even brighter if the deep-rooted ideals of its pioneers continued to guide the hearts and minds of its residents.

More than three-quarters of a century ago, the Jersey Journal first began to mirror and assist Bayonne community life.

Throughout the years, it has reported tragedy and happiness in the every-day drama that makes up the ever-changing life of the city.

The Jersey Journal is proud that it has retained a respected voice in community affairs and has given always a sympathetic hearing to the city's problems and trials.

It afforded us pleasure on many occasions to report the glad happenings, but never so much as today when we extend our hand of friendship to Bayonne and its official family on the occasion of this great anniversary.

Bayonne, 100 years young, belies its age with the vigor with which it is now attacking its civic problems today.

On this great occasion, Jersey City joins the rest of Hudson County in saluting a friendly neighbor, Bayonne.

[From the Elizabeth Journal, Mar. 19, 1961]

LINDEN'S 100TH BIRTHDAY

If the founders of Linden had been a little more prompt in declaring themselves free of Elizabeth and Rahway, the city's centennial planners wouldn't have had to work in the shadow of events such as the Civil War centenary.

But even the Civil War observance cannot obscure a community as vital and busy as Linden. The image it projects today is vastly different than the tree-bordered rural haven envisioned a century ago.

It is a bustling city, home to half-a-dozen of the best known names in American industry. It is the biggest taxpayer in Union County and one of its principal employers. Without Linden, Union would certainly diminish in the scale of New Jersey counties.

The city is more than a complex of smokestacks, oil tanks and generating stations, however. It houses 40,000 residents, boasts a fine school system, prides itself on its parks and municipal services, takes satisfaction in one of the lowest tax rates in Union County, and can still point to the groves of trees which gave the town its name.

Linden has something to celebrate in this, its 100th anniversary year.

A Statement on Veterans' Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to place in the RECORD the following statement of Mr. Felix M. Putterman, national legislative director, Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, concerning veterans' legislation:

The Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, the oldest active war veterans organization in the country, at its 65th annual national convention in August 1960, adopted Resolution 25 entitled "Presumptions for Peacetime Veterans." Pursuant to this resolution, we urge the favorable consideration of H.R. 5933, a bill to amend section 333 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the application of presumptions in cases of service-connected tuberculosis.

Under existing conditions, the Veterans' Administration has denied service connection to peacetime veterans who are consequently not entitled to presumptive service connection for tuberculosis. If the service had been wartime, the same condition would be allowed service connection found within 4 years of discharge from service. In establishing service-connection status, medical experts recognize a minimal period of inception or incubation of the disease.

Veterans' Administration's regulation 1307 reads as follows:

"For the purpose of VA regulation 1307, active pulmonary tuberculosis diagnosed by approved methods during the fourth year, will be held to have preexisted the diagnosis 6 months in minimal cases, 9 months in moderately advanced cases, and 12 months in far advanced cases."

In section 312 of the Veterans' Act, Congress has allowed a 3-year presumptive period following discharge from a wartime period as one in which tuberculosis if found, can be allowed service connection. On the other hand, peacetime veterans are not entitled to even this limited period despite the fact that section 333 deems it proper, with regard to peacetime veterans, to grant service connection on the basis of "sound judgment."

H.R. 5933, while taking nothing from the wartime veteran, would provide legislative sanction for the findings of medical experts and would entitle the afflicted peacetime veteran to a modest presumption.

The Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America urges the prompt approval by the House Veterans' Affairs Committee of the subject bill as providing a genuinely equitable and fair-minded solution to an extremely vital problem posed by the stark realities of long debilitating illness facing a number of peacetime veterans.

Esther Van Wagoner Tufty—National President of AWRT

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. HART

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. HART. Mr. President, it is customary for those of us who represent the various States of the Union to voice our pride in the men and women from our States who are appointed to positions of importance in the Federal Government.

Today I would like to pay tribute to one of Michigan's most illustrious citizens. She is not in a policymaking position in the Government, but she is one of the powers just the same.

Known and admired nationwide as "The Duchess," Esther Van Wagoner Tufty is a member of a prominent, civic-minded Michigan family. But through her own talents and energy she has risen, professionally, to the top ranks not only in the newspaper world but also in radio and television.

At the present time, she is serving as the national president of American Women in Radio and Television. This nonprofit professional organization of 1,600 women working as broadcasters, executives, administrators, and creative personnel in radio and television, is currently holding its 10th annual convention in Washington. As friends of ours we bid them welcome.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the excellent article that appeared in the Northern Virginia Sun of Tuesday, April 11, 1961. It tells the interesting story of Esther Van Wagoner Tufty.

She is fair and able and she asks no special favors.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Northern Virginia Sun, Apr. 11, 1961]

OUR INTERESTING NEIGHBORS: ESTHER VAN WAGONER "TUFFY"—NORTH VIRGINIA'S "DUCHESS" HAS MANY VIEWPOINTS

(By Janet Green)

Esther Van Wagoner Tufty is a woman who lives in a state of constant crisis. Her journalistic career has been filled with continuous excitement. To begin with, she was born during a crisis—the first cyclone to strike Tuscola County, Mich. Coming from a pioneering family that has left its impact in the realm of politics, Mrs. Tufty's tall, blond, regal appearance is characteristic of her father's Dutch ancestry. Appropriately, she is affectionately known as "The Duchess."

As one of the country's outstanding women journalists, she covers politics and international relations from her viewpoint, in the Nation's Capital.

Early in her career, when she had just been elevated to the exalted position of managing editor for former U.S. Vice President Charles G. Dawes' newspaper, the Evanston News-Index, Mr. Dawes is said to have remarked boastfully that he had not only a woman editor, but the only Democrat in the GOP stronghold along the north shore of Chicago running his paper.

During the first week in this new job, the linotype operators went on strike for higher wages. As they left the composing room, they took with them all of the letter "e's"—the most frequently used letter of the alphabet. Undaunted with this crisis, Editor Tufty rushed around Chicago begging, borrowing, and buying all the "e's" she could find.

The paper was published, but in retrospect, Mrs. Tufty says "I wish I had printed it without "e's," for it would now be a collector's item."

She began her news bureau in Washington 26 years ago with a string of 36 Michigan papers. It has developed into a flourishing, well-established bureau, servicing papers abroad as well as in this country. Additionally, she is outstanding on the lecture platform and tours the country under the auspices of W. Colston Leigh, Inc.

Her first radio news show "Tufty Topics" was a series of crises. She recalls the day the Canadian Ambassador was supposed to be interviewed, but at the last minute was called to the White House by President Roosevelt.

What to do?

Undaunted, radio commentator Tufty grabbed her taxi driver en route from her office in the National Press Building to the studio and put him on the air.

"After all, Washington taxi drivers are supposed to be a good news source," said the resourceful Duchess. "He would have sounded better, though, if he had been more used to his new store teeth which caused an odd whistle through the entire interview," she reminisced.

Mrs. Tufty's flair for being on the spot when news breaks paid off when she covered the 1952 Presidential Convention in Chicago as a member of the NBC television staff. She held in reserve one of the then scarce TV cameras for 7 hours—standing by on her hunch that the switch from Taft to Eisenhower would break in a Michigan Caucus. And it did, at 2 a.m.

She had been on NBC's staff at all presidential conventions since that time.

Another exciting crisis: She was the only woman reporter aboard Presidential Candidate Dewey's "Victory Special" train when it was wrecked, and is consequently a member of Tom Dewey's "Castle Rock Survivors Club." In memory of this event, the defeated candidate's autographed photo hangs in a prominent spot on the office wall.

Lord Halifax, British Ambassador to Washington in 1942, set the wheels in motion for another of her crises when he invited the duchess to go to England as a speaker, a consultant on American British relations in the port towns where the GI's were landing, and to broadcast back to America over BBC what was going on in the Battle of Britain from her viewpoint. Her assignment took her to the most dangerous spot, which, of course, resulted in some exclusive news stories. She calls this the most dangerous and yet most rewarding period of her life.

As a foreign correspondent in 20 countries, she has witnessed and reported many critical events. One of the few women to fly the Berlin airlift, her flight was buzzed by the "commies." At this fearful moment it was discovered all aboard had parachutes except the duchess, who was sitting calmly on top of 10 tons of coal being moved by the military aircraft from Weisbaden to Templehof Airport in Berlin.

Foreign Correspondent Tufty has been out of the country every year for the past 20 on news gathering trips. This year she hopes to visit India and Africa. Her elder son, Harold, is cultural attaché at the U.S. Embassy in Abidjan, Ivory Coast; her other son, James, is in the advertising business in Los Angeles. She has four grandchildren.

Named "Viewpoints," because Mrs. Tufty's objective reporting insists there is more than one, the Georgian colonial house in which she lives is on a point overlooking an especially wide part of the Potomac across from Broad Creek, Md., midway between Alexandria and Mount Vernon.

The house has a harmonious combination of elegance and personal reflections of the vivid, varied and active life of the owner. It is livable and most comfortable: "It could belong to no one but Esther," her friends agree.

It contains everything from her grandmother's corner cupboard to a drum from Haiti. Her two twin Japanese procelain pillows, now made into lamps, are in contrast to the bibelots that came from such far-flung places as the Netherlands and "down under" Australia. The 42-foot living room runs the full length of the front of the house overlooking the river. Three sets of glass doors open out into the brick terrace where her many friends from the worlds of politics, government and diplomacy are to be found of a summer's evening having lively arguments on what's going on in the world.

Viewpoints has been opened to the public in the past on the Virginia garden tours when visitors have noted that Mrs. Tufty avoids anything resembling a formal garden. She wants flowers blooming from the first crocus to the last rose of summer. There are always blooms around the lily pond. An extensive rose garden is a favorite. Boxwood surrounds the front lawn and the two prize possessions are planted near the house. One is a gorgeous magnolia, the farewell gift from the local chapter of the American Women in Radio and Television when she retired as president of that group and the Michigan maple that marks the day she moved into the historic home 7 springs ago. She formerly lived in another historic house in Alexandria.

As the national head of AWRT President Tufty is busy planning for their 10th anniversary convention which will be held in Washington at the Statler-Hilton, May 4 to 7. A number of northern Virginians are among the nationwide membership of 1600 who will participate.

How does she combine being the president of a national organization, she is past president of the Women's National Press Club, serve on numerous committees such as the American Newspaper Women's Club, WNPC merger project and on President Kennedy's Committee on the Employment of the Physically Handicapped, with a busy lecture and journalistic career and being the mistress of a mansion on the Potomac?

"I don't combine them, I mix them and the mixture results in a busy, exciting way of life."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HART. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. It is my pleasure to join in the tribute to Esther Van Wagoner Tufty. I know that she is a stanch Democrat in her politics. Her father, I believe, was a former Governor of the State of Michigan.

Mr. HART. If the Senator will permit me to make a correction, it was her brother who was a distinguished Governor of Michigan.

Mr. KEATING. Yes. It is true that in all her work she has been extremely fair. She graces the office of president of American Women in Radio and Television. I had the pleasure this noon of meeting with a group of these women, who are present in the city for their national convention. We are glad to have them here. We congratulate them on the leadership they have selected in Esther Van Wagoner Tufty.

Mr. HART. I congratulate the Senator from New York in being so fortunate as having been invited to be with this group this afternoon. I appreciate very much the kind remarks he made with reference to Esther Van Wagoner Tufty.

Where Are the Defenders?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have always wondered about the sincerity of the vociferous liberals who profess to be so concerned with the protection of freedom of speech and opinion.

The following editorial from the April 27 issue of the Appleton Post-Crescent is certainly timely and appropriate:

WHERE ARE THE DEFENDERS OF GENERAL WALKER?

Gen. Edwin Walker, commander of the 24th Infantry Division in Germany, has been relieved of his command pending a "complete and impartial" investigation of charges that he has bombarded his troops with ultrarightwing propaganda. The charge was made in a private serivceman's newspaper, the Overseas Weekly. According to this paper, General Walker called Eleanor Roosevelt, Dean Acheson, and Harry Truman definitely pink.

We do not know exactly how far in forcing conservative ideas upon soldiers General Walker is alleged to have gone. Nor do we know under the circumstances, exactly what the Army ought to do about it.

But we are interested to hear what ought to be a violent reaction from the so-called liberals of the country. They are the ones who raised the roof several years ago about a congressional investigation into alleged Red activities at Fort Monmouth. They are the ones who insisted that the "Who promoted Peress?" query was irrelevant. They have

moaned periodically that Federal employees could not be effective in their positions under the harassment into their private activities and their opinions. They are the liberals who have insisted that a man's job, in no matter how sensitive a category, should not in any way depend upon his political affiliations or personal views.

Have any of these liberals, so anxious to leap to courageous defense of those accused of having ultraleftwing tendencies, spoken up for General Walker's right of freedom of opinion? We are still waiting for even one small, grave voice.

Gordon Lowe—Soon a Legend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLAN HAGEN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to call the attention of the House to an editorial which recently appeared in the Tulare, Calif., Advance Register, concerning Mr. Gordon Lowe, who has resigned as director of the Tulare High School Redskin Band.

It is not often that a high school bandmaster achieves such acclaim as Gordon Lowe. As the following editorial will indicate, he is likely to become a living legend in the city of Tulare because of the remarkable achievements of the high school band during his tenure.

Perhaps the highlight of his career was the occasion of the 1957 inauguration when the Redskin Band achieved first place among high schools and colleges in the Inaugural Parade.

The editorial follows:

GORDON LOWE—SOON A LEGEND?

In a community such as Tulare, people come and go through the years, each leaving his mark on the town and its people.

Some are soon forgotten, if remembered at all. The memory of others lingers on for a while, then fades into the shadows. Still others become virtual legends.

One of the latter, we would say, is Gordon Lowe, who yesterday announced his resignation as director of Tulare High School nationally famous high school band to accept a similar job in San Rafael next year.

There will, in all probability, be other fine bandmen to follow in Lowe's footsteps. But to him will always cling the honor of having first put Tulare on the musical map from one end of the Nation to the other.

His Redskin bands have been the most respected high school musical organizations in all of California during the past few years. Other bands have won as many awards or perhaps more coveted (with the exception of the 1957 inaugural parade first prize) awards, but no band in all of the State has been such a unanimous choice of musical men and crowds alike as one which has had the benefit of learning the ropes from Gordon Lowe.

Lowe has been an outstanding success as a musical director and as a teacher of music-minded children in Tulare for the very reason that has brought him criticism in some circles.

He is not an ordinary schoolteacher, not a conformist. He is an individualist, a disciplinarian and a true artist. He is willing to settle for nothing but the best. And in Tulare he has gotten the perfection he demanded year after year because he refused to compromise his music principles.

Lowe has been well rewarded during his stay in Tulare. He has not had to punch a clock; he has been well paid as teachers go; he has had considerable individual freedom which some of his colleagues no doubt have envied. Further, in 1955 he was named Tulare's "man of the year"—an honor bestowed upon only a chose few—and 2 years later the community rallied around him and his band and raised some $35,000 to send the Redskins and their director back to Washington, D.C., to represent California in the inaugural parade.

In return, Lowe has provided Tulare with outstanding bands and, in his own way, he has given a great number of youngsters who might have gone astray a new sense of values through their membership in the band.

Most important, we think, Gordon Lowe has given Tulare something in which it has had a fierce pride. It seems strange to outsiders that a town of almost 15,000 can get so excited over a high school band as Tulare has on numerous occasions over Lowe's Redskins.

But once they hear the band strike up and see Lowe's great showmanship in action, as did 56,000 pro football fans at San Francisco's Kezar Stadium last fall, they begin to wax more than a little enthusiastic themselves, for the Redskin bands under Lowe's direction have not been ordinary bands. They have been the best, and Tulare has never failed to urge the world to appreciate that fact.

What happens now is anybody's guess. Lowe will go to San Rafael to face a challenge that for him is long gone in Tulare. We sincerely hope he will be successful and happy there. We doubt if any place will ever be quite like Tulare to him, but San Rafael, if it understands him as Tulare has, will never regret its choice of a new bandmaster.

Here, we sincerely hope that the high school trustees will not hire just anyone to lead the Redskin bands of the future, that they will choose Lowe's successor carefully and wisely.

Office of the Presidency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, David Lawrence, in yesterday's issue of the Washington Evening Star, pointed up some of the deficiencies in the general nature of the Office of President. Since the Cuban debacle was in major part due to inexperienced leadership, it would be well for all of us to examine this subject article very carefully:

FULL-TIME ADVISERS FOR PRESIDENT—TOP POLICY AIDS BELIEVED IMPERATIVE BECAUSE HE CAN'T DO IT ALL HIMSELF

(By David Lawrence)

Is there something wrong with the executive system in America? Or is there something wrong about electing to the Presidency of the United States a man who has had no executive training or intimate knowledge of the workings of the executive branch of the Government? Or is there something wrong in having a transition period of several months between an outgoing and an incoming administration, thereby paralyzing executive planning for the immediate future and causing serious consequences like the ill-fated venture in Cuba?

Answers to these questions are more important today than just how the United States is to help in Laos or what position is to be taken in Cuba. For if the executive office of the Government of the United States isn't functioning efficiently, how can the Chief Executive be expected to act instantly and effectively at a time when a missile or a bomb may be launched suddenly from an enemy area?

It does little good to blame this or that group of advisers—those who had experience in the last administration or the new set who have been brought in from academic circles. With all their earnestness and sincerity, most of the newcomers lack experience in and firsthand knowledge of Government operations at the top level.

What's fundamentally wrong is the executive system. Various members of Congress are spending a lot of time complaining that they should have been briefed on the administration's planning in Cuba. But it is the true role of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—admittedly a partisan group with some publicity-seeking members always vocal—which needs to be studied, so that it can play a proper but not a meddling part in the field of foreign policy.

There are some Members of Congress who feel they should make the Nation's policy in world affairs. Others feel they should only advise on foreign policy. But, as a practical matter, no Executive can be effective if he has to take into his confidence dozens of persons inside and outside Congress who "leak" information regularly to favorite members of the press.

President Kennedy likes to listen to a variety of views and is to be commended for his patience and restraint. But no amount of conferring with a lot of college professors can give him the maturity and experience he needs to run the high office to which he has been elected. He will be a much better President a year hence, because of actual experience in the office, than he is today. He will learn that too many academicians at his side can bring confusion instead of clarity, and that a diffusion of responsibility can only produce chaos and failure.

The Founding Fathers provided in the Constitution for heads of departments who would be nominated by the President and confirmed with the advice and consent of the Senate. Cabinet government has worked successfully in Britain and in other English-speaking democracies. Although Mr. Kennedy's Cabinet got at the start a lot of publicity as an able body of men, it turns out that this same group is rarely consulted on the broad aspects of national and international policy and that they have become mere heads of their own departments.

What is needed here is a cabinet council that gives full time to counseling the President. The departments can be run by general managers, and the cabinet council could meet every day and give the President advice. If the present Cabinet members aren't qualified to be presidential advisers on broad policy, there are plenty of able men in America who could serve in that capacity. But it is courting disaster to assume that academicians, who have little experience in the operations of Government, can shunt the Secretary of State aside or that decisions can be made with one or two Cabinet officers without the chance for a larger group of mature men to sit down and work out a policy based on principles of enduring strength.

There's much that is wrong in the current operations of the executive system. The so-called Cuban fiasco is but the beginning of a series of failures unless President Kennedy gets rid of most of the "kibitzers" who are running around in circles in the new administration and sets up at his side a cabinet council of men of stature to give full time every day to the task of helping him make national and international policies. He can't do it all himself.

Problems of Aging and Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, we on the Senate Special Committee on Aging are always heartened when we see effective community action to deal with any of the many problems facing the aging and aged today. The committee is trying to alert the Nation to a wide variety of these problems—everything from medical care for the aged to job discrimination against elderly citizens.

And, when we see that citizens recognize the need for a service and then do their best to provide it at a local level, we become more certain that there is a growing awareness in this Nation of the social revolution caused by entirely new longevity patterns and new forces at work in industry and commerce.

Within New Jersey, two such efforts may serve as a model for similar action for other groups across the Nation.

One is a "Meals on Wheels" campaign supported by donations and volunteer participation. Hot meals are provided for the elderly and sick confined to their homes.

The other is a campaign begun by the State Division of the Aging to educate older pedestrians on traffic safety.

The important thing about such programs is that they recruit the talents and interests of large numbers of citizens, who then realize that there is so much more to do if we are to deal effiectively with other needs of our senior citizens.

Mr. President, to explain each program in more detail, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a portion of a letter to me from Matthew P. Boyland, president of the East Orange Meals on Wheels, as well as an article from the Record, Hackensack, N.J., of April 21, 1961.

There being no objection, the excerpt and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

From Mr. Boylan's letter of April 17:

"Meals on Wheels was created in order to provide hot meals for the elderly and sick of our city who were confined to their homes and had no one to provide them with hot meals. The organization has served more than 130,000 meals to 120 persons in the 2 years since its inception in the fall of 1958. Volunteer teams of teachers and high school students deliver these meals in the late afternoon to those who have requested the service. The money necessary to defray the expense of preparing the meals and acquiring the necessary facilities for their preparation has been donated by various civic groups and by members of the organization. Membership in the organization is acquired upon contribution of $1 and our membership at present is approximately 700.

"Mayor James W. Kelley's Senior Citizen Council has played a large part in the creation of Meals on Wheels. The fact that approximately 17 percent of the population of the city of East Orange is over 63 years of age has created a tremendous interest in the need for facilities and services for this segment of our population. Recognition of this problem has prompted the East Orange Housing Authority to allocate 80 units of housing for a special senior citizens housing project. Moreover the housing authority contemplates the creation of kitchen facilities out of which Meals on Wheels may operate. The interrelationship between the needs of our senior citizens for housing and their need for the services which our organization provide is becoming more evident."

STATE DIVISION OF AGING URGES SAFETY COURSE FOR PEDESTRIANS

TRENTON, April 21.—The State division of the aging wants help from local authorities to educate older pedestrians on the hazards of the automobile.

FINDINGS STUDIED

Mrs. Eone Harger, of Ridgewood, director of the division, addressed the annual Governor's Traffic Safety Conference yesterday.

She said although there was a decrease last year in traffic fatalities, the proportion of over-65 pedestrians killed was up 4 percent.

A study of these victims disclosed that 90 percent of them had never driven a car, Mrs. Harger said.

"They have no understanding of what a car can do. They don't know how long it takes to stop. They don't understand a driver is unable to see a person dressed in dark clothes at night.

She said the division had written a pamphlet alerting older persons to pedestrian dangers. A movie on traffic hazards is also available, she said.

She asked for help in distributing the pamphlet to older persons.

Her address was part of a discussion of the pedestrian problem in traffic safety, moderated by Gerald J. Driscoll of Dumont, chief of the State's Traffic Safety Service.

The conference also heard a request for a crackdown on speeding truck drivers. George G. Traver, executive vice president of the State Safety Council, said "There's a broad opportunity for stepped-up enforcement here."

Hyman Siegendorf, Passaic's director of public safety, discussed his city's 1960 no-traffic-death record. He attributed it to what he called the three E formula: engineering, enforcement, and education.

State Highway Commissioner Dwight R. G. Palmer discussed some of his department's efforts to advance traffic safety.

Center barriers on key highways have almost eliminated head-on collisions, he said.

"On route 4 in Englewood, where 50,000 cars a day use the highway, there were six fatalities in a 33-month period immediately preceding erection of barriers," he said.

"All were due to cars crossing over the narrow island. In the 6 years since the barrier was erected one fatality has occurred. This occurred at a wire-rope barrier section, a design that has been discontinued since 1954," he said.

Gov. Robert B. Meyner opened the conference with a plea for unremitting traffic safety work.

The Government's Responsibilities In Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Clarence D. Martin, Jr., Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, at the 49th annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Government regulation of business luncheon, in Washington, D.C., on May 2, 1961. This is an address which speaks for itself.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GOVERNMENT'S RESPONSIBILITIES IN TRANSPORTATION

(Text of an address by the Honorable Clarence D. Martin, Jr., Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, at the 49th annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Government Regulation of Business Luncheon, Ballroom, Mayflower Hotel, Tuesday, May 2, 1961)

It is a privilege to appear before this distinguished chamber of commerce audience gathered here today in Washington for a discussion of the Nation's transportation problems. I appreciate the opportunity you have provided me—and it is a timely opportunity—to outline some of my views on the transportation responsibilities of the Federal Government.

The opportunity is timely for me because I have had several weeks now since I left my business in Los Angeles to get better acquainted with the nature of the Government's responsibilities—and the sobering reality of the difficulties our Nation's transportation system faces.

The opportunity is also timely because President Kennedy has just recently—in his special message to the Congress on the regulatory agencies—outlined the urgent need for transportation policy coordination, and called for "the shaping of attainable goals" in the Government's discharge of its transportation responsibilities.

The opportunity is timely for you because the difficulties our Nation's transportation system faces and the prompt, intelligent solution to those difficulties will be a key factor in the ability of our economy to grow and the ability of our Nation to achieve its goals.

I would like to address myself briefly this afternoon to some of the problems I have become aware of in transportation that indicate the nature of the Government's responsibility.

The United States, under a truly unique partnership over the years between private enterprise and Government, has developed the greatest transportation system known to the world. It has developed a transport system that has nurtured the growth of the world's most advanced industrial and agricultural complex—a system that has distributed the riches of this vast industrial society to every corner of the country and has provided our people with commercial and recreational mobility that makes life in the United States something of a completely different order than life anywhere else on the globe.

Economists have estimated that transportation is directly and indirectly a $100 billion a year business—a major segment of the U.S. economy.

It's no secret that this business is in trouble—real trouble. Under the leadership of Senator MAGNUSON, a Senate Commerce Committee staff recently issued a massive report—a bible, as the Senator has called it—which details these troubles. This is the most recent of a long series of Government and private studies calling attention to the ills of our transport system.

The study raises some difficult questions that businessmen might ask themselves. Why is it that the richest, most advanced society in the world has not solved the problem of getting to and from work efficiently and economically?

Our commuter traffic is choking the life from our cities. Our central cities are being covered with concrete and asphalt—streets, freeways, garages, and parking lots that are eating up the tax base that is the economic foundation of our cities. Mass transit systems are dying from the seemingly endless cycle of higher fares, reduced patronage, reduced service, still further loss of patronage, still higher fares and so on. Transit patrons turn to their autos—and the cities become still more choked. The air of our cities is fouled with exhaust. The death rate on our streets and highways is a national disgrace.

Another question of greatest concern both to the Government and the business community: Why must the common carrier system be in such acute trouble? Investors are losing millions annually in our dying rail passenger services—while unused on our drawing boards are technological improvements that might make short- and medium-haul rail passenger service competitive or even superior to short-haul air services.

Rail passenger services—indeed all common carrier services—are being lost to smaller cities across the Nation, threatening to make ghost towns of our small urban and rural commercial centers.

Our trunk airlines, serving the richest of long-haul passenger markets that were formerly the backbone of rail services, are now operating on razor thin profit margins, too small to attract capital adequate for future reequipment.

Future prospects are as bleak. Common carriers of freight face further traffic starvation with the growth of private and exempt carriage—entirely without regard to the needs of the Nation for a common carrier freight system. The report prepared for the Magnuson committee projected that by 1975—if present trends were to continue unabated—surface freight would move by private and exempt carriage to such an extent as to displace common carriage as the base of the Nation's transportation.

Accordingly, it is clear that there could be trouble ahead for the rails, trucks, and domestic water carriers in the freight field as serious as exists in the rail passenger field today.

Our merchant marine fleet is outmoded and is losing money. Shipyards are idle. And, there is no prospect for immediate improvement other than more and more Federal money. This should not be the only answer.

International air services by U.S. carriers are losing ground to foreign air carriers—and there is no remedy in sight.

Wherever we turn in our transportation system—and the list is far from exhausted—we are in serious trouble, with no comprehensive plan for getting out of it.

What has the Federal Government been doing about it? Last year, for example, it spent $3 billion to build highways—$300 million on merchant marine—$80 million on airlines—over $450 million on airports and airway aids.

Government expenditures for next year will be higher, and more new transportation spending is being proposed every day. For example, cities and their transit systems are in desperate need of assistance—and the major remedy seems to be the Federal Treasury. Our aviation community tells us that a supersonic transport development program is required to maintain U.S. air transport and manufacturing position—and that private capital cannot finance it.

Notwithstanding this Government aid, transportation is still in trouble.

What is wrong with the transportation system? What can be done about it?

Simply stated, the problem is that we don't know where we want our transportation system to take us—and we have no plans for getting there. We have promoted individual transport industries without knowing what job we want each industry to do. Regulation, as we all know, aims only at specific problems of individual industries. We have overregulated and overtaxed some parts of the system with little regard to what is expected of the industry. We have underregulated and undertaxed some parts with little regard to the effect on the whole.

The responsibility for leadership with respect to transportation problems and for development of overall transportation policy within the executive branch of the Federal Government rests with the Secretary of Commerce by statute. This responsibility is great and the statutory power is broad. As Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, I intend to do all within my power to help the Secretary discharge this duty in the public interest.

Recent years have spawned study after study to define the problems. In fact, the transportation industry is probably the most studied industry in the country. But with all the studies, we still have not had leadership, we still have not had the semblance of an overall transportation policy or the beginnings of a concrete overall program either for immediate relief or for long-range improvement. In my view, offering such a program is the Government's responsibility in transportation.

We should seriously consider every means to improve generally the position of the common carrier industry. One of the first jobs we are undertaking is the formulation of concrete recommendations for congressional action. Among the specific recommendations we are seriously considering is the granting of realistic tax and depreciation policies for the railroads, along with a declaration that unjust and undue discrimination in State and local taxes on railroads be declared unlawful as a burden on interstate commerce.

The common carrier transportation industry has been engulfed by a wave of rate cutting. Clearly, rate policy should be reexamined.

Looking at the situation as a businessman, it is neither fair nor sound transportation policy to allow the Federal Government to obtain free or reduced rates from common carriers without regard to the regulatory process. The Government in fairness should pay transportation charges subject to the same standards as those governing private shippers.

The tonnage of common carriers, as pointed out earlier, is being taken by private and exempt carriers. Would it not be sound to say that private carriers should remain as private carriers—and not be allower to invade the forhire field. Accordingly, the present exemptions under the Interstate Commerce Act—a virtual crazy quilt—require prompt reexamination.

It is often said that the portion of the Interstate Commerce Act pertaining to motor carriers is probably the most violated statute in the land. More vigorous enforcement of existing law and necessary amendments to the present statute should improve the lot of the common carrier by doing away with operations that either are in outright contravention of the act or are of doubtful legality—those in the so-called gray area.

There should be a clear and definite policy with respect to user charges paid by carriers making use of facilities and services provided by the Federal Government. A policy of assessing user charges for motor and air carriers has been reiterated by President Kennedy in recent messages to the Congress. Serious consideration should be given to extending this policy to other areas.

The long-term solutions to our problems, however, will come from careful planning of the expenditure of Government funds and the careful planning of the use of regulatory powers—planning not just for individual industries, but for the entire transportation system.

We have recently established in the Department of Commerce a task force on transportation policy to make specific recommendations for Government action—aimed at improving the transportation system as a whole—and coordinating transporation policy with the needs of the Nation for economic growth This task force is headed by Wilfred Owen of Brookings Institution. He is being aided by R. Boyd Ladd, Operations Research Office, Johns Hopkins University; Robert C. Lester, former Secretary of the Civil Aeronautics Board; Edward T. Chase, transportation adviser; Carl Feiss, urban renewal consultant; and Robert B. Mitchell, head of the Department of City Planning, University of Pennsylvania.

The urban transportation problem is the first attacked by this group—and, at the President's direction, we have joined with the Housing and Home Finance Agency in the first example of a real coordinated attack on a major transportation problem in a contract for a planned program of action on urban transportation consistent with the needs of our cities.

On merchant marine, on domestic water, on rail, on highway transport, other major efforts are underway and will go forward during the coming year, along with the aviation goals study directed by the President.

It is the comprehensive technique of this program that is important. For example, we will look at the future needs of highway-borne transportation. At the same time we will consider the possibility of reducing the cost of highway systems by technological methods to increase capacity. We will seek to improve highway safety. We will consider further steps to promote containerization and other systems to foster more economical through movement of traffic among different modes.

We will look not only at the economics of air transportation and the Nation's air transport needs—but at ways of improving ground time—both passenger and freight—by exploring alternative ground transport systems and the adequacy of airport location planning in relation to community transportation systems.

Even more important, the task force will approach these diverse industry problems in terms of the competitive roles of the industries. Intead of looking at rail freight, trucking, barge movements, and intercoastal systems separately, the group will consider the land movement of freight—in Commerce Secretary Hodges' words, we will consider "the part that the railroads must play" in an overall system, not just at the railroads as a separate industry. Instead of looking at airlines, buses, and rail passenger service, we will look at the intercity passenger market. Underlying all our efforts will be the search for technological improve-

ments and ways to introduce those improvements into the transportation system.

In short, the entire transportation system—and the transportation needs of the country will be viewed as a single system. It will be viewed as a single system to be developed by government promotional and research programs, tax programs, and regulatory programs—all coordinated to give the country the fastest, most efficient and the safest possible transportation system at least cost to the Government—at the lowest economical rates to the user—and at a reasonable profit to the investors in the private companies that are the foundation of the entire system.

Quite obviously we cannot—and do not expect to do this job alone. We shall look for help and advice to every government agency concerned with the promotion, the regulation, the utilization of transportation. We shall look to the transportation industry. We shall look to the entire business community for help and advice.

To most people, I trust, the job we are setting out to do will be encouraging news. Most of us know that the Federal Government cannot allow its policies to continue to drift—without any central purpose. Inequities in treatment of different modes are not only unfair, but inefficient for the Nation. Waste in Government subsidies—waste in the form of excess capacity—cannot continue in a nation that needs its resources to encourage economic growth. Private capital devoted to transportation must earn a reasonable profit.

Nevertheless, to some people the notion that the Government might act to end the drift in policy will not be well received. Special interests with favored positions are always opposed to change. A case in point: My recent remarks in San Diego on April 8 calling on the Nation's maritime industry to file agreements with the Maritime Board and to live up to them to the letter of the law was received with less than enthusiasm in some quarters, despite our offer to cooperate in solving their problems with the Congress. Any effort to develop a coordinated transportation policy—a rational program for the Government and the public—will make some people unhappy. Of one thing you may be sure, there will be no favoritism in our program save that of the public interest.

The relationship between Government and industry in transportation should not be ended—in fact, it should be enhanced. The Government should take still greater responsibility than it has for the assurance of adequate, efficient and safe transportation services to meet the needs of the Nation.

Our conviction that the Government must develop firm and sensible policies does not mean that we expect any abrupt changes in policy. The business community will be consulted at every stage in our reexamination—as in the case of Secretary Hodges' recent request to the Business Advisory Council to reexamine the broad goals of the U.S. merchant marine. The guiding policy in our efforts will be that stressed by President Kennedy in his speech earlier this year to the National Industrial Conference Board, where he said "there is no inevitable clash * * * between Government and business. All elements in our national economic growth are interdependent"—and I want to stress the word "interdependent." "Each," President Kennedy said, "must play its proper role—and that is the hope and aim of his administration."

Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961

SPEECH
OF
HON. PETER H. DOMINICK
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, every one of us today is being asked to vote on a bill which will have a major impact on all the people of this country. I say this advisedly because you know and I know that although the present act only takes in those companies which have a rather high gross volume of sales, nevertheless, the proponents of this measure have already indicated that they intend in future sessions to have the dollar volume test cut at least in half and perhaps lower than this. This admission means then that it is the purpose of the supporters of this bill to inject the Federal Government into every business in the country regardless of our constitutional and historical concept of government and regardless of location conditions.

I, for one, do not believe that the powers of the Federal Government should be so expanded. Certainly the framers of the Constitution must be having nightmares if they are listening to the proposition that the Constitution authorizes the Federal Government to determine the major operating expenses of every business in the country.

I strongly suspect that this act is unconstitutional but even if it is not, it is a return to the philosophy of the administration that businessmen of this country are so insensitive and so stupid that they are unable to properly handle their personnel problems and to manage their own businesses.

This bill is also being proposed on a humanitarian basis, but the obvious cynicism with which this is promoted can easily be seen when the proponents of the bill, in order to gain votes, have exempted from its provisions the lowest wage group of any in the country; namely, the laundry workers. This was further emphasized by the action of the conference committee in agreeing to take out of the coverage of the existing act employees of cotton gins, obviously for the purpose of picking up some additional southern votes.

I have said before, and I will repeat, that I have no objection to raising the minimum wage in legitimate areas of coverage, whether it be to $1.15 or to $1.25, but it is fundamentally wrong, in my opinion, to go beyond the constitutional authority granted to the Federal Government to control interstate commerce and to inject it into what has been always considered and known as local enterprise and local business.

There is a further point which should be brought up and that is the question of unemployment. We have been told by the administration, and the facts would bear it out, that there is substantial unemployment in many areas. There are a number of people who are now employed who are young or working part time or who are mentally or physically handicapped. Most of these are in serious need of employment at any level not only for living expenses but also in order to be able to show that they are capable of contributing some effort to the overall enterprises of the country. It seems apparent to me that the proposed minimum wage will immediately and sharply hurt these categories; namely, the ones who are least able to help themselves. Instead of improving the unemployment situation this bill will undoubtedly increase the problem. I would also suggest to you that where labor costs are a high item of expense in any business, the effect of the bill will be to accelerate automation. This will, in turn, increase unemployment problems.

As you can see from the foregoing analysis, it is my firm opinion that enactment of this bill will constitute a massive invasion of local rights by the Federal Government in order to give power to a few theoretical bureaucrats in Washington, will accelerate automation to the detriment of union members and nonunion members of the laboring force, and will create sharp distress for the marginal workers who are least able to help themselves. It is for these reasons that I most emphatically and sincerely urge you to vote against this conference report so that a reasonable bill can be produced by a new conference committee.

The DAR Bucks the Tide With Straight Thinking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the April 26, 1961, issue of the Edgefield Advertiser, which is edited and published by Mr. W. W. Mims, contains an editorial which voices strong support of that great patriotic organization, the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution. The editorial is entitled "The DAR Bucks the Tide With Straight Thinking." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

I am a native of Edgefield County, and I am proud of the strong support which the Edgefield Advertiser is giving to the great work of the NSDAR.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Edgefield Advertiser, Apr. 26, 1961]

THE DAR BUCKS THE TIDE WITH STRAIGHT THINKING

The DAR, one of the country's most patriotic organizations, is not one to question whether this country should recognize Red China: That's not in the picture at all. The DAR urges a stepped up support of Nationalist China.

True, it is bucking the tide; it is contrary to the expressed British policy for recognition of Red China. It might be called an "old fogey" slant on world affairs by the trend makers, but it is straight thinking the American way.

Leading politicians and Government officials in the United States hint of the ultimate action of recognition.

The DAR may be old and it may have a bit of long lost past in its resolution of last week in Washington calling for more support to Nationalist China.

But in the American sense it is still straight thinking.

Polish Constitution Day

SPEECH
OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am happy, again this year, to join with my colleagues in this traditional observance of Polish Constitution Day, celebrating the occasion when Poland became a free, independent, and democratic Republic 170 years ago.

It is indeed sad and unfortunate that this day cannot be commemorated publicly by the people who are most concerned with its significance—the people of Poland themselves. They are under the rule of a ruthless foreign dictatorship, whose control is enforced by military might and the oppressive methods of a police state.

So it remains for the people of Polish blood in America and the other areas of freedom throughout the world to publicly observe this occasion and in this they are heartily joined by all lovers of liberty, of all races, who respect the dignity of mankind and who believe that it is the inherent right of all men to live under governments of their own choice.

Who can doubt that if the people of Poland had the power to choose between the foreign dictatorship which now rules the nation and a democratic government under a free election what the outcome would be? Every reasonable person knows the answer to that question. The people of Poland would choose liberty.

It has been well said that the "Polish Government is Communist—but the Polish people are not." The people of Poland are a religious, God-fearing nation. Atheistic communism is abhorrent to them. They have demonstrated this fact at every opportunity.

Even though they cannot observe this significant day publicly, we can be sure the people of Poland commemorate it in their hearts and minds. Let it be known to them that the people of freedom-loving America are thinking of them today and commiserating with them over their servitude.

Even in these dark hours of their sad plight, we can derive encouragement from Poland's history. Numerous times in the past, she has fallen prey to a larger and more powerful neighboring nation but through the indomitable spirit of her people, she has broken the chains of bondage.

May God speed the day when she can do so again.

To Build a Rational City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, Representative FRANK THOMPSON, of New Jersey, challenged the National Housing Conference on March 13 to build "a rational city, a city devoid of racial, religious or even economic segregation."

In the course of his address he also gave vigorous expression to a description of the many irrational forces that now make a chaos out of urban-suburban life in so many areas of this Nation. He asks the Nation to end waste and begin greater efforts for conservation and rehabilitation. He asks for a new appreciation of original thinking about metropolitan problems; he asks us to shake off old, limited concepts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. THOMPSON's remarks printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR., OF NEW JERSEY, MARCH 13, 1961, NATIONAL HOUSING CONFERENCE 30TH ANNUAL MEETING AND BANQUET, HOTEL STATLER, WASHINGTON, D.C.

It has seemed to me in recent weeks that there is in official Washington an air of excitement, a feeling that purposeful changes are afoot. I suppose this feeling is usual in the opening months of the administration of any new President. But from my admittedly partisan point of view, I like to think that something more is afoot than just a simple change of personnel in the Office of Chief Executive. Students of American history say our political habit has been to alternate periods of great governmental creativity with periods of governmental resting. Without getting into the question of whether the past 8 years were ones in which it was wise to rest, I think we can all agree—on the basis of the steady flow of Executive messages from the White House to the Congress if nothing else—that once again we are entering upon one of those creative eras.

The problems facing the 1960's, upon which this new creativity must be brought to bear, are many. But one of the most crucial is the problem of housing. The President, in his message on housing sent to the Congress last Thursday, pointed out that residential real estate, now worth about $500 billion, is the largest single component in the wealth of the American people. Yet this enormous investment is being eroded on every side—by carelessness, by bad laws, by misunderstanding of its nature. It is threatened not only by deterioration but also by wild and disordered growth.

The population of the United States is increasing at a rate which by the year 2000 will bring us to a citizenry of 300 million persons. Current trends indicate that this growth will take place almost exclusively in our metropolitan areas; the United States may be a nation of great open spaces, but in the future we are going to be a city-dwelling people and we are going to have to learn how it's done. The beginning of this shift in living habits has been inauspicious—suburbs have multiplied upon suburbs, sprawling mile upon unplanned mile across our countryside, removing working people ever farther from their places of employment, stealing from the central cities vast segments of the middle-income families which are a principal source of their tax revenue, killing our transit systems with a surfeit of automobiles, and strangling downtown areas in network of traffic-jammed streets.

Nor have the steps taken to correct this situation had the results intended.

Public housing, intended to eradicate the slums, not only has not kept up the race against the spread of urban blight; it has on occasion turned into slum itself.

Freeway systems intended to solve the traffic problems of the inner city have rather merely increased the flow of automobiles downtown, poisoned the air with noxious exhaust fumes, and replaced the already sparse greenery of cities with jungles of concrete.

Title I developments, hailed as a means of restoring portions of the cities' lost tax base, have too often resulted only in depriving innocent people of their homes and businesses and replacing usable buildings with tracts of bombed-out blocks which stand vacant and untaxable for years and finally provide vast profits to private entrepreneurs.

I do not intend these criticisms to be interpreted as an attack on the strategies which have been developed in our efforts to build ourselves rational and attractive communities in which to live and work. I have studied the legislative recommendations of the National Housing Conference, many of which use current programs as a jumping off point, and can say that most of the recommendations I can support without qualification.

But I am troubled by the fact that liberal approaches to the problem of housing America, the type of approach I take these recommendations to be, have tended to become frozen into their own kind of orthodoxy. Obviously existing programs need more money. But also—perhaps even more—we need creative new approaches to these problems.

I'm not an expert on housing problems. I have no completely worked-out set of proposals in my briefcase which I can sell to you tonight. All I have are a few thoughts which may stimulate you, who are the experts, and grow in time into new plans and programs.

First let me remind you of those figures I mentioned in passing earlier. Present estimates are that the United States will grow to 300 million persons in the next 40 years. Since existing housing is inadequate for the needs of our present population, we know right now that in these four decades we must build new dwelling places for at least 120 million people. We know we cannot do this by rampantly destroying existing housing without multiplying our problem manifold.

Americans are the most wasteful people on earth. We are the Nation which devised the throwaway milk carton, the paper plate, the nonrefillable tin can. We have gone further than that, developing the automobile with built-in obsolescence, the furniture which scarcely hangs on to its veneer till it's paid for, the refrigerator, stove and washing machine guaranteed to be out of fashion in 5 years' time. And now we are moving in the direction of the automatically obsolescent house. In Europe, to which so many Americans travel to find the beauty they cannot find at home, there is nothing unusual in finding families occupying houses 300 and 400 years old. On this side of the Atlantic, on the other hand, we are docilely learning the dictum that if a house is second hand it must be inferior and if it's been built more than 25 years it must be getting ready to fall down.

What lies behind this mania for consumption, consumption, consumption? Simple. The belief that high consumption will keep our manufacturers churning out goods and hence counteract tendencies toward unemployment. But once again I remind you—just 40 years from now we are going to need new dwelling units for 120 million new Americans. I tell you we can't afford to let existing housing decay and then be torn down for as yet unthought-of urban renewal plans. In my more nightmarish moments I wonder where those millions of board-feet of lumber, those countless tons of clay for bricks, those endless bags of cement needed just for the houses of that 120 million are going to come from.

No, we are going to have to learn to preserve what we have and build upon it.

We must ponder long and hard before we kill existing neighborhoods. Carelessly uprooting people from a neighborhood in which they have lived a lifetime in order to replace their houses with something better may indeed provide sounder buildings and spruce up the area. But too often it scatters around the city confused and resentful people who vent their justified hostilities upon their new dwelling places and cause more slums.

One time when families moved to public housing developments, they went voluntarily, hoping they were finally getting the break that would permit them to build themselves a new and better life. Now, too often, they go because the place they lived in previously is being torn down and public housing is all they can afford. Construction specifications of public housing units frequently are an insult to the tenants. No doors on the closets, no baseboards on the walls have become symbolic of project living. What wonder is it that projects go sour and decay from the inside out?

Would not the cost be less in the long run, when renewal of a neighborhood seems indicated, to plan it honestly, step by step, with the residents of the area, to carry it out plat by plat with a judicious mixing of vest-pocket low-income projects, privately financed middle- and upper-income units and rehabilitation and retention of the bulk of the existing structures? Then persons necessarily displaced could just move across the street, retaining unbroken their neighborhood ties, and when the renewal job reached completion, could sit back proud in the knowledge that they themselves had made their neighborhood what it was.

Perhaps we should take a new look at the consequences of our taxing systems, devising means of encouraging desirable trends in housing. Do we want homeowners to keep their residences in tiptop shape? Perhaps we should permit tax deductions for home improvements?

Do we want to launch an attack on profiteers in slum real estate?

Perhaps we should change the tax laws to forbid real estate investors from depreciating the same piece of property again and again as it goes from hand to hand. Perhaps we should determine a slum building's value for property tax purposes not on the basis of its worth as a structure but rather on the potential worth of the land it occupies and the rental income it produces.

Let me cite to you an example reported recently in Look magazine of how our present tax laws stimulate the spread of slums. An investor purchased a 6-apartment building in Chicago for $25,000, and with the aid of a little plasterboard and chicken wire he converted it into a 24-apartment structure housing 72 people. Rental collections of more than $1,800 a month enabled him to recover the full amount of his equity in less than 18 months. He was aided in his depredations by depreciation, available only to investors, not to homeowners, and by the tax base on a building with a market value of only $25,000.

Are we convinced that owner-occupied property is generally better maintained than property owned by investors? Then perhaps we would be wise to provide Government insured mortgages on houses of all vintages, not just on recently built ones.

I sometimes wonder if we Americans are not overly dedicated to the principle of ownership of property in fee simple. Perhaps we could make our Government dollars go further if instead of buying properties in entirety before redeveloping them, our redevelopment authorities just purchased selected rights within the affected areas. This type of control would be cheaper than outright seizure, yet more effective than zoning ordinances. For example, it is generally acknowledged that open spaces between built-up areas are to be desired. Yet we cannot by zoning fiat declare that there shall be no subdivision of a given tract of land if its location justifies it. And the cost of buying the section for park land appears to the affected municipality to be prohibitive. Perhaps in this case we should study the possibility of buying not the entire tract but only the right to subdivide it.

Are we concerned that the natural leaders graduate from low-income housing projects leaving a vacuum behind them because their incomes increase beyond the maximums permitted? Perhaps we should consider the possibility of abolishing these income restrictions to residents already in the projects, raising the rent instead.

Do private real estate operators really need that guaranteed 20-percent gap between governmentally subsidized rents and the bottom of the private rental market? Let's find out.

Do our cities need all these freeways? Lewis Mumford, who sometimes seems to be a voice crying alone in the wilderness, has pointed out repeatedly that the foot is the most efficient mode of transportation and urged that our cities be planned for pedestrians.

I don't know what the answers to these questions are. As I said, I have studied your legislative recommendations and found them good. More money is obviously needed for all our housing programs. Special concern must obviously be given to the needs of our older people. Especially, I can salute your backing of the proposed creation of a Department of Housing and Community Development. In such a department I can see some of these problems being considered.

But most especially I want to leave you tonight with a challenge. I want to challenge you to the problem of building a rational city, a city devoid of racial, religious, or even economic segregation. There is no reason for low-income, middle-income, high-income families to live each in their own area. So far as this segregation is caused by custom we can only preach against it. But, surely, if it results directly from our own existing housing programs, we can change the legislation to reverse the trend.

Finally, I would leave with you this quotation from the poet T. S. Eliot, the relevance of which to planning was seen not by me but by Staughton Lynd writing in Commentary magazine:

"When the stranger says, 'What is the meaning of this city?'
Do you huddle close together because you love each other?
What will you answer? 'We all dwell together
To make money from each other'? or
'This is a community' "?

Jobs for the Handicapped—A Community Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to include as part of the RECORD a prize-winning essay which was written by a 16-year-old New Mexico senior high school student, Claire Marek.

The quality of her work indicates that this young lady thoroughly researched and gave serious thought to her topic, and I am sure you will all agree that this is an excellent essay.

The manner in which she has expressed her views regarding the problems of the handicapped particularly impressed me, and it is my hope that more members of our younger generation become aware of the problems confronting this segment of our citizenry.

The entire State of New Mexico is especially proud of Miss Marek's outstanding achievement, and I hope you will also share in our pride.

The essay follows:

JOBS FOR THE HANDICAPPED—A COMMUNITY CHALLENGE

(By Claire Marek, Albuquerque High School, Albuquerque, N. Mex.)

"Pencils for sale," a feeble voice comes from the weatherbeaten face of the old man sitting against the store wall. His shabby clothes and dilapidated shoes and hat present a sharp contrast to the fashions on the models in the store window above him. Dark glasses over his eyes, an old tincup in his hand, and a white cane lying beside him complete the picture. A shopper, dropping a few pennies in the tincup, so few that it hardly makes a rattle, passes by and remarks, "Why can't they do something about that?" "They" an easy way of passing the responsibility onto that vague group into whose care we place all the problems and mistakes of the world. The "they" should be you, I and all of us in the community where the pencil man exists.

The pencil man is of the older generation. Much has been done for younger people with the same handicap. One seldom sees a middle-aged person in the pencil man's plight. Still—

A young man wheels himself into the huge room furnished with benches and

tables on which various electronic equipment is placed. His eyes are bright and his excitement is quite evident, for this is his second day on the job. A man stops to say "hello" and chat a moment, but at another table, another man speaks to his boss, "Why can't that crippled guy work somewhere else? Why does he have to be near me? I can't do my job right because he makes me nervous."

The Government and the State have done their part of the job well. The man is efficient because the Government has trained him. He has a job. However, the community has failed to complete the work started by the Government. The community must educate the average persons about the ability and efficiency of the handicapped. Some prejudice has been torn down. Young children in school stand a better chance than ever of obtaining jobs. But—

A 5-year-old boy pauses as his instructor shapes her lips to form a vowel and places his chubby hand on her throat. She utters the sound again and again. Then she turns the boy to the mirror and places his hand on his own throat. He tries. The process is repeated until a satisfied smile appears on on the face of the young woman. Then one appears on the face of the boy. Watching through a one-way window, a society matron comments: "This education is fine, and we expect to raise quite a sum in our fund drive, but what good will it all do? Will he ever really amount to anything?"

Progress has definitely been made with the handicapped. Each succeeding generation has a better chance—but these questions: "Why can't they do something about that?" "Why can't he work somewhere else?" "Will he ever really amount to anything?" are asked frequently throughout the United States, and they reflect a broad area of Americans' opinions.

The Federal Government has done much to remedy such situations as that of the blind man selling pencils, in the form of special education programs and facilities for medical treatment. But this rehabilitation and education of the handicapped is worthless unless the community is educated to accept the rehabilitated as truly rehabilitated. Pamphlets can be sent out showing how everyone benefits when the handicapped are hired, for they may serve as contributing members of the community. This information acquaints the community with the efficiency of disabled persons, but does not erase the prejudice entirely. The old adage that "experience is the best teacher" holds true in this respect. The community must experiment with their handicapped by trying them and trusting them. It must be a community effort, for the people of a Minnesota town are not going to help a blind man in an Indiana town; the people of a small Texas city are not going to see that a crippled factory worker makes a "go" of his job, nor that his neighbors accept him; and the people of a Tennessee town are not going to arrange that a little deaf boy in Arizona has a job in 20 years. But, the people of each community can help the handicapped in their own town, and only by this "teamwork" can successful placement of the handicapped be attained.

Moreover, a job involves more than mere placement or position. A job for a handicapped person means being accepted by his fellow workers to the extent that they are able to concentrate on his abilities rather than his disabilities. Americans did not understand it when the Japanese rioters made Eisenhower cancel his trip to Japan. The handicapped person is in the same way puzzled when a job is refused him because of his disability. He wants a job and acceptance, not a job and avoidance.

The little boy working diligently trying to learn to speak, wants acceptance also. Right now, funds from the Government and some from the community are paying for his education. He appreciates this, and will appreciate it even more in 20 years, for it will mean his bread. But now and in the future, he will need more than bread. The friendliness of his community will mean the difference between a drab, lonely, and embittered life and a life of contentment and sharing in the community's privileges and responsibilities. Modern equipment and experienced teachers can fit him for meeting the outside world, but is the outside world a fit place for him?

This question and all the others that have been asked by pitying donators and charitable clubwomen can be answered only by the community. These questions are the challenge that faces each community today. The answer is community cooperation to do something about that blind man on the corner. The community must educate its members against prejudice so that the crippled factory worker is sought after and accepted for his abilities. Finally, the community can prepare its future citizens so that the deaf boy in the special school will some day amount to something.

This, then, is the complete challenge; the hiring of the handicapped devoid of any prejudice. When this challenge is met, each community, each State, and finally the Nation will be a better place for everyone; able and disabled alike, to live.

Failure of Geneva Nuclear Test Talks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the Washington Post of April 11 contained an editorial which, in my judgment, is worthy of widespread attention.

The commentary, entitled "Three-Headed Monster," examines the poor achievement record of the Geneva nuclear test talks. It not only bares the self-serving reasons behind the Soviet's three-sided inspection proposal but also suggests affirmative action on the part of the United States to bring matters to a head.

I ask unanimous consent that this excellent editorial from the Washington Post be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THREE-HEADED MONSTER

Everything disclosed so far of the Soviet approach to the nuclear test talks at Geneva indicates that Mr. Khrushchev is determined to apply to the inspection machinery the same three-way formula he seeks to impose on the United Nations. That is, he wants to give a veto power to each segment of the tripartite inspectorate now envisaged, so that the Communists could prevent an inspection proposed by Western and neutral members. This is analagous to his plan to replace Mr. Hammarskjold with a three-man U.N. secretariat, and it won't work for much the same reasons.

Such a system would make a complete mockery of inspection. It is totally unacceptable to Britain and the United States. The Western allies have gone very far in a good faith effort to meet Soviet objections and to make an agreement possible if the Soviet Union wants it. The question arises, therefore, of how long it is useful to continue the negotiations at Geneva. For what the Soviet Union really is arguing for is a continuation of the unpoliced moratorium on nuclear tests without agreeing to the necessary control measures.

A case can be made that not until the United States evidenced its determination to intervene militarily in Laos to prevent further deterioration did the Soviet Union show real interest in negotiations for a settlement there. If this is an accurate interpretation of the Soviet attitude, perhaps the Geneva talks are testing the determination of the United States and of President Kennedy. And perhaps what is necessary to produce a change of Soviet tactics is a clear indication that the United States is willing to break off the Geneva talks and, if that seems wise, to resume nuclear testing underground in such a way as to avoid fallout.

There is no firm evidence on whether or not the Soviet Union has been conducting clandestine tests in violation of the moratorium. Opinions differ on whether it would be militarily advantageous for the United States to resume testing of nuclear weapons if the Soviet Union is not in fact testing. But the willingness to take such a step may be important symbolically quite apart from the military value and may indeed be the key to eventual agreement.

Obviously this is not a decision to be taken lightly. There would be enormous propaganda liabilities for the United States even from an underground test unless the justification were very fully and clearly stated. It has not come to such a decision yet, for there is still a possibility that the Soviet position at Geneva will change. An enforceable test ban remains the most practical step that can be taken to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons and to build confidence for disarmament. But it may well be that the only way to make Mr. Khrushchev amenable is to show him that the Western allies will not be stalled indefinitely.

Wisconsin's Teacher of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the American educational system today is one of the most promising and challenging professions.

To pace our complex social-economic-political systems, to meet the evergrowing needs of the future, we will depend, to a large degree, upon teachers who not only instruct, but also inspire, the youth of America.

Recently, Miss Helen Adams, of Cumberland, Wis., was designated the "National Teacher of the Year."

The award was given to Miss Adams, a kindergarten teacher in Cumberland, for outstanding contributions to education in her community.

The award is sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education, the Council of Chief State School Officers, and Look magazine, to help encourage all teachers to aspire to greatness in their chosen profession and to help interest more young people in pursuing teaching careers.

At this time, I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of a press release by Look magazine, on the National Teacher of the Year Award printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Miss Adams was selected for the National Teacher of the Year Award after having been nominated for consideration by George E. Watson, superintendent of public instruction for the State of Wisconsin. To be eligible for consideration in the competition, teachers must first be nominated by the chief State school officer in their State. After being observed at work, nominees are then rated by a committee of national leaders in education, meeting in Washington, D.C.

Of the award to Miss Adams, President Kennedy said, "Today, the fate of individuals and nations rests upon education. In a real and immediate sense, the teachers of America hold our future in their hands. Miss Helen Adams is one of those to whom we owe gratitude and support. Her dedication and warmth, her struggle against high odds to become a teacher should stand as an example to future teachers and an inspiration to all Americans."

Miss Adams epitomizes not only high teaching standards, but also the old-fashioned virtues of individual enterprise and initiative. From the time she was 6 years old, the Look article reports, Miss Adams wanted to be a teacher, but she had to overcome tremendous odds before she could realize her dream. Financial circumstances forced her to stop her education after grade school, and for 5 years she worked at various domestic jobs before she was finally able to enter high school as a freshman. Following her graduation from high school, she enrolled in the kindergarten-primary department at Wisconsin State College in Superior. In her junior year, in 1944, she left college to become Cumberland's kindergarten teacher. Five years later, she was struck by polio. For a while, it seemed that she would be permanently crippled, but she fought her way back to complete recovery.

Since becoming Cumberland's kindergarten teacher 17 years ago, Miss Adams has attended summer school to get her B.S. degree at Wisconsin State in 1951 and her master of arts in education from Columbia University in 1958.

Says the Look article: "Cumberland's fierce pride in and devotion to Miss Adams reflect what she has given the town's children for 17 years: a blend of unstinting love and skillful technique that marks a great teacher."

Says Miss Adams: "The best I can do isn't good enough for my children."

In the 1961 National Teacher of the Year awards competition, eight other teachers were singled out for honor roll certificates: Adeline E. Babbitt, a teacher of remedial reading at Kamehameha School for Girls in Honolulu; James DeRose, science head of Maple-Newtown Senior High School, Newtown Square, Pa.; Kenneth H. Easter, head of vocational agriculture at Dos Palos (Calif.) High School; Ruth Lee, home economics director at Teague High School, Teague, Tex.; Mrs. Sherman Lee, Jr., a mathematics teacher at Marietta High School, Marietta, Ga.; Helen Maney, chairman of the citizenship-education department at Geneva High School, Geneva, N.Y.; Mrs. Isabelle Mattson, who teaches the fifth grade in Union City, Mich.; and Brook Peterson, a 25-year-old teacher of English and social studies in Waconia High School, Waconia, Minn.

The A B C's of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include a first prize winning essay in the Life Line patriotic essay contest, submitted by Mrs. Holly Holmes, of Hawthorne, Calif. The essay is entitled "The A B C's of America." This essay expresses so well the concept of governmental philosophy coincident with that of my own, I feel I would like to give it as wide circulation as possible:

THE A B C'S OF AMERICA

All around us, men are seeking new ideas to preserve world peace. We are told the world is sick and needs our help. But how can we cure the world by causing our own downfall? We could help the world more by strengthening our own country and proving that we have the solution to our own ills. If the real story were told and understood by all nations in the world, people everywhere would want to follow our example.

Our need, now, more than any time in the history of the United States, is to thoroughly understand the principles of Americanism.

We need now, more than ever, to understand that the Communists intend that this country remain in action, not ashes; therefore, their idea is to take it from within. Their frustration in this country, as in no other country, is the Constitution of the United States. They are frustrated because of our 50 separate State governments. The mistaken are for centralization. That simply underscores the necessity for our constant support of our Constitution with its provisions for States rights. Don't let the power over the police, land, ballot box, or any other thing in Government become consolidated. We must keep the Government dispersed, checked, balanced, and unconcentrated. Watch out for one big government, one big business, or one big union, which would monopolize the destinies of human nature. Centralization of powers inevitably leads to the control of wealth.

Under our free enterprise system, our Government does not have an unlimited claim on the earnings of Americans. When a strong Federal Government enacts programs that are not authorized by our Constitution, the money needed to pay for such programs exceeds the Government's rightful claim to our wealth. A centralized, powerful government is a government of men, not of law, and as such, is exactly opposite to our form of government.

We need to understand that this is a country of laws, backed by men and women of good will. Our human rights and equality before the law are without match anywhere. In this country human rights are first, freedom of the individual; second, the freedom to own property, which is the basic religious nature of our philosophy, as opposed to the atheistic concepts of communism.

We need to learn how the mistaken use our very freedoms to tamper with the mainsprings of this republic, how they have divided us through the use of Semantics, so that we are putting each other into labeled categories, often with deep insinuations of disloyalty to our country. We must learn how they abuse the Bill of Rights. The first amendment, freedom of speech, does not entitle anyone to cause riot and panic through words. We need to understand their use of the fifth amendment to protect themselves where it should only be used in criminal courts: their abuse of the 10th amendment, which reserves to the States their own independent governments.

We need to inform ourselves of how the Communists are doing their part to soften the younger generation to a point of "moral decay". With alcohol, narcotics, obscene literature available to our youth, and with much of our movie and TV-fare featuring crime, violence and loose morality, it is time our homes, churches, schools, and government combine forces to convince youth that honest and decent living represent the highest type of intelligence and patriotism. The individuals who are selling this for the dollars in it—do so under the guise of freedom and democracy but without regard for the common good, freedom becomes license.

A strong United States with the will to use its strength is the only obstacle between communism and world domination. Because of this, a subversive arsenal of Communist organizations is working to weaken our will to resist, confuse, promote class warfare and hatred and otherwise disorganize our society. Yet, under court interpretation of our laws, the Government cannot take effective action to counter such tactics. Private groups must fill this gap in our defenses by speaking out for freedom. To counter and block concealed Communist activities requires full knowledge.

We need to realize that a thorough knowledge of our economic system is necessary for clear thinking on this problem. Free enterprise has created a Nation of wants, where other nations have to work for needs. In a free society we have the time to combine natural resources plus human energy, plus tools to produce materials which give life more pleasure. It has been proven down through the centuries that man can create in a free society and that man cannot create in a controlled society.

The first thing we must do is reeducate ourselves in Americanism so that we have the answers clearly in our minds, realize the dangers and remember that the Communists deliberately confuse us about our own system. We then can be more effective.

What is Americanism? It is the right to be an uncommon man. The right to create—to succeed—and to fail. Life has a purpose and meaning to every individual with divine help. Equality means equal in God's sight and therefore equal before the law of the land, but recognizes that our individual differences feed and clothe us and give us the essential material conditions in which our society has progressed.

In short, Americanism is freedom.

Freedom is but an opportunity. We must hold it, feel it, and use it.

We must save our American economic institutions from socialism. Our political freedoms have released the energies and ambitions of the people so that they have produced the highest standard of living ever known in any land. It is this freedom to produce competitively and to keep a part of our production that has made our country the envy of the world. We must testify to our young people about the benefits of the competition all around us. Business success is attained by public opinion and demand in the face of competition. Competition gives you your choice. Competition lets you, the people, decide what you want. Competition and freedom to produce can only be kept in political freedom.

Another thing we must protect from the deadening hand of socialism is the education

of our youth (this cold war is real and the target is youth). Standards and goals of learning must be set. Rewards must be offered. We must have recognition of achievement. Competition in the classroom can be supervised to be as beneficial and as much fun as a football game. It will build strong minds, alert and capable of exploring new fields of knowledge and help advance the progress of mankind. Young people can be motivated to try as hard to excel in learning as in sports and their whole lives will be rich in accomplishment and their ability to serve their Nation intensified.

Our students should receive a clear explanation of the realities of the competitive world we live in and the fact that it is the people who will decide the future. If children are thoroughly grounded in the ideals and accomplishments of America and the thrilling history of how our people struggled to build this freedom, few will ever listen to Communist deceit. There can be no republic in America operating in constitutional liberty to express the will of the people unless we have citizens and leaders who are devoted to the Republic and who have been well taught in their youth all the methods and means of preserving freedom.

Freedom has not always been the natural state of human society. It is an achievement. It is not static. It is a living, moving thing, constantly growing with the movement and development of a people.

We have always depended on youth to pay a heavy price in blood to preserve our freedoms. Now it is from our elder citizens that we must expect the elite shock troops of defense for America in the decisive battles of the cold war.

Know the truth of the ideological greatness of our free Republic and meet the mistaken in forum and auditorium. Know that the American Bill of Rights is a brief but negative document telling our Government what it shall not do.

Our best defense is a good offense.

We must recognize the mistakes which have been made, not necessarily to advertise them, and then we can go on the offensive with commonsense, simple A B C's.

First, educate yourselves in the free-enterprise system. Know why communism failed with our Pilgrim Fathers and the great lesson we learned from them; that we had to have incentive to produce; that we have the right to own, to sell, to buy, and to compete.

Educate others and then go * * * or send informed people with know-how all over the world, to show the people this formula of the uncommon man. We can lift up through knowledge. Truth is fact.

Form youth groups, challenge them, let them learn then watch them go to work.

Watch them build a better America and in so doing, build a better world.

German Settlement in Kansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, many Germans were among the first settlers across the border when Kansas was opened as a territory, and during our centennial year as a State, I think it is fitting that we pay tribute to those early German pioneers for the many outstanding contributions they made to the growth and development of our State.

There appeared in the April-May issue of the American-German Review an article entitled "Germans in Kansas," and I ask unanimous consent that it be made a part of these remarks and printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GERMANS IN KANSAS

(By J. Neale Carman)

Before Kansas became a Territory and was opened for settlement in 1854 it belonged to the Indians. The few white men allowed in the area included some Germans, mostly soldiers and teamsters.

The epic of "bleeding Kansas," the struggle for or against slavery, began with the opening of the territory. Many Germans were among the first settlers across the border, and most of them were ardent Free-Staters. "Dutch Henry," Henry Sherman, so the records spell his name, was an exception. He had a trading post in John Brown's neighborhood, and the Browns murdered him. The Missourians intended to make Leavenworth a slave-State town but the large German element which almost immediately established itself there was an important factor in spoiling the plan. The presence of similar elements in Lawrence and Topeka was one reason why those towns soon choked off their neighbors with slave-State sentiments, Franklin and Lecompton. Not all German immigrants, however, liked to be within range of border-ruffian raids, and these formed settlements farther west than any others founded during territorial times; they advanced a third of the way toward the present Colorado line, as much as 150 miles from the eastern border, whereas most settlements in that period were no more than 75 or 80 miles from Missouri. Even these people were stanch unionists. Kansas was not the scene of any major fighting during the Civil War, but there were alarms of southern invasion, and the rosters of the militia companies that speedily formed were well furnished with German names, some among the officers. Kansas Germans also enlisted for service beyond the State.

During the Civil War, although the population of Kansas increased, the German population with the rest, there was a lull in the founding of new settlements. In the 20 years following, 1865–85, settlement spread to the Colorado line. Despite ups and downs, there was in general an ever increasing impetus in immigration until the boom collapsed in 1886.

During these years the German population in the towns thrived. Along the Missouri River, Atchison, Leavenworth, and Wyandotte (this last was the most important of the group of settlements later to become Kansas City, Kans.), as well as Lawrence and Topeka on the lower Kansas River, each had German wholesale grocery houses, German cigar makers, German furniture makers, German breweries, German newspapers, German harness factories, and as social manifestations German churches, turnverein, and German chapters of lodges like the Masons and the Odd Fellows.

Almost all these phenomena were to be found in the town of Hanover, too, on the Little Blue River near the Nebraska border. A line drawn from Lincoln, Nebr., to Wichita, Kans., runs through it. Its founder was Gart Henry Hollenberg (1823–74), a Hanoverian. As early as 1854, Hollenberg, forced by tuberculosis into a sedentary life after wandering over much of the globe and particularly the California gold fields, opened a store on the Oregon Trail. In 1857 he moved it to the junction of the trail and the Overland Road from St. Joseph, Mo. Here the store became known as the Cottonwood Ranch, and during the brief history of the Pony Express was a change house; hence the old wooden building is now a State monument. Hollenberg became a sort of local squire, a beloved leader who collected his countrymen around him. In 1869 he establish the town of Hanover in anticipation of the coming of the St. Joseph & Grand Island Railroad. The railroad arrived in 1871, and Hanover became a division point on it. The town was then prosperous for almost 40 years, though in population did not surpass 1,200. If Hollenberg had lived, it might well have become more important, but his old malady returned, and he died of a hemorrhage at sea on his way to Germany to search for immigrants. There were as many Oldenburgers as Hanoverians among the town's settlers and a very good representation of Westphalians, but the town deserved its name because there were so many Hanoverians in the surrounding countryside. To the east and northeast the district was and is solidly Hanoverian Lutheran, zealous members of the Missouri Synod. The town and the country to the west have their Lutherans too, but they are different: members of the Midwest Synod, the old German Nebraska Synod. Religiously the most important section of the urban population is Roman Catholic, long staunchly German in culture. The German language in Hanover is in a sad state now; only the old are expert in it. If, though, a Missouri Lutheran from Bremen, the next town east, be more than 20 years old, his Low German is fluent. There are a great many German communities east of Hanover all the way to the Missouri River, and for 20 miles south and west of it, with histories not dissimilar.

The presence of Württembergers, Rhinelanders, and people from other provinces along the Rhine, as well as the Hanoverians, Bavarians and some Pomeranians made for a maximum variation in dialects.

As at Hanover, so all over Kansas, the 1870's were important because of the coming of the railroads. The Atchison, Topeka, & Santa Fe and the Kansas Pacific, ultimately to be absorbed by the Union Pacific, had obtained land grants of millions of acres within the State. They accordingly became eager bidders for immigrant groups. The Kansas Pacific appealed in part to Swedes, and so did not attract a great variety of German settlements along its course. It had had certain settlements of Germans from Germany proper, Baptists and Missouri Lutherans, but its great settlements were made up of Volga Germans. The Santa Fe, on the other hand, because C. F. Schmidt was prominent in its land office, concentrated on Germans. Very early the railroad built a branch south from Newton to a newly founded town on the Arkansas River. This was Wichita, whose first inhabitants included William Greiffenstein, in 1869, Greiffenstein, born in 1829 at Frankfurt am Main, had been trading with the Indians for 20 years, latterly in the neighborhood of the future Wichita. For 8 years, centering around 1880, he was the city's mayor, generally well to do and prominent. Wichita, thanks to its own German citizens and to the St. Mark settlement nearby, became a strong Roman Catholic center: from 1887 the See of a diocese. Although its first bishop was an Irishman, almost all his clergy were German, and future bishops bore German names.

A little west of Wichita, at St. Mark, the Santa Fe established or at least encouraged a very strong settlement of Roman Catholic Rhinelanders. Farther west on the great bend of the Arkansas River it set up an area that is called Germania, where Germans of every type moved in. On Germania's edge were two quite strong groups of Moravian Germans, and not far off a settlement of East Frisians. There were numerous other small rural settlements, and the towns along the railroad had their German element too. Specifically, Dodge City was founded in 1872

when the Santa Fe went through, and became a division point. In 1875 Ford County's population was 813: males 626, females 187. Of these, 25 had been born in Germany, including 4 married women and 1 unmarried woman.

The greatest Santa Fe accomplishment in attracting German immigrants concerned neither Roman Catholics nor people born in Germany but Mennonites from south Russia, from the Molotschna River district just above the Crimea. At the end of the 18th century they had left Prussia on the Vistula Delta to enjoy guarantees against military service. In the 1870's the Russians revoked the guarantees, and several thousand Mennonites moved out to Kansas; others went to Canada, Nebraska, and the Dakotas. As a group, they were not poor; they could buy land. They had been wheat farmers in Russia, and they carefully chose an area here that had the same characteristics as their previous lands. In 1874 they began to occupy, and still do occupy, a rhombus of territory with sides 25 miles long. Its center is located some 40 miles north of Wichita. It is good land, and the size of the Mennonite churches testifies to the opulence of the people.

Their beginnings were a struggle, though not so much of a struggle as that of other thousands of Germans who came from settlements in Russia older and more remote than those on the Black Sea. In the 1760's Catherine II had settled more than 20,000 immigrants mostly from South Germany ("Swabians") at the point on the middle Volga that is farthest east. After a fearful struggle they established themselves well, but by 1870 they were outgrowing their holdings and though not pacifists like the Mennonites, they found that the new exposure to military service and its brutalities was nearly as repugnant to them as to the Mennonites. In 1875 several thousands of them began coming to Kansas. They were not rich, but they, too, were wheat farmers, and as particular about their land as the Mennonites were. They wanted black earth—it had to taste right—and all that the Santa Fe offered them was sandy soil. They, therefore, preferred the lands of the Kansas Pacific. In Russia they had been settled in villages either entirely Roman Catholic or entirely "Lutheran," a term which included both true Lutherans and Reformed, and eventually, by conversion, Baptists, and various other sects. In this country, too, the Roman Catholics and the Protestants isolated themselves from each other. The Roman Catholics took land south and east of Hays, at the time a town suspended in space 250 miles west of Kansas City, two-thirds of the way across the State. The heart of the district is some 18 miles square, but the Volgans have spread locally and also established colonies farther west, all the way to Colorado. The same thing may be said of the Mennonites and to a lesser extent of the Protestant Volgans. The Protestant settlements are nearly as large as the Roman Catholic, and east and south of them.

The Roman Catholic Volgans and the Mennonites are the groups which have persisted most faithfully in their use of German dialects. Few know standard German now, but in the heart of the Mennonite district anyone who has come of age is able to handle Low German, and in certain Roman Catholic Volga communities even small children speak Schwäbisch. The internal religious disunity of the Protestant Volgans has made them an easier prey to linguistic Anglicization, and while there are among them some ferocious advocates of the German language, very few of these are young.

Somewhat later than the Volga Germans a settlement of Bukovina Germans established itself in the northwest part of the same county (Ellis). They too increased considerably in numbers; by 1895 there were 1,300. But there were almost four times as many Roman Catholic Volgans, and the Bukovina settlement is dwarfed by comparison.

German settlement, and foreign settlement in general, has been light in the southern part of the State. On the northern border west of the groups discussed with Hanover there is a break for almost a hundred miles. Then there are small groups here and there until we reach the extreme northwestern county (Cheyenne) and the one just east of it (Rawlins). The latter contains a group of Hungarian Germans, which numbered nearly a thousand in 1895. These people came from the lake district just over the border from Austria, near Vienna. Very few could speak Magyar; theirs was a Swabian dialect. Their center is the town of Herndon: the Roman Catholics settled north and west of town; the Protestants south and east. The village itself harbored both. The Catholics as well as the Protestants were an argumentative lot in the beginning, but the dissensions were within each group rather than between the two. Latterly they are in harmony not only with each other, but with their Swedish and Bohemian neighbors, and intermarriage occurs.

The group that interests us in Cheyenne County is squarely against the Colorado line and almost against Nebraska too. In 1895 when immigration was not yet complete, it went on for at least a decade longer—this group was made up of 400 Black Sea Germans. Their settlements in Russia were farther west than those of the Mennonites, somewhat west of Odessa. Their nostalgia for things German is great, but in 1952 their children at the rural church could not understand a minister who explained that "Aller Anfang ist schwer." None of them knew schwer. Yet no community in Kansas is more remote from outside contacts, and almost no German settlements are of more recent origin.

During the hysteria of the World War I years against all thing German, feeling ran as high in Kansas as anywhere in the United States. Even in rural districts solidly German, certain churches and parochial schools were daubed with yellow. In the towns the pressures were still greater. In Kansas, as elsewhere, public urban use of German became almost impossible, and when the hostility died down and church services in German could be resumed, the spark was dim and in most towns it soon went out. Kansas City, Kans., is an important exception. By 1948 it was the only town of more than 4,000 population in which a German sermon could be heard in the Lutheran churches of the Missouri Synod. Up to 1959 St. Luke's Church still provided such a possibility.

Topeka offers another case of the persistence of the use of German in certain neighborhoods. The town as a whole contains a large German element which has shed its German. But the Roman Catholic Volga immigrants of 1875 took up temporary quarters in Topeka, and a few remained there, to be joined in the course of time, by many others (700 in 1895). They clustered together in the neighborhood of the Santa Fe railroad shops, had a church to themselves, St. Joseph's, and carried on with the culture that they had brought from Russia. Particularly their wedding customs and their language impressed this fact upon their neighbors. This culture has been slowly yielding to the waves beating against it. The wedding celebrations are less prolonged and less tumultuous, and German has disappeared from the sermons, but in 1940 students in high school often spoke German at home, and in 1961 on the streets women in the prime of life can still occasionally be heard speaking German to each other.

In Kansas the legislature, the congressional representations, the supreme court, the faculties of the universities, the professional organizations, the student bodies teem with German names. Statistically, in 1895 nearly 60,000 foreign-born Germans lived in Kansas; about 70,000 of their children lived with them. This was about 10 percent of the State's population. I venture to say that now, while the number of those with only German ancestry has decreased, half of the 2 million Kansans have some German blood in their veins.

There Is No Substitute for Seapower, Now or in the Foreseeable Future—An Address by Rear Adm. R. K. James, U.S. Navy, Chief of Bureau of Ships

SPEECH
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to hear recently an extremely fine and most timely address by Rear Adm. R. K. James, U.S. Navy, Chief, Bureau of Ships, at the annual convention of the National Association of Master Mechanics and Foremen held in the Nation's Capital. What he said, in my opinion, needed to be said during these turbulent and often confusing times in which we live. In addition to the specific comments contained in his address, it included a clarion call to all Americans to meet the challenges of our day. I hope Members of the House will read the speech which follows herewith:

Members of the Master Mechanics and Foremen Association and distinguished guests, the major purpose of any convention is to recognize and analyze the problems confronting the organization, to iron out the areas of difference, and arrive at a general agreement as to the course to be pursued for the future.

I am particularly appreciative of the invitation to participate in your convention because the conclusions you reach here will have a significant bearing upon the mission of the Navy Shore Establishment and the Bureau of Ships during the ensuing year.

Consequently, I welcome this opportunity to place before you a few of my thoughts in the hope that they will help to solidify our thinking and further cement the military-civilian partnership which is so essential to the operation of the Navy, the service to which all of us are devoting our careers.

For almost a century and a half those naval officers responsible for the construction and maintenance of the fleet have relied upon the production skill and management know-how of the predecessors of this association for the accomplishment of their mission.

This working partnership has been a significant factor in the creation of the world's mightiest sea power.

History has already recorded the accomplishments of the past, and while we take a natural pride in and draw encouragement and confidence from this brilliant history, the shoals of the future are our responsibility.

And what is the future of the Navy?

There is no substitute for seapower, now or in the foreseeable future. Nuclear energy,

guided missiles and even the spectacular man in space have not reduced the importance of sea power for the maintenance of our world position.

If anything, the importance of the Navy has increased with each of these scientific achievements.

Oceans can no longer be regarded as barriers behind which a nation can feel secure from an aggressor.

On the contrary, the seas are the highways which bind the world together and those nations which are in a position to protect themselves against aggressors who would deny them the free use of these seaways can maintain their world leadership.

The pages of medieval and modern history are strewn with examples of vigorous nations whose decline followed the disintegration or stagnation of their seapower.

The question then is not the continuing need for the Navy but rather our ability to satisfy the growing demands being made upon our forces afloat and, consequently, upon the Shore Establishment which supports them.

I need not review with this audience the grave crisis facing us in the unsettled world situation and the major role which the Navy Shore Establishment plays in this crisis.

A crisis is a time of grave danger and of great opportunity. Let us be aware of the danger but welcome the opportunity with courage and conviction.

We won two world wars because we had the time to marshal the sheer weight of our tremendous wealth in national resources, technical know-how and manpower and bring them to bear against an enemy which was not our equivalent in these assets.

Today, we no longer bask in the sunlight of these advantages. Time is no longer a protective factor. Many key natural resources are under the control of the opposition and our previously unchallenged leadership in the technological fields is not only being equaled but has been surpassed in at least one spectacular field.

Quite apart from the international situation, there is another potent and vocal force opposing us which is of grave concern to all of us who are dedicated to the support of the Naval Shore Establishment.

I am sure that you have noted the increasing frequency of articles in the daily press clamoring for a reduction in the work assigned to our naval shipyards and for a corresponding increase in work in the private shipyards. We are referred to as tax-free, high-cost naval shipyards in competition with taxpaying low-cost private shipyards. Legislation, with powerful backing, has already been introduced in the Congress, which, if enacted, would drastically curtail the work now being performed in our naval activities.

As an agency of the Government, we are not immune from public appraisal and criticism—nor would I deisre that we were. We can turn this criticism into a strong asset if we accept and handle it with intelligence and vigor.

These are not defeatist comments but only a realistic appraisal of the task which confronts us. We have rested on our past laurels in a spirit of complacency too long. We cannot build and maintain a missile fleet with the approaches and attitudes which produced the 16-inch gun.

Let us first make a soul-searching appraisal of ourselves as managers in a key segment of our Defense Establishment. We need to recognize and appreciate the problem fully before we can take the necessary action.

If our position is not now a satisfactory one, then some changes must be made. The evolution of our Navy from sails to nuclear power was not made without decided changes in the areas of organization and management as well as in the technological fields.

Past changes were a matter of gradual and easy evolution which made their assimilation relatively painless. However, if the management function is to keep pace with the rapid changes in hardware today, we cannot rely upon the gradual process of evolution to bring about the necessary changes.

Resistance to change is a natural human attitude. We are more comfortable amid customary surroundings and procedures. The new is sometimes strange and unknown and we have a natural apprehension for what might lurk behind the untried change.

But, progress is not made without change; not change for the sake of change but modifications to present procedures when we recognize a better way of operation.

In the 2 years that I have been the Chief of the Bureau of Ships, I have been accused, because of the changes I have initiated, of being a disturbing factor. This is the polite language I use in public although I understand there have been many more colorful sobriquets pinned on me.

I know that some of my changes have disturbed some people and I do not evade the responsibilities which are mine alone for the consequences of these changes. But, we are not moving fast enough.

Frankly, I am not satisfied with the limited progress I have made in my own job of improving overall Bureau of Ships management. I, too, am not excluded from the human limitations and shortcomings which plague us all.

But, there is no question in my mind as to what we have to do if we are to meet the international challenge successfully and also satisfy our critics at home.

I have said this many times before and you will hear it from me many times again.

We have got to improve the management of the Bureau of Ships from top to bottom with the ultimate objective of improving the job performance of every member of the Bureau family, both military and civilian, from top to bottom.

The end purpose, of course, is to do our work faster, better and at less cost. You may say that this is not only a preposterous task but one that we have been working on for years. But, have we really worked at it or have we just given it lipservice?

The big difference now is that it must be done. We have no other choice.

I agree that the challenge is great but the stakes are even greater.

We cannot accomplish this massive renovation by talking about it or by wishful thinking. We must make positive moves, step by step, as we recognize the problems and arrive at solutions.

Since it must be done, it can be done and we have already made a start. I speak, of course, of our ships cost analysis panel in which this association played a significant part.

Although in operation only a little over a year, these changes have saved the Bureau of Ships over $138 million. These millions are being used to finance needed work which was not budgeted for. In other words, this is additional work which we are able to do within our current budget limitations.

A significant portion of these recovered funds came from improved operations in our shipyards. While this is already a substantial figure, the SCAP item with the greatest potential savings is just now getting underway, and that is the grouping of our shops. The reports I am receiving from the yards indicate that the benefits which will accrue from this change will exceed our most optimistic hopes.

The grouping of shops is one SCAP item which generated some vigorous but honest difference of opinion between your association and myself. However, I hasten to add that once the decision to move ahead was made, those masters selected as the group heads are proceeding with the difficult task of setting up the new organization, and in many cases ably assisted by those masters heading up the individual shops. I am grateful to you for the splendid job you are doing in this regard.

As pleased as we are with our SCAP accomplishments, we must recognize that this is only one step in the direction of our ultimate goal. However, it is an important step and should encourage us in our conviction that we can move forward if we work together toward our objectives.

I have reserved the most vital and important area demanding our attention until now, and that is the people who make up the Shore Establishment family, both civilian and military.

We accomplish our mission through people, and no matter how dedicated and zealous those of us in this room may be, we will accomplish little unless we provide the leadership and the example to encourage our fellow workers, at all levels, to join us in our resolve for improvement.

All of our employees are dedicated Americans who have proven that they can rise to any occasion when the necessity becomes known to them. The necessity is here.

The cold war and the results thereof are just as real and effective as those of a shooting war. However, a cold war is the more insidious because it lacks the dramatic awakening and national alertness which is generated by a shooting war.

In other words, a cold war permits and even encourages individual and group complacency.

In a way a further handicap is our national history of world superiority. We have led the field for so many years that we find it difficult to realize that our world position is being seriously challenged.

The purpose of General Order No. 21 is to improve the quality of leadership of the military and civilian supervisors of the Department of Defense so as to bring about a massive revitalization of the basic moral principles which are the foundations of this democracy.

General Order No. 21 recognizes a gradual but steady drift away from strong personal convictions and firm commitments to definite courses of action which are traditional in America.

Patrick Henry's "give me liberty or give me death," and Jefferson's "we pledge our lives, our fortunes, our sacred honor," are examples of the type of moral courage which made our heritage possible.

The modern tendency seems to avoid taking a stand or course of action for fear of ridicule, or of offending someone, or being accused of being a flagwaver and oftentimes our immobility is controlled by purely selfish reasons.

We need to generate a grassroots movement to rededicate ourselves to the type of patriotism which made this country the light of the free world in order to meet the challenge at hand—for each of us to make a critical self-appraisal of our own performance to see how we can improve as individuals and as a group.

All of us have benefited handsomely from the wealth of this country. This is our heritage and certainly no one wants to reduce our benefits and blessings. But, as we continue to reap our privileges, benefits and protective rights which our forefathers never dreamed of, but for which we avidly continue to strive, do we give sufficient reflection to the obligation on our part to make an adequate return for these benefits?

Do we give equal concern for the adequacy of our own job performance as we do for the protection of our personal rights and privileges? Do we react to these increased benefits by greater dedication to the job or do we just accept them as a matter of our just due and keep pressing for more?

President Kennedy clearly set forth the principle when he said, "Ask not what your country can do for you but rather what can you do for your country."

Whether we realize it or not, we are now in a contest to prove that a free people, wealthy beyond the fondest dreams of most nations, still has the stamina and courage to resist and overcome the concerted opposition of a way of life completely inimical to our own.

As the leaders of our entire navy industrial complex, we have the responsibility and the opportunity by our own attitudes, job performances and personal example to set in motion an employee revitalization all down the line.

You have a tradition of performance behind you which is shared by few organizations. I am confident that you can add further luster to this tradition by the leadership and example you will provide to all your employees during this time of need.

In closing, let me quote from a recent speech by Secretary Connally to Navy and Marine Corps Officers, and I quote:

"Our tasks are great—our responsibilities no less exacting. Whether we are worthy to stand in the reflected light of those who preceded us we cannot now know. That judgment truly can be made only by those who follow us.

"Let it at least be said of us: 'They understood their task. They accepted their responsibilities, large and small. They were men and women of courage and understanding. And above all, they place country above service and service above self.' "

West Virginia School Boards Favor Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, the West Virginia School Board Association has endorsed H.R. 4970, and is urging an expansion of Federal assistance to graduate education.

I think it is extremely significant that I have received word of the action taken by the West Virginia School Board Association at about the same time that the Congress has received the request from President John F. Kennedy to express and make permanent the fellowship title of the National Defense Education Act.

As Members recall, the subcommittee, of which I have the privilege of being chairman, sat jointly with the subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] when the provisions of the NDEA were written. It is, therefore, gratifying to me to have this endorsement of one of these important provisions from the men and women from my own State who are devoted to the cause of education.

The West Virginia School Board Association has adopted two resolutions which will be presented to the delegate assembly of the National School Board Association this week by West Virginia delegates.

As a part of my remarks, I include the text of both resolutions together with a preliminary proposal for Federal assistance to graduate education:

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND SIXTY-ONE DELEGATE ASSEMBLY, NSBA

(Resolution offered by the West Virginia School Boards Association)

Whereas Federal aid to education has existed as a matter of fact since the Land Ordinance of 1785; and

Whereas the national security, well-being and progress of the United States are inextricably tied to the educational attainments of her people; and

Whereas these goals can best be achieved through nationwide cooperative action; and

Whereas the Federal Government alone is in position to implement and underwrite essential action; and

Whereas the West Virginia School Boards Association has approved the principle of Federal aid to education: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National School Boards Association adopt a position in support of Federal aid to education.

DELEGATE ASSEMBLY, NSBA

(Resolution, 1961, offered by the West Virginia School Boards Association)

Whereas the WVSBA recognizes that persons with graduate training and graduate degrees are in short supply, and

Whereas the public schools are extensively affected by this shortage as reflected in the shrinkage proportion of graduate degrees and baccalaureate degrees, and

Whereas the cost of graduate education is becoming increasingly burdensome to the individual and the insttiution, and

Whereas the graduate education program needs strengthening in all areas including education, mathematics, sciences, fine arts, humanities, medicine, technical, and

Whereas there is a recognized need for a general improvement in the quality of teachers and school administrators, and

Whereas there is a recognized need for increased research in areas presently under investigation as well as explorations into the peripheral regions

Whereas increased enrollments in our colleges and universities, as well as in our public schools, will demand increased numbers of competent, highly trained people to staff the positions created by these increases, and

Whereas in the race for survival our ultimate weapon is continually improved education on an ever-increasing scale, and

Whereas the Federal Government, since its initial participation in aid to education has focused its interest, attention, and support on the development of leadership, and

Whereas the West Virginia School Boards Association has passed two resolutions, one in support of the principle of Federal aid to education, and the other in support of a program of Federal aid to graduate education: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National School Boards Association support a program of Federal aid to graduate education, and recommend that the Federal Government accept for consideration the following proposal, or one of a nature which, in essence, will help the Nation achieve the objectives described below.

A PROPOSAL FOR A PROGRAM OF FEDERAL AID TO GRADUATE EDUCATION

(Submitted by Dr. Clyde M. Morris, professor of education, West Virginia University; executive secretary, West Virginia School Boards Association)

Under this plan persons who qualify according to terms cited below would be admitted to a graduate school of their choice, subject to approval of the officials of such graduate school. Such attendance would be continuous on a full-time graduate basis for not less than 1 academic year nor more than 12 months subject to compliance with the performance standards acceptable to the particular graduate school in question.

To qualify for such assistance a candidate shall have met the following prerequisites:

1. He shall hold a baccalaureate degree.
2. He shall have had at least 1 year of experience in his field of specialization.
3. He shall be currently employed full time in his profession.
4. He shall have been recommended by at least five persons in a position to evaluate his professional competency and his prospects for academic success at the graduate level.
5. He shall have been accepted by an accredited graduate school for candidacy to a specific graduate program
6. He shall not have received a similar grant from the same source within a period of 5 years prior to this application.
7. He shall agree to return for at least 1 academic year to the position vacated. Failure to do so shall make the candidate responsible for repayment of the grant.

Federal support will be extended to each qualifying person to a degree equal to two-thirds the national annual average teacher's salary computed according to training and experience.

The personnel of every school system [1] in the United States shall be eligible for participation in this program according to the following schedule:

Percent of staff eligible for participation during each year of program

Year of participation	1st	2d	3d	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	9th	10th and each year thereafter
Percent eligible	1	1½	2	2½	3	3½	4	4½	5	5

During the first year of operations a school system with from 50 to 99 teachers would be eligible to the extent of one graduate candidate. Systems smaller than this would be eligible only in combinations totaling 50 teachers or more.

Personnel employed in other fields of endeavor, qualified in every other respect according to terms herein outlined, shall be selected on a basis proportional to that in which teachers are selected.

In terms of cost to the Federal Government for the support of such a program the following figures are cited:

Estimated cost during the first year:

1 percent of estimated eligible population	23,500
Times ⅔ national average teacher's salary ($3,476)	$81,686,000
Plus ¼ additional increment for summer	$20,371,500
Total	$102,057,500

Estimated cost during the 10th year:

1 percent of estimated eligible population	235,000

[1] System is defined as the fiscally independent unit.

Times ⅔ national teacher's salary (estimated $5,214)	$1,175,290,000
Plus ¼ added increment for summer	$293,822,500
Total	$1,469,112,500

In addition to the grants available to qualified graduate students the Federal Government would provide assistance to accredited graduate schools in order that needed additional facilities, services, and staff might be made available to serve the increased number of graduate students.

Federal aid to institutions with accredited graduate schools will be apportioned according to the number of students enrolled in the federally supported program. The following schedule is suggested:

Year of participation	1st	2d	3d	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	9th	10th and each year thereafter to termination of aid
Support per student per year	$500	$550.00	$600	$650.00	$700	$750.00	$800	$850.00	$900	$950.00
Plus summer increment	125	137.50	150	162.50	175	187.50	200	212.50	225	237.50
Total	625	687.50	750	812.50	875	937.50	1,000	1,062.50	1,125	1,187.50

Total estimated Federal cost for aid to graduate schools during the first year of the program:

Number of eligible students	23,500
Grant per student	$625
Total grants	$14,687,500

Total estimated Federal cost for aid to graduate schools during the 10th year of the program:

Number of eligible students	235,000
Grant per student	$1,187.50
Total grants	$279,062,500

Estimated grand total of Federal aid to graduate education during the first year of program:

Student grants	$102,057,500
Institutional grants	14,687,500
Total grants	116,745,000

Estimated grand total of Federal aid to graduate education during the 10th year of the program:

Student grants	$1,469,112,500
Institutional grants	279,062,500
Total grants	1,748,175,000

The administration of the program, including the selection of candidates and the disbursement of funds, would be the responsibility of the Federal Government.

It will be borne in mind that these estimates are based on projected figures that may or may not materialize. It is possible that these figures may prove to be conservative.

One of the most desirable features of the plan is its avoidance of the "handout" principle. While individual assistance is given it demands prerequisite evidence of individual effort and achievement for qualification.

Other essential benefits include the following:

1. The strengthening of graduate programs in all areas of study.
2. Improvement in quality of teachers and school administrators.
3. Increased research and further development of pending investigations.
4. General elevation of the educational level of the people of the Nation.
5. Avoidance of the conflict of Federal aid versus Federal control.
6. Avoidance of the matching concept which works to the detriment of poorer States.
7. Provision for the preparation of highly educated personnel who will be staffing our colleges and universities in the future.
8. In the race for survival our ultimate weapon is continually improved education on an ever-increasing scale.

As a matter of interest to those who appreciate this kind of statistic, and in deference to its understandability, the estimated cost of Federal participation in such a program as this during the 10th year, assuming that the 10th year were 1971, would be $29 per pupil enrolled in the public schools.

New Hampshire Editor Is Asset to Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, an outstanding editor-publisher of a weekly New Hampshire newspaper was recently selected as editor of the week by Publishers' Auxiliary.

Recipient of this well-deserved tribute by the national trade journal of the publishing industry was Mr. Thomas F. Shehan of the Derry-Salem News and Enterprise. I have known Tom Shehan for some time, and I know that the tribute is well earned.

In a recent article about the editor of the week, which appeared in the trade journal, Associate Editor Clifford Holm describes the man who was selected for this honor. I ask unanimous consent that this excellent article, entitled "New Hampshire Editor is Asset to Community," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW HAMPSHIRE EDITOR IS ASSET TO COMMUNITY

(By Clifford Holm, associate editor, the Publishers' Auxiliary)

When he was asked to assess what benefits he has derived from the newspaper profession, Thomas Francis Shehan, editor and publisher of the weekly Derry-Salem (N.H.) News Enterprise said newspapering had led to a "happy, fruitful life."

For Shehan, a man who has ghostwritten bestselling golf books, and whose hobbies include reading, attending the theater, and publishing a monthly magazine for owners, trainers, and breeders of thoroughbred horses, running his weekly newspaper is still his most important and most rewarding job.

A man with a jovial, well-scrubbed appearance, and an enchanting smile, Tom Shehan fits in well in the New England atmosphere he calls home. Derry, with a population of about 7,000, is where he publishes his weekly, which, when he bought it in January 1959, was published along with the Derry Enterprise, a semi-weekly.

"I tried to make a twice-a-week operation out of them," the New Englander says, a tired look of resignation coming briefly to the surface. "But we failed to get enough advertising to justify it. It was not until the end of last year that we combined the newspapers into the Derry-Salem News Enterprise."

Born at Beverly, Mass., on a hot July day in 1911, Tom Shehan recounts nostalgically his seventh-grade teacher, Miss Maud Murphy, whom he still hears from occasionally, advising him to abandon his ambition to become a sports writer.

"She still insists I should have been a lawyer, having said so in those years, too," Tom says.

LEFT ST. JOHN'S PREP SCHOOL

Tom left St. John's prep school "when I recognized I was more interested in newspapers than homework."

With ambition and an unfinished education to offer, Tom accepted the position of sports editor on the now defunct Salem (Mass.) Sunday Tribune. Still only a boy (he was 16), Tom eventually moved on to the Boston Evening Transcript, Boston Evening American, the New York Morning Telegraph, and Miami Daily News.

In the spring of 1941, with a war in Europe raging and each day bringing closer the U.S. entry into the clash, Thomas Francis Shehan and Harriet L. Bishop were married in Danvers, Mass.

After the entry into the war, Tom left New England in exchange for Alaska and Italy, a startling contrast in climate.

"It was while I was covering a sneak raid on Bari, Italy, that I had a frustrating experience," Tom recalls. "I found myself with one other guy; John Frano, an ex-photographer from the Miami Herald, covering the story for Yank, the Army weekly. The city, it turned out, had absolutely no defense; 29 ships had been blown up in the harbor.

"Secretary of War Stimson, during a press conference at the White House, announced the story to the press, while my story languished in a pigeon hole of the censor's desk."

After the war, Tom was scheduled to return to his job as racing steward at Rockingham Park racetrack. It was then that he was offered an assignment as ghost writer for Byron Nelson. Tom accepted and toured with the old pro until Nelson's retirement a short time later.

"Then I transferred my allegiance to Ben Hogan, Nelson's successor, and not only wrote his column for McNaught Syndicate, which had 160 newspapers signed up, but also ghosted his book, 'Power Golf,' now in its 16th printing and still selling."

A member of the board of directors of the New Hampshire Publishers Association, Tom is of the opinion that the newspaper profession "is crowded with people who don't really want to know the joy of working. As for salaries, the minimum has become the maximum with no special rewards for special talents."

Tom, whose biting editorials in the News Enterprise work in the direction of improving the community through action, says that, in his newspaper days, he has found two kinds of newspapermen: "One wants to talk about stories, the other wants to write them."

With three children, the youngest a boy, Thomas F. Shehan, Jr., Editor Shehan looks to the future with confidence.

"We have had the usual problems for a new operation," he states blandly, "but our

business is expanding and we believe we have a good potential here. Incidentally, legend says that Robert Frost had his first poetry published in the News, around 1916."

Ghost writer, horse enthusiast, newspaperman. That's Tom Shehan. And you can feel certain that last appellation has given him his finest hours.

Filth Pays Big Dividends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I want to call attention today to an article which appeared in the February edition of Father Baker's Victorian, a monthly magazine published by Our Lady of Victory Homes of Charity. This article was written by Alice Ogle and is entitled "Filth Pays Big Dividends." The author discusses in some detail the business of publicizing and disseminating pornography, which has become a truly big industry in the United States.

Mr. President, I cannot understand how anyone with a conscience can knowingly profit from the publication and sales of pornographic literature. I personally believe it is imperative that steps be taken, both private and governmental, at all levels, to stem the growth of this industry.

Miss Ogle refers to certain key examples of large operations profiting from the sale of smut. The illustrations contained in her article should be useful to all who share the conviction that these practices should be the subject of widespread attention and action.

There is no national resource so precious as the energy of our Nation's youth. If this energy is channeled into immoral and unproductive activities, then we shall certainly be doing a disservice both to our Nation and to our youth.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Miss Ogle's article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FILTH PAYS BIG DIVIDENDS

(By Alice Ogle)

Where I grew up, small boys used to write four-letter words on sidewalks to show how much they knew about life. These were the aberrations of growing up, I suppose. I've never looked upon them as having been depraved. Compared with the filth that has been coming out of California recently, such juvenile obscenity is as innocent as smoking corn silk when opposed to smoking marihuana.

And what has happened in California can happen anywhere so long as people are indifferent and legislative bodies do not stem the filth with enforcible laws against smut. The public deserves protection against the moral pirates at work under the flag of freedom of the press.

CAPITAL OF FILTH

In September 1960, San Francisco was found to be the capital of the biggest, boldest, and slimiest attempt yet made to mass-circulate obscenity in book form in the United States. These books are not handsomely bound erotica sold under counters for from $5 to $50; they are inexpensively printed paperbacks priced to sell for 35 cents and 50 cents to attract youth. They have been selling openly on newsstands and in cigar stores for over 4 years in the United States as well as in certain European countries.

The mayor of San Francisco labeled them gutter trash when they were brought to his attention. Decent men in the bookselling business called them hard-core or black obscenity, explaining that monosyllabic muck that is concerned with one central idea, one theme, one story line, which is sex, sex that is spelled out in intimate how-to-do-it detail, is hard-core obscenity.

THE MAKING OF A SLAVE

This is the sort of thing that John Benedict wrote about in American Mercury, February 1960: Once man is animalized, de-Christianized, psychoanalyzed, debauched sexually, brainwashed into passive acceptance of immorality as the sine qua non of his existence, he is fit only to wear shackles of a slave. And that is exactly what the men who plan obscenity expect will happen.

BIGGEST OBSTACLE

Charles H. Keating, Jr., chief counsel of the citizens for decent literature, in Cincinnati, Ohio, who attributes his fight against smut to the inspiration of the Jesuits, said, "the biggest obstacle to action by legislative bodies is the confusion at the heart of the debate over what constitutes pornography."

What came to light in California, through perhaps the greatest exposé of smut in the Nation up to the present, resulted in a great gain: it should remove the prevalent confusion in many people's minds relative to the difference between "black" pornography and borderline obscene material. Unfortunately, many people have been hoodwinked into condoning "black pornography" under the guise of literary tolerance. The California case against pornographers parading as publishers should disabuse them of their error.

THE MID-TOWER CASE

A highly educated man, Wallace de Ortega Maxey, president of Mid-Tower Publishing Co., educated at the Yale School of Divinity, an active minister for 25 years, who was finally dismissed from his last church in Los Angeles for aiding the Mattachine Society—an organization dedicated to the better understanding of homosexuality—is one of the major figures behind the Nation's flood of lewd paperbacks. His secretary-treasurer, Sanford E. Aday, is an eighth-grade graduate who was convicted of pandering for teenage prostitutes in 1946 and sent to San Quentin for 2 years. Maxey now praises Russia's "men of steel" and described Christianity as a "veritable hodgepodge of puritanical and unnatural inhibitions," while his associate mumbles that the paperbacks are "real life."

Five years ago these unholy two pooled their slim resources to set up a firm called Mid-Tower Publishing Co. in Fresno, Calif. They spread the word around that they were looking for book manuscripts which would stimulate, sustain, and build up lascivious thoughts and desires in readers. An investigator reported, "it wasn't long until they were paying more per word than the Saturday Evening Post."

Matthew J. Meehan, who recently died in St. Agnes Hospital after indictment by an Alameda County jury on charges of conspiracy to violate the States pornography law, was the manager of the firm.

Accepted manuscripts were trucked to San Francisco where a printing firm converted them into books. The firm now declares blandly, "It was just another printing job."

The paperback books bore the names Fabian or Vega or Saber to cover their point of origin. Of all the rotten books produced by this tribe, probably the rottenest, says District Attorney Coakley, was Sex Life of a Cop. "It was read aloud with others to the grand jury. The others were, he said, stunning in their depravity.

Most of the books produced by these men deal with incest, lesbianism, homosexuality, and masochism. They are, say Coakley and his inspector of detectives, "horrible."

Literally tons of these books have been written, made up in book manuscripts at Fresno, shipped to San Francisco and Oakland for printing, and then shipped out all over the country.

Mid-Tower was also involved with a number of girlie magazines that are selling in the large cities of the country. Candida is the latest name of one of their fitted magazines. I saw a copy of one of the issues among other works seized by the district attorney, and I wanted to vomit.

DISTRICT ATTORNEY COAKLEY

One of Coakley's investigators said his guess was that distribution of the paperbacks and girlie magazines ran to 3 million copies every month.

That explains the tentacles of Mid-Tower.

Coakley says the defense attorneys for these men were Hollywood lawyers who specialize in defending smut merchants. He said, "One of them refused to answer when questioned about his onetime Communist tendencies. He leaned hard on the fifth amendment."

READY DISTRIBUTORS

Today, more than 150 independent distributors in the United States handle the Fresno-born books. Elgin, Ohio, and cities in Iowa have been fighting them, but only one city in the United States successfully banned some of them: Cincinnati, Ohio, the hometown of Charles Keating.

In these books, the poetry, the magic, and the beauty of human love becomes animal lust and abnormal depravity. Many San Franciscans asked, after reading reports in their newspapers on this flourishing publishing racket: "Why wasn't it discovered long ago?"

KEATING IN CALIFORNIA

When Charles Keating came to San Francisco, accepting the invitation from the San Francisco League for Decent Literature, he answered that question: "The public is steeped in apathy to the point where many of our children think the abnormal in sex is normal because we are oblivious. Those who would wipe out this cancer sit on their hands."

During his visit to California, he said, "I saw here on your stands more depravity, more filth, and more instruction in sex perversion than in any other place in the country." One newspaper commended him for his honesty; two other screamed abuse at him. These newspapers are as evenly divided on Mr. Coakley's drive against the Mid-Tower Publishing Co.

KEATING admitted that he has said this a hundred times, that the same things have been written and said over and over again with little effect. But he declares that exposes like the one in California are good. "Law enforcement will be successful before a background of public opinion—anywhere."

This was proven in California. Investigators learned that the tentacles of Mid-Tower Publishing Co. reached as far as the busy magazine presses in Los Angeles and Hollywood which specialize in grinding out the "girlie" magazines with the luridly suggestive covers which appear on too many newsstands across America. "These," reported one man, "and the millions of paperbacks originating here provide immense profits, billions of dollars."

But the crackdown came. Police and district attorney's men secured warrants from

judges in every county involved. Raids took place, tons of questionable material were seized, and indictments were aimed at everyone connected with the slimy racket. The Mid-Tower Publishing Co. is now padlocked.

The superior court upheld seizures and warrants despite angry objections from defense attorneys.

Frank Coakley, district attorney of Almeda County, had one of his men read aloud to the grand jury from some of the confiscated matter. The faces of listeners became red and angry.

OTHERS SPEAK

J. Edgar Hoover lauded the "splendid efforts" being made in California, saying: "Our country is plagued by this ugly brand of parasite who commercializes upon the immature judgment and curiosity of youth . . . purveyors of filth have so flooded the market these past years that to find a neighboring newsstand without any samples of it is a rare exception."

In his special statement to local law-enforcement men, Hoover said, "Stiffer legal penalties, particularly in local and State courts, are needed to replace the frequent slap on the wrist given those convicted of this vile trade. And not until longer sentences and heavier fines remove the financial advantages of this traffic will the producers, distributors, and dealers of smut be driven out of this sickening business."

Dr. Karl M. Bowman, one-time head of the psychiatric department of New York's Bellevue Hospital, and now a resident of San Francisco, branded the Fresno trash as "material written solely to stir people up sexually." Dr. Bowman has been conducting extensive studies in California for a report on pornography for U.S. Government publication.

Progress is being made, as these statements clearly prove. Alert now, a tendency to shift away from evading responsibility to an outright admission of guilt is found. Surely that is progress. As Chesterton said, "Men of science are much impressed with the need of beginning all inquiry with a fact. The ancient masters of religion were quite equally impressed with that necessity. They began with the fact of sin—a fact as practical as potatoes."

PROGRESS NEEDS YOU

During a hearing before the subcommittee on postal operations in Washington in May of 1960, Charles Keating described the obscenity situation as it exists today in such a way that he placed responsibility where it belongs. He said: "There is a real, present, and serious problem of obscenity and pornography in the United States. It has a devastating effect upon the people of this Nation, especially—but far from exclusively—the youth. It threatens to pervert an entire generation. It is creating criminals faster than we can build jails to house them, quoting Mr. Hoover. It will accomplish a moral decay wiping out our civilization as has been the case in the history of most of the world's civilizations, quoting Mr. Sirokin of Harvard.

"The presence of obscenity varies widely in form, but permeates our society as a result of unique systems of distribution which force local distributors and retailers to take and sell this cancerous filth in order to remain in business. This, however, is certainly no real excuse for the local outlets.

"The average person in our society knows what and where this obscenity is, but the courts ignore him and his contentions and welfare, catering to a vociferous minority which, skilled in the use and abuse of our laws and courts, manages to inflict upon the substantial majority of Americans the kind of corruption, filth, instruction in perversion, and sick abnormality which is displayed and sold here in Washington, or in New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, Oklahoma City, or anywhere else in the country.

"We have had enough in the way of hearings, talk, and inaction. What we want from our legislative, administrative, and judicial branches of government is freedom—freedom from filth—now."

When Mrs. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN, committee chairman and Congresswoman from Pennsylvania, asked Mr. Keating, "Do you believe we should have a Federal law dealing with obscenity, as we do for narcotics, which would be stronger than State laws?" He replied "I agree there should be a Federal law. I would like to say, however, that it would be a mistake for the people of the country to abdicate their own responsibility in favor of saying the Congress should pass a Federal law—I think we should continue to work in our own communities and bear our own obligations and responsibilities to eliminate this problem at the grassroots level."

In counties near San Francisco, cases are now pending against a dozen men who have been instrumental in spreading filth from this area. The Mid-Tower Publishing Co. wears a large padlock. The men involved may receive stiff sentences or they may receive light sentences, but it is doubtful, say county officials, that Mid-Tower will again operate in this area.

HYDRAHEADED

When these smut merchants are freed, where will they go? They will go right back to their demonic horror, because obscenity is like Hydra, the multiheaded serpent slain by Hercules in Greek mythology. While one head has been chopped off in San Francisco, two heads will very likely appear somewhere else, that is, until public opinion and adequate laws create a Hercules to strike at the most vulnerable part of the monster—the money motive. Our war against degrading, professional, and lucrative obscenity in publishing is liable to have a long, exhausting, and costly history. The public is strangely apathetic, and laws have many in-built escape hatches. But at least progress is noticeable. Few decent parents in California will ever again be without a nagging fear that their child may be exposed to degrading filth put out by firms like the Mid-Tower Publishing Co. Throughout the Nation, parents are being alerted to the danger between paper covers. They are no longer deceiving themselves. They are beginning to lose their apathy.

Still greater progress would be apparent if every parent in America realized that a child's single contact with pornographic slime can spoil forever the purity of the child's soul and ruin for him the beauty that belongs to human sex in a true setting.

Raritan Arsenal Closing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, on March 30 the Army informed me of their decision to inactivate and dispose of Raritan Arsenal in Edison Township, Middlesex County, N.J. Despite three meetings since that time with representatives of the Department of Defense, virtually no information regarding the reasons for this decision has been made available. On the contrary, I believe many arguments advanced to justify the decision were based on insufficient and inaccurate information.

Raritan Arsenal employs 2,600 civilians in an area which already suffers from substantial unemployment. This fact apparently was not considered when the action was taken. I consider the closing most regrettable especially since the missions now handled at Raritan Arsenal are not to be terminated but will be carried on at other facilities.

I am enclosing an editorial from the Daily Home News in New Brunswick, N.J., and one from the Perth Amboy Evening News regarding the closing of the arsenal. They support my contention that to date the Government has not given sufficient reasons to justify the closing:

[From the Daily Home News, New Brunswick, N.J., Apr. 21, 1961]

GOVERNMENT HASN'T PROVED ITS CASE

Despite the Pentagon official's statement that the order closing Raritan Arsenal is irrevocable, we think it's too early to accept that verdict as final.

The outburst of public indignation at the announced closing continues to gain impetus. The campaign of the arsenal workers is eloquent.

But beyond the emotional demonstrations, the facts which are being brought out tend more and more to suggest that the arsenal is a mighty useful enterprise. Certainly the vast printing and publications phases of the arsenal's work can be carried on here, with experienced personnel and modern equipment, as economically as elsewhere. And the move would be costly.

Certainly the arsenal's outstanding warehousing and shipping record belies any suggestion that the operation here is uneconomical.

We can see the missile argument. Maybe the arsenal is not big enough to store missiles safely; and we are not at all sure that the people of the area would like that kind of operation. But we cannot see any new development which suddenly makes heretofore efficient operation here inefficient, or heretofore economical operations here suddenly wasteful.

No one disputes the Government's right to close the Raritan Arsenal for logical reasons. But the Government must make its case plain. So far, it seems to us, the case of those who would keep the arsenal open seems the more convincing. The Government hasn't made its case yet.

[From the Perth Amboy (N.J.) Evening News]

GIVE THE FACTS

If the U.S. Government handles its broad scope of duties with the apparent clumsiness and indifference that has keynoted the confusion surrounding the situation at the Raritan Arsenal, it is little wonder that our prestige has taken a beating.

Last week, a team of representatives of governmental agencies told arsenal employees the plans they have in mind to lessen the impact on the personnel and the affected communities. Their explanations, quite frankly, were unenlightening and in the worst possible taste.

A Labor Department spokesman said that if jobs in the area are not immediately available, unemployment compensation will be put at the employees' disposal. A Commerce Department spokesman left a brochure on how to attract industry into the area as if Middlesex County was remiss in efforts to attract new business.

How can the Government expect these employees to be sympathetic to its order

when its spokesmen babble aimlessly about axiomatic conditions without presenting relevant facts?

Why can't the Defense Department say this?:

"Look, feloiws, we think it is in the best interests of the country to close the arsenal. But perhaps you may have an idea or two worth listening to. Why don't you come on down to Washington and we'll talk this thing over? We don't know that what you say will change our minds but we'll certainly listen to you. And we want you to know just why we have acted as we did."

Would something like this be out of order? We do not think so. We believe that the employees, once briefed on all the factors which led to the decision, will accede to the Government order. They are not unreasonable people. But let them know the facts.

The Public Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, an AP release carried by the Washington Star last evening from my home town could set a pattern for our more fortunate citizens that might well be encouraged in connection with our huge Federal indebtedness.

Banker Chauncey Winters, the donor of nearly a half-million dollars to our local municipal corporation, surely ranks high on the list of the Nation's public spirited citizens and through his benevolence, has rendered timely assistance to many local families in the form of much appreciated tax relief. The Star article is submitted herewith:

GRATEFUL BANKER GIVES TOWN $402,200 STOCK

[From the Evening Star, May 3, 1961]

RICHMONDVILLE, N.Y., May 3 (AP).—"Richmondville has been good to me" is Banker Chauncey Winters' explanation for giving this Schoharie County village of 743 persons the equivalent of $402,200 in International Business Machines stocks.

Mr. Winters, a white-haired, 68-year-old bachelor, is cashier and vice president of the independent Bank of Richmondville in this pretty, dairy-belt community 40 miles west of Albany.

A sewer and water project built in 1955 still was awaiting a $300,000 bond issue and the village tax rate seemed about to double when Mr. Winters acted.

He asked Mayor George Davis, "How much do you need?"

The mayor replied that $309,000 would pay the village's debts, including the sewer system bill.

"How about 450 shares of IBM stock?" Mr. Winters countered.

He later "rounded" the figure to 500 shares, with a cash value of $357,000.

Last year Mr. Winters gave the village 100 shares of IBM then valued at $45,200, to build a firehouse.

Mr. Winters said he acquired IBM stock for $7,000 after the stock market crash in 1929. The stock has split several times since then.

"My idea," Mr. Winters said, "was that it had grown to such proportions that I would like to capitalize on it. Not needing it myself, I thought I would apply it to some beneficial purpose. This struck me as good a purpose as any other."

Health Care for the Aged: Profound Issues for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week I had the privilege of addressing a luncheon meeting of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce's 49th annual meeting here in Washington. The subject of my talk was health care for the aged and how this care can best be provided in America.

This subject, and the legislative proposals that have grown out of it, raise many fundamental questions, profound issues which must be carefully considered by the Congress and the people of this country.

Chief among these is the total cost, not just the dollar cost, but the cost in decreased quality of the medical care for all Americans and the effect upon the dollar benefits under social security, that meeting the particular problem by placing health care for the aged under social security would bring.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to introduce this speech at this point in the RECORD:

HEALTH CARE BENEFITS FOR THE AGED

(Speech of Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS, Representative, St. Louis County-South St. Louis, at the health care luncheon of the 49th annual meeting of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, May 2, 1961, at the Statler-Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C.)

The new administration's proposal for health care benefits for aged under social security, and other proposals in this and earlier Congresses, have certain features in common. The more important of these are:

1. Use tax money by drawing on the Social Security Trust Fund, not to pay benefits in cash, but to pay for certain specified health and medical care services.

2. Such service benefits would be provided to some people under social security, usually the aged, those 65 and over.

3. Require contractual arrangements between the Federal Government and certain suppliers of health care, which would embody negotiated prices for federally approved services and treatment.

I agree with the moderator on the misrepresentations made about these proposals. Currently, some are saying the administration's proposal is really a very simple one. They say they are proposing merely to use social security as a useful device for collecting money to pay for health care for the aged. They go on to point out that it is the same device used by insurance companies in providing health insurance protection.

The issue is not this simple and advocates of the proposal know it is not. There are a number of issues, profound issues, raising several questions that all Americans should ask, and have the answers to.

For example, has a national need, a national problem, arisen because our present system of health care has failed and thus requires Federal intervention? Is insurance protection against the cost of illness out of reach of most people?

Is the quality of health care and availability of health facilities deficient and declining? Would all aged be provided for without discrimination? Can health care benefits through social security be provided for the aged only, and be stopped at that point? Will the ultimate tax costs of such a program seriously jeopardize the existing social security cash benefit program? Will the costs be no greater than what we now spend through private arrangements, and through local, State and Federal programs?

In answer to such questions, I want to give some of the reasons I am opposed to any kind of health care benefits being initiated in social security, or in any other payroll tax arrangement.

Initiating any kind of health care service benefits in social security for those 65 and over cannot be stopped, I believe, short of a comprehensive health and medical care program for everyone under social security regardless of age. The administration bill, H.R. 4222, for example, will provide certain hospital, nursing home, and home-health services to people 65 and older who are under social security. Within a relatively short time many of these individuals would find that, while they didn't have to go to the hospital or to a nursing home, they nevertheless had costly expenses for health care, such as drugs, other medicines, surgery, and so forth. In other words, they would find the administration proposal did nothing for them. Congress would soon be urged to expand the kinds of services provided.

That bill would do nothing for other social security beneficiaries, such as a widowed mother and her children. If one group of social security beneficiaries, the aged, are receiving this kind of protection, wouldn't it be logical to extend it to younger beneficiaries? And how about those receiving social security disability benefits? Wouldn't it be just as logical to provide the same health and medical care services to them? And who could possibly need them more?

These proposals do not restrict these health care services to those 65 and over who have retired, but would provide them for those of retirement age, even though they may be working full time, perhaps making the best pay in their lives. I feel confident Congress could not long provide any health care service to some people who are working, just because they are at least 65, and deny it to other workers under social security who are younger than 65.

If we once start down this road, the final result is obvious to me. And former Congressman Forand stated in January that after they get their foot in the door, they can then expand the program.

Experience shows that providing health care services on a seemingly free basis inevitably results in overutilization, and thus increases cost. For example, in Saskatchewan, the average hospital utilization rate prior to 1947 for those 65 and over was the same as in this country; 2½ days per year. Today, they have a State-operated program for the aged and the average utilization per aged is 8 days; three times as great. Meanwhile, the U.S. utilization rate for the older people remains about 2½ days.

We can turn to the experience in Great Britain with the national health service program, where the average hospital stay for their population is nearly three times what it is in this country.

Social security health care benefits can jeopardize the financial soundness of our present cash benefit program. The present

program will require 9-percent taxes on payroll by 1969. This is a provided in the existing law. If we start health care service in social security, with its inevitable expansion to all kinds of services and to people of all ages, the tax cost could well be another 9 or 10 percent. Overutilization would further increase costs and tax requirements. I am seriously concerned whether workers and employers will willingly carry the tax burden for the present cash benefits, in addition to another burden of equal or greater size for a universal, comprehensive health and medical care program.

The social security health care benefits proposal will achieve the same results as socialized medicine. Certainly, if any services are to be paid for by the social security system, the Federal Government must see that these services are provided at fair and reasonable costs. Congress is duty-bound to see that Federal funds are spent efficiently. All these health care bills properly include a provision that the Social Security administration enter into contracts with the vendors of the health care services in respect to their charges. It takes little imagination to understand what happens when a Federal bureaucracy gets into the business of setting fees and price schedules of health institutions.

The fact that the Federal Government would not own the hospitals, nursing homes, and so forth, as some claim is necessary for socialized medicine, is a superficial detail. The fact is, we would end up with Federal control of our health care institutions and professions. Call it what you will—at least the Socialist Party in this country has labeled the administration proposal "socialized medicine."

The socialization of medicine will inevitably lower the quality of health care available to all of us. In every civilized nation in the world except the United States, there exists a system of government or socialized medicine. It is no accident that by comparison we excel all these systems in the quality of medical care available to our population. We know that 30 years ago our medical students—in fact, medical students from many countries—flocked to the medical centers of Europe for their education, internship, and postgraduate study. This was before the day that governmental systems were established in these western European countries.

Today, medical students the world over travel, not to Europe, but rather to the United States. I believe there is one reason, and only one reason why this is so. It is because they can come to this country and practice their profession in complete freedom.

In every nation in the world except our own, the ratio of doctors to population is on the decline with all the adverse effects the decline has upon the health and well-being of the population. The ratio of physicians per patient in the United States is remaining steady at about 1 to 750 people. This is despite the population explosion in this country since 1940. Contrast this with Britain, for example. In 1947—the year before they established their national health service program—the ratio was 1 to 877. In 1957, 10 years later, the ratio had declined to 1 to 149 people.

There are other reasons why I believe this type of legislation is bad for Americans, regardless of age. Having social security pay for services provided to people is a step backward. H.R. 4222 would increase social security taxes to raise more benefit money. However, this would not be paid out in cash so each beneficiary could use it as he sees fit to meet his own special needs. Rather, the Federal Government would decide how this money is to be used—for selected hospital, nursing home and other health care. Denial of the freedom to choose would destroy the dignity and self-respect of every beneficiary.

A curious phenomenon to me is to find organized labor in the forefront endorsing this denial of freedom of choice—when I recall why they were equally enthusiastic 2 years ago in their support of the new health insurance program for Federal employees and for all Members of Congress. May I refer you to their committee testimony—and to their pamphlet entitled "Labor Looks at Congress, 1959." Their number one argument in support of this plan was that it preserved individual freedom of choice.

Any compulsory health-care program will snuff out innovation and experimentation for developing better methods of health care. It will also squeeze out private enterprise and voluntary group efforts which have been devising new forms of insurance protection against the cost of illness.

I want to close by emphasizing that this is not a case of being against something. We do have a health-care system in our society today. It is the greatest in the history of the world. We need to get across to the people the various factors that have made it the best.

Make no mistake about it. The supporters of the social security approach have made every effort to cleverly undermine the people's confidence in our present system of health care. They have attacked the integrity of the medical profession, of the drug profession, of our hospitals, of the insurance companies, all the people who are responsible for our present advancements and upon whom we must rely for future progress. They have attacked the integrity of these people, not their arguments, not their facts.

The problem of our older people in obtaining adequate health care is not just a problem of their personal budget. Indeed, the main problem they face is the same problem we all face in the health field. It is the problem of medical science continuing to advance, to find new cures, new drugs, new methods of treating health problems. It is the problem of getting new hospitals, new equipment, new techniques. It is the problem of spreading quality advancement in these areas, quantitatively throughout our society.

When we boil the matter down to where the real needs are, we find they are quite within the capabilities of our present programs to deal with—and not in a degrading way as some of the promoters of the social security approach would have us believe.

By 1970, 12½ million will have joined the aged group. The proportion of the aged with health insurance protection will have increased from 50 to more than 80 percent. I hope we will not establish a compulsory program in perpetuity to deal with a temporary, transitional situation.

Injustice of the Hiss Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article from the Washington Evening Star of May 2, 1961. This column points out the obvious injustices of the so-called Hiss Act.

On January 3, 1961, I introduced two bills in the House. H.R. 1033 would amend the Hiss Act so as to exclude all others from the penalty except those convicted of crimes involving the national security. H.R. 1042 would repeal the Hiss Act completely. I think it is time we took action to expunge this legislation, it is unfair and imposes penalties so harsh as to border on the unconstitutional. The article follows:

HISS ACT HARDSHIPS ARGUE FOR CHANGE

(By Joseph Young)

The Hiss Act now on the books is denying annuities to such retired Government civilian and military personnel as the following.

1. The sergeant who while driving a Government vehicle on a scheduled route deviated eight-tenths of a mile off that route. He was court-martialed. On retiring he learned that he would be deprived of his retirement pay estimated as having a lifetime value of $32,495.

2. The employee who was convicted of unlawfully claiming and receiving 195 hours of overtime pay of $347. Although he made full restitution, the employee on retirement is denied an annuity valued at $33,000.

3. The employee who was convicted of stealing a hindquarter of beef from an Army hospital and was fined $250. He is denied a lifetime annuity valued at $31,000.

4. The chief warrant officer who pleaded guilty to several minor Army violations with the understanding that the penalty would not be more than a reprimand and a $400 fine. He has fallen within the scope of the Hiss Act and will lose retirement pay estimated to be worth over $103,000.

What is the Hiss Act? It was enacted by Congress 8 years ago as a result of the outcry that resulted when it was discovered that Alger Hiss, who was convicted of perjury as the aftermath of the sensational charges of Whittaker Chambers that he and Hiss were members of a Communist ring, would be eligible for a deferred annuity at age 62.

The law denies retirement annuities or pensions to any Federal employee or military personnel who has been convicted of a felony against the Government. Although the law was aimed at Hiss, it has resulted in gross inequities and injustices against hundreds of retired civilian and military personnel.

Some of the annuities have been denied for offenses which occurred when the retirees were just starting their Government or military careers. In fact, many of these employees were rehired after their offenses and worked or served 30 or 40 more years with the Government or the military before retiring, only to find out that they were ineligible for annuities or pensions.

Congress nearly amended the Hiss Act last year to end these injustices. However, the bill failed at the last moment to get final approval.

This year legislation again has been introduced by key members of the House and Senate Civil Service Committees to amend the Hiss Act. The bill has the strong support of the Kennedy administration, including the Civil Service Commission, the Budget Bureau and the Defense Department. The General Accounting Office also favors the bill. Incidentally, the Eisenhower administration also supported the bill.

The bill would allow annuities to be paid to all these former employees and military personnel. It would deny annuities only in those cases involving national security factors. Alger Hiss still would not get an annuity.

Say It With Flowers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BASIL L. WHITENER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, in the April 1961 edition of Fibre and Fabric, an outstanding textile trade publication, there appeared a very forceful editorial with respect to the serious effect that excessive textile imports are having on our domestic textile industry.

I feel that my colleagues in the House, especially those from areas in the Nation where textile manufacturing is a very important factor in the economy, will find the editorial to be most interesting. I request that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD:

SAY IT WITH FLOWERS

The textile industry in this country has long been considered expendable by a government seeking to make it the door prize in the marts of international trade. Any opposition to such a greased chute to oblivion has been promptly entangled in governmental doubletalk as some kind of protectionist choir from the bandstand of isolationism. The voices were never looked upon as Americans interested in the industrial strength of their country. Instead, they were brushed off as ants in the pants of those who preferred to sit down on the job of representing the American people and their way of life.

We have a new Secretary of Commerce in Luther Hodges. Here is a former textile executive, the chairman of a cabinet committee studying the textile problem, and he seems to be on our side when he says he is convinced that "Our Government is actually destroying a basic industry essential to our economy and national defense." We say he seems to be on our side because investigating the obvious is something like saying it with flowers. What counts here is who gets them.

We have a few candidates. The likes of Japan, India, Hong Kong, Italy, and others flooding the domestic market with imports. They come from all over the world and the Government knows we can't compete because it made certain we couldn't. Americans are losing jobs, America an industry, and who do you suppose is laughing at us?

There are a number of ways an astute leadership can move this country forward in areas of need. It can recognize a weakness and move to strengthen it. It can survey a strength and take steps to make this strength more formidable. It can also right a wrong which, in the case of the textile industry, has become an industrial weakness forcing our dependence upon foreign manufacturers. We now import more textiles than we export and we have lost half our working force since 1947. Here's where a new frontier can be more than just a campaign slogan unless we intend to import that, too.

There is nothing phony about the textile position. We can do without the windmill of Government oratory, measuring its doubletalk by the pitcher of water. We need honesty and loyalty and action. When we get that we can tell ourselves that the after dinner windmills running on water have ceased to be all wet. They have moved us toward a new frontier for the textile industry.

What Price Glory?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DALE ALFORD
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, I recently called the attention of my colleagues to the shameful action taken against Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker because of his patriotism. I now want to invite your attention to an editorial published in the Richmond, Va., News Leader, April 19, 1961, as follows:

WHAT PRICE GLORY?

He was born in Center Point, Tex., in 1909. He grew up tall and straight, a boy 6 feet, 3, who loved horses and soldiering. He went to a military school in New Mexico, finished at West Point in 1931, and plunged at once into the disciplined routine of a professional soldier in peacetime.

His life, at first, was the life of any other second lieutenant in the horse-drawn field artillery: The pungent smells of sweat and stables, the dusty maneuver grounds of Fort Sill, the rumble of caissons along a cobbled street, the swing and jounce of a garrison saddle. Your horses first, your men second, your own needs last. He learned his weapons well: The slim 75, the ponderous howitzers, the clumsy tubular rangefinder of a bygone day.

He was at Schofield Barracks in Hawaii when the Germans went into Poland. Brought back to the States, he participated in the swift transformation of the old horse-drawn units into sleek mechanized divisions. But he had qualities too vital to be squandered in artillery logistics. Commando. That was his art. He became commanding officer of an outfit deceptively known as the First Special Service Force, a crack team of Canadian and American soldiers unafraid of hand-to-hand combat. He had to learn to use a parachute. "How do you put this thing on?" he asked a sergeant. And 5 minutes later he jumped.

He and his men fought their way up the Italian Peninsula, Anzio, the Aleutians, ski fighting in Norway, and a string of decorations to show for it: Silver Star, Legion of Merit, Croix de Guerre, Order of the British Empire.

Briefly, peacetime again: 2 years at Fort Sill, then a tour of duty in Washington, a stint at Sam Houston. But he was a fighter, not a diplomat: They sent him to Benning as assistant commander of the Army's toughest fighters, the Rangers. Then came Korea, command of an infantry regiment, the exhausting, maddening business of fighting an enemy but never quite defeating him.

Back to Fort Bragg, then again to the Far East as senior adviser to Chiang's Chinese Nationalist Army; back again to Schofield; and in a fateful, routine transfer, in August of 1957, to Little Rock, Ark. He was to command the Arkansas military district. It should have been an easy post.

"As an officer of the U.S. Army," he told the students of Central High School that morning in September, "I have been chosen to command these forces, and to execute the President's orders." He locked eyes with the students. A Texan. A soldier. "You have nothing to fear from my men. However, I would be less than honest if I failed to tell you that I intend to use all means necessary to prevent interference with your school board's plan. This is what I have been ordered to do, and I intend to carry out my orders."

That was the last time Maj. Gen. Edwin Anderson Walker figured very prominently in the news—the last time, until this week. After Little Rock, he had been sent to Germany as commanding officer of the 24th Division. There he found the same softness, the same purposelessness, that hundreds of other professional soldiers have found in youngsters raised on the milktoast liberalism that passes for education these days.

So he began to talk tough about communism, and what it is, and how the enemy conceals himself in an ambush of gauzy falsehood. He spoke to his troops of gullible, delicate men, safe at home in soft chairs, polishing their fingernails and coughing gently at strong language. He spoke bluntly of these influential people, the "anti-anti-Communists" whose gentle creed is that we must never be beastly to the Reds, the shrill and mocking men who deride patriotism as "superpatriotism" and love of country as distasteful and embarrassing. His object was to give his troops a "new and vital approach toward anti-communism—a positive approach toward the defeat of Communist subversion of the American way of life." He invited some hard, knowledgeable anti-Communists to speak: Edward C. Bundy and Willi Schlamm. He minced no words himself: Dean Acheson, he said, was "definitely pink."

All this appeared in a paper known as the Overseas Weekly, and we can guess from this distance how it appeared, with sneers, and contemptible little quotes out of context, and a self-righteous editorial along with it. And most disgraceful of all: General Walker had made use of some material from the John Birch Society.

This past Thursday morning, General Walker was called on the carpet by the commanding general of the 7th Army. He was asked for a full explanation. Saturday morning, the New York Herald Tribune blasted him in a lead editorial, published also in foreign editions. Any military indoctrination program, said the supercilious Tribune, "is an extremely delicate operation, particularly when it is directed toward those who would be in the front lines if any Communist aggression developed in Europe. It is repugnant to both the American military and civil heritage to use Army authority in an attempt to shape the political thinking of enlisted men."

Yesterday Maj. Gen. Edwin Anderson Walker, soldier, was suspended from his command. He is not yet 52. He is at the peak of his career as a combat-hardened officer. And the little, soft, spineless parasites of the liberal Left have got him. Thirty years as a first-class fighting man. And what price glory?

Virtue in the Body of the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the more than 600 prominent Americans who were in attendance at the annual George Washington awards dinner sponsored by the American Good Government Society in the Sheraton Park Hotel of Wash-

ington last Friday were privileged to hear an inspiring and informative address by C. J. Backstrand, president of the Armstrong Cork Co. Because of its historic value and in the hope it will be read by many students and lovers of our American institutions, I am inserting it in the RECORD.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the cost of printing the address in the RECORD will be $202.50. Notwithstanding that fact, I ask that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIRTUE IN THE BODY OF THE PEOPLE

(Address by C. J. Backstrand, president, Armstrong Cork Co., Lancaster, Pa., before the American Good Government Society, Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D.C., April 28, 1961)

Mr. Chairman, Members of Congress, trustees of the society, fellow citizens, it is a high honor to have the privilege of addressing this distinguished assemblage on the occasion which commemorates the 172d anniversary of George Washington's first inauguration and which honors two statesmen of current times for their outstanding achievements on behalf of good government.

The American Good Government Society makes an important contribution to the national welfare by sponsoring this annual George Washington dinner so that we may renew our understanding, revitalize our faith, and regenerate our zeal for those abiding principles which undergird this Republic—principles which are as valid today as they were in the age of Washington, Adams, Jefferson, and Hamilton. We should review the lessons of history more frequently, but all too seldom do we do so. However, this event assures that it will be done at least once each year.

Although a Californian by birth, I am an adopted Pennsylvanian who has been accorded—almost but perhaps not quite—the status of native after first coming to Pennsylvania 44 years ago and after 34 years of continuous residence in that great State. Because eastern Pennsylvania is part of the hallowed and historic ground over which significant actions in the war for independence were fought, it would seem appropriate tonight to consider one important engagement of the Revolution which was conceived on and launched from Pennsylvania soil—the Delaware crossing on Christmas night, 1776.

The site of the crossing—McKonkey's Ferry, in Bucks County a few miles up the Delaware from Trenton—has been preserved as a memorial by the establishment of Washington Crossing Park, a State park with monuments marking significant aspects of the operation, restored historic buildings, and a memorial building which houses Emanuel Leutze's world-famous painting of "Washington Crossing the Delaware." The park project was brought about by the leadership of a few patriotic and dedicated citizens who sought to preserve the historic area in order to encourage a knowledge of history and an understanding of the significance of the sacrifices of the patriots who made our freedom possible.

While every schoolboy knows that Washington crossed the Delaware and subsequently surprised and soundly defeated the Hessians at Trenton, all too few Americans appreciate the significance of that action. In the considered judgment of competent historians, the American cause was at its lowest ebb immediately prior to the crossing. Had it not been for the glorious victory at Trenton and the subsequent successful action at Princeton, which caused the British to withdraw from most of the Jerseys, American defiance of the Crown would have ended then and there. And there would have been no United States of America.

Some may quarrel with this evaluation, asserting that Valley Forge marked the low point from which American fortunes then rose to eventual victory. And certainly no one should minimize that dark hour of the Revolution when a pitifully small force starved and bled in the snow while Howe's superior forces were warmly and comfortably quartered in Philadelphia only a few miles away. But a review of events leading up to the Delaware crossing and a comparison of Washington's letters and dispatches for the two periods clearly indicate that the days before the crossing were truly the darkest hour.

When the Declaration of Independence was issued in July of 1776, there was wild rejoicing throughout the land. Summer patriots were in full force everywhere. The States were invincible. King George could not possibly cross the ocean with sufficient force to put down the rebellion. And if he should try, a few rugged Continentals and State militia would defeat the King's regulars, and liberty would be won in short order. Such was the temper of the times. Then as now the public sought an optimistic view.

But the British forces, evacuated from Boston in March, had been strongly reinforced with fresh troops and ships. The question was—where would they strike. The answer was not long in coming. Late in August, Howe landed a powerful force on Long Island. The American command was awed by the size of the opposing force and the smoothness with which the amphibious landing was affected.

There followed defeat after defeat accompanied by debilitating retreat—defeat at Long Island; retreat up Manhattan Island with momentary success at Harlem Heights; the successive losses of Fort Washington and Fort Lee with their garrisons and supplies; and then the retreat across New Jersey with an army dwindling by the minute from sickness, desertion and the termination of short enlistments. With customary foresight, however, Washington planned ahead. He wrote to Congress from New Brunswick on December 1:

"I have sent forward Colonel Humpton to collect proper boats and craft at the ferry for transporting our troops, and it will be of infinite importance to have every other craft, besides what he takes for the above purpose, secured on the west side of the Delaware. Otherwise, they may fall into the enemies' hands and facilitate their views."

With an adroitly executed rearguard action which delayed the British and deceived them with respect to the strength of American forces, Washington slowly withdrew to the Delaware, and utilizing the boats, transported his force to the other side. Then only the river and this small force stood as a barrier between Howe and the capture of Philadelphia. Even the river could not be relied upon as a barrier, for if it froze solidly, troops could march directly across.

From Trenton Falls on December 10, 1776, in a letter to Lund Washington, the general graphically described his plight:

"Our numbers, quite inadequate to the task of opposing that part of the army under the command of General Howe, being reduced by sickness, desertion, and political death were obliged to retire before the enemy who were perfectly well informed with our situation, till we came to this place where I have no idea of being able to make a stand as my numbers, till joined by the Philadelphia militia, did not exceed 3,000 men fit for duty. I tremble for Philadelphia. Nothing in my opinion but General Lee's speedy arrival can save it. We have brought over and destroyed all the boats we can lay our hands on upon the Jersey shore for many miles above and below this place; but it is next to impossible to guard a shore for 60 miles, with less than half the enemy's numbers; when by force or strategem they may suddenly attempt a passage at many different places."

It was a desperate hour, indeed. But yet another blow was to fall. General Lee was captured. This, coupled with the knowledge that almost all enlistments would expire by year's end, made Washington's plight seemingly hopeless. Under these circumstances, who but Washington would have decided to attack?

The best evidence indicates the general conceived the crossing and Trenton attack around December 14. His plan was for a force including the Philadelphia militia to cross at Trenton, create a diversion, and block enemy escape southward. Another force was to cross above McKonkey's Ferry and proceed overland to cut off Hessian retreat toward Princeton. Washington's main force of some 2,400 men was to cross at the ferry. However, the forces above and below never made the crossing. But Washington crossed. It was a foul night. The river was blocked with ice and a storm was raging. The crossing was effected in Durham boats, ordinarily used for the transportation of iron ore, manned by Colonel Glover's seafaring men from Marblehead, Mass. The watchword of the campaign was "victory or death," and the immortal words of Tom Paine, who accompanied the American forces throughout the New Jersey retreat, were read to the men shortly after they were written on December 19, 1776:

"These are the times that try men's souls: the summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will, in this crisis, shrink from the service of his country; but he that stands it now deserves the love and thanks of man and woman."

Washington had planned for the crossing to be completed by midnight so his force might arrive at Trenton by 5 in the morning. But weather conditions delayed operations, and it was 3 a.m. before all of the artillery had crossed, and nearly 4 o'clock before the troops took up their march. This made him despair of surprising the town, but he pressed resolutely onward. For those who think the victory was possible only because the Hessians were surprised in their beds still drunk from Christmas festivities, let it be known that the German mercenaries were formed and in the field when Washington's force struck from two directions. The engagement was brief—over within 2 hours. Not a single American was killed and only a handful wounded. The ehemy suffered heavy losses. Colonel Rall, the commanding officer, was killed and many prisoners taken. In reporting the event to Congress Washington wrote:

"In justice to the officers and men, I must add that their behavior upon this occasion, reflects the highest honor upon them. The difficulty of passing the river in a very severe night, and their march through a violent storm of snow and hail, did not in the least abate their ardor, but when they came to the charge, each seemed to vie with the other in pressing forward, and were I to give a preference to any particular corps, I should do great injustice to the others."

In a postscript he added:

"The prisoners we have taken amount in number to 918 of which 30 are officers. We have also got about 1,000 stand of arms and 4 standards and 6 brass pieces of artillery."

The effect of this stunning victory and the action at Princeton a few days later was electric. The American cause had new life, new vigor, and "summer patriots" who had defected to the enemy in his period of New Jersey success came swarming back.

But the cause was far from won. Untold hardships and many misfortunes and reversals were ahead, and no one knew it better than Washington. However, the brilliance of his moves at Trenton and Princeton had saved the flickering flame of liberty from being snuffed out, and equally important, had saved Philadelphia. Its loss at that stage of the war would have been a disastrous blow the cause probably could not have sustained. The city then was not only the seat of government, it was also the chief manufacturing and commercial center on which Washington's army depended. Later, when Howe's forces finally did occupy Philadelphia, the blow was not so severe. The city was a mere shell of its former self—many commercial and industrial enterprises having been moved out during the intervening months.

Further evidence of the crucial nature and importance of the Trenton and Princeton operations was given by Cornwallis, Howe's brilliant and aggressive field commander. At the victory dinner following eventual triumph at Yorktown, Washington proposed a toast to the defeated general. Cornwallis rose to respond as silence settled over the group and said: "When the illustrious part which your excellency has borne in the long and arduous contest becomes a matter of history, fame will gather your brightest laurels from the banks of the Delaware rather than those of the Chesapeake."

The banks of the Delaware. Yes, Cornwallis had known, as had perhaps no one else but Washington, the slender thread by which the fate of the United States hung that cold, stormy Christmas night in 1776.

Washington's role in the war cannot be overstated. To a very great extent, he was the revolution—strategist, tactician, quartermaster, diplomat, and consistent servant of the Republic—all combined in one man. A significant mark of the man, and one which could profitably be the topic of a separate treatise, was his steadfast refusal to usurp powers that properly belonged to Congress. Time and again he was plagued by problems which he could have solved if he had taken the law into his own hands. For example, the lack of food, clothing and equipment for the troops—a constant source of worry to him—could have been greatly minimized if he had chosen to commandeer supplies from the citizens. But he did so only in the most dire emergencies. He also had to suffer with incompetent officers commissioned and sent to him by Congress. His task would have been easier and his troubles diminished had he sacked them and chosen his own. But he did not do so. He deferred to Congress, because to him it was neither consistent nor proper to employ autocratic, arbitrary means to achieve victory in a war for freedom.

Immeasurably valuable though his contribution was in time of war, perhaps even greater was his influence in the years that followed. His calm dignity, sense of justice, and extreme patience in presiding over the Constitutional Convention served to bring dissident groups together and make final acceptance of that great document possible.

The general's virtue was widely recognized and this fact was a potent and influential force in bringing about ratification by the States. Many citizens felt that the powers accorded the Chief Executive in article II were, as Patrick Henry called them, an "awful squint toward monarchy," but some such critics were persuaded to approve by the comforting thought that George Washington—who they knew did not seek kingship—would be the man to put article II into effect.

Perhaps the best judgment that can be made of his 8 years in the Presidency is that he fulfilled the hopes of the friends of the Constitution and spiked the fears of its critics. The friends hoped for a vigorous, forceful executive with enough power to hold the Government together. He fulfilled that hope. The enemies feared that the Chief Executive would take so much power unto himself that the United States would go the way of most other popular governments—straight into tyranny. Such fears were groundless because of Washington's single-minded devotion to the principles of representative government.

Most scholars would agree that his greatest contributions during the period of his incumbency as President were those that derived from his character and integrity, his insight and his strict adherence to constitutional principles. Jefferson later wrote with gratitude that Washington had conducted the new Government through its birth until it "had settled down to a quiet and orderly train," principally by "scrupulously obeying the laws through the whole of his career, civil and military, of which the history of the world furnishes no other example."

Jefferson penetrated to the heart of the matter. How was Washington able to supply the inspiration, courage and leadership to carry the Nation through wartime crises? Why was he so influential in the post-war period? Why was he so universally admired and respected? The answer, simply, is that he was a man of great character and spiritual power—a man of complete integrity, dedicated to the establishment of an enduring government of free men. He made this amply clear in his first inaugural address when he said:

"The preservation of the sacred fire of liberty and the destiny of the republican model of government are justly considered, perhaps, as deeply, as finally, staked on the experiment intrusted to the hands of the American people."

Today—172 years after Washington spoke these solemn words—we find the fate of this noble experiment still reposing in the hands of the American people, and we find our Nation facing grave perils from within and without. A fanatical and conscienceless enemy has served notice that it will not rest until it has the entire world as its domain. The United States is regarded by this enemy as the principal barrier standing in its way.

Though the military threat is great, it is important to recognize that the Communist challenge today is economic as well as military. They have declare allout economic war against us, and currently are attempting by every means to undermine our industrial strength and the stability of the dollar. The Communist strategy is to weaken us economically by luring us into excessive Government spending at home and abroad—and to destroy international confidence in America by singling out our weaknesses and failures and ignoring our strengths and superiorities.

It seems clear that if, as a nation, we are to meet successfully this type of attack, there is urgent need for a greater degree of understanding of the operation of our system, or if you will, a need for a higher level of economic literacy. Unless the general public gains a better grasp of economic fundamentals, public support for the sound policies now so vitally needed will not be forthcoming.

Economic literacy may be defined as full comprehension of a simple principle that our commonsense tells us is true, namely that few things in life are free. Almost all carry a price tag in terms of cost, effort and sacrifice. Furthermore, liberty—individual freedom—is inextricably linked to economic freedom. If the allocation of goods, services and resources is made by the arbitrary decisions of the state, backed by the employment of force of which it has a monopoly, human freedom is inevitably curtailed. On the other hand, history teaches that human freedom and opportunity flourish under the operation of the free market mechanism of our capitalistic society. The facts are clear and the proposition basically simple—yet it is not generally understood.

If we as a people continue to embrace centralist concepts and grant continually greater authority to an all-powerful central government, and thereby lose our freedom, we will have been conquered by our own weakness.

Indeed prophetic were Washington's words in a letter to Lafayette dated February 7, 1788, referring to one of the constitutional safeguards, the division of powers, and setting forth the one essential and critical factor on which its continued existence depends:

"That these powers are so distributed among the legislative, executive and judicial branches, into which the general government is arranged, that it can never be in danger of degenerating into a monarchy, an oligarchy, an aristocracy, or any other despotic or oppressive form, so long as there shall remain any virtue in the body of the people."

"So long as there shall remain any virtue."

"Virtue" here, I believe, was used in the classic sense of civic virtue as known in the ancient world—prudence, the ability to regulate and discipline oneself through the exercise of reason; fortitude, firmness of mind in meeting danger or adversity; temperance, calm self-control; and justice, the principle of rectitude and just dealing of men with each other.

Does this kind of virtue exist in the body of the American people today? Certainly in many it does—in many, I fear, it does not. Perhaps the proportions are not significantly different from those that obtained in Washington's day. And yet observers of the modern scene detect some disturbing symptoms—the increase in crime and juvenile delinquency—the dependence on others and emphasis on security rather than opportunity—the behavior of American captives subjected to Chinese Communist brainwashing in Korea indicating a lack of faith in themselves, a feeling of insecurity, and only a hazy understanding of American institutions—and the indifference of so many to the responsibility of citizenship in failing to participate in Government and to exercise their franchise. This situation exists principally because in our homes, schools, and businesses, we have not sufficiently emphasized and practiced self-reliance, the assumption of personal responsibility, and such other virtues as thrief and industry, and we have failed somehow to develop an understanding of and zeal for American principles to the extent that our enemy has developed understanding, dedication, and zeal for his.

It seems clear that we have a job to do, and it must start with each of us as individuals. We can begin by accepting the personal responsibility to work to revitalize the essential virtues in our homes, our schools, our own businesses, or communities, and generally in the Nation.

In our homes, it is important for us to teach our children the values of personal responsibility, self-reliance and self-discipline, and to set an example for them with our own conduct.

In our schools, we must be alert to the atmosphere in which our children are being educated. We must use our influence to improve that atmosphere and to see that curriculum offerings and teaching methods encourage personal responsibility and accountability, and that emphasis is placed upon the underlying meaning of American principles.

Those of us in business must keep this objective in the foreground for ourselves and

our associates—being personally responsible ourselves and encouraging our associates to be responsible, self-reliant, and accountable for results.

In our communities, we must seek to encourage and support those programs that call for local responsibility and self-reliance as opposed to subsidy support from the State and Federal governments.

And, finally, in the nation we can reaffirm this principle by throwing our support in favor of policies and legislation that promote personal responsibility, and resist those that encourage dependence on government.

Each of us as individuals can do much to help—and we will do it if we accept the challenge as a personal responsibility—the responsibility for doing our part toward bringing about an increase in understanding and dedication to American principles and traditions, and heightened resolution to preserve our heritage for those who come after us. Thus must we assume our own individual responsibility in the fateful struggle for men's minds between the forces of liberty and the forces of totalitarian tyranny—to the end that there always may remain in America a great measure of "virtue in the body of the people."

Smart Young Newcomers Sell Conservative View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, in the May 1961 issue of the respected magazine Nation's Business, there is an excellent article about some of our 58 new Members of the 87th Congress. Many of these Members have already distinguished themselves in the Halls of Congress. They have impressed all of us, I believe, with their intelligence, self-assurance, judgment, and zeal. In my opinion, they have injected vital new blood into some of our hardening arteries in the Congress. After observing these distinguished gentlemen for 4 months, I have a distinct feeling that they may be doing their bit to give the Congress some new and healthier arteries before very long. I am pleased to introduce at this point in the RECORD the text of this fine magazine article:

SMART YOUNG NEWCOMERS SELL CONSERVATIVE VIEW—NEW TREND? OLD HANDS AT CAPITOL BELIEVE THESE NEW CONGRESSMEN SIGNAL SWING AWAY FROM FEDERALIZATION

Lanky, 36-year-old freshman Congressman JIM BATTIN, of Montana, strode into the ornate, high-ceilinged offices of Republican House Leader CHARLES HALLECK one day early in the present session of Congress.

"I want you to know, sir," he said to the conservative veteran GOP leader, "that I will be with you on most issues. But on other issues I won't be, because I'm just not that liberal."

Across Capitol Hill on the fourth floor of the Old House Office Building a few weeks later, 39-year-old DON BRUCE, of Indiana, another new Member of the House, calmly dictated a letter to a labor union leader in his home district. The union chief had urged Representative BRUCE to back the Kennedy administration program to "keep America moving."

"I intend to keep America moving," dictated Mr. BRUCE, "moving in the path of individual liberty and in strengthening the basic constitutional system of Government." He flatly stated that Government should "drastically reduce the entire tax burden and let the honest laws of economics get to working."

Warning your leader you won't always stand with him and writing your constituents that you disagree with them may seem unwise politics, particularly for new members. But Representatives BATTIN and BRUCE don't see it that way. Like many of the 58 first-term Members of the 87th Congress, they have both independence and conservatism as part of their makeup. Not only do they have convictions, but they and many of their new colleagues have the drive and the know-how to sell their beliefs. They are helping inject new vigor into the political cause of free enterprise.

Many new Members of the House in this Congress are sharply conservative in contrast to the 86th Congress when most new Members were liberal. The change is as drastic as has been seen in recent times.

Moreover, some congressional leaders not only predict that the new wave of outspoken young conservatives is the forerunner of many more young conservatives, but also consider it more representative of the philosophy of the Nation as a whole than is the welfare-state doctrine that has dominated National Government programs over most of the past generation.

"Many people say that resistance to radical ideas and the spendthrift schemes in government is growing; I believe this is true," Minority Leader HALLECK told Nation's Business. "Many of the new Members," he said, "were running against these radicals and they pitched their whole campaigns against this philosophy."

Key Democratic conservative in the House, Representative HOWARD W. SMITH of Virginia, also believes conservatism is on the rise. One indication is that he was swamped by letters of praise from all over the country after a recent television program on which he spoke out for constitutional and economical government.

House Republican Policy Chairman JOHN BYRNES of Wisconsin notes, "There has been a considerable rise in conservatism on the college level in the past several years. The conservatives in Congress could be a natural result of this, together with efforts to encourage younger people to participate in politics."

From Representative BRUCE comes this analysis: "I think we have seen the beginning of a philosophical evolution based on dedication to principle. In the recent past we have been seeing government as a false idol. Our bankrupt liberalism has been portrayed as a symbol of all good things. It has tended to erode our spiritual values that are the basis of our liberty. But I think this will be changed."

Another new Member, 32-year-old JOHN ASHBROOK, of Ohio, reports, "The temper of the people is more conservative than you would think." He concluded this after traveling and speaking in 200 cities around the country as chairman of the Young Republicans from 1957 to 1959.

Of the 58 first-term Members in the new Congress, 40 are Republicans; in the previous Congress, 59 of the 78 new Members were Democrats. Though most of the conservative freshmen wear the Republican label, the freshman Democrats also include articulate, self-reliant young conservatives.

One Democratic freshman, for example, was quizzed by the liberal chairman of a major congressional committee as to how he planned to vote on pending issues. At the risk of not winning a seat on this important committee, the new Member refused to commit himself to vote the way the chairman wanted. He lost the committee post.

Another new young Democrat pored over the administration's aid to education bill searching out cloudy phrases in its language that might make it unacceptable to him. He did this in spite of the fact that his State's political leaders were pressing him and other members of his congressional delegation to support the administration bill unswervingly.

Much has been made of the youth, scholarship, and vigor of Kennedy administration officials. It has reinforced the political cliche that links youth with liberalism and age with conservatism. The increasing age of some of the conservative congressional veterans also has served to point up the freshness and enthusiasm of members of the new executive branch. This has tended to draw attention from the youth, vigor, and intelligence that has come to Congress.

The seniority system in Congress makes legislative buck privates of all new Members. But in politics an attractive, persuasive, and sincere figure can begin to stand out and make himself heard rather quickly—as Mr. Kennedy proved.

As for the new Republicans who make up the bulk of the freshmen conservatives, "their influence is being felt already," according to Minority Leader HALLECK. Important committee assignments and wide opportunities to be heard at policy meetings also indicate the value being placed on the new men.

Congressional Campaign Chairman WILLIAM MILLER, of New York, says, "Never before have we had a young group as personable, articulate, and knowledgeable. There are lots of leaders among them."

"It's rather early to judge," comments Representative BYRNES, "but as a group, they seem outstanding in their enthusiasm, talent, dedication, desire to participate and awareness. We have been short on public relations and had difficulties getting across our true image in the past. We believed we were right, but we can't continue to take it for granted that everybody knows why we are right."

This is one reason the GOP policy committee has set up a new Subcommittee on Research to supply new fuel for conservative thinking. The committee is seeking fresh thoughts and information from academic and professional sources on the basic issues of our times.

A memorandum stating the objectives of the unit says its studies are "designed to provide a scholarly analysis of specific problem areas and ways of meeting these problems within the framework of our free enterprise society."

Its work will help supplement GOP policy formulation and may give extra ammunition to both older and new members of the party.

House Democrats are not without conservative organization and strategy. While the so-called Democratic study group, made up of about 70 to 80 House liberals, has developed an informal organization for concerted action and voting on liberal causes, conservative Democrats in the House also have an informal organization. As unpublicized five-man top command of conservative Democrats under Representative SMITH leads southern States-righters in legislative strategy.

The political party lineup in Congress is not nearly as important as the conservative versus liberal split. Although both Representative SMITH and Representative HALLECK deny that a coalition of Republicans and Democrats exists, rollcall votes have shown clearly a bipartisan opposition—formal or not—to excessive spending and welfare state legislation.

Conservative Republicans and southern Democrats now numbering nearly 200 members can be expected to vote the same way on many issues. Liberal Republicans and Dem-

ocrats mainly from the northern or border States or the West also number about 200. Normally about 5 percent of the House is absent on rollcalls. The remaining Members of the 437 total may swing from one side to the other depending on the legislation.

With such a near-even balance in the House, the new conservatives in the freshman class, both Democrats and Republicans, are an important element. This is particularly true since they seem likely to emerge as an energetic sales force for the free enterprise viewpoint.

Though political philosophy can only be fully judged in the light of a history of rollcall votes, many of the new Members' election campaigns, their activities since Congress convened, and their voiced intentions have made them appear promising to conservative congressional leaders.

Here is a closer look at a few of the men—some more conservative than others—who exemplify the new young men in Congress:

JOHN ASHBROOK, lawyer and newspaper publisher, singled out as a key issue of his election campaign the freedom of the individual. "Unbridled national power with a resultant loss of individual freedom and local autonomy would weaken our efforts in the international field," he told the voters. He said he would help guard against "State planners, the economy wreckers, the spenders and the destroyers of local government [who try to] weave a web of socialistic control over us under the guise of solving our problems by removing them from the careful scrutiny of the State and local government officials to the banks of the Potomac."

Representative ASHBROOK is the son of a Democratic Congressman who served the same district for nearly 20 years. The 32-year-old Republican is an honor graduate of Harvard like many members of the Kennedy administration. He studied under liberal Profs. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., and John Kenneth Galbraith, but was repelled by the theories they espoused.

Mr. ASHBROOK was graduated from Ohio State Law School in 1955. He became active in the Young Republicans organizations on the county, State and National level, heading the national organization from 1957 to 1959. He is publisher of the Johnstown Independent, a weekly paper.

A member of the House Education and Labor Committee, Mr. ASHBROOK has taken a strongly conservative stand on all major issues. He voted against the liberal move to enlarge the House Rules Committee which was intended to dilute the power of the conservatives to delay or block heavy spending, welfare, and union-backed legislation.

He also voted against the bill to extend unemployment compensation benefits for additional weeks and supported a bipartisan move to block so-called back-door spending, which permits Federal agencies to borrow from the Treasury without the traditional review and control of the congressional appropriations committees.

JAMES F. BATTIN, the young Montana Republican, says, "Being labeled as a conservative is not a kiss of death any more. The conservative today is not against progress. He's against disorganized change."

Representative BATTIN believes a trend against Federal intrusion is starting in the country, especially among younger people. "A young fellow some years ago could go into business on $1,000. Today, if you have $1,000, you have to hire a lawyer to see if you meet all the regulations. You have to hire an accountant to set up your books for tax purposes. Pretty soon you don't have anything left for inventory."

Though Representative BATTIN, like many of his new colleagues in Congress, grew up in the depression years, this did not make him distrust the private enterprise system.

"I seek opportunity and resent regulation. I believe I was elected not on promises, but on forwarding the philosophy of less control and more initiative," he told Nation's Business. "I have no quarrel with liberals. My job is to convince people my position is right."

Mr. BATTIN is a lawyer and veteran of Navy duty in the Pacific. He has served as city attorney in Billings, Mont., was a member of the State legislature and was active in State and county civil and political affairs for 10 years before his election.

He is a member of the House Judiciary Committee and the important GOP committee on committees, which determines Republican committee assignments.

DONALD C. BRUCE comes to Congress with 19 years' experience in the broadcasting industry. He has been program director, manager of radio broadcasting companies, and a news commentator. Over the past 11 years, he estimates he has made about 4,500 talks concerning national and international problems.

An Indiana Republican, Mr. BRUCE beat a liberal Democrat for the congressional seat. He serves on the Education and Labor and Un-American Activities Committees.

Years of study and evaluation of everything from the "Federalist Papers" and Adam Smith to news and publicity releases led him to his conservative convictions, he explains.

He sees the great question of our times as this: "Is the United States going into a collectivist state with total dependence on the Government or are we to continue as a free nation, independent and responsible?"

He says that Government should protect the nautral rights of the individual, but that "Government has become the aggressor against our rights in the guise of protecting them."

DAVID HENDERSON is one of many southern Democrats who voted against liberalizing the House Rules Committee on the crucial vote early in the session. Washington is not new to him. The Wallace, N.C., attorney was assistant general counsel of the House Labor and Education Committee in 1951 and 1952. So he is familiar with some of the fundamental issues before Congress as well as the workings of the legislative body. The former Air Force major and county judge came to Congress at the age of 39.

His assignment is the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, but his past staff experience gives him a natural interest in the breadth of problems that come before Congress.

Mr. HENDERSON, who knows a Member must stay attuned to his district to stay in office, reports that after Congress first convened he got telegrams urging him to support the administration, and he feels there will be heavy pressure to bring money from Washington to his area.

But he feels that people will eventually cease their requests for more and more Federal spending. "We can't undertake these spending proposals without the prospect of higher taxes," he says. Lately some of the same constituents who urged him to support the administration pleaded with him to oppose the President's proposal to raise the tax on truckers.

Like most Democrats, Representative HENDERSON will be under some obligation to support the Democratic administration. On some legislation he will undoubtedly go along, but not before he has examined in detail each proposal to make sure it doesn't conflict with his and his constituents' fundamental beliefs.

RICHARD H. ICHORD, 34, is another new Democrat who typifies the independent thinking and high qualifications of this year's congressional freshmen.

The youngest man ever to serve as speaker of the house in the Missouri Legislature, Representative ICHORD has almost a decade of legislative experience on the State level.

"No specific political philosophy fits all cases," he believes. He feels he is not a Jeffersonian Democrat because "this is no longer the agrarian society that influenced Jefferson's thinking, but an urban society." But he believes the Federal Government has gone too far in some fields.

"I'm a little jealous of the powers of the State government," he told Nation's Business. "All our Federal programs should be set up to assure that local government has a part in the workings of the program. Money from the Federal Government isn't money that just comes from heaven, as some seem to think."

A brilliant student, he was graduated from the University of Missouri School of Business and Public Administration with a degree in accounting in 1949. He taught courses in business law and accounting while attending law school and after graduation returned to Houston, Mo., to practice law.

He served on what was known in Missouri as the "Little Hoover Commission," a body that recommended efficiencies and economies in State government as the Hoover Commission did on the Federal level.

Coming from a lead mining district with high unemployment, Mr. ICHORD is particularly concerned with this problem. He believes, however, that "the answer is retraining, not putting people on the relief rolls. It is too easy to create a philosophy in people that the government will take care of them."

Mr. ICHORD, however, does not feel that the administration proposal for adopting a medical care program for the aged under the social security system is socialized medicine as do many of his colleagues.

But with this issue, as with others, he indicates he will study all facets and decide for himself.

He is on both the Interior and Post Office and Civil Service Committees.

HORACE R. KORNEGAY, 37-year-old former prosecuting attorney from Greensboro, N.C. is another Democratic freshman. He, too, refuses to be labeled as conservative or liberal. But he describes himself basically as a Jeffersonian Democrat.

"I don't believe that Government should compete with business," he says, "but with our role in the world today, the Federal Government has to be big, and there are activities that the private citizen can't undertake himself."

He also believes that we should not overspend our income. He says the Federal Government should not "step in and regulate the crossroads store," as has been the potential threat under the broadened coverage of some proposed minimum wage extension bills.

Mr. KORNEGAY favors a temporary Federal school construction bill, but he opposes any Federal action or legislation that encourages pirating of industries from North Carolina. He opposes the concept as well as the threat that the area redevelopment bill might attract some of his State's industry elsewhere. This bill provides loans and grants for establishing industry in labor surplus sections.

Mr. KORNEGAY is on the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

JOHN H. ROUSSELOT, one of the new Republicans, represents former Vice President Richard Nixon's old congressional district.

Like some of his fellow Republicans, he won over a liberal Democrat in a campaign that focused on the fundamental issues of conservatism versus liberalism.

Though he is only 33, Mr. ROUSSELOT's apparent leadership qualities made him the choice of the other first-term Republicans as their acting chairman on party matters.

He received a degree in political science and business administration from Principia College in Illinois in 1949.

He has been in public relations work on the corporate level and was president of John H. Rousselot & Associates, public relations consultants, from 1955 to 1958.

He, too, is no stranger to Washington. He was director of public information for the Federal Housing Administration from 1958 to 1960. In California he had broad experience in Los Angeles County Republican politics and in campaign political organization and publicity work.

Mr. ROUSSELOT was a member of the Republican State central committee in California.

He was vice president of the Los Angeles County Young Republicans and a past president of the Young Republicans of California.

"It used to disturb me in school," Mr. ROUSSELOT told Nation's Business, "that the New Deal was pictured as all virtue. I read and read to find the holes in this facade. I couldn't believe that it was right to discourage creative initiative and to abandon faith in the individual to do for himself."

Mr. ROUSSELOT campaigned hard against Federal intervention in the citizens' lives and against centralized government and its cost to taxpayers.

He broke down every issue where possible to show just what the citizens in his district would pay for any new Federal program.

He believes the ultimate choice for the Nation is constitutional government or socialism.

The conservative has to explain in simple, clear terms what is involved and why he is right, he says.

The assumption that conservatives must come up with constructive alternatives to any program proposed by liberals can be misunderstood, he points out.

The alternative may be no legislation. For example, my positive alternative for Federal money for school construction is free, locally controlled education.

Our philosophy is harder to sell, but when unions or other groups attack us, we'll ask to speak before them. I think people are becoming fed up with big, centralized government. This will make the conservative philosophy easier to sell and we will sell it anywhere any time.

Consumer Credit Trend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following speech was given by the Honorable M. S. Szymczak, member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System before the American Bankers Association annual National Installment Credit Conference in Chicago on March 21, 1961.

I believe that Mr. Szymczak's remarks are important and will interest our colleagues:

CONSUMER CREDIT TREND

(Speech by the Honorable M. S. Szymczak)

The Federal Reserve System has three principal responsibilities—bank supervision, fiscal agency functions, and monetary policy. Each of these covers a wide field of interest and a large area of activity. All of them have a relationship to credit—especially monetary policy. All of them require much research, for which the Board has a well-qualified staff.[1] Therefore, I feel competent to speak before this conference, but more importantly I am pleased to be here.

First, I should like to say something about the trends that have been in operation in the consumer credit industry for a number of years. Then I should like to see what modifications of earlier conclusions may be suggested by developments of the past few years.

Nothing is more illustrative of the changes in the attitude toward consumer installment credit and the dynamic character of the industry than the rapid increase in commercial bank activity in the field. It is hard to realize now that commercial bank installment loans were negligible until the late 1920's and that not until about 1935 did banks hold as much as 10 percent of all installment credit. By the end of the 1930's, however, the bank share had risen to about 25 percent, and during the postwar period banks have consistently held just under 40 per cent of a growing volume of installment credit. All but about 175 of the 13,000 insured commercial banks now make installment loans. Installment credit constitutes about 8 percent of the total loans and investments of all banks, and the proportion exceeds 10 percent for banks with total loans and investments of $5 million to $100 million. I do not need to emphasize to this group how actively banks have competed for consumer loans over the past 30 years.

DEVELOPMENTS IN CONSUMER CREDIT—1930–55

The rapid growth in commercial bank activity in the consumer credit market over the past several decades has reflected both the changing attitude toward installment credit generally and the ready availability of reserve funds over a substantial part of the period. As expenditures for automobiles and household appliances formed an increasingly important part of a rising level of consumer expenditures, more and more consumers made use of credit to finance the purchase of such items. It was recognized that these were large-ticket durable items for which expenditures were "lumpy" and which would provide services over a period of time. There was increasing acceptance of the appropriateness of consumers' financing purchases of these items by borrowing and repaying their indebtedness as they used them. It was observed that borrowers for the purchase of these items are not the impecunious but are predominantly young, middle-income families who can look forward to increasing incomes over future decades. Moreover, it was noted that these items could be repossessed and, at least in the case of automobiles, resold in an active market.

The rapid increase of bank activity in consumer credit reflected also the availability of a large volume of excess reserves during the 1930's and of Government securities that could be sold at pegged prices in the early postwar period. While seeking outlets for loanable funds, banks made a number of discoveries about consumer loans. First, they learned that consumer loans were sound loans. Even during the depressed 1930's, consumers did a remarkable job of repaying debts. Defaults declined to very low levels during the war and early postwar period.

Second, banks learned that consumer loans are very profitable loans. Most banks have discovered that their consumer credit departments are among their most profitable departments, despite relatively high administrative costs and laws limiting interest charges. Such loans seemed particularly attractive with the excess reserves of the 1930's and the continued low interest rates of the immediate postwar period. They have continued to be attractive, however, despite the higher levels of interest rates and security yields prevailing in recent years.

Banks also discovered that consumer credit was an area with rapidly expanding demand. Again, this was of particular importance when banks had excess funds and demands for other types of loans were depressed. It has continued to be important, however, as more and more banks have come to consider consumer loans an important part of their portfolios. Many banks learned that they could make direct loans to consumers while continuing to supply funds to other types of consumer lenders. I am sure that many, if not most, of the banks represented here make direct loans to consumers, purchase paper from retail outlets, and at the same time lend to retail outlets and finance companies for the purpose of carrying consumer paper.

In the decade following the close of the war the growth in installment credit was particularly rapid, giving rise in some quarters to expectations of continued growth at astronomical rates and in others to fears of a drastic cutback resulting from the high percentage of consumer incomes being devoted to debt repayments. Consumers incurred debt to meet the backlog of deferred demand resulting from wartime shortages. Increasing home ownership and the move to the suburbs together with increased incomes gave rise to the two-car family, which constituted 12 percent of all families by the end of 1955. The rise of new products, such as television, and the improvement of old products were further factors in credit expansion. New types of credit plans permitted the substitution of installment for charge accounts credit, and increased demand for services such as travel and education encouraged the expansion of credit for these purposes.

Installment credit controls were reimposed on two occasions—in 1948 and again in 1950—to moderate expenditures for durable goods and the expansion of credit. The removal of credit controls in each case was followed by an easing of credit terms which both encouraged consumer expenditures and intensified the effect of the expenditures that took place. After a moderation of credit growth in 1954, outstanding credit rose 23 percent in 1955 as automobile sales reached a record high and terms eased sharply further. At the end of 1955, total installment credit was 12 times as high as 10 years earlier and automobile credit was 30 times as high. The ratio of debt payments to consumer disposable income reached 12½ percent in 1955, compared with 3½ percent in 1945. To many it seemed that the demand for consumer credit was insatiable. There seemed also to be an almost unlimited supply of credit as banks and other lenders competed aggressively for business. To many observers it seemed that consumer credit controls were the only way to prevent continued sharp inflationary pressure from increased credit purchases and continued easing of terms.

WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED FROM RECENT DEVELOPMENTS?

In what ways have developments over the period since 1955 modified interpretations of consumer credit trends? Few would suggest that the trends just discussed have been reversed or that the basic quality of consumer credit has changed. I do believe, however, that developments over the last 5 years have taught us some new lessons about consumer credit—or, rather, retaught us some old lessons. I think that recent

[1] Practically all of the data I shall submit here today were compiled by our division of research and statistics. They have been brought together by Miss Mona E. Dingle, chief, consumer credit and finance section.

developments have pointed up the unusual nature of the early postwar period and the exceptional combination of circumstances that made 1955 possible. At the same time, they have emphasized the continued dynamic nature of the consumer credit industry.

What are the lessons that we have learned from developments of the last 5 years? First, I think that we have learned that consumer credit growth at the rate of the early postwar period was an unusual development that is not likely to be repeated under normal peacetime conditions. The rapid increase of credit in that period was associated with the backlog of deferred demand, the small volume of indebtedness at the beginning of the period, far-reaching social and economic changes, and expectations of continued inflation on the part of much of the public. I think that it is now generally recognized that the period 1946–50 was largely a catching-up period. The ratio of debt to disposable income was about the same in 1950 as just before the war. Developments in 1955 reflected an unfortunate combination of record automobile sales and sharp easing of credit terms. Since then we have learned that such a growth rate cannot be sustained. Moreover, we have learned that reductions in consumer credit may take place in periods of recession, and that these reductions are likely to be the greater the more excessive was the preceding credit expansion.

We have also learned that automobile credit is not necessarily the dominant factor in the expansion of installment credit that it seemed in the early postwar period. Expenditures for automobiles have increased less rapidly than many other types of consumer expenditures in recent years. Meanwhile, many of the factors which earlier resulted in such sharp expansion of automobile credit in relation to sales have not been operating to the same extent in recent years. At the end of 1960, automobile credit accounted for about the same proportion of total installment credit as at the end of 1953—slightly more than 40 percent. This was also about the same proportion as in 1941. Personal loans increased from 21 percent of the total in 1953 to 26 percent in 1960, while other consumer goods paper declined from 29 to 36 percent. Before I discuss these developments in more detail, let me mention two other lessons that I believe we have learned from recent developments.

One more lesson that we have learned is that there are such things as delinquencies and repossessions on consumer loans and that these need to be taken into account in administering consumer loan departments. Despite the generally good record of consumers in paying their debts, we have learned that not all consumers discipline themselves adequately and that many will attempt to borrow more than they can service from their incomes. We have also learned that recessions may convert otherwise sound loans into at least temporary defaults. We have learned that dealers that have sold recourse paper can go into bankruptcy, and that lenders can lose money on repossessions in a declining market. I know that a number of lenders are now operating with the highest delinquency and repossession rates of the post war period. Others are spending increased time and money in collecting overdue loans and in screening new loan applications. Many lenders have learned to their regret that injudicious promotion efforts may require a high refusal rate if a rise in delinquencies is to be prevented.

A fourth lesson that we have learned is that consumer loans are affected by limitations of credit supply as are other types of credit. We have learned that loanable funds cannot be made available in unlimited amounts in periods of prosperity and high level demand without encouraging inflation, and that restrictions on the growth of credit affect consumer as well as other types of credit. As long as banks had excess reserves or large amounts of securities which could be sold at pegged prices, and as long as they were actively interested in expanding the proportion of consumer loans in their portfolios, this limitation did not come into play. In the past decade, however, we have relearned the lessons of credit restriction in all areas. Credit restriction appeared at times not to affect consumer loans as banks as well as other lenders competed actively for such loans. As consumer loans have increased in proportion to bank assets, however, banks that have been pressed for funds have restricted expansion in this as in other areas. No doubt many of you were among the lenders who were curtailing promotional efforts sharply, screening loan applications more carefully, exercising caution in taking on new dealer accounts, and upping interest rates on some types of loans a year or so ago. Some of you have also discovered, however, that it may be difficult to apply the brakes on consumer credit expansion if there has previously been injudicious promotion or sharp easing of terms.

CHANGES IN OUTSTANDING CREDIT—1955–60

Having summarized the lessons that we have learned from developments of the past few years, let me review these developments in somewhat more detail, with special reference to changes in automobile credit. In 1955, as you are aware, automobile credit increased 37 percent and other installment credit about 13 percent. The sharp increase in automobile credit reflected in considerable part the record 7.4 million new cars sold. Meanwhile, however, developments were taking place in the market for automobile credit which both made these sales possible and intensified their effect on outstanding credit. The average size note on new car contracts rose sharply as automobile prices increased, consumers upgraded their purchases, and the real down payment ratio declined. The proportion of automobiles bought on credit also increased substantially. Meanwhile, the rise in repayments was moderated by the lengthening of average maturities as first 30- and then 36-month contracts became common.

The continued operation of most of these factors in 1956–57 kept extensions above the rising level of repayments despite a drop of almost 20 percent in new car sales. By the end of 1957 almost one-half of all new car contracts were being written for 36 months. The average size note on new cars was about one-third higher in 1957 than in 1954. The proportion of cars bought on credit rose about one-sixth from 1954 to 1956 before declining slightly in 1957. Automobile credit, however, rose more moderately than other types of credit in the 1956–57 period—an average annual rate of 7 percent, compared with 10 percent for nonautomotive installment credit.

A further sharp drop in automobile sales in 1958 reduced extensions below repayments. Outstanding automobile credit declined 8 percent during the year while other types of credit continued to rise.

Automobile credit extensions picked up with automobile sales in late 1958, but in the period 1959–60 automobile credit rose slightly less than other installment credit—an annual average rate of 12 percent, compared with 13½ percent for nonautomotive credit. The average size note declined slightly as manufacturers failed to increase prices for the first time in several years and compact cars became an important element in total sales. Downpayments and the proportion of cars bought on credit were unchanged. By late 1959, 36-month contracts on new cars accounted for about two-thirds of all contracts, but the proportion showed little further change in 1960. As you are well aware, the much-heralded 42-month contract failed to materialize. The growth of other types of credit in this period, however, was encouraged by promotions, by the adoption of new types of credit plans, and in some cases by an easing of terms. Automobile credit began to decline at the end of 1960, but personal loans continued to increase.

FUTURE TRENDS

What conclusions can you draw from the past with respect to probable future developments in consumer credit It is obvious that whether the early 1961 decline in installment credit will continue will depend largely on changes in consumer demand, particularly for durable goods. I do not think any of you expect a decline of major proportions in consumer credit. On the other hand, consumer credit as such cannot be expected to pull us out of the current recession. When consumer demand revives, however, consumer credit should be a contributing factor to the upswing.

Over the longer run, you would expect a continued growth in consumer credit as population and income increase and new items are bought on credit. You would expect, however, that the rate would be substantially slower than in the first postwar decade, and obviously you would expect periods of cyclical expansion to be followed by moderate declines.

The ratio of consumer debt payments to disposable income may rise moderately from the rate of slightly more than 13 percent which has prevailed since the second half of 1959. The large baby crop of the war and immediate postwar periods will be reaching maturity and setting up homes. Older people will also form an increased part of the population. This group has always accounted for a small part of total consumer debt, but the incidence of debt may rise as an increasing proportion of older people are accustomed to the use of installment credit and continue to have regular incomes after retirement. To the extent that an increase in installment credit reflects rising incomes and an increase in the number of creditworthy families using such credit, it is, of course, no cause for alarm.

Next, you would probably expect new items and the newer types of credit plans to continue to account for an increasing share of total installment credit. The proportion of credit accounted for by the traditional types of household durable goods has been declining for some time. You might question how much further automobile demand can increase, in view of the very high incidence of automobile ownership and the number of multiple-car families at the present time. On the other hand, other types of large-ticket items are becoming an increasingly important part of what Americans consider the good life. You might also expect a continuation of the trend toward the use of revolving credit accounts for making a variety of purchases.

Many of the big-ticket items that are entering into the standard of living of more and more Americans are durable goods like boats and camping equipment. Others are services like trips to Europe and college educations. Many of these services are lumpy in the same sense as purchases of durable goods—that is, they are made infrequently and they involve expenditures that are large relative to consumer incomes. The response of lenders to these new demands has illustrated the continued dynamic character of the consumer credit industry. On the other hand, some of these new types of credit may involve dangers if injudiciously promoted. Acceptance of the widespread use of consumer credit for the purchase of durable goods has been based in part on the fact that consumers were paying for goods as they were using them. I believe that there is a limit to the extent to which consumers can be expected to allocate current income in

payment for purchases from which they are no longer deriving utilities. This danger is likely to be greatest in the case of expenditures that are in fact of a more or less regular nature or are likely to be repeated at intervals shorter than the maturity of the debt. The danger may be aggravated in some of the new types of credit plans that do not require a complete payoff of debt incurred in connection with specific purchases.

Finally, on the basis of recent developments you would expect consumer credit to continue to show more sensitivity to developments in general credit and monetary policy than in the past. In view of recent increases in loan-deposit ratios and in the ratios of consumer loans to total loans, more and more banks will probably find it necessary to restrict expansion of consumer as well as other loans in periods of credit restraint. By the same token, other consumer lenders will also find it difficult to raise sufficient funds for unlimited credit expansion. I do not say that general credit and monetary policy can prevent all excesses in the consumer credit field in the future. I do believe, however, that the apparent insensitivity of consumer credit to general credit and monetary policy in some past periods has been associated in part with special conditions in the financial system and in the economy generally. After recent developments lenders may be less eager than in the past to enter into excessive credit easing or promotions that may be difficult to curb.

As in all things, we have much to learn, not only about consumer credit, but also and especially about its use. Experience teaches discretion. As in life generally, so in this field abuses and excesses have been experienced that were not in the interest of the borrower or the lender and of course not in the public interest. Nobody knows that better than you, and nobody can contribute to the welfare of the consumer credit industry as effectively as you. Your discretion is essential to its sound economic and social contribution.

The Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered to the student body at Pennsylvania State University by Milton J. Shapp, president, Jerrold Electronics Corp., Philadelphia, Pa., March 9, 1961:

Peace is a wonderful word.

One of the problems we face though is that each person thinks of peace as something different. The general concept is that we have peace when there is an absence of war. Unfortunately, this is not a true definition. There are many millions of people throughout the world who live lives of drudgery, amidst poverty and disease. They find no peace. Can we say that a mother who watches her children starve has found peace? We must think of peace as it applies to other people as well as to ourselves.

We tend to think of peace as a world order in which we Americans will be the benefactors. When you consider that the United States represents only 6 or 7 percent of the total population on this globe, peace to others might very well be achieved by our elimination as a powerful nation, thereby reducing the possibility of involving the world in a nuclear war. This might bring peace to them, but would be disastrous to us.

If you want to reflect a bit more on this, consider the Congo. We are concerned—all of us—that war in the Congo might erupt and involve us. But the people in the Congo have other concerns. They are starving; they are living in poverty; they have an epidemic. The pictures in Life magazine just a few weeks ago showed the horror of life in the Congo. To bring peace to the Congo, we must not only avoid war, but also help develop the country to give the Congolese a better way of life. So it is in other parts of the world.

BACKGROUND OF THE PEACE CORPS

The idea of a Peace Corps to achieve such a desirable goal is not new. For at least 60 years, there have been programs of this sort advocated in the United States. At the end of the Spanish-American War, in 1901, American soldiers in the Philippines were given the option of demobilizing and returning to the United States or staying in the Philippines to become teachers. Thousands stayed and went into the villages. Many of the present generation of Philippine leaders were trained by these teachers. I think this is a good example of the real benefits our Peace Corps program might bring to the world.

In 1904, a man named William James wrote a book called "Moral Equivalent of War." In this, he stressed the idea of rechanneling the aggressive instincts of youth to useful services, at home and abroad, giving them opportunities to lead purposeful lives.

There have been many private agencies with long, successful records of activities related to Peace Corps work. You are familiar with the American Friends Service Committee, the International Voluntary Service, the Voluntary Services Overseas (a British organization), Operation Crossroads of Africa, which is composed of many American college students, etc. The list is long. The Communist nations have many organizations doing similar work. At the present time in Cuba, for example, there are 180 youths gathered from all corners of the world (from 40 different countries), building a school in the mountains near where Castro started his revolution. The Soviet (and I will cover this in greater detail) has a large corps of young people in training for service in the underdeveloped nations of the world.

Senator Humphrey, Congressman Reuss, Victor Reuther, General Gavin (the new Ambassador to France), Max Lerner, and many others have been writing and talking about this concept for years. In fact, HUMPHREY introduced a bill in Congress in 1960, hoping to establish a Peace Corps. Congress passed legislation that authorized a study of the advisability of such a program, but did not act on the Humphrey bill.

Kennedy was the first President (though at the time he was a Presidential candidate) to endorse such a program. The results were what he hoped they would be—that the idea would capture the imagination and enthusiasm of the American people. This it did, primarily because Americans realize that the Peace Corps is needed in the world today. Its philosophy is consistent with the philosophy that established our country; its moral purposes are quite consistent with our religious goals. The motto, "Youth will be served" is now passe. In 1961 our motto is, "Youth will be of service."

PURPOSE

Let's take a look at the world and the need for establishing the Peace Corps. Two-thirds of the world live in wretched poverty. Three-fourths of the world are nonwhite. The population is expanding exponentially. There are 3 billion inhabiting the earth today, and there will be about 4 billion by 1975 or 1980. In Latin America, approximately 40 percent of the population is under 15 years of age: 50 percent under 20 years of age. This gives an idea of how fast the population is growing.

My generation did one big job. We defeated the Nazis and Fascists in their attempts to enslave the world. But I must say to you students—members of the new generation—we did a miserable job of analyzing and combating the spread of communism. We seem to have taken the easier path. We tried smothering it with slogans and then ignoring it, hoping it would go away, while we pursued materialistic goals. The efforts of the private service organizations and the individuals who attempted to awaken us to our true world obligations were, in a large sense, ignored. We have been content to know that we are the strongest nation in the world, and that other peoples should know that we have no intentions of using our strength for anything except peaceful purposes—our peaceful purposes, namely, to prevent the outbreak of wide scale war. We have deluded ourselves that other people in the world are as eager as ourselves merely to contain communism and that therefore they wait for us to help solve their problems.

Anticommunism has proven bankrupt as a foreign policy. We need a more positive program. The establishment of the Peace Corps is such a positive step.

Today, idealism has become realism and has become identified with our national purpose and with national security. Let's analyze that for a moment. We have observed in the Congo, in Laos, Algeria and other countries of the world that poverty, illiteracy and disease threaten our national security. Communists are entrenched a mere 90 miles off our shores. It was the poverty of the masses in Cuba that enabled Castro to assume power. All our bombs—all our missiles—have not stopped Castro from moving into the shadow of the Kremlin.

THE SOVIET CHALLENGE

Today, belatedly, our military experts are studying what they call the fourth dimension of war which is the mind of man. The Soviets moved in and took Cuba because they captured the mind of man. They are making great inroads in the other nations of Latin America, Africa, and Asia because they are penetrating the minds of men.

My wife and I visited the Soviet Union in the summer and early fall of 1959. To give you an idea of how they are accomplishing this program, I would like to relate what they are doing within their educational system to indoctrinate and sell their people on the ideas of communism. At the age of three, the children are placed in nurseries, where they are exposed to the principles of communism. We visited a grade school on the second day that it was open for the semester. We went into the first grade class with a group of 7-year-old children. The principal, through the interpreter, asked if we had any questions to ask the children. I said yes. "Why are they in school?" It was translated into Russian. Instantly, almost every hand in the room was raised. I pointed to one little boy. He stood up with a smiling face and said, "We are in school to gain knowledge, because only through knowledge can we build strong communism, and we are out to build a better world for all humanity through communism." Down he sat. This was a seven year old child on the second day of his first year in school.

I have often thought what the answers would be if I had walked into any grade of an American school and asked that question. I wonder what answers I might get if I should ask that question in this room tonight? I doubt if there were would be such a clear-cut exposition of American goals.

Later, during our stay in Moscow, we met a young couple who were in their second year of training at the Moscow Institute of Languages. They were studying Swahili. It is a 3-year course. They planned to devote many years of their lives to a service in Africa. He was a sanitation engineer, and she was a nurse. They were imbued with the same spirit of service that our religious missionaries have. Many thousands of such Soviet youths are in training in Moscow, Prague, and elsewhere, learning languages, culture, history, and religions of the countries to which they will go. It is this group upon whom the Soviet is relying to penetrate the minds of men and help win the world for communism.

When we read in our newspapers about "subversive agents" of the Soviet Union causing trouble in poor countries, we must remember that in many cases these are sincere people helping to improve standards of living—working as they see it to "build a better world for all humanity through communism." How the efforts of these dedicated people are used and controlled by their political leaders is a different story.

If we are to have any success in stemming the advance of communism throughout the world, we too must offer a positive program to aid the development of people in the have-not nations. Expert advice and top level governmental assistance such as we have been supplying is not sufficient, because the organization and administrative processes of many of the needy countries do not afford an efficient method for reaching the people. Money by itself will not do the job. Money is like rain to farming. Land may be fertile, but if there is no seed, rain will not bring growth. In fact, too much rain causes erosion, just as too much money spent without preparation and intelligent programs to use it properly, results in extravagance, waste, and corruption. So, we must have a people-to-people program at the grassroots level. And this is the Peace Corps.

AIMS

What will the Peace Corps do? Well, basically the job in the rural areas of the underdeveloped countries is to get change started. In the urban areas, it is to help meet the problems brought about by the changes already underway. The problem is not that these countries have no trained people. They just do not have enough. And, unfortunately, many of their trained people, having been educated, feel that their status now prevents them from going back to be of service to their own people.

The Peace Corps is our tool to raise the standard of living of these nations. Robert Sargent Shriver, the head of the Peace Corps, has outlined five major things that he wants the Peace Corps to do: (1) teaching; (2) health service; (3) working on agricultural and world development programs; (4) working on large scale construction and industrial programs; (5) working in governmental administration.

Education at all levels is the greatest need facing the world today. To start industrialization in Africa, Asia and Latin America, illiteracy must be overcome. Thus, the first and most important job is teaching. I mentioned before how the work of our ex-soldiers helped the Philippines become one of the strongest nations in the Pacific and one of our most loyal allies.

Education is the key to success. Machines may make life better, but it takes education and intelligence to design the machines. We must help the underdeveloped nations by teaching their people first to read and write; then the sciences and skills that will help lift them out of the morass in which they live today.

Red China now has over 200 million children in their schools. You can see what will happen one generation from now when this large number (the greatest mass in history) of educated people start moving throughout the world in diplomatic channels.

As for health projects—fighting malaria, improving sanitation, child care work, even serving as midwives, could be some of the duties of the Peace Corps. In the field of agriculture, many of the methods and standards used in these countries are antiquated even by Biblical standards. We certainly have much to offer to the nations of the world in this respect.

As for working on large-scale construction and industrial projects, we have many workers who can assist with irrigation problems, bridges, roads, factories, and also help train local construction people. At the government level, the training of clerks, typists, and secretaries is essential. It is hard to conceive of the problems involved in running a government where there are few typists to type letters or no trained clerks to file documents.

One of the other projects which will certainly find a big place in the Peace Corps activities will be that of disaster work. You can see the advantages of having many hundreds—or thousands—of trained people ready to move into areas that might be affected by earthquakes, floods, fires, etc.

The operation of Peace Corps should not be considered as a unilateral program. The more we can make it bilateral and multilateral, the greater will be its value. We should be working with other nations on joint projects. More nations will participate with less of a feeling of being regarded as second rate if we make programs reciprocal. We should use foreign exchange students now studying in the United States to help in our training, and also to participate in our projects. We have much to learn by working with these people. Also, this will give other countries a feeling that they are helping us.

OBJECTIONS

The question already has been raised, "Why send so many idealistic and dedicated people overseas, when we have so many millions living in our own slums?" Certainly, this calls for investigation. Already there is thought of using these areas in the United States as training grounds for those who would serve in the Peace Corps.

For the operation of the Peace Corps to be successful, there are many objections to overcome—both here and in other countries. First, strange as it may seem to us, many nations do not want American volunteers. They are fearful of getting caught in the crossfire of American and Soviet relations. Some have no budget to cover costs for housing, travel, administration of the program, and so on. And they have the same problems as we in trying to get money authorized for aid programs. Some governments look askance on allocating funds for a hut or house or even food for our volunteers when some of their own people do not have these things.

Then there is competition with the educated unemployed. There are many thousands of educated people unemployed in countries like India, for example, who may feel that our Peace Corps volunteers are taking jobs from them. (By the way, there is a real advantage to a 2 or 3 year limitation on service. The Peace Corps volunteer has no desire to establish a permanent job, and this can be made clear to the people with whom he is working and training.)

Another difficulty is that needy countries may be unable to work out programs of assignment. The biggest mistake we could make would be to send any group (whether it be two or a hundred) into a country in which the details of handling a specific program had not been thoroughly analyzed and cleared. With the leaders of the underdeveloped countries so busy on day-to-day problems, there is little time for such planning. Yet, without it, little would be accomplished by a Peace Corps group.

In many cases, it is not easy to find projects on which the Government is willing to use volunteers. National pride and sensitivity about their slums may be a deterring factor. This is one reason perhaps that working through the United Nations would be advantageous. National pride would not be affected to the same extent if a new nation were to ask for volunteers through the United Nations. The Peace Corps is already organized to send people directly to a needy country or through the United Nations or through any other agency whose services may be requested by the country involved.

COST OF PROGRAM

There are also objections to overcome here in the United States. Of prime consideration is the cost of the program and the balance of payments problem. It is estimated that it will cost about $10,000 per person overseas. Fortunately, most of this money is for training, administrative costs and supplies which would be spent here in the United States with only a small percentage of it going to a foreign land. So the balance of payments problem is not an important factor. However, Congress is on an economy kick. The Peace Corps is going to cost money, and they have to be convinced of its great value.

I should like to tell a story about an elderly couple who went to Wilmington, Del., and visited Longwood Gardens, a part of the Du Pont Estate that is open to the public. If you have been there, you know how beautiful it is. If you have not, it is worthwhile visiting. The lawn in the springtime is like a billiard table. The garden contains every flower imaginable. The bushes, trees, and birds are magnificent. It is just Heaven on earth. As this couple went through the grounds with the guide, they oohed and aahed all over the place. Finally, after about 2 or 3 hours, they were at the gate ready to leave. The man turned to his guide and said, "Would you do me a favor, please? My wife and I have enjoyed this so much. Please convey our personal thanks to Mr. Du Pont for allowing us to come into this garden. It is so beautiful." Then he turned to his wife and said, "Mary, just think what God could do throughout the world if He only had the capital."

It is going to take lots of money to do this program. But I believe it is a worthwhile service—one of the greatest America has ever undertaken. We must furnish the capital.

We face some problems due to erroneous concepts. There is a connotation in the minds of some that this is another CCC; that we are going to have overseas boy and girl scouts; that this is just going to be a little tea party. Well, I think—and I am certain that the men who are going to run the Peace Corps know—that proper administration and proper planning will overcome those objectons in a few years. The Peace Corps is not going to provide an easy life, but those who participate will find the greatest satisfaction that comes with being of service.

PERSONAL REQUIREMENTS

Probably, for a long time, maybe only 1 out of 10, or 1 out of 20 applicants will be successful in qualifying to serve in the Peace Corps. Let's see what skills are required to become a member of this group.

First, is dedication of purpose. Anybody who joins this organization must truly believe in the brotherhood of man. He (or she) must be dedicated to service. He must have patience and understanding. He must be willing to make a sacrifice for the good of humanity. He (or of course she) must have a knowledge of the language, the culture and history of the country that is being

served; also a good background in our own history and a knowledge of our own culture. He must have ability to work with people; to organize and to carry out projects. He will be the only trained person among many people who have never worked on similar projects before. He must be able to teach, without playing the role of teacher, and to develop a teacher-student relationship that has no implication of a superior-inferior, or privileged-less privileged classification. He must have training in health standards, sanitation, first aid, and also be something of a psychologist. He must pass a rigid physical fitness program, because he will have to stand the rigors of primitive life, eating local foods and living in a manner to which nobody in the United States, except perhaps the Indians on the reservations in the West and in the Seminole sections of Florida, are accustomed.

And then, he must be able to cooperate or to compete, as necessary, with similar groups of Communists who may be working in these countries. I say cooperate or compete, because at the beginning for certain we will be competing. I hope that before too long, perhaps we can cooperate. But as I stated previously, the Communists believe that only through communism can a better world be built for humanity. The first thing they teach is that it is communism that will bring these people a better way of life. Our people must be able to show that we can help people develop a better way of life, and that it is our intention to let each country develop politically as it will. Our Peace Corps representatives will be the salesmen and demonstrators of these concepts.

TRAINING

You folks at Penn State already have some of these skills that are needed, but many others must be taught. At first, training will be available through the Peace Corps. However, plans have already been announced for a training program which will be conducted as part of undergraduate and graduate work at colleges.

Before accepting anyone for training, there will be a very careful screening program. After training, there might well be assignments here in the States on which people can work. Here, many of the misfits can be judged and weeded out before going overseas.

The British who have many volunteers working throughout the world have a training program which consists of only 1 week in England. The balance of training is provided in the countries to which volunteers are sent. They find that letting a volunteer get acclimated to the country while receiving his training in languages, customs, etc., is much easier and has much more impact.

It is presumed the Peace Corps will try all kinds of training methods depending upon what is necessary. The training program is very important. The Soviet people I met were spending considerable time learning languages—including native dialects. When they go into the villages, they will speak like natives and will be accepted, I believe, more readily because of it.

ELIGIBILITY

Who is eligible? Well, anybody who qualifies is eligible. Anyone who has the skills and personality required and who is willing to serve—men and women of any creed, color, or race. Married couples, where both are qualified and willing to serve, will be sent together.

Young people will form the backbone of the Peace Corps for many reasons. Usually, they are not tied down by family. They are not as accustomed to high incomes They will be more interested in the nature of the work rather than in prestige. It is not necessary that they be college graduates, as the needs of a project will determine the level of education and training required.

Then, most important, older people who have overseas experience should be included. They will be needed for administrative posts to help guide the new initiates in this overseas service.

COMPENSATION

Let's take up some miscellaneous things. Pay. This will be approximately the same as the military scale, but the important thing is this: no one will receive more for his work than the equivalent salary of local people doing similar work. There is a good reason for this. To be successful in the Peace Corps, you have to be welcome. You have to live as part of a community. You have to be at the "grass roots."

When I was in Italy during the war, I was drawing $65 a month from my officer's pay. The rest went back home. But my $65 a month was about five times what the average Italian was making and about double what the GI's were drawing. We Americans caused tremendous inflation in Italy with our high pay scale. The Italians greatly resented this. People I knew said that at least under the Nazis they could buy food and other products, whereas we practically ruined their economy with our high wages.

There was a famous cartoon by Bill Mauldin that portrayed this feeling. It showed two GI's—cold and wet, huddled in a doorway out of the rain, but shivering around a GI lamp. A poor, ragged Italian walked by, looked at the lamp and said, "My, you Americans have everything."

We cannot have our representatives who are supposed to be living and working with unfortunate people and developing a "we" attitude, getting higher pay than the people with whom they are working. So the members of the Peace Corps will find it necessary to adapt themselves to the local standards. However, money will be put aside here in the States as a bonus to be paid when each volunteer returns.

LENGTH OF SERVICE

Length of service is stimated to be about 1 to 3 years. Certainly, the amount of training that is required would make it very wrong and expensive to try to train anybody to stay overseas less than a year. It is estimated that 3 years would be the longest that they would want to stay. So, we are talking about 2 years as an average length of time overseas in addition to training time. This training time could be anything from a week here in the States to perhaps a year, depending upon the type of service required, individual background, proficiency in languages, country of service, etc.

The draft status has been a ticklish subject. When Candidate Kennedy first announced the Peace Corps program, he suggested draft deferment for Peace Corps volunteers.

It is not likely though that there will be draft exemption. On the other hand, it is not likely that those who have served in the Peace Corps will be drafted unless there is an emergency. There might be some very good reasons, though, why those who go into the Peace Corps might find it advantageous to sign up for 6 months of prior military service They could use the 6 months to get into good physical shape and to learn skills before going into the Peace Corps. This would avoid the psychological disadvantage of considering those in the Peace Corps as draft dodgers. I think that it is not wise to have a draft-exempt group. But, on the other hand, we should consider the philosophy that obtained during World War II; that each person shall serve according to his capabilities.

We had many people who were draft deferred then, because they were in defense work or on farms. Certainly, if being in the Peace Corps is service to our country (and I am sure this will be recognized more and more in the years to come), then those who thus serve should get the honor that is due them. Perhaps at some future date, the draft situation will not even be an issue.

SIZE OF CORPS

How many will be selected? This year they are talking about 500 building up to about 5,000 as soon as possible.

It is estimated the Soviets have from 15,000 to 20,000 in training now for this service. Some news reports indicate that they have sent 3,000 technicians to Cuba alone in the last 6 months to work in the farm districts, to establish schools, communication systems, to work on newspapers, etc. Because of the influence of these people, it is doubtful that Castro could reverse his policy at this time, even if he so desired.

In Guinea, it is estimated that they have some 2,000 technicians. It is interesting to note that in this little country they are building the biggest printing plant in Africa—a printing plant about a block square—capable of producing Communist literature for all of Africa. Also, in Guinea, they are building one of the world's most powerful radio stations, capable of blanketing the entire African Continent. Once having placed their volunteers in a country, the Communists move with precision.

I visualize that at some date in the future we will have many thousands of our people trained for Peace Corps duty. Victor Reuther has estimated he would like to see 100,000. Some have estimated the need at 1 million. There is no way of telling how large the Peace Corps may grow to be. It is just a matter of how successful it is, how ably the first group demonstrates its value, and then how much money we are willing to spend in relation to what we get for it. After all, in World War II we mobilized well over 10 million to defeat the Nazis.

CONCLUSION

Let me summarize briefly. Our generation may have gotten the world into a greater mess than anticipated, but at least the problems are now clearly recognized. No longer can my generation, or yours, for that matter, shirk national responsibilities, for the results of such inaction may mean the complete collapse of our way of life.

Idealism has indeed become the only realistic course for us to follow. Certainly we are in a much stronger position, morally and traditionally, to practice idealism than are the Communists. Their one advantage over us is the closeness in time of their revolution to the present. This gives their people a closer identity to the aspirations of those who are seeking a better way of life in the have-not countries.

Communism runs into trouble as an ideology and as a governing force when it is imposed on people who have enjoyed any sort of freedom or any degree of living standard. But it has been accepted and implemented successfully by nations whose standards of living have been so poor that the people have nothing to lose by accepting it. It is poverty that we must wipe out. If we permit the Soviet Union or Red China to be the instigating force in the under-developed areas, we are opening the wedge for communism to spread, because then they can show visible proof to the other impoverished nations that their system produces improved living conditions.

The waging of peaceful competition offers a tremendous advantage to the world. The Communists and the free world compete to benefit the people of all nations, rather than to destroy their societies.

This raises the standard of living everywhere. Some people may not choose to identify themselves with us or with the Soviet Union, but like the citizens of Western Europe who gained from the Marshall plan, the impoverished nations in Africa, Asia, and Latin America will have the

strength to remain independent. Then these areas will no longer be breeding grounds for war, and a major step toward achieving a true peace will have been accomplished.

We should adopt as our goal a very simple concept; namely, "We seek to build a better world for all humanity." With this as our expanded creed, we can—I am certain—convince the masses of the world that the forces of freedom that started America's great revolution toward freedom in 1776 are still very much alive.

Thank you.

The Opinion of the 18th Congressional District, New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of representing the 18th Congressional District of New York. My area is populated probably by the most heterogeneous group in the United States. Their ethnic backgrounds are Irish, Italian, Puerto Rican, Cuban, German, Hungarian, Czech, Greek, Belgian. It is an integrated community with all races and religions. This area is known as East Harlem and Yorkville. It is strictly urban with few private residences or one-family homes. My district is populated by residents who are paying extremely high rents and extremely low rents. The rentals range from $100 per room per month to $5 per room per month. Included among them are the residents of a great number of low-income public housing projects. Within the past few years because of the great land values and desirability of location, more than 15,000 families have been dislocated in the Yorkville section. In a bulldozer operation, luxury housing has been built and is being built. As a consequence, great hardships have been suffered by residents who have lived within the area for more than a generation.

Many new residents have moved into the section whose viewpoints I have not had the opportunity of ascertaining. Because of the rapidly changing conditions, the viewpoints of my constituents whom I represented in the 85th and 86th Congresses may have changed, and consequently, I may not be aware of their present attitudes.

From 1947 through 1956, with the exception of 2 years, I represented the greater portion of this section as a State senator. I feel that I am close to my people and that their viewpoints are well known to me. However, one of the great political mistakes any public official can make is to assume that he knows at all times the thinking of his constituents. It is necessary, therefore, from time to time to be advised as to the opinions of the constituency as to specific issues. We public officials, after all, are the servants of the people representing them in a republican system where we are accountable for our decisions every 2 years.

In the early part of this year, before legislation was voted upon, I forwarded to all the registered voters in my congressional area a questionnaire. Approximately 10 percent of the voters or 5,000 responded to my request for their opinions, and I am pleased to present the tabulation of the answers to my inquiries. This tabulation was compiled by two collegians from University of Maryland and American University, Henry Hyde and Robert Hardgrove. While many of the results were expected by me, others were a complete surprise and a revelation. The two most surprising results related to the viewpoint of the constituency with respect to Federal funds to private or parochial schools for private school construction and Federal loans for private or parochial school construction. My district is populated by many persons of the Roman Catholic faith, including the Irish, the Italians, and the Puerto Ricans. The great number of my constituency consists of wage earners working in factories, in government, and in industry. Their answers with respect to their viewpoint regarding labor unions was a great surprise.

In view of the fact that most of the new construction with high rentals and luxury apartments are located south of 96th Street, I have had a separate tabulation of the answers with respect to the northern part of my district above 96th Street. The results of the answers to the questions in the entire district and the so-called low rental area and East Harlem section follow:

QUESTIONNAIRE

	Percentage results in entire district		Percentage results above 96th St. at East Harlem section	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Education:				
(a) Do you favor the administration program of providing Federal funds for school construction and teachers' salaries in the discretion of the States' government?	75	25	79	21
(b) Do you favor Federal funds to private or parochial schools for private school construction?	23	77	40	60
(c) Do you favor Federal loans for private or parochial school construction?	43	57	62	38
(d) Do you favor allocation of funds to States on the basis of school population in private and parochial schools as well as on population in public schools?	39	61	55	45
(e) Do you believe that Federal loans to private or parochial schools for school construction and teachers' salaries violate the principle of separation of church and state?	58	42	44	56
(f) Do you favor Federal scholarships of $1,000 based on merit without regard to needs test?	36	64	39	61
(g) Do you favor tax deduction of $1,200 for taxpayer for higher education of himself or dependents?	75	25	79	21
2. Foreign affairs:				
(a) Should economic aid to Europe and Asia and South America be—	*Percent*			
Increased	26			
Decreased	20			
Discontinued	15			
Maintained at present level	39			
(b) Do you believe that recognition of Communist China in the United Nations is inevitable?	54	46	46	54
(c) Do you believe that our support for NATO should be—	*Percent*			
Strengthened	44			
Maintained at present level	47			
Withdrawn	9			
(d) Do you believe that the United States should take—				
Economic sanctions against Cuba	44			
Diplomatic sanctions	16			
Maintain normal trade relations	19			
Economic and diplomatic sanctions	21			
(e) Do you believe our support of the U.N. in the Congo and Africa should be—				
Strengthened with additional financial aid	44			
Strengthened with military forces	26			
Discontinued	14			
Strengthened with additional financial aid and with military forces	16			
3. Foreign trade:				
(a) Do you believe that reciprocal trade agreements with foreign nations should be—	*Percent*			
Continued as is	55			
Revised with higher tariffs and lower quotas for foreign goods	40			
Discontinued	5			
4. Labor:				
(a) Should restrictions on labor's right to picket and boycott under Landrum-Griffin law and Taft-Hartley law be repealed?	36	64	48	52
(b) Do you believe that labor unions should be subject to antitrust laws?	80	20	76	24
(c) Do you believe that secondary boycotts and picketing on construction sites should be declared not illegal?	40	60	38	62
(d) Do you favor increase of minimum wage from $1 to $1.25 under present coverage?	78	22	87	13
(e) Do you favor extending coverage of $1 hourly minimum wage to employees in retail or service establishments grossing $1,000,000 or more annually?	85	15	84	16
(f) *Do you favor legislation granting $1 hourly minimum wage for service employees in hotel, motel, and restaurant establishments grossing $1,000,000 or more?	83	17	86	14
(g) Do you favor Federal funds for depressed areas to stimulate and revive business?	82	18	78	13

QUESTIONNAIRE—Continued

	Percentage results in entire district		Percentage results above 96th St. at East Harlem section	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
5. Social security:				
(a) Do you favor boosting minimum old-age pension from $33 per month to $43 per month?	93	7	98	2
(b) Do you favor permitting men to retire at age 62 instead of 65, the same as women, on reduced pensions?	74	26	81	19
(c) Do you favor raising pensions for widows to 85 percent of husband's pension?	87	13	92	8
(d) Do you favor increase of payroll tax of ¼ percent on employees/employers to finance liberalization of social security benefits?	79	21	82	18
(e) Do you favor legislation granting annually 60 days of hospitalization, nursing care, and surgical expenses for retired pensioners under social security system in lieu of present law which provides that Federal Government will match State expenditures for programs for retired pensioners earning less that $2,500 annually or who are welfare recipients?	74	26	87	13
6. Housing:				
(a) Do you favor Federal program for more public housing for more low-income families?	76	24	82	18
(b) Do you favor Federal program for public housing for middle-income families?	80	20	85	15
7. Rent control:				
(a) Do you favor—	*Percent*			
Continued and effective rent control	55			
15 percent increase for those who have not given 1 increase since 1950	18			
Decontrol of rents	6			
Decontrol of vacant apartments	4			
Continued and effective rent control	17			
Increase for those who have not given 1 increase since 1950	15			
8. Your standard of living:				
(a) Is your income as much today as it was this time last year?	74	26	63	37
(b) Are you now—	*Percent*			
Employed full time	64			
Employed part-time	8			
Unemployed	8			
Retired	20			

With respect to the answers 2(a), 2(c), 2(d), and 2(e), the following are the results of the entire district as compared with the results above 96th Street:

	Entire district	Above 96th St.
2. Foreign affairs:	*Percent*	*Percent*
(a) Increase	26	27
Decrease	20	17
Discontinue	15	18
Maintain	39	38
(c) Strengthen	44	46
Maintain	47	43
Withdraw	9	11
(d) Economic	44	45
Diplomatic	16	15
Maintain	19	25
Economic and/or diplomatic	21	15
(e) Strengthen financial	44	35
Strengthen military	26	35
Discontinue	14	19
Strengthen financial and military	16	11

With respect to the answers of 3(a), the following are the results of the entire district as compared with the results above 96th Street:

	Entire district	Above 96th St.
3. Foreign trade:	*Percent*	*Percent*
(a) Continue as is	55	43
Revise	40	50
Discontinue	5	7

With respect to the answers of 7(a), the following are the results of the entire district as compared with the results above 96th Street:

	Entire district	Above 96th St.
7. Rent control:	*Percent*	*Percent*
(a) Continue	55	63
15-percent increase	18	18
Decontrol	6	4
Decontrol of vacant apartments	4	3
Continue and 15-percent increase	17	12

With respect to the answers of 8(b), the following are the results of the entire district as compared with the results above 96th Street:

	Entire district	Above 96th St.
8. Your standard of living:	*Percent*	*Percent*
(b) Full-time employment	64	51
Part-time employment	8	7
Unemployed	8	19
Retired	20	23

It will be seen, therefore, that the answers to most of the questions are comparable and that the viewpoints held are held without regard to the economic status of the constituency.

President Kennedy has recommended legislation which would promote the economy of our country and increase the purchasing power of the workingman. My questionnaire discloses that two-thirds of my constituency are employed full time whereas one-third are employed part-time or retired or unemployed. This result justifies the viewpoint of our President in moving ahead to solve one of the major problems of the new administration, that is, the purchasing power of the working people in the United States. I am certain that my constituency will draw their own conclusions when they review the results as set forth above.

I thank them for favoring me with their opinions which I requested, and I intend to advise my constituency with the results. Many of my constituents included personal comments, suggestions, and notes, which because of their number, I am unable to answer individually. However, I am at my congressional office at 1484 First Avenue every Saturday afternoon between 1 and 5 p.m., and will be available and more than happy to have them pay me a visit, and to discuss any matter which they would like to personally bring to my attention.

Wall Street Journal Views Mass Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Wall Street Journal has just published, in its May 2 issue, a detailed and informative analysis of the commuter crisis, with particular reference to the problems facing the rail commuter carriers.

This is a very worthwhile study and I need not comment upon it, except to emphasize my view that the sum total of the commuter crisis is not just the precarious financial position of some of the railroads.

We would be making a serious mistake to equate the problem solely with the ability of some carriers to provide the service. The real problem is the growing strangulation of traffic congestion and how we can best come to grips with it. It is traffic congestion—and the social and economic costs it imposes—that makes the commuter crisis a national problem, especially in light of the staggering population and automobile ownership projections that have been made for the years ahead in the Nation's urban and metropolitan areas.

The problem would be no less critical were our railroads breaking even or making a little money on commuter service, which most of them are not. Our task is to seek ways to overcome traffic congestion through the development of a better total urban transportation system, using all forms of transportation to their best advantage. That will include automobile, rail, bus,

subway and other modes that we probably haven't even thought of yet.

I would only add that this article adds to the growing awareness of the scope and importance of effective mass transportation in maintaining and improving the economic vitality of our urban and metropolitan areas, which are the economic backbone of the Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Wall Street Journal, by David Jones, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AID FOR COMMUTERS: BIG CITY MAYORS, SOME RAILMEN EXPECT HELP FROM UNCLE SAM IN 1961—THEY SEE OPPOSITION WILTING AS KENNEDY BACKS THE PLAN; BUT IT MAY STALL IN HOUSE—WESTERN LINES FIGHT PROGRAM

(By David R. Jones)

WASHINGTON.—Backers of the idea that the Federal Government should provide financial aid to large cities with commuter problems are becoming increasingly hopeful that 1961 may be the year when their dreams finally come true.

The pressure on Congress to bail out out deficit-ridden commuter railroads is coming mainly from eastern railroads and from mayors and other community leaders in large urban areas.

This same coalition was aggressively seeking Federal aid a year ago. However, lack of enthusiasm by the Eisenhower administration for intervention by the Government in what it considered primarily a local problem was a crucial barrier to such plans. Also, many Congressmen, particularly those from rural areas, could find few benefits in the plan for their own areas. The principal recipients of the aid schemes were limited by the nature of the problem to a few metropolitan areas out of the 10,000 cities in the United States. And only abou a dozen of the Nation's 163 major railroads could expect to receive any of the aid funds.

A VOTE FROM SENATOR KENNEDY

Nevertheless, enough support was obtained last year to push a bill, introduced by Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Democrat, of New Jersey, and calling for $100 million in loan funds for commuter lines, through the Senate. It won the vote of then-Senator Kennedy but died in the House. It was being bottled up in the Banking and Currency Committee and never came to a vote.

Since then, the financial deterioration of the commuter railroads has lent new urgency to the proposals for Federal relief. Yesterday, for example, the Boston & Maine Railroad announced it is considering abandoning all commuter service because of continuing deficits.

Now, proponents of the aid plan claim they not only have the full support of the Kennedy administration but also assurances of backing from leaders of both parties. This, they believe, will be enough to override any remaining opposition by antiaid Congressmen. Although the rail-aid proposal still could hit a snag in the House this year, its backers believe that this would only be a temporary delay and that enactment of the legislation in the next year or two is almost inevitable.

"Two years ago interest in Federal help for commuter railroads was centered almost entirely on the eastern seaboard," says Patrick McLaughlin, a Washington representative of the American Municipal Association. "But now we have west coast cities, like Los Angeles and San Francisco, and even southern cities behind us."

HIGH HOPES

"The cities that would benefit from Federal aid represent a tremendous number of Democratic votes, and if you followed the election returns you know it was the big cities that elected Mr. Kennedy," comments a railroad executive, who says his hopes for passage of the aid legislation are now much higher than they were a year ago.

Senator WILLIAMS has reintroduced his 1960 bill, broadened considerably this time to provide for $325 million of Federal loans and grants for the improvement of mass transportation. Within a few days a special report on the Williams bill is expected to be finished by Mr. Kennedy's aides and presented to the President. According to men who have worked on the report, it will endorse the Federal loan-and-grant idea in principle and recommend that the job of administering the program be given to the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

This is how such a program might work:

The Federal Government would provide long-term loans to public authorities which would be set up in major cities to coordinate and integrate mass transportation of all types in their areas.

The public authorities then would contract with the railroads, buslines, and local transit agencies for commuter services, guaranteeing the carriers against further losses.

The authorities also would build new transportation facilities and purchase new equipment. It would lease the facilities and equipment to the carriers, collect all passenger revenues and use these to pay off the Federal loans. If revenues fail to cover expenses of commuter operations, the public authorities rather than the railroads would absorb the deficits.

Better integration of local transit facilities under the direction of the local authorities might be enough in itself to end the deficit operations of commuter service in some locations, the theory goes. A more likely possibility, according to the backers of the legislation, is that the deficits would be trimmed to the point where they would be small enough to be handled by State and local governments with tax relief and local subsidies.

Additional Federal funds would be made available in the form of demonstration grants, which would enable the public authorities to try out various experimental programs to win passengers back to the railroads. Other grants would be available for research on new kinds of commuter equipment that might cut costs and serve to reduce deficits in the future.

NO COST FIGURE SET

The initial cost of the program President Kennedy is expected to support is still indefinite although a $100 million revolving loan fund and $30 million for research grants—considerably less than Senator WILLIAMS' proposed $325 million Federal appropriation—have been mentioned. There was a dispute within the administration over whether the program should be administered by the Department of Commerce or the Housing and Home Finance Agency. The decision in favor of the latter is regarded by proponents of Federal aid as a favorable sign since, in their opinion, the housing people probably would pursue a more far-ranging approach than the Commerce Department.

Several other Federal aid proposals, not directly tied to the Williams bill, also are being studied in Washington. The Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee is due to begin hearings later this spring on a staff report recommending $650 million to $800 million in U.S. loans over the next 10 years to ailing commuter lines. This plan was proposed by Anthony F. Arpaia, former Interstate Commerce Commission Chairman, and by the Regional Plan Association, a nonprofit New York area planning body.

And a special Senate study group on transportation policies in January recommended Federal loans to help railroads buy new commuter equipment. This proposal has been endorsed by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

CONTINUED DETERIORATION

The commuter problem is particularly pronounced in the New York area where 8 rail lines link 200,000 commuters with their suburban homes. The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad has been teetering on the brink of collapse for months; recently ICC Commissioner Charles A. Webb warned the road may go bankrupt by June despite the plans of four States to give it $6.2 million a year in tax relief.

The Long Island Railroad, the Nation's busiest passenger line with 85,000 daily commuters, is so short of funds that it has been able to meet its weekly payrolls this spring only by means of a deferment of $700,000 in New York City taxes and the receipt of $400,000 from the sale of real estate, according to a spokesman for the road. The Nation's two biggest railroads from the standpoint of operating revenue—the Pennsylvania and the New York Central—also are afflicted with steadily increasing commuter losses.

The commuter problem, according to railroad men, stems basically from the fact that railroads must have crews and equipment available to handle heavy rush-hour traffic then see much of it lie idle for the balance of the day. The eight roads serving New York lost $29 million on commuter service in 1959 and probably more last year. The continued deficits have made most railroads unwilling to sink money into new equipment, and as a result facilities are aging and service deteriorating.

Proponents of Federal aid claim the problem of getting to and from work is spreading because of growing urban traffic congestion. At the moment, the most critical areas are New York, Chicago, Boston, and Philadelphia, where the bulk of the Nation's 500,000 commuters live. But transportation experts say other cities—such as Cleveland, Los Angeles, and Washington—soon will become hopelessly clogged with auto traffic unless new rail facilities are developed to take some of the load off the roads. By 1970, they add, three out of four Americans will be living in metropolitan areas.

TWO BILLION SPENT ON HIGHWAYS

"We're spending $2 billion a year on the Federal highway program and nothing on the railroads," declares Senator WILLIAMS. "The implications of urban traffic congestion are so important to the economy that it's ridiculous to have such a disproportionate setup."

It would be far cheaper for the Federal Government to salvage the sagging commuter lines than to make up for their collapse by building highways, says the American Municipal Association. The association estimates that it would cost $305 million to replace all the commuter cars now in use in New York, Chicago, Boston, Philadelphia, and Cleveland; providing highway space for the equivalent passenger-carrying capacity in autos would cost $31 billion, the association figures.

Not everyone agrees that Federal loans and grants are needed now. Chicago-based railroads, which lately have been turning modest profits on their commuter service, are standing fast against any Federal aid. We don't believe in subsidies," says an Illinois Central Railroad official. We don't feel the Federal Government should intervene in suburban service."

A DIFFERENCE OF OPINION

This attitude of the Western roads has so divided the Association of American Railroads that it has avoided taking any stand on the Williams bill. This naturally weakens the case of the aid-hungry Eastern carriers but is not an overpowering obstacle, they say. The Chicago roads can do better carrying commuters, according to spokesmen for the Eastern lines, because of lower local taxes, more freedom extended by state regulatory bodies to raise fares and a smaller percentage of their total revenue derived from commuter business.

Dwight R. G. Palmer, New Jersey Highway Commissioner who shaped that State's recent plan to give tax relief to railroads, agrees in principle with the Chicago railroaders. "The business of looking to the Federal Government to be all things to all men," he says, is a "weak-kneed approach" by State and local officials who have not exhausted their own efforts to solve the problem. And aids of New York Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller indicate they would prefer to push ahead to see if they can solve the problem on the State level.

However, eastern railroad officials complain that State and local commuter-aid programs so far have fallen well short of needs. Earl T. Moore, president of the Central Railroad Co. of New Jersey, says that New Jersey's rail aid program will provide the carrier with only $1.6 million to $1.7 million in the fiscal year starting next July 1, against an estimated passenger deficit of nearly $6 million, of which $4.5 million is traceable to commuter operations.

CASE OF THE NEW HAVEN

The ailing New Haven, which has been fighting for State and local subsidies since 1956, complains that over that 5-year period it has obtained only a total of $1.4 million in aid, compared to actual passenger deficits for the period totaling $66.5 million. Although the New Haven now is in line for tax relief totaling $6.2 million a year from the four States it serves, the road's officials say this still isn't enough.

On July 1, communities served by the Long Island Rail Road will take over all station maintenance and New York State will eliminate all remaining taxes on the road's passenger service, for an estimated annual saving of $3.1 million. But company officials say that even with this aid the road will barely break even and that further wage increases could quickly bring a return of big deficits.

One of the most widely acclaimed commuter-aid experiments has occurred in Philadelphia. There, with the aid of a city subsidy, the Pennsylvania Railroad and the Reading Co. have boosted commuter rail travel by 30 percent since 1958 by slashing fares and improving service. But the railroads claim they're losing as much on the service now as before because the subsidy hasn't offset rising costs. Moreover, 9 of the city's 15 rail lines stretch into suburban towns that so far have refused to go along with the subsidy program, further impairing its effectiveness.

BIG INVESTMENT NEEDED

"In view of the limited taxing power and fund-raising resources of municipalities and States, it seems clear that only the Federal Government can finance a large-scale capital improvement program by extension of Federal credit," says David Berger, Philadelphia's city solicitor, who played a key role in the city's rail aid plan.

Stanley B. Tankel, planning director for New York's Regional Plan Association, expresses similar pesaimism about the adequacy of local efforts to solve the problem: "While these current stopgap programs are keeping commuter service alive, they don't do much to promote a future system that would be less costly to operate and could handle increased volume with better service. The real need is for a big investment in physical improvements."

Hunting in South Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN REIFEL
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. RIEFEL. Mr. Speaker, one of the many delights of living in South Dakota is the opportunity to take advantage of our unexcelled hunting facilities.

The district which I am privileged to represent is often called Pheasant Capital of the World, and with good reason. Our pheasant hunting is the best anywhere. And any Member who doubts that statement need only ask the distinguished minority leader [Mr. HALLECK], who participates annually in South Dakota's great ringneck sport. His prowess with a shotgun is second only to his legislative prowess, I am told, and I hope to join with him in a foray into South Dakota's pheasant paradise next fall.

The same invitation is extended to all Members of this body. You will find South Dakota hospitality just as marvelous as our hunting.

Appearing in the May issue of the American Rifleman is an excellent article by Wallace Labisky describing the whole gamut of hunting activities in South Dakota. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include that portion relating to upland birds:

HUNTING IN SOUTH DAKOTA

(By Wallace Labisky)

South Dakota hunting includes small game, upland birds, waterfowl, big game, and predators.

Many years ago, when the raw grasslands were being settled, the abundant upland birds were limited to two principal species—the pinnated grouse, also known as the prairie chicken, and the sharp-tailed grouse. Now there are seven.

In 1959 shooting on upland birds spanned nearly 4 months.

LENGTHY PHEASANT SEASONS

South Dakota ring-necked pheasant hunting is characterized by long seasons, realistic bag and possession limits, and uncrowded conditions. The State has never operated a game farm.

The earliest planting of pheasants was in the Sioux Falls area in 1898, followed by others during the next 10 years, all privately sponsored. In 1911 the game department supervised the stocking of 48 pairs of ringnecks purchased with funds raised by sportsmen. The following year the game department itself distributed 200 pairs. During the World War I period, the State spent $20,000 for 7,000 birds. This big release was the clincher.

The first legal shooting was in the year 1919. The pheasants have been going strong ever since, though with occasional setbacks. Severe winter is the ringneck's worst enemy. When prolonged deep snow or ice prevents their scratching through to food, the birds eventually succumb. The hens are usually the first to go. A blizzard, followed by rapidly falling temperatures, can also cause large losses.

The eastern half of the State has always led in pheasants. It is a diversified farming area, with small grains and corn the principal crops. Except for a few counties in the extreme southeast, excellent shooting can be found nearly everywhere. West of the Missouri River, the predominating rangeland supports only a token number of birds. Most exist near the scattered tracts of cultivated land, especially next to creek bottoms.

Pheasant hunting usually begins in mid-October. Legal shooting hours are from 12 o'clock noon until sunset, the same hours which apply to the hunting of all other upland game birds. Nonresident hunters are required to pay $25.50 for a basic hunting license and a game bird stamp. This entitles them to hunt for 10 consecutive days. They may take pheasants and other upland species that are in season while their license is valid. Possession limits vary with species. The necessary coupons for transporting or shipping pheasants are a part of the nonresident license. To legally transport upland species other than pheasant, the nonresident hunter must obtain special coupons—issued free of charge by a game warden.

As in other States, most of the annual pheasant kill is made during the first week of the season. Nearly all the nonresidents hunt then. As a rule, the weather is clear, with frosty mornings and Indian-summer afternoons.

By the end of the season usually only the specialists are afield, but most of them still take limits. A carryover of surplus cockbirds is the rule.

FEW DOGS USED

Few resident hunters use dogs, although good retrievers are always desirable to bring in running cripples, otherwise lost. A popular method is to "drive" a grain stubble, cornfield, or soilbank acreage. A line of guns pushes the birds toward standers on the opposite end of the field. This can yield big kills. South Dakota law prohibits more than 12 guns working as a group.

A small group may work small cover areas such as swales, weed patches, willow thickets, shelterbelts, and trashy fence lines.

The State also offers excellent sharptailed grouse shooting. It is one of the few States that still permits shooting the famous pinnated grouse (prairie chicken), the game bird so plentiful in territorial days that its numbers seemed inexhaustible.

These prairie grouse have habitats so similar that where you find one variety you are likely to find the other. The sharptail tends to favor brushy draws and creek bottoms more than the prairie chicken does. Both like wheat stubbles and cornfields; thus the grasslands near such fields usually offer the highest potential. It is best to take the wooded draws during midday, then the grass and fields during late afternoon.

The main grouse range is west of the Missouri River. East of the river it is restricted to the Missouri Hills, a tier of north-central counties along the east bank of the river.

Fall bird densities depend to a large extent on summer conditions. Drought means short grass cover and, in turn, above-normal mortality among the grouse chicks. Conversely, adequate summer rainfall produces good grass growth which favors hatch survival.

The sharptail is by far the more numerous. The hunting seasons, however, are the same and the bag may consist of either species or a combination. Opening is regularly in mid-September. In recent

years there has been a split season, the second session beginning in October and overlapping the pheasant season. This makes it possible for nonresident pheasant hunters to hunt sharptails and prairie chickens also.

There was a ruffed grouse season in several counties in the Black Hills during 1959. This marked the first legal hunting of ruffed grouse in many years.

A fourth grouse species, the sage hen, inhabits the extreme northwestern prairies—the easternmost limit of the bird's range. This is strictly a wilderness species noted for its ability to survive long periods without water and to subsist chiefly on sagebrush leaves if necessary. Mature sage grouse average 5 to 6 pounds; young-of-the-year have the weight of a cock pheasant.

Sage grouse hunting in South Dakota is not an annual affair. There were seasons in 1945 and 1955, and again in 1959 when, in mid-August, Harding County was opened to shooting for 4 afternoons with a bag and possession limit of two birds.

HUNGARIAN PARTRIDGE

A second introduced game bird has been providing shooting for several years. This is the Hungarian partridge, a native of Europe.

Unlike the ring-necked pheasant, the Hun is monogamous and notably prolific. It has been said that under favorable conditions a pair of these partridge may raise up to 40 young each year.

Introduction of the Hun, probably prompted by successes in Canada, began in South Dakota in 1923. By 1941 the State had expended approximately $33,000 for 3,000 pairs which were released in various areas. The first open season was held in 1938 in the hilly northeastern counties of Marshall and Roberts. The partridges there are bagged incidental to pheasant hunting. The main partridge area is now the extreme north center of the State.

West of the Missouri River the Hun ranges the same kind of habitat as the sharp-tailed grouse, and the seasons there are the same. East of the Missouri the partridge season is concurrent with the early part of the pheasant season.

Attempts to establish a third exotic species, the chukar partridge, have thus far met with no success. The most recent was made in the spring of 1960 when 150 chukars were released in the rugged Cave Hills of the far northwestern corner of the State. Hunters and biologists are optimistic about this stocking, since the habitat of the area closely corresponds to the chukar's original home.

Newspaper records of pioneer times indicate that quail were then numerous enough on river bottom lands to provide some shooting, principally in southeastern and south-central areas. It was only recently, however, that the legislature placed the quail on the game bird list, and the first open season in the State's history of game management was held during the fall of 1959.

South Dakota has little future as a quail State; its winter weather is too severe. But from time to time huntable numbers do build up after a series of mild winters, mainly in the seven extreme southeastern counties. Rather than permitting these birds to fall prey to deep snows and subzero temperatures, hunters will now have the opportunity to harvest them.

MOURNING DOVE PROTECTED

Most resident shotgunners agree that there is only one thing lacking in South Dakota's upland picture—the mourning dove is still classed as a songbird. The State contributes substantially to the annual dove crop. Doves nest in large numbers in the eastern half of the State with its many farm woodlots and shelterbelts, and most of them bring off at least two broods. Heavy migrations from more northern breeding areas move through in early autumn.

Further information on South Dakota hunting regulations may be obtained from the department of game, fish, and parks, Pierre, S. Dak.

Support of the Navy FRAM Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement I have presented to the Defense Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations in the House of Representatives in support of the Navy FRAM program. The statement follows:

The continuing crisis in Cuba has again made us aware of the importance of the U.S. Navy in protecting vital American interests. Yet, the material condition and readiness of that navy, upon which we are so dependent, leaves a great deal to be desired. Indeed, as far back as 1958, the Blewett committee reported that "the U.S. fleet is not in an acceptable state of readiness; for the fleet of a leading naval power, its material condition is deplorable."

This situation is not the fault of the Navy which has been struggling for years with ships and equipment that are old, worn, and weary. The fault lies, rather, with our unwillingness to appropriate adequate funds for necessary periodic maintenance and overhaul of existing vessels and for construction of new ships.

Our failure to replace aging ships is resulting in a navy which is fast becoming obsolescent. The Blewett committee reported that 85 percent of the ships in the combat fleet in 1958 were more than 10 years old. At our present rate of new ship construction, by the end of 1963 more than two-thirds of our combat fleet will still be over 10 years old. Hulls are weakened. Machinery breaks down too frequently. Spaces are inadequate for new needs. Weapons are outdated. And the morale of our servicemen is affected accordingly.

The normal problems of obsolescence have been greatly intensified by the relentless operation of these ships over the past few years. Through a combination of inadequate funds for maintenance and almost uninterrupted operations, our ships have been badly worn out. An automobile must be tuned occasionally. It must be sent to the garage for preventive maintenance from time to time. There has been little or no opportunity to do this with our aging Navy. The effect was demonstrated by a survey of 170 ships which showed 61½ percent of them to be in unsatisfactory condition; i.e., unable to carry out the operational functions for which they were designed.

To meet these problems, the Navy has formulated the FRAM program—a program of fleet rehabilitation and maintenance which is designed to give added periods of effective service to existing ships through extensive modernization and overhaul. This work, carried on primarily in our naval shipyards, involves the rehabilitation of hull and machinery, modernization of weapons, and installation of the latest combat equipment.

However, even this essential and economical program was slashed by the previous administration. Originally, the Navy proposed to modernize 67 surface ships in fiscal year 1962. This was cut by about one-half to 35. President Kennedy has asked the Congress for funds sufficient to increase this number to 45. For less than $24 million we can change into modern fighting ships 10 tired World War II ships inadequate for today's task and subject to frequent breakdowns. This increase in the FRAM program would also serve to maintain the work level at naval shipyards like the Brooklyn yard where fluctuations present a recurring threat to the jobs of workers.

FRAM is not a permanent substitute for new construction, but it is a proven way to get 5 to 8 years of additional effective service to ships which would otherwise be virtually useless. Properly programed, it is also a way to spread out the obsolescence of our ships. This will make it possible for us to avoid in the future the situation created today by the block obsolescence of World War II ships.

To meet the overwhelming burdens and responsibilities created by crises in Laos, Cuba, and in the Congo, the Navy must have effective, modern ships to do the job. The issue is not whether we can afford $23.7 million in fiscal year 1962 for the FRAM program. The issue is whether we can afford not to have the modernized ships it would give us. I unqualifiedly support the President's request for these additional funds.

Address of Maj. Gen. James T. Cantwell, Chief of Staff, New Jersey Department of Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure last Sunday to participate in the 30th annual Americanization Day celebration sponsored by the Captain C. E. Fisk Post, Veterans of Foreign Wars, of Jersey City, N.J.

This event is traditionally organized by the Captain Fisk Post, which is well known throughout New Jersey for its leadership in patriotic endeavors.

The celebration began with a stirring parade, in which patriotic groups from all parts of the State and elsewhere participated. It culminated with a parade review in Pershing Field, where a number of community leaders paid tribute to the parading units and to the ideals which they honored that afternoon.

I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues the remarks which Maj. Gen. James F. Cantwell, Chief of Staff, New Jersey Department of Defense, and Rear Adm. Frederick L. Hetter, commanding officer, Naval Supply Depot, Bayonne, N.J., made on that occasion.

ADDRESS OF MAJ. GEN. JAMES F. CANTWELL, CHIEF OF STAFF, NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS, AMERICANIZATION DAY OBSERVANCE, JERSEY CITY, N.J., APRIL 30, 1961

From time to time it is well for us to pause and reconsider those things which, in the past, have made America a great country. We can therefore, be thankful that an organization such as the Veterans of Foreign Wars reminds us each year to think about these things.

We are sometimes prone to get carried away by our daily activities and the rush of

events, and forget that there are higher values in our lives. And we forget too, that these values must be cared for or we will lose them. As has been said so often and so well, "Vigilance is the price of liberty."

We know that today two ideologies stand face to face; each waiting for the other to fall before it. On the one side is the democratic ideal of individual freedom sustained by a government of laws. On the other, the totalitarian and godless political and economic system which we identify with the name of "communism."

We of the free world have made every effort, in good conscience, to live in peace with the Communist world. We have made mistakes in our dealings with that world. But, believe me, our mistakes were due largely to our good will. But also, and this is very important, neither have we understood the true nature of the Communist system. Especially, we have not understood that communism has never changed and will never change its ultimate objective, which is to remake the world into one Communist state.

Forty-two years ago Lenin said that Communist and Democratic countries could not exist side by side. One or the other must be overcome. He then put forth a plan for world revolution which to this very day has not changed in its basic objectives.

It is to this plan for world conquest that we can trace most of the troubles occurring in the new nations of Africa and Asia and the Caribbean.

While it is true that the appearance of communism seems to change almost from day to day, its substance does not change.

Communist leaders have said clearly enough that they will do anything to further their cause, even to making a show of friendship to democracy. They change their tactics to meet changing situations, they call for peaceful coexistence, they make friendly gestures. But we must not be fooled. Communism does not change; it cannot change without destroying itself. And the objective remains to conquer the whole world; by any means available.

We find subversion and Communist Parties in all countries. We find that these are controlled from Moscow. We find communism infiltrated into labor and industry, education, communications media, armed services and government, and, eventually, we see the attempt to destroy constitutional liberties.

These things have been accomplished successfully in many countries in Europe, Asia, and South America. We may rest assured that the Government and people of the United States are no less a target. Let us not forget that they promised to bury us.

As long as we remember these things we can hope to remain unconquered and free.

However, knowledge and the determination to resist the Communist ideology are only the necessary starting point. We must give deep and careful consideration to the fact that Russia and her satellites are strongly armed with the most modern weapons of war; that the economy of these nations is directed primarily to building up and maintaining armies, navies, and air forces.

At the present time they do not choose to use all-out war to extend their conquest of the world. They are doing well enough through subversion, infiltration, and localized fighting such as we have presently in Laos.

There is a good reason for this choice. The United States is too strong for them to attempt an all-out war. The odds are still not entirely in their favor.

It is self-evident that the people of the United States are a peaceloving people. We have extended the hand of friendship to all nations—even our former enemies—and still extend it.

You will pardon me if, with some pride, I declare that the men and women of the Armed Forces are doing more than any other segment of the American people to maintain the peace. I know that theirs is a constant endeavor toward this end. I know of no one in uniform who desires to achieve national objectives by means of war.

As I indicated a moment ago, the cold war continues cold because America and the free nations cannot be safely attacked—they are too strong right now.

The lesson is obvious. We must maintain our Armed Forces at a peak of strength and efficiency, armed with the latest and best in weapons systems and backed by a trained and ready Reserve, until the normal and peaceful methods of diplomacy can attain a reasonable degree of lasting peace and security among nations.

So long as the Communist bloc of nations, under the leadership of Moscow, maintain their policies of hate and their belligerent attitudes toward the free world, so long as subversion and infiltration threaten our liberties, so long must we maintain strong military forces in being.

But, military strength alone is not sufficient. Indeed it can lead to a dangerous state of complacency. How well we remember France's maginot line. It could not be breached, it was impregnable, it was to be the salvation of France.

It was breached however, and overrun, and France fell to a conqueror because that military might was not backed by people who wanted freedom hard enough to sacrifice for it. They left their defenses to a wall of concrete and metal and to soldiers who had neither inspiration nor will to fight. And the same will happen to any military force not backed by the spiritual and moral strength of the people.

This is the lesson of the Americanization observance of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. It reminds us that we have responsibilities which we cannot throw off to someone else. It reminds us that the enemy we face is fighting God and the goodness of His creation.

There is nothing new or radical in this observance. It serves to recall to our minds our national heritage of fraternal good will and dependency on God and that there are values above the personal, the material and the economic, which we call morality, patriotism, dedication to principle.

Our Founding Fathers knew this. They established this "Nation under God" and they acknowledged that our rights come from Him and not from a government or political ideology.

As a member of the Armed Forces, I can give you but one thought to carry with you. Our soldiers and sailors and airmen cannot be stronger than the people from whom they are drawn. If the people are strong in their convictions, individually and collectively, the Armed Forces will be strong, too. The strength of weapons united to the strength of character in each individual will maintain our country free, and, with her, the people of all other nations who want and appreciate freedom and peace.

Thank you.

ADDRESS OF REAR ADM. FREDERICK L. HETTER, S.C., U.S. NAVY, COMMANDING OFFICER, NAVAL SUPPLY DEPOT, BAYONNE, N.J.

It is always a pleasure to join in the observance of Americanization Day.

When you think of it, you realize that we are all honoring our forefathers. The original inhabitants of this country were the Indians. All others are either immigrants, the sons and daughters of immigrants or descendants of immigrants.

If you give a lot of thought to the matter, you will realize that this country is so great simply because of immigrants.

It takes a considerable amount of determination, courage and character for an individual or a family to leave the land of its birth, and set out across the ocean for a strange country where the people speak a different language.

These people were strong. They were not content to ride along on the tide in their native lands. They knew what they wanted, and went after it despite knowing that the road would be very rough.

Youngsters growing up today in America are in about the same position as their immigrant forefathers, except in a different line.

Our country is being challenged daily by a foreign power that regiments its schoolchildren. Courses of study are set up and the children must apply themselves. In that way, the state plans years ahead on the number of physicists it will have, the number of chemists, engineers, and others.

Perhaps some of the chemistry students would rather be studying engineering. But they have no choice.

Here things are different. A boy or a girl can become almost anything that they wish if they try hard enough. It is easy for a youngster to quit before he starts. There are many excuses available: not enough money at home; no time for study; difficulties of gaining entrance to schools, and many more.

But these are just excuses. They are not valid reasons why any youngster must miss out on a good education.

If you want an education strongly enough you will get it.

Your forebears could have stayed in their native lands. They could have found suitable excuses for staying. But they were not looking for excuses. They wanted to live in a free country where an individual's only limit was himself.

That is why this country is so great. We got the best.

It is now the duty of the descendants of these great immigrants to make themselves the best in the world.

We live in an age of science, space travel, automation.

I am sure that a very high percentage of our grammar school pupils would like to work on rockets and missiles. This requires a scientific background.

But I wonder how many of them are willing to put in the many hard hours of study in mathematics, physics, and related subjects. Much of this study is drudgery. But it is necessary. It is the foundation of careers that are adventurous and fascinating.

Do you youngsters have the determination to plow through the difficult and dull? Do they want to be leaders?

I know that most of our young people are interested in space travel. That evidence is too well publicized to be missed. A glance into the front window of a toy shop shows that interest in space starts very early. Also, high school science fairs produce more exhibits connected with space than most other fields.

These facts prove that our younger people have the interest. The important thing is: Do they have the determination?

We need trained minds to keep this country great. It is the duty of our younger generations to improve themselves. Make themselves the best anywhere. In doing this they carry on the noble example of their courageous predecessors, many of whom arrived with all their possessions carried in a paper bag.

They may have arrived steerage class, but they have been first class ever since.

Let's all travel first class.

Buffalo Evening News Reporter Ed May Wins 1960 Pulitzer Prize

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that a member of the staff of the Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N.Y., has won a Pulitzer Prize.

I would like to insert in the RECORD the following editorial and article that appeared in the May 2, 1961, issue of the Buffalo Evening News:

PULITZER FOR ED MAY

Once again we have the pleasant opportunity to congratulate a fellow member of the News staff on the receipt of a Pulitzer Prize. Three years ago Bruce Shanks won the prize for editorial cartoons. Now Reporter Ed May has received an award for local reporting.

Mr. May's winning articles, "Our Costly Dilemma," represented as penetrating a study of public welfare problems as was ever attempted by an American newspaper. They were the product of 6 months of research and reporting, including 3 months' service by Mr. May as a caseworker for the Erie County Welfare Department.

The outstanding merit of "Our Costly Dilemma" won instant acclaim here and elsewhere in the Nation. The series triggered a comprehensive reform program that is still underway—and still bringing beneficial results—in the Erie County department. Other newspapers carried the articles through the Associated Press. The News has complied with hundreds of requests from welfare authorities and others for reprints. The series' findings and conclusions have had an impact and an influence on public welfare throughout New York State and beyond it to other parts of the country.

The Pulitzer Prizes have served for nearly half a century as a measure of merit for creative and cultural contributions in many fields. For newspapermen everywhere they are especially significant as a yardstick of journalistic skill, enterprise, and devotion to public service. We are proud of the professional craftsmanship and energy that has earned for Mr. May his richly deserved honor and has brought to the News, and all who contribute to its quality, the happy distinction of two Pulitzer Prizes within the brief space of 3 years.

NEWS REPORTER ED MAY WINS 1960 PULITZER PRIZE—SECOND MEMBER OF STAFF IN 3 YEARS HONORED—WROTE SERIES OF ARTICLES ON WELFARE PROBLEM

A 1960 Pulitzer Prize for excellence in journalism has been awarded to Edgar May, Buffalo Evening News general assignment reporter.

The award, announced Monday, was for local reporting and is in recognition of Mr. May's work on a critical series of articles on the public welfare program in Erie County and New York State.

It marks the second time in 5 years a member of the Buffalo Evening News staff has won a Pulitzer prize—most coveted honor in journalism.

Bruce M. Shanks, News editorial page cartoonist, won a Pulitzer Prize for 1957. His cartoon, "The Thinker," was published on August 20 of that year. The cartoon pointed up the problem of labor racketeering.

Mr. May's articles were published in the News last summer under the series title, "Our Costly Dilemma."

WAS UNDERCOVER MAN

The 31-year-old reporter, who joined the News staff April 7, 1958, served as an undercover man to do the basic research that made the welfare series possible. He ostensibly left the News staff and took a job as a caseworker for the Erie County Department of Social Welfare.

Using his personal experience as a caseworker and facts uncovered during 6 months of research by News staffs in Buffalo and its Albany and Washington bureaus, Mr. May also interviewed recognized welfare authorities and made a careful study of private surveys of welfare agencies of the State.

The purpose of the series was announced at the outset as being to direct community thinking toward shortcomings of the welfare system and generate a grassroots demand that welfare be confined to the needy and dispensed with greater concern for the taxpayer.

NEWS CITED BY AP

That it achieved this purpose was evident even before the final article in the series was published.

Schools giving courses in social welfare and the welfare departments of various political subdivisions as far away as Texas requested reprints of the articles, which were made available by the News in convenient form.

The Associated Press awarded a citation to the News for making available for general distribution a five-part condensation of the series and praised the thoughtful, probing stories that won prominent display in newspapers throughout the State.

Letters praising the series were received from editors, State legislators, welfare officials and workers and from citizens in all parts of the State.

STUDIED BY COMMISSIONER

They contained such phrases as "a splendid job; a fine piece of work; admirable thoroughness; purposeful job of reporting; real public service; well documented and very revealing; outstanding service in presenting in an unbiased manner so many facets of this problem."

The Erie County citizens welfare advisory committee noted that the articles had been of great value to it because of factual content and practical presentation.

After a careful study of the articles, Erie County welfare commissioner Paul F. Burke submitted to the county board of social welfare a comprehensive 34-point plan for operation of his department.

CASELOAD DROPPED

Subsequently more caseworkers were added to the departmental staff, salaries were increased in amounts up to $300, and there was a general awakening of public interest in the welfare operations.

Although the series was not directed in the first instance at fraud, more vigorous prosecution of cases of welfare fraud and a general tightening of regulations were collateral results of the series. The welfare caseload dropped to th lowest point in 2 years.

Mr. May was born in Zurich, Switzerland. He was graduated from Northwestern University with the degree of bachelor of science, journalism, in 1957. Previously he had worked as a reporter on the Bellows Falls, Vt., Weekly Times and the Fitchburg, Mass., Sentinel.

WON PREVIOUS AWARDS

He served 6 months in the infantry and 18 months in the Public Information Office of 5th Army Headquarters, Chicago, 1953–55. He is a member of the American Newspaper Guild and Kappa Tau Alpha, journalism honorary society.

In 1951, Mr. May won an award from the New England Weekly Press Association for the best feature story. In the following year, he won from the same organization awards for the best news story and the second best news feature.

As acting editor of the Bellows Weekly Times in 1952, he received an award for the best weekly paper in New England. In 1959 he won the Walter O. Bingham Award of the Buffalo Newspaper Guild.

His mother is Mrs. Renee May of Pittsfield, Mass. A sister, Mrs. Arthur Kunin, lives in Burlington, Vt.

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I request that the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

HENRY REGNERY CO.,
Chicago, Ill., April 26, 1961.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I understand that you have introduced a resolution creating a special House Committee on Captive Nations. As chairman of the Chicago Committee for Captive Nations Week, may I commend you for introducing this legislation, and take this opportunity to express the hope that the committee is established.

It seems to me to be clear that our best allies are the people of the captive nations, and that the best way to bring this fact home to the American people, and to let

the captive peoples know that they have not been forgotten is through such a committee as you have proposed.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY REGNERY,
President.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, ELMIRA BRANCH,
Horseheads, N.Y., March 25, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Elmira branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America wishes to congratulate you on your move in introducing the resolution calling for the establishment of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

These nations constitute a perennial weakness in the Soviet Union. It is to our advantage to know these weaknesses and work to multiply them.

We are writing our Congressman and Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING asking them to support your resolution.

Very sincerely yours,

WALTER PETRIWSKY,
Chairman.

BYELORUSSIAN-AMERICAN ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Hawthorne, Calif., April 26, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
U.S. House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The membership of this organization and myself wish to express our wholehearted support for your proposal to form a House of Representatives Committee on Captive Nations which we consider to be a right step in dramatizing the situation of national slavery and colonial oppression and exploitation of the various peoples under Soviet domination. We believe that the committee will serve a good purpose by collecting and presenting to the American people and the whole of mankind the abundant evidence that the Soviet Union is practicing the crudest kind of colonialism in regard to all non-Russian peoples of the Soviet empire and the satellite countries.

Our reasons for supporting the proposal are as follows:

1. While the West is breaking up empires, giving freedom to more and more peoples, th Russian Communists are building one, reaching out for more and more, right to our doorstep.

2. While posing themselves as champions of all colonial and semicolonial peoples under Western domination and hypocritically preaching freedom and self-determination for these peoples, the Russian Communists are hard at work in trying to deprive the non-Russian peoples of the Soviet empire, which became victims of Russian imperialist conquests, of their national identities and finally to wipe them off the map as national entities.

3. While accusing this country of warmongering and imperialism, Khrushchev shamelessly calls for "liberational wars" and claims the right for the Soviet Union to assist (and stir up, of course) any uprising anywhere in the world, which might advance supremacy of Russian communism.

This country, unfortunately, has not come up with a solution for stemming this Russian tide. The Congress made a good start in 1959 by passing a resolution Captive Nations Week. Khrushchev's reaction to this resolution has showed that the captive nations are a weak and vulnerable spot in the structure of the Soviet empire. (Captive nations are a weak spot in any empire; that is what causes empires to disintegrate as history has proved it so many times.) But Western cold war strategists, for some obscure reasons, refuse to exploit this Soviet weakness. By exposing the Soviets for what they are, much of the wind will be taken out of the Soviet sails. The proposed committee could do a lot in this direction.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH P. ARCIUCH,
President.

CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF UKRAINIAN ORGANIZATION,
Brooklyn, N.Y.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Our organization wishes to congratulate you on your bold and farsighted move in introducing the resolution calling for the establishment of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. Needless to say, such a committee is long overdue. One of the greatest problems confronting our Nation today is the Soviet Union, a prison house of many nations and peoples. These nations are ever eager and wanting to escape Soviet Russian slavery and despotism.

A committee on the Captive Nations would serve as a reservoir of information and data on the various enslaved nations in the U.S.S.R., which information could be made available to the U.S. Government and its various agencies. Its main function, however, would be to inform the American people and the world at large on the state of affairs behind the Iron Curtain and assist the Government in formulating its policies with respect to the captive nations. We are writing our Congressman, Mr. ANFUSO, asking him to support your resolution.

Respectfully yours,

PETER DUBORVEKI,
President.

JOHN MAKAR,
Secretary.

APRIL 25, 1961.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: I have recently noticed that your resolution, House Resolution 211, which calls for the creation of a Captive Nations Committee, is presently before the Rules Committee. I wish to express my full support of this resolution.

I believe your resolution is a step in the right direction in overcoming the evils of communism and helping the captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain. I believe this resolution will have the full support of the American people.

Sincerely,

JAMES L. MANLEY.

AMERICAN-UKRAINIAN CITIZENS CLUB,
Stamford, Conn., April 12, 1961.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Our organization, the American-Ukrainian Citizens Club of Stamford, Conn., wishes to express our congratulations to you. We are glad to know that you were farsighted and bold enough to introduce the resolution for the establishment of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. We hope that this resolution will be acted upon due to your efforts.

We believe that such a committee would do much for all freedom-loving people that are enslaved, especially those behind the Iron Curtain. This committee would also help to keep Americans informed of the plight of these people and countries.

Again you are to be congratulated on your farsightedness and wish you luck with it. We are writing our Congressman SIBAL, expressing our views and asking for his support of this resolution.

Very truly yours,

——— ———.

MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY,
Milwaukee, Wis., April 26, 1961.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: The Slavic Institute of Marquette University wholeheartedly endorses House Resolution 211 dealing with the establishment of a special Committee on the Captive Nations.

Our institute has championed the cause of the captive nations since its organization 11 years ago and feels honored that the idea has been dignified by your resolution.

We hope that the bill will meet with the unanimous approval of the House of Representatives.

Very sincerely yours,

ROMAN SMAL-STOCKI,
Director.

ALFRED J. SOKOLNICKI,
Secretary.

UKRAINIAN NATIONAL HOME,
Willimantic, Conn., March 29, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: The members of the Ukrainian National Home of Willimantic, Conn., in the name of their president, wish to congratulate you on your presentation of a resolution to the House of Representatives, calling for the establishment of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations.

A Committee on the Captive Nations would furnish basic information and data on the various nations in the U.S.S.R. It would inform the world at large and the American people on the state of affairs behind the Iron Curtain and aid the Government in forming its policies with respect to these nations.

We are writing to the State of Connecticut's own Congressman KOWALSKI, asking him to support your resolution.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH RUDKO,
President.

BYELORUSSIAN-AMERICAN ASSOCIATION, INC.,
New Brunswick, N.J., April 24, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: On behalf of the Byelorussian-American Association in New Jersey I wish to express sincere congratulations on your introduction of the resolution for the establishment of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

The Soviet Union's goal is to dominate the world, and Americans shall know it because Soviet Russia has become a great imperialist peril which threatens all free nations and particularly our country—the United States of America.

Your resolution to create a committee is a great step in the right direction. It would serve as an information center on the enslaved peoples in the U.S.S.R. Our Government needs this information in making proper policies with respect to the captive nations and with respect to the security of the United States.

With personal regards and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

SERGIS HUTYRCZYK,
President.

WILLIMANTIC, CONN., *April 3, 1961.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Our organization, the Ukrainian Youth Association of Willimantic, Conn., wish to congratulate

you on your introducing the resolution calling for the establishment of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

We have also contacted our Congressman, Mr. KOWALSKI by letter, and asked him to support your resolution.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE TUSKEWICZ,
President.

A Look at John Birch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, many news sources have not objectively reported the facts concerning the John Birch Society. As a member of the society, I am anxious that it receive a fair and just hearing before the American public. I think the following editorial from the San Marino Tribune, the leading newspaper of San Marino, Calif., will interest those among us who want to know the truth about the society. Under unanimous consent, I insert this editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD:

A LOOK AT JOHN BIRCH

Why is it that partriotism is put on the defensive in the eyes of good Americans? Why do Americans question the motives or tactics of those whose only objective is the scourging of Communist influence from the American scene? Who turns American against American when the success of world-wide communism is concerned?

Is this attack on patriotism foreshadowing the day when patriots will be called conspirators against their own government, and placed under some sort of custody?

In every country where communism has taken over, the patriots were first considered controversial and later banded as conspirators against their government as it fell under the control of Reds. It happened in Cuba, which isn't very far away, and it could happen in America.

A favorite and effective tactic is to aim a smear campaign at anyone who is anti-Communist—discredit his political stand by lies or distortions, and destroy him by public censure. Those who use this tactic never answer this man's initial charges, nor do they ever replace him with another effective anti-Communist program. Their program is to smear and destroy.

The John Birch Society is getting a healthy start throughout the Southland and throughout the foothills. A program of positive, patriotic action, it has already attracted the usual smear. Some people who who have never tried to oppose the Communist threat, and some who have never recognized the Communist threat that now stands at their doorstep, are trying to discredit this group without knowing of its intents, its purposes, its methods. Some of them are becoming the unthinking tools of forces who oppose the John Birch movement because it is anti-Communist—a sobering thought.

The John Birch Society is a challenge to Americans. It shows them through films and speeches what the advance of communism has been. It recalls to their minds what they already knew but have forgotten—the events of recent history that have led America to the brink of disaster. It invites Americans to join in an effort to turn the tide.

There is no coercion in this movement; there couldn't be.

There are two forces operating in our world today, capitalism and communism. The John Birch Society is on the side of capitalism. It is frankly pro-American, pro-capitalist, and anti-Communist. There isn't the slightest doubt of its position. Lined up against the society and others like it are the Communists, the pro-Communists, the "do-nothings," the "let's-don't-rock-the-boaters," the "surrender is better than death" tub thumpers, and the anti-anti-Communists. This is quite a group; its program for anti-Communist action is no action at all; their syllabus could have been written by Lenin.

The John Birch Society has one more theory that its detractors refuse to recognize: They feel that the ordinary American has enough sense to make up his own mind.

Before you allow yourself to be stampeded by the critics, investigate the John Birch Society. A growing number of Americans have done so, and a growing number have joined its movement toward fundamental American constitutional government. The fact that they are under fire, is proof of their effectiveness.

Crop of Confusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include an editorial published in the April 18 issue of the Burlington (N.C.) Daily Times-News.

This editorial indicates that the activities of the Department of Agriculture are not escaping attention of the folks down home:

CROP OF CONFUSION

President Kennedy remarked the other day that he hoped farmers would join up with his new voluntary feed grain plan, thus assuring themselves of a good support price and enabling the Government to save money on the farm program.

But the Department of Agriculture isn't content merely to hope that farmers will volunteer. The Commodity Credit Corporation (a Government arm) has been busily dumping corn on the market to drive the price down and frighten farmers into volunteering. This brought about "the sharpest March decline in 13 years," the Wall Street Journal reported.

Thus the farmer is warned to sign up for supports at $1.20 and for acreage curtailment or try to survive in a market where the CCC has proved it can keep the price of corn down around $1.05.

Already, about 80 percent of Illinois farmers and about 60 percent of Iowa farmers have seen the handwriting on the crib wall and signed. What else could they do?

But how about the second part of the administration plan—reducing the cost of the farm program to the Government?

The administration's March revision of the budget ups the spending of the Agriculture Department by $658 million—the largest increase outside the Defense Department.

Meanwhile, the National Farmers Organization is in the midst of a drive to hold cattle off the market to drive prices up, and it claims some success.

If the meatpackers were to do the same thing, they'd be in line for prosecution under the antitrust laws.

Those who profess to see silver linings in the cloudy farm policy picture today must be overlooking some of the realities.

Poland's Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, it was my intention that these remarks commemorating Poland's Constitution Day be included in the RECORD on the appropriate anniversary day which was yesterday, May 3. Unfortunately, I was called away from the floor before I had an opportunity to include them. It does not lessen my appreciation of Poland's continual fight for freedom.

In the lives of all nations there is always one day that more than any other symbolizes the national spirit. For Poland it is her Constitution Day, celebrated on May 3 for 170 years this year.

Poland's Constitution Day commemorates the Constitution of 1791. In that year Poland made a great, almost convulsive effort to free herself from an outmoded political and social system. The "4 years' sejm" or Parliament, led by men of great force of character and capacity, adopted the Constitution we celebrate today. It converted Poland into a limited constitutional monarchy, with ministerial responsibility and biennial parliaments. Invidious class distinctions were abolished. The humble townsman might now own land, or enter the ranks of state or church, privileges formerly open only to the gentry. The protection of law was extended to the peasants, and serfdom was mitigated with a view to its eventual abolition. Absolute religious toleration was proclaimed, and provisions for periodical reform by subsequent parliaments were also embodied in this Constitution.

But this most liberal and progressive document was to be short lived. Some magnates who could not accept the new order of things sought Russian assistance, and Catherine the Great was only too happy to oblige. Prussia, a supposed ally, left Poland in the lurch. Betrayed but not broken, the tiny Polish Army put up a spirited resistance, but eventually the struggle was lost, and the second partition of Poland took place.

But neither that partition nor the subsequent travails through which Poland was to pass have ever been able to kill the spirit of liberty which lives in Polish hearts. That historic truth is being rediscovered by Poland's Communist masters today. Poland's Government may be 100 percent Communist, Poland's people are not. Poland's Government may adopt policies hostile to the United States, but Poland's people are friendly.

Indeed, if a free plebiscite were to be held today can there be any doubt that Poland would opt for the West?

To keep this spirit of liberty alive it is only fitting that we in the United States should commemorate this great anniversary of Polish freedom, and take this occasion for renewed expression of our faith that Poland will once again be free.

Loyalty Day, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very interesting editorial which appeared in the National Tribune, Stars and Stripes issue of May 4, 1961.

LOYALTY DAY, 1961

A number of years ago the Veterans of Foreign Wars conceived the idea of designating May 1 as Loyalty Day. The idea was to counteract the blatant propaganda put forth by the Communists around the globe on that particular day.

So, over the years Loyalty Day has been one of consecration to democratic principles which are so much a part of American life. It provides an opportunity for Americans to rededicate themselves to the democratic ideals set up by the founders of this Nation 185 years ago.

Loyalty Day serves a high and useful purpose. In its promotion of the idea the VFW adopted this slogan, "Loyalty, Our First Line of Defense." It proceeded on the premise that only through the loyalty and faithfulness of our citizens can this country retain not only its democratic ideals and principles but its position as a leader of the free world.

We are dutybound as citizens to counteract subversive influences and fight communist infiltration on every front. Ours is a land of many freedoms and it is ironic that traitorous Communists in this country were able to secure a substantial following because they took full advantage of the rights and liberties granted under the American Consttiution. Because of these privileges they were provided a chance to conspire against the Government which had given them an opportunity to express themselves without fear of reprisal.

We must impress upon our citizenry that they are a part and parcel of the greatest and most democratic government in the history of the world. The United States of America as a government is dedicated to personal and religious freedom regardless of creed, color or social station.

Democracy thrives upon full and complete knowledge and understanding. We must be strong in our determination to preserve our priceless heritage. It is worth an all-out effort on the part of every American to live up to the precious freedoms which thousands of men have laid down their lives to preserve.

In his definition of democracy, Abraham Lincoln once said, "As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master. This expresses my idea of democracy," and Lincoln added, "Whatever differs from this is no democracy."

Polish Constitution Day

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, 1791, just a short 2 years after the United States adopted its Constitution in 1789, the Polish Diet by unanimous and solemn vote enacted Free Poland's Constitution, kindling a flame of freedom that still burns brightly in the minds and hearts of a freedom-loving people.

Yesterday was the 170th anniversary of the Polish Constitution, and we rise in tribute to this anniversary and also to honor our Polish-American citizens who sense so deeply the blessings of a free land. For while the anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day finds that nation dominated by Communists, its people are still loyal to the ideals that initially whetted their appetite for independence and sovereignty.

Connecticut, my home State, and the Fifth District, which I represent, are privileged to have many fine citizens of Polish ancestry. I take pride in joining with friends and descendants of Poland, wherever they may be, in commemorating this day, because I can attest to the vital role they have played in the enrichment of my district, the State of Connecticut, and the Nation.

The best efforts of their Communist rulers have failed to destroy the spirit of the Polish people; nor have they been able to stamp out the characteristics of nationalism, religion, and love of personal liberty which have symbolized the Polish people since 1781.

These were attributes long recognized in men and women of Poland who won world renown and this Nation's admiration or gratitude for accomplishments in the military, scientific, medical, and musical fields they championed. I refer to Copernicus, Madam Curie, Chopin, Paderewski, John Sobieski, Casimir the Great, Kosciusko, and Pulaski. Poland has contributed enormously to the civilization and cultural heritage of the West. Our debt is great to Kosciusko and Pulaski, who contributed immeasurably to the achievement of our own independence.

Men who undertook the task to guide the Polish nation on the path of social progress belonged to the most enlightened brains of 18th-century Poland. They were inspired by the ideals of the American Declaration of Independence and influenced by the French proclamation of the rights of man and citizen. The principles laid down in the May 3 Constitution survived while Poland was struggling for independence and were referred to in the constitutional laws of the reborn Polish state after World War I. The present plight of Communist domination does but reaffirm the attachment of the Poles to their historic charter of 1791.

I hope that by these observances and commentaries we may bring inspiration and assurance to men and women who love liberty, that the yoke of oppression need not be eternal, and that, in the words contained in the Polish national anthem, "Poland is not lost forever, while our lives remain."

Government-Sponsored Security: You Can't Take It Or Leave It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, May 3, the Washington Daily News carried a Scripps-Howard article and an editorial on the sale by the Internal Revenue Service of the work animals of a Pennsylvania Amish farmer, a sale to permit the Government to recover unpaid taxes to provide for the old-age security of the individual. This farmer's present security—the animal power he needs to make his living—is taken from him to pay taxes for a program which he, and others of the Amish sect, wish not to participate in. In the name of welfare for this individual, this individual's welfare has been sacrificed.

To help return our social security system to a sound basis, I have offered a bill, H.R. 4817, to make it optional, allowing the individual to make arrangements for financing his retirement as he wishes, within certain qualifications to assure that the program will be sufficient. I offered this as an amendment to the recently passed Social Security Amendments in the Ways and Means Committee and, had it not been barred by a gag rule which I opposed, I would have offered it for the consideration of the House, so that it could work its will as promised by the leadership when the Rules Committee increase was voted.

I place this article and editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD under the unanimous consent of my colleagues:

AMISH FARMER REFUSES TO PAY—INTERNAL REVENUE AUCTIONS OFF THREE HORSES

PITTSBURGH, May 3.—The Federal Government auctioned off three horses belonging to a Pittsburgh area Amish farmer who refused to pay social security taxes because his religion forbids saving for old age.

Valentine Y. Byler owed $308 and his horses brought in $460.

Out of that $460, the Government will pay the back tax bill and expenses—insurance on the horses' lives, the cost of transporting them from the Byler farm at New Wilmington to the auction site, plus the bill for boarding them at a barn.

Mr. Byler will receive anything left over.

PURCHASED

Mark Andio, a Youngstown, Ohio, horse dealer, purchased Mr. Byler's three Belgian

work mares May 1 to climax the Government's attempt to collect social security taxes from the farmer.

The Internal Revenue Service, which is charged with collecting the tax, estimates there are more than 250 other Amish families in the same area who also are refusing to pay the levy.

The Amish sect is an offshoot of the Mennonites, the so-called plain people who emigrated to America in the late 1600's to escape religious persecution in Europe.

If anything even plainer and more fundamental than the Mennonites, the Amish believe the Bible and an enlightened conscience to be the final authority in all things.

The Amish farmers dress in either brown or blue work clothes, adopt beards once they are married, shun violence, keep to themselves and do all work in the fields with horses. Their religion also forbids the use of tractors as well as other mechanical aids.

SAME STEPS

W. K. Shaw, a regional IRS officer, intimated the Government may take the same step against other conscientious objectors to the payment of social security taxes.

This would be done even though Uncle Sam in effect is taking away an Amish farmer's means of earning a living when he seizes the farmer's horses since tractors can't be used.

An IRS district collection manager said Mr. Byler was singled out to have his horses sold "because he was one of the more aggressive, uncooperative taxpayers in my area."

The Government placed liens against Mr. Byler's horses in June 1959 and decided to proceed with the auction after subsequent negotiations failed to elicit payment.

THE STUPIDITY OF THE LAW

You don't have to go behind the Iron Curtain to find an example of heartless and inhuman use of the power of government against the individual citizen. You need go no farther than New Wilmington, Pa.

It was there that the power and the majesty of the Federal Government was invoked to show one Valentine Byler the necessity of conforming to the dictates of the Central Government.

Mr. Byler is a member of the Amish sect, a frugal, farming people who use horses instead of tractors.

Furthermore, their religion forbids them to make war or to accept anything from government. In case of need, they take care of their own.

Among other things the Amishman won't touch is the social security system. But the Government contends that, as self-employed farmers, they are obligated by a 1955 law to pay 4½ percent of their gross earnings into the social security fund, even if they never draw a nickel's worth of benefits—which no Amishman would do.

So the regional Internal Revenue Service selected Valentine Byler as the first candidate for punishment because he didn't pay his social security taxes. It seized three workhorses on a lien of $303. They were sold for $460, with the surplus above the lien, insurance and transportation costs to be turned back to Mr. Byler. Similar action is planned against other members of the Amish sect.

This action by IRS is in accord with the law. It is also nuts. There is room in this country for honest dissent and the law should be changed to provide for exceptions. It is obviously unjust that the Federal Government should seize the means of livelihood of these peaceful Amishmen in an effort to dragoon them into a forced welfare system—which, incidentally, they don't need. Amishmen know how to take care of themselves, both individually and as a group; an old-fashioned American trait antedating the so-called social security system.

Anti-Back-Door Spending Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, great progress is being made toward the elimination of the back-door spending device. By this, I mean information is reaching the public regarding the laxity of Congress in requiring justification for public expenditures. Likewise, the public is learning that the Representatives in the House are bypassing the provision for an annual review of all spending programs.

The progress I refer to is due to dissemination of information by organizations interested in sound fiscal procedures and also by newspapers that carry this message through their editorial columns.

A fine example, Mr. Speaker, of such an editorial appeared on May 2 in the Baltimore Sun, and under unanimous consent, I include this editorial following these brief remarks:

BACKDOOR SPENDING

One section of the depressed areas bill that the President signed yesterday has large constitutional implications. It is the part that provides a $300 million loan fund to be advanced directly from the Treasury without specific appropriation by the Congress. The loans would be made available for rehabilitating sagging factories, improving public services, in general for outlays increasing employment in the assisted areas. The purpose is all to the good, but the method of raising the money is well worth a second look.

Backdoor financing, to give this new practice the name invented by its critics, began before the New Deal. In Mr. Hoover's term the Reconstruction Finance Corporation—first large-scale government intervention to reverse economic downturns—was financed by direct drafts on the Treasury. The rationale then advanced, however, is not often heard today. In 1932 it was argued that since the RFC would make loans, and since loans are repayable, there would be no net expenditure of public money. So, in strict logic no congressional appropriation was necessary.

But as steady use erodes any loophole, so the backdoor financing loophole has been widened until the old limitation to repayable loans has long since declined. The Commodity Credit Corporation, for instance, is financed by backdoor access to the Treasury. True, the CCC poses as a bank advancing funds on farm produce deposited as collateral. But in fact the loans are payments and the so-called crop collateral is actually surplus purchased to hold up prices. Public money is spent—very conclusively spent—without detailed congressional appropriation. That some of the surplus may later be closed out at firesale prices does not alter the fiscal facts.

The main reason parliaments were invented in the first place was to impose taxpayers' control over what was done with tax money. The idea was that the people who paid the revenues would send representatives to the capital empowered to say how they could be spent. For various contemporary reasons there is a rising impatience with congressional control of the purse, and a notion that in fact various executive agencies know better how to dispose of public money than the elected representatives of the people who provide it. This is a notion which, if defensible at all, needs skeptical examination every time it is advanced.

Time To Stop Running to Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include an editorial published in the April 19 issue of the Observer-News Enterprise, of Newton, N.C.

This editorial should be required reading for those who are turning more and more to Washington for the solution of local problems. It clearly demonstrates what can be accomplished by the home folks if they use the initiative, resourcefulness, and determination practiced by their forefathers.

The editorial is as follows:

TIME TO STOP RUNNING TO WASHINGTON

One of the great, continuing issues of the time in this country has to do with the role the Government plays, or should play, in local problems and affairs. Without going into all the pros and cons involved, one thing can be said with certainty: "We now look to the Central Government for all manner of services and aids that were totally unknown a comparatively short time ago." And the cost of these has become staggering over the years.

It is argued that only the Federal Government has the resources to deal effectively with a lengthy list of local difficulties. And it is true that Washington has long provided aid and succor when disasters, such as floods and tornadoes, have struck various regions. However, in late times, local governments and local groups have turned almost automatically to Washington and to the Federal Treasury for troubles that are simply not in the disaster category and that, in a previous era, would have been dealt with at home.

The question, of course, is just how necessary Federal aid for certain purposes is—and whether or not the local community could solve most of the local problems if it only tried. A publication of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States casts a revealing light on the matter. It tells the story of Fort Smith, Ark., which, in 1959, became what is known as a depressed area.

Cause of the trouble was the closing of a major army base on the city's outskirts. The GI's who had spent freely disappeared. With them went a thousand civilian jobs. The area lost 6,000 of its population. Numbers of businesses went to the wall, and for sale and for rent signs appeared in hundreds of dwellings.

But Fort Smith did not go hat in hand to Washington for help. Instead, local leaders decided to do the needed job with local

energies and resources. The chamber of commerce was revitalized and given additional financing, and its industrial development program was completely overhauled. A 100-man committee was organized into teams to inventory the area's tangible assets.

Surveys were conducted to gather the material that would make Fort Smith attractive to prospective industry. It was shown that operating costs were lower than in many other places; that good municipal services were available at moderate tax cost; that the school system was excellent; that there was an abundance of the necessary natural resources; and so on down an impressive list. Then, whenever the opportunity presented itself, industrial location teams, armed with their inducements, pleaded their case before the executive officers of industries.

The program has been an outstanding success. Last year 1,188 new jobs came into being in the city—more than were lost when the army camp closed. The year also witnessed the coming of seven brandnew industries and 22 major industrial expansions, accounting for a capital expenditure of more than $18 million.

The chamber's report observes, "Disdaining any kind of Federal aid from Washington, Fort Smith's business leaders declare: 'We're a city on the move. There's no limit where we can go'." It seems only fair to say that many another community could do as much when trouble strikes, instead of asking Uncle Sam to take care of everything.

Polish Constitution Day

SPEECH
OF
HON. ANCHER NELSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the 170th anniversary of the Polish Constitution. The same spirit of democracy which the Polish people expressed in their constitution 170 years ago is the central theme of our American heritage and way of life, and this common dedication to the rights of man under God has been strengthened here in our country by the presence among us of the many thousands of American citizens of Polish origins.

The Polish people of the Second District in Minnesota are fine people, and I am happy that I can speak for them to bring their greetings to their fellow men throughout the United States in observance of the Polish Constitution Day. They are proud of their heritage and their common bonds with freedom-loving people all over the world, and their only regret is that they cannot look to their motherland as an independent nation enjoying its rightful place among the family of free and independent nations. Poland has been subjected to one invasion after another since the adoption of her republican constitution on May 3, 1791, and has not known the blessings of liberty except for a brief period of time between World Wars I and II.

It is amazing to me to realize that the spirit of the Polish Constitution still lives in the hearts and minds of the Polish people after these many long years of invasion and subjugation, and in a world torn today by the Communist-inspired cold war we can all take increased dedication to the cause of liberty from the inspirational example of the Polish people.

Some Merger Misgivings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. BATES
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, more and more, those of us who are interested in transportation are becoming concerned with the apparently unplanned or uncoordinated rash of rail mergers which are cropping up. We all want to have the best possible transportation system in this country over the next few years. This requires that rail mergers must be based on a comprehensive plan, not just thrown together for reasons of financial expediency.

In a recent issue of Trains, its editor, David P. Morgan, presented the views which many thoughtful observers of the railroad scene have been feeling. May I, therefore, call this editorial to the attention of our colleagues:

SOME MERGER MISGIVINGS

What follows is not intended for the aid and comfort of those who oppose all railroad mergers, per se. Indeed, it is precisely because mergers make sense that we are distressed at the industry's failure to follow St. Paul's injunction (1 Cor. 14: 40): "Let all things be done decently and in order." Instinct ought to warn us that some sort of ICC master consolidation plan is not the answer; there's too much Government in railroading as it is. But surely there should be a greater communion among the carriers themselves. There is scant evidence in the following items to indicate that the roads involved think of themselves as members of an interdependent industry:

The most critical area of U.S. railroading and hence the region in direct need of consolidation savings—New England—is without a merger plan. The roads there attempted and defaulted on a merger, mainly we gather because the various security holders involved could not decide which line would go bankrupt first. It is difficult to reconcile the fact that certain New England roads are home owned and others are controlled from Park Avenue or Montreal; and it's obvious that Alpert and McGinnis are beset with passenger woes that no longer bother Maine Central or Rutland. Still, some outsider is going to ask why the good merger patent medicine wasn't prescribed first for the patient nearest death; and what are we going to tell him?

The most obvious thing in 1961 railroad news is that the East is headed for a two-system map composed of (1) Pennsy and its satellites, and (2) everybody else. One unfortunate result is the ungentlemanly Jay Gould-like bidding for Baltimore & Ohio by Chesapeake & Ohio and New York Central. Another regrettable consequence is the plight of freshly merged Erie-Lackawanna, which wants no part of B. & O.-C. & O.-N.Y.C., yet discovers it isn't wanted in the Pennsy camp. (And for that matter, what of the famous and interdependent alphabet freight route which leaves tidewater over B. & O.-controlled Western Maryland, passes through independent middleman Pittsburgh & West Virginia, and winds up on Nickel Plate, which has agreed to merge with Pennsy-controlled N. & W.?) All this maneuvering may delight the financial editors but it proves little for railroad statesmanship and confirms our belief that the Eastern Railroad Presidents Conference should have put out the fire before it began when E.R.P.C. had a chance back in 1959.

Elsewhere: The bittersweet, on-again, off-again romance of Milwaukee and North Western continues to smolder, but assuming it catches fire, what then? Surely no final merger map will find these two comparatively weak grangers able to go it alone. The squabble over whether Santa Fe or S.P. gets Western Pacific is so delicate that neither buyer dares to ask for an outright merger, yet the implications are so profound that 2,000 miles distant we hear rumors that U.P. has bought up 8 percent of Rio Grande common. And there's Coast Line which quite naturally, if unrealistically, wants its cake and wants to eat it too; that is, it wishes to merge with parallel Seaboard without losing control of L. & N., a circumstance everyone in the South from G.M. & O. to Southern, finds intolerable.

Already the brotherhoods have decided to protest all mergers, per se; the Justice Department wants to sit in on the I.C.C. hearings; the Commission itself is beginning to narrow its eyes; and, expectedly, certain Congressmen are clearing their throats and oiling up their mimeograph machines. Which is to say that the railroads are going to have their hands full persuading the public of the validity of mergers without engaging in fisticuffs themselves over the issue.

Poland's Constitution Day

SPEECH
OF
HON. JESSICA McC. WEIS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, freedom is the great heritage of mankind. It is the foundation upon which this Republic of ours rests. We cherish the Declaration of Independence because it is one of the classic expositions of man's longing to be free. The Magna Carta and the Proclamation of the Rights of Man are similarly revered. A lesser known but equally important document which follows this tradition is the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791. The Polish Constitution, adopted on the eve of Poland's partition by its powerful neighbors, has been characterized as "one of the greatest achievements in Polish history." Another historian, speaking of the constitution, concluded:

This heroic breach with the past, this abjuration of the ancient sins, this renunciation of the idolized golden liberty throws an immortal gleam over the last dark years of the Republic.

Today Poland is once again under foreign rule. The Communist dictatorship which controls the country denies the people their right to govern themselves. We in America who have that right have a duty to those less fortunate than we. It is incumbent upon us that we use all our strength and resources to win the

struggle against communism. We cannot afford to slacken our effort even momentarily lest we find ourselves in the position of all too many nations which have fallen under Communist rule. It is fitting that on this the 170th anniversary of the adoption of Poland's Constitution we proclaim to the people of Poland and the world our dedication to the cause of liberty and democracy and our unflagging determination to fight for that cause.

St. Patrick's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, by leave previously obtained, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address I delivered in Cleveland on March 17—St. Patrick's Day:

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

On this feast of St. Patrick, the patron saint of the Irish, we pay homage to our patron saint. We refresh in our minds and hearts the memory of him and of his labors, and catch, if we can, some spark of the love and faith which produced such labors, such fidelity, such zeal in the saint himself, and in the whole Irish nation which followed his footsteps.

From the days of gentle St. Patrick, who brought the light of Christianity to a land even in those pagan days, a civilized nation, to our present time, the Irish race has played a part in world history out of all proportion to their comparatively small numbers. When Christian civilization was all but destroyed by the barbarian invasion of other days, Ireland became the sanctuary and refuge of learning and culture.

The Irish always had a genius for spiritual values. In their entire history they have opposed the false philosophies of materialism which have often distorted men's sense of proportion.

It is more than 1,500 years since Patrick, captured by pagan Irish, was brought to Ireland to work as a shepherd tending flocks on the hillsides. Most of you know the story of Patrick—the long nights on the hillsides he spent, pondering on the pagan blindness of the splendid race of the Gael who were his captors and knew not Christ; the dreams he dreamt that he might one day bring to them the gift of God's grace and the sweetness of His love; his escape, and the long years of study in the seminaries of the continent; his consecration and his return again as bishop to Ireland; the long years of missionary labors among princes and people the length and breadth of the Emerald Isle.

On this feast day of St. Patrick, the patron saint of the Irish, there is great rejoicing in the Christian world. It is also a day for serious reflection on the life and times of St. Patrick and the spiritual values which he brought to Western civilization.

Today Western civilization is in a state of profound doubt. This once dynamic way of life is now gripped with instabilities, fears, and uncertainties concerning the future. From within and from without, the timeless values which mark the character of the Western World are under assault.

The new barbarian has already breached the outer ramparts of our civilization. He has cast the heaviest of chains upon millions of people who have the right to claim a common heritage with us. At this hour he stands without our very gates, awaiting the moment when we shall hesitate or falter in our defenses, thence to strike us a mortal blow. But history has a manner of repeating itself.

Fifteen centuries ago another civilization was put to the test by destroying forces from within and without. The great Roman Empire then represented a way of life guiding the affairs of most of the known world. From within, the Roman Empire had become soft and purposeless, materialism and the pursuit of creature satisfaction had been eating away at the very heart of the civilization. From without barbarian tribes were battering at the walls of the empire, contemptuous of the once vaunted power and glory of the Roman leaders. And Rome fell, the victim of its own weakness, its unwillingness to change from within in order to meet the challenge of the barbarian assault from without.

It was at this crossroads in history that a young man, a former slave and later to be known as St. Patrick, was leaving his indelible mark upon the Irish people. So deep was his spiritual mark upon the once wild and war-like tribes of Ireland that it was not long before bands of his followers left the Emerald Isle to lift the curtain of spiritual darkness which had descended upon all of Europe after the fall of the Roman Empire. The barbarian hordes which flooded over most of known Europe brought nothing with them except power, brutality, despotism, and the pagan code of might makes right. St. Patrick and his teachings thus became the spiritual liberators of Europe, following a long period of darkness.

There are many signs today which indicate that Western civilization may be following the old roads of the Roman Empire—the roads to internal collapse. And the United States is no exception to this trend. The spiritual and moral values which brought greatness to our country have been pushed into the background. New and unbecoming standards and moral values seem to occupy a dominant role in our national affairs. Material values and creature comforts are the order of the day. Personal success is all too frequently measured by the external evidences of material wealth. By one common standard you are judged to be successful if you own a large rambling home in suburbia, two cars, and a private swimming pool. Thus the criteria for attaining success emphasizes what you have been able to get out of your fellowman—not what you have done for your fellow man.

To put it another way, it is said that we are living in the organization age and that the organization man is the key to 20th century success. Now who is the organization man? He is the man who can come closest to behaving like a well oiled machine, built to perform a special, but limited, function. His job is not to think but to follow out standard operating procedures. He must be impersonal and detached. Success is determined by the fewest possible mistakes reflected in his personnel record and the fewest possible mistakes urge the organization man to become a rigid conformist. Such a system drains the individual character from man, thwarts the creative initiative of the individual and produces a mediocrity which hinders progress.

The organization age also produces impersonal policies and the impersonal approach in business and government. The individual becomes little more than a number. In another sense, the people subjected to this system become a faceless mass, to be manipulated and moved about not unlike puppets on a string.

At this moment of economic crisis at home we witness the degrading results, in terms of human values, brought on by the organization age. The unemployed, for example, are nothing but numbers to be jostled about in public announcements every month or so. These numbers become cold and meaningless even when they increase in volume with each passing month. But behind each of these numbers is a human being and in most cases a family, the basic unit of Western civilization. Through overreliance upon numbers, charts, and statistics, a common evil of the organization age, the human factor is submerged. A coldness grips our civilization. The harsh facts of life which move thinking people to action are disguised by statistics.

It is little wonder then that our public life is gripped by doubts and uncertainties. We have strayed a long way from our beginnings. We must not become victims of a system which would make our people a faceless mass.

These signs and many more move me to conclude that we shall not withstand the barbarian assault from without if we do not undertake immediate and far-reaching reforms from within. This is the lesson we must learn from the hard judgment of history.

We hear on all sides that we live in a revolutionary era, that old values have lost their purpose and that even the language we use in expressing these values has lost its impact upon the minds of people. It would do us well to remember on this occasion when we celebrate the feast day of our patron saint that St. Patrick in his time taught a revolutionary belief. It was revolutionary because St. Patrick worked upon the then pagan tribes of Ireland. He taught that man—every man—possessed an individual dignity conferred upon him by God his creator, and that from this dignity came certain rights which were the birthright of every man. So revolutionary were these teachings that they soon converted the entire Emerald Isle.

What St. Patrick taught remains the issue of our time. That issue, stripped of all the confusion which now attends it, can be stated very simply. It is the dignity of man, with all that it implies down through the ages of man's experiences and aspirations. The enemy from without boldly proclaims that man has no dignity, that man is no more than an animal, simply an economic being who will be happy and contented if his physical needs are met. Believing this, the new barbarian feels free to visit all sorts of indignities and inhumanities upon all those who fall under his ruthless rule.

By turning to the life and times of St. Patrick we find the answers to the doubts which beset us, the uncertainties and fears which grip our daily lives. St. Patrick had many virtues in a full lifetime of great accomplishments, but these, in passing review, would serve well our present needs.

Conviction: St. Patrick believed. He made a commitment to spread the message of Christ and his teachings and thus to bring enlightment to his fellow man. Nothing could dissuade him from these beliefs—right was right and wrong was wrong, and there was no in-between in his code of moral values. In our times much of the public thinking is gray in character. That is, it is somewhere at the midpoint between right and wrong, a position which fails conviction and commitment.

A magnificent persistence: St. Patrick possessed a single purpose. He could not be diverted from his course. He refused to accept defeat and never turned his back on discouraging experiences. Nor did he ever tire of the daily burdens he bore.

Selfless devotion to his cause: St. Patrick was never mindful of material gain and was concerned only with what he could give to his beloved Irish people. Disdaining physical comforts, his greatest happiness was found in living the spiritual ideals of

Christendom. How different this is from what we see on all sides today, a spirit of selfishness and pursuit of worldly goods has become a career for too many.

A doer of the word: St. Patrick was first a teacher, but always taught best by personal example and work in his daily life, and his personal example inspired others to believe and to live the good Christian life. He was a doer of the word.

Fearless courage: St. Patrick went among the barbarian tribes of Ireland without the slightest trace of fear and this at a time when the hearty Irish people were inclined to indenture at hard labor all strangers who came into their midst. He entered the high temple of the Druids on command to come forward and present his case—mindful that certain death awaited his failure to convince them of his beliefs. The strength of St. Patrick's fearless courage was endless.

A sense of destiny: St. Patrick knew that he was not born to vegetate and then die like the flowers of early spring. His was a mission ordained among men, and the fulfillment of that mission was his destiny. Conscious always of the immortality of his soul, he instituted a sense of high destiny into his beloved Irish flock. This sense of high destiny has gripped the Irish in every generation. It is this sense of destiny which brings greatness to a people and which has moved our country to its present station among the nations of the world.

As we face the perplexing problems of our time, charting a course to withhold the enemy from without, we must revitalize our civilization from within. What better guidance could we have than the lessons learned from the life and times of St. Patrick. Nothing could more quickly transform Western civilization to its former dynamic status.

Accepting these virtues of St. Patrick, and adopting them into our daily lives, we need have no fear of the enemy from without, and may take comfort in the knowledge that this would soon eliminate the dangers from within our public life. But nothing less shall shelter us from the days of trial that lie ahead. We, in our times, are called upon to prove our faith in those timeless values and principles of Western civilization. Rejoicing in the glorious heritage handed down to us, by the good St. Patrick, we can face the future in the certain knowledge that these evil times shall pass and our way of life will have proved its worth in the test.

A Little Levity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, once in awhile a little levity is good for all of us. The letter to the editor which appears below is from a recent issue of the Sacramento Bee, Sacramento, Calif.:

INVESTIGATE RECORD

EDITOR OF THE BEE,

SIR: I recently came upon the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which I understand is an official Government publication. In that publication was a vicious article attacking the John Birch Society. When a magazine can attack a patriotic organization like the John Birch Society that is carrying freedom of the press too far.

I think the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD should be investigated and if it is found to be un-American it should be suppressed.

W.M.D.

NORTH SACRAMENTO.

Wage Bill: Political Expediency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, as was pointed out on the floor yesterday during debate on the minimum wage bill conference report, the bill is political expediency.

Our colleague WILLIAM H. AYRES, of Ohio, stated:

This bill does not help the really low paid workers of America. The Democrats were more interested in getting President Kennedy off the hook.

Columnist Doris Fleeson has pinpointed the hypocrisy in the bill. The sponsors of the bill should enjoy reading her column printed below:

WAGE BILL: POLITICAL EXPEDIENCY—ENACTED MEASURE CALLED HUMILIATING FOR PRESIDENT TO SIGN, AND INDEFENSIBLE

(By Doris Fleeson)

The minimum wage bill approved by the Senate is an ignoble monument to political expediency which sacrifices workers in greatest need to an effort to pick up conservative Democratic votes in the House. The final agony is that it wasn't even close. The bill passed with 34 votes to spare.

The end product is not one President Kennedy can sign with anything but personal humiliation and gravest misgivings. It will force him to swallow many brave and compassionate words of his campaign and what is worse, to defend the indefensible.

For what his signature on the minimum wage bill in its present form amounts to will be his consent to the thesis that this affluent American society which he heads has the right to dictate fair labor standards but lacks the will to apply them to areas which need them most.

It is a curious kind of standard to raise in a survival attempt to win the underdeveloped and uncommitted nations of the world. Perhaps it could not have happened had not the White House and the country been so absorbed in the cruel problems of Cuba, Laos and France. Generally speaking, little attention has been paid to the august U.S. Senate, logrolling shamelessly in a manner to make the poorest State legislature seem like men of Athens debating with Socrates at the Acropolis.

In instance after instance, the most poorly paid categories of workers were traded off for a few votes, those in laundries and hospitals being the most striking examples. Then, to make the bill look good, the coverage was extended as far as possible in better paid industries. The net is a bill aimed at including the maximum number of workers but the fewest possible employers.

The end figures may sound impressive to the uninformed but more so is the comment of a reported attached to the bill's progress from the beginning. "We've got the people who make $26 a day safely covered; it's the people making $26 a week who are left out."

Old hands in the Senate were comparing the outcome to the situation of President Hoover early in his term when a rampant Republican conservative, logrolling majority presented him the high-tariff classic, the Hawley-Smoot bill. Progressive Republicans publicly begged Mr. Hoover not to sign it but then as now, the major leaders of the Congress were involved in the bill and pressuring it to passage and his signature.

Even those less pessimistic about the importance of the minimum wage bill to President Kennedy concede that the present Congress bears a rather considerable resemblance to the one which had so adverse an effect on the Hoover administration.

Certainly, the kind of trading which has gone on, if extended to all the Kennedy program, would doom it to faint praise. Nor is it a true conservative victory as the principle of Federal control is accepted but its fruits then denied to those who were promised them.

The Democratic Party cannot escape the blame for this one. Its leaders led the fight for the many exemptions when they reached the conclusive Senate-House conference.

Holland's Leadership in Best Tradition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I call the attention of my colleagues to a very fine editorial appearing in the May 3, 1961, issue of the Florida Times-Union about our distinguished senior Senator from the State of Florida, the Honorable SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, on the occasion of his being presented the American Good Government Society award. The entire membership of the Florida delegation in Congress join me in tribute to Senator HOLLAND. We share his pride in the record he has made during his long service to the people of the State of Florida and to the Nation.

[From the Florida Times-Union, May 3, 1961]

HOLLAND'S LEADERSHIP IN BEST TRADITION

Florida's senior Senator, SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, this week is receiving congratulations not only from the citizens of the State which he represents for the award he has won from the American Good Government Society but also from his colleagues who understand the value of his wisdom and experience in these times of national and international stress. He spoke words on the occasion of the honor accorded him Friday night which call for serious consideration by every thoughtful American.

Senator HOLLAND decried centralization of government, declaring that the trend in that direction is one which is a threat to the rights and needs of States, communities and individuals. The clear vision which enables Florida's senior senator to see the magnitude of this threat has its source in the broad background of his experience and seasoned leadership.

Senator HOLLAND has given 44 years of his life to work performed in behalf of his fellow citizens, a record of public service which includes combat duty in France during World War I. Thereafter in succession, he served as prosecuting attorney, county judge and State senator of Polk County, of which he is a native.

He will long be remembered as World War II Governor of Florida during 1941–45, particularly by servicemen of this State who took courage from his personal visits to their training sites in the Louisiana maneuver areas.

Senator HOLLAND distinguished himself in the work which he did to vouchsafe to the people of our State and the Nation the Everglades National Park and the 17-county central and southern flood control district.

The fact that he was a leader in the battle for the passage of the tidelands law was noted in the scroll presented him in connection with the award, a part of which is quoted: "his notable contributions to the American constitution system include the farm credit acts which are moving into private ownership all institutions of the farm credit system, and the vital restoration to the coastal States of rightful ownership of undersea lands within their historic boundaries.

On this tidelands issue he was the leader in the Senate and before the Supreme Court of the United States.

Leadership demands respect for the people who are being led if this sentiment is to be reciprocated. It is a two-way street, and the fact that Senator HOLLAND has been returned to Washington time and again demonstrates that he exemplifies this relationship in the best tradition.

But leadership requires more. It demands that the person doing the leading set an example, and it is in the discharge of this function that Senator HOLLAND is drawing attention throughout the Nation to himself and the State he ably represents.

Protection for the American Consumer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 2, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on March 28, 1961, I introduced a resolution calling for the creation of a House Select Committee on Consumer Problems. Its purpose would be to conduct studies and investigations regarding the administration of Federal laws relating to consumers, the extent to which Government agencies adequately serve the needs of consumers, and to assemble facts and information on consumer problems to aid Congress in enacting remedial legislation.

In a statement in the RECORD at the time I introduced my resolution, House Resolution 240, I stated as follows:

Think of all the instances that have come to light in recent years involving price rigging, fraudulent advertising, low standards of purity and wholesomeness of food and other articles, misleading labeling, deceptive packaging, misrepresentations in manufacturing, and other ways to deceive the American consumer. This requires not only continual study and investigation, but also careful overseeing by Congress. It is time to stop making an easy victim of the consumer and to see that he obtains his dollar's worth in the marketplaces of our Nation.

I would like to see Congress take the lead in protecting the consumer, but unfortunately no action has been taken as yet on my resolution. The public, however, is clamoring for action. As more and more deceptions are uncovered, consumers everywhere are becoming thoroughly disgusted with the methods of certain unscrupulous business people and are beginning to turn to State legislatures for protection. An example is the situation which has arisen in New York.

A group of public-spirited New York State legislators has launched a campaign which, I believe, merits widespread attention, as their efforts will affect millions of consumers.

In the forthcoming session of the State legislature, a bill will be introduced to create a joint legislative committee on consumer protection to study overall textile performance with a view toward adoption of consumer labeling safeguards.

The joint sponsors of the measure are Assemblymen Max M. Turshen and Irwin Brownstein, of Brooklyn, Aileen B. Ryan, of the Bronx, Alfred D. Lerner, of Queens, and State Senator Frank J. Pino, of Brooklyn.

These State legislators, responding to hundreds of consumer complaints, are particularly concerned with clothing which is subject to undue shrinkage. They have noted that no law currently exists to require that clothing subject to this defect be properly labeled.

As a result, consumers—many of whom operate on a tight budget—are uninformed with regard to the type of performance they can expect from a particular garment. All they are told is the content.

It has been estimated that millions of dollars of clothing are dumped on the market each year which is subject to shrinkage, and can be worn only a few times. A few cleanings, or exposure to rain, will often render the garment useless.

This situation registers its severest impact on middle- and low-income families, who must spend hard-earned dollars carefully at a time when the spiraling inflation does not allow for needless financial losses.

The proposed committee on consumer protection would conduct a year-long study of overall textile performance.

At the end of the study the group would present its findings to the State legislature, along with recommendations for the adoption of minimum performance standards and labeling safeguards, particularly in the area of shrinkage.

This worthy program has aleady elicited widespread community support. In fact, the million-member Central Trades and Labor Council of New York City and the Union Label Trades Council, with 200 member unions, have indicated their whole-hearted support of this effort.

In connection with this legislative drive, the National Institute of Dry Cleaning has joined with the Textile Refinishers Association and Better Fabrics Testing Bureau in a study with the following objectives: First, to determine the shrinkage characteristics of unsponged woolen fabrics in repeated drycleanings; and second, to devise a laboratory test method by which the shrinkage propensities of a woolen fabric can be accurately determined by laboratory inspection.

The problem of clothing shrinkage after cleaning has existed for many years. I believe the program I have discussed here will be of great significance in correcting an inequitable situation.

Mr. Speaker, I think, however, that this is a national problem and should be looked into on a national scale by the Congress. Early adoption of my resolution will be an effective step in this direction.

Statement Signed by Members of the Faculty and Staff of Swarthmore College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Monroe C. Beardsley, department of philosophy, Swarthmore College, enclosing copy of letter to Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER and statement signed by members of the faculty and staff at Swarthmore College:

SWARTHMORE COLLEGE, DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION,
Swarthmore, Pa., April 30, 1961.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ROOSEVELT: Though we are not in your constituency, we would like to find some way of indicating to you our admiration for your courage in leading the effort against continuation of the HUAC. Conceivably the enclosed list of signatures to our statement opposing the HUAC may be of some use to you (I enclose also a copy of my letter to Representative WALTER).

Sincerely yours,
MONROE C. BEARDSLEY.

SWARTHMORE COLLEGE,
April 30, 1961.

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WALTER: I have the honor to transmit to you a statement opposing the House Committee on Un-American Activities, signed by 54 members of the faculty of Swarthmore College, and by 16 others on the staff. Many of us have been concerned about the committee's conduct, but were spurred into public opposition by seeing the film Operation Abolition. We cannot help feeling grave doubts about a congressional committee that would lend itself to the sponsorship of a film containing such distortions, and making such a sweeping and undeserved attack on the patriotism, intelligence, and sincerity of college students. By sending this signed statement to you, and, through you, the committee, we wish to make it clear that by no means everyone who is critical of the committee is either a Communist or a Communist dupe.

We believe that the harm done by the committee can best be prevented by its elimination or its drastic redefinition. But, since its existence has been prolonged for another year by House appropriation, may we respectfully urge you to use your great influence in the direction of caution, fairness, and reasonableness in the committee's conduct of hearings, its publications, and its public announcements.

Sincerely yours,
MONROE C. BEARDSLEY,
Department of Philosophy,
Swarthmore College.

STATEMENT OPPOSING THE HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE, SIGNED BY SEVENTY MEMBERS OF THE FACULTY AND STAFF OF SWARTHMORE COLLEGE

APRIL 29, 1961.

(The statement below was circulated among members of the faculty of Swarthmore College, 54 of whom have signed it. Their names and departments are listed below. Sixteen other members of the college staff have signed the statement; their names are also listed. The signed statements are in the possession of Monroe C. Beardsley, department of philosophy.)

In our opinion, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, by its chosen methods of operation, has made itself into an institution that is more dangerous to independent-thinking Americans than to subversive un-Americans.

1. The committee has confined itself almost exclusively to inquiry into the beliefs and associations of individuals. Such inquiry directly violates the most fundamental principles of liberty.

2. The committee, by its methods, and even by its very existence, discourages free association and the free exchange of ideas. It has itself become a dangerous threat to every variety of freedom, including the freedom of the teacher and scholar to think for himself and to speak the results of his best thinking.

3. The committee's chief procedure has been, and is, what it calls "exposure": that is, publicly condemning without the formality of a trial, and often without a hearing, people whom it suspects of wrong opinions, associations, or actions, but whom it cannot prove guilty of any crime by responsible legal evidence. To humiliate, and to incite others to persecute, those who have a right to be presumed innocent, is immoral; and it abuses the power of legislative inquiry.

4. The committee has repeatedly violated the principles of due process, by denying the accused the right to face and examine his accusers, and by enacting de facto trials without the traditional legal restraints.

5. The committee has constantly worked to undermine the American citizen's dedication to the preservation of his civil liberties. In its recent film, Operation Abolition, the committee has unmistakably implied that civil liberties are only a mask of subversion, and that anyone who opposes the committee is either a Communist or a Communist dupe.

In the face of such a general attempt to silence all open and rational discussion of the question of how communism is to be dealt with, and how it is not to be dealt with, we believe that it is our duty, especially as teachers, to speak out against the committee. We join with groups of concerned citizens throughout the country, professional, religious, labor, political, and social, that have urged the House of Representatives to abolish, or at least to curb, its Committee on Un-American Activities.

George C. Avery, modern languages; Stephen Barker, philosophy; Carl Barus, electrical engineering; Monroe C. Beardsley, philosophy; Richard B. Brandt, philosophy; William H. Brown, Jr., economics; Hilde D. Cohn, modern languages; Joseph D. Conard, economics; William C. Denison, biology; Edward A. Fehnel, chemistry; Duncan G. Foster, chemistry; Toshiyuki Fukishima, mechanical engineering; Milan W. Garrett, physics; Charles Gilbert, political science; Henry Gleitman, psychology; Mark A. Heald, physics; Helen M. Hunter, economics; Samuel Hynes, English; Walter B. Keighton, chemistry; Olga Lang, modern languages; Barbara Pearson Lange, English literature; James H. Loehlin, chemistry; Clark Mangelsdorf, civil engineering; Franz Mautner, modern languages; Norman A. Meinkoth, biology; Bernard Morrill, mechanical engineering; Edgar R. Mullins, mathematics; Jacob Nachmies, psychology; Helen North, classics; Gene D. Overstreet, political science; J. Roland Pennock, political science; Edith Philips, modern languages; Frank C. Pierson, economics; W. C. H. Prentice, psychology and dean; Kenneth S. Rawson, biology; Hedley Rhys, fine arts; Arnold Ricks, history; David Rosen, mathematics; Alburt Rosenberg, natural sciences; Justus Rosenberg, modern languages; Conrad Schirokauer, history; Jerome Shaffer, philosophy; James D. Sorber, modern languages; Gilmore Stott, philosophy and associate dean; Frederick Tolles, history; Peter van de Kamp, astronomy; Robert M. Walker, fine arts; Hans Wallach, psychology; Kenneth N. Waltz, political science; Willis Weatherford, economics; Clair Wilcox, economics; John W. Williams, fine arts; M. Joseph Willis, civil engineering; Elizabeth Cox Wright, English, members of the faculty.

Martha A. Connor, library; Marjorie Edwards, library; Elizabeth L. Harrar, library; Dorothy G. Harris, library; Mildred Hirsch, library; Sarah Lee Lippincott, research associate in astronomy; Betty Liveright, library; Eleanor Mayer, library; Doris P. Moist, library; Lois G. Peterson, library; Ruth E. Russell, library; Elizabeth S. Sharpless, library; Cornelia T. Stadler, library; William M. Stanton, Jr., superintendent; Gail C. Ticknor, library; Howard H. Williams, readers' services librarian, members of the staff.

Gen. Milan Stefanik (1880–1919)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. BROMWELL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, 42 years ago today Czechoslovak people lost one of their most gifted and gallant sons in the untimely death of General Stefanik. This born soldier and gifted leader is not as well known as he deserves to be. At the beginning of the First World War he was serving in the French Army, and thus had come to know French statesmen and men of public affairs who were later to champion the Czechoslovak cause. In this connection the part played by General Stefanik was of utmost importance, for it was he who facilitated the difficult task of Thomas Masaryk in France. Through his contacts he introduced Masaryk to influential French leaders whose help in the creation of the future Czechoslovak Republic was quite indispensable.

General Stefanik played an equally important role in bringing about harmony and union between the Slovaks and Czechs, thus contributing immensely to the formation of the Czechoslovak Republic. It is not by mere accident that he, with Masaryk and Benes, is credited in forming the great Czechoslovak triumvirate. In recognition of his devoted and signal services for the Czechoslovak cause he was made Minister of National Defense in the first Government of the Czechoslovak Republic. In his tragic and untimely death in an airplane accident on May 4, 1919, the Republic suffered the irreparable loss of its most gallant and gifted soldier. On this 42d anniversary of his death I join my Czechoslovak friends in paying tribute to the memory of this distinguished leader of his people, this gallant soldier of freedom and democracy.

New Medical and Biological Applications of Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, 1961, at Erie, Pa., it was my privilege to deliver the following address on the subject of "New Medical and Biological Applications of Atomic Energy" to the graduate seminar of the American College of Surgeons, northwest Pennsylvania chapter.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE THE AMERICAN COLLEGE OF SURGEONS, MAY 3, 1961, ERIE, PA.

I appreciate this opportunity to speak to you about some of the new medical and biological applications of atomic energy.

As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy since its inception in 1947, my interest in this subject has been a continuing one.

Recently, in March 1961, the Subcommittees on Research, Development, and Radiation, of which I am a member, held hearings on the Application of Radioisotopes and Radiation in the Life Sciences.

The purpose of these hearings was to bring the members of the committee up to date on research and development in the life sciences field since 1956. The time at which we last held similar hearings.

Tonight I should like to draw on some of the dramatic facts and figures given to us by the many experts who testified at those hearings and to briefly indicate to you the remarkable progress being made every day in the application of the peaceful atom for the betterment of mankind.

Despite the fact that radioactivity was discovered by man at virtually the same time he discovered X-rays, about 1895, it was not until the atomic bomb exploded over Japan in 1945 that we, as a society, really became conscious of the powerful energy locked in the atom and the catastrophic consequences of its misuse.

Because of this possible misuse, it was essential for some years after the war to gear our research efforts toward the development of atomic weapons so as to ensure our security as a world power.

Gradually, however, we began to devote more of our efforts toward the peaceful uses of the atom.

This development was highlighted by President Eisenhower's announcement in 1953 of the atoms for peace program.

The program was given further impetus by the Congress in the Atomic Energy Act

of 1954 which specifically called upon the Atomic Energy Commission to proceed with all reasonable dispatch in exploring the uses of the peaceful atom.

The program has been successful and today I should like to outline for you some of the many ways in which the lot of mankind has been improved by the atom.

The catalog of achievement is impressive for today we find the peaceful atom at work: (a) In the diagnosis and treatment of disease, (b) in the improvement of crops and agricultural practices, (c) in the study of basic life processes, and (d) in man's continuing effort to conquer space.

RADIATION IN MEDICAL TREATMENT

Let us begin with those things with which you in this audience are most familiar; namely, the medical aspects of atomc energy.

If we could step back in time to 1890 and ask a physician of that day what he needed most to assist him in the diagnosis and treatment of disease his reply might well be, "A way of seeing inside the human body."

He could not have even dreamed that 5 years later, in 1895, Roentgen would discover the X-ray.

This he did somewhat by accident when he happened to place his hand between the X-ray tube and a fluorescent screen.

This view of the bones of his hand startled him.

A few days later when he radiographed his wife's hand she was quite disturbed; the very thought of seeing your own skeleton.

Strangely enough, Roentgen did not report his findings to the physics society of the day but rather to the Physical Medical Society of Wurzburg because he recognized immediately the possible implications of the use of this technique in medicine.

The work with X-rays led the physicists to discover radioactivity in 1896 and by 1902 Madame Curie had isolated a very small amount of radium.

All of you know how the radiations from radium and X-rays have been used for medical diagnosis and treatment.

Between 1900 and about 1940 when research was started to build an atomic bomb a tremendous amount of information was compiled on the hazardous nature of radiation.

This background of information made it imperative that medical science be brought into the Manhattan Project at its start to insure safe handling of the radioactive materials needed to make the bomb.

As a result of these early precautions there have been only four or five deaths from radiation exposure in the history of the development of atomic industry—an outstanding safety record.

Because radiation is known to cause cancer as well as cure it, the atomic energy program very early developed a number of medical research projects to study the medical aspects of radiation.

Today there are six major medical facilities worth millions of dollars with annual operating budgets totaling approximately $9 million.

In addition there is a considerable amount of similar work in medical schools.

The major medical facilities are located at the Brookhaven National Laboratory, the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Argonne Cancer Research Hospital at Chicago, the Medical School of the University of California at Los Angeles, the San Francisco Medical School and the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory at Berkeley, Calif.

Each of these laboratories has its own special programs with large and very expensive pieces of specialized equipment including X-ray machines, cobalt and cesium radiation treatment machines, electron accelerators and, in some cases, linear accelerators and even nuclear reactors are available for medical treatment as well as for experimental use.

The electron accelerators are proving of particular value for deep penetration treatment with much less damage to surrounding tissue as compared to X-ray and gamma ray treatments.

The linear accelerators provide many different kinds of particles—protons—alpha particles, and some of the heavy atoms.

The laboratory at Berkeley has shown that certain kinds of irradiations are effective in controlling glandular cancers and offer promise in treating other diseased tissues.

The medical nuclear reactor, while still largely in an experimental stage may prove to be extremely valuable in particular cases.

Its effectiveness depends upon the ability of neutrons to induce radiation in chemical substances to produce localized useful effects.

The technique may prove very useful for brain tumors.

It is doubtful whether these enormously beneficial machines would have been developed as rapidly had it not been for the needs of the atomic energy establishment and the impetus of the atoms for peace program.

We can now confidently look to a future in which these machines, after fully proven, will take their place alongside existing conventional tools to see inside the human body and cure its ills.

THE PEACEFUL ATOM AND SPACE TRAVEL

An unexpected bonus has also come from the use and development of these large radiation machines mentioned previously and their use in basic research.

You have read and heard that the first man was launched into space and returned safely by the Russians.

Clearly this offers them a fine bit of publicity to serve as a vehicle for propagandizing the uncommitted nations on the communistic way of life.

You and I recognize, however, that this flight can be likened to the first airplane flight by the Wright brothers at Kitty Hawk in the early 1900's.

We still had a long way to go then and even further to go now before space travel is a reality.

We must not, however, decrease our efforts in reaching our own objectives.

Until about 1957 when Van Allen, a physicist, described two intense bands of radiation which surround the earth radiation was not really considered as a great deterrent to man's space travel.

We know now, however, that these two belts do offer serious radiation problems and in addition that the solar flares caused by nuclear explosions on the sun generate enough proton radiation to be of rather critical concern to space travelers.

It is, therefore, imperative that we learn more about space radiations.

The large accelerators previously mentioned are capable of generating various particles including some similar to the particles found in the cosmic radiation.

By cooperative efforts we can hope to find how better to protect man from these space radiations and thus accelerate his conquest of space, that space far beyond the range established by the Russians in both time and distance in their recent flight.

THE RADIOISOTOPE IN MEDICINE

However glamorous it may be to possess large expensive radiation producing machines, their use is relatively more restricted and in many instances they are even less desirable than the radioactive atom. This is particularly true since the atom is so versatile.

One of the first isotopes to be used in medical diagnosis was iodine 131 which selectively concentrates in the thyroid gland.

With the use of this isotope and special instrumentation now available for scanning the body one can precisely locate the thyroid gland and within limits identify the size and shape of the abnormalities which are present.

Similar techniques have been deevloped using other isotopes which localize in other areas of the human system.

Radioactive isotopes of chronium, iodine, sodium, iron, and cobalt are some of the more valuable elements presently playing an important role in medical diagnosis on the research level.

Much time could be spent listing various other isotopes which are used for specific tests but suffice it to say that there are about 275 which might be used for diagnostic purposes in humans.

The reason these radioisotopes are not presently available for general use is that they are undergoing tests in our laboratories with animals to determine their safe limits before being used in human medicine.

Time should yield these new tools.

Because of recent developments in our laboratories the day when you will be able to use all kinds of isotopes for diagnosis in almost every human, regardless of age or physical condition, is just around the corner.

With the whole body counter, which is simply an enclosure within which a patient is sensitively "counted" for radioactivity, one can detect less than a millionth of a curie of iron-59 in the whole body.

The radiation from this amount of activity is essentially negligible, yet the sensitivity of the measurement is such as to make the radioisotope feasible for diagnosis.

A modification of this instrument to accommodate only an arm, thus reducing the cost some fiftyfold, is even now being used for research studies.

A future in which the radioactive isotope will be used for faster and more efficient diagnosis of disease is certainly close and filled with promise.

It is rather obvious that the isotopes used for diagnosis can also be used in therapy if the isotope concentrates in diseased tissue.

Thus in the case of a thyroid disorder, iodine 131 or iodine 125 is indicated.

In specialized cases of bone cancer phosphorus-32 may be used and and in other instances other isotopes are used, the only difference between the diagnostic dose and the therapeutic dose is one of concentration.

The particular advantage of the isotopic method of treatment over that using the large machines mentioned earlier is that the isotope concentrates in the diseased tissue thus giving a higher dosage to the diseased area than to the normal, healthy tissue surrounding it.

Further studies currently going on in our laboratories will no doubt provide information which you as practicing physicians will be able to use.

In some instances isotopes have been used for implantation into the tumor area to provide a local source of radiation.

The great diversity of isotopes which are available makes this approach particularly desirable since by selection of an isotope giving a particular type of radiation one can irradiate an area as large or as small as desired.

THE ATOM IN AGRICULTURE

In the area of agriculture which is perhaps not so familiar to you, atomic energy has also made major contributions—contributions which can be measured in terms of dollars.

It has been reliably estimated that the use of radioisotopes in agriculture will result in annual savings of at least $180 million per year for the next 20 years or a total of some $3.6 billion.

Fertilizer practices are constantly being improved through the use of tracers.

Thus radioactive atom tracers used in fertilizers can show us how plants take up the various ingredients, where, when, and how they should be applied for maximum effectiveness and the factors which affect leaching and movement through soil.

These improved practices for more efficient use of fertilizers through the aid of isotopes are estimated to save some $20 million annually on fertilizer costs alone.

The additional yields resulting from the improved practices would perhaps double this figure.

Agricultural losses from weeds amount to approximately $4 billion annually and labeled compounds have helped us to understand when, where, and how to apply weed killers for maximum effectiveness.

The use of radioisotopes labeled compounds has led to the development of better compounds for thinning blossoms on fruit trees resulting in the production of better fruit and in the prevention of fruit drop.

Their use has also led to better defoliants for cotton and to the development of compounds which actually increase yields under otherwise ideal conditions.

Isotopes have helped the plant pathologist to understand how plant parasites invade the roots of tomatoes and other plants; how microorganisms cause rot and wilting and how these pests enter the plant to do their damage.

They have also helped to develop better control measures for the eradication of these pests.

Atomic energy has led not only to the development of better agricultural chemicals but also to the faster approval of these materials for introduction into the world marketplace.

As you know the Congress some years ago passed the Miller bill which required the manufacturer to establish safe limits for residues left on food crops after treatment with agricultural pesticides.

This is the "no cranberries for Thanksgiving" story which you will remember 1 or 2 years ago.

The Miller bill requires that the concentrations of these hazardous chemicals must be below some certain level in the food item before the food can be sold.

Often it has been completely impossible to determine these levels of the residue without the use of radioactive compounds.

Through their use the industrial companies have been able to "clear" compounds with the Food and Drug Administration much quicker and much more economically.

Radioisotopes have been of great value in determining what happens to plant pests from season to season.

For instance the cotton boll weevil which causes an enormous annual loss in the South was labeled with radioactive Cobalt-60.

With the aid of a Geiger counter he was tracked "bird dogged" if you will, to his hiding place in the trash at the side of the field.

By simply burning the trash at the end of the season the usual spring reinfestation by this pest could be prevented.

Studies with farm animals using isotopes have led to better feeding practices; practices which have often led to better nutrition of man himself.

Thus by radioactive tracers of different food products which the animal eats it has been possible to determine the availability of minerals from particular compounds, the availability of vitamins, proteins, and other essential factors under many conditions of feeding.

Various disease agents such as viruses; bacteria, hook worm, etc., are being studied with the aid of isotopes as are the ways in which milk, meat, eggs, etc., are formed by the animals.

RADIATION IN AGRICULTURE

External radiation itself has been used directly in the agriculture sciences.

Two specific cases warrant special mention—the control of insect pests and the development of useful plant varieties.

In both of these instances the work could have been done with X-ray machines but it took the glamour of atomic energy to provide the positive accomplishment.

One of the most striking examples is the case of the eradication of the screwworm fly.

The screw worm, which resembles a wood screw, is a serious livestock pest which lays eggs in cuts and scratches of livestock, particularly our meat animals.

The resulting grub, the worm, causes large sores, poor weight gain, permanent injury, and in some severe cases, death.

This pest did cost ranchers in the southeast alone some $20 million annually.

Those in the southwest lost another $25 to $35 million annually.

Basic research conducted in the early fifty's showed that the male screwworm fly could be made sterile by a dose of radiation from radioactive cobalt-60 which still permitted him to compete with the untreated males for the female population.

The peculiar thing about the screwworm which made it seem possible for eradication was that the female screwworms mated only once, laid their eggs, and then died.

If she happened to mate with a sterile male then none of her eggs would hatch and thus eradication would be completely after only a few generations.

It now is known that such habits are not required but this habit led to the development of the technique.

Field tests conducted on the West Indian island Curacao showed that the insect could be completely eliminated from geographically isolated areas when the numbers of sterile males introduced into the population was sufficiently large.

This success on Curacao led the Florida Livestock Board and the U.S. Department of Agriculture to start releases of sterile males in southern Florida in 1957.

By early 1959, some 18 months later, not a single fly remained.

Three billion flies had been released over a 70,000-square-mile area by 20 airplanes at a cost of about $8 million.

Considering that the annual losses in Florida and southern Georgia amounted to almost $20 million this was a noteworthy achievement; in fact $12 million in the bank after the first year.

This sterile male technique offers tremendous possibilities for the future and programs are now underway to develop methods to eradicate the Mediterranean Fruit Fly, the Melon Fly, and the Oriental Fruit Fly.

Our Government is also interested in eradication of the Olive Fly which makes olives unfit for either oil production or use in Martinis.

Only the future will tell us of the success of this technique in effecting biological control of these insect pests.

Another area in which there have been almost revolutionary advances as a result of atomic energy is plant genetics.

It has been known for many years that radiation causes alterations in the hereditary materials; that is, causes mutations and plant geneticists have used the radiation technique to produce new varieties uniquely suited to particular conditions.

For instance, a new bean variety, called Sanilac, uniquely suited to grow in Michigan saved the farmers $4.5 million in 1959 when only one-third of the acreage was planted to this variety.

In 1961 it is expected that most of the acreage will be so planted with possible savings of over $12 million.

A new variety of oat which is resistant to crown rust has been developed in Florida.

A new variety of peanut which yields more and is also easier to harvest mechanically has been developed in North Carolina.

In spite of the great advances measurable in terms of dollars which have come to man from the developments cited previously, one area in which the atom has contributed most is that of basic research, both in life and physical sciences.

Without the use of the isotope as a tracer many life processes now well understood could perhaps never have been understood.

Through our understanding of basic life processes we will be able to contribute to man's welfare, his longer and happier life.

In summary you and I can look to the future with its many benefits from atomic energy.

We are at this time only scratching the surface of its vast potential.

Many of you present can assist in helping us to reap these benefits since you are aware of what the problems are in your field and can point out most effectively where atomic energy will be most helpful.

In an age where the glamorous and the spectacular in scientific endeavors seem to preemp man's attention, the very solid accomplishments in the peaceful uses of atomic energy should not be overlooked.

I am certain that when the scientific history of our times is written it will be noted that, in our age, the peaceful atom helped to unlock the mysteries of the universe and to provide a better and more abundant life for mankind.

Polish Constitution Day

SPEECH
OF
HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, May 3 is celebrated as Polish Constitution Day.

The Polish people, like our own Founding Fathers, fought against overwhelming odds to secure the establishment of a parliamentary democracy. The Polish Constitution of 1791 is an achievement of this heroic struggle. Freemen everywhere have a special responsibility to commemorate this historic event, for in Poland, no such celebration is permitted.

Poland's Communist rulers know that promotion of democratic principles will be a prelude to their downfall. The Polish Constitution of 1791 proclaims that the state exists to serve its citizens and to do otherwise is to foster despotism. This is the lesson which freemen have learned to appreciate.

Thus, it is fitting that we recall the stirring words that were penned but 2 years after the ratification of our own Constitution:

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty, and the good order of society, on an equal scale, and a lasting foundation.

All freemen will do well to remind themselves of these truths.

Hungary, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on April 30, 1961.

The author, Gaston Coblentz, has reported the attitude of the Hungarians 5 years after the murderous suppression of their revolt against Moscow. It is fitting at this time that we be reminded of those terrible events:

HUNGARIANS LOOK GRIMLY AT THE UNITED STATES 5 YEARS LATER

(By Gaston Coblentz)

BUDAPEST.—"I can see you but I knew you can do nothing for us."

This is the look that Hungarians today throw at Americans; Americans in Budapest 5 years after the uprising against the Kremlin; Americans in Budapest less than a week after the Cuban fiasco and on the eve of a probable setback in Laos.

Gone from the Hungarians' eyes is the old, lively fellowship. The mood in this city is one of resignation, of getting on with life, a life that must go on somehow in a country that is moving through an important transition from Stalinist communism to a somewhat less repressive but no less odious brand promoted by Soviet Premier Khrushchev.

Within the narrow limits possible under Communist rule, life in Budapest has improved rather than worsened since the Russian army's bloody suppression of the rebellion in 1956.

The sadistic postwar reign of terror operated by former Communist leader Matyas Rakosi has been succeeded by the regime of Janos Kadar, whose name is inseparably linked with some of the most unpalatable acts in Hungarian history, but whose rule is notably milder at present than that of his predecessor.

STILL THE BARBED WIRE

Despite the ballast of his past actions and the odium attached to his name abroad, he is associated today with a trend of events which have made Budapest a somewhat more "liberal" city by Communist standards and which, if continued, may be conducive to resurrecting, in time, the capital's still-shattered morale.

However, this trend has failed to alter the Hungarian people's virtual imprisonment inside the Soviet empire, symbolized by the grim network of barbed wire, watch towers, mines and police dogs that guard the country's western frontier.

It has likewise not raised any hopes that this imprisonment is coming to an end. Hungarians have through tragic experience made a realistic appraisal of the United States inability to help them.

Rumors constantly circulate in Budapest that the Soviet Union may at last withdraw its large garrisons from Hungarian territory, estimated at some 50,000 men.

However, it is lucidly clear to every Hungarian that, were the Soviet forces to withdraw eastward across the Hungarian-Ukrainian border, they would remain ready for a swift return to keep Hungary under Communist control.

The result seems to be that the Hungarian people have submitted to their fate. They look for various improvements in their present situation, but within distinct confines. They believe that a continuing behind-the-scenes tug of war is taking place between the pro-Khrushchev-Kadar forces in the Hungarian Communist Party and the diehard rival Stalinist elements, who have active allies in Moscow and some of the satellite countries.

The Kadar group seems to be winning the inner party battle despite some serious setbacks and its followers talk with dislike of the terror-ridden Rakosi rule from 1948 to 1956. In Communist jargon, they call it a period of "serious errors."

Kadar has also succeeded presumably with Khrushchev's help, in fighting off at least one concerted effort by Stalinists in Moscow, Budapest, and Peiping to revive Rakosis' influence. (Rakosis is in protracted exile in the Soviet Union where he is occasionally seen by Western diplomats at the Moscow Ballet).

The Kadarite liberalization has gradually come into evidence in a number of ways. Followers say that it stems from their having "learned a great deal that we refused to recognize before about adapting communism to the nature of our people."

In part, it has consisted of a switchover from Rakosis' total contempt for the population to a policy that at last makes good food available in a wide variety of restaurants and goes at least some distance toward satisfying the human craving for a decent supply of consumer goods during one's lifetime rather than in the Communist millenium.

The result is the import and sale in Budapest stores of such items as Gilbey's gin, Martel and Courvoisier cognacs, Dior and Chanel perfumes, and the like. They are displayed in the shopwindows of bedraggled buildings on Vaci Street, once an elegant shopping center. The prices are very high, but the goods are there in increasing quantities.

There is also much less nagging of the Budapest population by the government, less overt interference in the minor details of daily life, and a deliberate avoidance of some of the annoyances that helped to build up the explosion 5 years ago.

There is far less browbeating of the population to take part in Communist propaganda rallies and parades. Likewise, it is no longer a burning issue whether every family in the block subscribes to the Communist Party organ.

NEW LOTTERIES

The annual forced subscription to government loans has been eliminated. In their place, Kadar is using sports pools and national lotteries to raise similar amounts of money without arousing resistance. The top weekly lottery prize is 1 million forints ($44,000) for a 3-forint (15-cent) ticket.

A noticeable change has also taken place in the handling of the population by the secret police. In the Rakosi era, denunciation by an informer or a personal enemy made imprisonment and torture a likelihood. This hideous practice is reported to have been generally curtailed. There is also reported to have been an improvement in prison conditions.

Hungarians who persist in accepting invitations from Western diplomats are still warned off by the secret police, but, as a rule, less punitively than before.

FEAR LESSENED

At a diplomatic cocktail party this week a Hungarian newspaper acquaintance told this reporter:

"We have been talking together for 20 minutes. Under Rakosi you know what it would have meant to be seen with you like this in public."

Another Hungarian journalist remarked:

"Under Rakosi I never really went to bed at night without fearing the 2 a.m. arrest. I may be wrong, but I do not go to sleep with that fear now."

However, parallel with this "liberalization" and these limited gains wrung from the Communists by the 1956 revolt, there have recently been three developments of an opposite nature.

First, a still somewhat obscure increase in secret police arrests in Budapest in the last few weeks.

Second, a drive to collectivize the Hungarian countryside against the will of the peasants on a scale never attempted before the revolt. Kadar men assert that this was forced through by the Stalinist faction. They say that Kadar wanted to proceed more slowly, although toward the same goal.

The drive began, almost unnoticed by the outside world, in late 1959 and has engulfed some 90 percent of the arable land. However, there have so far been relatively few reports of physical resistance on the part of the peasants.

Coupled with collectivization, a new assault is being made against the Roman Catholic Church, this time on the parish-priest level, the strongest stratum of church resistance left.

An unascertainable number of priests have been arrested—some estimates are about 150. There are signs that a show trial is being prepared against some dozen of the priests for allegedly distributing subversive Western literature. The literature is said to be mainly a West German book on archeological excavations of Biblical relics.

The 1961 balance sheet is reflected in a trend in Budapest not to think in terms of a few years in discussing possible changes in Hungary's status. People talk now only in terms of longer periods.

"We realize," three different Hungarians said to this reporter with strange uniformity and a strikingly similar gesture of resignation, "that there will be no real change in our lifetime."

Inwood Junior High School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, the congressional district which I have the honor to represent is located in New York City. There in harmony live people of all races, creeds, and colors. The schoolchildren, who study in schools which are fully integrated, have been recipients of many national honors.

Under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD a copy of a letter which I have received from Mr. Irving Mahl, one of the teachers of Inwood Junior High School. This letter is further proof that under progressive and efficient supervision children of all races, creeds, and colors can study together to become fine Americans.

The letter follows:

INWOOD JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL,
New York, N.Y., April 20, 1961.

Hon. HERBERT ZELENKO,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: It is too often that we hear of the bad things that our junior high school youngsters are up to. Newspapers are very prone to stress the sensational news of violence with very little to counterbalance with constructive accomplishments of our children.

Inwood Junior High School is very proud to inform you that for the second year in

succession our school has won the first and second prizes in the poster contest sponsored by the National Conference of Christians and Jews,

At an award ceremony on Tuesday, April 18, 1961, at the headquarters of the N.C.C.J., 43 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y., awards were given to the following children who reside in your district:

Gale McCray, 521 West 182d Street; Dina Tritsch, 558 West 193d Street; Sharon Lewin, 559 West 190th Street; were winners of two $50 bonds and a $25 bond, respectively.

These posters were the culmination of a project which had brotherhood as its theme. The project was especially rewarding because the neighborhood in which our school is located represents almost every race, creed, and nationality. We are proud of this example of the constructive effort on the part of our school, its teachers and the children.

Congressman ZELENKO, I thought you would like to share our pride with us.

Sincerely,

IRVING MAHL.

Wisconsin's Glacial Moraines Should Be Added to National Park System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Wisconsin's Veterans of Foreign Wars have adopted a resolution favoring the establishment of a national park that would include the glacial moraines located in some 26 counties in Wisconsin, a proposal that I have long supported in Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include this resolution in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION SUPPORTING ESTABLISHMENT OF WISCONSIN MORAINE PARK

Whereas the Department of Wisconsin Veterans of Foreign Wars, has previously gone on record in favor of legislation as well as other means, to create a national park in Wisconsin, from the meandering glacial moraines located in some 26 counties of the State, the nucleus of this area being the Kettle Moraine State Park, and

Whereas, it proposed that this park shall be named, Ice Age National Park: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of Wisconsin, That we again go on record to enthusiastically support this project; and that we urge our Representatives in Congress, the Wisconsin Legislature, county and municipal boards, to work cooperatively towards the conclusion of this proposal.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Mobilization of Republican Resources for the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, if we are to preserve the two-party system we cherish so deeply, Republicans and Democrats alike must speak out freely on their political philosophies and their goals.

One of the most forthright, forceful, and definitive discussions of the position and aims of the Republican Party was presented recently by Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL at a dinner sponsored by the GOP organizations of Baltimore City. Senator SALTONSTALL's address was extremely inspiring and thought provoking, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY U.S. SENATOR LEVERETT SALTONSTALL AT THE COMBINED REPUBLICAN ORGANIZATIONS DINNER MAY 3, 1961, LORD BALTIMORE HOTEL, BALTIMORE, MD.

We are gathered tonight to mobilize our resources for the future, to consider what we've got to do for Republican victories in the months and years immediately ahead, and to dedicate ourselves to the job of doing it. The glamour and the recognition for political effort comes during campaign time. But the rewards come only when the preparation is done thoroughly every day of every month of every year—when the spotlights are turned elsewhere. Politics is not a part-time job.

What is the current status of the Republican Party? What disadvantages do we have to overcome? What factors do we have basically working in our favor?

Nineteen hundred and sixty saw us lose the national elections for President and Vice President. After 8 years of sound performance under President Eisenhower, the Republican Party lost the White House. The House and Senate are still under the control of the Democrats by large margins.

But in losing the White House we won a majority of votes in more than half the States and more than half the congressional districts. We lost the Presidency by 112,000 votes—Vice President Nixon carried 26 States to the 23 won by Senator Kennedy. Nixon won 49.9 percent of the two-party vote and 49.55 percent of the total vote. In the Senate we elected three new Republicans and all who ran for reelection. In the House we find 44 new Republicans—only 3 who sought reelection failed, and we won a net gain of 21 seats. We picked up two more governorships and made a net gain of approximately 300 State legislature seats.

We were beaten in the big cities which dictate the electoral vote. But one of the most striking examples of Republican power is found in our party's performance in winning last fall's so-called independent vote. The Democrats went into the elections with a tremendous advantage over us in the "hard core" party vote—in the number of registered Democrats over registered Republicans. The incredibly close result means that we won this independent vote in a big way.

The fact that Senator Kennedy only won by sixteen one-hundredths of 1 percent in the popular vote leaves him without a clear-cut mandate from the American people. The American voter repudiated neither the 8 years of Republican leadership nor its platform and candidates of 1960. Our party improved its position at the polls following consecutive losses in 1954, 1956, and 1958. As Columnist Roscoe Drummond has pointed out, Senator Kennedy ran behind his party as its strength was receding while Vice President Nixon ran ahead of his party as it was on the upswing.

Now these statistics are of limited value. We didn't win, we lost. We lost a heart-breaker, and we are now, emphatically, the "out-party." But to overlook some of the heartening aspects of the last election would be foolish, particularly when they speak well for the future. The position of the Democrats is not without worry and danger. As Senator THRUSTON MORTON, our national chairman, recently said:

"In many respects I commiserate with the Democrats. They are in an unenviable position. They have come to power at a time when the public mind is strongly influenced by vivid memories and deep appreciation of those good Eisenhower years—years of peace and record prosperity.

"I would suggest that the Democrats will find little comfort or magic in the campaign image which projected them as would-be rescuers of a nation on the brink of disaster. Our ailments must not be minimized. The Nation must be informed, but it need not be informed in a manner which gives aid and comfort to those bent on destroying us. Any balanced assessment of the national economy, freed of political frenetics, will underscore the enduring potency of the great gains which the new administration inherited."

We have great leadership within the Republican Party which over the forthcoming months can clarify its energy and purpose for the benefit of all the people. You know the quality of your Republicans here in Maryland. President Eisenhower has sustained his massive public popularity and respect. Former Vice President Nixon spoke in Greenville last night and appears in New York tomorrow night. Within a week's time, he will also visit Chicago, Des Moines, Detroit, and Columbus. In March alone, Chairman MORTON delivered over 30 major addresses in many areas of the Nation. Senator BARRY GOLDWATER is so much in demand for speaking dates that he is booked up solid for well over a year. The minority leadership of Congress in applying Republican principles to the legislative arena with vigor. And throughout the Nation in State capitols we find strong, dynamic leadership from Republican Governors. Nelson Rockefeller of New York, Mark Hatfield of Oregon, and my own Gov. John Volpe are obvious examples. Let's add right now the name of former Labor Secretary James Mitchell, who has an excellent chance of becoming New Jersey's next Governor in the fall.

So we have strong men of proven capability to lead us, who, through their ideas and their experience, give the broadest possible representation of the American people, men of differing shades of political philosophy united behind the conviction that the Republican Party, in principle, purpose and performance, can best serve the Nation and her citizens.

Finally, the greatest resource of the Republican Party is the American people themselves. This is as it should be. Today American citizens want moderate action by Government. They have demonstrated their alliance with the middle of the road rather than with the far left or far right. They want to avoid extremes, trusting in balanced use of public and private resources. This desire for moderation is best met by Republicans, not by the Democrats. We, as a party, traditionally advocate the creative balance between extremes, steady performance over the long haul, and a close relationship between principle and practice.

Now it has been suggested that the fortunes of our party for 1962 and 1964 lie in two missions: developing strong, attractive candidates and building a strong organization—door to door and street to street, precinct to precinct and town to town. I agree. But I would like to discuss first what is absolutely fundamental to all of this—what we stand for. We must, in a meaningful contemporary context, vigorously demonstrate the vitality, applicability, and long-term validity of our principles, and we must do it right now. The best candidates and the most powerful organization mean nothing unless the beliefs that justify their existence are kept strong and vital and are boldly articulated.

While the ease of communication by telephone, radio, TV, and even through space has brought the world closer together, the greatest practical problem which the Republican Party faces is one of communication. We must make clear to the average citizens of America, the man and woman on Main Street, what we stand for. As Republicans what we need to do most of all is to identify ourselves, as a party, with them in terms of personal interest, economic interest, and national interest. We have not been sufficiently convincing. We have not identified our fundamental nature as a party with their best interests. During a time characterized by the similarity of party platforms, by the desire on the part of each party to appeal to the whole political spectrum, and by the increasing tendency to obscure party arguments by the direct appeal of a candidate's individual personality, we must make clear what we stand for—what we have to offer that the Democrats don't.

Sometimes people ask me what I am, whether I'm a conservative or a liberal. I answer that I'm a Republican. Period. What do I mean by this; what do I regard as the basic differences between our two parties?

First of all, the Republican Party stands for the freedom of the individual—not in

the abstract—but in the real sense. We do not hedge this principle. We do not cover it up with other immediately popular, emotional or more expedient ideas. We believe in advancing the genuine dignity of the individual in the most profound manner, to offer the most thorough opportunity for his growth and advancement physically, intellectually and spiritually.

Our concept of American Government is that it be committed to preserve individual reliance, individual vitality and individual resourcefulness within the framework of a Federal system equipped to deal efficiently with the great national and international problems that give us such anxiety today. The Government simply cannot answer all our dilemmas. If it attempts to play that role, the individual citizen's capacity to solve his own problems, to make decisive judgments with respect to them, will diminish, and soon he will be incapable of participating in the democracy of his society. He will lose his initiative, his energy and his courage, and, above all, his self-respect. Policies, programs, institutions which tend to interpret the role of Government as solving all of the individual's problems for him are first of all impractical, secondly, will gradually imprison him, and thirdly, are just plain disrespectful to the ideal of his freedom.

We think in terms of that individual. The Democrats think primarily in terms of groups of individuals or even the state itself. Real reliance on the freedom of the individual enables us as Republicans to consider more deeply the overall national interest, to disassociate ourselves from special interest groups. Our party has traditionally striven to represent the whole rather than the special interests of various groups, to advance the common purpose over often contradictory and divisive ends. We intend to pursue the common bond for the common good, rather than indulge for emotional gain in hostile in-fighting among classes and categories of people. Such activity saps the spirit of community loyalty, mutual helpfulness, and finally the ability to act in unity as a free people. The Democrats simply do not have as strong or consistent a record in this regard as do we.

Let me emphasize two more beliefs which are closely related to this conviction about individual freedom and which express differences between the two parties rather clearly. One is that the Republican Party emphasizes the principle of voluntary rather than compulsory participation in Federal aid programs, while the Democrats do not. The other is that we stress the concept of equality of opportunity among our citizens rather than the more recent "everyone gets the same deal" tendency to emphasize automatic equality per se, in which our Democratic colleagues frequently indulge.

Now the second major principle that we as Republicans stand for is a government close to the people. I have always liked to think of government starting from the family itself, and moving out to the community, to the State institutions and finally to the Federal level in Washington. The Democrats appear to believe now—though if you read Thomas Jefferson you will quickly find that this was not always the case—that it should work approximately the other way 'round.

The Republican concept of government's role emphasizes that State and local government must remain strong, that unless there is vigor, responsibility and purpose at the levels of government closest to the people themselves there can be no real governing "of, by and for the people." The functions of institutions at the sub-Federal level may certainly change—they should never remain static—but they must always exist. Here we see how the Republican concepts of individual freedom and government by the people are combined for the benefit of all. Without the opportunity to participate in self-government, the individual cannot be alert, informed, and able to influence the course of events about him. Without the presence of State and local institutions which are easily accessible to him, that opportunity is lost.

A related idea to the Republican belief in government close to the people is the conviction that private enterprise must be the ally of government, not its adversary; whereas the Democrats often seem to make private enterprise the whipping boy. We want to move forward to meet the grave new problems before us, and at the Federal level of government, without at the same time undercutting the open, free system upon which we really depend. We believe that this can be done. We believe that it must be done—or else we must radically revise our whole system of life in the United States. This is not to say that we can tolerate the violation of the law by business and industry any more than we can in the case of a labor union or an individual citizen. When business is found in any way lacking in public integrity it must be immediately and strongly called to task.

These two fundamental beliefs, individual freedom and partnership government, must be put across to the people by us who believe in them. It is from these two basic convictions that flow the ideas which have characterized Republican leadership over the past 8 years. From them President Eisenhower drew the policy that problems are not solved by dollars alone and that problems must be approached on a long-term rather than short-term basis, for instance. It is on these two basic convictions that I believe the victory and the survival of the Republican Party depend. We must market them. We must make them real.

How do we do it? Attractive candidates, money, topflight organization. You have good candidates, and you're coming up with more, of young blood. Encourage them. Tonight you are engaged in a money-raising effort. That is essential if your candidates are to win and your work is to succeed. It will succeed if the candidates encourage the workers and the workers have financial backing.

I was a candidate last autumn. Tonight I am here as a Senator from Massachusetts, which as you know is our new President's home State, too. Our statewide organization, which we had been working on for well over a year before the election, was a major factor in my reelection. We had a highly productive volunteer operation with a powerful emphasis on youth and great enthusiasm that did wonders. Other than that I did my best to get around the State as much as I could—again, starting the fall prior to the election to establish early momentum—to meet as many voters and their families as possible. I ran what is referred to as a "positive" campaign, that is, concentrating on my own experience and service and the kind of record I had developed in the Congress. On the other hand, particularly in the last few weeks before election day, I did not hesitate to fight back hard to counter attacks made by my opponent and do some punching of my own when this was clearly called for. Like all campaigns, it involved some fun, considerable exasperation, but above all—on the part of everyone concerned—hard, hard work.

Tomorrow, your good Senators GLENN BEALL and JOHN BUTLER, Congressman MATHIAS, and I will again take up our imperative responsibilities as members of the "loyal opposition." This is a delicate task, which must attempt to strike the dynamic balance between hard criticism when it is called for and solid support when it is merited. Without dissent—which in this case is the minority party in Congress—there is dictatorship. So we must be vigilant on the broadest plane in defense of the national interest. This involves the condemnation of reckless decisions by the administration, the spelling out of better courses, the backing of sound action when it is taken. We must keenly appraise the promises and performance of the Democrats in the official positions of leadership in the executive branch, for our constitutional system demands it.

Above all, the loyal opposition must develop programs of its own, to deal in our terms rather than exclusively with regard to theirs. We cannot strike a clear, dynamic image unless this is done. Many of the new administration's programs on the domestic front are continuations or enlargements of the Eisenhower policies. We can claim credit for these when they are ballyhooed as Democratic accomplishments. But we must move beyond them, building rather than standing on that record, as Dick Nixon has so well said.

On foreign policy, we will largely stand with the President, although never failing to bring our own ideas to bear in counsel with him and his advisers. On domestic issues, where the security of our country is not immediately at stake and where the philosophical differences between us are more striking, we must oppose the administration wherever its programs contradict our principles, and give those principles a new vitality with specific recommendations which embody them. We will not obstruct for its own sake; we will not rubberstamp in any event. I hope that we will be of some help to you here in Baltimore and Maryland in our mutual endeavor. I'm sure you will help us.

Thank you very much.

Decommissioning of the Steamer "Mississippi" and Commissioning of the Motor Vessel "Mississippi"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on April 19 last, an event of great historical significance to the Mississippi River occurred in Memphis, Tenn. After 34 years of faithful service, the steamer *Mississippi* was decommissioned, and a new motor vessel *Mississippi* was commissioned in very dignified and colorful ceremonies.

This steamer is operated by the Mississippi River Commission as a work boat. In addition, comfortable accommodations are provided for the necessary inspection trips up and down the river by the Mississippi River Commission.

Present at these exercises were Maj. Gen. Thomas A. Lane, president of the Mississippi River Commission, and one of our most distinguished Army engineers; A. H. McRae, assistanct director of Civil Works for the Mississippi Valley in the Office of the Chief of Engineers, represented that office.

Harold T. Council of Greenville, Miss., spoke as chairman of the executive committee of the Lower Mississippi Valley

Flood Control Association. Mr. Fred J. Mayo of Pascagoula, Miss., president of the Ingalls Shipbuilding Corp., which built the boat, was present and was recognized.

Col. Marvin L. Jacobs, district engineer at Memphis, where the steamer has formal headquarters, presided and introduced these gentlemen whose names I have given.

Three long blasts and one short from the old steamer *Mississippi* was a signal indicating that she was leaving the service of the Army. A like signal from the new motor vessel signified the change in command of the master, Capt. David M. Cook, from one boat to the other. Captain Cook is one of the finest men and certainly one of the most highly respected masters on the river.

It was my pleasure to introduce Hon. Jack Carley, chief editorial writer for the Commercial Appeal, and one of the country's most useful and dedicated citizens. Long has he been known as the voice of flood control and water resources.

Mr. Carley is equally well known as a long-time guest lecturer in the Federal Bureau of Investigation Academy. He has been honored by patriotic and other organizations too numerous to mention.

I have long counted him as one of my most faithful friends and most assuredly one of my most competent advisers. It was left to him to pay eloquent tribute to the old steamer.

Knowing that so many thousands of people will be interested in reading this tribute to the old steamer, I count it a privilege and an honor to include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The address follows:

And so we come to say goodby to this old friend of many happy years—of many, many miles of river journeying—to this good friend of fog and storm—of blue-clad days and starlit nights—of flood and drought, sunshine and shadow—to this friend of all the people in this mighty river's valley.

The words which she cannot speak for herself, we speak for her.

Hers is another tongue understandable only by those who have recognized in her so many of the elements which are a part of the mystery of the river itself.

Steamer *Mississippi*.

There is song in the name just as there was rhythmic melody in the sound of her wheel as it bit into deep water—into mark four water.

Hers is the language of her deep-toned whistle—of snapping tree branches as she tied against a sheltering bank—of a crying infant brought to succor from the flooded wastes into which she sturdily, dutifully pushed her away.

Hers is the voice of a leadsman crying out "no bottom."

Indeed, there was "no bottom" when she picked her folk off the roofs, out of the treetops, off of the levees by the hundreds—by the thousands almost—during the 1937 flood of record.

She has a song, does the steamer *Mississippi* and she is a song—the song of the stream whose name she has so pridefully borne.

And she is many things. It is to these, too, that we bid farewell.

No worn out hulk of wood and steel is she. Let no one make that mistake.

She is an old engineer soldier come to the day of retirement and honors earned.

She cannot troop the line and take the salute so we do it for her.

What a good soldier she has been.

Going wherever duty took her—into watery highways and byways—going where the need was—many a time going where the desk-bound experts said she would not be able to go—into the Cumberland and along the White—down the Atchafalaya and up the Missouri. Up the Missouri. They said it couldn't be done but she did it.

She has carried the red and white ensign of her corps with honor and devotion. She made the word "Essayon" her motto, too. She did try and in trying never failed—the Army, the Corps of Engineers. or we the people of this valley she served. Let not the Army forget that—or her.

Should it tarnish her record and memory through unseemly disposal it will demean itself.

What is best written of an old soldier on the day of retirement? These four old Army words:

Character: "Excellent."

Service: "Honest and faithful."

There is no greater accolade.

She has a soul and a spirit, does this old friend, and the two are the embodiment of all who has ever served in her, or journeyed on her and come to have affection for her. Their laughter and their fears—their anticipation and the disappointment—became hers by association's right.

She is peopled by those who have gone beyond our earthbound sight and whose friendly voices no longer reach our limited hearing.

She now becomes a haven for yesterday's dear ghosts—men of the soldier breed—the river breed—the valley breed. These do not desert her.

The desertion is ours. We, the living, a profligate people too bemused by the ambitions and anxieties of the present to place value on the past which is prelude—to care for and preserve the benchmarks of other days and the artifacts of those who placed them.

She is something else, is the steamer *Mississippi*—she's a mounted engineer detachment riding with "horse soldiers" into battle on a far away plain; she's an odometer cart measuring the distance between Reno Creek and Custer Hill on the Little Big Horn; she's a battery of artillery galloping forward to a command of "action front", she's a squadron of cavalry making a pistol, or a saber charge

She is all those things of an Army's yesterday—an old trooper—an old steamboat—now become part of the Army's and the river's past.

Hers has been a nobility of service which has surely made her worthy of our tears.

Let us be certain that as citizens of this valley empire we continue worthy the service she has given.

The line has been trooped, the colors dipped, the salute taken and returned. This "old engineer soldier" marches on alone from the present into the past.

How sad, indeed, would it be but for this: that those who have known her well and loved her know—that if, on some future, moon-bathed night they wait patiently on a bank along the river, she'll make a landing and pick them up and downstream she'll go steaming—full speed, without fogs, or shoals to hinder her and a good crew standing watch.

The yestedays were hers and so, too, will be the tomorrows as the spirit of her becomes eternally one with this ageless river.

It is to her yesterdays we say farewell.

It is of our tomorrows that we dream and dreaming, wait on the bank for her.

Steamer *Mississippi*—faithful soldier—salute.

Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1961 and Internal Revenue Code and Highway Trust Fund Amendments

SPEECH

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6713) to amend certain laws relating to Federal-aid highways, to make certain adjustments in the Federal-aid highway program, and for other purposes.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, as a State legislator before coming to the Congress, I attempted to persuade my own State of Indiana in the period immediately following World War II to embark upon a program of new highway construction and highway improvement. We were collecting at that time just enough to maintain the highways we had. It was very difficult, and I was not successful in persuading the people of the State of Indiana to do so. During the ensuing years, the need became greater and the lag in highway construction became more evident. Highways are extremely important, not only to the life and economy of our country, but they are one of our most important links in our whole defense setup. They provide for the American people a way to enjoy visiting and traveling in all parts of our great Nation.

I supported in 1954 the first highway bill under the Eisenhower administration and subsequently the 1956 bill, for they were set up on the basis that would give us ultimately a fine system of highways without, at the same time, creating any additional indebtedness. However, as it became evident that the cost of the system of implementing this highway program was going to be much greater than we had previously anticipated, it has become necessary that we either stretch out our program or levy a heavier tax to expedite it.

In voting "no" on H.R. 6713 I have had the feeling that the enormous increase in tax as proposed in this bill is so much greater than most people realize that in voting "no" I hope to be able to bring to their attention the amount of this additional tax, which is $9.8 billion. The American people are already overburdened with taxes. Of course, you can say this is for highway purposes, but, regardless of what you pay taxes for, nonetheless, it does represent your money that you have to put up for your Government. We are also confronted locally and statewide with a substantial increase in taxes.

As a candidate last year, I pledged to work for and support programs to reduce taxes rather than to increase them. This would very definitely add a substantial tax burden to all the people of my district, and I should also say to our whole country. As fine and as worth-

while as this highway program is, it seems to me it is more important to maintain fiscal stability and to prevent another inflationary spiral than it is to try to speed up the construction of our highways. I realize that in many instances this highway program is needed; but again I do not feel that a highway program is in such dire need that we have to resort to the kind of programs such as we have been witnessing at Cape Canaveral, where money has literally been wasted in millions due to an unfortunate necessity demanding great speed. In the example of Cape Canaveral it is possibly a justifiable waste of money, if any waste can ever be said to be justifiable, for the defense of our country. But in this instance I do not think a speedup in the program will actually see our highway system constructed efficiently or economically; this is certainly a very important consideration.

So again I say that I am reluctant to vote against this bill, but I feel under the circumstances I must. I would just like to add, in conclusion, that in my district the vote on the question of increasing the taxes or having a stretchout in the program resulted in almost a dead heat. Out of more than 13,000 ballots cast, we had less than a 300 difference in the final tabulation of the poll on this particular question.

School-Aid Compromise?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 8, 1961

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, there appears today in the Washington Post an editorial which brilliantly describes the dilemma facing many in our Nation today over the scope of Federal aid to education and any provisions for assistance to parochial schools. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCHOOL-AID COMPROMISE

Talk of broadening the National Defense Education Act of 1958 as a compromise of the differences over Federal aid to private schools calls for careful deliberation. The desirability of extending the present act beyond its expiration date next year seems to be pretty well established. The questions that arise are related to whether it should be used as an entering wedge for much broader aid to parochial schools.

President Kennedy has asked for a renewal of the powers granted in this act and for more money to be lent to private, church and public schools for the purchase of equipment to be used in teaching science, mathematics and foreign languages. Presumably he did not ask for a broadening of the purposes for which these funds might be used because of his belief that public support of parochial schools is unconstitutional.

Some Members of Congress, however, are advancing the view that National Defense Education Act funds could be spent for science, mathematics and foreign language classrooms as readily as for equipment. It is they who are sponsoring a bill for this purpose as a supplement to the administration's general aid-to-education measure.

There is a valid distinction, however, between equipment which can be used only for specific purposes in which the Nation has a vital interest and classrooms that could be used for general purposes. The Supreme Court has specifically ruled that public schools may not be used for religious instruction. If the proposed compromise were voted, would Congress require supervision of science, mathematics and foreign language buildings at church schools to make certain that they would not be used for religious purposes? Could the clergy teach or speak in such buildings?

The complications would be numerous, and the detraction from the atmosphere of education might more than offset any financial relief to be gained from loans of this character. There seems to be no safe way of intermingling what the Constitution and sound public policy have kept separate.

American Prestige

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, Marquis Childs touches on the meaning of our recent loss of prestige abroad, in his article, published in Nassau County's Newsday on May 2:

WASHINGTON CALLING—J.F.K.'s PRESTIGE SHAKEN

(By Marquis W. Childs)

PARIS.—In computing the score of the Cuban fiasco it is necessary to reckon with the effect it has had on President Kennedy's reputation in Europe and the rest of the world. It could well be that the cost is greatest in this department and particularly against the background of the remarkable prestige that the new young American President had begun to acquire.

His statements, his speeches, the whole tone of his conduct of the most important office in the world had inspired not merely respect but a widespread current of hope. This was a President proceeding with judicious calm, with quiet civility, to try to solve the grave problems threatening war and chaos on every hand.

To say that what happened—or failed to happen in Cuba—interrupted the current of hope is to resort to the most generous understatement. It brought a shock of surprise and dismay. The sudden seemingly impulsive act based on so many miscalculations was contrary to the whole impression Kennedy had begun to build up.

Now Europeans are asking nervously: What comes next? This reporter has talked with diplomats and officials of a half-dozen countries during the past week and without exception their hope is that the President will take his setback with as good a grace as possible, learning from an early mistake. They are aware of the mood of America as reported here—the hurt pride that must be quickly redressed. But the conviction is widespread that any direct intervention by the United States in Cuba with American force would make the situation much worse.

As one of the highest officials of the French Government expressed it, the position of America's allies would become difficult to impossible with Latin America torn asunder by such intervention. Others are fearful that the peace of the world would be put in even more precarious balance than it is today and perhaps irreparably shattered.

The question of Cuba has already been raised in the council of the North Atlantic alliance. Significantly, it was raised by Belgium which, with the issue of the Congo being brought up in various international bodies, has reason to be sensitive on the score of intervention. It was done politely—we should like to know the nature of this action and the motives behind it—but nonetheless firmly.

THE PROBLEM IN NORWAY

Norway, after all, has a common border in the Far North with the Soviet Union. If the United States should assert its right to intervene directly in Cuba because of the danger of communism 90 miles from America's shores, could not the Soviets use the alleged danger of NATO installations in neighboring Norway as the pretext for intervention there? This was the implication in Premier Khrushchev's note on Cuba and it is not dismissed lightly here in Europe. The Norwegians, occupied through four bitter years of World War II, have in their isolated position in the north given this solemn consideration.

Raymond Aron, long a friend of the United States, writing in Figaro on "The Cuban Disaster" suggests that the Monroe Doctrine, as enunciated anew by Kennedy, is outmoded. That doctrine was intended, Aron writes, to protect Latin America from European colonialism with the support of the British Navy, which was the supreme power in its day. But that day has passed and the United States can no longer consider Latin America a sphere of influence in which American power is free to work its own will. After all, Aron points out, the Soviet Union has long tolerated the military installations of the United States in Turkey, with its border on the Soviet Union. These installations, he might have added, include intermediate range missiles with nuclear warheads under the control of the United States.

The London Observer, in an editorial headed "Blinkers," goes further in accusing Kennedy, on the basis of his speeches since the Cuban misadventure of a view of the world which is dangerously oversimplified in that it leaves no room for neutralism and equates capitalism with total virtue and communism with total evil. "It is only when the neutral nations are convinced that the West is prepared to respect their independence and leave them alone that they will see much greater faults in the Soviet Union, which is bound by its own ideology to deny freedom of choice to its own people as well as to others," the editorial says.

To Americans suffering from the outrage of a defiant Castro just across the water this may seem heresy. But it should be understood that it is a widely held view among America's most loyal friends everywhere. To go against it will be to jeopardize the structure of alliances and friendships painstakingly built during 15 years.

Historical Observations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an arti-

cle entitled "Historical Observations," from the May issue of the Southwestern Episcopalian.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HISTORICAL OBSERVATIONS

Some 2,000 years ago, it was Plutarch who warned: "The real destroyer of the liberties of the people is he who spreads among them bounties, donations, and benefits." And it was an old French peasant who made the following sad observation after the collapse of France in World War II, burdened with social subsidies: "My country fell because we had come to consider France as a cow to be milked and not a watchdog to be fed." But it was Premier Nikita Khrushchev of the U.S.S.R. who predicted, shortly before his 1960 visit to the United States of America: "We cannot expect the Americans to jump from capitalism to communism, but we can assist their elected leaders in giving Americans small doses of socialism, until they suddenly awake to find they have communism."

The Effect of the Mexican Labor Program Upon U.S. Farmworkers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MERWIN COAD
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, there has been much generalization as to the effect of the Mexican labor program, Public Law 78, upon the U.S. farmworkers with whom they compete, more or less, directly. As one who has taken the trouble to become informed on some of the labor conditions in farm areas using Mexican workers, I have become firmly convinced that the Mexican labor program is a gross injustice which perpetuates, and sometimes actually worsens, the already substandard conditions of our farmworkers.

Now we have some specific testimony as to the effect of the program. I would like here to introduce, for the information of the Congress, a petition which has come to my attention signed by 25 residents of Texas, who attest to the evils of this system based on their own firsthand experience and misery.

The petition signed by these U.S.-citizen farmworkers states, as follows:

We trust that this may not be an addition to your burden of responsibilities. We are unemployed farm laborers, and would like to take this opportunity to inform you why.

From radio and television broadcasts we learn that farmers claim that Americans refuse to perform farm-labor tasks and, therefore, braceros must be hired.

From the Harlingen newspaper we further learn that ——— says that every man would be employed if he would accept the first job available. Such a job would be accepted if it would offer a meritorious salary.

Mr. ———, if our farmers would pay wages commensurate with our standards of living, countless of unemployed Americans would respond to the call of work and eliminate the need for braceros. At present most farmers offer only 45 to 50 cents per hour for fieldwork, far insufficient to meet our demands. Braceros can afford to live on low wages, as they do not have taxes to pay, and we do.

As citizens of our country, we believe that it is only fair and just that we get priority in employment and wages, rather than braceros who come from foreign lands.

Besides being paid low wages, we often work only 2 to 3 days a week. Sometimes the working hours in those days combined do not make a working day. We demand higher wages and longer working hours to meet our living costs.

We feel that in your position you could instigate action to persuade our farmers to pay decent wages to Americans and abolish the phrase "Americans refuse to work."

The Role of Women in the New Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on April 27, 1961, Baroness Garnett Stackelberg addressed the Women's Civic League in Baltimore.

As a columnist for the Baltimore News-Post, Baroness Stackelberg exemplifies the important role that women play in today's world. Her comments with respect to communism are most interesting and are based on personal experience.

I ask unanimous consent that this speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD and recommend its reading to all my colleagues.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH OF BARONESS STACKELBERG BEFORE THE WOMEN'S CIVIC LEAGUE IN BALTIMORE APRIL 27, 1961

Mrs. Wonderlic, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Senate, and distinguished guests, it gives me distinct pleasure to speak to you today and celebrate with you the 50th anniversary of the Women's Civic League of Baltimore.

There has been an outcry in the Nation for more women to be appointed to important posts in the new administration. The caliber of the ladies in the Women's Civic League is a proof of what intelligent and determined women can accomplish. If every city in the country had as alert a group, our Nation would be stronger. They have put forth time, thought and arduous work in the fields of health and welfare, aid to youth, education, recreation, proper zoning, worked to make theirs a cleaner city and in fact handled everything from juvenile delinquency to snow removal.

The power of women politically was demonstrated during the last campaign, when Mrs. Lyndon Johnson and various wives and sisters of the Kennedys, brought in thousands of votes to help swing the election for President Kennedy, by traveling 75,000 miles and making speeches all over the country.

As some of you know, I am a columnist for the Baltimore News Post, a Hearst paper. For a reporter to properly cover the youth packed New Frontier she needs today to be an expert on art, 18th century furniture, literature, poetry, gourmet cooking, and how not to spoil little girls.

Sinclair Lewis once said, that when audiences come to see authors lecture it is largely in the hope that they'll be funnier to listen to than to read. I think this may apply also to audiences who come to hear the lesser brand of writers, like columnists. But today I am not going to be funny.

I lectured for 4 years during the war to get women to support the war effort. I had been a prisoner of war for 7 months in Shanghai, China, where I lived for 10 years, and was returned to America on the exchange ship, *Gripsholm*. Those were treacherous times, but the problems we face today are infinitely more grave and complex.

The President will need all his youth and vigor to be able to handle the complex problems facing him today. He has aroused confidence in his first 100 days by his devotion to duty, urgency, and enthusiasm and gained much personal popularity. Whether that can be translated into support for his programs in Congress is another story.

Every President they say is allowed a honeymoon of about 100 days and judging from the criticism of the handling of the Cuban invasion, his is about over, whether or not the CIA or the Defense Department is to blame.

The President is making some bold changes in strategy. One of the most important is associating social reform with our foreign policy. In past administrations the foreign policy was beamed more to protecting American interests and property abroad. The pitch for social reform should help repair some of the damage that has been done to our prestige in Latin America.

Another innovation is the Peace Corps. If nothing more is accomplished than to arouse the interest and enthusiasm of American youth and channel it to try to create good will abroad, that is already something. The Peace Corps could succeed if we can train sufficiently the youthful emissaries, and if we can keep Communists from infiltrating the Corps. We should turn to missionaries, who have had a century of experience and training in medical and educational work abroad, as well as religious.

I remember well the Japanese slogan of "Asia for the Asiatics," that was painted on every building in the Far East and the effect it had on the Chinese. Also I memember saying, "This is the end of the white man in the Far East" on the morning of Pearl Harbor as the buildings shook and the 6-inch shells sunk British, American, and French gunboats in the harbor of Shanghai, a few hundred feet away in front of our windows. A few hours later the Japanese marched in and took over that great international city.

It was all a part of the old story of the Rising Tide of Color. A few years later after China fell, one-half of the earth's population came under Communist rule.

It was less than 45 years ago that communism was confined to a rented room in Zurich and the brains of one man—Lenin. Today communism dominates two-fifths of the globe and more than one-half of mankind, and is within 90 miles of our shores. How long can we go on permitting the Russians to take over the countries of the world, undermine our prestige, and gain lead time in science and psychological warfare, before we reach the point of no return?

We do not admit as a government or as a people that we are at war locked in a deadly and perpetual struggle with a conspiratorial elite, who have perverted every form of human activity to the cause of winning the conflict. Hence, we have no grand strategy and no sustained willpower as they have, either for offensive or defensive action. We tend to treat the as-

saults on Laos, South Vietnam, the Berlin blockade, and the penetration of Africa, as unfortunate isolated incidents, which only temporarily interrupt the world's "normal state of peace."

Our country, grasping for bigger and better material things, has become paralyzed by a cult of doubt and no longer seems to believe in its own values and traditions. Our only objective seems to be to maintain the status quo and assure ourselves after every disaster that there will still be time. The protection of our liberties and our way of life is far more important, than to maintain peace at any price.

The Soviets have more than 100 schools and academies in which agents from all over the world are trained in sabotage, guerilla warfare, and subversion, and are taught as well, the language, history, and customs of the countries they are working to undermine. As distasteful as it is to Americans to employ what we call dirty tactics, we probably won't survive unless we understand and perfect ourselves in the same methods. The Central Intelligence Agency's miscalculation of guerilla warfare and of the police state of Castro in the recent Cuban fiasco is a case in point.

The vital problem facing us today is what we can do as individuals. It may sound trite, but I recommend:

1. That you read your newspapers to keep well informed of facts which affect your homes and very existence, as well as what is going on in Congress.

2. That you write letters to your newspapers and elected representatives to keep a voice in what is going on in our Nation, and also to keep your editors and lawmakers informed of your views.

3. That you read books constantly to help you understand the people of other countries and their aspirations and needs.

4. That you be vigilant in getting out the vote at election time.

5. That you keep yourself informed of the aims of the men you vote for.

6. That you contribute to Radio Free Europe and encourage our Government and Congress to step up broadcasting in foreign languages to all the world, to counteract Russian propaganda. The Soviets spend 100 times more than the United States on propaganda.

7. That you promote exchange of students, the future leaders of the world.

8. That you set up organizations in every major city through which students from other countries can be invited to our American homes and learn about our hospitality and way of life.

9. That you treat with courtesy and kindness all foreign tourists, whom we need to bolster our economy.

10. That guide books be published with translations in many languages for our larger gateway cities. It should contain an explanation of our customs, historical heritage, how to order in a restaurant, how to find different priced hotels, tourist centers, YMCA's and YWCA's, and how to sightsee.

11. Finally, I also suggest that a committee of editors, columnists, and editorial writers, who know the world, should be formed to analyze Communist propaganda and then issue a weekly newsletter to say 1,000 editors who will publish same thereby enabling their readers to recognize and understand hidden and misleading Communist propaganda.

In closing I would like to again compliment the good deeds of the Women's Civic League of Baltimore, which indicate that during the last 50 years they have worked with a sure instinct and full awareness of the contemporary slogan of the DAR's: "For evil men to triumph, good men need only do nothing."

Gold, the Dollar, and the Free World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is a speech that was delivered by Mr. David Rockefeller before the Economic Club of New York on March 7, 1961.

Mr. Rockefeller has made some astute comments on the problem of gold and the dollar which I feel will be of great interest to our colleagues:

GOLD, THE DOLLAR, AND THE FREE WORLD

(By David Rockefeller, president, the Chase Manhattan Bank)

(A speech delivered before the Economic Club of New York, Grand Ballroom, the Waldorf-Astoria, New York City, Mar. 7, 1961.)

I have occasionally been seated along the wings of this table, and often with you out there in front, but this is the first time I have been privileged to stand at the rostrum, I thank you for the occasion. And I shall try to respect the virtue of brevity that I so learned to appreciate as a listener among you.

It is a special pleasure to appear on a program with Governor Coyne. No other friendship means more to us than that with our good neighbor to the north, Canada. And I know that we have all benefited from Governor Coyne's remarks here tonight. In the circumstances, it seemed logical to me to make this a completely international evening. I have, therefore, elected to share with you some further thoughts on the realities and the problems of our international financial position as I see them.

I speak of "further thoughts" since so much has already been written and said about this matter in recent months. We have had the specter of a sizable gold outflow to awaken us, and the President himself has labeled the international financial problem as one of the most pressing to confront us.

I think it is helpful, even necessary, in approaching this problem to recognize that it has two somewhat separate, but vitally related, elements. First, we have the fact of a continuing deficit in our payments with other nations, and the various actions that must be taken if we are to eliminate the deficit. But then secondly, we must consider the whole system of international currency reserves necessary to the financing of trade between nations, which has been built up in the postwar years, and the role of the dollar in that system. For I am not sure it is widely realized that the United States could have a sizable gold outflow even if our own international payments were in balance; or, conversely, that if foreign creditors are willing to keep on acquiring dollars, and dollar obligations in payment for goods sold and services rendered, then there can be a very sizable payments deficit with no outflow of gold. It is important, then, to face both aspects of the problem, and to take wise action on both fronts.

Clearly, the most urgent matter at present is the sizable deficit in our balance of payments. This deficit has not only led to a sharp rise in foreign holdings of dollars—it also raises grave concern about our ability to manage our own affairs. The result of a large and persistent deficit has been a tendency on the part of those holding dollars to convert them into gold or other currencies, lest the value of the dollar become impaired.

BIG STEP FORWARD IN 1960

There is a certain ironic quality in the way this payments deficit has continued to unfold over the past 12 months. For the truth is that our country made a great step forward in 1960 toward reducing our fundamental payments deficit. Our exports in this period have increased to a rate of near $20 billion annually, while imports have leveled out. The resulting favorable balance of trade of close to $5 billion is far larger than that of any other nation. Yet in spite of all this, we had more real difficulty with the dollar in 1960 than at any other time in recent years.

OUTFLOW OF $2 BILLION

The reason, of course, lay in a new element in the picture: A sizable outflow from the United States of short-term funds which was in no way related to trade. All told, this outflow amounted to $2 billion or more, much of it in the second half year. Never before in the postwar years have we experienced an outflow on a similar scale. Without it, the deficit in our foreign payments, because of our large favorable trade balance, would have been reduced to more manageable proportions—perhaps to $1½ billion.

The initial spark that induced these funds to move abroad was clearly a differential in short-term interest rates which opened up between the United States and Western Europe. In late summer, you will recall, this differenial amounted to as much as 3½ percent, and the cost of hedging on forward exchange was about half that amount. It was too great a temptation for treasurers and international speculators with sharp pencils. Unfortunately, the movement in dollars set off a gold outflow. It also produced the illusion that our basic payments position was getting worse, rather than better.

At any rate, certain companies that foresaw a need for funds abroad at some future date were spurred to make immediate transfers, and they were then joined by others, including speculators, who began to bet against the future of the dollar. A stream of modest size soon threatened to become a flood. An outflow of gold caused initially by a spread in interest rates came close to precipitating a confidence crisis for the dollar, which might have been far more serious.

Fortunately, this danger now appears to have passed. Not only Americans, but foreigners holding dollars seem to have regained their poise and perspective. In the meantime, too, the differential in interest rates has narrowed. Today, after hedging on forward exchange, the differential amounts to about 1 percent, a far less tempting lure to foreign exchange speculation. Certain American companies with rather sizable holdings of short-term foreign assets are now considering repatriating at least part of their dollars.

RESTRAINT IS DESIRABLE

A lesson might fairly be drawn from this experience for all of us in the business community. It would seem wise and responsible—in a time such as the recent past, when the national interest clearly is involved—to exercise restraint in responding to a differential in foreign interest rates, particularly when the gains are incidental to a company's main business, and loom relatively small on the income statement. Here, as in so many areas, the business community has an opportunity, even an obligation, to lead the Nation in a rational pattern of behavior consistent with our growing role in the world.

A return of short-term funds, which is bound to come sooner or later, will, of course, temporarily help our balance of payments. But this will only tend to conceal the real problem, just as last year's outflow tended to exaggerate it. Assuming our favorable trade balance continues at the present level, we will still have a hard-core deficit in our balance of payments in the neighborhood of $1½ to $2 billion a year. In view of the fact that our cumulative deficit in the past 10 years amounted to $17 billion, this continuing hard-core deficit is too large, and it should be our aim to eliminate it altogether—or at least to keep it within modest proportions. I know you all are familiar with the basic cause of this deficit—the fact that our favorable trade balance, large as it is, still is not great enough to finance the very sizable military, political and economic commitments we have abroad. One of the major outlays, of course, is the $3 billion we spend on the maintenance and support of military establishments in other countries. Another is the $2½ billion or so of private foreign investment by American business, and still a third is our foreign economic aid, including Government loans, which also amounts to $2½ to $3 billion. Let us look at these elements separately.

There has been much public debate on the subject of economic aid; but I believe more often than not it has generated more heat than light. There are those who would solve the imbalance in our payments by going after such aid with a broad-edged ax. I personally would be opposed to such action, as a serious disservice to our national interest. It is a political fact of life, in this divided world we live in, wrecking our foreign-aid program would gravely threaten the strength—and darken the hopes—of free nations throughout the world. On the balance sheet of history, there is no economic gain that weighs more than such a loss. Even in strictly economic terms, however, there is sound argument against such measures.

MOST AID TIED TO EXPORTS

The fact is that slashing our economic aid would cut away only a small part of our payments deficit. Most aid today—approximately 80 percent—is tied to exports of goods and services, rather than dollars. To cut back on aid would be merely to cut back on exports—and hence would be self-defeating. Although this linking of economic aid directly to exports runs counter to the trade policy we should like to see, I believe that, under present circumstances, the United States has no other alternative. President Eisenhower headed in that direction over the past 2 years, and the new administration indicates that it plans to carry on in the same manner.

The best way, of course, to solve our payments problem is further to expand exports. No one will quarrel with that. No is anyone likely to disagree with the obvious corollary: that to expand exports we need to cut costs, to become more competitive in world markets, and, above all, to keep our economic house, here at home, in good order. These are all appealing sentiments, and it is easy to voice them. It's a much tougher proposition to carry them out. All I can say tonight is that the responsibility falls on people in the business community like you and me, and on others like us. It's not something that can be pushed on to the next fellow or turned over to Government.

LONGER TERM CREDIT NEEDED

At Chase Manhattan, we have been conscious of this problem and are exploring ways to give constructive help, and I should like to take a few minutes to describe for you a plan for action along these lines that appears to us to be promising. Our primary business as commercial bankers, is, of course, to provide our customers with short-term credit. We know, however, that certain types of exports require longer term financing which is not as readily available on favorable terms for American manufacturers as it is for manufacturers in certain other countries, such as Canada, Britain, France, and Germany. This is the case particularly with respect to medium-term credits to finance exports of machinery, equipment, and other capital goods.

The provision of such credit obviously involves unusual and added risks. It might be expected that the commercial banks would be prepared to provide this type of credit if adequate guarantees or insurance were available. In point of fact, however, we are already so heavily committed with domestic term loans, that even if the hazards of lending abroad were eliminated, it is doubtful that most commercial banks would be in a position to expand to any considerable extent credits on exports, which tie up funds for periods of from 3 to 7 years.

COOPERATION IS NECESSARY

I am convinced that to generate this kind of credit in sufficient volume on the order, say, of a billion dollars a year, our great institutional investors—such as the insurance companies, the pension funds, and the savings banks—must be induced to cooperate. They, rather than the commercial banks, have the requisite funds available for longer term lending. But they will make such investments only if the extraordinary risks frequently encountered in export financing are covered by a reasonable guarantee, probably by our Government, and if they are not required to handle the credit investigations, the servicing and the collections for which they have no facilities.

What is needed is an arrangement that will result in bringing together institutional funds (under an appropriate Government guarantee) with the international banking facilities and services of the major commercial banks. I believe this could best be accomplished through the establishment of specialized export finance companies which might be organized as subsidiaries of commercial banks. The whole problem is one we in Chase Manhattan are currently exploring, and I'm happy to say that the Government is taking an active interest in examining it with us.

I wish that we could rely completely on a further increase in exports to solve our balance of payments problem, but unfortunately this would be unrealistic. Our trade balance already is large, and though we can and should stretch it further, there is a logical limit. To try to press beyond this would undoubtedly call forth vigorous counterreaction by competitors in world markets. Of course there are several additional steps that can be taken. For example, the expansion of tourism in our own country, and the removal of foreign restrictions on the flow of capital into the United States. And yet—in the final analysis—I doubt whether all of these together will be enough to bring our international payments into balance.

AN UNWELCOME CHOICE

If this is so, we must examine two further areas: first, whether the movement of long-term private capital abroad should be curbed; and secondly, whether our large military expenditures abroad could be reduced. To choose between these alternatives, if indeed a choice were required, would pose a most unwelcome task. Certainly, we all would want to avoid to the end, if possible, the imposition of exchange controls on private capital. The United States has never had such controls in peacetime, and they run completely counter to the type of economic world we are striving for.

Moreover, it is imperative to realize that what we have done in the past to build up our investment abroad acts today as a favorable factor in our balance of payments. Last year the inflow of earnings from these investments (not counting earnings reinvested abroad) amounted to almost $3 billion—a larger sum, actually, than our investment of new capital abroad in the same period. And yet, in spite of all this, I don't suppose there is anyone in this room who would hesitate to place controls on private capital, if the only alternative were to weaken seriously the national security of our country.

This leads us directly to one of the toughest elements to gage in our whole balance of payments problem. Just how essential are our military expenditures, and is it necessary for the United States to carry so great a burden as we now carry. It is almost impossible for anyone not involved in the military picture to judge whether total outlays in this field can be reduced—and indeed the military services themselves divide on the question.

And yet one thing seems clear: the world is now entering another period of revolutionary technology in the art of defense and aggressive warfare. It would appear that future emphasis will be placed on long-range missiles rather than on manned aircraft. In these circumstances, one might hope that over a period of time the revolutionary changes now under way would tend to reduce the size and cost of our oversea forces.

In the meantime, certain steps which would reduce our military expenditures abroad could be taken fairly quickly, if necessary. For example, a reduction in the purchase of supplies from local sources, with a possible saving of as much as $200 million annually was ordered by President Eisenhower and has been sustained by President Kennedy. With a total bill for supplies purchased overseas by the military probably exceeding $1 billion in 1960, it would seem possible, if need be, to shift a still larger proportion of our buying to U.S. sources.

BROAD PRINCIPLE RECOGNIZED

Since the common cause of all free nations is at stake, it also seems reasonable to hope that our allies might absorb a part of the present dollar cost of our common defense. This particularly should be the case with respect to Germany, which devotes only about 5 percent of its national product to defense, as against 10 percent in our own country.

The reports of the recent meeting between President Kennedy and Foreign Minister Von Brentano were encouraging in their recognition of one broad principle—that the large surplus which Germany has been running on its balance of payments has a bearing on our deficit, and that neither their surplus nor our deficit is good for the sound health of the free world as a whole. Germany's agreement to provide foreign aid on a continuing basis (although not yet clearly spelled out) and her recently announced upward revaluation of the mark, both could contribute toward an improvement of this situation.

SIX HUNDRED AND FIFTY MILLION DOLLARS IN GERMANY

Still more progress, however, should be possible with regard to military expenditures. Dollar outlays for this purpose run to $650 million or more a year in Germany alone. All of us can recognize strong objections to Germany financing the pay and living costs of American troops. But there are also German nationals who work in support of the American forces; and our forces use German railroads, telegraph, and other facilities. Why should not Germany offer such manpower and facilities as a contribution to our mutual defense in which she clearly has such a vital interest?

The serious settling of these problems requires a vision broader than any simple bi-

lateral view between the United States and Germany. The issues at stake involve not only balance-of-payments considerations. They also get into the thorny question of how the burden of economic and military aid should be shared. It would be manifestly unfair to single out Germany exclusively in this regard, for the United States pays out dollars for the use of facilities in many countries of Western Europe and all must participate, in varying degrees, in the solution of our common problem.

We sometimes forget that the allocation of mutual costs for defense was set, for the most part in the early fifties, at a time when the world had a serious dollar shortage, and when Western European economies were still recovering from the ravages of war. Now the whole picture has changed. It is time for a fresh look at the whole situation—a look that can best be carried out through organizations like NATO and the newly proposed OECD. The fact is that, in concert, the nations of the West should be able to meet all their commitments, both military and economic, without undue strain on the balance of payments of any single member, including the United States. But to do so, there must be a genuine desire to work together, based on mutual understanding and recognition of common interests. This is a job for quiet diplomacy and patient negotiation.

As I suggested earlier, however, the deficit in our foreign payments is not the sole problem that confronts us. We have in addition the question of the adequacy of the monetary system of the free world to provide sufficient liquidity for the growing volume of trade and to protect key currencies like the dollar and the pound from extreme pressures—pressures which are induced by economic and psychological developments, often intensified by speculators.

BIG RESERVES NECESSARY

I doubt whether many people who are not specialists in these matters realize what a dominant role the dollar has come to fill in the postwar years. To an extent even greater than the pound sterling, it has come to serve as the store of value accumulated and held by nations in all corners of the world who do not wish to hold gold for this purpose. Today other countries through their citizens, businesses, and official institutions, hold more than $19 billion worth of liquid dollar assets here in the United States, in the form of bank deposits, Treasury bills and other short-term instruments. If the dollar is to fulfill its role as a central reserve currency, these dollar holdings must be considered as safe as gold. Indeed, some $12 billion of them, representing central bank reserves, are immediately redeemable into gold.

DRAWBACKS AND COMPENSATIONS

Large reserves such as those we have described are essential to the smooth functioning of our international monetary system. The British still play a similar role with their sterling balances, although now on a more modest scale. But, as the British discovered a long time ago, the responsibility of being a reserve currency center has its drawbacks as well as its compensation. A country fulfilling such a role has to be as far above reproach as Caesar's wife. Once its fiscal virtue is doubted, rightly or wrongly, the damage could be fatal. There can be, in a word, a run on the bank, threatening the country's international solvency.

There are those who feel that pressure of this kind is all to the good, for it places a certain discipline on the United States to lead a sound, conservative economic life, and indeed there is much merit to this argument. But the trouble is that, during periods of economic recession at home, countercyclical measures, which are perfectly valid from a domestic point of view, may run contrary to our interests as a central reserve currency country.

At such a time, events outside our own control may buffet us—and drive the creditors clamoring to our doorstep. Even our own citizens may be induced to move their belongings abroad. No better illustration of this dilemma is needed than the pattern of the past year, when we found ourselves afflicted with a moderate recession, took a dose of easier money to cure it, and soon began reaping the whirlwind.

It is a fact of life that in a modern, industrial society, every nation needs a certain freedom of maneuver for its domestic economic policy. What is required of international finance is a system that will permit adequate flexibility, while affording the liquidity and safety that is needed in a world currency.

The international monetary mechanism as it now stands is clearly inadequate in this regard. It places too heavy a burden on the dollar and the pound, and it restricts action on the domestic scene, often at the expense of American and British citizens.

More and more this fact is gaining recognition among economists, bankers, and Government officials. A number of proposals have now been put forward to rectify it. Perhaps the most far-reaching of these is the so-called Triffin plan, developed by Prof. Robert Triffin of Yale University. Many of you will recall that Professor Triffin would transform the present International Monetary Fund into what, in effect, would be a supercentral bank. He would set up procedures to lead member countries eventually to transfer most of their official dollar, pound, and other foreign currency balances into the Fund. In addition, they could make a further transfer of gold. For all of this, they would receive deposits in the Fund.

UNIQUE FEATURE OF PLAN

Most nations would then hold the bulk of their official foreign exchange reserves in the form of deposits with the Monetary Fund, and the Fund would hold as assets both gold and liquid claims on other nations. In the case of the dollar, for example, the Fund might eventually take over most of the $12 billion of Treasury bills, time deposits and other liquid assets now held by foreign central banks. The Fund would earn interest on such assets, but it also would pay out interest to the central banks on the deposits with it.

A unique feature of the Triffin plan would be the ability of the Monetary Fund to create deposits, if necessary, under certain strict rules and procedures. In doing this, the Fund would provide added foreign exchange to countries needing it—exchange in a form acceptable to most other nations. Thus, the Fund would become in the international field a lender of last resort, just as the Federal Reserve System is in the United States today.

EXCHANGE RATE GUARANTEE

There seems to me much far-seeing sense in Professor Triffin's proposal, but it does involve the extreme measure of turning over to a central organization immense resources and power—indeed, a power which could impinge to some extent on our national sovereignty. Among other features, there is one that might make the United States in particular take pause. For the plan would require all member nations to give an exchange rate guarantee, in terms of the relation of their own currency to gold, on all assets of their country held by the Monetary Fund.

In essence, this means that the United States would guarantee the gold content of the dollar insofar as Monetary Fund holdings were concerned. We certainly would hope and expect that the price of gold would not be raised, and there is no earthly reason for such a step in the foreseeable future. Yet one hesitates to write a blank check for future generations on a matter not completely in our own control.

Much that the Triffin plan calls for could be accomplished, I believe, in other, more simple ways. The least complicated method, if it did not encounter serious obstacles, would merely involve an agreement among major central banks to hold each other's currencies, under certain conditions, rather than demand gold. Unfortunately, such an agreement runs counter to present policies and regulations of many central banks, and it is highly doubtful that we could expect its adoption. As a practical matter, I believe we may do best to look to the Monetary Fund for more effective help, making only moderate changes in its organization, rules, and procedures. This may not provide the ultimate answer, but it would go a long way toward meeting the immediate dilemma.

In line with this proposal, the United States itself might do well to contemplate borrowing freely from the Fund at an appropriate moment. Under existing rules, we have a theoretical capacity to borrow as much as $5½ billion. I use the term theoretical because the Fund at this stage doesn't possess the equivalent of $5½ billion of the types of currencies the United States would require. And, of course, no one would really expect us to borrow as much as $5½ billion.

There is no reason, however, why we shouldn't go to the Fund as a routine matter for as much as $1 billion, since that is approximately the amount of gold which the United States paid into the Fund. Such a borrowing would carry only a small service charge, and it should arouse no concern. At the same time, the Fund ought to use currencies other than the dollar in making new loans to deficit countries. For example, if the British have to borrow again, they might borrow in marks rather than in dollars.

UNDERSTANDING, COOPERATION NEEDED

If the Fund is to buttress the dollar against extreme swings, it will need to have at its command larger supplies of other currencies. It has been proposed by E. M. Bernstein, former Director of Research of the Fund, that the Fund, or a subsidiary set up for the purpose, be given the right to borrow automatically currencies of member countries which are running a large surplus. This is a very simple proposal that I think makes a lot of sense. It would assure a greater degree of flexibility for the Fund, and put it in a better position to deal with emergencies.

One overriding conclusion emerges from any consideration of these twin problems of the balance of payments and the gold outflow: that is the need not only for discipline at home, but for understanding and cooperation from other peoples, particularly those of the West. The United States would find it very difficult to erase the deficit in its foreign payments by acting alone—especially where heavy commitments for mutual defense and aid are involved. By the same token, if we are to realize stability in world currency arrangements, mutual restraint and coordinated action are imperative.

A CHALLENGE TO OUR WISDOM

For this reason, I share Douglas Dillon's belief in the great importance of OECD, the newly proposed Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. In OECD, as well as NATO, we have forums where many of these matters can be faced, where policies can be coordinated, and where burdens can be shared.

There is more here, then, than a gold outflow or payments deficit to challenge us. These matters challenge our wisdom, our patience, and the sense of common purpose binding all free peoples. We can never respond by retreat. For isolation means

evasion. We can never respond by panic. For no strength is born of fear.

We can respond only by acting—ourselves and with our allies—in a manner both mature and imaginative, to show the world the capacity of free nations to think anew and to act together.

Major Aspects of World Crises—The Challenge of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday, I was privileged to review major aspects of world crises in an address over radio station WGN, Chicago.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF ADDRESS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, REPUBLICAN, OF WISCONSIN, OVER RADIO STATION WGN, CHICAGO, ILL., MAY 7, 1961

Friends, the world—and we, as Americans—today are faced with serious issues which affect our progress, our survival, and the future of mankind.

The establishment of peace—or at least a climate in which differences among nations—can be accommodated or negotiated—still remains as the No. 1 challenge.

If this can be accomplished successfully, the world may progress to new, unparalleled heights of good living for all people.

If we fail, however, the erupting conflicts could well wreak catastrophe upon humanity.

In such tumultuous, complex times, then, the grave questions which require realistic answers include:

Can we stop the Reds without a global war; can we create machinery for resolving the great differences between East and West; can we encourage respect for, and adherence to, international law—not tolerate lawlessness, as now committed by the Communists?

Today, Mr. Khrushchev and his henchmen—now controlling about 1 billion people, or one-third of the earth's population—are throwing more manpower and resources into battle for attaining the ultimate goal of communism: that of world conquest.

What can we do about it?

First, as a leader of the free world, we have a great responsibility for providing not only the military power, but also the political-economic-ideological leadership to combat the Red offensive.

Second, the free world alliances—NATO, SEATO, ANZUS—need to assume a greater role of leadership in their areas of the world.

This includes:

Creating military forces adequate to combat Communist penetrations by force; developing more effective programs to meet the nonmilitary needs of the people—particularly the less-developed have-nots.

Third, we need to take a new analytical look at the role of the United Nations in world affairs.

This would involve the following:

1. Providing a United Nations military force to more effectively meet obligations in troubled areas.

2. Take measures to assure that the members meet their financial and other obligations—not shove off more of the burden on Uncle Sam.

3. Stop the Communists from using the U.N. as an international forum for propaganda.

Time after time, the United States and other non-Communist nations find themselves—unjustly, in many cases—as defendants against false and irresponsible charges by the Reds.

This should be stopped.

Unless we fight back more effectively, however, we can expect to fail—in the future, as in the past—to win battles in the court of world opinion.

NEEDED: GREATER NATIONAL UNITY

Now, how can we, as individual citizens, best face these challenges?

At this time in history, we need greatness, unity, dedication, and leadership and followership, to win the global battle against communism—as well as to fulfill the growing domestic, peaceful needs of a fast-expanding population.

In these critical days, there is no time for:

Unwarranted political sniping: headline seeking, at the cost of national prestige or policy; for defeatism or passitivity; or isolation or disillusion.

Rather, this is a time for stiffening our backbone, for reinvigorating the moral and spiritual, as well as the manpower and material strength of the Nation.

Then, we need to take a new, hard look at our domestic and foreign policies. The purpose would be to determine how or where these may be failing to effectively meet the challenges.

The new administration has had its baptism of fire, in Cuba and Laos. The results are today's headlines—regrettably not favorable.

Nevertheless, the task now is to learn a lesson; to revamp, as necessary, our policies; and to go forward in a united effort to meet the global threat to our security and freedom.

Teachers Against Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL FINDLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the National Education Association, consisting of public school teachers, has endorsed Federal aid to education. Some people assume from this fact that all teachers are like-minded.

Such is not the case. For example, here is a communication from a group of public schoolteachers in my district:

CAMP POINT, ILL., *April 17, 1961,*

Hon. PAUL FINDLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FINDLEY: Contrary to the stand taken by the delegates of the Mississippi Valley Division of IEA—Illinois Education Association—we the undersigned, all of whom are teachers in Unit District No. 3, Adams County, Ill., are opposed to Federal aid to education for the following reasons:

1. It will lead to Federal control of our schools.

2. It does not offer any solution to the present problem of our schools.

3. It will only be a tax burden without any justification.

4. We believe that the Federal Government should not interfere in problems which are the concern of the local government.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth J. McCoy, C.I C. Clapper, Virginia Henricks, Vivian Hufnagel, L. O. Romero, W. A. Harris, David L. Allen, Harold H. Sickles, Robert March, Joseph L. Wartick, Howard L. Carter, Ethel Blentlinger, Helen Wickliffe, Curtiss Sherman, Harry Elbe, Larry L. Westerman, Gladys Evans, Gene Parker, Marion L. Magill.

This communication contains the signatures of 83 percent of the teachers at Central High School, Camp Point, Adams County, Ill.

What Are the Sacrifices?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, we await the leadership of our President and the answers asked by Mr. Gould Lincoln in his article that appeared in the Washington Star:

THE POLITICAL MILL—KENNEDY HARDENING UP THE PEOPLE

(By Gould Lincoln)

Now the American people are being blamed—for what? For not being willing to do what must be done to check the drive of world communism—to win the cold war. President Kennedy said as much in his recent address prepared for delivery in Chicago.

"Our greatest adversary," the President wrote, "is not the Russians. It is our own unwillingness to do what must be done." Why is the President so sure the American people are unwilling to do what must be done? In the first place, they have not been told what they must do—except to sacrifice.

Was the President referring only to financial sacrifices—to an outpouring of more and more money to be collected in taxes by the Federal Government? If so, the people have been put on notice. The Kennedy domestic program, if fully implemented by legislation for all kinds of social welfare, will demand more and more of the people's income. But even in his tax program the President has asked for certain remission of taxes to meet certain tax increases.

Of course, more money will be needed by the Federal Government for meeting the Russian challenge in space, in missiles and in their ability, along with their Chinese allies, to conduct "limited wars." Is the President sure that the people will oppose such expenditures if they have to pay for them? There has been no reason to believe that the Congress, or the people will resist necessary expenditures for the security of the United States.

Or was the President referring to an unwillingness on the part of the people to fight a war? The people quite naturally want peace—but not at any price. They have never in their history failed to make the sacrifices necessary when this country has become involved in war. The United States is committed in many parts of the world to aid in repelling Communist aggression,

or any other aggression, when made upon nations of the free world. It is committed, too, to act in its own self-defense against Communist aggression.

PROBLEM OF PROCEDURE

The question is when and how is the Nation to act on such commitments. Only a couple of weeks ago the country was faced with the Cuban problem, and whether to go all out—with arms if necessary—to aid the Cuban rebels against the Communist-dominated regime of Fidel Castro. It does not help matters now to say that, of course, if we wanted to, we could have run over Castro. We didn't. As of today, no plan has been advanced by the Kennedy administration for dealing with this Communist government, the first set up in the Western Hemisphere, and only 90 miles from our shores. The Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee has been told there is no present plan for any operations against the Castro government—but that if Castro moves against our naval base at Guantanamo, our Armed Forces will be used.

Senator FULBRIGHT, chairman of the full Foreign Relations Committee, has said the invasion was a blunder for which the White House, the CIA, the Defense Department, and the State Department must bear responsibility. No one should expect the President to declare his intention of using armed force against Castro and the Communists in Cuba—certainly not until he is ready to do so—or until after the action has been taken. In the meantime, the American people are kept waiting to learn what, if anything, is to be done about Communist Cuba. There has been no unwillingness on the part of the people as a whole. There has been suspicion, however, that some of President Kennedy's advisers have taken a "hang your clothes on a hickory limb but don't go near the water" attitude, which may have contributed to the Cuban fiasco.

QUESTION OF PRESTIGE

The unfortunate part of this whole Cuban episode, beyond the fact it has resulted in a firmer Communist grip on the island, lies in the position it has left us in the eyes of the world, including the eyes of the other American Republics. What is happening to the prestige of the United States abroad—prestige that was made an issue in the presidential campaign of 1960? Democratic spokesmen, including Mr. Kennedy, spoke again and again of the loss of prestige under the Eisenhower administration. Today, former President Eisenhower, former Vice President Nixon, and other Republican leaders have assured President Kennedy they will support him in international operations—Cuba and elsewhere—for the safety of the United States and the free world. They have not criticized the President for having failed in the Cuban affair. They wish the country to show a united front as a champion of the free world and an opponent of the spread of communism.

Mr. Kennedy has taken a firm position in all his pronouncements and messages to the Communist leaders. He cannot afford, however, to have another "Cuba." It may be that in his Chicago speech and other statements about the perils confronting the United States and the sacrifices he has been hardening up the American people. He may be correct in saying they are their own worst enemy because they are unwilling "to do what must be done." But there is one sure thing—they have not been put to the test in this administration.

President Kennedy served gallantly in the Second World War. Like his predecessor, General Eisenhower, he is a strong advocate of peace. He realizes that we can lose the peace as well as war if we show weakness and unwillingness to do what must be done. The people will do neither if he provides the leadership of which he is capable.

Polish Constitution Day

SPEECH
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on the 3d of May, 170 years ago, in 1791, the Polish Constitution was proclaimed. George Washington, a man acquainted with constitutions and the meaning of liberty, write to a friend:

Poland * * appears to have made large and unexpected strides toward liberty * * *.

Large indeed were the strides, for the Polish Constitution was not just another ill-conceived and ill-drafted legal document, the like of which the world has seen too often. It was a monument to man's capability to rise above petty strife and self-seeking and establish a basis upon which liberty and human dignity might endure. Almost 2 centuries after this Constitution was drafted, it continues to be recognized as one of the major accomplishments of Western society, ranking with the British and American Constitutions.

The Polish Constitution was born not of abstract thinking but of the national virtue of courage, the ability to realize the misfortune of her geographic location and to heal the wounds of previous strife. The misfortune of her location between the aggressive neighbors of Russia and Prussia was soon to press again on the Poles. Barely a year after the Constitution was established, Russian troops invaded Poland to put an end to the "dangerous novelty" of a Constitution which provided liberty. Poland resisted as best she might, but did not prevail. Such has been the tragedy and the heroism of Polish history.

To some Americans, and some of our younger Americans, Poland has seemed a long way off and 1791 a long time ago. But Poland was not a long way off when our own Nation fought for its liberty in the 18th century. Poles with their attachment to liberty were among us then and their courage stood us well. Casimir Pulaski was the most notable of these. A Polish noble who had fought for liberty at home and had been thrust penniless into exile, Pulaski offered his services to General Washington. In the new America, Pulaski brought a skill most needed—the knowledge and ability to organize and direct calvary. He is properly remembered as the "Father of American Cavalry." But he brought more than skill. He brought a dedication to liberty and a knowledge that liberty for men is indivisible. He died in battle for American liberties in the knowledge that no man is fully free until man everywhere is free. He brought to Americans the knowledge that we did not struggle alone but together with men throughout the world.

In our times, Poland again, as throughout too much of her history, does not know liberty but knows the struggle for it. It is vital that the United States retain Pulaski's knowledge that liberty is indivisible and that we do what we can to aid Poles in their present hour of need. The task is neither simple nor easy, but we do have a definite opportunity in our foreign aid to Poland.

Our modern aid to Poland began in 1957 after the Gomulka government had indicated some ability to move out from under the closest and most complete Soviet control. President Eisenhower clearly recognized the difficulties in providing assistance to a nation under a Communist government in these words:

We do not demand of these governments their adoption of any particular form of society as a condition of our economic assistance. Our one concern is that they be free—for their sake and for freedom's sake.

In this framework, our Government proceeded to provide Poland with our surplus farm commodities, notably cotton, wheat and edible oils. These were paid for in Polish currency deposited to the credit of the United States in Poland. A small loan for the purchase of machinery, farm equipment and fertilizers was negotiated. In return for this initial assistance, the Polish Government agreed to reopen the question of claims of U.S. citizens for property seized by the Communist regime after World War II. In 1960, the Warsaw government agreed to set aside some $40 million to meet these claims.

Our assistance in surplus agricultural commodities has continued and as of the present the United States holds some $400 million in Polish money resulting from the sale of these commodities. This money is frozen within Poland and cannot be converted into dollars and a proposal is under consideration at present to use much or part of it within Poland on projects approved by the United States. They would be projects designed to improve the economic situation of the Polish people. It is a fashion in which our country can make a contribution to the eventual liberty of Poles and Poland.

Poland still knows and knows well the misfortune of her geographic location next to a rapacious neighbor. But the Polish virtue of courage quite clearly has not been lost and the United States must never lose sight of it.

The John Birch Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the other day Mr. A. B. Guthrie, Jr., prize-winning author of best sellers about the American West—"The Way West," "The Big Sky"—made the following comment about the John Burch Society in a letter to the Great Falls Tribune of Great Falls, Mont.

I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the EDITOR:

Mournful memo to members of the John Birch Society: there are more witch-hunters than witches.

Elsewhere some few but noble trophies have been taken—the Eisenhower witch, the Dulles witch and the Warren witch, who will be stuffed and mounted on their broomsticks as proof to our descendants of our prowess. Record specimens though they are, they aren't enough. For most of us the pickings are too slim. Our men go out with full hearts and come back with empty game bags.

This situation can't be tolerated.

There are things we can do right here in Montana. As a first step let's forbid hunting in our state to such notorious poachers as the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the House Un-American Activities Committee. They are better armed than we and know better where good hunting is Montana for Montanans!

As a second step, let's organize a local arm of government roughly like the Fish and Game Commission, one dedicated to the proposition that our witching grounds shall satisfy our hunters.

Matter of fact, maybe the John Birch Society is serving just that purpose.

A. B. GUTHRIE, Jr.

GREAT FALLS.

Nixon's First Hundred Days

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial on Richard Nixon's days, since the changeover in administration, as it appeared in yesterday's New York Herald Tribune:

NIXON'S FIRST HUNDRED DAYS

While we are all down with this "first hundred days" fever let us not overlook Richard Nixon. On the sidelines doesn't necessarily mean out of the headlines for a man who pursues a political career with the assiduity of the former Vice President.

The start of the Kennedy administration has meant for Mr. Nixon the start of a private law practice. And more, it has been a period of orientation and trial for him in the dual role of defeated candidate and Republican leader. In both capacities he has shone.

As defeated candidate he has conducted himself with statesmanlike restraint. He did indulge in a blast when Secretary of the Interior Udall tried to pin the Cuban fiasco on the Eisenhower administration. He called it "cheap and vicious," which it was, but annoyance with Mr. Udall in recent weeks has been neither an isolated nor partisan occurrence.

Mr. Nixon's appreciation for the difficulties and dangers of the American Presidency have prompted him to speak up at the right time, and keep his counsel to himself at others. A wire of Presidential gratitude from Mr. Kennedy bears witness. We trust this message to the defeated candidate was written with proper humility by the victor who said so much so bluntly and with such cocksureness during the campaign about the need to correct so many errors of the past administration.

As a Republican leader these first hundred days or so have found Mr. Nixon busily looking for Republican talent for the future, diligently prodding his party to greater effort, sharply reminding his fellow workers that with the right kind of planning the future need not be bleak. On his own horizon are a number of office-seeking possibilities, including the governorship of California as well as the most coveted of them all. That barely evaded his grasp last year.

But the elemental clue to Mr. Nixon's attitude is to be found in his decision to make a series of speeches summing up the events of his first 3 months out of office. This action bespeaks a Nixon anxious to apply his talents to the rebuilding of the Republican Party.

Mr. Nixon's "first hundred days" found him retiring gracefully from official life and then springing back unofficially, almost unnoticed, to the political arena where he feels so much at home.

One Hundred Days of "Ripening"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in view of the serious blunders that have marked the course of this Nation in recent weeks, it is not amiss to recall some of the warnings of less than a year ago.

When the then Senator Kennedy was gearing to capture the Democrat National Convention and the presidential nomination, former President Harry Truman said:

Senator, are you certain that you are quite ready for the country or that the country is ready for you in the role of President in January 1961? I am greatly concerned and troubled about the situation we are up against in the world now and in the immediate future. That is why I would hope that someone with the greatest possible maturity and experience would be available at this time.

And former Secretary of State Dean Acheson said:

Too young * * * still a very young man and uninformed. He needs to ripen.

The following article in the Washington Evening Star, by the columnist, Constantine Brown, is in the nature of a further warning that the "ripening" process can be still more costly:

The first 3 months of the Kennedy administration have come to an end with America at its lowest ebb in many years so far as international prestige is concerned. Mistakes have followed mistakes.

While the Chief Executive has assumed sole responsibility for what has happened in at least three corners of the world, there is no doubt that his intimate advisers have more than an equal share of responsibility. These men, almost without exception, are learned and studious economists, historians and scientists who have been able to deliver splendid lectures to their admiring students or who have written books and magazine articles winning plaudits from many intellectuals and book reviewers. But most of them have lived, relatively speaking, in the ivory tower of theory and have associated principally with other people who shared their theoretical thinking. Diplomacy and affairs of state, these days in particular, require a sense of sometimes ruthless reality. Perhaps the uneducated Nikita Khrushchev could serve as the best example of what modern diplomacy must cope with.

In the 3 months since Mr. Kennedy took office amid the loud approval, not only of the American people, but also of the rest of the world, we have lost more ground internationally than in the last 10 years. Mr. Kennedy, energetic, personable, articulate and full of the best intentions, makes an excellent impression on nearly everybody. His television appearances are described as nonpareil. But in these trying days, when Western civilization is on the brink, more than that is required—a maturity, if not of the Chief Executive himself, at least of those who surround him so closely.

It is in this that he has failed. The enormous blunders of the last 3 months are the result of the lack of realism and maturity of his entourage. The speeches and declarations made by the Chief Executive are inspiring, forthright and strong. But they are never followed by action.

For instance, powerful words were expressed when the Russians initiated the Lao crisis. To back up his words, a carrier and two destroyers were ordered to Saigon from Hong Kong. But all knowing quarters in Washington expressed confidentially the belief that these were mere gestures and that we would never actually intervene. Further, the Lao crisis actually was a Russian-American affair. Yet we accepted Britain as our middleman. The cease-fire agreement between Moscow and London came into effect only weeks after it was first proposed, when the Russian-backed Communist Lao already had taken the most important strategic points. It is an open secret that we accepted the terms demanded by the Soviets.

The fiasco in Cuba was one of the most monumental blunders ever committed by our frequently faltering diplomacy. Not only was the whole operation, directed from Washington in its initial phases, all wrong, but we announced before it occurred that we would not give it the backing without which it could never succeed.

It was folly to imagine that a group of 1,500 men could succeed against Fidel Castro's forces, 100 times as big and supported by MIG's and Russian tanks, all manned by crews from Poland, Czechoslovakia, and presumably China. Moreover, it was foolish planning to land the would-be rescuers of Cuba on only one strip 400 feet deep and half a mile long. Those conversant with such operations say that to make a successful movement it was necessary to choose several beaches on the more than 2,000-mile coastline of Cuba. It is highly doubtful that the operation was planned by our military, who have had such an excellent record for landings in World War II and in Korea.

Finally, the immaturity of Mr. Kennedy's advisers, whom he appears to follow closely, once more was demonstrated in the Algerian crisis, when the Chief Executive offered President de Gaulle of France all our support, including the use of our 6th Fleet and Armed Forces in Europe. It apparently was not realized that no French leader, any more than an American or British, would let foreign troops intervene in a purely national and domestic affair. There is no doubt that General de Gaulle would have preferred to go down to defeat rather than permit foreign soldiers to shoot at Frenchmen.

The Communist Technique

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, Constantine Brown, in his article as it appeared in the Washington Evening Star on May 4, shows excellent insight into the climate of the diplomatic world, as created by the U.S.S.R.:

KNOWING THE MIND OF KHRUSHCHEV—LESSON OF HITLER HELD STILL BEFORE US, AS PEACE DEPENDS ON ONE MAN

(By Constantine Brown)

Shortly before taking office as President Kennedy's new Ambassador to the United Nations, Adlai E. Stevenson remarked that the chief task of the new administration in international affairs was to know the mind of Nikita Khrushchev.

It is a sad commentary on the precarious state of the world that war or peace, in effect, must depend on the fallible mind of one man. All the decencies and aspirations of the peoples of the world could amount to nothing if, for example, Mr. Khrushchev for reasons known only to himself were to decide suddenly that nuclear war was the best way in which to achieve whatever it is he seeks to achieve.

The lesson of Adolf Hitler is still before us. Certainly Nikita Khrushchev is fully as capable, and as powerful, as the Nazi megalomaniac whose single distorted mind plunged the world into the maelstrom of World War II. Today's world can only hope that the mind of Mr. Khrushchev is not afflicted with fantasy.

But regardless of the state of one man's mind, the fact remains that the United States and the free world will have to depend on negotiation and palaver, measure and countermeasure, yielding and stiffening, to keep a precarious peace in existence between the two giants of the world.

Precisely here is the real trouble of the West. The Soviet Union has demonstrated time and time again that the Communists will negotiate only when the outcome is predictable, which means a Red victory every time. Sometimes the Communist gain may be a relatively minor one; sometimes it will be a whopper. But gain there will be, and all the little ones add up to great advantage sooner or later.

Settling the thorny problem of little Laos, for example, by negotiations can bring nothing but a substantial gain for the Communist world. The cards the negotiators will be using are already a marked deck, because Communist and pro-Communist military forces are already in control of the strategic heart of Laos.

This is only a sample, but it conforms to the unsual Communist techniques. Negotiations will, of course, preserve the peace of the world for the time being, but the West inevitably will be yielding position. In the chess game of international politics, position is everything.

Basically, to negotiate with the Communists must involve a clear understanding of Communist philosophy, tactics and strategy. For a Western diplomat to negotiate with a Communist without having a definite insight into the Communist ways of thought is to guarantee a major defeat even before the parleys begin.

The fundamental technique of Communist aggression is, first, the creation of a crisis in which Communist force is either presently active, as in Laos, or implied, as in Berlin.

The crisis is then whipped, agitated, exacerbated and irritated until it becomes a major threat to world peace. Immediately there is a cry for negotiations "to settle the issues peaceably." The Moscow propaganda machine picks up the Western hue-and-cry, and endorses these "peace lovers" who are urging their "warmongering" politicians to seek a peaceful solution.

Sooner or later, the pressures begin to tell. There are tentative approaches to a parley, and the initial Soviet response is invariably a qualified, conditional acceptance. The machinery grinds on until a date and a place are set for negotiations. By the time they are ready to begin, the Soviet position has been so well consolidated that about all the West can do is to accept the fait accompli, and hope that the Communists do not press their advantage too hard.

Moscow negotiates on its own terms, whether the issue be Laos or Berlin or disarmament or a nuclear test ban. The Kremlin is always ready to sign an agreement for peaceful solution of any crisis, so long as the settlement is made on Moscow's terms.

These are the challenging realities of the modern world. We must face them in full understanding of what they are. To do otherwise is to guarantee disaster.

Kennedy Speech Poses Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the San Francisco Chronicle of May 1, 1961, which eloquently speaks for itself:

KENNEDY SPEECH POSES DILEMMA

In his alarmed speech to the newspaper publishers President Kennedy has given a dismaying picture of himself as a frightened leader who would have the press suppress some of the facts of national life "in the national interest."

What particular news he would have the press withhold, or by what standards of self-censorship, he did not say. Nor did he say why the present situation is so grave and urgent as to warrant an appeal for news suppression.

Until he can illuminate the reasons we see no cause to modify our present practice of responsible news editing. No responsible editor in the country today will print anything which, in his opinion, is harmful to the Nation's interest. Mr. Kennedy must be specific about what it is he wants before he can hope for compliance with his ambiguous desires.

These are appallingly ambiguous. The President referred to the need for far greater public information and, at the same time, to the need for far greater official secrecy. Plainly, these two needs contradict each other, and the idea that broad government secrecy and broad public understanding of government can coexist is a delusion.

The whole modern concept of strength through secrecy is begotten of hysteria and panic; secrecy is the weapon of the weak, the dishonest, the fearful, or the immature. In the struggle with communism, we dare not employ the same means that the secret-police states us, for if democracy cannot be allowed to work in the open, then democracy is drifting toward its doom.

Is truth against the U.S. interest? Should a democratic leader expect editors to desert their function of responsibly reporting, for example, what they could discover about the fiasco of the Central Intelligence Agency's direction of the Cuban invasion? Mr. Kennedy seems to long for that; he has raised the question whether stricter restraints are not needed to prevent the "details of this Nation's covert preparations to counter the enemy's covert operations" from becoming available to every newspaper reader.

This speech was misleading and unfair in its implications against the press. It was not in the hitherto cool and confident speech-making style of the President. It would have been better left undelivered; in charity, the incident should be considered closed.

SS "Hope"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am enclosing a clipping which appeared in the Columbus, Ohio, Dispatch on April 14, 1961, relative to the recent tour of Dr. Walter Haynes on the American hospital teaching ship, SS *Hope:*

DR. HAYNES REPORTS—CLAIMS SS "HOPE" BUILDS GOODWILL IN INDONESIA

Dr. Walter Haynes is back in his Columbus office from remote regions of Indonesia, convinced his *Hope* ship tour scored a few points for both medical progress and the American image.

The young surgeon is one of the first doctors to serve aboard the SS *Hope*, the American hospital teaching ship, serving the second 2 months of a 4-month tour of duty he shared with his office partner, Dr. Jack Tetirick.

Dr. Haynes' tour took him to the islands of Indonesia, some of the most remote and primitive in the world, into contact with headhunters, strange customs and the sketchiest kind of medical practice.

He treated patients who had traveled 6 days to reach him and did operations never before performed in some of the areas he visited. He joined the ship in January at Makasar, in southern Celebes, and went with it to Ambon and Kupang on Timor.

At Ambon, famous as a World War II staging area of the Japanese, "we had a terrific operating schedule," he said.

"The first thyroid case I did was from the island of Buru. The patient didn't speak any Indonesian, and none of the Indonesian doctors and nurses aboard spoke her dialect. It was a real test for sign language."

At Kupang, "way out at the end," a veterinarian and a male nurse do the medical work for an island population of 500,000.

Some of the patients brought aboard the Navy hospital ship were from head-hunting areas, and some of the *Hope* doctors went on expeditions into the island.

"Ceram for instance is very primitive," Dr. Haynes explained. "They still practice cannibalism there, but only ceremonially. They eat only the fingers, heart and tongue."

Since all the *Hope* ship visitors returned with these important items intact, "I think you could conclude," Dr. Haynes commented, "that we were received there as friends."

Primary mission of the *Hope* ship is as a teaching center, to help local medical per-

sonnel observe new methods and practice and catch up with late medical thinking—a process which requires diplomacy.

"Doctors are slow to change anywhere—no less in Indonesia than in the United States," Dr. Haynes explained.

"You can't tell a doctor that what he's doing is all wrong and what you're doing is all right, but you can teach him the same thing by example.

"For instance, in the United States, we get our patients up the day after an operation. In Indonesia, doctors still keep the patient in bed for 2 weeks—something we haven't done for years.

"If you can get a man on his feet in 5 days instead of 15, you can treat three times as many patients in the 15 days. In Indonesia, where there's such a shortage of hospital beds, this is pretty important."

Convinced the ship and its mission serve a unique kind of diplomatic purpose, Dr. Haynes noted, "This shows to people on the personal level that we are human beings, that capitalism and the American people who are capitalists have a humanitarian side."

Doctors who serve aboard the ship go as unpaid volunteers. The ship is supported by American contributions. Referring to Dr. Tetirick's earlier tour in Java ports and Bali, Dr. Haynes said, "We both felt this was a project we wanted to support, but neither of us could take as much as 4 months. So we decided to split one tour."

Dr. Haynes' wife, Dr. Ruth Haynes, anesthesiologist at Grant Hospital, met him on his return. They live at 3555 Henderson Road.

Referring to the Indonesians with whom he came in contact, "It's hard for them to realize at first," he said, "that it is not the Government but the American people who are doing this directly.

"I think if you take the cataracts out of grandma's eyes, it's a lot better than giving a country a Sherman tank. Her eight children and their eight children and all the people they know will be grateful because the Americans made an old lady see."

Conservation of Natural Resources—Resolutions of National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, at their recent 70th Continental Congress, the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, adopted resolutions under the heading "Conservation of Natural Resources."

As one long interested in both pesticides research and water pollution abatement, I join conservationists everywhere in commending the ladies of the DAR for their forthright stand.

I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, urge the Congress of the United States of America to provide for a thorough research program to determine the extent to which the widespread use of chemical pesticides is endangering natural resources; namely, the slaughter of birds, the harmful effects on plant and wild animal life, and the possible cumulative aftereffects on human health;

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, urge increased activity and cooperation on the part of local, State, and Federal agencies to assure to the people of the United States adequate supplies of good, pure water for all purposes; and recommend to Congress that the Water Pollution Control Act which expires June 30, 1961, be extended and expanded.

Kennedy's Boomerangs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy's statements during the days of his campaign and returning, now, in different form, as summarized briefly in Nassau County's Newsday report of May 3, by Mr. Harold Levy:

J.F.K.'s ATTACKS ON GOP RETURN TO HAUNT HIM

(By Harold R. Levy)

WASHINGTON.—Some of the brickbats that John F. Kennedy heaved at the opposition a few months back are boomeranging.

Though inhibited to some degree by the danger of fomenting divisive debate on such difficult and delicate matters as Cuba and Laos, the Republicans have mounted their first full-blown attack against the Kennedy administration. Former Vice President Nixon, no longer constrained by his self-imposed, 100-day ban on partisan criticism, will move onto the firing line in New York tomorrow night in the first of a week-long series of speeches.

In his campaign for the presidency, Kennedy made a prime issue of what he called the sharp decline in American prestige, which he defined as "the esteem of good men for good action." Now, in the wake of this country's misadventure in Cuba, the question of national prestige is being raised again—this time by the Republicans.

During the campaign, Kennedy developed the theme which was to become a memorable passage in his inaugural address: "Ask not what your country will do for you—ask what you can do for your country." This week, at its annual meeting here, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce heard the administration's domestic program described as a paternalistic one which contradicts the President's admonitions on self-sacrifice.

Republicans in Congress yesterday began playing back some of Kennedy's campaign speeches as part of an "unbiased" appraisal of the President's first 100 days in office. They have resurrected, for example, his preelection vow that legislation embodying the Democratic platform's pledge on civil rights would be "among the first order of business when the new Congress meets in January." The administration has initiated executive action aimed at broadening minority rights in employment and education, but has made no request for new legislation in this field.

Some of the points now being raised by the Republicans and before such Republican-oriented organizations as the chamber of commerce are also being debated, seriously but less stridently, by many non-Republicans. There is a vague but discernible uneasiness among some Democrats in Congress and within the executive branch.

The mood here is in part a reflection of lessened public confidence in the new administration as a consequence of its miscalculated risk in Cuba. There are indications, too, that Kennedy may have lost some of the supreme self-confidence that once prompted him to say that what this country needed to combat communism in all parts of the world was a President "who acts first and acts fast."

The uneasiness among some Democrats here is not confined to the conduct of foreign affairs. During the campaign, Kennedy often addressed himself to what he called "the harsh facts of the matter" on various issues. There is a feeling in some quarters that, while he has had an opportunity to become more fully informed on the harsh facts of many matters since taking office, he has shied away from resolute action in some matters. However realistic and prudent his moderate approach to civil rights and other domestic issues may be, it has apparently irked some of his party's all-out liberals.

Results of a Poll of Citizens of the First District of Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, for the past 2 years it has been my custom, early in the session, to send questionnaires to the citizens of the First Arkansas District seeking their views on national problems and matters of current interest.

The tabulation of the latest poll has been completed and it is my wish to share with other Members the information contained in it. I would like to point out that the response to this effort was highly gratifying and the poll gives an excellent cross-section of opinion in eastern Arkansas. Farmers, bankers, wage earners, housewives, and people in all walks of life favored me with their replies to these questions and—in a great number of cases—added to the response by writing detailed letters as to why they favored or did not favor certain questions raised. Nor was the tabulation confined to merely the questionnaires mailed from my office. Arkansas newspapers printed copies of the questionnaire which many people clipped, answered, and mailed to me. Area radio stations publicized the questions and cooperated in the effort. The interest in their government and in the problems that face our Nation by Arkansas citizens has resulted in a definitive and a significant expression of opinion.

The poll results are as follows:

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Do you endorse the proposal to increase minimum wages to $1.25 per hour?	20	77	3
2. Do you approve or disapprove the expansion of the public housing program?	45	41	14
3. Do you favor medical and health care for social security beneficiaries financed by increased social security taxes?	32	64	4
4. Do you favor Federal aid for education for school construction and teachers' salaries?	37	59	4
5. The Post Office Department has an annual deficit of more than $500,000,000. Do you favor increasing postal rates to eliminate it?	55	40	5
6. Do you believe we should pay as we go in the building of the Interstate Highway System instead of going further into debt even if an increase in taxes is necessary?	79	15	6
7. The Secretary of Agriculture believes in increasing the prices received by farmers through higher supports coupled with acreage controls to keep production in line with demand. Do you agree with him?	50	44	6
8. Do you approve a food stamp plan under which needy persons would be issued certificates to buy surplus foods through regular business channels?	54	36	10
9. Our Government has warned the Russians "Hands off the Congo." Do you approve or disapprove this U.S. policy even though serious consequences could result?	78	9	13
10. Do you favor the passage of a law establishing the Peace Corps on a permanent basis to enable Americans to assist in U.S. aid programs in underdeveloped countries?	47	32	21

Struggle for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1961

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, May 3 marks a day of importance to millions of Poles throughout the world, for on this day in 1791 the Polish Constitution was officially adopted.

To the Polish people of that year and to the generations that have followed, this document remains as a symbol of liberty and independence. It remains in the hearts and spirit of the Poles even though officially it came to an end a little more than a year later. Under circumstances that have followed a recurring pattern in Polish history, the full fruits of independence were never fully savored.

Russia, always an ominous threat to Polish independence and fearing a united Poland on her western front intervened with military might and forced the Poles to abandon the constitution they had sworn to uphold. Since then Poland has faced a series of partitions and divisions which have tried and tested the Polish dream of a free and united Poland. That dream has not been forsaken.

We in the United States have always felt a strong bond with the Polish people. Some of the outstanding figures in our own struggle for independence were Polish. The names of Kosciusko and Pulaski are as much a part of our history as those of Nathaniel Green and General Gates.

The Polish Constitution was based on the same principles and beliefs as that of the United States and in 1791 only 2 months after the May 3 constitution was proclaimed, George Washington himself acknowledged the stride toward liberty that Poland had made.

Today the same bond remains between our countries. For once again we stand behind Poland as she struggles for freedom and unity. Although Russia has attempted to subjugate this country, the Polish People's Republic is far from a docile Communist satellite. The real Poland of today is a paradox—an example of Communist orthodoxy and Polish individualism.

And it is this individualism plus the proud and courageous spirit of the Poles that we in the United States recognize and admire. It is this spirit that carried the Poles through the ravages of World War I, saw them recoup their strength after the Germans had invaded in 1939, and finally it is this same courage, bravery, and spirit that would not permit them to be crushed under the Russian tanks that rolled into Poznan.

The hope of Poznan has not been fulfilled but the hope itself remains and will continue to live. The paradox of Poland will not endure forever and the Communist system will never completely transform Poland. No one yet has been able to destroy the Poles ability to survive as Poles.

H.R. 587, a Bill To Repeal the Tax on the Transportation of Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, with the House Ways and Means Committee now involved in hearings on the President's tax message, it was my privilege to have made part of the committee's record the following statement in support of my bill, H.R. 587, a bill to repeal the tax on the transportation of persons.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, MAY 3, 1961, IN BEHALF OF LEGISLATION TO REPEAL THE TAX ON TRANSPORTATION OF PERSONS

Mr. Chairman, as sponsor of H.R. 587, introduced January 3, 1961, and designed to repeal the tax on the transportation of persons, I appreciate the opportunity to join with other colleagues in advocating favorable action on such legislation.

During previous Congresses since the close of World War II, I have had similar bills before this committee. It was a source of disappointment in 1958 when the House conferees found it necessary to refrain from concurring in the action of the Senate in repealing the 10-percent tax on the transportation of persons.

Again in 1959 Congress voted to reduce the passenger tax to 5 percent, effective July 1, 1960. This action was later nullified, solely for budgetary reasons, when the House, by a narrow margin, voted to extend the 10-percent passenger tax another year. The Senate, disregarding the vote of the Senate Finance Committee for complete repeal of the 10-percent passenger transportation tax, voted against either repeal or the scheduled reduction of the tax on July 1, 1960. As a result, under Public Law 86-564, the effective date of the 5-percent reduction was postponed to July 1, 1961.

There is no doubt that the 10-percent passenger tax paid by users of for-hire airlines, bus, rail, and water carriers is proving a detriment to for-hire carriers of all modes of public transportation.

The transportation tax on passengers was levied in 1941 at 5 percent. It was increased in 1942 to 10 percent and raised again to 15 percent in 1944. It was decreased to 10 percent in 1954 and as previously mentioned its outright repeal was favored by the Senate in 1958 but failed to win the approval of both Houses of Congress.

It is common knowledge that the passenger tax was enacted during World War II and applied to travel at home and abroad. It was levied as an emergency measure designed to curb civilian travel on the then overburdened public transportation facilities. The tax on foreign travel has since been repealed.

Purely a wartime measure, the passenger tax is now regarded as a means of revenue despite the fact that it is highly instrumental in discouraging the use of the now underutilized modes of public transportation.

It is recalled that a similar tax on passengers was levied in 1917 during World War I, but it was repealed effective January 1, 1922, or shortly after the end of the war.

It is also of significance that Canada in 1949 repealed its 15 percent World War II passenger tax. Meanwhile we continue to tax domestic travel but exempt travel to foreign countries. This is a form of rank discrimination and serves as a source of discouragement to those who wish to heed the oft-repeated admonition, "See America first." Thus it is proving detrimental not only to public carriers but to the resort and recreational industry of our Nation. The 10-percent passenger tax affects in an adverse manner all forms of public transportation at whose expense private means of transportation and private carriers not subject to the tax become the sole beneficiaries.

Revenue from passenger transportation are practically the only source of revenues for bus companies and the main source of revenue for the scheduled airlines.

It has been estimated that about 85 percent of the bus carriers are small businesses. These small carriers have been especially hurt by the impact of increased costs and

the financial condition of many of them is cause for grave concern.

The financial situation facing many bus companies is further aggravated by decreasing patronage which is threatening the continuance of many bus services. Studies conducted in various States by State legislative committees since 1957 confirm the fact that a material amount of passenger traffic was being diverted from the common carriers by bus to private transportation resulting in the abandonments of bus routes and failures of bus companies. The present Federal excise tax of 10 percent on passenger travel discriminates in favor of private transportation and encourages it over essential public transportation. This is directly contrary to the recommendations of the reports filed by the various State legislative committees.

The intercity bus industry has experienced a steady decline in its volume of passenger traffic since the end of World War II. During this period there has been a decline from 32 billion passenger-miles to about 24 billion—a decrease of 25 percent—in a growing domestic market. While the total bus fleet has decreased about 30 percent during this period, the bus industry is still operating under 50 percent of its capacity. Since the majority of users of intercity buses comprise persons in the low-income level, the 10 percent passenger tax imposes a much heavier relative burden on them.

According to the recent report titled, "National Transportation Policy," released by a special study group for the Senate Commerce Committee, all of the domestic common carriers of passengers have found the number of empty seat-miles increasing since 1946. The rate of increase has been most pronounced in railroad service causing the passenger deficit to climb from less than $200 million in 1946 to over $700 million in 1957.

The report states "although bus service has improved in terms of seats and speed, the number of passenger miles in regular route service has declined since 1951."

With regard to the Nation's airlines the Senate study group found that, "while the available seat-miles for domestic trunk and local airlines from 1946 to 1959 increased from 7,490 million to 45,793 million, or almost 6 times, the revenue-passenger miles increased from 5,910 million to only 29,151 million, or a little over 5 times. The result has been an increase of empty seats from 1,580,000 to 16,642,000, or by an increase of 15,062,000 empty seat-miles."

In addition to the finds by the special study group for the Senate Commerce Committee the national trade associations for all three of the major public carriers—air, bus, and rail—report that they are currently operating below their capacity for handling passenger traffic. Both the bus lines and railroads are operating well below 50 percent of capacity, while the current load factor of the airlines of 59.5 percent is at the lowest level in 10 years.

Since I represent a congressional district in Pennsylvania that percentagewise has one of the largest railroad populations in the country, I have firsthand knowledge of the financial plight of the Nation's railroads.

The marked decrease in rail passenger travel is revealed by the fact that the volume dropped from 50 billion passenger miles in 1946 to 17 billion in 1960, a decrease of over 70 percent. This rail passenger deficit since 1946 has averaged $585 million a year and because freight revenues have had to absorb it there has been a steady decline the past 5 years of the overall railroad rate of return from 4.22 percent in 1955 to 2.13 percent in 1960. As long as freight revenue must absorb passenger traffic losses the need to seek increases in freight rates is not lessened.

Our nation as a whole is the chief beneficiary of a financially sound railroad system. With the vast investment in railroad passenger facilities and the heavy demands made upon the industry for such services in World War II, the constant decline in the railroads percentage of passenger business handled by all classes of public carriers is of national concern. The 10 percent passenger tax is a detriment to the efforts by the railroads to increase passenger revenues and thereby avoid further curtailment of service and poorer facilities. On the other hand, constantly rising passenger deficits are a dire threat to the railroad industry and will eventually result in rendering the Nation's railroad system wholly unprepared for emergencies of peace and war.

Speaking of the ill effects of the passenger tax, the Treasury Department stated in December 1947:

"The prewar history of railroad rates indicates that coach travel is rather sensitive to changes in passenger fares. Accordingly, under normal conditions, the profits of railroads may be affected substantially by the existence of the tax. Because of large fixed costs a small decrease in passenger revenue can have an important effect on profits from passenger operations."

It is not my contention that repeal of the 10 percent passenger tax will serve as the sole remedy for the passenger deficit on our Nation's railroads. I do contend, however, that repeal of the 10-percent passenger tax will have a stimulating effect and aid immeasurably in securing an increase in the volume of passenger traffic which is sorely needed by the Nation's railroads in their battle for economic survival. We should not lose sight of the fact that during World War II we relied upon the Nation's railroads for 97 percent of all organized military travel needs. Today the future of the railroad industry is threatened by operating deficits of over $700 million a year.

We cannot afford to ignore the plight of the Nation's railroads because to do so we are turning a deaf ear to the needs of a strong arm of our national defense. In fact, we should take affirmative action to strengthen our essential public carriers by recognizing that the current 10-percent passenger tax is not only discriminatory and regressive but it tends to undermine our national defense at a time when world tensions and the threat of an all-out war were never more prevalent.

One of the strongest recommendations for repeal of the excise tax on passengers is contained in the following excerpt from the Report of the Interstate Commerce Commission on Railroad Passenger Train Deficit, May 18, 1959:

"The excise tax on passengers was designed primarily to discourage unnecessary wartime travel and only secondarily as a revenue measure. Obviously the reasons for its imposition no longer exist. More important, however, it is harmful to our transportation system and is highly discriminatory.

"Without repeating all of the reasons advanced for the repeal of the transportation tax, we wish to emphasize that it is having a serious effect upon the passenger-train service of the railroads. Since the tax on passenger travel tends to discourage the public from using common carriers, it thereby aggravates the ever-mounting passenger deficit. While we recognize that the repeal would not provide a cure-all for the passenger deficit problems, such action would remove a serious deterrent to a greater use by the traveling public.

"In strongly urging that the Congress take action to repeal the tax outright, we are not unaware of the efforts which various members of the Congress have made and are presently making in this regard. We are also not unmindful of the revenue needs of the Government. We are, however, convinced that any possible loss of revenue would be more than offset by the public interest in strengthening and preserving a transportation system capable of meeting adequately the country's need for service both in peacetime and during emergencies in conformity with the national transportation policy as declared by the Congress."

One of the chief stumbling-blocks against outright repeal of the 10-percent tax on passengers is the assumption that such action would result in a loss of tax revenues. There has been no consideration of the effect of the repeal on the increased business in the resort, recreational, hotel and restaurant industries which would result in an increase in tax revenues.

Nor has there been any consideration given to the beneficial effect from the standpoint of aiding in alleviating unemployment that would result by making it possible for the airlines, bus, railroads, and ship industries to stabilize their employment.

Finally, an increase in passenger traffic on the public transportation system of the Nation would result in a tax yield that would compensate for any decrease in revenue occasioned by the repeal of the 10-percent passenger tax.

According to information available for the fiscal year 1960, the Government collected a total of $255 million, nearly half of which, or $119 million, represented a tax-deductible expense, because it involved business travel.

There is little doubt that if the $119 million in tax-deductible expense for travel had not been allowable, it would have increased the taxable income of business firms. Assuming these firms were in the average 50 percent income bracket, the Government would have collected nearly $60 million in additional tax revenue. In addition it has been estimated that a 5-percent increase in passenger revenues would have increased public carriers taxable net income by about $114 million.

In conclusion, it is apparent that repeal of the 10-percent passenger tax would not necessarily result in a heavy loss of tax revenues. The effect would be one of considerable return in the form of higher income taxes resulting from the greater volume of passenger traffic generated and from elimination of many tax deductible expenses.

Mr. Chairman, in expressing my appreciation for the opportunity of testifying in behalf of my bill, H.R. 587, it is my sincere hope that favorable action will be taken on legislation designed to repeal the 10-percent transportation tax on persons.

Independent Tire Dealers Versus Factory Stores

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on March 24, 1961, I introduced H.R. 5926, a bill to regulate the distribution of motor vehicle tires.

The purpose of this bill is to prohibit the manufacturers of tires from getting into the retail business through so-called factory stores.

It is quite clear that the factory store is doing a good deal of harm to the independent tire dealers across this country. The Congress has had ample evidence of this in the past and the time to act is now. A recent poll of independent business and professional men made by the National Federation of Independent Business shows that out of 15,126 responses received during the first quarter of 1961 more than one-third, 6,664, listed factory store competition as one of the things which hurt their business most.

The tire manufacturers have been increasingly active in undercutting the independent tire dealer by allying themselves with the oil companies and using their filling stations as retail outlets.

H.R. 5926 would remedy this situation and provide a much-needed boost to the independent tire dealers throughout our country.

Because of the nationwide response to the NFIB poll, Mr. Speaker, I have appended the first quarter results for the information of our colleagues.

Special poll summary, months of January, February, and March, 1961, based on 15,126 responses received during indicated period—Submitted by National Federation of Independent Business

States	Unfair competition	Import competition	Government competition	Unfair labor proc.	Overhaul tax laws	Factory store competition
Alabama	42	28	11	19	41	31
Arizona	63	27	26	33	110	41
Arkansas	145	63	46	110	183	86
California	1,109	666	644	876	1,487	699
Colorado	426	202	141	206	436	247
Connecticut	132	179	31	162	231	60
Delaware	42	22	21	24	49	20
Florida	221	158	129	204	340	159
Georgia	287	202	186	207	382	211
Idaho	40	26	11	18	37	21
Illinois	457	218	100	211	439	226
Indiana	269	118	79	111	276	120
Iowa	96	35	15	52	99	45
Kansas	315	113	91	254	344	133
Kentucky	106	51	61	47	127	48
Louisiana	81	81	64	60	114	72
Maine						
Maryland	48	26	28	28	68	27
Massachusetts	344	319	63	277	472	160
Michigan	560	432	206	498	705	397
Minnesota	389	190	133	237	366	190
Mississippi	144	65	47	86	261	87
Missouri	182	126	75	169	152	180
Montana	233	83	89	109	227	121
Nebraska	333	132	177	199	327	242
Nevada						
New Hampshire	25	10	6	5	34	19
New Jersey	370	217	110	325	577	246
New Mexico	84	57	44	59	103	54
New York	284	242	87	128	441	221
North Carolina	262	266	100	226	283	195
North Dakota	300	72	65	95	262	109
Ohio	773	461	162	435	720	406
Oklahoma	82	37	32	72	116	41
Oregon	190	71	60	165	272	93
Pennsylvania	370	296	124	240	528	265
Rhode Island	10	4	13	3	10	7
South Carolina	102	111	64	82	144	79
South Dakota	5			3	3	
Tennessee	58	35	30	27	72	30
Texas	538	279	216	312	649	392
Utah						
Vermont	38	16	15	26	58	18
Virginia	259	113	91	160	254	162
Washington	582	348	457	446	590	466
West Virginia	45	37	5	34	44	19
Wisconsin	269	104	59	94	342	130
Wyoming	74	38	36	45	90	49
Alaska	2	1	2	1	2	
Hawaii	26	22	36	36	61	26
Washington, D.C.	27	10	29	10	25	16
Total number of ballots on each issue	10,839	6,409	4,317	7,333	12,953	6,664

Arlington National Cemetery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, the following poem was sent to me by Barbara Leventhal, a 13-year-old, seventh grade student at Roosevelt Junior High School, Springfield, Ohio, after she recently visited the National Cemetery at Arlington. Barbara has so well expressed the great impression the National Cemetery makes on all of us that I thought her poem should be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and made a part of the official documents of the Nation:

ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY

People, our people, are buried here,
They sleep with peace away from fear.
Mere mortals are they in this land of many
But by them the foundation set.
Tis in the ground, that they doth lie,
Watched by God, the stars, the sky.
Little is their greatness realized
Yet without them
Who are we?

Farm Cost Prices as Compared to Prices Received for Farm Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the session, acting under authority granted by House Resolution 86, Representative HAROLD COOLEY, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, directed the Subcommittee on Equipment, Supplies, and Manpower to inquire into the cost of farm production and to study the impact of the cost-price squeeze on American agriculture.

Since that time hearings have been held in Washington, in Memphis, Tenn., and in Sioux City, Iowa. On Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday May 15, 16, and 17, the committee will hold additional hearings here in Washington to fill in the picture of the situation as outlined earlier by farmers and spokesmen for their organizations in all fields of agriculture.

That this inquiry is vital to American agriculture is evidenced not alone by the statement by Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman that such a study is the most important facet to a solution of our agricultural problems but by the truly startling attendance of farmers at our field hearings. In Memphis the hearings had to be scheduled in the Memphis Civic Auditorium to provide for the large group who attended. In Sioux City, as in Memphis, many farmers had to file statements because of the large numbers waiting to counsel with the committee. At Memphis farmers from throughout the mid-South were in attendance. In Sioux City the committee heard farmers and livestock men from Kansas, the Dakotas, Nebraska, Illinois in many sections of the midwest Farm Belt.

Members of the subcommittee have worked diligently to gather the pertinent information on this vital problem. I wish to commend each of them for their vital contributions to this inquiry. Members of the committee are JOHN L. MCMILLAN, of South Carolina; WATKINS M. ABBITT, of Virginia; CLARK W. THOMPSON, of Texas; FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD, of Kentucky; HAROLD B. MCSWEEN, of Louisiana; CHARLES M. TEAGUE, of California; DELBERT L. LATTA, of Ohio; PAUL FINDLEY, of Illinois; BEN REIFEL, of South Dakota; and Dr. A. FERNOS-ISERN, of Puerto Rico. Chairman HAROLD COOLEY and Representative CHARLES HOEVEN, both as ex officio members, have made excellent contributions to the work of the subcommittee as have other members of the full committee. And, we have enjoyed the assistance of interested Members who are not assigned to the Committee on Agriculture but who recognize the vital aspects of the problem and the work underway.

We have employed the talents of the Honorable John Mac Smith, of West

Memphis, Ark., who has served as the General Counsel for the inquiry. He has worked long and hard at the task assigned the subcommittee by the Congress.

As a means of better acquainting Members with the scope of this study, at this point it is proper to place in the RECORD a copy of the memorandum submitted to the committee last March 14 by the General Counsel, John Mac Smith.

Much information—not only statistical—but in the nature of human problems as presented by the farmers and their families has been submitted to the committee. More information of great significance is expected at the additional hearings. From this great compilation of information and comment by farmers and agricultural interests, it will be the task of the subcommittee to bring forth to the House Committee on Agriculture, and through that committee to the Congress, those recommendations and proposals that will seek to counter this erosive impact of the cost-price squeeze on our farming families and the farming communities of the Nation:

MARCH 14, 1961.

Memorandum to: Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY, chairman, Committee on Agriculture, U.S. House of Representatives; Hon. E. C. GATHINGS, chairman, Subcommittee on Equipment, Supplies, and Manpower, Committee on Agriculture, U.S. House of Representatives; Hon. CHARLES B. HOEVEN, Committee on Agriculture, U.S. House of Representatives.

From: John Mac Smith, general counsel, Subcommittee on Equipment, Supplies, and Manpower, Committee on Agriculture, U.S. House of Representatives.

Subject: Investigation and survey relative to farm cost prices as compared to prices received for farm products.

Pursuant to your direction, I have made a preliminary study in regard to the survey and investigation relative to the above subject to be made by the Subcommittee on Equipment, Supplies, and Manpower, Committee on Agriculture, U.S. House of Representatives, and I am pleased to submit the results of that study to you.

I. AUTHORITY

A. The basic authority for the survey and investigation on the part of the subcommittee is House Resolution 86, 87th Congress, 1st session, which was agreed to February 9, 1961.

B. In addition, Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, U.S. House of Representatives, has directed that the Subcommittee on Equipment, Supplies, and Manpower, proceed immediately with the survey and investigation in order that a prompt but accurate report as to the conditions relative to the subject be submitted at the earliest practicable date so that appropriate action may be taken.

II. NEED FOR THE SURVEY AND INVESTIGATION

A. The consumer has a distorted understanding of farm income and farm conditions, which redounds to the detriment of the farmer.

1. By reason of information which has been furnished over recent years to the news media the farmer has been pictured day after day as constantly at the public trough, and the primary cause of the rise in the price of consumer goods.

Chairman COOLEY stated the condition accurately and succinctly in his remarks in the House of Representatives, 86th Congress, 2d session, on September 1, 1960, when he said that there had been over the years "a design and calculation to inflame consumers against farmers."

2. This misunderstanding as to the farm problem must be corrected, and the consumer must be apprised as to the true farm condition. Actually, the farmer isn't getting anything like his equitable share of the price which the consumer is paying, for example: the consumer pays approximately $3.94 for a broadcloth shirt, and of this amount the farmer receives 28 cents; thus, if the farmer gave the cotton for the shirt the consumer would still have to pay $3.66 for the shirt. (S.P. 119, Agricultural Extension Service, the University of Tennessee, August 1960.) This is only one example of the disparity in prices received by the farmer and prices paid by the consumer, and similar figures, can be furnished as to every article processed from a farm product, which the consumer purchases. Despite this fact, the consumer constantly reads, hears, and sees the farmer as the ward of a beneficent Government. It is believed the survey and investigation can do much to correct the false pictures of the farmer in the event the survey and investigation is thorough.

B. The true picture of the farm problem must be presented to Congress and the general public.

1. The real need, however, for the survey and investigation is to point out to Congress and to the general public the sorry plight of the farmer who is being crushed out of existence by the squeeze between rising cost prices and falling prices for the products which he produces. I quote from a few of the letters and telegrams which Representative GATHINGS has received since the publication of news items in regard to the investigation of farm machinery costs.

"Unless we have help like you are going to give us, in 3 more years the farmers will begin to fall by the wayside like a bunch of flies in a DDT bomb.

"This section of the United States is very dependent on farming and this action is long overdue. As you well know, the cost price squeeze has been working us over. If some of it can be alleviated through this investigation, then you have certainly performed a great service for this section as well as the country as a whole.

"This investigation is long overdue, and I hope and pray your committee will not only get the true facts, but better still will find some solution to a very serious problem affecting (farm machinery) dealers and the farmers they serve."

"I think the investigation of farm machinery, spare parts, and maintenance is justified and you are to be commended for pushing it."

"The cotton farmers of the State and Nation * * * most interested in your attempt to lower cost of machinery. Not many years ago 10 bales of cotton would buy one heavy-duty farm tractor, and it now takes 40 bales of cotton."

"I know 15,000 to 20,000 people directly and indirectly who make their living farming and these farmers are trying to hold up a great burden by paying $10,000 for a combine and $20,000 for a cottonpicker. What is very alarming to me is that some of our best farmers are giving up and hoping that they can get someone else to rent their land. If prices keep going up as they have been, the whole situation is in danger of collapse and will fall in on top of labor and the manufacturers."

2. The economic position of the American farmer is tragic when it is noted that his net income has dropped from $17.3 billion in 1947 to $11.6 billion in 1960, which is an income reduction of more than 30 percent. It cannot be argued that the 1960 recession was in anywise responsible for this miserable condition for the farmer received even less in 1959, that figure being $11.3 billion (Economic Report of the President, January 1961).

What was happening to the cost prices of the farmer while the price he was receiving for his products was plummeting to new lows? Between the years 1946 and 1960 the former's cost for farm machinery more than doubled; his cost for motor vehicles increased 87 percent; the cost of fertilizer increased 25 percent; and his interest, taxes and wage rates increased 45 percent ("Agricultural Prices." U.S. Department of Agriculture, Oct. 15, 1960).

3. Unless the farm income is increased or the farm costs are reduced, the future of a large segment of our society is confronted with immediate tragedy.

III. WHAT CAN BE ACCOMPLISHED BY THE SURVEY AND INVESTIGATION

A. A forum will be offered to the farmer and the manufacturer.

1. The farmer will be given an opportunity to tell his own story. This is a story of pathos, a story when told by the farmer rather than by someone for him, will appeal to the spirit of fairness and equity which have always been characteristic of the American people. When a true word picture is painted by the farmer himself it is entirely possible that prejudice on the part of the consumer will, to say the least, be dissipated.

2. The manufacturer likewise has a story to tell, for he has been beset by increasing costs. However, he has had the means by the use of public relation experts and paid advertisement to tell his story to the public. Regardless of this, he should be made welcome to tell his story before the subcommittee with the same degree of welcome as will be extended to the farmer.

It is possible, although not probable, that the manufacturer may come to the conclusion he is pricing himself out of the farm market, and should make some concessions as to price relative to the articles he is selling to the public. This hope is based upon the fact that the two largest farm machinery manufacturers showed a substantial decrease as to earnings in 1960 by comparison to the 1959 earnings, as follows:

	Per share
International Harvester:	
9 months, July 1959	$4.12
9 months, July 1960	2.51
Estimated earnings in 1960	3.25
Deere & Co.:	
9 months, July 1959	5.99
9 months, July 1960	1.33
Estimated earnings in 1960	2.45

3. Congress will be furnished an accurate and complete report upon the plight of the American farmer in order that its membership may take such action as may be deemed appropriate to remedy this situation.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. The cooperation on the part of the executive branch of the Government should be requested. A copy of this memorandum may be made available to the Secretary of Agriculture in order that he will be advised as to the intended survey and investigation.

B. Preliminary hearings should be held in the farm areas.

1. It is suggested that a hearing be arranged in the cotton section, preferably Memphis, Tenn., and also a hearing be arranged in the grain section, preferably Sioux City, Iowa.

2. These local hearings should attract numerous farmers who are unable to come to Washington for hearings. The local witnesses who have an important statement upon the subject of the investigation could then be invited to the hearings in Washington.

C. Manufacturers and processors should be contacted.

1. Manufacturers and processers of farm machinery and other products used by the

farmer should be contacted and their story obtained. It is believed these companies will send representatives to Washington, if representatives are not here on a permanent basis, for informal discussion, thus eliminating the expense of trips for this purpose. Representatives of these firms should be invited to the Washington hearings.

D. Government and other lending agencies should be contacted.

1. It is believed that a substantial portion of the credit extended to farmers is extended by Government lending agencies. As indicated the rise in interest is an important cost factor to the farmer, and these agencies will, no doubt, be willing to cooperate.

2. Insurance companies and other companies making mortgage loans to farmers should be contacted in order that interest costs to the farmer may be explored.

E. Farmers' organizations should be contacted.

1. The Farm Bureau, Farmers Union, National Grange and other farm organizations should be fully advised and their assistance requested.

V. CONCLUSION

This memorandum, as above stated, is preliminary as to nature, and as the survey investigation proceeds additional memorandums will be furnished.

The Prisoner in the Legation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, following is the second in a series of articles on present-day Hungary which is appearing in the New York Herald Tribune. This one appeared in the issue of May 2, 1961. On May 1, 1961, I inserted the first of the series.

Gaston Coblentz reports from Budapest on the present situation:

HUNGARY OF TODAY—CARDINAL MINDSZENTY, THE FORGOTTEN MARTYR

(NOTE.—Gaston Coblentz of the Herald Tribune's foreign staff has gone behind the Iron Curtain for a fresh look at the situation in the satellite nations. He started in Hungary, and this is the third of 5 articles on conditions there 5 years after the bloody suppression of the anti-Red uprising. His reports will continue from other lands under the Communist yoke.)

(By Gaston Coblentz)

BUDAPEST.—The U.S. Legation in Budapest is a shabby building on Liberty Square. Its largest office is used as living quarters for Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, Roman Catholic Primate of Hungary, who received asylum in the Legation at the outbreak of the anti-Communist uprising in 1956 and has never left the place since.

The windows of his corner room, normally the office of the U.S. Chief of Mission, overlook the square. Three Hungarian secret police cars, occupied by unsmiling agents, are stationed continuously in the street in front of the building. The cardinal does not come to the windows.

NAME SELDOM MENTIONED

As the years go by, there is less and less talk about him in Budapest. His flight to the American Legation in preference to recapture by the Hungarian Communists may have somewhat diminished his stature as a martyr. When one talks with Hungarian anti-Communists, his name is not necessarily mentioned in reviewing the country's present situation.

The Hungarian Government seems almost satisfied with his continued presence in the Legation. However, a Foreign Ministry official said this week that it "probably" would be possible to reach a compromise on the cardinal's fate if the Vatican were to make an approach on the matter. The compromise presumably would have to consist of Cardinal Mindszenty leaving Hungary.

WANTS TO STAY

He does not want to do so. This much is known, although the American Legation categorically refuses permission for newspapermen to talk with him. The evident reason for this is to deprive the Hungarian Government of any pretext for charging that he is engaging in political activity while under the Legation's protection.

There is little doubt that this is a development that has disappointed the Cardinal, who had hoped to be able to play a greater role while in asylum. Literally the only contact he has with the church in Hungary is the bimonthly visit of a priest, to administer the Sacrament of Penance. These visits are known to the Hungarian Government, and the priests who make them are assumed to be under Communist surveillance.

There has been a further personal hardship for Cardinal Mindszenty: the impossibility last year for him to attend the funeral of his 92-year-old mother in a Hungarian village.

At 69, he has thus virtually been immobilized since his arrest by the Stalinist regime of Matyas Rakosi in 1948. Sentenced to life imprisonment after his forced "confessions" during a grim trial in 1949, he was briefly liberated by the rebels in the 1956 uprising. His long refuge at the American Legation began after only a week of freedom at the height of the revolt.

The only time he goes outdoors is for a daily walk in the bleak cement courtyard behind the Legation with an American official at his side. His meals are prepared in the Legation's cafeteria, and the mission's eight officers more or less take turns in paying him visits.

NO U.S. ENVOY

The legation has been without a chief of mission since the rebellion. However, the Communists seem to believe that the United States at last again may be considering the appointment of an accredited envoy.

It probably would have to be preceded by some easing of the harassments to which the legation is being subjected by the Kadar government, which in some respects have changed little from the practices of the pre-rebellion Stalinist regime of Matyas Rakosi.

Some of the Western missions fare better than others. The British have a fairly well-attended reading room and small film theater, although they have been forbidden, for example, to put up display posters outside their building on the ground that it would spoil the building's architectural line.

Moreover, the fear of Communist listening devices is so intense in several missions that a number of diplomats are extremely cautious in conversation in their own offices, their homes, and even in their automobiles.

REDS SELECT EMPLOYEES

Also, the Hungarian Government is forcing Western missions to employ personnel of the Government's own choosing. The result is that old and trusted employees of the legations are coerced into resigning their posts and because of their long employment by Western diplomats are unable to find work elsewhere.

Officers of the U.S. mission are still forbidden to travel more than 40 kilometers out of Budapest without special permits. Sometimes individual members of the mission wait a year before receiving permission to make a requested trip.

Visiting American newspaper men, once admitted to the country, receive more favorable treatment in being able to travel to virtually any part of Hungary without permission or prior notification to the Government.

White Paper on Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the State Department White Paper was summarized in a recent newspaper article which is here included as a condensation:

UNITED STATES PUTS CUBA IN RED BLOC

(By Robert Young)

WASHINGTON, May 2.—The United States today designated Cuba a member of the Communist bloc and declared that the government of Premier Fidel Castro has taken on aspects of the Hitler and Mussolini dictatorships.

The State Department said it appears that Castro considers Cuba "further along the Communist road" than some of the other countries in the bloc dominated by Russia and Red China.

The Department issued a long statement in response to Castro's May Day actions proclaiming Cuba a Socialist state, abolishing elections and clamping new restrictions on the Roman Catholic Church.

ON WAY A LONG TIME

The Department said Castro's planting Cuba solidly in the sphere of international communism should come as no surprise because Castro has been heading into the open embrace of the Sino-Soviet bloc for some time.

The statement, made public by Lincoln White, State Department press officer, advised the American people not to be confused by Castro's use of the word Socialist rather than Communist in describing Cuba's form of government.

The Department noted that only Russia and Czechoslovakia call themselves Socialist republics in this stage of their projected development toward communism, whereas the other satellite countries in the Communist bloc, including Red China, describe themselves as people's republics.

TRAGIC FOR CUBAN CITIZEN

"It would therefore appear," the statement said, "that Castro considers Cuba farther along the Communist road than some of the other countries in the bloc."

In reference to Castro's declaration that Cuba was abandoning the free elections he had promised in favor of people's mass meetings, the State Department commented that the Cuban citizen under the Castro regime is in really a tragic situation. Even Russia has so-called elections, although there is no real choice among candidates, the statement continued, so again Castro seems to have gone the other members of the Communist bloc one better.

"The Cuban has but one choice; namely, to say 'si,' and even that not in a duly-

constituted election but in a contrived mass meeting," the Department said.

A SHRUG MIGHT BE DEATH

"The average Cuban is in trouble if he so much as shrugs his shoulders. He is in real trouble—he can be put in jail or put to death—if he says 'no'."

The State Department asserted that Castro's election-substitute, mass meetings, "sound very much like Hitler and Mussolini's mass gatherings."

The Department quoted Jose Marti, Cuba's 19th century "George Washington," as warning that the socialist idea is dangerous in two ways.

Marti, a Cuban national hero, said socialism introduces a "confused foreign doctrine" and permits ambitious men to rise in the world, "to stand above the crowd by faking arrogance and fury and by pretending to be impassioned defenders of the underprivileged."

My concern is not in critizing the findings which appeared to be accurate, but the fact that this report is many days, if not weeks or months late in being released. Indeed the American people, I feel sure, had reached these conclusions long ago, and now the State Department assessment so belated is almost comical in its pronouncements. It would be comical if it were not so tragic, our conduct as Cuba went communistic. The tragedy is in two parts. First, that American lives and property were taken and the United States did nothing to protect them. Such protection is clearly within our rights, and the failure to act becomes patently an admission of weakness, vascillation, and indecision in the eyes of our neighbors in the world. No one, then, would have contested our right to invade Cuba, as we have done some 30 times in Latin America to protect our citizens against the threat of loss of life or property. The tragedy was our failure to act immediately when we clearly had the right.

Second, the tragedy is compounded and made the grounds for additional loss of life and property by our second failure to act to prevent a greater Communist buildup in Cuba. Why, oh why, does our Government let the precious hours and days slip away while Castro beefs up Cuba's military might for the showdown which most assuredly will come and most assuredly must and will be lead by the United States.

I, for one, am apalled at our failure to act, and over the condoning of our mistakes and/or our inability to learn from our mistakes which results from our alleged bipartisan harmony to show the world a unity of purpose. My undying belief is that the United States should protect by force of arms when necessary the live of her citizens and their property when jeopardized unfairly and illegally by any other nation. I shall never agree to a weak and supine policy underlying our foreign aid and our foreign relations as they exist today. It is late, but I suggest and I pray that it is not too late for tough action, not just tough talk. We must tell the world our terms in maintaining freedom and justice and peace. Terms which preclude Communist subversion and our pronouncements firm and clear should be overtly backed up by military power and our willingness to use our armed strength. Only as we get tough can we prevent world war III. A weaker policy will surely bring on the holocaust.

While I am just one voice, I am sure a majority of the American people would rather risk their lives now than to invite Communist enslavement by appeasement. The showdown is approaching. Every American citizen and every nation must now go through an agonizing reappraisal, freedom or slavery, if communism's total conquest of the world is to be stopped in its tracks and driven back.

Rochdale Village Groundbreaking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on April 29, 1961, ground was broken in New York City for one of the most important nonprofit community efforts in our Nation—the Rochdale Village housing development sponsored by the United Housing Foundation, which will be the largest housing cooperative in the United States. This development, which will offer accommodations at reasonable cost for 5,860 families in the middle income area, was made possible by the combined efforts of labor unions, housing cooperatives, civic groups, and other nonprofit organizations joined together in the United Housing Foundation, and through financing provided with the help of New York State's Mitchell-Lama Limited Profit Housing program and funds from the State's Teachers and Employees Retirement Systems. This project, whose carrying charges will be approximately $21 per room per month after a $400 per room down payment, represents the culmination of efforts by many dedicated officials, both public and private, including Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, State Housing Commissioner James William Gaynor, Robert Moses, whose idea it was to use the Jamaica Race Track site for middle income housing, and Abraham Kazan, president of the United Housing Foundation.

My bill to establish a Federal Limited Profit Mortgage Corporation, S. 766, follows the pattern of the State Mitchell-Lama program, and this new project illustrates again the kind of job that can be done for middle-income families under such a program.

I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the speeches made on this occasion by Governor Rockefeller and by Robert Moses.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY GOVERNOR ROCKEFELLER PREPARED FOR DELIVERY AT GROUNDBREAKING CEREMONIES, ROCHDALE VILLAGE, SPONSORED BY UNITED HOUSING FOUNDATION, NEW YORK AND BAISLEY BOULEVARDS, QUEENS, NEW YORK, SATURDAY, APRIL 29, 1961

My congratulations, first of all, to the labor unions, housing cooperatives, civic groups, and other nonprofit organizations, joined together in the United Housing Foundation, which have supplied the initiative that makes possible this project—the largest housing cooperative in the Nation.

By offering excellent accommodations at reasonable cost for 5,860 families, Rochdale Village is an important step toward meeting one of the most serious problems in the city of New York—the shortage of middle-income housing.

I am naturally proud of the State's role in the financing and supervising of this project, the largest of the 41 projects—providing 17,357 apartments—now either completed, in construction, or in the works under the middle-income housing program Commissioner Jim Gaynor is so ably advancing. This project, of course, began with an idea, and as is so often the case when something big happens in New York, the idea can be traced back to Bob Moses. When the decision was made to close the Jamaica Race Track, it was Commissioner Moses who suggested that this area be used for a large middle-income housing project.

The United Housing Foundation, with several other developments to its credit and with outstanding management headed by President Abraham Kazan, undertook the job. A unique feature of the financing of Rochdale Village is the fact that the New York State Teachers Retirement System and the New York State Employees Retirement System have invested $57 million in this project which, with $19 million of State money, makes up the $76 million mortgage fund.

For the 20,000 people who will live in this small city within a big city, perhaps the most important factor will be the imagination, the consideration for human values and human needs, that have gone into the planning of Rochdale Village. Vehicular traffic has been completely eliminated from the interior of the village—and parking spaces provided for 4,000 automobiles. Over 33 of the 170 acres in the project area have been donated for a park, schools, an athletic field, a public library, and a police station. The number of three-bedroom apartments was revised upward from original estimates to meet the demand of larger families. Special provision has been made for accommodation of elderly couples and the disabled.

With a membership cost of $400 per room and an average monthly carrying charge of $21 per room, Rochdale Village—named in honor of the pioneers of the consumer cooperative movement in Rochdale, England—is indeed a significant advance in the middle-income housing program.

But I am also pleased that an increasing number of rental projects are coming in under the middle-income program. This is especially important to young couples just starting out, and to the elderly.

And most significant of all is the acceleration of the entire program—the steadily increasing number of new projects and the fact that a program initiated by my administration has increased financing available for middle-income housing by 350 percent.

I am happy to announce that the new State housing finance agency has just approved a draft prospectus for its first sale of bonds under its $525 million authorization—and that sale of the first $50 million of these bonds should be underway in a few weeks.

For we are determined to do everything in our power to help lick the housing shortage in this State.

I was pleased to sign a bill the other day granting automatic property tax exemptions for limited-profit housing built for the aged. And as you know, we've just extended rent control for another 2 years—and tightened some loopholes. We've got to have rent control until we do have an adequate supply of decent housing that will keep rentals within the reach of the people everywhere in a free market. But rent control is only a transitional protection; the real solution is a scale of building that fully meets our needs.

It is a very big job. Rochdale Village is a real contribution. But we still have a long way to go, and the utmost cooperation of all concerned—of labor, business, and government—is essential. Working together, we can—and must—do the job.

REMARKS OF ROBERT MOSES AT THE GROUNDBREAKING FOR ROCHDALE VILLAGE, JAMAICA, QUEENS, SATURDAY MORNING, APRIL 29, 1961

This cooperative, middle income, nonprofit project, on the largest remaining centrally located, accessible vacant land in the city, represents my swan song as a houser.

All I can say, beyond expressing profound gratitude for release from some years of title 1 responsibilities, dating back to Bob Taft, is that the United Housing Foundation and its member organizations including the progressive labor unions are the best and in fact the only really well-equipped builders in this difficult, bedevilled, middle-income field. I hope they will be given the powers and aids required for a full-scale attack on the problem, both in areas requiring slum clearance and in the few where middle income apartments can still be built on vacant or relatively vacant land—for instance, on Staten Island, which the Verrazano-Narrows Bridge will bring close to work areas, the meadows north of Jamaica Bay and the East Bronx.

There will have to be much more sincere, reliable and courageous support if we hope to remove this reproach to our boast of leadership among cities. There will have to be less demagoguery, irresponsible criticism and wisecracking, wild-eyed planning, fanaticism, screaming headlines, lurid exposures which prove to be gross exaggerations, and plain ordinary personal malice. I believe my union friends can take it. They are inured to criticism. They have a rooted and sincere regard for their fellow men in the lower income brackets. They are genuinely concerned not only for their members but for the future of the whole city. They are clothed in justifiable armor of righteousness.

As a practical matter, more money will have to be spent on moving people and small business out of the slums if we are to have slum clearance—I mean in the form of cash payments and other aid. The price of decent, humane treatment of tenants is very small in the huge total scale of cost of such projects and should be included in the initial estimates like any other requirements and not left to subsequent debate and chance.

It is nearly impossible for outsiders to appreciate the many astonishing accomplishments of this, our city, in the midst of seemingly endless committee investigations, muckraking and hysterical detraction. The flowers of praise are lost in an atmosphere of Irish confetti and dead cats.

Stick around, my fine friends, tomorrow you may have good notices, but next week the critics will deplore your ground layout, criticize your architecture, question your downpayments and begrudge you partial tax abatement and cheap money. You have, however, cheerfully lived through these things before and you will survive them again. Meanwhile, you have the applause of your conscience and may look forward hopefully to the verdict of posterity.

Some 20,000 people who live here at Rochdale will be siphoned out of bad neighborhoods. They will no doubt make room in the rookeries they are abandoning for others perhaps presently even worse housed. Most of the places they leave would, under competent and courageous planning, be torn down entirely to make way for other new low- or middle-income apartments. Unfortunately we simply don't as yet have the guts, the ability and the support to rebuild New York. It will take a long time. A start has been made, and this must be manifest here at Rochdale even to the most jaundiced and skeptical.

My congratulations to Governor Rockefeller, Mayor Wagner, Borough President John T. Clancy, and to other members of the board of estimate; to James J. Felt, chairman of the city planning commission; to Col. Arthur Levitt, the State comptroller; to Col. James W. Gaynor, the State housing commissioner; and particularly to the unions and, since there is always one dedicated individual who overshadows such achievements to Abraham Kazan, the undisputed champion of cooperative housing. Give him the tools and he will finish the job.

Polish Constitution Day

SPEECH
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, toward the end of the 18th century Poland's greatness and glory had become past history, and she was fast becoming victim to the evil designs of her aggressive neighbors. By the early 1890's Austria, Prussia, and Russia had already robbed the Poles of a good part of historic Polish territory, and Poland's independent existence was under threats. In the midst of such anxiety, a band of patriotic and courageous Polish leaders tried to strengthen and overhaul Poland's Government. Their concerted action resulted in the Polish Constitution of May 3 in 1791.

This historic and memorable document at once became, and remains to this day, a real landmark in Poland's modern history. Through it Polish leaders meant to lead Poland from Middle Ages to modern times. This liberal, progressive, and democratic Constitution sharply curtailed the unlimited powers of the king, making Poland's Government one of limited, constitutional monarchy. A responsible form of cabinet government was provided for, and the legislative assembly became the supreme governmental authority of the country. The basis of the electorate was broadened and religious freedom was guaranteed. The nobility lost much of its privileges, and the peasantry were brought under the protection of the law. In short, this was a model Constitution, and as such was a great pioneering effort on the part of gifted Polish leaders.

Unfortunately for the Poles, before the Constitution was put into effective force, Poland's foes treacherously attacked her, partitioned her and put an end to her independence. But the liberal and democratic spirit of the Constitution of May 3 still lives in Poland, and on the 170th anniversary of its proclamation all patriotic Poles and all lovers of freedom observe that historic anniversary, the Polish Constitution Day.

Senator Mansfield on the World Stage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Senator Mansfield on the World Stage," which appeared in the April 4 issue of the Lewistown (Mont.) Daily News, and an article entitled "MANSFIELD Splits Work of Democratic Leader," which appeared in the March 27 issue of the Los Angeles Times.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to the printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR MANSFIELD ON THE WORLD STAGE

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON made his mark as one of the greatest majority leaders in the history of the U.S. Senate.

Filling the shoes of such a man is a difficult assignment.

This is especially true in view of the fact that Mr. JOHNSON is now Vice President of the United States and presiding officer of the Senate.

But Montana's own Senator MIKE MANSFIELD is certainly doing the job in a brilliant, quiet, and effective manner all his own.

In the first place, Senator MANSFIELD did not seek this post of heavy responsibility and in fact made it known that he did not want it. In short, the job sought him. This gave him a tremendous psychological advantage in dealing with the Senate. He was elected to lead the Senate because he enjoys the confidence and respect of southern, northern, and western Senators. This certainly speaks well for Senator MANSFIELD because it means that he is not a doctrinaire extremist. He practices the art of the possible. He strives to make democracy work despite the conflicts of various sections and interests.

Because Senator JOHNSON as leader had been so flamboyant as well as able in contrast to the quiet, studious Senator from Montana, the smart alecs and commentotors early assumed that JOHNSON still pulled the strings. They cited as proof such insignificant observations that Senator JOHNSON retained his old office. But more and more the analysts as well as the Senate itself have realized that Senator MANSFIELD is the majority leader in his own right. More and more everyone is beginning to realize that Senator MANSFIELD is on the way to becoming one of the really great Senate majority leaders.

Today, as the American Government deals with the crisis in Laos or the Congo or in Berlin, Senator MANSFIELD is playing a decisive role in history of the world. He is a national and international figure because he is one of the two or three most important men in the U.S. Government. On the domestic front, it goes without saying that he

is the chief architect for enacting the administration's program into law.

Evidence of Senator MANSFIELD's growing stature was recently pointed out in the powerful Los Angeles Times which is read by millions in California and elsewhere. The article, an examination of Senator MANSFIELD's role, speaks for itself. Suffice to say it is a real tribute to "our own MIKE," in whom all of Montana can take justified pride. Let him know that he has our best wishes as he moves through these momentous times.

MANSFIELD SPLITS WORK OF DEMOCRATIC LEADER—SENATE CHIEF EMPLOYS TEAMWORK TO GET JOB DONE—HIS ASSISTANTS KEPT BUSY

WASHINGTON.—The Senate, used to one-man command, is seeing a new kind of teamwork in operation under the direction of Democratic Leader MANSFIELD of Montana.

MANSFIELD has called into action his youthful and peppery assistant, Senator HUMPHREY of Minnesota, on a schedule that will divide the heavy leadership work between them.

Beyond that, MANSFIELD has moved committee chairmen into the foreground to direct the debate on bills sent to the floor by their groups.

SHARP CONTRAST

All of this is in sharp contrast with the methods used by Vice President JOHNSON of Texas in the years when he was the Senate's majority leader.

By nature, JOHNSON was a one-man operator. He was the commander who kept his finger on every development. As the expression goes, JOHNSON knew where all of the bodies were buried.

As the leader, JOHNSON knew when to put on the pressure and when to lift the safety valve to let members blow off some of their accumulated steam. But no one ever got the idea that JOHNSON wasn't in command of the situation.

But MANSFIELD works in a different way. He looks on his as the strategic job of getting President Kennedy's New Frontier program through the Senate. He is willing, and even eager, to share the tactical command.

That was why, when the depressed areas bill was before the Senate, Chairman DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, of the Banking Committee plumped his husky frame down in the first row seat usually reserved for the Democratic leader.

MANSFIELD moved back three rows and left HUMPHREY seated next to DOUGLAS. It was HUMPHREY's overall responsibility to see that all went well with the bill while DOUGLAS led the charge and countercharge of the debate.

HUMPHREY's assignment will be to shepherd what might be called welfare legislation through the Senate, assisted by the chairman of the interested committees.

MANSFIELD will take tactical command of bills involving international issues, treaties, nominations and the segment of domestic legislation not concerned primarily with welfare matters.

When Latin American issues are at stake Senator SMATHERS, of Florida, secretary of the Conference of all Democratic Senators, will be called upon to help carry the ball.

This division of the workload obviously gives MANSFIELD more time than he otherwise would have to deal with the broad aspects of the Kennedy program.

But HUMPHREY says the burdens of a job that once was more honorary than active are working him harder than at almost any time in his life.

Is Dictatorship America's Future?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the continuing concentration of power in the hands of the Executive at the expense of the legislative branch of government is a threat no American should overlook or condone.

If a gasoline motor could run without a carburetor, it would advance the efficiency of that motor for the carburetor to be taken out.

What is the use of having a Congress, either/or, for that matter, a Constitution—if an administration persists in running without them?

That, in essence, is the revolution which is going on today.

The Central Intelligence Agency is spending hundreds of millions of taxpayers' dollars every year. How many Americans, how many Congressmen—elected by their fellow Americans—know what the CIA does do or does not do?

A costly organization which might well involve this Republic in global conflict, the so-called Peace Corps, is very much in existence. Did the elected Congress create this mid-20th century childrens' crusade? No. It was established by Executive order.

More recently, the area development bill's conference report, containing a financing clause which bypasses the legitimate action of the Appropriations Committee, was approved by the House. This back-door financing method is rapidly becoming the rule, rather than the exception.

Congress has already given up its constitutional controls over the tariff. It is being heavily pressured to relinquish its controls over appropriations by giving the President an item veto.

Secretary of Agriculture Freeman has proposed a bill which would relieve Congress of the need for ever acting again on important aspects of American agriculture. This, in my opinion, is the first instance of a free man advocating a return to the slavery of the Dark Ages.

I serve notice that I will continue, that I will step up my fight on this insidious attempt to undermine and destroy Congress and the Constitution.

I speak for myself. I commit no other man.

Oh yes, there are still some individualists in Congress. But, as a current writer has so well put it, "The trouble with today's individualists is that they are getting harder and harder to tell apart."

I welcome others to join me in this conflict. Still, if need be, I will fight alone. I hope it will never come to be a one-man battle. Still—if it should be—I will be proud to fight my own "Algerian" counterrevolution.

Address by Mrs. Joseph E. Casey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Mrs. Joseph E. Casey, president of the Woman's National Democratic Club, at the 37th annual wreath laying ceremony of the club at the Tomb of Woodrow Wilson on May 1, 1961:

ADDRESS BY MRS. JOSEPH E. CASEY, WOMAN'S NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC CLUB, 37TH ANNUAL CEREMONY, LAYING OF THE WREATH AT THE TOMB OF WOODROW WILSON, MAY 1, 1961

Canon Miller, Mrs. Wilson, Mrs. Bolling, Mrs. Warren, ladies and gentlemen, this is the 37th annual ceremony in which the Woman's National Democratic Club has honored the memory of President Wilson.

Last year, I spoke of his ideals, his spirituality, his courage and his vision.

This year, I should like to discuss the inspiration to face the problems of today that can be drawn from his teachings.

First of all, he said, "This country is going to have crisis after crisis. No body politic so abounding in life and so puzzzled by problems as ours is can avoid moving from crisis to crisis."

Here then is his message that this country will live in a dangerous world and play a continuing important role in international affairs.

In the future, our country has no place, therefore, for the sunshine patriot. Neither can we afford to select as our leaders pleasant, mediocre men, upon the mistaken assumption that a man of the people can give us the necessary leadership in these days of struggle and difficulty.

"What," President Wilson asks, "do we mean by a man of the people?" He answers, "We mean a man who has his rootage deep in the experiences and consciousness of the ordinary soul of his fellow man—but we should not mean a man whose rootage is holding him at their level."

He tells us we should choose a man who has risen above the level of the rest of mankind, a man who sees horizons which they are too submerged to see. A man of the people, not because he speaks from their ranks, but because he speaks for them and for their interests.

Such a leader was Jefferson. "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal."

Such a leader was Abraham Lincoln. "A government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

And such a leader was Woodrow Wilson, who said: "The great Government we loved has too often been made use of for private and selfish purposes, and those who used it had forgotten the people."

Jefferson, Lincoln, Wilson, great leaders all—who had risen above the level of the rest of mankind, but who always spoke for the people and their interests.

Such for our high standard of leadership. Now what message does the immortal Wilson have for "we the people"?

He says, "I wish there were some great orator who could go about and make men drunk with the spirit of self sacrifice. I wish there were some man whose tongue

might every day carry abroad the golden accents of that creative age in which we were born a nation, so that America might again have the distinction of showing men the way, the certain way, of achievement and of confident hope."

Here is a clarion call to raise a standard to which all just men can repair—a reminder that the American experiment was intended as a conscious revolution in human affairs—that it was to evolve a way of living for all mankind to emulate.

Woodrow Wilson had a vision of an America "that would seek to serve, not to subdue the world."

We should not be Americans deserving to call ourselves the fellow countrymen of Wilson if we did not feel the compulsion that his example lays upon us—the compulsion not to heed him merely but to look to our own duty, to live every day as if that were the day upon which America was to be reborn and remade.

Labor From Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in a penetrating editorial the New York Times has attacked the continuation of Public Law 78, the Mexican farm labor importation program, without amendments which would guarantee American farmworkers sorely needed protection.

Legislation which would continue this program is scheduled to be voted on in the House Wednesday, and I urge my colleagues to give this editorial their immediate and thoughtful attention:

[From the New York Times, May 3, 1961]

LABOR FROM MEXICO

The time has come for the Federal Government to stop fostering the use of cheap foreign labor to the detriment of American workers. We refer to the program by which Mexican laborers are allowed to come into this country every year on a temporary basis to harvest the crops, mostly in the Far West and Southwest. These Government-authorized invasions, over 300,000 strong last year, have an adverse effect on the wages, working conditions, and employment opportunities of domestic farmworkers.

Public Law 78, which permits these incursions, expires at the end of the year. The Gathings bill (H.R. 2010), now before the House of Representatives, would extend its life as it is for 2 years more. But Representative COAD, of Iowa, has introduced a measure (H.R. 6032), strongly supported by the Kennedy administration, which also provides a 2-year extension, but in contrast to the Gathings bill, would give American workers much needed protection.

It requires that before growers can employ "braceros" they must offer U.S. workers wages that are at least equivalent to average farm wages in the State or Nation, whichever is the lower. Growers would also have had to make reasonable efforts to attract domestic workers by offering them conditions of employment comparable to those required by the existing law. Mexican workers would be limited to seasonal and temporary manual jobs and their numbers could be limited by the Department of Labor so as to assure active competition among growers for domestic farmworkers.

The House Agriculture Committee has reported favorably on the Gathings bill and the Rules Committee has cleared it for action by the House. It should be killed—unless it is amended along the lines of the Coad bill. Its death would be unlamented except by the large-scale growers. They have used it to obtain an endless supply of seasonal farmhands who work without complaint under conditions far below decent American standards.

New York Times Urges Establishment of National Seashore Area on Padre Island Cape Cod, Point Reyes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, most of us will recall that President Kennedy, in his message to Congress of February 23, specifically urged that National Seashore Recreation Areas be established at Padre Island, Cape Cod, and Point Reyes, Calif.

The New York Times of Sunday, May 7, 1961, published an excellent editorial which said, in part:

To delay can only increase the cost of the lands that have to be bought by the Park Service, at the risk of losing some of them permanently. At this very moment the bulldozers are scraping out a subdivision in the heart of the Point Reyes peninsula. Texas developers who envisage a new Miami Beach on Padre Island are trying to force a compromise that would leave to their devices an additional 20 miles, and widest and best parts of the long, wild barrier beach. Commercial and residential developments continue to whittle away at Cape Cod. The speculation that is always touched off by plans for public acquisition is driving land values skyward.

The quote from the New York Times, which I have just read, very accurately sums up the need for early action on bills to establish these National Seashore Recreation Areas. This is an informed and informative editorial. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Appendix the aforementioned editorial entitled "Three Needed National Parks."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THREE NEEDED NATIONAL PARKS

Now that hearings have been held by committees of both House and Senate, there is no reason for further delay by Congress in passing the bills to establish new national seashore parks at Cape Cod, Padre Island in Texas, and Point Reyes in California.

In his conservation message to Congress February 23 President Kennedy specifically named these three areas. Secretary of the Interior Udall has given them vigorous backing. The recent hearings in Washington disclosed overwhelming and nationwide public support. The opposition has dwindled to local minorities made up mostly of landowners still angling for a better price when they sell to the Park Service and would-be developers who are trying to shrink the size of the proposed parks so they can have additional, adjacent acreages to exploit.

Each of these areas has its own natural splendor: Cape Cod with its great Nauset Beach, windswept and surfswept by the North Atlantic; Padre Island in its setting of shallow, subtropical seas; Point Reyes with its backdrop of white cliffs and scenic California hills. Each is uniquely worth saving unspoiled for future Americans.

To delay can only increase the cost of the lands that have to be bought by the Park Service, at the risk of losing some of them permanently. At this very moment the bulldozers are scraping out a subdivision in the heart of the Point Reyes Peninsula. Texas developers who envisage a new Miami Beach on Padre Island are trying to force a compromise that would leave to their devices an additional 20 miles, and the widest and best parts, of the long, wild barrier beach. Commercial and residental developments continue to whittle away at Cape Cod. The speculation that is always touched off by plans for public acquisition is driving land values skyward.

In working out this kind of legislation, politicians often try to placate or accommodate every last segment of local interest. There comes a time when the few remaining dissenters, who will never quit grabbing for the extra concession, simply must be overridden in the public interest. At Cape Cod, Padre Island, and Point Reyes that time has arrived.

Address Delivered at Tomb of the Unknowns, Arlington Cemetery, Va., Sunday, May 7, 1961, by Gene J. Bianchi, Sovereign Grand Master, IOOF

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DOWDY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday May 7, 1961, hundreds of Odd Fellows from all parts of the United States and Canada participated in the Independent Order of Odd Fellows annual pilgrimage to the Tomb of the Unknowns in Arlington National Cemetery. Seventy-one wreaths from that many grand jurisdictions were placed at the tomb. The wreaths from the Canadian grand jurisdiction were laid at the monument constructed by the people of Canada in memory of those U.S. citizens who gave their lives in the service of the Canadian Armed Forces during World War I.

Hon. Gene J. Bianchi, sovereign grand master, IOOF, delivered an inspiring address at the memorial services held in connection with this pilgrimage. Under unanimous consent, I incorporate a copy of his address with my own remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ADDRESS DELIVERED AT TOMB OF THE UNKNOWNS, ARLINGTON CEMETERY, VA., SUNDAY, MAY 7, 1961, BY GENE J. BIANCHI, SOVEREIGN GRAND MASTER, IOOF

We have this day assembled here in the sacred and hallowed Arlington Cemetery for our annual pilgrimage and ceremony to pay tribute to the ones who have rendered military service to our country, many of whom

sacrified their lives that we may enjoy the blessing of living in a free world.

Today we pause to pay tribute to those whose names are unknown. We know not who they are, nor whence they came. We know not their stations in life, nor whether their possessions were many or few. We know not when or under what circumstances they left the ranks of the living and joined those whose mortal voices are silent.

This is one day when the past rises before us. Once again we are reminded that we are not creatures of chance nor of blind circumstances. It is obvious that this Nation of ours has been led and guided by the hand of our God. We would like to show that "God has provided some better things for us." However, it is only because gallant men, the young and many not too young of this great Nation and its allies, responded to the call of our Government at times when evil men sought to rob us of the way of life we love so much. The liberties and rights given to us by and through the Constitution of the United States of America.

In paying just tribute at this time, we do so, not only to the memories of the individuals whose remains lie at rest in this hallowed ground, but to those hundreds of thousands of known and unknown whom they represent.

Memorial Day will not let true Americans forget that men of many wars lie silent in their graves. Their names are etched on time-discolored tombstone and are unforgettably engraved on the hearts of posterity. Think if you will of the lonely widows who have been the victims of loneliness. The children who were and are tormented with mental anxiety because they have been denied the benefits and the joys of their earthly father. Think of the mothers and fathers who said goodbye to their sons and then carried the feeling that these boys would not come home again. Then there are the returned veterans who must go through life suffering from the effects of war. Men who sacrificed both success and happiness. Who set aside their own plans for the future, postponed their preparations for desired vocations, diverted their attentions from pursuits of peace and construction and directed them to war and destruction. Most of them responded not from any desire to engage in warfare or gain a fighter's fame, but for their recognition of a duty to serve their country and their fellow man.

Every individual who has served our Nation in the armed services is a witness pleading with American citizens to not forget that a great price has been paid for these liberties that are ours. They ask that we preserve that which they paid so dearly to obtain.

Multitudes of patriots paid the supreme sacrifice for their country, giving their lives for an undying cause. The right to worship God according to the dictates of our own heart. The right to a republic form of government. The right to live without being molested by a dictatorial regime. They are saying to every American: You dare not forget our devotion, our heroism, and our appreciation for the principles that make America great. With basic American rights being weighed in the balances, we dare not forget.

We have endeavored to establish and maintain government only by the consent of the governed. Unfortunately, this condition does not prevail within all nations. More than once in the lifetime of most of us here we have seen governments of other countries become intoxicated by power and authority obtained illegally according to our standards, and endeavor to destroy our form of government and impose upon us their form by force and against our will.

In such circumstances those in authority must make the decision whether to submit to force or resist force. There is only one honorable course and on each occasion we have chosen it, knowing full well that it would ultimately lead to war, which would demand the lives of thousands of our youngest and best of those with their most useful and productive years ahead of them. Such are the times when the individual must forsake his individuality, when the safety of the Nation is more important than the life of any citizen regardless of his wealth, position, or power. At these times our young men and women have not faltered nor endeavored to evade the challenge of duty. They have come forward by the hundreds of thousands and by reason of their response with all the sacrifice involved for them it is possible for you and me to gather here today. While we pay tribute to their memory we should thank God that we have had such men and women in our Nation.

Echoing through the corridors of time we hear them say: "You dare not forget the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the war with Mexico, the Civil War, the war with Spain, World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict. We will not allow you to forget what brought this Nation of ours into existence. We will not let you forget what gave birth to this Nation of ours. You cannot let loose of your hold on governmental policies that came about because of the Dark Ages. America, you cannot allow yourself to forget the way that God has led and blessed you."

It is particularly appropriate that the Independent Order of Odd Fellows should pay tribute here today for those who sought to destroy our Nation, first sought to destroy our order. In the form of government imposed by them on their citizens, and which they desired to impose upon us, there is no place for friendship, love, and truth; faith, hope, and charity, or universal justice, the basic principles and teachings of our order. Our brothers in other lands were among the first victims of their ruthless seizure of power. Those virtues which we adopt and which we believe have helped to make our Nation great, must continue to be attributes of the character of both the individual and the Nation. Yes, gallant warriors, you died in defense of those virtues and we here today in humility and reverence gratefully acknowledge our debt to you.

So Memorial Day brings us to the sobering thoughts that upon our shoulders rest the responsibility of reproducing the heroism to maintain that which was purchased and established at terrible cost, and as we approach the moment when we are privileged to place the wreaths at the tombs of America's best known and most beloved heroes, our minds will be closed to the audible word and only our hearts will feel the joy that is ours in representing some 2 million or more Odd Fellows and Rebekahs throughout the free world and we will know that each of these members whom we represent will, in their own way and in their own language, offer a prayer today that these young heroes will not have died in vain, and that the principles upon which our freedom is based and for which they died, will be preserved and respected by all nations, tongues and kindreds of the earth until time shall be no more. While our words and our actions of today deal with and pay well-deserved honor to the past, it is not the past alone which belongs to these who lie here. They gave their lives for the future, a future which can be realized only as we give ourselves to make secure the peace and freedom for which they died.

We stand now in the presence of those who made the supreme sacrifice and in their unseen presence we too must make a decision. Can we in all truth and sincerity say: "Soldiers, as we take our departure and leave you to your lone and silent sleep, be assured you have not died in vain. The generation of today accepts the challenge and goes forth into the world of the living, inspired by your example, to maintain the principles for which you gave your all, that freedom, truth and justice might prevail, and if need be, which God forbid, again lay down their lives, as you have done and until such time to live for their country as you have died for it."

Ladies and gentlemen, such is my hope and their expectation.

How Much Must We Lose?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, having read the columns written by George E. Sokolsky for many years and appreciating his great contributions to our thinking, I am inserting herewith an editorial by Mr. Sokolsky. I am sure that every American reading this must understand that time is not on our side but is on the side of the Communists. If they can continue to get us to talk while they are consuming the world, we already know the answer. The article follows:

HOW MUCH MUST WE LOSE?

(By George E. Sokolsky)

There is no use going into a fight unless the intention is to win. To lose is to strengthen the enemy. The only reason why Soviet Russia has defeated the United States in Korea, Cuba, Laos, as we shall lose in other parts of the world, is that the Russians are intent and aggressive whereas the United States prefers to retreat, to abnegate, to avoid direct action, to talk, talk, talk until the vapor of words fills the air.

All this talk of doing nothing about Cuba is childish because if the United States does not do something about Cuba, the Russians, using Cuba as a fortress, will do something about the United States. The logic which produced our defeat in Korea is producing our defeat in Cuba. The same men who brought about our defeat in Korea are bringing on our defeat in Cuba.

The argument runs that if we protect the United States in Cuba, Soviet Russia will seize Berlin. In fact, Khrushchev said so. The answer to that can only be, "Seize and be damned." Those who are afraid are already dead. When a nation shudders at the thought of war, it is already in the process of being conquered.

This is the basis of Soviet strategy against the United States. It is to defeat us step by step without war and to isolate us. In Laos, the British confused us by the proposition that they would act as brokers to effectuate a truce. Meanwhile, the Red Chinese-directed Lao rebels steadily moved forward. The game is nearly over but the truce is still in the making. Perhaps we shall get around to a truce when the Red Chinese will move into Cambodia and Thailand. Will we retreat from there, too?

If we have neither the courage nor the technique to defend our word, why don't we quit altogether? The Russians will isolate

us in a year or two unless we choose a place to fight them and stop this process. It is our isolation that is their target. The Russians and Red Chinese are building empire and are not wasting time with petty conversations either at the United Nations or any other conference. While they make speeches, they also march forward.

Their argument is:

"You want to talk, so talk. We have plenty of delegates to send to meetings. Let them talk. It counts for nothing but you Westerners are so bogged down in a swamp of words that you talk because it gives you pleasure, like a debating society in college. You talk to each other and you talk to us. But we are very busy men.

"With us, it is different. We are attending to business. Our business. Your business. It does not matter. We have men for talking and men for acting.

"If we have a man who jumps on a horse and rides furiously until he comes to a ditch; then he turns around and goes back slowly—if we have such a man, like some of my colleagues were, we send them far away. We do not need those who dare not take the next inevitable step. We get rid of them.

"The West objects that Khrushchev said, 'We will bury you.' So, he talked too much. So what. You are burying yourself by being afraid. And the more afraid you are, the more we will say, Boo!"

And it is all a correct position. Our President has chosen as his advisers those who advised President Roosevelt and President Truman. The results of their period of political activity have thus far been disastrous. During his campaign, President Kennedy said that we had reached a low prestige. He would raise our prestige, but many of those whom he chose to help him raise our prestige were among those who helped lower our prestige.

President John F. Kennedy is nobody's fool. Sooner or later, he will weary of the supercilious advice which he receives from those who are always proved to be wrong by the course of events.

He will ask himself why the course of events proves them to be wrong. He will then set up his own policy without the counselors of defeat. When he does, the United States will again go forward. It will not go forward by retreating.

Termination Payments Made, Sound Judgment Shown by Members

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, as you know, the Federal Government recently took title to much of the forest land of the Klamath Indian Reservation. This action was in accordance with the Klamath termination program enacted by the Congress. As a result a large payment was distributed to tribal members for these lands. I know that my colleagues will be pleased and interested in the following report from the Klamath Tribune, which reports from the area itself on the conduct of the tribal members receiving their payments:

TERMINATION PAYMENTS MADE, SOUND JUDGMENT SHOWN BY MEMBERS

Bank officers, police officials, and merchants expressed surprise and lauded the way in which Klamath Indians generally conducted themselves when they recently received their termination money.

Some 588 Klamath adults received their unrestricted funds each amount to about $43,000. Of the total number receiving their checks, slightly over 300 adults are residents in the Klamath Reservation area.

"It was fantastic" was the way one banker expressed it, remarking on the fact that there were only one or two individuals in the whole area who asked for cash. Bank representatives stated that tribal members took full advantage of savings and checking accounts, taking away very little of their money in cash.

Many wild and unfounded tales spread about the Indians' use of their money which, upon a little investigation, were found to be untrue. Newspaper accounts for instance, of one drunk withdrawee who landed in jail with $40,000 cash in a paper bag were denied by law enforcement officials. "There's no truth to it" said the sheriff's office where the story was supposed to have originated. Sheriff Britton remarked on how quiet it was, and the fact that law enforcement problems certainly did not increase as a result of the payments.

Stories of tribal members on a spending spree were for the most part grossly exaggerated. Most tribal members did purchase new cars, and a few, two new ones.

The few isolated instances of unwise spending, blown up out of all proportion in the papers, have overshadowed the other hundreds of tribal members who have wisely invested their money in bonds, mutual funds, real estate, etc., or are socking it away in savings accounts until they decide on a plan and in the meantime are quietly going about their business.

A College Student Looks at Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter from a student at Mississippi Southern College, dealing with our current crisis in Cuba. The letter was, in my opinion, such a splendid analysis of the situation that I secured permission of the writer, Mr. Nick Stratas, to have it included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am including Mr. Stratas' thought-provoking letter:

I write you this letter with the deep concern for the freedom of America. As a senior college student at Mississippi Southern College, I have witnessed the backward trend that this great country has taken in the cold war with Communist Russia.

The current situation involving the uprising of anti-Castro forces in Cuba gives America a chance to show Russia and the Communist countries that this country will not stand for communism in this hemisphere or the world and that America will come to the aid of those who seek freedom. Now is the chance for America to act. The eyes of every American are focused on Washington to show initiative in this crisis.

As a spokesman for the State of Mississippi and its people, you are implored to use all the power that you have in prodding our leaders to take the initiative. We do not want appeasement. We cannot be proud of it. The present policies of the United States in trying to negotiate with Russia for peace have shown no results. History shows that Russia negotiates only to gain time in a protracted war. They have made us look silly to the world when we are the greatest nation in the world.

We do not want to stand by and watch the world fall piece by piece into Communist hands. We do not want to fear the threat of a nuclear war until it is too late for even war to save us. If the trend continues, we will have lost this war with Russia, even though undeclared, without losing a drop of precious American blood. We have something to fight for. The Communists have used psychology on this Nation until some of us think that it would be better to be a Communist. I assure you that the feeling of anti-Americanism is in the minority. How long will it remain in a minority without American initiative?

We need a psychological boost. Cuba could be the place that the American spirit could show the world that we not only believe in freedom, but we will fight for it. Another Hungary will not make the American public or people over the world proud of this country. It would only make the downtrending feeling for this country continue.

Perhaps you are aware of the American feeling of living in a vacuum of security. As a journalism student I have witnessed this same feeling on the campus. Students as a whole have the feeling that nothing can happen to them. America has never known destruction in this present college generation's lifetime. What will it take to wake them up to the fact that America might be standing on its last legs? History has shown that great countries have fallen because the people thought they lived in a vacuum of security. I maintain that the leadership in Washington is the main cause. Let the people know of the situation they face. If they realize the dire need of action on their part and of our leaders, then perhaps we can be rid of the menace that threatens to enslave us all.

Governmental happenings are too complex for every individual to comprehend. We do not know of the many things that happen in the Capital because of their complexity. We do not know that our representatives are the only ones we can turn to. This is the first time that I have written to you or anyone in Washington. Perhaps this is but one letter among thousands of the same kind. I hope so. If so, I am glad to know that others feel as I feel.

I am aware of the fine job you are doing for this Nation, State, and its people. As I type this letter, I have the feeling that you will do the best you can to stem the tide of appeasement and will help turn America on the path forward to victory and not defeat.

Sincerely yours,

NICK STRATAS.

Third Party Threat Confronts Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted me, I am enclosing a letter to the editor of the Arizona Republic, by Mrs. Pat E. Paulsell, Coolidge, Ariz. It was called to my attention by Mr. John E. Robertson, of Phoenix, Ariz.

The apathetic party which Mrs. Paulsell describes here is known to all of us, and I wish every American citizen could stop and ask himself or herself if he or she is a member:

THIRD PARTY THREAT CONFRONTS NATION

EDITOR, THE ARIZONA REPUBLIC:

I used to think the United States had a two-party system, but I find we have three parties, and the third party is larger and more powerful than either the Democrats or the Republicans. It concerns itself not with elections exclusively, but with every phase of American life. It is known by many names, and its members often masquerade under the names of Democrats or Republicans. It is the apathetic party, and its campaign slogan is, "Let George Do It."

It's easy to recognize an apathetic. He is often heard to say, "I forgot to register to vote," or, "What difference does it make who I vote for? They're all crooks," or, "I don't want to get involved, I just vote the way my grandfather told me to when I was 9."

We Georges know the apathetic well. We fight for his rights, we give our money and our time to keep the United States the wonderful place that it is.

The apathetic enjoys the fruits of our work. He says nothing when we succeed, but when we fail, he says we haven't accomplished anything, and we're fools.

We can fight an evident evil, those of us who care, but we cannot win without help. The filth of communism spreads into our hemisphere, and we who try so hard are sickened by it. Something inside us forces us to try harder. But we have two enemies in everything we do—our obvious opponent and apathy.

I write this letter to arouse the apathetic party, but it is a helpless gesture, for the apathetics do not read beyond the first sentence. In fact, most of them do not read anything but the funnies.

MRS. PAT E. PAULSELL.

The Futility of More Talk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith a very pungent editorial published in one of the leading newspapers of the United States, the Long Island Press. This editorial expresses in no uncertain terms the futility of more talk:

THE FUTILITY OF MORE TALK

The long delay in arriving at a cease fire in Laos adds up to one more chapter in the doleful record of Western attempts to negotiate with the Communists.

Weeks go by; talks continue.

And the fighting goes on, with the Commie forces continuing to have the upper hand.

Obviously, the Reds don't mind prolonging the conversations. In fact their whole effort seems to prove that they regard peace as a kind of carrot to be dangled before the West and the West, we regret to say, is acting a bit like the donkey who hopes to get that carrot some day.

We fully expect these ridiculous "peace talks" to continue just as long as the Reds are able to push forward on the battlefield. The pro-Western Lao have never distinguished themselves by any great display of energy. And the supposed prospect of peace appears to have taken out of them whatever starch they may have had in the earlier stages of the war.

Further negotiations can only result in prolonging this situation.

"Youth Wants To Know"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 16, Secretary of Labor Goldberg appeared as guest on Theodore Granik's award winning television program "Youth Wants To Know." This was the premiere showing over WABC–TV, channel 7, in New York City and the program received wide acclaim. It may be interesting to note that Secretary Goldberg had the following to say at the conclusion of the program, "This is the most inquisitive and best informed panel that I have appeared before since I took my office."

Mr. Speaker, WABC–TV is to be congratulated on bringing this excellent program to the great metropolitan area of New York City. A special word of praise should go to Mr. Joseph Stamler, vice president and general manager of the station, and Mr. Al Hollander, channel 7 program director, as well as all other personnel associated with making this fine program possible.

As a Member of Congress from the borough of Brooklyn in the city of New York, I am proud and delighted to note that the Hotel St. George, the largest hotel in the city of New York which is located in Brooklyn, is presenting this program over WABC–TV and I should like to pay special tribute to Milton Kestenberg, president of the Hotel St. George Corp., for pioneering in this public service effort.

Without objection, Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in the RECORD a complete transcript of Secretary Goldberg's appearance on "Youth Wants To Know" at the conclusion of my remarks:

"YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW," SUNDAY, APRIL 16, 1961, THE HONORABLE ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG, SECRETARY OF LABOR, GUEST

Mr. BARBER. Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to "Youth Wants To Know." Our guest is Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg.

Secretary Goldberg is faced with many problems concerning the economic health of our country, but none is more urgent than the unemployment problem. Last month the number of unemployed represented 6.9 percent of the Nation's work force, a 20-year high for the month of March. Recently Secretary Goldberg said that within the coming year, the U.S. economy must turn up 10½ million more jobs. We will have our first question for the Secretary in just a moment.

[Announcement.]

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Secretary, it is a pleasure to welcome you to "Youth Wants To Know."

Secretary GOLDBERG. Mr. Barber, it is a pleasure to be with this panel, one of the most informed and inquisitive panels in Washington.

Mr. BARBER. Thank you. Now let's begin our questioning with Jerry.

Question. Secretary Goldberg, what indications of an economic upturn do you see currently?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Jerry, there are some signs of an economic upturn, but I want to warn that a few swallows don't make a spring or even a summer. And steel production has moved up and that is helpful. It has moved up several percentage points over the last period. As a result of the weather, construction activities have moved up. And then retail sales although they are not what they should be, are beginning to respond. Maybe they are responding to the fact that all of our women, those of us who are married, maybe some of your dates, went out and got some Easter hats and we have had a little upturn in retail sales as a result of Easter business, and finally there is a slight upturn in the amount of hours worked in our Nation's factories. Not enough to bring a 40-hour week, but a little benefit over the period that existed during the last several months.

Question. Do you believe then that certain parts of the Kennedy antirecession program may prove unnecessary.

Secretary GOLDBERG. Oh, no. We need all of the recession program and I just left the President and we were discussing whether or not it was not necessary to have further programs. That is a matter which is under study in the administration at the present time.

Question. Mr. Secretary, what can be done about this hard core unemployment, and what is being done during this administration right now?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Well, first of all, on the hard core of unemployment which some people call structural unemployment, the Congress of the United States has before it right at the present moment in conference an area redevelopment bill. This bill is designed to promote business opportunity and job opportunities in the areas which have hit by chronic unemployment—structural unemployment as some economists call it.

Question. How would you furnish this so-called feed money to badly depressed areas where they haven't money to start over again?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Well, the bill before the Congress which I hope Congress will enact in the next few days after they get through with the conference, provides for loans and grants of several hundred million dollars to enable these communities to develop businesses that will replace the businesses that have ceased to grant full employment because of technological and other developments.

Question. Mr. Secretary, we have been talking about quite a few recession measures. I think one of the important things to consider is the cost of these measures. Exactly how much is this going to cost the Government?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Well, this is hard to say, but the Kennedy administration has been very conscious of cost considerations. Now, for example, our unemployment compensation extension bill, the temporary unemployment compensation extension bill, that is going to cost about a billion dollars and that is a very substantial sum of money by anybody's reckoning. But we have imposed a tax on employers starting in 1963 to take care of the cost of that program.

So the Kennedy programs have been based upon realistic considerations and also based on sound fiscal reponsibilities.

Question. But sir, if there is any increase in taxes at all, which you say will

be necessary to finance these programs, is this a good measure in times of a recession, and won't this aggravate the economic situation?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Not necessarily. It depends on how you impose your tax. In this particular situation we are granting the benefits in the next 12 months, but we are postponing the tax for 2 years. In that way we think we have an ideal prescription. We meet the problems of the recession. We do not add to the tax burden at the same time. We hope by that time that we will have recovered from the recession and then it is appropriate to collect the taxes that will pay for the program that we put in during times of recession.

Question. Mr. Secretary, if local areas are willing to sacrifice, can't they solve most of their unemployment problem?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Well, local areas are doing a fine job. Take Scranton, Pa., for example. They have a great community effort. They have a great State effort in the State of Pennsylvania, headed by their fine Governor, Governor Lawrence, and Mr. Batt, their commissioner in this area. But this problem is more than a local problem. We need a working partnership between local government, National Government, community groups, labor people and management people to try and solve this problem.

Question. Since you cited the example of Scranton, Pa., couldn't other areas similar to this and in similar conditions solve this problem, thus making it not necessary for the Federal Government to intervene?

Secretary GOLDBERG. I wish they could. But the taxing powers which are basic, here, to a sound antirecession, and in fact a recovery program, have been really exhausted by many of the States and localities. They have reached the maximum power to tax. They are unable to cope with the magnitude of the problem which is becoming nationwide, by themselves.

Let me give you a figure: We have classified—I want to refer to the figure—101 major labor market areas of about 150, now, with a substantial labor surplus. This means that throughout the country, north, south, east and west, we have a problem of substantial unemployment. And this means that we have a national responsibility as well as a State and local responsibility to deal with this subject.

Question. Mr. Secretary, don't you think it would be a great burden on many of our country's employers to pass a bill to raise wages and at the same time encourage them to hire more people?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Well, the amount of tax we have imposed for example for unemployment compensation is four-tenths of 1 percent additional tax. That is a very small tax. But because it is a small tax spread largely over all the employers in the country, we are able to raise a billion dollars, and a billion dollars is very important for the relief of people who have been unemployed many long periods. We have 1,800,000 people right now who have been unemployed for 15 weeks or more.

Question. Well, don't you think it will be kind of a burden to ask them to raise the wages and then hire these other people and raise their wages to the same wages the other people working with them get?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Are you dealing now with our minimum wage law?

Question. Yes.

Secretary GOLDBERG. Well, that is another subject. First we were dealing with taxes. On taxes we have imposed a very modest tax and we hope by the time that that tax takes effect we will have substantial business recovery in the country. If we do there will be an adequate profit base to take care of that tax.

Now on minimum wage, the studies of our Department indicate that when we raised the minimum wage last time in 1955, which took effect in 1956, we expanded employment opportunities rather than contracted unemployment opportunities. Now we think it adds up to improvement in the economy rather than retrogression in the economy.

Question. Mr. Goldberg, would you consider a 3 percent unemployment rate the normal rate, and would you work strongly to lower this rate?

Secretary GOLDBERG. I think 3 percent is a high rate of unemployment. It is hard for me to accept the concept that any man who wants to work should be denied the opportunity to do useful and fruitful work.

Now it is true that there will always be a certain margin of unemployment in the country. This is because we are a tremendous country, this is because some people will be changing their jobs, this will be because some factories will be adjusting their product, so I suppose, and this is a very reluctant admission for me to make, that we have to live with a certain amount of unemployment.

Now some countries believe that 2 percent is a high rate of unemployment. When the President mentioned 4 percent, and Mr. Heller, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, mentioned 4 percent, they were not talking about desirable goals, they were saying we immediately or in the near future have to move the rate of unemployment down from 6.9 to 4 percent as the first measure of our achievement. They were not saying that 4 percent was the ideal goal for unemployment. Four percent is too high an unemployment rate.

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Secretary, at a recent news conference did you not use the figure 4 perdent, even though we would have a business upturn this year, the unemployment rate still would be 4 percent?

Secretary GOLDBERG. I said that unless Government, labor, and management did what they ought to do in this area, as I looked at the future employment and unemployment figures, I was very fearful that we would have several million jobs that we have to provide—about 7 million—and still leave the rate of unemployment at 4 percent. And I mentioned this not as a desirable situation, but as pointing up the challenge of the problem that lies ahead.

Question. What percentage rate would you be satisfied with, of unemployment?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Personally?

I would like to see everybody who wants to work and has the capacity to work fruitfully employed and I would not like to deal with this in percentage terms. I don't like to play the numbers game.

Question. I mean practically, not ideally.

Secretary GOLDBERG. All I would say is that we ought to strive toward the goal of bringing down employment to normal cyclical unemployment and normal employment of transitional people in the work force.

I have mentioned that in some countries this is regarded to be 2 percent. Ours is a larger country and maybe there has to be a little more play in the joints. But I would certainly believe personally that 3 percent is the top rate in the area that we are discussing.

Question. Secretary Goldberg, shouldn't Government play only a position of leadership in solving our problems while management and labor supply the action?

Secretary GOLDBERG. No, I don't agree with that. I think the great action that has to be taken in the country is of course in the private sector of our economy. I have repeatedly said that the best answer to unemployment are jobs at decent American wages in private industry. But Government has a responsibility in this area as well as industry and labor and the responsibility was written into our constitution and first in our preamble when we said we had to provide for the general welfare, and secondly in the powers of Congress. When Congress was empowered to tax, to promote the common defense and the general welfare of the United States.

Question. Mr. Secretary, in a recent 11 point proposal for migrant workers, 1 point was that a collective bargaining program be established for farm workers. How could this be done for this generation without further education and possible corruption?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Well, first of all I just testified yesterday on migrant farm labor. This is a sadly neglected area in our economy. These are the forgotten people of the country. They not only do not enjoy the benefits of collective bargaining, they often do not have adequate housing. They have inadequate education. They have inadequate health. They employ child labor. They do not have registration of contractors who deal in migrant labor. So that what we have to deal with first, since this is a sadly neglected area in our society, our first measure, and yesterday I appeared in support of first measures, but to see to it that on the farms no child works. I exempt from that family farms because the family environment protects against too much heavy labor and too much hazardous labor.

But I believe it ought to be a consensus in the United States as it is in industrial employment, that children less than 14 years of age do not work in the Nation's farms. We ought to house the migrant laborers adequately. We ought to see to it that a public group is created to watch over them. We ought to see to it that crew leaders do not exploit them. We ought to see to their education.

These are what I regard to be priority measures in the area of migrant farm labor.

Question. Mr. Goldberg, could not the local, possibly the State governments handle these problems that you have mentioned better than the Federal Government?

Secretary GOLDBERG. No, I don't think so, and as a matter of fact I have received letters from the States indicating that they need the help of the Federal Government in this area. For example, we have crew leaders. About nine States have enacted laws regulating crew leaders who recruit migrant labor. Six of the nine States have been in touch with me and they have said, "While we have regulated crew leaders, to evade our regulations crew leaders will take migrant labor to other States which do not regulate farm labor and protect them." So you see, since they move across States lines, the constitutional test of interstate commerce is fully met, and we have a national responsibility to see to it that these citizens are afforded real protection.

Question. How can the Federal Government move into this area which is obviously unorganized? The union representatives haven't even been able to unionize these workers. To have collective bargaining, you have to have this type of organization.

Secretary GOLDBERG. The Federal Government can move in by doing what they did for people when they enacted the Fair Labor Standards Act which originally some of the unions opposed.

The test for the Federal Government and for State governments is not whether unions support it or oppose it. The test is what is in the national interest and what is in the interests of people. The fact that unions either do or do not organize the migrant labor does not excuse Government from its responsibility to provide minimal standards, just as we have in the Fair Labor Standards Act, for wages, for children and so on in that area.

Now immediately in the migrant labor area we have not come to the wage problem. We are trying to deal with the elemental things: Health, hygiene, education, housing, crew leaders and matters of that type.

Question. Secretary Goldberg, at present under the Mexican labor program there are thousands of jobs on American farms being filled by Mexican citizens. Shouldn't Americans fill these jobs and therefore help to alleviate the farm problem?

Secretary GOLDBERG. I am now dealing with proposals on the Mexican farm labor program. One of the tests of the program, which is written into law and which will be written into the new law, is that domestic labor is not available to do the job. Only then do I and will I certify that the foreign labor, Mexican labor, or labor from other countries is admissible for the purpose of doing farm labor.

Question. Mr. Secretary, getting back to domestic migratory laborers, after the season is over and they pick their crops, they are then, shall we say, dumped in northern cities: Baltimore, Buffalo, New York. Whose responsibility is that now, the Federal Government or the State or local?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Unfortunately under present laws this is the responsibility of local governments and you have correctly portrayed what happens. The average farm laborer of the migrant character works 100 to 130 to 170 days a year and then he has unemployment unless he is able to get employment in factories or other areas.

I think this problem, which is the problem of sending hundreds of thousands of people across States lines in interstate commerce, is a problem which commands national attention.

Question. Well, now if he doesn't get into other employment, Mr. Secretary—Senator WILLIAMS I think says he makes about $790 a year. That means he must with his family go on the local welfare rolls. Do you see any chance for the Federal Government giving more money to areas impacted with migratory workers? The welfare aspects?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Senator WILLIAMS has been one of our great leaders in the area of trying to protect migrant labor. As pointed out, this statistic that you mentioned, seven hundred and some dollars, we have to add to it and I am sure he would agree—he agreed with me yesterday when I testified—that they earn in nonfarm employment a few hundred dollars more. The total is about $930, but that can't support a family. So that is true that when we advance standards, despite the common conception we are always increasing costs, that does not necessarily follow, because we are not going to allow these people to starve. And so cost exists in one area or another. The best way to do it is to do what has been done in the distressed areas bill and the area redevelopment bill, where we are now making provisions to encourage the employment of rural labor as well as industrial labor.

Question. Mr. Goldberg, now that there are approximately five and a half or six million people unemployed and continually more being let off their job because of automation, how do you see that we can employ these people and what types of jobs do you think we can fit them in?

Secretary GOLDBERG. You have put your finger on a very important problem. I have estimated that next year we will have to create, if we have full employment, ten and a half million jobs. I have estimated that even if we had 4 percent unemployment we would have to create 7 million jobs.

Now part of this is, we hope, the programs we have advanced already will help. We hope to create better opportunities for business so that private jobs can be created. And we are giving our continuing attention right now, the President and his advisers, to the whole question of whether or not the programs we have thus far advanced are adequate to realize our goal of reasonably full employment in the country.

Question. Mr. Secretary, are our present laws adequate to deal with the gangsterism and corruption in our labor unions?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Well, we have a new set of laws which was enacted about a year ago. It has been my philosophy first of all that laws don't solve all problems, any more than the Ten Commandments solved all of our moral problems in the country. Before I will be ready to go to the Congress for additional laws in this area, I want to study the laws that have already been entrusted to me. After I do so, if I am of the opinion as a Government official in charge of this area that existing laws are not adequate, I will not hesitate to go to the Congress for additional legislation.

Question. Mr. Secretary in relation to the Communist problem, why has it been necessary for the Federal Government to enact laws preventing members of the Communist Party to hold office in a labor union?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Well, because this has been the theory of the Federal Government and I must say with considerable justification, that Communists do not enter labor unions for the purpose of really working in labor unions, but that they enter labor unions for the purpose of carrying out the functions of the Communist Party.

I have had some experience in this area, when I represented the CIO and participated in the expulsion of the Communist unions. And I must say there is considerable validity to this position of the Government.

Question. Secretary Goldberg, in a recent news story of last week it was rumored that Mr. Reuther is rather upset with the President, saying that he has paid far too much attention to foreign affairs and has not put enough attention on the domestic problems of job opportunities and the unemployed.

What answer would you have to that?

Secretary GOLDBERG. First of all it is highly natural and understandable that our President should at the moment be devoting his prime attention to the great questions of survival. This is the question which is involved in foreign affairs, but I must say in all fairness to the President and with due respect to my friend Walter Reuther, I have never had any difficulty going to the President and discussing with him important questions of domestic policy. I have just, 45 minutes ago, finished a 45-minute discussion with our President on the whole area of employment and unemployment.

Question. Sir, William Morton of the Federal Reserve Board said that productivity should be increased and the gain should be passed on to the consumer through lower prices rather than to the unions through—to labor through higher wages or management through higher prices. Don't you agree with this?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Well, I hope the consumer and labor and management benefits from our increased productivity. One of the things we must remember in the country always is that we believe in not a stationary standard of living but we believe in advancing our standard of living. And we have many people in the country who still do not enjoy an adequate standard of living.

Question. Mr. Secretary, here is a theoretical question—utopian one, I guess: We have Mr. Stevenson at the U.N. seeking peace, we have diplomats in Geneva seeking peace. If we did get peace and then a demobilization of the people in the Army, just how would they be absorbed in the labor movement?

Mr. BARBER. Excuse me. I am very sorry to tell you that we will not have a chance to hear the Secretary's answer because we are almost completely out of time. I am sorry, Mr. Secretary.

Secretary GOLDBERG. I am sorry, too, because this was a very good question, but after Korea we had full employment without a tremendous armament budget. I am confident we can achieve it.

Mr. BARBER. Now we will have a final word from our guest in just a moment after this very important message.

[Announcement.]

Mr. BARBER. Secretary Goldberg, thank you very much for being our guest.

Secretary GOLDBERG. It is a great pleasure and I ought to correct myself. I said "after" Korea to you, Tom. I meant before Korea. I am delighted to share these thoughts with you and this bears out that this is the most inquisitive and best informed panel that I have appeared before since I took my office.

Mr. BARBER. Thank you, Mr. Secretary, very much.

Prelude to Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article "Prelude to Plan," by Neil H. Burlingame, of Binghamton, N.Y. This article is copyrighted 1961 by Mr. Burlingame, and is the sequel to his article "The Great American Deception," which I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 12, 1960: "Prelude to Plan" is inserted at the request of Mr. Burlingame, and I feel that it will be read with considerable interest:

PRELUDE TO PLAN

(By Neil Hancock Burlingame)

The American affluent society still hides—and breeds—massive poverty. It is of little comfort to 20 million poor families in the United States to know that the general level of prosperity is rising. It will need more than glowing newspaper reports to convince 60 million underprivileged American citizens that poverty is being wiped out in this country. The politicians and businessmen may ease their consciences by telling America's poor they have never had it so good, but this does not mitigate the hardships of millions of our countrymen who fail in the daily struggle to make ends meet.

Personal income information obtained from the Federal Government proves beyond doubt that poverty in the United States is as prevalent as ever, and that our low-income families are comparatively worse off today than at any previous time in the Nation's history. Furthermore, due to their dwindling share of the national income and the rapid increase in population, poor families are being added to the American scene at the rate of a quarter of a million annually. This hardly jibes with high level assurances that the number of poor families in the United States is rapidly getting smaller and smaller.

Shortly after the article, "The Great American Deception," which presents a statistical study of the poverty situation in this country, appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 12, 1960, one of the Presidential candidates, later nominated by his party, wrote the author as follows:

"I consider your article outstanding, not only because of its bold statistical attack on an ancient deception, but also because it has penetrated the myth that reforms have been effective in dealing with mass poverty."

It is true that the average family income in the United States is rising. But it is equally true that the poor families' share of the national income becomes less and less. What Government and business spokesmen do not tell us—if, indeed they are aware of it—is that economic gains, if any, resulting from so-called reforms to help the poor, actually benefit principally the well-to-do and the rich. At times these gains may tend to raise the average income, but they fail to help the poor families enough to offset the constantly rising cost of living. In the final analysis, it is the same old story: The rich get richer while the poor get poorer.

While our poor families cannot pay for all the things they need, many are better off in some ways, in spite of lack of money, than in former years. In emergencies, services are available that did not exist before. Progress in food processing and distribution, in medical knowledge and other vital areas, tends to benefit some of the poor. Technological advances make living, regardless of station in life, more enjoyable for many. But these considerations do not alter the fact that the overall poverty problem in the United States is no nearer solution than it was a half century ago. And now, suddenly, the security of the Nation and the whole free world depends upon an immediate solution.

Millions of words have been published lately about the national purpose. Outstanding Americans have discoursed on the subject at great length and with considerable eloquence. Yet everything they have said can be compressed into three simple words. The national purpose, as it always has been, is nothing more nor less than service to mankind—including Americans.

What has inspired this rash of rhetoric about the national purpose? Principally, the worry of our people about the security of the United States. Our welfare and security, thus our capacity to serve, depend upon economic growth, and the rate of that growth is diminishing and is inadequate for our needs. The experts agree that the present rate of growth of 3 percent annually must be doubled if we are to contain the Russian threat to impose dictatorship upon the world.

Measures are proposed, some acted upon, to speed up the economic processes. But those who chart the national course have never seemed to realize that the principal obstacle to necessary economic growth is mass poverty in the Nation. If the poor families of the United States could buy goods and services on a par with the other two-thirds of the population, the rate of economic growth would jump to over 11 percent and far exceed the fondest hopes and calculations of the experts and planners.

Among the many problems confronting the Nation, some of which will continue to serve as an economic brake until they are solved, are the following:

Eight to ten million American workers unemployed, including millions not recognized in official unemployment figures, and the situation getting worse;

Many millions of workers not covered by minimum-wage requirements, working for less than a decent wage, and subjected to abuses which free enterprise imposes for the selfish benefits of businessmen;

A perpetual inflationary business-labor climate which constantly advances the cost of living while undermining the purchasing power of the dollar, thus adding to the burdens of those who vitally need every particle of value that can be extracted from the few dollars that come their way;

Twenty million Americans living in slums, and millions more in substandard housing, while real estate interests and the politicians continue to make living problems for the poor more acute and difficult;

Agricultural surpluses mounting while millions at home and abroad are in need of food, with costs of storage and farmer subsidies falling heaviest on the very ones who receive the least benefits from ample national food production;

Opportunities for small businesses being obliterated by special privileges for, and arbitrary absorption by, the big corporations;

Flagrant abuses of civil rights commonplace in all sections of the United States, imposing further burdens on those already subjected to unfair and heavy economic loads;

Ten million needy older citizens without health insurance, and millions more of all ages, unable to pay for adequate medical care;

The richest and strongest Nation on earth second in many aspects of science, the space race, and in economic growth, while our Government temporizes with international affronts aimed at gaining for our enemies further advantages in military and economic areas;

The rapid increase in juvenile delinquency and crime, while parents and officials shirk their responsibilities in the chase for solely personal satisfactions;

Millions of our young folks without adequate educational facilities and oportunities while billions of American dollars are squandered on doubtful needs and whims of remote populations; and a host of others requiring vast sums presently, or potentially, unavailable from customary tax sources.

The present yearly income of the Federal Government is roughly $80 billion. Over half goes for defense, 15 percent to veterans and the farm program, 13 percent for interest on the national debt. This leaves less than $12 billion which is already allocated to the customary needs of Government. Where will the extra billions for the pressing problems be found? Given reasonably full employment of the labor force under the present rate of economic growth, the Federal income might reach $110 billion in 10 years at current tax rates. But the present percentage breakdown of expense will not materially change, and even with a doubled tempo of economic growth, the Nation will be much, much too late with too little to meet the Russian challenge. We need $50 billion in new Government revenue within the next 12 months, and by 1971 an estimated 10-year aggregate of $650 billion from new or vastly more productive tax sources for special measures on which the national security will depend.

Yet solving many of the pressing problems depends upon, and is not so immediately vital to our people as the eradication of poverty in the United States. Furthermore, many of the lesser problems will almost automatically solve themselves with added Government resources available under a sharply stepped-up economic expansion.

During a prolonged study of the low-income situation in the United States, the implication cannot be avoided that our Presidents, our lawmakers, our economists, and our business leaders, past and present, have never really understood the overall poverty problem in this country, and do not understand it today. They do not seem to have the slightest idea of how to go about it to abolish poverty in the United States. This probably explains why they have never seriously proposed it, and why they have never devised a workable program to accomplish it.

Without going into an extended recital of instances and reasons for failure of high-level efforts to improve the low-income situation, one can be singled out as especially typical of many. Outstanding among the better organized and more publicized attempts to analyze the causes of poverty and to suggest remedies, is the widely heralded Rockefeller report published in 1958. This document served as a basis for recommendations by special congressional committees and other groups proposing legislative help for the poor and to increase employment opportunities. Like so many other attempts to set a course for government and business, close study reveals its fallacies and inconsistencies.

If, as the Rockefeller report suggests, the large segment of our population outside the mainstream of our economic growth were switched to the mainstream—and that would take a lot of doing, and require a long period of years at best—how would these people be able to replace those in better paying jobs, or find new jobs at better pay? Or if new industries were formed to make a place especially for them—which is not likely—how would this change the existing proportion in different levels of pay?

Or if the impediments of cost of geographical movement were removed—and this might well be accomplished almost overnight—where would the travelling horde of workers find new jobs? And if they did find them, how would this change the prevailing ratio between the number of high and low pay workers? And if we could spread the educational opportunities for our low-income workers, where would they find additional jobs except as growth of business and industry kept pace, as it always must, with the mounting needs of a growing population?

While some of the changes mentioned in the Rockefeller, congressional, professional, and other special reports focused on the problem might be desirable, they could not be accomplished quickly enough, and would only evolve over the years at a pace determined by the year to year rate of economic development. Even if they could be speeded up or lumped into a priority program, they would not be enough, nor in time, to meet the needs of the Nation. They would not change the relative position that has endured between our income classes during the past half century. They would contribute little toward a solution of the perpetual and puzzling poverty problem.

Poverty has always plagued mankind. There apepars to be no accredited account of its having been abolished in any country in all recorded history. The Bible mentions the prevalence of poverty before and during the time of Christ. It even suggests that poverty will be always with us. Many Americans believe it can never be wiped out. Many believe it is a necessary evil in an economic system where men have individual freedom and are entitled to all their labor and ingenuity can acquire for them. But there never before was an America with enough of everything for everybody if properly channeled with fairness to all.

Some top-rated college textbooks for economics instruction tell us that our economy has never produced, and still is not producing, enough to provide everyone with what they need. The implications of such statements are utterly misleading and false. They reveal how little some of our most highly regarded economists know about the poverty problem. During the past 50 years there has been more than enough, or the capacity if well directed to produce enough, for every man, woman, and child not only in America but including some of the other countries of the world as well. But goods and services, even in the United States, are generally unavailable except to those who can pay for them.

And here is the shocker for our conventional thinkers in Government and business: Poverty can be completely and permanently eradicated in the United States within the next 10 years.

Under favorable circumstances it can be accomplished in 5 years. Not by legislation. Not by channeling more wealth to the top to trickle through to the folks at the bottom. Not by handouts. Not even through Christian faith. But only as a result of some basic changes in the attitudes and thinking habits of the American people. And poverty extinction can be effected without upsetting cherished institutions, or depriving the American people of their rights under the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the land.

Finally, as the most important element in a successful cold war program against the Russians, the abolishment of poverty in the United States as an economic, social, and ideological accomplishment, would be worth far more, and cost far less, in our efforts to gain the respect and love of peoples of the world, than all the billions of dollars we have given away, or the billions more we may be beguiled into surrendering for ephemeral friendships.

As a caution: Let us not get into prolonged controversy over details and lose sight of the broad needs of the Nation. It does not matter if the Government requires $50 billion, $500 billion, or $5 trillion in extra funds during the next 10 years. Whatever is needed, the American economy must provide. It is certain that present Federal revenue, or even that obtained from a doubled rate of economic growth, will not be enough for the programs that must be completed to successfully fight the cold war. Wanted: A writer of national distinction to help interpret the American plan to the American people.

Duval Engineering & Contracting Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, on April 19 of this year I voiced, on the floor of this great body, my opposition to the awarding of a Government contract to the Duval Engineering & Contracting Co., of Jacksonville, Fla., for the construction of a Saturn rocket complex at Cape Canaveral. My objections to this company's receiving any Federal Government contract was founded on the basis of proven fraud perpetrated by two of its supervisory employees who, before a Federal district court, were found guilty of fraud against the Federal Government in lightloading asphalt on the Mayport Naval Base under a construction contract awarded to the Duval engineering firm.

At that time, I pointed out that the Federal district judge who tried them concluded that they were taking the rap for the management of the company and this was borne out by the fact that they are still employed by Duval. At that time I also pointed out that Duval was removed from the State of Florida's bidding list because of fraud committed against the State as well as making payola to State employees a common practice. I further cited the conclusion of the Federal district judge concerning Duval's philosophy which, in the words of the court, was "to cheat the Government if you can."

On April 21, in spite of my objections, in spite of the Federal court's conclusion, in spite of two convictions, in spite of Duval's removal from the State of Florida's bidding list, and in spite of their record of fraud perpetrated against both State and Federal Governments, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers awarded this company a one-quarter million dollar construction contract for construction of the Saturn Complex at Cape Canaveral. May I point out that this company was denied a State contract, on which they were low bidders, the same day they received the Federal contract.

Following the awarding of this contract, I held a meeting with four representatives of the Corps of Engineers at which time I requested an explanation for their awarding this contract before thoroughly investigating my revelations, I having notified them about the highly questionable activities of this company 2 days in advance of their awarding the contract.

I received the Corps' reply today and it reveals that they have no intention of withholding the contract.

Paradoxically, I also received today a copy of a letter sent to the Governor of Florida, Hon. Farris Bryant, by the senior U.S. district judge who was assigned to and tried the Duval case, the Honorable Albert L. Reeves, of the western district of Missouri. Judge Reeves said:

U.S. DISTRICT COURT,
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI,
Kansas City, May 2, 1961.

Re. Duval Engineering & Contracting Co., Jacksonville, Fla.

Hon. FARRIS BRYANT,
Governor of Florida,
Capitol Building, Tallahassee, Fla.

DEAR GOVERNOR BRYANT: While holding court in Jacksonville, I tried a criminal case involving short loading on the part of the employees of the above-named company. They were both properly convicted for the reason that habitually, and almost daily, they caused a shortage of concrete designed for the runways of a Government airport.

It was obvious from the testimony that the acts of these employees were mere symptoms. The contracting company was performing a Government contract. Because of the extreme shortage in concrete loading, and because the Government knew about it, the company made a refund on the basis of a shortage of 451 tons; this, however, did not cover the entire shortage. From the testimony of witnesses, including the president of the contracting company, it appeared that the Government had not only been defrauded on the basis of a greater shortage than was accounted for, but that the employees were acting for the contracting company and were simply obeying orders. They did not profit—the company did.

I considered that the treatment of symptoms was of no value in the enforcement of the law, and granted probation to the two employees.

An effort should be made to remove the cause of wrongdoing and such an effort would reach fruition by denying an unworthy contracting company the right to be awarded Governmeht contracts under any circumstances.

It is for these reasons that I commend the authorities in the great State of Florida for denying Duval Engineering and Contracting Co. any further contracts. Companies of this character and repute should be taught that fair dealing is not only proper, but necessary in doing business with municipalities.

I take occasion to congratulate you on the splendid executive work you are doing in a great State.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT L. REEVES.

This letter certainly evidences the degree of concern in this matter by the judiciary and is, to be sure, a highly unusual statement for a district judge to make. Obviously, he is incensed at what he believes to be a great miscarriage of justice, and I most emphatically concur with him. I believe this letter to be most significant in that Judge Reeves is probably the man most familiar with the case, having tried it recently.

In light of this mounting evidence against Duval, I can see no alternative but to have the Corps of Engineers revoke this contract. And, in light of the fact that, since 1957, Duval has been awarded nearly $18 million worth of Federal-aid highway contracts, I will repeat my request that the Roads Investigating Subcommittee, on which I am ranking minority member, thoroughly investigate these projects in order to find out if the Federal Government has been defrauded on this $18 million worth of Federal-aid highways.

Senator KARL E. MUNDT, ranking minority member of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, presently conducting hearings on defense contracts, has already taken the lead in that body having requested an explanation from the U.S. Corps of Engineers concerning Duval's being awarded this Government contract.

Memphian Takes Command of Guided Missile Carrier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, April 29, 1961, I had the honor and privilege of witnessing the commissioning of the Navy's big new carrier, the U.S.S. *Kitty Hawk*. The impressive ceremony was on this huge carrier's deck at the Philadelphia Navy Shipyard.

The commanding officer of this new carrier is Capt. William Floyd Bringle, a native of Covington, Tenn., which is in the Eighth Congressional District, the district which I have the honor of representing in this body.

There follows a very vivid description of this commissioning by an excellent writer, Morris Cunningham, of the Commercial Appeal of Memphis, Tenn., an outstanding newspaper of the Nation. There also follows an editorial from the hometown newspaper of Captain Bringle, the Covington Leader, an outstanding weekly newspaper of the Nation. The leader is edited by Joe Buford and the managing editor is William C. Simonton:

[From the Commercial Appeal, Memphis, Apr. 30, 1961]

MEMPHIAN TAKES COMMAND OF GUIDED MISSILE CARRIER

(By Morris Cunningham, staff writer)

PHILADELPHIA, April 29.—Capt. William F. Bringle, Jr., of Memphis and Covington, Tenn., smartly accepted command of the huge *Kitty Hawk*, the world's first guided missile aircraft carrier, at commissioning ceremonies here Saturday afternoon.

As a host of notables looked on, the stern-faced 48-year-old graduate of Byars-Hall High School in Covington briskly stepped forward, read his orders, and assumed command of the 80,000-ton carrier.

In quick order, Captain Bringle directed his executive officer to set the watch, and proceeded with the other steps in the colorful, traditional ceremony.

Captain Bringle, in accepting command, called it "the high point of my years of Navy service." He pointed with pride to the magnificent fighting qualities of the ship and with a word to the crew said, "it is up to us to develop a ship with a fighting spirit second to none * * * we promise to devote all of our efforts to molding the *Kitty Hawk* into an efficient fighting ship."

At the conclusion the giant craft, which already has undergone sea trials, became an active unit in the U.S. fleet and America's latest contribution to the preservation of world peace.

Guests here for the ceremony included a score of Congressmen, among them Representative Robert A. Everett, Democrat, of Tennessee, who represents Captain Bringle's home district, Representative James B. Frazier, Jr., Democrat, of Tennessee, and Representative J. Carlton Loser, Democrat, of Tennessee, the captain's wife, his daughter, Lynn Bringle, 14; his son, Donald Bringle, 6; his mother, Mrs. William F. Bringle, Sr., his brother, and sister-in-law, Dr. and Mrs. Carey Bringle, all of 1639 Peabody, Memphis.

ADMIRAL BURKE PRESENT

Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, delivered the principal address and was the senior officer present. A Navy band played the national anthem during the commissioning.

The *Kitty Hawk* is unique because it is the first carrier to depend upon guided missiles, rather than conventional antiaircraft weapons, for its surface-to-air defense.

Rapid-fire advanced Terrier missile batteries replace the conventional dual-purpose 5-inch guns.

The Terrier is a missile about 15 feet long and about a foot in diameter and weighs about 1,100 pounds. It is propelled by a booster rocket of about the same length, but thicker, that weighs nearly 2,000 pounds. Automatic loaders enable two-missile salvos to be fired seconds apart.

Electronic brains in the missiles cause them to follow a thin radar beam that is projected from the *Kitty Hawk* to the target. The missiles explode when they hit the target.

LATEST TYPE PLANES

For additional defense, as well as for attack, the *Kitty Hawk* carries the very latest type of carrier-based planes. The planes, which can range out to distant targets, are equipped with missiles that can carry nuclear warheads.

Takeoff time is trimmed to minutes by high-speed elevators and other equipment designed to place planes in the air in minimum time.

The carrier, one of the world's biggest ships, is 1,047½ feet long, and 252 feet abeam. The flight deck measures 4.1 acres. The hangar area for handling, parking, and repairing of planes, measures another 2 acres. It is fully air-conditioned, and provides sleeping quarters for a crew of up to 3,855 men.

APPOINTED BY COOPER

He was appointed to the U.S. Naval Academy by the late Representative Jere Cooper, Democrat, of Tennessee, and was graduated in 1937. He was comissioned an ensign, and advanced steadily until he became a captain July 1, 1955.

During World War II he saw service both in the Atlantic and the Pacific. He was awarded the Navy Cross and the French Croix de Guerre for heroism in the invasion of France. Later in the Pacific area he commanded a cruiser squadron that made numerous strikes against the Japanese. There he was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross with 5 gold stars, and the Air Medal with 16 gold stars. He remained on active duty, accepting a variety of assignments, after World War II.

[From the Covington (Tenn.) Leader, Apr. 27, 1961]

A HIGH MARK

Saturday morning in Philadelphia, the helm of the Navy's newest, biggest, and presumably best, aircraft carrier was turned over to Navy Capt. William Floyd Bringle.

As a community, we can justly take pride in this announcement. Captain Bringle's people lived in Covington, he was born here, and he attended the local schools. He has many friends here who went to school with him and still remember him well, although he has not been back in several years.

The command of a ship such as the *Kitty Hawk* is a tremendous responsibility. That Captain Bringle has been selected by the Navy for the job, should be a real and bona fide inspiration to all of us here, especially the younger people. It shows just what personal endeavor and a little hustle can do if a man has the ambition to move up in this country.

Captain Bringle had no more advantages than most of us here—he graduated from Byars-Hall, and then attended a military academy until he got an appointment to Annapolis.

Being a captain in the Navy, while being a noteworthy achievement in itself, is not so much of an outstanding accomplishment—the Navy has lots of captains; they are comparable in rank to a colonel in the Army.

That Captain Bringle was selected above all the other captains to command the *Kitty Hawk* is more than ample evidence that the man has a lot on the ball and why we should feel community pride in his achievement. His command might be likened to being placed in charge of a multi-million-dollar business with several thousand employees.

He has set a high mark for the upcoming youth of this county to shoot at.

When Are We Going To Face Facts on Foreign Aid?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal should make us pause and think before we approve additional billions of American taxpayers' dollars being spent on foreign aid. Is it not time we ask ourselves just what we hope to accomplish through foreign aid and how close we are coming to our objective? Are we spending the money of the American taxpayer in the best interest of our own country or are we using it to subsidize socialism around the world? Is it not time we received some firm commitments from those we help so generously instead of pouring money into countries who lavish praise upon the Soviet Union any may even be lined up with the Communists in any showdown?

I urge the Members to read the editorial and ask themselves these questions:

NINETY-BILLION-DOLLAR LESSON

Secretary of State Rusk said the other night that 14 years' experience in handing out some $90 billion in foreign aid has taught this country a few lessons. He indicated that the most important of these is that aid, to be effective, must have clear targets and be carefully planned.

While Mr. Rusk was making these remarks, it became known that the United States plans to lend Socialist India $1 billion in the next 2 years. The state planners in New Delhi need the money because they have spent and borrowed themselves to the verge of bankruptcy on a variety of overambitious industrialization projects. The country's third 5-year plan is said to need a stiff hypo of foreign cash if it's not to crumble completely.

The United States plans to turn over the funds on a blank-check basis, with the New Delhi Socialists free to spend the money according to the same policies that have gotten India into gigantic debt in the first place. As part of the deal, however, Uncle Sam is considering helping New Delhi with two specific projects: A state-owned nuclear powerplant and another state-owned steel mill.

This brings up a couple questions. First, is it a clear target of U.S. diplomacy to further entrench socialism in India? And secondly, putting aside for a moment the fact that a billion-dollar boost for India will hardly help Uncle Sam's balance-of-payments problem, is it careful planning to mire India in still more debt? Another billion will bring the total U.S. aid to India to nearly $5 billion.

Mr. Rusk is certainly right when he says the Government should carefully plan its foreign-aid spending and aim it at clear targets. But when do we start?

Partisan Nominations Held Without Effect on Judicial Attitude

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, in the preliminary discussions which accompanied the recently passed bill increasing the number of judges in the U.S. courts, some commentators sought to make political capital from the fact that all of the appointments under this bill would be made by a Democratic administration.

The basis of this argument was that such appointments would necessarily be objectionable because they would be made under the auspices of a political party.

One of our colleagues the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN], in a letter to the New York Times skillfully and effectively demolished this argu-

ment. I feel that the rebuttal which he made is important enough to be brought to wider attention than that of the readers of the letters column of the New York Times and I append Representative MONAGAN's letter herewith:

PARTISAN NOMINATIONS HELD WITHOUT EFFECT ON JUDICIAL ATTITUDE

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

When one considers the history of judicial appointments to the Federal bench nothing could be less founded in fact than Prof. Robert Dixon's contention in his recent letter that partisan nominations lead to judicial partiality.

Without going so far as to advocate purely political designations, one must conclude that a review of past nominations clearly demonstrates that there is little connection between the nominal political affiliation of an appointee and his approach to the legal questions with which he deals as a member of the judiciary.

Justice Black is perhaps the greatest example of the fallacy of this argument. When he was named to the bench his nomination was criticized as being a threat to civil liberties. A former member of the Klan, he was opposed on the grounds that he could not, because of his former associations, exercise impartiality in the consideration of constitutional cases in the field of civil rights.

ACCUSATION OF CONSERVATIVES

Yet today Hugo L. Black is the archprotector of civil rights, a justice who is accused by some conservatives of desiring to strike down without discrimination all laws directed at the elimination of subversion and the restraint of freedom of expression.

Harlan L. Stone was Attorney General under President Coolidge and was named to the bench as a Republican. Yet many of his opinions—notably his dissent in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration case—rank as landmarks in the liberal approach to constitutional questions.

Earl Warren, a Republican Governor of California, and a candidate for Vice President on the Republican ticket, is the author of the liberal opinion in *Brown* v. *Board of Education*, a milestone in liberal opinion in the field of racial discrimination.

Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr.—sounded out in advance by Theodore Roosevelt, and nominated as a Republican Justice—gravely disappointed the President who named him. In the *National Securities* case, he was described by the ebullient Chief Executive as being a judge "with a backbone like a banana" and went on to become a darling of the liberals and an outstanding proponent of freedom of legislative action in the field of social legislation.

CRITICISM OF LIBERALS

Felix Frankfurter, a leading critic of the course of the judicial process in the *Sacco and Vanzetti* case, is today criticized by some as being hypertechnical and overconservative in civil liberties and free speech cases which reach the Supreme Court.

From these examples, it can be clearly seen that there is little connection between a man's political affiliation or his prior station in life and the attitude he takes when, as a member of the Federal bench, he deals with questions of great import.

His prior party allegiance may qualify him for nomination under our system. But when he is a member of our great Federal Court, relieved of obligation and sworn to the impartial administration of justice, he usually deals with the matters which come before him on their merits and in what he considers to be the best interests of the country.

JOHN S. MONAGAN,
Member of Congress.

WASHINGTON, *March 27, 1961.*

Legislating for Votes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in rushing through many measures demanded by the administration, much of it designed to expand Federal programs and controls, it may be that Congress is arousing suspicion that we may be playing politics with legislation. Just last week we pushed through a $9 billion highway bill which is going to cost every taxpayer of this Nation additional money and we did it without even a record vote. The handling of some of the other legislation has been equally haphazard and could well lead many citizens to believe that some are more interested in votes than in responsible government. In this light, I call the attention of the Members to the following editorial which appeared in the Wall Street Journal. Maybe we should take a little more time to study the legislation we pass before giving way to administration pressure:

ETHICS AND POLITICS

With so much high-sounding talk about "conflict of interest" and the presumed need for higher ethical standards in government and business, maybe it's time for some down-to-earth thinking about the state of political morality in Washington, D.C.

We have in mind, among other things, a brace of brandnew laws Congress has obligingly presented the President very much as he asked for them. Both the minimum-wage and the depressed-areas laws are marvels of political hypocrisy. We don't say they are the worst in the long history of politicking, but they are bad enough.

The basic concept of the minimum-wage bill has been described this way: Extend coverage to as many workers as possible while incurring as few enemies as possible. By noting that the law covers 3.6 million workers not previously included, the politicians can trumpet their compassion for the "poor little people."

That is a sham. The law excludes many workers—certain hospital workers, agricultural laborers, laundry workers, for example—who actually make less than $1 an hour. Such exclusions are not difficult to fathom; to take just one, the powerful congressional farm bloc wouldn't hear of bringing in agricultural laborers. Indeed, a small group of workers in the South that were previously covered are kicked out under the new law, in order to make it more palatable to southern politicians.

At the same time the measure extends coverage to many whose wages are far above present or prospective minimums. A choice instance is the inclusion of 1 million construction workers. The average hourly pay of construction workers in this country is $3.32. The reason for dragging them in is purely and simply to pad the apparent coverage and so make it appear that the Government is doing a lot for a whole lot of people.

This fraudulent law has good company in the depressed-areas measure. The definition of such an area is one where unemployment is above an arbitrary percentage. First of all, the Government makes only the most superficial attempt to discover how many people in this country are genuinely unemployed, in the sense that they are able and willing to work and actually looking for any work that will keep them off the governmental doles. Thus the very premise of the depressed-areas legislation is faulty.

Beyond that, it is designed to attract industry to areas whose problem of the moment is an excess of industrial capacity for immediate needs, while providing no assurance of attracting industry to economically unappealing areas. Some of the law's more candid supporters admit their doubts that it will do anything to relieve unemployment. The all-important political point is that it is a means of channeling nearly half a billion dollars to politically appealing areas.

More generally, it is becoming clear that this administration and this Congress propose to pursue their political spending plans with little regard to the Government's financial condition. Unless they change quickly and abruptly, they are setting the country on an inflationary course. That means shirking one of the Government's most basic moral responsibilities, the preservation of honest money.

We would want it well understood that we are not against politicians or politicking. In our Government a President is perforce a politician. In the nature and diversity of our political society, compromises in Congress—logrolling if you wish—are necessary and frequently desirable. In this way it is possible to reach something like a consensus of the country; it is frequently possible to defeat or modify dangerously extreme legislation.

But what is striking about many in this administration and this Congress so far is the high degree of political cynicism they have brought to Washington; the virtues of politics, after all, can turn into vices, as when they produce legislation and actions in clear conflict with the public interest.

So it is perhaps not out of place to suggest some examination of consciences in Washington. If that is asking too much, the public should at least take a good look at what is going on in its name.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States Deplores the Showing on Television of May Day Parades in Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, whose zealous efforts resulted in the approval of legislation designating May 1 of each year as Loyalty Day, sent a telegram to officials of the National Broadcasting Co. protesting the showing on television of the annual May Day parade in Moscow.

Observance of Loyalty Day, May 1, was conceived by the VFW as an effective means of counteracting the publicity given the annual May Day celebrations staged by the Communists in New York City. Loyalty Day celebrations have proved a powerful antidote to Red demonstrations in the United States and are worthy of the widest possible support and publicity.

The following telegram which I received on April 28, 1961, contains the text of the protest to NBC officials:

KANSAS CITY, MO., *April 28, 1961.*

Hon. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

The following telegram in protest has been forwarded to Robert W. Sarnoff, Robert Kintner, and Brigadier General Sarnoff:

"The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States bitterly opposes proposed showing by National Broadcasting Co., of the Communist May Day parades in Moscow. The Veterans of Foreign Wars, and many other patriotic groups in the United States, have spent much time and effort in promoting Loyalty Day in this country to counteract the effects of Red May Day celebrations throughout the world. In fact, Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff has participated in the Loyalty Day parade in New York and I am sure he is fully familiar that until the Loyalty Day parade were started in New York City, May Day was celebrated by huge parades in New York City by Communists and fellow travelers. It seems strange that National Broadcasting Co. should ignore Loyalty Day celebrations in the United States while stimulating interest in communism through extensive coverage of the Moscow May Day parades."

I trust that you agree with my protest in this instance and will join me as we all know that May Day parades in Moscow are forced parades and are not participated in by the citizens on their own volition. In my opinion, the best interest of our country in our fight against communism cannot be served by programs of this type.

ROBERT E. HANSEN,
Senior Vice Commander in Chief
(In the absence of T. C. Connell, Commander in Chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.)

Civil War Centennial Address by W. Houston Barclay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the adventure, the suspense, the agony, and the final tragedy of the War Between the States came to many communities, large and small, North and South, in a variety of ways.

The broad impact of the war on our civilization can never be fully understood without some appreciation of what it meant to the people it engulfed.

Mr. W. Houston Barclay, a descendant of a Valley of Virginia pioneer family, and a member of the Rockbridge Historical Society, described this recently in an address at the court house of my hometown of Lexington, Va., on the 100th anniversary of the departure of the first troops from Rockbridge County for the conflict. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the text of his remarks, from the May 4, 1961, edition of the Rockbridge County News.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"LEXINGTON AND ROCKBRIDGE COUNTY GO TO WAR"—CENTENNIAL ADDRESS GIVEN BY HOUSTON BARCLAY

(NOTE.—The text of the address by W. Houston Barclay at the recent Rockbridge Civil War centennial observance is published below. Mr. Barclay spoke at rites on the courthouse lawn sponsored by the Rockbridge Historical Society. The occasion was the 100th anniversary of the departure of the first county troops for the conflict, and a tablet honoring Rockbridge war dead was unveiled).

One hundred years have passed since our country went thorugh the period of its greatest trial. Before we start on the account of the Civil War itself and the effect on Lexington and Rockbridge County we must go back a few years before 1861 so that we may understand why our people felt and acted as they did. For those who do not know this history would have a hard time being sympathetic with them.

This part of my talk I have called "The Union Must Be Preserved," for this is the phrase most often heard repeated in the accounts of this period. As early as 1850 Judge John White Brockenbrough, of Lexington, in an address pleaded with his people to "stay the tide of fanaticism which is sweeping our land." Also in 1855 William Cabell Rives had spoken "to drive the spirit of fanaticism and sectional hostility from our land, which is leading to a struggle between blood brothers." Wise leaders here agreed that because Virginia was a border State it would most likely be the battlefield, and therefore they were much concerned.

The Virginia Assembly at Richmond sent out an invitation to all the southern States for a 'Peace Convention" to be held in Washington, D.C., on the 4th day of February 1861, at the Willard Hotel. Of the 34 States invited 21 responded by sending 133 delegates. These men were most earnest in trying to stop the coming onslaught and hold the Union together and by doing this to prevent a war. This same day 6 southern States that had already seceded from the Union met in Montgomery, Ala., and formed the "Southern Confederacy."

As we look back on this Peace Convention it is very easy to criticize it. In one way they missed the mark completely by not facing the facts but the resolutions that they formed after 23 days of debate were first "to try to hold slavery South of the 36° N. latitude and second to enforce the fugitive slave law. Both of these resolutions were voted down by the Congress of the United States.

Meanwhile, the secession convention of Virginia in Richmond kept trying to get an agreement among its members and a great uncle of mine, Samuel McDowell Moore of Rockbridge, was burned in effigy for a fiery speech he made in favor of the Union.

About this time Maj. T. J. Jackson of Lexington accompanied a detachment of Virginia Military Institute cadets to Harpers Ferry and they were present at the hanging of John Brown.

FAMILIES DIVIDED

Families were divided on the subject of preserving the Union at all costs and great misunderstandings were nurtured. Dr. George Junkin, president of Washington College was a strong Union man. His family was badly divided on this subject and one daughter and a nephew sided with the Doctor while another daughter, who had married Col. John T. L. Preston, a Lexington man, and her two brothers sympathized with the South. In fact, these two brothers were in the southern army. Another daughter who had just died was the first wife of Maj. T. J. Jackson. It was largely from the dairy of Mrs. Preston, a northern woman; that I have obtained much of my information for this talk.

Many other families were divided in the same way, which is one of the things that make a Civil War so horrible. Even as late as April 26, 1861, the "Southern Churchman" published a plea for peace. It said, "Some Christians think there is more power in a bag of gunpowder than in the arm of the Almighty."

On April 15, 1861, came the great blow. President Lincoln called for troops from Virginia to help bring the seceded Southern States back into the Union. April 12 Fort Sumter was fired upon and on April 17, 1861, Virginia seceded. The curtain was raised on one of the greatest tragedies in our history, for the Civil War was both futile and unnecessary.

Mr. Lincoln's call united all Virginians in one great cause to protect the State. Now nothing mattered but the preservation of Virginia and all the people of Rockbridge and Lexington began working together. I said all but this was not true, for there was a small group who refused to join the army or help in any way. Among these were a few merchants. These people were called "Yellow Dogs" and some of them were pointed out to me years later. But on the whole the better citizens responded bravely. From my family, my father and nine uncles were in this struggle. What stories I have heard, for strangely enough though most of them were wounded all came home alive. They talked about the war every day as long as they lived.

War was declared.

Bands played "Dixie."

Girls sang and put cockades of red and blue ribbon in their hair, the first symbol of the Confederacy.

Boys marched. The young men of Rockbridge County had been drilling and forming companies for some time before this. The Rockbridge Dragoons were organized in November 1859. Now a vote was taken in the county as to the advisability of Virginia seceding the result 1,728 for secession and only one vote against it.

LOCAL UNITS LEAVE

Gov. John Letcher (a Lexington citizen) called for volunteers for the southern Army. The day after Virginia seceded the Rockbridge Rifles marched to Staunton 103 strong. The same day the Rockbridge First and Second Dragoons with 60 men each left for the same destination. On Sunday, April 21, the Virginia Military Institute cadets under Maj. T. J. Jackson left Lexington for Richmond, where they took over the training of officers for the Confederate Army. All of these cadets became officers themselves in the years that followed.

These companies gathered in this courthouse square for a blessing and prayer by the ministers of Lexington, before leaving. Washington College professors and students were drilling on the campus under instructions by the VMI cadets before these men left for service.

After Mr. Lincoln's call and before Virginia seceded a Confederate flag was raised on Washington College. Dr. Junkin, the college president, ordered it taken down and a wise student said that as Virginia had not seceded they had no right to put up the flag, so it was agreed to take it down. A few days later it was raised again, and Dr. Junkin, his daughter, and a nephew left Lexington for Philadelphia.

The next company of which we have a record was the Rockbridge Artillery which was formed April 21, 1861, with 70 men. Gen. William N. Pendleton, of Lexington, the Episcopalian minister and a graduate of West Point Military Academy was elected the com-

mander. Colonel Poague in his book states that many men from over the mountain in Charlottesville at the University of Virginia came to join these Rockbridge companies because of their outstanding leadership. This was also helped by the fact that Sandy Pendleton, a son of the general who later became a member of General Jackson's staff, was a student at the University of Virginia. Also there were many Southern States represented among the students and cadets in Lexington.

The cavalry and artillery companies were outstanding for the care given their horses. This was due to the fact that a large number of the men in these outfits were Rockbridge County farmers, and knew how to select and care for their mounts.

There was much interest among the colored people of the county in forming a company of their own and Col. James Cole Davis was appointed to organize such a company.

The Liberty Hall Volunteers, named for a company from this area that fought in the Revolution under the president of Liberty Hall Academy, Dr. William Graham, was organized at Washington College on June 8, 1861, and my father than a student there at the age of 17 was among their number. They left Lexington after a period of prayer and worship led by Dr. W. S. White, minister of the Presbyterian Church. They were mustered in at Staunton the next day.

HEAVY TOLL

From then on for several months companies were leaving Rockbridge County for the army, a list of 15 in all. Two of this number were formed at Brownsburg, a company of rifles and one of cavalry.

In Rockbridge during the whole war 2,343 men enlisted. This was 86 percent of the manpower of the county according to census, and 37½ percent of these men never returned, but were killed or died in service. One strange thing was that all this time the people thought it would be a short war. Colonel Poague states that his law partner in Lexington wanted to go at once for fear the war would be over before he could enlist. Mr. Lincoln's first call for men was for three months' service.

The county women were not idle during these first days. The ladies of Brownsburg made 80 coats, 80 trousers, 80 knapsacks, 80 canteen covers, and 10 tents in 1 week for one of their companies. The years dragged on, and the time between 1861 and 1863 was known as the "Middle Years." Lexington and Rockbridge County during this period did not suffer nearly as much as they were to do later on.

Rockbridge people were chiefly concerned now with caring for the sick who came home, burying the dead, supplying the army with food and clothing and providing for their horses. Business in our towns was about at a standstill as supplies had to be gotten through the blockade and money was so scarce the people could buy nothing. The population of this area was composed mainly of women, old men, children and ex-slaves.

THE LADIES' WORK

The ladies formed Aid Societies and worked in the town churches making supplies which were shipped to the hospitals. One of these hospitals was at Alum Springs one at the White Sulphur and one at Staunton. There was another at the fairgrounds in Lexington and later in the war one was established at Washington College. The fairgrounds hospital had 150 beds and most of the time was filled with cases of smallpox. The ladies aid societies sent everything that they could possibly spare—beds, carpets, food, tableware, money, blankets, quilts and sometimes they gave the services of their servants. All the window curtains were used as bandages. Nothing was too good for our wounded and sick soldiers. All the ladies asked in exchange was that their men wherever they were would receive the same loving care.

Lexington was divided into seven parts and each part was responsible for a hospital a week. For example the wagons for Staunton left every Thursday loaded with all that was collected and made for that week in that section of town. After a time when all of the men were gone the Masonic Halls were used as workshops.

The Ladies Aid Society of Natural Bridge did a unique thing. They offered their houses for men on furlough who were too far away from their own homes to go there. Also the sick and men recuperating from wounds were cared for by them. The same was done in other parts of the county but not on as large a scale.

Colonel Poague tells that he came to his house near Falling Spring after being badly wounded and that he realized that his family did not have enough food to divide with him. His mother and sister were going without in order to feed him so he left and went back to the Army in order to relieve the strain on his people at home. He also stated that when he returned he took with him 60 new recruits from the county to the Army.

The Society of the Southern Cross was organized among the ladies and their special task was the making of surgical dressings for the hospitals.

The Lexington chapter had 70 members. When the boys came home hidden supplies were brought out and given to the neighbors to help them meet the need.

The town streets became almost impassable for there was no money and there were no men to work them. May 15, 1963, was a day never to be forgotten in this county. Gen. Stonewall Jackson was buried here. For the first time some of the inhabitants began to believe that maybe God was not on their side.

Exactly 1 year to the hour later the Battle of New Market was fought and the young cadets from Virginia Military Institute were present; 10 were killed and 45 boys and two officers wounded..

Whenever the stage coach arrived in Lexington everyone who could, ran to hear the news. Lists of wounded and killed were posted and the small boys who read the lists spread the news rapidly to the relatives and friends. We cannot picture a town without telephones, telegraph, radio, or television. How hungry they must have been for word of their loved ones, for often they had heard the cannonading and knew that a battle was in progress.

The doors of Lexington were never locked and this is a great compliment to the colored men of the town who were the only young men left at home, but the citizens had such perfect confidence in them that they never dreamed of any trouble.

THE BLACKEST DAY

Now came the blackest day in the history of Lexington. On June 7, 1863, news was received here that the Federal army of Gen. David Hunter (who was a Virginian by birth) was in Staunton and coming this way.

The town began to gird itself for the shock. Supplies were hidden along with the family silver and other treasures. All animals that could be moved were driven to the mountains, soldiers on furlough or wounded were moved to places of safety, June 11 the first scouts arrived in town. Mrs. Preston tells in her dairy of seeing a squad of cavalry in Confederate uniforms passing her front gate. She called to them to hurry for the Yankees were coming and one of them cursed her and said they were northern spies. Then came the infantry after the town had been shelled by cannon from across the river. Forty houses were hit beside the Virginia Military Institute and Washington College, although General Hunter in his report says he did not shell the town. The Confederate Army burned the bridge over what we now call the Maury River to slow down the progress of the Federals.

The houses used by the northern generals as headquarters while in Lexington were the Jacob Fuller house, the Francis H. Smith house, the Prof. James J. White house. At 9 a.m. the Virginia Military Institute was set on fire and burned. They burned it because this was State property and also because the Virginia Military Institute was doing such a fine job training soldiers for the southern Army. Gov. John Letcher's home was also burned.

As the infantry entered town the men began looting the houses on the pretense of hunting for Confederate soldiers, but taking all food found and anything else that pleased them. This of course frightened the occupants. Mrs. Preston's diary gives a full description of what went on. She said she wrote it down so that she could send it North to her father so he could know how they behaved. She and her daughter hid the family table silver and her brother-in-law General Jackson's sword under their hoop skirts all the time the Federal troops were around.

I also remember a family story of how an ex-slave slept on the doorstep of my grandmother Barclay's house with an ax to protect the three lone ladies in the house. The library at Washington College was looted and the guard at my grandfather Moore's house gave their cook a Greek dictionary for making him a pot of soup. Washington College was saved by a board member's going to General Hunter and telling him that Gen. George Washington had given the money to build the college.

On Thursday, June 14, the Federal troops left as quickly as they had come and carried away the Washington monument from in front of the Virginia Military Institute. This was returned after the war. The town of Lexington began to breathe again and lick its sores and adjust to an even more frugal life than it had known before. An average supper here at that time was hot milk poured over a slice of toast or occasionally a bowl of grits. As my father used to say about his northern prison experience, "We had a dried apple for breakfast, a glass of water for lunch, and let it swell for supper." That was almost as bad as it was in Rockbridge County in those days.

When the Yankees left a number of the young colored people went with them.

PRICES SOARED

Prices in Lexington after Hunter's raid are recorded as $30 for a gallon of sorghum, $6 for a pound of candles and $250 for a barrel of flour. This was for the people who had the money but most trading was done by exchange for some other product.

Colonel Preston sent his family for Christmas 1863 from Richmond a pair of rubber shoes for his wife for which he paid $30, some old illustrated magazines picked up in the barracks for the smaller boys, a piece of dress goods given him by a friend for the older daughter, a bridle picked up off a battlefield for the older boy, and as a special gift some writing paper from a captured northern supply train. This was almost impossible to obtain in civil life. And last but not least one orange.

Most of the schools in Lexington were closed by this period. Time was running out for the Southland.

Now we come to the sad story of Appomattox. After Petersburg, Lee realized that the end was near and on Sunday he sent word to Richmond to evacuate the city. This notice came while the people were in church so the news spread rapidly. The citizens of Richmond ordered the liquor shops to pour the whisky into the gutter. The riff-

raff drank it as it ran down the streets and the results can be imagined. For some reason the tobacco factories were set on fire and the flames spread to the residential section. Miss Ellen Anderson of Lexington has a clock carried out of their burning home to the sidewalk. It was the only thing saved and was found the next day unbroken. The city was in bad condition when the soldiers came through. Those who could left town; the rest boarded up for the arrival of the troops. Lee and his now small army marched toward Appomattox as they were overpowered by the enemy.

Surrender took place after very little fighting and Lexington heard the sad news quickly. The whole town and county virtually went into mourning. General Grant allowed the officers to keep their horses. My uncle Ned Moore, although a private, had acquired a horse. He was telling his neighbor from Lexington, General Pendleton, about it, whereupon the general appointed my uncle to his staff and he was able to keep his horse. When he came home to Lexington he sold the horse for enough money to enter Washington College the next fall. This is very revealing in the fact that it showed that officers and men had close contact all through the southern Army. All accounts tell of officers returning from furlough often bringing great numbers of letters to the private soldiers from families at home. How wonderful that this close fellowship existed.

General Lee was allowed to retire to Oakland on the James River, where for a few months, with his family once again around him, he could rest and catch his breath and get his bearings. Later, as you all know, he accepted the call of the board of Washington College to become its president.

The Carpetbaggers from the North were very discreet in Lexington because of the presence of so many ex-soldiers in the two schools; also because of the fact General Lee was living here. It was fortunate for our people that they had "Lee the Guardian Angel Myth" at this most trying time.

The people of Lexington and Rockbridge County were closely united because of the suffering they had gone through together as well as by the comradeship of the men in camp for 4 years. The boys and girls were together again and youth has a way of forgetting quickly. Small groups of young people began meeting and these gatherings were called "Starvation Parties", with little to eat but lots to talk about. The old custom of serenading the ladies was begun again and life in Lexington and Rockbridge County slowly became more normal.

Minimum Wage

SPEECH
OF
HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, the action of the House in approving the conference report on the minimum wage bill was a great victory, not only for the administration, but for underpaid workers throughout the Nation. It would have been unconscionable, in my view, to have permitted another session to go by without giving some relief to this group.

For the first time since 1938 we have succeeded in substantially extending the coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act. Under the bill which we approved on Wednesday retail and service establishments, with certain exceptions, which gross at least $1 million annually and which purchase or receive goods for resale that move or have moved across State lines in the sum of $250,000 or more per year, to pay their employees a federally designated minimum wage. It is difficult for me to understand why this provision evoked so much controversy. Small retailers are not affected, and surely it is not unreasonable to expect firms which do a business of $1 million a year to pay $1 or $1.25 an hour. Nor is the dollar volume yardstick a unique concept in determining what constitutes interstate commerce. As has been frequently pointed out, the National Labor Relations Board has used it for years, and the Congress gave its consent to this approach by incorporating it into the Landrum Griffin Act in 1959. As a Representative from the State of New Jersey I am deeply gratified by the new minimum wage law. Although most industry in my State already pays wages considerable in excess of the new minimum, the bill will help those workers at the very bottom of the wage scale. It will represent an increase in purchasing power as well, and this cannot but stimulate the expansion of our general economy. And, to some extent, it will tend to discourage industry from moving out of the State to areas where present wage rates are far below the national average.

Charles F. Crowley Nomination for the Football Hall of Fame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, it was most gratifying to have word recently of the nomination of my good friend, the late Charles F. Crowley, of Cambridge, Mass., for the Football Hall of Fame.

Charles F.—Charlie—Crowley, distinguished alumnus of the great Cambridge Latin School was one of the outstanding football leaders of his generation.

He was educated at Cambridge Latin, Harvard College, and Notre Dame University and his career on the gridiron of his day stood out like a beacon light in the history of American sport.

He was recognized by his contemporaries as a rugged, star football player of invincible spirit and dogged determination. The great Percy Haughton named him as the greatest end he had ever coached, and the famous Jim Thorpe hailed him as the only end who ever stopped him without a single gain during the course of any football game.

At Notre Dame, he was the teammate and close friend of the noted Knute Rockne, Gus Dorais, and others who were developing the modern game at Notre Dame and bringing the forward pass into the important role that it plays today.

After a brilliant career as a player, Charlie Crowley later entered the field of coaching at Harvard where I first met him, and where he aided materially in promoting the success of great Harvard teams of that time.

He was head coach at Dallas University in Texas where his teams made a deep impression on the entire southern conference, and later at Columbia University, first under Percy Haughton, and later as head coach, where his teams made the best record in modern Columbia history.

Charlie Crowley was undoubtedly an outstanding sports figure of his day, and a real credit to any and every institution with which he was associated and a great credit to the game of football and American sport.

But Charlie Crowley was something more than that: he was an outstanding coach, a great American, and a noble Christian gentleman.

While he was a rugged, courageous competitor greatly respected by his opponents, he was esteemed and respected for his sense of fair play, his inspiring leadership of young men, and his superb brand of sportsmanship.

While he believed that any game worth playing was worth winning, he was an ardent disciple of hard, clean play, and always stood for the highest standards of sportsmanship and conduct on and off the football field.

He was a man of amiable and generous personal qualities, a great human being interested in promoting sound values in his boys, helping them with their problems and encouraging them to seize their opportunities and take up the burdens of leadership in whatever field of life they aspired.

Though he was endowed with strong, rugged personal traits and a remarkable courage, and quick-witted reactions that enabled him to rise above almost any situation, he was a man of supreme kindness, gentility, and love of his fellow man. He was beloved by all who knew him, and he was a friend whose loyalty knew no bounds.

Such a man was Charles F. Crowley, who is so fittingly honored by a recent coaches' nomination for the Football Hall of Fame.

We can all be proud that this noble American lived in his time to make such noteworthy contributions to the game which he loved, to the youth which he so intelligently and devotedly trained, to our schools and colleges, and to the Nation which he served in war and in peace with all his heart.

The life and work of Charlie Crowley will long be remembered. His burning faith, his high ideals, and his unselfish contributions are a source of genuine pride to all of us who were close to him and to all of those in this great country of ours who admire rugged character, inspiring example, stalwart Americanism and unswerving loyalty to the principles of our national life.

It was a great honor and privilege for me, Mr. Speaker, to join in impressive exercises for my very dear and beloved friend, one of the great figures of the American gridiron, Charlie Crowley, on December 20, 1960, at Cambridge Latin School, Cambridge, Mass., when I made the presentation of the Charles Crowley Memorial Cup to a very fine young man of whom Charlie Crowley would be very proud, Louis E. Cellineri, Cambridge Latin football star and honor student who was selected for this honor by his coaches and Headmaster Jack Sheehan.

This award was made for the first time at an assembly at Cambridge Latin which had many of Charlie Crowley's old friends in attendance, including a large delegation of Gridiron Club members, and the proud parents of the outstanding young man, Louis E. Cellineri.

Crowley's career was one which truly serves as an inspiration for the young men of the Nation. Starting at famous Cambridge Latin School where he was an all-round athlete and captain of the football team, he was probably the only man in the history of American football who could claim the honor of having been a star player at both Harvard and Notre Dame. His outstanding skill as a player and repute as a gentleman, sportsman, and student, still continue to be legendary at both these great American universities.

At Harvard he played on some of the great Percy Haughton famous teams and at Notre Dame where, with his warm friends, the immortal Rockne, illustrious Gus Dorais and other greats, he became one of the leading originators and exponents of the type of forward pass football and the open game that now dominates the American scene.

The great and famed Boston sportswriter, George C. Carens, took occasion recently in his celebrated column to comment on the Crowley Award and at the same time briefly outline Charlie's brilliant career alluding to his close association with Percy Haughton and Rockne, two of the truly outstanding men in American football and Gus Dorais, another coach-player of first magnitude.

The fine young man, Louis E. Cellineri, is following in several respects in Crowley's footsteps, and as the first recipient of the Charles Crowley Memorial cup at Cambridge Latin School he unquestionably has a brilliant athletic, academic, and personal career ahead of him.

He was selected for the Crowley Award by experts who evaluated and appraised his magnificent work as a player and these included the very eminent headmaster of Cambridge Latin School, Hon. John Sheehan, his teachers, coaches and others familiar with his all-round performance, not only as an athlete but as a brilliant student and an inspiring young leader.

The selection of Cellineri as a student-athlete carries out the gleaming heritage and tradition of this old and highly esteemed secondary school, one of the greatest in the Nation, which throughout its long faithful service as an outstanding educational institution has emphasized the building of character, the cultivation of the arts and sciences, the encouragement and inspiration of lofty aims and achievement and the virtue of the old Roman expression "Mens sana in corpore sano" and the effective balancing of the intellectual and the physical, and, of course, proper emphasis on the role of those spiritual values which must predominate in any adequate, successful program.

The headmaster of this great school is an inspiration in himself and the same is true of the excellent teaching staff. Jack Sheehan has distinguished himself as one of the great educators of our State. A brilliant athlete in his day, an accomplished scholar and student, an inspirational and highly qualified leader, Jack Sheehan has admirably carried on the great traditions of Cambridge Latin and the same may be said of his associates on the teaching staff of this renowned school.

On the day I had the honor of presenting the first Charles F. Crowley Award, I was profoundly impressed with the atmosphere that prevailed in the school, the complete order and attentiveness of the more than 3,000 boys and girls crowded into the huge auditorium.

An air of solemnity prevaded the great room and you could almost hear a pin drop during the exercises presided over by Headmaster Sheehan. The dignified, able, and distinguished head of the Veterans' Administration at Boston, a great personal friend of Charlie Crowley for many years, the beloved and respected, Gen. William J. Blake, spoke of Crowley's great intrinisic worth, high character, and his superb contribution as a captain of the infantry in World War I and his highly gifted, effective, and outstanding service to the work of the Veterans' Administration as a learned lawyer, counselor, and valued aide in this vital work.

Lifelong friends, schoolmates, teammates, and admirers of Crowley's were gathered to join in the tribute of honor and affection being paid him. They included his Veterans' Administration associate, Neil Cronin, John Irwin, Patrick Roche, his close friend, Dr. Simon Kelleher, Tom Hickey, the incomparable N. V. (Swede) Nelson of Harvard football fame, one of the greatest after dinner speakers and finest American sportsman, John Carver, John Glacken, and his old and very dear friend, Charles Linehan, another inspiring football great and longtime outstanding beloved and revered coach of Rindge Technical School, a teacher, educator, and gentleman of unsurpassed character, integrity, ability, and good works, Joseph Kozlowski, famous Boston College football star, Henry C. Lynch, another warm friend and great teacher and Dr. Edmund J. Twohig, and very close friend, Dr. William Sharry. The distinguished colleagues and comrades were crowded into a special section reserved for Charlie Crowley's gracious and beloved wife and helpmate, Mrs. Myrtle Crowley, his two lovely daughters, Mrs. Mary Rogers together with her two sons, and Miss Jean Crowley.

There was an unusual quality of solemn appreciation of a great event about this award that made a vivid and lasting impression upon the participants and everyone in attendance and the stirring occasion will long be remembered as one of the moving events of its kind in the long, bright history of Cambridge Latin School and Massachusetts.

I feel that a special word of commendation should be said of the interest and efforts of the great sports figure and teacher, Mr. Charles Linehan, in assisting Headmaster Sheehan with the arrangements for the award which contributed so greatly to the success of the occasion. His loyalty to his ideals and his friends, not to speak of his other noble qualities, make him stand out in Cambridge and in the Nation.

Law Day, U.S.A., May 1, 1961—Due Process of Law—The Lawyer's Responsibility—By Hon. Joseph A. Cox, Surrogate, New York County; President, New York Law School

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, Law Day, U.S.A. was celebrated on May 1 throughout our land for the purpose of calling to mind the importance of the rule of law in protecting our cherished individual rights and liberties. A scholarly speech of national significance was delivered for this occasion at the New York Law School by the Honorable Joseph A. Cox, surrogate of New York County, who is also president of New York Law School. Surrogate Cox makes a lasting contribution to legal literature in pointing up the role of the judiciary and the responsibility of the lawyer for protecting due process of law.

Under unanimous consent, I include the full text of Surrogate Cox's speech in the Appendix of our CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

LAW DAY, U.S.A., MAY 1, 1961—DUE PROCESS OF LAW—THE LAWYER'S RESPONSIBILITY

(By Hon. Joseph A. Cox, surrogate, New York County, president, New York Law School)

This year, continuing the precedent of past years, President Kennedy has proclaimed today as Law Day, U.S.A. It is a day of introspection, reevaluation, and rededication by lawyers to the basic principles which distinguish our legal processes and procedures from those of countries where the rights of the individual are subordinated to those of the state.

One of the most important and basic rights in our form of government is the constitutional guarantee of due process of law. I have chosen to discuss this phase of our system of jurisprudence, not only because of its fundamental significance to the individual, but because of certain notable developments during the last year which merit consideration and reflection on this occasion.

The lawyer has a singular obligation, to safeguard due process. His duty to his clients requires that charges or allegations

be proved before they may be asserted or published as facts. His training compels him to reject hearsay, surmise and suspicion. Allegations and charges must be supported by admissible evidence, either in the form of sworn testimony subject to cross-examination, or by means of documents possessing probative value, or both. Thus is the integrity of the judicial process maintained. The presumption of innocence, the privilege against self-incrimination, the right to reasonable bail, the right to counsel, and the right to be confronted by witnesses—these and more are legacies of the common law and our constitutional history—legacies which the legal profession utilizes, yet seeks to preserve and even enlarge, as the custodian and the protector of due process of law, the trustee of individual rights.

Our constitutional guarantees of individual freedom are under constant attack, and our continuous preoccupation with legal questions involving due process bears witness to the zeal of our courts and lawyers to maintain and indeed broaden the scope of these guarantees, in some cases abandoning long-accepted procedures in the light of more searching analysis, as we shall see in considering several recent cases.

These cases, to the observant and studious lawyer of experience, as well as to the lawyer in the making, emphasize that we should not espouse the concept of due process of law as a high-sounding phrase, to be favored in general terms or in theory. Due process is tested again and again in our judicial forums, and these adjudications should rekindle our faith in our judicial system, even when the result may be momentarily distasteful or unwelcome.

Let us take, as our starting point, the case of *Matter of Wood* v. *Hughes*, decided by the New York Court of Appeals as recently as February 23, 1961, reported at 9 N.Y. (2d) 144.

In this case, the court, at long last, nullified the heretofore existent power of a grand jury to file a so-called report or "presentment" where the evidence is insufficient to warrant an indictment.

The decision was 4 to 3, which is indicative of the gravity and closeness of the question to the members of our highest court. Hence, it may be of value to appraise the facts, the implications, and the reasoning which resulted in a much needed clarification of an important application of due process.

The case involved an investaigation by the grand jury into charges against public officials. Previously, although the evidence failed to sustain an indictment, the grand jury had been permitted to file with the court a public report, censuring the officials for their conduct. In its majority decision the court held that the grand jury lacked such power, and sustained the right of the New York Supreme Court to refuse to accept the so-called report.

Prior to the decision in the Hughes case, a grand jury report which criticized the actions of private individuals was suppressed by the court of general sessions of New York County. The comprehensive opinion of Judge Mitchell Schweitzer so holding is reported at 19 Misc. (2d) 682 (Nov. 19, 1959).

The Hughes decision, applying as it does to public officials, must apply a fortiori in the case of noncriminal conduct by private individuals. The opinion of Judge Schweitzer, rendered in such a case, is now validated by the Court of Appeals decision in Hughes.

Those who advocate that a grand jury, lacking sufficient proof to base an indictment, should nevertheless have the right to file and make public its so-called presentment, predicate their contention upon the belief that the public has the right to know the facts, and to judge whether the presentment fairly reflects the situation found by the grand jury. I, too, believe—and just as passionately—that in a democratic society the public is entitled to the fullest knowledge of the functioning of its public servants. Doubt arises, however, when we consider whether the grand jury is the appropriate vehicle for disseminating knowledge to the public of noncriminal acts or conduct—knowledge which has been derived from evidence given in secret, not in a judicial forum, not before a jury, not by confrontation of witnesses, but merely as a preliminary to possible later judicial review and determination after indictment, after due process of law, with every safeguard of our judicial machinery available to the defendant or defendants.

In the Hughes opinion, written by Judge Fuld, the Court of Appeals reasoned that the grand jury's historic function is limited to determining whether the evidence submitted constitutes the commission of a crime. If so, the grand jury should find an indictment; if not, the grand jury should dismiss the charge or remain silent. If it goes beyond this, becoming in effect a self-appointed censor of morals, the court stated that it engages in conduct which is "legally unauthorized and morally obnoxious."

We may, and should, in this connection, take note of the view with which the general public regards the grand jury. To the layman it is a part of the judicial process particularly associated with criminal law. To him it is a public body whose pronouncements carry the weight of official condemnation. Any published statement of its activities, whether called presentment or report, carries with it an implicit accusation of wrongdoing. Though the person involved may not be guilty, even were he indicted, his reputation may suffer incalculable harm through a critical pronouncement or censure which he is given no opportunity to refute.

The grand jury is composed of men and women, sincere and honorable in their purpose, but possessed of no greater wisdom than the rest of us. As stated by Judge Fuld in the Hughes decision:

"Grand jurors are not selected for their skill in appraising efficiency in public office or delving into matters more appropriately reserved for executive or legislative action."

Their views on public morals are no more sound, nor any less so, than yours or mine. Yet, until now, the grand jury has been privileged under the law to do what might be defamation of character were you or I to engage in similar conduct.

Consider also that an individual maligned in a grand jury presentment or report has no forum to which he may resort for vindication. If indicted, he may attempt to secure vindication at the ensuing trial. If defamed by you or me, he would have a similar remedy, with possible pecuniary recompense. He is powerless, however, to obtain legal redress when possibly baseless charges of a grand jury are publicized in the guise of a public court record.

Again, Judge Fuld in the Hughes case:

"A report * * * is not intended to serve as a basis for prosecution. It is not a criminal accusation, grounded on legally sufficient evidence of the violation of a criminal statute, to which answer may be made in court; it is rather a moral condemnation or exhortation without any forum being provided for explanation or defense."

When the grand jury's investigations concern the question whether or not to indict, its activities and all subsequent procedures are circumscribed by applicable law. The members of the grand jury are assisted by the district attorney and his staff in determining the legal effect of evidence prescribed in reaching their decision to indict or not. This is not the case where they step outside this narrow area into the limitless range of public or private morality. This is the function of the legislature, which is empowered to conduct the type of investigation required to establish the foundation for needed legislation.

Much has been said and written concerning legislative investigatory procedures, and it is not my purpose to discuss the controversial aspects of this subject. It is to be noted, however, that legislative investigation differs fundamentally from the type of investigation hitherto resulting in the so-called presentment or report of a grand jury.

Legislative investigation is specifically authorized by law. Its purpose to to provide a factual basis for new or remedial legislation, if deemed necessary. All of the investigative procedures are public and published, including the evidence presented by witnesses and documents. It is in these important areas that legislative investigation differs from the findings of a lay body based upon secret examination of witnesses for a totally different purpose. While it is true that legislative investigations have developed their own shortcomings particularly with respect to possible impairment of individual rights to due process, no one will dispute the right of legislative bodies, under sanction of law, to throw a searchlight on activities which may require regulatory legislation, and to garner facts upon which such legislation may be premised.

With the Hughes decision before us, it may well be appropriate for us, as lawyers, in our pursuit of justice, to consider on this Law Day, 1961, how we may help to curb excesses in our legislative investigatory practices and procedures, to the end of still further safeguarding the rights of the individual and restraining unwarranted encroachments on those rights, even as we acknowledge the basic soundness of the right of legislative inquiry.

The decision in the Hughes case, in my opinion, is a landmark in the application of due process. Not only does it finally clarify a long-disputed question, but its effect is to contribute to the greater protection of individual rights as against the encroachments of the State. I trust that our legislature will not alter this signal advance.

I turn now from the Hughes case and its important implications to another noteworthy case involving individual rights—in this case the rights of unpopular individuals, persons of disreputable and in some instances criminal background. I refer to the case of *United States* v. *Bufalino*, reported at 285 F. (2d) 408.

This is the so-called Apalachin case, with which I am sure you are all generally familiar. The indictment charged conspiracy to obstruct justice and commit perjury on the part of a group of allegedly unsavory characters meeting at Apalachin, N.Y. These defendants were convicted in the U.S. District Court after a trial by jury, and it was this conviction which was reversed by unanimous decision in the Circuit Court of Appeals.

In its reversal, the court found it necessary to state that it was remarkable that the case was started in the first place. Circuit Judge Clark, in his concurring opinion, made a substantial contribution to the long history of due process in words which deserve to be quoted:

"From its inception this case was given unusual and disturbing publicity in newspapers, journals, and magazines; and this unfortunate feature has persisted up to this date, with even the prosecutors indulging in highly colored accounts while the case has been pending on appeal. Much of this has been in terms of a crisis in law administration seemingly demonstrated by an unexplained gathering of arch criminals and of a general satisfaction that somehow they have now met their just deserts of long imprisonment. This is vastly unfortunate; not only does it go beyond the judicial record necessary for its support, but it suggests that the administration of the criminal law is in such dire straits that crash methods have become a necessity. But it seems we should have known better, and a prosecution framed on

such a doubtful basis should never been initiated or allowed to proceed so far. For in America we still respect the dignity of the individual, and even an unsavory character is not to be imprisoned except on definite proof of specific crime. And nothing in present criminal law administration suggests or justifies sharp relaxation of traditional standards.

"Chief Judge Lumbard and Judge Friendly authorize me to state that they agree with the writer that the publication by former special prosecutors of accounts and comments regarding this case and the appellants, while this appeal was pending, was improper."

I am sure that neither the Circuit Court, nor I, nor you, would wish to disparage the serious task of law enforcement which confronts our officials and our prosecuting attorneys. We all owe them our respect and support. Their zealousness may, however, at times, lead them to excesses which must be curbed, as in the Bufalino case. Here I may advert for a moment to the sense of frustration we may feel at times when our law enforcement machinery seems powerless to reach the known criminal and give him his just deserts. Yet we, as lawyers, must restrain our impatience, we must reject the concept of trial by newspaper, and above all, we must accord to the lowliest individual and the most disreputable character the same basic rights which are the foundation upon which our entire system of criminal law rests. An individual's past transgressions afford no justification for relaxation of time-honored principles of due process.

The third case which I shall discuss with you concerns the overzealousness of local government and the power of its law-enforcement machinery to violate personal rights when under public pressure to produce results. This is the recent case of *Monroe* v. *Pape*, decided February 20, 1061, by the Supreme Court of the United States, reported at 5 L. ed. (2d) 492. The complainants, husband and wife and their children, alleged that 13 Chicago police officers, without search warrants or arrest warrants, broke into their home in the early morning, routed them from bed, made them stand naked in the living room, ransacked every room, emptied drawers and ripped mattress covers, took the husband to the police station and there detained and interrogated him for 10 hours about a 2-day-old murder and during this period failed to take him before a magistrate, though one was available, refused to permit him to call his family or his attorney, and then released him without preferring criminal charges against him.

The action which the complainants brought against the police officers and the city of Chicago was under our Federal statute which prohibits any "person" from interfering with the "rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution" to any citizen or other person. The Supreme Court held that the complainants had a cause of action against the police officers, but not against the city of Chicago because it was not a "person" within the meaning of the statute.

It is a grave question whether the law should not be amended so as to make a municipality liable as well for violating the statute. Such an amendment would impel the local government to take effective measures to restrain its law enforcement officers from violating the requirements of due process.

The vitality of due process in our emerging electronic age was demonstrated by the Supreme Court of the United States within the past several weeks in its holding in *Silverman* v. *United States*, decided March 6, 1961, reported at 5 L. ed. (2d) 734. The question in this case was whether evidence in the form of conversations obtained by the police through use of a so-called "spike mike" driven into the premises occupied by the defendants was illegally obtained and therefore inadmissible at the defendant's trial for carrying on unlawful gambling activities.

The "spike mike" is an electronic listening device, a microphone with a spike about a foot long attached to it, together with an amplifier, a power pack, and earphones. The police had obtained permission from the owner of adjoining premises to drive the spike mike through a party wall until it made cotanct with a heating duct which served the house occupied by the petitioners. The entire heating system was thus converted into a conductor of sound, making conversations which took place on both floors of the house audible to the police who were listening through earphones.

The Supreme Court held that the conversations thus overheard were inadmissible as evidence because obtained by means of an unauthorized physical peneration into the premises occupied by the petitioners. It was a breach of due process, an instance of illegal search and seizure, for the officers to usurp part of the defendant's premises without warrant, and without their knowledge or consent.

It was brought out in the Silverman case that electronic devices now exist which the courts may find difficult to reach under existing tests deriving from the preelectronic era. Among such devices described to the Court were a parabolic microphone which can pick up a conversation 300 yards away; an instrument for flooding a room with sonic wave which will permit a person a hear everything said in the room without ever going into it; an instrument which can trap conversation through an open office window on the opposite side of the street.

The Court indicated it would deal with all of these devices at the appropriate time. In the meanwhile, the court adhered to the established tenet of the law, the right of a man to retreat into his own home and there be free from unreasonable governmental intrusion. In line with this principle, conversations overheard by electronic devices which physically penetrate the premises in question will be denied admissibility in evidence.

I do not know that this test will suffice in the face of the newly emerging ingenious electronics devices for eavesdropping. I do not believe, however, that the courts will be powerless to meet new situations in this field. The Supreme Court has been able to adapt itself in the past to novel encroachments on due process, and has struck them down unhesitatingly when necessary for the protection of individual rights.

Our common law system has evolved in large measure by emphasis upon procedure. Procedure requirements are basic to the protection of the individual, whose rights are paramount in our democratic society. The strains and stresses of modern life often result in encroachments upon the individual rights and freedoms we all enjoy and we as lawyers, particularly, must be vigilant in forestalling even the slightest invasion of the civil liberties we have achieved over the centuries. For even the slightest letdown, a minor deviation resulting from hysteria, overzealousness, or contempt for the type of individual concerned, weakens the fabric of due process and lays the groundwork for further deprivations in the future.

The law's will is not the will of the wind, nor is it the popular will at a particular time or place. The law is not static, as the cases I have discussed amply demonstrate, but the law cannot move in response to whim, emotion, or fancied emergency. Justice under the law is different from the vagaries of justice in the marketplace. It stands firm when it should; it bends, not to pressure, but to progress and as the result of deep and unemotional thought.

It is in this spirit of introspection that Law Day is of moment to the lawyer, for it is a day of stock-taking, of evaluation, and of rededication to the ideals of equal justice under law, the firm and unyielding pillar which is the vital distinguishing characteristic of our form of government from others which pay but paper homage to individual freedom and individual rights.

How To Finance Aid for Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I was very pleased to hear the announcement of the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee that hearings will be held on proposals to provide health care for the aged through the social security system. It was good news to the supporters of this legislation, and I compliment Mr. MILLS.

There have been expressions of doubt that any progress would be made on this important matter in the current session of Congress. I think the announcement by the Representative from Arkansas should diminish those doubts. We hope the House hearings will be followed by hearings in the Senate.

The subject of providing health security for our aged has received increased and deserved attention in the press. I ask unanimous consent that a recent article from the Richmond Times-Dispatch detailing the views of those who see the wisdom in the social security approach be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. It was written by John E. Raine, chairman of the Virginia State Commission on the Aging.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Richmond Times-Dispatch, Apr. 16, 1961]

HOW TO FINANCE AID FOR AGED?

(By John E. Raine)

The most controversial subject discussed at the White House Conference on Aging and one which will continue to be polemic until the issue is finally settled, is the financing of medical care for the aged.

All agree that more medical care and medical care for more of the aged is a humane as well as an economic problem.

All are not in agreement as to how such medical care is to be paid for.

Some believe that there should be no fund to provide this care.

There are many others, honest, sincere, practical, and conscientious citizens—including the almost unanimous vote of the Virginia Commission on the Aging—who believe that the recently enacted Kerr-Mills law effectively meets the needs of the aged and that proposed alternatives under social security are unnecessary and unwise.

However, a substantial number of others believe that the financing of medical care, as approved by the White House Conference on Aging, should be a part of the social security program. This is a difference of opinion between well-meaning individuals and each is entitled to his own opinion.

SOLE CONCERN

My sole concern, and one to which I have given study and solemn thought, is that the aged should be provided with the medical care they need.

The Congress has enacted the Kerr-Mills law which is supposed to provide medical care for the aged but which law has been put into operation in only six States, Virginia not being one of those six, and it is questionable whether the Kerr-Mills law will ever become operative in Virginia.

Seventeen States are contemplating legislation to meet the requirements of the Federal statute, with 11 States not planning any action in the near future.

Pending in the Congress is legislation providing medical care under social security. Many of our highest type, conscientious citizens whose integrity and honesty are beyond reproach, do not favor this approach. Their opinions I respect but with those opinions I do not altogether agree.

BOTH SIDES

The arguments of the opponents to financing medical care through the social security system are ably presented in this issue of the Times-Dispatch by a most capable, conscientious member of the Virginia Senate.

In order that the views of the proponents of financing medical care through the social security system might be considered by the general public, some simple, factual statements and comments are timely.

The Kerr-Mills law provides for medical care. This law is endorsed by the American Medical Association, and is 100 percent tax sponsored, with the Federal Government from general tax income paying 65 percent of the cost, the State of Virginia paying 22 percent, and the local communities paying 13 percent. No one can estimate the total cost to Virginia, for which an appropriation will be necessary, or to local communities, if the Kerr-Mills law ever becomes operative in Virginia.

It is possible, under the Kerr-Mills law, for any State participating in the program to use every penny of income to increase the per diem payments to hosiptals or nursing homes and no State is required to provide more medical care or medical care to more people.

RESTRICTED POLICY

The social security approach to medical care legislation is restricted to those who qualify for social security, but so is every insurance policy restricted to those who qualify for insurance benefits.

Old age assistance and benefits under the Kerr-Mills law are based entirely on a means test and are outright charity, and as needy and deserving as they may be, this is not a dignified approach to help those who built our cities and towns and who laid the foundation for the America we have today.

Income from social security is a return (just as ordinary insurance from premiums paid) as a result of a tax paid by the recipient of such income, plus a contribution from the employer of the recipient.

A recent survey of 1,233 large and small businesses concerns throughout Virginia indicates that 78 percent of such firms, employing over 175,000 persons, have no retirement plan in effect.

I do not agree with the medical profession, who are trying to confuse the issue, that the medical care for the aged is socialized medicine or even an approach to socialized medicine. A majority of students of medical care for the aged are not in agreement with the American Medical Association's views that health care through social security would socialize the practice of medicine to the everlasting detriment of the American people.

Medical care under social security is not going to add or subtract one doctor or one nurse from general practice or detract from the type of service rendered.

I am too much of an American to agree with many that the cooperation or the participation of the Federal Government with State government or agencies of State governments is cancerous and should be avoided at all costs.

HOW TO PAY

The issue we are facing today is not that of medical care but how is that medical care to be paid for.

Until recently the eligibility requirement for indigent hospital care in Richmond was low. A person with a total income of more than $90 a month or a couple whose total income was $110 from all sources per month, was not eligible for indigent hospitalization.

At present, regardless of the income of any person no funds are available to aid the indigent with hospital costs as the city's medical bureau has exhausted its total funds for that type of aid so that in Richmond medical care of the indigent becomes an acute problem.

Dr. F. J. L. Blassingame, executive vice president of the American Medical Association, said, in a prepared statement, published by the Times-Dispatch on February 28, that President Kennedy's proposals for hospitalization and nursing home care for the aged are "unrealistic, limited, and coercive" and that while AMA finds much to applaud in the President's overall program, and supports the general goals of his program, it cannot support his proposal that such program be financed under social security.

DEFINES POSITION

The above official statement of the American Medical Association clearly defines the position of the AMA and establishes the demarcation between the proponents and opponents of this controversial issue.

No one has yet expressed opposition to medical care for the aged.

The issue is how this care is to be paid for.

Not all doctors agree or are in sympathy with AMA's stand on the social security approach to the medical care for the aged.

REPROVED APPROACH

At the White House Conference on Aging, Dr. Elkin Ravetz of Philadelphia, joined with Dr. Benedict Duffy of the Hudson County (N.J.) Medical Society, in reproving the AMA approach to the financing of medical care, which they said was negative.

Dr. Richard J. Ackert, medical director for Richmond's Blue Cross-Blue Shield, at a meeting at Newport News recently, stated that while being opposed to medical care under the social security formula he conceded that private insurance cannot cover the medical needs of all the aged.

In answer to the off-expressed argument that the enactment of legislation providing for medical care for the aged would encourage a rush for hospital treatment for the correction of minor ailments, the proposed legislation under the social security approach provided a majority of insurance policies provide for a deductible provision of $10 for each of the first 9 days of inpatient hospital care, with a minimum deductible of $20 with a deductible for each diagnostic study of a hospital outpatient.

The fact that a patient will have to bear a part of the cost of the services received is a safeguard against unnecessary use of health services and reduces the administrative cost of handling small claims.

Nothing is provided in the proposed legislation which would, in any way, conflict with the established practice of the medical profession.

FREE CHOICE

The health benefits would be provided without interfering with the patient's free choice of his physician or facilities for treatment and the medical profession would continue to be responsible for the method and quality of such medical care.

The payment of such medical care would be through the social security fund much the same as that now used when such care is paid for by Blue Cross and other purchasers of accident and health insurance.

HONEST BELIEF

There are some who state, in all honesty and sincerity, that no one in our State or Nation goes without the medical care (including drugs) they need.

Communications received by the Commission on the Aging do not support this view insofar as Virginia is concerned.

It is true that under Virginia's indigent hospitalization program medical care is provided for those who pass a means test and who cannot pay for hospitalization.

It is also true that public assistance agencies and private charitable organizations do a most commendable job.

Many physicians and institutions are generous in reducing their charges or providing care at no cost. Relatives and friends frequently pay medical expenses of those who have no funds of their own.

TOO PROUD

But what is also true is that many older people who are sorely in need of medical care, do not get it because they are too proud to accept charity and will not undergo the humiliating experience of proving that they are in want or are practically paupers.

Also, it is true that many friends and relatives, in an effort to aid elderly members of their families, do so at the terrific cost of denying an adequate education to their children and even go without food and clothing they need because grandfather has to go to a hospital or because grandmother must have her pills to keep alive.

I have reached my conclusions, not only from a study of the proposed legislative bill but from the reports of congressional hearings and discussions on similar proposed legislation in Washington and in eight of nine cities throughout the country and from the endorsement of such organizations as the National Council of Churches, the American Public Welfare Association, the American Nurses' Association, the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, the American Veterans Committee, the Group Health Association of America and the Synagogue Council of America.

In conclusion, notwithstanding the views and opinions of so many of my friends and acquaintances, for whose judgment I have a profound regard, I am of the opinion that medical care for the aged through the participation in social security is the best, most practical and most economical of all the health care programs discussed.

The Saga of Our Italians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, many people have contributed to the greatness of the United States. Our

country has been called a melting pot of the world with freedom being the alloy, fusing the various metals together. Our ethnic groups have been likened to a symphony, with each one playing an instrument in harmony with the other instruments and completing a symphony of joy and beauty.

Frequently discordant notes arise which can easily be remedied with a little attention and with determination. In recent years Americans of Italian ancestry have been besmirched by various media of communication, sometimes unintentionally, other times inadvertently, and frequently with design. As a consequence, programs stereotype Americans of Italian origin as disreputable characters and cause a great deal of bitterness and resentment among an ethnic group which has contributed so much to the founding, development and preservation of our country. One of the programs, known as "The Untouchables" was a particular source of displeasure and aroused the ire of Americans of Italian origin throughout the land. Economic action, moral pressure, and literary persuation brought about an understanding whereby the sources of friction were gradually eliminated.

One of the great newspapers of New York, the New York Mirror, recognizing the sentiments of Americans of all ethnic backgrounds has commenced a series of articles, publishing the good deeds of persons of Italian ancestry and their contributions to our beloved land. I believe the first article publiced on Sunday, May 7, under the byline of Ara Piastro and Harry Altshuler, is a harbinger of greater understanding and paves the way for a new approach. I take pleasure in setting forth the article in the New York Mirror, and I salute them for their endeavors to paint a more truthful portrait of Americans of Italian ancestry:

THE SAGA OF OUR ITALIANS

(By Ara Piastro and Harry Altshuler)

It was the challenge of America that swept an Italian youth—Pietro Belluschi—into a lifelong love affair with this country from the time he first set foot here in the mid-1920's.

Mention his name, now, and perhaps a few knowing people will recognize it. If they do, you'll see a look come into their eyes a thrill of appreciation that mingles delight of the spirit and the senses in the work that bears Belluschi's name.

Most people, frankly are strangers to his name. And why should they know it? He's never figured in a page 1 newspaper headline. He's never taken a bow in the spotlight before a hushed mass audience.

Yet he has taken from America—and given back tenfold in his contributions, seeing the grand promise of the land, the inarticulate dreams in the faces of its people and clothing these dreams in visible form, solid yet soaring.

Bricks and stones and mortar, steel and aluminum and native woods are his materials. He is an architect.

There are graceful homes dotting the Pacific Northwest area—spirit-lifting churches of many denominations but all striving toward God—airy office buildings, college libraries and art museums that show his hand, with still more to come as America builds and rebuilds, filling its needs and interpreting its yearnings through the art of architecture.

He is a consultant on the huge Pan-Am building that is rising over Grand Central, and on the new Juilliard School and the new high school that are part of Lincoln Center. Perhaps most important of all, he is helping to shape and train new generations of architects, new interpreters of America, as Dean of the School of Architecture and Planning at Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

This story—so woven into the texture of American life—began in Ancona, Italy, where Belluschi was born on Aug. 18, 1899.

He pursued his studies in Rome, winning a degree as doctor of architectural engineering at the university there in 1922. Why did he choose this career? Well, his own dreams can be seen in a pamphlet he once wrote for young people about the field:

"The architect has the satisfaction of knowing that he is helping people to live, work, and play together better—he won't become a millionaire, but there are moments that cannot be measured in dollars. There is enormous gratification in an architect's work. No other art can give its practictioner such a sense of completeness. The buildings an architect designs not only can be seen and felt, they can be lived in and used. And they add to the world's store of beauty."

In 1923, as a young man still looking for the direction his life would take, he won a year's study in civil engineering at Cornell as an exechange student.

He came here, largely unacquainted with the language but eager to see and study. He spent the first 6 months mostly sitting alone, laboriously translating his textbooks into Italian, so he could tell what the professors were talking about in class. By the end of that time he knew textbook English, at least, pretty well. Then the Italian ambassador boosted his education in the more colloquial language of the country, by finding him a job at a lead mine in Idaho. Belluschi started there by stringing power lines, and ended by designing powerplants.

An architect's office in Portland, Oreg., offered to take him in, and when he went out there he was struck by the rugged beauty of the country. From laboring over specification sheets and minor details on the drawing board, he rose to quick recognition as a modern master. His house designs were not only built—they were widely published and commented on by other architects.

He opened his own office. Not only homes, but large-scale jobs flooded in. At times he had 40 designers and craftsmen assisting him there, but he always kept the atmosphere of a small office with Belluschi involving himself in every phase of the work even when it drove him to exhaustion. A constant stream of students, young graduates, and admiring colleagues were coming in also, and he was never too busy to pour himself out in talk with them.

His friendly nature needed these contacts—and more, his architecture needed them. His art was not something conceived in lonely granduer, and imposed from above. It was give and take—interpretation through the screen of his brilliant mind and warm spirit. He once wrote:

"We architects, of the common working variety, who must be frontline men, facing frustration and compromise; we, who must understand, absorb and give visual form to so many of the forces which make our world move, must not be ashamed to listen nor to understand what lives around us, ever mindful that each one of us can give more in a creative way by being part of the great mass of people, sharing their loves and enthusiasms, guiding them in the realization of their obscure ideals—not disdainful, temperamental stars—but men of vision among men. * * *"

It was this spirit of sharing which led him to make a drastic change in his way of life and locale by answering the call to the deanship at MIT. Now he lives in Boston with his wife, the former Helen Hemila, of Finnish descent; and their two sons, Peter, 22, and Anthony, 20.

He became a naturalized citizen in 1929. "I've never been sorry for a moment," he said recently. "Europe is stifled with too much population and not enough wealth. Here, there is so much to be done—we are just now beginning to find our way, with faltering steps, in changing raw land into civilized country."

Pietro Belluschi is one of the changers. One of those who is shaping America, and its image in the eyes of the world.

Opposition to Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I am pleased to learn of recent action by the Washington Court House, Ohio, Board of Education, expressing opposition to Federal aid to education. A resolution on this subject is a part of a letter I recently received from that board of education. I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON COURT HOUSE
CITY SCHOOLS,
OFFICE OF THE CLERK-TREASURER,
May 5, 1961.

The Honorable FRANK J. LAUSCHE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have been requested by the board of education of the Washington Court House City School District to transmit to you their following action taken in the regular board meeting of May 1, 1961:

Mr. Flee moved the adoption of the following resolution:

"Whereas the Washington Court House Board of Education holds the firm belief that the children of this Nation may best be served by schools controlled and financed at the local level and responsibile to local people;

"Whereas the various communities throughout our Nation have responded to the financial needs of education; and

"Whereas we are anxious to preserve the freedom of thought upon which our Nation was founded: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Washington Court House Board of Education go on record as opposing additional Federal money for support of education; and be it further

"Resolved, That Senator FRANK LAUSCHE, Senator STEPHEN M. YOUNG, and Congressman WILLIAM HARSHA be sent copies of this resolution."

Mr. Girton seconded the motion.

On rollcall, the members voted as follows: Reed, yea; Flee, yea; Dray, yea; Girton, yea; Willis, yea. Five yeas.

The president declared the resolution adopted.

Respectfully yours,
THELMA E. ELLIOTT,
Clerk, Washington Court House Board of Education.

A Midwest County Editor Fears for Nation's Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the State Department held what it called a foreign policy briefing session. Newspapermen from all over this Nation attended the 2-day meeting and listened to foreign policy experts from President Kennedy down through some Assistant Secretaries in the State Department.

What they heard was almost totally pessimistic. It was so pessimistic that one might have thought the answer to a question such as "What do you thing of the Kentucky Derby?" would be greeted by an answer such as "The owners of all the losing horses will be mighty sad and will have lost prestige."

This foundation of frustration upon which America's foreign policy is now being built greatly alarmed one newspaperman, my good friend, Robert Gordon, editor of the Columbus Evening Republican, a newspaper that is looked to by residents of several counties in Indiana for information and guidance.

Mr. Gordon did not return to write his accounts of the meetings on the same basis of thought that he found here in Washington. He did not resign himself to the reduction of our Nation by the forces of communism. He did not capitulate to the calumnies of the Reds. He chose to adopt a positive outlook and state in his own terms what he feels is wrong with our present positions and the present direction of our foreign policy.

In four publication days of his newspaper he had the readers of the Evening Republican aroused to the dangers of our present policy posture. His comments are so good, so level headed and so typical of the Midwestern trend of thought that I offer them here today.

They show that we in the Midwest are not ready to resign ourselves to being pushed around by the Communists and their cohorts all the time. They display Midwestern patriotism, Midwestern willingness to get on with a job that needs to be done, and Midwestern candor.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include one of Mr. Gordon's articles in the Appendix of the RECORD:

FOREIGN POLICY ON THE BRINK—HOW U.S. COPES WITH THREE BIG "IFS" MAY DECIDE THE NATION'S FUTURE

(By Robert E. Gordon, editor, the Evening Republican. Last of four articles)

If the Government of the United States continues to drag its heels on initiating a "get tough" policy with Communists, its years are numbered as the land of the free and the home of the brave.

If the United States does not throw Castro and the Communist government out of Cuba before the Russian military buildup is completed, it will be extending an invitation to Russia to expand its foothold throughout Latin America under threat of bombs for the U.S. mainland.

If our Government fails to make a realistic reappraisal of our foreign aid program, and its noble but stupid effort to be all things to all people in free world, it will destroy the free enterprise system that has made it possible for us to help others and defend the cause of freedom.

These may seem harsh statements, but they are my opinions previously formed but cemented during a 2-day U.S. State Department background briefing session which I attended last week in Washington.

Speaking in Chicago Friday night President Kennedy told an audience of 5,000 people: "Every new piece of information, every fresh event, have deepened my conviction that the survival of our civilization is at stake—and the hour is late."

These words by the President of the United States were based on his new experiences during 3½ months in the White House. I believe that the President is facing reality and every word he spoke is the truth. Godless communism is relentlessly on the march following the blue print drawn more than 100 years ago in the writings of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. The dedicated Communist leaders of Soviet Russia are playing it to the hilt and we of the free world are today, and have been for 30 years, performing exactly as they would have us from the Communist point of view.

SAY THEY WILL BUT DON'T

Communism is expanding over the world and it has finally gained a foothold just 90 miles from the U.S. mainland, 30 minutes flying time on commercial transport. We ask the Communists to stay put and they say they will, but they don't. We spend billions to win friends around the world and awaken to discover that most of them are either playing both ends against the middle, or are inclined toward the Communists.

Meanwhile our capitalist free-enterprise system of production is being financially sapped, we are producing more than we can sell thereby creating unemployment and conditions which make us susceptible to the alleged "better things" which the isms so graciously advocate. We have managed in the past to weather such problems as unemployment and out of balance production, but today our plight is more grace than at any time before. Militarily and economically, we are committed in a hundred or more countries around the globe. The Department of State reports that we are now maintaining embassies in 193 countries plus 20 other State Department service posts. The insults are many and the broken window cost is high. We are spread so thin that it is easy to understand the warnings President of the United States acknowledges that for more sacrifices by the American people.

The very serious problem which we face today was not created over night. It has been building up over the years and has finally reached the point where the President of the United States acknowledges that "the survival of our civilization is at stake—and the hour is late."

FEW CARE TO LISTEN

In spite of the scolding which President Kennedy gave the Nation's press in a talk before the American Newspaper Publishers' Association in New York Thursday night * * * it has been the American press and only the press over the years that has been telling the American people what is happening to them. But few have cared to listen or give consideration to doing anything about it. We, the people, have been too busy worrying about what the Government can do for us * * * and the Government certainly is trying to be all things to all people. You and I have been saying for years that it's a mess, and it really is.

The United States is the greatest country in the history of the world, where the individual is supreme. There is no challenge insurmountable if the people have the facts. Freedom of the press was based on a concept that if the people have the facts they will make wise and judicious decisions. The problem is for the people to know what the facts are * * * and I am convinced that too many don't want to know what the facts are, rather than being unable to get the facts.

Now to pass on some of my country style opinions and impressions after sitting in for 13 hours of discussions and questions and answers participated in by the top brass in our Government. Not more than two were on at the same time, but they included President Kennedy, who spoke off the record for 20 minutes and answered questions for 10 minutes; Secretary of State Rusk, Central Intelligence Agency Director Dulles, Edward R. Murrow, Information Agency; Adlai Stevenson, Bowles, Williams, Bohlen, Jones, Ball, Kohler, and Tubby, top men in the State Department, the heads of the Space Agency, and the Defense Department.

HAVE RED BULL BY TAIL

It was my opinion that the heads of our Government are aware they have a great red bull by the tail and they don't know where to let go.

To me, these leaders of our 180 million people are running frightened if not downright scared. President Kennedy learned quickly in his first 100 days that you can't negotiate with communism and that the spending of billions in foreign aid has not accomplished the results that had been hoped.

I fear that a disillusioned President Kennedy, stunned by the seriousness of world problems, is ready to search every avenue for an answer.

Since the Cuban invasion failure and the stepping up of Communist activity in Laos, he has conferred with President Eisenhower, Rockefeller, Nixon, Goldwater, President Truman, President Hoover, and General MacArthur. I do not believe all of these consultations were for the sake of national unity. Rather, for the most part, I think he was asking advice on what to do.

With the information he has collected from these leaders—military and political—plus the dismal reports from the members of his staff, let it be hoped that he will meditate in the seclusion of his private chambers and reach a decision based upon what is best for the United States and mankind. As I view it, his position today is much like that which faced President Lincoln before the Civil War.

SPEAKS OFF RECORD

President Kennedy spoke off the record to our group and he was humble, more so than I had ever seen him. Frankly, I thought the President acted like he wished he were back in the Senate.

I gained the impression that these leaders of our Government lack confidence and that they are fearful of the American people and our friends around the world on the decisions they make. There seemed to be fear of the reaction to new decisions in view of statements and commitments previously made. For example, in a press conference on April 13 the President said, "There will not be, under any conditions, an intervention in Cuba by U.S. Armed Forces."

President Kennedy need not fear the American people in a crisis. Give them the facts and if the cause is just they will make wise decisions. They always have.

In view of the failure of the Cuban-Florida trained American equipped invasion force, I wonder if such statements as the above might influence the President against making an immediate decision on what he believes now should be done.

PRESTIGE IMPORTANT

Prestige seemed to be a major consideration in foreign policy. In a discussion of the possibility of sending a man to the moon, it was brought out that it would cost from $20 to $40 billion and require about 6 years and then there was no assurance that we would be first. No mention was made of what it might mean to mankind or in the defense of the free world. It would be a race or a contest. If that is the main concern, it should be tossed out the window.

Our officials discussed at length our costly foreign aid programs and the new Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. Our share would be 1 percent of gross national product or $5 billion plus. This cooperative effort with other free nations would be for the purpose of helping the underdeveloped countries of the world improve their standards of living so that they would be less susceptible to the bait of communism. It was brought out that this is not a case of trying to buy friends or to have others be like us, but rather to place them in a position where they can improve their own economy with assistance.

This, and all our foreign aid efforts designed to aid the people, are noble efforts, but a look at the past doesn't seem to show where they have paid many dividends in the cause of freedom.

COMMONSENSE

Applying the horse or commonsense measuring stick, it is inconceivable how we can stand back and permit a Russian military buildup in Cuba. We must get them out of Cuba and the quicker the better. If we don't, Russia and Castro will be in a position to strengthen their foothold in Latin America under threat of bombing the U.S. mainland in case of interference.

It is inconceivable how we can successfully accomplish economic development and appreciation for the finer things in the underdeveloped countries without a stepped up educational program. Success of slum clearance in our own Hoosier State has only been accomplished through education. Dr. Blackburn of Flanner House, Indianapolis, emphasizes that education is essential in a redevelopment program.

It seems that our finest tools in the cause of freedom are our missionaries, who work from a Christian foundation with understanding of the weaknesses and problems of the hungry and ignorant of the underdeveloped countries.

YOU CAN'T NEGOTIATE

Based on past experience it is inconceivable that we can expect peaceful negotiating with communism. We have lost every round because that is the way they play it. They are cunning and dedicated to the Communist cause and they know what they are doing.

It is inconceivable that we, the American people, should be afraid and lack confidence. If any one should be afraid it is Russia. In the face of a get-tough U.S. policy, based on fairness, wouldn't you hate to be occupying the Kremlin with Russia ringed with allied nuclear bases, and hated by the peoples of the world more so than we are * * * plus the fact that the United States has the greatest capacity in the history of the world?

Further, it is inconceivable that we would permit our own successful free system of economy to be strangled to death in much the way blueprinted in the Communist manifesto.

WHAT SHOULD WE DO?

What should we do? You may ask.

That is a big question * * * and all that I can do is give you one country editor's opinion.

Being a "good Joe" has gone on far too long. Surely we have learned that you can't negotiate with Khrushchev * * * and that too often those we help become our enemies.

The United States must take off its velvet gloves and adopt a get-tough policy with communism. This it must do if it is to survive as the land of the free and the home of the brave.

It must lead from a position of strength, but with fairness and peaceful intention.

The United States must throw Castro and the Communist government out of Cuba * * * and do it now * * * and we must tell Khrushchev and the Communists in no uncertain terms to get out of the Western Hemisphere and stay out. As for our policies in Europe and Asia, we need to take a fresh and realistic look at our foreign aid and our commitments around the world.

It is inconceivable that we can go on and on supporting the world without destroying our own system which has placed us in position to help others and defend the free world.

Our friends, what few we have left, will respect us more if we get tough in the cause of freedom.

Killer Substances in Food

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the American people have been greatly disturbed over a period of time now about persistent reports of increasing peril from cancer-causing agents in foods, drugs and cosmetics. From time to time the Congress has given considerable attention to this most serious question and some legislation seeking to control this menace to human welfare has been enacted.

Recently Dr. Freddy Homburger, president of the Bio-Research Institute of Cambridge, Mass., testified before our House Subcommittee on Health Appropriations that a Federal appropriation of $10 million is urgently needed to help protect the American people against cancer-causing agents in the above products. At the same time he suggested that this sum would enable the Food and Drug Administration to speed up research on improved methods to detect cancer-inducing substances in consumer goods.

We have a law designed to exclude from human consumption all cancer-producing substances, said the doctor, but we lack the methods to determine exactly what constitutes a cancer hazard, even for test animals.

Pointing to the fact that in existence today there are innumerable consumer items which never have been adequately tested because of the lack of quick, economical and reliable methods, the doctor outlined a $10 million program, one-half of which would go for intramural studies, grants-in-aid and contract research programs. Another $5 million would go for the construction of needed laboratory space for the Food and Drug Administration.

Dr. Homburger's recent demonstration that an agent used widely in soft drinks and contained in many other flavoring components produces cancer in rats was most alarming. Strongly urging the Congress to take action, this well known scientist declared that as an example of what the public must be guarded against, was the substance used as a weight-reducing agent for years until it became evident that it caused cataracts of the eyes. Dr. Homburger also urged Congress to support and bolster independent research institutions which exist outside of universities and hospitals, and requested an appropriation of $50 million to create new institutes of this kind throughout the country. He said this sum would make it possible to organize, construct, and equip 100 independent institutes at the rate of two in each State, to be operated by government and private grant-in-aid funds.

He summarized his case by stating:

The universities, with their team efforts, educate a type of scientists who work together admirably in committees, research teams, and departments of large laboratories. But nowhere are we training—systematically—the leaders of tomorrow who will guide new scientific developments. Such leaders can emerge from independent institutes.

I trust that the Congress will take Dr. Homburger's urgent warning to heart, and I urge the Appropriations Committee to make sure this year that sufficient funds are appropriated to take every effective measure that is necessary to eliminate cancer-causing agents or other deleterious substances in food, water, drugs, and cosmetics and other products, materials, or substances with which the public comes in contact and are capable of producing incurable or serious disease or affliction.

This question is one of greatest urgency and topmost priority because America's food preparation and eating habits are changing greatly. Additional effective controls must be found to protect the public health and to prevent millions of innocent people from being poisoned or rendered sick or afflicted by what they eat, what they use, what they wear, or what they may be exposed to in modern society.

There is need for boldness and immediate action in fashioning the broadest type of program to combat these evils. Congress must provide the answer at an early date and I strongly urge that it be done.

The article follows:

FUNDS ASKED FOR RESEARCH—FOOD TESTS VITAL IN WAR ON CANCER

WASHINGTON.—A Boston scientist told Congressmen Thursday that a Federal appropriation of $10 million is urgently needed to help protect the American people against cancer-causing agents in their foods, drugs, and cosmetics.

Dr. Freddy Homburger, president of the Bio-Research Institute of Cambridge, Mass., told a House Subcommittee on Health Appropriations the sum would enable the Food and Drug Administration to speed up research on improved methods to detect cancer-inducing substances in consumer goods.

"We have a law designed to exclude from human consumption all cancer-producing substances," Dr. Homburger said, "but we lack the methods to determine exactly what constitutes a cancer hazard, even for the test animals."

WORKED AT TUFTS

"There exists today innumerable consumer items which never have been adequately tested because of the lack of quick, economical, and reliable methods," he said.

Under the Homburger plan, one-half of the $10 million appropriation would go for intramural studies and for a grant-in-aid and contract research program. Another $5 million would make possible construction of needed laboratory space for the Food and Drug Administration. "The agency," Dr. Homburger said, "now has practically no funds for such research."

Dr. Homburger, former research professor of medicine and director of cancer research at Tufts University, recently demonstrated that an agent used widely in soft drinks and contained in many other flavoring components produces cancer in rats.

As an example of what the public must be guarded against, the Boston scientist cited the case of a substance used as a weight-reducing agent for years until it became evident that it caused cataracts of the eyes.

NEW TEST DESCRIBED

"Dr. Bernard Armbrecht of the FDA has now developed a method, using chickens, that can demonstrate toxic properties of drugs in a matter of days," Dr. Homburger said.

Dr. Homburger also urged Congress to encourage independence in health research by bolstering independent research institutes which exist outside of universities and hospitals. He requested an appropriation of $50 million to create new institutes of this kind throughout the country.

He said this sum would make it possible to organize, construct, and equip 100 independent institutes at the rate of 2 in each State, to be operated by government and private grant-in-aid.

"The universities, with their team efforts, educate a type of scientists who work together admirably in committees, research teams, and departments of large laboratories," he said. "But nowhere are we training—systemically—the leaders of tomorrow who will guide new scientific developments. institutes."

Herb Klein Evaluates the First 3 Kennedy Months

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, Herbert G. Klein, press secretary of former Vice President Richard M. Nixon, recently addressed the Joliet, Ill., Rotary Club giving his evaluation of the Kennedy administration in the field in which Mr. Klein is most knowledgeable, that of public relations. Mr. Klein is well remembered and highly regarded in Washington from his years of service here and I am sure that his remarks will be of interest. I would like to place Mr. Klein's statement in the RECORD at this point:

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY HERBERT G. KLEIN, EDITOR OF THE SAN DIEGO UNION, AND FORMER PRESS SECRETARY TO VICE PRESIDENT RICHARD NIXON, BEFORE THE JOLIET, ILL., ROTARY CLUB, APRIL 18, 1961

We are nearing the completion of the first 3 months of the Kennedy administration. During this time there has been much talk of proposals in various fields ranging from oceanography to unemployment, but there has been major action only in the field of public information.

President Kennedy has set double standards—negative and positive—in the field of information. He has appeared on television and issued news statements whenever he has had a story he wanted to put over, but oppositely, he has simultaneously tightened news restrictions on information which does not fit into his domestic propaganda machine. This is a serious matter. The President and his staff have done more to hinder a free flow of information than has any administration in this century. The resultant damage is serious.

The public has even lost its watchdogs. Representative JOHN MOSS, a Democrat from California, was the congressional checkmate against censorship during the Eisenhower administration. But today he is strangely silent. He has pointedly ignored restrictions which he previously protested loud and hard. His silence today unfortunately indicates that his previous concern for the free flow of news must have had partisan connotations. He should be as free in his criticism of the Democratic administration as he was of the Republican. He has not been.

And what of the press? I am afraid too many of my colleagues also have joined the widely publicized honeymoon period. One of the major developments of this first 3 months has been the lack of constructive criticism of this administration by many of the usually watchful elements of the press. It is time for the newspapers and television to call off the honeymoon. The Nation's best interests are better served by constructive criticism than by silence.

I'm not advocating free-swinging unreasonable criticism. But it is essential to our democracy to have the free press criticize vocally and constructively, honeymoon or no honeymoon. Unless this is done, the habits of our first months of marriage to this administration may permanently handicap the Nation.

Some have questioned whether former Vice President Nixon should give his critical analysis of the administration when he appears in Chicago on May 5. For him not to do this would be to fail in his responsibilities as the leader of the Republican Party. Incidentally, those who question his position of leadership should consult with the citizens who have been writing him at a rate of 2,000 a week or the other thousands who have turned out to meet and cheer him at every stop in California.

There is no one actively leading the Republican Party today whose national popularity even approaches Mr. Nixon's. In Chicago and in subsequent speeches elsewhere he will offer guidance on national programs.

I think that few have realized the changes in news restrictions because they have not been fully analyzed.

Double talk on the part of Mr. Kennedy and his press aids is largely responsible for this.

Mr. Pierre Sallinger, Mr. Kennedy's able press secretary, recently told Democratic women that the public is "entitled to know what is going on when it is going on." He added, "nothing is more vital in government than the freest possible flow of news."

He then went on to criticize the Eisenhower administration. Mr. Sallinger is skillfully practicing doubletalk.

As an example, newsmen now are being barred from traveling with the segments of the 7th Fleet which is patrolling off the Lao-Indochina area. During all previous wars, cold or hot, newsmen have been allowed aboard ships because, as Mr. Salinger says, the public is entitled to know what is going on. The Kennedy administration has not revealed why it has this ban. I haven't even seen a news story on it. I can only surmise that this is part of the naive policy to avoid offending the Soviets by stories from a fleet unit. This is the Kennedy sound barrier.

This policy of treading quietly around the Communists has resulted in the muzzling of our military leaders. Rear Admiral Frankel found his speech censored last week. Earlier Admiral Burke himself was the victim of the sound barrier.

Recently the national space surveillance control center has been forced to halt its public confirmation of Soviet space shots. We hide information only from ourselves.

The administration is censoring even such matters as the Boite report which deals with such top secret measures as the officer grade spread, promotion patterns and whether Navy rear admirals of the lower half should be floated or selected to the upper half. Navy men are barred from discussing this publicly under Defense Department restrictions.

Mr. Khrushchev has imposed no barriers on his willingness to criticize the United States. He takes the best possible advantage of strong propaganda.

Why are we restricting ourselves? The Soviets are not going to deal with us on the basis of their appreciation of our timid comments. Mr. Khrushchev enjoys give and take as well as anyone. He respects strength and evaluates in terms of self-interest. The Kennedy sound barrier will not help our relations with the Soviets but it may well endanger traditional American freedom of information and criticism.

True national security comes from outbuilding and outpacing the enemy.

An Editorial Analyzing the Position of a Typical American Community on Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, with the clamor for Federal aid to education at a public school level, it is interesting to observe the attitudtes of those who are sincerely pledged to improving educational standards at every level.

One of the finest editorials I have read on this subject appeared in Life newspapers, published in my district. The editorial deals with the issue in my home community—a middle-income city where folks take pride in their homes, schools, churches, and civic functions of every nature.

Many of the folks who live in this community have mortgages on their homes—but they have met the growing cost of government without neglecting their responsibility to their school systems. They have supported bond issues and willingly accepted this additional tax burden in recognition of their primary civic responsibility. It should be noted, too, that this community is without the advantage of the large industrial tax income which others enjoy.

I commend the author of this editorial, Frank Dillett, and the Life publications for the exceptionally fine job

they have done in presenting the issue to their thousands of readers and in doing so in factual perspective.

The editorial follows:

Somewhere in the distant past, born of an idea and nurtured by organized groups, there has arisen the belief that the subject of education is sacrosanct and that only those in that field were qualified to discuss the subject with any authority.

Further than that, any critic of instructional matter, curriculum, or supposed academic facilities was pilloried in the public press as somewhat of an undesirable citizen and the mechanics of the educational front groups were loosed to drive him to silence.

Slowly, but surely, local school district authority over educational affairs was limited by county and then State jurisdictions, and now Federal aid to education has become a national issue with Congress currently considering the administration's $5.6 billion Federal aid to education program.

Over the school Easter vacation, we had an opportunity to discuss this latest trend with a teacher whose experiences on the staffs of schools in both Minnesota and Wisconsin, as well as on the instructional staff of a school teaching children of our Armed Forces overseas, provides more than the average background for an opinion on the subject.

This teacher is unalterably opposed to Federal aid to education as a practical business proposition. It will simply mean, our teacher said, that we will be taxed more and send our money to Washington, D.C., where a large share will be siphoned off by a whole new bureaucracy before some of it is remitted back to the source.

Looking at the matter dispassionately, how would the $2.3 billion earmarked for construction of public school classrooms and raising teachers' salaries benefit our area? Our school facilities in this community are more than adequate, since there are many empty classrooms not now in use and not expected to be. We have paid or are paying for them without any help other our own. We didn't ask county or State help. We certainly don't need Federal aid.

On the teacher salary question, the Federal measure would provide for increases for the next 3 years. What happens then? Are teachers any more willing to take pay cuts than you if the local school district is unable to meet the expanded payroll at the end of that time?

Won't it breed dissatisfaction among teachers and the teaching profession when that happens? We certainly think so.

The other $3.3 billion proposed in the Federal measure would be authorized for loans to colleges for housing, construction of academic facilities, and for scholarships. Won't this encourage demands for more grants and more scholarships; and where will it end?

Let's take a look at the facts in our own area as well as in Illinois. Between 1948 and 1959, a total of 1,276 new school buildings (not classrooms) were constructed in Illinois. In the last 5 years alone, 15,390 classrooms were either put up or are now scheduled for completion in the State.

Nationally, school construction and teachers' salaries have kept pace with Illinois and with our local school districts. It might be pointed out that in the past decade, public school enrollment has increased approximately 50 percent but school expenditures increased approximately 200 percent.

In Illinois last fall we voted for a $195 million bond issue for our State universities and the teachers' college board has recommended a 31 percent increase in the total of the operating budgets for the next biennium for the four State universities (not including the University of Illinois or its Navy Pier branch) under its jurisdiction.

In the last few years, all four area grade school districts have built or are building new schools, while nearly every school has some degree of renovation, many of major character. Morton West has been built and further construction is planned for the junior college as well as at Morton East. Every dime has or will come from local taxes.

In Illinois between 1948 and 1959, average annual salaries of teachers in Illinois schools rose from $3,059 to $5,224, or 70 percent. We don't have the averages of teachers' salaries in each district locally, but a few years ago the Cicero district average was over $5,900.

With such increases in the offing on a State basis, can we afford to pay more Federal taxes for teachers' salaries and school construction? We're scheduled to get a healthy increase in State taxes in any event, not all due, however, to educational increases which have been asked for other schools. Those taxes all come out of the same pocket. It would seem that we ought to keep our spending closer to home where we'll have a better chance to keep track of our expenditures.

Trend Toward Centralized Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the nationwide "what America thinks" poll was recently conducted on the question of government powers in our country becoming more and more centralized in the Federal Government. Since increased Federal Government powers represent an important issue to all Americans, I believe my colleagues would find the results of this poll revealing. Following this report, the Rochester Post-Bulletin newspaper, of Rochester, Minn., made some editorial observations on the results of the poll. I believe the cogent observations in that editorial, which was published on Tuesday, May 2, will be of value to all our citizens:

GROWING TREND TO STRONG CENTRAL GOVERNMENT FAVORED BY MAJORITY

(by Jack Boyle)

NEW YORK.—Americans are conditioning themselves for a strong, central Government in Washington, this week's "what America thinks" poll indicates.

Of those with opinions, 55.3 percent think a more centralized Government in Washington would be a good thing for the individual American, 44.7 percent said it would be bad for the individual.

Trained interviewers asked a scientifically selected cross section of Americans this question:

"Government powers in the United States are becoming more and more centralized in Washington. Do you think this is a good or bad thing for the individual American?"

The answers were:

	Percent
Good	45.8
Bad	36.9
No opinion	17.3

Of those saying good, few spoke out for completely authoritarian rule in the United States, but many approached that idea.

THOSE IN FAVOR REPLY

"The head of Government could get and give out knowledge to the people and we would be better informed. Besides, more money could be had from a centralized power in Washington," declared a Massachusetts crane operator. "Kennedy is looking ahead by getting all the keymen and advisers in one place. He is pretty sharp," said the owner of a California dental laboratory. "The Government knows more about what is necessary and best for the country," said the supervisor of a naval air base in Rhode Island.

The wife of an Iowa packinghouse operator said, "The Government should operate like a family and, like a family, branch out in every direction." The wife of a Colorado railroad telegrapher said, "We've grown so big, it's the only way things can be handled."

"It's a trend to socialism, and, while some may think this is bad, I think it is a good thing," said an Arizona lumberman. "We need leadership and it's a good thing for our country to have it centralized in Washington," said an Ohio advertising copywriter, a woman.

A few had monetary reasons for favoring a strong central Government. "There is too much redtape in the Pentagon. If things were more centralized, there would not be so much duplication and waste of taxpayers' money," said an Ariozna plumbing warehouseman. "It's the quickest way for minority groups to benefit from legislation that will improve their status," said a Long Island teacher, a man. "It's good because people will be able to get more financial help or business loans. State governments can't lend as much money as Washington can," said a Massachusetts brush manufacturer's wife.

THREAT TO DEMOCRARY

Those who thought the trend toward centralization was bad often said it was a threat to democracy.

"It's dangerous. We are a democracy and believe in the voice of the people and, when too much power is concentrated in one place, decisions are taken away from the people," said a retired Texas salesman.

"We are getting too much like Russia—too centralized and too socialistic," said a Maine coed. "This can lead easily to a real bureaucracy and do away with the rights of individuals. All kinds of graft can flourish this way," declared the wife of a Long Island businessman.

"It seems to be the Government is getting into too many things and pretty soon it will be all government instead of 'of, by and for' the people," said an Iowa farmer.

"From a medical viewpoint, it's bad, but from a scholastic viewpoint, it's good," said a Missouri secretary. "I'm a Republican and I don't believe in the slow socializing process that is taking place," said a California mortician. "Socialism is being brought about by ignorance. People have to realize government spending can come only from the people," said a New Mexico dental technician.

"When you send tax money to Washington it goes into many hands. So much of it is spent along the way. Washington is getting too big," said an Ohio State road watchman, a woman. "Centralized Government is trying to force integration," declared a Mississippi farmer. "The Government should keep out of schools. We look to Washington for too many things, such as teachers' salaries, and this encourages the pressure groups," said a Rhode Island postal supervisor. "I believe in the rights and privileges of the individual," said a California flight engineer.

The following is the editorial which, as I have mentioned, appeared in the

Rochester, Minn., Post-Bulletin on May 2, 1961:

POLL RESULTS DISTRESSING

The weekly report of the "What America Thinks" poll, which appeared on this page Monday, couldn't help but be distressing to those of us who believe in individual initiative and individual freedoms.

The question posed was: "Government powers in the United States are becoming more and more centralized in Washington. Do you think this is a good or bad thing for the individual American?"

The answers, in a scientifically selected cross-section of Americans, were: Good thing, 45.8 percent; bad thing, 36.9 percent; no opinion, 17.3 percent. Of those with opinions, 55.3 percent said this trend is a good thing.

This sheep-like reliance on a "big brother" to take care of them is based on the socialistic trend of the past 30 years in the United States. Evidently the people have swallowed the line that Federal bureaucrats know what's best for the people and that Federal spending aid is free.

Witness some of the explanations given in the poll by those saying the trend is a good thing:

"More money could be had from a centralized power in Washington."

"The Government knows more about what is necessary and best for the country."

"The Government should operate like a family and, like a family, branch out in every direction."

"We've grown so big, it's the only way things can be handled."

"It's good because people will be able to get more financial help or business loans. State governments can't lend as much money as Washington can."

These kinds of "reasons" are what perplex conservatives. No amount of logic seems able to overcome these specious arguments.

It's so easy to be in favor of vast Government spending programs and then attack the opposition for failure to come up with "positive" programs. It's so much harder to sell a program of individual initiative and liberties when too many individuals apparently are willing to exchange the traditional American way of life for some imagined economic blessing from Washington.

Over and over, in every poll on this subject, the same silly argument repeats itself—"the people can get more money from Washington." Just why the people don't understand that the money obviously comes from them through high taxation is simply beyond comprehension.

When 45 percent of Americans think a growing socialistic trend is a good thing, and another 17 percent don't even know what they think, it's almost too discouraging to put up a fight against the trend.

But we must. The only chance to halt the cancerous growth of the Federal Government into every phase of life is to fight against it whenever and wherever possible. Maybe it will be a losing battle, judging from the poll results, but it definitely is a battle which should not be lost by default.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of May 6, 1961:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

MAY 6, 1961.

At the end of the first 100 days of the Kennedy administration we find U.S. prestige apparently at its lowest in history and our domestic programs merely an extension and acceleration of the New Deal-Fair Deal programs, which the President admires, but which many consider proven failures. Worldwide Russian leaders are accelerating their Communist subversion, stimulated by Kennedy's failure to follow firm talk with firm action. Bipartisan harmony to show the world U.S. 'unity of purpose' fails on two counts, at least: (1) Our purpose is not clear, thanks to contradictory programs; (2) past mistakes are not only buried from view, such as the Cuba fiasco, but so, too, are the lessons we might have learned. Our contradictory programs are daily delineated on the House floor. This week's crop includes (1) the minimum wage final version; (2) Federal aid for water pollution; (3) a $9-billion tax increase to highway users.

The minimum wage House-Senate conference was a capitulation by the House Members. The Speaker selected as House conferees (POWELL, ROOSEVELT, DENT) Members committed to the dollar volume view already voted down by the House. The House had endorsed the Interstate Commerce principle as the basis for Federal participation in wage setting. The Senate bill embraced the dollar volume view and it prevailed contrary to the legislation passed by the House. Once again we witnessed the House views flouted by the Senate and the administration. So now we will have a minimum wage forced on our people based on $1 million gross and $250,000 of goods crossing State lines—with some businesses exempted. It is apparent that some of the exemptions were politically motivated, such as laundry workers and cotton gin employees, in an effort to secure more Members' votes in support of the administration plan. Despite a determined Republican stand, the bill passed 230 to 196—30 Republicans voted for it; 57 Democrats against. Federal Government wage setting must and will be accompanied by direct or indirect Federal price control—neither of these is compatible with a free, private enterprise system—there's the basic contradiction. In other words, it's unconstitutional.

The water pollution bill doubling the amount of Federal aid for construction of of local sewage disposal plants passed 307 to 110. The bill provided $1 billion total at $100 million per year—a doubling of amount in a program only 4 years old. What business the Federal Government has in this, I don't know. Stream pollution, which everyone disapproves, can be prevented in other ways (State compacts, for example). The construction of sewage plants is a local matter. Here again is the basic contradiction—Federal intervention in a local-State matter.

The highway taxes were increased $9 billion without House Members even demanding a record vote (only 24 arose, not a sufficient number). It was late in the day (6 p.m.) and, also, the Members don't want to appear to be against highways, even though disapproving somewhat the increase of taxes. I opposed it for several reasons, including (1) taxes are high enough now, on motorists, truckers and all related industries which pay taxes as highway users—$1.6 billion of highway users excise taxes annually now go into the general treasury beyond the amounts spent on highway construction; (2) as alternatives, we can either cut spending on welfare programs or stretch out the construction timetable.

The omnibus judgeship bill was probably our most ignominious action of the week. Instead of 35 or 59 additional judgeships (last year's maximum declared needs) or even the 70 passed by the House (see Newsletter, Apr. 22), the Senate version was adopted providing 73 new judgeships. The actions of Members of both Houses is quite transparent. Many have hopes for such an appointment, a lifetime job. The House leadership, under the Speaker's guidance, can receive the credit and blame for our legislative accomplishments to date.

Worldwide, meanwhile, we are losing ground in the Communist-free world contest. Daily Cuba is importing the sinews of war—oil, weapons, and Russian technicians. Every hour is irretrievably lost to the United States which must mount the offensive to free Cuba. When will the American people demand action? The State Department only now has released a study of Cuba, acknowledging officially and warning the American people of the socialism and communism the American people have recognized for months. Our inaction now, following our earlier mistakes, is almost unbelievable. In Laos, Africa, Vietnam, Berlin, Mexico, South America, we face Communist subversion: We know that under present policy a temporary slowdown will not prevent a later takeover. Day by day, we see the showdown coming closer. It will be wth Russia, not just with Cuba, Laos, Congo, Vietnam or other peripheral areas. So what are we doing? Meanwhile, we learn that supposedly patriotic union leaders and members have struck again and again at our missile sites pushing up wages to fantastic amounts of $400 to $700 weekly; legalized blackmail, you might call it. It's beginning to look as though our Nation, the leaders and/or the people, is suffering from mass hypnosis or sickness, making sensible conduct as the free world's leader an impossibility. Foreign aid to our enemies and neutrals is a leading example of this sickness. Our lack of firm action another.

The astronaut's successful flight, fully publicized, was a tremendous success for the United States way of life over Russia's secrecy and propaganda. Uncommitted nations may well be influenced to recognize (and emulate) the advantages of our way of life which combines a free society with military might, a happy and tough combination (if we don't sell ourselves short).

Americans Have Cause To Outrun the Communist Design To Enslave the World—Text of Communist Party Dedication Must Be Outnumbered by Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I present to the attention of yourself and all the other Members of this great legislative body, and also to all others who read or learn of it, the following text which I received through the U.S. mail this day:

A TOTAL COMMITMENT DESIGNED TO ENSLAVE A TOTAL WORLD

JEFFERSON STANDARD BROADCASTING CO.,
Charlotte, N.C., March 10, 1961.

MR. NORMAN R. GLENN,
Editor and Publisher, Sponsor,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR NORMAN: Enclosed is an exact copy of a letter which a young Communist sent to a friend of his back in the United States.

The letter appeared in Presbyterian Survey, a very fine publication of the Presbyterian Church. In reproducing it, the editor made one of the most profound and thought-provoking observations I've ever read. He said, "We think this letter shows more graphically than any editorial what total committee means." He went on to say, "Are we as committed to the truth as this young Communist and millions like him are committed to an empty hope?"

To a great majority of people in the free world, particularly people in America, this kind of dedication is unheard of. They simply cannot believe that the architects of communism, Karl Marx, Lenin, et al., could possibly have such influence on any human being. I feel that to defend and protect freedom as we know it today, it is imperative that all people in the free world understand the inner feelings of those who are determined to destroy it. I am hopeful, therefore, that you—through your widely read publications—will give the enclosed letter as much publicity as you see fit.

We simply must convince Americans and as many of our friends in the free world as possible that communism is by no means just another political party. It is a form of religion, a complete dedication, a total commitment designed to enslave a total world.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLIE CRUTCHFIELD.

A YOUNG COMMUNIST WRITES

What seems of first importance to you is to me either not desirable or impossible of realization. But there is one thing about which I am in dead earnest—and that is the socialist cause. It is my life, my business, my religion, my hobby, my sweetheart, wife, and mistress, my bread and meat. I work at it in the daytime and dream of it at night. Its hold on me grows, not lessens, as time goes on. I'll be in it the rest of my life. It is my alter-ego. When you think of me, it is necessary to think of socialism as well, because I'm inseparably bound to it.

Therefore, I can't carry on a friendship, a love affair, or even a conversation without relating it to this force which both drives and guides my life. I evaluate people, books, ideas, and notions according to how the Socialist cause and by their attitude toward it.

I have already been in jail because of my ideas, and if necessary I am ready to go before a firing squad. A certain percentage of us get killed or imprisoned. Even for those who escape these harsher ends, life is no bed of roses. A genuine radical lives in virtual poverty. He turns back to the party every penny he makes above what is absolutely necessary to keep him alive. We constantly look for places where the class struggle is the sharpest, exploiting these situations to the limit of their possibilities. We lead strikes. We organize demonstrations. We speak on street corners. We fight cops. We go through trying experiences many times each year when the ordinary man has to face only one or twice in a lifetime.

And when we're not doing these more exciting things, all our spare time is taken up with dull routine chores, endless leg work, errands, etc., which are inescapably connected with running a live organization.

Radicals don't have the time or the money for many movies or concerts, or T-bone steaks or decent homes and new cars. We've been described as fanatics. We are. Our lives are dominated by one great, overshadowing factor—the struggle for socialism. Well, that's what my life is going to be. That's the black side of it. Then there is the other side of it. We Communists have a philosophy of life which no amount of money could buy. We have a cause to fight for, a definite purpose in life. We subordinate our petty personal selves into a great movement of humanity. We have a morale, an espirit de corps such as no capitalist army ever had; we have a code of conduct, a way of life, a devotion to our cause that no religious order can touch. And we are guided not by blind, fanatical faith but by logic and reason, by a never-ending education of study and practice.

And if our personal lives seem hard or our egos appear to suffer through subordination to the party, then we are adequately compensated by the thought that each of us is in his small way helping to contribute something new and true, something better to mankind. (Reprinted from the Presbyterian Survey.)

Mr. Speaker, in reading and rereading the text following the words: "A young Communist writes: 'What seems of first importance to you is to me either not desirable or impossible of realization,'" my memory is refreshed of an experience I have not infrequently had during these 14 years of my membership on the House Committee on Un-American Activities when I have been sitting as a member of an investigating committee of that vital and essential committee in some part or other of our beloved Nation. For, Mr. Speaker, the text of what I herewith present as a dedication of this "young Communist" is strangely familiar; yes, is substantially what I have heard many times stated under oath, by American citizens who have formerly been dedicated members of the Communist Party of the United States. Time and time again, under oath, as friendly witnesses in an endeavor to help the committee understand the danger resulting from the dedication of themselves and others as Communists to the Communist cause, I have sat in amazement and trepidation, as I heard them state their former dedication to the Communist conspiracy directed against the freedom-loving and freedom-dedicated philosophy of our beloved Nation, and to hear them say without hindrance or limitation or any thought of equivocation, that they had thus formerly dedicated their life, when they became Communists in the United States of America, to live for, and often, in fact, even to make unbelievable sacrifices for the Communist philosophy.

Mr. Speaker, I am referring to the former Communists in the United States who have had a revulsion of feeling against the philosophy and practices of the Communist Party; I speak of such of those who have volunteered to come to the support of the U.S. Congress through their cooperation with the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and thus to help us better to understand, not only the threat of subversive Communist infiltration, but to understand the direct and positive danger and hazard thereof to American ideals and to American institutions of government, schools, churches, labor unions. I have heard them tell of divorcing a wife, or a husband, respectively, because of their Communist Party loyalty and dedication. I have heard them tell of habitually deceiving their loved ones; of neglecting their families, of going without food and going without adequate necessities of life. I have heard them tell of going underground and undercover like so many moles and gophers; living a daily life of deceit and false identity. I have heard them tell of abandoning loved ones and parents and brothers and sisters and sweethearts. Mr. Speaker, these former Communists who thus desert this Godless philosophy help very much indeed when they voluntarily come forward and help the people of the United States to protect themselves against the dedication of those who have not yet revolted against those false ideologies of communism sufficiently to take that step. Mr. Speaker, I would to God that we Americans who have no use for the Communist philosophy and would not think or dream of uniting with it in any way whatsoever, would have a devotion to our constitutional way of life; to our heritage, as God-loving American citizens; of freedom and dignity for the individual, might consciously and deliberately place these elements sufficiently into our daily experience so that all mankind would know from our daily life, in our actions and by our daily dedication to all that is high and lofty, patriotic and righteous that we do dedicate our substances and ourselves to a valiant and steadfast desire and readiness to make any sacrifice necessary to perpetuate the philosophy of the individual dignity of man and reverence for God, for our beloved Nation in a safe and sound world of enduring peace. Dedicate bespeaks loyalty and love. We have cause to outmatch and outrun the Communist dedication.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Appendix

Inspection of the Combined Arms School of the 7th Army Training Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, last November while on a Reserve officers tour of duty with other Members of Congress, I had the pleasure of inspecting the Combined Arms School of the 7th Army Training Center. This school, under the training center command of Brig. Gen. Edwin H. Burba, is operated by Lt. Col. Carl G. Witte, assistant commandant, in Vilseck, Germany, near the Czechoslovakian border.

The itinerary afforded an excellent opportunity to observe field exercises of the combat arms which stressed realistic tactical conditions, leadership training, and teamwork within and between the arms. A tour of the academic facilities disclosed a remarkably high degree of ability on the part of the staff and faculty. The efficient planning, conduct, high standards, and excellent quality of instruction proved to be an exceptional example of the formal military training program in Europe. It is a recognizable fact that the Combined Arms School, as part of the 7th Army Training Center, plays a very important role in the readiness mission of the 7th Army.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD some remarks I have prepared on my inspection of this fine service school.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THURMOND

The Combined Arms School, as it is known today, was originally the Tank Training Center of the U.S. Constabulary. Established as a school in 1948, its primary mission was to train the personnel of the Constabulary to accomplish border surveillance duties. The 7th Army commander, realizing the shortage of well-trained personnel during the transitional period following the war, directed that the school be expanded to include training for all armor personnel. As a result, in 1951 the U.S. Constabulary School was redesignated the 7th Army Tank Training Center and again in 1958 was renamed the Combined Arms School in consonance with the addition to the curriculum of training that applied to all arms.

The mission of the Combined Arms School is threefold in nature and accomplishes the following:

1. Prepare and conduct instruction in communications, gunnery, small unit tactics, wheeled and tracked vehicle maintenance, and chemical, biological and radiological warfare, reflecting the latest Department of the Army doctrine, as applicable to the needs in Europe and foreign students.

2. Conduct studies, experiments, and tests for the purpose of developing the capabilities of equipment and supplies, and adapting existing doctrine and techniques to requirements peculiar to 7th Army operations.

3. Control, operate, and maintain live fire combat ranges for armor, artillery, infantry, and engineer units.

In accomplishing the primary mission, the Combined Arms School's curriculum includes courses for the advanced armor crewman, the turret mechanic, reconnaissance leader, track vehicle mechanic, motor officer, motor sergeant, chemical, biological and radiological courses for officers and noncommissioned officers, and special courses that are conducted relative to new equipment. These courses vary in length from 2 to 6 weeks and are programed to graduate in the vicinity of 3,200 students per year.

In addition to these courses the school also conducts classes and special training for units that come to the training center for field work on a request basis in over 200 related subjects. Since its inception, the Combined Arm Shcool has graduated over 30,000 officer and enlisted students in programed classes and 103,000 in the nonprogramed field.

Tactical training on combat ranges consists of small unit live fires, day and night exercises which provide integrated, progressive training for infantry and armor units with support from mortar and artillery units.

The personnel of the staff and faculty are imbued with a special sense of responsibility toward the student and his unit in that they make certain he learns his required skills. To accomplish this, small group instruction and practical work or "hands on equipment" instruction is emphasized. Through these methods much individual attention can be given to the student thereby turning out an exceptionally high rate of successful graduates who have been rapidly taught and are trained so that they in turn can serve as instructors in their own units. This system gives unit commanders the highly trained specialists, supervisors, and leaders needed to fill the gaps in the trained personnel ranks of 7th Army and other NATO commanders.

The activities of the Combined Arms School are under constant observation by visiting military and civilian representatives. These visits are practically daily affairs and consist of representatives of many foreign countries as well as many senior commanders of our units in Europe. The school's methods of instruction are being emulated widely.

Of particular note, disclosed by this visit, was the sincere attitude of the instructors in the conduct of their duties. This fact was repeatedly reflected by the interest and attention of the students to the instruction. The school undoubtedly is an outstanding model for military schools of this type and should be considered a pattern to follow by other military institutions of learning.

In addition to the normal functions of a school, the Combined Arms School is also conducting a searching study in methods of instruction in a constant endeavor to teach more to more students in less time. In this respect the school is now programing selected subjects for presentation by the teaching machine method.

The school's knowledge of educational psychology, coupled with their sense of urgency and the spirit of a crusader, is well worthy of our recognition.

Pioneers Grow Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABNER W. SIBAL
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of great satisfaction that I commend to this body an article written by Gene Shumate, and appearing in the Washington Daily News of May 4. It concerns a constituent of mine, Samuel F. Pryor, one of the senior vice presidents of Pan American Airways. By an interesting and pleasant coincidence, the president of that famous carrier, Juan T. Trippe, is also a constituent of mine.

Mr. Shumate writes about Pan Am's inaugural flight from New York to the Scandinavian countries last week, and of his pleasure in having Sam Pryor as his traveling companion.

PIONEERS GROW UP

(By Gene Shumate)

Pan American World Airways, with great success, pioneered the first American jet service from New York to Scandinavia the other day. I was along for a very enlightening ride.

This wasn't the first pioneering adventure for Pan American. This company, our leading flag carrier, has blazed trails over most of the aerial routes.

For instance, it first flew the old China Clippers over the Pacific, down the coast of South America, and today the firm is operating the Cape Canaveral space center for the Government with 5,000 space engineers helping get our first astronaut off the pad.

NOSTALGIA

All of the in-between stories bring Pan Am around in a full circle from old planes to space trips.

Remember those days of the China Clippers. They were seaplanes, and they plopped and plopped across the Pacific. Once in a while the pilots had bad luck and ripped the bottom out of their plane.

Later came the Japanese in World War II. The last people out of Hong Kong, evacuating Americans home, were Pan Am pilots.

I couldn't help thinking of all this the other day as we whisked across the Atlantic at 580 miles an hour.

I couldn't forget either how Lindbergh and his wife, in a single-engine Lockheed, pioneered the polar route from Washington to Japan on behalf of Pan Am.

TRIPMATE

Along on the trip with me was Sam Pryor, a vice president of Pan Am.

This old World War I Marine Corps pilot is today a combination secretary of state

and secretary of health, education, and welfare for Pan Am.

He's also a sophisticated rubberneck.

In Helsinki, Sam did more good for American-Finnish relations than can easily be imagined. The Finns loved him.

He's slight of build, with bushy eyebrows, a strong chin, and a gab that will melt most anybody.

Helsinki, he said, was not only a new stop for our flag carrier; the stop meant money for Finland and his line—he didn't equivocate about that—but it also meant that two nations that had reason to resist the Russians were closer by many hours.

FELLOWSHIP

Along also on the trip were some Hawaiians. The Finns reacted wonderfully to them.

Elbowing and squeezing, a hundred or more Finns squeezed around the Hawaiians who were singing. Soon, at least 16 Helsinki policeman came to break up the demonstration.

On the way home from Helsinki, Sam slumped back in his chair. If he was tired he didn't look like it.

After a few days rest in New York and Washington, he was set to shove off again for Europe for Pan Am.

The story he was carrying was Pan Am, a competent private company, and Pan Am, our No. 1 flag carrier overseas.

Collins Off to Fine Start as Head of National Association of Broadcasters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, former Gov. Leroy Collins, the new president of the National Association of Broadcasters celebrated his new assignment with a speech that should be welcomed by thoughtful Americans everywhere.

He called on the TV and radio industry to do these things:

First, take sides on hot issues and editorially shape society.

Second, provide more blue-ribbon programing on the networks in the evening.

Third, have less regard for the sacred rating systems that have destroyed so many excellent programs.

In an appraisal of Collins speech critic Jack Gould, of the New York Times, properly notes that Collins has not given adequate attention to some of the excellent programs the networks are in fact showing.

The Gould appraisal is so perceptive, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RADIO-TV—COLLINS ENTERS NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS LISTS—TALK BY BROADCASTERS' LEADER IS ASSESSED

(By Jack Gould)

The National Association of Broadcasters is a study of puzzlement tonight: it does not quite know what to make of its new president, LeRoy Collins, former Governor of Florida. The members are going to live with him; they just wonder if the experience is going to be a little like falling in love with the Federal Communications Commission.

In his maiden address to the full membership of the trade organization, the soft-spoken southerner illustrated one of his points by disagreeing with the traditional admonition to the darling daughter. This was a time, he said, when it was not enough to hang one's clothes on the hickory limb; to swim properly it is necessary to get wet.

By the time Mr. Collins had finished, the rank and file of the National Association of Broadcasters realized they had engaged a formidable diving instructor, not a beachcomber.

Mr. Collins said that the broadcasters should stand up, take sides on the hot issues of the day and editorially help to shape society, a thought that traditionally has left most station owners monumentally skittish.

He called upon the three networks to cooperate on a plan for substantially more "blue-ribbon programing" in the evening. He vigorously denounced the sacred rating systems as statistical poppycock. Point by point, he ticked off what he felt were the requisites to make broadcasting a noble profession and not a coast-to-coast supermarket.

In tone and fervor it was a remarkable speech, in part because the level of its prose was so far above the norm for TV's high brass. It was also a courageous and heartening display; it is not every day that the head of a trade organization, normally preoccupied with lobbying for the status quo, charts a program that potentially steps on the toes of many who pay his salary.

In broad outline there can be no question that Mr. Collins was dead right. Television has stood in need of vigorous leadership and stimulation and one of the jobs of the head of the National Association of Broadcasters should be to point the way.

But in one respect Mr. Collins' speech was somewhat disappointing. His generalizations about more blue-ribbon programing have their place, but the time would seem to have come to spell out his plan much more specifically. Actually, the networks are not so bereft of worthwhile fare as his remarks might imply and some of their schedules next fall will show further improvement.

If the full effectiveness of his leadership and inspiration are to be realized, an intimate familiarity with what is actually on the air is extremely important. The broadcasting industry will be more inclined to cooperate if the most prominent critic within the industry recognizes more generously not only what they should do but also what they are doing.

Mr. Collins' assault on ratings was especially welcome in the depressing environment of the National Association of Broadcasters' convention. He placed principal stress on the question of the accuracy of the ratings, a point upon which he will receive arguments for the duration of his administration. But in the larger sense his emphasis was telling and superbly pertinent.

The competion between the networks, as reflected in concern over ratings here at the convention, is reaching an intensity that is often distasteful. In some quarters of the industry there is a calculated policy of disparagement of a rival's wares and efforts that is simply childish.

When one hears the scuttlebut in corridors about campaigns to win this or that award one cannot be blamed for concluding that most of TV's publicized honors are chosen on the basis of pure politics, not merit. The normal zeal to toot one's own horn is giving away to cheap pettiness at a competitor's expense. Even the magnificent pooled coverage of the space flight has been tarnished by partisan claims of superiority.

The current trend of many in TV, though not all, to tear down the rest of the industry's house for purposes of fleeting strategic advantage made Mr. Collins' espousal of true professional behavior seem like a breath of fresh air.

Will Democratic Apathy Defeat Move To Make the Lafayette Square Opera House a Living Memorial Symbolic of the Spirit Which Has Always United America and Germany in Spite of All Storms and Years of War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, a German-language newspaper, the Washington (D.C.) Journal reported on May 5:

During the past weeks talks had been conducted in the congressional office rooms and in the cultural department of the German Embassy, which proved that the project (to restore the old Lafayette Square Opera House in the Nation's Capital as the Beethoven Opera House and as a living memorial to the friendship which unites Germany and the United States in spite of all storms and years of war), which is especially close to the hearts of all Washingtonians, is also of great interest to the German authorities.

This seems to me to be an especially meritorious project, and it is my hope that the familiar Democratic apathy toward the arts will not strangle it in official redtape or smother it with less worthy plans to destroy this great structure in order to build a Federal court building, which could better be located elsewhere.

Only last year the President introduced a bill, S. 3280, to restore the Lafayette Square Opera House, which David Belasco once owned, as a civic theater.

It can be expected that the President, who is known as a great student of our history, will look with approval on the conversion of the Lafayette Square Opera House to the Beethoven Opera House. Certainly he would have strong support from the Republican side of the aisle in such an historic development.

I include as part of my remarks the article from the Washington Journal which has been translated for me by the Library of Congress:

WILL BELASCO THEATER BECOME "BEETHOVEN OPERA HOUSE"?—GERMAN INTEREST IN THE RESTORATION OF THE OLD THEATER ON LAFAYETTE SQUARE—ONE-HALF MILLION DOLLARS NEEDED

During the past week talks had been conducted in the congressional office rooms and in the cultural department of the German Embassy, which proved that the project, which is especially close to the hearts of all Washingtonians, is also of great interest to the German authorities. Other European countries, among them Italy and the Netherlands, in the past years expressed their gratitude to the United States for its active postwar assistance, by donating representative gifts to the American Federal Capital. With-

in the Federal Republic, the desire to give a lasting token of this gratitude in a suitable form, has been repeatedly expressed. Now a project is being considered, which has a special symbolic significance.

For years a struggle of prominent citizens and numerous organizations of Washington has been going on to preserve historical buildings on Lafayette Square, that park in front of the White House which, among other things, honors such revolutionary generals as Friedrich Wilhelm von Steuben and Thaddeus Kosciuszko. One of the buildings which are threatened to be torn down by the renewal plans of certain ambitious circles, is the old Belasco Theater which, since 1940, has been used for other purposes. Today it serves as a USO soldiers home. From 1895 to 1940, this chamber theater was one of the few cultural centers of our Capital City and generations of Washingtonians experienced unforgettable artistic adventures in its cozy rooms. To be sure, the theater is not large, but is it not a fact, that it is the small opera houses and stages of Europe that belong to the jewels, to those places where one can make music, sing and spin yarns without enormous costs?

BEETHOVEN OPERA HOUSE IN THE FEDERAL CAPITAL

Well, German circles now think not only of rescuing this Washington theater from destruction (in which task they will need an active support of uncounted citizen's associations of Washington and the whole country), but also of its restoration and, while preserving the traditional frame, of converting it into a snug opera house for our city. The name of Ludwig von Beethoven would suit more than any other to symbolize what had always united America and Germany in spite of all storms and years of war.

We have learned from the circles which are interested in the preservation of the theater, that the total cost of the restoration of the Belasco Theater would amount to about $500,000—DM2 million. Recently, the Federal Republic offered DM1 million for the preservation of the Nubian Temple of Kalabasha in Egypt. In spite of all savings appeals to all free governments, those in Bonn know that cultural needs require sacrifices which are never spent needlessly. Perhaps, a part of these expenses could be meet from contributions by those industrial enterprises and institutions which were able to regain their world importance with the aid of the Marshall plan money. In this way, the gift would not be just a Government matter, but an expression of gratitude of the German people. Congressman CARROLL D. KEARNS, Republican of Pennsylvania, who was quite happy to learn about these plans and who, together with his Democratic and Republican colleagues has taken the stand for the preservation of the buildings on Lafayette Square, told us that a European country could hardly select a better form of the expression of its gratitude to America, than this contribution to the cultural life of the capital city. In the meantime, Mr. KEARNS and Congressman HARRIS B. MCDOWELL, Democrat of Delaware, together with other representatives of the population, continue their campaign for the preservation of the Belasco Theater (which, by the way, has received its name from the unforgettable manager David Belasco), because the original idea of rescuing the theater through the initiative of the American citizens has not been given up. It is possible, however, that an initiative from Bonn will precede these endeavors, and erect a lasting cultural memorial in Washington, in the spirit of American-German friendship.

Preservation of Indiana Dunes Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on May 3, for six other Senators and myself, I introduced S. 1797, a bill to preserve for the people portions of the priceless recreation area and geologic and botanical wonderland known as the Indiana Dunes. This bill and the next few months will provide what is perhaps our final opportunity to protect from thoughtless destruction the little that remains of this irreplaceable natural heritage.

It is gratifying to note the increased support which is building for our purpose. In addition to the great conservation groups which have been our allies for some time, elected officials in Indiana are now urging that the proposed lakeport and terminal facilities be located at an Indiana site other than Burns Ditch. They say, as others of us have said, that it would be senseless to destroy the dunes for the sake of a harbor at Burns Ditch, because putting a harbor there would serve only the narrow interests of one big corporation. The economic interests of Indiana will be better served—and an important part of the dunes will be saved—these Indiana officials say, by putting the harbor at another site more accessible to many Indiana industries.

Another new statement of support for saving the dunes has come from the New York Times, which, in a May 4, 1961, editorial, asked the people of Indiana to demonstrate that "vision and understanding" which would "reject the cold cash advantages of wrecking the dunes today, in favor of the long-term benefit of a unique scenic and recreational area of great value for tomorrow and all time." I ask unanimous consent that this New York Times editorial be printed following these remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DUNES AGAINST DOLLARS

We cannot quarrel with the ambitions of Indiana to have a deepwater port and to expand industrially with the growing commerce on the Great Lakes induced by the St. Lawrence Seaway.

But we can and do quarrel with the dredging plans of the Army Corps of Engineers and the Indiana Port Authority, which would hopelessly destroy the unique Indiana Dunes area, proposed by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS and other Members of Congress for permanent preservation as a national monument.

Alternative plans have been offered; but the Engineers say the evidence is all in favor of spending $80 million for terminal facilities at a site which would split and devastate the remaining unspoiled area of dunes wonderland located a figurative stone's throw from Chicago. Engineers can cite cost figures with an air of ominous finality and doubtless they will do so at the current hearings on the project in Indianapolis.

It is difficult to balance the intangible values of fresh air, clean beach and natural beauty at the doorstep of a great metropolitan area against the cost-benefit ratios of the Engineers. But if the people of Indiana have vision and understanding, they will reject the apparent cold cash advantages of wrecking the dunes today, in favor of the long-term benefit of a unique scenic and recreational area of great value for tomorrow and all time.

Cuba and Laos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial by H. B. Snyder, publisher of the Gary (Ind.), Post-Tribune, sets out some practical and constructive thoughts on our international situation in Cuba and Laos.

The same should be read by all Members of Congress:

As this is written there is a provisional cease-fire in Laos, but there is no peace in Laos.

An abortive invasion has been crushed in Cuba, but there is no peace in Cuba.

There is a continuing attempt for coalition government in the Congo, but there is no peace in the Congo.

At the moment of writing there was no war in any of those places. There was an absence of war, that is, in the sense that men were not dying in the battle lines—though some died before firing squads and some in intertribal and interparty bloodletting.

But there definitely was not and is not peace. In a very real sense the whole world is at war. The war is for men's minds and for men's souls and for men's lands and the way men live and the way their children and their children's children shall live for generations.

It has been called a cold war, and it is, in the sense that bombs are not dropping, except sporadically, and that guns are not firing, except intermittently. But the danger in that phrase is in thinking that it is not a real war, in thinking it is not a war to the death.

The important difference between this cold war and the wars the world has known is that for the time being the weapons of potential world annihilation possessed by both of the major camps are held in check.

The important similarity between this cold war and the other wars in this century of total wars, a similarity which is too often overlooked by our side—is that issues in it are not settled by polite negotiation, but by the application of strength.

We can negotiate with the Kremlin, as we have, and in such negotiations see Czechoslovakia and Hungary, North Korea and the Chinese mainland pass into the Communist orbit.

The British and the French tried that kind of negotiations with another land-

hungry, man-hungry totalitarian regime less than 25 years ago and finally learned on a long, hard road that it wouldn't work. It is working no better now and can't work.

And that's why it is necessary for those on our side, and particularly for those of us in the United States—both the people and its leaders—to realize the similarity between our cold war and any other war, the fact that nothing can win but strength.

What strength is needed?

The strength of continued nuclear power, of increased space power, certainly.

The strength of troops in readiness, more troops that we now have in readiness, and troops who are thoroughly trained in guerrilla warfare.

The strength to help build up anti-Communist forces in the various threatened areas into effective guerrilla bands, and to keep those guerrillas continually supplied and conscious of strong backing.

The industrial strength to produce and the willingness to turn that strength away, when needed, from production of mere home consumer goods.

The economic strength to help those nations of lesser opportunity to raise their standards of living to the point they will be glad to be on our side, the side of freedom.

The moral and intellectual strength to teach and to guide, not in a spirit of intellectual superiority or in the comfort of an air conditioned classroom, but by working with real sympathy among people eager to learn but resentful of an attitude of white superiority which they have come to hate.

The strength of patience, not patient listening to Soviet rantings, but the patience of really learning the needs and the aspirations of the new peoples from the bush-roots up and learning the complexities of their languages and traditions so that they can be guided to the lives they want in an image they have come to know.

What would such strength cost?

Sacrifice, no doubt.

Sacrifice by our youth who very probably would have to spend more time in more numbers in the armed forces.

Sacrifice by the mothers, wives, and sweethearts of those same youths.

Sacrifice by the specially educated who would be asked to go to less lucrative jobs in order to work with the people of the new nations whom we want as our allies.

Sacrifice by business and by individuals in the form of new taxes, very possibly heavy new taxes.

Sacrifice by industry and by consumers in the terms of frills that most of us have come to regard as necessities.

Sacrifice by workers, unionized and not, perhaps, of increased pay and easier hours and sacrifice by industry of more certain and increased profits.

We doubt if we have named all the strengths required or all the sacrifices which might be required to obtain those strengths. We doubt if we know the full need or the full price.

But the question arises: Would the American people be willing to pay the price?

Perhaps on the basis of present information they might not, certainly would not without loud complaint.

But if the proper leadership—the President and his advisers who are in a position to know—would speak out we think they would be willing.

Granted, it is easier to stir a nation to sacrifice when bombs are falling, when its sons are dying, when the danger is as obvious as it is real.

But we are in a war now.

It is up to the President to impress that fact on the people. It is up to the people to realize and face that fact.

It probably will not be a short war. In some ways it will be easier than a shooting war—which we hope it does not become—but in other ways it will be harder. It is harder to sacrifice when that sacrifice is not stirred by actual killing.

But we believe it is necessary for our diplomats to realize that it is not a war which can be won in negotiations unless those negotiations are backed by very real strength; for our generals to realize that that very real strength must be built up and kept in readiness; for the people to realize that victory can be won and liberty preserved only through sacrifice.

We believe that it is up to the President to bring this realization to the people.

We believe that once they realize it, the people will be willing to do their part.

Democracy Under the Guns of Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, our Nation is in a conflict of ideologies and many ask themselves can a democracy survive and retain the freedoms that we enjoy under our Government.

There are many who believe that the only way we can survive as a Nation is to give more power to the executive branch of the Government, so that necessary actions may be taken more quickly in order to cope with the decision-making ability of a totalitarian state. There are many dangers involved in giving the executive branch of the Government absolute authority to make hasty decisions without recourse to the people.

We are a representative Government, and therefore, it is essential that the Congress, which is the representative branch of the Government, maintain its position as the direct voice of the people.

Roy Roberts, one of the outstanding students of government and editor of the Kansas City Star, wrote an article "Democracy Under the Guns of Cold War," which appeared in the Sunday, May 7, issue of that publication, and I recommend it for thoughtful study.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOCRACY UNDER THE GUNS OF COLD WAR
(By Roy Roberts)

More than once democracy, with its inefficiency, has shown that it can win a shooting war, even against the most ruthless dictatorship.

But can democracy with all its peacetime checks and balances, its delays and its lack of protective secrecy, win the deadly cold war that is making the history of the mid-20th century?

The obvious answer: Yes. Undoubtedly democracy can and will muddle through somehow. But the United States must admit, as its leaders have pointed out, that the perils confronted today and to be confronted for many tomorrows are in fact greater than those of the battlefield. Is the present mechanism of our democracy best constituted to meet the new, grave challenge of peace that is not peace?

Many students of government and world issues have their doubts. There is a growing belief that a genuine reexamination of our governmental structure is necessary, if the United States is to counter the drive of the Communists for total domination. They suggest that such a reexamination may be as essential to the Nation's future as building military defenses, voting billions for aid, shoring up foreign policy and hastening into outer space.

Basically, the argument boils down to this:

The American constitutional structure was built in the days of an agrarian society, when the principal concerns of government were purely domestic. Only to a limited degree did international problems intrude on the thinking of the Founding Fathers.

So there was a system of effective if clumsy checks and balances, designed primarily to keep the executive or either of the other branches of Government from becoming too powerful.

The system worked and with amazing effectiveness. It brought the United States to an unprecedented level of greatness. Never before had the mind of man devised so vital a principle of government.

But times and the world have changed. And it may be necessary to verge on political heresy by suggesting that some changes in the American democratic system may now be imperative. Today our international concerns overshadow our national problems, as great as they may be. Today, we live on a globe in the ferment of revolution.

Pinned down, almost any national leader would admit that there is validity in the argument for national reexamination. Privately there is much talk of relieving the President of some of his burdens, of streamlining the mechanism of democracy. But it is regarded as political poison to get out in front in this area. There is philosophical discussion, usually in private. Then the business of government, of politics, of life goes on in the old-fashioned way.

In 1961, however, the world picture grows increasingly darker. New and critical decisions face Government each day, each hour. Can the United States afford to pursue the old ways? There seems to be more, and timely, discussion of this question than at any time in the past.

Indirectly, President Kennedy was dealing with this overall problem in his recent speech to the American Newspaper-Publishers Association. Bluntly, he outlined the dangers of the cold war, dangers greater than those of shooting war.

"No war ever posed a greater threat to our security," he said.

Candidly, he urged the press, television, radio and other media to accept more responsibility by suppressing stories that might conceivably give valuable information to the enemy.

Because the question raised by the President may provide the initial reappraisal of democracy fighting a cold war, we mention it first. Already leaders of the press have accepted Mr. Kennedy's challenge. This week they will confer with him on the problems of a free press in a moment of great world crisis.

We may note, certainly, that freedom of information is an essential of democracy. It is one of our cherished heritages. That it should be discussed by the President in such a manner is a measure of the new menace of the cold war. If we were trading bullets with the enemy, there would be no problem. There would be precedents from the past to guide us. When a national emergency is officially declared, the powers of the Presidency are immensely strengthened. Numerous special laws, on the statute books, come into force. In a sense, the President

becomes as powerful as a dictator for the duration of the emergency.

In shooting war, too, censorship may evolve from two sources. It may be imposed by the Government. Or it may be voluntary. Self-imposed censorship is apparently what Mr. Kennedy seeks in this nonshooting war—a voluntary self-discipline by all the news media.

Such discipline can be attained and direct Government censorship avoided, as it was in World War II, if the occasion demands. But pressed to an unwise extreme, it could also mean the withholding of information to which the public is entitled, and which is essential for the development of enlightened public opinion.

Certainly the voluntary censorship of World War II was one of the great achievements of democracy. It reflected credit on the press and radio—there was no TV then.

Leaders of Government, of the military and of the press set up the codes, and they were self-enforced. Now and then the codes were changed with the changing military situation. But they worked so well that there was no suggestion of formal censorship.

It was a great example of democracy in action, meeting one of its problems effectively. But it was an example of wartime.

Could similar codes of self-discipline be imposed in time of peace, even though it is a peace in which the world is divided into menacing and armed camps?

The problem of cold-war censorship is mentioned as a typical example of the problems of democracy in these changing times. There are, of course, many other crucial areas where Government and the Nation must take a long look. We suggest, however, that there are three major areas for reexamination:

The office of the Presidency itself.

The organization of the executive branch.

The relationship between the Executive and Congress.

Let's look at the Presidency. And here we are thinking of the office in the abstract, not as occupied by John F. Kennedy or any incumbent of the moment. For years, there have been urgent conversations about the need for removing some of the crushing workload from the Chief Executive. Little if anything has ever been done about it.

Yet the writer of this editorial, on a recent trip to Washington, was impressed particularly by one fact of life in the White House: The great and time-consuming demands that the Nation makes of its Chief Executive.

How in the world, you wonder, does Mr. Kennedy find time simply to think?

When, in the silence of his office, can he meditate on the forces of the world and reach the momentous decisions that must be made by him and him alone?

For a President—whoever he may be—is at once Chief of State, his own premier, leader of his Nation and leader of his political party. This thought is not original, of course. But look at the burden carried by the President as he wears his several hats:

As Chief of State he must meet all visiting foreign potentates, from the smallest and mightiest of nations. Trips to the airport, formal dinners, receptions take countless hours—usually given to smalltalk. The vital conversations take place in short, private conferences.

As Premier, the President must run the vast executive department of the Government. A multitude of details fills his every moment. He must be available to Cabinet officers, to agency heads. He must maintain his contacts with congressional leaders or he will lose his hold on Capitol Hill.

As leader of the Nation, the President must provide a program and must be concerned with every aspect of national life.

As political leader, he must open the baseball season, greet delegations, and make many speeches. He must attend this function or that. The American people expect all this of him. If he fails, he slips politically. And a President without the country behind him cannot furnish leadership.

Yet our world, today, is on fire. How can one human being, as endless as his energy may seem, do all that is expected of the President—and still think through the vital decisions that affect our very survival?

There have been, in the cold war, many suggestions for giving the President more authority, for permitting him to act with greater celerity, and greater secrecy in matters of world policy. But what new powers? And what routine details will be removed from his daily agenda to give him more time to function as a true leader? It is easy to suggest the advisable changes; but it is not so simple as it sounds. Yet the Star believes that some changes in the machinery of government are imperative to meet the relentless threat of communism.

Obviously, the President himself should not be burdened with the task of reexamination. That would simply add to his man-killing schedule. The Star suggests that there are three men in the United States who are eminently qualified to make suggestions on the Presidency today. We refer to the three former Presidents, Mr. Hoover, Mr. Truman, and General Eisenhower.

Here we have three men who have experienced the rigors of the White House. Yet they are otherwise very different men, different in personality and methods of operation.

Mr. Hoover is recognized as a close student of Government organization. The two Hoover committees have served the Nation admirably.

Mr. Truman is known as a scholar of the Presidency, its power and traditions. The Truman Library at Independence is a veritable storehouse of White House lore and it is becoming more important every day.

General Eisenhower served as President through 8 years of cold war. In office, he himself tried two methods. First, delegating power to his staff, then assuming more personal leadership.

The Star believes that these three former Presidents, if their views should be brought into focus, could make a valuable and lasting contribution to their Nation.

We doubt that Mr. Kennedy himself should guide this grand reappraisal. But Vice President Lyndon Johnson, between his many diplomatic trips for the President, would be the ideal man to coordinate the efforts of the three former Presidents. He has had many years of experience in the legislative branch and has learned, in a short time, a great deal on the problems of the Presidency. He knows the ins and outs of government. And he knows, we imagine, how to deal with three such diverse men as Mr. Hoover, Mr. Truman, and General Eisenhower.

The second area for reexamination is the whole executive branch. The need was dramatized by the recent Cuban fiasco and the role of the Central Intelligence Agency. Its effectiveness and its relationship to the Presidency have been questioned. In the U–2 incident and in the post mortem on Cuba, General Eisenhower, and Mr. Kennedy have taken personal responsibility for events with which they possibly had little to do.

The CIA is the most secret agency in our constitutional system. In a manner of speaking, it has simply mushroomed since World War II, a peacetime carryover of an essential wartime agency. After Cuba such a reexamination or study is being made under the direction of Gen. Maxwell Taylor.

We hear the suggestion, for example, that the agency should be confined to the gathering and evaluation of intelligence. That was its original purpose. It did and must involve some espionage, of course, as distasteful as the thought may be to a democracy.

It has been suggested, too, that the "paramilitary" end of the Central Intelligence Agency operation should be turned over to some other agency. "Paramilitary" is a polite term for the guttertype operations that involve demonstrations and counterdemonstrations and other subversive work. It may lead to the sparking of counter-revolutions. It is dirty work and abhorrent to our system.

But it becomes more apparent every day that we are going to have to get down into the gutter and fight the Communists with their own subversive tactics. In this paramilitary phase of cold war, the United States has been a sitting pigeon for the Reds. The Nation has been on the defensive, constantly. And nations don't win wars, hot or cold, on the defensive.

Obviously, if the United States is to undertake this type of operation it must do so without retreating from its humanitarian principles of justice and freedom. On those principles, this Nation would like to see the world build. The Communists pay only lip-service to them, at most. They are not bound by the rules of decent conduct and high motivation that bind a democracy. Democracy must find ways to overcome its operational handicap.

We cite the present appraisal of the CIA operation as an example of the problems that have grown up in the executive branch.

The third basic area for democracy's self-examination lies in the relationship between Congress and the executive branch. Again the Nation must consider the vast changes that have taken place since this relationship was originally outlined in the Constitution. More than 40 years ago the writer of this editorial was covering Congress from the press galleries. There have been a few changes since. But the fundamental operation has hardly been altered.

There are countless examples of the anachronistic ways of Congress and of its time-wasting relationship with the executive branch. Let's consider one, and follow a foreign aid proposal through the Capitol Hill corridors.

First there is the presidential message. Then the authorization bill, with hearings in one house, then the other, leading up to final action. Each house calls the same top officials, from Defense, State or other departments, and asks, in effect, the same questions.

Then, after the authorization, the appropriation bill is considered. Again, hearings before the money-approving committees, more questions of the same officials.

We could not guess at the lost hours in this whole process, hours devoted to repetition and hearings and rehearings. Now certainly no one would strip Congress of its power to question or to investigate. No one would suggest that the lawmakers should relinquish even slightly their control over the purse strings. That control has been a constantly restraining hand on the executive. It is a proper and essential force in our democracy.

Because of that zealously guarded power over the purse strings, Congress has shunned long-term money commitments.

Not one but several of the Kennedy administration officials have said, privately, that because they have had to spend so much time on the Hill, it has been much more difficult to organize the departments. The hearings don't last forever, of course, although to a weary Cabinet official it must seem that they do. Eventually there is final action on the bills. But obviously this intricate relationship between Congress and the executive branch slows the machinery of government and hampers the ability to make decisions and to follow through.

A genuine streamlining of the legislative process, we believe, might provide some intelligent and time-preserving shortcuts. Again, we return to Vice President JOHNSON as the man qualified to consider the problems of government from the viewpoint of both executive and legislative branches.

More combined Senate-House hearings might be considered, for example. Such combined hearings were held in World War II. The system worked. But when the battlefield pressures ended, combined hearings were abandoned.

More long-term commitments, particularly in the foreign aid field, might strengthen the cold war counteroffensive.

We recognize that this is a sensitive field. Congress is a private club jealous of its prerogatives. It has not and will not change easily. But the Star believes that Congress itself should make its own contribution toward improving the efficiency of democracy for the long cold war.

There you have the case. We suggest that it is fundamental to the Nation's future.

As a nation, we speak of greatness, and we are great. We talk of efficiency, and we are efficient.

But our aspirations to greatness, our goals of efficiency can be expressed only through Government. Our hopes for cold war victory—indeed, for survival—can be fulfilled only through Government.

Thus it is for Government and for the people to look seriously at democracy, to assess its mechanism in the light of new and relentless world forces. It is for the Nation to determine whether it is best equipped to meet the pressures of communism that has world conquest as its goal.

Frankly we believe this process of reexamination is essential, not tomorrow, but now. It is as essential as devising new missiles, as building spaceships, as voting billions. Hard decisions must be made. For the United States must at all costs find the most efficient battle dress for democracy as it goes forth to wage cold war.

New President Learns Leading the Nation Isn't a Simple Matter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, with a bit of nervousness the Nation willingly heeds the admonition of former President Eisenhower to stand behind the new Chief Executive in this tense international situation.

However, there is concern about our position among other nations of the world and our allies in particular as the result of recent developments. This is a time for firmness and consistency.

This is ably pointed out by David Lawrence, noted columnist and publisher, in his recent syndicated column in the Washington Star.

His comments follow:

IT'S NOT SO SIMPLE, AFTER ALL—FIRMNESS, CONSISTENCY, EXPERIENCE SEEN AS SOLUTION TO GROWING CRISES

(By David Lawrence)

On the surface, it does look like there's another mess in Washington. But there's nothing really wrong here that wouldn't be cured by some consistency and firmness, plus a little more experience by President Kennedy.

Tens of thousands of words are poured out in Presidential messages. Task forces galore—composed of earnest-minded but often naive intellectuals—are running around here trying to spell out reforms in well-written phrases that read like the promise-all planks of the political platforms.

After 100 days in the White House, Mr. Kennedy, himself a well-meaning, conscientious young man, is finding out the hard way that National Government isn't so simple after all. He perhaps wishes he had not been so critical of the Eisenhower administration a few months ago and probably regrets the demagogery he put into those campaign speeches.

Nobody will deny that Mr. Kennedy has an almost superhuman job on his hands and needs every bit of sympathy and help that he can get. But he will not win cooperation by alibis attempting to shift responsibility to the press, nor by spending so much of his time at partisan political dinners or in conferences with political bosses while international crises in Laos, South Vietnam and Cuba worry the American people.

The President's speech in New York last week urging the press to be cooperative was well intentioned, but it has very little to do with the mess that arose in the handling of the Cuban invasion. For the press, after all, has been indoctrinated during most of the last 8 years by congressional committee studies and hearings to believe that "freedom of information" is paramount and that everything must be made available to the public. Members of Congress themselves have often given out military information they thought was important to the American people even though at the same time potential enemies of this country were unwittingly furnished some valuable data.

What is the remedy for this continuing depreciation of the United States? The first restraint will have to be imposed by members of Congress and the politicians upon themselves. They had a field day a year ago over the U–2 incident, and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's partisans even went so far as to publish a detailed report on the U–2 affair—an obviously secret operation in the "cold war." The formal report made joyful reading in Moscow.

The press, of course, will print what is visible or audible to people generally. Democratic Senators and Representatives who made speeches about our "missile gap" could not expect the press to refrain from publishing them—in fact, they sought such publicity even though it undermined the prestige of the United States at home and abroad. Rarely has any individual newspaper come up on its own with what might strictly be called military information that wasn't generally known.

Anyone who takes into account the large size of the Cuban exile group and the open operations of some of its leaders in Miami must realize that semipublic activities of this kind will be fully covered in the press and will be widely broadcast.

The Central Intelligence Agency is supposed to collect intelligence information, and it rarely makes anything available to the press. Whether it really knows what's going on abroad sometimes is difficult to establish, but nobody can quarrel with its desire for secrecy.

There's one important question to which the Kremlin wants the answer: Is the United States going to stand up for its rights and fight if necessary? To put it another way, is the real viewpoint of this Government expressed by the appeasers in our midst who go around telling the world we are licked on the issue of Red China's admission to the United Nations and might as well surrender? Defeatism of this kind does more harm than news stories of a dozen Cuban "invasions." All that Moscow wants to know today is whether the United States is bluffing on Berlin or Laos or Cuba.

There was no doubt left by President Eisenhower that America would defend Formosa. It was made clear that we would defend Quemoy and Matsu under certain circumstances. Mr. Kennedy during the campaign last year didn't help the cause by expressing opposition to a defense of Quemoy and Matsu. It was unwise then to broadcast such information to the Kremlin, because there was the possibility that, as President, Mr. Kennedy might face a decision on that very point. The press wasn't to blame for this dilemma, created to gain votes in a political campaign.

All in all, the press can help the cause of the United States by voluntarily suppressing news of weapons or gadgets or the mobilization of ships or airplanes or armies unless such movements have been officially announced. But the press can't help much in suppresing news about the administration when so many spokesmen are available from day to day to hint at changes in foreign policy that amount to a weakening of the U.S. position.

Nor does it seem to make much sense for the State Department to hold—as it did last week—two days of secret conferences with 250 American newspaper editors, including an off-the-record talk by President Kennedy himself, while a Communist newspaper was present and took notes which doubtless were being read in the Kremlin within 24 hours. The episode is explained as a mechanical error in making up the invitation list and the President was advised about it before he began speaking, but it was then too late to do anything without creating an international incident.

Sooner or later the mess in Washington will have to be cleaned up. It will be done when the number of cooks now making the broth is reduced considerably and some firm decisions are made by the President himself that are consistently maintained by deeds as well as words.

Kennedy Gives Brunswick Boy Heroism Medal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRIS FAIRCLOTH BLITCH
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, recently it was my honor and pleasure to have as my guest at the Capitol, Mr. Donald McGregor, of Brunswick, Ga., while he was in Washington to receive recognition for an outstanding feat of heroism off the Georgia coast.

It was Donnie McGregor who on July 20, 1959, rescued four persons from the Atlantic Ocean after their boat ran aground, turned over, and sank.

For his bravery, Donnie was awarded the Young American Medal for Bravery and the Carnegie Medal.

I am very proud of Donnie McGregor. Because the story of his brave deed means so much to the people of Georgia and to the Eighth Congressional District, which I represent, I wish to submit to my colleagues and friends the Associated Press report of his visit to Washington on March 24, 1961:

KENNEDY GIVES BRUNSWICK BOY HEROISM MEDAL

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy has presented a medal for heroism to a 16-year-old Georgia boy who saved four lives.

The President pinned the Young American Medal for Bravery on Donald Eugene McGregor, of Brunswick, at a ceremony at the White House. The tall crewcut youngster saved a family which was aboard a cabin sloop that went aground and broke up in a storm on the Georgia coast.

McGregor was guest of honor later at a luncheon given by Representative IRIS BLITCH, Democrat, of Georgia. Mrs. BLITCH presented him the Carnegie Hero Medal.

Attending were McGregor's parents, Mr. and Mrs. Ernest McGregor; his younger brother James, an uncle and aunt, Colonel and Mrs. Roland Linker of Petersburg, Va., and the Linkers' daughter, Dianne.

The family Donald saved also attended. They are Mr. and Mrs. Harold Clark of Jacksonville, Fla. and their children, Robin and Christine.

Senators RICHARD B. RUSSELL and HERMAN E. TALMADGE, of Georgia attended the White House award, and most of the members of the Georgia House delegation attended the luncheon.

McGregor's act of heroism occurred on July 20, 1959. He was on a fishing boat when he sighted the Clarks' cabin sloop aground and went on board to help them.

Rough seas turned the sloop over and the Clarks and McGregor decided to try for shore. All had lifejackets except Clark, who clung to a small cushion seat preserver.

Holding onto a small plastic float, with McGregor at the head of it, they made for Little Cumberland Island, about 3 miles away.

The group got within 200 feet of the beach after 3 hours in the water, but the current halted further progress, and Donald swam ashore for help. Running along the shore for several miles he came across a shrimp boat which radioed the Coast Guard for help and a Navy blimp was brought into the search.

Donald then went back to where he had left the Clarks. As the tide changed, the family had been able to make shore. Donald spelled out the word help on the beach with marsh grass, enabling the Navy blimp to locate them and direct the Coast Guard to their rescue.

The Young American Medal for Bravery was established by Congress in 1950. No more than two of the medals may be awarded each year. The other medal this year was awarded to Shirley Frances O'Neill, 20, of San Francisco, who pulled a swimming companion ashore after he was attacked by a shark.

Advantages of Routing More Naval Work to Commercial Shipyards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I have been increasingly concerned by the policies of the Department of Defense which permit the Government-owned, Government-operated naval shipyards to operate at fairly steady levels of activity while private commerical shipyards go out of business. This is Government competition in its purest form, and no other major industry in the United States is confronted with the same intensity of Federal competition. The absurdity of this situation is demonstrated by the fact that the Navy yards are immune from all forms of taxation and that their costs are higher than the private yards. In other words, tax-free Government facilities are excessively draining the Federal Treasury while tax-paying private shipyards are forced to curtail operations or go out of business.

Maritime Reporter magazine editorially asked on April 15, 1961, "How Much Longer Will the Navy Ignore the Facts." This editorial impressed me greatly. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD so that my colleagues will have an opportunity to consider this problem which has a damaging effect upon private industry.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Maritime Reporter, Apr. 15, 1961]

HOW MUCH LONGER WILL THE NAVY IGNORE THE FACTS

Any dispassionate examination of comparative production records for naval versus private shipbuilding and repair yards should convince the Navy's Bureau of Ships and the Armed Services Committees in both branches of Congress of the advantages of honest and vigorous action to route more naval work to commercial shipyards.

A recent objective study showed that during the 7-year period from 1953 through 1959, major private shipyards throughout the Nation built and delivered 415 ocean-going naval and merchant ships, repaired another 106,603 vessels, and converted 187 ships for a total value output of $9,674,293,000. The average yearly employment for this tremendous production was 74,875 workers.

In the same period, the 11 Government-owned and operated naval shipyards employed a yearly average of 104,393 men to produce only 16 new ships, repair about 5,700 vessels, and convert 120 ships at a total cast of $5,325,604,000. In other words, naval shipyards employed one-third more men to produce only a fraction of the tonnage turned out by the commercial yards.

In the event that a reader is preparing to argue that the Navy yards may have produced bigger and more complicated ships and therefore needed more men, we again refer to the study which shows that the 16 vessels built by the 104,393 workers in the Navy yards comprised two giant aircraft carriers, three atomic-powered submarines, four conventional submarines, two guided missile submarines, two fleet minesweepers, two coastal minesweepers, and one landing ship tank.

The 229 naval vessels built by the 74,875 workers in commercial yards included two sisterships to the giant aircraft carriers, five nuclear-powered submarines, five conventional submarines, an assortment of destroyers, cruisers, minesweepers, and all the other naval types. The cost figures, incidentally, do not include the tremendous loss when fire partially destroyed the aircraft carrier *Constellation* last December in the Navy's Brooklyn, N.Y., yard.

What the study boils down to is this: that private commercial shipyards can perform work on Navy ships at some $500 per displacement ton less than in naval yards. Last fall, Vice Adm. Ralph E. James, Chief of the Navy's Bureau of Ships, conceded that naval shipyards were wasting at least $95 million a year through inefficient management techniques.

President Kennedy has said that the public is entitled to the fullest values for its tax dollars. The study proves conclusively that one of the best ways to get this value is to build and repair naval ships in commercial yards.

Proposed Cape Cod National Seashore Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the proposal to establish a Cape Cod National Seashore Park has been under close consideration by Congress now for well over 18 months. The original bill, cosponsored by Senator Kennedy and myself in the 86th Congress, is now represented by a revised version, S. 857, cosponsored by my junior coleague from Massachusetts [Senator SMITH] and myself. Three separate sets of hearings have been held by both House and Senate subcommittees, and we believe that action on the measure is near at hand.

Both a front page box entitled "Some Facts About the Seashore That Seem to be Overlooked" and an editorial entitled "Your Homes Are Safe Within the Park," appeared in the May 4 edition of the Cape Codder, a weekly newspaper published in Orleans, on the lower cape, which has taken a forthright and articulate stand on the issue since it first developed. These articles are most helpful in explaining in clear terms the kind of protection which local communities and citizens will receive under the provisions of the proposed legislation. I ask unanimous consent that they both be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUR HOMES ARE SAFE WITHIN THE PARK

Homeowners within the boundaries of the proposed National Seashore Park may keep their houses forever if they choose to. They can bequeath these houses to their children or they can sell them to another individual without any interference at all from the Federal Government. The only qualification is that the towns cover these areas with adequate zoning regulations. The principles for such zoning have been made public by the Secretary of the Interior. Since the towns already have zoning codes which pretty much cover these requirements, this is really no qualification at all.

We feel a little silly in writing the above. But, for some reason, and despite the fact that it has been true ever since the original Saltonstall-Kennedy-Keith bill was drafted a year and a half ago, an amazing number of people do not know it or choose for some exotic reason not to believe it.

We had an irate telephone call last week from one reader who had seen a statement to this effect in the paper. We estimate that the same statement has appeared a couple of scores of times before. But, for some reason, this particular time it hit home. Was this person calling us filled with the joy of

discovery? Not at all. She simply did not believe it. She had read the bill and there was no such clause in it. We were liars and deliberately misleading our readers. She demanded that we retract the statement and apologize.

This is all very bewildering, to say the least. The principle is emblazoned upon the bill in unmistakable language, and we are asked to deny that it even exists. We are at a loss to explain this phenomenon. But it is obvious that somewhere along the line someone has failed to communicate. And others are so emotionally involved that they fail to look a fact in the face.

It was exactly because Cape Cod was an area different from any other ever considered by the National Park Service that Senator SALTONSTALL, the then-Senator Kennedy, and Representative HASTINGS KEITH developed the idea of suspending the power of condemnation of property so long as proper zoning requirements were met. This was a creative piece of legislation. On the one hand it recognized the area under consideration contained quite a number of homes owned by people who had no desire to be displaced. On the other, it realized that the Park Service was interested in keeping the area as it is, including the homes. The real purpose of the seashore is to stop further despoiling of the area and keep it in its present state for generations to come.

For the record, once again, the language which covers this principle is contained in section 4b, subsections 1 and 2, of the current version of S. 857. The wording is as follows:

"(b) 1. The Secretary's authority to acquire property by condemnation shall be suspended with respect to all improved property located within such area in all of the towns referred to in section 1 of this act for 1 year following the date of its enactment.

"2. Thereafter such authority shall be suspended with respect to all improved property located within such area in any one of such towns during all times when such town shall have in force and applicable to such property a duly adopted, valid zoning bylaw approved by the Secretary in accordance with the provisions of section 5 of this act."

It is true, of course, that owners of these homes within the park boundaries will not be able to subdivide their property, put up a motel, or otherwise change the character of the property as it now is. But live in it themselves, rent it, bequeath it to their children and their children's children * * * this they can do.

There may be some confusion in the fact that homeowners within the park will have alternative choices open to them. They may decide to sell outright to the Government. They may decide to sell and accept life tenancy on the property. Or, as we have recounted, they may obey the zoning requirements and continue to live as they are in peace and quiet.

The National Seashore is an emotional issue in these parts. Often in an emotionally charged situation people will see only what they want to see, refusing to be confused by the facts. Nevertheless, these are the facts, ma'am.

SOME FACTS ABOUT THE SEASHORE THAT SEEM TO BE OVERLOOKED

The Park Service is not taking your home. Many people seem still not to understand this but it is true. Current seashore park legislation provides specifically that people within the taking may keep their homes just as they are, provided that adequate zoning regulations are applied. Since, with minor exceptions, the towns already have these zoning codes, there are no ifs, and or buts—a man's home will still be his castle in the park area. We repeat: The Park Service cannot take your home. Those wishing to see this in black and white should read section 4b, subsections 1 and 2 of the bill, S. 857.

You can leave your house to your children. This, too, is true. If you live within the park area and decide not to negotiate with the Government, you are perfectly free to pass on your house to your children or anyone else. The thing to remember about the current legislation is that the choice has been put in your hands. You may negotiate with the Government for the sale of your home if you wish. Or you may decide to have nothing to do with the Park Service and live on as you always have. The decision is yours.

You can sell your house if you wish. Yes, you may sell your home to someone other than the Park Service. Or rent it, if you like. The only thing you cannot do is breach the zoning requirements. You may keep your home within the park area and carry on as before, but you may not change the character of the property. For example, you cannot change it from a residence to a commercial property.

Soil Stewardship Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. M. BLAINE PETERSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask the House to pause with me a few moments today to reflect upon the importance and significance of soil stewardship which is observed this year from May 7 through May 14.

Soil stewardship is simply our account to the Maker for the use we have made of His land.

This applies to all of us alike and not only to the man who cares for the large acreage; the home gardener is equally as responsible as the home developer. If our soil is destroyed and abused, our future generations are doomed.

The custom of giving special recognition to soil stewardship has been brought to prominence by the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts together with churchmen from several denominations. In 1955 they undertook the first national observance. A committee of churchmen from several denominations, working with an Association committee, develops each year appropriate materials which the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts prints and distributes to local districts and church groups throughout the country. These include booklets, programs, posters, and related materials.

Each spring, thousands of rural and urban churches, in cooperation with a local Soil Conservation District, devote time to recognition of the urgency of good stewardship of the land as a fundamental of moral and civic responsibility.

At the national meeting of the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts in Minneapolis in 1958, one of the outstanding features of the program at the annual banquet was an impressive stewardship ceremony written and presented by the Reverend E. W. Mueller, secretary, rural church program, National Lutheran Council. Entitled, "The Gift of Precious Soil," it included the presentation and blending of soil from each State of the Union. Subsequently, a tree was planted in this soil on the grounds of the Minnesota State Capitol.

Earlier mention of stewardship was made in the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts prayer written by Director W. F. Hall, of Sparta, Ga., during the fall meeting of the National Board of Directors held at Galveston, Tex., November 1955. It was given for the first time at a luncheon there.

On motion of Director Dave J. Doneen, seconded by Southeastern Area Vice President A. D. Holmes, the board voted to adopt this blessing officially and use it on all occasions when the board met together for breakfast, luncheon, or dinner.

It has since been used on numerous occasions by individual soil conservation districts and State associations at formal luncheons and banquets:

OUR PRAYER OF STEWARDSHIP

Our kind Heavenly Father, giver of all good gifts. As we partake of this food and drink, may be realize that You willed it so in the beginning. May we know that Thy promises are everlasting.

Give us wisdom, O Lord, that we may know Thy will; give us courage to do Thy will. Convince us that we really owe nothing, but that by Thy grace we are stewards of Thy many resources and that Thou dost rejoice in the service of a good and faithful steward.

As this food and drink restores our strength and energy may we render pleasing service to Thee. Help us to be worthy of Thy many blessings.

All of this we ask in Jesus' name. Amen.

Soil Stewardship Week is a modern version of Rogation Days. Observance of Rogation Days began centuries ago. In the observance, man has given thanks to Almighty God for His bountiful gifts.

Many thousands of people each year now are participating in soil stewardship and Rogation Day prayers in city, village, and open country churches.

"Rogation" comes from the Latin word "rogare" meaning "to ask." Rogation Day began at Vienne, France, in the year 470. It was a time of crop failure—due to earthquakes and bad weather. It was a time of hunger.

St. Mamertus, bishop of Vienne, ordered prayer and penance on the 3 days preceding the Ascension. The clergy and the people called upon God to help in their desperate need.

Other communities took up the custom, and from France it spread throughout the world. At the end of the eighth century the observance had been formally accepted by the church. It has been the custom to hold each year before Ascension Thursday a special rogation service.

On Rogation Days people implore the mercy of God that He may keep us from all evils of soul and body, and give to the plants of the field an increase. In the spring, when the fields are green and there is promise of a good harvest—but also the possibility of destruction by

frost, hail or rainstorm—prayers and processions have served as a reminder to feeble man to turn with humility and confidence to the Giver of all good. For, it is not the earth alone which brings forth fruit, nor is it alone on the busy hand of man that increase depends; but it is God who gives the increase.

Utah is equally conscious of the proper use of other vitally important natural resources like forests and ranges, fish and wildlife, minerals and petroleum. The vacationer who chooses Utah for his holiday has in store for him a breathtaking wealth of natural beauty.

Over 12 million acres of farmland are benefiting today in Utah from one or many of the practices sponsored by the Soil Conservation Service. We have five excellent watershed protection projects in my congressional district and the sixth lacks only congressional committee approval.

These accomplishments would not have been possible without the work of many dedicated people who pioneered the field of today's progress.

One such outstanding individual is Mr. A. R. Croft, a personal friend of mine for many years who was recently honored upon the completion of 30 years of distinguished work. The Salt Lake Tribune of May 1 gave such a fitting tribute to Mr. Croft that I feel it is worthy of your attention:

HE MENDS WATERSHEDS

The outstanding performance rating and cash award given A. R. Croft, watershed management specialist and hydrologist for the regional office of the U.S. Forest Service, Ogden, caps 30 years of distinguished work.

Mr. Croft's scientific treatises on erosion problems appear regularly in professional journals and he is in demand as a speaker before both laymen's and academic societies. Four years ago he received the Agriculture Department's Superior Service Award, recognizing among other things his work in establishing analytical criteria for and gaining public support for scientific watershed management.

Formerly a research forester for the Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station, Mr. Croft helped develop and improve the contour trenching system on the steep Davis and Box Elder Counties watersheds, a system now widely used throughout the Nation and abroad to prevent floods and mud-rock flows.

Through the work of Mr. Croft and other dedicated ecologists, the flood peril which has plagued Wasath Front communities since the turn of the century eventually may be eliminated.

However well the State of Utah and other States have heard and heeded the advice and direction of the conservationists, there is still much to be done. After all, our natural resources are a direct gift of the Almighty for which we will be required to give an accounting. It behooves all of us, therefore, to use them prudently and yet preserve them for our children.

Perhaps it is well for us to ponder the wisdom propounded in the so-called 11th Commandment which begins: "Thou shalt inherit the Holy Earth as a faithful steward, conserving its resources and productivity from generation to generation."

Expense Accounts and Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, reform of our Federal tax system is one of the most important and controversial issues this Congress will face. The present treatment of business expense accounts has been a longstanding source of inequality in our tax structure.

The President in his tax message of April 20, 1961, stated:

In recent years widespread abuses have developed through the use of the expense account. Too many firms and individuals have devised means of deducting too many personal living expenses as business expenses, thereby charging a large part of their cost to the Federal Government. Indeed, expense account living has become a byword in the American scene.

There may be differences of opinion over such matters as the proper degree of progressivity in the tax structure. However, all parties who are concerned with justice in the tax structure certainly ought to agree that those individuals with equal incomes should receive equal treatment under the tax laws. Individuals who abuse business expense accounts should not be permitted to avoid taxes and shift the tax revenue burden to those who must pay for personal entertainment out of their own pockets.

Mr. President, on Friday, May 5, the New York Times carried an excellent editorial supporting tax reform entitled "Expense Accounts and Taxes." This article deserves the attention of every Senator who is concerned about tax reform. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPENSE ACCOUNTS AND TAXES

The scandalous abuse of tax-deductible expense accounts is a well-known feature of American business life, but some of the extremes brought to public attention by Secretary of the Treasury Dillon in his testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee may have surprised even the most jaded tax evaders.

The administration merits support in its apparently determined effort to force those who wish to enjoy yachts and other expensive forms of entertainment to pay for them out of their own pockets, and not at the partial cost of the great majority of American taxpayers who must make up the revenue lost through the broad loopholes of present law. Expense-account living is not the only area to be attacked; there are many other special kinds of exemptions, such as the exaggerated depletion allowances enjoyed by producers of oil and other raw materials, that deserve reexamination and drastic revision.

Those who have defended the exceptions and the loopholes make essentially this argument: present rates of individual and corporate taxation are so high that they tend to reduce incentives for the exercise of talent and initiative, as well as for the assumption of capital risk. The loopholes are needed, it is contended, to make up for the disincentive effect of present tax rates.

The core of this argument, the need for incentive, cannot be dismissed. But its use to defend special privileges for some at the expense of the majority is wrong. The general impression of inequity created by the present extensive system of loopholes strikes at the basic confidence required for a workable tax system, a confidence that the system is really fair to all, to poor man and rich man.

A more sensible approach to the problems of equity and incentive would entail drastic reduction of loopholes that create unjustified special privileges for special groups, more vigorous use of excise or sales taxes on luxuries, with possibly a slight lowering of income taxes feasible as a result of the increased revenues thus obtained.

Operation Challenge II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, there is much talk of the failure of the regulatory agencies to perform the functions for which they were conceived because of the inefficient ways in which they operate. I have watched the work problems of the NLRB. It is a pleasure to point out at least one of our regulatory agencies has sought by modern management techniques to streamline its operating procedure to give fairer and more thorough service with dispatch. The General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, Mr. Stuart Rothman, has in short order dramatically and fairly reduced the time delays and backlog which had prevailed for many years in that Office, and has established Advisory Conferences on Administration at the local or regional level where it counts most. I have recently received a copy of a new program, Operation Challenge II, which the Office of the General Counsel has announced with the purpose of further improving the Office's performance in effectuating the policies of the act. I am inserting a copy of this program in the RECORD because I believe it deserves the attention of everyone who is interested in what an office can do to provide better public service:

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL,
April 12, 1961.

OPERATION CHALLENGE II

The best way to administrative betterment and improvement is through the process of continuous self-evaluation. In the Office of the General Counsel we have often said that we shall be our own severest critics. If, armed with the knowledge that we have of our own work, we have the capability to stand back and objectively evaluate it; if from time to time, we can set fire to our administrative imagination and conceive of new and better ways of realistically improving existing operations; and, if we

can make certain that these new ways are effectively translated into action; we have the ingredients of a successful operation.

From all reports, the Office's two previous programs, Operation 60 and Operation Challenge, were successful. Naturally, the question arises whether or not it would be desirable to undertake another management improvement program of major proportions with new emphasis and priorities, similar to Operation Challenge. The matter has been talked over in Washington and it is the consensus of the staff that the goal of high administrative and operating efficiency in the face of continuously rising caseloads would be substantially helped if we would undertake another well-defined improvement program, Operation Challenge II, by name.

We have learned much from our experience with Operation Challenge and Operation 60. Necessarily, the push and responsibility for these two programs had to come from Washington. Operation Challenge II, however, contemplates greater responsibility and participation by the field. This has certain advantages. The cooperation and integration of effort between Washington and the field will produce better overall results. It will mean a mutual sense of responsibility in Washington and the field by those who carry out the parts of the operation and permit increased delegation of authority at both levels.

Operation Challenge II, while keeping many of the programs and objectives of Operation Challenge, as indeed it must because of their continuing nature, will be based upon an increasing refinement of solutions to problems, some new and some chronic. Our Office's experience under Operation Challenge should help us tackle and solve these problems, and, we trust, enable use to progress even beyond the present high level of time and quality standards to which the latter has carried us. Operation Challenge II goes into some of the problem areas which, until now, we have been unable to deal with, as well as some in which much has already been done but in which more can still be done by more precise effort. Those in the Office of the General Counsel who have done so much to improve the time and performance efficiency of the Agency and have been in a position to look at and evaluate our performance over the months, are now in a better position to recommend further areas of possible increased efficiency and better public service.

The ultimate test of the administrative process, of course, is not necessarily efficiency for efficiency's sake. However, it is submitted that only the Government bureau that has reached adequate time and performance standards has earned the right to say this. The ultimate test is the due protection of the rights of the person as an individual, and efficiency and the elimination of unreasonable delay are but a means to that end—a means of avoiding the oft-repeated truism, "Justice delayed is justice denied."

The objective of Operation Challenge II, then, is simply this: While remaining on our present high plateau of time and quality performance, to concentrate our efforts with increased precision, new emphasis and priorities in important areas where any degree of further improvement will pay off in better public service, fairness of administration, more effective litigation and enforcement, and generally in a better effectuation of the purposes of the act.

Operation Challenge II has many parts. The following major ones are briefly identified.

I. Strengthening collective bargaining through voluntary processes: Continued emphasis on new ways to encourage fair and amicable settlement between the parties in meritorious cases, and the encouragement of better voluntary industrial relations by new and appropriate uses of all of the processes of the act which lend themselves to that end.

II. Securing more effective compliance: A better effectuation of the purposes of the act by continuing and furthering recent improvements in obtaining timely, voluntary, fair and more meaningful compliance with board and court decisions.

III. Protecting the act's integrity against racketeering influences: A program to strengthen office knowledge and practice to safeguard the board's processes against established labor-management racketeering including continued concentration on adaptabook on Racketeering Abuses" which is designed to aid in identifying true racket and criminal situations.

IV. Improving field litigation services: A continuing improvement program to provide the public with highest quality legal services and assure the fullest degree of fairness to all parties in the event of litigation, including continued concentration or adaptation, where practicable and justified, of proven modern principles of judicial administration. This item includes important subdivisions; for example:

(a) Analytical study of long litigated cases, with a report and recommendations for the improved handling of the protracted case before the NLRB;

(b) Continued attention to the adaptation of pretrial conference techniques to be utilized pursuant to agreement of the parties litigant and which may appropriately and justifiably be incorporated into office administrative processes;

(c) Study and recommendation with respect to reasonable use, where required, of the investigatory subpena.

V. A consideration of administrative due process in discharging the office's responsibilities under the act: A further review to determine whether adjustments in procedures may be indicated as justified to assure what may be termed "administrative due process" in the discharge of all responsibilities of the Office of the General Counsel so as to provide absolute fairness, impartiality and objectivity in all aspects of case handling, including consideration of any necessity for improving appellate procedures with respect to dismissed unfair labor practice charges.

VI. Meaningful communications as an aid to good administration and a better effectuation of the purposes of the act: Full utilization of established and new means of discussing matters with labor law practitioners and specialists, including the regional advisory conferences on administration, to provide exchanges of views and for informational and educational purposes in novel substantive, as well as procedural areas; including increased concentration upon the techniques and possibilities of preventive law in labor management relations.

VII. Field office representation case handling: The development and utilization of procedures designed to best achieve dispatch, thoroughness, and fairness in clear and simple ways in all areas of representation case work which fall within the responsibility of the General Counsel.

VIII. Greater use of the act's equity powers to effectuate its purposes: Consideration of the problems and possibilities of recommending greater use of the preventive measures provided under section 10(j) and 10(e) in those cases where it is desirable and necessary to maintain the status quo and to safeguard the statutory rights of individuals.

IX. Relating developments in the law to administrative case handling matters: Basic legal research and consideration of the impact, meaning, and interrelation with administrative problems of developing law, such as Columbia Broadcasting decision and revision to update basic legal memorandums, under operation 60, concerning the effect of Landrum-Griffin amendments.

X. The role of Office of the General Counsel as an employer: Continuation of the program of effective personnel policies which recognize the Office's responsibilities as an employer, and which are designed further to raise the high level of employee morale and satisfaction in doing the job by, among other things, appropriately rewarding talent and meritorious performance, giving special consideration to the equitable classification of employees, clerical as well as professionals, providing effective means of recruitment and training; continuing consultation with the NLRB Union and assuring that all aspects of personnel policies are free of discrimination based on race, creed, color, or national origin.

XI. Internal improvements in management and budget controls: Continuation of studies to achieve fullest use of adaptable modern management techniques to all phases of the office's internal administration, with special emphasis upon thoroughgoing improvement in methods of formulation and establishment of workload and budget estimates, and increased emphasis upon post-budget control.

XII. Residual Operation Challenge program: The time and performance standards for case handling developed under Operation Challenge have become integral and basic to operational procedures of Washington and the field. They will, of course, be continued under Operation Challenge II. In the face of a steadily increasing workload every effort will be made to continue on our present high plateau of quality and time performance and, with continued good performance and cooperation of the regional and Washington staffs, the Office shall seek to improve further our administrative and operational efficiency through Operation Challenge II.

Operation Challenge II is a substantive and procedural program of which these are special parts. In addition, special machinery on a functional basis has been created for its effective implementation.

The operation provides for an executive secretary, a steering committee, operational chairmen with select committees, proposed procedures for consultation with regional advisory conferences, and correspondent regional participation in program development. The planning and the initial work programs have been completed.

The operational chairmen have the responsibility to comprehensively evaluate processes within their respective terms of reference, to guard against improper or unwise changes, to make recommendations for improvement, and to carry out operations through to effective action ends.

Each of the operational chairmen has been assigned the projects within his major program area. In coordination with the steering committee he will appoint subpanels when necessary to consider those proposals requiring subcommittee consideration. Some action programs are ready to be communicated to the field, but the first 60 days will emphasize program development. The operational chairmen will have the continuing responsibility for insuring that each of the programs which became earmarked for definite action is carried through to the end. Operation Challenge II will bring regional representatives into the program development phases as much as possible. It is also intended that, to the extent practicable, members of the Regional Advisory Conferences will be requested to comment.

Regions with good constructive suggestions or recommendations which may further enhance the objective of Operation Challenge II should submit them directly to the appropriate operational chairman.

STUART SYMINGTON,
General Counsel.

Commemorative Postage Stamp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, traditionally the postage stamps of our Nation depict in miniature its famous men and women, the great events of its history, its organizations, its industries, its natural wonders.

As we know, selections of subjects for the commemorative stamps are performed by a Citizens Stamp Advisory Committee through the offices of the Post Office Department.

Recently, I received a recommendation from Mr. Leslie H. Fishel, director of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin. Mr. Fishel proposed that such a stamp be issued in honor of Frederick Jackson Turner, one of the preeminent American historians.

I quote the following reasons by Mr. Fishel:

No historian has ever been honored by a commemorative stamp and Turner, whose work at Wisconsin and Harvard materially changed the study and interpretation of American history, deserves this recognition.

I commend this recommendation to the Congress, to the Post Office Department, and to the Advisory Committee.

Reflecting further on the merits of Dr. Turner's contribution in his field, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter by Mr. Fishel to Postmaster General Day printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE HISTORICAL
SOCIETY OF WISCONSIN,
Madison, Wis., March 15, 1961.

Hon. J. EDWARD DAY,
Postmaster General of the United States, Post Office Department, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DAY: Together with colleges and historical agencies all over the United States, the State Historical Society of Wisconsin respectfully suggests and will support the issuance of a special commemorative postage stamp during the year 1961 to honor the historical profession and a great movement in American history. This year marks the centennial of the birth of one of the greatest historians this Nation has produced, one whose influence as a teacher and a scholar has been worldwide, Frederick Jackson Turner.

Frederick Jackson Turner (Nov. 14, 1861–Mar. 14, 1932) first came into national prominence in 1893, when he head his epochal "The Significance of the Frontier in American History" before a special meeting of the American Historical Association. He developed a hypothesis which marked a significant interpretation of American history. In this essay and in subsequent historical writings he pointed out that men behave differently in a free environment as compared to their behavior under social and economic coercion, that equality of opportunity gave a substance to democracy in politics, that the social and governmental institutions which the frontier created were a constructive amalgam of the old and the new, and that the frontier as it moved from east to west, left a legacy of freedom with responsibility of which our Nation can be proud.

Dr. Turner believed that the frontier was less a place than a process which swept the American Continent. Noting that by 1893 much of the physical frontier was gone, he foretold a future much different from the past insofar as the open physical frontier had been a positive force. His belief in the quality and power of the American democratic experiment permeated his work. For his contributions to American historical theory and writing, Dr. Turner received the Pulitzer prize in 1932.

You are aware that there never has been a special U.S. commemorative postage stamp to honor the historical profession in the "Famous Americans" series. We believe that the centennial of Frederick Jackson Turner's birth affords an opportunity to honor the profession of which he was so great an exponent.

We would like to suggest a stamp of the size and horizontal arrangement of the recent "Conservation Series," a portrait of Dr. Turner to occupy its central panel to be flanked by right- and left-line drawings of Bascom Hall of the University of Wisconsin, where Dr. Turner taught, and of the building of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, which collected and housed the library and archival materials upon which Dr. Turner's monumental thesis was established. It was the man, the materials, and the necessity for communicating to the future through students of the day which brought about the doctrine, and in honoring the man and the two institutions the whole profession of historian will be honored.

We would like further to suggest that design, engraving, and printing of the stamp—whatever form its final design may take—be hastened so that the stamp may be issued in Madison, Wis., on the centennial of the date of the birth of Frederick Jackson Turner, November 14, 1961.

Very truly yours,
LESLIE H. FISHEL, Jr.

United States Did It Where All Could See

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence:

UNITED STATES DID IT WHERE ALL COULD SEE—THE OPENNESS OF AMERICA'S SPACE SHOT COMPARED TO SECRETIVENESS OF SOVIET'S

For the first time in the history of the world, a man has gone up into space who was watched by millions of people both before he ascended and when he came down to earth.

This is, however, only one of a series of "firsts."

For the first time, a man in capsule was able to control and guide his flight while in the air. The Soviet astronaut who orbited the earth was just an inanimate passenger.

For the first time, a man who flew into space was photographed as he entered the capsule before he ascended and immediately after he came down. The Soviet astronaut, on the other hand, was not photographed by anyone except government representatives. No free press was present afterward to make its own record or freely to interrogate the astronaut.

For the first time, a nation sent a man into space and paid for the project out of a small fraction of its tax receipts. No class of human society was deprived of anything by reason of that expense—and no hardship was imposed upon the people. The enormous sums spent to send Soviet satellites aloft have been taken from a people deprived of the necessities of life. All this was ordered merely to advance the propaganda of totalitarian rulers.

America is rightfully emphasizing to the world that its achievement was in the open where nothing was hidden. To this day, the true facts about the flight of Major Gagarin of Russia are still unavailable, either to the press or to the international scientific organization which must eventually pass judgment on the validity of the claims.

Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr., who made the great flight for the United States, captivated Washington. He is a credit to his country in general and to the U.S. Navy in particular. He handled himself with modesty, tact and skill, not only in his public appearances at the White House and at the Capitol but in the press conference that was televised to the Nation.

Here was an example of a naval officer trained, of course, for the physical hardships he might have to endure. But where did the training come from that enabled him to take in his stride the adulation and applause that were showered upon him? American manhood—the product of a free environment and the heritage of sturdy American parents—can be given the real credit. For the risks were great and a steady-nerved young man took them bravely for the cause of science and the advancement of man's knowledge.

Undoubtedly there has been a spirit of competition aroused ever since the Russian sputnik circled the earth. The Soviet press and radio played up the Gagarin flight, and there was a big celebration in Moscow, too, as Premier Khrushchev made speeches and bestowed the accolade on the Russian astronaut.

While doubts still persist as to what Major Gagarin really did—perhaps he also only went up and down at a given place in the air—the disposition of officialdom here is to credit him with his claim. But at the same time there is a natural pride here that America did everything in the open and made all facts available immediately to the public. Meanwhile, the Soviet people have been given skimpy accounts of Commander Shepard's feat, which is being deliberately played down inside the Soviet Union by orders of the Moscow government.

Why should the Kremlin be afraid to concede the significance of Commander Shepard's flight? Because it is important to the Communists to make the Soviet people feel that their sacrifices must be continued and their hardships borne in the interest of a patriotic spirit. The rulers of Russia rely heavily on patriotism to help them to excuse their failure to provide food and decent living quarters for the millions who are enslaved.

It has been of incalculable value to the prestige of American democracy in the free world to demonstrate the virtues of freedom to the smaller nations just emerging from bondage. For years to come the exploit of Alan Shepard will be remembered not only because of the bravery of a man who ventured into the vast unknown of space but for his dedication to the cause of science for which he was ready to risk his life.

Commander Shepard will remain a national hero because of what he has accomplished, but everlasting credit will also go to the scientists, engineers, and devoted

leaders in our Govrnment who, with cautious and faithful adherence to scientific research, refused to be stampeded prematurely into a manned flight and ordered it only after many experiments, including failures, had shown them it could be done with a reasonable chance of success. How many lives the Russians lost in their experiments may never be known.

As for a manned flight in orbit around the earth by the United States, this will come in due time. Already this country has 21 satellites circling the globe, while the Soviets have only one. A trip 115 miles up and then 302 miles across the ocean through space is an indication that at the proper time the United States will make the flight around the earth with an astronaut who will keep the world informed with his own voice, as did Commander Shepard—the first of all firsts. He talked and sent messages from the suborbital spaceship, and all the world knew it simultaneously—a truly great first.

Tribute to Cedric Adams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Minnesotans were deeply saddened by the recent passing of one of their most colorful popular and beloved fellow citizens, Cedric Adams, the Minneapolis Star and Tribune reporter, radio and TV personality, and literally jack-of-all-trades. Everyone in the Twin Cities, and Midwest automatically turned to Cedric's column in the Minneapolis Star not only to keep up with local events, but also to share Cedric's unique philosophical outlook on life. Cedric was also well known nationally through the media of radio and television, endearing himself to all who came into contact with him.

Mr. President, I know that I voice the opinion of my fellow Minnesotans when I say that with the loss of Cedric Adams, Minnesota witnessed the passing of an era. It is with heavy heart that I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Bob Murphy's article commemorating Cedric Adams in the February 26 Minneapolis Sunday Tribune be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORTING AT LARGE
(By Bob Murphy)

As a newspaperman, I thought I had been dealt on occasion, some pretty rugged assignments. None, though, was ever as rugged as this. The thought is to keep this a friendly corner of the newspaper, as it was developed by Cedric Adams. And it falls to me to carry on, in as much the same vein as I can manage. The ruggedness comes about not only as a call on craftsmanship; it's a personal thing. I was a friend of Adams. And I think he was a friend of mine. The news that he had gone over the divide was as profound a shock as I've yet had to undergo. I had seen him the day before, and there had been the usual amount of kidding, and a comparing of notes which we hadn't had the chance to do for a while. And now, for the time being, I'll attempt to fill what has suddenly become the most vacant newspaper space in the world.

It's something like trying to follow the chariot race in "Ben-Hur" with a solo excursion on a motor scooter. I first met Adams in 1935, when he walked into the old second-floor sports department space in this building, where I was a sports writer with something like a couple of months seniority. He was by then to me a Mr. Big. Working on a weekly paper elsewhere, I had read and admired the column he wrote for a shopping gazette. As a matter of fact, I robbed him blind, stealing any of the bewildering variety of items he published that I could use.

I became acquainted in detail with the Adams power of appeal, however, when a photographer—I think it was Hy Sommer—and I went up north on a story. A small boy had become lost in the swamps north of Pine River, Minn. I think the boy's name was Hickle Harley Ware, and I don't believe he was ever found. Anyway, for 2 or 3 days we went out and joined the hunt. The national guard sent hundreds of men to the scene. Hundreds, or thousands, of extra mouths, hungry ones after tramping the muskeg, made a drain on the town's food supply.

I was asked if I could get Adams to appeal to food trucks traveling that territory—communications and highways were less efficient then than now—to stop in with extra supplies. I appended the request to the story I overheard—Sent by wire—to the office that night. It got to Adams, he relayed it, and the trucks began calling. The next day, we went out in the field, and when we got back to town the word was around. We were a lionized pair, because we had enough influence with Adams to get the appeal circulating. We knew, and I think the townspeople did too, that no influence was required—just a small note about a small but locally important problem.

On another occasion I did a little outside work for Adams. It included reading batches of his mail. He was in a reminiscing mood, and offered small prizes for the best letters of the "I remember when" type. I went through this mail, to screen it for the judges. And I was astounded to discover that fully half of the letter writers weren't even in the contest. They were just people in whom he had perhaps awakened a sense of nostalgia. They wrote to express gratitude, affection, the feeling of kinship or companionship that he aroused in most people, whether they knew him personally or not.

In no sense could I ever consider myself a replacement for Cedric. He was unique and irreplaceable. While he built a vast audience through friendliness and seeming simplicity, the simplicity was deceptive. He was a complex man. Nobody who juggled as many tasks as he did with finesse could be anything but complex. Newspapermen knew him as a bewilderingly fine reporter who could soak up information, detail, attitudes, nuances like a blotter, without apparent effort. Everybody knew him as a glowing writer with a facility for the twist, the word, the usage that made an item not only more readable but, frequently, memorable. Sinclair Lewis said he had the best enunciation of any broadcaster in America. And he had an uncommon resilience; if he did bobble, he could laugh about it or make an apology read or sound like a tribute. I have never seen him angry, or even perturbed.

It's with deep humility that I approach this responsibility. I know that comparisons with the Adams output are inevitable. I must plead that neither I nor anyone else could ever be another Adams. I could try to emulate him, but emulation is travesty unless it's correctly done. And here's where a lot of you come in. I'd like to earn at least a small measure of the huge friendship you had with Cedric, and to keep going the type of work he did in the Minneapolis Star and the Sunday Tribune. To do that, I need your mail—accounts of incidents touching, humorous, offbeat or personal. Believe me, everything will get thorough reading, full consideration and my heartfelt gratitude. I feel the best possible effort is owed to the Adams tradition. And I'd lay a fast buck he'd be grateful, too. He always was.

Aid to Dependent Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Manitowoc County, Wis., memoralizing Congress to enact legislation permitting localities to give recipients under the aid-to-dependent-children program commodities or vouchers for purchases in lieu of cash at the discretion of the local public welfare department. It outlines a problem which should receive consideration by the Congress:

Whereas the Federal Government contributes funds for such aid-to-dependent-children program, only upon the condition that such aid be disbursed in cash payments, and that no accounting be demanded of individual recipients thereof as to how such cash is spent; and

Whereas in many cases due to poor financial management or other reasons, the cash disbursed has been spent unwisely or inadequately to protect the children involved; and

Whereas it would be beneficial to the public interest to permit local authorities to exercise such discretion and control in cases where the recipients of such aid either manage their money unwisely, or conduct themselves improperly, or care for their children inadequately: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Manitowoc County Board of Supervisors, That the Congress of the United States be respectfully requested to consider and enact legislation in 1961 amending the laws relating to aid to dependent children categorical aid program administered by the Federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to grant discretionary authority to local governing bodies and public welfare directors to enable them to distribute such aid in the form of commodities or vouchers for the same in lieu of direct cash payments, as such local governing bodies of public welfare directors may deem appropriate in individual cases; and be it further

Resolved, That authenticated copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Wisconsin Members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives; and be it further

Resolved, That such Wisconsin Members to Congress be requested to take joint action to insure that this resolution be spread upon the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the purpose of making know the contents thereof to all Members of the Congress of the United States; and be it

Resolved, That the legislative committee of said Manitowoc County Board of Supervisors

be, and they hereby are instructed to sponsor a similar resolution in the 1961 Wisconsin Legislature so that the foregoing objectives will be adopted by the latter body as the intent and public policy of this State.

Dated this 18th day of April 1961.

RAY FRICK,
E. C. KRONBERG,
ARNOLD NELSON,
MAX BIGEL,
Legislative and Rules Committee.

The Expensive Federal Road Program Moves Ahead

SPEECH
OF
HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 4, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6713) to amend certain laws relating to Federal-aid highways, to make certain adjustments in the Federal-aid highway program, and for other purposes.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Chairman, according to testimony by the Honorable C. Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury, before hearings of the House Committee on Ways and Means, a total of $9.7 billion will be needed to meet the anticipated costs of completing the Federal highway program by 1972. This means $900 million a year must be raised to meet the 1972 target date for completion. Further, $2.5 billion has been diverted into the general fund making a real cost total of $12.2 billion.

It is interesting to note that the bill proposes a tax increase from 8 to 10 cents per pound on tire rubber; 3 to 5 cents per pound on tread rubber and 9 to 10 cents per pound for tube rubber—for an estimated total of $1.1 billion, raising about $150 million a year. The bill also calls for a continuation of the 1 cent temporary tax on gasoline for the duration of the Federal highway program keeping the Federal gasoline tax at 4 cents a gallon—for an estimated total of $8.3 billion or about $600 million a year.

It is my conviction that the Members of this House have an obligation to the people in three respects regarding the Federal highway program and its financing:

First. To allow the one cent tax on gasoline offered as a temporary tax to expire June 30, 1961. The people cannot long be patient in view of the fact that temporary measures seldom are temporary but with seeming apparent ease are extended and made permanent. The people have a right to expect their Representatives in Congress to mean it when they say that a measure is temporary.

Second. To expect that money raised in support of the Federal highway program is used for the program and not diverted to the general fund. I was happy to hear the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee assure the House that this bill will not permit such diversion of funds in the future. However, the public has a right to know that some of the excise taxes collected on vehicles and equipment are being placed in the general fund and are not being used to pay for the Federal highway program.

If the $2.5 billion diverted from the Federal highway program to the general fund were replaced, the additional tax levy against rubber would not be necessary. The fact is that the 1 cent temporary tax on gasoline could be allowed to expire and a new tax of 0.9 cent could be levied to pick up the tab for the balance needed to complete the program by 1972.

Third. To expect to be informed that this is a pay-before-you-go bill and not a pay-as-you-go bill.

I am not opposed to the highway program. However, I do feel that the cost for completion of the 41,000-mile program should be shared by all who benefit from it and not just those who happen to operate motor vehicles. The fact that the highway system contributes substantially to our national defense indicates that part of the burden of the cost should be levied against the defense budget.

An Idea on Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

THE EDITOR'S LETTER
(By F. F. McNaughton)

Here's an idea on taxes.
Kennedy's camp hatched it.
Reduce taxes on two classes:
1. The poor;
2. The rich.
What's the idea?
Purpose is to boost business.
What makes business?
1. Buying;
2. Investing.

They say, "The poor spend all they have, probably of necessity, although it may be what keeps them poor." Anyway, if the tax of the poor is lowered $300 a year, they will buy something with the $300—and that will make jobs.

The J.F.K. schemers also say:

"The rich likewise don't hang onto their money; they keep it working for them; they invest it." It is the investments of the rich that build factories. That makes jobs. If Government leaves a rich man only 8 cents out of each top dollar he makes, he, first, doesn't have the money to invest; and, second, why should a man risk $10,000 to make (at 6 percent) $600 and get to keep only $48 of it—and he might lose the whole $10,000.

But the middle class man, they argue, is too thrifty to spend the $300 or $3,000 that his taxes might be reduced, and he is too wary to invest it in factories or mines or toll roads or electronics, or jet plane or outboard motor manufacturers, or citrus groves or wonder drugs or plastics, or atomic powerplants, all of which make jobs.

Our forecast: Congress will not pass it.

Jesus said: "The poor always ye have with you." Abraham Lincoln said: "God must have loved the common man; he made so many of them."

By now Congressmen are well aware that in 1961 America, the middle class has the most votes.

H.R. 6713, Highway Bill

SPEECH
OF
HON. ROY A. TAYLOR
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 4, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6713) to amend certain laws relating to Federal-aid highways, to make certain adjustments in the Federal-aid highway program, and for other purposes.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I am in full accord with the interstate road program and the results that we hope to achieve by the final passage of H.R. 6713.

No person today can fail to see the critical need for improvement in both our primary and secondary road systems. As our economy becomes more complex so does transportation and commerce. It therefore stands to reason that as we progress economically our highway program must move forward on schedule.

The transportation needs of our country demand that our highways be made modern and safe. I am reliably advised that completion of the $41 billion Interstate System by the target date in 1972 will reduce highway deaths by as many as 4,000 persons a year. On a four-lane divided highway with controlled access the number of deaths by vehicle mile traveled is reduced by two-thirds as compared to traffic on the ordinary two-lane road.

Aside from this foremost safety aspect highway users, truckers, businessmen, vacationers, will be saved an estimated $2 billion a year in vehicle operating costs and upkeep.

The interstate highway program in many sections of our Nation will bring about unprecedented economic growth. The congressional district which I am privileged to represent, situated in western North Carolina amidst the most lofty and picturesque mountains in the Appalachian Range, is among those sections of our Nation which has suffered economic retardation because of geographic isolation and inadequate highway facilities. The people in this district are now receiving their full share of interstate roads. They appreciate this program and are willing to help pay for it. The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1961 has given the people of my district, and I am sure the people in the districts of most of my colleagues, new hope for modern highway facilities in their areas commensurate with the needs.

It is incumbent upon Congress to provide the necessary financing if the In-

terstate System is to be completed in 1972 as originally planned. Now that we have this program moving we must not only continue at the present rate but should accelerate construction.

By our action we determine the future speed and direction of this important program. We hasten the day when interstate roads will stretch in all directions across the face of this great Nation for all citizens to use and enjoy.

Michigan's Governor Cracks State Police Knuckles With Censorship on "Operation Abolition"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, the people of Michigan have a right to a forthright answer to the question of what is expected of their State police in combating the Communist menace.

Governor Swainson is responsible for the question that exists in the minds of the people whose commonwealth he heads. Without ever seeing the film "Operation Abolition," Governor Swainson invoked censorship on the Michigan State Police Department and forbade that agency's showing this film of the disgraceful Communist inspired episodes at the congressional hearing in California.

The editor of the Midland Daily News very well sums up the situation in the following editorial:

SWAINSON HASTY IN BANNING FILMS

Governor Swainson may be already regretting his hasty decision ordering the Michigan State Police to stop showing two controversial films depicting Communist tactics.

His first mistake was in taking a position before he viewed the actual films. He admitted that this was done on the advice of some of his staff and that he had not had an opportunity to see "Operation Abolition" and "Communism on the Map."

If these films are objectionable in the mind of Michigan's Governor, the people of the State have a right to know that his decision is from firsthand information. In other words, to be blunt, they expect him to know what he is talking about.

Reaction came quickly and members of the legislature are scheduled to view the films at a special joint meeting tonight. No doubt we will be hearing and reading of the views of various members and possibly some legislative action will be proposed.

In Grand Rapids Monday, the National Association of Evangelicals took issue with the Governor and asserted that he "yielded to certain pressures."

Rev. Thomas F. Zimmerman, president, and Dr. George L. Ford, executive director said: "We want to express our concern over widespread efforts to suppress information concerning Communist defiance of law and order in any free society."

They said they recognized differences of opinion on the "merits of the film" showing student riots in San Francisco but hoped "public officials will exercise real caution in yielding to any pressure groups who plead for such suppression of information."

The Michigan State Police is an agency long trusted by the citizens of the State to defend the people against crime and subversion.

Members of that force detailed to investigation of subversive activities are students of corruption and the evil tactics of communism. They believed that the two films were worthy of public attention.

The least that Governor Swainson could have done before passing judgment was to look at the films himself. Then he would be in a better position in ordering the State police to desist educating the public of Communist dangers via the films in question.

There are rumors that the State police have also been ordered to discontinue Communist investigations. These should be either confirmed or denied because the people of Michigan have a right to know whether their State government is succumbing to the well-known Communist tactics calling for nullification of all anti-Communist legislation, muzzling of investigations and elimination of security programs. A side line is to humiliate and challenge the integrity of law enforcement agencies.

Censorship of State police efforts to let citizens view the two films in question tends to aid and abet the Communist line even though such action might have unwittingly come from a busy Governor who did not take time to investigate for himself.

Address By Hon. Clark W. Thompson, of Texas, at Rice Millers Convention, Galveston, Tex., May 5, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, some men have the happy faculty for making difficult tasks appear easy—and that is the way in which our colleague, the Honorable CLARK THOMPSON, of Texas, handles his duties as chairman of the Subcommittee on Rice—now the Oilseeds and Rice Subcommittee—of the House Committee on Agriculture.

As an indication of how he works effectively to represent not alone the constituents of the Ninth District of Texas, but the Nation and the Congress in its relations with our citizens, it is a pleasure and a privilege to call attention to the address given by Representative THOMPSON before the Rice Millers Association convention held last weekend in Galveston, Tex.:

ADDRESS OF CLARK W. THOMPSON, OF TEXAS, AT RICE MILLERS CONVENTION, GALVESTON, TEX., FRIDAY, MAY 5, 1961

I am very highly complimented by the invitation to confer with you in behalf of the Rice Subcommittee at your annual convention. I have worked, for many years, with the Rice Millers Association and I think it is safe to say that all of our relationship has been pleasant and I hope that you have profited by it.

You will be interested in the background of the various commodities subcommittees in general and the Rice Subcommittee in particular. Some 6 years ago, when the Democrats reorganized the Congress, our chairman, The Honorable HAROLD COOLEY, of North Carolina, and our vice chairman, our own BOB POAGE, of Waco, conceived the idea that each basic commodity should have a special group with which to resolve the various problems peculiar to that commodity.

Perhaps because the congressional district which I represent produces more rice than any other in the United States, I was named to head this particular subcommittee. With me since the beginning on the Democratic side is E. C. ("TOOK" as we call him) GATHINGS, of Arkansas, who has always been a grand member for me to work with and I am sure that you would say the same.

GRANT of Alabama, MCMILLAN of South Carolina, ALBERT of Oklahoma, ABBITT of Virginia, COAD of Iowa, and MCSWEEN of Louisiana are the other Democratic members.

On the Republican side, the senior member is PAGE BELCHER, of Oklahoma, with FINDLEY of Illinois, DOLE of Kansas, BEERMANN of Nebraska, and REIFEL of South Dakota.

We have not transacted much business thus far, but I have already learned very much to my satisfaction that these members are all interested in the subject of rice and also oil seeds which is a new responsibility of our subcommittee.

I note with particular pleasure the presence here, today, of HAROLD MCSWEEN, of Louisiana, and BEN REIFEL, of South Dakota, who have come here to take part in our conference.

In the years gone by, this subcommittee has been blessed with the most pleasant kind of relationship with the entire rice industry. It is an industry which we have always found is particularly easy to work with whether it be producers, warehousemen, or millers. When you have a problem, you have the habit of thrashing it out before hand among yourselves. Then, you take it up with the Department of Agriculture, and finally you bring it to our committee all wrapped up in a nice package and generally ready for me to simply write it in bill form and drop it in the legislative hopper.

Since any differences of opinion have been ironed out before Congress ever sees the legislation, we generally pass our bills by unanimous consent. When we have had opposition in the past, it has never been of a serious nature. Let's hope that as long as I serve you, we can say the same thing.

Later this year, I would like to bring this subcommittee back to the rice belt to spend a few days observing the production and the operations of all phases of your business. Speaking for myself, and I believe I voice the opinions of the rest of us, we have a lot to learn. You in the industry can certainly teach us. Both sides would profit tremendously from such a visit.

If there are problems confronting us at the time, we could hold some hearings, something which I always like to do at the grassroots, to give producers who could not otherwise present their views to the Congress the opportunity which the Constitution provides to every citizen to make his voice heard in the Legislative Halls.

Maybe they can't come to Washington, but we can bring Washington to them.

At the moment, two pieces of legislation are before the committee. One is our succession of interest bill which is ready for action as soon as we receive the Department report. The measure is a very simple one and I have informal advice that the report will be favorable as it was last year.

It provides for the transfer of acreage history where a producer withdraws from the production of rice. It lets him transfer to a son, son-in-law, grandson, or nephew.

The Secretary has covered the provisions of this bill by written regulations in the past, but the attorneys for the Department feel that there should be statutory expression to protect both sides.

Since you are all more familiar with it than I am, I shall not take the time today to elaborate.

I see no reason when we should have any legislative problems in passing the bill since it does not affect any commodity except rice, and as a matter of fact, it only gives the rice industry in Texas and California, where we have hip-pocket allotments, the same privileges that the producers in other States already have.

Another piece of legislation which I recently introduced is designed to make rice more attractive for the school lunch program. There is constant resistance to the inclusion of rice because some who administer the school lunch program think that it should be enriched and that it should be packaged in a more sanitary container than is presently the practice.

Another very important factor is the size of the packages.

This bill would require rice which is stored in commodity credit warehouses to be in packages of not more than 25 pounds so that they could be easily handled by the cooks and thus be more attractive for the school lunch program. So much for rice legislation.

I don't see why we should have any particular trouble passing that bill but, of course, I always run scared on legislation and never count it in the bag until it is signed by the President. However, at the moment, it looks all right to me.

Now as to legisaltion generally, the so-called Cooley bill, H.R. 6400, is in the mill and is being thoroughly aired out in the committee. There are some basic differences of opinion and, as is so often the case, the good parts of the bill are lost sight of and the snipers get busy on the party they don't like meanwhile condemning the entire legislation which, of course, is very foolish. The bill contains such things as the school milk program, Public Law 480, and various other generally noncontroversial items.

The real controversy is over the proposal of the Secretary of Agriculture to consult with the grassroots committees in the various commodities to find out what sort of program the farmers, themselves, desire; then to thrash out the legislative features in the Department of Agriculture, and finally to submit the proposal to the Congress.

The original idea was to give Congress the veto power just as it has in the Hoover committee recommendations. This has not proven to be acceptable to the Congress and whatever happens, we will have to retain, in the Congress, legislative jurisdiction—in other words, we will pass laws; we will naturally consider any recommendation which the Sscretary sends up; but we will act on it affirmatively rather than negatively.

This is not a serious difference of opinion at all. The basic idea of consulting with the producers is as sound as it could be, and it reflects what I believe to be an excellent attitude on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture. After all, this is exactly what we do in the rice industry. You get your heads together, decide what you want, clear it with the Department, and then bring it to the Congress. And, that is just exactly what he wants the other commodity groups to do.

I shall not undertake any detailed discussion of the legislation because it is so uncertain at the moment that we might just be spinning our wheels.

I do strongly recommend that you consider with open minds whatever proposals come from the Secretary of Agriculture. Please realize that now, for the first time in many years, we have a Secretary who is trying to do something for agriculture and to stabilize the position of agriculture in the broad economy of the country.

It is a refreshing change, and any man who tries as hard as Secretary Orville Freeman is trying surely deserves a friendly consideration on our part.

This day has been a great pleasure and privilege for me. You are here in my hometown and I am glad that you have been so cordially received. It has been wonderful to work with and for you. I trust we will be together for a long time.

The Union Lag at the Missile Sites

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, along with the success of our first man-in-space venture, the construction problems at Cape Canaveral and the exorbitant costs involved have been disclosed by a Senate Investigating Committee.

The editorials, "The Union Lag at the Missile Sites," from the Chicago Daily Tribune of May 5 and "Extortion at Canaveral" from the Chicago American of April 29 should be carefully studied since this entire problem is certainly the responsibility of the Congress.

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune, May 5, 1961]

THE UNION LAG AT THE MISSILE SITES

The Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee has now heard a description of how four union ironworkers shut down the missile launching site at Cape Canaveral, Fla. They simply posted a roadside notice, "Ironworkers not working today." So every otherworker of the numerous unions employed on the base honored the unauthorized walkout and stayed away from work.

This process, known as "going fishing," is invoked to force the Government into overtime work in order to catch up on lost time. The result is that fantastic premium wages have pushed the weekly wage to $400 to $700, while construction on missile sites has fallen months behind schedule. Not content with this gouging, the unions also compel the Government to pay every worker a travel allowance averaging about 5 hours of overtime pay each week. The work roster is crowded with unnecessary and unqualified foremen who draw an extra 25 cents on each hour's pay, though they do not work.

Heads of national unions examined about this stay-away substitute for the picket line testified that no strike is authorized without their permission, but admitted no disciplinary action had been taken against anyone. They expressed no shame over union racketeering, though they know the United States is competing with Russia for mastery of space.

This lack of union morality is not surprising, but the complacency of government labor relations representatives and officers of the Air Force and Army Engineers at Cape Canaveral is shocking. Instead of going to bat with the unions, they badger the contractors to find out, if they can, what the unions want and to give it to them.

A colonel of Engineers brushed off contractors' complaints with the observation that for 10 years "the atmosphere of Congress has been prolabor" and that if the military sought to break a strike, "all hell would break loose politically."

If the survival of the Nation depends on the patriotism of the unions at the missile sites or the backbone of the military in charge of them, we are in a bad way. Congress should lose no time in cracking down.

[From the Chicago American, Apr. 29]

EXTORTION AT CANAVERAL

In view of the pressing national need to develop its space and missile programs in a hurry, it is surprising—to put it mildly—that there are people who have been allowed to slow it down to a comparative crawl by means closely resembling extortion.

These are the leaders of some of the 30 unions whose members work at Florida missile bases. Witnesses before the Senate investigations subcommittee have testified that 162,872 man-days of work have been lost in 4 years because of strikes and slowdowns called to reinforce demands for huge wages.

Two Air Force officers and a Government contractor told in detail how some union leaders at Cape Canaveral have forced abnormal working shifts on contractors, so workers can collect sky-high overtime pay. As a result of overtime finagling, skilled workers pull down $450 to $611 a week and one supervisor, an apprentice electrician whose brother-in-law happens to be a union leader at Canaveral, gets top pay of $673 a week—exactly what Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON is paid.

This gouging has added up to millions of dollars in excess costs for taxpayers and has cut working efficiency to 20 to 30 percent of expected norms.

Rivalry among unions contributes to the slowdown. If the members of one get overtime for essential work, others will insist on getting overtime too, justified or not. This has led to such incredible make-work practices as disassembling component parts shipped from factories so that workers on the scene can assemble them again, at full pay.

Subcommittee Chairman JOHN F. MCCLELLAN has indicated that Congress will act if necessary to prevent any more work stoppages and gouging at missile bases. We hope Congress won't waste time about it. Any agency that sabotages the Nation's defense and space programs for its own gain has no claim to sympathetic treatment.

Back-Door Finance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, opposition to the recently considered conference report on the depressed areas bill was based primarily on the so-called back-door financing provisions which the bill contained. The dangers inherent in this sort of financing are the subject of much concern and, although this battle against back-door spending was lost, the war is far from over.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include the following editorial which appeared in the May 5, 1961, edition of the Syracuse (N.Y.) Post-Standard:

BACK-DOOR FINANCE

Taxpayers should note that the aid-to-depressed areas bill just signed by President Kennedy provides for back-door financing.

That is, most of the $451 million allocated will be borrowed direct from the Treasury without going to the bother of getting congressional Appropriations Committee approval.

The House finally agreed to this, although Congress is supposed to keep some control over spending and maintain a system of checks and balances. It abdicated this right in the depressed areas bill.

Advocates of the method of financing maintain it makes money quickly available. But there is no need for haste in this instance because the administration is not organized to channel funds to depressed areas.

The Commerce Department will run the program but six other agencies will have a hand in it—the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare; Agriculture, the Interior, Labor, the Small Business Administration, and the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

All will be clamoring for a slice, yet the Senate has not confirmed a candidate to take over the depressed areas command post in the Commerce Department.

In fact the boundaries of depressed areas have not been mapped out, and the task will not be eased by heavy pressure from Congressmen, mayors, and local chambers of commerce.

All of which makes it clear there was no need for Congress to give up its right to review such financing.

The depressed areas picture may change considerably before the money begins to flow, yet the back door to the Treasury has been opened wide. The taxpayers would feel better if they knew the appropriations committees were keeping a watchful eye on the operation.

Television To Develop Literacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that television can be a powerful medium for providing greater educational opportunities to people of all ages. My bill, H.R. 132, would encourage use of educational television channels.

Because of my interest in this subject, I was particularly intrigued by an address delivered at the 6th annual conference of the International Reading Association, held in St. Louis May 4 to 6.

This address "Shall We Use Television in Developing Literacy?", was delivered by Mrs. Pauline Jones Hord, literacy consultant, Memphis, Tenn., and, under unanimous consent, I include it in the RECORD at this point:

SHALL WE USE TELEVISION IN DEVELOPING LITERACY?

(By Pauline Jones Hord)

Who is the illiterate?

Census takers, going into crowded row houses of a swarming city or into tenants' homes in the agricultural South ask the question, "How many grades of school did you complete?" Millions of answers are gathered and finally a statistic is ready for a speech which states "10 million over 25 years of age have less than a fifth grade education." This is generally accepted to mean "10 million persons are functionally illiterate."

We all know people who have been through grade school. Many were able to complete the third or fourth grade. Many who completed the eighth grade are still unable to write a telephone message and can't read their children's report cards intelligently. All too often they are unable to decipher the recipes on the freely distributed surplus food packages.

When we add our out-of-school citizens under 25 years of age who are unable to communicate with their fellowmen through the written word to the large block of adults who are recorded as having less than an eighth grade education, it is reasonable to say that the functionally illiterate group is shockingly beyond any official figure. According to a special spring census of 1958 there are approximately 23 million persons above age 14 who are functionally illiterate. Perhaps the most realistic figure comes from UNESCO: 1 in 10 Americans, they estimate, cannot pass their test which is to read with understanding or to write a short statement on everyday life.

Where are these people and what are they like?

The largest group is in the South. Two-thirds of this largest group is Negro, one-third white. The next largest group is congregated in the big northern cities. It includes the foreign-born who are illiterate in our language; it includes many Negroes who have migrated from the South in increasingly large numbers within recent years. Idle boys, the streetcorner loafers, who are over 16 and not compelled to attend school swell the numbers of this group. Another segment is the migrant farm laborers, scattered widely through the Middle and Far West. Nationwide we must include the isolated mountain and sharecropper families.

In the cities we can locate the functionally illiterate by the welfare list, the unemployment compensation list, and at the bottom of charts on earning power where the income ceiling is $500 a year. Most often the illiterate is the man without a steady job. We do not find hih listed as physically crippled or blind perhaps; but he is crippled because he cannot write; blind because he cannot read.

Should they be in school?

Yes, they ought to be going to school. But are they?

The answer is close to a 98 or 99 percent "No" as far as public school classes are concerned. It may be as low as 95 percent "No" if we count those reached by TV literacy programs in the South, and in two northern cities—Baltimore and Philadelphia. It may be as low as 94 percent if we count the classes sponsored by church and other non-school organizations, such as the program for migrant workers carried on by the council of churches.

Why is so little done through public school facilities? In the past these have seemed to be the obvious logical media. Frequently public school officials reply that "the results simply don't justify the expense and effort." The public schools, we all realize, are already overburdened and overworked; it would take additional funds and communitywide effort to reach and teach the illiterates. However, a subconscious attitude that the illiterate is a lesser breed has undoubtedly hindered such a program, just as it has probably kept school officials from bringing the problem of the illiterate to public attention.

We recognize the serious obstacles to the success of a literacy program. Illiterates are not eager to attend classes. They are rather like sinners who won't come to church. Shame keeps them away. They are isolated, often physically, always mentally, because of their reading disability. Defense mechanisms keep them from admitting their handicaps. Habitual failure saps the will to self-discipline. They are "used to" the little islands of life on which they drag out their limited routines. It is difficult to convince most of them that reading will make even the slightest difference in their lives.

To say "the results simply don't justify the expense" is seemingly substantiated by records which show that many students learned little even though they showed up regularly for class. The tendency is to blame the student. There is evidence, however, that an appropriate program makes the diffrence between success and failure. A good remedial program must begin at the beginning, move forward logically, with special stress on the fundamental relationship between speech sounds and their related written symbols. The adult student needs, above all, to see his progress the very first day. Without this initial success, discouragement and skepticism push him back into the limbo of disillusion and our country has another confirmed nonreader.

What about television?

Television, the mass medium, can reach most of the 23 million functional illiterates. This giant visual aid can go anywhere and almost everywhere in our Nation. It can tackle the job with amazingly successful results. TV can reach the unreachable if it travels the popular wave lengths. By projecting the one well-done, effective program, one expert teacher will be available to all. Lay assistants can supervise groups of students watching as a class. Such laymen may well be unpaid volunteers as is true of projects in Tennessee, Alabama, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Texas.

Memphis has the first and probably most ambitious literacy project on TV. Dr. Laubauch, world literacy missionary, who is here today, sparked the program into life on Educational TV Station WKNO back in 1956. His own visual-phonetic approach was combined with many teaching techniques to produce a literacy series known as streamlined reading. Working with Dr. Laubauch, I spent 5 absorbing years directing the writing of TV scripts, creating teaching materials, training TV teachers and their assistants who were lay supervisors of classes. Ninety-eight films were made of the lessons which we broadcast 3 nights a week. Ten commercial TV stations, mostly in the South, have rebroadcast these lessons. All educational TV stations in Alabama are currently broadcasting them. The University of Georgia educational TV station in Athens is beaming these classes to a third of the State. Soon a Dallas station and a Little Rock station will begin.

The Memphis experiment included registration of pupils and evaluation of their work. Some literacy programs have not. Attendance records show a heavy toll of dropouts, even among those who paid the fee for their books. Roughly 5 percent of the registered students viewed the TV class at home. The majority of the dropouts were in this unsupervised, unaided group. About 95 percent of the registered students attended supervised classes of from 5 to 25 persons. The majority of this group completed the program. Their test scores showed rewarding results. Various methods of evaluation showed the effective results of phonetic approach in well devised courses of study. In 8 months these adults, encumbered with layers of bad mental habits, psychological learning barriers, and adult cares and responsibilities, accomplished as much as average primary grade children learn in 27 months. These lessons worked equally well with the beginning and the remedial students.

The Memphis project had the essential elements. We had sufficient money to keep going. We had community support. The lay supervisors of classes were all volunteers.

Civic groups, radio, and TV stations, newspapers, women's clubs and the church contributed their energies and abilities to our publicity and support. We had a well-designed approach to a logically developed series of lessons.

In all such projects, on TV and off, the greatest single problem lies in the recruitment of students. If only 1 percent of the functionally illiterate will want and avail themselves of the classes, the project is performing but a part of its job. Station WBAL in Baltimore is concerned with this problem. In this once-a-week literacy program the teacher devotes a good deal of time to motivating the students. She urges them to join night classes for adults held in the public schools.

Is such motivation enough? Think of an individual's responsibility to his country, his community, and to his family. Couldn't we make literacy training a prerequisite for receiving certain now-free benefits? The need for assistance usually is dictated by lack of or limited education. Many of those who receive welfare aid would have an intimate and compelling reason to attend classes.

Is there a solution?

During the war some illiterates were required to attend school. Since literacy was considered an urgent factor in our national defense, nobody waited for this illiterate to decide whether or not he wanted to be taught. In this present semipeace can we afford to wait for the illiterate to feel the urge? Should we wait for him to overcome, independently, his long-practiced inertia?

In a certain county in Michigan, surplus food and welfare help are donated to long lines of the unemployed. Each person receiving aid is not only expected, but required, to give of his time and services in the distribution center. A better requirement of the functionally illiterate would be to attend a TV literacy class. Perhaps, under a national plan, we could turn to the Peace Corps for enthusiastic young supervisors. Funds from money appropriated for public education could be tapped for TV station costs. If literacy competence were required by major social and governmental agencies, we could, lesson by lesson, week by week, whittle away the deadwood of illiteracy.

Let us not be nearly so afraid of communism in this country as of the apathy and indifference which now exists toward the functional illiteracy of 22 million of our people. We have temporized far too long. We have the technical skill and mass media to wipe out illiteracy. Through increased social action we can narrow the yawning gap between our educational and technological achievements. As our new and vigorous President has already said, "Let us begin."

The John Philip Sousa Home in Nation's Capital Now Threatened With Destruction by Officials Inspired by Proposed Razing of Historic Buildings on Lafayette Square

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation, H.R. 6893, to provide for the preservation and maintenance of the home of John Philip Sousa, one of America's most beloved composers. The home is located at 318 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

The building was the first home Mr. Sousa owned, and he occupied it from about 1900 to World War I. The home, a Victorian-type house, has been condemned by the officials of the District of Columbia despite the fact that it has been planned as a shrine by those concerned with the advancement of American music for at least 20 years.

The destruction of the Sousa home by insensitive officials is just one more example of the present disregard for America's historic and culturally important buildings by top Government officials. During the past 20 years one-fourth of our significant buildings have been destroyed, many of them by Government action.

Last week William Walton, a painter, was revealed as the gentleman who, despite his lack of any official status, had advised leading Federal Government officials to destroy the Dolly Madison House, and the Benjamin Tayloe House, and the Belasco Theater on Lafayette Square. Various groups of citizens of this Nation have been trying to save the historic buildings on Lafayette Square for 20 years.

Mr. Walton was reported by the Washington (D.C.) Star, of May 3, 1961, as saying that—

The Dolly Madison House was completely gutted by the Cosmos Club in 1895 so that it no longer has any historical meaning. Inside of the outside stucco are some original brick walls, that's all. If rebuilt it would be essentially a replica. The same thing is true of the Tayloe House, which is of less historical importance.

The Washington (D.C.) Star report went on to say:

As for the Belasco Theater, it is so outdated, he said, no theater company would want it. And since its facilities are too limited for theater, the stage would be hopelessly inadequate for the opera.

The argument over whether the John Philip Sousa Home, and the historic buildings on Lafayette Square should be preserved will doubtless continue until the present criteria are revised, or until some new and more competent advisers are found.

Miss Gertrude Carraway, honorary president general, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, indicates that the problem is really a national problem in a recent letter in which she declares:

I am having a similar argument with the National Park Service over their failing to include Tryon Palace in their Registry of Historic Landmarks that you seem to be having in Washington over the failure of "some national authorities" to recognize Lafayette Square as possessing exceptional value in commemorating and illustrating the history of the United States.

Mr. Walton would have us believe that no one is interested in the Belasco Theater. The Citizens Committee to Save Lafayette Square was formed last year by the Washington Opera Society which was intensely interested in saving the Belasco Theater in a city which has been called a hick town and a cultural backwater by such national publications as the New York Times and Time magazine, because of its lack of cultural facilities.

Other groups interested in preserving the buildings on Lafayette Square are the DAR, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, and the National Federation of Music Clubs. In fact, there is not a single national organization which has demanded the destruction of the buildings on Lafayette Square.

Only one short year ago the President introduced legislation to save the Lafayette Square buildings in the form of a bill, S. 3280, and he made a strong speech to rally support for his measure.

One can only guess at the number of history-minded Americans who voted for this history-minded candidate in last fall's political campaign on the basis of his well-known and widely heralded drive, in which he was joined by eight leading Democratic Senators, to preserve the Lafayette Square buildings. These votes might have been decisive since the results were close.

If the Lafayette Square buildings are destroyed, then this will amount to a repudiation of his position of last fall.

The New York Times recently reported how the President intervented to save Harvard Yard at Harvard University from an office building:

Kenneth P. O'Donnell, class of 1949, and special assistant to the President, phoned leading (Massachusetts) State Democrats urging them not to make the (15-story office building) project a party issue.

McGeorge Bundy, Yale 1940, and a Republican, former dean of the Harvard faculty, and now special Presidential assistant for national security affairs, passed the word to some Republicans.

One can only surmise that there is not a single Presidential assistant with the courage to face up to William Walton and defend Lafayette Square at this crucial period in our history.

The New York Times reported on April 8, 1961, that the President asked Congress on April 7 to—

authorize U.S. participation in an international effort to save antiquities marked for inundation by the Soviet-financed Aswan Dam, which is being built in the United Arab Republic.

The President suggested that the United States finance alone the estimated $6 million cost of preserving the Pearl of Egypt, a group of temples on the Island of Philae, between the old and new Aswan Dams. They now are submerged part of the year.

Mr. Kennedy also proposed that the United States take part in preserving lesser temples both in the United Arab Republic and in the Sudan, at a cost of $2,500,000, and that it contribute $1,500,000 to speed extensive archaeological and prehistory research in areas now unexplored but threatened with flooding.

One way, perhaps the only way, to save such buildings as the John Philip Sousa Home, and the Dolly Madison and Benjamin Tayloe Houses, would be to replace some of the students of the history of Egypt or Harvard University on the President's staff of advisors with students of the history of our own Nation. A start could be made by bringing in such cultural leaders as Gertrude Carraway of the National Society, DAR; or Helen Sousa Abert, a surviving daugh-

ter of John Philip Sousa; Joseph Watterson, editor of the Journal of the American Institute of Architects; Mrs. Ozbirn, national president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs; or Mrs. Bullock, president of the National Federation of Clubs.

I include as part of my remarks the text of my bill, H.R. 6893, and articles from the Washington (D.C.) Post on the John Philip Sousa Home:

H.R. 6893

A bill to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 to provide for the preservation of the home of John Philip Sousa, and to protect the homes of residents and the businesses and good will of the small businessmen in the vicinity of the United States Capitol Building

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 7 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 (D.C. Code, sec. 5–706) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(j)(1) For the purpose of providing for the preservation, and maintenance as a shrine, of the former home in the District of Columbia of John Philip Sousa, there is hereby established a board consisting of the conductor of the band of the United States Army, the conductor of the band of the United States Navy, the conductor of the band of the United States Marine Corps, and the conductor of the band of the United States Air Force, ex officio, plus ten additional individuals appointed by the President, which shall acquire the home of John Philip Sousa at 318 Independence Avenue, in the District of Columbia, and shall preserve and maintain such home as a shrine dedicated to his memory, and as a museum for the preservation of memorabilia of John Philip Sousa.

"(2) For the purpose of obtaining funds for carrying out this subsection, the board is authorized to accept donations of funds, services, and property, and to conduct a nationwide fund-raising campaign. All departments and agencies of the United States, upon request by the board, shall transfer to the board all memorabilia of John Philip Sousa in the custody or control of such departments and agencies.

"(3) Members of the board shall serve without compensation for their services as such, but they shall be reimbused for their expenses of travel and subsistence while actually engaged in the performance of the duties vested in the board. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this subsection.

"(k) Until a comprehensive plan has been prepared for the proper development, preservation, and improvement of the physical environs of the United States Capitol Building and the surrounding complex of Federal buildings, including the Senate and House Office Buildings, the Library of Congress, and the United States Supreme Court, no funds shall be expended for the acquisition of real property or for the purchase or demolition of existing buildings located in the vicinity of the United States Capitol Building and the surrounding complex of Federal buildings.

[From the Washington Post, May 8, 1961]

HOME SLATED AS SHRINE TO SOUSA IS CONDEMNED

(By Stephen S. Rosenfeld, staff reporter)

The Capitol Hill home of John Philip Sousa, the man who put a nation on march time, planned as a shrine for 20 years, now faces destruction.

The District has condemned as unsanitary the victorian edifice at 318 Independence Avenue SE., the first home Sousa owned and where he lived from about 1900 to World War I. Unless the Condemnation Board is dissuaded or the home repaired, it will be razed.

With it will go the last chance to memorialize America's premier bandsman within walls that he knew, since his birthplace at 636 G Street SE., was chopped up into apartments.

Efforts to make the home a museum in the early forties and middle fifties flopped. But another effort has been mounted.

Sousa's daughter, Helen Sousa Abert of New York, who owns the house, entrusted it a few years back to the Sousa Memorial Committee.

So when the District told her last week she had only until May 9 to ask for a stay, she turned to the committee.

This, apparently, is fine by the Condemnation Board. At its meeting Wednesday it probably will shelve the matter until the committee acts, Director Richard L. Mattingly said.

The committee itself will meet informally this week in Coral Gables, Fla., where its chairman, Lt. Col. William F. Santelmann of Arlington, former Marine Band director, will be visiting Otto Kraushaar, president of the American Bandmasters Association.

Kraushaar, who played in Sousa's band, said a fund-raising scheme would be mulled over. Mrs. Abert estimates $50,000 to $100,000 is needed.

She stands ready, she said, to furnish several rooms with her father's belongings and to give a roomful of his trophies, his music library, books of press clippings, pictures and such memorabilia as batons. The Library of Congress already has the manuscripts of his marches.

"There's so much talk about culture and the arts in Washington," said Mrs. Abert, "it would seem rather wicked to drop this. It's unique."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 9, 1961]

MEMORIAL TO "MARCH KING"—HOUSE BILL TO PRESERVE SOUSA HOME WOULD BLOCK CAPITOL HILL EXPANSION

Legislation was introduced yesterday to preserve the Capitol Hill home of John Philip Sousa. The bill includes a provision which would block efforts of the Government to purchase a block of Capitol Hill property.

The bill, introduced by Representative CARROLL D. KEARNS, Republican of Pennsylvania, besides providing for the Sousa memorial, would require a comprehensive plan for development, preservation and improvement before any Federal money could be spent to purchase or demolish buildings in the area around the Capitol.

The Republicans' Capitol Hill Club, at 214 First Street SE., has already been purchased for $600,000 but other residences and small businesses in the area scheduled to be taken over, bounded by Independence Avenue, First and Second Streets SE., are still to be affected. The eminent domain proceedings have come under attack by area residents who charge that the payments to be made are both inadequate and inequitable.

The Kearns bill would establish a 14-member presidentially appointed board to acquire the Sousa residence at 318 Independence Avenue SE. and maintain it as a shrine.

Kearns submitted the measure after reading in the Washington Post that the residence of the famed bandsman had been condemned by the District as unsanitary.

If it is razed, it will end years of effort to memorialize Sousa within a home that he knew. His birthplace at 636 G Street SE. is no longer available for a shrine. His birthplace was restored by R. C. King & Associates into a home quite similar to the original home, but with an apartment on the first floor.

In view of the Condemnation Board's pending action, the Sousa Memorial Committee, which has been entrusted with the preservation of the Independence Avenue dwelling by Sousa's daughter, announced it intended to consider a fund-raising effort to save the home.

Under KEARNS' bill, however, the proposed 14-member board would be authorized to conduct a nationwide fund-raising campaign. The board would include 10 members appointed by the President and the conductors of the Army, Navy, Marine, and Air Force bands.

The proposed legislation, amending the District Redevelopment Act, goes beyond the preservation of the Sousa home and seeks to protect other Capitol Hill residences and businesses.

San Francisco Verdict

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Battle Creek Enquirer and News, a leading newspaper in my district, has been outstanding in its editorial recognition and support of the necessary and vital work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Its judgment in this matter coincides with the overwhelming judgment of this House in its 412-to-6 vote on March 1 of this year in support of the committee's appropriation.

This newspaper has been equally firm in its support of the film "Operation Abolition," as depicting the events in San Francisco during the hearings last May and as disclosing the organized Communist campaign to abolish the committee.

Under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I include an editorial from the May 5 issue of the Enquirer and News commenting on the recent acquittal of a student charged with assaulting a policeman during the May riots:

THE FACTS ARE UNALTERED

The acquittal of a University of California student on charges that he assaulted a policeman during the riots at a hearing by the House Committee on Un-American Activities in San Francisco last year does not in any manner alter the basic facts of the affair. It does, however, raise a few interesting questions.

The student, Robert J. Meisenbach, was charged specifically with slugging an officer over the head with the officer's own night club. The issue was centered on the young man's guilt or innocence on that count and not whether a riot or other form of violence took place.

Mr. Meisenbach's attorney, Jack Berman, has never been more mistaken than when he declared that the verdict "knocks 'Operation Abolition' into the creek." Mr. Berman, of course, was referring to the controversial film of the riots which has been circulated

under sponsorship of the House committee. The fact that riots did take place, and that the film depicts them, remains unchallengeable.

The Meisenbach verdict proves only one point—that in the United States any man or woman can be tried by jury and that a jury's decision, popular or not, is the final word, except for a defense appeal. This is one situation that should be borne in mind at all times. This country still stands on the principle that the outcome of trials shall be decided upon the evidence submitted. In the Meisenbach case, the evidence in his favor apparently outweighed that offered by the prospecution, as far as the jurors were concerned.

There is, by the way, one intriguing aspect of this case that deserves emphasis. After his acquittal, Mr. Meisenbach celebrated at a beer party and among the guests were four of the jury members, including the foreman. Since jurors are expected to be impartial and not personally acquainted with a defendant during a trial, the appearance of four jurors at the party is rather strange. Perhaps it only serves to show how quickly some people can make new friends.

As to the effect of the verdict on the House committee film, we feel that the mayor of San Francisco, George Christopher, has summarized the situation nicely. He said bluntly that Mr. Meisenbach's acquittal "does not alter the fact that there was general rioting, nor that a duly constituted official committee, as well as courts and other city hall departments, were forced to cease operations pending restoration of order."

The primary purpose of the film has not been affected. We have contended—and continue to do so—that the film was prepared to show how Communists have tried to destroy the House committee and to portray how the Reds can infiltrate American college campuses. There is absolutely nothing in the acquittal of Mr. Meisenbach—on an assault charge—that can be truthfully construed as a repudiation of the film, either by the court or the jury.

Mrs. Maier Has a Message for Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to place in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from one of my constituents, Mrs. Alfred A. Maier, of Port Washington, N.Y., with a message for all Americans. I particularly admire her sound, basic reasoning.

Mrs. Maier writes:

DEAR MR. DEROUNIAN: With reference to the Russian accomplishment, man's first flight into space, I wish I knew a way, through you, to tell all Americans to talk less and work more. Everyone is giving an opinion; everyone thinks it should have been done his way, etc.—radio, TV, and the printed media—What's wrong with our NASA, etc.—just now I heard on radio that a Congressman is asking for a public hearing as to why we lagged?

Why can't there be less breast-beating and more silent, contemplative work?

Sure, being first has propaganda value, but I think this bickering among ourselves certainly has a propaganda angle, too. What's wrong with being second and doing a better and more thorough job—and as Mr. Kennedy said, "One that endures"?

How can you Congressmen go about the job of suggesting that people as a whole be just a little more circumspect and not so rash in their pronouncements?

Yours very truly,

MRS. ALFRED A. MAIER.

Frank N. Graass

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a signal honor was paid to one of Wisconsin's distinguished citizens recently when the Wisconsin State Assembly adopted a resolution commending Frank N. Graass for his significant service to the State over a span of more than 4 decades. Businessman, orchardist, conservationist, politician, administrator, and legislator, Frank N. Graass has had a notable career, and I join his other friends in wishing him long and fruitful retirement from public service.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the resolution adopted by the Wisconsin State Assembly on March 8, 1961:

STATE OF WISCONSIN JOINT RESOLUTION COMMENDING FRANK N. GRAASS FOR HIS SIGNIFICANT PUBLIC SERVICE EXTENDING OVER A PERIOD OF MORE THAN FOUR DECADES

The convening of the 1961 Wisconsin Legislature marked the first time in more than 40 years that Frank N. Graass did not have an active part in the public affairs of this State.

Few people have had the opportunity to influence the trend of events in certain fields of public concern which was afforded Mr. Graass. His forceful nature was early predicted when he captained his high school football and track teams all 4 years while in high school. He not only held the Wisconsin high school shot-put record but also the American high school discus record.

A native of Sturgeon Bay, he was long an active fruitgrower, and he has never permitted anyone to lose sight of the products of that area.

As the secretary-treasurer of the Wisconsin Izaak Walton League for more than a decade he not only strengthened that organization but developed a strong and lasting interest in conservation problems which led to his active participation in the formulation of many of the basic conservation laws under which this State operates.

In his early adulthood, he started a tree seed business, and at one time was America's largest exporter of seeds. Many of his seeds were shipped to Germany and Austria where selective forestation was put into operation while we were still ruthlessly destroying our own great resource.

His legislative service in the assembly of 11 sessions extended into every decade since World War I, and he served with distinction on the joint finance committee, conservation committee, legislative council, commission on interstate cooperation, board of governors of the council of State governments, committee on Great Lakes fisheries, and the Great Lakes area council. During the first period of his legislative service he was active in the establishment of the Wisconsin General Hospital, and has continued his interest in the handicapped throughout his career.

As the chief aid to Governor Goodland from 1941 to 1945 he was described by one political analyst at that time as the most powerful politician in the State. Intensely loyal to the octogenarian Governor, he devoted tremendous energy to his work as the Governor's assistant.

Few legislators expended as much time and thought each biennium in the interests of their constituents.

In view of his long and distinguished career in the service of Wisconsin and his community; be it

Resolved by the assembly, the senate concurring, That the legislature commend Frank N. Graass for his service, and extend to him the most sincere wishes for a long and enjoyable retirement from the public service.

Federal School Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Jackson Citizen Patriot (Mich.) of May 4, 1961:

FEDERAL SCHOOL AID

As so often is the case, there has been much more racket than revelation about the hot issue of Federal aid to education.

Supporters have jumped to claim for themselves the position of defenders of good education, as attractive as apple pie and motherhood.

The opposition has raised grim specters of Federal control, and conjured fake dragons of all sorts to slay.

All this is in the nature of politics, but it doesn't get to the heart of the issue.

School budgets are in trouble, and it is not the sort many would have us believe. The prattle about classroom shortage, for example, is outdated by recent progress.

President Kennedy said America needs 60,000 classrooms each year; construction in the past 5 years has averaged 68,000.

The real snag lies in paying day-to-day bills for teachers, lights, heat, special programs, and improvements, chalk and talk.

And those bills put a severe strain on the old property tax.

The choice is simply whether to cut the program or find other money.

There's been little talk of the former and too much nearsightedness about the latter.

Instead, many immediately turn to the Federal Government, seeing it as an inexhaustible source of cash. They forget that purse problems exist in Washington, too—the Federal debt is around $750 billion, including all commitments, the equivalent of $4,100 for each man, woman, and child in the United States. The current budget promises a deficit of $5 billion more.

Total State debts run around $60 million; many States have no debts at all. One half of 1 percent—1 in 200—of the Nation's school districts have reached the limit of their available bonded debt.

Yet, because Washington is far away, people seem to turn there rather than to local means.

This sort of wishfulness is encouraged by State legislators, who believe it more con-

venient to hold taxes down and then let problems pile up until solutions must come from the Federal Government—at increased cost, with less awareness of what's going on.

But a State lawmaker who refuses to consider tax revision that would include giving local communities the right of home rule and local taxation, can claim he kept taxes low. His words have a hollow echo, though they may sound good at a Fourth of July speech.

Education is the proper duty of the States, and States refuse to accept that duty. People should rap on doors in the State government, rather than look towards Washington.

Well aware that there are real problems, we have continued to oppose Federal aid. We do this less because we fear Federal control than because we believe people should solve difficulties as close to home as possible rather than sweeping them under the Federal rug, already bumpy with other difficulties.

President Kennedy has urged that we "ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country." One of the first things we can do is face local responsibilities so the Federal Government can do things of a truly national scope.

Voters should urge State legislators to assume that responsibility, rather than passing it to Washington.

You can keep tabs on local officials much better than on the far-off folks in Washington. It seems a shame people would rather pass the buck than bear down on those who should be working to solve the problems on a State rather than national basis.

Not a Very New Frontier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, my reservations about the monstrosity we passed last week under the guise of minimum wage legislation are shared by others. Those of you who saw the Doris Fleeson column know that it is very unusual for her to find fault with the Kennedy administration, but this legislation was more than she could stomach and I commend her for speaking out so forthrightly.

The Des Moines (Iowa) Register carried an excellent editorial on Friday, May 5, which says many of the same things I have been saying about this legislation. I think that all of the points in this editorial are well taken and under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD:

NOT A VERY NEW FRONTIER

The minimum wage bill passed by Congress is being called a victory for President Kennedy, and on the surface it sounds like a substantial modernization of an old law. The minimum wage in covered businesses will rise from $1 to $1.15 per hour within a few months if the President signs the bill, and will rise to $1.25 per hour in 1963.

Also, 3½ million new workers are to be covered. The newly covered workers will be guaranteed a minimum of $1 an hour at first. Two years later they will start getting overtime pay for hours in excess of 44 per week. In another year they will get a minimum of $1.15 an hour and overtime will begin after 42 hours. In still another year—by 1965—they will get the $1.25 minimum, and overtime will begin after 40 hours.

Thus the adjustment to the new minimum will be slow in businesses already covered and even slower in the new businesses to be added. There will be no shock to the economy nor a sudden increase in unemployment because of the higher minimum wages.

This bill falls far short of the goals set by Mr. Kennedy in his campaign for the Presidency and, on analysis, proves to be a political compromise with little real gain for the lowest paid workers in the country.

The administration forces traded off the workers most in need of protection in return for votes from southern Democrats and Republicans. Of the 3½ million new workers to be covered, only 660,000 are getting less than the minimum now. Only 1.9 million of the 22 million workers now covered are likely to get any increase as a result of the raise in the minimum.

Southern Congressmen succeeded in eliminating cotton gin employees, tobacco processing workers and others. Farmworkers—the lowest paid of all in the affluent U.S. economy—still are not covered. Laundry workers and workers in nonprofit hospitals were cut out.

The bill extends the coverage in better paid industries but does not move far to extend the coverage to workers who need it. The bill comes close in numbers added to the President's proposals, but not in the kinds of workers to be included.

We agree with Representative CHARLES A. GOODELL, Republican of New York, that "this was a cynical approach." If a minimum wage law is to have meaning, it should provide help to workers who are unorganized and who are unable to protect themselves against exploitation. This bill does little to accomplish this. It enables the least efficient industries to continue to pay far below the U.S. standard wages. It also tends to retard the application of improved methods in the least efficient industries.

The administration and the Democratic Party must accept full responsibility for this retreat. Democrats in Congress made the moves for the many exemptions.

Aid to Dependent Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from a constituent. I think it is too good to just file away in my office and under unanimous consent I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The letter is as follows:

E. Y. BERRY,
Congressman.

DEAR SIR: I think the idea of staying home and raising kids will be a lot better than working.

If I cannot get this aid to dependent children in South Dakota, I will move to a locality where I can.

Will you publish a list of places where it can be had and which one pays the most.

I am tired of digging post holes and anyway, with the number of kids I can produce while not working, it will bring me a much better income than I would earn as a laborer, or even a professional.

I will not sign this as it may keep me from drawing aid for my dependent children when I move to a place where I can get it.

Thank you.

A LAZY FARM LABORER.

Encouragement for Textiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Greenville, S.C., is the textile capital of the world. The following editorial appeared in the Greenville News May 5:

TEXTILE INDUSTRY GETS A HEARING

President Kennedy's announcement last Tuesday of a seven-point plan for the relief of the besieged and beleaguered textile industry is encouraging in that it represents a long step toward what the experts of the industry, and many of those of the administration, feel is necessary.

There has been no final decision on the basic specifics as to how the domestic industry is to be protected. That should be clearly understood.

But the Kennedy administration has agreed to give the industry the best chance it has yet had, since the end of World War II, to make its case. And we think it can.

Some weeks ago, the industry, acting through a congressional committee headed by Representative CARL VINSON of Georgia, went to a White House group with the plea that a strong textile industry was essential to national defense and that it was being damaged, perhaps hopelessly, by foreign imports.

These men asked for a country-by-country, category-by-category, system of import quotas. This would mean that no country could export to the United States more than a limited amount of cloth or finished goods of certain types.

This the administration has not yet agreed to, but it has left the door open to the textile industry to prove its case and, perhaps, win its point.

That is the most important element in the situation as it now stands.

With some of the President's points we cannot agree. He said for instance, that he had directed the Department of Commerce to launch an expanded program of research and development to discover new products, processes and markets. This the industry has been doing for years, sometimes with Government assistance.

He said he would ask for a review of the tax structure with a view to improving depreciation allowances on machinery. This has been an issue for years.

He said he would ask for assistance for textile plants running into serious financial difficulties. An American textile industry in a fair competitive situation should not need this.

Textiles are the mainstay of the southern industrial economy. Our people are not asking for a "distressed area" act. But they are asking for a fair shake. And Mr. Kennedy has indicated that this will be forthcoming.

There are two key phrases in his statement of Tuesday. One is that the problem is important and deep rooted. That it is. It is entertwined with the national economy and

with foreign policy. We cannot suddenly shut off textile imports without jeopardizing the economies of some of our staunchest and strongest allies.

The other is that the time for action is now.

For too long the American textile industry has been inhibited in its planning. The trouble with the import problem has been that at no time have the men who plan production known just how much they might expect in the way of foreign competition. If they could know that, they could proceed intelligently and with a measure of certainty.

But all of this may be remedied. We hope so.

Acting on the advice of such men as Gov. Ernest F. Hollings of South Carolina and southern textile executives, the President has paved the way for a solution.

The industry is basing its case on its essentiality to the national defense. It has been assured of a hearing of its case "on its merits," in the words of the President himself. That's all that could be asked.

As the President said: "I believe it is time for action."

It is.

Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1961

SPEECH
OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill, H.R. 6441, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for a more effective program of water pollution control.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, as one who advocated and supported the pasage, in 1948, of the first water pollution control bill, I rise to urge my colleagues to promptly approve the measure presently before us, H.R. 6441, designed to amend the existing Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to provide for a more effective program in this area which so vitally affects the Nation's health and welfare.

From the expert testimony that has been presented so ably here by the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, the author of this bill, it is unquestionably clear that water has become the No. 1 resource problem confronting the United States today.

Although Federal financial assistance has been of great help to the States in dealing with this urgent problem of water pollution control, the evidence before us demonstrates the urgent need for an expansion and extension of the current program.

Over the past 4 years, contract awards for sewage treatment plant construction have averaged almost $360 million annually, an increase of 62 percent over the 5-year average before Federal aid became available.

However, according to the U.S. Public Health Service 4,136 new plants are required for 23 million people in communities now afflicted with health dangerous sewage, and to replace sewage treatment plants that have long been obsolete and operationally deficient. Another 991 communities require major additions and enlargements of existing plants to provide the minimum measure of health safety for 19 million persons.

Mr. Chairman, it is eminently worthy of note that nothing in the measure before us is intended to impair or in any way affect any right or jurisdiction of the States with respect to the waters of the States, including but not limited to the power, authority, and jurisdiction of the States to enforce their own water pollution control laws and regulations.

I submit that the problem of water pollution control is so essential to national welfare and progress that it can be most realistically overcome only by the joint efforts of the States and the Federal Government. Let us bear in mind, however, that under the provisions of this bill the role of the Federal Government is that of a stimulator and helper to keep the important pollution abatement program moving ahead.

Mr. Chairman, the basic duty we all have in the enactment of legislation is the fullest exercise of our reason and intelligence in attempting to provide today, as best we can, a solution for the problems of the future. In my considered judgment, we now have the opportunity, in this measure, to discharge that basic responsibility in great measure.

In order to sensibly forestall the disaster of a growing water pollution and shortage problem, let us approve this bill without extended delay so that the expanded procedures of research, planning, and construction, so necessary to preserve the health, safety, and welfare of American citizens, may begin.

The Future of Naval Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the attached article concerning the future of naval aviation by Vice Adm. Robert B. Pirie, U.S. Navy, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Air, is such an interesting and important one that I felt it should be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This article is taken from Sperryscope and I submit it as follows:

THE FUTURE OF NAVAL AVIATION

(By Vice Adm. Robert B. Pirie, U.S. Navy, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Air)

(On January 18, 1911, Eugene Ely, a civilian, flew his bailing wire and canvas Curtiss pusher out to the U.S.S. *Pennsylvania* anchored in San Francisco Bay and landed it on a wooden platform built over the ship's stern. What is even more remarkable, he turned his Curtiss around and took off after the deck had been cleared of the sand bags and ropes used as a primitive, but effective, arresting gear. Behind Ely's dramatic flight was the vision and foresight of a Captain Chambers, who had been appointed to look after aviation correspondence the year before. Captain Chambers got together with Glenn Curtiss, and the result was an experimental flight from the deck of the cruiser *Birmingham* in November 1910. This flight convinced Captain Chambers and others that an airplane would be of no advantage to the fleet unless it could both take off and land on the same ship. The U.S.S. *Pennsylvania* was made ready, and when Ely took off and landed on its deck, naval aviation was born.)

This year marks the 50th anniversary of naval aviation; and there will be quite a lot written and said about the accomplishments of Navy and Marine Corps pilots. As we talk with people about the past 50 years and the celebration commemorating them there is one question that is always asked: What is the future of naval aviation? Related to this one are further questions: What of the carrier in the age of the Polaris missile? What of the manned aircraft in the age of the guided missile? In the space offered here, rather than furnishing yet another capsule history or a bare chronology of past achievements, I would like to use the 50 years of naval air warfare evolution as a vantage point from which to survey the air Navy of today and tomorrow.

Naval aviation, is defined by law as such aviation as may be organic to the naval forces of the United States of America, including the organic aviation components of the Marine Corps.

It consists therefore, of such integral air components as are necessary to carry out the Navy's missions and tasks around the world.

Since the air is but one of several inseparable dimensions of a combat commander's sphere of influence, air combat units of the Navy are organized, are assigned, and operate as appropriate and responsive elements of the larger task organizations.

In its broadest divisions, naval aviation can be said to consist of the fleet or combat elements, direct fleet support elements, indirect support elements, aviation training activities, and Aviation Reserve Forces. Marine Corps aviation is a part of each of the segments; and its organization parallels, or is integral with it, as is most appropriate.

All other elements of naval aviation are concerned with furnishing the fleet and fleet aviation units with goods, services, and properly trained personnel. The missions and tasks of the fleet air elements, therefore, are the proper context in which to consider the present and future of naval aviation.

PATROL RESPONSIBILITY

The international waters of the earth are extensive and public. In an era when potential enemies are strong, aggressive, and unpredictable, the sea lanes may hold highwaymen as well as peaceful merchants. As a consequence, a great deal of the air Navy's work is involved with patroling the sea roads of the world.

These patrol commitments and other specialized scouting and patrol (reconnaissance) functions comprise one of the primary missions of naval aviation. Land-based patrol planes; seaplanes; lighter-than-air ships; photographic, weather, radar, and observation aircraft all contribute to the Navy's continuous surveillance of all manner of activity in, over, and on the sea. Needless to say, these observation tasks are continuing ones and ones which require continuous evolution to keep ahead of a potential enemy's technology.

Patrol aircraft are not just observers of the seas' traffic. In addition to their eyes, most of them have an offensive capability against submarine operators. A high percentage of the patrol aircraft are assigned to antisubmarine task elements. Observation can become antisubmarine attack with the flip of a switch. This responsibility will

continue as new weapons evolve from those presently in use.

In addition to the patrol type of antisubmarine activity, naval aviation furnishes fleet commanders with other antisubmarine forces. These are the antisubmarine carrier forces, and, like their attack carrier counterparts, they are prepared to operate as a moving area of national sovereignty; not necessarily playing cat and mouse with a single submarine, but rather, ready to aggressively purge the seas of submarine opposition. These hunter-killer groups, as they are sometimes called, are composed of surface units, conventional aircraft, and helicopters. They can move anywhere there may be submarines, untrammeled by the need for bases and special supply lines—an irresistible nemesis of underseas craft. As submarines continue to increase in speed, range, and maneuverability, there will be a corresponding need for the higher speed and wider coverage that only aircraft can provide. As the number of modern Soviet submarines grows, there will be an increasing need for all types of air antisubmarine offenses.

Closer air support aviation has been called the modern, longer-range, flexible artillery of amphibious forces. The Navy and Marine Corps implement this philosophy by attaching a Marine air wing to each Marine Corps division. By this integral association, the immediate responsiveness, so necessary to amphibious assault, is furnished to the combat troops by the wing. Its aircraft are the airborne guns, the airborne eyes, the aerial troop carriers, and supply trucks of these modern amphibious task forces. These assignments will continue as all-weather air operation techniques improve, and it is likely that airborne components of Marine forces will be around indefinitely.

ATTACK CARRIER FORCES

The Attack Carrier Forces, historically are the first available sea power at any trouble spot; and they are now the Navy's frontline forces of the cold war.

The fast carrier task force is a mobile, self-contained, self-sustaining, versatile, and nearly irresistible sphere of national sovereignty, influence, and if necessary control. This unique weapons complex has several exclusive advantages over other forces. These advantages are derived from the related characteristics of mobility and location in extra-national territory—the sea.

Mobility removes these forces from preplanned ballistic attack and makes them hard to find, and virtually impossible to hit.

Foreign bases are certainly desirable and necessary for many reasons, but conversely, sea-based strength is free from the effects of some of the factors that are encountered in maintaining bases in foreign lands.

As a brushfire fighter, the attack carrier task force can cover a big neighborhood. From an enemy's point of view, the modern attack carrier task force is so well defended that striking it involves almost unacceptable losses. The carrier furnishes a very practical substitute for vertical takeoff and landing (VT–OL) with the very efficient and economical catapult and arresting system. This system is also available for quick installation ashore by Marine Combat Engineers.

In addition, we build our carriers at home, where we do not contribute to the imbalance of international payments. Supporting the carriers in operation causes no loss of gold in rents, salaries, or supplies. In every sense, they are relatively inexpensive and easy to supply.

Finally, attack carrier task forces are one of the Nation's greatest positive military influences in the cold war. Their value as a maker of friends and supporter, and as a preventer of aggression is a matter of record. The Polaris missile will undoubtedly play a greater nuclear deterrent role, but attack carrier forces do have a nuclear deterrent role as a collateral responsibility. Inasmuch as this is in addition to their limited war role, it is more or less a dividend.

The carrier's desirability as the small war brush fireman is self-evident. The function of the attack carrier as the shock troops of limited wars is a role that appears to have more and more importance in the constant but shifting skirmishes with aggressive communism.

If the study of military history teaches us anything, it is that progress is made through evolution, that there is no ultimate weapon, and that wars are won by being ahead in the evolutionary process of weapon, counter-weapon, and counter-counter-weapon.

NEW FACTORS

A new weapon and a new area of operation have caused an upheaval in the evolutionary process. The new weapon is the nuclear bomb, and the new area of operations is space beyond the earth's atmosphere. But I would like to observe that the nuclear warhead, for all of its size, is only a very advanced evolution of Greek fire and gunpower. And further, the leap into space is no more a departure than was Columbus' first voyage, or the Wright brothers' first flight. It can be strongly contended that assurances for safe recovery of the first astronaut will be greater than they were in either the Columbian venture or the Wright experiment. Nuclear weapons may increase explosions by 10 to the 12th power, and space exploration increase ranges as much, but these increases in destruction and distance, like earlier evolutions, do not displace the ultimate area of contention: The inhabitable land areas of the earth. They simply add new dimensions to the age-old problem of control of people and real estate.

As to participation in the new dimension of space, the Navy's role will undoubtedly be an important one. A great deal can be said for the experience that the Navy has in the construction of heavy, self-contained vehicles and in distant and lengthy voyages, as well as the special knowledge that it has always had of the spacial oceans of the solar system and beyond. The Navy has been the leading pioneer in the development of space equipment and in experiments in space medicine. Four of the seven astronauts now in training are naval aviators, and a large majority of their training has been conducted by naval personnel at naval air installations. It seems quite certain that naval aviation has an important future role in the exploration of space.

In summary, it is true, beyond a shadow of a doubt, that naval aviation occupies a vital and growing role in the defense forces of the free world. Furthermore, it is just as true to assume that this role will continue to grow in size and importance with the shifting conflicts of the cold war and any forthcoming leap into space. As I look back on the first 50 years and turn to look forward to the next, it is hard to decide which era will be the more exciting or offer the greater challenge. Certainly, those of us who have participated, and will participate, in both of these unprecedented periods are fortunate. Those who will play a major part in the future are to be congratulated on their good fortune and wished God speed in their endeavors.

America Dares

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Chicago Sun-Times of Saturday, May 6, 1961 entitled "Safe in Space":

SAFE IN SPACE

The prayers of America rode with Alan B. Shepard, Jr. yesterday. If we judge correctly the faces and the feelings of those who watched with us on TV the orange plume of fire that pushed a human into space, Shepard's countrymen were concerned with his fate, the life of another human being, more than they were with the success of Government test No. 108.

Shepard went into space safely and returned no worse for the trip. That's what counted most and, that accomplished, the fete itself could be assessed.

First of all, Americans are proud of their new hero and first spaceman, the 37-year-old New Englander, Shepard, who turned out to be exactly the right man for the job—calm, and scientific, but thrilled as any average person would be at the sight of the entire east coast of the United States below him, "a beautiful sight."

Americans can be proud of their scientists and technicians, especially since they came through in a goldfish bowl performance. And Americans can be proud that they are not so proud that they would forget the value of one human life and rush into an orbital space flight simply to catch up with the Soviet Union.

Measured against the Russian achievement of 23 days ago, when a man was put into orbit for 108 minutes and returned safely, the American flight may seem anticlimactic. But in the long view of history the American achievement must be registered as a classic first in categories not touched by the Soviet space shot. And in the long view of history a few months' head start should not make a great deal of difference.

The grand success of the Shepard flight was magnified by the manner in which it was conducted—before the entire world.

If it had failed, American scientific prestige would have suffered. But it succeeded.

Americans demonstrated that their plans were so well calculated and their equipment so good that they could let the world watch them lift their first man to space. The open manner of the test bespoke a confidence the Russians surely must envy.

Conversely, Russia's secrecy—announcement of their successful flight only after the fact—has created some doubt about its authenticity. Our scientists are satisfied it took place as reported, but there is some belief in world circles that the Soviets sacrificed one or more astronauts in unsuccessful tests before Yuri Gagarin zipped once around the world and returned safely.

No such beliefs are possible about America's spaceman shot.

America showed with meticulous detail every step of the way how precautions were taken to prevent harm to her first astronaut. His life was more important than the experiment or even America's prestige. The concern paid off; stories that America sacrificed lives to learn how to put a man in space would now simply be incredible.

Although Shepard's flight was not as spectacular as Gagarin's some parallels are worth noting.

Fifty miles up, there is not enough air to support airplane wings. Space begins at 100 miles. At this point satellites can go into orbit. Shepard went to 115 miles, Gagarin to 188 miles.

Shepard could have been orbited if the controls had been set to do so. But America chose at this time to forgo the spectacular. Shepard's flight was preliminary to an orbital flight to make sure a pilot can manipulate controls in space at 5,100 miles an hour. Shepard proved this and the world heard the learning of this lesson step by step or rather one tense minute by one tense minute.

The world does not know whether the same precautions for Gagarin's safety were taken by the Soviet Union through preliminary flights such as Shepard's. The world has not been told what information his flight added to mankind's store of scientific knowledge. Russia proved a man could be orbited safely. America showed a space flight can be made publicly, which is a political as well as scientific achievement.

Perhaps America shouldn't have risked her prestige by putting on her first human space shot live on television. But where human life is concerned, America has a reputation for being open and aboveboard. And who can say whether the prayers that went aloft with Shepard, because all America knew he was on his way, did not help make every valve and transistor do its job exactly right?

These Fighters Against Youth Crime Need Your Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the 37th anniversary of the appointment of J. Edgar Hoover as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The Nation owes him a debt of eternal gratitude for his contributions to law enforcement, to patriotism, to the fight against internal subversion.

In a recent article in Reader's Digest, which I ask leave to include with my remarks, Mr. Hoover has made a worthwhile contribution to our understanding of the problems of juvenile delinquency. I commend it to your attention:

THESE FIGHTERS AGAINST YOUTH CRIME NEED YOUR HELP

(By John Edgar Hoover)

This Nation is hurtling toward a frightful internal crisis. Indeed, I am convinced that we have already reached a crossroads we have been heading for since the beginning of World War II; and that if we fail to admit the deadly nature of this crisis and to meet it quickly and aggressively, we will pay with the life of our republic.

The crisis manifests itself in what some call juvenile delinquency, and what I call youthful criminality, for that is what it is. I refer to the vicious acts of vandalism, wanton brutality and mounting savagery which typify today's arrogant teenage gangs.

One night last summer, five youths between the ages of 15 and 18 viciously attacked two families in a Chicago park. After beating both husbands senseless with baseball bats, stabbing them with switchblade knives and robbing them, these five terrorists turned upon the two pregnant mothers and brutally raped them while the two children of one mother—aged 3/1½—watched, weeping and horrified.

"They held a knife at my throat and threatened to kill my two little children if I resisted," one of the women said. "We pleaded with them, but they paid no attention."

Convicted of rape and assault, each of the five young thugs received 65-year sentences. The sentencing judge recommended that the youths never be paroled.

Tragically, similar acts of brutal violence are perpetrated daily across the country by rampaging teenage criminals. Blazing headlines of murder, sadism and gang warfare toll the depredations of youthful criminals. An 18-year-old California art student obtained money to purchase books by robbing elderly people. Known as the "mugger bandit," he committed six vicious attacks on elderly victims which netted him $70. Two of the victims, both elderly men, subsequently died as the result of the violent assaults. In describing his actions, the youth commented, "I picked on old men because they could not fight back."

Today youthful offenders account for one-half of the burglary and larceny arrests in this country and nearly two-thirds of the arrests for automobile thefts. And their rate of participation in more serious crimes—assault, robbery, rape, murder—is steadily rising.

If we are to continue living in a free and decent society, we must do much more than halt this trend; we must reverse it. Preoccupied with the pursuit of wealth and luxury, we seem to have lost touch with our basic traditions—work, discipline, duty, honor. But if this Nation is to survive, we must give our youngsters more chance to know and revere the spiritual concepts which are the real sinews of greatness.

We can help them best by committing ourselves unreservedly to a battle that an all-too-small vanguard of dedicated Americans has been fighting for us for years—the professional leaders and part-time volunteer workers of such groups as the Boys' Clubs of America, Girl Scouts and Boy Scouts, YMCA and YWCA, Police Athletic Leagues, and Catholic, Protestant and Jewish youth organizations. The results these groups achieve continually reaffirm my faith in the strength and appeal of the American idea, and my conviction that American youth, if given the opportunity, will eagerly accept honorable challenge.

Here are some heartening examples:

During the 8 years following World War II there was a 61-percent increase in juvenile crime in Louisville, Ky. But during the same period there was a 52-percent decrease in one of Louisville's poorest, toughest areas. No new industry moved into this neighborhood to upgrade incomes; there was no decrease in the youth population; housing conditions were not improved. One thing happened: A boys' club was established there.

Within 5 years after a boys' club was organized in a delinquency-ridden area of Schenectady, N.Y., there was an 80-percent decrease in youthful crime in that neighborhood. Results like these can be found in many of the 383 cities where 575 Boys' Clubs of America serve 600,000 lads.

The formula is simple: It consists of a genuine, active adult interest in youth; a deep respect and sympathy for the individual boy and girl, tempered with rigid, tough-minded adherence to the legal and moral principles which are the cornerstones of any decent society; and, above all, an unwavering faith in our youth, and Job-like patience in helping every youngster realize the best that is in him.

This formula has worked countless times. At the end of World War II one neighborhood just west of Chicago's Loop was virtually an armed camp, torn by bloody juvenile gang wars. The streets were not safe for women, night or day; children could not be sent to the grocery store with cash.

For 10 years various social agencies tried to deal with these gangs with little success. Then, in 1955, a young boys' club extension worker whom we shall call Richard West began hanging about the pool halls and candy stores where the dominant, most vicious gang met. For months he studied the boys, listened to them, tried to talk with them. It wasn't easy. These boys came from homes filled with fearful frictions. Most had quit school. The gang was their refuge from the hostile world around them.

Rebuffed and threatened time and again, West doggedly shadowed the gang. When members were arrested, he would appear in court with them and speak in their behalf. He made the gang aware that arresting officers and judges listened to him. He was on call day and night for advice and whatever help he could provide.

Finally, one by one, gang members began coming to him with their problems. They found he could arrange loans when there was serious need—medical or dental problems, lack of food in the home. West kept watching, waiting for a display of interest he could seize on as a foundation for launching these youngsters into productive lives. Then he found it. Several times each week they would wander to a nearby high school to watch in absorbed silence as an ROTC unit performed military drill. Talking with the boys, West found they had deep respect for the kind of discipline which could produce precision drill. Here was a chance to get them active in a field in which they could win what they needed and wanted most desperately and had never had—adult support and praise.

From Government surplus West obtained Army uniforms. Combat helmets were painted bright blue and white. Drums and bugles were provided. The boys learned fast. As a gang this group had flourished under iron discipline. Now the same discipline drove them toward perfection in military drill. Interest in gang feuds and hoodlumism faded. They concentrated on mastering the fast, tricky cadences of the drill repertoire. Soon they were taking part in civic parades, performing at sports events and on television.

Their success as a drill team fired the imagination of rival gangs. Before long the drill teams in this area included more than 400 youngsters who had once belonged to 17 different gangs. A boys' club was built in the center of the area. Here boys worked off excess energy in all kinds of sports and discovered new interests in handicrafts, science, photography, and drama. Gang structures disintegrated. Boys' club workers stayed in close touch with parents, kept pointing to the worth and potentialities of their sons, awakened parental enthusiasm for the boys.

As a result of concerted adult direction and encouragement, many of these boys returned to high school; others found jobs and completed their high school requirements during evenings in the Boys' Club library.

Today this Boys' Club thrives with a membership of more than 1,000. This area, 5 years ago a spawning ground for big-time crime, is now a respectable neighborhood whose citizens can walk the streets unafraid, with pride in their children and hope for the future.

Some communities have done much to combat youthful criminality through wholesome recreational programs for their children. Great progress is being made in areas where men and women care enough to do something about the problem. Seven years ago, the vast Surrey Lane area of St. Louis, Mo., faced with a growing juvenile-crime problem, did not have a single park or community center. Parents and youngsters of Surrey Lane went into action. With great effort and hard work they converted a tract of land, once a swamp, into a recreational area covering 31 acres. They raised money, cleared the land, built roads and constructed recreational facilities. And they did it as a family project—father and son, mother and daughter, young and old alike, united in the common endeavor. Today, with over 2,000

youths participating in recreational activities, Surrey Lane's juvenile-crime rate is practically nil. Last year, the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, Pa., honored Surrey Lane with the Nation's first-place award for a community program.

The Boy Scout movement, too, has proved that when a worthy challenge is promoted among youngsters, it takes. In 1 year the crime rate in East Harlem was more than double that of any other section of New York City. Youthful gangs kept the 64-square-block area in terror. Scouters moved in. First they sold Scouting to the ruler of the ruling gang, an 18-year-old whom police suspected of organizing the gang wars which rocked the community. Soon that gang—11 boys—was a Scout troop, dedicated to the principle of helping people instead of hurting them.

More than 150 police departments in the United States now sponsor Boy Scout units, with some police officers serving as Scout leaders. We in the FBI are proud of the fact than nearly 50 percent of our FBI agents are former Boy Scouts.

In no instance have the Boys' Clubs of America or Boy Scouts designed special programs for dealing with problem boys. They have succeeded simply by providing adult friendship, guidance, worthy challenge, a desire for the rewards of disciplined living. Their achievements are a monument to the intrinsic worth of our youngsters, and a powerful lesson for us all.

It is long past time that every one of us understood the deadly nature of the sickness in our society and went to work on the cure. Each one of us must help turn back the tide of moral laxity and public apathy which threatens us. Our youth movements have proved it can be done. We must get interested in our children again—in what they read, see, hear, and do.

And we must get tough with ourselves. We must stop governing our lives by expediency. Nothing is so infectious as example. We must measure our every act by the same single, simple, stringent criterion that made us a great Nation: "Is it right?"

Plain Talk About the Administration Plan for Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, how do the Democratic campaign promises square with performance in the first months of the new administration? The Democratic candidates for President and Vice President promised to free the farmers from Federal bureaucracy, to eliminate Federal controls. How do these promises fit in with the farm program the administration is now trying to sell to the farmers and to force through Congress? Some interesting facts on this issue are contained in two articles from the forthcoming June issue of the magazine Farm and Ranch. I urge the Members to think carefully about these articles which I insert as a part of my remarks. The editorial, "Blackball, Bribery, and Blackmail," raises some serious questions as to the real purpose of the administration farm program. The interview with Mr. Charles B. Shuman, respected and able farm leader, in the article "A Way To Comfortable Peasantry," points to the dangerous amount of power to be vested in a single individual, the Secretary of Agriculture, in dealing with farm problems:

WASHINGTON WIRE—BLACKBALL, BRIBERY, AND BLACKMAIL

(By Bill Kennedy, editor)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Two years ago a "mad economist" named Willard Cochrane outlined in the Journal of Farm Economics a plan for complete government takeover in agriculture. Now he has detailed the plan in the form of Secretary Freeman's Omnibus farm bill.

If the farmers of America sit on their grass and let this bill go through Congress * * * they deserve to lose their freedom. For only a grassroots rebellion can stop it.

Every Member of Congress who votes for it—Republican or Democrat, city representative or countryman—must be "turned out to graze" on the government-regimented lands he is helping to create. And you can put him there. This is especially urged for Southern members—because the law is one that surely discriminates against the South.

It gives the Secretary the powers of a farm dictator, with authority to put every phase of agriculture under controls—including livestock, poultry, and the 250-odd plant crops. This in itself is a monstrous crime. But the bill further spells out in its language the possible use of a 10-year production history in setting up allotments.

Any Congressman or farmer can see that this would halt the expansion of livestock and poultry enterprises in the South (fastest expansion of its kind anywhere in the country's agriculture) * * * what's worse, it could set production back to the levels of years ago.

And yet, two southerners—so-called farm leaders Representative COOLEY, Democrat of North Carolina, and Senator ELLENDER, Democrat, of Louisiana, introduced the bill and are helping the administration push the legislation through before you can figure out what it's all about.

Backers of the Freeman bill are using bribes, threats, and deception to try to pass it hurriedly. For example:

Veiled promises have been made by administration leaders that they will "stay off civil rights" (integration) for a year or two if southerners will go along with this and other Kennedy-pushed legislation. (Explains, perhaps, some of the strange votes recorded earlier.)

Judgeships and other appointments have been promised, passed out, to keep some southerners in line.

The Secretary's office has quietly threatened to keep poultry products out of the school lunch program if poultrymen fight this legislation.

That office has also made it plain that organizations fighting the bill will not get appointments to the commodity committees when the program goes into effect. "You'll be left out in the cold."

John Duncan, Assistant Secretary from Georgia, appointed to the staff as an embarrassment to the American Farm Bureau (Georgia is the only State Farm Bureau on record in support of the bill), has said, in effect, to Georgia poultrymen: "If you actively oppose this bill, don't come to Washington again for anything."

ASC committeemen and other paid employees of the Department of Agriculture are being openly used to promote this legislation among farmers.

One State ASC committeeman was quoted in House committee hearings as saying to county committees, "If you don't actively support the Department's views, you'd better resign. Doing nothing is not good enough—we will have State 'shock troops' come in and do the job for you."

In other words, the administration is using every trick in the book to put this over on you. And it is working.

While hearing testimony against the bill, by the American Farm Bureau, Congressman Cooley made the public admission that "I have stacks of mail on my desk this high (measured with his hands), all against this legislation." He then went on to add "But that doesn't frighten us. We have been around Washington long enough to evaluate propaganda when we see it."

This is a clear indication that the pressure being applied from the top is far more important to the Congressman than the reaction he gets from the people he is paid to represent.

Land reform may be next. In a speech before the Nation's farm magazine editors in Washington, Secretary Freeman spoke freely (twice) about the need for land reform. "We are selling land reform to other countries," he said, "while drifting into trouble here in our own country." He did not say whether his land reform would follow the line of Castro's or that of some other systems proposed for Latin America. But after what he has asked for in the omnibus bill it is evident that he wants to be the man to do the dividing up, once the Government decides to take charge of farm real estate.

In this bill he asks power to write the laws; to use committees nominated by his own Government workers and appointed by himself as a front for doing whatever he pleases. He wants to give Congress the veto right instead of the legislative job, with the very two men who introduced the bill sitting in position to prevent the Congress from getting even a chance to vote.

He wants the right to build a government machine, made up of $50-a-day Department workers in every rural county of America.

He asks the unprecedented right to dictate working conditions on the farms of participating farmers. And the power to force every farmer to participate, with referendums in which he gives them a choice between a rock and a hard place.

All this he wants, plus having the taxpayers pick up a $20-billion-a-year tab (estimate) to pay for his machine. That's about half what the whole Defense Department costs.

Would a man like that hesitate to ask for a redivision of our farmlands? We think not. Will Congress give it to him? If it will pass this farm bill, it might.

CHARLES B. SHUMAN, CHAMPION OF AMERICAN FARM FREEDOM—WHAT HE SEES IN NEW AND PROPOSED FARM LAWS; THEIR THREAT TO THE FUTURE OF AGRICULTURE—"A WAY TO COMFORTABLE PEASANTRY"

(Exclusive Farm and Ranch interview by Bill Kennedy)

Question. How do you explain the fact that while Farm Bureau wants a program of less Government in agriculture, many other farm organizations ask for the exact opposite?

Answer: This is not surprising because farmers themselves vary in their views. Three-fourths of the organized farmers are Farm Bureau members and Farm Bureau reflects the majority opinion in our own organization. There is always a small minority which disagrees with any position you take.

Question. You opposed the present feed grain law. Why?

Answer. The temporary feed grain law was a step in the wrong direction—it was clear that it would cause damage to farm income and hamper opportunities to produce what is needed.

Question. What happens if this type of program is continued?

Answer. I think it means that we move step by step toward a completely regimented agriculture with the imposition of specific controls in acres or in pounds, bales, barrels, bushels, cows, sows and hens—and embracing all the trappings that go with a completely controlled agriculture. This is the clear choice that faces us now with the proposals of the Cochrane-Freeman bill currently in Congress.

Question. The "Omnibus" bill! Exactly what is it?

Answer. It is the greatest bid for power that we have ever seen in American agriculture. Power for the Secretary.

Question. But Mr. Freeman explains that nothing will be done without a referendum and a two-thirds vote of the farmers.

Answer. Well, this sounds all right until you examine the Secretary's powers. He has the power to exempt certain producers and certain areas; and when they are exempted from the program they don't vote. He will determine who will vote. Then, he will submit the proposition. The farmers who vote will not vote for or against a proposed program; but for one of two alternatives, both of which may be bad.

The Secretary, by establishing the alternatives, can almost dictate the result of the referendum.

Question. This bill has been touted as a program in which the farmers would write their own ticket. Are you saying that they will neither write it nor have a fair chance to turn it down?

Answer. This proposed legislation is a fraud from beginning to end. It starts out by giving the impression that farmer committees are going to draft proposals. All right, let's look at the farmer advisory committees. They are to be appointed by the Secretary, two-thirds of them from nominees suggested by ASC committeemen—in other words, per diem employees of the Department of Agriculture. Of course, their interest is going to be in perpetuating and expanding control programs. And the Secretary has final selection.

Question. These commodity committeemen will be paid?

Answer. Fifty dollars a day plus expenses. Now, the other third of the commodity committee will be from nominations made by "appropriate" farm organizations. I am sure that after our opposition to the bill we will not be considered "appropriate." This committee is to make suggestions. Only suggestions. It is under the absolute control of the Secretary and, in my opinion, subservient to the wishes of the Department of Agriculture, the Secretary, the administration.

First, the Secretary has the power to establish the committee. Secondly, he appoints the committee. Third, he can decide when to discontinue the committee. And fourth, he dosen't have to accept a single recommendation it makes.

Question. Mr. Shuman, these committeemen will not be subject to regulations on political action?

Answer. They will not. I am convinced, Bill, that the Cochrane-Freeman bill would set up apparatus for one of the most far-reaching and dangerous political machines that we have ever seen anywhere.

Question. But how about the right to veto by Congress?

Answer. Well, Congress has a limited number of days in which to act. Those of us who have been around the Congress know that if the chairman of the House and Senate Agriculture Committees (COOLEY and ELLENDER) didn't see fit to bring this to an issue the Congress would have no opportunity whatsoever to veto.

Question. One accusation is that the Secretary could enforce certain regulations about the use of labor, etc., by the participants in various programs. Is that also in the package?

Answer. Yes, the Secretary is authorized to establish terms and conditions for price or income support. This could include minimum wages, housing regulations, etc. for farm labor.

Question. What about the check-off feature of the bill?

Answer. The Secretary is authorized to make a check-off from the returns of all farmers producing products covered by these programs for research, promotion and advertising.

Question. This is not subject to farmer vote?

Answer. No! Not as a separate proposition.

Question. The term "socialized agriculture" doesn't seem to scare people anymore, but it appears to me, from your analysis of this bill, that we would be right in the middle of it. You have intimated that you think the No. 1 purpose here is to build a political machine. Do you think this is over and above the effort to socialize agriculture?

Answer. I really believe that the first objective of a group of folks who are most aggressive in support of this bill is to build a political machine which will change the farmer vote.

Question. Mr. Shuman, there has been a lot of talk about farm freedom. Will this law destroy it?

Answer. I think there is a very real danger that this bill would take us beyond the point of no return and move in the direction of a completely regimented, comfortable peasantry in agriculture. I am equally sure (I have observed this in foreign countries, where they tried it) that this kind of an agriculture means lower income, lower opportunity and not an improved standard of living for farmers.

Question. If this bill passed would the Secretary of Agriculture have as much power as Minister of Agriculture in Russia?

Answer. Well, I know very little about the powers of Russia's Minister of Agriculture. But I would say this—the Secretary of Agriculture in the United States would have more absolute power over the farm management and operating decisions of farmers than any other government official in the world outside the iron curtain.

Question. The Secretary has said he probably wouldn't bother the livestock people.

Answer. But there is nothing in this bill to prevent it. In fact, it is contemplated in the legislation, because livestock is specifically named.

Question. There seems to be a great sense of urgency about passing the bill. What is the big hurry?

Answer. Personally, I think the reason they are in such a hurry is that they are afraid farmers back home will find out what it is.

Question. You seem convinced it won't help farmers. Will the bill help consumers?

Answer. Consumers will be its strongest opponents when they understand it—because of the cost.

Question. How much?

Answer. My estimate is that it would be from four to five times the cost of the present (price support) program, which runs in the neighborhood of $3 to $4 billion. So my guess (as good as anybody's) is that it will run from $15 to $20 billion per year.

Question. You have strenuously objected to that part of the bill that will let the Secretary base allotments on a 10-year history. Why?

Answer. Whenever you base a control program on production history, you inevitably penalize the areas—and the farmers in the areas—where production patterns are changing. I cannot believe that the Members of Congress from these areas want this to happen.

Adenauer Reports on His U.S. Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, following his return to Bonn from a 6-day visit to the United States, Chancellor Konrad Adenauer reported to the German Bundestag on his talks with President John K. Kennedy, Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, and with other members of the administration. Excerpts from the Chancellor's statement, delivered before the Bundestag on April 21, 1961, follow:

ADENAUER REPORTS OF HIS U.S. VISIT: "WE CAN HAVE UNLIMITED CONFIDENCE IN PRESIDENT KENNEDY"

Our discussions with President Kennedy were not based on any rigid agenda. The number of those present was large or small, depending on the subject under discussion. President Kennedy and I also had a number of conversations between ourselves. Almost all important questions were discussed. The communique issued on these discussions contains a good account of the subjects dealt with. I would recommend a thorough perusal of that very carefully formulated communique.

From the conversations I have had, I have gained the impression and the confident hope that the Federal Republic will cooperate very closely with the United States and that this cooperation will spread increasingly to all spheres which are of importance either to the Federal Government or to the U.S. Government. The talks in Washington have laid the foundation for such cooperation.

NATO

President Kennedy and I went into particular detail on the subject of the North Atlantic defense alliance. We both agreed that NATO constitutes the foundation of our joint defense and common policy and that it should be further developed both in a political and in a military respect in order to be able to carry out the ever-increasing task of defending the free world. Thorough consultation on all questions affecting one or more NATO members must be the paramount principle of political cooperation. It is only on that basis that an alliance of free peoples can be kept alive. The United States, being the most powerful country, is the natural leader in that alliance; among free people, however, leadership does not consist in the strongest member simply notifying his partners of his wishes, but in letting them know his intentions in good time and discussing those intentions with them. The United States follows this principle, and it intends to continue doing so in full measure.

We are at one in considering that the plans for conventional armaments agreed within NATO should be fulfilled. This also applies to valid nuclear armament planning, on the further development of which we shall continue to consult within NATO. There was no doubt and no difference of opinion about the fact that it is indispensable for the

alliance to maintain and develop all military means; i.e., both conventional and nuclear.

GERMANY, BERLIN, AND EUROPEAN UNIFICATION

The President and I have also discussed in detail the problem of Germany, including Berlin. Germany and Berlin can—and of this I am certain—rely on the pledges which the Americans have given to protect the freedom of Berlin. The foundations on which the Federal Government's policy with regard to Germany has rested since 1949, a policy with which our allies solemnly associated themselves in the Paris conventions, remain unaltered. A just and enduring solution for the problem of Germany, including Berlin, is possible only on the basis of the right of self-determination. The restoration of Germany's unity in peace and freedom remains the goal of our joint policy.

The President presented his Government's standpoint on European unification with great emphasis. The new administration, like its predecessor, regards the European Economic Community as the center and motor not only for the economic but also for the political unification of Europe. The President and I agreed that the EEC constitutes an important element of strength for the Atlantic community. As repeatedly stated by the governments of its member states, the EEC is not exclusive, but is open for membership to other European states. We hope that others will decide to take that step. This applies most particularly to Great Britain, with whom the continental European states, like the United States of America, are linked by close political and economic ties. I also think that the realization is growing in Britain that the time has now come for her close association with the EEC, and that such association must not weaken the dynamic political and institutional potential inherent in the European Economic Community.

Another important subject of my talks with the President was economic cooperation with the other countries of Europe and with Canada. We agreed that the nascent organization for economic cooperation and development is to be regarded as a decisive step in the further development of the Atlantic community.

DISARMAMENT

The problem of controlled disarmament occupied an important place in our discussions. We agreed that the goal of our discussions and efforts is general and total peace. Controlled disarmament would be an important milestone on the road to that aim. The statements by the President and his advisers have convinced me that the United States is working with all its vigor on a solution to this problem and is trying to reach an understanding with the Soviet Union. They are, however, not prepared to consent to any solutions that would make the agreed measures pointless from the start. This applies particularly to solutions providing for inadequate controls or none at all.

STRONG EVIDENCE OF FRIENDSHIP

All during our stay, both in Washington and in Texas, we experienced great cordiality and genuine solidarity. These feelings emerged again and again in all our conversations and more particularly during a meeting of the Senate in Washington which I attended at the suggestion of the President of the Senate, Vice President JOHNSON.

We can have unlimited confidence in President Kennedy, in his energy, wisdom and foresight. The energy and human warmth of the Vice President are other essential factors to be highly appreciated in these times.

The President, the U.S. Senate assembled in plenary meeting—I have just mentioned this—as well as the people and Legislature of the State of Texas gave me and, through me, to the German people such strong evidence of their friendship that I cannot be but deeply moved in recalling it all.

It is one of the most momentous happenings of our time, burdened, as it is, with so many difficult problems, that in the course of recent years the United States and Germany have arrived at ever closer relations and firm mutual friendship and that, at the same time, the unification of Europe has constantly progressed with the full agreement of the United States.

Our awareness of all this gives us the strength we need to face with equanimity the difficulties which continue to confront us. A united Europe and the United States of America jointly constitute a haven of freedom and security for all those whose freedom is threatened.

Who Really Controls Our Foreign Policy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, we continue to read reports that the Central Intelligence Agency isolated certain Cuban revolutionaries and in some instances imprisoned them before the ill-fated invasion. I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to an article in the New York Times of May 7, 1961, by Sam Pope Brewer which describes the experience reported by an anti-Castro Cuban volunteer. Apparently the Central Intelligence Agency was operating a private foreign policy of its own. I certainly hope that Congress will be told the true facts and that steps will be taken to make our intelligence and information agencies responsible to the Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article from the Times as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 7, 1961]

ANTI-CASTRO CUBANS SAY CIA IMPRISONED THEM FOR 11 WEEKS—SPOKESMAN ASSERTS 17 WERE MISTREATED FOR OPPOSING ROLE FOR "BATISTA MEN"

(By Sam Pope Brewer, special to the New York Times)

MIAMI, May 5.—An anti-Castro Cuban volunteer declared today that the Central Intelligence Agency had held him and 16 others prisoner and incommunicado for 11 weeks before and during last month's abortive invasion of Cuba.

He said he was in fear of death much of the time.

The statements were made by Dr. Rodolfo Nodal Tarafa, 27-year-old lawyer, 1 of 17 held in a remote camp in the jungle of Petén in northern Guatemala until last Friday. The fact of their imprisonment was well-known in Miami and was reported earlier.

Originally their number was given incorrectly as 18. The full details have not been available until now.

Dr. Nodal and his fellow prisoners have just organized a new Cuban movement to be known as the 17th of April Movement in memory of the invasion they missed. They have called for the cooperation of all Cuban groups to overthrow Premier Fidel Castro but under Cuban leadership and without the participation of the CIA.

Dr. Nodal and his companions maintain that because they opposed Capt. Manuel Artime and other leaders backed by the CIA, they were threatened, handcuffed, kept in "subhuman" prison conditions, accused of being Communists and submitted to lie detector tests at gunpoint.

According to Dr. Nodal, members of the group were neither charged with any offense, nor brought to trial during their 11 weeks of imprisonment. He said that until they landed outside Miami last Friday they had not been able to find out where they were being taken.

They charge that the intelligence agency employed thugs and gangsters who stood between the Cuban volunteers and their own Cuban leaders. Dr. Nodal said that throughout their imprisonment, except for a few days, they were under American guards.

Pressed for details, he said that by American he meant that they were the CIA representatives in charge of the camp who were assumed to be American and whose authority was unchallenged. He said that some spoke English with an accent and were believed by the Cubans to be naturalized U.S. citizens, "perhaps of Central European origin." They were known to the Cubans only by code names.

MOST REFUSE TO TALK

Most of the former prisoners will not discuss their experiences for fear of some form of reprisal.

Dr. Nodal emphasized that the group's resentment was directed not against the United States but against the incredible men who ran the camp. This, in chronological detail, is his story:

Dr. Nodal came to Miami from Cuba to work for the Democratic Revolutionary Front last October. On December 6 he enlisted in Miami and was sent to Guatemala for training.

On January 31 about 300 men in the training camp at Trax, Guatemala, were mustered by their senior military adviser known to them only as Frank. They were told that two Cuban officers who had been in charge had been sent away "for playing politics."

This left Capt. José Perez San Román in charge of the camp as far as Cubans had any control. Captain San Román was one of the leaders of the April 17 invasion and has since been captured by the Cuban Government.

Exile sources here agree that Captain San Román was an officer in Cuba under Fulgencio Batista, whose dictatorial regime was overthrown by Fidel Castro. He is said to have fought against the Castro revolution in the Sierra Maestra, although there is no way to confirm this.

230 SEEK TO RESIGN

Of the 300 men, 230 asked to resign from the force at Camp Trax because of the change in leaders. A new North American agent known to them as Bernie then appeared on the scene. He accused the troops of insubordination as a result of Communist influence.

Bernie said he had authority from the Democratic Revolutionary Front to name commanders and that he had chosen Captain San Román.

The 230 dissenters demanded that their case be heard by a member of the Front within 72 hours. Otherwise they wished to be discharged and returned home.

They elected a committee of five to call on Bernie with their demand. He refused to see more than a single spokesman and Dr. Nodal was chosen by the others.

Dr. Nodal said he explained in detail that they were neither mercenaries nor conscripts but volunteers and that they could not accept leaders who they considered represented the opposite of what they were fighting for.

After discussion it was agreed that the men would continue training for 5 days while they waited to hear when they might expect a representative of the Democratic front.

TROOPS STRIKE AGAIN

When 7 days had gone by without an answer the troops went on strike again.

Frank arrived back from a trip to Washington on that day but would say only that he hoped a representative of the Democratic Revolutionary Front would arrive "within a month."

The next day they were formally ordered back to training. Under the pressure of threats and promises all but 20 gave in during the next few days. The others agreed to resume training with the promise that their demands would be met.

On February 11 the men were ordered out on a field exercise. While the camp was virtually empty one of the advisers called for 8 of the 20 remaining standouts and asked them to go with him. They thought there was to be a further conference.

They were led along a jungle path to a big canvas-covered truck and suddenly found themselves covered by Thompson submachine guns held by three men. They were ordered into the truck and driven away.

At La Suiza, an estate where there was a Guatemalan Army camp, they were surrounded by 8 or 10 men with automatic weapons. The prisoners were taken from the truck one at a time and led away out of sight. They felt they were about to be shot.

Each was taken into a small room, forced to empty all his pockets and remove all his clothes.

"I felt this was it," Dr. Nodal said. "I was sure we were going to be murdered."

When they had given up all their possessions—"even our love letters"—they were told to dress again and taken away to a shed in the camp. As they assembled they found five other men from their unit who had had no connection with the mutiny but who had quarreled with Capt. San Román. Two days later another prisoner was brought in, making their total number 14.

The shed they were in was about 15 by 30 feet with a concrete floor, wooden walls, and a galvanized iron roof. In the sunny Guatemalan highlands it was so hot in the daytime that they lay naked and panting on the floor. But it was bitter cold at night.

Dr. Nodal said they were given black beans, rice, and tortillas without salt to eat.

FIVE PRISONERS QUESTIONED

On February 24 five prisoners were taken away without any explanation. Outside each was put into a pickup truck and driven away to the Halevtia camp not far away.

There they were questioned separately by Pat, the chief security guard. Dr. Nodal described him as "6 feet, 4 inches tall and about 230 pounds and stupid." His questioning, however, was said to be courteous at La Suiza Dr. Nodal said.

Dr. Nodal was then taken into another shed and turned over to a young man operating a lie detector.

Dr. Nodal said the interrogation was aimed at making him say he was a Communist.

The prisoners then were allowed to bathe and shave for the first time in 12 days and were given clean clothes and an edible meal. Then they were taken back to the shack at La Suiza.

Five days later, March 1, an agent known as Pappy, who was said to be the chief of the whole operation in Guatemala, came to say that they were being moved again but he would not say where.

Four were taken away in handcuffs at that time. The next day the remaining 10, including Dr. Nodal, were taken to the airbase at Retalhuleu, and flown to a river in the Petén jungle area.

They were taken up the river for an hour in canoes. There, in a crude camp at the top of a cliff they found their four previous companions and two other men they had not seen since leaving the Trax camp.

They were warned, Dr. Nodal said, that they would be shot if they tried to escape. They found living conditions better than in their last prison. Yet still no one would answer any questions.

Their guards brought in a radio set for an hour a day so they could hear the news programs from Radio Swan, a station operated from Swan Island, off the Honduran coast.

A 17th prisoner was brought in to join them when they had been there 2 days.

On March 25 they heard that Dr. José Miró Cardona was to be named president of the Revolutionary Council. Two days later he arrived to visit them, Dr. Nodal said, with Dr. Manuel A. de Varona, the Council's Secretary of War.

Dr. Miró Cardona said he had no part in their misfortune and that he would see they were set free within a few days. He carried away the first letters they had been able to send out to their families since their arrest.

They awoke April 17 to find that their guard had disappeared. They were still guarded, however, by a detachment of 47 Guatemalan soliders under a lieutenant. "At all other times," Dr. Nodal said, "we were guarded by Americans with automatic weapons."

INVASION NEWS BROADCAST

Later that day they learned by radio of the Cuban invasion. They were discussing their chances for an escape when the Guatemalan lieutenant, who had a direct radio link with Retalhuleu, told them that an American was coming from Retalhuleu to get them.

Two days later five heavily armed men arrived, headed by a short, bald, middle-aged man known to them as Mac.

Dr. Nodal said Mac berated them at length for not being with the invasion forces. He said they had missed their chance to do their patriotic duty and that when the invaders won out the prisoners would be handed over to Capt. San Román "in handcuffs."

Mac then left the camp but four guards stayed with them.

On Friday, April 28, 11 days after the invasion began, their guards suddenly took them by canoe to a village on the mainland and, after an hour's ride in a jeep, they were put into a DC-3 airplane at a jungle airstrip.

They were flown back to Retalhuleu, carefully searched and loaded into a C-54 aircraft, where they found 118 other volunteers who for one reason or another had not taken part in the landing.

Even then, they said, when they asked the security officer, whom they knew as Don, where they were going, the only answer was that they would learn when they got there.

They arrived at a Florida airport before dawn Saturday. Dr. Nodal said he found himself in the same hangar from which he had started out for Guatemala. He did not know where it was except that it was about an hour's ride south of Miami.

That odyssey ended when they were dumped from trucks before daybreak in Miami itself. They found themselves free men again after 11 weeks.

NODAL HEADS NEW GROUP

Dr. Nodal is president of the new 17th of April Group. He was politically active in Cuba in the AAA movement, a code name for the National Revolutionary Front headed by Dr. Aureliano Sanchez Arango during the Batista regime.

The secretary general of the new group is Dr. Omar Castaneda, a lawyer who was a leader in the university students anti-Castro organization.

Their fellow prisoners included: Francisco and Rene Chavez, newspapermen on the staff of the Diario de la Marina; Adalberto Delgado, medical student; Rodolfo Bartelemy Dominicis, captain in the Castro police; Antonio Frontela Gomez, electrical worker; Cecilio Fuentes Rico, bartender; Rolando Fuentes Rico, truckdriver; Epifanio Gonzalez Errasti, laborer and a member of the Castro commandos of the National Institute of Agrarian Reform; Humberto Olivera Perez, former captain in the regular army; Luis Alberto Olivera, student; Ricardo Martinez de la Cruz, customs chief of José Marti Airport, Havana, under the Castro regime; Julio Antonio More, law student; Martin Torres, art student, and two others who concealed their names because they have families in Cuba.

A Heartening Look at Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, a recent edition of Time magazine took a look at the State of Florida and its forward progress in an article "Fast-Growing Florida, a State That Can Hardly Wait," and the editors have taken note of the sound basis of the Florida economy and our hopes for the future.

The Fort Myers News Press, one of our leading newspapers, has called attention to the Time story and Editor William Spear expresses the interest and appreciation of the people of Florida for the type of reporting found in the Time article. Because the Spear editorial states the high points of the magazine article along with the views of many of our citizens and will be of interest to those people thinking of moving to Florida, or planning to invest in our State, I ask that it be reprinted here in the RECORD:

[From the Fort Myers News-Press, Apr. 13, 1961]

A HEARTENING LOOK AT FLORIDA

"Fast-Growing Florida, a State That Can Hardly Wait," is the title of a 2-page article in the April 14 issue of Time magazine. A great deal has been written and published about Florida in the national magazines, including Time. But its latest article is evidence that its astute editors consider that the State's phenomenal growth is still news and that the story of it still has not been fully told.

As this Florida story is news to northerners, so many of its details also will be news to Floridians who perhaps fail to see the forest for the trees. Especially at this time when uncertainties of the national recession cause some anxiety in Florida, some of the details recounted by Time need to be appreciated by Floridians. Here are some salient excerpts from the article:

"Florida, ending one of its balmiest winters in history, last week greeted the spread of spring across the North with remarkable

equanimity. Once the northward exodus of tourists in the springtime rated with the hurricanes as a natural catastrophe, inevitably followed by a summer-long slump. Now Florida is the focus of a permanent population shift that has made it the fastest-growing State in the Union and a bustling, year-round center of industry, commerce, and building.

"More than 3,000 new residents pour into Florida every week and 76 percent of them come to settle permanently. Last year its new citizens demanded 104,000 new dwellings. Beyond Florida's tawdry nightclubs, neon facades and kidney-shaped swimming pools lies a new and sustaining domain of factories, fresh communities, and solid citizens.

"Florida has already attracted 177 electronics plants with a total of 20,000 employees and payrolls of $100 million. Florida's climate is so strong a lure that few Florida firms have trouble getting skilled workers. Many firms find that men will even leave California for Florida, where they feel closer to home ties in the East and Midwest.

"Florida has plenty of homegrown industry as well, ranging from fashions to phosphates, from oranges to oysters—which are having one of their best years. Florida's oranges, grapefruit, tangerines, and limes and its fresh and frozen orange juice account for 65 percent of the U.S. citrus crop, a third of the world crop.

"The airlines, which have helped to change the kind of sun lovers that Miami Beach draws, are also making Miami a springboard to Latin American markets. Miami has more direct air connections to the 21 principal U.S. air hubs than has either Boston or San Francisco, and more flights to Midwestern manufacturing cities than any other city in the United States.

"Retirement is still big business to the State. But people are retiring younger than ever before. Mackle's Port Charlotte has so many young retired servicemen that the city's average age is only 42. And more and more young Floridians are staying home. Half of the 12 colleges started in the United States last year were in Florida.

"Florida has become a state of mind, an American dream of rejuvenation, of living the simple life, of going back to the outdoors—even if that outdoors becomes one long, neat stretch of suburbia. To many industries and individuals alike, Florida suggests an escape from the ugliness of old, tired, industrial cities with their dark pewter skies and soot-covered bricks."

It is always helpful to see how one looks to others. This view of Florida from the outside looking in should be heartening to all Floridians at this time.

Finding Housing for Those Displaced by Urban Renewal—A Study and Report by the Missouri Advisory Committee of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious problems we have been encountering in our cities in carrying out extensive urban redevelopment programs is the problem of finding suitable housing for families forced out of their homes by the bulldozers and wrecking cranes of municipal progress. This is, of course, a difficult problem also for small businesses faced by the same need for temporary or permanent relocation.

Urban renewal programs by and large are planned for areas of blight and deteriorating values. In those areas, however, there are usually good housing facilities, owned or rented by families of moderate income, as well as slum housing occupied by families eligible for relocation to public housing. But for the family which has an income above the level of eligibility for public housing, but below that needed to purchase or rent comparable housing in a stable neighborhood, the urban renewal program constitutes a real personal hardship. We are very much aware of this problem in the Housing Subcommittee of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, and in our hearings we have discussed at length various plans or programs for meeting it.

MINORITY GROUPS FIND PROBLEM HARDEST TO SOLVE

It is a particularly serious problem for minority groups who often find certain neighborhoods or facilities closed to them, even if they can afford to buy or rent at prevailing prices. This situation has been the subject of a comprehensive survey in my State of Missouri by the Missouri Advisory Committee of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, as outlined in a report by the committee's subcommittee on housing and urban renewal and adopted by the entire committee at a meeting in St. Louis last month.

In our deliberations on a new housing bill, the housing subcommittee has been considering such ideas as the President's proposal for 40-year mortgages on new sale housing constructed primarily for families displaced by urban renewal. I personally do not see how we can solve our problems in St. Louis in that fashion, but such a plan may be a useful addition to other programs.

VALUE OF LONG-TERM REHABILITATION LOANS

More important as a weapon in attacking the lower middle-income housing problem may be long-term rehabilitation and modernization loans which we have been discussing in the subcommittee. By making it possible for good, solid, but deteriorating housing in good, stable neighborhoods to be renovated and improved on a 25-year-plan basis, we can provide a substantial amount of good housing at reasonable prices and also prevent the slippage of additional areas into the so-called slum category.

The report of the Missouri Advisory Committee to the Civil Rights Commission points up the extent of the problem of finding suitable replacement housing for Negroes, particularly, in our State. This is an interesting and important contribution to our information in this field of urban renewal, and I commend its contents to all Members of Congress conscientiously concerned in achieving the modernization of our cities while at the same time achieving decent housing accommodatons for those forced to move in the name of municipal progress.

MRS. FRANKIE M. FREEMAN, CHAIRMAN OF SPECIAL STUDY GROUP

The chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Renewal of the Missouri Advisory Committee of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Mrs. Frankie M. Freeman, has, I believe, done an outstanding research job on this project and I congratulate her and the other members of the advisory committee on their report. The recommendations will probably evoke some controversy, but I do not think there is or can be any controversy over the need for solving this serious problem, which is typical of just about every American city now engaged in an urban renewal program.

The report referred to and a covering letter are as follows:

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS,
MISSOURI ADVISORY COMMITTEE,
Washington, D.C., May 4, 1961.

Hon. LEONOR SULLIVAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: Enclosed for your information is one copy of the Report of the Missouri Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights on Housing and Urban Renewal in Missouri which was adopted by the committee at its meeting in St. Louis on April 24, 1961.

Yours very truly,

FRANKIE M. FREEMAN,
Vice Chairman and Secretary.

REPORT TO THE U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS ON HOUSING AND URBAN RENEWAL IN MISSOURI

On April 4, 1959, the Missouri Advisory Committee submitted its report to the Commission on Civil Rights on housing problems of minorities in Missouri. Included in its summary was the finding "that racial and religious discrimination and segregation in housing exist in varying degrees in all sections of the State * * * restrictions are practiced in both the sale and rental of housing. Kansas City and St. Louis each report cases of discrimination against Jews in private housing sales and rentals. Negroes are generally excluded from suburban and other outlying residential districts and are concentrated mainly in the older and blighted areas in the center section of the cities. Discrimination against racial and religious minorities in the operations of the housing market has become a controlling factor in establishing, reinforcing and extending patterns of segregation and discrimination in Missouri."

The Missouri Commission on Human Rights was created as a permanent State agency by the Missouri Legislature in 1959. The 1959 act charged the commission to conduct research projects and make studies into and publish reports on discrimination in Missouri. In its report to the Governor of Missouri, dated December 1, 1960, the commission submitted data on verious civil rights areas affecting 97.56 percent of the Negro population of the State. In a summary of its findings in housing, the report stated: "Discounting those counties which reported few or no Negroes living in the county, every unit (responses from 78 counties and 2 cities) reported some type of residential segregation. Five of the units reported segregation in public housing. Negroes experience difficulty in obtaining FHA and VA loans when they contemplate buying or building in integrated areas. Discrimination in housing may also be associated with (1) discrimination by real estate agents in the advertisement, listing, sale, rental or lease of private housing and in

unethical real estate practices which cause panic selling and subsequent increased cost; (2) discrimination by lending institutions in lending money, guaranteeing loans, accepting mortgages or otherwise making available funds for the purchase, construction or repair of housing. ("Study of Human Rights in Missouri, 1960 Report of Missouri Commission on Human Rights." p. 41. Report is attached.)

Based upon the foregoing findings of the Missouri Commission on Human Rights, and the reports of other intergroup organizations and agencies working in this State, in addition to reports made to this committee, it is the conclusion of this committee that the findings, conclusions, and recommendations contained in its summary statement, dated April 14, 1959, continue to reflect the housing problems and needs facing Negroes in Missouri today.

The Missouri Advisory Committee has considered those problems as extensively as possible within the framework and limitations of its structure, functions and authority. However, one of its first recognitions was that the subject of housing and urban renewal is so complex and multifaceted that this committee was not equipped to conduct the kind of study the urgency of the problem requires.

The Missouri Legislature has made the following declaration of policy: "It is hereby found and declared that there exists in municipalities of the State insanitary, blighted, deteriorated and deteriorating areas which constitute a serious and growing menace injurious to the public health, safety, morals and welfare of the residents; that the existence of such areas contributes substantially and increasingly to the spread of disease and crime, necessitating excessive and disproportionate expenditures of public funds for the preservation of the public health and safety, for crime prevention, correction, prosecution, punishment and the treatment of juvenile delinquency and for the maintenance of adequate police, fire and accident protection and other public services and facilities, constitutes an economic and social liability, substantially impairs or arrests the sound growth of communities and retards the provision of housing accommodations." The State law creates land clearance for redevelopment authorities and prescribes their area of operations, powers, and duties. Thus urban renewal activities in Missouri are declared by law to be public uses and purposes.

In accordance with the request of the Commission on Civil Rights Urban Renewal questionnaires were sent by the Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Renewal to the 17 localities within the State where urban renewal activities are under consideration, planning or execution.

Replies were received from St. Louis, Kansas City, Joplin, St. Charles, Mexico, Columbia, University City, Sikeston, Webster Groves, Kirkwood, Fulton, St. Louis County and Olivette. Of the agencies responding, only two (Fulton and Sikeston) do not have urban renewal programs. The following localities have urban renewal programs, but do not have low rent housing programs: Joplin, University City, St. Louis County (PHA projects at Jefferson Barracks and Webster Heights were halted through litigation), Kirkwood, Webster Groves and Olivette. Thus six localities in the State with urban renewal programs do not have low rent public housing programs. The five localities in this State that have both urban renewal and low rent public housing programs are: Kansas City, Columbia, Mexico, St. Charles and city of St. Louis.

All agencies except one (University City) identified the minority as Negro.

The first questionnaire that was mailed to the agencies requested data concerning name of agency, number of board members and minority representation, information concerning professional staff and activities of citizens advisory committees. From a review of the responses, a determination was made to seek further information concerning the nature of the urban renewal program and its effect on each community. A second questionnaire entitled "Urban Renewal Questionnaire—Part 2", was prepared and sent to those agencies that had indicated they were engaging in urban renewal activities. The responses to parts 1 and 2 are attached hereto and made a part of this report. The committee could not attempt a comprehensive analysis of the date obtained; however, some questions and responses will be noted because they give support to the conclusions reached by this committee in its 1959 report and to the December 1960 report of the Missouri Commission on Human Rights.

In response to the question concerning representation of the board or commission of members of the minority in that locality, the following agencies reported that they have minority group board members: City of St. Louis, St. Charles, Mexico, University City, Columbia, Kirkwood, and Webster Groves. Four agencies reported that the Urban Renewal Agency has no minority group board members. They are Joplin, St. Louis County, Kansas City, and Olivette.

With respect to professional staff employed, reports indicated that St. Louis, Kansas City, Webster Groves, St. Louis County, University City, Columbia, St. Charles employ minority group professional staff. It would appear from some of the replies, however, that the definition of professional staff tends to vary with the locality. It was not indicated also whether the staff was temporary or permanent, part time or full time.

In part 2 of the questionnaire the agencies were asked to identify each project and to indicate the number of white and nonwhite to be relocated. They reported as follows:

Locality	Number of projects	Families to be relocated		Percent nonwhite	Total
		White	Nonwhite		
Kansas City	4	326	398	55.7	714
St. Louis	2	1,110	2,320	64.7	3,430
Joplin	2	49	10	17.0	59
St. Louis County	2	20	516	96.0	536
Columbia	1	10	400	97.6	410
Mexico	1	11	156	93.4	167
Webster Groves	2	124	477	79.4	601
Kirkwood	2	41	72	65.0	111
St. Charles	1	0	18	100.0	18

The above figures indicate that the percentage of nonwhite to be relocated ranges from 17 percent in Joplin to over 90 percent in St. Louis County, Columbia, Mexico, and St. Charles. In only one locality is the number of nonwhite to be displaced less than 55 percent of the total and in four localities the number exceeds 90 percent.

Most of the replies to the question, "Into what areas are the displaced nonwhite families moving?" indicated that the nonwhite persons are moving into "areas adjacent to Negro areas, public housing, or other Negro areas." All agencies replied that the new housing or rehabilitated housing on the urban renewal site will be available to all, but several questioned whether those displaced would be able to afford it. In St. Charles where all of the families that were displaced are Negro, the agency reported that 80 percent moved into low-rent public housing and others bought property in outlying areas. Webster Groves reports that its urban renewal project will be construction of private, single-family housing which is being built on a "controlled-price basis for persons who live in the area, primarily." In Columbia 17 percent of the displaced families have been relocated into low-rent public housing. In St. Louis County the response indicated that the new housing in the project area would be primarily Negro. The city of St. Louis reports 10 percent of the displaced families moved into public housing and that rental scale for new housing will be too high for most displaced families.

Thus, given the situation (1) that the mobility of the Negro in Missouri is restricted by discriminatory housing practices coupled with an inability to afford most of the new housing to be constructed in urban renewal areas after slum clearance; (2) that the Negro resides in the blighted and deteriorating areas within a locality and (3) that generally the larger percentage of persons to be relocated from an urban renewal area are Negro, the process of relocation takes on real significance in an evaluation of the urban renewal concept and the realization of the goal of a decent home and suitable living environment for every American family. If the new construction continues to be priced beyond the ability to pay of the majority of the persons displaced by urban renewal areas, and if large areas of a community remain closed to such persons, the problems of slums will not be solved.

If the national housing goal is to be achieved and urban renewal is to be a success the following is required:

1. The Federal Government should declare its policy of a decent home and suitable living environment for every American family in a free and open housing market.

2. Where Federal assistance is used, all housing should be available to all persons without regard to race, creed, color or national origin.

3. All Federal agencies charged with administering Federal assistance should assume the responsibility not only to adopt a policy of nondiscrimination, but to take such affirmative action as is necessary to enforce such policy.

4. Contracts for Federal assistance between agencies of the Federal Government and developers, builders, and lenders, and public agencies should include nondiscrimination clauses with respect to sale, resale, lease, and occupancy of the dwellings. Such provisions should have the same force and effect as other provisions of the contracts, and Federal agencies must recognize their responsibility to employ adequate manpower to obtain compliance with such provisions.

5. Federal agencies should employ an adequate number of technical assistants who will be available for assistance to communities, investors, planning agencies, builders, and sellers in the early planning stages and throughout the program.

6. The Commission on Civil Rights should be a permanent agency of the Federal Government with powers and functions to include additional responsibilities in the field of housing.

7. The President of the United States should be asked to appoint a National Committee on Equality of Opportunity in Housing, to assure that benefits of all Federal housing laws are available to all persons on the same conditions and without regard to race, creed, or color.

Respectfully submitted.

FRANKIE M. FREEMAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Renewal.

Missouri Advisory Committee: Dean J. Norman McDonough, chairman, St. Louis, Mo.; Mrs. Frankie M. Freeman, vice chairman and Secretary, St. Louis, Mo.; Dr. Lorenzo J. Greene, Jefferson City, Mo.; Abe J. Kaplan, Kansas City, Mo.; John I. Rollings, St. Louis, Mo.; Judge Edmund B. Smith, Kansas City, Mo.; Rev. Arnold A. Wessler, St. Louis, Mo.; Mrs. Hugh P. Williamson, Fulton, Mo.

The Remaking of American Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the following article on "The Remaking of American Education," appearing in the April 1961 issue of Fortune magazine, is not only timely but is worthy of careful consideration by all of those who pin their faith in Federal aid to education as the sole solution to our educational problems:

THE REMAKING OF AMERICAN EDUCATION

(By Charles E. Silberman)

Traveling about the country in the winter of 1961, a visitor might wonder what was happening to the American public school. In Snowflake, Ariz., in Red Wing, Minn., in Humboldt, Iowa, and in, roughly, a thousand other cities and towns, high school students were studying a rigorous new physics course developed by some of the Nation's leading nuclear physicists. Teachers in several thousand schools were trying out a new math curriculum designed to take students further into the basic concepts and structure of mathematics than had ever been attempted at that level. In Carson City, Mich., in Melbourne, Fla., and in several suburbs of New York City, schools had abolished grade levels in some or all subjects and were moving students along according to how much they learned rather than their age. In Sacramento, the California Legislature was considering some 14 bills to raise standards in the State's public schools—for example, by reducing drastically the number of methods courses and increasing the number of content courses required for a teaching license. And in Normal, Ill., competition for college admission was leading students to drop out of industrial arts and home economics courses and to aim for higher grades. "No one wants a C grade any longer," the town superintendent of schools, Lowell Krutsinger, told the local Rotarians. In some bewilderment, he asked, "Where are we going?"

Where we are going is toward a major overhaul of U.S. education. The current controversy over Federal aid to education—important though it is—obscures the far more significant fact that American society has embarked on an effort to lift the quality and change the direction of its schooling.

The present ferment has gone beyond a restless discontent with the educational ideas of the recent past. Nearly all of the change and experimentation now apparent turns around a central idea: the pursuit of intellectual excellence. For two generations intellectual training has not been the main goal of the U.S. public school system; indeed, it has never been the main goal of any school system designed for the broad mass of a population. To focus mass education on intellectual development will require nothing less than an educational revolution, and, like all revolutions, it will have to overcome enormous inertia. It is still true today, as Nicholas Murray Butler wrote in 1893, that "school superintendents, principals, and teachers are to the last degree impatient of criticism and suggestion." Although the present tide of change has the approval of many teachers and school administrators, it has to buck entrenched theory protected by powerful organizations. The tide would never have begun to flow if parents, scholars, scientists, members of school boards, had not come to the conclusion that the educational needs of the U.S. future would be very different from those of the past. And the new movement will not carry through to success unless the leaders of American public opinion deepen their understanding of what is stirring in the schools—and why.

The task ahead cannot be understood without a brief look back at how the present system, now obsolete and inadequate, evolved from other systems that were discarded by a dynamic society aware that education was an essential part of the public business. In the early years of the Republic, education was a concern chiefly of the social and economic elite. The content was largely classical, the purpose principally to train clergymen, lawyers, and other community leaders. For the rest of the population, as Abraham Lincoln recalled, "there were some schools, so-called; but no qualification was ever required of a teacher beyond 'readin', writin', and cipherin' to the rule of three.'" Sparked by men like Horace Mann, however, the conviction that everyone ought to be educated spread gradually and led to the creation of public schools; but the classical curriculum remained largely unchanged.

Toward the end of the last century the rise of industry was creating the need for a literate working class, and was shifting hordes of illiterate people from the farms to the cities, where there were no chores to keep the children occupied all day. At the same time, the large cities were being engulfed by waves of immigration from southern and eastern Europe. The traditional curriculum obviously was not suited either to the capacities or to the needs of children from peasant and frequently alien backgrounds—particularly with the teachers available. Instruction, as a result, degenerated into singsong concert drill and recitation by rote, and children in droves deserted the schools as irrelevant to the world in which they lived.

It was against this background that the last great change in American education began. "Progressive education" and the "life adjustment" curriculum did not spring full-blown from the head of John Dewey. His theories were adopted largely because they met needs strongly felt in American society around the turn of the century. The demands for change came from all sides, as Prof. Lawrence A. Cremin has reminded us in "The Transformation of the School." Social reformers saw the school as the only public agency able to Americanize the immigrants and lift them out of their squalor. Psychologists and philosophers at Chicago, Clark, and Columbia Universities and elsewhere were developing new theories of behavior and learing that emphasized the interaction between the child and his environment, and that saw learning as a process affecting behavior and social attitudes as well as intellectual skills. And business leaders saw a program of vocational education as the only way in which the United States could keep its place in the international economic race. "You know, as does every manufacturer in this Nation know," Frank A. Vanderlip, of the National City Bank, told a worried business audience in 1906, "that Germany's superiority in international commerce rests almost wholly on Germany's superior school system"—a system, Vanderlip proclaimed, that aimed "to make of each citizen an efficient economic unit." The National Association of Manufacturers had been pushing for a good many years for a broadening of the school's role. "The classical and the general literary studies have their place in all educational systems," President Theodore Search told the National Association of Manufacturers convention in 1898, "but it is unfair and unjust to the great material interests of the land to leave out of account the obvious demands of industry and commerce."

And so the schools, tailoring their curriculum to the needs of the times, took the emphasis off intellectual discipline and broadened their function to include a concern for health, vocational training, and the quality of community life.

For 50 years this system helped the United States to make more smoothly than any other nation the difficult transition from a farming to an industrial society, at the same time absorbing and Americanizing the children of millions of immigrants. Adjustment was what the American school child needed—and the schools of yesterday supplied it.

But recently the feeling has been growing that the educational system we have is not right for the future needs and responsibilities of American society. For a decade or more, critics have been clobbering the professional educators for their failure to teach reading, for their excessive interest in children's social adjustment at the expense of intellectual achievement, and for their naive faith that a simple dose of more money would solve all the school's ills. Philip H. Coombs, of the Ford Foundation, now Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs, with only slight exaggeration, put the verdict this way: "Almost everything that the schools and colleges are doing is obsolete and inadequate today. This applies to the curriculum, to the arrangements for teacher training, to textbooks, to organization, to methods of teaching and learning, to school architecture." Education's greatest need was not for more money from the outside, but for sweeping change on the inside.

The United States today is moving away from progressivism not because it is false in some absolute sense, but because it badly serves the needs of our own time. The growing complexity of organization and the explosive pace of technological and social change are creating an enormous demand that is without historical precedent. Society has always needed a few men with highly developed and disciplined intellects; industrial society needed masses of literate but not necessarily intellectual men. Tomorrow requires something that the world has never seen—masses of intellectuals.

The kind of deadly monotonous assembly line Chaplin satirized in "Modern Times" no longer reflects the reality of industrial life. Rather, as Peter F. Drucker has cogently suggested, the prototoype of the large productive organization seems increasingly to be the Strategic Air Command base, which must integrate the highly developed skills of thousands of people—pilots, navigators, and meteorologists, radio technicians, doctors, mechanics, operations researchers, computer programers, operators, repairmen, and the like.

The U.S. need for educated men is sometimes stated in terms of specific skills said to be in short supply—electronics engineers or nuclear physicists. Educationally, this is the wrong way to approach the problem because it is impossible to predict today what skills will be needed 10 years from now. Nothing could be more wildly impractical, therefore—and nothing more destructive to the future of an individual or of society—than an education designed to prepare people for specific vocations and professions or to facilitate their "adjustment" to the world as it is. To be practical, an education now must prepare a man for work that doesn't yet exist and whose nature can't even be imagined. This can be done only by teaching people how to learn, by giving them the kind of intellectual discipline and the depth of understanding that will enable them to apply man's accumulated wisdom to new conditions as they arise. "The qualities essential to employability and productivity," Francis S. Chase, dean of the Graduate School of Education of the University of

Chicago, has observed, "are coming closer and closer to the characteristics that have long been attributed to the educated person."

How far has the United States come toward accepting the new goal—an educational system able to turn out vast numbers of people educated up to and considerably beyond the level that the 19th century demanded only of its ruling elite? Certainly the idea has made substantial progress in professional educational circles in recent years. Even Columbia's Teachers College, for 50 years the stronghold of "life adjustment" educational philosophy, is now beginning to adjust to higher intellectual standards. "We need now to recognize," the college's new dean, John H. Fischer, told his colleagues last fall in an article provocatively (for a Teachers College dean) entitled "Schools Are for Learning," that "in the last half-century a whole network of services has come into existence to do many of the things only schools were in a position to undertake when Teachers College was founded." Dean Fischer urged the schools to shuck off their extraneous functions so that they can begin to fulfill their overriding responsibility for intellectual development.

It was public opinion that changed the attitudes of a good many educationists, who, like politicians, keep their fingers to the wind. "Over the years, studying different school systems across the country," San Francisco Superintendent Harold Spears, once a leading light of the "life adjusters," says, "I came to appreciate that education is a matter of time and place; you've got to retool your plant to fit the needs." The needs have clearly changed, and with them Spears' own aims. "Right now," he says, "I'm for quality education." And Spears is improving the quality of San Francisco's education, though his critics are unwilling to admit the fact. In line with the vehement recommendations of a group of Stanford and University of California professors, who studied the city's curriculum at the board of education's request, he is increasing the time devoted to the three R's and dropping the life-adjustment courses.

Throughout California a so-called conservative revolution is forcing an overhaul of the State educational system. Last November a citizens' commission of 27 members appointed by the legislature issued a report that thumpingly affirmed the intellectual aims of education. The citizens demanded a number of drastic changes in the State educational code—e.g., increasing the minimum time allotted to the three R's from half to two-thirds of the elementary school day; elimination of courses in driving automobiles; creation of a system of statewide exams for high-school students; and a thorough upgrading of teacher certification standards. The report has been supported by Governor Brown, and bills embodying the bulk of its recommendations are now before the California Legisalture. A poll of 2,000 randomly selected high school teachers in the State showed that 84 percent agreed with the citizens' commission's criticism of life adjustment, social adaptation, and similar nonintellectual goals of education. Even the California Department of Education—until recently one of the chief citadels of life adjustment—has swung behind the most important of the changes. State Superintendent of Public Instruction Roy E. Simpson laid down the new line early this year at the annual education department meeting. "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present," he told his staff, quoting Lincoln. "We must disenthrall ourselves."

MIT physics Prof. Jerrold Zacharias compares education to high fidelity. To have good hi-fi, you need a good performer on a good day, a good recording, a good pressing of it, and a good pickup and amplifier; you need a room with good acoustical qualities and a person with the intent to listen. "But most important of all," says Zacharias, "is the composition itself; without a great composition, everything else is pointless." The most profound change taking place in U.S. education today is that the schools are beginning to be supplied with "great compositions"—that is to say, with new courses and textbooks created by the Nation's leading scholars.

In this new attention to curriculum, no one has played a more important role than Zacharias himself. A distinguished nuclear physicist, director of MIT's famous radiation laboratory, and member of the President's Science Advisory Board, Zacharias 5 years ago dedicated himself to the task of improving the high school teaching of physics—indeed, high school teaching in general. At the cost of $1 million a year, supplied principally by the National Science Foundation, his physical science study committee not only developed a new high school physics course, it has revolutionized the whole approach to the teaching of science.

The most radical innovation has been to enlist the best scientific minds in the country for the job of developing a public-school course. The physicists dropped perhaps 50 percent of the material treated in the conventional course—e.g., hydrostatics, hydromechanics, surface tension—in order to expand the treatment of such critical subjects as electricity and the atom. (In discussing the subject of mechanics, the new course starts right in with dynamics, treating statics as a special case.) And instead of presenting the material on the basis of authority, the new course tries to lead students to think like physicists—i.e., to test every hypothesis and accept nothing until demonstrated. Creating the new course proved to be a lot tougher than the scientists had anticipated. "You have no idea how hard it was to get the subject right," Zacharias recalls. "We had to work on it until it was crystal clear in our own minds."

They had to do more than get it right. Zacharias and his colleagues had made a fundamental decision that they would not merely try to train future scientists, but would attempt to make physics appealing to the majority of students. If they were to close the gap between the two cultures of science and the humanities, they needed a great composition that could be taught by ordinary teachers to ordinary students. The regular students' textbook is supported by a four-volume teachers' guide and a laboratory workbook containing instructions for a complete set of experiments requiring inexpensive and frequently homemade equipment—e.g., a microbalance made out of a straw, a book of matches, a needle, and a wood screw. The physical science study committee has also produced a set of 60 films to explain fundamental concepts and to demonstrate phenomena too big or too small or too complicated for ordinary classroom presentation. In addition, the committee has organized innumerable courses and conferences to give high school teachers the considerable retraining they need to handle the new course. Today more than 10 percent of the high school physics students in the United States are taking the Zacharias course.

The effects of Zacharias' work reach far beyond the physics classroom; his example has stimulated similar attempts to revise the curriculum in chemistry, in biology, and in mathematics. Biology, for example, is studied by 75 to 80 percent of all high school students in the United States, most of whom take no other science; it is the widest opportunity, therefore, to impart the excitement of the scientific process. And yet biology is usually presented as a deadly exercise in the classification and memorization of the types of plant and animal life. The biological sciences curriculum study is working to develop new courses that will give students an appreciation of the complexity of living things and of their interrelation. Some laboratory experiments permit several results, in order to familiarize students with the principles of scientific criticism and controversy. And to encourage further work by gifted students, the group has devised a series of 100 experiments students can do on their own, but for which there are no answers in scientific literature; the students are encouraged to correspond with working scientists concerning their results.

All students study mathematics at least through the junior high school (9th grade) level. The President's Commission on National Goals gave math a priority second only to reading. A number of groups are working on new courses; the largest—the school mathematics study group headed by Professor Edward Begle of Yale—is attempting to reconstruction of the entire math curriculum from the fourth through the twelfth grade. Without dropping the traditional training in computation, the courses place a new emphasis on giving students an understanding of the logic of the number system and an appreciation of the intellectual grandeur and elegance that mathematics can provide. The object is to teach students why they can do things with numbers and symbols instead of just teaching them how.

Revising the sciences alone is not enough, of course. "A sense of tragedy and triumph achieved through the study of history and literature," as Prof. Jerome S. Bruner has written, "is surely as important to modern man as a sense of the structure of matter achieved through the study of physics." So, one might add, is the ability to speak and write lucid, grammatical English. The public schools have not been notably successful in either venture, nor have the humanists or social scientists evinced much interest in correcting the situation. And yet there are some hopeful signs even here. Having heard colleges bellyaching for years about the dreadful inadequacy of high school preparation in English, the college entrance examination board decided to take matters in its own hands so far as that subject is concerned. Eighteen months ago it established a commission on English, headed by Harold C. Martin of the Harvard English Department. The commission is running summer institutes for high school teachers and is revising the high school English curriculum with an emphasis on teaching the students to write.

These efforts at curriculum revision have had important byproducts, notably a radical reorientation of educational research in psychology. For over half a century educational psychologists have neglected the question of what and how much children can learn—perhaps because no one was terribly interested. They addressed themselves instead to the measurement of aptitude and achievement and to the study of how a child's social and psychological background affects his motivation to learn—not to the way learning occurs in the classroom. "It seems as if all of us were afraid to do anything to the child," Prof. John B. Carroll of Harvard recently confessed. "All we do is measure him, and this doesn't get us very far."

Some theories of learning now emerging may accelerate the educational process. These new theories and insights have been set down lucidly and persuasively in "The Process of Education," a little volume published last fall by Professor Bruner of Harvard's psychology department, which already ranks as one of the most important and influential works on education in some time. Bruner emphasizes the importance of giving students an understanding of the

fundamental structure of whatever subjects they are studying. To teach structure is to enable them to bring knowledge to bear on problems and events they will encounter outside the classroom. To know facts is not enough. Bruner wants to improve students' ability to guess intelligently, for in research, in business, and throughout life itself we are almost always forced to choose on the basis of incomplete knowledge—i.e., to guess. "The shrewd guess, the fertile hypothesis, the courageous leap to a tentative conclusion," Bruner writes, "these are the most valuable coin of the thinker at work, whatever his line of work."

Structure can be taught, however, only if teachers have a real mastery of their subjects; the younger the students being taught, paradoxically enough, the more important it is for the teacher fully to understand the subject in order to present its structure in the simplest possible way. Prof. David Page of the University of Illinois, an experienced teacher of elementary mathematics and the head of the university's elementary mathematics curriculum project, says, "Young children learn almost anything faster than adults do if given to them in terms they understand." Prof. O. K. Moore of Yale has shown that even 2- and 3-year-olds of average intelligence can learn to read, write, and type.

Public schools have been wasting valuable years by postponing the teaching of many important subjects on the ground that they are too difficult. In fact, the basic ideas of science and mathematics and the basic themes of literature and history should form the heart of the curriculum from the elementary grades on. The progression in each field should resemble a widening spiral, in which students continually expand their knowledge of the basic concepts by learning to use them in more and more complex and sophisticated ways. Contrariwise, a tremendous amount of material that's needlessly cluttering up the curriculum today should be discarded.

It follows also that the most pressing need of the public schools is not for more classrooms or even for higher teachers' pay (though both are surely needed), but for curriculums that present clearly the basic principles of all the major fields of inquiry and that can be taught by ordinary teachers to ordinary students. It's necessary to revamp the basic courses and to gear the materials to the capacities of students of different abilities and in different grades. Obviously this is an enormous job that would take years to complete. But the new science courses have shown how much can be done with relatively small amounts of money when the best academic minds in the country work with curriculum specialists and classroom teachers. Given $100 million a year to spend on new courses, texts, films, and the like (a sum equal to one-half of 1 percent of total U.S. educational expenditures), Professor Zacharias believes he could work a revolution in the quality of U.S. education.

The growing emphasis on the pursuit of intellectual excellence does not mean, however, that the schools should concern themselves only with the high I.Q.'s. On the contrary, as the Rockefeller Report on Education argued, the idea of excellence embraces many kinds of achievement at many levels. And yet it is by no means clear just how much "intellectual discipline" can be taught to that large group of students who fall between "normal intelligence" (an I.Q. of 100) and mental retardation (an I.Q. of 75). These students make up 45 percent of the student body of the average comprehensive high school, and they tend to be apathetic or actively resistant when offered academic subjects. But these same students, Dean Fischer of Teachers College points out, are going to participate in the decisions made by political clubs, trade unions, and groups of all sorts, and they will need to grapple with the fundamental concepts of science and the humanities in the course of living their lives. "I can't see why these students can't deal with them in school," Fischer says. "We really haven't tried to do it yet; we've just brought them to the minimum of literacy." What's necessary, he says, is a good deal of experimentation to discover how and how much these students can be taught.

For the 50 percent or so of high school students who will not go to college in the sixties, some amount of vocational education is inevitable. But in a dynamic and fluid society it does no good to anyone—least of all to the students involved—to tie the vocational program to the specific present employment opportunities in each community, as Dr. James B. Conant suggested in his widely publicized but disappointing report on "The American High School Today." For employment opportunities change from year to year; industries move away or decline in importance and new ones spring up; specific skills and even whole occupations are automated out of existence and new ones created in their place. A program for the student who is not college bound should emphasize fundamental skills and fundamental ways of approaching problems, and leave much of the specific job training to industry. And industry has created a huge system of vocational education that did not exist when high school vocational programs were started. International Business Machine's annual educational outlays, for example, run to $45 million a year—almost as much as the budget of Columbia University.

It may even be true, as Thomas Bledsoe, executive director of the Council for Basic Education, has suggested, that a solid training in the skills of reading and writing is the best vocational training of all. Most complaints about secretaries, for instance, concern their spelling and grammar, not their typing and shorthand.

READING IN THE SLUMS

Interestingly, the emphasis on intellectual training may even be applicable to the most intransigent problem of all—that of educating the children of the big city slums. The problem chiefly concerns 10 or 12 big cities, though it is spreading, with industry itself, to a host of smaller towns and suburbs; it involves several million children. Coming from culturally deprived rural backgrounds, quite frequently with one or both parents missing, and moving about from sordid neighborhood to sordid neighborhood, these children usually appear uneducable. Their IQ scores are low—an average of 90 or less in New York City slum schools—their reading ability poor, and their attitude increasingly hostile as they are forced to stay in school until the legal age for quitting. (Then, when they do leave school, these youngsters turn out to be unemployable because of their illiteracy.) The largest number are Negroes recently moved from the South and, in New York, Puerto Ricans new to the mainland. But the Anglo-Saxon hillbillies and Ozark whites in Baltimore, Chicago, Detroit, Dayton, Columbus, and Cincinnati pose the same problem.

It seems that these children can be educated. New York City's board of education has shown that it is possible to salvage a large amount of hidden talent, to raise IQ scores by 30 or 40 points, to educate a large proportion of these children at least through the high school level, and to gain college admission for significant numbers. According to Daniel Schreiber, coordinator of the city's Higher Horizons program, it's necessary to do two things that lie far outside the school's normal operations. The school must persuade the children and their parents that education is useful, which means persuading them that education makes occupational mobility possible. And the school must give the children synthetically the experiences and cultural background that can be taken for granted in most schools. To do the first, the school needs a whole panoply of guidance counselors, psychologists, etc., to work during and after school hours with the children and their families. To do the second, the school must take the children on trips around the city, introducing them to air, grass, music, art, etc.

At first glance, the approach sounds like an extreme form of "life adjustment." It is, but with a crucial difference. All of the counseling and all of the trips are designed to develop an interest in the intellect, and specifically, to teach the children how to read. "Our basic approach is through reading," Schreiber explains; extra teachers are assigned to each school to help with remedial reading, and the counseling, trips, etc., are all used to stimulate an interest in reading. Unless a special effort is made, the slum-school children in the third grade read a half-year behind the city average. The gap widens rapidly—by eighth grade they average 2 years below the city level—and so the children are increasingly unable to cope with any subject. The results of Schreiber's program have been striking. After only 1 year of concentration on the third grade, the average retardation was cut from 6 months to just 1 month.

BREAKING THE LOCKSTEP

To give all students—slow, bright, and average—the education and training they need, to develop their intellectual capacities to the fullest, the schools will have to do more than revise the curriculum (though this is the starting point). They must also learn how to deal more effectively with individual differences among the students and among the teachers and how to utilize teachers in more efficient ways. On both scores, some notable progress is being made, adding up to a thorough reorganization of the classroom and of the school itself.

The most important change in school organization—though not the most dramatic—is the rapid spread of socalled homogenous grouping, i.e., grouping students within a given course or grade according to their intellectual ability and achievement. There has always been a tug of war in the American mind between appreciation of excellence and a fear that to admit the existence of differences was somehow undemocratic. This fear is rapidly dying down. According to Dr. Charles E. Bish, director of the National Education Association's Project on the Academically Talented Student, high schools enrolling approximately 80 percent of the student population have already established some sort of special program for the top 15 to 20 percent. Ability grouping is useful not just because it lets the brighter children learn more but also because it lets the school establish separate curriculums for different levels of understanding. It would be unfortunate if the schools in their new concern for the gifted were to neglect the needs of the average child, who can also reach much higher intellectual levels than has usually been assumed.

Ideally, schools should allow each student to go ahead in each subject as rapidly as he can. Where abolition of grades is combined with an emphasis on intellectual excellence, the result is extremely interesting. Perhaps the most stimulating high school in the United States is located in Melbourne, Fla., near Cape Canaveral. Melbourne High has completely abandoned grades. Each course is given on four levels—advanced college placement, accelerated, average, and remedial—and each student's admission to each course is determined solely by how much he knows; how much he knows is

measured by his score on an achievement test—not on an IQ test. Students thus may leapfrog the usual sequence of courses conceivably, a student could be taking calculus at the advanced college placement level and at the same time be put in a remedial English course in which reading is being taught at the fourth grade level. To accommodate students who move through the usual curriculum at a rapid pace, the school offers a large number of courses at the college level, for which college credit may be granted. It also offers a wider range of courses than most high schools—e.g., Chinese and Russian in addition to French, German, Spanish, and Latin. Melbourne High Principal B. Frank Brown has even substituted the motto "in search of intellectual excellence" for the school emblem (a bulldog) embossed on the pencils sold in the school's canteen. "It hasn't hurt the sale of pencils any," he says. Proximity to Cape Canaveral, in Brown's view, does not account for the plan's success; he claims that any high school anywhere in the country with a large enough student body—e.g., 1,200—can do the same thing.

AN IMMEMORIAL FUNCTION

In the end, if education is to be improved, Mortimer Smith, of the Council for Basic Education, has written, it must come through individual teachers "carrying on their immemorial function of stirring young minds to learn about, and think about, the history of man and his world."

It is an unpleasant fact that the public schools are not attracting as many very able individuals as they should. One reason is that a kind of cultural Gresham's law has been operating to drive out the better ones. To qualify for a teaching license in most States, students must take an inordinate number of dreary and trivial courses in "education" rather than in the subjects they will teach. And if the certification requirements are not enough to repel the intellectually able, the low academic standards of most teachers' colleges do.

On the other hand, Harvard, Chicago, and New York City's municipal colleges have shown that high academic standards can attract able undergraduates into teaching, and that education courses can be made meaningful. Columbia's Teachers' College, which has always accepted any college graduate, will henceforth require a minimum of a B average in undergraduate work. Teacher certification requirements are being revised radically in a good many States.

Raising standards isn't enough, of course; salaries must also be increased. After a decade and a half of pressure, the starting pay for public-school teachers has risen to quite respectable levels (a $4,400 average for metropolitan areas) compared to the starting pay for college graduates in other fields. But there is too low a salary ceiling thereafter. In metropolitan areas the statutory maximum averages only 60 percent above the minimum, and it probably averages less in smaller communities. Equally important, teaching is the only profession that neither recognizes nor rewards individual excellence; public schoolteachers with the same number of years of experience are generally paid the same salary, regardless of ability, interest, or initiative.

If the public schools are to attract and keep able people, they must develop a salary structure that encourages and rewards superior performance. The trend is clearly in that direction, despite continued though weakening opposition by teacher organizations and unions.[1] A growing number of communities—e.g., Summit, N.J., Ladue, Mo., and Evanston Township High School, Evanston, Ill.—have installed systems of merit pay. Other communities are giving teachers a chance to break out of the salary straightjacket by establishing the position of "master teacher," or by experimenting with team teaching. In the Franklin elementary school in Lexington, Mass., for example, the 20 teachers are divided into three teams, each handling two grades of roughly 175 children. Each team includes a team leader, responsible for curriculum, student grouping, etc.; one or more senior teachers, who hold the rank because of particular competence in one or more fields; and a number of garden-variety teachers. Team teaching offers greater flexibility in student grouping and permits elementary school teachers to specialize. But its principal virtue, in the eyes of the Harvard Graduate School of Education professors who designed and supervise the experiment, is that it establishes a career line that enables teachers to advance in status and salary without going into administration, or into some other line of work altogether.

THE FIRST SHIBBOLETH

No reconstruction of salary schedules, however, will fully solve the teacher shortage. There never can be enough truly gifted teachers; the qualities that make for greatness in teaching—like those that make for greatness in any field—are rare. And given the current ratio of students to teachers, the supply even of ordinarily competent teachers is almost bound to fall short of the demand. To take care of expanded enrollments and to replace teachers who leave to get married or take other jobs, between one-third and one-half of all students graduating from college in the next 10 years would have to go into public school teaching. It's wildly unrealistic to expect anything like that number to enter teaching; the current ratio is 20 to 25 percent.

It is clear that the schools must learn to utilize their teachers, especially their gifted teachers, more effectively than they do now. A search for improved methods of instruction and of school organization has in fact been going on around the country, in large part stimulated and financed by the Ford Foundation and its fund for the advancement of education.

"Because so much in education depends upon it," Dr. Alvin C. Eurich, vice president of the fund for the advancement of education, told the Governors of 50 States at their annual conference last June, "the first shibboleth that requires critical examination is the fixed teacher-student ratio" of 25 or 30 to 1.[2] Far from being the optimum, the usual class of 25 or 30 children now seems a very undesirable size; it is too large for active dialog and discussion, and unnecessarily small for the kind of learning that can be imparted through lectures or demonstrations. Thus, Dr. J. Lloyd Trump, who has been directing a major study on teacher utilization for the National Association of Secondary School Principals, recommends that students spend roughly 40 percent of their time in large group instruction (with classes of a hundred or more), 20 percent in small seminars of 10 to 15, and 40 percent in individual study (see diagram, p. 131). Whether abandoning the standard class size permits any increase in the overall ratio of students to teachers is not yet clear, but it does seem to be established that flexible class size raises the level of instruction, by using the best teachers to reach a maximum number of students, and by giving teachers more time for preparation.

EXPOSURE TO GREATNESS

Since students in a large class taught by a superior teacher will learn more than students in a small class taught by an inferior teacher, the Ford Foundation has been enthusiastically promoting the use of educational television as a means of exposing the maximum number of students to superior teaching. Whether TV or films (which serve the same purpose) will let schools increase the student-teacher ratio without reducing the quality of instruction remains to be seen; the evidence so far is ambiguous. But there is no question that their use can improve the quality of teaching; at the very least, TV and films make it possible for every student to have that exposure to greatness which Alfred North Whitehead thought was essential to the process of education.

Among other new devices are language laboratories employing tape recorders; these seem to improve students' verbal command of a foreign language, and they are rapidly becoming standard equipment in most high schools. A good deal more controversy surrounds the so-called teaching machine (see "Can People Be Taught Like Pigeons?" Fortune, October 1960). But enough experiments have been performed to indicate that with programed instruction, as its advocates prefer to call it, students learn some subjects faster and retain a remarkably high proportion of what they learn. Experience in Roanoke, Va.; suggests that the average student can learn math in half the time required by conventional methods. And when children who had taken algebra on machines last year were retested in February, they answered correctly 90 percent of the questions they had answered the preceding June. What's crucial in the use of teaching machines, of course, is not the machine itself but the way the material is organized for presentation. At the Collegiate School in New York, for example, teachers are using the machine programs without the machines.

The most important technological device of all is the printing press. "I think the biggest revolution in education will come from better use of books," says Dean Chase of Chicago, "not from television and teaching machines. We've never really taken advantage of the printing press." A growing number of educators share Chase's conviction that U.S. schools have not given students enough responsibility for their own education; the emphasis, Chase holds, should be on learning rather than teaching, with the latter used less to impart knowledge directly than to stimulate and direct learning. In the model school, as Chase sees it, the library would be the focal point, and students would devote a substantial part of the day to independent study.

There is a good deal of faddism, to be sure, behind the current experimentation with new techniques of teaching and school organization, and a certain amount of disillusionment among school-board members and parents may result when panaceas turn out to be only partial cures. The faddism, however, does not result from mere restlessness. Almost anything going on in the schools today either proceeds from or contributes to a reemphasis on the intellectual aims of education. And in their search for new ways to transmit knowledge, the schools are once again learning that there must be something to transmit. The principal payoff of the team-teaching experiment in Lexington, for example, has been to demonstrate the need for a thorough overhaul of the elementary curriculum. When the teaching teams met to discuss what they were teaching and why—the first time this had ever been done—they discovered that the curriculum was a "mishmash" of unrelated and frequently irrelevant detail. And in Washington County, Md., preparation of math and science programs for use over a closed-circuit TV net-

[1] The National Education Association favors merit pay in principle but opposes it in practice; the NEA doesn't even use the term, preferring "salary recognition of quality of service."

[2] The rule that class size should not exceed 25, Eurich discovered, goes back to the Babylonian Talmud, written in the third century, A.D.

work revealed that the old curriculum had been inordinately repetitious. As a result, School Superintendent William Brish eliminated the old eighth grade math course, thereby starting the high school sequence a year earlier, and he dropped the ninth grade general science course, moving biology up a year and adding advanced courses in physics and chemistry.

THE UPHILL PURSUIT

Although evidence appears on every side of a great tide of change that can carry the schools to a new standard of excellence, there is no assurance that this movement will succeed. Students, parents, teachers, administrators, school boards, and taxpayers will have to make millions of right decisions on the road to excellence, which is always uphill. There will be resistance from parents who prefer the easy way and from educators reluctant to try any new way. It's never easy for any group to abandon ideas and practices of long standing, and educators are perhaps more hidebound than most where their own work is concerned. But this Nation will be unable to hold its own in the hard and exciting years ahead unless the great change now beginning in public education comes to fruition. Community leaders throughout the United States have no graver responsibility and no more inspiring opportunity than to lend a hand in the remaking of American education.

The Courier-Journal and Times Best Daily Combination in United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article entitled "The Courier-Journal and Times Best Daily Combination in United States" which appeared in the May 8 issue of the Courier-Journal of Louisville, Ky.:

THE COURIER-JOURNAL AND TIMES BEST DAILY COMBINATION IN UNITED STATES

The Courier-Journal and the Louisville Times were rated the best pair of newspapers in America, morning and evening, published by the same organization, in a survey announced today by the Saturday Review.

And for the second time this year the Courier-Journal was rated among the 10 best individual newspapers in the Nation.

The voters in the poll were those who, according to the sponsor, should know newspapers best—the men and women who teach journalism in colleges and universities.

The survey was conducted by Benson & Benson, a professional polling organization in Princeton, N.J. Only professors in schools accredited by the American Council on Education for Journalism were questioned.

Three months ago, Edward Bernays, New York publicist, announced the result of a poll of newspaper publishers which for the third straight time rated the Courier-Journal in the top five newspapers.

ONLY FOUR COMBINATION PAPERS GET HIGH RATING

Out of 18 combinations of morning and evening papers jointly owned, the Saturday Review ranking was: the Courier-Journal and the Louisville Times, the Minneapolis Star and Tribune, the Des Moines Register and Tribune, the Baltimore Sun papers. No others received enough votes to be listed.

The poll gave this rating of the top 10 individual newspapers: New York Times, Christian Science Monitor, Wall Street Journal, St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Milwaukee Journal, Washington Post, New York Herald Tribune, the Courier-Journal, Chicago Tribune, Chicago Daily News.

The announcement said: "A Courier-Journal reader observed: 'When many papers are omitting and cutting down serious news, it rises above provincialism and sensationalism.' "Another (Courier-Journal) summary: 'Editorial page in its entirety—editorials, Editorial Notebook, letters to editor; columns (syndicated), including those of differing political hue; broad scope of foreign and national news; typographical makeup; sports page—among the best.' "

MANY CRITERIA MENTIONED IN RATING PAPERS

One breakdown showed which newspapers had received the most votes for "best."

"On this basis the St. Louis Post-Dispatch scored highest (86 percent); Milwaukee Journal and New York Times 83 percent each; Christian Science Monitor 80 percent; Washington Post 79 percent, and the Courier-Journal 74 percent.

"After this, scores fell off sharply."

John Tebbel, who wrote the analysis for the Saturday Review, said: "When this audience (journalism teachers in accredited schools) chooses the best newspapers in the Nation, one must attach more significance to the results than to a survey of nonprofessional readers who simply know what they like."

Many criteria were mentioned as valid in rating a newspaper as "best"—complete news, comprehensive treatment, 66 percent; unbiased, objective treatment of news, 47 percent; judgment in selection of news, 28 percent; layout, typography, 28 percent; good writing, style, 26 percent; accuracy, 25 percent.

J. R. Cominsky, publisher of the Saturday Review, said of the survey: "We are confident that this constructive study will be helpful to the American press in maintaining its high standards and better serving the needs of the community and of the Nation."

Castro's Prize

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, in a few, well-chosen words, my hometown newspaper, the Lowell Sun, comments on the irony of the peace prize awarded by the Kremlin to Fidel Castro—the irony both in the giving and the receiving. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial in the RECORD:

CASTRO'S PRIZE

The Soviet Government has awarded one of the Lenin peace prizes to Cuba's Castro, who was cited as "a public leader and statesman whose entire life is dedicated to the noble cause of the peoples for freedom and independence."

That's one way of puffing up the Cuban dictator who feels he has become a kingpin in the society of nations.

It is also another way of keeping him in line by strong appeal to his ego—of which he has plenty.

The citation, however, could have been written differently and more to the point. Rather than a peace prize, it should be a turmoil prize, if it is to fit Castro.

It should also be awarded because Castro has dedicated himself to totalitarianism and has become a stooge for Moscow. For such things it would be natural for the Soviets to pay him tribute.

Missile Program Sabotaged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Union, San Diego, Calif., of May 4, 1961, entitled "Strikes, Greed, and Graft." This editorial succinctly expresses the deplorable situation existing at our missile bases with regard to deliberate union strikes and slowdowns.

STRIKES, GREED, AND GRAFT: MISSILE PROGRAM SABOTAGED

America's missile program has been sabotaged on the launching pad by greed, graft, and confusion.

A parade of witnesses before a Senate investigating subcommittee have testified that strikes, slowdowns, and excessive overtime payments have endangered national security and put this country behind Russia in important phases of the space race.

The chief test officer for Convair-Astronautics charged that the Project Mercury man-in-space program has been delayed for several months because of labor troubles at Cape Canaveral.

Other witnesses have told these shocking and disgusting examples of waste and mismanagement:

There have been 327 strikes at 22 missile bases in 4½ years. Many of these were used as blackmail to force payment of exorbitant, needless overtime to workers.

Wildcat strikes and deliberate union slowdowns have cost the missile site programs 162,872 man-days since mid-1956. They have resulted in overtime wages as high as $1,000 weekly to some union craftsmen.

Ditchdiggers are getting fatter paychecks than U.S. astronauts. Plumbers are being paid more than the commanding general at Vandenberg Air Force Base.

One subcontractor, who was doing satisfactory work on a 40-hour week, was permitted to match another contractor's 53-hour week at a cost to the Government of $70,000.

The Air Force could have saved $3 million by having plugs attached to electric cords at the factory instead of letting workers do it at missile sites.

In his testimony, one electrical contractor charged that unions are doing more damage to the Nation's missile programs than the Communists ever could. Yet he insisted that none of the union sabotage was Communist inspired.

Greedy laborers and contractors who haven't the will to make them work are not the only reason for this tragic situation.

The Pentagon and its representatives at the missile sites must share the responsibility. So must Congress, which finally is facing up to the facts.

A typical attitude was expressed by the Army colonel who refused to intervene in

work stoppages at Cape Canaveral. The colonel said Congress has been prolabor since 1951 and that "all hell would break loose politically" if he tried to use military authority.

It is time for "all hell to break loose politically" on those who are obstructing our missile program. The national prestige and survival of the United States is dependent on a solution.

Perhaps Congress and the Defense Department should designate a single boss with responsibility for all missile base construction. Somebody must eliminate featherbedding on the firing pads.

The Survival of the Theater

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, Arthur Gelb, of the New York Times, has written an informative and necessary article summarizing a 105-page study, prepared by Dr. O. Glenn Saxon, professor of economics at Yale University, on "The Plight of the Living Theater in the United States."

The survival of the living theater is of vital concern to the Nation. In January I introduced H.R. 2043 to repeal the 10-percent admissions tax on live dramatic theater performances, including musicals.

Mr. Gelb's article on the Saxon report draws attention to an inescapable conclusion drawn by Dr. Saxon that the "only real and last chance of survival for the theater as a free, private, competitive enterprise depends on the elimination of the 5-percent city tax and the 10-percent Federal tax on tickets."

Mr. Gelb reports that the 1960 season has been described by Robert Whitehead, president of the League of New York Theaters, as "the most disastrous year on Broadway" even though it occurred during a period of relatively high prosperity.

Out of a total capital investment of over $8 million in 56 productions, over $4 million was last, more than half of the total investment—

Whitehead said:

The current 1961 season shapes up to be even more disastrous.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD at this point additional excerpts from the Gelb summary which clearly bespeaks the need for prompt hearings on my bill:

The report, according to Dr. Saxon, is an extension of a research study he made in 1953. The men declared that the theater's financial position was much worse today than it was 8 years ago. It was reported then that Broadway had taken a precipitous economic drop since its heyday in the twenties.

According to the report, 636 new commercial shows were produced on Broadway during the last 12 seasons, and of these, 470—or 74 percent—were flops and 166—or 26 percent—were financial hits.

The profits of the 166 hits, the report said, have amounted to $47,300,000 from all sources, a return of 236 percent on their combined capital investment of $19,964,000.

During the same period, the losses of the 470 failures amounted to $42,300,000; capital investments of flops are available only for the last 9 of the 12 seasons. During these nine seasons, the 334 failures suffered combined losses of $30,972,000, or 90.2 percent of their total capital investment of $34,300,000.

NUMBER OF THEATERS DROPS

The report also stressed Broadway's decline by noting that there were 66 playhouses in 1931 and only 33 in 1960 and that there were 264 productions in 1928 and only 57 in 1960.

Between 1930 and 1960, the report added, total Broadway attendance fell from 12,300,000 to 8,100,000, a decline of more than a third.

Meanwhile, Dr. Saxon pointed out, the population of the United States increase 46 percent and "the disposable personal income" rose 355 percent.

Other statistics showed that between 1944 and 1959 the average maximum box office price of dramas rose 105.5 percent while the price of musicals rose 77.1 percent.

"The Consumer Price Index between 1944 and 1959," the report emphasized, "rose only 65.9 percent. It appears, therefore, that theater ticket prices on Broadway have risen considerably more than the Consumer Price Index since the end of World War II."

The report noted that the theater like other profit-seeking industries in the country, "has been the victim of the cost-price squeeze since 1939."

"As a consequence," it said, "profits of the industry have been greatly reduced and a major and increasing percentage of each season's productions is forced to suspend because of operating losses or the imminent threat thereof."

The report said the United States and Norway stood alone as the only major nations that "have not experienced a rise in theater popularity and attendance since the end of World War II." Most of the foreign theaters are aided by government subsidy, the study noted.

"The American theater cherishes that competitive independence," it said. "It now seeks only to be left free to continue to earn and pay its own way—free from all governmental subsidies, free from all socialistic controls, but also free from all unfair and discriminatory taxation."

Following Dr. Saxon's earlier study the 20 percent Federal tax on tickets was reduced to 10 percent in 1954; the following year, however, New York City voted its own 5-percent tax.

Either for or Against

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, Stark County, Ohio, my home county, has developed an active and alert civil defense staff which publishes an unusual and interesting newsletter edited by Mrs. Kay Nimon, deputy county director.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I offer Mrs. Nimon's excellent editorial from the May 20 Home Guardian:

EITHER FOR OR AGAINST

(By Kay Nimon)

There seems to be a new and spreading outburst of agitation against loyalty oaths to the U.S. Government and the Constitution. Last month the loyalty oath was discarded from the New York public school systems, to be replaced by an oral oath to be recited voluntarily at graduation exercises.

Why should the question arise as to whether we pledge loyalty to the United States? To be a mere citizen, who loves her country and all the freedom it gives us, there appears to be only one question: "Are you for or against the U.S. Government and the system of individual liberty maintained by this Government under its Constitution?"

Those of us who are for the United States should be proud to stand up in public and swear our loyalty. Those who refuse to give this pledge (unless for religious reasons) would seem to have other loyalties which come before the United States.

In these days when the world is divided into two groups, freedom and communism, and when the cold war makes the hot war danger very grace, there is no room in the United States for halfway people. You are either for American, with no limitations or reservations, and willing to stand up and be counted as a loyal American, or you are against America and may be counted as its enemy.

We have two loyalties that we must maintain—or lose them both—loyalty to our God and loyalty to our country.

You Can't Buy Friends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. HALEY
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two editorials which appeared in the Sunday, April 23, 1961, issue of the Winter Haven News-Chief, which is published at Winter Haven, Fla.

The editorials entitled "You Can't Buy Friends" and "Now If We Get Blamed," emphasize the failure of our "checkbook" foreign policy and point to the fact that it has become imperative that we establish and follow a firm positive foreign policy.

The editorials follow:

YOU CAN'T BUY FRIENDS

Thirteen years ago that same editorial heading was used in this paper. We said then that our extensive foreign aid plan would never win friends or influence people. Thirteen years later with some $90 billion spent, we have failed to win friends or influence people. And yet we are planning more and more such nonsense, more and more billions and to top it off, a Peace Corps.

All over the world people are marching because a crafty foe, the Russian Communist, is telling Hitler-sized lies and people are believing that we are nothing but a bunch of dollar-worshiping imperialists. Even in our own country the Communists have enough power to mount demonstrations in New York, San Francisco, and even Washington.

Nehru, the Prime Minister of India, in his two-faced way of doing business will accept our dollars, our grain, our machinery and then turn right around and give a speech in

his parliament condemning us for the internal strife in Cuba. It's about time we stop trying to buy friends. It's about time that we get some commonsense in our heads and heed President Washington's admonition to stay out of foreign entanglements.

NOW IF WE GET BLAMED

If we are going to get blamed all over the world, it's about time that we show our tougher side. We have been all light and sweetness, have repeatedly turned the other cheek. Have taken insult after insult and tried to laugh it off. If we are going to be accused of being warmongers etc., let's try the other tack.

For instance, let's go into Cuba, regardless of the consequences, throw the communistic Castro government out, including thousands of Russians and Chinese, set up a provisional government, stabilize the situation and see what develops. Nothing will happen except instead of being loved or hated, we'll be respected.

The cries would soon change from Yankee no to Yankee si, fine fellow.

Dedicated to the Memory of Dr. Hugh Bennett

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include a letter—in part—to me from Mr. H. Wayne Pritchard, executive secretary of the Soil Conservation Society of America, Des Moines, Iowa. Also included is a copy of the resolution adopted by the Iowa Legislature commending the Soil Conservation Society of America, of which I am proud to be an honorary member, for selecting the great agricultural State of Iowa as its permanent home and honoring Dr. Hugh Bennett, the father of the Soil Conservation Service. Mr. Pritchard's letter refers to a new building which, when completed, will be the permanent home of the Soil Conservation Society of America and will be a beautifully and suitably designed building, located a few miles west of the city of Des Moines.

This building will be dedicated to the memory of "Big Hugh" as he was admirably called by millions of his admirers for his great and good work in conserving our priceless topsoil on which every American depends for his bountiful supply of good food and fiber.

The new home will be built with contributions from thousands of the American people who will, by their contributions, pay their respects to Dr. Hugh Bennett and make this home a reality. As reported by Mr. Pritchard $70,000 is still needed.

The above-mentioned letter follows:

MAY 4, 1961.

DEAR BEN: I wanted to bring you up to date on the society's housing situation. You will be interested to know that the House and Senate of the Iowa Legislature have passed a concurrent resolution commending the society for locating its building here in Iowa and I am sending you a copy of the Iowa State Senate Journal for Wednesday, April 12, that contains the resolution on page 812.

Considerable progress is being made as we have $30,000 of the necessary $100,000 on hand. We are getting a finance drive under way in the Des Moines area now and also the tempo is increasing throughout the society. I have just written to E. A. Norton giving him some additional information and asking him to pass it on to Mrs. Bennett.

I thought you would want to be brought up to date on this situation. Best personal regards.

Sincerely,

H. WAYNE PRITCHARD,
Executive Secretary,
The Soil Conservation Society of America.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 23
(By Schroeder)

Whereas within the boundaries of the State of Iowa lies a large part of the world's most fertile and productive soil—mankind's basic resource; and

Whereas the general assembly and the officials of the State of Iowa have supported with vigor the conservation of the soil and water resources of their State; and

Whereas the Soil Conservation Society of America is dedicated to advancing the science and art of good land use; and

Whereas the international headquarters offices of the Soil Conservation Society of America have been permanently established in Iowa and will serve the more than 10,700 members in every State of this Nation and in 84 other countries of the world; and

Whereas the Soil Conservation Society of America was founded by the late Dr. Hugh Hammond Bennett, whose efforts brought forth effective programs in soil conservation districts and by others, whereby the soil and water resources of the State of Iowa, the United States of America, and all countries on earth can be wisely husbanded, managed and developed for the everlasting benefits of man; and

Whereas the Soil Conservation Society of America is now building a permanent home within the borders of the State of Iowa, dedicated to the memory of Hugh Hammond Bennett: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Assembly of the State of Iowa commend the Soil Conservation Society of America for selecting the great agricultural State of Iowa for its permanent home, that the General Assembly of the State of Iowa extend appreciation to the Iowa leaders who have assisted in bringing their international office to Iowa, and that the general assembly, through this action, call to the attention of all Iowa citizens this action, which will show the world that Iowa is proud of her soil and water resources and treasures them beyond value in her recognition of the need for careful husbandry of them.

What Do We Do, Mr. President?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, here is a letter to the President from his supporter, the editor and publisher of Nassau County's Newsday. The date of the editorial is May 5:

AN OPEN LETTER

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In your great inaugural speech January 20, you called upon the citizens of the United States to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle, year in and year out. You reminded us that only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum dangers. And you said to us: "Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country."

These were words in the tradition of Winston Churchill when, in the hour of England's greatest danger, he offered its people only "blood, toil, sweat, and tears" if they wished to remain free of Nazi tyranny.

All of us wanted to respond to your call, although you did not spell out what the American people must do in order to measure up to the challenge. We have heard the same message from you again and again, most recently in Chicago the last weekend in April. At that time you said: "Our greatest adversary is not the Russians. It is our own unwillingness to do what must be done."

But still we do not know what it is that must be done, and how you as our elected leader want us to do it. The American people are willing to make any sacrifice to preserve this system of government and the freedom that is its warp and woof. What do we do? Where do we sacrifice?

We want to know so that we can let our readers know. For "If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?" (I Corinthians 14: 8).

ALICIA PATTERSON,
Editor and Publisher.

New York City's Public Housing Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the New York City Housing Authority is doing an excellent job in providing low-cost housing for the people of New York.

As of May 1, 1961, the housing authority had 93 developments in full operation and 5 new developments partially occupied. When fully occupied, these 98 developments will provide 114,829 apartments for approximately 460,000 persons. Under construction are 18 other developments containing 14,962 apartments. In the planning stage are 35 developments containing 20,539 more apartments and 3 developments containing 1,216 apartments are under study at this time.

When this program is completed, it will total 154 developments for 151,546 families whose incomes are too low to enable them to secure decent and adequate housing at present. These developments will house approximately 600,000 persons in comfortable, modern homes in beautiful environmental surroundings at rents which they can afford to pay.

The total of this investment of Federal, State, and city funds is nearly $2 billion—an investment in the future of America and hundreds of thousands of its citizens.

To afford our colleagues the opportunity to examine the details of this program, I have appended a press release of the New York City Housing Authority dated April 25, 1961, and an editorial from the New York Journal American of April 29, 1961:

PRESS RELEASE OF THE NEW YORK CITY HOUSING AUTHORITY, APRIL 25, 1961

In filing building plans for six new public housing developments with Building Commissioner Peter J. Reidy, New York City Housing Authority Chairman William Reid today, April 25, 1961, said: "This represents the largest number of building plans ever filed at one time in the 26-year history of public housing in New York City."

"This unprecedented activity is in keeping with the directive of President Kennedy and Mayor Wagner to step-up the public housing building program in New York City," Mr. Reid added.

By the end of the year a total of 16 building plans are expected to be filed—another all-time high in the history of the New York City Housing Authority.

Plans for the 6 low-rent developments filed today will provide 4,739 apartments for an estimated population of 18,000 persons. Development costs are expected to total $83,200,000.

This will provide employment in the various construction trades for about 3,300 workers over a 2-year period. This will be the equivalent of approximately 1,220,000 man-days of work.

The six developments are: Tompkins houses, Brooklyn (federally aided), Jonathan Williams houses, Brooklyn (State aided), John Purroy Mitchell houses, Bronx (federally aided), Chelsea houses, Manhattan (State aided), Gerard Swope houses, Manhattan (federally aided), and Richmond Terrace houses, Staten Island (federally aided).

BROOKLYN

Tompkins houses: A $17,185,000 federally aided development to be set on 11.98 acres bounded by Park, Myrtle, Tompkins, and Throop Avenues. Will consist of eight buildings (four 8-story and four 16-story), with 1,046 apartments (90 reserved for elderly tenants); estimated population, 4,5111. Construction is scheduled to start in August. Architects: Unger & Unger. Facilities include five-room children's center and a small community center.

Jonathan Williams houses: A $10,855,000 State-aided development. Will be erected on 5.28 acres, bounded by Roebling Street, Division Avenue, Marcy Avenue, and Broadway. To consist of five buildings (two 14-story, three 21-story), with 577 apartments (59 reserved for the elderly). Estimated population, 2,129. Construction is scheduled for September. Architects: Eggers Higgins.

BRONX

John Purroy Mitchel houses: A $28,175,000 federally aided development to be built on 15.6 acres bounded by Lincoln and Willis Avenues, and East 135th and East 138th Streets. Will consist of nine 20-story buildings; 1,567 apartments, 270 of which will be reserved for the elderly, with an estimated population of 6,250. Construction is scheduled for early next year. Architects: Greenberg & Ames.

MANHATTAN

Chelsea houses: An $8,390,000 State-aided development to be set on 1.93 acres, bounded by Ninth Avenue, the John L. Elliott Houses, and West 25th and 26th Streets. Will consist of two 21-story buildings; 424 apartments (60 reserved for elderly), with an estimated population of 1,525. Construction is scheduled to start in September. Architects: Paul L. Wood & Associates. Community center to be operated by Hudson Guild, which also operates the Elliott Houses Center.

Gerard Swope houses: A $9,970,000 federally aided development to be set on a 3.52-acre site, bounded by East 93d and 95th Streets, First Avenue and Franklin D. Roosevelt Drive. Will consist of three 24-story buildings, containing 636 apartments, including 282 for the elderly. Estimated population has been set at 1,757. Construction is scheduled for November. Architects: Frederick G. Frost, Jr. & Associates. Plans provide for a large community center including meeting rooms, craft rooms, cafeteria, and health center.

STATEN ISLAND

Richmond Terrace houses: An $8,627,000 federally aided project to be erected on 10½ acres bounded by Richmond Terrace, Westervelt Avenue, Cleveland Street, Crescent Avenue, and Jersey Street. The project will consist of six 8-story buildings, and will provide 489 apartments, including 65 reserved for the elderly. Estimated population, 1,800. Construction is scheduled to begin in October. Architects: LaPierre Litchfield & Partners. Among the project's features are several play areas and a large community center including an auditorium, recreational facilities, and two meeting rooms for elderly tenants.

[From the New York Journal American, Apr. 29, 1961]

MORE HOUSING

We commend William Reid, chairman of the New York City Housing Authority, and his associates for the promptness with which they have moved to comply with President Kennedy's urging to speed up housing construction as an aid to the economy.

The plans for six new housing developments which Mr. Reid filed with the buildings department represent the biggest group of such projects this city ever scheduled at one time in the 26-year history of public housing.

The 6 new developments will cost $83,200,000 and provide 4,739 low-rent apartments for an estimated 18,000 persons. One feature we like is that each of the projects has a group of apartments specifically earmarked for the elderly.

From the economic standpoint, Mr. Reid points out that construction of these buildings will provide 3,300 jobs over a 2-year period. And he promises that by the end of the year the authority will have a total of 16 new projects in the works, and alltime high.

If the Federal Government speeds funds for this housing as the President promised, this is good for New York and for the Nation.

But much as we need low-rent housing, we need apartments for middle-income families even more. This city cannot exist as a community of the very rich and the very poor.

With the Federal Government anxious to speed funds for urban renewal, let's take advantage of this opportunity to provide more middle-income housing.

They Keep on Pushing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial published in the Shelbyville (Ind.) News, of April 8, 1961:

THEY KEEP ON PUSHING

A great many people in America who are in a position to know, have warned repeatedly that Communist infiltration in the United States is increasing. They continue to warn that there are more Communist spies in the world today than ever before. Yet many Americans who are loyal to our country continue to be used by the Red conspiracy.

We can be quite sure that this conspiracy has given its full support to efforts to cripple the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. These are the only two congressional groups which constantly expose to public view the conspiracy's operations within the United States. Thus they are a principal target.

These two committees have performed an especially valuable service in turning the spotlight on Communist agitation among young Americans. The danger to our young people is very real. Some of them on the west coast were led—or misled—into rioting against a hearing of the House Committee in San Francisco last May. Riot charges against the demonstrators were dismissed by a local judge for what he called practical reasons, but he has made it clear since then that his action did not mean he condoned what happened in San Francisco.

The judge said: "I very definitely agree with the view of FBI Director Hoover that the city hall riot on May 13 was instigated by Communist subversives."

Unfortunately, some Americans pooh-pooh the menace of communism within our own country, pointing out that it is simply a belief or the dogma of a political party which happens to differ with our two big political parties. That idea is both naive and dangerous.

Communism is a worldwide conspiracy against human freedom and the dignity of man. The members of this conspiracy in the United States constitute a deadly danger to our future. To dismiss lightly the existence of the subversive threat to the United States is to deliberately commit national suicide.

We must face honestly the gravity of the situation. We must give it top priority in our thinking and in our actions.

If you were a member of a conspiracy set upon destroying America from within, what plan of action would you follow?

The most obvious answer in view of the nature of the problem, would be first of all to lull the people, the lawmakers, and the courts of this country into the belief that there is no serious subversive threat to freedom in our Nation and therefore no cause for worry or concern.

Patriotic Americans must not be deceived. They must remember that the attack on freedom takes many guises. It is well for us to give our attention to some of the things that happen when personal rights come into conflict with what some would tell us is the public welfare. When individual freedom is lost to any man, the freedom of all men is threatened.

How can we help to maintain freedom in America?

First of all, we must march straight down the road of personal enterprise. We must have faith in a man's reliance upon himself. If we fall victim to the Federal Government's free this and free that, we cannot escape weakening ourselves in character, and the only end is serfdom.

It is not too late to save freedom if patriotic Americans will act with knowledge, with decisiveness, with firmness. There is work for all men and women who love freedom and who feel a deep-seated loyalty to America and all that America means.

Never forget that the Communist conspiracy is on the job constantly. We who want to keep our traditional freedom must be no less diligent. Our freedom is at stake. Western civilization is at stake. Our Christian way of life itself is at stake.

Nehru's "Thank You" for Massive U.S. Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, it is reliably reported to me that the following statement are the words of Mr. Nehru, the Prime Minister of India.

It is true he is entitled to his view but that is all he is entitled to. We, of course, are entitled to our view and it is high time we let the world know that we intend that our view will prevail.

It is high time we stopped worrying about a public image based on trying to buy friends and giving ourselves away to build others.

Here, of course, is Mr. Nehru's thank you after receiving billions of dollars of aid from the United States.

It is high time for us to adopt and follow a policy solely in U.S. self-interest with no apologies and no "with your permission" of our world neighbors. As the leader of the free world there comes a time to be the leader, not the follower. To lead we must set the policy, not dance to someone else's tune.

Now let us set the policy of restating and backing up the Monroe Doctrine and let others fall in line behind us. Let us reassure others following our leadership that we will protect them if they are with us. Then let us get out of those areas of the world where we are not prepared to back up tough talk by tough action.

Here now is the thanks we get from Mr. Nehru:

NEHRU'S "THANK YOU" FOR MASSIVE U.S. AID

Speaking in the Rjya Sabha, i.e., the Upper House of Parliament of India, on April 20, Mr. Nehru, the Prime Minister of India, said:

"News is scanty, but some facts are clear and one of these is that some kind of invasion of Cuba from outside has taken place and that invasion could only have taken place from American mainland. We feel that this invasion and manner in which it has taken place is bad and is dangerous.

"It was fairly well known that Cuban exiles had been collecting in various places in Florida and possibly in Guatemala and elsewhere and training there and supplied arms and encouraged to go and invade Cuba. And now this invasion has taken place. It does appear to be a case of intervention. I say so because in a recent statement issued by President Kennedy he had stated very clearly that he will not permit American armed intervention in Cuba on any account. That statement is to be welcomed. But I find it a little difficult to understand the major difference between that type of intervention and intervention like encouraging and supplying arms and training to Cuban exiles to go over there and invade."

The American Field Service Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the following fine speech was given by Mrs. William R. Brown, of Kansas City, Mo., chairman, American Field Service, Greater Kansas City area, at a rally for American Field Service Day in Kansas City, Friday, April 14, 1961. I hope it will be the inspiration it should be to all who read it:

This program will be broadcast in September from Recife, Brazil. Maria Xavier has a contract for one-half hour every day on the air when she returns home and she will use some of this time to tell about Kansas City.

In Athens, Greece, today a surgeon is operating and when he goes home tonight he will eagerly ask, "Is there a letter from Nicos in Kansas City?"

There's a grandmother in East Germany behind the Iron Curtain who thinks of her granddaughter, Gina, in Kansas City who made the National Honor Society.

On a farm outside Tokyo a mother who is a Christian bows her head to bless America and the home in Kansas City where her son, Hidetaka, is living.

In Norway two parents are talking and because they are deaf they speak with their hands. "How fine that our daughter, Mary, can help teach the deaf children at Troost School in Kansas City."

And tonight a father may have worked late in his shop in Udine, Italy. Shelves around him are stacked with beautiful Italian silks from which he makes the finest men's ties. He may be wondering how he can get enough money to give his son a college education. You have heard that son, Italo, speak tonight.

Add to all these families ones in Indonesia, Costa Rica, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, France, England, Argentina.

Add to these the families our Kansas City young people lived with this year in Japan, Finland, Belgium, Holland, Sweden, Germany, Brazil, etc.

Add to these the 2,000 families all over the world who have sons and daughters at this moment living in American homes, going to our high schools—experiencing our free way of life and telling us of their countries—broadening our understanding and knowledge.

Add to this the 975 homes all over the world where our best American young people lived last summer—with sacrifice. This is the American Field Service program—not projects or plans, but people. This is our audience.

The future? Why this program especially? Three reasons for American Field Service.

1. Carefully selected young people whose ideology is not solidified—clear eyed—open-minded—idealistic about the future.

2. They live in our free way of life and do not look at it from the isolation of a college campus or a tourist bus. This becomes not only an intellectual experience but an emotional one which will give dynamics to their future attitudes.

3. They have more time and opportunity when they return to their own families and countries to influence them.

We of the free world have run interference for the Communists who have proceeded to exploit and direct the hopes we raised but did not fulfill.

To all you young people, I say freedom is not something you inherit—a free deal—each generation has to reearn it and fight for it. This is the heroism of peace which is greater than the heroism of war.

A wind of change is blowing over the continent of Africa. A forest fire of revolution is ravaging the black continent devouring the cobweb and dry weed of imperialism to the last straw. We have the chance of burning the rubbish heap of our colonial and corrupt traditions and of clearing the field for a new society and a new way of life. Thanks to the Russian October Revolution which hatched the greatest single anticolonial force in the world. Thanks to the rise of China. Thanks to the struggle of Jomo Kenyata.

To the young men of Africa, at least, the sons of Washington and Jeffrson are no longer the vanguard of the forces of liberation.

This is an interesting figure: The United States spends $70 million a year to support the United Nations. New York City spends $140 million a year—twice as much—to collect its garbage.

WHAT OF THE FUTURE?

Not many of us in this room can directly do much about missiles, Hydrogen bombs, or Astronauts shot into space except with our taxes to pay for them. By tomorrow night at midnight about 45¢ of each of your tax dollars will go for armaments. Has history shown this to be the answer? The A.F.S. started in the war to end all wars. Did it work? How about investing in peace? This program needs money to increase the number of students and to carry on an important alumni program all over the world, especially in undecided areas. Not many of us can directly do much about the Pentagon but you could offer to share your home. We need homes for our increasing program.

Of him who hath, much shall be required.

Never has our land been invaded by war. How blest we have been in America. Mr. Galatti has been asked by the State Department to double our program in 3 years. What of the future? Well—

Where is the Secretary General of the United Nations in 1980 coming from? A Danish student who was in Kansas City in 1959?

Who will be the Prime Minister of the Congo, Nigeria, Guinea? Who will represent Japan, Pakistan, Indonesia in SEATO? Whose voice of leadership will be raised in Iceland, Turkey, Costa Rica, Argentina?

Will the top young people of the world from 16 to 18 years of age accept the easy-to-get scholarships to Moscow or will they, through American Field Service and other groups, come to America which still is the land of the free and the home of the brave?

The best way to export an idea is to wrap it up in a person. Our American outstanding young people who will be our leaders of 1980 will bring experience and understanding to their responsibilities—not bigoted superiority and the use protection of the clique it (war) can't happen here. They know it can happen in Kansas City as easily as Hiroshima.

What can we do? Here's a handle behind which to throw the stubborn ounces of our strength.

Perhaps, at last, we are driven by fear of annihilation—confronted by the witness of history that power does not bring peace—that the way of a Dr. Thomas Dooley, an Albert Schweitzer, a Gandhi, a Ralph Bunche, or a Stephen Galatti does get the job done, we now have the full support of our administration in Washington. This is the New Frontier.

Or is this a New Frontier? Over 1,900 years ago Jesus taught that "love is the greatest force on earth." He brought the good news, "Peace on earth, good will to all men."

The future? Yes, I believe there will be a peace if we build it with knowledge, sacrifice, good sense, understanding, and heroism, and ask God to give us love.

There will be peace and may that peace begin with me.

Good-Will Ship Rewarding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a copy of a newspaper article which appeared in a recent edition of the Spokesman-Review newspaper, Spokane, Wash.

I am certain my colleagues share with me the feeling of pride and humility for the many members of the medical and dental profession who are serving on the SS *Hope*, the former Navy hospital ship currently sailing on a privately sponsored good-will trip to underdeveloped nations. I am particularly proud to learn of the activities of one of my constituents, Dr. Stanley E. Mayall, D.D.S., and his service aboard the SS *Hope*. His participation in this venture is another manifestation of the dedication of our American medical personnel who serve with *Hope* in their unselfish desire to help those less fortunate to help themselves.

GOOD-WILL SHIP REWARDING

"This is a wonderful experience and what a terrific opportunity to learn as well as to teach. One sees more in a day out here than in a lifetime at home, medically and dentally speaking.

So wrote Dr. Stanley E. Mayall, Spokane dentist, on March 9 from Djakarta, Indonesia, where he was waiting to join the staff of the S.S. *Hope* in Far East waters. The former Navy hospital ship is on a privately sponsored year's cruise—and good-will trip—to underdeveloped nations.

"It would be utterly impossible to put it all (his experiences) down in writing," Dr. Mayall wrote. "In the United States there is 1 dentist per 1,000 population, while out here there is 1 for each 270,000 * * * so you can imagine the very great need for help and encouragement—and the people are so very grateful for anything you can do."

When the Spokane native arrived in Djakarta, where he was slated to board the *Hope*, he discovered the vessel was 2,000 miles away—at Kupang, Timor, Eastern Masatenggara. Earlier it had been anchored at Ambon Island. During a 1-month stay there, according to a Djakarta newspaper clipping from Dr. Mayall received here yesterday, 20 operations were performed and 1,800 outpatients were treated. Of the latter number 500 were dental patients, it was said.

VOLUNTEERED AID

Arriving on the same plane from the United States with Dr. Mayall were two X-ray technicians from California and an eye surgeon from Illinois. The foursome, upon learning there was a dental school on Bali, volunteered their services there until they obtained transportation to the *Hope* in Kupang Harbor.

"It would be a wonderful thing if * * * you could encourage qualified ethical men to offer their services for a 4-month tour of duty (aboard the *Hope*). And even though they receive no salary, their spiritual and mental rewards would pay them one hundred times over. If you hear of anyone interested, they should contact the Hope office in Washington, D.C.," the letter continued.

Dr. Mayall indicated he would be replaced (as one of two dentists aboard the *Hope*) in September. His main work with the *Hope* will be to teach modern dental techniques to medical men and laymen of the region. Dr. Mayall's offices at W-904 Bishop Court are being maintained by his associate, Dr. M. Allen Peery.

How Important Is the Individual in America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the winning essay of the Orange Council No. 4922, Knights of Columbus 1961 Essay Contest, written by Mary Anne Bogucki, a senior at Orange High School, Orange, Calif. The essay is entitled "How Important Is the Individual in America?" I believe this essay is indicative of the true Americanism to be found in our youth of today, who will hold the fate of our Nation in their hands tomorrow:

HOW IMPORTANT IS THE INDIVIDUAL IN AMERICA?

Without the individual, there could not or would not be an America. Our whole society is based on the rights and privileges of the individual. Our Constitution's main purpose is to provide a form of government which will protect the individual.

Since the individual is so important in this country, each one must do his part, however small, to keep America strong and active. There is an old saying which says that "a chain is only as strong as its weakest link." If one link begins to corrode and rust, it will eventually break off and the chain will no longer be whole. In a way, one can compare America with a chain, each link representing a segment of our society. As with the chain, this country cannot last or remain whole and strong if corruption begins to tear away at its vitals, and finally, destroy its unity. The whole of anything cannot be good unless each individual part is not equally good. Here, again, we come right back to the inidividual. He must be strong if our country is to be strong. He must have a sincere desire to serve if he expects his country is to serve him. He must remain free from corruption if his country is to remain free from corruption. He must have loyalty and patriotism if he wants his country to stand tall in the eyes of the world.

The individual has been the glorious past, continues to be the triumphant present, and is the hopeful future of this great land. Her very life and existence depends on how much each individual loves her and wishes to protect her. As with the chain, each person must strive to keep his link strong if the whole is to remain strong. Yes, the individual is not merely important in America—he is America.

Public Law 78, a National Disgrace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House is scheduled to consider the bill reported by the Committee on Agriculture which would extend the program of importing Mexican farm laborers—Public Law 78—for another 2 years.

Mr. Speaker, the May Newsletter of the National Advisory Committee on Farm Labor has pointed out the shameful fact that at the present time American farmworkers can expect to earn less than $900 a year from farm employment; that they can expect to be out of work and without unemployment compensation about half the year. This condition is a disgrace to a country such as ours which prides itself on its affluence and high standard of living; it is a disgraceful condition which will continue to plague us so long as a few, large farm employers are allowed their present access to an unlimited supply of low-cost imported labor from Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to read this newsletter carefully before the House meets tomorrow, and I trust that we will be able to deal effectively with the searching questions which it raises:

PUBLIC LAW 78

This information letter is devoted entirely to the Mexican farm labor program and Public Law 78 which authorizes it. Because House action on H.R. 2010, which would extend Public Law 78 without any reforms, seems imminent, we are concentrating on the importation program and the proposed reforms contained in H.R. 6032.

This reflects our belief that reform of the Mexican Farm Labor Program is essential to achieving any real improvements in the conditions of American farm workers. So long as farm employers can hire all the contract labor they want, at whatever price they choose to pay, so long as Public Law 78 does not contain any effective safeguards to protect the wages and job priorities of domestic workers, American farm workers will remain underpaid and underemployed.

Public Law 78 was enacted in 1951 to provide temporary supplemental Mexican labor to work in unskilled agricultural jobs on essential crops. It was proposed as an emergency measure to meet a labor shortage during the Korean conflict. Although the program was not intended to displace domestic workers nor to depress their wages, these results have occurred because the clauses supposed to protect American workers are at present ambiguous and ineffectual. In recent years, over 400,000 Mexican contract workers or braceros have been imported annually. Last year, the number dropped to 315,000. A major decline took place in California where the AWOC cam-

paign had pushed wages up to a level that attracted far more domestic workers than had sought farm jobs in recent years. Despite this decline, the U.S. Department of Labor again found that—

"In some areas entire crop activities were dominated by foreign nationals. At the peak of the season, approximately 95 percent of the melon harvesters in the Yuma area of Arizona and of the cotton harvesters in the Trans Pecos area of Texas were foreign workers. About 9 out of 10 workers in the California lettuce harvest, in the tomato harvest of California's Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys, and in the New Mexico cotton harvest were Mexican. Three-fourths of those employed at the peak of Michigan's pickle harvest were foreign workers."

About 95 percent of the imported labor force is employed in just 7 States. Less than 2 percent of the Nation's farmers employ braceros. These farmers are typically large-scale operators or corporation farmers and their use of low-cost contract labor gives then a considerable advantage over family farmers with whom they compete.

REFORM OF THE MEXICAN FARM LABOR PROGRAM

Major reforms of the Mexican farm labor program are contained in H.R. 6032, introduced by Representative MERWIN COAD. The bill incorporates the proposals of the Kennedy administration to check the restrictive effects of the program on the wages and employment opportunities of domestic workers. In brief, the reforms would require that wages in bracero-using areas keep pace with farm wages generally and that domestic farm workers are offered conditions comparable to those guaranteed Mexican contract workers.

Representative COAD was one of the minority members of the House Agriculture Subcommitee who last year issued a blistering attack on Public Law 78. Their minority report stated in part:

"Public Law 78 is a major factor in creating the extremely low income and the great underemployment of American farm workers. It not only helps to prevent wages and working conditions from improving but in many areas it actually makes them worse. The Mexican farm labor importation program quite simply exploits the poverty among Mexicans to increase poverty among farm workers in the United States * * *. It provides corporation farms with a means of competing unfairly with the family farm."

Supporters of the Coad bill face an uphill fight. Despite widespread criticism of Public Law 78, the small percentage of growers who hire braceros have so far been successful in their efforts to continue the importation without any reforms. The House Agriculture Committee, traditionally more sympathetic to growers than to farm workers, has already approved H.R. 2010, which would extend the present program with no reforms, for another 2 years. The House may act on Public Law 78 at any time.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

The Coad bill contains the following provisions:

1. Eligibility to employ Mexican workers would be limited to employers who attempt to recruit U.S. workers by offering them wages at least equal to average farm wages in the State or the Nation, whichever is lower. Employers would not be required to raise their wage offers by more than 10 cents per hour in any 1 year.

Comments: Farm wages in bracero-using areas have lagged materially behind farm wages generally. In many cases, wages have actually declined in these areas. The only visible solution, if the program is to be continued, is to assure that the availability of Mexican labor is made dependent upon upward wage adjustments of the type to be expected in a labor shortage market.

2. Eligibility to employ bracero labor would be restricted to employers making reasonable efforts to attract domestic workers by offering—and actually providing—terms and conditions of employment roughly comparable to those offered imported workers.

Comments: The contract governing the employment of braceros guarantees them many benefits that, with few exceptions, domestics do not enjoy. These include: workmen's compensation, occupation insurance, free housing and transportation, minimum work guarantees, written contracts and grievance procedures, and subsistence when work is not available.

3. Imported Mexican workers would be confined to employment in seasonal and temporary jobs and to work not involving the operation of machinery, except in "hardship cases" certified by the Secretary of Labor.

Comments: Tens of thousands of braceros have been hired in skilled jobs and on a year-round basis, contradicting the original intention behind the Act.

4. The Secretary of Labor would be authorized to limit the number of foreign workers who could be employed by any one farmer to the extent necessary to assure active competition for domestic farm labor.

5. If amended in these respects, Public Law 78 would be extended for 2 years, terminating December 31, 1963.

PUBLIC LAW 78 AND INDUSTRIALIZED FARMING

In major bracero-using areas the importation program plays a crucial role in the overall farm-labor situation. The small percentage of farmers who hire braceros are typically large-scale operators. Their position vis-a-vis both farmworkers and family farmers is strengthened by their reliance on low-cost imported workers. A close examination of a particular case, the Imperial Valley, is instructive.

California's Imperial Valley is one of the richest and most productive farming areas in the world. With a growing season that lasts the year around and with rich irrigated soil, growers in the county dominate the Nation's production of winter lettuce and carrots, spring melons, and several other crops. In 1959, the average farm in the valley was valued at $205,000 with estimated sales of $100,000, about four times the statewide average. Value of the winter lettuce crop, which has just been harvested, was estimated at $20 million. Just 16 of the 112 lettuce farms in the valley accounted for two-thirds of the 40,000 acres of lettuce and hired most of the workers. As of the end of January, the smallest of the truck farms had some 700 acres of lettuce under cultivation. Many of the big growers are also packers and shippers, thus eliminating (and enjoying the profits of) the middlemen with whom most farmers must do business.

Once the Imperial Valley provided employment for thousands of domestic farmworkers, but now most of the work is done by Mexican nationals. Unable to compete with the braceros, an estimated 7,000 to 8,000 American farmworkers, plus their families, have left the area altogether in the past 10 years. The decline in the domestic payroll has had predictable results. According to one count, about 250 stores have closed for lack of sales, a dozen big chainstores among them.

DISPLACEMENT OF AMERICAN WORKERS

The recent attempt to organize workers in the winter lettuce harvest was handicapped by the fact that at the start of the season close to 9,000 of the 11,000 lettuce workers were Mexican contract workers. Hundreds of domestics in the valley were unable to find jobs, or were laid off and replaced by braceros. A letter appearing in the Brawley News, a valley newspaper, on March 1, 1961, bears this out. Written by a farm-labor contractor and signed by the 35 members of his crew, all citizens born in Imperial Valley, it told how they lost their jobs to braceros. The letter states in part: "Last week the men and women were employed on one particular field by a farmer near Holtville and were promised work on an additional field by the same company. However, they were laid off, and subsequently it was discovered that the work was being done by braceros."

Another instance of displacement by braceros, involving 125 domestics working on the Danenberg ranch—one of the 20 struck by the unions—was reported by two crew leaders on March 27, 1961. On that day, both crews were laid off and work was resumed with Mexican nationals.

THE PREFERENCE FOR BRACEROS

There are many reasons why these large growers prefer bracero labor, and the fact that they can be hired for comparatively low wages—between the advent of bracero labor and this past lettuce harvest, average wages in the Imperial Valley were frozen at 70 cents an hour—is only part of the story. By hiring braceros, growers think that they have solved their labor problems. Like indentured workers, braceros are bound to one employer or to one association of farmers. If they are dissatisfied with their wages or conditions, they are not free to seek employment elsewhere. They may complain, but those who do are often deported and blacklisted for future employment in this country. Even the complaints or requests registered by their own Government are often ignored, as the recent inability of the Mexican Government to remove braceros from struck farms demonstrates.

WHAT PRODUCES LABOR SHORTAGES

The availability of domestic labor depends greatly on proffered wages. Extremely low wages will create a labor shortage because local workers will migrate in search of better pay. On the other hand wage hikes will attract workers, just as happened in California last year. In 1960, about 100,000 braceros were brought into Texas. About the same number of Texas citizens left their homes to look for farm employment in areas which were not dominated by braceros and where wages were significantly higher. A recent study on the effects of Public Law 78 in Texas showed consistent positive correlations between the numbers of braceros, low wage levels, and the origins of domestic migrants. Wages were lowest in heavy bracero-using areas, and in some cases declined from their 1951 levels. These same areas produced the greatest number of Texas migrants.

Labor shortages are sometimes the result of a lack of housing suitable for domestic migrants. Instead of family-type dwellings, many farm employers offer only barracks for single men. In 1951, 82 percent of farm housing in California was designed for family groups; in 1960, only 26 percent of the housing was suitable for family dwelling. Last summer, a spokesman for the Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee told the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor that:

"A family wishing to work in apples, berries, beans, or other crops in Santa Cruz County will find no family facilities whatever. The same is true in horticultural and agricultural work in San Mateo County. Family housing is no longer to be found in Santa Clara County, even in the prune harvest which is probably the State's largest user of migratory family labor. There is no family housing in the Lake County pear harvest, the Mendocino hop harvest, the Napa County grape harvest, or the Sonoma County apple harvest. There is no family housing to be had in San Joaquin County, with its immense tomato, grape, and other harvests; none in Stanislaus County, with its rich peach, almond, and walnut harvests; none in

any of the harvests of Sacramento, Solano, Yolo, Alameda, or Contra Costa Counties. All of these areas and all of these crops are heavy users of bracero labor."

CONCLUSION

Hired farmworkers can expect to earn less than $900 a year from farm employment. They can expect to be out of work, without unemployment compensation, about half the year. Growers are supposed to make positive efforts to attract domestic workers before they are eligible for Mexican contract labor. The record shows that many do not. Present provisions of Public Law 78 are not sufficient to insure that they do. Unless reforms, such as those proposed in H.R. 6032, are enacted, the hypothetical priority of employment for domestic workers will continue to be mocked in practice. Low wages, underemployment, and substandard conditions of work and life will continue to plague domestic farmworkers so long as farm employers are allowed their present access to an unlimited supply of low-cost imported labor.

Back-Door Spending Is Fiscal Insanity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, it is only through editorials such as recently appeared in the Washington Daily News that the public can learn of the evils of funding Government programs without control or scrutiny of the Congress.

I count on public opinion when the facts about this device called back-door spending are fully understood to bring about a change so that the Congress again will exercise its constitutional responsibility over Federal expenditures.

The editorial referred to reads as follows:

SWING THE DOOR OPEN

Early in this session of Congress, there was a strong movement started in the House to stop the back-door spending method of financing Government do-good projects.

This is a system, invented in the thirties, which permits Federal agencies to spend freely without the traditional—and constitutional—control by Congress. The agency simply notifies the Treasury it wishes to borrow $300 million, say. The Treasury hands over the money and goes into the money market and borrows enough to replace the $300 million.

Congress passes no bill saying to the agency you may spend so much, and how. The spending is not counted in the budget. There is no revenue raising—just borrowing.

This is one of the reasons the Federal debt is now at $288 billion and headed higher. This is the way Congress has lost control of Government spending.

The strong movement to stop this back-door system of spending the taxpayers' money has just been dealt a fatal blow. Congress has passed and the President has signed the so-called depressed areas bill—and $300 million of the money to be spent on this project will be obtained through the back door. No budget accounting. No real strings on the spending.

No wonder the veteran chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, CLARENCE CANNON, cried out from the well of the House: "It is financial duplicity. It is fiscal insanity."

Whether the depressed areas bill ever will do anything for the areas it is supposed to help is a good question; 193 Members of the House, including 56 Members of the President's own party, didn't think so.

But one thing is pretty sure: this reckless raiding on the Treasury can depress the value of the dollar, already down to less than half its old worth. For it was just this type of finagling which got us our present 48-cent dollar.

Meet the Secretary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, in the past months an outstanding series of informative television programs have been aired with marked success. The news program entitled "CBS Reports," has been well received by the public, which further proves that horses, guns, rum, and mayhem are not the only essentials for audience appeal.

I am pleased to note that one of the unheralded heroines of this successful venture is Miss Elizabeth Sweeney, who is a resident of the 17th Congressional District.

The March issue of Today's Secretary pays deserved tribute to Miss Sweeney, secretary, researcher, and general assistant to one of the producers of "CBS Reports."

To borrow from one of the recent productions of the network's series she is indeed "An Influential American."

Under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD an article entitled "Meet the Secretary":

MEET THE SECRETARY

Elizabeth Sweeney—called Betty by all but her boss—seems to have a knack for making valuable contributions in almost any job she tackles. "I don't know her secret," Arthur Morse says, "but I think it's just a matter of keeping her eyes open. Elizabeth is much more than just a secretary—she's a fund of pertinent information and a pretty good judge of quality. We may not use every one of her suggestions—but we welcome all of them."

This is one reason why Elizabeth enjoys her work as CBS. "It's a free wheeling operation," she explains, "with absolutely no routine. Often we just sit around exchanging ideas— and they listen to me as if my thoughts really mattered. Other times it's the hectic pace of getting scripts typed, answering mail, pouring over newspaper clips and hundreds of little details. But it's always stimulating."

Elizabeth began her secretarial career at CBS. "It was June of 1955 and I had just received a B.A. degree in English from Marymount College," she reminisces. "I wanted to get into the communications field—but it took a summer of training in Gregg and typing before I was able to get my foot in the door."

She started as a typist-receptionist but soon was promoted to secretary to the information specialist in the public affairs department. "It was public relations work and they let me do a lot on my own. That's where I got my basic training in television."

But the job was limited—and she was anxious to move on. When a sister and brother-in-law, living in Hollywood, asked her to come to the coast, Elizabeth grabbed the opportunity. Within a short time, she was working for the Republican Senator from California, THOMAS H. KUCHEL.

"That was only a temporary job," she explains, "filling in at his Los Angeles office during the Senate recess. But it fit in perfectly with my own plans. I thought the position would last just long enough so that I could earn enough money for my return to New York."

Elizabeth found working for a U.S. Senator interesting—but far from glamorous. "There's a tremendous amount of mail to answer, plus piles of other routine correspondence."

About that time the world was beginning to look toward Brussels, Belgium, where a fair was taking shape. "I heard they were looking for guides and, almost as a lark, sent for an application."

Elizabeth's working knowledge of French—plus her excellence appearance and background—made her a natural for acceptance. Almost before the breathless young lady know what was happening, she was living in a beautiful Brussels' apartment and wearing the smart uniform of an official guide.

"I'll never be able to measure my 8 months overseas," she says. "It was a wonderful, once-in-a-lifetime experience."

Elizabeth was put on the fair's special list of guides—a select group used primarily for escorting VIP's. One of her first customers was former Secretary of State Christian Herter.

"He's a marvelous man, and I'll never forget him. The day was cold and rainy—and he seemed to be in great pain from his arthritis. Yet he was never anything but friendly and courteous—and we had many laughs together."

The laughs stemmed from Elizabeth's attempts to be an all-knowing guide. "The fair had been only only a few days and I wasn't familiar with all the buildings yet. As we rode along in an electric scooter, I'd steal a quick look at the name on the pavilion and then repeat it almost verbatim. Of course, Secretary Herter saw through my little subterfuge right away. But he understood—and we had a wonderful time exploring the fair."

Elizabeth Sweeney stayed in Brussels for the duration of the fair and then, with another girl, spent 7 weeks touring Spain, Italy, and Switzerland. "We spent every penny we had saved—but it was great."

Once back in the United States, Elizabeth went to work at Life magazine as secretary to the art director, but soon decided she wanted more responsibility. "When a friend told me that Arthur Morse was looking for a secretary-researcher, I applied for the job."

The book "Schools of Tomorrow—Today" was their first project together. While Morse spent most of his time traveling, Elizabeth took over the office.

"It was an exciting experience," she says, "watching an important book grow from just an idea to the finished product."

What must have made it doubly exciting was the last line in the foreword of the book. It reads: "A special word of acknowledgment is due Miss Elizabeth Sweeney who, as secretary-researcher, made a valuable contribution to this project."

The next step was "CBS Reports." Morse asked Elizabeth to come along when he was appointed a staff producer. At first, she worked as secretary to both Morse and another CBS producer, David Lowe. Later, she worked for Morse exclusively.

"There's no telling where Elizabeth is going to make a contribution during a project," Morse says. "In Massachusetts she worked with the children on 'The influential Amer-

icans.' In Washington she transcribed Howard K. Smith's questions to Congressman Howard W. Smith. She selects pictures for publicity layouts, suggests program titles and most recently made a report on the college crisis."

"I'd say my most interesting job is gathering research material for projects underway—and projects we might take on in the near future," Elizabeth says. "Usually, there are about 10 possible programs under consideration. And it's part of my job to constantly scan newspapers and periodicals for information pertaining to them—or to check the various libraries for background material."

"Just about every job she does," her boss comments, "she does well. I often ask her to screenings of shows just to get her reaction. Although officially she's a secretary, I think she has the ability to go on much farther."

We think so too—and, from now on, we'll keep our eye on Elizabeth Sweeney of "CBS Reports."

Eliminating the Age Barrier to Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the age barrier to employment has caused harsh and unnecessary hardship to mature jobseekers who want no more than an even break in the labor market. During his term of office Gov. David L. Lawrence, of Pennsylvania, has worked unceasingly to solve this problem. He recognizes, however, that the problem has not been solved and he seeks suggestions and cooperation from employers and all citizens who are concerned with the problems of older workers.

Under leave heretofore granted, I insert a letter from Governor Lawrence and a folder entitled "10 Reasons Why You Should Disregard Age When Hiring New Employees":

DEAR SIR: We need your help.

We are continuing to experience great difficulty helping job applicants over 40 years of age. Arbitrary age barriers to employment make it hard for many jobseekers to find employment in work for which they are otherwise well qualified.

The law in Pennsylvania forbids discrimination in employment because of age, and there has been some improvement since its passage. Nevertheless, we know that the problem will never be fully solved until we get the wholehearted cooperation of enlightened employers.

Enclosed you will find a folder which gives 10 documented reasons why age should be disregarded when hiring new employees. I would appreciate having your reaction to this information.

In addition, I would appreciate having your comments on the following questions: (1) What more should we do to remove unjust discrimination against older workers? (2) What have you done in your business and what more can you do? (3) What should other employers do?

You can be sure that we will be grateful for any help you can give in breaking down age barriers that deny mature jobseekers an even break in the labor market.

Very truly yours,

DAVID L. LAWRENCE.

TEN REASONS WHY YOU SHOULD DISREGARD AGE WHEN HIRING NEW EMPLOYEES

1. Ability is ageless: U.S. Department of Labor studies show that output and work performance vary greatly among individuals of the same age. Many older workers perform better than the average younger worker. (See "Comparative Job Performance by Age: Large Plants in the Men's Footwear and Household Furniture Industries," Bulletin No. 1223 of the U.S. Department of Labor; and Bulletin No. 1273 reporting a similar study on office workers.)

2. Older workers are capable: Over 90 percent of employers asked by the National Association of Manufacturers rated older workers equal to or better than younger workers in work performance. (See "Report on Employment of Mature Workers," NAM, September 1960.)

3. Older workers are dependable: Virtually every plant executive asked by Factory magazine rated older workers better than or equal to younger workers in dependability. (See "Factory Management and Maintenance," March 1958.)

4. Older workers are more available: Persons in the 25–44-year-age bracket will be relatively scarce in the coming years. Rigid age requirements for jobs will create unnecessary and costly labor shortages. (See "Manpower, Challenge of the 1960's," U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.)

5. Older workers are trainable: Experts report that older workers can be successfully trained for new jobs, and once retrained, outperform younger workers in the same jobs. (See "How to Achieve a Better Balanced Labor Force by Removing Age Barriers to Employment," Pennsylvania Department of Labor and Industry, 1958, pp. 163–173.)

6. Older workers are careful: Surveys show that older workers are more careful, have fewer accidents than younger workers. (See "The Problem of Making a Living While Growing Old," proceedings of the Second Conference on Age Barriers to Employment, pp. 292–314.)

7. Older workers are steadier: Many businessmen find that older employees have a steadying influence on the work force—are less likely to become restless with routine tasks. Older workers are more likely to stay on the job. (See "Older Worker Adjustment to Labor Market Practices," BES No. R151, U.S. Department of Labor.)

8. It costs about the same to hire mature workers as it does younger workers: When all fringe benefits are considered together—pension plans, accident, health and life insurance—the experts say it costs just about the same for younger workers as for older workers. (See "Pension Costs—In Relation to the Hiring of Older Workers," BES No. E150, U.S. Department of Labor.)

9. It is illegal to discriminate in employment on account of age in Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania Fair Employment Practice Act requires employers to refrain from denying employment to an individual solely because of age. (See act of the general assembly No. 222, approved Oct. 27, 1955, amended Mar. 28, 1956.)

10. It is unfair to discriminate in employment on account of age: Nothing could be more unjust than to tell a person he is disqualified from earning a living solely because of his chronological age. (See your Bible, Psalms 71, verse 9.)

New York Mirror Series on Italian-Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 2, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the New York Daily Mirror is currently publishing a series of articles on eminent American citizens of Italian descent, depicting their rise to eminence and their contributions to the American way of life and its culture. The Mirror is to be congratulated for undertaking this series, especially at a time when certain individuals in our press, television, and other media of public information are presenting Americans of Italian origin in an ugly stereotype and in a false image which is an insult to millions of Americans.

In this respect, the Mirror is rendering a public service in presenting a true image.

The series is written by Miss Ara Piastro and Harry Altshuler, and their articles show a great deal of understanding on their part of the role and significance of the people they portray. I want to commend them for an excellent job.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD, two articles of this series, one about Judge S. Samuel DiFalco and the other about Prof. Mario A. Pei of Columbia University. The articles read as follows:

[From the New York Mirror, May 8, 1961]

THE ITALIAN WHO MADE SURROGATE

(By Ara Piastro and Harry Altshuler)

There was no printed program by which you could recognize the players, there on the teeming East Side of New York half a century ago. There was no label on little S. Samuel DiFalco, saying "future surrogate."

You couldn't tell by the dirty faces of the youngsters, playing stickball in the street or potsie on the sidewalk, how they were going to grow up.

One might be destined for jail, and another for the judge's bench. There was no knowing.

Nowadays it seems fashionable to blame crime and misused lives on environment, neighborhood influences, poverty and youthful hardship.

But you could hardly prove that point by naming the few bad eggs who came out of the Lower East Side. For there are so many others—so many notables, honored citizens and torchbearers of the American dream—who also originated there.

One of those who seems to have thrived on hardships, turning each difficulty into a steppingstone, is DiFalco, Surrogate of New York County and an honored leader in numerous areas of community life.

Actually he was 6 months old before he was brought to New York and the Lower East Side. He was born in Sicily in 1907. In New York his father, Antonino opened a small business, while his mother, Rose, was busy bringing up young Sam and his sister and brother.

Maybe the distinguishing mark on Sam was work. He cannot remember when he wasn't working. Going to Stuyvesant High, he worked after school as a postal telegraph messenger. Later attending the New York University School of Commerce, and New York University Law School, he worked out a frantic schedule like this:

Morning: work as a customer's man in a Wall Street stockbroker's office. Afternoon: attend classes. Evening: work on a newspaper, soliciting phone ads or reading copy.

By 1930, he had a law degree, but that was only the beginning. A young lawyer's struggle to get a foot in the door is notoriously hard. He clerked in a law office for a year, then hung out his own shingle at 401 Broadway, waiting for someone to entrust a case to him and filling up the long hours of waiting by taking a hand in local Democratic politics.

He was a member of the Manhattan Democratic Club, president of the Italian-American Democratic Club, and he was busy with church and other community activities.

Then in 1935 he took a serious step: He ran as an insurgent against the organization candidate for assemblyman in the 8th assembly district, in the primaries. He lost—but only by 80 votes, a showing that demonstrated remarkable strength.

For 4 years then, he gave up his growing private practice to serve the Government as Associate Counsel in the Interior Department. He came back to general practice in 1939 in the firm of DiFalco, Field and DiGiovanna, and in 1941 really emerged on the political scene when he was nominated by the Democrats for city council. He was elected, then reelected in 1948.

The rest of the story, to date, is one of winning more nominations and elections: State supreme court, and then in 1957, surrogate, for which he had both Democratic and Liberal support.

He lives at 983 Park Avenue with his wife, Emma, and their two children, Anthony, 22, a Fordham Law School student and Elisa, 15, a student at Marymount.

The political milestones tell only the results, not the why and wherefore. The numerous awards and citations bestowed on the man tell part of the rest. The votes came in because, in all walks of life, a great many people had come to know DiFalco, to respect and trust him and depend on him. He could be counted on to be in the forefront in charitable and civic activities covering a wide range of interests.

Hospitals, for instance, have been one of his special concerns. He is a director of Stuyvesant-Polyclinic and Grand Central Hospital; a trustee of Long Beach Hospital and the Children's Blood Foundation of New York Hospital, a director of the Home of Sons and Daughters of Israel.

He is a founder and director of the Columbus Day Citizens Committee. He is active in the Knights of Columbus and the Catholic Lawyers Guild.

For promoting tolerance and understanding among peoples of all faiths, he was honored in 1958 with the Eternal Light Award. The Israel Bond Committee named him its man of the year in 1954. He belongs, of course, to numerous professional, philanthropic, and social groups. He is chairman of the National Italian-American League To Combat Defamation, which he helped organize in 1959 with other outstanding Italian-Americans.

"We felt," he recalls, "that the presentation of the Italian-American to the American public through many media—television, radio, press, and movies—was not only unfavorable, it was untruthful and defamatory. There was overreporting, out of all proportion, of the actual activities of an infinitesimal few, as against the positive contributions of the great masses of Italian-Americans in all walks of life. We don't advocate censorship; we aren't against the truth, but mere repetition of errors is brainwashing, likely to mislead the public into regarding with suspicion anyone with an Italian name."

To make the point, he displayed a clipping from a minor California newspaper, with a headline that screamed, "Mafia Involved in Stock Fraud." The story concerned an indictment against 17 men, just 2 of whom had Italian-sounding names.

Speaking for himself, and all the others who came here as immigrants or struggled upward through the obstacles of underprivilege and harsh environment DiFalco said, "We feel a deep debt of gratitude to America, the land we came to for opportunity, for making it possible for us to achieve any success we have."

He himself is a shining example that it can be done.

[From the New York Mirror, May 9, 1961]

COLUMBIA'S DR. PEI, A FAMOUS LINGUIST—HELPED MAKE UNITED STATES GREAT

(By Ara Piastro and Harry Altshuler)

Just what song the sirens sang and what language they sang it in, on that distant day when Ulysses sailed by lashed to his mast, is a mystery of antiquity which has always intrigued scholarly folk.

If anyone can fathom the answer, it might well be Dr. Mario A. Pei, professor of roman philology at Columbia University, world-renowned authority on languages—and quite an expert amateur in the field of folksongs as well.

He speaks four languages—Italian, French and Spanish, as well as English—admits that he can manage 12 or 15 others "rather well," and is modest about his ability to "stumble around" in 30 to 40 more.

Currently he's on a sabbatical leave from Columbia and is due back in the fall. He's spending the holiday by teaching at the university in Lisbon, Portugal, under an arrangement with NATO. He picked up Portuguese in the last year or so—just for fun. The earlier part of the sabbatical year, he spent as acting dean of the U.S. Army language school in Monterey, Calif.

Dr. Pei was born in Rome on February 16, 1901. The family—Francesco Pei, a businessman; his wife Luisa; Mario and his sister—moved to New York in 1908. Mario attended a parochial school, St. Francis Xavier, took his bachelor's degree at City College, then skipped right on to a Ph. D. at Columbia.

There was never any doubt about the field he wanted to work in. He had a gift for languages, originating, his wife Pearl suggests, in the remarkable keeness of his ear.

"He never forgets the sound of anything he's heard," she said. "He can remember folk songs he listened to years ago—not only the words, but the tune, also. He hums them for me and I pick them out on the piano."

Very quickly, too, it was apparent he had a gift for teaching, which has occupied much of the rest of his life. But before he became a teacher, it was a point of pride with him to pay for his own education: He did it with jobs as a floorwalker at Macy's, a salesman in a jewelry store, and tutoring less gifted students.

His doctoral thesis on "The Language of the Eighth-Century Texts in Northern France" created a stir among scholars around the world, and is still considered one of the best dissertations ever to come out of Columbia.

But for all the vast, erudite research that went into it, and his other studies of the languages of Charlemagne's time, here is no dry-as-dust scholar picking musty texts to pieces. His feeling for languages is a romantic one.

"Language is people," he says. "It's history and politics. It's civilization."

Something that underlines this point is his one venture into popular fiction, "Swords of Anjou," a historical novel.

It's a cloak-and-sword romance, swashbuckling with the best of them, and must have given him as much joy to write as it has given many a reader.

On another level, a great deal of his serious work has been popular also. "The Story of Language," his volume tracing the tongues of the world and their interrelationships, was written with such deceptive ease and compelling color that it became a Book-of-the-Month Club selection.

He has written many other books from the scholarly, "French Precursors of the Chanson de Roland," to the lively "Our Names" which traces the fascinating origins of what we are called, and other books that are used as texts.

Dr. Pei travels widely. Everywhere he goes, he's teaching—and learning. When home in New York (at 35 Hamilton Place) he and his wife like to have friends in for parties and trot out the folksongs he's picked up here and there.

His studies in phonetics and linguistics have made him one of the world's foremost authorities on language. But his influence goes far beyond academic circles. The Phi Beta Kappa key, the gold and silver medals from various schools, testify to his excellence as a scholar; the Bronze Plaque of the Freedom Foundation of Valley Forge attests to his "outstanding achievement in bringing about a better understanding of the American way of life."

The Italian Government decorated him as Cavaliere Ufficiale in 1958. Even the Soviets have done him the singular honor of publishing a shrill attack on his book, "The World's Chief Languages"—because he didn't put Russian up at the top of the list. They saw his book as a sinister Anglo-American plot to dominate the world—maybe because it was written in English.

Right now, with the growing realization of the free world's urgent need to pull together, the towering and friendly figure of Dr. Pei is being recognized in its true importance.

We need to understand our friends and they need to know us better. Dr. Pei speaks their language and can help us all to communicate.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert in the RECORD, as requested by the Ashley Board of Education, the following letter setting forth their views on Federal aid to education:

HON. JAMES HARVEY,
Congressman, Eighth Congressional District, Saginaw, Mich.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HARVEY: The Ashley Board of Education at a regular meeting held on April 27, 1961, unanimously adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas the need for adequate support of public education is a responsibility of parents, school districts, the State of Michigan, and the Federal Government.

"The Ashley Board of Education hereby urges the active support of all citizens to effect legislation whereby the Federal Government assumes its rightful responsibility in American education by providing Federal funds for the construction and operation of public elementary and secondary schools so that a reasonable basic educational system for all children may be maintained.

"Further, That all such funds be disbursed through the State school agency without Federal control."

Mrs. MARGARET BLANCHARD,
Secretary.

Research Will Help Redevelop Coal Areas, but Elimination of Unfair Competitive Practices Is a Prerequisite to Permanent Economic Gains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week a very distinguished executive in the coal industry, Walter F. Schulten, vice president of the Consolidation Coal Co., spoke before the Altoona Lions Club. His subject was research, and I would like to have unanimous consent to include portions of his address in the RECORD. At the moment, however, I submit this single sentence from Mr. Schulten's address:

The policy of opening our fuel markets to the production of alien refineries has left deep scars upon the economy of this area.

Mr. Schulten was, of course, alluding to the great volume of residual oil imports that have captured east coast fuel markets and left a severe impact back along the right-of-way of the Pennsylvania Railroad—from unloading piers, through the yards and shops of transportation centers, and right up into the coal mines. Over the years that this type of unfair competition has been accepted and even nutured by the Federal Government, many of those mines have had to close and are now hopelessly flooded. Others may possibly be reactivated if sufficient hard work and cold cash are engaged.

These conditions have persisted since foreign oil began to flood traditional coal markets on the Atlantic seaboard shortly after the conclusion of World War II. Except for a control program put into operation by the White House in 1959, the Federal Government has done nothing to check the imports. In fact, since the new administration took office in January, controls have been relaxed to such an extent that the whole program has been rendered ineffectual.

Last February 21 I submitted to the Secretary of Interior a statement explaining the hardship that Pennsylvania is undergoing as a consequence of too much foreign oil. I protested the Department's unexpected increase in residual oil quotas, a decision that took place less than 1 month after Inauguration Day. On the assumption that the new Secretary was unfamiliar with many facets of the import control program, I urged that he reconsider his hasty judgment and cut import volumes at least to the levels provided for when the program was created as a security measure. Last week I received a letter from L. J. O'Connor, oil administrator, acknowledging receipt of my statement but containing no indication that a revision of the allowable import volumes is in prospect. I remind the White House that increasing the quota levels is in direct contradiction to preelection promises to help coal areas bring about economic recovery.

Within the past several weeks the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has been replete with statements by Members of Congress from all sections of the country whose constituents are experiencing economic suffering as a result of our unwise foreign trade policies. Paradoxically, some members of the New England delegation who vehemently denounce restrictions on residual oil imports have taken lead parts in the chorus clamoring for protection for their native industries. While I am in complete accord with their wishes and demands for safeguards against foreign products that create havoc in America's marketplaces, I trust that the experience of having to endure business losses in home constituencies will tend to make them more sympathetic to the problem perennially facing coal producing areas.

I am convinced that our whole international trade program requires close inspection and a complete going over before any serious thought is given to renewal of the reciprocal trade program next year.

Mr. Schulten was a witness to depressed conditions when he visited Altoona this week. He is not a stranger to our area and for years has recognized that a high degree of unemployment in central Pennsylvania can be directly attributed to excessive imports of residual oil. Never in the past two decades, however, has the mining situation been in such disastrous economic straits as it is at the present time.

We are anticipating better times Mr. Speaker. We are looking to an economic upturn when the new area development program gets rolling. There is no question but that this type of artificial economic stimulus can set many industrial machines back into motion. To keep them running without continuous Government dollar pumping operations however will require a rearrangement of foreign trade policy. America must return to the logical philosophy of enabling products of its own workers to find an outlet in the marketplaces of its own people.

The coal industry has made an heroic effort to keep its product competitive but there is no competition when international oil shippers are allowed to discharge their cargo in defiance of established marketing practices. As Mr. Schulten points out, the coal industry has made spectacular gains in production efficiency; it is going forward with a research program that will unquestionably prove beneficial to the consuming public.

I commend to the attention of Congress the portions of Mr. Schulten's address which I am enclosing in the RECORD. Meanwhile, I ask that you bear in mind that thousands of miners, railroaders, and industrial neighbors in my State and in other areas of the Appalachian region are without work today wholly because of the unreasonable and unrealistic trade policies pursued by the Federal Government.

Unless these policies are revised drastically and based on the premise that protection of American industry and labor is essential to the Nation's economy and security, there will be no permanency in the economic gains anticipated under the depressed area legislation which became effective this week; nor can the United States be assured that adequate fuel resources will be available in an emergency.

Portions of Mr. Schulten's statement follow:

Perhaps the best testimony to coal's progress in research is the stabilized price structure that has prevailed over the past decade or so. Today, coal sells at the mine on an average of variously estimated to be from the same price to 26 cents per ton less than it did in 1948. The answer is mechanization. Through research and development, mining machines and techniques have more than doubled output per man-day in the short space of 10 years. Our skilled American mineworker can now get out as much coal in 1 day as his counterpart elsewhere in the world can produce in a week.

* * * * *

Altoona is a railroad town. It has depended and still depends a great deal upon the coal traffic that moves between our producing fields and the east coast. You will be happy to know that coal and the railroads are cooperating in the constant struggle to keep down the delivered price of coal. The railroads have introduced volume rates and trainload rates in an effort to remain competitive and thus provide coal a greater opportunity to share in the fuels market.

Neither this cooperation nor continued research, however, are adequate to overcome the handicaps that we face in dealing with competition from foreign residual oil and dump natural gas. Congressman VAN ZANDT has carried on a never-ceasing campaign for legislation to protect coal's markets against the rising tide of foreign residual oil engulfing many of our markets on the east coast. The policy of opening our fuel markets to the product of alien refineries has left deep scars upon the economy of this area.

The coal industry and our producing regions have sustained similar losses through the illogical Federal Power Commission policy of permitting natural gas pipeline companies to invade coal markets by offering natural gas to industry at whatever rate is necessary to undersell coal. A recent Supreme Court decision may be instrumental in checking this invasion. The Court affirmed the authority of the Federal Power Commission to take conservation into consideration when deciding on applications for transportation and use of natural gas. In addition, the general public is becoming increasingly resentful of having to pay two or three times as much for natural gas as industrial customers are charged for the same product. These factors can bear heavily in coal's favor and restore at least a modicum of the business that has been lost through prevailing inequitable competitive practices in the fuel industries.

* * * * *

To attempt to predict the outcome of a research effort is hazardous, but at least I can say with confidence that 1961 will be a key year in the field of coal research. If not the year of greatest accomplishments, certainly it will mark the start of more important coal research programs than have ever previously been undertaken in this country.

At Monroeville, near Pittsburgh, is the site of the new Bituminous Coal Research laboratory. To the unsuspecting passerby, this cinder block and grayish brick structure beginning to take form could be the makings of a schoolhouse, an office building, or even a small manufacturing plant. Come back in another 6 months, however, and you will find the likes of which has never before existed in America. You will see scientists and engineers delving into projects designed to do something fast for the coal industry—to develop new markets, to expand old ones, to keep prices down, to get coal to market at less cost and whatever other research approaches seem to be most feasible for quick action. The complete facilities will be valued in excess of a million dollars. There will also be fundamental research activity, but for the time being emphasis will be on applied research and immediate results. The building, incidentally, will be entirely fueled by electricity, "coal by wire," in advancing and increasing utilization for coal.

Capital funds for construction of the research center have come from electric utilities, equipment manufacturers, railroads, chemical companies, and engineering firms. This joint effort reflects the general confidence in the future of coal. Bituminous Coal Research has for some time carried on research activities in smaller laboratories in Columbus, Ohio, and in the Oakland section of Pittsburgh. This work is now being consolidated and expanded.

The Monroeville Research Center cannot alone make 1961 a monument to coal research. There are also things stirring in Washington. Last month with the swearing in of George Lamb as Director, the Office of Coal Research in the Department of the Interior started to get into motion. This office is the outcome of a long effort initiated by Congressman JOHN P. SAYLOR of Johnstown, and supported enthusiastically by Congressman JIMMY VAN ZANDT. In his capacity as director, Mr. Lamb will be charged with responsibility for selecting the research proposals submitted to his office that have the most likelihood of immediate favorable results. He will decide where the best results are likely to be obtained—whether in our own industry laboratory in Pittsburgh, at a university, in the development facilities of an allied industry, or through a private operation.

* * * * *

Coal is, of course, not dependent upon research alone to answer its problems. The national security demands that present coal output be increased by approximately 20 percent if our industry is to have the capacity to meet emergency demands. Idle mines and idle facilities of allied industries are a definite threat to our defense structure. There is a good possibility that research will gradually account for important increases in coal tonnage. Meanwhile, however, every responsible citizen should demand cutbacks in the residual oil imports that are depriving coal of its legitimate markets. Dump sales of natural gas at rates tilted to undercut coal must be checked in the name of fuel security and conservation of a scarce natural resource.

The National Coal Association has invited officials of chambers of commerce from coal areas who are attending the meeting of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce to meet there this afternoon. The local chamber representatives will be informed that the National Coal Association is ready to assist coal areas in attracting new industry. NCA's Economics and Transportation Department has been conducting a pilot study based on business conditions, natural resources, and transportation facilities in Cambria County. The pilot study has now been completed and NCA is ready to make similar information available to interested groups in Blair and all coal-producing counties.

From the foregoing you will deduct that the coal industry is more and more expanding its research activities. Current concentration is upon the development, through research, of immediate ways, means, and processes by which the use of coal may be immediately increased. With population increases and increased energy requirements, coal production and use will increase in the next decade. Our problem now is to develop a market to sustain the present production capacity. To this effort research will make a considerable contribution.

Chancellor Konrad Adenauer's Visit to Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, it was the privilege of the people of the State of Texas, and of the 21st Congressional District in particular to publicly welcome His Excellency Dr. Konrad Adenauer, Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, on his recent visit to the United States.

In these times of international tensions the importance of the warm personal regards that enveloped the members of the official Germany Party and the people of Texas, cannot be overemphasized.

The public reception for the Chancellor at the Gillespie County Fair Grounds at Fredericksburg, Tex., on April 16, and the visit of Dr. Adenauer to Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON's nearby ranch, was a heartwarming occasion.

The spirit in which the elder statesman from Germany was received may be best exemplified in two editorials which appeared in the Fredericksburg Radio Post. I therefore, at this point, include the editorials in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Fredericksburg (Tex.) Standard, Apr. 12, 1961]

WELCOME CHANCELLOR ADENAUER

Fredericksburg and Gillespie County on Sunday and Monday will have in their midst one of the great leaders of the free world, Chancellor Conrad Adenauer.

The intrepid leader of West Germany is the highest ranking official of the government of his country ever to visit in this community, whose origin stems back to his native land, and whose residents today are third and fourth generation descendants of a hearty band of immigrants who left their homeland over a century ago to settle a region of the State that then and now reminds them of the land from which they came.

The eminent visitor will find touches of his country everywhere in the names he sees on mailboxes and on storefronts, in the language many of them still speak, and in a people whose honesty, frugality, hard work, and love for their land is unmatched by any nationality in the Nation.

Here he will see farms and ranches that are the pride of their owners, whose fields and ranges, homes and buildings, many in an architectural style reminiscent of Germany, are kept in perfect condition year in and year out, as exemplified by persons of German extraction everywhere.

He will also learn that descendants of the pioneers who came here in 1846 have risen to become some of the greatest men America has produced.

The man of whom he is a guest, Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON, is a product of these hills and dales, and an example of the great men that have helped lead America to its pinnacle of greatness.

There are Adm. Chester W. Nimitz, the renowned naval leader, and many others who have risen to important positions in the State and Nation, and in virtually every field of endeavor.

It comes as a distinct salute to our community that you, Conrad Adenauer, have taken time from your multitudinous duties, as one of the great leaders of the free world, to come to the hills of Texas, and be our guest.

We know that the hospitality you will receive at the hands of your hosts will be unmatched, but you would find the same hospitality and the same hand of friendship in every home in the community.

Fredericksburg and Gillespie County bid you welcome, hope you enjoy your stay and will some day return. We sincerely hope you leave with the knowledge of the great contribution your nation has made through its people to our own progressive community, and that here in the hills of Texas, are a people who count your friendship and the friendship of your country as one of our Nation's great assets.

[From the Fredericksburg (Tex.) Standard, Apr. 19, 1961]

A DAY TO REMEMBER

Sunday, April 16, 1961, will be a day long to be remembered in the history of Fredericksburg and Gillespie County, as generations to come will recount the occasion on which Fredericksburg was host to one of the world's great leaders, Chancellor Conrad Adenauer, of the Republic of Germany.

It is a day that will go down in history as did such momentous occasions as the centennial of Fredericksburg's founding and the homecoming of Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz.

Few, if any cities the size of Fredericksburg, can lay claim to two of its native sons who have risen to the pinnacle attained by Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON and Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz, who joined in honoring the Chancellor.

Fredericksburg's place in the sun never shone brighter than it did Sunday, as the thousands of people joined in the tribute of this trio of great men.

In reality, the visit of the Chancellor is a tribute to the sturdy folks of Gillespie County, who for over a century have never been ashamed of their heritage, and who have never forsaken the ideals of their forefathers.

There are many cities in the Nation today who have slipped away from the principles laid down by their Founding Fathers, who have let the traits of their pioneer forebearers go by the wayside in the onward rush to progress.

Here, however, we have vigilantly sought to retain our ties with the past and use them as our basis in building for the future.

That Fredericksburg has built well through the years is shown by the solidity of the community today, as evidenced by its record of home ownership, high percentage of tax payments, adherence to law and order, and its cleanliness.

That these traits have been retained has been known far and wide for many, many years, but occasions such as the one last Sunday forcibly bring out our good fortune to our own attention, and truly to the attention of the whole free world.

Address by Senator Vance Hartke in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of an address by the very able and distinguished Democratic Senator of Indiana, the Honorable VANCE HARTKE, which he delivered before the New York County Democratic Committee at a dinner on April 27, 1961, at the Commodore Hotel in New York City.

Senator HARTKE, who is the chairman of the Democratic senatorial campaign committee, delivered a very stirring address on the occasion. By his wise counsel, his political sagacity, and his ability to understand the specific problems of the Democratic Party in New York, he played a great part in heelping to unite Democratic forces in our State. I was privileged to hear Senator HARTKE on this occasion and was very pleased to hear the many commendations expressed later.

The text of Senator HARTKE's address follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR VANCE HARTKE, OF INDIANA

I consider myself greatly privileged to be in New York tonight in such distinguished company, having been invited by both your leader—my friend Carmine DeSapio—and by the national chairman—my friend John Bailey.

Political dinners are old favorites of mine since I come from a political organization background. In our committee, as in yours, we pride ourselves on uniting old-fashioned political organization with the reform-type service demanded by today's voters.

This is, I submit, uniquely possible within the framework of the Democratic Party. We are at once the oldest political party in continuous existence in the world today and yet we are the party of programs and progress. Our party and its leaders have always had a way of cutting through the fat and getting to the meat of the problem. They have always led when leadership was demanded. They have always had programs when programs were needed. They had all this because they were Democrats and the Democratic Party has always been grounded among the great masses of people.

Thomas Jefferson won the country's first contested election in 1796. His campaign theme was "The Rights of Man." As we look back to then from the problems of 1961, we must conclude that things have not changed much.

Jefferson said there were two kinds of people in political parties. "First, those who fear and distrust the people and wish to draw all powers from them into the hands of the higher classes. Secondly, those who identify themselves with the people, have confidence in them, cherish and consider them as the most honest and safe." Jefferson, of course, belonged to the latter.

In nearly every election since Jefferson's time the basic struggle has been between the people's party and the party of special interest. Last fall was no different. But this Nation saw a bitter campaign in which issues that have no place in American politics were blown far beyond their importance. After this campaign, you people delivered the Nation's largest package of electoral votes to John F. Kennedy. New York State provided 45 of President Kennedy's 303 electoral votes. The Kennedy majority in New York City was 792,000.

Immediately after that election, one of the closest in history, we listened while the Republicans cried "foul" and parroted the party line that they had been robbed. Yet, 2 months after taking office, President Kennedy pulled up with an astounding vote in the Gallup Poll. Dr. Gallup, just a month ago, reported 73 percent of the American people approve of the job the President is doing. That was 6 percent more than the figure recorded by Dr. Gallup for President Eisenhower at a comparable time in his first term. Last Saturday the Nation's newspaper editors voted 104 to 11 that the President is doing a good job.

President Kennedy and his new administration have awed the skeptics and fascinated the admirers. His grasp of presidential responsibilities and his forthright efforts to meet these responsibilities have been wonderful.

Every man and woman comes into this world without any understanding concerning his future, his life, his destiny. Yet, in spite of difference of wealth, position or birth, there is a difference in that individual who ultimately in life says that my soul and mind shall not be dedicated to serving only myself. This to me is President John F. Kennedy. This truly great individual possesses a soul and mind that is trying to comprehend the wonders of this world and trying in some measure to reproduce these wonders into something better for mankind. He is a mirror of the world—alive, not dead, active, not dull; courageous, not a coward. He is always thinking, learning, experimenting and practicing his knowledge. He is the kind of person who has learned that his own personal life is subordinate to achievement of the higher goals.

It is to him that others look for leadership. The world, his community, his party, his friends—and even his enemies—look up to him and expect to learn from him. Sometimes his ability is not immediately recognized or appreciated; in some cases, repelled by envy.

He cannot move in order to expect gratitude—but must move for posterity in the firm confidence that the future will benefit from his efforts. He must be like an acrobat who takes leaps which others cannot execute. He thereby derives a direct and lively pleasure in every accomplishment—in every problem solved, in every election won.

The boredom which haunts the ordinary man can never come close to him. Yet to him there can be a lonely existence in that he can expect little, if any sympathy for apparent failures. He cannot be surprised if society at times wants to repel him. The great and extraordinary work done by him can only be done if he disregards the talk, speeches, and opinions of critics. He must quietly continue on, in spite of their criticism.

The sloganeers have now come up with a new slick trick. They are trying to sell the people on the idea that the President may be popular, but his programs are not. I call this the soft-soap sell. It is not going to work because President Kennedy's programs are the Democratic Party's programs. The Democratic Party is the people's party and the majority party, and it always has been.

What these Republican sloganeers are trying to do is as transparent as glass. They know that President Kennedy is popular. They know he has nudged the ship of state out into the breeze and is piloting it with a firm hand on the rudder while heading it in the direction of progress.

So, the Republicans now know they have another popular Democrat. The Republicans want to turn what was a fact in the last administration into a salable myth for this one.

President Eisenhower was a popular war hero. He had no political affiliations before becoming a candidate and no experience in civil government before becoming President. Ike's idea of the Presidency was to allow the Government and the country to coast along with a minimum of guidance and a minimum of push. He liked to be known as one who was above party.

Yet, with such a popular hero in the White House, we Democrats gained control of Congress in 1954 and kept control throughout the remainder of the Eisenhower years. It was because the Democratic Party and its principles were still speaking for the majority of Americans.

The Republicans think they can suddenly hang a no-party label on President Kennedy, belittle his programs and seize control of Congress in 1962. I say it will not be done. I say we Democrats are going to increase our majority in Congress and get along with the job we have set out to do. And I think New York Democrats are going to do their part in 1962 as they did in 1960.

President Kennedy sought the office and brought to it a lifetime as a Democrat and many years of service in politics. In addition, he is blessed with intelligence, education, sincerity, experience, energy, and capable advisers. What is more, the girls say he is good looking.

With all this going for him, it is no wonder he is popular. The new spirit he has brought to the White House adds to his popularity. Yet, President Kennedy would never set himself apart from his party. He is, indeed, part of the Democratic Party and, happily, its best spokesman and salesman.

In capturing the spirit of the party, President Kennedy has captured the spirit of the Nation—tired of foundering, tired of drifting, worried about health and housing, work and waste, taxes and troubles.

We Democrats know that we cannot solve all the troubles of this Nation overnight. But we also know that these problems cannot be solved unless we dare to try.

In Congress we are working to hammer out the program designed by the President. We have made substantial progress on the antirecession bills, having passed extended jobless benefits, a bill to aid depressed areas, a new higher minimum wage, and measures to help out families suffering from unemployment. We are working on housing, tax reform, highways, incentives for business and industrial expansion.

It is we Democrats who are intent upon an expanded economy so that we can provide not only jobs for the jobless, but 1.2 million jobs for those youngsters who will enter the labor market this year and for the estimated 2.3 million jobs that we are told will be lost to automation and better efficiency.

It is a Democratic administration that is insisting on full protection of the rights of all Americans to work, to vote, to live in peace, and dignity. It is we who are insisting on full application of equal rights. It is we who are tackling problems of spreading communism around the globe, inadequate defense, second best in space, commuter transportation needs, better highways, polluted rivers, recreation needs, juvenile delinquency, not enough schools and teachers. It is we who are setting the pace as good neighbors at home and abroad.

Of course, some of these things may be unpopular with some of the special interests and with some Republican leaders. It is basic Republican belief that government should do as little as possible. It is basic Democratic belief that government should do what is necessary.

These programs are popular. They are being pushed by popular men, men who dare to act and who dare to tell the bald truth and not sweep unpleasant facts under the rug.

If any State in our Union understands leadership of this kind, it is New York. In our lifetime, New York has given us superlative leadership—from Franklin Delano Roosevelt to your present great leaders.

Republicans, too, have had great leaders in this State. The trouble is, when a New York Republican wins prominence in city hall or up in Albany or down in Washington, he ends up fighting a rear-guard action with his own party. This was true in the days of Teddy Roosevent and it still is true today.

In our party the program is clearly laid out. The leadership is firmly established and its goals are clear. The mood of the people is caught up in the program of the party and the determination of the leaders to get the job done.

The opportunity for service is as great as any time in our history. With dedication of purpose and belief in the undying principles of our party, confidence in the leadership, unity in the organization, we will accomplish the job we have set out to accomplish. We shall reach the goal we have set out to reach. We shall move from platform and promise to programs and performance.

The call has come clearly from the man in the White House. Ours, said President Kennedy, is the challenge to "get this Nation moving again. As the party of hope, it is our responsibility and opportunity to call forth the greatness of the American people. In this spirit, we must rededicate ourselves to the continuing service of the rights of man everywhere in America and everywhere on God's earth."

Poland's Constitution Day

SPEECH
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 170th anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day. It was on May 3, 1791, that the Polish patriots, without bloodshed or disorder, won approval of a Constitution which assured important social, political and educational reforms for the Polish people. The Polish Constitution was adopted only 2 years after the adoption of our own Constitution, and was imbued with the same spirit of freedom and democracy; in fact many Polish patriots had aided us in our own earlier struggle for freedom.

Unfortunately, Poland's 3d of May Constitution is no longer the foundation stone of the Polish Government; instead it has been replaced by a Communist "constitution" forcibly imposed on the Poles in 1953 by the Soviet Union. But the Polish people have not abandoned the ideals and aspirations embodied in their 1791 Constitution. Despite the ruthless Communist oppression, the Poles have not accepted this Russian domination and have not surrendered their love of freedom.

Millions of Poles have emigrated to this country and contributed their strength and vigor to the building of America. Today, I would like to join with them and freedom-loving Poles everywhere to mark this important anniversary of freedom, and to pledge our support for returning to Poland the Liberty and sovereignty she has known in more fortunate periods of her history.

Wake Up, America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, Ohio's 16th Congressional District is honored this week as the home of James Lutz, champion orator in the national contest sponsored by the Sons of the American Revolution at Clearwater, Fla.

James is a senior student at Louisville High School, Louisville, Ohio, where Donald R. Terry, director of forensics, has established a prize-winning department of speech.

The son of Mr. and Mrs. Mervin Lutz, of Louisville, James is an outstanding student who was a certificate winner in the national merit scholarship test this year, winner of the Stark County debate championship for the past 2 years, winner of the McKinley invitational debate tournament for 2 years, debate champion of northeast Ohio district No. 3, winner of the tri-State debate tourney, and winner of second place in the National Forensic League district tournament.

I am pleased to include with my remarks the address that won for James the Ohio original oratory contest of the Sons of the American Revolution and the right to participate in the national contest, which he has also won:

WAKE UP, AMERICA

In 1836 at the dedication of the Concord Battle Monument, Ralph Waldo Emerson wrote this famous statement:

"By the rude bridge that arched the flood,
Their flag to April's breeze unfurled,
Here once the embattled farmers stood
And fired the shot heard around the world."

With that shot our forefathers engaged in a bitter struggle to obtain freedom from a blundering Hanoverian English King George III who ruled the colonies with a hand of tyranny. This tyranny, a lack of political and personal freedom, the Townshend Act, the Quartering Act, and the Stamp Act, became intolerable to the colonists. Unrest appeared. Americans openly voiced their feelings. Patrick Henry in his famous oration to the Virginia House of Burgesses stanchly declared:

"Is life so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it Almighty God. I know not what course others may take, but as for me give me liberty or give me death."

Thomas Jefferson's immortal words when he penned the Declaration of Independence rang out:

"We hold these truths to be self evident—that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Emotions were stirred, feelings were aroused until by a rude bridge that arched the flood some embattled farmers fired a shot heard around the world. That shot was a symbol. It was a symbol of a burning and intense desire for freedom. A desire which burned at Bunker Hill, at Lexington, at Concord;a desire which warmed the souls of men during the dark hours of Valley Forge; a desire which was kindled in the hearts of women and children as they endured hardships to support an army. A desire for which no price was too high to pay; no sacrifice too great to make; or no blood too precious to shed.

Freedom was won. The Colonies were victorious, but only because lowly, humble farmers were willing to die and shed their blood that others might be free. They suffered, they sacrificed, and they died that succeeding generations might know and enjoy the liberties which they so earnestly sought. To those who died, freedom was an unfulfilled dream; to us, a reality.

Have we lived up to the heritage which is ours? In examining ourselves, can we honestly say that we are of the same caliber as our forefathers? Can we say that we honor and cherish freedom as much as did those embattled farmers? In truth we cannot equate ourselves with those dedicated colonists who died for freedom. For you see our people are a people of complacency, a people made up of college students who riot against the House Un-American Activities Committee, a people infiltrated by Communist influence in business, labor, and politics. Ours is a people who are lax in using their rights and a people who no longer practice that all men are created equal.

Freedom is a word for which men have died, a word which we abuse and a word which the Communists want to eliminate from the hearts, minds, and souls of all men. The Communists to realize the values of liberty. Lenin has stated this about liberty:

"It is true that liberty is precious, so precious that it must be rationed."

So wake up, America! The clarion call to duty sounds today with as much imperativeness as it sounded in 1776 for those gallant Americans who answered the call and brought the birth of freedom to our Nation.

Today, we as free Americans stand at the cross roads of human destiny. The choice is ours, will we throw away the priceless heritage passed down to us etched in the blood of gallant Americans or will we pick up the gauntlet and answer the challenge of communism in the tradition of America's past?

What will be your answer, America of today? Will freedom or tyranny be reborn? Wake up, America, wake up before the slumber of apathy becomes the death sleep of the great heritage of 1776.

The Saga of Our Italians—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, a great writer, Emma Lazarus, caught the

spirit of America in her poem "The New Colossus." The words are so beautiful that they bear repetition:

Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost, to me
I lift my lamp beside the golden door.

Millions of immigrants thirsting for freedom have poured through the Golden Door of New York or the Golden Gate of San Francisco. They have contributed mightily to the building of our Nation, the preservation of our institutions and the enhancement of its reputation. Dr. Mario A. Pei, a son of an Italian immigrant, has contributed in a large measure to the growth of education and the enhancement of American prestige, not only in America, but throughout the world.

The New York Mirror on May 9, 1961, continued its series on famous Italians and their contributions to America by writing about the background and the life story of Dr. Mario A. Pei, one of Columbia University's famous sons. Dr. Pei was born in Italy and was brought here by his parents at an early age. I had the pleasure of knowing Dr. Pei when he was a student at Columbia University and also had contact with him when I was a young assistant district attorney and he was a member of the grand jury. This world-renowned scholar has not only affected the lives of public officials, but also the minds of young people searching for education and for knowledge.

Under the byline of Ara Piastro and Harry Altshuler, the story of Mario Pei is unfolded. I believe that the American people would appreciate knowing the contributions of this immigrant boy who helped make the United States great, and whose influence in the minds of his students will project itself for the good of America and for the future. The story of Dr. Pei, Columbia's famous linguist, follows:

COLUMBIA'S DR. PEI, A FAMOUS LINGUIST

(By Ara Piastro and Harry Altshuler)

Just what song the sirens sang and what language they sang it in, on that distant day when Ulysses sailed by lashed to his mast, is a mystery of antiquity which has always intrigued scholarly folk.

If anyone can fathom the answer, it might well be Dr. Mario A. Pei, professor of romance philosophy at Columbia University, world-renowned authority on languages—and quite an expert amateur in the field of folksongs as well.

He speaks four languages—Italian, French, and Spanish, as well as English—admits that he can manage 12 or 15 others "rather well," and is modest about his ability to "stumble around" in 30 to 40 more.

Currently he's on a sabbatical leave from Columbia and is due back in the fall. He's spending the holiday by teaching at the university in Lisbon, Portugal, under an arrangement with NATO. He picked up Portuguese in the last year or so—just for fun. The earlier part of the sabbatical year, he spent as acting dean of the U.S. Army language's school in Monterey, Calif.

Dr. Pei was born in Rome on February 16, 1901. The family—Francesco Pei, a businessman; his wife Luisa; Mario and his sister—moved to New York in 1908. Mario attended a parochial school, St. Francis Xavier, took his bachelor's degree at City College, then skipped right on to a Ph. D. at Columbia.

There was never any doubt about the field he wanted to work in. He had a gift for languages, originating, his wife Pearl suggests, in the remarkable keenness of his ear.

"He never forgets the sound of anything he's heard," she said. "He can remember folksongs he listened to years ago—not only the words, but the tune, also. He hums them for me and I pick them out on the piano."

Very quickly, too, it was apparent he had a gift for teaching, which has occupied much of the rest of his life. But before he became a teacher, it was a point of pride with him to pay for his own education: He did it with jobs as a floorwalker at Macy's, a salesman in a jewelry store, and tutoring less-gifted students.

His dictoral thesis on "The Language of the Eighth-Century Texts in Northern France" created a stir among scholars around the world, and is still considered one of the best disertations ever to come out of Columbia.

But for all the vast, erudite research that went into it, and his other studies of the languages of Charlemagne's time, here is no dry-as-dust scholar picking musty texts to pieces. His feeling for languages is a romantic one.

"Language is people," he says. "It's history and politics. It's civilization."

Something that underlines this point is his one venture into popular fiction, "Swords of Anjou," a historical novel.

It's a cloak-and-sword romance, swashbuckling with the beat of them, and must have given him as much joy to write as it has given many a reader.

On another level, a great deal of his serious work has been popular, also. "The Story of Language," his volume tracing the tongues of the world and their interrelationships, was written with such deceptive ease and compelling color that it became a Book-of-the-Month Club selection.

He has written many other books from the scholarly, "French Precursors of the Chanson de Roland," to the lively "Our Names" which traces the fascinating origins of what we are called, and other books that are used as texts.

Dr. Pei travels widely. Everywhere he goes, he is teaching—and learning. When home in New York (at 35 Hamilton Pl.) he and his wife like to have friends in for parties and trot out the folksongs he has picked up here and there.

His studies in phonetics and linguistics have made him one of the world's foremost authorities on language. But his influence goes far beyond academic circles. The Phi Beta Kappa key, the gold and silver medals from various schools, testify to his excellence as a scholar; the Bronze Plaque of the Freedom Foundation of Valley Forge attests to his outstanding achievements in bringing about a better understanding of the American way of life.

The Italian Government decorated him as Cavaliere Ufficiale in 1958. Even the Soviets have done him the singular honor of publishing a shrill attack on his book, "The World's Chief Languages"—because he did not put Russian up at the top of the list. They saw his book as a sinister Anglo-American plot to dominate the world—maybe because it was written in English.

Right now, with the growing realization of the free world's urgent need to pull together, the towering and friendly figure of Dr. Pei is being recognized in its true importance.

We need to understand our friends and they need to know us better. Dr. Pei speaks their language and can help us all to communicate.

The C. & O., the B. & O., and the Public Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following brief discussion of the current attempt by the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway to gain control of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad. This April 26, 1961, statement of the New York Central Railroad is to the point and should be of interest to all of us:

ACADEMIC?

By a Wall Street Journal Staff Reporter:

"WHITE SULPHUR SPRINGS, W. VA.—Walter J. Tuohy, president of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway, told the annual meeting the question of Federal approval of C. & O. control of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad is 'academic because we're going to get it.'"

This clipping obviously refers to the fact that the Interstate Commerce Commission will open hearings on C. & O.'s application to control B. & O. on June 19, 1961.

We don't believe this question is the least bit academic.

The Interstate Commerce Act is quite clear on the responsibilities of ICC concerning proposed mergers or consolidations of railroads. It says in part:

"In passing upon any proposed transaction under the provisions of this paragraph, the Commission shall give weight to the following considerations, among others: (1) The effect of the proposed transaction upon adequate transportation service to the public; (2) the effect upon the public interest of the inclusion, or failure to include, other railroads in the territory involved in the proposed transaction."

"The Commission shall have authority in the case of a proposed transaction under this paragraph involving a railroad or railroads, as a prerequisite to its approval of the proposed transaction, to require, upon equitable terms, the inclusion of another railroad or other railroads in the territory involved, upon petition by such railroad or railroads requesting such inclusion, and upon finding that such inclusion is consistent with the public interest."

The New York Central Railroad will demonstrate to the ICC that inclusion of the Central in any C. & O.–B. & O. proposal is essential to the public interest. We are absolutely convinced that the proposed haphazard C. & O.–B. & O. plan, without the Central, will do irreparable damage to railroad service east of the Mississippi.

And we are not alone in this conviction.

SENATE STUDY REPORT

An official report to the Senate of the United States, titled "National Transportation Policy"[1] published on January 3, 1961, supports Central's position on the B. & O.–C. & O. proposal.

This exhaustive study, prepared by transportation experts, says today's railroad problems might have been avoided except for "the unfortunate and frustrating experience of falling back on the piecemeal approach" to consolidation of our rail facilities.

[1] Prepared for the Committee in Interstate and Foreign Commerce by the Special Study Group on Transportation Policies in the United States.

The proposed C. & O. control of the B. & O. is nothing but a piecemeal approach to the rail problems east of the Mississippi.

The Senate report says "general consolidation (of rail facilities) must be approached on a regional or national basis."

The C. & O.–B. & O. scheme is neither regional nor national in concept.

The Senate experts say "Furthermore, in the absence of a regional approach there is danger of a merger of the two largest systems which would make impossible the formation of another system in that region that could provide either extensive or intensive competition."

Central is convinced that a strong, competitively balanced two system rail complex is by far the most effective answer to rail problems east of the Mississippi. The Pennsylvania Railroad and its affiliates are forming one such system. A N. Y. C.–B. & O.–C. & O. merger would permit the formation of the second.

THE PUBLIC INTEREST

It is entirely possible that some people with financial interests in the C. & O. would benefit from its control of B. & O.

Here's what the Senate report says about interests.

"The overall public interest must supersede the interests of participating carriers and of opposing interests. This position has been emphasized throughout the report and is the basis of reorientation of national transportation policy. Applied to the subject of railroad consolidation it means that various individual interests may not be permitted to impede a program deemed essential to our national security and economic growth."

CONCERN OF U.S. SENATE

The Senate of the United States is deeply concerned with the problem of rebuilding a vigorous, competitive rail system. In a letter concerning the Senate transportation study, for example, Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, said: "The increasing challenge of world economic competition makes imperative a transportation system which will assure rapid economic progress and provide adequately for national defense with a minimum expenditure of national manpower and material resources."

We of the Central intend to make the fullest possible contribution toward building such a transportation system. We shall welcome your active support.

THE NEW YORK CENTRAL RAILROAD.

April 26, 1961.

The Need for a Naval Hospital at Long Beach, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on March 23 the House passed H.R. 5000, the military construction authorization bill for this year. Included in its provisions was a sorely needed item for construction of a naval hospital at Long Beach, Calif. The sum authorized was $8,763,000. No cost for land acquisition is involved because land required is being donated to the Government.

Subsequently, the Senate Armed Services Committee deleted this item from the bill. The bill passed the Senate in this form.

The priority for this item is great. The Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget fully support the project. It is respectfully submitted that it should be restored. This can be done in conference.

Long Beach, Calif., has the third largest concentration of naval ships in the country, exceeded only by Norfolk, Va., and San Diego, Calif. Long Beach is the home port of 112 Navy ships. There are approximately 32,000 active duty personnel in ships home-ported at Long Beach and 16,700 active duty personnel ashore of all services within a 30-mile radius of the proposed hospital site. Additionally, there are 3,400 Army and 5,900 Air Force personnel stationed in the area requiring medical support.

Long Beach is the hub of the large military community, afloat and ashore, in the entire Los Angeles-Long Beach metropolitan area of over 5 million population. If a naval hospital is not provided, these thousands of active-duty personnel in the Los Angeles-Long Beach area will continue to be without the adequate and timely medical and hospital care to which they are legally and morally entitled, and continued deterioration of the welfare and morale of these personnel can be expected.

The mission of the naval base at Los Angeles is to provide logistic support to fleet units and other designated commands. In addition to assistance to the forces afloat of ships repair, supply, and other support elements, a naval base must provide for the care and the hospitalization of the sick, injured, or wounded entrusted with the complex and hazardous task of maintaining our fleet in readiness for war. To do this adequately, medical facilities must be available. This moral responsibility of our Government is understood and fully met in most instances throughout the Naval Establishment, but in the Los Angeles-Long Beach area it is paradoxical that our naval base, supporting the third largest group of ships homeported in the United States, does not include a naval hospital. Other than an 86-bed Army station hospital at Fort MacArthur and a 40-bed dispensary at the Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, there is no existing similar-type facility within 80 miles of Long Beach.

The hospital ship *Haven* berthed at the naval station in an in-service-in-reserve status, is being used as an interim hospital facility and although it has an authorized allowance of 425 beds, only 350 of these can be considered to be usable for this interim mission. In addition, the facilities of *Haven* are such that only active duty and retired males can be accommodated. There are no suitable accommodations for servicewomen. The ship is old. It was designed as a seagoing ambulance, which may have been adequate for the evacuation of casualties from forward areas in World War II, but is entirely unsuitable as a substitute for a hospital ashore. Its deficiencies include lack of facilities to promote a healthful, rapid convalescence. Crowded compartments, bunks in tiers of two and three, critically excessive noise levels, lack of accommodations for visiting, and exposed ducts, piping, etc., which preclude proper cleanliness, are included among the factors which militate against fully satisfactory hospital services being provided forces afloat and ashore in the Long Beach area.

This naval base is the only naval base in the continental United States that does not have a naval hospital. Below is a recap of the other naval bases, their attendant naval hospitals, and approximate distance of hospital from base headquarters area:

Naval base	Hospital located at—	Approximate miles from headquarters area
Boston, Mass.	Chelsea, Mass.	0
Newport, R.I.	Newport, R.I.	0
Portsmouth, N.H.	Portsmouth, N.H.	0
New York, Brooklyn, N.Y.	St. Albans, N.Y.	15–20
Philadelphia, Pa.	Philadelphia, Pa.	0
Norfolk, Va.	Portsmouth, Va.	8–10
Key West, Fla.	Key West, Fla.	0
Charleston, S.C.	Charleston, S.C.	0
San Diego, Calif.	San Diego, Calif.	0
San Francisco, Calif.	Oakland, Calif.	15–20
Bremerton, Wash.	Bremerton, Wash.	0
Pearl Harbor, Hawaii.	Pearl Harbor, Hawaii.	0

While there are no naval bases in the 8th or 9th naval districts, a naval hospital is located at Corpus Christi, Tex., and Great Lakes, Ill., to serve the needs of these respective areas.

The limited number of beds previously mentioned at Fort MacArthur, San Pedro, and at the Dispensary, Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, added to those of the hospital ship *Haven*, whose inadequacies have been previously stated, cannot begin to provide the required and expected medical care for this vast military population. Continual reliance cannot be expected from *Haven* due to the possibility of an emergency commitment elsewhere such as could be caused again by a limited war or disaster. *Haven* was active during the Korean crisis and the "Passage to Freedom" evacuation in Indochina in 1954.

Other than the limited facilities mentioned above, the nearest adequate hospitals are located at Camp Pendleton—600 beds—and at San Diego—1,750 beds—distances of 80 and 110 miles respectively. Long Beach-based personnel use these hospitals, but this situation is analogous to Washington, D.C., personnel traveling to Richmond, Va., or Wilmington, Del.; to Charleston, S.C., personnel traveling to Savannah, Ga.; to Norfolk, Va., personnel traveling to Richmond, Va.; or to Boston personnel traveling to Portland, Maine, for hospital care.

Although of secondary importance as compared to the active forces, the requirements of service dependents and retired personnel should also be consid-

ered. There are 21,800 Navy and Marine Corps retired in the area, 22,900 dependents of active duty personnel, and 21,800 dependents of retired personnel. The disadvantages of the distances to Camp Pendleton and San Diego are obvious, particularly in the case of the dependent women and children who either do not have private cars or do not drive. The net result of the absence of suitable medical and hospital facilities in the Long Beach area is that adequate care is not readily available for the personnel to whom the Government has this responsibility. As a consequence, their welfare and morale have deteriorated and will continue to suffer unless the situation is corrected. The recently expanded Medicare program wherein dependents can consult civilian doctors and use civilian medical facilities under certain restrictions has tended to alleviate this condition. However, it does not authorize outpatient care for many medical needs, and when the medical care is authorized the serviceman pays part of the expense.

With the mounting cost of Medicare in civilian hospitals, it is considered that the Long Beach Naval Hospital would pay for itself in a few years. From information obtained from the Blue Cross office in Los Angeles, 4747 West Sunset Boulevard, in the Greater Los Angeles area alone since January 1960, average monthly hospital cost for Armed Forces dependents under Medicare has been $363,000. This amount does not include approximately $145,000 per month cost of doctors' fees under Medicare. Sixty-five percent of the Medicare costs in the Greater Los Angeles area are incurred by Navy and marine dependents. It is a conservative estimate that funds in the amount of $225,000 per month would be saved in dependent medical costs alone, that is, tonsillectomies, examinations, laboratory tests, X-rays, and the like, if a naval hospital were constructed in the Los Angeles-Long Beach area.

When the former naval hospital, which the Navy had to vacate and transfer to the Veterans' Administration in 1950 under a preemptory order of their Defense Secretary Louis Johnson, was started in 1941, the fleet based here had its own hospital ship. There were so many hospital cases requiring treatment in facilities ashore, however, that a convenient hospital was needed. Before the hospital was completed, the patients were sent by ambulance to San Diego. Traffic conditions were hazardous and numerous accidents occurred. To accommodate such patients, the Long Beach Naval Hospital was built. During the year before it was closed, even during the slump in military activity following World War II, about 550 active military personnel were being cared for at all times.

The proposed hospital will be smaller than the former one but the need for a naval hospital in Long Beach is just as urgent today as it was in 1941. Under today's world conditions the fleet and its shore support activities must operate with much greater intensity than in the period between World War II and Korea. The availability of proper medical care is a necessary prerequisite for the morale and operating efficiency of this fleet.

The logical means of correcting this military medical problem in the Los Angeles-Long Beach area is to construct the 500-bed naval hospital. Approval of this project is urgently needed. This can best be accomplished most economically on the land which the city of Long Beach has so generously set aside for this purpose at the nominal cost to the Government of $10.

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I request that the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

APRIL 25, 1961.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 17, 1961, I read your statement concerning H.R. 211, which would establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

Please accept my hearty support for this resolution. It should prove embarrassing to Communists, and therefore will further the cause of freedom everywhere.

Yours truly,

MRS. JOSEPH SHULSINGER.

ANTI-COMMUNIST ASSOCIATION OF UKRAINIANS OF REVOLUTIONARY-DEMOCRATIC PERSUASIONS IN THE U.S.A., INC.,

March 26, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Anti-Communist Association of Ukrianians of Revolutionary-Democratic Persuasions in the U.S.A., Inc., expresses support for your resolution introduced in the House of Representatives March 8, 1961. We heartily favor the creation of a special permanent committee to deal with the captive nations in the grip of Soviet Russian tyranny and enslavement.

Sincerely yours,

K. PRYCHODKO,
Chairman of the Association.
M. SEMENEC,
Secretary, the Branch of External Connections by the Association.

MAY 1, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Your leadership in introducing H.R. 211 is most commendable. I feel that there is a pressing need for a special committee on the Captive Nations to counteract the tremendous Communist propaganda machine which has put us to a terrible disadvantage in the waging of the cold war.

I am writing letters both to my Congressman, JOEL T. BROYHILL of the tenth district of Virginia, and to chairman SMITH of the Rules Committee urging them to support this bill. I am also encouraging my friends to support this bill by writing to their Congressmen.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. VINTER.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, TROY, N.Y., BRANCH,
Troy, N.Y., May 3, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Our organization the Troy, N.Y., Branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America wishes to congratulate you on your bold move in introducing the resolution calling for the establishment of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. Such a Committee is long overdue.

A Committee on the Captive Nations would be a popular source of information on the various enslaved nations of the U.S.S.R. It would inform the American people and the world at large on the state of affairs behind the Iron Curtain and assist the Government in formulating its policies with respect to the captive nations. We are writing our Congressmen CARELETON KING and LEO O'BRIEN asking them to support your resolution.

Sincerely yours,

PETER TARNOWSKI,
President.

APRIL 21, 1960.

Hon. DANIEL FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In looking through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for 1961 I saw House Resolution 211. It was very gratifying to see that our Congress has a man who is deeply interested in captive nations.

It is clear that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is not a union by consent of the people, but a union imposed upon them by a dictatorial regime. It is a sign of healthy mind, of sound character and of deep democratic feeling for us Americans to realize this situation. That we should

help these enslaved nations is a duty of brotherhood and a duty to mankind.

I hope, Mr. FLOOD, that your resolution is passed, so that we, as conscientious American citizens know that the cries of the enslaved people under Communist Russia are heard by our Government and that action is taken.

Respectfully,

JESÚS E. JIMÉNEZ.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *April 30, 1961.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I herewith express my sincere gratitude to you for your prevailing action in the matter of enlightening our fellow Americans on imperialistic Soviet policy and supporting the liberation efforts of nations subjugated by the Russians.

I appeal to you to continue your support of this magnanimous aim.

Very truly yours,

NICHOLAS BOHDAN LUCZAKOWSKY.

MAY 2, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We, Americans of Cossack background, expected your reelection, and we are happy you will continue your activities in the Congress of the United States.

Your reelection signifies the acclaim of your constituents and their approval of your splendid political work. We are glad that you now in position to continue your work for the benefit of the captured peoples. This work, in our opinion, serves at the same time the best aims of the United States.

In the furtherance of your patriotic service to this country, and in pursuance of the best traditions of its glorious past, and for the ideals of the humanity in general, you presented in the Congress a new resolution, proposing to establish a permanent congressional Committee for the Captive Nations. This proposal evoked in us a feeling of deep moral satisfaction because we remain firmly convinced that our enemy can be conquered only by the common efforts of all of us, the peoples of the free world together with the peoples suffering under the yoke of the Communists.

On behalf of the Cossack national liberation movement we offer to you an expression of our deepest gratitude for all that you have done for our common cause, and we ask you to accept our sincere wishes for the realization of your highly humanitarian and politically significant proposal. We are convinced that the acceptance of your proposal will prove to be a great historical event.

Respectfully yours,

IGNAT BILYJ.

MAY 1, 1961.

Mr. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: I appreciate receiving news from Washington, D.C. This is it, House Resolution 211, proposing a special Committee on Captive Nations.

The three Baltic States lost their independence under the agreement made between Germany and Soviet Russia. The tremendous merciless power of Soviet Russia swept over Estonian territory in 1940 and those who had been serving their fatherland for the benefit of future generations were treated as the biggest criminals.

The Baltic States are looking forward to free existence again according to human rights in the world, where every nation, big or small, should have the right to live.

Very truly yours,

ROMAN LAES.

1411 Toberman Street,
Los Angeles 15, Calif.

MAY 4, 1961.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DANIEL J. FLOOD: In respect to Moscow's increasing propaganda on the subject of "liberation" of the colonial nations from capitalism, it is very necessary to coordinate our activities in revealing the Russian tactics of colonizing other nations, which is still continuing but with disguished maneuvers and methods.

In fact, there is no capitalistic or "imperialistic" country in the world which might have one-tenth of that number of colonized nations that Russia has at present. Unfortunately, their lasting struggle for independence had never been supported by any outside power nor had sufficiently been realized. The physically hard and morally humiliating conditions that the captive nations are bearing under the Moscow dictators must be highlighted.

I don't wish to extend this letter to the history of struggle of all captive nations but wish to point out some facts that took place with the Idel-Ural or Volga-Ural nations from where I've come.

The Kazan and the Astrakhan Kingdoms on the Volga had been conquered by Ivan the Terrible in the midst of the 16th century and the native people were slaughtered and scattered all over Russia so that the Tatars were thoroughly weakened. However, in the course of 400 years the Tatars staged many uprisings but every time they were repulsed by the Russian military forces.

Toward the end of the First World War, when Russian power was shaken by the Germans, the Idel-Ural Tatars managed to restore their national independence and established a parliamentary government in November 1917. At the same time, the Russian Communists seized power, not so such by force but by means of propaganda, which even at that time was used by the Communists with astonishing skill. The main theme of their propaganda was: "Liberty to All," which was also interpreted by the former colonial nations that "They may even choose their own way of the future."

But as soon as the Bolsheviks eleminated the Czars remnants, they directed their military forces against the Idel-Ural state and captured it in April 1918.

Where is that promised "Liberty" of 1917? Nowhere. On the contrary, all nations "liberated" by the Russians since 1917, are in the Communist orbit and are the subjects of the Central Communist Party of Moscow.

Moscow can't tolerate when someone dares to speak against it. Thus, your House Resolution 211, which applies to the captive nations in the Russian orbit, is the most powerful blow against its prestige. And that once started, this blow against the Moscow colonizers should be continued with increasing power. With hope.

Yours faithfully,

AHMED GEREY.

APRIL 22, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: We know from the press that you have introduced the resolution calling for the establishment of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

We wish to congratulate you on your boldness and wisdom in introducing such a resolution.

We believe that the captive nations problem is steadily growing in importance in world affairs.

The need to realize it, know it, and consider a proper solution of it when the time comes, is becoming more and more evident and necessary.

Your resolution is, in our opinion, a timely and proper answer to this need.

We wish you full success in your action.

We also are writing our Congressman, the honorable HOWARD B. ROBINSON, asking him to lend his support to your resolution.

Respectfully yours,

WOLODYMYR B. SHEMBEL.
WILLIAM IWANONKO.

Castro's Cuba Should Teach Us a Lesson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously obtained, I insert in the RECORD an excellent article which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on May 5, written by Philip W. Porter:

CASTRO'S CUBA SHOULD TEACH US A LESSON

(By Philip W. Porter)

Another useful lesson from the Cuban fiasco—in addition to the discovery that our high Government officials are fallible and human—is the extent and speed with which the Communist-style police state has taken over this island at our back door.

Most Americans, being casual readers and inattentive listeners, knew dimly that Castro had abolished freedom of the press and of the air—that's the first thing all dictators do—and had confiscated American-owned property without compensation.

They knew also that he had steadily increased the size and armament of his militia, and was doing business with Russia, China, and other Iron Curtain countries. And that he and the Catholic church were making faces at each other.

They knew the tourist business with America is shot and it's extremely difficult, if not impossible, for Cuban citizens to leave the country now.

SOME CHERISHED ILLUSIONS

But somehow they had maintained the hope, and probably the belief, that there were enough people in Cuba who hated all this and would stick their necks out when the proper moment for revolt should arise.

The slowly sinking standard of living in Cuba, particularly for the middle classes—shortages of familiar goods, shortages of repair parts, etc., is no particular secret. It has begun to hurt.

Well, the abortive invasion abruptly ripped the veil off those illusions. Castro has apparently scared the daylights out of those remaining in Cuba and established such a tight Gestapo-type espionage that his gangs were able to round up thousands of suspects overnight and keep them in jail until all danger from the invading forces had passed. Most of them may still be in jail. Little verifiable information comes out of Cuba these days.

Now he has started open warfare with the church, which in every country has historically resisted communism. All Catholic priests in Cuba have been put under house arrest, and priests who are foreign citizens will require permits to stay. This means soon they'll be ousted. Church schools are to be "nationalized."

THEY WERE BRAINWASHED

Few civilians, and no militia stuck their necks out when the small band of Cuban patriots landed in the Zapata swamp. Some

might have, had they been out of jail. But the sad fact is that they did not though the resistance forces had counted on them. They had been brainwashed.

And Castro now no longer pretends that some day he is going to have an election.

Even in the Iron Curtain countries they pretend to have elections. The people have no choice among the candidates, and the few dissenters who vote "no" or don't vote at all usually wind up in Siberia or a concentration camp.

But the Communists governments find it useful propaganda to pretend they are holding elections, just as they pretend to have a parliament.

Thus the familiar pattern of dictatorship—from Hitler, through Mussolini, Mao Tse-tung, Stalin, and Khrushchev—unfolds. No freedom of the press, no free passage of citizens in and out of the country, confiscation of foreign property, organization of ignorant camp followers into storm troopers, jailing of suspects without trial, conflict with the church, establishment of an official villain (with Hitler it was the Jews; with Russia, China and Castro it's the United States, particularly "Wall Street").

It's idle to debate whether Castro himself is a Communist. His principal lieutenants are. He is doing business with the Communists. He has been following the pattern of the police state step by step. Now he has cast off all pretense. When you walk like a duck, and act like a duck, you are a duck.

Didn't take long, did it, once he got rolling? Less than 2 years.

"Symbol of the Nation: Shepard Restores the Capital's Faith in Virtues of the American People," an Article by James Reston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a brilliant article published in the New York Times of May 9, 1961, by the distinguished correspondent of that newspaper, James Reston, concerning the remarkable achievement of America's first astronaut, Comdr. Alan B. Shepard.

The article follows:

SHEPARD RESTORES THE CAPITAL'S FAITH IN VIRTUES OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, May 8.—Comdr. Alan Shepard had a triumph in Washington today because he revived the faith of a sad and disillusioned city.

It was not that he represented the courage of this country's first explorer of outer space—everybody expected that—or that he was something new. On the contrary, it was because he symbolized what Washington was created to celebrate but had begun to doubt: the free and natural man: simple, direct, thoughtful, and modestly confident.

No matter what he had been like, Washington would have been enthusiastic, for Washington, weary of defeat, was prepared to exaggerate any achievement.

What surprised this sophisticated and cynical capital was that Shepard turned out to be that recognizable American character: The kid next door, the dream of the easy athletic all-American boy, with faith in the Lord, and a glorious happy wife, and everybody's mother.

During the troubles in Cuba and Laos, this city has been in a peevish mood. Its theme has been that the American people were letting the Government down. They were selfish and materialistic, uninterested in paying for the education of their children, unwilling to make the sacrifices necessary to meet the challenges of their enemies.

What had happened to the old virtues, Washington was asking. How could we compete against a centralized, conspiratorial Communist society with a free and easy society in which peoples were concentrating on their own personal aims and unwilling to volunteer for the great tasks essential to the Nation's survival?

ASTRONAUT THE ANSWER

Shepard provided at least one dramatic answer to this indictment. He was not the brilliant exception to the rule. He was not top of his class at Annapolis. He was well down in the middle, with over 40 ahead of him, yet he moved in here with a poise that astonished everybody from the President to the lowliest reporter in the press corps.

Even President Kennedy, that cool master of the news conference, never put on a better demonstration of grace and detailed knowledge under fire. Shepard fielded the questions like a pro. He was in command of the situation from the start to finish. He answered the fair questions and refused to answer the imprudent questions. And he was always considerate of the other astronauts who sat behind him on the stage and might have been chosen to take the first dramatic ride into space.

When he was asked whether he had any doubts or fears before he entered the big rocket, he admitted that he had. When he was asked whether he ever had any doubts about the risks he was taking, he replied that that was the easiest question of the day because he had never had a single doubt.

SUSTAINED BY RELIGION

When he was questioned about his faith, he said simply that all of the astronauts were sustained by their religion. When he was asked whether he had called his wife before he took off, he said he had, but that that was a personal question.

Danger he took as part of life and duty without question, and even with a kind of quiet pride. One was reminded of what Albert Camus, the French author and patriot, said just before he died:

"My conclusion will be simple. It will consist of saying in the very midst of sound and fury of our history: 'Let us rejoice.' Let us rejoice at being faced with cruel truths. * * * Let us seek the respite where it is—in the very thick of the battle. * * *"

In a way, Shepard made almost as much of an impression on Washington with his words and spirit as he did with his flight. He reminded the Nation that there are free and able men here unknown to the Nation as a whole, and he talked about himself as if he were very lucky, and that there were many other men who might have had the chance he had to prove the point.

Accordingly, this was a memorable occasion, which cut through the gloom of the last few weeks and provided new hope for the future.

Away back in 1913, Oliver Wendell Holmes reflected on the disappointments of the day and expressed the kind of faith many men felt here today after listening to Shepard.

"If I am right it will be a slow business for our people to reach rational views, assuming that we are allowed to work peaceably to that end. But as I grow older I grow calm. If I feel what are perhaps an old man's apprehensions, that competition from new races will cut deeper than working men's disputes and will test whether we can hang together and can fight. * * * I do not lose my hopes. * * *

"I think it not improbable that man, like the grub that prepares a chamber for the winged thing it never has seen but is to be—that man may have cosmic destinies that he does not understand. And so beyond the vision of battling races and an impoverished earth, I catch a dreaming glimpse of peace."

Federal Control Must Follow Federal Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, many of us who oppose Federal aid to education because there is no way that such aid will not be followed by Federal control, are in complete agreement with Senator HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, who so eloquently points out that "it would be irresponsible for a Federal agency to pass out billions of dollars without exercising control over the programs for which they are provided." Senator BYRD calls attention to one major field in which Federal control in the schools will cost the taxpayers millions and will result in less school construction for which the money is allegedly being raised—that is in providing that Davis-Bacon wage rates on all public school construction be paid whenever Federal subsidy is used. I sincerely urge that all my colleagues carefully read the editorial, herein inserted, based upon Senator BYRD's statement and printed in the Wall Street Journal:

THE LOGIC OF CONTROL

Speaking of the administration's Federal aid to education bill, Senator BYRD the other day remarked that it would be "irresponsible for a Federal agency to pass out billions of dollars without exercising control over the programs for which they are provided."

We think that sums up the inherent and inescapable logic of the matter. Many people scoff at the danger of Federal control of education; the bill itself contains a specific disclaimer. Yet, how, in fact, is it possible to have a large, costly, long-lasting Federal program and no Federal responsibility?

Actually, despite the disclaimer, the present bill already has control features. For one thing, Senator BYRD notes that it would provide for paying so-called Davis-Bacon labor wage rates on all public school construction wherever Federal subsidy funds are used. He adds that these rates, "almost without exception, are metropolitan rates. To apply them elsewhere for school construction means spending more money for fewer classrooms."

More direct controls could easily be added by amendment. The Federal subsidies might be limited to States which put greatest emphasis on science courses, or which use certain textbooks. It takes no effort of the imagination to see the growth of such controls.

And why not? It is idle to argue that the Federal Government should put up these billions for education and refrain from any say in how and for what purposes they should be spent. The real question is something else: Whether the Nation wants to jeopardize the principle of local control, which continues to yield excellent results,

for the sake of political handouts for which no need has yet been demonstrated?

It is certainly the right of the people to decide either way. But if they choose the Federal road they should at least be in no doubt about its logical destination.

A Big Job For Batt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring the attention of the Congress to an editorial which appeared in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette and Sun-Telegraph on May 3, 1961. All who know of Mr. William I. Batt, Jr., and of his appointment to be the Administrator of the depressed area program concur with the sentiments expressed in this editorial. We shall look forward with pleasure to the privilege of having his service in the Federal Government after such an able demonstration of his abilities as secretary of labor in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

A BIG JOB FOR BATT

President Kennedy made a good choice in naming William L. Batt, Jr., secretary of Pennsylvania's Department of Labor and Industry, to administer the new program of Federal aid to depressed areas.

Mr. Batt has had wide experience as a Federal and State administrator in the fields of labor and economics. He has been head of this State's labor and industry department since 1957.

Under his leadership, Pennsylvania's first effective program of minimum wages for women was put into force, programs for rehabilitating areas of chronic unemployment and retraining technologically displaced workers were initiated, and the State's labor-management climate was improved despite the stresses of two national recessions.

Prior to his service in this State, Mr. Batt held several positions in the Federal Government, including staff offices in the Department of Labor, Department of Commerce, Office of Production Management and the Lend-Lease Administration.

During the 1960 presidential campaign John F. Kennedy named Mr. Batt to organize and chair the Kennedy Conference on New Jobs and New Growth in Charleston, W. Va. Thus Mr. Batt was tagged from the outset to administer any Federal program to aid depressed areas in a Kennedy administration.

Certainly Mr. Batt knows firsthand the problems of depressed areas in Pennsylvania and West Virginia, including the Pittsburgh area. We are confident that he will move promptly to implement the legislation.

Just what effect the program is likely to have on an area like the Pittsburgh district remains to be seen. Since there is already more plant here than anyone knows how to operate profitably, it may be that the provisions for building new plants will not be particularly useful.

This and other depressed areas might well benefit, however, from the program's provisions for retraining surplus labor. The legislation authorizes the expenditure of $4.5 million per year to finance retraining programs and another $10 million annually for the subsistence of trainees. The Office of Education can, if it will, supplement this program with various forms of help. We hope it will, for this may prove to be for some areas the most valuable part of the depressed areas bill.

The Saga of Our Italians—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, the great New York newspaper, the New York Mirror, has commenced a series of articles publishing the good deeds of persons of Italian ancestry and their contributions to our beloved country. This newspaper recognizes the bad and the good, the debased and decadent, with the sound and vital. It has decided to stress the positive good instead of the negative which other media of communication have so blantly stressed during the past several years.

To the American who was born in freedom, the hopes and aspirations of the foreign born for a new life guaranteed in his liberties, in his rights and privileges are not fully appreciated. A native son of America cannot receive the thrill which the Statue of Liberty generates in the hearts of those going through the Narrows past our Golden Gate. Many of those foreign born who came to America in their early youth have repaid this Nation for the opportunities afforded them by outstanding service to the community in all fields of endeavor. One of those is Judge S. Samuel DiFalco, who was born in Italy and was brought here by his parents when a young boy. He truly represents the spirit of freedom and his story is a demonstration of democracy in action where a person may succeed on his own ability without regard to his place of birth, his race or his ancestry. His work has helped make the United States great. I have the privilege and honor of knowing Judge S. Samuel DiFalco intimately, and I can state that here is an American who has grafted the great traditions of the land of his father, Italy, upon the principles of America. The story of Judge DiFalco's career is set forth in the New York Mirror on Monday, May 8, and I believe that the reading public will find pleasure in understanding the background of the Italian who became surrogate of New York County:

[From the New York Mirror, May 8, 1961]

THE ITALIAN WHO MADE SURROGATE—HELPED MAKE UNITED STATES GREAT

(Less than a month from now, on June 4, the greater New York chapters of the City of Hope, a free nonsectarian hospital for victims of cancer and other illnesses, will honor their man of the year with a dinner at the Waldorf-Astoria. The man is New York's Surrogate S. Samuel DiFalco—who half a century ago was a poor immigrant lad on the lower East Side. The story of his rise to honor and eminence in American life is one of the chapters in the saga of our citizens of Italian birth or heritage, told in a new Mirror series about their many contributions to our culture.)

(By Ara Piastro and Harry Altshuler)

There was no printed program by which you could recognize the players, there on the teeming East Side of New York half a century ago. There was no label on little S. Samuel DiFalco, saying "future surrogate."

You couldn't tell by the dirty faces of the youngsters, playing stickball in the street or potsie on the sidewalk, how they were going to grow up.

One might be destined for jail, and another for the judge's bench. There was no knowing.

Nowadays it seems fashionable to blame crime and misused lives on environment, neighborhood influences, poverty and youthful hardship.

But you could hardly prove that point by naming the few bad eggs who came out of the Lower East Side. For there are so many others—so many notables, honored citizens, and torchbearers of the American dream—who also originated there.

One of those who seems to have thrived on hardships, turning each difficulty into a stepping stone, is DiFalco, Surrogate of New York County and an honored leader in numerous areas of community life.

Actually he was 6 months old before he was brought to New York and the Lower East Side. He was born in Sicily in 1907. In New York his father, Antonino opened a small business, while his mother, Rose, was busy bringing up young Sam and his sister and brother.

Maybe the distinguishing mark on Sam was work. He cannot remember when he wasn't working. Going to Stuyvesant high, he worked after school as a Postal Telegraph messenger. Later, attending the New York University School of Commerce, and New York University Law School, he worked out a frantic schedule like this:

Morning: work as a customer's man in a Wall Street stockbroker's office. Afternoon: attend classes. Evening: work on a newspaper, soliciting phone ads or reading copy.

By 1930, he had a law degree, but that was only the beginning. A young lawyer's struggle to get a foot in the door is notoriously hard. He clerked in a law office for a year, then hung out his own shingle at 401 Broadway, waiting for some one to entrust a case to him and filling up the long hours of waiting by taking a hand in local Democratic politics.

He was a member of the Manhattan Democratic Club, president of the Italian-American Democratic Club, and he was busy with church and other community activities.

Then in 1935 he took a serious step: He ran as an insurgent against the organization candidate for assemblyman in the 8th assembly district, in the primaries. He lost—but only by 80 votes, a showing that demonstrated remarkable strength.

For 4 years then, he gave up his growing private practice to serve the Government as Associate Counsel in the Interior Department. He came back to general practice in 1939 in the firm of DiFalco, Field and DiGiovanna, and in 1941 really emerged on the political scene when he was nominated by the Democrats for city council. He was elected, then reelected in 1948.

The rest of the story, to date, is one of winning more nominations and elections: State supreme court, and then in 1957, surrogate, for which he had both Democratic and Liberal support.

He lives at 983 Park Avenue with his wife, Emma, and their two children, Anthony, 22, a Fordham Law School student and Elisa, 15, a student at Marymount.

The political milestones tell only the results, not the why and wherefore. The

numerous awards and citations bestowed on the man tell part of the rest. The votes came in because, in all walks of life, a great many people had come to know DiFalco, to respect and trust him and depend on him. He could be counted on to be in the forefront in charitable and civic activities covering a wide range of interests.

Hospitals, for instance, have been one of his special concerns. He is a director of Stuyvesant-Polyclinic and Grand Central Hospital; a trustee of Long Beach Hospital and the Children's Blood Foundation of New York Hospital, a director of the Home of Sons and Daughters of Israel.

He is a founder and director of the Columbus Day Citizens Committee. He is active in the Knights of Columbus and the Catholic Lawyers Guild.

For "promoting tolerance and understanding among peoples of all faiths," he was honored in 1956 with the Eternal Light Award. The Israel Bond Committee named him its Man of the Year in 1954. He belongs, of course, to numerous professional, philanthropic and social groups. He is chairman of the National Italian-American League To Combat Defamation, which he helped organize in 1959 with other outstanding Italian-Americans.

"We felt," he recalls, "that the presentation of the Italian-American to the American public through many media—television, radio, press, and movies—was not only unfavorable, it was untruthful and defamatory. There was overreporting, out of all proportion, of the actual activities of an infinitesimal few, as against the positive contributions of the great masses of Italian-Americans in all walks of life. We don't advocate censorship—we aren't against the truth—but mere repetition of errors is brainwashing, likely to mislead the public into regarding with suspicion anyone with an Italian name."

To make the point, he displayed a clipping from a minor California newspaper, with a headline that screamed, "Mafia Involved in Stock Fraud." The story concerned an indictment against 17 men—just 2 of whom had Italian-sounding names.

Speaking for himself, and all the others who came here as immigrants or struggled upward through the obstacles of underprivilege and harsh environment, DiFalco said: "We feel a deep debt of gratitude to America, the land we came to for opportunity, for making it possible for us to achieve any success we have."

He himself is a shining example that it can be done.

Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961

SPEECH
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I earnestly hope this House will promptly accept and approve this conference report on the minimum wage bill as the most reasonable compromise that can be effected at this time.

Department of Labor statistics show that 665,000 of the workers to whom coverage will be extended under this compromise now earn less than $1 per hour and about 4½ million of the presently and newly covered workers earn less than $1.25 per hour.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that it is difficult, indeed, to understand how anyone living in the United States can regard as in any way excessive a take-home pay of $50, before deductions, to an American working man or woman for a 40-hour week in this economic day and age.

In my opinion, the whole Nation will benefit by the acceptance of this compromise agreement which seeks to provide a firm foundation for the country's wage structure and which embraces a great assistance toward further economic recovery and employment stability.

Of significant import is the objective, contained in this agreement, of eliminating competition among the several States on the basis of low wage standards. As minimum wages are reasonably increased throughout our economy incentives for plant migration to low-wage States are reduced. It is certainly not in the American tradtion to encourage competition for industry among the States solely on the basis of attraction through an available supply of cheap labor. All authorities agree that sort of competition is unfair and serves to encourage only social and economic dispute and disorder in the Nation.

This compromise agreement is as close to the President's recommendations as can now be accomplished and it is as reasonable to everybody involved as can be expected. I earnestly hope it will be adopted by this House without undue delay.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, May 3 last week was the 170th anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day. It is celebrated each year as a national holiday to commemorate that date when the Polish Diet enacted a constitution to place the power of the nation in the hands of the people. Poland was a frontrunner among the nations of Europe in asserting the right of men to be free and to chart their own destinies; and although liberty has been wrenched from the Poles by Soviet Russia, the love of freedom—the desire to restore liberty to Poland—still lives in their hearts. Someday, Mr. Speaker, the will of the Polish people will prevail, and they will realize the true destiny of their country—which was sounded on May 3, 1791, with the passage of a constitution inspired by our Declaration of Independence and the French proclamation of the rights of man. Two years ago I visited Warsaw to attend the 48th annual Interparliamentary Union Conference, and I sensed then the fact that the Poles yearn again for freedom. If there is a weak link in the Soviet chain of satellite nations, I think Poland is it. The peoples of free Europe and of our own Nation join the Poles in holding forth the hope that they soon will enjoy liberty under a government truly responsible to the will of the people. It is because the torch of liberty is held so close to the hearts of the Polish people that I call upon my colleagues in the Congress to remember Polish Constitution Day and to cherish their hope for freedom.

The Press and the Cuban Fiasco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, during the past few weeks we have heard much about the responsibilities and duties of the free press in this country, especially in regard to the coverage given the Cuban invasion and its failure.

The press, many citizens and the President himself have discussed the need for the press to exercise more self-restraint on matters affecting our national security.

A recent editorial by Jack Gore in the Fort Lauderdale News suggests the need for action by the news media themselves. Editor Gore, winner of the Freedom Foundation Award, summarizes what he sees as the abandonment of the American press.

It is encouraging to see this kind of comment come from within, and I ask that the editorial be printed here in the RECORD:

AMERICAN PRESS CAN SHARE PART OF THE IGNOMINY OF CUBAN FIASCO

(By Jack W. Gore)

In the aftermath of last week's ill-starred invasion of Cuba, and in the rash of recriminations that have followed, it appears to us that the American press, while pointing a critical finger at all those who were at fault, is overlooking some of its own muddy fingers.

In referring to the American press we aren't limiting the term to just newspapers. We include the pundits of television and radio who in their desire last week to be there first with the most and the latest news forgot all about their responsibility to their own Government.

In wartime it is a basic tenet of responsible journalism that the press should not be the medium for giving military information to the enemy nor for providing him with ammunition for his propaganda guns.

Yet, in this Cuban fiasco, the American press failed on both those counts. Not only were our columns and our airwaves filled with military information of value to an enemy, but we provided that same enemy with all the ammunition he needed to pull the rug right out from under our own Govment.

In this latter regard we specifically refer to the manner in which some news agencies and reporters deliberately and almost gleefully went about the business of exposing our own Government's clandestine role in the invasion immediately after President Kennedy had told the world we had not taken an active part in this affair.

Now, perhaps, Mr. Kennedy was guilty of a bit of bad judgment in trying to disguise what we may have done to back up and support the Cuban rebels. But if the President was guilty of bad judgment, then the press was guilty of infinitely worse judgment by making Mr. Kennedy out to be a liar and thereby providing the Communist propaganda machine with the wherewithal to deal American prestige a crippling blow all over the world.

Was it necessary or even in good taste, for instance, for the Columbia Broadcasting System to tell the world via television that the rebel invasion had been planned by our own Central Intelligence Agency and that it had been launched from some tiny islands off the coast of Nicaragua which were under the control of the U.S. Government? Sure, this was juicy information, but whom did it help? Not our own Government or the American people, to be sure. And while CBS may have scooped the world in revealing this little tidbit of information, it was the kind of scoop that must have drawn some real smiles of pleasure from the Kremlin propagandists and the Cuban Communists who couldn't have had their cause served better if they had been over here directing the activities of the American press.

We have the greatest respect for freedom of the press. It is a vital adjunct to the preservation of our way of life and our system of government. But freedom of the press does not carry with it the license to provide information and comfort to the enemy, and the American press was guilty of this in large measure last week.

In World War II the American press did an admirable job of cooperating with our armed services and with the Government in voluntarily censoring itself. On many occasions news agencies and reporters uncovered stories which would have made real headlines if they had appeared in print. But they didn't appear because the news agencies and the reporters were willing to sacrifice a few headlines in the best interests of our war effort, and, as a result of this kind of cooperation, it wasn't necessary for the Government to resort to formal press censorship to keep vital information out of the hands of the enemy.

It can be argued that since this country is not at war at the present time there is no reason for television, radio and newspaper reporters to pull their punches in regard to this country's activities. This argument, however, belies the fact we are engaged in fighting a cold war that is just as much a threat to our security as any hot war we have ever fought.

Under these circumstances is it wise or proper for the American press to bare our secret operations to the whole world under the guise of reporting in depth? Does it make sense for the American press to give Fidel Castro enough information about rebel military operations that he can boast he knows all about what is going to happen from reading American newspapers?

The American press has always been quite skilled at the business of finger-pointing and exposing somebody else's mistakes. After what happened last week, however, we think the American press has some soul-searching of its own to do. It was primarily our fault that the American people and the rest of the world were given the impression that the rebel invasion was much bigger than it actually was, and it was primarily our fault that President Kennedy had the rug pulled out from under him when, for strictly propaganda purposes, he tried to make it appear that the Cuban rebels had our sympathy and little else in their invasion attempt.

Thanks to eager beaver reporters, television newsmen and editors who couldn't wait to display how smart they were in digging up inside confidential information, however, American prestige has been dealt a crippling blow throughout the world and our Government has now been put in the acutely embarrassing position of having to admit it helped plan and stage an invasion that was a costly failure and which may well lead to even further and more dangerous involvements.

Call this good reporting, if you will. In retrospect, however, it adds up to some mighty irresponsible reporting, and, as one small segment of American journalism, we think it is high time the people in our business started using a little more restraint and a bit less freedom in deciding how much of our cold war dirty linen has to be washed right out in front of the whole world.

Good News—Calendar of Events, May 1961, National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, as I believe that the wonderful collections, facilities, and programs of the National Gallery of Art in Washington, D.C., are outstanding for the month of May 1961, I am inserting these programs in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to call these happy events to the attention of the U.S. Congress and the American people.

I am so tired of reading in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD what is wrong with our good country and the world in general, that I am submitting this under the heading of "Good News."

David Finley, the former curator as well as John Walker, curator, continue to maintain the high level of excellence in the administration of the National Gallery of Art which has made this one of the outstanding institutions of the world. If you have not seen the National Gallery of Art, or have not participated in its programs recently, you are really missing a high reward:

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

MONDAY, MAY 1 THROUGH SUNDAY, MAY 7

Painting of the Week: Reynolds. "Lady Elizabeth Compton" (Mellon Collection). Gallery 63. Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Harriman exhibition: 19th century painters. Rotunda. Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda. Tuesday through Saturday, 11; Monday through Saturday, 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "Christian Iconography and the Christian Religion in Antiquity (IV)." Guest speaker, André Grabar. Lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: The Alard String Quartet, with Overda Lipp Page, flute. East Garden Court, 8.

MONDAY, MAY 8 THROUGH SUNDAY, MAY 14

Painting of the week: "Canaletto. Venice, the Quay of the Piazzetta" (gift of Mrs. Barbara Hutton). Gallery 55. Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Harriman exhibition: 20th century painters. Rotunda. Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda. Tuesday through Saturday, 11; Monday through Saturday, 3; Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: "Christian Iconography and the Christian Religion in Antiquity (V)." Guest speaker, André Grabar. Lecture Hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Jacob Maxin, pianist. East Garden Court, 8.

MONDAY, MAY 15 THROUGH SUNDAY, MAY 21

Painting of the week: Scorel. "The Rest on the Flight Into Egypt" (Samuel H. Kress collection). Gallery 41. Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Rubens and the baroque. Rotunda. Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda. Tuesday through Saturday, 11; Monday through Saturday, 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "Christian Iconography and the Christian Religion in Antiquity (VI)." Guest speaker, André Grabar. Lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: National Gallery orchestra. Richard Bales, conductor. (Music performance trust fund concert), east garden court, 8.

MONDAY, MAY 22 THROUGH SUNDAY, MAY 28

Painting of the week: Dufy. "Nude, Reclining" (Chester Dale Collection). Gallery 62. Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour for the week: Boucher and the rococo. Rotunda. Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda. Tuesday through Saturday, 11; Monday through Saturday, 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "Americans in Paris." Guest Speaker: Yvon Bizardel, Honorary Director of Fine Arts of the City of Paris. Lecture Hall, 4.

Sunday concert: National Gallery Orchestra, Richard Bales, Conductor. Church of the Reformation Cantata Choir and Soloists (Civil War Centennial program). East Garden Court, 8.

All concerts, with intermission talks by members of the National Gallery staff, are broadcast by Station WGMS–AM (570) and FM (103.5) in sterophonic sound.

Inquiries concerning the Gallery's educational services should be addressed to the Educational Office, REpublic 7–4215, extension 272.

Gallery hours: Weekdays, 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. Sundays, 2 p.m. to 10 p.m. Admission is free to the Gallery and to all programs scheduled.

Permanent collection: Paintings and sculpture comprising the Mellon, Samuel H. Kress, Widener, and Chester Dale Collections, with gifts from other donors, are located on the main floor. The Widener Collection of decorative arts is on the ground floor.

New exhibition: Chinese art treasures. An exhibition of paintings, calligraphies, porcelains, ancient bronzes, jades, enamels, lacquers, carvings, and silk tapestries, sponsored by the Government of the Republic of China. Central Gallery, G–7 through G–15. May 28 through August 13.

Continuing exhibition: The Marie and Averell Harriman Collection, Galleries 68, 69, 69–A, and 70. Through May 14.

New publication: Chinese art treasuries. Exhibition catalog of 326 pages with text, 140 illustrations and 8 color plates. Size 11 x 9 inches.

Concerts: The Gallery's 18th American Music Festival, sponsored by the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, will open on May 7 and continue through May 28.

Tenth annual series of the A. W. Mellon lectures in the fine arts: Lectures by Dr. André Grabar, professor of Byzantine and early Christian archaeology, Collége de

France, Paris, on May 1, 8, and 15 will complete the series.

LecTour: A radio lecture device, running continuously, is installed in 28 exhibition galleries, 10 of which have recently been added. The talks cover most of the periods of art represented by the collections. A visitor may rent a small receiving set for 25 cents to use in hearing these LecTour broadcasts.

Cafeteria: Open to the public Mondays through Saturdays, 11 a.m. to 4 p.m. Sundays, 4 p.m. to 7 p.m.

Giovanni da Verrazano: The Discoverer of the Hudson River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, April 17, 1961, at the famous Battery Park in New York City, the Italian Historical Society of America, commemorated the anniversary of the discovery of the Hudson River by Giovanni da Verrazano. The Italian Historical Society of America is spearheaded by the indefatigable John N. La Corte, general director, also publisher and editor. Many dignitaries were present, and the New York Naval Base Band entertained the large audience with its wonderful music. The program was opened with the U.S. National Anthem, sung by Olivia Bonelli, lyric soprano of the Brooklyn Opera Company. The invocation was given by the Most Reverend Joseph M. Pernicone, auxiliary bishop of New York, representing His Excellency, Francis Cardinal Spellman. The Commissioner of Sanitation, Hon. Frank J. Lucia, introduced the honored guests. Thereafter, the general director, Mr. La Corte, read the New York State Verrazano Day proclamation. Words of greeting from the Honorable Robert F. Wagner, mayor of the city of New York, were extended by the commissioner of gas, water, and electricity, the Honorable Armand D'Angelo. The Italian Government sent its representative, the Italian Vice Consul, Dr. Emanuele Scammacca. Inasmuch as Giovanni da Verrazano sailed under the French flag, the French Government was represented by Mr. Bernard Malandain, the French Vice Consul, who extended words of greeting from the French Government. The U.S. Government sent Maj. Gen. Ralph A. Palladino, U.S. Army, who delivered an address which follows hereafter. Telegrams of greetings were read by me.

A highlight of the day was an address by the Honorable Edward D. Re, Chairman of the U.S. Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, a former member of the board of higher education of the city of New York and professor of law, who talked of the "Significance of the Centennials—the U.S. Civil War, and the Unification of Italy." The implications and contrast between the two centennials were so clearly set forth that I believe the readers of the United States would gain extreme enjoyment in reading them. The speeches by Professor Re and Major General Palladino, follow:

THE HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF TWO CENTENNIAL CELEBRATIONS: THE AMERICAN CIVIL WAR AND THE UNIFICATION OF ITALY

Remarks of Dr. Edward D. Re, Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, on the Occasion of the Eighth Annual Verrazano Day Ceremony, Originated and Sponsored Annually by the Italian Historical Society of America, John N. LaCorte, Founder and General Director, Battery Park, New York City, April 17, 1961

Mr. Chairman, reverend clergy, distinguished public officials, my fellow Americans, and friends, we who enjoy the cherished blessings of liberty and freedom, in a land where we have labored to stamp out both tyranny and oppression, do well on this solemn occasion to reflect upon the significance of the events that we commemorate this day.

We gather at this historic site to pay tribute to a great Florentine navigator, Giovanni da Verrazano, who was the first to open the great portals of New York Harbor to the entire world. Since all of us are in a sense immigrants, each and every one of us owes a real debt of gratitude to Verrazano, who, as the first immigrant, made possible our happy and fruitful life in this land of opportunity. Yes, it was Verrazano who was commissioned by Francis I of France the pilot of the 100-ton caravel named *La Dauphine*. Yes, it was Verrazano who on this day in 1524 sailed into New York Harbor, 85 years before Hudson. He named the land Angouleme in honor of the French sponsorship of the voyage, and the bay, Santa Margarita, in tribute to Verrazano's Italian heritage.

Our story now begins to assume meaning because it shows the combination of efforts and forces that had to unite in order to achieve the historic event. And it has always been thus, as illustrated by the very discovery of America by Christopher Columbus. For the monumental discovery of America in 1492 was only made possible by the indomitable spirit of an Italian sailor, and the generosity and wisdom of a Spanish queen.

Consequently, to the thoughtful student of the lessons of history it becomes readily apparent that the history of America is one of cooperation and joint effort. It reveals the indelible imprint of so many people from different lands.

From the two historic events cited, it is clear that just as the American of Italian heritage derives justifiable pride from the knowledge that his forebears have played a vital role in the discovery and development of this great land, so may Americans of Spanish and French extraction swell with pride because their ancestors too have made an invaluable contribution.

Countless other events of American history can be recounted to attest to the contribution of every other national and ethnic group that forms the total panorama of America and the American way of life. Our national motto, E Pluribus Unum—out of many, one—truly describes this multinational contribution that fused to form a new nation, founded upon principles of freedom and equality of opportunity for all.

This Verrazano Day ceremony takes place at a time when by a coincidence of history, two centennials are being celebrated simultaneously. While we as Americans celebrate the principles of unity and liberty that were vindicated by the Civil War, all Italians are celebrating the centennial of the unification of Italy. Although the common purpose may not at first seem obvious, only a moment's reflection is required to reveal that both events, analogous by reason of time, struggle and bloodshed, were historic landmarks in the cause of national unity and universal liberty. Just as Italians labored and fought to unite, and to expel foreign power from Italian soil, Americans fought to preserve the Union and to make that Union all free. Since clearly we could not survive, in the words of the Great Emancipator, half slave and half free, war was the price that had to be paid for a free America.

Great deeds and great achievements are often only born of even greater sacrifices, and the American Civil War was no exception. Those sacrifices, however, produced an emancipation proclamation, a beacon light of freedom destined to illumine the world. For us Americans this is the true significance of the Civil War, and this is the meaning and inspiration that we hold forth to all peoples everywhere.

On March 16, 1961, I had the privilege to be present at the centennial celebration of the unification of Italy held in the city of Washington in the District of Columbia. This celebration, perhaps the first of its kind, was under the high patronage of the President of the United States and the President of the Republic of Italy. On that occasion it was my high honor to hear President John F. Kennedy pronounce some truly inspirational and reassuring words.

Speaking to a most distinguished audience assembled in the State Department auditorium, President Kennedy stated that "Italy and the United States are inextricably linked in their past, present, and, we believe, in the future." In paying gracious tribute to Italy, President Kennedy added that "Western civilization, as we know it, has risen from the bank of the Tiber." Calling for a "new risorgimento" he declared that what is needed today is "a new awakening of man's ancient aspiration for freedom and progress until the torch lit in ancient Turin one century ago guides the struggle of man everywhere—in Italy, in the United States, and in the world around us."

From this thought, so beautifully expressed, we see a common theme applicable to both centennials. The theme is one of unity, freedom, and, yes, as stated by President Kennedy, progress. Notwithstanding the hardships and calamitous events of the Civil War, that war was a step in the growth, development, and progress of America.

And notwithstanding the hardships endured by Italians such as Cavour, Mazzini, and Garibaldi, the Italian unification too was a step in the development and progress of Italy—culminating in the present Italian Republic. These events on either side of the Atlantic helped make a reality the passion for liberty shared by both Italy and America.

With these thoughts foremost in our hearts, each of us owes a debt of gratitude to patriotic organizations that sponsor celebrations such as this Verrazano Day ceremony. In addition to giving us a sense of history, national pride, and international understanding, they serve the useful purpose of teaching us the lessons of the pages of history, that the liberty that so many take so readily for granted was only achieved by struggle and bloodshed. No nation that boasts of liberty and freedom acquired those blessings without toil and struggle.

We who cherish the liberties that we enjoy must pledge ourselves not only to preserve those liberties for all future generations, but ought to dedicate ourselves anew to the principles that inspired the founding of this great country. We must preserve what is good and we must strive to go forward to achieve the progress that was mentioned by our President. Surely no one ought to be satisfied by merely passing on to posterity what he has received from the past. Rather we of this generation must feel that

our mission will not have been accomplished unless we can say with complete honesty to ourselves, and to the world, that we are striving to pass on to future generations an even better America than was passed on to us.

REMARKS BY MAJ. GEN. RALPH A. PALLADINO, U.S. ARMY, MILITARY EXECUTIVE, RESERVE FORCES POLICY BOARD OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, AT THE VERRAZANO DAY CEREMONY, APRIL 17, 1961, IN BATTERY PARK, N.Y.

Most Reverend Bishop Pernicone, Mr. Chairman, Congressman SANTANGELO, other distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am most happy to be with you here today, representing the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of all our military forces, that splendid soldier, Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer. Let me assure you that I am highly honored at this opportunity to represent such a distinguished leader, as well as to personally visit with so many fellow Americans of Italian heritage.

It is an honor and a privilege to participate with you in this tribute to Giovanni da Verrazano, Italian sailor, navigator, and explorer.

I hope you will not consider it incongruous for an Army officer to participate in ceremonies honoring a sailor—especially one as illustrious as Verrazano. For it appears quite proper for all Americans—whether in uniform or not—to pay homage to this 16th century Florentine, whose explorations in 1524 brought to Europe a new concept of North America.

By one voyage to these shores, Verrazano carved out his place in history. With his maps and the accounts of his discoveries, he gave to the world the first description of the eastern coast of what was to become the United States and, in so doing, helped to guide those millions who were to come to these shores—shores which held out the promise of escape from oppression and tyranny.

It is especially fitting that we honor him during this year, marking the centennial anniversary of Italian unification. History bears witness that much of what we Americans believe originated in that slender finger of land which pushes into the Mediterranean. In a real sense, all that we fight to preserve today had its origins either in Italy or Greece. From the banks of the Tiber rose western civilization as we know it; a civilization whose traditions and spiritual values have great significance for our lives today.

The bonds between the people of Italy and the people of the United States have never been stronger than they now are. These bonds are the natural result of our common love of liberty, our common devotion to representative government, and our common appreciation for the rights of the individual.

Our freedom is written in the histories of our two countries, and on those pages of history, the names of Garibaldi and other great Italians, together with those of Washington and other great Americans, stand out for their dedicated efforts in bringing about freedom for the individual.

America offered our fathers the freedom, the latitude, the opportunity to expand, to express ourselves, to be creative, and we Americans of Italian descent have responded by bringing to this great country our great vitality, our vibrance, and our passion for life, our creative abilities.

These have become an important part of the American character, an important part of the American scene.

The Italian blood which flows among us carries in its stream the stuff from which American sinews are made stronger, the stuff from which American industry and culture have grown. America gave us the opportunity for expression and there never was a more grateful people than we.

You cannot begin to name the many great Italian-Americans who, coming from another heritage, have made so great a contribution to our American way of life.

Beginning with Verrazano, one could name the other great explorers, Columbus and Cabot, to truly tell the story.

Or one can turn to origins of American freedom to find there the words of Philip Mazzei, an early Maryland settler, or William Paca, one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence.

Or to our military, where Americans of Italian descent have provided leadership in our Armed Forces for many years, and one of the most notable was Gen. Luigi Palma De Cesnola, a Civil War general, who not only was among the first of many Americans of Italian descent to receive the Congressional Medal of Honor, but also was the first director of the Metropolitan Museum of Art in this great city of New York.

Or to our public servants of today, where we find Senator PASTORE, of Rhode Island, Governors DiSalle, of Ohio, Rosellini, of Washington, and many others, and then for Congressmen, we have your own ALFRED SANTANGELO, who is on the platform here with us, and many more too numerous to mention, from several sections of our country.

There is no area in American life in which Italian-Americans have failed to make an important contribution. "The fine Italian hand," so frequently referred to, is evident everywhere.

And so I say to all of you, be proud of your heritage. Hold your heads up high and continue to help America and the free world meet the challenge that threatens us today, just as Verrazano, by his faith and courage, met the challenges which faced those intrepid seafaring explorers of the 16th century, and as Italians rose to the challenges which faced them in 1861, and gave birth to the modern freedom-loving country of Italy.

And so, as we pay tribute to Giovanni da Verrazano, during this Centennial Year of Italian unification, we realize that those concepts upon which both Italy and the United States were founded are again being challenged. And from this challenge we must find, as President Kennedy expressed it, "A new reawakening of man's ancient aspirations for freedom and for progress, until the torch lit in ancient Torino one century ago guides the struggle of men everywhere—in Italy, in the United States, in the world around us."

Healthy Economic Growth With Economic Stability

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on April 21, 1961, Secretary of the Treasury, Douglas Dillon, made a most important address at the annual meeting of the American Society of Newspaper Editors. It is worthy of the attention of every Member of Congress. I set it forth in full:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE DOUGLAS DILLON, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF NEWSPAPER EDITORS, STATLER-HILTON HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 21, 1961

It is a pleasure to be here and to share with you the administration's thinking about some of the pressing economic problems that have a bearing upon our Nation's present and future well-being.

To begin with, I think one can fairly say that there is a substantial concensus in our country today on national economic goals:

We want a steadily expanding economy, based upon a strengthened system of free enterprise;

We want a rate of growth sufficient to give us an ever-rising standard of living and to provide jobs for all;

We want to assure the education of our youth and the health and security of those who are growing old;

We want an economy that can adequately provide for our national defense and furnish our fair share of the development needs of less fortunate peoples in Africa, Asia, and Latin America;

We want to accomplish all of this in an atmosphere of relative price stability.

Inevitably there will be differences among us over the means we should employ to achieve our objectives. But we must not permit such differences to obscure our basic agreement. We must recognize that unless all elements in our society work together, we cannot mobilize the massive effort required of our Nation in meeting the challenge of the sixties.

Before considering the fiscal and monetary policies we should follow to achieve our objectives, let us look briefly at ourselves as we are today:

We are a people who have built what is clearly the strongest and most advanced economy on earth. But, as recent experience demonstrates, we have not mastered the art of keeping our economy operating at the highest sustainable levels.

The recession from which we are now beginning to emerge has been relatively mild. For example, in terms of constant dollars which allow for inflation, gross national product is now only 2.2 percent below last year's peak, compared with a decline of 4.7 percent in the 1958 recession. Personal income and industrial production have also fallen less than in previous postwar recessions.

However, before we take too much satisfaction from these figures, let us remember that they are relative. The absolute figures tell a far different story: current unemployment, with 6.9 percent of our labor force out of work, approaches the worst days of the 1958 setback. A record number of our cities are classified as areas of substantial unemployment.

Why, in view of the relative mildness of the recession, do we have 5½ million people unemployed?

The answer is clear: We have not been producing at our full capacity for some years. Even last year, at the point of highest production in our history, our economy was operating well below its potential, and we still had 5 percent of our labor force unemployed. We can and must do better in the future. Meanwhile, until we find ways to improve the overall performance of our economy, the extent of current unemployment demands prompt and forthright action by the Federal Government. President Kennedy has, therefore, taken a number of steps to speed recovery:

The annual veterans' dividend of $250 million, ordinarily paid out over the course of a year, was paid in full during March.

Tax refunds were speeded up, and we are now $500 million ahead of last year's pace.

Government programs have been expedited by the prompt obligation of available funds.

Most important, a temporary unemployment compensation bill has been enacted.

These actions, together with increased defense spending that got underway last fall

and reduced revenues stemming from the recession, have created a budgetary deficit of about $2 billion in the current fiscal year. Such a deficit is not a cause for alarm in times like these. On the contrary, it is a stimulus to recovery that can, and should, be readily offset by surpluses as prosperity returns.

Another deficit is in prospect for fiscal 1962: $1 of about $3 billion. This, too, will be entirely appropriate. The economy will require the stimulating effect of a modest deficit in the coming fiscal year if it is to move forward at an adequate pace.

The innate strength of our economy, the increase in Government outlays which I have mentioned, and the automatic action of the so-called builtin budgetary stabilizers, are apparently putting an end to the current recession. Looking backward we may well find that the turning point was reached early in March. But, unless we act energetically, recovery is likely to be sluggish, just as the decline was gradual and slow.

No matter what the pace of our recovery from the recession, there are major problems confronting us which must be solved if we are to realize our full economic potential. We must find ways first to achieve and then to maintain production at full capacity. We must ensure employment for our steadily growing labor force. At the same time, we must preserve reasonable price stability.

If we balance these goals against our accomplishments, I think it obvious that new and forward looking governmental action is called for.

Excessive Federal spending is clearly undesirable. But our minimum national needs must be met. Let me cite those which merit highest priority:

First, after careful reexamination, the President has concluded that we must increase our defense expenditures in the coming fiscal year by 1½ percent, or about $650 million. Surely, no one can logically question our need or our capacity to spend whatever is required for our Nation's security.

Second, we are confronted by a shameful lag in education. More education will, of course, assure the flowering of our national culture. But, beyond this, we must recognize that education today lies at the very root of a Nation's power and well-being. Without adequate education, we cannot hope to achieve the economic growth we desire. Our shortcomings in providing our citizens with education according to their needs and capacities is a blight upon our future. The problem has grown so large that an additional Federal contribution is clearly and urgently required.

Third, we must supply the ever-growing needs of our municipalities: slum clearance, improved transportation, modern sewage facilities, and increased water supply. These needs are placing an unbearable burden upon our larger cities.

We can and we must fulfill these needs. Fortunately, if our economy operates at full capacity, our present tax system can yield a surplus of several billion dollars. Our problem is not, therefore, how to raise additional revenues but to get our economy operating at higher levels. Moreover, in setting tax policy, our most difficult task is not obtaining more revenue but strengthening and modernizing our whole tax system so as to stimulate growth and improve equity. One of our major objectives is thoroughgoing tax reform. An extensive review is now under way and we expect to present concrete recommendations to the Congress next January.

In the meantime, there is one important tax reform that cannot wait: This is legislation to spur the modernization of our plant and equipment. It is an unpleasant fact that our plant equipment is growing older year by year. By contrast, thanks to more liberal investment incentives than are available under our laws, Western Europe and Japan are moderning at a much faster rate. We must step up our rate of modernization if we are to maintain our Nation's competitive position. The installation of new and more efficient equipment is of prime importance in enabling us to meet foreign competition in the drive for export markets which are so essential to improving our balance of payments.

Since the installation of modern equipment means that labor can produce more, we must recognize that it may complicate the problem of unemployment. However, modernization will also increase jobs in the capital goods industries. Indeed, we estimate that the tax incentive President Kennedy has recommended should lead to an increase of from $2 to $3 billion a year in expenditures for plant and equipment. Some 250,000 new jobs would be required to provide this equipment. In addition, at least as many more people would find employment as an indirect result of these expenditures. Although major benefits to economic growth will accrue over the longer run, it is also clear that this tax incentive will have a substantial effect in speeding our recovery from recession. And, as our economy speeds up, increased consumer and business demand will expand the variety and volume of goods produced, thus creating new jobs to replace those eliminated by increased productivity. This is the way of future progress.

The legislation the President has requested is carefully designed to promote increased spending for modernization and expansion. Its enactment is necessary to speed full recovery and promote rapid growth thereafter. Initially, it will result in some loss of revenue. To compensate for this loss, he is asking that a number of serious tax defects be corrected:

First, expense accounts—an area where abuse has virtually become a national scandal. Tighter enforcement of the present law is not an adequate solution, for it would put an unacceptably heavy discretionary burden upon Government tax auditors. What is needed is a new and stricter legislative definition of allowable deductions. This is what we are asking.

Second, we are asking for withholding at the source of interest and dividends. Our best estimate is that about $3 billion of income from interest and dividends goes unreported every year. This situation is clearly unfair to all wage earners and, indeed, to the majority of taxpayers. We are asking that it be corrected by a workable withholding provision that, as in the case of wages, will collect at the source a substantial portion of the tax on interest and dividend income.

Third, we are asking for repeal of the 4 percent dividend credit. This credit was adopted in 1954 in an attempt to lighten the double taxation of dividend income. But, at only 4 percent, it has not served its purpose. Furthermore, it gives considerably greater benefit to those in the higher income brackets than to the vast majority of stockholders. This favoritism in the law is unhealthy and should be ended. The related $50 exemption should also be dropped.

Finally, we seek an end to tax provisions that encourage American business operations abroad through the use of tax havens. We also want to withdraw preferential tax treatment for American capital going into industrially advanced countries, for such treatment discriminates against the investment of capital at home. These changes will have a needed and favorable impact upon our basic balance of payments deficit. We are not, however, recommending changes in tax inducements for investment in underdeveloped countries which are an essential part of our overall program to help these countries grow.

I have briefly outlined our overall fiscal and budgetary thinking. I have also told you something of our plans for the immediate future as regards taxation.

Now, let me take up monetary policy. This is a field where we face an entirely new situation brought about by the recently achieved convertibility of foreign currencies. Convertibility permits owners of liquid funds to shift them freely from one world financial center to another in search of higher interest rates. Therefore, the extremely low short-term interest rates of previous recessions could have dangerous repercussions today. Short-term interest rates much below present levels might well touch off a renewed outflow of dollars that could imperil our balance of payments and the soundness of our dollar.

Nevertheless, we need low long-term rates to stimulate borrowing for modernization, plant expansion, housing construction and the like just as much today as in previous periods of recession. Accordingly, the administration is attempting to promote lower long-term interest rates without putting downward pressure on present short-term rates. For one thing, the Federal Reserve is now purchasing securities of all maturities, instead of restricting itself to short-term Treasury bills. For another, President Kennedy has taken direct action in the housing credit field which has helped to lower average mortgage rates by more than a quarter of 1 percent since the turn of the year.

Far more meaningful than interest rates, however, is the quantity of funds flowing into investments. Here, we see evidence of improvement in the mortgage credit area, where, although rates are still on the high side, availability of credit is no longer an inhibiting factor. We also see increasing evidence of growing municipal and corporate borrowing.

Finally, since the budgetary deficits that are presently envisioned are modest and bear no comparison to the deficit of 1959, monetary policy will remain free to act in support of business recovery. Therefore, the substantial increases in interest rates that characterized the 1958–59 period are not likely to recur this time.

To sum up:

Our policies—be they budgetary, tax, or monetary—should have one overriding goal: the promotion of a healthy rate of economic growth within a reasonable atmosphere of economic stability. We must meet the needs of the day in the fields of defense, education, housing, highway construction, urban development, and other essentials. Fortunately, we are in a position to meet them—this year, and the next, and in the long run—without undue strain on our economy.

We must overhaul our tax system to provide greater fairness and incentives for efficiency and growth, beginning with an investment incentive this year, and following with a basic overhaul next year.

We must maintain an interest rate structure conducive to the steady flow of funds into investment.

To achieve all these things will not be easy. But with determination and perseverance we should be able to attain our goals. In the process, we can look forward to a period of growth and prosperity during the sixties such as this Nation has never known.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that everyone will agree with the Secretary's statement of national and international goals.

He also properly indicates that there will be some disagreement on the methods to be used to accomplish our desires and our needs.

I, for one, sincerely hope the administration will abandon its attempt to remove the tax exemption on dividends. That request weakens the overall tax plan.

The reason for the exemption was to lighten the burden of double taxation. No one can deny that double taxation is unfair and inequitable. The enactment of this small exemption recognized that principle. We should not now back away from it but should seek an early opportunity to further implement it.

In fact, the same exemption should be extended to interest and dividends paid on savings accounts.

The capital that makes up the backbone of our economy comes from investors' stock purchases and savers' thrift accounts. They supply our long-term funds. They need the incentives to invest that the administration avowedly wishes to encourage.

There is no favoritism in giving everyone an exemption of the first $50. No one should complain that an across the board 4-percent exemption favors the recipient of $1,000 in dividends with a $40 exemption as against a $4 exemption on $100 of dividends. Both dividends are an aliquot part of what was left of corporate earnings after the full share of municipal, State, and Federal taxes were taken out of the profits. The $100 dividend was probably the return on a $2,500 investment, while the $1,000 dividend was on a $25,000 investment. The amounts might differ but the participation was exactly equal. Both investments were undoubtedly made from funds retained as net income from earnings or profits that had already been fully taxed at least once and more likely two or three times.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Our Depressed Gold Mining Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, much has been said in the past few months about our declining gold reserves. Efforts have been made to check the outflow of gold, but the basic need is to get at the root of the problem, our steadily declining production of gold. The domestic production of gold has declined to the point where we are not even meeting our industrial and commercial demands for the precious commodity, to say nothing of producing any gold for our reserve stocks.

Mr. L. L. Huelsdonk, vice president, Best Mines Co., Inc., Downieville, Calif., one of the outstanding men in the field of gold production, made an excellent statement on this problem for the hearing this week held by the Mines and Mining Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

With your permission, I would like to insert this into the RECORD:

OUR DEPRESSED GOLD MINING INDUSTRY

(By L. L. Huelsdonk)

The United States—prior to World War II—was the second largest gold producer in the world. Today Russia holds that position and is now producing at least five times more gold than this country. The Russians have realized the necessity of a large gold reserve for international trade and a sound monetary policy—and thus have given top priority to their gold mining industry.

The United States on the other hand—through Government regulation and national policy—has forced 97 percent of its gold mines to close down. Past decisions have deprived the gold miners of their property and are forcing them to sell their gold at the 1934 price of $35 per ounce—in the face of mining costs which have risen over 300 percent.

By law the miner must sell his gold to the Government and in turn the Government must sell the gold to the domestic user and the foreigner for the same low price. There are then no restrictions on the resale of this gold after it leaves Government hands. It, therefore, forces the gold miner to become a partner with the Government to subsidize the domestic commercial usage of gold and the importation of foreign goods.

Since the end of World War II the Government has sold to the industrial, professional, and artistic users of gold $166 million more than our mines produced in the same period.

These sales—added with the tremendous withdrawal of gold from foreign claims—has caused the United States to lose over $5 billion worth of monetary gold reserves in the past 3 years. Even with this tremendous drawdown of our reserves and the increasing demand for gold, the Government still refuses to help the gold miner. He is even denied the right to sell his product on a free market for a fair price.

During World War II gold was declared nonstrategic to the war effort, so the gold mines were closed by Government order. However, Treasury figures show that within 3 years of warfare, every single ounce of our net gold reserve[1] had been mortgaged in financing our fighting strength and that our war industries had demanded and were granted increasingly enormous amounts of gold from the Treasury stock. By the end of the war, sales to these privileged buyers had risen to more than 270 times the average yearly requirement for peacetime use. This indicates that gold is not only strategic to war—but that it is also a sinew of war—and that under present world tension, our gold supply should not be at the mercy of foreign demand.

In 1945, through the Bretton Woods Agreement, the U.S. dollar was set up to act as gold and with gold as an international standard to set the par values of foreign currency at the given weight and fineness of gold on July 1, 1944. However, no provision was made for adjusting an inflation-bound domestic dollar. Because of this neglect, inflation has persistently divided our dollar into two widely different values. This has upset all of the possibilities of maintaining the dollar as an international standard with gold, simply because American inflation automatically guarantees a decreasing value for the domestic paper dollar—while gold redemption automatically guarantees stability of value for the foreign-held dollar.

The development of this double dollar standard has caused much economic trouble in this country which has been evidenced in our gold losses and in our dwindling ability to compete—not from a productivity basis—but from the exchange depreciation of our domestic paper dollar; which not only generates high-priced exports and low-priced imports—but in turn provides for the exportation of our industries and the domestic jobs which they support.

Even though the dollar price of American goods has more than doubled—and is steadily climbing—the foreigner still has the privilege of purchasing an ounce of gold for $35. In other words, if a foreigner earned 35 of our dollars in 1945, he had a choice to buy either an ounce of our gold or 100 pounds of our goods. Today, he can still buy an ounce of our gold with his $35, but he can only buy 50 pounds of our goods. This is why he buys gold—this is why our industries must move abroad in order to compete—this is why we lose employment at home.

Since the signing of the Bretton Woods Agreement (as an adjustment to internal inflation) practically all of the currencies of the world have been devalued (either officially or defacto) except the American gold dollar. Because of this—and the fact that we, as citizens cannot own gold—our dollars at home are only as good as the management of our money—while abroad—they are as good as gold.

The steadily increasing variation in dollar values forces our industries to move much of their production abroad, rather than keep it at home in a hopeless attempt to defend an export position against the rising tide of international competition. This exportation of our domestic production will increasingly hire more foreign labor and widen the road to our unemployment offices, if positive steps are not taken—because foreign-held dollars are privileged to buy American gold and, therefore, foreign goods at the 1944 price—while American goods steadily increase in price.

While these industries are exporting jobs, Secretary of Labor Goldberg is asking for 10 million new jobs in 1962. The Government is trying to fill this wish by creating federally supported projects, increasing and extending unemployment benefits and raising the minimum wage. This, of course, is commendable, but it does not provide a solution. It can only generate more inflation and widen the gap between the gold and domestic dollar values and thus force more industries abroad where their paper dollar investments can turn into gold worth twice their domestic value.

The true value of all currencies is measured in gold, and those countries which have been unable to hold adequate reserves of gold invariably have degenerated. Since the amount of potential demands for our gold by foreigners far exceeds the amount of gold that we own, a menace to our national solvency rests in the tempers of foreign official banks and governments. It is their decision that can draw out our gold—not ours.

The only positive solution to this dilemma is to equalize and stop the growing difference between the values of our domestic paper dollar and that of our foreign-held gold dollar. By doing this, the billions of our foreign-held dollars would be released from the influence of our gold bargains and become free to purchase American goods on an equal level. This in turn would hire American workers and return American industry on an international competitive basis within its own boundaries.

Without the virtue of equality in exchange, dollars of the same denomination are not equal in value. The disequilibrium that now exists can only be corrected in two ways—either by lowering the value of the foreign-held dollar in terms of gold until it equals the purchasing value of the domestic dollar in the terms of U.S. goods—or by lowering prices and wages in America (via depression) until the value of the domestic dollar is raised to the value of the foreign-held dollar.

In conclusion—it might be pointed out that the complexity of this problem has taxed the brains of our financial experts and economic advisers, but to date no positive, simple, or understandable solution has been devised. In the meantime the United States has lost at least 97 percent of her straight gold-mining industry and over 20 percent of her gold reserve at a time when gold in the world is becoming increasingly important—and for the first time we are facing the possibility of a world war without a net reserve of gold.[2]

Since it seems impossible that our experts will resolve this problem within a reasonable length of time, it is imperative that some-

[1] Gold above claims—over $10 billion.

[2] Gold above foreign claims.

thing be done to stimulate our domestic gold production.

Therefore, I respectfully request that your subcommittee consider and act favorably on House Joint Resolution 185, a bill which is designed to accomplish this purpose and relieve the most depressed industry in the Nation.

The Monroe Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I commend to you this perceptive article by a former U.S. career diplomat, Francis B. Stevens, as it appeared in the May 15 issue of the U.S. News & World Report:

CAN UNITED STATES STOP CASTRO?—THE RIGHT OF SELF-DEFENSE

(By Francis B. Stevens)

Setbacks to U.S. policy in such remote parts of the world as Laos and the Congo, while serious and damaging, are of secondary importance compared with the failure of the attempt to invade Cuba and overthrow the Castro regime.

The U.S. defense perimeter, formerly on the other side of the great oceans, has been breached and a hostile base established within 90 miles of the United States. The Communist regime in Cuba is a military threat to the United States, endangers U.S. communications in the Caribbean, and provides a springboard for the extension of the Communist system to all Latin Amercia.

It was to avert precisely such a situation that the Monroe Doctrine was proclaimed 138 years ago. In 1823 President Monroe served notice on European powers that any attempt to extend their system to a part of this hemisphere would be regarded as dangerous to our peace and safety. Whenever in the past such attempts were made, the U.S. Government acted vigorously and successfully to oppose them.

For 30 years after the Spanish-American War, the United States intervened repeatedly in countries of the Caribbean, not to defend them against extra-hemisphere designs but to preserve order and protect American business interests. This policy created a revulsion to Yankee imperialism through Latin America—a feeling which persists to this day and, skillfully exploited by the Communists, effectively stymies any form of collective-security action by the Organization of American States.

In 1933, Franklin D. Roosevelt proclaimed the good neighbor policy toward Latin America and withdrew the last of U.S. occupation forces from the Caribbean. Since that time the United States has worked consistently to evolve collective-security arrangements which would make the defense of the hemisphere a joint responsibility, not the task of the United States alone.

The Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance of 1947 provides that armed attack against any American state will be considered an attack against all, and obligates all signatories to assist in repelling it. A resolution adopted at the Inter-American Conference at Caracas in 1954 called for consultation in case of attempted Communist subversion of the government of any American state.

But these paper obligations have proved ineffectual. Latin American governments, always touchy about their sovereignty, are reluctant to participate in joint action which can be construed as intervention in the internal affairs of another American state.

To the masses in Latin America, communism is less of an ogre than Uncle Sam. Castro's agrarian policies have wide popular appeal in Latin America; the dictatorial aspects of his regime have little impact on peoples long ruled by local strong men.

President Kennedy has warned Moscow that the United States would protect the hemisphere against outside military intervention in Cuba. This, in effect, is a declaration of intention to go it alone, to enforce the Monroe Doctrine unilaterally if necessary.

But what is "outside military intervention"? The Russians are unlikely to send troops or airmen to Cuba, or to seek base rights there. That is not their way. Does the arming of Castro's forces with Soviet tanks and planes, which foredooms anything but a full-dress invasion to failure, constitute such intervention? If so, what is to be done about it? These are the critical questions facing the President.

In Government circles in Washington, some talk is now heard of possible action against Castro in terms of self-defense, not intervention. This has important legal implications. International law recognizes the right of every sovereign state to act in self-defense against outside aggression. This was precisely the motivation for Soviet action in crushing the Hungarian rebellion in 1956. A hostile, non-Communist regime was considered to be a threat to the security of the Soviet Union, and as such could not be tolerated.

This new emphasis on self-defense is an indication of the seriousness with which the administration views the situation resulting from the failure of the invasion attempt to dislodge Castro.

That ill-starred venture revealed several facts which were either unknown or disbelieved in Washington. Castro was shown to have military forces sufficiently strong and disciplined to deal with incursions by irregulars. His police apparatus was able to repress any show of sympathy by the population for the invaders, and to maintain internal order. And the invaders were exposed as ideologically bankrupt; their program of anti-Castroism was insufficient to arouse support among the masses who have fed at the Castro trough and whose help is essential in any effort to overthrow the regime from within.

Hence the quandary in which the President finds himself. There is now little hope that the anti-Castro forces inside and outside Cuba can gain their ends without solid military support from outside the country. That support can come only from the United States.

The President obviously wishes to avoid an American Hungary which would bring down on the United States the wrath of the world and jeopardize his entire foreign policy. But he cannot tolerate indefinitely the cancer of communism in the Caribbean. In the final analysis, great powers will take whatever steps they consider necessary to guard their national security.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very interesting editorial which appeared in the Chelsea Record, Chelsea, Mass., on May 5, 1961, regarding the heroic efforts of the Polish people to regain their freedom:

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Polish Constitution Day, which was commemorated on May 3 is a tribute to a brave and heroic people and offers a stirring inspiration to freedom-loving people everywhere. The repeated efforts of the Polish people to gain, keep and regain their freedom offers a lesson from which all people may learn.

Though these people are kept under the heels of the Communist tyranny their hopes and determination that they will again regain their freedom and the Polish Constitution will again reign as the supreme law of their homeland still lives and can never be destroyed.

This love for freedom and their willingness to fight for their independence has been carried by the Poles wherever they have scattered. The heroic efforts of such Polish patriots as Kosciuszko and Pulaski were important factors in our Revolutionary War victory and they have done more than their share in every war since then.

Here in Chelsea Polish friends and neighbors have always been active in every phase of our communal life. Their names and contributions are indelibly inscribed in the business, political, communal, religious, fraternal and charitable history of our city.

Such determination, sacrifice and courage cannot continue forever without success. We look forward with them to the day when the flag of an independent and democratic Poland will again wave and the Polish Constitution will again be the law of the land.

The Common Situs Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVE MARTIN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the fundamental reason for consideration of common situs legislation, as shown by the testimony, is that there is a basic dispute between unions themselves. This is a family squabble between industrial and craft unions for jurisdiction.

Testimony before the Senate committee in regard to the construction of missile and test centers has brought out a swarm of problems. The chief one is rivalry between craft unions and industrial unions as to whose members are to perform the work. In addition, craft unions have squabbled amongst themselves over jurisdiction. This has resulted in a greatly increased cost of missile site construction and a subsequent delay in our missile program.

The common situs bill would greatly aggravate this situation because it makes legal the secondary boycott on construction jobs. The secondary boycott is the most vicious weapon—and at the present time is outlawed by the statutes. The passage of this bill would greatly aggravate the irregularities which have been disclosed to exist at our missile sites. The unions are treated fairly under the present laws, and the bosses

are not entitled to receive the big whip which the passage of the common situs bill would give them.

Are a few union bosses going to dictate to the Congress of the United States what action should be taken? Is Jimmy Hoffa going to be made more powerful than the very Government of this country?

Such would be the result if this vicious piece of legislation was passed.

The Magnitude of Our Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, with the unfortunate emphasis these days on our Nation's problems and imperfections, it is refreshing to have one of the syndicated columnists take an affirmative position in discussing American virtues. I believe the column by Constantine Brown in the Washington Evening Star, Tuesday, May 9, needs no further comment, and I place it in the RECORD in order that it might provide inspiration to those who read it:

THE MAGNITUDE OF OUR HERITAGE—CHILDREN SINGING "AMERICA THE BEAUTIFUL," STIR MOVING VISION IN AN OLD NEWSMAN

(By Constantine Brown)

A few days ago this reporter sat at lunch with another reporter and three little children ranging in age from 4 to 9. The little ones in unison recited a simple little blessing when their food arrived, a nondenominational, fervent prayer that could as properly be offered by a Moslem or a Jew, as by any Christian.

They did this in a public restaurant, quietly enough so that few seated at tables nearby would know. They began together, without suggestion by any adult, and without self-consciousness. Then, like healthy kids anywhere at any time they tackled their meal with enthusiasm, albeit with politeness.

But that was only the beginning of what seemed to a well-seasoned old writer to be a memorable occasion. A little while later, when the small ones had completed their dessert and milk, they offered another contribution to spirituality and to the soul, if you will, that moved our companion, himself an "old hand" at reporting the news and certainly no sentimentalist, to tears.

Real tears. Not perhaps, entirely unashamed tears, in a sense, because no grown man is fond of such a public display of emotion. So deep was his feeling that he clasped his hands to his head and bowed it low for a moment, perhaps the better to mask his open yielding to his inner self and its loves.

Almost no one nearby, however, noted the little tableau at our table. They did not, many of them, hear what caused this reaction from a veteran newsman with years of experience in a world of cynicism, doubletalk, dubious loyalties, self-seeking, and intrigues.

The children, in bewilderment, wondered why he should weep. He reassured them that they were not the reason; it was only, he said, that the song they had sung had brought back to him, in a few lines, all the wonderful things he felt about his homeland.

The small ones had sung one verse of "America the Beautiful."

When the childish harmony (suitably low-pitched, as befits public singing in grownups' restaurants) smoothed out along "How beautiful for spacious skies, for amber waves of grain; For purple mountains' majesty above thy fruited plain * * *." I saw my friend melt. When the chorus came, he was unable for another instant to repress his response. He wept.

After a few moments he straightened, smiled at the youngsters, thanked them for their singing and praised them for their skill. They gravely acknowledged, explaining that this song was one they learned to sing in school along with others, and that the two older ones explained its words to the little one, who was not yet enrolled at a seat of learning.

Then, when the children were occupied with another ice-cream pie, he apologized to me for the incident. Not in years, he said, had he felt so suddenly and so overpoweringly swept with love of his country, its sweep, its beauty, its nobility. Yes, he added, probably every man loves his motherland like that, and there is no reason to weep with the emotion.

"But I'm too close to it all. Every day in my field of interest, covering international affairs and the business of politics, seeing the dangers, the threats, the contrived enmity, the blunders. All of a sudden the sound of these little voices overwhelmed me with the magnitude of our heritage.

"In a rush I saw the mountains and the prairies and the rivers; I saw the pioneers and the mountain men, the Jeffersons and the Lincolns, the vast spaces of the deserts, the resounding phrases of the Declaration of Indepndence and the Gettysburg Address—all these and much more in one blinding vision. All this because three little children, the future of our country, put their voices together in song as though to tell the world that all this I saw was not to be swept away."

This reporter understood. There was no reason to explain. Probably both of us spent the next few minutes reflecting on the majesty of a simple chorus: "America, America, God shed His grace on thee, and crown thy good with brotherhood, from sea to shining sea."

Golden Spike Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. BLAINE PETERSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most significant and dramatic events in the history of our Nation took place exactly 92 years ago today. I refer to the completion of the first transcontinental railroad route in America.

It was at high noon on May 10, 1869, that the famous Golden Spike was driven at a point called Promontory in the mountains north of the Great Salt Lake in my native and historic Utah, connecting the tracks of the Central Pacific—now the Southern Pacific—and the Union Pacific railroads.

In order that nationwide recognition may be given to the 100th anniversary of this great achievement, I have asked the Postmaster General to issue a special stamp. By my advance request I hope to reserve 1969 for the observance of this spectacular and meaningful occasion which, even today, in the age of almost inconceivable ecientific progress remains one of man's greatest engineering feats.

But more important, at least as I see it, is the fact that it marked the beginning of a new and vital era of national development. Immense regions were opened up to farming, mining, lumbering, and manufacturing. Struggling, pioneer settlements found themselves linked to new life and growth. Distance was no longer a barrier to trade.

Early in life my father taught me a respect for the importance of the railroads. He was a conductor on the Southern Pacific for 45 years and remembered the days when towns sprang into being and commerce developed wherever the rails were laid down or were extended. Millions of acres of land were put under cultivation, and land values were multiplied.

In short, the railroads encouraged expansion at a time when both encouragement and expansion were sorely needed, and they have ever since been an indispensable part of everyday American life.

When that first transcontinental rail route was completed, there were about 50,000 miles of railroad in the entire United States. Today, a network of some 220,000 miles of railroad line and 370,000 miles of track stretches between our cities and towns. And for all the vision of those who were present at the driving of the golden spike, for all their faith in the future of transportation by railroad, I feel sure they would still marvel at the transportation job done by the railroads of 1961 and at the tremendous technological advancements which have been brought about in the industry.

Last year, the class I railroads alone produced 572 billion ton-miles of freight service. This is the equivalent of moving nearly 9 tons of freight a mile each day for every man, woman and child in the United States. And in passenger service, they transported more than 325 million travelers.

Altogether, the railroads today carry nearly half of the Nation's intercity freight load, more than a fourth of all commercial passenger traffic and three-fourths of all nonlocal mail. It strikes me that it is worth remembering that were we ever to be without railroads our American way of life, based upon large-scale production and consumption, would be utterly impossible.

In addition, of course, the railroads are major employers with some 800,000 people on their payroll. They provide work for many additional thousands through purchases of the Nation's products to the healthy tune of $2½ billion annually. And their tax payments average a billion dollars a year.

This great transportation complex, representing a total investment of $36 billion, is indeed a far cry from the railroads of 92 years ago. And it is reassuring to see the many evidences of the railroad industry's determination to continue to move ahead.

Thus it is that in taking this opportunity to pay a tribute to these important

facilities on which the welfare of our Nation is so dependent, I am also mindful of the fact that a further safeguard of the national interest would be an updated national transportation policy suited to a truly balanced transportation system. The new and growing demands of an expanding America have need of ever better transportation services and our total effort to that end is essential to the economy and defense of this Nation.

A Great American Marks an Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like today to join my colleagues in the Congress and millions of Americans across the Nation in wishing Godspeed to a great American who today celebrates his 37th anniversary of incomparable service to his fellow citizens. It was on May 10, 1924, that the then Attorney General, Harlan Stone called in young John Edgar Hoover and told him that he was to head up the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

From that date, the course of American history was changed. Mr. Hoover took command of an agency which had become the haven for political hacks. He changed it promptly into a hard-working organization whose members produced—or got out.

His first great job was to tackle the organized crime of the lawless decade. Under his forceful leadership the FBI developed into an agency capable of meeting the challenge of the Dillingers and their kind. Under his leadership the FBI became the scourge of the underworld and the guiding force in developing sound and scientific police methods throughout America.

To improve this universal police protection to all of our citizens at every level of Government, Mr. Hoover established in 1935 the FBI Academy and since that time more than 4,000 outstanding police officers from every State have attended to improve their ability to cope with crime at the local level.

Mr. Hoover and his many dedicated coworkers in the Bureau have held thousands of conferences with police officers throughout the country, designed to bring to the local level the know-how and organizational ability built up within the FBI itself.

In a real sense of the word, Mr. Hoover's personality has been stamped on law enforcement agencies everywhere.

During World War II the already heavy burden carried by the FBI was increased to include counterespionage and sabotage work within this country. Again, his men made spectacular contributions to the Nation and its safety. As a result of careful, scientific work by the Bureau there was not a single case of enemy-inspired sabotage in our World War II defense effort within the continental United States.

Since then his men have been hard at work protecting the American people against the inroads made by communism. His men uncovered the plot and developed the evidence which brought to justice the atomic spies, Julius and Anna Rosenberg. His agents have been active in trying to prevent subversives from invading the Government to destroy its effectiveness.

Mr. Speaker, a man like J. Edgar Hoover did not win this high position of esteem he holds with his fellow citizens today by being a great personality, a great politician or even a fine administrator. He has won that position because he has done the job so well. He has held the post now for 37 years. If he wishes, I am sure that the American people will want him to keep it another 37.

Encroaching Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include an address which Mr. Ronald Reagan, TV and movie star, is delivering to audiences throughout the United States. Mr. Reagan is an outstanding American patriot who is giving unselfishly of his time to warn the people of America of the disastrous direction in which this country is heading.

Mr. Reagan has been fighting Communist infiltration into the moving picture industry for many years, and recognizes the threat of international Communist conspiracy. He is an outspoken foe of socialism and the welfare state, believing that our survival depends upon the free enterprise system and the preservation of the checks and balances provided in our Constitution.

The address follows:

ENCROACHING CONTROL

(An address by Ronald Reagan)

It must seem presumptuous to some of you for a member of my profession to stand here and attempt to talk on problems of the Nation. It would be strange if it were otherwise. We in Hollywood are not unaware of the concept many of our fellow citizens have of us and of our industry. We realize that our merchandise is made up of tinsel, colored lights, and a large measure of make-believe. It is also true that our business methods and practices have reflected this footlight glamour more than the very real side of our very real business.

However, a few years ago "a funny thing happened to us on the way to the theater." Ugly reality came to our town on direct orders of the Kremlin. Hard-core party organizers infiltrated our business. They created cells, organized Communist fronts, and for a time, deceived numbers of our people, who with the best of intentions, joined these fronts while still ignorant of their true purpose. The aim was to gain economic control of our industry and then subvert our screens to the dissemination of Communist propaganda.

Whatever the shortcomings, Hollywood had achieved a great deal. In the finest traditions of free enterprise, 70 percent of the playing time of all the screens of the world had been captured by the output of the American film capital. You may disagree sometimes with our boy-meets-girl plot, but all over the world our pictures were a window through which less fortunate humans had a glimpse of freedom and of our material comforts as well. The men in the Kremlin wanted this propaganda medium for their own destructive purposes.

Confident of their power, the Reds in our midst made one mistake in judgment. They mistook their ability to deceive for success in conversion. Under the guise of a jurisdictional strike, they made an open effort to destroy the guilds and unions who remained free from their control. Ultimately, they hoped for one vertical union of motion picture people under the umbrella of Harry Bridges' maritime union. After the first shock, the people of the movie colony rallied quickly—we lived through scenes that heretofore had been only make-believe. Thousands of massed pickets overturned cars, homes were bombed, and threats of acid in the face were directed at performers. Months later their power was broken. The studios had remained open thanks to the refusal of management and the majority of our people to be intimidated.

We now know, of course, that we only won an isolated battle. In the spirit of Camp David the Communist Party has ordered once again the infiltration of the picture business as well as the theater and television. They are crawling out from under the rocks; and memories being as short as they are, there are plenty of well meaning but misguided people willing to give them a hand.

We don't mean to present ourselves as "being able to run the circus now that we've seen the monkey," but it is possible we have an awareness not shared by many of our fellow citizens.

Most people agree that the ideological struggle with Russia is the No. 1 problem in the world. Millions of words are used almost daily to record the fluctuating temperature of the cold war. And yet, many men in high places in government and many who mold opinion in the press and on the airwaves, subscribe to a theory that we are at peace, and we must make no overt move which might endanger that peace. "Men cry peace, but there is no peace." The inescapable truth is that we are at war, and we are losing that war simply because we don't, or won't, realize that we are in it.

True, it is a strange war fought with unusual weapons, but we cannot yell foul, because it is a declared war. Karl Marx established the cardinal principle that communism and capitalism cannot coexist in the world together. Our way of life, our system, must be totally destroyed; then the world Communist state will be erected on the ruins. In interpreting Marx, Lenin said, "It is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue to exist for a long period side by side with imperialistic states. Ultimately, one or the other must conquer."

Last November, the Communist parties of 81 countries held a convention in Moscow; and on December 6, reaffirmed this principle of war to the death. In a 20,000-word manifesto, they called on Communists in countries where there were non-Communist governments to be traitors and work for the destruction of their own governments by subversion and treason.

Only in that phase of the war which causes our greatest fear are we ahead—the use of armed force. Thanks to the dedicated patriotism and realistic thinking of our men in uniform we would win a shooting war. But, this isn't a decisive factor in the Communist campaign. They never really intended to conquer us by force unless we yielded to a massive peace campaign and disarmed. Then, the Russians would resort to armed conflict if it could shortcut their timetable with no great risk to themselves.

In 1923, Lenin said that they would take Eastern Europe, next organize the hordes of Asia, then surround the United States, and, he predicted, "* * * that last bastion of capitalism will not have to be taken. It will fall into our outstretched hands like overripe fruit."

Eastern Europe has been taken, and they are organizing the hordes of Asia around the red colossus of China. Even now, it would appear we are preparing to drink the bitter cup of capitulation in Laos only partly diluted by face-saving devices. Cuba is a Soviet beachhead 90 miles offshore, and more than 250,000 Communist organizers are spread up and down Latin America.

Meanwhile, other Communist tactics are also working on schedule. Bulganin said, "The American workingman is too well fed; we cannot appeal to him, but when through inflation America has priced herself out of the world market and unemployment follows—then we will settle our debt with the United States."

American apathy is due at least in part to our belief that the small number of American Communists is evidence of weakness and a lack of threat. But, history makes no secret of the fact that Lenin became the leader of the world conspiracy on just that issue—that the Communist Party would remain a small, dedicated, highly trained cadre which would use and manipulate the masses when necessary. Lenin termed us the willing idiots. In our life time ,this dedicated handful has enslaved one-third of the world's people on one-fourth of the earth's land surface.

The Communists are supremely confident of victory. They believe that you and I, under the constant pressure of the cold war, will give up, one by one, our democratic customs and traditions. We'll adopt emergency temporary totalitarian measures, until one day we'll awaken to find we have grown so much like the enemy that we no longer have any cause for conflict.

Three months before his last visit to this country, Nikita Khrushchev said, "We can't expect the American people to jump from capitalism to communism, but we can assist their elected leaders in giving them small doses of socialism, until they awaken one day to find they have communism." This is not a new thought. In 1788, James Madison told the Virginia convention, "Since the general civilization of mankind, I believe there are more instances of the abridgement of the freedom of the people by gradual and silent encroachment of those in power than by violent and sudden usurpations."

Others much more recently have counted on this with no realization they would one day be furthering the Soviet cause. A Socialist clergyman, writing in the New Leader, the Socialist magazine of 1927, called for a new strategy. He said Socialists should place themselves in Government jobs and work for Government ownership of power, and control of railroads, banking, and key industries. He called his program—"Encroaching Control." Not too long ago, Norman Thomas, six times a candidate for President on the Socialist Party ticket, commented that "the American people would never knowingly vote for socialism but that under the name of liberalism, they would adopt every fragment of the Socialist program."

Appealing not to the worst, but to the best in our natures, they have used our sense of fair play—our willingness to compromise—and have perfected a technique of foot-in-the-door legislation. Get any part of a proposed program accepted, then with the principle of governmental participation in that field established, work for expansion, always aiming at the ultimate goal—a Government that will someday be a big brother to us all.

Traditionally, one of the easiest first steps in imposing statism on a people has been Government-paid medicine. It is the easiest to present as a humanitarian project. No one wants to oppose care for the sick. Today, we have the costliest governmental medical program in the world in our Veterans' Administration hospitals. All of us are agreed that a man wounded in the service of his country is entitled to the finest in medical and hospital care. However, today three out of four Veterans' Administration beds are filled with patients suffering diseases or injuries neither originated by, nor aggravated by military service. There are only 40,000 service-connected disabilities in the United States, yet every year the Federal budget contains millions of dollars for additional Veterans' Administration hospital building and expansion. Counting the 23 million of us who are veterans plus other governmental programs, one of four citizens are entitled to some form of Government-paid medical or hospital care.

It is now proposed that all people of social security age be given Government-paid medical and hospital care. Once again, emergency is invoked, and we are given a picture of millions of senior citizens desperately needing medical care and unable to finance it. In all the emotional presentation, the backers of this program seem strangely reluctant to face the facts. In the last 10 years, 127 million Americans have come under the protection of some form of medical and hospital insurance. This includes more than two-thirds of those of social security age and more than 70 percent of all citizens. If the present rate of increase continues, by 1970 some 90 percent of the population will be so insured. As nearly as can be determined, less than 10 percent of our senior citizens require aid in meeting their medical needs.

The last session of Congress adopted a measure known as the Kerr-Mills bill to provide money for State-administered aid to these people. However, without even waiting to see if this meets the problem, a revised version of the once-defeated Forand bill is advocated to force all people into a compulsory Government health insurance program, regardless of need. Why? Well, ex-Congressman Forand provides the answer. He says, "If we can only break through and get our foot in the door, then we can expand the program after that." Walter Reuther has said his group makes no secret of the fact that they want nationalized health service for all. New American, a Socialist magazine, writes, "The Forand bill will not be paid for on the insurance principle according to factors of estimated risk. It will be paid for through the tax mechanisms of social security * * *. Once the bill is passed, this Nation will be provided with a mechanism for socialized medicine."

In 1935, social security started with a 3-percent contribution on $3,000 of income. Now it is 6 percent of $4,800; and if the proposed expansions plus the medical program are adopted, by 1969 it will be 11 percent of $5,000. It is no secret that pressure is being exerted to remove even the $5,000 ceiling and make social security payments be based on total gross income.

Social security was never intended to replace private savings, pensions, or insurance. It was to provide a basis for savings so that outright destitution would not follow unemployment by reason of death, disability, or old age. In that light, the actuarial experts in charge estimated in 1943 that by 1957 social security benefit payments would total $1.2 billion per year, but, the temptation to politicians to vote people a raise particularly in election years was too great. In 1957, the total outgo was more than $7 billion and in 1959 outgo began exceeding income. The recipients of social security benefits today will collect $65 billion more than they paid in. You and I, who are paying into this program are unfunded to an amount between $300 and $600 billion.

The average citizen has been led to believe he and his employer are contributing to a fund and that some day he will call upon this, his own money, to carry him over his nonearning years. But this isn't what Social Security representatives said before the U.S. Supreme Court. They stated that social security was not an insurance program and was not based on any actuarial standards. They stated that social security dues are a tax for the general use of the Government, and the payment of that tax does not automatically entitle anyone to benefits. Benefit payments are a welfare program which can be curtailed or canceled anytime Congress should so decide.

And what of our sons—the young man joining the work force in the next few years? He will be taxed to try and catch up on that mounting deficit. If he could have his social security tax to invest in private insurance, it would provide for almost double the benefits provided by social security. This is not the only price we are paying in individual freedom.

The press recently told of a group whose religion belief forbade their participation in any Government welfare program. Their property was seized and their cattle sold at auction to enforce their payment of social security taxes.

In education, the foot in the door was the $900 million National Defense Education Act of 1958. The excuse was, as usual, the cold war. Russia had put a sputnik into orbit; obviously, our educational system must be at fault. Now the largest spending lobby in Washington is promoting a $2½ billion program to alleviate allegedly crowded schools, underpaid teachers, and bankrupt school districts.

Again, the facts seem strangely at variance. Ninety-nine and one-half percent of the Nation's school districts have not even approached their bonded limit of indebtedness. A 35-percent increase in students over the last decade has been matched by a 134 percent increase in spending by the local communities. An increase of 10 million students has seen classrooms built for 15 million. Five hundred colleges, as of this moment, can take an additional 200,000 students without adding so much as a desk or chair. We are told we must build 60,000 classrooms a year for the next 10 years, but they forget to tell us we've been building 68,000 a year for the last 5 years and that continuation of this rate will give us a surplus of classrooms by 1970.

Of course, we want teachers to be paid adequately; and we are doing something about it. Their average pay has risen in the last few years from $3,100 to $5,300 annually. The truth is, not one shred of evidence has been presented that Federal aid of any kind is required. Could we possibly believe that three-fourths of $1 billion a year in Federal aid could solve any great emergency when we are spending nearly $20 billion a year at the local level?

Federal aid is the foot in the door to Federal control. In spite of their denials, their own words betray them. The director of public education of the State of Washington tells of the 2-year struggle of his State to meet the rigid requirments of the National Director of Education under the present act. He says, "This is Federal control by indirec-

tion—all the more dangerous because it poses as a Federal handout."

A former president of the National Education Association states publicly, "We might have to have temporary Federal control to bring about integration in the South."

A former chairman of the President's youth fitness program says, "We can no longer afford local management of the schools. We must have a national school system to compete on equal terms with Russia."

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has quadrupled its staff and admits it is working to create national standards of education and a national curriculum.

In short, Federal aid is the first step in a Federal school system with teachers and subjects removed from parental control on the theory that a bureau in Washington is better qualified to supervise the upbringing of our youth.

Twenty-seven years ago, our farmers were told that a Federal subsidy did not mean Federal control. Now we have seen a rancher, Evetts Haley, Jr., fined $4,000 for raising wheat on his own land and feeding it to his own cattle. The Supreme Court upheld his conviction with a single sentence ruling—"Yes, an agency of the Federal Government has the right to tell an American citizen what he can grow on his own land for his own use."

This Nation has tried to curb the production of a surplus by making it so financially attractive to produce a surplus that we own enough wheat to bake 25 loaves of bread for every person alive. In the State of New Mexico, citizens learned they could rent State-owned land for 25 cents an acre and immediately apply for and receive $9 an acre from the Federal Government for not planting the land.

All of the farm mess is concerned with the 20 percent of agriculture coming under Government regulation and subsidy. Eighty percent of our agricultural economy is out in the free market of supply and demand. It would seem that the answer to the farm mess would be to free the other 20 percent of governmental regimentation; but, what is being advocated? We are told that the only solution to the problem is to bring the other 80 percent into the Government program. To that end a plan is advanced that would result in the licensing of every farm in the United States with complete governmental regulation of production and price. Proponents of the measure admit it will require thousands of additional Government employees, more subsidy on a permanent basis, and reduction of supply to raise food prices 15 to 25 percent. As an example, it is estimated that meat would be reduced in quantity to about what we knew under rationing in World War II.

Thomas Jefferson said, "If we let Washington tell us when to sow and when to reap, the Nation shall soon want for bread."

Today, no one denies the American people would resist the nationalization of industry. But, in defiance of this attitude the Federal Government owns and operates more than 19,000 businesses covering 47 lines of activity from rum distilling to the manufacture of surgical equipment. The estimated book value of 700 governmental corporations is $260 billion. Operating tax-free, dividend-free, and rent-free in direct competition with its own citizens, the Government loses billions each year in these businesses.

The next time you are caught in traffic take satisfaction in the knowledge that one of these Government corporations built a six-lane highway in Spain. It runs 15 miles from Madrid to a gambling casino.

All of these things have led to the growth of a collection of internal powers and bureaucratic institutions against which the individual citizen is virtually helpless. We now have a permanent structure of Government beyond the reach of Congress and actually capable of dictating policy. This power, under whatever name you choose, is the very essence of totalitarianism.

I quote here a statement by Congressman JAMES B. UTT on this subject:

"We are rapidly coming to a point where a complete change of elected officials, including Congress and the White House, can mean little change in policy. You are governed more and more by people for whom you have never voted, for whom you never will vote, whom you have never seen, and whom you cannot recall by your vote. They are entrenched in the boards, bureaus and commissions, even at the policy level. For example, you may think that the Secretary of Labor sets the policy of his Department, but I know that much of the policy of that Department is set by civil service employees who have been with the Department for 20 years and they have no intention, now or ever, of recommending to the Secretary of Labor any policy which does not fit their personal philosophy of government, and you cannot remove them or replace them by your ballot. This is a form of invisible government and can lead to the most oppressive type of tyranny."

A year ago, a subcommittee of Congress reported its findings in the field of Federal employees. There are almost 2½ million. In 1942, there was 1 top-salaried executive for every 89 employees; today, there is 1 for every 17. The committee further reported it found little evidence that any bureau, agency, or commission created in answer to an emergency ever went out of existence after the emergency disappeared.

A case in point: Congress ordered the liquidation of the Spruce Products Corporation in 1920, but, 30 years later it was still in existence. This Corporation was founded in World War I to find spruce wood for airplane fuselages.

Some people attempt to justify government in business on the grounds of greater efficiency due to central control. An example of this efficiency can be found in the claims department of the Veterans' Administration insurance program. In that department, three Government employees take double the time to perform the task normally assigned to one employee in a private insurance company.

Hopeless as it may seen, we can do something about it. We must inform ourselves on the proposals pending in Congress. Look beyond the foot in the door to the ultimate aim. Weigh the price we must pay in individual liberty and whether these programs qualify as things the people can't do for themselves. Then write to your Congressmen and Senators. Also, don't forget to write now and then just to say "well done" to your Representative when he has acquitted himself well on the firing line.

A basic point to remember is that none of these extensions of socialism can be effected without money. The fodder upon which our Government has fed and grown beyond the consent of the governed is the fruit of the tax system whose only consistency is that a levy once imposed is seldom removed. An excise tax on telephones imposed during the Korean war was to curb telephone use during the emergency and really wasn't intended for revenue. The war is over, but the tax lingers on—the Government has discovered it needs the revenue. This particular tax, plus some of the hundreds of hidden and indirect taxes that burden us, accounts for one-third of your telephone bill. One hundred such taxes account for one-half the price of a loaf of bread, one-fourth the cost of an automobile, one-half your gas and oil.

Once we were told the income tax would never be greater than 2 percent and that only from the rich. In our lifetime, this law has grown from 31 to more than 440,000 words. We have received this progressive tax direct from Karl Marx who designed it as the prime essential of a Socialist state. In the surtax brackets, the steepest rate of increase occurs through the middle income range where are to be found the bulk of our small businessmen, professional people, and supervisory personnel—the people Marx said should be taxed out of existence. At $16,000 to $18,000 of income, a man reaches the 50-percent tax rate. From 50 percent on up to the confiscatory 91 percent rate, the Government can only justify these brackets on a punitive basis, for the gross revenue derived from all the tax of the 50 percent or above is less than three-fourths of $1 billion.

There can be no moral justification of the progressive tax. Perhaps that is why the bureaucrats pretend it is proportionate taxation. Proportionate taxation we would gladly accept on the theory that those better able to pay should remove some of the burden from those least able to pay. The Bible explains this in its instruction on tithing. We are told we should give the Lord one-tenth and if the Lord prospers us 10 times as much, we should give 10 times as much. But, under our progressive income tax, computing Caesar's share is a little different. If a $5,000 a year man today is prospered 10 times, his income tax increases 53 times as much.

Does this help the little man? A man with a gross income of $3,500, a wife and two children, will find when he has finished paying the hidden and indirect taxes, that the tax collector's share of his gross $3,500 is $1,059. Some suggest the answer to his problem is to tax the upper incomes even more—but what leeway is left? If the Government confiscated all personal income above $6,000 a year, the increased revenue wouldn't pay the interest on the national debt.

No nation in history has ever survived a tax burden of one-third of its national income. Today, 31 cents out of every dollar earned is tax and of that 31 cents, 23 cents goes to the Federal Government, leaving 8 cents to be shared by the State, county, and local community. No wonder we are told to ask for Federal aid. But wouldn't it make more sense to keep the money here in the first place instead of running it through that puzzle palace on the Potomac only to get it back minus a sizable carrying charge?

Lenin once said, "The way to destroy capitalism is to debauch the currency. Through a process of planned inflation, a government can quietly and unobservedly confiscate the wealth of its citizens."

Henry VII substituted copper for silver in his coins, and we have been no less deliberate in our inflationary policies. Our dollar has lost more than half its purchasing power in 20 years. Of course, we are told that incomes have kept pace, that we are earning twice as much so we are still holding our own. This reasoning overlooks the part played by the progressive tax which is based on the number of dollars earned—not their value. The man who earned $5,000 a year in 1940 must earn $14,000 today to break even and pay his increased surtax. The $10,000-a-year man faces an increase of $12,000 in his tax bill and must now earn $31,000 just to maintain the same purchasing power.

Project these figures ahead just 15 years, keeping the same annual rate of inflation and the same tax rate, and could anyone even pretend that free enterprise will exist? By 1975, the $5,000-a-year man will have to earn $33,000, and the $10,000-a-year man will have to earn $84,000 just to maintain their 1940 standard of living.

Here is the main battleground. We must reduce the Government's supply of money and deny it the right to borrow.

Two years ago, I appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee as a representative of the motion picture industry

to urge tax reform. This was an experience similar to going over Niagara Falls in a barrel—the hard way, upstream. In a month of hearings, representatives of practically every segment of our society appeared before the committee. All of them urged some kind of tax reform. It was obvious that the majority of the committee had little sympathy with our plea, so it was no surprise when, several months later, the committee decided to hold new hearings. This time no volunteers were allowed. A hand-picked group of predominantly campus economists appeared and talked of plugging loopholes to increase the Government's tax revenue. Most of these so-called loopholes are the legitimate deductions without which the whole tax structure would have long since proved unworkable. The suggestions included disallowance of property taxes and interest on loans for income tax purposes and even the elimination of 100-percent deductions of charitable contributions.

The biggest lobby in Washington pushing tax reform has a bill which will increase the Government's tax take about $18 billion. It is no coincidence that they have, on the other hand, recommendations for $18 billion worth of welfare legislation. This measure will actually be presented as tax reduction with some cut in surtax rates.

Those of the "liberal" persuasion say they "reject the notion that the least government is the best government.' They claim our citizens are not intelligent enough to spend their money properly. They feel the Government should take the money through taxation and then buy the welfare programs for the masses which they are not smart enough to buy for themselves.

When the old-fashioned idea of living within our means and paying something on the national debt is suggested, these same liberals tell us that "only State and local debt is bad." Through some exotic bookkeeping methods, they seem to feel that the Federal debt is meaningless. It is—it is incomprehensible.

If I had a 4-inch stack of thousand dollar bills in my hand, I'd be a millionaire. If we had the national debt of $293 billion before us in thousand dollar bills, the pile would be more than 18 miles high. Maurice Stans, former budget director, has said that this debt is only the part of the iceberg which shows above the surface. Legislation already enacted into law has obligated our Government to more $750 billion. Add to this the local and State debts plus the private debts of our citizens, and we find that we are mortgaged in an amount more than double the market value of every tangible asset and every foot of real estate in the United States.

When we point out the danger of more deficit spending, we are told, "we are sacrificing our security on the false altar of a balanced budget." This is not so. Our individual freedom and our free enterprise system are the very sources of our strength, and there can be little security any place in the free world if there isn't fiscal stability in the United States.

With no one using the term "socialism" to describe these encroaching controls, we find that today 1 out of 7 of the Nation's work force is on the public payroll. In just 15 years a 50 percent increase in employees has been met with a 170 percent increase in the public payroll. One-fourth of our medicine is socialized. Senator Byrd estimates that 40 million Americans receive some form of direct cash payment from government. We have a tax machine that in direct contravention to the Constitution is not designed to solely raise revenue but is used, openly and admittedly, to control and direct the economy and to equalize the earnings of our people.

Do not forsake the other issues; but, as Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes said, "Strike for the jugular. Reduce taxes and spending. Keep government poor and remain free." Write to your Congressmen as individuals. Fifty letters from a group such as this means more than a resolution or a petition. Demand immediate tax reform which will reduce the percentage of the national income taken by Government. There is a bipartisan tax reform bill, the Herlong-Baker bill, now before the House Ways and Means Committee. A 5-year gradual reduction of rates makes it the best planned tax reform bill introduced in the last hundred years. For every billion saved in Government spending, we can have a 2½-percent reduction of income tax.

If your Congressman should say we must cut costs first and then reduce taxes—don't stand for it. Remind him that no government in history has ever voluntarily reduced itself in size. Governments don't tax to get the money they need. Governments will always find a need for the money they get.

There can only be one end to the war we are in. It won't go away if we simply try to outwait it. Wars end in victory or defeat. One of the foremost authorities on communism in the world today has said we have 10 years. Not 10 years to make up our minds, but 10 years to win or lose—by 1970 the world will be all slave or all free.

In this land occurred the only true revolution in man's history. All other revolutions simply exchanged one set of rulers for another. Here for the first time the Founding Fathers—that little band of men so advanced beyond their time that the world has never seen their like since—evolved a government based on the idea that you and I have the God-given right and ability within ourselves to determine our own destiny. Freedom is never more than one generation away from extinction—we didn't pass it on to our children in the bloodstream. It must be fought for, protected, and handed on for them to do the same, or one day we will spend our sunset years telling our children and our children's children, what it once was like in the United States when men were free.

Address by Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy at the University of Georgia Law School, May 6, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most eloquent and inspiring statements on the problem of civil rights that I have ever seen was the address delivered by the distinguished Attorney General of the United States, the Honorable Robert F. Kennedy, on May 6, 1961, at the Law Day exercises of the University of Georgia Law School, Athens, Ga.

The courage and candor and, I believe, understanding with which the Attorney General spoke in Georgia are clear evidence of the intention of President Kennedy's administration to uphold the rule of law and the Constitution of the United States in the field of human rights.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Attorney General's address on this occasion will come to be regarded as one of the finest affirmations in many years of the American tradition of equal rights under the law.

The text of the address follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT F. KENNEDY, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

(Prepared for delivery at the Law Day exercises of the University of Georgia Law School)

For the first time since becoming Attorney General, over 3 months ago, I am making something approaching a formal speech, and I am proud that it is in Georgia. Two months ago I had the very great honor to present to the President, Donald Eugene McGregor, of Brunswick, Ga. Donald McGregor came to Washington to receive the Young American Medal for Bravery. In 12 bad hours, he led a family of four to safety from a yacht which broke up in high seas off the Georgia coast. He impressed all of us who met him with his quiet courage. And, as the President said, Donald McGregor is a fine young American—one of a long line of Georgians who have, by their courage, set an outstanding example for their fellow Americans.

They have told me that when you speak in Georgia you should try to tie yourself to Georgia and the South, and even better, claim some Georgia kinfolk. There are a lot of Kennedys in Georgia. But as far as I can tell, I have no relatives here and no direct ties to Georgia, except one. This State gave my brother the biggest percentage majority of any State in the Union and in this last election that was even better than kinfolk.

MUST PRESERVE FREEDOMS

We meet at this great university, in this old State, the fourth of the Original Thirteen, to observe Law Day.

In his proclamation urging us to observe this day, the President emphasized two thoughts. He pointed out that to remain free the people must "cherish their freedoms, understand the responsibilities they entail, and nurture the will to preserve them." He then went on to point out that "law is the strongest link between man and freedom."

I wonder in how many countries of the world people think of law as the "link between man and freedom." We know that in many, law is the instrument of tyranny, and people think of law as little more than the will of the state, or the party, not of the people.

And we know, too, that throughout the long history of mankind, man has had to struggle to create a system of law and of government in which fundamental freedoms would be linked with the enforcement of justice. We know that we cannot live together without rules which tell us what is right and what is wrong, what is permitted and what is prohibited. We know that it is law which enables men to live together, that creates order out of chaos. We know that law is the glue that holds civilization together.

ACCEPT COURT DECISIONS

And, we know that if one man's rights are denied, the rights of all are endangered. In our country the courts have a most important role in safeguarding these rights. The decisions of the courts, however, much we might disagree with them, in the final analysis must be followed and respected. If we disagree with a court decision and, thereafter, irresponsibly assail the court and defy its rulings, we challenge the foundations of our society.

The Supreme Court of Georgia set forth this proposition quite clearly in 1949 in the

case of *Crumb* v. *the State* (205 Ga. 547–552). The court, referring to U.S. Supreme Court decisions, said there and I quote:

"And whatever may be the individual opinion of the members of this court as to the correctness, soundness, and wisdom of these decisions, it becomes our duty to yield thereto just as the other courts of this State must accept and be controlled by the decisions and mandates of this court. This being a government of law and not by men, the jury commissioners in their official conduct are bound by the foregoing ruling of the Supreme Court of the United States, notwithstanding any personal opinion, hereditary instinct, natural impulse or geographical tradition to the contrary."

Respect for the law—in essence that is the meaning of Law Day—and every day must be Law Day or else our society will collapse.

The challenge which international communism hurls against the rule of law is very great. For the past 2 weeks I have been engaged, for a good part of my time, in working with General Taylor, Admiral Burke, and Mr. Dulles, to assess the recent events in Cuba and determine what lessons we can learn for the future.

COMMUNISM CHALLENGES LAW

It already has become crystal clear in our study that as the President has stated so graphically, we must reexamine and reorient our forces of every kind. Not just our military forces, but all our techniques and outlook here in the United States. We must come forward with the answer of how a nation, devoted to freedom and individual rights and respect for the law, can stand effectively against an implacable enemy who plays by different rules and knows only the law of the jungle. With the answer to this rests our future—our destiny—as a nation and as a people.

The events of the last few weeks have demonstrated that the time has long since passed when the people of the United States can be apathetic about their belief and respect for the law and about the necessity of placing our own house in order. As we turn to meet our enemy, to look him full in the face, we cannot afford feet of clay or an arm of glass.

Let me speak to you about three major areas of difficulty within the purview of my responsibilities that sap our national strength, that weaken our people, that require our immediate attention.

CRIME SAPS NATIONAL STRENGTH

In too many major communities of our country, organized crime has become big business. It knows no State lines. It drains off millions of dollars of our national wealth, infecting legitimate businesses, labor unions, and even sports. Tolerating organized crime promotes the cheap philosophy that everything is a racket. It promotes cynicism among adults. It contributes to the confusion of the young and to the increase of juvenile delinquency.

It is not the gangster himself who is of concern. It is what he is doing to our cities, our communities, our moral fiber. Ninety percent of the major racketeers would be out of business by the end of this year if the ordinary citizen, the businessman, the union official, and the public authority stood up to be counted and refused to be corrupted.

This is a problem for all America, not just the FBI or the Department of Justice. Unles the basic attitude changes here in this country, the rackets will prosper and grow. Of this I am convinced.

The racketeers, after all, are professional criminals. But, there are the amateurs—men who have law-abiding backgrounds and respectable positions, who, nevertheless, break the law of the land. We have been particularly concerned lately in the Department of Justice about the spread of illegal price fixing. I would say to you, however, it is merely symptomatic of many other practices commonly accepted in business life.

Our investigations show that in an alarming number of areas of the country businessmen have conspired in secret to fix prices, made collusive deals with union officials, defrauded their customers and even in some instances cheated their own Government.

COMPETITIVE ENTERPRISE BEST HOPE FOR FREEDOM

Our enemies assert that capitalism enslaves the worker and will destroy itself. It is our national faith that the system of competitive enterprise offers the best hope for individual freedom, social development, and economic growth.

Thus, every businessman who cheats on his taxes, fixes prices, or underpays his labor, every union official who makes a collusive deal, misuses union funds, damages the free enterprise system in the eyes of the world and does a disservice to the millions of honest Americans in all walks of life.

Where we have evidence of violation of laws by the respectables, we will take action against the individuals involved, as well as against their companies. But in the end, this also is not a situation which can be cured by the Department of Justice. It can only be cured by the business and unions themselves.

The third area is the one that affects us all the most directly—civil rights.

CONFLICT OF LAW AND LOCAL CUSTOMS

The hardest problems of all in law enforcement are those involving a conflict of law and local customs. History has recorded many occasions when the moral sense of a nation produced judicial decisions, such as the 1954 decision in *Brown* v. *Board of Education*, which required difficult local adjustments.

I have many friends in the U.S. Senate who are southerners. Many of these friendships stem from my work as counsel for the Senate Rackets Committee, headed by Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN of Arkansas for whom I have the greatest admiration and affection.

If these southern friends of mine are representative southerners, and I believe they are, I do not pretend that they believe with me on everything or that I agree with them on everything. But, knowing them as I do, I am convinced of this:

Southerners have a special respect for candor and plain talk. They certainly don't like hypocrisy. So, in discussing this third major problem, I must tell you candidly what our policies are going to be in the field of civil rights and why.

First let me say this: the time has long since arrived when loyal Americans must measure the impact of their actions beyond the limits of their own towns or States. For instance, we must be quite aware of the fact that 50 percent of the countries in the United Nations are not white; that around the world, in Africa, South America, and Asia, people whose skins are a different color than ours are on the move to gain their measure of freedom and liberty.

From the Congo to Cuba, from South Vietnam to Algiers, in India, Brazil, and Iran, men and women and children are straightening their backs and listening, to the evil promises of Communist tyranny and the honorable promises of Anglo-American liberty. And those people will decide not only their future but how the cause of freedom fares in the world.

In the United Nations we are striving to establish a rule of law instead of a rule of force. In that forum and elsewhere around the world our deeds will speak for us.

In the worldwide struggle, the graduation at this University of Charleyne Hunter and Hamilton Holmes will without question aid and assist the fight against Communist political infiltration and guerrilla warfare.

AMERICANS LIVE BY RULE OF LAW

When parents send their children to school this fall in Atlanta, peaceably and in accordance with the rule of law, barefoot Burmese and Congolese will see before their eyes Americans living by the rule of law.

The conflict of views over the original decision in 1954 and our recent move in Prince Edward County is understandable. The decision in 1954 required action of the most difficult, delicate, and complex nature, going to the heart of southern institutions. I know a little of this. I live in Virginia. I studied law at the University of Virginia. I have been privileged to know many able southern soldiers, scholars, lawyers, jurists, journalists, and political leaders who have enriched our national life. From them I have drawn some understanding of the South, but my knowledge is nothing to yours.

It is now being said that the Department of Justice is attempting to close all public schools in Virginia because of the Prince Edward situation. This is not true, nor is the Prince Edward suit a threat against local control.

We are maintaining the orders of the courts. We are doing nothing more nor less. And if any one of you were in my position you would do likewise for it would be required by your oath of office. You might not want to do it, you might not like to do it, but you would do it.

For I cannot believe that anyone can support a principle which prevents more than a thousand of our children in one county from attending public school—especially when this step was taken to circumvent the orders of the court.

Our position is quite clear. We are upholding the law. Our action does not threaten local control. The Federal Government would not be running the schools in Prince Edward County any more than it is running the University of Georgia or the schools in my State of Massachusetts.

In this case—in all cases—I say to you today that if the orders of the court are circumvented, the Department of Justice will act.

We will not stand by or be aloof. We will move.

Here on this campus, not half a year ago, you endured a difficult ordeal. And when your moment of truth came, the voices crying "force" were overridden by the voices pleading for reason.

And for this, I pay my respects to your Governor, your legislature, and most particularly to you, the students and faculty of the University of Georgia. And I say, you are the wave of the future—not those who cry panic. For the country's future you will and must prevail.

ACCEPT 1954 COURT DECISION

I happen to believe that the 1954 decision was right. But, my belief does not matter, it is the law. Some of you may believe the decision was wrong. That does not matter. It is the law. And we both respect the law. By facing this problem honorably, you have shown to all the world that we Americans are moving forward together, solving this problem, under the rule of law.

An integral part of all this is that we make a total effort to guarantee the ballot to every American of voting age, in the North, as well as in the South. The right to vote is the easiest of all rights to grant. The spirit of our democracy, the letter of our Constitution and our laws require that there be no further delay in the achievement of full freedom to vote for all. Our system demands upon the fullest participation of all its citizens.

The problem between the white and colored people is a problem for all sections of

the United States. And as I have said, I believe there has been a great deal of hypocrisy in dealing with it. In fact, I found when I came to the Department of Justice that I need look no further to find evidence of this.

GOVERNMENT ACTS TO HALT DISCRIMINATION

I found that very few Negroes were employed above a custodial level. There were 950 lawyers working in the Department of Justice in Washington, and only 10 of them were Negroes. At the same moment the lawyers of the Department of Justice were bringing legal action to end discrimination, that same discrimination was being practiced within the Department itself.

At a recent review for the visiting leader of a new African state, there was only one Negro in the guard of honor. At the Bureau of the Budget, Negroes were used only for custodial work.

The Federal Government is taking steps to correct this.

Financial leaders from the East who deplore discrimination in the South belong to institutions where no Negroes or Jews are allowed and their children attend private schools where no Negro students are enrolled. Union officials criticize Southern leaders and yet practice discrimination with their unions. Government officials belong to private clubs in Washington where Negroes including ambassadors are not welcomed even at mealtime.

My firm belief is that if we are to make progress in this area—if we are to be truly great as a Nation, then we must make sure that nobody is denied an opportunity because of race, creed, or color. We pledge, by example, to take action in our own backyard, the Department of Justice, we pledge to move to protect the integrity of the courts in the administration of justice. In all this, we ask your help, we need your assistance.

ADVOCATES REASON AND RULE OF LAW

I come to you today and I shall come to you in the years ahead to advocate reason and the rule of law.

It is in this spirit that since taking office I have conferred many times with responsible public officials and civic leaders in the South on specific situations. I shall continue to do so. I do not expect them always to agree with my view of what the law requires, but I believe they share my respect for the law. We are trying to achieve amicable, voluntary solutions without going to court. These discussions have ranged from voting and school cases to incidents of arrest which might lead to violence.

We have sought to be helpful to avert violence and to get voluntary compliance. When our investigations indicate there has been a violation of law, we have asked responsible officials to take steps themselves to correct the situation. In some instances this has happened. When it has not, we have had to take legal action.

These conversations have been devoid of bitterness or hate. They have been carried on with mutual respect, understanding, and good will. National unity is essential and before taking any legal action, we will, where appropriate, invite the southern leaders to make their views known in these cases.

WARNS AGAINST ANOTHER LITTLE ROCK

We, the American people, must avoid another Little Rock, or another New Orleans. We cannot afford them. It is not only that such incidents do incalculable harm to the children involved and to the relations among people. It is not only that such convulsions seriously undermine respect for law and order, and cause serious economic and moral damage. Such incidents hurt our country in the eyes of the world. We just cannot afford another Little Rock or another New Orleans.

For on this generation of Americans falls the full burden of proving to the world that we really mean it when we say all men are created free and are equal before the law. All of us might wish at times that we lived in a more tranquil world, but we don't And if our times are difficult and perplexing, so are they challenging and filled with opportunity.

To the South, perhaps more than any other section of the country, has been given the opportunity and the challenge and the responsibility of demonstrating America at its greatest—at its full potential of liberty under law.

WILL ENFORCE CIVIL RIGHTS STATUTES

You may ask, will we enforce the civil rights statutes. The answer is: "Yes, we will."

We also will enforce the antitrust laws, the antiracketeering laws, the laws against kidnapping and robbing Federal banks, and transporting stolen automobiles across State lines, the illicit traffic in narcotics and all the rest. We can and will do no less.

I hold a constitutional office of the U.S. Government, and I shall perform the duty I have sworn to undertake—to enforce the law, in every field of law and every region.

We will not threaten, we will try to help. We will not persecute, we will prosecute.

We will not make or interpret the laws. We shall enforce them vigorously, without regional bias or political slant.

All this we intend to do. But all the high rhetoric on Law Day about the noble mansions of the law; all the high-sounding speeches about liberty and justice, are meaningless unless people—you and I—breathe meaning and force into it. For our liberties depend upon our respect for the law.

On December 13, 1889, Henry W. Grady of Georgia said these words to an audience in my home State of Massachusetts: "This hour little needs the loyalty that is loyal to one section and yet holds the other in enduring suspicion and estrangement. Give us the broad and perfect loyalty that loves and trusts Georgia alike with Massachusetts—that knows no South, no North, no East, no West, but endears with equal and patriotic love every foot of our soil, every State of our Union.

"A mighty duty, sir, and a mighty inspiration impels every one of us tonight to lose in patriotic consecration whatever estranges, whatever divides. We, sir, are Americans, and we stand for human liberty."

Ten days later Mr. Grady was dead, but his words live today. We stand for human liberty.

The road ahead is full of difficulties and discomforts. But as for me, I welcome the challenge, I welcome the opportunity, and I pledge my best effort—all I have in material things and physical strength and spirit to see that freedom shall advance and that our children will grow old under the rule of law.

A Poem in Honor of President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem written in honor of President Kennedy, by Miss Marty Hale, "The Old Spinner," 883 Buena Vista Blvd., Steubenville, Ohio:

WRITTEN IN HONOR OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, JOHN F. KENNEDY

(By Marty Hale, "The Old Spinner," 883 Buena Vista Blvd., Steubenville, Ohio)

He is rocking alone in his old rocking chair,
His young shoulders bearing a world's load of care.
Cramming a lot of work into each day,
He is trying to rock the world's burdens away.
The path he has chosen the boy knew was rough,
But he figured himself as sufficiently tough.
And we think that he is. So our faith we place there,
With this young man who rocks in the old rocking chair.

He must uphold the honor his land has achieved,
Through the years of hard struggle for things we believed.
Strange things sometimes happen, and it just might be so,
The great problems be solved as he rocks to and fro.
Hate and spite are rampant, and the world is so ill,
And its healing must lie in this so-young man's will.
God bless him and guide him we say, with the prayer
That our freedom be saved by his old rocking chair.

What Can We Do for America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am glad to place in the RECORD a thoughtful and constructive editorial entitled "What Can We Do for America?" It is written by Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and appeared in the April 1961 issue of the Federation's magazine Nation's Agriculture. It deserves careful consideration and I hope its conclusions will be reflected in appropriate congressional action:

WHAT CAN WE DO FOR AMERICA?

(By Charles B. Shuman)

In his inaugural message, President Kennedy challenged all of us with the statement—"Ask not what America will do for you, ask what you can do for your country." At times of great crisis Americans have repeatedly demonstrated their loyalty and willingness to sacrifice everything, even life itself, for their homeland.

Freedom is our most precious possession and we do not intend that it shall be taken from us by any other power on earth. Unfortunately, we sometimes forget that freedom must be earned by each generation and unless we are eternally vigilant, it may slip away from us without a single missile being fired.

Many of the slave state dictatorships of the modern world have been established by power-mad minorities who took advantage of the complacency and selfishness of their own citizens—not by major military operations of a foreign power.

Not long ago I was shocked by a letter from a farmer who said, "You talk about

freedom; I would be glad to give up some of my freedom for $1.20 corn."

A factory worker wishes to exchange some of his freedom for increased unemployment compensation.

The schoolteacher wants the entire community to give up certain freedoms in order to get Federal money for school salaries.

The land owner justifies his subsidy for the purchase of agricultural limestone with the cliche—"Others get government subsidies."

The secretary of a local chamber of commerce cannot understand why obtaining a Federal appropriation for the local airport or a dam on a nearby river means the sacrifice of a certain amount of freedom.

Freedom includes many privileges—freedom of worship, of speech and of the press; the opportunity to move about without permit or supervision; the right to choose an occupation or to change jobs; and often overlooked but extremely important—the right to own property and to decide how to spend one's income.

As citizens turn more and more to government for economic gain—for big spending projects—taxes spiral upward and confiscate a higher portion of each person's income. It has been estimated that taxes now take approximately one-third of total national income in the United States.

Since the cost of the basic needs of life—food, shelter, and clothing—now require 50 percent or more of the average family's income, there remains only about 17 percent for free choice spending and for saving.

Each time Congress appropriates money for a sewage disposal plant for a prosperous city, a subsidy for the airlines or the billions of dollars lost in supporting farm prices we all give up an essential part of our freedom—the freedom to decide how to use the income from our work.

The argument is often made that good schools, adequate highways, higher farm prices, and safe airline transportation are highly desirable and that since the politicians are willing to provide these things taxpayers should be happy to give up some of their freedom of choice. The fallacy here is that all of these things can be obtained, and at less cost, without huge Federal spending programs.

Just what did President Kennedy mean when he said "Ask what you can do for your country"? One newly appointed Washington bureau chief contends that he was calling for higher taxes and more regimentation—a modern form of economic slavery. This view is supported by recent recommendations for big increases in Federal spending. In any case, the President has presented a worthy challenge. He is correct in placing the responsibility on the citizens—not Members of Congress or other elected officials. The greatest thing we can do for America is not to "ask."

The Will To Fail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, on the subject of our foreign relations, I recommend to you this thought-provoking article by Marguerite Higgins as it appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on May 8:

THE WILL TO FAIL
(By Marguerite Higgins)

WASHINGTON.—The swift undoing in Laos of the independence to which the United States has long been publicly committed is due neither to the fighting qualities of the Royal Lao Army nor to the presence of too many Cadillacs in Vientiane.

It is due fundamentally—and—inescapably—to the fact that America's will to defend Laos by force if necessary rather than let it go down the drain appears in doubt before the world. The Communist bloc no longer finds the only real deterrent in its way—the possibility of American counteraction—to be completely credible.

And, Kennedy historians please note, it is this possibility of help to Laos from the outside and this alone that kept the Communist Vietminh neighbors of Laos in Hanoi from sending some of their 300,000-man army to seize the strategic prize that is the mountain kingdom. Alone, Laos could have fallen at any time, irrespective of what particular mode of pressure the Reds decided to bring.

It doesn't matter whether the Vietminh soldiers came into Laos in organized battalion strength or, as in fact happened, as officers and technicians to command and supply so-called Pathet Lao forces. If the Communist world with all its vast resources of guns and ruses could be sure that its sole opponent on the ground would be the 20,000 men of the Royal Lao Army, then Laos was in due course theirs for the taking.

As to the Cadillacs, since when did honor, integrity and popularity with the masses save an unwilling victim from communism?

Jan Masaryk, Eduard Benes, free Czechoslovakia—where are they now?

And if it is going to be argued that they are where they are because Russian troops were on Czechoslovakia's borders, the answer must be made that so were American troops on Czechoslovakia's borders. (U.S. occupation troops in Germany.) And the fact that people remember the former but forget the latter provides an insight—not just to Communist estimates but to worldwide estimates of America's will to help those on its side at a time when something far more precious than a Cadillac is required.

If corruption in Laos were really an issue, the time for the Communists to have struck was between 1954 and 1958. But not August, 1960. For the fact is that the government of that time, led by Premier Tiao Samsonith, whose overthrow last August by Capt. Kong Le began the present tragedy, was by far the most progressive Laos ever had. If John Cool, the American director of the village help program and the one American who has really been to the grassroots in Laos, is to be believed, there is an excellent case for asserting that the Pathet Lao went back to war last year because their hopes of winning by political means were going glimmering.

There is, indeed, in Laos itself a province that aptly demonstrates the irony and tragedy of the belief that having the support of the people is a shield against communism. This is Xieng Thousang Province, peopled by the Meo tribesmen who fought the Communist Pathet Lao so fiercely both before and after their invasion that the tribe is being hunted down with a ruthlessness that indicates genocide. And yet fiercely anti-Communist Xieng Thousang Province was the first to be seized in this latest Red offensive.

"Thank God there was a Korea," an American diplomat said the other day. "For there the Communists found out that, even if every outward sign showed that America would not fight, they couldn't count on these signs because at the last minute America could change her mind."

And the crucial necessity of maintaining the deterrent of doubt explains why professional diplomats around town raised their eyebrows when Senator FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, engaged in what Washington has dubbed "the wrong words at the wrong time at the wrong place." (A televised declaration opposing American intervention in Laos under virtually any conditions, made when critical negotiations with the Communists depended on their being faced with this possibility as a deterrent to their aggression.) Said a veteran diplomat: "If Senator FULBRIGHT'S words had been taken by the Communists as serious American policy, it could have had tragic results on the battlefield by removing the last real incentive for the Communists to stop the fighting."

In southeast Asia the United States dared to tempt the Communists with weakness—not of arms but of will. And however well meant, public declarations of a will to let freedom fail in Laos rather than intervene cannot but help to undermine the West's negotiating position, not only on the battlefield but in the crucial conference on Laos at Geneva.

Domestic Cancer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DOWDY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Domestic Cancer," published in the Sunday, May 7, 1961, edition of the Palestine (Tex.) Herald-Press, be made a part of the appendix to the RECORD.

The malignancy that is eating away the moral structure and very vitals of our system of government is becoming increasingly apparent and more and more disturbing to many American citizens. This fine editorial is further evidence of that fact:

DOMESTIC CANCER

Thinking Americans of all walks of life, dismayed by the severe losses this country has taken in recent weeks in dealing with international communism, are wondering what is wrong. What has happened to the courage this country has always before shown in the face of adversity?

One very wise man we know supplies the answer. He says the United States "is eaten up with domestic cancer."

It is the cancer of being lackadaisical, the cancer of failing to react against the things in American life that are clearly wrong. We are not being defeated by communism. Instead, by failing to show the industry, the honesty, and the pride of work that is a major part of the American heritage, we are dying the slow death of rot—the rot of moral and physical courage.

The blame is easy to assess. Americans have lost their strength of individual character and purpose because Federal paternalism and soft living, coupled with incentive-destroying Federal taxes, have made the majority voluntary wards, as far as thinking is concerned, of the master-minds of Washington. But assessing blame for the past, that has brought us to a dangerous present, serves no purpose now.

In the present, and facing a relentless Communist enemy, it is up to all of us as Americans to bring back, if we can, our

American courage to do the right, and our temper to resent the wrong.

Resentment against wrong has been lulled to sleep. Most Americans merely shrugged, for example, when they learned that the Nation's biggest manufacturers of electrical equipment had been engaged in a massive and lengthy program of price fixing. So what? That was the usual comment, if comment was made.

Now comes word, from top officials in the U.S. missile program, that sloppy work and featherbedding, coupled with strikes, slowdowns, and astronomical wage scales, have drastically added to the cost of this vital defense program while slowing down development of missile bases to the point of acute national danger. During the four and a half years this country has been working to set up missile bases at 22 sites, there have been 327 major work stoppages and strikes. Refuse has been tossed into fuel tanks, perhaps causing some of our missile failures. And on wages:

A Cape Canaveral apprentice electrician has been drawing $748 a week. Unskilled laborers at some bases draw $287 a week, truckdrivers up to $324 a week, elevator operators $360.

In other years public indignation would have been instant and volatile. Now the topic hardly makes conversation.

We are in the most intense danger this country has ever faced in its history, and we are not going to survive unless we shake off national lethargy, in our private lives as well as in government. Yet neither category has shown real signs of shaking it off.

In answer to the missile base problem, Labor Secretary Arthur Goldberg has assigned a three-man team to try to resolve jurisdictional disputes between the unions. He also has appealed to the unions to stop striking.

Such a powder-puff approach to the problem would be inexcusable in a time of world tranquility. With the very existence of the United States at stake, it borders on idiocy. Yet, there's no point in getting too hard on Goldberg. How resentful have you been? How much capacity for resentment against wrong, or determination to correct it, remains in the average American?

Law and the Free Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an essay written by a 14-year-old girl from Alamogordo, N. Mex., Miss Barbara Lawless. The essay was the winner of a contest sponsored by the VFW auxiliary for junior high students, and I count it a privilege to call it to the Members' attention:

LAW AND THE FREE CITIZEN

Law is not something that this Nation, or even this country, can claim as its own. Even ancient tribes had their type of justice. Down through the ages, from the Greeks and Romans, the French and English, from Hammurabi's Code to the Magna Carta, the foundation for our code of law was being laid. Drawn up by our Founding Fathers, our Constitution, the law of the land was based on ancient and preceding law. The Constitution—and I refer also to the Bill of Rights—was established to protect not only a new republic, but also to safeguard the rights of individuals. Used properly, and as originally intended, our Constitution will accomplish these aims. If used improperly, however, untold damage may result. When the Constitution is not merely interpreted, but actually made over to fit a few individual ideas, then it is time to be wary, for our road to disaster is not only being paved, but actually being laid out.

Our country is distinguished from totalitarian forms of government principally by the rights of the individual. While a person living in an Iron Curtain country may be a citizen, he has no individual rights. We could hardly say that he is a free citizen.

A free citizen is one who, either by birth or naturalization, is recognized as having the rights of a citizen and is independent from the state. His rights cannot be infringed upon. He can, within reason, do what he pleases, unless his rights encroach upon the rights of another.

It has been said that the Constitution gives equal rights and privileges to everyone. In reality this is not always correct. Often a person's wealth, prestige, race or beliefs have interfered. While perhaps this may be unfair, it is a condition that exists and must be dealt with, not only by the legal profession, but by unprejudiced citizens.

Justice Hugo Black explained the position of the courts on equal rights in 1939 when he stated: "Courts stand as havens of refuge. No higher duty rests upon this court than that of translating into living law and maintaining this constitutional shield, deliberately planned and inscribed for the benefit of every human being."

When we study the crime rate we begin to understand how our system of law and order is seriously being undermined. Crime has outpaced the population at a rate of 4 to 1. The Federal Bureau of Investigation states, in its Uniform Crime Report of 1959, that crime has increased 69 percent over 1950. Having the highest crime rates of all civilized nations, we realize that all free citizens do not value their freedom highly.

There is perhaps no area in which the law is as openly disregarded as in respect to mobs. A country ruled by mobs inevitably falls. Police usually go easy on mobs, fearing that if they used some old time courage of law and order they will be called Gestapo brutes. As the fairly recent Communist-led demonstrations on the House Committee on Un-American Activities in San Francisco showed, unless the law cracks down on our misguided and disloyal free citizens, the mobsters and rioters will soon be running the country.

In 1940 the American Bar Association issued a statement on mob rule which is still applicable today. The statement said, in part: "Illegal violence in any circumstances cannot be justified upon grounds of supposed necessity. Orderly methods exist under our Constitution and law which are fully adequate to protect the legitimate interests of all groups. There is no place in this country for mob rule. Individual liberty cannot long endure in a society which allows violence to supersede the law."

Many otherwise respectable citizens continually flout laws they consider unjust. The high rate of traffic fatalities alone bears testimony to this condition.

In return for the law's protection, a free citizen has certain obligations to meet. Although he may feel that a certain law is unjust, the free citizen has a moral responsibility to obey all laws. It is far better for him to urge his legislators to change the unjust law than to determine for himself which laws he will observe. The free citizen conforms to the law, yet retains his individuality, doing what the law commands and conscience demands. While many shirk from jury duty, and although many plans have been advanced to abolish the jury trial, the facts remain that the jury is one of the most important planks in the platform of freedom. It is a free citizen's right and duty to serve on a jury when called. As noted attorney Melvin Belli has remarked, "If one man could infallibly tell the truth we would be ready for trial by him." Since such a human Solomon doesn't exist, we shall keep and treasure jury trial.

When a free citizen is in need of legal advice, he should exercise his right to an attorney. It has been said that the person who tries to be his own lawyer usually has a fool for a client. This is not to imply that a little knowledge is not a very valuable thing. Since he is presumed to know the law, ignorance is no excuse in the eyes of the law.

The free citizen, having the privilege of suffrage, has an obligation to vote for responsible officials. The law does not apply itself, but requires good men to make, apply, and interpret it.

Throwing aside apathy and laziness, all loyal free citizens should become informed and take a part in our government of law, remembering the words of that great Roman statesman, Cicero: "Only in states in which the power of the people is supreme has liberty an abode."

The Man in the Glass Cage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Herald American and the Daily Republican of Monongahela, Pa., on Tuesday, May 2. This thoughtful editorial on the Eichmann case merits the widest possible dissemination and for that purpose, I am placing it in the Appendix of the RECORD and commend it to all Members for careful reading.

THE MAN IN THE GLASS CAGE

In the issue of Life magazine of November 28, 1960, Adolph Eichmann, now on trial in the State of Israel for crimes against the Jewish people and others during the Hitler regime, stated: "My first assignment there (in 1935 in Berlin) had been extremely dull, sorting what ultimately became a huge card index of Jews, Freemasons, members of various secret societies and other subversive elements in the Reich." This revelation explains more than anything else the underlying purpose in bringing to historic justice the notorious defendant.

Israel regards Eichmann as the symbol of a wholly different concept of society for the Western World. This refers to the totalitarian state, for it is only in the monolithic world as envisioned by Hitler that Jewry and organizations like Freemasonry, Knights of Columbus, YMCA, Kiwanis, Rotary, and others are not permitted to exist. The Soviet Union is a typical example of a regime where such groups would be considered subversive within the meaning indicated by Eichmann. Red China is another glaring example. Accordingly, such organizations, because of their essential character in adhering to democratic principles, do not fit into the

authoritarian scheme. Jews and Christians, as far as dictators are concerned, are therefore in the same boat. Their concepts on substantive rights of the individual are identical.

We should note, incidentally, as Eichmann's trial unfolds, the application of the self-evident truth of Lord Acton's declaration: Power corrupts; absolute power corrupts absolutely.

For awhile, Germany, like Russia and Red China, had become a totalitarian state. Hitler was the head and exercised unbridled power having invested in himself dictatorial authority. Eichmann was one of many millions in Germany who submitted to an unmitigated despotism. The extent of his commitment to the hooked cross was clearly established during his interrogation in Israel. "I would have killed my own father," he said, "if I had been told that he was a traitor." Eichmann made no reply when it was suggested that such a charge against his father should be supported by competent evidence.

Countless Eichmanns had become creatures of the Nazi monstrosity, an evil that did not die when Hitler committed suicide in his Berlin bunker. They were the completely valid examples of the actual criminals in Hitler's Reich. It is because of a certain degree of depravity reflected in his obedience that Eichmann is now being tried. He had taken a leading part in history's most ghastly massacre.

The purpose of the trial of the man in the glass cage, it should be emphasized further, is to show that the unceasing struggle against the causes of deterioration in human relations is continuing with unabated zeal. The administration of justice by the Nuremberg International Tribunal constitutes the pattern for the Eichmann trial. And now as then, the sole purpose is to demonstrate the basic proposition that society has the right to protect itself against destructive elements in its midst.

It is hoped, too, that Israeli justice will point the way, through the trial of one unspeakably foul creature, to the promotion of virtue and intelligence of people everywhere.

Law Enforcement Speaks to Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, last Monday, May 8, the second annual law observance exhibit was dedicated at the Philadelphia National Bank, Broad and Chestnut Streets, at 12:30 p.m. It was again sponsored by the Philadelphia Chapter of the Federal Bar Association, law observance committee. This exhibit was entitled "Law Enforcement Speaks to Youth."

The Attorney General of the United States, Robert F. Kennedy, in writing to the chairman of the committee about the exhibit, said:

Many persons who will see your exhibit will gain a new insight into the high caliber of law enforcement in our country.

He also remarked in a letter attached to these remarks:

The vigor, dedication, and skill of the Philadelphia Chapter in making this unique contribution sets a high standard and an excellent example which I hope other public-spirited organizations will see fit to emulate.

I have included a copy of the splendid remarks by Harry D. Shargel, Esq., the indefatigable chairman of the law observance committee, as well as a memorandum on the highlights of the exhibit and the personnel who participated.

This type of program may well be a factor in the effort to reduce crime by encouraging the people to observe, respect, and obey the law:

REMARKS BY HARRY D. SHARGEL, CHAIRMAN, LAW OBSERVANCE COMMITTEE, MAY 8, 1961

The Federal Bar Association (Philadelphia chapter) through its law observance committee is engaged in a year-round program to promote respect for law and those who enforce it.

Our activities are designed to educate the public in the functions of the Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies; to urge the public to respect and uphold the law; and to improve the morale of law enforcement personnel, broaden their training, enhance the prestige of law enforcement as a career and help attract the highest caliber of personnel to this field. We have promoted coordination among law enforcement agencies, prosecuting attorneys, the judiciary, penologists and welfare organizations.

As part of our endeavors we have caused posters to be displayed bearing the slogan, "The Law Protects You, Respect It, Uphold It, Obey It"; published a directory of law enforcement agencies; sponsored television programs designed to educate the public concerning the fine work of law enforcement agencies; organized coordination conferences among those concerned with crime and delinquency; arranged the distribution to teachers, parents and students of relevant literature; established a speakers' bureau which furnishes speakers in furtherance of our program; arranged for the establishment of a degree course in police science and administration at Temple University and organized exhibits.

Today we inaugurate our second annual law observance exhibit under the theme of "Law Enforcement Speaks To Youth." We have chosen to emphasize the message to youth because we live in a period of an ever-mounting crime rate among our young people. It is important that they realize the importance of law observance—that respect for law and law observance are essential to the preservation of America's freedoms. They and all of us should become familiar with the fine work of each law enforcement agency and realize that the law enforcement agent, whether a local policeman, State official, or Federal agent, is a friend dedicated to public service and the protection of each of us.

We want to make parents and children alike, aware of the fine career opportunities in the law enforcement field and to attract the best of our youth to seek this field as a career. The higher educational facilities available in this area through the degree course of police science and administration offered by the Community College of Temple University, and the courses in public administration offered by the Fels Institute of the University of Pennsylvania, emphasize the high professional opportunities available to those who have the ambition, ability, and willingness to dedicate themselves to the public service. The opportunities for advancement are unlimited.

I want to express my appreciation to the Philadelphia National Bank for making this space available and to especially commend the bank's Vice President Charles Hoeflich and Federal Bureau of Investigation Field Supervisor Norris Harzenstein for organizing and coordinating this exhibit.

MESSAGE FROM ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES, READ AT DEDICATION CEREMONIES, MAY 8, 1961

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., April 28, 1961.

MR. HARRY D. SHARGEL,
Federal Bar Association,
Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR MR. SHARGEL: The law observance committee of the Philadelphia Chapter of the Federal Bar Association, in promoting respect for the law and those who enforce it, is making an outstanding contribution to law enforcement.

I wish to express my appreciation and best wishes to the Philadelphia chapter in its latest endeavor to aid and assist law enforcement. Many persons who will see your exhibit will gain a new insight into the high caliber of law enforcement in our country. The vigor, dedication, and skill of the Philadelphia chapter in making this unique contribution sets a high standard and an excellent example which I hope other public spirited organizations will see fit to emulate.

I wish you all success.

Sincerely,

ROBERT F. KENNEDY,
Attorney General.

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE LAW OBSERVANCE EXHIBIT, "LAW ENFORCEMENT SPEAKS TO YOUTH"

District attorney's office: The display of the district attorney's office focuses upon the problem of juvenile delinquency in Philadelphia and specifically the relationship of the courts and the district attorney's office in the handling and supervising of juveniles who find themselves in trouble with the law.

Federal Bureau of Investigation: Extensive and dramatic exhibit depicting the training of special agents, identification through finger prints and scientific solution of a bank robbery. Portrays career opportunities for young people at various tasks at headquarters in Washington and at local office. Shows samples of educational materials furnished to schools, young people and parents, industry and police. Many of these will be available to the public at the bank. The exhibit is keynoted by quotation from J. Edgar Hoover, "The American people can solve any problem they want if they wake up to the facts, and go into action." This applies whether the problem is that of the mounting rate of crime or the dangers from communism.

Fairmount Park guard: Feature canine corps with live dogs and trainers to depict their remarkable record in holding down crime and delinquency in park areas. Portray area of jurisdiction including 7,700 acres of park area, 60 miles of bridle paths, recreation centers, playground and swimming areas. Also 85 miles of parkways and drives which carry a large amount of auto traffic in Philadelphia.

Police department: The Philadelphia Police Department's exhibits depict several facets of interest: the variety of civilian career opportunities in the department all the way from clerk-typist to administrative analyst; the new adjutant group, which was established to recruit and train promising young men for police work; additional education available to police of all ranks through the board of education, Community College of Temple University and Fels Institute of the University of Pennsylvania; the application of electronic data processing to police work in analyzing the time, place, etc., of crime as well as anticipating where accidents are prone to happen; how to keep a business burglary proof; and an analysis of the occurrence of accidents by day of the week. Pamphlets on how to aid police in preventing burglaries and on how to guard against shoplifters will be distributed to the public. Literature relative to educational opportunities for police will also be made available.

Postal inspector: An exhibit furnished by the Bureau of the Chief Inspector, Post Office Department portrays the history of the postal inspection service beginning with its inception in 1737 when Benjamin Franklin was first appointed by the British Colonial Postmaster General as postmaster of Philadelphia and given the additional duties of regulating the several post offices and bringing the postmasters to account. The display shows an outline of functions and graphically portrays the general areas of investigation: Post office burglaries, holdups of mail custodians, poisons and bombs sent through the mail, extensive direct mail selling of pornography, and fraudulent schemes by unscrupulous promoters.

U.S. TREASURY ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES

Alcohol and tobacco tax: Will have photographs of illicit alcohol and "moonshine" stills and contraband firearms.

Coast Guard: Display depicts their enforcement activities with relation to the safety and security of the port of Philadelphia.

Customs Bureau: Official photographs will show the smuggling of contraband into the United States by various schemes and devices.

Secret Service: Will display genuine and counterfeit currency and photographs depicting their work in the fields of counterfeiting and the protection of the President.

WHYY–TV and radio: The exhibit depicts the use of educational television and radio as a weapon in the fight against delinquency and crime.

DEDICATION OF THE LAW OBSERVANCE EXHIBIT, "LAW ENFORCEMENT SPEAKS TO YOUTH"

HOST

Philadelphia National Bank, Frederick A. Potts, president; Charles Hoeflich, vice president.

EXHIBITORS

District attorney's office: James C. Crumlish, Jr., district attorney; Paul M. Chalfin, first assistant district attorney.

Fairmount park guard: Francis C. Deegan, sueprintendent; Philip J. Cella, inspector.

Federal Bureau of Investigation: Fred A. Frohbose, special agent in charge, Philadelphia.

Police department (Philadelphia): Albert N. Brown, commissioner; Howard R. Leary, deputy commissioner.

Post Office Department: A. J. Harkins, postal inspector in charge, Philadelphia.

Treasury Department: Alva M. Meyers, regional commissioner. Alcohol and Tobacco Tax: Louis DeCarlo, assistant regional commissioner. Coast Guard: Henry U. Scholl, captain of the port of Philadelphia. Customs Bureau: Charles Beiswinger, customs agent in charge. Secret Service: Joseph P. Jordan, special agent in charge.

WHYY–TV and Radio: Richard S. Burdick, managing director.

Temple University Community College: Dr. William A. Schrag, dean.

University of Pennsylvania Fels Institute: Dr. Stephen B. Sweeney, director; Dr. Thomas J. Davy, assistant director.

SPONSOR

Federal Bar Association: Thomas G. Meeker, national president; A. S. Harzenstein, national vice president, third district.

Federal Bar Association (Philadelphia chapter): President, Congressman Herman Toll; first vice president, Harry D. Shargel; second vice president, Judge Earl Chudoff; third vice president, Russell J. Borden; treasurer, Herman R. Testan.

Law observance committee: chairman, Harry D. Shargel, special assistant to general counsel; Military Clothing and Textile Supply Agency. Members: David Berger, city solicitor; Paul M. Chalfin, first assistant district attorney, Philadelphia; Earl Chudoff, judge, court of common pleas, Philadelphia; Louis DeCarlo, district coordinator of Treasury enforcement agencies; Ephraim Gomberg, executive vice president, Philadelphia Crime Commission; Norris S. Harzenstein, Federal Bureau of Investigation, field supervisor; James McGirr Kelly, assistant U.S. Attorney; Herman Toll, Member of U.S. House of Representatives; Harold K. Wood, judge, U.S. District Court.

Community relations adviser; Milton A. Eisenberg, director of public relations, Yellow Cab Co., of Philadelphia.

Adviser on radio and television: Martha A. Gable, director of radio and television, Philadelphia public schools.

Adviser on municipal police problems: Howard R. Leary, deputy police commissioner, Police Department of Philadelphia.

An Unfair Tax Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee is conducting hearings on the President's tax proposals. The Chicago Daily News' editorial on Monday, May 1, 1961, discussed these same proposals with the following editorial entitled "An Unfair Tax Proposal." I believe this analysis is an accurate appraisal of the issue involved:

AN UNFAIR TAX PROPOSAL

Canada has carried wealth-leveling pretty far, but never so far as the United States in the double taxation of corporate earnings. Even Socialist Britain did not exact the harsh bite imposed here.

In 1954, Congress passed a token acknowledgment of the injustice of the U.S. treatment of income from dividends. President Kennedy now recommends that this be canceled.

The 1954 law excludes $50 of dividends from taxation and allows a taxpayer to deduct from total taxes 4 percent of his income from dividends. This was a miniature recognition of the fact that the earnings from which the dividends were paid to the corporation's owners were already taxed at 52 percent.

Canada allows a 20 percent individual tax credit, in contrast to the United States 4 percent.

The case was made for the token exemption that it would be useful in attracting capital for productive enterprise, and promote a desirable broadening of the base of industry ownership. That may have been a debater's argument; the ground for the credit was quite good enough on a simple basis of equity.

The President says the dividend credit has been found to favor taxpayers in high brackets more than those in low. Naturally; and why shouldn't it? The allowable deduction for medical expenses is of more benefit to the cancer patient than to the man who has a wart removed. It should be.

The President's proposal for withholding tax on dividends and interest seems to us only slightly less dubious.

He said that $3 billion a year in interest and dividend payments are not being reported. But it does not follow that all of this income is taxable at the withholding rate—or even taxable at all.

Failure to report taxable income cannot be condoned, but it is a drastic remedy to withhold taxes on the earnings of small savings accounts and the few dollars of dividends going to any thousands of small stockholders. They would be entitled to rebates, of course, but that involves trouble, perhaps an acutely inconvenient loss of time, and heavy expense to the Government.

In attempting to justify the President's recommendations, Treasury Secretary Dillon asserted that, anyway, the dividend tax credit was "only a token" toward easing the double taxation of dividends. That is to concede its inequity, but to contend that the relief is so slight that it might as well be removed.

If Mr. Dillon had been candid, he would simply have said that the Government needs all the money it can extract, and it can probably get more with the fewest and most easily disregarded squawks from the owners of securities.

This seems to us to be pandering to the popular itch to soak the rich and the thrifty on the ground that they can survive it, and haven't much right, anyhow, to be better off than the rest of us. It is not a creditable motive for taxation.

Publisher William Dwight Welcomed to New Hampshire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PERKINS BASS
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include an editorial from the May 8 Nashua Telegraph welcoming William Dwight, of Holyoke, Mass., to New Hampshire. Mr. Dwight recently purchased the Concord Daily Monitor, published at Concord, N.H., from Mr. James Langley, who has served New Hampshire and the Nation with distinction. Mr. Langley was recently our Ambassador to Pakistan, and since 1923 has published the Concord Monitor. Associated with Mr. Dwight in the new Concord Monitor management are two young men familiar to the House, his son Bill, who served as assistant to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE], and the general manager of the Monitor, Tom Gerber, for many years an able and respected member of our press gallery. We wish them all success:

[From the Nashua Telegraph, May 8, 1961]

WELCOME TO NEW HAMPSHIRE

The Nashua Telegraph welcomes the new owner of the Concord Daily Monitor, William Dwight, of Holyoke, Mass., to New Hampshire.

The Monitor, a long-established and responsible daily newspaper in our State for more than a hundred years, will remain in good hands under the control of Mr. Dwight, who has operated a family newspaper in Holyoke, Mass., for many years and who recently bought a newspaper in Illinois and is part owner of a daily in Greenfield, Mass.

The change in ownership means partial retirement of the longtime owner of the Monitor, James M. Langley, from the newspaper field in this State after some 40 years as guiding director of the only daily newspaper in our State capital. We are sorry to see Mr. Langley retiring from the publishing field—but it is to a reward he richly deserves. The lanky publisher of the paper,

a familiar figure to most newspapermen in the State, will serve as consultant to the new management and, we expect, write some of his pungent, hard-hitting editorials.

Mr. Langley purchased the Monitor in 1923 and combined it with the ailing Patriot—in those days there were two daily papers in the capital city—and under his management the paper has prospered and has won the respect of its readers.

Bill Dwight is well qualified to carry on the high traditions set by the retiring owner of the Monitor. He has been in the newspaper business since cradle days, figuratively speaking, through family ownership of the Holyoke paper. His mother, the late Minnie Dwight, was one of the great figures in New England journalism and ran the newspaper up until her death at an advanced age several years ago.

On his own he brought credit to that newspaper and to the newspaper business in general. He is a past president of the American Newspaper Publishers Association, the New England Daily Newspaper Association and last week at the annual meetings in New York he was elected a director of the Associated Press, which serves this newspaper and hundreds of others throughout the world.

His known abilities in this important form of communications can only augur well for the people of Concord and for all of New Hampshire.

Welcome to New Hampshire, Bill.

Dangerous Tax Ideas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I addressed the House of Representatives with respect to the administration's tax message. I made specific reference to three aspects of that message which I believe would be damaging to our American free enterprise economy if they were adopted. One of these aspects on which I commented pertained to the suggestions for changes in the tax treatment accorded foreign income. I stated that this proposal constituted an "economic Pearl Harbor" and embraced the slogan "Yankee Come Home." The Journal of Commerce of May 10, 1961, contains an editorial captioned "Dangerous Tax Ideas," which discusses the administration's proposals for taxing foreign corporations in which American investors have an interest. As a part of my remarks, I will include that editorial in the RECORD at this point:

DANGEROUS TAX IDEAS

Congress may soon receive draft legislation from the administration providing for immediate and heavier taxation of earnings of foreign subsidiaries of American corporations.

This action, recommended by President Kennedy and Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon for balance of payments and revenue purposes, would tax parent companies on the earnings of subsidiaries in "economically advanced countries" (industrial nations such as the West European countries and Canada).

It has been estimated by officials that this move, combined with proposed different tax treatment of the so-called tax haven corporations and compensation of Americans working abroad, would net the Treasury around $250 million in 1963 and improve the balance of payments by about twice that amount.

Currently, parent U.S. companies are taxed on earnings when received (dividends) of foreign subsidiaries.

We believe that the administration proposal to tax earnings of foreign subsidiaries located in these industrialized countries would be most ill advised, on policy grounds. Furthermore, it would ultimately weaken our balance of payments position and also would not automatically lead to heavier investment in the less developed nations, as some assume.

At a time when the best possible relations with the other industrialized nations (many of them our NATO allies), are so obviously imperative to our future well-being, such taxation could impose an undesirable strain.

Consider such taxation from the host country's point of view. Foreign subsidiaries controlled by U.S. parent companies are nonetheless domestic corporations that must and should act as good citizens or residents of the country where they operate and earn their way.

Decisions regarding what to do with income after payment of local taxes, accordingly, should give due consideration to the needs of the host country. Of course, a reasonable host country expects that the parent company which took the risk and utilized its funds and skills in setting up the subsidiary should be recompensed. Once a subsidiary has got well under way, it frequently has remitted a bit more than half of earnings to the parent, the remainder being ploughed back to finance growth.

On the other hand, if parent companies have to pay taxes on the entire earnings of subsidiaries in countries with lower corporate tax rates so that U.S. tax credits would not offset the proposed new U.S. taxation, the former will be under pressure to push for remission of a greater proportion of subsidiary earnings.

Transfer of a larger proportion of subsidiary earnings could help our balance of payments on short-term, perhaps by $500 million in the first year in which the proposed new tax measures were fully effective. But, in the long run, the effect would be the opposite.

American companies have been investing abroad on a generally raising scale since the forties and our balance of payments has been benefiting from this. Last year the return on private direct investment abroad probably amounted to around $2.4 billion, while the outflow of funds for direct investment ran around $1.5 billion. Thus, direct investment provided a clear net of nearly $1 billion.

Basic correction of our balance of payments, which last year showed a huge deficit of $3.8 billion, is absolutely essential, but by means that do not threaten to be self defeating in the end as would this tax proposal.

The less developed and developing nations are in urgent need of more capital to enable them to step up production and to raise standards of living. Private foreign investment that carries with it managerial and technical skills can help importantly in achieving these aims, but decisions to do so, to invest in less developed countries, are not made becaus U.S. capital must move.

Capital can always stay at home. Or it can be invested in foreign interest and dividend-paying securities as it was in the latter half of last year when the payments deficit rose to record proportions in spite of an extremely large export surplus in our merchandise trade.

If and as opportunities develop in the nonindustralized countries and the latter provide an attractive climate for private direct investment, U.S. corporations can be expected to establish subsidiaries if this does not hamper expansion plans at home and also if the companies are not deterred by fears of betrayal by the U.S. Government.

In our broad interest, Congress should refuse to accept the administration's proposals for taxation of earnings of foreign subsidiaries in the economically advanced countries before such earnings are received here.

The House Ways and Means Committee should not approve legislation carrying out the administration's proposal, without modifying it drastically. The proposals appear clearly contrary to this country's longstanding principle of taxing income only as the U.S. corporation earns or receives it.

The Lincoln Enigma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLARD S. CURTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, the Lehigh County Republican Committee, in the district that I have the honor to represent, annually sponsors two essay contests on the "Life and Ideals of Abraham Lincoln" as a part of the Lincoln Day celebrations, one being for senior high school students and the other for junior high school students of Lehigh County. The winning selections are made by a board of distinguished educators from several hundred essays submitted. I am very proud of the fine students and the essays they submit. This year, the contest for the senior high school students was won by Terry Lee Eck, a Parkland High School sophomore.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the winning essay of this young man, entitled "The Lincoln Enigma":

THE LINCOLN ENIGMA

Millions of words have been written about Abraham Lincoln and countless books about his life, career, and death can be found on almost every library shelf. Almost every phase of his life, career, and untimely death have been explored by dramatists, authors, and historians. Little has been written, however, about the Lincoln that might have been, the Lincoln that may have lived, the Lincoln America lost. Much of Lincoln is an enigma, in this I am interested; it is in this phase I am concerned.

Let us flash back to the year 1865. Suppose that on the evening of April 14, 1865, Lincoln had not visited Ford Theater; suppose Abe Lincoln had lived. What would the course of American history have been like in the next decade, for the rest of the century, today?

There never was a darker period in our history than the years following the close of the Civil War called the reconstruction era. This was a period marked by selfishness, corruption, political ambitions, and greed. All these horrible things fixed themselves upon our people—particularly upon

our Southern brothers. Due to the death of Lincoln, the mantle of responsibility fell upon President Johnson who by circumstances was forced to face the reconstruction era. Congress vehemently opposed Johnson because they hated his Southern birth and felt that his reconstruction methods were too lenient toward the rebellious South.

These became the ingredients of a conflict destined to last a decade. The failure to resolve it led to the crimes so well known and so shamefully a part of the history of the era. What about Lincoln had he lived? Might there not have been a brighter hope?

The basic philosophies of Lincoln and Johnson were generally the same. Both believed fundamentally in the equality of all men. Both men pondered in their hearts the theory that the South had never left the Union, and that the South had received more than sufficient punishment through the dreadful battles that made up the history of the Civil War.

The difference, then, does not lie in the philosophies of these two men as it does in the way each practiced his belief. Lincoln possessed many qualities so essential to good character. He was sympathetic, slow to anger, self-educated in the formal arts, and a master of human nature. He knew the right time to be firm, and the moment it was necessary to be kind. In his simple homespun manner he was humble, but confident in that what he knew, he knew well. Lincoln was very much a humanitarian in that he was deeply concerned with people, their fortunes, their problems, and their rights. Lincoln believed that no man should rule another man without that man's consent. His whole attitude toward the postwar South and its problems can be capsuled in these few words from his second inaugural address:

"With malice toward none, with charity for all,

With firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on * * * to do all which may achieve and cherish, a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all Nations."

There are explainable reasons why Lincoln and Johnson while having the same views as to the reconstruction theory often pursued different courses in achieving their ends. Among these reasons lies the basic idea that the personalities and approaches of these two men were vastly different. Johnson was a crude, quick-tempered man. He was undiplomatic, drab, and colorless. He had little self-confidence. It would be unfair to say that his conduct stemmed from the fact that he was not a humanitarian. Johnson followed closely and even patterned his reconstruction policies with slight variation after those of Lincoln. At all times he kept the welfare and the few remaining rights of the southerners foremost in his mind. The lack of tact, so evident in Johnson, was soon to ruin his career, wreck reconstruction, and disgrace the pages of American history. Congressional leadership was determined to crush him.

We must recognize that even possessing these outstanding qualities of sympathy, understanding, and honesty, Lincoln would have met opposition in the likes of Thaddeus Stevens and Charles Sumner. These men were committed to the exact opposite theory to that expressed by Lincoln and Johnson, namely, that the South must be punished for their inhuman crime of rebellion. The war they said had subdued them, reconstruction must punish them.

The political polish and personal finesse possessed by these leaders of Congress, Stevens and Sumner, were too much for Johnson; but Lincoln, with his simple, direct, and understanding manner most definitely would have been more than equal to the challenge these men afforded. His cleverness, shrewdness, and political know-how would have given Lincoln a decided political edge over these men. Had Lincoln lived, these men would not have been able to control reconstruction like one who merely pulls a string to move the hands of a puppet. Johnson, although a sincere and honest politician, was too quick to act. He lacked the ability to attract support to his cause and this was so much a necessity if the Congress was to be brought around to the presidential way of thinking. Johnson was therefore not able to handle the men through whose hands his policies would have to pass. Lincoln knew how to manipulate the intricacies of politics that would have built the machine in Congress so necessary to put a program through.

Assuming then that Lincoln had lived—bearing in mind his keen political sense and his virtuous patience—let us take a candid look at what the United States today might have been like. Let us consider our present national status if "Honest Abe" had been at the helm throughout the Reconstruction Era.

Consider the integration crisis in the South. Would the Little Rock incident have ever occurred? The problem would not have been nearly so acute. Lincoln's mild policies would have led to a gradual absorption of the Negro into the southern society and at present color would not be a serious barrier. Bitterness and hatred caused by the harsh reconstruction policy that was eventually fixed upon the South would not have developed. It is very probable that the Negro would have achieved economic, political, and social status slowly but progressively as the facilities for better education were opened to him.

Ever since the war, bitterness has existed between the North and the South. Terms such as "damn Yankee" and "dirty rebel" can still be heard occasionally. Surely the policies of Lincoln would have led to a healing of all the Nation's wounds and these phrases would not have become part of our national vocabulary.

Under the plan which went into effect in 1865, the South was plunged into economic turmoil. Little progress toward rehabilitation was made and hunger existed everywhere throughout the South. The foreign trade of the South was cut to nothing. All of these horrors could have been spared had Lincoln lived. His plan called for a simple economic transition built upon a quick restoration of southern white economy.

Another horrible page in American history could have been spared if the scalawags and carpetbaggers, who were political opportunists, had never gained power in the South. Lincoln's plan had no place for these men as he firmly believed in a restoration of the dignity of the southern white.

Many people cringe at the mention of the Civil War because it meant "brother against brother." After this terrible event, however, insult was heaped upon injury when "brother was used to guard brother" in the unnatural circumstances of martial law. Martial law is generally regarded as being contrary to the democratic spirit of the free people. The South would have been spared this suffering had Lincoln lived because there was no place in the Lincoln plan for armies of occupation. Much of the hatred bred in the South by the use of these armies might never have developed.

It is difficult to comprehend, but true that the facts of history would have been vastly different. There would have been no disputed election of 1876. Without martial law two sets of election returns would never have been submitted by the Southern States. The existence of an Election Count Act of 1877 would not have been necessary. The impeachment of President Johnson would not have blotted our history and the Tenure of Office Act would never have been passed or repealed.

Probably the greatest change one would notice, had Lincoln lived, would be the stronger unity of purpose existing between the sections of the country. Assuming that things would have been pretty much as we have described them, it is proper to assume that the whole nation would be, today, displaying much stronger nationalism.

We can not prove that these things would have been this way, but we can not assume that they would not have been this way. We understand Lincoln well enough to know that these things (all of them) could have been. America might have been a better place in which to live and our national posture may have been more secure. Death, however, removed Abraham Lincoln from the mainstream of American life. Many of these mythical assumptions surrounding his career will, therefore, forever remain an enigma.

The Lillian Diebold Poling Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, next Sunday, May 14, is Mother's Day, founded over 40 years ago. For the past 27 years the American Mothers Committee, Inc., has had as one of its major functions the selection of an outstanding mother to be honored annually. This committee is dedicated to the development and strengthening of the moral and spiritual foundations of the American home and to give to the observance of Mother's Day a spiritual quality which highlights the standards of ideal motherhood in the significant role of the mother in the home, the community, the Nation, and the world. The committee, a nonprofit organization, is recognized by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce—and each year the Mother of the Year is graciously received at the White House. Mr. J. Edgar Hoover has said, "The fact that the American Mothers Committee, Inc., has indicated its determination to take action on a problem nationwide in scope and bearing the seeds of great danger to the future of our country is most encouraging."

With the cooperation of Governors, educators, civic leaders, and major organizations, each State selects from many worthy nominees its choice for the State mother. This is a fact of which each Member of this body is personally aware because many of the wonderful women from each district have been so honored. From these fine women the American mother is chosen after prayerful consideration by a national jury. This year, in addition to the national mother just announced this week, the committee will pay tribute to the president, Mrs. Daniel A. Poling, naming her their first honorary president. Nineteen hundred and sixty-one has been declared the Lillian Diebold Poling Year. Numerous tributes will be paid to this remarkable 81-year-old mother. As a fellow Ohioan, it gives me great pleasure to call attention to her achievements.

Four score years and one. And all but her very young childhood years have been dedicated to the service of humanity. Lillian Diebold Poling was born on May 7, 1880, in Canton, Ohio, and educated in the schools of that city. She received her certificate for teaching in home economics from the University of Ohio, in Columbus. At a very early age her interest was centered upon the home and the great need for improving the living conditions of the underprivileged. In Canton, Ohio, with this thought uppermost in her mind, she became chairman of an Americanization committee, organized a nursery during the flu epidemic of World War I, and as a teacher of home economics in a school district with 14 nationalities she founded the Little Nell House. Here young girls were given instruction in homemaking and the boys were taught worthwhile trades—they helped build the Little Nell House. As this indomitable young woman went about her teaching, the need for adequate meals for little children drew her attention. She pioneered in the Middle West the program of serving milk to underprivileged children in the public schools. But it was to all humanity that she was devoted. From the neglected and undernourished children to the young girls in need of counseling and direction, and then to the older forgotten mothers—shutins in hospitals and institutions, no longer remembered by their families, with few pleasures in their daily lives—these were another concern of Lillian Poling.

In Philadelphia she founded the religion-in-life group, bringing together Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish women for the purpose of interfaith understanding. How for nearly a decade she has been president of the American Mothers Committee. To her determination to develop and strengthen the moral and spiritual foundation of the homes of America goes the major credit for the basic program of the committee—family life institutes and counselor motherhood services, reaching young mothers with preschool-age children, helping them with the problems of their new lives and in the rearing of their little ones—the future hope of America.

At the age of 81, this most remarkable woman, in addition to her duties as the wife of one of the world's most prominent ministers and editors, Dr. Daniel A. Poling, sustains a daily schedule of activities that would tax the stamina of a 60-year-old. Mrs. Poling's chief interests and activities have always centered in the church. She has organized and conducted prayer groups, taught Sunday school classes and for several years, served as president of the international and interdenominational Woman's Board of Home Missions. Her achievement with her own family is a beacon light for all, bringing to her the recognition of her State. In 1945 she was chosen the Pennsylvania mother of the year. Dr. and Mrs. Poling are the parents of eight wonderful children.

In 1955 Mrs. Poling was awarded the medallion of honor of the Women's International Exposition as a woman of achievement for that year. Already in 1961 Stetson University, of DeLand, Fla., has conferred upon Lillian Poling the university's distinguished service award. On November 2 a testimonial dinner will be given in her honor in the Sert Room of the Waldorf-Astoria, New York.

We salute this illustrious mother, Lillian Diebold Poling, president of the American Mothers Committee, Inc.:

GOD FASHIONED HER

He took the laughter of a child,
A naiad's grace; a spirit kind
And innocent; a voice as mild
As waters deep,
And whatsoe'er was undefiled
To have and keep.
All things soever pure and good
By mortals known or understood;
All charms of healthful solitude
And social grace;
He mingled in divinest mood
To light her face.
He took the softness of the dove
To make her gentle; looked above
As if to catch the glamor of angelic art,
And then He breathed a mother's love
Into her heart.

Safety of Southeast Asia Hinges on Firm United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

SAFETY OF SOUTHEAST ASIA HINGES ON FIRM UNITED STATES

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

Southeast Asia is being lost to communism not in the jungles of Laos, but in the jungle of Washington, D.C.

A more impenetrable thicket of interdepartmental and office squabbling, of political backing and filling, of silly boasts and pacifist bleating, can not be found.

As a result, almost everybody in the Capital now realizes that, regardless of the cease-fire and the coming peace conference in Geneva, Laos has slipped through our fingers into the Communist Sing Sing. Just imagine—out of the 14 participants in such a conference, the United States can count on the firm support of only two, the Philippines and Thailand.

The several Communist members will support their Pathet Lao stooges. Britain, France, and India will be conciliatory, presumably to the point of surrender. The Premier-designate of "neutral" Laos, Prince Souvanna Phouma, is a Communist agent and will deliver the country to his bosses as completely and rapidly as he can. Laos, short of a miracle, is gone.

In view of President Kennedy's rash vows not to permit such a loss, this event will make the Cuban humiliation seem like a minor setback. To save him from unpopularity, certain apologists of retreat are busy explaining that his were just "promises which our better judgment told us we should not keep." (Then why make them and repeat them?)

But whose better judgment is meant? Not the Defense Department's (which would have the responsibility for making good), not mine, and, I hope, not yours.

Many think that the prospects of a successful stand in Laos—given the readiness of Pakistan, the Philippines, Vietnam, and Thailand to send troops—were not at all poor, provided the decision was made early enough. They see in the renunciation of Laos just one more unhappy attempt to disguise faint-heartedness as sound strategy.

But their advice was neglected or scorned. Faced with bold Soviet brinkmanship and the possibility of a new Korea, the President's chief advisers, led by the ever trembling State Department, decided that retreat was the better part of valor.

Conveniently overlooking the military potential of our Asian allies, these apologists of defeat successfully insisted that the United States was "over-extended." They meant that we do not today possess large enough ground forces and specially trained guerrilla fighters to win all local wars without using atomic weapons. And they are afraid to use these weapons.

If they are right about the size of our conventional forces, whose fault it is? Kennedy supporters lay the blame on the defense saving of the Eisenhower administration. True enough. But since J.F.K. entered the White House, to what has he given his chief attention? To minor domestic problems entirely irrelevant to the major job of stopping communism here and now. Not to saving Laos.

His requests for additional defense funds have been insignificant. Some of his trusted servants even argue that no amount of additional spending would increase the security of the United States, which is a flat lie.

Would not shelters that could save the lives of over half of all Americans in case of major war increase the security of the United States? Woud not crash programs in bigger rockets, in antimissile missiles, in space and in new weapons that are going to upset the present balance of terror—would not these increase the security of the American people?

Every intelligent student knows that they would—and that Khrushchev and Mao could hardly afford to keep up with us in a race for them. Nothing but the inertia and cold feet of its leaders prevents the free world from reasserting military preponderance in every important field.

To add a touch of humor to a tragic situation, some Americans suggest that, as a substitute for defending unhappy Laos, the President should send a new solemn warning to Mr. K. telling him that our present and past retreats before Communist bluff do not mean that we shall retreat forever.

But why should Khrushchev or Mao believe the President? For 20 years the United States has, with a few splendid exceptions, talked big and acted small. I believe that Mr. K. is now convinced that American leaders lack the guts to call his bluff and fight, if necessary, either in Laos or Berlin.

As for atomic weapons, how can a government that is resigned (or says it is resigned) to their role in defending Vietnam complain of having to use them for Laos? It makes no sense.

Meanwhile, the stake has grown from Laos to all southeast Asia. It includes Cambodia (already compromised by its scared rulers), South Vietnam (whose loyal leaders State Department officials criticize as "mandarins"), Indonesia (whose playboy President plays footsie with Communists ready to eat him), Thailand (presumably forced to come to terms with communism if South Vietnam goes) and, finally, huge and flabby India. What a prize for Khrushchev and Mao.

Is it too late to thwart them? Top American military leaders do not think so. They believe we can win, provided the United States immediately, in the next few days and not after the opening of the coming

Geneva Conference, sends American troops to Thailand and Vietnam while inviting neighboring Asian states to do the same. But nothing short of some such tangible demonstration of determination can change the situation.

These are no days for rabbit men.

Legislative Views as to the Value of the Sentencing Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address I made before the Sentencing Institute for the Fifth Circuit in New Orleans, La., Tuesday, May 9, 1961:

LEGISLATIVE VIEWS AS TO THE VALUE OF THE SENTENCING INSTITUTE

This is a particularly gratifying occasion for me—attending a sentencing institute in pursuance of the authorizing legislation which I sponsored in 1958. I am indebted to Judge Clayton for his kindness in inviting me and for the opportunity to renew so many old acquaintances among the judges.

It is a difficult but most worthwhile task that you have before you. We are living in troubled times. We are living in the midst of vast social changes, changes which have brought with them conflicting political philosophies and a rapidly developing technology that has uprooted old ways of life. Inevitably under these circumstances the traditional values of our society and particularly the administration of justice must struggle to maintain some semblance of stability.

But times of change are also times of challenge. I am confident that what we do today will eventually bring about a more orderly society, one that will enhance the moral values of the past and make them more meaningful in the future. As President Kennedy, in his historic and beautifully drafted inaugural address, said: "And if a beachhead of cooperation may push back the jungles of suspicion, let both sides join in creating a new endeavor—not a new balance of power, but a new world of law, where the strong are just and the weak secure and the peace preserved."

If we are to create that new world of law, we must, of course, look to our own laws and see to it that they are carried out firmly and fairly and with justice for all. In our system of government the judge inevitably occupies a central role in this all-important endeavor. On judgment day he is the one who speaks for society, and translates into his decisions the values and objectives of that society.

This central and difficult role of the judge is perhaps best illustrated in the realm of sentencing. As my good friend Judge Irving R. Kaufman wrote in the Atlantic Monthly last year: "If the hundreds of American judges who sit on criminal cases were polled as to what was the most trying facet of their jobs, the vast majority would almost certainly answer 'sentencing.' In no other judicial function is the judge more alone; no other act of his carries greater potentialities for good or evil than the determination of how society will treat its transgressors."

Apparently in recognition of the magnitude of this responsibility, the House Judiciary Committee has received over the years a number of proposals which would restrict a judge's discretion in imposing sentence or take that function out of his hands entirely. Every year there are introduced into the Congress a number of bills which would provide minimum mandatory penalties for certain types of crimes. We have had proposals to establish a method of sentence review, with the argument that at present the United States is the only nation in the Western World where, with the exception of a few states, one judge can determine with utter finality the minimum period of time which a convicted defendant must remain imprisoned. We also have had proposals to establish sentencing tribunals along the lines of the California plan which leaves the length of sentence and time of release on parole, to a State commission.

Personally I am convinced that sentencing is inherently a judicial function and that the judge, equipped with the necessary resources and advice, can carry out this function with more regard for principles of justice than persons untrained in the law and unfamiliar with the facts of a case. But a judge cannot, acting alone, be the end-all and the be-all as to whether the offender shall be incarcerated, and if so, for how long. He must and should take advice and counsel from various sources.

Judicial sentencing has been subject to considerable criticism, not without some justification. The inconsistencies that account for this criticism have stemmed from the fact that until relatively recently the judges have lacked the expertise, the resources and information that they have needed to accomplish the task of sentencing as skillfully as might be desired. Also, the courts themselves have not yet reconciled their individual viewpoints into a common sentencing philosophy. I emphasize that it is not exact mathematical uniformity that is important but rather an agreed upon approach to sentencing.

When eventually the courts have succeeded in working out the principles which underlie sound sentencing philosophy, I am sure it will be done through general acceptance of a set of values.

As you know there are different schools of thought as to the purpose of a sentence. Some believe that punishment of the offender is the primary objective of sentencing. And punishment does have its role in vigorously reaffirming the moral standards of our society.

Others believe that the sentence must be severe enough to scare potential criminals into compliance with the law. And I am not so sure that the deterrent purposes of the law have been adequately effective to keep down certain types of crimes. If the deterrent concept were absolutely true, there should really be no criminals. But as you know we have been punishing criminals for centuries and crime is still with us.

Still others believe that the offender should be kept in prison to immunize him physically, so to speak, from the commission of further crimes. None among us questions that there are criminals who must be treated in this fashion. They must be set aside as pariahs. Society must be shielded from them.

Then too there is the school which subscribes to the philosophy that the sentence must be adjusted mainly to the rehabilitative potentialities of the individual offender. This of course is most difficult to calculate but it is certainly one of growing importance in our search for civilized social justice.

But behind all of these purposes is the single objective—the protection of society. This is the judge's prime responsibility, and to fulfill that responsibility he must, in varying degrees apply each of these philosophies to the formulation of an equitable and fitting sentence. It is not a matter of choosing a rigid sentencing philosophy but a matter of finding a reasonable middle ground between competing considerations.

You are here today to search these considerations and to work toward a common meeting ground for the viewponts which you individually hold. No one expects that the formula for equitable sentencing will be found today or tomorrow, but your efforts here will contribute to an eventual solution to a problem which has existed as long as there have been judges.

You are here to give and take various opinions and viewpoints. You are here to discuss the various aspects of sentencing. On the anvil of discussion you may forge some helpful solutions of the vexatious problem.

The characters, personalities, mental makeup, education, experiences on and off the bench, differ with judges. Their philosophies, mental processes and judgments differ—hence their sentences differ. This is natural. Nonetheless patterns of sentencing can evolve that the judiciary will support.

You know there are 437 members of Congress, representing all sections of the United States having many differing points of view and attitudes. Somehow, in the legislative process, despite the varying attitudes, a common ground is found on which the majority can agree. With the exception of a very few bills, the acceptance of the common ground always is unanimous or nearly unanimous. So, too, I feel that the judges who come from as many sections of the country as do Congressmen, can agree upon a set of values and rules for their guidance in the sentencing of offenders.

The existence of sentence disparities has long been the subject of anxiety among those associated with the administration of justice. Every Attorney General since the Hoover administration has voiced his concern about it. Every Congress since the Roosevelt administration has considered bills to deal with it. And the Judicial Conference of the United States has had it under continuous study since 1938.

There still remains much basis for concern. Disparities are widespread and in many instances flagrant. For example, one of the last acts of President Eisenhower was to commute or reduce the sentence of a first offender to the time he had then spent in jail. This first offender was a combat veteran of two wars, who had been given a term of 18 years for forging six small checks. Only last year another first offender, out of work and desperate for funds to pay for the medical care of his sick wife, received a term of 15 years for cashing a check illegally for $58.40. At about the same time another defendant, whose background and crime were almost the same as the other man's, received a term of 30 days in Federal court for illegally cashing a check for $35.20.

At a Federal institution in the West a 47-year-old embezzler, with an unblemished past record, is serving 20 years, with 5 years probation to follow. This sentence was imposed despite experience which demonstrates that embezzlers are among the most hopeful prospects for rehabilitation and despite data indicating that across the Nation the Federal courts impose sentences averaging less than 2 years upon this type of offender.

Under appeal at the present moment is the case of a tax accountant who received a term of 31 years and 31 days on tax fraud charges last year. It was an extremely harsh sentence, and, of course, there is little the appellate court can do about the sentence directly. It cannot substitute its judgment for the trial judge. It can find some other ground, some technicality I suppose, to reverse the trial court and thus negate the sentence. In doing so, however, its own decision and opinion may be so strained as to handicap our legal system in future cases.

The sensivity of members of the Congress to disparity in sentencing is illustrated by a sentence that was imposed after my bill, the Celler sentencing law, was passed. A middle-aged bank clerk had embezzled approximately $70,000, much of which he used for the benefit of harassed debtors of the bank. This defendant was not motivated by personal gain, instead he manipulated the books of the bank to cover up the accounts of delinquent depositors. A judge, on assignment from another district, imposed a 12-year term without securing even as much information as could have been provided by a presentence report by the probation officer. One of my colleagues promptly introduced a bill which would make immediately eligible for parole any Federal offender who has been sentenced without the benefit of a presentence investigation report. This bill is again under consideration in the current session of the Congress.

In contrast to the excessively severe sentences I have cited, there are also the sentences which are excessively lenient. In 1960 a youth with a sex offense record was given 98 days for robbing a bank of $5,000. In another case an offender who was on probation on a robbery charge at the time of his crime received 1 year for holding up a bank at gun-point and obtaining $600. Again in the same court an offender with a similar background received a 1-year term for robbing a bank of $2,100 armed with a sawed-off shotgun. An eastern court imposed the so-called split-sentence on two defendants who also used a sawed-off shotgun in robbing a bank of more than $12,000. As you know, under split-sentencing, this amounted to only 6 months in jail.

From the data I have secured it appears that some courts are as prone to identify themselves with the plight of the defendant as other courts are prone to throw the book at him. Unduly lenient sentences fail to give the institutions sufficient time to re-educate and resocialize the offender. And they provide the basis for further doubt in the minds of the criminal element and the public alike that our laws are being administered impartially. It is this type of sentence, moreover, that lends so much strength to the group in the Congress who propose and favor minimum mandatory penalties for a growing number of offenses.

Thus it is that sentence disparities bring about both bad laws and bad interpretations of the law, as well as many other undesirable effects which undermine the purposes and prestige of the law.

I have heard the claim that such cases are rare, but they can be backed up by innumerable similar examples. Statistics tell the same story although, dealing as they do with averages, they tend to conceal the extremes in brevity and length of sentences. In the 1960 fiscal year the proportion of all types of convicted defendants placed on probation in Federal courts ranged from 69 percent in New Hampshire to 17 percent in eastern Lousiana. Forgers receive average terms of 63 months in western Oklahoma, but average terms of 9 months in southern New York. For auto theft, usually an offense involving the unauthorized use of an auto for a short-lived joyride, southern Iowa imposed terms averaging about 46 months, while western New York imposed terms averaging about 11 months.

The existence of marked disparities in sentences is undeniable. And I think it was to the credit of the Federal judiciary and a healthy augury for the future resolution of this problem that you acknowledged their existence and wanted to do something about it when, in 1958, I wrote you on the subject. Over 80 percent of the Federal judges who responded to my inquiry favored the establishment of these institutes as a means of finding some way to minimize these disparities. The proposal was also backed formally by the Judicial Conference of the United States.

It is also to the credit of the judiciary that they have acted promptly on the congressional authorization for these institutes. The first such institute, held on a national basis in Boulder, Colo., in 1959, did much to bring to light many of the issues which apparently account for disparities. I hope at this institute and at others scheduled for this year that further progress can be made on achieving the objective of the law, to formulate sentencing principles and criteria which will assist in promoting the equitable administration of the criminal laws of the United States.

The institute program assumes particular importance at this time. As you know, the Congress has under consideration a bill to authorize 70 or more new judgeships, and it is a measure which I strongly favor. However, many of the persons appointed to these offices will know little about sentencing philosophy when they reach the bench. Few, in any, will have had the awesome responsibility of imposing one. The institute program is ideally suited for their orientation in this difficult task which they will have to assume so abruptly.

Moreover, there is legislation pending in the Congress which will add substantially to the burden of their task. A number of bills have been introduced which, if enacted, will bring many new categories of offenders under Federal jurisdiction—gamblers, racketeers, almost anyone who might use some interstate facility in the commission of crime. The proposed broadening of the Fugitive Felon Act alone will bring thousands of offenders who have violated state laws under the purview of the Federal courts.

The courts may receive some badly needed assistance in the event the public defender bill which I have sponsored passes. For example, more than 80 percent of the defendants presently convicted in Federal courts have waived counsel and entered pleas of guilt. The public defender can insure that these actions are taken more intelligently and that worthy cases will have a competent defense. The role of the public defender in providing the court with a more balanced knowledge of the defendant should do much to help the court in its efforts to achieve an equitable and fitting sentence.

The sentencing institute also seems an ideal forum for more experienced judges, affording them an opportunity to exchange views and evaluate the rapidly accumulating knowledge in the field of sentencing. Some senior judges have reported to me that their participation in these seminars has given them new insights into sentencing problems and in some instances have changed viewpoints which they have long held.

Inherent in the statute authorizing the institutes is the desire that any accord and common agreement reached in these institutes be circulated to the entire Federal judiciary. An ideal instrument for the circulation of this information appears to me to be the sentencing Desk Book, first developed for the Boulder institute and now being extensively revised by the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts and the Department of Justice. I have read this document. It is a comprehensive and concise treatment of the sentencing alternatives available to the courts in disposing of various types of cases. It should prove to be a valuable handbook for the individual judge, for it would otherwise take his law clerk many months to research and gather together any comparable material.

You will recall that the same statute which authorized these institutes also provided for an indeterminate method of sentencing by which the court could impose a minimum term up to one-third of the maximum imposed for parole eligibility or leave this determination to the board of parole. Unfortunately, this provision has not seen much use thus far. Last year, out of more than 8,600 commitments to which the law is applicable, only about 700 were sentenced under this indeterminate provision. It is my hope that a better understanding of this provision can be achieved through the institute program and the data contained in the Desk Book, and that this will lead to an increased use of the indeterminate sentencing procedure.

In my opinion, the indeterminate sentence offers one of the chief means by which the disparity problem can be minimized. It is difficult for the court—virtually impossible in many cases—to predict when a given offender will have been rehabilitated in prison to the point where he can safely be released. The judge loses jurisdiction over the sentence after 60 days, but through the indeterminate procedure the actual time to be spent in prison by the offender can be adjusted by the parole board in the light of later developments. The indeterminate sentence is a means by which the judge can make the original sentence a continuously fitting instrument in the treatment of the offender. It should also prove to be a most effective means of motivating the offender to work earnestly to demonstrate his fitness for parole and release.

Through the sentencing institute program, the judge can also learn more about the resources he has available to him in the sentencing process. In this respect, I am pleased to learn that the diagnostic and observation procedures of the new Federal Sentencing Act have proved extremely valuable to the courts. Mr. Bennett, of the Bureau of Prisons, informs me that he received at least one of these cases a day, on the average. Some of the individuals involved have turned out to be mentally ill and should have been handled under the competency procedures of the Criminal Code. I understand that practically all of the commitments under section 4208(b), the so-called presentence observation procedure, have been defendants whose problems were so profound that the courts were well advised in seeking the extended period of study for them that the statute authorizes.

I was particularly interested in the case of the offender who became involved in a minor Dyer Act automobile theft offense and who was committed to a Federal institution for study as John Doe, when he steadfastly refused to give his true name or any information about himself to the court, the probation officer, or his court-appointed attorney. The institution circularized identification data to various police departments and eventually succeeded in uncovering his true name and the fact that he had once been arrested for carrying a homemade bomb. Further, he had a history of mental illness, and the institution psychiatrists felt that he was currently psychotic. The case was further complicated by the circumstance that one of our States still wanted to prosecute him for carrying the bomb. With the assistance of this information from the Bureau of Prisons, the court worked out what appeared to me a wise solution. The court felt that the several months the defendant had already spent in the Federal institution was a sufficient penalty for the minor offense he had committed, and authorized his immediate release to the State authorities who wanted to prosecute him. The court at the same time expressed the hope that they would commit him to a State mental institution, where all the facts indicated he belonged. Through the Prison Bureau this was done. There are, I am sure, many others with equally interesting and perplexing problems which the new procedure makes possible of solution prior to final sentence.

I am hopeful too that the sentencing institute program will encourage and stimulate the individual judge to take it upon himself to learn more about the problems involved in sentencing. The social science disciplines, for example, are developing a large body of knowledge that has direct implications for sentencing. I commend to your attention in this connection the growing body of literature dealing with human behavior and also the many conferences and seminars now being held in various parts of the country by our social scientists. In this respect I note that a recent report of the Senate Judiciary Committee recommends that the Federal judges adopt as a part of the sentencing institute program the practice of visting the penal and correctional facilities of the Federal Government. Certainly a knowledge of the resources of these facilities is indispensable to the judge if he is to make his dispositions intelligently. A number of Federal judges, I am informed, have already embarked on an extensive program to familiarize themselves with these institutions.

It is further heartening to note that the institute program has encouraged other measures on the part of individual judges to achieve higher standards of consistency in sentencing. I am advised that Judge Theodore Levin, of Detroit, holds a weekly conference of the judges of his court for the purpose of discussing the appropriate dispositions of cases currently under sentencing consideration by each of them. Judge George H. Boldt of Tacoma, Wash., records the reasons behind his sentencing dispositions and explains their consistency with those he has previously imposed. Judge Emett C. Choate, of Miami, attempts to get the views of both the defense and the prosecution when considering his own dispositions. And Judge Wallace S. Gourley, of Pittsburgh, has developed a checklist of factors to be considered when formulating a sentence in an individual case.

I might add here one fairly old suggestion that every modern judge might follow. Sir Matthew Hale, Lord Chief Justice of the Kings Bench from 1665 to 1676, also had a checklist of factors to be considered in carrying out his own sentencing duties. The first item on the list was: "That in the execution of justice, I carefully lay aside my own passions, and not give way to them, however provoked."

The even-handed administration of our criminal laws remains a vital concern of the Congress and particularly my committee. In the report which accompanied my Federal sentencing bill to the floor in 1958 we commented: "The prevalence of such disparities weakens respect for the administration of justice, both on the part of the criminal element and on the part of the general public. Consequently, much of the potential for the prevention of crime inherent in a wholesome respect for the law is not realized." I am fully aware that the sentencing legislation that I sponsored holds within it the potential for bringing about more disparities rather than less if the expanded discretion it conferred upon the courts is not used knowledgeably. In the institute program lies our hope and our trust that the new discretion of the courts will be exercised in what might be termed a "common Federal sentencing philosophy."

As I have said, if we are to achieve the new world of law that President Kennedy described, we must retain in our own Nation unquestioned confidence in the fairness and justice of the law. The Congress has provided the statutory means through the institute program and sentencing discretion. But it is only you judges who can make these instruments work.

In conclusion, I would be very much interested in hearing from Judge Clayton, when the institute is over, as to the conclusions you may reach as to the causes and remedies for sentencing disparities. I have every confidence that this report will be encouraging and that we will continue to strengthen our procedures so as to make equal justice under law a reality for all our citizens.

Statement by Theodore Roosevelt III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, at the urgent request of our distinguished former colleague, the Honorable Edward Lowber Stokes, I am pleased to include an article taken from a recent issue of the Philadelphia Inquirer which sets forth the considered views of Mr. Theodore Roosevelt III, a resident of my congressional district, who is presently the president of Americans for the Competitive Enterprise System, Inc., and speaks from the practical knowledge gained as a partner of Montgomery Scott & Co.

Mr. Roosevelt reviews some current misunderstanding relative to the net profits of corporations and the association which he heads is trying to help clear up some of the misconceptions presently held by many of our citizens in regards to the operation of the American competitive enterprise system. The full article entitled "Truth Is Weapon," follows and is commended to your careful perusal.

TRUTH IS WEAPON

Truth is the greatest weapon of the American competitive enterprise system, according to Theodore Roosevelt III, president of Americans for the Competitive Enterprise System, Inc.

"Our system does not need to be sold to Americans," he said. "It sells itself when it is understood."

He noted, however, that polls of high school students and other groups show that it is not understood, and that many students believe that companies make as much as 50 cents in profit on every dollar of sales.

"This misunderstanding," Roosevelt claimed, "is emphasized by headlines which read 'General Motors Earns $875 Million in Profits for Year.' The public gets the impression that a group of wealthy stockholders sit around a table to divide up this melon. What the headlines don't say is that General Motors spent $3,317 million in wages in 1959 for its 550,000 employees, $5,500 million for materials and supplies and paid $1,250 million in taxes. Of the $875 million profit, $575 million in dividends went to some 787 stockholders and the remainder was reinvested in the business. American industry at times appears to have a remarkable ability unwittingly to create the wrong impression about its finances."

Roosevelt, who is a partner of Montgomery Scott & Co., pointed out that ACES tries to help clear up such misconceptions by bringing to high school and college students and teachers, and clergymen a better understanding of the American competitive enterprise system.

"Too often," Roosevelt observed, "conservative groups in the field of economic education waste their efforts talking or writing to themselves or to people already on their side."

Since teachers and clergymen do not often receive economic education, Roosevelt contended their ideas on the economics of business are often vague.

"People are usually suspicious of things they don't understand," he said. "Teachers and clergymen are idealists and to them the profit motive has been made to seem selfish and sordid because they do not understand the legitimate function of profits as the sparkplug of our economy.

"When ACES," he continued, "gets across to them through its programs the concept that profits are really a cost item—the cost of using tools of production provided by the investments of stockholders—and that it is superior tools which enable us to outproduce the rest of the world, their views change."

Lock-Changing Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, Laos is another stark example of Communist tactics threatening world peace—Red infiltration, inspired rebellion, and a rebel force armed by the Communists. The Lowell Sun, an outstanding daily newspaper in the fifth district, has done a commendable job of pinpointing the complex and crucial problems facing the free world in this little nation which, as the Sun points out, frequently is called the key to southeast Asia.

The editorial follows:

LOCK-CHANGING TIME

The cease-fire will bring the problem of Laos into new phase, but will do nothing to solve it.

The Communist Pathet Lao forces hold sizable and crucial areas of that country. They cannot be expected to yield any of these at the conference table.

Indeed, they are certain to press for more. And it is a question whether the free nations have the bargaining position to resist all the Red demands.

Any effort to divide Laos between free and Communist sectors would be complicated by the facts that there is no clear battle line and that the Reds hold pockets of land deep within the free zone.

If the attempt is not to divide the nation but to create a neutral government, the rebels obviously have the bargaining cards to insist on strong, possibly commanding representation in such a government. The prospect for its continued neutralist character would not be bright.

In other words, no settlement reachable at the council table offers real hope now of blocking Communist domination of Laos. Red gains, pressed deliberately to the very end, will have gone too far.

The question of importance to the West is what can be done, if anything, to bar the Reds from the fruits of their gains.

Laos is not a country in any real sense. Its value to both sides in the cold war is strategic, resulting from the geography which gives it borders that touch still-free South Vietnam, Cambodia, Thailand, and Burma.

In a mood essentially defeatist, it has been said again and again that Communist control of Laos could lead to Red domination of all southeast Asia.

Political and military realists evidently do not doubt this possibility. Yet the only

same Western course would seem to be not to accept its inevitability.

In conjunction with our SEATO allies, we plainly must act to stiffen the defense of Thailand and South Vietnam, the latter already deeply undercut by infiltrating Reds.

Neutralist Cambodia and Burma constitute a separate and perhaps even more difficult problem. Cambodia especially could prove vulnerable unless it chooses to alter its posture to join in stern resistance to Red inroads.

No one dares pretend that holding the remainder of free southeast Asia has been made anything but harder by events in Laos. But any ceasefire should serve as the signal for the immediate undertaking of those harder tasks to secure what still remains free.

If Laos has been judged the key to southeast Asia, then we must somehow change the lock which bars the door to its vulnerable neighbors.

James Ford Bell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK MacGREGOR
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the founder of one of America's most respected business establishments passed away Sunday. Mr. James Ford Bell died at 81 years of age after a life of outstanding contribution not only to the business and agricultural life of our Nation but to the cultural progress of all of us.

I request that the following article be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that my colleagues may be further aware of Mr. Bell's valuable life. The article appeared in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of May 8, 1961:

J. F. BELL, OF GENERAL MILLS, DIES—MILLING FIRM'S FOUNDER WAS 81 YEARS OLD

James Ford Bell, 81, founder of General Mills, Inc., died Sunday morning in Abbott Hospital.

He had been ill for several weeks with a respiratory ailment.

His death came just 12 days after that of his wife, who died in Honolulu, Hawaii, of a heart attack.

Mr. Bell's credo of "Think it big and keep it simple" guided him through a lifetime of bringing order to the milling industry, of pushing research in widely scattered fields and of pursuing a number of hobbies.

Even after he retired as chairman of the board of General Mills in 1948, "The Chief" continued to serve until 1959 as a director and as chairman of the firm's committee on finance and technological progress.

Gerald S. Kennedy, present chairman of the board, said of Mr. Bell yesterday:

"He was a man of insatiable intellectual curiosity. He was never satisfied with the present except as it prepared for the future. Research was his lodestar.

"No conflict of interest ever diverted him from his appointed task. He was single-minded in his determination to accept nothing but the best.

"The food industry, education, the arts, basic research and a wide circle of friends will keenly miss him now and in the years ahead."

Services for Mr. Bell will be at 3:30 p.m., Tuesday in the main church at Westminister Presbyterian Church. He will be buried in Lakewood Cemetery.

The family prefers memorials to medical research funds at the University of Minnesota.

Mr. Bell was born August 16, 1879, in Philadelphia, Pa. His father, James Stroud Bell, was one of the Nation's leading flour merchants. His mother was Sallie Montgomery Ford Bell.

The family moved to Minneapolis in 1888 when Mr. Bell was 9 years old. His father had accepted the presidency of Washburn-Crosby Co., with the assignment to expand the company and build national prestige.

Young Bell started at the Jefferson Public School, a few blocks from the West Hotel where the family lived for 2 years. They later moved to a house at 2215 Park Avenue, which now is Waite Neighborhood House.

Mr. Bell attended Lawrenceville Preparatory School in New Jersey. In 1901, he was graduated from the University of Minnesota with a major in chemistry.

While he was still a student under Prof. Harry Snyder, Mr. Bell created the first laboratory for testing flour.

Mr. Bell married Louise Heffelfinger of Minneapolis December 10, 1902. They had three sons and a daughter.

Son, Charles H., is president of General Mills. Ford Bell is chairman of the board of Red Owl Stores, Inc. Samuel H. is a rancher near Chandler, Ariz., and a sculptor whose work is displayed at the Museum of Natural History at the University. Sally is Mrs. Herbert O. Perry, who lives on a ranch in California.

After James Ford Bell finished college he took his first full-time job with Washburn-Crosby.

At the age of 30, Mr. Bell was elected a director of the Crosby company. Six years later, in 1915, he became a vice president following his father's death.

Recognition of Mr. Bell's rising importance in the milling industry came in 1916, when he was appointed chairman of the milling division of the U.S. food administration.

The committee was created to meet problems caused by World War I.

Mr. Bell resigned from Washburn-Crosby and devoted all his energies to making effective the slogan—"Food Will Win the War."

Mr. Bell spent nearly every night on trains between New York and Washington. In New York, about 2 million barrels of flour were shipped each month to the allies. In Washington, high policies were being made or changed.

In 1918 Mr. Bell was named treasurer and general manager of the Sugar Equalization Board. Not until March 1919 was he able to resign and return to his affairs in Minneapolis.

It has been estimated that Mr. Bell's contribution, along with the voluntary cooperation of the Nation's millers in helping to stabilize flour prices, saved the public half a billion dollars during World War I.

For his work, Mr. Bell was made a member of the Belgian Order of the Crown. The French Government awarded him the Cross of the Legion of Honor, later making him an officer in the legion.

Mr. Bell returned to Washburn-Crosby in 1919, inheriting a host of problems.

During the war, milling industry had increased its capacity tremendously to supply oversea nations. That market now was cut off. In addition, people had been taught to save wheat and to develop tastes for other foods. Now millers were shocked to find the per capita consumption of flour declining sharply.

Most important to the Minneapolis mills was that Minnesota farming was being diversified. Wheat growing was moving South and West.

In a bold plan of reorganization, Mr. Bell presented to his partners a project to invade the Southwest. His idea was to establish more plants close to the new centers of wheat production, to work closely with commercial bakers, to work just as closely with the new chainstores springing up across the Nation, and to create new food products bearing the firm's trademark.

On the death of John Washburn, John Crosby II became president and Mr. Bell, as vice president, assumed the duty of running the mills.

In the next few years, following his plan, he established the bakers service department and helped embark Betty Crocker on her famous career.

Meanwhile, bumper crops of wheat in 1919 and 1920 resulted in huge surpluses as flour consumption continued to decline. The Farm Bureau Federation started a wheat strike withholding the crop from the market, but the surplus grew and prices slumped.

Buyers canceled orders for flour in a panic and seized upon excuses to repudiate contracts.

What spared Washburn-Crosby in this disastrous period was that its operation always had been conservative and did not depend on speculation in the wheat market.

Although his company was safe on an island of security, Mr. Bell maintained an intense interest in the problems of agriculture and the milling industry.

From 1921 to 1923, he commuted between Minneapolis and Washington. He served on numerous committees and boards looking into various programs.

The "eat more wheat" campaign was launched by Mr. Bell in March 1923 with all the verve of a showman. He worked feverishly on the program for a year, promoting advertisements in newspapers and on billboards.

Mr. Bell was also instrumental in developing Wheaties in 1923.

A health clinician presented Mr. Bell with his idea of a wheat flake, which originated when he accidentally splattered some drops of whole wheat gruel on a hot stove.

Mr. Bell authorized the clinician to work on the project, but months later he gave up after experimenting without success.

Mr. Bell then assigned his head miller, George Cormack, to the project. Cormack tested almost every known variety of wheat and finally came up with a successful formula.

On July 22, 1925, John Crosby stepped down as president of Washburn-Crosby and Mr. Bell was named president.

During the next 3 years, Mr. Bell gradually evolved his plan for consolidation of the milling industry. He visited New York and studied financing.

He earned a reputation as a prophet by pointing out, 3 years ahead of the stock market crash, that such feverish financing could come to no good.

With the keen fascination that led him to tinker with gasoline engines and household gadgets, Mr. Bell began formulating his plan for the milling industry.

He started by putting down on paper an orderly analysis of the industry as it existed. Busy as he was on a dozen boards and running an office filled with business details, Mr. Bell found little time for his "magnum opus," as his associates jokingly called his blueprint for the industry.

His home, filled with four children, their friends, musical instruments and consequently noise, offered no retreat.

And so Mr. Bell retired to a bathroom to do his writing and locked the door.

The outline for forming General Mills was born in the Bell family bathroom.

Mr. Bell noted that milling wages were rising and prices were falling. Profits had shrunk dangerously. At the same time competition was increasing and the inefficient mills were being eliminated.

Consolidation was to be observed everywhere. "Horizontal integration" had given huge buying power to new elements in industry. Chain stores had sprung up, eliminat-

ing jobbers and wholesalers. Only the miller continued to act as an individual operator.

The decline in use of flour and the fact there were too many mills was now being aggravated by the growth in power of great chain retailers, Mr. Bell noted. The miller was at the mercy of these chains and also of large commercial bakery chains.

Within 5 months the firm obtained the Larrowe Milling Co., Detroit, Mich., a progressive seed firm, for $6½ million and 14,000 shares of General Mills' stock.

With the verbal backing of a New York banker, Mr. Bell visited mills around the country. In June 1928, General Mills was formed through a consolidation of Washburn-Crosby Co. of Minneapolis; Royal Milling Co., and Rocky Mountain Elevator Co., Great Falls, Mont.; Kalispell Flour Mill Co. of Montana; and Red Star Milling Co., Wichita, Kans.

A short time later there were added El Reno Mill and Elevator Co., El Reno, Okla.; Kell Milling and Elevator Co., Oklahoma and Texas; and Sperry Flour Co. of the far west. The formation created the largest flour milling concern in the world.

In setting up this combine, Mr. Bell worked toward broad geographical representation rather than seeking to unite the existing large milling firms in Minneapolis. His idea was to cut the costs of distribution and help pass along the savings already made in efficient production.

Mr. Bell was named president of the new $50 million corporation, General Mills.

So soundly was Mr. Bell's plan put together that when the stock market crash of 1929 brought collapse to many seemingly indestructible firms, General Mills entered a period of steady and solid growth.

On August 14, 1934, Mr. Bell resigned as president and became chairman of the board.

His belief that "one must follow where research leads" has guided General Mills into such diversified fields as vitamins, industrial chemicals, soybean products, starches, cellulose sponges, refrigerated foods, ready-mix cakes, precision instruments, defense machines, formula feeds, and polyethylene balloons.

Mr. Bell launched the informal stockholder meetings of General Mills. These meetings, held at intervals on a regional basis from coast to coast, keep the stockholders informed about the company's operations.

This is in keeping with Mr. Bell's idea that a business is a corporate citizen; that it must have a social conscience, and has a responsibility to the public.

Through the years, Mr. Bell had a variety of interests and hobbies. He traveled through Europe and the Americas in his explorations, hunting, and collecting.

One of his outstanding hobbies was the James Ford Bell book collection which he donated to the University of Minnesota. It deals with the early search through North America for trade routes to the Orient.

Later Mr. Bell broadened the theme to show how trade influenced exploration and development of the world. The collection contains about 700 volumes.

Mr. Bell also gathered one of the top collections of manuscripts and first edition books, stressing quality rather than numbers. Included are a first edition of Marco Polo (1477), a first Latin edition of Columbus' seven-page report after his 1492 voyage, and a first edition (1523) of Magellan's trip around the world.

Other interests included a collection of early American silver, much of which was given to the Minneapolis Institute of Arts.

He enjoyed cooking and collected many recipes. The scope of his interests also included music. He once composed a song sung by Galli-Curci.

Mr. Bell's father, James S., had a motto in his office: "You can catch more flies with sugar than with vinegar."

At an early age, Mr. Bell was impressed by this motto and he quoted it all his life.

Associates relate that Mr. Bell also took time to entertain children of employees or friends who visited General Mills offices. He would take the children up to the Betty Crocker kitchens and ply them with cookies.

His closest employees always referred to him as the chief.

A lover of the outdoors, Mr. Bell financed the major part of the university's museum of natural history and contributed many specimens and exhibits.

Hunting was his favorite sport. He shot mountain sheep in Alaska, caribou in Newfoundland, grouse in Scotland and Hungary, and fished for salmon in New Brunswick.

In 1931, Mr. Bell established and endowed the Delta waterfowl research station 60 miles north of Winnipeg to study the habits of ducks and geese. Biologists from all over the world carry on experiments at Delta.

Mr. Bell's fondness for quail hunting prompted him and 10 other Twin Cities men to buy the 1,700-acre Paulette plantation at Macon, Miss.

When this venture broke up, Mr. Bell bought a plantation at Thomasville, Ga.

During the Macon venture, Mr. Bell noted the pitiable condition of many of the Negroes. He converted a plantation building into a trade school, equipped it with tools and machinery, and hired a teacher to give the Negroes training so that they could find jobs.

Mr. Bell's Minneapolis home was Belford, a 39-acre estate at Ferndale, Lake Minnetonka. There he found time to be a scientist and mechanic, and could give the botanical name of every plant on the estate.

Mr. Bell had been a member of the University of Minnesota board of regents, a vice president and trustee of the Minneapolis Society of Fine Arts, trustee of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, and trustee of Dunwoody Industrial Institute. He belonged to the Minneapolis Club, Chicago Club, and Links (New York) Club.

Last fall Mr. Bell was honored by fellow University of Minnesota regents with a citation as a "builder, doer and originator" who "served his alma mater faithfully for 21 years as a regent."

Mr. Bell's parents were Quakers and he was brought up as a Quaker. During recent years, he attended the Wayzata Community Church, but still considered himself to be a Quaker.

Although Mr. Bell's wealth did not begin to compare with that of Texas oil zillionaires, it was no secret that he controlled a substantial fortune. During the years he headed General Mills, he received salaries of up to $100,000 a year, in addition to dividends from stock he held dating back to Washburn-Crosby days.

In addition to his duties at General Mills, Mr. Bell also was a director of American Telephone and Telegraph Co.; Pullman, Inc., and subsidiaries; Eastman Kodak Co.; Northwestern National Bank and Northwest Bancorporation.

She Sings for the Boys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, in the hurry and bustle of daily life we are sometimes prone to forget how important it is to maintain the morale of our Armed Forces, the guardians of the peace and the security of our Nation. Whether these young people are stationed at home or abroad, they are still away from their loved ones. It is, therefore, most important that their morale be kept high and that we give them all possible assurance of a strong, secure and free America.

I have written these words as I was listening to an album of favorite recordings by the popular singer, Jennie Thomas, who has made it a part of her career and duty to visit military installations all over the country and sing for the boys. She has selected 12 of the songs most frequently requested by the boys at the Army camps, the Air Force bases, the Navy installations, and these she has recorded for them. In fact, she calls her album "Jennie Thomas Sings for the Boys."

One really grows nostalgic listening to such well-known favorites as "Summertime," "Carolina in the Morning," "I'll See You in My Dreams," "Stardust," "Night Train," and others. Miss Thomas is not only popular at the military camps where thousands of the boys have heard her, but she has also appeared on radio and television. She can sing a hymn as inspiringly as a popular melody. Miss Thomas and all those associated with her in the production of this album deserve to be congratulated for a job "well done."

Cynical Politics in Wage Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last week, almost 9 months after President Kennedy arbitrarily rejected a minimum wage bill in the closing days of the 86th Congress, we did approve the 1961 version of this bill.

This has been acclaimed as a great victory for the New Frontier and its revolutionary social philosophy, yet it is interesting to note that the substantial metropolitan newspapers of our Nation have for the most part condemned both the contents of the bill and the unethical procedure used to achieve passage.

An editorial in the Chicago Sun-Times, Friday, May 5, 1961, entitled "Cynical Politics in Wage Law," is typical of the editorial comment that greeted this New Frontier achievement:

CYNICAL POLITICS IN WAGE LAW

Seldom has there been so much agreement on the basic aims of legislation, and so much disagreement on how to achieve the aims, as there has been on the U.S. minimum wage law from its inception in the 1930's.

No one can properly quarrel with any step which has as its stated objective the raising of the living standards of American working men and women. The argument stems from the very real fears that imposition of an added burden on marginal busi-

nesses, by hiking the floor on wages, will have the opposite effect on countless workers who may be thrown out of their jobs.

For this reason we think the minimum wage measure which has now been passed by Congress is a bad bill.

It is bad because it was conceived at the height of a national presidential election campaign. To give it the widest possible mass appeal, President Kennedy, then Senator Kennedy, demanded that coverage be extended to more than 4 million new workers.

Most of these are not engaged in interstate commerce by the usual definition. Under this concept, there is no limit to the number or types of enterprises that can eventually be brought under Federal wage jurisdiction.

The compromise version which has been approved by the House and Senate calls for bringing 3,624,000 new workers under the act at $1 an hour to start, and $1.25 after 5 years.

Lopped off by the conference committee were 462,000 workers in laundry, auto agency and transit enterprises. They will not be covered, and herein lies an open admission of the political cynicism which has surrounded this measure from the onset.

The rights of these workers were bargained away at the conference table to secure the votes on the House floor necessary for the bill's passage.

The bill is bad because it commits the Government to enforce future boosts in the basic wage rate regardless of what the economic conditions may be at that time. Although advertised as a $1.25 minimum wage bill, minimum wages will not reach that point for 28 months.

A sounder procedure would have been to let future Congresses adjust the rate according to circumstances then prevailing.

At this time business is probably turning the corner from the recession. But an arbitrary increase in operating costs coming now will find a great number existing on a close margin. For many of these, a politically expedient wage bill could very well spell disaster.

Proposed KLM Airline Concession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to add a word to what has already been so ably said by the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN] yesterday in the RECORD on page 7163, regarding the proposed approval by the United States of an airroute to Los Angeles for the Dutch-flag line KLM.

If the State Department justifies each fresh concession to Dutch diplomatic pressure on the ground that the concession will remove friction, I do not see how it can ever end. We cannot continue to reward the Dutch for creating the friction.

There is another element of the Dutch campaign for Los Angeles rights which I find deeply disturbing. It has been alleged that the Dutch have been in flagrant violation of the capacity and frequency clauses of the 1957 agreement, ever since that agreement was signed. I am advised that this is not a matter which is disputed on the United States side. I understand that even the State Department concedes that the Dutch are in violation of the 1957 agreement.

Under these circumstances, why do we not say—"The United States will not negotiate regarding Los Angeles until KLM comes into compliance with the capacity and frequency clauses of the 1957 agreement?" If KLM is operating more than four times as many flights to and from the United States as can be justified under the agreement, the State Department at the very least should certainly bring this situation under control before discussing the Los Angeles route for KLM.

A Patriot's Views

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, from a distinguished Republican, active and, in a constructive way, helpful Member of the House for 25 years, comes the following:

KENNEDY AND PEACE—HIS INVOLVEMENT IN A NUCLEAR WAR OVER LAOS DOUBTED

(The writer of the following letter was a Republican Member of Congress from 1920 to 1945.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Five months ago John F. Kennedy was elected President by one of the closest votes in American history. The slightest change in public sentiment and he would have run second best. His margin of victory was probably due to his personal attributes and not so much to the views he expressed in the campaign.

The political honeymoon is about over. The American people have been anxiously watching his Executive actions not based on campaign oratory but on deeds and achievements. It is still too early to give the final answers.

Based, however, on his 3 months' honeymoon certain facts are crystal clear. President Kennedy is the greatest peacetime spender in history, far beyond Franklin D. Roosevelt's spendomania. It is also clear that he is far more international, if that is possible, than F.D.R., and has already raised the $4 billion foreign-aid handouts by one-third and has created an interventionist Peace Corps outside the U.N.—a dangerous innovation that plays into the hands of the Communists.

The only policy left undetermined is that of peace, and this seems to be hanging in the balance—not like F. D. R., who, despite his promises to keep us out of war, did everything within his power to maneuver us in.

NO WINNING HAND

President Kennedy should be given the benefit of the doubt that he is not flirting or playing Russian roulette with war in Laos, but has been bluffing without holding a winning hand. President Kennedy is too smart to become involved in a war in the jungles and swamps of roadless, landlocked Laos, where we will be outnumbered 10 to 1 by the Chinese and doomed to defeat. He is also too intelligent to involve us in a nuclear war over Laos.

Every English and French newspaper realizes that we hold no high cards and consequently they are unanimously for peace. The Communists in Moscow and Peiping, unfortunately, know the precise situation in Laos far better than the American people. They still confuse Korea, where we had the support of Britain, France, the United Nations and the powerful use of our own Navy, with Laos, where we have no big nations with us and cannot use our Navy.

The American people by this time know President Kennedy as a monumental spender, as the foremost internationalist in a nationalistic world, and as the champion of the socialistic Americans for Democratic Action. But on the peace issue, the most important of all, they should wait further developments and reserve judgment. In my opinion President Kennedy, contrary to the war-provoking record of F. D. R., is not in favor of sowing the seeds of a nuclear war.

In view of the fact that the United States proclaimed the Monroe Doctrine, our relations with Cuba are on an entirely different basis than with jungle-infested Laos thousands of miles away.

HAMILTON FISH.

New York, April 21, 1961.

The Centre Daily Times, State College, Pa., Launches a Campaign as a Public Service To Revive the Grand Old American Custom of Displaying Old Glory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, in the early part of this century the time-honored American custom of displaying the Stars and Stripes from homes and business establishments was observed with pride and fervor on many national holidays. In recent years the custom has been abandoned to the extent that it has prompted the burning question by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate:

What has happened to the exultant surge of pride in the hearts of Americans when anywhere the Stars and Stripes are unfurled?

Dr. Harris' piercing question has been echoed by many Americans who deplore the lack of ardor for displaying our national emblem on various days of the year when a tribute to the American flag by every family would not only be highly appropriate but also warmly commended as further evidence of love of country.

Despite a negligent attitude regarding public display of Old Glory, there is none of us who lacks thrill in reading the following stanza from the stirring poem by Henry Holcomb Bennett titled "The Flag Goes By—Hats Off."

Along the streets there comes
A blare of bugles, a ruffle of drums,
A flash of color beneath the sky:
Hats Off!
The flag is passing by.

It is realized that on certain occasions such as parades or celebrations involving military units, the flag is displayed and heads uncovered as it passes by thus creating the impression that deep

reverence for Old Glory has never been at greater heights.

On the other hand, since the close of World War I, the custom of displaying our National emblem from homes and business establishments has vanished to the extent that our negligent attitude is an indictment on this generation. As a matter of fact, criticism is being voiced throughout the Nation over the abandonment of the grand old custom of unfurling the Stars and Stripes from nearly every American home on important national holidays.

In my congressional district the Centre Daily Times, State College, Pa., one of the prominent daily newspapers in central Pennsylvania has launched a campaign for what it terms "a chance for reviving a rich American custom."

Beginning its campaign with an editorial which appeared in the April 29, 1961 issue, the Centre Daily Times has made available to its readers at the cost of $3 postpaid, a flag kit which includes a 3- by 5-foot, 50-star flag with a 6-foot brass-jointed hardwood staff with top decoration, halyard, and metal window socket.

Reminding its readers on the handy order blank printed in the form of a coupon that "The Crusade for Freedom Starts Right at Your Door," the Centre Daily Times urges "Fly this flag which we offer you at cost as a public service." In addition, there is listed a total of 11 National holidays when the flag should fly from every home in the Nation.

In congratulating the publishers of the Centre Daily Times in its campaign to overcome complacency regarding public display of the flag, I hope that other newspapers and business firms in the Nation will conduct similar campaigns designed to revive the honored custom of publicly displaying our national emblem. Such concerted action can succeed in carrying the following message of the Centre Daily Times to every hamlet in our Nation:

Let none say America is losing the spirit of freedom, or that her people are growing soft and complacent. Fly the new 50-star flag at your home on every holiday. The more homes that fly our flag * * * the more the whole world will know that the Spirit of '76 is just as fresh in our hearts today as it was 185 years ago.

The editorial previously referred to follows:

[From the Centre Daily Times, Apr. 29, 1961]

A CHANCE FOR REVIVING A RICH AMERICAN CUSTOM

(An editorial)

It wasn't too many years ago that the American flag was flown proudly from virtually every home, every place of business in the United States.

And, in Centre County, it was particularly noticeable.

On every national holiday of importance, anyone traveling the streets was reminded of the occasion as flag after flag came into view, lined up, as it were, as emphasis on the rich traditions which it signified.

The most beautiful flag in the world—the Stars and Stripes—still flies proudly over military installations, Government and public buildings at all times. But it's just plain absent at most homes and most places of business.

We believe the flag should fly on every home in Centre County on, at least, our national holidays. We believe it's a patriotic duty for everyone to return to the heart-warming custom. It's one way our Nation, our county and the communities within it, through its citizens, can show our ideological opponents that the Spirit of '76 is just as strong in American hearts today as it was 185 years ago.

And we believe, too, that failure to fly the flag is due more to lack of opportunity to fly the proper flag than a lack of patriotism. Indeed, we'd guess few homes have available the 50-star flag.

That's why the Centre Daily Times has obtained a quantity of handsome 50-star flags. Their size is suitable for flying from front porch or window. We offer these 3- by 5-foot flags in kits which include flag, staff and metal socket for mounting. And we offer these kits to our readers at cost as a public service. The price of the complete kit is only $3.

We believe that the people of Centre County will respond to this wonderful chance to buy and fly the flag. We hope that all civic groups will encourage their members to respond.

No reward can be greater than to help bring about a revival of the old heart-warming custom of flying the Stars and Stripes proudly on all our national holidays and other days set aside to honor those who have died for it. Decoration Day on May 30, Flag Day on June 14 and Independence Day on July 4 provide early opportunities for "Long May It Wave" observances.

It's a timely move, too, in these times of tension when the press of selfish interests and unrest elsewhere may pressure us into forgetting the basic inspiration which we all need if we're to remain free and, indeed, if we're to strengthen that freedom.

Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, on the face of the matter, it would appear that this body stands in rather a ridiculous position of now considering the importation of Mexican farm labor. Last week we were engaged in assisting our unemployed in distressed areas and previously we were engaged in extending and raising unemployment benefits—all hailed in turn by this administration as emergency matters of the greatest importance. I can well appreciate that our colleagues now approach the subject with trepidation and apologies.

The subject of farm labor certainly deserves the consideration of the best Harvard minds in the White House and it would be well to include as much commonsense as possible. My own district, for instance, is one of the leading dairy areas of the New York City milkshed. We are operating under a marketing order that has effectively been maneuvered by the milk corporations in a manner that has all but eliminated the family farm. This situation, in my opinion, is extremely bad with 9 out of 10 of our family farms already added to the ranks of the unemployed at the present time. High costs have all but eliminated farm labor in the area and farm operators in many cases cannot even afford the necessary machinery to put themselves in a competitive position. There has been much talk of committees and do-it-yourself, but no positive action.

If this administration is sincere in its belief that unemployment should be curbed, the lot of the farmer improved and his economic position strengthened, I would respectfully suggest that we forget about committees, investigations, and do-it-yourself programs; and that the Secretary of Agriculture under the complete authority heretofore extended him in these matters, correct the evils which the farmers are operating under—I refer to Marketing Order No. 27 in the New York-New Jersey marketing area.

America Loses Ambassador Brosio to France

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, more than most professions or careers, diplomacy demands men of complete expertise to make it function at its best. Since February of 1955, this Nation has been fortunate to have one of the most accomplished diplomats of our age at the helm of Italy's delegation to the United States. Manlio Brosio, although not a career diplomat by explicit training, has exercised the techniques of diplomacy with great finesse here in Washington as he did in similar capacities in London and Moscow previously.

Now Ambassador Brosio is going to France to represent his Government there. The bonds between our two great nations have been strengthened; the mutual interest of both our nations has been extremely well served.

Personally, it has been a privilege to know Manlio Brosio and to be able to think of him as a friend. His stature as a human being is as tall as his diplomatic astuteness. America will miss him, and all Americans wish him well.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of Wednesday, May 10, 1961, extending the city's good wishes to Ambassador Brosio:

[From the Washington Post, May 10, 1961]

GOODBY TO BROSIO

More than 5 years as Italian Ambassador in Washington have earned Manlio Brosio a wealth of respect and a wide circle of friends. This blue-eyed native of Turin, once described by a Londoner as having "the look of an austere minor saint from a medieval mural," has been anything but austere in his relations here. An expert on the Soviet Union in the Stalin era, he has been a warm friend of the United States and an alert and effective representative of the interests of Italy. As he and Signora Brosio leave for their new assignment in France they will take with them a host of good wishes.

Armed Forces Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, next week is designated Armed Forces Week. At that time the country pays tribute to those devoted citizens who defend our land. They make possible our precious American way of life.

Doubly essential in this age of lightning attack are the Reserve forces.

A friend of mine, J. Spencer Gray, editor and publisher of the Herald of Westchester, has written a splendid editorial on the job being done by the Army Reserve. I believe that this description of the vital roll played by the Army Reserve will be of interest to the Congress:

ARMY READY RESERVE IS AMERICA'S FIRST LINE OF DEFENSE

(This is the first in a series of two articles which will appear prior to the local and national observance of Armed Forces Week, May 13 to 21.)

(By J. Spencer Gray)

He may be the man living down the block or next door. He may be the neighbor you nod to on the train. You might know him as an executive, a professional man or merely as a solid member of your community.

Just like you, he'd go to and from his daily work and on wekends relax and do that which you and so many other Americans do.

But, if war was to arrive, he'd suddenly vanish, for he is a selected reservist of the U.S. Army.

Enjoying little publicity and operating in some ways, under less-than-ideal conditions, the Nation's Ready Reserve stands by, prepared for instant mobilization if a national emergency should arise.

Army reservists are surrounded by little of the glamour that attaches to some units and members of the Armed Forces. But, their hard work and diligent preparation during the hours they regularly set aside for reserve training are one of the crucial ingredients to the United States of America's answer to aggression, limited or all-out, if it should come.

Most of the men in the Ready Reserve have either had full tours of duty in the armed services, or at least 6 months active duty training.

All of them know exactly how they fit into the overall table of command of the Nation's Reserve arm.

If they were called, they would know their missions instantly—and without further ado, go to it.

These citizens fill a vital role.

As Gen. Bruce C. Clarke, commanding general of the U.S. Army Continental Command recently put it, "no victory in American military history has ever been won by a single arm, service or component of the Army.

"Victory in the field has always been the product of the combined efforts of regulars, guardsmen, reservists, and army civilians with all arms and services working as a compact team."

This would hold just as true today as in the past—whether reservists should be called to aid in the Nation's resistance in a localized conflict, or whether the worst should happen and all-out nuclear warfare exploded.

But, there is a life and death difference between reservists of today and past years, as with all elements of the Armed Forces:

"Space, allies, and the pace of warfare granted years to activate unity and teamwork in the Army after war began," as General Clarke put it.

Today, the time is zero.

From the very outset of a shooting war, general or localized, all components and all arms and services would be involved.

"The unity of spirit and teamwork of performance so essential to combat readiness, must exist throughout the Army before the first shot is fired."

And today, our reserve forces are an integral part of this spirit and teamwork.

Has nuclear war, with its incredible technological advances and highly specialized demands, made the reservists obsolete?

Absolutely not, the Army replied. Says General Clarke:

"The focal point of all our efforts is the ground combat soldier." (Modern concept fo defense have not changed this, he emphasizes.)

Organizing, equipping, training, sustaining, and supporting the combat fighter so that he can perform his indispensable combat job is the Army's role.

"This role," he emphasizes, "is equally significant in any kind of war—hot or cold. It is just as important in general war as in limited war.

"For our Nation to entertain any notion to the contrary, would be dangerous."

George Fielding Eliot, regarded as among the Nation's foremost observers of military affairs, recently underlined the necessity for giving to both full-time and part-time combat manpower, whatever peacetime training it requires to meet its wartime responsibilities.

The Army has been training its reservists with ever-increasing effectiveness.

Said Eliot: "There has been a remarkable improvement in the combat-readiness of the Army's reservist components."

He stressed, however, that "much remains to be done, with time and the enemy still pressing on our remaining moments of opportunity."

Why the necessity for a reserve, when we are supporting today a fairly larger peacetime Active Army than ever before?

"With rising costs and a demand of other essential military expenditures," says Major Sliot, "It's neither politically nor economically possible to keep up an Active Army of sufficient size to deal with all foreseeable emergencies.

"The time limits being what they are, this simply means that the peacetime level of readiness of the reinforced citizen components of the Army must be such that the interval between M-day and their programed entry into action, will suffice to bring them to full combat readiness."

"Today, the Active Army alone cannot carry out the Army's mission of providing a well rounded defense capability.

"Today the reserve components—Army National Guard and Army Reserve—are essential elements of our ready forces.

"They are of greater importance now than ever before in our history.

"This new stature has come with a new requirement: Many of their units must be ready to fight now; other units must be ready within a matter of weeks or months."

Thus, does the Army itself describe the role of the reservist in the modern Army—an Army poised to reply within minutes to the threat of nuclear attack.

The reservist today is "no longer a man to be called upon only after an emergency has developed," the Army emphasizes. "He is part of our strength in being and our strength in depth. Without him, our military power would be damaged irremediably."

RESERVES MORE VITAL TODAY THAN EVER BEFORE, ARMY SAYS

(This is the second in a series of articles which will appear prior to the local and national observance of Armed Forces Week, May 13 to 21.)

(By J. Spencer Gray)

The Nation's Defense Establishment regards the training of reservists with deadly seriousness.

Only last year, for example, a conference called by Secretary of the Army Wilber M. Brucker devoted a great deal of time to the question of better integrating reservists with full-time forces in line with the "one army" theme of the modern organization of our defense.

Progressive ideas advanced at that conference included:

1. Elimination of the Reserve or Regular Army designation from the names of units to the extent permitted by law.

2. Joint utilization of training facilities by both Reserve and full-time soldiers.

3. Establishment of Army area schools to improve the training of critical specialists in both the Reserve and full-time forces.

4. Priority for reservists in attendance at Army service schools during certain periods to facilitate their attendance during vacation and slack-business periods.

5. The loan of such new and exotic weapons as the Honest John to Reserve components, along with sufficient instructor personnel, to assure the Reserves maximum training.

6. Establishment of quotas for participation by Reserve component commanders and staff in field exercises and maneuvers conducted by the Active Army.

Just what is the Army Reserve?

It consists of three aspects—the Ready Reserve, the Standby Reserve, and the Retired Reserve.

The Ready Reserve is made up of units and individuals.

The units are combat, combat support, supporting forces, special activities, and mobilization base units.

The Ready Reserve also includes some 750,000 reinforcements or nonunit members who would provide replacements for early combat losses and fill the full tables of organization strength in both the Active Army and mobilized Reserve units.

Citizen-soldiers assigned to a Reserve unit take part in both year-round training and annual active duty.

The former takes place at an Army Reserve center or National Guard armory near the reservist's home.

Annual duty is conducted for 15 to 17 days (including travel time; during the summer). Here, the reservist puts into practice what he learns in his year-round training.

If a unit isn't available for the reservist, he is assigned to the Ready Reserve Control Group and is required to take part in 15 days of active duty annually.

Ex-GI's who entered the service for the first time before August 1955, aren't required to train as reservists. Those who entered after that date may be required to train if they were under 26 when they were inducted.

Reserves who train actively may join a National Guard or Reserve unit actively. If they don't do this within 60 days of their release from active Army duty, they are ordered to report to a Reserve unit with vacancies in its table organization.

Such reservists continue as National Guard or Reserve unit members until their active-duty time and Reserve-unit time totals 4 years.

Numbers tell one aspect of the importance of the Ready Reserve.

Total strength of this Reserve is 1,448,000, including 700,000 in a paid drill status—400,000 in the Army National Guard and 300,000 in the Reserve.

The Army Reserve comprises 10 infantry divisions, 13 training divisions, two maneuver area commands and two engineer amphibious support commands.

During the last fiscal year, the Army Reserve trained 301,801 men on active duty for 6 months.

Another 60,000 Ready Reservists participated in 15-day annual training tours.

More than 660,000 individuals who did not participate in paid Reserve training were subject to recall to active duty in the event of mobilization or a national emergency.

These Army units are in addition to the Reservists of the Air Force, Navy, and Coast Guard.

The most elite Army Reserve unit is the scantily publicized Special Forces (airborne)—sometimes dubbed, in the armed services, the dirty-work outfit.

Special Forces' mission: Guerrilla warfare behind enemy lines.

Special Forces men are highly qualified parachutists, expert marksmen, sabotage, and communications experts.

Because they were physically fit as young people, in later years they achieved the distinction of being regarded as among the toughest in the world.

And they are rugged.

In recent hush-hush refresher training exercises, their maneuvers included:

A night jump into a thick forest, a day-and-night forced march through an alligator and snake infested swamp, a hand-over-hand climb up a sheer cliff, leaping from landing craft into turbulent surf of the Atlantic Ocean along the southeast coastline.

These men, who when on active duty wear the Special Forces' coveted sky-blue arrowhead sleeve insignia with gold lightning bolts, sign a unique contract which places them in Special Forces for 6 years under these conditions:

"Fully realizing that Special Forces teams will be deployed immediately on outbreak of hostilities deep behind enemy lines to organize, train, and exploit guerrilla forces, and to perform other missions."

Special Forces men must always be in top physical shape (they frequently work out on weekends), have outstanding Army intelligence test marks, and know or be willing to acquire several specialties, which usually includes an intimate knowledge of one or more foreign languages and advanced judo.

They are able to survive under hazardous conditions, withstand intense heat and cold, and act and live like a native of the land or area of their particular asssignment.

Courage, of course, is a must.

But brains count more than brawn.

Of scores of men of high character who periodically apply to serve their country in this unique way, only a few of each group are chosen. And they are likely to come from any city, county, and State in the United States.

The Reserve units (the first of which was activated at Fort Bragg, N.C., in May 1952) are divided into teams of about 12 to 18 men each, in charge of a captain.

Each team, in event of war, would be called upon to organize a command or regiment of underground freedom fighters—from 100 up to 1,000 guerrillas.

Armed Forces Reserve strength not on active duty, by component and by Reserve status [1]

	Total Reserve	Ready Reserve	Standby Reserve	Retired Reserve
Army National Guard	[2] 407,549	[2] 407,549	0	0
Army Reserve	2,217,472	1,024,549	1,118,393	74,530
Naval Reserve	672,227	503,020	120,530	48,677
Marine Corps Reserve	258,477	209,245	42,608	6,624
Air National Guard	70,820	70,820	0	0
Air Force Reserve	520,749	202,506	303,677	14,566
Coast Guard Reserve	32,073	29,662	1,930	481
Armed Forces Reserve	4,179,367	2,447,351	1,587,138	144,878

[1] Taken from the Department of Defense "Report on Reserve Forces."
[2] Includes 5,784 Inactive National Guard.

Men Who Dared To Be Different

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 7, 18 members of the Congressional Christian leadership breakfast group went to the Naval Academy to attend chapel and have lunch with our appointees.

It was a most satisfying experience, and we were all so impressed with the sermon by Chaplain Charles L. Greenwood that I asked for a copy to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Chaplain Greenwood has had a most unusual career, having graduated from the U.S. Naval Academy in 1950 and commissioned an ensign in the U.S. Navy. In November 1951 he was designated a naval aviator—jet qualified.

From 1952 to 1954 he was a carrier pilot, resigning his commission in 1955 to enter Princeton Theological Seminary. In June 1957 he was commissioned a Navy chaplain and served from 1958 to 1960 as a chaplain aboard destroyers in the U.S. Pacific fleet. He is now chaplain at the Naval Academy.

I am privileged to insert his sermon:

MEN WHO DARED TO BE DIFFERENT

(Sermon preached at the U.S. Naval Academy Chapel on May 7, 1961, by Chaplain Charles L. Greenwood, U.S. Navy)

Scripture: Daniel 3.

This story of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego is a familiar one to all of you here this morning I am sure. If by any chance you missed learning it in your early church school days, you probably danced to it a few years ago when it was high on the popular music hit parade.

The story should be one that most of you can feel a great deal of identification with, as it is a story of three men who got fried for breaking a regulation. Form 2's had not yet been invented, so fiery furnaces were used instead (now you can be thankful for the invention of the form 2).

This story comes to us from that period of Israel's history called the exile. After the fall of Jerusalem to the Babylonians in 586 B.C., the cream of Jewish society was carried off to Babylon in exile. Among those exiles were our heroes of today—Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego.

We read that the king of Babylon, King Nebuchadnezzar, made an image of gold and commanded that at a certain signal everyone would fall down and worship that image. It was soon brought to the attention of the King that there were certain Jews who were not obeying his command. The King had them brought before him, and he told them again, that at the sound of the musical instrument, they should bow down to his idol—and if they didn't, they would be thrown into the fiery furnace which would be heated seven times hotter than usual.

It would be an understatement to say that these men were on the spot. They were faithful Jews, and knew well God's command to them through Moses at Mount Sinai:

"I am the Lord your God. You shall have no other gods before me. You shall not make yourself a graven image, or any likeness of anything that is in the heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth; you shall not bow down to them or serve them."

It boiled down to, "Shall we obey God or man?"

Listen carefully to the answer, as it plays an important part in our message today:

"O Nebuchadnezzar, we have no need to answer you in this matter. If it be so, our God whom we serve is able to deliver us from the burning fiery furnace; and he will deliver us out of your hand, O King. But if not, be it known to you, O King, that we will not serve your gods or worship the golden image which you have set up."

The King was furious, and had them bound and thrown into the fire. Our story ends with an amazed and astonished King, looking into the fire and seeing four men walking around where the three had been thrown, and the appearance of the fourth was, in the King's words, like a son of the gods.

In an age when conformity is so prevalent, it is refreshing to study about men who, for certain religious convictions, dared to be different.

These men dared stand up for what they knew was right even though they were a small minority, and even though it would have been easier and less costly to go along with the crowd. They were more concerned with being right, than being popular. They were more concerned with obedience to God's command, than conformity to the crowd's conduct. They were more concerned with what God saw in them, than what the crowd thought of them.

We have been accused in our age of being more concerned with what other people think—about being accepted by the gang—than being morally right.

Mr. Frank Pace, chairman of the board of General Dynamics, said in his lecture to the first class last week that we have a "great urge for conformity; a great urge for social correctness; a great urge to substitute being correct for being right and being courageous."

Perhaps the classic expression of this tendency in the American character has been described by David Riesman in his book entitled "The Lonely Crowd." This book is a study of the changing American character and it describes our present age as an "other-directed" generation. He pictures us as a people with radars protruding out of our heads which sweep the horizon to pick up the trends of the times. We are super-sensitive to the pulse of society—what others think about us—what others do and wear—what others would have us do—receiving our direction from the pressures of the crowd.

Over and against this is the rugged individualist of an earlier period of our history who the author calls an inner-directed man. This man's life is directed by an inner gyroscope which keeps him headed for his goal and makes him less dependent upon any external pressure. There is no need greater

today than for men of great spiritual convictions who know where they stand, know where they are going, and know why.

Men who are able to stand up and be counted for what they know is right, regardless of the pressure about them.

This is not a plea for beatniks. In their rebellion against conformity they have fallen into a society where conformity again plays a most important role—and this time in a less orthodox and less acceptable manner.

This is not a plea for rebels without a cause, or for nonconformity for the sake of nonconformity. This world has enough rebels, who though dissatisfied with things the way they are, have nothing better to offer.

In order to keep a sane balance as we think on this subject of nonconformity, it is well for us all to remember that we do not live in this world as isolated individuals, but as members of a society. As such, we have certain responsibilities to obey the laws of that society which have been made in order that this communal life can be carried on in an orderly fashion.

We of the military are keenly aware of the necessity of discipline and obedience to regulations. Without such discipline the military could not accomplish its mission.

But this does not detract from our earlier statement: There is no need greater today than for men of great spiritual convictions, who know where they stand, know where they are going, and know why.

You men of the class of 1961 will be entering a new phase of your lives exactly 1 month from today. You will be going out into the world—every corner of the world—and assuming new duties and new responsibilities as commissioned officers in the Armed Forces of your country. In fact, as we have seen in our first space probe 2 days ago, Naval Academy graduates are going farther then the corners of this earth. As you enter this new phase of your life, you will find at times that the cry of the "easy way," the cry of the "expedient," will be presented to you in all its appealing popularity. It will be accompanied by such remarks as:

"Don't be naive. Everyone does it. It's just life. It's the way things are. Don't be a fool."

"Why not bow down to the king's silly little idol? It won't hurt anything. It'll be much easier. Besides, everyone is doing it."

"Why not throw in a few extra figures in the monthly division officer's report on training? The captain will be happy when he reads it. And besides, everyone does it—why shouldn't I?"

The smooth sounding appeal to forget moral integrity is widespread.

In business: "Why not fix prices among competitors? Everyone does it and it's a necessary part of good business."

In sports: "Why not take a little cash to shave points in basketball? We'll still play to win. What's the difference how much we win by?"

Why not?

And so, with such appealing words, your moral integrity will be tested—perhaps as it has never been tested before. Before you too quickly take the easy way—before you too quickly take that way which seems so popular and follow the crowd—ask this question:

"Where is the crowd going? Is this where I want to go?"

Jesus said, "The gate is wide and the way easy that leads to destruction and those who enter are many."

What did Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego have which enabled them to stand firm in their convictions regardless of cost? These men had a complete trust in God's ways.

They were willing to put their lives completely in His hands. They had absolute faith in God's ability to save. They knew that if God so desired, he could save them from the fire. But the real mark of the greatness of their faith is seen in those three words—"but if not." Even if God did not choose to save them from the fire—even if it was His will that they perish in the flames—they still would not worship the idol or bow down to the golden image. They knew that they still were in God's hands.

What we need in the Christian faith today is a fuller understanding of these three words—"but if not."

We too often play "trick or treat" with the Almighty.

"If you will do this for me, I'll do this for you."

"If you'll just save me from the hell of this battle, Lord, I'll serve you the rest of my life."

As if we could bargain with the Almighty God. We have nothing to offer but an I O U which, by the way, we so often fail to make good later. Compare this with our story today:

"Our God whom we serve is able to deliver us from the fire." Complete trust in God's power and ability to save. "But if not" even if it be His purpose not to save us, "we still will not serve your gods."

Here is a faith which defies defeat. Here is a faith which sees God, not as a jolly old man with a red suit and long white beard and team of reindeer, but as the Creator and Redeemer of men, and as the Lord of History. Here is a faith which can live victoriously and joyously no matter what life brings.

It's the kind of faith that Paul showed when on trial for his life he wrote, "For me to live is Christ, to die is gain." If it be God's will that I live, it means further service to Him. But if not, it means I'm with Him sooner. If it is life it's Christ, if death it's Christ even more. How can you beat such a faith? It defies defeat. It recognizes that wherever we go, whatever we face, whether we live or die, we are in God's hands and can put our trust in Him.

Our story ends today with the appearance of a fourth in the fiery furnace "like unto a son of the gods."

We who live on the resurrection side of the cross know more fully than the author of this book of Daniel just who this fourth person was. For the Son has become flesh and dwelt among us, full of grace and truth. Here is the gospel message even in this Old Testament story. Here is the good news which applies to every generation: Insofar as our lives are put completely in the hands of Almighty God, insofar as we have given ourselves to Him in Jesus Christ and have put our complete faith and trust in Him, we can be assured that we face no trial, no temptation, no sorrow, and no illness, alone.

Note that it was not said that we would never face these situations in life—only that we face no situation alone.

Jesus said, "Lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the age."

The psalmist said, "Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil, for Thou art with me."

Jesus said, "I will not leave you desolate. I will come to you."

The need of the hour is for men and women who are filled with the presence and the power of the Living Christ. Men and women who know whom they have believed, and know whereof they stand and are willing to stand up and be counted for Christ.

The need of the hour is for men and women who will let their Christian convictions be the basis of their action in life: Men and women who will let their lights shine before men.

God grant us such a faith; God grant us such a witness.

Woman Doctor, 85, Is Happy in Practice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, even after 38 years of caring for the people of Arcadia, Wis., Dr. Elizabeth Comstock has no intention of retiring. The dedication of this 85-year-old physician is in our very finest tradition of the general practitioner and well-loved country doctor. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD an article about Dr. Comstock which appeared in the April 30, 1961, Milwaukee Journal:

ELIZABETH COMSTOCK OF ARCADIA FINDS IT STIMULATING IN HER HOME TOWN

ARCADIA, WIS.—The visit was unscheduled and this town's 85-year-old woman physician was not enthusiastic. But she relented, agreeing to see the reporter after his lunch. And she added: "Better chew it well."

In her cluttered office, two dozen steps up and adjoining her apartment, Dr. Elizabeth Comstock laced her talk with more such down-to-earth remarks.

Farmers, she said, are healthier now because "they get their shots." Her happiest experiences were "confinement cases," she said, using the old-fashioned term for childbirth cases. Then she added, either with great naivete or wisdom:

"Babies always are wanted. There is such a good feeling when they come. The families are happy to see them."

RETURNED IN 1923

This is Dr. Comstock's hometown, from which she strayed a few years to get her medical education and work in New York City. She was born on a farm near here on September 2, 1875. She came back to stay in 1923, into the same office she now has. Her waiting room, which she shares with a dentist, is a wondrous little museum, with a hexagonal clock, spool legged table, a chair with a mirror in the back and a tremendous piano, which the doctor used to play years ago.

Her blue eyes sparkling behind glasses, her smooth hands folding and unfolding, Dr. Comstock rolls back the years. When a detail or a name eludes her, she says "Oh, shucks," in the manner of a million grandmothers—although she is a spinster.

A general practice such as hers is "the most stimulating, because you get tired of doing one thing," Dr. Comstock said. A great deal of her work has been in obstetrics and gynecology. Although she didn't keep track, she probably has delivered several thousand babies.

HONORED AT CENTENNIAL

Medicine had interested her from childhood, perhaps from the time her brother cut his finger and she couldn't stop the bleeding. She recalled her own childhood illnesses—a throat infection when she was 4 that made her very sick, and a skull fracture from a cutter accident when she was 16. Years later she diagnosed a temporary impairment to her mathematical ability as aphasia, loss of understanding caused by the head injury.

Arcadia honored Dr. Comstock at its centennial 5 years ago. She has been active in cancer drives. The State medical society has cited her for her contributions to medical history.

The white-haired Dr. Comstock wound up the interview with the not surprising comment that she had no plans to retire. She said goodby, then added: "Be careful how you drive."

Damage of World War II Still Visible in Budapest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues a third article in the series by Gaston Coblentz on present-day Hungary appearing in the New York Herald Tribune. It appeared in the issue of May 3, 1961:

WORLD WAR DAMAGE REMAINS—SCARS OF 1956 REVOLUTION ERASED FROM BUDAPEST BY COMMUNIST REGIME

(By Gaston Coblentz)

BUDAPEST.—Few signs remain of the physical destruction wrought in Budapest in the fierce fighting of the 1956 uprising.

In the blocks around the Kilian barracks, a few hundred yards from the heart of the city, new apartment buildings have been built on the sites of those too badly damaged for repair, and other shell-pocked structures have received a new coat of plaster.

The thoroughness with which the Kadar government has obliterated these scars—the same thing has been done at other points, such as the National Museum and Moscow Square—offers a startling contrast to the continued failure to refurbish thousands of buildings damaged in the savage battle between the Soviet and Nazi armies in Budapest in early 1945.

MARKS OF WAR VISIBLE

The walls of practically every second building in the city are still marred by the deep shrapnel holes of that earlier struggle. But at the Kilian barracks, next to nothing remains to indicate that it was the spot where the troops of the ill-fated Gen. Pal Maleter, one of the revolt's great heroes, rose against Soviet rule.

The barracks themselves, a large four-story structure at the corner of Ulloi Street and Jozsef Boulevard, have been completely restored and repainted a pleasing ochre. They have been converted into offices and apartments, and are no longer used by the Hungarian army. Across the street, the tiled dome of the Museum of Applied Art has been restored to a bright green and gold.

NEW BUILDINGS

One of the new apartment buildings in the area, a glass-fronted structure with green facing, is among the few distinctly modern buildings to have been put up in Budapest in 13 years of Communist rule.

After the last 5 years under the post-rebellion Kadar regime, the Budapest of 1961 is a city which one judges very much according to the direction from which one arrives here.

Those who come from Moscow find it almost a gay place.

To those who arrive from the West, it seems drab and dilapidated.

GOOD FOOD, MUSIC

On balance, within the limitations of a Communist city, it unquestionably has some relieving features. Among them are a fair choice of restaurants with good food served from extensive menus and Magyar music played with verve and style. There is also a night life of sorts.

One otherwise rather desolate night club features a five-girl Can Can. The closing hours in the bars have been extended by the Kadar regime. The center of the city is likewise dotted with new espresso coffee bars in imitation of those that have flourished since the war in Italy and Austria and which, in Budapest and in Vienna, are replacing Central Europe's traditional prewar stammtisch cafes. The Budapest espresso machines are manufactured in Hungary in the same shiny silver-plated style as the Italian type.

HOTELS FOR FOREIGNERS

There are at least two comfortable hotels for foreigners, of which the newest is the handsomely renovated Gellert on the west bank of the Danube, with a large modern lobby that would look well almost anywhere. These hotels are equipped with well-serviced international Telex machines for use by foreign businessmen.

In the realm of arts, the 200-page "New Hungarian" is a potentially interesting development. It is a newly established publication which seems to reflect limited liberalizing trends in belles-lettres, painting and sculpture. Its first issue late last year featured the bronzes and captivating drawings of Ferenczy, a half paralyzed artist of 70.

A NEW TREND

Its second issue, in dealing with modern Hungarian novels, has the following to say on Socialist realism as practiced in post-rebellion Budapest:

"During the last 4 or 5 years the formerly restricted concepts of Socialist realism have been discarded and a more reasonable view has come to prevail."

The magazine makes some deep bows to communism, but is distinctly readable.

Everything considered, Budapest is obviously neither a happy city today, nor is it any longer a beautiful one. But it has recovered somewhat from the low ebb of the Rakosi era.

Goodby to Manlio Brosio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, two stories appear in the Washington Post today which, though unrelated, bear on a matter close to my heart.

The first one appears on the editorial page, and I quote:

GOODBY TO BROSIO

More than 5 years as Italian Ambassador in Washington have earned Manlio Brosio a wealth of respect and a wide circle of friends. This blue-eyed native of Turin, once described by a Londoner as having "the look of an austere minor saint from a medieval mural," has been anything but austere in his relations here. An expert on the Soviet Union in the Stalin era, he has been a warm friend of the United States and an alert and effective representative of the interests of Italy. As he and Signora Brosio leave for their new assignment in France they will take with them a host of good wishes.

The second appears on page A16, and is a report of certain statements made by our distinguished colleague in the other House, the junior Senator from Arkansas. The Senator deplores the policy of shifting our capable ambassadors from country to country after but 2 years' service.

We are fortunate that the Italian Government is more liberal than ours, for we have had the privilege and pleasure of Ambassador Brosio's representation for over 6 years. In that time he has done much—officially and personally—to improve our already pleasant and healthy relations with his Government and country. "An alert and effective representative" of Italy and "a warm friend of the United States" describe him well. I was perhaps more fortunate than many, for over these 6 years I came to know Manlio Brosio as a thoroughly delightful, understanding social associate, as a keenly intelligent, inspirational professional colleague.

We shall all miss the distinguished Ambassador and his gracious lady. I shall miss them both, and I shall envy Paris.

Unofficial Good-Will Mission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, each Member of this House works dedicatedly and diligently with the hope of improving America's international relations. Governmental agencies and departments have been instituted for this purpose. The new Peace Corps has been created to perform people-to-people tasks that will win America friends in nations throughout the world.

An individual who is not a "department" nor a "corps," nor governmentally created nor regulated, took it upon himself to perform a good-will mission that from all reports won support and admiration of the people of Mexico.

Early this year, Mr. Frank Sinatra was asked to make a charity appearance in Mexico City on behalf of the Mexican Rehabilitation Institute. The institute is the first Latin American center to assist amputees.

Mr. Sinatra, who during his tour was referred to by one patient at the center as the "man with the golden heart," readily accepted the invitation to appear at a society ball on April 21. At his suggestion, three performances were held for the general public the following day with proceeds going to the Mexican Rehabilitation Center. Four appearances brought $45,000 to aid in the work of the center.

Mr. Sinatra's appearances were profitable in a greater sense. They illustrated a care, concern and regard for the people of Mexico and their problems. I feel that Mr. Sinatra's humane conrtibution entitles him to applause beyond that given a great entertainer.

Printed below is an article which appeared in the April 21, 1961, edition of

the News, Mexico's English-language newspaper, telling of Mr. Sinatra's tour. I hope you will find it to be a good account of this unofficial good-will mission:

SINATRA TOURS MEXICAN REHABILITATION INSTITUTE

(By Margaret Butler)

"Good morning, Frank See-na-tra," sang the children of the Mexican Rehabilitation Institute to the famous singer Thursday morning.

Their performance climaxed a tour of the institute by Frank Sinatra and his party, led by Don Rómulo O'Fárrill, ex-president of the institute and president of Novedades and the News.

"I've never seen anything like this," said Mr. Sinatra. "It's incredible work. I'm really moved."

Gesturing around him, he exclaimed, "Everyone is smiling. There's a wonderful psychological atmosphere here."

One reason for the high morale in the institute is Don Rómulo O'Fárrill who, in addition to being a founder of the rehabilitation plant, has only one leg himself. At the appearance of any long faces in the practice line, he calls cheerily, "Look, this is the way. Stand on your new leg. Like this. Hop on it," and proceeds to do the exercise himself.

Upon his arrival, Mr. Sinatra was greeted with a football cheer from the children on the balcony. Mrs. O'Fárrill decorated him with the heart-shaped insignia of the institute, and Mr. OFárrill showed a large stack of car radios piled ready for delivery. Seventy of these are produced in the workrooms of the institute every day, as well as precision parts and the needed supply of artificial limbs and braces.

In addition to the workshops producing articles for sale, the tour included the physical therapy department and gymnasium, occupational therapy rooms and the prosthetics section where artificial limbs that defy detection are made to individual specification.

In recognition of his great work for the institute, Mr. Sinatra was presented with a plaque by the women's auxiliary.

Mr. Sinatra, whose benefit performances this week will aid both the institute and the National Institute for the Protection of Children, has donated a complete high fidelity system and record library to MRI.

Copies of his recent record, "Ring-a-Ding-Ding," were on sale and many managed to get their's autographed. A percentage of the profit from record sales this month will also be given to charity.

It has been estimated that the "April in Mexico" ball at the Hilton last night and the three benefit performances at the Cine Internacional will net some 350,000 pesos in the 3 days of Frank Sinatra's visit for these two worthy organizations.

Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, the Balkan Peninsula has been the home of a large number of peoples differing in race, language, history, and traditions. However, throughout their long and eventful history they have shared one thing in common: they all have fought for their freedom, and thus have shared the same fate. The Rumanian people, constituting one of the largest of the group in the area, have suffered a similar fate.

Early in modern times their country was overrun by the Ottoman Turks, and they were subjected to the unwelcome and harsh rule of their conquerors. For centuries they struggled for their freedom from the oppressive yoke of their overlords, but most of their attempts ended in disasters and bloodbaths. In the middle of the last century, however, they had better luck. At the end of the Crimean War in 1856, they gained autonomous status, and this status was guaranteed by the great powers of Europe. The next and more important move was made in 1877, during the course of the Russo-Turkish War of 1877–78. On May 10, 1877, they took their destiny into their own hands and proclaimed their independence. Since that memorable date, for 84 years May 10 has been celebrated as their national holiday, their independence day.

Today on the observance of this anniversary I join the Rumanian National Committee and voice my heartfelt sympathy for the sad plight of their compatriots in Communist-dominated Rumania.

Ex-Soldier Flies to Reunion of Elbe River Linkup Vets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, when American and Russian troops linked up at the Elbe River in Germany 16 years ago, one of the members of the six-man American patrol was Pvt. Leroy Hamlin, a member of the Ute Mountain Ute Indian tribe of southwestern Colorado. A recent article in the Denver (Colo.) Post recalls that historic moment. Under leave to extend my remarks I should like to include in the RECORD the Post article, in recognition of the service rendered their country by members of Indian tribes throughout the Nation:

EX-SOLDIER FLIES TO REUNION OF ELBE RIVER LINKUP VETS

(By Marilyn Robinson, Denver Post staff writer)

A World War II veteran from Towaoc, Colo., boarded a jetliner in Denver Tuesday afternoon for his first jet flight and the first leg of his journey into the past.

The man: Leroy Hamlin, 38, who as a private in the 69th Infantry Division was a member of the first American patrol to link up with Russian troops at the Elbe River in Germany 16 years ago.

His destination: Torgau, Germany, where American and Soviet veterans of the famous meeting held a 16th anniversary celebration April 25.

How did he become a member of the six-man patrol that dashed across the broken girders of a bridge over the Elbe to greet the Soviet soldiers?

As Hamlin, who lives on the mountain Ute Indian Reservation at Towaoc and works for the tribe as a filing clerk, waited to board his plane at Stapleton Field, he described how chance made him a participant in the historic linkup.

"I was an artilleryman and was sent as a replacement to an outfit," Hamlin said, "but somehow my name was left off a list and an officer told me to join an infantry unit so I joined up with the infantry boys."

When they reached the river and spotted the Russians, he said, "a lieutenant—I don't remember his name—told six of us to go over."

The meeting, which came just 2 weeks before the end of the war with Germany, was "pretty friendly," Hamlin recalled. "We all shook hands and were laughing and trying to talk to each other."

What of the strained relations between the United States and the Soviet Union today?

"It's pretty hard to pinpoint the exact conditions," he said. "I sure hope they are friendly again in the future."

Hamlin, divorced and the father of one son, has lived on the reservation all his life except for his 3½ years in the Army which took him to north Africa, Italy, France, Belgium, and into Germany.

The Ute tribe contributed $1,000 toward his trip expenses to help fulfill Hamlin's long-time dream of returning to Germany.

"This is the first time I've gone back but I've always had hopes," he explained.

Federal Government Cannot Create Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in an editorial in the Wall Street Journal, which I include as a part of my remarks, the writer calls attention to a great truth many have overlooked in the rush to adopt New Frontier-sponsored programs. Many of the so-called solutions to our economic problems have been tried before and found wanting. Are we so bankrupt of ideas that we have to resurrect all the New Deal formulas which failed before and, in fact, contributed to many of the current weaknesses of our economy? I believe the best solution to building a strong economy is to give full rein to our private, competitive system and sound economic principles upon which our prosperity and our unexcelled standard of living have been built. There is no possible way, under a free society, that government can create jobs. Only private investment, with as little Federal control as possible, coupled with the vision and the daring of free men can put men to work and keep them working at high wages. The fallacy of the administration-sponsored programs for greater public works and expanded Federal controls is ably stated in the following editorial:

RUSTY MACHINERY

It's the dream of a certain kind of economic planner to reduce the most complex problems to simple-pushbutton solutions. And it's his custom, once his scheme is wired up through Washington, to ignore the clanks

and flashing lights that warn of short circuits between the theoretical model and the real world.

Right now, one gadget being promoted in Washington is a revival of the New Deal job making machine: Massive public works spending. Even as they concede the economy's recovery from the recession, some of President Kennedy's advisers urge works spending as the solution to an "unacceptable" level of unemployment. They would prefer immediate spending, but are willing to settle for standby authority to punch the public works button if present unemployment persists into next fall.

It would be well if the President looked into the innards of the machine set before him, tracing the mixedup circuits and loose wires. First, the machinery of massive Government works programs accomplished little during the thirties; unemployment remained at high levels right up to World War II.

Moreover, today's unemployment situation is in no way comparable to that of the 1930's. There are no masses of people made jobless by a general slump; instead, genuine joblessness exists largely among those who, for one reason or another, lack the skills necessary to take advantage of increasingly demanding job opportunities.

Make-work is no solution to such unemployment. Indeed, a new WPA-style program, with its promise of the indefinite dole, would be likely to delay adjustment to change. It might even create a permanent body of "unemployables" who would remain jobless amid plentiful job openings they could not fill.

If the economists in Washington really want an expanding economy and higher employment, they ought to put the rusty public works machinery of the depression back on the scrap heap.

Rivers Need No Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I rise in defense of a Member of the other side of the aisle, L. MENDEL RIVERS, of South Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, as a Member of this body, I take exception to the contents of an article by a well known Washington columnist on Monday of this week reflecting on the character, the reputation and the integrity of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS]. Mr. RIVERS is a veteran Member of this House and enjoys the respect and confidence of all who know him. I have known him pleasantly during my membership in the Congress. He is a dedicated Member of the Congress of the United States.

While columnists make a livelihood of this kind of writing, it is the first time I have read such a criticism of Mr. RIVERS. With his accustomed dignity, Mr. RIVERS elects to treat such a tirade with quiet disdain. This is admirable.

Mr. Speaker, I have never traveled outside the continental limits of the United States, consequently, I am not defending myself or my record. However, I have complete confidence in Mr. RIVERS, his judgment, his conduct, and his responsibility. I am sure he represents the best interests of the great Committee on Armed Services and of the Congress of this Nation in his travels.

I am sure the people of South Carolina will not be swayed, in the slightest, by an unwarranted and highly inaccurate article.

Currying Favor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, in days of old, court jesters, in order to curry favor with the king, used to do small things to please him. Apparently this custom is still prevalent, especially in the New Frontier. The following article by George Dixon, in today's Washington Post, is most timely:

NAME DROPPING

(By George Dixon)

Herbie Klotz, who used to be a ski jumper and escort of Hedy Lamarr, has a new pastime. He is trying to get President John F. Kennedy mentioned in the newspapers.

Herbie is an exceedingly proper young man, so I suppose we should employ his proper name. It is Herbert W. Klotz, thanx lotz. He is special assistant to Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges, in charge—apparently—of roundheeled-robins.

"Klotz' Shotz," as Herbie's penetrating pronouncements are now known to the cognoscenti, are aimed at the administration's press information officers, or flacks, as they are called in the sordid world of private enterprise.

Herbie spread this scatter shot all over the Commerce Department:

"At a White House meeting of Cabinet assistants, we have been advised again that speeches of Cabinet and sub-Cabinet officers do not contain sufficient reference to the President and his personal interest in, and compassion with, the problems which face the Nation. Liberal quotations from his speeches, past and present, should be used * * *. It should also be kept in mind that, in making announcements of local projects, the President should be given a credit line in the lead paragraph.

I trust Herbie will note that I heeded his injunction in this column. He can't say the President is the only one with compassion. I am so compassionate I will never be able to rest until I smash this foul plot to keep Mr. Kennedy in anonymity. Let the miscreants who are conspiring to go to press without a line about him blanch at this: Kennedy, Kennedy, Kennedy, Kennedy, Kennedy, Kennedy, Kennedy.

They may send goons to intimidate me, but I won't retract a single Kennedy.

I wish I could get clearance to ask Herbie about the plot to keep the identity of the Nation's Chief Executive secret. But I am forced to suppress my curiosity. This new passion, or compassion, for secrecy in Government has rendered me almost tonguetied.

It is extremely difficult for one who has been in this business as long as I have to readjust to not asking questions, but complete suppression of news can be achieved only if we put into it our whole hearts and our thoughts, Klotz.

Noble examples have been set for us. The U.S. Naval Research Laboratory gave us possibly the greatest inspiration of all. It tried to hide its telephone book behind a wall of secrecy.

There was a disposition on the part of Chairman JOHN E. Moss of the House Information Subcommittee to challenge the classification of the Navy Lab's interoffice phone directory, but the secrecy was so effective that, for 48 hours, not a single enemy agent got a wrong extension.

This must, however, have caused Herbie Klotz misgivings. It was a local project, but the President was not given a credit line in the lead paragraph.

Nevertheless, I am determined to be an old dog learning new tricks. I believe I have made a commendable start, although it is causing some people to stare at me rather quizzically.

I go around with my hand clamped over my mouth. Statesmen plead with me to ask them questions, but I refuse—even though I'm convinced it isn't the questions, but the answers, that endanger the national interest.

Cooperation Among Farmers Is an American Tradition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Farmers Union Central Exchange's 30th annual meeting, held recently in St. Paul, Minn., drew 5,000 members and visitors, who learned that this regional wholesale cooperative had just completed its second largest year. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include an article on the highlights of the meeting in the RECORD. This story appeared in the May 1961 issue of the magazine News for Farmer Cooperatives:

FARMERS UNION CENTRAL EXCHANGE HAS NEAR RECORD YEAR

The 30th year of Farmers Union Central Exchange, St. Paul, Minn., turned out to be the second largest in its history—with over $8 million distributed to affiliated cooperatives as patronage refunds on a total sales volume of $90.7 million. This amounted to 8.9 percent in net savings to be distributed to patrons.

More than 5,000 people attended the 3-day annual meeting February 27, 28, and March 1. Here they heard Thomas H. Steichen, general manager, give some highlights of the year and do some projecting. He said:

"A generally depressed agricultural economy, unfavorable weather, a nationwide soft market for refined petroleum products affecting the entire industry, and a reduction in the number of farms has had its impact on central exchange's operations. And although unit sales were up for some products, market prices for them were lower. If it weren't for these factors, dollar volume would have hit an alltime high.

"As I see it, there are three things we must strive to do. They are: (1) Attract new members, (2) expand and integrate even further, and (3) offer the best in product and services."

Some highlights of the 1960 year for this regional wholesale cooperative—owned by 350,000 farm families through 850 locally controlled co-ops—were:

One million dollars' worth of improvements and repairs at Exchange's oil refinery in Laurel, Mont.

Construction of $5 million Cenex pipeline and oil storage terminal at Minot, N. Dak.

Retiring $1.6 million in cash of the remaining half of 1950's patronage refund stock.

Expanded operations of soil service centers to 14 plants where members can get prescription mix fertilizers.

Increased authorized capital stock to $100.2 million.

Among the many agricultural and cooperative leaders speaking at the meeting was Senator EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, of Minnesota. Among the points he made were that there were three important basic characteristics a sound farm program must recognize. The first is that of the family farm where the family lives on its holdings, supplies most of the labor and capital, and makes the basic managerial decisions. The second is that of the farmer's close association with the rural community * * * a community from which they have received benefits and to which they have contributed resources and leadership.

"The third characteristic of American agriculture is that of farmers working together for mutual benefit," according to Senator MCCARTHY. "Though they settled on individual holdings and each is the manager of his own operation, American farmers have a tradition of cooperating. On the frontier such cooperation was informal and local, sufficient for the needs of the times. They exchanged work and united in common efforts for harvesting, building and similar activities. Later, this spirit was channeled into larger and more formal groups, giving rise to farm organizations, cooperatives, and occasionally political parties."

COOPERATIVE SYSTEM THE OUTCOME

"From this tradition has developed the farmer cooperative system, one of the most effective means by which the farmer has maintained his individual ownership and management, while still securing the advantages of collective marketing and purchasing."

The 1960 annual report of the Exchange used as its cover a painting by one of its employees, Forrest Hill, and offered reproductions to farm families who wanted an art print. The original hangs in the Exchange's lobby beside the painting used on last year's cover.

Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in the turbulent history of Eastern Europe May 10 is one of the most glorious of dates. For on that day 84 years ago, the Rumanian people achieved their long sought independence.

One of the richest countries, one of the largest in area and population, Rumania had for centuries been a part of the Roman, then the Ottoman Empire. In the 19th century the Sultan's grip was at last loosened, and the Balkans broke free. In 1877 while the Turks were engaged in a defensive war against the Russians, Rumanian leaders took their destiny into their own hands and proclaimed their independence from Turkey. Thus, 1,776 years after its beginnings as a Roman colony, Rumania was a nation of free people.

For 64 years she remained free; but in the last 20 years she has again been under the yoke—first of the Germans, then of the Russians.

Today in their Communist-dominated homeland, unhappy Rumanians cannot publicly observe their most important national holiday. But in their hearts, I know they join with me and my Rumanian friends everywhere in the free world in celebrating this historic occasion. May the day soon come when Rumania will again be a free and independent nation.

The Call to Arms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, on April 27, 1961, the New York County Democratic organization gathered at the Hotel Commodore to review the principles of the Democratic Party, rejoice in the victory of the Democratic standard bearer, John F. Kennedy, as President of the United States, and issued a call to arms. My colleague, ADAM C. POWELL, delivered a fiery address and laid down the gauntlet to splinter groups. The leader of the New York County Democratic organization, Carmine DeSapio, who was also the national Democratic chairman of New York, delivered a stirring address to 2,000 participants, summarized the principles of the Democratic Party, set forth the program of the accomplished Democratic deeds and joined the call to arms by Democratic forces against splinter groups and the second major party of New York City which claims credit for Democratic accomplishments. The speech was so well received and its message so important that I believe that a reading of the message will open our minds to the wonderful opportunities which are becoming realities in an incredibly fast moving world. Mr. DeSapio's speech follows:

Reverend clergy, Senator Hartke, Congressman Powell, State Comptroller Levitt, Chairman Prendergast, Council President Abe Stark, Comptroller Larry Gerosa, members of the board of estimates, our distinguished District Attorney Frank Hogan, my esteemed colleagues, the county chairman, Congresswoman Edna Kelly, Vice Chairman Mae Gurevich, distinguished guests, district leaders, captains, friends, and my fellow Democrats, if throughout my life, I have ever believed in the old adage that a man can be judged by the company he keeps, then this is the very moment I would choose to be judged.

Surrounded as I am by so many loyal, distinguished and dedicated friends and fellow Democrats, I am moved to a sense of gratification and gratitude that I find difficult to express. I thank you from the bottom of my heart.

During my lifetime as a Democrat, but especially in my 12 years as leader of the New York County Organization, I have given constant and repeated thought to the principles of our party. And, if those principles needed reaffirmation, we all have merely to look about us to find it. For the men and women who have gathered here tonight, in the spirit of party purpose and warm friendship, represent as near a cross section of the greatness that is America as can be found anywhere, at any time, under any roof.

In our midst are lawyers and industrialists; doctors and government officials; labor leaders and salesmen; teachers and housewives; men and women from every walk of life. We are Protestants, Catholics and Jews, all united for a common goal. And we can trace our ancestories to the vales of Ireland, the shores of the Mediterranean and to virtually every corner of the earth.

And, I cannot help but reflect upon the contrast between the Democratic Party, and what it stand for, and the Republican Party and what it pretends to stand for.

I cannot help thinking of the callous Republican attempts to represent itself as the party of progressive principle, while it behaves in its more familiar role as the party of privilege and pretension.

The New York State GOP historically has offered the people a program of accomplished Democratic deeds. They have consistently tried to steal the Democratic thunder but only after the clouds have passed, and the storm was over.

To understand the Republicans, one need only conjure up the picture of the old plowhorse, wearing blinders, refurrowing the same fields—time after time—in the vain hope that it will choke off the weeds of outmoded ideas and archaic philosophies.

And if the Republican plowhorse wears blinders, my friends, then there is another plowhorse which wears magnifying glasses. For like most third party organizations in the history of our country—and particularly of our State—the Liberal Party has equated its dreams with its claims, and confused its promises with its achievements.

Of the almost 8 million voters in New York State, it has enrolled a little less than 100,000—approximately 1 percent. And yet its leadership, with neither compunction nor embarrassment, proclaims to the world that the election of a Democratic President was its gift to America.

And at the same time that they agree to secret covenants with the Republican bargainers in Albany—at the same time that they conspire to scuttle deserving candidates and make patronage deals with whoever will barter with them—they sanctimoniously preach to the Democratic Party about the character and meaning of honest leadership.

The Liberal Party's subterfuge and its transparent techniques would really be quite comical, if so many well-meaning and well-intentioned people were not deluded. For even the tiniest splinter, if neglected, can cause a serious infection.

It takes a special and rare ability in the art of manipulation, for them to claim to control the elections in our city or State. The election results in our city in 1953 and 1957 evidence the futility and the sham of this assertion. It sets a new high or low in temerity, for the Liberal Party to suggest that if it didn't nominate President Kennedy, those who voted for him on its line would have cast their ballots instead, for Richard Nixon.

I tell you, my friends, never have so few claimed so much for so little.

But even more pretentious than their claim to a balance of power—even more egotistical than their claim to strength and

popular support—is their boast that they—and only they—represent the labor leaders and the trade unionists of our State.

For the traditional home of labor in New York State has been—and will continue to be—the Democratic Party. For what party, after all, is more liberal than the Democratic Party? We Democrats are proud of the close working relationship which we enjoy with the great majority of labor leaders. We seek their counsel and their help, and when we advance deserving, progressive and farsighted candidates for office, we invariably win their support.

For it has been proven time and again—election after election—that the responsible labor leaders of our city and State have never compromised the principles nor the aspirations of organized labor for political aggrandizement. Neither have they sacrificed the aims or the purpose of the labor movement, for political power.

And it is significant, my friends—and the best testimony to the inherent weakness of splinter parties—it is significant, indeed, that in the history of our State, no third party has ever survived for much more than a single generation.

And I am sure, that even more shortlived than the Liberal Party's effectiveness, will be the spasms of another vindictive group. And, as seems to be the habit among willful minorities, this one also parades under a righteous and sanctimonious name; this time it is called: reform.

If we are to judge the effectiveness of a political group or party on the strength of its vocal chords, there is no doubt that those self-proclaimed reformers would be a powerful instrument within the framework of our body politic. But, unfortunately for them, the people of our city and State do not trade promises, slogans and scapegoats * * * for performance, purpose and character.

Nevertheless, it is the hope of the reformers—the very vain hope indeed—that their voices, like the horn of Joshua, will crumble the Democratic Party structure of progress and growth, a structure which, in our county, has taken 160 years to build.

It is this very structure, my friends, which we, as Democrats, must keep uppermost in our minds. We must not only defend it against those who, for the sake of personal power and gain, would find comfort in its destruction, but we must always secure it; strengthen it; and assure its continued growth.

It is easy, indeed, for opportunists to attach themselves to fashionable phrases and words, words like "reform." But it is the very principle of reform; of improvement; of progress which has been greater than all others in turning us, and millions of Americans, to the Democratic Party.

Whether it is the principles, so clear and pure, of the party of Jefferson; the ideals of Wilson; the humanitarianism of Roosevelt; the courage of Truman or the force and vigor of Kennedy, these are the emotions and influences which we must now keep before us, and which must inspire and guide all of our thoughts.

As Democrats, we must concern ourselves with the communal good and with the national progress. We must not let self-interested crusades gather momentum against any of the fundamentals of our society. With our Nation facing its most critical test in history, we must work toward unity and progress.

As an organization, we are dynamic and strong. We have the finest leaders and the most devoted party workers.

As Americans—and as Democrats—we must call upon our deepest and most fervent beliefs, and summon our greatest faith and strength for the battles that lie ahead. Ours is the heritage of enlightened leadership. Ours is the tradition of government by conscience. Ours is the history of forward-looking dedication. Ours is the symbol of noble example and forceful action.

Neither idleness nor isolation can protect us, either from the Republicans; from the capital "L" liberals, or from the self-styled reformers.

We must not permit splinter groups to splinter our unity of purpose.

The two-party system is the very essence of our democracy, and the very source of America's strength.

Those, who would conspire, through faceless fusion or devious deals, to undermine that system, bring upon their own house the danger of destruction.

Yet, as reckless as it seems, and as obvious as the consequences appear, the seeds of this disruption have already been sown in the most hypocritical of gestures.

Only 2 weeks ago, the Republican Advisory Council said, and I quote:

"Healthy government under our traditional American system is the progressive, vigorous government administered and legislated through the constructive competition of the two-party system." End of quote.

But, 2 days later the Republican Party leadership announced it would welcome a coalition with the Liberal Party.

It will be interesting to see whether the Republican Party heeds its Advisory Council or its leadership, in what promises, this year, to be a year of decision. The 2½ million voters of New York City will welcome the opportunity to determine whether it is practical, and whether it is wise, for a political party to trade principle for expediency.

For our part, we in the New York County Democratic Organization will not permit any splinter group to dictate who our candidates shall be.

And we are confident that our standard-bearers will be of such high caliber, character, and qualification that all of the truly independent voters of our city will support and help elect them, as will those Liberal Party leaders who seek good government, rather than power and patronage.

The American people carry the pain of anxiety in their hearts, as they observe the tragic results of unchecked political opportunism in Cuba—only 90 miles from our shores.

Let us here, in our own city—in the Capital City of the world—set an example of the kind of unity and dedication on which progress thrives, and from achievement grows.

The best defense of our system of government, and one which will withstand all attacks, is to remain firmly dedicated to the principles which are traditionally identified with the Democratic Party. Yet me must always remain open in mind and spirit to the beautiful phenomenon of change * * * and of social, economic and political advancement for all of our fellow citizens.

I have no doubts, my good friends, that this thought; that this pledge, is uppermost in the minds and hearts of everyone here tonight. For it is no more than a rededication to the very ideals which have carried each of us—and our party—to the great heights of public support and to the great responsibility of safeguarding the public well-being.

In the days ahead, let us not lose, but let us rather gain momentum. Let us not waver, but let us rather grow stronger in our convictions. Let us not close, but let us rather open our minds to the wonderful new opportunities and dreams which are quickly becoming realities in an incredibly fast-moving world.

Our work here in New York must serve to spread the fulfillment which is democracy, to a world which is today half in slavery. And by our continued expression of faith in the Democratic Party, we will build together a meaningful, purposeful and bountiful life for ourselves, our children and for all humanity.

Thank you, thank you very much.

A Message From Garcia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, it is my present recollection that some voices in the United States have been raised in criticism, even in suspicion, of some of the pronouncements and actions of the present President of the Republic of the Philippines. Whether or not such criticisms or suspicions had or have any justification is of no concern to me as of this particular moment. Rather, would I bring to my colleagues' attention an address made recently by Carlos P. Garcia, President of the Philippines. I believe it to be an outstanding pronouncement of a friend of democracy, a friend of the free world, a loyal citizen of his own country and an understanding and loyal ally of the people of the United States of America. I recommend the reading and study of the address to my colleagues and fellow Americans. Mr. Speaker, the brief paragraphs which follow are by way of further introduction of President Garcia's recent address:

A MESSAGE FROM GARCIA

(Since the day he took office in 1957, Carlos P. Garcia, President of the Philippines, has worked to develop an independent foreign policy which would best serve the interest of a young democracy at the crossroads of the Far East.

(He has sought to develop closer relations with his country's Asian neighbors, without in any way weakening Filipino friendship with the United States "our closest ally and friend."

(President Garcia has consistently guided Philippine policy along lines which would enable his country to serve as a magnet, drawing together the non-Communist nations of Asia.

(Although the Philippines itself is not yet fully developed, President Garcia has backed the cause of economic development at home and among other Asian nations which are also undertaking the transition from agricultural to industrial economies.

(Since communism first appeared on the Asiatic mainland, Filipino political leaders have recognized it for a deadly enemy. President Garcia has repeatedly warned that its relentless drive for world domination "is something that cannot be ignored by any free Asian."

(Two years ago, at the Manila Overseas Press Club, President Garcia outlined his efforts to promote closer cooperation between the nations of free Asia while retaining traditional ties with the United States.

(This year he again used the same forum to emphasize his philosophy and, in particular, to define his nation's policy with respect to the recognition of Red China and its admission to the United Nations.)

ADDRESS BY CARLOS P. GARCIA

A little over 2 years ago, I broached the idea of bringing about in this region (southeast Asia) an association of states which, mostly in the cultural and economic sectors, might explore common areas of interest, common problems and perhaps avenues of cooperative action for a common good. Shortly afterward we had the pleasure of welcoming among us the Premier of Malaya, Tengku Abdul Rahman, who likewise saw

merit in the concept and became one of its most vigorous advocates.

This month a beginning was made, a limited one to be sure, but one holding great promise. In the agreement between the Governments of Thailand, Malaya, and the Philippines to confer on the mechanics of such regional association is the beginning of the kind of understanding and cooperation so essential to the free world in this time of trial.

Before discussing this development more fully, however, it might be useful to sketch briefly the background against which elements of our foreign policy should be viewed.

First let us examine the current international situation and the nature of the tensions which constitute the crises of our day.

A great scholar and observer of world affairs makes the significant observation that it is inaccurate to speak of the conflict between the free world and communism as a contest of two similar power blocs. He points out that whereas the Communist bloc is a monolithic organism held together by violence and intimidation, such as the Russian tanks in Hungary, the free world bloc is a voluntary association impelled toward pooling its resources in the interests of collective security only by the threatening pressures of the Communist bloc itself. I think it is also useful to define more sharply the nature of the conflict.

It is a matter of Communist doctrine for all to read that the Communist revolution will not, indeed cannot, stop short of an all-Communist world. No Communist of any stature has as yet repudiated this basic doctrine of international communism. In fact, careful study of their most recent literature establishes conclusively that even the concept of peaceful coexistence is seen by top Communists as a temporary lull in armed hostilities during which they may consolidate their gains and prepare for the next violent phase of Communist expansion. The present world crisis therefore derives from the Communist Party's continuing attack, by whatever means possible, on all non-Communist countries, since the continued existence of free societies, of free men, cannot be tolerated within the concept of an all-Communist world. Thus, unless we consider surrender to intimidation, the initiative for ending the cold war and averting a hot war rests with the Communists—and only the Communists.

I think it is also high time that we demolish the distortion heard from some quarters that small nations committed to the free world bloc are merely pawns fighting the war of the United States in a big power contest with the Soviet Union.

The question has been asked in some quarters, for example, why the Philippines, a small nation, has chosen to take an active part in this decisive world struggle. Our reasons in terms of political and religious belief, or morality and justice, already have been adequately stated. For the benefit of those who claim to be practical realists, however, I think it might be wise to add this further practical and realistic reason. The free world is fighting for a world community ruled by law, the Communists for rule imposed by force. As one of the small nations, a world of laws is our sole hope of stature and dignity. Under a world rule of force we can expect nothing better than national extinction and racial absorption.

There is little need to labor the obvious as to why we accept American leadership in this struggle. The American record for supporting freedom for all peoples is ample endorsement of their motivation and intent. In material resource and tenacity no other nation or combination of nations can claim the contribution already made to the fight, or match the strength and potential of America to sustain it. (In this connection, it is interesting to note that while some commentators go so far as to claim Soviet superiority over the United States, Mr. Khrushchev himself promises his people only that they will catch up with the United States in 7 to 10 years.)

To summarize up to this point, we may say that until the Communist bloc decides to abandon the world revolution, international tensions and conflict, regardless of temporary lulls of peaceful coexistence or peaceful competition, will continue. Further, by the Communists' own doctrine, every free society, committed or otherwise, will continue to be a target of whatever weapon is considered appropriate, whether armed aggression, assistance to internal rebellion, economic sabotage, or any of the many forms of subversion. It may also be assumed that America will continue to exercise the leadership and shoulder the major material burden of free world defense, while her allies gain the strength necessary to tip the balance so decisively that the Communists will be discouraged from further pursuing their aggressive expansion.

This brings us to the question of what may now be forecast as to the American posture of free world leadership under a new administration.

From President Kennedy's pronouncements to date, from those of his major appointees, and from the writings of those known to influence the thinking of the new administration, it is possible to derive at least a preliminary assessment. It now appears likely that there will be no alteration of basic policy and fundamental objectives. In executing policy and pursuing these objectives, however, it may be expected that full advantage will be taken of the opportunity afforded by change to secure a broader area of tactical maneuver, greater flexibility and variety in the instruments of policy brought to bear. Although for years the United States, almost alone, has carried the burden of military and economic assistance to the recovering and developing nations of the free world, and today is suffering in some measure from the economic consequences, it appears likely that neither of these programs will be abandoned or drastically reduced. There appears to be some inclination to lean more toward acceleration of economic growth, and it is predictable that because of economic pressures both military and economic foreign aid programs will be more sharply scrutinized and more carefully weighed, so that each dollar of investment in free world strength delivers its maximum yield.

In his inaugural address, President Kennedy said: "My fellow citizens of the world: Ask not what America will do for you, but what together we can do for the freedom of man."

What can we do together for the freedom of man? What can a small nation such as ours do now?

It seems immediately obvious that maximum acceleration of economic growth and technical development serve not only the individual national interest, but also the objective of strengthening the free world alliance. It is toward this end that we are taking steps toward stimulating both foreign and domestic private investment, expanding and diversifying our pattern of trade and commerce, and developing new credit lines with appropriate nations of the free world.

Another contribution we can make to the free world effort, one wholly compatible with the national interest and aspiration, is in the political sector—not alone in terms of maintaining our own domestic stability but even more in terms of the posture and initiative we take in our regional and global international relationships. For example, the consultative conference held recently in Manila, I believe, established firmly for the information of all concerned the fact that the peoples and governments of this region see the situation in Laos not as a big power contest but as a serious threat to their own peace and security and a manifestation of renewed Communist expansionism.

Aside from the special and significant features of the free world bloc already mentioned, it should not be forgotten that the free world, precisely defined, includes the so-called uncommitted nations which nevertheless are as dedicated to the preservation of their own free societies and individual freedom as ours. With these nations, while we may differ on the measures taken to insure national integrity, we have much in common in terms of other problems and aspirations wherein mutual understanding and cooperation can be mutually beneficial.

For the most part, these common problems are characteristic of the developing new nations: security against external aggressions, internal defense and protection of free institutions, and the acceleration of economic growth and technological development. It is no coincidence certainly that each of these areas is today included in the broadened front of Communist attack. As the arms race reaches a point of stalemate, the political and economic sectors grow in importance, and whatever can be done to increase the strength of these sectors in every free nation, regardless of military commitment, is a net gain in terms of free world security.

This has been the underlying purpose of our determination to broaden the base of our relationship, first with neighboring free societies and later with those geographically more remote. It would be Utopian to think that in the free association I have described there could be complete agreement in all matters, but it is a characteristic of a democratic community such as the free world comprises that the individual and the community may seek benefits wherever agreement and cooperation can be achieved.

While on the subject of the small nation—committed, uncommitted or neutral—we might stop to consider a particular phenomenon of our times—a phenomenon, incidentally, which underscores my earlier emphasis on the fact that it is the small nation that has the greatest stake in realizing a world community accepting the rule of law.

Recently the General Assembly of the United Nations has been augmented by the admission of many new small nations. Small though each may be in resource and limited in experience, each enjoys numerical equality with the oldest and largest in that assembly of nations. The magnitude of the influence these nations acting in concert can wield has been demonstrated and commented upon. Some view the phenomenon with elation, others with concern. We of the Philippines, ourselves a small nation, experience both reactions. We are elated to have this confirmation of our most fundamental foreign policy outlook, but we are concerned that this power of small states, unique in mankind's history, not be lost or destroyed by abuse.

We must never lose sight of the fact that the power exists only by virtue of the organization in which it is exercised, the United Nations. This organization itself will exist only so long as it honestly and impartially reflects the intent of its Charter, only so long as each member feels that its decisions and judgments are the result of sober and honest deliberation. The intrusion of petty or sordid motives, of ancient grudges or racial bias, could bring about the the destruction of what the world has so painfully tried to restore since the tragic collapse of the League of Nations.

Before concluding, there is one other aspect of this administration's foreign policy I should like to clarify. Our determination to withhold recognition from nations of the Communist bloc has been questioned as being more rigid than that of the United States. "More popish than the Pope," is one of the flippant criticisms.

In the first place it should be pointed out that the free world alliance by its very nature does not impose rigid conformity of policy upon each of its members. For its own reasons, the United States recognizes the Soviet Union and sits with its representatives in the United Nations. We have avoided such diplomatic relations without impairing our U.N. participation. Should Red China shoot its way into the United Nations, or even negotiate formal relations with the United States, we see no reason why either development need influence our own policy, which is based upon considerations of practical self-interest. In terms of trade, we certainly have not so thoroughly exhausted the markets of the free world as to turn in desperation to those of the Communist bloc. As for diplomatic convenience, we ask "Whose?" All too vivid is the experience of many of our neighbors, warning us of the tremendous burden that would be placed upon our security services should we permit an influx of hordes of spies, propagandists, and professional saboteurs, working from the protection of a diplomatic sanctuary in our very midst.

This then, in summary, is our position. The clash between world communism and free societies is not of our choosing and not subject to our evasion. We believe that the only way to avert war, or win it if it is forced upon us, is by a pooling of all free world strength in every sector, that weakness or disunity can serve only to invite aggression or piecemeal capture. For ourselves we choose active participation. In the case of those of our free world neighbors and friends who choose otherwise we are prepared to respect their freedom of choice, developing our relations with them in any or all of the other constructive categories of democratic activity mutually acceptable.

Contrary to Marxist dogma, we hold that tyranny—not the free society—carries within it the seeds of its own destruction. We believe, too, that the urge toward freedom is one of the strongest instincts, a divine endowment of all living things—including the people of Russia and Communist China. Therefore, the longer the free world can maintain and widen the margin of deterence, the closer we come to peace with justice and freedom for all mankind.

Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM W. SCRANTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. SCRANTON. Mr. Speaker, Rumania has been the source of contention for many centuries between Western and Eastern forces. Containing territorially the mouth of the Danube, this great artery into the heart of Europe, the Rumanian nation has passed under the suzerainty of Hungary, Russia, Austria, the Ottoman Empire, and Poland. Its aspirations for independence were not realized until the great powers were engaged in a struggle among themselves. At that time only was Rumania able to declare itself at war with the Ottoman regime, the dominating power then, and to declare itself independent. The date was May 10, 1877.

From that time on, the Rumanian people have celebrated that date as their official national holiday, a day always to be cherished. Coincidentally, too, this day, May 10, marks the emergence of the kingdom of Rumania. For, on May 10, 1881, the elected Prince Carol was proclaimed king.

Today, we in America must celebrate this momentous self-determination of an ethnic group for the people of Rumania since they are prohibited from honoring this holiday by their Communist overlords. Let us hope that once more the yoke of captivity will be overthrown and that Rumania will stand free and independent among the freedom-loving nations of the world.

Saturday Evening Post Says Congress Should Slam the Back Door

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the May 6, 1961, issue of the Saturday Evening Post. In a relatively few words this editorial explains the backdoor spending loophole by which congressional spenders are able to finance programs outside the scrutiny of Committees on Appropriations, thus abdicating a responsibility written into the Constitution itself.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that this editorial will reach and be read by hundreds of thousands of taxpaying Americans who in turn will be alerted to the need for Congress to curb this fiscally irresponsible device.

In the end, public opinion must surely force Congress to act, and anyone reading the following editorial from the Post will understand why:

CONGRESS SHOULD SLAM THE BACK DOOR ON THE SPENDERS

One of the first acts of the liberalized House Committee on Rules was to bottle up a resolution calling for an end to back-door spending, by which is meant the bypassing of Congress by Government agencies. Through this device billions of dollars never appropriated by Congress flow into spending agencies. This is how it is done:

Under normal procedure two separate steps must be taken by Congress to establish a program or set up a project. First, Congress must authorize the program or project. Then Congress must appropriate funds from the U.S. Treasury to pay for it. Unfortunately it is not required that the two steps be taken together.

Why would Congress authorize a project, but fail to provide money to carry it out? The answer is that it is easier to favor some grandiose plan as a good idea than to knuckle down to the task of finding the money. Besides, it is more popular. Many a fancy spending program has sailed through both houses of Congress, only to be stopped dead in its tracks by one of the Appropriations Committees.

Now where does the back door come in? This way: To bypass the Appropriations Committees the sponsors of some spending programs hit on the device of writing into each authorization bill a provision by which money for the program could be borrowed from a specified fund in the U.S. Treasury. This fund consists of money paid back to the Treasury by those who had previously borrowed from it—other countries, for example. This money is earmarked to be applied on the public debt. Before it can be so applied, it is up for grabs by the various agencies named in the authorization bills.

Back-door spending has become a popular instrument for initiating programs involving large-scale spending unlikely to be approved by Appropriations Committees.

Well, what's wrong with this? Authorization to drop around at the Treasury's back door comes from the same Congress that appropriates money in the ordinary way.

First, this method is a loophole in the control of Federal spending and budgeting. It encourages special-interest groups and spenders to avoid budgetary controls.

Second, back-door spending has enabled some Federal programs to continue year after year without scrutiny by the Appropriations Committees.

Finally, it's probably unconstitutional. The Constitution provides that "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law."

The situation calls for reform, but the House Rules Committee, apparently reluctant to throw up any barriers to Federal spending, refused to let the House vote on a bill which would have outlawed the practice.

A Plan for New Election Districts on a Uniform Basis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 841, which I introduced on January 3, 1961, would provide for the establishment of congressional districts composed of contiguous and compact territories and require that such districts contain approximately the same number of inhabitants.

The need for this legislation has long been apparent and serious consideration in this session is called for. The following article is pertinent to this subject. It appeared in the New York Herald-Tribune on May 7, 1961:

KENNEDY AND THE RELUCTANT CONGRESS

(By Don Irwin)

WASHINGTON.—The reluctance of the Democratic-run House to advance President Kennedy's New Frontier has administration forces at both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue examining causes and cures.

The immediate phenomenon is plain: While the Democratic paper majority is 260 to 172, administration proposals face resourceful opposition from a conservative coalition drawn from the ranks of its 99 southern Democrats as well as its 172 Republicans. So far, the coalition has lost more often than it has won, but it poses a hazard to most bills in the President's domestic program.

Raw material for the same coalition exists in the Senate, where 34 Republicans and 22 Southerners could add up to a 6-vote majority in the 100-seat Chamber. But the 4-month record of the 87th Congress shows these elements haven't coalesced effectively in the Senate. Why is the modern Senate generally less conservative than the House?

The answers lie partly in the constitutional system, partly in the legislative machineries of the two Chambers, partly in shifting historical trends.

Constitutional differences worked for more than a century to make the Senate a citadel of conservatism, while the House was more responsive to popular demands. But the public demand in the big metropolitan areas that are absorbing more and more of the Nation's population is often very different from—and more conservative than—the demand in the rural and small-city districts represented by most of the members of the conservative coalition.

There is convincing statistical evidence to suggest that nonmetropolitan areas in Congress are overrepresented under the present apportionment of congressional seats which expires with the current Congress. The new apportionment, now underway, will bring substantial changes in the allocation of the 435 permanent House seats. The changes are likely to cut into the coalition's strength—for reasons more of politics than of equity.

MANY STATES GERRYMANDERED

The Constitution sets a 2-year term for Representatives and requires that they run from districts laid out by State legislatures in compliance with the allotment of seats apportioned each State under the decennial census. The Constitution says nothing about districts being compact and approximately equal in population—and they often aren't.

In many States, including New York, the legislatures that did the apportioning 10 years ago were themselves gerrymandered to furnish built-in majorities for the nonmetropolitan sections of the State. They were and are generally conservative and, outside the South, Republican. Repeatedly underweighted in the legislatures were the less conservative (and usually Democratic) big cities.

A recurring result from coast to coast was the creation of urban districts that included more inhabitants than the national average of 346,000, balanced off by rural districts that repeatedly run below that figure.

There is a congressional saying that "Congressmen vote their districts; Senators vote their States." It is true often enough to contribute to the difference in voting patterns between the Chambers.

CONSTANT CAMPAIGNS

The explanation lies in part in the limitations of the 2-year House term, as opposed to the 6-year Senate tenure. Because he must stand for reelection the year after he is sworn in, the House Member is generally campaigning covertly or openly from the time he takes his seat. If he comes from a nonurban district, however under par its population may be, he is as much a captive of majority opinion back home as is the most liberal New Frontiersman from the cities. Only bold, foolhardy or very safe Members break often from this pattern.

Senators represent statewide constituencies which are usually sufficiently varied—and conflicting—in their interests so that a Senator can pick and choose, since he can't please everybody anyway. If there are obvious political axes to grind, he can save them for the 2 years before he runs for reelection.

A House Member has less than a quarter the weight of a Senator, numerically speaking. If he is a rank-and-filer, his principle avenue for self-expression is group action, either behind his regular party leadership or in a sectional or ideological subgroup. The largest of these is the southern Democratic bloc, the Dixiecrats who so frequently lend muscle to Republican minority efforts. There is also a Republican fragment of about two dozen Members, all from urban or suburban districts, that tends to help the administration Democrats on economic issues.

The Congressmen with power are the chairmen of the 20 standing committees and their important subcommittees. The seniority system requires long tenure—which means a safe district—to attain a chairmanship. The result in the present Democratic-run Congress is that 11 chairmen are southerners and, in varying degree, conservatives. They can, and do, exercise considerable influence over the treatment of legislation, including administration bills.

The House is more rule-bound than the smaller Senate, and this is essential to the conduct of business in the ungainly House. But rules can also be used to shape the will of the House—as was demonstrated when Republicans and Dixiecrats sidetracked the administration's minimum-wage bill on a poorly attended nonrecord vote. They were working under rules that prevented its being brought up for a roll call, so the House passed a cutdown coalition bill. The Senate supported the broader administration plan.

Congressional historians date the rise of conservatism in the House from the bitter fight in 1937 over President Franklin D. Roosevelt's plan to pack the Supreme Court. It alienated most southerners and shredded big Democratic majorities in both Houses of the 75th Congress. The effect lingered on in the House long after the Senate breach was patched up on most questions except civil rights.

Last August, loyal Democrats were supposed to be working to put over the legislative program backed by Senator John F. Kennedy, the party's Presidential nominee. But Dixiecrats worked successfully with Republicans, mostly in committee, to spike the bills the candidate sought. Revived now as key parts of the Kennedy program, they would: raise the minimum wage; initiate Federal aid for public schools, and incorporate a plan for medical care to the aged into the social security system.

SPEAKER SAM'S TEAM

Administration lieutenants clipped the coalition when a hairsbreadth House vote reorganized the House Rules Committee to insure enough proadministration votes so that the conservatives on rules couldn't bottle up program bills. Since that vote in February, no administration bill has finally failed in the House—although the minimum wage bill was temporarily emasculated there and the President's medical care bill has yet to stir in the Ways and Means Committee.

But most White House proposals have begun to move in the House. The credit goes primarily to a legislative combat team working under Speaker SAM RAYBURN that fights each issue as a separate engagement in a campaign mapped in close liaison with the White House.

Building from a big minority of northern Democrats, the team scrounges the rest of its votes from big-city Republicans who are less conservative than their party's leadership and from administration-minded southerners, especially those whose districts include burgeoning new industry. Incidentally, the President's habitual courtesy to his elders hasn't hurt his cause with etiquette-conscious senior southerners.

To accommodate the population shifts, 25 States face reapportionment action before the 1962 election. Sixteen have little choice except to revise congressional district lines to compensate for loss of seats. Nine can either carve out new districts for new Congressmen or elect them "at large"—statewide. Altogether, 19 seats will be switched in a transfer in which the Northeast loses and the West and South gain.

Nonsouthern Democrats stand the best chance of gaining in the ungentle game of redistricting. When the last apportionment was made in the 18 months before the 1952 election, Republican strength stood near its postwar zenith in the State governments where reapportionment is decided. The party had across-the-board control of 16 State governments and commanded either the executive mansion or the legislature in a total of 30 of the States, which then numbered 48.

Republican fortunes have ebbed to the point where the party holds full legislative and executive command in only 10 of the present 50 States. In 21 States, Republicans control as much as one house of the legislature.

The statistics look like good news for the Democrats, but they don't answer the biggest question raised by the migration of the 1950's—what is the voting taste of the millions who swarmed to suburbs of big cities from coast to coast? Most of them are former city dwellers, mostly Democratic by habit. They are moving into suburban counties most of which are historically Republican. No one is sure which pressure will prevail, but smart politicians can do a good deal for the party in power by judicious drawing of the new district lines. Democrats will do some of the most strategic drawing.

Their bonanza is California, which heads the list with an eight-seat gain. Democrats who now run the State are more than likely to atone for a decade-old Republican apportionment which laid out the State's 8 most populous congressional districts in Democratic areas and 10 of its 12 thinly populated districts in Republican sections. The present House delegation is 16–14 Democratic, and that ratio seems likely to increase.

CHANGE MICHIGAN RATIO?

Michigan, now solidly Democratic, had a Democratic governor and a Republican legislature when the last apportionment was made. Its present lines were drawn so that 11 Republicans fill seats which represented an average of 319,000 persons each in 1950, while 7 Democrats speak for an average of 406,000 each. In the process of fitting in one new seat, it seems likely that the Democratic legislature will find a way to change these ratios.

Pennsylvania, the apportionment's big loser, must pare three places off its 30-seat delegation. With Democrats controlling the governorship and the legislature, it's likely that Republicans will take more than their share of the cuts.

In the South generally, reapportionment means contraction or expansion of the number of (southern) Democratic Congressmen from each State. It's not that easy in fast-growing, fast-changing Florida, which picks up four seats. There is already one Republican Congressman from Florida and there may be more, no matter how the Democratic legislature draws the lines. The legislature will be hardput not to give more seats to the State's badly under-represented cities.

Another puzzler is New Jersey, which gains one seat. It is the only State with reappointment problems that holds its State elections this year. If the Democrats retain their hold in Trenton, there is sure to be an assault on lines drawn by Republicans in 1951. If not, Republicans might just leave the old lines alone and elect the new Congressman at Large.

Although New York must give up 2 of its 43 seats, change is likely to be kept to a minimum. It is the only big State under full Republican control that faces reapportionment. The upstate Republicans who run the legislature aren't anxious to upset the happy balance laid down by their predecessors a decade ago. Under it, New York City, with 7,517,000 inhabitants, was awarded 21 Congressmen. The 7,203,000 New Yorkers who

lived elsewhere divided 22 Representatives between them.

If the metropolitan voter continues under the new apportionment to receive a smaller share of a Congressman than his rural or smalltown counterpart, the House could continue to be the more conservative arm of Congress. But the trend could be drastically reversed if city-oriented Democrats take advantage of their present power to do some gerrymandering on their own.

Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today we observe the traditional national holiday of the people of Rumania in commemoration of that nation's independence and the formation of the Kingdom of Rumania. Since Rumania is one of the unfortunate nations now held in bondage behind the Iron Curtain, it is especially significant that we cooperate with the Rumanian people throughout the world in energetically perpetuating their goal of eventual freedom for their oppressed nation.

The Rumanian people and their vigorous monarch, King Michael, fought courageously to maintain their freedom before engulfment by the Soviet hordes in the closing days of World War II, and under the unfortunate wartime blunders of President Roosevelt and his advisers, Rumania and the other nations now behind the Iron Curtain suffered their present enslavement.

We, as Members of the U.S. Congress, have an obligation to the cause of true freedom throughout the world to rededicate ourselves on occasions such as this to the proposition that Rumania and its fellow satellite nations will, as soon as practical, see a rebirth of freedom.

Rumania has had a long, unique history marked by numerous battles for survival. As is the case in all small nations, the danger of domination by huge neighbors has always been present, but the Rumanian people have maintained their spirit of resistance to oppression, their nationality, their culture, their distinctive customs and observations, and they are maintaining them today.

Mr. Speaker, as we commemorate the Rumanian national holiday, it is well for us to appreciate the Rumanian historical contributions but also to emphasize that we look forward to the future when these heroic people will once again share in true freedom and be permitted to establish a government of their own choice.

I also wish to take this opportunity to commend the Americans of Rumanian ancestry for their great contributions to the United States. They are honest, hardworking, dedicated people, who have made great contributions to the development of this country, just as their people in Europe for centuries who were the bulwark of Christianity against the Moslem invaders, and who always stood for sound principles in government, and freedom and legitimate nationalistic aspirations for all men.

Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the average man on the street has become familiar with many strange new countries since the beginning of World War II. Rumania, however, remains relatively unknown. Indeed to many people the word suggests haunting melodies played on the violin but little else. Even the geographical location of this country of 17 million people is remote—it is east of Hungary and west of the Black Sea with the Danube flowing along its southern border.

Even less known is the history of Rumania. Since the beginning of modern times, Rumania has been overrun again and again by Huns, Goths, Turks, and others. For nearly 700 years, from the 13th to the 19th centuries, they lived under the harsh rule of the Ottoman Empire. After several unsuccessful attempts during the last century they finally achieved independence on May 10, 1877. This is the date which we commemorate. Unfortunately, their freedom was not to endure. In December 1947 King Michael was forced to abdicate under Communist pressure and the country is now completely dominated by the U.S.S.R. The Russians "liberated" Rumania primarily to make use of its rich oil reserves.

Since the country is so far removed from the lives of most Americans—the question may be asked—why is Rumanian Independence Day being celebrated in the House of Representatives of the United States of America?

The answer can be found in the quotation from John Donne—

> No man is an island, entire of itself; every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main; any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind; and therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee.

Like the Poles, the Hungarians, and other mid-European peoples, the Rumanians loved freedom and fought gallantly and stubbornly for it. Their unfortunate position, flanked on every side by greedy and unscrupulous neighbors, has doomed them to subservience time after time.

Just as John Donne reflects that the death of one person diminishes all of humanity, so the loss of freedom in one country, even though a small and remote one, is a loss of freedom to all mankind.

How can we encourage people suffering under foreign domination as the Rumanians are today? One way is by being very conscious, very aware of our own privileges. Such dedicated men as Comdr. Alan Shepard are an inspiration to all who love freedom. But his achievement was only possible because he had complete faith in the vigilance of the hundreds of other people working on the Project Mercury. In the same way we cannot for one moment be unmindful of our responsibilities. We cannot, as participants in the government of this great Nation, "cut corners" or in any way jeopardize those values which differentiate our system of government from the communistic system.

There is another reason for our awareness of the plight of captured nations. Here in the security of the United States, long accustomed to our advantages, there is a tendency to use such words as "freedom" and "justice" lightly. In our efforts to be tolerant of all opinions we sometimes become fuzzy-minded. Tolerance is an innate part of our philosophy of government but it requires thorough knowledge. When we fail to be cognizant of the real meaning of such words as freedom and justice, we can quickly clear our minds by observing the plight of a conquered people. There is nothing indistinct about the difference between our system of government and that of the so-called People's Republics. This is an euphemistic term for a government which is not of the people, nor by the people, nor for the people, but on the people.

We must keep faith with the Rumanians, and the other captive nations in bondage. The Rumanians, who have continued the struggle for freedom over the centuries can be trusted to keep up their resistance to this sinister new ideology. We cannot be an island entire of ourselves, we cannot forget the ordeal of this small and remote country, we must offer all encouragement to these valiant people.

This is why Congressmen of widely divergent racial backgrounds come down to the well of the House of Representatives of the United States of America to commemorate Rumanian Independence Day for a nation which today is without independence.

We Can Have Adequate Defense if We Cut Nonessential Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the American people have never failed to make whatever sacrifices are necessary to preserve our freedom and to protect this Nation against any threat by foreign foe or natural cause. I believe the American people have demonstrated they are far ahead of our national leadership in meeting the challenge of today. I have not heard a single objection to spending

whatever is necessary for defense and for winning the race to conquer space. We can budget whatever it takes to do these jobs and still maintain a strong economy, if the administration will stop pushing the nonessential, nondefense programs for which we are spending an ever-increasing amount far out of proportion to the increase we are asking for defense spending. We must make a choice. If the administration will take the lead, I am sure it will find a ready and willing people to support whatever action is necessary. "The Need To Choose" is a thought-provoking editorial from the Wall Street Journal, which is included herein:

THE NEED TO CHOOSE

No one, we suppose, is under any lingering illusion about the costs of exploration and national defense in the years ahead; those costs promise to skyrocket.

President Kennedy has just spoken of a bigger space effort. Annual outlays for civilian space work alone will probably more than triple, to $3 billion, within a very few years, this newspaper has reported. Military spending, already consuming more than half the national budget, will also continue to rise; for one reason, the engines of war grow more costly as they grow more complex.

Whether all the prospective increases in defense and space spending are absolutely necessary is something few of us are in a position to judge, though all would agree that whatever is necessary must be spent. But the prospect does raise what former Vice President Nixon calls a fundamental issue, an issue all but overlooked by most commentators and most people in Washington.

The issue, as Mr. Nixon puts it, is "how our national effort is being mobilized to meet the threat to our existence. For example, the new administration has made proposals which would impose upon the Nation, over a 2-year period, an additional $10 billion in new obligational authority, with the result that we shall have a new deficit of at least $5 billion even if revenues are estimated on the optimistic side.

"Of this new total of $15 billion in spending and obligations, less than one-third is to be spent for defense and national security over and above the Eisenhower estimates. Fully $11 billion is budgeted for spending and obligational authority in nonmilitary areas such as health, welfare, education, housing, and public works."

Opinions naturally differ about the merits of these new domestic spending proposals; our own opinion is that most of those presented or enacted so far are remarkably ill-conceived even in terms of their ostensible aims. There is no doubt at all, however, that they are extremely expensive and that they will grow still more expensive in the later years when defense and space costs will also be much higher.

And when the Government is already heading into deeper deficits, it takes no great economic foresight to see the inflation that is being built up for the future. Among its many other evils, such inflation would of course boost still more the costs of all the things, including defense and space work, which the Government is trying to do.

Even if the various new or enlarged domestic programs were desirable in themselves, the necessity for choice is inescapable. President Kennedy and most Americans believe international communism's threat is grave and getting worse; then the priority belongs on meeting the threat. The Nation cannot undertake all these things as well and still maintain a strong economy which is the foundation of military strength.

The President recently referred to what he regards as a kind of collective American unwillingness to do the things that must be done in the face of the Communist threat. We do not believe such unwillingness exists; on the contrary, we think the people are perfectly prepared for greater sacrifices if needed to preserve their freedom and their Nation.

What many people are perhaps unwilling to countenance, in a time of international peril and domestic inflationary danger, is business as usual in Washington—this splurge of new billions for political handouts. That is not a particularly noble cause for which to pay still higher taxes or suffer more inflation or both.

The United States has never been, and we think is not now, a Nation of children incapable of understanding the need for choice. The choice today is as simple as it is fundamental. In Mr. Nixon's words, "before we embark on any new spending programs at home, we should put first things first * * * so that we can meet the increased threat of Communist aggression."

If the Kennedy administration and the compatible Congress would restrain their extravagance for the nonessentials, they would be able to see clearly America's willingness to sacrifice for the essentials.

Year-Round Lakes Shipping Feasible From Technical, Economic Standpoints

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, the possibility of keeping the Great Lakes open to commercial shipping during the winter months has intrigued businessmen, scientists and the general public for the last 50 years. Since the completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway this interest has intensified with the realization of the annual economic benefits which would derive from year-round shipping activities on our great inland seaway.

Last week a number of Members of this body from the Great Lakes area, including myself, introduced a bill to authorize a study by the Corps of Engineers of the feasibility of keeping the lakes and the seaway open during the winter months. This study will be concerned with various deicing systems and methods of removing ice blockades, and its purpose will be to determine the possibility, means, and economic justification for providing year-round navigation on the Great Lakes—including connecting harbors and channels—and the St. Lawrence Seaway.

The following article by Ray Bruner, science editor of the Toledo Blade, contains an interesting and informative discussion of the problems, possibility and potentiality involved in this undertaking. I commend it to the attention of all who are interested in the subject:

YEAR-ROUND LAKES SHIPPING FEASIBLE FROM TECHNICAL, ECONOMIC STANDPOINTS—INCREASINGLY URGENT BECAUSE OF FUEL STORAGE PROBLEMS

(By Ray Bruner)

Shipping on the Great Lakes and through the St. Lawrence Seaway can be conducted the year around, providing there is a willingness to make the investment.

Year-round shipping, in spite of ice formation, is both technically and economically feasible.

The necessity is becoming increasingly urgent, particularly in the Toledo-Detroit area, where fuel storage is a problem in meeting the demands of a growing economy.

These are the conclusions today of Rear Adm. Edward H. Thiele, Coast Guard engineer in chief, Washington, which he based on a thorough study of weather conditions, ice formation, ice breaking potentialities, ship design and other considerations. He recently presented his ideas for study to faculty members and students of naval architecture at the University of Michigan.

In his analysis, he did not take into account such proposals as H-bomb blasting under the lake bed, or the more recent suggestion that atom plants be constructed at the headwaters of the St. Lawrence River to provide heat for keeping the ice melted.

Admiral Thiele pointed out that Great Lakes' open water navigation extends from April 15 to December 15, that relatively few commercial vessels, during the 4 months of winter, ply the lakes and interconnecting channels, and that no traffic moves along the St. Lawrence Seaway.

"The situation exists," he said, "not because navigation is impossible within the present state of the art, but because of tradition, economic requirements, and the lack of modern equipment to cope with the ice problem."

There is an increasing demand for fuel in areas where land transportation facilities are not adequate to meet the requirements. In the heavily industrialized Detroit area, year-round movement of coal is necessary.

"In past years," he said, "the storage yards were adequate to take care of the winter demand, but with the ever increasing output required by our expanding economy, a continual resupply is now mandatory.

"Over the years, the coal industry and the railroads have developed the Toledo area as a major distribution point on the Great Lakes. This corresponds to the Hampton Roads outlet on the east coast. Economically, the combined use of rail and water transportation is sound, and provides a flexibility and low cost not possible by rail alone.

"Today, all-year operations are maintained between Detroit and Toledo by standard self-unloaders, some of which have been ice-strengthened. With the assistance of Coast Guard icebreakers, the Detroit River and shallow passes into the Maumee are kept open throughout the winter.

SIMILAR DEMAND FOR OIL

"There are many other industrial areas along the Great Lakes that depend on coal from Toledo, and as their demands increase, they too will require winter resupply."

A similar demand exists for oil along Lake Michigan. Present oil tanker fleets are inadequate for operations through the ice. They are being successfully employed the year around, however, through a cooperative effort of the Coast Guard and industry.

The Great Lakes, with 95,000 square miles of water surface and 8,300 miles of shore line, drain approximately 325,000 square miles of land. During the warm months they store up a tremendous amount of heat, which is not entirely dissipated until midspring. Winter winds cause surface water to sink, with the warm water rising to the top. This "mixing bowl effect" prevents some areas from freezing, even though the air temperature is below zero.

The stored up heat, along with the mixing bowl effect, keeps large areas free of ice, even in Lake Erie, Admiral Thiele said.

ICE SURVEY MADE

Under different conditions, nine different varieties of ice form on the lakes.

Occasionally ice dams form, threatening floods in some localities and city water supplies in others. Ice thickness may reach 50 inches in some areas, but, in most, it ranges only from 6 to 18 inches.

In the winter of 1958–59, the Coast Guard's aircraft, surface vessels, and shore stations made a complete survey of ice formation and breakup.

During the last 15 years, Admiral Thiele said, the Coast Guard cutter *Mackinaw* has been able to plow through all ice barriers. This cannot be done by the customary lake freighters, however, with their shallow draft and blunt bows.

Another obstacle is the freezing spray, to which low board boats are particularly vulnerable. Ice jams also block the channels at the Soo, Welland Canal and St. Lawrence Seaway. Because of the ice, buoys serving as guides into channels, must also be taken in during the winter.

Solutions to problems such as these would include:

More consistent and thorough ice reporting system.

Larger fleet of ice breakers to be of service over the entire lake area.

Change in design of Great Lakes ships "to permit all-year operations without excessive damage and uneconomically overpowered propulsion plants."

Improved navigation system to provide guidance in unbuoyed channels.

Compressed air bubbler systems to prevent ice formation in locks and dock areas.

De-icing devices on all mechanical equipment ashore and on ships.

Ice diversion jetties and changes in some channels in the Soo-Whitefish Bay area and along the St. Lawrence Seaway.

"There is every reason to believe," Admiral Thiele concluded, "that general all-year commercial navigation on the Great Lakes will become a reality with the expanding economy and increased demands for transportation facilities."

Government Requirements Contracts—Snares for Unwary Contractors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the January 1961 issue of the Commercial Law Journal:

WASHINGTON NOTES

(By Solomon Dimond)

GOVERNMENT REQUIREMENTS CONTRACTS—SNARES FOR UNWARY CONTRACTORS

The increasing use by the Government of term requirements contracts has spotlighted new hazards for heedless Government contractors. Term requirements contracts for goods or services are used when the Government does not know what its requirements will be for any stated period of time,[1] but wishes to have a contractor commit himself to supply the Government's needs for that period at a fixed price. Ostensibly the Government commits itself to place all of its requirements for the specified goods or services with the contractor during the stated period. In discussing requirements contracts, the U.S. Court of Claims said: [2]

"Though this type of contract lacks the fixed and definable signposts of quantity which are ordinarily found in supply contracts, business necessities require that they be deemed enforceable."

The contractor gives a valuable consideration for the promise of performance on his part, which entitles him to a reasonable opportunity to make a fair profit. However, overzealous contracting officers, anxious to give the Government every advantage and with an utter disregard for "mutuality" can cause the entrapment of a contractor.

SNARE NO. 1

As an aid to the contractor in determining the quantity of goods or services he might be called on to furnish and to compute his price, the Government furnishes its quantitative estimate of requirement. Government requirements estimates are sometimes either deliberately or carelessly computed to the advantage of the Government and to the detriment of the contractor. In most instances, since the contractor cannot determine the Government's requirements, he has no way of knowing or ascertaining whether the Government estimate is realistic. However, to rely on the Government estimate could be fatal. The cemetery of defunct Government contractors has a good number of tombstones indicating the demise was due to a reliance upon Government estimates.

The Government view of the obligations to furnish correct estimates is illustrated by a recent decision [3] of the Comptroller General. The case involved a requirements contract for the removal of all trash from specified buildings for a period of 1 year. The Government estimated the number of cubic yards of trash which would be generated per month at each building. The bid invitation required the bidders to quote a lump sum monthly fixed price to perform the services. The contractor had no way of computing the amount of trash which would be generated in 1 month at each building and was forced to rely on the Government's estimates. Despite the fact that the Government concededly erred in its computation of the estimates, the Comptroller General refused to give the contractor any relief. The Comptroller General held that there could be no reformation of the contract because the mistake was "in the inducement of the contract and not in the drafting or execution of the contract."

Further "the contract as written expresses the true intention and agreement of the parties and the fact that the parties might have made a different contract had they known the true state of affairs is immaterial." The Comptroller General ignored the fact that the parties had intended the "estimate" to be a realistic one and that the contract as written did not represent the true intention and agreement of the parties. He likewise concluded that to have a reformation on the basis of misrepresentation or fraud, it must be based upon a failure of the contract, as written, to express the true intent of the parties. He placed great reliance on the fact that although the amounts indicated were "estimates," the dominant quantity was "all." There was, however, no recognition of the conceded fact that the estimates were based upon factual errors made by the Government. The contractor had no way of ascertaining the true facts and if he made an error, his error was in relying upon the Government's representations.

The Court of Claims takes the position that "where the understanding of the parties, as embodied in the language of the contract, is for the supplying of whatever amounts of goods or services the buyer may require, then the inclusion of a quantity estimate will not be viewed as anything more than a device to assist the parties in coming to terms." [4] The fact that quantities are set forth as "estimates" creates no obligation upon the part of the Government, absent bad faith, since the dominant measure is the Government requirements. The court contended that the Government could not give a guarantee or warranty as to any specific amount for the reason that "the exigencies of national security in today's world make the number of troops situated at any given installation subject to sudden, unexpected upward and downward fluctuations."

Yet the court failed to recognize that if the Government had no way of estimating the quantity, certainly a contractor would have less information on which to evaluate the future requirement.

In a classical situation of entrapment a contractor had a contract to remove "all" of the garbage as a particular Navy installation which had a population of about 500 men. The contractor had a pig farm and a sufficient number of trucks to give him a balanced operation. With the advent of the Korean war, the installation quickly expanded about tenfold and the contractor had more garbage than he could cope with, and pleaded for relief. Despite the fact that the Navy recognized the hardship and wanted to give the contractor relief, the Comptroller General held that the dominant measure was "all" and the contractor was stuck with his "bargain." While the U.S. Court of Claims has recognized the fact that some courts in the past have held this type of requirements contract invalid for want of mutuality, the current view is that they have mutuality of consideration and enforceable cross-promises. The court states that: "Their utility in the commercial world demands that they be recognized as binding." The unconscionable advantage given to the Government is obvious. But the greater fault is the likelihood that many unsuspecting contractors, not versed in the intricacies of the law, will be victimized because they ascribe significance to the inclusion of "estimates."

SNARE NO. 2

Gambling is a universal custom in which the participants are both willing to take a chance on a contingency, providing that neither party can influence the outcome. Requirements contracts are in effect wagering contract. Both parties assume that the contract price is a fair one and that the supplier of the goods or services will make a reasonable profit.

As the gambler would put it, the odds favor the Government. If the cost of supplying goods or services should rise (there is no ceiling to rising costs), the contractor is faced with an unlimited loss. On the other hand, if the cost of supplying goods or services should drop (there is a base to the dropping of costs), the contractor might enjoy a relatively small windfall.

The contractor must perforce rely upon the integrity and good faith of the Government. However, this reliance is on occasion misplaced. Government personnel, like their commercial counterparts, sometimes cannot resist the temptation to take advantage of the contractor. Although the requirements contracts are usually mandatory contracts, requiring the Government to order all of its stated requirements from the contractor, the Government has two escape routes. If the cost of goods has dropped, the Government can wait until the contract period has expired, and then buy at the lower price. In some instances, the Government has withheld placing orders and utilized its reserve warehouse stocks.

If there is a long waiting period, there is a built-in escape route. Tucked away in the "General Provisions" which are included in practically all Government supply contracts (goods and services) is a provision permitting the Government to cancel at will for its own convenience. If the price of the goods or services should drop, the Government can terminate the contract. Of course, the Government would be liable for termination charges. However, the Government would

Footnotes at end of speech.

probably accept and pay for what it had ordered, but undoubtedly would resist paying any termination claim on what it had not ordered. Since the requirements contracts generally are for staple items, it would argue that the Government had no fixed obligation to take any additional quantity of services or goods. It is clear that the contractor would lose his profit on the terminated portion of the contract. If the Government terminates a mandatory term supply contract, under the termination for convenience clause, and then reprocures from another source at a lower price, it should be considered as a breach of the contract, although a court might conclude that the Government was merely exercising a contract right when it terminated the contract.

The U.S. Court of Claims recently considered the problem of whether a contractor whose typewriter repair service requirements contract was terminated had a claim against the Government for breach of contract. The case[5] involved a contractor who was one of four contractors in the San Diego, Calif., area who were awarded identical typewriter repair service contracts. Government agencies in the area who had need for such services were required to utilize the services of any one of the four companies. The contract of one of the four companies was improperly canceled for default. The court held that the contract was breached and remanded the case to the Commissioner to determine the extent of damages. While the court recognized the difficulty in determining the amount of damages, it gave the Commissioner guidelines, by asking for findings on specific points.

However, the court intimated that if the Government enlarged its own repair facilities so that it had no further needs, the Government would have no obligation to the contractor since it no longer had requirements. This indicated view is manifestly unfair, for the contract required the contractor to maintain his facilities and to provide services at a fixed price for 1 year without any corresponding obligation upon the part of the Government to utilize those services merely because the Government during the contract year had expanded its own facilities so that it had no requirements. Under these conditions it would permit the Government to take advantage of the contractor by causing him to expend time and money and additionally have him keep his facility in a standby condition during the contract period, without any corresponding obligation on the part of the Government to utilize the contractor's services. It would be the same as getting the benefit of insurance without having to pay any premium for the protection.

A mandatory 1-year requirements contract for a staple chemical product was recently terminated by the Army for its own convenience. Subsequently, it alleged it had found another Government agency that had available material which it would acquire at a saving to the Government. The contracting officer contended that he was merely exercising a right afforded to him under the contract. The standard termination for convenience clause in the contract gives the Government the unilateral right to terminate its contract obligation, while requiring the contractor to stand ready to perform for the full stated period of 1 year. It would appear that the canceling of a requirements contract, not because there were no requirements, but to effect a saving by buying the requirements from another source, albeit a Government source, would be such an act of bad faith as to constitute a breach of contract. The Government would have been in a better technical position had it not canceled the contract, but merely did not order its requirements. It is the deprivation of the contractor's right to get orders for the Government's requirements which is the gravamen of his right to redress, and not the failure of the Government to place orders with him for its requirements. The latter involves the issues of administrative discretion and the meaning of the word "requirements." The unconscionable advantage given to the Government by permitting it to escape from its contract obligation can hardly be considered to give mutuality to the contract.

If the Comptroller General and the courts do not provide relief to entrapped contractors, and the Government persists in taking advantage of unwary contractors, it is up to Congress to see to it that the situation is rectified. If the Government were not involved, this might well be the sort of ethical situation which would get the interest of a better business bureau.

---

[1] Contracts are usually for 1 fiscal year's requirements.

[2] *Walker Manufacturing Co.* v. *Swift & Co.*, 200 Fed. 529, 531 (1912).

[3] B–143438, Oct. 24, 1960.

[4] *Shader Contractors, Inc.* v. *United States*, — C. Cls. — (Apr. 6, 1960).

[5] *Harvey Ward Locke* v. *United States*, — C. Cls. — (Nov. 2, 1960).

The New York Times Views House Un-American Activities Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues a New York Times editorial of May 8, 1961, which points up one of the issues which I raised in my remarks in this House on March 1, 1961.

The editorial follows:

"OPERATION ABOLITION"

The film entitled "Operation Abolition" is an official production of the House Un-American Activities Committee dealing with the demonstrations against it during hearings in San Francisco last May. It gives a misleading impression that the demonstrators were organized and directed by Communists as part of a campaign to abolish the committee—with the implication that all who opposed the committee are Communist-inspired. Defense Department purchases of prints for its libraries, and a great increase of its sales and public showings, make essential a full understanding of the film's accuracy and origin.

The pictures in the film feature almost exclusively the disorders that occurred. They give special prominence to the inexcusable disruptions at the hearing by a few Communists and others charged by the committee with being such. The fact is, however, that the demonstrators were almost entirely students who were peacefully, though noisily, protesting what they believed to have been the committee's unfair and unconstitutional conduct and its refusal to admit them to the hearing room packed with friends of the committee.

The only violence shown in the film is that of the police in ejecting many of the protesters from the city hall. But every one of the 64 who were arrested by the police has since been found innocent of wrongdoings by the courts. Neither the picture nor the commentary gives any firm evidence of Communist direction or control of the bulk of demonstrators, as is charged by members of the committee who appear on the film.

Not only is the film itself reprehensible, but so also is the way it was made and is distributed. It is composed of cuttings—chosen without regard to sequence—from pictures made by the broadcasting companies and subpenaed by the committee. These were turned over to a commercial company to make the film. More than 700 prints have since been sold by the company at $100 each. This whole un-American operation by the Un-American Activities Committee is evidence not of the need of its continuance but need of its abolition—a course we have urged before.

New York Mirror Portrays a Great American: Senator John O. Pastore, of Rhode Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of an article appearing in today's New York Daily Mirror entitled "Immigrant Boy to U.S. Senator." The article is written by Ara Piastro and Harry Altshuler and is another in the series on eminent Americans of Italian extraction.

The immigrant boy who reached the position of U.S. Senator is none other than our beloved and very able Senator from Rhode Island, the Honorable JOHN O. PASTORE, who is a credit to America and a source of joy and honor to his Italian forbears. Those who are seeking to malign the good name of the Italian American community should study the career of a man like Senator PASTORE and his record of service to America, before they are ready to condemn a whole people because of the misdeeds of a few.

The article in the Mirror reads as follows:

IMMIGRANT BOY TO U.S. SENATOR

(By Ara Piastro and Harry Altshuler)

"Don't look at it as a 'hyphenated-American' story," said U.S. Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, Democrat, of Rhode Island, "It's just an American story. Nothing unusual about it. It happens all the time."

He was talking about his own career.

It isn't often, however, that boy orphaned at the age of 8 finances his own education, rises to the governorship of his State, and becomes a Member of the U.S. Senate.

PASTORE, born in Providence, R.I., on March 17, 1907, is the only man of Italian parentage in the Senate. He is conscious of the old world heritage, and proud of it—but he has never traded on it or tried to turn it into a political asset.

"Though I am very proud of my ancestral background and wouldn't allow anyone to belittle it," he said, "I feel wholly American. I wouldn't wear my heritage on my sleeve or attempt to enhance my career with it. My feeling is that it's not wise to fence yourself in with groupism, a form of self-segregation. In my State, with only a nominal population of Italian background, I had to be everybody's Governor—and I try to be everybody's Senator."

His father, Michele, came to this country as a young man from San Archangelo, near Naples. Here Michele married a young woman named Erminia, also from Italy. Together they sought in the new land the same shining light that brought so many others—"a better life."

Michele, a tailor, died at the age of 41, leaving his widow with five children to bring up. John was 8. Almost from the time he could walk, he learned to work. When he was going to grammar school he had errand-boy jobs after class. Through high school, he worked in jewelry shops and for a power company. It didn't appear to hurt his schooling; he was an honor student at Classical High School in Providence.

Impelled—he doesn't quite know why, it just seemed natural—toward the study of law, he took his law degree at Northeastern, a Boston-based university which at the time ran an extension division in Providence.

Getting involved in a political career seemed inevitable for him. He was intensely interested in government problems on all levels. He began to do a lot of public speaking because he enjoyed being with people. All of this catapulted him into the State assembly in 1934, when he was 27, and ever since then his career has been one of public service.

He was reelected in 1936; served as an assistant State attorney general for several years, Lieutenant Governor in 1944–45, and Governor from 1945 to 1950. In 1950 he went to the U.S. Senate.

He was married in 1941 to the former Elena Elizabeth Caito, and they have three children—John, Frances, and Louise.

As a legislator he prefers not to be labeled as specially interested in a particular field, but he admits a profound concern for what he calls "the consumer panorama." He thinks like an ordinary citizen, a consumer, and tries to represent that point of view on matters as varied as civil rights, naturalization, trade and the other things that affect the average family.

He is a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the Defense, Appropriations, Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committees, and chairman of a subcommittee working out a new policy to help the textile industry.

He is busy enough—and sure enough of himself and his ground—so that petty prejudice against Americans of Italian birth or descent has never troubled him.

"As a people," he remarked, "we have withstood the vicissitudes of the ages; we are virile and strong enough to withstand this offending trivia which will wash away like footprints in sand. Let us not give it credence that it doesn't deserve. Within the scientific community, for instance, in the world of scholarship, music, art, also, in the courts where there are many judges of Italian ancestry, there is no such prejudice."

For himself, his area of concern is the problems of all people, because political life stands, in his estimation, next to the ministry as the human instrument for helping everyone.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Senator Edward D. Baker, of Oregon, a Civil War Hero and Friend of Lincoln, Killed in Battle of Balls Bluff, October 21, 1861

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the first and greatest U.S. Senators from my State was Edward Dickinson Baker, whose brilliant career was cut short by his tragic death nearly 100 years ago in the battle of Balls Bluff, Va., October 21, 1861. He was one of the first senior officers of the Union Army to die on the battlefield. In his honor and memory stands a statue of Baker in the Rotunda of the Capitol, which was placed there at President Abraham Lincoln's suggestion.

Born in England, Baker served as an Illinois lawyer and congressman and as a volunteer colonel in the Mexican War. He achieved fame as a trial lawyer in San Francisco and was elected by the Oregon Legislature to the Senate of the United States October 2, 1860. The "Grey Eagle" as he was nicknamed was considered one of the great orators of the 19th century. He died serving as a major general of volunteers.

It would seem particularly appropriate to honor Senator Baker on the 100th anniversary of his death in connection with the Civil War centennial. I have corresponded with the Post Office Department urging the Department to issue a special commemorative stamp in honor of this distinguished leader. I am hopeful this might be done. State representative Clinton P. Haight, Jr., who represents Baker County in the Oregon Legislature, has called this matter to my attention, and the Baker County Historical Society has also corresponded with me on this matter. The city and county of Baker in my State are named after this outstanding public figure.

Former Representative A. W. Lafferty of Oregon has written a penetrating biographical sketch of Senator Baker which appeared in the Sunday Oregonian of May 7, 1961. I ask unanimous consent that this article "Was Oregon's Hero-Senator An Alien?" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAS OREGON'S HERO-SENATOR AN ALIEN?
(By A. W. Lafferty)

In 1801 or 1811—the evidence is conflicting—a handsome manchild was born in London, England, to Edward Baker, a weaver by trade, and his wife Lucy Dickinson Baker.

He was their first born, and they named him Edward Dickinson Baker.

Charles Dickens, writing of our American statesmen, said Stephen A. Douglas was "a steam engine in breeches."

Today it may be said that Edward Dickinson Baker, a Civil War Senator from Oregon, was a human jet, who rose to immortality with the speed of spacecraft still in the making.

The Bakers, father, mother, and children, including Edward Dickinson, arrived in Philadelphia as immigrants in 1815, when the future Oregon Senator was either 4 or 14, depending on date of his birth.

Feeling his genius, young Edward lost no time. He attended public school, did homework at night, was a little later apprenticed as a student weaver to a Philadelphia textile mill, which would indicate he may have been born in 1801 instead of 1811.

In 1825 the Bakers moved West, first to New Harmony, Ind., for a year, then on to Bellville, Ill., where young Edward had the free run of a fine library owned by a former Lieutenant Governor of Illinois.

That was the first main source of young Baker's self-education, which was classical, broad, and deep.

In 1828 young Baker went to Carrollton, Ill., where, in 1829, he was admitted to the bar, "at 19," the biographers say, and soon married a widow lady, Mary Ann Lee, "10 years his senior." Mrs. Lee already had two children. Four more were born to the new union, and affectionately reared.

In 1837 Mr. and Mrs. Edward Dickinson Baker moved to Springfield, Ill., whereupon the lifelong friendship between Lincoln and Baker was formed.

Long before he was President, Lincoln named his first son, who died young and is buried in Springfield, Edward Dickinson Lincoln.

Baker's service in the lower House of Congress: One term from Springfield, 1845–47; one term from Galena, a different district, 1849–51. Baker was elected from the Galena district on 3 months' residence. The reason Baker went to Galena was that Lincoln, who served one term in the Congress, 1847–49, was still the incumbent when Baker got home from the Mexican War in 1848, and thinking Lincoln might desire a second term, which Lincoln didn't, Baker went to Galena, registered at a hotel, and was elected from there.

Col. E. D. Baker arrived in California in 1852, practiced law and was active in politics until February 1860, when he arrived at Oregon city, registered at the hotel, announced as a candidate for the U.S. Senate from Oregon, and was elected by Oregon's legislature 8 months later, October 2, 1860. He fell in battle at Balls Bluff, Va., October 21, 1861, a colonel in the Union forces, though he had not resigned his seat in the Senate.

There appears to be no record that either of Senator Baker's parents were naturalized before he was 21, if at all, or that he ever found the time, if it were necessary, to apply for formal naturalization. It may not have been called for. His early military service in the Black Hawk War, or early immigration laws, may have covered his case.

As to Senator Baker's birth date: A biography by John D. Baltz (1888), a citizen of Pennsylvania who served under Baker at Balls Bluff, recites that one of Baker's earliest recollections, which impressed Baker most, was his attendance as a child of 5 at the funeral of Lord Nelson, in London, which was in 1806. That would put Baker's birth date 1801.

James G. Blaine in his "Twenty Years in Congress" (vol. 1, p. 321), refers to the unproved Nelson funeral incident, as follows:

"From the far-off Pacific came Edward Dickinson Baker, a Senator from Oregon, a man of extraordinary gifts of eloquence; lawyer; soldier; frontiersman; leader of popular assemblies; tribune of the people. In personal appearance he was commanding, in manner most attractive, in speech irresistibly charming. He was born in England, and the earliest recollection of his life was the splendid pageant attending the funeral of Lord Nelson."

I express no opinion on Baker's birth date. I do say he never misrepresented anything. Nowhere do I find where Baker ever stated himself, or authorized anyone else to state, the date of his birth. He is immortal. Only his biographers, after his death, some of them, stated that Baker was born February 24, 1811, and that is generally accepted.

I may say that many were the remarks, in Oregon, and in the Senate, that Baker "looked much older than his years," which was attributed to his severe illness in Panama before his arrival in California.

In the Senate, where Baker was sworn in December 5, 1860, at only 49 if he were born in 1811, he was gray, and mature, and his colleagues affectionately nicknamed him "Grey Eagle."

Lincoln attended Baker's memorial services in the Senate late in 1861, and sat sorrowfully in front of the Vice President's podium.

On his way to Washington as Oregon's Senator, Baker spoke in the American Theater, San Francisco, the night of October 26, 1860.

His opening sentence was:

"I owe more thanks than my life can repay, and I wish all Oregon were here tonight."

The space immediately under the Capitol's dome is known as the Congressional Hall of Fame.

By act of Congress, passed soon after the Civil War, Baker's life-sized statue was placed in that rotunda. Baker's is the only life-sized statue of a person from west of the Mississippi River so far admitted to the Congressional Hall of Fame. Also in that sparsely filled rotunda are the life-sized statues of only seven others: Washington, Hamilton, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, Grant, and Garfield.

Communism: Our Active Enemy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following essay by Janet Schick, a student of Richmond High School. This essay was

published in the April 16, 1961, issue of the Palladium-Item and Sun-Telegram, of Richmond, Ind.:

(By Janet Schick, Richmond High School)

In the beginning, Eve plucked an apple from a sinful tree and gave it to Adam. Then God grew wrathful with them, and they walked in His grace no more.

Thousands of years later, a man without sin stood on a mountainside near Jerusalem and said to His disciples, "Beware of false prophets who come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. Ye shall know them by their fruits."

Today, trees laden with their corrupt fruits are flourishing. Silent, unseen flocks of wolves in sheep's clothing are lurking everywhere in the world, everywhere in America.

Immediately we ask ourselves, "Are we in America being tricked by this guise?"—for our future lies in the answer. First of all, we Americans seem to think that communism without Russia is an acceptable thing. We don't realize that Communists are more than native Russians, Cubans, or Chinese; they are the men who plan in secret rooms today's hatred and tomorrow's wars.

ALL AROUND US

They are the men standing in the shadows behind kings, presidents, and dictators. They speak in languages of the past, the present, and the future. They are all around us, but we will know them by their fruit.

Secondly, the United States believes it has an impregnable front against communistic infiltration. In reality, communism is threatening us and we don't see the danger signals. The "Star-Spangled Banner" is not as popular as some well-known advertising jingles.

Every time your watch ticks off 12 seconds, a major crime is being committed in the United States. In June of 1958, Nikita Khrushchev told of the communistic goal to have our grandchildren under the communistic power. Yes, we are being warned; we must take notice.

Thirdly, the Communist Party in America has been revitalized. While duping us with clever propaganda, it is starting new campaigns for infiltrating our Government, our industries, our school systems, and most important, our youth through church and civic organizations. Supreme efforts are being to ban our nuclear weapons tests. Minority and majority groups are being set up to fight each other.

SWEEPING NATION

Oh, yes, this Red WAVE is sweeping across our Nation. Its weapons of deceit, duplicity, division and disunity are battering at our door. Its workers are sowing seeds of destruction among the innocent, ignorant, and the indifferent. How will we know them? Christ told us 2,000 years ago, "Ye shall know them by their fruits."

We have one last question to ask. What are the fruits of communism? The victims of its terrible onslaughts would have many answers. "Death," Hungary would cry, weeping for its lost loved ones. "Famine," the Russian peasants would wail, looking for garbage in the streets.

The brainwashed postwar victims would groan, "Torture." The ex-dictators of Latin America would sigh, "Corruption." J. Edgar Hoover, in his famous speech about crime and communism in America, stated: "No matter how enticing the mask it wears, no matter how seductive its promises, the fruits of communism are inescapably and inevitably evil."

Truly, if communism succeeds in its efforts to pit race against race, nation against nation, world revolution will be its final, most bitter fruit.

Seizure of Katanga President Moise Tshombe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. BRIDGES. Madam President, an editorial entitled "Congo Treachery," which appeared in the May 10 edition of the Chicago Daily Tribune, is a very significant commentary in my estimation on recent events in one of the world's chronic sore spots.

The editorial provides a provocative analysis of the recent seizure of Katanga President Moise Tshombe and focuses attention on the far-reaching implications of this act.

I believe the views expressed are worthy of widespread attention, and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGO TREACHERY

Moise Tshombe, president of Katanga, ran the only orderly and thriving provincial government in the chaotic Congo. At a conference in neutral Madagascar, he produced a plan for confederation which promised stability for the whole country. A second conference opened late last month at Coquilhatville, under the control of the Congo's central government, to work out the details.

When Tshombe decried the subservience of his fellow administrators to the United Nations and attempted to leave the conference, he was seized by troops of the Leopoldville regime. Now it is announced that he is to be tried for treason and a variety of other offenses, among them the assassination of the unlamented Patrice Lumumba, the original pro-Communist premier.

Seven U.S. Senators, protesting the arrest, have called upon the United Nations to procure Tshombe's release. This group argues that Tshombe WAS cloaked in the immunities of a negotiator for peace and that his arrest violates good faith. The U.N. maintains a so-called peace force in the Congo, and the Senators argue that it is duty bound to intercede for the Katanga leader.

To find a parallel to the treacherous arrest of Tshombe, it is necessary to recall the Soviet invitation to 16 Polish leaders to come to Moscow early in 1945 to consult about the future Polish Government. They were promised personal safety, but, after they entered Russia in March, nothing was heard of them. Five weeks later Moscow announced they had been imprisoned.

Although the United States is paying the greatest part of the whole U.N. bill in the Congo, it is idle to expect U.N. to do anything for Tshombe unless the Washington administration puts on the pressure. The U.N. is seeking its own mysterious neutralist ends in the Congo, and its boss, Rajeshwar Dayal, an agent of Premier Nehru of India, has been hostile to Tshombe, and indeed to any Congolese, who has his own ideas of putting the country in order.

Because Tshombe had the good sense to utilize Belgian administrators in industry, to rely on Belgian political advisers, and to support his 10,000-man army with a core of white mercenaries, there have been frantic U.N. demands to run the Belgians out. His Government undoubtedly had something to do with the removal of Lumumba, for which it deserves a vote of thanks, but the death of this prophet of Marxian confusion brought bellows of rage from the Soviet Union, which has systematically employed every means of promoting chaos in the Congo.

The neutralization of Katanga through the seizure of its leader, to be followed predictably by his execution if the United States does not take firm action to save him, will hasten the process of violence and dissolution which the Communists have been stimulating in anticipation of a takeover.

The question is whether Mr. Kennedy will realize that without this pro-Western leader and his center of order in the midst of anarchy the Congo may well be added to the recent disasters in Cuba and Laos. Can Mr. Kennedy afford that?

WGY Radio and WRGB–TV of Schenectady Undertake a Public-spirited Campaign To Stimulate Buying in Upstate New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, everyone is agreed that at least one part of the answer to our current economic recession lies in stimulating the purchase of needed commodities, especially in those cases where an individual may have the necessary funds on hand but may simply be holding back momentarily. In an effort to stimulate such purchases, for example, President Kennedy recently directed the early distribution of dividends from veterans national service life insurance policies.

In that connection I was pleased the other day to read of a public service drive recently started in my home community of Schenectady by one of our leading radio and television stations, WGY–WRGB, the stations of the General Electric Co., to stimulate our economy by making purchases now rather than deferring them.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of several of the public service announcements over radio and television used in this public service campaign.

The announcements follow:

WGY "BUY NOW" CAMPAIGN No. 1

(Sixty-second announcement)

It is smart to have a rainy-day fund, and it is necessary to save for future educations, major purchases, and those private little retirement dreams. However, if you have been saving for a major purchase now is the time to make it. It is a buyer's market for everything from automobiles, to appliances, to new homes, and homefurnishings. So, if you can afford that major purchase now, make it now. You will personally save many dollars on your purchase and at the same time you will be injecting a shot of economic adrena-

lin into the current sagging marketplace. Every purchase you make helps preserve or create another job. The more people employed, the sounder the economy, the sounder the economy, the sounder the community. So WGY offers this advice: If you can afford it now, and need it now, buy it now. It is a buyer's market.

The headlines shout unemployment, recession, economic slump, and poor business barometer. But the fact remains, that in practically all communities savings deposits are at an alltime high. How come? It's simple. The people who have been saving money for major purchases—a car, a home, new furniture, new clothes, and so on—are simply not buying. The result, more unemployment. What's the solution? Simply this: If you've been saving money to make a major purchase, and you need that article, now is the ideal time to buy. It's a buyer's market. You're the boss. Your local retailer is offering the best possible deal and the best possible service to keep his merchandise moving. Shop carefully, wisely, you'll not only save on your purchase, but dollars you do spend will contribute heavily toward boosting the present day sagging economy, WGY says: If you can afford it, and need it now, buy it now.

The big game hunter is a choosy hunter. He doesn't knock over the first elephant, lion or tiger that happens in his path. He waits for the right season, he stalks his trophy, and then he strikes. You can play at this game, too, when making that major purchase of an automobile, furniture, a home, or similar item. The market is right, a buyer's market, perfect for the smart shopper. So, if you've been putting off that purchase waiting for a better time, better get on your hunting shoes now. Retailers, salesmen, and agents are at your service with the best possible prices. But remember, it's a buyer's market. So hunt wisely, compare prices, values, features, and service warranties. Major appliances, furniture, automobiles and homes are the biggest targets today. Trot out that economic weapon known as cash, and get your trophy at big, big savings. You'll enjoy the hunt, your community will enjoy a healthier economy.

Good old-fashioned thrift makes good old-fashioned commonsense. And although you may not realize it, spending as well as saving is a part of being thrifty. Right now you the buyer, are boss in the marketplace. And if you can afford it now, buy it now. You'll get the best possible deal on clothing, furniture, appliances, automobiles, or new homes. You'll buy at big savings, and at the same time, give our sagging economy a well-needed shot in the arm. Spending when prices are right is the smart way to save. So, think about it, now is the time to make that important purchase, if you can afford it now, and need it now, buy it now. It's a buyer's market, and you, the buyer, are the boss. Your local retailer, automobile dealer, and building contractor is offering you red carpet service, and the best deals that they've been able to offer in many years.

WRGB "BUY NOW" CAMPAIGN

Good old fashioned thrift makes good old fashioned commonsense. And although you may not realize it, spending as well as saving is a part of being thrifty. Right now, you the buyer are boss in the marketplace. And, if you can afford it now, buy it now.

You'll get the best possible deal on clothing, furniture, appliances, automobiles or new homes. You'll buy at big savings, and at the same time, give our sagging economy a well-needed shot in the arm. Spending when prices are right is the smart way to save.

So, think about it, now is the time to make that important purchase * * * if you can afford it now, and need it now, buy it now.

It's a buyer's market, and you, the buyer, are boss. Your local retail automobile dealer and building contractor are offering you red carpet service * * * and the best deals that they've been able to offer in many years.

The big game hunter is a choosy hunter. He doesn't knock over the first elephant, lion, or tiger that happens in his path. He waits for the right season—he stalks his trophy—and then he strikes. You can play at this game, too, when making that major purchase of an automobile, furniture, a home or similar item.

Trot out that economic weapon known as cash, and get your trophy at big, big savings. The market is right, a buyer's market, perfect for the smart shopper. So, if you've been putting off that purchase waiting for a better time, better put on your hunting helmet now.

Retailers, salesmen, and agents are at your service with the best possible prices. But, remember, it's a buyer's market. So hunt wisely, compare prices, values, features, and services warranties. Major appliances, furniture, automobiles, and homes are the biggest targets today. You'll enjoy the hunt, your community will enjoy a healthier economy.

Atlanta Journal Opposes Civil Rights Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the Atlanta Journal in its lead editorial of May 9, 1961, forcefully emphasizes the great damage which would be done to harmonious race relations by the enactment or serious consideration of the drastic and far-reaching civil rights proposals which have been introduced by the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and the Representative from New York [Mr. CELLER]. This outstanding metropolitan daily in stating its opposition to these proposals correctly points out that social progress should be a matter of evolution rather than revolution. Its position is an accurate assessment of the feeling of the overwhelming majority of Southern people, and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of the editorial entitled, "Too Much, Too Soon," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOO MUCH, TOO SOON

The civil rights proposals adopted last summer at the Democratic convention in Los Angeles have turned up in Washington as legislation to be acted upon by Congress.

Time neither has mellowed them nor added to their charm. And while these proposals may please the idealists and theorists and be useful as vote catchers in some States, as practical matters they won't all work.

The six-point program was drawn up by Senator CLARK, of Pennsylvania, and Representative CELLER, of New York, two Democrats who have nothing to lose and much to gain, including reelection, by pushing the plan.

The most troubling provision here and now, where we already have more troubles than we can say grace over, is the plan to compel every board in the country operating segregated schools to file a desegregation schedule within 6 months after the measure becomes law and start actual desegregation by 1963–64.

This disregard for local customs and traditions and the cold realities of the situation may be only a bit of political cynicism useful for bargaining with southern conservatives over other questions.

But if it is sincere, the administration's domestic intelligence is every bit as faulty as that which caused the Cuban fiasco.

This is pushing the revolution too far and too fast at a time when evolution should be the order of the day. Adoption, or even a serious effort to press this legislation, would reopen old wounds and make even more difficult the sort of progress being made now.

Small Businessmen Oppose Postal Rate Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues the following text of a news release issued this date, May 11, by Mr. George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business:

George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, today sent the following wire message to the Honorable TOM MURRAY, Democrat of Tennessee, chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, opposing any postal rate increase at this time which would place an added burden on small business throughout this Nation.

The full text of Mr. Burger's message is as follows:

"MAY 11, 1961.

"Hon. TOM H. MURRAY,
"*Chairman, House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.*

"Nationwide poll of federation small-business-and-professional man members during April 1961 discloses 72 percent oppose increasing first-class mail rates to 5 cents and airmail rates to 8 cents.

"This poll was taken among our 166,003 individual, directly supporting members (this total has since increased) as of that period, business and professional people located in all but a very few of the Nation's 439 congressional districts. Results announced in this message are based on verified records of signed ballots which they sent directly to their Congressmen at Washington, D.C.

"These independents are heavy users of first-class and airmail in their operations. Their opposition is based primarily on the conviction, founded in their practical daily business experience, that postal rate increases in these categories, such as have been proposed to your committee, can but add further to their overhead burdens, and by further tightening their cost-price squeeze make it more difficult for them to continue in operation.

"In line with outcome of this poll we urge you to turn down proposals you have been given for increases in first-class and airmail rates specifically, and any other increases which would add further cost burdens on the backs of struggling independents.

"Let us remind you that President Kennedy recently declared that the small business sector of the economy has to be sustained and broadened if the Nation is to achieve the growth rate it must have to maintain employment and national strength.

"Will you kindly make this message a part of the records of your hearings?"

Secondary Education Lag and Medical Problems in the Congo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the two articles written on problems of the Congo, which have appeared in the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Argus-Leader.

One of the articles is written by Mr. John A. Kennedy, publisher of the Argus-Leader, and the other is written by Mrs. Kennedy, president of the Argus-Leader.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECONDARY EDUCATION LAG DULLS HOPES FOR FUTURE

(John A. Kennedy, publisher and editor-in-chief of the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader, and Mrs. Kennedy just concluded a stay in the Congo and compared conditions in that strifeworn land with what they observed in traveling in five of its six provinces for nearly 2 months in 1959.)

(By John A. Kennedy)

LEOPOLDVILLE, CONGO.—Two years ago in Elisabethville, Mrs. Kennedy and I visited a native Congolese grammar school. It was of the 4-year variety but had students varying in age from 8 to 25.

Its director complained of a serious problem—the older students, when they finished, didn't want to go to secondary school. Because of their age they felt they should be able to enter universities and colleges on graduation from their present status—the equivalent of completion of the sixth or seventh grade in the United States.

The lack of a system with sufficiently high standards in the secondary schools is the worst problem facing the future of the Congo according to Msgr. L. Gillon, president of Louvanium University at Leopoldville.

"The aid which countries abroad must give the Congo is first and foremost a direct effort in the development of secondary education," he said. "In the immediate future, this aid must be that of providing this country with secondary schoolteachers and helping it to train its own teachers for this level of education."

FEW GRADUATES

At the present time the Congo has four universities getting started but it is having difficulty filling the halls and residences because of the lack of qualified secondary school graduates.

Primary education was being hastily pushed by the Belgians in the few years prior to independence—but unfortunately too little and too late.

There were approximately 1,500,000 students in schools before the chaotic independence of last July but more than 900,000 were in the first two grades and of this number, only 300,000 were in the second grade.

Again quoting Monsignor Gillon, "Some countries, such as Ghana and Nigeria, see their universities refusing qualified students because their secondary schools turn out more young people than can be absorbed by their national universities.

"Our situation here at Louvanium is that we could take in a far greater number of students than we are admitting because the secondary schools are not preparing them in sufficient numbers."

Dr. M. Dartique, vice president of Louvanium, pointed out that for the year 1959–60, there were only 13,400 students in the secondary schools in the whole of the Congo of which only 9,000 were natives and 4,000 Europeans. Only 8 percent of these were in the upper two classes.

Ninety-five percent of the schools are run by Catholic and Protestant churches. They are subsidized by the Government.

Like in other basic civic housekeeping the European teachers fled the Congo in droves when the independence riots got underway, but about 1,200 already have returned.

RETURN FORECAST

Dr. Dartique feels that by August 1961, if the general situation quiets down, they will have approximately 80 percent of the Belgian teachers back.

"But that doesn't solve the problem," he explained. "We must have trained native teachers and the only place we can get them is through first having good secondary schools to produce able students in our pedagogic institutions who can learn to teach the Congolese children."

U.S. Ambassador Clark Hayes Timberlake is suggesting that American colored families take Congolese primary school graduates into their homes so that the youngsters can attend American high schools.

This move may get some important backing, but other experts here raise the question, would these returning natives become dissatisfied with their lot at home. And in addition they might not be able to pass the rigid Louvanium University entrance requirements by merely getting a minimum diploma from some of our American high schools.

ANOTHER PROBLEM

Education of girls is another problem in some parts of the Congo—and in many other parts of Africa.

Here in Leopoldville 2 years ago they told us the story of a 12-year-old miss, the daughter of a plantation worker who had agreed to let his daughter attend a boarding school.

She was to return to her parents' wattle hut on weekends. In school she was taught to use plates, cups and saucers, knives and forks.

After the first weekend at home, she seemed more reluctant to enjoy the new tools of her school dining room.

After the second weekend the child did not return.

School social workers visited the parents—they thought they found the answer—"We don't need these fancy tools," the father said. "We have been getting along very well the way we have been living."

That may not be the full answer, but it's one of the problems of educating the women natives.

DOCTOR SELDOM CALLED TO ASSIST AT BIRTH OF NATIVE

(John A. Kennedy, publisher and editor-in-chief of the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader and Mrs. Kennedy just concluded a stay in the Congo comparing conditions in that strifeworn land with what they observed in traveling in five of its six provinces for nearly 2 months in 1959.)

(By Bruce Lee Kennedy, president of the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader)

LEOPOLDVILLE, CONGO.—They brought a 14-year-old half-paralyzed youngster into native Katambo hospital the other day. A cursory examination revealed the child was suffering from polio.

Nine others were already in a ward in this institution, one of the two in Leopoldville taken over and operated by the Congolese last summer.

"What are you doing for these children?" Sister Eloardo, the medical Sister Superior, was asked.

"All we can do is put them to bed and hope this is not the start of a polio epidemic because we have no vaccine and have only very limited technical facilities for treatment, and very few doctors, technicians, and nurses."

SANITARY CONDITIONS DETERIORATE

Sanitary conditions in the Congo have disintegrated terribly—the Belgians used to spray for mosquitoes twice a week with helicopters, and three times a week during the rainy season. Additional spray tanks roamed the street, taking care of lawns and gardens to curb the rise of mosquitoes and the dreaded tsetse fly in the swamps. A little spraying was being done a few weeks ago but this too has vanished for lack of equipment and material.

The Sister's worry could be a genuine one for only a small percentage of the sick people come to the hospital and then only as a last resort—whether because of fear, ignorance or superstition, I could not find out.

It was our last day in the Congo. I tried to contact Dr. M. Bellerive, World Health Organization chief sent by the U.N. as senior consultant after the collapse of civilian government with the advent of independence last July. He was away from the headquarters until after 7.

SCHEDULE INTERRUPTS STUDY

Our plane left at 6:30 so I couldn't find out how widespread polio had developed and whether the Sister's concern of its possible epidemic proportions was justified.

Katambo is a cluster of many one-story buildings, started by the Belgians years ago as one of a variety of hospitals and dispensaries which they had spread throughout the six Provinces of this now-troubled land.

We visited many of them when we were in the interior in 1959.

I made my tour with Mrs. Clare Hayes Timberlake, wife of our Ambassador. She is "Julie" to the nuns and to the many native assistants who greeted her warmly. She works there every Monday morning, bathing babies, changing their umbilical cord dressings and assisting in every way possible. Her German pediatric nurse does the same on Wednesdays.

Mrs. Timberlake devotes an additional two afternoons each week teaching English in a secondary school.

Sister Eloardo greeted us even before she had time to wash the blood from her hands as she had arrived just after she had assisted with two Caesarean deliveries.

She took us into classrooms where 29 students between 14 and 17 years of age were learning to be assistant midwives. They have to take them at that age as otherwise the girls would be married.

MIDWIVES ASSIST DELIVERY

All babies are delivered by midwives here. If a doctor is called to the maternity section, it is to do some repairing on a patient who is badly torn.

Only about 25 percent of the Congolese women come to the hospital to have their babies. To our eyes this one seemed quite unsanitary and of very low standard but it is far superior to giving birth to a baby in the bush.

Most maternity cases are kept in the hospital for a week—at least until the baby's cord is healed so as to prevent infection that could develop after they return to their primitive wattle huts.

MOTHERS WALK TO THEIR BEDS

After the birth in the maternity room the mothers walk to their beds in a nearby ward, taking their babies with them. There is a bassinette at the foot of each bed but as I walked around the wards, I didn't see a single baby in its bassinette—they were all in bed with their mothers.

The student midwives wore short white uniforms, sandals and blue bandanas. Both their uniform and the bandana were embroidered with EAL, for "École Assistantes Accoucheurs." One girl's uniform was very soiled and the Sister reported that it was almost impossible to teach them cleanliness.

"COULD HAVE SAVED HER"

I saw a 1-day-old baby whose mother died having her eighth child. She had been in labor for 24 hours when she arrived at the hospital and then was near death. "We could have saved her," Sister Eloardo said, "if she had been brought to us earlier." She felt the chances are the baby will not live as there will be no one to feed and nurse him.

In one of the wards there were about 40 children with various illnesses. Many of their mothers were with them as well as their brothers and sisters who had no one to care for them at home—some were crawling around the floor.

The screens on the windows had many big holes made by patients or parents who wanted to get back to their families or friends. It was impossible to keep the screens repaired so there were many flies, and some mothers were fanning them away from their sick children.

In the kitchen, six men, dressed in khaki aprons, were preparing lunch for 387 patients registered that day.

There were three Africans, dressed in white in the sterilizing room and I peeked into two operating rooms where European surgeons were at work. Two of them had red crosses on their uniforms.

LAUNDRYMEN STRUCK

In the laundry and sewing room, men were doing the work. Sister Eloardo said the laundrymen struck the week before. They wanted to work from 7 a.m. until 2 p.m. She said those hours were impossible as the clothes would not dry in that time and if left unironed would mildew. There were huge washing machines but no dryers.

We met the new superintendent who was in an air-conditioned office, the only cool room in the hospital. He was a very young Congolese and had no medical experience.

I left feeling grateful that the hospital had the wonderful Belgian sisters who dedicated their lives to helping the sick of the Congo.

SS "Hope I"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, at the present time the SS *Hope I* is in Indonesia displaying the advancement and benefits of the American medical world to people in that part of the globe. I am especially pleased to note that two Chicago area people, Dr. Stanley Hellman, a dentist, and Miss Charlotte Roller, a medical secretary, are presently serving.

The Chicago Daily News, in an article May 3, 1961, described in a most interesting fashion some of the latest experiences of staff members of the SS *Hope I*. I believe this article is an appropriate item for study in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Chicago Daily News, May 3, 1961]

BACKWARD NATIONS ARE PORT FOR FLOATING YANK HOSPITAL—SS "HOPE" SERVES AS TEACHER TO THE WORLD'S MEDICS

(By Georgie Anne Geyer)

Many think the most interesting hospital in the world today is a former Navy hospital ship that sails with the winds of change.

It is Project Hope, a privately sponsored floating medical school serving the underdeveloped nations of the world in the name of concerned Americans.

Slight, easy-smiling Dr. Jack Tetirick, of Columbus, Ohio, was one of the first concerned Americans to go aboard.

Djakarta, Bali, the storied islands of Indonesia, where Western conquerers and adventurers once sailed, Dr. Tetirick and his medical colleagues on the SS *Hope* sailed last fall bringing the newest medical techniques.

"The Indonesian doctors are very sophisticated," Dr. Tetirick said on a stopover in Chicago. "For instance, they do heart surgery, but certain things like vascular surgery they've read about but never seen.

"So we were able to show them.

"The *Hope* is, of course, primarily a teaching venture," he said.

"We televised operations aboard the ship into classrooms—operations that the doctors had never seen before.

One day the Russian Ambassador came aboard. When he saw 300 Indonesia doctors sitting in this ship watching an operation by TV, he looked a bit unhappy.

"When the *Hope* left, four Russian surgeons suddenly appeared in Djakarta to help the Indonesians."

Dr. Tetirick joined the ship on its first voyage last September. Aboard were 18 doctors, 20 nurses, a medical crew of 60 and a crew of 150. Indonesia was its first stop.

For the medical contingent aboard this meant no pay. It meant leaving wives, families, and practices for 2 months.

The idea for SS *Hope* originated from a private source, but the U.S. Government donated the former Navy hospital ship. Industry, labor, medicine, the public and the host country share the $3,500,000-a-year costs through the People to People Health Foundation in Washington.

Dr. Tetirick is a member of Lions International, which has shown great interest in the project.

Local committees in Indonesia met before the ship arrived to select cases to be treated aboard the *Hope*.

American doctors then reviewed the cases "to be sure the wealthy doctors didn't pack the ship with rich patients."

Relations between the two peoples were excellent, he said. Americans were charmed by the Indonesians in addition to being aghast at their cleanliness.

"We soon ran out of water aboard, because they were always taking showers."

From the capital of Djakarta, the ship sailed to remote and fabled Bali. Here several sturdy midwives from Kentucky's tough pioneer Frontier School of Nursing held a meeting with the local Dukens, semiwitches who deliver children.

"They got along fine," Dr. Tetirick said. "The Dukens tried hard to impress the midwives with how modern they were."

"We found the Indonesians really like the American people," Dr. Tetirick said. "They even like rock and roll. They call it folk music. But they criticize any outside control of their resources."

"The *Hope* only goes where it's asked," he added. And already it is booked into various other Southeast Asian countries.

As soon as Dr. Tetirick got home, his partner, Dr. W. M. Hayes, went aboard. And, as the SS *Hope* is steaming ahead now to Singapore to reload, hundreds of others are joining to keep it sailing.

The Need for Tax Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Need for Tax Reform," which appeared in the Shelbyville (Ind.) News, April 19, 1961.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEED FOR TAX REFORM

The recent Federal income tax deadline should make all of us more painfully aware of one of the most pressing needs of the American economic system: tax reform.

As we and many others have said before, the present tax structure is self-defeating. It is hampering the economic growth that is needed to provide jobs, the growth that is needed to benefit everyone.

Now that the so-called recession is apparently nearing its end, this is a good time for each of us to make the point that a complete overhaul of the tax system could provide an effective deterrent to any future business slump. Our Members of Congress should be told how we feel about this.

The arguments in favor of tax reform are many and varied; and all are valid.

For example, take unemployment. Its high rate was one of the key barometers during the recent slowdown in industry. It is important that the number of jobless be kept at a minimum.

But the creation of new jobs costs money in the form of investments (anywhere from $10,000 to $20,000 per job). And the fact is that the present high personal burden prevents many Americans from saving their funds and investing in private ventures.

Or consider the matter of depreciation. The current long-term writeoffs discourage firms from replacing obsolete equipment with the modern machinery America needs to meet foreign competition.

As recently pointed out by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, it is ironic that the United States is the most backward of all leading industrial nations in this matter of depreciation. The more flexible systems prevailing in such once war-devastated countries as West Germany, Japan, Italy, and Britain have enabled them to become major competitors of this country in world markets.

At the present time, it appears that neither the administration nor a majority of the Members of Congress expects to seriously consider any major tax reform program this year, although the urgent need for such a program should be well known to all.

Comprehensive tax reform legislation already has been introduced in Congress in

the form of the Herlong-Baker bills, which would provide for a gradual 5-year decrease in both personal and corporate levies. Such legislation is not only needed now—the need will become increasingly great in order to provide the job demands for the record numbers of men and women who will enter the labor market in the next decade.

It is very difficult to understand why both the administration and the Congress seem unprepared to act for major Federal tax reform now. Lengthy and comprehensive studies have been completed. Legislation has been introduced. Why further delay?

Address by Newton N. Minow, Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, to the 39th Annual Convention of the National Association of Broadcasters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I am inserting an address by Newton N. Minow, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission to the 39th Annual Convention of the National Association of Broadcasters meeting here in Washington this week.

This is the first time Chairman Minow has spoken directly to the broadcasting industry since his appointment last January. There has been considerable concern, if not apprehension, as to his real philosophy in respect to broadcasting program control by the Federal Communications Commission. Although the Federal Communications Act of 1934 contains a direct prohibition against censorship, there are many ways that the industry can be induced to conform to a prescribed program pattern through administrative control under existing law. The remarks of Mr. Minow yesterday are generally along lines that would not be objectionable to a viewer or a licensee, or even to a Member of Congress. However, when this statement is read in connection with other statements made by the Chairman I want to again express my concern, Mr. Speaker, over the extent that the Commission, under Mr. Minow's chairmanship, may go into the field of program control.

In previous correspondence, Mr. Minow has generously documented what he believes to be the Commission's right to intervene into broadcast programing; and that documentation would no doubt stand. It is more the philosophy of Mr. Minow as reflected by Commission action that continues to concern me and, I think, the broadcasting industry as well.

Mr. Minow's address follows:

ADDRESS BY NEWTON N. MINOW, CHAIRMAN, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION, TO THE 39TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS, WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 9, 1961

Governor Collins, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, thank you for this opportunity to meet with you today. This is my first public address since I took over my new job. When the New Frontiersmen rode into town, I locked myself in my office to do my homework and get my feet wet. But apparently I haven't managed to stay out of hot water. I seem to have detected a certain nervous apprehension about what I might say or do when I emerged from that locked office for this, my maiden station break.

First, let me begin by dispelling a rumor. I was not picked for this job because I regard myself as the fastest draw on the New Frontier.

Second, let me start a rumor. Like you, I have carefully read President Kennedy's messages about the regulatory agencies, conflict of interest, and the dangers of ex parte contacts. And of course, we at the Federal Communications Commission will do our part. Indeed, I may even suggest that we change the name of the FCC to the "Seven Untouchables."

It may also come as a surprise to some of you, but I want you to know that you have my admiration and respect. Yours is a most honorable profession. Anyone who is in the broadcasting business has a tough row to hoe. You earn your bread by using public property. When you work in broadcasting you volunteer for public service, public pressure, and public regulation. You must compete with other attractions and other investments, and the only way you can do it is to prove to us every 3 years that you should have been in business in the first place.

I can think of easier ways to make a living. But I cannot think of more satisfying ways.

I admire your courage—but that doesn't mean I would make life any easier for you. Your license lets you use the public's airwaves as trustees for 180 million Americans. The public is your beneficiary. If you want to stay on as trustees, you must deliver a decent return to the public—not only to your stockholders. So, as a representative of the public, your health and your product are among my chief concerns.

As to your health. Let's talk only of television today: 1960 gross broadcast revenues of the television industry were over $1,268 million; profit before taxes was $243,900,000, an average return on revenue of 19.2 percent. Compared with 1959, gross broadcast revenues were $1,163,900,000 and profit before taxes was $222,300,000, an average return on revenue of 19.1 percent. So, the percentage increase of total revenues from 1959 to 1960 was 9 percent and the percentage increase of profit was 9.7 percent. This, despite a recession. For your investors, the price has indeed been right.

I have confidence in your health, but not in your product. It is with this and much more in mind that I come before you today.

One editorialist in the trade press wrote that "the FCC of the New Frontier is going to be one of the toughest FCC's in the history of broadcast regulation." If he meant that we intend to enforce the law in the public interest, let me make it perfectly clear that he is right—we do.

If he meant that we intend to muzzle or censor broadcasting, he is dead wrong.

It would not surprise me if some of you had expected me to come here today and say, in effect, "Clean up your own house or the Government will do it for you." Well, in a limited sense, you would be right—I've just said it. But I want to say to you earnestly that it is not in that spirit that I come before you today, nor is it in that spirit that I intend to serve the FCC.

I am in Washington to help broadcasting, not to harm it; to strengthen it, not weaken it; to reward it, not punish it; to encourage it, not threaten it; to stimulate it, not censor it. Above all, I am here to uphold and protect the public interest.

What do we mean by "the public interest"? Some say the public interest is merely what interests the public.

I disagree.

So does your distinguished president; Governor Collins. In a recent speech he said, "Broadcasting to serve the public interest must have a soul and a conscience, a burning desire to excel, as well as to sell; the urge to build the character, citizenship, and intellectual stature of people, as well as to expand the gross national product. By no means do I imply that broadcasters disregard the public interest. But a much better job can be done, and should be done." I could not agree more.

And I would add that in today's world, with chaos in Laos and the Congo aflame, with Communist tyranny on our Caribbean doorstep and relentless pressure on our Atlantic alliance, with social and economic problems at home of the gravest nature, yes, and with technological knowledge that makes it possible, as our President has said, not only to destroy our world but to destroy poverty around the world—in a time of peril and opportunity, the old, complacent, unbalanced fare of action adventure and situation comedies is simply not good enough.

Your industry possesses the most powerful voice in America. It has an inescapable duty to make that voice ring with intelligence and with leadership. In a few years, this exciting industry has grown from a novelty to an instrument of overwhelming impact on the American people. It should be making ready for the kind of leadership that newspapers and magazines assumed years ago, to make our people aware of their world.

Ours has been called the jet age, the atomic age, the space age. It is also, I submit, the television age. And just as history will decide whether the leaders of today's world employed the atom to destroy the world or rebuild it for mankind's benefit, so will history decide whether today's broadcasters employed their powerful voice to enrich the people or debase them.

If I seem today to address myself chiefly to the problems of television, I don't want any of you radio broadcasters to think we've gone to sleep at your switch—we haven't. We still listen. But in recent years most of the controversies and cross currents in broadcast programing have swirled around television. And so my subject today is the television industry and the public interest.

Like everybody, I wear more than one hat. I am the Chairman of the FCC. I am also a television viewer and the husband and father of other television viewers. I have seen a great many television programs that seemed to me eminently worthwhile, and I am not talking about the much bemoaned good old days of "Playhouse 90" and "Studio One".

I am talking about this past season. Some were wonderfully entertaining, such as "The Fabulous Fifties", the "Fred Astaire Show", and the "Bing Crosby Special"; some were dramatic and moving, such as Conrad's "Victory," and "Twilight Zone"; some were marvelously informative, such as "The Nation's Future", "CBS Reports", and "The Valiant Years". I could list many more—programs that I am sure everyone here felt enriched his own life and that of his family. When television is good, nothing—not the theater, not the magazines or newspapers—nothing is better.

But when television is bad, nothing is worse. I invite you to sit down in front of your television set when your station goes on the air and stay there without a book, magazine, newspaper, profit and loss sheet or rating book to distract you—and keep your eyes glued to that set until the station signs off. I can assure you that you will observe a vast wasteland.

You will see a procession of game shows, violence, audience participation shows, formula comedies about totally unbelievable families, blood and thunder, mayhem, violence, sadism, murder, western badmen, western good men, private eyes, gangsters, more vio-

lence, and cartoons. And, endlessly, commercials—many screaming, cajoling, and offending. And most of all, boredom. True, you will see a few things you will enjoy. But they will be very, very few. And if you thing I exaggerate, try it.

Is there one person in this room who claims that broadcasting can't do better?

Well, a glance at next season's proposed programing can give us little heart. Of 73½ hours of prime evening time, the networks have tentatively scheduled 59 hours to categories of action-adventure, situation comedy, variety, quiz, and movies.

Is there one network president in this room who claims he can't do better? Well, is there at least one network president who believes that the other networks can't do better?

Gentlemen, your trust accounting with your beneficiaries is overdue. Never have so few owed so much to so many.

Why is so much of television so bad? I have heard many answers: demands of your advertisers; competition for ever higher ratings; the need always to attract a mass audience; the high cost of television programs; the insatiable appetite for programing material—these are some of them. Unquestionably, these are tough problems not susceptible to easy answers. But I am not convinced that you have tried hard enough to solve them.

I do not accept the idea that the present overall programing is aimed accurately at the public taste. The ratings tell us only that some people have their television sets turned on and of that number, so many are tuned to one channel and so many to another. They don't tell us what the public might watch if they were offered half a dozen additional choices. A rating, at best, is an indication of how many people saw what you gave them. Unfortunately, it does not reveal the depth of the penetration, or the intensity of reaction, and it never reveals what the acceptance would have been if what you gave them had been better—if all the forces of art and creativity and daring and imagination had been unleashed. I believe in the people's good sense and good taste, and I am not convinced that the people's taste is as low as some of you assume.

My concern with the rating services is not with their accuracy. Perhaps they are accurate. I really don't know. What, then, is wrong with the ratings? It's not been their accuracy—it's been their use.

Certainly, I hope you will agree that ratings should have little influence where children are concerned. The best estimates indicate that during the hours of 5 to 6 p.m. 60 percent of your audience is composed of children under 12. And most young children today, believe it or not, spend as much time watching television as they do in the schoolroom. I repeat—let that sink in—most young children today spend as much time watching television as they do in the schoolroom. It used to be said that there were three great influences on a child: home, school, and church. Today, there is a fourth great influence, and you ladies and gentlemen control it.

If parents, teachers, and ministers conducted their responsibilities by following the ratings, children would have a steady diet of ice cream, school holidays, and no Sunday School. What about your responsibilities? Is there no room on television to teach, to inform, to uplift, to stretch, to enlarge the capacities of our children? Is there no room for programs deepening their understanding of children in other lands? Is there no room for a children's news show explaining something about the world to them at their level of understanding? Is there no room for reading the great literature of the past, teaching them the great traditions of freedom? There are some fine children's shows, but they are drowned out in the massive doses of cartoons, violence, and more violence. Must these be your trademarks? Search your consciences and see if you cannot offer more to your young beneficiaries whose future you guide so many hours each and every day.

What about adult programing and ratings? You know, newspaper publishers take popularity ratings too. The answers are pretty clear: it is almost always the comics, followed by the advice to the lovelorn columns. But, ladies and gentlemen, the news is still on the front page of all newspapers, the editorials are not replaced by more comics, the newspapers have not become one long collection of advice to the lovelorn. Yet newspapers do not need a license from the Government to be in business—they do not use public property. But in television—where your responsibilities as public trustees are so plain, the moment that the ratings indicate that westerns are popular there are new imitations of westerns on the air faster than the old coaxial cable could take us from Hollywood to New York. Broadcasting cannot continue to live by the numbers. Ratings ought to be the slave of the broadcaster, not his master. And you and I both know that the rating services themselves would agree.

Let me make clear that what I am talking about is balance. I believe that the public interest is made up of many interests. There are many people in this great country and you must serve all of us. You will get no argument from me if you say that, given a choice between a western and a symphony, more people will watch the western. I like westerns and private eyes too—but a steady diet for the whole country is obviously not in the public interest. We all know that people would more often prefer to be entertained than stimulated or informed. But your obligations are not satisfied if you look only to popularity as a test of what to broadcast. You are not only in show business; you are free to communicate ideas as well as relaxation. You must provide a wider range of choices, more diversity, more alternatives. It is not enough to cater to the Nation's whims—you must also serve the Nation's needs.

And I would add this—that if some of you persist in a relentless search for the highest rating and the lowest common denominator, you may very well lose your audience. Because, to paraphrase a great American who was recently my law partner, the people are wise, wiser than some of the broadcasters—and politicians—think.

As you may have gathered, I would like to see television improved. But how is this to be brought about? By voluntary action by the broadcasters themselves? By direct Government intervention? Or how?

Let me address myself now to my role not as a viewer but as Chairman of the FCC. I could not if I would, chart for you this afternoon in detail all of the actions I contemplate. Instead, I want to make clear some of the fundamental principles which guide me.

First. The people own the air. They own it as much in prime evening time as they do at 6 o'clock Sunday morning. For every hour that the people give you—you owe them something. I intend to see that your debt is paid with service.

Second. I think it would be foolish and wasteful for us to continue any wornout wrangle over the problems of payola, rigged quiz shows, and other mistakes of the past. There are laws on the books which we will enforce. But there is no chip on my shoulder. We live together in perilous, uncertain times; we face together staggering problems; and we must not waste much time now by rehashing the cliches of past controversy. To quarrel over the past is to lose the future.

Third. I believe in the free enterprise system. I want to see broadcasting improved and I want you to do the job. I am proud to champion your cause. It is not rare for American businessmen to serve a public trust. Yours is a special trust because it is imposed by law.

Fourth. I will do all I can to help educational television. There are still not enough educational stations, and major centers of the country still lack usable educational channels. If there were a limited number of printing presses in this country, you may be sure that a fair proportion of them would be put to educational use. Educational television has an enormous contribution to make to the future, and I intend to give it a hand along the way. If there is not a nationwide educational television system in this country, it will not be the fault of the FCC.

Fifth. I am unalterably opposed to governmental censorship. There will be no suppression of programing which does not meet with bureaucratic tastes. Censorship strikes at the taproot of our free society.

Sixth. I did not come to Washington to idly observe the squandering of the public's airwaves. The squandering of our airwaves is no less important than the lavish waste of any precious natural resource. I intend to take the job of Chairman of the FCC very seriously. I believe in the gravity of my own particular sector of the New Frontier. There will be times perhaps when you will consider that I take myself or my job too seriously. Frankly, I don't care if you do. For I am convinced that either one takes his job seriously—or one can be seriously taken.

Now, how will these principles be applied? Clearly, at the heart of the FCC's authority lies its power to license, to renew or fail to renew, or to revoke a license. As you know, when your license comes up for renewal, your performance is compared with your promises. I understand that many people feel that in the past licenses were often renewed pro forma. I say to you now, "Renewal will not be pro forma in the future. There is nothing permanent or sacred about a broadcast license."

But simply matching promises and performance is not enough. I intend to do more. I intend to find out whether the people care. I intend to find out whether the community which each broadcaster serves believes he has been serving the public interest. When a renewal is set down for hearing, I intend—wherever possible—to hold a well-advertised public hearing, right in the community you have promised to serve. I want the people who own the air and the homes that television enters to tell you and the FCC what's been going on. I want the people—if they are truly interested in the service you give them—to make notes, document cases, tell us the facts. For those few of you who really believe that the public interest is merely what interests the public—I hope that these hearings will arouse no little interest.

The FCC has a fine reserve of monitors—almost 180 million Americans gathered around 56 million sets. If you want those monitors to be your friends at court—it's up to you.

Some of you may say, "Yes, but I still do not know where the line is between a grant of a renewal and the hearing you just spoke of." My answer is, "Why should you want to know how close you can come to the edge of the cliff?" What the Commission asks of you is to make a conscientious, good faith effort to serve the public interest. Every one of you serves a community in which the people would benefit by educational, religious, instructive, or other public service programing. Every one of you serves an area which has local needs—as to local elections, controversial issues, local news, local talent. Make a serious, genuine effort to put on that programing. When you do, you will not be playing brinkmanship with the public interest.

What I've been saying applies to broadcast stations. Now a station break for the networks:

You know your importance in this great industry. Today, more than one-half of all hours of television station programing comes from the networks; in prime time, this rises to more than three-fourths of the available hours.

You know that the FCC has been studying network operations for some time. I intend to press this to a speedy conclusion with useful results. I can tell you right now, however, that I am deeply concerned with concentration of power in the hands of the networks. As a result, too many local stations have foregone any efforts at local programing, with little use of live talent and local service. Too many local stations operate with one hand on the network switch and the other on a projector loaded with old movies. We want the individual stations to be free to meet their legal responsibilities to serve their communities.

I join Governor Collins in his views so well expressed to the advertisers who use the public air. I urge the networks to join him and undertake a very special mission on behalf of this industry: you can tell your advertisers, "This is the high quality we are going to serve—take it or other people will. If you think you can find a better place to move automobiles, cigarettes and soap—go ahead and try."

Tell your sponsors to be less concerned with costs per thousand and more concerned with understanding per millions. And remind your stockholders that an investment in broadcasting is buying a share in public responsibility.

The networks can start this industry on the road to freedom from the dictatorship of numbers.

But there is more to the problem than network influences on stations or advertiser influences on networks. I know the problems networks face in trying to clear some of their best programs—the informational programs that exemplify public service. They are your finest hours—whether sustaining or commercial, whether regularly scheduled or special—these are the signs that broadcasting knows the way to leadership. They make the public's trust in you a wise choice.

They should be seen. As you know, we are readying for use new forms by which broadcast stations will report their programing to the Commission. You probably also know that special attention will be paid in these reports to public service programing. I believe that stations taking network service should also be required to report the extent of the local clearance of network public service programing, and when they fail to clear them, they should explain why. If it is to put on some outstanding local program, this is one reason. But, if it is simply to carry some old movie, that is an entirely different matter. The Commission should consider such clearance reports carefully when making up its mind about the licensee's overall programing.

We intend to move—and as you know, indeed the FCC was rapidly moving in other new areas before the new administration arrived in Washington. And I want to pay my public respects to my very able predecessor, Fred Ford, and my colleagues on the Commission who have welcome me to the FCC with warmth and cooperation.

We have approved an experiment with pay TV, and in New York we are testing the potential of UHF broadcasting. Either or both of these may revolutionize television. Only a foolish prophet would venture to guess the direction they will take, and their effect. But we intend that they shall be explored fully—for they are part of broadcasting's New Frontier.

The questions surrounding pay TV are largely economic. The questions surrounding UHF are largely technological. We are going to give the infant pay TV a chance to prove whether it can offer a useful service; we are going to protect it from those who would strangle it in its crib.

As for UHF, I'm sure you know about our test in the canyons of New York City. We will take every possible positive step to break through the allocations barrier into UHF. We will put this sleeping giant to use and in the years ahead we may have twice as many channels operating in cities where now there are only two or three. We may have a half dozen networks instead of three.

I have told you that I believe in the free enterprise system. I believe that most of television's problems stem from lack of competition. This is the importance of UHF to me: with more channels on the air, we will be able to provide every community with enough stations to offer service to all parts of the public. Programs with a mass market appeal required by mass product advertisers certainly will still be available. But other stations will recognize the need to appeal to more limited markets and to special tastes. In this way, we can all have a much wider range of programs.

Television should thrive on this competition—and the country should benefit from alternative sources of service to the public. And—Governor Collins—I hope the NAB will benefit from many new members.

Another and perhaps the most important frontier: television will rapidly join the parade into space. International television will be with us soon. No one knows how long it will be until a broadcast from a studio in New York will be viewed in India as well as in Indiana, will be seen in the Congo as it is seen in Chicago. But as surely as we are meeting here today, that day will come—and once again our world will shrink.

What will the people of other countries think of us when they see our western badmen and good men punching each other in the jaw in between the shooting? What will the Latin American or African child learn of America from our great communications industry? We cannot permit television in its present form to be our voice overseas.

There is your challenge to leadership. You must reexamine some fundamentals of your industry. You must open your minds and open your hearts to the limitless horizons of tomorrow.

I can suggest some words that should serve to guide you:

"Television and all who participate in it are jointly accountable to the American public for respect for the special needs of children, for community responsibility, for the advancement of education and culture, for the acceptability of the program materials chosen, for decency and decorum in production, and for propriety in advertising. This responsibility cannot be discharged by any given group of programs, but can be discharged only through the highest standards of respect for the American home, applied to every moment of every program presented by television.

"Program materials should enlarge the horizons of the viewer, provide him with wholesome entertainment, afford helpful stimulation, and remind him of the responsibilities which the citizen has toward his society."

These words are not mine. They are yours. They are taken literally from your own television code. They reflect the leadership and aspirations of your own great industry. I urge you to respect them as I do. And I urge you to respect the intelligent and farsighted leadership of Governor LeRoy Collins, and to make this meeting a creative act. I urge you at this meeting and, after you leave, back home, at your stations and your networks, to strive ceaselessly to improve your product and to better serve your viewers, the American people.

I hope that we at the FCC will not allow ourselves to become so bogged down in the mountain of papers, hearings, memorandums, orders, and the daily routine that we close our eyes to the wider view of the public interest. And I hope that you broadcasters will not permit yourselves to become so absorbed in the chase for ratings, sales, and profits that you lose this wider view. Now more than ever before in broadcasting's history the times demand the best of all of us.

We need imagination in programing, not sterility; creativity, not imitation; experimentation, not conformity; excellence, not mediocrity. Television is filled with creative, imaginative people. You must strive to set them free.

Television in its young life has had many hours of greatness—its "Victory at Sea," its Army-McCarthy hearings, its "Peter Pan" its "Kraft Theaters," its "See it Now," its "Project 20," the World Series, its political conventions and campaigns, the "Great Debates"—and it has had its endless hours of mediocrity and its moments of public disgrace. There are estimates that today the average viewer spends about 200 minutes daily with television, while the average reader spends 38 minutes with magazines and 40 minutes with newspapers. Television has grown faster than a teenager, and now it is time to grow up.

What you gentlemen broadcast through the people's air affects the people's taste, their knowledge, their opinions, their understanding of themselves and of their world. And their future.

The power of instantaneous sight and sound is without precedent in mankind's history. This is an awesome power. It has limitless capabilities for good—and for evil. And it carries with it awesome responsibilities, responsibilities which you and I cannot escape.

In his stirring inaugural address our President said, "And so, my fellow Americans: ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country."

Ladies and gentlemen, ask not what broadcasting can do for you. Ask what you can do for broadcasting.

I urge you to put the people's airwaves to the service of the people and the cause of freedom. You must help prepare a generation for great decisions. You must help a great Nation fulfill its future.

Do this, and I pledge you our help.

Will the Farmers Have a Voice?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN KYL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, the farm legislation now pending before the Agriculture Committee is the most comprehensive and far reaching ever considered in a single proposal covering this industry. If this measure becomes law, it will probably be in effect through several administrations and would be administered by several Secretaries of Agriculture. It is, therefore, apparent that

there must be adequate safeguards in the bill to make it function in accordance with the broad and commendable purposes stated in the preamble. If the purpose of the bill is to give farmers a voice in writing legislation, we should guarantee that this will be done in fact.

Concern that this may not actually be the case is expressed in the Washington Report of Wallaces Farmer for May 6, 1961. A part of the report is printed here:

Don't count on farmers running the farm program if the bill passes. All the talk of farmer-elected committees calling the shots is proving to be just that—talk.

Farmers will be asked only to submit nominations. Of these, the Secretary of Agriculture will select about a third to serve on the advisory committee. Other committee members will be farm organization officials plus one or more consumer representatives. And if the advice of the advisory committee does not suit, the bill allows the Secretary to reject it.

Then why bother to have committees? One guess is that USDA intends to advertise the committees as the voice of farmers * * * largely to offset somewhat similar claims by the Nation's largest farm organization.

The Press and Federal Deposit Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a splendid editorial from the American Banker of May 10, 1961, entitled "The Press and Federal Deposit Insurance."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the American Banker, May 10, 1961]

THE PRESS AND FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE—EDITORS OF THE NATION FULSOME IN PRAISE OF FDIC

Every time an insured bank closes there is an outpouring of editorial comment in the Nation's press. The closing of the Sheldon, Iowa, National Bank, following disclosure of an embezzlement of more than $2 million was no exception. Comment is almost uniformly favorable, viz:

"The consolation Sheldon residents can have is that it has afforded an opportunity to observe a Government agency which operates smoothly, efficiently and very courteously, and treats individuals as if they were indeed individuals and not merely a sort of nuisance. * * * We are referring, of course, to the very fine relations the public is having with the FDIC at the Sheldon National Bank. There is a great deal of praise throughout the community for their excellent work."—Sheldon (Iowa) Mail.

"Another demonstration of the speed with which the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation works is furnished in Sheldon, Iowa. The insurance officials were right behind the police in moving into the bank which suffered a $2.1 million loss from embezzlement. * * * An entire new generation of Americans has grown to adulthood without ever having seen or suffered from a run on a bank."—Ogden (Utah) Standard Examiner.

"Thanks to the FDIC, Sheldon, Iowa, is 'back on its feet' financially.

"Economic recovery for most of the people in Sheldon was swift, thanks to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corp."—United Press-International report 6 weeks after the Sheldon National Bank closing.

"Discovery of the theft ($2.1 million Sheldon bank defalcation) did not create a panic among depositors. They knew they were secure, and within 10 days after the bank was closed, the FDIC began paying off in fully up to $10,000. As evidence of public calmness and confidence, many depositors took the money they received and went up the street to place it in another bank, also insured * * *. This is one of the bulwarks of the nation's economy, providing an absolute guarantee against a run on a bank ever again."—Henderson (N.C.) Dispatch.

"It takes something like that astounding $2 million embezzlement to recall that for nearly 30 years, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corp. has stood ready to reimburse depositors up to $10,000. Since the FDIC law was enacted, there have been 439 bank closings, and 99.7 percent of depositors were covered by deposit insurance."—Newport (R.I.) News.

"This importance of the protection afforded bank depositors by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has been dramatically demonstrated in the collapse of the bank at Sheldon."—Des Moines (Iowa), Register.

"When Money Vanishes, Federal Bank Agency Appears Like Magic."—New York Daily News headline on Sheldon, Iowa, post closing report.

"The FDIC is probably the best reason for people's confidence in our banking system and the safety of their money * * *. When people have confidence in banks there is little danger of panic."—L. A. C. in the Long Beach (Calif.) Independent.

"Before FDIC, depositors usually lost money if a bank failed. * * * Uneasy depositors could cause a run on strength of a rumor. * * * However, the FDIC has changed all that."—Champaign (Ill.) Courier.

The public, speaking through its newspaper and magazine editors, obviously is satisfied with the manner in which the FDIC operates to protect depositors' interests.

A step in the direction of educating the public with regard to this agency's efficient function should be taken by banks through utilizing these laudatory comments and expressions of confidence in their promotional efforts.

Nature and Directions of the New Frontier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, one of the Midwest's notable newspaper editors, Mr. Herbert H. Heimlich, of the Lafayette (Ind.) Journal-Courier, set forth some interesting views in an editorial after his return from the recent editors' meeting in Washington. He titled his editorial "The Washington Scene," and his observations are so interesting that I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WASHINGTON SCENE

Something of the shape, nature, and directions of the New Frontier, as well as the problems facing the United States on many fronts, were described and explained, and in some cases defended, for newspaper editors of the United States at two meetings in Washington which your editor was privileged to attend over a span of a week.

Some 35 top Washington officials, headed by President Kennedy himself, gave addresses, took part in panels and discussions, and answered questions, first before the annual meeting of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, and then at a foreign policy briefing conference conducted by the Department of State.

A great deal of enlightment was provided the editors. Whether or not they agreed with all they heard, there was ample opportunity to learn firsthand of administration thinking on a wide variety of problems facing the Nation, both at home and abroad. This comphensive backgrounding is bound to prove useful and valuable. Come to think about it, there may have been a degree of attempted brainwashing, also.

Washington lives in an atmosphere of crises. A deep sigh or frown on the part of a high official can only be a sign of trouble and next morning there are reports of new difficulties and top-level decisions. Nothing seems very clear or certain. A Cabinet member sized up this situation most aptly, it appeared, when he remarked: If you leave here more confused than when you came, perhaps you may be closer to reality.

The pervading spirit of Government leaders and the atmosphere they created breathed of crises and urgency, and also of frustration and uncertainty in some respects. The threat posed by communism overshadowed all else. What to do about it was on about all tongues.

Some of us who attended both sessions heard the President three times within 6 days, including a regular Presidential press conference. In addition the programs included six members of the Cabinet and various administrators, deputies, assistants, directors and others in such Departments as State, Defense, aeronautics and space, task forces, the U.S. Information Agency, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency, as well as the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations.

The foreign policy conference was conducted under rules which forbade attribution to the many speakers. However since at leats one Communist correspondent was present, it may be that top Reds will know more about who said what than Americans.

As might have been expected, Cuba and Laos came in for main attention. While some things, such as these, were described as bad, there was the intimation that they may become worse. There was some recrimination as to who goofed on Cuba, with interested parties defending themselves and their agencies. One held there had been some bad miscalculations, while another insisted there had been none. Just what did happen, or why, never was explained.

The President made a strong impression upon the editors when he promised with reference to Cuba, that this Nation "will not hesitate in meeting its primary obligations, which are to the security of our own Nation," whatever the cost or peril and alone if necessary. He appeared well informed, alert, and clear on all questions. At a time of a rising crescendo of criticism, the President undoubtedly won a great deal of sympathy from the editors, and was credited in a special poll with having performed well thus far.

The President, while appearing confident generally, also gave evidence of the weight of the office he holds and of the responsibility which goes with it, in special relation

to the confusion and grave situations which exist today in the world.

As might have been expected, the speakers were received with mixed emotions by the bipartisan audiences.

Two Cabinet members, Secretary of Commerce Hodges and Secretary of Labor Goldberg, declared that the country seems to be pulling out of the recession. Mr. Goldberg, however, appeared to take special delight in recounting our difficulties. He properly insisted that the country should know the truth about our economy, the bad as well as the good, but went further, unnecessarily emphasizing and repeating the unfavorable factors, it seemed. Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Ribicoff also was in an argumentative mood.

Secretary of the Treasury Dillon also surprised us by citing the Nation's shameful lack in education. Further, he outlined an extensive Government program designed to make everyone happy, holding we can and must fulfill all of the Nation's needs. In this connection he assured there is no question as to adequate revenue, but that the main question is how the billions are to be spent. Also, he shocked not a few editors when he stated that multibillion deficits this year and next are "not a cause for alarm" and that a "modest deficit" is required to stimulate the economy.

Some of the so-called Republicans who have accepted appointment to high posts sounded as Democratic in some of their approaches as those who chose them.

Other Cabinet members—Secretary of State Rusk and Attorney General Robert Kennedy—were less partisan and more moderate in their discussion of national problems, it seemed to this observer.

Highlighting the American Society of Newspaper Editors program and of great significance to the Nation and to the world was the President's declaration on Cuba, providing a sharp break with our former stated position. Earlier, he had given assurance that U.S. forces would not be used, but now he has opened the door on this point.

This array of top brass, all articulate spokesmen, might well have dazzled the editors in some ways, but we doubt that the New Frontier gained any new converts.

Communism: Our Active Enemy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following essay by George Duncan, of Test Junior High School. This winning essay appeared in the Palladium-Item and Sun-Telegram of Richmond, Ind., on April 16, 1961:

COMMUNISM: OUR ACTIVE ENEMY

(By George Duncan, Test Junior High)

Communism, the economic theory by which all of the property, industry and distribution of the products are controlled by the community or society as a whole, is a science and its followers consider themselves scientists.

Communism denies God. With this denial all of the standards of truth and righteousness, all of the moral laws for which He stands, and all of the values and virtues which originate with God are completely destroyed.

In communism man is a body which is explained by the terms of chemistry and physics. He has no soul, no spirit, and no continuity of life.

According to Karl Marx, the originator of communism, the perfect government would equally distribute all of the income, property and produce among its members. This government would be spread throughout the world by force. Numerous attempts have been made to establish a "Utopian" community, none have suceeded.

Although Russia is said to have had a communistic government since 1917, in order to make is succeed and I use succeed with numerous reservations, many of the Marxist theories were amended and now lean toward the capitalistic ideas.

UNSCRUPULOUS METHODS

It is a proven fact that communism is being disseminated throughout our country by various powers using low and unscrpulous methods. This infiltration has become entrenched in our religion, education, and government. It has been so cleverly carried out that we, the victims, have been unaware of its occurrence.

Most people think only of a nuclear attack in the communistic conquest of the world. They do not realize that right now, in our own country, the Communists are making their most forceful and, thus far, most successful attack on the American people. This attack is on our students. In some of our schools Communist teachers are trying to turn America's future adults into traitors by instilling the ideas of communism in them with sly, scarcely perceptible teachings of their doctrine.

WHAT CAN WE DO?

We also find Communist speakers attending youth meetings and church groups attempting to convert the youth of America from capitalism to communism. How can I, as a student, differentiate the communistic teachings imperceptibly slipped upon us from our American teaching? How can I protect myself?

You might wonder what appeal a student could find in the principles of communism; however, numerous details presented to the student can produce an appealing future. The nature of this appeal is that the student can participate in the conquest of the world and, later, in a program to change human nature, perfect human character and populate the entire earth with a new quality of personality.

You might consider a Communist monopoly of world government a long way off; however, it is very near. Not long ago the United States was told that its next generation would live under a communistic government.

I cannot and will not be willfully led away from our American government and principles. However, I repeat, how can I differentiate the communistic teachings from our American teachings? I devoutly pray for perception to see the truth.

Continuation of Mexican Farm Labor Program

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2010), a bill to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, the remarks I am about to make are in my individual capacity as a Member of the House and not as majority leader. Because I am majority leader I do not completely abdicate all my rights as a Member of this body.

I can remember this legislation through the years. Not so many years ago we were fighting to bring about better conditions for the poor, unfortunate Mexican workers. More should be done. Now we are trying to do something for Americans.

I supported this legislation in the past. I recognized the necessity for it in past years. But our fight then was to try and have the Department of Labor get some authority to go in and use its offices to protect human beings, Mexican workers, who were being exploited, not by all the farmers, but by a sufficient number so that it was a public scandal. Now we are trying to do something for American workers.

Those who favor the bill—and I have no quarrel with them—talk about the need for Mexican workers. That is not our immediate concern today. What we are concerned about today is to try and get some fair consideration given to American citizens.

I offered an amendment to the committee which I thought might solve the situation, in trying to help this problem as I saw it, and I knew it would arise today. I know you are going to put your bill through. You are going to win a battle, but you might lose a war later on. Some of you members of the Committee on Agriculture, all of whom represent agricultural districts, must recognize that sometimes some of us Members from the urban districts have a thought. I have a 1,000-percent voting record on agriculture and I do not think many agricultural Members are able to say that they have a 1,000-percent voting record on agriculture. I offered a single amendment, but a fair amendment. What was the substance of it?

No workers recruited under this title shall be made available to any employer or permitted to remain in the employ of any employer unless the employer has made and is making reasonable efforts to attract domestic workers—

What is wrong with that? Then I give some criteria. Then I add a paragraph as follows:

Provided further, that in no event shall Mexican workers be permitted to be employed by any employer who is paying domestic workers less than the prevailing wage rate for the activity in the area.

That is the combined effect of my amendment. Yet they opposed it. They declined it. If they had accepted that amendment we would not have been completely satisfied, but the bill would have gone along. Of course you are going to put it through, but later on there will be other legislation coming up and you might regret that you rode roughshod over some of us who have humanitarian considerations in our minds, who had them years ago for the Mexican worker and who have them now for the American worker.

You are going to bring a bill out of your committee in the near future entitled the Agricultural Act of 1961. And what is a part of the declaration of principle of that bill? One part is, "to afford farmers the opportunity to achieve parity of income with other economic groups."

I am for that. But there are some of us today who are trying to give consideration to American citizens, who are trying to get economic parity for American citizens in connection with this type of work.

So where are you going to be when you get up?

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will our distinguished majority leader yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am talking now as an individual member.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Will the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts state what he thinks the position of the Department of Agriculture would be in connection with the amendment that he offered?

Mr. McCORMACK. As I understand it, this amendment would be satisfactory. That is my understanding. I will ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. COAD]. We conferred on this. I should like to ask that of the gentleman with whom I consulted about trying to draft one simple amendment to try to iron out the situation for the House purposes.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I was informed yesterday in the presence of many other Members of the House that the administration speaks with one voice, that is, it favors the extension of Public Law 78 only if it is amended, and that includes the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. McCORMACK. Might I say to the gentleman without changing his position at all, if this amendment had been accepted we would gladly have gone along.

Mr. BECKWORTH. That is correct, if the administration would accept it.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would go along with this if the administration would accept it, but I hear no voice from the committee.

Last Chance for Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I invite attention to an article entitled "Last Chance for Unity," written by Mr. A. N. Spanel, founder of the International Latex Corp., of Dover, Del. It is a matter of public record that Mr. Spanel has sought to alert, times without number, the whole free world to its danger and the compelling need for dedicated unity among its member nations, to successfully meet those threats.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the editorial by Mr. A. N. Spanel, which appeared in the New York Times on March 21, 1961, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 21, 1961]

LAST CHANCE FOR UNITY

(By A. N. Spanel, chairman, International Latex Corp.)

"We are unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this Nation has always been committed. Let every nation know, whether it wish us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend or oppose any foe, in order to assure the survival and success of liberty."

This inspiring declaration was made by President Kennedy in his inaugural address. Rarely in recent years have the American people—as well as their friends and enemies throughout the world—heard a pronouncement so firm, clear eyed and courageous from a President of the United States.

If it proves a portent of policy and action in the same fearless spirit, the forces of freedom may at last seize the initiative in the historic world struggle, now held by our monolithic adversary.

The President's words will be appraised, moreover, in the light of significant points he underlined in his inaugural address. The world will recall that there he renounced any self-delusion as to the extreme gravity of the present international situation. "The tide of events has been running out and time has not been our friend," was the way he put it.

Even more important, he in effect rejected as unrealistic the perennial hope that world communism—in the name of peaceful coexistence or some other slogan of confusion—will suddenly give up its inflexible goal of totalitarian world rule. Referring to Red Russia and Red China, he declared:

"We must never be lulled into believing that either power his yielded its ambitions for world domination—ambitions which they forcefully restated only a short time ago."

The implications of this essential truth should be self-evident: (1) Those Communist ambitions cannot be wished away or argued away; they can only be curbed and defeated by those whom they endanger, which means all non-Communist nations and peoples; (2) the free world must generate quickly—before the point of no return is reached—not only superior military-economic power on a united basis but an unswerving determination to win the struggle.

And if these imperatives for survival are to be met, the central and indispensable condition is genuine and dedicated free world unity which can only exist in depth and in breadth. As we have emphasized repeatedly in these columns, "To meet the challenge of Communist hordes under totalitarian discipline, we need a free world unity to match." For the continued divisiveness of the Western World, even as the tide of events runs out, defies all reason and could well encompass our annihilation.

The Communists use their threats and their blandishments on the Marxist premise that capitalist nations, among themselves, have no friends, no enemies, only interests. For their leaders from Lenin to Khrushchev it has been a basic principle of operation in their assault on our world.

It must be refuted and frustrated, not in words but in wisely formulated acts and institutions to promote true unity of the nations earmarked by the Moscow-Peiping axis for conquest and burial, whatever the price and sacrifice. On April 7, 1959 we wrote:

"The Soviet bloc is a monolithic entity. The free allies are at best a collection of strong-willed individual countries and governments. In order to cope with the life-and-death menace posed by the Red monolith, we have no alternative but to provide a voluntary unity to match. Only by pooling more of its resources, brains, and skills and facing up to the need for sacrifice—including the sacrifice of some types of sovereignty—can the free world thwart the Soviet pattern of pillage."

It is noteworthy that General de Gaulle in the past called for the closest harmony among the United States, Great Britain, and France wherever the Communists threatened our world. He was misunderstood and ignored. Washington and London failed to grasp that such a leadership union would have given other free nations, new and old, the confidence and the courage to stake their destinies on the freeworld alliance

General de Gaulle also urged that the responsibilities of NATO be broadened to include areas affecting the very lives of its members. Again he was misunderstood and ignored—until the chaos in the Congo confirmed his fears.

It is interesting to note that the Foreign Minister of West Germany, Dr. Heinrich von Brentano, has come closer to this view. In an article in the current Foreign Affairs, though he disapproves of the proposed three-power council, he does agree that a reorganized NATO must extend its influence outside of Europe.

NATO and the whole Western World must know that weaker nations generally gravitate toward the strong; and that historically, communism feeds on the fears and appeasements it can generate in its divided opponents, weakened targets.

Of what avail a stabilized and neutralized Africa, for instance—even if the miracle were achieved—if in the process the strength of our European allies is sapped, their resolution for the common cause eroded? The resultant disunity, to the point of driving some allies to seek shelter in neutralist delusions, would make of Africa a time bomb in the hands of the Communists.

"Support any friend and oppose any foe."

This deceptively simple but actually profound formula advanced by President Kennedy offers a firm guide to the conduct of free men in a free world. It should serve as the acid test of every specific policy. If adopted by common consent by all the major free powers, it could cut through confusions and self-destructive quarrels among them.

If adhered to in earnest in everything involving the Communist challenge, it would sustain the unity of the free world essential to victory for the world of freedom.

U.S. Relief Program and Shortage of Doctors in the Congo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, during the past month the publisher of the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Argus-Leader, Mr. John A. Kennedy and Mrs. Kennedy, have been visiting in the Congo, surveying the conditions in that land.

Two excellent articles, providing us with an insight into the many problems which confront the people of this

troubled nation, have been written by the Kennedy's and carried in the Argus-Leader.

Because of the importance of this area of the world to the international scene, I am bringing the attention of the Senate to these articles.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the two articles on this subject:

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. RELIEF PROGRAM SHOWING DRAMATIC RESULTS IN CONGO

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—John A. Kennedy, editor in chief of the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader and his wife serving as photographer, spent nearly 2 months in the Congo in 1959. They have just concluded another survey of conditions in that chaotic land.

(By John A. Kennedy)

LEOPOLDVILLE, THE CONGO.—Last January 20 President Kennedy announced his foreign relief program to help needy nations to help themselves.

Yesterday I saw that plan combined with the U.S. food for peace project dramatically in action.

From a small hill not far from the Leopoldville Airport we watched 1,300 laborers digging ditches with shovel and mattock to drain the swamps and marshes.

The land will be used to grow cash vegetable crops to be sold in Leopoldville markets.

The wages for the workers come from the sale of U.S. gift surplus flour to local bakeries.

Earlier I had visited one to watch American flour sent by the food for peace administration—headed by South Dakota's George McGovern—made into tasty loaves of bread.

The third shipment of 1,400 tons of American surplus flour arrived at Matadi port this weekend. The first 700 tons reached the Congo March 16, the second reported ready for unloading March 28.

The flour gift is distributed under U.N. supervision in a three-way deal approved by the Congolese and U.S. Governments. It helps meet a serious shortage in this troubled republic and also curtails unemployment.

TIRED OF RED LABEL

The flour arrived just in time. In fact, for a few days there was none to supply the bakeries. U.S. Ambassador Clare Timberlake had urged speed in its shipment because Western people here had grown weary of the earlier Russian Red Star labeled flour bags that had been the source of their bread under the then premier Lumumba.

The U.N. sells the flour to importers on a quota basis, established and approved by U.N. and Congo authorities.

The importers in turn sell to local bakers at prices fixed by the Government. All moneys received from the sale are deposited in a special account in the Central Bank drawn on to finance many public work projects jointly started by a U.N. team and Congolese officials. This helps to stem the growing tide of unemployed caused by the brakdown of normal commercial and manufacturing operations following the explosive independence emergence of July 1960.

MARSHES DRAINED

The draining of the Stanley Pool marshes for conversion into truck gardening is the first of these public works projects. The plan, originally started by the colonial Belgians, was interrupted when they lost the Congo.

This reclamation is combined flood control and ditch drainage providing vegetable growing land for Leopoldville needs because soil in surrounding areas is generally unsuitable for gardening.

The area is 15 miles above the capital and embraces 30,000 acres, 80 of which already are in production of maize, manioc, and other basic needs.

DIKES STRENGTHENED

The dikes along the drainage ditches are reinforced by revetting with mattresses of young trees and strong reeds filled with palm leaves to keep the banks from caving in—somewhat similar to the early U.S. Army Engineers protection of the Missouri River in the first two decades of this century in South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, and Missouri.

Surplus vegetation was being burned off when we were there. Congolese laborers were cutting trees with their machetes. Others were tying the mattresses while the rest were digging the drainage ditches.

From our hillside vantage point we were not bothered by mosquitoes and tsetse flies that swarm in the swamps where 1,900 men were laboring below.

Up to the end of February the U.N. spent about $200,000 for this project. Practically all the money went for wages, but now the U.N. appropriation is exhausted.

And here is where the proceeds of the American gift flour came to the rescue.

TO MEET NEEDS

In addition to giving needed work for 1,900 men—much like our public works projects of the 1930's—they expect to produce all the vegetables needed for metropolitan Leopoldville which now are flown in often from Europe or other areas of Africa.

The pilot project, now being drained, will be ready for planting next month—if, and a big if—they can obtain seeds from abroad. It will give permanent employment eventually, the sponsors hope, to thousands of men.

Since the Stanley Pool area is the breeding ground of mosquitoes near Leopoldville, the authorities feel it will greatly improve health conditions in the capital.

NARY A NATIVE DOCTOR IN VAST LAND OF UPHEAVAL

(By John A. Kennedy)

LEOPOLDVILLE.—When the Belgians pulled out of the Congo last July, there was not a single Congolese medical doctor in this vast country.

And only 50 students now in the new medical college at Louvanium University here as the only pipeline to supply Congolese health supervision in the future.

This medical-health picture perhaps dramatically points up the problems of the Congo—and for that matter similar difficulties already present or certain to be encountered in the emerging of the new African nations today.

NOT ALL THE WAY

Experts say the people just can't all go back to see the sorcerers and witch doctors of the past—though these mysticists still prevail in a large part of the uncivilized areas of the bush and jungle.

On Independence Day, there were 761 Belgian doctors. After the uprisings, only 150 remained and those were mostly in the big cities to care for 13 million Congolese and 4 million more in Belgian administered Ruanda Urundi.

The departing medicos took with them the technicians, X-ray and laboratory experts, leaving only a very few to help man the hospitals and dispensaries.

Under Belgian rule, according to Dr. M. Bellerive, senior U.N. medical consultant who had visited the Congo several times before as World Health Organization expert, medical care of natives in hospitals and dispensaries had been, perhaps, the best and most complete of any nation in black Africa.

With the aid of hurriedly recruited Red Cross teams, the U.N. chief has been able only to partially reorganize the nation's health setup.

AT LEAST 15 YEARS

Dr. Bellerive's most optimistic guess is that it will take at least 15 years before the Congolese can get along without foreign doctors—if then.

Through the Red Cross, Dr. Bellerive tried to get 130 doctors immediately. Of this number, 72 have arrived. In addition to medicos, public health advisory teams were assigned to each of the six provinces consisting of a doctor, one sanitary engineer, and a public health expert.

The Belgians fortunately had medical stores which they believed adequate for 1½ years in the event the Congo was cut off by another world war. The first 6 months since July drew heavily on this stock but Dr. Bellerive says they are not too desperate on this score at present. But Sister Eloardo of Katambo Hospital reports that her equipment and supplies are running very low.

"The big problem today," the WHO chief said, "is what can we do in the future because the Red Cross doctors are planning to leave in June?"

TO SCHOOL IN FRANCE

The U.N. already has sent 61 medical assistants to France who have been accepted into schools with the understanding that in addition to the 3 years in these institutions, the students at the same time will make up their deficiencies in the basic sciences. By comparative training, that would rank between an intern and a graduate nurse.

If they do not pass the French medical exams—which are tough—they will be returned to the Congo as supermedical assistants. The first reports from five French universities are quite good. It is the hope of Dr. Bellerive to send 20 more medical assistants to school this year. The World Health Organization is picking up the tab. They also have worked out a full program for public health doctors with about 1,000 students.

Some Swiss medical schools are also training natives but the small supply of medical assistants here is so badly needed to help to at least partially preserve the Congo's health that it will be difficult to let them leave the country.

In 3 years time this group of Congolese will form the backbone of the country's health service and will be augmented by graduates from the relatively newly formed medical school at Leopoldville—Louvanium University.

COOL RECEPTION

Dr. Bellerive reported considerable difficulty in the placing of doctors after they arrive.

Kivu, from where most of the Belgians were chased when the tribles rose against their former colonial masters, first said "No" to proferred medical teams. In April they cabled the U.N. in Leopoldville for 10 doctors including surgeons and specialists.

There has been some difficulty in obtaining full cooperation with native officials by U.N. heads. A few doctors were roughed up a bit but Bellerive feels his operations are beginning to work more smoothly.

The lack of medically trained Congolese has presented the most serious problem to the U.N. health authorities. They cannot find trained medical experts to suggest as commissioners of health.

Under the Belgians, both the national and provincial posts of this type were occupied by top medical men—nonnative.

When Lumumba was president, he appointed a 29-year-old medical student as commissioner. The present head, Paul Bolyx, is a former medical assistant who had quit the profession to head a semipolitical organization.

Lawmakers at School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial dealing with an outstanding lawmaker, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of Massachusetts, which appeared in the Boston Globe for May 10, 1961.

LAWMAKERS AT SCHOOL

Few public figures have as good a claim to the title of Old Pro as has JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of Attleboro, 37 years a Congressman, long House minority leader, twice Speaker. No one is better qualified to coach freshman Republican Members in parliamentary rules and courtesies.

He teaches them besides to be punctilious in answering mail and in doing legitimate favors for all constituents; to be seen and not heard at their first session; to be conscientious in committee, and to avoid unnecessary floor fights. These suggestions may sound elementary, even amusing to some, but the freshman Congressmen soon discover they are vital.

Actually, Congressman MARTIN has brought informally to Republicans in Washington the kind of course the Massachusetts Division of University Extension has been offering all freshman lawmakers on Beacon Hill for more than a quarter of a century. Prior to every session, Clerk Lawrence R. Grove gives 12 one-hour periods to new legislators, whom he informs as to the rules, parliamentary courtesies, and even the idiosyncrasies of the House (but not, of course, those of individual Members).

In such teaching, Massachusetts has once more proved herself a pioneer. In a kindred enterprise, selected college graduates are learning at first-hand by working for a year under a Carnegie Foundation grant as "political interns" in departments of the State government or with the Legislature.

The full implication of such courses, their vast potential importance, even those responsible for them may not realize. Science and technology are advancing at a fantastic pace, but there is little reason to amend Al Smith's comment of 40 years ago that the art of government has lagged badly. Desparately needed once more is the kind of creative political action which laid the basis for national independence and the Federal Government, opened the way to national growth, rallied the Union against rebellion, and met the challenge of the post-Civil War period, when an agricultural country became industrial.

Crowding upon most Americans today are the new problems of a society fast becoming urban. How to meet them? How in time to stabilize a world order in a cold war and nuclear age? Who will find the answers?

The word "politician" has taken on an uncomplimentary meaning. But this term applies to all the great creative public figures of the past. Ben Franklin served in the Pennsylvania Assembly, and prepared for his diplomatic mission to France as colonial agent in London. In the Virginia Legislature, Washington learned that the military should respect the civil power. Jefferson, the Adams', Madison, Hamilton, John Marshall, Jackson, and Lincoln all had experience as lawmakers.

A statesman was once described as "a famous politican, now dead." The definition has this much truth; achievement in government is only possible for those of sufficient knowledge and experience to hold their own and make their way in the intangibles of public life.

Following Massachusetts, it is good to know, other States, and now the Republicans in Washington, are teaching freshman lawmakers. The financing of Beacon Hill political internships by the Carnegie Foundation is heartening evidence that the need of creative action in public affairs is beginning to be recognized. In the face of today's frustrating, dismaying, and sometimes terrifying problems, full realization cannot come too soon.

Communism: Our Active Enemy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following essay by Linda Brown, a student of Dennis Junior High School, which appeared in the Palladium-Item and Sun-Telegram of Richmond, Ind., on April 16, 1961:

COMMUNISM: OUR ACTIVE ENEMY

(By Linda Brown, Dennis Junior High)

Probably the first question we should ask ourselves is why is communism our most active enemy? Indications are it is so. Just whose fault is it? Maybe it's the Government's or the church's. Perhaps the finger should point at us. Have you ever contemplated on the thought that we may be the guilty ones?

This presents another question: How have we failed? In the book, "What We Must Know About Communism," the authors give four elements of our way of life that we wish to preserve.

"Law is the first element, for where there is no law, the people will perish." This isn't stressed enough in America. Children are not reared to respect the law. "No one who is familiar with our law can learn about phony trials, forced confessions, arrests for no reason, use of secret police, that are the basis for Communist law—and not to pledge anew faith in our own liberty under law."

"The second element is respect for the individual." If you read a book, magazine or other Communist publication you would realize that in all the hundreds of words you would not find one word, individual. You now see that communism is only interested in a person as part of a larger class.

ATMOSPHERE OF HATRED

"A third element is our personal right to feel friendship and good will toward others." Communists, live in an atmosphere of hatred for all who do not agree with or believe in the Communist theory. On the other hand, we are protecting the right to feel affectionate and have mercy.

"The fourth element in our life is our right to learn." How many of us really seek knowledge or do we just take one person's acclamations to be the true word?

When the first satellities were shot into space, many people claimed that Russian education was ahead of ours. We do not deny this, but those same people should compare the percentage of educated Russians with the learned Americans. We are interested in educating the whole population in the ways of democratic freedom, not just a few chosen to serve the State.

Looking over these elements, how many of us have conscientiously obeyed the law, respected each person as an individual and not just part of the population, have been friendly, affectionate, and merciful, and have taken advantage of the opportunity given everyone for equal education?

OUR NEGLECT CITED

Communism is our active enemy only because we have allowed it to be by neglecting to recognize and guard against its evils by realizing and learning what our own democracy stands for. Democracy is a priceless possession. Few people realize its true value until it is lost or threatened.

Since communism is the enemy to be opposed, our counterattack must be a rebirth of patriotism in America. People must know the cause for which they fight, because the enemy is dedicated in its belief, and we must be strong in ours.

Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Step at a Time Toward Socialized Medicine," which appeared April 17, 1961, in the Fort Wayne News Sentinel.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STEP AT A TIME TO SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

The Socialist Party has long demonstrated that it is willing to take one step at a time as long as it makes some progress toward socialization of all phases of the American economy.

This is demonstrably the case with socialized medicine the same as everything else, despite the denial of proponents of Federal medical aid to everyone over 65 under social security, that this would be an opening wedge to all-out socialized medicine. Indeed, the party has now issued a pamphlet which describes a program for bringing about socialized medicine on a bit-by-bit basis.

Norman Thomas, long the dominant voice of socialism in the United States, makes this clear when he says that the bill in question is insufficient and a timid start, but he advocates its support—and with good reason, considering his format for continuing progress toward complete socialization.

Thomas' philosophy follows the old Chinese proverb that the longest journey begins with a single step, and that the program for socialization must also begin, and continue, in a limited way. He knows full well that if one group—arbitrarily defined, regardless of need—is to have medical care bills paid by the Federal Government, other groups will demand and ultimately receive the same handouts. And that thus, little by little, socialized medicine will eventually be brought about.

To oppose such a program, of course, is not to deny medical services to elderly people whose own resources are inadequate. Indeed, the Federal-State cooperation measure passed by the last Congress provides for aid to all who need it, whether they are under social security or not. That, of course, is the right and fair way to meet this problem.

Farm Strangulation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, considerable discussion of late has emanated from the executive branch of government urging voluntary censorship upon the nation's press. Personally, I feel that the expressions of our American press are basically free from abuse. If there is abuse, it emanates from extremists who normally support the administration's socialistic proposals and not from newspapers and columnists who support the American free enterprise system.

In today's Chicago Daily Tribune, the "Report From Washington" column, by Walter Trohan, chief of the Chicago Tribune Washington bureau, discusses an aspect of Secretary of Agriculture Freeman's farm strangulation program. Many of us realize that this bill contains the basis for administrative dictatorship over the farm economy. I believe Mr. Trohan's article should be thoughtfully read by all Members of Congress before they are pressured into supporting the monstrosity that is labeled an agriculture program:

REPORT FROM WASHINGTON

(By Walter Trohan)

WASHINGTON, May 9.—The House Agriculture Committee is holding hearings on an overall farm bill, a most complicated measure with far-reaching implications because it would supposedly let farmers write their own tickets but actually puts final power in the hands of Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman.

The bill, by which the administration hopes to discharge its campaign promises to solve the farm problem, is a 79-page affair which covers the soil front. Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau federation, says it will give Freeman absolute control over agriculture.

There is something for every farmer in the measure, from a low interest program to build farm houses and irrigation ditches to crops themselves. The home and irrigation loans would be paid over a 40-year period with the interest rate no higher than 5 percent.

The measure would expand the power of farm cooperatives, which many businessmen consider too big at present. There is a program for setting up food reserves in so-called underdeveloped countries and much more. Of course, the costs will fall, where they always come to rest, on the American taxpayer.

PLAN REVIVAL OF PAYROLLER VOTE FORCE

Plans are to revive the field committee set up to administer many items of the bill. This spells a return to a program that will place approximately 50,000 field committeemen on the Federal payroll, where they can be expected to constitute the potent political force they were back in the days of such Democratic Agriculture Secretaries as Henry Wallace, Claude Wickard, and Charles Brannan. The boost in administrative costs would be about $250 million a year.

Whether or not this will be approved by Congress, it is evident Freeman wants to dictate farm production and prices. His chief economic adviser is Willard Cochrane of the University of Minnesota, who was Kennedy's farm adviser during the campaign and who proposed the concept of parity income which would be even higher than parity price for farmers.

During the campaign, farm economists in the Department of Agriculture said the Cochrane formula would mean a 10-cent-a-pound jump in the price of hogs, a 17-cent-a-pound increase for chickens, and a 19-cent hoist in eggs, with other food prices jumping in proportion. The Department said the plan would raise food costs for consumers by almost 25 percent.

The first major piece of farm legislation under the New Frontier was the feed grain bill, which gave the Department authority to control production and price of corn and grain sorghums. If the overall farm bill now under consideration goes through, Freeman will undoubtedly try to promote the farm parity income concept.

VOTE TO RAISE CHICAGO FOOD PRICES

To win, Freeman is counting on the support of many big city Congressmen, who know nothing about the farm problem, but vote regularly for more and more Government domination over farmers, even though the domination means higher food prices for their constituents and less and less free enterprise.

The margin for passage on the feed grain bill last March 9 was furnished by Chicago's Democratic Congressmen. Led by the dean of the city's delegation, THOMAS J. O'BRIEN Democrat of Illinois, all 10 Chicago Democrats went down the line for the measure which passed the House by a vote of 209 to 202. Had the Chicago Democrats voted against the measure, it would have lost 212 to 199.

Undoubtedly, House leaders are counting on Chicago's Democrats, as well as those of other large cities, to go down the line again when the big farm bill comes up for a vote. In view of the prospective higher food prices, interference with the operations of merchants and traders of Chicago, and damage to the free trade system generally, it seems strange that Chicago Democrats are so loyal to the ideas of Professor Cochrane and Secretary Freeman.

Armed Forces Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. BARRY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, the Armed Forces of the United States have been paid a tribute in a special poem written by Chaplain Gilbert Darlington, lieutenant commander, NYMN retired, entitled "Frontiers of Brotherhood and Freedom."

The poem was first read before the Military Chaplains Association of the United States meeting at the U.S. Military Academy, West Point, May 3. Dr. Darlington also has been asked to read the poem at the Waldorf Astoria banquet May 20, which marks the culmination of Armed Forces Week observances in New York City.

I have been asked by the New York Chapter of the Military Order of the World Wars to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this poem dedicated to "all who are working for peace and freedom everywhere":

FRONTIERS OF BROTHERHOOD AND FREEDOM

God of our Fathers, hear our prayer,
  Bless all Your children everywhere,
From pole to pole, land, sky, and sea;
  Teach us the truths that make men free
And laws that safeguard liberty
  To all Your worldwide family.

Hunger, disease and poverty—
  These are the frontiers where we see
Roadblocks to human dignity;
  But doubly damned is tyranny
  That shackles men that should be free,
Censors the news, denies free speech,
  Readies armed forces out of reach,
Plans ultimatums often hurled
  At its own serfs, or anxious world;
Boasts launching pads prepared to kill
  All those who vex a tyrant's will;
Trains saboteurs to infiltrate
  The heartbeats of some newborn state,
And teaches hatred as a tool
  To justify its own misrule.

Why must so many million men
  Beat plowshares into swords again?—
Wasting in sterile armament
  The lifeblood of each continent
  That should be used to set men free
To live in peace and dignity,
  Secure from want and tyranny—
To win from rivers, sun, and soil
  Rich dividends from honest toil,
Till not oppressed and more mature,
  For ancient ills they learn the cure.

Poor propaganda-blinded youth
  Can never hope to grasp the truth
That brotherhood makes mankind free,
  But hate and fear breed tragedy.
The burdens of another war
  Will be far greater than before.
Those who survive will fail to see
  A healthy, free economy,
For misuse of atomic power
  Can blast man's progress any hour,
And open wide the bloody door
  From world war III to world war IV.

Father, why do there have to be
  Frontiers of brutal enmity,
Where lack of true humanity
  Blinds us to our real destiny?
Teach us to serve our fellow man
  With all the strength and skill we can
To conquer through fraternity
  Hunger, disease, and poverty.
As ill will and aggression cease,
  Help us to share enduring peace;
And may the Prince of Peace, Your Son,
  Bless us until this peace is won.

Hoover 37 Years Head of FBI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include an article from the Boston Traveler issue of May 10, 1961, which depicts the 37-year reign of J. Edgar Hoover as the Nation's top G-man:

[From the Boston Traveler, May 10, 1961]

ATTORNEY GENERAL STONE PICKED HIM FOR JOB IN 1924—HOOVER 37 YEARS HEAD OF FBI

(By Joe McLaughlin)

The temporary Government messenger in 1924 who remained to revolutionize U.S. law enforcement, J. Edgar Hoover, today rounds out 37 years as the Nation's top G-man.

On May 10, 1924, "Speed" Hoover, aptly described as "that bundle of high-charged

electric wire," took command of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

BECAME "J. EDGAR"

Seven years earlier, he had gone to work for the Justice Department as a clerk-messenger, after learning his way around the Capitol as a congressional messenger.

In 1919, a scant 24 months later, he became a special attorney in the Justice Department. His first task, prosecuting subversives.

That was when he became "J. Edgar" Hoover, changing from "John E." to avoid confusion with a fellow employe of the same name.

In 1921, he became Assistant Director of the FBI.

On May 10, 1924, at the age of 29, he was named Director.

There were 657 employes in the bureau then, a politics-ridden unit practically helpless in the face of organized crime and violence sweeping the country.

NOT ALLOWED TO CARRY WEAPONS

Agents were prohibited from carrying weapons. They were poorly paid, poorly equipped and literally orphans of the Government.

They had not a single vehicle at their command, and their pursuit of criminals was keyed to streetcar timetables.

Today, the "temporary" messenger who almost became a minister heads the finest law enforcement agency in the world.

The force that numbered 657 when he took over 37 years ago has swelled to 14,000.

Political hacks went out the window. FBI badges handed out to politicians and ward-heelers were withdrawn in a hurry.

TEST TUBE MIGHTIER

He hammered home the principal that the "test tube is mightier than the rubber hose," banning use of the "third degree" by his agents.

He started from scratch with that theory, and from it pioneered the scientific law enforcement that is a blueprint worldwide.

The FBI's fingerprint file is the repository today for more than 189 million prints.

Its crime laboratory, its services available to police departments throughout the nation, almost daily weaves tiny scraps of evidence into irrefutable proof of guilt, or innocence.

The world-renowned National Academy trains police officers from departments all over the United States.

Under his direction, the FBI's scientific law enforcement has branched into scores of highly special units, including subversives, codes, and ciphers and disaster squads to name but a few.

INSISTED ON TWO CONDITIONS

When he took the top job in 1924, he insisted on two conditions that were backed to the hilt by the then Attorney General Harlan Fiske Stone.

They were: "no politics and no outside interference."

Since then, Hoover has served under 6 Presidents and 13 attorneys general with the 2 conditions unviolated.

His agents today, unfettered by political patronage or sponsorship, are top college graduates with a law degree or CPA's certificate.

Unlike their counterparts of 1924 who couldn't carry guns and who even lacked power of arrest, today's FBI men are backed to the hilt by Hoover and the law.

From a hard-hitting agency that cowed the underworld of the 30's into meek submission, the FBI almost overnight moved in as the shield of national security.

With the outbreak of World War II, thousands of potentially dangerous enemy aliens were scooped up and jailed within 24 hours after Pearl Harbor.

Secret arsenals were raided and explosives and other tools of sabotage seized.

Security measures were laid down for thousands of war plants.

So rigid and effective were the FBI's operations that not a single caste of foreign-directed sabotage took place during the entire war.

It's most spectacular wartime action was the capture of eight German spies and saboteurs landed from submarines on the coasts of Florida and Long Island in 1942.

With the war's end, the Hoover-directed security swung quietly into the nests of communism, effectively burrowed in strategic areas here during the war.

ARREST OF DR. FUCHS

Relentless probing into Red atomic spy rings brought about the arrest of Dr. Klaus Fuchs, Britain's top atomic scientist.

His arrest eventually culminated in the electrocution of the Rosenbergs and the jailing of scores of others.

Leo L. Laughlin, present head of the Boston division of the FBI, played a leading role in the Judith Coplon case in New York.

During the trial of 11 top Communist leaders in New York in 1949, it was revealed for the first time that agents had infiltrated the ranks of the Communists themselves.

Then, as today, Hoover warns, Communists here constitute a "fifth column far better organized than Hitler's fifth columns in Europe before World War II."

Today, at 66, the top G-man, who holds the alltime record for tenure as a Government agency head, still operates with the same drive and vigor.

His personal life is reflected in the spartan-like appearance of his office, which he calls "The Cave of the Winds."

Appointments, conferences and appearances adhere to a rigid schedule ticked off with clocklike precision.

The 14,000 members of the FBI—including 6,000 agents in the field—work 'round the clock under the strictest of discipline and conditions.

They are a monument to the man—FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover—who has molded the Nation's mighty shield of protection and security through eternal vigilance.

The John Birch Society—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Herald-Express, a newspaper published in Los Angeles, Calif., has printed a series of six articles by George Todt concerning the John Birch Society. I had the first two articles of the series inserted in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 10, 1961. I ask unanimous consent to have the third and fourth articles of the series printed in the Appendix of the RECORD for today.

[From the Los Angeles Herald-Express, Mar. 24, 1961]

GEORGE TODT'S OPINION

"By their fruits ye shall know them"—Matthew vii : 20.

A sign of the increasingly dangerous times we live in today may be seen in the predilictions of the anti-anti-Communists to make reckless and irresponsible charges of "fascism" against almost anybody who might be guilty of fighting the Reds.

The reaction of the AAC's to lump the opponents of communism as being in the so-called Fascist camp is a Marxist semantics trap in the first place.

In the second instance, most of the hurlers of these shotgun charges would not know a Fascist if he saw one.

What is a Fascist supposed to be, anyway?

NO MIDDLE

I asked this question of 12 knowledgeable persons recently and got 12 different answers.

My own thinking on the subject runs like this: Communism is the leftwing of Marxist socialism; fascism (and the National Socialism of the Nazis under Hitler), the right wing. Somewhere off to the side is Fabian socialism.

What decent American should wish to buy any one of these three items?

Or consider it another way. Let's put a triangle with three equal sides on the blackboard. And next to it a circle. The latter we will call Americanism and the triangle Marxist socialism.

One side of the Socialist triangle will be marked communism, another side fascism, and the third fabianism. These are the three chief brands of socialism.

But our Americanism in the adjacent circle would be none of this said trio, fortunately. Who among us that believe in our constitutional Republic and free enterprise system would want to be a Communist, Fascist, or Fabian Socialist?

Now the semantics trap the Communists and their unwitting helpers, the AACs, attempt to bait for unwary Americans is this one—and the argument often seems sound at first blush. It goes like this:

OR LOGIC

"Yes, the Communists are admittedly the left wing of Marxist socialism. We agree to that much, at least, without taking the fifth amendment. But since we are left-wingers, then it also stands to reason that our opposition are right-wingers. And who are the right-wingers? Why, the Fascists, of course. Therefore, all those who oppose us are Fascists."

This specious line might find more adherents if we did not have the little example to choose from which I have indicated previously in this column.

Remember, we pointed out that a good American will not buy any part of the Marxist triangle. When asked if we are Communists or Fascists—or Fabians—our correct answer ought to be: "None of them. I am an American. Period."

Lately the smear bund now working overtime against the patriotic John Birch Society, of which I am not a member, seems determined to fix it with the appellation "Fascist." Why?

THEY BELITTLE

Last weekend an effort to brand the John Birch Society with this tired, tarred brush was made in the State and Nationalities Committee of the California Republican Assembly which met at El Segundo. It was decisevly beaten down, although I was told by members that almost intolerable pressures from topside had ordered it.

Later in the session a milder, unemotional resolution was passed unanimously which stated that the GOP was against all Communist and Fascist organizations, if any there be, and this was heartily approved by all the John Birchers present.

They are equally as much against fascism as communism, and vice versa. All the rest of us ought to feel the same way about it, too.

Here are some pertinent words of Robert Welch, founder of the John Birch Society, on this important subject:

THIS NO TRICK

"It is our purpose in the John Birch Society to inspire and cordinate greater efforts on the part of all men and women of good conscience and good will, who want to bring about 'less government, more responsibility and a better world.' Our long-range objectives are not negative, but positive. We know, however, that under present circumstances a preponderant part of our efforts must be directed in turning back the Communists, as a prerequisite to all else we wish to accomplish.

"In neither the defensive nor the constructive part of our program is it necessary, nor even desirable, that all our members be alike, or think alike on all subjects.

"One of the very things we are trying to prevent is the conversion of our civilization into a collection of standardized robots."

Does this sound like a Fascist speaking here?

[From the Los Angeles Herald-Express, Mar. 29, 1961]

GEORGE TODT'S OPINION

"Methinks thou dost protest too much."—SHAKESPEARE.

The weeping, wailing and gnashing of teeth by the "liberal" enemies of the beleaguered John Birch Society has suddenly assumed tempest proportions across the length and breadth of the land, and perhaps we should wonder why.

What are these people accused of doing, anyway?

They have banded together to fight socialistic communism, a termite disease which threatens to destroy the American Republic and its productive free enterprise way of life. This is bad?

The detractors of the John Birch Society hasten to assure us that they, too, are against the philosophy of communism. They merely deplore the methods which the society uses, or advocates. An old story.

DOUBLETALK

When asked what we ought to do to resist the international Communist conspiracy to dominate the world, the so-called liberals never quite seem to have a plan. But we hear a lot of doubletalk.

"Just be good, complacent little Americans," they tell us. "Above all, don't do a thing that our implacable enemies are doing to us. Just smile and take it. Show the world that we are so strong that nothing—absolutely nothing—can disturb us. That is the way to win." (But for which side?)

Frankly, the one-word reply of Gen. Anthony McAuliffe to the Nazis in the Battle of Bastogne during World War II is most appropriate here.

And that one word was "nuts".

Actually, we have had the pants beaten off us during the last 15 years by the highly competent and effective Red leadership—and they are now winning the battle for a planet, not us.

A CEMENT BLOCK

Complacency. Apathy. Incompetence. Those are the three greatest enemies of the American people today, veritable albatrosses about our collective necks. Without them we could give the Reds the short shrift they deserve—and much quicker than might be imagined by most of us.

Since the end of the Second World War, the forces of Liberalissimo in the United States have ridden tall in the saddle. In the main, they have called most of the signals. Where are the victories? What kind of ideological leadership have we had to be in the sorry position in which we now find ourselves? Why should the mightiest Nation on earth be a potential loser?

BE A HAWK

The main reason I am disgusted with the leadership provided by Liberalissimo is because it has managed to turn certain victory into defeat, order into chaos, hope into despair. It just cannot win.

To my way of thinking, leadership is only valid for a people as long as it can win for them. There is no other excuse. Whenever our leaders fail to win—or even when they don't win fast enough—it is time to call for new leadership.

The ideological leadership of Liberalissimo is bankrupt and we are dangerously close to the abyss of neutralism, appeasement and surrender.

We have no real choice left to us except to fight realistically against Marxist communism in all its phases—at home and abroad. No more shadowboxing, please.

The Reds only accomplish diplomatic agreements with us in order to make suckers of those who foolishly trust them. What do we gain by playing their deadly game?

Why make a treaty in the first place with a liar who will break his word as soon as it may profit him to do so?

The John Birch Society is basically designed to ultimately wrest the ideological leadership in the United States away from bumbling, inept Liberalissimo and return it to conservative fountainheads closer to the people.

Americans, by and large, are still overwhelmingly conservative and closely wedded to the principles of the Founding Fathers of our Republic—based on the Declaration of Independence, Constitution and the Bill of Rights. They believe in our free enterprise system.

CLOSE THE LOCK

But the unimaginative forces of Liberalissimo—led by the Americans for Democratic Action and their friends—would appear to have their hearts set on leading us into a Social Laborite government of the demoralizing type inflicted upon Great Britain from 1945–50 by Clement Atlee and Aneurin Bevan.

Fabian socialism would have proved an even worse calamity than it did for our English cousins except for the fact that the American taxpayer was required by the Truman administration to contribute literally billions for its upkeep. This deadly lesson ought not to be lost upon us now.

The liberals presently perceive the massive threat posed to them by the John Birch Society and are pulling out all the stops to discredit it—mainly through innuendo, emotion and hysteria to date. Strictly "stampeding the mob" kind of action definitely not in the spirit of Voltaire. How come?

Let's not buy a bill of goods from those with axes to grind.

The San Francisco News-Call Bulletin, Reporter Donald Canter, and 9,000 San Franciscans Receive 1961 Inter-American Press Association—Tom Wallace Award

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention, and to the attention of our colleagues a series of articles which appeared in the San Francisco News-Call Bulletin, written by Reporter Donald Canter, which has recently received the 1961 Inter-American Press Association—Tom Wallace Award. This merited award is financed and supported exclusively by editors and publishers of the Latin American republics, and given to a United States or Canadian newspaper that has most distinguished itself for its work in behalf of closer friendship and mutual understanding among American nations.

The award this year was given by the unanimous decision of the awards committee of the Inter-American Press Association—Tom Wallace Award in recognition of the campaign of the San Francisco News-Call Bulletin, to help the victims of the Chilean earthquakes of 1960.

Mr. Speaker, on April 18, 1906, the city of San Francisco was torn asunder by a great earthquake; what part of the heart of the city escaped the temblor itself was soon leveled by the raging fire which immediately followed. This crushing experience is deeply engraved on the memories of thousands of San Franciscans who either themselves suffered or whose closest relatives endured that great disaster.

Thus, when, 54 years later, in May 1960, when much of southern Chile was desolated by a terrible earthquake, what was more natural than these memories of San Francisco should have been rekindled? This natural sympathy that existed throughout the United States and the world for the poor, terror-stricken families of Chile struggling out of the wreckage was particularly felt by San Franciscans. The feelings of San Franciscans, appalled and grieving by this dumfounding destruction, was marshaled and channeled into concrete action, largely by the writings of reporter Donald Canter. In a great out pouring, 9,000 San Franciscans donated money sufficient to build 33 apartment units and a modern school in Valdinia, the heart of the Chilean disaster area.

Mr. Canter's efforts went far beyond authoring the articles which struck so responsive a chord in the memory of San Franciscans. Making several trips to the devastated area, he saw the stricken population first hand, and determined their most crying needs. With local authorities, he arranged for construction of apartment buildings and a school for the destitute families he located. He saw his work come to fruition when 75 people moved out of their 1-room huts without water or electricity, into modern dwellings. All of this promises to perpetuate itself with the new apartments, financed by the nominal rents from the original units. Thus, the Ciudad of San Francisco project, is rising, from the rubble left by the great disaster of May 1960.

It is more than heartening, Mr. Speaker, to read of this sympathy translated into such a spontaneous, concrete expression of sympathy between the citizens of two cities geographically so many thousand miles apart.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I submit the following articles written by Mr. Canter and two others relative to the situation in Chile written by Mr. James O'Neill, Jr., and Mr. William Cooper. These latter articles are included within the award-winning series:

[From the San Francisco News-Call Bulletin, May 26, 1960]

LET'S HELP CHILE—SHE HELPED US IN 1906

More than half a century ago, the people of Chile established a San Francisco Quake Fund. That was in 1906.

Now Chile has experienced how one of the world's biggest quakes feels and hits, destroys and kills.

San Franciscans, perhaps better than anyone else, can imagine what it's like.

That's why we, and we especially, ought to rush to the aid of the Chilean quake victims, just as they helped us in our darkest hours.

The News-Call Bulletin therefore has started a fund drive to bring relief to the homeless and desperate people of Chile.

This newspaper has kicked off the drive with a contribution of $500.

Now it's your turn. Mail us your checks, big or small. Make them out to Chilean Quake Fund, care of News-Call Bulletin, 860 Howard Street, San Francisco.

Do it now. Show them we care.

[From the San Francisco News-Call Bulletin, May 26, 1960]

BAY AREA CHILEAN COLONY PLANS AID FOR STRICKEN

(By Donald Canter)

Members of the bay area's Chilean colony met in emergency session last night in the home of Consul Eugenio Ovalle Devoto to discuss measures for aiding their stricken homeland.

Just before their meeting started, a phone call came through from Santiago de Chile for Fernando Alegria, professor of Spanish-American literature at the University of California.

The call provided dramatic evidence of conditions back home.

Reported Alegria:

"I was told by my folks that my brother Julio, an administrator for the University of Chile, barely escaped death.

"He was aboard a boat off the port of Puerto Montt (670 miles southwest of Santiago) when a tidal wave hit, following an earthquake. The boat overturned, but through some miracle my brother was rescued."

Alegria, who was promptly appointed chairman of the local Chilean Relief Committee, also told the meeting that other Latin American countries are rushing to the aid of their neighbor.

It was decided to contact Latin American clubs and societies here to organize a city-wide aid Chile campaign.

With Chairman Alegria the following persons will serve on the committee: Enrique Lopez, 6 Seymour Street, San Francisco; Antonio Alcalde, 125 St. Francis Boulevard, Daly City; George Trench, 15 Mill Street, San Francisco; Mrs. Malens Armstrong, 8 Glenn Drive, Sausalito; Julio Marchant, 256 87th Street, Daly City; Fernando Guzman, 71 Wavecrest Drive, Daly City. An American official will be asked to join the committee.

These Chileans will contact local businessmen and firms urging them to donate funds for the quake victims.

It was decided that the first few weeks of the campaign would be dedicated solely to fund raising and that only afterward appeals would be made for other means of aid.

Mrs. Armstrong, a native of Chile, reported that next Saturday, Sunday, and Monday a stand will be maintained at Sausalito's Vina Del Mar Plaza, where contributions will be received. (Chile's Vina Del Mar and Sausalito are sister cities.)

Chairman Alegria announced that the shortwave station of the University of Concepcion in Chile today will broadcast any available information about the fate of relatives of Chileans in the bay area (25-meter band from 5 to 8 p.m.).

Committee members expressed appreciation for the prompt action of the News-Call Bulletin in establishing a Chilean quake fund.

Persons wanting to contact the committee may call Guzman at EX-7-4411, or PL-6-5855.

Mayor George Christopher said today he intends to appeal to San Franciscans to send aid to Chile. A meeting with civic leaders was scheduled for this afternoon.

The mayor stressed that he understands money is urgently needed right now, because food and clothing would cost too much to ship.

"I imagine that our money will help them with the job of cleaning up and moving the debris," Christopher said.

Surplus Property Allocated to the States for Purposes of Education, Health, and Civil Defense

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Public Law 61 which I introduced in the 84th Congress, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare allocates surplus personal and real property to the 50 States and Territories for purposes of education, health, and civil defense.

The Honorable Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare reports that property costing $82,795,415 was made available to the States during the period January 1 through March 31, 1961. It should be noted that many of the States received property which cost in excess of a million dollars during this period. California received in excess of $8 million.

I am advised that the property received by the States, especially for educational purposes, is one of the most beneficial contributions made by the Federal Government to what many of us consider to be our first line of defense in this space age.

I wish to congratulate Secretary Ribicoff and his staff and the other agencies notably General Services Administration and Department of Defense who cooperate in making this program so successful.

Secretary Ribicoff's report follows:

Surplus property for which the Federal Government paid $82,795,415 was made available to the States for educational, public health, and civil defense purposes during January, February, and March 1961 by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Real property accounted for $5,559,507 and personal property for $77,235,908.

Secretary Abraham Ribicoff announced the totals in making his quarterly report to Congress on the Department's surplus property program.

Property no longer needed by the Federal Government is distributed, under the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to educational and public health agencies and civil defense organizations of State and local governments, and to eligible nonprofit health and educational institutions exempt from Federal taxes. Regional offices of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and various State agencies channel the surplus property to the institutions.

Property transferred to the States includes such items as school and hospital building sites; buildings suitable for college dormitory or faculty housing; motor vehicles; hospital, school, and office furniture; hand and machine tools; motion picture projectors; laboratory equipment; and school and office supplies.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Personal property received by State surplus property agencies for distribution to public health and educational institutions and civil defense organizations and real property disposed of to public health and educational institutions, Jan. 1 through Mar. 31, 1961 (acquisition cost)

States	Personal property	Real property	Total
Total	$77,285,908	$5,559,507	$82,795,415
Alabama	2,950,773		2,950,773
Alaska	300,541		300,541
Arizona	741,290		741,290
Arkansas	505,189	15,750	523,939
California	8,230,901	110,914	8,341,815
Colorado	696,467		696,467
Connecticut	1,112,292		1,112,292
Delaware	240,897		240,897
Florida	3,764,356	320,821	4,085,177
Georgia	1,648,355		1,648,355
Hawaii	744,291		744,291
Idaho	351,172		351,172
Illinois	2,018,440		2,018,440
Indiana	1,848,064	41,195	1,889,259
Iowa	734,773		734,773
Kansas	1,291,454	117,343	1,408,837
Kentucky	1,288,514		1,288,514
Louisiana	2,226,105	230,656	2,456,761
Maine	651,719		651,719
Maryland	1,766,992	1,732	1,768,724
Massachusetts	2,214,688		2,214,688
Michigan	2,115,622	2,827,869	4,943,491
Minnesota	1,071,437		1,070,437
Mississippi	2,249,753		2,249,753
Missouri	921,229		921,229
Montana	217,811		217,811
Nebraska	903,126	935	904,061
Nevada	228,452		228,452
New Hampshire	326,218		326,218
New Jersey	992,534		992,534
New Mexico	982,335		982,335
New York	4,088,904		4,088,904
North Carolina	2,359,819	3,841	2,363,660
North Dakota	517,667		517,667
Ohio	4,280,456	80,000	4,360,456
Oklahoma	1,392,137	55,140	1,447,277
Oregon	1,215,003		1,215,003
Pennsylvania	2,512,502		2,512,502
Rhode Island	354,033		354,033
South Carolina	1,140,131		1,140,131
South Dakota	221,823	57,018	278,841
Tennessee	1,593,399		1,593,399
Texas	3,353,521	151,468	3,504,989
Utah	928,231	54,357	982,588
Vermont	219,668		219,668
Virginia	2,804,781	1,416,512	4,221,293
Washington	1,683,758	39,454	1,723,212
West Virginia	936,154		936,154
Wisconsin	1,425,286		1,425,286
Wyoming	227,913		227,913
District of Columbia	274,427	2	274,429
Puerto Rico	367,465	34,500	401,965
Virgin Islands			

Problems of the Congo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles on the Congo problems written by Mr. John A. Kennedy, publisher of the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Argus-Leader.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEOPOLDVILLE BOASTS SOLE ATOMIC REACTOR

(By John A. Kennedy)

LEOPOLDVILLE—A blue-helmeted Tunisian soldier stands stiffly with his ever-ready Sten gun guarding Africa's first and only atomic reactor functioning in Louvanium University's hills overlooking Leopoldville.

Others of the 150 unit U.N. troop protect the adjoining physics laboratory where we saw native and white scientists working with isotopes in this most incongruous surrounding.

Louvanium is the Congo's huge new outstanding university—a tribute to the tenacity and imagination of Msgr. L. Gillon who got the Belgian Government to start it from scratch on a brush covered townsite 16 miles from Leopoldville in 1954.

The soldiers are housed in the basement of a men's dormitory. Other military—some 25 American Air Force and Navy technicians on duty at the U.S. Embassy—occupy two faculty houses nearby.

TWO YEARS OLD

The reactor was brought to the Congo 2 years ago through the intervention of Monsignor Gillon. He had had considerable training at the Princeton (N.J.), nuclear physics center and participated in much of the early work at Brookhaven atomic laboratory in the United States.

Congo educators say they are not about to try to launch a native into space—they are using it to help in medical, agricultural, and scientific experiments.

The Triga reactor was the first made by General Atomics in its huge, sprawling laboratories in La Jolla, Calif.—designed, built, and installed for former President Eisenhower's opening of the Atoms for Peace Exhibit in Geneva in 1957.

Monsignor Gillon, working with the Belgian Government, got the United States to sell it to his new university.

Mrs. Kennedy and I were present when U.S. atomic energy scientists were placing it in operation in 1959.

The isotopes from it are used in scientific research in medicine, agronomy, geology, physics, and biology. Canon A Vander Perre told us as he showed us the beautiful new buildings of this most extraordinary school.

This equipment with its deadly atomic pile figured large in the problems of the Congolese chaotic takeover last July.

URGENT MATTER

Urgent telephonic and cable messages from U.S. military and top scientists warned that a mistake in pushing of a control button by inexperienced help could unleash the lethal rays with a potential of wiping out the population of Leopoldville and its surrounding areas.

Monsignor Gillon appealed to Congo and U.N. authorities for ample protection—hence the soldiers' guarding the buildings and entrances—keeping out all unauthorized visitors.

In the meantime experiments continued throughout the revolt, although insistent demands were made at one time to close down its operation.

Monsignor Gillon, who left for the United States while we were in Leopoldville, pointed out that he is particularly happy that his people have the Triga because of the vital role played by the Congo in supplying the refined uranium which went into the first atom bomb dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

BELGIANS LEFT A LEGACY—$15-MILLION UNIVERSITY

(By John A. Kennedy)

LEOPOLDVILLE, CONGO.—There were only 19 native Congolese college graduates in the whole of the Congo at the time of independence last July.

With that fact, according to Dr. M. Dartique, senior educational consultant to the U.N., lies the explanation for most of the Congo's troubles today.

He had traveled through the six provinces of this country on his special duties as a UNESCO representative several times before. On those trips he questioned the Belgians as to why they did not send Congolese secondary school graduates to Brussels and other educational centers for university training.

WANTED NO PART

The answers invariably were that students who went from other African colonies to England, France or the United States to study came back to their native countries as "partially educated radicals."

"The Belgians wanted no part of that in this formerly prosperous colony of theirs," he explained.

Mrs. Kennedy and I got about the same answers in our touring of the Congo, talking with its experts, inspecting its schools and colleges 2 years ago.

They claimed to have profited by the mistakes of other nations who have send students from French and British colonies to European and American universities where they are exposed to political ideas they are not sufficiently educated to be able to criticize.

Educationally they told us they thought it was frong to teach the natives to run before they learned to walk.

The Belgians started to create a university—Louvanium, that would do credit to any nation in the world. It is modeled after the centuries-old institution of the same name in the mother country.

More than $15 million has been poured into its modern, beautiful, efficient, well-equipped laboratories and plant.

"AUDACIOUS MOVE"

It opened in 1954 with 33 students described by Monsignor Gillon as "an audacious move" to launch at that time considering the difficulty they were having recruiting students.

When we were there in 1959, they had 450 students in its various colleges, two-thirds of whom were Belgians, either sons and daughters of Congo residents or students from the mother country.

When we visited this time, all but 10 were natives from the Congo or other areas of Africa.

It has a college of medicine, agronomy, engineering and is starting a school of law.

Its hospital is as modern as most of such institutions in the United States.

The Belgian authorities made it an institution as difficult to get into scholastically as any in the world, patterning their requirements for entrance after that of the alma mater, Louvanium University in Belgium.

In October 1960, the new center of learning was admitted to the International Association of Universities which Monsignor Gillon pointed out is "the highest official academic body in the world."

When it was started, the ruling senate of the Belgian Louvanium supervised it but last June, on the eve of independence, complete control was transferred to the Congo.

There are now 6 African members among the 14 appointed at the present time and Monsignor Gillon hopes to have a majority running the institution as soon as possible.

Three other universities were being started just before independence—the most important one in Elizabethville, capital of the Congo's richest province—Katanga.

When we were there in 1959 it was just being organized—actual construction work was still months away. But a faculty was being appointed and some classes were meeting in various offices and houses which served as temporary classrooms.

What About Silk Industry?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Scranton Times of Thursday, May 4, 1961, in which that newspaper comments upon the impact of foreign textiles on the textile industry of northeastern Pennsylvania, particularly as they affect silk weavers and throwers in that area of Pennsylvania.

The indicated editorial follows:

[From the Scranton Times, Thursday, May 4, 1961]

WHAT ABOUT SILK INDUSTRY?

While the seven-point program of assistance to the Nation's textile industry just announced by President Kennedy seems to be directed chiefly at aiding cotton goods manufacturers, it is to be hoped that the administration will be equally concerned about the sorry plight of silk weavers and throwers. It is with the latter segment of the textile industry that we in northeastern Pennsylvania are particularly interested. In our area there are reported to be 21 such plants employing an estimated 4,000 persons whose annual earnings approximate $11 million.

Area representatives of the silk industry have tried—futilely so far—to convince the U.S. Tariff Commission of the urgent need for restoration of a 20-percent duty on imported silk. This area, once the Nation's second largest silk center, has suffered serious economic setbacks because of competition from Japan and it is about time American mills and workers should be given some consideration. It is immaterial whether relief comes through administrative or congressional action, just so it is provided promptly.

A ray of hope for this area may be seen in the awareness of the President of the fact that "unemployment in textile mills strikes hardest at those communities suffering most from depressed conditions." The truth of that statement is evidenced forcefully in our area, as well as in the President's home State of Massachusetts.

The San Francisco News-Call Bulletin, Reporter Donald Canter, and 9,000 San Franciscans Receive 1961 Inter-American Press Association-Tom Wallace Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following in a series of articles relative to the situation in Chile, written by James O'Neill, Jr. The article is included within the award-winning series:

[From the San Francisco News-Call Bulletin, June 4, 1960]

THREE CHILDREN IN A CHILEAN PARK, THEN THE EARTH SHOOK—THEY WERE ORPHANS—U.S. AIRFORCE TOOK THEM INTO A NEW WORLD

(By James O'Neill, Jr.)

It was Sunday, May 22. Mass was over in all of the churches in Puerto Montt, Chile.

The sun at noon was warm in this Chilean autumn, and there was to be a band concert in the park at 2 p.m.

Carlos Fernandez Rojas had to change his white shirt before his mother would allow him to go across the waterfront to the park and listen to the musicians and to play with the other children.

Older people sat around the park and the young lovers were holding hands.

URGE HIM TO PLAY

Carlos' friends urged him to stay near the municipal pier to play.

Sunday is a lazy time in Puerto Montt.

Besides listening to the band, or playing on the pier, you can walk beyond the town and into the hills and sit on the green turf and watch the slow ships casually drifting at their anchor chains, the whaleboats drift-ings with them like gnarled logs.

Carlos considered all this, but chose the plaza and the people, and the gloriette, which is Spanish for bandstand, with the musicians sitting in it.

HOME NEAR THE WATER

Carlos' home stood on a high hill, near the water.

His mother called from the back. "Change your shirt, Carlos. Take off your new shoes. If you are going to play don't ruin the shoes. Or soil the shirt. And leave your father's necktie on his bed."

Carlos grudgingly obeyed.

He put on his patched shorts and his grey sweater and removed his new shoes.

Orefelina called.

"Carlos, Carlos, are you going to the park?"

He was, he said, but he was going alone; how can you run and fight and quarrel and holler if your sister, who wants to be a nun, is walking with you?

"Mother said to wait for me, Carlos. I am taking Rafael. And papa said I was to look out for you. We must go together, papa, said."

Carlos didn't like it but what could he do?

Orfelina had changed her white dress. Now she wore her old green sweater and a rumpled brown shirt, but her hair was neat, and combed. Rafael wore his blue sweater and shorts and one of Carlos' old open-necked shirts. Rafael was big and strong for his age.

Their mother called "goodby" and the children disappeared down the street.

WAS A GRAND CONCERT

The concert was grand. The amateur band was not quite in tune, but played with gusto.

When the concert was over, Carlos stood alone, near the front of the German Club. (Southern Chile has a lot of citizens of German descent; many of them wine growers). Carlos' friends had by this time gone home, or to the hills. Orfelina was dragging Rafael tired and reluctant across the grass toward the city hall and then on home, up the hill, and down the hill, and into the waterfront area.

It was 3:10 p.m. The musicians had left.

At that moment, Carlos looked out across the blue Pacific and wondered if it was not changing color. Some slight, minor, unidentifiable change, a shaft of light, or dark? What was it?

Now it was 3:12.

Carlos stuck a dirty toe into the grass of the park and wondered if he should go home.

There, across the lawn, was Orfelina and little Rafael, eating candy.

Then something moved.

Some small, unreal movement beneath his bare, brown feet.

It was so small a movement it made the soles of his hardened feet itch. He leaned over to scratch them and suddenly fell.

The ground was moving.

The ground was rolling, surging, heaving like the sea.

They were small rolls at first and then grew until the ground was shaking. Shaking, beneath his feet.

FILLED WITH TERROR

He was flat on the moving ground now, and his eyes were wide and round with terror.

He felt a tear on his cheek; his own.

I am too old to cry, he though, but I am afraid. He wanted Orfelina and Rafael, but they were way over there, across the park. His sister didn't hear him scream, "Orfelina."

The earth was talking now, as well as moving. It was rumbling and growling and shaking. Then, right beneath Carlos there appeared a crack, breaking autumn's sod apart with slow, grim motion.

Carlos scrambled to his feet and away from the horrifying crevice, fell, and snatched at the short grass with nailless fingers.

Orfelina!

Rafael!

The earth moaned and creaked and shook, and Carlos was so dry with fear he couldn't call out again.

There was a crash. And another.

THE BUILDINGS CRUMBLE

With a child's amazement at the sudden impermanence of familiar things, he realized the buildings he knew all his life were falling down.

The German club was all askew.

The front of the city hall was crooked.

Lying terrified on the grass, Carlos felt the earth—his own familiar earth—against his stomach, rolling like a huge snake, as if it wanted to get away from him.

He was crying now. Crying for himself, and for Orfelina.

For little Rafael.

I didn't mean to hit you, Rafael.

I love you, Rafael.

Please God, not little Rafael and Orfelina. Dear God, tell Orfelina how I love her. Don't die, Orfelina. Please God.

And where were father and mother? He wanted them most of all.

In a flash, Carlos remembered Father Miguel at the Church of St. Mary, telling how the end of the world would come, with fire and death and falling buildings—falling buildings—falling. Now he was seeing it.

HE SEES HUGE WAVES

Carlos scrambled to his feet, whole walls of buildings were falling now; all around the square.

Carlos ran to the end of the Plaza.

Orfelina was there. She lay still, her brown little arm across Rafael's small back. Carlos whispered, "Orfelina."

Orfelina turned her head and took Carlos under her arm and he felt a small hand pat him.

Rafael turned his bewildered little face to Carlos.

Tears muddied his tan cheeks, but the familiar sight of Carlos comforted him a bit.

The earth's groans and rolling continued and then diminished. Sea water lay all the way across the Plaza. Carlos was wet.

Now the earth was still. The waterfront was crumbled. Shards of broken walls still stood here and there.

Water flushed from a broken main, then dribbled to nothing. The curbs were split. Some fences on the steep hill toward Carlos' home were ripped from their concrete bases, warped into crazy patterns.

But the earth was still again.

Carlos cautiously got to his feet.

Orfelina crept to hers, too, and pulled Rafael to his.

The children stared with awe at the strange shambles.

"WE MUST GO HOME"

"We must go home," Orfelina said. "Mother and father will worry."

So, holding hands and moving with wary eyes and bare feet through the rubble to the waterfront street, they went to where their home had been. It was a pile of broken boards and timbers.

One small, worn hand, with a slim gold band encircling a finger, reposed limply on a heap of rubble. That to which it was attached was lost in a jumble of broken wood and plaster.

A man's shoe protruded. It held a foot. The foot was still.

The children knew it without really knowing it; their father and mother were dead.

It was quite a while before they moved aimlessly away. Carlos clutched Orfelina's hand, and she caught up Rafael in her free arm.

"WE'LL FIND THEM"

"We must go away from here," said Orfelina. "Come, Rafael. Take Rafael's hand, Carlos." A little later, as Rafael began to sniffle and cry for his mother, Orfelina said, "Perhaps it was not mother's hand we saw. Perhaps she is safe. Perhaps Father took her to the hills for a walk. We'll find them!"

With Rafael still looking wistfully at the broken house, she cajoled Carlos into leaving.

Carlos was being very brave. He was looking at the wreckage of the street, their old home, and he didn't want to be brave at all, really. He wanted things as they used to be.

Back past the Plaza where frightened people clustered and tried to talk, Orfelina, Carlos and Rafael saw no one they knew. And there was no place to go.

So they sat on a bench until night.

A waitress from the German Club who knew all the children who used to play in the square, came over and scolded—"Orfelina, why are you not at home? Your mother will worry. And little Rafael.

"MAMA, PAPA DEAD"

Orfelina said, "Our home is gone. Mama and papa are dead, I think." The waitress took them into the German Club, which was cracked, but hadn't fallen down.

The three orphans spent the night of Sunday, May 22, in the German Club, with countless other refugees.

On Monday the sky was clear. Light tremors moved the earth briefly.

A priest with a pushcart gave them some bread. A kind stranger shared some dried meat.

Officials told them to "drink no water, no matter how thirsty you are."

They were given small cups of red wine.

Tuesday, May 24, they gave them water—bottled water. And more bread.

THERE ARE MORE TREMORS

Wednesday, the tremors again. Rafael cried a little now and then; he wanted his mother. When he cried very loud, Carlos tried to talk him out of it. But his heart wasn't in it.

On Thursday, May 26, hope was dying in the hearts of the refugees. The homeless had sat, lost, for what seemed countless days. Food was running out.

Orfelina took Rafael to the toilet, only the toilet was down near the beach and there was no privacy.

Carlos shifted for himself and for Orfelina and Rafael. He stole some bread, and an orange from under the nose of a policeman who was guarding a food supply, and who probably saw him steal it and looked away.

He stole some dirty sweets from a ruined candy store.

For some time, there had been airplanes overhead, and now a curious looking man got off a truck in the square. He was an American soldier. His name, Carlos learned, was Sergeant Hall.

He was here to help them, he said. But he said it in English. The kids didn't understand.

On Friday, May 27, a carabiniero came to them with their uncle. Poor uncle Sebastian. He had been disfigured as a child and wasn't very bright. Uncle Sebastian had lain for 3 days in the wreckage of his humble house. He didn't recognize his niece and nephews. But the policeman knew them and told Orfelina to watch out for him.

"YOU WILL LEAVE"

"Feed Sebastian, if you have food. Soon you will leave," he said.

"Leave?" Carlos asked, incredulously.

"Yes," he said, "the U.S. Air Force has sent airplanes. They will take you to Santiago."

Carlso said, "I have never been to Santiago. We know no one in Santiago."

The policeman explained patiently:

"Carlos," he said, "you are a big boy. You will take your uncle, who is sick, and Orfelina and Rafael, to Santiago. The Americans will look out for you. The Red Cross will give you beds and clothes. You will be warm."

Saturday, May 28, was spent in wild speculation as they saw groups of people leave. An airplane flight! Hunger, fatigue, and now excitement dimmed their longing for home and parents. It was too painful to think.

Sunday morning, May 29, they missed Mass. The policeman and the American sergeant found them and told them to wait for a bus in front of the city hall.

HE WAVES GOODBY

With about 40 others, they got in, and as the wornout bus started away, Carlos leaned from the window and waved goodbye to their friend, the policeman.

But the policeman was too busy to wave back, and Rafael was weeping again.

The bus jolted across the earthquake fractures in the road to the airstrip.

Puerto Montt's airport is only a strip of concrete laid in a piece of badly drained land.

Huge, really huge, airplanes labeled "U.S. Air Force" stood waiting.

The wait seemed interminable. Uncle Sebastian said nothing. He smoked an occasional cigarette.

A man with a megaphone suddenly shouted:

"Carlos, Orfelina, Rafael, Sebastian Rojas." They walked up to him and he said, "You must board the plane."

They went slowly to the giant thing, and a smiling man in a light gray suit, a flying suit, met them. He had gray hair, and very white teeth. Orfelina thought he was very handsome.

"Capt. J. Denardo, U.S. Air Force," said a sign on his suit.

THEY BOARD PLANE

"Walk up the ramp, children," Captain Denardo said. "Don't be frightened. Just walk right up." He touched Orfelina's mussed-up hair, and then gently patted her head.

They boarded the plane, Uncle Sebastian leading the way.

A sergeant told them where to sit and strapped them in. He patted Orfelina on the head, too.

Then the noise of the engines filled the plane and Rafael's eyes went wide with fear but they all knew they were with friends. Carlos was very brave. Orfelina felt only wonder. She was tired out.

They saw the earth slide by, ever faster, and then sink out of sight. After a while they slept.

Below them and now far behind, Puerto Montt lay crumpled and woebegone in the last rays of the setting sun, where their mother and father were still, quiet in a litter of boards and broken plaster.

When they woke up, the plane was already on the ground at Las Cerillos Airport at Santiago, and they had to be shaken a bit and hurried down the ramp.

It was over.

And for them it was only the beginning.

Iowa Newspaper Supports Department of Urban Affairs and Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the impression exists in some places that the proposed Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, which President Kennedy has asked Congress to establish, would be of interest and benefit chiefly to the large cities in the industrial regions of the country.

I am therefore particularly gratified, as Senate sponsor of the administration bill to create the new department, to have received a copy of an editorial in support of the proposal printed by the Cedar Rapids, Iowa, Gazette, a newspaper published in a middle-sized city in the heart of agricultural America. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

URBAN AFFAIRS IN THE CABINET

President Kennedy's request for congressional approval of legislation to set up a Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs and Housing contemplates an action which would appear inevitable. If it doesn't happen now, it probably will some time in the future.

The proposal would declare that national policy "shall be to assist communities in developing and carrying out local programs to meet the problems resulting from growth and change."

The new department would concern itself with many things: Comprehensive community planning, eliminating slums and blighted areas, providing decent homes in a suitable living environment for the Nation's population, providing adequate industrial and commercial locations, developing effective urban mass transportation, acquiring open space for recreational and other purposes around population centers.

It would deal, according to sponsors, not only with problems of great metropolitan centers but also with those urban areas regardless of size or incorporation status.

Opposition so far has issued largely from the council on State governments and an executive-committee majority of the Governors' Conference. In the forefront have stood Governors of chiefly rural States, expressing a fear of Federal-influence extension and weakening of local government.

On the other side, the American Municipal Association and the Conference of Mayors have long urged creation of such a department to put urban programs on an equal plane with those of labor, agriculture, and commerce.

Director Robert C. Weaver of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, mentioned as likely to get the new Cabinet post, also notes that about 70 percent of the American people now live in metropolitan areas.

"In another couple of decades," he says, "anywhere from 80 to 85 percent of the people will be so concentrated. It seems to me that these concentrations of people give concentrations of problems. A concentration of problems needs a concentration of attack."

Needless extension of Federal power for the sake of power is a trend that should be resisted at every turn. But an Urban Affairs and Housing Department, proponents insist, would add no new programs or operations.

Purportedly it would simply elevate the existing Housing and Home Finance Agency to higher status, bring other present agencies under its wing and assign "additional responsibilities for leadership in coordination."

An element of controversy over who would get the new Cabinet appointment is seen as another roadblock to creation of the post. This is not germane to the issue. Whatever comes of it, the bill should be considered on its own merits alone.

It is hard to argue, finally, against an urban affairs and housing department when such other groups as agriculture, labor, and commerce have fully justified their own for so long.

In the interests of coordinating agencies, perhaps streamlining their work, possibly avoiding duplication or overlapping functions, and minimizing jurisdictional conflict, action on the urban affairs move seems inescapable. Sooner or later it will have to come.

Hoover of the FBI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Boston Traveler of May 10, 1961, which will be of interest to the readers of the RECORD:

HOOVER OF THE FBI

It was 37 years ago today that J. Edgar Hoover took his oath of office as Director of the Federal Buerau of Investigation.

Since then he has served under 6 Presidents and 13 Attorneys General. He has won honorary degrees from 18 colleges, medals from his own Government and from abroad. But probably his greatest honor lies in the fact that his name has become a national symbol for the maintenance of security, law and order.

The FBI didn't amount to much when it first passed into Hoover's hands. It was a small and sickly collection of hack agents who worked without weapons and who used streetcars in pursuit of criminals.

Hoover changed all that. He wiped out the Nation's organized gangs of the 1920's and 1930's. He went after enemy agents in World War II so successfully that the country never experienced a single case of foreign sabotage. And now in the cold war, he and his men have been the nemesis of Communist spies.

Today his agency is a model for the world to admire, and his devotion to duty is beyond criticism.

The anniversary of his directorship calls for congratulations, appreciation, and our sincere hope for many more years of such service.

Tribute to Charles A. Dana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel on April 25 paying tribute to a great American, Mr. Charles A. Dana, on his 80th birthday.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY HONORS A GREAT BENEFACTOR

Officials and numerous citizens of Fort Wayne joined with Indiana Technical College in paying fitting tribute today to an outstanding benefactor of the city and college, simultaneously along with a dozen other cities throughout the United States he had similarly benefited, an a unique mammoth birthday party in his honor. This great American is Charles A. Dana who today reached his 80th birthday still as virile and active as many men half his age.

As in all the other cities, including New York, which he has so munificently benefited, at Indiana Technical College today was cut a huge birthday cake which was shared by members of the student body, faculty, staff members, and guests. Thus, homage was most deservedly paid to the man who Tech President Archie T. Keene logically describes as the inspiration for the "New Indiana Tech."

At th New York party which was attended by many of Mr. Dana's friends from all over the United States, including Mr. Keene, Fort Wayne particularly stood out when a mommoth greeting card, which when unfolded, reach 60 feet in length, was presented to Mr. Dana, along with the best wishes from, and signatures of, the Indiana Technical College students, faculty, and staff.

The reference by Mr. Keene to Mr. Dana as the inspiration for the "New Indiana Tech" was indeed profoundly appropriate, for it was Mr. Dana who, in 1956, offered the Fort Wayne science and engineering college a gift of $300,000 for the construction of a new science building. The gift was met by the public to enable the college to add the first building to the campus formerly occupied by Concordia Junior College.

However, generous as the gift was in itself, it proved but the prelude—although a mighty important prelude—to the campaign presently in progress by Indiana Technical College to meet the challenge recently made by Dale W. McMillen, Sr. Mr. McMillen offered to donate a million dollars to the college, provided the college could raise an additional $2 million. This challenge made possible through the pledges from Louis Meyers, Mrs. Mary English, James D. Edgett, Sarkes Tarzian, and others, was accepted.

Mr. Dana's first gift, which spearheaded the promise of even greater gratuity for the city and Indiana Tech, understandably is a profound contribution to education in Fort Wayne as well as to the city's economy, to which Mr. Dana had already contributed so much through the Dana Corp.'s big plant here.

His great educational contribution to Fort Wayne can be particularly appreciated when one considers that today's enormous costs almost preclude the possibility of institutions of learning making it on their own. Colleges obviously need support and they will need to get it even more in the years to come if America's youth and America itself are to keep abreast of the rest of the world. Mr. Dana and those following in his footsteps at Indiana Tech and other institutions throughout the Nation he has so generously benefited, indeed have the foresight to recognize this challenging axiomatic truth.

Mr. Dana's philanthropies to American colleges and hospitals indeed stand as a monument to one who has lived a notable life that has been as varied as it has been productive. In his broad diversified career he attained fame as a lawyer (besides his practice of industrial law, he was counsel in the Harry K. Thaw-Stanford White case), besides as a financier and industrialist.

The practical operation of his administrative ability is remarkable as well as unique. Mr. Dana, whose corporation spreads across the country, has no office. He communicates with his staff from wherever he happens to be, and usually on hotel stationery. For him it has proved a highly successful method. He has enjoyed the remarkable ability of retaining the myriad details of running a vast corporation in his head. And fortunately indeed for such cities as Fort Wayne, and such institutions as Indiana Tech, in his head he has also kept this fortuitous counsel—that American higher education is one of the best investments Americans can make.

We join in congratulating Mr. Dana on his birthday, not only for reaching four score years, but for living them so energetically, fruitfully and beneficially for his fellowman.

Salute to Spaceman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial that appeared in the Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N.Y., on May 9, 1961, saluting Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr.

The contrast between our showing every detail of our shot and the secrecy thrown around the Russian shot should score a few points for our side in the propaganda war. Likewise, the contrast between the gay and unrestrained celebration of Russia's spaceman and the quiet dignified manner in which we welcomed our spaceman further reflects the ways a free country—a free open society—does things:

SALUTE TO SPACEMAN

Washington could have staged a hero's welcome for Astronaut Shepard rivaling the hoopla—planned and unplanned—that greeted Major Gagarin in Moscow's Red Square. That it did not do so—that the space officials instead kept the reception on a level of dignity and understatement—is a tribute to the good sense of Commander Shepard himself and his superiors.

In everything he said and did, Commander Shepard played the role of a down-to-earth test pilot and member of a scientific team. He used the "we"—the "we" being his colleagues—and there wasn't the faintest suggestion of the cold-war ideological guff that came through so purposefully in the utterances of the Russians first spaceman. Nor was there either false modesty or bowing and scraping to any central committee.

In ruling out other public appearances or the trappings of Soviet-style acclaim (the reels of red bunting, the spontaneous devised floats, the fireworks and gargantuan banners, the hastily printed biographies), the U.S. Space Agency officials did their best to keep the celebration in proportion. An unrestrained circus atmosphere would have undone much of the prestige benefit attaching to the comparison between the secrecy-shrouded Soviet achievement and the world's witness to the Freedom 7 flight.

Congressman Conte and the Depressed Area Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT T. STAFFORD
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a copy of a recent editorial which appeared in the North Adams (Mass.) Transcript.

The position which my distinguished colleague, Congressman CONTE, took on the depressed area bill, as outlined in this editorial, seems to me to be worthy of review by all of us. As one who shared the feelings of Congressman CONTE, I can only add that I hope experience will not prove that our northeastern area is further raided of its industry or crippled in its attempt to replace industries already lost.

Several areas in my own State of Vermont—indeed, my own native city of Rutland, Vt., is a good example—are working desperately through private initiative and private capital to attract new industries. The depressed area bill, with further Federal interference, can only hurt this effort.

WILL IT HURT OR HELP?

Congressman CONTE's vote against the depressed areas bill passed by the House last week may have seemed paradoxical. It

wasn't. The Congressman was voting in the best interests of the depressed areas, including northern Berkshire, in his district.

For it is entirely conceivable that the House bill, like the administration bill passed by the Senate, will make it harder rather than easier for places like North Adams and Adams to attract new industries to replace those they have lost in recent years.

This is because the legislation that was passed will provide Government loans and grants to promote industrial development in purely rural areas—most of which are in the Deep South. This means that industrial areas, like North Adams, which are striving to replace their lost manufacturing activity, will now have to compete not only with other industrial areas trying to do the same thing, but with rural areas which have never had any industry whatsoever.

What the House-passed bill will do is try to make rural communities that have never had any industry because they are not suited to industry into industrial communities. It will do this not only through loans for industrial building but also through Federal grants to build water, sewer, and other facilities they don't have now—but which we do have—and which industry would need.

In short, Uncle Sam is now going to make it harder for already industrialized areas to get new industry by increasing the number of areas that are competing to attract new plants.

All during the House fight on the legislation, Congressman CONTE fought sturdily for a bill that would really help the depressed communities in his district.

He supported a measure that would have authorized industrial area plant loans of $150 million, compared to only $100 million in the bill that was adopted.

He supported a measure that would have authorized a $500,000 study to develop a planned workable program for depressed rural areas, rather than set up a $100-million loan program for such areas without any idea of where or how the money would be used, as was done in the bill that was passed.

He supported a measure that would have omitted altogether the $75 million public facility grant contained in the final bill.

He supported a measure authorizing $10 million in annual grants for vocational retraining of industrial workers in new skills, compared to only $4.5 million a year for this purpose under the bill that was passed.

He supported a measure that would have made the legislation much less political by eliminating the power of the Secretary of Commerce to use his discretion in designating areas for industrial redevelopment—discretion that was given the Secretary in the bill that was passed.

In other words, Congressman CONTE fought for a depressed area bill that would really have helped depressed industrial areas.

The bill that was passed was tailored to win Southern Democratic votes by setting up Southern rural areas in the industrial development business. Proof of this is that not a single southern Democrat supported the industrial-area help supported by our Congressman, but they voted almost to a man for the measure that was finally passed.

Congressman HAROLD D. COOLEY, Democrat, of North Carolina, who favored the rurally slanted bill that was adopted, put the whole matter in a nutshell when he ranted that the substitute measure favored by Representative CONTE "is an insult to those who live in rural areas of our great Nation."

Rural areas certainly are a problem, but to try to solve that problem by transforming them into industrial areas can only hurt areas that are already industrial in nature. That's why Congressman CONTE voted "No."

The Late John Cashmore—"Mr. Brooklyn"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH L. CAREY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, in all its history the Borough of Brooklyn, N.Y., has had no more able proponent than its late President John Cashmore. To its waning moments his life was given to his office and his people. About the duties of the borough president he said: "I love the work and I love Brooklyn and I never want to do anything else."

The 20 years he served as chief executive of the Nation's most populous county followed 18 years during which he was a distinguished legislator in the State assembly, member of the city council, and alderman. World War I began his upfront career; he joined the infantry. Returning to Brooklyn in 1922 he became the candidate of the fifth assembly district for the State legislature. His opponent was seemingly unbeatable. The young candidate and his supporters staged a dynamic campaign.

He was 1 of 10 children of a proud, devoted mother who had immigrated from Canada. She had been widowed when John was 14 and she had seen him leave school to help support the family. He worked as a bellhop, newsboy, truckman and eventually became the proprietor of a furniture business. On behalf of her son she wrote a letter to every mother in the district—John was always proud of that letter which read:

> My youngest son, John, is running for the assembly. He is a good boy and I do wish you'd vote for him.

The young campaigner won the election to the surprise of everyone but his friends and family and never again left public office.

His abilities, vigor and warm personality won him many new friends. Among them, James A. Farley, who became his Albany roommate, Alfred E. Smith and James J. Walker. Like General Farley he became a party leader of stature as well as an outstanding public official. In the troublous post-war years he became leader of the Kings County Democratic organization and helped build it to its position as the strongest in the State of New York.

John Cashmore knew not only how to campaign, he knew how to win, fairly and cleanly and as his first victory was an upset. So were others.

In 1924 he defeated an incumbent on the board of aldermen by 37 votes. No one in New York City ever came that close to defeating John Cashmore for office again.

He was a striking 6-footer, whose warmth, wit and wisdom made him a platform natural. No smile was more engaging because none was more genuine. He was hailed as a speaker because his words packed the power of truth and sincerity. He was that rare combination of dauntless leader and capable administrator. In 1940 he succeeded Raymond V. Ingersoll as borough president. He won reelection to that office in 1941, 1945, 1949, 1953, and 1957. In the last two elections the Republican Party, to its credit, recognized that on his record of merit, no one could displace John Cushmore as long as he chose to run. They endorsed him.

Of his extraordinary accomplishments the New York Times in its editorial of May 8, said:

JOHN CASHMORE

In the nearly 40 years John Cashmore was in public life enormous changes have taken place in Brooklyn. As borough president for the past 20 years he was responsible for a great many of them. Some of these will serve as monuments for many years to his tremendous interest and pride in the borough where he was born and where he lived all his life.

Probably the best known and admired of the improvements for which he was responsible are the $250 million civic center, which has completely altered the appearance of downtown Brooklyn, and the downtown Brooklyn educational complex which now provides educational opportunities for 36,000 high school, public and private college students daily.

And on the same day, the New York World Telegram, "Voice of Brooklyn," by Roland Eckman:

CASHMORE'S WORK STANDS AS MEMORIAL TO HIM

It's a little early, just a few hours after his death, to speak of memorials to John Cashmore. We do so today, in the full shock of his loss, because among our first thoughts when we heard the news was the idea that Mr. Cashmore's memorials—the ones we're sure he would prize most—are already here and are destined to survive.

The first of these is the almost universal affection he inspired in his fellow Brooklynites. Mr. Cashmore was in public life 39 years. He was borough president since 1940. That's a long time in politics and in the course of it he undoubtedly made some enemies. It is a tribute to John Cashmore that he made many more friends.

The second memorial is the Civic Center. The borough's younger citizens probably can't imagine the snarl and tangle and blight that surrounded Borough Hall not so many years ago. All of that has been swept away and has been replaced by public and private buildings, acres of greenery, a smooth flow of traffic, in short, a downtown Brooklyn that is a model of city planning.

There are those who may argue with this or that aspect of the plan, this or that building design. But all can respect the vision of the overall plan and the fight to see it realized, and for this Brooklyn can thank John Cashmore.

We are sure all citizens of Brooklyn will join us in extending their sympathies to Mr. Cashmore's wife and family. It will be a long time before the borough again will have soneone it can call "Mr. Brooklyn."

Sunday evening, May 7, John Cashmore was doing what he loved best, aiding the underprivileged at a fundraising dinner to assist the work of the Williamsburgh Settlement House. On the way home, in the words of Michael O'Brien, (the Daily News Reporter who is Brooklyn's best biographer)—"God did what no man or women on this crazy whirling globe could to—tell John Cashmore to quit."

Among his friends, those of us in Brooklyn who learned from John and leaned on him for counsel will miss him most. His advice was sage and sound because he knew and loved Brooklyn. But our loss is not to be compared to that of his family's—a devoted husband, father, and grandfather. I trust that his wife Edythe Cashmore and his son James and his family will find solace in the realization that his deeds, monuments, and memorials will long surround them. John Cashmore found Brooklyn as an adolescent. While it raised him, he raised Brooklyn. He made his mark—everywhere. He is "Mr. Brooklyn."

Wisconsin Association of School Boards Votes Against Federal Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, for the RECORD, I would like to include the results of a poll taken of local Wisconsin school board members regarding the support of local education and other programs by the Federal Government. It would be well for us to heed the voice of the people:

WISCONSIN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL BOARDS, INC.,
Winneconne, Wis., May 9, 1961.

WISCONSIN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL BOARDS POLLED ITS MEMBERSHIP ON FEDERAL AID

What are the personal opinions of local Wisconsin school board members regarding the support of local education and other programs by the Federal Government? This was the purpose of the recently completed survey by the Wisconsin Association of School Boards as reported by President T. G. Holthusen, Stevens Point, and the response indicates that many members are opposed or have reservations.

In answer to the questions of Federal support for education the responses indicated that 62 percent were registered "No" as compared to the 37 percent voting "Yes" of the 834 answers. This response represented expressions from members from 92 percent of the association member schools.

The association polled the individual board members of its member schools and the nonmember school boards of districts operating high schools. This included 438 local boards. The survey results are based upon a response from the members of 92 percent of the member boards, representing an estimated 85 percent of the student population in public schools. Only 29 school boards failed to return any response from any of their membership.

The query asked for an expression of the respondents opinion of having the Federal Government grant funds to local municipalities for other activities. Greatest approval was granted to highways (74.5 percent), to be followed by conservation at 57 percent and agriculture was sanctioned by 47 percent of the answers. Lowest of the 11 categories was housing at 22 percent and library services with a 15 percent favorable vote.

Of the 62 percent registering "No" on the Federal aid poll there were 74 percent expressing the opinion that education is a State responsibility. High Federal taxes was the next most popular reason to be followed by the fear of curriculum control.

The group of 37 percent of those participating in the survey the priority reasons for supporting Federal aid was the overburdened local tax sources; following closely in priority were such reasons as: the goals of education are now nationwide; education should be better in every State and Federal aid will reduce inequities among the States.

The questionnaire further asked the no respondents if they would make exceptions. Fifty-six percent allowed exception to school lunches; 20 percent for construction; 18 percent for instructional materials. Teacher salaries and student transportation had a 3 percent support.

The proponents of Federal aid gave top priority, 83 percent to school construction with school lunches, instructional materials and teachers salaries ranking next in that order.

In answer to the question of Federal matching funds, 40 percent of the opponents didn't like this as compared to 27 percent favoring while the proponents of Federal aid registered 48 percent approval as compared to a 16-percent dislike.

On the question of "earmarked funds" from Federal sources a majority of both groups expressed a dislike.

Do you favor limiting distribution of Federal aid to public schools? The answers from both groups on this question were "yes" in the majority of cases.

If Federal aid were distributed, and on an equalization basis, 40 percent of the opponents dislike this idea and 63 percent of the supporters of Federal aid like this plan.

The reaction to the question of effective results of the present National Defense Education Act indicates that 50 percent of those opposing Federal aid say "yes" and 72 percent of the supporters gave this same answer.

A majority of both groups agree that redtape, followed by dictating which subjects to be taught are their top priorities to the question on Federal control.

The answers from those not favoring Federal aid included: 50 percent self-employed, 1.7 percent retired, 7.9 percent housewives, and 35 percent "other" with 5 percent not answering their occupational category. Those school board members favoring Federal aid included: 40 percent self-employed, 1.6 percent retired, 11 percent housewives, 42 percent "other," and 5 percent not indicating an answer.

The school board association conducted this survey in their effort to establish a basis for representing their membership at the national school board convention and to determine how local Wisconsin board members felt about this most timely national question.

President T. G. Holthusen reported that the survey was under the direction of the Wisconsin Association of School Boards and in cooperation with the University of Wisconsin Cooperative Educational Research and Services Division of the School of Education.

W. A. Walden Named Alumnus of Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABNER W. SIBAL
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, Bill Walden, an outstanding newspaperman in my hometown of Norwalk, Conn., is to be honored next month by the Norwalk Fathers Club. In recognition of his achievements, I would like to have reprinted the following article from the Norwalk Hour, of which he is city editor:

W. A. WALDEN NAMED ALUMNUS OF YEAR

The Norwalk Fathers Club announced today that it has selected William A. Walden, Jr., of 10 Thames Street as the outstanding Norwalk High School alumnus to be honored June 2 at the Shore and Country Club, at the Fathers Club eighth annual banquet.

Walden is now city editor of the Norwalk Hour and is a product of the local school system, having graduated from Norwalk High School in 1934. Walden became a high school sports correspondent for the Norwalk Hour in 1931 and following graduation was made a full-time reporter. He covered beats in Norwalk, Westport, and Darien and for several years was city hall reporter. In 1956 he was named to his present post as city editor.

A veteran of World War II, he has long been active in civic, veterans, and fraternal organizations and is a member of Trinity Episcopal Church.

Walden is the son of William and Elizabeth Walden, with whom he has made his home. His sister Amelia Elizabeth Walden of Westport, a well-known author, is also a graduate of Norwalk High School. Walden, a bachelor until this time, will be married in June to Mrs. Grace F. Sanders, 8 Elmcrest Terrace, a freelance writer and news correspondent.

Harold Munhall, president of the Fathers Club, stated that plans for the June 2 banquet are progressing and it is expected that a turnaway crowd will be present to honor Walden for the many services he has rendered to the community.

Collapse of Anti-Communist Invasion of Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Old Fashioned Fault Finding," which appeared in the Indianapolis Star April 30, 1961.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OLD-FASHIONED FAULT FINDING

The official line of the Kennedy administration is that there will be neither recrimination nor fault finding after the miserable collapse of the anti-Communist invasion of Cuba. To adopt such an attitude is certainly the President's privilege. Also, the office requires that the President accept responsibility for this failure, just as a success would have been credited to him.

However, there is every reason for some plain, old-fashioned fault finding if the country is to learn anything from the Cuban fiasco.

Only a few hours before the Cuban landing, the President issued a statement in which he assured the world that the United States would not use any armed forces in Cuba under any circumstances. The Star questioned that position immediately, and suggested that at a later time, President Kennedy would find some way to withdraw from such an unfortunate, ill-considered policy.

The President should take this step at the earliest moment. The cold, harsh facts are that the United States will have to intervene, sooner or later, in its own interests to root Castro and communism out of Cuba.

Insofar as international public opinion is concerned, a few other facts must be stated for the record. The anti-Castro forces who were wiped out in the Bay of Pigs were faced with tanks, planes, and arms of modern design. Does anyone think that Fidel Castro and his bearded cohorts manufactured this accumulation of armaments during the last 2 years between television appearances and cane-harvesting? The cold fact is that international communism has already intervened in Cuba. The Cubans living in that island are well aware of the fact, the United States knows it, the Communists certainly have full knowledge of what is going on.

The American policy of no intervention under no circumstances has to be reversed if the anti-Castro forces within Cuba are to become effective. If those fighting the Cuban Communists are assured by the President of the United States that they can expect no aid from this quarter, where are they to seek help? Cubans cannot be asked to sacrifice themselves for the cause of freedom against Castro's Red planes and tanks while this country stands with its hands in its pockets.

All reports indicate that the nonintervention policy is the work of Adlai Stevenson, representative of the United States at the United Nations. The President will not say precisely who is the author of the idea, or who persuaded him to make it a matter of public, international record only a few hours before the Cuban invasion. The timing of the two events, it may be pointed out, was too precise to be coincidental.

The President and the American public need to understand that the United Nations does not and will not concern itself with the best interests of he United States. Mr. Stevenson must be led to understand that he speaks for his country, and not for some conglomeration of foreign lands. If he cannot accept this line of action, Mr. Stevenson should be returned at once to Illinois where he can resume his hobby of turning out stratospheric thoughts and sculptured phrases for the self-proclaimed intellectuals.

There needs to be some criticism of the Cuban situation, and the gravity of the circumstances demands immediate action by the Kennedy administration.

Communism's Rejection of God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, writing in the Los Angeles Herald Express, a widely read newspaper in Los Angeles, Calif., George Todt succinctly discusses communism's complete rejection of God. To the hard-core Communist, man just simply exists, and only things material are important in the scheme of life. I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Todt's article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

GEORGE TODT'S OPINION

"The first great break for the Communist conspiracy came in 1933, with our formal recognition of Stalin's regime."—Robert Welch, "Look at the Score."

Do more than 100 American patriotic societies possess the right to press for the impeachment of the Chief Justice of the United States by Congress in these modern times?

Many members of the press consider this such a ticklish question that they would prefer to see it swept under the rug.

Frankly, I think the question deserves to be aired. Why not put the cards on the table for everybody to see? Who is afraid of the truth? Let the chips fall where they may.

What are the facts in this case?

They are, quite simply, that the John Birch Society—a rapidly mushrooming anti-Communist organization in the United States—has requested a large number of American patriotic societies to join with it in whipping up popular support in Congress to impeach Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

There seems to be a lot of grassroots sympathy for this action, and the movement is apparently growing by leaps and bounds.

QUESTIONS WISDOM

I do not believe that there has been any false inference that Mr. Warren is a Communist, which he most certainly is not. The John Birch Society merely claims that he has performed his official duties poorly and in such manner as to bring considerably less than terror to the hearts of the Reds. It questions the wisdom of certain key decisions.

According to Robert Welch, founder of the society, one of these was *Brown* v. *Brown* because it overturned numerous previous decisions by the same court on nothing more substantial than "a set of psychological and sociological theories advanced by a Swedish Socialist named Gunnar Myrdal and a group of American Communist-fronters with whom Myrdal had been associated."

Here are three more decisions which have particularly incensed Welch and his supporters, as seen through his eyes:

"In the Steve Nelson case the Warren Court wiped out the antisedition laws of more than 40 States, and denied those States the right to protect themselves against treason, on the ground that the Federal Government had preempted the sedition field by passing the Smith Act (which act this same Supreme Court has done everything it could to vitiate).

OF HIS ACTS

"In the Konigsberg case the Warren Court canceled the right of any State to deny a license to practice law to a man merely because he would not say whether he was a Communist or not.

"In the Sweezy case the Warren Court reversed the New Hampshire Supreme Court and held that the attorney general of New Hampshire was without authority to question a lecturer at the State university—supported by the taxpayers of New Hampshire—concerning reported subversive activities.

"There have been dozens more which we cannot even mention here."

Welch bases his argument for impeachment on article III, section 1 of the Constitution, which provides that Federal judges "shall hold their offices during good behavior."

HERE ARE SOME

Since the Constitution specifies no other arrangement for limiting the tenure of Federal judges to the periods of their "good behavior," Welch believes it is to be considered obvious that impeachment is to be used for those who violate this requirement.

Now it appears that there is a considerable body of American citizens who express themselves as dissatisfied with the behavior of Mr. Warren as Chief Justice of the United States.

They want Congress to bring impeachment proceedings against him.

I am not arguing the merits of this case, pro or con.

But the question has been raised as to whether these people are within their legal rights to take this kind of action.

Actually, it seems to this writer that no officeholder in this democratic Republic of ours ought to be beyond the reach of the people should they become dissatisfied with his public actions.

UNDENIABLE FACTS

I say this impartially with reference to any position and regardless of the political party, race, creed, or color of the person holding it.

Those in public life who arouse the wrath of the people must expect to settle their account with the people thereafter.

Impeachment by Congress under special circumstances is a legitimate kind of accounting in the Republic of the United States.

I am not a member of the John Birch Society, although I know fellow citizens who are enrolled in the organization.

From all outward appearances I have been impressed with their dedication to anti-communism and constitutional Americanism.

I cannot see where they have overstepped their rights here.

The San Francisco News-Call Bulletin, Reporter Donald Canter, and 9,000 San Franciscans Receive 1961 Inter-American Press Association - Tom Wallace Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following in a series of articles relative to the situation in Chile, written by William Cooper and Donald Canter. These articles are included within the award-winning series:

[From the San Francisco News-Call Bulletin, June 9, 1960]

UNITED STATES TOLD HOW YOU HAVE COME TO AID OF CHILEANS

(By William Cooper)

WASHINGTON, June 9.—A San Francisco newspaper reporter arrives in Chile today with proof San Franciscans have long memories of earthquake calamity—even after 54 years.

Donald Canter of the San Francisco News-Call Bulletin carries bank credits for $25,000 for relief of Chilean quake victims.

"It's our readers' money," he says. "I'll look around and see how it best can be put to use."

The fund was the idea of Canter, Rene Cazenave, assistant managing editor, and News-Call Bulletin associate editor Mary Ellen Leary. Looking through files, they found that Chile had sent aid to San Francisco after the disastrous earthquake and fire of 1906.

Fifteen days ago they suggested to News-Call Bulletin editor, Charles H. Schneider, that the paper sponsor a campaign on the idea that "Chile helped us in 1906, let's help them now."

Schneider agreed, and contributed the first $500 on behalf of the newspaper.

"The first editorial and story went on the streets in a late edition," Canter says. "An hour later the first $5 came in. We guessed it might grow to $3,000 or $5,000. Now it's over $27,000 and still growing."

The appeal hit quake-conscious San Franciscans in a number of ways.

Old-timers who remembered the 1906 San Francisco disaster were among the first to respond. Contributions were heavy from San Francisco's large Latin-American colony, anxious to help a sister republic. Chinese were among the most generous—many wrote that they remembered floods and natural disasters in their home lands.

Contributions came from Hungarian refugees—many of whom were personally thankful to Canter. At the time of the 1956 revolt he helped 100 refugee Hungarians come to San Francisco with money contributed by readers.

One man wrote the appeal came at a bad time; he'd been laid off work for months. But he enclosed a check for $10. A housewife sent a check for $5.10, explaining the dime came from her little boy, the only money he had. Another boy sent his stamp collection and asked the newspaper to sell it and send the money to Chile.

Canter visited Chile's Ambassador, Walter Muller, at Washington yesterday on his way to Chile. "The reaction has simply been incredible and most touching," Muller told him.

The Chile Fund even grew a littled uring Canter's stop here. Ellen McGinty, 14, San Francisco's entry in the Scripps-Howard National Spelling Bee, pressed a few dollars in his hand.

Canter plans to spend about 10 days in Chile and visit the disaster area. With the help of Chilean authorities he'll decide how the money can best be spent—and report to San Franciscans what their money went for.

[From the San Francisco News-Call Bulletin, June 9, 1960]

NEWS-CALL BULLETIN EARTHQUAKE FUNDS TOTAL: $27,461—DONATIONS CONTINUE TO ROLL IN

A benign tidal wave of bay area contributions to the suffering thousands of Chilean earthquake victims is still rolling in today.

The Red Cross here announced that it has received $44,845.12 from its nine chapters in the area.

This sum is in addition to the generous donations to the News-Call Bulletin Chilean quake fund, which today reached a total of $27,461.10.

And it did not include a special collection for Red Cross Chilean relief taken up last night at the First Unitarian Church here.

Meanwhile, Mrs. M. Justin Herman, chairman of a people-to-people citizens' committee in Sausalito, sister city of a Chilean community, announced that proceeds from this Sunday's excursions to Angel Island will be given to the Chilean victims.

Russell Lewis, of Lewis Excursions, announced plans for a special trip to the island aboard the *Blue Spirit*, leaving the Sausalito sandspit at 2:30 p.m. Sunday and returning from the island at 7:30.

Round trip fare will be $2.50 for adults and $1.25 for children under 12. Mrs. Herman advised phoning for reservations at ED-2-2163.

As San Franciscans were responding to the needs of Chile's hungry and homeless, News-Call Bulletin Staff Writer Don Canter was winging his way to Chile to determine how funds contributed by readers of the paper best can be spent.

Mayor Christopher, in a special telegram to Chilean President Jorge Alessandri Rodriguez, notified him of Canter's trip and its purpose and said:

"Your cooperation will be appreciated and any information you give Mr. Canter will aid in better serving your stricken people. Please be assured of our city's deep and heartfelt sympathy."

Here are the latest contributions to the News-Call Bulletin Chilean quake fund:

Balance brought forward, $25,281.89.

[From the San Francisco News-Call Bulletin, June 27, 1960]

ANOTHER "SAN FRANCISCO" RISES IN QUAKE RUINS—NEWS-CALL BULLETIN FUND THE NUCLEUS FOR CITY VICTIMS' DEMAND

(By Donald Canter)

In the ruins of Chile's quake-shattered Valdivia, a new city of San Francisco is rising.

Its future residents are still huddling together in shacks, tents and refugee centers today.

But not for long. The first homes of the city of San Francisco, a little city within a city, will be ready for occupancy in about 4 months, planned and built through the generosity of News-Call Bulletin readers.

To floorless shacks, where babies crawled in the rain-soaked adobe soil, and to stables where the smell was overpowering, I brought this message:

The people of San Francisco know how a quake hits you. They've given money to help you. Say the word: What do you need most?

In Chile's untouched capital, Santiago, officials had answered that question, too:

"Schools," they said, "schools, that's what our people need most of all."

But those who said it hadn't lost their children, friends and homes.

So is was from the people who did, that I asked advice on how to spend the money which warmhearted readers of the News-Call Bulletin had poured into their Chilean Quake Fund. I asked the people of Valdivia, the hardest hit center of the quake's wrath.

On Valdivia's Catrico Hill, where 1,200 people are trying to survive in the most miserable shacks I've ever seen, I asked a man what he wanted done with the money.

His shoeless, mud-covered daughter cuddled up to him and asked:

"Who is that man, father?"

He told her: "He says he's a newspaperman from San Francisco. But he could be God himself. For us at least. He says he came to help us and asks what we need. But when he looks around, he knows what we long for: homes. That's what we need. Homes and more homes. Please."

In the auditorium of Superior School No. 1, the only structure on Valdivia's main street still standing, I looked in the eyes of hundreds of miserable children huddled together in a refugee center.

Outside, in the courtyard, their parents lined up for food, tin soup cans in their hands.

I asked a pregnant woman if she wanted schools built first, as they'd told me in Santiago.

Her eyes shot fire as she grabbed my arm:

"Please, Senor, don't listen to them. Sure we need schools. But later, not now. Give us homes to raise our children."

But what kind of homes did she want built? The same shacks many had lived in before the quakes? Was that what she wanted?

"For God's sake, don't," she cried. "If you build houses, build decent ones, places fit to live in, not the shacks that were destroyed. Give us better homes and the quakes may have done some good, after all."

She saw me starting to agree and instantly her eyes lit up: "Senor, could you build us some houses Norte Americano with a bath and running water?"

Yes, running water, a bath and a kitchen and bedrooms enough to enable parents to sleep apart from their children, that's what they wanted, the homeless poor of Valdivia. So they told me, over and over, wherever I went in the emergency districts into which Valdivia is divided.

Everywhere, Bianca Freire went with me. She's an ex-San Franciscan—used to live on Geary Boulevard—and now runs Chile's Governmental social service for the Valdivia area.

I talked with her; with Sergio Bruce Saint-Jean, local director of the Chilean Housing Authority; with Gen. Alfonso Canas, temporarily in charge of Valdivia, and with his English-speaking legal advisor, Juan Michelson.

All agreed: The people want homes, decent homes.

That's why today, in Valdivia's Gilde Castro district, construction has started on a community to be known as the city of San-Francisco.

About 100 homeless Chileans will be its first residents. They are families I found in the mud of Catrico Hill, in the stables of the city's farm exposition grounds, in refugee centers in every corner of Valdivia.

The San Francisco of Valdivia won't be a golden gateway, I can assure you.

But to its residents it will be something close to heaven on earth, a place with water and electricity, a place without mud, a place to raise children, a place for hope—a place like Norte America.

What's more, these people will be held in high esteem by their fellow citizens. For these poor people, given homes by the generous readers of the News-Call Bulletin, are going to provide housing for other roofless folks.

Here's how they'll do it:

These people, handpicked by Bianca Freire and myself from the Valdivia refugee camps, will live in their new apartments rent free for the first 3 months.

Subsequently, they will become owners of their apartments by making payments of $10 a month for 30 years.

Their paymetns will be deposited in a special bank account, which draws 10 percent interest at present Chilean rates.

Every time sufficient funds have accumulated, another apartment building will be built on this land, which is big enough to hold two dozen similar buildings.

Thus, the money donated by News-Call Bulletin readers will be a self-perpetuating fund for the construction of homes and eventually will create an entire community proudly bearing the name of the city of San Francisco.

What will happen to some $5,500 which this paper's Chilean quake fund is holding to date in excess of the $33,000 needed for the initial building program?

Many Valdivians would like to see a small school incorporated in the plans for their city of San Francisco. It could be built at a cost of $10,000.

Since over half of that amount is already available, you and we may be able to make that dream come true in the near future.

Next: Who will live in Valdivia's San Francisco?

WHAT CHILE FUND GIFTS WILL BUY

Here's what the first phase of your Chilean building program includes:

Three apartment buildings providing 11 three-bedroom units in all.

Living room, dining area, bath, kitchen, hot and cold water and electricity in each unit.

Two-story, concrete and redwood, structures to be built in a triangle with a central playground.

Land donated by Chilean Housing Authority (CORVI).

Contractor: Empresa Constructora Nahmias Hermanos.

Building supervision by CORVI.

Completion scheduled within 4 months.

Here are financial details of the first phase of your Chilean building program:

Construction cost: $33,000.

Payment to contractor in four installments.

Funds remitted solely upon signature of Chilean Housing Authority (CORVI) director attesting to proper completion of construction for quarterly payments.

Monthly payments of $10 a month collected from residents by CORVI and deposited in Banco de Chile.

Free administration by CORVI.

No payments by tenants for first 3 months.

"Helping Latin America," and "Federal Aid to Schools"—Editorials in the New York Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials from this morning's New York Times. One is entitled "Helping Latin America," and the other "Federal Aid to Schools."

The editorial page of the Times this morning is exceptionally good. These two editorials are very well written, and concisely sum up the substance of these very difficult subjects.

I believe that the editorial on Federal aid to schools is one of the best that I have seen, and I thoroughly approve of it. I wish to congratulate the New York Times on the quality of their editorial page.

Whether or not the recent change in the staff of the newspaper is the reason for it, I do not know, but certainly this morning's editorial page is a very superior one.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HELPING LATIN AMERICA

The law appropriating $500 million for social and economic development in Latin America (plus $100 million in earthquake aid for Chile) has been handled by Congress with admirable speed and realism in the wake of the Cuban fiasco.

North Americans are learning about Latin Americans and their problems in a hard school, but we are learning. There have been few top-level statements on the question of the U.S. economic relations with Latin America more important than President Kennedy's to Congress on March 14: "Economic growth without social progress lets the great majority of the people remain in poverty while a privileged few reap the benefits of rising abundance." Our aid in the past has largely benefited those "privileged few," the ruling classes of Latin America who have neither paid fair taxes nor distributed the wealth amassed by the national economies, nor given workers and peasants a fair share of the produce of their labor, nor made the social reforms now being demanded with revolutionary insistence.

Both Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy have made it clear that the United States will and can only help those countries which help themselves. The half billion dollars now being appropriated will, as Senator FULBRIGHT put it, be used "primarily to help the common man." Under the ground rules described by Senator GORE, the money will not go to dictators, to a few large landholders nor to the wealthy who avoid paying their due share of taxes.

It must be recognized and accepted that in making such terms the United States will offend many Latin Americans who are sensitive to dictation and who are afraid, politically, to appear to take orders from the "Yankees." It will not be easy for them to share some of the power, privileges and wealth which they and their ancestors have held for centuries. The United States cannot force them to make social reforms. But the people of their countries can and will force them if the reforms are not made voluntarily. It must not be assumed any longer in Latin America that a rightwing military reaction will get from the United States the support or tolerance of past years.

A new era is taking shape in Latin America. It will, as Senator FULBRIGHT indicated, center on "the common man." The policies we are trying to follow today might have prevented the Cuban revolution if they had been employed in time. There is still time to forestall other Castro-type revolutions in Latin America if the governments there cooperate with us in trying to advance the social and economic welfare of their people.

FEDERAL AID TO THE SCHOOLS

Both Houses of Congress are now putting into final form the major proposals for direct Federal aid to elementary and high schools.

There can be no doubt about the need for action. Average teachers' salaries in the poorest States still hover around $3,500 a year. Almost 700,000 pupils are presently attending school in double or triple sessions. The Eisenhower administration, which earlier had held out the hope that the States could catch up with school construction, admitted in its final report that the classroom shortage has increased from 135,000 to 142,000 in the past year.

Enactment of a Federal aid bill has been blocked in the past by three major controversies.

One of them involves the question whether a Federal aid law should specifically exclude segregated school districts from Government assistance. In principle, aid to segregated schools is objectionable. But since school segregation is now a violation of the law of the land, the battle against segregated schools can, and must, be carried on under that law, in the courts. It is therefore now not only legitimate, but essential, to keep the issue out of Federal aid.

Equally controversial is the issue of aid to nonpublic schools. We believe that direct aid to parochial schools is a clear violation of the doctrine of separation of church and State. The fact that inroads have already been permitted is only added reason not to let the erosion go further.

Finally, there is the question whether Federal aid would limit the rights of the States or, worse, lead to Federal control over the schools. It is hard to see how any bill which leaves the distribution of Federal funds entirely to the States could offend even the most adamant of States righters. The long history of Federal participation, from the land-grant provisions of almost a hundred years ago to the Federal school construction program during the depression and finally the GI bill of rights after World War II and the Korean war, has established a clean record of freedom from political interference.

In the final analysis there is, of course, never any ironclad guarantee that government—Federal, State, or local—or any other agency or interest group will not try to control, or interfere with, education. This danger calls for constant vigilance, but cannot serve as an argument against aid which is needed and should rightfully be provided by the Federal Government.

In summary, we believe that passage of a bill for Federal aid to the public schools, without any extraneous riders concerning either segregation or aid to nonpublic schools, is urgently needed. The $2.3 billion bill proposed by President Kennedy is sound and should be passed.

Economic Impact of Highways With Particular Reference to the Merrimack Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include a very interesting article by Dr. J. Laurence Phalan, staff economist of the Massachusetts Department of Public Works, which appeared in the spring 1961 issue of Business Review published by Boston University College of Business Administration.

ECONOMIC IMPACT OF HIGHWAYS WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO THE MERRIMACK VALLEY

(By Dr. J. Laurence Phalan, staff economist, Massachusetts Department of Public Works)

Are the present and planned Massachusetts highways capable of giving the boost required to sustain and/or make possible resurgence of much needed growth in the State's economy? This article embraces that subject with particular emphasis placed upon the Merrimack Valley which for too many years has existed under depressed conditions.

Broadly speaking, the location of production of goods is either materials oriented or market oriented with, of course, concern being given to present or potential labor supply and other factors. By this is meant that firms will tend to locate plant facilities near either sources of raw materials or adjacent to markets for goods produced.

Importance in location at the source of raw materials in the primary stages of industrial development will depend greatly upon the amount of waste involved in production. For example, in the production of steel the Pittsburgh area rose to prominence because of the nearness of coal and iron ore, the basic ingredients of steel, and because of the much less bulk and weight of the finished product than of the ingredients which went into its production.

In addition to the basic raw materials, power has played an important part in the location of plant facilities and at times more than offset lack of adjacency to raw materials. It was in this area that New England offered many advantages. Thus, notwithstanding its complete lack of cotton and wool, the Merrimack Valley of Massachusetts became the textile center of the Nation.

Concomitant with the establishment of an area of production, there develops a hierarchy of skilled and other types of labor firmly entrenched in the area and offering resistance to movement from it, thereby deterring industry shift to other places offering various later inducements.

The textile industry of the Merrimack

Valley was to no small degree protected from migration in the face of competition from other areas by this hard core of skilled and allied workers until the 1930's.

Relative to this competition, some claim that for years limited management ingenuity was exercised; and others place blame upon too high wage scales making impossible profitable operations irrespective of management's failure to invest old or new capital in the area. We prefer to take the position that much of the reduced production is attributable to a wide variety of factors which made the fall in the valley inevitable, chief of which were decline in the world textile market, foreign competition, and the rise of the South out of its agrarian economy.

History shows that a first step out of an agrarian economy is in the manufacture of textiles. The South was ready and did take that step in its efforts to attract the textile industry from the valley—that is, to attract the industry from the multi-storied loft buildings in which it was operated to electrified single-floor efficient buildings located in areas of mass underpaid, unorganized workers.

The rush from the valley started and/or prepared to start in the 1930's. Blocked for a while by the production demands of World War II, it subsequently resurged and left the valley almost denuded of its chief source of industry.

What did the South get? A low wage industry suffering from worldwide depression pains whose new workers, while yet unorganized, may eventually prove disadvantageous to management that thought it was heading into paradise in the shift of operations from the valley.

What was left? Unemployment by the thousands, empty antiquated buildings, unacceptable to modern industry—a definitely distressed area with unemployment in Lawrence reaching 32.3 percent in 1949 and 20.5 percent in Lowell in the same year.

What is in the area now? A growing diversification of new industry, several new industrial parks, plant modernization, some abandonment of antiquated structures, an average wage rate still low but more closely approximating the statewide average, and greatly reduced unemployment rates. While the unemployment rate nationally has climbed to the highest point since 1940 (8.7 percent in February), that for the Lawrence-Haverhill standard metropolitan statistical area (8.2 percent) in that month was slightly below the national average. Lowell, while its situation has improved over 1947, had an unemployment rate of 10.7 percent in February 1961 and suffered from the unenviable distinction of being one of the three areas in Massachusetts classified as distressed,[1] the others being Fall River and New Bedford.

Route 128 with its supplementary and radial roads has been of great value in this limited resurgence. Route 128 has made for greater availability of materials of production to the valley and for the movement of goods to markets, but of most importance has been its offering of job opportunities to residents of the valley in new plants located on or close to the highway. It was not conceived as an industrial highway, and by some it was called the "road to nowhere." Now, for the past 5 or 6 years, it has been termed the golden semicircle of industry, and the magnitude of its industrial growth is widely known throughout the Nation.

While many of the firms located on it are those which have transferred operations from the central core of Metropolitan Boston (and the shift has caused complications in cities in that central core), generally, changed site of operations has been accompanied by expanded production and increased employment. To these firms have been added numerous other plants not previously located in the area.

While large numbers of displaced textile workers have not been absorbed by this new enterprise, chiefly because of age barriers and inability (or lack of retraining) to shift old skills to new, yet many of them (together with new and/or secondary workers) have been absorbed in varied and newer growing industries to the noted advantage of the valley. Not all plants through which the improvement has come are located immediately adjacent to route 128, but the highway has been an important factor in their location.

Previously, it was pointed out that industry tends to locate because of proximity to raw materials and/or markets for goods produced. With the passage of time, other factors, such as availability of workers (their degree of skill, supply, stability and resistance to relocation) and access to power facilities, likewise have been sources of attraction and industrial retention.

With today's high power transmission facilities the average Massachusetts manufacturer is not required to worry unduly about that element in his production costs. Notwithstanding the higher-than-the-national-average power costs in the State, that item (particularly when only percentage differentials are involved) presents no serious problem in locating a multitude of types of industry in and about the valley.

Nor are taxes, and in particular tax differentials, important cost determinants in the location of a plant in the State and valley—other than when there is intra-area competition in the location of a particular plant.

Massachusetts has been called taxachusetts by many who should know the relative unimportance of tax differentials in production costs, but who do not seem to realize that a well-publicized minor weakness, if there be such, may develop monstrous psychological impact. In other words, studies show that while property taxes, for example, are a minor cost item in the manufacture of goods, harping upon minor sectional differentials is destructive and may build a psychological block toward the entry of new industry into an area, which would enable the elimination of existing differentials. Of much greater importance in industrial development and/or resurgence are the availability of a good labor force, efficient plants or space for their construction, accessibility to materials and to markets.

Let us briefly consider each of these items and the valley. In doing so, we should bear well in mind that industrial and population shifts and growth are rapidly developing a single eastern Massachusetts metropolitan area rather than segmented Metropolitan Boston, Metropolitan Lowell, Metropolitan Lawrence-Haverhill and Metropolitan Brockton areas.

LABOR SUPPLY

What does the thoughtful employer consider a good labor supply? It is believed that the following would fill most of the requirements.

1. That there be an ample supply of highly skilled, skilled, semiskilled and nonskilled workers sufficient to his demands, without those demands immediately throwing the supply-demand relationship out of balance to his disadvantage.

2. A wage scale that, when weighted with productivity, results in comparative labor cost advantage.

3. Stable labor force mature enough in terms of unionization to be disciplined toward reasonable collective-bargaining demands and procedures.

The valley and the surrounding area have these. While the whole Nation is suffering from educational malnutrition damaging to productivity maximization, our area of discussion is above average, and college and university facilities are far above the national norm. We have been the university-trained feeding-ground for the rest of the Nation, exporting the products of Harvard, MIT, Boston College, Boston University, Northeastern, etc., to the advantage of the rest of the Nation and world.

Contrary to some belief, eastern Massachusetts is one of comparatively low wages. For example, recent community wage studies made by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics showed that, among the 20 largest metropolitan areas in the Nation, for comparative jobs, salaries or wages were third lowest in Metropolitan Boston—where wages are higher than in the Metropolitan Lowell and Lawrence-Haverhill areas.

Indicative of the stability of the work force in Massachusetts and the valley, as a segment of it, are data supplied by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics relative to work stoppages for the year 1959. In that year the average time lost in labor disputes in the State was only one-third the national average. In the Metropolitan Lawrence area there were only 6 work stoppages, involving 900 workers and 4,500 men-days, far below national averages. In deriving these figures, a work stoppage is defined as one involving six or more workers idle 1 workday or one full shift. Only areas where stoppages were five or more were reported by the Bureau. There was no report for the Lowell area; therefore, the number was less than five.

EFFICIENT PLANTS OR SPACE FOR THEIR CONSTRUCTION

In this area the Merrimack Valley has been weak for two major reasons. One, notwithstanding some acceptable improvements, too much of the factory space which cities like Lowell, Lawrence, and Haverhill have been trying to sell industry is completely unadaptable to modern manufacturing and distributive requirements. Two, many of the available sites for the construction of modern facilities are or were reached only through the use of comparatively over-trafficked city streets and/or inadequate country roads feeding into outmoded Routes 3, 28, and the Old Newburyport Turnpike. Perhaps topping all main arteries in the valley in their inadequacy to meet current demands are narrow, winding Routes 113 and 110, both of which transverse heavily populated sections and are far from capable of handling heavy, fast traffic.

A continued solution to the problems of the valley as well as those of eastern Massachusetts overall will be found partially in a new road complex involving the completion of Routes 3, 95, and 93 and the construction of an entirely new circumferential highway, Route 495, and outer belt running largely through underdeveloped land 12 to 17 miles to the west of Route 128.

These new and/or improved, relocated roads will make available sites closer in time to materials and markets necessary for retaining and expanding industry. At the same time they will relieve overburdened older roads, particularly those in the inner core of Lawrence, Haverhill, and Lowell, making more feasible extensive redevelopment plans.

ACCESSIBILITY TO MATERIALS AND TO MARKETS

Whether these hoped-for redevelopments will take place returns us to further questions revolving about our original thesis of industrial location being based chiefly upon materials and market proximity.

Let us devote a few words to the term "proximity." There are three factors to which one must give consideration. One, the bulk of raw materials and finished or semifinished products moved; two, the extent areawise of the market; and three, the vehicular methods used in transport.

Footnote at end of speech.

Goods of heaviest bulk generally can best be moved by ship, intermediate bulk goods by rail, and light goods by truck. Proximity to both materials and to markets is not based entirely upon distance or spatial relationships. The bulk and value of goods and transportation facilities involving time relationships are also of prime importance. More and more is "proximity" becoming a very flexible term.

The Massachusetts economy is one basically of production of light goods and services. Both of these require extensive use of highways and mass passenger transportation facilities.

The central cities in our State have become, and will become to an ever greater degree, service centers to the total areas of which they are the core. Downtown Lawrence (a city of only about 8 square miles in all) and overcrowded downtown Boston (the capital of the State, and yet surpassed in land area by many populationwise small towns) are not places for retention of manufacturing operations and truck-cluttered streets. It is of interest to note that Andover, bordering Lawrence, is almost four times as large areawise as is the core city, and that Boston is only two-thirds the size of the hometown of our new President, Barnstable.

If the central cities are to take their rightful place in the newly developing economy, they must seek ways to clear their streets, to replace antiquated loft buildings, and to erect modern central office and service buildings. The newly constructed highways will greatly aid in removing through traffic from the centers of cities of the Merrimack Valley making possible the expeditious safe use of the streets of those cities. The core areas can then be planned for optimum use by those who have business in them and are not merely exasperatingly attempting to use them as an impossible speedway to get from one point to another.

Cases of the benefits of traffic diversion are counted in the thousands across the Nation. For more on this we refer to the excellent publication of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce—Businessmen's Guide to the Road Program.

As a prime example, Lawrence should be aided by Route 93 removal of through traffic to New Hampshire from Essex Street, which as part of old Route 28 bisects the city.

Now let us look a little more closely at specific major highway improvements and what they likely will do, together with a few actions being taken by some communities to participate in the advantages offered.

Route 95: This road, a considerable portion of which is completed, goes both north and south of Boston. It connects on the north with the Maine Turnpike and on the south with roads in Rhode Island. Through Boston, it is both an overpass and underpass. Upon completion it will be a high-speed, controlled access road which will not only decrease time relationship to markets and sources of raw materials transported entirely by highways, but will also act as a feeder road to the Port of Boston. Thus world markets and materials will be made more readily available.

Route 93: This high-speed controlled access highway replaces Route 28 as a main road from Boston to New Hampshire. In doing so it takes dangerous through traffic off the major streets of Stoneham, Reading, Andover, Lawrence, and Methuen. Within the next few years it will terminate at the much discussed Route 695 Inner Belt through Boston, Cambridge, Brookline, and Somerville.

Route 3: This controlled access, high-speed road will also ultimately be a radial highway off the Boston Inner Belt. At its opposite terminus it will tie in with the New Hampshire Turnpike. With its completion will come elimination of bottlenecks now found in Arlington, Winchester, Burlington, etc.; also, the Lowell area will have greatly improved access to materials and new markets.

All three of these roads connect with Route 128, the complex of which will serve as continuous high-speed roads to the markets and suppliers of the Nation. Likewise, all will connect directly with the facilities of the Port of Boston and the markets of the world. Via all of them also will be high-speed, almost nonstop connection with Logan International Airport.

In the minds of many is the thought that circumferential highway Route 495 will be the road of the future—perhaps, even surpassing Route 128 in its eventual economic impact. Its most immediate impact likely will be felt in two areas. One, is in its more northerly segment where it will eliminate present tortuous, uneconomic use of Routes 110 and 113. The Haverhill area should be particularly benefited both because it gives the area new high-speed facilities and because it bypasses the centers of the city of Haverhill and other communities. Two, the other area which will likely show the most immediate economic effects is that directly west of Boston in a "wedge" generally bounded by Routes 135, 495, 2, and 128. This is the area immediately to the southwest of the valley wherein there was a population growth of 54 percent between 1950 and 1960, compared with the statewide 9-percent increase. It is the area which includes the junction of Route 495 and the Massachusetts Turnpike.

Now, what are community responses to the growth possibilities outlined?

On the one hand some of the industrial developers who played such an important part in the growth of Route 128 have a "wait and see" attitude toward 495, such a feeling being due chiefly to a knowledge that much of the 128 growth resulted from a running away of firms from core cities of Metropolitan Boston to areas of continued accessibility to the coordinating educational facilities of the core area universities. Others, recognizing the overburdened traffic load on 128, are quite certain that in not too many years Route 128 will be practically "downtown" and the Route 495 (feeding directly into the valley, its labor supply and markets, picking up the overload of 128 and shifts in plant operations in the Worcester area) is a road of tremendous economic growth potential.

Analysis of educated opinions would seem to lead to four basic conclusions. One, Route 495 and the other roads mentioned are a must for the economic welfare of the valley, and the whole State as well; two, Route 128 is not adequate to the travel requirements of eastern Massachusetts and must be supplemented by a road such as Route 495; three, industrial growth along most of 495 will not be so spectacular as along 128 and growth may not reach a high level of acceleration until about 1970; and four, the growth will be in manufacturing contrasted with research to a greater degree than along Route 128.

Perhaps brief descriptions of some representative community actions may best illustrate feelings toward the anticipated impact of these highways. Four are given.

1. There has been a marked awakening on the part of almost all communities affected relative to the need for planning. Basic to this awakening is the question of the future residential-industrial mix. Is the particular community to be a "bedroom" suburb, an industrial and commercial town, or somewhere in between? The great number of communities that have obtained Federal planning grants under title 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 is indicative of this awakening.

2. In Lawrence are being prepared adjacent industrial parks, one entirely financed with private funds, the other with city funds, 1 mile from access to Route 93. It is anticipated that single level plants with floor space approximating 4 million square feet will be constructed in these parks, covering about 40 percent of the 229 acres in them. Removed from the center they are located in the one sizable open space area of the very small city and will aid redevelopment along lines proposed for the rest of the central core area.

3. With the shift of through traffic from the main street of Andover to Route 93, a redevelopment program now in the planning stage will facilitate removal of the one "eyesore" area in this lovely community.

4. In Haverhill a new zoning law which permits industrial use of land adjacent to Route 495 is in the process of adoption.

These are but a few of the thoughts and plans revolving about the social and economic impact of some of our new State highways. We conclude this article with brief answers to three common questions:

1. Can we afford to spend the money for these highway improvements? The answer is that we cannot afford not to spend it. A brief digest of a study by Moody's Investment Service is to the effect that Massachusetts is at a turning point. Its economy can grow or shrink. Presently the State has a basic economy upon which to grow that is considerably stronger than some other States which have done more. Essential to our "doing" is a greatly improved highway system.

2. Who pays for these highways? All of the new routes mentioned in this article are interstate highways, the construction costs of which are paid 90 percent by the Federal Government and 10 percent by the State.

3. If these roads are imperative to aid the Valley in its long battle out of depression, why not concentrate upon them and get them built rather than build segments of highways in the valley, in Boston, in the southeast and in the Springfield-Holyoke area, and in other sections? To be able to do so would be of great advantage to the valley. However, important as that area is to the well-being of the Commonwealth, so too are Boston, Springfield, New Bedford, and Fall River. Only so much money is available each year for the building of roads. It is only equitable that it be distributed throughout the State in the best manner possible.

---

[1] A distressed area is one where unemployment is in excess of 6 percent and where the unemployment rate has been in excess of 100 percent of the national average for 1 of the past 2 calendar years, or 75 percent for 2 of the past 3 years, or 50 percent for 3 years of the past 4 years.

Fiasco of Invasion in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Let's Pick Friends," which appeared in the Indianapolis Star April 26, 1961.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S PICK FRIENDS

Be thankful that the fiasco of invasion in Cuba has set off some investigation in Washington of the misinformation and miscalculation and sloppy direction which went into the United States role in the affair.

Most urgent and necessary of all is to inquire into the selection of the figures to receive the blessing and backing of the United States as leaders of Cuban patriots in exile seeking to unseat Fidel Castro. This decision—this selection of men to be backed—is at the root of most of the other error and blunder.

These top figures, chosen to lead and mastermind the plot, are themselves leftists and former Castro aides, closely tied to the Castro movement, its activities and its policies. They were with Castro in his revolution and in setting the course of his regime after he came to power. Their differences are with Castro personally, not with the principles of his war, his dictatorship or his anti-Americanism.

One of the expectations of the invaders was that both soldiers and civilians inside Cuba would turn against Castro and help the rebels. This did not happen.

There is strong reason to suppose that the reason it did not happen was that the invasion movement was led by men tarred with the Castro brush. Jose Miro Cardona was premier under Castro, and is a signer of Castro's constitution by which Cuba is now ruled. Manuel Ray Rivero was minister of public works under Castro. Maj. Raul Chibas presided over some of the circus-like trials which sent anti-Castro and anti-Communist Cubans to the execution wall.

What kind of thinking in American high circles led to the approval of these men and others of their kind to lead the anti-Castro rebels? Why should Cubans have been expected to risk their necks to help men such as these, in the role of ambitious adventures, against Castro, holder of the power of life and death in Cuba?

And what would the United States have gained if the invasion—under this leadership—had been successful? Castro himself would have been deposed. Some of his top lieutenants doubtless would have gone with him. Perhaps the ties to the Soviet Union and Red China would have been pushed into the background. But the regime would have been essentially the same in philosophy. The confiscated properties would have remained in government hands; the socialistic trend would have continued. In all likelihood, an end of the anti-American agitation would have hinged on unreserved official U.S. blessing of the new regime's program—essentially the Castro program.

How came the United States to give aid and encouragement to such leadership of the Cuban exiles? How much farther is the United States about to go in fostering such leadership throughout the Americas?

On April 3 the State Department issued a statement written by Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. This statement attacks Castro. But it praises the Castro revolution and many of his accomplices who only recently deserted Castro and came to the United States in hope of taking Castro's place. It praises the positive programs initiated in the first months of the Castro regime, when it was setting its course of property seizure, socialization, blood purges and Yankee-baiting. It spoke warmly of authentic and autonomous revolution in the Americas.

Does the State Department want to replace only Castro in Cuba, not his principles? Does it plan to encourage other Castro-type revolutions in Latin America? The Schlesinger statement implies, as a judgment of the U.S. Government, that revolution is the only hope of spreading political liberty economic development and social progress through all the republics of the Western Hemisphere. Is this the New Frontier for Latin America?

This, even more than other aspects of the invasion disaster, needs to be investigated. It probably won't be covered by the administration's inquiry. It is a job for Congressmen and others not committed to the administration.

And next time we back an invasion or an uprising, let's pick one that is going our way.

Congressional Investigation Requested—A Resolution by American Legion Post No. 52, Houston, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB CASEY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, the loyalty and support of our Nation by the American Legion have long been a source of pride to Members of Congress. One of the most active American Legion posts within the 22d Congressional District of Texas is Post No. 52, and it is my pleasure to insert the following resolution adopted by unanimous vote and forwarded to me by Post Adjutant George Siefert:

Whereas the local press of this date reports that ex-President Dwight D. Eisenhower has spoken out against congressional investigation into the U.S. role in the recent Cuban invasion fiasco; and

Whereas we believe such an investigation should be had, but on a much broader scale: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the American Legion, Post 52, Houston, Tex., in regular meeting this May 1, 1961, as follows:

1. We believe that our national security now demands a thorough congressional investigation into the influence in the administrations which have heretofore been in office since World War II and which influence has led to a shameful disregard of our best interests where Russia and communism have been concerned, which has permitted Russia to kidnap out of Germany, including our zone, the German space scientists, which has abandoned the Freedom Fighters in Hungary and now in Laos and Cuba while the Communists have been permitted to supply their partisans with arms.

2. That no good has come to the American people because of the squelching of other investigations and none will come from this present squelching.

3. That prior administrations under both parties have been to blame for the Cuban debacle while the present administration may yet, it is hoped, make a better, pro-American, anti-Communist record.

4. That a copy of this resolution be sent to the local papers, to President John F. Kennedy, and to the Honorable BOB CASEY with the request that it be inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The foregoing is a true and correct copy of resolution adopted as stated, same having been adopted by unanimous vote. To which I certify this the 8th day of April 1961.

GEORGE SIEFERD,
Adjutant, Post 52, the American Legion, Houston, Tex.

Rickover's Brilliant Educational Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, Admiral Rickover is recognized as a great military man who has contributed immensely to the defense of freedom. The admiral also has some provocative ideas on education. While almost everyone must be grateful to him for the inspiration he has given the country toward improving education, many educators disagree with what he has proposed.

It has been said that Admiral Rickover may be a great Navy man—but he has no real experience as an educator. This simply is not true. The admiral has not only had substantial experience, he has had eminent success as a professional educator.

The story of this success will make Americans grateful and proud. Admiral Rickover has ingeniously and significantly improved the quality of naval personnel in a way that richly merits emulation as well as warm gratitude.

For this reason I ask unanimous consent that an article from Time magazine, reporting on the Nuclear Power Schools of Admiral Rickover at New London, Conn., and Mare Island, Calif., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ABLE-MINDED SEAMEN

For his salty criticism of U.S. schools, Adm. Hyman G. Rickover is often dismissed by professional educators as an out-of-his-depth amateur. In fact, Rickover is a seasoned schoolmaster running one of the most efficient school systems in the United States: the Navy's little-known Nuclear Power Schools at New London, Conn., and Mare Island, Calif.

Rickover launched them in 1956 and 1958 because he considered the products of U.S. schools illiterate in science and unfit for nuclear sailing. In his own 24-week schools, which already have 2,000 alumni, Rickover hurls college courses at enlisted men and graduate courses at officers with an intensity that is probably unmatched anywhere else.

FAT-FREE DIET

The schools' function is to train the men entrusted with the powerplants aboard nuclear subs and ships—about half the crew on a sub—and the training is aimed strictly at making sailors think. ("Hardware" courses come later at land-based nuclear plants.) The curriculum is a fat-free diet of pure math, physics, chemistry, electronics, engineering, and health physics (to guard against radiation) that goes on for seven 50-minute periods a day, plus an average of 4 hours of homework done in a tiny, distraction-free cell. Teachers are on duty for help around the clock, and Rickover himself often conducts a final oral exam.

Last month 500 more students entered the schools after rigorous selection and anguished boning up on calculus. Rickover personally screens every officer who enters,

grills every enlisted man who flunks to find out why. He checks the courses and picks the teachers, many of them former college professors now happily authorized to toss erasers at window gazers—if any.

Distractions are banned. A freshman must settle his money problems before arrival, and Navy rituals, such as marching and swabbing, are cut out. At Mare Island, the base commander gingerly treats Rickover's school like a well-armed island owned by a foreign power.

A $20,000 EDUCATION

Though they may have entered the Navy with a sketchy scientific schooling, Rickover's recruits soar in his rarefied atmosphere. "I had the best math teachers in the world," gloats one sailor. "It's like getting a $20,000 education," says another. The most impressive result is a new willingness to keep studying after graduation. On the Polaris sub *George Washington*, for example, sailors will soon attend classes in everything from calculus to computers, recently took a Harvard extension course using kinescoped TV lectures by Historian Crane Brinton.

Just to make sure the studying takes, Rickover requires requalification tests aboard ship. A man has to study to keep his rating, study harder to get ahead. This produces an odd personnel problem: a steady drain on savvy chief petty officers as they get commissions. Compared with the Navy as a whole, 30 times more Rickover sailors become officers. "You lose 20 percent of your people," growled one sub commander last week as he stared at a couple of chief petty officers hunched over books as well as black coffee. That fails to daunt "the admiral," as he is called without further identification. Says Rickover: "The main thing is that the men have been taught to think. It just shows what we can do with all our youngsters if we try."

Notes Toward an Understanding of the U.S. Airlines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, on May 1 a constituent of mine who lives in Rockville, Mr. Stuart G. Tipton, president of the Air Transport Association of America, delivered a most informative address before the Aviation & Spacewriters Association convention in New York.

We are all aware of the difficult times which have come upon our scheduled commercial airlines, both domestic and international. Not only did our domestic carriers have a bad time of it in 1960, but our international airlines are now faced with a prospect of further concessions on the part of our Government to foreign carriers.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Tipton's speech, in its entirety, is too long to be completely included in the RECORD, but I have read it in full and have edited it for the sake of space. Under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts of this talk be made a part of the RECORD:

NOTES TOWARD AN UNDERSTANDING OF THE U.S. AIRLINES

(Remarks by Stuart G. Tipton, president, Air Transport Association of America at the ATA luncheon in connection with the Aviation Space Writers Association convention, Hotel Commodore, New York, May 1, 1961)

One of the greatest assets our industry has had over the years has been a dedicated and competent press. In a difficult, fast-changing field, the aviation press not only has kept pace, but managed to interpret developments so that the Nation at large has been able to absorb a radical change in transportation habits.

Even with this invaluable contribution, however, and despite our best efforts, there is one big worry of major concern today. It has to do with the disparity of opinions or views that exist concerning the status, problems, and needs of the air transport industry.

On the one hand, there are those who envision the airlines as prosperously expanding while, on the other, there are those who see the industry as dangerously walking the brink of financial crisis.

This, of course, is no fault of the press and, we hope, no fault of ours. Actually, both things are true. We have expanded; we have improved our services; and we have bought the most modern, the safest, the most efficient and the fastest flight equipment available.

And we are just about broke. Last year, for example, the domestic trunk airlines, despite record revenues, earned a profit after taxes and interest of only $1.1 million.

Normally, the average corporation in the United States nets 5 cents profit out of every $1 of sales. The trunk airlines last year had to do $83 worth of business to produce the same nickel profit.

As most of you know, there are more complicated formulas for determining the adequacy of the profits of public utilities. For example, the Civil Aeronautics Board, after a 4½-year investigation, concluded last year that the trunk airlines needed earnings equivalent to a 10.5 percent return on capital investment.

That means that the sum of net profits plus the interest paid on long-term loans should be 10.5 percent of the capital invested by stockholders and that invested by lending institutions.

The $1.1 million net profit I mentioned is the return on stockholders equity; the return to lender was $43.7 million or the interest paid by the trunks in 1960. Add them together and they come to 2.9 percent of total investment, far below the 10.5 percent that CAB determined the airlines need. In fact, it would have taken about $118 million more in net operating profits to show a return equivalent to what the Government deems necessary.

While 1960 was the worst profit year in over a decade for the airlines, it was by no means the only year of subnormal profits. It was the fifth consecutive year in which profits have fallen far below the standards set by CAB.

This is the situation in an industry committed to one of the most progressive expansion and modernization programs in the history of American business. Over $3 billion is involved in this undertaking. Yet, the trunklines' profit last year would barely be enough for a healthy downpayment on a new airplane. It would just about cover the cost of the engines on one new jet.

I cannot stress enough the need for correcting this situation.

But corrective measures that might be forthcoming seem lost somewhere in the haze of what might be described as a strange paradox. There are those, as I mentioned, who seem to misconstrue the airlines' dynamic growth and modernization as prima facie evidence of financial well-being.

This reflects an attitude that seems to say that an airline that buys new airplanes, installs modern ground facilities, etc., must be well off—otherwise it couldn't afford such expensive equipment.

The purchase and utilization of the best tools available is a major part of meeting that obligation. When, in the course of progress and event, the tools are completely revolutionized—as was the case when jet-powered aircraft came along—meeting that obligation assumes massive proportions.

The only alternatives are: get the tools and give the public the best—or voluntary stagnation. And, as you well know, stagnation is no alternative in world aviation today—it is a death sentence.

Nor are the tools we are now getting the ultimate in what we will be operating. These are the subsonic jets. In the next decade we probably will be dealing with supersonic jets. And beyond that who can accurately predict?

Nor are these amazingly advanced and productive machines merely expensive playthings. On the contrary, they represent the safest and most efficient tools that technology has yet produced to serve the public need. When you consider that the entire U.S. certificated industry, that is, trunks, international, local service carriers, helicopter, air cargo, Alaskan and Hawaiian paid some $65 million in interest alone in 1960, it is apparent there is nothing casual about airline modernization.

The fact that airline management has consistently exhibited the courage necessary to move ahead, to provide the best possible service for the American public, despite severe handicaps and obstacles, should not be accepted at face value as economic strength.

The airline industry is modern, progressive, and growing, but it is not rich. It is in serious financial trouble.

In saying that, I don't suggest or imply that the industry will collapse overnight. The need for air service is too strongly woven into the economic and social fabric of the modern world. And that need is increasing daily. Nor do I imply that the airlines will cut corners on service and safety to accommodate poor profit results.

But it stands to reason that the ability of an industry to progress is strained when the circumstances in which it must operate exclude reasonable earnings. This country can no more afford to strive for the status quo in civil aviation than it can in the military, space, or broad industrialization fields. It is bound by the events of the world today to gear itself to maximum progress.

Since 1946, the railroads have suffered a 70-percent decline in total passenger miles. Their passenger deficits have averaged $585 million a year. Yet, a 20-year-old tax continues to discourage passenger use of their facilities.

The intercity bus fleet of the Nation has decreased since World War II yet the reduced fleet is operating at less than 50 percent of capacity today.

While airline passenger traffic has grown dramatically, the fact is that growth is being stifled by the unfair travel tax.

Of course, what happens is that the tax serves first to discourage travel at all, and second, to drive many of those who would travel away from the common carrier system onto our overburdened highways.

This is borne out by the figures which show that, since 1950, common carrier passenger travel has increased only 19 percent while travel by private automobile has increased 77 percent. Over that same period,

the common carrier share of the total market dropped from 15 to 10 percent.

It is interesting to reflect that if removal of the 10 percent tax were to permit common carriers to attract as little as 1 percent of private automobile travel, their traffic would be increased by almost 9 percent. If the railroads, buses, and airlines could but regain their 1950 portion of the total market, their traffic would increase over 45 percent.

What strength would flow into our common carrier system today with 45 percent more passenger traffic? Is the revenue from this 10 percent tax worth denial of that strength to such an essential national industry? Is it worth denial of the benefits that would flow throughout the whole economy?

The Government continues to grant new routes to foreign airlines to this country without, in many cases, consideration of the impact on U.S. carriers. The consideration we may exact in exchange is in areas completely unrelated to air transport economics.

One can't rightly object to friendly gestures to traditional allies, especially considering the condition that the world is in today. But the policy can be overdone. We certainly don't want to be like the fellow who, when his own house is in serious need of repair, spends all his time helping his neighbor improve his house. We would gain little respect that way.

And, believe me, we better look to repairing our own house. Ten years ago, the U.S. airlines carried 75 percent of the air traffic between this country and foreign lands. Last year, the U.S. carriers' percentage of this traffic was only 51.8 percent. The drop from 1959 to 1960 alone was five percentage points.

On the important North Atlantic route, that is, between the United States and Europe, our airlines last year carried only about 38 percent of the business.

What we are witnessing is a modern day version of the sad decline of our merchant marine—only the airline decline is occurring at a much more rapid pace.

And this is not limited solely to overwater competition. Our entire airline network is affected. The foreign carriers to which our Government has given domestic penetration rights, in addition to normal gateway rights, are diverting passengers who normally would fly via U.S. domestic carriers.

Sadly, our Government gives no indication of reversing this alarming trend. On the contrary, recent news reports indicate it is backing down from one of the few courageous stands it has taken in this entire area. I refer to the recent State Department notification that it has agreed to confer with the Netherlands Government on KLM's request for additional U.S. landing rights, this time at Los Angeles.

A year ago, the United States stood firmly against a Dutch request to add Los Angeles to the landing rights it already had at New York, Miami, and Houston. We will now apparently entertain this request even though KLM receives some 30 times the revenue from operating across the North Atlantic as our carriers receive from operating to Amsterdam.

We have already lost almost two-thirds of the North Atlantic traffic to the 17 foreign lines now operating that route. How much of our domestic market are we going to give up to those lines which are stretching clear across to the west coast for traffic?

Make no mistake about it. There is a race on in the world today for civil aviation supremacy. It includes the airlines of friendly nations and those of the Communist bloc, particularly the fast-growing system of the Soviet Union. Our air transport industry asks no special favors in this race—not even from our own Government. We ask simply that the race be a fair one.

The San Francisco News-Call Bulletin, Reporter Donald Canter, and 9,000 San Franciscans Receive 1961 Inter-American Press Association - Tom Wallace Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following in a series of articles, relative to the situation in Chile, written by Donald Canter. These articles are included within the award-winning series:

[From the San Francisco News-Call Bulletin, June 28, 1960]

YOU HELPED THESE CHILENOS

(By Donald Canter)

Down Catrico Hill we came, Laura and I.

The gummy adobe soil sucked into my shoes with every step.

Not in Laura's. She had no shoes.

My pants were rainsoaked and soiled with mud.

Not Laura's. She had neither pants nor skirt.

I tried to avoid the filthy pools that blocked our descent.

Not Laura. She waded through them, often knee deep.

But then, her undernourished little body was already one with the mud.

I was searching for people to live in quake-torn Valdivia's city of San Francisco housing project—made possible through $33,000 of the money donated by generous News-Call Bulletin readers—when Laura's path crossed mine.

A social worker had given me the address of a family said to live in the debris of their shattered home.

On my way, a bunch of barefooted, half-dressed children followed me over the rubble-strewn streets, shouting the only English words they knew: "Chiclets, please, senor."

The smiles on their faces as I gave them candy froze when I asked directions to the street I sought.

One stretched out his arm: "That way," he said. Then they deserted me.

Within a few minutes I was wading through foot-deep water extending as far as I could see. Scattered remains of caved-in shacks rose from the water, but very little debris was floating around.

Then I saw the hill. From the front it looked like a giant mud heap crawling with undefinable creatures. Were those creatures human beings who had lived in the flooded lowland and dragged themselves and pathetic remnants of their shacks onto the hill?

I sloshed through the water and crawled onto the hill on all fours.

There they stood, the people of Catrico, gazing at me from the entrances of their hovels as if I came from another planet.

From the adobe rose a mud-covered bundle that had the shape of a little girl. No shoes, no skirt. Just a rag draped about the top of her body. This was Laura.

She touched the army jacket I'd borrowed from the Embassy in Santiago. I cried out loud.

I took Laura by the hand and started to move down the hill. Nobody spoke a word. We waded through the mud. I fell flat in it. Laura didn't. She waited for me.

We walked 2 miles to the Catrico emergency center. There, with the help of social worker Blanca Freire, an ex-San Franciscan, I removed the rags and aimed a DDT gun at the lice on her body.

From a stack of clothes I grabbed underwear, skirt, blouse and sweater. Laura hardly moved as Blanca dressed her. I washed her face with a few drops of Valdivia's scarce water. She was pretty.

I asked her age. Seven years, she said.

An hour later Laura and I were back on the hill. There were smiles as they saw her metamorphosis.

She went back to the shack where her parents and eight brothers and sisters huddled on two soiled mattresses.

I offered Laura's father an apartment in the city of San Francisco housing project in the neighboring Gilde Castro district. I told him that was high ground and safe from floods.

He shook his head.

"That's a wonderful thing you're offering and God bless the people of San Francisco for it," he said. But he added: "I can't take it. The water that came with the quake and tidal wave will go one day. Under it is land I own. It's all we have. We want to live there."

But he knew the family I'd first been looking for. They had moved from the hill to a refugee center in the city.

"They'll love it," he assured.

I didn't find the Jorge Vasquez family in the refugee center, but in a friend's home in the Gilde Castro district, near where the first apartment houses of the city of San Francisco will soon stand.

Jorge's four children were there: Maria, 5; Jorge Hernan, 4; Monica, 3, and Victor Eliso, 1 month.

I asked for his wife and he told me:

"That Sunday when the quake struck I worked in the morning at my job as a furnituremaker. I quit at 2 and went to the hospital to visit my wife, Zumilda, who had a baby the previous day.

"I stayed with her only 45 minutes because she was very tired. Moments after I left the hospital the earth trembled and then it shook and shook, I fell on the street, but it kept moving and houses collapsed all around me.

"The only thing I could think of was my wife and the baby. I rushed back. The hospital had split. Concrete blocks were all over the place. I rushed up six floors to my wife's room. I took the baby of 1 day in one arm and dragged my wife down six flights of stairs with the other.

"Four days later my wife died of a hemorrhage, senor."

Within 4 months, when the first apartment houses of the city of San Francisco are ready for occupancy, Jorge and his children will move in. Living with them there will be his parents and two inlaws, who also lost everything they had.

They will occupy a three-bedroom unit with living room, dining area, kitchen, and bath, built for them by warm-hearted readers of the News-Call Bulletin. They will be 9 of about 100 people who will move into 11 concrete-and-redwood apartments near the end of October—the 100 will live rent-free for 3 months, then pay $10 a month into a bank account which, when it grows big enough, will be used to build additional homes for the stricken families of the Valdivia.

But isn't a three-bedroom apartment too small for a family of nine?

"To us it will be a palace, senor, created by the Lord Himself."

That's what Jorge Vasquez said.

BUILDING PLAN IN CHILE

First phase of building program financed by News-Call Bulletin's Chilean Quake Fund:

Three apartment buildings housing approximately 100 people.

Two-story structures, built in triangle with central playground.

Land donated by Chilean Housing Authority, which supervises construction.

Completion expected within 4 months.

Financial arrangements:

Construction cost: $33,000.

Tenants make monthly payments of $10.

No payments for 3 months.

Rental proceeds to be used for more buildings.

Free administration by Housing Authority.

[From the San Francisco News-Call Bulletin, June 30, 1960]

YOUR GIFT RENEWS VALDIVIAN'S HOPE

(By Donald Canter)

Until May 22 of this year Humberto Segundo Leiva, 34, made $80 a month as a dental technician at Valdivia, on Chile's west coast.

This was more than the average take-home pay of his fellow Valdivians, and Leiva, a careful man, had carefully budgeted his income to acquire sturdy furniture and precious materials for the dental lab he'd installed in a backroom of his home.

He was, he thought, leading the good life. He had four children by his 27-year-old wife, Encarnacion del Carmen, and they were expecting their fifth momentarily.

At 3:12 p.m. on May 22, the first tremor of Valdivia's city-shattering quake struck the Leivas' home.

The living room collapsed. Falling debris wrecked all their furniture and buried the whole family.

Leiva managed to free himself, then dragged his wife and youngsters from the shambles. Only Son Alejandro, 7, was hurt, his face cut by glass.

For a moment the Leivas huddled in a corner of their ravaged living room. The earth rocked again, stronger this time.

Leiva rushed to push open the door. It was jammed. He kicked it—how many times he doesn't recall. Finally it gave way. He herded his family into the street, carefully helped his wife to a seat on the rubble-strewn cobblestones.

Another quake rocked Valdivia—a quake seismologists later said showed a force of 7.4 on the Richter Scale (San Francisco's 1906 quake registered 8.2).

Before Leiva's awe-stricken eyes the rear of his home, with his precious dental lab, disintegrated.

An adjoining home toppled, crashing within feet of the Leivas.

The family fled, leaving in ruins a newly purchased cradle.

The youngest Leiva came into the world under the roof of a hospitable friend.

Today the careful dental technician is working for a college whose lab still stands.

But soon he'll be on his own again. A few blocks from his old neighborhood a city of San Francisco is raising, and the Leivas will be among its residents.

The project, built through generosity of News-Call Bulletin readers, is scheduled for completion in October.

Its first structures are three apartment buildings erected at a cost of $33,000. They will consists of 11 three-bedroom units, complete with living room, kitchen, bathroom, flush toilet, and a central playground for children.

Leiva, like other tenants of the city of San Francisco, will live rent free for 3 months, then make monthly payments of $10 for 30 years, after which the apartment becomes his property.

His money, together with all other payments, will be deposited in a special account of the Banco de Chile. The moment sufficient funds have accumulated, more homes will be built in Valdivia's San Francisco on a site donated by the Chilean Housing Authority.

When I'd finished negotiating for construction of this development, the first permanent housing project after Valdivia's disastrous quakes, I asked Leiva for a down-to-earth appraisal of the project.

His answer:

"Senor, this is the kind of help the people of Valdivia have been praying for. We hadn't expected these prayers to come true so fast and certainly not through the prompt action of thousands of unknown San Franciscans, 10,000 kilometers away.

"Sure, we've been grateful for the food, clothing, and medicine we've received from every corner of the world. Those have kept us alive, senor. But they were not enough to live. For that you need a roof over your head, a decent roof. And that senor, the people of San Francisco are now giving us. How can we ever repay them?"

I showed Leiva the list of his fellow tenants, handpicked by social worker Blanca Freire and myself.

Among them is a diabetic, now trying to survive with his clan of eight in an overcrowded refugee camp; a cabinet maker, whose four children lost their mother in the quake; an upholsterer whose family of eight has to call a stable at Valdivia's farm exposition grounds their home.

"Never, as long as we live, and never as long as our children live, will we forget who built us a roof when ours was down. The name San Francisco will forever be engraved in our minds.

[From the San Francisco News-Call Bulletin, July 1, 1960]

YOUR GIFT WINS OVER YANQUI-HATER

(By Donald Canter)

It happened in the Chilean town of San Jose de Mariquina, 30 miles north of quake-shattered Valdivia.

My mission—to determine how the funds amassed in the News-Call Bulletin's Chilean Quake Fund could be used most effectively—was completed and I was heading home.

But transportation was poor and I decided to try to hitch a ride on a freight going north.

The conductor was a broad-shouldered, rough-looking character named Fernando Valenzuela.

"Who are you, anyhow?" he asked me.

I told him.

"Get in," he said.

I climbed into the caboose. Valenzuela followed me.

"Know why I took you aboard?" he said with a grin.

I wasn't quite sure. So he let me know:

"Because all of my life I've been a Yanqui-hater, that's why."

"Thank you for being so honest," I countered. "Mind telling me why you're giving me this ride?"

Valenzuela smiled enigmatically.

"First I'll cook you a dinner," he said.

He did and served it with a bottle of young Chilean wine.

After Valenzuela cleaned the crude wooden table of the last crumbs, he resumed:

"Anti-Yanqui, violently anti-Yanqui, that's what I've been all my life. Then came this quake, and the American Globemasters came. They didn't have to. Nobody asked them. They brought medicine and clothes and food. A lot of other Americans came. I watched them. They talked little—not a word about politics—and worked hard. Most worked harder than our own people.

"Then you came. I know all about you. You say you're a newspaperman from San Francisco and that you were in Valdivia. So you must be that fellow who collected money for us and is going to build homes. I read all about you. Nobody asked you to do that. You did it anyhow.

"Why? That's what I asked myself."

Valenzuela wiped his forehead with a dirty rag.

"I speak English," he said. "I've got a college education. I'm supposed to have some intelligence.

"Because I've got intelligence, there was only one thing to tell myself:

"Valenzuela, you've been stinking wrong all of your life. You're not anti-Yanqui. You just told yourself you were."

He looked me straight in the eyes:

"That's why I gave you this ride," he said.

President Kennedy's Tax Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Taxpayer's Still Not Happy," which appeared April 22, 1961, in the Lafayette (Ind.) Journal Courier.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAXPAYER'S LOT STILL NOT HAPPY

Every time taxes come up for revision, taxpayers always light up with hope, but inevitably plunge again into the dark despair which is their normal estate.

Such was the case as they waited for, and then heard, President Kennedy's tax proposals.

There was little to take comfort in, except that things don't look like they'll go up much. But neither will they go down—a direction every taxpayer some day hopes to see.

Individuals face basic Federal taxes just about like they have been, but dividends on stocks will be depleted by higher taxes, no exclusions, and subjected to withholding.

Corporations, scheduled for a five-point tax reduction on July 1, will just have to whistle for it. The President wants present rates renewed and the reduction forgotten about.

Excise taxes, also scheduled to be reduced or expire on July 1, will stay on at present rates of President Kennedys' proposals prevail. And jet fuels will join them with a new 2-cent-a-gallon tax.

Loopholes which many riding expense accounts have galloped through to combine business expenses with the costs of pleasure will be plugged with fewer deductions and more enforcement under the Kennedy plan.

The President's proposals did present some help to businesses burdened by poor depreciation allowances and obsolete equipment. The recommendation was for tax reductions for investments in plant and equipment up to 30 percent of the firm's or businessman's taxes for 1 year. But it's still short of needs for a solid, realistic, long-range depletion allowance schedule which would recognize how quickly equipment can become obsolete and require replacing in this fast-moving age. And it's not as much encouragement for dynamic industrial expansion, plant building and modernizing as the country needs right now.

One thing the taxpayers were promised with some certainty: More Treasury agents to check returns and the assignment of an account number to each taxpayer so each person's reports and activities can be followed more closely.

So for another year, it looks like taxpayers will come out pretty much as they always do—second-best to the Government.

The Waiting Is Over

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the successful space flight of astronaut Alan B. Shepard, Jr., a commander in the U.S. Navy, will be forever recorded as one of the bright moments in history for our Nation.

While much has already been written and much has been said concerning this important achievement, I believe it is important—if for no other reason than the sake of history—that the observations made by those who were on the scene should also be recorded for posterity.

Two such observations were reported to the American public this past Sunday on the NBC radio program "Weekend Report," by Mr. Russell Tornabene and Mr. Robert Abernethy.

I think both of these fine reports give us further opportunity to understand something of the strain and tension that enveloped those who were so much a part of this operation, and the type of men that we have serving our country in these vital assignments.

I ask permission to include in the Appendix of the RECORD at this point these excellent reports of Mr. Tornabene and Mr. Abernethy, which were aired over the NBC radio network.

There being no objection, the reports were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(By Russell Tornabene)

Among the many arts the rocket launchers and space pioneers must have is the art of waiting. No one likes to wait; it's more tiring than action, often is more exhaustive than work. But the hundreds of men who helped launch Alan Shepard last Friday have learned the art of waiting, the art of patience—of being in readiness.

Waiting is the mother of tension; the longer the wait, the preparation, the checking of a thousand and yet another hundred items, the longer it takes—the higher the tension. The men who helped launch Shepard have waited before, by the hour have sat before the radar scopes, the dials, the control boards. But this time, in the darkness before dawn Friday, the waiting seemed more charged for them, for a simple reason. A live man was sitting in a metal cabin atop their rocket.

It's said at Cape Canaveral that wives of the rocket launchers and the missile scientists at the Florida installation go down to the sands of Cocoa Beach when they know a manmade bird is to be put into flight. They stand there, knowing their men purse their lips and squint their eyes and frown in a blockhouse down the beach behind the well-guarded launch area. It's said when a missile is destroyed after launch, the men bite their lips—and their wives, on a nearby beach, cry.

We who covered the Mercury story, who prepared to report and to broadcast live the first attempt to put a man into space, were well aware of one Satan sitting on the beach—possible utter, complete failure of the mission, the possible death of the man. Who among the 500 news people there had no heart, who did not take 1 second at blastoff to offer a quick prayer?

The zero count did come, there was fire at the base of the Redstone, there was the holding of breath by us all as the burning fuel finally urged the rocket from the pad, the delayed thunder of the machine, it's flight straight up and then to the Atlantic waters where other men waited, too—the men who would pick Shepard from the waters, the men who would attend him, who would doctor him if necessary.

Mercury control gave crisp reports as the rocket winged 5,000 miles an hour from the cape with its precious, its historic passenger. Blood pressure, perspiration, breathing, speed, response to the weird demands of space travel upon a human.

Fifteen minutes after the rocket lifted from a concrete slab in Florida, the space capsule landed gently by parachute in the water, a helicopter picked up its passenger and let him down on the deck of a ship. It was said Alan Shepard hopped casually from the sling that brought him to the ship. The years of preparation before that moment were anything but casual.

(By Robert Abernethy)

The other evening in Cocoa Beach, a group of us were sitting at dusk on the terrace behind a comfortable new motel. There may have been some music in the background. The weather was good, and a few children took another plunge into the swimming pool before bedtime. Suddenly, we looked up and saw a man in a white tee-shirt and white shorts jogging over the sand to the beach.

It was John Glenn, one of the astronauts, off for his daily 2-mile run.

Glen is almost 40, a superb physical specimen whose doctors say he is physiologically 10 years younger than his chronological age. Like Alan Shepard and all the astronauts, he is highly trained and deeply disciplined.

I think at that moment, there on the terrace by the pool, a number of us felt as if our relaxation were in fact indulgence, and our talk just like a shell for lives which suddenly seemed soft.

The seven astronauts are remarkable men. All of them have the equivalent of a bachelor's degree in engineering. All are military test pilots. Their faces are lean and their eyes alert. Watching one of them run on the beach or ride into space may make one feel older, or envious, or regretful. But it also makes one proud of the kind of men this country can produce.

One of the interesting things about these seven is that most of them are from towns with names which sound as if they are relatively small. Carpenter is from Boulder, Colo., and Schirra from Hackensack, N.J. But Cooper is from Shawnee, Okla.; Glenn from New Concord, Ohio; Grissom from Mitchell, Ind.; Shepard from East Derry, N.H.; and Slayton from Sparta, Wis.

There was a time not too long ago when a boy growing up knew the rest of the world by train whistles. His dreams of adventure usually began with the sounds of the railroad and the imagined luxury of a pullman car appointed in green plush. More recently, the dreams of the young have involved the automobile and the airplane. Now, it is space.

All over the country, youngsters today are probably dreaming of following the trajectory of Alan Shepard.

But how did Shepard come to his flight last week? What did he and Grissom and Glenn dream of when they were boys?

They have been asked this. But they have not admitted to anything more than normal attention to Buck Rogers.

Shepard and Schirra are career officers, graduates of Annapolis. The others got into the service during the war, became pilots, then test pilots, then astronauts.

But one reason they are doing what they are doing today is that they stayed in the service after the war. And one reason for that may have been that they were from small towns. In 1945, a military career to a successful young officer from a small town—especially to a pilot—may have seemed more attractive than it did to his counterpart from a large city, where there may have been more civilian opportunities to which to go home.

If this is so, we should be grateful. And if men like the astronauts are what small towns can produce, we should do something quickly to help stamp out cities, before their steady spread swallows up the towns now producing the Shepards and Grissoms and Glenns of tomorrow.

Law Day in Los Angeles, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 2, 1961

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, May 1 marked the fourth annual observance of Law Day, U.S.A. nationwide. In Los Angeles, Calif., the main event of Law Day ceremonies was a Law Day luncheon at the famous Cocoanut Grove of the Ambassador Hotel. Participating in this most outstanding observance were more than 100 women's organizations, representing a cross section of the leading civic, business and professional women's organizations in the area. Also on the program were 12 women judges, other leaders of the bench and bar, top public officials, civic leaders, and other distinguished guests.

Miss Adele I. Springer, past president of the National Association of Women Lawyers and national chairman of the committee on law day and world peace through law, presided at the Law Day luncheon and welcomed the participants.

Miss Springer delivered an address on the objectives of making Law Day, U.S.A., worldwide.

The meeting also heard Law Day addresses by Justice Mildred L. Lillie, of the California District Court of Appeal, who is the highest ranking woman judge in the Nation, and James C. Sheppard, president of the State Bar of California.

I am including herewith these three outstanding addresses which were delivered at the Law Day meeting in Los Angeles, and am sure that these remarks of outstanding members of the legal profession on Law Day will be of special interest to my colleagues:

LAW DAY, 1961

(Address by Adele I. Springer, past president, National Association of Women Lawyers, national chairman, Committee on Law Day and World Peace Through Law)

The women lawyers have adopted a new slogan this Law Day: "Law can launch peace into world orbit; lets win the case for world peace through law."

The growing fear and defeatism which mark the current state of the world give

urgency to the efforts of all who seek world peace.

Law Day is a reminder that lawyers have always been in the front ranks as defenders of individual rights, and in directing social movements, in overthrowing tyranny, exposing intrigue, enacting laws and maintaining our constitutional system of government.

Women lawyers, trained in government and law, should and must take the leadership in bringing the objectives of Law Day to the women of the world.

Women lawyers can lead the way and can assist, but cannot alone produce the results which are required. Concerted understanding and action with other women and organizations are essential. In larger numbers we must take counsel together on those problems which press for solution in our Nation and in the world.

The need and the challenge are great—to assist in establishing a workable system of law and order in the world. Replacement of the rule of force by the rule of law is the only hope. Just as people take their disputes to court and disobedience of law is punished, nations should settle their disputes in a world court and the judgments of a world tribunal should be enforced.

With concerted action women can make their voice heard for world peace through law.

Womanpower can launch peace into world orbit. Womanpower is the greatest unreleased power in the world today. Womanpower can and must win the case for world peace through law. It can be done.

LAW DAY 1961

(Remarks of Justice Mildred L. Lillie of the California District Court of Appeals)

In 1958, American lawyers, realizing that most people in this country are neither aware of the true meaning of the rule of law nor appreciate its essential place in American life, procured the President of the United States to proclaim Law Day on May 1—to foster a deeper respect for law, to point up the contrast between freedom under law in a democracy and tyranny and oppression under the communistic ideology celebrated on May Day in the countries of the Soviet Union, and to encourage the settlement of international disputes under law. It is today we rededicate ourselves to freedom under law.

But the mere assertion of individual rights and liberties guaranteed by the constitution and laws and the declaration of principles of a democratic government is not enough—they can only be given meaning and substance by independent courts and a legal system dedicated to preserving them. Lawyers, a great factor in the administration of justice, are the technicians of democracy; they are essential to the implementation of the rule of law—indeed, to its very existence. Freedom under law cannot be maintained without the safeguards provided by our courts, or without confidence in our lawyers, or without faith in our judiciary, court proceedures and decisions. The Judiciary of this country is dedicated to the living American ideal of equal justice under law, and has the profound responsibility by its service to government and by education, of maintaniing and preserving our system under the rule of law that secures individual rights, freedoms and dignity and guarantees an impartial forum; of protecting and passing on to future generations our judicial system which unconditionally guarantees justice under law; of preserving and strengthening the administration of justice at home, and of extending the rule of law as an instrumentality of peace and orderly progress in all international relations.

LAW DAY 1961

(Remarks of James C. Sheppard, president of the State Bar of California)

This is the fourth annual observance of Law Day, U.S.A., in America. This is not a day of celebration, but a day of dedication. Our priceless liberties are preserved by law. Our government derives its power from the people, and exists only with the consent of the governed. For the rights which we enjoy, there are correlative duties. These are the duties which we individually owe to our government. It is later than we think. Just 90 miles off our shores a fortress of communism is being built. There, Cuba is an immense concentration camp where millions of anxiety stricken Cubans live under a ferocious, inhuman, cruel and fanatical tyranny. As in other redoubts of communism, the courts are but a part of the executive authority of a totalitarian state. When courts cease to be independent liberty dies.

Let us here dedicate ourselves to a renewed faith in our democratic republic. Let us here resolve that this government and these liberties shall not perish from the earth. Let us determine that we shall observe and respect and preserve a government of law.

Tribute to FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday, J. Edgar Hoover celebrated the 37th anniversary of his appointment as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

In itself, this long tenure of public service is worthy of recognition.

Of greater significance to the American people, however, is his dedicated, imaginative, farsighted, fighting leadership, unparalleled in our history, in combating crime, strengthening our internal security and promoting peace and order in our society.

Under his directorship, the FBI has set new standards of law enforcement, worthy of emulation throughout the world. In addition to effective law enforcement, the integrity and dedication to service of Mr. Hoover and his associates in the Bureau have elicited new respect for law and justice in our people.

Reappointed by President after President, regardless of political party, Mr. Hoover has rigidly established high standards and required conformance to such standards by his employees.

Rightfully known as "Mr. FBI," J. Edgar Hoover deserves a salute of gratitude from the American people for his long, splendid record of outstanding service.

Yesterday, the Washington Daily News published an article by Lyle C. Wilson entitled "A Toast to J. Edgar Hoover."

Reflecting some of the highlights of Mr. Hoover's accomplishments, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, May 10, 1961]

A TOAST TO J. EDGAR HOOVER

(By Lyle C. Wilson)

Now is the time for all good men to drink an anniversary toast in wine or water to J. Edgar Hoover of the FBI.

Today is the 37th anniversary of his appointment as FBI director. That choice was made by the late Harlan Fiske Stone, Attorney General in the Coolidge Cabinet before he was boosted to the U.S. Supreme Court.

The Justice Department and its investigative arm had been in ill repute before Justice Stone and Mr. Hoover began in 1924 to figure in the headlines.

William J. Burns was head G-man during the Harding administration and Harry M. Daugherty was Mr. Harding's Attorney General. Mr. Daugherty was head of the so-called Ohio Gang, a principal figure in the scandals which degraded the Harding administration. President Coolidge forced Mr. Daugherty out of the Cabinet in 1924, named Justice Stone to succeed him.

One of Justice Stone's first acts was to name 29-year-old J. Edgar Hoover director of the newly created FBI. Messrs. Stone and Hoover began accomplishing the almost impossible. Their task was to restore public confidence in the Department of Justice. Mr. Daugherty left the Department under charges of corruption growing out of an investigation which, according to the Encyclopedia of American History, "revealed that the Attorney General, acting in concert with members of the Ohio Gang, had received payments from violators of the prohibition laws (and) also disclosed that Mr. Daugherty had failed to prosecute for graft in the Veterans Bureau." He was acquitted in 1927 on a conspiracy charge.

Mr. Hoover established high standards for the FBI. He compelled his men and his organization to conform precisely to those standards. Soon, Mr. Hoover became and has remained a legend in his own time. It became standard operating procedure for the Congress and Presidents of the United States to turn to Mr. Hoover and his men when the Nation was troubled with a law enforcement problem of great magnitude and the citizens were uneasy in their beds at night.

That is the way it was when Charles A. Lindbergh, Jr., was kidnaped and murdered. Congress enacted the Lindburgh kidnap law and stipulated that Mr. Hoover and the FBI should enforce it. Not a moment too soon, either. When prohibition finally came to an end, the hoodlums who had been enriched by bootleg booze turned to kidnaping as a new bonanza. Others began knocking over national banks. They, also, were in FBI jurisdiction. One by one, the Dillingers and the Machine Gun Kelleys were disposed of.

Meantime, the Communists were crawling out of the internal woodwork in the United States. Mr. Hoover and the FBI drew the assignment to ride herd on them. Then began the ceaseless effort of the American commies, their friends, and their dupes to get Mr. Hoover.

Mr. Hoover and the FBI comprise the most effective roadblock in this country to the objective of all Communists here and abroad which is to bury the American way of life.

Harry S. Truman probably was under the greatest pressure of any President to fire Mr. Hoover and to cripple the FBI. H.S.T. wouldn't have dared even if he had wanted to do that. To Edgar Hoover: Skoal.

Tall Statesman From Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the great record of service of our distinguished senior Senator, JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, from Arkansas, is well known. As chairman of the great Committee on Government Operations of the U.S. Senate and to the Special Investigating Committee he has performed a service to his country which in my judgment is unsurpassed.

He has been the recipient of many outstanding awards for service he has performed to his State and country and received many honors in recognition of his outstanding performances.

In the performance of public service and especially in intricate and important policy matters on which there is difference of opinion one often encounters contrary views and criticism. It is well known however that Senator MCCLELLAN is not easily disturbed because someone may have a different opinion on a matter of public policy. "He is too big to let such things bother him." This statement was contained in an article of the California Industrial News, Monday, May 8, 1961.

The article is entitled "Tall Statesman From Arkansas," by John Marschalk. It is a tribute to the Senator, well deserved, and I ask unanimous consent that it be included with these remarks:

This is our day for eating crow, and enjoying it.

A few weeks back this space carried a column titled "Collectivist Invention" in which the facts were right as rain, but there weren't enough of them.

Result, we did an injustice to one of our finest statesmen. Though we are sure the piece did the gentleman no harm—he is too big to let such things bother him—the impression given needs correcting for our own sake.

The statesman is Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas. Among other honors, Senator MCCLELLAN is chairman of the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks and Copyrights of the Senate Judiciary Committee. His committee is currently holding hearings on two bills; S. 1176 by Senator LONG and S. 1084 introduced by Senator MCCLELLAN himself.

Both of these bills are opposed by every businessman we have talked to.

Summed up, these bills would take away the right of inventors to patents in any inventions where the Government has contributed even the slightest fraction of assistance in the form of a research contract. (Under the Long bill, a subcontractor who received not a dime of Government money toward his invention would still lose his patent rights.)

As earlier noted, Senator MCCLELLAN's bill would establish that "Notwithstanding any law, custom, usage, or practice to the contrary, no invention resulting from a research contract or grant financed by the United States shall be patented other than in the name of the United States."

We observed that this is a whole-hog proposition—that the Government already gets the right to use all such inventions for Government purposes—but that this proposal would prohibit the inventor from even having a patent to exploit his invention commercially.

Seeing as how the Government dollar doesn't do the thinking which produces the invention—and may only represent a tiny portion of the total dollars spent in development—the proposition has struck us as being both unfair to the inventor and shortsighted for the public. At a time when we need every possible inducement to advance technology, such bills would darn near club inventors to stay away from Government contracts.

Our views on these bills have not changed a bit. Nor have the facts. But like we say, there weren't enough of them—the facts, that is—in our earlier column. So they gave the wrong impression—and we'll eat the crow with pleasure.

The fact we didn't know that Senator MCCLELLAN introduced S. 1084, not as a reflection of his own views, but to keep a promise to the former subcommittee chairman, the retired Senator O'Mahoney who originated the bill in the last session. Additionally, Senator MCCLELLAN felt that the subject could best be considered in the spotlight of public hearings.

Happily, the truth was evident to anyone who attended the first 4 days of the hearings, April 18 to 21.

Every action of the Senator made clear that his mind was not made up ahead of time, that he was probing for facts, that he wanted to pick his way through the conflicting claims of the anti-private-patent boys, versus those of the believers that patents and productivity still walk hand-in-hand.

With one witness after another—pro and con—Senator MCCLELLAN listened to a volume of verbage. In each case he seemed to have the wheat separated from the chaff long before the testimony ended. Usually, he summed up an entire presentation in a single phrase to which the witness quickly agreed.

"Basically, that states your position?" the Senator would ask.

"Yes, sir," the witness would reply.

We wouldn't venture a guess as to how these hearings will come out. Our impression of the committee staff was quite different from our impression of the Senator. Whenever committee counsel had the floor, he conveyed to us the impression that he was intent on building the record in favor of the two bills.

Whether this impression of counsel was correct or not, Senator MCCLELLAN obviously stands on his own two feet. We are glad he is there. Our country can use more men like him.

Senator, to us, you stand 9 feet tall.

A Forward Strategy for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I recommend for thoughtful reading in critical times a new book published as a Foreign Policy Research Institute book, University of Pennsylvania, by Messrs. Strausz-Hupe, Kintner, and Possony.

To illustrate the vital need for tougher thinking about an alert, reasoned, and determined forward strategy for the United States, I attach some pertinent excerpts from the conclusions reached in this careful study.

I ask unanimous consent that the excerpts be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM "A FORWARD STRATEGY FOR AMERICA"

(By Strausz-Hupé, Kintner and Possony)

The unsure response of the Western Powers to repeated Communist-instigated crises and the ever-resurgent hopes of Western democracies for a magic formula for peace bespeak the drift of the Western mood at the threshold of the sixties—the decade considered by the Soviets as the most crucial operational period in their history. The Soviets, beset by the internal contradictions of the Communist world, may try to finish us. Our defeat will free their hands for settling domestic issues. Communist ideological vulnerabilities and the latent antagonism among the peoples of the Communist bloc argue persuasively for the Kremlin to adopt a course of action that will insulate the Communist experiment from interference from outside. There is, last but not least, the problem of Kremlin succession. The present generation of Russian Communist leaders must seek to bring about a decisive change in the balance of power in order to harvest the fruits of victory. They may have left, at best, only 10 years to do the job. For the very dynamics of the power struggle within the Communist orbit accelerate the momentum of Communist strategy. The Communists, if they want to remain standing, must seek to keep us off balance to cause us to fall.

Neither our people nor our Government, nor for that matter the free peoples in general, have agreed on the basic nature of the Communist threat. Lacking this consensus, they cannot agree on a common plan for meeting it.

We may assume that, as long as present trends in the free world continue, Communist power will grow not only absolutely but, far more important, relatively.

Only an American forward strategy can halt the Communist assault.

At present, we are dissipating much of our incomparable national power through defensive measures taken in counteraction to calamities which timely action on our part might have prevented. This is the heart of our strategic problem. Unless and until the United States discards strategic concepts that are passive or, at best, reactive, our choice will be confined to two equally disastrous alternatives: (1) To keep on living in a fool's paradise and to let ourselves be drained slowly of our strength, or (2) to risk the holocaust of nuclear destruction. Is it too much to ask of ourselves that our range of choice be wider?

How can the United States discharge its obligation to mankind and itself? The answer seems to lie in a paradoxical strategy that will engage us deliberately in a variegated range of "warfare" over an indefinite period for long-term political objectives. Our efforts should be always harnessed to the pursuit of prudent measures; toward limiting, but not to shrinking from, risk; and toward the positive, the creative solution.

Lacking the demonstrable capability for the measured employment of power in all its aspects, including military force, the art of statesmanship is reduced to an idle exercise in rhetoric. Rhetoric has its place in international politics, but neither clever arguments nor noble sentiments are substitutes for power.

Whether the United States does act in its true self-interest in the new few years de-

pends on its will to act and hence its will to sacrifice.

The principles of a forward strategy for the United States must be derived from the following propositions:

1. The priority objective of any American grand strategy is, by a broad margin, the preservation and enhancement of our political system rather than the maintenance of peace. All other objectives, such as increased social welfare and continuing economic progress, while interrelated with the primary objective, are of secondary importance. Historically, democracies have proved to be short lived. In the light of the unprecedented dangers which now beset human freedom, it behooves us to think through the weaknesses of the democratic system and to overcome them. Perhaps the root weakness of democracy is reluctance to gage the full measure of the perennial and ever-recurring threat to its very existence, the very precariousness of freedom. It is because of this deficiency of will that democracies cavil at taking the steps in time that will insure their defense in the moment of supreme peril. The very existence of so aggressive and dynamic a force as communism imperils the survival of democracy everywhere.

2. The argument that the permanent threat to our existence can be fought by limiting our initiatives to programs for better education, higher living standards and improved international cooperation for world economic development is not only fallacious but also dangerously deceptive. It detracts attention from the hard solutions which our continuing survival demands.

3. Alliances are an integral part of our security system. But alliances will not lighten our burden. Unless our intrinsic strength improves, defection will inevitably thin the ranks of our allies. Our own strength is the most convincing pledge of our loyalty to friends and allies. Our military programs are the hard core of our alliance systems and free world security. We do not hold with the comfortable assumption that economic assistance to the underdeveloped countries can be a satisfactory alternative to military and alliance programs. Programs of economic development redound to our benefit only if they are fitted as secondary elements in to an integrated system of strategy. Such an integrated system must be designed to deal with all techniques of conflict. At the very heart of the Communist strategic system lies the will and the commitment to permanent conflict.

4. However sound our long-range programs may be, the day-by-day decisions (and, in particular, the responses to crisis situations) are crucial. When the chips are down, an instant of equivocation can reduce the most elaborate and foresighted strategy to gibberish. Strategy is inseparable from the willingness to take risks and deny the enemy a guarantee of immunity in case he desists from a particular aggression. If it is our purpose to combat communism, then it follows that our overriding objective is not to preserve peace at all costs, but to destroy the aggressive power of communism. In approaching specific problems we should ask: Does the decision hurt the enemy or put him under pressure or at least compound his decision-making problems? Does it hasten his demise, or help to replenish his capabilities for waging international conflict? Firmness, hardness, of decision should not be mistaken for continuously rattling the saber. A sense of measure and moderation is the leaven of all constructive undertakings. But without the willingness to use force and without the sacrifice which the use of force as well as the prevention of war entails, no major international crisis ever has been settled short of appeasement or surrender.

5. Our political system is basically sound, but it must be stripped for action and, in part, reorganized so it is equal to its dangerous tasks in a dangerous environment. It would be foolish to pretend that, in a crisis in which societies are pitted against societies, the collective will is not a decisive element. Our collective will is weak, partly because our grasp on the meaning of the challenge has been weak—and because we persist in emphasizing the products of our system to the detriment of the system itself.

6. The fundamental decision before us is whether we should accept the Communist concept of coexistence in one form or the other or bring about the final defeat of communism.

Shorn of all ideological connotations, our policy must be based upon the premise that we cannot tolerate the survival of a political system which has both the growing capability and the ruthless will to destroy us. If we are to triumph in the protracted conflict, we have to face what it means to have implacable enemies who, in turn, deem us to be their implacable enemies. We have to cultivate those dour virtues which alone sustain a people in mortal combat. To equate democracy with vapidity of spirit and the indulgence of the flesh is an unforgivable insult to democracy. Freedom is not a marginal luxury. Of all forms of government, democracy should be the one best fitted to inspire men with the sense of what they owe to one another and to themselves. But, if the Communists prove to have more courage, a stronger will, a more steadfast spirit, a clearer intellectual insight into conflict in the nuclear age, they obviously are the better men and deserve to win—and probably will.

The many great forces at work in the world are locked so intensely in struggle that the future of all mankind is at stake for the first time in history. The basic conflict over the question as to whether all mankind shall live henceforth under tryranny—for however long—or under freedom could be decided one way or another within the next decade.

America and her associates, their commitments to the cause of freedom notwithstanding, have failed to rally their moral and material strength sufficiently to enhance and extend freedom and make it prevail over tyranny. We have not unambiguously accepted the fact that the battle is already engaged. We have comported ourselves in the world struggle in a manner that is essentially passive, reactive, and defensive. We act as if time were on our side, when the evidence points to the contrary.

In the protracted conflict, the aspirations of the Communist elite have been fulfilled far beyond the reach of their material power. The phenomenal growth of Communist power and the naiveté and opportunism of many free world elites obscure the real issue of tyranny versus freedom. The forces of tyranny and inhumanity are gaining in relative power over the forces of the free and open societies. More specifically, Communist power is reaching a point where its integrated and manifold instruments of protracted conflict may achieve the triumph of Communist tyranny.

Only by bold and sustained action can the United States and the free world emerge the victor in this deadly struggle. There is a burning need for the restatement of the free peoples' common ideal of human progress under freedom, for concerted action to check and reduce the spread of Communist totalitarianism, and for the advancement by mutual endeavor of the well-being of mankind.

No people can be forced to be free or exhorted to make sacrifices which they do not believe are necessary. The great stumbling block to positive American action is not only American affluence but, above all, the intellectual euphoria that it engenders. In history, political systems usually were destroyed by their foes after their own leadership groups had committed intellectual suicide. Can a prosperous, easygoing people be aroused to their own defense? Can it master intellectually the discipline and sacrifice required for survival. This perhaps is the central question which this book must leave unanswered. In the last resort, the answer is given—as it has always been given in history—by the unique response of the living.

A national strategy for the next decade that measures up to the great issues of our times calls for an increase in effort and expenditure of resources. The impact on our way of life of sustained national effort may not be a cheerful prospect.

Actually, the gap between present levels of effort and the requirements of the next decade may not be so difficult to close as one might think. The American people have always met a genuine challenge when it was put to them squarely. Conversely, the record is replete with instances of national erosion in response to pusillanimous leadership. The potentialities of the American people should not be underestimated. We believe they will do what has to be done provided they are given the opportunity.

Public support requires education of the public by the responsible leaders, and trust by them in the people. Education in national strategy calls for patient and persistent effort. This is the task of leadership.

There never was a time in our history more propitious for great leadership than now. We face a challenge beyond historic precedent.

The great leader conquers the awful loneliness, which imprisons the holder of supreme power, by inner certitude and faith in a good cause, from which springs the power of decision. Aloofness and righteousness are inseparable from leadership. These unlovable and unsociable attributes are basically alien to the character of contemporary civilization. Many of those, therefore, who call for U.S. leadership do not recognize or, at least, are unwilling to admit the objectionable and repugnant elements in the very concept of leadership.

That we do consider these elements repugnant and objectionable is a symptom of high civilization and genuinely humanitarian trust in the dignity and equality of men who live with one another on a basis of free consent and free cooperation. But modern man feels entirely insecure, if not within the United States, then certainly in the world at large. Whatever our own predilections, the burden to provide certainty and thus security for the world that is still free does lie overwhelmingly on our shoulders. We cannot impose this burden on the shoulders of others, more exposed and less powerful than ourselves. We try to obtain universal consent and agreement for policies and actions. We feel more at ease if we scatter our bounty over the lands of the needy and desist from exploiting our potential power. But in a crisis of such magnitude as the one the world faces now, this reluctance to lead appears also as an unwillingness to accept ultimate responsibility and as an attempt to lighten the terrible load by sharing responsibility with those who simply cannot bear it.

The corollary of our right to guide and to prescribe a course would be our duty to protect and support our friends even where our specific interests do not coincide. How, otherwise, can we make credible our pledge to stand at their side in the hour of need?

Unfortunately, we are confronted by an opponent who sees to it that the "normal" processes of history shall not remain normal. Our lot is conflict. History brings us not peace but a sword. Will our hands grasp it?

The San Francisco News-Call Bulletin, Donald Canter, and 9,000 San Franciscans Receive 1961 Inter-American Press Association—Tom Wallace Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following in a series of articles relative to the situation in Chile, written by Donald Canter. This article and an editorial are included within the award-winning series:

[From the San Francisco News-Call Bulletin, Oct. 17, 1960]

MOVING TIME IN CHILE—THANKS TO YOU

(By Donald Canter)

People in the Chilean coastal community of Valdivia say they've witnessed various miracles during the past few months and one glance at the pictures on this page shows you some of them.

It all began when the earth beneath them started weaving and gyrating like the traditional dragon on Chinese New Year. Concrete buildings toppled, frame houses crumpled, shacks just disintegrated.

When the land steadied, volcanos spewed streams of lava, wiping entire villages off the face of the earth. Then the sea struck.

Wave after wave battered the coastline in one of the most terrifying tidal catastrophes of recorded history, taking thousands of lives in mere seconds.

And when the holocaust was over, a strip of land 300 miles long and 40 miles wide had sunk some 12 feet, radically changing the country's geography.

That happened in the last week of May.

Then came the first week of June and a stranger—this reporter—came to Valdivia with the message that thousands in distant San Francisco (those were you, donors to the N–CB Quake Fund) had rallied to Valdivia's aid and planned to replace some of the houses the quakes had felled.

Some said it was a miracle that people in a faraway land would bother about the fate of a handful of destitute creatures thousands of miles away.

They heaped praise on me (intended for you) and those hit hardest of all by nature's wrath eagerly signed up for the new homes which I assured them would be ready before long.

Early this month word came from Valdivia that what was to be known as the City of San Francisco Housing project was about ready for occupancy and so, as your representative, I hurried back to Chile.

Of course, I expected to find all prospective tenants to be camping on the doorsteps of their new homes the moment I arrived. It wasn't quite so.

Most of them had scattered to new temporary shelters without leaving their addresses with the local authorities as I'd asked them to.

But why had they failed to do so when homes were what they needed so desperately?

Steelworker Herminio Rodriguez, one of the first I traced through an appeal by the local radio station, gave the answer:

"Sure, you promised us a new home last June, but a man who's just passed through the gates of hell doesn't believe any fairy tale a stranger cares to tell him. Oh, I didn't doubt your good intentions. But believing you—pardon me, Senor, that I just couldn't do."

Rodriguez' temporary home (where he'd lived for months unaware that in Valdivia's city of San Francisco a comfortable three-bedroom apartment was rapidly nearing completion) was a "ruco" (hut) of which the city had erected some 5,000 in 5 days.

It was a triangular contraption, constructed of a few shaky 2-by-4's, covered with a few sheets of galvanized iron. Not only was there no electricity, there was no water.

In that ruco, 10 feet long and 7 feet wide, Rodriguez lived with his pregnant wife, Silva, their two small children, and two in-laws. There they slept on a couple of soiled mattresses.

I took the Rodriguez clan out of their ruco and on a taxi ride (their first in years) to that gleaming new development where a sign proudly announces that this is San Francisco soil.

With disbelieving eyes they gazed at the bright, mustard-yellow color of the structures' ground floor and at the deep brown of the varnished wood of the second story.

Their eyes popped as I handed them a key to a corner apartment. Still they didn't move. "Come on, go in," I said, "it's all yours."

Slowly they shuffled toward the entrance. But before Mrs. Rodriguez stepped over the threshold, she turned to me and pleaded. "You're not kidding us, are you?"

Then she and her loved ones stood in the corridor, a few seconds later in the spacious living room, its large windows looking out over the inviting Gilde Castro woods.

From the bathroom came sounds of splashing water. Dark-eyed Emilia, 6, was trying the shower, the first she'd ever seen. I flushed the toilet to show her it really worked. She giggled. "What's that for?" she asked.

Then the clan climbed the stairs to the second floor with its three spacious bedrooms, complete with walkin closets and real electricity switches.

Herminio Rodriguez and his wife just stood there, hand in hand. She started crying: "Lord, you're too good to us," she stammered.

I asked her whether she had beds to sleep on and blankets to keep warm. Whether they possessed a stove that deserved that designation and a table to serve dinner and chairs to seat all seven of the family. I inquired whether they had plates and forks and pots and pans, a table cloth and possibly a little dresser.

They stared at me as though I was asking for the moon and I realized my blunder.

So I asked Mrs. Rodriguez to meet me in 2 days, armed with a list of the most necessary household items.

"We're going on a shopping tour," I announced, "you and some other folks who have homes now but nothing to put in them. You do the buying and I'll pay the bill. All right?"

She just nodded and promised to meet me at 9 a.m. sharp.

When I left her, she was on her knees, waxing the living room floor with the most loving strokes any boards of lumber ever have received.

HERE ARE FACTS

This is the first of three reports on how the News-Call Bulletin and its readers rushed to the aid of Chile's destitute quake victims.

Here are some pertinent facts about the dramatic campaign:

Reader donations to date: $46,238.02.

Of this amount, $33,000 has been used to build in the hard-hit city of Valdivia three two-story apartment buildings containing 11 three-bedroom apartments.

The housing development, named "City of San Francisco," is now occupied by families handpicked by reporter Donald Canter.

They will live rent-free for three months, then pay $10 per month for 30 years, after which the apartments are their property.

The monthly payments are deposited in a special fund with which additional houses will be built on the same site.

How the balance of the News-Call Bulletin Chilean Quake Fund will be expended will be announced in subsequent articles.

(None of the money has been or will be used to cover expenses such as those for Canter's trips to Chile. The News-Call Bulletin picks up the tab for that.)

[From the San Francisco News-Call Bulletin, October 17, 1960]

VALDIVIA SAYS "THANKS"

The following paragraphs are excerpts from an editorial in the Chilean newspaper El Correo de Valdivia.

"We, the people of Chile, have many reasons for being grateful to the readers of the News-Call Bulletin.

"Because they taught us a lesson.

"After all, while many of us who were not stricken so hard by the recent quakes lived only a few blocks away from our fellow citizens leading an animal-like existence, we did not especially show them the true Christian spirit.

"That spirit was shown by some newspaper readers thousands of miles away, who built our destitute countrymen a little City of San Francisco, a housing project here in Valdivia, which will forever be a landmark to us.

"How can we possibly repay those warmhearted men and women in San Francisco, Calif.?

"We can, by proving to them that we have learned our lesson, by following their example of trying to give every citizen a real reason to love life."

"The Casey Bill Deserves Support"—Editorial in Support of H.R. 5082, To Permit Income Tax Deductions for Housing and Home Repair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB CASEY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, earlier this session, I introduced H.R. 5082, which would permit home and rent property owners to deduct a limited portion of the cost of repairs from their income tax.

The bill is receiving tremendous support from all segments of our economy, for many see it as not only a shot in the arm for their particular trade, but a possible answer to the cause of substandard housing and slum areas.

The support given this measure by the painting and decorating industry is deeply gratifying, and it gives me great pleasure to bring to the attention of my colleagues the editorial from the May publication, American Painter and Decorator, sent to 50,000 members in this great industry.

THE CASEY BILL DESERVES SUPPORT

Where the public stake in legislation is concerned, sauce for the goose has not always

been sherry for the gander. The consumer sometimes has been regarded as duck soup.

It is pleasurable, therefore, to report that a bill currently before Congress is meaningful not only to one section of the economy—in this case the hard-pressed construction industry, and the painting trades in particular—but is something the public can cheer about as well.

We refer to the measure introduced by Representative ROBERT CASEY, Democrat of Texas, which would allow the homeowner a maximum $750 income tax deduction for home maintenance and repairs, including painting and decorating, up to that amount spent in any one tax year.

In some quarters, H.R. 5082 undoubtedly will be tagged as "special interest" legislation. A similar measure died for lack of support in the last session of Congress. Nevertheless, we believe it is in the national interest for this bill to be vigorously supported and enacted into law.

President Kennedy has expressed himself as favoring tax changes that will encourage business expansion by allowing a faster depreciation rate on certain items of business housekeeping. This is exactly what the Casey bill is designed to accomplish, except that here the principal beneficiary would be the homeowner and small landlord, who get no tax writeoff for maintenance and repair as does business and industry. The bill would correct this longstanding inequity.

No one quarrels seriously with the need for slum clearance programs to arrest the dangerous spread of blight in large cities. But it is likewise clear that Federal urban renewal spending, which has been criticized as the biggest ragweed grower in the Nation, far exceeds the cost of the limited tax relief proposed in the self-help Casey bill. By stimulating home decorating and improvement and providing an incentive for the owner of rental housing to rehabilitate his property, would there be an increasing need for bigger and better public housing programs?

Finally, and perhaps most significantly, the tax proposal would ease critical unemployment in the Nation's largest industry—construction—and the added income to painters and decorators alone would give the entire economy a boost.

According to FHA estimates, 10 million homes in the Nation have not been painted for at least 5 years. As a result of liberalized tax incentives, suppose just a million were painted at an average cost of $375. This would quickly add $375 million to the income of painters and decorators. Since labor costs are computed at 60–75 percent of the cost of a paint job, an estimated $225 to $300 million in added wages would go into the pockets of painting mechanics and thence into the mainstream of the economy.

We can't see anything wrong with this. The painting and decorating industry would do well to put the case before the public on its merits.

The Role of the Federal Government in Our Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an address by the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania, the Honorable JOSEPH S. CLARK, delivered at the 49th annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States at the Statler Hotel in Washington, D.C.:

THE ROLE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN OUR SOCIETY

The role of the Federal Government in our society should be whatever it needs to be to keep America prosperous and free. The first thing we have to do in deciding what is needed is to think. Too many people do not really think about the proper role of the Federal Government in the modern world; they just react. Their conclusions are arrived at emotionally, not as a result of careful thought.

I suggest these premises as a basis for rational thought:

First. The Federal Government is neither the "Great White Father" who will save us all, nor is it George Orwell's big brother.

Second. The Federal Government, in itself, is neither necessarily good nor necessarily bad. It is part of us. We created it.

Third. Federal officials are not necessarily inferior in ability to State and local officials, nor are they necessarily superior.

It follows that any particular role for the Federal Government should be considered on a case by case basis.

In short, if the Federal Government is the best means to accomplish a desirable end, let's use it. If it isn't, let's not.

For example, it may be the national judgment—as I think it is—that the choice of teachers, the kind of buildings and the curricula of our public schools should be determined by State and local elected officials, because these decisions cannot be made as wisely or as well by the National Government.

At the same time, it may be the national judgment—as I think it is—that part of the money for public education should be raised through national taxation. The national tax system, it is argued, is more equitable, and relatively less overburdened, then State and local tax systems.

Thus, our decision should be—and, I think, will be—for Federal aid to the public schools without Federal control. Nor should we be deterred by the irrational plea of those who argue that to put the Federal Government into any new field of "spending" is, in itself, undesirable and bad.

From these premises and this example, then, I conclude:

First, that insofar as our national resources must be mobilized to meet current problems, only the Federal Government can do it. If it be true that our human resources must be as fully educated, as fully trained, and as well utilized as possible—then the Federal Government must take an active role in planning for the development and utilization of our national manpower. Just as the personnel director of a company must be concerned with staffing his corporation, so must the U.S. Government concern itself with staffing freedom.

Second, only the Federal Government can effectively intervene in economic affairs where such intervention is necessary in the public interest. Our economy is now national in scope. Almost every transaction is inextricably intermingled with every other transaction. Such a national economy can be dealt with intelligently only through our National Government. We can argue among ourselves whether minimum wage laws, or labor relations laws, or unemployment compensation laws are necessary or wise. But if necessary and wise, they cannot be left to the 50 States for independent action. And, of course, nobody really thinks they should be the States rights argument in the economic area is a facade for opposition to any laws at all.

Third, our national tax system falls on the whole across the country in some relation to the ability of everyone to pay. Our chaotic State and local tax systems do not. The time is at hand to utilize the national tax system to raise the money to solve certain of our national problems, which have up to now been left strictly to State and local governments.

Many of those who inveigh against the Federal Government are really not devotees of States rights as such; they are interested in the incidence of taxation, and they know that they fare better when needed services are financed through local property taxes and State sales taxes. It is not that local democracy is purer democracy; it is just cheaper—for them.

I do not love big government as such; far from it. But I am convinced that as the world becomes constantly both smaller and more complex the role of the Federal Government in our society is both inevitably and, on the whole, wisely bound to become a larger one.

An Opportunity Remains Unchallenged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES HARVEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a recent editorial from the Saginaw News, which is worthy of capturing the attention of all Members. In these current days where we hear and read of restraining news coverage, this editorial is of particular significance. While we have heard much of "Ask not what your country can do for you, but rather what you can do for your country," it is obvious to an editorial writer of the largest daily newspaper in northern Michigan that the President has failed thus far to tell them simply what he wants from the people:

WILL PRESIDENT ASK FROM THE PEOPLE WHAT HE ALONE CAN?

What does President Kennedy want the American people to do? What does he ask of us, not as a nation but as individuals? Where can we move forward, physically or in verbal or financial response to his repeaded suggestion that the American people were unwilling to do what he thought essential to defend the Nation?

As good Americans, all of us are concerned with him about the fiasco in Cuba, the discouragement in Laos and the imminent threat to the independence of South Vietnam. We are concerned even more about what may lie ahead in half a dozen other danger spots if somehow we cannot soon come up with a more effective means of combatting Communists. They have been beating us to the punch.

What disturbs is that President Kennedy and his Cabinet some days ago quite frankly confessed faults about military planning and intelligence in discussing what happened in Cuba. It is a fair presumption to say that failures elsewhere are traceable to faulty plans and approaches.

Still, after all the administration soul-searching that has gone on since Cuba and Laos slid against the Red buzz saw, Mr. Kennedy last weekend told a Chicago audience, "Our greatest adversary is not the Russians. It is in our own unwillingness to do what must be done."

We would say with equal candor and we believe with more accuracy, that it is the American people's ignorance of what needs to be done—because the President simply has not told them what he wants from them.

No citizen can tell the Joint Chiefs of Staff how to mount an offensive capable of beating the Communists without turning the world into a nuclaer holocaust. Neither can a private citizen offer to do better what our various Government intelligence services have not managed to do. Relatively few Americans can fly jets or lead forces.

The fact is that the American people have not been shown by the President that our foreign relations situation is so desperate as to make almost any sacrifice here at home needful to force a change in the direction the world is going.

It is well enough to talk about "the winds of change" and the "tide of history" now sweeping over vast populaces in the underdeveloped areas of the world. But the role that the people of the United States must play has to be more specific than the President has defined it, for all his admirable words of courage and challenge.

Will the President dare challenge the American people to accept austerity at home, for example, to jolt them to a wideawake awareness of the Red peril that surrounds them?

By example, he has done anything but. Americans were stirred to hear his inaugural challenge: "Ask not what your country can do for you, but rather what you can do for your country." We regret to say that President Kennedy has done more to apply that exhortation in reverse than any other American living today.

One would never dream that such was the case if, on almost any day, you dropped into the House or Senate Chambers of Congress to witness the bleeding and pleading that goes on in behalf of a procession of administration domestic spending programs.

New perennial programs are being adopted and pushed—aid to depressed areas, aid to public schools, college scholarships, college loans, youth corps—that would add some $3.5 billion to the swollen budget within 5 years. Proposed expansion and extension of existing programs—college housing loans, urban renewal, home financing, water pollution control—could add up to $8 billion more annually by 1965.

If the American people are to be criticized for complacency about the state of the world or for their preoccupation with personal, private, and domestic interests, the business-as-usual politicking that goes on in Congress afford them a fine example of governmental complacency.

If President Kennedy should announce that his Government, awakened to the real peril pressing on the free world, was calling for a moratorium on all new or expanded domestic programs, he would have a test of the people's will to sacrifice.

If he said that our new understanding of Red warfare means fast and heavy investment in a new kind of military, with new equipment and new training—that we further must do what must be done by increasing our foreign aid (while insisting that the governments we seek to help act with equal dedication to provide honest, effective advancement benefiting all their people)—the American people would see their duty.

This would be a test of the American will to sacrifice for the protection and preservation of liberty and security. Confronted by it, each American would be forced to ask himself whether or not he could refrain from asking Washington to solve his every trifling domestic ache or pain.

In reality, it would prove a small price to pay when measured against the current defeatism about combating communism that has seized on all too many of us. To the contrary, Americans well might find themselves glorying in the discovery of a purposeful, fighting course which would provide every citizen with that good feeling that comes of punching a villain in the nose.

The President has done moderately well in telling the American people what the Communist menace means. He has not done well in failing to tell them something of the magnitude of the job or of the added billions of dollars necessary to finance it. He has a great opportunity to set an example of a special kind of courage—political courage to call back his plans for Federal indulgence of the people at home in exchange for an invitation to commit this wealth to the cause of free world liberty.

Centralization of Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Back to Apron Strings?" published by the Indianapolis Star May 2, 1961.

There being no objection the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BACK TO APRON STRINGS?

If a poll is right, almost half of Americans have had their fill of thinking and planning and making decisions for themselves, and can hardly wait for the Federal Government to take over enough of these functions to relieve them of the strain. The "What America Thinks" poll dealt with the question of centralization of Government powers in Washington. Forty-five percent of those polled thought this was a good idea. Only 37 percent thought it was bad, and 17 percent had no opinion, indicating that they've already given up thinking anyway.

Some of the reported answers were just plain idiotic. One declared that there is "too much redtape in the Pentagon," and from there reasoned that "if things were more centralized, there would not be so much duplication and waste of taxpayers' money." The Pentagon represents 15 years of effort at centralizing the Department of Defense, which is well over half the entire Federal Government. How can someone who sees the result as "too much redtape" at the same time want to do the same with the rest of the Nation's affairs? This fellow, too, has already given up thinking.

Some indicated they had some inkling of what centralization of power means, but just don't care. "The head of Government could get and give out knowledge to the people and we would be better informed," said one. "The Government knows more about what is necessary and best for the country," said another. These are frank expressions of a desire to get out from under the problems of life. Let the Government handle them. Let the people be told what to do so they won't have to worry.

Is that really what is wanted by 45 percent of the people who responded to this survey? Is that really what is wanted by anyone, outside of the relative few who mentally and physically actually can't think for themselves and take care of themselves?

What is it toward which almost every young person looks so eagerly as he advances through the teens? It is the time when he can be independent, when he can cut loose from parental control and start planning and living his own life. Millions of young and not-so-young veterans came pouring out of military service at the end of the last war with the same eager objective. They wanted to get away from constant daily ordering of their lives by higher authority.

One person answered the pollster's question by saying it's a matter of point of view. "If the centralized powers are used for something I believe in, then I believe in greater centralization. If they are used for something I don't believe in, I'm opposed to them."

This might be called cynicism. But it's something much worse than cynicism. It's ignorance. It's a blithe, innocent supposition that centralized powers can be handed to government to be used only for the things approved by the people who hand over these powers, and not for things these people don't like.

People who think this either forget history, or have never read it. They do not understand the nature of centralized power.

The head of a centralized government does get control of knowledge, and give out knowledge to the people. But this does not make the people better informed. It makes the people informed according to what government wants them to know. Centralized government does assume that it knows more than the people about what is necessary and best for the country. And it acts on that assumption without bothering the people with information which might cause them to wonder.

The trend toward centralization of power in the Federal Government is a trend toward making Government the father and mother of everyone. It is a movement toward a paternalistic control of life which will not be relinquished at the end of the years of childhood, but will go on perpetually.

We can't believe this is what Americans want. So wake up! Shake the fog out of the minds of those who don't realize where they're pushing this country. Let's face the realities of the situation. Let's get back on the track of the wise separation and decentralization of power which for so long have kept us free from the control of tyrannical government.

Kansas Keynotes Boilermakers and Blacksmiths Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news account of the opening of the International Boilermakers and Blacksmiths Convention in Long Beach, Calif., from the newspaper, Labor, of May 1, 1961. Mr. William A. Calvin, president of the brotherhood, is my constituent. In his keynote address, which this news account liberally quotes, Mr. Calvin reviewed the progress of the brotherhood, now in its 80th year, and spoke about certain aspects of the economy and the present U.S. and world political situations I am certain the article will be of

interest to my colleagues, and I respectfully call it to their attention:

"MOVE FORWARD OR PERISH," HE TELLS DELEGATES—KEYNOTE TO BOILERMAKERS AND BLACKSMITHS CALLS FOR UNITY TO MEET PROBLEMS

LONG BEACH, CALIF., May 1.—Opening the big 21st convention of the International Brotherhood of Boilermakers and Blacksmiths here this week, President William A. Calvin warned of grave perils ahead in the challening sixties, both for unionism and for the free North American peoples.

"Meeting the challenges, known and unknown," he declared, "will call for maximum courage, intelligence and impartiality that is not circumscribed by petty prejudices, racial or religious discrimination—and loyal adherence to the principles of morality and integrity."

The brotherhood itself, Calvin indicated, is hale and strong in its 80th year, having won enormous gains for its far-flung membership. "We have accomplished much," he declared, amid applause from the delegates. "We must accomplish more."

Observing that "we will either move forward or perish," Calvin stressed: "We must remain united if we are to reach the beckoning new horizon."

WAY TO ACHIEVEMENTS

"Courage, initiative, and honesty have always returned dividends in organizational achievements," the noted union leader added, "and as we meet the challenge of the sixties we serve notice that there is no sanctuary within the International Brotherhood for the disciples of fear, disunity, and defeatism."

In an era when the "octopus of world communism" has extended its tentacles over one land after another, Calvin warned that major problems exist also here at home.

"For approximately 8 years," he noted, "we have been plagued by repeated industrial recessions; our economy has been sick." Moreover, he pointed out, "each new recession has begun with a greater number of workers already unemployed."

IMPACT OF AUTOMATION

In contrast, he said; "our recent recessions have had little if any impact upon big business. In the steel and automotive industries, for example, where unemployment is rampant, automation has made it possible to produce an enlarged volume of products with a drastically reduced work force.

"The industries are making enormous profits while the workers are unemployed and the communities in which the industries are located have been declared distress areas."

In Washington, Calvin said, President Kennedy and his aides have been grappling "earnestly and energetically" with these problems—only to be thwarted often by the "horse and buggy" conservative coalition in Congress.

For workers, the Boilermakers and Blacksmiths president suggested, the lesson is clear: "No political party can be an effective substitute for a strong, solvent, and honestly administered labor movement."

Calvin called also for strong action against foreign low-wage competition sponsored by big business operators—such as "the building of giant oil tankers in Asiatic shipyards for American owners which will sail under foreign flags and carry petroleum to the United States."

Reviewing the massive gains won by the brotherhood, Calvin cited such facts as these: "Health and welfare insurance is now established for our construction members; supplemental pensions to afford greater security to those receiving railroad retirement and social security benefits; travel time, showup time, or daily subsistence allowances when on construction projects outside of the immediate area. * * *

"All of the mentioned fringe benefits, in addition to the highest wage rates and shortest workweek, have been attained through the efforts of our brotherhood, coordinated in some general instances with the combined efforts of the entire labor movement," Calvin noted.

Speaking seriously and forthrightly to the hundreds of delegates, Calvin recalled how the newspapers have made a sarcastic byword of the phrase labor boss.

"Within our brotherhood," he declared, "the word boss is a misnomer. Actually, our convention is the boss; your international president is a servant rather than a boss. As delegates to this convention, the future of our organization is a responsibility resting upon your shoulders. It cannot be shrugged off. You are the supreme tribunal representing every member of our organization."

Calvin's keynote speech was the first of many addresses to be heard from leaders in labor, industry, and government at the big union convention. Meanwhile, delegates also began progressing the wide variety of business before the convention.

GAINS ON ALL FRONTS

Delegates to the convention were also informed of a long list of gains won since 1957 in the various fields represented by the Boilermakers and Blacksmiths. Highlights of some of these gains, as described in the report of the brotherhood's executive council, are as follows:

Average hourly pay increases between 1958 and 1960 ran as follows in these industries: shipbuilding, 32.1 cents; boiler manufacturing, 29.3 cents; plant fabrication, 24.4 cents; forging, 28.9 cents; and miscellaneous manufacturing, 26.1 cents.

In field construction, numerous wage increases were obtained. In addition, a national agreement was signed with the National Contractors Association, representing major firms in the heavy construction industry. Improvements were negotiated in the Boilermakers' national health and welfare plan for members in the construction industry.

UNITY PAYS OFF

Shipbuilding, organization of the Iron Shipbuilders International Marine Council and its four regional district lodges marked a major step forward. The Pacific coast master agreement was signed, covering shipyards in that region.

In boiler manufacturing, the council report describes how united effort has begun to pay off in very practical terms. "In every case," the report says, "our members obtained greater increases than the national average for manufacturing, and better than any other organization was able to accomplish in this industry. In addition, fringe benefits were substantially improved in every case where such items were open for negotiations."

OTHER ACHIEVEMENTS

In the forge industry, the new Forge Workers International Council has begun plans to cope with the big economic and technological changes underway in that industry.

On the railroads, hard hit by unemployment, the Brotherhood has continued to make substantial gains in pay and fringe benefits for its members, in cooperation with other railroad unions.

The Brotherhood's new national pension trust has been established, and payments are being made into it for Brotherhood members by most employers in field construction, by west coast shipyards and by shop employer groups in Chicago and Los Angeles.

In Canada, widespread and substantial progress has also been achieved by Boilermakers and Blacksmiths units since the last convention in 1957.

Deicing Program for Icebound Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, earlier this session, I introduced a bill, S. 1704, to authorize the study by the Corps of Engineers on the feasibility of developing a deicing program for regions of the United States normally icebound in winter—particularly the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Recognizing that this would essentially be a long-term project—beset with difficult problems—I, nevertheless, feel that there has been sufficient progress in development of deicing systems to warrant further investigation. The purpose would be to determine the feasibility of developing broader scoped programs for icebound areas. As of now, annual trade and commerce are reduced by about one-fourth by the old foe—winter ice.

Following the introduction of my bill, a number of forward-looking newspapers in my home State and elsewhere have endorsed the idea. To give Congress the benefit of this constructive support, I ask unanimous consent to have the following items printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

First, an editorial entitled "Cracking the Ice Barrier," from the Green Bay Press Gazette of May 1, 1961; and second, and article entitled "Ice Melting Hot Idea," written by Woodie Jarvis and published in the Bay City Times, of Bay City, Mich., on April 27, 1961.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Green Bay Press Gazette, May 1, 1961]

CRACKING THE ICE BARRIER

Senator WILEY has proposed legislation in Congress which would authorize the Corps of Engineers to make a complete investigation of problems involved in the development of a de-icing system for Great Lakes ports and the St. Lawrence Seaway.

His aim is to extend the shipping season, help to resolve icing problems in harbors on Great Lakes routes and in the seaway, and possibly to open the way to year-round shipping in the Great Lakes and the Seaway.

He admits that the task is a difficult one but says that in view of the progress that has been made in this field it would warrant a thorough investigation by Government.

The United States has a tremendous investment in the Seaway and in the lake ports. More money will be poured into harbor facilities along this course in years ahead. The investment is so large that a study such as Senator WILEY proposes and indeed any study which offered reasonable hope to extend the shipping season would be warranted. The extension of the shipping season by only a few weeks annually would warrant the investment of millions of dollars. It is inexcusable for the Government not to have available in understandable form all useful information on this subject.

[From the Bay City Times, Apr. 27, 1961]

ICE MELTING HOT IDEA

(By Woodie Jarvis)

DETOUR.—Among all the worthy projects Congress may consider in coming months, the most interesting is a proposal to melt the Great Lakes ice in winter.

This suggestion is the brainchild of Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, who obviously is an intelligent and imaginative fellow.

It is proposed on the practical basis of cracking the ice barrier to maintain shipping throughout the winter, a worthy cause deserving of all support.

And if in the process there should be a slight side benefit or two, such as bringing eternal summer to the shores of the St. Mary's River, and perhaps the Saginaw and Detroit Rivers as well, who could honestly complain of that?

The idea isn't exactly new. A year or so ago a space scientist suggested hanging a big reflector in the weightlessness of space, adjusted so it would concentrate the sun's rays on the Great Lakes.

This, the scientist said, would melt the ice in winter and make possible year-round shipping on the inland seas. But there seemed to be one catch that wasn't explained. How could the gadget be turned off in spring and turned on again in the fall?

If there were no turnoff button summer temperatures might become pretty drastic, hot enough to evaporate the lakes and fry all the inhabitants.

Senator WILEY, on the other hand, has more down-to-earth proposals. He would work on the ice directly, either with an ice-melting bubble system, chemicals or underground explosions.

Convinced that this is a worthy project, he has introduced a bill in the Senate that would direct the U.S. Corps of Engineers to investigate all possible methods of deicing the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway as well.

This project isn't as complicated as it looks at first glance. Ice forms only on a small percent of the Great Lakes in winter. Mainly it is in the connecting channels and the ports, and rarely extends for more than a few miles from shore.

No ice of consequence forms in the vast open surfaces of the Great Lakes, even in northernmost Lake Superior. As they say of Superior, it never freezes over in winter and never thaws out in summer.

With the exception of the Straits of Mackinac, all connecting channels of the northern lakes are in the form of swift-flowing rivers—the St. Mary's, the St. Clair and the Detroit.

All main ports likewise are built beside rivers—Alpena, Bay City-Saginaw, Muskegon, to name a few.

The problem therefore becomes greatly simplified. Warm water melts ice. Heat the rivers, and the natural flow of the current will carry warm water through the area of the ice fields, releasing all our ports from the iron-bound clutch of winter.

Heating water is an extremely simple process, as every housewife knows. But to put the matter on a high scientific plane, let us describe this process of melting ice as the teakettle theory. This will involve applying heat to the bottom of the river.

We have at hand a readymade process to do this work. All atomic energy plants must be located on water because of the tremendous amounts of waste heat they generate.

So the answer is simply to build large nuclear or thermonuclear electric power plants on the rivers and use the waste heat, or even some of the working heat if necessary, to keep the ports and channels ice-free.

Heat could be applied to the river bottoms through a series of radiators with simple thermostats to turn it on or off as the water temperature dictated.

Making a rough guess, the thermostats could be set to maintain a constant surface of 70 degrees, with booster stations established at suitable intervals along the course of the current.

Engineers of course would be required first to solve the problem of radiation, but that's a mere technical detail along with other construction problems.

More interesting to contemplate are the results of such a deicing system. It would in effect create a series of warm Gulf Streams flowing through the Great Lakes, bringing comparatively balmy climates to previously frigid shores.

Warm water fish would rush into the rivers and grow huge from a year-round growing season as they do in tropic waters. Cold water fish such as the trout and chubs would simply retreat from the warm streams into the deep, cold holes in the open lakes, where they could be more easily located.

The future holds visions of year-round bathing beaches. Perhaps lush palms beside the pine trees, a day when Michigan, almost entirely surrounded by the Great Lakes, would become the Florida of the north.

Senator WILEY has a real good idea here. He should be—pardon the expression—warmly encouraged.

Fliers Deliver Santa Fe Scroll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the centennial of Kansas' role as a member of the United States of America, and we in and of Kansas are celebrating the event in appropriate ways. A centennial wagon train—of which I am an honorary wagonmaster—will roll along the Santa Fe Trail, as part of the celebration. From time to time I will invite my colleagues' attention to the progress of the Centennial Wagon Train. Today, I bring to your attention a news story from the Olathe (Kans.) News that tells about the arrival in Olathe of a scroll bearing the names of mayors and city officials of some of the major towns along the Santa Fe Trail. The scroll will be delivered to Council Grove, Kans., by the centennial wagon train, where Gov. John Anderson will sign it and start it on its final lap.

The article follows:

FLIERS DELIVER SANTA FE SCROLL

Six of 17 airplanes which left Santa Fe, N. Mex., about 8:30 a.m. Monday arrived on schedule Tuesday at 5:15 p.m. at NAS Olathe.

The six planes were the survivors of a flying farmers flight which followed the Santa Fe Trail Highway, U.S. 56, from Santa Fe, N. Mex. to Independence, Mo., as part of the Kansas centennial celebration.

A scroll, carried by the flight of light aircraft, was delivered to the centennial wagon train. The scroll bears the names of mayors and city officials of some of the major towns along the trail.

Mrs. Grace Collier, executive secretary of the Santa Fe Trail Highway Association, accompanied the flight. Mrs. Collier described the flight as "something more than routine." She will also serve as mule skinner on the return trip through Kansas, Oklahoma, and New Mexico with the wagon train.

After the scrollsigning ceremonies were completed at NAS, Olathe, the flying farmers continued to Independence, Mo., for a dinner date with Mr. and Mrs. Harry Truman.

Bob Frizell, Fort Larned, piloted the first plane to land at NAS.

The scroll carried by the flight commemorates the 140th anniversary of the Santa Fe Trail. It will end its tour when a Navy jet pilot delivers it to President Kennedy in Washington, D.C.

The scroll will be returned to Council Grove by the centennial wagon train, where Gov. John Anderson will sign it and start it on its final lap.

Members of the Olathe Chamber of Commerce and the Olathe city government were on hand with members of the wagon train to welcome the fliers here.

The John Birch Society—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, George Todt has written about the John Birch Society in a series of six articles which have appeared in the Los Angeles Herald-Express newspaper. The Herald-Express is published in Los Angeles, Calif. Mr. Todt's articles are commendably objective. I had the first two articles of the series inserted in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 10, 1961. I ask unanimous consent to have the fifth and sixth articles of the series printed in the Appendix of the RECORD for today:

[From the Los Angeles Herald-Express, March 30, 1961]

A VIEW OF THE NEWS—GEORGE TODT'S OPINION

(Every war of the Soviet Union is a war of defense, even if it is conducted with offensive weapons.—"Fundamentals of Communism," published by the Communist Party of America, p. 31.)

Recently I watched and listened to a 2-hour debate on a Los Angeles television station between a skillful liberal leader, who vigorously opposed the John Birch Society, and one of its members.

The former is a past master at the art of debating and needled his opponent so unmercifully that, understandably, he seemed rattled at times. Some ideological haymakers were missed.

For instance, toward the end of the debate when the liberal gentleman indicated that, in the spirit of Voltaire, both the Communists and the John Birch Society ought to be heard by the American people.

He indicated that, in his opinion, Communists had civil rights in our Republic—as did the John Birchers—and all should have the full protection of the law. What could be fairer than that?

WHEN U.S. SON—

While I have long admired the ability to win and technical savvy of the well-known

liberal leader—an effective and articulate champion of the ADA viewpoint. I must, nevertheless, disagree with him.

Here we go directly to the heart of the problem, the fundamental issue between conservatives and liberalissimo in our Republic as to the nature of the Communist beast we all say we oppose. But how?

To the liberal mind, the American (?) Communist is just another U.S. citizen who—in the interest of academic freedom—must be considered simply as a member of a routine political party, the same as Republicans or Democrats. Who has the right to persecute a bona fide political party?

This is where the liberals and conservatives part company.

Conservatives do not consider the Communist Party of America to be a bona fide political party—but a Trojan horse, or fifth column.

The reason: Every Communist upon entry into the party must subscribe to the traitorous and treacherous Communist oath.

Here is what it says:

TAKES RED OATH

"I now take my place in the ranks of the Communist Party, and the party of the working class. I take this solemn oath to give the best that is in me to the service of my class. I pledge myself to spare no effort in uniting the workers in militant struggle. I pledge myself to work unsparingly in the unions, in the shops, among the unemployed. I pledge myself to rally the masses to defend the Soviet Union, the land of victorious socialism. I pledge myself to remain at all times a vigilant and firm defender of the Leninist line of the party, the only line that insures the triumph of Soviet power in the United States."

Reread carefully those last two lines. Can any person, calling himself an American citizen, take such an oath and still remain a citizen?

Express provisions of the Nationality Act of 1940 and later the McCarran-Walter Act say thusly:

"Loss of Nationality: A person who is a national of the United States, whether by birth or naturalization, shall lose his nationality by taking an oath or making an affirmation or other formal declaration of allegiance to a foreign state."

HE SERVES ONE

Would the great Democratic or Republican Parties sanction the Communist oath for any of their members? Of course not.

If the Communist Party of America is a bona fide political party of the United States, then the other two major parties are not—and vice versa.

To compare loyal Democrats and Republicans with a group which has taken an oath of allegiance to the enemies of our country at this time is intolerable, or should be. It is a smear of the worst kind.

The same goes for the John Birch Society vis-a-vis the Communist fifth column group located in our midst—like the Nazi fifth column in France before Hitler conquered our Gallic friends in 6 weeks in 1940.

The only oath, if any, these much-maligned people have sworn to is to the constitutional republic of the United States—not the Soviet Union.

I think real Americans ought to have the academic freedom to discuss and advocate any philosophy they desire—including even socialism and its tenets if they want to do so.

NOT BOTH

But members of the Communist Party are not real Americans after they subscribe to the Communist oath—and allegiance to the Soviet Union.

If an American wants to become a Russian, let him go to Russia and become one. Give him a one-way passage and good riddance.

But when a traitor takes an oath of allegiance to the Reds while on our soil—he is just one more reason why we all ought to get behind Glendale Congressman H. ALLEN SMITH's bill to make membership in the Soviet's fifth column here a major felony. The right idea.

SMITH, a former member of the FBI, is one of our smartest and most astute members of the Capitol Hill set. Let's get behind him all the way on this damaging blow aimed at Red quislings in our country.

[From the Los Angeles Herald-Express, Mar. 31, 1961]

A VIEW OF THE NEWS—GEORGE TODT'S OPINION

("Truth forever on the scaffold. Wrong forever on the throne."—Lowell, "The Present Crisis.")

Once again the forces of liberalissimo are treating the American people to their clarion call of Wolf. Wolf.

Not so long ago it was with reference to the so-called missile gap. Now it is the conservative John Birch Society.

A large number of citizens are already gagging at the emotional hysteria of the liberals as they view with alarm this small group of constitutional anti-Communists. Why?

Seldom before has there been such a determined brand of name-calling as evidenced now on the American scene.

We ought to be ashamed of ourselves.

WHEN YOU SAY

Unbiased and unprejudiced investigation of the John Birch Society reveals that the members are anti-Communist, anti-Fascist, definitely not anti-Semitic and proconstitutional to the *n*th degree.

Why try to railroad a society such as this one?

We can stipulate that the founder of the JBS does not seem to rate three recent Presidents highly because of their failure to stem effectively the Communist advance throughout the world. Is this a crime?

I, personally, have admired the last three Presidents—Republican and Democrat. My work indicates that much. All were my commanders in chief in the past while I was a young officer in the U.S. Army. I would never speak ill of any of them.

But our Republic has long been spoken of as the one place in the world where a man may have his honest disagreements with anyone—including the President, himself. Do we really mean it?

ONE IS VILE

It appears to me that Robert Welch, founder of the JBS, felt that our leadership in the highest brackets has not done enough to stem the Communist onslaught against us in the past 20 years.

He has raised his own particular brand of hell on this subject. The dramatic shock of his approach has focused much attention upon a matter all too many of us piously deplore—and do nothing constructive about.

It is not enough any longer that we adopt mere poses or spout wishful thinking to try to get the necessary job done.

We must not be lulled to sleep by such a fallacious approach to our problems.

The only things that count any more are results.

The people of the United States know that they don't want the slave ideology of communism fastened upon us, or our allies throughout the world. We must fight, if necessary, for our freedom.

We must charge our leadership regardless of political affiliation, with accomplishing desired results—or we must get rid of that inept brand of leadership. We must pay off on results, alone.

AMERICAN WAY

The John Birch Society is dedicated to the proposition of exposing mistakes made by any group on the national scene—and then requesting the American people to take action. They proposed to do this by constitutional and legal means. Such as letter-writing and working within the established Republican and Democratic political parties.

Actually, they are hardly more than an answer of sorts to the Americans for Democratic Action (ADA) who have been on the national scene for a generation.

Although one may not agree with the socialistic tenets of ADA philosophy or ideology, it would not be fair to call them vituperative names and suggest that they were alien totalitarians inimical to our way of life.

Yet this is exactly what some of their people are doing now to the young John Birch Society. How fair can we get?

I am not a member of the JBS but I dislike seeing it given slanted "hit-and-run" treatment.

Now the liberals are saying that after they have dumped their unfair innuendoes and garbage on the society—even calling for an investigation by the House Un-American Activities Committee and other bodies of inquiry—they really don't want such an informative investigation, after all. Also, after telling a large TV audience the Birchers were guilty of Fascism, they should not be given a public hearing. How un-American can he get?

CALLS FOR TRIAL

The specious reasons given us are that they don't want the JBS to have its day in court for fear it would propagandize the issues.

How quaint. The liberals knew all along that their fantastic charges were apt to be repudiated if open hearings were later to be held. They knowingly made their vicious attacks against JBS—but now whine that they don't want the American people to hear immediately the correct answers by their opponents.

Let's be fair and allow both sides to be heard. Robert Welch, JBS founder, will be in Los Angeles next week. I suggest he be heard by the people. Let your own eyes and ears be the judge. Don't buy false rumors.

To: Alan Shepard, Jr., Successful Astronaut, May 5, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I include a poem "To: Alan Shepard, Jr., Successful Astronaut, May 5, 1961," written by Florence C. Blake of Lochmere, N.H. which appeared in the Laconia Evening Citizen published in Laconia, N.H., on Tuesday, May 9.

TO: ALAN SHEPARD, JR., SUCCESSFUL ASTRONAUT, MAY 5, 1961

(By Florence C. Blake)

Your stamina, knowledge, courage supreme
Have for your country perfected its dream—
Advance into space. The big race is won.
With endurance, precision, and bouyancy
run.

The world will remember your missile's race—
Its beautiful progress as it sped into space,
Straight to its goal, as an arrow shot true,
The Mercury Redstone—the capsule and you.

A space pioneer with courage to match
Unfolding a dream we privileged watch.
The Zenith is reached as we strain to hear;
Then your confident voice rings back to our sphere.

We thankfully bless you, follow you through
Floating next seaward and back to earth too.
Thanks, Alan Shepard, for such faith and will;
Your hemisphere's proud of your helpers and you.

Poultry Trade Barriers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I should like to share with my colleagues a thought-provoking editorial which appeared in Poultry and Egg Weekly on April 29, 1961.

The editorial follows:

POULTRY TRADE BARRIERS

For many years the United States has taken the lead in expanding trade among the nations of the world on a mutually benefiting and reciprocal basis.

Our support of and participation in intaken the lead in expanding trade among the GATT, and similar international groups are broadly indicative of our efforts to implement international economic trade policy. This policy is basically aimed at permitting the freedom loving countries of the world to so allocate their resources that they may produce that for which they are best fitted and to trade with one another, achieving the highest standard of living for all. Such a policy permits the forces of competition to function and to be the prime determining factor in resource allocation, instead of attempting to create uneconomic islands through the use of man-made trade barriers. Trade barriers serve only to protect uneconomic production. They force the consumer to pay higher prices and consume less.

Our foreign economic policy has been consistently followed by all administrations since it was first outlined in 1933 by Cordell Hull, then Secretary of State. It is in the light of this policy that we should attempt to evaluate the current position which the United States should take at the negotiations now being conducted in Geneva, Switzerland, with respect to the European common market. Policies are no better than their implementation. It is obvious, then, that our negotiating team must do more than give obsequious lip service to this policy. On the contrary, they should seek vigorously to obtain the benefits of this trade policy not only for U.S. agriculture, but in the interests of world trade.

Trade is a two-way street. No country can, or should, receive the benefits of exports unless it is willing to recognize the right of others to have access to its market on an equitable and nonrestrictive basis.

The six countries comprising the European Common Market (Holland, West Germany, Italy, France, Belgium, and Luxembourg) are attempting to establish rules and regulations which would increase duties on U.S. poultry to approximately 18 percent of ad valorem. They seek to establish an additional barrier in the form of fees which are designed to reflect the difference between feed grain prices in the respective countries (prices established by government action of such countries) and free market prices. While barriers in the form of increased duties and additional fees would be applied against U.S. poultry, duties on poultry originating in Holland and other common market countries would be progressively reduced to zero. Obviously such a policy is clearly designed to freeze out U.S. poultry and preempt the market for other supplying countries. This is the antithesis of expanding trade. It is protectionism in the extreme. How these countries can expect to resort to such protectionist devices, how they can also expect to have the continued support of the U.S. poultry industry and other segments of the U.S. economy for free and nonrestrictive access to the U.S. market is difficult to understand.

Only recently, in the hearing involving the confirmation of the Under Secretary of State, it was pointed out by Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, that the United States could not continue to be a market for Volkswagens, which Germany produces so efficiently, if restrictive trade devices are to be employed to exclude agricultural commodities which our American farmers produce so efficiently. The point can be further emphasized by making reference to Renaults from France or Fiats from Italy, countries which totally exclude U.S. poultry and other agriculture commodities through the use of exchange controls and other restrictive devices.

It could also be pointed out that substantial quantities of Dutch hams are given free and equal access to the U.S. market and substantial quantities of such hams are being imported. Notwithstanding the fact that American farmers are capable of producing hams in abundance, the United States, instead of attempting to employ restrictive devices, has constantly reduced its duties and the duty on hams is now 2 cents per pound or 62 percent less than formerly.

These facts must be well understood not only by U.S. farmers, but by the responsible people in our Departments of State and Agriculture. It is also of equal importance that these facts be recognized by the government officials of these countries seeking to continue to discriminate against U.S. poultry products and by the producers in those countries whose products find profitable outlets in U.S. markets. It should also be of concern to the great port cities, such as Rotterdam, through which exports from Holland and other countries of Europe deport and into which U.S. products flow.

It is recognized that international negotiations are not an easy matter, but we are confident our negotiators will be successful if they make it clear that our agricultural producers are aware of these discriminations and that continued support of trade policies which have provided much broader and freer access to the U.S. market will be difficult if policies are not adopted at Geneva which remove these unfair barriers.

Henceforth and Forever Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLARD S. CURTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, the Lehigh County Republican Committee in the district that I have the honor to represent, annually sponsors two essay contests on the "Life and Ideals of Abraham Lincoln" as a part of the Lincoln Day celebrations, one being for senior high school students and the other for junior high school students of Lehigh County. The winning selections are made by a board of distinguished educators from several hundred essays submitted. I am very proud of the fine students and the essays they submit. This year, the contest for the junior high school students was won by Carol Margaret Boyer, a South Mountain Junior High School eighth grade student.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the winning essay of this young lady, entitled "Henceforth and Forever Free":

HENCEFORTH AND FOREVER FREE

(By Carol Margaret Boyer)

Abe Lincoln. The very name always sends the blood coursing through my veins at a furious pace and, head bowed, I murmur a fervent, worshiping prayer. For, you see, I was a slave.

I remember the first day I saw him. He was standing at the stern of a flat-bottomed boat, lazily floating down the broad and muddy Mississippi. Even then, in his late teens, he was ungainly tall and awkward with a shock of rumpled black hair hanging over a fine, broad forehead, partially concealing a keen, dark eye beneath thick brows. In all truth and due respect he was in nowise handsome. But I knew in a minute that he was honest, sincere, and (as I had noticed the bulge of his hard, strong arms) hard working.

I was at an auction for the purpose of trade. I usually brought fine prices for my master, as I was then quite young and obviously strong. I'll never forget that particular auction. There was a decided meanness in the air and we were whipped and lashed and abused until our bonds were wet with blood and our bodies ached from beatings. This was unusual, as slaves were considered far too valuable to mistreat. Nevertheless, the afternoon proved to be unbearable for me, and unforgettable to Mr. Lincoln.

After my first encounter, I was to see and hear more of this man Lincoln. The emotional blow that the young boy Abe received that memorable day hit him hard and left a permanent scar. Previously unfamiliar with slavery, he was appalled and disgusted with the whole procedure.

And this boy, this same awkward, unpolished backwoodsman, grew up to become the greatest President that our country has ever known. But that's ahead of my story.

Abe was one of us. His beginnings were shabby and totally unpromising. In the backwoods of Kentucky in a three-sided, mud-chinked log cabin he was born and bred. He worked hard and long, and often went to bed hungry. Yet he was eager, alert, intelligent. He had been known to walk many miles merely to secure a book that he wanted to read. His yen for knowledge was a physical ache inside him. And, book in hand, he would read far into the night by the flickering light of a fire. These were his crude beginnings. I once heard Lincoln himself say simply, "I am humble Abraham Lincoln."

So when the long-awaited day arrived when Abe was a legal 21 years of age, he set out, clad in buckskin with a homemade rifle slung over one shoulder, for New Salem, Ill., with a long, determined strike of one who has finally achieved a high purpose. For Lincoln this was, at the time, to shed the fetters of his humble home, and thus, freeing himself, set out to make it "on his own."

And there lived in New Salem a girl named Ann Rutledge, to whom a 26-year-old Abe was first engaged. And when she died not many weeks later, Abe felt his life was not worth living. Grief and remorse were a part of Lincoln's life as they have so often been akin to me. Great as he became, Abe was not set up on a spiritual pedestal that sheltered him from all things wretechedly tormenting and unbearably painful. And his gloomy moods of utter despair were far more severe after the tragic death of his young love.

From then on Lincoln's life is an almost continuous success story. However, when he had climbed the rugged mountain of hope and prosperity, the worst was yet waiting for him after he had finally reached the summit. Young Abe climbed up and up—from a farmer and a rail splitter to a lawyer, a Congressman, and—at last—President.

In that crucial year of 1860, the eyes of the land were focused on Lincoln. The tension mounted and was broken. Abraham Lincoln, 16th President of the United States.

But it was a Nation torn by conflict and hate that Lincoln tried desperately to hold together by sheer faith. He knew that the country's only hope was faith in God. And Lincoln prayed. No one could possibly know how long, how much, or how reverently. Knelt humbly at a window, he lifted his long, sad, thin face to the heavens and it was suddenly transformed by the radiant sun streaming through the glass into something awesome and holy.

It was a kind, compassionate, tenderhearted Lincoln that traveled to the very battlefronts to observe the bitter struggle: brother against brother; father against son.

The war lasted 4 years. Four long years that turned a young, eager, promising, hopeful candidate into an old man with the drawn, pale face of one who has aged suddenly, and a decided stoop in the worry-worn shoulders upon which the solemn problems of the Nation were to rest until his death.

And then it happened. The taut line of strain suddenly snapped. The summer of 1861 was hot, dry, and bloodstained. The battles continued wearily. Mr. Lincoln could wait no longer. With prayerful heart and doubtful mind he issued the Emancipation Proclamation. "As I would not be a slave," declared Lincoln, "so I would not be a master." The South had 3 months to free its slaves. All the world waited with bated breath. A faint wind of peace brought the first sweet scent of freedom to my nostrils. Alas, not all were as sure as I that his was the best course of action. I was sure. I knew in my heart that it was now or not at all, and I fell to my knees and praised the Almighty—and Mr. Lincoln.

September, October, November, December—there was no real Christmas that year. There was tension in the air, and an inner turmoil that had become a part of every American's life. With fear, trepidation, and sincere bewilderment, the South debated.

December 29, 30, 31, no action was taken. Wherefore, on January 1, 1863, Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation, proclaiming all slaves "thenceforward, and forever free." My throbbing heart suddenly burst with a divine joy. I was free.

Not that this didn't present new problems. Perhaps if the kindly Mr. Lincoln had lived, many of these problematical aftermaths of war could have been avoided. But this was not to be.

It was a lovely, balmy April in 1865. The war was over. Joyfully, the lilacs and lilies burst into bloom and the robins and bluebirds warbled spring songs of ecstasy. The strain eased, but, unfortunately, the South did not hold true to "malice toward none" and a very bitter feeling still existed.

Accordingly, I journeyed north and soon acquired the position of head usher at the Ford Theatre.

Meanwhile, Mr. Lincoln was beginning to relax for the first time in 5 years and had begun to enjoy the luxury of the Executive Mansion.

A secretary popped his head into Mr. Lincoln's private room. "Sir, they'd like to see you in the library."

"Who would?"

"The Cabinet members, sir."

"Did we make an appointment?"

"Yes, sir."

"I'm sorry, but I'm going to the theater."

The fateful words were spoken. But how could anyone know that this rare night of pleasure would bring national disaster? The President had a mysterious dream while resting before the evening's festivities.

Everything was misty. Through the fog, a voice penetrated the gloom. "They'd like to see you in the library, sir."

He lifted his large dark head from the pillow and slowly stood up. He walked hesitantly, tiredly, as if his mind were in an ethereal sepulcher. The massive oak doors swung open, guided by an invisible hand. The middle of the room was a garden of blossoms and fragrance. The air was filled with loud wails and crying and tears adorned each flower. In the center of the blooms was a long, highly polished box of rich dark wood. "My soul," demurred Lincoln. "It's a coffin. But who is dead? And why are all the immortal spirits shrieking and crying?"

Slowly, carefully, he opened the casket. There, lying in serene beauty upon the satin, was * * *. "Lord," thought Lincoln, more than mildly alarmed. "It is I. I am dead." He dropped the lid that shut with a bang. The noise broke the spell. His eyes opened and Lincoln was once again in his own bed in his own quiet room.

Lincoln was not superstitious. He considered superstition ignorance, and had always said, "I do not respect a man who is not wiser today than he was yesterday." Nevertheless, when Mrs. Lincoln came in to wake him, he proteste mildly that he had so much to do, he didn't see how he could possibly find the time to go to the theater. But Mrs. Lincoln was firm, and shortly after 7 they departed.

That was the slave's story. I'm sure you know the rest. The shot that rang out through the darkness, piercing the peace and the gala atmosphere; the vivid image of that great man's lanky figure slumped almost lifelessly in his chair. Death could not reduce a man of Lincoln's stature. Rather, it conceived greater respect and deeper love for an immortal soul.

Today Lincoln is gone. Fate took a great man much too soon. To future generations he may be but a sculptured marble slab turned gracefully into a long-remembered monument of a long-forgotten man. God forbid it. Lincoln lives. He lives on and on in the hearts of true Americans.

The San Francisco News-Call Bulletin, Reporter Donald Canter, and 9,000 San Franciscans Receive 1961 Inter-American Press Association - Tom Wallace Award

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following in a series of articles relative to the situation in Chile, written by Donald Canter. This article is included in the award-winning series:

[From the San Francisco News-Call Bulletin, Oct. 18, 1960]

MIRACLE IN CHILE—FROM SAN FRANCISCO HEART

(Last spring, when earthquakes brought ruin to Chile, News-Call Bulletin readers were quick and warmhearted in their response to this newspaper's appeal for aid to the Chileans.

More than $46,000 was contributed. News-Call Bulletin reporter Donald Canter visited Chile, decided that the money should be spent on a housing project in Valdivia, a southern Chile town hardest hit by the quakes.

Now that project has been completed. Canter has just returned from its dedication. This is the second of three stories about Valdivia and the "little City of San Francisco" built with the contributions of our readers.—The EDITOR.)

(By Donald Canter)

They're still talking in Valdivia about that stranger who took a dozen housewives on a shopping tour, with a million pesos in his pocket, and made them spend it all.

Many insist he's a miracle man. He definitely isn't. This reporter should know, since he was that stranger.

What I was equipped with, when I went back to Chile earlier this month to dedicate the city of San Francisco housing project, was some hard American dollars of your money, if you were one of the 9,000 donors to the News-Call Bulletin Chilean Quake Fund.

These homes, 11 of them, built with $33,000 from your quake fund, were now ready. But what good is a home when you've got nothing to put on its floors, no beds to sleep in, no stove to heat your food, no tables to eat your meals, no plates to eat from?

That's why I embarked on my 1-million-peso shopping spree, not doubting for a moment that you wanted me to.

Last June, when I first went to Valdivia and handpicked 11 families to live in the planned San Francisco apartments, I hadn't bothered to check on their wordly possessions.

This time, as the moment had come to move them from their hovels or out of friends' homes, I discovered six of them didn't possess even the most elementary items to set up decent housekeeping.

I'd found steelworker Herminio Rodriguez' clan of seven huddled in a bare hut around a brazier with glowing coals.

I'd traced the five-member family of carpenter Wenceslao Aresmendi to an unlighted emergency house, which they shared with eight other families.

His wife was nursing a newborn baby in a corner of the litter-strewn room. Asked what he could call his own, he pointed at the half-burned candle. "Not much more than that," he said.

Dental technician Humberto Leiva, who lost his home and all of his professional equipment, proudly showed me his 2-month-old baby boy, when I asked him what he'd acquired since the quake took all.

"That's about it," he said, but there was no bitterness in his voice. For the past 3 months he'd made it his daily routine, after returning from work in a friend's shop, to pass the construction site of the city of San Francisco. "Seeing it grow and knowing we'd live there gave me the strength to carry on," he laughed.

His wife, Carmen, asked me to guess the baby's name. When I failed, she gave me a reprimanding look.

"There was only one way I could show the people of San Francisco my gratitude,"

she said, "that was to name my boy after their great city. His name is Francisco, and I know he'll bear it proudly."

She asked me and Blanca Freire, a Chilean welfare worker who got her training in San Francisco, to be Francisco's godparents. We accepted, pointing out we did it in your name, that from this moment on virtually all of the News-Call Bulletin readers could consider themselves Francisco's godparents.

I asked Mrs. Leiva, Mrs. Rodriguez, Mrs. Aresmendi and three other women to make a list of what they needed most of all to start a half-way decent existence in their new houses in the City of San Francisco.

I urged them to shop around the next day, jot down the bargains they found, and come to my hotel 2 days later at 9 a.m. sharp.

Then I headed for the bank, exchanged $1,000 American into its equivalent of one million Chilean pesos.

The Chilean Red Cross readily offered me, without charge, two dozen mattresses, three dozen blankets and 11 cases of kitchenware, all brand new and all labeled: American Red Cross. They were promptly delivered by truck to Valdivia's City of San Francisco.

Then came the big day. I was still asleep when the phone rang in my hotel room. I looked at my watch. It was 7 a.m. The operator told me that a Mrs. Rodriguez was waiting for me in the lobby. None of her family had been able to sleep that night out of pure excitement, she confided when I came down.

By 8 a.m., a full hour before the appointed time, all six women were there. I looked at their shopping lists. Some of them had done pretty sharp looking around.

Mrs. Victor Gomez for example, had listed an entire rattan living room set for $35 (35,000 pesos) and Mrs. Rodriguez had found three brand-new beds for the grand total of $27. Mrs. Enedina Pavie had marked such items as an electric iron, 8 yards of drapery material, a table cloth and a doormat. And all of them needed stoves.

So we boarded two taxis and headed for the Molina stove factory, where I let the women loose, to the consternation of the owner. One particular model caught the fancy of all and in their inspection-fury they might have taken it apart if I hadn't calmed them down.

The price was $87 each, but after some determined bargaining (after all, I was working with your money) I got six of them for $450. There went close to half of my million pesos.

And so we went after the beds and the iron and the drapery material and the tables and the chairs and the dressers and the rattan furniture.

When the day was done and my wallet empty, I got six luscious kisses, which I gratefully accepted on your behalf.

It was Friday evening and tomorrow was moving day. That night I dreamed that all of you were there in Valdivia's City of San Francisco, that you watched them come to the homes you gave them, their old and new belongings loaded on horse and buggies, push carts and an occasional rickety truck.

Too Much About the Unpleasant—Too Little About the Worth While

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, today's installment in the series of eminent Americans of Italian descent, currently being published by the New York Daily Mirror, is devoted to the famous novelist and biographer, Frances Winwar. She is a native of Sicily and her original name was Francesca Vinciguerra—the English meaning of the last name being win war.

Miss Winwar's novels and biographies have attained best-seller popularity. Her contribution to American literature is widely acclaimed. We agree with her view that too much is told about the unpleasant, the misdeeds of the few who gain notoriety, but unfortunately too little is told about the worth while, about those who make lasting contributions to the welfare of America.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the article published in today's Mirror:

CHILD OF BUILDER—SHE BUILDS BOOKS

(By Ara Piastro and Harry Altshuler)

On a house in the middle of the Sicilian town of Taormina there's a plaque honoring a distinguished native, a world-famous novelist and biographer. "Frances Winwar was born here, May 3, 1900," it says.

It's the wrong house, and she wasn't Frances Winwar, then—but the date, at least, is correct.

Francesca Vinciguerra, which was her name, was actually born in a cottage on the outskirts of town. But the one with the plaque is a lot more convenient for tourists; maybe that's what inspired the townsfolk to place it there.

Every now and then in New York, she encounters friends just returned from Taormina; she can tell by a certain glazed look in their eyes as they recognize her. "They think I'm supposed to be dead," she laughs, "to have a memorial already."

Frances Winwar is very much alive, and looking forward to the publication next fall of her latest biography: "Jean-Jacques Rousseau: Conscience of an Era." Random House is the pulisher.

How did "Vinsiguerra" become translated to "Winwar," its English equivalent? It happened about 30 years ago, when her first novel, "The Ardent Flame," was accepted. "We've got to do something about your name," the editor protested. "It's too long to fit across the spine of the book."

She went along with the idea, and even trimmed "Francesca" down also.

She had been in this country since the age of 3. Her father, a singer well known in Sicily, turned to the building trades here, and her two brothers also are in the building trades. Some delightful magic in an eighth-grade public school class here turned the girl in another direction: the teacher read Stevenson's "A Child's Garden of Verses" aloud.

She was enchanted. She knew from that moment that poetry—or some form of writing—would occupy her life.

From poems in the school paper, she progressed after studying at Hunter and Columbia, to writing book reviews and newspaper features in a literary vein.

One of her early triumphs came on the day famed writer Joseph Conrad died in 1924. An afternoon paper, short of reference material and desperate for an adequate obituary, called Frances in, and she knocked out a front-page story about Conrad's life and work. When the great actress Elenora Duse and the playwright Luigi Pirandello visited this country in the 1920's, she helped them find their way around and interpreted for them.

She wrote seven novels, but her great interest in people led her into the field of biography, where she has won international acclaim—and best-seller popularity as well—with her lives of literary figures and others who trod the pages of history. Among them are "The Romantic Rebels," about Byron, Shelley and Keats; "Oscar Wilde and the Yellow Nineties," "American Giant," a life of Walt Whitman; "The Immortal Lovers," on Robert and Elizabeth Browning; and most recently, "Wingless Victory," about Duse and poet Gabriele d'Annunzio; and "the Haunted Palace," a biography of Edgar Allen Poe.

She also did, for the Limited Editions Club, what is recognized as the finest translation of the Decameron.

She was married early in life and has a son and a grandson, an accomplished musician at 15, of whom she is fondly proud. She lives in a pleasant apartment on Central Park West and has a summer home in Vermont.

Stories about criminals of Italian background, publicized out of all proportion to their trivial number, bring this comment from her: "We know too much of the unpleasant, not enough of the worthwhile.

"If Marconi had come to America at the same time a gang killing occurred, which do you think would have gotten the publicity?" The obvious answer: "Unfortunately the sensational, rather than the worthwhile."

And she develops a pet theory that our whole heritage of Western culture was channeled to us from the ancient Greeks through Sicily. "Sicily was the first Greek colony, and the cradle of European culture," she says. "Sicilians can be very proud of that."

Wyoming, Pa., Borough Council Commends Comdr. Alan B. Shepard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter of transmittal from Mrs. William Semmens, secretary, Wyoming Borough Council, with which she forwards a copy of a resolution adopted on May 5, 1961 by the council in recognition of the space exploit of Lt. Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr.

The indicated letter and resolution follow:

WYOMING BOROUGH COUNCIL,
Wyoming, Pa., May 5, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: Enclosed is a copy of the resolution sent to Lt. Comdr. Alan B. Shepard. Burgess Jack Dempsey told me to send you a copy, which I was pleased to do.

We wish to say, in the past your generous hospitality, kindness, and thoughtfulness will always be remembered.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. WILLIAM SEMMENS,
Secretary, Wyoming Borough Council.

RESOLUTION OF COMMENDATION

We the members of Wyoming Borough Council, Wyoming, Pa., in our regular meeting of May 5, 1961, hereby resolve, and said resolution has been spread on the minutes of this meeting.

We commend Cmdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr. for his brave effort,

We are proud of a fellow American who has brought to our country the honor of having successfully achieved the flight into space,

Our respect, love, and kindest wishes for your future will always be with you, Cmdr. Alan B. Shepard,

LEE CHIAVACCI,
BERNARD GAVLICK,
PETER CHRONOWSKI,
CLAIR MURDOCH,
JOSEPH MICHAELS,
GEORGE METCALFE,
Council Members.
JACK DEMPSEY,
Burgess of Wyoming Borough.
MRS. WILLIAM SEMMENS,
Secretary, Wyoming Borough Council.

People Over 65 Have Best Payment Record at Wisconsin Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, how well do our older citizens meet their hospital bills? Certainly, one of the best criteria of ability to pay for hospital services is the record of actual payments. One survey of actual hospital records shows that our older people have a far better record of payment of hospital bills than other age groups.

This survey was made by Mr. L. T. Servais, credit manager of the Bellin Memorial Hospital in Green Bay, Wis., one of the principal cities in my district. It is based upon actual records of hospital admissions and delinquent accounts over a 2-year period.

It shows, contrary to popular belief, that people over 65 have a significantly better record of payment of hospital expenses than other patients. While they represented 14.6 percent of admissions to this hospital, they constituted only 9.6 percent of delinquent accounts and only 4.7 percent of uncollectible accounts.

Particular attention is called to Mr. Servais' statement that "all three hospitals (in Green Bay) take care of whatever patients the doctors send regardless of financial status. The matter of payment is taken up after the patient is admitted, not before."

The results of Mr. Servais' survey are contained in an article he wrote for the magazine, Hospital Management. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include it at this point in the RECORD:

DO THE AGED REALLY NEED FEDERAL AID?

(By L. T. Servais, credit manager, Bellin Memorial Hospital, Green Bay, Wis.)

For the past few years or more we have all been subjected to the oratory of the politicians declaiming for further medical assistance to the aged by the Federal Government.

Probably no individual has more genuine grassroots experience with the paying ability of the elderly than your hospital credit manager. As such I had been conscious of no greater percentage of hardship medical expense among the aged than of any other age group.

To a great extent the ability of any group to pay is reflected in how well that group does pay. The elderly, I had thought, were paying as well as any of the others, until the dingdong ng of the politicans made me curious.

For the past 23 years I have been credit manager of one of three private hospitals in Green Bay, Wis. There is no county hospital here to take care of welfare cases or those, far more of a problem, who are not quite poor enough to qualify for welfare assistance. All three hospitals take care of whatever patients the doctors send regardless of financial status. The matter of payment is taken up after the patient is admitted, not before.

THE SCORE

It was decided to find out just how well, or how poorly, patients over 65 were paying their accounts. The first step was to gather data on all of the admissions for the previous 2 years to see what percentage constituted those over 65. While we were at it we classified maternity cases separately, too, as we did think that we were having more than average difficulty with this class. Our percentage ratio (less newborns) was as follows:

Patients:	*Percent*
Over 65	14.6
Maternity	20.4
All others	65

Next we classified all delinquent accounts of 3 months to 1½ years of age. The percentage ratio was:

Patients:	*Percent*
Over 65	9.6
Maternity	29.6
All others	60.8

These percentages showed that the group over 65 were by far the best paying of the three. Their rate of delinquency was almost a third less than that of the average patient under 65 (other than maternity) and less than half of that of the maternity accounts.

Next we did a bit of further investigating. We went through our "dead file." This consists of a group of accounts accumulated over the past 23 years on which all collection effort has ceased. For adequate reasons they had become hopelessly uncollectible. We classified maternity and old age accounts, with the following percentage results:

Patients:	*Percent*
Over 65	4.7
Maternity	25.2

We did not have a classification over the 23 years to compare these percentages with. However, the percentages over the 23 years would not be greatly different than those shown above for the past 2 years. In other words, while oldsters made up about 14 percent of all accounts, they constituted only 4.7 percent of those not ultimately collected. While the maternity accounts consisted of about 20 percent of all accounts, those never collected amounted to 25.2 percent of the dead accounts.

MATERNITY ACCOUNTS

To extend this analysis a bit further, if a hospital were losing 4 percent a year through uncollectible accounts, about 1 percent of this loss would be on maternity accounts, while a little over ⅔ of 1 percent would be on the over-65 group, though these accounts average larger than maternity accounts.

Maternity accounts have become more difficult to collect over the past 20 years because of the younger age of marriage, and because of the ease with which a young couple can now get themselves hopelessly in debt.

At least from our findings it might seem to be a question as to whether the old folks are really the group most in need of aid. It must be pointed out though that old age assistance has played a large part in keeping down the losses on those over 65. However, this law, as that of social security, has been in effect for the past 25 years. It must also be pointed out that Wisconsin, as well as most States, has long had statutes covering necessary medical care by municipalities, counties, and townships of indigents of any age.

It might be quite interesting as well as illuminating for other hospitals to make a somewhat similar survey to see if the over 65 are really the problem that certain lawmakers depict. We were quite surprised to find that they were actually paying better than any other group. We had thought they might merely be doing as well.

Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1961

SPEECH
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6441) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for a more effective program of water pollution control.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, the subject of H.R. 6441, the water pollution bill, is one which is of very great interest, not only to the people of my district but to all Americans who share their concern with the preservation of our great national heritage of rivers, lakes, streams, and beaches, for health, for beauty, and for recreation.

I am privileged to have sponsored similar legislation on this subject and warmly associate myself with the proposals embodied in the measure introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK].

The bill would, among other things, first, increase the annual authorization for grants for waste treatment works construction from $50 million to $100 million and the total authorization from $500 million to $1 billion; second, increase the maximum allowable grant from $250,000 to $800,000 and substitute a sliding scale formula for the existing 30 percent grant limitation; third, require priority for previously filed applications under $250,000; fourth, increase from $3 million to $5 million annual grants to State and interstate water pollution control programs, and extend the time limit from June 30, 1961, to June 30, 1971; and fifth, transfer the administration of the Federal Water Pollution Control Program from the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

It is essential that we should act immediately, through the Federal Government, to protect our coastal waters and navigable streams and many other waters which are now faced with the threat of sewage, industrial wastes, garbage and other sources of pollution.

The plain fact is, Mr. Chairman, that the tremendous growth of population, especially in the suburbs of our metropolitan areas such as my own district in

New York, requires action of a kind which was not needed in an earlier, simpler age. Practices which were tolerable even a generation ago, today threaten the homes, health, and happiness of millions of decent, self-respecting American families. I know nothing that is of greater ultimate national importance than to preserve our heritage of water for ourselves and our children. I freely acknowledge that State and local governments also share this responsibility. We of New York State have long recognized our obligation, through our long fight for conservation which began over a generation before the Federal Government concerned itself with this great national problem. It is clear now, not only for reasons of jurisdiction over coastal and navigable waters, but for the pooling of experience and the administration of broad conservation policies to deal with problems which are interstate in their nature, that the Federal Government should play a stronger and more decisive part in the struggle to preserve our heritage.

I hope that in the enactment of this bill in its entirety that the Congress and the Government of the United States will lend full authority, wisdom, and experience to the solution of the many problems of pollution and deterioration which have been created by generations of human carelessness and indifference.

Mr. Chairman, again I say I am pleased to be identified with this vital legislation.

Thailand Reported Moving Toward Neutralist Stand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK MacGREGOR
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow in Geneva there is scheduled to begin an international conference on the subject of peace and war in southeast Asia. In this connection, and in view of our deteriorating position in Laos, I should like to call attention to the following article appearing in the New York Times of today:

THAILAND REPORTED MOVING TOWARD NEUTRALIST STAND

(By Robert Trumbull)

BANGKOK, THAILAND, May 10.—A strong drift toward neutralism is reported to be growing in Thailand as a consequence of a general feeling of discouragement over the prospect of keeping adjacent Laos out of Communist hands.

Unless the United States takes strong and immediate steps to halt Communist advances in southeast Asia, Thailand may leave the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, in the view of some observers. She would then seek security with her neighboring neutralist or nonalined Nations: Cambodia, Burma, Malaya, and India.

Marshal Sarit Thanarat, Thai Premier, and Foreign Minister Thanat Khoman are expected to warn Vice President JOHNSON, who is on a tour of Asia to pledge U.S. support against Communist aggression, that the United States must act quickly to save the free southeast Asian countries for the West.

Although the Thai leaders may refrain, perhaps out of oriental politeness, from threatening Vice President JOHNSON with Thailand's withdrawal from SEATO, there is no hesitation here in communicating such sentiments to other Americans.

Some knowledgeable circles in Bangkok speculate that the Government might set the stage for a break with the alliance by first arranging Premier Sarit Thanarat's resignation so that the decision for neutralism could be made by a new leader.

The Thais are worried by the prospect that the forthcoming Geneva conference on Laos will end with some arrangement leaving the Communists in control or in a position to take control later of the Mekong River basin. This would leave the Thai border exposed to Communist infiltration, as South Vietnam is exposed to Communist North Vietnam.

Thai authorities have evidence that Communist agents are already training young men in northern Thailand for an eventual attempt to take over this country by arms. The police have reported the arrest this week of 50 persons suspected of plotting for the Communists in Ubon and Sakonnakhon Provinces.

Remnants of Communist guerrilla bands driven from Malaya to the wild Thai border form the possible nucleus of a Communist insurrection.

The Thai Government wished to protect the vital Mekong basin by sending troops to aid the Royal Lao Army against the pro-Communist Pathet Lao movement. The Filipinos also wanted to intervene militarily. Both Bangkok and Manila were disappointed when the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization conference here last winter merely issued a vaguely worded warning to the Communists against further encroachments.

The failure of the alliance—and the United States—to act as the pro-Communists continued to advance in Laos sharpened doubts here over the value of continuing the eight-nation alliance linking Thailand in a pro-Western defense pact with the United States, Britain, France, Australia, New Zealand, Pakistan, and the Philippines.

Some observers feel the United States might save the Western position in Thailand by standing firm at the Geneva talks for a truly neutral Laos and by positive military steps to assist South Vietnam against Communist guerrillas and infiltrators.

Bangkok opposes a settlement in Laos that would either bring the pro-Communists into a coalition government or that would partition the country so the Communists would be able to take advantage of an easy infiltration route into Thailand across the Mekong Valley.

Even if Thailand becomes neutralist she would continue to be anti-Communist and would probably avoid diplomatic connections with Communist China, it is believed here. On the other hand the likelihood is seen that a nonaligned Bangkok would seek friendship with the Soviet Union as a counterbalance to Chinese Communist ambitions to dominate southeast Asia.

Two Hundred Eighty-Seventh Anniversary of the Founding of Germantown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1691

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, many old communities in the United States annually celebrate their founding dates with events which excite the interest not only of the residents of the area, but also of Americans everywhere. Some of these communities are so old that they deserve special comment because of a record of progress that has been both continuous and substantial. Such a place is Germantown, which is a part of the Sixth Congressional District which I have had the privilege to represent in the 87th as well as in the previous Congress. This settlement was founded more than a hundred years prior to the inception of the United States. It continues to flourish while maintaining the traditions which have made it one of the leading communities in the country. It will be recalled that George Washington was a familiar figure in Germantown in 1793 and 1794. He rented the Perot-Morris House for personal lodging; and it was here that his Cabinet met frequently during the summer of 1794.

The 278th anniversary of the founding of Germantown will be celebrated the week of May 14 with a series of events over an 8-day period. The celebration will be sponsored by the Germantown Community Council, comprised of some 150 organizations, and the Business Men's Association of Germantown. The activities will begin next Sunday with Prayer Day and a fellowship service at James Methodist Church. At 2 p.m. the annual Vernon Art Exhibit will open in Vernon Park, with awards presented at 3 p.m. Highlights of the week's exercises will include the traditional Vernon Fair to be held May 17 in Vernon Park. Value Days offered by the business community will be on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, May 18, 19, and 20. A tour of historic homes will be conducted on May 21.

The Youth Forum—Teen's Views on U.S. Prestige

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the very real contribution our young people want to make for their Nation is thumbnailed in a feature which appeared in the Lowell Sunday Sun, my hometown newspaper, and which is well worthy of sharing with my colleagues. Under leave to extend my remarks, I now insert it in the RECORD:

(By Dow L. Case)

LOWELL.—The centuries-long picture of America in the eyes of the world, as a political, scientific, and cultural power without peer, is admittedly dimming with the ascendency of Russian accomplishments in these realms. This situation is troubling all intelligent, patriotic citizens in every age group.

Today's panelists were asked what they think American youth can do, individually and collectively, to refocus the spotlight of

favorable world opinion upon these shores once again.

Burlington High School's Paul Luti said: "Normally, people seem to lack spirit and patriotism unless there's a war in progress. I believe greater emphasis on a display of this spirit of patriotism before the world, coupled with a sincere effort to help others, to share their interests and respect their national pride, and above all, to reveal genuine effort to understand them and their ways of life, can do a great deal to rebuild the image of America."

Irene Simano, St. Joseph's Girls High School senior, believes students at all levels should show a greater interest in governmental affairs and such projects as the financing of CARE packages for the underprivileged overseas. Understandably, she also believes that a greater emphasis on prayer for the rectification of world tribulations should be indulged in by all who would aid in the rebuilding of the picture of America. She terminated her stand with the following observation. "I think that these things should not only be done in order to defeat communism as such, but also because sincerity within the heart dictates that all humans seek to aid their less fortunate brothers and sisters simply because it is right that they so do."

Returning to Burlington High, John Harff believes that those young people outside of Peace Corps ranks may best serve the Nation and improve the posture thereof, by standing solidly together as an unofficial group, willing to sacrifice and work diligently for all worthy causes aimed at aiding others overseas. As for the political and scientific losses thus far, he is convinced that a greater concentration of interest and activity in both fields by American youth could snowball into a point where Government improvements would be definitely led or forced into new progress.

Theresa Betty, St. Joseph's Girls High, stated her case by saying, "First, I am convinced that we should get more young enthusiasm and vigor behind the push to accelerate relief programs for those overseas. It is the people we want to reach to prove that we are not only humanely interested in their welfare, but have the will and where-with-all to give them practical aid. Not that we want them to feel we are handing out charity, but to know within themselves that we are interested in them as equal, if underprivileged, fellow men. We must prove to them that while some Russian advances seem spectacular and overpowering, we are still the Nation with the greatest heart and fraternal warmth in all the world. We must convince their young and adults alike that, though we may be temporarily behind in the spectacular, in the long pull, we will again lead in the democratic ways of peace and human good."

The San Francisco News-Call Bulletin, Reporter Donald Canter, and 9,000 San Franciscans Receive 1961 Inter-American Press Association - Tom Wallace Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. SHELLEY, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following in a series of articles relative to the situation in Chile, written by Donald Canter. These articles are included within the award-winning series:

[From the San Francisco News-Call Bulletin, Oct. 19, 1960]

WHEN A CITY OPENED ITS GOLDEN GATE

(By Donald Canter)

"San Francisco, open your Golden Gate."

They sang it in the Chilean port city of Valdivia as the doors to the just completed City of San Francisco housing project swung open for a dozen delirously-happy quake victims.

Unlike the actors in the famed movie depicting San Francisco's quake and fire of 1906, their names weren't Jeanette MacDonald, Spencer Tracy, Nelson Eddy, or Clark Gable, but rather Maria Vasquez, Victor Gomez, Humberto Leiva, and Francisco Avilez.

They weren't good actors, either, and they didn't have to be. They played it "live."

From their hovels where they had fled after the quakes crumbled their houses, they'd come to take possession of their new homes, to herald the first step in the revival and reconstruction of Valdivia, once known as "Pearl of the South."

Nine thousand readers of the News-Call Bulletin, well aware of the horrors of an earthquake, had contributed more than $46,000 to build these homes, which one Chilean newspaper described as an "everlasting landmark of true Christian spirit."

On moving day, shortly after sunrise, steelworker Herminio Rodriguez loaded his clan of seven and his few meager possessions on a rickety truck. They gave the "ruco" (hut) where they had spent the past few months, a last disgusted look and headed for the Gilde Castro district and the gleaming buildings of the city of San Francisco—the newest welcome additions to Valdivia's skyline.

On their way, they came alongside a horse-drawn cart carrying a load of rattan furniture in the same direction. The driver, Linotype Operator Victor Gomez, stopped at a little shop where he picked up a couple of beds, stacked them on top of the furniture and urged the horse on again.

Following them closely was the truck of Pharmacist Rosalda Leopoldo, the pushcart of Bookkeeper Isaac Garrido, and the human caravan of the Francisco Avilez clan, who carried their wordly belongings on their backs.

Laborers, on their way to an early shift, asked where they were heading for, shrugged their shoulders as they heard the answer: "For San Francisco, senor."

But they realized something unusual was going on when, in rapid succession, the limousines of Mayor Luis Damann, Valdivia's military commander, Gen. Alfonso Canas and Bishop Jose Sanos Ascarza went the same way, followed by a caterer's truck loaded with delicacies and four dozen bottles of good Chilean champagne (supplied by city of San Francisco building contractor Alberto Nahmias).

All the dignitaries made speeches, which—because of my knowledge of Spanish is limited—I understood only in part.

But what I picked up I want to share with you:

"News-Call Bulletin * * * wonderful people of San Francisco, Calif. * * * others made rash promises but you people delivered the goods * * * forever indebted to you * * * God bless all San Franciscans." And a few less relevant remarks about this reporter.

Then I crashed a bottle of champagne against one of the walls. The wall held up just fine and I told the contractor that his construction was apparently solid. Everybody agreed.

All of us walked a hundred yards or so to a site where a big sign announced that the Escuela Ciudad San Francisco (City of San Francisco School) soon will stand.

It will be constructed with the last $12,000 available in the News-Call Bulletin Chilean Quake Fund, and completion is scheduled in 4 months.

The school will accommodate some 150 children from 6 to 9 years, not only those from the city of San Francisco, but also from neighboring housing projects.

They don't know yet how to furnish the school properly, but they'll worry about that later. Their main concern are school benches, which are in short supply.

After some more speeches about your generosity (your ears must have been burning) somebody gave me a spade and I poured the first concrete for the foundation.

That ended the official part of the ceremonies, but to me that's when things just started.

Dozens of kids, who'd quietly stood by as the adults were engaged in their serious official acts, now suddenly rushed me, grabbed my hands, hugged me, and shouted gracias, senor, gracias, thank you a thousand times."

That's when I knew we, you and I, had done the right thing with our money.

We walked back to the home of the Leiva family, where contractor Nahmias was popping the corks off his champagne bottles.

We danced a Chilean cueca, sang the Chilean national anthem and the Star Spangled Banner.

Then somebody asked: Isn't there a San Francisco song?

And so I taught them the only one I know:

"San Francisco, open your Golden Gate."

Nothing seemed more appropriate that memorable day in Chile's Valdivia, when the doors of the city of San Francisco swung open wide.

GRATITUDE

"Without minimizing other foreign aid for our quake victims in the form of food, clothing, and donation, it should be said that this city of San Francisco housing project, presented us by readers of the News-Call Bulletin, to date is the only positive contribution for the reconstruction of Valdivia."

[From the San Francisco News-Call Bulletin, Dec. 30, 1960]

SAN FRANCISCO'S WARM SANTA SPIRIT IN CHILE

(By Donald Canter)

Never, in all of Valdivia's history, had the post office handled so many letters and postcards from Norteamerica.

As Christmas approached, they poured by the hundreds into that quake-stricken Chilean port city.

Most of them carried the same postmark: San Francisca, Calif.

And all of them carried the same address: San Francisco, Valdivia, the little city built for Chile's quake victims by warm-hearted readers of the News-Call Bulletin.

Some of the Christmas cards, individually addressed to the 11 families inhabiting the San Francisco apartments, contained dollar bills.

The Herminio Rodriguez family, whose plight was featured in one of the News-Call Bulletin stories on the Chilean disaster, received from one reader a substantial money order.

Along with the Yuletide cards arrived huge parcels containing dozens of dolls, toys, color books and warm clothing.

They were gifts from News-Call Bulletin readers who wanted to share the Christmas spirit with their Chilean friends.

When contractor Emilio Torrealba, who is nicknamed "bandido" but has a heart of gold, saw the display of good will for his people all the way from San Francisco,

U.S.A., he got into his truck and drove some 25 miles over a muddy road.

Then, in the town of Lanco known for its superb pine trees, he asked for the most beautiful Christmas tree of them all.

He erected the tree in front of the houses of Valdivia's city of San Francisco and asked the children to decorate it with some of the Christmas cards you sent them.

To most of them it was their very first Christmas tree and to all the most blessed Yuletide ever.

In the warmth of their brand new homes they played with their toys made in Yankeeland and tried to decipher the Christmas greetings written in Yankee-English.

All sang Christmas carols.

And none chanted "Yankee No".

Extent of Back-Door Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, an idea of congressional lack of control over the Federal purse strings can be gained by examining the status of back-door spending authorizations to agencies of the Federal Government, permitting these agencies to borrow from the Treasury and expend the funds without requiring an annual justification or review by the congressional committees having jurisdiction over appropriations.

Just to show the enormity of these public debt transactions and their ever-continuing growth over the years, I include a tabulation covering the period from the time this device of bypassing the scrutiny of Congress was first used and on through the years until 1960.

However, the most shocking figures of all cannot yet be calculated; namely, the amount Congress will add to the total this year. Altogether on the heels of the recommendation of President Eisenhower that back-door spending be discontinued, the Kennedy administration requests already exceed $18 billion and thereby and therein is the threat of greater use than ever of this fiscally unsound method of financing Federal programs.

If the Congress enacts a $8 billion housing bill, a $7 billion foreign aid bill and $7 billion more for grain disposal under Public Law 480, plus many more, plus those that have passed to date—all outside the normal appropriations process—history may well set the 87th Congress as having yielded its constitutional responsibility to the executive branch in greater degree than any Congress before. If so, the Representatives of the people this year will have contributed more to "one man rule" than Members during any time since the Constitution was adopted.

Here, Mr. Speaker, is the year by year record of weakening of the legislative branch through increasing loss of control of money drawn from the Treasury without the regular process of appropriation as contemplated by the Founding Fathers:

Record of public debt transactions from June 30, 1932, to June 30, 1960

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Borrowings and other advances from Treasury	Unused balance of authority at end of year	Balance of borrowing from Treasury at yearend
1932	$350.0	$1,150.0	$350.0
1933	1,235.0	2,537.4	1,585.0
1934	1,670.0	7,570.7	3,255.0
1935	825.0	5,890.4	3,655.0
1936	805.0	4,586.9	4,030.0
1937	227.0	4,997.8	3,630.0
1938	345.0	5,783.8	882.7
1939	426.3	6,235.2	273.3
1940	641.8	6,874.3	104.3
1941	798.2	9,374.4	301.7
1942	4,178.3	18,868.4	4,078.7
1943	6,969.0	15,774.7	7,519.1
1944	7,615.0	15,156.8	10,717.3
1945	4,149.0	16,810.0	12,168.7
1946	3,553.1	24,527.1	12,504.9
1947	7,346.6	21,206.2	16,579.8
1948	5,505.0	15,166.8	9,122.7
1949	5,851.0	13,473.8	13,184.3
1950	4,031.7	16,991.4	14,756.8
1951	3,780.6	17,604.9	15,360.7
1952	2,739.2	21,326.7	15,854.1
1953	4,420.4	20,006.2	18,369.3
1954	5,398.4	20,738.4	19,067.4
1955	6,224.0	19,245.2	22,347.6
1956	5,273.1	17,979.9	26,172.8
1957	6,077.7	19,834.4	28,887.9
1958	7,301.7	25,197.4	28,019.2
1959	9,958.7	25,185.7	32,827.7
1960	6,733.6	25,734.0	33,068.4
Total	114,489.6		

George Washington Memorial Parkway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, on May 10, 1961, I testified before the Senate Appropriations Committee, Interior Subcommittee, in favor of immediate action by that committee to provide a right-of-way appropriation for the purchase of parkland to complete the George Washington Memorial Parkway. This parkway is not a highway project for the benefit of local residents, but a national project conceived 31 years ago with the passage of the Capper-Cramton Act, Public Law 284. Prince Georges County has acted to meet its responsibilities and for the Federal Government to renege on its part of the bargain at this late date would be an obvious act of bad faith. Unless immediate steps are taken to preserve this historic stretch, announced private development plans will make land acquisition costs prohibitive.

In support of my views, I should like to commend to the attention of my colleagues a recent address by Assistant Secretary of the Interior John A. Carver, Jr.

The address follows:

REMARKS BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR JOHN A. CARVER, JR., AT 10 A.M., MONDAY, MAY 8, 1961, AT A CONFERENCE SPONSORED BY THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION AT THE INDIAN SPRING COUNTRY CLUB, GLENMONT, MD.

While we are meeting here, the city of Washington is honoring an American who only 96 hours ago experienced for a few minutes a dimension of open space the rest of us will only imagine, never experience, in our lifetimes.

It seems to me, however, that two lessons from that leap into open space have relevance to this conference: First, that it is not necessary personally to leave the sights, sounds, smells, and horrors of our atmosphere, to thrill vicariously in a fellow man's sampling of such escape.

The second lesson is more mundane—the escape may be enormously expensive. For Alan Shepard's 5 minutes out of this world the cost, I read yesterday, was $400 million.

In such terms, we must learn to think about man's need for parkland and open space here on the planet—the paradox that man needs some openness, though he himself may never sample it; and that to get it will not be easy or cheap.

The front page of the program for this conference says that Prince Georges and Montgomery Counties will have 700,000 more people by 1980 than they now contain.

Population experts tell us that by the same year Greater Metropolitan Washington's population will be between 3 million and 3½ million. These statistics creep upon us inexorably—most of you here can remember, as I do, when it was announced that the metropolitan area had passed the million mark.

By 1980 about 60 million additional humans will be added to the population of our country's metropolitan centers, and 50 million of them will live in new suburbs, in new houses on new streets. The children will attend schools which are not yet built. Country which is open space today will furnish their driveways.

In order to accommodate these new Americans, many wild and beautiful countrysides will be buried beneath the waves of population, pollution, profligacy and what some people call progress.

Those areas will have vanished like so many of the forests and grasslands of the past; like the clear water from our springs and streams; like the topsoil we have spilled into the seas; like the departed heath hen, the Eskimo curlew, the Atlantic salmon and the passenger pigeon.

It is a cruel hoax to dismiss the thought with a comfortable recollection that vast open areas still exist in the West. In my own State of Idaho, the struggle in which you are here engaged seems more abstract, but it goes on nonetheless. "What meaning," they ask in the West, "can a mountain lake in the Sawtooths have to an easterner who never in his lifetime will see it?"

The same meaning, I submit, that Alan Shepard's voyage has to all of us. Man's spirit soars in the escape of others. John Muir said it: "If I should be fated to walk no more with Nature, be compelled to leave all I most devoutly love in the wilderness, return to civilization and be twisted into the characterless cable of society, then these sweet free, cumberless rovings will be as chinks and slits on life's horizon, through which I may obtain glimpses of the treasures that lie in God's wilds beyond my reach."

I am not here to paint a rosy picture of the future for our crusade to save the Nation's parkland and open spaces. With the cooperation of groups like yours, we can win, but it will be a grinding battle all the way.

It is an honor to join your conference as the representative of Secretary Udall and the Department of the Interior. President Kennedy's special message to Congress on natural resources charted the broad outlines of the most ambitious park conservation program in our lifetime. Secretary Udall's immediate action to move ahead on that program I think is the greatest stimulus to the park movement since the days of Teddy Roosevelt.

The Secretary of the Interior is responsible for a vast Department with a multiplicity of duties. He is the Cabinet member responsible for the operation and administration of huge dams and enormous reservoirs, giant public land holdings, mining, grazing, fisheries, wildlife management, government of the insular territories and the real estate of about 350,000 American Indians. He is responsible for finding a way to turn ocean water into drinking water economically and for running a railroad in Alaska.

Yet of all these assignments and more, he has chosen for his burning personal interest the program for parks and open spaces.

The President has instructed him to take the lead in setting the course of the executive branch in meeting the challenge of our vanishing parklands.

It it no news to you, but a lot of Americans do not realize how far we have gone already to using up and wasting our national heritage. The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission merits high praise for its forward-looking 5-year plan to quadruple the public parklands in its two counties.

In the entire Metropolitan Washington area, the goal for park and recreation lands by 1980 is 200 square miles, including Federal, State, county and community facilities. It does not include the farmland and other open country we need.

The pressure to commit the available land to commercial exploitation is terrific. For instance, the fate of the George Washington Memorial Parkway in Prince Georges County is probably being settled on Capitol Hill today at the final Senate subcommittee hearing on appropriations for right-of-way funds.

Frankly, the chances do not seem good for saving the riverfront for a parkway down to Fort Washington. If it goes, it is gone forever, for the brutal realities of governmental finance argue against converting apartment buildings back into park sites.

Similar conflicts are taking place across the face of our country. And time is our mortal enemy, in the struggle to get park and recreational areas for present needs and to save them for future needs.

Secretary Udall defines it as a quiet crisis in conservation. One of our first needs is to turn it into a noisy crisis, with Americans from coast to coast realizing their predicament and clamoring for action.

We in the Federal Government need you to put the heat on, to step up the temperature.

Appeals from the White House, glowing promises in congressional bills, dramatic pledges by the Interior Department are all very fine intellectual exercises—but they are meaningless unless the general public gets behind them and pushes.

It is up to you to bear down hard so that your splendid plans won't get bogged down in public apathy or break into bits against a stone wall of bureaucratic excuses.

The nightmare rate at which the open country has been sacrificed to the concrete mixer has shown clearly that the task of protecting adequate parkland is simply too big for most individual communities to handle alone.

The Federal Government is forced by events to play a major role in helping towns and counties with the job. The Department of the Interior is concentrating major efforts on the evaluation of the national park needs. We are trying to do everything we can to see that easterners are provided with parks in the East. It is a new approach—and long overdue. The No. 1 item on our legislative calendar is the Cape Cod Seashore bill. We want the cape made part of the National Park System, as Cape Hatteras has been saved for the public.

The preservation of eastern parklands is expensive. But it will be more costly in terms of damage to the human spirit if we permit them to be buried under blacktop roads, parking lots, and barbecue shacks.

Theodore Roosevelt said: "The great natural resources which are vital to the welfare of the whole people should be kept either in the hands or under the full control of the whole people for the benefit of all our people and not monopolized for the benefit of the few."

President Kennedy had that admonition in mind when he warned in his natural resources message:

"Our entire society rests upon and is dependent upon our water, our land, our forests, our minerals. How we use these resources influences our health, our security, our economy, and well-being. And if we fail to chart a proper course of conservation and development, if we fail to use these blessings properly, we will be in trouble within a short time."

The public cheerfully spends millions of dollars for highways, cars to fill them with, cloverleaf interchanges, and overpasses. But only pennies are allotted, and then reluctantly, for the acquisition of land for park uses.

Parklands are expensive. But can we afford not to buy them? Costs are doubling about every 10 years. Is it economically sound to put off any longer what we should have done years ago?

The soaring rate of the population increase, coupled with the additional leisure time of our people, and their automotive mobility, all combine to exert a pressure on existing park facilities which is becoming unbearable.

The face of the Nation has been altered abruptly and without proper planning. Unless we come to grips with the park problems now the spaciousness of our country will be damaged profoundly.

Our abundant land is diminishing rapidly under the demands of the booming population increases. The American wilderness has helped to shape the American character. Something important would go out of us if we destroy our out of doors. We need it to maintain our very sanity against the pace of this age of plastics, motorcars, hypertension and tranquilizing pills.

Man does not live by bread alone—nor by outdoor movies, interstate turnpikes, and jet airports. As the quail have disappeared from the edge of our woods, as gadget-filled houses and swimming pools crowd out the bloodroot and the blackberries, as English sparrows and starlings chase away the titmouse and chickadee, our truest standards of living have gone down.

Suburban realty values have increased manifold. But we confront the paradoxical problem that they may become so valuable in terms of cash that the land will be just about worthless as a fit place to live.

Sherwood Anderson said that when America was new and men were often alone in the fields and forests, they got a sense of bigness outside themselves that has now in some way been lost. The bigness of the country took the shrillness out of them and they learned the trick of quietness.

"We simply need some wild country available to us even if we never do more than drive to its edge and look in, for it can be a means of reassuring ourselves of our sanity as creatures and part of the geography of our home."

Historically through the years the Department of the Interior, working through its National Capital Parks, has been concerned with your problems in the field of parklands. Now that we are in a crisis, our concern is more profound, and we will be devoting even more time and attention to them.

If you find yourselves getting tangled in our redtape, we will look around for the sharpest shears we can find. We are all in the same fix, and we have to work together. I know that we can and will.

Letter in Support of H.R. 6400, Proposed Farm Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received a letter from my good friend, Al Lamb, manager of the Morrow County Grain Growers, which indicates his support for the administration's proposed farm bill, H.R. 6400. The points which he makes are, I believe, basic ones and I am sure that they will be of interest to my colleagues. The text of the letter follows:

MORROW COUNTY GRAIN GROWERS, INC.,
Lexington, Oreg., May 4, 1961.

Hon. AL ULLMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In examining H.R. 6400, usually referred to as the omnibus farm bill, it appears to me that the Secretary of Agriculture will have less power under the proposed law than he now has under the present acts.

This is in effect a "do it yourself" farm bill under which the first responsibility of making changes in present programs lies with the growers of the various agricultural commodities. After the respective growers' committee comes up with a program, the Secretary of Agriculture and either Houses of Congress have authority to veto such a program individually or together should a review cause them to feel the plan is not in the public interest. Should there be no veto, the plan then goes to a vote of the farmers affected and must receive a two-thirds vote before becoming law. These provisions appear to give adequate safeguards from ill-planned moves or abuse and to refute any charges that Congress might be surrendering its responsibility.

It appears to me that any farmer organization opposing this bill would be indicating a great lack of confidence in the intelligence and integrity of their own members. This proposed bill should take farm plans out of the political arena and put the making of them into the hands of those directly concerned and who would naturally set them up on an economic basis. There seems to be ample protection for the consumer and taxpayer through the review and veto powers outlined above.

For many years wheat farmers have been trying to have a two-price plan enacted. Under the proposed law such a plan could be offered for a farmer referendum subject to first having been reviewed by the Secretary of Agriculture and both Houses within a 60-day period. We wheat people feel that this program would end the wheat problem with much less cost to the taxpayer than under the present program.

No doubt other commodity organizations have general plans affecting their crops, which would be offered for respective farmer acceptance after examination by the Congress, and the Secretary of Agriculture, should the machinery for such an undertaking be set up via Senate bill No. 1643. Such an action would be far less political in origin and be subject to far more farmer cooperation than has been experienced from one handed down from on high.

As long as the plan calls for a review and provides for an easy veto by the President, the Secretary of Agriculture, and either House of Congress. I cannot see any dodg-

ing of congressional responsibility or excess grant of power in the enactment of the proposed act. It appears to simply leave the writing of individual commodity programs in the hands of those most experienced and affected.

It is recognized that farmers are in a low-income category, that in many cases are subsidizing consumers through extremely low prices received, at a time when most other costs and incomes have been on the rise. This is true in spite of the fact that many billions of dollars have been spent by the Government in the effort to correct this situation. In view of the results, it seems highly necessary to try another approach.

Sincerely,

MORROW COUNTY GRAIN GROWERS, INC.,
AL LAMB, *Manager*.

Dr. Edward C. Welsh, Good Choice for Space Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD an article published in the New York Mirror on Wednesday, May 10, 1961, entitled "Behind the Space Scene."

The article is about Dr. Edward C. Welsh, who was recently named as executive secretary of the National Aeronautics and Space Council. In this capacity, Dr. Welsh will be the principal assistant to the Chairman of the Council, Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, whom he will aid in drafting the Nation's space budget and step up the U.S. space effort.

It is universally recognized by now that the space age is the most challenging factor of our times. Under the circumstances, we are indeed fortunate to have a man of Dr. Welsh's caliber and background to assume a leading post with the Space Council. I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate President Kennedy and Vice President JOHNSON on the excellent choice they have made in selecting Dr. Welsh for this very important and responsible position. There is no doubt in my mind that he will render great service to our Nation.

The article about Dr. Welsh is as follows:

[From the New York Mirror, May 10, 1961]

BEHIND THE SPACE SCENE

(By Edward Cristy Welsh)

WASHINGTON, May 9.—For nearly 20 years Dr. Edward Cristy Welsh has belonged to the legion of public servants who from behind the scenes influence and direct public decisions but never receive public recognition.

The post-war reorganization of Japan's industry was largely the result of the handiwork of the 51-year-old economist, who started off as a university teacher and turned to Government service in World War II. The attacks of Senator STUART SYMINGTON of Missouri and his fellow Democrats on the defense policies of the Eisenhower administration were often based on the ideas and facts furnished by him.

Recently Dr. Welsh moved into a more open role as executive secretary of the National Aeronautics and Space Council. As the principal assistant to Vice President Johnson, the council chairman, he has been given the responsibility for drafting an expanded space budget, which is to accelerate the Nation's efforts in space.

As the alter ego for public officials, Dr. Welsh has two necessary attributes for any good staff assistant—a gluttony for work and an incisive mind which can digest vast amounts of material and then present it in condensed form for an official.

A slight man 5 feet 11 inches, 140 pounds, Dr. Welsh has a reservoir of energy that permits him to work up to 90 hours a week when a lively issue is boiling. As a physician told him after a recent physical examination, "You seem to be strung together with electrical wires."

In recent years, Dr. Welsh has been legislative assistant to Senator SYMINGTON—a job that has permitted him to become one of the best informed military experts on Capitol Hill.

His association with Senator SYMINGTON dates back a decade, when Mr. SYMINGTON, after resigning as Secretary of the Air Force, became chairman of the National Security Resources Board, and hired Dr. Welsh as his assistant.

Mr. SYMINGTON took Dr. Welsh along when he moved over to become administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and when he was elected to the Senate in 1952.

Dr. Welsh started his Government career in 1942 as regional price executive of the Office of Price Administration's headquarters in Cleveland, Ohio. After 2 years he was brought to Washington to become Director of Field Operations for Price Control and then Deputy Administrator for Price Control.

Early in 1947, at the invitation of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, he became chief of the antitrust occupation government in Japan. Among his responsibilities were the dissolution of the Japanese cartels and financial reorganization of most of Japan's major companies.

At the conclusion of his work in 1950, he was cited by General MacArthur for "laying the foundation for private competitive enterprise in Japan."

Dr. Welch, who was born in Long Valley, N.J., in 1909, began his career as a university teacher and economist. After graduating from Lafayette College in 1930, he taught at Tufts College, the University of Cincinnati and 8 years at Ohio State University, where he received his Ph. D. in economics.

It was while on the faculty of the University of Cincinnati that he met his future wife, Carolyn B. White of Cincinnati. They were married in 1935. The Welshes, who have no children, are a working team, with Mrs. Welsh serving at his secretary.

Soviet Consumer Goods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article from the New York Herald Tribune of May 8, 1961. Apparently Communist economic planning just does not fill the bill. Perhaps we should establish a technical assistance program for the Soviet Union.

THAT BETTER LIFE IN RUSSIA—WARES SCANTY, INFERIOR

(By Walter Lister, Jr.)

Moscow, May 7.—Soviet yearnings for the conveniences of modern life are being frustrated by the practical exigencies of fulfilling the very planned quotas under which these conveniences are supposed to be provided.

Production of vast consumer goods—the Soviet generalization for items beyond the bare necessities—is being encouraged at the top. The trouble is, these goods are measured in the planned economy by quantity, not quality. Weight and arbitrary ruble valuation are prized far above either efficiency or attractiveness.

Soviet technicians can design an electric iron or a television set for Socialist homes as efficiently as they can put together a spaceship for Maj. Yuri Gagarin—in theory.

"LESS THAN IDEAL"

In practice, the Soviet housewife has to wait hours, months or even years to get devices that turn out to be less than ideal. The intentions often are good, but the overriding importance of the plan is ruinous.

Furniture is made big and bulky, because that fills the plan—no matter, apparently, that overstuffed couches won't fit in the tiny rooms of apartments being built by the hundreds of thousands. Almost every issue of Economic Gazette, a Communist Party daily, carries some criticism of performances in the consumer goods industry.

Soviet manufacturers should be able to produce refrigerators and washing machines on a par with the best produced in capitalist countries, the journal recently insisted.

"However," it added, "a majority of complex technical goods needs serious renewal and modernization. Industry is slow to produce new models and to expand assortment."

COST IS EXCESSIVE

Washing machine production has been stepped up, but only 10 percent of the machines are equipped with automatic devices. Of the 45 different plants making washers, some are so small and inefficient that they turn out as few as 1,000 machines a year, naturally at excessive cost.

Only old-fashioned electric irons, without any heat regulators, are being produced in quantity. To change over to new models would jeopardize fulfillment of the plan.

Soviet cameras which the newspaper Economic Gazette has said are as good as any cameras made abroad 5 years ago, have not kept up to date. The cameramakers here "rested on their oars," the journal charged, and now Soviet cameras are 4 to 5 years behind the best imported models.

Soviet watches keep excellent time, it was said, but the owners wince at the crudely designed exterior of most timepieces made here. In 1960 Moscow had 135,000 new television sets, and during that year these sets needed 315,000 repairs, or an average of 2.4 repairs a set.

Similarly, among owners of 16,000 new refrigerators, there were 13,000 requests for repairs.

When Soviet equipment breaks down, repair is sometimes difficult. In all of the Soviet Union there are only five cities where the Volga model washing machine can be fixed.

Village Life, a publication for rural areas, complained recently that tires for motorcycles are virtually impossible to obtain in the small towns where they are most useful. The tiremakers, the journal said, prefer to turn out automobile tires because these are bigger and cost more and therefore fulfill the plan much more easily and quickly.

"NO VITAL CHANGES"

Committees were established under the Council of Ministers (Cabinet) 2 years ago to expedite new improved models of house-

wares, but Economic Gazette said the committeemen have not carried out their obligation. There have been "no vital changes," it charged, and not a single research laboratory has been set up to design electric devices for modern Soviet homes.

The journal said state committees on automation and electronics should start matching their words with deeds.

"A very good idea," it said, would be to encourage Soviet designers "materially"—that is, give them bonuses, as in the capitalist system—and to boost their egos in a rather non-Communist way by letting customers know the name of designers "who make comfortable, economical household goods."

"VERY NICE" BUT—

An exhibit of homefurnishings opened this month at Moscow under the banner: "Art in everyday life." The Soviet voice of labor, "Trud," said the exhibit was "very nice," but the most impressive items either are not in production or, if they are being made somewhere, are not available.

Despite the frequent complaints, the Central Statistical Board could announce that in the first quarter of 1961 Soviet industrial production exceeded the planned target by 2.5 percent and that volume was up nearly 9 percent, compared with the first quarter of 1960.

Four-Mile Run Called Most Polluted Stream

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Washington Post on Sunday, February 12, 1961, entitled "Four-Mile Run Called Most Polluted Stream":

FOUR-MILE RUN CALLED MOST POLLUTED STREAM—AREA SAMPLES SHOW BACTERIA COUNT REACHING STAGGERING LEVEL

(By James R. Carberry, staff reporter)

The most grossly polluted stream in the Washington area—and possibly the Potomac River basin—appears to be Arlington County's Four-Mile Run.

The stream enters the Potomac just south of National Airport, about 1,000 yards upriver from a sailboat marina operated by National Capital Parks.

According to a report released last week at the winter meeting of the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, samples taken from Four-Mile Run during the water year ended last October 1 showed:

Bacterial levels reached staggering counts. Analysis of the April samples found 2.4 million germs of sewage origin in each cupful of water. The average for the year was 550,000. The U.S. Public Health Service advises against swimming in water with counts above 3,000.

The dissolved oxygen content, as measured just above the stream's mouth, was among the lowest of any tributary tested. Lack of dissolved oxygen causes a "dead" river, one which can support no aquatic life, including the useful bacteria that decompose wastes.

The biochemical oxygen demand (BOD), an engineering term which roughly describes the capacity of river to assimilate wastes, showed Four-Mile Run spectacularly overloaded. The stream's average BOD was 90. The average for the worst section of the Potomac was 5. An engineer who saw the figures said they were more characteristic of raw sewage than river water.

Arlington County's sewage treatment plant discharges about 15 million gallons a day into Four-Mile Run several thousand yards above the point the stream meets the Potomac.

(Upstream of the plant, pollution levels are not unduly high.)

It is the largest primary treatment plant in the area, removing about 40 percent of the principal pollutants in sewage The District's secondary treatment plant at Blue Plains removes about 80 percent.

Arlington Manager A. T. Lundberg said yesterday that the county plans to install secondary treatment facilities at its plant starting in 1963. The job will cost about $5 million, Lundberg said, and will take about 2 years.

During the 3 summer months, when the Potomac is most used by boatsmen, the river was in much improved shape off Sue Plains. Tributary samplings, however, showed serious pollution.

Hunting Creek, above the Alexandria and Fairfax treatment plants discharge, had bacterial counts about as bad as Four Mile Run's. But figures were available for only 2 months.

The Anacostia, partly because of a sewer breakdown which resulted in overflows of raw wastes, had bacterial counts as high as 800,000 near the Bladensburg marina.

Virginia's Difficult Run and Pimmit Run, both of which carry treatment plant effluent, also have sizable pollution loads. Rock Creek was unclean, also, chiefly because of raw discharges from double-duty sewers during rainstorms. National Zoo also flushes out animal pens directly into the stream.

As the pollution carried into the Potomac from the Washington area diminishes, the river becomes increasingly pure downstream, according to the report. During June and July, for example, it was safe for swimming below Fort Foote.

Forthcoming improvements to the Arlington County plant, the abandonment of two Fairfax plants on Pimmit Run, and construction of improved sewers along the District side of the river might even allow removal of the famous sign at the boat landing below Mount Vernon.

Hundreds of thousands of tourists have seen the sign, which says: "Warning: Avoid Contact With Polluted River Water."

Fidel Scores a Win

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we give considerable attention to the editorial position of metropolitan newspapers throughout the country. It has always been my contention that local newspapers carry the most effective grassroots comment on the perplexing issues that we face here in Washington.

Two of the outstanding local community newspapers of the suburban area which I represent recently discussed the Cuban problem. I submit for the RECORD the editorial entitled "Cuban Sellout," from the Lansing Journal of April 27, and the editorial entitled "Fidel Scores a Win," from the Harvey Tribune of May 2, which give you an insight as seen through the eyes of the grassroots newspaper editors:

CUBAN SELLOUT

Only last week, the United States suffered a severe setback in Cuba when an invasion which we sponsored was crushed by the unexpected military might of Fidel Castro.

Blamed by most commentators and spokesmen for the collapse of the attack is the Central Intelligence Agency which directed it, and on a supposed miscalculation that the Cuban people would support such an attack on Castro.

For some reason we fail to understand, few people are placing the blame where it belongs.

It belongs to the traitor or traitors in our Government or closely informed by it who sold out to the Communists—the traitor or traitors who gave the Communists the exact time and place of the main ill-fated Cuban invasion.

The following can be blamed only on an inside leak and not on the CIA planning or Cuban people's sympathies.

That Castro was able to move a large store of heavy arms to the landing site at Cochina Bay in time to overpower the invasion within 2 hours after landing. These arms required 22 to 23 hours to transport from their Havana depot.

That these heavy arms, including Russian-made jet fighters and 40-ton Stalin tanks had been unloaded from 13 Soviet freighters only 2 weeks before.

The arrest of 60,000 people and the jet planes and mammoth tanks had more to do with the failure of the Cuban people than any real and unreal amount of sympathy with the invaders. The day when a people could revolt with pitchforks has passed for good.

Given these same weapons, Batista may not have been overwhelmed by Castro—regardless of the people's sympathy.

The effect of the criticism so far is calculated to (1) discredit our intelligence agency and (2) create an opinion that the Cuban people really don't want to overthrow Castro and communism.

The effect of the criticism is not being directed against the traitor or traitors who sold us out.

Undercutting the operation of the CIA, and forgetting the Cuban as a lost cause will serve communism—as will keeping public attention away from the "smell" within our own ranks.

Perhaps we are mistaken or unreasonably harsh in our conclusions, but we are disturbed over past leaks—as when Gary Powers' U–2 flight was immediately tracked up entering Russian territory at 40,000 feet, and as only a few months ago when a precision-machine shipment from the United States to Russia was nearly allowed to leave the country—a shipment that would have placed them well ahead in the missile race.

Are they all mere mistakes.

FIDEL SCORES A WIN

It would appear—though a postive and final analysis is not yet possible—that rebel hopes of an uprising in Cuba strong enough to depose Fidel Castro have been dashed, at least for the immediate future.

It would also appear that the invasion of Cuba was not as massive as rebel reports would have us believe. Perhaps the purpose of the grand announcements was to stir resistance sentiment inside Cuba and lure new recruits to the anti-Castro movement.

Whatever the purpose of these optimistic communiques, the result of the victory of

the Castro forces is a bitter blow to the United States, in several ways.

This country is being blamed for the uprising against Castro, and the world apparently is convinced that U.S. undercover work was involved. Even our allies, unofficially, and in the press, are assuming we had a hand in the revolution.

As long as we are to bear the brunt of unfavorable world opinion and publicity we might as well have won the battle. We are now in the position of having been judged at least partly guilty, without having any gain to show for the loss.

Obviously, the Russians will make great propaganda capital out of their threats to us—to stay out of the Cuban revolution—and our alleged timidity to defy them. And Castro's successful defense against an invasion—which he has been predicting for many months—will only strengthen his hold on Cuba.

It discourages others who would rebel and it solidifies his power with some of the population, since defending one's country against invasion is a popular rallying cry, even for demagogues and dictators.

It seems, then, that we have suffered a heavy blow in the recent events in Cuba and it would appear that someone pretty high up the line underestimated Castro's real strength and overestimated that of the rebels. It would have been far better for the United States if the revolt had not been launched until success was certain.

Gallaudet: The World's Only College for the Deaf

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, since 1957 I have been privileged to serve as a member of the board of directors, representing the House, of Gallaudet College, the world's only college for deaf students.

I have been greatly impressed during this period at the sound and steady growth of the college. Its new buildings, modern equipment, and growing faculty and student body testify to the wisdom of the Congress in helping to support this uniquely important institution. Under the leadership of President Leonard M. Elstad, Gallaudet has more than justified the confidence which Congress placed in the importance of its mission.

My most recent visit to the college, Mr. Speaker, took place over the past weekend when I attended its second annual open house in observance of Better Hearing Month.

I wish it had been possible for more of our colleagues to attend the open house, to witness the demonstrations arranged by members of the Hearing and Speech Center, to see at firsthand the processes developed to counteract the loss of hearing and to develop lipreading skills and speech proficiency. It was a source of great encouragement to see what can be done to overcome the handicap of deafness.

But the source of Gallaudet's progress is not alone in the highly refined processes and techniques they have developed. It soon becomes clear to even the most casual visitor that the college's outstanding work is the product, fundamentally, of a devoted faculty and an enthusiastic student body—men and women, boys and girls who will let nothing stand in the way of leading full and productive lives in a time when our country needs the brains and talents of all our people.

In the interests of achieving a greater awareness of the valuable work being done by the people of Gallaudet College, I include as a part of my remarks the following United Press International story which appeared in the April 18 issue of the Newark (N.J.) Evening News.

COLLEGE FOR DEAF STUDENTS IS UNIQUE

WASHINGTON.—A short distance from the U.S. Capitol is a unique college where lectures are given simultaneously by voice and in sign language.

It is Gallaudet College, the only college for the deaf in the world. There professors and instructors must help ideas penetrate the soundless world of every individual student.

In the classroom a professor speaks clearly and distinctly, just as though his students had normal hearing. At the same time, he moves his hands rapidly, using a combination of sign language and the manual alphabet. This is known as the simultaneous method. The student is able to read the professor's lips as he is speaking, yet this alone is an inaccurate method of comprehension. What the student misses by lipreading he is able to understand by watching the professor's hands spell the words or by his use of sign language.

USES FLASHING LIGHT

To attract student's attention, a professor uses a flashing white light. Nearly every room has two lights high on a wall. A flashing red light denotes danger. Deaf people are so sensitive to light that a flashing red light will awaken them from a sound sleep.

Gallaudet College is an accredited college operating as a private corporation, but it receives 70 percent of its operating funds from the U.S. Government through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The remaining funds come from tuition and grants.

Students are drawn from all over the world. India, Korea, Canada, England, Hong Kong, Taiwan, and Vietnam are represented in the current student body, along with 47 U.S. States. Its modern buildings rest on a lush green campus. A varied program of instruction and an abundance of undergraduate activities are offered as in other colleges.

PLENTY OF ROOM

It has 391 students, the highest enrollment to date. The college has facilities to accommodate 1,000 students.

Amos Kendall, a member of Andrew Jackson's "kitchen cabinet" and later Postmaster General under Martin Van Buren, was responsible for its start. In 1857 Kendall found himself caring for handicapped children abandoned in the streets of Washington. At his farm 2 miles from the Capitol, he founded the Kendall School for the Deaf. He contributed a house and land, guaranteed the teachers' salaries, and later built a schoolhouse. He appointed Edward Minor Gallaudet to head the institution.

Seven years later, in 1864, Abraham Lincoln signed a special act establishing Gallaudet College as an institution with power to grant academic degrees.

Today students eagerly pursue courses in science, mathematics, social studies, romance languages and the humanities.

Participation in sports is compulsory for every student.

The college has an ultra-modern gymnasium and an Olympic-size swimming pool. Many students and faculty alike are looking forward to the ninth International Olympic Games for the Deaf which will be held in Helsinki, Finland, next August.

In the snack bar and lounge students gather to relax. They may be discussing their fraternities and sororities or a dance to be held on campus. The students enjoy dancing. They feel the vibrations of the music through the wooden floors.

"Right or Wrong," by Father Ginder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, when the National Catholic Action Weekly Our Sunday Visitor first began coming to my office I, as a Protestant, gave it scant attention since I do not like to be proselytized any more than I think others like to be indoctrinated with my views.

In a casual reading of a recent issue, however, I chanced upon the column by Rev. Richard Ginder and since that time I have looked forward with increasing interest to his weekly articles. Father Ginder takes them all on—regardless of station or creed—and what I especially like is his utter indifference to the political complexion of the subject at hand. It should also be noted that most of his discussions are on secular matters and I have not yet found in his writings anything that has ruffled my religious sensibilities, even slightly.

His column in the current issue of this weekly is entitled "Double Standard in Our Modern World," and is commended to the attention of everyone who believes that we cannot have it both ways—that we cannot fight communism in Cuba and then take it to our bosom in the Metropolitan Opera House.

RIGHT OR WRONG—DOUBLE STANDARD IN OUR MODERN WORLD

(By Father Ginder)

It is interesting to read in the current issue of Holiday that "when major decisions affecting Britain's national life have to be taken," the answer is provided by a triumvirate: the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Prime Minister, and the editor of the Times. It is this third person who interests me for it clearly shows that there must be two aspects to each problem.

First: "How shall we handle it?"

Second: "What shall we tell the people?"

Indeed, as one ponders the news of the day, the mind goes back uneasily to the subtle error of Averroes in the 12th century which so horrified St. Thomas Aquinas that he concentrated all of his massive genius in one mighty effort to crush it forever. But is it staging a comeback?

Averroes, a Muslim, was a brilliant student of Aristotle. But his thinking led him to

believe, somehow, in a double standard of truth. His followers taught that what is true in philosophy may be false in theology, and vice versa: "True for you but not for me. True for me but not for you."

WAY TO CYNICISM

If such a system were valid it could lead to complete cynicism in our daily affairs. The initiates, the enlightened, would be winking at one another and smiling behind their hands as they passed on the streets.

"We are in the know," they would be thinking. "The rest of the world, poor boobs are paying, suffering, dying for what they think is right, but we know better."

That is why one gets uneasy when one reads that the press is considered an ally of the ruling class in every national crisis. It means that the press is to tell not necessarily the truth, not what is in the best interests of the people, but rather what their rulers want the people to think.

For an example here in the United States: Instinct, common sense, all our past experience and education from first grade up, demonstrate that we can't afford to be shovelling out billions of dollars all over the world. The whole giveaway program has been discredited so often that one gets weary hearing about it.

Now the press and practically all of our elected officials know these facts, and yet they vote the same disastrous program through each year without batting an eye, pushing the country closer and closer to fiscal catastrophe.

There are not two systems of truth. That much is certain. But there must be certain facts that are being withheld from the public. It is likely that when a man enters life he is "briefed" by his party leaders and told, perhaps, that our whole economy depends on the Giveaway, that we have to go on making heavy machinery and trucks even if only to dump them into the ocean—else hard times will return. Inflation? That is the more remote of the two evils: "We can cross that bridge when we come to it."

Recently we have been reading a great deal concerning the Central Intelligence Agency which, we are calmly told, "fights fire with fire," fomenting rebellions, toppling governments, parachuting agents behind enemy lines, and operating generally along the standard lines of a Grade-B movie. The complaint, oddly, is not that their methods are "un-American" or "un-democratic," but that they have not been successful.

It is "patriotism" in the CIA—"subversion" in any other group.

You run into this double standard constantly. Watching "Mein Kampf" on the screen the other day, I heard the narrator protest that Franco had conspired against the "legally elected" government of Spain.

Is it evil to plot against a "legally elected" government? But Hitler's government was at least as "legally elected," and so was Mussolini's. From the context, however, I judged that the narrator would not appreciate that particular application.

EICHMANN AND KHRUSHCHEV

Again: While Eichmann killed only Jews, Khrushchev killed just as many without bothering to make any racial distinction. The one used gas, the other used mass starvation. The one is being exhibited to the world in a glass cage, the other is being wined and dined in every capital of the world. Why? Evil for Eichmann, but not for Khrushchev?

But the most painful appearance of this ambiguity concerns our present war with Russia. On the front page we are told that we have just received a terrible humiliation at the hands of the enemy in Cuba, while that same enemy is pouring arms into Laos. President Kennedy called a special meeting of the Security Council to decide whether or not our American boys should be sent to shed their blood in the Southeast. We are close to war. With whom? With Russia.

At the same time, "a happy throng" greeted a group of enemy "dancers" at the Metropolitan Opera House in New York—the Moiseyev Company: "The lively group from Moscow won the wild applause of a large audience of society, stage and movie celebrities, in a $15 a seat, mink-and-chinchilla atmosphere that almost rivaled the annual opera opening. The Star Spangled Banner and the Hammer and Sickle hung side by side."

Also, Rear Adm. S. B. Frankel was squelched by the Defense Department when he wanted to give a talk to the people of Houston questioning the value of negotiations with the enemy.

LOYALTY IN PEACE CORPS

Also, when it was suggested that applicants for the proposed Peace Corps take an oath of loyalty to our country as one means of excluding the enemy from membership, the proposal was voted down.

Also, while Dr. Linus Pauling goes on propagandizing for enemy objectives, he still seems to be well thought of, draws big crowds to his lectures, and continues secure on the faculty at Caltech.

Then there is always Cyrus Eaton. As far as I know, he has not yet been ostracized or thrown out of any of his clubs, despite his seeming preference for the enemy over our own country.

Dr. Robert Oppenheimer admitted giving aid and comfort to the enemy. He has never explained this. Yet he is still an honored member of the Institute for Advanced Studies at Princeton.

To the best of my knowledge, Owen Lattimore is still teaching at Johns Hopkins in Baltimore.

Alger Hiss was the subject of a benign writeup last winter in Esquire, and a man who swore to Hiss' integrity and good reputation at the trial enjoys Cabinet rank as our Ambassador to the United Nations. Mr. Stevenson has never repudiated his opinion of Alger Hiss.

In recent weeks, the U.S. Government has stopped interpreting enemy propaganda mailed from abroad. This moves at your expense, gentle reader. It goes postage free in this country—17½ tons in 1 week through the San Francisco post office alone.

The Government has stopped fingerprinting aliens because the enemy does not like it.

The Government has lifted the ban on products of forced labor, so that now the enemy stands to get real profit from his slave camps.

Apparently, the enemy is regarded as an enemy only when he actually shoves a gun into an American belly in Laos, in Katanga, or in Berlin. Otherwise, why, he is an utterly charming ballet dancer, pianist, or physicist.

St. Thomas would certainly have a hard time understanding.

Failure of Attempted Rebellion in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "It Is Our Problem," which appeared April 21, 1961, in the Indianapolis Star.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT IS OUR PROBLEM

The Government and the public must face up to the fact that the smashing of the attempted rebellion in Cuba is a disaster. It would be foolish to console ourselves with explanations of why it might be considered otherwise.

The much-heralded invasion has been tried. The rebels could not make it stick. Much of the anti-Castro leadership inside Cuba necessarily will have been exposed during the period of fighting, and has been or will be destroyed. The mounting of the next attempt to overthrow Castro will be 10 times as difficult.

Castro has made good his boasts that he was ready to meet and crush any invasion. His stock and that of the Communists will soar throughout Latin America. Anti-American propagandists have been handed a windfall. Respect for the United States—and for U.S. strength—will be the butt of a new surge of attack.

Another fact to be faced is that the United States is involved. Manpower for the invasion was openly recruited on U.S. soil. Self-styled leaders of the rebellion have moved about U.S. cities openly and unhindered. Sympathy with the invaders was officially expressed in Washington. In the eyes of the whole world, the United States was at least a partisan, if not a participant, in this effort. The United States was defeated along with the starcrossed patriots who assaulted the beaches.

The interests of the United States are still bound up with whatever may be left of this rebellion, and with what may follow. The President has declared that the United States would stand on the Monroe Doctrine and its obligations to the hemisphere, and would not tolerate intervention in the rebellion by the Soviet Union or other outside powers.

Well, the Soviet Union, directly and through other Red powers, has intervened. The invaders were met with guns and planes and tanks that came from Communist plants in Europe and Asia. There are thousands of European and Chinese Communist technicians in Cuba.

If the invasion has been smashed and things become as they were in Cuba, more arms and more men will be sent to Cuba by the Communist powers.

What will the United States do about it?

If the Nation means to stand on the Monroe Doctrine, there is only one thing to do. The further arming and supplying of Cuba from Communist sources must be stopped. If it takes a blockade to do it, then a blockade should be established.

The hard question facing the President and Congress is whether the Communist intervention already accomplished in Cuba does not require, even now, steps to protect American interests and to renew the standing of the Monroe Doctrine.

Industrial Gains in Hungary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is the fourth in a series of articles by Gaston Coblentz appearing in the

New York Herald Tribune. This one appeared on May 4, 1961, and continues his coverage of the Hungarian situation:

FIVE YEARS AFTER REVOLT, HUNGARY MAKES GAINS IN THE INDUSTRIAL FIELD

(Gaston Coblentz of the Herald Tribune's foreign staff has gone behind the Iron Curtain for a fresh look at the situation in the satellite nations. He started in Hungary, and this is the last of five articles on conditions there 5 years after the bloody suppression of the anti-Red uprising. His reports from other lands under the Communist yoke will continue tomorrow, from Rumania.)

(By Gaston Coblentz)

BUDAPEST.—Hungary has emerged, 5 years after the anti-Soviet uprising, as an important supplier of industrial equipment to the Soviet bloc.

The reconsolidation of Communist power in Hungary has simultaneously been marked by industrial advances that are currently bringing Western European businessmen to Budapest to obtain license rights to a number of Hungarian technical processes.

HUNGARY'S PRODUCTS

Under the recently more rational allocation of economic functions to individual satellite nations under the Soviet-sponsored Comecon, Hungary is producing principally the following items for export to the Communist world:

Electronics and instruments. In some electronics branches, the Hungarians are considered by Western experts to be producing equipment of advanced international standard.

Diesel engines, railroad passenger cars, some types of locomotives, and buses.

Automatic control equipment for such major installations as the huge projected Eastern European pipeline from the Soviet Union to East Germany. The remote control valves, flowmeters, and other items will be mainly supplied by Hungary.

Raw bauxite for aluminum production. Hungary is short of the necessary electric power needed for bauxite processing.

CHEMICAL PLANT CONTROLS

The Hungarian processes for which Western European industrialists are reliably reported to be negotiating consist, at present, mainly of a number of sophisticated new devices used in the automatic control of chemical plant operations.

Western interest in this and other developments has caused Budapest's few hotels to be fully booked for the 2-week Hungarian Industrial Fair starting on May 19. Rooms have in many cases been rationed to 2- or 3-day visits to accommodate a maximum number of persons.

EUROPE BANK DEPOSITORY

Meanwhile, in an unusual development, the Hungarian National Bank is reported by Budapest officials to have become a depository for short-term funds being placed abroad by some Western European banks.

Neither the identity of the banks nor the rate of interest being paid on the deposits was specified. However, the officials cited it as proof that the Hungarian National Bank has again begun to play a role on international money markets.

In addition, Budapest has some extremely knowledgeable Marxist economic theoreticians who follow business developments in the United States and the free world in remarkable detail.

SEE NO U.S. DEPRESSION

Through the offices of the Kadar government, this reporter was placed in contact with two of the leading Hungarians in this field and queried them at length on their interpretation of current business developments in America and Western Europe.

One of them was an old-line Stalinist, the other a more liberal Marxist. They were in agreement on the following in a joint discussion:

Contrary to earlier Communist theory they do not believe that the United States will inevitably plunge into another disastrous depression on the 1929 scale. However, they see a serious American recession ahead in the coming year, far deeper than any other of the postwar era. They judge that the root cause will prove to be American industrial overcapacity.

SEE DOLLAR EVALUATION

They believe that the United States will not be able to continue shouldering vast foreign-aid burdens and other large expenditures abroad without a resumption of the gold outflow. They regard a devaluation of the dollar as inevitable.

They do not consider that the Soviet Union will engage in a full-scale onslaught on the dollar by manipulation of its own gold reserves. They see the Communist economic threat to the United States in other important industrial and commercial areas.

Their conclusions may or may not prove correct, but their precise information and easy familiarity with American discount rates, capital investment trends, unemployment statistics and ratios, automation problems and the like was striking.

Henry J. Kaiser, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, last week, Henry J. Kaiser, Jr., the son of one of America's great industrialists, died. He was a victim of the dread disease, multiple sclerosis. In spite of his affliction, Mr. Kaiser devoted his life to the improvement of his community, and encouraged public interest in welfare, education, and safety programs that would be of great benefit to the people. At the same time he was doing this, he was diligently carrying on his job as a high executive in his father's corporation. His life was truly exemplary, and his death brings a void to his community, our State of California, and the United States.

I would like to have incorporated in the RECORD an editorial from the May 4, 1961, San Leandro Morning News, which presents a fitting eulogy of Henry J. Kaiser, Jr.:

HENRY J. KAISER, JR.

The death of Henry J. Kaiser, Jr., youngest son of the internationally known industrialist, is a great loss to the entire community.

A victim of multiple sclerosis, young Kaiser, nevertheless, gave the best he had to the industrial empire which his father headed, and of which he was a working vice president and director of Kaiser Industries Corp.

He was named Oakland's outstanding citizen for 1960 for his many interests in the welfare programs of not only Oakland, but the entire bay area.

Under his direction, the people of Oakland rallied from defeat of a school bonds election, then went on to win the election. Young Kaiser sparked the city's interest in better schools and better school support, through an independent organization which was set up to spotlight the needs of Oakland schools.

The merit of a man is not in what he says, but in what he has accomplished. And Henry J. Kaiser, Jr., has accomplished much for the betterment of the community. He was a leader who was respected by all who came in contact with him and loved by all who knew him.

A New Lobbying Technique

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, during the last Congress, I took the floor to discuss in some detail the then current proposal which was being advanced to put medical care for the aged under the social security system—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 24, 1960, page 6066 and the following pages. In the course of that speech I made reference to post cards which had been printed by the Committee on Political Education of the AFL–CIO, post cards picturing two fine looking old people and quoting, out of context, the Bible by use of the phrase "Cast me not off."

In this Congress we have another proposal to put medical care for the aged under social security, H.R. 4222, the so-called King-Anderson bill. Once again there has begun a post card campaign in support of this measure, a campaign which, I feel certain, can once again be laid at the doorstep of the COPE. The technique has changed; no longer do the post cards bear the picture of the handsome old couple and the printed message. There is a new, stereotype message, it asserts that the writer "personally" knows some older people who do not have adequate medical care.

In the past, when proponents of the social security approach to medical care said they had personal knowledge of elderly persons who were unable to afford medical care, I have taken great pains to look into these assertions. I shall do so again with these post cards, asking for specific in the cases of which the signers of these form post cards have knowledge.

I have the same desire as any other Member of this House to see these elderly people in our society receive adequate health care, health care in the finest tradition of the American society which now enjoys the greatest health care program of any society at any time. I believe, and this belief is based upon the experience I have had in studying other cases cited to me in which it was claimed that an individual or group of older persons was without adequate medical care, that upon careful investigation of those situations in which it is asserted that an elderly person cannot obtain proper health care, it will be found that any failure is in the administration of an existing program and not in the absence of a program to fit the need.

I am anxious that the cases which these post cards cite, cases of elderly people without adequate medical care, be carefully studied and that the cases be put before the proper authorities so that the programs which now cover these situations can be put into effect in the particular instance. I believe that by a thorough study of the assertions that there are those without proper care under existing health care programs we can get closer to the heart of the real problem in health care and the financing of it and frame policies by which we can assure the benefit of our great American health care system is extended to all of our citizens.

I would like at this point, Mr. Speaker, to insert in the RECORD a mimeographed sample from which post cards in this new campaign are being prepared. The writer is urged to write his Congressman using the suggested wording. One of my constituents, perhaps unwilling to put this message in his own handwriting, sent the sample instead:

SAMPLE, FRONT OF POSTCARD (ADDRESS)

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS, House Office Building, Washington 26, D.C.

SUGGESTED LETTER NO. 1

Date _____

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CURTIS: I feel that it is most important that H.R. 4222 be passed. I personally know some elderly persons who are not getting proper medical care at this time because they cannot afford it.

Sincerely yours,

_____
(Write in your name)

_____
(Write in your address)

SUGGESTED LETTER NO. 2

Date _____

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CURTIS: I feel that it is most important that H.R. 4222 be passed. I personally know some other elderly persons besides myself who are not getting proper medical care at this time because we cannot afford it.

Sincerely your

_____
(Write in your name)

_____
(Write in your address)

Freedom, Si, Communism, Never

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a most impressive editorial from a recent edition of the celebrated Worcester (Mass.) Gazette entitled "The Meaning of Communism." It is refreshing that the able editorial of this paper which makes many valuable contributions to contemporary thought on public issues should have drawn attention in this admirable editorial to the morals and concepts of family life against the Communist backdrop.

When fundamental Marxist beliefs are considered, it will be seen and recognized by fair, impartial commentators that, as the editorial points out, the Marxist virus is imbedding itself deeper into Soviet society, and this trend appears most ominously in the field of family relations which are, in contemplation of Western civilization, the very foundation stone of free, democratic society.

It is unfortunate, indeed, that we have some thinkers and commentators among us who are willing to gloss over or make light of the various antidemocratic, antireligious, and antisocial ideas which are essential parts and working techniques of the Communist ideology. There are also those who do not believe that the Communist conspiracy constitutes a great threat to our democratic system, or our free enterprise system.

Even a cursory study of Marxism demonstrates certain fundamentals that are not only alien to but incompatible with free, democratic principles. The specious idea of class struggle, the materialistic conception of history, the fanatical hatred of and opposition to all forms of religious belief, the incessant warfare against the institutions of the family and other traditional patterns of freedom, the fostering of racial, and religious antagonism, offenses against international order and continual aggression, and threats of aggression, accompanied by nefarious infiltration of other weak governments and nations—all clearly reveal the Marxist system as one committed to hatred, animosity, violence, and enmity toward most of the most precious ideas upon which Western civilization rests, toward the human race itself.

The Soviet Marxist system is based on the theory that a man as such has no being or existence independent of the state, but is merely a puppet of the great, bureaucratic, absolute superstate which neither recognizes his existence as an individual soul, nor his basic rights as a human being.

Under this system marriage and divorce are reduced to post card status. Human relations between husband and wife, father and mother, sister and brother, and relatives and members of the family circle are either blatantly ridiculed and discouraged, or systematically prohibited with the thought that in time over the course of a few generations, filial love, and the instinct for family life can be suppressed and its great powers transferred to a superstate ogre.

People who are capable of holding to such beliefs simply do not know human nature. They fail to observe the conduct of the jungle beast, let alone the sacrifice that parents and members of families have historically made throughout the centuries in ways so graphic as to defy description. The idea of this seeming, gross oversight could not be better expressed than it is in this editorial. If we destroy the family institution there will be little, if anything, left of civilization.

The eloquent editors of the Gazette could do no better service to the country at this time than to continue their writings on the ghastly ideological deficiencies of the Marxist system and the debasement of human feelings and human values which it entails, not to speak of its dangerous penetration into the internal fabric of this Nation and much of the free world.

Let us awaken, Americans. Tomorrow may be too late.

Time and time again in my public utterances and statements I have decried the subtle and not so subtle attacks of organized communism on the family unit, upon our Western religious spirit and morality, upon our basic economic and social patterns and our entire way of life. I have repeatedly deplored the insidious growth and spread of Communist ideas in American educational, scientific, and secular life. But my warnings and urgent pleas seem too often to have fallen on deaf ears. Why will not the American people and their leaders be aroused to these great perils?

The article follows:

THE MEANING OF COMMUNISM

For the past few years, certain quarters have been hopefully promoting the theory that the Soviet Union is mellowing. Those who hold this view predict that time is softening the harsh Communist ideology and that greater wealth and freedom will eventually turn Russia into a sort of middle class, social welfare state with which we can coexist peacefully.

But recent indications suggest that this is at best a half-truth, if even that. Far from relaxing its hold, the Marxist virus is embedding itself deeper in Soviet society. In some respects, at least, the Soviet Union is becoming more like George Orwell's vision of 1984 than like the United States of America.

This trend is seen most ominously in the field of family relationships, which are the foundation and the key to the free, democratic way of life. The Soviet planners have correctly concluded that reactionary family ties are the biggest obstacle to "pure communism." And they have also apparently concluded that the answer is the virtually total separation of children and parents from infancy, with the children brought up in state-run collectives.

A recent article by Stanislav Strumilin, deputy chairman of the Soviet State Planning Commission, spells it out:

"Parents will be permitted to visit the children's premises and their living quarters as often as the rules allow. But a children's collective, when directed by an experienced pedagogue, is incomparably better equipped to give the greatest indoctrination to the child with the best social habits than the most loving and attentive mothers. Egotistic inclinations of the child will be snuffed out in the cradle. In place of this, all inborn social instincts and sympathies will be developed as the result of new conditioned reflexes formed in the process of daily comradely interrelationships."

To the Westerner, there is something obscene in this. The idea of tiny children being deliberately cut off from the loving care of their mothers, brought up through their formative years to think of the state as the source of all intelligence and goodness, without religion, without the warmth of family ties, without knowing the meaning of home, is abhorrent. The generation thus produced will surely be a new race of massmen, cut off from the human traditions that have shaped all civilization for thousands of years.

The Soviet state apparently is preparing to go through with this program, to separate children from their parents as early and as completely as possible. But in their rush to produce a breed of willing, instinctive automatons, will the masters of the Soviet people overreach themselves? Is there anything in Marx or Engels that can ease the ache in the lonely human heart?

Urban Renewal Work Slowed by Stringent Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Kansas City Kansan, of April 23, 1961, concerning problems faced by certain urban renewal efforts. I respectfully call it to the attention of my colleagues:

URBAN RENEWAL SLOWED BY STRINGENT LAWS
(By Bob Snair)

President John F. Kennedy, who has been trying to uncover stumbling blocks delaying Federal urban renewal programs, can find one of the biggest obstructions right in his own backyard in Washington, D.C.

It is the estrangement between the Urban Renewal Agency and its parent organization, the Housing and Home Finance Agency. The HHFA's stringent requirements in sale contracts between cities with Federal urban renewal projects and developers has been a source of irritation to URA officials throughout the Nation.

A case in point is the Gateway project here. Reynolds Metals Co., a subsidiary of Reynolds Aluminum Co. submitted its offer to buy the residential portion of Gateway in September of 1959. Following a public hearing on April 8, 1960, the city commissioners accepted the offer.

One year has lapsed and the URA here still does not have a signed sale contract with Reynolds to nail down the transaction.

Price has nothing to do with the inability of the city and Reynolds to get together.

It is the HHFA which has insisted on having certain requirements written into the sales contract which Reynolds finds inacceptable. Since the HHFA guarantees financing, its approval must be obtained.

There are no standard sale contracts acceptable in all parts of the country partly because of the difference in State laws.

Many URA officials contend the Housing and Home Finance Agency does not understand the conception of urban redevelopment projects. The HHFA has become oriented to profitable suburban developments and is afraid to take risks involved in underwriting less profitable blight clearance projects, URA officials have said.

Kansas City, Mo., met with even more frustration in attempting to develop the Attucks Urban Renewal project. Attucks lay cleared for about 3 years before it was undertaken by the Reynolds Co. after two other contractors failed to get it started.

Reynolds Metals submitted an offer to buy Attucks about the same time it made the offer on the Gateway property. The Reynolds Co. decided to develop the Attucks project first, primarily because the land was already cleared and also because of Missouri's tax abatement laws.

The Reynolds Co. and Kansas City, Mo., still have not signed their sale contract for Attucks. Kansas City, Mo., URA officials believe, however, it will be signed within a few days as the result of some pressure on the HHFA from high government sources.

A URA official in Kansas City, Mo., said his organization met with a series of baffling delays in their attempts to execute a sales contract for Attucks. A contract acceptable to the URA and the developers never seemed to be suitable to the HHFA, he said.

Frequently the HHFA would return the contracts without giving adequate explanations why it was rejected, the URA official reported. When the URA pressed the HHFA for more information, they were unable to get a satisfactory explanation, he said.

The Reynolds Co., one of the biggest urban renewal developers in the Nation, is featured in an article in April 15 edition of Business Week.

The Reynolds Co. had said it would not start Gateway until Attucks is underway. Since that goal is near reality, Reynolds Metals is expected to start exerting more pressure to get a contract for Gateway.

Address by Irving Maness, Deputy Administrator of the Small Business Administration for Procurement and Technical Assistance, Before National Independent Dairies Association, April 11, Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEED
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, at the recent convention of the National Independent Dairies Association, held here in April, an informative address was made by Mr. Irving Maness, Deputy Administrator of the Small Business Administration for procurement and technical assistance. He explained SBA procurement policy and its effect in the dairy field.

For 6 years prior to his recent assumption of his present position Mr. Maness did distinguished service as a member of the staff of the House Select Committee on Small Business.

His address follows:

ADDRESS BY IRVING MANESS

I am glad to be here today to meet with you members of the National Independent Dairies Association on the occasion of your fourth annual meeting.

When your executive secretary, D. C. Daniel, asked me to speak about our programs to assist small firms, I was only too glad to do so. For I know that you are faced with many problems, not the least of which is having to compete with giant concerns in the dairy industry.

As you may know, I took office less than a month ago as Deputy Administrator of the Small Business Administration for Procurement and Technical Assistance. But I hasten to assure you that I am no stranger to the problems of small business. For 6 years before assuming my present post, I was counsel to the House Select Committee on Small Business and chief counsel to the House Subcommittee No. 2 on Government Procurement Loans and Disposal and Subcommittee No. 3 on Foreign Aid-Foreign Trade and Basic metals.

So I have long been concerned with the problems of small business and I assure you that as Deputy Administrator of the Small Business Administration I share with Administrator John Horne a determination to make our programs of assistance to small firms as effective as we possibly can.

You will be glad to know that our determination to increase the amount of Government purchases awarded to small firms has the wholehearted support of President Kennedy. The President recently announced that his administration will try to increase by at least 10 percent the $3,444 million in military contracts allotted to small firms in 1960, with particular emphasis on defense contracts to small firms in distressed areas.

As many of you gentlemen know, one of the basic and continuing problems of small business is that of securing a fair share of Government purchases. This is important. When one considers that total Government procurement expenditures amount to $29 billion a year—that the U.S. Government is by far the largest single consumer of goods and services in our economy—then it readily becomes apparent that it is important for small firms to have an opportunity to share in this continuing investment in our national security.

For the fact of the matter is that about 96 percent of the businesses in our Nation are small businesses, and the continued welfare of our economy depends in great measure on keeping open the avenues of opportunity for small firms.

The larger firms have a very important role to play in our economy—no one, I think, would deny this. But the Congress has long been concerned that the smaller firms be given a fair opportunity to share in the purchases and sales of the Federal Government.

That is why in the Small Business Act, as amended, the Congress stated its intention that "a fair proportion of the total purchases and contracts for property and services of the Government (including, but not limited to contracts for maintenance, repair, and construction) be placed with small-business enterprises," and that "a fair proportion of the total sales of Government property be made to such enterprises."

As Deputy SBA Administrator for Procurement and Technical Assistance it is my job to make this program as effective as we possibly can, and I assure you that we have the full support of the Kennedy administration and of the Congress on both sides of the aisle.

We have developed a number of programs to carry out this objective. I shall not go into detail about these programs here, but we have pamphlets which explain these programs fully and, of course, our procurement specialists in each of our 55 offices throughout the country stand ready to offer their assistance.

But today I do want to tell you about how this program of procurement assistance applies to the small dairies, what we have done to help these small dairies sell their products to the Government, and some of the problems we have encountered.

The SBA and the principal Government buying agencies cooperate in setting aside suitable Government purchases to be made exclusively from small business concerns.

Class set-asides have been made by the SBA on Government purchases of dairy products including fresh milk at 24 Government installations. In addition to this, individual set-asides have been made at a number of other installations.

In recently looking over some of the preaward individual set-asides I find that sizable proposed Government purchass of milk and dairy products have been set aside for bidding by small firms at Government defense

bases in Missouri, Kansas, Colorado, and Wyoming.

But you small dairy operators must understand that in order to obtain such set-asides the Small Business Administration must be able to assure contracting officers that there will be sufficient competition from small business concerns to insure a reasonable price to the Government.

In the past we have often had to work very hard to interest small dairies in bidding on proposed Government purchases in order to obtain the necessary competition.

Many military bases, posts, camps or stations purchase their own requirements of dairy products and fresh milk. Others have military subsistence market centers make the purchases for them.

Joint set-asides have not yet been made on purchases of dairy products by military subsistence centers. However, an arrangement is now being negotiated with the Headquarters of the Military Subsistence Supply Agency for set-asides on perishable subsistence items, including dairy products.

When the details of this arrangement are completed we expect that a small business set-aside determination for each purchase by a market center will be made at the Headquarters in Chicago.

In all candor, I must admit that there are a number of military installations at which joint set-asides are not being made on dairy products. But let me explain to you just why this is so.

In the first place, our manpower for this type of work is limited. We have simply been unable to cover all of the many widely-scattered installations with our capable but limited staff.

But this is only part of our problem. As I said before, in many cases small business concerns—and this includes small dairies—hve not been competitive at many installations.

I cannot emphasize too strongly that we cannot make small business set-asides unless small business concerns will follow through and enter competitive bids. Quite often in the past we have asked small dairies if they would like to bid on a proposed Government purchase of dairy products and have gotten very favorable replies. But when the opportunity to bid is presented, when a set-aside has been made, they simply fail to respond with a bid.

In cases like this there is very little we can do.

Let me cite briefly a single case, which I have been assured is only too typical.

Two small dairies in a mid-Western State had come to the SBA and requested help in obtaining a share of Government business. We explained our program and they assured us they were interested and would follow through on any help we could give them.

Later we notified them of a proposed purchase of fresh milk by a local military installation and told them we were seeking to have a portion set-aside for bidding by small firms. The manager of each of these small dairies assured us that they would follow through and enter competitive bids. They were enthusiastic in their response.

On the basis of this assurance a set-aside was initiated by the SBA but was rejected by the contracting officials because they said they had assurance from only one small firm—which incidentally was not one of the two which had come to us for help in this instance—that it would enter a competitive bid.

So the SBA again talked with the managers of these two small dairies and again we received assurance that they would bid. On the basis of this we appealed the set-aside to the Secretary of the Service.

Our appeal to the Secretary was made on the assurance given us by these two firms that they wanted and needed this business and they were eager to bid.

Well, what was the upshot? Even after we carried an appeal to the Secretary of the Service, these two small dairies failed to submit bids.

When we later asked the managers of these small dairies why they had not submitted bids, what were their replies? One of them said, "The bidding forms were mislaid when we moved our office." The other said, "We received the bidding forms, but frankly we just forgot to bid."

There is an actual case. And I must say that at this installation our chances of getting set-asides for small business concerns are decidedly remote.

I have spoken to you today as straight forwardly as I know how. I have done this because I want to make it perfectly clear that our program of procurement assistance for small firms is a two-way street.

We are determined to carry forward this program of assistance to small firms as effectively as we can. And when we do get the wholehearted support of the small firms we are trying to help, we can and do get good results.

Let me say in closing that government and business are natural allies. We know that your success in business and our success in government are intertwined.

It is in that spirit that we shall forge ahead to bring in the months ahead a greater measure of participation by small firms in the supplying of the goods and services that our Government needs.

Birthday Greetings to Former President Harry S. Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to join with millions of my fellow citizens in paying tribute to former President Harry S. Truman on the event of his 77th birthday. It was a high privilege for me to have had the opportunity to serve as a Member of this body under this great American's strong and vigorous leadership.

As histories are written in later years, I am confident that they will place Mr. Truman among the greatest of our Presidents. He was a good President. It has been said that a truly great man is one who can walk with kings but never lose the common touch. Of no man was this more true than of Harry Truman.

President Truman was called upon to guide our Nation through the period of rebuilding a free and stable world—a world which knew the threat and danger of totalitarian tyranny.

TRUE TO HIS CONVICTIONS

Crucial decisions were made by President Truman with frankness and courage. He stood firm in his convictions and for economic, social, and humanitarian justice to which he was sincerely dedicated. He bravely withstood the smears and insults which throughout all history have been hurled at those who champion human rights and social justice. It is these qualities that will give Harry Truman a rightful place in history as one of our great Presidents.

While the duty of President Franklin D. Roosevelt was to lead our Nation through the war, it was the duty of President Truman to lead us through the long, hard peace which was always threatened by the perils of communism. I am sure that future historians will bear out my firm belief that Mr. Truman carried out his duty with vigor and strength.

When communism threatened Western Europe, President Truman answered with the Marshal plan. When communism threatened our Asian neighbors, President Truman met their challenge with firm and resolute action. When communism threatened Berlin, President Truman met their challenge with all the resources of our free Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues and fellow Americans in extending to President Truman and his wonderful wife my best wishes for continued good health and many more happy birthdays.

Back-Door Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DURWARD G. HALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my "Report From Washington," on the subject of "Back-Door Spending":

The following statement is taken from the U.S. Constitution:

"No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law."

When one tries to find out what governmental policies have contributed to our 48-cent dollar, he finds that a reckless unconstitutional procedure called back-door spending must bare a major share of the blame.

Back-door spending is the method by which many Federal agencies are able to get their hands on funds without annual review by House or Senate appropriations committees, or by Congress as a whole. Basically, it is of two types:

1. The agency is permitted to borrow money directly from the Treasury instead of being required to justify expenditures and obtain funds from the Appropriations Committee * * * or * * *

2. The agency is permitted to incur contractual obligations prior to review by the Appropriations Committee, which in effect reduces the appropriating process to a mere rubberstamp approval of money already spent. In this manner, billions of our tax dollars are authorized for expenditure with no control being exercised by the Congress. Congress has no chance to tell the agency, "You may spend so much." The spending is not counted in the budget. There is no revenue-raising, just borrowing.

If we played ball like this back home, the police chief, the fire chief, the public works director, and all the other city department heads would merely tell the finance director how much money he needed (or wanted) and the finance director would be obliged to comply with the request. The city council would have no say over how wisely the money

was spent, or if there was enough revenue to pay the total bill.

This is one of the major reasons why the Federal debt and limit is now at $288 billion and headed higher. This is the way Congress has lost control of Government spending to the agency directors with their insatiable appetites.

The effort of conservatives to stop this back-door spending of taxpayer's money has been dealt a severe blow with the passage of the so-called depressed areas bill—and $300 million of the money to be spent on this dubious project will be obtained through the back door. No budget accounting and no strings attached.

The chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, CLARENCE CANNON of Missouri, called it "financial duplicity, fiscal insanity."

Several other bills have contained this same back-door provision, notably the Latin-American $500 million foreign aid measure.

Shortly after the Rules Committee was packed, a resolution calling for a halt to the practice of back-door spending was submitted to the committee. It carried the signatures of 122 Members of the House, including mine, so here was an issue on which the House could work its will.

At this point it became clear that the purpose of the Rules Committee packing was not to allow legislation to reach the floor, but to prevent legislation from reaching the floor which the administration did not approve. The committee killed the resolution by an 8 to 7 vote.

The sooner we recognize that this has been a pure and simple power struggle, the sooner the Rules Committee fight will be placed in its proper perspective. The public should know that we did not experience a fight to abolish the power of the Rules Committee. It was a fight to place that power in different hands—those of the spenders.

A final last-ditch battle is underway to bypass the Rules Committee in an effort to stop back-door spending. A discharge petition is being prepared to take the issue out of the clutches of the Rules Committee and on to the floor of the House. It will require 219 signatures. I will sign the petition and am making every effort to influence others to do the same. I believe our future solvency is at stake.

New Developments at the Speculator Tree Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York State Conservationist of February–March 1961 relating to the Speculator Tree Farm of the International Paper Co., located at Speculator, N.Y., in my district:

THE SPECULATOR TREE FARM—A MAJOR ADIRONDACK LANDOWNER BECOMES A COOPERATOR UNDER THE FISH AND WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT ACT

(By Robert G. Zilliox, regional supervisor for fish and game, New York State Conservation Department)

In September of 1959, the State Fish and Wildlife Management Board invited representatives of private and corporate owners of large timberlands to a meeting in Ray Brook. The objective was to discuss mutual problems and determine how and where the provisions of the State's new Fish and Wildlife Management Act could contribute to their solution and, at the same time, add to the opportunity for public hunting and fishing. This preview was followed by several meetings between the International Paper Co. and the department during the spring and summer of 1960. Specific problems were discussed and provisions for a cooperative agreement worked out.

Now, to shed a little light on the type of operation involved, a tree farm can be considered any privately-owned, taxpaying forest area, larger than five acres, scientifically managed and dedicated to the growing and harvesting of tree crops. Certain standards and procedures are required before a tract can be certified by the New York State Tree Farm Committee. Contrary to popular belief, certification as a tree farm does not entitle the landowner to any tax abatement "gimmick."

Nor is the Speculation Tree Farm a level piece of ground with waist-high trees over which deer heads are readily discernible. Rather, as the accompanying photographs show, this 29,400 acres of International Paper Co.'s land, located in Hamilton County near Speculator, is typical Adirondack big woods country.

Most of International Paper Co. lands in New York (including their Speculator Tree Farm) are open to the general public—and have been for more than 60 years. However, increasing hunting pressure and unsolved wildlife-forestry management problems set the stage for negotiations under Fish and Wildlife Management Act. International was interested in the orderly harvest of fish and game, the effects of big game population on timber resources and the Department was interested in the possible solution of these problems so as to keep these lands open to public recreation. The resultant cooperative agreement included the following management procedures:

1. Deer browse damage information. Deer browse surveys are presently in progress in this area by company personnel. The Department will provide advisory assistance in these surveys and aid in the analysis of survey data.

2. Hunter distribution and deer harvest information. The Department conducted four deer check stations per weekend for the first 3 weekends of the big game season. The record showed that approximately 5,000 man-days were spent hunting in the interior portion of the area and it is apparent a comparable amount of time was spent hunting the lands bordering Routes 8 and 30. Forty-two deer and three bear were checked through the deer stations, with an estimate of about 100 deer coming from the tract. Most of the deer taken were shot less than 2 miles from where the hunters' cars were parked. Check station data showed that 31 percent of the hunters stayed at hotels, motels, or leased camps; 39 percent traveled to and from home; 5 percent stayed at Department campsites; 9 percent camped on State land or in trailers; 2 percent slept in cars, and 14 percent were not classified. Approximately 11 percent of the hunters had party permits involving a possible 42 percent of the hunters in party permit hunting. Many hunters came from the Albany-Schenectady area. Southern New York and Long Island were also represented. Five percent of the total were out-of-State hunters.

3. Safety precautions for active logging operations. The Department provided safety zone posters which the landowner put up in areas where active logging operations were in progress.

4. Parking areas. The landowner provided strategically located parking areas and permitted the use by the public of its logging roads.

5. Mile markers. The landowner provided mile markers on the interior road network as a guide to the hunter.

6. Protective patrol. The Department provided full-time protective patrol and also aided in controlling camping, fires, and educating the public in use of the area. No hunting accidents, few conservation law violations and good cooperation from hunters highlighted the big game season.

7. Education toward proper land use. The landowner provided a detailed brochure and sportsmen's map of the area showing nearby Lewey Lake and Moffet Beach campsites, operated by the Bureau of Camps and Trails to provide camping facilities for tree farm and other hunters.

8. Identification of nearby State lands. The Division of Lands and Forests erected signs denoting State lands adjacent to the cooperator area.

9. Fisheries. Although the cooperative agreement received its inaugural during the hunting season, plans are in progress for lake, pond, and stream surveys of area waters during 1961. Some of the waters on the tree farm area are now being stocked by the Department; however, up-to-date management plans for all waters are needed.

Due to the road network and mile markers in the area, there were few lost hunters. However, midway through the big game season one hunter became separated from his companions and spent the night in the woods. Game protectors, rangers, and volunteers searched until 2 a.m., firing many shots in an attempt to guide him out to a road. Finding his way out the next morning, the errant nimrod's opening remarks to Special Game Protector Robert were: "I don't know if you guys know it or not, but there is a heck of a lot of night shooting going on in this country."

Some hunters were undoubtedly disappointed about the deer not being as numerous as the hunters on the area. The excellent sportsmen's map prepared and distributed by International Paper for the Speculator Tree Farm and the resultant publicity unintentionally contributed to the idea that the place was overrun with deer. At any rate, Ranger Page stopped to talk to a hunter who was reclining against a tree, sipping hot coffee and munching on a sandwich along the East Road. After listening to the hunter's pleasantries concerning a dearth of deer in the area, Page pointed up the road about 100 feet and casually asked the hunter what was in the road. Feverish activity on the part of the once reclining hunter failed to affect the health and mobility of an 8-point buck crossing the road.

The development and execution of the plans called for in the Tree Farm agreement was an excellent example of cooperation between various departmental units. Frank Moore, chairman, district board 10, likened the cooperation to the play of a well-drilled football team.

The significance of this agreement between the Department and International Paper is the concept and vision it embodies for the future of public uses of private lands in the Adirondack region. Here is a design for large Adirondack landowners beset with problems related to continued recreational use of private lands by the public. It should serve as a blueprint for other large landowners whose acres are presently closed to the general public. With the big game season ended in the Adirondacks, International Paper and Department personnel concur that the aims and objectives of the cooperative agreement have had a successful launching. Proper behavior, sportsmanlike conduct, respect for signs, buildings and equipment and observance of laws, rules and regulations will, in the last analysis, decide the fate of this and most other landowner agreements.

Appendix

Dr. Edward C. Welsh, Good Choice for Space Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD an article published in the New York Times on Wednesday, May 10, 1961, entitled "Behind the Space Scene."

The article is about Dr. Edward C. Welsh, who was recently named as executive secretary of the National Aeronautics and Space Council. In this capacity, Dr. Welsh will be the principal assistant to the Chairman of the Council, Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, whom he will aid in drafting the Nation's space budget and step up the U.S. space effort.

It is universally recognized by now that the space age is the most challenging factor of our times. Under the circumstances, we are indeed fortunate to have a man of Dr. Welsh's caliber and background to assume a leading post with the Space Council. I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate President Kennedy and Vice President JOHNSON on the excellent choice they have made in selecting Dr. Welsh for this very important and responsible position. There is no doubt in my mind that he will render great service to our Nation.

The article about Dr. Welsh is as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 10, 1961]

BEHIND THE SPACE SCENE—EDWARD CRISTY WELSH

WASHINGTON, May 9.—For nearly 20 years Dr. Edward Cristy Welsh has belonged to the legion of public servants who from behind the scenes influence and direct public decisions but never receive public recognition.

The post-war reorganization of Japan's industry was largely the result of the handiwork of the 51-year-old economist, who started off as a university teacher and turned to Government service in World War II. The attacks of Senator STUART SYMINGTON of Missouri and his fellow Democrats on the defense policies of the Eisenhower administration were often based on the ideas and facts furnished by him.

Recently Dr. Welsh moved into a more open role as executive secretary of the National Aeronautics and Space Council. As the principal assistant to Vice President Johnson, the council chairman, he has been given the responsibility for drafting an expanded space budget, which is to accelerate the Nation's efforts in space.

As the alter ego for public officials, Dr. Welsh has two necessary attributes for any good staff assistant—a gluttony for work and an incisive mind which can digest vast amounts of material and then present it in condensed form for an official.

A slight man 5 feet 11 inches, 140 pounds, Dr. Welsh has a reservoir of energy that permits him to work up to 90 hours a week when a lively issue is boiling. As a physician told him after a recent physical examination, "You seem to be strung together with electrical wires."

In recent years, Dr. Welsh has been legislative assistant to Senator SYMINGTON—a job that has permitted him to become one of the best informed military experts on Capitol Hill.

His association with Senator SYMINGTON dates back a decade, when Mr. SYMINGTON, after resigning as Secretary of the Air Force, became chairman of the National Security Resources Board, and hired Dr. Welsh as his assistant.

Mr. SYMINGTON took Dr. Welsh along when he moved over to become administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and when he was elected to the Senate in 1952.

Dr. Welsh started his Government career in 1942 as regional price executive of the Office of Price Administration's headquarters in Cleveland, Ohio. After 2 years he was brought to Washington to become Director of Field Operations for Price Control and then Deputy Administrator for Price Control.

Early in 1947, at the invitation of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, he became chief of the antitrust occupation government in Japan. Among his responsibilities were the dissolution of the Japanese cartels and financial reorganization of most of Japan's major companies.

At the conclusion of his work in 1950, he was cited by General MacArthur for "laying the foundation for private competitive enterprise in Japan."

Dr. Welch, who was born in Long Valley, N.J., in 1909, began his career as a university teacher and economist. After graduating from Lafayette College in 1930, he taught at Tufts College, the University of Cincinnati and 8 years at Ohio State University, where he received his Ph. D. in economics.

It was while on the faculty of the University of Cincinnati that he met his future wife, Carolyn B. White of Cincinnati. They were married in 1935. The Welshes, who have no children, are a working team, with Mrs. Welsh serving as his secretary.

Statement by Episcopal Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement adopted by the Washington Diocesan Convention recently, with reference to the giving of invocations at our major national ceremonies.

For the interest of the Congress, I feel it is wise to publish the following statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY EPISCOPAL CONVENTION

At the inauguration of President Kennedy four clergymen shared in the ceremonies. With the wide diversity of religious beliefs among the people of our country, it is understandable that those who planned the inauguration and that those who have planned other ceremonies of national significance would wish to have the major religious groupings of our Nation represented. We understand this and we appreciate the intention, but we do not believe it is necessary or wise. Such representation makes for imbalance in the ceremonies and reduces their total effectiveness.

We know that the members of each church group represented by a clergyman in a national ceremony are honored to have one of their church chosen to participate. We also know that a clergyman of any church, distinguished by his life and gifts, would bring honor and respect to members of all churches. This does not mean that there would not be some who would be troubled when their tradition was not represented. There would be. But it does mean that the number would be small; for in spite of the wide differences among religious people and in spite of all their human weaknesses, there is a fundamental mutual respect and a warm good will among them.

In the judgment of this convention it is not in the best interest of religion and it lessens the effectiveness of great national ceremonies to have the several major religious groups represented and participating. Furthermore, we believe that the common practice of having one clergyman offer a simple invocation at the beginning of the ceremony and another give the benediction at the end is sufficient and much to be preferred; therefore, be it

Resolved, That this convention send the above statement to the major religious faiths in Washington and to the Congress of our country for their consideration and for such action as may seem to them wise.

Economic Hashish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, since even the deficit-spending minded Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Dillon, has now stated that the recession is over, why do not we forget the kind of nonsense proposed by the President's Council of Economic Advisers. The following editorial in today's Wall Street Journal brings some kind of sense into the whole picture:

ECONOMIC HASHISH

Sometimes the statistical theorizings of economists get so involved they're funny. But when the economic policies of the U.S. Government come to be based on woozy theories, the thing ceases to be a joke.

We have in mind the President's Council of Economic Advisers, which has propounded an elaborate theory of an output gap between the economy's potential and its actual performance. The theory, described on this page recently by Mr. Otten, is a masterpiece of algebraic triple-talk. It is designed to prove a gap, reckoned at $40 billion at the end of last year, and so it does—assuming all its assumptions and mathematics.

Having demonstrated the gap, the Council logically concludes that the country faces not only temporary economic problems like the recession now evaporating, but a "persistent slack in production and employment, a slowdown in our rate of growth." We have it seems, "a problem of chronic slack in the economy—the growing gap between what we can produce and what we do produce." Especially since 1955, we learn, "the gap has shown a distressing upward trend."

If this were all just idle chatter, no one would particularly mind. But this great and growing "output gap" naturally becomes part of the justification for the Federal Government to fill it—with the tremendous new domestic spending the administration has already embarked on and with the even more massive public-works spending it has in mind. And since the slack is persistent and chronic, the Government has an excuse for trying to take it up indefinitely.

Fortunately, the United States still has respected economists who can recognize economic hashish when they smell it. One such is Columbia Prof. Arthur Burns, himself a former chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers. Mildly but nonetheless devastatingly, Dr. Burns has taken apart the gap his successors have so painfully constructed out of thin air.

Among other things, Dr. Burns shows that the Council is not relying on sound, far-reaching historical evidence in projecting its output gap. It rests its case importantly on the fact that unemployment at the business-cycle peak in 1960 was slightly higher than at the business-cycle peak in 1957. The Columbia economist suggests that this gives fragile support to the theory that "the gap between actual and potential output has a distressing upward trend."

Moreover, Professor Burns quietly notes that it matters a good deal at what period you start drawing a curve of potential output. The council chose mid-1955; for no more valid reason than it could have chosen the second quarter of 1957 or the second quarter of 1947—all periods of high employment. If the council economists had chosen 1957, their own reckonings would show a gap of only $20 billion instead of $40 billion.

And, Dr. Burns goes on, "if the curve had been started in the second quarter of 1947, when we likewise had a full-employment output, the gap would have vanished. In fact, we would then have to say that actual output in 1960 exceeded potential output by more than $2 billion."

We hope the council has the grace to say touche to that.

But perhaps the most significant part of the Burns analysis is not in exposing the council's statistical juggling to prove the point it wanted to prove. There is also the attitude behind such output gap theorizing. It is reminiscent of the dominant economic thinking of the thirties, which was that the U.S. economy had become stagnant or mature and therefore required increasingly heavy Federal spending to keep it going.

That theory was proved resoundingly false by events, but here it is again in different form, once again an alibi for massive Federal intervention. The urge to control the private economy never dies.

Not many of us are trained in the intricacies of economic theory, but it takes only common sense to see through the council's unamusing fun and games. We hope the President and Congress are not bemused by the latter-day stagnation theorists. Otherwise some of these people may at last succeed in bringing about Government-managed economic stagnation.

Watershed Man of the Year—John S. Wilder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. KEFAUVER. Madam President, on April 18, 1961, the National Watershed Conference named as its Watershed Man of the Year a Tennessean, whose dedication to conservation and good farming practices is unexcelled. I refer to Mr. John S. Wilder, of Mason, in Fayette County, Tenn.

I am proud to add my congratulations of Mr. Wilder's achievements and to call attention to an editorial praising him which appeared in the Memphis Press-Scimitar on April 22.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHN WILDER IN MANY WAYS MAN OF YEAR

From a farm in the hills of northwest Fayette County, Tenn., a mild but enthusiastic and sincere young man has come forth full of ideas to improve the welfare of the farmer.

He began with the conservation of the soil, and then he turned also to the conservation of good farmers.

The man is John S. Wilder of Mason, Tenn., whom the National Watershed Congress has named Watershed Man of the Year. As a conservation-minded farmer, Wilder has done about all one man could to promote the idea of soil and water conservation through the collective action of all the landowners living in a single watershed.

He practiced good conservation on his own farm. He made effective speeches. He served on public boards and committees, eventually becoming president of the Tennessee Association of Soil Conservation Districts. He became a lawyer, and was elected to the State senate where he helped push through conservation legislation.

He did all these things modestly—without ever seeming to be pushing himself forward, only his causes. Nor have his interests been limited to conservation and to the farm alone.

He effectively brought city and farm folk together in an agri-industry effort.

He also went to bat for the little farmer and tenant who was being frozen out of business by increasing restrictions on cotton acreage.

We think that if some other institutions, as well as the Watershed Congress, would examine Wilder's record, they, too, would find reasons for naming him "man of the year" in other fields.

The Responsibility of Being a Republican

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on May 13, 1961, Congressman CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, JR., of Maryland's Sixth District, addressed the annual convention of the Maryland Federation of Young Republicans in Hagerstown, Md.

I ask unanimous consent that this speech may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF BEING A REPUBLICAN

(Delivered before the Maryland Federation of Young Republicans in Hagerstown, Md., Saturday, May 13, 1961, by Congressman CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, JR., Republican, of Maryland)

Just one century after the Republican Party saw its first President inaugurated on the steps of the east front of the Capitol, the party is faced with the necessity to assess its maturity. In spite of valid cause for optimism in many areas, the Republican Party in Maryland and throughout the Nation will face one of its most crucial tests in less than 18 months. Our optimism can only be justified and the tests can only be met if we realistically assess the validity of our cause, the soundness of our principles and the maturity of our party. If the results of this self-examination give us the confidence that our dedicated work is an essential ingredient of national existence and progress, we can go forward.

In the first place, let us be honest with history. In many respects, the Republican Party has been a minority party since 1932. We have attained a majority in the House of Representatives at only brief intervals since that date. Without the tremendous personal prestige of General Eisenhower it is questionable whether we would have held the White House at any time since that date.

Although this record is not encouraging, many Republican leaders, newspaper editors and political commentators now predict that we have an opportunity to gain a majority in the U.S. House of Representatives in 1962 and to increase Republican membership in the 50 State legislatures. With proper planning, sound policy, adherence to principle and hard work, these prophecies can become reality. Nowhere is the promise greater for a Republican victory than in the State of Maryland.

The Monday morning quarterback can serve a useful purpose. While it may not serve the needs of the moment to review in detail the presidential election of 1960, it is possible to draw some conclusions that may guide us in the future. These conclusions take into account both our gains and losses on November 8, 1960.

Without trying to alibi the fact that we lost; we lost the White House and we lost

the House of Representatives; yet we did make the impressive gain of 22 seats in the House. Before examining some of the reasons for the loss, let us consider the factors which may have influenced the gain. Most of these 22 seats were won from Democrats who had earned the radical tag for extreme records far to the left of center of both political parties. At the same time, seven incumbent Republican Congressmen lost their seats and an analysis of these losses indicates that they suffered from either positions in the extreme right wing or from weaknesses engendered by factional fights within their district Republican organizations.

Comforting as the gain in House membership may be to the Republican Party, it is still necessary to realistically remember that in Congress the Republican Party ran behind Nixon and the Presidential ticket. John F. Kennedy won the White House by only two-tenths of 1 percent of over 68 million recorded votes. This is a plurality of less than a single ballot in each of the Nation's precincts. President Kennedy's plurality was 49.7 percent of the total recorded vote with Richard M. Nixon being credited with 49.5 percent. Cope, the political paper of the AFL–CIO, estimated that in 11 States a popular shift of a fraction of 1 percent would have resulted in a Nixon victory. The New York Herald Tribune has pointed out that excluding Dixie, Democrats outpolled Republicans in contested elections by a total of 26,950,000 to 26,-295,000

These figures indicate that the Presidency of the United States hung as evenly in balance as it is historically possible to imagine. This balance, of course, turned upon the personalities of the candidates, the campaign that they conducted and the assets and the liabilities that each brought into the campaign with him. But, if personality can sway a presidential election, we may assume that the collective election of the Congress reflects more accurately the reaction of the electorate to parties and platforms. In this respect, the Republican Party in congressional campaigns throughout the country did not equal the performance of Vice President Nixon. This is the gap that we must recognize and seek to close next year.

The New York Times in an article which appeared on May 7, 1961, analyzed the problem as follows:

"This raises the question of what new factors are in play to affect the long-term trend, and here everything is arguable." (The very short-range factor, how time and change will treat President Kennedy, is not arguable except by the most reckless knights of the crystal ball.)

The most compelling phenomena, as always for politicians, are voting statistics. These suggest—though not to Senator GOLDWATER'S satisfaction—that the electorate will take large doses of Republicanism of the liberal, internationalist persuasion, but has less and less taste for the party in traditional old-guard packaging.

In the 1960 elections, for example, Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE, running on a strongly liberal-Republican voting record, won by a majority of a third-of-a-million votes in New Jersey at the same time Kennedy was carrying the State for the Democrats. The two other Republican senatorial victories won with impressive ease also returned liberals—MARGARET CHASE SMITH in Maine and JOHN SHERMAN COOPER in Democratic Kentucky, by wide majorities.

Conservatives, by contrast, had difficulty everywhere except in New Hampshire and Kansas, and KARL MUNDT of South Dakota, that model of orthodox prairie Republicanism, barely squeaked through with a majority of only 15,000 out of over 300,000 votes cast.

The 1958 Senatorial elections were even more conclusive. Democrats won seats previously held by such stalwarts of conservatism as John W. Bricker of Ohio, George W. Malone of Nevada, Chapman Revercomb of West Virginia, William E. Jenner of Indiana, Charles E. Potter of Michigan, Edward J. Thye of Minnesota, Frederick G. Payne of Maine, and Frank A. Barrett of Wyoming.

Former Senator William F. Knowland, running for Governor of California on a platform endorsing the so-called "right-to-work" law, was humiliatingly defeated. The only new Republican Senators elected this year—KENNETH B. KEATING of New York, WINSTON L. PROUTY of Vermont and HUGH SCOTT of Pennsylvania—quickly identified themselves with the Senate's liberal Republican minority and have since been voting accordingly.

I do not know whether you will agree with Russell Baker, the author of this quotation, but I think that we have to recognize that he is expressing the opinion of many Americans both within and without the Republican Party.

I would personally take issue with Mr. Baker on one point. I would take issue with him to the extent that he attempts to draw a sharp line of division between elements within the Republican Party. To this concept I must address myself today.

I do not mean to contend that there will not always be variations of opinion within the Republican Party and I hope that the day will never come when this is not so. We shall always have Republicans who, by virtue of background, environment, and experience react differently to national issues. But such healthy variety of viewpoint should not inhibit Republican unity and a solid party front. Such party unity can, however, be only achieved when there is a firm adherence to the basic principles of the party and a willingness on the part of individual Republicans to slough off personal and sectional interests for the sake of advancing our ideas of government and policy. For those of us who feel deeply about public questions it is often a great sacrifice to realize that an abiding principle of the party would restrict the exercise of our own whim in such matters. As one who has felt it necessary to cast an independent vote on occasion in my brief career in the Congress, I feel peculiarly qualified to issue this call first to party responsibility and secondly to the resultant party discipline. I do not believe that my conduct in the past has been inconsistent with this challenge.

I speak of principles, you may well ask me to define what I mean. In other words, what is a Republican?

The answer is simple: individualism is the bedrock of our party. If we are a conservative party, it is that we are dedicated to conserving human freedom and human dignity above all else. As Republicans we recognize that human freedom does not originate in Annapolis or in Washington. Human dignity is not the product of legislation or bureaucracy. Liberty is a common goal of people and we as a party contend that it can only flourish in the soil of freedom, economic and human freedom. Nor can the seat of any government be the source of the wealth of nations. It is created in factories or farms, at desks and in the market places where thrifty, industrious Americans earn. Although some Democracts may choose to forget, it was Thomas Jefferson who said, "That government which governs least, governs best," and it was Woodrow Wilson who said "The history of liberty is a history of limitation of governmental power, not the increase of it. When we resist, therefore, the concentration of power, we are resisting the processes of death, because a concentration of power is what always precedes the destruction of human liberties."

Republicans are unshaken in the wisdom of individuals to determine their own personal and national destinies. We are Republicans because our party is more deeply endowed with a sense of integrity in public affairs. We are Republicans because we seek to speak as Americans not as members of special groups of economic or social interests which may be inconsistent with the larger interests of our Republic. We can become the voice of the Nation expressing the opinions and the aspirations of all the people; truly a collective voice rather than a mere babble of shrill, individual cries for preference.

Adherence to principle can cause hard decisions. I frankly mention the recent vote in the House of Representatives on the enlargement of the Rules Committee as an example of this. There we had a simple choice between an opportunity to embarrass a new administration, but to do so we had to deny the right of a representative assembly to control of its own legislative processes. For me the choice was compelling, but not easy. At no time in the protracted debate on this subject in the press and on the floor of the House did I ever hear anyone deny this simple proposition.

In Maryland we have a similar difficult but compelling choice. We have seen how a ruthless majority has ridden roughshod over the principles of representative government and ignored the demand for equitable congressional representation. The creation of the so-called Eighth Congressional District violates every concept of fair and reasonable congressional districting. I personally went to Annapolis and testified in favor of a complete and equitable redistricting of seats in the House of Representatives. When the general assembly ignored all the calls upon its sense of fairness and historical and constitutional policy on this question, I then announced my support of the petition for referendum on the Congressional Redistricting Act of 1961.

But at this point we have another decision to make. If we support fair representation in the Congress of the United States, it follows that we must support fair representation in the General Assembly of Maryland. This may be less popular among some Republicans but I say to you that the principle is the same and that we as a party will gain dignity, honor, and victory if we recognize the validity of the principle. From my personal experience in campaigning in one of the largest suburban communities of Maryland, I can assure you of the tremendous response that we will receive if we demonstrate that we are ready to act upon this principle.

What I have had to say amounts to a plea to all of you and to all of our fellow Republicans throughout the United States that by our actions and our words we make it clear to all our fellow countrymen that true Republican doctrine is as we know it.

This does not mean that we should compromise our principles and our convictions for the sake of a transitory success. It does not mean that we should become the feeble echoes of the cry of "tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect." It does mean that as the one political party which can genuinely represent a majority of the American people we must offer constructive opposition and reasonable alternatives to the proposals of the other party. It means that we must constantly evidence our concern for human problems and human rights. It means that we must persuade the American people that we do not regard power and responsibility as an end in itself but rather as an evidence of our conviction that human freedom rests on economic freedom.

In the light of recent events in Cuba, in Laos and around the world we must demonstrate that our respect for the individual is the most important political weapon in our struggle with the forces of communism. Our national purpose as stated in the Declaration of Independence is to proclaim "that

all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." As this is the essence of the American spirit, it must be the essence of the Republican policy. As we recognize that there are human needs to be met, we can recognize that there are solutions to be found within the framework of our principles. We must know ourselves to be the party of responsible progress and we must be willing to organize ourselves to fulfill the responsibility of that role.

Science Lure in Kansas City at Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Kansas City Star of Tuesday, May 9, 1961, about the tour taken last week by the National Science Fair international finalists of the science based industries and institutions of the Kansas City area. I think my colleagues will find it interesting, and informative of the tremendous facilities offered by the Kansas City area for contributions to the onward march of science:

[From the Kansas City Star, May 9, 1961]

SCIENCE LURE IN KANSAS CITY AT WORK

National Science Fair-International finalists will get a unique, closeup look at Greater Kansas City science-based industries and institutions this week.

The youthful exhibitors see a wide array of products in various stages of manufacture—the normal procedure at most plants for visiting groups. They also will be taken "behind the scenes" to learn how basic science is utilized in production and research.

The tours will start tomorrow after the official opening of the fair.

Special tours and demonstrations have been arranged at 16 large firms with the assumption that the guests won't settle just to see production lines in action, according to Leo J. Roedl, executive director of Science Pioneers, Inc. That Kansas City organization is the cooperating sponsor of the fair. The officials also have been warned the youthful visitors may ask difficult, penetrating questions about the scientific facets, Roedl added.

EAGER TO LEARN

"Because of the extra reading and research they've done," Roedl explained, "these youngsters are experts in some phases of science. An ordinary tour wouldn't do. These kids want the opportunity to see scientists at work and to question them."

The Buick-Oldsmobile-Pontiac assembly plant, Kansas City, Kans., is representative of the companies that have designed tours especially for the teenagers.

The big plant has tours for thousands of visitors annually. But this is the first time a scientifically pointed visit has been arranged. To insure a smooth running program, those who will conduct the youths held four rehearsals.

The youngsters will see the assembly line as an exercise in applied mathematics. Fundamentals of trigonometry and algebra are parts of the problem that makes it possible for the scores of parts to mesh together at the right time and right place in the assembly process.

The basic problem faced by planners is to combine two seemingly opposite concepts—"custom" building—on a mass production line, they will be told. Theoretically the B.O.P. plant could produce more than 3 million different 1961 models, with no two alike.

The young scientists will hear how the probability theory is used in advance ordering of component parts and options based on expected customer preference. An explanation will be given on relative motion, which insures that parts on the subassembly lines coincide with the steadily moving final lines, even though some cars with extra equipment take longer to assemble than others, thus complicating the timing sequence.

PROCESS MUST MESH

Trigonometry determines the rotary speed required to move the assembly lines at the prescribed rate and linear programing provides the most efficient order of scheduling in the assembly process. A study of lead time will show how it is possible to place orders with suppliers as far in advance as is feasible, but to produce a car, once it is ordered, in a minimum amount of time.

"As soon as a buyer decides what kind of car he wants," an executive remarked, "he can hardly wait. We get it to him as quickly as we can."

Armed with such mathematical knowledge, control men can cut weeks out of the supplier plant lead time by considering it as a part of the huge production line, starting at the suppliers and extending across country by rail and highway.

After watching newly assembled cars go through final tests, the youths will return to the plant's conference room for a question-and-answer session.

An insight into how computer machines protect this country from enemy attack will be seen at the Semi-Automatic Ground Environment (SAGE) installation at the Richards-Gabaur Air Force Base.

SAGE, it will be related, links equipment at airbases, missile sites, radar, communications systems and other facilities with agencies that supply information upon which valid air defense decisions are based. The machines correlate the data and identify a track of an airborne object.

The youngsters also will have the option of touring the Truman Library in Independence and other Kansas City points of interest.

The other places to be toured:

Long lines department of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co.—How network television programs are carried to 675 stations throughout the United States; an "electric brain" that keeps a vigil on switching circuitry of direct dialing to 50 million telephones.

Sheffield division of the Armco Steel Corp.—Open hearth operations in which steel is made from scrap metal with the addition of certain alloys.

Chemagro Corp.—Biological and other research in the manufacture of agricultural chemicals, with emphasis on insecticides.

Gustin-Bacon Manufacturing Co.—Raw materials automatically "batched" in two-story-high machines, which produce glass "marbles." These then are melted and transformed into blankets, boards, molded insulation which are automatically faced with plastic, foil, fabric, and other finishes.

Linda Hall Library.—One of the largest special scientific and technical book collections in the United States, with more than a quarter-million volumes; many of the first editions of the classic milestones in science.

Midwest Research Institute.—Specialized laboratories for research in biology, chemistry, economics, engineering, physics, and mathematics.

Spencer Chemical Co.—Current research in synthesis, screening and development of pesticides; plastics equipment tests and evaluations; instrumentation in analytical analysis, production of nitrogen fertilizers, industrial chemicals, polethylene, and nylon.

Sugar Creek Refinery of Standard Oil.—Processes that include a combination crude and coking unit, fluid catalytic and thermal craking units, polymerization, blending, and finishing units.

Transworld Airlines overhaul and maintenance base.—The functional direction, coordination, and specialized training required for daily maintenance and servicing of aircraft over the entire system; the utilization of X-ray and supersonics in inspections.

Nike missile sites.—How the system works; a tour through the vans containing electronic equipment that guides missiles to their targets.

University of Kansas Medical Center.—The laboratories of microbiology, pharmacology, and pathology to show the work in progress on cancer, arthritis, and other diseases.

Vendo Co.—Testing and research on coin-operated automatic merchandising machines.

Weather Bureau.—The severe local storm forecast center, the National Radar Analysis Development Unit, the National Communications Center for the U.S. Weather Bureau Internal Teletypewriter Circuits, and the national severe local storm research project.

Hallmark cards.—The silk screen process in greeting card production and the world's largest art department with 350 persons at work.

The Late Gary Cooper: A Real American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALPHONZO E. BELL, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has suffered a great loss in the passing of a distinguished citizen, Gary Cooper—actor, artist, business leader, husband, father, outdoor man; a real American.

He came to be a symbol of vigor, courage, and heroism in American life. He served as a source of inspiration to many of the youth of this Nation who admire such pioneer qualities of quiet strength of character, steadfastness, honesty, and fairplay.

He had a public career of the highest order of fidelity and service. He gave of both himself and of his resources, not only to many of the worthwhile charities, but to many of those who needed a helping hand in their strife for a better life.

His two Oscars—given for his performances in the title role in "Sergeant York," 1941, and as the courageous sheriff in "High Noon," 1953—doubtless rank among the most popular awards ever presented by the Motion Picture Academy.

Mr. Speaker, the manly qualities in American life that Gary Cooper so ably portrayed in such pictures as "The Virginian," "The Westerner," and "For

Whom the Bell Tolls," future generations will not only continue to enjoy, but what is more important, will continue to emulate and thus will find a source for renewed courage.

I am honored by listing myself among those who have been Gary Cooper's friends. I will miss him. The people of this Nation and of this world will miss him.

But at this sad time our particular sympathy goes out to Mrs. Cooper, the devoted wife who shared the trials and satisfaction of our friend's varied and eminently useful career.

Needed: Neutralist United Nations Dis-Armament Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the arms race between the Communist world and the non-Communist world poses an ever greater threat to peace, either by premeditated war or by accidental war.

For almost 15 years, the world has talked of reduced—rather than increased—armaments.

Regrettably, however, the Communists adhere to a policy of aggression. Their aggression is ever toward ultimate triumph of communism, rather than the establishment of peace in a world of self-governing nations.

Consequently, progress has been literally impossible. The Communists have continued to block conference after conference. Militarily, they have reduced manpower only if such reductions were balanced—or perhaps stepped up—by increases of firepower by new weapons.

Because of the stalemate, I suggested yesterday, in a broadcast over radio station WGN, in Chicago, the establishment of a neutralist United Nations commission to attempt to set up universally recognized criteria for disarmament. I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY, OF WISCONSIN

Today, the United States and the non-Communist world, face major challenges, including efforts to find:

Ways to stop Communist aggression without sparking a third world war; a formula for negotiating differences between the non-Communist and Communist worlds; and, establishment of a climate of peace and law by which nations can, by self-determination, seek and attain their national destinies.

These are great and formidable challenges.

Around the globe—in Cuba, Laos, Berlin, the Congo, and elsewhere—Red troublemakers are threatening the freedom of peoples and nations.

What can be done about it?

Over the years, there has been a great deal of talk about disarmament. Unhappily, this has been difficult to achieve. Why? Because the Communists are committed to aggression rather than to disarmament and peace.

Time after time, Lenin, Stalin, and Khrushchev have restated their ultimate goals of world conquest. As recently as January of this year, Khrushchev, in a policy speech, reemphasized that if a takeover of the world, nation by nation, could not be accomplished peacefully, then force would be utilized to attempt to gain this objective. Despite an all-out addiction to aggression—military, political, ideological, however—the Reds continue to pay lip service to the cause of disarmament. Why? Because it serves as a smokescreen behind which to carry on their evil acts of aggression. Actually, too, they frustrate every effort to negotiate for realistic reduction of armaments. At the same time, they accuse—and all too often successfully—the United States and the Western allies of roadblocking progress in this field.

In the light of the Reds' sabotaging disarmament at the conference table—and indulging military-economic-political-ideological aggression elsewhere in the world—is there any hope for realistic negotiations?

Personally, I would like to be more optimistic. Unhappily, however, the picture is darkly clouded. Nevertheless, we must keep on trying: (1) to get agreement at the conference table; and (2) to mobilize world opinion on the side of realistic disarmament.

How can this best be accomplished? Perhaps by the following suggestion: The United Nations, I believe, could well establish a Commission on Disarmament comprised solely of neutralist nations. The commission would have the responsibility of hammering out a realistic plan of disarmament. The plan could be presented to the United Nations. Then, a vote of "Yes" or "No" would be required by the major powers. This would put all nations—including the Soviet Union—of the world on the spot—reflecting more clearly whether they were for or against disarmament. Regrettably, the smokescreen of charges and countercharges fired between East and West have made it difficult for nations of the world to clearly discern who is responsible for the obstruction of progress.

The traditional, major points of difference between East and West have focused upon inspection. Experience—both prior to, and following, World War II—should have taught the world, however, that treaties signed by tyrants are so much paper—unless self-enforcible. The Russians—like Hitler—have freely and recklessly torn up a great many treaties and agreements, after these have served their cause.

The establishment of such a neutralist U.N. Commission could not be expected to miraculously resolve the difference between East and West in negotiations. Nevertheless, such a body could, I believe, (1) develop criteria which would be universally recognized as fundamental to reduction of arms in the world; (2) present a clearer picture of who—namely, the Red bloc—has continually been obstructing progress.

Until a realistic system has been developed, we will need to continue (1) to maintain a strong deterrent power against massive attack; (2) develop more effective forces to cope with brushfire wars; (3) design techniques for stopping the infiltrative actions of the Reds in Southeast Asia, Latin America, Africa, and elsewhere in the world; and (4) gird ourselves for a long, difficult struggle—for the battle against the great and growing Red threat to freedom will not be easily won.

Project Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to see the progress made by the people-to-people program, Project Hope. This private medical mission from America to the underdeveloped nations of the world has received tremendous acceptance from the nations it is visiting.

As a member of the Massachusetts Committee for Project Hope, I bring to the attention of the House the accomplishments and future plans of Project Hope.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles from the Boston Globe and the Boston Traveler of recent dates:

[From the Boston Traveler]

FLEET OF HOPE

You don't have to be young enough to join the Peace Corps to extend a helping hand and boost the free world's stock in underdeveloped nations.

A contribution to the current drive for funds to expand America's ocean-borne medical mission from one ship to a fleet of four would be a worthy alternative.

The success of the SS *Hope*—a converted Navy hospital ship—in bringing treatment to 15,000 Indonesians and training to scores of doctors and nurses in southeast Asia has opened new doors for reaching ordinary men, women, and children in the uncommitted nations.

What is being done in the port cities of the Orient can be done—with more ships—in South America, Central America, and Africa. That we need to do it is abundantly clear from the close study a team of Soviet doctors is making of the SS *Hope's* successful mercy mission as it steams from port to port.

[From the Boston Globe]

FUNDS FOR FOUR MORE SHIPS SOUGHT TO EXPAND U.S. MEDICAL MISSION

The mercy of *Hope*—an American hospital ship serving people everywhere—will blossom from a fleet of four such vessels if the current fund drive of Project Hope is a success.

The need for more ships was shown by the termendous success of SS *Hope I* in Indonesia, according to Dr. William B. Walsh, founder of the nonprofit project.

Dr. Walsh, in Boston to confer with leaders of the Massachusetts campaign, said more ships are needed to bring medical knowledge, supplies and service to people in South America, Central America and Africa.

SS *Hope I* will leave Indonesia for Vietnam in June, he said.

He said that reactions from the people of Indonesia toward the vessel have been enthusiastic.

"The prestige of America has been vastly improved all over Asia because of the medical mission," he said.

FIFTEEN THOUSAND TREATED

More than 15,000 patients have been treated, hundreds of operations performed, and scores of Indonesian doctors and nurses trained aboard the ship.

He told of the thousands of people who lined a beach when the SS *Hope I* came into port.

"They were waving banners of welcome," he said.

He said that a team of 10 Russian doctors followed the ship to several ports to observe the effects of Hope's program.

SS *Hope I* was one of six Navy hospital ships built during World War II.

It was taken out of mothballs and rebuilt last year.

Administration Spokesman Again Endorses Congressional Study of Fuel and Energy Resources—Assistant Secretary of Interior Addresses American Mining Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, today in Cleveland, Ohio, the Honorable John M. Kelly, Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Mineral Resources, again stated the administration position favorable to a congressional study of fuel and energy resources, a resolution relating to which is pending in the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. Kelly's significant address was delivered at the 1961 coal show of the American Mining Congress.

His comments concerning coal research were pertinent and progressive, and I commend especially his remark that coal "is too large a resource, too valuable a national asset, to be allowed to lie fallow."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the text of Assistant Secretary Kelly's remarks.

There being no objection, the text of the remarks was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF JOHN M. KELLY, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR FOR MINERAL RESOURCES, AT THE 1961 COAL SHOW OF THE AMERICAN MINING CONGRESS, CLEVELAND, OHIO, MAY 15, 1961

Mr. Salvati, Mr. Elfred, Mr. Conover, friends and guests, most speakers begin their remarks with a word or two concerning their personal gratification at being invited to speak. Today, I say it with all sincerity because this is the first opportunity I have had to meet with a group representing our Nation's vital and essential coal industry.

I am making many new friends here today—new associations which, I am sure, will be close and lasting. Secretary Udall has asked me to convey his personal regards and his best wishes for a most successful show this year.

Although I have spent most of my adult life closely associated with the extractive industries—first as a mining engineer, and later in the oil industry—I was surprised to learn of the coal industry's achievements in production efficiency. The advances scored by your industry in this field are in themselves a tribute to your determination to expand existing coal markets and to find new ones.

This farsighted, self-enlightenment deserves commendation and support, and, I can assure you that such support and cooperation will be found in the Department of the Interior under the Kennedy administration.

This farsighted self-enlightenment dehealthy, prosperous coal industry is essential to the welfare and social progress of our Nation. We in the Kennedy administration appreciate its importance, recognize its complexities, and admire the ingenuity and imagination of those who direct it. We are familiar with some of your problems—and we are more than willing to help you do something about them.

Coal was the main source of our Nation's energy supply for 60 years or more, and it still contributes a significant part of our current energy requirements. In the years ahead coal will continue to have an important share of the Nation's energy market.

I am informed that we have perhaps three-quarters of a trillion tons of coal at our disposal, assuming mining recovery of as little as 50 percent of coal in place in the more available seams. Under improved technology, we can look forward with assurance that fully half again as much will eventually be available.

This is too large a resource, too valuable a national asset, to be allowed to lie fallow. The demands of this country—its growing population, its mounting standards of living, its international obligations and responsibilities—require that we make the best use of all of our resources, including coal.

Today, we are organizing the new Office of Coal Research in the Department of the Interior. This office will look hard and closely into many aspects of coal. It is always valuable to have a new pair of eyes looking at old facts, and this is our philosophy regarding the coal research program.

As I said earlier, you have already performed an amazing feat managing to hold your overall cost of operation steady, countering the trend of most commodities toward increased cost. In part, this has been possible through research—research in mechanical engineering without which we would never have the fantastic show of equipment here on the exhibit floors—research in the application of electronics for automation in mining and preparation, research in metallurgy, in hydraulics, in marketing, in new applications.

The time has now come to pool our research energies to attack old problems, to find new and better uses for coal—and to do it as promptly as possible.

We must look deeper into the problems surrounding the use of coal as an industrial commodity, as well as a fuel.

We must move ahead on the gasification of coal with the aim of producing a gas which can be mixed with natural gas for industrial and consumer use.

We must devote more energy to the creation from coal of a liquid fuel which could be utilized by oil refiners.

We must work harder to develop efficient, inexpensive new methods to transport coal.

These are but a few of the things which, I am sure, will be investigated by the Office of Coal Research.

While I have talked about the Office of Coal Research, I do not wish to leave the impression that this organization will affect the continuing growth and importance of the types of research conducted by the Department's Bureau of Mines.

As those of you here know full well, the Bureau of Mines has performed outstanding work and has made major contributions to coal technology for over 50 years. The work of the Office of Coal Research will complement the longer-term research of the Bureau of Mines by concentrating on projects showing promise of more immediate expansion of coal markets.

Both organizations will continue to grow in the future, in their respective approaches to advancing the technology of coal production and use.

In the short time available, it would be impossible to list the outstanding accomplishments of the Bureau of Mines. Whether you are engaged in the mining of coal, its preparation, or its many uses, I am sure the work of the Bureau has provided valuable technologic information and important statistical and economic facts.

The Bureau is now making real progress in its research in hydraulic mining. Very substantial progress is also being made in making gassy mines safer, in new and improved designs for a coal-fired gas turbine for electric generation, and in many other projects currently underway.

The Bureau of Mines makes its impressive contribution in many ways—in its pioneering of roof bolting, mine ventilation, and respiratory protective devices, for example. Permissibility, also, is a word familiar to those of you attending this show. The Bureau of Mines seal of permissibility can be seen on many pieces of equipment displayed here. Through the testing services of the Bureau, effective and efficient mining equipment has been developed—equipment which is dependable and safe.

At this time, I want to say a few words about the proposed study of fuel and energy resources which is pending before the Congress.

A few days ago, the Department of the Interior announced its formal endorsement of a balanced, long-range study. I am hopeful that this study will get under way in the current Congress.

In the past several weeks, I have made a number of appearances before various oil industry groups, and should like to repeat to you today the substance of my remarks to them regarding an energy and fuels study.

President Kennedy, Secretary Udall, and I firmly endorse a balanced, long-range fuels study which uses the test of the public good as its cardinal principle. In Secretary Udall's words, "We cannot in something as important as fuels and energy let policy be set by drift and default."

No one can dispute the right of the Congress of the United States to initiate such a study. Unthinking, blind opposition to an impartial, long-range study serves no useful purpose. Out of such a study will come the determination that sound and consistent Government policies are vitally essential in maintaining a healthy fuels and energy situation in this country.

We have much to gain from a thorough look at where we have been, where we are, and where we are going.

We need to know what public policies are necessary to assure an adequate, dependable fuel supply for the Nation in order to achieve a healthy, balanced development of the national economy. We need to know whether our present Federal, State, and local laws and programs promote the public interest in the wise development of our fuel resources. Finally, we need to know how to define in specific terms what the public interest really is, when confronted with the technical, economic, and international problems entailed in fuel resource development and use.

I think the proposed fuels study poses a real challenge to a major segment of our economy. Can we unite in exploration for a fuels policy that is in the public interest?

This is hardly the time to utilize the forum of the fuels study in a knockdown drag-out fight for competitive advantage.

The 1960's are going to be a period of many changes in the United States and in the world. As President Kennedy has expressed it, "We are crossing frontiers which

involve the struggle for freedom here in the United States and around the world."

This fact overshadows all other aspects of our national existence. Life in the years ahead will not be easy. Wishing for it, asking for it, predicting it, will not bring it to pass. Again, as the President has stated it, "Before my term has ended, we shall have to test anew whether a nation organized and governed such as ours can endure."

The outcome is by no means certain. The answers are by no means clear. All of us—in this administration, in the Congress, throughout our land—must forge the answers and buttress our determination so we shall not fail this new test of man's dignity and freedom.

What does this mean specifically to the coal industry?

It means simply that we must join—in industry and in Government—in a united effort to achieve our common objectives. We must work together in the knowledge that the ultimate and final test of our actions will be tested in the crucible of history.

Federal Support of Medical Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an address on Federal support of medical education, which I delivered at the John Archer Society dinner, University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine, Philadelphia, Pa., on April 26, 1961:

FEDERAL SUPPORT OF MEDICAL EDUCATION

(Address of the Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY, U.S. Representative, Second Congressional District of Rhode Island, at John Archer Society dinner, University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine, Philadelphia, Wednesday, Apr. 26, 1961, at 6. pm.)

Of the many responsibilities shared by all Members of the Congress of the United States, none is more important than the one I shall attempt to fulfill today.

I refer to the duty to render public reports on matters of national significance. There are several ways to do this. One of the best is direct, face-to-face discussions.

Because of the particular congressional role I have held for many years, I believe I have a special obligation to conduct such discussions before groups of physicians.

When that group is within so distinguished an institution as the University of Pennsylvania Medical School, that obligation becomes, instead, a privilege.

In Philadelphia, a Member of Congress cannot help but feel the presence of those early patriots who established the political foundations of the Republic. I am sure that physicians visiting this old city must, in similar fashion, feel the presence of John Morgan and William Shippen, who pioneered our great national structure of medical schools. Close behind these two we—both the legislator and the physician of today—can discern the heroic figure of Benjamin Rush, pioneer in mental health, who in spite of his busy schedule of medical practice and teaching, found time to help formulate the Declaration of Independence.

On down through the years we are reminded of other great physicans associated with this city and this school: men like Archer, Long, Osler, De Leon, and Barnes. Then we reach the contemporary scene and encounter figures such as Drs. Isidor Ravdin, Howard Rusk, Charles Mayo, and E. Vincent Askey, who in the same tradition, combine the talents of teacher, researcher, or practitioner of medicine with invaluable contributions to the larger national scene.

And thus I must blend my gratitude and pride for being chosen to present the annual lecture of the John Archer Society with a large portion of humility in the presence of a gathering which represents so vital a segment of our national history and of present-day imminence in medical science.

As chairman of the subcommittee of the House which has responsibility, among other things, for the annual appropriations for the U.S. Public Health Service, my work obviously has a direct impact upon the scope and directions of Federal, State, and local public health programs and the very important research programs of the U.S. Public Health Service. Less well known among physicians is the fact that the actions of my subcommittee have had, cumulatively, a far-reaching impact on medical education.

When I first became a member of my subcommittee, the research program of the Public Health Service was small, and limited principally to its own epidemiological and laboratory study of the communicable diseases. Funds for research grants and training awards to non-Federal investigators and institutions were relatively insignificant. This was but a reflection of the emphasis then being given to consolidating the great advances made against communicable diseases in the first three decades of the present century. Even then, however, the shape of our population and its environment was undergoing important changes, creating new health problems and needs for a new research effort.

Oversimplified, the two most significant changes were these:

1. Emergence of the chronic disease problem: Because of reductions in morbidity and mortality from communicable diseases—particularly among infants, children, and mothers—more people were living longer, and therefore becoming more susceptible to the chronic diseases such as cancer, heart disease, arthritis, and emotional disorders.

2. Emergence of environmental health problems: The longer average life expectancy, together with improved economic conditions and other factors, had greatly expanded our population. The flowering of U.S. technology and industry concentrated more and more of these people in our cities. At the same time it introduced an entirely new set of health problems—air and water pollution, ionizing radiations, food additives, a deluge of new drugs and synthetics, an alarming increase in accidents on the streets, in the factory, and in the home.

Thus, almost from the beginning of my service on the subcommittee, we have had to devote more and more attention to national needs in these two areas of chronic diseases and environmental health.

Back around 1945 and 1946 we felt that the Nation should begin learning more about the cause, prevention, and treatment of chronic disease. This required some redirection and strengthening of the Public Health Service's own research. More important is the fact that expansion of research in universities and medical schools was considered imperative.

According to their own representatives, the size of the needed expansion was clearly beyond the resources of the universities, foundations, voluntary health agencies, and other private sources. In concurrence with the advice of experts in and out of the Government, we determined that a gradual, year-by-year buildup of a Federal grants-in-aid program, would be required. The mechanism to be used was the National Institutes of Health of the Public Health Service—an organization with experience in the granting field and a tradition of first-class medical and biological research.

So much for philosophy and background. Now let us look at what has happened. The simplest and quickest measurement is in terms of the dollars that have been spent to bring our Nation unquestioned world leadership in medical and biological science. Taking as our baseline the last prewar year, the total national investment in this work has risen from about $45 million in 1940 to around $715 million in 1960. In 1940 Federal support of such research was 7 percent, or $3 million. In 1960 the Federal share was 53 percent or about $380 million, most of which was provided through the National Institute of Health.

Here I should like to point out that although the percentage of non-Federal funds has greatly decreased in relation to Federal funds, there has, nevertheless, been a remarkable increase in the actual amount of non-Federal assistance to medical research—from $42 million in 1940 to an estimated $335 million in 1960. It seems to me this affords clear proof that Federal funds have stimulated rather than suppressed private expenditures in medical research.

Most of these Federal funds have been appropriated for research and training related to specific diseases such as cancer, arthritis, neurological disorders, cardiovascular diseases, and the like. However, very sizable amounts have, of necessity, gone into study of basic medical and biological questions. Overall, the great bulk of the research up until now has been oriented toward laboratory rather than clinical phases.

As to results, a gathering such as this would know, far better than I, of the remarkable array of new concepts, drugs and procedures that have already come forth. You, better than I, know of the still greater advances which lie ahead simply because the greatest part of the work of the past decade has been of a fundamental nature and therefore provides the building material for tomorrow's new clinical developments and the substance of tomorrow's medical education. The research construction program has had the same effect on the physicial plants of our schools.

Now I must look at the other side of the coin. The very scope and vigor of our national research effort, not only in biology and medicine, but in many other scientific fields, has either created, intensified, or at least revealed certain problems.

It is easy for us to forget the national proliferation in these other fields of science, paralleling the growth in biomedicine, but involving vastly greater Federal funds. These other research interests of the Federal Government also have had to be advanced primarily through project grants and contracts, largely with the same institutions who are the mainstay of our health-related research.

I am sure you are familiar with the administrative problems; with the rigidities; and with the tendency toward creation of imbalances between research and teaching functions that have been reported from many institutions, as resulting from the volume of project research.

I have heard it said that our national concentration on direct project research grants and contracts carries an inherent danger of causing the universities to lose control over such factors as the relative emphasis their faculties shall give to fundamental versus applied research. Some authorities feel the very independence of many universities is threatened.

These possibilities are a matter of grave concern to my committee, as I know they are also to other segments of the Congress having similar interests in preserving a

healthy research and educational structure in our Nation.

As one approach to a redress of the present trend as it relates to medically oriented research, the Congress recently authorized NIH to explore methods for a new program of general research grants to universities and similar institutions. These general grants would augment rather than replace the project grant system. Our thought was that reasonably large sums made available for institutions to use as they saw fit, in meeting particular internal problems, would help them achieve their own institutional goals, objectives and standards of excellence.

The Congress has not yet approved the details of this new grants program. However, the principle is sound and the need seems to be well established. I am hopeful that something concrete will be forthcoming in the near future.

Another problem growing out of the emphasis on laboratory research during the past decade has been the need for more funds, facilities and projects for clinical research facility grants program was established last year by NIH as a result of recommendations by the Congress.

Totally, the program aims to provide support for a variety of basic and clinical research efforts on a broad variety of diseases and fundamental biomedical problems. The similar clinical facility programs of the NIH categorical Institutes are to be concerned primarily with a particular type or group of diseases, such as heart disease or cancer.

Behind the original congressional action were the considerations that (1) clinical research has been insufficient because of a lack of adequate means to provide the careful observation and control needed for research in the complexities of human biology; and (2) that valuable research in animals or chemical laboratories often has not been carried over into studies in human patients because of a lack of proper research facilities and conditions. One of the principal reasons for these deficiencies has been the high costs of clinical research.

A clinical research facility is defined as a resource within a medical institution, aimed at enhancing the quality and quantity of clinical investigations. It is a discrete physical unit or research ward of about 10 to 20 beds in a hospital, but apart from the general care wards, with a stable, well-trained nursing and dietetic staff to provide precise control and observation, and with directly supporting specialized laboratory facilities.

The grant funds pay for the renovation and equipment of the centers, the costs of the care of research patients (including specialized nursing, diet kitchens, and other services), supporting laboratories and certain staff salaries.

In those facilities, scientists can carry on coordinated investigations in a wide range of diseases and basic scientific problems. NIH cites as an example of such cooperative work, the problem of transplanting human tissues and organs. Advances in both the basic sciences, such as chemistry and immunology, and in the clinical sciences, such as surgery and internal medicine, are necessary before important advances can be made in transplantation techniques.

Good progress has been made in getting this clinical program under way. First-year grants averaging about a half-million dollars each have been awarded to 19 institutions in every part of the country. A number of other very promising applications is being studied by NIH and its advisory groups and action on these should be forthcoming soon.

AID TO MEDICAL EDUCATION

While not created by the large-scale investment in medical research, the third problem I wish to discuss was intensified by it. Furthermore, the continuation and future expansion of that research effort will be jeopardized if this third problem is not solved. And finally, full public benefit from the results of the medical research program will depend to a significant degree on how well that problem is solved.

I refer to impending deficits in both the quantity and quality of new physicians that our country must have if we are to maintain and improve our present high standards of medical practice.

Studies made by my committee and by other responsible groups over the past 2 or 3 years indicate that our medical schools are losing ground in the competition for superior college students.

During the current fiscal year approximately 10,000 predoctoral fellowships in the physical, life, and social sciences, psychology, engineering, the arts, humanities, and education will be awarded by four Federal agencies—the Department of State, the National Science Foundation, the Office of Education, and the National Institutes of Health.

These fellowships provide a stipend of from $1,800 to $2,500, plus $50 allowance for each dependent, and travel allowances. Full tuition is paid to the institution which the recipient chooses to attend, and in some instances an additional subsidy to the institution is provided.

We all know that college enrollments are rapidly increasing. However, the number of college students applying to medical schools has dropped at a time when the number of college graduates has been increasing. Furthermore, the quality of applicants is said to be decreasing. These trends offer a serious threat to the necessary increase in the number of physicians in the future. It is a threat also to the quality of future graduates.

Against this decline of medical school applications is the widely held belief that, today, this country has a relative shortage of medical manpower. We believe that shortage will become acute in the years ahead unless action is taken.

One of the several expert committees that have been studying this problem reported last year that it found four principal reasons for the impending physician shortage:

1. The tremendous increase in population in the past 20 years—from 132 million in 1940 to 180 million in 1960;

2. We have not expanded our production of physicians at a sufficient rate to meet the needs for medical care of the increasing population in an addition to the augmented needs for teaching and research;

3. The shift in the U.S. population distribution resulting in a greater percentage of the very young and very old who require the greatest amount of medical care;

4. The demand for health services resulting from our rising standard of living, wide expansion of hospital and medical insurance, and the increasing health-consciousness of our people.

In addition there are such factors as the great length and cost of medical training and the fact that many other satisfying and intellectually stimulating scientific careers with high prestige and adequate finanical reward have developed during the past 20 years.

This same study found the average cost of 4 years of medical school to be approximately $11,600 for those graduating in 1959. Since scholarship support has been meager, many students hesitate to shoulder a large loan, and the curriculum is so demanding that few students can carry a part-time job without considerable sacrifice of time needed for their studies. Thus the choice of medicine as a career has been to a considerable extent influenced by financial factors, and many promising college graduates who would have liked to study medicine have been discouraged.

To help remedy this situation it has become apparent to me that (1) the Federal Government must provide direct assistance to the teaching functions of medical and related schools; (2) that the Federal Government should supplement private, industrial, and State sources in providing scholarship, fellowship, and loan assistance to medical and dental students as it now does to Ph. D candidates in the basic sciences; and (3) it should relieve the serious financial and administrative imbalances between the research and teaching functions of the medical schools.

Several legislative proposals now being studied in the Congress are designed to meet these needs. I would like to describe very briefly my own bills which I believe would go a long way toward helping meet our national requirements in this area.

On January 25 of this year I introduced a bill which would provide for a 10-year program of grants for education in the fields of medicine and dentistry to be administered by the U.S. Public Health Service. Under this program each accredited degree-granting medical and dental school would receive a block grant of $100,000 each year, together with $500 for each student, plus $500 additional for each student enrolled in excess of average past enrollment.

For schools providing only 1, 2, or 3 years of professional training in medicine or dentistry, block grants of $25,000, $50,000, and $75,000, respectively, would be awarded. With these funds the schools could meet the costs of establishing, maintaining, or enlarging their teaching staffs and of maintaining, acquiring, and operating the necessary equipment.

I should like to emphasize that these funds are intended primarily to meet the costs of new or expanded instruction programs. Special training projects outside the regular curriculum which are financed with other public funds or private grants are excluded. The same exclusion applies to the costs of research and to the operations of any hospitals.

My bill applies a few conditions for institutional eligibility for Federal grants that I believe you will agree are entirely reasonable and desirable:

1. The school must be either a public or a nonprofit private institution located within the United States.

2. The school must provide reasonable opportunity for the admission of out-of-State students.

3. During the period it is receiving Federal payments, the school must make every reasonable effort to maintain its income for operating expenses from sources other than the Federal Government at a level equal to that which existed before receiving the Federal funds. In the case of a new school, similar efforts should be made to obtain such non-Federal operating income at the highest possible level.

4. The school will submit from time to time such reports as the Surgeon General may reasonably require to assure that these purposes are being carried out.

To advise the Surgeon General on the policies and regulations under which the program would operate, there would be established a National Council on Education for Health. The Surgeon General would be ex officio chairman and the Commissioner of Education an ex officio member. The council membership would include 10 leaders in the fields of health sciences, education, or public affairs. Four of the ten would be persons actively engaged in an appropriate field of professional education.

A companion bill was introduced by me on the day after the first bill was offered. This second legislative proposal is designed to provide Federal funds which would stimulate and supplement non-Federal scholarship funds for medical and dental students. Each State wishing to participate would es-

tablish a commission on medical and dental scholarships, or designate an existing agency to serve as the State commission. The commission would develop a plan covering certain broad eligibility requirements which are spelled out in my bill, and which stipulates that the annual stipend paid any individual would not exceed $1,250 of Federal funds or one-half the amount of the total awarded to the student. My plan also provides that, insofar as possible, 75 percent of Federal funds awarded the State commission must be used for medical and 25 percent for dental scholarships.

Another important requirement is that the State commission review annually the educational progress being made by each scholarship recipient.

To finance this program the bill calls for an appropriation of $5 million for the first fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961; $10 million for the next fiscal year, and an equal amount for the next 8 years.

The Surgeon General will be advised on policies, regulations and administration of this program by a National Advisory Committee on Medical and Dental scholarships. This group will include the Surgeon General, who shall also serve as Chairman, the Commissioner of Education, and 10 members appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Three of these shall be recognized authorities in the field of professional education, three shall be teachers or practitioners in medicine or dentistry, and four shall represent the general public.

Since my bills were introduced, others having the same general objectives have been proposed in response to the request made by President Kennedy in his health message of February 9, that over the next decade the capacity of medical schools be increased by 50 percent and of dental schools by 100 percent.

I am particularly impressed with a provision of one of these which would help expand teaching facilities of our medical schools by means of matching grants of Federal money for construction purposes. This provision follows in principle the methods under which the research facilities of the schools and universities have been helped to expand by Federal grants in recent years. This particular bill would also extend and strengthen this latter program of research construction for another three years, an action I heartily approve.

I believe the needs for strengthening the medical schools in their teaching function are so clearly apparent that this Congress will take affirmative action of some kind. Whatever that action may be, I will do all in my power to make certain that it does not lead to Federal control.

Now I would like to discuss briefly the impact upon graduate and continuing medical education of these existing programs of Federal aid to medical and biological research, including the recently initiated clinical research facilities program.

NIH and the American Hospital Association have recently completed part of a study on how much research is being conducted in hospitals throughout the country. They found that in 1958, over $125 million was being spent on research in more than 850 hospitals—1 out of every 8 in the United States. Twenty-three averaged $3 million a piece; 58 averaged over $1½ million; 62 averaged about $158,000 on research; and 145 were spending over $50,000 annually.

Now my committee has been told by experts that clinical research in a hospital setting is a very painstaking and precise matter. Care and study of the research patient demands much more of the physician-investigator, of the interne and residents, and of every hospital department than does the care of the usual nonresearch patient.

We also understand that the viewpoints and methods of scientific inquiry acquired by students and house officers participating in laboratory and clinical research enhances their ability to practice a superior kind of medicine throughout the rest of their professional lives.

The surprising amount of clinical research already in progress in hospitals and the large expansion now being undertaken should, in my opinion, not be overlooked in any consideration of the impact of research on medical education.

Of the same nature, but perhaps to a different degree, is the impact of the new knowledge resulting from these research programs on the continuing education of physicians having little direct exposure to the organized research process itself.

It seems to me their already difficult task of keeping up with the latest scientific developments in clinical medicine will become even more difficult. In this connection it would appear that more study should be given to improved and expanded methods of medical communications. I expect the professional societies and the medical centers will need to develop more and better kinds of short refresher courses and symposia; more extensive use of new educational media such as closed circuit TV programs may have to be explored.

All of these concerns would seem to be applicable in even greater measure to the schools in their need to keep their curriculums abreast of the rapidly expanding flood of new knowledge.

This brings me back to the need for direct Federal aid to the medical schools and to the greater numbers of superior students needed by medicine and the Nation.

I accept the proposition that medical research, medical practice and medical education are interdependent, and that anything affecting one in an important way will have discernible effects on the other two.

The medical research potential and performance of our country has been greatly enhanced, so much so that it bears little resemblance to what existed before.

With respect to medical practice, the new knowledge and tools coming out of that research already have added greatly to the physician's ability to help his patients. Still greater advances are in prospect.

Thus it follows that the third component—medical education—will have to be helped if we expect it to keep in balance with research and practice, and with the needs of our exploding population.

The Federal Government should not be expected to do the whole job. But it should do its share by reinforcing the efforts of the medical profession and the schools, the foundations and other important elements of our society having a direct interest in maintenance of medical education.

I am committed to the principle that teaching at every level and in every field of science must remain free of central domination. It must retain flexibility to meet rapidly changing scientific patterns and the particular needs of diverse geographical areas. Also, it must truly reflect the wishes of the scientific and academic community. All of these requisites are served best when governmental financial responsibility is shared by nongovernmental funds and interests, and is guided by nongovernmental advice. My bills stress this factor, and I believe, reflect the wishes of all who know the importance of maintaining the integrity of the teaching of medicine and science.

Fifteen years of experience with the NIH research grants, research training and research construction grants programs have demonstrated that Federal assistance need not bring Federal control. Instead, these programs have nourished freedom rather than restricted it. They have helped stimulate a volume, scope, and quality of medical research in this country that has no parallel in history.

By following the same principles I believe we can accomplish the same objectives in Federal aid to medical education.

I can conceive of no more appropriate setting than this city and this school of Rush and Morgan for a careful reexamination of our national methods and goals of furthering teaching and research in science and medicine. These men were physicians who not only helped form a new Nation and its first medical school, but were also participants, with men like Franklin and Jefferson, in laying the foundations for the age of reason and its superstructure, the age of free science pursued by free men in free institutions of learning.

The First Hundred Days in Foreign Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the first hundred days of the Kennedy administration have been interesting and in some fields very eventful. In the field of foreign affairs, no one can deny that the President has been busy.

Mr. President, I have here an excellent article by Paul Martin, chief of the Washington bureau of the Gannett News Service. It compares the first hundred days of the Eisenhower administration, when President Eisenhower forcefully outlined a program for peace, with first hundred days of this administration, when President Kennedy has been faced with an increasing number of difficult decisions, involving peace and war around the globe.

Mr. President, the new administration has the strong support of all Americans in any and all steps necessary to preserve our country's security, as soon as we hear what actions are going to be taken, what policies pursued to advance the course of freedom in this hemisphere, in Europe, and in Asia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD the fine article of Mr. Martin.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KENNEDY'S 100 DAYS

(By Paul Martin)

WASHINGTON, May 3 (GNS).—The Kennedy administration started out with high hopes of being able to "get along with Khrushchev."

President Kennedy called for a new beginning in relations with Russia. In his January 20 inaugural message, he said: "Let us never negotiate out of fear—but let us never fear to negotiate."

The first exchange between the 43-year-old President and the 67-year-old Soviet dictator took place immediately after the inauguration.

It was carried out in Moscow by notes and diplomatic conversations when U.S. Ambassador Llewellyn Thompson held an unusual

2-hour conference with Khrushchev at the Kremlin on January 21.

Administration spokesmen told newsmen that word had been sent to Khrushchev that Kennedy would need a breathing spell of around 6 months to get his Government organized.

If the Communist tried to pull any fast ones in the meantime, it was said, the new Democratic administration would feel compelled to react more positively than the outgoing Eisenhower regime.

Former President Eisenhower said at Blue Springs, Ga., on January 24, that he thought Soviet professions of peace were insincere. It would be infantile to accept them, he said, until Russian words were accompanied by deeds.

During the 1960 political campaign, Kennedy was critical of Eisenhower for his handling of the Paris Summit Conference, personal diplomacy, "missile gap," Cuba, disarmament planning, and nuclear test ban negotiations.

Kennedy said he would have "expressed regrets" to Khrushchev over the U–2 spy plane incident.

After the change of administrations, the Russians returned the two American RB–47 fliers who were shot down July 1 over the Barents Sea, permitting Kennedy to make the announcement of their release at his first televised press conference January 25.

Ambassador Thompson was summoned from Moscow. The new administration began a high-level review of Soviet relations February 11. Parties to the White House discussions included Vice President Johnson, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Roving Ambassador Averell Harriman, and Soviet experts Charles "Chip" Bohlen and George Kennan.

Since then, Kennedy has undergone a disillusioning process in relations with the Sino-Soviet bloc. It is the same kind of ordeal that former Presidents Truman and Eisenhower went through during the first 15 years of the cold war.

Eisenhower made a major foreign policy address to the American Society of Newspaper Editors on April 16, 1953, in which he called on the Soviets for "deeds, not words." Ike invited the Russians to join the United States in diverting resources from the arms race, to a war on poverty and disease. He asked: "What is the Soviet Union ready to do?"

Among other points, Eisenhower called for (1) an honorable peace followed by free elections in Korea, (2) an end to Communist attacks on the security of Indochina and Malaya, (3) an Austrian peace treaty, (4) a free and united Germany, (5) full independence for "captive nations" of eastern Europe, (6) step-by-step disarmament, (7) international control of atomic energy, and (8) a limitation or prohibiton of nuclear weapons.

Eight years later, most of these points have not been realized. But the Eisenhower speech was hailed at the time in many countries as a stroke which seized the "peace offensive" from the Soviets. Winston Churchill called it a "massive and magnificent statement."

Eisenhower said on February 25, 1953, he would be willing to meet Stalin any time or place if it would improve chances for world peace. The old Russian tyrant, who negotiated the wartime Yalta, Teheran and Potsdam agreements with Roosevelt and Truman, died on March 5.

Stalin was succeeded by a five-man Presidium headed by Premier Malenkov, and Deputies Beria, Molotov, Bulganin, and Kaganovich. Khrushchev was not even mentioned then, whereas none of the other five holds a position of power in the Soviet Union today.

When Eisenhower took office in 1953, the Communists had 40,000 Vietminh guerrilla fighters massed to invade Laos. The Vietminh radio said they would create a revolution in Laos and Cambodia, to bring about Communist control over all of Indochina.

In the 3 short months that Kennedy has been President, he has been confronted by major foreign policy crises in Cuba, the Congo, and Laos. And the Russians are acting just as truculently about negotiating a nuclear test ban agreement at Geneva as they did with Eisenhower.

The President has issued a series of stern warnings to Khrushchev. He warned the Russians at his February 15 press conference that the United States would defend the U.N. Charter by opposing any attempt by any government to intervene unilaterally in the Congo.

It was disclosed in March that the United States would have to absorb virtually the entire costs of the U.N. Congo operation, including $50 million for 1960 and an estimated $120 million in 1961, since the Soviets, France, and Latin American countries refuse to pay their share of the U.N. apportionment.

With maps and charts at his March 23 TV conference, Kennedy warned Russia that the United States would not tolerate the loss of Laos to the advancing Communist Pathet Lao rebels.

On April 3 the administration issued a white paper on Cuba written by Harvard historian Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., under Kennedy's personal direction.

This document called the Castro regime "a Soviet satellite," said Castro was "a clear and present danger" in the Western Hemisphere, urged Cuba to "sever its links with international communism," promised "full and positive support" to any future democratic government in Cuba.

After a poorly planned and inadequately supported invasion of anti-Castro Cubans resulted in failure, Kennedy made a speech to the ASNE on April 20 in which the President said:

"Our restraint is not inexhaustible; Cuba must not be abandoned to the Communists, and we do not intend to abandon it either; we and our Latin friends will have to face the fact that we cannot postpone any longer the real issue of survival itself."

There are no indications that these Presidential warnings have intimidated or deterred Khrushchev.

One month after the 1960 election, the Communists resumed a march in Asia that was halted by the Korean war and the 1954 Geneva agreement partitioning Indochina.

Soviet planes began supplying arms and ammunition to Communist rebel forces in Laos by airlift from the Vietnam stronghold at Hanoi.

The British Ambassador in Moscow on January 21, with approval of the Kennedy administration, submitted a proposal to the Kremlin to call a cease-fire and convene a new 14-nation conference similar to the 1954 Geneva meeting.

Communist pathet Lao forces continued to gain, while the Soviets delayed a reply. On March 10, nine battalions of Red troops launched a major offensive in central Laos.

The New York Times reported massive shipments of Soviet arms to the rebels, including heavy artillery, armored cars, machineguns, mortars, and ammunition, accompanied by North Vietnamese military advisers.

By March 18, the Communists had advanced to within 22 miles of the royal capital at Luang Prabang.

Kennedy ordered an increase in U.S. military aid to Laos. The decision was taken at a series of White House meetings March 20–21, including Vice President Johnson, Secretary of State Rusk and Undersecretary chester Bowles, Defense Secretary McNamara, CIA Director Allen Dules, and Chief of Naval Operations Adm. Arleigh A. Burke.

The President flew to Key West, Fla., to meet British Prime Minister Macmillan on March 26. Kennedy returned to confer with Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko at the White House the next day. U.S. intentions of supporting the Lao Government were impressed on Gromyko.

Rusk flew to the SEATO Conference at Bangkok, March 27, 28, and 29. The Philippines, Thailand, and Pakistan strongly supported the United States, but Britain and France opposed taking military action in Laos. The Conference issued a communique saying vaguely that if peace efforts failed, SEATO members would "take whatever action may be appropriate."

The Russians finally replied on April 1 to the British note of January 21. They agreed to an international conference, failed to say when a cease-fire would take effect in Laos, claimed that the question of a future government was an internal matter for the Lao themselves to settle.

The Communists recognize the former neutralist premier, Souvanna Phouma, who recently visited Moscow, Peiping, and Hanoi, but turned down an invitation to come to Washington. A coalition government would likely turn Laos into another Communist state.

By the end of Kennedy's first 100 days, the Soviets, still talking peace, had not agreed to a cease-fire in Loas, nor a nuclear test ban at Geneva, nor an end to Communist subversive activities in Latin America staged from Castro's Cuba.

The President was faced with the dilemma in southeast Asia of (1) yielding territory to the Communists in an area the United States is pledged to protect, or (2) getting American Armed Forces involved in another Korean-type war.

Kansas Firm Thanked for Space Role

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article from the Kansas City Kansan of May 5, 1961.

The article relates the role played by the Midland Manufacturing Co. in America's recent successful man-in-space venture. I am proud that this firm in my district was associated with the effort, and am pleased to call this article to the attention of my colleagues:

MIDLAND THANKED FOR ROLE IN FLIGHT

Midland Manufacturing Co. here, which made crystals used in radios and rockets on Comdr. Alan B. Shepard's space capsule during his history-making flight, has received congratulations for its contributions to the space effort.

The firm, at 3155 Fiberglas Road, in Fairfax, supplied highly specialized crystals to the Motorola Military Electronic Division at Scottsdale, Ariz. Motorola built the receiver and transmitter for the space capsule.

Harvey Humann, Midland manager here, said, "We provided them with very specialized, highly rugged units that take much shock and vibration." He said Midland crystals also were used in the controls of the space capsule's retro rockets, used to guide it back into the earth's atmosphere.

"The crystals are not production items, they are made by technicians in our laboratories here, and were designed by our engineering department," Humann said.

He added that Midland has supplied crystals to several contractors working on Project Mercury for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Congratulations to Midland were sent by Motorola, which in turn, had been thanked by NASA officials.

The 1961 Minutemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, in an article by Earl Mazo, in last Saturday's New York Herald Tribune, the President wired the 14th Annual Convention of Americans for Democratic Action that their members are "today's minutemen." In today's New York Herald Tribune, under AP dateline of May 14, it is reported that this same convention adopted a resolution calling for "immediate initiation, together with our allies, of negotiations toward diplomatic recognition of the Peiping regime and its accreditation to the United Nations as the Government of China."

History informs me that the minutemen were patriots who were willing to bear arms immediately to annihilate tyranny. The ADA wants to embrace tyranny. Perhaps the President should reread his history or stop referring to the ADA as "today's minutemen":

START TO OPEN PEIPING TIES, ADA URGES—HIT KENNEDY ON JOBS AND PLANS FOR GROWTH

WASHINGTON, May 14 (AP).—Americans for Democratic Action today urged a start toward recognition of Red China and described as inadequate the Kennedy administration's employment and economic growth plans.

The ADA adopted a resolution calling for "immediate initiation, together with our allies, of negotiations toward diplomatic recognition of the Peiping regime and its accreditation to the United Nations as the Government of China."

Concerning domestic matters, the self-styled liberal organization said it sees the new administration "drifting into the worst mistakes of the Eisenhower years—that is, improvisations for segments of the economy without adequate regard to long-range requirements of full employment and economic growth."

LONG-RANGE OBJECTIVES

The ADA resolution then recommended a number of long-range objectives, including "expanded support for negelected segments of the economy, notably, housing, urban redevelopment, water conservation, depressed areas," and "constantly expanding consumer purchasing power for a rising standard of living."

Before adjourning its 14th annual convention, the group reelected Samuel H. Beer, Harvard professor, as chairman; Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, as honorary chairman; Richard C. Sachs, New York, treasurer; Roy Bennett, New York, assistant treasurer, and Paul Seabury, University of California professor, as chairman of the executive committee.

The Red China resolution said recognition of the Peiping regime and its accreditation to the U.N. should not be done "as gestures of moral approval of its past actions but as a means of establishing the normal channels of international communications."

TO INCREASE DATA

"Such steps would increase our access to information on Chinese affairs and the possibility of affecting Chinese foreign policy," the resolution added.

Concerning Formosa, the Red China resolution said:

"The admission of China to the United Nations should be linked to the condition that the inhabitants of Formosa shall themselves democratically decide whether they shall be admitted to the United Nations as an independent nation or that they shall rejoin mainland China."

The resolution added that "recognition of Communist China and its accreditation to the United Nations does not mean abandonment of Formosa."

"Until a U.N. solution is reached," it added, "the United States of America's treaty pledge to defend Formosa would be unaltered, with the explicit understanding that this pledge does not include the defense of Matsu and Quemoy." These are islands a short distance offshore from Red China.

KENNEDY TO A.D.A.: COUNTRY'S LIBERALS ARE 1961 "MINUTEMEN"

(By Earl Mazo)

WASHINGTON, May 12.—President Kennedy today proclaimed liberals to be the Nation's "Minutemen leading the way" to peace, progress, and the good life in the space age.

Only a "progressive America" can master this era's national and international challenges, added the Democratic Chief Executive, who at one time or another has been characterized by various political friends and foes as a "liberal," a "conservative," or a "moderate."

Mr. Kennedy's salute to America's liberals was in a message to the 14th annual conventional of Americans for Democratic Action, a national organization of anti-Communist liberals. It was distributed at a press conference by Samuel H. Beer, the A.D.A.'s national chairman. A Harvard history professor, he was hailed by President Kennedy as "my good friend Sam Beer."

HAILS ADMINISTRATION

For his part, Mr. Beer pronounced the Kennedy-Johnson administration "a brilliant, progressive administration."

"I like very much all they are doing," said Mr. Beer, "but there is much more to be done."

The spirit of good feeling that pervaded the session seemed to extend even to Vice President Johnson, who has stated that he would feel "uncomfortable" having the A.D.A. on his side.

Principal speakers at the 3-day convention will be Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., a Kennedy adviser on the White House staff, and Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, majority whip in the Senate. Both are national vice-chairman of the organization.

In his personal word of greeting to the delegates, Mr. Kennedy stated, in part:

"You are meeting at a time of unprecedented danger, not only to our Nation but to the democratic way of life. As the danger is great, so also must be the efforts we make to meet and master it. For if there is one thing that is certain it is that this is no time to stand still; rather it is a time for movement, for action, for change, and thus for liberalism.

CALLS FOR "MOMENTUM"

"With liberals as today's minutemen leading the way, it is high time to recover the historic momentum of the American Revolution—the democratic social revolution as against the revolutions of nihilism and totalitarianism.

"We must build a society in which no one is held back by race or religion. We must create a healthier and stronger world community by supporting democratic development and changes everywhere. We must push forward relentlessly to achieve just and lasting agreements which will reduce the threat of nuclear war.

"There are risks and costs to a program of action. But they are far less than the long range risks and costs of comfortable inaction. A progressive America—and only a progressive America—can refute and roll back the challenge of Communist totalitarianism and rise to the challenges and seize the opportunities that surround us all today."

Emptiness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. KEFAUVER. Madam President, on Sunday, April 30, I was privileged to attend the morning worship service at the First Baptist Church of Newport, Tenn., and to hear a challenging sermon by the pastor, the Reverend Harold A. Collins.

Taking his text from Matthew 12: 43–45, the Reverend Mr. Collins spoke about "Emptiness"—that great void in the lives of many Americans who, chained by materialism and transitory comforts, lack the will to take their stand on the side of right in the crucial battle between Christian and Communistic ideals.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of his sermon be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EMPTINESS

(By Dr. Harold A. Collins, First Baptist Church, Newport, Tenn., April 30, 1961)

Matthew 12: 43–45.

Isn't there a strange feeling when one examines an empty house? My, how soon they get that "rundown look" and actually deteriorate. Ugly weeds take the yard, spiders knit their amazing webs to shade the windows, insects and rodents take over the house.

Jesus described the dangers and wretchedness of an empty life with the analogy of an empty house. A man just can't go on living when he is empty—he must be filled with something. And the truth is that unless he is filled with righteousness and goodness, evil will rush in to the vacuum like water rushes to a lower level. A vacuum is a dangerous situation. Weather experts explain twisters and foul atmospheric conditions as a situation where a near vacuum and a low pressure area develop. There is a rushing of winds with changing temperatures into the empty area.

An empty mind, an empty heart, an empty life react like an empty house. Such a life is potentially dangerous.

Politically, much of the unrest and danger in our world today are due to the vacuum created by World War II. Prior to that war, evil men had seized control of the masses of people. In the war those leaders and governments were removed. The national houses were swept clean, but nothing with

strong moral and spiritual principles replaced them. Communism found a vacuum throughout much of the world, into which its evil ideas and powers flowed. Wherever there is emptiness: empty stomachs, empty wallets, empty heads, or empty hearts, the Reds move in quietly and effectively. Now the United States has been aware of the dangers of empty stomachs and wallets and has spent billions of dollars in economic aid for needy countries. Yet much of the aid never reached the neediest people. Greedy government officials in the aided countries drained much of it into other canals. And when our aid reached the needy in those countries, the United States received little credit, most of it going to some local political party in power.

However, we are now realizing that filling stomachs isn't enough. We have done little to fill their empty minds and hearts with something they can live by, hope in, and cleave to. Into these empty minds the Communists have poured their doctrine and propaganda. With every loaf of bread they gave, went a book to read on communism. We in the West have not shouted our beliefs. One could conclude that we have none of which which are proud. On the other hand, a few Reds believing something and preaching something, even though it is based upon a denial of God, have overwhelmed the drifting majority of the masses. This always happens. Only a few do the real thinking for the masses, even in democracies, and a very few who really believe something can win the drifting masses.

There are at least two actions that the free world must take immediately if it isn't already too late. One is to unmask the Communist lie. The truth and reality of communism must be made plain to the whole world. Communism in its basic philosophy is evil. God is denied. Yet they preach a classless brotherhood and a comradeship of man. There can be no brotherhood of man if there is no fatherhood of God: There can be no real freedom, truth, love, and respect apart from a holy God who has created and is running a moral world. True, the Communists speak of truth, trust, honor, and welfare. But these things are not the same things to the free countries. To the Reds these things are relevant; they get their basic meaning from their relationship to the Communist state. Ours come from our understanding of the one true God as revealed in Jesus Christ.

Of course, the denial of God is the basic evil of communism. The second evil in importance is the denial of individual worth and rights. The latter thought is tied directly to whether there is a belief in God. Even in a democracy there is no natural power for the right consideration and treatment of the individual. This power comes from God. Take Christian principles away from our democracy and nothing that is lasting is left. In all Communist writings nowhere does one find real significance for the individual. Everywhere he is a number in the masses, a member of the party, and has value only as related to the state. In communism the individuals exist for the state; in democracies the state exists for the individuals. Karl Marx, himself, in the first volume of "Das Kapital" wrote: "I speak of individuals insofar as they are personifications of economic categories and representatives of special classes of relations and interests."

We in America have not been in the exposing business when it comes to this evil that has already engulfed about a half of the world. We are afraid of being prejudiced, of being bigoted, of being unfair. But when a building is on fire, or an evil beast is stalking a helpless child, you do not think in terms of prejudice and fairness to all things involved. Christianity is positive in its approach, but t is also committed to fight evil wherever it is. The Apostle Paul wrote: "Put on the whole armor of God that you may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. Take and use the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God. We fight not against flesh and blood, but against principalities and powers, against the spiritual hosts of wickedness in high places" (Ephesians 6: 10 ff).

We in America have been treating communism about like we treat alcoholic beverages. We do not think beverage alcohol is very bad. Why, it does have some good qualities like relaxing troubled minds and nerves, dialating the restricting blood vessels, making for real comradeship and fun. But suddenly the liquor seizes and enslaves the social drinker. Millions are having both their own lives and the lives about them destroyed by this evil. Yet we do not want to be narrowminded, and, consequently, we do not take a positive stand against it. We do not stand against anything that is evil; we just make a big joke out of it and let it have its way.

It is that way about communism. We say: "Let the people decide for themselves," and little do we realize that the masses of people cannot even read and write. They hear but cannot detect the lies of communism. And the greatest tragedy is that we make little effort to point out these lies to them and to tell them about democracy, freedom, and the value of the individual. Only after we have made these Christian principles plain to them, can we say "now let them decide for themselves." If all they know is communism, they have nothing to decide between.

The second action for the democracies is to flood the world with what we do believe. We believe in the worth of the individual. But it isn't enough just to believe it. We must preach this belief and our other beliefs to the masses of the world. We believe in the sacredness of human personality—the individual who laughs, cries, doubts, and hopes. We believe every person has the right to dream his own dreams, to work out his own life, to choose his own profession, to meet at will with his friends and neighbors, to speak what is on his mind without fear, to worship God as he pleases, and to criticize his government and leaders without fear of death. These beliefs are basically religious; they are born in the Fatherhood of God. Our Declaration of Independence does not talk about mere human rights—it talks about human rights endowed by our Creator. This is the difference between communism and Americanism — Christian principles! These principles underly the whole concept of our democracy.

The individual is of supreme value because of the conviction that all men are significant in the eyes of God. We believe that the voice of wisdom may often come from ordinary men and not only from the expert. This is based on the belief that God's Spirit is given to all believers. We believe that government can only be by free discussion in which all views can be expressed and heard. We believe the rights of the multitude must be respected. This doens't mean that the minorities are allowed to do whatever they like. It is a denial of the infallibility of the 51 percent.

These are beliefs that are very important. We must invade the entire intellectual world with them.

Charles Malik, Foreign Minister of Lebanon, has pointed out this failure. Said he to America: "You have in your traditions certain invaluable beliefs about man, society, history, human destiny, and the nature of God, beliefs that you should not be ashamed of. You should export them to the world. You export material goods, but not ideas and beliefs. First you must rediscover them yourselves and believe in them profoundly. The Communist believes in communism and honors it by exporting it. My fear is that you may not know the infinite value of your civilization and that you don't believe in them strongly enough to give them to the rest of the world."

Finally, before we can sell these beliefs to the world, we must show the peoples of the world that we practice what we preach. The church should encourage a devoted patriotism at all times. Yet the church cannot encourage a nationalism that justifies "my country, right or wrong."

There is no doubt that all too frequently we have made ourselves the laughingstock of world opinion for having so many contradictory practices. There are our frightening crime rate, our social injustices, our obsession with sex as portrayed in obscene and pornographic materials and cheap motion pictures exported to the world. There is our exaltation of things material, our strange standards of success. Isn't this true that if these practices continue unabated, it will be unnecessary for communism to wage either cold war or hot war against us. We will fall apart from within. We will rot to death.

How empty are our lives? Only God can fill the emptiness of individual lives and of the world. Only God can help us and save us. Only God can dispel the closed room, the dead end, the empty feeling.

Let's learn from Thomas Calhoun Walker, who was born a slave in 1862. He had everything against him, but he grew up to be a fine lawyer and citizen. He tells about when freedom came after the war. His family lived in a little shack and knew extreme poverty. He says that he would often be awakened during the night by his father praying so very earnestly that he almost shouted. He prayed: "O God, please take care of my chillun, 'cause I don't know how."

None of us know how to take care of our children, our brethren, our country. God can help us. Let's ask Him.

(Acknowledgments: "Religion and Moral Leadership in Relation to the Military Mission," George A. Rosso; "The Unfinished Task," Stephen Neill.)

Pennsylvania Is Meeting Its Responsibility in School Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, yesterday it was my privilege to address a group of students, teachers, parents, educators and other citizens of one of the communities in my district of Pennsylvania. The occasion was the dedication of a new high school at York Springs, in the Bermudian Springs Joint School System.

Because I, as a former schoolteacher, and school director for many years, feel very strongly on the subject of school and education, I ask consent that my address be made a part of my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ADDRESS OF HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING AT DEDICATION OF HIGH SCHOOL, BERMUDIAN SPRINGS JOINT SCHOOL SYSTEM, YORK SPRINGS, PA., SUNDAY, MAY 14

I think it significant that you dedicate this building on the day we honor the mothers of America.

The mothers and schools of today will pretty largely determine the shape of the world tomorrow.

One hundred years ago, April 12, 1861, members of the Confederate Army shelled Fort Sumter. Recently I was privileged to visit Charleston, S.C., and this fort which became the first target in a tragic era of civil conflict and hatred—which, unfortunately, did not end with the surrender at Appomattox, on April 9, 1865. Adams County bears mute testimony to this strife since many regard the Battle of Gettysburg as the turning point of the war.

The years 1861 to 1865 were years of crisis. Since that time we have had similar critical times: 1914–18 and the First World War; 1941–45, the Second World War; 1950–53, the Korean conflict. Today we are living through a continuing, highly tense cold war with Russia, Communist China and Socialist Cuba.

We have achieved a remarkably high level of scientific and technological knowledge—for peaceful as well as warlike purposes. How we use this knowledge will depend pretty largely on you and me. With every scientific advancement, life appears to become more complex and highly mechanized. We use our cars to drive a block. Our children are transported to schools. Electrical appliances tell us when to get up, furnish music in the process, perk the coffee while we shave with an electric razor, tell us when the evening roast is cooked to our specifications, stop the washer when the clothes are clean, show us what others are doing on our TV screen, heat our houses, cool our food and drinks; jet airplanes transport us at 600 miles per hour, and so it goes.

Six days ago I stood within 3 feet of the man whom we know definitely and without any question of doubt whatsoever, was in outer space and returned safely. A prior claim by another country has never been fully substantiated to the satisfaction of some of us.

The splitting of the atom was the first step in the preparation of the atom bomb—a device which could either destroy all mankind or result in undreamed of technological advances. With each advance tensions rise and it will require all of our intelligence, conscientiousness, and strength to avoid war and with it, the possibility of total annihilation.

How will we meet this challenge and what bearing do wars, spacemen, and atomic bombs have on dedicating a new school building? Each can have a tremendous impact—not only on Adams County and the United States but on the entire world. All are involved in these new discoveries and the accompanying threats to our lives and well-being. Those of us who are older are attempting to deal with the world's problems of today, but age ultimately takes its toll and others take our places. This school has been construoted for one purpose—to better prepare those who follow, to meet life's many challenges and obstacles, and I predict these challenges will multiply with each advance in knowledge. This high school and the adult community of the Bermudian Springs school system have the responsibility for training students to better meet these challenges.

This new structure is another expression of our American ideals and traditions. We believe that obtaining an education is the privilege of every American, regardless of race, creed, or color. John Adams, our second President, expressed the views of most of us when he said: "The education here intended is not merely that of the children of the rich and noble, but of every rank and class of people, down to the lowest and poorest. The revenues of the state would be applied infinitely better, more charitably, wisely, usefully, than even in maintaining the poor. This would be the best way of preventing the existence of the poor."

Theodore Roosevelt expressed a similar sentiment: "From the lowest grade of the public school education in this country is at the disposal of every man, every woman, who chooses to work for and obtain it. Each one of us, then, who has an education has obtained something from the community at large for which he or she has not paid. The man who accepts it (education) must be content to accept it merely as a charity unless he returns it to the State in full in the shape of good citizenship."

Public education has expanded from an isolated, poorly supported concept to a nationwide system controlled by each individual State and I might add, parenthetically. I trust the individual State concept will remain.

After spending half a lifetime in some phase of public education, I become intensely weary and my blood pressure rises on many occasions when calamity howlers, for political expediency or for some other personal or selfish reason that cannot be justified, continually condemn our system of education. Their remarks are an insult to every loyal, conscientious administrator, classroom teacher, and school director. I want to be the first to admit our system is not perfect, but what, I ask you, is?

I like a phrase coined in the last political campaign—"A record is not something on which to stand but on which to build." You people in education have compiled a good record but, that is not enough. You must and will, move forward.

In January I was driving from Washington to my home. It was the day on which an educational task force appointed by the President, made its report. The chairman of the committee, Dr. Hovde, president of Purdue University, was being interviewed on radio. He remarked quite casually that a Federal outlay of $2½ billion per year would be required to give American education a significant uplift. What that significant lift should be, he did not say. When asked how the committee proposed to raise this money he replied even more casually, they had not gotten around to that.

Sometime later Governor Lawrence was quoted as having said, and I quote: "We must come face to face with the chaotic, frequently obsolete, educational system which surrounds us." Just when did the Governor become an authority on public education? He also quoted Dr. McMurrin, U.S. Commissioner of Education, as having "called many of our schools flabby and soft." I should like to ask the educators present, what is a soft and flabby school?

This week a publication, Decade of Experiment, came to my desk. It is a report of the Ford Foundation for the Advancement of Education. The following is the first sentence in the publication: "In the middle of the 20th century the American educational system—a distinctive feature of our democratic life and one of which we have been traditionally proud—finds itself in crisis."

On the opposite page is a statement made by Walter Lippmann in 1954: "Our educational effort today is still in approximately the same position as was the military effort of this country before Pearl Harbor."

To what period do these dispensers of gloom refer? A product can only be evaluated after it has been tested. The end product of every school system is its citizens. Ten, fifteen, or twenty years from now an honest value can be placed on your efforts here today and in the days to come. Didn't the school systems of a decade or two ago produce the Alan Shepards and thousands like him? Let's quit being calamity howlers and talk of accomplishments.

This building has been erected to meet the demands of an ever-increasing school population as well as to improve the standards of the education being offered. A phenomenal growth on high school population has recently occurred. In 1905 one-third of those enrolling in grade school entered high school and only about 9 percent of an age group graduated. By 1930 over 75 percent entered with 45 percent graduating. Today those figures are higher.

There are reasons for this change. The non-high-school graduate has a difficult time finding employment. Our expanded courses such as vocational education, tend to keep students in school longer because they realize in this days of automation some knowledge of mechanization is essential.

The little red schoolhouse was a landmark and served a distinct and useful purpose in a pioneer society in thinly populated areas.

However, with the tremendous growth of urban areas, a complete revamping of our school system seemed desirable. Smaller districts were consolidated and were thus able to offer advantages not possible previously.

Larger units in themselves do not necessarily mean improved education. It does mean an expanded curriculum, easier administration and better physical facilities. Stone and mortar do not make a school. You now have the physical facilities and it becomes the responsibility of teachers, administrators, students, parents and that maligned group of men who have a thankless job and whose reward comes only in the knowledge of a job well done—and I mean school directors—to provide the best education possible for the children of this community. In building a better educational system here, you make your contribution to a better America—this in turn, helps build a better world. The starting point for all of this is the individual citizen and that citizen dare not be a mediocre one of he is to make his contribution to society. He must be equipped to take his place in an extremely diversified world and become a conscientious, contributing citizen. He must maintain a vital interest in all that occurs around him.

Someone has said, "the success of democracy rests on wise citizen participation in public affairs and on respect for the individual wherever his talents lie."

My experience in Washington sometimes makes me fearful there are those who would take away our individual freedoms and rights and in their place substitute rule from a central point. We do not want all roads leading to Washington. That day can come only if we fail to exercise our God-given rights and remain strong as individuals.

We are still a relatively new country and the opportunities for discoveries and advancement have never been greater. To meet the mounting challenges, we must produce citizens capable of maintaining the strength and integrity their country demands. This can only be accomplished if all take advantage of educational, social and political opportunities offered. This school, and every similar one throughout this great State, is another indication of our vast resources available to interested individuals, and may I remind you all this has been done at the State and local level and I trust will continue to be done in that manner.

Our hope and future strength lies in an educated populace which will form an intelligent, dedicated citizenry.

May I wish you, citizens of this community, parents, teachers, students, members of the school board, good fortune and success in all your endeavors.

An 18th Century Ideal in a 20th Century World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on May 5, 1961, Hon. Theodore R. McKeldin was installed as an honorary member of the Clarence Darrow Chapter of the Phi Alpha Beta fraternity of the University of Maryland Law School. In addressing the chapter, the former Maryland Governor chose as his topic "An 18th Century Ideal in a 20th Century World."

The ideal, in this case, is the first amendment to the Constitution.

Too often we lose sight of the principles upon which our country was founded. In this troubled world, we tend to see only our weaknesses. Governor McKeldin's words are reassuring and give us cause to look back with pride on the principles which have helped make the United States a great Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that this address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN 18TH-CENTURY IDEAL IN A 20TH-CENTURY WORLD

Address of Hon. Theodore R. McKeldin, Governor of Maryland, 1951–59, Clarence Darrow Chapter, Phi Alpha Delta Fraternity, University of Maryland Law School—Installation as Honorary Member, Officers Club at Fort Meade, Md.

Ideas no less than men, have their time and pass. They are born, flourish for a season, lose their vitality with the passage of time, grow more and more feeble, and die.

We see this plainly enough as regards trivial ideas—Davy Crockett caps, Elvis Presley haircuts and similar fads—but it is also true of profound philosophies and theological systems. They pass much more slowly, but they pass.

It is therefore no sacrilege but, on the contrary, an act of reason and prudence to take a fresh look, from time to time, at the ideas that we have inherited from the past, including those that we customarily take for granted as fixed and eternal.

Take, for example, those early amendments to the Constitution that we are accustomed to describe as the Bill of Rights. Ten amendments were adopted and came into force together in 1791, 2 years after ratification of the original Constitution, but of the 10 only 8 comprise the Bill of Rights; the 9th and 10th merely clarify the reservation of powers not granted in the Constitution.

There is no question as to the value of these amendments in 1791. They were demanded by public opinion at the time, and without a solemn promise that they would be added the Constitution would never have been ratified by nine States; so in a sense it is true that the Constitution itself was brought into being by these amendments.

However, this is 1961 and a great many ideas that had vital force in 1791 are now dead and gone—for instance, the idea that it was lawful to assert property rights over another human being, and the idea that a man could vindicate his honor by shooting a detractor in a duel. It is a legitimate inquiry, therefore, to ask how the ideas set forth in the Bill of Rights have stood the test of a hundred and seventy years. Are all, or any of them still valuable enough to make the very existence of the Government hinge upon their support?

First, let us examine these eight propositions, stripping away the legal verbiage and considering only their substance.

They are first, freedom of worship, speech, press and assembly.

Second, the right to keep and bear arms.

Third, freedom from the necessity of keeping soldiers in a man's house.

Fourth, freedom from arbitrary searches and seizures.

Fifth, freedom from prosecution except after indictment by a grand jury, with no double jeopardy, no forced self-incrimination, no punishment except by due process of law, and no confiscation without compensation.

Sixth, the right to speedy, public trial by jury at home with witnesses for both defense and prosecution compelled to appear, with all counts in the indictment clearly stated, and with the right to counsel.

Seventh, the right to trial by jury in civil suits, the jury to be the final judge of the facts.

Eighth, no excessive bail, nor cruel and inhuman punishments.

One thing stands out conspicuously in all eight propositions. It is a deep suspicion of all government, including the American.

Bear in mind, if you please, that this was the generation that had formed the American Government. The Constitutional Convention had labored hard and long to make it a perfect government. The convention was the most brilliant collection of political thinkers ever assembled on this continent, and one of the most brilliant ever assembled in the world. If any group of men were ever capable of forming a perfect government, that was it; yet they were so little satisfied with their work that 16 of their number failed to sign it, and the rest did not oppose the adoption of further articles specifically forbidding the Government to practice the outrages enumerated in the first 8 amendments.

Was the generation of 1791 unduly suspicious? Complacent patriots say yes, and cite the fact that the American Government has been reasonably trustworthy for the better part of two centuries. Granted; but how much of its decency was due to the bridle and curb that the Bill of Rights put upon it?

The best answer to that is to look around at other nations that also have overthrown monarchy, but without putting similar restrictions on the governments that have replaced the kings. The survey is not reassuring. In country after country, in Germany, Italy, Russia, Spain, China, and a dozen smaller nations it has been demonstrated that 20th-century governments are quite capable of repeating the tryranny of Nero at his worst. The injustice and cruelty of absolute power have not changed in all the centuries that history has been writen. Nor should we lay the flattering unction to our souls that we Americans are by nature better than others. Occasionally the law has broken down in this country; and when that happens an American mob can be just as vicious as a mob in any other country. If American officials could escape the control of law there is little reason to doubt that they would be as bad as Nazi brown-shirts and Russian secret police.

The mere fact that we are living in the 20th century is no proof that safeguards against domestic tyranny are useless.

But granting that some safeguards against arbitrary power are still needed, what about the specific safeguards mentioned in the eight amendments?

As a matter of fact, one has been pretty well abrogated. The right to keep and bear arms has been sharply restricted, not by the National Government, but by State and local governments through the police power. But the restrictions apply to small arms that would be of little use against the Government anyhow. The kind of arms the writers of the amendment had in mind cannot be kept and borne by a private citizen because they are too big and expensive—imagine trying to keep a tank, or an antiaircraft gun on private premises.

Of the other seven, one, freedom from having soldiers quartered in one's house, has not been tested, because the necessity has not arisen.

Six remain, of which five are concerned with securing the right to a fair trial of persons accused of crime. There can be no doubt that these sometimes help the guilty to go unwhipped of justice; but they were based on Blackstone's dictum, "It is better that 10 guilty persons escape than that one innocent suffer." It is a sound dictum, because when one innocent person suffers the law itself becomes guilty; and when the law loses the respect and confidence of the people, all government collapses. As society grows more complex, equal justice becomes more difficult, and these safeguards do not lose, they gain importance.

This brings us to a single article of the Bill of Rights, the first. It guarantees freedom of worship, speech, press and assembly, but I shall waste no time today talking of the value of those rights. Instead, I invite your attention to the way in which they are guaranteed. The first amendment decrees that on certain subjects "Congress shall make no law." This is a tremendously important phrase. As touching conscience and opinion, Congress shall not make even good law. As touching freedom of speech and assembly, it shall make no law abridging either, but as touching men's beliefs and opinions it shall make no law at all, good, bad, or indifferent.

If Congress can make no law, the executive can enforce none, the judiciary can interpret none. All three branches of the Government are forbidden to enter this field. It is an area of life into which the jurisdiction and authority of the United States do not extend. For his beliefs and opinions an American citizen is accountable to no earthly power, but to God alone.

This idea, that there are parts of a man's life over which no Government, not even a democratic Government established and maintained by the people, has any just power is the very heart and soul of American freedom; yet it was not originally an American idea. As Lord Acton pointed out long ago, when Christ said, "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's," he drew the distinction. Deciding which things are Caesar's and which are God's is a matter of detail; the important thing is that Caesar does not possess all, and when he attempts to seize all, he becomes a tyrant and should be resisted by all who are resolved to be obedient to God.

Here is the fundamental principle of the Bill of Rights. You could destroy the other seven amendments completely, but if you leave this one, sooner or later all the others will be restored; but abandon this one and all the others will eventually fall because they will have no solid foundation in logic and reason.

When we, the people of the United States, said Congress shall make no law about even one subject, we asserted the dignity of the individual against all princes, potentates and powers of this earth; and it is upon the dignity of the individual that the whole concept of political freedom rests. To maintain social order in a crowded world we are compelled to yield much of our freedom of ac-

tion; but while we retain freedom of thought and freedom of speech, we are not the slaves of Caesar.

As regards any other item of the Bill of Rights, while I have strong opinions, I am willing to debate the matter. I am willing to concede that the importance of the other articles varies from time to time. The right to keep and bear arms, for instance, is obviously not as important today as it was in 1791; and the right to keep soldiers out of the house is not important as long as nobody is trying to put soldiers in the house. On such things as these the passage of time has had some effect.

But the first amendment is in the 20th century exactly what it was in the 18th, exactly what it was when Christ distinguished the things that are Caesar's from the things that are God's, exactly what it was when Socrates, granting that the law of Athens had the right to put him to death, denied that it had the right to keep him from speaking the truth.

As long as Americans hold this principle more valuable than property, or bodily freedom or even life itself, the things that it implies will stand; and as long as its implications stand this country will remain the land of the free and the home of the brave. But if we abandon it, the tread of our regiments may shake the earth, our fleets may cover the seas, our flights of bombers may darken the sun, but we shall nevertheless be on the road to extinction, the road that Assyria and great Babylon trod, the road to oblivion, where all too soon we shall be "one with Nineveh and Tyre."

Senator Keating Delivers Address at 75th Anniversary of Temple Israel in Binghamton, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, Temple Israel in Binghamton, N.Y., recently celebrated the 75th anniversary of its founding. On this important occasion the principal address was delivered by New York's junior Senator, Mr. KEATING.

In his remarks, Senator KEATING paid tribute to those who have participated in the wonderful work of the temple and who have helped make it such an important part of the Binghamton community. In addition, he surveyed the situation in the Middle East and pointed out the dangers of American neglect of problems in that area.

Senator KEATING has traveled to Israel and other Near East points frequently in recent years and his remarks, therefore, have special significance. Under unanimous consent, I include them at this point in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF SENATOR KENNETH B. KEATING, OF NEW YORK, AT 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF TEMPLE ISRAEL, BINGHAMTON, N.Y., APRIL 23, 1961

Mr. Chairman, Rabbi Hurwitz, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, my pleasure at being with you tonight is the deeper, the greater, because of the very special event that you mark and commemorate this day. The diamond jubilee of the founding of Temple Israel Congregation is indeed a meaningful and heart-lifting anniversary. Each of you must feel a great warmth of pride as you meditate on the significance of this magnificent milestone in the long and distinguished history of your beloved spiritual and religious home. But, in the truest sense, this is a pride, this is an honor, not yours alone. It is shared with the entire community, and with the good people of all faiths who are your neighbors and friends. For this synagogue has not only been in the community for three-quarters of a century, it has been of the community—a vital part of its life and culture, a source of its spiritual strength, an element of the growth and vitality that are the common heritage of citizens of all faiths, of all races, of all walks of life in this fine community.

That is why it is so fitting that the civic leaders of Binghamton should be with us tonight. Their presence symbolizes the recognition of the fact that this congregation—this golden thread that has been woven into the tapestry of community life for 75 years—represents not your pride alone, but the pride of all who have enjoyed the radiation of its influence.

Rabbi Hurwitz, this night is especially rich in meaning for you. I would take this opportunity to wish you many more yearly harvests of the spiritual satisfaction that makes the hardest work seem light.

As we celebrate the 75th anniversary of the founding of Temple Israel, our thoughts turn inevitably to another anniversary that is being celebrated this month, an anniversary that is of deep significance to all free peoples the world over.

I am referring, of course, to the 13th anniversary of the independence of the State of Israel. April 20 marked the passing of another year of independence, of effort, and of successful striving for Israel.

Conceived in farseeing idealism and born of war and concentration camps, Israel has grown to manhood. The Bar Mitzvah year has come, and in celebrating it, we all must acknowledge that Israel has taken its place as an adult in the family of nations. The secret behind the progress which has been made in this small state surrounded by enemies lies to a large extent, I believe, in the great spiritual force which has been supplied through the centuries by the Jewish religion. Never losing hope, despite the obstacles and inertia of centuries, never losing faith despite what must have appeared to be the hostility and indifference of the whole world—the Jewish people have been inspired to build a country where freedom will be unchallenged.

For generations, the members of the Jewish religion, although segregated throughout Europe in ghetto-like conditions, have made their tremendous contributions to culture and intellectual development. In the United States, citizens of the Jewish religion have shown in their fellowship and common effort with citizens of all other faiths a determined ambition for civic and national progress. The same spirit which has contributed so much to the intellectual climate of European nations has carried over first to the United States, and now in similar measure to the new State of Israel.

Politically, the prospects for Israel's survival seemed small indeed in 1948 when it emerged, ravaged and war torn, from an unhappy British mandate. Enemies stood on every side. Its friends were far away and deeply preoccupied with the world problem of containing Communist aggression. It was the supreme accomplishment of the people of Israel, with continuing assistance from the United States, that they passed through the night of despair and turned their attention at once to the new day that dawned for Israel.

At once, with an energy and enterprise that must be the envy of all nations, the people of Israel threw themselves into the tasks that faced them. They held off the surrounding enemy, and they built in the barren desert a fruitful home for their people.

Economically, the obstacles must have seemed well nigh insuperable. A small country, with an even smaller area of arable land, Israel nevertheless threw open its doors to the oppressed of other lands. Regardless of nationality, background, or political views, refugees to Israel were made welcome on the grounds of the common faith which has been shared for generation upon generation. The economic problems were deliberately subordinated to the sense of moral purpose and destiny.

What was the result? Over the last 13 years, the population of Israel has more than tripled, from less than a million in 1948 to over 2 million in 1961. At the same time, per capita income has nearly doubled, the amount of cultivated land has more than doubled, the gross national product has tripled, the acreage under irrigation has been increased fivefold, and agricultural production has increased more than seven times. These are the economic accomplishments of the people of Israel. It is a record to be proud of.

Moreover, the technical skills and energies behind this achievement are being generously shared with other newer nations in Africa which can benefit by the help of Israeli experts.

If it be true indeed that "the Lord helps those who help themselves" there can be no doubt that the State of Israel has merited, many times over, the divine assistance and protection which I believe it has surely enjoyed.

There are undoubtedly limits to what one small country, surrounded by enemies, can do to bring about the peace which we know would benefit not only Israel but the whole Middle East and indeed the whole world.

It behooves the United States above all, as the leader of the free peoples of the world, to press more vigorously for negotiation and settlement of the problems of the Middle East. In general the Government of the United States has been rather remiss in its treatment of Middle Eastern problems recently. There has been no action taken to stop blockades, reprisals and boycotts against American Jews in the Middle East. In fact, we have continued to supply foreign aid, derived from the taxes paid by all American citizens, to these very countries which discriminate against Americans.

Furthermore, we have made no positive steps to stop the Arab boycott of Israeli and other cargo ships passing through the Suez Canal, even though such a blockade is in violation of the principles laid down by the United Nations and recognized by all nations. I myself have several times called this whole question to the attention of the State Department, most recently last month. But the reply is always the same and it is always disappointing—the U.S. Government is always exploring methods by which Arab blockades, boycotts, and other restrictions can be ended, but somehow it never seems to find anything. And it never seems to feel the time is ripe for a more vigorous initiative.

Obviously, at the moment, there are other parts of the world which demand our urgent attention and our most concentrated efforts. But, I can virtually guarantee that if we do wait until a crisis arises once more in the Middle East, it will be too late.

In the meantime, I fear that Middle Eastern problems are being neglected. Just last week, for instance, the United States lost a critical vote in the United Nations Special Political Committee merely because friendly delegations had not been informed of the vote or kept up to date on U.S. policy.

So what was the result? A resolution supported by the Arab States, and the Soviet Union was passed which would urge the General Assembly to safeguard the property rights of the Arab refugees who fled from Israel during the 1948 fighting.

It is certainly ironic to see the Soviet Union trying to look out for property rights of Arab refugees. What about the property rights of Hungarian refugees or Tibetan refugees? In fact, what about the property rights of Russians themselves where the Communist dictatorship has seized all land and vigorously preaches the evils of private property and capitalism. The whole Soviet position on this matter is absurd, but it is most unfortunate that the U.S. delegation to the United Nations was not more on the ball to prevent this propaganda play.

In short, I feel there is a real danger that the Arab-Israeli problem, neglected by our Government today, will emerge as a crisis again at some point in the future.

Then we would have to pay the price of our neglect. Our prestige is suffering today because we neglected until 1952 the whole field of missiles and rockets until then and therefore allowed the Russians to put a man into space ahead of us.

We are at a disadvantage in the Far East because we allowed the Chinese Communists to seize control of China more than 10 years ago. It is clear that mistakes of the past are going to come home to roost. I do not want to see the same thing happening in the Middle East in 1970 because we neglected to handle the problem with proper care and attention in 1961.

Today as we look toward Israel, the most immediate point of interest is the Eichmann trial. It reminds us, more poignantly than we like to admit, of the sad and recurrent theme of man's inhumanity to man. The horrors of the Nazi regime are over, crimes that were committed against the Jewish people and indeed against all mankind are now being revealed in their true horror.

I think the revelations of the Eichmann trial must be not only a reminder of the brutalities of the past, but also a warning for the future.

These brutalities still exist in other parts of the world—in Cuba, where innocent men are sent without trial to the firing squad; in Tibet, where a whole religion is being wiped out by alien dictators; in Eastern Europe, where freedom is quelled with threats and imprisonment; and even in southeast Asia, where Communist terrorists murder their own countrymen at the bidding of Peiping and Moscow.

The horrors of the Nazi regime were beyond belief. And in reminding themselves of the past the people of Israel and indeed of all the free world should render thanks unto the Lord that these days are past for them. But murder, brutality, and persecution will continue on the earth as long as Communist and other dictatorships exist. And, to paraphrase the immortal words of Abraham Lincoln, it is rather for us the living—and for us the free—to be here dedicated to that noble cause for which freedom-loving men have ever given the last full measure of devotion—that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth.

Local Support Strong for Area Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, there can be no doubt about local interest in and support for area development, after a remarkable meeting held yesterday afternoon in Muskogee, Okla.

In response to a letter inviting their attendance to discuss the program, more than 100 mayors, city managers and other county and local officials of Oklahoma's Second Congressional District met for more than 3 hours.

Federal officials attending the conference said last night they had never attended a more enthusiastic and constructive meeting of local officials.

Tomorrow, because of the widespread interest in this program, I will submit a more detailed report on the Oklahoma area development meeting.

Under aggressive and enlightened New Frontier leadership, the tremendous area development program just passed by the Congress is off to a flying start—and the people are ready and eager for action at the earliest possible date.

Social Studies and Humanities Held as Important as Science

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, much emphasis has been placed upon the sciences during the last few years as this Nation has made a substantial effort to increase the effectiveness of its educational program. I propose that we take note of the imbalance developing between the sciences and the social studies and humanities and then seriously contemplate the wisdom of such a development. Dr. Paul H. Giddens, a noted educator from Minnesota, recently commented upon this development and its implications for citizen understanding of the complicated social, economic, and political problems facing our democracy today. I commend his words to you:

SOCIAL STUDIES AND HUMANITIES HELD AS IMPORTANT AS SCIENCE

(By Dr. Paul H. Giddens)

Within the last 60 years the United States has been transformed from a relatively simple agricultural state into a highly industrialized nation.

As this industrial revolution progressed, it required a greater and greater number of highly trained and educated men and women for all kinds of positions in business and industry.

To meet the demand, more and more emphasis was placed upon the teaching of science in high schools and colleges and universities.

Corporations, business firms, and foundations made grants for scientific research and established scholarships and fellowships at leading universities to further graduate study in the sciences.

In more recent years the development of the atomic bomb gave further impetus to the study and teaching of science. The launching of Sputnik I and other space satellites by the Soviet Union resulted in putting huge sums of money into the study of science in high schools, undergraduate colleges, and in graduate and professional schools.

The need for excellence in science training and basic research, for more and better educated scientists, and for more money to assure excellence is understandable, necessary, and widely recognized.

It is distressing, however, to note the great and rapidly growing imbalance between the sciences and the social studies and humanities and the lack of appreciation for the latter.

Compared with science, there seems to be relatively little interest in or financial support for the study of economics, government, history, English, foreign languages, philosophy, sociology, psychology, and other liberal arts subjects.

Relatively little money is being spent to encourage gifted high school and college students and high school and college teachers in the social studies and humanities and provide them with opportunities similar to those in the sciences. For students and teachers in those areas, this neglect is a cause for low morale.

Worse yet is the fact that no one seems to be greatly concerned or alarmed over the disparity that continues to increase. It is particularly surprising that businessmen, of all people, do not show more interest than they do in providing financial support to strengthen the study of economics and government.

The need for emphasizing the social studies and humanities is just as great and pertinent to our survival as science. How can we possibly operate our democratic form of Government successfully unless we have citizens and leaders who have a knowledge and understanding of the complicated economic, social and political problems that confront us?

How many citizens have sufficient knowledge to vote intelligently and make a rational decision on such current issues as taxation, inflation, civil rights, the farm problem, medical care for the aged, the flight of gold, foreign aid and the regulation of business by government?

We are even less prepared to make intelligent decisions on foreign policies and international issues. If we are to deal successfully with the thorny international problems that plague us and avoid war, there must be greater emphasis placed upon the study of the nature of communism and the history, language, economic system, politics and government, religion and philosophy, and the culture of Russia, Europe, Africa, the Middle East, Far East and Latin America.

If we are unable to cope successfully with these domestic and international issues, all of which have their roots in the social studies and humanities, spending more money on science will not enable us to survive. There must be as much emphasis given to the study of human affairs as to science.

Turnpike Benediction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following item from the Lawrence (Kans.) Daily Journal-World of Monday, May 8, 1961.

In my hometown—Lawrence, Kans.—is one of the outstanding schools in the

Nation, Haskell Institute. It provides top-grade training and education and leadership for the young Indian men and women of America. Haskell Institute also enters into the community of Lawrence, and indeed, the State of Kansas. For example, Dr. George Smart, Haskell religious activities director, has provided a brief prayer which will be used by and in connection with the Kansas Turnpike. It is a good prayer for all automobile travelers, and I take pride in bringing it to the attention of my colleagues, together with the news item about it:

TURNPIKE ISSUES PRAYER—PRESENTED BY DR. SMART AT MARKER DEDICATION

Kansas Turnpike officials, impressed by the benediction given by Dr. George Smart of Haskell Institute April 10 at the dedication of an historical marker at the Lawrence service area, are placing copies of the prayer in all the turnpike restaurants.

The Haskell religious activities directors' words will be printed on "table tents" to be placed on all tables and counters at the six pike restaurants.

KTA officials hope the safety message will do some good and that the patrons will carry off the cards. The cards are expected to be placed sometime this week.

The benediction is:

Lord, grant a steady hand and watchful eye,
That no man may be hurt when we pass by.
Thou gavest life: let none who drive a car
Be careless once, life's gift to steal or mar.
Teach us to use our cars for other's need,
Nor miss this world's beauty, through love of speed.
Shelter those, dear Lord, who bear us company,
From accident and all calamity.
Guard trooper and traveler on this pike,
Safe be father, mother, and tiny tyke.
With courtesy and joy we'd go life's way
And reach, without mishap, our destiny.
Amen.

H.R. 7036: A Bill To Prohibit Strikes at Defense Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVE MARTIN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which would outlaw any strikes, work stoppages, or slowdowns at any defense facility or any plant or enterprise in connection with the national defense or security of the United States.

The recent hearings in the Senate have disclosed the scandalous events which have taken place at our missile installations. Strikes, slowdowns, and work stoppages have greatly curtailed our program—a program which is costing the taxpayers billions of dollars.

The shocking disclosures have made every American citizen sick at heart, and has caused a sense of frustration for our well-being. I think it is high time that legislation be introduced and passed, which would make unlawful these tactics.

The work stoppages have resulted in the loss of over 162,000 man-days of work during the last 5 years at our missile sites. It has resulted in much overtime pay which has resulted in workers on the job receiving more pay than our top scientists. This is a ridiculous situation, as every American well knows. Without these labor abuses, the United States would probably have been first with a man in space. Labor unions are disregarding their responsibilities. There is involved here too much urgency—yes, even our own survival—to allow these irresponsible actions to continue.

The danger from communism is too real and too great to tolerate this condition to exist further. Action to correct these abuses is needed now. We are in a desperate fight to maintain our freedoms against the evil forces of communism. The hour is late, action is needed now.

Beware Government Dictation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I urge attention to the following, foresighted article by David Lawrence, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on May 11:

FEDERAL THREAT TO BROADCASTING—WARNING BY MINOW SEEN RAISING ISSUE OF POSSIBLE GOVERNMENT DICTATION

(By David Lawrence)

Is the Kennedy administration about to take over the radio and television stations of the country and make them obey the Government's dictation as to what they shall put in their programs?

If so, then will there have to be a soft-pedaling of some of the criticisms usually launched against Nikita Khrushchev's methods of controlling public opinion?

These questions are asked because of the amazing speech just made by President Kennedy's appointee as Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, Newton N. Minow. He spoke before the annual convention here of the National Association of Broadcasters.

If Mr. Minow's speech is carefully analyzed, it can only mean that broadcasting companies in America hereafter will be under the constant threat of Government confiscation and punitive measures. This could readily lead to the use of Government influence to get publicity and favorable treatment politically for whatever administration happened to be in power in Washington.

Mr. Minow takes the position that, because the Government issues licenses to broadcasting stations, it has the right to decide whether a station is giving good programs to the public. It's the same thing, in effect, as saying to a newspaper or other publication that, if it doesn't provide what the Government might set up as the standard of news and feature content, then second-class mail privileges granted by the Government may be taken away as a punishment.

There is nothing in the Constitution which says and agency of the Federal Government may tell any medium of communication what shall be published or broadcast. Indeed, the Constitution specifically says that Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of the press. Both radio and television are integral parts of the press.

There are, of course, areas in which the Government can exercise supervision so as to avoid collision on wave lengths, for example, and it can inquire also into the character and integrity of the applicant for a license, or his sense of responsibility in business. But no chairman of the FCC heretofore has claimed the wide power that Mr. Minow now claims. He said directly to the broadcasting companies:

"As you know, when your license comes up for renewal, your performance is compared with your promises. I understand that many people feel that in the past licenses were often renewed pro forma. I say to you now: Renewal will not be pro forma in the future. There is nothing permanent or sacred about a broadcast license.

"When a renewal is set down for hearing, I intend—wherever possible—to hold a well-advertised public hearing, right in the community you have promised to serve."

This means that whatever passions or emotions prevail at the moment will guide the FCC in its decision whether to renew or reject a license application. Where is there any such power in the Constitution? It was to prevent the pressures of mob rule, or even the threats of an intolerant majority in Congress, that the Constitution specified that no control over the press can be exercised by the Government.

But who is to define now the standard that shall be applied by the FCC? Who shall judge how much entertainment, how much information, how much editorializing done by a radio or television station is just the right combination? Yet Mr. Minow says:

"We all know that people would more often prefer to be entertained than stimulated or informed. But your obligations are not satisfied if you look only to popularity as a test of what to broadcast. You are not only in show business; you are free to communicate ideas as well as relaxation. You must provide a wider range of choices, more diversity, more alternatives. It is not enough to cater to the Nation's whims—you must also serve the Nation's needs. The people own the air."

Who speaks for the people? Who interprets their wishes or their "whim"? The people have never delegated to the Government any power to decide for them what is or is not a good program, content or entertainment content—or what is a satisfactory publication. Can the Federal Government tell a newspaper it is printing too many comic strips or giving too many columns of space to murder trials or crime or scandals because all this theoretically doesn't "serve the Nation's needs"?

Mr. Minow makes the usual disclaimer that any governmental censorship is intended. What the FCC chairman proposes, however, is broader than censorship. No particular program or particular declaration or particular form of speechmaking will be ordered suppressed—that's censorship. Instead, a whole broadcasting company would be suppressed and put out of business and its source of revenue taken away altogether unless that company toes the mark and conforms to the doctrines of the administration which happens to hold office when a broadcasting license comes up for renewal. This is a form of dictatorship which it is surprising to see advocated under a so-called liberal administration.

Challenge in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in an article entitled "Challenge in Latin America," by the distinguished Spanish diplomat and author, Salvador de Madariaga, which appeared in the Saturday Review issue dated March 25, 1961.

The opening portions of this article, it seems to me, point up a problem in our future Latin American relations which my colleagues in the House might find of interest and value. Consequently, I am quoting the first six paragraphs of this article:

CHALLENGE IN LATIN AMERICA
(By Salvador de Madariaga)

For a person alive to the dangerous state of world affairs, and therefore to the importance of preserving friendship and respect for the United States, a trip through Latin America is a strange experience. Wherever he goes he will be struck by a widespread and intense anti-American feeling, particularly among students and professors as well as the professional classes. It seems to me that the international situation is the very worst for such a situation to develop at the very doorstep of the United States; for we are witnessing a great movement toward political liberty and national independence on two other continents in circumstances which by no stretch of imagination can be said to contribute to a stable order. At such a time, the world can ill afford to set a third continent in turmoil.

We are everywhere seeing the forms of liberal democracy jeopardized. It is being twisted and tortured by foreign oppression in Communist-dominated countries, as in Eastern Europe, or by a homegrown form of oppression, as in Yugoslavia or in Spain; it is being exposed to the hazards of inexperience and of a more vigorous than intelligent nationalism, as in a number of newborn Asian and African nations. Disorder and confusion are the inevitable dust clouds in the wake of such agitated events. And disorder and confusion are as favorable to communism as they are injurious to liberal democracy.

The affairs of men are ruled by a kind of law of sociological gravity that forces them to fall toward chaos if not held at a certain level of order by an intelligent hand. This intelligent hand is what we call government. It is plain that in a number of cases too high for the peace of mind of the world the hand that keeps the affairs of men from falling into chaos is neither strong nor intelligent enough to fulfill its task. It follows that in wide areas of the world, circumstances are being created that favor communism, since communism thrives on disorder and confusion while liberal democracy requires calm and the rule of the law.

Such being the general picture, we must look on the considerable progress made by communism in Latin America as a serious threat to our civilization, particularly as such progress is observable mostly among the intellectual classes. In the United States, one gathers the impression that the intellectual is an oddity, a freak, at times a joke. His opinions are heard with polite deference and soon forgotten. As for his chances of a political career, they simply do not exist. A flavor of intellectuality has barred Adlai Stevenson from access to the White House, and one wonders whether Mr. Kennedy's success may not be due to the keen intelligence he devoted to hide his intellectuality (I am not saying "his intelligence") from his suspicious voters. The situation may be evolving. To be a Harvard professor is no longer a disqualification for becoming a member of the Presidential Cabinet; but to have published a book of poems might still be so.

In Latin America, however, a man may be writing poetry on Friday and become President or Minister of Foreign Affairs the following Sunday. Nor should one suppose that this phenomenon is limited to that form of power which derives from actual political functions. It cannot be doubted, for instance, that the high reputation which Pablo Neruda enjoys as a poet considerably enhances his power over Chilean public opinion as a Communist leader.

No more grievous mistake could therefore be made by the public opinion of the United States than to shrug its shoulders at the pro-Soviet and anti-American wave that is sweeping intellectual circles in Latin America. From the ranks of these pink professors, poets, doctors, and lawyers, the men will be recruited who will actually govern Latin America not merely 10 years hence, but maybe next year, maybe next month. The issue is immediate and urgent; and we must waste no time in facing it.

Polk Brothers Honored as Brand Name Retailer of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on May 4, Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON was principal speaker at the annual brand names dinner in New York at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel, during which one of my constituents, Mr. Sol Polk, president of Polk Bros., was honored as "Appliance Store Brand Name Retailer of the Year."

This is undoubtedly the highest award that American brand name manufacturers bestow upon a retailer in this country, and needless to say, I am extremely proud that a merchant in my congressional district received this coveted award this year.

The full significance of this annual award dinner in New York I believe can be focused by the fact that our Nation's Vice President did take time out from his very busy schedule and, by his presence as principal speaker, signify his own respect for the great contribution to the American economy that the name brand manufacturers and dealers of this country are making.

This is the first time since the founding of the Brand Names Foundation, which annually issues this highly respected tribute to American merchants, that the Brand Name Retailer of the Year Award has been presented to a retailer of the Midwest.

Mayor Richard J. Daley has eloquently expressed the pride experienced not only by the people of my district, but by all the people of Chicago, when he wrote Mr. Polk the following message upon learning of this great honor bestowed on Polk Bros.:

I extend to you my warmest congratulations. It is edifying when a native Chicagoan, or a Chicago enterprise, wins just acclaim for integrity and ability, as some of this glory is always shared by Chicago as a whole, adding, as it does, to our reputation for growth, enterprise, opportunity.

Recalling the humble beginning of the Polk Bros. organization some 25 years ago and observing your growth to a group of large marts covering Chicagoland, I am sure that you and your brothers and sister who make up your executive group well deserve the award which has been bestowed upon you.

Mr. Speaker, several hundred stores from all parts of the country compete for this Retailer of the Year Award. It is like TV's Emmy, or the motion picture industry's Oscar, something like winning the world's series, or bowling a 300 game, or running a 4-minute mile. It is one of the highest honors in the retailing business, and I am sure that in accepting this award, Sol Polk received it with a feeling of deep appreciation not only because he has brought a great distinction upon the retailing firm he heads, but also because his firm reflects so eloquently the high standards of merchandising throughout Chicagoland.

I am sure that all the merchants of Chicago were indeed honored to know that one of their associates was singled out for this great national honor. But the full significance of this award can be realized only if we fully understand what a great contribution American retailers are making toward the survival of free enterprise in this country.

At a time when many of us are deeply concerned over the problems which are being created throughout this country because American workers are being displaced by foreign imports competing for their jobs, it is encouraging to know that firms like Polk Bros. and thousands of other American retailers exert a profound effort to encourage the purchase of American-made name brand products in this country.

Recently I stated that the movement of durable consumer goods across the counters of America is the best way to sustain our Nation's economy. Sol Polk and his brothers and sister have made a tremendous contribution which can be felt not only within the immediate area of their retail stores, but throughout our Nation, in promoting sales campaigns which help move the products of American workers from factory to consumer and which have brought them this outstanding award this year. By their outstanding techniques of merchandising name brand products, Polk Bros. helped produce a sufficient demand in the appliance manufacturing field so that thousands of Americans can continue at their productive jobs.

The American retailer is the backbone of economic survival for the United States. It is only when he devises methods to continue the flow of commerce across his counters that we can look with confidence to a high standard of employment in our Nation. When his business suffers, it is not long before

the workers in American factories, manufacturing the goods and appliances which are sold at the retail level, begin to curtail their workweek and ultimately suffer long layoffs.

In the struggle for survival we frequently hear a great deal of discussion about arms and military weapons to protect the security of our country. Too often we overlook the fact that as important to our survival and security is a sustained economy because people who have an opportunity to earn a living and an opportunity to share the comforts of a bountiful nation will not easily fall prey to the prophets of false ideologies.

Polk Bros. clearly exemplifies the high standards of American merchandising. In their 26 years, this firm has risen from a small store located in the very heart of my congressional district to one of Chicago's leading merchandising establishments. It is particularly significant that they have accomplished this by their purchase and distribution of trademarked products and by publicizing the values of American engineering, ingenuity, research, and integrity of brand name manufacturers.

Mr. Speaker, in paying tribute to Sol Polk as retailer of the year, I am sure that America's industry is also paying tribute to his brothers, Morris, Sam, and Harry, and his indefatigable sister, Mrs. Goldie Bachmann-Luftig, as well as the entire staff of this awe-inspiring firm.

We in Chicago are proud of them all because working as a closely knit family, the Polk's have inspired new vistas for all retailers in America's second largest city and throughout the Nation.

Plight of the Sheep-Raising Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CHURCH
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, last week the President announced a seven-point program for the textile industry. This is a primary concern to Idaho, because of our large sheep-raising industry, which in turn is dependent upon textile manufacturing for its market. A flood of foreign imports of low-priced woolen cloth and clothing has had a very adverse effect upon this industry.

Senator JOHN O. PASTORE's Subcommittee To Study the Problems of the Domestic Textile Industry made several recommendations which were considered by the President's Textile Advisory Committee and the President prior to the announcement of the seven-point program.

One of these recommendations was that quotas be imposed on wool textile imports. I heartily seconded these recommendations when they were made, as did Mr. M. C. Claar, Secretary of the Idaho Wool Growers Association, and many sheep producers who wrote me from Idaho.

In his seven-point program, the President said he planned an international conference of principal textile exporting and importing nations. It is my understanding that the President believes that such a conference might lead to a new system of voluntary quotas on textile imports from abroad.

Because this problem is a pressing one in our economy, as well as being "serious and deep rooted," as the President said in announcing the program, I am most hopeful that the administration will move promptly toward the calling of such a conference.

The entire sheep-raising industry, not only of my State, but of the Nation, has been imperiled, and if relief is not forthcoming, we may lose this vital and historic segment of our economy.

Just how serious this situation has become in my State was recently related in the Twin Falls (Idaho) Times-News, one of Idaho's outstanding newspapers, and I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHEEP, WOOL MARKET TROUBLES FORCING AREA OPERATORS INTO CATTLE BUSINESS

More than a year ago, a buyer of Australian feeder lambs stood at a California dock watching the last of more than 20,000 of his imported lambs coming down the unloading ramp. Many shiploads of live lambs had preceded this ship and many others were to follow it.

At the same time, across the United States, sheepmen were protesting strenuously that imported sheep were underselling domestic lambs. Quarantines were placed against the imported sheep by health authorities, but imports continued. The tariff of 3.5 cents the same amount placed against imported sheep in the 1930's, was too small to protect the domestic sheep industry.

The Californian buying Australian lambs predicted "Within 5 years, there won't be a sheep industry left in the United States."

Already the sheep industry, across the United States and in Idaho, is suffering. Sheepmen are losing money on each lamb and ewe, labor costs are rising, and the situation seems so hopeless to many sheepmen that Magic Valley bands are being placed for sale.

Dennis Burks, Rupert, manager of the Flat Top Sheep Co., watched Angus heifers grazing near a stock pond and said, "This is the first time cattle have grazed on the Flat Top Ranch. It has been only sheep before and the only cattle that grazed here were those that came through the fence from a neighbor's pasture."

With Burks was Eugene Gulick, Buhl, who had located 20 Angus bulls to be used in the new 600-head cattle herd, and John Muirhead, also Buhl, foreman of the Dan Cavanagh Sheep Co.

Muirhead pointed out he, too, is planning conversion from an all-sheep operation to at least half cattle.

Burks said for the first time in Flat Top history he had not purchased replacement ewes this year. Normally, he purchases 2,000 yearlings each year as replacements.

Among other reasons for not buying replacements, the company's owner, Mrs. Mary Brooks, Chicago, daughter of the late Senator John Thomas, Gooding, was absolutely convinced the U.S. sheep industry is doomed.

Five other prominent sheepmen from this area each representing a different type of operation, were interviewed about their attitude toward the current sheep situation, and the consensus is gloomy.

The five are Rex Taylor, Burley, who with two partners runs about 8,000 head of lambs on the open range near Pocatello; Pete Cenarrusa, Richfield, who with his brother and Frank Somsen, Hailey, runs about four bands of sheep and trucks them each winter to Blythe, Calif.; Charles Coiner, Hansen, one of a family that feeds out from 20,000 to 35,000 lambs a year; John Noh, Twin Falls, range operator, breeder, and a director of the American Sheep Producers Council; and Leonard Winkle, Filer, Suffolk ram breeder and farm flock operator.

Today's sheepmen are harassed by the lower prices being paid for imported frozen lamb and live lambs. They find manufacturing mills for their wool are closing down at rapid rates because of competitive synthetic materials and imports of woolen fabrics from Japan and Australia. Their historic grazing privileges on desert and forest lands are being curtailed. And they are finding lamb consumption isn't increasing despite an increasing demand for red meat.

The industry is worth $70 million in Idaho, and it brings an annual revenue of more than $22 million, spent mostly within the State for taxes, grazing fees, labor, equipment and feed grains. (The Flat Top Sheep Co. alone spends from $175,000 to $200,000 each year for hay and grain for lambs and ewes.)

Replace part of this industry with cattle, and the new revenue still won't equal the current income. In Idaho, the Federal Government owns 68 percent of the land, and much of it is unsuited for anything but grazing. Without grazing, the income derived from this land would decline sharply.

Allotment cuts on public grazing lands have contributed to problems of Idaho sheepmen. They agree that some ranges had to be restored but they disagree that some of the cuts had to be so severe. In some cases cuts have been as high as 80 percent, and many sheepmen feel the Forest Service is trying to get them out of the mountains within the next 10 years.

Lately, they have read hostile statements about grazing advisory boards by Stewart Udall, Secretary of the Interior, and Karl S. Lindstrom, Director of the Bureau of Land Management. They have been asserting that livestock people are too narrow in their attitudes toward multiple use of public lands.

Thus sheepmen and cattlemen are feeling more than ever that the Government agencies are out to eliminate public grazing areas. Without these areas they feel their operations will have to fold and their base properties, which are used only to supply winter quarters and feed for the livestock, will turn out to be worthless, insufficient to maintain economical-sized units the year around.

Packers and buyers from chainstores now demand a grade of lamb that is more costly to produce than a few years ago. The percentage of fat on the lamb mustn't be excessive; the weight of the lamb shouldn't be more than 100 pounds, and it takes either a continual source of lush grass to produce such a lamb, or only the best grains and hay in the feedlot.

In addition, sheep producers are confronted with increased competitions from other "speciality" meats such as processed frozen fish, turkeys, and broilers.

Red meat consumption is going up and it has been calculated that the average per capita demand is 160 pounds per year, but lamb consumption isn't going up.

Between the end of World War I and the Korean war, the highest peak of lamb imports was 7 million pounds, in 1951. It dropped to 1 million pounds in 1956 and 4 million in 1957.

In 1960, the United States imported 40 million pounds of frozen lamb from New Zealand and thousands of live lambs from Australia. The live lambs arrived for a cost less than domestic lambs can be produced. Foreign frozen lamb undersold American lamb by 15 and 20 cents per pound at the meat counter.

The outlook this year is worse than ever. The Idaho Legislature sent a memorial to President John Kennedy this winter asking for assistance and understanding about the domestic sheep industry.

The U.S. Tariff Commission has been requested by the National Woolgrowers Association to raise duties on lamb, but the request was denied. Since sheep producers are not in the slaughtering business, the Commission would not accept their proposals about regulating frozen lamb.

While domestic sheep numbers have declined from 50 million sheep in 1942 to 34 million this year, Australia's sheep population has risen from 103 million in 1927 to 150 million, New Zealand's from 25 million to more than 50 million.

The wool situation has not fared any better in recent years, with imports crowding domestic wool raisers into a corner.

In 1954, Congress passed the National Wool Act to stimulate sheepmen to produce 300 million pounds of shorn wool annually. Congress stated wool was essential for the Nation.

Wool production increased to 265 million pounds in 1960 as a result of the act, but tariff rates against foreign wool materials haven't been increased to keep out lower priced goods.

Put all these together—lower wool prices, lower lamb prices, low lamb consumption, increased operating costs, grazing costs and imports—and it spells disaster for American sheepmen.

Choice lambs this spring should be near the high peak for the year, but instead they are selling for 17 cents a pound. A year ago they were selling for 22 cents.

Charles Coiner, lamb feeder, bought 70-pound feeder lambs a year ago for 19.25 cents and lost money. Earlier this year he bought lambs for 16.25 cents and had to sell them at 16 cents. His feed cost to put on a pound of gain is 20 cents.

Coiner doesn't see how he can pay more than 14 cents for feeders and even then has a good chance of losing.

Coiner says the reasons for the poor price are many. "Perhaps the most important is that lamb distribution throughout the United States isn't spread wide enough over more areas and counters. I hate to get out of the sheep business. It's the only thing I know. But I suppose I can convert the yards to handle cattle if the situation lasts another year."

Says Burks, Flat Top Sheep Co., "It cost us $28 last year to carry a range ewe through the year, feed, her replacement, labor and other items. The figure would be higher if we included other depreciations and taxes. We need to get $20 a 100 for the lamb to break even. And last year we lost $2.50 per head."

Last year, the Flat Top ran more than 5,500 ewes, 2,000 yearling ewes and about 8,000 lambs on private and public grazing lands till September 1.

Burke said Mrs. Brooke agreed this year to purchase 600 head of black cows and heifers, a conversion he never dreamed would take place so fast. Cattle can come off poor range looking fair and then be fed to look well. Sheep, especially lambs, have to be on lush, green forage to fatten.

Moreover, a fat lamb can't be held more than 10 days after ready for market regardless of price, because the price drops rapidly as the lamb begins to get heavier than the 100 to 110 pounds. A rancher can hold cattle longer, even 30 days on fat steers.

Burke said advertising on lamb and wool has been ineffective. If the situation doesn't improve, he plans to buy another 400 black cows and run 1,000 head, allowing the ewes to run a few years until they're worn out.

John Muirhead, Cavanagh's foreman, says Cavanagh wants to convert entirely to black cattle and abandon the sheep operation he has had 30 years.

Muirhead plans some 600 cows and about 3,500 ewes. Presently, there are about 6,000 ewes and 100 head of bred heifers on the Cavanagh spread.

Muirhead says the grading system has raised havoc with the sheep operation. He sells 65 percent of his lambs as Choice, and about 35 percent as feeders. Not too many years ago he sold 80 percent Choice and 20 percent feeders.

He also feels sheepmen are being crowded off the range. To try to find a solution, he kept lambs in the feedlot 2 years instead of sending them out on the range with the ewes. One year he fed 3,600 lambs and the next 4,000. However, he lost money last year and broke even the year before.

Rex Taylor, Burley, trails sheep toward eastern Idaho in the spring, lambing on the open range near Bannock Creek, west of Pocatello. He says his costs have risen sharply while the price has gone down.

Taylor used to trail all the way to Bannock Creek but now trucks most of the way because the desert has been cut up into fenced off farms. Another cost is his recent acquiring of more forest range to handle his sheep. His allotments had been cut.

Taylor hopes the sheep industry will see better days and will ride with it for another year or two to see how matters develop. He runs cattle and may expand this operation later. He feels the wool situation is particularly bad, and if it weren't for the incentive program he feels the situation would be intolerable. He would like to see lamb promoted strongly throughout the country.

Pete Cenarrusa, Blaine County representative and chairman of the appropriation committee in the State legislature, runs four bands of sheep. He trucks them to Blythe, Calif., in mid-December, and lambs there in January and February. During the first 2 weeks in April he trucks his sheep and lambs back to Magic Valley.

Cenarrusa says his sheep and lambs gained more than enough on the lush feed in California until this year to compensate for the hauling.

Counting his dry ewes, last spring he sold 143 pounds of lamb per ewe. The normal operator sells 133 pounds and Idaho's average is 123 pounds of lamb per ewe. Alfalfa pastures in California cost him 4 cents per head daily until this year when he had to pay 6 cents.

Freight rates of $5 per head for the trip down and back have gone up in recent years. Coupled with the increased cost for pasture, this has nullified some of the advantages.

In view of the costs and lower price for lambs this spring, Cenarrusa says this is the first time he would have done just as well keeping his sheep in Blaine County during the winter.

He also feels imports are wrecking the sheep industry. Unless there's an improvement soon, he and his two partners will have to become cattle operators. He estimates his cost to carry a ewe through a year is $32 per year. An $18 lamb will not allow him to break even.

Leonard Winkle, Filer, Suffolk breeder who sells many stud bucks to range operators, says prices for his stock have fallen considerably.

The only optimistic note was voiced by John Noh, Twin Falls, who runs sheep on the range and has been breeding a faster-gaining strain of sheep.

When he attended the directors' meeting of the American Sheep Producers council in Denver last March, Noh was the only one who didn't feel the sheep industry was practically dead.

However, he points out many sheepmen didn't buy whiteface ewe lambs for replacements this year. As a result, Noh said, many ewe lambs went to the feedlot for fattening and helped account for the 10-percent increase in fat lambs reported selling out of feedlots.

Noh thinks lamb prices will pick up this spring, but in spite of his optimism, he is going to start building up his cattle operation just as a precaution.

No Need To Get Moonstruck

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD, an article from the Christian Science Monitor of May 10, 1961, entitled "No Need To Get Moonstruck":

[From the Christian Science Monitor, May 10, 1961]

NO NEED TO GET MOONSTRUCK

One question which hovers in the aftermath of the Alan Shepard space flight is whether the United States now should go all out to beat the Soviet Union in a race to be first to put a man on the moon.

There are historical reasons why Russian rocket building is ahead of America in load-carrying capacity, just as there are reasons why American space exploration has contributed and is contributing most to overall knowledge of what exists beyond the earth's atmosphere.

Soviet technicians were faced with the demand to build a rocket engine that would carry an atomic bomb 5,000 miles. When they did, that kind of an engine would send a satellite to or around the moon. American engineers and physicists developed the hydrogen bomb, which would do the work of an atom bomb but at a fraction of the weight. Hence, militarily the pressure to build a rocket engine of a million pounds thrust was off, and Western researchers turned their attention to the nearer reaches of space.

But the first sputnik and the orbital flight of Yuri Gagarin showed the propaganda value that Communist spokesmen could and did reap from space exploits. This has led some to feel urgently that the United States, even with a late start, must at all costs overtake the Soviet Union in the specific competition aimed at sending a man to the moon and back.

There is, however, such a thing as what Benjamin Franklin called "paying too much for your whistle"—that is, spending so much for one gewgaw that you deny yourself more substantial objects the money would have bought.

Or to use another figure of speech, the shotput is not the only event in this track meet. There are other contests, many of them, for which history and informed scorekeepers will award equal points. The development of weather and communication satellites, space platforms, and eventually of gear to enable men to do useful work on the moon or a planet may be likened to the

broad jump, the sprints, the mile run, the low hurdles, or the javelin throw in the interstellar competition.

So far as international law on the claiming of new lands or continents on earth may apply, the Russians would by no means acquire title to the moon simply by landing the first man there. Not only discovery and exploration but also colonization is required to establish a territorial claim.

Describing the orderly basis on which Project Mercury proceeded, Commander Shepard said, "There were times when we could have rushed the program, but we chose not to * * * because we felt we had a well-laid-out, well-designed, reliable program."

The thought applies reasonably well to the overall program of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, leading up to the Saturn rocket which will eventually hurl a 6-ton payload to the moon. To endeavor to speed up that program by crash projects to beat the Russians might, it is estimated, cost anywhere from $6 to $40 billion—and with no assurance then that a hammer-and-sickle ship still would not get there first.

In athletics, no matter what exertion may be involved, the competitor who is relaxed usually does better than the one who tenses up. And so does the fellow who knows where his own prowess lies rather than who tries necessarily to excel in the other fellow's chosen department.

Era of Appeasement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Gould Lincoln, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on May 11, points out, further, the softening of our defenses against Communist aggression, being brought about by this administration:

THE POLITICAL MILL—DIPLOMATIC DETENTE WITH CUBA

(By Gould Lincoln)

Is an era of appeasement upon us—as it was when Hitler came into supreme power before World War II? In Hitler's day, the United States was not involved in the appeasement of the Nazi leader. Today, however, the seeds of appeasement seem to have been sown in this country—and the appeasement runs to Communist leaders in Soviet Russia, in Red China, and now to the Communist-directed government in Cuba—to Fidel Castro. So far this appeasement trend has not involved in any way President Kennedy and the Government of the United States. But pressures are being brought to bear. And they are pressures of various kinds of intensity.

For example, an open letter, published in the New York Times May 10, addressed to the President of the United States, signed by 68 college professors and two "intellectuals," proposes that the United States "seek instead [of intervention] to detach the Castro regime from the Communist bloc by working for a diplomatic détente and a resumption of trade relations (between this country and Cuba)." Probably many, if not all, of the signers of this open letter would resent being called "appeasers." It is difficult, however, to characterize their proposal as anything except appeasement in view of the stand taken and by Castro's actions toward the United States and its citizens, along with Castro's recent statement that his government had become completely "socialistic" in the sense the word is used by the Communist Russians. A détente—a relaxing of strained relations between nations—as asked by the professors so far as Castro is concerned, appears naive in the extreme and completely unrealistic.

A member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, questioned about the open letter to the President, commented: "The signers of the proposal show a failure to recognize the facts of life. The Communists—and Castro has announced his Communist form of government—do not compromise. They may talk of coexistence. What they work for constantly—and they never relent—is a Communist-dominated world, including the United States.

BLAME UNITED STATES FOR CASTRO

The college professors seem to imply that we, by our actions after Castro took over in Cuba 2 years ago last December and January, forced Castro into the arms of Russian Premier Khrushchev and the Chinese Reds. When Castro came to this country soon after his successful revolution, largely at the invitation of the press, he was guest at a luncheon given in Washington by the National Press Club. Repeatedly he was asked by newspapermen at that luncheon if and when he proposed to hold a popular election and so give the Cuban people an opportunity to select their own rulers. In each and every instance, he replied that he could give no time for an election—that it was a matter which would have to be determined later. Now he has given the answer almost immediately after the recent invasion of Cuban freedom fighters had been crushed. No elections.

SEE NO GOOD IN FIRMNESS

The statement prepared by the college professors insists that the struggle against communism in the Western Hemisphere will not be won by brandishing the big stick, and that the effort to destroy Castro fails to come to grips with the meaning of the recent Cuban experience and seriously endangers the pursuit of our most vital interests in world affairs. It puts the blame on the CIA for the invasion disaster. This has become an increasingly favorite pastime of those seeking to find a scapegoat for the fiasco. It attacks the U.S. Cuban policy of more than a year, which was to crush Castro. The open letter says, too, that Castro may well be a threat to the security of the Americas. "But," it continues, "this is not primarily a military threat." The real danger Castro presents, is one of subversion and the example of his own brand of social revolution in other Latin American Republics. The professors couldn't be more correct. But the remedy they propose does not take into account either the kind of man Castro is nor the fact that Khrushchev will never allow Castro, even if he should have a change of heart, to become reconciled to the United States—unless it is for the purpose of throwing dust in our eyes while he builds up a really powerful military threat, capable of blackmailing us in the end.

Propaganda for dealing gently with Castro is not confined to college professors. More than a year ago the Fair Play for Cuba Committee was organized to work among college students—a pro-Castro organization. It sent a delegation of students to Cuba last December to take part in the second anniversary of Castro's gaining control. Members of this group apologized to Castro for the conduct of the United States and returned home singing praises for what Castro has done in Cuba.

The college professors signing the open letter to President Kennedy are all from the Boston area; 41 of them at Harvard and the rest at MIT, Boston University, and Brandeis. It remains to be seen how soon college professors and intellectuals in other sections of the country will join in such proposals.

Progress at This Session of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, Congress has now passed the midway mark in this session. In a weekend address over Wisconsin radio stations, I was privileged to review some of the progress, as well as some of the jobs left to be done.

I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM RADIO ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

Today, we live in a pushbutton age. In Congress, however, the right buttons have not been pushed to create the kind of fast-paced progress anticipated in this era of the New Frontier.

Now, it is true that the problems are complex. And the instruments of accomplishment are sometimes unwieldy.

As of now, the major legislation—and some of it very controversial—passed, included:

Increase in minimum wage and extension of coverage to workers;

Area development program for communities suffering from economic depression;

Extension of unemployment compensation benefits;

Approval of additional Federal judgeships.

However, midway in the session, this is not a startling record.

What are some of the major fields in which action is still needed? These include:

Speeding up the space program;

Strengthening our defenses; this involves also reexamination and improvement of our global effort to combat communism, not only in the military, but also on the nonmilitary fronts;

Reexamination of the farm problem to try to find realistic solutions to production-consumption imbalance;

Needed improvement and expansion of our educational system;

Carrying forward the highway construction program, if possible, on a pay-as-you-go basis;

Equitable revision of our tax system to better serve, not stunt, economic growth and progress;

Liberalization of social security, including realistic efforts to meet the health needs of our aging folks.

These measures and a long list of others still await final consideration in Congress.

LEGISLATION OF SPECIAL INTEREST TO WISCONSIN

In addition, there are a number of pieces of legislation of special interest to Wisconsin. These include:

(1) Appropriations for improvement and expansion of our port and harbor facilities and flood control:

(2) Congress has failed, in my judgment, to provide realistic legislation to enable the Menominee Indian Tribe—now terminated from Federal control and constituting our 72d county in Wisconsin—to meet the great economic, health, sanitation, educational, and other problems confronting them. Early this session, I cosponsored legislation for extension of Federal control until a proper foundation could be laid for tribal control over their affairs. Unfortunately, the Congress too long delayed consideration of such legislation.

Now it appears that the best that may be achieved is legislation to (1) extend as-

sistance in the field of education, health, and sanitation until the tribe itself can handle these matters; (2) provide loans to help meet the tremendous financial obligations; and (3) authorize Uncle Sam to keep a watchful eye on the financial affairs of the tribe to attempt to assume its economic stability.

Unless these minimum actions are taken, however, the tribute will find itself hard put to meet its obligations and fulfill the needs of the Menominee Indians in years ahead.

(3) Next, we find that there has been a failure to act expeditiously on my bill S. 1515 to provide $10 million supplemental funds for the school lunch program for the current fiscal year.

Unfortunately, the Department of Agriculture has too long delayed a report on the bill—holding up action in Congress. As a result, the program is now suffering serious curtailment. In the light of these facts, I contacted, not only the Appropriations Committee, but the Secretary of Agriculture to "prod" them for action.

(4) The appropriation of funds for expansion of research facilities at our Forest Products Laboratory in Madison, also, is of major interest to Wisconsin.

Regrettably, the House of Representatives cut out $300,000 for much-needed expansion of the research facilities. In the Senate, however, I urged reinstatement of these funds. In my judgment, this is essential, not only for our forest interests, but for the economy of Wisconisn and the Nation.

INVEST IN AMERICA

Now turning to another topic: A great many of you will recall that during the past week there have been nationwide observances held to encourage more folks to invest in America. This is indeed a sound, most worthy project. Today, there are more than 13 million shareholders in publicly owned corporations. In my judgment, however, this number can and should be greatly expanded to include more people. Why? Because by sound, confident investment in our job-creating free enterprise system we can—

More quickly lick such problems as unemployment and business and industrial slowdowns;

Successfully meet the Communist challenge to our free enterprise systems; and

More effectively fulfill the evergrowing needs of a fast-expanding population.

Investing in America, however, means more than just investing our money for a profit. Rather it means also dedicating the time, thought, energy, and resources to building a stronger, better America to meet the growing challenges of the future.

NEEDED: GREATER PUBLIC EDUCATION ON FREE ENTERPRISE

The economy, in my judgment, could be greatly strengthened by instilling in our people, particularly youth, a greater understanding of the working principles of our free enterprise system.

Today, unfortunately, there is an abysmal lack of such knowledge.

To a large degree, too large, I believe, people still believe—in a vague, distorted way—what, in effect, the Communists are saying about us, that is—

That big business attempts to bleed the public for profits;

That labor represents a class struggle against the capitalists; and

That our society is essentially one of conflicts, rather than of cooperation in efforts to fulfill our needs, individually and nationally.

Now, it's true that, in the past, there have been conflicts, and abuses of power.

Today, however, the enlightened interests are becoming more and more aware that the broad, long-range interests of management, labor, consumer, and the Nation can be best served, and are being best served, by cooperation, rather than by antagonism and conflicts of interests.

Management, traditionally interested, to a large degree, in profits, more and more, looks after the human needs of their workers; for a happy, well-paid employee is a more productive worker; and also a market for more products of the economy.

Labor, also has a vested interest in the success of the business upon which jobs are dependent.

The public, as consumers, as well as investors (exemplified by the 13 million shareholders of publicly owned corporations) has a real interest in the success of job-creating, commodity-producing enterprises, as well as the welfare of the American worker.

The American people, however, in school and by adult education, need to be better informed of ways in which we, as individuals, can contribute to further strengthening our free enterprise system.

Only if this is done, can we successfully meet the ever-growing needs of a fast-expanding population, as well as the challenge of the Communists.

NEEDED: SPEED UP U.S. SPACE PROGRAM

During this past week, also, we witnessed one of the great "breakthroughs" in our space program: that is, the successful suborbital flight of Cdr. Alan B. Shepard into space. This was a historically significant step forward in freemen's efforts to explore the universe.

The American people, I believe, can be justly proud.

Now, however, we look forward to success, with, we pray, a minimum of setbacks, in our next step of launching a manned spacecraft into orbit around the earth.

In the world stadium, nations are carefully watching the contest between the major protagonists of freedom and communism in space exploration, the United States and the Soviet Union. Although we didn't plan it that way, this is, indeed, a real space race.

According to experts, the cumulative scientific-technological value of our accomplishments far exceeds that of the Soviet Union.

Nevertheless, we cannot ignore nor underestimate the psychological impact which Russian "firsts" in space have had upon the minds of the world.

Regrettably, the U.S. timetable has run only a short distance behind Communist launchings. After the first sputnik, for example, we shortly orbited not one, but many satellites—now outnumbering the Soviets by about 40 to 15.

Recently, the Soviets reportedly orbited the first man in space. Now, we have successfully conducted a suborbital flight.

With such a relatively short lag in timing, it would appear that by only a slight speedup of our program we could demonstrate to the world that we can accomplish space feats not only equal to and greater, but also faster, than the Soviet Union.

"The question is not: Will we do these things? Rather, the issue is: When will we do them?

"Will we do them before, or after, the Soviets? In my judgment, we should do it before.

"We recognize, of course, that space feats are basically scientific-technological-military accomplishments rather than weapons of propaganda warfare.

"Nevertheless, we cannot ignore the tremendous psychological impact which Soviet triumphs have had upon the world.

"The task now is to first, predetermine the next major accomplishments in space; and second, as possible, set up the timetable so that the United States can get the maximum benefit not only from the accomplishments themselves, but also from the great psychological impact of firsts in the space race," Senator WILEY concluded.

Caliber of American Movies in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks the administration, the Congress, and the people of this Nation have evidenced great concern regarding our problems in Latin America. We are seeking through various programs to strengthen our ties with our neighbors, and to meet the challenge of communism which has established a beachhead in this hemisphere.

One of the programs which, I believe, can contribute to the development of a better understanding of the United States and of the social and economic problems of Latin America is the educational exchange program for university students administered by the Department of State.

Recently, it was my privilege to join with other members of the Kansas congressional delegation in meeting with a group of students from the University of Kansas who were in Washington for a briefing at the Department of State prior to participating in an exchange program at the University of Costa Rica in San Jose.

Several weeks later I received a letter from one of the students who is a constituent of mine. In the letter the student expressed to me concern over the reactions and the experiences she has had as a result of American films distributed and shown there.

I would like to place in the RECORD an excerpt of the letter from this Kansas student in Costa Rica:

The subject which weighs my mind is perhaps not in your field, but perhaps you would do me the favor of referring it to the proper persons. I am deeply concerned with the caliber of American movies which are allowed to be sent to Latin America. In the 8 weeks that I've been in San Jose, there have been only four presentable movies," "Spartacus," "The Big Fisherman," "The Wild River," and the "FBI Story." The rest have been either horror movies, such as the "Seven Brides of Dracula," or what are called "rave" movies, which must be advertised "for adults only." These include "Summer Place," "Because They're Young," and others which deal with misplaced love, adultery, and unfaithfulness. These, of course, draw great crowds and are therefore very profitable for the movie companies, but you can't imagine the harm they do to the American image. This was really brought home with a jolt when one of the boys in our group was asked confidentially how university men ever studied when they "had girls in" every night. And we girls must chaperon each other on dates because of this mistaken image of American college life.

Isn't there some type of censorship for movies which are sent out of the United States? How can we expect these people to respect an American people such as the sex maniacs, monsters, and adulterers they see in these films—which are practically the only ones they come in contact with, excepting tourists (and I shall say no more on this subject).

Now I am certainly not advocating, and I know that this student does not want, Government censorship of films, newspapers, magazines, or other media produced by private enterprise and distributed overseas.

However, I believe that we should expect the members of the great American film industry to heed the counsel of Mr. Eric Johnston, president, to the board of directors, Motion Picture Association of America, who has spelled out a guideline for decision by the motion picture industry. He said:

This is the decision to be vigilant in responsibility, alert to the sensitivities of others. To be aware of public values, both at home and abroad. In that atmosphere, any subject can be treated, all faithful to the American scene.

In that atmosphere, we will continue to make an endless variety of motion pictures, each conveying an impression of one facet of our life, and in totality presenting our people as a nation believing in charity and in justice.

Consumer Interests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on the 24th of March I introduced, and was joined by 15 of my colleagues, Senate Resolution 115, to establish a Select Committee on Consumer Interests. It was my conviction that the consumer needed a responsible public forum to which he might bring his purchasing complaints with some prospect that if deceit, fraud, or shoddy practices were shown that something might come of it. For too long has the consumer been buffeted about in the market place, the victim of false packaging, watered foods, inferior goods, foisted off on him by such terms as convenient, economy, or time saving.

To highlight the significance of the problem the consumer faces, I ask unanimous consent that the following article by Sidney Margolius entitled "Neuberger Bill Would Handcuff Real Experts at Fooling Public," from the AFL–CIO News of May 13, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW TO BUY—NEUBERGER BILL WOULD HANDCUFF REAL EXPERTS AT FOOLING PUBLIC

(By Sidney Margolius)

Would you like a cop with muscles to help make sure you aren't deceived, by real experts at deceiving, when you go out to buy?

You'd have a powerful policeman on your beat if the U.S. Senate would approve Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER's proposal to establish a Committee on Consumer Interests. The committee would investigate, inform, and figure out legislation to halt the many gay deceivers who sharpshoot the public today.

The proposal is backed by 15 other Senators. But, ironically, there has been no public support. The proposal is idling away. It will die for lack of gas unless people start telling their Senators they want this committee.

Of all the proposals now being advanced in Washington for protecting consumers, this watchdog committee is potentially the most quickly useful, as shown by the success of the Kefauver subcommittee's investigation of drug prices. The drug hearings not only spurred efforts by unions and other groups to find ways of buying medicines at reduced prices, but actually have helped deflate drug prices. Ever since June, the Labor Department's consumer price index has shown a gradual decline in prices of prescriptions and other medicines.

Three leading deceivers currently begging for congressional investigation, and for your own awareness to avoid being fooled, are:

The increasing trend to what we can only call imitation foods—watered meats, ready-prepared foods with various cheap fillers, etc.

For example, the Kansas State Food and Drug Division is carrying on a running battle against products sold under such names as Chef's Delight, Dairy Spread, Protein Loaf, etc. Evan Wright, division director, says these products are, in fact, imitation processed cheese spreads. Such "cheese" products are sold all over these days.

Wright told this reporter that some of these products contain as little as 10 percent cheese and as much as 65 percent water.

Wright reported that State food and drug officials throughout the United States are opposed to the addition of excess water to smoked pork products. The U.S. Agriculture Department is holding public hearings in May in various cities to review the permission to add water to smoked ham granted by the previous administration.

The great amount of buyer-fooling packaging, making it difficult for you to know what you get for your money.

In June, a Senate Antitrust Subcommittee headed by Senator PHILIP HART, Democrat, of Michigan, is going to hold hearings on this trend to fool-the-eye packages. There's plenty to investigate, and you could waste a lot of money between now and June if you don't look for the tiny print stating the number of ounces.

Recently the Grand Street Consumers Co-op in New York showed a display of fool-the-eye packages which startled co-op store customers.

The co-op reported that All had dropped from 23 pounds, 10 ounces, to just 20 pounds, while the price remained the same. Similarly, Kraft caramels changed from a 16-ounce bag to 14-ounce, with the price still 39 cents. And, the co-op suggested, try to find the tiny 14 ounces on the cellophane caramel bag while you're being pushed by a crowd of other shoppers.

Are you also aware of the candy-mint boxes? The Food and Drug Administrattion recently won an important court decision in a case against Delson Thin Mints. The evidence showed that less than half of the total volume of the container and only 75 percent of its practical volume was filled with mints. The remainder of the usable space was taken up with hollow cardboard dividers and end pieces. The court held that you have a right to expect that a non-transparent container of food is reasonably full.

Deceptive interest rates—the most dangerous fooler of them all: Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, "truth in lending" bill has been reintroduced with the cosponsorship of 20 other Senators. The bill would require that you be told the true annual interest rate when you buy on time or borrow money.

As this department has warned many times, rates quoted by banks and finance companies, such as $6 or $7 per $100, are actually true annual interest rates of approximately 12 or 14 percent. Rates quoted by small-loan companies, such as 2 percent a month, are actually 24 percent a year.

Vance Austin, managing director of the Credit Union National Association, warns consumers that passage of this bill is vital. "It's necessary to know the annual rate you pay for credit so you can compare different deals," he advises. "If the price tag clearly shows the simple annual interest rate, you'll be able to make an intelligent comparison of fees charged by different lenders and installment sellers."

Rural Areas Development Program Is at Crossroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on May 15, Clyde T. Ellis, general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, pointed out to 750 Rural Electric Co-op leaders meeting here in Washington how their cooperatives can be utilized as vehicles for carrying out the rural areas development program. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include Mr. Ellis' speech in the RECORD:

VEHICLES OF OPPORTUNITY

We've come a long way toward a realistic rural redevelopment program since our NRECA annual meeting in Dallas. And we still have a long way to go.

At Dallas, you instructed us to help to get the necessary legislation passed. This we have done. You said you wanted the primary responsibility for administering the rural portion of the program lodged in REA. This we are still working on, and we're hopeful.

This can be a fine program—the finest for rural America since the REA program began. Or it can be just another "talking" program, with lots of ideas, lots of studies and investigations and lots of pilot projects—but little action or few practical results.

It seems to me we're just about at the crossroads now. Pretty soon the program will start to go one way or the other.

Which way it goes depends upon a lot of things, and upon a lot of people. It depends in part on the administration, in part on the Congress, and in part on you—and by "you" I mean you personally, your rural electric system, your statewide organization and your National Rural Electric Cooperative Association—for all this is you.

Let's look at the unique role each must play.

The administration must set the pace and call the shots. The basic program and the money to set it up have been authorized. Now the program must be implemented with bold policy decisions and firm delegations of authority. If the administration is slow or timid, this program will bog down before it ever has a chance to get started.

Unless firm administrative delegations are made quickly, the program will settle down into months of haggling between departments and agencies which are unable to agree among themselves on who will do what—and be dissipated into thin air. We've already seen evidence of this.

And finally, once the delegations and basic policy decisions have been set, the administration must provide dynamic and imaginative leadership and this spells promotion.

It will not be enough for the administration to announce that these funds are now available, and any community, corporation, or individual who can qualify invited to apply.

The Federal Government must provide exactly the same kind of leadership it exerted in getting the rural electrification program started. Rural areas development will need the same kind of promotion and technical help the old REA Applications and Loans Division used to provide in creating and furthering our systems. We need and must have men of that same stripe—men who are willing to ride the roads day and night to get new organizations started and stir the imagination and enthusiasm of the people to set their sights high and keep them there.

None of us would be in this rom today and most American farms and rural homes and institutions would still be unelectrified if the REA program had not been actively promoted and supported by the Federal Government after the basic legislation had been passed.

And in my opinion unless that same kind of assistance is given now to this new program, there will be no rural redevelopment as we have envisioned it. We have the lesson of the past. I hope we have the intelligence to profit from that lesson.

On Congress will rest the responsibility for passing new legislation to implement the basic bill and for providing the necessary funds. What Congress has done so far is take the first step toward making a real rural redevelopment program possible. Under the initial legislation a few of the most depressed rural areas can get some help, including financial. Many, many others which need help will not be able to qualify for the financial aid. The funds authorized in the bill will only be a drop in the bucket compared to the total need.

There are other kinds of help, other than financial, that all communities can get, of course, and I will return to that later.

Experience in the initial program will soon reveal what new legislation will be needed. Congress must then follow through to strengthen and perhaps reshape the program.

Assuming efficient administration, then it follows, I believe, that what you do will be more important than anything else to the success of this program.

For regardless of how wisely and boldly the administration and the Congress act, the work is going to have to be done by the local people. All we will have at best in the new program will be opportunity—a real opportunity to rebuild our areas. The same kind of opportunity we had after Congress passed the REA Act. The act didn't electrify rural America, it merely made it possible. It still took people to do it locally—organizations of people locally, some power districts but mostly cooperatives.

With all its monumental effort, REA itself could never have done the rural electrification job alone. The managers, directors and members of the local rural electric systems did that—supported by the membership. Supported, too, by nearly all organizations working in rural America, both Government and non-Government.

The RAD program begins its life with one great asset the rural electrification program did not have. RAD will have the support, cooperation, and leadership potential of the network of rural electric cooperatives and power districts, dynamic, locally controlled corporations, which blanket the areas of greatest need. Let's refer to all of them as cooperatives. In these cooperatives there is a great pool of experienced community leaders, efficient managers and other personnel, and a tradition of unselfish public service.

The local people who own and run the rural electric cooperatives are experienced in running businesses with assets of millions of dollars. They're experienced in working with government agencies, in dealing with other businesses and industries and with other organizations of people. They know the requirements of success.

You are those people. It's inconceivable to me that the new RAD program will not be so designed to utilize your talents and your demonstrated interest to the fullest. Secretary Freeman has indicated that he intends to do just that.

If the rural electric systems are not utilized as vehicles for carrying out the RAD program, I can't see that it has any real chance of success, for they are the ready-made vehicle of opportunity. I do not say that your individual systems should actually administer the program at the local level, but I believe you will have to play the major role in whatever form the local administration takes.

The major difficulty in running a program like RAD in rural areas is the lack of local governmental machinery for administration. The cities are organized down to the block level. City officials, with their staffs are capable of administering such programs. The cities are actually corporations themselves, chartered by the States. Their governmental operation at the local level is both broad and complete.

Nothing like this exists in the rural areas. There is no formal governmental structure, no staff. So there is no effective way for the rural people to help themselves, for example to pool their collective credit, except through some organization of their own—such as the rural electric system or some similar undertaking.

It has seemed to us that one solution to this problem might be the creation of a new type of cooperative, a Rural Development Cooperative, with broad authority to carry out many kinds of projects to aid rural areas. These cooperatives would have the power to borrow government funds, to develop local industry, to build rural community facilities and perhaps to assist with various government credit programs. They could even assist individually owned enterprises, including, say, an incorporated local industry.

Certainly your experience and know-how would be invaluable in the establishment and successful operation of such institutions. If in some instances, State enabling acts are necessary, it can be done, I am sure, just as the electric co-op enabling acts were passed.

Perhaps the job can be done in some other way, too. I hope this conference can develop other ideas—all ideas possible at this time. I do know this. Rural areas are going to have to have better organization before they can do much toward helping themselves. Maybe it's even time for rural and farm leaders to rethink the traditional governmental concepts as they affect rural areas. The city people do not hesitate to rethink along these lines anytime it's to their advantage. In some cases they're abolishing the county concept altogether. They do this very effectively—by eliminating the county through annexation of the territory as part of the city. Or by turning the whole county into a city form of government. At least one such county borders the District of Columbia.

And throughout the Nation, of course, the towns and cities have changed the traditional concept of the politician-mayor. In many places these days the mayor is just a ceremonial figurehead. The business of the city is run by a professional manager. And so is the county to which I referred.

If rural people are to keep pace economically with the cities in our present complex society they have got to have some kind of organization or governmental structure to carry out their desire to help themselves. Only thus can they have dynamic local government. Only thus, for instance, can they pool their collective credit and get decent credit terms as a public group.

The need for help is clear. NRECA President Yarbrough talked about it last night. The mass exodus from rural areas continues, because better-living opportunity lies elsewhere.

There is a point below which any community tends to disintegrate and the people, who can, move away; and conversely, there is a point above which the community tends to hold together and other people move in.

And it's in an effort to help our communities hold together and improve that you have supported these rural redevelopment activities. That's why you're here today in such numbers to find out what you can do.

I'm sure all of us recognize, as President Yarbrough said, that the present program is no panacea. We have not suddenly discovered the magic key that will solve all the problems of rural America. What I feel we have done is take that all-important first step. Much, much more remains to be done.

Since this is primarily a rural electric audience, I also want to emphasize that success in this area will intensify some of our other pressing problems—in particular the problems of power supply and territorial integrity.

As I said at our national meeting in Dallas, these three overall problems cannot be separated. We need bold, giant steps in each area.

And while the new REA Administrator, Mr. Clapp, is here, I want to say publicly to him, as I have done privately and in my magazine column this month, how encouraged we are by the fine policy statements he has made on each of these problems. It's good to know that REA stands foursquare behind its borrowers, and that the REA Administrator speaks out bodly and courageously in areas that have been controversial.

This meeting got off to a fine start last night, and I'm sure you will find today's program interesting and informative and well worth your trip here. I hope, too, you will remain over for the next 2 days and participate in the George W. Norris centennial program. I think you will not find these two meetings unrelated. You are all invited.

Now I want to join you in hearing our experts tell us about rural area development.

The Right Time for Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, as Marguerite Higgins, in today's New York Herald Tribune, points out, the time for a nation's courage to show itself to the world does not depend upon the "right" time or the "wrong" time, when this courage is based upon fighting for principles:

THE DOCTRINE OF WRONG WARS
(By Marguerite Higgins)

WASHINGTON.—If there is a wrong war, just what is a right war? Remember Korea? It was the first of the wars that the Defense Department generals led by Omar Bradley dubbed as the wrong war at the wrong time in the wrong place—a doctrine that is as false as it is dangerous.

For the basic premise of this doctrine—that, for democracies, there can be right wars at the right place at the right time—is completely contrary to the realities of our world.

Who chooses the time, place—and very often—the kind of battle? The passing years haven't changed the facts of war very much and in the 20th century it is still the side that starts the fight.

But by accepted Western doctrine, neither the United States nor anybody on its side would strike first in a fight against the Kremlin and its allies. And since the Communists strike first, gaining the right of choice, why should they ever confront the West with anything but the most disadvantageous terrain, the most confused picture and the grimmest of alternatives?

In Korea, as in Laos, the Communists attacked in terrain which the Pentagon viewed with dismay and at a geographical point so remote as to cause the planners to concentrate on ways of staying out instead of getting in. ("Let's not get bogged down on the mainland of Asia," the saying went.)

In Korea, as in Laos, it was said that the native army just won't fight.

In Korea, as in Laos, charges were made that corruption and apathy in the government made the country scarcely susceptible of rescue.

But in Korea—and not in Laos—the United States intervened, for the State Department and the White House overruled the military reservations and for two main reasons: nonintervention—failure to at least try and help a protegé—would have shaken the faith of all of free Asia in the value of American protection; second, an unopposed Communist victory would have emboldened the Kremlin to who knows what further aggressions.

In the case of Korea, Washington was able to act on the international and psychological merits of the case. In Laos when the moment for intervention came and went (and it may yet come back), President Kennedy could not help but be restrained by factors external to the immediate Asian situation—the need to repair the damage done to his administration's image by the Cuban affair.

But was Korea a "wrong war," as some polemicists now claim in arguing, of all things, that what happened there is a reason for not going into Laos?

It's true that in the first terrible days in Korea we began to learn how much we had underestimated the Communist enemy and the word "Dunkirk" was no stranger to our typewriters. But we did learn. Our forces rallied and—lest we forget—our armies were grinding back those Communists, including those awesome sounding but not awesome fighting Chinese hordes and it was they, the Communists, not we who publicly sued for peace. It was acting Soviet Foreign Minister Malik, not Secretary of State Acheson, who made the truce plea.

And without the lessons of Korea—half-learned though they may be—where would America be now? In the month before the Korean war broke out, President Truman had said America was "stronger than ever in peacetime history" and General Bradley had told Congress that the U.S. economy "cannot afford" a defense budget of more than $13 billion a year.

Yet within 3 days of the outbreak of the Korean war we found out that American bazookas were no match for Soviet tanks and within a year of Bradley's dictum the U.S. defense budget was pushing $50 billion a year. What Korea should have taught America is that it has the capacity to afford anything whatsoever necessary to its survival, if it also has the will.

A decade ago this was written of Korea: "Despite its many tragedies, we know now that it is fortunate for our world that it resisted Red aggression at that time and in that place. Korea has served as a kind of international alarm clock to wake up the world * * * nothing can make up for the licking we took in the early days. But those men in their icy graves will have died for something vital if their warning galvanizes us to the point of becoming so strong, that we will win, at the least possible cost, the struggle we cannot escape because the enemy will not cease attacking."

Today to me these words, which are my own, are sadly disturbing. For who can help but wonder whether our Nation will ever be so galvanized, especially when the false doctrine of wrong wars is being given as valid reason for the wrong deed: retreat at Communist gunpoint?

At Least With Pruning Shears

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, since the Ways and Means Committee is now considering the extension of the 10 percent discriminatory Federal excise tax on automobiles, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues a very lucid discussion of this tax. This is an editorial by Publisher Robert B. Powers, of Ward's Automotive Reports, which will appear in the forthcoming Automotive Yearbook. Mr. Powers' editorial follows:

AT LEAST WITH PRUNING SHEARS

No family possession has as great a dollar tax levied on it as the essential family car.

In the typical State close to $700 out of a $2,500 car goes for taxes—Federal and State.

With 50 percent of new cars purchased by families earning less than $5,000 a year, it is small wonder that the average family car becomes something of an heirloom before it is traded in for a new car—or for a safer used model.

Of the 55 million cars on the roads and highways of the United States, more than a third—18 million—are 4 years old or more. Of these, 1,164,000 are pre-war models. Many of these cars are not safe to drive or to meet on the road.

In 1960 the garages of the Nation received 61 million emergency calls. The bulk of these calls was for battery, tire, electrical, brake failure—failure due to a great extent—to neglected repairs or make-shift repairs.

Many of these failures were accompanied by death, injury, and property damage.

The annual loss in the United States in life and in the wages of the injured reads like the casualties of a world conflict and the annual appropriation for foreign aid.

Much of this economic and human loss can be traced to the reluctance or inability of the family bread-winner to pay for a new car, a better used car, or to make expensive car repairs.

We can understand why a legislative tax committee scrounging in all corners of our national life for more tax dollars would be reluctant to recommend—especially in this tax-hungry emergency year—the elimination of the annual $4 billion take on the punitive 10 percent Federal auto excise tax.

Creative legislation, as we have pointed out before, however, could make up these tax billions—and more—by a general manufacturers' tax of 3 or 4 percent.

Over the years congressional tax committees have been snipping away at the conglomerate Federal excise tax structure. And usually only as a result of persuasion by a well organized pressure group.

Last year was another "crisis year" as far as the annual search for more tax money was concerned. Congress nevertheless saw fit to cut in half the Federal tax on certain saloon and night club tabs.

On another year, the amusement industry was benefited by a somewhat similar preferential tax reduction treatment.

Despite our arrival on the New Frontier, with its promise of dealing with neglected problems, this is probably not the year to expect Congress to produce a new, simplified and more equitable tax structure.

There is some urgency, however, in getting out the pruning shears and assisting in the correction of a national problem that reaches into the lives and pocketbooks of a large segment of our population and into the Federal Treasury as well.

It is this never-ending problem and concern to make the highways safer from controllable hazards. Assuring greater safety with and from aging cars in need of repairs could be a giant step.

To the head of a household of five or more earning less than $5,000 a year, an extra Federal tax dollar or two on a tire or a battery, or a connecting rod, often makes the difference between his taking a chance with life or playing it safe.

A government so rightly concerned with the welfare of the unemployed, the underprivileged, the underpaid, should be equally concerned with their safety on the streets and highways.

Removing the Federal excise tax, at least from replacement parts, tires and batteries, could spur millions of our population to stop playing Russian roulette on the highways with the family car.

The dollar loss to the Federal Government would be made up—and more—by keeping workers on the job instead of on the hospital bed.

Mr. Legislator, as the saying goes—"It doesn't cost, it pays." And this is the year for action—at least with pruning shears.

The Mind of John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in the May 8, 1961, issue of the New Republic. It presents a clear and incisive portrait of the President's intellect and his method of gaining information—the importance of which is recognized by all of us. Information is probably the most important single item in government: without it none of us could function in the decisionmaking situations inherent in our way of life:

THE MIND OF JOHN F. KENNEDY

(By Frederic W. Collins [1])

One of the most stylish weddings of this or any other year united the mind of John F. Kennedy with the Presidency of the United States. While the intensity of the courtship

[1] Veteran Washington Correspondent Frederic W. Collins wrote this article—before the unsuccessful U.S.-supported landing of Cuban exiles—as a picture of "what seem to be continuing qualities of mind, a picture which is not altered by a single transitory event."

had been observable to the whole public for a year and more, it was not evident until after the ceremony just how deeply the mind was in love with the job. Ambition, extroverted self-esteem, and the other routine motivations of politicians can explain the pursuit, but the unflawed happiness the mind finds in its union with the Presidency is something that makes this Presidency new and different.

A large body of expert testimony about the quality and properties of the Kennedy mind is available in Washington, largely because the President attracts to himself people who are interested in—as a spectator sport—among many other things, minds. Out of this expert testimony, separate properties of the Kennedy mind can be isolated and described on authority. Some of the principal ones, in summary, are these:

A compulsive instinct for inquiry, effectively used. Utter independence. A range of concern which thrusts the Presidency far out and deep down in the Government. An insistence on extracting decisions from a sum total of original materials instead of from alternatives precooked by staff. An ease of decision, including decision on what needs to be decided, and when. A talent for suspended judgment, strikingly described as "an ability to live with chaos." An instinct for the relevant. A sense of personal responsibility equaling the most rigorous doctrine of command responsibility. Sharp, drift-free tuning which permits movement from the problem to another without overlap or confusion.

An all-encompassing political sensitivity ranging from the world to the ward. An unflagging intent of action. A zest which confers absurdity upon all the melodramatic and maudlin folklore about the loneliness, anguish, and burdens of the Presidency.

These are the properties of the Kennedy mind, and I am by no means one of those ready to conclude, on the strength of the admittedly serious error of his administration in the Cuba case, that they are not the intellectual qualities of a potentially distinguished President.

Kennedy's extraordinary curiosity is linked to an expressed belief that getting information is one of the greatest difficulties confronting a President, that the more people he can see and the more widely he is exposed to different ideas, including clashing ideas, the more effective he can be. Obviously, he has two main ways of getting information: reading, and talking with people. His reading has been rather fully described. His art in discussion is perhaps even more impressive, and less well known.

To Kennedy, it is said by those close to him, conversation and discussion and meeting people are always a means of finding something out or putting into a head something he wants there, or both. One expert on such matters, impressed by Kennedy's skill as an interviewer, called him "the best reporter in town."

One recent day he had as successive visitors G. Frederick Reinhardt, Ambassador designate to Italy, and Lord Louis Mountbatten, Chief of the British Defense Staff, accompanied by Gen. Lyman Lemnitzer, Chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Kennedy had already had two sessions with Reinhardt. This was a farewell. In the environment of their conversation were such circmstances, not spoken of, as the fact that Kennedy is a Catholic, that the United States has no emissary to the Vatican; and that Reinhardt, accredited only to Italy, will in Rome be in the heart of the Vatican's relationship with Italy and the rest of the world. Kennedy gave Reinhardt no explicit instructions. He interviewed him: About his knowledge of the Vatican, Vatican-Italian relations, the role of an ambassador to a capital encompassing the Vatican State, his knowledge of Catholicism, his views on Italy, the governmental problems of Italy, and four or five leading Italian political personalities. It did not seem to be a catechism, but a searching and probing for information. When Reinhardt didn't know an answer, Kennedy did not make it embarrassing but slid the question off as a passing thought; Reinhardt, for his part, no doubt understood he would do well to get the answers for his own need. Kennedy knew the Italian background and knew the Reinhardt background as a career officer. He was educating himself—and the Ambassador. In respect to a preconceived State Department opinion, Kennedy said, "Better challenge that before you act. Let's see if it's still right this year."

In the talk with Mountbatten, who preceded Reinhardt, Kennedy had ranged from Hong Kong to Berlin by way of NATO and such specific problems as nuclear arms for NATO. In each case he got an opinion from Mountbatten. In turn, Mountbatten got a vivid impression of what was in Kennedy's mind. While the President of the United States cannot dictate NATO policy, Kennedy certainly planted ideas in the Mountbatten mind which would color his thinking and are probably bound to affect policy.

The interview demonstrated the retentiveness of Kennedy's mind. With Mountbatten, he discussed Berlin contingency plans. It had been 6 weeks or more since the Kennedy mind absorbed that information, but it was immediately on call in detail as if, it was remarked, he had been working on it for 20 years. Examples of his power of retention abound. In one press conference he remarked that he was "somewhat familiar" with the disarmament conversations which took place in Geneva "from 1928 to 1929 through 1933–34," when he was in his teens. Various persons independently call that understatement, and testify that Kennedy has almost total recall of that voluminous record. When he first took it in is not known, but it is assured he brushed up on it in the campaign.

The judgment has also been made that through unrelenting inquiry, Kennedy, when he came to interview Robert S. McNamara for the post of Secretary of Defense, was able to employ a broader knowledge of Pentagoniana than Dwight Eisenhower could claim after 37 years in the Army—part of it in the Pentagon—and 8 White House years. The comparison draws malicious chuckles, but is meaningful just the same.

Kennedy's interest in differing opinions and currents of information is so great that he has formalized arrangements for making sure he gets them. That is one of the things the operation conducted by McGeorge Bundy as his special assistant, and Walt W. Rostow as Bundy's deputy, is all about: To give Kennedy information on State Department and Defense Department matters independent of what the Departments provide. This looks awkward and dangerous on an organization chart, but it is asserted that Secretary Rusk and Secretary McNamara know and accept the purpose of the arrangement and there is no resentment.

The importance of information to Kennedy is demonstrated by a converse example. The clumsiest move he has made, the nomination of his friend Earl E. T. Smith, former Ambassador to Cuba, as Ambassador to Switzerland, resulted from a failure of information. Somewhere down the line in the State Department an officer did not make the significant association between Smith's service in Cuba and the present Swiss function of representing U.S. interests there. It is amazing that Kennedy did not make the association himself, or pick it up in his seine, and catch on to the prospect of Swiss resentment. But the failure was complete all around, up and down, and had to be marked as a Kennedy error.

His curiosity may be the most important characteristic of his method of conducting the Presidency. It is indispensable to solo decision. When a matter comes before him, he is the one man who has read all the lessons, heard all the arguments, commands all the information. No one could write down for him all the considerations involved. He has acquired them for himself from all his sources, or he doesn't have them.

There is evidence that Kennedy consciously wills it that way. The speed and vigor with which he brushhooked his way through the committee growth in the Government reflects his resistance to, and his rejection of, preordained decisions, his refusal to choose among alternatives formulated elsewhere than in his own mind. There is dependable testimony that Kennedy understands, as Churchill understood, the danger built into any organization that alternatives will be so defined by staff as to mean the staff is dictating executive decision. Any President learns that the Presidency is not a collective office. Kennedy seems to have known this instinctively at once.

Kennedy's solo performance as a decider arises also from a sense of personal responsibility which has been developed, it must be assumed, by his whole background, upbringing, and training. To those around him, it is symbolized by the physical mass of the papers on his desk, and displayed in his insistence on knowing the name and the face of every person in the pattern of responsibility centered in himself. He takes all the responsibility which is his, and expects others to take all which is theirs. But, as in the case of a ship's captain, the total responsibility for the whole system comes, in his mind, to lie upon no one but himself.

One of the happiest gifts of the Kennedy mind, for its own sake, may be a talent for deciding what needs to be decided. He may make a decision when it is ready, or when it is easy and might as well be got out of the way, or when it is to his advantage to do so. He does not make others which do not need to be made (which is different from deferring decision), which saves a certain amount of wear and tear. But he is evidently quite capable of making decisions when all the circumstances say the act of decision will be most difficult.

Laos was one such situation which came to require decision under pressure. It was on his desk when he walked into the White House. It had been a major subject of discussion between him and President Eisenhower in their first meeting during the transition, and the major subject of their meeting on January 19, the day before inauguration. Kennedy put a task force to work on the subject. He read the intelligence reports every day and could see that the situation not only was not solving itself but getting worse. He began to ask questions: "We're backing Phoumi—who's for Souvanna? Why not have him on our side? Isn't there any plan except to sit and watch the British wait for a note?" Early in March he called a conference of his Government from which there issued some 20 decisions setting military and political measures in motion to support a central decision that the United States should take action. At that point there was no emergency, but the clear prospect that one was develing unless action occurred. Ambassador Thompson was instructed to talk with Khrushchev, Ambassdaor Stevenson to talk with Gromyko. Then, as the week of March 20 began, Kennedy conducted a review of what had been done, including steps taken to convey to the Soviet Union a sense of the seriousness with which the United States viewed the situation. He then decided it was time to tell the public, time to tell Congress, and time for him to talk with Gromyko (which he did on the 27th).

Secretary Rusk and Secretary McNamara were sent to the Capitol to brief the leadership of Congress and report back on their reaction. He had a press conference scheduled for Wednesday the 22d, which he moved to the 23d and into prime time at 6 p.m. He himself decided on the map presentation as the best means of dramatizing what he was talking about. He himself rejected any reference to Laos as a "small country" (it is the world that is small) and spoke of it as "three times the size of Austria." He himself designed and edited his statement to fulfill a prescription of no threats, but clarity and firmness. He rejected the idea of a fireside chat in favor of a press conference at which he could offer "warning and knowledge" to the public.

If that is a history of multiple decisions of first magnitude, it is also, to those who observed it, an example of the Kennedy "ability to live with chaos." That quality can also be observed in domestic affairs. Waiting for Congress to act is almost by definition the art of living with chaos. The strategic decision to discard the enticements of a razzle-dazzle first 100 days until Congress had been brought more effectively under the Kennedy influence reflected the same capacity. The deferring of broad Federal actions to get at the bedrock problem of the lagging growth rate is another example—a recognition of the "education gap" and "the vote gap" represented by the public's failure to share Kennedy's urgency about the economic gap, and the shortage of congressional votes to support his proposals for closing it.

But in daily practice, this quality of Kennedy's mind is shown to those around him by the fact that whatever his first inclination may be, he is always ready to listen to the last person—provided that person is counted worth listening to—even though what he says may be contrary to a fairly strong first inclination in the Kennedy mind. This suspension of judgment produced a mental picture of Kennedy listening to arguments within his own mind as he listens to a presentation. If he is listening to hard data on a new weapon, he is also listening to inner advice from other parts of his mind about its effect on the budget, its meaning in politics, its influence on relations with allies, and the probable reaction from adversaries. But he does not stop listening to the data, because if the weapon is no good, none of his projections from it mean anything.

This marshaling of related considerations is also what is meant in describing Kennedy's mind as political in the most all-encompassing sense. The whole of politics, in other words, is to such a mind a seamless fabric, in which a handshaking session with a delegation of women is an exercise directly related to hearing a report from a task force on Laos.

The bounds of Presidential concern in the Kennedy government are not yet fixed, but certainly they extend further out and deeper down than usual. It is not at all unusual for him to telephone direct to an assistant desk officer in the State Department—not a desk officer, but an assistant—and put a question. Before hanging up, he tells the officer to let Secretary Rusk know the call was made. The relatively small matters with which Kennedy concerns himself in detail show up time and again in his press conferences.

Very recently, for example, he reported the sale of a surplus Navy building in West Virginia to a private firm. The idea was that this was a step in economic redevelopment. It seemed to reporters to be awfully small potatoes for a President to be handling, and there is, indeed, a question whether at some point the expanding boundaries of Presidential interest do not run into the law of diminishing returns.

But it takes only an ordinary knowledge of government to suggest that such broad-ranging Presidential interest notifies every worker, however far out and low down, that he may for all he knows be working within the area of Kennedy's concern, and that he had better give that some consideration. One result is that Kennedy gets to govern the whole Government to a new high degree, and therein lies one of the promises that this Presidency might outmatch the permanent residue of wilfulness, stubborness, lethargy, and mere bad habits existing in this and any other bureaucracy.

The Kennedy instinct for the relevant is a quality which perhaps has to be taken on faith, but its existence is unanimously testified to by those who deal with him. If it is a big problem, they see him taking hold of something on the edge that matters, and following it to the center.

But there is no question about his ability to keep problems separate and move from one to the other and back again. To describe him as being seized of a problem would be wrong. When he is working on problem A and problem B requires his attention, it does not intrude upon him. He is not distracted. He accomplishes a complete transfer of his mind from one to the other. And when he goes back to Problem A he knows where his place was without a bookmark. The afternoon the Congo crisis boiled up in the United Nations, Kennedy was engaged in a conference in his office on a supplemental appropriation request, a distinctly complicated piece of business. In the middle of it he got a call from Adlai Stevenson at the U.N. He moved from a side chair to his desk—and from one subject to another. After listening to Stevenson a bit, he broke in to ask, without any trimmings: "What about Gizenga? What about his legitimacy?" (As an example, by the way, of instinct for the relevant.) His conversation with Stevenson over, he moved back to his side chair and with a purely pro forma "Where were we?" picked up on the appropriation bill with an immediate series of informed and penetrating questions.

Saturday, March 25, was an extremely busy day for Kennedy. He dispatched a message to President de Gaulle on Laos. He made a quick decision to fly to Palm Beach to see Prime Minister Macmillan. He had conferences on both those subjects and on his meeting with Gromyko on the coming Monday. Forty-five minutes before takeoff for Palm Beach, he found himself with nothing to do. Quite evidently dismissing all the other matters from his mind, he set himself at the task of dotting i's and crossing t's—and doing some undotting and uncrossing—in a message on oceanography he wished to send to Congress the next week.

Kennedy obviously could not do so much without employing a rigorous order of values and priorities. Not everything a President does is of first importance, and matters of lesser importance must be restricted in the exactions they may make upon him. The appointment of Charles M. Meriwether, of Alabama, as a Director of the Export-Import Bank, probably fell within the category of lesser matters in the Kennedy scale. Meriwether's association with political champions of white supremacy in Alabama campaigns kicked up a fuss. There were, on the other hand, orthodox political reasons for the appointment. Kennedy resented the criticism; he was unusually brusque in response to press conference questions about the appointment. It may be justifiably speculated that his resentment resulted not from thin skin, but from a feeling that he had given the matter the consideration it was worth, had exercised in other appointments at each level the appropriate degree of care, had exercised maximum care in those of most vital importance, and ought to be criticized on the total performance, not on one time at bat. On the other hand, the broader philosophical proposition that southern politicians will never change if national preferment is bestowed on them despite their adherence to rejected ideology does not seem to have played any part in his decision.

The Kennedy mind's inherent intent of action pervades his whole operation. His virtual abolition of the Cabinet as a formal joint council, his abandonment of the formalism of National Security Council meetings and procedures, his excision of committees, his dismantling of the Operations Coordinating Board as an elaborate follow-up instrument for the NSC, were all aimed in some degree at closing the gap between decision and action. He is not interested in statements of the problem that carry no action consequences. The purpose of his conferences is to balance out the general considerations that relate to a course of action. Under him, the NSC is not a place for generating big papers on broad objectives here and there in the world. It is a place in which policy is exposed to final discussion, where the President confronts a problem and then finally a decision.

His procedures are high speed. Pick up the phone and ask McNamara what he thinks. Pick up the phone and ask Rusk what he thinks. Don't wait for them to get a staff report. Ask somebody going by what he thinks, if his opinion is worth anything. Or let him speak up if he has an opinion, and he ought to have, that's his job. If there has to be a conference, call in the people who belong in it and forget the table of organization, the NSC and the Cabinet. Out of an ad hoc conference of weight equivalent to the NSC, there recently flowed 17 action memos. These chits, recalling the "Action This Day" memos emitted in torrents by the wartime Churchill, may result from a meeting or Kennedy may generate them on his own. Dictated to a secretary, they flow through McGeorge Bundy's office. A paper control was hastily established to keep track of them. It amounts to little more than numbering, and distribution of copies to those who "should know," apart from the addressee. They assume action, eliminating the need for ponderous follow-up.

The Kennedy "task force" intends action. It is not, like a study commission, an elaborate means of putting off action. It is focussed on a problem; its activity forms around that problem and the need for action. Kennedy uses them often: On Laos, Cuba, Vietnam, NATO, minimum wage policy, integration in Federal employment, and so on.

Heading a task force on NATO, Dean Acheson was not expected to write a book, but to produce ideas for action. He perhaps found this out the hard way. When he was still 2 weeks from a final draft of his report, Kennedy began pressing. The result was a rough draft in 4 days, because it was in the rough draft stage that Kennedy wanted to get aboard. Then there was a conference—McNamara look into this, Rusk write a report on that, let's take this paragraph out because it's not really intelligent. Following the conference there were reviews by the departments. There were injections of Kennedy ideas, and when reports from the departments were received, the report had the form of a list of proposals which, it was remarked, the United States could put down on the NATO Council table the next morning. There is no handsomely-bound Acheson study cluttering the Kennedy desk.

One of the cumulative effects of Kennedy's constellation of mental attributes can be summed up by saying that this is a President who has no advisers. The term is used, even by Kennedy, and will go on being used. The fact is, however, that the highest func-

tion of his councillors is to tell him what questions he needs to have the answers to before making a decision. They give judgments, conclusions, opinions, analyses, and information, but there is not one who on any occasion is contributing any more than a part of the mix of materials from which Kennedy's mind will get a decision.

There were a couple of interesting sidelights, in a recent TV interview, on Kennedy's monopoly of decision. He paid warm compliments to a book, "Presidential Power," by one of his assistants, Professor Richard E. Neustadt. But with obvious deliberation he stopped short, when asked, of conceding any specific point on which his conduct of the Presidency had been guided by it. Again, paying equally warm compliments to his Council of Economic Advisers, he remarked, "I'm dependent on the Council for their views of what action we should take." The phrase "their views" carries its own notice that those views are only a part of the material on which Kennedy decides "what action we should take." It is quite evident right now that a host of other considerations, including political realities, go into the mix.

Kennedy's mind is such, indeed, that he tends to advise the "advisers." This happens all the way from minor politics to international affairs. A political aide presenting the pieces of a problem to Kennedy will get back one of his 1–2–3 responses which may mean go ahead as you propose, but will provide reasons for the action which had never occurred to the aide.

Kennedy rejected the implications of the long bilateral negotiations the predecessor Administration had conducted with the Germans on how to get their help in easing the U.S. balance-of-payments problems. (And Douglas Dillon, one of his "advisers" as Secretary of the Treasury, had taken part in those negotiations.) "This is wrong," Kennedy told his "advisers." "It is politically impossible for the Germans to ask their people to give money to the rich Americans. This is a crucial, fundamental imbalance affecting the whole alliance, and it has got to be solved on alliance principles. That's the only way to get acceptance for it among Germans." That approach opened up a wide new assortment of means, which became the basis of fruitful negotiations with the Germans.

The Kennedy mind, at the decision point, seems to close its intake valve and retire within its cranium to be utterly alone with itself, if only for a split second. At that point, it appears to be separated effectively from all the apparatus which has been pouring materials into it. The decision which emerges may run contrary to the weightiest considerations advanced by the associated minds he values the most: From pre-Presidential days there are the examples of his entering the Wisconsin and West Virginia primaries; from Presidential days, the most compelling example is the retardation, for political reasons, of an economic program which as an intellectual concept had won his commitment in full.

A second cumulative effect of the properties of the Kennedy mind is to avoid handling of problems within compartments. Decisions made wholly within the Kennedy mind are made within the whole context of Government and politics, which is the only place the whole context exists, and where compartmentalization can be avoided. It follows that a pattern of policies thus conceived shows an integration not to be achieved by the most elaborate coordinating mechanism in the Government outside the mind.

Kennedy is conscious of, and working on, the problem of how he transmits his power so that it will not be blunted and negated in the Government. The expansion of his area of concern, the direct contact with people at all levels of the Government, the uprooting of committees, the very speed of his activity, the action memos, are ways of dealing with the problem. He himself has said that one of his methods is to gather as many people as he can and then stimulate them.

To close-in students of his Presidency, Kennedy's deliberate generation of rival currents of information and judgment, is a means of transmitting power. In their judgment, Kennedy does not derive an inner satisfaction, such F.D.R. enjoyed, from setting people at cross purposes. But the means by which he obtains independent perspective through clash of opinion or multiple streams of information are also a means of inducing productive tension in the Government. That, and the energy Kennedy puts into the Government from his own supply, combine as the main propulsive force of this Government.

It is also a conscious policy of Kennedy's to make the existing departments and agencies more effective by giving them more responsibility. This is particularly true of the State Department, which in his view has suffered a serious attrition of stature, prestige, and leadership in the public mind in recent years, but it is true of all. It explains Kennedy's observation that while he finds plenary Cabinet sessions a waste of time, the Cabinet will become more than ordinarily important as his administration goes on.

The capacity of the Kennedy mind to sustain the evident intensity and speed of its activity is a question which obviously interests the public, watching him on television to see whether he looks tired or whether his tongue get tangled up.

One answer is that busy as he may be, he has more leisure than anyone else working for him in the top echelon. But it may not be wholly a matter of physical stamina. His load will build up like a coral reef, but faster and in larger increments.

When he becomes preoccupied with Cuba, Laos will still be on his desk, and when he becomes preoccupied perhaps with Berlin, Cuba will still be on his desk beside Laos. There are only so many hours in a day, and only so much energy in Kennedy. The forecast is that there will have to be a shift in emphasis, with the scope and number of his personal involvements in policy shrinking, although the absolute aggregate mass of policy within his direct concern may not. The men around him now generating ideas will find themselves more and more engaged in managerial tasks relating to activities already under way and stubbornly continuing.

But Kennedy's capacity to sustain action is certainly supported by an extraordinary zest. There is nothing he dislikes more, it is testified, than a nice, orderly day with five appointments neatly spaced. With the first 15 minutes he has free in the morning he subpenas Robert from the office of Attorney General for a conference in the presidential office. Then he keeps filling in the gaps in the appointment list until he has guaranteed himself a 12-appointment day of continuous action. A man lacking zest for his job does not deliberately and even joyously fill in gaps in his workload.

The Kennedy mind being what it is, a Kennedy concept of the presidency has already evolved. It is that the Presidency of the United States is conducted by the President. When he says "we," as he usually does, he means "me and my mate, the Presidency."

POSTSCRIPT

As to the role of Mr. Kennedy in connection with the defeated April 17 expedition in Cuba, the point may be made that the event endorses this analysis of the Kennedy mind far more than it might impeach it.

To begin with Kennedy in the Cuban case faced preordained alternatives. A rebel force in being, on the shores of the United States, and by decision other than his own, was a preordained alternative. Its very existence forced a choice between other preordained alternatives: Whether to let it go or not let it go. By no act of Kennedy's, the matter had become, before he took office, one he could not handle in his own way; that is to say, while a policy can be rescinded, an armed force of fervently motivated men, under another flag, cannot.

Second, and perhaps most important of all, there was a failure of information—specifically, accurate information as to the potential of sympathetic internal uprising in Cuba. If an opinion may be ventured, it would seem a pity if Kennedy, on the basis of results in one situation which may literally have defied his best efforts, were yet to change his way of doing things. The carryover of preordained alternatives on his desk will dwindle with some speed. He must overhaul his feedlines of information. His procedures of decision can then be thoroughly tested in an environment of his mind's own creation.

To Use the Past

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, former President Eisenhower has the respect and admiration of every American citizen and I believe everyone will appreciate the editorial that appeared in the Washington Evening Star on May 4:

THOUGHTS WHILE RIDING

Dwight D. Eisenhower's first magazine article since leaving the White House provides a fascinating and not at all surprising insight into the unpretentious personality of the former President.

Writing in the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post, General Eisenhower recalls his thoughts of last January 20, when he ended, "with mixed feelings of satisfaction and regret," almost a half century of public service. He has learned once more for example, how to dial a telephone and how to drive a modern automobile—small chores that had been done for him for so many years. And he writes humorously of the "puzzlement" obviously bothering others about how to address him—as Mr. President, as General, as Ike or even just Mr. Eisenhower.

But it was during his automobile ride with Mrs. Eisenhower, over the familiar route from Washington to Gettysburg, that a lot of memories and a lot of questions, about small matters and large ones, went through his mind. Perhaps most typical of his personality and his longtime sense of duty, perhaps most predictable of any decision he will be called upon to make, is his "simple conclusion" to the question of "what next?" as they arrived at the front door of the Gettysburg farmhouse. These are his own words:

"There is little reason for me or anyone else to think and talk of or to live in the past, smugly hugging to himself memories of successes or futilely bewailing setbacks. The task is to use the past and its experiences to help us peer more clearly into the future and to do our best to make it better.

"This, in my own way, I shall try to do whether I talk or write about farming, Federal aid and grants, mutual security, governmental organization, foreign relations or of political doctrines, political parties or, in fact, just plain politics.

"I think it will be fun; I hope it will be useful."

For our part, we hope it will be fun. And we have no doubt that, out of that half-century of service and of study, General Eisenhower's further reflections and opinions will be most useful.

Israel: A Demonstration of Freedom With Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it was my privilege on Saturday, May 13, 1961, to have been a participant in the ceremonies at Clarksburg, W. Va., commemorating the 13th anniversary of the State of Israel. This bar mitzvah anniversary observance, which afforded me a stimulating and enriching experience, was sponsored by Louis Hiller Lodge No. 727 of the B'nai B'rith, the Sisterhood of the Tree of Life Congregation of Clarksburg, and the Clarksburg Chapter of Hadassah.

Mr. S. J. Birshtein, a prominent civic and business leader of Clarksburg, conducted the gathering as master of ceremonies and reported that the subscription of $15,000 in bonds for Israel was the best in recent years.

Rabbi Elihu E. Elefant, spiritual leader of the Tree of Life Synagogue, offered an inspiring invocation, and warm welcoming addresses were delivered by Mr. Hyman Rosen in behalf of the B'nai B'rith and Mr. Donald Berman, chairman of the Clarksburg Israel Bond Committee.

Among the dramatic highlights of the evening was the lighting of 13 candles for each of Israel's years as an independent state, and one for growth. The participants in this ceremony were Mr. Jake Berman, Mr. H. A. Caplan, Mr. Abraham Chapnick, Mr. Leonard Gotlieb, Mr. Ray Kramer, Mr. Jack Marks, Mr. Albert Rosen, Mr. Jack Schwartz, Mrs. Jack Schwartz, Mrs. A. Robert Marks, Mrs. Sarah Markowitz, Mrs. George Rosen, and Mr. Maxwell Samuel.

Mr. Steve Gaynor, prominent vocalist and comedian from Pittsburgh, added the lighter touches to an evening of encouragement and inspiration.

It was my pleasure on this occasion to confer awards on the two winners of a community essay contest on Israel commemorating the bar mitzvah of Israel, Mr. Robert Lees, age 14, and a student at Central Junior High School, who received the junior award, and Miss Barbara Birshtein, age 16, a junior at Washington Irving High School, winner of the senior award.

Dr. Isadore Buff of Charleston, State chairman of bonds for Israel, and Mrs. Buff were among the honored guests at the celebration, as were also Mr. and Mrs. Julian Blackman, community and State civic leaders from Portsmouth, Va., and Mr. W. G. Stathers, a leading Clarksburg attorney.

As speaker of the even, I was introduced by the Honorable Howard Caplan, a close personal friend and former U.S. attorney for the northern district of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD my remarks delivered at the bar mitzvah celebration of the State of Israel in Clarksburg.

There being no objection, the remarks will be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ISRAEL: A DEMONSTRATION OF FREEDOM WITH RESPONSIBILITY

(An address by Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat, of West Virginia, commemorating the 13th anniversary of the State of Israel bonds for Israel rally, 8:30 p.m., e.s.t., Clarksburg, W. Va., Saturday, May 13, 1961)

Seldom has the ancient ceremony of the bar mitzvah been more symbolically appropriate than this year in its application to the State of Israel. The Jewish nation, the source of much of the greatest moral and religious philosophy of Western civilization, now observes the "coming of age"—the traditional acceptance of moral responsibility—of the State of Israel.

There has probably been no state, not excepting even our own United States, which has achieved statehood with a higher degree of moral consciousness and national self-awareness than has the State of Israel. And the Christian world is reminded today by the State of Israel—as it has been in times past by the Jewish people themselves—of how far we have often strayed from our own moral commandments. Thus, though it is a grim connection to make, there is an almost poetic justice in the Eichmann trial being held in Israel during the year of its bar mitzvah.

For this trial, which is being conducted with the most scrupulous regard for judicial process, is not animated by the desire for vengeance against the man Eichmann. There can be no mortal punishment or vengeance suitable to the ghastly crimes for which he stands accused. Nor is it a trial merely of the Nazi system and the German people who supported it during its days of power. Western civilization itself is, to some extent, on trial. For the Nazi system prospered in one of the most advanced nations of the Western World, and it had its apologists even in the United States and in England. Thus, each of us who, as an adult during the thirties and forties, did less than his utmost to combat the disease of nazism, shares a portion of the guilt for the crimes for which Eichmann is accused. In this sense, the State of Israel, in the year of its bar mitzvah, probes the moral responsibility of the Western World.

The American poet, Robert Frost, during his recent visit to Israel remarked half facetiously that he "looked upon Israel as an American colony." Though it would not do to overstate the point, as in most of Frost's remarks, there is the pungent taste of truth in this one. I refer not only to our official and early recognition of the State of Israel, nor to that country's substantial financial support from Americans of Jewish faith.

Equally important is the hold which Israel has upon the imagination of millions of Americans of every faith because so much of the Israel experience seems related to our own national experience. Like the United States, Israel has drawn its population from the exiles and refugees of many lands—the "ingathering" of the past 13 years, which has almost trebled the population of Israel, being one of the great and dramatic achievements of this century.

And as the United States, the first great democracy of the modern world, was viewed with dislike and anxiety by the monarchies of Europe, so Israel, the first experiment in democracy in the Middle East, is feared and disliked by the Arab autocracies.

Finally, Israel shares the American "frontier experience" in the form of the Negev desert, which comprises half of the entire country. This region, as forbidding as the most wild and barren regions of the American west, has already begun to yield to the genius of Israeli science and the courage and industry of Israeli pioneers.

Thus, as Americans and as participants in the great enterprise of Western civilization we are committed—within certain limitations—to the support of Israel for moral, political and practical reasons.

First, we have been politically involved in the support of an independent and peaceful development of Israel since our support of the United Nations partition out of which the State of Israel emerged. This was further sealed by President Truman's immediate recognition of Israel on May 14, 1948, only a few hours after the final withdrawal of the British forces.

But American political support of Israel is not solely a matter of our keeping trust with past resolutions to serve the rightful and legitimate interests of Israel. We have strong and compelling practical reasons of our own self-interest in our desire to see Israel prosper and flourish in peace. As a cultural enclave of the West, it offers our best hope for the development of democracy in a section of the earth torn by centuries of oriental despotism, intrigue and tribal rivalries. Israel thus offers the best hope for political stability and orderly progress in the Middle East, and hence, our strongest defense against the infiltration of Soviet power.

Though the Middle East has temporarily yielded the headlines to Cuba, Laos and Vietnam, we know that as long as that region is a battleground of the cold war, Russian interests are served by instability and by pitting Israel and the Arab nations against one another, while we must seek to maintain political stability and develop friendship with the Arab nations without sacrificing the claims of Israel.

Another eminently practical reason for our support of Israel is the increasing importance of its role of technical assistance and guidance to the lesser developed countries of Asia and Africa. Commenting on the contributions of foreign specialists to the development of such countries as Ghana, Nigeria, Liberia, Ceylon, and the Philippines, one observer recently remarked:

"Perhaps the most sympathetic figure among these rivals experts is the Israeli, sunburnt, stripped for action; he too comes from a poor land which is making itself richer by sweat and ingenuity. Many in Asia and Africa would prefer to go into partnership with Israel, whose problems are more nearly related, and who, therefore, sees solution in more realistic terms."

In addition to such technical assistance, Israel has provided training in Israel for a significant number of students and civil servants from Asia and Africa. The variety of training and education ranges from a special "in residence" study of Israel cooperative villages by 30 Burmese officials and their families to Japanese scientists doing advanced research at the Weizmann Institute of Science and other Asian and African students engaged in postgraduate studies of mathematics, medicine, architecture, and economics.

A third form of cooperation between Israel and the new states has been the establishment of joint economic enterprises in which Israel provides managerial experts and tech-

nical training for the local personnel, participates in the work, and contributes a substantial share of the capital. Typical of such ventures are the Black Star Line, an Israel-Ghana shipping company, and the Ghana National Construction Co., in both of which companies ownership is vested 60 percent in the Government of Ghana and 40 percent in Israeli principals.

The contributions of Israel to the development of the new states and to the extention of democratic forms of government is perhaps best expressed in the words of an African official from Senegal upon the completion of his tour in Israel, when he declared:

"Naturally many of us are overawed by the Soviet experiment. It's a very tempting road to rapid modernization for an underdeveloped country. But we couldn't stomach the forced labor that goes with it. We don't think parliamentary democracy as it is practiced in certain Western countries can work in Africa, yet most of us are anxious to retain the basic principles of a democratic society. In Israel we see a whole nation working hard for the same goals under a democratic system of government."

Thus, the people of Israel, by virtue of their contest with a harsh and formerly barren land, and out of their heritage of democratic idealism which has withstood the centuries of privation and suffering, may assume a role of leadership among the underdeveloped countries which the larger and more prosperous Western democracies are denied.

But equally binding as our political and practical commitments to Israel, is the debt we owe to Jewish culture and tradition for having first awakened the moral consciousness of Western man. In the history of the Western World perhaps the first truly civilized answer to the question of what each of us owes to his fellow man solely for the sake of man's humanity to man was that given by the writer of Leviticus: "The stranger that dwelleth with you shall be unto you as one born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself; for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt" (Leviticus 19: 34).

The intellectual and spiritual contributions of Judaism were the source of the early nourishment of that which is most precious in Western civilization. The idea of the dignity and integrity of the individual expressed in Job's despairing cry that "I will not sacrifice my integrity"; the ideal of social justice, served in varied ways and by such diverse personalities as Moses and Spinoza, and the belief in the brotherhood of all men as the children of one Creator—these values have shaped the aspirations of Western man and were the source of much of Christianity and Mohammedanism.

Not only did the Jewish people animate Western moral and religious thought by giving the world their own Book in the Old Testament, but it was the Alexandrian Jews who translated the Book of Law, the Pentateuch, into Greek.

It was these Jews and succeeding generations who kept alive the knowledge of classical Greek during the early Middle Ages when the light of learning had been virtually extinguished in Europe. And it was in large part through Jewish philosophers in the service of Moslem courts that classical learning was reborn in Europe, thus laying the foundation for the Renaissance.

This Jewish devotion to the life of the mind—so strong as to have been thought by many Jews and non-Jews as a hereditary trait—has placed the civilized world in lasting debt. Negligible as a political power in the world at large, and representing less than 1 percent of the world population before World War II, the Jewish people have supplied a leadership far out of proportion to their numbers in every field of human arts and sciences.

Of the 257 Nobel Prizes awarded in the first 50 years of this century, 34 were awarded to Jews. Though the intellectual achievements of Jews have been the product of individuals rather than of a group, they have in large part resulted from mobilizing the individual's resources in response to the oppression of the group. This capacity, perhaps more than any other, has been responsible for keeping the Jew alive as a cultural and national identity through 2,000 years of the dispersion.

Nor is there any indication that the well springs of Jewish creativity have been dried by the creation of the State of Israel. To name only one instance: the desalination of sea water on a practical and economic basis—which may well prove to be the greatest scientific boon to mankind in this century—has been further advanced by the scientists of Israel than by those of any other nation.

But whatever the source of Jewish creativity, the modern world would be far poorer but for the artistic and scientific contributions of Jews. Indeed, it is not overstating the case to observe that of the four men who have framed the problems of our century, three were Jews. I refer to Charles Darwin—the only gentile—Karl Marx, Sigmund Freud, and Albert Einstein.

Whatever one may think of the conclusions they reached, the works of these four men opened new ways of thinking and gave an indelible and distinctive stamp to the modern world.

Thus, as legatees of Western civilization and as brothers of the human race we are morally obligated to the cause of a Jewish national homeland. We are thus compelled, not only as an acknowledgment of our debt to Jewish culture, but as insurance against the persecution and oppression which has marked the life of the Jew in Diaspora.

Spinoza, among the most gentle and noble of our great philosophers, once wrote that "A free man thinks of nothing less than of death; and his wisdom is a meditation not of death, but of life." Thus he set forth the text of Israel. For certainly no people has offered its martyrs more bravely or in greater numbers than the Jew. The Christian martyrs of the Roman Empire are numbered in the thousands. The Jews cannot name or number their martyred millions in the world of Christendom, culminating—to the eternal shame of all men—in the ghastly and bestial crematoria of the Nazis.

There has been a further difference between the lot of the Christian martyr and that of the Jew. The Christian died secure in his faith in the reward of immediate afterlife. The Jew received no halo and no promise of reward; and though the idea of an afterlife acquired some popularity after the Dispersion, it has never been the article of faith, the flaming conviction for the Jew that it is for the Christian.

Thus, if Jewish martyrdom had meaning, it was related to the continuity of Judaism and the hope of the ultimate rebirth of a Jewish national homeland. In the moving words of the ancient lament, "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning—let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth, if I prefer not Jerusalem above my chief joy." For this reason also, the free nations of the West—which call themselves Christian—must help justify the nameless martyred millions of Jews.

The two millennia of the Diaspora are drawn to a close. But the epic struggle of the Jewish nation is not at an end, but a new beginning. The State of Israel, as it observes its Bar Mitzvah, has a man's work to do. In the words of Mrs. Golda Meir, Foreign Minister of Israel, in her eloquent address to the United Nations in 1957, "The deserts of the Middle East are in need of water, not bombers. The tens of millions of its inhabitants are craving for the means to live and not for the implements of death."

Israel has shown the way. There, in a desolate and alien land the broken victims of the Nazi horror and destruction brought only their faith and the invincible spirit of free men and women. The desert has retreated under the steady advance of fields of cotton, corn and wheat; forest and vineyard are covering the once barren and eroded hills; and the new city of Eilat has become a thriving port and Israel's outlet to Africa and the Far East.

Under the inspiration of the example of Israel, and with the support of the free nations of the West, these acts may be duplicated in the other countries of the Middle East, and thus bring that region to a new level of civilization. In this way also Israel will serve the spirit of freedom and responsibility.

Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, in this study of the administration's first hundred days, there is not, I believe, a more significant or important trend indicated by acts and omissions than that which lies in the area of foreign policy.

We are living in an age in which the very structure of our civilization, the lives of our people and their offspring yet unborn, the whole future course of history particularly as it has reference to the continuation of the principles of this Republic, are being determined by the conduct of our foreign policy.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, there has never been a period in the lifetime of our Nation in which our lives and liberties, our goals and hopes, were more dependent upon the delicate strands woven into the fabric of our relationship with other nations, with other ideologies rooted deep in the foundations of foreign states.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, the activities of the President and his subordinates in this most sensitive area must be based upon sound, indeed, upon faultless judgment. The lessons of recent history must be ever present in the minds of those who guide the ship of state. This is not, Mr. Speaker, a time for innovation for the sake of innovation, a time to ignore the realities of the situation solely to provide an outlet for the ever-busy minds of those within the administration whose penchant for social experimentation has blinded them to the cold winds that swirl about the fringes of civilization.

With these facts in mind, Mr. Speaker, an examination of the first 100 days of this administration reveals not a parallel with the first 100 days of the New Deal, but rather a trend that brings to mind discomforting thoughts of the 100 days to Waterloo.

Let us examine the drift of American foreign policy since January 20. Has it followed the course charted by the

dictates of past experience? Experience which has taught all reasonable men that any embraces shared with the ravenous Soviet bear will ultimately result in benefit to the bear and the bear alone.

The acts of the Kennedy administration in these first 100 days indicate that it has not.

Much has happened since January 20. The Republican Members of this body have not sought to exploit recent disasters for the very obvious political benefits that might be gained. I do not intend to depart from this policy.

However, Mr. Speaker, I believe that there is a very legitimate question that can be raised over the trend toward appeasement that has manifested itself since the administration took office.

Many of the old Acheson appeasers have reappeared on the scene still befogged by the notion that softness is the best reply to Soviet aggression.

Their hands have been visible in such instances as the release arranged by the State Department and the Attorney General of a Soviet spy caught redhanded in the process of committing espionage against the United States.

Communist propaganda, much of it not bearing the label of the Soviet Union from whence it comes, has been freed from restrictions and permitted to flow into the mainstream of American thought and opinion.

One of the more disquieting aspects of this trend toward appeasement has been the tendency of President Kennedy to make ringing declarations concerning our determination to resist Communist aggression while so many of those formally dedicated to appeasement are still in the background of this administration.

This, I submit, is disquieting since it causes the American people to believe that we are adopting the hard attitudes they favor when, as a matter of fact, precisely the opposite is true.

It is unfortunate, but obviously true, that the hard words are a facade whose only supports are the bean-pole and cornstalk braces of indecision, wishful thinking and the almost Freudian desire to have all the world love the United States regardless of the cost to our national security.

Consistent rumors and vague statements that dart in and out through the dense undergrowth of the English language by administration figures such as Adlai Stevenson, Chester Bowles, and J. K. Galbraith have characterized the administration's attitudes on the question of Red China.

This single question, Mr. Speaker, contains more omens of trouble to come than any other problem now in existence. It illustrates the trend toward softness better than any other subject recently discussed in the Nation's press.

For some years, the U.S. Government has, through the strongest diplomatic pressures, prevented the admission of Red China to the United Nations. Such pressure was necessary since many of our fellow U.N. members were being subjected to relentless campaigns at home demanding admission at all costs.

Because Ambassador Stevenson, Chester Bowles, and J. K. Galbraith, each high in the Kennedy administration have been less than concise in their expressions on the subject, doubt has been sowed around the world as to our real sentiments on the question. Already, the Brazilian and Commonwealth nations have let it be known that they will not support our position any longer.

Mr. Speaker, any signs of a weakening of our position on this matter, and I submit that the failure of many administration officials to take a forthright and unmistakable stand on the subject is, in fact, a sign of weakness, and will inevitably lead to admission of Red China into the U.N. and the ultimate crippling of that body as an instrument of world peace.

We find scant comfort in Mr. Kennedy's description of the Associated Press story out of London on April 12, which said, among other things, that the President had told Prime Minister Macmillan that he would need "12 months to prepare the American people" for the admission of Red China, as inaccurate "in that it stated that we had changed our position on the moratorium."

Mr. Speaker, it may be that my command of the English language is inadequate and leads me to mistaken conclusions, but this statement does not appear to disavow the body of the story—the brainwashing of the American people into accepting a betrayal of the people of China—and it leaves open the real question, the administration's true attitude on the matter.

Admission of Red China to the United Nations, Mr. Speaker, would lead to the eventual loss of all Asia. It would be a betrayal so cynical in its nature that the entire free world would be put on notice that the United States does not stand by its friends—that it only appeases its enemies.

Nor can we find solace in the continual reference by the administration to the legitimate Government of China—the Republic of China—as the Taiwan or Formosa Government. This, I submit, is a harbinger of a two-China policy and I put it to you, Mr. Speaker, that such a policy also represents betrayal.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that the Republican Policy Committee of the House of Representatives took a firm stand in opposing admission of Red China to the United Nations only 3 weeks ago. This stand, contained in a statement of policy unanimously adopted, was carefully documented.

Another area that causes great concern is that in which lies the question of a nuclear test ban.

This shameful masquerade has been going on for years, and it has failed to bear any fruit whatsoever. In the meantime, we have crippled our nuclear capabilities by continuing a unilateral ban on safe underground testing so vital to the development of new fallout-free small weapons. If we are to survive, Mr. Speaker, we must resume such tests immediately should the Soviet Union fail to reach an agreement with us within the next several weeks. Any other course is madness and I cannot avoid calling to mind the injunction that "whom the gods would destroy they first drive mad."

Mr. Speaker, I have tried, in these brief remarks, to point out a disturbing trend toward appeasement which is a product of these first hundred days. There are other instances where this trend has been manifested. The return to secret diplomacy is one such instance. Another is the tendency of our Ambassador to the United Nations to ally himself against our friends and allies in NATO and to join with the Soviet bloc in the vague and unrealistic hope of impressing certain underdeveloped nations whose populace, by virtue of an appalling mass illiteracy and ignorance, is far beyond being impressed by such sophistry as votes in the United Nations. Further, Mr. Speaker, I submit that our votes on the Angola question have now laid us open to a similar situation regarding the Panama Canal Zone.

Mr. Speaker, in closing permit me to sound a warning—if the trend toward unrealistic, wishful thinking and appeasement so manifest in these first hundred days is not corrected at once there may well be a very limited number of 100-day periods left to us during which we can enjoy our liberty and its concomitant blessings.

Facts as Seen in South America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Olathe (Kan.) News of Wednesday, May 10, 1961, pertaining to the state of affairs in South America. A penetrating editorial, it needs no further introduction:

FACTS AS SEEN IN SOUTH AMERICA

The Presidents of two of the more important nations of South America have felt the revolutionary winds sweeping their part of the world, as well as Africa and Asia. In acknowledgment they have joined in this statement:

"The preservation of representative democratic institutions and the consolidation of the principles of freedom and dignity of the human being require with the greatest urgency, an effort of great scope to accelerate development of Latin America and eradicate the ills which afflict the greater part of the peoples of the continent."

Lofty words, those, which convey to the erudite the problems and the immediate needs of these countries. They are couched in such beautiful bureaucratese, that they are only pious expressions with no determined purpose behind them. Rather than inspiring the masses of hungry peasants they rule, to the latter they will be incomprehensible.

Were these heads of states practical politicians and were they effectively to counter the threats of fidelismo and of communism, they would say more simply:

The landed estates will be broken up and divided among the people. Equitable taxes will be assessed and collected from the rich. Law will demand the payment of reasonable minimum wages. Unemployment, sickness, and retirement insurance programs will be established immediately.

Broadcasters Versus Minow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, few recent speeches have been cause for as much cheering as the forthright and challenging message delivered last week by Mr. Newton N. Minow, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, to the broadcasters convention. Tired eyes and bored minds all across our Nation perked up at the news that the viewing public might soon be freed from the tyranny of the TV ratings and that the future holds out the prospect of a bit more qualitative return for their devotion to the medium. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. John Crosby's article from today's Washington Post, entitled "Broadcasters Sure To Challenge Minow," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROADCASTERS SURE TO CHALLENGE MINOW
(By John Crosby)

NEW YORK.—Newton N. Minow, the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, has done the unforgivable thing for a man in his position. He has watched television. Already, the wiseacres on Madison Avenue are spreading the word that the man's an amateur in broadcasting. If he were a professional, he would go yachting with the broadcasters whose affairs he regulates (as did one of his predecessors) or drink with them and be rewarded with a fat legal job after his tenure of office is over.

Minow's tough talk to the broadcasters, probably the toughest speech ever made by an FCC Chairman in office, will be followed—you mark my words—by a fog of propaganda from the broadcasters which will follow these lines: first, it is un-American for the chairman of a regulatory commission to regulate; second, it is a violation of the first amendment for the Chairman of the FCC to look at television (none of the others did) or to harbor opinions about it; third (this has been the battle cry against the critics the last couple of years, he doesn't understand the economics of broadcasting. (The broadcasting industry earns a mere billion and $100 million a year with a mere $222 million profit, and how can you expect anything good for that kind of money?)

Trying to put good programing on is considered censorship and maintaining the general level of mediocrity is freedom of the press. That's the way these guys argue.

The charges Minow made against TV programing—"A procession of game shows, violence, audience participation shows, formula comedies about totally unbelievable families, blood and thunder, mayhem, violence, sadism, murder, western badmen, western goodmen, private eyes, gangsters, more violence and cartoons. And endless commercials"—have all been made before by TV critics and by various other editorial writers and just plain people.

But this blast is different because it comes from the head of the FCC, a man usually seduced or intimidated or both by the lobbyists and propagandists of the broadcasting industry. There was the clear threat that if the broadcasters didn't do something about cleaning their houses, licenses would not be renewed. Well, I've heard that before and nothing has ever happened. We shall just have to wait and see.

While everything Minow said was not only true but glaringly obvious (and it's very difficult to state the obvious), the remedies are not so simple, so long as the business is run the way it is. I mean personal sponsorship of particular programs. If I were a manufacturer of toothpaste, which sponsored a television program, I'm afraid I too would go along with the mob and sponsor a private eye or a situationer (as they call them) or some other popular program. It's asking too much of the toothpaste manufacturers to sponsor an unpopular program, although many of them do just that—more's the wonder of it.

It's the system that's wrong. No single sponsor should have the ownership or responsibility of any single program. And I'm willing to venture the prediction that no amount of railing from either critics or FCC chairmen is going to change the dismal picture of TV programing. No cigarette sponsor is going to give a tinker's damn about what other programs are on the air, only his own. The solution, I'm convinced, is the British system with the insertion of ads as in magazines. The station or network can then take its total revenue and bring about some semblance of unity and sanity in its total programing.

"The squandering of our air waves is no less important than the lavish waste of any precious natural resource." I'm pleased he put it like that, waste is the proper word for it. Television is a national treasure and it should be used for something besides the waste of time. It should not be used as a soporific, draining the national energy and blanking the national imagination.

Newton Minow is a courageous man to state these glaring truths.

Now let us see how the broadcasters plan to grapple with these uncomfortable truths and the man who uttered them. As for the threat not to renew a license just because the licensee asks for it in perpetuity, we should all live so long as to see a single license revoked.

Welcoming Hand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Camden Chronicle, Camden, S.C., of Wednesday, May 3, 1961:

WELCOMING HAND

Nations and peoples abroad want American dollars, and have received them in vast quantity since World War II. Now another element is added. We need and want more money from abroad—more pounds, more francs, more marks, and the rest. Over a period of time, our payments abroad of all kinds have materially exceeded foreign payments made to us. The result is the balance-of-payments deficit and a reduced gold reserve.

A campaign is underway to increase American exports, as a means of remedying the situation. This is vitally needed. So is another step. Free world economic recovery has given great numbers of peoples the means of traveling. Governments have relaxed or eliminated currency restrictions. And the jet airplane has dramatically shrunk the globe.

But there are serious catches. American visa and entrance permit laws are completely out of key with the times. They were designed, apparently, to keep people out—not to induce them to visit us. The redtape is all but endless, and most of it is clearly useless.

We alone, of all the major nations and many of the small ones, are without a foreign tourist and information service. There's no convenient way for interested foreigners to obtain authentic data concerning what they'll find in the United States.

Let's lower the bars, as most free world countries have done, and hold out the welcoming hand. And let's spend the small sum of money that an adequate foreign information service would cost. We'll get it back many times over.

Law Day, U.S.A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. Louis B. Heller, justice of the city court of the city of New York at Law Day ceremonies on May 1, 1961, in trial term, part XXI, of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, county of Kings:

The COURT. Members of the jury, counsel and litigants, I should like to make a few comments. As you know today, May 1, by proclamation of the President is a day that we reaffirm our complete dedication to our form of government and the supremacy of law in our lives. The justices of this court met this morning to bring this message to public attention, and I observed that the members of this jury attended toward the end of the ceremony. Each justice this morning is expected to make a few comments. Mine shall be very brief.

Law Day, U.S.A., is a very significant event in these troubled times during which nearly everything we do is in some measure controlled by the ideological struggle between the free world and the doctrine of communism. Equal justice under the law is one of the foundations of our freedom. There is no system which does more to uphold our freedom than the court system, and both judges and lawyers feel a deep sense of responsibility to the public and the great body of the law. We never relax in our efforts to make its significance understood among the peoples who come here to seek justice. We, therefore, pause this morning before entering upon the business of the court, to reflect upon and remember with pride the great heritage of liberty, justice and equality under the law, which our forefathers bequeated to us, and which we must vigilantly guard.

The principle of guaranteed rights of individuals under the law is the heart and sinew of our Nation and distinguishes our system from the type of government that rules by might alone.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States conceived the idea of celebrating Law Day a good many years ago so that the world could know that our faith and our ideals of democracy will never permit us to lose the courage to uphold them. Dedication to the principle of government under law and loyalty to our country go hand in hand. Good citizens obey the law and good citizens are always loyal to their country.

This day is set aside nationally to show the world that we are united in our determination to oppose any encroachment on our freedom, and this has now become a part of our yearly ritual. And today we all know how close we are to encroachment.

The President in signing the proclamation declaring Law Day has used his pen as a launching pad to blast off a new type of moon into the sky. This moon illuminates human freedom as our offer to the world and that ideal can be more meaningful than any satellites in these days when the strength of man resides in his mind, his brain, and not muscles.

I am sorry to have to state that in this morning's newspaper I noted that in Cuba, Castro has declared that Kennedy will be burned in effigy. Well, there is an old saying that he whom the Lord would destroy he first makes mad.

I have had the great honor, and I feel it very deeply, to have served in the House of Representatives for a number of years with the President of the United States. During this period I learned a little about the problems of the world, and I had an opportunity to observe the President at close range. May I assure all within the hearing of my voice, and believe me this is not to be understood as being a political speech. It is not. I want to assure you that we have a truly dedicated and learned and courageous man as our President, and he will serve this country and the world with intelligence and understanding. We are in safe hands. Let us, therefore, rededicate our thoughts and actions to Americanism to the hilt of its institutions and ideals, to an eagerness to defend it against all enemies, to undivided allegiance to the flag and a desire to secure and guard the blessings of liberty to ourselves and posterity.

Thank you very much.

Toward a Better Educational System—Dr. Marcella R. Kelly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, in this day of emphasis on the quantity of education that America provides for her children, I am pleased to bring forth an example of the work being done to better the quality of that education. We find a trend, too often, to teach young Americans how to fit into our social structure with the result that they assume no real identity at all, satisfy themselves with little more than economic security, and contribute less, eventually, than if they were robust individuals.

Dr. Marcella R. Kelly, asssistant superintendent of schools in Holyoke, Mass., has devoted her life to education. Even more than this, though, she has made a lasting contribtuion to a vital area within the realm of education. She has developed comprehensive programs to give our youngsters the theoretical and factual background of our democratic way of life. They are programs of citizenship and responsibility, rather than security and conformity. They expose the individual principles fundamental to our way of life.

Dr. Kelly and her curriculum have received national recognition. The Freedom Foundation, 2 years ago, acclaimed her elementary school citizenship instruction. This year, Dr. Kelly is 1 of 12 recipients of the Freedom Foundation's American Educators Medal.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial entitled, "An Award Well Earned," from the Holyoke Transcript Telegram of May 11, 1961, which commends and thanks Dr. Kelly:

AN AWARD WELL EARNED

Holyoke proudly applauds Dr. Marcella Kelly on the occasion of her being honored by the Freedom Foundation for her work as an educator in the field of good citizenship. That Dr. Kelly should be 1 of a select group of 12 school administrators chosen from throughout the country for educators medals is most gratifying if not completely surprising.

Dr. Kelly has done conspicuous work in the whole area of citizenship training. The program carried out in our public schools under her initiative and direction has been widely recognized. Holyoke schoolchildren experience in a quiet and sensible way the lessons of respect for the rights of others, recognition of differences among people, and the duties of democracy.

It has been a healthy and refreshing change from the older emphasis on social adjustment as the path to self-centered success. Citizenship training puts responsibility in the place of conformity and a friendly interest in other people in the place of the search for popularity. And one significant aspect is that the children themselves have liked it. It means something to them.

Dr. Kelly's achievement in this area has been the community's good fortune, and the honor now bestowed upon her reflects credit on the schools that have demonstrated her planning so successfully. We add our congratulations to the many that are coming her way today.

Lt. Gen. William Howard Arnold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago Lt. Gen. William Howard Arnold, retired after a distinguished career. At the time of his retirement he was commanding general, 5th U.S. Army, headquarters in Chicago, Ill.

General Arnold was born in the Eighth Congressional District at Dyersburg, Tenn., on January 18, 1901. He graduated from the U.S. Military Academy in 1924, and also the Infantry School, and the Command and General Staff College.

Prior to World War II he served with various infantry units, including a tour of duty at Tientsin, China, 1934–36. He was a member of the staff and faculty, the Infantry School, Fort Benning, Ga., from June 1938 to October 1939.

In April 1943 he proceeded from headquarters, IV Corps at Fort Lewis, Wash., to the South Pacific Theater of Operations. As Chief of Staff, XIV Corps, he participated in the campaigns of Guadalcanal, New Georgia, Bougainville, and the Bismarch Archipelago.

He assumed command of the American infantry division in November 1944, leading it in combat in the Philippines and in the occupation of Japan, remaining in command until deactivation of the division at Fort Lewis in December 1945.

After his return to the United States, General Arnold served in various War Department staff capacities until his assignment August 13, 1950, as Chief, the Joint Military Mission for Aid to Turkey. He was then assigned, on May 1, 1953, to Austria as commanding general, U.S. Forces in that country. He returned to the United States following withdrawal of occupation troops in 1955.

General Arnold assumed the post from which he was retired of commanding general of the 5th U.S. Army in Chicago on November 1, 1955.

He received the following citations and decorations: Distinguished Service Medal and oak leaf cluster, Silver Star, Legion of Merit with oak leaf cluster, Bronze Star Medal with "V" device and oak leaf cluster, Air Medal, Army Commendation Medal, American Defense Service Medal, Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal with arrowhead and four stars, American Campaign Medal, World War II Victory Medal, Army Occupation Medal—Japan, National Defense Service Medal, Philippine Liberation Medal with star, Philippine Legion of Honor Degree of Chief Commander, Philippine Independence Medal, Philippine Presidential Unit Citation, Combat Infantry Badge, War Department General Staff Badge, National Order of the Legion of Honor France Degree Officer.

It has been an honor and pleasure to know General Arnold and he has certainly contributed much to the U.S. Army.

We wish him the best of everything in the many years to come.

The Perils of Appeasement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Edgar A. Mowrer, which appears in the Long Island Press, May 12, dramatically points out the perils of the present administration

policy of appeasement to the Communist tyrant:

WORLD AFFAIRS: FIRM STAND AGAINST REDS DEMANDED

(By Edgar A. Mowrer)

Evidence of a deep and basic division in the American people is mounting. Recently in discussing the John Birch Society, I observed that unfortunate as it was for members of the society to disqualify themselves as fighters against communism by their attacks on democracy, desegregation and the civil rights that are the basis of American civilization, their presence showed the deep and abiding anxiety of increasing numbers of Americans at successive administration's unwillingness to refuse further concessions to Moscow and Peiping.

At the base of this division lies a simple choice—either you understand that the United States is in a war (cold but genuine) which requires victory, or you don't.

If you admit the existence of war you start playing to win, not just bumping back Communist advances. If you don't know we are at war you try to capitalize on the Americans' desire for peace to scare them into successive surrenders by threats of atomic destruction.

You argue that Cuba and Guinea are not really Communist. You insist that the Russians have just as much right to have a missile base in Cuba as we have to have bases in Italy or Turkey or wherever. (This is the same as saying in 1944 that the Nazis had as much right to land on Cape Cod as we had to invade Normandy.)

In other words, you try to ignore the existence of the key fact of existence today—Communist aggression.

Such talk is not merely found in the mouths of pro-Russians like Linus Pauling and Cyrus Eaton (to mention only a pair of prize exhibits). No, it exists in attenuated form even around the White House.

Adlai Stevenson is quoted in the Boston Herald as having said that we "cannot save some countries from going Communist" (why not?) and "ought not be too upset when one of them vanishes behind the Iron Curtain." He also argued, according to Holmes Alexander, who wrote the story that "we ought to stop overstressing the Communist conspiracy." (I hope this story is inaccurate.)

Stevenson is also believed to have been the chief influence that caused President Kennedy in advance of the Cuban invasion, to make the public declaration of no American support, which broke the back of the anti-Castro Cubans' morale.

In fact, certain highly placed advisers came to Washington with three assumptions—all of them mistaken. One was that quiet diplomacy and greater civility would be reciprocated by the Communists. A second was that there existed large areas of potential agreement with the Russians. A third was that the neutrality of certain newly independent nations would strengthen the free world. (Nonalinement of areas and peoples once under anti-Communist control—its exactly what Khrushchev and Mao want, too).

As a result, the foreign policy of the new administration has been fainthearted from the beginning.

President Kennedy made the finest, most stirring declarations heard in many a day. Many of us were thrilled and eager to support him in what looked like a call to win the cold war. But he has retreated in Cuba and Laos.

Secretary of State Rusk has talked big at Oslo, reiterating our resolution to defend our rights in Berlin at any cost. Who believes him? Let Khrushchev offer a new summit to discuss Berlin, and who believes Mr. Kennedy will not come running?

How To Fight Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have received considerable mail from my constituents asking what is the most effective way to fight communism. Much has been written on this subject, but I believe an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times very eloquently summarizes a most effective approach to this entire problem.

I believe this editorial deserves most thorough attention from all of us. Mr. Speaker, the editorial follows:

HOW TO FIGHT COMMUNISM

The arguments that have welled up in the debate about the John Birch Society are reminiscent of the arguments made during the heydey of the late Senator Joseph McCarthy. Now, as then, they show an appalling misconception by a frightening number of well-intentioned Americans about communism—and about the American system of free speech and opinion as well.

When Senator McCarthy was active, his supporters angrily answered criticism of his methods by saying: "McCarthy is fighting communism. Anyone who is against him helps the Communists."

The same theme runs through many of the letters we have received from readers in praise of the John Birch Society since the Sun-Times printed a series of articles on the history, goals and methods of the organization. (Up until noon Friday our letters count was 43 for the society, or critical of our articles, 92 against the society or in praise of the articles.)

The Birch Society was founded as a secret organization by Robert Welch, a former candy manufacturer, who once labeled President Eisenhower and other eminent Americans as tools or agents of communism. Welch believes that social security and the Federal income tax are Communist schemes to soften up America for Communist conquest.

Welch is entitled to hold these views and to preach them, if he wishes. He and his followers may, if they wish, hold the view that Chief Justice Earl Warren, of the U.S. Supreme Court, should be impeached because of the Court's school segregation decision, which Welch believes was brought about by Communists to foment civil war.

By the same American right to free speech and opinion, other Americans are entitled to disagree with Welch and to consider him and his followers as crackpots, without being subject to abuse, gossip, and community ostracization. These are precisely the methods and weapons used by Communists to impress their views on communities; in Red China, for example, brainwashing and ostracization are employed to force acceptance of communism.

Americans have a right to voice opinions critical of Welch and his associates without, in turn, being accused of being anti-anti-Communist, whatever that means.

Because the Sun-Times told the story of the Birch Society and its members, some of its sympathizers wrote in that we were discrediting other good anti-Communist organizations, such as the American Legion, the Knights of Columbus, etc. This is manifest nonsense. The Birch Society is discredited in the minds of its critics because it pursues the methods used by Communists themselves. Moreover, as Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy said last week, the Birch Society is making no contribution in the fight against communism and is, in fact, a hindrance in the fight.

And how, the Birchists argue, should the Communists be fought?

A good answer for the question will be given in Chicago starting tomorrow when some of the Nation's most important industrialists, educators, military, and professional men meet here to conduct the Seventh Annual Military Industrial-Educational Conference of the Institute for American Strategy. They will discuss and exchange ideas on the most fundamental step in fighting communism: Teaching what communism is—and isn't—and what democracy is.

Americans can't fight communism if they don't know what it is or what democracy is. There is an ignorance on those subjects in the United States that is appalling. That ignorance is reflected in support for Welch.

The conference to be held tomorrow at the Hotel Sherman will tackle the problem of dispelling ignorance by improving methods of teaching communism and democracy at the high school level.

This is the same objective recently set forth by the American Bar Association. Some of the cooperating agencies of the conference to be held in the Hotel Sherman are the American Legion, Freedom Foundation at Valley Forge, Loyola, De Paul, and Notre Dame Universities, the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry, Armour Research Foundation, and the Armed Forces.

When we say that this organization is taking an effective and important attitude toward fighting communism—as distinguinished from an organization such as the Birch Society—we will have in mind some of its basic tenets. Here in the words of Dean John H. Fischer, Teacher's College, Columbia University, a member of the institute's educational advisory committee, are some appropriate observations:

"There are Americans * * * whose attitude toward communism is under all circumstances to avoid it. * * * To follow such a policy in schools would make selective ignorance a goal of education. * * *

"A somewhat more aggressive approach, rooted in fear rather than hope, sees communism as a menace to the unwary and would counter the danger by teaching Americans to hate it. Those who espouse this line are unwilling to trust students ever to reach reliable value judgments through the objective study of facts and principles involved. These people prefer to teach for the specific purpose of inducing a predetermined negative emotional response.

"The unfortunate practice of using the word 'Communist' as a political epithet will not be eliminated unless it is recognized and attacked through education. One of the outcomes of our teaching should be the development of an awareness on the part of students that a person is not to be labeled a Communist merely because his views on racial segregation may be somewhat more liberal than his Senator's, or because he sees merit in the TVA. The silly nonsense that calls an experimental school report card in a primary school a machination of the Kremlin should be exposed for what it is. In order to understand the actual threat of communism, Americans must learn to distinguish between the Leninist and the liberal, between what is communistic and the nonconforming."

This is a primary lesson not only on communism but democracy. To be effective, this lesson must be learned and believed. Members of the Birch Society who do learn it, we expect, will change their procedures

or resign and join up with an organization such as the Institute for American Strategy, which is helping, not hindering, the fight against communism.

Those Fundraising Letters—The Difference Is—One Is a Democrat, the Other a Republican

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, a leader of the Republican Party made headlines over the weekend with a typical political press release criticizing Democratic solicitation of Government personnel to attend a dinner celebrating the President's birthday.

The interesting point is, I do not recall the same gentleman having made similar protest when the Republicans resorted to the identical practice when they were in control of the national administration. I dare say, the gentleman's own Republican Party went much farther. But there was no cry of indignation from the gentleman.

The nationally recognized columnist Drew Pearson, sizes up the way some people look upon these situations in his news column of May 11. Mr. Pearson has been around Washington for a long time. He is thoroughly qualified to make a factual appraisal of the Republican attempt to stir up a controversy over a political fund raising dinner—an institution both parties rely on to provide operating expenses.

Mr. Pearson's column follows:

WHAT ICKES WOULD HAVE SAID

(By Drew Pearson)

WASHINGTON.—When a friend of the Secretary of the Interior was found writing letters to oil executives to raise money for President Kennedy's birthday dinner, this town shook with consternation. Secretary Udall covered his head with sackcloth and ashes. President Kennedy acted as if someone had been caught taking a vicuna coat. And part of the press gyrated as if Udall had been caught with his hand in the gold vault at Fort Knox, Ky.

There was once another Secretary of the Interior, the man who served longest in history, named Harold Ickes, also in charge of the Public Works Administration, who was severely criticized because an aid wrote several thousand letters asking PWA personnel to buy copies of Ickes' book, "The Old Curmudgeon," Ickes did not run for cover.

Ickes was also War Petroleum Administrator and once brought howls of anguish from the press when he permitted his Government limousine to tote eggs from his farm at Olney, Md., to Washington, D.C., while he was driving to work. Ickes took the nitpicking in his stride.

Those were days when the President—F.D.R.—was surrounded by vigorous Cabinet officers like Henry Wallace, Harry Hopkins, Henry Morgenthau, who took the rap, sometimes undeservedly, for their chief while the President went unscathed. Eisenhower used the same technique. He got a vicuna coat as well as Sherman Adams, but few people remember that.

This is tried and proven political technique—not only for Presidents, but for military commanders and heads of big electrical companies which get caught violating the Sherman antitrust laws.

Harry Truman didn't use the technique. He stood up and took full responsibility for firing General MacArthur instead of the Defense Department. And Kennedy took full responsibility for the fiasco in Cuba, though obviously he inherited much of it.

This is laudable. However, there is something to be said for the other technique of having the commander in chief stay behind the lines, away from the shot and shell, while subordinates get wounded in the frontline. Wounds are necessary in battle.

THE OLD CURMUDGEON

If Old Curmudgeon Ickes had been Secretary of the Interior when the Republican press howled about the recent letters of political solicitation sent by a friend to oilmen, he would have held a press conference and spoken as follows:

"I have in my hand a photostat of a check for $5,000 signed by Howard Keck of the Superior Oil Co., and made out to the Eisenhower dinner committee. It is dated January 10, 1956, which was right in the middle of the debate on the natural gas bill.

"Mr. Howard Keck and Superior Oil," Mr. Ickes would have continued, "are the very same people whose lobbyists got caught trying to bribe Senator CASE of South Dakota during the gas debate.

"I am a bit surprised that the press would howl so loudly about some letters written by a friend to raise some money for the birthday dinner of one President when they completely ignored this check for $5,000 contributed—and cashed—for the anniversary dinner of another President.

"Perhaps the difference is that one is a Democrat, the other a Republican.

"But after all $5,000 in the hand is a lot more important than a lot of letters in the bush.

"The protests over these letters are the kind that should have been made over a tractor with a radio set which was given to a certain farm," the old curmudgeon would have continued, "or over that planting of Norway spruce with $300,000 worth of other gifts, including a putting green, which were donated to that certain farm.

"I am curious as to why the press gets in such a lather over letters raising money for a President's birthday dinner which were certainly not secret, but doesn't let out a peep of protest when a former President of the United States permitted three oilmen, Alton Jones of Cities Service, Billy Byars of Temple, Tex., and George Allen, to pay the entire cost, secretly, of his Gettysburg farm.

"I am especially curious about this, since never in history has any President permitted so many rich rewards—tidelands oil, the stacking of the Federal Power Commission, permits to drill for oil in wildlife refuges—to be handed the oil industry.

"'Of course' the venerable Secretary of the Interior would have said 'oil contributions are the accepted way of political life. If the Republican Party did not get its contribution of $152,600 from the Rockefeller family of Standard Oil or its $216,800 from the Pew family of Sun Oil, or its $100,150 from the Mellon family of Gulf Oil, as it did in the last Eisenhower election, it would feel robbed and cheated.

"So perhaps these soliciting letters sent out by a Shell Oil man, which is Dutch, aren't so bad. After all, Dutch Oil has little or no concessions to seek from the Department of the Interior."

Thus would have sounded off the man who served as Secretary of the Interior longer than anyone else in history.

Small Business Administration Steps Up Programs, To Help Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues an address by Mr. Irving Maness, Deputy Administrator for Procurement and Technical Assistance, Small Business Administration, before the first meeting of the Temple University Government Contracts Association, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa., May 10, 1961. Mr. Maness' remarks indicate that the new leadership of the Small Business Administration has taken bold and decisive steps to improve the economic climate for the Nation's small business concerns.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY IRVING MANESS, DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR FOR PROCUREMENT AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, BEFORE THE FIRST MEETING OF THE TEMPLE UNIVERSITY GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS ASSOCIATION, TEMPLE UNIVERSITY, PHILADELPHIA, PA., MAY 10, 1961

Since I am here in Philadelphia tonight, I think it is appropriate to quote Benjamin Franklin: "No nation," he said, "was ever ruined by trade." Trade is what we are here to talk about tonight; more specifically, how small business can increase its share of trade with the Federal Government.

You people, I know, are not novices on this subject. Stanley Cantor has informed me that Temple University has been offering a course, "negotiating and administering Government contracts," since 1955, and has now taken the further step of sponsoring the Temple University Government Contracts Association.

I congratulate Temple University, Mr. Cantor, and you members of the newly formed Government Contracts Association. You are all experts in the field of Government contracts procurement; you are gathered here to pool your knowledge and to work together to do a more effective job of obtaining Government contracts for your firms and performing them efficiently, and on time.

Administering a Government contract is most important. It does no good for the individual small firm, or for the Government, to have a contract that is not properly carried through to completion.

But I have no intention tonight of delivering a long discourse on the highly complicated subject of Government contracting. This is a field in which you are experts.

What I propose to do is to tell you briefly about the Small Business Administration's many programs to help small business, including Government contracts assistance, and beyond that to tell you something of the change of climate in Washington that I think is going to open up great new avenues of opportunity for small firms to trade with the Federal Government.

Trade cannot exist without opportunity. Too often in the past the small fellow who was willing and eager to add his productiveness to help meet his country's productive needs, has not had an opportunity to do so. That is now being changed.

You have all read in the papers recently of vigorous antitrust action being taken by the Government, and of steps being taken to stamp out identical bids and other collusive

bidding practices. Your Government is also taking vigorous action to open up a larger share of Government contracts to small firms, and to create a climate in which small business can play a more vigorous role.

In his state of the Union message, the President said: "We cannot afford to waste idle hours and empty plants while awaiting the end of a recession. We must show the free world what a free economy can do—to reduce unemployment to put unused capacity to work, to spur new productivity, and to foster higher economic growth within a framework of sound fiscal policies and relative price stability."

I can assure you that the Small Business Administration agrees completely with his aim, and is determined to use its resources to help achieve the President's goal.

Here are some of the recent steps we have taken in the Small Business Administration to make our programs of assistance to small firms more effective.

President Kennedy's recent directive to the Department of Defense to step up the share of military procurement going to small firms by at least 10 percent has given a great boost to our joint set-aside program. In fiscal 1960, out of total military purchases of $21.3 billion, small firms received only $3.44 billion. This must be increased substantially, and I am happy to note the encouraging help we are receiving from high officials of the Pentagon.

We are already off to a good start. During the first 3 months of this year, nearly $300 million in prime Government contracts were awarded to small firms under the joint set-aside program of SBA and the procurement agencies.

This represents an increase of 67 percent over the value of contracts awarded small firms under this program during the same period of last year.

This encouraging increase is due in large measure to closer working relationships and cooperation between the SBA and the military and civilian purchasing agencies of the Government.

During March SBA procurement representatives stationed in major military and civilian purchasing installations throughout the country cooperatively earmarked $165 million in proposed purchases for exclusive award to small firms. Included in these set-asides were $11.4 million in research and development contracts.

This is a good beginning. I can assure you that we are planning additional steps to make this major program of assistance to small firms more effective than it has been in the past.

Certificates of competency issued by the SBA during the first quarter of 1961 nearly doubled in number with an increase of more than 700 percent in contract value over the same period of 1960, and will result in about $2.8 million in savings through purchases of low bidding certified small firms.

Through the issuance of certificates of competency the SBA offers an appeals procedure for the small firm or group of small firms whose low bid on a Government purchase, or high bid on a Government sale or lease, is rejected for reasons of financial ability or productive capacity.

By law, a Government contracting officer must accept a certificate of competency issued by SBA as conclusive, without requiring the small business or group of small firms to meet any other requirements as to financial ability and productive capacity.

Government contracts awarded to small firms are closely tied to another small business need—adequate financing. In many cases small firms have recourse to advance payments or progress payments to help them finance production under a Government contract. But when this aid is not available, SBA stands ready to help finance small firms to provide them with adequate funds to carry to completion any Government contract they may have.

SBA also makes loans to small firms to finance business construction, conversion or expansion; for the purchase of equipment, facilities, machinery, supplies or materials; or for working capital. In the field of financing, small business, SBA is also setting new records. Business loan inquiries and applications are the highest in SBA history. Loan approvals are also up sharply. During March we approved nearly 500 loans for more than $21 million, a 39-percent increase in dollar value and a 60-percent increase in number over February. Final figures are not yet tabulated for April, but from all indications there will be a large volume of small business loan approvals for that month.

To expedite action on this heavy volume of loan applications, SBA has given its regional directors additional authority to approve loans locally. The new policy permits SBA regional offices on their own to approve direct business loans to small firms up to $50,000 and bank participation loans up to $100,000 or $150,000, depending upon the amount of the bank participation. The average SBA loan is about $43,000, so nearly 80 percent of our business loans may now be approved more speedily, since Washington approval is not needed.

SBA is also taking steps to speed-up its program of licensing and helping finance small business investment companies. By the end of this year we confidently expect that more than 300 of these investment companies will be in operation, and they will stand ready to provide at least half-a-billion dollars in equity financing and long-term loans to small firms.

The SBA is making a special effort to give as much aid as quickly as possible to major surplus labor areas. Interest rates of SBA business loans and on loans to State and local development companies have been reduced to 4 percent in these localities. In areas where surplus labor is not a major problem, the interest rate remains at 5½ percent. Priority is also given to loan applications in these labor surplus areas, and to firms in these areas seeking Government contracts.

Another step we have taken to help provide greater aid in these areas is a revision of our small business size standards. Our modified size standards permits loans and Government contract assistance to firms which are up to 25 percent larger than those eligible under the established standards, provided the firms are in major labor surplus areas.

This makes SBA assistance available to a larger number of firms in these hard-hit areas, and it is our hope that this increase help will aid small firms in these areas to expand their operations, modernize their facilities or purchase new equipment, thus stimulating business, jobs and income.

I have touched only very briefly on SBA's many programs of assistance to small business and of our efforts to help restore a forward movement to our economy. We in the Small Business Administration believe that a start has been made toward our goal of making our programs more effective. Our efforts to increase the flow of Government military procurement contracts and subcontracts to small firms are continuing and much remains to be done before our immediate objective of at least a 10-percent increase in prime contract awards to small business is achieved.

SBA is planning meetings in Washington and around the country with national, county, and local groups to bring facts to the public about its State and local development company program. Under this program a local community, working through a publicly owned and controlled development company, can provide the initiative and initial investment to help established small businesses expand and modernize and to assist new small businesses to get started. The SBA, in turn, can lend the development company the major part of the funds it needs to help small enterprises.

For example, if a community needs $100,000 to help expand an existing firm or establish a new business and provide jobs, all it has to do is raise $20,000 through a local development company, and the SBA can provide the remaining $80,000. We believe that this program offers a great potential for sound economic growth.

I should like to emphasize that our free enterprise system is our strongest bulwark against communism. A vigorous and thriving small business economy is basic to a real free enterprise system. It is imperative that we encourage and foster small business. The ingenuity and inventiveness or small business is essential to our economic well-being.

Beyond that, we must bear in mind the importance of small business to our national security. Our productive capacity must be maintained and expanded for peace and for possible war, as well. Our larger plants would be the first targets for an enemy aggressor. The smaller plants might well have to bear the brunt of our productive needs in such times.

We must be strong militarily, morally, and economically. We are confronted with challenges on all three fronts.

I have faith that we can meet these challenges and, in the words of President Kennedy, "move forward." This administration is pledged to do what needs to be done to fulfill the high promise of the future.

With the help and cooperation of all Americans, the President's goal can be achieved and our economy can flourish again to the point that full employment and well-being can be enjoyed by us all.

Long Arm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as the Nation braces each year for a new onslaught from the tax-hungry bureaucracy we have developed in Washington, it is well for us to realize that the money appropriated by the Congress must first be raised through the sweat and blood of the Ameriacn workingman. The inconsistency of the New Frontier in piously promoting what it terms social progress while at the same time breaking the back of the taxpayer with these huge spending schemes is indefensible. An outstanding community newspaper of my district, the Southwest Messenger Press, in an editorial this April 20 entitled "Long Arm," discusses the effect of our crushing tax structure and makes the most effective point that reductions in nonessential governmental spending would certainly be in order:

LONG ARM

Another income tax time has cone and gone. And millions of us feel a sad flatness in the pocketbook.

Once the income tax was a rich man's tax—people of small and moderate earnings

paid little or nothing. But now, as Citizens Public Expenditure Survey observes, "the long arm of the Internal Revenue Service reaches out to nearly everybody."

Here's the cold statistical story: Of the total Federal tax, people who earn under $5,000 a year pay 21 percent. The $5,000-$10,000 group pays 39 percent. The $10,000-$15,000 earners pay 11 percent. The $15,000-$50,000 people pay 17 percent. And the real big income group—$50,000 and over—pays only 12 percent.

This isn't because the rich are favored—income tax rates reach a top bracket of 91 percent. It simply reflects the fact that there are not enough wealthy people to foot the bill for government—but there are millions of individuals in the modest income brackets. So, inevitably, the latter must pay the great bulk of government costs. And they, collectively, would gain the most from reductions in nonessential governmental spending.

Hon. A. R. Stout

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herewith a letter from the president of the Waxahachie Junior Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Glenn H. McDaniel, transmitting a resolution adopted by that organization relative to the fitness and competency of the Honorable A. R. Stout for a Federal judgeship. I share their feelings in this matter and it gives me great pleasure to submit their letter and resolution:

WAXAHACHIE, TEX., *May 5, 1961.*

Hon. OLIN TEAGUE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: The members of the Waxahachie Junior Chamber of Commerce have, for the first time in the history of the organization, drafted and voted unanimously in favor of the attached resolution concerning the appointment of a dedicated public servant, Hon. A. R. Stout to Federal judgeship.

It is the opinion of our membership that no other man in our State has better exemplified the part of the Jaycee creed, which states: "We believe that Government should be of laws rather than of men."

The elevation of Judge Stout to the Federal courts will certainly be in keeping with the trend and action of the present administration in choosing the most capable people for the positions to be filled.

Sincerely,

GLENN H. MCDANIEL,
President, Waxahachie Junior Chamber of Commerce.

RESOLUTION BY WAXAHACHIE JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Whereas it is imminent that the New Frontier is on the brink of bringing forth a progressive enactment to benefit the citizens of Texas by enlarging the Federal trial bench in Texas; and

Whereas the citizens of Texas, the New Frontier, the bench, and the bar of Texas all deserve and demand that the prospective Federal appointees be mellowed with the wisdom of judicial experience; be with ability supplied and wed to the principle that justice therefrom is the demand; and be born to the notion of fairness to all;

Now, therefore, the Waxahachie, Tex., Junior Chamber of Commerce humbly proposes a man stanchioned in the ground of judicial competence, namely, the Honorable A. R. Stout.

Judge Stout stands as a prolific contributor to scholarly legal publications as the author of the definitive branch's Texas Annotated Penal Code; as the presiding officer of the Texas Judiciary Association; and as a rampart to the cause of informal justice.

But beyond the call of duty goes our judge, who, because of his policy for the education of the prospective litigants and juror, contributes his abilities and patience thereto in bountiful qualities.

Having submitted the name of a jurist of sterling quality, the Waxahachie Junior Chamber of Commerce submits itself to the wisdom of the administration and to the will of God.

Respectfully submitted.

GLENN H. MCDANIEL,
President.

Importation of Surplus Foreign Military Rifles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions by the Massachusetts State Senate urging the Director of Civil and Defense Mobilization to take appropriate action to protect the domestic rifle industry from the importation of cheap, surplus, foreign military arms.

The problem, which affects a much greater area than just Massachusetts, and suggested solutions to it, are concisely stated in the resolution. I, as well as other Congressmen from Massachusetts, New York, and Connecticut, have long been urging action on this matter:

RESOLUTIONS REQUESTING THE DIRECTOR OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION TO TAKE ACTION TO HALT THE FLOOD OF SURPLUS FOREIGN MILITARY RIFLES INTO THE UNITED STATES AND TO PROTECT THE DOMESTIC RIFLE MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY

Whereas an overwhelming rise in the importation of surplus foreign military rifles has occurred in the past 5 years, and the influx of said rifles has caused an alarming decline in the sale of domestic rifles, seriously affecting the rifle making industry in this country and in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and has resulted in hundreds of skilled craftsmen being forced into the ranks of the unemployed; and

Whereas the importers of surplus foreign military rifles, pressing the advantage of the low costs of foreign labor, can convert surplus military rifles to sport or hunting rifles at a very low cost thereby placing them in a position which enables them not only to undersell but also to imperil the domestic rifle manufacturing industry: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate respectfully urges the Director of Civil and Defense Mobilization to take such action, including the submission of legislation to the Congress of the United States, as may be necessary to protect the domestic rifle manufacturing industry; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the State secretary to Mr. Frank Ellis, Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Washington, D.C., and to each Member of the Congress of the United States from this Commonwealth.

Senate, adopted, May 1, 1961.

IRVING N. HAYDEN,
Clerk.

A true copy.
Attest:

KEVIN H. WHITE,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Speech of Theodore R. McKeldin to the State Council of Maryland Daughters of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, last week in Baltimore, the State Council of Maryland, Daughters of America, held their 66th annual meeting in Baltimore, under the leadership of Mrs. Nellie Miller, State counselor; Mrs. Alfred Chesney, associate State counselor; Mrs. Alline Allison, vice counselor; Mrs. Charlotte Hallock, associate vice counselor; Mrs. Marion Rogers, State secretary; Mrs. Margaret Durner, assistant State secretary; Mrs. Mabel E. Cox, State treasurer.

The principal speaker at their Monday session was Theodore R. McKeldin, former Governor of Maryland. His comments on the conduct of those present at a convention in Washington the previous week are very timely and especially noteworthy, because he is not a member of the political party to which Senator CLARK belongs. His remarks show the stature one can reach when ignoring partisan politics, and it is a pleasure to insert them in the RECORD:

ADDRESS OF THEODORE R. MCKELDIN STATE COUNCIL OF MARYLAND DAUGHTERS OF AMERICA, 66TH ANNUAL STATE SESSION, EMERSON HOTEL, MAY 8, 1961

Within a few hours of this meeting the Walters Art Gallery will be entertaining a distinguished guest, Senator CLARK, of our neighbor State of Pennsylvania.

Senator CLARK is not of my political faith, and I have no idea what line of argument he will take tonight, but I bespeak for him here in Baltimore a more courteous hearing than he received last week in Washington. He was greeted with boos, while applause was given a speaker who called for abandonment by the Government of social security, farm price supports, securities and exchange controls, and other social welfare legislation.

Senator CLARK responded by advising the hecklers to grow up. It was good advice, for any man who expects, or wishes for repeal of all the progressive legislation of the past 30 years is childish. I don't want that kind of reputation hung on any part of Maryland, so it is my hope that when Senator CLARK appears here tonight he will be given evidence that he is in a different atmosphere.

As for Maryland Republicans, we are so far from imagining that we can put the clock

back that we incline to accept the sober words of Senator CLARK's party leader. President Kennedy in a letter to the very audience that booed Senator CLARK, said, "To meet the hard, tough issues ahead, we need all our resources and all our energy, for freedom in these critical days will not be maintained by default."

There is a statement of grim truth. "Freedom in these critical days will not be maintained by default." Neither will it be maintained by Democrats alone. The combined efforts of wise men of all parties, of all creeds, and of all races will be needed to carry us safely through "these critical days." Therefore I confess that I am exasperated when I find men old enough to be grayheaded still preaching economic and social theories that were exploded by the time the 19th century ended.

It is childish, but it is also dangerous, for boys' minds will never be equal to the man-size thinking that the 20th cenutry requires.

For instance, we are all rejoicing today in the splendid achievement of Commander Shepard, the first American to travel in the edge of outer space.

Yet it is to be doubted that most of our people realize fully the way in which this feat excels. We have proved to the world that we can produce a hero as brave as any that the Russians can show. The flawless performance of the rocket proves that we have engineers as ingenious and as competent as the Russians' best. The work of the launching crew at the beginning, and of the rescue crew at the end of the project proved that our Armed Forces can develop a disciplined efficiency as good as anybody can show.

All of which is fine, all of which should arouse our pride and enthusiasm. But all of it simply shows us equal to the best in the world. Where we excelled, where we were better than the best, was in the openness of the operation. Within 20 minutes of the end of the project the President of the United States announced that all scientific knowledge gained thereby will immediately be made available to the whole scientific world.

Shepard did not take that appalling risk for America alone. What our man learned was learned for mankind, and may be applied at once by anyone who can use it. For it is not and never has been the purpose of this Republic to seek to dominate the world by force. Therefore we reject the idea of amassing secret knowledge by which we may lay an ambush into which our rivals may fall.

We are not without ambition, but not that kind of ambition. We aspire to lead, but not as the slave dealer of long ago used to lead a coffle of wretched victims loaded with chains.

Theodore Roosevelt, asked what character in fiction he would rather be, astonished the reporters by answering, "Mr. Greatheart." Most of them had never heard of Mr. Greatheart, but when they looked him up they understood what Roosevelt meant. Greatheart is a character in Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress, a strong man who walked in front on the perilous way to the Celestial City, while the women and children followed. His right arm was powerful and his sword was terrible, but it offered no menace to the weak and defenseless, only to the fiends and dragons that lusted to prey upon them.

In that saying Theodore Roosevelt offered an ideal to America in these critical days. Greatheart's sword must be swift and sharp and of the finest tempered steel; his eye must be ever alert, and his heart as stout as those of Mr. Yuri Gagarin and Alan B. Shepard. Yet with all that, he would not be Greatheart unless his purpose was to clear the way for all mankind to march toward a better world.

When we announced that what we may have learned, at great cost and greater risk, about the physical universe will not be kept to ourselves but made available to all men we gave evidence of that purpose; and that is the point at which we gained not equality, but superiority. For our rivals have not been wise enough to understand, or bold enough to adopt this policy.

I am keenly aware of the burden that the armament race imposes upon us, and I heartily wish that it might be reduced. But the sword of Greatheart must be sharp, and of the finest metal that the world can supply; which means that it must be costly. We may not enjoy it, but we can and we must pay the price of being well armed, for that price will not destroy us.

Nor do I believe for a moment that the fiends and dragons that lurk along the way will ever prevail against Greatheart, as long as his purpose holds. What I do fear is some forgetfulness of that purpose. The physical power of America, however great, will offer no menace to the world as long as it is the firm purpose of America to lead the way toward an organization of the world that will serve liberty and justice rather than power and avarice.

For mind you, Theodore Roosevelt never for one moment claimed that he was Greatheart, only that he aspired to be. Yet the mere aspiration served to make him such a man that, although he has been 40 years dead, he yet can stir the generous impulses of American youth as few figures in our national history ever could.

I am not such a utopian as to believe that the United States of America can reform the world. Not to any man or any nation is power given to achieve that feat; it is reserved to God alone, and He has not seen fit to exercise it. But I am utopian enough to believe it possible for civilization to advance. I believe it has advanced, painfully, slowly, and with dreadful setbacks, but definitely. I believe, furthermore, that an intelligent policy on the part of this Nation can speed that advance, not as much as idealists demand, but more than cynics will admit. But an intelligent policy means influencing others more by practice than by precept, by example, rather than sermonizing.

That is why I am exasperated when I hear men who claim to be intelligent denouncing every effort to eliminate bondage and injustice in this country. For the sermonizer who adjures the world to "do as I say, not as I do," has not the faintest aspiration to have this country play the role of Mr. Greatheart.

Of course we can't be perfectly successful, or even perfectly consistent. Of course we are going to encounter many failures, and probably backslide from time to time. Yet if we maintain the purpose, if at the bottom of our hearts we truly aspire to be Mr. Greatheart, our failures will never be complete, nor our backslidings ruinous.

It is the possible failure of purpose that is our danger and our only fatal danger. If we sincerely believe that our strength is given us not to lord it over the world, but to clear the way of the world toward freedom and justice, I firmly believe that that strength will not diminish, but will endure and increase. If we hold to that purpose, I believe that we will establish a leadership based on trust, not on fear; and that leadership will be "a stronger thing to endure and stand than the square stones of Rome."

The President's grim warning is true. "In these critical days freedom will not be maintained by default." Nor will it be maintained by men who are themselves not freemen, but slaves to their own passions and prejudices, in bondage to ancient error and outworn theory, bought by their own money and held in thrall to their bank accounts.

It will be maintained by men who do aspire to establish their country as the Mr. Greatheart among the nations. That aspiration may be feeble, at times. It may often flicker and grow dim. We may occasionally betray it by foolish action. But if it is genuine, it will not fail of its effect upon the world. It may never bring us, as the ships of Tarshish brought to Solomon, "gold and silver, and ivory and apes and peacocks," but it will bring us a power over the hearts of men that will long outlast our day; and the name of America will stir the generous impulses of youth when you and I have long returned to dust.

Chicago Has Largest Polish Population in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to call the attention of my colleagues to an excellent article by Mr. Stanley Pieza which so graphically describes the Polish-American community of Chicago and which appeared in Chicago's American on May 6.

Americans of Polish descent have played an important part in the development of America's second largest city, and I believe Mr. Pieza has magnificently caught the full depth of this contribution.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Pieza's excellent article follows:

CHICAGO HAS LARGEST POLISH POPULATION IN UNITED STATES

(By Stanley Pieza)

You can have a tour of Poland—right in Chicago.

If you go northwest by bus or auto from the Loop you will be attracted to the copper spires of St. John Cantius Holy Trinity and St. Stanislaus Kostka Roman Catholic Churches—and then you are in the heart of Chicago's old "Little Poland." Autos zip by on the recently constructed Northwest Highway, which bisects the picturesque neighborhood.

With an estimated 750,000 population of Polish immigrants and their offspring, Chicago continues to be the second largest Polish city in the world. Only Warsaw, Poland's capital, with a population of 1,142,000, is larger.

Today the Poles reside in every section of the city, and there are still at least 70 Chicago Polish communities and each having a church or cultural center. The Poles make up the largest ethnic group in Chicago.

If you take a walk in the triangle of Ashland and Milwaukee Avenues and Division Street, you are in what is still known as the old heart of Chicago's Poles. Here now you see the faces of Chicagoans of many origins, but still mostly Polish. Some 25 years ago this center was solid Polish. The population movement to the edges of the city and suburbs is changing the heart of Chicago's Polish community—but slowly, stubbornly.

Standing at the triangle, you will hear the sounds of the Polish language as men and women gather to talk. Some of the business signs are also in Polish. Less frequently, however, you'll see a shawled aged woman walking with a mustached man—as did first Polish immigrants.

In front of you parade some of the prettiest women of Chicago, blue-eyed blonds whose antecedents come from Poznan, and the brunettes whose fathers came either from Galicia or Cracow.

BALL IS ANNUAL EVENT

Donna Marie Winiecki, 20, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Sigmund L. Winiecki, 4040 West 55th Street, a typical Polish-American girl, is a candidate for national honors during a presentation May 28 of Polish National Alliance debutantes, according to Mrs. Frances Dymek, PNA vice president and general chairman of the annual Polish Constitution Day parade.

A bevy of pretty Polish-American girls participate each year in Legion of Young Polish Women's White and Red Ball, an annual social highlight among local Poles.

Fortifying the old heart of Chicago's Poland are the magnificent public buildings of the Polish fraternal organizations: Polish National Alliance, 1520 West Division Street; Polish Women's Alliance of America, 1309 North Ashland Avenue; and at 984 Milwaukee Avenue, the headquarters of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America. In the vicinity are also the publishing houses of the two Polish language dailies: the Polish Dziennik Chicagoski and the Polish Daily Zgoda.

In the neighborhood are also Holy Trinity and Holy Family High Schools, old Gordon Technical High School, and the new St. Stanislaus Kostka High School for girls.

There also are restaurants where you can get Polish sausage and sauerkraut, rolled beef a la Zagloba, Polish dumplings, filet mignon Warsaw style, and soured milk with boiled potatoes.

HUMBOLDT PARK MECCA

It is from this triangle that thousands of proud Americans of Polish ancestry tomorrow will parade to Humboldt Park and gather at the equestrian statue of Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko, hero of two nations. This site is the patriotic mecca of America's Poles. Each year Chicago's Poles parade to mark Poland's historic freedom constitution and to rededicate themselves as Americans.

The Poles of Chicago are happy and smiling neighbors. They are in small businesses, in small and large industries, and among them are bank presidents, engineers, doctors, artists, dentists, scientists, politicians, baseball players, janitors, tailors, steelworkers, butchers.

The magic words to make quick friends among them are:

"Jak sie masz?" "How are you?"

"Bardzo dobrzie, dzienkuje." "Very well, thank you."

It is in the fourth generation where the Polish fathers of the preceding generations are making tireless efforts to keep Polish language and culture alive. The fraternal organizations conduct special schools in which language, songs and customs of Poland are taught the young. The Polish language is also taught in the parish schools and in some public high schools.

Some of the Polish youngsters of the Polish Alma Mater fraternal organization, with headquarters at 1645 Milwaukee Avenue, have adapted themselves so much to the Polish language that "they even play baseball in the sand lots shouting at each other in Polish," according to Val Janicki, 1159 Milwaukee Avenue, president.

POLISH HISTORY DRAMATIC

Polish history in Chicago is a dramatic one. Polish immigrants came here to work. They were strong and able and factories and docks wanted them. They brought with them a strong faith in God and they were happy to become Americans for they found the country of their adoption a land of opportunity.

With the increase in population, the Poles became active in organization work, cultural achievements and started in business, industry and establishing building and loan associations. Since they were believers in strict economy they saved their money so that today there are four out of five Polish families who own their homes. Soon they sent their sons and daughters to college and they became doctors, teachers, engineers, priests and nuns. They also built homes for the aged and orphanages.

DISTINGUISHED CHICAGOANS

Many distinguished statesmen and civic leaders have emerged from Chicago's Polish community, among the early ones being Stanley Kunz, who was the first Pole to be elected to the state senate and to Congress, and John F. Smulski, lawyer and banker, the first to be elected to the office of city attorney. In 1906, Smulski was elected State treasurer. Among the great members of the bench was Edmund K. Jarecki, Cook County judge. Serving as county judge today is Thaddeus V. Adesko, another outstanding American of Polish ancestry.

Other Chicagoans of Polish descent serving as political leaders are U.S. Representatives JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, Democrat, District 5; DANIEL D. ROSTENKOWSKI, Democrat, District 8; EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, Republican, District 4; and ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, Democrat, District 11.

Judge Walter La Buy, 71, another Chicagoan of Polish birth, recently retired as Federal district judge after 17 years of service.

There are also John C. Marcin, city clerk; Francis S. Lorenz, county treasurer; Matthew V. Bieszczat, municipal court bailiff; Theodore A. Swinarski, superior court clerk; Judge Thomas E. Kluczynski, circuit court; Judge Sigmund Stefanowicz, superior court; Frank Bobrytzke, county commissioner; Bernard J. Korzen, probate court clerk; and Municipal Court Judges Eugene Wachowski, Casimir Cwiklinski, Chester Strzalka, and Walter Kowalski.

Chicago also became the center of Polish organizational activity in the United States. The oldest of these is the Polish Roman Catholic Union, founded in 1873, now numbering 182,000 members and its assets reaching over $43 million, according to Stanley Turkiewicz, president. In the PRCU Building is housed the magnificent Polish Museum of America, which contains a full memorabilia of Ignace Jan Paderewski, famous pianist and Polish statesman, and in whose memory the U.S. Post Office last year issued an 8-cent postage stamp. Paderewski has left an everlasting influence on Chicago's Poles.

ALLIANCE IS LARGEST

The Polish National Alliance, largest Polish fraternal organization in the world, has a membership of 340,000 and its assets reach over $110 million, according to Charles Rozmarek, president and one of the outstanding Polish-American leaders. The organization also maintain Alliance College in Cambridge Springs, Pa. The PNA annually sponsors the Polish Constitution Day parade and program with the cooperation of the other Polish organizations and church groups.

The Polish Women's Alliance of America, founded by Stephanie Chmielinska in 1898, has 91,000 members, according to Miss Adelle Lagodzinska, president.

The Polish Alma Mater, organized 64 years ago by the Reverend Francis Gordon, Costa Rica, has 10,000 members.

In the two World Wars and the Korean conflict, the Polish Americans were among the first to respond. There is not one casualty list that does not contain some names of U.S. servicemen of Polish origin.

Chicago Poles have given their best to their beloved city, their United States, and to the country of their forefathers.

The Press and Federal Deposit Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRENT SPENCE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD the following editorial from the American Banker entitled "The Press and Federal Deposit Insurance":

THE PRESS AND FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE—EDITORS OF THE NATION FULSOME IN PRAISE OF FDIC

Every time an insured bank closes there is an outpouring of editorial comment in the Nation's press. The closing of the Sheldon, Iowa, National Bank, following disclosure of an embezzlement of more than $2 million was no exception. Comment is almost uniformly favorable, viz:

"The consolidation Sheldon residents can have is that it has afforded an opportunity to observe a Government agency which operates smoothly, efficiently, and very courteously, and treats individuals as if they were indeed individuals and not merely a sort of nuisance. We are referring, of course, to the very fine relations the public is having with the FDIC at the Sheldon National Bank. There is a great deal of praise throughout the community for their excellent work"—(Sheldon, Iowa, Mail).

"Another demonstration of the speed with which the Federal Deposit Insurance Corp. works is furnished in Sheldon, Iowa. The insurance officials were right behind the police in moving into the bank which suffered a $2.1 million loss from embezzlement. An entire new generation of Americans has grown to adulthood without ever having seen or suffered from a run on a bank"—(Ogden, Utah, Standard Examiner).

"Thanks to the FDIC, Sheldon, Iowa, is 'back on its feet' financially. Economic recovery for most of the people in Sheldon was swift, thanks to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corp."—(United Press-International report 6 weeks after the Sheldon National Bank closing).

"Discovery of the theft ($2.1 million Sheldon banks defalcation) did not create a panic among depositors. They knew they were secure, and within 10 days after the bank was closed, the FDIC began paying off in full up to $10,000. As evidence of public calmness and confidence, many depositors took the money they received and went up the street to place it in another bank, also insured. This is one of the bulwarks of the Nation's economy, providing an absolute guarantee against a run on a bank ever again"—(Henderson, N.C., Dispatch).

"It takes something like that astounding $2 million embezzlement to recall that for nearly 30 years, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corp. has stood ready to reimburse depositors up to $10,000. Since the FDIC law was enacted, there have been 429 bank closings, and 99.7 percent of depositors were covered by deposit insurance"—(Newport, R.I. News).

"This importance of the protection afforded bank depositors by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corp. has been dramatically demonstrated in the collapse of the bank at Sheldon"—(Des Moines, Iowa, Register).

"When Money Vanishes, Federal Bank Agency Appears Like Magic"—(New York Daily News headline on Sheldon, Iowa, post closing report).

"The FDIC is probably the best reason for people's confidence in our banking system and the safety of their money. When people have confidence in banks there is little danger of panic"—(L.A.C. in the Long Beach, Calif., Independent).

"Before FDIC, depositors usually lost money if a bank failed. Uneasy depositors could cause a run on strength of a rumor. However, the FDIC has changed all that"—(Champaign, Ill., Courier).

The public, speaking through its newspaper and magazine editors, obviously is satisfied with the manner in which the FDIC operates to protect depositors' interests.

A step in the direction of educating the public with regard to this agency's efficient function should be taken by banks through utilizing these laudatory comments and expressions of confidence in their promotional efforts.

To Stand or To Retreat—That Is the Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include the following article by Edgar Ansel Mowrer:

CONFLICT DEEPENS IN UNITED STATES

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

Evidence of a deep and basic division in the American people is mounting. Recently in discussing the John Birch Society, I observed that unfortunate as it was for members of this society to disqualify themselves as fighters against communism by their attacks on democracy, desegregation, and the civil rights that are the basis of American civilization, their presence showed the deep and abiding anxiety of increasing numbers of Americans at successive administrations' unwillingness to refuse further concessings to Moscow and Peiping.

At the base of this division lies a simple choice: either you understand that the United States is in a war (cold but genuine) which requires victory, or you don't.

If you admit the existence of war you start playing to win, not just bumping back Communist advances. If you don't know we are at war you try to capitalize on the Americans' desire for peace to scare them into successive surrenders by threats of atomic destruction.

You argue that Cuba and Guinea are not really Communist. You insist that the Russians have just as much right to have a missile base in Cuba as we have to have bases in Italy or Turkey or wherever. This is the same as saying in 1944 that the Nazis had as much right to land on Cape Cod as we had to invade Normandy.

In other words, you try to ignore the existence of the key fact of existence today—Communist aggression.

Such talk is not merely found in the mouths of pro-Russians like Linus Pauling and Cyrus Eaton (to mention only a pair of prize exhibits). No, it exists in attenuated form even around the White House.

Adlai Stevenson is quoted in the Boston Herald (May 1, 1961) as having said that we "cannot save some countries from going Communist" (Why not?) and "ought not be too upset when one of them vanishes behind the Iron Curtain." He also argued, according to Holmes Alexander, who wrote the story that "we ought to stop overstressing the Communist conspiracy." (I hope this story is inaccurate.)

Stevenson is also believed to have been the chief influence that caused President Kennedy in advance of the Cuban invasion, to make the public declaration of no American support, which broke the back of the anti-Castro Cubans' morale.

In fact, certain highly placed advisers came to Washington with three assumptions—all of them mistaken. One was that quiet diplomacy and greater civility would be reciprocated by the Communists. A second was that there existed large areas of potential agreement with the Russians. A third was that the neutrality of certain newly independent nations would strengthen the free world. (Nonalinement of areas and peoples once under anti-Communist control is exactly what Khrushchev and Mao want, too.)

As a result, the foreign policy of the new administration has been fainthearted from the beginning.

President Kennedy made the finest, most stirring declarations heard in many a day. Many of us were thrilled and eager to support him in what looked like a call to win the cold war. But he has retreated in Cuba and Laos.

Secretary of State Rusk has talked big at Oslo, reiterating our resolution to defend our rights in Berlin at any cost. Who believes him? Let Khrushchev offer a new summit to discuss Berlin, and who believes Mr. Kennedy will not come running?

Faintheartedness in the White House has encouraged a whole host of defeatists to emerge who have been lying low since the unhappy McCarthy days. One such is a certain Taylor Adams of New York City, a defender of Castro's Cuba, who concludes an attack on me with the question: "Why are you people always obsessed with this 'free world and freemen' stuff?" Why, indeed?

* * * * *

In any case, the dispute over how to deal with communism—defeat it or try to mollify it with sweet words and continual concessions—is not going to stop. For the proponents of conciliation turn the situation exactly upside down: far from preserving us from a nuclear catastrophe, faintheartedness and retreat are making world war III ever more certain. At some point, after the loss of 2 or 10 more Allies to neutralism or communism the American people are going to brush aside the fainthearts and pro-Communists at home and decide to defend their heritage of freedom.

Los Angeles Board of Supervisors State Need of Parking Space for Federal Buildings in Los Angeles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I call to your attention, and the attention of my other distinguished colleagues, a letter I have received from the clerk of the board, Board of Supervisors for Los Angeles County, concerning the great need for parking areas adjacent to Federal buildings.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,
Los Angeles, Calif., May 12, 1961.

Members of the Los Angeles County Delegation to Congress.

GENTLEMEN: At the meeting of the board of supervisors held May 9, 1961, on motion of Supervisor Kenneth Hahn, an order was adopted respectfully requesting President John F. Kennedy, Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, Senator CLAIR ENGLE and the U.S. Congress to take corrective action regarding parking requirements in metropolitan areas.

It was brought to the board's attention that it is generally the practice of the Federal Government not to provide parking when new Federal buildings are constructed It is requested by the board of supervisors that the Federal Government institute a policy of complying with requirements of local governments in metropolitan areas, in practice as well as in spirit, in providing adequate parking facilities not only for citizens and taxpayers who must travel to conduct business in Federal buildings, but also for employees working in these buildings.

Respectfully yours,

GORDON T. NESVIG,
Clerk of the Board.

Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy Pays Tribute to Poland's Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. O'BRIEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, May 7, by proclamation of Mayor Richard J. Daley, Chicago officially observed the 170th aniversary of Poland's inspiring constitution.

More than 150,000 Chicagoans participated in a colorful parade and a program in Humboldt Park in tribute to this magnificent Polish document, which in 1791 brought to the people of Poland and to the European Continent for the first time the principles of dignity and self-rule, which only 2 years earlier had been incorporated into the Constitution of the United States.

I am sure I speak for all of those who participated in Sunday's inspiring program that we were indeed proud to welcome as the main speaker for this event in Chicago the Honorable Robert F. Kennedy, Attorney General of the United States.

I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues the inspiring remarks delivered by the Attorney General in tribute to Poland's Constitution of 1791. His remarks reflect to a great extent the sentiments expressed here in Congress by more than 100 of our colleagues last week, when on May 3 we honored the Polish Constitution here in the House of Representatives. I am sure it is a source of great pride to all Americans of Polish descent that the Attorney General of the United States would join in this tribute.

Mr. Speaker, Attorney General Kennedy's remarks, delivered in Chicago on Sunday, follow:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE ROBERT F. KENNEDY, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES AT THE POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY OBSERVANCE, CHICAGO, ILL., MAY 7, 1961

I want to express my deep appreciation and gratitude to all of you for inviting me here today because I know I am among people who are dedicated forever to love of country and liberty. It is a great honor to join with you in celebrating the 170th anniversary of Poland's adoption of a constitution which gave meaning and noble expression to liberty and the fundamental rights of man.

The history of Poland goes back many years—many more than that of the United States, but almost since the day the Declaration of Independence was drafted in Philadelphia, the history of Poland and the United States have been entwined. These close ties have existed between the Poles and the Americans because of mutual respect for each other.

Casimir Pulaski was 29 years old when he came to America as a volunteer to serve in the Continental Army. He participated with distinction in the Battle of Brandywine and formed his own cavalry unit which was known as Pulaski's Legion. Pulaski was with the ragged American Army during the cruel winter at Valley Forge and lost his life leading an attack against the British defenses at Savannah, Ga. Though he died fighting for America's freedom, I cannot help but believe that he also was fighting for Poland's freedom.

Thaddeus Kosciusko, another Polish volunteer, was one of the most popular officers in the Continental Army—by all accounts. He was Washington's adjutant, built the fortifications at West Point and later served as a strategist and fighting officer in the recapture of Charleston, S.C.

After the United States had won its independence, Congress awarded him American citizenship, the rank of brigadier general and a large land grant. But Kosciusko returned to Poland and a few years later fought to defend the constitution which we honor today. In 1794, when Polish patriots again sought to win their freedom by fighting, Kosciusko returned from exile to lead them—and again distinguished himself—only to be overwhelmed by vastly superior forces.

Kosciusko still was pleading the cause of Polish independence in 1814—at the Congress of Vienna. He was then 68 years old, but the same democratic spirit which burned brightly in Jefferson and Lafayette—also was unquenchable in him.

And down through the years to the Second World War—Poles and Americans have stood steadfast for the cause of liberty. The Poles, under Lt. Gen. Wladyslaw Anders, had the distinction of capturing Cassino and its historic abby which blocked the Allied advance in Italy for so many months. I visited Monte Cassino several years ago and climbed up the steep, rocky hillside where the Polish soldiers fought their way forward. I will never forget the inscription on the memorial to the Polish soldiers who are buried there:

"We Polish soldiers, for our freedom and yours, have given ourselves to God, our bodies to the soil of Italy and our hearts to Poland."

These very same principles of freedom for which these gallant Polish soldiers died at Cassino, should be an inspiration to free people everywhere in the world today.

I might add that on this same trip in 1955, I visited Poland, too, and after traveling through the Soviet Union, it was inspiring to see that the people of Poland still stand and yearn for the principles of freedom and meaningful democracy.

So, the ties between our countries, beginning with Pulaski and Kosciusko, go to the present time and it just wasn't a coincidence that the President, in his state of the Union message, mentioned one country—Poland—because he has the same admiration and affection for the Poles than I do.

We continue to be interested in and have concern for the welfare of the Polish people and we have attempted to maintain our close ties with them. In doing this, we have developed cultural relations and exchanges. We have developed economic programs which are of assistance to the Polish people.

What we need are:

1. More flexibility in giving assistance to Poland and other countries behind the Iron Curtain.

2. Strengthen the economic and cultural ties between Poland and the United States.

3. Increase the exchange of students, teachers, and technicians.

4. Explore with the Polish Government the possibility of using our frozen Polish funds on projects of peace that will demonstrate our abiding friendship for and interest in the people of Poland.

Recently, we have been disturbed by a number of hostile statements made by Polish leaders. However, we believe that the Poles favor, as we do, the continuing development of constructive relations between the two countries and we hope that they will avoid words and actions which would impede such development.

The Polish people will know that the American people and the American Government will continue to seek friendly relations. They also will know that we will work unceasingly to defend freedom and individual rights as heirs of a noble heritage—in the spirit of 1791 as well as in the spirit of 1776.

Senior Citizens' Month

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, recent developments in the city of New York hold out the promise for greater understanding and better treatment for its senior citizens. On May 3, 1961, New York City began a month-long program of activities in connection with Senior Citizens' Month.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of a radio address over station WNYC opening Senior Citizens' Month. The address was delivered by Mr. Theodore Charnas, chairman of the citizens committee on aging of the Community Council of Greater New York, and also coordinator of a self-regulating program of proprietary nursing homes. Mr. Charnas reports on important developments that have taken place in New York City to help the city's older citizens. These developments may well serve as an example to other communities throughout the United States. I commend his address to all my colleagues, and especially to all those interested in the problems of the aged:

TALK GIVEN BY THEODORE CHARNAS IN CONNECTION WITH SENIOR CITIZEN'S MONTH OVER WNYC, MAY 3, 1961

Respect for age is fundamental in our tradition. All of us know the fifth commandment—honor thy father and thy mother. We all understand that this means an obligation not only to our own parents—but to all parents—to all older people. We all know that the Declaration of Independence says that all men are endowed with inalienable rights—and that these are rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—and we understand too that this means that all men—the old as well as the young—the sick as well as the sound—are entitled to life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

I think we would all agree that the greatest asset of any society—especially in a democracy—is its citizens, its people, all its people. A community must realize a fair return from all its people. If it doesn't the community is not receiving a fair share on its investment. On the other hand, a community must make its maximum contribution to all its citizens. If it doesn't, some are being cheated.

At the beginning of Senior Citizens' Month, it is appropriate that we should pause and ask why are we so concerned with the problems of our older citizens?

More than 2,00 years ago during the Golden Age of Greece, the life expectancy of the average Greek was 25 years.

In 1900 in our country, the average life expectancy was 47 years. Only one person in 25 could expect to reach 65 years of age. Then a wonderful thing happened. People began to live longer. By 1940 the average life expectancy was 63 and one man in 14 could expect to reach 65. By 1955 the average life expectancy for men reached 68 and for women 72. One out of every 12 men could expect to reach 65 and 1 out of every 8 women could expect to reach 65 years of age. Today that life expectancy is even greater.

In 1900, 96,000 reisdents of our city—about 3 percent of the population, were 65 or older. Today, more than 750,000—almost 10 percent of the population are in this group. There are almost 1½ million over 60 years of age who live in New York City.

Now what kind of life is our society offering our older citizens? What are people doing with the additional years with which we have been endowed? As our population increases and life is prolonged, we have more and more aged, more and more chronically ill, more and more older people who need help to make their lives more complete and more meaningful.

How does a great community like ours in New York City plan for its older citizens? Who does the planning? How is planning structured in a community with about 1,200 health and welfare agencies of which more than 200 serve the aged?

Thirty-five years ago New York City had an alms house and a haphazard system of private homes for the aged. There was no public old-age assistance. There was little thinking in terms of recreation, employment, housing, geriatric medicine. The New York Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor, the Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of New York and of the Diocese of Brooklyn, and the Jewish Social Service Association were each developing a point of view in making provision for the needs of older people. And as the thinking of these agencies developed and crystallized, they came to realize that a community-wide framework must be established to deal with the many problems of the older person.

In 1925 the Welfare Council of New York City, now known as the Community Council of Greater New York, was established. Until then our services for the aging could best be described in terms of Mark Twain's definition of the dictionary—interesting but terribly disconnected.

The council played an active part in the promotion of the old-age pension of 1930. It issued the first statement on acceptable minimum standards on homes for the

aged some 20 years ago. It played an important role in public housing, which led to the construction of the first 50 apartments for older people in the Fort Greene housing project. It made intensive new studies on the multiple problems affecting older people. It took an active part in stimulating the growth of such facilities as the Goldwater Memorial Hospital. It played a vital part in the enactment of the nursing home legislation and only very recently, in December of 1959, it conducted a regional conference preliminary to the White House Conference on Aging, which was magnificent in terms of representation and good, sound, solid thinking.

At the same time the great Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish sectarian agencies were improving and extending their facilities and services for older people.

Then in 1949, a mayor's advisory committee for the aged was organized and charged with the duty of improving conditions affecting older people in New York City. It made a monumental study of living arrangements for older people in a public housing project—the Vladeck study. It was a vehicle for the exchange of information between voluntary groups and city agencies. It published many valuable papers. It inaugurated and assumed responsibility for Senior Citizens' Month in New York City.

But it is especially in the last 12 months that we have achieved extraordinary advances in planning for older people of New York City.

During these past 12 months, many fine voluntary homes for the aged and the chronically ill have developed plans for enlarging and improving their facilities. They are planning to bring within the scope of their services more and more older men and women who will continue to reside in their own homes but have the opportunity to make use of the facilities of these institutions. They have begun to study and make provision for the senile and they are employing newer and better techniques in the care which they provide.

During the past few months responsible private nursing homes have accepted a recommendation of the city administrator and they have voluntarily adopted a program of self-regulation. The homes which subscribe to this program are elevating their standards and improving their services. The planning includes new central services which will be furnished to member homes, the availability of expert guidance in several areas of service, special courses for administrators, and the adoption of a code which must surely result in better care for residents of the nursing homes which subscribe to the program. This voluntary effort should be applauded by the community and it will undoubtedly be encouraged by the city administration which suggested this constructive program.

During the past 8 months we have seen the creation of the first citywide planning agency for our older people.

In October of 1960 the mayor's advisory committee on the aged and the committee on welfare of the aged of the community council merged into a Citizens Committee on Aging for the City of New York under the auspices of the Community Council of Greater New York. Thus, for the first time, we have responsible community planning on a citywide basis.

The objectives of the committee are to promote community education on the needs of the aged and on the concepts of aging; to develop a master plan for programs and services to the aging; to foster the development of recommended programs and services; to sponsor new legislation and review proposed legislation; and to coordinate community activities on proposed legislation which concerns older people.

The committee consists of 105 members who are leaders in the community, of these 60 are lay people. It numbers among its members a representative of the mayor and of each major city department concerned with old people. In addition to 30 experts serving on the committee, the subcommittees have involved 50 additional experts in the various fields in which these subcommittees are involved. The membership includes representatives of health and welfare agencies, clergy, members of the city council and the State legislature and the judiciary, the junior league, board of trade, commerce and industry, labor, fraternal organizations, and each of the great sectarian agencies.

The citizens' committee is independent, notable for its membership, ably staffed and completely flexible and with a program of the broadest possible scope. It holds tremendous promise for the future.

Since its beginning last October, the citizens' committee has functioned with remarkable efficiency. A number of committees have been hard at work isolating problems and evolving programs to meet the demonstrated needs. The committee on legislation has analyzed and made itself heard on proposed bills. The committee on retirement planning is working out a program to stimulate employer interest in preretirement programs. The committee on health is especially concerned with facilities and services for the senile and for the mentally ill. The income maintenance committee is analyzing the public assistance program. The housing committee is preparing a brochure outlining funds available from Federal, State, and city agencies for private builders and organizations undertaking to house old people. The committee on services is preparing a recommendation for the mayor at his request, on information and referral services.

And finally Mayor Wagner has announced a program of action for the aged which describes steps to be taken by the city government to provide a network of services for the aged. He has called for the assumption of greater responsibilities by the community and has asked the citizens' committee to cooperate with city government. The mayor made this announcement at the first meeting of the citizens' committee on aging last October. The mayor will address the next meeting of the committee on May 9 at city hall and he will then make a further statement about his action program. This meeting will be the occasion for the formal opening of Senior Citizens' Month and the presentation of a scroll to Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt.

What are we really trying to achieve?

We want the older person to have pleasant and agreeable shelter. We want him to have economic security. We want to make provision for his physical and mental health. We want him to have recreational activities which will deter the degenerative effects of old age. We want him to have a meaningful old age with dignity and self-respect. And isn't this really what we want for ourselves?

What can we ask of the community?

I believe that the older person has a right to the sympathetic understanding of the entire community—not only during Senior Citizens' Month but all the year round.

I believe that the planning and the programing can flourish only if we have a climate which is hospitable to this planning and programing. We must all understand that everyone of us is involved in the process of growing older. And we must teach our children and younger people to respect the experience and the contributions of our elders. We must make it possible for our older people to find dignity and self-respect and the awareness of being needed. Only when we have learned to honor our fathers and mothers and to respect all fathers and mothers can our programs come to fruition. And only when we conscientiously strive to give older people their rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness will we be able to say that we have planned well.

We all have a stake in this business of getting older. Let us try to make life more complete for our older men and women and for ourselves as we grow in years so that we can say with the poet:

"Age is opportunity no less than
Youth itself, tho' in another dress,
And as the evening twilight fades away,
The sky is filled with stars visible by day."

We Must Stop This Slide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 2, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I call to your attention, and the attention of my other distinguished colleagues, a timely and pertinent editorial appearing in the Huntington Park, Calif., Daily Signal newspaper, for Tuesday, May 9, 1961:

WE MUST STOP THIS SLIDE

Never in peacetime has American power suffered such damage as by the Cuban invasion fiasco coupled with the all but completed loss of Laos to the Communists.

Since we back the invasion that failed communism is more firmly entrenched to fester in Cuba and its potency to filter into other lands in our hemisphere has been increased.

In Laos, which we talked loudly of holding, a new strategic gateway is rapidly falling open to the Communists. But far more important that the geographic conquest is the psychological effect so easy a victory must have upon Khrushchev. We must surely expect him to strike now for a more valuable stake and the chances are good American troops will be needed to stop him.

An appraisal of our failures is essential if we are going to prevent the slide of many more nations into the Soviet orbit.

NEEDED: A REAWAKENED SENATE

Corrective action should be taken on four fronts. Presumably study of the CIA and Joint Chiefs of Staff responsibility in the Cuban debacle is already underway. Of more long-range value can be a closed-door, nonpartisan Senate investigation of the reasons why the administration made the decisions it did on Cuba and why it chose a course to drift on Laos.

Such an investigation is fundamental if the Senate is to return to its constitutional responsibility to watchdog the Chief Executive in his foreign actions. Certainly events of the last 2 weeks show that we have need of the Senate to act again in this role and to its full capacity.

Finally, it is probably a safe presumption that President Kennedy has realized that the methods he personally chose to reach his decisions were at fault. New types of judgments and new wisdom in his decision making are needed.

FORCE AND ONLY FORCE

Of all the guidelines which can be laid down from our present setbacks the most fundamentally useful was pointed out by Stewart Alsop in his column in this news-

paper yesterday. As Alsop wrote, Khrushchev really means it when he says, as he did a year ago, that "the world balance of power has now turned sharply in favor of the Socialist countries."

If President Kennedy becomes fully aware that Khrushchev means and believes this he will sweep from his administration all who counsel that a deal be made with the Soviets either to "settle" the cold war or to negotiate a disarmanent pact. As long as the Russians think they are winning only force or the determination to use force can halt them.

Wiretapping and the Rights of the Individual

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, recently the Assistant Attorney General, Herbert J. Miller, Jr., argued that the Justice Department should have added legislative authority to permit wiretapping. Perhaps one of the arguments Mr. Miller used in urging this new authority indicates the depth to which our conception of the rights of the individual have sunk. The Assistant Attorney General argued that "law enforcement officials should be as free as criminals use modern scientific methods."

I know that my colleagues agree that the powers of the State must be constrained lest they infringe upon the rights and privileges of the individual. Were we ever to allow the State the freedom of criminal methods, we would have lost the very meaning of the free society we so hopefully proclaim to the world and in which we have trusted throughout American history.

While I must personally register my strong objection to the demand for greater wiretapping authority, I think that other members may find the views of Prof. Charles A. Reich a sound and careful analysis of the problem. I would submit these excerpts from much longer testimony which was given on May 9, 1961; before a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, to the consideration of the House:

STATEMENT BY CHARLES A. REICH BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF THE SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

My opinions about eavesdropping and wiretapping reflect a long time interest in the fields of constitutional law and property, the principal subjects that I now teach. They are views which many of my students tell me are old-fashioned, but that you will have to judge for yourselves.

Private property is to me one of the most basic institutions of a democratic country like ours. Without it individualism and freedom inevitably wither and die, no matter how democratic a government purports to be. One of the major purposes of our Constitution and Bill of Rights was to safeguard private property, and it should not be forgotten that the framers were mostly men of substantial property.

Among the most important attributes of private property is the right to possess it exclusively—to keep all strangers out. The householder may shut his door against the world. That is one of the proudest rights of an American—a right enjoyed by the householders of few other countries in the world today. It applies with equal force whether the intruder is a private trespasser or a Government agent.

This right of a citizen to shut the door against anyone, even the king himself, is part of our ancient heritage of freedom from England. One of the great ends for which men entered into society was to secure their property. By the common law every invasion of private property, no matter how minute, was a trespass, even if no damage was done. And the king's man, entering without sanction of law, was as much a trespasser as an ordinary man.

Eavesdropping and wiretapping are trespasses against the home. Let there be no question about that. They are much more serious trespasses than an unlawful search of the premises for they may continue over long periods of time and are usually unknown to the householder even after they occur. The householder never even gets a chance to fight for his privacy. Eavesdropping has always been regarded as despicable by those who believe in the privacy of private property, and wiretapping, while of more recent origin, is in no way different.

When eavesdropping and wiretapping are carried on by government against its people we have a condition that reminds me of what George Orwell foresaw for 1984, when Big Brother will be able to watch what each of us is doing at home. Spying by government against its citizens is odious to a free people, and I think the framers of our Constitution forbade it once and for all when they provided that the right of the people to be secure in their homes against unreasonable searches "shall not be violated."

As I understand it, there are two principal arguments in favor of legislation which would permit some eavesdropping or wiretapping. First, there is the testimony of many law enforcement officials that such methods are needed in order to track down organized crime. Second, there is the view that since wiretapping now goes on in defiance of the law, it is wiser to attempt to regulate it than to continue a largely ineffectual band. I do not think either argument justifies the legalizing of eavesdropping or wiretapping.

On the first point, my position, very simply, is that fundamental rights—the rights that make this country what it is—must not be abandoned no matter how strong the claims of law enforcement. Each of our fundamental rights—trial by jury, necessity of indictment by grand jury, the prohibition against coerced confessions, the right to bail, freedom of speech and press, may well make law enforcement less efficient. Necessity could be advanced as justification for giving them all up. But without these rights what would these enforcement officials be protecting? We would be a totalitarian country. I myself would rather have law enforcement less efficient than to move in the direction of abandoning our freedoms. At least law enforcement must stop short of destroying the very rights it is supposed to protect.

On the second point—existing wiretapping in defiance of law—I have two comments. First, have we ever tried really enforcing a ban against wiretapping? Have we ever made it a felony in explicit terms and set about jailing those who violate the law? It can be and is argued that present laws do not actually ban the interception of telephone messages. A law that clearly did so might be tried. Or, if prosecution of law enforcement officials is unrealistic and undesirable, have we tried banning the shipment of wiretapping equipment in interstate commerce—a prohibition that might reach the evil at its source. Similar bans have worked. We should not anticipate failure until we have made a genuine effort to succeed.

In the second place, is there any reason to believe that by permitting some wiretapping under regulation other types of wiretapping would be eliminated? If wiretapping goes on outside the law now, legalizing some types would hardly be calculated to change the situation. Instead, it would amount to a congressional declaration that wiretapping is not always bad. I recognize that it is proposed to enact new penalties against unauthorized wiretapping. But we have no assurance that these penalties would be enforced or are enforcible. If they are, this argues strongly that all wiretapping could be banned, and that there is no need to give even partial legislative section to lawlessness that now exists.

Mother's Day Service, Combined Church Schools, First Lutheran Church of Altoona, Sunday, May 14, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 14, 1961, it was my privilege to deliver the following Mother's Day address to the combined Sunday Schools of the First Lutheran Church of Altoona, Pa., as part of their annual Mother's Day service:

MOTHER'S DAY ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT MOTHER'S DAY SERVICE, FIRST LUTHERAN CHURCH, ALTOONA, PA., MAY 14, 1961

Holy Scripture reminds us that "he that honoreth his mother is as one that layeth up treasure."

The converse of this text for my Mother's Day message is to be found in Proverbs, chapter 14, verse 20: "A foolish man despiseth his mother."

The scriptural lesson here taught agrees with common experience and general opinion.

A man's value can generally be pretty well determined—by his relations with his mother—by the way he looks at her—speaks to her—speaks about her.

The attitude of an honorable and manly man toward his mother is an attitude of love and respect.

An affectionate regard for the wishes of his mother does no harm to a man's dignity and independence, and a protective chivalry helps a man to develop a firm courage.

Mother's Day is an excellent institution if we take it as an occasion to emphasize an attitude that reveals our conduct and speech the year round.

Thus we can observe Mothers' Day in an appropriate manner by giving some extra remembrance to one we never forget, and by displaying on Mothers' Day before the world a feeling that we show to our mothers and experience in ourselves, every day of the year.

Mothers' Day can be worthwhile, too, if it marks a turning point in our relations with our mothers, by providing a time of good resolutions which are adhered to in a conscientious manner.

It can be worthwhile if we write a letter and continue the correspondence, if we give needed help, resume close association,

apologize for past neglect and, above all, resolve to do better in the future.

On the other hand, Mothers' Day is a mockery if it is only an occasion of momentary attention after 12 long months of utter disregard for our obligation of love and respect.

Wear a carnation if you wish, but unless it represents an emotional tie, a relationship of affection and honor between you and your mother, it might just as well be a lowly cabbage.

The beauty of the carnation must represent the beauty of the relationship it is intended to symbolize.

To wear it honestly as the token of Mothers' Day you must mourn your mother if she is dead, or rejoice in her if she is living. Living or dead, she should be the object of your unfailing love and deepest respect.

Every mother has borne pain and undergone danger for her child. Mothers down through the ages have given years of effort to the physical care and sustenance, the intellectual development, and the moral training of their children. This display of deep maternal love is a free gift, expecting no sort of return or reward.

But though our mothers have freely given, with no thought of recompense, the gift itself demands at least the just recognition of gratitude and of whatever form of expressing that gratitude deemed appropriate to present circumstances.

For those who are grown up and have established their own families and independent way of life there is no one prescribed and proper form of relationship with their mothers.

In some families it has been found an ideal arrangement to have the mother live with them, helping with the household duties, thus being spared the expense of a separate establishment and benefiting by the consciousness of being needed.

In other families, where circumstances or personalities may differ, such an arrangement might be disastrous to family relationships. In such cases harmony and happiness might be best served by the mother's keeping a separate and independent living place, to whose upkeep her children might contribute if necessary. Some find the best answer in a flexible system of traveling and exchanging visits.

The basic necessity is affection at the core of the relationship, with the physical details to be adjusted by mutual agreement, and with regard to financial and other circumstances.

What is essential is the attitude of mutual respect and love that leads to cordial agreement and generous cooperation in establishing harmonious conditions of living.

This attitude is represented neither by the slogan, "Mother knows best," nor by the masterful declaration, "Now, mother, we know what is best for you, and you needn't trouble yourself—we'll arrange it all."

Respect should not be exaggerated into abject submission nor care and solicitude degraded into tyranny.

A mother is, first of all, a person entitled to recognition as an equal and independent personality, with her own opinions and preferences.

Her opinion on your affairs is to be sought with respect, listened to with courtesy and attention, and given its due weight in the formation of your decisions. Her opinion on her own affairs is paramount and decisive, except insofar as she may choose to defer to your opinion or preference.

Courtesy is the outward expression of the warmth of affection that must permeate family relationships. But courtesy does more than express that warmth of affection—it preserves and stimulates it. Mothers' Day affords the opportunity for an expression of formal courtesy from all of us toward our mothers.

The writing of letters, the wearing and giving of flowers, the special celebrations of the day such as dinners, parties, entertainments, all these are of value as acts of courtesy, as tangible, audible, visible assurances to our mothers of the warmth of our feelings for them.

This virtue of courtesy has been fittingly celebrated by the English Catholic poet, Belloc, in terms that associate it vividly both with religion and with motherhood:

"Of courtesy, it is much less
Than courage of heart or holiness,
Yet in my walks it seems to me
That the grace of God is in courtesy.

"On monks I did in Storrington fall,
They took me straight into their hall;
I saw three pictures on a wall,
And courtesy was in them all.

"The first the annunciation;
The second the visitation;
The third the consolation
Of God that was our Lady's Son.

"The first was of St. Gabriel;
On wings a-flame from Heaven he fell;
And as he went upon one knee
He shown with heavenly courtesy.

"Our Lady out of Nazareth rode—
It was her month of heavy load;
Yet was her face both great and kind,
For courtesy was in her mind.

"The third it was our little Lord,
Whom all the kings in arms adored;
He was so small you could not see
His large intent of courtesy.

"Our Lord, that was our Lady's Son,
Go bless you, people, one by one;
My rhyme is written, my work is done."

Courtesy is a form of politeness, but it is a stronger word than politeness, carrying with it the implication of real feeling, of gentleness and courage and kindness.

Courtesy goes with the "something more" of politeness, with the dramatic demonstration of affectionate respect.

Politeness, therefore, is suitable to our everyday relations with our mothers and courtesy is suitable to this special day.

Not a nod of greeting but a low bow, not a hasty kiss but a hearty embrace, not a friendly word but a gift, a flower, a speech of tribute.

This is a day for the plentiful and courteous bestowal of gifts and praises—upon our mothers. Let us be grateful and gracious in our observance of the occasion.

We ourselves know, and we can be assured our mothers know, how we feel about them. If our feelings are not such as are appropriate to the day let us labor to amend them.

If our feelings are, however, in tune with the spirit of the day, let us not shrink from giving full and enthusiastic expression to them in the confidence that a bold expression of devotion to the ideal of motherhood, and to one particular mother, will be beneficial not only to our personal relationships but to the community in general, and particularly to our young people.

Standing in this holy place, I am made strongly aware of the most fitting celebration of this occasion—the spiritual. The best and greatest gift we can give to our mothers is to pray, sincerely and fervently, both for their welfare and for our own fulfillment of their hopes for us.

Nearest to the heart of any mother is the hope that her son or her daughter will be a good man or woman. An endeavor to fulfill this hope in the development of our own characters should, therefore, be our resolve on this day for the coming year.

May God guide our consciences in the formation of this resolution and strengthen our wills in its performance.

The value of this day, in strengthening and renewing our relationship with our mothers, is great and lasting. From the natural human virtue of love between mother and child we rise easily and naturally to the love of God.

The value of such natural human emotions and virtues is eloquently celebrated in a familiar poem by Father Abram J. Ryan, which might well be taken as the keynote of our Mothers' Day observance:

"Better than grandeur, better than gold,
Than rank and titles a thousandfold,
Is a healthy body and a mind at ease,
And simple pleasures that always please.

"A heart than can feel for another's woe,
And share his joys with a genial glow;
With sympathies large enough to enfold
All men as brothers, is better than gold.

"Better than gold is a conscience clear,
Though toiling for bread in an humble sphere.
Doubly blessed with content and health,
Untried by the lusts and cares of wealth,
Lowly living and lofty thought
Adorn and ennoble a poor man's cot;
For mind and morals in nature's plan
Are the genuine tests of an earnest man.

"Better than gold is a peaceful home
Where all the fireside characters come,
The shrine of love, the heaven of life,
Hallowed by mother, or sister, or wife.
However humble the home may be,
Or tried with sorrow by Heaven's decree,
The blessings that never were bought or sold,
And center there, are better than gold."

Our Religious Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address given at the annual meeting of the Religious Heritage of America, Inc., during the annual Washington pilgrimage which it sponsors:

OUR RELIGIOUS HERITAGE AND THE BLESSINGS OF LIBERTY

(Keynote address by the Honorable WALTER H. JUDD, of Minnesota)

Mr. Chairman, it is a great privilege to participate in the conferring of the Religious Heritage Awards to these distinguished men and women whose service to God and man has been so outstanding as to merit this recognition and tribute.

Your Washington pilgrimage comes this year at a time characterized by perhaps as great a confusion of emotions as at any period in American history. On one hand there is profound gratitude for the goodness of life that is possible for us in this land. On the other hand there is great uneasiness, uncertainty, perplexity, even anxiety and despair. Less than 15 years after winning a war with total, unconditional surrender of all our enemies, we are soberly asking, What can we do to survive?

We are profoundly grateful that no such thing has happened here as we saw happening in Hungary 3 years ago, in Tibet last year, and in Japan this week. But we are dismayed that such things can be happening to anybody anywhere on this globe in the

middle of the supposedly enlightened 20th century.

Can Korea go on indefinitely half slave, half free? Or Germany? Or the whole wide world? Down deep inside, we know the answer is "No."

I

Much of the reason for our confusion is that we have not understood the nature of the conflict in which we are engaged.

We have seen that it is a conflict of arms; who will win the missile race? Whichever side wins could compel the other to surrender or perish. Because of our religious heritage, we would not use superior power for that purpose. Because of their Communist heritage, the other side would so use it—Mr. Khrushchev reavowed that last month.

We have seen that it is a conflict of economic systems. Which will crack up first under the strain?

We have seen that it is a conflict of educational systems. Which will produce not only the smartest but the toughest minds?

We're beginning to see that it is a conflict, not so much of wealth and weapons as of wills. Which side will work the harder?

But many have not seen that the basic conflict is far deeper and more fundamental. It is a conflict between two totally different philosophies of life and, therefore, of government.

It is a conflict between wholly different sets of values.

It is a conflict between two wholly different concepts as to the nature of man; which means two different concepts as to the nature of the universe; which means two different concepts as to the nature of God—or whether there is a God.

We have not fully understood that most of all it is a conflict of faiths.

On one hand are those who openly proclaim that there is no God, that there is no moral order in the universe, and that man is merely an animal with a larger brain than others—the smartest of the animals, but nothing more. The conduct of the Communists which we denounce flows naturally and inevitably from that philosophy and faith.

During the 8 months in 1930 which I spent in an area under the control of the Chinese Communists in South China, and during visits behind the Iron Curtain in Europe in 1947, I learned—as did you who have had similar experiences—that Communists have no more scruples about wiping out a hundred, or a thousand, or a million human beings who stand in their way than you and I have about spraying DDT on some mosquitoes that are troubling us. And why should they hesitate or have scruples, if man is just an animal? If there is no God, then to whom can we expect men to consider themselves accountable?

On the other hand, our country and our free society were founded on the belief that there is a God; that there is a moral order in the universe; that there are moral laws which men and nations can no more violate with impunity than they can the laws of gravity or electricity; and that, while man is indeed the smartest of the animals, he is also something more—he is a child of God, and therefore, a part of God. Because he is a part of God, he is capable of becoming more and more like God, if willing to respond to God's loving quest for him, as your child is capable of becoming more and more like you, of whom he is a part, if he is willing to do so.

It is this, the divine in man, which we believe is different in character and kind from anything the animals have. It is this which is the unique and precious thing about man. It is this which we, at our best, have always believed it is the first business of a good government and a good society to protect and nourish and develop. It is this religious faith which is responsible for the unique values our civilization has developed. It is because our heritage is a religious heritage that the individual human being is considered by us at our best as sacred and of infinite worth.

Many in our country have assumed that the conflict between the Communists and free peoples is like that between the two major political parties in America. Both want the same good ends, but differ as to the best means to gain those ends—and keep them. But the world conflict is not over different means to the same good ends, different ways to attain the same good objectives; it is a conflict over objectives. Ours is peace; theirs is conquest. We want to end this world conflict; they intend to win it.

A truce to them, or a conference at the summit, is not, as we assume, a move toward real peace, which means a resolution of difficulties; rather, it is a politico-military tactic designed to win another victory. If they offer a truce in Korea, when their military operations there are no longer paying them dividends, it is not because they desire to end the struggle; it is only to shift to some other place like Indochina where they believe they can carry on the war more successfully.

"Peaceful coexistence" means that as long as we are stronger than they, we should be nice enough to allow them to coexist peacefully until they can become enough stronger than we so they can then compel peaceful submission by us.

And when they break up a conference at the summit as soon as they know they cannot divide the free world and score there another triumph, it is only to shift to some other place like Japan or some other tactic than smiles or threats, some tactic like subversion, which offers better prospect of success in advancing toward the never-changing goal of world domination.

The reason why it has not proved possible to get any real agreement with the Communist world, whether at Yalta or the United Nations, at Panmunjom or Geneva or Paris, is because the Communists are not pursuing the same goals as we at our best are pursuing.

And why are they not pursuing the same goals as we? Because they do not believe the same things as we believe—about man, and about the universe, that is, about God.

One reason for our difficulties is that we have been exposed so long and continuously to the Judeao-Christian body of ethics that we take its moral standards for granted. We assume that they are normal human standards. We tend to equate Christian with human. And since the men in Moscow and Peiping are human beings, we assume they will react as Christians do. When they do not so react, we are surprised, angry, and call them inhuman. But their ruthless behavior is not because they are inhuman; it is because they are merely human. We have almost forgotten that human beings, unexposed to moral teachings based on belief in a moral universe under a moral God, or with their spiritual natures unsensitized by a morally and spiritually regenerating religion, are predatory, like other animals. If this is not so, why should any men—including you and me—need a Saviour?

We cannot rightly condemn atheistic Communists for bertaying Christian values which they have never professed, and which, in fact, they denounce.

It is absurd to expect them to live as if this were a moral universe when they insist there is no such thing as a moral order in the universe, that there are no such things as right and wrong, good and evil, truth and falsehood.

It is absurd to expect them to believe that man has the capacity to make moral judgments, when their creed tells them that man is not a moral being, he is an economic animal.

In short, it is absurd to expect them to build up a heritage of freedom and to recognize and guard the unalienable rights with which we believe man is endowed by his Creator, if they do not believe there is a Creator.

II

All this means that we have not understood the world conflict because we have not understood the adversary. And a main reason why we have not understood the adversary is because we have not really understood ourselves and our own culture and heritage. We have almost forgotten that our heritage in this land is a religious heritage, predominantly a Christian heritage.

So, our first task is to reexamine our heritage, rediscover the essential elements and forces in it, rededicate ourselves to that heritage, fulfill it in our own land and time and generation, and share it with the world.

How did it begin? Our Pilgrim Fathers came to this land because they were determined to have religious liberty. They had discovered that it was not possible to have religious liberty without political liberty; and that political liberty could not be maintained without economic liberty, that is, opportunity for the individual to improve his lot, in accordance with his ability and his effort.

They had no precedent, no blueprint, but they had clear minds. They devised, for the first time on a major scale in all of human history, a system whereby people control government instead of government controlling people. It worked. It released the creative capacities previously unrecognized in all sorts of persons from all sorts of races, climes, and countries. It led to an unprecedented outburst of creative energy, imagination, effort, production, and progress.

As long as our people adhered to it they progressed, and prospered. Then, little by little, many came to forget the heritage in their preoccupation with the goodness of living which had become possible. They came to trust results more than causes; material fruits more than spiritual roots. They paid less and less attention to the textbook from which the heritage had come. They paid less attention to the counsel of the prophets of their heritage, ancient and modern. They paid less and less attention to its moral principles. Many began to believe that its possible to get good by doing evil, to get justice by bowing down before injustice, to get right by might, to get trust by being untrustworthy, to get peace by sacrificing our principles and other peoples' rights and territory.

Many came to think it is possible to get a brotherhood of man without first of all believing in the fatherhood of God.

Thus has our society come to its present confusion, division, uncertainty, despair.

III

All this tells us what we have to do. We have to return to our religious heritage—not in order to go back, but in order to go forward.

First, we must recapture our faith: faith that God is, that He and His power are available to men, that with God it is possible for man to build His kingdom on earth.

What we need in America today is to recapture a faith in our heritage and our faith comparable to the faith the Communists have in theirs.

For our free society to survive, we must qualify in our generation as a worthy spiritual instrument, as the founders of our heritage did so qualify in their time and generation.

Second, we must rediscover the principles of our Christian heritage. They are recorded in a Textbook, a sort of laboratory manual, which faithfully records the experience of those who have followed and those

who have rejected the principles. It makes clear that it is not possible to get good by doing evil, but that it is possible to get good by doing good. The latter is just as dependable as the former. It teaches that we cannot get peace by direct pursuit of it. Men have been trying that for 50 centuries and there still is no peace. Rather, peace is a byproduct that follows, if we seek first His kingdom and His righteousness, His right relations in the world. There will be "peace on earth" only when there is "glory to God in the highest."

Third, we must rededicate ourselves to the principles, and put them into practice—in our work; in our homes; in our social and civil organizations; in our churches.

With all my heart, I believe that the religious heritage which our forefathers developed here, a heritage leading to voluntary federation under law, represents the best set of ideas and values ever put together in one place in the world's history. I think they are the hope of mankind. The achieving of a world of freedom and peace depends upon our understanding their true nature, making them work better here at home, and helping spread them throughout the world—with all our hearts and souls as well as our minds.

This world conflict is not an old-fashioned struggle for the control of land; it is for control of man—the mind of man, the soul of man, the whole of man.

Fourth, if we are to have the inner strength to fulfill our religious heritage here and to share it abroad, we must ally ourselves with the truly great leaders, the founders of our faiths. This means for us who are Christians that we must rediscover Christ our Master, must recommit ourselves to His Lordship and His direction, receiving from God the power to be and to do that He promised to His disciples.

IV

If these things in our heritage are not true, if God is not, then of all men we are the most foolish. Our whole effort in this land is futile, in fact makes no sense.

But if God is, then what ought to be can be. There are dark valleys to go through, but there is no reason for dismay or despair.

God regularly operates through men and women—men and women who allow themselves to be captured by Him, give themselves to preserving and strengthening the heritage others have developed thus far, and work and walk forward with God unafraid.

Never did we in America face such a fundamental challenge to the ultimate values of life. Never did we have to think so deeply or work so hard as we shall have to in the years just ahead if we are to live in dignity and usefulness—or even to live at all.

Our generation cannot escape the call to great dedication and heroic effort if we are to "secure the blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity" which came out of our religious heritage. It is not necessary to remind you of this pilgrimage that on these blessings depend all others.

Notice: It's $1.15 Pay Law for 2 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose a news item from the Des Moines, Iowa, Register of May 7, 1961, written by the Register Washington Correspondent, Mr. Richard Wilson:

NOTICE: IT'S $1.15 PAY LAW FOR 2 YEARS—THEN MINIMUM WILL GO TO $1.25

(By Richard Wilson)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—A good many lower paid workers in the Nation who have been watching only the headlines are likely to be disappointed when their pay isn't immediately raised to $1.25 per hour.

They are going to wonder what it is all about when they get a raise to $1.15 per hour and this remains the federally supported minimum for 2 years more.

President Kennedy, it has been reported, won a big victory when the House passed the $1.25 per hour minimum wage bill which he backed last year in Congress and this year in the White House.

The point is that it isn't a $1.25 per hour minimum wage law yet; it is a $1.15 minimum wage law. That is exactly the figure the Republicans under President Eisenhower supported last year.

A YEAR LONGER

If the Ensenhower-supported legislation had passed, lower paid workers would have had their $1.15 per hour minimum for a year longer.

Moreover, in one important respect the legislation hailed by the Democratic leadership isn't even a $1.15 per hour bill; it is a $1 minimum for all new persons brought under the bill's coverage. This will last for 3 years, become $1.15 in the 4th year and $1.25 thereafter.

About 3½ million new workers will be blanketed into the guaranteed minimum, but not the laundry workers.

President Kennedy campaigned the country last fall with the aim of getting the laundry workers covered by the minimum-wage bill, one of his most frequently mentioned proposals.

In the Southern States a large percentage of laundry workers are Negroes.

But when it came to performance, President Kennedy couldn't get Congress to include laundry workers.

The House of Representatives wouldn't stand for it, though the provision passed in the Senate.

HASN'T GIVEN UP

But President Kennedy hasn't given up. He discussed the problem at length at a press conference Friday.

"One of the problems with laundry workers, of course, is that they are paid quite badly now. I would say they are among the lowest group—almost the lowest group in the American economy.

"Laundries are not a prosperous business at the present time. The passage of the minimum wage of $1.25 would increase the cost of the laundry owners by a substantial sum because manpower represents a high percentage of their cost, and they are competing with home laundries, which now have become a rather easy alternative in many cases, so that the argument is made that we would liquidate a substantial percentage of the industry and throw them out of work."

All the same, President Kennedy still wants the laundry workers included, and indicated he will ask Congress to reconsider its action.

Passage of the minimum-wage bill with the $1.25 figure in it—more than 2 years from now—was a hard job for administration leaders and skillfully executed.

The day before the House voted on the conference report last week, President Kennedy announced a broadly phrased but very vague program to help the U.S. textile industry. It has mostly to do with curbing imports of competing goods.

In recent years a sizable portion of the textile industry has moved into the Southern States. It was from the Southern States also that most of the Democratic opposition came to the so-called $1.25 minimum-wage bill.

BID FOR SUPPORT

President Kennedy's prevote announcement of the textile program was commonly accepted at the Capitol as a bid for support from southern Congressmen for the minimum-wage bill. The southerners might get into trouble with some business elements because of the wage vote, but at least the textile manufacturers would be happier with their representatives in Washington.

There were other little details of the bill that were compromises to win votes. Processing of shade-grown tobacco was excluded. It was also specifically provided that the minimum-wage standards should not apply to the ginning of cotton nor to workers at country elevators.

There are dozens of other exemptions, with the main extended coverage applying to employees of some retail and service establishments.

Hotels, motels, hospitals, restaurants, motion-picture theaters, lunch counters in retail establishments are on the exemption list. Retail establishments must handle goods moving across State lines in total annual volume of $250,000 or more.

What President Kennedy emphasizes, however, is that progress has been made, and the action of Congress was the first expansion of coverage of the minimum-wage law since New Deal days.

FIVE YEARS

And even if workers have to wait a couple of more years they will get the $1.25 minimum, provided they are covered by the law.

But for the 3.5 million newly blanketed into the act, they won't get the $1.25 minimum until the fifth year in this long-range legislation so strongly hailed as an example of Democratic Party concern for low-income people.

"Because of the Health Condition Described at the Time of Application, We Cannot Accept Your Wife as a Member"—A Sidelight of Hospitalization Insurance for the Retired

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, few issues scheduled to come before the Congress are as controversial as the proposal for hospitalization and nursing home cost insurance for persons retired under social security. We are told repeatedly that such a proposal has little if any merit, and should not be considered seriously. However, I have a letter in my possession which raises an interesting sidelight on this issue, and I would like to share it with the Members of the House of Representatives as a factor to be considered.

First of all, I should say that our Blue Cross-Blue Shield program in St. Louis was among the first such plan in the country to make it possible for retired persons over 65 to obtain coverage on an individual basis. It is my understanding that in many areas of the country,

the worker who goes on retirement under social security can no longer obtain insurance coverage from Blue Cross-Blue Shield, whether he can afford it or not. So our situation in St. Louis is therefore much better than the arrangements possible for elderly people in many other parts of the country.

WIFE'S APPLICATION FOR HOSPITALIZATION INSURANCE REJECTED

Nevertheless, in the instance just called to my attention, while the retired worker was able to apply for and receive coverage for himself under Blue Cross-Blue Shield following his retirement and following the cancellation of his coverage under the group plan in effect where he had been employed, he and his wife now discover that the wife's application for nongroup coverage can not be approved "because of the health condition descrized at the time of application."

The wife writes me:

Am enclosing a letter from the Blue Cross, which tells me they cannot give me hospital insurance. My husband retired recently, and up until then we had a policy from where he was employed, but canceled at the time of retirement.

We are living on our social security and veterans bonus, and if I would become ill and had a large hospital and doctor bill we would have to mortgage our home. I know there are thousands of people in the same position we are in, and would appreciate your voting for passage of the medical bill when it comes to a vote. I would be happy to have my social security reduced by a few dollars and have it applied toward the insurance. Now this might be a suggestion when it comes up for discussion. I would thank you very much if you would give this a thought.

The letter from Blue Cross Service which the wife forwarded to me notified the husband of acceptance of his application for both Blue Cross and Blue Shield nongroup enrollment but added:

Because of the health condition described at the time of application, we cannot accept your wife * * * as a member. This notation has been made on your application.

WHAT IS THE SOLUTION FOR FAMILIES IN THIS SITUATION?

Mr. Speaker, one of the strongest arguments made against the proposed social security program of hospitalization insurance coverage is that retired individuals and couples—who are not medically indigent and thus not eligible for coverage under the Kerr-Mills Act of last year—can purchase adequate insurance by themselves and thus do not need such insurance under social security.

But what about cases of this kind? During his working lifetime, the husband could purchase both hospital and surgical coverage for himself and his wife under the group policy at his place of employment. Suddenly, however, he finds upon retirement that his wife is not eligible for either coverage under the nongroup enrollment open to such individuals following retirement.

Presumably, if the wife has a health condition which makes it uneconomic for the Blue Cross-Blue Shield program to accept her, her chances of requiring hospitalization would be such that the need for pre-payment hospitalization insurance becomes even more urgent.

I would urge that those who have insisted there is no need for the coverage under social security proposed for retired persons by President Kennedy come forward now and advise how this kind of case should be handled. I am certainly anxious to learn how the couple involved in this particular case can solve what to them is a most important and worrisome retirement problem. Everyone interested in this issue would have to concede it is a problem which demands solution.

U.S. Trade With Castro Continues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the legislation before the House today concerns two aspects of the Cuban problem. However, there is another aspect of Cuban relations which has gotten much attention but little action, and that is United States-Cuban trade.

Though we have broken diplomatic relations and called for strong action against Cuba, each month we import more than $2 million worth of Cuban tobacco alone. Fruit and vegetables are among the other imports which supply revenue for Castro's domination of the Cuban people.

I call to your attention this very timely article by Victor Riesel which appeared in the Palm Beach Post:

U.S. TRADE STILL GOES ON WITH CASTRO

The last time I spoke to Castro he was wild eyed and muttering. But apparently he has not lost touch with the practical. His devotion to communism has not developed in him a distaste for our capitalist dollars and it should be known that Cuba still is selling over $40 million worth of produce a year in the United States. This business, though not quite as usual, is going on right now, invasion or no invasion, insults or no insults.

His economic chief "Che" (Okay) Guevera, needs these dollars to keep the island's gasping economy from choking to death. The Soviets are sending him military hardware, not hard rubles. The Cuban State Trust collects these dollars from some "Americans" through letters of credit placed to Cuba's accounts in Canadian banks.

With these $40 million, Castro actually is still purchasing some vital machinery in the United States and vital livestock in Canada to bolster his regime—not to feed his people. Despite everything that Castro has come to mean, some U.S. machinery is permitted him by the State Department on the theory that a total embargo now would cause hardships to some international brokers. The American suppliers of machinery would lose money if they could not complete orders Castro and Guevera placed here over the past year or so—that's the theory. What about the hardships of the Cubans who hit the beaches for freedom. They lost more than money.

Furthermore, some of the $40 million the Communist Cuban Government earns from its sales in America is paid to Canadian ranchers. They have been rolling their livestock south along the eastern seaboard to West Palm Beach.

There, twice a week—Tuesdays and Thursdays—the cattle have been shipped on the West India Fruit & Steamship Co. ocean ferries.

The overnight ferries were shut down for a few days during the life of the liberty beachheads. But now they have resumed supplying Castro and returning with his moneymaking produce. Other Cuban cargo is flown in by his communized companies to Miami.

It is inconceivable that tens of thousands of U.S. citizens do not wander about with a perpetually bitter taste in their mouths. They still are buying Castro's tobacco and vegetables. Even at this minute Castro's plantations are selling some $2 million worth of tobacco a month in the United States. This is a Government—well documented—figure. The Cubans are even selling us a synthetic filament made by the Rayonera factory in the Matanzas district. Thus, the State Department permits this neo-Communist competition with our own hard-hit textile industry, which President Kennedy is attempting to aid. Those people at the State Department should check with the White House.

The State Department should check with somebody. As recently as March 10 Castro was permitted to buy live cattle, live hogs, baby chicks, and even hatching eggs from us. These purchases were not made for the benefit of the people of Cuba.

The livestock was being used for breeding purposes, so Castro could equip future collective farms. If we had not been sending him these animal cargoes, the Russians would have had to supply Cuba. This would have drained the scarce Soviet stocks. It would have put a heavy load on the already overburdened Red bloc merchant fleet.

But early in March someone told the boys at the State Department the facts of barnyard life. Only then did the trade end. But if we had not permitted the Cubans to make money in the United States they never would have had enough to pay for the cargoes for their Caribbean communes.

What makes this business as usual between Cuba and some private U.S. brokers even more galling is the fact that our military finds itself in an awkward position in Cuba. There are some dollars the Pentagon must pay Castro. We rent the Guantanamo Bay base for $150,000 a week. Also we pay some 3,500 Cuban workers on the base some $15 million a year in wages. This we have to do in dollars.

But why should private U.S. citizens add to Castro's Communist exchequer? The anti-Communist Cubans who fought Soviet tanks on the beaches can tell you that liberty is dearer than money.

Winchell Apologizes for Slur Against Italian-Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, many of our colleagues will recall the slur contained in a recent column by Walter Winchell in which he said that the reason President Kennedy did not appoint any prominent Democrats of Italian origin to public office was because

always lurking in the background was the control by or link with the underworld.

Millions of law-abiding and decent American citizens of Italian extraction felt that this was an insult to the entire Italian-American community. I had subsequently written to Winchell and asked for an apology. In the meantime, a number of my colleagues in both Houses of Congress were similarly deeply disturbed over the matter. When the matter was called to the attention of the White House and the Department of Justice, the White House branded Winchell's statement as being "totally inaccurate" and Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy said that the report by Winchell was "completely false."

Mr. Speaker, I am now in receipt of a recent column by Winchell containing an apology and also a letter from his attorney Ernest Cuneo stating that "he was wrong and he says so." I wish to insert these into the RECORD:

WALTER WINCHELL OF NEW YORK—MAN READING HIS MAIL

"Wilmington, Delaware, May 4: Dear Mr. Winchell," writes Joseph A. L. Errigo, "As supreme recording secretary of the Order of the Sons of Italy in America, I wrote you a congratulatory letter on October 19, 1960, relating to a story written by you titled: 'Thoughts on Columbus Day' which appeared in many of our papers, including the Pittsburgh Post Gazette on October 11. On April 12, 1961, I wrote you on another matter. I have always had the greatest respect and admiration for your integrity and honesty.

"As one of your ardent supporters in the Order of Sons of Italy, it now becomes necessary for me to answer many questions for and on your behalf. If you are wrong, and if you made a mistake, you should offer an apology and an explanation."

DEAR MR. EGGIGO: Thanks for your letter, the only one not written in anger. The source reported the President hadn't appointed any Italian-Americans. Because the Big M was always in the background. Characters (I added) right out of "The Untouchables."

Congressmen of Italian-American parents offer the names of four Italian-Americans appointed by the President. That's enough for me to make that fact and my apology public.

The mail that brought your letter also brought a clipping from an Italian-American newspaper published in New Jersey on April 21. A column of comment (on this controversy) includes the following puzzling observation: "Some of our people may be bitter at President Kennedy for his failure to give due recognition to our great Democrats of Italian extraction, and justly so."

NORTH AMERICAN NEWSPAPER ALLIANCE, INC.,
New York, May 11, 1961.

Hon. VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR VICTOR: Walter wanted you to have a copy of this.

He was wrong and he says so, and than this, no man can say more.

With warm regard.

Sincerely,

ERNIE CUNEO.

The Case for an Ireland, One and Indivisible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, long after England has relinquished her subject colonies in other parts of the world, she stubbornly clings to the one next door—the six counties that were cut off from Ireland in 1920 and have since been occupied by British troops, with a satellite government under the domination of England. This was a betrayal of the freely expressed will of the Irish people.

In 1918, and in June of 1920, the Irish people by a vote of 80 percent of its adult population throughout all of Ireland declared that they wanted an Irish Republic for all of their land of 32 counties—and not merely 26 of them. A striking example of English perfidy is the fact that after this vote throughout all of Ireland by the Irish people, through the process of democracy, to have an Irish Republic for all of their little ancient nation, partition was imposed on them and their rights denied.

Americans cannot understand why England continues its occupation of the six counties in defiance of world opinion.

The Irish appeal for the restoration of the land that was stolen from her must be heard by the United Nations.

In support of her claim for justice, I want to remind all Americans of the irrefutable facts in the case as presented in the following editorial: "Ireland and Partition," from the March–April 1961 issue of the National Hibernian Digest.

IRELAND AND PARTITION

American public opinion since Revolutionary times has been friendly to Ireland and to the Irish. Today, public opinion in the United States is still very friendly in this direction. Public opinion as referred to here means the wishes and sentiments of the individual men and women who make up the population of our country, the United States.

A FEW EXAMPLES OUT OF MANY

U.S. public opinion helped Ireland during the English-manufacturer famine of 1845–47 in Ireland. It also helped the Irish during the English landlord eviction period of the 1850's. Likewise, it helped the Fenians to strike a blow for Irish freedom in 1867 and helped the Clan-na-Gael of America to maintain the Fenian tradition of independence for Ireland. It helped to stop additional executions in Dublin of many leaders of Easter Week, 1916, already sentenced to death, at the time that 16 of their comrades had been executed without trial and their bodies without coffins buried in fresh lime to destroy quickly the last bit of their flesh and bones so that there would be "no relics."

It helped to stop the infamous English Black and Tans in 1921 from continuing their deliberate plan to exterminate the patriotic Irish after these English-selected demons had for almost 2 years murdered, raped, shot, burned, jailed and tortured thousands of innocent Irish men, women and children and looted their homes.

IRELAND IS NO JOHNNY-COME-LATELY

Ireland, one of the oldest nations in Europe, traces its nationhood back to a point beyond 1,500 B.C. The nationhood of Ireland had already been an accepted fact recognized as such by Europe at the time St. Patrick began his missionary work in 432 A.D. among the Irish. After 1492, America then called the New World recognized Ireland as a one undivided nation. In short, the undisputable evidence formed in history and geography covering a period of over 3,400 years proves that the entire island of Ireland was always one geographical unit and one complete nation.

IDENTIFICATION MARKS OF NATIONHOOD

The identification marks of Ireland's nationhood are genuine and incontestible; one geographic unit with the sea and ocean as its boundaries; a national language, Gaelic, which lives today as it did in ancient times; a distinctive culture and code of laws from that of other lands; a homogeneous people whether they live in north, south, east, or west; a national tradition going back to the dawn of history.

Ireland's churches and religious bodies of today be they Catholic, Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist, the Religious Society of Friends, the Jewish congregations and also other religious denominations are now as in the past organized on a national all-Ireland basis. Her schools and universities; her sports are and have been nationwide. Her shamrocks grow in every part of the country; her music and song echoes throughout the length and breadth of the land. Above and beyond all is the name Irish, for the people in all parts of Ireland are Irish and proudly tell the world that they are Irish.

THE YEAR OF PARTITION, 1920

The historical fact that all the island of Ireland was one national unit and one undivided Ireland was never questioned until 1920. At this time the English Government for its own special political purposes in England partitioned Ireland by cutting the nation into 2 parts—1 part composed of 6 counties representing one-sixth and 1 part composed of 26 counties representing the other five-sixths of Ireland.

Yes, it was on December 23, 1920, that 6 of Ireland's 32 counties were cut off from their sister counties by a law made in England by the English Parliament. The deed itself was officially called the Partition of Ireland Act. With pride, it can be said that no Irishman in the English Parliament, although some were there, ever voted for this act or deed. And again with pride, it can be said that in 1918 and in June 1920 the Irish people by vote of 80 percent of its adult population throughout all of Ireland declared that they wanted an Irish Republic for all their land of 32 counties.

A striking example of English perfidy is the fact that after this vote throughout all of Ireland by the Irish people, through the process of democracy, to have an Irish Republic for all of their little ancient nation, partition was imposed on them and their rights denied.

ENGLAND WANTS TWO IRELANDS

Today, England would have the world believe that there are two Irelands. She makes it appear that way. The one-sixth part, pres-

ently occupied by 71,000 armed English forces, has an English dominated and controlled government in Belfast. The five-sixths part, free from English military occupation since 1922, has a government in Dublin.

So the little ancient Irish nation, today, has two governments—one for the minority of 20 percent and one for the majority of 80 percent. This setup is alien to American concepts that under democracy the majority should rule. Under American principles of democracy, it is the majority of the entire country that counts in an election of a government.

As long as English armed forces occupy any part of Ireland, against the wishes of the majority of Irishmen, the Irish nation as such is an English military-occupied land where democracy is denied. The denial of democracy to Ireland should pain American public opinion if and when it is informed and aroused. Justice requires and demands that all of Ireland should be free entirely from English occupation and that the government of the Irish Republic should govern all the land.

A JOB TO BE DONE

Hibernians, there is a job to be done. Unite on it. American public opinion, world renowned for its fair play to all, must be kept informed that partition with all its repugnancy to democracy exists in Ireland and that England is solely responsible for this evil condition. American public opinion, ever eager to help the oppressed, must be aroused to the fact that England today maintains a police state in its occupied area of Ireland—a police state similar in structure and function to the ones that America in World War II found it morally proper and absolutely necessary to destroy.

Rural Electric Co-op Leaders Mobilize for Success of Rural Areas Development Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on May 1, President Kennedy signed into law the $394 million areas development bill, an action that some day may be as significant to the rural economy as the rural electrification program has been.

This week, some 750 rural electric co-op leaders from across the Nation are in Washington for a Rural Areas Development Conference sponsored by the National Rural Electric Co-op Association. The conference makes it possible for member systems to unite their strength and combine their abilities and resources toward the common goal of revitalizing their communities and raising the economic and social standards of the areas they serve.

During the conference, delegates heard REA Administrator Norman Clapp outline the REA approach to rural areas development. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include Mr. Clapp's speech in the RECORD:

THE REA APPROACH TO RURAL AREAS DEVELOPMENT

The size and temper of this great gathering here today demonstrates one thing for sure about the rural areas development program.

There is no question about the interest that the leaders of rural electrification cooperatives have in this program. Nor is there any question about your enthusiasm and determination to do something about improving the economy of the rural communities in which you live.

Now that you have made that clear, let's get down to cases about the size of the job we face and do some hardheaded thinking about how we should proceed to develop our areas.

When we look at our national economy, we see a sharp disparity of income and economic opportunity between rural areas and urban areas. Census figures show that the median annual income for an urban family in 1959 was $5,755. The median income for farm families was less than half that amount—only $2,800.

Now that does not mean we want to pull down the economic levels of the urban areas. It simply means we must get busy and build up the economic health of the rural areas. From a better adjustment of income between these two great segments of our economy will come greater growth for both. Each will serve as a better market for the other. Business will prosper, production will increase—and be consumed.

The present disparity in income reflects low farm prices, and it also reflects widespread rural underemployment. It doesn't take as many people to raise the food and fiber we consume as it used to. Unfortunately, many of the people displaced from full-time agriculture have not found jobs off-the-farm. There are not enough jobs to go around in rural America today.

One unhappy result of all this is that our young people are leaving the farm in large numbers. The Department of Agriculture estimates that fully 75 percent of our farm youths leave the rural communities where they grew up and went to school by the time they are 30 years old.

Our areas are losing these young people to towns and cities, and the rural population left behind is an aging one. In 1959, for example, young men and women of 20 to 34 years of age comprised only 14 percent of our farm population. This age group represented 19 percent of our urban population.

It was in 1958, for the first time in the history of our farm population, that there were more people on farms who were over 45 years of age than there were people between 18 and 45.

This aging creates many difficulties for a community in terms of education, health facilities, taxes, new business and services. I will not comment on them further today except to say that this imbalance between young people and older people is a serious threat to the future soundness and growth of our rural communities. The economic health of a community depends upon its retaining its proportionate share of young men and women, starting new families, new households, and new enterprise.

The economic lag in rural areas also has serious implications for our national economy, both from the standpoint of domestic welfare and from the standpoint of our position as a world power: Domestically, the depressed state of rural income is acting as a brake on the whole recovery program. The jobs of city workers depend in large measure on the market in rural areas for the things they manufacture and sell. In recent years, agriculture alone has represented a $56 billion annual market for production goods and consumer goods. Figures for 1955 show that farmers spent $795 million for automobiles and trucks; more than $1 billion for household furnishings and equipment; more than $2 billion for clothing. It should be perfectly obvious to everyone that what hurts the rural market hurts the urban worker as well. When rural people can buy, city cash registers will ring.

* * * * *

REA and REA-financed electric systems have for 26 years been in the forefront of the battle to raise living standards in rural areas. We helped bring the blessings and the enormous productive power of electricity to rural people. We are moving fast to help bring them the modern telephone service which has been denied them for so long. In providing these services, tens of thousands of new jobs for local people have been created. With this background of leadership in bootstrap enterprise, we have logical responsibility to offer leadership in the wider fields of rural areas development.

Our job cannot end with bringing people electricity and telephones. These services have made rural life more attractive for many young people, but they are not enough by themselves to arrest the drift away from our communities—and away from the meters on your power systems. Idle services on our co-op systems have reached the 500,000 mark.

We now must tackle the crisis of rural income and find ways to keep a larger share of the food and fiber dollar at home, where it is produced.

I am convinced that President Kennedy's farm bill, which offers farm producers a means of uniting and through democratic processes, molding the production of their commodities to fit market demands, will go a long way toward raising farm prices to fair and reasonable levels. It represents one vital and essential approach to the problems which beset us.

But again, even higher farm prices alone will not solve the need. As farm technology advances, the actual production of farm commodities requires fewer people. Many rural people need supplementary employment and are unable to find it.

Those of us in rural electrification have long been identified with the needs and aspirations of rural people. I think we can say, in all modesty, that we know a thing or two about helping rural people help themselves through cooperative action. Let us now apply this knowledge to the creation of more rural employment. Let's provide more paychecks, circulate more dollars, generate a more vital national economy.

How can we do it? What do we need to bring this to pass?

First, we need local leadership. We need men and women who are determined and imaginative. We need people of energy who are impatient of delay. We need the qualities that you people here today have to offer. We need your development groups, your committees, your cooperatives. Pull together all those local people who can make and will make a genuine contribution.

Then develop complete information on your local needs and resources. Get the facts on your labor supply and local skills. Find out where your food and fiber and timber go when they leave your area. Know the size of your local market for goods and services, and study the requirements of all your markets. Make a complete inventory of your community, and plan how they can best be fitted into potential markets.

Third, concentrate on homegrown industry. There is no reason why our rural areas should not retain a bigger share of the food and fiber processing dollar. We can do much more food processing, packing, handling, and packaging close to home than we are doing now. Let's get our farm produc-

tion as nearly ready for the retail store as we possibly can.

* * * * *

Give some careful thought to developing better recreational facilities. Frequently, a distressed agricultural area has great potential for outdoor recreation and tourist business. And make no mistake. The tourist business is very big business today. You local people have it in your power to make sure your woods and rivers and lakes are developed intelligently, to be of maximum benefit to all people who use them. The multipurpose development of natural resources, particularly water resources, is not new to REA people. Be tough-minded enough to oppose those interests who imagine recreation to consist of a roadside string of hot dog stands and cabarets. Recreational projects should improve a community, not cheapen it. Scenery belongs to everyone. Make it an attraction, not an eyesore.

Finally, what is needed is long-term, low-interest credit for rural projects. The new Area Redevelopment Act will make some such credit available for new enterprises in designated depressed areas. In other areas, planners should investigate the loan programs of the Small Business Administration, Farmers Home Administration, and other Federal agencies, including REA. As far as conventional financing is concerned, the tight money situation which has plagued small business for so many years appears to be easing somewhat. You can be certain that this Administration is going to pay careful attention to the credit needs of small enterprise.

In initiating any program of community development, there are several pitfalls which we must be careful to avoid. One is the danger of eternal planning, of confusing the organization for action with action itself.

* * * * *

There also is a danger that this program can degenerate into a kind of game of industrial musical chairs. Merely moving a plant from one part of the country to another will not solve our problems. It will raise neither our national income nor our national product. The Federal Government cannot participate in programs involving the pirating of industry from one place to another. It may be that local groups think they can justify such actions out of strictly local considerations, but we at REA certainly could not justify them on a national basis. And I suspect that whatever local advantage such a game might seem to have would in the end prove only temporary. Keep your eye on homegrown projects.

I hope that I have made this point clear. It is certainly sound and praiseworthy to improve your community so that an industry will want to locate there. It is something else again to extend artificial bait in the form of uneconomic cash or other inducements.

Finally, there is the danger of making imprudent or unsound investments. Be sure there is an adequate market before you leap into a new venture. Be sure that the goods and services you sell can be priced competitively. The projects you initiate will be only as sound as your own judgment.

Now let's talk about where REA fits into this program for rural areas development. I can only speak for REA today and not for any other agency.

First, our interest is in you. Our interest is tied to our working relationship with 1,000 rural electric borrowers and 750 telephone borrowers. Our interest is in you and the more than 20 million rural people in 2,700 counties who depend on the systems you represent for low-cost electric power and telephone service. We want these people to continue to receive all the power and modern telephone service they need at reasonable rates, and we believe one way to assure this is to help you develop a healthy balance between agriculture and industry.

Second, as an agency responsible for public funds, we have a self-interest in the growth and financial stability of our borrowers and the protection of the Government's loans in your rural electric systems. The migration of our young people out of rural areas, the depressed state of farm income, and the lack of job opportunities pose a threat to your continued growth and security, which must be met.

Third, we have an interest as a lender of section 5 funds. We expect to emphasize the availability of section 5 loans through our borrowers to finance the installation of electric machinery and equipment for industrial, commercial, and agricultural enterprises in rural areas.

REA's interest in rural community development is clear on all these counts, and I want to emphasize that in this sense we are prepared to offer any assistance we can to borrowers, no matter where they may be located.

* * * * *

But the major burden and initiative must, of necessity, fall on you people here and your neighbors back home. I hope you will face up to the challenge when you return home and get some projects on the drawing boards that will help us stop this migration of our young people to the cities and boost rural income.

The greatness of America is rooted deep in its soil. The distinctive stamp of American character has sprung from the pioneer life of yesterday and the influence of rural living today. Here the rugged independence of the individual, the human qualities of neighborliness, the virtues of cooperation have been nurtured. We must not, we cannot, abandon rural America to economic inertia, for in these rural communities, as well as in our magnificent technology, lie the wellsprings of our greatness.

Detroit, 1961: A Changing Face—A Growing Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article prepared and published by the Michigan Bell Telephone Co., entitled "Detroit, 1961: A Changing Face—A Growing Force":

The Michigan Bell Telephone Co. has prepared and published a report entitled "Detroit, 1961: A Changing Face—A Growing Force."

The report points out that Motor City is only a limited description of Detroit's new makeup. The Detroit of 1961 is a city that is broadening its manufacturing horizons, adding new industries (120 per year), and building an even healthier and more diversified business community.

Detroit creates more wealth per capita than any other city in the United States. Nearly 50 percent of Detroit's total labor force is engaged in the stable, wealth-building activities of manufacturing or construction. Productivity in these two fields doubles that of San Francisco and is half again as great as New York's. Detroit's wage scale equals or exceeds that of any other industrial area, and only Washington, D.C.'s spending measures up to the $10 billion Detroit spends annually for goods and services.

Starting from the Detroit River, redevelopment activity is reaching deep inside the city to create new housing and provide needed acreage for industrial, commercial, and institutional expansion. Port activity in 1960 opened a new gateway to greatness for Detroit as an international shipping center. Now 101 oversea ports in 48 countries are linked to the port of Detroit by regularly scheduled steamship lines. In an 8-month shipping season total tonnage going through the Detroit River exceeds combined tonnage through the Panama and Suez Canals in a full year.

Detroit is a busy city—busy growing, busy creating its greatest progress in history.

DETROIT'S INDUSTRIAL MAKEUP IS DIVERSIFSED

More people are employed in nonautomotive manufacturing in Detroit than are employed in all manufacturing in either Boston, St. Louis, Baltimore or San Francisco.

The city is a production giant in the fields of machine tool accessories, gray-iron foundry items, metal stampings and hardware. Detroit uses more finished steel (more than 10 percent of the total national output) than any other industrial area in the country, and ranks high in the manufacture of drugs, paints and varnishes, wirework, tires, machine tools, and office machinery. Wayne County, according to Dun & Bradstreet's new Metalworking Directory, is now the third largest metalworking county in the United States. Of the 145 classifications of manufacturing recognized by the Department of Commerce, 127 are represented in Detroit. (For a partial list of the wide range of industries in Detroit, see exhibit A.)

DETROIT'S COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL EXPANSION SHOWS STEADY INCREASE

With each decade, Detroit's ability to expand gathers momentum. More industrial building permits were issued during the past decade than in any other decade of the city's history (including two booming postwar periods).

The number of industrial building permits issued in Detroit from 1920–29 was 1,486, and from 1930–39 the total issued was 674. In the decade from 1940–49, the number jumped to 1,242. But even this total was small compared with the 2,306 industrial building permits issued from 1950–59.

And here's just a partial list of building permits issued by the city of Detroit during the first 11 months of 1960:

Twenty-six new factory and shop buildings with a valuation of $1,327,815.

Three hundred and seventy-six additions and alterations to factory and shop buildings with a valuation of $4,454,708.

Sixty-three new office buildings with a valuation of $2,008,800.

One hundred seventy-one additions and alterations to office buildings with a valuation of $2,271,894.

Sixty-five new storage and warehouse buildings with a valuation of $1,569,355.

One hundred forty additions and alterations to storage and warehouse buildings with a valuation of $2,156,459.

Sixty-five store buildings with a valuation of $2,145,750.

Four hundred thirty-one additions and alterations to store buildings with a valuation of $1,884,893.

A total of 219 new building permits with a valuation of $7,051,720, and 1,118 permits for additions and alterations with a valuation of $10,767,954 were issued.

The sources of these statistics were the city building inspector's office and the city plan commission.

DETROIT ATTRACTS NEW INDUSTRY

Good government, a designed-for-industry expressway system, production know-

how, a limitless pool of skilled labor all serve to attract out-of-State industrial firms at the rate of 120 per year.

During the past two years, Detroit has welcomed more than 300 firms from out of State, according to the Detroit City Industrial Coordinator.

More than 400 industrial and commercial firms have expanded in Detroit during the past two years.

Here are just a few projects undertaken in 1960 or planned for this year:

Cadillac House Motel, adjacent to Detroit's Civic Center, was constructed at a cost of $1,500,000.

Casa Balcona, a $10 million cooperative apartment building, is planned on a 5-acre site.

The Detroit Edison Co. announced a construction budget of $70 million.

Easton Manufacturing Co. will build a new research center at an estimated cost of $1,250,000.

Fairlane Shopping Center announced a $15 million project on a 50-acre site.

Florists' Telegraph Delivery Association built a $1 million national headquarters building.

Plans have been announced for two 21-story apartment buildings and a shopping center, costing $13 million in the Gratiot Redevelopment Area.

A $1 million home office for the Great Lakes Insurance Co. has been announced.

A 5-story, 80-unit motel, Highland Inn Motor Motel, will be built at a cost of $1 million.

Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp. plans a $1 million expansion at its Stainless & Strip Division.

Michigan Bell Telephone Co. announced a construction program during 1960 of $101,500,000, including three new buildings to house its engineering department, Woodward Division headquarters, and a service center. They will cost $6 million and will be located on a 40-acre unit.

Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. plans to spend $22,238,000 on new facilities and equipment.

The New York Central Railroad began work on a $13 million electronically controlled freight yard.

A 12-story office building is planned in the Northland Shopping Center area. An identical building will follow if the first unit is successful. The two structures will cost approximately $8 million.

A 17-story hotel, costing $2,500,000 will be built downtown.

A GREAT CITY PLANS FOR A FORGE-AHEAD INDUSTRIAL AND COMMERCIAL FUTURE AND—LOOKS TO THE SOCIAL NEEDS OF ITS PEOPLE

Twenty-one clearance and conservation projects (covering nearly 3,000 acres) make a strong contribution to Detroit's new growth in greatness.

Blight areas are being transformed into park settings for long-needed housing projects. Progress-planned corridors are cutting wide arcs through yesterday's slums—providing prime sites for industrial, commercial, and institutional growth.

An example of such projects is Lafayette Towers where construction will start this spring on a 4½-acre site. Estimated cost of this project is $14 million, including twin-20-story apartment buildings, a 2-level 351-car garage, and a swimming pool and recreation area. The towers will contain 680 living units.

WEST SIDE INDUSTRIAL CORRIDOR

Located less than a mile from the shopping district on Woodward Avenue and a half mile from the new Convention Hall, the West Side Industrial District is a project designed to create a center for wholesaling, manufacturer's warehousing, truck terminals, and light industry. The Fort-Vernor Expressway will be routed directly to the north of the district, providing a nonstop westerly route to Chicago, easterly to Port Huron, and southerly to Ohio. The district lies along a section of the Detroit River which has potentialities for much more intensive marine terminal activity in the future.

Here are a few of the commercial and industrial firms that have elected to locate in the West Side Industrial Corridor:

National Dry Goods proposes to build a $125,000 warehouse and office facility.

Rim & Wheel Service Co. has been operating from its modern $125,000 building.

A $5 million Graphic Arts Center (for printing and allied industries) will absorb 17 acres.

Holiday Inn is planning a 100-unit, million-dollar hotel.

Detroit has 18 major redevelopment projects, totaling $150,791,000, either underway or in planning stages. Three conservation projects, amounting to $39,320,883, also are in various stages of development. The 21 clearance and conservation projects total $190,111,903.

(For a list of major redevelopment and rehabilitation projects, see Exhibit B.)

DOWNTOWN DETROIT MAKES STRONG BID FOR LEADERSHIP IN RETAIL SALES

Downtown Detroit contains the most highly concentrated shopping facilities of any major city in the country. Clustered in an area 8 blocks long by 4 blocks wide are 800 department and specialty stores. It is estimated that Downtown Detroit accounts for one-third of the total volume of retail trade in the standard Metropolitan Detroit area—significant evidence that urban Detroit is still making a strong contribution to the economic health of the metropolitan area.

PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL VILLAGE WOULD PROVIDE SHARP INCREASE OF BUSINESS ACTIVITY IN THE DOWNTOWN AREA

A 30-acre site in the downtown redevelopment area has been selected as the site for an International Village. This village would include a strip of continental resort-type motor hotels, an international trade office building, a high-rise apartment building, several large restaurants and night clubs, and a group of restaurants, gift and curio shops of an international type.

Not only would the village attract more conventions to Detroit, but it would also attract thousands of tourists, stimulate development of other businesses, and cause a general surge of local business activity in the downtown business district, according to The Detroiter, a weekly publication of the Detroit Board of Commerce.

DETROIT EMERGES AS A CONVENTION INDUSTRY GIANT

Although a newcomer to the top ranks of the convention industry, Detroit is rapidly climbing to the lead position.

In 1950, convention spending was estimated at $6,500,000. By 1957, spending had risen to $10 million. In 1958, eager-to-spend delegates vaulted the figure to $11,390,000. In 1959 and 1960, spending rose to $13,250,000 and $17,182,000, respectively. And in 1961, this amount will be nearly doubled when convention spending is expected to soar to the $30 million mark, according to the Detroit Convention and Tourist Bureau.

DETROIT'S CONVENTION INDUSTRY LOOKS TO A $65 MILLION FUTURE

The Detroit Convention and Tourist Bureau has advance bookings for 358 conventions through 1972. An estimated 839,000 delegates will attend the conventions and spend $65 million.

A recently announced $8 million project that will offer a combination of hotel and motel facilities is sure to give added thrust to Detroit's convention business. A 306-room high rise center hotel will be flanked by two 100-unit motel wings. Features will include a dining room seating 400 persons, a garage designed to hold 300 cars, an Olympic-size swimming pool on the garage roof, and an outdoor restaurant.

PORT OF DETROIT SHOWS 461-PERCENT INCREASE IN OVERSEA TRADE SINCE 1958

The St. Lawrence Seaway has firmly established the port of Detroit as a new gateway to world trade. Since 1958, oversea shipments and receipts through the port of Detroit have shown a 461.5-percent increase. Detroit is the pivot of the Michigan Customs District, and now handles a greater volume of imports and exports than any other port of entry except New York.

The acting port of Detroit director reports that oversea shipments and receipts climbed from 68,626 cargo tons in 1957 to 87,232 tons in 1958. They jumped to 362,808 tons in 1959, and reached 489,791 tons as of October 1960. The estimated total tonnage for the 1960 season exceeded a half-million tons, and exports during 1960 nearly doubled the volume of imports.

DETROIT PREPARES FOR LEADERSHIP AS AN INTERNATIONAL PORT

The current net direct income from general oversea cargo is $17 per cargo ton, while indirect income amounts to $51 per cargo ton, according to the Port of Detroit Commission.

The commission estimates that within 3 years the port should receive between $3 million and $9 million in direct income. In the distribution of this additional income, wholesale trade is expected to account for between $800,000 and $1,400,000; retail trade between $1,800,000 and $3,200,000; finance, insurance, and real estate between $1,200,000 and $2,200,000; and services between $1,200,000 and $2,200,000.

The commission further estimates that this influx of income into the area will stimulate indirect financial benefits amounting to between $10 and $18 million.

Waterfront improvements, totaling $1,600,000, will be constructed this spring. Three projects included in the program are: An Engel Park marina for seasonal mooring of 330 boats, costing $981,000; outboard launching facilities at the foot of St. Jean Street, $368,000; and a civic center breakwater and dock, $250,000.

DETROIT MARKET FACTS

The Detroit market zone, which includes Detroit and 18 communities in the metropolitan area, has a population of 2,412,620. The Detroit zone includes 689,320 families, with a junior market of 885,440 children 18 years of age or younger, according to Michigan Bell Telephone Co. commercial engineers.

In September of 1960, the number of telephones in the Detroit zone reached 1,129,904, an increase of 127,213 since 1955 and 26,105 more than in 1959. Customers made an average of 5,625,952 telephone calls a day from these telephones.

During the first 10 months of 1960, permits were issued in the Detroit zone for 2,644 new homes, with a valuation of $37,358,818. Also issued were 834 industrial and commercial building permits, with a valuation of $34,115,143, and 11,858 permits for alterations and additions, with a valuation of $41,068,363. Permits for 6,202 garages, valued at $7,273,549, and 134 miscellaneous permits, valued at $123,528, were issued, making a total of 21,672 building permits and a valuation of $119,939,401. These figures came from the various building inspectors' offices.

Employment figures for the first 10 months of 1960, showed an average of 1,301,560 employed persons in Wayne, Oakland, and Macomb Counties, the three most populous counties in the Detroit metropolitan area.

The total represented an increase of 14,060 over the same period of 1959, according to the Michigan Employment Security Commission.

Of these persons in the labor force, 514,550 were in manufacturing, 520,790 in nonmanufacturing, 129,520 in Government employ, 10,700 in farm labor, and 126,000 self employed.

Retail sales in the Detroit zone for the first 10 months of 1960 totaled $2,617,875,526. Retail sales in Detroit were 11 percent above the national level in 1959. Total retail sales for Wayne County for the first 10 months of 1960 were $3,246,193,833. Retail sales in the Detroit zone represent 81 percent of the Wayne County total.

Residents in the Detroit zone spent $799,221,088 for food, $569,591,231 for automobiles, $321,480,385 for general merchandise, $174,651,061 for building materials, $137,893,950 for apparel, $123,720,710 for furniture, and $491,317,101 for miscellaneous items, according to the Michigan Department of Revenue and the U.S. Census of Business.

According to the Sales Management Survey of Buying Power, the Detroit zone had a spendable income (after taxes) of $5,241,979,410. The average income per household in 1959 was $7,593.

As of June 1960, banking institutions in the Detroit zone showed total resources of $4,816,527,573 and total deposits of $4,380,964,184, according to individual bank statements. Bank debits for the first 11 months of 1960 amounted to $98,494,110,000, an increase of $6,975,800 (7.6 percent) over the same 11 months of 1959. Detroit checkbook spending was up, according to the Federal Reserve Bank Research Department. As of October, among the major areas in the Midwest, bank debits of Detroit and Chicago scored the largest rise, up 9 and 10 percent respectively.

Motor vehicle registration for Wayne County in 1959 totaled 1,008,725. Only two counties in the United States have a higher registration. In 1959, more new cars were sold in Wayne County than in Arizona, Arkansas, Delaware, Idaho, Maine, and New Hampshire combined.

In 1959, 167,411 new cars were sold in Wayne County. For the first 9 months of 1960, new car sales in Wayne County reached 121,084. Added to the new car sales figure, was the sale of an estimated 275,000 used cars during the first 9 months of 1960.

Approximately 352,000 vehicles enter and leave the Detroit zone each 24-hour period.

These figures came from the Michigan Department of State, the State highway department, Michigan Auto Dealers Association, and the Automobile Manufacturers Association.

EXHIBIT A

Here is just a partial list of industries that are making Detroit a growing industrial force: 7 flour mills; 119 meat product plants; 17 canning and preserving plants; 79 beverage companies; 7 hat, cap, and millinery manufacturers; 11 paper mills; 466 commercial printers; 14 industrial organic chemical firms; 86 soap and detergent manufacturers; 52 paint, varnish, and lacquer manufacturers; 13 petroleum refineries; 11 manufacturers of tires and inner tubes; 9 flat glass companies; 55 blast furnaces, steelworks, rolling and finishing mills; 50 iron and steel foundries; 17 rolling and extruding plants; 34 cutlery, hand tool, and general hardware manufacturers; 47 millwork, veneer, plywood, and prefabricated structural wood products; 48 concrete, gypsum and plaster products; 50 iron and steel foundries; 207 fabricated structral metal products; 29 jewelry, silverware, and plated ware; 41 toys, amusement, sporting, and athletic goods; 52 nonferrous foundries; 74 miscellaneous primary metal industries; 106 coating, engraving, and allied services; and 36 office, computing, and accounting machines.

Source: City of Detroit personal property rolls.

EXHIBIT B

Major redevelopment and rehabilitation projects

Project	Net project costs	Predominant proposed use	Area in acres
A. Redevelopment projects:			
1. Gratiot (B) General boundaries: Gratiot; Grand Trunk R.R.; Lafayette, Chrysler Expressway.	$6, 800, 298	Residential	129
2. West Side industrial General boundaries: Bagley-Porter; Lodge Expressway; West Lafayette; 12th.	5, 220, 889	Light industrial	77
3. Lafayette (B) General boundaries: Lafayette; Grand Trunk R.R.; East Jefferson; Chrysler Expressway.	5, 930, 208	Residential	64
4. Central business district No. 1 (B) General boundaries: Bagley; Cass; West Lafayette; Lodge Expressway.	6, 934, 882	Commercial	59
5. Central business district No. 3 (B) General boundaries: Gratiot; Chrysler Expressway; Larned; Beaubien-St. Antoine.	4, 568, 210	Institutional	33
6. Medical center No. 1 General boundaries: Alexandrine; Chrysler Expressway; Mack; Woodward.	6, 055, 930	Commercial and institutional	58
7. Medical center No. 2 General boundaries: Canfield; Chrysler Expressway; Alexandrine.	7, 500, 000	Commercial, institutional, and residential	58
8. Medical center No. 3	9, 000, 000	do	120
9. Medical center No. 4 General boundaries: East Kirby; Chrysler Expressway; Canfield; John R. Brush.	6, 000, 000		
10. Milwaukee—Junction No. 1 (D) General boundaries: Ford Expressway; Russell; E. Ferry; Chrysler Expressway.	2, 056, 000	Industrial	17
11. Milwaukee—Junction No. 2	7, 899, 502	do	318
12. Milwaukee—Junction No. 3	4, 500, 000		
13. Milwaukee—Junction No. 4 General boundaries: East Grand Blvd.; St. Aubin; Hancock; Chrysler Expressway.	10, 500, 000		
14. Elmwood Park No. 1 (C) General boundaries: East Vernor; Chene; East Lafayette; Grand Trunk R.R.	10, 144, 747	Residential	127
15. Elmwood Park No. 2	9, 000, 000	do	277
16. Elmwood Park No. 3 General boundaries: East Lafayette-East Vernor; Mount Elliott; East Jefferson; Grand Trunk R.R.-Chene.	11, 100, 000		
17. University City No. 1 (C) General boundaries: Ford Expressway; Lodge Expressway; Warren; Trumbull.	8, 197, 736	Institutional and residential	61
18. University City—Balance General boundaries: Ford Expressway-Warren; Woodward-3d; Forest-Canfield; 14th.	29, 382, 528	do	235
Total, redevelopment	150, 791, 020		
B. Conservation projects:			
1. Mack—Concord (B) General boundaries: Gratiot-East Warren; Van Dyke; Mack; Bellevue.	3, 894, 862	Residential	264
2. Eight Mile-Wyoming (B) General boundaries: Eight Mile; Santa Barbara; Pembroke-West Outer Dr.; Birwood.	3, 626, 021	do	293
3. Riverview General boundaries: Mack; Maxwell-Parker; East Jefferson; Bellevue.	31, 800, 000	do	640
Total, conservation	39, 320, 883		
Grand total	190, 111, 903		

Source: Urban Renewal Division, Detroit Housing Commission.

NOTE.—(B) Federal contract in effect; (C) Federal contract in preparation; (D) local project in execution.

Students Hope To Meet German Pal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PORTER HARDY, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, in these days of ideological conflict, when division and misunderstanding among free people gives advantage to the enemies of freedom, it is encouraging to learn about actions initiated by our young people to exchange ideas and develop friendships and understanding with their counterparts in foreign countries. The following article from the Virginian-Pilot and Portsmouth Star newspapers in my district is an account of just such an activity on the part of a group of students at Cradock High School located in Portsmouth, Va.

I am sure there are students in other high schools who are participating in similar exchanges with students of other countries. I commend them for their good work in building good will. It has often seemed to me that people-to-people contacts like this can be more effective in promoting our country's foreign policy objectives than any other type of diplomacy:

STUDENTS HOPE TO MEET GERMAN PAL
(By Charles V. Pritchard)

PORTSMOUTH—If they can figure a way to finance it, members of a Cradock High School English class will meet one of their German pen pals this Christmas.

One of Miss Cora Mae Fitzgerald's freshman English classes wants to invite the Germany pupil here.

The pen pal project started in September after the pupils learned that Ingeborg Jutta Gregory is a native of Germany. Her father was killed in the war, and later her mother married an American, P. L. Gregory. About 4 years ago, they came to America and they now live at 7 Sampson Place in Cradock.

American English students and German English students began correspondence when Miss Fitzgerald's class sent a box to Germany. It was filled with candy, marshmallows, and chewing gum, most of which are quite expensive or unavailable in Germany. Miss Fitzgerald sent the German English class' teacher, Wolfgang Erbroth, coffee and cigarettes.

The German English students responded with a box and letters. Their box was filled with homemade cookies and cognac chocolates. Their letters said they liked the gift from America, but the chocolate was "too sweet." Germans like their chocolate bitter.

More letters followed. Then tapes replaced paper. Voices of Cradock students went east, and voices of German students came west. Included on the tape from Germany was the class singing "Oh, Suzanna" and "Carry Me Back to Ole Virginny." Miss Fitzgerald said that, except for the tempo of the State song being faster than it is sung here, it was very nice.

The Cradock students now are packing a box with American newspapers, magazines, and compositions on life in America which the German students requested.

Miss Fitzgerald reports that the project has been a very interesting one for the students. It has helped them in their studies and she hopes it has increased world understanding.

Because classes stay together in Germany, Miss Gregory remembers her former classmates and tells about them when the letters are read or the tape is played in class.

Miss Fitzgerald's class will be together again next year, too, so they will be able to continue the pen-pal project. For this reason, the idea to invite a student here from Germany developed.

At first the students talked about the wonderful opportunity it would be for one or more of them to be able to go to Germany.

But after thinking about how wonderful America is, they decided that it would be much nicer if a German student could come to this country.

Director Bennett Tells How To Improve the Administration of Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most efficient and progressive agencies of the U.S. Government is the Bureau of Prisons and its highly regarded Director, Mr. James V. Bennett.

His reputation as a modern penologist is nationwide because of his success in rehabilitating violators of the law. His constructive experience in this field is an inspiration to inmates, prison officials, judges, and probation officers, who seek out and benefit from his philosophy of justice tempered with mercy.

Mr. Bennett is concerned about the disparity in sentencing, and he documents his theme with actual but anonymous cases that reveal the uneven administration of justice from court to court and State to State.

He tells of two cases that "indicated no significant differences for sentencing purposes, but they appeared before different judges and the first man received 15 years in prison and the second man 30 days."

There is much food for thought in Director Bennett's observations and suggestions. I, therefore, under previous permission, insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of the speech that he gave before the Sixth Circuit Judiciary Conference at Dearborn, Mich., on April 28, 1961, titled "Count-Down for Judicial Sentencing":

COUNT-DOWN FOR JUDICIAL SENTENCING
(By James V. Bennett, Director, Bureau of Prisoners, before the Sixth Circuit Judiciary Conference, Dearborn, Mich., Apr. 28, 1961)

The title I selected for this paper—"Count-Down for Judicial Sentencing"—sounds a little more ominous and much more mathematical than I intended at the time I submitted it to my good friend and your distinguished colleague, Judge Levin. No comparison with modern space science, however, is needed to alert us to the fact that a searching and perhaps agonizing reappraisal of present sentencing methods is also underway. Yet I doubt, as a matter of fact, that the new wonders of this scientific age would be of much more help to us in our deliberations than it was to one of the obsessive compulsive gamblers we have in one of our institutions.

I refer to a bank officer who had a long record of reliability and trustworthiness. I presume he would have continued in what he apparently considered a dull routine had he not suddenly acquired an uncontrollable urge to obtain a lot of money quickly, possibly for some foreign travel he had in mind. He read that a Massachusetts Institute of Technology instructor had devised a strategy for winning at blackjack. With the aid of an electronic computer this mathematics genius found that the chances of winning at blackjack depended greatly on the cards that had been played in previous hands. With the use of an electronic brain that is guiding some men through space and showing others how to make money on the commodity exchange he evolved a formula which showed for instance that the house wins more often if the aces have been exhausted and the player more often if the fives have been exhausted. Our guest checked this theory as best he could and then undertook to put it into practice with the bank's money. His only difficulty was that he did not have beside him at the gambling table a computer and data processing machine to help him apply in the few seconds allowed to place a bet the proven system. To his everlasting chagrin he lost a great deal of the bank's money and ended up ignominiously in one of our institutions teaching fifth grade arithmetic to persons less advantaged in this esoteric field.

It may be that some day some electronic whiz will come along who can develop what the computer people call a program which will enable the judge to put into the machine certain facts, standards and values about the prisoner at the bar and out will come the perfect sentence—consistent in every way with the needs of the defendant, the sound objectives of law enforcement and in conformity with a humane and civilized system of justice.

That may seem remote now but experimental research is already underway to determine how accurately a computer can predict the future conduct of individuals having like backgrounds, mental capacities, skills, experiences, and so on. Princeton grades its football players that way, baseball managers are thus determining their batting orders, and 7,000 doctors are assigned each year on the basis of computer findings.

If we could find out and scale the important factors and considerations which should be taken into account in determining the correct sentence the computer might be helpful. As a matter of fact, with the help of a Ford Foundation grant we are ourselves now trying to determine the factors which account for one prisoner making good in the community after he is discharged and why another one fails. So, in my countdown on judicial sentencing I suggest that the potentialities of electronic computers and data-processing machines be taken into account.

My next number in the countdown series calls to mind the fact that our population will increase by 50 percent in the next 20 years. Thus there will be not only more people to keep in order but more accompanying strains and stresses upon our social structure. The growing rate of alcoholism, divorce, and unemployment as well as the degree to which race relationships and urbanization are changing point inexorably to a further increase in our crime rate. If you judge, for instance, the effect the automobile has already had upon the growth and prevalence of crime it's not difficult to imagine what will happen in an era when our population becomes larger, more mobile and more dependent upon cars. What indeed will happen to the economically dis-

advantaged when the automobile becomes even more of a necessity and status symbol than it is at present. Upward of 275,000 automobiles are now being stolen each year and, of course, every bank robbery, kidnaping, and most crimes of violence require the use of the automobile for its perpetration. Moreover, almost every case of juvenile delinquency, as you know, now revolves around the automobile. In sum exposure, opportunities and causes for crime are all on the march. How then can we possibly cope with the problem of sentencing fairly and properly and evenly so large a number of criminals if there is not some consensus as to how it should be approached?

The next number in my countdown on judicial sentencing follows logically from this facing up to facts. I ask you to consider the widening role of the Federal Government in the field of crime control. Already there are hundreds of laws on the statute books that bring the errant citizen under Federal jurisdiction but the end is certainly not in sight. Proposals, for instance, have been made to bring under the umbrella of title 18 of the Criminal Code practically all offenses where an interstate facility is used in its promotion.

Consider for instance the scope of Senator KEATING's bill which would give the Federal courts jurisdiction over any conspiracy which utilizes the mails, any transportation facility, any interstate communication by wire or radio in furtherance of an organized crime offense. Organized crime is defined to include violation of any law relating to gambling, narcotics, extortion, intoxicating liquor, prostitution, criminal fraud, false pretenses, murder, assault, and so on. All encompassing as this is there are others which seem to have reasonable chances of enactment, such as the proposed plan to broaden the Federal Fugitive Felon Act to include most other felonies. You are all familiar with these proposals and I have no doubt can judge their potentialities accurately. The only point I wish to make is that it is inevitable that more and more cases of more and more different types of offenders are to be brought into Federal court.

That brings me to my next number in this perhaps awesome count-down on the future of our sentencing methods and philosophies. This one concerns the challenge which Congress has presented in the recent new statutes dealing with these matters. Vast new discretionary powers with regard to sentencing have been granted the courts. Some 60 new district judges are about to be authorized and 15 or so will be appointed to fill existing vacancies. These obviously pose new opportunities for disparity since they widen the exposure, so to speak, for inconsistencies. While this is occurring there is a growing acute consciousness of the importance of more exacting standards of criminal justice. I judge from recent appellate and Supreme Court decisions that the trend in this direction is unmistakable. So the conclusion is inescapable that we must step up the time table for working out common Federal sentencing philosophies.

Now my next number in my count-down requires that we look at what has been happening with regard to judicial sentencing. Certainly we must not blind ourselves to the fact that there are many who feel that the task of sentencing should be taken out of the hands of a single judge. I disagree with that approach. Nonetheless, California has already adopted a sentencing tribunal plan and other jurisdictions are working in that direction. Senator Hruska has introduced a bill providing for appellate review of sentences, a procedure already in effect in such States as Massachusetts and Connecticut. Nor can we fail to notice how in moments of hysteria minimum mandatory penalties are prescribed for certain offenses that at the time affront our legislators. A bill, for instance, has been introduced this year to extend the mandatory penalty principle to transporting obscene literature. In my opinion we already have far too many mandatory penalties and some system must be evolved that will make these seem wholly unnecessary. But I emphasize that the whole question of sentencing has come under close and continuous scrutiny.

As we pronounce the next number in our countdown let's take a little look at the differences in approach among the judges as to how this problem of disparity should be attacked. One of my oldest and best friends, and now chief judge in one of our largest metropolitan areas, tells me to tread very softly, speak in generalities, and never mention cases that can be identified. Another tells me candor, frankness, and forthrightness is the only way that will bring home the seriousness of the situation. Another of my good friends among the judiciary tells me that he must know the potentialities of an offender for reformation, how long this will take, and what psychiatric and penological techniques are to be used before he can conscientiously pronounce a sentence. In contrast another judge on the Federal bench says that lectures by penologists and sociologists are of little value. One judge writes that uncertainty of the extent of any sentence is of the greatest value as a deterrent. Another rejects entirely the idea of an indeterminate sentence. And yet there are those who say judges have the same basic sentencing philosophies. I wonder.

I have a great and abiding respect for judges and for their courage as demonstrated particularly in this circuit in recent months. I admire them for their dedication to the ideal of equal justice under law. The care that is taken to ascertain the facts about an offender and how he is to be treated constantly amazes me. In no other judicial system in the world do judges now have or are able to obtain so much information about an offender as in the Federal system. And it is being used effectively to improve the administration of justice.

Even though I feel thus and agree that our courts and judges are the bulwark of our way of life, I cannot be so shortsighted as to overlook or shrug off without concern some cases where I have been dutybound to carry out the mandate of the court. Take for instance the cases of two men we received last spring. The first man had been convicted of cashing a check for $58.40. He was out of work at the time of his offense, and when his wife became ill and he needed money for rent, food, and doctor bills, he became the victim of temptation. He had no prior criminal record. The other man cashed a check for $35.20. He was also out of work and his wife had left him for another man. His prior record consisted of a drunk charge and a nonsupport charge. Our examination of these two cases indicated no significant differences for sentencing purposes. But they appeared before different judges and the first man received 15 years in prison and the second man 30 days.

These are not cases picked out of thin air. In January the President of the United States commuted to time served the sentence of a first offender, a former Army lieutenant, and a veteran of over 500 days in combat, who had been given 18 years for forging six small checks.

In one of our institutions a middle-aged credit union treasurer is serving 117 days for embezzling $24,000 in order to cover his gambling debts. On the other hand, another middle-aged embezzler with a fine past record and a fine family is serving 20 years, with 5 years probation to follow. At the same institution is a war veteran, a 39-year-old attorney who has never been in trouble before, serving 11 years for illegally importing parrots into this country. Another who is destined for the same institution is a middle-aged tax accountant who on tax fraud charges received 31 years and 31 days in consecutive sentences. In stark contrast, at the same institution last year an unstable young man served out his 98-day sentence for armed bank robbery.

An examination of sentencing statistics produce a less-dramatic picture, for they inevitably level off the extremes of leniency or severity. But they do serve to prove the widespread extent of disparities. For example, the crime of forgery usually involves similar circumstances and individuals, but last year the district of northern Indiana gave average terms of 52 months, while western Washington imposed an average of 10 months. For auto theft, an offense so often involving similar factors, one court in this circuit imposed terms averaging 48 months, but eastern New York imposed terms averaging slightly in excess of 14 months. The proportion of all types of convicted defendants placed on probation ranged from 67 percent in South Carolina to 10 percent in western Tennessee.

I will pronounce the next number in my countdown roundly and slowly, in order to take a look at some of the things that are being done to prevent blast off on judicial sentencing. It is most encouraging to note that the resources of the courts are being expanded in several ways to meet the challenges. The number of probation officers has increased sharply during the past 5 years, from approximately 300 in 1955 to more than 500 this year. With the reduction in the caseload per officer that this expansion has already brought about, the probation officers can be expected to do a better job in the preparation of presentence reports for the use of the courts and in supervising the clients assigned to them. The results of these improved services should become apparent within the next year or two.

Apropos, incidentally, of the importance of the presentence report let me say that a bill has been introduced in Congress which would in effect set aside a sentence by a visiting judge who pronounced his judgment without having such material before him. This came about because a bank embezzler was sentenced by a visiting district judge to 12 years without benefit of any information as to the background of the offender. In this connection I am reminded of a comment of the late revered Judge Schwellenbach who once said:

"The knowledge of the life of a man, his background and his family, is the only proper basis for the determination as to his treatment. There is no substitute for information. The sentencing judge in the Federal court has the tools with which to acquire that information. Failure to make full use of these tools cannot be justified."

The extent to which individual courts are following this advice and experimenting with various methods of assuring a greater measure of sentencing consistency can be noted right here in Detroit. Chief Judge Levin, as many of you know, has introduced the presentence conference for the judges of his court. The judges, as I understand it, meet once weekly and discuss the cases currently awaiting disposition. Each judge weighs a checklist of factors to be considered in imposing sentence and submits a recommendation. Through discussion some resolution of divergences in point of view are sought, and I am told, usually successfully. Chief Probation Officer Dick Doyle will give you more information about the presentence conference later this afternoon.

In Tacoma, Wash., Judge George H. Boldt follows the practice of recording his own dispositions in given types of cases. When imposing sentence on an individual defendant, he studies these records in an effort to make the sentence consistent with his previous dispositions. In Miami, Fla., Judge Emett C. Choate invites representatives of

the investigating agency to make suggestions as to disposition after the defendant has been convicted. This practice, of course, assures that the court receives the point of view of the people who are charged with enforcing certain statutes and who may be primarily interested in the deterrent purposes of the sentence.

The courts are also showing a commendable and increasing tendency to look for help and guidance when confronted with difficult sentencing problems. By the end of December 1960 they had sent to our institutions approximately 500 defendants under the diagnostic and observation procedures of the 1958 act. And these cases are now coming to us at an accelerating rate.

We seldom get a case that is routine or easy to decide. And properly so. Our grist consists for the most part of alcoholics, mental defectives or sexually deviated persons, people who commit bizarre crimes, nomadic youngsters in search of some El Dorado in a stolen automobile, bank embezzlers who steal not for themselves but for some friend or to aid some tottering business, veterans who try to square accounts with society because of the hostilities they harbor, women who are the doting accomplices of some man, and finally many rejected, unwanted youngsters who basically are social casework problems. These are all hard cases and we do all we can to summarize the facts, describe the findings of the psychiatrist, give our estimate of the time required to teach the offender a trade or how to get along despite his handicap and otherwise try to help the court in the proper disposition of the case.

Since all these factors are so difficult to appraise we feel that the indeterminate sentencing provision of the 1958 statute should be used unless there is some good reason to the contrary. The courts, I am glad to say, are using this provision of section 4208(a)(2) in increasing numbers.

The value of indeterminate sentences is demonstrated by the case of a 32-year-old bank robber who came to us only a few months ago. As a juvenile he had been institutionalized on two occasions, but he had kept out of trouble for the past 13 years. He had an excellent work record, but his family troubles piled up on him. His wife, after having four children, became openly promiscuous, and when the marriage ended he was saddled with heavy support payments. He again married, more happily this time, but his wife brought to the marriage three more children whom the defendant had to support. He and two companions robbed a bank and they were promptly apprehended. The judge gave him 15 years under the indeterminate procedure. We have been able to set certain goals for him in terms of academic schooling, trade training, group psychotherapy, and self-discipline which he must achieve before he can be advanced to the next step. I have recently been informed by the institution that the defendant is making such marked progress on his training program that we should be able to bring his case to the attention of the parole board soon.

As I reach the last number in my countdown I think we can say with justification that the Federal judiciary has made an excellent start within the past two years toward its goal of reducing the problem of sentence disparities to reasonable proportions. No one of course is so naive as to believe that perfect justice is attainable. The fortunes of men are subject to too many vagaries of fate. But certainly through the Institute approach we are seeking out better ways to reach this clearly achievable goal. This circuit is an outstanding example of the critical self-analysis with which the problem is being viewed.

No one can doubt the difficulty of this task. It calls for sober thought and hard work on the part of every individual judge, and it calls for the full cooperation of every agency and official who is asked by the courts for their assistance.

No other judicial act I venture can bring the judge the intense personal satisfactions that come from wise sentencing. I am sure all of you can attest to that experience. One of you, to my knowledge, has at the present moment the heart-warming feeling that the sentences he imposed on a group of youths several years ago have helped them to a better life and have served society well. Although these youths became involved in a rather sensationalized offense and the judge was under considerable public pressure, he nevertheless committed them under the Youth Act. All have now returned to the community on parole, and all are doing exceptionally well. One is graduating from college in June, two have become respected married men, and a fourth is well on the way toward success in the business field.

Except for a wise judge, it could have turned out much differently, both for society and these individuals. Confronted with a challenge, this judge searched his own soul, ignored cries for retributive justice and called rather upon the best resources of the law to solve the problem. And his wisdom, compassion, and understanding evolved a sentencing plan that worked.

It is heartening and strengthening to see that the Federal judiciary by and large is adopting similar soul-searching and resourceful methods. Thus it is that the challenge inherent in any countdown on judicial sentencing will, I feel sure, stop short of launching our legal system into an unknown "stratosphere." Instead, the even-handed administration of justice will be raised to new heights through perfection of present techniques, sharing of views and experiences and through practical implementation of the cooperative spirit of understanding and good will that has always characterized the Federal judiciary.

Congratulations! This Is National Tax Freedom Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, it takes the average taxpayer today just short of 4½ months to earn enough to pay his year's local, State, and Federal taxes. So assuming on January 1, 1961, he assigned the entire amount of his regular weekly paychecks to the tax collector until his annual tax debt was paid, today for the first time in 1961 his taxes would be paid up and he would commence receiving his own paychecks to expend for his own family needs.

Today, for the first time, the average American breadwinner is free, as such, and will be until December 31 to earn his and his family's needs for food, shelter and recreation if there is any left for the latter.

A similar average taxpayer in 1920, in the days when Government was not so big and costly, would have worked to cover his share of taxes from January until February 28. After 2 months of work the average taxpayer 40 years ago could have celebrated Tax Freedom Day.

Twenty years later in 1940 taxes had increased so that March 27 could have been celebrated as national average taxpayers Tax Freedom Day. The anniversary was almost a month later.

If one figures the rate of increase each 20 years and projects it into the future a taxpayer in due course will be working 365 days a year for his Government and all his needs will be provided. But until then, Mr. Average Taxpayer, congratulations are in order—the rest of your paychecks this year you can keep.

Mr. Speaker, during the days of the "old frontier," a citizen if he desired could work a few days on the local roads and his obligation was over.

Today under the New Frontier the people are headed into full-time employment but under the modern affluent society of the near future there will be only one employer and the work will be steady.

The only freedom will not be tax freedom but, unfortunately, will be the freedom to work day in and day out, year in and year out—all needs cared for from the cradle to the grave—for Uncle Sam.

Until then, congratulations, Mr. Average Taxpayer. This is your National Tax Freedom Day.

"Forest Shield," Timely and Pertinent Editorial in the Los Angeles Examiner for May 11, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 2, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent granted me heretofore, I am pleased to bring to your attention, and the attention of my other distinguished colleagues, an editorial appearing in the Los Angeles Examiner, Los Angeles, Calif., on Thursday, May 11, 1961.

Supervisor Bonelli and his associates, who came to Washington as mentioned in this editorial met with the southern California delegation in Congress and was very informative to us. Having lived in Los Angeles County myself for over 50 years I witnessed, both from long distance and close up, some of these terrible fires in the Angeles National Forest—and even closer to metropolitan Los Angeles than that.

The editorial follows:

FOREST SHIELD

Tinder-dry conditions from years of scanty rains in the Angeles National Forest have prompted renewed efforts to obtain adequate Federal aid to preserve this vital watershed of Metropolitan Los Angeles.

A county delegation headed by Supervisor Bonelli is now in Washington discussing with Congressmen from this area an emergency fire prevention program for Angeles Forest.

The key to this project is access roads designed to permit firefighting equipment to penetrate portions of the thickly wooded and precipitous terrain now inaccessible.

Mr. Bonelli and his delegation want the Federal Government to supply $31 million in 10 years to help build these roads, which are not boulevards for public use, but trails for specialized vehicles.

In the past 10 years alone, the Forest Service has incurred losses and expenses exceeeding that figure, because it could not reach little fires in time to prevent them from becoming major conflagrations.

We are now in the driest period of 30 years; the number of forest visitors and campers is at a high peak.

And sad to say, there is no decrease of careless smokers, untended campfires, children playing with matches, flames from motor accidents, incendiarism and occasionally, natural causes like lightning.

Every fire that gets out of hand inflicts on our communities serious losses in naturally stored water, not to mention destruction of property caused by flash floods.

Until a system of access roads makes it possible to reach all points, we will be constantly threatened with losses in life, property and natural resources.

That is the simple proposition the county delegation is trying to impress upon Congress. We hope it will command the attention it deserves.

Please, Mr. President, Don't Overlook Arizona

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, on May 8, 1961, the following editorial appeared in the Tucson Daily Citizen, Tucson, Ariz. Since it is timely, I am inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to be enjoyed by my colleagues in the House:

PLEASE, MR. PRESIDENT, DON'T OVERLOOK ARIZONA

President JOHN F. KENNEDY,
New Frontier,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Now that you have signed the $394 million depressed areas bill, making it the law of the land, we would like to call your attention to some badly depressed areas you may have overlooked.

There are a lot of them. Some of them are so badly depressed they are defunct. Out here on the old frontier, we used to call them ghost towns. We liked that poetic term, but to expedite communication on the New Frontier, we'll call them depressed areas. They certainly qualify.

Consider, for example, such towns in Arizona as Contention, Russellville, Charleston, and Galeyville. These once-thriving communities were centers of employment and recreation for miners and mill hands, gamblers, outlaws and bartenders.

But the mines closed. Nobody thought of moving a lace factory out from Boston and training the miners to work in it. So the miners left. So did the bartenders and barbers. The towns died.

This tragedy could have been prevented, Mr. President, had your Depressed Areas Act been operating. As we understand it, you have set up a Federal loan and grant program to attract industries to areas which have lost their main source of support and to retrain workers with obsolete skills.

It probably isn't fair to ask you to revive Contention, Charleston, and Galeyville. You have less than $400 million to work with, and that's too little and too late. These defunct areas are a long way from any major market for lace. And, besides, no voters live there anymore.

But we do call your attention to Tombstone. This is no ghost town, but it is one of the most famous depressed areas in all America. Once the biggest and busiest city in Arizona, Tombstone lost its main source of support when its silver mines flooded. Jobs disappeared by the thousands. The 1,200 people presently living in Tombstone deserve a lot of consideration because their area has been depressed ever since 1860. We doubt if any area in West Virginia or Pennsylvania can match that.

There are, Mr. President, some 18,000 communities in this Nation engaged in a highly competitive battle to attract industries. They have been doing this with their own money. As we understand it, the depressed areas program will use Federal money, largely collected in successful areas, to pay for increased competition from unsuccessful areas.

Some diehards out here on the Old Frontier don't think that's fair. They don't even think it will work. Even in Tombstone, some folks refuse to believe a cold cash subsidy in the offing will freeze economic history in the making.

We think they'll quit carping just as soon as you move a nice, big factory to Tombstone from, say, Chicago. You might get a few complaints from Chicagoans because their city, with its unemployment rate of 6 percent, also qualifies as a depressed area. But Tombstone certainly deserves priority. It has been depressed ever since Wyatt Earp hung up his six-guns for the last time.

And then, Mr. President, we suggest that Jerome be next on the priority list. This Arizona copper mining community was thriving until 1925, when the whole town started skidding slowly down the mountain at three-eighths of an inch per month. The mines have closed, but a couple of hundred people still live there. We don't know what they do for a living, but they have a nice museum.

We would like to put Allentown—formerly a cattle shipping community—on the list, but are afraid the New Frontiersmen couldn't find it. The realistic citizens of Allentown, not offered a subsidy, went along with economic history and deserted the place. And the Navajos carted all the buildings away to their reservation.

Respectfully yours,
AN OLD FRONTIERSMAN.

When the Going Gets Tough, the Tough Get Going

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. BARRY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, this Nation's citizens have achieved a very high degree of physical health. We live longer, and while we live we are freer from disease, than almost any people in the history of mankind. On the other hand we are continually getting softer and less physically fit. Health, that is freedom from disease, is not the same thing as physical fitness which is toughness, strength and endurance. We have the former and it is ever increasing. We once had the latter, but it is lessening every year.

It is probably startling to most Americans, but it is apparently true, that the youth of Europe are fitter physically than we. As the Olympic games graphically illustrate, the majority of world champions in athletics are no longer Americans. Excuses have been made for that. Far worse is the fact that fully half of our young men are unfit even to be admitted to the Army.

It should be profoundly disturbing to every American that this is so. Are we approaching that moment in our history when we have passed our great age and are on the decline? Great nations decline because of the lack of fitness and determination in their people. Having struggled to achieve and having succeeded, too often a people will sink into luxury. The trouble with this is that there are always many others at once willing to struggle and sacrifice to seize the lead. Have we reached the stage of decline? Is our industry no longer able to compete with the world? Can it only exist within a "protected" market? Are we incapable of being first with a man into space? Will we have to watch while others exploit ahead of us our century's geographical frontiers, the moon and the planets? Is the American way of life such that others no longer wish to emulate it, but different systems have the strength to attract the newly emerging peoples of the world?

I fervently hope not, but mere wishing will not prevent it being so. Recently a splendid address came to my attention by West Point's director of physical education, Col. Frank Kobes. I commend it to everyone. In it he says:

Vigorous spirit and tough minds are usually found in strong bodies. We have a motto in our boxing room at West Point that reads: "When the Going Gets Tough, the Tough Get Going." I for one, feel it is time that we started getting tough.

I, for one other, agree.

WHEN THE GOING GETS TOUGH, THE TOUGH GET GOING

(This address by Col. Frank J. Kobes, Jr., professor of physical education, U.S. Military Academy, was delivered to the annual meeting of the New York State Association for Directors of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation and also at the Peekskill, N.Y., Exchange Club, Stuart Weinger, president, during its dinner arranged by Mr. Edward Gibbs for Peekskill High School athletes.)

President John F. Kennedy recently stated: "The next year, the next decade, in all likelihood the next generation will require more bravery and wisdom on our part than any period in our history." As those charged with developing in the next generation, a good share of this bravery and wisdom, we as teachers, are faced with a tremendous task, especially since we find this generation growing up in an era which is completely different from any our country has previously experienced. It has been called the space age. It has also been called the age of anxiety or the aspirin age—whatever its name, it is a protective age; parents protect their children from the jolts which they themselves absorb; the State protects its citizens against unemployment, sickness, profit or loss; schools, more and more, pro-

tect their pupils from the reliable old corrective of trial and error. The final result of this over-protection is stultification—a cocoon which strangles the butterfly.

This is also an age of leisure and abundance. We have so much food that it is collected and hoarded in storage bins throughout the country. Not far in the future is the 4-day work week for the same wages as the old 6-day week.

Today also, we have the situation of 16 million men and women past the age of 65 who are classified as aged. These 16 million, in just 15 short years from now will become 20 million. One of the great problems here is that many of these elderly people are not really living but merely existing, being kept alive by drugs and medicines, not able to lead active lives.

The space age child is one who is overfed, overweight, and underactive. This generation of the tallest, heaviest, and most nearly disease-free youth in all history is being victimized by an age of mechanization, specialization, and materialism. He doesn't have to perform chores around the house such as carrying in coal and kindling; he doesn't have to carry out the ashes or chop wood; he doesn't have to walk to school or anywhere else, for that matter. More than likely, he finds recreation in sitting or watching or listening or riding. He finds ideas clouded and values confused. He believes that his forefathers handed down to him the right of happiness, rather than the right to pursue happiness. With the passing of time, some of the words in our Bill of Rights have been obscured or faded away; that important word pursuit seems to be one of them.

The space age curriculum is loaded with abstract intellectualism. It overemphasizes science. Physical education is crowded out by spudnikitis. Priority is given to the development of a select group of minds that are supposed to solve the mysteries of space. In this new academic attitude, the question that arises is, "How do we intend to conquer space and survive when only about 50 percent of our male population has enough physical efficiency to be qualified to wear the uniform of our Armed Forces? Should this trend continue, our children will certainly become a race of "eggheads walking around on birdlegs."

It is later now than it has ever been and frankly I'm not sure that we will wake up in time. Dwight D. Eisenhower issued the alarm 5 years ago—the Youth Fitness Council was born. And there was a great beating of wings in the area of physical fitness. Still, there hasn't been a great deal of change for the better. In fact, in some instances it has grown worse; for example, I am told that in the past year or two, some 55 colleges have considered dropping the physical education requirement, and a few of them already have.

For your consideration, I offer the following comments relative to physical education and athletics in the curriculum today:

First of all, we must have sound objectives. They must be well thought out, adopted and written down where they may serve as constant guides. The No. 1 objective (which is the fundamental reason for the existence of physical education) is the development and maintenance of a high level of health and physical fitness. We must accept the responsibility for the physical aspects of the growth and development of young people.

This is our unique purpose in the educational environment. To put it in another way, it is our job to see that the student develops the capacity for work. Too many students, and even adults, have never experienced the joy of real work or all-out effort.

Do not be afraid to give conditioning exercises or vigorous calisthenics to your pupils—give more concern to good, hard, physical effort and challenge and less concern to insuring that the activity is fun. More kinds of physical activity will be more fun if our children are well conditioned physically.

Dr. W. Raab, eminent cardiologist at the University of Vermont, stated recently: "I often get the impression that fitness is being advocated as nice rather than necessary and that our instruction is promoted in a spirit of fitness for fun rather than fitness for survival in keeping with the seemingly popular take-it-easy philosophy. I am not being melodramatic in my use of the word 'survival.' We are faced by a shrewdly calculating and patient enemy who is waiting for our economic, moral, and physical disintegration, firmly convinced that our complacency will work in his favor. Whether we like it or not, we have to be prepared to live with a creeping emergency or cold war that may last for decades." Our very survival of our way of life may well depend upon how well we maintain the physical fitness of all our citizens.

Any really informed person knows that youth develops as a total entity, that growth and development of any part is related to the growth and development of the whole. And that if active cells are wanted in the brain or any other part of the body, activity of the total organism is a necessity.

Therefore, it is difficult, indeed, to understand the argument of the scientist against physical education and athletics as a part of education. It is difficult because the scientist is creating a situation which emphasizes the very need for physical activity.

This era of automation creates less and less the need for muscular activity. But it has not changed, nor will it change the requirements for living. In spite of our sedentary life, the same physiological needs are there, and the answer lies in exercise and muscular activity. This is a basic requirement for success and productive living, and it will remain a requirement until the scientist creates some machine to save man from deterioration because he has become a sedentary creature.

I am fairly certain that this gadget will never come into existence.

Our second objective should be that of providing a wide variety of motor skills in our program. By this, I mean such skills as running, jumping, throwing, climbing, lifting, balancing.

These are the basis for leisure time sports skills which will be so valuable in maintaining, as well as creating, the habit of keeping physically fit throughout life. This entails a positive health program, not just prevention of disease.

We must be constantly aware of the fact that in 20 years, few men will have to work with their hands. Also, we must realize that all those young people whom we teach, have a life expectancy of about 22 years more than their grandparents. We must do something to prepare them to live these additional years with dignity and vigor. We must educate them to the need for the habit of physical activity.

They must understand that in their leisure time, they may seek release from the fast pace of today's world and tomorrow's world, through physical activities which are relaxing and which counterbalance their otherwise physically inactive routines of daily living. However, the development of skill alone for these activities is not enough.

Continued participation depends upon the development and maintenance of muscular strength and endurance to offset the physical deterioration which accompanies the inactive years of later life. One of the major objectives in physical education and athletics should be the development of moral fiber in our young people.

By moral fiber, I mean such attributes of character as courage, the will to win, daring, perseverance, sportsmanship.

It is a recognized fact that the worth of any activity for character development depends upon the nature and intensity of the emotions it arouses, and the standards which control the expression of these emotions.

Because physical and athletic activities involve the deepest and most powerful of human emotions, they are of exceptional value from the character development standpoint. In addition, they appeal strongly to children and elicit their energetic, enthusiastic participation. Of all the experiences which they undergo, none possesses more opportunities for the building of these desirable moral qualities. Since many of the activities are contests in which the participants are brought into close contact with one another, and in which personal courage and daring play very decided roles, manliness, aggressiveness, confidence, determination, and the ability to think and act quickly and efficiently under pressure are developed to a degree unattainable by other means.

Hundreds of young men in whom these attributes might have never been awakened, are for the first time, given a chance to find themselves. This laboratory of the sports field simulates the conditions of life where leadership, self-discipline, and teamwork are experienced over and over again.

Athletics are an integral part of a boy's educational experience, not just a diversion or safety valve for excess animal energy. Athletics offer the boy the chance to meet the challenge of his own inadequacy, face to face, and do something about it, as no other activity does. They give him the spirit of adventure, the opportunity to dare. An end in football may wear a protective face mask, but he still must tackle a hard running back. If he flinches or fails, he knows.

Negotiations will not lower a high jump bar from 5 feet to 4. Promises will not put a soccer ball into the goal. Guidance counseling will not raise a batting average or give a pitcher control. Only the athlete can accomplish these feats and he does so, primarily alone. It is the athletic program's function to see to it that he faces the task squarely and does not hide from it. The help it gives is to help the boy gain satisfaction and confidence from continuous self-improvement.

Now, I hasten to point out that I have listed our contributions in this area of character building as the third objective. Many of us already have placed this too high on our list of objectives; there is no question that through physical activity, the pupil has the opportunity to develop this moral fiber of which I speak. And, if there is anything our citizens need today, it is moral fiber. However, many of the academic subject areas can claim that they, too, contribute to moral development and this, of course, is true to some extent.

But, physical fitness is our unique contribution to the educational environment. We can measure it, we can show improvement, we can show deterioration. On the other hand, it is extremely difficult to measure moral and social outcomes.

Furthermore, these so-called moral and social outcomes of physical education are by no means automatic. They are achieved only with intelligent, patient, and meticulous planning and supervision of activities. Without qualified leadership, physical education becomes merely a series of exercises and games, with no significant impact upon the growth of the child. In fact, all too frequently, weak teaching creates a learning situation which produces negative rather than positive outcomes.

Too often we have appeared to our academic colleagues as having the answer to all the problems of education within our own subject area.

Perhaps we have moved too fast and made the same mistake that the academicians are now making. They have wandered too far away from fundamentals; they are more interested in mathematical logic than the problems of human existence.

In this day of peril, we must remember that we are educating boys and girls, not machines. We must get back to the emphasis on fundamentals. We have become so concerned about breadth that we have been blinded to the need for depth.

We often refer to the great educational system of the Greeks—they believed in educating the "whole" man physically, mentally, and morally. The Spartans, in particular, were great believers in the fact that health and physical fitness were the very foundations for building good citizens. When a child was born, he would be examined by his father and if there was evidence of physical weakness or ill health, the child was abandoned on a mountainside to perish. Thank goodness that our respect for human life today considers such action unthinkable. This is real fundamentalism and I certainly do not advocate going quite that far. However, the pendulum appears to have swung too far in the opposite direction. Too many of our school administrators are of the same opinion as one of our supposedly outstanding college presidents who stated not too many years ago, that when he feels the urge to exercise, he lies down until the feeling goes away.

Yes, primarily, we must develop in our children, strong foundations of physical strength and endurance. On this foundation then, we can, in the laboratory of the gymnasium and the athletic field, build the skills and the moral fiber which our citizens need. But the foundation comes first, the moral attributes are additional dividends. They are the frosting on the cake and without the cake, there can be no frosting. I fear that too many of us have been attempting to mix the frosting without the cake.

Physical fitness is not only the key to a healthy body, but it is the basis of creative intellectual activity and adjustment to our ever changing environment. We don't understand all the aspects of this—the molding of a sound body with an energetic mind is complicated. Nevertheless, it is there. We have made several studies at the Academy which have convinced us that among the several entrance examinations which are given to candidates, the best single criteria for cadet success at the Academy is physical ability. I have a suspicion that this may be just as true in many of our civilian colleges.

Vigorous spirit and tough minds are usually found in strong bodies. We have a motto in our boxing room that reads: "When the going gets tough, the tough get going." I, for one, feel it is time that we started getting tough.

The principles of curriculum construction indicate that programs of education for our children should be based upon their needs. The needs are determined by the society in which they live and the challenges and problems which face that society. Therefore, in these threatening times, the needs of our children must be adjusted to this situation. Our boys and girls, who are growing up during troubled times such as we are experiencing today, certainly have a vital need for physical fitness. Our physical education must provide effective programs and must demand that all pupils meet adequate physical fitness standards.

It is imperative that we so educate our young people that they may be able and eager to draw on the well of physical vigor throughout their lifetime.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

New Superior California Product Breaks a European Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, California is justly proud of her great and historic vineyards and of her preeminent wine industry. We produce 92 percent of all the grapes and 85 percent of all the wines produced and consumed in our country. And now the College of Agriculture of the University of California has been able, through science, to improve the quality of the production of our vintners, and to produce a gourmet treasure.

A few weeks ago, at the World Trade Center in San Francisco, I made some comments on the new Premier Semillon, a new California wine, created by the joint efforts of the university and one of our great California wineries. I ask consent that those comments appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY U.S. SENATOR THOMAS H. KUCHEL, OF CALIFORNIA, MARCH 6, 1961, SAN FRANCISCO

Mr. Feldman, Dr. Amerine, Dr. Nelson, Mr. Nightingale, ladies and gentlemen, today California produces 92 percent of all the grapes and 85 percent of all the wine produced and consumed in the United States. As for jobs—a category of which all of us are particularly conscious—our vineyards and wineries employ, if seasonal workers are included, approximately 111,000 persons.

Those figures are not new to many of you. I iterate them to remind you that the accomplishment we honor today is part of something vital and important to our vital and important State. California and its wine industry have prospered together for almost 20 decades. It behooves all of us to do all in our power to strengthen that mutual prosperity in the decade of the sixties—and the decades to come.

The mutuality of California and its wine industry is due primarily to three causes.

The first is appreciation and utilization and, perhaps, I might add, improvement, of European wine-making know-how. Rather than trying to start from scratch, California's early vintners transplanted to the New World not only the cuttings but also the practices of the great Old World wine makers. And, incidentally, they included Armenians and Hungarians and Germans as well as Spaniards and Italians and Frenchmen. Charles Wetmore, who founded the Cresta Blanca Winery, which helped develop and bottle the great new wine we have just tasted, was a prominent enologist of his day who was commissioned by his fellow vintners in the early 1880's to sail to Europe and buy for them the finest European cuttings. Dr. Nelson and Mr. Nightingale used modern temperature and humidity controls to induce the noble mold to grow, but the Semillon grapes on which they induced it were hand-picked from vines born 80 years ago in France.

The second major reason for the growth of our great wine industry is appreciation and utilization of intelligently controlled research. California vintners have not merely followed their ancestors. Led by the progressive college of agriculture of our great State university, they have tried constantly to improve the quality and yield of their grapes, and the purity as well as the taste of their wines. When the vineyards of Europe were threatened by the dread pest of phylloxora near the end of the 19th century, American roots were exported to France and Germany. Today, in one of the most interesting examples of cultural exchange the world has ever seen, the great vineyards of both Europe and California are stocked identically with American roots on to which European cuttings have been grafted. All three of the wines just tasted—the traditional California semillon—the world-famous standard of excellence, Chateau d'Yquem—and our precedent-breaking new Premier Semillon—were pressed from grapes grown from European cuttings grafted to American rootstock.

Finally, California's wine industry was driven forward by the vigor and daring of our free-enterprise system. It took courage and confidence 80 years ago to nurture helpless vine seedlings when banking, shipping, and railroading were the accepted, safe-and-sane occupations for growth investment. And it took courage and confidence 5 years ago for Cresta Blanca to underwrite an experiment in applied science from which no immediate returns could possibly be foreseen.

There is, then, a heritage behind Premier Semillon—not only the obvious, European-rooted heritage of fine winemaking, but also the specific heritage of California's wine history. And that heritage and that history, I believe, are more important for what they portend than for what they have accomplished. This is nearly always true of a vigorous civilization such as ours, and it should be true: The future magnetizes the present, and overshadows the past. Only by growing can we remain a healthy social order, and only by looking ahead can we grow.

This is particularly true of an accomplishment like that represented by Cresta Blanca Premier Semillon. Its importance today lies in its promise for tomorrow. Certainly, no one is going to get rich on the 1,300 bottles a year that Mr. Nightingale is now producing and Mr. Feldman is now rationing like tickets to the Giants' opener next month.

It is a magnificent fact that production of California wine as represented by shipments last year set an alltime record of—I may as well be precise about this: 129,355,394.06 gallons. That's the official Wine Institute figure, and I plan to ask Roy Taylor who bought that six-hundredths of a gallon. That total is 3.92 percent higher than the 1959 figure, which was itself a record.

Two subsidiary facts directly related to the product being introduced today are, if anything, even more impressive.

Shipments of California table wine have burgeoned much more than shipments of all wine. Since 1952, total shipments of California wine have increased a little more than 11 percent, while shipments of table wine have risen a whopping 55 percent. In every year since 1952, table-wine shipments have been higher than the previous year.

Even more encouraging, California's premium table wines are doing best of all. Nobody publishes premium-wine as distinct from popular-priced-wine figures, but I have been able to learn that sales of premium wines from 1953 through 1959 increased more than 46 percent. The corresponding figure for all California table wines is around 25 percent, so premium wines are surging ahead at nearly double the rate of all table wines.

We can enjoy this pleasant picture, then: That segment of the California wine business which is doing best is the most culturally important, the most promising and the most profitable segment—the segment encompassing premium table wines.

And that is the segment to which the new wine honored here today belongs, and which, I am convinced, it will materially bolster.

I wouldn't dare try to improve on the descriptions of Premier Semillon presented so eloquently by Dr. Amerine, Dr. Nelson, Mr. Nightingale and Mr. Feldman, but I would like to point out that this superior new California product in effect has broken a European monopoly of one of the gourmet treasures of the world. With one or two minor exceptions, Premier Semillon represents the development in and by California of the only European wine type not previously produced successfully outside of Europe. It demolishes one of the few remaining bastions of European winemaking superiority.

From our viewpoint, the elimination of European exclusiveness in the production of botrytised wine is simultaneously an elimination of just about the only unfilled setting in the bracelet of great California premium wines.

Until the university and the Cresta Blanca winemasters applied their genius to the problem, the comfortably dry California days and pleasantly cool nights in which we glory, prevented us from also enjoying a wine of our own enriched by the noble mold. To urburden ourselves from the patronage of the lovers of Chateau d'Yquem and the other famous botrytised wines of France and Germany, we had to offset the perfection of our climate. That is quite an assignment. I salute the responsible gentlemen for accomplishing it, and I trust it will be accomplished for this purpose only.

I have waited throughout this program for one of my predecessors to tell the beautifully ironic story of an earlier conquest. I don't know whether they saved it for me or didn't do their homework, but here it is.

Among the cuttings Charles Wetmore brought back from Europe on the trip to which I have alluded were some from the world famous Chateau d'Yquem vineyard which Wetmore planted in his new acres in the Livermore Valley. The cuttings grew to vines, and in 1889 Wetmore entered a California white table wine made from grapes grown on those vines in the wine judging of the great Paris Exposition. As I was told the story, the upstart entry from an un-

Appendix

New Superior California Product Breaks a European Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, California is justly proud of her great and historic vineyards and of her preeminent wine industry. We produce 92 percent of all the grapes and 85 percent of all the wines produced and consumed in our country. And now the College of Agriculture of the University of California has been able, through science, to improve the quality of the production of our vintners, and to produce a gourmet treasure.

A few weeks ago, at the World Trade Center in San Francisco, I made some comments on the new Premier Semillon, a new California wine, created by the joint efforts of the university and one of our great California wineries. I ask consent that those comments appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY U.S. SENATOR THOMAS H. KUCHEL, OF CALIFORNIA, MARCH 6, 1961, SAN FRANCISCO

Mr. Feldman, Dr. Amerine, Dr. Nelson, Mr. Nightingale, ladies and gentlemen, today California produces 92 percent of all the grapes and 85 percent of all the wine produced and consumed in the United States. As for jobs—a category of which all of us are particularly conscious—our vineyards and wineries employ, if seasonal workers are included, approximately 111,000 persons.

Those figures are not new to many of you. I iterate them to remind you that the accomplishment we honor today is part of something vital and important to our vital and important State. California and its wine industry have prospered together for almost 20 decades. It behooves all of us to do all in our power to strengthen that mutual prosperity in the decade of the sixties—and the decades to come.

The mutuality of California and its wine industry is due primarily to three causes.

The first is appreciation and utilization and, perhaps, I might add, improvement, of European wine-making know-how. Rather than trying to start from scratch, California's early vintners transplanted to the New World not only the cuttings but also the practices of the great Old World wine makers. And, incidentally, they included Armenians and Hungarians and Germans as well as Spaniards and Italians and Frenchmen. Charles Wetmore, who founded the Cresta Blanca Winery, which helped develop and bottle the great new wine we have just tasted, was a prominent enologist of his day who was commissioned by his fellow vintners in the early 1880's to sail to Europe and buy for them the finest European cuttings. Dr. Nelson and Mr. Nightingale used modern temperature and humidity controls to induce the noble mold to grow, but the Semillon grapes on which they induced it were hand-picked from vines born 80 years ago in France.

The second major reason for the growth of our great wine industry is appreciation and utilization of intelligently controlled research. California vintners have not merely followed their ancestors. Led by the progressive college of agriculture of our great State university, they have tried constantly to improve the quality and yield of their grapes, and the purity as well as the taste of their wines. When the vineyards of Europe were threatened by the dread pest of phylloxora near the end of the 19th century, American roots were exported to France and Germany. Today, in one of the most interesting examples of cultural exchange the world has ever seen, the great vineyards of both Europe and California are stocked identically with American roots on to which European cuttings have been grafted. All three of the wines just tasted—the traditional California semillon—the world-famous standard of excellence, Chateau d'Yquem—and our precedent-breaking new Premier Semillon—were pressed from grapes grown from European cuttings grafted to American rootstock.

Finally, California's wine industry was driven forward by the vigor and daring of our free-enterprise system. It took courage and confidence 80 years ago to nurture helpless vine seedlings when banking, shipping, and railroading were the accepted, safe-and-sane occupations for growth investment. And it took courage and confidence 5 years ago for Cresta Blanca to underwrite an experiment in applied science from which no immediate returns could possibly be foreseen.

There is, then, a heritage behind Premier Semillon—not only the obvious, European-rooted heritage of fine winemaking, but also the specific heritage of California's wine history. And that heritage and that history, I believe, are more important for what they portend than for what they have accomplished. This is nearly always true of a vigorous civilization such as ours, and it should be true: The future magnetizes the present, and overshadows the past. Only by growing can we remain a healthy social order, and only by looking ahead can we grow.

This is particularly true of an accomplishment like that represented by Cresta Blanca Premier Semillon. Its importance today lies in its promise for tomorrow. Certainly, no one is going to get rich on the 1,300 bottles a year that Mr. Nightingale is now producing and Mr. Feldman is now rationing like tickets to the Giants' opener next month.

It is a magnificent fact that production of California wine as represented by shipments last year set an alltime record of—I may as well be precise about this: 129,355,394.06 gallons. That's the official Wine Institute figure, and I plan to ask Roy Taylor who bought that six-hundredths of a gallon. That total is 3.92 percent higher than the 1959 figure, which was itself a record.

Two subsidiary facts directly related to the product being introduced today are, if anything, even more impressive.

Shipments of California table wine have burgeoned much more than shipments of all wine. Since 1952, total shipments of California wine have increased a little more than 11 percent, while shipments of table wine have risen a whopping 55 percent. In every year since 1952, table-wine shipments have been higher than the previous year.

Even more encouraging, California's premium table wines are doing best of all. Nobody publishes premium-wine as distinct from popular-priced-wine figures, but I have been able to learn that sales of premium wines from 1953 through 1959 increased more than 46 percent. The corresponding figure for all California table wines is around 25 percent, so premium wines are surging ahead at nearly double the rate of all table wines.

We can enjoy this pleasant picture, then: That segment of the California wine business which is doing best is the most culturally important, the most promising and the most profitable segment—the segment encompassing premium table wines.

And that is the segment to which the new wine honored here today belongs, and which, I am convinced, it will materially bolster.

I wouldn't dare try to improve on the descriptions of Premier Semillon presented so eloquently by Dr. Amerine, Dr. Nelson, Mr. Nightingale and Mr. Feldman, but I would like to point out that this superior new California product in effect has broken a European monopoly of one of the gourmet treasures of the world. With one or two minor exceptions, Premier Semillon represents the development in and by California of the only European wine type not previously produced successfully outside of Europe. It demolishes one of the few remaining bastions of European winemaking superiority.

From our viewpoint, the elimination of European exclusiveness in the production of botrytised wine is simultaneously an elimination of just about the only unfilled setting in the bracelet of great California premium wines.

Until the university and the Cresta Blanca winemasters applied their genius to the problem, the comfortably dry California days and pleasantly cool nights in which we glory, prevented us from also enjoying a wine of our own enriched by the noble mold. To urburden ourselves from the patronage of the lovers of Chateau d'Yquem and the other famous botrytised wines of France and Germany, we had to offset the perfection of our climate. That is quite an assignment. I salute the responsible gentlemen for accomplishing it, and I trust it will be accomplished for this purpose only.

I have waited throughout this program for one of my predecessors to tell the beautifully ironic story of an earlier conquest. I don't know whether they saved it for me or didn't do their homework, but here it is.

Among the cuttings Charles Wetmore brought back from Europe on the trip to which I have alluded were some from the world famous Chateau d'Yquem vineyard which Wetmore planted in his new acres in the Livermore Valley. The cuttings grew to vines, and in 1889 Wetmore entered a California white table wine made from grapes grown on those vines in the wine judging of the great Paris Exposition. As I was told the story, the upstart entry from an un-

known winery in the unknown wine country of California was a laughing matter throughout Paris. On the day of the announcement of the winner, a single shrouded bottle stood on a long table. The shroud was removed, revealing—as the Grand Prix Gold Medal winner—Cresta Blanca's Livermore Valley entry.

To the chagrined audience of Parisiennes, the Marquis de Lur-Saluces, the owner of Chateau d'Yquem, gallantly made one of the great statements of wine history.

"The daughter has excelled the mother," the Marquis said of Wetmore's wine.

I have no intention of competing with a deceased Marquis who cannot fight back, but I cannot help suggesting—after tasting a vintage Chateau d'Yquem and our new Premier Semillon—that this great California winery has done it again.

In closing, thank you very much for allowing me to take part in this delightful ceremony.

J. Edgar Hoover: A Look at the Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALLEN SMITH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, in marking the 37th anniversary of J. Edgar Hoover's outstanding service to his fellow Americans, I would like to include in the RECORD today an editorial from the Milwaukee Sentinel, May 8, 1961, which, as the writer says, speaks for itself.

WASHINGTON PARADE—37-YEAR RECORD TELLS G-MAN STORY

(By David Sentner)

America's No. 1 G-man—J. Edgar Hoover—marks his 37th anniversary this week as the head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Let the record speak for itself.

Here are some highlights in the FBI's history since Hoover took over as its Director on May 10, 1924:

July 1924: FBI Identification Division founded to serve as national repository for fingerprinting identifying data.

November 1932: FBI laboratory founded.

September 1933: Trapped at hideout in Tennessee, George "Machinegun" Kelly gave FBI agents a nickname when he shouted, "Don't shoot, G-men," and meekly surrendered.

July 1934: FBI agents killed John Dillinger, notorious shoot-from-the-hip bank robber outside a Chicago theater.

July 1935: FBI National Academy founded.

May 1936: FBI Director Hoover personally led squad of agents in apprehension of notorious Alvin Karpis at New Orleans, ringing down curtain on Barker-Karpis gang—one of the most vicious gangs of the "terrible thirties."

June 1941: FBI agents rounded up Frederick J. Duquesne and other members of German spy ring. Duquesne and 32 espionage associates convicted and sentenced to terms exceeding 300 years.

June 1942: Eight Nazi saboteurs who landed on coasts of Florida and Long Island from German submarine arrested by G-men. Not a single act of enemy-directed sabotage was committed in United States during World War II.

October 1949: Eleven national leaders of Communist Party convicted under Smith Act on FBI evidence. Scores of more party leaders to be convicted through later years.

March 1950: Klaus Fuchs, identified as atomic spy on basis of information gathered by FBI, sentenced in Britain to 14 years imprisonment.

June 1953: Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, atomic spies, convicted in 1951, were executed. They were identified and arrested as Soviet agents by FBI.

January 1956: After 6 years of intensive investigation, FBI agents in Massachusetts arrested six men on charges of participating in $2,775,000 robbery of Brinks, Inc., on January 17, 1950. Five other men also named as members of Brink's gang.

October 1958: Master spy Col. Rudolf Ivanovich Abel, one of most highly trained espionage agents in services of Soviet Union, convicted and sentenced to 30 years imprisonment. He was identified and traced to New York hotel by FBI agents. Abel found to possess latest tools of Soviet espionage, including shortwage radios, code books, microfilm and such hollow objects as coins, flashlight batteries, hardware and jewelry.

February 1959: In war on organized crime and racketeering, FBI scored major breakthrough with arrests of group of New Jersey men on charges of jury-fixing. Jury-fixing occurred in 1956 Federal income tax evasion trial of Abner "Longie" Zwillman, reputed boss of New Jersey underworld and prohibition era bootleg baron. Less than 2 weeks after FBI agents took men into custody, Zwillman committed suicide. Three of those arrested pleaded guilty.

February 1961: Melvin Davis Rees, Jr., Maryland musician and sex criminal, convicted of brutal kidnap-murders of Mildred Jackson and her 6-year-old daughter, Susan Ann. Intensive 18-month FBI investigation established that Rees was responsible for abduction of these two victims in Virginia and transporting them into Maryland where they were murdered and buried. Bodies of Mrs. Jackson's husband and infant daughter, who disappeared on same night as Mildred and Susan Ann Jackson were found in shallow grave near Fredericksburg, Va.

The County Official—A Composite Picture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, across the Nation we as a people are being served by an army of dedicated, loyal, competent, but largely unheralded, individual: our county officials.

At a government level close to the people, these officers represent a real key to progress in the community.

All too often, however, the outstanding service of this public-spirited corps is either overlooked or not given due recognition.

In a political system, of, by, and for the people, it is extremely important: First, that we elect, or appoint, highly qualified and dedicated officials to such posts; second, that we provide them the opportunity and facilities to do a good job; and third, that we give them due recognition for outstanding service.

Recently, the County Officer, official publication of the National Association of County Officials, published a splendid article to better acquaint us with the ability, dedication and service of our county officials.

I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COUNTY OFFICIAL—RESULTS OF A COUNTY OFFICER QUESTIONNAIRE

The county official—what sort of a man is he?

If the term were used to include the full range of public employees on the payroll of the 3,042 American counties, there would be some 668,000 of him (or her), 568,000 of whom are classified as full time. This is an army of workers surpassing in size that of any corporation in the Nation, and growing faster than any other level of government.

It is not with the whole army that we are concerned here, however, but only its leaders, and more precisely, the leaders of National Association of County Officials. It is the elected or appointed officials in policy-making or managerial positions who are eligible for National Association of County Officials membership.

From this group, the County Officer recently polled a representative cross section, chosen from the officers and directors of the association, from committee chairmen, from officers, directors and paid executives of State associations of county officials. More than 50 percent responded to the questionnaire, and out of the answers has emerged the first full, composite picture of the American county official as he is today.

TWO GROUPS OF OFFICIALS

Broadly speaking, the county official breaks down into two groups, the elected (two-thirds), and appointed (one-third). If he is an elected official, his title is likely to be county supervisor, commissioner, chosen freeholder, councilman, parish juror, judge, clerk of the court, or treasurer.

If he is an appointed official, his title is probably county manager, county executive, planning director, county engineer.

Having established who he is and how he got there, let's break him down further, dissect him thoroughly on the basis of information he supplied about himself.

THE COMPOSITE STUDY

The composite county official today is 52 years old and married. He has been in the public service for 16½ years (half of his adult life), and a member of NACO for 8½ years.

By occupation, the elected official is a small businessman—insurance, real estate, or retailing—a farmer or rancher, with a small number from the teaching profession. In contrast to the public concept of the local politician, only a small percentage of those reporting are lawyers. If he is an appointed public official, chances are his only occupation has been public service.

If he has been, as most were, a small businessman, farmer, or rancher, he has learned the value of prudent spending or he would not have survived in private business. He carries this natural fiscal conservatism and thriftiness into his conduct of public affairs. He is likely to insist on brand names he is familiar with, from dealers that he knows.

HE IS CLOSE TO HIS PEOPLE

He is likely to consider the public coffers as a public trust, and he guards it accordingly, because he is closer to the people he serves than most other public officials. The money that he raises, appropriates, and is entrusted with, comes from the homes, the real estate, the tangible worldly goods of his friends, neighbors, and churchmen.

His salary was not asked on the questionnaire, but from many sources it can be ascertained. If he is an elected official, chances are he serves only part time, and receives only a very minimum stipend, although the list of those not receiving any pay is diminishing. If he is an appointed official, or an elected official serving in a full-time capacity, he will probably be paid between $3,600 and $25,000 a year, with the median about $7,500. If he is a county chief executive, he is likely to be in the lower ranges of the five-figure bracket, where salaries range from $6,000 to $25,000. If he is a county engineer, he will be just one-side or the other of the five-figure bracket, ranging roughly from $3,600 to $22,500, with the average close to $10,000.

At any rate, he did not enter public service for the money it pays. There is a little bit of the dedicated man in him.

The homelife of our composite county official is remarkable for its stability. Chances are about even that he has lived his entire life (outside of his military service and his trips to NACO conferences) in one State, and if he did move, it was to a neighboring State (roughly 20 percent). Highest mobility among those responding are those now living on the west coast. Only three of these were natives.

HE IS A JOINER—A PUBLIC-SPIRITED MAN

Our composite man is likely to be gregarious and a joiner (less than 20 percent reported nonjoiners). Chances are 3 to 1 he belongs to two or more organizations of the professional, service, civic, or governmental type. Some report membership in a dozen such associations. He has a fondness for professional groups (nearly a third of all respondents), service clubs (better than 25 percent), charitable and health organizations, the chamber of commerce, governmental associations (20 percent), lodges, and church groups. A surprising find: only 6 to 7 percent belong to veterans organizations, although over half of them have had prior military service.

Not only is he a public-spirited man—generous with both his time and talent in civic and community activities—he is to a surprising degree an educated man as well. Almost without exception he has a high school diploma, more than likely in the public high school in his home county—and chances are exactly even that he has had some college. Nearly 25 percent have college degrees, and this percentage is rising as the postwar generation comes to power.

Among the appointed county officials, two-thirds have finished college and nearly half have graduate degrees. There are even Phi Beta Kappa keys among them. His high level of education speaks for a high level of intelligence as well, gained as an astute observer of his community's problems, and the trend of the communities around him. He has knoweidge temepered with wisdom.

HE IS FROM A SMALL COUNTY

Our composite man is more than likely from a small county—the highest proportion is in the 10,000–25,000 population group. Because counties of this size do not always need nor can they afford the specialized personnel of their large brothers, our official is probably both legislator and executor, serving two of the three functions of our governmental system. Because his community is of moderate size he knows it well. Because his taproots grow deep, he is sensitive to its pulse and vitally and personally concerned with its needs. He is willing to move ahead, but not at breakneck speed or over uncharted courses. By sentiment he is for governmental improvement by evolution and not by revolution.

From training and inclination he wants to be personally involved in every decision and every policy action in his county, from right-of-way acquisition to the purchase of typewriter ribbons. He is the small businessman, shrewdly and carefully conducting the business of local government.

HE IS A VETERAN

Chances are better than even that the county official is a war veteran; and if he isn't, it's usually because his average age—52—made him too young for one war and too old for the next two. An unusually high proportion—nearly half—were officers. In the service he was a coastguardsman manning an assault boat against a hostile beach, changing the bulb in a lighthouse; he was a jet fighter pilot in the cold war, a B–17 pilot, a seaman in World War I, a marine engineering officer building airbases, a legal officer in the Air Force, an infantryman with a rifle in his hand and mud in his eyes, a chief petty officer in the Navy, a National Guard company commander.

Our composite county official has already made his mark in his community—and many are destined to move on to higher positions. He is likely to be the director of a bank or savings institution, has been chosen to sit on some kind of State policy council or committee; and chances are 1 in 10 that he has earned an outstanding citation such as the junior chamber of commerce's "Young Man of the Year" (2 percent), the chamber of commerce's "Good Citizen, Good Government" (6 percent), or the American Public Works Association's "Man of the Year" (2 percent).

He is, in short, a community leader, stable, just under middle age, educated, intelligent, and dedicated. He is the hope of the future for local government.

Who Judges?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Ottawa (Kans.) Herald of Thursday, May 11, 1961. The editorial points to an alarming situation—a situation of which I am sure some of my colleagues are aware. Believing that all of my colleagues will be interested in the facts which the editorial pionts out, I am pleased to insert it in the RECORD:

WHO JUDGES?

Terming today's television a vast wasteland, the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission this week issued a word of warning to television officials.

He said the Federal regulatory agency intends to judge station license holders on how they meet community needs. The time of judgment is to be when licenses come up for renewal.

Disclaiming any intended censorship, the FCC Chairman said TV is filled with murder, mayhem, Westerns, cartoons, and commercials. He said his agency will see that TV stations serve their listeners.

His remarks stirred a wave of objections. Enforcement of such a policy will create even more trouble.

It appears that the new FCC Chairman is one of those knights in shining armor out to cure the ailments of the world.

He may not like Westerns, blood and thunder shows and the TV commercials but he will find it is not the three-man FCC which sits in judgment of this new media.

This judgment is reserved for the man, woman or child in front of the home TV set. The viewer decides with the flip of the wrist what he or she wants on TV.

When the do-gooders start deciding what the public wants, they are in for a surprise. It usually winds up with John Q. Public getting the do-gooder's scalp.

Prayers of Reparation Offered for Acts of Desecration in Cemeteries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a thought-provoking article which appeared in the Lawrence Eagle-Tribune, Lawrence, Mass., on May 11, 1961:

PRAYERS OF REPARATION OFFERED FOR ACTS OF DESECRATION IN CEMETERIES

A group of young persons from St. Augustine's Parish met for an unusual but thought-provoking purpose Wednesday evening at the veterans lot in the Immaculate Conception Cemetery.

Members of the Chi Rho and youngsters from the school offered prayers of reparation for the desecration in the Immaculate Conception and Bellevue Cemeteries by two young men on April 30. Their moderator, Rev. Bernard J. O'Dowd stated that the idea was that of the young people in the organization and was a wonderful thought.

Father O'Dowd not only led the prayers but spoke on "Community Responsibility" to the gathering. He stated that the purpose for assembling at the cemetery was not for vengeance, "for that belongs to God alone," nor for justice "for that belongs to a civil power." He said that they had come for the purpose of prayer to make recompense before God for these crimes and to pray that our community may be spared similar crimes in the future.

"Our presence here is to give voice to the sentiments of outrage justly felt by the people of Lawrence. Further, it is our hope that we may exert moral force by impressing upon all our people that civic responsibility is within the purchasing power of all," he said.

Father O'Dowd stated that a frightening fact in the Nation today is the rise of the crime rate. "At present," he said, "it is four times greater than our population rate expansion." Certain crimes, he stated, touch even the sacred, and something sacred was violated in these acts of destruction.

"Reverence and respect for the dead is a trait evidenced even in some uncivilized tribes and nations. Every nation worthy of the name civilized has possessed this quality of reverencing the dead," Father O'Dowd said.

The physical damage done, he stated, is within the realm of repair. The crime itself, while sufficiently disturbing, is yet more distressing if considered as a symptom, he remarked. "If resting places for the deceased be defiled, what more shocking crime will headline our press tomorrow or the day after?"

BRIEF BACKGROUND

Father O'Dowd gave a brief background to the events which led to the desecration at the cemeteries and then told of the apathy shown by individuals who were asked opinions concerning the act.

"Let each of us search his heart this evening and register his reaction to this desecration. The answer you find in your heart will be the directional signal for the future course of decency in our community," the priest said. "Any community is safe, strong, and healthy as the various components which comprise it: the individual, the family unit, the religious bodies, the business associations, the social organizations, and the various departments of the governing body," Father O'Dowd said.

He stated that every individual must realize that his social acts have repercussions on the community for better or for worse and that the welfare of this city is partially held in his hands.

He closed his talk to the group by saying, "As we stand here this evening among the dead, overlooking the resting place of those who fought to make our country free and decent, let us pray that we will not have to come here again to protest crimes against the place of their repose."

PRAYER RECITED

Following the recitation of the Lord's Prayer by the group, Father O'Dowd offered the following prayer:

"Show Thy mercy to us, O God, that Thy just punishments be not delivered upon our people who have witnessed the desecration of sacred resting places. We know these crimes should see Thy vengeance visited upon us, but may our presence here this evening appease Thy wrath, and restore our people to Thy favor. We know only a handful of Thy creatures were responsible for these wrongs, O God, but still Your spotless majesty has been offended.

"In speaking for all good people in our community, we pray and beg your kind forgiveness, O Lord, and most humbly petition that we be given the strength, courage, and vision to combat the forces of evil about us. Conscious of our own inadequacies, our imperfect petition, O God, is that you will not desert us in this hour of need. Without Thy help our efforts will avail nothing. But, if Thy hand supports us and all men of good will, then we may labor with genuine hope in our hearts.

"We pray, O Lord, for our civic leaders whose weighty charge and duty, is the preservation of justice and good order in the community. May they discharge their obligation with vigor of purpose and uprightness of character.

"We pray, O Lord, for those whose task is the education of our youth. May they inspire their students to follow the path of righteousness toward their fellow man and to develop in their own lives personal integrity and a true sense of responsibility.

"We pray, O Lord, for our religious leaders that their presentation of your divine message may be attentively listened to and acted upon.

"We pray, O Lord, for all our people that they may fulfill their personal, family, and civic obligations with courage and enjoy the fruits of a good and holy life in your sight.

"Memorial Day, 1961, will soon be here. May we on that day witness the true spirit of our people giving respect to their departed loved ones."

Zeal for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, to place in the Appendix of the RECORD, the address I delivered on May 1 in Tulsa, Okla., at an extraordinary Americanism Day rally of northeastern Oklahoma junior and senior high school students in Skelly Stadium. It was sponsored by the Intercounty Council of Civitan International, which includes four clubs in Tulsa, and one each in Sand Springs, and Broken Arrow, Okla.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ZEAL FOR FREEDOM

(By Senator MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma)

What a great honor it is to be here today, to be chosen to address this huge Civitan Americanism Day program welcoming 36 new citizens, to be a part of the answer of the freedom-loving citizens of Oklahoma, of America, and of the world to the challenge of the Soviet conspiracy on this May Day. I want to thank the six Civitan clubs who launched this Americanism Day observance, in a new dimension, with thousands of students participating.

Years ago Americans stood idly by as the wobblies, the psychopaths, the unbalanced and the hard core Communists observed May Day as a day dedicated to the propagation of communism, and its fellow-travelers marched in regimented style attempting to show worldwide adherence to their slave-state system.

Today the answer of the free world to this challenge of captives of communism gives ringing proof of the vitality and dedication of free men around the world. Students participating today from 23 public high schools and 4 parochial schools give a new and strong emphasis to America's answer.

I am thankful that Civitan International here in northeastern Oklahoma has planned full participation of our young Americans in this day. The American Bar Association, the American Heritage Foundation, the National Governors Conference, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National Educational Association, the International Association of Police Chiefs, the Association of American Law Schools, the National Conference of Bar Presidents, the Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Rotary, Kiwanis, Lions International, and dozens of other national and local organizations join with Civitan International to today dedicate themselves to an American offensive against this seizure of May Day as a day dedicated to communism.

It is fitting indeed that instead of permitting this seizure through abdication of Democratic zeal in our system, that we make it our day of observance of the power, dignity, and moral strength, a day dedicated to our belief in the eternal and undying principle of law and order.

Two Presidents have marked May 1 previously as Americanism Day, by proclamation. Last month, President Kennedy did likewise.

DEMOCRACY CHALLENGES FALSE DOCTRINES

More than 40,000 celebrations were held as the United States last year observed this law day of dedication to the eternal verities of individual freedoms guaranteed by law. Each year the national impact of a resurgent democracy challenging the false doctrines of communism grows as America's answer to the slavery of the mind, the body and the spirit that holds captive one-third of the world's population.

Today here in Tulsa, as elsewhere throughout the entire Nation, we observe this day as a militant answer of America's youth, of its adults, and of its new American citizens receiving their rights of citizenship—there were 364 new citizens in Oklahoma last year—and as a day of militant free men unwilling to sacrifice our birthright for the chains of dictatorial rule over every facet of our daily life.

These priceless freedoms to walk erect in dignity as individuals instead of pawns of an all-powerful state did not come to our forefathers on a silver platter. They did not come in ease or complacency as a casual gift nor as the answer to a frivolous wish. They came because men and women chose to risk death rather than to submit to the imprisonment of their minds and spirits by alien control that could bend them to their will or force their compliance to the goals of the chosen few in the privy council or the Kremlin.

Today in Red Square in Moscow and in the dozens of captive satellite countries overrun by communism the youth of those nations march in regimentation to the pageantry of their system. Massive propaganda efforts, worldwide in their scope, attempt to portray this pageantry of flags, of armed might, of massed marching as the wave of the future in the world contest in which freedom everywhere is challenged.

With the powers to command compliance, with a state-owned press, with the suppression of all avenues of open and free criticism or thought, this ominous wave of massed millions seeks to convince the underprivileged billion people of the new nations that communism is so militant, so vigorous, so overwhelming in its zeal and missionary spirit that the old-fashioned freedom of democracy will fall before the loud blasts of its shrill and screaming trumpets.

But all the pomp and ceremony of the Soviet system that masks the ugly treachery of conspiracy and contempt fails to realize the span of nearly 3 centuries that gave deep root and substance to the democracy and freedoms that are our priceless heritage.

FRONTIER NO PICNIC

It was not an easy task that the Pilgrims took to carve out a place for religious freedom on our continent. It was no accident that we transplanted the Magna Carta into the soil of the colonies of Virginia and Pennsylvania. It was no picnic to transform a hostile frontier into a homeland for patriots who loved their God, revered the law and were willing to die rather than submit to any government that was not of their own choosing. Their right to freedom under laws of their own making took precedence over the accumulation of wealth, of power or of prestige. Next only to the love of family, for whom they sought this freedom in perpetuity, was their love of America and the hope it held for liberty for all mankind.

It was this torch of freedom that was passed on to much of the world as it existed then. It was this spark of democratic zeal that swept away the long-established dynasties that had long ruled the Western World by divine right of kings. Thus it was American ideals of liberty that set the course for dozens of other nations to achieve their freedom.

Eight wars, from the Revolutionary War of 1776 to the Korean war of 1950, have been waged to preserve the freedoms of man. In America and around the world, the blood and resources of this Nation have been spent that all manner of men could hope for a way of life of brotherhood in equality instead of slave and master.

Yet growing out of the rubble and ruin of two World Wars has come a new virus of totalitarian dictatorship that is threatening to quench the light of liberty and hope that was lighted over the years at such cost in life and property.

Today by subversion, conquest, and revolution this mighty force seeks to expand its system to the very shores of our continent. Nearly one-third of the world's people today are under its ironclad rule as it reaches now westward for still more power.

It wears many faces and speaks with many voices. Its methods are ever-changing but

its motives never change. Purporting to end colonial power, it actually (but secretly) seeks to build up the most ruthless colonial empire ever known. Falsely speaking for freedom, it woos the newly independent nations into a new and viciously captive state. Propagandizing for peace and disarmament, it seeks under this false cover to subvert new millions to iron curtain power.

WAR IS INVISIBLE

It is a war of new dimensions that we face, not a war wherein the brave and the bold can face on the battlefield the enemy of freedom. From 5,000 miles away through outer space is the ever-present threat of total war of annihilation by ICBM. One hundred divisions, mobilized on two continents, and more threats to their so-called "peaceful expansion" of the Communist philosophy. Blackmail, espionage, agents provocateur, volunteers, and military training missions add to the underground methods by which expansion of the system is forced on the unwary or the weak nations that fall in the path of their desires. It is an invisible war in which the outstretched hand is in reality the mailed fist. May Day in the Communist world is the pageant of its method of exploitation and expansion of its system.

Never underestimate the dedication and zeal of the Communists for their cause.

That is why this huge rally of Tulsa's youth today is important. We must show ourselves and the world that the missionary zeal and dedication that we have for our system of democracy and freedom is greater than their zest for and belief in their slave-state system. That is why we must on this day have a greater sense of responsibility for the preservation of our heritage than can be lathered into the pageantry in Red Square, Moscow—or in Peiping or Budapest or Prague or Warsaw. We must have it because we know and understand the great difference between our two systems.

In the kind of war that we face, hot or cold, we must understand that our enthusiasm for our system must be more sustained, more enduring, more vigorous and more intelligently directed than the Communists can muster from their regimented captive peoples. If we de not have this sustained sense of enthusiasm against all obstacles, we may lose the conflict in the years to come.

There are times, as we face them now, when the tide of battle in the invisible war seems to run against us and the course of freedom everywhere. These are merely individual battles, only a small part of the enduring and lasting conflict that may go on for decades before this threat of Communist domination of the world wil be ended.

RUSSIANS NOT 10 FEET TALL

We would make great errors if we suddenly decided that the Russian Communists have grown 10 feet tall, or that their achievement of a man in space marked the final decision in the conflict. They have their failures, too, although a controlled press can hide their failures while we tell the world of all our actions, good or bad.

In such conflict, whether in actual brush war as in Laos today, or in Cuba, the fortunes may go temporarily against us. These reversals must not be a time for despair or a signal to weaken us in our purpose. They signal instead a time for reexamination of the broad scope of the conflict and of its ever-changing course. They should inspire Americans everywhere to new vigor and new determination to build our strength and our determination to carry on to a final victory.

Russians and their captives are of the oriental mind. Time means little to them as they calculate the impatience of the Western World. If a score of years finds them ahead of where they are today—they mark it as a victory of great importance. They hope that because of the impatience of America and our Western allies, they can wear us out as we weary of the continuous tensions and conflict. Sustained, determined, steadfast we must be in order not to fall victims of the fatigue of the ebb and flow of the cold war fortunes.

Perhaps we are facing a new and a different call to duty in the battalions of freedom than our forefathers answered. Theirs was a call to die for freedom if it were necessary. Ours may be to risk dying, but also to be ever conscious that we must be willing to think for our country, to understand the cold, calculating movements of the Communist conspiracy in every part of the world, and to react with a clear, unimpassioned mind in the way that will best serve America and uphold the shield of liberty we carry for most of the free world as well.

The long, tedious task of constant readiness to fight if need be with conventional weapons or with missiles may be the duty of this generation. But on top of this military readiness must be even other offensive weapons in the field of winning the hearts and minds of a billion of the world's people in the new and uncommitted nations. This billion of the world's population will look either to the United States or to communism for leadership in the decades to come.

THINK FOR COUNTRY

Today some of them lean toward communism in the new nations of Africa, southeast Asia, the Middle East, and in Latin America. They are not lost to the free world, yet, but the siren song of quick industrialization, a better standard of living, and world trade with the Iron Curtain bloc is false, but attractive bait to undeveloped nations emerging from centuries of colonial rule. What a shame it would be in modern history if these people won their freedom from one form of colonial rule to exchange it for a more ruthless, vicious colonial system under the Communist hammer and sickle.

Thus, we must not only be prepared to die for America and freedom in today's threat, but to think and serve in ways that will make it possible to prevent this world's domination by communism, of which Mr. Khrushchev so often boasts.

This one-third of the world's people must be permitted to see the good and the bad in our system of democracy by our acts and deeds, not just our words. And it must be made possible for them to see clearly, without the rose-colored glasses of Communist propaganda, the acts and deeds, not just words, of the Kremlin conspiracy.

To do this will take great efforts, not on the battlefield, but in the schoolroom, in the laboratories, in the hospitals, in the mines and on the farms of the farflung areas of the continents were these billion people live. We, with our science and our feeling of the brotherhood of man, must find ways to show the true and kindly face, the humanitarian face, of Uncle Sam. We must show that, while our fist is a strong shield of freedom, the hand is open in friendship and in cooperation for their chance to develop a prosperous, progressive freedom-loving democracy where man is the master of his own destiny, the author of his own scheme of business, the owner of his own enterprise, and the one who can make his own decisions instead of carrying out the orders of a foreign master.

SHOW BY DEEDS OUR LOYALTY

We must show them by deeds, not words, that we on the freedom side of the world seek friends and partners, not slaves or automatons carrying out the orders of distant masters.

By unlocking the secrets of nature through atomic research in health, engineering, and peaceful power, by transforming the salty waters of the seas surrounding desert lands into vast sources of usable irrigation water, by engineering and by education, we can with the perseverance, patience and endurance that the conflict requires, in God's good time roll back the Iron Curtain so that democracy and freedom will again take the offensive.

And in so doing, by our concern for the freedom and development of all manner of men, we earn anew for centuries to come the right to be known as the defender of man's precious freedoms and the friend who helped a billion of the world's underprivileged people to find their way into the 20th century.

The Innocent American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, when President Sukarno visited Washington in late April, I questioned the red carpet treatment he received. Others also questioned our all-out welcome in light of Indonesia's relationship with the Soviet Union and its President's guided democracy. Among those who viewed this display of hospitality as unnecessary and undeserved were the Seattle Post-Intelligencer and the New York Journal-American.

Subsequently, I have read an editorial in the Djakarta Daily Mail, an English-language newspaper published in Indonesia's capital, which takes me and the Journal-American to task. I believe that this editorial is worth the few minutes time it would take Members of this body to read it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out the full implication of this editorial. In the two paragraphs just before the last one, the newspaper says in effect that America must buy Indonesia's friendship, otherwise she will sell herself to Russia. The $450 million Indonesia received in military aid from Russia in January may have been the downpayment.

You cannot buy friendship with a few million silver dollars or a chunk of gold. We did not buy the Dutch. Our friendship is built on mutual respect and purpose and sealed with mutual loss of blood in a bitter war against a common enemy, an enemy with whom Sukarno cooperated.

It is possible Indonesia's guided democracy is being directed toward the Communist camp and the editorial indicates that the Djakarta Daily Mail may approve.

The editorial follows:

THE INNOCENT AMERICAN

A Republican Congressman JACK WESTLAND has found it necessary to question the red carpet treatment accorded to President Sukarno during his recent informal visit to the United States.

Said he: "President Kennedy has accorded President Sukarno a most cordial welcome despite the fact that he has repeatedly criticized the United States and just recently received $450 million from the Soviets to be

used against the Dutch who are our proven friends.

Echoing the Republican Congressman's anti-Indonesia barrage, the newspaper New York Journal-American declared: "The red carpet treatment accorded to Indonesian President Sukarno who is scheming to grab West New Guinea, the last remnant of the Dutch East Indies and impose on it a new Sukarno imperialism, is a totally unnecessary display of hospitality to one who has done nothing to deserve it."

So, the fight is on between the "beautiful, innocent American and the ugly American." The black sheep, President Sukarno of independent, actively and positively nonalined Indonesia. The stake, American democracy.

Indonesia's view on this uncalled for blistering attack? Let the dogs bark while the caravan finds its way with its strictly nonalined policy and guided democracy, until the liberation of Irian Barat as General Nasution said it, has been peacefully realized.

With or without the reactionary blessings of Congressman JACK WESTLAND and the New York Journal American, the Indonesian caravan will move on to meet its moral commitments toward the Indonesians still living in bondage under the Dutch in Irian Barat.

Anyway, barking dogs do not bite. If they do bite at all, they will bite their own kinds only, while a third one, the real enemy, gets away with the spoils.

How pitifully childish can one be? How ugly must the "Ugly American" appear in the eyes of beautiful innocent Congressman JACK WESTLAND and the New York Journal American? And how dangerously narrow can the mind become when lost in a democracy Monroe-ism brew?

Let the dogs bark, while we continue with our guided democracy caravan that is positively against imperialism, whether new or old, whether it comes from JACK WESTLAND and New York Journal American's proven Dutch friends or not.

If Congressman JACK WESTLAND and the other Americans of his kind choose to sit on their money rather than help Indonesia to achieve prosperity for all and real democracy, let them.

The caravan will roll on, on, and on, with somebody else's dollars, like for instance, the $450 million from Russia. If and when that happens, we can just imagine how JACK WESTLAND and New York Journal American will yell and scream about communism in Indonesia.

How sadly ridiculous can be the reasoning of this "innocent American" by the name of JACK WESTLAND, who obviously had the courage to insult a visiting friendly President, but who very likely was cringing in his corner when his own Republican President was made a fool of by Khrushchev, in Paris last summer.

Relocation of Right of Way of Canyon Power Project Tunnel Aqueduct, California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to call to the attention of my distinguished colleagues the Department of the Interior's approval of an application by the city and county of San Francisco to relocate a right-of-way for the canyon power project tunnel aqueduct to be constructed between O'Shaughnessy Dam at Hetch Hetchy Reservoir in Yosemite National Park and the Early Intake in Stanislaus National Forest.

This approval, pending for 2 years under the previous administration, was accomplished in little more than 3 months after the present administration took office, with Secretary Stewart Udall directing the operation of the Department of the Interior.

The relocation of the right-of-way will save the city of San Francisco approximately $1 million in construction costs. At the same time, the approval bound the city to engineering and esthetic considerations which will guarantee the preservation of fish and wildlife under optimum conditions and maintain the natural beauty of the site.

San Francisco Representative JOHN F. SHELLEY maintained close contact with the Interior Department in settlement of what at first appeared to be conflicting interests. Representative SHELLEY is widely and fondly known for his ability to negotiate happy conclusions to troubled situations.

It is proper that the Congressman's efforts are fully appreciated in his native city of San Francisco.

It gives me pleasure to call attention to the excellent editorial which appeared in the San Franciso Examiner, May 3, 1961.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MAJOR SERVICE

For months it has been touch and go as to whether San Francisco would get the required Federal permit to relocate the aqueduct for its $21 million canyon power project on the north side of Tuolumne Canyon in the Sierra. The relocation involves a saving of $1 million to the city.

This week, thanks largely to the quiet efforts of Congressman JOHN F. SHELLEY, the permit was granted. Wisely, the permit requires the city to maintain a streamflow and preserve recreational values in the canyon.

We congratulate Congressman SHELLEY for performing a major service to this city.

H.R. 6611

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week the House considered H.R. 6611, providing for a temporary reduction in the duty free allowance for returning American tourists. I support the basic principle of this legislation, but I believe sincerely that it should not apply to imports from our neighbors, Canada and Mexico.

Under the legislative procedures, it was not possible to amend the bill to except these imports from contiguous countries. Therefore, I had no choice but to oppose this legislation. On Wednesday, May 17, the House will vote on this bill.

Believing as I do in the basic principle of this legislation I am today introducing a substitute bill which carries out the fundamental intent but excepts imports from the two contiguous nations, Canada and Mexico.

Kiplinger Sheds Light on Farm Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Kiplinger Agricultural Letter, published on Saturday, May 13, was like a bright sun breaking through cloud, fog and mist. I commend the Kiplinger editors for bringing into the true light of day the farm legislation with which this body soon must deal.

By permission of the House, I am inserting the first part of this letter in the Appendix of the RECORD, in the thought that it will be helpful to the members in the enactment of a sound agricultural bill which will afford our farmers an opportunity to share equitably in our free enterprise economy:

THE KIPLINGER AGRICULTURAL LETTER,
Washington, D.C., May 13, 1961.

DEAR SIR: You may wonder what to believe now about the omnibus farm bill after the sweeping statements this week by Shuman of the Farm Bureau.

Shuman heads one of the biggest farm groups and is the first major farm organization spokesman to speak out in complete opposition. Grange, Farmers Union, co-ops, and others have testified for the bill.

Thus Shuman becomes the rallying point for the opposing forces and that makes it important to understand his view for perspective.

Shuman went overboard in his denunciation of the omnibus bill, in opinion of many farm experts on both sides of the political fence.

He is out to kill the omnibus farm bill, and no holds barred. The tactics are the same as those refined by former Agriculture Secretary Benson to whip up public animosity to all farm programs, and same as were used 11 years ago to beat the Brannan plan; big controversy of that time.

This means the bill may not be judged strictly on its merits.

Here's where Shuman went off the deep end. He says the bill would regiment all farmers. It is impossible for anyone to know that, simply because bill does not set up programs but merely provides a procedure for setting them up at a later date.

Safeguards exist in the bill and others can be built into it which further rule out this possibility. For example, two-thirds of growers of any commodity would have to approve a program to put it into effect.

His charge that the bill would cost 15 to 20 billions is unfounded, as he admitted later on in Senate hearings. Still, this made headlines and reinforced the public misunderstanding about the farmers' problems.

Charge assumes that all commodities would get Government programs. But the blunt truth is that most commodities would

not get them. The bill provides fire extinguishers which growers can get to help them, but only if a majority wants them * * * and then only if in price trouble. Agriculture Secretary could raise no support levels without Congress consent.

Shuman's claim that the bill would reduce powers of Congress had been met by earlier changes in the omnibus bill—nothing to it now.

Under terms of bill—which could be changed now or later—Congress can approve or disapprove any plan, or write its own program. City-dominated Congress will continue to have final say on the programs.

So, net, there is nothing in the bill to regiment farmers, there is nothing in bill indicating $15 ot $20 billion in Government costs, and there also is nothing in the bill asking Congress to abdicate.

Involved is basic idea conflict on role of Government in farming. You may agree with Shuman that farm economy can right its own wrongs and gain prosperity with less Government, or you may disagree on the basis that Government has a responsibility to assure strength in the economy.

But no matter where you sit, it's important to know the facts.

The Emergency Feed-Grain Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an advertisement that appeared in a newspaper in the State of Minnesota, the Fairmont (Minn.) Sentinel, under date of April 28. The advertisement was placed in the paper by some of the farmers and other leading citizens of the area. It is entitled "The Emergency Feed-Grain Program" and it spells out the purpose of the feed-grain program that was recommended by the President and the Secretary of Agriculture and passed by the Congress.

The record in my State is remarkable. About 70 percent of the eligible farmers in this program are now active participants. The program is going to work. It is a good program. It was the first major farm legislation offered by the administration. I compliment the Secretary of Agriculture and the President upon their foresight. We again see farmers participating in a farm program, and for one reason. They have faith in the Department of Agriculture, in the Secretary of Agriculture, and in the administration. It is only on the basis of such faith that we can have farmer participation—a faith which in recent years was almost destroyed, but which is now being revived.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EMERGENCY FEED-GRAIN PROGRAM

Millions of farmers, acting individually, cannot effectively influence the total output or the price of the products they sell, but cooperating in this feed-grain program will do it.

WHY FARMERS JOIN

There is some talk about the need of reducing the corn surplus but the principal inducement is financial.

By reducing the corn acres by 20 percent as compared with his average for the last 2 years, a farmer is assured a price support based on the national average of $1.20 per bushel of corn, and in addition, he gets paid for conservation practices which might be as much as $32.40 per acre for the first 20 percent and $38.90 per acre for the next 20 percent of allowed acres of corn.

For details contact your ASC office as soon as possible. The time for signing closes on June 1, 1961.

A farmer who also sells seed corn recommends this program even though his sales will be reduced by about 20 percent.

The manager of a co-op, selling fertilizer, advocates this program even though it will reduce his sale of fertilizer.

In Iowa, bankers are trying to encourage people to go into this program. They feel their customers need the money.

Many livestock feeders appear ready to join; they figured it will benefit them, too.

The new feed-grain program, in the minds of both farmers and business, holds a promise of reversing the trends of recent years.

Your neighbor signed up; why don't you?

NEA Survey Shows Many Changes Now Underway in Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, agriculture has many dimensions, taking diverse forms and evidencing varying prospects in different geographical locations.

I insert into the RECORD an article depicting a sectional sampling of agriculture in America. This article has been extracted from the May 1961 issue of the National Publisher, which is published by the National Editorial Association:

NEA SURVEY SHOWS MANY CHANGES NOW UNDERWAY IN AGRICULTURE

Though farm income has fallen sharply in some areas in the last 10 years, many of the Nation's farmers are holding their own and some are doing better than ever before. What accounts for the difference?

A survey of the National Editorial Association's agricultural committee members, just completed by the National Publisher, shows that fast-moving changes are taking place in agriculture today. The trend is toward fewer but larger farms, more mechanization, and in some areas, such as the South, there is a wholesale shift from the production of traditional crops to more diversified farming.

Where readjustments are taking place, the cost-price squeeze has not been hurting farmers so much. Nonetheless, small farms, particularly in the northeast, are being abandoned or sold to city residents for summer homes or hunting preserves. Geography, always a major factor in farming success, is reflected in the changing pattern of agriculture. Here is a regional breakdown of reports from the members of NEA's agriculture committee.

NORTHEAST

Roswell R. Sanford, of the Catskill Mountain News, Margaretville, N.Y., reports that dairy farming is the largest industry in his county, and milk is the direct or indirect source of income for almost every businessman in the area. When farmers prosper, he says, so does everyone.

Right now the farm economy in his area is in a state of flux. The small 25-cow family farm is rapidly going out of business. The better land is being absorbed into larger producing units and some farms are being abandoned. Few young people are interested in becoming farmers.

The big local issue, he says, is support prices. Farmers in his area fear that proposed feed grain supports will raise the price of cattle feed with little or no increase ahead in the price farmers get for milk.

In Vermont, says Otis F. Rockwood, of the Rockwood Publications, Vergennes, Vt., dairying produces more dollars than any other line of farming. In his area the view is held that President Kennedy's farm program, as so far announced, is not going to help the Vermont milk producer.

Most Vermont farmers are suspicious of his price supports. They have an uneasy feeling that the promises to let farmers write their own programs do not square with the unfolding shape of the pending bills that look in the direction of tighter controls.

MIDDLE ATLANTIC

In southern New Jersey John A. Vernon, of the Plain Dealer, Williamstown, N.J., reports that truck farming is on the decline but poultry farms are holding their own. He estimates that overall farm income in his area is down about 25 percent from 10 years ago. A big reason for the decline, he feels, is the shortage of good farm labor.

In contrast Phillip St. C. Thompson, of Stromberg Publications, Ellicott City, Md., reports that the farm economy is very sound in his area and in the State in general. He says "we are near large metropolitan markets and most of the production is in perishable products that have a constant demand." Nonetheless, he notes that although his county's population has increased 55 percent since 1950, the number of farms has decreased by 30.4 percent and total production of agricultural products has remained at the 1950 level.

Thompson says the best service hometown publishers and all news media can give to agriculture is sound public relations information and factual reporting. He adds "I am distressed about articles that have damaged farm economy in the past. Since agriculture is responsible for 40 percent of the Nation's economy, I feel we of the newspaper industry should give the farmers of America a boost and be sure that we stick to factual reporting."

MIDWEST

In many areas of the Midwest farm income has fallen markedly in the past 10 years and there appear few signs of any immediate upturn.

Noteworthy is a report from Tom W. Eylar, of the Defender Publishing Co., West Union, Ohio. Eylar says "farm income is falling so fast that many farmers have to seek aid from relief agencies to exist."

In his area, he says, there is little industry, agriculture is of small scale and some type of employment on a part-time basis would do more to help the farmer than anything else.

In Iowa the situation is somewhat different. C. D. Elling, of the Garner (Iowa) Leader, cochairman of the NEA Agriculture Committee, reports that while the farm economy in the Midwest is down and an immediate uptrend is not foreseen, the distant outlook on our area is good.

He says the size of family farm in his area is constantly growing, rural zoning is becomming an important issue, and there is a good trend of industry to rural areas and small towns.

Elling points out "the newspapers in this area promote 4–H Club activities, the farm bureau, junior fair, rural development, and other relevant programs," and adds, "This is our obligation and responsibility for a brighter, progressive, and more prosperous rural Midwest—especially in the agricultural State of Iowa."

The viselike grip of the price-cost squeeze is being felt in Wisconsin as it is in many other areas, says Walter E. Gleason, of the Tribune Gazette, Clintonville, Wis. Although industry is employing more and more people each year in this area, the economy is still based on agriculture in general and dairying in particular.

One farmer interviewed by Gleason put it this way: "The average northeastern Wisconsin dairy farmer received only 39 cents per hour for his labor in 1959. How does he live? Part-time and full-time jobs in industries have cushioned many farm family pocketbooks and have kept the rural economy in better shape than might otherwise have been the case.

"Another economic factor should be mentioned. Twenty-five percent of the dairy herds are too small to make for an efficient operation. Most of these operators are trying to expand. Small and large dairy farmers in this area are faced with a need to increase production in order to improve their income and to lower units cost. Supplies already are excessive and if all farmers accomplished this increase the price decline will more than offset the gains made. This is the dilemma facing the Wisconsin dairyman."

This farmer continues "the supply-management idea of the Kennedy administration has been getting some attention here in the form of a quota plan for milk with the rather significant favorable reaction of most larger, efficient producers and lukewarm to hostile reaction of some small producers."

As a publisher, Gleason adds, he has been trying to "play down the middle" on the farm problem, discouraging reliance upon governmental action and encouraging greater efficiency on farms. "We do all we can to bring farm life into its properly important place in our community picture," he says. "We don't treat the farm problem. We record the news about farming at every opportunity."

Other areas of the Midwest appear to be faring very well in this period of transition. Reporting from Illinois, Donald T. Forsythe, of the Hancock County (Ill.) Journal, says his community is almost wholly dependent on farm income and that business fluctuates with the farm situation which "has been consistently good for the last several years."

He reports no major farm issue in the area outside of the ever present support problem.

Rural development is the biggest local farm issue in his area, reports Robert Cummings, editor of the Cannelton (Ind.) News. He says "in this day of mechanization of farming the trend toward big acreages on farms has caused a need for part-time farming and part-time employment elsewhere for our rural residents.

"At our newspaper we help vigorously in promoting 4–H, industrial development, rural development, and farm surveys to know our local agricultural problems so that they can be remedied."

SOUTH

The farm picture appears bright in Arkansas according to a report from Melvin Schexnayder, of the Dumas (Ark.) Clarion. In his area cotton is being mechanized and modern production methods are being introduced and expanded for rice and soybeans. The new developments, he says, have doubled the size of farms and boosted the value of land.

He explains that while the number of farm operators has decreased sharply, agriculture-connected industries are beginning to take up the slack in the area. Of Dumas' 17 homegrown industries, originated with local initiative and capital, all but 6 are directly connected with agriculture.

With agriculture so much a part of our economy, he says, the Clarion devotes a great amount of space and time to farming news and promotions, including such items and activities as the promotion of cotton uses, the establishment of the only farm-raised fish plant in the United States, twice yearly rice promotions, stressing the value of marketing plants for such crops as soybeans, grains and vegetables, and countywide agricultural planning.

Diversification has opened the door to greater farm profits in Mississippi says J. O. Emmerich, of the McComb (Miss.) Enterprise Journal. He reports that farmers' income has increased in Mississippi as the result of diversified changes. Specifically, we have changed from row crops, largely cotton, to livestock, dairying, tree farming and poultry.

While cotton remains dominant in the delta section of the State, he says "Mississippi now has more cattle than any State east of the Mississippi, leads the Nation in the number of tree farms, is the State with the largest tung oil production, and the world's largest broiler plant, world's largest pecan orchard, and world's largest cotton plantation. In some areas of livestock we have broken the world's selling prices in pedigree stock."

Emmerich adds that the outlook for continued agricultural progress in the area looks good and that his paper is cooperating in every way possible to keep the farm economy moving ahead.

SOUTHWEST

As in the South the farm economy in the Southwest is exceptionally strong and for many of the same reasons. Jessie Stewart, of the Ochiltree County Herald, Perryton, Tex., reports that "the status of the farm economy throughout this area is exceptionally good; much above the average. The per capita farm indebtedness is very small; the outlook for the future of farming is exceptionally good."

Besides a thriving agriculture she reports that oil and gas discoveries since 1956 are providing new income to many farmers.

The big local farm issue is the Government's farm program on which, she says, many farmers of her area take the position that the program is unfair to them and they are against Government support of any type.

Bob Lee Kidd, Jr., of the News-Sun, Poteau, Okla., on the other hand reports that "the farm economy in extreme eastern Oklahoma must be boosted if the farmers and ranchers and the communities in the area are to be helped." But, he does not feel that "any pump priming on the part of the Government will materially assist the economy."

NORTHWEST

The farm economy is booming in Oregon according to Bill Robinson, of the Madras (Ore.) Pioneer. He says "farm income figures for 1960 show a gross of $13,534,400, an alltime high. Potatoes topped the crops with $3,700,000. Beef showed a gross of $3,620,000. Wheat with a gross of $1,073,000 will remain fairly constant. Peppermint, a relatively new crop, will gross over a million in 1961."

As to the future, his area is adjacent to the Portland metropolitan market and he feels that expanded farm production is almost inevitable. He adds, "many of the farmers are young men with keen interest in new crops and new methods."

Much the same situation is described by Gerald Bardo, of the Lusk (Wyo.) Herald. He reports few marginal operations in his area and says that both the cattle industry and wheat farming are in a healthy condition. However, the sheep industry is in a precarious position, "dependent as it is on the whims of governmental favor in relation to foreign competition."

As to the role of his newspaper, he says, he "has worked closely with the farm bureau and the extension service programs in the belief that considerable strength for America lies in this field and the related 4–H program, and that the future of our small rural towns is dependent on cooperation and understanding between town and country."

SUMMARY

While farm income is down in some areas, it is holding steady or is actually up in others. Major factors in areas of higher farm income appear to be shifts to more profitable crops, more efficient farming methods, and new industries which provide part-time income for farm families.

In all areas of the country the survey indicates that hometown newspapers are doing their part by keeping farmers up to date on changes that will bring them more income, supporting programs which benefit the farm economy, and interpreting agriculture fairly to town and city residents.

FARMERS ARE GOOD CUSTOMERS

American farmers are among the best customers of industry and business. They spend $40 to $41 billion every year to produce crops and livestock and to buy consumer items such as appliances, automobiles, television sets, clothing, furniture, and, yes, food.

The cost of producing 1959 crops and livestock was $26.2 billion. It probably was $100 million higher in 1960. Other purchases of farmers run around $15 billion a year. Those are figures from the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

On top of these production and living costs, there are capital expenditures by farmers—big ones.

Look at some of the bills the farmer paid in 1959 in order to run his business of farming, and see where it meant income for you:

Fertilizer and lime, $1.4 billion.

Petroleum fuel and oil, $1.5 billion.

Cost of other motor vehicle operation, $1.4 billion.

Pesticides, $250 million.

Short-term interest, $617 million, and interest on farm mortgage debt, $580 million.

Electricity, $147 million.

Insurance (fire, wind, and hail), $200 million.

Telephones, $131 million.

Veterinary services and medicines, $168 million.

Dairy supplies, $52 million.

The cotton farmer spent $219 million to have his cotton ginned; the dairy farmer $180 for milk hauling.

The containers used on the farm to package farm products cost $139 million.

Although the farmer spends $2.5 to $3 billion a year for new farm tractors and other motor vehicles, machinery and equipment, he still used in 1959 about $30 million worth of small handtools.

The 1959 feed bill of the farmer was $4.6 billion. He bought livestock costing him $2.7 billion. The seed he bought cost $534 million.

The farmer in 1959 spent more for nearly every production item (except some like harness and saddlery) than he did in 1949.

And the farmer, if he meets the demand of our estimated 230 million people in 1975,

will require more and more nonfarm inputs—more machinery, more fertilizer, and more of other input items.

Department of Agriculture economists estimate that the total demand for farm products will be 35 percent greater in 1975 than in the late 1950's. We'll need, they say, 45 percent more livestock and 25 percent more crops to supply the demand of 230 million Americans and of the growing number of oversea customers for U.S. farm products.

Budgetary Reforms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, Members of the Senate will be interested in the valiant fight, now being waged by a distinguished Member of the House of Representatives, to implement the Kennedy Budget Reform Act designed to offset huge deficits in Federal spending. Representative F. BRADFORD MORSE of Massachusetts has been urging the administration to consider adopting those steps necessary to give full effect to a Hoover Commission recommendation, written into law by the Congress, under the leadership of the President, when he was a Senator from Massachusetts. This act would bring up for annual congressional scrutiny unobligated and unexpended carryover funds in executive departments. The law is in the public interest. MORSE deserves great credit for his leadership in this field.

Discussing the exertions which Mr. MORSE is making, Mr. Raymond Moley, in an article published in the Los Angeles Times of April 25, comments favorably on those activities of Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Moley's article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENT URGED TO PUSH REFORM THAT HE ADVOCATED AS A SENATOR

(By Raymond Moley)

BRADFORD MORSE, new Congressman from Massachusetts, has called upon the President to put into effect a reform which was sponsored by Mr. Kennedy in 1957 when he was a Senator.

This legislation, which passed the Senate by unanimous vote and later by a large majority in the House, was designed to enforce one of the major recommendations of the second Hoover Commission, of which the President's father, Joseph P. Kennedy, was a member. The bill became Public Law 85–759.

In its report early in the Eisenhower administration the Hoover Commission called attention to a longstanding defect in the method of making up the annual budget and in the practices of the Appropriations Committees of Congress. Reduced to simple, nontechnical terms it was this:

On the recommendation of the Appropriations Committees Congress was in the habit of voting funds for new programs annually. But since many such appropriations were not spent in the year designated they were marked as "obligated" and carried over from year to year.

In the years which followed there was no review of these unexpended funds by the Appropriation Committees of Congress. Thus Congress lost control of expenditures and could not control or even predict accurately the amount to be spent.

The recommendation of the Hoover Commission was that Congress should by law and in practice review annually not only the requests for new appropriations for new purposes but should take into review all of the unexpended balances from previous authorizations and appropriations.

This would bring into focus annually the real fiscal situation of the Government and its many agencies.

This bill, in combination with the cost-basis bill passed last year, would give us far greater control over the amounts of money the Government will spend in each year.

But despite the urging of President Eisenhower in two of his budget messages following the passage of Public Law 85–759, the House Appropriations Committee refused to put the plan into practice.

In his letter to the President, Representative MORSE expressed disappointment that President Kennedy has not recommended that the provisions of his own plan be adopted.

In reply a special counsel to the President noted that the idea has been adopted in the requests for appropriations by 75 percent of the civilian agencies and that the President had urged that the remaining agencies, including the Defense Department, get their accounting in shape.

As MORSE pointed out, the various departments were carrying over from past appropriations in the form of obligated funds the vast total of over $37 billion. Over much of this Congress simply has refused to assume reviewing responsibility.

The value of such a reform, if the President would put the heat upon a Congress of his own party, would be that in a year such as this it might be possible to balance the budget by simply looking over these projects and programs to see if some could be deferred or dropped entirely.

Now since a deficit will appear this year and a larger one next year it should be the determined policy of the President and of Congress to prevent these inflationary drains. In short it is time for the Government to put its house in order.

Opposition to Proposed Department of Urban Affairs and Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on April 18, 1961, the administration submitted to Congress draft legislation to create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. This bill would submerge the activities of the Housing and Home Finance Agency into a new Cabinet-rank Department and add a new administrative layer onto the housing programs. My attention has been called to an excellent editorial on this subject printed in the Reading (Pa.) Eagle, commenting with favor on a speech in opposition to the new Department, made by Mr. O. G. Powell, president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards. I hope that the House Committee on Government Operations in its deliberations will weigh carefully the issues involved in this bill and the implications it has on the size and efficiency of the Federal Government. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have the editorial inserted in the RECORD.

NEW POST OPPOSED

The 70,000-member National Association of Real Estate Boards (NAREB) recently went on record as opposed to President Kennedy's proposal to create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, headed by a person of Cabinet rank.

Speaking at the recent annual convention of the Missouri Real Estate Association in St. Joseph, Mo., O. G. Powell, NAREB president, warned that such a proposal will "complete the erosion of our system of Federal-State-local relations."

Observing that the country's cities "paid handsome tributes to the majority party in the last election," Mr. Powell said that perhaps it is only human for the cities to want something in return.

Noting that the cities are aware the Federal Government has preempted most of the sources of tax revenue, he asserted: "Rather than use their tremendous voting power to get the Federal Government away from the taxpayers' trough, they apparently have decided that they might as well join up and get it while they can."

The NAREB leader was apparently referring to the strong support given to the President's proposal by the U.S. Conference of Mayors.

Speculating on what such a proposal would mean to local responsibility for the solution of problems that are inherently local, Mr. Powell expressed fear that this approach "will soon create a situation in which the mayors of our cities will have little to do other than perform the ministerial task of distributing Federal money."

He traced the suggested creation of the new Federal department to its inclusion in the Democratic platform at the request of mayors of large cities who cited a wide variety of problem areas, and added these areas affect all of the American people—not just large cities.

He noted these problem areas included public health, water and air pollution, airports, highways and railroads, unemployment, the relocation of industry, fire protection and prevention, and civil defense.

Mr. Powell observed that many existing Federal departments are to be raided of some of their traditional functions (among those cited) in order to create the proposed new entity. And he warned that the existing departments are identified with national interests, and such interests have been the basis of their creation.

"The proposed Department of Urban Affairs," he said, "would be a departure from this broad national interest because it would be identified with the interests and objectives of a handful of metropolitan areas.

"If the Department of Urban Affairs is to have jurisdiction over these matters, then who will take care of the same problems as they affect the small towns and rural communities? Will it be necessary to create a Department of Small Towns and Rural Areas?"

Mr. Powell then quoted the National Association of County Officials, which expressed opposition to the proposed new department on the ground "that it would further weaken the States and would tend to create an unwieldy bureaucracy of the type found in many foreign countries."

As we pointed out in a preceding editorial, the creation of any new Cabinet setup in

Washington is inevitably accompanied by bureaucratic confusion and redtape, as well as calling for expenditures of vast sums of the taxpayers' money.

Since the "guy" (government in this case) who pays the bills will also end up by telling you how to spend your money, various city officials may well regret their original enthusiasm for the establishment of such a new department.

Yalta Again?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, with our studied retreat in Laos, the following article by David Lawrence in today's New York Herald Tribune indicates that our direction is not toward a New Frontier of freedom, but toward the old frontier of Yalta.

Is it not about time the President was forthright with the American people?

TODAY IN WORLD AFFAIRS: SUMMIT MEETING NOW SEEN AS SIGN OF U.S. WEAKNESS

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, May 15.—If President Kennedy holds a summit meeting with Nikita Khrushchev—now reliably reported to be planned—this will be construed throughout the Communist world as a sign of America's weakness rather than strength, especially in the wake of the administration's retreats in Laos and Cuba.

It would be just as logical for Mr. Kennedy to meet with Fidel Castro. Both dictators have insulted a President of the United States. Both are guilty of mass murders and other international crimes. It was just a year ago that Nikita Khrushchev—after having invited the American President to visit Russia—deliberately refused to meet with him when the heads of government assembled at Paris. The Soviet Premier then withdrew the invitation in an outburst of vituperative propaganda. He hurled such epithets as thief and coward at President Eisenhower.

IMPROPER ATTACK

The excuse given for all this was the overflight of a U–2 plane which the Soviet Government knew was but one of a series of such flights for the previous 4 years. Also, though it was proper to lodge a diplomatic protest to the U.S. Government, it was highly improper to make a personal attack on the man who happened to be President of the United States. This was an act of ingratitude which put the Soviet people in an unfortunate light. For it was an insult to the very man who, as the commander in chief of the allied forces in Europe during World War II, had helped to save the Russian people from being overrun by Hitler's armies. If there had not been the successful invasion of North Africa and then of southern Europe led by General Eisenhower, the Nazi forces would have been free to pursue their invasion of Soviet territory on the eastern front.

The U–2 episode was a pertinent subject for debate in diplomatic channels. There is, for instance, no clear-cut understanding among international lawyers as to how high planes or sputniks may fly over a country without permission. Nor is there any persuasive argument in international law against the privilege of a government to protect itself against surprise attack, especially when an adversary is conducting espionage and a cold war throughout the world.

FUTILE CONFERENCES

But, it will be said, President Eisenhower did go to Geneva in 1955 to participate in a summit conference and was ready to go into another such meeting in 1960 in Paris. The truth is that the futility of such conferences has been pointed out repeatedly by many observers, including this one, ever since such meetings were first suggested.

It is to be noted that Vice President Nixon a few days ago, in a public comment, urged President Kennedy to meet with Nikita Khrushchev. But this by no means takes away from the present occupant of the White House the responsibility for participating in such a meeting.

It will be recalled that again and again President Kennedy has intimated—and his Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, has spelled it out—that there ought to be no summit meetings unless some agreement has been previously achieved through diplomatic channels on important topics. The argument has been that summit meetings are all right to ratify agreements or understandings already reached at a lower level of diplomacy.

DIPLOMATIC PROGRESS

Mr. Kennedy started out rightly with an emphasis on quiet diplomacy in the hope of achieving a better relationship with the Soviet Government. If, as is claimed, some progress has been made by that method, then it is logical to continue that course rather than indulge in spectacles like the summit conferences. For Khrushchev's main purpose in such a meeting is to afford him a big opportunity for Soviet propaganda. Doubtless it will be broadcast throughout the Soviet Union that President Kennedy made good his offer of an apology publicized during the 1960 preconvention campaign.

There are two major forces in the world today than can affect the issue of peace or war. One is military—but this is being more and more decried as a form of suicide. The other is moral force.

The theory behind moral force is that, while it should never be the sole reliance of a nation, it should be used to the maximum before there is any resort to military power.

FREEDOM THE ISSUE

Primary in the use of moral force is the need for a repeated emphasis on the principles of human freedom. The United States is desirous of helping in every way to emancipate the Russian people and the other peoples behind the Iron Curtain so that some day they may rise up and establish a free government. The moment autocratic force of major proportions is eliminated, it becomes safe for arms to be reduced, and democracy can thrive in the world.

To kow-tow now to Nikita Khrushchev, however, only serves to dishearten the peoples behind the Iron Curtain, especially in the enslaved states bordering the Soviet Union where some day the revolt will inevitably begin. Whether the fateful day of liberation is many years away or nearer at hand is a matter of speculation, but for President Kennedy to ignore the insulting behavior of Nikita Khrushchev and to meet with him in Austria or elswhere cannot but set back and weaken the moral position of the democracies of the world.

Coast Guard Warrant Officer Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following brief history and commentary on the Warrant Officer Corps of the Coast Guard, prepared by Mr. Mark B. Sandground.

A Coast Guard warrant officer is in the netherland between officer's status and enlisted rank. A warrant officer is a real specialist in the Coast Guard and is well regarded by all who have the opportunity to come in contact with them. They have an important role in today's technological military service setup:

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE WARRANT OFFICER CORPS IN THE COAST GUARD

(By Mark B. Sandground)

The vessels of the original Revenue Marine, founded in 1790, were small cutters carrying 3 commissioned officers and from 12 to 20 men and boys. To almost the end of the 19th century there was no intermediate rank or grade between that of commissioned officer and the enlisted members comprising the crew. Rates of pay in general paralleled the current wages for like services in the merchant marine. As cutter sizes increased and with the advent of steam propulsion, the traditional sailing ship rates of boatswain, gunner, carpenter, cook, as well as specialist engineering ratings (oiler and water tender) had been added. However, it was not until 1898 that the status of these specialists was definitely fixed. During that year three General Orders were issued raising boatswains, carpenters, gunners, and machinists to a status above enlisted grades. These officers were "warranted" by the Secretary of the Treasury and authorized to be addressed as "mister." Distinctive uniforms were prescribed. By the act of May 26, 1906, further recognition was given by designating their status as warrant officers and, in addition, higher rates of pay and retirement benefits were granted. The act of April 16, 1908, required that candidates for warrant appointments must qualify by examination for promotion to that grade, rather than adhering to the older practice of being appointed by recommendation of commanding officers. It was not until 1920 that the officers and men of the Coast Guard attained parity in pay with naval pay scales (act of May 18, 1920). Since that time there has been a gradual movement toward making the Coast Guard warrant corps as much like that of the Navy as the mission of the service and essential differences between permit.

At present there is a definite place for the commissioned warrant and warrant officer corps in the Coast Guard. The service has many small isolated units. This is particularly the situation in the lifeboat stations, group commands, and small patrol craft. The complement and physical proportions of many of these units do not require a commissioned officer; in fact, the assignment of such would be a wasteful expenditure of the limited commissioned personnel. On the other hand, isolated location and operational requirements imposed on these units demands more than the authority of the chief petty officer for proper

maintenance of discipline and unit efficiency. The warrant or commissioned warrant officer is suitable to fill these billets. In some localities there will be in close proximity a lifeboat station with small patrol craft, a light station, and small light depot. When this and similar situations exist a group command is organized with a commissioned warrant officer as commander. In this manner the group receives the required on-the-spot supervision which it might not have the benefit of, if a lower grade were in charge and the necessary authority to administer discipline lay in the hands of a distantly located commissioned officer. Further, the Coast Guard has small tenders and patrol vessels in isolated locations, performing somewhat specialized tasks. Here again the warrant officer fills the need of having a proper person in charge when the requirements of the assignments do not merit the assignment of a commissioned officer. In addition to the above-mentioned factors, there is the time-proven necessity of having warrant specialists, the boatswains, machinists, electricians, carpenters, etc., to serve afloat and ashore, to provide the knowledge and know-how gained by practical experience, which commissioned officers are often unable to acquire due to the demands of their diversified duties and advanced study.

The Addition of Electric Generating Facilities to the New Plutonium Production Reactor at Hanford, Wash., at a Cost of $95 Million Not in Best Interest of All the American People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, about 2 weeks ago Congress gave its final approval to the depressed areas bill authorizing almost $400 million for loans and grants to revitalize depressed areas. I supported that legislation because it was for the national good as well as for the good of my constituents. But, now I want to call attention to a proposal that will come before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy May 17 which, if approved, would result in spending $95 million of Federal funds—taxpayers' funds—that would further aggravate the conditions we are trying to correct. I refer to the proposed addition of electric generating facilities to the new plutonium production reactor being constructed at Hanford, Wash.

The needless expenditure of this $95 million would, in my opinion, be contrary to the best interests of the citizens. It would result only in producing heavily subsidized electricity by nuclear fuel which would be used to lure industries away from other areas where there is a serious need for additional employment opportunities.

Present challenges facing this Nation from international tensions have already placed considerable stress on available Federal finances. As the trend seems to continue toward the Government doing more and more for everybody and because greater use of the back-door spending mechanism makes it easier to spend tremendous amounts of money, it has become a matter of the utmost urgency for every thoughtful Member of Congress to evaluate each new spending proposal very carefully. There seems to be a serious relaxation of what used to be considered as fiscal guidelines so we should determine whether such spending is absolutely necessary and is the best possible utilization of available funds.

With this in mind, let us look at the $95 million proposal to add electric generating facilities to the new Hanford plutonium production reactor.

Many of us remember the House debate in July 1958 on authorizing construction of the plutonium production reactor at Hanford. It was to cost $145 million, including $25 million to allow for subsequent addition of electric generating facilities if and when Congress should authorize it.

There were clear assurances in 1958, however, that incorporating convertibility features in the project to the tune of $25 million would not commit Congress to the actual addition of electric generating equipment at some later date. In fact, during debate on the project, the Vice Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy said:

> I want to say and reiterate that by passage of the authorization legislation today we shall not in any way commit ourselves ever to convert the plant.

Let us not forget this important point—there is absolutely no commitment for Congress to proceed with adding generating facilities to Hanford now or even in the future simply because it has equipment which would permit such an addition. The proposed Hanford steamplant can and should be considered solely on its merits or demerits.

I will not attempt at this time to elaborate on all the demerits of adding electric generating facilities to Hanford, because I, along with several of my colleagues, will have much to say about this project in the next few days. But, today, I will limit my remarks to its effect on other areas and resources of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I supported construction of the new production reactor in 1958 to produce weapons grade plutonium and asked other Members to support it also. During debate on that bill, I pointed out that nothing in the bill at that time—and I repeat at that time—should cause the coal industry concern because we were making no commitments to add electric generating facilities to the reactor. Now, however, this administration has requested authorization to proceed with the addition of these facilities, and this should cause serious concern to the coal industry. I do not say this merely because I am privileged to represent a coal mining area; but, rather, because this major industry represents a vital natural resource of America which is presently in a seriously depressed condition.

The proposal is to add about 700,000 kilowatts of generating capacity to Hanford. This is roughly equivalent to 2,319,000 tons of coal per year, based on an 85-percent load factor. The load factor may seem somewhat high to many, but let me quote from page 16 of the "Supplemental Report on New Production Reactor Power Plant Economic Feasibility Study" prepared by the Federal Power Commission and dated February 1961. The report states:

> An NPR maximum annual power plant factor of 85 percent has been adopted for comparison of NPR plant dependable capacity to that of conventional fuel-electric plants.

Since it takes less than one pound of coal to generate a kilowatt-hour of electricity in most modern steamplants, the total kilowatt-hours from the Hanford steamplant can be translated into 2,319,000 tons of coal.

This figure can also be expressed in terms of man-days of employment for miners in this depressed industry. An average of 12.12 tons of coal can be mined per man per day. This would mean that approximately 19,136 man-days of gainful employment could result from generating 700,000 kilowatts of electric power using a modern fossil fuel steamplant.

I recognize there is no proposal to construct an alternative steam facility of this size presently being considered. But I can assure you that if the future power needs of the area require such an additional block of power—and I might point out that the Bonneville Power Administration reported in its 1960 annual report there is a surplus of power in BPA—there are other resources that can be developed to meet the need, including conventional steamplants. In fact, some of the power companies in the Pacific Northwest are already planning for the time when steam generating units will be required on their own systems. For this reason, it might be said that adding these electric generating facilities to Hanford would further postpone the use of coal-fired stations to firm up much of the Pacific Northwest's nonfirm hydropower.

Mr. Speaker, another criticism I have of this proposal is even more important than the first. This is that $95 million of sorely needed Federal funds would be used in such a way as to further aggravate conditions which we have attempted to alleviate by enacting the depressed areas bill. A serious concern of the Congress at that time was to devise means to forestall shifting industrial enterprises from one area to another. But, the availability of such a large block of heavily subsidized power would be used to lure industrial enterprises away from other sections of the country that are in desperate need of additional employment opportunities.

In urging that these generating facilities be added to the Hanford reactor, the Bonneville Power Administration said to do so would make possible the early sale of an additional 400,000 kilowatts of firm industrial power. Such an appeal from the BPA is by no means new. For years they have been saying:

> Low-cost hydroelectric power is the great drawing card for the Pacific Northwest. Ample supplies provide immediate opportunities for power-using industries.

Now they want to use $95 million of Federal funds—taken primarily from taxpayers in the industrialized East—to produce approximately 700,000 kilowatts of steam electric power. Which, by the way, would be the first Federal steam electric plant outside the TVA area.

There was be no question but what this power will be heavily subsidized, because the various studies of economic feasibility for this project indicate significant items of economic cost have been excluded from consideration. The studies have not been based upon the cost of producing power at the Hanford site, but rather have been based upon the economics of merely adding power to the heat source which will be finished late in 1962. As an example of the cost factors which have been excluded, I might point out that none of the capital costs of the plutonium reactor itself are charged to power production, in spite of the fact it would be impossible to produce power without the heat generated by the reactor. This to me, is just as illogical as attempting to evaluate power costs in a conventional plant based solely on generating costs and excluding the price which had to be paid for the boilers and other standard equipment required to produce steam to turn the generators.

Furthermore, no portion of the $25 million now being spent for the convertibility features of the reactor has been allocated to the cost of power. This, in spite of the fact, that it is admitted electricity could not be produced without such features and they serve no useful purpose other than making the addition of power generating facilities possible.

These are but two of the significant items of economic cost which have been excluded from the economic feasibility study of this project, and there are others. But I think they are sufficient to indicate that if power facilities are added, the resultant electricity would be heavily subsidized, and could be used by the Bonneville Power Administration to entice new industries into the Pacific Northwest.

It is interesting to note that on the basis of the percentage of Federal taxes borne by individuals in the various States, the people of Pennsylvania are being asked to pay almost $7 million toward the cost of adding electric power at Hanford.

Mr. Speaker, there can be no question of my devotion to the orderly development of atomic power as rapidly as improved technology will allow. But, I cannot—and I will not—lend my support to a project such as the one being proposed at Hanford that will only very slightly, if at all, mean substantial advancement in reactor technology. There are many more advantageous ways for the Federal Government to use $95 million for the national good than to waste them on unnecessary and uneconomical undertakings such as this.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I sincerely feel that the addition of electric generating facilities to the new production reactor at a cost of $95 million will be contrary to the best interests of all the American people and will have the effect of dissipating many of the benefits which we hope will accrue from the enactment of the depressed area law.

I urge every Member of Congress to search deep within his conscience and answer truthfully whether he or she feels that this expenditure is absolutely necessary and is the best use of available Federal funds.

Massachusetts Lauds National Commander John E. Erickson, Veteran of World War I, U.S.A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include part of my remarks delivered at a dinner in honor of John E. Erickson, national commander of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., held under the auspices of the Department of Massachusetts in the town hall in Stoneham, Mass., on Sunday evening, May 14, 1961. Department Commander Edwin Hayden Lombard was toastmaster of the evening:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE THOMAS J. LANE, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Greetings, in my travels—from barracks to barracks—I have noticed a special spirit that distinguishes the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., from other veterans' groups.

Like them, we are united by shared memories.

And we have our own legislative program.

But more important than these—in some respects—are the strong social ties that transform comradeship into friendship.

This closer relationship is evidenced by the warm welcome that we give to our national commander, John E. Erickson, here in the hometown of Department Commander Edwin H. Lombard.

Stoneham sent many volunteers to serve with the famous 26th Yankee Division. That was one of the first to fight in 1917, and earned one of the best combat records in the American Expeditionary Force.

Stoneham has a long tradition of service for freedom, beginning with the farmers and tradesmen who fought a short distance from here, at Bunker Hill, and Concord and Lexington.

This area is rich in patriotic traditions.

That spirit was exemplified on May 5 of this year. Our neighbor from Derry, N.H., less than 40 miles north of Stoneham, became the world's first true astronaut as he operated the manual controls of the space capsule named "Freedom 7" 115 miles above the earth.

What inspired Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr., with pioneering courage?

As a matter of fact, we had only spent $31,000, including items that did not have to be reported, such as the purchase of office equipment and miscellaneous outlays.

We knew that our organization was growing rapidly, but we also knew that it was not so prosperous that it could spend more money on influencing legislation than the National Association of Manufacturers, for example, or any of the other powerful lobbies.

Although the truth is that we spent $31,000 instead of $200,000 for this purpose, the charge that was subsequently disproved shows that some people on the outside are jumping the gun and are apprehensive about the actual progress we are making.

For this growth we give credit to the energetic leadership of Commander John E. Erickson.

Last year we had a membership of 170,000.

It is expected that the total will pass the 200,000 mark, by the time of the national convention in September.

In the name of the 67 barracks in Massachusetts with returns still coming in we thank our national commander for his hard work and his success in building up the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A.

I think that some of his ancestors must have come from Massachusetts, because Commander Erickson typifies the patriotism, the courage, and the determination of the Massachusetts officer of World War I who gave us this battle cry: "The command is forward."

It was the example of his parents and his community.

His father served in World War I, and World War II.

In the years between and since, he made it a daily custom to fly the American flag outside his home, and outside his downtown business office.

His son grew up as a participant in this moving ritual. Patriotic reverence for the flag, and the ideals that it symbolizes, developed the courage and the faith in freedom that we admire in Commander Shepard.

As veterans of World War I, we feel that we are related in spirit to this brave young officer of the U.S. Navy.

Our active service ended long ago but from that experience we learned a continuing devotion to what is best for our country.

There are some people with no faith in anything but themselves who seize upon the slightest pretext to discredit the veterans and the organizations that represent them.

It was our turn to be the target a short time ago when some newspapers carried the report that the veterans of World War I had spent over $200,000 in lobbying for a separate monthly pension for all veterans of the First World War. This made us out to be "Mr. Big" among all the lobbies.

Our guest of honor, National Commander Erickson, promptly exposed the false charge that our organization had spent more money on lobbying efforts in 1960, than any other of the 283 groups who must report on these activities to the Congress.

Mrs. Gladys Gardner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, great is the satisfaction that comes to those who have dedicated their lives to teaching. Mrs. Gladys Gardner of the Allagash in Maine is one of these, and soon she will be retiring from her chosen life's work.

In her teaching career, she has gathered unto herself a virtual treasure house of experiences, building up a fund of memories upon which she can generously draw to lend real sparkle to her leisure.

The May 11, 1961, issue of the St. John Valley Times in announcing Mrs. Gardner's planned retirement presents a highly interesting projection of this teacher's school life. This is an account that reaches out and captures some of her rich experiences of the past, and I commend this to my colleagues as truly stimulating reading.

Good wishes to Mrs. Gardner in her retirement. May the many years that lie ahead be filled with the rich rewards that are the just due of one who has brought brightness into the lives of a multitude of fellow Americans:

[From the St. John Valley Times, May 11, 1961]

SERVED THE AREA FOR 48 YEARS—ALLAGASH TEACHER TO RETIRE IN JUNE

Mrs. Gladys Gardner is retiring this year after many wonderful years of teaching. We are sure that you will enjoy the story of her and her school life.

"I was born in Fredericton, New Brunswick. I started school at the age of 5. This was in a one-room schoolhouse. Unfortunately, we had to walk about 3 miles to and from school each day to a little town in the country called Kingsclear.

"In those days one had to buy his own books, paper, slate, and pencil. I now remember the first slate and pencil I ever had and how it got broken. Not being able to have another was a terrible feeling, because one had to last all year. Those same old slate pencils, that usually broke in many pieces if we children weren't careful, still served us as the new ones had. Oh, how hard they were to write with.

"When my family moved to St. Francis, Maine, I was in what we would now call the third grade. Our readers were numbered, so I was in the third reader. When we got through the sixth one, we were quite grown up. At the school in St. Francis, we didn't have to buy our own supplies; this was a real surprise for my sister and myself. The Canadian school system was a whole lot different. Here, we went to a one-room building. All the grades were together—from subprimary to the eighth. I remember all my teachers, and to the last of my knowledge, two of them are still living today.

"After the eighth grade I went to work doing housework and baby sitting. Being the oldest of 13 children, leisure was just another word that didn't mean anything to me.

"I was out of school a year. At the end of that year, school meant more to me than ever before. In the fall of 1909, my mother and I went to Fort Kent to see if I could find a job and work for my board, so that I might enter the Madawaska Training School. Traveling by horse and wagon was a very slow process and took us all day.

"We finally found that there was an opening at the dormitory and I gladly took it. It was at the Madawaska Training School for 3 years, gradually working my way through. My wages were $2 a month.

"Early one morning as I was going to school from the dormitory, I met a Mr. Henderson, who asked me if I would like to come to the Allagash to teach school. He talked to the principal of the school. She gave her consent, and said that I could take my exams that day.

"When I went back to my room, my sister and another girl were packing my suitcase. I asked them what they were doing and they said, 'You're going to "Moosetown" to teach school.' This was all a big joke to them.

"When I got home I told my mother that I was going to Allagash to teach and amazed her. Then at once she said 'How in the world are you going to get there?'

"At that time of the year the roads were terrible. There was mud a foot deep in places.

"The next morning my brother volunteered to take me to Allagash, and what a ride it was.

"Monday morning I went inside my first school. A one-room building with benches and desks. I had a small blackboard, very few books, and 10 pencils.

"I taught that summer and went back to school in September. I graduated the next June (1913) and went to teach in what was called Dickey, about 4 miles from my first school.

"In 1914, I taught at the Siding School. In 1925 back to the Allagash I went and in 1916 I found myself in Dickey again. I got married that year. While raising a family of seven children, I had to take quite a few years out of my teaching career. I didn't return to school until 1942. I then went to teach at the Lindbergh School and that was the last 1-room, country school I taught in before moving to the new school.

"In 1942 when I started teaching at the Lindbergh I had some very studious pupils. I might take time to mention a few starting with the older ones: Doris Jandreau, Albertine Pelletier, Florence Hafford, Arlene Jackson, Arlene Pelletier, Wilda Jackson, Audry and Joyce Hafford, Roy Gardner, Queenie McBrearity, Albert Hafford, and there were so many more. Of course, there was Tunny, who knew more than I did until the skunk came into the shed and Tunny fled.

"Cecil was the quiet boy in school. I doubt if I'll ever have a better student than Cecil. But Glen, his brother, was the smart one. He got all hundreds on his papers and then he was too lazy to even take them home. These boys lived across the St. John River and what a time they had to get to school. Then there were the 'Robbins brothers,' Boog and Bill. One noon hour while I was having dinner with Mr. and Mrs. Dave Jackson, Billy and Boogie ruined a panel in the wall by throwing their favorite jackknives. Their father came to school later and fixed it up good as new.

"One day Bernard 'Squeaky' Pelletier cut his finger and fainted. I told Billy to run quick and get some water. Billy dashed into the coatroom and returned with a dish of dirty water. He threw it all over Squeaky's head and all over me. It just happened that I had on a new dress and a white one at that.

"Bobby Jackson came to school and so did his pet ram, Bimbo. I think that Bimbo's attendance was as good as Bobby's.

"The children brought their lunches in lunch boxes and drank milk or soda.

"I can remember so well one morning Loman McBrearty's mother sent him to school. He was in the fifth grade then. He only made it halfway to school and I think the nature of the forest called him, because he never came back. He preferred being in the woods hunting or being along the river fishing rather than coming to school.

"Duane 'Sleepy' Hafford was with us in the old school and in the new school a while. Duane used to sleep the greatest part of the time but was I ever surprised the day I go a card from him and it said 'Congratulations to baby' and the holiday was Christmas.

"Not to forget Carol and Dale Pelletier and their baby sister, Mary; Joyce; Audrey and Dayle Hafford, Thressa and Pauline Jackson.

"Perry and Phyllis Gardner were with us in the old school several years before moving to Bangor. One day Perry Roderick, and Louis pushed Phyllis, Beverly and Linda down in the forms they were putting up for the new school. When I rang the old hand bell, and took the attendance I found that three of the girls were missing. Boze soon spoke up, 'Mrs. Gardner, they are hiding out back of the school and won't come in.' Instead of finding them hiding, I found them crying. I ordered the boys to help the girls out and they did because they sure were scared of the strap in my desk drawer.

"When Louis Pelletier began school, he was only 4 years old. About the same time every day he used to ask me if he could go outdoors and since he was so tiny, I let him.

"None of the children knew he used to sit on the step and suck his nipple, until it fell out of his pocket in front of everyone.

"One day shortly after school opened in August, I noticed the children had some kind of stain on their mouths. Later I found that Wilmer Hafford had brought some choke cherries into the room under his shirt.

"Larry Ouellette was another of my pupils at the Lindbergh School. He is now attending Fort Kent Community High and will graduate this year.

"The Hafford children lived next door to my school. Mrs. Hafford was my janitor.

"In these days I walked to school through rain, mud and snow. We did not have a bridge across the Allagash River, but instead we had a ferry boat. Tom Pelletier was our ferryman until Fred Hafford took it over for a while.

"I would like to mention the warm dinners I had at Mr. and Mrs. Dave Jackson also.

"We moved to the new school in 1953 and the old school was hauled away. It is still standing there across the road, but in my heart it still looks as it did all those years I taught there.

"The pleasant memories of school years keep coming back as I keep thinking of how joyful they were. This will be my last year of teaching and I want to thank you and wish you all the luck and sucess ever."

How Our Experts Almost Ruined Bonn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most informative and interesting column from the New York World Telegram and Sun written by Lawrence Fertig. It discloses some events of history which should be of real concern to the Congress and to the country.

It also demonstrates again the capacity of the present leaders of West Germany by vindicating their good judgment in rejecting the unrealistic counsel of Professors Hansen and Heller and by following, instead, the proven policies and programs dictated by sound economics in public affairs.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the World Telegram and Sun, May 8, 1961]

HOW OUR EXPERTS ALMOST RUINED BONN

(By Lawrence Fertig)

In 1951 the U.S. State Department sent a commission of American economists to Western Germany to investigate and make recommendation to that government on fiscal policy. Chairman of the commission was

Prof. Alvin W. Hansen of Harvard, and Prof. Walter W. Heller, now chairman of President Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers, joined the commission and is reported to have had a hand in writing the report. The world has long waited to view this report, which was classified by the State Department as a secret document. Many people want to know precisely what measures were recommended by Dr. Heller and the other economists, and to what extent the phenomenal West German prosperity is related to the prescription which they gave for Germany's economic health.

I have had a special interest in this report ever since I heard economic minister of Germany Ludwig Erhard tell a small group of economists that the recommendations by American experts in the 1946–48 postwar period could have wrecked the feeble German economy. In 1948 our experts insisted that the only way out for Germany was by inflation. Erhard threatened to resign if this view was forced upon him, and the Americans backed away. The German Government insisted upon the opposite course—upon the maintenance of a sound currency, a balanced budget, the elimination of price controls, incentives to business and individuals to save and invest, and encouragement to private enterprise rather than government directed economy. The rest is history. Erhard won the battle in 1948 and Germany went on to be the most prosperous nation in Europe.

What then did the Hansen-Heller Commission recommend in 1951? Here I must tell the reader of a mystery. A copy of the 1951 report, which was declassified a few months ago, is nowhere to be had in Washington, not even in the Library of Congress. At first State Department representatives blandly asserted there were so many reports they could not locate this particular one. Finally they stated that the only copy in existence is in the Department's library and a responsible person could get a peek at it by going through a complicated process. The question arises, is the State Department trying to hide this document because its recommendations may cast some reflection upon economists who are high in administration circles today?

On excellent authority I have the substance, as well as a number of quotations from this 400-page report. I believe it is in the public interest for the American public to know about this. In summary it would appear the the German Government practically threw this report into the wastebasket. It pursued policies which were the opposite of those recommended by Dr. Heller and his associates. Today, as we know, German prosperity is the envy of the world. What would have happened had they followed the commission's recommendations? The reader may answer that for himself.

Here are some of the recommendations in the report: (1) That Germany had an "excessive concern for price stability." It tried to egg the Germans on to more inflation and said that they (the Germans) tended to "confuse wartime inflation with the normal operations of peacetime credit." The Germans would have none of this. They kept the lid on the money supply and refused to pursue a cheap-money policy. Germany had less inflation than any nation in Europe, and as a result she had more prosperity.

(2) Our economists told them that "a rate of interest high enough to stimulate any large volume of personal savings would seriously curtail investment." The Germans scoffed at that idea and they encouraged savings by a high rate of interest. Instead of German investments being curtailed they were expanded. German industry made the most rapid strides in Europe.

The German allowed fast depreciation of capital investment and gave special inducement to corporation to increase their investment in new plant and equipment. The American economists objected to this, saying that "it was an expenditure of tax funds which would otherwise have been collected by the government." Always the Americans suggested that the government should be dominant in the economy. The Germans completely disregarded this recommendation and went their own sweet way to prosperity.

Finally the American report said that "the nostalgic hopes looking toward a revival fo the 19th century role of a capital market are doomed to disappointment. The capital market plays no such role in any modern country and there is no prospect that it will." This is probably the most ridiculous statement in the report. It reveals the deep prejudice of American economists in favor of government rather than individual action.

The capital market has been the mainspring of German prosperity and it is certainly the heart of American progress. Plainly, Dr. Heller and his associates never had any confidence in the heart of the private capitalist system—the private capital market.

If the above statements are not correct, the State Department or Dr. Heller should disavow them. If they are correct they lead to grave questions as to whether we ought to follow similar advice for this country now being given by some of the same people in Washington.

Food for Peace Is Coming of Age—It Started With Humphrey in 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Milton D. Hakel, editor of the Minnesota Agriculture:

WITH HUMPHREY IT STARTED IN 1949—FOOD FOR PEACE IS COMING OF AGE

(By Milton D. Hakel)

Here and now in 1961, food for peace is at last coming of age, the culmination of a 12-year dream of Minnesota Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Americans are entering a New Frontier. A new administration, led by President John F. Kennedy, is determined to learn to live in and make an asset of the age of abundance, rather than being embarrassed by it.

President Kennedy has given a high priority to the food-for-peace program. His appointment of Dr. George McGovern as the food-for-peace administrator means that there will be coordination of all effort along these lines whether in the State Department or the Agriculture Department and there will be a stepping up of these efforts, as HUMPHREY has pleaded so many times, "to use our farm abundance as the humanitarian arm of the Nation's foreign policy in our efforts to create a better and more peaceful world."

As with any great idea, no man perhaps has exclusively originated and developed it. Others, too, have recognized the importance of food, others have helped enrich this concept of food as a weapon for peace and economic development. Others have authored and worked for bills and resolutions.

But now, in 1961, the man who is most humbly thankful that America has at last begun to move vigorously in this field, is the Minnesota Senator who, for 12 years, like a great conscience, has persistently and relentlessly pleaded with the Nation to understand the opportunities to "use food to help establish a climate for peace."

Year by year and session by session, his insistent voice has explained the possibilities of food for peace to a sleek and fat America, bulging to the seams with abundance. He has urged—he has proposed—he has needled our conscience, he has chided us for our lack of Christian perception, and mostly, he has just pleaded with a complacent America to open up its heart.

Always a man of keen insight into the problems of peace and foreign relations, Senator HUMPHREY embarked upon the food for peace theme soon after he first arrived on the senatorial scene in 1949.

Recognizing the concern about China's having slipped behind the Communist curtain, HUMPHREY warned in February 1949 that India needed food to help expand her economy and, incidentally, to prevent a repetition of what had happened in China.

Speaking before a meeting of the India League in New York City in May of 1949, Senator HUMPHREY said:

"Without stability in southern Asia, without freedom for Asiatics, without education for the people of Asia, without food and nourishment for the children of Asia, there can be no real peace in the world."

In 1949, India was seeking to barter mica, maganese and other raw materials for a million tons of wheat. The negotiations broke down.

The purchase of wheat on long-term credits was proposed by Indian leaders but again no agreement was reached.

To Senator HUMPHREY, who was so cognizant of the needs and the opportunities, it was the beginning of a frustrating two years of effort.

ANOTHER PLEA

Upuon the opening of the Congress in 1950, Senator HUMPHREY took to the floor with another fervent plea for action.

"What is the most important problem of the government of India today? It is food.

"Who has the food? We ought to get down on our knees and pray to God to forgive us our sins—for here on the eastern coast of our land are Liberty ships, 10,000-ton freighters loaded with wheat which the Commodity Credit Corporation has purchased.

"The wheat is stored up and here are people who are dying of hunger, with the Communists on top of them, with their government almost tottering. What are we doing? We are sitting around saying we cannot get along with Pakistan, or with this country or with some other country."

Conditions continued to get worse in India, and in August 1950, Senator HUMPHREY proposed an immediate opening of negotiations to make 60 million bushels of wheat available for famine relief.

"Here would be a grand gesture of good will and basic humanitarianism, a firm cementing tie between our nations, and one of the most significant steps we could take for the preservation of world peace and democracy," he said.

He had been conferring with the Secretary of State and his assistants to try to pave the way for an agreement.

"The people of India are suffering from a food shortage," HUMPHREY declared. "It would be good foreign policy, it would be a good neighbor policy, it would be sound and prudent policy, to make available to this great country (India) some of the foodstuffs

which we have in our storehouses at the present moment."

VOICE IN WILDERNESS

Later in 1950, the Senator sought to rally support for the Javits resolution to extend assistance to India to avoid food shortages.

But, the effort was destined to go well into 1951 and to reach a conclusion only after Soviet Russia had taken a propaganda offensive with delivery of 50,000 tons of wheat to India, and after China had offered rice.

India had bought some wheat from the United States, but far short of the supply needed. Senator Smith of New Jersey sponsored a bill for emergency food aid to India and he was joined in the sponsorship by Senators Humphrey, Saltonstall, and Gillette and 26 other Members of the Senate.

The Smith bill came up for final action in May 1951, and Senator HUMPHREY, who observed that he had begun to feel like a voice crying in the wilderness of politics during the 2 years of effort, made an impassioned plea for the bill:

"I am appealing today that the great American nation answer these basic human needs before it is too late. What India is asking for today is not 300 tanks. She is not asking for arms aid. She is not asking for money to develop atomic energy plants. What she is asking for is something we have in abundance. We do not have to recruit a whole new group of laborers to produce what India neds. We already have it. We have the millions of bushels of wheat that India needs. We have it in storage.

"This is only to remind ourselves again that food is a weapon in the arsenal of democracy and that particularly it is an effective weapon where people are hungry. We have an arsenal of democracy filled with food," he said.

After much debate as to whether the wheat should be in the form of a grant or a loan, the bill was passed and became Public Law 48 of the 82d Congress.

FOOD RESERVE

Early in 1953, Senator HUMPHREY joined with Senator Murray and others to sponsor a joint resolution for the creation of an international food reserve.

Shortly thereafter, the attention shifted to Pakistan where a crisis-ridden government had collapsed, largely because of inability to deal with a famine, Senator HUMPHREY conferred with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Mutual Security Administrator, about using some of our food surpluses to help the new government meet the food crisis.

Senator HUMPHREY introduced a wheat for Pakistan bill in April 1953.

This time action came more quickly. President Eisenhower adopted the wheat for Pakistan suggestion as one of his legislative proposals. An administration bill was introduced and adopted and some 1 million tons of wheat were sent to Pakistan.

The need to legislate in each crisis and to risk serious delay, led Senator HUMPHREY and others to think in terms of legislation which would permit the administration to move more promptly to use surplus foods in famine relief. He pressed successfully for an amendment to the Mutual Security Act broadening the power of the MSA Administrator to use surplus foods in foreign aid programs.

Testifying before the Senate Agriculture Committee on July 13, 1953, the Minnesota Senator spelled out the needed legislative authority for the President to donate commodities, to sell at world prices, to sell at concessional prices, to sell on long-term credits, to sell for soft currencies and to trade food for strategic materials. Several Members of Congress sponsored amendments or bills including one or more of these points and HUMPHREY urged development of a single-package bill.

"I would like to see it undertaken in a nonpartisan spirit, sifting out the best that may exist in any of the Humphrey or Aiken suggestions, the Mundt suggestions, the Case suggestions, the Murray suggestions, the Schoeppel suggestions, the McClellan suggestions, and coming up with a committee bill we can all unite in supporting," he testified.

FOREIGN POLICY ARM

Speaking at a cooperative meeting in St. Paul in December 1953, Senator HUMPHREY reiterated the need for policies to "make more effective use of the abundance farmers are capable of producing.

"We need policies which will enable the farmer to see his food used wisely, rather than wasted, to see the output of his land, his toil make its utmost contribution to stamping out hunger and deprivation at home and abroad, and serving as the humanitarian arm of the Nation's foreign policy, in our efforts to create a better and more peaceful world," he said.

Numerous bills were considered in 1954, including HUMPHREY'S broad proposals for food for peace.

An administration bill, the Schoeppel-Judd bill, was finally adopted, considerably narrower in scope and slanted more to surplus disposal than toward foreign economic development. It was titled the "Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954" and became more commonly known as Public Law 480.

While the law itself could have been effective, unfortunately the administration of it was even more narrowly committed to surplus disposal.

The original Public Law 480, a 1-year program, was subsequently extended by 2 years. In 1957 Senator HUMPHREY introduced a bill to extend it for an additional 2 years with an additional $3 billion in authorizations. He urged a broadening of the scope of the plan. The administration recommended a 1-year extension with $1 billion more in program activity.

Supporting a compromise bill for the extension, HUMPHREY called on the administration to end its timidity and indecision and to make Public Law 480 a fundamental arm of our foreign policy.

"By sharing our blessing of food abundance with the peoples who seek to break away from Soviet tyranny, we can make American food the 'yeast of freedom' which can expand and strengthen the movement to freedom and independence. We take a calculated risk, but all we have to lose is the food itself."

U.N. DELEGATE

In early 1957, as a delegate to the United Nations General Assembly, HUMPHREY proposed a plan for international cooperation toward the establishment of a world food reserve.

"It would seem only logical if some of the world's surplus holdings were used to bolster stocks in areas where people live on the brink of disaster from one harvest to the next," HUMPHREY told the U.N. General Assembly. A resolution providing for consultations on such a world food reserve was approved.

HUMPHREY was determined that he would work for further improvements in Public Law 480.

"I regret the necessity of constantly building fires under the administration to get it to use this effective program fully, or to support its proper expansion. We have hardly scratched the surface of what can be achieved with our abundance under the concept of Public Law 480."

Speaking before the national convention of the American Soybean Association in August 1957, Senator HUMPHREY said:

"In time of war, we recognized the importance of food and fiber. We created a War Food Administrator to mobilize our food resources for victory. Perhaps, today, in time of a shaky and uncertain peace in the world, it is time to think about a similar role for a special 'Peace Food Administrator' to guide more effective use of our food resources for another victory. It is even more important to use our food abundance as a constructive force for peace," he declared.

PEACE FOOD ADMINISTRATOR

Later the same year, speaking before a Minnesota Farmers Union convention in St. Paul, HUMPHREY elaborated on his proposal for a "Peace Food Administrator," suggesting that the Administrator be responsible to the President and have responsibility for coordinating the various functions of food distribution, then scattered among agencies in the Departments of State, Commerce, Agriculture, Defense, Bureau of the Budget, the ICA, and the ODM.

In 1957 also, Senator HUMPHREY made a tour of the Middle East countries and came home more impressed than ever with the opportunities to use our food to improve our foreign relations.

He told of the thrill of finding Land O'Lakes dry milk from his home State of Minnesota being distributed to needy Greek children.

In 1958, HUMPHREY took a personal hand in breaking the stalemate in negotiations by Spain to buy U.S. food and fiber. Agreement was finally reached for Spain's purchase of $69 million in commodities including 110,000 tons of soybean oil.

In a lengthy report to the Senate Agriculture Committee in February 1958, Senator HUMPHREY recounted the accomplishments of the Public Law 480 and outlined the dimensions of what could be accomplished under a broader food-for-peace program.

He recommended use of Public Law 480 as an instrument of economic policy, rather than merely as an agricultural surplus disposal program, he urged assurance of greater continuity of the program, and again he proposed putting the entire effort under a central guiding hand.

ABOLISH HUNGER

Despairing that Public Law 480 would be properly broadened in spirit, Senator HUMPHREY in July 1959 introduced a comprehensive International Food for Peace Act incorporating the improvements he had recommended in 1958.

In introducing the bill for a 5-year expansion of the program, HUMPHREY said:

"The purpose of the Food for Peace Act is to so amend and revise Public Law 480 as to make it a more effective instrument for using U.S. abundance of food and fiber to help build essential world conditions of peace and freedom and thereby strengthen and promote the foreign policies of the United States. It is intended to enable the United States to promote more effectively the economic and social development of friendly nations and to lead the way in cooperation with other nations toward the abolition of human hunger."

The findings of fact and policy tell the purpose:

"Because of the increased productivity made possible by science and technology, there is now, for the first time in history, no reason in physical scarcity for the continued existence of hunger—anywhere on this earth. It is now possible and practical for mankind to take cooperative steps to abolish human hunger.

"This being so, massive hunger and suffering from want of clothing, existing in the shadow of unused present and potential surpluses of food and fiber, are no longer tolerable, either morally, politically, or economically.

"The Congress, while recognizing the difficult international, political, and economic problems that lie between hunger and want

of clothing in many parts of the world and food and fiber surpluses in others, declares it to be the policy of the United States to move as rapidly as possible in cooperation with other friendly nations, toward putting its abundance of food and fiber more effectively in the service of human need."

History, hopefully, is now about to witness the opening up of the American heart for which Senator HUMPHREY has so long pleaded.

Housing for Young and Elderly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, statistics compiled from the 1960 census indicate that about 60 percent of our population growth in this decade will consist of persons in two widely separated age groups—those 15 to 24 years of age, and those 65 and older. This change in the makeup of our total population, expected to reach its peak around 1966, calls for a thorough examination of our national programs in the field of housing.

The younger group, in which the formation of new family units will be greatest, will have somewhat limited income for housing. The senior citizens group will have less need for large houses. Thus it appears that there is a built-in demand for smaller homes during the period immediately ahead of us. As a member of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, I will be very much interested in exploring the housing proposals of the administration designed to meet the needs of these groups.

I am pleased to report that the people of Oregon have taken a leading part in developing housing for the elderly. One specific Oregon development was discussed at length in the April 1961 issue of the Mortgage Banker. I ask consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from the article entitled "Housing for the Elderly A New Problem and New Market for Mortgage Bankers," written by the magazine's associate editor Robert J. Beran.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY—A NEW PROBLEM AND NEW MARKET FOR MORTGAGE BANKERS

(By Robert J. Beran, associate editor, the Mortgage Banker, April 1961)

One of the least explored, but potentially one of the biggest markets in the housing business today, is that of housing for the elderly.

For the mortgage banker, it offers bright new prospects. It is, as one member of the industry so succinctly phrases it, "an issue which is a hot one—as hot and as current as anything will be for a long time."

A rapidly growing feature in our American economy, not only in numbers but in economic power, the more than 15 million persons in this country who are 65 years of age or over (a number increasing at the rate of one-half million yearly) are beginning to exert a marked effect on the housing market. It is, in fact, this segment of the population—these "senior citizens"—which makes the market decision for every sixth dwelling unit rented or purchased.

Significantly enough, however, these older persons do not share proportionately in the 2 percent or more which new construction adds each year to the Nation's housing supply. Their share, actually, falls well short of the annual quota of 250,000 units (one-sixth of the production) which might be expected for an elderly market consuming one-sixth of the total housing supply. And, as a result, all too many of these citizens are forced to share cramped quarters with their children, to live in neighborhoods which have seen better days or to occupy homes too large for their comfort or for their needs.

In short, their special housing requirements, generally, are not being provided—largely because proper financing does not seem to be available, or at least not in ready supply.

This is not to say that nothing whatsoever is being done in this field. All over the country beautiful housing for the elderly is being created. As might be expected, church groups and fraternal organizations are leading the way. The Methodist Church alone now has 104 (as of November, last year) nonprofit retirement homes affiliated with its Methodist Board of Hospitals and Homes. These are located in all parts of the country. Throughout the Midwest, in Arizona and in the Gulf States, and in the Northwest particularly—in Oregon and in Washington—there are many fine projects, either completed or in process.

There is activity, too, under the Housing and Home Finance Agency's new $20 million program of direct, low-interest loans. Just recently the "go ahead" signal was given to nonprofit organizations with plans to build in St. Paul, in Peoria, and in Manhattan—plus groups in the first two small communities to gain approval for such projects: Cordell, Okla., and Eagle Grove, Iowa. Likewise, local housing authorities across the country are gearing to provide housing for the low-income aged, those old folks for whom the only answer to housing problems is the low-rent program.

But the fact remains that the number of units constructed—to date—is insufficient to the need. And the need is there, for all types of housing—for both nonprofit and profit-motivated, for single family residences, multifamily, duplex, high-rise apartments and the like. Private enterprise, generally, since the Housing Act of 1956, has proved itself inadequate. It is going to have to mend its ways. If ever there is to be volume production in elderly housing, it will have to come in the main from the private sector of the housing industry.

To encourage private enterprise in this direction, to spur on the development of good housing which can meet the varying special needs of elderly occupants, the Federal Housing Administration's special section 231 program authorizes FHA mortgage insurance for both nonprofit and profit-motivated rental housing for the elderly. It was legislation, as set forth originally in the 1956 Housing Act (in particular the provisions for liberalized FHA financing for the elderly), which paved the way for the still further liberalized provisions in the Housing Act of 1959—from which evolved this present program.

By removing elderly housing from under the older section 207 program which had preceded it, and by making it a separate program—section 231—FHA gave it status. It took it out of the range of being only a "gimmick" under 207 and made of it another major "financing tool." Like all FHA programs, it depends for its success on the cooperation of private enterprise. Not a subsidy program, it encourages private sources to furnish the necessary capital and private industry to build the kind of housing older people need. It's a program intended to help communities meet their responsibilities to the elderly at the local level.

Although a "hot item" in the FHA showcase, this program, admittedly, has been a slow starter. Thus far, participation in the program on the part of private lenders has not been widespread. Some lenders have not fully appreciated the extent of the need for this kind of housing, some have overlooked the fact that qualified nonprofit sponsors have demonstrated their ability to meet their obligations, and some have turned away because of the interest rate and the long term of the insured mortgages.

There is evidence, however, of a growing interest throughout the country in this sovital Federal program of assistance. As of May 31, last year, FHA had applications for mortgage insurance on 97 projects in 32 States. Mortgages had been insured on 42 projects. By November 30, the total number of active projects—under both sections 231 and 207—stood at 96. This represented 11,365 units for a total mortgage amount of almost $115 million. At year's end there were 102 projects on the active list, 18 of which were then in process. One year earlier, in December 1959, there had been only 59 projects with active status. And, according to the man in charge of the section 231 program, former Senator Gerald P. Nye, "FHA ended up the year 1960 with an even 100 additional applications."

To date, except for isolated examples—the mortgage banker has failed to see the significant business opportunities in the field of elderly housing. He has failed to step up his efforts to accommodate this burgeoning market.

Of course, it's still a relatively new picture—one which hasn't yet registered with the majority of mortgage bankers. Most mortgage bankers tend to shy away from it. But some are off and running in this comparatively new field of building and financing homes for the elderly.

"Financing a large housing project for senior citizens," as one mortgage banker experienced in this work points out, "is a major undertaking and involves considerably more than securing the mortgage commitment."

For one thing, it involves time—a great deal of time. A project very often can be in the formative or development stages anywhere from 1 to 3 years, during which time it is quite possible that it might—and many do—wash out. When this happens, all of the time that the mortgagee has invested in the development of the project is lost without any prospect of compensation for his efforts. Likewise, because of the inexperience of the sponsoring body in most cases, the prospective mortgagee must provide a vast amount of gratuitous service.

For another, the project must have a strong, sound demand from enough of those who can afford to subscribe—if success is to be assured. It is important to determine in advance who will be living in the project and from where these people are to be drawn. Will the project be close to local transportation? Will it be in proximity to local community activities? In short, the elements of success must be inherent within a project from its inception—or it can result in failure.

In profit-motivated projects, particularly, a key point is the management which the sponsor eventually will employ, for it is the caliber of management which will determine the profit. It must be interested in doing a good job, in providing services, etc., and the financing agent must be assured of this in advance. Most mortgage bankers, as potential financing agents, have not pursued this to a point.

In Newberg, Oreg., this month (Oregon, incidentally, is a leader among States in

amount of elderly housing activity) one mortgage banker's efforts reach fruition with the opening of Friendsview Manor, a 126-unit, high rise, nonprofit project. First such FHA-insured 231 project to be completed in Oregon, outside of Metropolitan Portland, Friendsview Manor represents the successful culmination of many, many months' hard work and effort by the sponsoring group's mortgagee representative, State Finance Co. in nearby Salem. It shows it can be done—and, certainly, it makes an interesting case study.

Currently, State Finance has three other projects on the boards, for a total of $5½ million, with each in a different stage of planning. Friendsview Manor, however, was the firm's first experience with this type of project.

"It all began," recalls Vice President Ernest H. Miller, "approximately 3 years ago, when a group sponsored by the Friends Church of Oregon decided to construct a retirement home at Newberg, the site of the Quaker-sponsored George Fox College and the rather informally recognized center of Friends Church activities in the Northwest area.

"The project had been under development for a considerable period of time and had had a rather large amount of publicity. Following the announcement of the creation of FHA section 231, we contacted the sponsors," says Miller. "We described the provisions of the new section to them and we were appointed their contact representative with FHA and their financing agency for the completion of the project."

From their experience with the Quakers and the Friendsview Manor project, and from discussions with numerous later sponsors, Miller and his firm learned a great deal about the problems associated with the promotion of projects of this type.

One of the first—and possibly one of the most important—points to be reckoned with, according to Miller, is that of the 100 percent maximum loan ratio based on the FHA-estimated replacement cost when construction is new, or on the FHA-estimated value when it is a case of rehabilitating existing construction. Theoretically, this is true. A nonprofit group can borrow out at 100 percent, but there is a catch.

"While FHA does have available a 100 percent loan," Miller points out, "the loan is not necessarily 100 percent of the cost of the project—and, most certainly, it is not 100 percent of all expenses involved in its promotion, construction and completion. We have found," she emphasizes, "that only the most Spartan-like project is likely to have even a nearly 100 percent loan and that as the quality of the living units is enhanced, the amount of equity required by FHA increases."

This aspect of 100 percent mortgage insured financing, while it might very well be the heart of the whole 231 program, does not—as some sponsor's agents would make it seem—practically eliminate equity requirements altogether. It does not, in a word, pay the bills.

Sponsors also encounter unsuspected cash requirements, not only in the form of the demanded equity, but in the very large amount of FNMA fees which, until just now, have amounted to 2½ percent of the amount of the mortgage and have now been reduced to 1½ percent of the mortgage amount. Also to be considered is a 2 percent operating capital deposit and the large amount of cash required for furnishings not included or allowable under the mortgage.

This all means, of course, that the sponsor of a $1-million project will find that it has an actual nonrecoverable cash requirement of somewhere in the neighborhood of $100,000 to $150,000. Most of the sponsors are people of religious affiliation and with limited business experience, and the prospect of having to provide this substantial block of cash often turns out to be an extremely discouraging factor.

Admittedly, in projects of this type, the profit potential for the mortgage banker is not great. But, incentive or not, this is work which private enterprise is going to have to do—and be prepared, if necessary, to take a smaller profit in so doing.

Strategy for Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following forthright analysis of the perils in which our country stands and a realistic prescription for us to follow. It was written by Gen. Clyde J. Watts, retired, now practicing law in Oklahoma City. If Americans would only read such a document and face up to the realities of the situations into which our drift and Communist guile have led us, we would not be unprepared for the defeats we have sustained and the worse ones still to come unless we quickly arouse ourselves and rally all the will and resources of the whole Nation. The article follows:

STRATEGY FOR SURVIVAL

(By Gen. Clyde J. Watts)

We are at war. A space age type of war, a protracted conflict in which our enemy has promised a materialistic god * * * his all powerful state * * * our utter annihilation.

In this all-out war, we are making less than a halfhearted effort.

We sporadically demand of our scientists and military the security they are powerless to provide, because it is not their war * * * it is our war * * * a personal war made more sinister and more protracted by our inability to comprehend its objectives, its strategies, its tactics, or even our enemy, who has been charting its course behind barriers of land, sea, and air that have lulled us into a sense of false security.

With the present compression of these barriers from days and miles into minutes and seconds (Oklahoma is now as close to Moscow as Berlin to Paris in 1940), we begin to recognize this enemy * * * powerful, brutal, determined, arrogant in his military might and scientific accomplishment, contemptuous in his cloak of invincibility.

Through the mist of his propaganda, he becomes more obvious; from his initial pronouncement of global objectives:

"We shall first dominate eastern Europe, then the masses of Asia. Finally, we shall encircle the United States, as the last bastion of capitalism. We shall not have to fight. It will fall like an overripe fruit into our waiting hands" (Lenin, 1918).

down to his confident boasting of present accomplishment.

"Victory is now in sight" (Khrushchev, January 1961).

It may be later than we know; but it is also earlier than they think. The weakness of power-mad dictators has ever been to underestimate the latent forces of freedom. Our survival is still within reach, but the time to reach is desperately short.

Our first reluctant awakening must comprehend the nature of the war our enemies fight—psychological, political, social, economic, industrial, scientific, military—and must include the concept that the nonmilitary phase, though lacking the horror, is the more deadly, for it will set up the military phase as a brief but foregone conclusion, a violent, but final, climax.

We must understand that the terrain of this unconventional warfare transcends land, sea, and air, involves a fourth and new dimension—the mind of all mankind.

We must next study our enemy, his objectives, his strategies, his tactics, as he has been studying us for 40 years; and, with stakes of life or death, we must recognize that our enemy:

1. Has warned that "War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable and that the democracies, stupid, and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction * * * in return for phony peace overtures."

2. Has through the means of a world revolution, pledged his all to accomplish a Communist utopia after bloody elimination of capitalist opposition.

3. Has mounted a steadily accelerating offensive, to push us into a nuclear corner, where we must choose between surrender or world destruction.

4. Has sold us his concept of peaceful coexistence, with implied promise of easing cold war tensions, which he alone controls, concealing that his concept of peace means only that we will not seriously challenge his goals.

5. Has used the hope of peace itself as an implement of psychological war.

6. Has built up, with Western aid, a colossus 1 billion slaves; a Frankenstein that challenges our very survival.

7. Has extended communism over two-fifths of the land surface of the earth and is reaching for one-third more, including the Carribbean nations to form the boundary of a new Communist lake.

8. Has organized and supports a hard core Communist conspiracy in the United States of America with awesome capabilities, as evidenced by the success of Communist organized, engineered and financed student riots against the House Committee on Un-American Activities, in San Francisco last May (see J. Edgar Hoover report, "Communist Target—Youth").

Finally we must study ourselves, recognizing that we are constantly being weighed in the balance of protracted war, that will change overnight from cold to hot, if and when we are found wanting. We must evaluate our strength and weakness; and resolve to mobilize our vast resources for the awesome conflict, before shifting of the balance of power past the point of no return.

What can we do? If our Government cannot meet the threat, if our leaders be not aware of the stark reality of our peril, how can we? We can. We must. We shall.

We must recognize that our Government is us; and our leaders simply mirror the composite thought and motivation of their people.

We must reject the old truism that the most significant fact of history is man's refusal to learn from history; and avidly do our homework to learn what has produced our present dilemma. This will reveal:

1. In March 1942, our President, expressing the sentiments of the vast majority of his people, wrote to Churchill:

"By the time you receive this, you will have learned of my conference with Litvinov, and I expect a reply from Stalin shortly. * * * I think I can personally handle Stalin better than either your foreign office or my State Department, Stalin hates all of your top people. He thinks he likes me better and I hope he will continue to do so."

2. Believing that Communists could be motivated by humanitarian motives, we made it possible at Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam for communism to extend its dominion over eastern Europe and the millions of China, in the belief we could enlist Soviet cooperation in creation of a new world order.

3. We witnessed the ringing down of an iron curtain over helpless peoples of the captive nations, who would have throttled their Communist enemies, had we been prepared to assure them the benefit of our liberty and justice, for which we had just fought the greatest war in history.

4. We can learn of our rejection of the warning of Churchill, in his 1946 Fulton, Mo., speech that Communist promises and treaties are scraps of paper.

5. We can observe desperate efforts to deter further Communist aggression by a ring of bases and worldwide subsidies.

6. We can even find Americans describing these bases, as "increasing cold war tensions," forgetting that they were installed only for defense, and after the aggressive intent of the enemy became brutally obvious.

7. We can find organized theft of our nuclear and defense secrets by the most highly developed spy organization in peacetime history.

8. We can find our people complacently oblivious to the stark reality of their peril—traditionally devoted to life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness; but so intent upon pursuing happiness that loss of liberty and even life seems imminent.

9. We find ourselves, after bitter disillusionment, still equating the enemy's prime propaganda weapon, "peaceful coexistence," with an expression of a sincere desire to abandon the icon of his fanatic devotion to world revolution, and this so avidly that we have developed the distressing habit of referring to the second greatest butcher of all history by the affectionate appellation of "Nikita."

We must, by a dynamic awakening, as a chain reaction, where the spirit of each will pierce the air conditioned shell of complacency of all, produce a new determination:

1. A determination that our religion will be revitalized as an impenetrable roadblock against the further advance of Godless communism. That we will meet the challenge of our unholy enemy that he is fighting a holy war (Khrushchev, Jan. 17, 1961).

2. A determination that we will know, meet and vanquish this enemy in every field of human endeavor in which he chooses to challenge us; and will select new fields of competition in which we are more adapt than he.

3. A determination to know, appreicate and perpetuate, as the last bastion of Christian civilization, this great country of ours; making an all out effort our first order of business, and relentlessly wiping out those eroding weaknesses with which we no longer can afford to live, particularly the following:

(a) Snobbery which has been classed as the tendency to spend money we don't have to impress people we don't like, and certainly furnishes high octane fuel for expanding the class warfare upon which our enemy thrives.

(b) Glorification of crime in our press, TV, radio, magazines, and movies, which not only impose bad thought habits upon the subconscious minds of our people, especially youth, but steals precious time that should be spent in study of our biggest problem—survival. Consider the time and space that could be made available if no crime were publicized within a radius of more than 100 miles from where it happened.

(c) Sophistication: Where it has made us apologists for Americanism; and replace it with a new birth of simple patriotism based upon sincere gratitude for the God-given privilege of being Americans. Recognizing that this is the only nation that seems to have outgrown a spirit of nationalism, we must foster a return to fundamentals that can be epitomized by the pledging of our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor upon the altar of our country.

(d) Graft, corruption, inefficiency in our Government—recognizing that the governmental system of our enemy is staffed by scientists, experts and devoted Communists, we must consider the recent warning "concepts and patterns of a more secure past no longer fit present reality," and recognize that only the best in government can meet the competition we face.

4. A determination to reestablish discipline in our homes, schools, and daily life. The discipline of force employed by our enemy can be met by our discipline of faith only if our people, especially our youth, are trained to voluntarily and cheerfully do the right thing in the right place, at the right time, the classical concept of discipline for the American serviceman. We need a new fad. With our marvelous mass communication media, could we not convince our youngsters that it would be "sharp" to say to elders "Yes, sir" and "No, sir," rather than "Uh, huh" and "Hunh, unh" and "Yeah," as an expression of respect for age and authority, of self-respect, and of the new determinism of which he is a part.

5. A determination simply to go to work; a columnist has recently said, "This is the era of the great 'goof off,' the age of the job half done. We have plumbers that won't 'plumb,' executives that won't 'execute,' businessmen that won't attend to business and workmen that won't work." Either America is going to work or a stronger civilization will put us to work.

In conclusion, the challenge of New Frontiers is gone, with only a faint echo remaining in the gunsmoke of western movies and TV; but we face a new and more demanding challenge, into which our enemy has preceded us, the stratosphere and outer space itself, that can be conquered by the same determinism that will insure our survival.

Our President has well stated, "Let every nation know, whether it wish us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend or oppose any foe to assure the survival and success of liberty."

He cannot do it alone.

Waterways Tolls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. BARRY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, identical bills—S. 78, BEALL, of Maryland; H.R. 2963, VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania—have been introduced in the two Houses of the Congress which would create a commission empowered to assess tolls against users of improved national inland waterways. These charges would be designed to recover capital investment in existing waterways, costs of future improvement and current operating costs. An initial charge of about 2 mills per ton-mile is contemplated. These bills, now in the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committees of the House and Senate, would impose tolls for the first time upon the users of national waterways. Heretofore the general taxpayer has paid for the costs of maintaining our national inland waterways. This legislation proposes that the users should be assessed something to contribute toward the maintenance of the waterways they use. Naturally the waterway users are opposed to the imposition of any tolls.

I have been asked by the National Waterways Conference, which represents the inland and intracoastal waterway users of the country, to place in the RECORD an article from the March issue of Rivers and Harbors, which expresses their views. It contains a recital of various proposals which would impose a user charge on the Nation's waterways and describes the opposition to the legislation.

Since this is a vital matter to an important section of our transportation industry, a thorough examination and complete knowledge of the effects of the proposals should be in hand before any action is taken by the Congress. Consequently I felt it to be in the interest of the Congress and of the Nation that the point of view of the National Waterways Conference be put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

NO TIME FOR TOLLS

Ask your Congressman, any Congressman, in fact, how he feels just now about a piece of legislation that would further blight depressed areas and put the cost of essential goods and services still further beyond the reach of millions of consumers. After he recovers from the shock, he is apt to be delighted with your question. It's one he can answer with no equivocation whatsoever.

Tell your neighbor you're ringing doorbells to line up support for legislation that will junk some of the Nation's most valuable resources and open the doors even wider to lower cost imports from abroad. He may, as you request, write his Congressman—but he will probably suggest you be hauled up for interrogation by the Un-American Activities Committee.

Yet, ask either your Congressman or your neighbor about bills that would impose tolls on users of federally improved waterways and you may find considerable support for such an idea. Reason—neither Congressmen nor neighbors have been untouched by this year's all-out sky's-the-limit campaign for user charges.

CAN'T KEEP TABS WITHOUT A SCORE CARD

This year there are four separate and distinct toll proposals, all being widely publicized. In order of probable potential for immediate devastation, they are:

(1) Identical bills in the House and Senate (introduced by Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania, and Senator J. GLENN BEALL, of Maryland) which would create an Inland Navigation Commission empowered to assess tolls against users of improved inland waterways. Levies would be designed to recover (a) capital expenditures on all existing waterway projects; (b) capital costs of future improvements; and (c) operating and maintenance costs. An initial charge of about 2 mills per ton-mile is contemplated.

(2) The Department of Commerce report on "Federal Transportation Policy and Program" recommended (in March of 1960) tolls to recover Federal costs of new projects, plus operating and maintenance charges. This proposal advocates a fuel tax which, according to reliable estimates using data supplied by the U.S. Engineers, would amount to about 40 cents per gallon. Currently, diesel fuel is about 10 cents per gallon.

(3) The Doyle Transportation Study Group also concludes that waterway users should be charged for all future projects as well as maintenance and operating expenses on existing improvements. The Doyle group takes a somewhat different task, however, in proposing a varety of charges that would gradually increase over a period of years. A further feature is that before the user charge program is placed on an expenditure-revenue balanced basis "cost related tariffs" shall be prescribed by regulatory agencies for all modes of transport.

(4) The Landis report, submitted in December by James M. Landis to then President-elect Kennedy, lists among other long-range objectives "a reconsideration of the field of user charges for Federal facilities, particularly as regards air carriers, trucks and inland waterways." While this is not a specific endorsement of waterway tolls, it nonetheless indicates a possible change in waterways policy.

A COUNTER OFFENSIVE IS LAUNCHED

To combat the relentless and increasingly vigorous agitation for tolls, water carriers, their customers and suppliers, and others interested in the orderly development and preservation of the Nation's water resources, banded together last fall to organize the National Waterways Conference, Inc. With the recent appointment of Mr. Joseph J. Gannon, Jr., as managing director, this organization is now gearing up to wage an effective campaign of its own—an educational campaign designed to alert the publice to the inherent dangers in any waterway toll proposal.

For example, the conference circulated last month some of the basic considerations in support of the established free waterways policy. Some are particularly pertinent in view of today's economic and social probems.

In brief, the conference cited the following injurious effects of waterway user charges on the economic well-being of the American people:

(1) Such charges would wipe out by far the greater portion of the inland waterway commerce of the Nation.

(2) They would leave largely unutilized the navigable channels of our rivers and canals, thus wasting major natural resources and the large public investments in navigation improvements already made.

(3) User charges would increase the prices paid by consumers for a wide variety of products in all sections of the country, contributing to the forces of inflation.

(4) They would seriously damage the competitive position of large industrial communities, retard economic development, add to unemployment in critical areas, and stunt the potentials for economic growth of the Nation as a whole in a period of expanding needs for an explosively growing population.

(5) Finally, waterway user charges would be a shocking breach of faith with the many thousands of communities and the millions of people who have made enormous investments of their savings and who have committed their occupational destinies to water-oriented industries and locations in implicit confidence in the continuing free waterways policy of the Nation.

Full elaboration on these arguments is impossible here, but let's get back to the questions posed to Congressmen and neighbors.

Would tolls further blight depressed areas? According to the National Waterways Conference, tolls would be a crippling blow for the coal mining regions of Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Kentucky, Indiana, and Illinois. The coal industry, historically the principal business activity in some of these districts, has staved off virtual extinction only because low-cost barge transportation has created new far-distant markets for coal. Boost the delivered cost of coal ever so slightly and volume users—utilities and heavy industrial plants—will be compelled to switch over to competitive fuels.

Would tolls further inflate the price consumers pay for essential goods and services? Again the conference comes up with a clear-cut answer. "Products carried on the inland waterways consist primarily of the basic materials and fuels of our industrial civilization—steel, chemicals, alumina, coal, oil, gasoline, agricultural commodities, etc. User charges would add to the cost of these materials and fuels, leading inevitably to price increases of almost every manufactured product throughout the United States. Higher transportation costs will trigger chain reactions. In the case of grain, for exemple, not only will the consumer pay more for bread and other cereal products, but because grain is an essential feedstuff, he will find prices rising on meat and dairy product too.

Would tolls lead to the junking of some of the Nation's most valuable resources? The conference points out that for well over a century the Federal Government has been making improvements in the waterways system that represent an accumulated public investment of hundreds of millions of dollars. These works are now in place, delivering benefits to the American people in the form of lower cost transportation on continuously growing tonnages of water-born freight. This freight will rapidly be taken over by higher cost modes of transportation if tolls are enacted.

The bills before Congress, for example, are pegged at a toll levy of 2 mills per ton-mile. This would approximately double the transportation cost of petroleum products now being carried by barge. Petroleum, which accounts for 35 percent of the total barge traffic, would disappear from the rivers as fast as pipelines could be built to provide the same service. This would mean that the remaining 65 percent of the traffic would have to be charged at a rate of about 3.3 mills per ton-mile—the amount to be reclaimed by tolls remains constant regardless of the volume of traffic. If another 15 percent of the freight is lost because of the 3.3 miles per ton-mile charge, the toll jumps to a rate of 4 mills per ton-mile. The process continues, with less and less traffic being burdened with heavier and heavier tolls until freight on the rivers dies.

Tolls therefore are not only self-defeating from the standpoint of reclaiming expenditures for waterway improvements—they deprive the public of all possible benefits from these experiments. The great locks, dams, and harbor projects would stand as sterile monuments to the defeated hopes and unfilled expectations of the millions of Americans who helped develop one of the most efficient transport systems the world has ever known.

Proposals for initially "small" and "relatively painless" user charges are equally dangerous. The idea here is that tolls start out at low levels and gradually build up to the point of full recovery of Federal expenditures for waterways improvements. Such proposals implicitly concede the ultimate consequences of user charges and merely substitute a gradual strangulation of water-borne commerce in place of immediate destruction.

Would tolls encourage still more penetration of domestic markets by lower cost imports? No doubt about it. Petroleum products from the Southwest compete in northern and eastern markets with imports from Venezuela, the Near East and elsewhere. Iron ore from Minnesota and Michigan contends in domestic markets with ore from Labrador, Venezuela, and other sources. In recent years, American steel producers have found it increasingly difficult to compete with imports from Europe. Efficient water transportation has helped immeasurably to maintain the cost advantage of these and other American industries in the domestic market. To remove this vital support would seriously impair the ability of American producers to compete with the mounting volume of imports from abroad.

A RAY OF HOPE—A WORD OF CAUTION

Offsetting to a large degree the current anxiety over tolls, President Kennedy has made crystal clear his opposition to any deviation from the established free waterways policy in a strongly worded statement recently released by the Kennedy-Johnson Natural Resources Advisory Committee further spelling out the administration's views. Typical quotes are:

"Availability of low-cost water transportation provides a foundation for economic growth which could not occur on a comparable scale in its absence."

"Navigation improvements have exhibited their values most strikingly in stimulating development of resources in regions of the country where growth has heretofore lagged through lack of economic access to markets and sources of raw materials."

"The emerging problems of the future urgently demand a vigorous rededication to the philosophy of free waterways improvement. Considerations of national security, involving encouragement to dispersion of strategic industry, capabilities for low-cost mass transportation of basic industrial commodities and fuels, economy in the consumption of fuels and scarce materials and optimum recuperative power following heavy nuclear attack, also counsel an expanded program of waterways improvement."

But, warns the National Waterways Conference, "President Kennedy's stand is both a blessing and a danger. Some people inevitably are going to say we have nothing to worry about." The statement goes on to say that should Congress pass a toll bill, there'll be plenty to worry about. In such an eventuality, the President might be forced to reconsider his position.

In conclusion, the NWC declares "the Conference has its work cut out for it. We have to see that no such bill passes the Congress. That's why the Conference so urgently needs well-informed public support."

Use of Arkansas River for Navigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, because of the very real progress being made along the Arkansas River to make it navigable and useful to several States, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the spring "American Scene" on the history of the river's use for navigational advantage. The description of a trip down the Ohio and Mississippi and up the Arkansas of the *City of Muskogee*, a 125-foot steamboat bearing a huge sign "Bound for Oklahoma," was especially interesting. The article was written by Glen R. Ames, museum director of the Gilcrease Institute in Tulsa, Okla., which publishes the magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOUND FOR OKLAHOMA—THE FRONTIER DREAM OF A NAVIGATIONAL ARKANSAS RIVER WILL SOON BECOME A REALITY

(By Glen R. Ames)

When Oklahoma entered the Union in 1907 Muskogee was a thriving city of more than 14,000 population. It had been founded in 1872 when the Kansas, Missouri & Texas Railroad was constructed through Oklahoma along a route closely paralleling the old Texas Road. But even in 1872 the region around Muskogee had long been a center of commercial, military, and Government activity. The first trader is said to have settled here in 1806 and before the Civil War riverboats regularly made their way to Fort Gibson with freight and passengers.

The real expansion and growth of the city came however after the turn of the century when Charles N. Haskell moved there from Ohio to spearhead a development program that turned the little town into a bustling city. His promotions led to the construction of a fine modern hotel, of the Midland Valley Railroad, the interurban line from Fort Gibson to Muskogee, and other businesses. An oil pool was discovered within the city limits and the Pioneer Oil and Gas Co. drilled the first well in October of 1903 and by 1905 Charles Madison had organized the Muskogee Oil and Refining Co. to build a refinery. Business was good, bond issues for civic improvements were passed easily, and real estate sales flourished.

Now one of the things which was pretty evident to the alert and able businessmen of Muskogee was the fact that the Arkansas River was no longer being utilized to its navigational advantage. It was indeed river transportation that had made this Three Forks region the hub of eastern Oklahoma and the supply depot for the military operations of Texas and the Southwestern frontier for many years. Why not put it to use again? True there was the railroad, but then there was the high railroad rate, too. Thinking along these lines, seven prominent Muskogee businessmen were inspired to raise a fund of $3,000 for the purchase of a little steamboat at Fort Smith called the *Mary D*. These men organized the Arkansas Navigation Co. and put the *Mary D* into service plying the river between Fort Smith and Muskogee.

By comparing the freight rates on merchandise brought up the river on the *Mary D* and similar loads that arrived by train it was discovered that the goods could be delivered in Muskogee by boat for about half the railroad cost. This set the men to thinking and being good businessmen they decided to do something about it. The Muskogee Commercial Club published a study entitled "Commercial Value of the Arkansas River Improvement" by Theodore Gulick. Then A. C. Trumbo and John R. Dudding were authorized by the club to go to Jeffersonville, Ind., and enter into a contract for the construction of a large steamboat that would engage in the riverboat business on a grander scale.

A steamboat 125 feet long with a 25-foot beam and a draft of three and a half feet was now constructed at cost of $15,000 and named the *City of Muskogee*. On July 2 a group of Muskogee boosters went aboard and it made its maiden voyage down the Ohio and Mississippi and up the Arkansas Rivers. When the *City of Muskogee* arrived at Muskogee July 18, a large banner with the words "Bound for Oklahoma," hung from its upper deck. Blaring bands and a large crowd in festive mood were on hand to watch it dock. On this trip it had carried a cargo of 41 tons of nails and barbed wire. Commercial navigation on the Arkansas was a fact.

But not for long. The *City of Muskogee* made only one other long trip and then limited its travel to as far as Fort Smith. Some 4 years later even those irregular runs were ended. The difficulties of the river proved too much for the boat and it was transferred to the White River where it ended its days as a gravel barge.

Yet the experiment was not a failure; neither for the people of that day nor for us today. The placing of the *City of Muskogee* into actual operation on the Arkansas caused the railroad company to lower its freight rates substantially. The Arkansas Navigation Co. did prove that river navigation was possible, that it could be economically feasible and attractive, and that there were only certain engineering problems which prevented the dream from becoming a fact.

Nothing more was done in behalf of commercial travel on the Arkansas until about 30 years ago. Then the idea of making the river truly navigable began to be considered. At first it received little encouragement but under the leadership of such men as Newton Graham, P. H. Stephens, John Dunkin, and Gary Vandever the idea caught on and a feasibility study was made. The report was gratifying and the formation of the Arkansas Basin Development Association followed.

After the Arkansas River leaves Kansas conditions are favorable for navigation provided three engineering feats could be accomplished. The first was the construction of reservoirs to permit a steady and ample supply of water, the second was the construction of locks to raise the loads to the proper elevation level, and the third was the construction of jetties and revetments to control the vagaries of the channel of the old and meandering stream. The association, composed of leading businessmen, civic leaders, and legislators of Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Kansas, publicized the program and its goals. It made technical studies and in general undertook such actions that would overcome the obstacles and established the financing required to get the project underway. It was of course a long-range program requiring vision and faith on the part of the people actively concerned with it. The program has now moved forward by the construction of reservoirs and locks to the point where there is now a good possibility that Catoosa, 15 miles from Tulsa, will be a navigation port by 1970.

This will be the realization of the long-time dream of citizens of Oklahoma, Kansas, and Arkansas. It provides the means for unlimited industrial growth for Tulsa and the entire Arkansas Valley. But commercial advantages are not the only values offered by the Arkansas Basin development program. In addition, great values will be achieved by flood control, waterpower, improved soil conservation conditions, and by recreational opportunities for everyone. Indeed the value of this latter service is now recognized as a very important reason for the program. Grand Lake, Fort Gibson Lake, and Sequoyah State Park are only three examples of how this project has already given Oklahoma recreational benefits not previously known to us. The many beautiful resorts already developed indicate something of what is yet to come.

The vision of the Muskogee citizens of an earlier day was a clearsighted one but the engineering requirements were too tremendous for the economic resources of those times. Today, however, we have those resources and we are making use of them in such a manner that the time will come when the frontier dream of a navigable river will become a reality. Such legislative leaders as Senator Bob Kerr and Mike Monroney and Representatives Page Belcher, Ed Edmondson, Karl Albert, and Tom Steed, together with the earlier work of Senator Elmer Thomas and Representative Wesley Disney, are to be honored and remembered for the invaluable work they have done in behalf of this project. The Gilcrease Institute salutes the pioneers in this project and all the people now engaged in this great effort to get the project completed. If the Muskogeans of a previous generation could look upon us now they would see that river commerce is bound for Oklahoma after all.

Meddling Points Up School Aid Dangers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very timely editorial from the Mobile Register of May 2. It deserves very careful reading:

[From the Mobile Register, May 2, 1961]

MEDDLING POINTS UP SCHOOL AID DANGERS

A current piece of Federal meddling in Virginia may help prove that Shakespeare was right: "Ill blows the wind that profits nobody."

If Congress reacts to this piece of meddling as it should, the whole country will be better off, for the result will be to lessen the danger of Federal aid to education being put across as an entering wedge to Federal control of the schools from stem to stern.

In another extreme act of blackjack wielding, the Washington Government is attempting to force Prince Edward County, Va., to reopen the public schools it closed in the racial integration fight.

William F. Arbogast, Associated Press correspondent in Washington, reports that so-called aid to education is one of the bills facing serious congressional trouble because of the Government's move in Virginia.

He quotes one of the backers of school aid legislation as saying, "We don't stand much chance now. It would have been much better if the administration had waited a while before jumping into the Virginia fight."

That meddling action will forever remain unjustified in any circumstance, but if it contributes to the defeat of manuevers holding Federal control danger for the schools, the country will be able to feel that some good has come from the concern caused by it.

Meanwhile, U.S. Senator FRANK J. LAUSCHE, of Ohio, is performing a timely service by helping keep the spotlight on the fact that the Federal aid clamor is not a people's movement.

"The record will clearly show," he reminded his colleagues in Congress the past week, "that it is not local school boards, not the municipal or county governments, nor even the State governments that are demanding that the Federal Government wedge its way into this field."

The clamor for a massive outpouring of so-called aid to the schools from the Federal treasury comes from a lobby that neither represents popular sentiment nor reflects popular sentiment on this issue.

Mr. LAUSCHE correctly says that "none but the blind will deny that if the Federal Government is going to pay the piper, it is most certainly going to call the tune."

Of course the meaning of this remark is that Federal aid would threaten to operate as a steppingstone to Federal control.

The Ohio Senator did not hesitate to put it in more specific words: "The end result of (Federal aid) will be eventual Federal domination of our system of public education and the absorption by the Federal Govern-

ment of one of the last remaining privileges of home or self-rule and determination."

He also warned:

"For the Congress now to acquiesce to the pressure demands against which it has stood so firmly, and rightly so, for more than a century and a half will mean complete capitulation against the will of a vast majority of the citizenry of our Nation."

Congress should heed this warning, for certainly the aid-to-education lobbyists clamoring so incessantly on Capitol Hill do not symbolize or typify the voice of the American people on this question.

The current meddling act by Washington in the school affairs of a Virginia county is a new example of the lengths to which Federal blackjackers seek to go even now in throwing officious weight around in education.

Community Development Key to Economic Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, a strong economy provides a foundation upon which to build a dynamic social, political, and military structure to serve and protect the Nation.

This involves:

Strengthening of our free enterprise system;

Smoothing out lines of cooperation between local-State-Federal Governments and free enterprise, in creating jobs and producing commodities for progress;

Putting more "muscle" into our national defense;

Fulfilling the human needs of our people.

In creating such machinery to meet challenges to our security and progress, we must not overlook the potentials of effective leadership and support at the community level.

Recently, I was privileged to publish an article in the County Officer entitled "Community Development—Key to Economic Progress." The article reflects upon the ways in which community action can strengthen our overall economy. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT—KEY TO ECONOMIC PROGRESS

(By the Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY, U.S. Senator from Wisconsin)

(Whether you are a prosperous county, merely interested in increasing the economic potential you already have, a growing county seeking new industry, or a depressed area looking for a push to get you off economic dead center, this article, written by a famous and respected member of the U.S. Senate, may prove to be the most profitable piece of reading you will do this year. Senator WILEY, in this exclusive article for County Officer, has outlined a finely detailed, clearly marked blueprint for your county's economic future.)

The progress and security of our Nation and its people depend upon a strong, dynamic, forward-moving economy. A good rate of economic progress, however, can be attained only by full utilization of our human and natural resources.

Today, the challenges to our economic system are manifold, including the need for:

Maximum employment;

A good rate of business, industrial and other commercial activity;

Fulfilling the growing needs of a fast-expanding population;

Competing successfully against the Communist system;

Proving to the world that our free economic system, operated by a free people, can best serve a nation and its citizens.

To attain these objectives requires cooperation among citizens, local government and free enterprise, to creatively tailor plans to the needs of each locality.

By experience, programs have been evolved to provide a framework of action within which communities can move ahead to resolve economic problems and to promote progress. Among the major ones are included:

Encouraging greater industrial development in both urban and rural areas;

Creating a better climate of opportunity for job-creating businesses—large and small;

Expanding rural development programs, particularly in areas of chronically low income;

Exploring for new economic opportunities, such as promoting tourism, to bolster local economies.

Other efforts for maximum utilization of natural and human resources to serve our people are also needed.

Local-State interests—working with, and utilizing services provided by, Federal agencies—also can serve to promote progress in these areas of economic activity.

SPURRING INDUSTRIAL PROGRESS

Now, what can be done, for example, to spur industrial progress? This can be accomplished in two ways:

(1) By attracting new industries:

A community development committee can be formed to:

Determine quantity and skills of available workers;

Study economic trends in area;

Determine likely industrial prospects;

Survey local market needs and opportunities;

Enlist assistance of State engineering schools, bureaus of business research, etc., to assist in specific technical problems;

Discover why in the past, industry may have failed, or moved away;

Survey locally available natural resources and industrial potential;

Set up clearinghouse of information on sources of venture capital;

Examine and utilize applicable methods of successful industrial expansion programs of other communities;

Determine needed civic improvements, i.e., traffic arteries, store fronts, garbage disposal, street paving, etc.

Enlist assistance of Office of Area Development of the Department of Commerce and the Business and Defense Administration;

Review and, as possible, favorably adjust tax system and/or other local government services.

Having made these determinations, projects to remedy weaknesses should be commenced and publication and promotion of area's advantages should be undertaken. Additional steps may include: developing and reserving for industry suitable industrial sites; modernizing old industrial facilities, and building new ones. Financing for such efforts can be raised by contributions or floating bonds.

(2) To expand existing industry:

Steps include efforts to:

Find sources of business expansion loans (banks, individuals, insurance companies, the Small Business Administration);

Initiate local business and industry improvement clinics with assistance of local trade associations, government field officers, university engineering and business schools;

Render where possible, or suggest specialists to render, market and product development assistance.

The Office of Area Development of the Department of Commerce provides technical services to States and local communities; issues publications on area development problems, and assists States and local groups to:

Create new industrial diversification;

Acquire and prepare land for industrial use;

Organize industrial districts;

Develop new products;

Locate new markets;

Locate industrial prospects;

Help manufacturers who are seeking sites for new branch plants on plant location data.

IMPROVING THE OUTLOOK FOR SMALL BUSINESS

Now, how is it possible to brighten the outlook for small business? Nationwide, there are over 4.6 million enterprises, of which about 95 percent are in this category.

To help meet some of the different problems, the Small Business Administration provides a number of services to small businesses and local companies seeking to raise employment or economic development in a community.

The programs include:

(1) Local development company loans:

Companies having a broad base of ownership may borrow funds to buy land and either build a new factory or expand and convert an existing plant, provided the project will aid a small business concern.

(2) Production assistance:

Small businesses are invited to register their facilities at the SBA regional office. The SBA acts as a clearinghouse for services which small firms may offer other small firms or larger firms.

(3) Research and development assistance:

Technical assistance is provided by SBA on—

Product research;

New product potential;

Processing methods;

Product and marketing developments;

New industrial uses for materials; and

Industrial uses for agricultural products.

Assistance is also rendered through—

Advice on problems of plant location and plant space and undertaking the locating of tools or materials needed.

Awarding of a certificate of competency, to the small business is a device to encourage it to bid in competition with larger firms for Government contracts.

Management courses, in conjunction with local educational institutions.

Management counseling with SBA regional office.

Management seminars and 1-day conferences.

Publishing information on available materials, patents, and "how-to" articles.

(4) Financial assistance:

Business loans for financing on reasonable terms when it is not otherwise available through private lending sources;

Disaster loans granted to aid firms stricken by either physical damage or economic injury.

In general, the assistance rendered small business emphasizes efforts to aid areas adversely affected by: Unemployment, economic dislocation, chronic depression, and "natural" economic shifts.

DEVELOPMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS "POOLS"

The development of small business "pools," also, is helping to meet some problems that could not otherwise be resolved, such as programs to:

Collect market and research information related to a particular industry for dissemination to participating members;

Contract, acquire or establish laboratories and other facilities for the conduct of research;

Prosecute applications for patents and render patent services for participating members; as well as

Negotiate and grant licenses under patents held under joint programs.

RURAL DEVEPOPMENT PROGRAM

Today, urban-rural communities are becoming more closely integrated and interdependent. Consequently, greater cooperation is essential to progress. Local business, industry, and services, for example, may depend upon the buying power of the farmers in the surrounding community. The rural development program aims at resolving economic problems in chronically depressed areas in agriculture.

The general objective of the rural development program is to assist in remedying low income on farms and disadvantaged rural families.

The major targets of the program include:

Providing farm families with information and ability to gain tools, land and skills for successful farming;

Education and job training;

Health services and community sanitation;

Expansion of markets for products of small farms, i.e., new processing plants, additional co-ops;

Changes in crops and increased crop production;

Forestry and conservation assistance for small woodlots and timber processing enterprises;

Water resource development;

Industrial development, etc.

About 200 counties in 30 States have been designated for the rural development program.

The accomplishments achieved have been:

New businesses and services activities have added nearly 18,000 full- or part-time jobs;

Market improvement projects started;

Soil mapping completed on farms in rural development areas;

Projects in health services reported;

Rural clubs organized in communities, to exchange ideas on promoting better living;

And other steps that have improved income and farm life.

How can a local county with chronic low-income initiate a rural development program? A county may apply to the State rural development committee. The committee decides which counties and/or areas will be designated, and how extensive the program will be in those areas. Even though the county may not be designated a rural county under the program, it can ask the State extension service for technical assistance. It can, under its own aegis, follow closely the form of the rural development counties. And, if the State rural development committee assents, it can have the help of rural development agents on specific problems.

CUTTING A BIGGER "SLICE" OF THE "TOURIST PIE"

In exploring for new economic opportunities, let's take a look at the development of tourist trade. Tourism is one of the fastest-developing businesses in the United States. Annually, tourists in this country spend between $15 and $20 billion.

By developing tourist attractions, a great many communities can cut for themselves a larger slice of this "economic pie."

Overall, tourism benefits not just a few, but many segments of the community's economy, including services, transportation, accommodations, entertainment, cleaning services, products such as sporting equipment, souvenirs, fashions, etc., utilities (power, water, light). The result: greater economic growth and easing of the local tax burden. A secondary benefit from tourism is that it attracts new industry through increase in population, pleasant locale for plant location, etc.

A great many communities, either by exploiting an existing potential or even by importing one, can probably turn themselves into meccas which will appeal to tourists. Examples of attractions:

A good inn, an historical landmark (battlesite, churches, mill, etc.);

A body of water, an animal preserve;

Hills, mountains, valleys, forests or woods;

Geological formations and other natural or man-made features.

Programs that will develop tourist trade include:

A facelifting program for unsightly areas, refuse, junk; paint and spruce up; encourage clean, comfortable lodging places with well-cooked, well-served meals;

Developing or improving specific tourist attractions; obtain expert advice in restoring historic structures, draining lakes, etc.

Determine from what areas to attract tourists, and then advertise; enlist cooperation of area newspapers, magazines, TV and radio stations to help sell community.

What are basic tourist habits? According to a report by the Department of Commerce:

Eighty percent travel by car;

Sixteen-nine percent stay in motels;

Twenty-six percent stay in hotels and resorts; 27 percent with friends and relatives. (These add up to more than 100 percent because many tourists use more than one type of accommodation on a trip);

Most tourists take two vacation trips a year, totaling 20 or more days;

Seventeen percent go in the winter; 18 percent in spring; 40 percent in summer; 25 percent in fall;

Average annual expenditure per family is $400;

Roughly 1 out of 12 goes abroad each year. The rest stay in the United States, the largest single tourists market in the world.

Tourists development programs can be supported by private or business financing; by group (chamber of commerce, community associations, etc.) contributions; or other ways. Overall expanding tourism promises ever-greater economic opportunity for the years asead. Why? Because of paid and increasingly longer vacations, good roads, more leisure time and money, early retirement, more education—all these portend a fast-growing opportunity for the American to travel.

SUMMARY

This, then, is a brief look at some opportunities to better utilize our human and natural resources for economic progress. Our success is dependent upon forward-looking, hard-working creative leadership, including private citizens, county officials, civic leaders, and others. In facing the future, however, I am confident that—as in the past—such high-quality leaders will continue to emerge to do a successful job of building a stronger economy.

Oregon Dunes National Seashore Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I have previously had printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles from the Oregon Journal regarding an important conservation issue in Oregon; namely, establishment of a national seashore park.

I ask unanimous consent that the third and final article in this series, written by Mr. Anthony Netboy, be printed in the RECORD, along with an announcement by the Oregon Dunes National Seashore Committee.

There being no objection, the article and announcement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregon Journal, Mar. 24, 1961]

(By Anthony Netboy)

The leaders in the movement to place the spectacular Oregon Dunes in the national park system are the Neubergers—the late U.S. Senator and his wife and successor, MAURINE. In an effort to overcome opposition of vociferous local property owners, who call themselves the Valley Voters Association, Mrs. NEUBERGER has incorporated in her bill, S. 992, two provisions that will protect local autonomy: (1) A five-member Oregon Dunes Advisory Board to consult with the Secretary of the Interior on management policies and zoning standards; and (2) a mechanism for local zoning of private property within boundaries of the seashore.

Private ownership of land and water areas would be permitted in the park if they are used in a manner consistent with park purposes. It is expected, said Mrs. NEUBERGER in introducing her bill, that "the Secretary's ability to utilize condemnation (of private property) will be circumscribed by the degree to which the counties wish to use their own authorities for land use zoning."

In redrafting the legislation, Mrs. NEUBERGER says she "endeavored to meet all of the various points of view that have been expressed and, in the process, to make certain that we will protect an important scenic and recreational resource, while at the same time promoting both economic growth and stability in this important area of the Pacific coast."

Despite these assurances and the manifest economic benefits which an additional national park would bring to Oregon, Representative DURNO, leader of the opposition, will have none of it. Indeed, DURNO strengthened his position to do battle against the proposal by getting an assignment to the newly created Subcommittee on Parks of the House Interior Committee. In this position he is in a good position to kill the Oregon Dunes proposal in the House.

DURNO says the dunes area does not have the scenic grandeur to be made part of the national park system, and the proposal is not in the best interests of the people of Oregon. He objects to the Neuberger bill because it would give the Secretary of the Interior the right to condemn private property and thinks the zoning features of S. 992 are meaningless because the board would have only advisory authority. He is also worried that the Secretary would have the power to determine whether any proposed industrial operations would impair the scenic an drecreational values of the park.

DURNO seems satisfied that the recreational potential of the area will be taken care of by the public agencies now in control—the Forest Service, State park department, Bureau of Land Management, and Lane County Park Department. He says: "If you took one-fifth of the money they propose to spend for this park and gave it to the Forest Service and these other agencies, you could do something much more useful and habitable than if they create a national park."

DURNO's stand brought a sharp retort from former Governor Charles A. Sprague, who commented that his "statement has done

more to unify opinion behind the proposal than any of its advocates."

The Coos Bay World, most influential paper in the dunes region, editorialized, "scenic grandeur and natural interest are no doubt a matter of taste. What Representative DURNO's taste is in these matters is his business. But if our coast lacks scenic grandeur, and the dunes lack scenic or natural interest, we wonder how we've managed to defraud the thousands of tourists who do come through here every year in believing the opposite."

Since the President failed to mention the Oregon Dunes in his list of seashore areas recommended to Congress for inclusion in the national park system, Senator NEUBERGER has called upon Oregon residents to rally to her proposal. "It has been apparent," she said, "that if Oregon people turned their back on the seashore park proposal, the development would go elsewhere, possibly to California."

In the long run, it is up to the citizens of the State to determine whether or not they wish to preserve a spectacular scenic area and upgrade the economy of the southern Oregon coast.

Formation of a new statewide organization to promote the Oregon Dunes National Seashore proposal was announced today at a luncheon meeting of the seashore advocates in Portland. The organization, known as the Oregon Dunes National Seashore Committee, will conduct a campaign to inform the people of Oregon, and the Nation, of the outstanding scenic and recreational values of the Oregon Dunes and rally support behind Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER's bill, recently introduced in the Senate, to put the dunes area into the national park system.

An executive committee was formed under the chairmanship of James A. Mount, local advertising man, to launch the new organization. Other members of the executive committee are Marshall N. Dana; Dr. Sanford Tepfer; Don Malarkey; Anthony Netboy, Portland State College; Dr. David Charlton, Izaak Walton League; M. L. Thomson, visitors committee, Portland Chamber of Commerce; Carleton Whitehead, Reed College; John Goss; Ben Fleischman, visitors committee, Portland Chamber of Commerce; William B. Morse; and Charles Collins, director of parks, Douglas County.

The Portland meeting, chaired by Marshall Dana, chairman, recreation subcommittee of the Columbia Basin Interagency Committee, heard various speakers describe the seashore proposal and the benefits that will accrue to the State if Congress passes the Neuberger bill.

Dr. Sanford Tepfer, of the University of Oregon, told the meeting that the Oregon Dunes would become one of the Nation's prime recreational attractions, if incorporated into the national park system, and bring many millions of dollars of additional income to the area. Daniel Burroughs, regional representative of the National Park Service, said there is no conflict of interests in the proposal between the Forest Service and National Park Service but that under Park Service management the 35,000 acres, now under diverse public and private ownership, would be tied together into one unit for maximum recreational development.

William B. Morse, of the Wildlife Management Institute, said that Oregonians must get behind the Neuberger proposal if the dunes park is to become a reality. Don Malarkey, former president of the Oregon Coast Association, made a strong plea for public support to save the unique dunes for development as a recreational area under national park auspices.

A Place for the Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the problems of urban places in our contemporary society have been focused anew by the introduction of S. 1633, by the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. Public interest and concern with the problems of all urban places—large and small, incorporated and unincorporated—is gratifying.

An excellent editorial appeared in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune on April 20, 1961, calling particular attention to the need for Federal participation in attempts to devise solutions to these pressing problems, and the necessity for the coordination of efforts if success is to be attained. I recommend this fine editorial to all those concerned with this most modern problem, and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PLACE FOR THE CITIES

The President has just asked Congress to create a Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, a move foreshadowed both by the Democratic Party platform and by Mr. Kennedy's housing message last month.

Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, who introduced the administration's bill implementing this request, explains that "no new programs or operations" are contemplated. It is simply intended that the present housing and home finance agency shall be elevated to Cabinet status "with additional responsibilities for leadership in coordination." The new Department would be concerned not only with the problems of our great metropolitan centers, but with those "of all urban areas, large and small alike, incorporated or unincorporated."

The Kennedy plan would unquestionably dramatize these problems before the Nation. It would impart a proper sense of urgency to the need for attacking what Mr. Kennedy calls "the appalling deterioration" of many of these areas. It might also help to intensify the Nation's efforts to insure adequate housing for its slum-dwellers and others living in the midst of blight and squalor.

We applaud the President's insistence that the Federal Government help in the solution of these urban problems. We feel that their solution requires Federal, as well as local, leadership. The cities cannot bear the financial burden of urban renewal alone; the pressures of rapid growth, with their tremendous impact on the pattern of community living, have made substantial and consistent Federal aid imperative.

Perhaps the drawing together of many programs and activities into a single department of urban affairs and housing would present formidable difficulties. But the need for greater coordination of such efforts, and for increased Federal participation in the attack on urban problems should be fairly plain.

It seems to us, therefore, that Congress should give sympathetic consideration to the President's request. One way or another, the sturdy and well-ordered growth of our exploding urban areas must be assured.

Seventy-fifth Anniversary of Vending Machine Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, this is the 75th anniversary of the vending machine industry, one which provides a useful service for millions of consumers and one which provides employment for many thousands of Americans. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a story about that industry which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer on April 21, 1961, which calls attention to the role played by two Philadelphia businessmen.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INVESTOR BACKGROUND—VENDING MARKS ANNIVERSARY

Vending, automatic merchandising, is celebrating its 75th anniversary in America. The observance starts this month in some 300 cities and communities from coast to coast and will continue until the annual convention next November.

The industry is rated as one of the fastest moving in the Nation. Total value of U.S. production rose 128 percent between 1946 and 1959 while vended merchandise sales rose 296 percent to $2.3 billion during the same period. Some 6,000 companies are engaged in the vending business. And there are about 4 million machines in operation. It is estimated that within the decade the gross sales figure will exceed $6 billion.

Each day, 1,700,000 Americans buy at least one meal through vending machines. In 40 percent of the U.S. industrial plants, vending machines now are the only source of food and beverage for people on the job. And this is on the increase.

The industry had its beginning in this country with the issuance of the first U.S. patent in 1886 for a postal card-cigarette automatic vending apparatus.

Since then the industry has grown with increasing acceleration. It was during the years following the Second World War that perhaps some of the most significant strides were taken. Most of these were brought about by major technical breakthroughs.

One of these focuses the national spotlight on Philadelphia, for it was here that two young ex-GI's, Lloyd K. Rudd and K. Cyrus Melikian, just returned from the service in 1946, invented and marketed the first automatic coffee vending machine.

Last year the coffee segment of the industry dispensed 1.5 billion cups of coffee through 100,000 machines with gross sales of about $175 million. These figures become extremely meaningful when you consider that prior to 1946 not one cup of coffee was dispensed through vending equipment.

Today inventor-businessmen Rudd and Melikian are the chief officers of their $8

million manufacturing firm in suburban Hatboro.

The spectacular growth of the coffee vending business has led the entire industry to unprecedented progress and success.

There are about 150 vending machine manufacturers in the country. And the situation today can be likened to the automobile industry of a few decades ago. At that time there were numerous auto makers with many brand names. Then came the era of mergers, and acquisitions. Today, as a result, there are a few giants such as General Motors, Chrysler Corp., Ford Motor Co., and American Motors. The same is true today in the vending industry. The trend in vend is to acquire and merge, slimming down the ranks of vending machine manufacturers.

A similar trend is taking place at the operating company level. The people in these companies are the specialists in the industry. They purchase machines, place them in operation, and service and supply them.

There is a major shakeout in this segment of the industry, too. It can be likened to the grocery business of years ago when there were only "moms and pops." Now there are moms and pops, true, but the food business is dominated by national, regional, and local chain operations. The trend in vending is the same. Operating companies are merging to form national, regional, and local operating giants. Three national and two regional chains now serve the Delaware Valley area.

Shepard's Flight Casts Doubt on Yuri's Account

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I pointed out that the world should indeed have a great deal more scientific proof before it conclusively accepts the Soviet claim of having put a man into space.

I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues the fact that the response to this admonition has been overwhelming from people all over the country.

Last Sunday the aviation editor of Chicago's American, Mr. Peter Reich, wrote an interesting analysis of the experience described by America's spaceman, Commander Shepard, and the Soviet Union's spaceman, Major Gagarin. I should like to call this article to the attention of those who have been discussing this entire subject because I believe it so forthrightly casts an even deeper doubt on the Soviet claim.

Mr. Reich raises two significant discrepancies between the experience of Commander Shepard and the heretofore unsubstantiated experience claimed by Major Gagarin.

Mr. Speaker, Editor Reich's article follows:

SHEPARD'S FLIGHT CASTS DOUBT ON YURI'S ACCOUNT

(By Peter Reich)

CAPE CANAVERAL, FLA.—When Astronaut Alan B. Shepard Jr., zipped through space on his 5,000-mile-per-hour rocket ride, was he able to pierce the thick fog of mystery surrounding the orbital flight of Yuri Gagarin, Russian cosmonaut?

The answer could bolster a suspicion in some quarters that Yuri never made the trip—that he is merely a stand-in for the real cosmonaut who may have been killed or injured on his return from space.

SEVERAL DISCREPANCIES

There are several unexplained discrepancies in Yuri's story. They range from his reported observation of the earth from space (too clear), to his description of weightlessness (too muddled).

Since Commander Shepard remains under observation in a Grand Bahama Island hospital today, reporters have not had a chance to compare his story with that of Russia's spaceman.

DIFFER ON TWO POINTS

However, Shepard's radio reports from space give a clue to at least two points on which the astronaut and the cosmonaut differ.

1. Shepard indicated the smallest object on earth he could see from 115 miles up was Andros Island, an island 10 miles in diameter located northeast of Grand Bahama. Yuri, on the other hand, reported seeing cities, rivers, and even plowed fields during his 109 to 287 miles high orbit.

2. Shepard's voice under the forces of deceleration (at one point he weighed 11 times his normal 180 pounds) was strained. Just talking was difficult. Yet, Yuri reported he sang "The Homeland Knows the Homeland Waits," a Russian song, during his reentry.

DICTATES EXPERIENCES

Although Shepard reportedly is dictating his experiences into a tape recorder at the hospital, reporters will not get a chance to query him about these points until he is interviewed at a news conference in Washington tomorrow or Tuesday.

Interestingly, upon reaching space, Shepard used almost the same words ascribed to Yuri at a similar juncture: "It is beautiful up here."

A Job Well Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, while the Nation is praising Astronaut Alan Shepard for his epoch-making flight into space, high commendation is also due the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for a public relations job well done.

NASA had a difficult task cut out for it in seeing to it that the American public was able to see, hear, and read about Shepard's dramatic leap into the unknown. That it did so well is a tribute to the men of NASA who made it possible.

As the Huntsville (Ala.) Times pointed out:

NASA was set up under a precedent-setting clause which provided that its business was going to be the public's business—and that the public has a right to know. In that spirit, NASA operated last week, and the success of its endeavor was as clearcut as Alan Shepard's path across the skies.

I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an editorial in the Huntsville Times of May 8, "A Job Well Done."

The editorial follows:

[From the Huntsville Times, May 8, 1961]

A JOB WELL DONE

Among the footnotes which should be added to last Friday's mercurial American venture into space is some tribute to NASA's crew which assisted 600 reporters in putting the event before the people of the world.

It is amazing how close the story of this history-making adventure came to the hearts of people of all classes, sizes and kinds. And most amazing to us has been the constantly repeated remark that the United States put Alan Shepard up in full view of the world—something hardly true of the earlier Yuri Gagarin affair. This pride that America did dare to do it under such a full and searching glare seems to us to justify all the agonies and exasperations which such a full coverage cost the NASA public relations people.

Threescore of foreign reporters were in the record number of newsmen which invaded the Florida beaches. No one yet has the answer as to why Russia chose to ignore having representation there—though if absence were intended to indicate a snub it doubtlessly reacted unfavorably in the eyes of the rest of the world's newsgatherers.

Considering the deadlines and the inherent drama, most news coverage of the Project Mercury story was perhaps acceptable enough.

In candor it must be added that (because of the number attempting to report the affair) there was amazing irresponsibility on the part of a few—for in the news field, as in all others, neither ability nor responsibility are impartially spread. (We recall, for instance, one agency's widely distributed Tuesday night report that any further attempt to launch the Redstone could not come before Tuesday of this week.)

But all the small agonies, all the pitfalls of this reporting job are past now. And the thing that stands out is that NASA's handling of this awe-inspiring descent of the world's reporters was a task well and patiently handled.

Readers, viewers, listeners owe that NASA groups thanks quite as much as do the hundreds of newsmen whom NASA hosted at the cape.

NASA was set up under a precedent-setting clause which provided that its business was going to be the public's business—and that the public has a right to know. In that spirit, NASA operated last week, and the success of its endeavor was as clearcut as Alan Shepard's path across the skies.

Czechoslovak National Council of America Warns Against Coalition Government in Laos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the executive board of the Czechoslovak National Council of America, which has its headquarters in Chicago, recently adopted a resolution which so properly enumerates the dangers ahead for the free world if a coalition government is established in Laos with a representative of the Communist Party.

It goes without saying that the Czechoslovak people have had a tragic experi-

ence with coalition governments in which the Communists participated, so much so that today this wonderful country, which was once the cradle of democracy in Europe, is forced to exist under Communist rule.

I trust this resolution will find the attention of those who are formulating foreign policy for the free world today.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution follows:

The executive board of the Czechoslovak National Council of America respectfully submits to your attention the resolution passed at its annual meeting on April 16, 1961, in Chicago:

Whereas the Communist guerrilla forces, with the help of Soviet Russia and other Communist countries, are trying to defeat the present Government of Laos by military action, and

Whereas various spokesmen of the United States and her allies have voiced their readiness to settle the present crisis by agreeing to a coalition government in Laos which would include representatives of Communist forces; be it therefore

Resolved, That the Czechoslovak National Council of America voice its grave concern to the President of the United States, the Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, and the Honorable Adlai Stevenson, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, about the proposal to form a coalition government in Laos with Communist participation. The tragic example of countries behind the Iron Curtain, that of Czechoslovakia in particular, serves as a warning against any coalition government which would include Communists. Always in the past Communists have used a coalition or "national front" government as a base to infiltrate parliament and the entire structure and finally to crush any democratic opposition.

The Czechoslovak National Council of America opposes, therefore, any coalition government with Communist participation in Laos or anywhere else. Disasters of the past should serve as a lesson to us in all future decisions.

Very respectfully yours,

CZECHOSLOVAK NATIONAL COUNCIL OF AMERICA.

A Flight To Remember

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, in these troubled times, when our enemies are daily reviling us and even our friends are often loud in criticism, it is a pleasure to come upon a case where American effort has been expended and American lives risked in a gesture which has received abroad the credit which is its due. I refer to the magnificent rescue flight made by a Navy aircraft to Byrd Station, Antarctica, to evacuate an ailing Russian scientist.

This historymaking aircrew are members of Rear Admiral Tyree's Task Force 43, whose Antarctic operations are mounted from an advanced base in Christchurch, New Zealand. New Zealanders know about the Antarctic, and the risks which are run by those who since the days of Captain Scott at the start of this century have been leaving New Zealand for "the ice," and some of the best of whom have not returned. When the New Zealanders praise an Antarctic exploit, they are speaking from knowledge and experience. I would, therefore, like to enter into this RECORD the following editorial from the Christchurch Star, expressing the reaction of New Zealanders to this American rescue of a Russian from the depths of the Antarctic wastes. It is something which every American must read with pride, and gratitude that this at least of our efforts to do good in a distracted world, has not gone unappreciated.

[From the Christchurch Star, Apr. 12, 1961]

A FLIGHT TO REMEMBER

Gratitude and admiration are the sentiments aroused by the successful completion of the world's most notable mercy flight. When the U.S. Navy's ski-equipped Hercules left Christchurch International Airport manned by a complement of brave men, it was to face something never before encountered by flying men. Little wonder that among those left behind anxiety mingled with pride in what men will attempt to succor other men. Over long miles of water and ice, on a route not previously traversed so late in the season, flew the Hercules, bound for McMurdo Sound, and then for Byrd Station, where lay the sick Russian scientist. Not only did those aboard face the normal hazard of Antarctic weather, they were also heading towards a land where the hours of daylight are few.

Now that it is all over the modest tendency is to regard the flight as more or less routine. But that in no way diminishes the value of this arresting example of the oft-repeated, and several times proved, phrase that among those who face the perils of the polar regions national barriers mean nothing. There maybe other flights like this, but there can never be one quite the same. It is something to remember as a stirring example of the call that humanity can exercise in a world where so much stress is apt to be laid on inhumanity.

Joseph E. Moody Tells of Importance of National Fuels Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, there has been a growing concern over the present economic situation regarding the fuels of this Nation. So much depends on the exploration, development, and production of fuel, not only for national defense, but for our national economic well-being, that the pending Senate Resolution 105, which I cosponsored along with Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, and 63 of our colleagues, becomes of increasing importance with each passing day.

This fact is attested to in a presentation made on May 15, 1961, by Mr. Joseph E. Moody, president of the National Coal Policy Conference, before the 15th annual meeting of the Texas Independent Producers & Royalty Owners Association, in Midland, Tex.

Mr. Moody's position on the need for a national fuels policy is thoroughly sound, and because he represents a large and important segment of the economy of this Nation, his views on the matter must be considered as being of prime importance to all of the people of our country.

Because I feel that Mr. Moody's keen analysis of the situation regarding our basic fuels should be universally read and studied, I ask unanimous consent to have his presentation printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the presentation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PRESENTATION BY JOSEPH E. MOODY, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL COAL POLICY CONFERENCE, INC., WASHINGTON, D.C., BEFORE THE 15TH ANNUAL MEETING OF TEXAS INDEPENDENT PRODUCERS & ROYALTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION, MIDLAND, TEX., MAY 15, 1961.

Ladies and gentlemen of the great oil-producing community of Texas, to say that it is a pleasure to be here is an understatement. Since the day when my good friend Mr. Earl Turner invited me I have looked forward to this opportunity of talking with you about the problems of the domestic fuels industries. I believe it is fair to say that 6 months ago I would have given some pretty stiff bets that I would never have this opportunity of presenting our thinking—that is, the thinking of the leadership of the coal industry and more particularly the thinking of National Coal Policy Conference—to a group such as the Texas Independent Producers & Royalty Owners Association.

There have been some words of disagreement expressed by some parts of the oil and gas industries concerning some of the purposes of the National Coal Policy Conference. However, I think there is a comparison that can be made which may explain to some extent your willingness to sit with me this afternoon and my anxiety to learn from you so that we can, as Mr. Turner put it in his letter to me "develop the possibility of common ground between these industries." As president of the National Coal Policy Conference I can speak with considerable authority on the matter of common ground between industries. The National Coal Policy Conference is a unique organization, made up of five groups, each one representing an industry or organization that has comon ground with the coal industry. One group is composed of the coal producers; another of coal-carrying railroads—some 32 of the largest railroads in the country; another group is the United Mine Workers of America, a labor union rather well known over the past 20 or 25 years to have had troubles and contention in our industry; another is the builders of the wonderful machinery which is contributing so greatly to the mechanization of our industry and last, but not least, that great broad industry known as the electric utility industry—now the largest single customer which the bituminous coal industry has, and I might say the fastest growing of any of our major customer groups.

The point I would like to make is that all of these groups have spent the past generation in what probably will be recorded in history as the most violent of contention in industry. Certainly the United Mine Workers and the coal producers have not had an easy time; nor the railroads and the coal producers on freight rates; nor the utility companies on coal prices; nor the manufacturers of equipment and the people who use that equipment. Still, when we were backed up against the wall, we all realized that if the coal industry was to be a vibrant, vigorous, growing industry that would con-

tribute most to the welfare of this Nation, and in so doing make it possible for all of these to be profitable, then we were going to have to find a common ground and close ranks in an effort to maintain our industry.

This, the leaders of these industries did, and in my own way I have unbounded respect for them because of this. I say to you gentlemen that any industry that has the leadership with the kind of foresight and courage and respect for the other fellow's point of view so that they can join in a common effort of this kind, will always be in the forefront among the industries with which it competes.

In the fuels industries of this Nation, the competition has been gradually changing from the time when coal was the unchallenged king which represented the fuel producing over 80 percent of our energy requirements. Since then energy demands have increased and the various domestic fuels have undergone a changed relationship until today when we are entering a new era—an era in which the domestic fuels industries are in danger of being completely demoralized by an unrestrained inflow of foreign fuel. And so we find that although there is still the unrestrained competition between domestic coal and oil and gas, I find today there is a new dimension of competition—the competition between all domestic fuels and imported foreign fuel.

What we are talking about here today is whether we are smart enough and have leaders in our industries of sufficiently high caliber to maintain the stiff domestic industry competition which contributes to the ultimate welfare of this nation and its economic growth, and at the same time defend ourselves against the common menace of foreign fuel importation.

Let's review the situation in the short time that I have. By necessity it will be rather sketchy and if in making this presentation I make some statements not fully explained, it is only because of the limited time alloted to me.

On the Eastern Seaboard there has been, over the years, a growing importation of residual oil and with that growing importation a dislocation and erosion of the coal markets in that area. The coal industry, as is natural on the part of any industry, tried to meet that competition in service, supply, in delivered prices and by pointing out the unlimited resources of the coal industry to supply its customers over a long period of time with a very high quality product.

In the last few years the railroads, through massive modernization efforts and rate adjustments worked out with the Interstate Commerce Commission, have given relief wherever they could, so that the ultimate consumer would receive our product at a competitive price.

The producers of coal, by fully mechanizing their mines and with the investment of millions and millions of dollars, have put on one of the greatest productive efforts in any industry at any time in the industrial history of this world.

They have doubled their production per man shift in the last dozen years and at the same time they have actually shown a reduction in price, f.o.b. the mine; we anticipate they will be able to continue this record. So, for those who rather widely proclaim that the coal industry has just cried on the breast of the Government, I point out to you that there is no record to match what we have done to help ourselves by vastly improved productivity, stable prices and a tremendously improved product.

But we are up against a peculiar situation, one that has nothing to do with the free enterprise system or with true industrial competition—two terms which have been so loudly proclaimed by some people during the past few years. We have been fighting desperately for our lives in the eastern seaboard market against excessive residual fuel oil imports. Residual oil has no real cost compared to coal. No matter what price level we reach with coal we find residual oil being offered under contracts at so much per barrel below coal equivalent. We also find that by political clamor and political pressures, even though a system of quotas had been established to act as a restraint on the inflow of this foreign residual oil, their effectiveness has all but been destroyed. In this year alone, established quotas for the first quarter were increased at one time by 9 million barrels, and then a 12-month quota was announced, providing for an increase of an additional 13 million barrels over last year, and 40 million barrels above the 1957 base year established by Presidential proclamation.

I would like to emphasize that that 1957 level was established as a maximum of imports which could be replaced by coal or other domestic fuels in case of political or war emergency.

Since the original Presidential proclamation on March 10, 1959, establishing the oil import control program, there has been a disregard of this defense of the Nation's criterion. We have a desperate fight on our hands to make the present quota system an effective instrument to maintain the coal industry of the United States at a high level of production and efficiency, and thus a major contributor to the safety of our Nation.

The importation of foreign residual oil and the importation of crude oil are inseparable. It has been said of the coal industry that we are complaining about something representing only about 10 percent equivalent of our national annual production. But this 10 percent affects our whole sales and pricing structure. This is also true in the case of crude oil. Imported crude represents only approximately 10 percent of domestic crude production, but it affects every barrel of domestic production regardless of where it is produced.

If I read the reports correctly, and I am not an expert on worldwide petroleum production, there is every reason to believe that any of the majors in the international oil game could put almost unlimited supplies of foreign crude at the head of the ship channel at Houston at well below one-half of the cost of any Texas-produced crude. There is also every reason to believe that these majors are pushing for that day when they can control the entire fuel economy of the United States. There are no doubt some people in the United States, particularly the world do-gooders, who would applaud this innovation of the United States purchasing all of its fuel abroad and abandoning the domestic fuels industries.

The impact of foreign fuel imports on the U.S. economy cannot be measured with complete accuracy. But certainly there is a wide difference between the importation of residual oil, which produces a nominal tariff revenue of 5 cents a barrel, and the production, distribution and sale of its equivalent in coal or other domestic fuels, which would produce local State and national tax revenue, and provide payrolls for the sustenance for American families, while at the same time contributing to the growth and strength of our economy.

This relationship has been recognized by Texas Independent Producers and Royalty Owners Association and I quote from the testimony of Mr. John Hurd, your president, in the May 10 oil import hearings when he was comparing imported crude with domestically produced crude:

"Texas State government is also suffering from the ill effects of oil industry decline. The State anticipates a deficit of at least $63 million by the end of the current fiscal year ending August 31. Most of this deficit is represented by failure of oil tax revenue to maintain pre-1956 growth rates in the past 5 years. Decline in oil production and regulation taxes alone has cost the State $43.4 million this year. Further loss has occurred in revenue from franchise, ad valorum, and related industry levies."

Going a little further there can be no question but that the purchase of residual or crude oil outside of this country, when we have so much on hand domestically, must drain working capital from our economy and we do not know what benefits accrue to the United States from such a transfer of funds to a foreign nation. Although we cannot measure accurately how much the draining of these vast sums of money from American industry increase our international payments deficit, it is fair to assume that it has a major impact.

Up to this point I have avoided elaboration of some of the competitive aspects of domestic fuels which we in the coal industry find so hard to bear. I feel I must, however, at least refer to one major fact of life in the production of domestic oil and gas which is of major importance to us all.

The commercial policy in the past, and this largely still applies, has made oil the major revenue product and priced gas first as a waste product and then as a byproduct as distinct from being a major product or joint product.

The failure of natural gas to make a satisfactory contribution to joint costs is having an adverse affect on the oil industry and hence on the future of royalty owners.

John G. Winger of the Chase Manhattan Bank concludes quite correctly that the crux of the competition between oil and gas is in the matter of cost allocation between the two. I also share his belief that gas should contribute and bear a larger part of the burden than it does. He points out that in household heating, where oil and gas are in stiff competition, the householder on the east coast pays $200 for oil as against $282 for natural gas, but that the oil producer gets $102 to pay for the crude while the gas producer gets only $22 to pay for the gas at the wellhead. His point is that only the portion of the total revenue the producer retains goes for exploration for more reserves.

In the industrial market, gas is competitive with coal and that competition results from the same kind of failure to contribute its proper part to the cost of exploration, development, and production and is the major cause of that awful invention known as the interruptible clause in gas contracts which has been a point of contention to the coal industry over these years.

I know you are working on this problem here in the Permian Basin where you are trying to get a readjustment of gas prices that will eliminate much of the friction that has existed between the coal and gas industries in recent years.

One of the things that the National Coal Policy Conference has advocated from the start is that a very thorough study be made of the fuels of this Nation, looking toward a national fuels policy. Somewhere in the very near future a decision has to be made as to whether we will continue to have strong and vigorous domestic fuels industries, or not. That has to be a Government decision. Left alone, the domestic industries can compete only to a certain limited point, beyond which the imported foreign fuels, having no actual cost relationship with domestic fuels, will overrun our markets. This trend, which is now underway, must be halted or it will eventually destroy us. There have been many things said about the Nation Coal Policy Conference's sponsorship of a fuels policy and a fuels study. In fact, I have with me an ad which appeared in the Houston Chronicle which I think is a good example of the unthoughtful approach to the subject.

I say to you that our proposal of a fuels study by the Congress of the United States has no tricks in it; we have no preconceived ideas of its results; we have only a faith in American people looking at American problems, and that faith extends to a point where we believe that recommendations coming from such a thoughtful study by a special committee of the Congress will be constructively helpful and in the best interests of the United States of America and American industry.

Your organization, to which I have the honor of presenting these remarks, has shown great restraint in its consideration of the proposal before Congress, when I am sure there has been urging from certain quarters to oppose such a study. I believe it is only fair to say that when the original proposal first came before the Congress, opposition from the oil, gas, or domestic energy industries was not anticipated. It was well along the way that we realized that certain groups, mainly affiliated with the international major units, built up an almost fanatical opposition to a study of the fuels industries of this Nation.

We are sincerely hopeful that as times goes on this will change. However, we are reaching a point where we are more or less convinced that the interests of certain of these great international organizations are contrary, basically and fundamentally, to the interests of a well-developed, high productive, and profitable domestic oil, gas, and coal industry.

Therefore, there is common ground for the domestic fuels industries.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of May 13, 1961:

WASHINGTON REPORT—TOWARD DICTATORSHIP?

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, May 13, 1961)

The Constitution, the basis of our limited Federal-State Government, outlines a republic within a democracy to safeguard personal liberty and dignity from Government regulation and control. Checks and balances are stipulated to assure limited government by prevention of the executive, legislative, and judiciary from encroachment on each other through balance of power. Any factor affecting this balance must be resisted. The world has witnessed a series of dictatorships, so it is not surprising that many people are aware of the need for containing the power of the Executive. It is in order, therefore, at any time and particularly now to evaluate the performance of the executive branch since this administration took office 3½ months ago.

Here are a series of actions by the Executive, by officials within the administration following President Kennedy's demands, or by Congress as controlled by the Democrats and following his demands: (1) The President's first Executive order was to declare food surpluses and give them away as a welfare measure for nutritional reasons. This exceeds the Executive's jurisdiction under the law. (2) The Rules Committee membership was increased to expedite legislation programing and to control the ground rules of debate and the amendment of legislation; (3) military speeches must be censored, must go through the executive (Arleigh Burke); (4) newspapers asked to impose self-censorship; (5) television and radio executives told by FCC Chairman Minow, "There is nothing permanent or sacred about a broadcast license. I intend to see that you pay your debt to the public with service." (6) Regulatory agencies, arms of the Congress, not the administration, are the subject of President Kennedy's proposals to reorganize and delegate powers; (7) Congress forced to give up constitutional duty to scrutinize and approve appropriations annually in the depressed areas bill during the House-Senate conference (back-door spending); (8) Congress told to approve $500 million for foreign aid to Latin America, the Executive absolutely refusing to specify countries and projects to receive aid, although Congress was told last year such information would be forthcoming; (9) Peace Corps set up by Executive order not by legislation; (10) House minimum wage replaced by President Kennedy version in House-Senate conference; (11) judgeships, public works, and patronage used to force and keep Congressmen in line to vote as President Kennedy decides on all his many legislative proposals; (12) the agriculture bill proposed by Secretary Freeman would relieve Congress from any future need for action.

When you realize that already the House has given up constitutional control of trade and tariffs, that CIA intelligence information goes to the administration, not Congress, and that the Presidency has already been likened to a benevolent dictatorship through past transfer of power from Congress to the Executive, what does it add up to?

Now let's explore the foreign situation: (1) The Executive is Commander in Chief of our defense forces representing approximately one-half of all Government expenditures; (2) Foreign aid is almost entirely under the control of the Executive and nations, friend or foe, may be subsidized at the will of the Executive. In summary, are we indeed becoming a dictatorship? Can we hope to maintain our individual freedom and free institutions, indeed, our very form of society, if we concentrate the balance of power in one branch of government, dominated by one man? On the contrary, are we not then trying to beat dictatorships (communism) by becoming a dictatorship, while preserving the outward form of constitutional government?

The international scene is no more encouraging at this time: (1) Cuba continues unhampered its warlike buildup; (2) Laos seems scheduled to be added to Communist victories; (3) Pro-Castro sentiment runs rampant in many Latin American countries; (4) No apparent end is in sight for settling the dangerous issues in the Congo; (5) The Soviet Union continues to stall in negotiations for the control of nuclear weapons.

Optimistically, positively and constructively, I say there is a solution to our present troubles at home and abroad. At home, let us reassert constitutional checks and balances—let us keep Federal Government limited, cut welfare spending, reduce debt and taxes—in short, the reassertion of Jeffersonian Democracy now championed by conservatives. Internationally, let us show to the world once again the majesty and power exemplified by our national symbol, the American eagle. Let us demonstrate to all people, and especially the Communist leaders, that we are not the "paper tiger" the Chinese Reds have been able to convince too many uncommitted peoples that we are. The American people are far ahead of the leadership in demonstrating our willingness to show the world that the American eagle will remain a symbol of hope and strength and courage to all who desire to be free. The leadership must let the world know the will of the American people to support with action the magnificent words of President Kennedy in his inaugural address. There can be no further stalling. We must be done with continuous negotiations which are merely used by the Communists to cloak further aggression. We have the will and the means to show clearly that America is not a "paper tiger" but a mighty eagle, soaring into the heavens with strength and ready to defend freedom by backing up our words in Cuba, in southeastern Asia, and wherever the Communists threaten the freedom and liberty of mankind.

Sixty-one Years of "Newspapering"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the constitutional guarantee of a "free press" is perhaps all too often something we Americans take for granted. And perhaps too often we also take for granted the achievements of one segment of the press—our weekly newspapers—and the contributions which are made by individuals who have dedicated themselves to the furtherance of our freedoms in a profession which has long held the reputation for perseverance, unstinting effort and devoted hours of work over and above what is considered a normal work week.

It has long been my opinion that our weekly newspapers—and this is no reflection on the metropolitan or city daily press—are in the forefront with respect to accurate and objective representation of "grassroots" thinking.

Today I wish to call attention to one of our weekly newspaper editors in South Dakota who has had a part in the publication of her hometown paper since the turn of the century.

She is Mrs. Jane Black who is the editor and publisher of the Waubay Clipper. Mrs. Black, now 79 years of age, and although assisted in the publication by her son, Bill, still "stands up and speaks her piece" when she feels the occasion warrants such an editorial.

Mr. President, Mrs. Black was the subject of a recent article which appeared in a number of South Dakota newspapers and it seemed to me that this story of Mrs. Black is so representative of the dedication we have come to recognize as one of the stronger traits of our weekly editors, I felt it should be brought to the attention of the Senate. I request permission to place the article in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOMAN EDITOR CAN TAKE "CUSSIN"

(By Chuck Cecil)

WAUBAY.—"If I don't get a good 'cussin' one or two times a week, I know there must

not have been any mistakes in the paper," quipped Mrs. Jane Black, longtime editor-publisher of the Waubay Clipper.

But if there is an error in the news columns of the Clipper, Mrs. Black can take the "cussin" with the best of them. She's had a hand in production of the paper since 1900, and has done everything from writing the copy to laying out pages and coaxing the old Clipper press along.

"I can't operate the Linotype machine though, that's Bill's baby," the 79-year-old senior South Dakota woman editor said, smiling as she surveyed the newspaper office that has been her life since the day she was married.

Bill is her son. He assists in the printing of the paper.

Mrs. Black was born in a covered wagon in Douglas County, Minn., April 25, 1881, while her parents were en route from Iowa to a homestead south of Webster.

RODE IN JET

And she's almost as proud of her mobile birthplace as she is of the jet airplane ride she took earlier this month to visit a daughter in Michigan.

But with experience in both extremes of transportation, Mrs. Black still prefers to ride in a car. "You can take your time and see the world," she said.

When Mrs. Black was 9, her parents moved from the farm south of Webster to the city of Webster. Later, the family moved again, this time to a farm east of Waubay.

It was in Waubay that she met her husband, the late Charles F. Black, who was then working for the owner of the Clipper. The Blacks were married in 1900 and from the day of the wedding on, Mrs. Black, too, was an employee of the Clipper. "I've been here ever since," she said.

Three years later in 1903, the Blacks purchased the Clipper, the town's only newspaper. That same year, fire burned the Clipper building to the ground and the Blacks published from a rented office until a new structure could be constructed.

The Clipper still comes out each Thursday from the building the Blacks built. And Mrs. Black still lives in the apartment in the rear of the shop, only a few feet from the cluttered desk where her husband wrote those crackling editorials during the election of 1908.

One of the candidates in that election sued Editor Black for libel. His price was a mere $25,000. Like all editors of that day, Black had written just exactly what he thought—and like most politicians of the same era—the candidate didn't believe Mr. Black's comments helped his election cause any.

But the $25,000 suit wasn't enough. The candidates' lawyer joined the parade and sued Black another $15,000 because he said he had been slandered by the editor.

But Black must not have been too worried about the $40,000 suit. "He used to kid the candidate and the lawyer about how one man's reputation was worth $25,000 and the other's worth only $15,000," Mrs. Black recalled.

Tempers cooled following the election and the suit was dropped.

HUSBAND THREATENED

She also recalls the time her husband threatened—and was consequently dared—to print the names of men who signed a petition which would allow saloons to operate in Waubay.

"The fellows all wanted the saloon but they didn't want their names in the paper," Mrs. Black said, adding that her husband took the dare and printed the names of those signing.

"We lost about 22 subscriptions because of it but they all came back later."

After Mr. Black's death in 1923, Mrs. Black assumed the responsibility of publishing the paper which was so prosperous that work often required hours long into the night.

During World War II Mrs. Black tried to put out the paper with only part-time help from a relative and with type set at the Reporter and Farmer in Webster.

She worked alone in the office for 3 years and finally had to call for help.

Mrs. Black still does most of the writing for the Clipper's news columns, but leaves the heavy work to her son, Bill, "I like meeting people, and wrestling with their problems," she says.

ACTIVE ELSEWHERE

Publishing a newspaper isn't the only activity in which Mrs. Black is engaged. She is a member of the county mental health organization, has been chairman of the county's Indian Welfare organization since 1932, was secretary of the Sunday school for 15 years, and superintendent of the Sunday school for another 8 years.

For 55 years she has been a member of the South Dakota Press Association, and has been active in the city's Commercial Club for as long as there has been one. To relax, she writes poetry.

Does she still stand up and speak her piece when an issue comes along? "I'm not easily swayed," she said, "I still like to bark at them once in a while."

But folks in Waubay wouldn't have it any other way. They think too much of her to do much "cussin'" anymore.

Solid Rock or Sinking Sand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, a month ago I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Easter message of Dr. Frank N. D. Buchman, the initiator of Moral Re-Armament, entitled "All the Moral Fences Are Down." In his message Dr. Buchman recounted some of the advances of Moral Re-Armament through which an answer to conflict and moral decay is being brought by that great ideological force for freedom.

In the past month a further heartening advance has taken place in our own hemisphere. A great assembly for Moral Re-Armament was held in Miami in April, where leading figures from many nations of Latin America joined with men from Europe, Africa, Asia, and the United States in planning an ideological offensive for the hemisphere.

From that assembly a force of Moral Re-Armament, spearheaded by the Japanese Zengakuren students with their play "The Tiger," has gone forth to South America. Led by Gen. Hugo Bethlem, of Brazil, they have been received with acclaim in the great industrial city of Sao Paulo, initiating what the newspaper El Pais of Montevideo called "The greatest ideological offensive undertaken on the Latin American continent."

In his latest message to the world entitled "Solid Rock or Sinking Sand," Dr. Buchman gives the amazing story of the impact in Brazil of this offensive as well as further news of MRA's global advance in Asia and Africa.

This June a Moral Re-Armament World Assembly will be held at Caux, Switzerland. Dr. Buchman, who will be celebrating his 83d birthday on June 4, will be taking part. Gathering with him will be leaders from every continent to plan the global ideological thrust that will be needed in the months following.

From the Congo, Cyprus, Kerala, Japan, the German Ruhr, north Africa, Latin America, and other focal points of the ideological struggle, will be coming men with evidence of the significant action of Moral Re-Armament in those areas. Their experience will assist the Assembly in planning a global strategy to answer corruption, communism, and war.

Dr. Buchman's message which appeared in many publications throughout the Nation is included herewith:

SOLID ROCK OR SINKING SAND

(By Dr. Frank N. D. Buchman)

A month ago I sent an Easter message to the world, "All the Moral Fences Are Down." There was an instant response. From the statesmen and the ordinary man in country after country came the word, "That is the problem. Help us to rebuild those moral fences for our nations and the world."

General Bethlem, of Brazil, is a man who is doing just that. In Miami, Fla., he dropped down on a group of leaders from all the hemispheres. There was the general commanding the Army of Peru. There was the President of Parliament from Uruguay. There was the representative of the Minister of War from Argentina, the wife of the Minister of Reconstruction of Chile, dockers' leaders and industrialists from Brazil. There was the man who founded the Communist Party in Peru and brought in the first popular front government in Chile.

There General Bethlem also met General Inoue from Japan and with him the force of Japanese youth with "The Tiger," their play about the answer to the Tokyo riots. He met Chief Walking Buffalo from Canada with his braves and councilors. He met businessmen from Switzerland, labor leaders from France and Germany. He met Philip Vundla, the elected leader of 600,000 Africans, whom the police once described as the most dangerous man in South Africa; and Vaitheswaran, 6 years a dedicated Communist in South India, whose change has helped give Kerala the solid rock of an answer to communism. He met William Pawley, son of a former U.S. Ambassador to Peru and Brazil. From Britain he met Peter Howard, the author, and Adm. Sir Edward Cochrane, great-great-nephew of the famous Lord Cochrane who helped liberate Chile and Brazil. He met a Jamaican leader who said, "You men have the only hope for the Caribbean. We must mobilize now for this answer, otherwise we shall quickly go the way of Cuba."

ANSWER FOR THE HEMISPHERE

General Bethlem had held two diplomatic posts as Ambassador of Brazil to Bolivia and Pakistan, but now he was on a trip with his wife for a holiday in New York. As he listened to these men speak, he was gripped by their unity that was like a rock because God was in command. This was the answer for the hemisphere. Within a week he had turned around and was leading an advance force of these very men to Brazil, which was followed a few days later by a plane-load of 129 from 25 countries, to initiate what the newspaper, "El Pais," of Montevideo called the greatest ideological offen-

sive undertaken on the Latin American continent. The general eagerly went back to give Brazil the solid foundation for world leadership that he had longed for for his nation. As his advance-guard he took with him Rajmohan Gandhi, grandson of Mahatma Gandhi, Admiral Cochrane, Vaitheswaran, and Takasumi Mitsui of the great Japanese industrial family. They prepared the way.

When the main international force arrived they were met by radio, press, and television. In fact, one enthusiastic television cameraman got on the plane before the visitors could get off. It was national news.

Immediately they spoke at a lunch to 400 leading industrialists and businessmen, including the representatives of Ford, General Electric, Goodyear Rubber, and Swift. General Bethlem said, "Both North and South America are at the most critical points of our history. Against the background of Cuba, Venezuela and Bolivia where I have been Ambassador, and the new Russian offensive starting in Mexico on May Day, the inescapable choice for Latin America is Moral Re-Armament or communism. I know you businessmen, because I was like you. We ask our wives to live purity, but we are not pure. We ask our workers to be honest, but we are dishonest. I have changed and committed my whole life to this fight."

To General Bethlem's surprise and astonishment these businessmen three times halted his presentation at that lunch with standing ovations. Some people may say this is an incredible response, but here is the fact. Immediately General Bethlem and his force were invited to speak to a meeting of 600 leaders of the industrial and business life of Brazil and to take an hour and a half television program.

Chief Walking Buffalo of the Stony Indians and his party created such a stir coming to this luncheon that hundreds of schoolchildren crowded into the lobby to meet him. For half an hour he told them how, in the previous year, 100 million people had seen and heard him on the warpath in his 90th year in a 62,000-mile tour for moral rearmament. He spoke of the time he made me a blood bother 28 years ago, when he gave me the name of "A Wo Zan Zan Tonga—Great Light in Darkness." While the chief was speaking, there came a message from across the street from the mother superior of Sao Paulo's most famous convent school for 700 hundred children from leading families, asking him to come with his friends to speak to a quickly convened school assembly. The response was electric. Said the mother superior, "This will be a marking day in the annals of this college." Said another Sister, "This is the work of the Holy Spirit." After a television program that reached a 4 million audience on the No. 1 program of the week, a mother superior said, "This is a very profound message. We must work together. You must go to all the Catholic schools. They will respond."

This can be the normal life of these countries, for which people have been saying there is not much hope. Otherwise these businessmen and their families with all their money and social life will lead to an absence of God, spelling the breakdown of the moral fences of democracy and, eventually, to communism.

"THE TIGER"

On May Day the Japanese launched their ideological weapon, "The Tiger," in Latin America. Crowds outside the municipal theater in Sao Paulo were so great that the traffic was stopped. General Bethlem introduced on the stage a force of 150 people from 25 countries, and read cables from Italian and French Socialist leaders, from 17 mineworkers of Britain, from the dockers of Holland, India, United States and Brazil, and from Hollywood stars. Former Prime Minister Kishi of Japan cabled: "Tonight is being followed by millions of Japanese who are joining this fight to root out communism, exploitation and slavery all around the world. Your fire and passion for a way which is not left nor right but straight will give the South American Republics their true destiny."

Mrs. Dorothea Buck of Virginia, former president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs with a membership of 11 million women, received a rousing ovation when she challenged the women of North and South America to "lay down their comforts and complacency, and to unite to take up this ideology without which our children and grandchildren will live behind the Iron Curtain." Dr. Raul Migone, former Minister of Labor in Argentina, summed up his convictions when he said, "Moral Re-Armament is the chosen weapon for humanity not only to overcome communism, which I am absolutely convinced it will do, but also to show the way for mankind as a whole."

A CURRENT IN THE AIR

These men of action and responsibility like General Bethlem get this message on the move. It is like a current in the air. Take the story of that remarkable man U-nu of Burma. He visited Moscow and being attracted by their concern for Asia said they should be invited to the next Afro-Asian conference. But then he came to Finland. There he found the ideological plays of Moral Re-Armament. He knew the effect they had had in his own country. He came at 9 o'clock in the morning with the foreign minister of Finland. What he saw in that theater changed his policy. On his next stop in Stockholm he called in the press and apologized for the hasty statement which had suggested the inclusion of the Soviets in the conference.

U-nu knew that Burma was a nation deeply influenced by MRA. U Tin-tut, former foreign minister who had been to Caux, spoke of it "as the one unfailing light"; and Aung San, the first Prime Minister, whose widow as Ambassador in India closely follows this work, said, "This is what I want for the whole country." U Narada, the abbot who is the secretary to the Presiding Abbots' Association, responsible for 75,840 Buddhist Monks, has mobilized these monks throughout the country who believe in the validity of this message for Burma. He says, "My colleagues in the all-Burma Presiding Abbots' Association and myself have accepted the responsibility of rebuilding the moral fences in our country. Then we will have new men, new nations and a new world."

These monks are enthusiastically at work, and have shown the MRA film, "The Crowning Experience," in the presence of the Prime Minister at the national celebration at the Peace Pagoda in the open air to crowds so large that they had to sit on both sides of the screen. The speaker of the Chamber of Deputies said, "This film is tailor made for Burma. It exactly fits the need of the country."

The last time U Nu came to America he told reporters in New York that he was coming especially to Arizona to see me because of the urgent need for this message for his country. He had already sent his daughter to be with us at our assemblies. His word on leaving me was simply, "Come soon, come soon to Burma."

Meanwhile U Narada and five abbots are coming to Europe for the assembly at Caux, Switzerland, and will celebrate with me my 83d birthday in June. These worthies are welcome here and the highest in the land, also, who long to come and find in the quiet of these mountains the key to their country's destiny.

In Japan it is the former Prime Minister Kishi and his chief adviser, Mr. Saburo Chiba, who are planning the delegation for this assembly, with Senator Ohtani, a director of the World Buddhist Federation, and adviser to a 5-million-strong Buddhist group in Japan. Senator Ohtani says, "What Asian Buddhism now needs is moral rearmament. We in Japan have been given the light of MRA. Now we must sweep the whole world with this light."

"YOU SAY WHAT IS STRAIGHT AND RIGHT"

It is just a year now since a force of Moral Re-Armament left from Caux to work in the Congo. What is the battle they are fighting? It is a difficult task. But they are meeting with such a response that the Minister for Information and National Defense in Leopoldville says that "Moral Re-Armament has saved the Congo from a far greater catastrophe."

The other day they were invited to the controlled area of the lower Congo, in which are the ports of Matadi, Boma, and Banana. En route they encountered several Congo Army roadblocks. At one the sergeant said, "Moral Re-Armament. We listen all the time to your radio broadcasts," and he began to sing one of the songs. He was overjoyed to meet the Colwell brothers from Hollywood, who had put these songs twice a day on the radio in the languages of his people. At every roadblock, as the soldiers realized the MR-A men were in the car, they crowded enthusiastically around, and at the last block before entering Matadi, the soldiers cheered them for bringing the answer to communism.

At the end of the road in Boma the square was a sea of faces as 10,000 people crammed into the civic center to see the MR-A films and hear these men speak. That crowd stood for 4 hours and when asked if they wanted more, roared their approval and said, "We want the MR-A force to stay for a month right here to spread this idea."

The Bishop of Matadi said after the film, "You say what is straight and right. This is the good and only way, the way of MR-A which we all need. I congratulate and thank you. I will give you my fullest support so that the masses will follow this idea."

Africa can be lost in the sinking sands of the materialism of East and West. Leaders of Africa welcome Moral Re-Armament because it is the solid ground on which a hate-free, fear-free, greed-free continent can be built. Marking the independence of their country the Government of Sierra Leone invited the representatives of 66 nations to see "The Crowning Experience." The Deputy Prime Minister, presenting the film said, "I have decided to throw my whole weight into this work of Moral Re-Armament," Humphrey Wood, officially representing Moral Re-Armament at the independence celebration, presented my message: "Sierra Leone's destiny is to be a nation guided, not by the will of others but by the will of God to follow what is right. Strong as a lion she will be among the nations. The whole world is anxiously waiting to see what God can do through one nation wholly given to Him. Sierra Leone can be that nation. My heartiest congratulations."

Introducing "The Crowning Experience," which was repeatedly interrupted by applause, Manasseh Moerane, Vice President of the thousands of African teachers of south Africa, said, "Political independence is important: economic stability is important, but above all a new nation needs an ideology. We in Africa cannot afford neutralism. We have got to stand for what is right."

Bremer Hofmeyr, whose family have held six Cabinet posts in south Africa, said, "Moral Re-Armament is the ideology that sets men and nations free, that keeps men

and nations free, and unites free men to win the world."

President Tubman of Liberia has also asked for the men of Moral Re-Armament to present "The Crowning Experience" to the Pan-African Conference which opens this week in Monrovia. He says, "I invite the leaders and people of Africa to join in this supreme task and to give priority to the moral rearmament of our nations."

THE FUNDAMENTAL ANSWER

This African statesman echoes the convictions of Eudocio Ravines of Peru, former Latin American delegate to the Comintern, who spoke at the Moral Re-Armament Hemisphere Assembly in Miami. He said, "The fundamental answer to communism in Latin America is moral and spiritual. Events in Cuba are happening because the Americas have not lived an ideology superior to communism. That is where we Latin Americans are responsible. But neither has the United States exported moral values to Cuba. It has exported dollars and tourists and those things which made Latin Americans cynically call Havana the cabaret of North America. Moral decadence opens the door to Communist penetration. Many people say that communism is the product of poverty, hunger, and underdevelopment. However, I say with the authority of having successfully conducted one of the greatest Communist movements in creating the popular front in Chile, the cause of the penetration of communism is corruption and moral decadence. Now the Government of the United States is offering millions of dollars to solve the economic problems of Latin America. But military aid and dollars alone are not enough. This is the moment for America to export a moral ideology to Latin America. Therefore, the mission of Moral Re-Armament is of fundamental and particular importance."

From this assembly in Miami returned two Swiss businessmen who had given evidence of the striking response to this answer from industry, politics, and press in Catholic central Switzerland. One said, "I came back from America with the deep conviction that my job was to be ready to pack my bags and travel to bring this answer. In a world crisis like today the old style businessman simply doesn't make sense." Businessmen without a superior ideology only help communism. I think of the industrialists who gave Castro $30 million and have lost it all. And of the corruption that has become a way of life for businessmen in many Western lands and brought us to the edge of the abyss. We need men and women who will pay the full price and change, honesty, and fearless leadership in our nations if the world is to be saved.

SOLID GROUND FOR STATESMANSHIP

The Moral Re-Armament Assembly at Caux in June will be the focus for leaders from every continent who are seeking solid ground for statesmanship. His Excellency Bernard Hardion, a senior diplomatic adviser to the French Foreign Office and former ambassador in Brazil, said, "Moral Re-Armament is a modern chivalry. Chivalry was inspired by faith and belief in God. It was not a substitute for religion. We must once and for all end this defense of a past forever dead. We must take the offensive in the battle for the future and for the submission of men to the divine voice."

Dr. Azikiwe, the first African Governor-General of Nigeria, who architected his country's freedom, told how he discovered in Caux the idea of "Not who is right, but what is right," which "proved to be a pearl of great price at a time when we were on the threshold of a great political awakening."

The Catholic Philosopher Gabriel Marcel spoke to the foreign press in Geneva. He said that in Caux he had seen a power that brought "a radical and lasting transformation in people. It is magnificent, and cannot be gainsaid."

Robert Schuman said of his experience at Caux, "I am accustomed to conferences, but they are very different from this. Normally they end with great disappointment. Here we find nothing but satisfaction and hope."

Gen. Marcel Carpentier, who commanded the ground forces of NATO of central Europe, sounded a challenge at the most recent assembly in Caux, "We need a floodtide of Moral Re-Armament to sweep across the world. Then men in government will be forced to make the right decisions that spring not just from the intellect, but from our hearts and faith."

Like a mighty army moves this force across the world. Men and women of all races and nations united with a common commitment. The world is on the knife edge of decision. We must go all out to save our nations. When men change and are gripped by the fire and passion, the purity and honesty of a moral ideology, miracles happen. The foundation is laid of a new world, not on the shifting sand of corruption and compromise, but on the rocklike character of God-directed men and nations.

Encouragement of Travel to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senate has wisely and favorably acted upon a bill sponsored by the distinguished chairman of the Commerce Committee, Mr. MAGNUSON, S. 610, which provides for the establishment of an International Travel Office in the Department of Commerce to promote foreign tourism in the United States. I am pleased to note that the House is scheduled today to consider similar legislation. However, the establishment of this office is only the first step—private organizations and businesses as well as the private individual have much to contribute to the impetus of foreign tourism in the United States.

Mr. President, with this in mind I wish to call attention to a most interesting editorial on this subject which appeared on April 20 in the Minneapolis Star and Tribune. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WELCOME TO UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The plan to encourage more travelers from other countries to visit the United States is gaining strength, and if Congress appropriates money for the purpose a worldwide promotional campaign will be launched.

But advertising, travel-poster appeal, and cutting the redtape of Government procedures for visitors are not enough. Some practical problems, long since solved in most big cities of other well-traveled countries, have yet to be faced in America.

Information service for foreign visitors is scarce. Few adequately staffed information centers exist in our port cities where visitors who do not speak English can learn easily where to go and how to proceed and what is interesting to see in the area. Few hotels have staff people who can speak other languages. Practically no restaurants have menus printed in any language beside English. Few taxi drivers, bus drivers, policemen, and shop clerks have had much experience in helping travelers from other countries.

Even Government immigration and customs authorities have been more carefully taught to take the suspicious approach to visitors than to welcome them and help them on their way.

Prices are usually a shock to foreign visitors used to both lower income and lower costs than their American counterparts—and they don't have the American natives' knowledge of where to find hotels, restaurants, and stores with a moderate price range.

These problems are not insurmountable. The Departments of State and Commerce are working on them. Travel agencies, hotel associations, and transportation firms are beginning to think in terms of what would make travel easier for the visitors from elsewhere.

The possibilities are infinite, and range from the firms directly involved in the travel business to the individual American called upon for extra courtesy if he encounters a stranger asking directions. All sorts of organizations, public and private, might well get into the project of welcoming foreign travelers and helping them see America.

The dividends will extend beyond the dollars the Government is concerned about to some valuable international good will and some interesting experiences for Americans.

Role of Cuba in Inter-American Affairs

SPEECH

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, of course, I am very much in favor of a strong, vigorous, and decisive action against the Cuban Communists and their leader, Fidel Castro. From the very moment this man began to come to power, I felt the need for a strong policy against this Communist leader. In fact, I believe everywhere communism rears its ugly head, it should be fought. "Faint heart never won fair lady," they say, and certainly a faint heart is not going to win confidence, support, and the conquest of the minds of men—freemen—all over the world in our fight against communism.

It is true that Cuba was ruled by a dictator when Batista was in power. I did not like Batista then. Batista, however, was our friend, and certainly it is better to have a dictator opposed to communism than to have the present pro-Communist dictator.

It is obvious Fidel Castro has taken advantage of the interim since his rise to power to build up his armament. The fiasco resulting from the premature invasion of Cuba by exiled patriots shows only too well the fact that the Communists have furnished leadership, military organization, equipment of an ad-

vanced design and large amounts of materiel and supplies to Castro. All of these things under skilled direction made it relatively easy for the Cuban dictator to crush the last spark of opposition of the freedom-loving invading patriots.

With this invasion threat out of the way, the bearded Castro is working to make his island even more of a military bastion. He is now building more military roads, unpacking Russian Mig planes shipped to him from behind the Iron Curtain, unloading more tanks and stocking up his arsenals of arms and ammunition.

Our people sit aloof, 90 miles from the coast of Cuba, waiting for something favorable to develop. During all of this time, the "bearded one" goes about his business of extending the tentacles of communism into every nook of Cuban life. Our people may appear patient at present, but they are greatly disturbed. Should Castro's plans encompass the building of a launching pad for ballistic missiles, our people will not seem so patient. On the contrary, they will reach the point that they will not tolerate communism in this offshore island. The beginning of the actual construction of a missile base in Cuba will demand immediate action from us.

I do not believe anything we have done denies us the right today to apply and enforce the Monroe Doctrine. The time for colonization by the European powers in the New World has ceased. Our Nation first announced over 100 years ago the principle of the Monroe Doctrine and now we should step in and affirmatively show the world that communism is going to be stamped out in the Western Hemisphere as many years ago were the European efforts to colonize Central and South America.

Mr. Speaker, we need a blockade of the ports of Cuba. We need to give active support to the freedom-loving elements operating against Castro. We need to move forward on a line that will show the Cuban people clearly what a monster they have in Fidel Castro as dictator of their country, and we should give support, help, and inspiration to those patriotic Cuban people who want to see their land free, wanting to stamp out the last vestige of communism in the island which America freed from the Old World in 1898.

Shortage of Physicians and How To Solve It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting into the RECORD the text of an address by Dr. Dominick F. Maurillo, entitled "A National Emergency—Ways of Meeting the Physician Shortage," as well as a copy of a letter I am this day addressing to the Honorable OREN HARRIS, chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, calling his attention to the address.

Dr. Maurillo is a member of the board of regents of the University of the State of New York. He has headed several committees of the board of regents in studying medical education in Europe and has made several notable recommendations which have since been adopted. In this address, delivered on May 16, 1961, before the International Congress of Surgeons in Chicago, he makes some very interesting observations on medical education in the United States and suggests way to solve the problem of physician shortage.

His address is as follows:

A NATIONAL EMERGENCY—WAYS OF MEETING THE PHYSICIAN SHORTAGE

(An address by Dr. Dominick F. Maurillo)

For the past 13 years I have been trying my best to prove to medical educators that there really is a shortage of doctors in the United States and something must be done about it.

The Board of Regents of New York State has accepted one important suggestion that was made: they have approved medical education given in Italy, Switzerland, France, Holland, Belgium, and Ireland. Now 400 to 500 American doctors are being graduated every year from the institutions in those countries. I was the chairman of each of the committees which made the study of European medical education and which made the recommendations to the board of regents.

On May 8, 1956, I gave an address before the 150th annual meeting of the New York State Medical Society in which I emphasized the critical need for more doctors. The New York Times, in an excellent editorial on the following day, quoted important parts of my speech and my conclusions.

Congressman FRANCIS E. DORN, of Brooklyn, N.Y., presented to his fellow Congressmen the entire New York Times editorial and a résumé of my speech. This was repeated in the U.S. Senate and recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

On May 29, 1956, Congressman DORN introduced a bill (H.R. 11518) which incorporated all of my conclusions with particular emphasis on the part which suggested that an impartial, disinterested congressional committee be appointed to study the reasons for the shortage of doctors in the United States. This bill has been pigeonholed every year since its introduction as a result of the action of lobbyists.

On March 28, 1957, I delivered a major address on the same subject before the New York State Board of Regents. Copies were sent to all the medical college deans of New York, to all college and university presidents, to all assemblymen and senators, and to the Congressmen and two U.S. Senators from New York State. In that speech, I also stated that specialization in medicine was getting out of control and that 80 percent or more of the graduates of medical colleges wanted to specialize. I then suggested that all specialty education should be controlled by the medical colleges and that a Ph.D. degree should be awarded to each specialist.

In July 1959, I was summoned to Washington to testify in connection with a bill concerning the grant of $50 million a year for international health research. The Congressmen were alerted by my talk to the peril to national health caused by the shortage of doctors and they were urged to amend the bill by adding $50 million a year for medical education. This bill was kept in committee with no chance of passing.

The need for more physicians is common knowledge today. Even the AMA and the deans of the medical colleges admit that our country needs more medical faculty doctors, more research doctors, more full-time doctors for our independent hospital centers, more doctors for public health and mental hospitals and for industrial clinics, more interns and residents, and—most important—more general practitioners for our 180 million people. A very conservative estimate of the shortage of doctors would be 35,000 and this could easily be stretched to 50,000.

Now let us look at the reason behind this critical shortage. Many experts concede that the United States had enough doctors in 1935 for its 125 million people. You must bear in mind that 75 percent of the total number of doctors were doing general practice in that year. Today the percentage of doctors doing general practice is less than 30 percent.

In 1935, 77 medical colleges graduated 5,183 doctors.

In 1950, 79 medical colleges graduated 6,135 doctors.

In 1955, 82 medical colleges graduated 6,845 doctors.

In 1960, 85 medical colleges graduated 7,081 doctors.

I mention these figures to show that in a period of 25 years—and even with the addition of eight new medical colleges—there was an increase of only 27 percent or fewer than 1,900 doctors. This small, inadequate increase does not compensate for the more than 3,500 doctors who die each year.

In 1935, the medical colleges and other agencies doing medical research spent about $1 million of Federal, State, and private money; in 1940, about $5 million; in 1948, approximately $90 million; and in 1960, approximately $730 million. The last sum, $730 million, is more than the total amount of money spent for medical research in the rest of the world.

The Federal Government gave the following amounts to medical colleges in 1960: Harvard, $7,130,919; Columbia, $4,427,285; New York University, $4,772,755; University of Michigan, $4,025,157; the two New York State Medical Colleges, $2,069,087. Each medical college in the United States received upwards of $500,000 in 1960.

The figures are not available, but I doubt that the entire cost of undergraduate medical education in the 85 medical colleges can be more than $125 million a year.

Should there exist such a great discrepancy—$730 million for medical research versus $125 million for medical education? I am not against research work for I am convinced that it is absolutely necessary in our very competitive world. Let us be reasonable. We should not spend such a large amount of money for research without first producing more doctors. Let us not put the cart before the horse. If we want to get full value for the money spent, we should have research doctors who are really dedicated individuals.

Recently we have been reading in the daily newspapers that there are not enough college graduates available for medical education. Here is the record on this score:

Last year, the 85 medical colleges selected about 8,100 students from a list of more than 15,000 students who had been recommended by the premedical faculty committee in each of the colleges and universities in the United States. All these students had been screened during each year of college work and only those with the highest averages were recommended. If the medical colleges want more students, why don't they take more female students? Why this discrimination? Why do females constitute only 5 percent of the total number of medical students? It isn't that way in other countries, 50 percent or more of the doctors in Russia are females. Why are more than 2,300 Americans studying medicine in foreign coun-

tries? It seems to me that the medical colleges should be grateful for the fact that they have a fine selection of students to choose from. I am absolutely sure that more students would want to become doctors if some of the existing barriers were removed.

Russia, with 68 medical colleges, graduates more than 14,000 doctors a year. In 1960, 1,000 doctors were graduated from the University of Paris Medical College. This is about one-seventh of the total number of doctors who were graduated from the 85 medical colleges in the United States in the same year. Let me emphasize this point: these graduates from the University of Paris are well-trained doctors. They are ready to practice immediately after graduation without internship training and I would trust any one of them to do good general practice of medicine in any country in the world.

The Japanese tried our system of medical education. They built 80 medical colleges with an average capacity similar to ours. They have learned their lesson. Today they have centralized and have only 44 colleges. They expect to have only 40 by 1965. Their doctors are better trained today in the larger medical centers. Why? Because the cost of operating small medical centers is tremendous and uneconomical.

What is the best treatment to combat this very critical shortage of doctors in the United States? I suggest two practical solutions.

My first plan:

Congress should pass a bill at this 1961 session and incorporate the following:

(a) Allocate to the 45 private medical colleges $50 million with no strings attached other than the guarantee mentioned below. Beginning with the freshman class of 1962 and at a rate of $4,000 per student for each of 4 years, this money is to be paid to the colleges for the undergraduate medical education of each additional student admitted beyond the total of the 1961 freshman enrollment. The colleges must guarantee the acceptance of 3,125 students above their 1961 enrollment, otherwise the Federal Government will not grant any research money. In this manner, the colleges will produce 3,000 doctors by 1966.

(b) Allocate another $35 million to the 41 State medical colleges on a matching-plan basis; $2,000 of Federal money for $2,000 of State money for each additional student admitted beyond the total of the 1961 freshman enrollment. Likewise, this is to begin with the 1962 freshman class. As for the private colleges, no research money will be given unless additional students are accepted.

(c) Allocate $10 million for medical scholarships on the basis of need and at a minimum of $300 and a maximum of $1,500. This will increase the number of scholarships each year by 2,500.

(d) Set up a fund of $5 million for medical student aid. This fund will guarantee the payment of loans made to students by the banks of the United States and will pay the interest of 6 percent on the loans for 6 years.

This bill will not cost more than $90 million a year after 1966. In 4 years time, it will have produced 6,000 more doctors a year. By means of the scholarship and student-aid plans, it will stimulate college students to enter the profession of medicine. This bill can be financed from the money saved by the Federal Government since it will not add, until 1966, $1 to the present allowance for medical research.

My second plan:

Congress should pass a bill at this 1961 session and incorporate the following:

(a) Allocate $50 million a year to the 85 medical colleges for trisemester undergraduate medical education in 1962. The formula for the best method in which to divide the money among the colleges can be worked out either on the basis of student population, or on the size of the medical college or on the number of doctors to be graduated. This plan was used during World War II and, to the best of my knowledge, it was successful.

(b) Allocate $10 million for scholarship money as in plan I.

(c) Allocate $5 million for student aid as in plan I.

The number of doctors graduating under this plan will depend on whether a new class is admitted each semester or only every other semester. I can assure you that the increase in the number of doctors will be greater than 50 percent.

Now, what would be the cost of adding 30 medical college centers with the capacity to graduate 150 doctors yearly in each college—a total of 4,500 doctors. The money required would be $1½ billion for capital costs and between $150 million to $300 million per year for operating expenses. Isn't this a tremendous and fantastic amount of money to pay for the education of an additional 4,500 doctors a year? It would take 8 years before the first doctor is graduated. Thirty thousand doctors will be needed to operate the 30 medical centers. By 1970, the population of the United States will be 210 million. Where are the doctors to come from who are needed to take care of that population?

My conclusion is that there is no need to study this problem further. We have reached the emergency point. Congress must act now and not next year. I firmly believe that the deans of the medical colleges will accept the first plan. At any rate, either plan is much better than building 30 more medical college centers. It is especially better for the taxpayers who must pay the bill.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 16, 1961.

Hon. OREN HARRIS,
Chairman, Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have the pleasure of transmitting to you a copy of an address by Dr. Dominick F. Maurillo, which he delivered today at the International Congress of Surgeons now being held in Chicago. The title of his address is "A National Emergency—Ways of Meeting the Physician Shortage."

Dr. Maurillo is a member of the board of regents of the University of the State of New York. He has been for many years interested in the field of medical education and the problem of the shortage of physicians in the United States.

His address contains some very interesting information on the problem, as well as statistics explaining the critical shortage. In particular, however, I want to call your attention to his proposals to Congress, beginning at the bottom of page 5 of his address and continuing until the end.

I shall appreciate having your comments regarding his proposals. Do you think that legislation along the lines he suggests should be introduced? Is there such legislation before your committee now? Do you have any other suggestions or ideas in connection with Dr. Maurillo's letter and the proposals he makes? I feel that this is a serious problem which should not be ignored or neglected. Your views in the matter will be of prime importance to me.

Sincerely yours,

VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
Member of Congress.

Luxury Taxes Must Go

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, as the cogent editorial below, from the Livingston County Press, Howell, Mich., argues, the wartime excise taxes on luxuries such as essential toiletries and women's handbags should be allowed to die their natural death. In addition, there should not be a further extension of the 10-percent excise tax on automobiles.

The automobile tax, originally designed during World War II to curb the purchase of passenger cars by pricing them outside the reach of the average consumer has succeeded only too effectively—as the recession demonstrated recently. The monthly unemployment statistics indicate the excise tax on automobiles has been viciously efficient. But, as we all know, these are not times when it is desirable to have efficient production curbs; rather, all barriers to full use of our manufacturing potential should be removed. I am convinced that removal of the excise barrier to automobile sales would be a greater stimulus to our economy than would any artificial measure which has been proposed.

The editorial follows:

LUXURY TAXES MUST GO

Fourteen years ago, come June 30, those wartime excise taxes on luxuries such as toiletries and women's handbags were to have expired. But, as every woman knows, and most men have heard about, these taxes are still with us. In 1954, the tax on these items was reduced from 20 to 10 percent, but if you think this has soothed the gentler sex, just ask one of 'em.

Wherever they gather, in their community groups, the PTA, the women's business and professional clubs, social clubs, the corner drug store and the grocery, one woman tells another and both of them tell their Congressmen. They are bearing down especially on the lady members—2 Senators and 15 Representatives—and on the mere men who constitute the House Ways and Means Committee.

The theory is that the lady members will understand that a woman needs a handbag like a man needs pockets; that you can't get very far in business or social life with a shiny nose and that there's no luxury involved in keeping a bunch of kids clean and polished up. And the committee is getting its come-uppance for repeated failure to clear repeal legislation. But you may be sure no member will be spared the pointed advice of his lady constituents.

The girls are also pointing out that while Congress is so disturbed over "distressed areas" it might give a thought to the "distressed" homemakers, secretaries, career girls and the little girls with their school bags who are still being penalized by a war that was officially over on December 31, 1946. The luxury taxes, they observe, were imposed to choke off sales and production in order to divert the utmost in manpower, machines, and raw materials to the war effort.

While reading his mail, the Congressman might reflect on the probability that more women than men voted in 1960, since there are 3 million more of them who are eligible. Nor should he think that the men, who pay the bills in most households, are disinterested. And now that the women are on the warpath, the men are going to follow.

At least, we always have.

Truth or Most Gigantic Hoax in History?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, shortly after the Soviet Union claimed to have launched Major Gagarin into an orbital space flight on April 12, I urged that an international committee of scientists be permitted to investigate all the facts regarding this Soviet claim. At that time I said it was not my purpose to in any way negate the Russian claim, but I felt an event of such historic importance certainly should be reviewed by some international body before it is accepted by the world as a fact.

I am absolutely amazed at the response my suggestion received not only throughout the United States, but throughout the world. I have in my files editorials which have appeared in many countries suggesting extreme caution in accepting the Soviet claim at face value.

Many of America's outstanding journalists have taken a similar position, and I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues the column of Mr. John C. O'Brien, which appeared in the New World in Chicago, Ill., on May 5. I believe Mr. O'Brien raises some extremely interesting questions that will indeed have to be resolved before we can accept as certain the Russian claim that Major Gagarin actually made the space flight on April 12.

Mr. O'Briens' editorial follows:

TRUTH OR MOST GIGANTIC HOAX IN HISTORY?

(By John C. O'Brien)

Did the Soviet Union actually put a man in orbit, as Premier Nikita Khrushchev claims?

This is a question that has been raised by Averell Harriman, former U.S. Ambassador to Russia and by two or three Members of Congress. Harriman stated recently that he did not believe American scientists ought to accept the Soviet story about its cosmonaut without scientific proof.

But no official spokesman for the Government and no responsible space scientist has questioned the veracity of the Soviet Premier. President Kennedy promptly sent Premier Khrushchev a warmly worded message of congratulation. The director of the siesmological laboratory at the California Institute of Technology, who is a member of the President's Science Advisory Commission, told a convention of newspaper editors recently that "there is no doubt in the mind of any knowledgeable person in this field that the Russians did what they said they did."

But there are knowledgeable space scientists in the Government who are not as convinced as the California scientist seems to be. They say that no one in the Government has any scientific or intelligence evidence as to whether or not the story is true, false, or partly both. All they know for certain is that the Soviet Union had the capability to orbit a vehicle of sufficient weight to contain a man and that U.S. tracking stations did track a vehicle of some sort in orbit, presumably launched by the Soviet Union, on April 10.

The Russians had plenty of reasons for inventing the story about the orbiting cosmonaut. It is common knowledge that they have been laboring mightily to put a man in orbit so as to capitalize on the obvious propaganda advantage such an achievement would give them. They know the United States was working on its Mercury project. They needed some kind of propaganda victory to offset the good impression the Kennedy administration was making among NATO and uncommitted countries until the failure of the ill-starred invasion of Cuba.

To have rigged a so-called man-in-space exploit would have been well within the capabilities of as shrewd and unprincipled a propagandist as the Soviet Premier. He was well aware that to lay a foundation for such a hoax all that he needed to do was put a vehicle in orbit.

The presence of the vehicle in space was the only element of the Soviet claim that could be checked by other countries. The reported return to earth (staged in an area out of bounds for foreign observers) could not be checked by intelligence agents of any foreign power.

The creation of a synthetic cosmonaut and his elevation to the rank of a national hero in a well-staged, emotion-packed, widely publicized demonstration would be child's play for the Soviet propaganda machine. With a controlled press and radio and subservient scientists, it would have been just as easy to fool the Russian people as those of other nations.

The skepticism that has been expressed in this country about the cosmonaut exploit is based mainly on the discrepancies in the stories told by the supposed cosmonaut about his experiences in orbit and in the reports in the Soviet press and on the Soviet radio about the return to earth.

Maj. Yuri A. Gagarin told about observing the strange and startling brilliance of the heavens and sighting coastlines and other configurations of the earth, including arable fields green with crops. A Soviet scientist in Italy said the vehicle which carried Gagarin into space had no openings or portholes. A later version said the scenes described by Gagarin were visible on television. Just how this was done was not explained.

The question therefore arises, why, in view of the known cupidity of the Soviet leaders, the lack of any evidence to support the Soviet claim and the discrepancies in the Soviet accounts of the exploit, the Government has not challenged the Soviet story.

Th answer is that U.S. officials are afraid of being mousetrapped. They fear that the discrepancies were deliberate. The Russians may have planted them, hoping the United States would raise a question.

And if a question were raised, U.S. officials suspect the Russians may be in a position to come forward with the positive scientific proof, as they did when the United States tried to get away with the story that the U–2 had flown only a few miles into Soviet airspace. The Russians, it will be remembered, produced photographs and other proof that the U–2 had flown over the heart of Russia.

American scientists have expressed the hope that the Soviet Government will share scientific information gained on the reported man-in-space exploit. It is possible they may do this and thus remove all doubt about Soviet claims. But if they do not, it may be a long time before we know whether Yuri A. Gagarin was the first man to orbit the earth or whether Premier Khrushchev staged the most gigantic hoax in history.

Man in Today's World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, May 5, Sister Marie Therese, of the Order of the Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur, addressed the Capitol Hill First Friday Club.

Sister Marie Therese is the daughter of the late Anthony J. Dimond, Delegate to Congress from Alaska during the years 1933 to 1944. She is a professor of biology at Trinity College in Washington.

Sister Marie Therese's address, entitled "Man in Today's World," was very timely and provocative. I am certain that it will prove of interest to many Members of Congress, and I wish to place it in the RECORD under leave to extend my remarks:

MAN IN TODAY'S WORLD

(Address by Sister Marie Therese)

No one can deny that our age is critical, probably one of the most critical in Christian times. Father Teilhard de Chardin in his inspiring and controversial book "The Phenomenon of Man" states: "In every epoch man has thought himself at a 'turning-point of history.' And to a certain extent, if he be thought to be on a mountain spiral, he has not been wrong. But there are moments when this impression of transformation becomes accentuated and is thus particularly justified. And we are certainly not exaggerating the importance of our contemporary existences in estimating that pivoted upon them, a turn of profound importance is taking place in the world which may even crush them."

The famous anthropologist, the late Abbé Henry Breuil, is quoted by Father Teilhard as saying: "We have only just cast off the last moorings which held us to the Neolithic Age." Such a statement may seem surprising when we look back at centuries of civilization, but let us examine it. What characterized the Neolithic Age that we are now said to be leaving behind? Again Father Teilhard: "First of all come the incessant advances of multiplication. With the rapidly growing number of individuals the available land diminished. The groups pressed against one another. As a result migrations were on a smaller scale. The problem now was how to get the most out of ever more diminishing land, and we can well imagine that under pressure of this necessity the idea was born of conserving and reproducing on the spot what had hitherto been sought for and pursued far and wide. Agriculture and stock-breeding, the husbandman and the herdsman, replaced mere gathering and hunting.

"From that fundamental change all the rest followed. In the growing agglomerations the complex of rights and duties began to appear, leading to the invention of all sorts of communal and juridical structures whose vestiges we can still see today in the shadow of the great civilizations

among the least progressive populations of the world. In regard to property, morals and marriage, every possible social form seems to have been tried.

"Simultaneously, in the more stable and more densely populated environment created by the first farms, the need and the taste for research were stimulated and became more methodical. It was a marvellous period of investigation and invention."

Such being the case, how does our age differ from the Neolithic? Is it not also an age of socialization and of science? Is it not therefore only a specialization of what was part and parcel of the Neolithic Age? Does not the future hold the almost certain prospect of a further and fuller development of both socialization and science? How than can we agree with Abbé Breuil and Père Teilhard that we have left behind the Neolithic Age?

Perhaps an analogy with our growth and development would be pertinent. One might compare the Neolithic Age to childhood and the last few centuries to the period of adolescence, with its external and internal changes, with its process of physical and spiritual metamorphosis. The adult speaks the same language, eats the same food, offers the same worship to God as does the child, but there is a great difference nonetheless. Language can now express thought and reflection rather than mere observation and logic; food is no longer used for growth, but for consolidation; worship becomes in one sense less personal, in another sense, more personal, for one seems more clearly the absolute transcendence of God, and at the same time realizes more fully the ineffable love of God for man as revealed in Christ.

The socialization and science which characterized the Neolithic Age, out of which Abbé Breuil says we have only recently passed, are certainly the source of what we have today and of what we shall have tomorrow. But there has been a metamorphosis, and we are in the stage of consolidation, of confirmation, of intensification. The adult just out of adolescence has by no means reached his full potentiality: all is not settled by one choice. There are further crises, perhaps externally not so dramatic as that of adolescence, but real and deep and vital nonetheless. One must continue to choose and choose and choose again the same ideal. And as time goes on, if the right choices are made, the ideal becomes clearer, the will becomes more fixed in good, and suffering of any kind seems a small price to pay.

Our period in history, I suggest, is one of early adult crisis.

To summarize Père Teilhard, the whole world has been peopled, and not only that, but the whole world has been brought into communication. Man can no longer be alone physically. We are not alone in our nature, and we are now not alone in our habitation. Father Hans Urs von Balthasar says in his recent book, "Science, Religion, and Christianty": "There is someone else, who is not God, and who has come nearer to (man) than ever before. This is his brother." The crisis of our time is how to love our brother, for in order to live with him, we must love him, and in order to love him truly, we must meet God in him."

At the end of the section of St. Matthew's Gospel on the Univeralism of the Kingdom of God, our Lord describes the last judgment, which He himself will pronounce: "Then the King will say to those on his right hand, 'Come, blessed of my Father, take possession of the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world; for I was hungry and you gave me to eat; I was thirsty and you gave me to drink; I was a stranger and you took me in; naked and you covered me; sick and you visited me.' Then the just will answer him, saying, 'Lord, when did we see Thee hungry, and feed Thee; or thirsty, and give Thee drink? And when did we see Thee a stranger, and take Thee in; or naked, and clothe Thee? Or when did we see Thee sick, or in prison, and come to Thee?' And answering the king will say to them, 'Amen I say to you, as long as you did it for one of these, the least of my brethren, you did it for me.'"

Now it is impossible to do what God wants us to do, to love our brother in deed, without technological development. There can be no doubt that the advance of science is in his divine plan. I should like to consider that aspect of charity in our age.

I think of the story about the old lady who was asked whether she would fly when she went to California to visit her daughter. "Of course not," she replied, "I'll travel the way the good Lord intended us to travel, by train." And I remember a few years ago when cloud-seeding was first being tried for rain production hearing a woman say, "It is almost blasphemous." Well then, so is ploughing a field and planting it; so is digging up coal and drilling for oil; so is practically anything we do.

Technology, of course, is only one aspect of science; the other is intellectual apprehension. One sometimes hears about a rivalry between basic or pure science and applied science. There is no such thing, for far from being antagonistic, they are synergistic. One cannot flourish without the support of the other. Trial and error by itself is a very slow and expensive way to make progress. Concepts, principles—these are the bases of scientific advance. And, on the other hand, there is nothing so effective in demonstrating the truth or falsity of a concept as a concrete application. An absurd example is that of the theoretical physicist (of some years ago) who calculated from the laws of mechanics then known that the wings of a bumblebee are not sufficiently strong to support the weight of the body, and therefore the bumblebee cannot fly.

Now, the primary aim of a research scientist is to know God's creation, to know what is. He wants to know, for example, what the gaseous envelope of Jupiter consists of, what means the bees use for informing the hive of the location of a good field for nectar and pollen. He does not necessarily, however, look for a practical application of his discoveries and may well leave that to someone else.

If I may speak of my own work, which I know best, I want to find out how thyroid activity is controlled in the turtle embryo. As you may know, turtles lay eggs which are like bird eggs. Or rather bird eggs are like turtle eggs, for turtles have been on earth since Permian days, over 200 million years ago, and birds, justly termed "glorified reptiles," are about 50 million years younger. Now the thyroid gland is very active during the last half of the incubation period of the turtle, and apparently it is necessary not only for normal growth but also for hatching. Baby turtles whose thyroids have been inhibited by drugs shortly before hatching time cannot make their way out of the eggshell. I should like to know if there is the same relationship between thyroid and pituitary gland as exists in amphibians, birds, and mammals. Has this any bearing on medicine? I do not know. I cannot see any. But facts of medical importance are found in the most unlikely places: witness the discovery of one of the most revolutionary drugs, viz, penicillin, in a weed in a bacteria culture.

And from a practical point of view, there must be advance in basic research. We cannot love our brother effectively, i.e., we cannot provide food, clothing, and shelter for mankind today without both pure and applied science. For example, increased and more efficient production of foodstuffs requires improved conservation practices, and these in turn depend on knowledge of the life histories of organisms and of the environmental factors which affect them. Not only biology but also the physical sciences must be developed to take care of transportation and preservation of food and safe disposal of radioactive wastes. And then we have opening up before us space exploration with who knows what marvelous discoveries.

There is a danger in the service of our brother, however, as there is in anything man sets his mind and hands to—to be overanxious, to make this thing the exclusive object of our endeavors, to lose sight of other—and at times more important—values.

Our purpose in improving living conditions, in encouraging freedom and respect for human dignity, is not to form a paradise on earth. That is the Communist dream, and only a dream. It can never become a reality because of sin and death. Nevertheless, to quote Father Louis Bouyer in "Liturgical Piety": "The vast misery of war, of starvation, displacement, unrest that afflict so much of mankind today positively prevents great numbers of human beings from hearing the message of the Gospel. And, also, the materialistic spirit of our age, whether in countries primarily capitalistic or communistic, is in its own way at least as effective as misery itself in preventing people from taking the message of the Gospel seriously. One aspect of the work of Christians in witnessing to the mystery in the world is, therefore, the task of trying to alleviate the misery on the one hand, of trying to change the organizations, institutions and ways of life on the other hand, which prevent people from even beginning to face the true problems of human and Christian living."

In addition, the conquest of the universe is a task given by God to man at the time of his creation. "Let us make mankind in our image and likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, the birds of the air, the cattle, over all the wild animals, and every creature that crawls upon the earth." The power to do so was terribly weakened by original sin, but we are living now in the days of redemption, and the conquest of space as well as of this planet can be considered part of the "restoration of all things in Christ."

There is another danger we must be prepared to meet, and that is discouragement arising from temporary failure, for frustration in our endeavors to help others is to be expected, and expected as an integral part of the whole. That does not mean that we should give up all effort; rather, we should accept the immediate failure not as a true failure but as a means par excellence of extending the kingdom of God. Father Balthasar says: "The present and future of Christendom depend on this, whether an Escorial (or monastery-palace) of silent obedience rises again in individuals. The action in a wider sphere as represented by the church's call to the laity will avoid being frittered away in irrelevancies only if the interior spires of invisible cathedrals rise always equally high into the mystery of God. For the Son has not redeemed the world by humanitarian and social works, but by the blood of His obedience shed in apparent frustration on the cross, by which he penetrated beyond the sphere of the social as well as of the personal factors into the nameless and faceless silence of the Godhead which, being three-personal, transcends the personal."

We do not comprehend God—if we did He would not be God—and our knowledge of His will in particular instances is not always clear. He means us to trust Him, whether or not we see. Even the Blessed Virgin, the holiest of all creatures, did not always understand. When the angel announced to her the glorious news that she had been chosen and from the beginning of her existence prepared to become the Mother of the Messiah,

she asked a question, "How shall this happen, for I know not man?" She suffered anxiety at the time of the loss of the child in the temple, and did not understand what Jesus meant by his reply to her complaint: " 'Son, why hast thou done so to us? Behold, in sorrow thy father and I have been seeking thee.' And he said to them, 'How is it that you sought me? Did you not know that I must be in my father's house?' And they did not understand the word that He spoke to them."

But her response to all situations whether she understood or not was "Fiat: let it be done." And the Mother of mankind gives us as directive for our life what she practiced and what she said to the serving men at the wedding feast: "Do whatever He tells you."

What God tells us can be expressed in two words: Love God. Love your brother. And for us today, our brother is not only potentially but actually everybody.

Tshombe Should Be Freed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that our State Department seems to be completely ignoring or else is in complete ignorance of the situation in the Congo, it is refreshing to note that our free press, despite the pressures of the administration, still speaks in a firm, forthright manner on problems of foreign affairs. The Wednesday, May 10, Chicago Sun-Times article "Tshombe Should Be Freed," is a good example of American newspaper reaction to the latest developments in the Congo:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, May 10, 1961]

TSHOMBE SHOULD BE FREED

There can be no excuse for the highhanded arrest of President Moise Tshombe of Katanga Province by the Congolese Government. The announced plans to try Tshombe for the murder of Patrice Lumumba smack of the revenge long demanded by the Soviet Union for Lumumba's death.

Tshombe is openly anti-Communist and a friend of the West. His death, by any pretext whatever, would suit the Kremlin perfectly. And only Russia, feeding on strife and subversion of hopes for a peaceful settlement in the Congo, would profit from the disorders certain to follow harm to Tshombe.

Unhappily, this latest controversy has disrupted a period of relative calm in Central Africa. Ever since the Tananarive Conference, there has been increasing optimism that the feuding Congolese leaders might reach an amicable settlement of their differences.

President Kasavubu, of the Congo State, has been making his peace with the United Nations, accepting U.N. demands for withdrawal for foreign troops and opening the port of Matadi for U.N. supplies. Meanwhile, talks have been going on among the Congolese leaders, including the military, seeking grounds for establishing a federation of Congo States in lieu of a central government.

The steps admittedly have been slow but the signs have been hopeful.

Against this background, it is impossible to understand why Kasavubu has now precipitated a new conflict by ordering Tshombe's arrest and trial for high treason.

Tshombe was attending a conference in Kasavubu-controlled territory and, according to every common law consideration, had a right to safe conduct.

And if the seizure of the Katanga leader was not enough, Congolese Foreign Minister Justin Bomboko poured gasoline on the rekindled embers by announcing that Katanga would be "liberated" from its present leadership. By this, it is supposed he means attempts will be made to force the province back under the Congo Government.

As was to be expected, the reaction from Katanga was ominous. The Elizabethville government bluntly served notice that violence would follow interference in Katanga affairs.

It is true, Tshombe has been at odds with the rest of the Congo hierarchy since he led Katanga out of the central African state last July, and he has been quarreling with the United Nations since as he tried in vain to keep its forces out of Katanga after the dissolution of the Congo Republic. Also, he has not been a strong supporter of a Congo federation, preferring instead, his autonomy at the head of the Congo's richest province.

But these circumstances do not answer for Kasavubu's rash irresponsibility in the present episode, raising the prospect of renewed strife and promising liquidation of a foe of communism.

Before the grim situation is compounded by further foolhardy action, the United Nations should move to secure Tshombe's freedom and his early return to Elisabethville. After a cooling-off period, the Congolese leaders can try to get together again to try to work out the form of a future government.

A delay in positive action at this point by the United Nations could be as damaging to its own prestige as it could be fatal to long-range peace prospects in the Congo.

Memorial by Menominee Indian Tribe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, last week the House of Representatives passed legislation to aid the Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin. This legislation was designed to ease the effects of termination of Federal supervision over the Menominee Indian Reservation which became a reality on April 30, 1961.

The elected tribal delegates who represented the tribe here in Washington during this first session of the 87th Congress have forwarded to you as Speaker of the House of Representatives and to me as their Representative in the U.S. Congress the following signed memorial expressing gratitude on behalf of the Menominee Indian people for the action taken by the House of Representatives.

I wish to express at this time my appreciation to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for supporting H.R. 4130 which was introduced by me to aid the Menominee Indian people. Under unanimous consent, I include the memorial from the Menominee Indian people in the Appendix of the RECORD:

MEMORIAL OF GRATITUDE TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN CONNECTION WITH THE MENOMINEE TERMINATION ACT

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN and
The Honorable MELVIN R. LAIRD:

The undersigned, delegates of the Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin, presently undergoing termination of Federal trusteeship under the Menominee Termination Act, out of a sense of gratitude for the work and efforts of the House of Representatives, express to you, and through you to the membership of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and Members of the House, gratitude for the efforts which have been made to bring about passage of H.R. 4130, as reported in Report No. 272, 87th Congress, 1st session, under date of April 24, 1961. This act, vitally needed to give termination a chance to be successful with the Menominee Indian people, has been brought about through the great care and attention of the sponsor, Hon. MELVIN R. LAIRD, and of the membership of the committee; and it is the purpose of this memorial to accord appropriate recognition on behalf of the Menominee Indian people.

JEROME GRIGNON.
AL M. DODGE.

MAY 12, 1961.

Italian Team Launches Jupiter Missile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to insert into the RECORD a brief article, "New Link in the Missile Chain," by Bob Considine, published in a recent issue of the New York Journal American.

The interesting part about this article is the story about a 10-man team from Italy, who were trained by the United States and recently executed a successful test of a Jupiter missile at Cape Canaveral. The team has since returned to Italy where it will help man a Jupiter missile base as a part of NATO activities. Thus, Italy is fully cooperating with the United States in the defense of the free world and is one of our greatest allies.

The article reads as follows:

NEW LINK IN MISSILE CHAIN

(By Bob Considine)

CAPE CANAVERAL.—In the excitement attending the preparation for America's first manned suborbital lob, sight was lost of the fact that we gained a valuable ally in our spreading network of missile bases.

A 10-man Italian team, trained first in Italy and then given postgraduate work here at this crossroads of the future, planned and recently executed a perfect test of a Jupiter intermediate range ballistic missile. Italians were in every position of control during the fueling of the bird, the incredibly complicated countdown, and the launch. The Jupiter sped 1,500 nautical miles down the test range and hit the proper target area.

The team returned to Italy last week and will be the prime operations group manning a Jupiter base which is already in existence there. The base is part of NATO, and the agreement between this country and Italy is similar to the United States-British and United States-Turkish pacts in respect to missiles. Under this newest pact, the deci-

sion to launch missiles would be made by Saceur—the Supreme European Commander, after due consultation with Washington, Rome, and NATO.

Italian crews will be trained by Americans until such time as Italians can take over the program. All must know or learn to speak English. All are Italian Air Force people.

Despite all the wonders one sees at Canaveral, we still haven't arrived at the stage where a button will take care of our defense problems.

President Kennedy's decision to cut back the B–70 program to the development of a few prototypes is a cause for alarm in many an Air Force general's heart. This 2,000-miles-per-hour manned bomber would be a natural next and perhaps last step in our conventional bomber program, just as B–29's gave way to B–36's and 36's to 47's and 47's to 52's and 52's, in a sense, to 58's.

The blunt truth is that the Air Force believes it is perilous to depend on the reliability of the missiles we now have in being or on the drawing boards. It believes a mix of weapons, some manned, some unmanned, is our best insurance for the foreseeable future.

"I am deeply concerned with the need to maintain a proper mix of weapon systems in our future aerospace forces," Gen. Thomas D. White, USAF Chief of Staff, said before the Senate Armed Forces Committee recently.

"There is no question, for example, that this country's defense posture will be greatly improved by the phase-in of effective and reliable intercontinental ballistic missiles. They are exceptional weapons. Nevertheless, they cannot perform all essential combat tasks. We will have to rely upon manned weapon systems to perform vital war functions which require on the spot, trained human judgment."

Homo sapiens still have a place in this space age. General White put it this way, in his plea for a full B–70 program:

"There are two incontestable overriding mandates for the continuation of manned systems. The first concerns the simple but awesome decision to commit the force. Bomber aircraft can be launched with orders to proceed to and loiter at a prearranged line from which they subsequently can be ordered to attack—or to return. Their operations do not pose the problem of finality of decision which must inevitably accompany the launching of ballistic missiles.

"A second mandate for the manned system concerns the perpetual requirement for operational flexibility. There will be a tremendous premium on systems which can look, and find, and report, and attack, and return, and attack again."

Law of Rightness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, one of the country's greatest and most widely read authors today is Clarence Budington Kelland. His articles, stories, and novels have been read by people all over the world for almost 60 years. The warm, homespun philosophy of his most famous literary creation, Scattergood Baines, reflects the sound commonsense and resolute character of the ideal American. Clarence Budington Kelland is still writing his vigorous, action-packed stories, and they are being enjoyed by millions of devoted Kelland fans in a way that reminds us of Charles Dickens and his following in the early 19th century.

In a special article written for the Arizona Republic, Mr. Kelland has given us one of the finest expressions of good judgment and commonsense for the times in which we live that I have read anywhere. Under permission previously granted, I am inserting his article as follows:

[From the Arizona Republic, May 7, 1961]

LAW OF RIGHTNESS ALWAYS INTERVENES FOR HUMANITY

(By Clarence Budington Kelland)

Let us not succumb to terror or despair.

Since Noah's Ark came to ground on Mount Ararat, thus continuing the existence of human life on earth, there have been many threats of calamity. Again and again malign powers have threatened to engulf the world and to destroy all that makes life precious to mankind.

Again and again terrible men and terrible forces have arisen whose march seemed irresistible and whose powers of destruction seemed to spell ultimate doom. History's tragic pages tell us of dark days when what existed of promise in the world had been shouldered to the brink of disaster, and one more push would hurl it into the gulf.

But always, just as ultimate disaster seemed about to darken the earth, something happened.

The careful perusal of hundreds of books relating the happenings of the past convinces of a great and wonderful truth. That truth made manifest by repetition down the ages is that there exists some law, natural or Divine, which intervenes and confronts every such threat of debacle and says to it, "Thus far shalt thou go and no farther."

This is not mysticism or some eggheaded form of metaphysics; it is fact arrived at by cold logic. It is not a mere groping for solace or hope in a world frightened, bewildered, praying for something to cling to in the darkness.

How does one find truth? He finds verity by experiment, by collecting provable facts, by adding separate facts together until they form a true conclusion.

When the earth came into being there accompanied its birth certain immutable laws. With these laws like the law of gravity, we are familiar. With other physical laws we are acquainted. They are accepted as existing and indispensible. In our laboratories we are discovering new laws of nature every day. Who, then, dares deny that there are laws, imponderable, potent, which are as necessary and is immutable as gravity?

In this piece we wish to propound a very real law, as real as any law of mathematics of physics. And that is the law of the indestructibility of rightness. And the powerlessness of wrongness to do more than threaten for a time until it suffers defeat.

Communism, as exemplified by the military might of Russia and China and their satellites, is such a menace today. The law of the indestructibility of rightness will be the rock upon which these enemies of humanity dash themselves to destruction.

Now to our proofs.

The greatest proof is that we still survive. And what have we survived down the centuries? More dire dangers have threatened us than communism. Out of Asia erupted that great conqueror Genghis Khan with his golden horde. He overran Russia, reached Austria, bade fair to inundate the world. But the Law said to him, "No farther shalt thou go." And he went no farther. He receded, disappeared.

Tamerlane conquered all of Asia, Constantinople, southern Europe, and was but a step away from the conquest of the world. But the Law intervened and he is only a memory today.

The forces of Islam erupted, mastered Africa, poured its armies into Spain. It was on the point of mastering the world when Charles Martel, less potent than the armies of Islam, stopped it at Tours and the world was saved again.

We study Napolean, greatest military genius of all. He had the world all but conquered when madness seized him, and he overreached himself and was halted and destroyed by the working of the law.

And we come to Adolf Hitler, commanding the mightiest military forces on land and in the air that ever have been amassed. Victory after victory perched upon his banners. But he, too, went mad. England miraculously held out until the United States intervened. And this man, crushed, humiliated, took his own life and vanished. The Law had asserted itself again.

Today we face once more the crucial hours. The idealism, the science, the military potency of communism are arrayed against us. They seem to surpass us in science and in production and in the subtle arts of propaganda. They shoot a man into space and win the plaudits of most of the world. The answer to this man into space will not be spoken save by some feeble voice. That answer is "What of it?"

So let us, in this awesome day, remember what has come to pass again and again, and never has failed. Let us be comforted by what thousands of years of history give as ample proof. And that is that there exists a law, natural or divine, which guarantees to us ultimate safety, which guarantees to us and our children and our children's children that rightness shall prevail and that wrongness, sooner or later, shall be hurled down to destruction.

Resolution of Michigan Counties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter dated May 12, 1961, from Mr. Gerard H. Coleman, executive secretary, supervisors intercounty committee:

SUPERVISORS INTERCOUNTY COMMITTEE,
Detroit, Mich., May 12, 1961.

Re S. 986, H.R. 6441, and H.R. 2403.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: In considering S. 986, H.R. 6441, and H.R. 2403 before the 88th Congress, the purpose of which is to make available loans, grants, and Federal faith and credit to further the planning and construction of public facilities in urban areas, thereby increasing the ability of local government to help itself in a properly financed and orderly planned manner in solving urban problems, the supervisors intercounty committee, which represents the six Michigan counties of Macomb, Monroe, Oakland, St. Clair, Washtenaw, and Wayne, respectfully presents the following

resolution for your consideration and whatever action you deem advisable:

"Whereas the supervisors intercounty committee composed of representatives from the boards of supervisors of the Michigan counties of Macomb, Monroe, Oakland, St. Clair, Washtenaw, and Wayne, has been vitally concerned with the inability of local government to finance the planning and construction of public facilities; and

"Whereas there have been introduced into the U.S. Congress S. 986, H.R. 6441, and H.R. 2403, which would make available loans, grants, and Federal faith and credit to further the planning and construction of public facilities; and

"Whereas such facilities are needed for the orderly development and growth of urban areas and are beyond the ability of local government to finance; and

"Whereas these three bills, S. 986, H.R. 6441, and H.R. 2403, will also aid in creating employment in an area in which unemployment is reaching distressing levels; and

"Whereas the supervisors intercounty committee has already developed a partial list of projects which would solve some of these problems, and which would benefit from passage of these bills: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the supervisors intercounty committee heartily endorses and supports Senate bill 986, House of Representatives bill 6441, and House of Representatives bill 2403, as being vitally needed measures which should be enacted, thereby increasing the ability of local government to help itself in a properly financed and orderly planned manner, in solving urban area problems; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Senators and Representatives from Michigan and the National Association of County Officials for their information and use."

Very truly yours,

GERARD H. COLEMAN,
Executive Secretary, Supervisors Intercounty Committee.

The $50 Dividend Credit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, among the tax change recommendations which the administration sent to Congress is one recommending the repealing of the so-called dividend exclusion. I object to that recommendation. The Santa Paula Chronicle of August 24, 1961, contains an excellent editorial, in which it discusses this proposal and points out its fallacies. I commend the editorial to the attention of Senators, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TAX ON SAVINGS

President Kennedy has asked Congress to repeal the 4-percent dividend credit and the $50 dividend exclusion. What's wrong with that? In our opinion, it would remove important incentives for American investors to provide the equity capital so necessary for the sound growth of our economy.

Corporate earnings are subject to taxation before being available for distribution as dividends. And then these dividends are taxed again. This is known as double taxation. The present 4-percent credit offers only a partial relief from this unfair double taxation. Shareowners are therefore being discriminated against taxwise. Many of these investors are saving for their own rainy day, retirement, or other family purposes. They have put their savings in stock of American enterprises.

How well does the average person understand this double taxation? Let's see how it works. Profits of most corporations are taxed by the Federal Government at rates up to 52 percent. The Government again taxes the shareholder at rates from 20 to 91 percent for corporate earnings distributed in the form of dividends. Prior to 1936 this double taxation did not exist for most owners of companies.

In 1954, Congress granted modest relief from this double taxation by excluding the first $50 of dividend income from taxation at the individual level and permitting the tax on the balance to be reduced by 4 percent of dividends from qualifying corporations.

Since enactment of that relief, the number of shareholders has approximately doubled. Today, over 15 million people who own corporation equities benefit from this present partial relief from seeing their earnings pay taxes twice. Repeal of the credit and exclusion would not only be unfair to these 15 million taxpayers, but it could well discourage further equity investment necessary for the sound growth of our economy.

Corporations provide the only means whereby everyone, instead of a few, can readily participate in a growing America. In view of this, it is unfortunate that our present laws discriminate against the corporate form of doing business by taxing company profits and then taxing them again when the net profit is distributed to shareholders, while other forms of business are taxed only once.

The credit and exclusion should be continued to provide modest relief from double taxation for these 15 million owners of corporations. In fact, both should be increased to encourage even broader ownership.

What are your views on this important tax question? If you wish to make known your thinking there is a way. Senators KUCHEL and ENGLE, Senate Office Building, and Congressman TEAGUE, House Office Building, Washington, D.C., are always glad to hear from the folks back home on pending legislation.

American International Academy Fosters Pan Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following speeches delivered April 18, 1961, in Panama City, Panama, at the investiture ceremony of the American International Academy. This fine organization is playing an important role in fostering understanding and cooperation between the peoples of the Western Hemisphere.

Those presented with diplomas as fellows of the Academy were Mr. Nathan A. Reid and Mr. Walter C. Watson—the former a citizen of Panama and the latter of the United States. Our Ambassador to the Republic of Panama, the Honorable Joseph S. Farland, made the presentations to these two distinguished representatives of pan-American friendship.

The speeches follow:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY GEO. W. WESTERMAN, INTERNATIONAL SECRETARY, AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL ACADEMY, ON OCCASION OF INVESTITURE CEREMONY AT KOL SHEARITH ISRAEL, PANAMA CITY, APRIL 18, 1961

His Excellency, the U.S. Ambassador to Panama, members of the diplomatic corps, members of the clergy, representatives of the Governments of Panama and the United States, military and civilian officials of the Canal Zone, distinguished friends, it is especially pleasing to greet, both effusively and cordially, the distinguished friends who have come here this evening to witness a simple ceremony such as the conferring of membership upon two Americans tried and proved in the spirit and ideals of pan-Americanism.

We are conducting this act just outside the week set aside annually for observance of pan-Americanism. Of special significance is the fact that it is being carrier out in the historic city in which the ideal of continental unity, first conceived by the liberator, Simón Bolivar, found its expression in the Treaty of Union signed at the Congress of Panama in 1826.

The purpose of pan-Americanism is to promote friendly relations and mutual understanding among the American peoples, in order to strengthen the peaceful sentiments that have characterized the evolution of this hemisphere.

A principal aim of the American International Academy since its creation in 1898, is ti help in fostering pan-American cooperation and solidarity through membership of persons devoted to the principles of political liberty and human progress. This devotion is what is needed today to give new strength and vigor to the democratic way of life, and it is symbolized in the membership being conferred upon such upstanding citizens as Mr. Walter C. Watson and Mr. Nathan A. Reid.

We are in the midst of a period in which the democratic way of life is being severely tested. An active communism and a sometimes misguided nationalism are competing for the allegiance of the underprivileged, the disgruntled, the weakminded, or the merely dissatisfied. The threat of a third world war and the grim spector of atomic weapons as well as intercontinental ballistic missiles hang over us. Now, man's successes in rocketry and space explorations tend to confound many who are not anchored in their political beliefs or convictions.

In such a world the attainment of the democratic ideal is not something which can await our leisure. Democracy's greatest hope lies in a progressive realization of James Truslow Adams' dream: "That dream of a land in which life should be better and richer and fuller for every man, with opportunities for each according to ability and achievement."

In these days of discord, conflict, and tension we would do well to apply the principles of Pan-Americanism in finding solutions for the tremendous problems of Latin America. Over half of the people of this region are undernourished; nearly half are illiterate. The overwhelming majority are propertyless, both land and natural resources being concentrated in the hands of a few. Over half the working population lives and toils under semifeudal conditions which retard health, welfare, and education. Until the new, more broadly based social, economic, and political equilibrium is achieved,

Latin America will remain an area of turmoil.

The responsibility of what is happening throughout this hemisphere is mine and yours. It involves the abandonment of indifference. It means a closer adherence to the spirit of Pan-Americanism which bids us to dedicate ourselves to the collective achievement of political liberty, social security, and economic prosperity. We must strive to strengthen the imperfections of democracy, by continuing our collaboration on matters of mutual concern both directly and through international organizations, as befits neighboring republics sharing a common faith in freedom, social justice, and Christian belief. We must find a way to live happily together according to the principles of Pan-Americanism, or continue definitely to have within our lives all the agonies of war, hatred, frustration, and desperation.

In order to preserve our democratic way of life we must prove that it is capable of resolving the urgent and undelayable socio-economic problems and political disorders of this second half of our century. No democracy will be able to endure if it is not capable of liberating man from misery, ignorance, and injustice; no democracy will survive if it is unable to satisfy the vital needs of a growing population; no democracy can remain triumphant if it fails to raise living standards to reasonable human levels.

The world today is divided by two great ideological forces. On one side there is the force that thrives on the ills of mankind such as poverty, hunger, disease, illiteracy, unrest; on the other side is the force which seeks to promote man's natural desires for individual liberty, human dignity, personal well-being. It is contrary to all reasonable supposition to conceive that the voters of this hemisphere, in any considerable number, would ever willingly enslave themselves to a system which demands the surrender of individual freedom, renunciation of whatever religion they may hold, or abject subjection to any state.

But the great majority of the voting and nonvoting population of Latin America has already awakened and is definitely on the march. These people demand more active participation in the destinies of their respective countries. They welcome international cooperation but without arrogance and without prejudice. What yesterday was resignation among them is today nonconformity and protest. All of us, then, find ourselves living through the anguish and the urgency of dissatisfied aspirations. To satisfy these aspirations is the task of democracy of our day; or, as President Kennedy said in his Pan American Day talk last Friday: "Our task is to build a society of men and women conscious of their individual identity, of their national aspirations and also of their common hemisphere interests."

Pan-Americanism holds us together not merely because of geographic bonds, but through a system of representative governments dedicated to serve both the desires and interests of their own peoples as well as those of the inter-American community.

I realize that for the continuing vitality of the inter-American system the spiritual, social, political, cultural, and economic progress of all the peoples of the hemisphere is necessary. I share, then, with all of you present the conviction that free peoples who respect human rights, the dignity of the individual, and the equality of nations can, through cooperation, not only preserve their liberties, traditions and cultures but also build a better and fuller life for themselves and their children.

May I take this opportunity on behalf of the Academy to express our thanks to His Excellency, the Ambassador of the United States to Panama, for his participation in this evening's activity. His presence here has once again demonstrated his genuine desire to promote the highest degree of good will among the peoples of the Americas. In direct contrast to the characters portrayed in the novel, "The Ugly American," Ambassador Farland has undoubtedly earned himself the title of "The Handsome American," by using his many talents to win friends and influence people to the glory of the country he represents.

Our sincere thanks to—

Mr. Ralph de Lima, president of Congregation Kol Shearith Israel, for the privilege of using this hall;

The gracious Miss Emily Butcher who seemingly has not yet learned to say "No" when it comes to cooperating with her gifted musical groups;

Pfc. Bertram L. Monroe and his accompanist, Sgt. William Johnson III, both of the 79th U.S. Army Band, for their willing instrumental contribution;

Rabbi Nathan Witkins and the Reverend E. S. Alphonse for their spiritual offerings;

Col. John K. Eney for the spontaneous cooperation of his USACarib office;

Members of the diplomatic corps accredited to Panama; officials from this country as well as the Canal Zone and military command; and to all our distinguished friends.

This evening in the name of the American International Academy we assemble here in this sacred edifice to bear witness to an expressive act of mutual understanding and good neighborliness. May we all reaffirm our faith in the eternal truths upon which pan-Americanism is founded, and from which flows all the strength and the greatness of our inter-American community. May we also keep shining and unsullied before us the essential value of being good neighbors.

REMARKS OF WALTER C. WATSON ON BEING MADE A FELLOW OF THE AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL ACADEMY, APRIL 18, 1961

The Honorable Dr. Westerman, Your Excellency Ambassador Farland, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, the honor of accepting the awards presented to Mr. Nathan Reid and myself this evening has been given me. Though I sincerely believe that this task should have been entrusted to my fellow honoree whose qualifications as a public speaker excel mine by far, at his insistence I shall attempt to carry out this assignment and I plead for your indulgence.

Dr. Harry Cohen, of New York City, provost of the American International Academy, is personally known to me. He is a man in public life who holds that it is the duty of all citizens of the United States to help strengthen the links which join our country to the Republic of Panama. And, in practice, he does everything in his power to foster good will toward Panama and its citizens. I feel sure, you all agree with me, that his organization has done the cause of pan-Americanism a great good by the appointment of a Panamanian of the distinction and merit of Dr. George W. Westerman as its international secretary. On behalf of my fellow honoree and myself, we most heartily congratulate Dr. Westerman on this additional honor which has come to him and of which he is most deserving.

The last person from this Isthmus of Panama to have been made a fellow of the academy was Doña Ester Neira de Calvo, of the Pan American Union, in Washington. She followed into this organization such distinguished Isthmianites as Second Vice President Heraclio Barletta, Ambassador Eusebio Morales, Eduardo Ritter Aislan, Miss Isabel Mendoza, former vice minister of education, and Don Hugo C. Bycroft, well-known civic worker.

We are proud to follow in this line and to be associated with the men and women of this hemisphere identified with the American International Academy because of their adherence to the ideals of Pan-Americanism. This list includes such dignitaries as ex-President Harry Truman; ex-President Manuel A. Odria of Peru; Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt; Gen. Ulysses S. Grant, grandson of President U. S. Grant; Gen. Lewis H. Hershey, U.S. Director of Selective Service; Gen. Carlos Quintanilla Quiroga, Bolivian Ambassador to the Holy See; Dean Eudore Dubeau of the University of Montreal; Bishop Benjamin Eckhardt of Canada, Rector Luis Garrido of the University of Mexico; Chancellor Rufus B. Van Kleinsmid, University of Southern California; Ambassador Jose Gabriel Navarro of Chile; Congressman George A. Dondero, Senator William H. King, and numerous others.

We are grateful to you, Dr. Westerman, for having made this momentous occasion in our lives possible. Your recommendation that we be honored in this way invokes within us great pride and profound gratitude. Through you we extend our heartfelt thanks to that eminent citizen of the world, Provost Harry Cohen, and to the academic council for the confidence they repose in us. We shall always strive to be worthy of this trust and shall endeavor to live up to the high and noble ideals of the Academy of which we are now proudly a part.

A wise woman once wrote that gratitude is much more than a verbal expression of thanks. "Action," she said, "expresses more gratitude than speech." In other words she implied advice was that we let our gratitude be known by what we do.

By continuing in our circumscribed and unspectacular way to foster good will and human brotherhood we hope to prove worthy of this tribute to ourselves and our respective communities.

May I here observe that our great American President, John F. Kennedy, who is following in the footsteps of the immortal F.D.R., has given new meaning to the words of F.D.R. who in 1933 gave birth to the good neighbor policy, stating:

"In the field of the world policy I would dedicate this Nation to the policy of the good neighbor."

Years of bitter trial have proven that this is the only policy which can bring peace and harmony to our relations with each other. But, this policy must be the result of actions and not words. We must commit ourselves, all of us—Americans from North, South, and Central regions—to dedicate all of our time, energy, and effort to making it a reality.

As Dr. Westerman so eloquently stated in his opening address, the human race is now passing through one of its greatest crises. Never before have we passed through a period of greater challenge to our democratic way of life. It is a challenge to those of us who recognize democracy as a force to be used and not a form to be served.

Despite the claims of those who would impose their totalitarian ideology of communism upon us, no existing form of government is better equipped than democracy to build bridges of understanding between man and man, and between one people and another, without regard to race or creed.

The ideological struggle has become critical as a result of the unparalleled progress during the past 40 years in controlling man's relations to the physical world. The tragedy of this tremendous progress in the control of the physical world is that no corresponding progress has been made in the understanding of human relations. This tragedy has brought us to a crisis. The accelerated progress during the past 40 years in understanding and applying the physical sciences has brought about a shrinking of the world, whereby we are living next door to peoples who do not understand us and whom we do not understand;

and it has brought us also a strain upon the capacity of the individual citizen to evaluate world events.

This strain stems from the increased velocity in the change of public opinion. Never before in the world's history has the individual citizen been given so little time in which to reappraise his relationships to other peoples in the light of changing events. No longer does he have an appreciable time lag between the reporting of one news event and another in which to reflect and come to a deliberate conclusion. The increased velocity in the dissemination of news has inevitably brought with it an increased velocity in the change of public opinion.

Because of all this I repeat that our only hope lies in the fulfillment of the good neighbor policy. We owe it to ourselves and the world at large to unite in bonds of common brotherhood and properly to present a united front against those who would, by force or intrigue, impose their totalitarian ideologies upon us. We must build bridges of understanding between man and man, between people and people.

How shall we build these bridges of comprehension so essential to our democratic way of life? I readily admit my limitations to speak authoritatively on the subject but it is obvious, even to my layman's mind, that the avenues immediately at hand are the approaches of government to government and people to people. We build bridges of understanding when we act with reasonable deliberation in appraising our neighbors.

We who are members of the free democracies must approach the problem of this troubled world with an inspired hope and a determined courage, not with the pessimism of Diogenes. It is said that when he was about to die, he asked to be buried face downward because the world would soon be upside down anyway. We, with an inspired hope and faith in our heritage, must convert the problems of today into opportunities for human service.

How shall we build bridges of human understanding between man and man? By a ready acknowledgment that although contemporary values and goals shift and change with changing conditions, there is a set of universal standards by which we must govern our conduct and which include: justice and fair dealing, honesty, truthfulness, observance of covenants, recognition of regularly constituted authority, due regard for the rights and feelings of others, cooperation and mutual assistance, disposition to carry one's load, tolerance, respect for individuality and mutual respect.

How shall we build bridges of understanding? By being imbued with the spirit of being our brother's keeper, regardless of his race, creed, or color, and by not restricting or isolating man from man by walls of prejudice, bigotry, or intolerance.

AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL ACADEMY INVESTITURE CEREMONY, SALON ABRAHAM D. MELHADO (KOL SHEARITH ISRAEL), APRIL 18, 1961

CITATION

Nathan A. Reid

Supervisor of a vital U.S. naval installation in the Canal Zone; a citizen of the Republic of Panama who, through his years of social contribution, has been helping to achieve for the Isthmian community the abundant life in things material and the noble life in things spiritual; a man of conviction without bigotry; courage without pugnacity; self-respect without vanity; regard for human dignity without bombast; a crusader for the democratic ideals embodied in Pan-Americanism.

It is my pleasure to present you with a diploma as a Fellow in the American International Academy, and to confer upon you the Star and Cross of Academic Honor of that organization.

AMBASSADOR FARLAND.

Walter C. Watson

Supervisor of a vital U.S. naval installation in the Canal Zone; a citizen of the United States who, through his years of social contribution, has been helping to achieve for the isthmian community the abundant life in things material and the noble life in things spiritual; a man of conviction without bigotry; courage without pugnacity; self-respect without vanity; regard for human dignity without bombast; a crusader for the democratic ideals embodied in Pan-Americanism.

It is my pleasure to present you with a diploma as a Fellow in the American International Academy, and to confer upon you the Star and Cross of Academic Honor of that organization.

AMBASSADOR FARLAND.

The New York Mirror Series on Italian-Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wsh to insert into the RECORD the concluding two articles in the series on eminent Americans of Italian origin as published by the New York Mirror. The article in the issue of Sunday, May 14, 1961, is about John F. Cuneo, head of the well-known Cuneo Press, one of the largest printing and book publishing companies in the world. The article in the issue of Monday, May 15, is about the Nobel Prize-winning physicist Dr. Emilio Segre.

The series thus described highlights in the lives of eminent Italian-Americans in various fields, such as the judiciary, education, politics, literature, science, the business world, and others. It merely proves once again that no group has a monopoly on good, or evil. All groups in this country have made notable contributions to the growth and development of America, and it is the contributions that are important not the misdeeds of the few in each group which give it a bad name.

The New York Mirror and the authors of the series, Miss Ara Piastro and Harry Atlshuler, deserve to be commended for helping to dispel prejudice. The articles referred to above are as follows:

[From the New York Mirror, May 14, 1961]

THE CUNEOS: EMPIRE BUILDERS

(By Ara Piastro and Harry Altshuler)

When Mrs. O'Leary's cow kicked over the celebrated lantern on October 8, 1871, starting the Chicago fire, there already was another less spectacular flame burning high in that city. It was the Cuneo family, blazing with energy.

The first of them in this country, Giovanni Batista Cuneo, came from Genoa in 1847 and settled in Chicago, while his brother Andrew trekked on with the pioneers to California. Giovanni was a successful businessman, and his son, Frank, in his turn built up a large wholesale fruit business and developed real estate interests also. He is remembered as the founder of Chicago's Cuneo Memorial Hospital.

The third generation appeared to take another turn. John F. Cuneo, born to Frank and his wife Amelia on December 24, 1885, was a bookish lad—with an unsuspected gift for salesmanship. He went to the private University School in Chicago, then tackled an engineering course at Yale, but his real interest was in books, particularly those with fine bindings. He didn't want to go into his father's business.

Engineering, he decided, held no genuine lure for him unless it was connected with making books, preferably beautiful ones. He went back to Chicago and started a small bookbinding firm. Then he had to fling himself into the business world, to get contracts to keep the plant going.

He did it so successfully that Cuneo Press, Inc., now is one of the world's largest printing and book manufacturing establishments. Recent volume has been at the rate of $60 million a year. The company occupies almost 3 million square feet of space in Chicago, besides large plants in Philadelphia, Milwaukee, Los Angeles, Kokomo, Ind., and Weehawken, N.J.

It has 6,200 employees. It prints and binds practically every type of printed matter. Each month its presses roll out more than 32 million copies of magazines for various publishers, and more than 83 million rotogravure newspaper supplements.

Besides books and magazines, the company prints millions of catalogs, trade publications, labels, and even railroad timetables. It is also one of the major producers of Bibles.

Cuneo never let his growing interest in business distract him from his first love, fine bindings. He still collects them, as well as rare first editions and Italian primitive and renaissance paintings. His painting collection has been exhibited at the galleries of Notre Dame University.

After his marriage in 1930 to the former Julia Sheppard, he established a farmhome at Libertyville, Ill., as a place to relax. But Cuneo's idea of relaxation was to stock the place with purebred cattle, and before long he was involved in a dairy business, Hawthorn-Mellody Farms, which has grown almost as large as his printing business. It now runs dairies and ice cream plants across the country from Kansas City to Buffalo, and Cuneo permits himself one joyous boast: "we make the best ice cream in the world."

In both World Wars, the country called on his services, putting his wide knowledge of the graphic arts to work, in the first one as associate chief of the Labor Department's poster division, and in the second as a member of the War Labor Board's advertising section.

He and his wife have two children, John Jr. and Mrs. J. C. Bowes, and two grandchildren.

In both Chicago and Libertyville, the indefatigable Cuneo is active in community affairs. In a self-effacing way, too, he has devoted much help to charitable organizations. One of them is a foundation he established which gives scholarships for educational and scientific purposes.

He has received Papal decorations as a Commander of St. Sylvester of the Grand Cross, Knight of Malta, and Knight of the Equestrian Order of the Holy Sepulchre.

He is a director of a big Chicago bank, the Continental Commercial, and chairman of the executive committee of National Food Stores. But this emphasis on the worldly and bodily needs of man has never made him lose sight of his prime interest: the printed word, which feeds the mind.

[From the New York Mirror, May 15, 1961]

THE NOBLEMAN IL DUCE OUSTED

(By Ara Piastro and Harry Altshuler)

When he stood before the august Swedish Academy to accept the Nobel Prize in physics for 1959, Prof. Emilio Segre quoted a line from Dante:

"Tu se' lo mio maestro e il mio autore."

"Thou art my master and my author," he said of the late great physicist Enrico Fermi, under whom he had studied. "I learned from him not only a good part of the physics I know but above all, an attitude of constant devotion to science which has affected all my work," Segre explained.

No one could ever doubt Segre's devotion to science and the questing, questioning spirit of man.

In other sorts of circumstances, his devotion has been less wholehearted. Mussolini, for instance, could never get the man to knuckle under. He was director of the physics laboratory at the University of Palermo, and already a famous man in 1938, when the Duce kicked him out of the job.

Segre sailed for America, a new life, a new career, and greater triumphs.

He was born in Tivoli, a suburb of Rome, on Feb. 1, 1905, and attended schools in Tivoli and Rome. Entering the University of Rome as an engineering student in 1922 he soon transferred to physics and took his doctor's degree as Fermi's first doctoral student in 1928. After 2 years of compulsory service in the Italian Army, he returned to his studies, teaching and working closely with Fermi.

Then came the abrupt shift of scene in 1938. Dr. Segre went to the University of California at Berkeley, first as a research associate in the radiation laboratory and then as a lecturer in the physics department. From 1943 to 1946—the crucial years in the development of atomic energy—he was a group leader in the Los Alamos Laboratory of the super-secret Manhattan District. In 1946 he returned to the University of California as professor of physics and still holds that post. He became a U.S. citizen in 1944.

To scientists, the bibliography of his more than 120 published papers on such topics as "Quantum Theory of Fluorescence" or "Nuclear Radii from Antiproton Measurements," is vastly exciting.

Some of his scattered paragraphs, however, are in simple powerfully beautiful language that gives the average man a glimpse of the measure of his mind.

Comparing the roles of theory and experiment, he wrote recently: "We know the human mind is less imaginative and fertile than nature; that experimental confirmation is a prime necessity in the physical sciences."

And again: "The postwar years have seen the opening of the purposeful study, experimental and theoretical, of the 'elementary' particles and the beginning of the exploration of the subnuclear world. Theory and experiment in strong and continuous interplay have both contributed to the at least partial elucidation of the new domain. But the same thing that happened to Columbus, who, when seeking the route to India predicted by the geographers, discovered America instead, has repeated itself several times in the subnuclear world. Continuing this figure of speech, I may say that the continents discovered by the explorers considerably outnumber the predictions of the geographers."

Together with other scientists, Dr. Segre discovered the elements technetium and astatine, and plutonium 239 with its fissionable properties.

His recent work has been on the antiproton, which was only a theory of the English physicist Paul Dirac until Dr. Segre and his California colleague, Owen Chamberlain, actually discovered it. It was for this work that Segre and Chamberlain shared the Nobel Prize. It has vast implications concerning the symmetry of the universe, what matter is really like, and even what strange things may be in store for men if they ever go out amid the stars.

Dr. Segre and his wife, the former Elfriede Spiro, have a son Claudio, and two daughters, Amelia and Fausta.

His work in his laboratory, his teaching not only at Berkeley but also in New York, Illinois, Rio de Janeiro and elsewhere, has furthered man's eternal quest into the nature of the universe and the elements that compose it.

Commuter and Other Passenger Services on the New Haven Railroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRESCOTT BUSH
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, one of the major problems facing the people of Connecticut, and especially residents of Fairfield County, is the deterioration of service by the New Haven Railroad. This problem is an urgent one to some 30,000 people who must use the railroad to commute to their jobs each day.

The Honorable ABNER W. SIBAL, of the Fourth Connecticut District, which embraces all of Fairfield County, has introduced in the House of Representatives a bill proposing an interstate compact in which Connecticut, New York, and other affected States would unite to bring about an improvement in commuter and other passenger services by the New Haven Railroad. I hope that Representative SIBAL's excellent suggestion will be given serious consideration by the States concerned and by the Congress, which must give its consent to the proposed compact.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. SIBAL's bill, H.R. 6705, may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with an editorial from the Westport Town Crier entitled "Unsolved Problem," which comments favorably upon it, following these remarks.

There being no objection, the bill (H.R. 6705) to grant the consent of Congress to the States of Connecticut and New York, and other affected States, to enter into a compact relating to the taking of action to bring about improvement in commuter and other passenger services of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad, and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the States of Connecticut and New York, and any other State affected by the commuter and other passenger services of the New York, New Haven, and Hartford Railroad, to enter into a compact designed to aid in the maintenance and improvement of such services of such railroad in the States which are parties to such compact, and such compact, among other things—

(1) shall provide machinery necessary for the determination of the need of such railroad for public funds and the uses to which such funds should be put;

(2) shall contain provisions to insure that any public funds made available would be used to improve commuter and other passenger services;

(3) shall provide for financial participation by each State which is a party to the compact; and

(4) shall provide for giving the public a voice in the policies of such railroad insofar as they relate to commuter and other passenger services.

SEC. 2. No such compact shall be binding or obligatory on any party thereto unless it shall have been ratified by the legislature of each State which is a party thereto and shall have been approved by the Congress of the United States.

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is hereby expressly reserved.

UNSOLVED PROBLEM

Congressman SIBAL'S proposal for an interstate authority as a further step toward solution of the commuter problem in States served by the New Haven Railroad comes as a timely reminder that the matter of the New Haven is by no means finished business.

It is true that the legislatures of three out of four States have approved multimillion-dollar tax concessions designed to aid the railroad. The commuters have coughed up with still another 10-percent fare increase. Not only, however, do a number of the other points in the agreed-upon program await implementation, but the overall economic climate assures that the emergency program itself will not be enough.

It will be recalled that the four-State emergency project involved State aid, which is partially arranged for; commuter contribution, which was first to come; Federal aid in the form of repeal of the tax on passenger transportation, for which the Kennedy administration has shown no enthusiasm; and a program of improvement of service on the part of the railroad, which is hardly visible as yet.

Even these, however, do not strike at the heart of the problem. Thanks largely to the system of super highways that has been developed—and is still being developed—the New Haven's freight revenues are not likely to rise to the former level. Even with the tax concessions, it is not at all certain that carrying commuters is not, per se, a losing proposition. This combination can only mean continued financial distress for the railroad and continued pressure on commuter service.

It was all to the good that our lawmakers, finally and belatedly, stepped in and performed an emergency bailout for the New Haven. The fact is, however, that they did so without adequate background information and with no real plan for the future. They failed entirely to answer the really basic questions: Will it be possible to continue commuter operations under private management, or should the public take a hand? Is the present operating management adequate? How feasible are plans for complete operating reorganization, such as the Baldwin-Towers proposal?

These are just a few of the questions that must be answered. The time to look for those answers is now, not when the next severe crisis raises its ugly head. Connecticut has suffered from Ex-Governor Ribicoff's 6-year neglect of this problem. It is encouraging to see freshman Congressman SIBAL urging a look ahead. He deserves the Legislature's support.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Massachusetts Lauds National Commander John E. Erickson, Veterans of World War I, U.S.A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include part of my remarks delivered at a dinner in honor of John E. Erickson, national commander of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., held under the auspices of the Department of Massachusetts in the town hall in Stoneham, Mass., on Sunday evening, May 14, 1961. Department Commander Edwin Hayden Lombard was toastmaster of the evening:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE THOMAS J. LANE, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Greetings, in my travels—from barracks to barracks—I have noticed a special spirit that distinguishes the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., from other veterans' groups.

Like them, we are united by shared memories.

And we have our own legislative program.

But more important than these—in some respects—are the strong social ties that transform comradeship into friendship.

This closer relationship is evidenced by the warm welcome that we give to our national commander, John E. Erickson, here in the hometown of Department Commander Edwin H. Lombard.

Stoneham sent many volunteers to serve with the famous 26th Yankee Division. That was one of the first to fight in 1917, and earned one of the best combat records in the American Expeditionary Force.

Stoneham has a long tradition of service for freedom, beginning with the farmers and tradesmen who fought a short distance from here, at Bunker Hill, and Concord and Lexington.

This area is rich in patriotic traditions.

That spirit was exemplified on May 5 of this year. Our neighbor from Derry, N.H., less than 40 miles north of Stoneham, became the world's first true astronaut as he operated the manual controls of the space capsule named "Freedom 7" 115 miles above the earth.

What inspired Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr., with pioneering courage?

It was the example of his parents and his community.

His father served in World War I, and World War II.

In the years between and since, he made it a daily custom to fly the American flag outside his home, and outside his downtown business office.

His son grew up as a participant in this moving ritual. Patriotic reverence for the flag, and the ideals that it symbolizes, developed the courage and the faith in freedom that we admire in Commander Shepard.

As veterans of World War I, we feel that we are related in spirit to this brave young officer of the U.S. Navy.

Our active service ended long ago but from that experience we learned a continuing devotion to what is best for our country.

There are some people with no faith in anything but themselves who seize upon the slightest pretext to discredit the veterans and the organizations that represent them.

It was our turn to be the target a short time ago when some newspapers carried the report that the veterans of World War I had spent over $200,000 in lobbying for a separate monthly pension for all veterans of the First World War. This made us out to be "Mr. Big" among all the lobbies.

Our guest of honor, National Commander Erickson, promptly exposed the false charge that our organization had spent more money on lobbying efforts in 1960, than any other of the 283 groups who must report on these activities to the Congress.

As a matter of fact, we had only spent $31,000, including items that did not have to be reported, such as the purchase of office equipment and miscellaneous outlays.

We knew that our organization was growing rapidly, but we also knew that it was not so prosperous that it could spend more money on influencing legislation than the National Association of Manufacturers, for example, or any of the other powerful lobbies.

Although the truth is that we spent $31,000 instead of $200,000 for this purpose, the charge that was subsequently disproved shows that some people on the outside are "jumping the gun" and are apprehensive about the actual progress we are making.

For this growth we give credit to the energetic leadership of Comdr. John E. Erickson.

Last year we had a membership of 170,000.

It is expected that the total will pass the 200,000 mark, by the time of the national convention in September.

In the name of the 67 barracks in Massachusetts with returns still coming in we thank our national commander for his hard work and his success in building up the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A.

I think that some of his ancestors must have come from Massachusetts, because Commander Erickson typifies the patriotism, the courage, and the determination of the Massachusetts officer of World War I who gave us this battle cry: "The command is forward."

One Hundred and Seventieth Anniversary of Polish Constitution of 1791

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRESCOTT BUSH
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, on May 7, 1961, the Polish American Congress, district of Connecticut, passed a resolution in conjunction with the commemoration of the 170th anniversary of the great Polish Constitution of 1791. The resolution reaffirms the deep patriotism of the membership of the Polish American Congress and outlines certain views on our relations with Poland which is now suffering under Communist tyranny but whose people still long for freedom.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas 170 years ago, a handful of Polish patriots gave Poland its great constitution of the 3d of May 1791.

We today, bowing to the past, resolve as follows:

1. Aware of the danger confronting the United States from the international Communist conspiracy, we raise our voice in concern and alarm. The time for appeasement at the expense of the freedom of other nations is over, as well as coexistence of wishful thinking by free world politicians with Soviet duplicity and a cold-blooded policy of aggression.

The new frontiers of the United States are the boundaries of the free world. Let us make sure they do not shrink. Let the grave words coming from the Nation's Capital find understanding in our hearts, and let us inspire those at the helm of government by our attitude of firmness and readiness to endure the sacrifices which the time ahead may require of us. It is time for reappraisal, and for a policy of boldness carried into the Communist-dominated world.

The recognition de jure by the United States of Polish western territories and the Polish western borders on the Oder and Nysa is necessary. It would be a strong blow at the link of delusion forged by Communist propaganda, which is scaring Eastern European nations, chained to Soviet Russia by fears of a rebirth of German imperialism, that would be fostered by an unthinking American policy.

2. We are reaching the millenium of the Polish nation. In captive Poland, this will be the occasion for mass propaganda that will distort the Polish past and glorify the Communist present. It is to us here in the free United States to show to the world the true face of Polish history and of Polish culture.

We call on Polish-American organizations and the clergy of Polish descent to join us in this task, and work for the rebirth of the Polish language and culture among Polish-American youth.

Let us not be misled by Communist propaganda smuggled into the United States under the cloak of cultural exchanges. We call on the Government of the United States to close Communist agencies which spread Communist literature and broadcast news inspired by these agencies under a cultural cover.

Those ruling Poland on behalf of the Kremlin, by their unfriendly attitude toward the United States, are endangering the future of American aid to Poland.

We understand the concern of American legislators willing to help the Polish nation but not its regime. We must remind public opinion in this country that the Communist regime in Poland is not the legal Government of the Polish Republic. The test of legality is the same on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean; it is the will of the people expressed by free elections and not the will of the Soviet Politbureau sanctioned by the

concessions given Russia at Teheran and Yalta.

A nation which lost millions in the last war fighting for freedom does not need to be reminded what freedom is. A nation experiencing 16 years of Communist rule does not need to be lectured about the evils of communism. Let us save this kind of talk for those in this country who watch Communist inroads into the free world with indifference.

The Poznan uprising of 1956 proved that Poles are willing to fight againt all odds for ideals they cherish. Yet nobody has the right to call for bloodshed behind the Iron Curtain who is not ready to back eventual uprising by armed intervention. Let us remember that the gallant Hungarian nation received no other help than words of sympathy.

We hail the Polish nation that is resisting Communist oppression under her spiritual leader, a great Pole and a great Prince of the Church, Prince Primate Cardinal Wyszynski.

4. We send greetings to our friends, the captive nations. Let us forget about what divided us in the past and look to the future.

We do not recognize any territorial change or annexation brought about forcibly in Eastern Europe. We are sure that freed from communism, Poland and its neighbors will be able to solve their problems peacefully.

5. We greet the Cuban nation and express our sorrow that events have postponed her liberation from the Communist yoke. In the end justice will prevail, and Cuba will be free from its Communist-selected masters.

6. We hail the great American victory in space flight. The achievements of freedom are on behalf of freedom, and for the glory of mankind. We warn that Soviet Russia is reaching for outerspace for warlike purposes.

In adopting this resolution, we call on all Polish-Americans to dedicate themselves to the high principles and ideals expressed in the Constitution of the United States and the Polish Constitution of the 3d of May 1791, and to be ready to bear all the sacrifices they may require of us.

So, may God help us.

Long livè the United States.

Long live free and independent Poland.

Proposed by the Polish-American Congress, District of Connecticut, at Hartford, the 7th of May 1961.

Germany Teaches The U.S.A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN KYL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker on Wednesday, May 17, the Washington Daily News carried an eloquent editorial of tremendous impact:

GERMANY TEACHES THE U.S.A.

U.S. economic advisers increasingly are embarrassed by contrasts between America and West Germany—persistent unemployment here as against a labor shortage there.

Scripps-Howard Writer Roger Stuart has dug up a long-secret report which helps explain the embarrassment.

The report was made by a team of U.S. economists and submitted to the West German Government September 24, 1951. On the U.S. team was Prof. Walter Heller, now chairman of President Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers.

Some of the recommendations:

West Germany was told it couldn't achieve the necessary rate of industrial expansion if it kept on worrying about inflation. The government was chided for an "excessive concern for price stability."

However Dr. Ludwig Erhard, West German Finance Minister, knew something about inflation. He had seen his parents' life savings lost when the mark went to pot. He rejected this advice.

Dr. Erhard also was told by the U.S. advisers that "a rate of interest high enough to stimulate any large volume of personal savings would seriously curtail investment." But German interest rates were left to find their own high level and so were savings and investment. Today West Germany is investing up to a quarter of its national output annually in the most modern industrial plant in the world.

Dr. Erhard was cautioned against liberal depreciation policies and advised instead to adopt a "compulsory investment program." But liberal depreciation policies helped the German economy grow last year at the rate of 10.8 percent. The U.S. rate was less than 3 percent.

Just 15 years ago West Germany was a defeated and demoralized nation, its resources squandered by Hitler, its factories and homes flattened by bombs. Since then it has taken in more than 12 million refugees. It has imported nearly half a million more and still has a labor shortage.

Average wages have doubled in 10 years and still are climbing. And increases mostly are in true values because of effective measures against inflation.

West Germany last year lost fewer than 40,000 man-days thru strikes. We lost twice that many on missile bases alone. German wage raises have come out of increased productivity—8 percent last year. German prices have been kept competitive in world markets, thus rapidly expanding foreign commerce.

The Germans, in short, have followed the historic principles of free enterprise—despite the advice they got from the United States. Even the West German Socialist Party has repudiated socialism.

The general theories of the 1951 report, rejected by the Germans, are the general theories now being urged on America by Professor Heller and other Adminisration economists: big spending and even budget-busting tax cuts, which breed inflation; artificial restraints on interest rates, which discourage saving and encourage Americans to export jobs by investing abroad; gimmicks in the form of tax "incentives," instead of adequate depreciation allowances.

Somewhere in all this may be found a clue to our "creeping rate of growth," so roundly deplored in the campaign. Now Professor Heller wants us to follow some more of our own bad advice.

The Monroe Doctrine and the Situation in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Is the Monroe Doctrine Dead?" from the Palladium-Item, Richmond, Ind., of April 28, 1961. The editorial deals with the relation of the Monroe Doctrine to the Cuban situation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Palladium-Item and Sun-Telegram, Apr. 28, 1961]

IS THE MONROE DOCTRINE DEAD?

Indiana's U.S. Senator HOMER CAPEHART has come forth with the kind of spunk that often is found in Hoosier citizens.

He has taken the position that our Government has absorbed about all the nonsense it should swallow in connection with the Cuban situation.

The Senator favors sending our troops into Cuba to throw out the Communists if that is necessary to free the Cuban people of a Red dictatorship and to provide greater protection for our own people.

He points out the Monroe Doctrine has been violated by the Soviet Union. And the Senator declares that our country has all of the evidence it needs to show that Cuba now has become a satellite of Red Moscow.

He cites the millions of dollars in war materials which has been sent into Cuba by Communist countries to enable pro-Communist Fidel Castro to keep his people in bondage and at the same time be prepared against an attack by the United States.

Castro forces have been trained in Red Czechoslovakia, which country also has shipped in arms to bolster Communist forces in Cuba.

The time has come for action if our hemisphere is to be kept free. We should put up or shut up in the case of Cuba and its practice of communism within 90 miles of our coast.

Castro's government supported by Russian Dictator Khrushchev has adopted the firing squad to eliminate those who oppose him.

He has become the counterpart of Adolph Hitler, the Nazi leader in Germany who murdered by the millions those he chose to wipe out. Castro also recalls to mind Benito Mussolini, the Fascist dictator of Italy.

Hitler ended his own life hiding out from allied troops in World War II, and Mussolini was caught by the Italian people he betrayed, and as a result was hanged by his heels by those who destroyed him.

Our Monroe Doctrine has been scrapped by former President Eisenhower and President Kennedy.

That doctrine voiced by James Monroe, our fifth President, stated that our country would regard as an unfriendly act any move by a European nation to interfere in the affaires of, or increase its possessions in the Americas.

The wishy-washy modern leadership we have found in the White House has rightly won for us insults and contempts. We have put into mothballs principles vital to the preservation of our republic.

The question today is how long we can follow this course and still remain a free people.

Chicago Regional Port

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article written by Nick Poulos, of the Chicago Tribune, in the issue of May 4, 1961, and an editorial

appearing in the May 6, 1961, edition of the Chicago Tribune:

CALUMET HARBOR SITE PICKED

(By Nick Poulos)

Union Tank Car Co. will invest $17 million to build a huge bulk liquid terminal at Lake Calumet harbor, the port of Chicago's main ocean shipping facility, it was announced yesterday.

The terminal will be built on a 177-acre site at the harbor entrance and will handle such products as petroleum, animal fats, vegetable oils, and chemicals carried by ocean and lake ships, inland waterway barges, rail tank cars, and tank trucks.

The project, a giant step in the development of the port as a world shipping center, was announced at a city hall press conference by Mayor Daley, Edwin A. Locke, Jr., president of Union Tank Car, and Floyd G. Dana, chairman of the Chicago regional port district.

WORK STARTS MAY 15

Locke said work on the terminal project will begin May 15 and predicted that the first storage tanks will be ready for use by the end of the current shipping season which ends in late November. Union Tank Car plans to spend $6 million in the next 12 months. The entire project, Locke said, will take 10 years to complete.

Daley said the terminal will mean additional trade, commerce, and employment for the city.

INCLUDES PACKAGING PLANT

The terminal, he added, will permit oversea steamship lines to establish express freighter service between Chicago and Europe with voyage time cut down to about 10½ days. Availability of the bulk liquid facility will guarantee return cargoes for incoming ships, he said.

The ultimate capacity of the storage facility will be 200 million gallons. The terminal also will include a plant for packaging liquids.

The first stage of the development will include preparation of the site, most of which is now under water. The channel area will be dredged, land filled in, and bulkheads and docks built to handle both ships and barges.

DEVELOPED BY SUBSIDIARY

The bulk liquid terminal will be developed by a new Union Tank Car subsidiary, Bulk Terminals Co. Union Tank Car, which owns and operates the largest fleet of rail tank cars in the country, recently acquired Bulk Terminals for cash. The new subsidiary held a long term lease with the port district for the site.

The port district has developed the existing dry cargo facilities at Lake Calumet at a cost of $24 million and plans a $30 million expansion program.

BEST EQUIPPED PORT

The attractiveness of Chicago as a port will be greatly enhanced by the building of a bulk liquid terminal costing $17 million at Lake Calumet Harbor. No tax funds will be used for the project; it will be built by the Union Tank Car Co. on 177 acres leased from the Chicago regional port district. When fully developed the new facility is expected to pay the district $75,000 to $100,000 a year in fees.

Ever since the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway, Chicago's port has been handicapped by the lack of a terminal where petroleum, animal fats, vegetable oils, and chemicals could be loaded and unloaded by ships, barges, and railway tank cars. Such products were taken aboard by vessels in the oversea trade but the makeshift facilities made loading slow and expensive. With the new terminal, Lake Calumet will be the best integrated port on the Great Lakes, equipped for handling all kinds of cargo efficiently.

The willingness to commit $17 million in private capital to this development should make it easier for port district officials to float another revenue bond issue for harbor works. The district gets no money from the taxpayers. A $24 million revenue bond issue was sold to build the first group of facilities. Arrangements now are being made for a new $30 million bond issue which will provide for doubling the wharves and cargo sheds and erecting another huge grain elevator.

Lake Calumet is the only place on the Great Lakes where ships from the lakes and seaway can exchange cargoes with the barges of the Mississippi Valley waterways. It cannot fail to become a great center of world commerce.

George Norris Centennial Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. KEFAUVER. Madam President, at noon today before the George Norris centennial celebration luncheon held at the Willard Hotel, a very excellent address was delivered by George Meany, the president of the AFL–CIO, which deserves the consideration of all Members of Congress and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD at a separate place from that of Mr. Sorenson.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a very great privilege, and one that I appreciate, not only personally, but as a spokesman for the labor movement—to take part in this centennial tribute to Senator George Norris.

In the last day or so, you have heard a great deal about Senator Norris and his contributions to American life as we know it today. You have gotten most of the history of his battle for natural resources, and especially the TVA. You have gotten some insight into his character and his principles.

I cannot improve on the points made by Secretary Udall and Mr. Sorenson, among others. I want to take as my theme—in the broadest sense—a few words from a statement by Senator Norris himself, spoken to a staff meeting of TVA people in Norris, Tenn.

The Senator was then near the end of his career—and his life. He saw, at long last, the realization of his dream; he saw the dawn of a new day just as his days, as he knew, were nearly over.

So he told those TVA people, "You are working for a new world."

That's what he wanted; a new world; a better world.

That's what we want, too. And I think we can take heart from the story of George Norris.

As he himself says in his autobiography, we are talking about a man who began his political life as a McKinley Republican.

However, the record shows McKinley Republican or no, that Norris quickly responded to Theodore Roosevelt's challenge to the Nation on conserving our resources; and once aroused, he never lost faith, he never quit, he never let the issue drop during all the years of drought that followed.

I want to take a long leap in time, now, from the newly educated McKinley Republican of, say, 1904 to the silver-haired statesman who cosponsored the Norris-LaGuardia Act of 1932.

What a leap that was for George Norris, the McKinley Republican. For that matter, what a leap it would have been at that time for a Cleveland Democrat.

But at that time, it seemed to be no real leap at all. It was the logical outcome of more than 30 years in the people's service; 30 years in which George Norris had learned much, not only about forests and water and electric power, but also about the greatest natural resource of all, the American workers.

You have already heard about the dams, the power projects and all the other monuments to George Norris. You have heard about the power trusts, the big businessmen, the private profiteers that he—a McKinley Republican, mind you—fought and defeated.

Let me tell you something about injunctions.

We had injunctions—granted by the Federal courts without hearings, that flatly violated the first amendment to the Constitution.

They not only told pickets where and when and how to picket. The told strikers when and if they could meet; they told preachers what they could preach; they decided everything before the union ever had a day, or an hour, in court.

Under these injunctions, the employer was always right. The strikebreaker was the respectable citizen; the striker, though he might have been fourth generation in the community, was always wrong.

What led George Norris of Nebraska, even at that time a living legend, champion of the small farmer, to join with a brilliant but erratic Congressman from New York, in a measure to end such injunctions for a purpose that had nothing to do with farming and very little to do with Nebraska?

There is only one answer, conscience.

This, I think, offers a lesson to all of us.

We bring into the world each year, and into Congress every 2 years, a substantial quantity of McKinley Republicans—good people, three generations behind the times, who sincerely believe that diligence, thrift, rectitude, and respectful worship are of themselves a guarantee of individual prosperity.

They also believe, as young George Norris believed, that the rich and powerful can be relied upon to do the right thing to uplift the unfortunate and protect the weak.

George Norris learned it just wasn't so.

George Norris learned that the rich and powerful did indeed oppress the poor—that the rich wanted to control power sources, mineral rights, mining claims, and all the rest for their own benefit, regardless of the public interest.

Against this background it was much easier for George Norris to understand the motives of those who sought injunctions against trade unions. They were cutting down people instead of trees; they were draining away men and women instead of watersheds; but the purpose was the same—private profit at the people's expense.

It seems to me this offers an example for us today. In the case of George Norris, the old saying proved itself: "Truth is mighty and will prevail." But it's not an automatic process.

People can be educated to see the light.

We, and I speak of the liberal community as a whole, have a tendency to be defensive these days. We who are older, we who survived the great depression, realize that the new generation cannot possibly appreciate our experiences.

They're sure it can't happen to them; and they are right. They are right—because we planned it that way. That's our contribution to society; and I think we can be proud of it.

But we can't sit back and be content. We are the victims of our own success; and George Norris would be the first to tell us so.

The great struggles for human progress are never really won. They must be fought over and over again—not just at intervals, but all the time.

Certainly there appeared to be good reason to believe, in the thirties, that TVA and the principles it represents were permanently established in our country.

Yet only 20 years later, TVA was under siege by a conservative administration; not a frontal attack, but an encirclement, aimed at strangling it.

Happily, TVA survived. But let us keep in mind that the motto of the last administration was, "Let's never do anything like TVA again."

I say we can't be content with a victory that barely preserves something we already have. We can't set our sights on maintaining the status quo. Just trying to stand pat is a formula for defeat.

A moment ago I drew a parallel between Norris' fight for public power and his sponsorship of the Norris-LaGuardia Act. Just as the forces of reaction tried to throttle TVA, and have blocked efforts to duplicate it elsewhere, so have they hacked away at the Norris-LaGuardia Act.

The antiunion injunction is not dead, not by any means. In some parts of the country, injunctions are issued by State courts that match anything we suffered before 1932. The ingenuity of management lawyers has circumvented the established policy of the United States as set forth in Norris-LaGuardia.

My point is that in the two great areas identified with George Norris, we have not moved ahead; we have not built upon the foundations he created; we have been pushed back.

And what is our answer? Too often it is simply an effort to regain the lost ground, to get back to where we were.

All over the country, and in this city, perhaps more than others, there are hundreds, and indeed thousands, of good people who look back to the heady days of the New Deal; who wish for a return of the Wagner Act, the PWA, the CCC.

There were giants in those days, they say. If we could only go back to that atmosphere, everything would be all right.

It's a temptation to think in those terms, especially as we grow older. But it's a mistake; the kind of mistake that is holding us back right now.

We ought to be looking ahead, not back. We ought to be looking at the jobs that were still left unfinished by Franklin Roosevelt, George Norris, and others who did so much.

Let me give you a small but specific example.

In 1920, more than 40 years ago, George Norris was taking an active part in the debate on the Federal Water Power Act. One of his special interests was the Potomac River.

It would be illuminating to all of you to read what Senator Norris said at that time.

He was proposing an amendment to the bill to authorize the construction of a dam at Great Falls, both for water supply and the generation of hydroelectric power.

As usual, he had done his homework. He told the Senate that the water power possibilities of Great Falls had first been explored by George Washington. More than a century then passed. Then there was a whole succession of studies, in 1894, 1903, 1904, 1907, 1909, 1911, 1913, and 1916.

As Norris told the Senate, "I presume it has been investigated more in detail than any other water proposition in the whole world and as far as I know, without exception, where an investigation was through, the result was favorable and a recommendation was made that the waterpower at the falls should be developed."

I wonder what George Norris would say about the Potomac River now? How much water has flowed under the 14th Street bridge since he made that speech in 1920? And what kind of water is it?

George Norris would be ashamed of us, and disappointed in us; not just because of the Potomac, but because of the Missouri, the Connecticut, the Colorado, and many more.

He would be disappointed in us on other issues, too.

He would be shocked that in 1961, a liberal—or, to use a word more common in his day, a progressive—could be defined as a fellow who was trying to protect the achievements of George Norris.

What is progressive, he might ask—about the issues of 30 years ago?

What is progressive in an effort to turn the clock back?

I am afraid George Norris would find it hard to understand us. Thanks to him and to others, we have a base to build on. Thanks to him and to others, we have political strength far beyond that of the little band of dedicated liberals who fought a rearguard action against the reactionary forces of 1920.

Yet how are we using this legacy? How are we exerting our strength?

We are not raising a standard for men of good will to follow. We are full of good will ourselves; we are full of good intentions; we are motivated by high principles. But we have lost some of the boldness that is the very essence of progress.

I think I know as well as anyone the reasons why this is so. We have our daily problems—troublesome, important, time consuming. They have to be resolved.

So it is hard to be a visionary, a man who looks a hundred years ahead, at 5 o'clock in the afternoon, when you have spent all day on problems that came up yesterday or the day before, and must be settled by tomorrow.

Regardless of that, all of us, in Government, in labor, or wherever we may be, have to make that extra effort.

Let us think about our country and our society, not as it is; not as it might have been if George Norris, Franklin Roosevelt, and the rest had been as immortal in body as they will be in history; not as something to be restored, but as something to be created.

The remedies of yesterday have little meaning for tomorrow. They will not enlist the minds and hearts of the new generation. By today's standards, going back to Roosevelt—either one—is little different than going back to McKinley; and if that's the direction we're heading, it can well be argued that McKinley's era was a more tranquil and a happier one.

No, we must do better than that. We whose struggles began just as those of George Norris were nearly over must maintain our own tradition as well as his.

We must look to the Nation and the world as they ought to be—peaceful, prosperous, and free; with nature's bounty harnessed for the good of all; with an ample living for all men, and with all men able to rise unhindered according to their talents; a world of justice, order, and law; a world of charity and human kindness.

You may say "Utopia"; but so was TVA to George Norris a scant 40 years ago.

We need more such Utopias; and more people who are determined to give them reality. We can offer no other meaningful tribute to the man we are honoring today.

Business Freedom and Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Roger Stuart, as it appeared in the May 16 issue of the Washington Daily News, shows how government economic meddlers can be wrong. By not following the advice of the U.S. economists, headed by Dr. Walter W. Heller, President Kennedy's Chief Economic Adviser, in 1951, the Bonn Government, with liberal depreciation policies, built up a firm prosperity remarkably free of inflation.

The Committee on Ways and Means is now conducting hearings on the President's tax message. Weaved in, throughout the message, are these same false trumpets of the economic planners headed by the same Dr. Heller. I feel that, as in the case of Germany, if sensible depreciation policies are allowed to American businessmen, with their ingenuity and without governmental direction, they can raise this country to new and lofty economic heights.

The article follows:

EMBARRASSED ECONOMIC PHILOSOPHERS—GERMANS PROSPERED WHEN THEY REJECTED U.S. ADVICE

(By Roger Stuart)

A 10-year-old report and analysis of the West German economy is the "button" in a childish game of concealment now being played by the State Department.

The 446-page document was prepared by a Marshall plan team of U.S. economists in 1951 and was submitted to the German Minister of Finance with recommendations for action.

When the State Department was first asked about the report officials said they could not find their copy. Later they admitted it was in the files, but said it couldn't be released because its classification was uncertain. (It was recently declassified from "secret.") However, information about the advice was readily available from other sources.

Why do State Department officials trying, despite the reports' declassification, oppose disclosure of its contents? The answer apparently is twofold:

First, because it would reveal how poorly advised were the Germans by the team of American economists, since the extraordinary prosperity that has been achieved under practices which were precisely the reverse of what the report advised.

Second, because those who prepared the report include economists now helping to shape the Kennedy administration's multibillion-dollar program of Federal action and controls.

The Marshall plan team of 1951, whose prophecies were to prove so wrong in the case of West Germany, included Prof. Walter Wolfgang Heller, now serving as chairman of President Kennedy's three-member Council of Economic Advisers.

Mr. Kennedy made it clear before his inauguration last January that the council would become "a key element within the Presidential Office".

The President-elect said the CEA would "deal not only with the state of the econ-

omy but with our goals for economic progress." And he was leaving it to the chairman, he said, to find ways and means "of providing us with the best possible staff assistance and advice in the major fields of economic and social policy with which the administration will be concerned."

Among other things, Dr. Heller and his 1951 teammates told Dr. Ludwig Erhard and his Finance Ministry that West Germany couldn't achieve the necessary rate of industrial expansion if it kept worrying about inflation.

A certain amount of inflation wouldn't hurt, it was suggested, and the Germans shouldn't "confuse war time inflation with the normal operations of peacetime credit."

Moreover, the newly organized ministry was told that it had an "excessive concern for price stability" and was "overly timid" in allowing the creation of new credit.

But Dr. Erhard knew from bitter experience in the catastrophic days following the First World War what terrible things might occur as a result of runaway inflation.

"We shall continue to resist inflation," he declared. And West Germany, to its great good fortune, did.

The report, calling for easy money, said that "a rate of interest high enough to stimulate any large volume of personal savings would seriously curtail investment."

Nevertheless, West Germany maintained its high rate of interest—and watched both personal savings and investments grow.

Rather than grant industry liberal depreciation allowances, a compulsory investment program should be put in force, said the American fiscal advisers, adding that "the nostalgic hopes * * * looking toward a revival of the 19th century role of the capital market plays no such role in any modern country and there is no prospect that it will."

Dr. Erhard, who had studied his economics under a professor whose slogan was "free enterprise is the essence," saw to it that West Germany kept its liberal depreciation policy. Industry expanded rapidly, and the country prospered.

By the end of 1951, John J. McCloy, U.S. High Commissioner for Germany, was able to report that already a transformation had occurred which might almost be called a miracle, and he added:

"West Germany has largely reestablished itself as a solid, productive country. Its production has increased from 1947 threefold, until it has become the second largest industrial producing country in Western Europe."

The steady growth and development since then provide one of the brightest pages in the history of free enterprise—anywhere and in any age.

Honor for Mr. McGowen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call to the attention of the Congress a fine article from the Shreveport Times, Shreveport, La., paying tribute to a great American, Mr. N. C. McGowen, chairman of the board of directors of the United Gas Co.:

HONOR FOR MR. MCGOWEN

Support of youth activities is the measure of a man's faith in the future of his country. Few Louisianians have given such practical expression of that faith as has N. C. McGowen, chairman of the board of directors of United Gas.

Mr. McGowen's 20 years of quiet absorption with 4–H leadership programs—not only in Louisiana, but in Mississippi and Texas as well—was capped with national honors at the recent 4–H conference in Washington. With six other Americans, he was named "Partner in 4–H," the highest recognition the clubs can bestow.

His encouragement of 4–H leadership as well as active financing of attendance at State and National training programs, were cited by American 4–H leaders. Back of the citation lie 500 paid trips for "4–H'ers" of 3 States since 1948, and a 20-year program of raising the rewards of youths investing in livestock competition.

Mr. McGowen's lifelong interest in youth activities was transformed into constructive concern when he attended a junior livestock show at the Louisiana State Fair in the early 1940's. That concern was carried over into the community activities of United Gas, and the 4–H activities of Mr. McGowen and the company intertwined in a program which has grown steadily since 1942.

That year, Mr. McGowen instituted United's vigorous program of bidding up also-ran junior livestock entries at the State fair.

Since 1948, "4–H'ers" from Louisiana, 328 from Mississippi, and 84 from Texas have been given expense-paid trips to conferences aimed at preparing them to be better farmers.

The many 4–H clubs of the tri-State area have just reason to rejoice in the recognition of their benefactor for his many years' support of their cash enterprises and farm training. The Times joins them in paying tribute to the humanitarian and civic concern which inspired the United Gas 4–H program.

J. Edgar Hoover, Guardian of Internal Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to include an editorial from the Nashville Banner, Nashville, Tenn., entitled "J. Edgar Hoover, Guardian of Internal Security."

Mr. Hoover began his 38th year as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation on May 10, 1961. No other citizen has contributed more to law enforcement and public security than this dedicated American and I hope the entire membership will take time to read this splendid tribute to this great public servant.

The editorial follows:

J. EDGAR HOOVER, GUARDIAN OF INTERNAL SECURITY

For more years than the average American—being under 37 years of age—can remember, a basic agency of internal security has been under one great public servant. He is John Edgar Hoover, director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Wednesday he began his 38th year in that capacity—in which he has served, note it, under six Presidents.

A remarkable tenure, yes. In far more ways than one. Significant for its length, that in itself attests to the quality of service which has led these Chief Executives one by one to retain him at this helm.

It was on May 10, 1924, that Mr. Hoover accepted the assignment at the urgent request of the late Harlan Fiske Stone, who had just been named Attorney General. He stepped from the ranks to that position, and immediately began the overhaul from which emerged an FBI of standards commanding confidence and respect. He rebuilt it from the ground up.

Whether it was the hoodlum element of professional gangsterism preying on society, or subversives, boring from within to overthrow this Government, the Nation's public enemies have found in J. Edgar Hoover and his organization an uncompromising instrument of law and public security. He has defined them, identified them, hunted them down, and brought them to book.

The Nation breathes easier, with the FBI on guard.

He has avoided political pitfalls, and kept the operation of this primary arm of law enforcement within the legal limits. Dedicated to that, he has blocked all idea suggestive of creating in it a national police force. He has, indeed, helped train local police, the Nation over, for their own jobs of law enforcement, through a police academy that is the best in the world.

By and large, those who are enemies of J. Edgar Hoover are elements with designs upon the United States of America.

At the age of 66, he still bears with distinction—and heroic devotion to duty—an unsurpassed burden of responsibility. The finest tribute is the public knowledge of a job superbly done; the continuing call for his stewardship, and the pattern of a service to guide any successor when the time comes, as eventually it will, to entrust this key security assignment to other hands.

Farmers Home Administration Operating Loan Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I share with all of my fellow Members of both parties, those representing urban districts as well as those of us representing predominantly rural areas, a deep feeling of concern about the cost-price squeeze in which our farm families are caught. As a result of rising costs on the one hand and declining prices of farm products on the other, many farm families have exhausted their capital and credit.

The Farmers Home Administration operating loan program has provided the credit to stave off bankruptcy for many thousands of farm families but the unprecedented demand for this type of credit, which is available only when other normal credit resources are exhausted,

has depleted the funds available to the Farmers Home Administration for making these loans.

Recently, I addressed a letter to Mr. John Baker, Director, Agricultural Credit Services, U.S. Department of Agriculture, to inquire as to the status of the funds available for this purpose. In order that my colleagues may have the benefit of the reply to this inquiry, I would like to include as part of these remarks, my letter to Mr. Baker and Secretary of Agriculture Freeman's reply thereto:

Mr. JOHN BAKER,
Director, Agricultural Credit Services, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BAKER: I am concerned about the possibility that the very heavy demand by farmers for operating credit from the Farmers Home Administration may exceed the funds available.

Since FHA operating loans are available only to growers who are unable to obtain needed credit elsewhere it would be most unfortunate if farmers were forced into bankruptcy because of unavailability of this kind of credit. This would be even more distressing in view of the hope that the income from farming is on the uptrend.

In this connection I noted Secretary Freeman's recent statement that to the extent that farm loan policies and available funds can prevent it, no qualified farmer will be required to give up farming because of his inability to finance his 1961 operations.

I am concerned, however, about the phrase "to the extent that farm loan policies and available funds can prevent." I would appreciate it, therefore, if you will advise me as to the amount of operating loan funds now available for loans to new applicants, and also your best estimate as to when these funds will be exhausted. If your estimate is that the funds will be inadequate, I would also appreciate being advised the amount of additional funds that you estimate will be required to meet the needs for this kind of credit during the remainder of this fiscal year.

In addition, I would appreciate being advised as to the amount of funds which you estimate will be needed to meet this type of credit need for fiscal 1962, and how that amount compares with the amount requested in the administration's budget.

Relative to the phrase "farm loan policies" in Secretary Freeman's statement, I would appreciate your comment on any anticipated changes in the lending policies which have a bearing on the operating loan funds which will be needed for 1962.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., May 11, 1961.

Hon. FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STUBBLEFIELD: This will acknowledge your letter of April 11 concerning the Farmers Home Administration operating loan program.

In the fourth paragraph of your letter you requested us to advise you as to the present status of operating loan funds and the amount of additional funds that would be needed for the remainder of the fiscal year. As you know, the Department made available in February an additional $35 million for operating loans from the contingency fund authorized by the Congress. This was the full amount remaining in that fund for the 1961 fiscal year. As a result of this increase, the amount available for operating loans for the 1961 fiscal year totaled $232,100,000. During the 1960 fiscal year $197,100,000 was used for operating loans.

Even though additional funds have been made available for operating loans this year, the funds for initial loans are now nearly exhausted. Thirty-four States have already discontinued processing initial operating loans due to the lack of funds. The remaining States also will find it necessary to discontinue processing initial loans in the near future. A limited amount of operating loan funds has been reserved to meet the subsequent loan needs of indebted borrowers for the remainder of this fiscal year. This is necessary in order to protect the interests of both the borrower and the Government by enabling the borrower to continue with his farming operations.

There has been a substantial increase in the applications for initial operating loans during the 1961 fiscal year. Such applications were up approximately 21 percent for the fiscal year by the end of March as compared to last year. Applications received during the month of March in 1961 were 70 percent greater than during March of 1960. Many other agricultural lenders also have experienced a similar increase in demand for credit from farmers this year. Many factors are involved in this increased demand. The major ones seem to be the high cost of farm inputs, the narrow margin between income and expenses, the increased mechanization required on farms, and the need for making major adjustments and improvements in farm operations in order to assure a profitable return.

With respect to your question concerning expanded credit policies, we wish to advise you that one of the factors in the increased demand for Farmers Home Administration operating loans was the expansion of the agency's credit policies in March of 1961. This was done to make credit available to more small farmers who needed such assistance to continue their farming operations in 1961. This policy should be continued next year and will further increase the demand for operating loans during the 1962 fiscal year.

The substantial increase in applications for operating loans and the recent estimates received from field offices indicate that it might require up to $20 million in additional funds to meet the demand for these loans during the remainder of the 1961 fiscal year.

You raised a question in your letter with respect to the amount of operating loan funds which will be needed for the 1962 fiscal year. The estimates referred to above, along with the accelerated trend in applications, indicate that it may require $300 million or more to meet the need for operating loans during the 1962 fiscal year The budget of the previous administration had recommended a total of only $160 million for operating loans for 1962. When the present administration took office, a thorough review was made of the need for loan funds for Farmers Home Administration programs as well as the need for funds for other programs of the Government. The President submitted a budget amendment on March 20, 1961, in House Document No. 112, recommending an additional $72,100,000 for operating loans for 1962, or a total of $232,100,000. In view of the needs of other high priority programs, and the competition for limited budgetary resources, the President did not consider it possible to request all the funds proposed by the Farmers Home Administration. However, budgetary needs and resources are under frequent review, and I am sure that if the President finds it possible to recommend additional funds for loans he will do so.

We appreciate your interest in the activities of the Farmers Home Administration. Please be assured that we are interested in meeting the credit needs of qualified applicants to the maximum extent possible under the authorities and resources available through the Department.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN.
Secretary.

Proposed Presidential Citation for Oskar J. W. Hansen for Accomplishments in the Field of Sculpture and Art

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, on January 23, 1961, Representative BEN F. JENSEN wrote a letter to the President of the United States, praising Mr. Oskar J. W. Hansen now of Charlottesville, Va., as the sculpture of Liberty, and requesting that he be given a Presidential citation and the Medal of Merit for his accomplishments in the field of sculpture and art.

Fifty-two Members of the U.S. Senate, and 12 Members of the House of Representatives joined with Mr. JENSEN in this communication, and I ask unanimous consent that the body of this letter, with the signatures and my remarks, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 23, 1961.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In 1910 Oskar J. W. Hansen was 18. He wanted to become an American. In a rough sea and the dark of night he dived over the side from a foreign ship and lived to make the beach on the Carolina Banks "By the Dawn's Early Light."

The United States has come into being through attrition of folks who preceded Oskar onto those self-same beaches. These in time collected their forces at Yorktown. When the news of October 19, 1781, reached Philadelphia, our First Congress authorized a monument in commemoration of the alliance and victory which had given to our country both hope and a future. It is this very monument which Oskar restored and completed with his magnificent sculpture of Liberty in order that, the will and obligation of the First Congress could be dedicated at long last on behalf of the President, by the Secretary of the Army, on October 19, 1957.

I have known Oskar many years. His renown as a sculptor and person both at home and abroad, has advanced with the growth and prestige of our country. Secretary Harold Ickes wrote about his sculptures at Hoover Dam that he had "completed the most difficult task ever assigned to an artist." There Oskar built a monument which is competent, imaginative and unique. He won this Government commission in a national competition with all his peers. The astrophysical data and star diagram preserve a basic thesis for projecting our national skill into space. Kindly note the abstracts in the pictorial record which may be had on request from the sculptor.

The Constitution covers all Americans like a seamless robe. It heals our inadequacies and adds luster to our defense of right. It was available to Oskar when he regained consciousness on that beach. At Yorktown we have written into the granite after his name a noble phrase: "Sculptor of Liberty." This is what he did: This, above all, is the sum of his life.

I now wish for myself and my fellow Americans a pause to consider the strong

bond that binds us together as we face the future. For that reason, and because it is proper, I urge that you, Mr. President, give a Presidential citation and the Medal of Merit to the Sculptor of Liberty.

Respectfully and sincerely yours,

BEN F. JENSEN.

I concur in what BEN JENSEN has written.

CARL HAYDEN, U.S. Senator; SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, U.S. Senator; ALAN BIBLE, U.S. Senator; HARRY F. BYRD, U.S. Senator; J. W. FULBRIGHT, U.S. Senator; EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, U.S. Senator; KARL E. MUNDT, U.S. Senator; PAUL H. DOUGLAS, U.S. Senator; A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, U.S. Senator; HENRY M. JACKSON, U.S. Senator; HOWARD W. CANNON, U.S. Senator; LISTER HILL, U.S. Senator; GEORGE A. SMATHERS, U.S. Senator; FRANK E. MOSS, U.S. Senator; JOHN A. CARROLL, U.S. Senator; WARREN G. MAGNUSON, U.S. Senator; FRANK CHURCH, U.S. Senator; STEPHEN M. YOUNG, U.S. Senator; ERNEST GRUENING, U.S. Senator; LYNDON B. JOHNSON, President, U.S. Senate; HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, U.S. Senator; MAURINE NEUBERGER, U.S. Senator; NORRIS COTTON, U.S. Senator; B. EVERETT JORDAN, U.S. Senator; H. E. TALMADGE, U.S. Senator; STUART SYMINGTON, U.S. Senator; THOMAS H. KUCHEL, U.S. Senator; CLAIR ENGLE, U.S. Senator; GALE W. MCGEE, U.S. Senator; JACK R. MILLER, U.S. Senator; JENNINGS RANDOLPH, U.S. Senator; HOMER E. CAPEHART, U.S. Senator; LEE METCALF, U.S. Senator; OREN E. LONG, U.S. Senator; STYLES BRIDGES, U.S. Senator; FRANK CARLSON, U.S. Senator; LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, U.S. Senator; HIRAM L. FONG, U.S. Senator; E. L. BARTLETT, U.S. Senator; RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, U.S. Senator; ESTES KEFAUVER, U.S. Senator; ALEXANDER WILEY, U.S. Senator; WAYNE MORSE, U.S. Senator; PAT MCNAMARA, U.S. Senator; ALLEN J. ELLENDER, U.S. Senator; HUGH SCOTT, U.S. Senator; JOSEPH S. CLARK, U.S. Senator; SAM J. ERVIN, JR., U.S. Senator; JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, U.S. Senator; JAMES O. EASTLAND, U.S. Senator; ROBERT S. KERR, U.S. Senator; JOHN SPARKMAN, U.S. Senator; SAM RAYBURN, Representative in Congress; JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Representative in Congress; CHARLES A. HALLECK, Representative in Congress; HOWARD W. SMITH, Representative in Congress; HAROLD D. COOLEY, Representative in Congress; EMANUEL CELLER, Representative in Congress; THOMAS E. MORGAN, Representative in Congress; BRENT SPENCE, Representative in Congress; CLARENCE CANNON, Representative in Congress; W. D. MILLS, Representative in Congress; OVERTON BROOKS, Representative in Congress; EDWARD P. BOLAND, Representative in Congress.

Forty-third Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution by the Lithuanian American Council of Greater New York:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE LITHUANIAN RALLY ON FEBRUARY 19, 1961

We, Lithuanian-Americans of Greater New York, citizens and residents of the United States, gathered on February 19 of this year of grace 1961, at Webster Hall in New York, to commemorate the 43d anniversary of the restoration of the Independent Lithuanian State after a prolonged eclipse of its liberty;

Voicing once again our indignation and our protest against the brutal suppression by the Government of Soviet Russia of Lithuania's independence and freedom and her subjugation to ruthless Soviet colonial exploitation, perpetrated at a time when Lithuania was living in peace with the U.S.S.R. and was bound to her by a peace treaty and a nonaggression pact;

Pointing out that the global surge toward self-determination and national independence poses a particular challenge to the West to press for application of the principles of self-determination in Lithuania and the entire captive part of Europe;

Stating that the present Soviet diplomatic overtures and coexistence offers are aimed at the settlement on Soviet terms of the political problems resulting from World War II, namely, at the legalization and consolidation of Soviet criminal conquests in Europe and at creating conditions for further Communist expansion in Europe and elsewhere;

Considering that the present abnormal and dangerous situation in Europe, characterized by the division of Germany, the subjugation of nine formerly sovereign states of central and eastern Europe, including Lithuania, and by the division of the Continent is the major cause of the present international tension and requires an urgent and global settlement in conformity with the wartime and postwar commitments and pledges of the Great Powers.

Resolve,

1. To appeal to the President, the Secretary of State, and the Congress of the United States firmly to restate and vigorously to promote permanent U.S. policy of the restoration of the independence and freedom of Lithuania and other captive countries of central and eastern Europe through free and unfettered elections after the withdrawal of Soviet armed forces and agents, and to reaffirm the determination of the Government of this great country not to be party to any agreement or treaty which would confirm or prolong the subjugation of Lithuania, now help in bondage by the U.S.S.R.;

2. To request the President of the United States that, in line with the pledges and principles enumerated above, and to the advantage of both the United States and captive Lithuania, the issue of Lithuania's subjugation be raised at any forthcoming negotiations with the rulers of the Kremlin and international conferences;

3. To express our complete agreement with the determination of the President of the United States, as expressed by him to give "permanent instructions" to the U.S. delegates at the United Nations "to press for the restoration of free elections wherever Communist imperialism has denied them";

4. To ask the President of the United States to designate the third week of July 1961, as Captive Nations Week;

5. To insist that the Free Europe Radio initiate broadcasts to occupied Lithuania;

6. To rededicate ourselves to the just cause of Lithuania's independence and freedom and to combat Communist aggression and Soviet-Russian imperialism;

7. To assure the Lithuanian people under Soviet occupation of the indissolubility of our ties and of our unswerving determination to spare no efforts and sacrifices for the attainment of the sacred goal of the Lithuanian nation—its independence and freedom.

8. Actively to support the policy of the U.S. Government aiming at the establishment in Europe and elsewhere of a just and durable peace based on the inalienable right of the respective peoples to governments of their own choosing.

DR. ANTANAS SKERYS,
President, Povilas Alisauskas, Secretary.

Federal Aid to Education: A Virginia View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of Warren County, Va., have demonstrated notably their ability to deal effectively on the local level with problems of public education.

In this connection I include, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, a resolution of the Warren County School Board.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE SCHOOL BOARD OF THE COUNTY OF WARREN, VA., AT ITS REGULAR MEETING HELD ON MAY 11, 1961

Whereas the Federal revenues have been inadequate to meet Federal expenditures in 26 out of the last 30 years; and

Whereas Federal aid to education does not represent a new source of revenue; and

Whereas three-fourths of all personal income goes to wage earners, the cost of Federal aid to education will not be borne by the rich and large corporations as the public is led to believe; and

Whereas the Federal Government now takes 64 percent of all public revenue and will have to demand more if it attempts financial support of public education; and

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has in effect ruled on several occasions that the Federal Government can regulate that which it subsidizes; and

Whereas Federal involvement in public education is contrary to the 10th amendment to the Constitution of the United States which provides that "powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people"; and

Whereas financial dependence on the Federal Government for support of public education will at best reduce local control over our public educational system: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the School Board of the County of Warren, Va., publicly announce that it is opposed to Federal aid to education and does feel that such assistance is not needed; and be it further

Resolved, That this board pronounce its opposition to any movement which will give the Federal Government one scintilla of control over any local school system and any attempt to standardize or to destroy the flexibility of public education throughout the local school divisions or districts in the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be furnished to the Senators and Members of the House who represent the Commonwealth of Virginia and its political subdivisions in the Congress of the United States of America.

Results of a Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN
OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to a questionnaire on nine important legislative matters which I have recently completed and tabulated.

The questionnaire was sent to approximately 7,350 residents of the Fifth Congressional District and drew a response of more than 1,373 replies. This response of more than 18.5 percent was highly gratifying to me and indicates a responsible interest in Federal legislation on the part of Conecticut Fifth District residents. In many instances, those who completed the questionnaire supplemented the form with lengthy letters and commentaries.

The questionnaire was not printed at Government expense and those who returned it affixed their own postage. One resident of Winsted, Conn., who remained anonymous sent me $2 with his questionnaire making the offering as "my mite toward sharing the expense" and asking for more opinion surveys.

A New Milford resident sent me a check to help share the cost of the survey which I returned with a note of thanks.

The nine questions included in the questionnaire were concerned with issues that touch on the lives of all of us and it was because of this that I sought a representative cross-section of opinion from the people of the Fifth Congressional District.

After the initial mailing, there were many requests received for the questionnaire and actually returns are still coming into my office. The survey included questions concerning Federal aid to education, health protection for people over 65 years of age, import tariffs, regulation of drug prices, Federal aid to depressed areas, nuclear weapon testing, foreign aid appropriation, recognition of Red China, and the length and cost of presidential election campaigns.

While overwhelming support was shown in favor of Federal aid to education, and for school construction, there was a division of opinion on the question of aid for increasing teachers' salaries; and the score was almost 3 to 1 in opposition to aid for private schools.

A heavy vote was registered in favor of legislation to provide health protection for people over 65 years old, under social security protection from low-cost imports was advocated, either by quota or by higher tariffs, in preference to the present system. Government control or regulation of drug prices drew a 2 to 1 affirmative vote, and there was an even stronger expression of opinion in favor of Federal aid to depressed areas, which has recently been enacted into law.

By a score of more than 2 to 1, Fifth District residents would support the resumption of nuclear weapons testing, with or without agreement on effective inspection and control. And while they would favor reductions in foreign aid appropriations, they placed higher emphasis on the curtailment of military aid and split about even on the question of economic aid.

I have introduced legislation to curtail the cost and time of presidential campaigns. Fifth District residents agreed by a vote of 1,096 to 232, with 45 uncommitted, that presidential campaigns "are too long and too costly in time, money, and human energy."

In many instances comments on other pending legislation were written in the margins of the questionnaire. Among these were: "I favor withholdings on savings, and so forth. There is too much money being spent." One who identified himself as "just an old vet" urged $150 pension a month for all veterans at 65 and no less than 50-percent disability allowance for all World War I service-connected compensation claimants. There was a request for more Government curbs on unions. One wrote, "May God give you strength to do the right."

Other quotes from letters returned with questionnaires:

Goshen:

I do not think that Government can increasingly relieve the individual of his responsibilities and his self-reliance without also relieving him of his self-respect and his worth to himself and to others.

Waterbury:

I think the less we depend on Federal help the better we will be. I disagree with levying taxes to send things over to foreign countries. It is my experience that if you start helping or supporting someone and then you cease doing so, all you have done becomes a waster.

Watertown:

So far the Government seems to be hamstrung in its struggle to cope with Mr. Hoffa; I hope it will find some way to reverse the trend effectively.

Naugatuck:

I hope Congress will support the President on the proposals he has made to date.

Thomaston:

I am sure these questionnaires will remind more people as to their duty as Americans.

New Milford:

Perhaps if we applied some commonsense approaches to our problems, this country of ours would not be in the dire straits it is. We have spent billions all over the world and all over the world people are taking our dollars and stabbing us at the same time.

Derby:

If "low-cost imports" means materials may be bought inexpensively from foreign nations and in turn sold inexpensively to our own public we must have much to gain by low-cost imports.

Bridgewater:

Your questionnaire is a good idea. I'd been intending to write to you anyway, so I'll enclose it in this letter.

Canaan:

Federal control of drug prices as such seems to me hardly proper. But proceedings could be taken against collusive pricing under antitrust laws. Some drug prices seem to me much too high.

Waterbury:

I hope you will consider the results of this questionnaire merely as a guide to your thinking and continue to exercise your own good judgment on what is good for the district.

Warren:

In addition to my answers on the enclosed card I am opposed to all forms of paternalism in government, and the age 65 rather young to become a charge on the Government for aid of any kind.

Derby:

I, for one, as a citizen of this country, would like to see a more forceful attitude taken toward any would-be aggressor. Also to stop apologizing to the world for every move we make. We need a positive attitude. For myself, this is my country, right or wrong.

Seymour:

The strength of this Nation lies in the ability of its people to care for themselves. Don't penalize those who would and do care for themselves by taxing them to support others who will not meet their own responsibilities.

Ansonia:

Foreign labor costs are presently undermining our economy in many lines of industry. I work for a heavy machinery manufacturer who has suffered from loss of orders to West German manufacturers. The present system is inadequate and I feel a higher tariff would not be the solution.

Warren:

The big change needed on the New Frontier is the change in social security first. Amend our present social security law or scrap it and start with an up-to-date pension system. Enact a pension law which would cover every American citizen of retirement age, regardless of the amount of money they have paid into the fund.

Watertown:

We both favor continued economic aid to the underdeveloped countries. I do think we should be more careful to see the aid reaches those we want to help rather than line the pockets of the few. I wish we might give in a more generous spirit. We seem to haggle so over things.

Thomaston:

I would be presumptuous, indeed, to express an opinion on the resumption of testing of nuclear weapons. There is no question facing humanity today that transcends control of nuclear power. I believe that this is a decision that will have to be made by more knowledgeable and wiser heads than mine.

Bridgewater:

Your questionnaire impresses this writer as an extremely worthwhile method for making democracy work. It is, I think the first such communication I have ever received from one of my Representatives.

Wolcott:

Since the need for schools is so great, nothing should impede the construction and expansion of same. Private and parochial school assistance should not be considered presently since the subject is too controversial. However, we should consider the latters' needs later.

Torringford:

Since we are virtually supporting the free world, might we propose a world tax on these

nations and then disperse payments for their support. Those that don't pay—no support, i.e., Yugoslavia, etc.

The survey report has been given wide coverage by the newspapers and the radio stations in my district and I call it to the attention of my colleagues with my own comment that it will be of great assistance to me in the consideration of major legislative measures pending in the Congress. I was genuinely impressed with the interest and knowledge in legislative matters displayed by so many residents of my district. Their reaction to the questionnaire and to my report on its results has been so favorable and receptive that I am making preparations for a future endeavor to organize similar public opinion surveys on an even larger scale.

The following is a breakdown of the results of the questionnaire:

Results of questionnaire

	Yes	No	Uncommitted
1. Do you favor Federal aid to elementary education?	900	405	68
For school construction?	954	315	104
For increasing teachers' salaries?	581	573	219
For private schools?	277	966	30
2. Do you favor legislation which would provide health protection for people over 65 years of age?	1,160	178	35
If so, should it be under social security system?	859	260	254
3. Do you favor protection from low-cost imports?	1,069	173	131
By higher tariff?	381	272	-------
By quota?	505	233	-------
By present system?	137	392	-------
4. Do you favor Government control or regulation of drug prices?	919	436	18
5. Do you favor temporary Federal aid to depressed areas?	1,001	298	74
With adequate "antipirating" provisions?	958	124	291
6. Do you favor resuming the testing of nuclear weapons?	968	373	32
Before agreement is reached on effective inspection and control?	856	331	206
7. Do you favor reductions in foreign aid appropriations?	732	335	306
Military?	664	449	260
Economic?	598	504	361
8. Should the United States recognize Red China?	318	948	107
9. Do you feel that presidential campaigns are too long and too costly in time, money and human energy?	1,096	232	45

Joint Statement to the House Agricultural Subcommittee on Equipment, Supplies, and Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANCHER NELSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Equipment, Supplies, and Manpower of the House Agriculture Committee is presently holding hearings on the farm cost-price squeeze problem. The committee is hearing testimony from various individuals and organizations to determine the nature and extent of this problem and I hope that out of these hearings will come some possible solutions. This cost-price squeeze is one of the most difficult situations that confronts the farmer in our Nation today.

Yesterday Mr. Buren Watland, an implement dealer from Jackson, Minn., and Kenneth Austin, the managing director of the Minnesota Implement Dealers' Association, appeared before the subcommittee to present testimony concerning the nature of this cost-price squeeze and its effect on implement dealers who provide the farmer with his working tools. I ask that the prepared statements of Mr. Watland and Mr. Austin be included at this point of the RECORD, as part of my remarks:

JOINT STATEMENT TO THE HOUSE AGRICULTURAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EQUIPMENT, SUPPLIES AND MANPOWER

(Presented by Buren Watland, an implement dealer from Jackson, Minn., and Kenneth Austin, managing director of the Minnesota Implement Dealers' Association, with offices in Owatonna, Minn.)

My name is Buren Watland. I am an IHC dealer from Jackson, Minn. Our firm was originally started by my father in 1910 and, personally, I have been active in the management of the business since 1934. It has been my privilege to serve as a director and as the president of the Minnesota Implement Dealers' Association. At the present time, I am the director from Minnesota on the Board of the National Retail Farm Equipment Association. The managing director of our State association is here with me and we will share our allotted time.

You may rest assured that implement dealers do not like to see increases in the price of farm equipment. When we talk about the cost-price squeeze, remember that the implement dealer is in it, too, along with our friends, the farmers. In 27 years as an implement dealer, I have never seen price competition between farm equipment dealers as keen as it is today. Excessive price-cutting is sending and has sent many fellow dealers right out of this business. Many new $5,000 to $6,000 tractors in our area are being delivered by dealers with as little gross profit as $50. We know that dealers will not stay in business long with this cut-price selling pattern.

There are countless farmers in our area of southern Minnesota who need and would buy a new tractor and the accompanying working tools that they need to reduce their unit cost if their farm income was adequate. Many of our farmers today are farming with obsolete, outmoded, and under-powered equipment. To emphasize this, we have sold two used tractors during the past week that are 25 years old and the farmers who bought them are expecting these antiques, which we had intended to junk and probably should have, to do some of their field work this spring. Had these farmers been able to afford a newer and better unit, I know they would have bought it. Since the first of January, our dealership has sold 24 used farm tractors and only three new ones. These used tractors are being put back to work on good Jackson County farms that have a market value of anywhere from $250 to $400 an acre. The need for better equipment is there, but the money to purchase it isn't.

The implement dealers are concerned over this low level of farm income. As farm equipment dealers, we are an integral part of agriculture and rural life in America. The only customers we have are farmers. A large majority of our dealers have had past experience as farm operators and as dealers, we are probably closer to the farmers and know his problems better than any other group of people.

In my own business and in contacts with other dealers in my area, I know that our profit patterns have been deteriorating for the past 5 years. According to the National Retail Farm Equipment Association's 1960 cost-of-doing-business survey, the average Minnesota dealer had an annual sales volume of $284,190 and only a 1.54 percent net operating profit before taxes. The dealerships in our part of the country are small. The owner is nearly always a working partner in the business and I can assure you that dealers are not profiteering at the expense of the farmer. Since the mechanization of the farm, the servicing farm equipment dealer has become an indispensable part of agriculture. The dealer and the farmer need each other. I have faith in our future. As long as people eat, we will need to produce food and this will be done on farms by farmers with equipment sold and serviced by farm equipment dealers.

I am proud to be an implement dealer. I know that we have contributed much toward making our American agriculture the greatest productive machine in the world. Sometimes we overlook the fact that we are blessed as is no other country with ample food supplies. Consider the prices that our American housewife would have to pay if we were plagued by a food scarcity. Compare, if you will, the cost of any of our food commodities at the producer's level with the cost of food in other countries.

Not long ago a good friend of mine made a trip to Russia. While there, he took the time to shop and compare prices in a food market in Kiev. In arriving at what the Russian housewife would have to pay in American money he used the regular rate of exchange of four rubles to the dollar. A Russian housewife pays 25 cents a piece for eggs as compared to 35 cents a dozen for large grade A eggs in a supermarket in Minneapolis. Here are a few more comparative prices. Oranges in Russia, 50 cents a piece; in a Minnesota supermarket, 59 cents a dozen for the best oranges available. Flour in Russia, 50 cents a pound; in Minnesota, $3.69 for a 50-pound sack, or less than 8 cents a pound. Pork in Russia is $1.75 a pound and in Minnesota, 49 cents a pound. Sugar, 24 cents a pound in Russia compared to 11 cents here in Minnesota. The Russian lemons were over $1 a piece and in Minnesota you can buy the very finest lemons for 69 cents a dozen. From this comparison it is easy to see what country's farm program is costing the consumer the most. The fact is that our American consumer purchases more and better food for less money than do consumers anywhere else in the world. For this agriculture can be proud and certainly doesn't deserve to be the perpetual stepchild of our economy.

Incidentally, a 1-cylinder, 14 horsepower tractor from the Kharkov Tractor Works in Russia had a price tag of $3,000. Rubles again were converted to American money at the 4 to 1 exchange. Compare this with a Farmall 340 that I sell. It has a suggested list price of $2,425. It has a 4-cylinder engine and has 32.68 horsepower at the drawbar.

I have faith and confidence in the people and the Congress of the United States of America and believe that together we will see that agriculture in the future will be given a more just share of our national income.

I am convinced that we cannot afford to go back to farming with horses, and the back-breaking drudgery that our farmers have known in past generations. We must continue to mechanize and to continue to im-

prove the high standard of living that our country enjoys today.

Thank you for the opportunity to visit with you. Kenneth Austin, will conclude our joint statement.

My name is Kenneth Austin. I am the manager of the Minnesota Implement Dealers' Association. I have been with the Implement Dealers' Association since 1949. Our association was founded in 1904. We are the largest in membership of the State or regional implement dealer associations in the country. We are affiliated with the National Retail Farm Equipment Association. There are 1,017 franchised farm equipment dealers in Minnesota. This past year 993 of these dealers were members of the Minnesota association.

In the past 10 years over 500 dealers in our State have quit the implement business and have not been replaced. In 1959, 32 dealers closed their doors and 60 more did the same thing in 1960. There are numerous farming communities in Minnesota that do not have any servicing farm equipment dealers left. If the farm equipment business were a lucrative one, I can assure you that there would be a waiting line for a franchise. Several of the farm equipment manufacturers have lost dealers in good farming communities and though they have tried to get a new dealer, they have been unable to do so. These companies have found it necessary to establish company-owned stores in order to service the farmers using their products. There are eight such company-owned retail stores now in Minnesota.

In the trade we know there is a problem to attract new dealers with risk capital. We also observe that the same problem seems to exist with the wholesalers and manufacturers of farm equipment. I don't know of any new companies who have gone into these fields in recent years either. Apparently they have problems too.

In comparison with other manufacturers' products, I don't believe that the price of farm equipment is out of line. However, it is evident that the price a farmer gets for what he has to sell is out of line with nearly all manufactured items. This could and must stand some improvements.

Occasionally, we hear the criticism that the price of farm equipment is up because of the unnecessary gadgets on today's equipment. It is distressing to find out that these so-called gadgets are often the needed improvements such as wider, safer, more comfortable seats and power steering. It is true that these improvements cost money but I don't believe we can begrudge the farmer these conveniences. Anyone who has sat all day on an old steel-wheeled, hard-metal-seated tractor knows what I am talking about. Farmers want heater cabs, platform steps and fenders. I am confident that the farm equipment industry will continue to come up with even better labor-and life-saving equipment.

We can't compare today's tractor with the old "wrist breaking" cranking type of 20 years ago. Today's tractor is bigger, better, faster, and does more things for a farmer than was even dreamt of just a few short years ago.

Accounts receivable for dealers has been a severe problem. This is a direct result of the money shortage of our farmer customers. It is not uncommon for a small dealer to have $40,000 to $50,000 out on open account. Farmers are inherently honest and they pay these bills when they can but, in the meantime, it really puts a strain on all the operating capital that a dealer can put his hands on. If he doesn't have it, he borrows from the bank at going rates of interest.

In my work with implement dealers, I have observed that one of the serious problems confronting small business is the lack of operating and expansion capital and I know of only one implement dealership in Minnesota that has been successful in securing an SBA loan. Our people are optimistically hopeful that the Congress will act favorably on the reinvestment of earning principle as encompassed in the Curtis-Ikard Bill, H.R. 2. This we feel would be a big help to our type of small business.

We believe that good equipment makes a good farmer better. The farm equipment dealers will continue to do their part in keeping our farmers the best in the world.

Thank you for the opportunity of being here. If there are any questions that either Mr. Watland or myself could answer, we would be happy to do so.

Respectfully submitted.

BUREN WATLAND.
KENNETH AUSTIN.

Delaware River Basin Compact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Governor's conference which is an association made up of the 50 Governors wholeheartedly supports our distinguished colleague's Delaware River compact House Joint Resolution 225. This compact, introduced by Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, will permit the States with the aid and participation of the Federal Government to coordinate and develop the vast resources of the Delaware River Basin.

The accompanying letter speaks for itself, but I wish to point out the unanimity of opinion that is shared by the report of the House Committee on the Judiciary, the Governor's conference, the report of the House Public Works Committee of last year.

At its most recent meeting, held in Washington, April 26, the Governors' Conference Committee on Federal-State Relations considered the Delaware River Basin compact and the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources compact. Following an extended discussion, the committee requested me to write to the President, the Attorney General, the Secretary of the Interior and the Chairmen of the House Committee on the Judiciary and the House and Senate Committees on Public Works urging that early and favorable consideration be given the legislation to grant congressional consent to the compacts. Copy of such letters is being sent to Members of Congress who sponsored the consent legislation and the Governors of the States that are parties to the two compacts.

The House Committee on the Judiciary in its report on House Joint Resolution 225 (the Senate bill is S. 856) described very well the need and purpose of the proposed Delaware River Basin compact. The committee report, House Report No. 310, discussed the constitutional questions that have been raised, questions which concerned the Governors in their deliberations. The Committee on the Judiciary reached the same conclusion that the Governors reached, that ample precedent exists for an interstate-Federal compact such as is proposed. On the policy question, the Governors concur in the committee's conclusion that it is logical to create a single agency to coordinate functions of Federal, State, and local agencies and to effect unified solutions to problems of the river basin.

In the view of the Governors, the conclusions and recommendations of the House Committee on the Judiciary have equal validity with respect to the proposed Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources compact. The same view was expressed by the House Committee on Public Works last year when it reported H.R. 12467 (H. Rept. No. 1767, 86th Cong., 2d sess.), a bill identical to the pending bills, S. 374, H.R. 30, H.R. 2437, H.R. 3457, and H.R. 6066.

There is little that the Committee on Federal-State Relations can add to the persuasive arguments of the two house committees. We concur in them most heartily. We feel that the compacts add a new dimension to Federal-State relations which may have application in other geographical areas or with respect to other problems shared by governments of different levels. Finally, we believe that the two proposed compacts, in their respective areas, would help in attaining the goal of coordinated water resources policies called for by President Kennedy in his special message on natural resources.

Yours very truly,

ROBERT E. SMYLIE,
Chairman, Committee on Federal-State Relations

Needed: A Wave of Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. HALEY
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I have long been concerned about our faltering national spirit and the casual attitude with which we look upon our freedoms. My good friend, Mr. Harris Sims, editor of the Lakeland (Fla.) Ledger, has been concerned also about the fact that a regeneration of Americanism is badly needed.

I have asked permission to insert in the RECORD an editorial, entitled "needed: A Wave of Americanism," which appeared in the Lakeland Ledger on Sunday, May 14, 1961. Mr. Sims deals in a very forthright manner with this problem and the farreaching effect it has had upon not only the American people but also upon nations of the free world. I hope my colleagues and all people who read the RECORD will give attention to the recommendations made in this editorial.

The editorial follows:

[From the Lakeland (Fla.) Ledger, May 14, 1961]

NEEDED: A WAVE OF AMERICANISM

We Americans are no longer a nation of cocky people.

Communistic aggression has spread a feeling of anxiety among us.

We are now soberly aware that our way of life is seriously threatened by forces committed to a sinister, vicious ideology.

We do not know what lies ahead. We know we cannot trust Russia's leader to be either honest or reasonable. Plain enough it is to all that the scope of Russia's ambitious program of aggression and conquest is worldwide.

Our anxiety is all the more pronounced because we know our Nation does not have the great number of warm friends across the world that it ought to have.

We have given away billions of dollars to help the less fortunate but the hostility toward us increases.

We know the American way of life is a good way. We cherish our freedom. But we have become casual about our freedom and we have failed to make the merits of our way of life apparent to the world.

As a people feeling anxiety, we are now in a mood to take action. The hour is late. But we know we not only have a good way of life but also the potential with which to preserve it.

Our national spirit needs new vigor. It is drooping.

We need a great, dynamic wave of Americanism.

We cannot survive merely by being anti-Communist.

We need to be gloriously, enthusiastically, shoutingly pro-American. We need to salute our flag with new vigor and gratitude. We need to sing our national anthem with new fervor.

In short, we must now be emphatically American, put the accent on the positive, not the negative.

We need to shake off lethargy spawned by prosperity and to be anti-Communist by being pro-American.

If this be nationalism, then let it be nationalism, but not in the narrow, exclusive sense. We need to generate among ourselves a spirit of Americanism that will vibrate across the world.

Such a spirit would leave no room for communism in the United States.

Russia is boldly and shrewdly selling communism to nation after nation. But the United States is not selling democracy, freedom.

For several years the United States has been waiting to see what Russia was going to do next. We need to reverse this situation. Let Russia wait to see what the United States is going to do next. And let us do what will convince the world that ours is the valid way, that the environment of freedom which prevails in the United States is the kind in which man can realize his fullest potential of productive, civilized, happy living.

We need a great tidal wave of American enthusiasm. It cannot be imposed from Washington. Our President and the other leaders in Washington can give it impetus. But it is something that must well up from the people and roll across the land.

Such a tidal wave could sweep from our shores the last vestige of communism and impress the world that we Americans have something very special that other nations could well afford to emulate.

Such a regeneration of Americanism would give our Nation new strength and command greater respect over the world.

Ours is a nation of supersalesmanship. We can sell anything. But we have been so preoccupied with the selling of visible, tangible products we have neglected to sell democracy.

We have sold a great array of American products to Cuba. But we have let Russia come over here within 90 miles of us and sell communism to Cuba and thereby establish a stronghold from which to sell communism to other Latin American countries.

A tidal wave of our magnificent Americanism was never more urgently needed. It could bring magical, miraculous results. It could make our treasured freedom secure.

We tired, soft, sophisticated, bored Americans had better pull ourselves out of our inertia with all haste or we may find the cycle of history repeating itself.

A great tidal wave of Americanism could shake the earth and provide new security of freedom for millions of peoples in other lands.

May the spirit of Americanism roll soon and mightily.

Reformatory Head Middle-of-the-Road Penologist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, one of the great domestic problems of this era has been the upsurge of crime. Often, unhappily, it breeds in the very institutions designed for its correction. We in the Fifth District are proud to have Edward Grennan as superintendent of Concord Reformatory. The following article from the Lowell Sun describes the excellent work he is doing there:

REFORMATORY HEAD MIDDLE-OF-THE-ROAD PENOLOGIST

(By William Fripp)

CONCORD.—The old Hollywood fostered concept of prison—a snarling Cagney breaking out of the "Rock" with brave Chaplain O'Brien as his hostage—has fortunately changed, as have prisons themselves.

While in actuality some correctional institutions were stark bastions of oppression and cruelty, the last century has witnessed prison reforms characteristized by the philosophy that the rehabilitation of the inmate is as important as his punishment.

The Concord Reformatory on Route 2 is an example of a modern institution, and its superintendent, Edward S. Grennan, a spokesman for current penological practices.

In rejecting both ultramodern and archaic reform philosophy, Grennan stands as a self-confessed middle of the roader. He is not enthusiastic about the proposal that prison walls should be completely torn down and the atmosphere be made as homelike as possible. While "walls do not a prison make," he recognizes that they are necessary if only to remind the inmate that he is, after all being punished. Nor does he agree with those who maintain that prisoners are mentally ill and should be treated as patients. At Concord only 5 percent of the inmates are mentally ill, and none of these are legally insane.

Grennan realizes that it is the responsibility of the institution to meet the emotional and psychological needs of the inmates and to prepare them for the time they will be released. The majority of the Concord inmates are serving only a 14-months them, and before they are returned to the outside world they must be equipped to face the demands of society.

To prepare them for their release, Concord offers traditional courses in auto mechanics and trade skills in addition to high and post high school extension courses. A more ambitious liberal arts program which includes musical appreciation, current events, and "great books" discussions is also offered. Grennan admits that if he can only interest a handful of inmates in this heady curriculum he is gratified. But he is not without hope; at the Norfolk prison, where he previously served as superintendent, the debating team consistently defeated such stalwart opponents as Oxford, Cambridge, and MIT.

Grennan, who points to the fact that the great majority of prisoners come from broken homes, is interested in starting an A.A. type of group therapy session for the inmates, an approach which for alcoholics has been practical and successful. Right now he is working on a new program aimed at relieving the impact of incarceration for new groups and which will at the same time improve the training of correction officers.

The famous reformatory riot of 2 years ago is just one indication of why a superintendent is always on duty and must live on the grounds. This uprising, which was led by the sociopathological "Bull" Martin, a 20-year man, involved only a small core of the inmates. Although the men were holding guards as hostages and negotiating for a getaway car, at no time did Grennan consider meeting their demands. Martin incidentally, later committed suicide. As interested in the prevention of crime as he is in the rehabilitation of prisoners, Grennan advocates home, school, and church as the bulwarks of character formation.

The Ill-Considered Treatment of Farmer Byler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and appalled at the recent arbitrary and confiscatory act of the Internal Revenue Service in seizing three horses of an Amish farmer in Pennsylvania just at spring planting time.

I am referring to the case of Valentine Y. Byler, of New Wilmington, Pa., who was about to start his plowing when the Government took his horses and sold them at an auction to satisfy his delinquent social security payments.

Taking this man's horses at plowing time is tantamount to removing his means of livelihood. The cruelty of the act is further compounded by the fact that Farmer Byler's net annual income is reported at only $1,864 and he supports his wife, four children, and 83-year-old mother.

We still have freedom of religion in this country, and the Amish sect does not believe in insurance of any kind. By merely following his religious beliefs that social security is a form of insurance, this frugal, peace-loving farmer has been deprived of his ability to provide for himself and his family.

Only through the generosity of his neighbors and friends, who have donated from their meager savings to buy him new horses, has Byler been able to continue his farming pursuits.

I am not alone in my indignation over this harsh treatment. Letters from my friends in the Sixth District of Indiana indicate a strong public repugnance for the Internal Revenue Service's act.

One letter stated, in part—

Why can't they let these (Amish) people alone? They are the only ones in the world

who don't have their hands held out for a handout from our Government. They want to get along on their own and we should certainly help them.

The letter continues—

This is the most picayune, despicable thing our Government has ever done. Can't you find someone who will crack down on the Internal Revenue Service and make them use a little commonsense?

One of the most respected jurists in Indiana protested the IRS action. He wrote, in part—

I demand the conscience of Congress and the President awaken. Pass a law exempting men and women from social security if they please. Likewise, get busy and amend the law so that Federal hatchetmen will have to go into court and get an order before confiscating 100 percent of a person's property or salary.

I join with these and other outraged Hoosiers in protesting this ill-considered, oppressive, and stringent treatment of Farmer Byler.

Let Earned Bread Replace the Doled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD an excellent editorial from the Nashville Tennessean, Nashville, Tenn., emphasizing the importance of putting first things first and focusing attention on the opportunities rather than the problems that beset the Appalachian and surrounding region. This editorial provides sound advice to every section of the country vitally interested in development and progress.

The editorial follows:

LET EARNED BREAD REPLACE THE DOLED

Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall pays his first official visit to middle Tennessee today, to address members of the Elk River Development Association at Fayetteville.

The Secretary probably knows it already, but in case he doesn't he should be informed that he is about to be introduced to vigorous grassroots, an articulate organization which has already had a hand in shaping regional development policy.

In a sense, the Elk River Basin's needs are akin to those discussed Monday by President Kennedy during a conference with eight governors from the Appalachian region, among them Gov. Buford Ellington.

The so-called Depressed Area Act recently approved by Congress is designed to attack these problems on a broad, but rather short-ranged basis. Elk River Basin can hardly be termed distressed, but its need for industry is reflected in regional migration and it has a water problem in the instability of mid-state streamflow.

President Kennedy, following the Monday meeting, said he had directed that the new Area Redevelopment Administration focus attention upon the opportunities as well as the problems of Appalachia; that the worker retraining program be stepped up; and that the Defense Department review its policies with regard to placement of contracts in areas of substantial unemployment.

This is all well and good, but we believe the first order of business for the administration is to busy itself with the suggestion of the governors that there be a speedup in Federal programs on highway construction, water resources, forestry development, etc. And this would apply in the Elk River Basin, too.

This, we believe, would be in the nature of putting first things first, and the rest would follow. Focusing attention on opportunities instead of problems has its psychological advantages. But creating those opportunities where few exist is more important than the power of positive thinking. Hardheaded private investors are not apt to sink their money in an area without adequate water supply or flood protection and the poorest sort of transport. Who could blame them?

Retraining workers, while essential, would be of little value if the workers had no place to apply their training without migrating to industrial centers outside the region.

Knowing this region as we do, our advice would be that of the Governors: Build. In distressed Appalachia, build decent roads to replace the winding, narrow threads that ill serve so much of this region. Build dams—multipurpose dams. Build the kind that will stop recurrences of the disastrous flood that all but wiped Hazard, Ky., from the map a few seasons back.

Build them at Carthage and Celina with navigable locks so that the main stream leading into this region can be put back to work in the service of private commerce. And build tributary dams, as on Elk River, capable of saving the soil and the forests; of creating recreational-business opportunities; of providing reservoirs of industrial water.

Then the job will replace welfare; bread will be earned, not doled.

Green County, Wis., Governmental Affairs Committee Votes "No" on Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, on May 11, the Green County Governmental Affairs Committee met at Monroe, Wis., and after considerable discussion, the members of this committee who come from all the surrounding communities in Green County, adopted a public statement urging strong opposition to the Federal aid-to-education proposals.

I heartily endorse their statement, and insert it at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

MAY 11, 1961.

PUBLIC STATEMENT

Federal-aid-to-education proposals now before Congress would prove a costly mistake if enacted into law. It is estimated that Wisconsin taxpayers would have to provide $13.5 million of the $665.2 million the proposed program would cost. Wisconsin would receive in aids some $11.6 million or $1.9 million less than the tax cost.

Since this is a net loss there can be no aid for the Wisconsin taxpayer with Federal support of public schools. Federal control of our system, which would be assured, is thus achieved at a cost of nearly $2 million. The subsidy provided by Wisconsin is for the taxpayers of other areas that have failed to provide adequately for their own school responsibilities. Therefore, the Green County Governmental Affairs Committee is urging that Congress defeat Federal-aid-to-education proposals and that Wisconsin citizens and taxpayers urge their Congressmen to vote against these measures.

In addition, Federal aid to education is not needed in Wisconsin. In the past decade enough schoolrooms have been constructed by the districts in this State so that with an average of 30 children per class more than 60 percent of Wisconsin's public school enrollment could be housed in rooms not more than 10 years old. This was accomplished at a cost of $536.7 million and without either Federal or State aid. Wisconsin has done a better job of providing classrooms for its children than any State in the Union.

Federal-aid-to-education will mean that Wisconsin taxpayers will enable other States to provide classrooms for their children as has been done here but at the expense of the Wisconsin taxpayer. Is it any wonder that other States can offer lower tax rates and inducements to take our industry that provides essential jobs? The Green County Governmental Affairs Committee urges strong opposition to Federal-aid-to-education proposals.

We Are Being Suckered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, now that President Kennedy is being pressured by the State Department to submit to a summit conference with Mr. Khrushchev, which will result, no doubt, in concessions on our part, one matter that ought to be discussed is the nuclear test conference at Geneva. An editorial in the Thursday, May 11, edition of Chicago's American, entitled "We Are Being Suckered," should be directed to the attention of our President and his advisers so that they may avoid being further outmaneuvered by Soviet Union deceit:

WE ARE BEING SUCKERED

The most encouraging thing we have heard lately about the Nuclear Test Conference at Geneva is the announcement by the American delegate, Arthur H. Dean, that President Kennedy has instructed him to size up and report on the future prospects of the Conference.

This shows that our Government is at least beginning to understand that this Conference has no future. The Russians have turned the discussions into a device for keeping the United States from making any atomic tests while they go forward secretly with their own.

There is authoritative evidence that the Russians are regularly setting off nuclear explosions which they do not report. But the United States, having made a promise to suspend nuclear firings while an effort is made to end them permanently by negotiation, keeps the promise.

By stalling the talks at Geneva, the Russians have managed to maintain this situation for 30 months, and the advantage they may have gained by continuing their own development of nuclear explosives while we do nothing about ours is terrifying to think about.

The task of the Russian delegate, Semyon Tsarapkin, is to keep the conversation going by continually devising "compromise" plans which he knows the United States cannot accept. It is obvious, and has been for 2½ years, that he is making no actual effort to reach an agreement.

American Delegate Dean should now officially report this fact to the President. Then President Kennedy should give the Russians a reasonable time—a week, say—to agree to an honest nuclear test ban, warning them that otherwise the United States would renew its own tests at once.

Let us not go on playing chump for the Russians at the risk of losing the nuclear arms race.

Americans Have Lost Ability To Get Mad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES HARVEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting into the RECORD an editorial written by Dale Stafford, editor and publisher of the Daily News, Greenville, Mich., in the May, 9, 1961, edition of that newspaper. I believe the editorial pinpoints a current trend that we in Congress are and should be most aware of in our work:

[From the Daily News, May 9, 1961]

AN EDITORIAL—WE DON'T KNOW HOW TO GET MAD

Americans shouldn't be blamed.

Blamed, that is, for looking to a Federal Government to provide an abundance of money for any and all enterprises in good times and bad.

This editorial is inspired by a news item from Lake Delton, Wis. It describes the naming of officers of the North American Ski Area Operators' Association.

Fred Bocks, one time chamber of commerce secretary in Greenville, was reelected president. He runs the successful Caberfae ski operation near Cadillac.

The article goes on to say:

"About 60 ski area operators from Wisconsin, Michigan, Minnesota, and Illinois attended the meeting to discuss the possibility of obtaining Federal aid to offset business downturns caused by lack of snow."

Now skiing is a luxury business, not a necessity item. And many of the resorts have made big money from the growth in the sport's popularity. In most instances they have poured profits in their enterprises to increase volume.

Federal aid to prevent cycles in the business volume for ski resort operators?

We'd like to hear the reaction of the applegrowers out on Peach Ridge who accept the fact of life that a bad year is certain to occur every so often.

With little snow, the ski boys have had a long winter and plenty of time to read. No doubt they have noticed the results of the pouring of millions of American dollars into Laos and other distant spots in the world.

And probably they have read about the labor shenanigans at Cape Canaveral where an apprentice electrician drew $748 a week (an electricians' foreman at Cape Canaveral earned $26,843 last year).

Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN unearthed the fact that unskilled laborers at Vandenberg Air Force Base collect as much as $287 weekly and elevator operators get up to $360.

Compare the largess of your money with what the brave astronauts get paid.

Unfortunately, the American public has lost its ability to get mad. Otherwise it would be fuming at this wastage of taxpayer money and any suggestion that ski resorts should get U.S. help when it doesn't snow on schedule.

Trend of the Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following two articles by Mr. Nate White, business and financial editor of the Christian Science Monitor. The articles appeared in the Monitor on May 11 and 13.

Penetrating, stimulating, and thought provoking, the articles go into detail on some recent analyses of our economy by the eminent Dr. Arthur F. Burns, one of America's most respected and unpolitical economists.

I believe that we may all profit by reading and studying these articles, and the far-reaching implications of the content:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, May 11, 1961]

BUSINESS AND FINANCE—"ECONOMIC NEGATIVISM" IN WASHINGTON SCORED BY BURNS

(By Nate White)

Mr. Business Cycle himself has taken a look at the Kennedy economists and their "neostagnation theory" of the economy and pronounced it as unfounded in fact, unsound in principle, and based on negativism instead of expansion.

No greater condemnation of the economic theories or economists of the Kennedy administration could be made than that which was leveled recently at them by Dr. Arthur F. Burns, John Bates Clark, professor of economics at Columbia University and president of the National Bureau of Economic Research which is the fountainhead of knowledge on the subject of business cycles.

Dr. Burns is a gentle man, but his respect for facts and for the results of scientifically arrived at knowledge is such that no other voice can be heard when he is speaking. He inherited the mantle of Mr. Business Cycle from the late Wesley Mitchell who founded the Bureau of Economic Research, and he, with Dr. Solomon Fabricant, the bureau's research director, and Dr. Geoffrey Moore, the assistant research director, have done more than any two dozen other individuals in the world to find out just what makes an economy tick and what are the ingredients of recessions, inflations, cyclical causes, cyclical effects.

Dr. Burns, in a quiet, unheralded address at the University of Chicago in April, took a cool look at the economics of President Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers, under the chairmanship of Dr. Walter W. Heller, and found it wanting. Dr. Burns was Chairman of the Council under President Eisenhower, but he resigned and returned to his academic chair when he thought he had done his job. He never became politically minded in his job, but constantly strove for a scientific approach.

Dr. Heller, a noted economist, with a high respect for economic facts but obviously a different interpretation of them, is to speak at the Loeb Awards luncheon in New York May 18. Undoubtedly he will feel called upon to defend his position, and that of the administration.

Dr. Burns took as his text for present CEA economic philosophy the statement from its March 6 policy position before the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress: "The American economy today is beset not only with a recession * * * but with persistent slack in production and employment, a slowdown in our rate of growth.

"Economic recovery in 1961 is far more than a cyclical problem. It is also a problem of chronic slack in the economy—the growing gap between what we can produce and what we do produce. * * * Especially since 1955, the gap has shown a distressing upward trend."

Dr. Burns then interpolated: "The essential point of this theory is that, quite apart from the recession, there is increasing slack in our economy; there is a growing disparity between actual and potential output; in short, America faces a problem of secular stagnation."

This is the theory which Dr. Burns labeled the theory of "neostagnation," saying that it was "gentler and less pessimistic than the Keynes-Hansen theories which dominated the thinking of the 1930's and 1940's," and "gay and optimistic in the light of still older stagnation theories such as Friedrich Engels' or Thorstein Veblen's."

Fortunately the present "neostagnationists" do not reflect the "morbid pessimism of earlier stagnation theories," Dr. Burns notes.

Mr. Business Cycle then examines the CEA arguments, agrees with some of them on facts, and adds, "I hope I have not left the impression that the new theory of secular stagnation is utterly without foundation. That would not be true. This theory is tied to some actual experience. But when the evidence is examined, it turns out to rest fundamentally on one fact, namely, that the business-cycle expansion of 1958–60 was exceptionally short and incomplete. When the expansion ended, our economy was still some distance from full employment.

"I do not question the importance of this fact. Nor do I question its disturbing character. But I do question what inference can properly be drawn from this solitary fact.

"I would urge two things. First, a theory which has such a slender foundation in experience must be viewed somewhat skeptically. Second, there is a better explanation of what happened between 1958 and 1960 than is offered by the neostagnation theory which of late has become quite fashionable."

Dr. Burns then offered three developments which he said were decisive in the "unsatisfactory character of the business-cycle expansion from 1958 to 1960":

1. A violent shift in Federal finances. Between the first quarter of 1959 and the third quarter of 1959 the Federal cash deficit allowing for seasonal factors fell from an annual rate of $17 billion to $2 billion. By the second quarter of 1960 the rate had changed to a surplus of $7 billion.

Thus, in a period of little more than a year, we had a turnaround in Federal finances of about $24 billion, undoubtedly one of the very sharpest shifts of Federal finance in our Nation's history.

2. Fiscal restraint on general economic expansion was accompanied, indeed preceded, by a tightening of credit conditions.

By mid-1959, commercial banks were already in debt at the Federal Reserve to the tune of $1 billion. The money supply stopped growing. Demand deposits diminished by nearly $4 billion between July 1959, and May 1960. Interest rates rose sharply, both on short-term and long-term loans. Indeed, long-term rates advanced faster than during a comparable stage of any business cycle during the past 100 years.

3. The protracted steel strike in the second half of 1959.

The strike led to a buildup of inventories in steel; it caused uncertainty in the business community and delayed orders on investment goods, and confused Government circles on the magnitude of the restraints they were imposing on expansion, and after the strike businesses practiced new inventory economies.

The steel strike thus looms as a major factor in Dr. Burns' thinking in the early end of the expansion which commenced in the spring of 1958.

Dr. Burns did not say so, but those with fairly quick memories remember that Arthur J. Goldberg, present Secretary of Labor, was generally credited as being the architect and engineer of the 1959 steel strike.

The Burns conclusion:

"On my reading of recent history, the neostagnationist theory which now is being widely used to explain the incompleteness of the expansion of 1958–60 is, therefore, quite unconvincing."

Dr. Burns then goes on to the affirmative statements of his own economic beliefs:

"There is no chronic slack in the economy.

"Full employment is not a remote possibility. On the contrary, it may well be reached some 15 or 18 months from now.

"The underlying forces of economic expansion are strong and have of late been only temporarily suppressed.

"We would be courting inflation and a gold crisis if we now arranged new governmental spending programs so that they would mature when the economy was already advancing without them."

Dr. Burns makes the point that Kennedy programs for medical care for the aged, liberalized social security and other social welfare programs, while humane, do not promote real economic growth. He added that he doubted the wisdom of increasing the minimum wage at a time of recession as a "useful antirecession device."

Dr. Burns listed restrictive practices that abound in construction work, railroading, agriculture, and in many manufacturing firms as impediments to efficiency and economic growth, "whether they arise from careless business management, or from coercive power of trade unions, or from governmental legislation itself."

Dr. Burns regretted that he felt compelled to criticize economic policies promulgated by some of his colleagues in the economic profession, and concluded as follows:

"I deem it only proper to conclude by saying that the administration has avoided extreme economic views, that it has in no way shown hostility to business enterprise, and that the economic moves actually taken by the administration have been more prudent than some of its economic rhetoric has at times suggested."

[From the Christian Science Monitor, May 13, 1961]

TREND OF THE ECONOMY—THE BURNS MEGATON BOMB

(By Nate White)

Dr. Arthur F. Burns, the dean of American economists, has taken issue with the theories of stagnation which the present official economists of the Kennedy administration have been advancing.

The words of Dr. Burns ring with a background of factual clarity. Here is a man who has devoted his professional life to finding out what are the ingredients of business cycles, recessions, booms. He has no political ax to grind, and he has no commitments to the Republican Party or any other party to develop a theory of political economics.

Dr. Burns is not a political economist. He is a man dedicated to scientific fact-finding and analysis. He is president of the National Bureau of Economic Research, which is a private, nongovernmental, objective organization for factual analysis of economic movements.

Dr. Burns worked with the bureau's founder, the late Wesley Mitchell, in developing the early series on business cycles. He is the Einstein of the economics profession. He carried this valuable research work much further along, and his writings on the subject are the textbooks used throughout the world as source material on business cycles. His associates, Dr. Solomon Fabricant and Dr. Geoffrey Moore, together with Dr. Burns, constitute a triumvirate of fact and analysis which is grounded on bedrock facts.

Dr. Burns has dropped a megaton bomb. When he calls the economic theories of the Kennedy economic team "neostagnationist," it is time to listen.

He agrees with the thoughts advanced by Dr. Paul A. Samuelson, professor of economics at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, who did the early spade work for Mr. Kennedy's economic analysis, Dr. Walter W. Heller, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, the other CEA members, and Labor Secretary Arthur J. Goldberg that unemployment is disturbing, that the lag in the economy is disturbing, but he thoroughly disagrees on the interpretations, either of the causes or the trend.

Furthermore, Dr. Burns finds that the Kennedy group deliberately chose a point of departure for their growth rate which gives, as he sees it, an incorrect view of the economy—one of slow growth. If they had chosen a different departure point, the growth rate would be greater.

Washington journalists have accepted the Kennedy economic analysis and as a result a theory has been effectively spread through America and the world that the United States is in a posture of economic stagnation.

To an economic scientists such as Dr. Burns, especially the economic scientist who knows more about business cycles than any other, this use of facts and their resulting interpretation is a disservice to the economics profession. Even more serious, when such an analysis is used as the foundation of national policies it becomes dangerous.

Dr. Burns does not spare the Eisenhower administration, in which he served, the responsibility for its part in the recession now ending. He puts the blame on the sudden change in Federal finances from an annual deficit rate in 1958 of $17 billion to an annual surplus rate of $7 billion—a swing of $24 billion in little more than a year; the Government's restraints on expansion, including Federal Reserve action to raise interest rates; and the steel strike.

These factors stopped an expansion from the 1958 recession, Dr. Burns reasons, but he also argues that they were artificial factors, superimposed by decisions, and were not basic problems with the growth process.

Dr. Burns thinks the "neostagnationists" have wrongly reasoned and have based their conclusions on a too narrow period of time.

In answer to the CEA's conclusion that "we face a stubborn problem of chronic slack, and the road to recovery is a long one," Dr. Burns says, "there is no chronic slack of our economy. Full employment is not a remote possibility. The underlying forces of economic expansion are strong. We would be courting inflation and a gold crisis if we now arranged new governmental spending programs so that they would mature when the economy is already advancing without them."

The issue between the economic schools of thought is thus joined. The Samuelson-Heller-Goldberg school will be heard from without question. They have been challenged by the dean of their profession, and they cannot remain quiet.

What will be even more interesting, however, will be the trend of events. Time is rushing on. The pace of the American economy is proceeding much more rapidly than seemed possible from the January forecasts.

Facts will soon catch up with theory, in other words, and the sooner the better.

Western Association of State Highway Officials Pledge Cooperation to Federal Highway Administrator

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I call to your attention, and the attention of my other distinguished colleagues, a letter I have received from the Secretary-Treasurer of the Western Association of State Highway Officials, Salem, Oreg., Mr. Forrest Cooper, enclosing a resolution which was adopted by that association and which the secretary "was instructed to furnish a copy to you as a Member of the Congressional Delegation of the State of California."

This resolution pledges full support and cooperation to the Federal Highway Administrator, Mr. Rex M. Whitton.

WESTERN ASSOCIATION OF
STATE HIGHWAY OFFICIALS,
Salem, Oreg., May 15, 1961.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DOYLE: At the 40th annual conference of the Western Association of State Highway Officials held in Las Vegas, Nev., April 23–28, the attached resolution was adopted and the secretary was instructed to furnish a copy to you as a Member of the congressional delegation of the State of California.

Very truly yours,

FORREST COOPER,
Secretary-Treasurer.

RESOLUTION NO. 2—ADOPTED BY THE WESTERN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY OFFICIALS AT LAS VEGAS, NEV., APRIL 28, 1961

Whereas the 40th annual meeting of the Western Association of State Highway Officials at Las Vegas, Nev., on April 23–28, 1961, was honored by the presence of Federal Highway Administrator Rex M. Whitton, upon his being invited to speak to our Conference; and

Whereas the position of Federal Highway Administrator, as head of the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads, calls for full cooperation and respect between the Administrator and the various State governments; and

Whereas we are highly pleased by the presence of Mr. Whitton in this position of ex-

treme importance and trust, since he is a recognized engineer of outstanding ability, with many years of experience in State highway matters, a man of integrity, honesty and with a personal character above reproach: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Western Association of State Highway Officials pledge full cooperation and support to Mr. Whitton in performing the duties associated with his new position and wish him Godspeed and good luck; be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary furnish copies of this action to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges, and to all committee chairmen in the National Congress having to do with highway legislation and to the congressional delegations of the States of the Western Association of State Highway Officials.

Faith and the Fourth of July

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, I have just read a most interesting article in Classmate, a Methodist Church publication for teenage youth which is published in my congressional district, entitled "Faith and the Fourth of July." Mr. Fred Cloud, associate editor, board of education, the Methodist Church, wrote the article as a devotional for the July 1961 issue of the publication.

The article points out most vividly the part religion played in the lives of those persons who gave America its heritage of liberty, and I hope the Members of this great body will find the time to read the inspiring message. It follows:

FAITH AND THE FOURTH OF JULY
(By Fred Cloud)

The freedom which you and I enjoy did not come about as a mere accident of history. It was bought by our forefathers with their blood, sweat, and tears. The American brand of democracy is the end result of a vision of freedom, equality, and human dignity held by the Founding Fathers of our Nation. For the most part, they caught this vision from the Christian view of man. Thus the signing of the Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776, had religious meaning as well as political significance. It was a latter-day parallel of the exodus of the Hebrew people from slavery in Egypt.

Daniel L. Marsh sees in the early political documents of American history a large degree of inspiration. He would have us compare them with the Bible as an interpretation of Americanism. For example, the beginnings of American democracy were seen in the Mayflower Compact, comparable to Genesis. The "American exodus" was the Declaration of Independence. The "book of laws," or Leviticus, is the Constitution of the United States, with the Bill of Rights constituting the "American 10 commandments."

The greatest of the American "prophets" was George Washington; while the "gospel" of Americanism was voiced by Abraham Lincoln, especially in his second inaugural address. "The Star-Spangled Banner" is one of the great "American psalms."

This does not mean that Americanism or democracy is in any measure a substitute for the Christian religion. It does mean that those persons who gave America its precious heritage of liberty were unashamedly religious. Further, it means that without the Christian beliefs in the spiritual nature of man and the equality before God of all men, our particular type of democracy could not have arisen.

The roots of American freedom are faith in God and respect for one's fellow man. If we care for the "roots," we can be sure of gathering the "fruits."

Liberal Myth Needs Unmasking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed recently increased interest in the conservative viewpoint by the youth of our Republic. It is very encouraging to see young men and women becoming aware of the dangers of the welfare state and related evils which would level humanity into one common mass where individuality, independence, initiative, and self-discipline are unknown.

The conservative youth of today are vocal, intelligent and able. Representative of this enlightened group are the collegians who edit and publish the Campus Conservative at Jackson, Miss.

The May issue of Campus Conservative contained several fine articles and editorials. It is my desire to call two to the attention of the House. One was written by John Perkins and the other by Jere Real, the executive editors of Campus Conservative.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include these two articles: "Liberal Myth Needs Unmasking," by John Perkins; "Real Thinking," by Jere Real:

LIBERAL MYTH NEEDS UNMASKING
(By John Perkins)

Liberal soothsayers and apologists have been perpetrating a great myth concerning the philosophies of liberalism and conservatism during the past few decades.

First, they bleat and cry that the conservative principles which helped make this Nation the greatest in the world are out of date and should be relegated to the political graveyard.

WELFARE PROGRAMS

Second, that only by adopting the programs of welfare statism and centralized bureaucracy based on lavish Government spending and a weakening of individual responsibility—glossed over by the liberals, of course—can out Nation survive the threat of modern, technological society problems and international communism.

For years this facade of mythology has been palmed off on the American people as the gospel of truth, with the result that many of our people, particularly in the younger generation, have become brainwashed of the reality constituting the essential facts of American history, development, and age-old truths that cannot be denied.

The liberal contention that conservative governmental philosophy is archaic and a thing of the long ago eras at the dawn of man's history is a myth of such preposterous absurdity that consciensious conservatives cannot remain silent.

LIBERAL THEME ARCHAIC

History reveals that it is the liberal theme of greater centralization in Government and unbridled spending programs that reaches back into the first eons of man's organized existence. The conservative philosophy, on the other hand, firmly endorses the republic-type government, with the cornerstones of individual freedom and initiative—a philosophical position that is much newer in history than the liberal doctrine.

Another facet of the liberal mythology that needs scrutinizing is the attempt by the prophets of doom to stampede the populace into accepting their "cures" for alleged ills in our society, economy, and international policy. What may not be obvious to many is that the liberals and leftwingers botch up situation after situation and then piously weep—seeking to blame it all on conservatives, and suggesting their own schemes as remedies. We strongly deplore such two-faced whitewashing of actuality.

DECLINE AND FALL?

Conservatives of this new generation are making a strong revival in an all-out offensive against the disillusioned liberal forces and their mossbacked, illogical philosophy.

After 30 years of idleness and defensive retreating the conservative ranks are being encouraged and reinforced by an upsurge of youthful enthusiasm over neoconservatism.

The 1960's will see, we are confident, a continuation of this political phenomenon; and, with the rising upsurge of conservatism among the new generation, the decline and fall of the liberal mythology and the leftwing manifestos will only be a matter of time.

REAL THINKING
(By Jere Real)

Conservatives are charged with many offenses by their liberal counterparts, but one of the most recurring criticisms is that "the conservative has no respect for the dignity of man."

Although this idealistic catch phrase seems to convince many persons, a study of the real philosophy of the conservative will reveal the fallacy of the accusation.

Conservatism is most certainly concerned with the dignity of man. It is not concerned, however, with the dignity of every man. It is concerned only with the dignity of the individual. And it is this concern that separates the conservative from the idealistic liberal.

In an age that has been termed the "age of the common man," too many persons have come to accept the idea that every man must exist to share the profit of his own labor for the common good of all those in society.

The conservative, believing as he does in the total independence of the individual, cannot accept this view.

Individual human dignity ceases to exist when any man is forced, either by law or custom, to sacrifice what he has created and what he has earned for the common good.

Everything of value in the history of civilization has been produced not by the collective efforts of common men but by the individual efforts of a very uncommon man, a man of vision, ability, and creative power.

And in almost every instance, the creative individual has been looked upon as wrong because he broke with the established traditions of practical mediocrity.

Man must live for himself first. If he concerns himself with the so-called humanitarian aspects of our modern society, he will soon become nothing more than a very productive slave for a parasitic society that seeks only to benefit from someone else's

creative abilities. There are many indications that our society is approaching such a state.

We are confronted daily with new programs and utopian plans to make life easier for various unfortunates and unemployed. Our society moves ever closer to establish norms and averages to which everyone must conform.

Such a leveling process will only destroy a society that was once creative and vital. What America needs is not more welfare programs with increasing dependence of all its people on someone else.

America needs a revival of independence, a new creative energy in which a man can profit for what he does and succeed or fail in proportion to his abilities, not in accord with an established norm dictated by the masses.

It is as Ayn Rand pointed out in her novel "The Fountainhead": "Degrees of ability vary, but the basic principle remains the same: the degree of a man's independence, initiative, and personal love for his work determines his talent as a worker and his worth as a man. Independence is the only gage of human virtue and value. What a man is and makes of himself; not what he has or hasn't done for others. There is no substitute for personal dignity. There is no standard personal dignity except independence."

We Boast, but What Do We Believe?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial by Attorney Richard S. Kaplan, past first district commander, department of Indiana, and chairman of the Indiana Department Counter-Subversive Committee of the American Legion, is deserving of national attention.

Mr. Kaplan has been a stanch worker for the veterans not only in his district, but throughout Indiana and the Nation. He has also contributed greatly in exposing the international Communist conspiracy:

WE BOAST, BUT WHAT DO WE BELIEVE?

(By Richard S. Kaplan)

We have heard countless speakers boast of the greatness of America, our great power, our economic strength, our military prowess, our industrial wealth, but we have never heard any speaker answer the question, "What is our soul?"

This crazy, anxious, turbulent world is looking at the United States and is asking us a question which we must answer if our prestige is to be great among nations, and that question is, "What do you, Americans, believe?"

Do we honestly believe in Mammon, the god of wealth? Is our industrial might, our inventiveness, our desire for wealth and more wealth, more cars, more mink coats, more and better homes, more leisure time, more wages all we believe in?

Are we a people interested only in the material things of life? Apparently that is the picture the world is beginning to see although in our humble opinion the picture is not a true one and is distorted.

We shall attempt to aswer that question.

WE BELIEVE IN GOD

That is our basic belief. There are more churches in the United States than anywhere else in the world. Never before has attendance in church been so great as it is today proving, at least, one thing, that our people are making an effort to get closer to God.

WE BELIEVE IN HUMANITY

The admonition, "Love ye one another," is best exemplified by the outpouring of our wealth and our love upon people of the world whenever a need for help is present. No matter what the cause, when disaster strikes, whether it be an earthquake, a flood or pestilence of one kind or other, we respond quickly and eagerly to help those in need. Our yearly charity drives for polio, muscular dystrophy, heart disease, tuberculosis and funds for a multitude of other similar purposes attest to the basic desire of our people to help one another. The desire to help, assist, aid one another clearly depicts the kindliness and generosity of our people.

WE BELIEVE IN EQUALITY

Our very Constitution, under which we live, sets out the great truth that all men are created equal and that they are endowed with the unalienable right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. True, there are bigots everywhere who would violate this truth, but as a government, as a nation, as a people we believe in this great truth and we practice it.

WE BELIEVE IN FREEDOM

From the very beginning of this great Nation, when our forefathers pledged their "lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor" in their fight for freedom, this has been our great treasure and for this one great cause we have fought several wars and many of our bravest young men have died in the effort to preserve freedom not only for ourselves but for the peoples of the world.

WE BELIEVE IN PEACE

Being a peace-loving people, we want peace but not at the price of giving up our right to worship God in our own way, our freedom, our love of humanity, our belief in equality and freedom. That's why we have, many times, turned the other cheek when other nations have goaded us to the brink of war. We have fought only when war was absolutely necessary to preserve our sacred ideals and beliefs.

Oh, yes, we have juvenile delinquency; many people are thoughtless, selfish, greedy and filled with hate. But, that is not the picture of our people as a whole.

What do we believe in? The divinity of man who was created in God's image. We believe in the sanctity of life. We believe in doing unto others as we would have them do unto us. We believe in remaining wrapped in the spirit of God.

We believe in the dignity of man.

A nation possessing this belief simply cannot perish. But we must spread this belief among all people, even unto the least of us, so that every man, woman and child sees, feels and lives this belief, for no chain is stronger than its weakest link and we cannot afford weak links in this churning world where dictators and madmen are struggling for power.

In conclusion may we point out that the American Legion is a symbol of all we believe for the American Legion stands for a firm belief in God and the brotherhood of man.

All this and even more we, as a people, believe.

Santa Fe Trail Caravan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following narrative of the activities of the Santa Fe Trail Caravan which is presently in progress as part of the Kansas Centennial Observance.

Taking part in the caravan are two very fine young people, Mr. and Mrs. Dick Janes, constituents of mine from Mission, Kans. I have asked Mr. and Mrs. Janes to be my reporters on the caravan, so that I, in turn, may inform the Congress about the progress of the wagon train. Mr. and Mrs. Janes are going to report every 2 days, and I will put their reports into the RECORD periodically.

The account of the first few days follows:

After months and months of planning 29 entries assembled on May 7, 1961, in Shawnee Mission, Kans., to begin the Sante Fe Trail Caravan.

May 8 was the first day on the trail, taking us through Mission, Merriam, Shawnee, and Overland Park, Kans. Down the trail came the 7th Cavalry from Mission, the Territorial Governor from Merriam, a horse-drawn black hearse from Shawnee and the Overland Stage from Overland Park, plus all the other entries. In the evening the people in the caravan participated in the frontier days celebration, consisting of a gaslight tent show held in Mission, and a buffalo barbeque.

May 9 found us on our way to Olathe and the first leg of our journey. Quantrill's Raiders were the entry from Olathe, bringing back the memory of the many raids Quantrill made in this area.

A circuit rider was the entry from Baldwin, our next stop. Upon arriving we were served a nice box lunch and we then had a parade through the town.

At dawn the trail was Overbrook, with the horse and buggy doctor as their entry. It was to commemorate the mode of transportation of doctors during that era. After a barbeque supper we then traveled on to Burlingame for the night, where we were received with much hospitality. Our horses were well taken care of while we stayed in homes. Entertainment was plentiful and varied, with a carnival, horse show, square dancing, and a huge fire to gather around. Bright and early the next morning breakfast was served to us at the high school before the parade. Two dragoon soldiers were the featured entry from Burlingame. The town's hospitality was again shown with a delicious lunch prepared at the barbeque area.

Things were pretty windy and dusty as we came into Council Grove, but the show did go on. We paraded before the largest crowd so far. Everyone had turned out to see the chuck wagon pulled by oxen and the trail scout which was their entry. Council Grove was the last place to buy supplies for the trek across the plains.

Before we knew it, we were on our way to Herington, however, not without a couple of mishaps. One horse got tangled in barbed wire and fell, and another tried jumping out of his trailer.

Upon arriving in Herington we fed and bedded the horses down for the night and we were fed a delicious supper there at the camping grounds. Then we were free to join the entertainment of the evening, consisting of a street square dance. The next morning breakfast was served at the camp grounds and then preparations for the parade got underway. Wild Bill Hickock and Calamity Jane were the historical characters represented from Herington.

Barbecued chicken was the specialty for lunch when we arrived in Marion. General Francis Marion, the "Swamp Fox" was the entry from Marion, for whom the town was named.

An immigrant grain wagon commemorating a Mennonite settlement was the entry from Hillsboro. After the parade we toured the sod house which is a memorial to the Mennonite colonization of the area. The townspeople had prepared a delicious Dutch-German supper for us. While we ate we were entertained by music and singing.

Traveling on to McPherson where we stayed the night, we were free to participate in the evening's festivities. Gen. James B. McPherson is remembered in this area with a statue in the park, so he is the natural entry from here in the caravan.

We are now heading down the trail to Lyons, Kans.

Justice Above Spoils

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of May 11, 1961:

JUSTICE ABOVE SPOILS

Last year Congress did not feel that any new Federal judgeships were needed. Now it has voted for 73.

The key to this sudden reversal? Partisan politics. For several years the courts have been disgracefully clogged. Last year the Judicial Conference urged 59 new judgeships to take care of increased business. But the Democrats controlling Congress didn't want President Eisenhower to have the appointments—even though he offered to name Democrats to half the new posts.

That looked like a very good opportunity to get justice out of the Federal spoils system—where both parties had too largely kept it for many years. It was lost. But President Kennedy has a chance to repair the position. In his campaign he said qualifications should be the first test for judicial appointments. Undoubtedly party leaders will put forward many deserving Democrats who also possess some qualifications for the bench. But undoubtedly also in a good percentage of districts the best qualified man will not be a Democrat.

The partisan pressures, which caused Congress so long to neglect the needs of the courts and then to add extra judges to satisfy demands for patronage plums, will now focus on the Attorney General's office where nominations will originate.

The Attorney General happens to be both the President's brother and his campaign manager. He does not appear to be in the happiest position to satisfy at the same time political creditors and the President's qualifications-first criterion.

This is unfortunate. It underscores the need for both parties to drop the practice of placing campaign managers in the Cabinet.

But even now the final responsibility—and opportunity—rests with the White House. Congress has given John Kennedy an unprecedent opportunity to influence the Federal judiciary for good or ill. Appointments made now can decisively affect national affairs for many decades.

The President faces a major test. How he meets it can be estimated by the caliber, character—and party affiliations—of the judges he selects.

Dr. Thomas Anthony Dooley III Medal

SPEECH
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support House Joint Resolution 306, a bill which calls upon the Nation to award, posthumously, to Dr. Thomas Anthony Dooley III, a token of the affection, the esteem and the admiration which his fellow citizens hold for him. Last session when I introduced H.R. 9404 and at the beginning of this session, when I introduced a joint resolution similar to that being considered, to make an award to Dr. Dooley, a number of people asked me just why I wanted to see this man singled out among the other brave and dedicated people who are serving humanity in faraway places. Frankly, I found it a little difficult to enunciate my precise sentiments. I have been trying, in the months since, to put into words just why I felt this gallant doctor should be an object of special consideration.

The reasons for my admiration for Dr. Dooley—for the Nation's admiration and respect for him—are manifold.

First, it is customary and proper for a grateful country to decorate those men who have, at the risk of their lives and safety, gone forth to do battle against our enemies. We most often give medals to men who do this in the uniform of their country. Dr. Dooley wore that uniform with distinction, when he served as medical officer during the evacuation of the thousands of freedom-loving Vietnamese who fled south after the partition of that unhappy country. I suspect most of the Members of this House have read with incredulous wonder of the harrowing experiencies which that young man underwent during that evacuation. This, in itself, would be ample excuse for some token of his country's esteem. In helping give to thousands of Vietnamese relief from pain and sickness—in helping men, women, and children to escape from the encroachments of the unfree world, Dr. Dooley adequately and more than adequately performed his duty to his country, and to mankind.

But for this young man it wasn't enough to put in his years in the Navy, do his work creditably and courageously, and retire to a civilian life in which, judging by the prophecies of his medical professors, he could have had a remunerative and not particularly wearing medical practice as a "society doctor." Tom Dooley was not content to count his years in the Navy as the payoff to his country and to the spark of love of humanity which illumined him so brilliantly. Like most other great men, Tom Dooley was a little unreasonable, a little impractical, somewhat unused to balancing credits against debts and closing the books as soon as possible. Tom Dooley had to go back, because he had looked upon the naked face of pain and disease and found it unbearable. He was not content with returning to the United States and telling people about what he had seen, hoping to inspire other young men to go forth and emulate what he had done. Instead he had to go himself. He had to throw his own not-very-sturdy body and his steel-tough soul into the fight against mankind's oldest and most implacable enemy—disease. Tom Dooley had to go back to the steaming and disease-ridden jungles of Southeast Asia, to the border settlement of Nam Tha. Why? He had to do it, I think, for the same reason mountain climbers have to climb mountains—for the same reasons country doctors have to answer 2 a.m. calls at homes where they know they won't get paid—for the same reason saints have to march singing into the arenas and the concentration camps. Tom Dooley had to do what he did because he believed in the highest of religious dictates—"That Ye Love One Another." To Tom Dooley this was not a once-a-week text, to be trotted out on Sunday, admired, and put back in its case until next Sunday. It is a commandment—a requirement—a price we must pay, in a way, for being human beings. Tom Dooley, like a few other outstanding human beings in every country and every age, did not begrudge that price, or try to keep his bill low, or to pay it in easy installments.

So, for his devotion to his duty—to a higher and more difficult duty than simply serving his Nation in its uniform, Tom Dooley deserves our respect and our appreciation.

But mere devotion to duty is not enough, I suspect, to merit the medal which we are about to give to Dr. Dooley. What else was there in this man's life and work that merits such an accolade?

Tom Dooley was a dedicated fighter against disease and against pain. In his own books, he quoted the great Albert Schweitzer to the effect that there is a worldwide brotherhood of those who have known pain—that there is an empathy possible among those whose lives and health have been threatened. Tom Dooley belonged to this brotherhood—to this international conspiracy against death. In the course of his own selfless work, Tom Dooley incurred a dangerous cancer. He returned to the United States to have it removed, and then, without knowing whether he had

creative abilities. There are many indications that our society is approaching such a state.

We are confronted daily with new programs and utopian plans to make life easier for various unfortunates and unemployed. Our society moves ever closer to establish norms and averages to which everyone must conform.

Such a leveling process will only destroy a society that was once creative and vital. What America needs is not more welfare programs with increasing dependence of all its people on someone else.

America needs a revival of independence, a new creative energy in which a man can profit for what he does and succeed or fail in proportion to his abilities, not in accord with an established norm dictated by the masses.

It is as Ayn Rand pointed out in her novel "The Fountainhead": "Degrees of ability vary, but the basic principle remains the same: the degree of a man's independence, initiative, and personal love for his work determines his talent as a worker and his worth as a man. Independence is the only gage of human virtue and value. What a man is and makes of himself; not what he has or hasn't done for others. There is no substitute for personal dignity. There is no standard personal dignity except independence."

We Boast, but What Do We Believe?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial by Attorney Richard S. Kaplan, past first district commander, department of Indiana, and chairman of the Indiana Department Counter-Subversive Committee of the American Legion, is deserving of national attention.

Mr. Kaplan has been a stanch worker for the veterans not only in his district, but throughout Indiana and the Nation. He has also contributed greatly in exposing the international Communist conspiracy:

WE BOAST, BUT WHAT DO WE BELIEVE?

(By Richard S. Kaplan)

We have heard countless speakers boast of the greatness of America, our great power, our economic strength, our military prowess, our industrial wealth, but we have never heard any speaker answer the question, "What is our soul?"

This crazy, anxious, turbulent world is looking at the United States and is asking us a question which we must answer if our prestige is to be great among nations, and that question is, "What do you, Americans, believe?"

Do we honestly believe in Mammon, the god of wealth? Is our industrial might, our inventiveness, our desire for wealth and more wealth, more cars, more mink coats, more and better homes, more leisure time, more wages all we believe in?

Are we a people interested only in the material things of life? Apparently that is the picture the world is beginning to see although in our humble opinion the picture is not a true one and is distorted.

We shall attempt to aswer that question.

WE BELIEVE IN GOD

That is our basic belief. There are more churches in the United States than anywhere else in the world. Never before has attendance in church been so great as it is today proving, at least, one thing, that our people are making an effort to get closer to God.

WE BELIEVE IN HUMANITY

The admonition, "Love ye one another," is best exemplified by the outpouring of our wealth and our love upon people of the world whenever a need for help is present. No matter what the cause, when disaster strikes, whether it be an earthquake, a flood or pestilence of one kind or other, we respond quickly and eagerly to help those in need. Our yearly charity drives for polio, muscular dystrophy, heart disease, tuberculosis and funds for a multitude of other similar purposes attest to the basic desire of our people to help one another. The desire to help, assist, aid one another clearly depicts the kindliness and generosity of our people.

WE BELIEVE IN EQUALITY

Our very Constitution, under which we live, sets out the great truth that all men are created equal and that they are endowed with the unalienable right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. True, there are bigots everywhere who would violate this truth, but as a government, as a nation, as a people we believe in this great truth and we practice it.

WE BELIEVE IN FREEDOM

From the very beginning of this great Nation, when our forefathers pledged their "lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor" in their fight for freedom, this has been our great treasure and for this one great cause we have fought several wars and many of our bravest young men have died in the effort to preserve freedom not only for ourselves but for the peoples of the world.

WE BELIEVE IN PEACE

Being a peace-loving people, we want peace but not at the price of giving up our right to worship God in our own way, our freedom, our love of humanity, our belief in equality and freedom. That's why we have, many times, turned the other cheek when other nations have goaded us to the brink of war. We have fought only when war was absolutely necessary to preserve our sacred ideals and beliefs.

Oh, yes, we have juvenile delinquency; many people are thoughtless, selfish, greedy and filled with hate. But, that is not the picture of our people as a whole.

What do we believe in? The divinity of man who was created in God's image. We believe in the sanctity of life. We believe in doing unto others as we would have them do unto us. We believe in remaining wrapped in the spirit of God.

We believe in the dignity of man.

A nation possessing this belief simply cannot perish. But we must spread this belief among all people, even unto the least of us, so that every man, woman and child sees, feels and lives this belief, for no chain is stronger than its weakest link and we cannot afford weak links in this churning world where dictators and madmen are struggling for power.

In conclusion may we point out that the American Legion is a symbol of all we believe for the American Legion stands for a firm belief in God and the brotherhood of man.

All this and even more we, as a people, believe.

Santa Fe Trail Caravan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following narrative of the activities of the Santa Fe Trail Caravan which is presently in progress as part of the Kansas Centennial Observance.

Taking part in the caravan are two very fine young people, Mr. and Mrs. Dick Janes, constituents of mine from Mission, Kans. I have asked Mr. and Mrs. Janes to be my reporters on the caravan, so that I, in turn, may inform the Congress about the progress of the wagon train. Mr. and Mrs. Janes are going to report every 2 days, and I will put their reports into the RECORD periodically.

The account of the first few days follows:

After months and months of planning 29 entries assembled on May 7, 1961, in Shawnee Mission, Kans., to begin the Sante Fe Trail Caravan.

May 8 was the first day on the trail, taking us through Mission, Merriam, Shawnee, and Overland Park, Kans. Down the trail came the 7th Cavalry from Mission, the Territorial Governor from Merriam, a horse-drawn black hearse from Shawnee and the Overland Stage from Overland Park, plus all the other entries. In the evening the people in the caravan participated in the frontier days celebration, consisting of a gaslight tent show held in Mission, and a buffalo barbeque.

May 9 found us on our way to Olathe and the first leg of our journey. Quantrill's Raiders were the entry from Olathe, bringing back the memory of the many raids Quantrill made in this area.

A circuit rider was the entry from Baldwin, our next stop. Upon arriving we were served a nice box lunch and we then had a parade through the town.

At dawn the trail was Overbrook, with the horse and buggy doctor as their entry. It was to commemorate the mode of transportation of doctors during that era. After a barbeque supper we then traveled on to Burlingame for the night, where we were received with much hospitality. Our horses were well taken care of while we stayed in homes. Entertainment was plentiful and varied, with a carnival, horse show, square dancing, and a huge fire to gather around. Bright and early the next morning breakfast was served to us at the high school before the parade. Two dragoon soldiers were the featured entry from Burlingame. The town's hospitality was again shown with a delicious lunch prepared at the barbeque area.

Things were pretty windy and dusty as we came into Council Grove, but the show did go on. We paraded before the largest crowd so far. Everyone had turned out to see the chuck wagon pulled by oxen and the trail scout which was their entry. Council Grove was the last place to buy supplies for the trek across the plains.

Before we knew it, we were on our way to Herington, however, not without a couple of mishaps. One horse got tangled in barbed wire and fell, and another tried jumping out of his trailer.

Upon arriving in Herington we fed and bedded the horses down for the night and we were fed a delicious supper there at the camping grounds. Then we were free to join the entertainment of the evening, consisting of a street square dance. The next morning breakfast was served at the camp grounds and then preparations for the parade got underway. Wild Bill Hickock and Calamity Jane were the historical characters represented from Herington.

Barbecued chicken was the specialty for lunch when we arrived in Marion. General Francis Marion, the "Swamp Fox" was the entry from Marion, for whom the town was named.

An immigrant grain wagon commemorating a Mennonite settlement was the entry from Hillsboro. After the parade we toured the sod house which is a memorial to the Mennonite colonization of the area. The townspeople had prepared a delicious Dutch-German supper for us. While we ate we were entertained by music and singing.

Traveling on to McPherson where we stayed the night, we were free to participate in the evening's festivities. Gen. James B. McPherson is remembered in this area with a statue in the park, so he is the natural entry from here in the caravan.

We are now heading down the trail to Lyons, Kans.

Justice Above Spoils

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of May 11, 1961:

JUSTICE ABOVE SPOILS

Last year Congress did not feel that any new Federal judgeships were needed. Now it has voted for 73.

The key to this sudden reversal? Partisan politics. For several years the courts have been disgracefully clogged. Last year the Judicial Conference urged 59 new judgeships to take care of increased business. But the Democrats controlling Congress didn't want President Eisenhower to have the appointments—even though he offered to name Democrats to half the new posts.

That looked like a very good opportunity to get justice out of the Federal spoils system—where both parties had too largely kept it for many years. It was lost. But President Kennedy has a chance to repair the position. In his campaign he said qualifications should be the first test for judicial appointments. Undoubtedly party leaders will put forward many deserving Democrats who also possess some qualifications for the bench. But undoubtedly also in a good percentage of districts the best qualified man will not be a Democrat.

The partisan pressures, which caused Congress so long to neglect the needs of the courts and then to add extra judges to satisfy demands for patronage plums, will now focus on the Attorney General's office where nominations will originate.

The Attorney General happens to be both the President's brother and his campaign manager. He does not appear to be in the happiest position to satisfy at the same time political creditors and the President's qualifications-first criterion.

This is unfortunate. It underscores the need for both parties to drop the practice of placing campaign managers in the Cabinet.

But even now the final responsibility—and opportunity—rests with the White House. Congress has given John Kennedy an unprecedent opportunity to influence the Federal judiciary for good or ill. Appointments made now can decisively affect national affairs for many decades.

The President faces a major test. How he meets it can be estimated by the caliber, character—and party affiliations—of the judges he selects.

Dr. Thomas Anthony Dooley III Medal

SPEECH
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support House Joint Resolution 306, a bill which calls upon the Nation to award, posthumously, to Dr. Thomas Anthony Dooley III, a token of the affection, the esteem and the admiration which his fellow citizens hold for him. Last session when I introduced H.R. 9404 and at the beginning of this session, when I introduced a joint resolution similar to that being considered, to make an award to Dr. Dooley, a number of people asked me just why I wanted to see this man singled out among the other brave and dedicated people who are serving humanity in faraway places. Frankly, I found it a little difficult to enunciate my precise sentiments. I have been trying, in the months since, to put into words just why I felt this gallant doctor should be an object of special consideration.

The reasons for my admiration for Dr. Dooley—for the Nation's admiration and respect for him—are manifold.

First, it is customary and proper for a grateful country to decorate those men who have, at the risk of their lives and safety, gone forth to do battle against our enemies. We most often give medals to men who do this in the uniform of their country. Dr. Dooley wore that uniform with distinction, when he served as medical officer during the evacuation of the thousands of freedom-loving Vietnamese who fled south after the partition of that unhappy country. I suspect most of the Members of this House have read with incredulous wonder of the harrowing experiencies which that young man underwent during that evacuation. This, in itself, would be ample excuse for some token of his country's esteem. In helping give to thousands of Vietnamese relief from pain and sickness—in helping men, women, and children to escape from the encroachments of the unfree world, Dr. Dooley adequately and more than adequately performed his duty to his country, and to mankind.

But for this young man it wasn't enough to put in his years in the Navy, do his work creditably and courageously, and retire to a civilian life in which, judging by the prophecies of his medical professors, he could have had a remunerative and not particularly wearing medical practice as a "society doctor." Tom Dooley was not content to count his years in the Navy as the payoff to his country and to the spark of love of humanity which illumined him so brilliantly. Like most other great men, Tom Dooley was a little unreasonable, a little impractical, somewhat unused to balancing credits against debts and closing the books as soon as possible. Tom Dooley had to go back, because he had looked upon the naked face of pain and disease and found it unbearable. He was not content with returning to the United States and telling people about what he had seen, hoping to inspire other young men to go forth and emulate what he had done. Instead he had to go himself. He had to throw his own not-very-sturdy body and his steel-tough soul into the fight against mankind's oldest and most implacable enemy—disease. Tom Dooley had to go back to the steaming and disease-ridden jungles of Southeast Asia, to the border settlement of Nam Tha. Why? He had to do it, I think, for the same reason mountain climbers have to climb mountains—for the same reasons country doctors have to answer 2 a.m. calls at homes where they know they won't get paid—for the same reason saints have to march singing into the arenas and the concentration camps. Tom Dooley had to do what he did because he believed in the highest of religious dictates—"That Ye Love One Another." To Tom Dooley this was not a once-a-week text, to be trotted out on Sunday, admired, and put back in its case until next Sunday. It is a commandment—a requirement—a price we must pay, in a way, for being human beings. Tom Dooley, like a few other outstanding human beings in every country and every age, did not begrudge that price, or try to keep his bill low, or to pay it in easy installments.

So, for his devotion to his duty—to a higher and more difficult duty than simply serving his Nation in its uniform, Tom Dooley deserves our respect and our appreciation.

But mere devotion to duty is not enough, I suspect, to merit the medal which we are about to give to Dr. Dooley. What else was there in this man's life and work that merits such an accolade?

Tom Dooley was a dedicated fighter against disease and against pain. In his own books, he quoted the great Albert Schweitzer to the effect that there is a worldwide brotherhood of those who have known pain—that there is an empathy possible among those whose lives and health have been threatened. Tom Dooley belonged to this brotherhood—to this international conspiracy against death. In the course of his own selfless work, Tom Dooley incurred a dangerous cancer. He returned to the United States to have it removed, and then, without knowing whether he had

five decades or 5 months to live, he returned to Laos, to give whatever time his Maker had allotted to him, to the continuing fight. At the risk of his life, in sublimed disregard for his own pain and his own welfare, Tom Dooley returned to the task which his own compulsions drove him to. We all know the story—and the ending. Here, indeed, was devotion to duty, above and beyond the call of duty, at the risk of life and limb.

But what, Mr. Speaker, does this all add up to? Does the fact that a human being may be dying of cancer earn for him anything beyond the sympathy of us all? Does the simple fact of physical courage entitled a man to special recognition by the Congress? Perhaps not. But, Mr. Speaker, there is more meaning than this to Tom Dooley.

In going into Laos, this dedicated physician was not acting as a symbol of American foreign policy. He didn't go to Laos to convert the heathen, or to make good little pro-Americans out of them. Tod Dooley went back to Laos, up to the border village of Nam Tha, a few miles from Communist China, in country where few white men had ever gone, and fewer still were wanted, to heal the sick. He went there, not as one American spreading a newfangled kind of foreign aid, but as a man seeking to serve his brothers in God's family. Tom Dooley's medicine has been criticized as 19th century medicine. It has been defended, on that very basis, as a vast improvement over the 14th century medicine available, and as the kind of thing the people of the area could most effectively utilize and continue when Dooley was gone.

In doing this, Tom Dooley has done something for us all. He has, no doubt, made friends for America in Laos. That is very desirable, and very laudable. But he has done more—and for his fellow-Americans. He has shown them a vision of the kind of faith that moves mountains and conquers worlds. He has shown us a better way to win men's hearts than by giving them bombs and bullets to shoot at our enemies. He has shown us a new glimpse into an old reality—into the kind of power that brotherhood can have.

But let me say it in Tom Dooley's own words:

Let us stop all this blather and bleat about the beatitudes of democracy. Let us get out and show, with simple spontaneity and love, our ability to work at the level of the people we aim to aid. Let us stop proclaiming ourselves as the world standard. Democracy, as championed by the United States, does not translate well into Lao. Not yet. We evolved it from 1776 to 1958. Let us be patient with the Asian. The Lao need only time, education, and stimulation.

I believe that we would gain more for our own country (and this is certainly part of the incentive behind our foreign aid) if we emphasized the connections that exist between peoples. Let us show that we believe these connections to be greater than the differences. The cables binding humanity around the world are stronger than national rivalries. Let us reaffirm, and then live, our belief in the family of man. Let us prove again that America understands that "God hath made of one blood all men for to dwell upon the earth."

For his personal courage, for his devotion to his duty, for the gift, not the loss of his life, for the lesson in the stimulation of humility and the power of love that he has given to all the world, but mostly to us, Tom Dooley deserves the gratitude of our Nation.

Route 8: A Joint Operation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD to include an editorial printed on page 1 of the Winsted (Conn.) Evening Citizen endorsing a proposal by Gov. John N. Dempsey for a $150 million State bond issue for the very commendable State highway construction program.

A public hearing on the proposal will be held Thursday in the Connecticut Senate Chamber and I am confident that public support such as that expressed in the Winsted Citizen and in the other newspapers of Connecticut, particularly in the Fifth Congressional District which I represent, will play an important role in bringing this desirable program to fruition.

Unless immediate steps are taken to improve the Naugatuck Valley Highway System, this great industrial center is faced with economic strangulation.

Governor Dempsey has taken a bold, forceful, and imperative step in his recommendation which I believe merits the support and endorsement so eloquently expressed by the Winsted Citizen editorial which follows:

ROUTE 8: A JOINT OPERATION

With yesterday's announcement by Gov. John N. Dempsey that a public hearing on his $150 million State road construction program will be held Thursday at 1 p.m. in the senate chamber, Route 8 supporters started planning today for another assault on Capitol Hill.

At the Route 8 public hearing held recently in the house of representatives, other towns in the Naugatuck Valley turned out great numbers of supporters but Winsted missed the boat. Let's hope the turnout is appreciably greater for this one.

Governor Dempsey made it apparent only last night, that if we want the roads, we must sacrifice. He advised 85 newspaper executives at a meeting in Bristol that Route 8 hasn't chance unless Routes 9, 12, and 72 are also considered. It is evident that unless the entire Dempsey program is endorsed we won't get the roads.

Winsted needs an improved Route 8, as much as Torrington, Thomaston, Waterbury, or any other of the towns down through the Naugatuck Valley. The $150 million bonding program as proopsed by the Governor appears the only answer.

To junk the program would mean that future Route 8 improvements would be done on a piecemeal basis, taking years to complete. Even under the present program it will be 2 or 3 years before new concrete slabs are available for transportation. But this is due to the giant proportions of the program.

Governor Dempsey said last night that were the $150 million program approved by the General Assembly, he could visualize a crash program being instituted to bring about as quick results as possible.

The Naugatuck Valley road program has long been overlooked by both political parties and it is high time that these same politicians toss aside their battle axes and join forces to bring about this necessary improvement.

But, as the Governor reiterated, we won't get Route 8 without granting Routes 9, 12, and 72, so the battle goes on.

It is a gigantic program and one that will cost money. The $150 million being asked will cost somewhere between $50 and and $75 million in interest over the next 30 years. If we want the roads, we'll have to pay but in this case paying appears justified.

New industry, and old industry too, demand decent roads. This is proven by the numbers of new plants which have located along the recently completed Connecticut Turnpike. If Winsted, like Torrington, Waterbury, etc., is to prosper in the future, these roads must be provided.

Governor Dempsey takes no personal credit for the program. Rather he credits the individuals who came to his office in great numbers, appealing that something be done. He says, "It's not my program—it's yours."

In this issue Democrats and Republicans should unite behind our legislators, Representative John G. Groppo and James P. Walsh, for the one common interest—the completion of the program as proposed—with the knowledge that what is good for the town is good for its people, and Route 8 to Winsted is a must.

No Meat in Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a timely editorial in the May 9 edition of the Muncie, Ind., Star commenting on proposed new farm legislation. The editorial is entitled "No Meat in Moscow," and it merits thoughtful attention:

NO MEAT IN MOSCOW

Congressman RALPH HARVEY, as a member of the House Committe on Agriculture, has questioned Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman closely and specifically about the proposed new farm law. He was most particularly concerned to know whether "it would be possible for hogs or cattle, or even sheep, or poultry, to be put under Government marketing orders" if the Kennedy plan for farmers is adopted. Freeman replied that it would although he stated that he did not think such a step would be practical at this time.

HARVEY pointed out that once one type of meat product is put under Government control "then * * * all livestock products would eventually wind up under Government control." He added that there are many reasons why he did not think it a good idea. Some of those reasons include the complexity and size of the livstock industry, the general satisfaction of farmers with a free livestock market and the fact that this country exports only a small amount of meat products.

Perhaps HARVEY did not see the Associated Press news story from Moscow which appeared about the same time he was talking

to Freeman. He would have found additional reasons to oppose the Freeman-Cochrane-Kennedy plan for controlled farming.

An acute meat shortage has hit Moscow, according to the news report of April 28. The Government in Russia, operating in accordance with the Communist theory of national planning, sets the amount of meat which Soviet citizens need to consume and which Red farmers are to produce. An AP correspondent who toured the state-run butcher shops in Moscow failed to find a single scrap of fresh meat, not even sausages. Canned meat from Bulgaria and dried fish were available.

Meat could be bought in the central market where the peasants bring produce grown on their private plots of land. But the peasants set their own prices in that market, and chunks of beef including the bone were being sold for 4.75 rubles per kilogram, or more than $2 per pound. The peasants were selling eggs for 16 cents each.

Pravda, the official news outlet for the Communist government, made some vague allusion to the fact that public control had not forced the fulfillment of meat quotas. Other Soviet newspapers offered no explanation. Apparently it isn't good form to point out that Red agriculture has failed under the direction of Nikita S. Khrushchev.

If an American farmer, or any American Congressman, wants to know how a controlled agriculture operates, all he has to do is look to Russia. Government control of supply, which is exactly what Freeman wants and what the Communists have in Russia, will bring meatless days to Washington.

The United States doesn't need to adopt any plan of this kind.

We Can Defeat Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include an essay on the subject of "Communism," written as an English assignment by one of my young constituents, Willard M. Hanzlik. It is always encouraging to find our youth of today so cognizant of the necessity to heed the teachings of our forefathers and the laws of the Constitution with which we have been endowed, in order to preserve our country and our way of life. I feel this essay has set forth quite well, the basic ideals of all loyal American citizens:

WE CAN DEFEAT COMMUNISM

Communism can be defeated by our having more confidence in our own Government, and by each person trying harder to make the system work. American citizens who develop a love for their country will not be influenced by outside political forces. Good American citizens will be alert to the evils of the atheist communism. The Government of the United States was founded in 1776 by earnest God-loving men. These men had a surging power behind them—this was faith. If faith had not been so strong as it was, America would not be America as we know it today. Men like Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson had great faith in America. We cannot afford to let these Founding Fathers down; America must be kept strong. By supporting America's democratic ways, we, as citizens, can help to make America stronger. Communism is completely contrary to all of our basic standards; therefore by allowing communism to enter America, we are actually denouncing our democracy. Is America to allow foreign aggression, or are we to stand up and fight for what we believe? Certainly an atheist society cannot spread to a God-loving society of freedom. Above all else, remember this: Jesus said: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." J. Edgar Hoover says at the conclusion of his book, "Masters of Deceit," "In communism we see what happens when freedom is extinguished. This must give us renewed zeal to work untiringly to uphold the ideals of justice and liberty which have made this Nation great."

Address by Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, at the testimonial luncheon given in his honor by the mayor and city of New York on Monday, May 15, 1961, Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg presented a most interesting and thought-provoking address in which he touched on several important problems of national interest. His views and thoughts deserve wider attention, and I am therefore pleased to insert his address into the RECORD.

Secretary Goldberg deserves to be commended for demonstrating that his approach to problems is not one-sided. He gave sound advice to both labor and industry, and I hope and trust they will take his advice in a spirit of cooperation for the Nation's interest. He asked both of them to observe "a simple rule of mortality" by eliminating discrimination in housing and employment. Laws alone will not end such discrimination, but it can be accomplished through fair practices and unprejudiced policies.

Significantly, Secretary Goldberg spoke about the work stoppage at our missile bases in which we are all so deeply concerned. In speaking of the remedies to this situation, he said:

It has been suggested that the quickest way to attain the goal we seek is to adopt a law, to compel a solution.

But I have learned from long experience that the adoption of laws does not necessarily solve the problem. Whether a law could or could not is beside the point. Labor and management, without a law to compel them, can on their own volition agree on these principles:

That the program is one of urgent priority;

That the work should be performed economically, at decent wage levels, under fair conditions;

That, as during the war, free labor and free management can outproduce the regimented and compelled work force of the totalitarian countries;

That, therefore, no interruption of work should take place.

I consider these proposals by the Secretary of Labor as very sage advice and I sincerely hope that both sides will agree to it. As a member of the House Science and Astronautics Committee, I was extremely perturbed when I learned about these work stoppages and how much it is hurting our progress in scientific research and development, especially in space research.

The text of Secretary Goldberg's address is as follows:

I am greatly honored by this affair tendered to me by the mayor and the city of New York. It is, I think, characteristic of this city that you have so honored two members of President Kennedy's Cabinet, and that those members are the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Labor.

I am sure my distinguished colleague, Luther Hodges, was as gratified at the luncheon given for him as I am today.

These affairs show an awareness—by your great mayor and the citizens of New York—of the interrelationship of industry and commerce and labor in the life of this city, and indeed in the life of the country.

Gestures of this sort are indications of the truly progressive character of your city. It is that progressive tradition, dating back many years, that has helped New York attain the eminence it enjoys in this Nation and throughout the world.

I would like this afternoon to address myself to a provocative concept advanced by our President, one that has been the subject of much discussion and soul searching, both in our press and in our own individual minds.

In his inaugural address, the President said: "Ask not what your country can do for you, but ask what you can do for your country."

The question has been raised as to why the country was not furnished with a bill of particulars. This desire of people to be told specifically how to make their contribution to the national effort is quite understandable. Yet, I would like to raise the counterquestion with you as to whether this uncertainty does not in itself reflect a lack of awareness on the part of the people of their responsibilities to our society.

We pride ourselves for our dependence upon free enterprise, a free economy and personal decision to provide us with the goods and services for a good life. We are justifiably proud of our free institutions and the contributions they make. The managers of our vast industries, the leaders of our great labor unions, the important citizens who direct community affairs—all are among the prime movers of our national life.

At the same time, while Government has important responsibilities which it must exercise responsibility in our society, we ought not let Government dominate our lives. I am sure that most of us agree with that concept.

Given that general frame of mind, then, I would like to pose this question: Why is there any lack of awareness of what these tremendous groups, and the individuals in these groups, can do to advance the national interest?

I would like to suggest some answers, by way of specific examples in fields closely related to my own responsibilities as Secretary of Labor. I am, for example, the Vice Chairman of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity. The problem of discrimination exists in our national life.

That problem is not geographic in character. It is not, as those of us who live in the large, northern industrial cities would sometimes like to believe, strictly a southern

XUM

problem. It exists here in New York, for example, in housing and employment practices.

Of course, the National Government is very much concerned with this problem, and is taking what are hoped to be effective steps to discharge its own obligations in this area. I believe that the beginning that has been made is extremely promising. President Kennedy's forceful leadership in this field has been reinvigorating. Under it, this administration has been able to create what I believe is a new and better climate for opportunity to flourish.

And here in New York, under your Governor and your distinguished mayor, much has been done. In this enlightened State and city, statutory protections exist to insure fair employment practices, for example.

Thus far government; but what of our private groups?

In reply to the question—what can I do for my country?—I say to the members of the business and management and labor communities of America: stop discriminating.

No individual or group needs a law or an Executive order to coax or command them to observe a simple rule of morality.

That would be a genuine contribution to the national welfare. Businessmen can follow fair employment and promotional practices and policies on their own volition, in their own businesses. Labor unions can end discriminatory habits using their own means and powers.

I might add a corollary thought here, as a visitor to this greatest of all western metropolises. As hosts to the world, and especially to the United Nations, the citizens of New York can make a real contribution to our welfare by pursuing the open and unprejudiced policy of the civilized host—as I am sure you try to do.

This should be true not only for first rank Ambassadors and diplomats but for the entire world community that lives and works here within your city limits.

My hometown, the Nation's Capital, faces the same responsibility.

What can you do for your country?

Let me give another example. I am, of course, very much concerned with labor-management relations. We have lately been engaged in an effort to insure regularity and stability in the work going on at our missile bases. This, in fact, is one of the things that brings me to New York today.

It has been suggested that the quickest way to attain the goal we seek is to adopt a law, to compel a solution.

But I have learned from long experience that the adoption of laws does not necessarily solve the problem. Whether a law could or could not is beside the point. Labor and management, without a law to compel them, can on their own volition agree on these principles:

That the program is one of urgent priority;

That the work should be performed economically, at decent wage levels, under fair conditions;

That, as during the war, free labor and free management can outproduce the regimented and compelled work force of the totalitarian countries;

That, therefore, no interruption of work should take place.

Now this attitude, and this remark, are not necessarily limited to the organizations working at missile bases.

My experience has convinced me that if labor and management are awaiting a bill of particulars on what they can do for their country, they don't have to look far.

There is no Government policy that prevents labor and management from developing, by mutual effort, better machinery for the settlement of disputes in vital matters—and in other matters as well. I would and do encourage such an effort. When labor and management ask: What can we do for our country?—an obvious answer is: Keep the peace. Keep the industrial peace not because a law compels you to but because of the welfare of the country and because it is to your own enlightened self-interest to do so.

I mentioned civil rights and labor-management relations as examples where voluntary effort in the public interest is self-suggesting.

Let me give you a third, based upon an interest inherent in the Secretary of Labor's job. Last week, the President issued an Executive order creating a Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime. I have the honor to serve with Attorney General Kennedy and Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Ribicoff on that committee.

The President's Committee will, of course, enlist the aid and seek the cooperation of governments and private organizations in this fight against the waste of delinquency.

In this important area, with $10 million authorized for Federal grants, it is obvious that if the President's Committee is to succeed it must depend upon the cooperation and aid of States and private organizations.

In commenting on this Executive order, the Washington Post remarked: "Juvenile delinquency is essentially a local problem which must be dealt with through local agencies—schools, churches, settlement houses, community welfare agencies—operating together to bring hostile and rebellious youth into participation in the community's life. The real need is to put what is now known into use and to prod responsible private and public agencies at the local level into more effective operation."

I agree with that sentiment. The Federal Government can perform good and needed service in this field. It is also true that long before the Executive order was issued, manifesting Presidential concern and intention to appropriate action, the question of what you could do for your country provided its own answer to men and women already at work on delinquency.

I have given you three instances of areas where individual and group response to the President's concept should be clear. There are many others, both inside and outside my own responsibility.

In the singular world of today, a world of troubled neighborhoods rather than separate nations, our Government undertakes aid programs that are of vital and paramount importance for the peace and security of the world.

These programs do not exclude voluntary efforts by groups and individuals.

A religious group near Washington, D.C., for example, has been sending cows to areas in the world where a cow is a treasure, and where fresh milk is a luxury.

Large programs like CARE are effective expressions of private American concern. They are examples of what persons in private capacities can do for their country and the world—for in leading the world toward greater well-being they also strengthen the United States.

This is a great metropolitan area, a huge complex of people and activity.

You know that as social problems arise, as the daily business of living becomes more and more demanding and challenging, the powers that can be brought to bear upon solutions need to be more effective. Responsible government must be an instrument for progress when the means at hand to private groups are not adequate to the problem they face. At the same time, government cannot be responsible unless our people make it so, unless they view their own actions in the light of the interest of all.

I would paraphrase the words of the President this way: All of us know what our country has done for us, and all of us know, in our heart and conscience, what we should do for our country. The resolution to act, to move forward, to seek the path of good conscience, is the only decision that remains.

The John Birch Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, an article by George Todt which appeared in the April 28, 1961, issue of the Los Angeles Herald-Express, a newspaper published in Los Angeles, Calif., helps to clarify the objectives of the John Birch Society. Mr. Todt's observations stem from an interview he recently had with Mr. Welch. Under unanimous consent I include the article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

GEORGE TODT'S OPINION—WHY WELCH IS ATTACKED

"Neither cast yet your pearls before swine."—Matthew XIII: 6.

Not long ago I had a private interview with stormy petrel Robert Welch of the much-publicized John Birch Society and asked him what he was up to in these modern times.

"Do you intend to form a third party?" I asked him.

"Not at all," he replied. "The real purpose of the John Birch Society is to act as a positive force for moral rearmament in our Republic. We wish to rejuvenate the Nation with the spirit of the Founding Fathers and the American Revolution of 1776. It has been sadly lacking in recent years. What could be more important now?"

Welch appears to be anything except the Fascist ogre he has been represented to be in the so-called liberal comunications media from here to New York City and points in between.

HIS SECRET?

When one talks to this sincere and dedicated person at close range, it is hard to imagine valid reasons for the hysterical hatchet work from so many sides.

Why does this mild-mannered little man panic the "liberals" more than all of Nikita Khrushchev's armored divisions, submarines and his Communist fifth column now operating with near-impunity and untold impudence in our country today?

What is his secret, anyway? Perhaps, I have a hunch that might explain it. It's only a guess—but here goes.

I think Bob Welch may have pricked the moral conscience of all too many Americans who have had their head much too far down in the sand ere now. Many of us have been fiddling carelessly while the Republic is burning in more ways than one. Our slogan has been "business as usual."

Frankly, we have been so preoccupied with our materialism that we have pretended the danger which now threatens us with potential destruction unless defeated just did not exist in the past.

Or if we did not go quite that far, we at least minimized the danger of the Communist conspiracy to our national welfare. It was something we kept putting off for "manana"—the tomorrow which never comes.

DID THE BEST

So we really did not do enough of what we ought to have done competently in our own interests. We spent a lot of money as taxpayers, to be sure. But what did it gain us? Where are our friends? Who can we count upon now?

If any were to ask me whether I lacked confidence in the good intentions of previous Presidents regarding our national security vis-a-vis the Communist world government conspiracy, my answer would be an unequivocal "No." I think they did the best they knew how.

But if the question were put to me in the vein of whether I thought they might have done enough to stem the onrushing Red tide, sorrowfully I would have to say "No" to that one, too. Well-intentioned though they might have been, the present day results attest to the fact that not nearly enough actually has been done. Not against the cunning and wily Marxist global strategists.

STUDY HOOVER

The only exception among our Presidents was wise octogenarian Herbert Hoover, Sr., a down-to-earth thinker who called the shots right where world communism was concerned from the beginning.

The smartest thing we could do, it seems to me, is to study again the brilliant counsel this tragically underrated President had to give a heedless people concerning the Red menace from Eurasia.

We have been at fault as a nation because we listened to the wrong advice about the Communist peril. Now we are sorry.

We have traveled down a blind alley until we have reached a swamp of bitter disappointment—and now we must need retrace our steps if we may hope to get out of the deadly morass alive.

FITTING GOAL

We have only ourselves to blame for our numerous troubles today.

And now comes forth Robert Welch to chide us and even to shame us for our inept failures to meet properly the Marxist menace in the past—and many of those with saddened consciences as to their previous roles in the unhappy scheme of things must presently in self-defense feel obliged to strike back at him.

Perhaps Welch has become something of a goad to the national conscience by this time. Is that why his detractors fear him?

At any rate, I think his idea for a bona fide moral rejuvenation of our Nation is a fitting goal to strive for nowadays. We need it.

Maybe the John Birch Society will ultimately help to get a real moral renaissance underway in our country, not a third party. Let's hope so.

Tribute to Arthur Joyal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most inspiring men with whom I have shared friendship, and with whom I was privileged to work closely during the period I was Deputy Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, is Mr. Arthur Joyal of my hometown of Lowell, Mass. The Lowell Sun recently paid well-merited tribute to Mr. Joyal, and under unanimous consent I include this column in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

SKETCHBOOK—HELPING OTHERS IS HIS MAIN PURPOSE IN LIFE

(By Robert Hatem)

DRACUT.—If you are looking for a man with personality and qualifications that make him a man among men, meet Arthur Joyal, medical supervisor of the local Veterans' Administration office.

To find out why our subject works overtime trying to help others one must first consider events that led to a hospital bed; a year of convalescence, and the approach Mr. Joyal decided to take in starting his life all over again.

Born in Lowell, he was educated in local public schools and after completing studies at Lowell High School was employed by a roofing company and a sheet metal firm.

That was before World War II rattled the globe. Then in 1942, he enlisted in the U.S. Navy, and that became his way of life for the next 3 years.

During this period, he became ill and was confined to a naval hospital in California.

While a patient he kept abreast of developments around him by reading as many as five newspapers daily. Good literature, particularly biographies, became his favorite pastime.

This lasted for 8 months. Late in 1945, he was released from the hospital and given an honorable discharge from the military. He was 100 percent disabled.

He returned to Lowell, but he did not readjust immediaetly. Mr. Joyal was ordered to bedrest for 4 months.

However, he refused to sympathize with himself during this period and when he was told he might leave his bed, Mr. Joyal did not waste time telling friends and neighbors of his misfortune.

He was employed by the Veterans' Administration in Boston and commuted from Lowell to the Hub until 1949, when he was appointed a medical supervisor of the Lowell office.

Since that time he has become friend and adviser to almost every disabled veteran in greater Lowell.

However, helping people doesn't end there. Mr. Joyal through the Knights of Columbus, the United Fund, the Community Council, and the Catholic Charitable Bureau has taken it upon himself to help people.

Why? Well, as far as the Sketchbook was able to learn, spending a year in a hospital and seeing firsthand the problems of others, brings out the "I am my brother's keeper" instinct in the man.

A Dream of an Educator, Dr. Peter Sammartino, Becomes a Reality at Fairleigh Dickinson University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, Ralph Waldo Emerson, the sage of Concord, once declared that a man's reach should exceed his grasp, else why are the heavens made? Dr. Peter Sammartino is an educator who built dream castles in his early days, and by dint of stick-to-itiveness and sacrifice finally made his dream castle develop into reality.

As a young college student, I met Dr. Peter Sammartino, who was teaching in the College of the City of New York and also in Columbia University. We were fraternity brothers of Alpha Phi Delta, and while I represented the metropolitan area as the vice consul which included the major colleges of the eastern seaboard, Dr. Sammartino was the consul or president of the national fraternity in the major colleges throughout the country. We knew each other intimately and frequently exchanged our viewpoints as to the best method of developing a full man and an educated man. In those days, Dr. Sammartino indicated his broad perspective and understanding of what made our country great—that all men had equal opportunity to advance themselves to the limit of their ability, sacrifice, and intelligence.

The great New York paper, the New York Mirror on Saturday, May 13, 1961, in commenting upon the contributions of outstanding Americans of Italian ancestry, wrote a life story of Dr. Sammartino. In that article, the feature writers, Ara Piastro and Harry Altshuler, describe the manner in which the dream of Dr. Sammartino became a great university. On one occasion I attended a ceremony at Fairleigh Dickinson University, at which the young ladies who were about to graduate made their debut before the parents, public officials, and outstanding citizens. It was a thrilling experience and one in which I shall never forget. I believe that the article in the New York Mirror would prove of interest to the readers and will demonstrate how one man can make his imprint upon Americans seeking higher education and can prove an inspiration to those who desire enlightenment and educational opportunities.

The article follows:

HIS DREAM BECOMES A GREAT UNIVERSITY

(What makes a community a good place to live in, what makes a nation great? People—the devoted ones, the dedicated ones whose lives stand as shining examples to the rest of us. It's high time to recognize, among these builders of our civilization, the many and notable contributions of citizens of Italian birth or descent. Here is the seventh article of a new Mirror series about some outstanding members of this group.)

(By Ara Piastro and Harry Altshuler)

Fairleigh Dickinson University began with a haunted house.

It was a handsome but unused 25-room mansion known as "The Castle," in Rutherford, N.J. What haunted it was not a spook, but the thoughts of Dr. Peter Sammartino, who saw it frequently in 1933 when, just across the street, he was courting Sylvia Scaramelli, who became his wife late that year.

"What a wonderful place that would be," he kept thinking, "to start a college."

Dr. Sammartino was associated at the time with New College, part of Columbia University Teachers College. With some other educators, he had conducted a survey of the higher education needs in the Rutherford area. Local high school principals were complaining that many of their better students had to give up plans for college because the colleges were too far away and too expensive.

The house and the idea continued to haunt Dr. Sammartino, but through the

years of the great depression little could be done about it. Finally, late in 1941, he and 16 of the high school principals interested Col. Fairleigh S. Dickinson, head of a surgical appliance concern, who bought "The Castle" and handed it over to them.

On December 3, the New Jersey Board of Higher Education tentatively approved their plan to establish a college. Then came December 7—Pearl Harbor. The following day, the board of higher education met to reconsider. By a single vote, the college plan squeaked through. A year later, Fairleigh Dickinson opened its doors, as a 2-year junior college, with a student body of 59 coeds and 1 lone 4–F.

Currently the university has 14,000 students on three campuses. It has a 4-year college of liberal arts and sciences, it has the only new school of engineering established in this country in the last last decade, a school of business administration, a school of education, a school of dentistry, and a graduate school. Dr. Sammartino has been its president and guiding hand from the beginning.

He was born in New York City on August 15, 1904, one of the two children of Guy and Eva Sammartino. The father had come to this country in 1901, working first as a pastry chef, then as a wholesale dealer in pastry.

Peter attended Stuyvesant High School and City College here, playing piano in an orchestra to help meet his expenses. He did graduate work in education at New York University, taking his master's degree in 1928 and his doctorate in 1931. Interested in teaching French, he topped off his own background with courses at the Sorbonne in Paris.

He taught for several years in New York City schools before going to Columbia's new college, where he was chairman of the language department.

Somehow, he found time in the midst of this busy career to write a number of language textbooks, as well as studies of educational techniques and philosophy, and on the side to pursue such diverse hobbies as golf and folklore.

The phenomenal growth of Fairleigh Dickinson stands as a living monument to his beliefs that a college can "give training in some career field so a student can achieve economic security within a reasonable time after graduation," and at the same time, "give a cultural background of general studies, vital and dynamic, to help a student live a full and successful life."

This his work has accomplished for the community—and its larger meaning to the Nation cannot be overlooked either. That value, Sammartino has written, "is to point out how a region can help meet its higher education needs without recourse to tax funds."

His work is a lesson that has inspired and will continue to inspire teachers as well as students.

Foreign-Made Glass

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to bring to the attention of the Congress a statement written by Mr. Thurman M. Nelson, president of Local No. 5, United Glass and Ceramic Workers of North America, from Shreveport, La. This statement refers to the flood of foreign glass which is being imported into this country.

On March 14, I appeared before the U.S. Tariff Commission, urging that this Commission take immediate action in further curbing the imports of foregn glass made by the low-paid workers in foreign countries at this time. I thought the reception given to me and others by the U.S. Tariff Commission was excellent and I was buoyed up with the thought that the Commission would give the glass people throughout the country a quick decision. Months have gone by since then and no decision has come from the Tariff Commission. In the meantime, conditions in this country in the glass industry have become more acute. Foreign-made glass continues to pour into this country in competition with glass made by American workmen.

Within my own home city of Shreveport, La., there is a large glass factory, owned by Libbey-Owens-Ford. Hundreds of workers are employed in this industry. They are outstanding citizens with reputations for paying their bills, supporting local civic projects, and rearing their families in this community as American citizens should do. I want to join with others who are working toward the reducing of foreign-made glass, in support of these people. They are fine citizens and they should have our active and aggressive support.

Before the glass industry reaches such a point that it may have to close the doors of many of its plants, I make another appeal to the Tariff Commission to make an early decision on the request submitted to it for the reduction of foreign-made glass in competition with our own products.

This statement is as follows:

On March 14, 15, and 16, 1961, the U.S. Tariff Commission held escape clause hearings concerning the imports of window glass from abroad.

Since the imports of window glass ran 425 million square feet in 1959 and approximately 354 million square feet in 1960, the domestic industry finds itself reeling under the impact.

Other than the Libby-Owens-Ford Window Glass Plant in Shreveport, La., a city of some 175,000, there is very little industry as this is an oil and gas center. The glass industry is known as a "family" industry and we have second and third generations of numerous families employed in the Shreveport plant.

This fact in itself illustrates that a glass worker would be very much out of place in any other industrial plant even if Shreveport were an industry city.

We have made a plea to the U.S. Tariff Commission through our international office for relief through the establishment of quotas as outlined in section 7 of the trade agreements legislation. We are therefore very prayerful that this relief will be granted so that this old American industry can continue to be enjoyed by the present workers and the glassworkers of the future.

If the U.S. Tariff Commission recommends relief for our glass industry, we hope and pray that you will give it your most serious consideration.

Respectfully yours,
THURMAN M. NELSON,
President, Local No. 5, United Glass and Ceramic Workers of North America, AFL–CIO.

Uneasy Alliance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Gaston Coblentz which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on May 5, 1961. This is the first of Mr. Coblentz' reports from Romania:

BORDER CONTROLS STRINGENT—ROMANIA AND HUNGARY: AN UNEASY ALLIANCE OF TWO COMMUNIST NATIONS

(By Caston Coblentz)

CLUJ, RUMANIA.—Coming from Hungary, the fascinating northern route across Rumania to Bucharest begins near Oradea with one of the most stringent frontier inspections in Europe.

Although the frontier runs between two Communist nations, the Rumanian side is guarded by high wooden watchtowers. Three are visible from the border-crossing point.

The scene somewhat resembles the watchtower network the Hungarian Communists have erected along their common border with neutral Austria some 250 miles farther west.

Rumania is, in a number of respects, a land of still tighter controls than Hungary. It has for example, built watchtowers of the same type at various points along its borders with Yugoslavia and even, in northern Moldavia, as some localities on the long stretch of Rumanian frontier that faces the Soviet Union.

AHEAD OF THE BARRIER

The exhaustive customs check at Oradea starts when a stiff-gestured Rumanian soldier steps athwart the highway to halt approaching cars, a few feet before the Rumanian frontier barrier. The inspection takes place before you are allowed to pass the barrier.

Pactically everything has to be taken out of the car. The inspector's intention seems to be concentrated on preventing letters or political literature from being smuggled in. Virtually every book or pamphet in the baggage is rifled.

Casually but systematically, you are asked whether you speak Rumanian, whether you have relatives in Rumania, and, above all, whether you speak Hungarian.

The latter question is of primary importance in this region, the westernmost portion of Transylvania, where some 1,600,000 Hungarians live under Rumanian rule. Northern Transylvania, long a source of conflict between Hungary and Rumania, was recovered by the Rumanians at the end of World War II.

STILL A SORE SPOT

While territorial issues between Eastern European states are officially stated to have been liquidated by their common Communist allegiance, it is apparent that the Transylvania matter is still alive in many minds in each area.

In Budapest, this correspondent heard Hungarian Communists speak acidly about it. One of them, a man of 50, raised in Oradea, referred to the town exclusively by its Hungarian name, Nagyvarad. In common with his secretary, a woman born in the same area, he bitterly asked a reporter to give the town his best wishes, somewhat in the manner of West Germans speaking of their lost homes in the Polish-ruled Oder-Neisse area.

Moreover, Hungarian Communists complain that the Rumanian Government is exasperatingly slow in granting visas for Hungarians, Communist or otherwise, to visit relatives in Transylvania. It is reported to take a month to 6 weeks to obtain a visitor's visa, if it is granted at all.

NOT HARD FOR WESTERNER

For a Westerner in possession of a visa, the crossing at Oradea is tedious, but not difficult. After about an hour's formalities you are permitted to proceed eastward.

After Oradea the first Rumanian town with any kind of hotel is Cluj. Like every other place in the region, it also has a Hungarian name, Kolozsvar. It is reached over 90 miles of good asphalt road, along which you gain a vivid impression of Rumanian life.

In Oradea, khaki-uniformed Rumanian soldiers sauntering in a nicely kept park give snappy off-duty salutes to officers strolling amid baby carriages and scampering children on a quiet afternoon.

On the eastern outskirts, a militiaman steps into the middle of the road, notes the license numbers of passing cars and writes them down.

A dozen miles farther on, a long string of small covered wagons driven by some of the most poorly clad peasants in southeastern Europe heads slowly in for the Monday morning market.

ROADSIDE PROPAGANDA

Large numbers of billboards begin to appear on the road, at intervals of 200 or 300 yards. It is a far greater concentration of Communist roadside propaganda than is visible in Hungary or Bulgaria. The posters carry monotonous slogans about fulfilling the current 5-year plan. The texts are in print too small for automobile or truck drivers to read in full, and seem intended primarily for the peasant drivers of the thousands of plodding carts that creep along the roads.

While stopping to read a poster, this correspondent was approached by a motorcyclist, a man of about 48. After a preliminary reconnoiter, he explained that he was a Hungarian living in this part of Rumania and he described Transylvania as currently "occupied" by the Rumanians. He soon raised the subject of Cuba. He had heard about it on the radio, he said. How could the United States have possibly failed to help the invading rebels crush Fidel Castro? he asked with a gesture of dismay.

GAYETY AND RAGS

At Urvind, practically every white house fence is painted with red or blue Communist slogans, many of them in Hungarian.

At Grosi, the entire town is out for a stroll. A half dozen peasant girls are dressed in beautiful national costumes, a riot of bright colors richly embroidered on black cloth. Other peasants are literally in rags.

A few miles onward, a factory is topped with the usual red star and decorated with the oldest of Communist slogans: "Proletarians of the World, Unite."

The process of parking a car in a Cluj garage overnight requires filling out a duplicate form that records where you came from and where you are going.

The 150-mile road to Rumania from Budapest, Hungary, leads to Biharkeresztes, a mud-street village in eastern Hungary, flush on the Rumanian border.

As the asphalt highway bears eastward out of Budapest across the plains, the sights along the way show countryside conditions in Hungary 5 years after the Soviet Army's suppression of the 1956 uprising.

WORKERS WITH CARBINES

The first traffic is a six-truck convoy of workers armed with carbines and wearing red armbands. Heading into town for a Communist ceremony in the capital, they form part of the reconstructed factory militia of the Janos Kadar regime and are among the diehard supporters of Hungarian communism, a small minority in the country, now as before. They are extremely hard-faced in appearance, almost brutal.

On the outer edge of Budapest, there is a large Russian Army barracks along the road, topped with a red star. A few Russian soldiers kick a ball in a sloppy courtyard. Soldiers' wives wander around the barracks, and a few children play something resembling basketball. These troops, also visable on the opposite end of town, are part of the multidivision Soviet force that remains encamped around the city and elsewhere in Hungary.

At Szolnok, about 15 small, new 1-family brick homes are under construction on the outskirts, a characteristic sight in Hungarian villages now. The shops in this rural center of 35,000 persons are better supplied than would be expected. Store windows display rather attractive clothing, and, among other items, pretty toys.

In this area, collective farms are seen in increasing numbers. At one or two, half a dozen tractors are alined under open sheds.

CHECK THOSE NUMBERS

Near Puspokladany, at a red-starred Hungarian military barracks, a soldier with slung rifle on a low guard tower brusquely motions passing cars to go faster. He records the license numbers through binoculars.

At the eastern end of the town a small synagogue is now used as a granary. A girl of 14 offers the assurance that there are no more zhidos (Jews) left in Puspokladany. The windows of the synagogue are smashed. Only the wrenched Stars of David are left in the iron window grillwork. Above the boarded front door, still legible scriptural tablets are engraved in stone.

Grain is heaped in sacks in the entrance and piled loose in the center of the synagogue under the small dome.

Statement of Dr. Freddy Homburger on Using Nation's Health Research Potential

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following :

STATEMENT PRESENTED APRIL 20, 1961, BY FREDDY HOMBURGER, M.D., CAMBRIDGE, MASS., IN TESTIMONY BEFORE THE LABOR, HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen; my name is Freddy Homburger and I am president of Bio-Research Consultants, Inc., in Cambridge, Mass., a firm which carries out consultant services to the chemical, pharmaceutical, cosmetic and food industries. I also serve without salary as president and director of Bio-Research Institute, Inc., of Cambridge, Mass., which is a nonprofit research organization. I come before you as a private citizen not representing any group or organization and I appreciate the privilege of being heard.

To back up the pertinence of my testimony, allow me briefly to review my professional experience in this field which qualifies me as an informed and competent expert on the subjects I am going to discuss. Since 1941, when I came to this country from Switzerland, I have been engaged full time in medical research and teaching and have served in various faculty positions at Yale, Harvard, Cornell, and Tufts Medical Schools and at the Sloan-Kettering Institute for Cancer Research. My last academic appointment was that of research professor of medicine at Tufts University and director of their cancer research unit from 1948 to 1957. I have published more than 145 scientific papers, mostly on experimental biology, cancer, and geriatrics; edited two standard reference works on cancer research, and authored a book on cancer and another on geriatrics. During my career, I have been responsible for the administration of $1,164,020 of U.S. Public Health Service research and teaching funds. I have repeatedly testified before congressional committees and have appeared in newspapers in favor of increased Government support of medical research. I believe that what Congress has done in the past two decades to further the progress of the health sciences will go down in history as one of the great examples of intelligent cooperation among people for the welfare of mankind, and I also believe that the U.S. Public Health Service has done a unique and magnificent job in administering these programs. If these achievements are to be equaled or exceeded in the decades to come, we must have the courage continuously to adapt administrative methods to the changing demands of the times, to face our failures and omissions objectively, to learn from our mistakes and to take action which will prevent future failures and correct past omissions:

1. I submit that we could do much more effective research work than is being done at present to protect the public from cancer-causing agents in consumer goods.

2. I submit that we are not making the fullest possible use of the Nation's health research potential.

3. I submit that the methods used in evaluating research grant applications for support by the U.S. Public Health Service are unnecessarily cumbersome, wasteful of scientific manpower time and not designed to select for support the most important type of research.

I submit that the specific and constructive suggestions I am about to make can, if adopted, effectively overcome the shortcomings just listed.

REGARDING POINT 1

To hasten research designed to give the Food and Drug Administration the methods it needs to enforce the Delaney amendment of the Food and Drug Act and to improve methods for the evaluation of safety of foods, drugs, and cosmetics, I suggest that it is necessary to appropriate funds for such research to the Food and Drug Administration itself, both for intramural work and for a grant-in-aid and contract research program. In my estimation, such a program could be started with a $5 million appropriation for this purpose, together with another $5 million for construction of needed laboratory space in addition to those construction funds now contemplated for the Food and Drug Administration, and in addition to any funds now budgeted for FDA research.

In the field of cancer prevention, we face today a methods gap. We have a law designed to keep from human consumption all cancer-producing substances, but we lack the methods to determine exactly what constitutes a cancer hazard, even for the test animals. The U.S. Public Health Service has taken the position that "the development of bioassay procedures of limited usefulness does not really constitute research" at the very time that the Food and Drug Administration is crying for means to develop these very methods. To round out the fundamen-

XUM

tal research work supported by the Public Health Service in these areas, applied research is needed in fetal, newborn, and adult animals of various species and strains and by various routes of administration, in tissue cultures, micro-organisms, etc. There are today innumerable consumer items which have never been adequately tested because of lack of quick, economical, and reliable methods. It took over 2 years of experimental studies to learn, for example, that Safrole, which has been widely used in soft drinks and is contained in many flavoring agents, is actually a cancer producer in rats. What could be done by effective methods to protect the public against other types of hazards is illustrated by the experience with dinitrophenol, which for years was used as a weight-reducing agent until it became evident that it caused cataracts of the eyes. Dr. Bernard Armbrecht, of the Food and Drug Administration, has now developed a method, using chickens that can demonstrate this toxic property of drugs in a matter of days.

It is eminently reasonable to spend money on the development of preventive measures by reducing to an unavoidable minimum the presence of toxic and carcinogenic matters in the environment, and money so spent will eventually reduce the amounts now expended for research on the diagnosis and treatment of cancer and other diseases. The agency to do this most effectively and with the greatest awareness of the practical problems to be met is the Food and Drug Administration which now has practically no funds for such research.

REGARDING POINT 2

To utilize more fully the Nation's health research potential, better use must be made of the independent research institutes which already exist in this country, outside of universities and hospitals and sometimes loosely affiliated with the latter, and the creation of many more such institutes must be encouraged. I suggest that Congress make certain that research funds be available for independent research institutes on the same basis as they are available to academic institutions. It is further suggested that the full cost of research be paid to independent research institutes whose sole function is research. In addition to this, it is urged that $50 million be appropriated for awards to qualified scientists to enable them to organize, construct and equip 100 independent research institutes at the rate of 2 in each State of the Union, to be operated by Government and private grant-in-aid support. My own experience has shown that less than half a million dollars suffices to create adequate facilities for up to 10 senior scientists and their personnel to conduct research in the life sciences. We have, in the Bio-Research Institute, 7 senior scientists, 45 assistants, and 35,000 animals.

In 1960, 935 institutions were given 11,279 research grants totaling $193,820,591. Of these, 95 organizations, or 10.2 percent can be considered as independent institutes. These independents received 360 grants, or 3.2 percent of the total grant number amounting to 4.6 percent of the money, or $8,931,126. It is not suggested to reduce the research funds available to medical schools, but it is strongly urged to make available sufficient additional money to multiply and strengthen independent institutes. We suggest a new and bold approach toward increasing research in the fight against disease at relatively little cost and without deterring the program already underway in medical schools. This will create more opportunities for full-time researchers to function most effectively in their chosen profession. We spend much time and money today to train scientists, but many of them, after years of such training, have no place to go where they can employ for the benefit of mankind their hard-earned skills. Independent research institutes could provide full-time research opportunities for these highly trained people.

In large academic institutions, today's emphasis is on teamwork and this is indispensable for the progress of a certain type of research. The new, original and imaginative research, however, on which all other types of progress must be built, springs from the minds of individuals who often have difficulty finding their place within a team. It is around such individuals that independent institutes must be built. The universities, with their team efforts, educate a type of scientist who admirably work together in committees, research teams and departments of large laboratories, but nowhere are we training, systematically, the leaders of tomorrow who will guide new scientific developments. Such leaders can emerge from independent institutes.

Research in the independent institute can be as good as in any school or hospital. Years ago, most research was a part-time endeavor, best carried out in a school or hospital with the rest of the time spent in teaching and patient care. Today's research is largely a full-time profession; thus, the researcher often becomes a liability rather than an asset to an institution devoted to teaching or patient care. So far, our research support policies have not kept pace with this development.

The full-time researcher is most productive in an institute organized for full-time research and, per dollar spent, the return will be far greater in the independent institute than under any other system. That the independent institutes are effective and productive is shown by the fact that these institutions which, as stated before, received only 3.2 percent of the grants awarded, contributed 5.3 percent of the 2,815 scientific papers presented this month at the annual meetings of the Federation of the American Societies for Experimental Biology.

In the biologic sciences, we are concerned with the preservation of life, health and happiness,-but in these days of unremitting ideologic struggle, we cannot forget that the very same scientists who labor to preserve health are also one of our most important defense assets. During the cold war the productivity of the Nation is dependent on a healthy labor force and in case of a hot conflict, especially, one involving atomic warfare, biologic knowledge needed for the development of defensive and protective means against the hazards of such a war may spell the difference between survival or destruction. A network of research institutes scattered throughout the Nation could save American science from obliteration if the great urban medical centers were to be destroyed.

Finally, large size in research is an impediment rather than an asset. Here, more than in other fields, we must return to the old American principle of individual enterprise and encourage those who have the courage of pioneering. It is from small independent seeds that all great American achievements have sprung and it is from such new centers built around imaginative and creative men that new progress will emanate.

REGARDING POINT 3

Further to enhance the use of the Nation's research potential, it is suggested that Congress request a study of the methods used at present by the National Institutes of Health to evaluate requests for research grants; this study to be made by experts in the fields of business management and data processing in cooperation with scientists not now associated with the evaluation system, the councils or the study sections.

Uncounted man-hours are needlessly spent today by applicants in the preparation of project grant applications and by scientists of the study sections and councils in reviewing such applications. Consider that, on the average, five pages be written per application. Assuming a rate of rejection of 33.3 percent which prevailed in 1959 (Allen: Science, November 1960), 16,900 scientists wrote 84,500 pages of applications (these are multigraphed for review, with 40 copies of each, or a total of 3,380,000 pages of paper). Put end to end, these papers would reach twice across the United States from Boston to Los Angeles, and stacked, they would be more than twice the height of the Washington Monument. Assuming only 3 days of work per application, which is probably far too conservative, this means that 50,700 working days, or about 283 man-years of highly skilled scientific manpower are spent each year for the simple purpose of applying to the National Institutes of Health for research support. Nearly a thousand scientists serving on councils and study sections review these applications, each member of such groups spending at least 2 weeks per year at this task leading to another 40 years of scientific manpower, or a total of 243 man-years. Viewed differently, it would mean that in each of our approximately 80 medical schools, 27 scientists are, in effect, working full time all year just writing or evaluating appliactions for money. The lucky ones who receive the grants are then informed (and wisely so) that they "are not required to follow the specifific details of the project submitted for review." Dr. Ernest M. Allen has recently reviewed in Science the reasons for disapproval of grant applications, and Dr. Yohan Bjorksten, of the American Institute of Chemists, has commented on these reasons in a letter to Science published April 7, 1961, which I should like to place in the record and which concludes that "the criteria now being applied in the National Institutes of Health, according to Allen, would have resulted in refusal to support those investigations which became milestones of progress in medicine."

This system of study section reviews has also led to the formation of an oligarchy of scientists on the inside, who hold power over the majority of scientists who are on the outside, and this opens the door to domination of trends in science by those few who, in the judgment of a minority which selects them, are the so-called distinguished scientists. In the cancer field, for example, this has led to waves of succeeding fashions in research. Where, for example 5 years ago virologists had difficulty getting support, today applications dealing with viruses are favored.

Obviously, in the light of present knowledge, such work was as important then as it is now. For a time, chemotherapy was the most fashionable thing, and before that, endocrine studies, and so forth. If the scientific community as a whole, rather than 1,000 scientists, were to influence awards of grants, more orderly progress on a broader front would result.

It is merely suggested here that Congress order an independent, expert study of the problem, but I should like to go on record as believing that scientists who had previous and renewed National Institutes of Health support must get such support thereafter simply on demand if they choose to submit a brief request, subject to appropriations and to be continued only if meritorious work results. The study sections which will review and evaluate such work and will judge new applicants should be limited to three members chosen from a panel, one member chosen by the applicant and two by the Surgeon General. The panel from which these experts would be selected should include all scientists who ever had National Institutes of Health grant support or are otherwise qualified as experts. It would no longer be necessary to write lengthy appli-

cations; no meetings of large groups would have to be held, each applicant would have at least one friend in court chosen for his specific knowledge of the man and his problem, and the scientific community would be far better represented. The selection of the two experts for the Surgeon General could be made in minutes by IBM machine, and the entire evaluation process could be handled in 2 weeks with one-tenth of the paperwork. The advisory councils could be enlarged to include sufficient members so that an adequate number of them could meet at least every month and final decisions could be made far more quickly than is now possible.

No system can be perfect which must channel funds into the unknown, such as is research. However, the present method is no longer geared to the needs of this age and holds within it the dangers of Lysenkoism, where the thoughts of a few can misguide the scientific efforts of many. Science thrives best in a free and democratic atmosphere and the advisory function on Government spending in this field must be returned to a more representative segment of scientists, rather than to be held by select committees.

Year after year you listen to a number of expert witnesses urging you to appropriate more money for medical research because of the progress we have made and because of the important work that remains to be done. I have, in the past, added my voice to this plea, and I do so again. Even if none of my suggestions were adopted, a good job would be done by the Public Health Service, as well as by the Food and Drug Administration. But we must have the courage to recognize where there is space for improvement and to do something about it. President Kennedy has called on us Americans to ask what we can do for our country. This witness has deeply pondered that question and concludes that we must bring to the attention of our Government whatever experience we have amassed in our professional life that might be of help to the country. It is in this spirit, and out of a sense of obligation and gratitude to the United States and to its Public Health Service for the opportunity of a lifetime of research that I have come here to be heard and to suggest that you:

1. Appropriate $10 million of separate research and research construction funds for the Food and Drug Administration;

2. Encourage independence in research by strengthening independent research institutes and create new ones throughout the country by a special appropriation of $50 million; and

3. Take action to bring about modernization, streamlining, and democratization of the methods whereby National Institutes of Health grants are evaluated.

Respectfully submitted.

FREDDY HOMBURGER, M.D.
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

A Matter of Judgment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, the editorial writer for the Newark, N.J., Star-Ledger, in the editorial appearing on May 13, 1961, which is attached herewith, has, in my opinion, put his finger on an important factor in a bipartisan approach to foreign affairs.

He points out that all criticism must not be submerged and that the purpose of a loyal opposition is to keep the Nation strong and to keep the Government alert.

A MATTER OF JUDGMENT

Former President Eisenhower, for years the target of sharp critical barbs from his Democratic opponents, has announced that he will not retaliate in kind. He is advising Republicans to support President Kennedy's foreign policy and to refrain from destructive criticism in these times of crises.

Kennedy undoubtedly appreciates the support given by his predecessor in the White House, but unity behind any policy should result from unified belief that the policy is the correct one, or at least that it offers sufficient hope of success to warrant a chance.

A bipartisan approach to foreign affairs will not be effective unless there is agreement, or at least near-agreement, on principles. Americans are not likely to hold their tongues for long in the absence of such agreement.

In foreign policy the ultimate aim is the same for almost all Americans, whether Republican or Democratic. There is no such solid agreement, however, on how to achieve these aims.

The Republicans are seeking to develop into a party of loyal opposition—one which will not put party advantage over national interest. This does not mean that all criticism must be submerged. If it were, there would be no opposition, loyal or otherwise.

The purpose of a loyal opposition is not to weaken a country and its government. On the contrary, this opposition serves to keep the Nation strong and to keep the Government on its toes.

Republicans, as the opposition, must be wary of divisive tactics which will give aid and comfort to the hostile nations challenging us. But this does not mean they must remain silent. Good judgment, not silence, is needed.

City Wage Woes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DURWARD G. HALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that the minimum wage bill recently enacted into law was a poor bill and ultimately will have serious affect on our economy. There were many arguments against this bill which were never considered in our discussions and to illustrate one of these I include, under unanimous consent, in the RECORD the following editorial which appeared in the Joplin Globe on May 7, 1961:

CITY WAGE WOES

Joplin taxpayers have been warned by City Manager Don Harmon that in 4 months the city's annual expense will jump some $17,292. That's when the new Federal minimum wage of $1.15 an hour goes into effect.

Joplin's city charter provides the city cannot pay any employee less than the Federal minimum wage. The added cost will be due mainly to wages to city firemen, who are on duty 72 hours a week.

It would be nice if the city could pay all employees higher wages. But Joplin needs streets and many services, and around three-fourths of general revenues now go for salaries and wages.

With taxpayers already hard hit by Federal, State, school, and city taxes, the council must budget closely. It isn't as rich as Uncle Sam. So it well may be time to think about changing the charter provision tying Joplin city wages to the Federal minimum, which goes up another 10 cents in 2 more years.

A mere local government trying to watch its finances cannot afford, so it seems, to bind its spending to a Federal administration which is less than cautious in fiscal policy and uses the cuff freely.

Address of Mayor Robert F. Wagner at Testimonial for Labor Secretary Arthur J. Goldberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 15, 1961, I was privileged to attend a testimonial luncheon given by the mayor and the city of New York at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel in honor of Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg. This is one of a series of such luncheons planned with the members of the President's Cabinet who thus have the opportunity to meet with financial, industrial, labor, and civic leaders of New York to present the policies and programs of the present administration. It should make for better understanding and greater unity by all concerned.

In introducing Secretary Goldberg, Mayor Robert F. Wagner made some very fine remarks. In fact, I regard it as one of the best introductions I have ever heard. He spoke not merely of the man, but what he stood for in this hour of national crisis. Mayor Wagner spoke of Secretary Goldberg's objectivity in his present post. Although Mr. Goldberg was formerly associated with the ranks of labor, the Mayor emphasized, he realizes that there are two sides to a coin and two sides to every story.

Mayor Wagner referred to Secretary Goldberg's own words when he said that he was "not representing the labor movement in this administration," but considered himself a "counsel for the public interest." Mr. Goldberg has made these words come true through his deeds and action. His most significant contribution to date is the creation of the President's Labor-Management Advisory Committee whose task it is to solve common problems of interest to labor, management, and government.

It was a wonderful idea to have this dinner in New York City, which Mayor Wagner aptly describes as the "mirror of the Nation."

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to insert into the RECORD the

text of Mayor Wagner's address in introducing Secretary Goldberg:

REMARKS BY MAYOR WAGNER AT TESTIMONIAL LUNCHEON FOR HON. ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG, MONDAY, 12:30 P.M., MAY 15, 1961, WALDORF-ASTORIA HOTEL

Commissioner Patterson, Secretary Goldberg, distinguished guests and friends, it is a source of great pride and pleasure for me to participate here today and to honor, in the the name of the city of New York, our honored guest and my good friend, Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg. In honoring him, we also honor the great combined labor movement which he served for so long, and the national administration for which he is such an articulate and enlightened spokesman in the field of labor-management relations.

We are both fortunate and honored to have him here with us today. These occasions are not merely luncheons for the purpose of entertaining a visitor, but briefing sessions where members of the President's Cabinet can come face to face with leaders in our financial, industrial, labor and civic life to present the administration's policies and programs.

Perhaps, in a way, our honored guest symbolizes our changing times. We no longer have as Secretary of Labor, to represent this great segment of our population in the President's Cabinet, an industry man with some sympathy for labor, but instead a labor man who understands and sympathizes with the problems of industry. How times have changed, and how much for the better.

Since he entered the Cabinet, Secretary Goldberg has been no stranger to us here in New York. We were the beneficiary of his valuable mediative talents in a strike involving our harbor railroad tugs.

I alluded to the fact that our guest symbolized our changing times, and the changing status of labor in our national life. He received his law degree at Northwestern University in 1929 being, incidentally, top man in his class.

After a short general legal practice, he was drawn to the then resurgent and growing labor movement by a sense of idealism and a dedication to the cause of economic justice and a better way of life for the workingman.

His ability as a lawyer brought him to the posts of general counsel to the CIO, and to the United Steel Workers, and as special counsel to the AFL–CIO.

He also served as counsel to the Ethical Practices Committee of the AFL–CIO which adopted a policy of self-discipline and a program of self-policing for the labor movement.

His broad outlook and depth of vision dramatizes the changing status of labor that has come about in the lifetime of most of us here.

Labor, both organized and unorganized, reached the lowest point of its fortunes during the early days of the great depression.

During the great upsurge of economic and social reform that reached its high water mark during the early days of the New Deal, primarily through section 7A of the National Recovery Act, later the backbone of the Wagner Act, organized labor at last found itself in an atmosphere conducive to growth.

Long denied its right to organize into unions of their own choosing and bargain collectively, the working men and women of this country flocked into labor organizations in unprecedented numbers.

In this atmosphere of growth, the emphasis was on recognition, on obtaining long deferred dignity and security and on long overdue wage raises, reduced hours and improved conditions of employment. In this struggle for growth and recognition with its emphasis on so-called bread and butter issues, it was only natural that for a time organized labor, absorbed with its own problems, tended to divorce itself from other aspects of our national life. Confronted with a day-to-day fight for very survival, it understandably had little time or inclination to participate more fully in community life or to see itself as an integral part of a much broader picture, the whole Nation.

This concept has largely changed. Though it still must apply itself to the daily "bread and butter" tasks of handling grievances and negotiating contracts for improved wages, hours and working conditions, organized labor has found its place as an integral, vital part of our whole Nation.

In other words, labor has achieved status, it is no longer an enemy to be grudgingly tolerated but a full partner with industry in our economic life.

With this changing role, of course, have come new concepts, new emphases and new responsibilities.

As I stated earlier, the appointment by the President of Secretary Goldberg, symbolized this changed relationship between labor and management in this country. Secretary Goldberg has already faced the basic challenge raised by his appointment. This challenge simply put was this, could a man identified for such a long time with the labor movement, objectively and successfully carry out the labor policies of the U.S. Government?

Secretary Goldberg left no doubt about his personal feelings concerning this challenge. In his own words, he made it clear that he was "not representing the labor movement in this administration" but considered himself a "counsel for the public interest."

In his few short months in office, he has demonstrated to everyone that these words were no convenient rhetorical expressions. He made it clear from the start that he was not going to preside over any mere pedestrian administration of the Labor Department.

He assumed the burden at once as a Secretary of Defense for the Nation's economy seeing his role as a domestic counterpart of that of the Secretary of Defense, realizing that our enemy at home and abroad must be fought on both levels, military and economic, and that sound domestic economic health was a necessary ingredient in the larger worldwide struggle.

Shortly after taking office, he made a tour of the States where unemployment was at its worst, in which he not only talked to Governors, mayors, businessmen, and labor leaders but to hundreds of unemployed as well. In his own words, he said: "We had to show these people that their Government has a heart, as well as a head."

Equipped with a broad understanding of the dimensions of the economic challenge and with a familiarity of the long- and short-term problems, Secretary Goldberg has played a vital and decisive role in the shaping of the administration's antirecession program. He carried the ball on Capitol Hill for President Kennedy's first two major bills, extension of unemployment compensation and minimum wage increase. He has attacked, with vigor and intelligence, two of the most vexing sore spots in our economy, the problems of the depressed areas and the plight of the migrant worker whom he has characterized as "the forgotten man."

He has realized, as few have, that one of the main causes of idleness in our depressed areas is the problem of automation and that people, long out of jobs, must be trained to do something different than they have done in the past, and that Government must supply some of the money for this retraining. He has vigorously dedicated himself to the cause of helping our minority groups, to see that discrimination in employment practices will be eliminated as far as possible.

Above all, Secretary Goldberg's main contribution and the most potent expression of his philosophy has been the creation of the President's Labor-Management Advisory Committee, consisting of seven business representatives, seven from labor, five from the public, with the chairmanship alternating between the Secretaries of Labor and Commerce. (He is now the first Chairman.)

The creation of this Committee, backed by the wholehearted cooperation of the administration marks the first genuine and sincere effort to bring together the combined creative genius and ability of labor, management, and Government in an effort to solve our common problems.

It brings together, at high level, both sides of labor and management; in an effort to recognize what these problems are and to understand their relative positions in regard to them. Together, labor and management face the vexing problems of foreign competition, automation, migrant labor and unemployment.

These domestic problems are present in an international atmosphere of grave crisis and tension. They must be faced together and solved together.

New York, it has been said, is a mirror of the Nation. What happens nationally affects us as a corporate being and what we do here has national overtones.

I want you to know, Mr. Secretary, that this city points with pride to its efforts to solve these problems on our own grassroots level. Administered by our city labor department, we have through executive order set up a "little Wagner Act" which has supplied a system of labor relations similar in many fundamental respects to the system under Federal and State laws for workers in private industry.

A Commission on Intergroup Relations has been created to promote harmony and good will in human relations among the various ethnic racial and religious groups residing and working side by side in New York City.

A committee on exploitation of workers has been established to help workers, primarily Negroes and Puerto Ricans, who are victimized by collusive agreements between unions and management.

This city has, for a long time, a nondiscrimination policy in its public housing and the New York City Fair Housing Practice Act, which eliminated discrimination as to race, color and religion or national origin in the rental, leasing or sale of private housing and makes of New York a real open city.

We have bent all of our efforts to make political and industrial democracy operate on our local grassroots level. Against this background, I commend you for your efforts to perpetuate our democratic institutions by developing in this country an enlightened, foresighted and realistic program of labor relations.

It is with deep pride that I present to you, in the name of the people of the city of New York, this medallion which reads: "Presented to Arthur J. Goldberg, Secretary of Labor, statesman and leader, dedicated to the principles of a just and equitable relationship between management and labor, by Robert F. Wagner, Mayor of the city of New York, May 15, 1961."

And with this, Secretary Goldberg, go my sincere personal best wishes and esteem.

Study of the Effects of Imports and Exports on American Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, my friend and our distinguished colleague Mr.

DENT who represents the 21st District of Pennsylvania is to be congratulated on his plans as chairman of the special subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor to make a study of the effects of imports and exports upon American employment. I have received his invitation to provide information that might be helpful in the pursuit of his study; I and my entire office force will, of course, cooperate in every way possible.

There is no doubt but that the Dent special subcommittee can make an invaluable contribution toward a new approach to international trade. Now is the appropriate time for this investigation to begin. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act expires in 1962. Before Congress even considers its extension, all the facts about the impact of imported commodities should be available to Members of the House Committee on Ways and Means. Because of the many important measures that will be before that committee during the second session of this Congress, Congress itself will understandably not have sufficient time to delve into the subject to the extent that is warranted and necessary. The Dent subcommittee, by undertaking to probe all facets of the subject, will thus have obtained vital data that can be used by the committee responsible for initiating the trade agreements extension.

I have today written to local civic, labor, management, and other relevant organizations in my district inviting them to cooperate with the new subcommittee. I submit that my friend, a colleague, will be welcomed enthusiastically should he decide to hold hearings in the 22d Congressional District of Pennsylvania, but I am fully aware of the demands that will be made upon him in various areas of the country. Our particular region offers especial evidence of the destructive consequences of unfair competition from abroad.

The wide varieties of manufacturing and processing industries in central and western Pennsylvania can provide vital evidence for the import-export study. The textile industry has suffered severe damage from the inequitables of foreign goods. This product of alien countries has been entirely responsible for depriving our people of many man-years of employment.

Our glass industry has experienced continuing damage from imported products made in countries where wages are a small percentage of those made in this country. The effect of excessive imports extends into machine tools, electrical equipment, pottery, dental and medical equipment, and even household furnishings and kitchen appliances.

While the Dent subcommittee's assignment may primarily relate to economic implications of international trade, the study will unquestionably provide documentation that will prompt Congress to insist upon substantial cutbacks in the imports of numerous commodities because of their threat to the national security. Many of the industries enumerated above as well as other independent and allied industries, have been reduced to the level of uncertainty with respect to their role in a national emergency.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to comprehend how the State Department can continue to insist upon policies that are not reconcilable with fundamental defense requirements. What Congress must begin to do is review the accomplishments of State Department activities at least in the postwar years. Such an investigation would disclose one of the most consistent records of failure and tragic frustration ever compiled, and Congress might finally come to realize the absolute source of our difficulties in the field of international trade. The next step is for this legislative body to reassume the obligation entrusted to us by the Founding Fathers in the Constitution. Had the State Department enjoyed any measure of success in its diplomatic overtures and negotiations, its apologists might have some excuse for the policy of disregarding domestic need in favor of diplomatic expediency.

Each succeeding failure in the field of international policy places a greater responsibility upon the defense mechanism of our own country. For this reason alone, progressively tighter restrictions on imports that affect the national security should have been imposed during the past decade—must we continue to have failure upon failure in our international affairs without even an occasional victory to cheer us.

The crisis in the Carribbean must surely have jolted even the most inert minds into realizing that it is foolhardy to rely on foreign sources for fuel to drive our domestic economy and to stand ready to serve the military machine.

American refineries were expropriated with least difficulty and far less time than it takes two railroads to merge in this country. Regardless of how soon the Peril of the Antilles is deposed, his brief career should stand as a monument to the ineptitude of our State Department and its spokesmen. It should be recorded indelibly in handbooks to be used as primers for Members of Congress and all Government officials concerned with this Nation's self-sufficiency in an era of global tension.

I am certain that the evidence generated by the Dent subcommittee hearings in the months ahead will be invaluable to Congress when it considers reciprocal trade policies next year. I urge all Members of Congress whose constituencies are affected by excessive imports to cooperate closely with the subcommittee. Whatever be your local domestic problem, caused by unfavorable trade agreements, whether it be the result of too much oil, too much fish, too many textile products, too many farm products from foreign countries, or too much of anything else that affects the people in your district, your State, and your country it is time that we get together on common ground and work out our problems to the best advantage of the Nation and our constituencies—from both the defense and the economic standpoint.

Government's Plans for Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Hugh Cosline in American Agriculture of May 20 is an excellent review of the effects of the present farm bill, passed by the 87th Congress. Of course this law is simply more of the same, and of course it is putting agriculture and the American farmer in a straitjacket.

GOVERNMENT'S PLANS FOR FARMERS

(By Hugh Cosline)

The present administration has announced its intention of taking effective steps to increase farm income.

The first method proposed is to increase supports, at the same time preventing troublesome surpluses by strict production controls on a bushel and ton basis rather than by depending solely on reduction in acreage. However, it is understood that if supports and controls do not do the job, there will be no hesitation to try other methods, including, if necessary, compensatory payments—polite words for the Brannan plan.

In one sense, what we so glibly term "the farm problem" is really an administration problem, a problem which was inherited by the present administration—but which was also inherited by the Eisenhower administration.

Be that as it may, the present administration had three choices of action: one was to continue the old programs, with resulting continued increases in Government-held farm products. One reason why this was impossible was the growing sentiment by consumer-minded Congressmen to do something to stop this pileup.

The second choice was to get out of "the mess" entirely by cutting off all programs as soon as possible. This was unthinkable politically, and in fact, has never been seriously suggested by responsible people. The results would be tragic. What has been proposed and never seriously tried was a gradual reduction in supports and a steady trend toward getting Government out of the farm business.

The third alternative was to get in deeper, and this was the approach the administration adopted.

Supports on manufactured milk, have already been increased, but, strangely, without any provision for controlling output. That will come later.

The feed-grain program now in effect meets the requirements of high supports plus strict controls. While it has been labeled voluntary the advantages of participation are so large that it becomes difficult for a farmer to turn it down. Also there is the implied threat that the cash corn price will be beaten down by sales of Government-held corn, as well as the possibility that those who stay out will be denied supports in the future, or at least penalized. In addition, while it is voluntary in the sense that no farmer is required to participate, considerable pressure has been used to sell the program to farmers.

Wheat presents another grave problem to which attention is promised, the approach likely being similar to the feed grain law. The commodity by commodity program is

favored by some farm groups, and some advantages are apparent. The question does come up as to what effective approach can be taken on perishables, such as fruits, vegetables, and poultry products?

What can we expect in the way of results from Government action?

No one can argue that farm prices will not be upped at least temporarily, but serious doubts can be raised as to the ultimate effect. One distinct possibility is that controls necessary to prevent full production under high supports will necessarily become so severe that Government will to all intents and purposes put agriculture in a straitjacket.

It has been repeatedly pointed out by responsible people that high supports must necessarily be accompanied by strict controls. You just cannot have high prices due to supports and also complete freedom to produce. It's high time for food producers to decide which they want.

Another possible, perhaps probable, outcome of the feed grains law is that control efforts will be ineffective, and that present attempts to remedy the situation will actually complicate it and get it into a bigger agricultural mess than we are now in. Already ways are being suggested for getting around the feed grain law.

One effect that seems almost certain is that the chief beneficiaries of Government programs will be the larger farmers. Farmers with operations too small to produce at average costs or below can well be encouraged to hang on to an impossible situation a few more years. Their problems will be postponed, but never solved.

When anyone points to the shortcomings in any course of action, it is only fair to ask, "What alternative do you suggest?"

There is only one real alternative, one which has been proposed for years but steadily ignored, while the situation worsened. That alternative is slowly and gradually to reduce supports and again to permit farmers to run their own business. If this program had been adopted soon after World War II finished, or even after the Korean conflict, American agriculture would be in a far sounder position that it is now.

In an early issue we plan to give you some of the implications of the proposed Agricultural Act of 1961 now being considered by Congress.

Questionnaire Results for 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, every year since coming to Congress I have conducted a poll of the people of the Sixth District of Florida to seek their views on major issues expected to come before the House of Representatives.

This year the response exceeded 48,387 returns. By mailing back such a big response the people of the district indicate their concern in the affairs of their Government, and these citizens deserve praise for taking the time to study the issues and make their opinions known. The fact that every questionnaire is signed indicates a firm conviction of opinion and it is most helpful to me to have the views of so many.

The newspapers of the district publish the questionnaire as a public service, and additional mailings are made from lists to the entire area.

So that all Members may have the benefit of this questionnaire, under unanimous consent I include the results in the RECORD:

Congressman Paul G. Rogers' 1961 questionnaire results

Total response 48,387

[In percent]

Question	Yes	No
1. Do you favor reduced foreign aid spending?	91	9
2. Do you favor the proposal to make a compulsory medical care plan for the aged part of the social security program?	55	45
3. Do you favor using Federal funds to aid depressed areas?	70	30
4. Do you favor Federal aid for—		
(a) School construction?	52	48
(b) Teachers' salaries?	33	67
5. Do you feel that the Federal Government should assist in solving problems affecting migrant laborers?	56	44
6. Do you favor legislation which would—		
(a) Raise the minimum wage from $1 to $1.25?	56	44
(b) Extend the coverage of the present wage and hour law?	61	39
7. Do you favor my proposal for systematic annual repayment of the national debt?	95	5
8. Would you favor an amendment to the Taft-Hartley labor law which would permit union picketing at construction sites?	21	79

A Sense of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excellent address by F. J. Rarig, president of the Board of International House of Philadelphia, Pa., delivered before the students and faculty at Lincoln University on October 27, 1960, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SENSE OF FREEDOM
(By F. J. Rarig)

It is delightful to return to Lincoln on such a lovely fall day. I have often recalled with pleasure the gracious reception you gave me 2 years ago on a day when your campus looked as beautiful as it does today.

My remarks today might be said to be a report to you on my personal effort during the past 2 years to preserve and extend some of the social and human values enshrined in the humanities. I discussed some of these values and their meaning to us in my talk 2 years ago on "Is There a Conflict Between Science and the Humanities?" Since that time I have become involved in work on behalf of the foreign students who are studying in our community. My talk today might be said to be an analysis of my justification for devoting a considerable amount of my free time to this work on behalf of young people from other lands who have come here to study and to learn first hand about our country and our way of life.

In 1860 two systems of justice, each housed within the borders of the United States, clashed in an agonizing ordeal. After 4 years of war, the Union, which had been a house divided against itself, was put together again through the assertion of fantastic military power.

Justice Holmes who, as a young man, had served the Union Army well in that Civil War, has given us a trenchant rule of political behavior which has behind it the weight of his experience in that war and the authority of his great knowledge of history.

Let me warn you that we should each of us accept the obligation of proving the great Justice wrong, or we must, by peaceful means, make the free society the dominant society—we must win the cold war. For Justice Holmes generalized regarding the lesson of history and of the Civil War with the following maxim: "When two systems of justice clash," he said, "war is inevitable."

No one in this audience needs to be told why I suggest that this law of political behavior is germane to the world political scene in 1960. Surely, it does not strain historical metaphor to suggest that the world today is a house divided against itself with two clashing social systems representing two systems of justice engaged in a global struggle for the minds of men and the allegiance of their hearts. Ironically, this world of 1960 is a community more interdependent and closer to its parts than was the national community of 34 United States 100 years ago.

Certainly, the two systems of social justice which occupy this divided planet in 1960 are in conflict. Conduct which is virtuous under one system is criminal under the other. In one, the state compels the acceptance of the only lawful religion—Marxism—and places the full weight of its authority in support of atheism.

In the other, the Constitution forbids the State to enact any law respecting religion and guarantees freedom of worship to all religions.

One system was created to destroy private property and to collectivize under state ownership the means of production and distribution. The other was established to protect private property and to provide a secure environment for private enterprise. Under one system, the prime objective of all law and all effort is to establish the power and authority of the state. The welfare of the state is the paramount concern. Under the other, ultimate power is reserved to the people. The state is given only limited power and the welfare and freedom of the individual is of paramount concern to the state. The individual is protected in the exercise of basic rights which are enshrined in the Constitution and vigilantly enforced by an independent judiciary.

Under one system, criticism of the government outside the prescribed procedures and channels of the only lawful political party is treason. Freedom to speak is freedom to agree. Under the other, freedom of the individual and of the press to criticize the government is considered indispensable to the welfare of the government.

In brief, it is the monolithic society against the open society. It is the police state versus the democratic state. It is collectivism versus free enterprise. It is mobilization of economic power to support and advance the political objectives of the state versus enterprise organized for private gain. It is the pyramid of feudalism versus the diffused effort of individual enterprise.

Where these two systems resemble one another the resemblance is the result of imperfection—the failure of the actual operation to conform to one or the other of the antithetical theories which is supposed to define the society and its operation.

Compared with these two systems, the systems which clashed in America 100 years

ago were almost identical. Still, it was said by our sage, that when two such social systems clash, war is inevitable.

Well, you might say, if war is inevitable why not get it over with? Why not press the green button? Why not let our bombs go with SAC and Polaris? Strike both East and West and over the top of the world. Demolish the Soviet Union and Soviet China in simultaneous all-out attacks.

Even if annihilating attack had been the way out, it is probably no longer a means of escape from the stricture under which Holmes' law places us. Politically and morally, this preventive war was not available to us. We were right not to make use of it when the naked power was ours and ours alone. Now the balance of power has shifted and our security depends upon the Russians' sense of self-restraint. We have arrived at the point of balance of terror and some well informed men say that we are now vulnerable to attack so devastating and so complete that if attacked, we could not retaliate.

Even if the balance of power has not shifted as far as some people say it has, or has not shifted at all, reason and fear alike tell us that we cannot exercise our ancient privilege to die fighting for our country. War has become a luxury which we cannot afford but still the awful lesson of history is that when two systems of justice clash, war comes. In circumstances analogous to these in the year 1860, at Cooper Union, Abraham Lincoln concluded the address which made him President of the United States with the following peroration:

"Wrong as we think slavery is, we can yet afford to let it be alone where it is, because that much is due to the necessity arising from its actual presence in the Nation; but can we, while our votes will prevent it, allow it to spread into the national territories, and to overrun us here in these free States? If our sense of duty forbids this, then let us stand by our duty fearlessly and effectively. Let us be diverted by none of these sophistical contrivances wherewith we are so industriously plied and belabored—contrivances such as groping for some middle ground between the right and the wrong; vain as the search for a man who should be neither a living man nor a dead man; such as a policy of don't care on a question about which all true men do care; such as Union appeals beseeching true Union men to yield to disunionists, reversing the divine rule, and calling not the sinners, but the righteous to repentance; such as invocations to Washington, imploring men to unsay what Washington said and undo what Washington did.

"Neither let us be slandered from our duty by false accusations against us, nor frightened from it by menaces of destruction to the Government, nor of dungeons to ourselves. Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it."

One hundred years ago slavery was not permitted to spread throughout the land. War came and thousands died fighting that the Union might survive free from the cancer of slavery. If we cannot fight a war against slavery in the year 1960, what is our duty and how do we discharge it? Are we to sit idly by while the globe shrinks and slavery spreads throughout the world? While nations freed by the decent impulses of our own tradition are chained to Moscow in the name of anti-imperialism and people's democracy? Beguiled by a fraudulent claim that all-pervasive tryranny is freedom—that terror is a new political servant of the people—that peaceful democracies are warmongers? Beguiled by the language of our revolution spoken by the agents of today's practitioners of the most ancient form of government—tyranny?

Will Americans respond to the call of duty in the cold war? Most of us are bored with the whole thing. A few of us try to keep well enough informed to be able to make what passes for intelligent criticism of our Government's policy. But for the most part, we do not trouble to inform ourselves regarding the forces which threaten to destroy us. The gyrations of the stock market concern us more than the state of our preparedness.

We luxuriate in the comfort of our homes and clubs and amuse ourselves, at best, with cultural and outdoor interests and, at worst, viewing perversions of art and life that become more and more gross as our entertainers seek desperately to discover some novelty or crudity that will stir us from our sophisticated ennui.

Fight for our country—oh yes! We will fight bravely for our country when and if it is possible to do so. But as for living, we will live for ourselves.

My suggestion is that our duty is to live not for ourselves alone but for our country as well. To live effectively for our country we must convey to others the "sense of freedom" that is our heritage and we must prove ourselves to be citizens worthy of this heritage. This "sense of freedom" is the intangible product of the free society—the most potent product which we have to give to the world. It is this "sense of freedom" planted and nurtured in the hearts of men which dooms the system of justice which is in conflict with our system of justice. Our task is to spred this sense of freedom to the peoples not yet committed to one or the other of the conflicting systems. Once imbued with this sense of freedom, these people will recognize the spurious claims of Communist agents and resist the encroachment of slavery. They will, with our help, build in their countries the institutions of the free society which alone are consistent with the dignity of man. Then slavery will be confined to those areas where its actual presence confronts us today and gradually there will develop even in the totalitarian countries the sense of freedom which will alter their institutions and produce a system of social justice whose commitments and aspirations we can trust. When that day comes, the cold war will have been won. The basis of the present deep conflict between the social systems will no longer exist and war will not be inevitable.

How do you spread the "sense of freedom"—how do you innoculate people emerging from fuedalism with a love of and a dependence on the institutions of the free society which took centuries of trial and error and suffering to develop among the few people who enjoy their benefits today?

For my part, I am convinced that the most effective way to communicate the meaning of freedom to people in countries which have been subjugated for centuries is to give the youth of these countries the opportunity to experience freedom in America—by studying in American schools, working in American business, visiting in American homes, playing with Americans, and living and traveling in America with Americans. As I see it, we must share our good fortune with others, and particularly with the youth of the new and emerging nations.

This we can best do by inviting their able young men and women to America for training and education.

If these young people will accept our invitation and come to America, we must be prepared to provide them with a worthwhile and constructive introduction to the American community outside of the academic community as well as within the academic community. This we can do most effectively by placing our student guests as quickly as possible in American homes so that the first few days in the United States are spent with an American family. Host families serve as orientation instructors, guides, and counselors. They provide assistance to the students in finding living quarters, registering at school and learning the homely details of the business of daily living in the United States.

During their stay in America, our guests should be offered continuing hospitality in American homes.

Such hospitality in American homes is the key to a constructive community experience for the foreign student in America. The American family at home is the most potent source of the freedom virus. Few people from any country can resist the informal charm of the child-centered American home. There is no cold war propaganda weapon that can match it in persuasive power. It speaks a language that transcends all barriers and it strips away prejudices and stereotypes carefully nurtured by Communists and reinforced by cheap U.S. films and cheap U.S. magazines.

Next in importance to home hospitality is student social life and recreation. This is where our International House in Philadelphia really shines. At our new building we offer a pretty wonderful social center—a home away from home that is literally a warm and gracious home for some 65 resident foreign students and 20 resident American students. This home is also a meeting place and entertainment center for all foreign students and their friends.

We owe it to the potential leaders of these lands to show them how we have kept the faith which is implicit in our heritage of freedom by showing them our contemporary American institutions as they really are. The best thing we can possibly do is to present our record of accomplishments and failures in all humility. It is the best thing we can do—first, because it is the honest thing to do, and secondly, because it will be the most effective possible demonstration of how hard it is to maintain freedom and to be worthy of freedom.

We cannot transport the institutions and the environment of America abroad and when we try to communicate the meaning of America to people abroad by writing and speaking and through exhibits we find that the effort not only seems to fail, it seems to aggravate the envy, the jealousy—and the hurt of those who hear about opulent America, and read about opulent America but do not experience hard working America. Yet we spend millions on our propaganda and information programs—not without some effect—but the effort is out of all proportion to the result. The opposite is true when we can expose a foreign student to American institutions. He learns at once that we are human, that we work hard, that we are not all materialistic bores and that many of us are neither racial or religious bigots—and if he experiences America deeply enough, he will also experience the "sense of freedom." Once the student, who comes from a land that has never known freedom from fear and freedom from want, senses what it means to be free from fear, he has picked up a virulent virus that can raise havoc with the regimented utopia of theoretical communism or any other system of tyranny.

I say this despite the shortcomings of our present pattern of living which certainly only approximates and does not conform to the ideal pattern of ordered liberty. Perhaps there is no better proof of the depth of our commitment to freedom, however, than the fact that we are voluntarily striving to arrive at a true state of harmony between the races by the painful process of overcoming ignorance, fear, and hatred through democratic procedures and the development of mutual respect. Little Rock may be a lost battle in the propaganda war, but it is only one battle in and only a part of the best war that any nation ever de-

cleared—a war against racial discrimination and race hatred. We can at least be proud that this war has been declared and that our institutions and most of our people are committed to its successful outcome. I proudly assert that no other nation is grappling with this vicious problem on such a vast scale or more courageously or with surer prospects of a lasting victory.

I do not claim that our guests will place this hopeful interpretation upon our current social scene. I do not claim that every exposure to America will convert the observer to our way of life.

I am fully aware that in bringing foreign students here, we are risking that the reaction will be adverse. After all, we are dealing with something as elusive as creating a sense of freedom when the reaction goes correctly and perhaps an aggravated sense of bitterness when it does not go correctly. The all pervasive fact is that we are dealing with human beings representing diverse interests and motives and reflecting different cultures, different political systems, different economic systems, different religions, different moralities, and different ethical conceptions. An amazing combination of abilities is needed to insure that the right reaction takes place when such a heterogeneous group of students is exposed to the uncontrolled and uncontrollable myriad of influences which is the democratic American community.

Of one thing I am confident, our society has produced as of the year 1960 the people and the facilities with which to carry out this sharing of our experience and our good fortune. But we will not be successful in truly helping others unless we dedicate ourselves to the task and unless we are prepared to abandon perverse prejudices and sacrifice a measure of personal convenience. Can we do less than this? We are, after all, the trustees of democratic institutions produced out of a true revolution in 1776 and vindicated three generations later in a terrible yet magnificent war for social justice.

Let us admit that we have not fully kept faith with millions who labored and died that our free institutions might exist. But we have by no means failed completely. We have fought two World Wars against tyranny and emerged from the second of these as the generous, if not always bright, leader of the free world.

We are the somewhat battle-weary inheritors of freedom and we now have the awesome duty to transmit our heritage to others that they may know the meaning and value of freedom so that they may take up in their turn the fight to preserve and extend its institutions.

I say that the simple and practical way to keep the faith and to meet our obligations is to open our arms in welcome to all qualified young people who will come to study, to work, and to live with us as our guests. While we share our good fortune with them, we must also share the common struggle for freedom. To the greatest possible extent they should become involved in this struggle so that they will be educated in the values and the problems of the free society while they acquire the training needed to bring their countries abreast of us technologically, commercially, and industrially.

By giving all that we have to give of our educational facilities and of our experience in the struggle for social justice, including the lessons of our terrible era of slavery and of our terrible civil war, we may well discover within ourselves new resources which will enable us to grow with the new nations and rise with them to that higher level of social behavior which must be attained if nationalism is to give way to a world community based upon mutual trust and human brotherhood.

Let us then invite these young men and women to our country. Let us welcome them with the warmest possible hospitality. But in our pleasure at their coming, let us not forget the seriousness of the joint adventure or the awful import of the plea of the French Revolutionist, that should be in our hearts, if not on our lips, as we extend our hands in friendship—"Be my brother or die."

Let us so conduct ourselves toward our guests that when they leave our land, they will respond, "We are brothers. We shall not die. For there shall be a new birth of freedom throughout all lands and among all people; and peace, based on freedom, shall prevail throughout the world."

The Need for a National Fuels Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, we have in the Honorable John M. Kelly, Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Mineral Resources, an erudite and forceful pleader for an understanding by all producers of natural fuels of the need for a national fuels policy. This is attested to in an address which he made on April 13, 1961, before a meeting of the Independent Oil Producers & Land Owners Association, Tristate, at Evansville, Ind.

I feel that Secretary Kelly's remarks deserve the attention of Americans in all walks of life, and for this reason I ask unanimous consent to have his speech printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR JOHN M. KELLY AT MEETING OF INDEPENDENT OIL PRODUCERS AND LAND OWNERS ASSOCIATION, TRI-STATE, EVANSVILLE, IND., APRIL 12, 1961

America has many modern faces—a composite face of many people living in and contributing to many ages. Our society is in the atomic age, in the space age, the steel age, the chemical age, the electronic age, and the age of energy.

And, unlike Shakespeare's seven ages of man, our modern ages are ticking forward simultaneously, in continuity. Furthermore, the ages of our world are interdependent—each existing only because of the contribution of the other.

The demands of these ages on our natural resources are unparalleled in history. Usable mineral resources are being exploited at a tremendous and accelerating pace. Not only do we need mineral raw materials for fuels, chemicals, and machines, we also need them for building and construction materials, for agriculture, and for transportation.

We have used, are using, and will continue to use our mineral wealth lavishly. During the first half of this century, we have consumed 26 billion tons of coal, 40 billion barrels of petroleum, 3 billion tons of iron ore, 22 million tons of lead, 26 million tons of zinc, and 33 million tons of copper. In the short span of half a century, we have utilized up the products of eons of geologic time.

Our Nation covers only 8 percent of the land area of the world. Our people comprise less than 10 percent of the world's population. Yet, annually, we consume a little more than half of the world's petroleum production, about one-half the supply of iron and manganese ores, and about a third of the world's production of copper, lead, and zinc.

The problems of filling, and keeping filled, America's mineral resource cupboards are tremendous. In many instances, we are not self-sufficient and must depend wholly or in part upon the products of other nations to meet our requirements. In this connection, we are buyers in the marketplace with the other industrialized nations of the world. In other mineral areas, we need today—or in the foreseeable future—supplemental supplies of mineral resources from other lands to meet our mounting requirements. Finally, in some areas, our Nation and its businessmen compete with other nations in meeting world demand for certain minerals.

This interdependence of nation on nation leaves no room for isolation in natural resource development and use because our economic progress, our national security, and our essential foreign policy aims will not permit us to emulate the ostrich.

Many solutions are advanced to meet some of the more vexing problems we face. While these solutions are wrapped with sophisticated and often self-serving drapery, the position of any group is generally governed by the dictates of its pocketbook.

There was a time when America could afford to dissipate its energies leisurely in segregating the wheat from the chaff in conflicting economic positions of various industries. However, our society has changed. Our world has changed. Today, more than ever before in its history, our Nation needs straightforward, clear-cut thought and decision—decision which meets the test of the public interest first, special interest second.

Today, the leaders of industry and the leaders of government are bound together by mutual responsibility for the social, economic, and political impact of our individual actions on the affairs of our country and of our world. We in government, and you in industry, must accept this responsibility—a responsibility which we must meet on common ground, side by side.

In his inaugural address, President Kennedy also uttered these now-historic words, "Ask not what your country will do for you—ask what you can do for your country." A few days later, in his first message to the Congress, the President pledged his administration "to a continuous encouragement of initiative, responsibility, and energy in serving the national interest."

These are times which demand far more than mere cooperation between government and industry. In this troubled world, a world restless, changing, a world challenging old ideas and moving toward new horizons—in a world of this fabric, the United States must demonstrate that its economic system is efficient, that it is flexible, and that it is the servant not the master of a great people. Such demonstration demands, on the part of us all, an identity of purpose and a dedication to the common interest.

The petroleum industry is one of the key building blocks in the foundation of American economic strength. The industry is essential to the welfare and social progress of our Nation and the free world. We in the Kennedy administration know its importance, we recognize its complexities, and we respect the intelligence and ingenuity of those who direct it.

In looking realistically at the future, the petroleum industry itself must bury the shibboleths and totems of the past—the outworn creed that looks at cooperation with government as a mutually antagonstic part-

nership, temporarily formed by expediency—at government, as an evil to be tolerated.

Government is inescapably involved in this industry, and this involvement—particularly in the Department in which I serve—will grow rather than diminish in the years ahead. The petroleum industry itself, on many counts, has actively sought this involvement as being in its own best interests. Conversely, it must willingly accept government as a referee of the industry, as its shield in foreign affairs, and as the protector of the public interest.

We have a new administration in Washington, a new attitude toward national affairs, and a new dedication to the principle of mutual action in the best interests of the people. We have a Secretary of the Interior who personally maintains an open door and an open mind on the pressing subjects of natural resource development.

And, his policy is also my policy in the field of mineral and fuel resource matters falling under my jurisdiction.

The door of my office—and the doors of those who work in the mineral and fuel bureaus of the Department—will always be open to your industry, to the coal industry, to the extractive industries, and last but foremost of all, to the public.

We want your ideas, we seek your counsel, and we value your suggestions. There will be times when we will not see eye to eye—when our views will not coincide. Responsible government cannot let others make its decision by default, and this administration intends to renew and revitalize responsibility in government.

There will be times when our views will be identical—and I hope this will be the rule—because that which is in the best interest of the American people is also in the best interest of American industry, whether it be oil or oysters.

In recent years, fuel programs have been hammered out behind locked doors. We in the Department of the Interior intend to reverse that trend. We actively seek greater public participation in government, greater public awareness of the programs of government and their impact on all aspects of American life.

We seek an active, participating citizenry from all walks of social and economic life which will work together without regard to personal interest but dedicated rather to the utilitarian principle of the greater good for the greatest number.

In the area of our Nation's mineral resources, we face many problems—complex problems which were not made in a day and which will not be solved by a stroke of a pen or in a constant reassurance that we live in the best of all possible worlds.

In the metals and the nonmetalic mineral industries, we have—as in the petroleum industry—a mixed picture. A number of commodities have shown steady growth and radical progress has been made with respect to some of the newer metals.

It is, however, in the group of metals which in their own right are as essential to our economic well-being as oil that serious difficulties have been encountered in recent year. I speak primarily of lead, zinc, and copper.

Lead and zinc have been subject to declining domestic production and increasing pressures from imports. The copper industry has been affected materially by events in distant parts of the world with resulting instability, although production has expanded. Speaking parenthetically, this should have a familiar ring to this audience.

These are pressing problems which require—and which will get—a substantial portion of my energies and the energies of my staff.

In coal, we have the problem of an underdeveloped, underused natural resource. Let me say, at this point, that underdevelopment of a vital natural resource is as abhorrent to true conservation as wasteful use.

The coal industry today has fewer employed miners than in the year 1890—the first year for which reliable statistics are available. Coal production declined drastically from 1947 to 1958, and, while minor gains were achieved in 1959 and 1960, the rate of activity is falling again in 1961.

We have a coal industry which cannot be allowed to decline and also expected to meet the greatly increased demands which would be placed upon it in time of national emergency. This is a disturbing situation—a situation to which the Department of the Interior will direct its efforts to alleviate.

In oil, we have almost a parallel situation. Current refinery capacity and current crude oil productive capacity in the United States, even after allowance for a defense reserve, exceeds the consumptive capacity of the American people.

However, this is more closely defined as a current economic problem, as distinct from some of the more technological problems which stand in the way of a marked increase in coal consumption. No matter which economic crystal ball you look into, the picture is always the same: Progressively mounting petroleum requirements in the years ahead.

Here is the crux of the petroleum problem. Reserves of crude oil available to the people of the United States must be abundant, must be secure, and must be available on a reasonable economic basis.

In this regard, we are distressed by the 1960 showing in exploration and development. In 1960, the volume of new crude oil discovered in the United States was only slightly higher than in 1946. Furthermore, the addition to proven reserves by extension of known fields was the lowest in 10 years. It was only through an increase in natural gas liquids that total liquid hydrocarbon reserves made any advance over 1959 levels. Here also, the picture is not completely bright because the discovery rate of natural gas liquids was also declining.

Although we have skirted them briefly, I think we can see a similarity in the various minerals problems of the Nation, a basic pattern of immediate abundance of resources, underdeveloped demand, and overdeveloped productive capacity.

These problems present a unique, tremendous challenge to American ingenuity, for we must show the world we have the maturity and vision to make our basic abundance a blessing, rather than a millstone around our economic necks.

Turning now to the more immediate matters of interest, Secretary Udall has pledged the Department of the Interior to a "new look" at the oil import program—the philosophy which underlies it, the machinery by which it operates, and the effectiveness of this machinery in meeting the objectives of the program.

This searching reappraisal for residual fuel oil has been completed. We feel that some of the earlier inequities have been eliminated and that the residual portion of the program is more firmly based, more responsive to public policy, and more soundly geared to efficient supply and distribution.

We intend to give the crude oil portion of the program equal scrutiny in the weeks ahead. Yesterday in San Antonio, I announced that two public hearings have been scheduled—one in Washington on May 10 and 11, the other in Los Angeles on May 4.

We approach this review without preconceived conclusions, as we did in the case of residual fuel oil. We want to hear all views on the question of the need for import controls. From those who feel such a program is necessary, we want to know why, we want to know how it should be operated, how import levels should be set to whom allocations should be given, and on what basis should they be set. We want to know where the inequities lie, and we want specific suggestions to alleviate them.

We want all interested parties to come to us, to give us their thinking on the best way to do the job—if, in fact, the job should be done. In the future, let no one say that he has not had his day in court, that this administration embarked on a course of executive action without full public participation, that all points of view were not fully considered and fully weighed.

I would not predict the outcome of this review, for the basic decisions belong to Secretary Udall and the President, but I will say we are determined that a review of the crude oil import program will be fair, open, impartial, and thorough.

We come now to the subject of another review—that of a congressional fuels study, a study of no little controversy in the petroleum industry.

President Kennedy and Secretary Udall has firmly endorsed a balanced, long-range fuels study which uses the test of the public good as its cardinal principle. In Secretary Udall's words, "we cannot in something as important as fuels and energy let policy be set by drift and default." For this reason, the administration is supporting legislation which provides for a thorough study in the national interest.

Let me say this—no one can dispute the right of the Congress of the United States to initiate such a study.

Let me also add this—unthinking, blind opposition within the petroleum industry to an impartial, long-range study can easily leave the mistaken impression that the interests of the industry are somehow different than the interest of the Nation as a whole.

For these reasons, I am personally gratified that in recent weeks, many responsible leaders within the petroleum industry have endorsed a national fuels study.

We have much to gain from a thorough look at where we have been, where we are, and where we are going. I, for one, would like to know the answers to some of the more searching questions, questions such as:

What public policies are necessary to insure an adequate, dependable fuel supply for the Nation in order to achieve a healthy, balanced development of the national economy?

Can our present Federal, State, and local laws and programs promote the public interest in the wise development of our fuel resources?

Finally, how can we define in specific terms what the public interest really is, when confronted with the technical, economic, and international problems entailed in fuel resource development and use?

Hand in hand with this demand for greater national purpose goes the need for sound maturity. We cannot teeter-totter between sudden hysteria when something goes wrong and smug complacency when things seem bright.

In America today we need continuity of purpose. Too many Americans have been prone to accept the attractive but fatal fallacy that there is some easy way to build a progressive and abundant society in a peaceful, free world—a way which does not demand personal participation and personal dedication.

In the days and years ahead, we must form balanced judgments based on mature values—hardheaded judgments based on cool logic rather than the heady intoxication of emotion. Lipservice to catch words and the slogans must be replaced by a creative and realistic attack on the problems which confront us.

America is moving forward. The petroleum industry will go with it—or be left behind. In times of national peril, the in-

XUM

dustry has responded promptly, meeting its challenges with credit and honor. This selfless effort must now become the industry's watchword as it moves ahead in the mainstream of American life and American purpose.

Henry Ford's Contribution to Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, coming from a district where the vigor and imagination of the people have produced many historic benefits in the past and where that same vigor and imagination is being applied for the future welfare of America, I am pleased to present for the RECORD the story of Henry Ford's adventure into aviation as an outstanding example. The story as it appeared in the American Legion magazine, of May 1961, follows:

MR. FORD'S TIN GOOSE—THEY DON'T MAKE PLANES NOWADAYS LIKE THE FABULOUS TRI-MOTOR THAT FORD BUILT

(By W. E. Davis)

Every day a school bus leaves Port Clinton, Ohio, and picks up six children on their way to school at Put-in-Bay. At the end of the day it returns them to their homes.

However, the operation is unusual for two reasons. The children live on three islands in Lake Erie, their school is on still another island, and the "bus" is an old Ford tri-motor plane. Leaving Port Clinton the flying bus goes to Rattlesnake Island, then to North Bass Island, then to Middle Bass, and finally to the school at Put-in-Bay, which is also an island. Rarely is the "bus" late and almost never does a flight have to be canceled because of bad weather.

This same plane performs other chores. Time and again it has served as a flying ambulance, hauling sick island residents to mainland hospitals. Little wonder that this rugged tri-motor Ford plane, dubbed the "Tin Goose," has not only carved a niche for itself in history but has also earned a lot of affection for its good deeds.

By modern-day standards, the ancient trimotors should have been dead, buried, and forgotten years ago. They were the rage of aviation during the Roaring Twenties, when flappers sneaked off for a nip of bathtub gin. The trimotor came to life before, and flexed its sturdy wings during the Great Depression, yet lived to tell an aviation story in spite of it.

Every trimotor built—and there were exactly 199 in all—can claim a share of the title of aviation's granddaddy. Ford's corrugated steel giant was the first all-metal passenger plane. It contributed to American history, carrying Adm. Richard E. Byrd on the first airplane flight over the South Pole.

It lugged thousands of bags of mail and freight between American cities, with not one accident. And it performed like a never-tiring workhorse, year in and year out, in the desolate jungle areas of Central and South America, in Russia and China and Japan, flying lifesaving cargo into postage-stamp landing areas where even smaller planes feared to go.

The man given singular credit for developing and overseeing Ford's aviation pioneering was the late William B. Stout. Oddly enough, up until the time he died, he had hoped the day was not too far distant when a new breed of trimotor would roll off a California assembly line, nearly 30 years after trimotor production had shut down. But when he died 5 years ago at 76, so did any hope for reactivating the famed plane.

Stout had already made his mark as a design engineer before being bitten by the aviation bug. Among his design credits were theater seats which pushed back when the patron stood up, and the world's first high-speed pullman car.

In 1923, he got the idea that a metal airplane would be cheaper, safer, and more durable, plus better able to handle a large load of cargo.

Stout's hopes and dreams, of course, could never become real without money. He developed a plan to get to the men who might be interested in helping such a revolutionary idea develop.

A letter was sent to 100 Detroit businessmen, asking each of them for $1,000. One contingency was that they promise to bid the money goodby forever. In exchange, they were to receive a series of weekly newsletters explaining the fundamentals of aviation, plus a report of Stout's activities.

Stout received 65 replies immediately, and they eventually grew to 128. The Stout Metal Aircraft Co., Dearborn, Mich., found itself off and running, and it was quickly able to square its debts.

The company's first product was a single-engine plane of all-metal construction. It attracted plenty of attention from all sides, with two more than casually interested spectators being motor genius Henry Ford and his son, Edsel.

The business so intrigued Ford that he bought out the Stout interests in 1925. He immediately built a factory and airfield, hiring Stout as vice president and general manager of the Stout Metal Airplane Division of the Ford Motor Co.

A newspaper of that time echoed both Ford's and Stout's sentiments. It said, "This business venture will accelerate airplane development by backing the design with the diversified resources and experience of Ford Motor Co."

The newspaper's prophecy was to be true several years later.

Ford, in his typical "get it done fast" fashion, immediately set up a Dearborn-to-Chicago freight airline. Ford's efficiency took this plan from the idea stage to the first scheduled flight in exactly 1 week's time.

With the big auto company showing the way, Stout and his associates developed the first Ford trimotor in 1926. Many said Stout's design closely resembled the German Fokker, also a three-engine airplane. But rather than being fabric-covered like the German ship, the American trimotor was all metal.

The first trimotor differed from its later brethren in several important respects. Pilots in World War I liked the idea of an open cockpit. With the wind blowing in his face, the pilot could tell whether the ship was slipping or "mushing" in flight. So the trimotor bowed to the pilot by having an open cockpit, now relocated near the plane's nose rather than toward the rear as in planes of that time.

The pilots also feared the fast landing speed of the trimotor—an incredible 60 miles per hour—so Stout slowed down the landing by mounting the engines downward from the wing, giving the necessary drag.

Stout, however, won a personal victory in gaining a closed cockpit after several test pilots nearly froze to death in winter flights. The trimotor thus became the first transport plane which combined enclosed cabin, brakes, heater, cantilever wings and doughnut tires.

Stout didn't gain the heater without a stern battle, however. One economy-minded Ford official decided a heater meant too much extra cost and ruled this accessory out. To prove his point, Stout got the man into a heaterless trimotor, lifted the plane to 10,000 feet, where Stout donned a sheepskin jacket and waited. A few minutes later, the official, with teeth chattering behind blue lips, decided it was necessary to include the heater in every trimotor produced.

In 1926 alone, 1,000 flights, each carrying 1,000 to 1,500 pounds of airmail and Ford cargo, shuttled between Chicago, Detroit, and Cleveland. That year, the sturdy trimotors logged over 200,000 miles, and not a single accident marred the record—that year or any other.

Ford was determined to make aviation a going industry. The company turned out factory-trained mechanics, set standards for airport design, built concrete runways, experimented in radio and navigational aids, produced dirigible mooring facilities, and aided aviation wherever it could.

The company poured hundreds of thousands of dollars into newspaper and magazine ads to keep people abreast of flying's progress. One newspaper editorial credited the company with "doing more to popularize flying among the public than all of the stunts that have been stunted, at the risk of life and limb. * * *"

A $500,000 plant fire in 1926 failed to slow down trimotor production for long. Within 4 months planes were again rolling. By the end of 1927, 14 were built. Two years later, 146 had rolled off the assembly line.

The trimotors were soon in tremendous demand. Major American airlines, including United, Pan American and Eastern, found the 12 seats just right for passengers, and the big cargo area the answer to their freight needs. Foreign countries joined the enthusiastic response.

The giant planes were adaptable for many purposes. For approximately $50,000 (the Ford roadster sold for $435 at this same time) the buyer got an airplane that had a cruising speed of 112 miles per hour, with a maximum of 135. If one engine conked out, the trusty Tin Goose limped along at a steady and reliable 112 miles per hour. Cruising range of the ship, which had a length of 50 feet and a wing span of 79 feet, was about 450 miles, or approximately 4 hours.

In 1930, a souped-up trimotor succeeded in establishing a multiengine speed record of 164 miles per hour.

What made the Tin Goose a wanted item were its quick takeoff, heavy load capacity, slow speed and high rate of climb. Even today, a loaded trimotor can be off the ground in about 6 seconds, equal to about 200 feet.

As popularity increased, options were added to cater to everyone's interests. Trimotors were available with overstuffed chairs, divan, card tables, refrigerators, lavatory and running water, all depending on the customer's preferences.

The trimotor undoubtedly made its most significant contribution to history in 1929. Adm. Richard E. Byrd enlisted the aid of 4 trimotors and 50 men to prepare for his 1,600-mile flight to the South Pole. His trip in the *Floyd Bennett* was preceded by weeks of preparation. Prior to the flight, the weather was so cold that the engines had to be warmed with a gas torch. Oil was heated on a stove before being poured into the engine.

Limping along in 15-degrees-below-zero weather, the trimotor struggled ahead. In order to get across two of the jagged peaks guarding the polar plateau, Byrd gave orders to dump 250 pounds of food and supplies—a 3-week emergency backlog in case they were forced down. Pilot Bernt Balchen coaxed the trimotor upward—she responded—and the ship with its 15,000-pound load

edged over by a scant few feet. The 18-hour flight made history and gave the United States an aviation "first."

The Tin Goose also contributed to the humor of the times. In 1928, Mrs. Calvin Coolidge was selected to christen a plane inaugurating the first mail and passenger service between the United States and South America.

The plane chosen for this "first" was a Fokker dubbed, appropriately, the *Christopher Columbus*. Unknown to many, the *Columbus* had been damaged the week before and was unable to fly.

Rather than spoil this monumental occasion, a Ford trimotor was flown in for the christening ceremony, her fuselage emblazoned with the freshly painted letters *Christopher Columbus*.

Mrs. Coolidge smashed the champagne bottle, cameras clicked, and the stand-in trimotor zoomed away—not to South America, as originally scheduled (and as the crowd believed), but back to New York where the real plane was undergoing repairs.

Another humorous anecdote of the late 1920's was pictured in the New York Times roto section. An 8x10 photo showed how it was "possible to climb to the tail of a trimotor in flight to make repairs." A man was pictured hanging below the fuselage, halfway between the tail and the door, at a 1,500-foot altitude.

The caption read, "Another step to greater safety in passenger flying." No comment was made on what repairs would be needed on a plane capable of flying straight and level enough to enable a mechanic, with no parachute, to attach his belt to a cable and slide to the tail.

The Ford trimotors were gaining world fame, and cloth-covered planes such as the Fokker were fast disappearing. The death of famous Notre Dame football coach Knute Rockne in a Fokker plywood model signaled the death knell of these ships. His death was attributed to "structural failure in a storm," but the possibility of dry rot in the superstructure was not entirely discounted.

The trimotors were heralded for their many unique uses. Royal Typewriter Co. bought one and equipped it with a hatch hole, manned by a shipping clerk. The ship visited out-of-the-way typewriter distributors by air, parachuting machines three at a time in remote areas to save landing time.

In 45 days, the plane flew 14,350 miles to 114 cities in 27 States delivering its airborne booty. A humorous editorial of the time asked the question, "What's going to happen when they start delivering pianos this way, particularly when the parachute doesn't open?" Luckily, no one ever found out.

A new Ford trimotor plant had stepped up production from three a week to one a day. But increasing economic gloom abruptly curtailed production. In 1933, the trimotor factory was out of business. The tightening market, need for a faster, more economical plane, the accidental death of three Ford test pilots, and the money lost by Ford in producing the planes were the chief reasons.

Fortune magazine estimated Ford lost between $1 and $3 million in building trimotors.

Now, nearly 30 years later, 11 of the original 199 are known to be operating. Two make regularly scheduled commercial flights from the mainland to the tiny islands of Lake Erie. In summer, the planes are jammed with vacationers. During winter months, when the lake is frozen solid, the trimotors zip into the tiny airfields with food and supplies.

The Johnson Flying Service of Missoula, Mont., uses several Ford trimotors for hauling freight, spraying timber, and carrying parachute-jumping forest firefighters. The high stabilizer allows a chute-free fall, making the trimotor a real favorite with jumpers.

Passengers and crew alike praise the high-mounted engines and square picture windows, which allow maximum visibility.

An Arizona sportsman-pilot has a trimotor which he uses to fly hunters and fishermen in and out of remote hunting areas. Mules or a smaller plane might attempt to do such a job, but they couldn't carry the load or save the time possible with a trimotor.

Other Tin Geese are still believed to be in use in Central and South America, hauling diesel oil and mining equipment in and out of hard-to-reach areas.

About 10 years ago, these limited but necessary modern-day needs got veteran Stout interested in once again cranking up trimotor production. Original blueprints of the trimotor plane were presented Stout and his fellow California business associates by Henry Ford II, then company president. At that time it was Stout's hope to build 100 trimotors at a sale price of $100,000 each—with no structural changes except for smaller, more powerful engines.

One contemplated change in the modern-day counterpart was brakes mounted on the pedals, rather than the outmoded hand-brake located between the pilot and co-pilot. The ship's overall weight would closely conform to the original 12,500 pounds.

Perhaps nostalgia contributed more than anything to Stout's enthusiasm. He had found memories, and at least one memento—a tiny piece of trimotor metal sent to him by an Air Force general. It came from an aged Tin Goose used to evacuate personnel from Bataan in the Philippines during World War II.

Although the 15-year-old trimotor could comfortable accommodate about 12 people over a 300-mile range, the dependable Goose had been flying evacuees 500 miles over water twice a day—with passengers aboard.

The evacuation plane was later found as a pile of scrap by the general, who reported it had been strafed almost beyond identity by the Japanese.

Incidents such as these no doubt contributed to Stout's fond memories, for he helped create a plane successfully used by the Army, Navy, and Marines, a plane that operated on wheels, floats, and skis, a plane that had carried searchlights, dusted timber, sprayed crops, hauled machinery, gas, oil, live cattle, and precious human cargo.

Perhaps a new Tin Goose may someday become a reality. But without the guiding force of William B. Stout, it's a remote possibility.

The Tin Goose has made a contribution to history as no plane before it ever did—and quite possibly—as no other plane ever will.

State of California Department of Public Works Adopts Resolution Regarding Highway Advertising Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I have obtained unanimous consent heretofore to bring to your attention, and that of my other distinguished colleagues, a letter, with copy of resolution adopted by the commission on April 13, 1961, concerning the very important subject of "Outdoor Advertising Along the Interstate Highway System," from Mr. Robert B. Bradford, director of public works and chairman, California Highway Commission:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS,
Sacramento, Calif., May 12, 1961.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DOYLE: On behalf of the California Highway Commission, I respectfully submit for your consideration a resolution relative to regulation of outdoor advertising along the Interstate Highway System, which resolution was adopted by the commission on April 13, 1961.

This resolution recites the difficulties experienced by California, along with most other States, in execution of the Federal-State agreement required to establish eligibility for Federal participation in the cost of regulatory measures.

Further, the resolution requests consideration of extension of the July 1, 1961, deadline for execution of the Federal-State agreement.

In forwarding this resolution to you, I would like also to comment on the general situation of the highway program in California. Since passage of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 by the Congress, California has made optimum use of available Federal funds, matched by State funds, in advancing the expanded highway program. Our most serious problem has been the recent uncertainty as to the amounts of Federal funds which would be available. Not only have the fiscal uncertainties slowed the rate of progress below that necessary for completion of the Interstate Highway System on schedule, but it has also posed problems of efficient utilization of the capabilities of the construction industry, which has an overall effect on the general economy.

It has been most encouraging to note that the Congress is making definite progress toward resolving this matter.

In further regard to the outdoor advertising subject covered by the California Highway Commission resolution, we sincerely hope that you will be able to support appropriate legislation to extend the present deadline. We would be most happy to furnish any additional information you may desire on that subject or on other highway matters.

Respectfully,

ROBERT B. BRADFORD,
Director of Public Works and Chairman, California Highway Commission.

CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY COMMISSION RESOLUTION

Whereas under the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1958 provision was made for increased Federal participation in the cost of certain portions of the Interstate Highway System for States which regulate outdoor advertising on areas adjacent to the Interstate System; and

Whereas such increased Federal participation is conditioned upon the execution of an agreement between a State and the Secretary of Commerce by July 1, 1961; and

Whereas most States, including California, have been unable up to this time because of legal and administrative problems encountered to obtain necessary legislation to comply with the Federal requirements: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the California Highway Commission, That it requests that the time for the execution of such agreements be extended beyond the date of July 1, 1961, in order that further study may be made of the problems involved at both the State and Federal levels; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of this commission to the Senators and Representatives

from the State of California in the Congress of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the minutes of the California Highway Commission meeting of April 13, 1961.

Catholic School Crisis Underlined by Furor on Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Sun-Times has started an excellent series on the problems of America's Roman Catholic parochial schools, which today absorb an estimated 5,300,000 of the Nation's total elementary and high school age population.

I should like to call this excellent series to the attention of my colleagues particularly at this time since Congress is presently considering legislation to provide Federal aid to help solve the Nation's educational crises.

I believe the Chicago Sun-Times and the two outstanding journalists who have prepared this series deserve our highest commendation. This excellent Chicago newspaper is indeed rendering an outstanding public service in helping all of us better understand what a vital role the Roman Catholic parochial schools play in our Nation's overall educational program.

Mr. Speaker, the first two articles of the Chicago Sun-Times follow. I will insert into the RECORD the rest of the series as it is published:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, May 14, 1961]

CATHOLIC SCHOOL CRISIS UNDERLINED BY FUROR ON AID

(This is the first of a series of articles examining the issue of Federal aid to schools—private as well as public. This national issue has focused attention on the Roman Catholic school system. The series was written by Terry Ferrer, education writer for the New York Herald Tribune, and Dolores McCahill of the Sun-Times.)

(By Terry Ferrer)

NEW YORK.—American Roman Catholic parochial schools—the largest nonpublic system of education in the world—are facing a period of unprecedented crisis.

Never before in the century-old history of mass Catholic education has the parochial school been so sharply in the limelight, so bitterly involved in national controversy over Federal aid to education, so hard-pressed to meet the exploding needs of Catholic families.

The 5,300,000 children in Catholic elementary and secondary schools this year—92 percent of the nonpublic U.S. school enrollment—are indicative of the fantastic growth and mounting pressures on those schools.

In 1900, 1 of every 20 children in school in the United States was attending a parochial school. This year, the figure is 1 of every 8. In New York City alone, every third child between 5 and 18 years of age is now in a parochial school. In Pittsburgh, it is about 1 of every 2.

While this year's national public school enrollment of 36,305,000 elementary and high school students dwarfs the Catholic parochial figures, the fact that since the turn of the century the public schools have a little more than doubled their pupils. In the same period, the Catholic parochial schools have increased enrollment almost 6½ times. And even so, an additional 5 million Catholic pupils—many of them unable to gain admission to a parochial school—are in public schools this year.

As for the future, no cardinal or bishop, no priest or layman is willing to predict with certainty what will happen. All conceded that the number of prospective parochial pupils will continue to rise, even as the number of Roman Catholics has—47 percent in 10 years for a current total of more than 42 million.

DEMANDS FOR AID

The Catholic parochial school—major investment of the Catholic Church in the United States—is short of money, short of classrooms, short of teachers. Voluntary Catholic support of these schools has been generous, but the crush of numbers has overwhelmed the amount of dollars, estimated at $1.5 billion a year in maintenance alone.

Out of this background of need and pressure has come this year the most insistent Catholic demand to date for Federal aid to parochial schools.

The acrimonious debate over including church-related schools in President Kennedy's $5.6 billion aid-to-education program has already delayed the administration timetable on education help by almost a month.

The Catholic hierarchy has no quarrel with the President's higher education provisions—including a direct Federal grant of $350 per student to public, private or church-related colleges who accept the proposed 212,500 Federal college scholarship winners over the next 5 years.

INJUSTICE SEEN

But both prelates and Catholic laymen, by and large, feel that it is unjust and discriminatory to exclude Catholic parochial schools from the $2.3 billion proposal for public elementary and secondary schools, which provide that Federal funds can be used at the States' option for school construction or teachers' salaries.

The President has said that he believes that Federal aid for "constructing church schools or paying church school teachers' salaries" is unconstitutional as a violation of the principle of the separation of church and state.

At a March 2 meeting in Washington, the administrative board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, representing the Catholic hierarchy in this country, asked for long-term, low-interest loans to private schools, which would total about $350 million as part of a Federal aid program.

DELAY IN HOUSE

At no time during their meeting, it is understood, did the bishops discuss the possible advantage or disadvantage of having a Catholic President consider their request. Rather, they felt, Federal aid to education of one kind or another may well become law this year. The President campaigned vigorously on the issue, and only legislative tieup in the House Rules Committee held up such legislation last year.

The Catholic bishops reasoned that any pattern of Federal aid to education laid out this year would become the model for permanent Federal aid. Parochial school help, they believed, should be part of that pattern.

The Catholic bishops' requests prodded the administration into a legal examination of the constitutionality of such loans. In a brief prepared by the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare and Justice, the administration heard on March 28 that both loans and grants were deemed unconstitutional.

Within a week, the National Catholic Welfare Conference had decided to step up the loan requests and try for grants for construction of nonreligious facilities and perhaps for lay teachers' salaries.

SPELLMAN A SPOKESMAN

Most vociferous and most persistent spokesman for these new requests has been Francis Cardinal Spellman, archbishop of New York. As head of an archdiocese which currently enrolls 216,013 pupils in its parochial schools—more than the combined public school enrollment of the States of Delaware, Vermont, and Alaska—Cardinal Spellman believes there is a "large gray area of constitutionality" in the Government's March 28 brief.

In a fresh expression of his views April 29, the cardinal made these points:

There is "common ground" legally for resolving the controversy over Federal aid to church-related schools. The Government's memorandum made "three substantial concessions to the position taken by proponents of aid to church-related schools."

First, the cardinal said, it might be permissible for the Federal Government to provide for church-related schools "nonreligious facilities" such as gymnasiums, cafeterias, laboratories, and medical-dental facilities, and "perhaps for the compensation of teachers of secular subjects." Second, Federal funds might be loaned to church-related schools to build nonreligious facilities. And third, the memorandum concedes that it might be constitutional to provide parochial students with secular textbooks and nonreligious equipment. Also, the cardinal said, income tax benefits to parents might be another form of aid.

GALLUP POLL CITED

The majority of Catholics, both religious and lay, reportedly agree with the cardinal's position. A recent Gallup poll reported that two-thirds of the Catholics questioned felt that Federal aid should go to Catholic and other private schools as well as public. Conversely, almost two-thirds of the Protestants polled were for public school aid only. The National Council of Churches, representing almost 40 million Protestants and Eastern Orthodox, opposes Federal aid to church-related schools.

The second largest parochial system in the country is operated by the various Lutheran bodies, and they are opposed to any Federal help for their schools. But it must be pointed out that 8 major Lutheran churches, including the Missouri Synod—with the biggest church-school enrollment—currently enroll 178,139 pupils, according to figures compiled by the National Lutheran Council, against the Catholic count of 5,288,705.

Meanwhile, in Washington efforts are underway to solve the bitter fight over Federal aid, perhaps through combining the $2.3 billion school-aid bill with a measure extending and liberalizing the National Defense Education Act of 1958, which expires in 1962.

PRESSURE FROM LAYMEN

Catholic churchmen believe that the voice of the layman is louder in demanding more parochial schools than ever before. The Reverend Neil G. McCluskey, a Jesuit who is dean of the School of Education at Gonzaga University in Spokane, Wash., and one of the leading Catholic educational theorists, puts it this way:

"There is a tremendous pressure from laymen, more than ever before. For the first time, parents feel that the parochial schools belong to them. They just used to leave the schools for the bishops and priests to look after, and parents just expected to be serviced by such schools. Fifteen years ago, for example, Catholic parent-teacher organizations simply didn't exist. Now they are growing every day. These parents believe the situation is desperate for these schools—

and they are aware that they are part of them."

The Right Reverend Frederick G. Hochwalt, director of the education department of the NCWC, testified before a Senate Education Subcommittee that parochial schools perform a public function by educating large numbers of children under standards accepted by the State as fulfilling its requirements of compulsory education.

PARENTS AGREE

The Catholic parents who are pounding on the doors of the already overcrowded parochial schools agree. Forty-five percent of elementary Catholic children and 55 percent of Catholic high school students are now unable to get into parochial schools across the country.

And the specter of insufficient funds and increasing pressure on these schools haunts layman, nun and priest alike.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, May 15, 1961]

COSTS TIGHTEN GRIP ON CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

(This is the second of a series of articles on Federal aid to schools, private as well as public. The series was written by Terry Ferrer, New York Herald Tribune education writer, and Dolores McCahill of the Sun-Times staff.)

(By Terry Ferrer)

NEW YORK.—To many of the 139 million Americans who are not Roman Catholics, a parochial school is something of a mysterious place. The average non-Catholic thinks vaguely in terms of a catechetical school—one entirely staffed by nuns, brothers or priests who lead the children in prayer and teach them Christian doctrine all day long in a dingy classroom.

That is a fallacious picture. To begin with, none of the 50 States would permit daylong religious teaching. Parochial schools must conform to the same State instruction requirements time as do public schools.

Nuns and brothers no longer man teachers' desks in parochial schools single handedly. For every three nuns, brothers or priests teaching in these schools in 1959–60, there was one lay teacher, or a ratio of 108,452 religious to 34,878 lay teachers. While both nuns and brothers continue to increase, their numbers are being drawn from the low-birth period of the 1930's, and there are simply not enough to go around.

The phenomenal rise in the number of lay teachers—they have increased more than eight times since 1920 and more than five times since 1945—is putting a large hole in many a parish budget. To make the future even gloomier, the National Catholic Educational Association predicts that sometime in the 1970's there will be 2 lay teachers for every 1 religious teacher.

While many Americans believe that nuns and teaching brothers receive no salary, each of them does receive a stipend, nationally averaging from $650 to $1,250 a year, which goes to their religious orders to maintain them.

But the lay teacher receives a salary three to four times that amount, estimated at an average national figure of $3,400 for an elementary school teacher and $3,650 for a high school teacher. Even with this added expense to the parish, lay teachers do not begin to receive the salaries of public school teachers. The National Education Association has computed the national 1960–61 average public school teacher's salary at $5,215.

In the archdiocese of New York, for example, the 164 brothers teaching in 327 elementary schools receive $1,500 to $1,740 a year, while the 2,946 nuns in elementary teaching get $1,200 to $1,380. The 1,200 elementary lay teachers are paid $2,100 to $2,400.

In the 99 New York archdiocesan high schools, the 359 brothers receive stipends of $1,560 to $1,800 per year, and the 718 nuns get $1,440 to $1,620. The 528 lay teachers are paid "no less than $2,600." An archdiocesan study is now under way to find means of raising lay teacher salaries, according to the Rt. Rev. John Paul Haverty, archdiocesan superintendent of schools.

The difficulty of finding even this many lay teachers is evident when their salaries are compared with the single-salary scale in the city's public schools. It runs from $4,800 to $8,300 in 14 steps.

The construction of new parochial schools and the modernization of old ones is booming, and the so-called dingy classroom is fast being outgrown.

While there are no official national figures available on the amount of parochial school construction now going on, a survey conducted last year by the magazine Catholic Building and Maintenance showed that in 1961 Catholic schools will spend almost $100 million in maintenance, operation, and renovation of their facilities. In 1958 alone, the magazine said, $175 million was spent in new elementary and high school construction. Next fall, 190 new elementary schools and 30 new high schools will open.

In the New York archdiocese, more than $98 million has been poured into the building of 1,498 elementary and 495 high school classrooms since 1945. In the same 16 years—a "boom" period in all school enrollments—the archdiocesan school enrollment almost doubled, jumping from 132,623 to 216,013.

TWENTY-FIVE MILLION DOLLAR DRIVE

Last September, Francis Cardinal Spellman announced a $25 million drive for school building funds, largest in the history of the archdiocese. It has already been oversubscribed by more than $13 million. With the money, the cardinal plans a new seminary, four new archdiocesan high schools, and a pool of funds to finance future high school construction.

In Brooklyn, a $25 million drive begun last year is also oversubscribed by $13 million. Ninety percent of the funds raised will be used to start six new diocesan high schools. Since the end of World War II, parochial enrollments in Brooklyn have jumped from 131,855 to 210,668, and schools from 197 to 231. An estimated 100 more high school classrooms and about 500 elementary classrooms have been built.

NEW DIOCESE

In the booming new diocese of Rockville Centre, N.Y.—created less than 4 years ago and embracing Nassau and Suffolk Counties—$43 million has been spent in that period for 28 new schools and 27 additions to provide 673 new elementary classrooms, 2 new high schools and 1 college building.

Since 1945, the parochial school population has almost quadrupled, with elementary enrollments jumping from 16,796 to 61,244 this year, and high school pupils rising from 2,345 to 8,962.

The archiocese of Newark, N.J., has also announced a $25 million drive for funds to build eight new regional high schools, a building for its seminary, and four homes for the aged. The new high schools will accommodate 12,000 more boys and girls than the present 21,624.

CHICAGO COMMENT

In Chicago, largest archdiocese in the country with more than 2 million Catholics, Msgr. William E. McManus, superintendent of schools, does not care whether there is Federal aid this year or not. He said recently, "We're going to have 125 new classrooms next fall, no matter what they do in Washington."

Who pays the bill for all these projects? The answer, of course, is the Catholics themselves. Pastors of churches are responsible for supporting the schools attached to them. The diocesan school is supported by the Catholics of that diocese, while the private Catholic schools—considered a part of the Catholic school system—charge tuition comparable to other private schools.

In elementary schools, the cost to the church per pupil per year is about $120 on a national average, according to figures of the National Catholic Educational Association. The parent pays about a third of this in comparatively low tuition and books and other small charges. But, naturally, he pays again by putting money in the collection plate.

In the New York archdiocese, the tuition is about $20 or $30 per 10-month school year. In New York high schools, the average tuition is $100 to $150 a year in the parish and diocesan schools. In Philadelphia, the high schools are free. In Chicago, the high school tuition runs about $225 a year.

Throughout the country, parochial schools participate in the Federal or State school lunch program. In 16 States, they receive free pupil transportation, and in Oregon, Louisiana, Mississippi, and New Mexico parochial children receive free textbooks.

Last year, parochial schools in the United States borrowed about $1 million under title III of the National Defense Education Act for science, mathematics, and foreign language improvement. Unlike public schools, which receive matching grants, private schools are only entitled to borrow Federal funds.

Since the principal support for parochial schools comes from Catholics, many of them argue that they are already paying a "double tax"—especially in fast-growing suburban districts. They pay for both new public schools and new parochial schools. And many of them feel, as one priest said, that a new Federal aid program excluding them would bring a "triple tax" since their Federal taxes would be used to finance a new program in which they had no part.

Yet Catholics today are already accused of sabotaging public school budgets and bond issues to support their own schools. The record may be poor in some States, such as Rhode Island. But after the New York State budget "revolt" of 1959, when 34 budgets went down to defeat, the State education department in Albany launched an investigation to see if parents of parochial students had helped to defeat the budgets. It could find no evidence of Catholic efforts to hinder public budgets.

As Archbishop Karl J. Alter of Cincinnati, chairman of the administrative board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, has stated: "It would be a dereliction of duty and an offense against both justice and charity if it were to be assumed by representatives of church-related or private schools that their own interests could prosper at the expense of public school interests. No responsible Catholic authority has ever advocated any such attitude."

But for the Catholic parent with several children in parochial schools, there is no doubt that the temptation is there.

Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, I recently pointed out to the House that our various governmental programs are working at cross-purposes. We are driv-

ing out our small farmers about as fast as possible and bemoaning our unemployment.

Surely the statistics down in the Department of Agriculture must show that the large and flexible farm operations have continued to hold their own, but the smaller and possibly more inefficient operations, face steadily declining incomes. Under all of our so-called farm programs, either the consumer or the taxpayer has to pay the bill and it has grown to be no small item. I do not know whether it is fair to say that a marginal farmer would probably be marginal in other pursuits as well, but I do know that he has been largely overlooked in most of the farm programs. The surpluses can be eliminated only if some of the big producers are induced to alter their habits.

I am advised that Congress is soon to vote upon a do-it-yourself scheme which, in my opinion, is strictly old hat. How about the existing milk orders which were set up on that basis, to be altered only upon the vote of the producing farmers? The Department tolerated group voting, which meant that the individual had no vote at all. Disparity in producer payments and technicalities by the dozen crept in, but certainly not through any effort on the part of the farmers. I think we should take a long hard look at the milk order procedure before embarking on countless other enterprises of this nature.

Comments on the American Customs of Observing Holidays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Leon K. Bryner, 1001 27th Street South, Arlington, Va., a most patriotic citizen of my northern Virginia district, has written a letter to me which merits insertion in this RECORD so that my colleagues and all persons who follow the proceedings of Congress may have the benefit of his thoughtful comments on the American custom of observing holidays.

With your permission, I shall include Mr. Bryner's entire letter below:

WHAT WILL YOU BE DOING?

Certain national holidays have been set aside for special observance—Memorial Day, the Fourth, and Veterans' Day. But what do most of us do on any or all of these commemorative days? Well, here are just a few for instances:

Sleep late, perhaps to recharge the old battery after last night's all too successful party.

Work around the car, the home or apartment; interspersed with an occasional beer, julep, highball, or collins; or merely sit in front of the TV, or play bridge.

Play golf, or visit the club and sunbathe at the side of the pool.

Go to the ball game, the races, or perhaps a movie.

Take the family to the beach, or on a picnic.

Take advantage of the long weekend by visiting friends or relatives. Like as not if you don't, they may get the same idea and you'll be stuck.

Or, perhaps just sit and gripe because the weather has interfered with your plans and your holiday.

There are many variations of the above, all of which omit both the spirit and the intent to which each of these days is dedicated; namely, to each individual giving a bit of oneself; and to a personal rededication to the task ahead. Today's younger generation have not the least conception of the meaning of observance. Observance in its true sense went out of fashion about the time the age of the goof off phased in. It was superseded with more and more pleasant living, with less and less personal acceptance of duty except perhaps to the family and to self.

There may be those with honest doubts as to what is expected of them in observing these days. They may challenge the need for personal observance in this day of highly organized society in which organizations take care of the formalities of observance. But observance is everyone's business—a personal responsibility not to be delegated or ignored. As to how one can observe such days properly; there are several ways. But the underlying theme of each is beamed at individual participation. Take time out to pause, reflect, and thank God for our country and its way of life. Then ask oneself, how can I be effective in helping to keep it that way and to make it better? Our heritage is what it is because it was fought for and won the hard way, by individuals with a compelling sense of duty and responsibility. It just didn't happen perchance, nor will it remain here long unless we free ourselves of our complacency.

Another symbol common to all 3 of these days—display Old Glory proudly. How long has it been since you last did that? There may have been times when you considered those who did eccentric. Have you ever sat down alone or with the family and attempted to analyze, for example, what Memorial Day really means? How can I demonstrate the sort of observance the day deserves?

There are many cemeteries in every nook and corner of this land, none of which doesn't have its graves mutely testifying to abandonment by those who no longer care, or are too far removed to decorate or maintain the grave site.

So much for Memorial Decoration Day; each of the others has its special significance, and purposeful meaning, if we would only take time to search them out and to regain and restore lost values. It is much later than we think.

Sincerely,

LEON K. BRYNER.

Talking Back to the Admen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, Marya Mannes, in a recent speech before the Association of National Advertisers, underscored the lengths to which some advertisers are willing to go in their efforts to persuade us to want a lot of things we do not need and buy a lot of things we cannot afford.

Miss Mannes' forceful and delightful plea for a saner, more reasonable approach to advertising has my wholehearted endorsement. I am quite sure my colleagues will feel a similar response and I urge them to read the excerpts from Miss Mannes' speech which appeared in the May 1961 issue of the Reporter. Under unanimous consent I include these remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

TALKING BACK TO THE ADMEN
(By Marya Mannes)

Asking me to address a conference of advertisers is a little like having a rabbit address a planned parenthood meeting. To put it gently, you and I don't always see things the same way. I keep accusing you people of making us people want a lot of things we don't need and buy a lot of things we can't afford. And I scream just as loudly against having to work my way through three pages of ads in order to find one column of print as I do against having the televised life of Churchill interrupted by a dietary product. Sir Winston, of all people: Where would he have got on Metrecal?

But relax, as you boys say. Underneath the Amazonian form, this fuzzy-headed starry-eyed do-gooder exterior—underneath all this beats the heart of a sucker. I too want to be a younger, fresher me. A little of that cream every night and I will be. I too want to own a swimming pool so that I can meet a better class of people. I too believe that if I use that soup mix my husband will murmur sweet words. Your message, gentleman, gets through to me.

Moreover, my dreams of a better society where you people don't clutter up our lives with urges to consume are matched by plain commonsense: I know you are here to stay, that our economy might grind to a halt without you, and what's more, that a nation forced to read text without the distraction of girls in bras and liquor in bottles would be a nation of hopeless neurotics.

So I'm going to be constructive if it kills me. How? By giving you one consumer's reactions as to the degree of success or failure your ads enjoy with me, whether on paper or on television. It is my contention that especially on television you are pitching too low and treating us like the mentally retarded. The male voices you use to sell us soap or detergents or waxes or polishes would do splendidly in clinics for the emotionally disturbed—so kind, so gentle, so tender, so repetitive. Do you really think we need that much soothing?

Furthermore, I would like to tell you certain things that you keep showing us we do but which we never do. No. 1: no woman in her right mind takes her wash to the window to see if it's white. No. 2: no woman in her right mind rubs her cheek on newly washed diapers. No. 3: all women know that no bath soap in the world covers the bath and herself in impenetrable lather. I know it has to be impenetrable for reasons of deceny, but now that we the New Frontier, why couldn't you say, "The lather you see here is not from our soap," or "Men, you can see through our lather."

In other words, be reasonable. The most effective ad on television as far as I am concerned, was the one where a detergent made dishwashing almost nice. That got me—that almost. I've used the stuff ever since.

In passing, I might also add that a good institutional ad is as interesting to women

as it is to men. There is a fascination in seeing how a product is made, and I think we would all prefer to see how some cosmetic is made—or would we?—to looking at some dumb babe tell us that her beauty came from using toilet soap. She'd be beautiful if she used axle grease.

Oh, just one more thing. You are making the rearing of responsible children much harder when you show a kid scribbling on walls, planting dirty fingers on white surfaces, and spilling chocolate fudge sundae on the floor. What happens then? Mommy wipes up after him with Mr. Clean. Moral to the young: be a pig and let Mom worry. You would be doing an immense public service if you showed piggie cleaning up his own mess—as indeed he should.

New York's Reform Democratic Clubs Hail the Anniversary of the Supreme Court Desegregation Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by officers of the Reform Democratic Clubs of New York's West Side on the occasion of the seventh anniversary of the Supreme Court decision outlawing school segregation. One of the characteristics of the reform clubs is a vital concern with issues. This statement reflects their deep commitment to the achievement of full civil rights for all our citizens now—not later:

A STATEMENT BY THE REFORM DEMOCRATIC CLUBS OF NEW YORK'S WEST SIDE ON INTEGRATION IN SCHOOLS

On May 17, 1954, the Supreme Court of the United States handed down its decision in the case of *Brown* v. *The Board of Education* outlawing segregation in the public school systems of the United States.

On this, the seventh anniversary of this momentous decision, we, the Reform Democratic Clubs of the West Side of the Borough of Manhattan in New York City, wish to state our belief in the right of every individual of any race, religion, or creed to equal opportunity and to equal enjoyment of the guarantees given to all citizens by the U.S. Constitution.

The Supreme Court's decision in 1954 was a step toward converting this ideal into a reality. Though much has been done, much remains to be done in education, housing, job opportunities, and voting.

Although 7 long years have passed, only a small percentage of the public schools in the United States affected by the Supreme Court's decision have complied with the decision. Discrimination in employment on the basis of race or color still exists. Few States have as yet enacted legislation prohibiting discrimination in housing; and, in those States which have, the legislation has often proved inadequate to meet the needs. In many States minorities still are not allowed to vote. Without the vote, they have no say in their Government.

Today these minorities in our population are justly demanding that the American political system live up to its ideals. This demand has been articulated through the courts and by social actions such as the sit-in demonstrations.

We reaffirm our support of these efforts by our fellow Americans to acquire political and social equality. We realize that this is a problem for the North as well as the South. It is an American problem; and to solve it we need an American solution.

It is both our hope and our belief that the Federal Government will not shirk its responsibilities in this field and will act affirmatively toward eliminating all inequalities in our society.

It is both our hope and our belief that the State governments will do their part in guarding the rights of their citizens by faithfully implementing the laws already passed for this purpose, and by passing new legislation if needed.

It is both our hope and our belief that the city of New York will continue to take the lead in the advancement of civil rights, and by so doing, promote a vital, heterogeneous city life which will make New York City into a model of urban development.

We, the Reform Democratic Clubs on New York City's West Side, pledged ourselves to continue to support the efforts of government on all levels to end segregation and discrimination in our land. We pledge to continue to aid those community organizations working toward these same goals, and we further pledge to initiate programs of education and social action to help make our country into a land of opportunity for all its citizens.

ALFRED H. KLEIMAN,
President, Riverside Democrats.
ERIKA TEUTSCH,
President, West Side Democrats.
MARTIN BENIS,
F.D.R.-Woodrow Wilson Democratic Club.
FRANCES TEPPER,
Reform Independent Democrats.
RAYMOND GUENTER,
President, New Chelsea Club.

The European Free Trade Association and Its Implications for the U.S. Pulp, Paper, and Paperboard Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter by the American Paper and Pulp Association:

THE EUROPEAN FREE TRADE ASSOCIATION AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR THE UNITED STATES PULP, PAPER, AND PAPERBOARD INDUSTRY

(Statement of American Paper and Pulp Association by Robert E. O'Connor)

In a memorandum previously filed with the Department of Commerce, we had pointed out that U.S. industry was faced with discriminatory action on the part of the European Free Trade Association which would put industry generally and the pulp and paper industry, specifically, at a competitive disadvantage. This discrimination has already been evident in the 20-percent tariff reduction shared among the member nations of EFTA with no comparable tariff reductions to nonmember nations, and will be further heightened on July 1, 1961, when an additional 10-percent reduction in tariffs among the members is put into effect. This program of mutual tariff reductions may very well be accelerated even more rapidly than currently anticipated and the ability of a nonmember nation, such as United States, therefore, to compete in markets of member countries in which it had formerly shared, will be virtually lost.

The formation of EFTA and the implementation of its aims will put the U.S. paper industry at a very serious competitive disadvantage. Two of our industry's greatest international competitors, Sweden and Norway, were original members of the European Free Trade Association and more recently, Finland is now participating in this trade bloc and sharing in the same tariff reduction arrangements contemplated by the original seven members. These competitors, therefore, by July 1, 1961, will enjoy a 30-percent tariff preference for their exports to the United Kingdom, which has been one of our industry's major markets for exports of paper and paperboard.

The problem is particularly grave as it relates to U.S. exports of containerboard liners to the United Kingdom, since over the past 3 years exports of this commodity have comprised 90 percent or more of the total U.S. paper/boards shipped to that country. For example, in the year 1960, our domestic industry exported 170,051 tons of kraft board liners to United Kingdom with a dollar value of $21,617,439. We are currently faced with the erosion and ultimate loss of this market entirely to our Scandinavian competitors because of our inability to overcome the substantial tariff differential to which our products will be subjected in contrast to those of the Scandinavian producers who will eventually be shipping these products duty free into the United Kingdom.

At the present time the United Kingdom imposes duties of 14 or 15 percent ad valorem, depending on the weight of the board. These duties are assessed on the CIF price plus an additional amount (called commuted rate) of one-half of 1 percent representing the costs incident to getting the goods through customs. The value is thus higher than our usually quoted U.S. export value, which employs an f.o.b. port of exportation basis.

The effect of the tariff reduction to be shared by the participants in the European free trade area is clearly illustrated by the following computation made just prior to the first tariff reduction by EFTA. In the interest of simplicity we used linerboard of 47 pound weight, which carries a duty of 15 percent. The figure would not vary significantly for the next lighter weight if 14 percent were used. The tabulation is in terms of prices then existing.

	Export from United States	Export from Scandinavia
C.i.f. price	$134.55	$135.00
C.i.f. price less cash discount	133.41	132.30
Present duty	20.11	19.94
Duty July 1, 1960	20.11	15.95
Duty Jan. 1, 1970	20.11	0
Net price plus duty	153.52	152.24
Net price plus duty, July 1, 1960	153.52	148.25
Net price plus duty, Jan. 1, 1970	153,52	132.30

As the foregoing table shows, United States and Scandinavian net prices plus duty were then very close—as they had to be in a competitive market. The difference was $1.28 per ton.

On July 1, 1960, as a result of the 20-percent reduction in duty under the EFTA Treaty, the difference increased to $5.27 per ton. By 1970 (or sooner), when duties will have been entirely eliminated, the difference in favor of the Scandinavian competitors will be $21.22.

These figures are based on the assumption that c.i.f. prices will remain constant. This assumption is probably unwarranted. Freight rates now are very low. In all likelihood, these rates will increase substantially. With any increase in freight rates, the duty will increase. These, therefore, are minimum differentials.

In order to remain competitive, U.S. manufacturers will have to reduce their prices by approximately $21 per ton. A reduction of $21 per ton from present prices will produce so low a return at the mill as to make export sales unprofitable and will probably eliminate completely our export trade in kraft linerboard to the United Kingdom.

The need for help: Without the help of our Government, we will be compelled to stand by and see the gradual attrition of this sizable export business. We ask that our Government, through every means at its disposal, endeavor to secure for our domestic industry equality of tariff treatment with Scandinavia.

If EFTA's contemplated tariff reduction in internal tariffs should be extended to the United States by the United Kingdom, we would then be in a position to compete on equal terms for sale of our kraft linerboard in the United Kingdom. Scandinavian competitors now have and will continue to have important advantages over us by virtue of geography alone. We do not ask for assistance in this respect, nor do we venture to request any alteration in the EFTA Treaty. But an extension of the tariff reduction to the United States is entirely consistent with the EFTA tariff plan and is essential if our market in the United Kingdom is to be saved.

The pulp and paper industry position on export trade can be reduced to one fair and simple objective: That the U.S. pulp and paper industry be accorded the same tariff treatment and other trading privileges as the pulp and paper industry in other countries producing like products for world trade. We simply ask for the opportunity to compete without the burden of discrimination.

It is our hope that this position and our request for governmental assistance in this area will be prominently kept in mind by our Government representatives during the GATT negotiations.

Another War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will we again be called upon to say goodby to loved ones, some of whom may return permanently disabled—others who will never come home?

There is every reason to be apprehensive, fearful, to gird ourselves for determined effort, be willing to sacrifice to preserve this a free, independent nation, where we and those we bring into the world can continue to enjoy the freedom and opportunity which have always been ours.

Another war confronts us because we have pledged help to others throughout the world who are less fortunate. We have forgotten that self-preservation always has been, and ever will be, uppermost in the minds of individuals and nations. When the chips are down every individual, every nation, always has and will continue to look first to its own welfare and existence.

As a member of so many international organizations, we have surrendered our right to act independently, even though our own existence be at stake. On our doorstep, in Cuba, because of our international agreements, the Communists have been able to establish a base—in violation of the Monroe Doctrine. Were it not for our international agreements, we could, and long ago, had we the spirit of the forefathers, have kicked the Russians, the Communists, from Cuba—blockaded the island itself if necessary.

Carried away by the natural and laudable desire to be helpful to others, listening to the preachment of intellectuals and internationalists whose objectives are laudable but impossible of attainment, we have fought and sacrificed not only to bring peace throughout the world, but to make the intellectual and spiritual standards of all others conform to our own.

Nowhere in America is there a reading or listening intelligent individual who does not know that, because of our commitments to international organizations, disputes in the Middle East, in southeast Africa, in Germany, in South America, as well as in Cuba, war is on our doorstep. We have spread our power too thin, in too many places. Overextension, over-commitments threaten our ruin.

The President—an earnest, able, patriotic and courageous young man—is rightly apprehensive of what may befall. Some have criticized him because he relies to such a great extent upon members of his own family. For my part, I can understand his need for confidence in his advisers. Today, he does not know which way to turn for sound, patriotic advice.

A few years ago, the State Department, upon which he should be able to rely, was shot through and through homosexuals, moral perverts and Communists. Today, there is no certainty that in it Communists do not know and betray to our enemies our most secret plans and accomplishments. Recent developments in Cuba may indicate that such is the fact.

The President has wisely called upon many of his political opponents, experienced individuals, to advise and help him, and, without exception, all have given him of their best. However, the ultimate plotting of our course rests with the President, a burdensome responsibility which he has generously assumed. I doubt not that he has asked for Divine guidance.

We have been told that "God helps them that help themselves." As individuals, we cannot shirk our responsibility. Likewise, we cannot shirk our own responsibilities, either as individuals or as a Nation, to see that we remain strong, do not lose our freedom, our ability to defend our independence as a Nation.

Our efforts to help others will be futile if they continue to refuse to do their part toward the attainment of their own freedom and independence.

We cannot turn back the pages of history, rechart our course. New scientific and productive methods and achievements have created tremendously destructive and costly weapons. Another war may turn back for centuries present-day civilization. Our individual and national responsibility to our own and future generations cannot be shirked. Other nations, powerful because we have built up their strength, now challenge our ability to successfully meet a destructive war. The President has called for and we are preparing to defend the continued existence of our Government, of our way of life.

Throughout the country individuals and corporations granted billions of your tax dollars are engaged in the production of things and weapons needed if we are to preserve our own existence. This program we must all support. We can no longer tolerate the existence of groups or organizations which render production for defense more costly or inadequate.

When the Congress appropriated billions for the production of missiles, other implements of defense, at plants in Florida, in California, and other places throughout the United States, a few greedy, selfish groups took advantage of the opportunity and the need to secure for themselves benefits to which they were not entitled, the granting of which threatens our very existence. Some of these strikers received as much as $700 a week, in just one case added $692,000 to the cost.

While the average member of a union is just as patriotic, willing to pay his or her share of the tax burden, make as great a contribution to the general welfare, engage in combat fighting, as are the members of any other civic or religious group, because of the special privileges and benefits which have been granted, some few leaders and individuals have been able to and have taken advantage of the present situation.

For more than 20 years, when war or unemployment threatened or were with us, they have interfered and sabotaged our efforts to be ready, insisted that they alone should have the available jobs, and at a price named by them.

I need but cite strikes in Detroit more than 20 years ago where the Navy, in need of equipment necessary for national defense, was held up for 24 and again for 41 days by strikes, the issue being additional benefits for those engaged in such work.

Some have forgotten that, on May 25 of 1946, when strikes by railroad employees threatened to tie up the transportation system of the Nation, President Truman came before Congress and demanded, and the House passed by a vote of 306 to 13, legislation which gave him, as President, authority to seize some industries and imposed upon the railroad strikers the necessity of either permitting the railroads to be operated or themselves being drafted into the armed services where they would receive the pay of a serviceman. The strike ended very quickly.

Is there any reason why some should enlist or be drafted into the armed services while jobs in factories producing munitions of war should be available only to members of unions; nonunion men, veterans, and taxpayers, discriminated against?

In Michigan, employees in several plants, in order to keep production going, voluntarily took a lessened, a decreased wage, willingly offered to work additional hours. What a contrast between the action of these patriotic employees and those to whom I have just referred and who were in a situation to prevent us from adequately preparing for war.

The remedy?

Recently, Senator MCCLELLAN suggested that, in such situations, some of the special privileges and benefits granted to unions and their members should be suspended.

Twenty years ago, legislation designed to prevent the abuse and misuse of special privileges by any organization which interfered with our national welfare, public health, or our ability to defend ourselves, was introduced by me, but it never, because of the political power of a few union leaders, received consideration.

Another bill has just been introduced which would take from employees and unions, when they sabotage our national defense, the special privileges and benefits granted them by Federal legislation.

Our Constitution defines treason: I quote:

> Treason against the United States, shall consist only in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort.

Get that? Giving them "aid and comfort."

Neither a lawyer nor a judge is needed to determine that, if you are drafted or enlist in the defense of our country, I, working in the plant which produces a gun or the shoes you must wear while at the front line, by refusing to produce those things you need, am giving "aid and comfort" to the enemy—otherwise defined by that short and ugly word "treason."

No one is asking that those who are sabotaging our national defense, our ability to preserve ourselves and protect our position in the world, be punished by hanging, the punishment prescribed by the Constitution for treason, or even by imprisonment or fine. All anyone is suggesting is that those who strike, who refuse to work, while being permitted to refuse to contribute to our national defense, shall not be permitted to hinder others from carrying on; that the organizations to which they belong be deprived of the special privileges which they are abusing.

Just as the father takes from the son who drives the family automobile in a reckless, dangerous manner, so, too, should organizations and individuals who misuse and abuse to the detriment of the public the special legislation, privileges and exemptions which they enjoy, be deprived of those special privileges when misused or abused.

Those who pay, the parents, the wives, the sisters, the children of those who are called to the armed services, should insist that our legislators—whether in State or National office—give first consideration to the national good, the welfare of all, rather than granting some special benefit to members of particular groups and organizations expecting in return support, come election day.

Back of this whole present-day effort to involve us in war throughout the world, then to sabotage our production, are the Communists, and we, because of the foolish agreements we have made, seem to be powerless to act independently, act effectively.

The least we can do is to make an effort to prevent those here at home from interfering with our efforts to preserve our national welfare and sovereignty.

Let us once more make our own independence, our own welfare, our own security, our first consideration.

"Rotten" Boroughs in the States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Saturday Evening Post of April 22, 1961. It reflects a growing feeling among responsible elements outside of Government that Government—and particularly its legislative branch—is not truly representative of the people. This article deals with the State legislatures. It is my feeling that the Congress also must recognize the serious inequities existing in the present apportionment of congressional districts.

In commending this article to the attention of our colleagues I would also respectfully suggest that they examine my bill H.R. 841, to provide for a new apportionment of congressional election districts. The editorial follows:

TOO MANY STATES FAIL TO ABOLISH "ROTTEN" BOROUGHS

The recent ruling by an Indiana superior court judge that the Indiana Legislature is null, void and unconstitutional points up the sorry fix that a number of our State governments have got themselves into by not tending to their knitting. The Indiana constitution stipulates that the general assembly shall reapportion itself every 6 years in accordance with population growth and shift, but the legislators have not done this since 1921.

Indiana is by no means the only State that has been lax in reapportionment. Alabama has had no legislative reapportionment since 1901. Iowa last reapportioned its lower house in 1927 and its senate in 1911. Kentucky has ignored the matter since 1942, and Louisiana since 1921. Massachusetts has had no reapportionment in its house of representatives since 1947, and Mississippi has touched neither its house nor senate since 1916. North Dakota's last reapportionment was in 1931. Yet all these States are required to reapportion their legislatures every 10 years or oftener.

Vermont is in a class by itself in this field, not having got around to reapportionment since 1793, 2 years after it joined the United States. But Vermont at least has the excuse of a constitution that is somewhat vague on the duties of legislators in this regard. Not so Tennessee, which has sat tight on reapportionment ever since 1903, and consequently finds itself haled before the U.S. Supreme Court. Tennessee's legislative districts vary in population from 3,900 to 75,000, and it is charged that this violates not only the State constitution but the "equal protection of the law" clause of the 14th amendment.

Numerous test suits of a similar nature, originating mostly in expanding metropolitan areas, have been brought in the Federal courts in the past 15 years in an attempt to make the representatives of the people live up to their constitutional duties. Only a few weeks ago New Jersey legislators hurriedly voted a law to reapportion their seats when the State supreme court threatened to do it for them if they did not act.

All this seems so unnecessary. The reapportionment provisions of the State constitutions, like those of the U.S. Constitution, reflect fundamental principles of American Government and are meant to be carried out. Representative government is weakened when it permits rotten boroughs.

One trouble is that most State constitutions put the responsibility for reapportionment exclusively on the legislature, which is the very body most sensitive to changes of this nature. All the delinquent States listed above are found in this category. Many States have safeguards against legislative inaction. Some take the power to reapportion entirely out of legislative hands and set up special apportionment boards to handle the problem. Others give the legislatures a reasonable time to act, but if they don't, alternative procedures can be called into play.

In a time when the States are hard put to hold their own against the looming Federal colossus, it seems essential that the State governments should make every effort to become as effective and responsible as possible. It is pretty obvious that a legislature which is set up exactly as it was in 1921 or 1901 or even 1947, taking no account of subsequent population changes, is not reflecting the will of the people.

House Concurrent Resolution 298

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, Premier Khrushchev and his associates in international communism, with the full cooperation of Dictator Fidel Castro, are making attempts to extend the system of communism to and within this hemisphere. This is most dangerous to our peace, to our safety, and to our security. Faced with the intolerable communistic Cuban situation, we must in the interest of our national security reaffirm the Monroe Doctrine by an immediate air and naval blockade of Cuba. This will make clear to the world that we do not intend to tolerate the Castro menace and that we are taking positive and effective action to prevent the extension of the system of communism in this hemisphere.

XUM

On May 9, 1961, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 298 expressing the sense of the Congress that an immediate air and naval blockade of Cuba should be imposed for the purpose of implementing the Monroe Doctrine.

The resolution is as follows:

Whereas the Monroe Doctrine expresses the historic policy of the United States with respect to the Western Hemisphere; and

Whereas the United States considers any attempt on the part of foreign powers to extend their system to any portion of the Western Hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety; and

Whereas the United States considers that any interposition by any foreign power in the affairs of the Western Hemisphere can only be considered as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States; and

Whereas it is impossible that any foreign power can extend its system to the Western Hemisphere without endangering our peace and happiness, and it is equally impossible that we should behold such extension in any form with indifference; and

Whereas recent events in Cuba and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere have indicated that attempts are currently being made to provide a permanent foothold for international communism in this hemisphere: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the Monroe Doctrine should be reaffirmed by the immediate imposition of an air and naval blockade of Cuba by the United States for the purpose of preventing further intervention or exercise of control by foreign nations affecting the internal affairs and destinies of nations of the Western Hemisphere.

The adoption of the foregoing resolution will make clear to the world that we do not intend to tolerate the Castro menace and that we are taking positive and effective action to prevent the extension of the system of communism in this hemisphere.

The Confederate Cemetery in Washington County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, a poignant reminder of the Civil War exists in Washington County, Md. The Confederate Cemetery at Hagerstown contains the bones of over 2,500 southern soldiers who died in battles and skirmishes at various places in Maryland and in nearby Pennsylvania. In connection with the Civil War Centennial commemoration I include the following history of the Confederate Cemetery:

THE CONFEDERATE CEMETERY IN WASHINGTON COUNTY

Only one Confederate cemetery exists in Washington County. This is very significant as Maryland was a border slave State where North and South now clasp hands. There are no Confederate war dead in Pennsylvania except two graves in Fulton County at McConnellsburg. Here two graves were missed when the Confederate dead were collected after the war.

After the battles of South Mountain and Antietam and the consequent engagements in Maryland, the dead of both sides were interred in graves, mounds, gullies, gutters, ravines, quarries, rock crevices, sink holes; in fact, in any place where they could be quickly buried. At Fox's Gap in South Mountain, 100 of the dead "Boys in Gray" were dumped into an old well. Rows of dead in ridges extended across some of the best fields of farms where the fighting took place. These were the furrows where the dead had been hastily covered the day of the battle or the days that followed. Graves were in gardens, along the roads, in fence corners, by springs and streams, and under trees.

In March 1865 the State of Maryland, by an act of the legislature appropriated $7,000 and appointed four trustees to purchase and enclose a suitable lot on ground on the Antietam Battlefield as a final resting place for the remains of the brave soldiers on both sides, the boys of the North and the boys of the South. Appropriations by other Northern States, whose troops participated in the battle, together with an additional $8,000 from Maryland placed at the disposal of the board of trustees, brought the total to about $70,000. When the lot was purchased, however, the Northern States refused to advance their money if southern soldiers were to be interred therein. On the lot was a large rock where it was known General Lee had stood when he watched the battle of the afternoon. They demanded that this be blown out in order that their honored dead be not contaminated with treason.

So the national cemetery became a Union cemetery only. The work of removing the Union dead from the Antietam Battlefield and South Mountain commenced in October of 1866 and was finished in August 1867. The number of bodies buried in this cemetery was 4,759 of which 1,848 are unknown dead. More Union dead are buried at Antietam than at Gettysburg.

The Confederate dead remained untouched except souvenir hunters who scratched out bones, bullets, buttons, and belt buckles for mementos. But every large rain washed out a number of bones. No one was responsible for their reburial, so many bones remained to bleach or wash away in the flood waters of other hard rains. Some bones were even built into stone walls or into stone fences. The South had lost so much of its wealth during the war that nothing could be done by it to remedy these circumstances.

The new-born organizations of Confederate Veterans and the Sons and Daughters of the Confederacy did all in their power to awaken an interest that would provide a more respectable situation for their honored dead. In 1870 a provision was made by the Maryland Legislature for the decent burial of the bones of dead southern soldiers, many of whom were sons of Maryland. The sum of $5,000 was appropriated and the Governor was authorized to appoint trustees to the custody of the money and have the work done.

Governor Bowie named Henry Kyd Douglas, George Freaner, and James H. Gambrill to the board of trustees. Sums of money were contributed by the States of Virginia and West Virginia. The trustees purchased a portion of Rose Hill Cemetery along South Potomac Street in Hagerstown, which they ornamented with a fine monument and called their reservation the Washington Cemetery. It was dedicated on the 15th of June 1877. At the dedication there was a great gathering of people and Gen. Fitzhugh Lee of the Confederate Army was the orator of the day. Later he became Governor of Virginia.

As early as 1872 the work of removing the bones of the Confederate soldiers to this cemetery had begun. All identifications of the skeletons were lost. The bones of 2,500 men were interred.

They were buried in a large mounds at first, which were leveled off into graves later. A number of Confederate graves, in addition to those of South Mountain and Antietam, along the Greencastle-Williamsport Pike, along the northern roads leading into Hagerstown, also at Funkstown, St. James, and Williamsport, put there during the retreat from Gettysburg, together with graves of McCausland Raid of 1864, were opened and the bones were removed to the Washington Cemetery. The last bones of a boy in gray were interred about 25 years ago. The bones were uncovered at Gettysburg when a road was being constructed on the battlefield there.

The grounds of Washington Cemetery, where the graves are, is marked off on the south side by 15 granite blocks or posts connected with a powerful iron chain. One speaker represented them to be the 15 States that would have made up the Confederacy had the South won. The border States of Delaware, Maryland, Kentucky, and Missouri are included. The South never recognized West Virginia as an independent border State. In front of the monument are 7 granite posts connected by a heavy chain representing the original Confederate States. To the right are 7 other granite blocks with a heavy chain attached; why this should not be 11 representing Virginia, Arkansas, North Carolina, and Tennessee that joined the 7 original Confederate States is not clear. In front of the monument outside the circle of graves is the speaker's rostrum built of stone in 1914. Maryland has the soldiers' cemetery marked off from Rose Hill with posts of granite bearing the Maryland seal.

The monument faces the graves of the dead; it is a marble statue of a maiden leaning on an anchor. She represents hope—the hope these men had when they died for a great Southland. But now that the war is over that hope was translated into a new beginning of the South. They accepted the old South's surrender and the start of a new day for its people. Not a soldier who wore the gray after the surrender carried on guerilla warfare or a gangster revenge fight. He stepped from the trenches into the furrow; his horses "that charged Federal guns marched before the plow, and fields that ran red with blood in April were green with harvests in June." The South lost the war but gained the peace.

There are three inscriptions on the monument. On its front are these words: "The State of Maryland has provided this cemetery and erected this monument to perpetuate the memory of the Confederate dead who fell at Antietam and South Mountain." On the right side is inscribed, "The State of Virginia has contributed toward the burial of her dead within this cemetery." On the left side, we read: "The State of West Virginia has contributed to the burial of her dead within this cemetery."

To Persons Interested in Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MERWIN COAD

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, since the omnibus farm bill was submitted by the Kennedy administration much distorted propaganda concerning it has been disseminated by some of its opponents. It

is incredible to me how the American Farm Bureau makes everything so simple by saying a program is all good or all bad. Every Benson proposal was good and now every Freeman proposal is all bad. One constituent, after a particularly vehement tirade against H.R. 6400 in which he said the whole bill should be killed, was asked if he were opposed to the school lunch program, wool program, and so forth. He seemed quite surprised to learn that they were in this bill as well as several other noncontroversial items. If we are going to legislate in the best interests of the Nation and American agriculture I believe we have to make sure our farmers and agricultural leaders fully understand what is in this bill in order that they may properly evaluate it.

A letter from one group interested in sound agricultural programs has just come to my attention and under unanimous consent I include a copy of this letter from Robert M. Koch, president of the National Limestone Institute to persons interested in agriculture:

MAY 16, 1961.

To persons interested in agriculture:

As has been our custom, we attempt to call to your attention developments here in Washington which we think will be of interest to you and which we believe your local press and other information-media do not make available to you—at least not in as much detail as you would like.

I am sure everyone knows that the so-called omnibus farm bills (H.R. 6400 and S. 1643) embodying many of the Kennedy administration's proposals for getting our agricultural plant in order were introduced in their respective Houses by Senator ELLENDER, of Louisiana, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and Congressman COOLEY, of North Carolina, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture. The statements made by these two key legislators at the time the bills were introduced have been reproduced from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and are enclosed.

Anyone who has access to the American Farm Bureau publicity knows that they have been bitterly attacking these bills. The National Grange under the leadership of Herschel Newsom, master of the Grange, and the Farmers' Union under the leadership of President James Patton have endorsed these bills. The Georgia State Farm Bureau has already broken away from the national group on this issue, and others are expected to follow suit. The Georgia Farm Bureau president advised Charles Shuman, the president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, that his group was convinced that unless this bill or a modified version of it was enacted into law, sooner or later we would have no national farm program. Many Congressmen, under the terrific barrage of distorted material from Mr. Shuman and his coworkers, are confused because they are getting practically nothing to counteract this. (Three leading farm legislators told me just last Saturday morning that they had received nothing but slanted letters full of misstatements attacking these bills.)

On the other hand, there are a number of Congressmen who fully understand the bills and believe that the Congress should not turn over so much authority to the Executive and only retain a veto power. Many others, however, point to the failure of our present approach and believe we should try something different, particularly in those areas which have acute problems. Furthermore, nothing in these bills prevents the Congress from exercising their present legislative processes in developing farm legislation.

While some are damning the bills in no uncertain terms others are saying that these bills are the Magna Carta for farm people. It provides the machinery whereby farmers themselves working with the Secretary of Agriculture can work out and propose solutions to their own problems on a commodity-by-commodity basis. The objectives of these bills are:

1. To improve and protect farm prices and farm income.

2. To increase farmer participation in the development of farm programs.

3. To adjust supplies of agricultural commodities in line with the requirements therefor.

4. To improve distribution and expand exports of agricultural commodities.

5. To liberalize and extend farm credit services.

6. To protect the interest of consumers.

While some are saying it gives too much authority to the Secretary, others believe adequate safeguards are provided. Plans proposed by farm advisory committees which involve controls or price supports must be approved by the Secretary of Agriculture who will protect the interest of other commodity groups; approved by the President of the United States who will be mindful of the interest of all the people; may be vetoed by either House of the Congress who are concerned about the interests of their own constituents as well as the general public; and finally, must be approved by a vote of two-thirds of the farmers affected who vote in a referendum conducted for this purpose. Most people feel that these are not only adequate provisions but an excellent blueprint of practical democratic procedure.

Congress will have more, rather than less power under these bills, as some of its critics maintain. For example, under existing legislation, the Secretary of Agriculture has wide latitude and discretion with respect to the size of allotments and quotas and the level of price support, whereas under these bills either House of the Congress could exercise veto power.

Neither would these bills disturb existing programs where they are working satisfactorily and the producers concerned are satisfied. By the same token, producer groups who have no program and who do not want one, would continue exactly as they are now.

It seems to me that this approach is in keeping with President Kennedy's determination to see that farmers have an opportunity to achieve an income comparable to that achieved by other segments of our economy for comparable investments in labor and capital.

The following are some recent quotes which illustrate Secretary Freeman's thinking and give the basis for the policies outlined in these bills:

"The problems of agriculture in the United States today, and the prevailing attitudes toward these problems, present us with a paradox that is both disconcerting and challenging. Agriculture in America today is an industry that, in terms of fulfilling its primary function, has achieved phenomenal success. For the primary function of agriculture is to provide food and fiber to meet human needs. Nowhere on earth, and never in history, has agriculture met this function so well as it has in the United States today. The American consumer is better fed, and at lower real cost, then ever before. American agriculture has abolished here in America, one of mankind's oldest anxieties, the fear of hunger and famine. Yet American agriculture is referred to more often in terms of surplus or subsidy than in terms of success. One reason why this is so is that, successful as American agriculture has been in achieving this major function, it does not today provide to farmers the reward that their success deserves. I assure you that you and all other members of ASC Committees will be encouraged to accept every responsibility which, under the law, I can share with you in the development and administration of farm programs. You have the greatest stake of all in the successful administration of farm programs. Farming is your business, your future, and the hope of your children for education and opportunity. It is our firm belief that the ASC farmer-committee system is the most effective and economical method of operation if it operates as originally conceived under enabling legislation. We intend to see that the committee system functions with full authority and responsibility in the days ahead."

You will note that two-thirds of the members of the farmer advisory committees who must consult and advise with the Secretary in working out solutions to farm problems on a commodity-by-commodity basis, must be nominated by county ASC committees. This demonstrates the faith and confidence which the sponsors of these bills, the President of the United States, and the Secretary of Agriculture have in these committees.

I am confident that if you review these bills you will find much of it that you can back without reservation. If there are parts you cannot subscribe to, I hope you will not be completely against the bills as the American Farm Bureau leadership is. American democracy has always been a compromise of many and frequently divergent views. For example, the administration and the congressional committees have already discussed modification of certain provisions and are in complete agreement on several points.

From my talks with agricultural leaders, farmers and people like myself who want to do what they can to help American agriculture, I am confident that there is much in these bills which has universal support amongst the rank and file of farmers. Now that we have a Secretary of Agriculture who not only wants to do something for farmers but wants to make sure the American consumer fully appreciates the terrific job farmers have been doing for them let's give him the tools he thinks he needs. Congress can always veto a program or for that matter withdraw any provisions of these bills. Any Congress can change any law because, under our system of Government, no Congress can bind another.

I hope that, after reviewing this material as well as whatever other information comes to your attention, you will help democracy be effective by getting your views to your Congressman and your Senator. I hope you will let Senator ELLENDER and Congressman COOLEY, the men who will have to guide this legislation through the Congress, know you feel—and get your neighbors and local farm organizations to go on record too. Many fair-minded Congressmen, who have been getting the distortions as outlined so well in the enclosed reproduction of this week's Kiplinger Letter, would, in my opinion, welcome the views of their constituents on this important legislation.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT M. KOCH,
President.

No Man's Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I have read with interest the article

printed below from the 1960 issue of the Labor Law Journal, written by Jonathan Matthew Purver, which deals with Supreme Court decisions leading up to the 1959 amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act, and feel that the scholarly manner in which the background material is presented will be of interest to my colleagues. It is my hope that Congress will see fit to scrutinize this entire matter carefully.

THE SUPREME COURT AND THE FEDERAL-STATE NO MAN'S LAND

(By Jonathan Matthew Purver)

(This article examines the constitutional sources from which the doctrine of preemption developed and the Supreme Court's decisions pointing the way for Congress to correct flaws in the legislative structure. The publication of this article was recommended by Paul Prasow, a lecturer in personnel management and industrial relations at the University of California at Los Angeles. Mr. Purver is a senior honor student at UCLA.)

Mr. Justice Frankfurter has maintained that one function of the Supreme Court is to study the balance between the respective spheres of Federal and State power.[1] Indeed, not only has the Court studied this balance, but it has in great part determined the respective spheres of Federal and State jurisdiction through its decisions which have established Federal supersession with respect to congressional labor legislation.

The principle of supersession, as discussed by the Court, is that once Congress has legislated within a particular field, State legislation within this field will be inoperative. It thus happens that, upon occasion, State legislation will be considered invalid—or "preempted"—because of the existence of Federal legislation in that area, even though such Federal legislation may appear too general to apply in that instance. In such cases a no man's land is created within the legal system in that the State is not permitted to act because of Federal legislation, although, at the same time, the Federal Government does not act because its legislation is too general in nature and does not provide for action in the specific case at hand.

The effect of Supreme Court decisions with respect to Federal preemption in relation to labor legislation has been to place this "no man's land" of labor law generally within Federal hands, and to allow congressional labor legislation of a general nature to be so construed as to apply to specific cases arising thereunder. Before we discuss and analyze these Court decisions, we shall examine the constitutional sources from which the doctrine of preemption developed in the United States and the legislation which interjected this doctrine into the area of Federal labor law.

The constitutional basis for supersession is found in section 2, article VI, of the Constitution—the "supremacy clause"—which states that "[t]his Constitution, and the laws of the United States * * * shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding." The more specific legislative basis of Federal supersession in the labor field is found in the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947.

Whereas the National Labor Relations Act of 1935 (Wagner Act) had set down specific actions which the Government would consider to be unfair labor practices on the part of employers, it did not attempt to determine unfair labor practices on the part of labor organizations or their agents. Thus, it remained primarily within the jurisdiction of the States to deal with such union activities as strikes, picketing and boycotts. The Labor Management Relations Act of 1947, which amended the Wagner Act, left intact that part of the Wagner Act specifying unfair labor practices of employers, but added a section delineating unfair labor practices by labor organizations as well. It placed boycotts and other unlawful combinations within the jurisdiction of both State and Federal courts.

Supreme Court decisions (hereinafter discussed) relating to Federal labor legislation—more specifically, the National Labor Relations Act of 1935 and the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947—permitted the Federal Government to preempt jurisdiction with respect to certain sections of these acts in areas formerly considered within the limits of State authorities.

As the following cases are studied it will be seen that "it is not [always] easy for a State court to decide * * * whether the subject matter [of a labor case] is the concern exclusively of the Federal Board and withdrawn from the State."[2] The Supreme Court has in some instances set those boundaries, while in other cases it has refused to act in this regard, thus requiring congressional legislation to clarify the scope of the functioning of the National Labor Relations Board. These cases shall in turn be discussed.

The remainder of this article shall be devoted to an analysis and examination of the effects of several specific Supreme Court decisions upon jurisdictional problems created by Federal labor legislation and upon the creation and administration of Federal labor law with respect to the "no man's land," culminating in the passage of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959.

During the period from 1946 to 1955, the Supreme Court affirmed the doctrine of Federal preemption of State legislation in the field of labor law through four leading decisions. Each of the last three of these decisions relied heavily upon the precedent established in the case immediately preceding it. The first of the group, however, the *Bethlehem* case, looked to the *Shreveport* doctrine of 1914 for precedent.

BETHLEHEM CASE

The first of these cases, *Bethlehem Steel Company* v. *New York State Labor Relations Board* (12 L.C. par. 51,245, 330 U.S. 767 (1947)), was brought before the U.S. Supreme Court upon appeal from the Court of Appeals of New York in 1946. The issue in question arose from the fact that the National Labor Relations Board had asserted general jurisdiction over unions of foremen employed by industries subject to the National Labor Relations Act. The NLRB had then refused to certify such unions as collective bargaining representatives on the grounds that it would obstruct the purposes of the act. The Board also maintained that the New York State Labor Relations Board could not certify such unions, because for it to do so would conflict with the National Labor Relations Act and, consequently, with the commerce clause of the Constitution. The Circuit Court of Appeals in New York had, nonetheless, upheld the State labor relations board in such certifications, and the Bethlehem Steel Co. brought the case before the U.S. Supreme Court on appeal.

Mr. Justice Jackson delivered the opinion of the Court, stating that "[t]heir [New York's] labor relations are primarily of interest to the State * * *. [But] the subject matter is one reachable * * * under the Federal commerce power, not because it is interstate commerce but because * * * Congress can reach admittedly local and intrastate activities. * * *"

In support of this position, the Court cited *Houston, East and West Texas Railway Company* v. *U.S.* (234 U.S. 342 (1914))—the *Shreveport Rate Case* of 1914—in which Mr. Justice Hughes handed down the classic doctrine that Congress may, upon occasion, regulate local and intrastate commerce "to foster and protect interstate commerce."

With respect to the "no man's land" in labor law, under which prosecution is difficult because jurisdiction is uncertain, Jackson held that "the mere fact of delegation of [Congressional] power to deal with the general matter, without agency action, might preclude any State action if it is clear that Congress has intended no regulation except its own."

The Court made clear that Congress may intentionally reserve to itself specific powers without creating agencies to exercise these powers; and that, in such case, jurisdiction is removed from the respective States. But in the instant case, Congress was even more specific, and the certification of a union as a bargaining representative was clearly within the hands of the NLRB.[3] The opinion of the lower court was reversed.

The Bethlehem case was consolidated with *Allegheny Ludlum Steel Corporation* v. *Kelley* (12 L.C., par. 51,245, 330 U.S. 767 (1947), decided on the same day (April 7). The Bethlehem doctrine was an affirmation of *Packard Motor Car Company* v. *NLRB* (12 L.C., par. 51,240, 330 U.S. 485 (1947), decided a month earlier, in which Mr. Justice Jackson expressed the opinion of the Court that foremen were "employees" within the meaning of the National Labor Relations Act of 1935.

LA CROSSE DECISION

The second case in the series, *La Crosse Telephone Corporation* v. *Wisconsin Employment Relations Board* 16 L.C., par. 64,913, 336 U.S. 18 (1949), was brought before the U.S. Supreme Court upon appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin in 1949. The issue herein arose from the fact that the NLRB has assumed jurisdiction over the industry in question, but the NLRB's standards were different from those applied by the Wisconsin Employment Relations Board, the State agency.

Mr. Justice Douglas delivered the opinion of the Court. He looked to the Bethlehem case for precedent in determining whether, in the present case, the Wisconsin board's certification of a certain union—as the bargaining agent of the employees of La Crosse Telephone Co.—was in conflict with the National Labor Relations Act. The Court held that "certification by a State board under a different or conflicting theory of representation may * * * be as readily disruptive of the practice under the Federal act as if the orders of the two boards made a head-on collision," and that the State board had in this case presented such conflict.

Equally important, the Court maintained that the National Labor Relations Act would have been controlling even if it had not been applied in any formal way to the particular employees. In its decision, reversing the Supreme Court of Wisconsin, which had upheld the Wisconsin board's certification, the U.S. Supreme Court brought congressional labor legislation within the realm of the supremacy clause to a still greater extent than it had in the Bethlehem case—in that now not only was the Federal labor law clearly supreme, but is was supreme even when it did not specify the particular type of employee in question.

GARNER VERSUS TEAMSTERS UNION

The third case in the series, *Garner* v. *Teamsters Union* (24 L.C., par. 68,020, 346 U.S. 485 (1953)), was brought before the Court upon writ of certiorari to the Supreme

Footnotes at end of speech.

Court of Pennsylvania in 1953, and it established the importance of determining the correct tribunal before which a labor case arising under the Taft-Hartley Act can be tried. The issue in question here resulted from a Pennsylvania attempt to assume jurisdiction to enjoin peaceful and orderly picketing for the purpose of forcing an employer to coerce his employees to join a labor organization.

Mr. Justice Jackson delivered the opinion of the Court. The Court held that where a labor dispute affects interstate commerce, a State—in this case, Pennsylvania—lacks jurisdiction to enjoin "peaceful and orderly picketing."[4] The reasoning of the Court was that the enforcement of "public right," a Federal function, supersedes the enforcement of "private right," generally a State function. Here the Court looked for precedent in *Amalgamated Utility Workers* v. *Consolidated Edison Company* (2 L.C., par. 17,055, 309 U.S. 261 (1940), which held that the NLRB is "a public agency acting in the public interest."

Secondly, the Court examined the congressional debates over passage of the Taft-Hartley Act and, noting the importance of correctly interpreting the "congressional will," held that "[t]he National Labor-Management Relations Act * * * leaves much to the States, though Congress has refrained from telling us how much. We must spell out from conflicting indications of congressional will the area in which State action is still permissible."

While the Court maintained that the present case concerned a labor area in which State action was not permitted, it established the more important concept that henceforth it would be the Supreme Court which would, when possible, interpret this "congressional will" with respect to the labor field, as expressed through labor legislation coming before the Court.

Third, and finally, the Court held that part of "[f]ederal law * * * consists of substituting Federal statute law applied by administrative procedures in the public interest in the place of individual suits in courts to enforce common law doctrines of private right."

The Court thus clearly enunciated the doctrine that labor law was to be interpreted in such manner as to place it "within the realm of public interest," and that this was to be done by encouraging such litigation within the framework of Federal tribunals.

The decision of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court, which had deprived petitioners the injunction sought, was affirmed.

WEBER V. ANHEUSER-BUSCH, INC.

The fourth and final case discussed, *Weber* v. *Anheuser-Busch, Inc.* (cited at footnote 2), was brought before the Supreme Court in 1955. The *Weber* case, in addition to reaffirming the decisions of the earlier three cases by citing them as precedent, established several additional doctrines with respect to supersession of State labor legislation.

The issue here in question grew out of the issuance of an injunction by the State circuit court, enjoining the International Association of Machinists Union, an AFL affiliate, from striking the St. Louis Anheuser plant. The injunction was upheld by the State supreme court, and from there it went to the U.S. Supreme Court by certiorari.

Mr. Justice Frankfurter delivered the opinion of the Court, first holding that "the principal question that the case raises * * * [is] whether the State court had jurisdiction to enjoin the IAM's conduct or whether its jurisdiction had been preempted by * * * the National Labor Relations Board. * * *"

To this question the Court cited the *Garner* case, and held that "[a] State may not enjoin under its own labor statute conduct which has been made an 'unfair labor practice' under the Federal statutes."

Thus far the Court followed the lines of precedent of the earlier three preemptory cases. At this point, however, the Court enunciated a new doctrine, holding that Congress did not intend by the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947 to deprive State courts of jurisdiction in all labor disputes affecting interstate commerce, but merely in those situations covered by the Federal law; and that "by the Taft-Hartley Act, Congress did not exhaust the full sweep of legislative power over industrial relations given by the commerce clause."

The Court made clear that, in the instant case, the decision of the State court would be reversed not because Congress had full sweep of power over labor legislation, but because the particular Missouri antitrust laws here at issue conflicted with those unfair labor practices covered under the National Labor Relations Act. Moreover, Justice Frankfurter cited *United Construction Workers* v. *Laburnum Construction Corporation* (26 L.C., par. 68,460, 347 U.S. 656 (1954)) to show that State courts can grant relief against conduct violating both the National Labor Relations Act and State statutes or common law, where such relief is not available under the National Labor Relations Act and where it does not conflict with remedies available through National Labor Relations Board proceedings.

The Court also cited *Allen-Bradley Local 1111* v. *Wisconsin Employment Relations Board* (5 L.C., par. 51,135, 315 U.S. 740 (1942)) as an example of how State courts could enjoin mass picketing, which was a breach of the peace, by the use of State "police power," so as to avert local violence.

The importance of the Anheuser case is that, although reversing and remanding the Missouri Supreme Court, it made it clear that the State courts still retain a great measure of power to deal with labor problems, and that Federal labor legislation, while superior to State labor legislation, leaves much in the field of labor legislation to the discretion of the several State legislatures.[5]

CONCLUSIONS

Thus, the Supreme Court, beginning with the Bethlehem case, clearly established the supremacy of Federal labor legislation with respect to the National Labor Relations Act of 1935; in the LaCrosse case, with respect to conflicting State labor legislation; and, finally, with respect to the Taft-Hartley Act in the Garner and Anheuser cases.

Passage of section 701, title 7 of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, which substantially removes the "no man's land" in labor law, was in part influenced by various Supreme Court decisions—notably with respect to the Bethlehem, LaCrosse, Garner, and Weber decisions.

As has been discussed, the effect of these decisions was to preclude State labor boards from asserting jurisdiction over matters covered by Federal legislation, even though a gap may have existed in the National Labor Relations Board's jurisdiction. By 1957, the States finally began to accept this "doctrine."[6] The Court, thus, would not take the position of construing inadequate congressional labor legislation to fill gaps in the law. Rather, the Court interpreted such legislation as literally as possible, sometimes denying State labor boards' jurisdiction even though the preemptory Federal labor legislation created a "no man's land."

A recent example of the above-mentioned situation is *Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America* v. *Fairlawn Meats* (32 L.C. par. 70,564, 353 U.S. 20 (1957)), in which the Court maintained it was never the intention of Congress to have the Supreme Court decide "how consistent with Federal policy a State [labor] law must be," but that such decision was in the first instance given to the Board—although existing Federal legislation did not make this entirely clear.

Another example is *Guss* v. *Utah Labor Relations Board* (32 L.C., par. 70,563, 353 U.S. 1 (1957)), in which the Court held that a State is not free to exercise authority to regulate activities covered by the National Labor Relations Act even when the National Labor Relations Board declines jurisdiction of the specific case over which the State board wishes to assert jurisdiction.

The Amalgamated and Guss decisions thus answered the one question left unsettled in the Garner case: Could the State law apply if the National Labor Relations Board declined to exercise its jurisdiction? In the above cases, the Court answered in the negative.

For this reason, I disagree with a 1957 opinion of the American Bar Association that "the Supreme Court opinion is, in a sense, merely a rationalization of the artlessly drawn legislative command. * * *"[7]

The Court has constantly maintained that "Congress is free to change the [no man's land] situation at will,"[8] and that the Court indeed will not rationalize inadequate legislation but rather will indicate the need for better legislation to take its place. Prior to 1953, the Watkins-Smith and the Ives labor bills,[9] both of which aimed at allowing the Board to cede jurisdiction to State boards when a case had an "insubstantial" effect upon interstate commerce, failed Senate passage.

Beginning with the Garner case in 1953, the Supreme Court decided no less than 16 cases with respect to jurisdictional problems created by Federal labor legislation; and in nearly all cases the Court suggested more adequate congressional legislation to cover this void.

In September of 1959, Congress passed the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959. Title 7, section 701(a), reads:

"(c)(1) The Board, in its discretion, may * * * decline to assert jurisdiction over any labor dispute involving any class or category of employers, where, in the opinion of the Board, the effect of such labor dispute on commerce is not sufficiently substantial to warrant the exercise of its jurisdiction. * * *

"(2) Nothing in this act shall be deemed to prevent or bar any agency or the courts of any State * * * from asuming and asserting jurisdiction over labor disputes over which the Board declines * * * to assert jurisdiction."

The Supreme Court thus played a vital role not simply in affecting existing labor legislation, but also in creating Federal labor legislation with respect to the "no man's land" of American labor law. The Court in so many instances had refrained from being placed in the position of having to decide at what point a labor dispute substantially involves interstate commerce that Congress was finally compelled to clarify that henceforth it would be the National Labor Relations Board which could rightfully determine that point, and could, if it wished, delegate certain phases of its jurisdiction to the respective State labor boards.

Thus, the Supreme Court, acting its part in the Federal trilogy of legislative, executive, and judicial branches, has, by determining the relation between Federal and State labor legislative action, pointed the way for Congress to correct flaws in the legislative structure and thus, in turn, implement executive action called for in the public interest.

---

[1] Frankfurter, 98 Proceedings of Amer. Phil. Soc. 233 (1954).

[2] *Weber* v *Anheuser-Busch, Inc.*, 27 L.C., par. 69,064, 348 U.S. 468, 481 (1955).

[3] Justices Frankfurter, Murphy, and Rutledge filed separate opinions to the effect that New York should have been able to act, following pragmatic, rather than strict constitutional, reasoning.

[4] When the picketing disrupts the peace and order, the State, in that case, may be allowed to move in under its police power even though Federal law be involved.

[5] The most recent decision involving Federal preemption legislation is *Youngdahl* v. *Rainfair, Inc.*, 33 L.C., par. 71,120, 355 U.S. 131 (1957), which enunciates the doctrines of the latter four cases while adding no new concepts to the field of labor legislation.

[6] States refused their jurisdiction in many cases; most notable are *Gallub Motors* v. *Local 259, UAW*, 20 S.L.R.B., No. 36 (N.Y., 1957) and *Aaron Bring Bay Ridge, Inc.*, v. *Local 917, IBT*, 21 S.L.R.B. No. 28 (N.Y., 1958).

[7] 1957 Proceedings of the ABA Labor Relations Law Section (Chicago 37, Ill.), p. 67.

[8] *Guss* v. *Utah Labor Relations Board*, cited in text; Chief Justice Warren speaking.

[9] S.B. 1723 and S.B. 1772.

Members of Congress Have Little Time To Think

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial comment appeared in the Saturday Evening Post of April 22, 1961. It touches a problem which is with all of us.

OUR MEMBERS, OF CONGRESS HAVE TOO LITTLE TIME TO THINK

"It was all very disillusioning. I went to Washington to see Congress at work. I viewed the House and Senate debates, but where were all the Members? Each Chamber was practically empty. Oh, yes; we went to one or two hearings, but neither hearing had a quorum. .Is this the way our laws are made?"

These are the comments of a high-school student who is interested in public affairs after a visit to the U.S. Capitol. Adult questions or statements are similar, but frequently in a cynical vein.

Despite outward appearances, Congress works hard and conscientiously at its tremendous task.

During the last Congress more than 20,000 bills were introduced—15,506 in the House and 4,658 in the Senate. Of course, this number of bills includes some duplications and various bills which were not under active review. However, a considerable number of them were analyzed and considered. And 800 of them were passed by both Houses and were added to the law of the land in their original or amended form.

However, the detailed study of all of these bills cannot be accomplished on the House floor or on the Senate floor. Therefore, preliminary and careful evaluation of all of these bills is distributed by subject matter among 16 Senate committees and 20 committees of the House, plus additional select and joint committees. Every Member is on at least one committee; many serve on two or more committees. Each committee is busy with hearings and executive sessions. For example, the House Ways and Means Committee of the last Congress heard 703 witnesses during 62 days of public hearings. Numerous executive sessions followed each of these hearings. More than 2,100 bills were referred to this committee. It reported favorably on 98 bills, and 61 became laws.

Members of Congress have competent staffs, but in the final analysis each legislator must make his own decisions. When does the Member of Congress do his meditating? That is a question which many Members of Congress ask themselves.

The Bewildering Issue of Capital Punishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by the Honorable James V. Bennett, Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons in Washington:

WANTED: A FAIR DEAL FOR PRISONERS—IV—THE BEWILDERING ISSUE OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

(By James V. Bennett)

WASHINGTON.—Not long ago I attended the funeral of a friend. As I entered the vestibule I noticed one of the church officials standing by and recognized him as a man who had once been sentenced to death. During the services I sat beside another man, who had once been similarly doomed and who for 20 years has led a spotless life as a hard-working civil servant.

Following his conviction and sentence, questions arose as to his actual guilt. President Roosevelt commuted his term to life imprisonment, and later when a full-fledged investigation established his innocence, released him from prison.

He received full pardon from President Truman.

The man who was now serving his church had his death sentence commuted to life imprisonment, and following another commutation further reducing his sentence, he was paroled. Since that time he has devoted his life to the assistance of troubled and unfortunate persons.

These cases make me, and no doubt you, question whether we should retain the capital penalty.

But my life's work has been the protection of society and that is a responsibility that carries with it little room for sentiment.

I cannot help but think of two men now serving out their lives in Federal prisons.

One is still in his twenties, as violent and mutinous an individual as ever a prison held. On separate occasions he has killed one fellow inmate and seriously stabbed another. There is no question that unless he is closely guarded he will kill again.

The other is an old man now. Early in his prison career he stabbed one inmate and a few years later killed a guard. For the protection of inmates and guards alike he had to be closely confined for decades.

I have often wondered if any useful purpose can be served by the lifelong imprisonment of these men. If they had paid the supreme penalty for their terrible crimes, would other inmates subsequently killed in prison brawls now be alive, would the lives of other guards killed in their efforts to protect society have been spared?

The capital punishment issue is indeed baffling, particularly in the wake of the Chessman case.

It is true that although the number of executions has dwindled from two hundred 25 years ago to 50 to 60 in recent years the volume of homicides has not significantly increased. The number fluctuates between 7,000 and 8,000 from year to year.

However, who can say that the use of capital punishment, regardless of the number actually executed, has not had some effect in keeping the homicide rate down even though other crimes punishable by lesser penalties have increased enormously?

I do not take issue with the abolitionists who point out the grimness of execution. I do contest their charge that it brutalizes those whose job it is to carry out the sentence when a court condemns a man to death.

The strongest and most eloquent abolitionists have been prison wardens like Lewis Lawes of Sing Sing, James Johnston of Alcatraz, and Clinton Duffy of San Quentin. Confronted with the necessity of arranging an execution a prison warden's concern must be with the welfare of society, not the plight of the condemned.

These men and others who know the facts about how the death penalty is actually applied in this country lost faith in it as an effective measure.

I believe that the deterrent effect of the death penalty would be more effectively realized if its use were put on a more equitable and judicious basis, and if some way could be found for minimizing the almost endless litigation that surrounds some of these cases. The Chessman case was kept going in the courts for 12 years.

Unquestionably there are some crimes that are so heinous, so outrageous, that society recoils in such horror that execution is the only means of expressing it.

The death penalty, in my opinion, should be retained for such offenses as murder for hire, murder involving a law enforcement officer engaged in his duties, the kidnaping and injury of a child, treason, bombing of an airplane, and bombing of innocent people in a school building or a church.

For all other capital offenses now on the statute books, I would make the penalty life imprisonment.

For the death penalty even under the circumstances I have mentioned I would require the concurrence of the judge and the jury. I would require a separate jury trial on the issue of sentence, as divorced from conviction. I would provide for an automatic psychiatric examination of the defendant prior to sentence, and I would provide for an automatic appeal.

With these safeguards we could assure ourselves that the death sentence would not be lightly or indiscriminately used.

Address by Hon. Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior, at the Tennessee River Tributaries Association and Elk River Development Association, Fayetteville, Tenn., May 12, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I bring to your attention, and the attention of my other distinguished colleagues, the very timely, pertinent, and interesting address made by our former colleague, Hon. Stewart L. Udall, who is now the distinguished Secretary of the Interior:

ADDRESS BY HON. STEWART L. UDALL, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR, AT THE TENNESSEE RIVER TRIBUTARIES ASSOCIATION AND ELK RIVER DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION, FAYETTEVILLE, TENN., MAY 12, 1961

You do me a unique honor in asking me to talk with you about development of water resources. You were in the front lines of the long battle for water development in this region when I was a schoolboy in a little Arizona ranch town. You were among the first New Frontiersmen because you were pioneers in a coordinated comprehensive river development plan. To all of you residents of the Tennessee Valley, the subject of water and its planned control and use is far from novel.

I understand your valleywide association is only slightly more than a year old. You can accomplish much through joint and coordinated action, and you hold it within your power to be of considerable assistance to the directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority. You are holding fast to the original brilliant concept of TVA. You well realize that we can no longer afford to be piecemeal in our development of water resources. We must devise plans which will transcend the interests of individual localities or agencies, and which will conform to a broad plan of integrated development of all the resources of a great watershed. This is no time for standpatters, it is no time for the overly cautious approach to resource development—it is a time for broad gaged planning and bold action. President Kennedy has told us, "Failures to act now may be opportunities lost forever."

Years ago you and other farsighted men set the pattern. You saw the opportunities available in harnessing the mighty Tennessee and making it work for mankind. In so doing, you made the three letters TVA synonymous with the idea of overall basin development.

It wasn't a simple matter. I'm sure many of you vividly rememer the slow and often disappointing struggle which you underwent before TVA became a reality. Perhaps by now, though, that stirring story is "old hat" to some of your neighbors in this valley. I know that you here tonight, representing various area development associations, have not forgotten and will not forget.

The world outside this beautiful valley of yours continues to hold up TVA as a shining example of the best that man can accomplish in utilizing nature. Just 6 days ago, the Christian Science Monitor carried a long story about the Cauca Valley Corp., a new river development effort in the South American nation of Colombia. It quoted the English-speaking general manager of the CVC as saying, "We think we are admirably suited for a TVA-type development." It isn't the admittedly great water development works of Russia that these South Americans look to as a guide—it is your own, our own, TVA. And so it goes, everywhere in the free world. Do not, yourselves, become immune to the great accomplishments around you.

Not all of the development of the Tennessee River region is to be spoken of in the past tense. Part of the job still remains to be done. I'm sure you recall the words of the late George Norris who said in his autobiography that:

"This program of controlling the surplus floodwaters of the great Mississippi Valley by storage in natural reservoirs situated on the main stream and along the tributaries is an immense one. It may never be fulfilled. That depends entirely upon the vision of the American people. It will require a vast amount of money to complete it; it will take years of planning and of labor to meet fully all of its factors; and yet it offers the only promise discovered by men for the effective control of floods and efficient conservation of natural resources."

Yes, you have begun to make real use of your river system—but you've only begun, as George Norris foresaw. Now you face the challenge of continuing with his great vision—yes, and that of many others as well. You who continue to hold to the vision, you who still have the evangelist's fervor and the salesman's persistence, must work together with the officials of the TVA to complete this project that is of great importance to all America. One of the dreams that you in the Southeast have long held is that of joining the Tennessee and the Tombigbee to cut off 600 miles of the long water journey from your ports to the gulf. The TVA itself was once such a pipedream—who knows, perhaps your later efforts will be crowned with success. Certainly, this administration favors a stepped-up program of long-range planning now in the resources field.

You leaders realize, too, that river development doesn't necessarily mean great power dams or navigation channels on every watercourse. You realize that some areas of this vast river basin are best suited for recreation development, others are promising for intensive agricultural undertakings, such as your growing poultry industry, or timber production, and some spots are best retained for the benefit of wildlife. There's room on the big Tennessee and its tributaries for all kinds of development. Not every mile of the system can be developed as a new Pittsburgh—just as not every mile can be drained farmland, a river park or a wildlife refuge. But every mile can be developed in some manner, with due consideration for economics and always with a progressive and farsighted standard of feasibility that holds great faith in the future.

Listen again to George Norris' words: "Every drop of water that falls from the heavens to the earth beneath should perform its proper share of preserving the blessings God intends to bestow upon his people." Every drop of water in this watershed can be made to work, over and over again, and it must be done. The important thing, it seems to me, is to develop this homeland of yours that the natural resources so abundant here are utilized and conserved in the highest and best manner appropriate to the overall concept of basin development.

All of us in the Kennedy administration were enthused and challenged by the precedent-setting special message of the President concerning natural resources. Here was given all of us a blueprint for the construction of an integrated program for the wise conservation and use of our natural resources. If that stirring message could be summarized in only two words, I believe those words would be, "Think big."

We must all think big and act in accord with that thought. Here we can see that even George Norris, who thought some of the biggest thoughts ever to burst forth in the U.S. Senate, didn't think big enough. George Norris almost overlooked one of the primary items in the Tennessee River development—the recreation potential of water. Recreation is a latecomer on the list of benefits of comprehensive river development, and certainly we cannot blame the founding fathers of TVA for initially paying it little heed. But now, in a Nation of rising wages and increasing leisure time, recreational use of the TVA facilities is growing at an astonishing rate. Americans have discovered that yours is one of the most diverse and enjoyable outdoor recreation areas in our Nation. I'm told that an average of $8½ million worth of new recreation facilities is added each year at the reservoirs of the TVA. In addition to a total governmental recreation investment here of $120 million, there has been nearly an equal amount in private recreation investments such as cottages and resorts. You have close to 50,000 boats on your river system. Think what all this already means to the economy of your valley. Think what more it will mean in the years immediately ahead.

Everywhere in the United States recreation is becoming big business. We're going to have to think and act mighty big if we meet the pent-up recreation demand.

We in the Department of the Interior have taken this recreation boom, and the President's message, to heart. We are embarking on some big planning for recreation development throughout the United States. We feel that this is the moment of decision. What we do, or don't do, in the next 10 years will set the character of this Nation for generations to come. America's open space is disappearing rapidly at a time when all signs point to mounting demands for parks, parkways, recreation areas, and wildlife refuges. We need open space in which to find outdoor enjoyment and refreshment of mind, body, and spirit.

To meet this need we are laying plans for a program without parallel in our history. Because much of this recreational development is of national impact, we want the Federal Government to take the lead in a program we're calling "Parks for America." And we want to encourage local areas and States to do more through a cooperative effort. Only a few areas and a few States, notably New York and California, are keeping up or vigorously attempting to keep up with the mounting demand.

This generation, as we see it, has a last-chance opportunity to save perhaps 15 or 20 million acres for national parks, another 2½ million acres for national recreation areas, more than a million acres for national parkways and scenic roads such as your Natchez Trace, 4½ million acres for wildlife refuge areas. The program will be costly, but every year we delay the costs will rise. Fortunately, much land we propose to retain as open space already is in public ownership. But for 4.6 million acres of privately held land that we foresee as national park lands, the estimated cost has doubled in the past 10 years, and is expected to nearly double again in the next 10. Make no mistake about it, if we do not act now the opportunity will vanish. What we save in the next 10 years may well be all we will ever have the chance to save.

These aren't the only ways in which we are undertaking to implement the natural resources program outlined by President Kennedy. We hold uppermost his warning that "Our Nation has been blessed with a bountiful supply of water; but it is not a blessing we can regard with complacency." In all those areas wherein we have primary responsibility for multiple-purpose water development we are hard at work drawing up plans for a resumption of the effort that shriveled into near nothingness during the past 8 years. In this we have as a shining example the transformation wrought in hydroelectric power production and consumption by your TVA. That transformation brought you from an area of relatively little electric use to one in which electric power consumption is nearly twice the per capita average for the rest of the Nation.

Too, we accept the goal of developing comprehensive river basin plans during the decade of the sixties, so that all parts of our country can follow the steps to progress that you have made.

And we share with others in the Government a concern that a major breakthrough be made, and made soon, on the growing problem of cleaning up our streams. Conserved water will be of little use if it is polluted water. No longer can we rely on the adage that "dilution is the solution to pollution." Something more, something positive, must be done. We face the imminent peril of having our major rivers become thousand-mile sewers.

XUM

No longer is water pollution a problem of a few metropolitan areas; it is a problem nationwide in scope. To meet it we must spend twice as much on municipal waste treatment plants as we now do. The administration's program for a grant-in-aid system to help communities meet this problem is the start. With its adoption perhaps I won't have to inhale the stench of the Potomac when I drive home on a hot day. Perhaps we will close out the business I read about recently in a magazine—the business some private enterpriser started on the Missouri River. He skims and sells the grease from the surface of the broad Missouri.

Already the Secretary of Agriculture and I are working together in another area to which the President directed his attention. Together we are formulating a comprehensive Federal recreational lands program and working to eliminate conflicts in fish and wildlife programs so that an increased and improved wildlife conservation effort may be made. If this takes some knocking together of a few bureaucratic heads, then Secretary Freeman and I are ready to do it.

I hope it goes without saying that in all these various fields of natural resource planning and development the Federal Government does not desire to move ahead alone. Nor does it expect to. We are heeding President Kennedy's view that only through the fullest participation and cooperation of State and local government and private industry can this task be done wisely and effectively. It's up to you folks just as much as it is to us. Resource development is a must—a natural, if you'll permit the pun. With our soaring population we are facing what I call the quiet crisis. For all its quietness, this crisis in the field of resource development is just as real as the one we face in world affairs. America has the ability to meet this crisis—we aren't a poor nation. Just a small part of the money we now spend on pointed-toed shoes and overpublicized gimmicks can have a beneficial effect for many generations if we direct the money into public investment. As progressive conservationists concerned with the efficient development of our Nation our job is cut out for us.

I'm sure I could do no better than to end with the closing words of the President's natural resources message: "The task is large but it will be done."

The Late John Cashmore, Borough President of Brooklyn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the people of Brooklyn have recently suffered a most grievous loss in the death of their beloved borough president and my very dear friend John Cashmore. He died unexpectedly after suffering a heart attack while being driven home from a dinner in Manhattan Sunday evening, May 7. I was present at the dinner and spoke with him there. A few hours later I heard the news of his death over the radio and was tremendously shocked.

His passing is a terrible loss for Brooklyn. John Cashmore was a great borough president, whose heart was with the people and with the borough he served so well. He was president of the borough of Brooklyn for 21 years. He was often referred to as "Mr. Brooklyn" because of his long years of service in the interests of the borough where he was born, raised, and lived all his life.

John Cashmore was born in Brooklyn on June 7, 1895. He attended elementary school, but was forced to go to work at an early age because of the untimely death of his father. He continued his schooling at night, including law courses at New York University. He enlisted in the U.S. Armed Forces during World War I and served in France. He was primarily a businessman and a public official who gave a lifetime of service to his community and to the people, regardless of race, color or creed.

Cashmore's political career began in 1922 when he was elected to the State assembly on the Democratic ticket. Two years later he was elected to the New York City Board of Aldermen, and then was reelected to five successive terms. From 1937 until 1940 he served in the city council, where he became majority leader and vice chairman. When Brooklyn Borough President Raymond V. Ingersoll died in 1940, Cashmore was elected as his successor and he has served in that office since then. He was reelected in 1941, 1945, 1949, 1953, and 1957. He had become so popular and beloved by all segments of Brooklyn's 3 million population that in the last two campaigns the Republicans supported him, too.

Cashmore's only defeat for public office took place in 1952 when he was nominated for the U.S. Senate against the Republican incumbent Senator Irving M. Ives. He often ran far ahead of the party and on one occasion received 33,000 more votes in Brooklyn than the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

His funeral on Thursday, May 11, was attended by many hundreds of people from all walks of life, including a group of more than 200 honorary pallbearers led by Mayor Wagner of New York. The group also included all Members of Congress from Brooklyn, 22 State assemblymen, 9 State senators, members of the city's board of estimate, and many other city and borough officials. He is survived by his widow Edythe, to whom he was happily married since 1926, and a son James and his family.

John Cashmore's death will be deeply felt in Brooklyn. He was dedicated to our borough and to its betterment. He was a distinguished citizen, an able leader, and a devoted public servant. He was a man who inspired great loyalty in all those who came in contact with him, and he returned the same loyalty. It is often said that Brooklyn is more than just a place—it is a state of mind. John Cashmore had a leading role in creating that state of mind in the 21 years that he served as its borough president. The people of Brooklyn will long remember him.

I extend my condolences to his widow and to his son. May the good name that he leaves behind serve as a consolation to them in this hour of their great bereavement.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Appendix

Free Peoples Need To Stand Up and Be Counted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, last Saturday night in Los Angeles I had the honor to speak at the annual banquet of the Association of American Editorial Cartoonists. I ask unanimous consent that a partial text of my remarks at that time be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the partial text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREE PEOPLES NEED TO STAND UP AND BE COUNTED

(Partial text of speech of THOMAS H. KUCHEL, U.S. Senator from California, before the annual banquet of the Association of American Editorial Cartoonists, Biltmore Hotel, Los Angeles, Saturday, May 13, 1961)

The decade of the 1960's will present to the peoples of the earth unbelievable new horizons. Peoples will have traveled to the moon and back, and flights to the stars will be nearer to reality. From earth satellites, global television will reach into the homes of every hemisphere. Weather may well be subject to the control of man. Unimaginable breakthroughs in our struggle against the most dread diseases will have been attained. Twenty-six million young Americans will have come into our labor force for the first time. Our annual gross national product will have expanded from $500 billion to $750 billion.

But unsolved problems of supreme importance remain to plague us. How many people live together in a just peace? How may the United States best assure her own perpetuation? How may the evil dream of international communism for world domination be dissipated? How may freedom live and flourish?

For America, the quest for answers assumes a twofold, crucial importance: one, because we intend to keep our freedom, and, two, because we must, with courage and with vigor, and with honor, fulfill our tasks as leader of the cause of human freedom, a heavy burden which the exigencies of time have thrust upon us.

America is a peaceful Nation. Our people yearn for a just peace. Our history is free from acts of wanton aggression. But there is aggression in the world. The assault upon the peaceful aims by communism seems to be a neverending one. Meeting that assault, meeting it successfully, is the basic issue of the 1960's. It must be met by the free nations of the world, standing side by side, gaining strength from their common resources, and from their common resolve.

I believe in the wisdom of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization comment: "The fundamental historical fact * * * is that the nation state, by itself, and relying exclusively on national policy and national power, is inadequate for progress or even for survival in the nuclear age."

This protracted, interminable conflict with communism can be won only by the free world marshaling and applying its economic, technological, political, and military resources on a collective and coordinated basis. No single state, in the decade of the 1960's, can hope to "go it alone," and still provide security for its people.

We maintain, and shall continue to maintain and strengthen our own American Military Establishment. But we shall also seek to continue and to improve our collective security systems wherever that is feasible.

Our collective security systems came into being in the aftermath of World War II for the purpose of opposing the spread of communism. A few weeks ago, I attended ceremonies at the SHAPE headquarters of NATO, outside Paris, which commemorated the 10th anniversary of the establishment of NATO's defensive shield. I watched with pride, as NATO troops in the military uniforms of their several countries, marched together, an imposing symbol of their nations' compact to defend collectively the security of Western Europe.

And defend that security, they have. We must never forget that since NATO's creation, no free European country has followed her unfortunate neighbor down the dark Communist drain.

The world is in trouble and in turmoil. In every part of the globe, communism probes and penetrates, seeking to find or to develop weaknesses by which it may overrun and subjugate more peoples and more territory. Where it can create and control puppets, it does.

In our own hemisphere, a Communist clique, led by the infamous Castro, increases its control over Cuba. Freedom in Cuba is all gone. Elections are abolished. The highest judicial establishment is the firing squad. Private property is taken over by the Castro forces.

The strength for these opertaions has come from behind the Iron Curtain. Che Guevara, Castro's Minister of Industrialization proudly proclaims a $100 million loan from Russia, a $70 million loan, interest free, from Communist China, and enough more from satellites to total, he says, about a quarter of a billion dollars.

To secure for communism what Lenin called the commanding heights, the Soviet and her pawns have loaded Castro with as much as a hundred thousand tons of military materiel. Castro has paraded over 50 heavy Soviet J-3 and J-4 tanks, plus lines of 55 and 105 millimeter cannon, truck-drawn field artillery, mortars, 6-barrel rocket launchers, 4-barrel antiaircraft guns, and bazookas. He has received an unlimited amount of small arms, and ammunition of all types. While there is no absolute evidence of MIG aircraft, there have been recurring reports along these lines. In any event, Castro's airmen are being trained in the Soviet bloc.

Last July, Khrushchev said: "One should not forget that now the United States is no longer an unreachable distance from the Soviet Union as it was before. Figuratively speaking, in case of necessity, Soviet artillerymen can support the Cuban people with their rocket fire if the aggressive forces of the Pentagon dare begin their intervention against Cuba."

Then on April 22, this year, he said: "I am stating again that our Government does not seek any advantages or privileges in Cuba. We do not have any bases in Cuba and we do not intend to establish any. And if * * * they (American generals and admirals) still try to frighten the people by fabrications about 'Soviet bases' on Cuba, this is obviously designed for simpletons."

Maybe so, maybe not. One never knows what the Soviet leaders really have in mind. But the facts, and the implications point up the gravest kind of question. How do we, the American people, and the American Government propose to answer?

The first obligation of the Government of our country is the security of our own people.

In the furtherance of that obligation, we have adopted, as one technique, the theory of collective security.

In the Americas, we have no unified system of defense such as NATO affords the Atlantic community, although mechanisms for coordinating joint hemispheric action do exist. Basic to this framework is the Organization of American States, agreed upon in 1948, designed "to achieve an order of peace and justice," "to provide for action on the part of (the member) states in the event of aggression," and finding that "an act of aggression against one American state is an act of aggression against all the other American states."

A year earlier, in 1947, the Rio Pact was adopted. It holds, in part: "If the inviolability or the integrity of the territory or the sovereignty or political independence of any American state should be affected by any aggression which is not an armed attack or by any extracontinental or intercontinental conflict, or by any other fact or situation that might endanger the peace of America, the organ of consultation shall meet immediately in order to agree on the measures which must be taken in case of aggression to assist the victim of the aggression or, in any case, the measures which should be taken for the common defense and for the maintenance of the peace and security of the continent."

There is the Declaration of Caracas of 1954, which finds, in part: "That the dominance or control of the political institutions of any American state by the international Communist movement, extending to this hemisphere the political system of an extracontinental power, would constitute a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of the American states, endangering the peace of America, and would call for a meeting of consultation to consider the adoption of measures in accordance with existing treaties."

But there is also a basic U.S. hemispheric policy first enunciated in 1823. It is a rather intriguing fact that in that year, imperial Russian outposts were being established along our California coast. Russian expansionism threatened the Americas equally with the expansionism of European powers in Latin America. How strange this seems today when Soviet expansionism again threatens the New World.

At any rate, President Monroe laid it on the line. We were determined to prevent the encroachment of any outside power upon the

soil of the Western Hemisphere. "We should," he said, "consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and security."

That policy remains, as it should remain, America's policy in the 1960's as well.

Last year, in Brazil, President Eisenhower reaffirmed the Monroe Doctrine, when he said: "I assure you that my Government, while honoring its commitments outside this hemisphere is in no mood to allow its special responsibilities among the American States to go by default. Indeed, these commitments and responsibilities are part and parcel of the same problem—preserving the strength and unity of the free world."

And on the steps of the American Capitol, as he took his oath of office, President Kennedy reiterated that policy and reminded the world that—"This peaceful revolution of hope cannot become the prey of hostile powers. Let our neighbors know that we shall join with them to oppose aggression or subversion anywhere in the Americas. And let every other power know that this hemisphere intends to remain the master of its own house."

In my view, the time has now come for our friends in this hemisphere to stand up and face the need to implement their jointly approved resolutions. The State Department accurately describes Castro's Cuba as a member of the Sino-Soviet bloc. International communism is implacably dedicated to the destruction of free Western institutions.

This is not simply a problem for our beloved Republic. It is the gravest kind of issue for all the peoples of the Americas. In my view, the members of the OAS should stand up and face the responsibilities which they assumed in approving the several declarations to which I have alluded. A meeting of the representatives of the OAS should shortly be convened. The meeting should be called by one of our neighbors or by us. The agenda for the meeting should be unequivocal. The menace of Castro's clique to the political independence of our hemisphere should be clearly enunciated. Arrangements should be agreed upon for collective defense if an act of aggression were to take place against any of us. With equal clarity, the members should agree upon specific diplomatic and economic measures to be undertaken, and undertaken jointly, to isolate this Communist pawn. Economic sanctions should be jointly invoked. It is fantastic, for example, that we, the United States, continue to enrich Castro's regime by about $5 million per month. We prohibit Cuban sugar importation but continue to receive Cuban molasses, tobacco, fruits, and vegetables which totaled $60 million last year. Meanwhile, we prohibit our own people from exporting goods to Cuba with the exception of food, medicine, and medical supplies.

We are playing our part, with our neighbors, in attacking hunger, poverty, disease and despair here in the Americas. We are a minority stockholder in the Inter-American Bank. Congress is about to approve a $600 million appropriation for additional assistance to the Americas. This is a tremendously important joint undertaking. But it is not all that is required. While we try to take care of our own, we shall brook no interference from those whose single aim is our undoing. And in that resolve, let those who spoke with us at Rio, at Bogotá, at Caracas, and at San Jose, now agree to a common course of action which our several statements of common principle require.

I speak tonight as an American Senator devoted, like each of you, to the perpetuation of the Republic. Our country stands for liberty. It is our Nation which must hold high the torch of liberty. We dare not shirk our responsibilities of leadership. Let those who are like-minded repair to our side. Let those who, together with us, courageously underwrote clear declarations of our joint resolve, now stand together before mankind, ready, together, to extirpate communism from the New World; ready, together, to improve the lot of our peoples, their life, their health, their minds, their homes, and their welfare, through freedom and not by slavery; ready to demonstrate to all our unyielding resolve to maintain our freedom. This is a time for free peoples to speak up and be conuted.

I believe, with Lincoln, that sin by silence, when there is a duty to speak, makes cowards of men.

New York's Reform Democratic Clubs Hail the Anniversary of the Supreme Court Desegregation Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by officers of the Reform Democratic Clubs of New York's West Side on the occasion of the seventh anniversary of the Supreme Court decision outlawing school segregation. One of the characteristics of the reform clubs is a vital concern with issues. This statement reflects their deep commitment to the achievement of full civil rights for all our citizens now—not later:

A STATEMENT BY THE REFORM DEMOCRATIC CLUBS OF NEW YORK'S WEST SIDE ON INTEGRATION IN SCHOOLS

On May 17, 1954, the Supreme Court of the United States handed down its decision in the case of *Brown* v. *The Board of Education* outlawing segregation in the public school systems of the United States.

On this, the seventh anniversary of this momentous decision, we, the Reform Democratic Clubs of the West Side of the Borough of Manhattan in New York City, wish to state our belief in the right of every individual of any race, religion, or creed to equal opportunity and to equal enjoyment of the guarantees given to all citizens by the U.S. Constitution.

The Supreme Court's decision in 1954 was a step toward converting this ideal into a reality. Though much has been done, much remains to be done in education, housing, job opportunities, and voting.

Although 7 long years have passed, only a small percentage of the public schools in the United States affected by the Supreme Court's decision have complied with the decision. Discrimination in employment on the basis of race or color still exists. Few States have as yet enacted legislation prohibiting discrimination in housing; and, in those States which have, the legislation has often proved inadequate to meet the needs. In many States minorities still are not allowed to vote. Without the vote, they have no say in their Government.

Today these minorities in our population are justly demanding that the American political system live up to its ideals. This demand has been articulated through the courts and by social actions such as the sit-in demonstrations.

We reaffirm our support of these efforts by our fellow Americans to acquire political and social equality. We realize that this is a problem for the North as well as the South. It is an American problem; and to solve it we need an American solution.

It is both our hope and our belief that the Federal Government will not shirk its responsibilities in this field and will act affirmatively toward eliminating all inequalities in our society.

It is both our hope and our belief that the State governments will do their part in guarding the rights of their citizens by faithfully implementing the laws already passed for this purpose, and by passing new legislation if needed.

It is both our hope and our belief that the city of New York will continue to take the lead in the advancement of civil rights, and by so doing, promote a vital, heterogeneous city life which will make New York City into a model of urban development.

We, the Reform Democratic Clubs on New York City's West Side, pledge ourselves to continue to support the efforts of government on all levels to end segregation and discrimination in our land. We pledge to continue to aid those community organizations working toward these same goals, and we further pledge to initiate programs of education and social action to help make our country into a land of opportunity for all its citizens.

ERIKA TEUTSCH,
President, Riverside Democrats.
ALFRED H. KLEIMAN,
President, West Side Democratic Club.
MARTIN BENIS,
President, F.D.R.-Woodrow Wilson Democrats.
FRANCES TEPPER,
Reform Independent Democrats.
RAYMOND GUENTER,
President, New Chelsea Club.

Making a Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Making a Job" published in the Wall Street Journal of May 1, 1961.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAKING A JOB

While the immediate concern of the Kennedy administration is present unemployment, reckoned at some 5.5 million by Labor Secretary Goldberg the other day, another Labor Department estimate is also causing anxiety in Washington.

It is the prediction that upward of some 13.5 million new workers will enter the labor market during the 1960's, an increase of 40 percent over the influx during the fifties. Will jobs await these jobseekers?

Some economists expect that there will be jobs enough, and more. No one, of course, can guarantee it. But the likelihood of reducing present unemployment and creating future job opportunities will be improved if the Government understands how a job is made.

A real job cannot be made in Washington, as even some of the most ardent proponents of Federal pump-priming concede. Every new job carries an investment price-tag which must be paid by private capital. In

1950, a single job in manufacturing industry cost an investment of $9,500. Today, a capital outlay of almost $20,000 is required. Hence, if the aim is to create as many jobs as possible, the means obviously must be to hold down the cost of providing a job and to increase the amount of capital available for investment.

Additional capital for investment could be released by an across-the-board liberalization of depreciation allowances on plant and machinery. But President Kennedy proposes instead a complicated scheme of tax credits designed to reward certain investment after the fact. Whatever the equity of this proposal, many businessmen regard it as a dubious incentive.

Unrealistic restriction of investment is one Government check on jobmaking. Increasing the cost of a job is another. Inflation generated by Government deficit spending does that. So do direct and indirect charges on the employer, whether in the form of higher contributions to unemployment benefits or through an arbitrarily determined minimum wage. The latter can actually aggravate unemployment in some businesses. More broadly, excessive union wage demands, enforced by the union's unique monopoly power, push up the cost of creating new jobs and thus accelerate the trend toward greater mechanization and automation of industry.

Mechanization and automation will continue in any case; they are the means by which industry maintains its efficiency and competitiveness. But automation need not be a serious barrier to greater employment. Given the right climate, investment in modern machinery can provide more and better jobs. Certainly automation does not stifle employment as surely as Government obstacles to investment and Government-sanctioned inflation of labor costs by monopoly unions.

Thus, the objective of increased employment can best be achieved by permitting industry to keep and invest more capital. That would mean less Government spending, to be sure. But it would also ease Washington's worries about the problem of making all those new jobs.

Blundering Into the 21st Century

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Burnett Roth is a lifelong resident of Florida and a graduate of the University of Florida.

He is presently a member of the National Executive Committee of the Anti-Defamation League and national chairman of its discriminations committee. He is an ADL commissioner representing the Southern States from Maryland to Florida.

Mr. Roth is a respected citizen of the Dade County community, having served in all communal, civic and religious affairs. He is active in and past president of the United Cerebral Palsy Association of Miami, B'nai B'rith, and served as councilman and vice mayor of the city of Miami Beach.

On April 15, 1961, he presented the keynote address at the Florida State Convention of B'nai B'rith lodges and chapters in St. Petersburg, Fla., emphasizing the important role that all Americans must play to insure the preservation of peace in the world and to guarantee the recognition of human rights by the peoples of all nations.

His address follows:

BLUNDERING INTO THE 21ST CENTURY

Ladies and gentlemen, a number of persons have asked me whether my keynote address would discuss in detail the important matters before the world presented in the Eichmann trial; others have suggested that perhaps I was going to discuss the decision entered this day by the circuit court of Dade County, Fla., which concerns itself with religious practices in the public schools; others have intimated that perhaps my remarks would touch upon the delicate problems presented with today's bombing and invasion of our neighboring island of Cuba where human and civil rights and liberties have been desecrated by the present leaders of that country; others have suggested that perhaps my talk would emphasize B'nai B'rith activities, the Anti-Defamation League, the B'nai B'rith Youth Organization program with particular emphasis upon the contribution we should make in supporting that portion of President Kennedy's program which relates to public institutions and programs of education.

But while all of these are important and part of the program of B'nai B'rith and part of the interest of B'nai B'rith, your State B'nai B'rith leadership evidenced its farsightedness when it suggested that in keynoting this working convention, I emphasize the important role that we as Americans must play in the changing world and changing times.

The B'nai B'rith"s many faceted program tional local, and world problems. Our Anti-Defamation League program insures the preservation of the principles of democracy; our youth and vocational guidance efforts insure a recognition of the important part our maturing citizens must play in achieving world peace; the other services of this, the oldest service organization in our land, combine in B'nai B'rith to give this Nation the wealth of our heritage as American Jews.

Today we are concerned with so many national, local, and world problems. Our chagrin at being bested in the successful world-circling flight of the Russian astronaut is tempered by our realization that Khrushchev was correct when he said that the conquest of space "is a victory for all people throughout the world".

If we are disturbed by the disorder in Laos, or the turbulence in the Congo; if we are ashamed of the besmirching of the American flag by the handful of shrieking women attacking a minister of God escorting his child to a school in New Orleans; or if our conscience is shaken by the picture of an Eichmann in an Israeli dock being called upon to answer for the crimes against humanity which resulted in the inhuman sadistic murder of 6 million lives; or if we are incensed by the imitative swastika desecrations of houses of worship in our own State and throughout the world, it is because the world has so shrunk in size. No longer do we think in terms of the 80 days of Jules Verne's imagination; now it is but 89 minutes of the historic flight of Gagarin.

All these, and other problems are related. And all the people of the earth are as one. Determined and dedicated to upholding the dignity of man, and the freedom of the individual under law.

Each of us, whether here in St. Petersburg, Fla., or in the former St. Petersburg, Russia, must know the need of peaceful coexistence. While our aims may be the same, we may attempt to reach them by dissimilar paths. What is good for us, the path we choose, may not necessarily be the path of other persons. But if we all have moral courage, loyalty, and integrity we can maintain inviolate the relations of amity and peace among nations.

It is our responsibility to recognize the dignity of all nations, and their right to run their own affairs. Some may desire to exercise that right with a leftist Socialist philosophy; but however contrary to our principles of democracy they may be, they have that right. Without at the same time violating the principles of human rights as enunciated in the Charter of the United Nations, and as now recognized by the civilized nations of the world.

Much of the world will not buy our anti-communism; not Latin America, not Africa, not even many of our allies in the Western bloc. If we cannot sell our democracy, let us at least be prepared to spread the seed of liberty by a program of realism, not just idealism.

It is in this framework that we must realize that we are truly blundering into the 21st century. There is a new generation emerging in America, a tough generation which does not want to be deceived by shibboleths. These people were born into a troubled world in which our way of life is threatened. But youth is powerful, and can face the monumental problems with recourse to fundamental truths of justice and freedom, and they are prepared to meet the challenge hurled out by President Kennedy by answering him that they are willing to ask what they can do for our country, rather than what our country can do for them.

It is but a short time until the 21st century. How many of us can go back 40 years to the early thunderous twenties—it is as yesterday. Just as tomorrow will see the birth of a new century, which we are not prepared for.

Have you ever wondered what life will be like then? Today we are alarmed with the growing challenges which demand the highest kind of leadership from the policy level to the grassroots. These forces are represented by three phenomena: First is the threat of the ideology of world communism; next is the rising tide of nationalism in the world's underdeveloped areas; and third is the unbelievable advances of science and technology.

The first force, that is, the threat of the Communits philosophy, we have tried to meet in many ways. We have dispensed $81 billion in foreign aid to 70 nations since World War II. Our emphasis was to bolster the allied and uncommitted nations against the Communists. But our handouts have not paid off. And neither have the billions for defense and armaments been fruitful. As President Kennedy said, "The primary purpose of our arms is peace, not war, to make certain that they will never be used; to deter all wars, general or limited, nuclear or conventional, large or small, to convince our potential aggressor that any attack would be futile. Our arms must be adequate to meet our commitments and insure our security."

Most important, perhaps, is the second challenge to world peace, the rising tide of nationalism in the underdeveloped areas.

With our eyes wide open, we must plan intelligently how to give realistic aid to these nations, not just because we can benefit from this aid, but how the world will benefit. The program to spend $11 billion to feed and clothe the hungry and ragged of the world in the next 5 years is a program which will harness America's farm abundance to meet our foreign policy objectives. Out of the storage bins into the bellies of the hungry, should be our realistic program.

This will be one step in the organization of the human and material resources of the free world to benefit mankind, without regard to any economic aggression which we may face of the Communist bloc.

XUM

There is an individual contribution each of us may make toward this worthy ideal. Some will make that contribution in joining the Peace Corps. These volunteers will not convert or propagandize, but will work with their hands in a commitment that all men are equal, working side by side with persons of all faiths, colors, and creeds, and show by example that we can live our democracy. This can prove to be one of the most far reaching instruments for the spreading of brotherhood ever attempted.

Others will contribute by joining movements which mean to change the image of the United States in the minds of those who only know of our prejudice and hate. We have a long way to go. In the United States the Negro and the Jew are still victims of prejudice, and do not have the fullness of opportunity to which all men are entitled.

As former Governor LeRoy Collins said, in addressing our State Anti-Defamation League in December, 1960, "The Negro longs to be treated equally before the law, and not have their worth measured solely by the color of their skin. And this is a goal the Constitution of the United States holds out assurance they can achieve. The struggle toward it is no more their responsibility than ours, if we accept the idea of the brotherhood of man and the dignity of the individual under the fatherhood of God.

"Real progress in race relations depends much less on the desegregation of a school here or there, or on a biracial eating at lunch counters, than it does on meaningful changes in the hearts and minds of the people of a community.

"I am convinced that the antidote to intolerance and bigotry and prejudice is people * * * people learning about people who are different from themselves * * * learning they have common hopes and fears, common concerns and aspirations.

"The great American goal is freedom, both at home and throughout the world. We cannot be free if our minds and hearts are enslaved by prejudice."

American prestige in the Africas has corroded because of racial discrimination. News stories of school desegregation incidents, race riots, and bars to Negroes make the front pages of the African press. We cannot tolerate racial incidents which mar our relations with the new nations of Africa such as occurred last week at Hagerstown, Md., where an African diplomat was refused service in a restaurant. Remember that America has more people of African descent than any African country, except Nigeria. So they are concerned with inequities.

So are all the colored people of the world. Whether negroid or Mongolian. Of the 2,851,000,000 people in the world, half are colored, and sensitive to affronts against their colored brethren.

The young American Negro is identifying himself with the larger struggle for freedom in which our Nation's ideals are proclaimed to the world, but denied to many Negroes at home. Some of these Negroes may be caught up in the Muslim movement which espouses superiority rather than equality. Others will seek to migrate to Africa, reminiscent of the Garvey movement 40 years ago. Still others will seek to insist upon their human rights and dignity in the United States.

And every Negro stands straighter, bolstered with pride at each new African state which gains independence. Just as the American Jews looks proudly at the progress and accomplishments of their coreligionists in the tiny democratic State of Israel; just as most persons look back with some concern and interest to distant points of origin to which even now they find some common bond or heritage, so the Negro looks to Africa.

Nationalism and emotional hunger is felt here, and is felt particularly in Africa. And it is this continent which concerns me most as we blunder into the 21st century. For the peace and dignity of the world depends upon the hunger for independence and freedom which now binds the African continent together.

The African States are gripped in a tremendous unprecedented upheaval. At the start of World War II there were but 3 independent areas in this great continent which comprises one-fifth of the total world's land area, and in which there are now 50 countries, colonies, and territories, with a population of 230 million. Just 4 years ago the former British colony of Gold Coast became Ghana. Since then we have seen an end to empires. Nationalism has swept the continent. Twenty new nations have gained, and are earning, independence. But it is quite a struggle to really earn freedom. The men who lead that struggle still proudly display tribal scars on their faces.

It is a continent which looks hopefully to the future, for everything lies ahead. It seeks not charity but a partnership into which we must join. All of these nations have the lowest possible income, but the greatest potential which will begin to be realized as we blunder into the 21st century.

It is our responsibility to help them overcome their hunger, ignorance, chaos, and desperation. Remember they must try to accomplish in the span of a few years what we have developed over hundreds of years. And in doing this, we will be helping to create social and political and economic conditions in which free institutions may flourish. But this does not necessarily mean that democracy as we practice it will be emulated.

The Africans have persisted in a restless surge toward their destiny of freedom. While initially their goal will be achieved through education, we know that along with that will come the desire for personal gain. The glamor of the big city will lure the Africans into searching for profits, and here we will be faced with human greed and avarice. And here lies a real danger to the peace of the world.

Africa offers a tremendous market, but the risks are great for investment capital. While tax and other concessions are granted to foreign investors, the governments are so pressed to meet their governmental financial obligations that there is the threat of eventually taking over property in the nationalization of certain key industries.

While this may be true to some extent, with intelligent leadership on the part of our Nation, their society may become one in which much of our economic system will be incorporated, while the African does not lose his own economic identity. Their economy may become a mixed one; part free and part government controlled. And that need not be taken by us as an invitation to communism.

We must have faith in our American way of life and our institutions, and trust them to emulate us in the world battle of ideas and ideals of freedom. The nations will accept those of our principles which they feel can best serve their progress and their people.

Since the establishment of Ghana we have been unprepared to meet the challenge of the drive for freedom. We failed to act promptly in the recognition of Guinea in 1958 when it became independent from France, and we have fumbled all along the route, not fatal fumbles, but enough to require the kind of new leadership we are now displaying.

While the day may come when rivalries will exist between the African States, at this time they are united in their determination to remain free from domination of the left, or of the right, from Russia or from the United States.

They look to us for action, and our new leadership is beginning to give it. Several weeks ago an article in Look magazine on Africa, portrayed the Portugal colony of Angola, a nation of 200,000 people, 40,000 of them white; and a nation in which the black man is ruthlessly exploited. Even talking about independence leads to prison there. Look suggested it would be years before independence could come to this downtrodden nation. Yet before the ink on the print was dry, Angola was erupting. Unhappily a desperate people were taking lives ruthlessly. Twenty-eight whites were slaughtered. However ill advised this was, they were on the move against what they considered a tyrannical power.

The Security Council of the United Nations was called upon to investigate the Portugal suppression of riots in Angola. The resolution met the traditional rebuff by the Western majority of Britain, France, Turkey, Nationalist China, Chile, and Equador, on the theory that the U.N. had no jurisdiction.

And here suddenly Secretary Stevenson stated that the United States regretted to find itself in disagreement. For the first time, the United States took an historical step forward, and our representative said to the world, "Angola is but a part of the overall picture of evolution on the African Continent. The views of the United States have not changed since Jefferson wrote, 'We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.' "

Stevenson said that Portugal should plan step by step so that Angola could soon enjoy full self-determination. And the Liberian delegate rose to announce that our action would reverberate throughout Africa and the world.

This reorientation of American policy proved dramatically our real friendship for the people of Africa, and it is so recognized by the world. Particularly by those African-Asian nations which hold 45 out of the 99 seats in the United Nations.

And the very next day Mr. Stevenson took another step forward to end the scourge of imperialism, by voting with a majority of the General Assembly to censure segregated South Africa for its occupation of South West Africa.

Here we are confronted with the apartheid South Africa for its occupation of South Africa, where the whites are out-numbered by the Africans, mulattoes, and Asians 4 to 1. The 4 million whites have ruled the nonwhites with a hard hand. There is no appeal or argument from injustice with the police, the courts and prison. But within the immediate future we shall see some radical changes forced upon South Africa. And only with intelligent understanding will these changes come about without blood-letting.

As we blunder into the 21st century, we can ease the path with continued orientation of our policy toward an intelligent program to help the new nations of the world. As G. Mennen Williams, the Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs has reported, the Africans want to assure their freedom from colonialism, while remaining neutral in the great power struggle.

This is reminiscent of our own fight for independence. George Washington, in his farewell address, said that it was our duty to remain neutral and urged this neutrality by imposing upon ourselves the mandate "to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity toward other nations." It is this same mentality that persuades the African nations today, as we were persuaded in 1796, to remain neutral from the East and the West.

And as Secretary Williams has said, the Africans seek racial equality in the world. Their governmental institutions will fit their own society, and perhaps be more centralized in authority than the Western civilization, but they must plan their economy, not we try to impose ours upon them.

And of course, their standards of health, and vitality, their diet and medical care

must improve. All this will come with the fulfillment of their great desire for education. While they may be ripe for some demagogery, we must exploit our opportunities and meet the leadership challenge. They need our support in meeting their newly assumed obligations.

Twenty-two African States this week submitted their own development plan which calls for an expansion and existing U.N. technical assistance, and establishment of training institutes for technical personnel. They urge the establishment of an economic development bank for Africa, and the creation of an economic development institute for training personnel in economic planning, programing and other phases of economic development.

I am reminded of that portion of the preamble of the Constitution of UNESCO where it is declared that, "Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed." So must our leadership today, with your support, recognize that the peace we seek must be in the minds of all men * * * whether they be from Communist China, the U.S.S.R., Egypt, Israel, or the rest of the globe.

And the globe is a small one today as we join in paying tribute to Yuri Gagarin, tribute to the nationalism of the African States, and as we pay tribute to the foresight and determination of our President.

Together we can meet these problems, intelligently, forthrightly, honestly, and with concern for others. Through our program of B'nai B'rith, and our interest in and service to our Nation and the world we can make a real contribution to peace and help establish basic human democratic rights.

Let us utilize our Hillel organizations on the campuses of so many of the important colleges of the country to enlist persons to join in the Peace Corp. Our young people are dedicated and should be encouraged to make this important contribution to their country. Perhaps we could go beyond Hillel. Our whole B'nai B'rith framework can be mobilized within the technical and economic assistance program contemplated by our Government and so sorely needed by the nations of Africa.

From among our membership there are hundreds who should be mobilized through the instrumentality of B'nai B'rith; individuals who cannot meet the special requirements of the Peace Corps but who can be integrated in the tremendous program being sought by the African States themselves and encouraged by our Government to give assistance to the nations of Africa in the furnishing of scientific, economic and technical skills. This is in keeping with the heritage of the Jewish people.

By such service can we insure that the technical skills which are so rapidly developing shall be put to the best interest of mankind. And perhaps we can help smooth the way into the rapidly approaching 21st century.

In that era may our children, and our children's children live in peace, contentment and harmony with all the peoples of the world.

Moscow on Day Gagarin Returned From Space Flight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, one of my constituents, Mr. Clayton Willis of Greenwich, Conn., an editor of Newsweek magazine, happened to be in Moscow on the day that Yuri Gagarin allegedly became the first human to make a space flight and return to earth, having lived through the experience. Mr. Willis' impressions on that day in Moscow are set forth in an article which he wrote for the Greenwich Time, our daily newspaper, under the title of "Impressions of Greenwich Man—What Moscow Was Like on Day Gagarin Reported Returned From Space Flight." It is an article which I think may be of interest to Members of Congress. For that reason I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPRESSIONS OF GREENWICH MAN—WHAT MOSCOW WAS LIKE ON DAY GAGARIN REPORTED RETURNED FROM SPACE FLIGHT

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Clayton Willis, of Old Bedford Road, was in Russia on Apr. 12, 1961, when Yuri Gagarin was rocketed into orbit and returned safely. Mr. Willis, upon his return last week, submitted the following impressions for publication in Greenwich Time.)

(By Clayton Willis)

Moscow, a huge, grim city of over 5 million population, was a different city April 12, 1961.

That was the historic day when Yuri Gagarin allegedly became the first human to make a space flight, return to earth, and live through it.

Reports that Gagarin may not have been the first to fly to space were circulating in the western world but it wasn't of the slightest interest in Moscow. The reason—the Soviet citizen never heard about them and may never—except through the grapevine.

I first learned about the Gagarin flight in my hotel about 9:45 a.m., Moscow time (1:45 p.m., Greenwich time). He reportedly took off at 9:07 a.m. (1:07 p.m., e.s.t.). I had arrived in Moscow 6 days before, April 6.

I noticed people gathered around radios in the Metropole Hotel, listening excitedly to reports of the flight.

I rushed out of the hotel from which the Kremlin can be seen, raced across Revolution Square in front of my hotel into Sverdlov Square (one runs into the other) past the Bolshoi Theater, past the Dom Souzou, where the Powers trial was held, turned right on Gorky Street and ran 1 block to the central telegraph office.

The Russian public address system was carrying reports of the space flight. In between reports, the Russian national anthem was booming out of the public address systems, then more nationalistic music. People were talking and gesturing excitedly as they walked along Moscow sidewalks and waited in queues for buses. Some stopped completely.

There wasn't a single newsman at the central telegraph office; so, I dashed out of the large building and hurried a few more blocks up Gorky Street to the Izvestia newspaper office. This is the leading evening newspaper in the U.S.S.R.; Pravda being the top morning paper.

Contrary to Russian custom, no one "intercepted" me at the front door. So, I walked in, crossed the lobby a few steps to the elevator, got in, and went to the top floor. I had never been to the office before and had no idea where I would end up. It turned out that the top editors were on this, the sixth floor.

I saw what looked like a receptionist in a room to my right, but I hurried past her down a corridor into what appeared like the main office. It was. In fact it was the reception room for the chief editor, none other than Khrushchev's son-in-law, Alexei I. Ajubei.

There V. Sdobnov, assistant to the editor in chief; Vikenty Matveyer, a foreign observer on American affairs, were huddled around a radio listening to reports of Gagarin as he was speeding around the earth in his five-ton spaceship, "Vostok" (East).

You just don't pop into Russian newspaper offices unannounced, and I may have been the only Western newsman at Izvestia on April 12, 1961. In fact, Matveyer asked politely, "How did you get here?" He was amazed.

Matveyer said Gagarin was over South America and that he was feeling fine and was weightless, a good sign. At 10:25 a.m., Gagarin said he was coming down as we were standing there listening to the radio reports. He landed 30 minutes later—but I heard this later.

I noticed copies of the New York Times, Newsweek, Time, Life, and other American publications in the office. Those were the only Western publications I saw in the Soviet Union except when I visited the Pravda newspaper office the evening before. The Daily Worker of London and the Daily Worker of New York City were the only exceptions.

Then another foreign observer (writers on foreign countries are called foreign observers—they may observe, but they certainly don't report), Vladimir Silantiev, took me through the whole plant, the pressrooms, the composing room, the city editor's office and so on—all this while Gagarin was reportedly flying around the earth.

Out on the street people were still excited, hands were playing music from the public address system.

I returned to the Central Telegraph Office and it was really popping. S. Yoshikawa, correspondent for N.K.K., Tokyo, was broadcasting from an oversized telephone booth. He was listening to Soviet Central Radio on a portable and put it up to the microphone to carry reports of Gagarin to Japan. Soviet newsmen, more accurately called propagandists, were taking notes of the scene and shooting picture of Yoshikawa and the few correspondents who were there—many apparently still hadn't heard the news and some were working in their offices.

For Moscow, as gray a city as I have ever seen in the more than 60 countries I have visited, this was the supreme moment. The excitement and the gaiety of the people stood in sharp contrast to the huge, carless boulevards, the dull colored and poorly constructed apartment houses which are going up everywhere in Moscow and the Soviet Union, the terribly low living standard of the people.

At the central telegraph office I was asked my reaction to the spaceman. Deliberately being brief, I said, "It is exciting to be in Moscow when this news broke." The reporter never used a word of this in his account which appeared in Moscow News. What he did write, fortunately very little, was completely fictitious. He said only whatever suited his propaganda purposes, the custom of Soviet journalists.

The general impression I got throughout the U.S.S.R. (and I visited 5 of the 15 Republics from Leningrad, on the Bay of Finland, to Alma-Ata, Kazakhstan in Central Asia about 100 miles west of Red China) was that the Reds have achieved much in education, science, industry and the military. But the housing and the clothes are drab and very poor. And the cost of living is extremely high. But, it's important to realize that although in our eyes Russian living standards are miserable, the Russian doesn't have anything to compare his life with. The Russian people complain about their standard of living, but are almost powerless to do anything about it. The Russian press only feeds the people what the Kremlin

wants them to read—so, there's no comparison—that's the danger.

For the military and scientific achievements which give them propaganda value, the Soviets have sacrificed the life of their people. The living standard is improving a little, but it has a long, long way to go. The thing they have the least of, of course, is freedom. They just don't have it in our understanding of the word.

The Concern of the Democratic Party for Small Business—Myth and Reality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, for a long time now the fearless leaders of the Democratic Party have been hard at work projecting an image of themselves as the one political party concerned with the problems of small business.

They have pursued this through the many avenues they have developed for reaching the public. Members of the Democratic Party in both Houses of Congress are constantly at work on this image, building it up. The press, radio and television find that it helps with the Democratic Party leaders to aid them in the projection of this image.

But the Democratic Party does not stop there. For many years its leaders have, at the same time, been engaged in the projection of the image of the Republican Party as the party of big business.

As a result of long practice the leaders of the Democratic Party have developed to a fantastic degree their expertise in this matter of image projection.

What is the reality behind the myth?

Well, let us look at what the Democrats are doing to a hundred small businessmen just down the street from them on Capitol Hill. It immediately becomes clear that the supposed concern of the Democrats for small businessmen is only a myth.

The Democrats are not even good neighbors.

Suppose a family moved into the house next door to you, and, after getting settled down began shortly thereafter to use the vast powers of Government to dispossess you and push you around?

You would not like it, and the small businessmen on Capitol Hill don't like it either.

If they are forced to move from Capitol Hill, they lose their customers and they lose their means of livelihood.

When they relocate somewhere else they will have to begin a hard fight for new customers and they will have to take these customers away from other businessmen. They may never recover from this enforced move.

Roll Call, the newspaper of Capitol Hill, reports in its current May 17, 1961, issue that Nicholas DeGiovanni, restaurant owner, said he has been on Capitol Hill for 14 years and will join any movement to stop purchase of the block.

According to Roll Call, Mr. DeGiovanni added that if the Government was really concerned with the plight of small businesses it would not be moving out a block of them.

This is exactly the point I have been making.

As a matter of fact, Mr. DeGiovanni might have added that the Democrats in the Congress would not have called the Attorney General—another great champion of small business—into the case to help throw their neighbors out of their places of business, and their homes.

The Government should not take over property under the powers of eminent domain when it does not even have a definite plan for the use of such property. This is totalitarianism.

The indiscriminate use of the vast powers of Government in this instance to satisfy the whims of the Democrats and their desire for wide open spaces is to take a long, long step toward the kind of governments with which we are at war in Europe and Asia.

Dave Bassin, president of the Capitol Hill Merchants Association, whose firm would be purchased under the Democratic move to dispossess the neighboring small businessmen, said, according to Roll Call that "his group will support the Kearns measure and anything else which will allow them to stay where they are."

Mr. Bassin and Mr. DeGiovanni and their colleagues among the small businessmen on Capitol Hill thus have had a personal experience with the reality behind the image of the Democratic concern for small businessmen.

I would judge that they are experts on what lies behind the image which the Democrats have been so industriously building up for so many years.

Actually, the Democrats are no more interested in small businessmen than they are in big businessmen. What they are really interested in, and are deeply committed to, is big government.

What would it cost them, actually, to be good neighbors? The Democrats like to pride themselves on being good neighbors to the rest of mankind.

The Congress has appropriated $80 billion to help businessmen in other nations get back into business and to stay in business.

Here at home, on Capitol Hill, they could not care less.

For the benefit of Dave Bassin, and Nicholas DeGiovanni, let me say that all Democrats are not alike.

Many of them are deeply interested in the plight of Mr. Bassin and Mr. DeGiovanni and their colleagues.

But for some strange reason all of them are silent.

All, that is, except Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, who has joined me in sponsoring legislation to hold up the impersonal processes of government which the Democratic Members of the Congress have set in motion.

We have made a very simple proposition to the Democrats.

We have said to them, look, why not develop a long-range plan for beautifying the environs of the U.S. Capitol Building?

We have said, why not protect the small businessmen of Capitol Hill in line with the Democratic statements which have been given such wide publicity through the years?

We have said to the Democrats, why not make Capitol Hill as beautiful as Williamsburg, Va.?

We have said, these businessmen on Capitol Hill are wonderful hosts and they make constituents who come to Capitol Hill feel welcome. These constituents are not welcomed by the restaurants and cafeterias run by the Congress in its own buildings. There the signs plainly say, over and over again, "For Members of Congress and employees."

Where will the constituents of Members of Congress go to eat when the small businessmen on Capitol Hill are dispossessed by the Department of Justice and the Democrats in the Congress?

These are the problems, or some of them.

The Democrats seem to be perfectly unaware of the great human tragedy which they are inflicting on the businessmen and residents who are so unfortunate as to be their neighbors on Capitol Hill.

I would say to Dave Bassin and Nicholas DeGiovanni, Do Not Give Up. Hold on to the businesses which you have built up through the years.

I am confident that justice will triumph in the end.

Take your case to the American people. Take it to the voters who elected the Democratic Members of Congress.

The voters will undoubtedly respond, for they believe in fair play. I am confident you will win.

I would only suggest that you mobilize support for the bills which Senator STROM THURMOND and I have introduced.

I include as part of my remarks an article from Roll Call, and the text of the bills which Senator STROM THURMOND and I have sponsored:

[From the Roll Call, May 17, 1961]

HILL MERCHANTS FIGHT ANEW IN 100 BLOCK

Merchants in a block to be levelled for Capitol Hill expansion are launching a new, two-pronged attack at the Government takeover.

One phase is a bill introduced by Represenative CARROLL D. KEARNS, of Pennsylvania, which would prevent expenditures of funds for purchase or demolition of buildings in the Capitol area without a comprehensive plan for the development, preservations and improvement of the area.

The bill, if approved, would block eminent domain proceedings for the purchase of the block, which is bounded by Independence Avenue, First, C, and Second Streets, SE. There is no specific proposal for the use of the property.

The merchants are also planning a private bill which would be tacked onto the appropriations bill. It would authorize payments to them in addition to funds for the physical value of their property.

Several Representatives are looking over the measure for possible sponsorship. It would reimburse owners for intangible good will values of their locations in the event the Kearns bill dies and they must move out.

The private bill will substitute for another bill which had been introduced by Representative CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, of West Virginia, reimbursing the owners for intangibe values. Word leaked out of the Public Works Committee that the bill could not be adopted since it would set a costly precedent.

The Kearns bill will probably be bounced since proceedings are already well underway to buy the property.

Under an order of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, residents must vacate by August 1 and commercial establishments must vacate by March 1, 1962.

Dave Bassin, president of the Capitol Hill Merchants Association, whose firm would be purchased under the Government's move, said his group will support the Kearns measure "and anything else" which will allow them to stay where they are.

Nicholas DeGiovanni, restaurant owner preparing to open a new addition, said he has been on Capitol Hill for 14 years and will join any movement to stop purchase of the block.

DeGiovanni said he hoped the Kearns bill will revive interest, and "maybe someone will lend a sympathetic ear." He said Speaker SAM RAYBURN "has said he needs room to breathe," but "If he does he should go back to Texas."

The restaurant owner added that if the Government was really concerned with the plight of small businesses it wouldn't be moving out a block of them.

Representative KEARNS told Roll Call that the Government should not try to take over the property when it doesn't even have a definite plan for its use.

H.R. 6893

A bill to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 to provide for the preservation of the home of John Philip Sousa, and to protect the homes of residents and the businesses and good will of the small businessmen in the vicinity of the United States Capitol Building

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 7 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 (D.C. Code 5–706) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(j) (1) For the purpose of providing for the preservation, and maintenance as a shrine, of the former home in the District of Columbia of John Philip Sousa, there is hereby established a board consisting of the conductor of the band of the Untied States Army, the conductor of the band of the United States Navy, the conductor of the band of the United States Marine Corps, and the conductor of the band of the United States Air Force, ex officio, plus ten additional individuals appointed by the President, which shall acquire the home of John Philip Sousa at 318 Independence Avenue, in the District of Columbia, and shall preserve and maintain such home as a shrine dedicated to his memory, and as a museum for the preservation of memorabilia of John Philip Sousa.

"(2) For the purpose of obtaining funds for carrying out this subsection, the board is authorized to accept donations of funds, services, and property, and to conduct a nationwide fundraising campaign. All departments and agencies of the United States, upon request made by the board, shall transfer to the board all memorabilia of John Philip Sousa in the custody or control of such departments and agencies.

"(3) Members of the board shall serve without compensation for their services as such, but they shall be reimbursed for their expenses of travel and subsistence while actually engaged in the performance of the duties vested in the board. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this subsection.

"(k) Until a comprehensive plan has been prepared for the proper development, preservation and improvement of the physical environs of the United States Capitol Building and the surrounding complex of Federal buildings, including the Senate and House Office Buildings, the Library of Congress, and the United States Supreme Court, no funds shall be expended for the acquisition of real property or for the purchase or demolition of existing buildings located in the vicinity of the United States Capitol Building and the surroundng complex of Federal buildings."

H.R. 6134

A bill to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 to provide for the preservation of restoration of housing and certain other structures in the District of Columbia, where such housing or other structures are not substandard or can be restored to good condition, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 7 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 (District of Columbia Code 5–706) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(j) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, (1) housing (including structures of historic or general significance) which is not substandard in any project area shall be preserved and shall not be demolished or included in the acquisition and assembling by the Agency of the real property in such area; and (2) the owner of any substandard housing (including structures or sites of historic or general significance) in the project area which can be rehabilitated or restored to good condition shall be encouraged and assisted by the Agency to undertake and carry out such rehabilitation or restoration, and such housing (or structures or sites) shall not be demolished or included in the acquisition and assembling by the Agency of the real property in such area unless such owner, after having had a reasonable time following notification by the Agency to complete such rehabilitation or restoration, has failed to do so; and in the case of any such failure the Agency, after acquiring such housing (or structures or sites) shall itself provide for the rehabilitation or restoration thereof whenever it determines that such rehabilitation or restoration is desirable or appropriate.

"(k) There is hereby established a Commission, consisting of the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia of the Senate and two members of such committee appointed by the chairman; the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia of the House of Representatives and two members of such committee appointed by the chairman; the Librarian of Congress; the Chief Justice of the United States; and eleven distinguished cultural leaders from the fields of architecture, history of architecture, landscape architecture, and the other arts appointed by the President; which shall study, develop, and on or before February 15, 1962, recommend to the Congress a comprehensive plan for the proper development, preservation, and improvement of the physical environs of the United States Capitol Building and the surrounding complex of Federal buildings, including the Senate and House Office Buildings, the Library of Congress, and the United States Supreme Court. Until such recommendations have been submitted to the Congress, no funds shall be expended for the acquisition of real property or for the purchase or demolition of existing buildings located in the vicinity of the United States Capitol Building and the surrounding complex of Federal buildings.

"(1) The Committee on the District of Columbia of the Senate and the Committee on the District of Columbia of the House of Representatives, acting separately or jointly, shall conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the following matters as they relate to the Agency and to the performance by the Agency of its functions under this Act:

"(1) Methods of appraisal and land disposition procedures and contracts;

"(2) Compliance with this Act in the development of project plans;

"(3) Reduction of project cost by emphasis on rehabilitation;

"(4) Propriety of excessive credit for noncash grants-in-aid to the District of Columbia;

"(5) Public interest versus negotiation with single developers;

"(6) Establishment of sound accounting and financial practices;

"(7) Lack of provision for privately built middle-income housing;

"(8) Relocation procedures as they relate to displaced persons and businessmen, with special atention to the problems of small businessmen;

"(9) Adequacy of opportunities afforded local contractors and redevelopers to participate in renewal projects;

"(10) Problems of undue delays in restoring neighborhoods to viable condition so as to produce both business and individual tax revenues for local government; and

"(11) Such other matters as are related to the expeditious and efficient restoration of neighborhoods in accordance with provisions of Federal and local laws.

Each such committee shall report to its respective House at the earliest practicable time the results of the investigation and study together with such recommendations as it deems advisable."

S. 1681

A bill to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 to provide for the preservation or restoration of housing and certain other structures in the District of Columbia, where such housing or other structures are not substandard or can be restored to good condition, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 7 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 (District of Columbia Code 5–706) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(j) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, (1) housing (including structures of historic or general significance) which is not substandard in any project area shall be preserved and shall not be demolished or included in the acquisition and assembling by the Agency of the real property in such area; and (2) the owner of any substandard housing (including structures or sites of historic or general significance) in the project area which can be rehabilitated or restored to good condition shall be encouraged and assisted by the Agency to undertake and carry out such rehabilitation or restoration, and such housing (or structures or sites) shall not be demolished or included in the acquisition and assembling by the Agency of the real property in such area unless such owner, after having had a reasonable time following notification by the Agency to complete such rehabilitation or restoration, has failed to do so; and in the case of any such failure the Agency, after acquiring such housing (or structures or sites) shall itself provided for the rehabilitation or restoration thereof whenever it determines that such rehabilitation or restoration is desirable or appropriate.

"(k) There is hereby established a Commission, consisting of the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia of the Senate and two members of such committee appointed by the chairman; the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia of the House of Representatives and two members of such committee appointed by the chairman; the Librarian of Congress; the Chief Justice of the United States; and eleven distinguished cultural leaders from the fields of architecture, history of architecture, landscape architecture, and the other arts appointed by the President; which shall study, develop, and on or before February 15, 1962, recommended to the Congress a comprehensive plan for the proper development, preservation, and improvement of the physical environs of the United States Capitol Building and the surrounding complex of Federal buildings, including the Senate and House Office Buildings, the Library of Congress, and the United States Supreme Court. Until such recommendations have been submitted to the Congress, no funds shall be expended for the acquisition of real property or for the purchase or demolition of existing buildings located in the vicinity of the United States Capitol Building and the surrounding complex of Federal buildings.

"(l) The Committee on the District of Columbia of the Senate and the Committee on the District of Columbia of the House of Representatives, acting separately or jointly shall conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the following matters as they relate to the Agency and to the performance by the Agency of its functions under this Act:

"(1) Methods of appraisal and land disposition procedures and contracts;

"(2) Compliance with this Act in the development of project plans;

"(3) Reduction of project cost by emphasis on rehabilitation;

"(4) Propriety of excessive credit for noncash grants-in-aid to the District of Columbia;

"(5) Public interest versus negotiation with single developers;

"(6) Establishment of sound accounting and financial practices;

"(7) Lack of provision for privately built middle-income housing;

"(8) Relocation procedures as they relate to displaced persons and businessmen, with special attention to the problems of small businessmen;

"(9) Adequacy of opportunities afforded local contractors and redevelopers to participate in renewal projects;

"(10) Problems of undue delays in restoring neighborhoods to viable condition so as to produce both business and individual tax revenues for local government; and

"(11) Such other matters as are related to the expeditious and efficient restoration of neighborhoods in accordance with provisions of Federal and local laws.

"Each such committee shall report to its House at the earliest practicable time the results of the investigation and study together with such recommendations as it deems advisable."

Let's Put a Poet Into Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the world is advancing in the physical sciences at an almost mariculous rate of progress.

The resources of the earth, the element of nature, and now, the reaches of outer space: within the laboratory of man's exploratory spirit, these are subjects for the discovery of new things and new ways to benefit mankind.

Unfortunately, however, our advances in science have not been accompanied by proportionate maturity of understanding in man's relationship to man.

Why? Perhaps, because the tangible is less difficult to master than the intangible; because the physical things usually get a higher priority than do the things of the mind and spirit.

For the most part, such considerations have been peripheral, rather than the heart of day-to-day conduct.

Traditionally, also, our interrelationships have been left to the church, to the poets, to the philosophers.

Now, we find ourselves on the edge of space, teetering on the brink of global war, ready on the launching pad of new progress.

Unless there is greater progress in human understanding, however, the creations of our hands may, instead of serving us, ultimately blow us up.

The time has come, I believe, for a reexamination of our efforts, or perhaps the lack of such broad-scope efforts, for finding new ways of improving the fundamental interrelationships, sometimes conflicting, of humanity.

Recently, the Milwaukee Journal published an article, reprinted from the Saturday Review of Literature, by Mr. Norman Cousins. The article, entitled "Let's Put a Poet Into Space," stresses the need for a better perspective, in effect, attaining a space-eye-viewing, of man's progress.

Mr. Cousins also states that we need to "chart a direction for human survival with at least as much concentration of effort as we are putting into a trip to the moon."

We recognize, of course, that this is not the province of legislation. Nevertheless, national policy is determined, not only by the need of the times, but by the philosophy and perspective of the leaders who make major decisions in our national life.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article entitled "Let's Put a Poet Into Space," printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S PUT A POET INTO SPACE

(By Norman Cousins, in the Saturday Review)

The idea of man in space is an explosion in the imagination. It shakes free the sense of wonder; it cracks open a vast area of the human potential; it confronts the intelligence with the prospect of an encounter with the infinite.

But it also adds to the terror. Not terror from what is unknown about space but from what is known about man. These cosmic vehicles are the forerunners of space platforms carrying loaded nuclear pistols pointed at the head of man on earth. A great ascent has taken place without any corresponding elevation of ideas. Man has raised his station without raising his sights. He roams the heavens with the engines of hell.

No human being who ever lived was able to see more of the world than Yuri Gagarin. No human being was ever in a better position to reflect on human destiny. Yet at precisely the moment that he should have been asserting the cause of man he was asserting the cause of the nation.

The one thing on earth that most needed to be left behind—the sense of the tribe—he had carried securely with him. A magnificent new vantage point was not enough to offset an old perspective. Into the center of the focused view came the national flag.

This is not to say that there is anything wrong or unnatural about a surge of national pride over such an event. Nor is it strange that the reaction in the United States should have been registered so largely on the level of the national ego-hurt, with assurances from Government that we were not too far behind. In the context of a struggle for world balance of power, for prestige, and for preeminence, every gain is bound to be posted on the competitive scoreboard.

But at some point the human race must have its innings. An assessment must ultimately be made in terms of human development. In the end, it is not the nation but man who will have to account for the record of life on earth.

The journey into space is, or should be, a sublime experience. The selection of astronauts ought not to be confined to men in the military or in technology. Why not poets, philosophers, or theologians? If it is said that space has stern physical requirements, the problem can be met. There are strapping fellows among those who have demonstrated their capacity to think creatively and who have some convictions about the nature of man.

One of the prime requisites for an astronaut is not just his ability to follow a specified procedure and to take measurements but to be able to be at one with a new environment. A space ship requires true perspective. This is nothing that can be imparted in a course on astronautics; it comes with the responsible development of intellect and insight. A respect for the human spirit may be even more important than a knowledge of centrifugal force.

Moreover, a certain artistry is called for when man proposes to range the universe. For when the astronaut returns to earth his message should be more than excited series of remarks on a fabulous journey. The returning messenger should have the ability to impart a sense of great new connections that may transform life as we have known it.

Men like Paul Tillich, Reinhold Niebuhr, Lewis Mumford, and Robert Frost may be too old to withstand the rigors of training for such an assignment, but at least they ought to be consulted on the younger men who may be equal to the job. In the meantime, the rest of us can try to prepare ourselves to accord a full measure of comprehension to the dimensions of a new age. There is something else we can do. We can try to chart a direction for human survival with at least as much concentration of effort as we are putting into a trip to the moon.

The ADA Is at It Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith an article from the Evening Star of Washington written by

the Associated Press with the heading "ADA Says Red China Should Be Recognized." Mr. Speaker, the Americans for Democratic Action are up to their old tricks of advocating recognition by the United States of Red China as well as admission to the United Nations.

Many of the people associated with the ADA formed the policies years ago that caused the loss of free China behind the Iron Curtain of communism, as well as the loss of many other countries. Certainly their policies at that time were wrong and the policies they advocate today are just as bad and as detrimental to the interest of the United States and the free world:

ADA SAYS RED CHINA SHOULD BE RECOGNIZED

(By the Associated Press)

Americans for Democratic Action urges a start toward diplomatic recognition of Red China "and its accreditation to the United Nations as the government of China."

This should not be done, the ADA said, "as gestures of moral approval of past actions but as a means of establishing the normal channels of international communication."

The ADA's views on China were in a resolution adopted yesterday before its 14th annual convention adjourned.

PROVISIONS FOR FORMOSA

Recognition of the Peiping regime and its accreditation to the United Nations, the ADA said, "would increase our access to information on Chinese affairs and the possibility of affecting Chinese foreign policy."

Admitting Red China to the United Nations, the ADA said, "should be linked to the condition that the inhabitants of Formosa shall themselves democratically decide whether they shall be admitted to the United Nations as an independent nation or that they shall rejoin mainland China."

The Chinese seat at the United Nations now is held by representatives of the Chinese Nationalist Government, which is based on Formosa.

On domestic matters, ADA, a self-described liberal organization, said the Kennedy administration was "drifting into the worst mistakes of the Eisenhower years."

The ADA defined them as "improvisations for segments of full employment and economic growth."

ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

The resolution recommended a number of long-range objectives, including:

Expanded support for neglected segments of the economy, notably housing, urban redevelopment, water conservation, depressed areas and constantly expanding consumer purchasing power for a rising standard of living.

The convention reelected Samuel H. Beer, a Harvard professor, as chairman; Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt as honorary chairman; Richard C. Sachs, New York, treasurer, and Roy Bennett, New York, assistant treasurer. Paul Seabury, a University of California professor, was elected chairman of the executive committee.

The Case Against Castro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Arthur Krock writes in the New York Times this morning an article that to me represents a devastating reply to those who contend that this country had not given Cuban Dictator Castro fair treatment.

Frankly, a surprising number of my own constituents persist in arguing with me that we have been too harsh and peremptory in our treatment of Castro. Because this badly mistaken view may be shared by many Americans, I ask unanimous consent that the column in today's New York Times, entitled "The Lively Issue of Castro's Justifications," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LIVELY ISSUE OF CASTRO'S JUSTIFICATIONS

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, May 17—Two conclusions reached by this department after an examination of the origins of the currently hostile United States-Castro relations, and published here under date of May 10, have evoked an unusual number of remarkably uniform dissents from readers. These conclusions were:

1. The factual weakness of an advertisement in this newspaper, signed by a number of Harvard professors among other distinguished citizens, which justified Castro's anti-Americanism on the ground that for "at least a year" U.S. policy has been "We must crush Castro," is that it began the chapter of United States-Castro relations in the middle.

2. Castro's unfriendly and illegal acts, and his anti-American incitements of the Cuban population, long preceded the date chosen in this advertisement to demonstrate that the burden of blame is on his government.

In rebuttal of these conclusions the letterwriters generally contended that the United States refused a request from Castro to be invited for talks; rebuffed and snubbed him when he came here in February 1959, to speak to the American Society of Newspaper Editors; and refused his offer at that time and thereafter to negotiate the differences between his regime and the Government of the United States. But the open record is the following:

1. Castro never requested an official invitation. When, on his own volition, he came unofficially to Washington, in April 1959, Secretary of State Herter gave him a luncheon at which no mention of any desired negotiation was made by the Cuban officials present; and, in the absence of President Eisenhower, the Premier was received by Vice President Nixon.

2. On February 22, 1960, Castro did propose—but for the first time—to negotiate with the United States on compensation to American citizens for their property in Cuba that he expropriated soon after his accession to power. However, his conditions were that during the negotiation the United States should bind both the Executive and Congress to refrain from any action which Cuba would consider to affect its interests, while he remained free to negotiate or procrastinate as he chose—conditions obviously unacceptable and, so far as Congress was concerned, constitutionally impossible.

3. From the time Castro assumed power until May 17, 1960, the United States made 9 formal and 16 informal offers to negotiate all differences with Cuba. The first was by Ambassador Bonsal in March 1959. In each note and statement the United States expressed sympathy with the social and economic objectives of the Cuban agrarian reform law under which the expropriation was made.

HERTER'S INDICTMENT

4. At the San José, Costa Rica, conference, August 1960, Cuban Foreign Minister Roa charged that this Government had consistently refused Castro's offers of negotiation. Secretary Herter made and documented this reply: That continuing attacks on the United States by the Castro regime began in January 1959 before the acts it alleges were U.S. aggression. He said also that from this date forward political assaults on the U.S. Government, "and scurrilous attempts to besmirch the characters of its leaders, have nevertheless been consistent and made with increased savagery."

The circumstances that the charges in Castro's justification that this open record refutes are being made by citizens of such quality is strange, disturbing, and mysterious. But it is true, as pointed out in some of the letters, that Castro also can cite grievances prior to the preinvasion programing. For example, the United States did not completely bar arms to dictator Batista until March 14, 1958; sent a marine guard for the Guantanamo pumping station 6 miles into Cuba on July 28, 1958; and concluded a 20-year atomic energy aid agreement with Batista September 9, 1958.

The silly paradox, however, is that all this time U.S. businessmen in Cuba were knowingly financing Castro's revolution by paying their taxes at stations where he could seize them. Prior to that, the taxes on Cuban properties owned by Americans were always sent to Havana, the central collection office, until the other arrangement was deliberately made for the financing of Castro. And meanwhile the State Department was totally ignoring successive warnings from two Ambassadors that the interest of international communism would be served in Cuba by Castro's success.

The John Birch Society—1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, a leading newspaper published in Whittier, Calif., a city located in my district, has printed a series of five objectively written articles concerning the John Birch Society. This newspaper, the Daily News, is to be commended for basing the articles on facts which many news media have ignored in reporting on the society. Under unanimous consent I include the first three articles of the series in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Daily News, Whittier, Calif., Apr. 26, 1961]

HOW TO TELL A COMMIE FRONT

(First of a series)

The John Birch Society may be a movement aimed at strengthening Americanism and weakening communism, but it is mysterious and controversial, too.

Mysterious although its meetings are public and its membership open to any good American who will subscribe to its beliefs.

Controversial although its business is Americanism.

It has been subjected to criticism by political officeholders, newspaper editors, church pastors, and the man on the street. There has been clamoring for an investigation of its purpose and organization and its founder, Robert Welch.

XUM

IGNORANCE OR MISUNDERSTANDING

Public ignorance or, at least, misunderstanding may be the cause of accusations that have run the gamut from dictatorship to Klan.

But the Birch Society is neither dictatorial nor a form of the infamous Ku Klux Klan, according to Whittier chapter leaders.

Five of the leaders have compiled a five-part series of articles explaining the aims and objects of the society. The series has been jointly written by Augustine Cervantes, of South Whittier; Joseph Coffman, of La Habra; Raye King, V. C. Ramier, and Joseph Sullivan, all of Whittier.

The first article in the series follows:

HOW TO TELL ONE

J. Edgar Hoover tells us in his book, "Masters of Deceit," that a Communist-front organization can be detected by applying the following test:

1. Does the organization espouse the cause of Soviet Russia? Does it shift when the party line shifts?

2. Does the organization feature as speakers at its meetings known Communists or sympathizers?

3. Does the organization sponsor causes, campaigns, literature, petitions, or other activities sponsored by the party or other front organizations?

4. Is the organization used as a sounding board by, or is it endorsed by Communist-controlled labor unions?

5. Does its literature follow the Communist line or is it printed by the Communist press?

6. Does the organization receive consistent favorable mention in Communist publications?

7. Does the organization represent itself to be nonpartisan yet engage in political activities and consistently advocate causes favored by the Communists? Does it denounce both Fascists and Communists?

8. Does the organization denounce American foreign policy while always lauding Soviet policy?

9. Does the organization utilize Communist doubletalk by referring to Soviet dominated countries as democracies, complaining that the United States is imperialistic and constantly denouncing monopoly capital?

10. Have outstanding leaders in public life openly renounced affiliation with the organization?

ATTRACT OR DENOUNCE?

11. Does the organization, if espousing liberal, progressive causes, attract well-known honest, patriotic liberals or does it denounce well known liberals?

12. Does the organization consistently consider matters not directly related to its avowed purposes and objectives?

Let us assume that the average apathetic but patriotic citizen had just read the above 12 items and decided to apply these measures to the organizations in his circles of acquaintanceship. Would he be able to do so effectively? The answer is obvious. He would need to become trained to apply the above measures intelligently. This then requires a thorough education and background in dialectical materialistic communism. How does one receive this type of education so necessary in our defense against internal subversion?

DIALECTIC MATERIALISM

There are a number of organizations usually local in nature which to a pretty good job of teaching dialectic materialism. However, December 1958 Robert Welch recognized the need for a national organization to train and recruit those already trained into an effective coordinated group. This resulted in the conception of the John Birch Society.

Up until the John Birch Society was organized, well-informed and well-trained patriots more or less worked as individuals or in uncoordinated groups and as such did not worry the Communists except as a nuisance. However, after the origin of the John Birch Society, those thousands of concerned people recognizing their former inadequacy in fighting communism joined the society in such numbers that the Communist Party became alarmed and decided to apply their proven forces against them. It was recognized that at the present rate of growth the John Birch Society could attain almost unlimited power to cope with them and thus destroy 40 years of labor. It should be understood that the present status of Communist power in the United States had, except for a brief but fatal effort by Senator Joseph McCarthy, been reached through almost continuous default on the part of the American people

---

[From the Daily News, Whittier, Calif., Apr. 27, 1961]

CONCERNED SHOULD BECOME INFORMED

(This is the second of a five-part series on the John Birch Society. The articles were jointly written by Augustine Cervantes, Joseph Coffman, Raye King, V. C. Ramler, and Joseph Sullivan, all members of the Whittier chapter of the society.—Editor.)

The John Birch Society has tabulated literally hundreds of documented books, tape recordings and reports which it makes available to members and nonmembers alike which will make informed people out of concerned people.

Communists are not alarmed about concerned people; however, they recognize that informed people are dangerous because they can intelligently inform others.

It is the greatest fear of the Communist Party in the United States that despite their tremendous influence in our Government and over all our means of mass communication, the American people will wake up too soon to what has really been happening right under their very noses.

Communism operates for the most part in this country by utilizing front organization and underground activities.

COMMON ORIGIN

Communist-front organizations are characterized by their common origin, the rigid conformity of these organizations to the Communist pattern, their interlocking personnel and their methods generally used to deceive the American public. Being part of a conspiratorial movement their essence is deceptive.

The tactics of these fronts is to push as far as possible constitutional privileges by enlisting through this deception the cooperation of as great a segment of the public as can be deceived.

When activities of the Communists reach the realm of unconstitutional endeavor then the underground members take over. These activities go so far as to place concealed members in government, education, and industry.

PROPER TRAINING

Only organizations with members who have been properly trained can cope with the pressures brought to bear between these front organizations and those concealed underground. By watching the front groups and their unconcealed programs it is simple logic to connect those places in government, education, and industry where the party line expounded by the front groups receives the greatest reception.

It should be pointed out here that in all localities where the Birch Society is active it is well established in short order by its members and other freedom groups utilizing the above reasoning and J. Edgar Hoover's 12 rules for identifying fronts, where the Communist danger points that need to bear watching are.

However, none of these people or organizations are ever labeled Communist by the society or its members. Instead, a system of defense is set up to reduce to zero the effectiveness of the Communist activity. This is accomplished without fanfare or publicity, thus leaving the subversive group frustrated but aware of who was responsible. Reports of facts as to subversive activities observed are reported to national headquarters where once assembled can point to future trends in the fight.

[From the Daily News, Whittier, Calif., Apr. 29, 1961]

SOVIET PROPAGANDA TECHNIQUE STUDIED

(This is the third article of a five-part series on the John Birch Society written by Rave King, V. C. Ramier and Joseph Sullivan, all leaders of the Whittier chapter; Augustfine Cervantes, South Whittier chapter leader; and Joseph Coffman, La Habra chapter leader.)

Everyone who reads the newspapers or magazines, watches television or listens to the radio is aware of the recent great volume of adverse publicity spewing forth against the John Birch Society and its founder Robert Welch.

This is a special type of treatment reserved by the Communist conspiracy for special people or groups that have been really effective and which they cannot directly infiltrate or subvert.

An informative pamphlet printed in the U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., on instructions from the 86th Congress, 2d session, entitled "The Technique of Soviet Propaganda" should be read by every man and woman in the United States.

This report is an official document of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. The purpose of the report was relative to the administration of the Internal Security Act and other internal security laws.

PRESS INVADED

Quoting from page 6 (a) of the Judiciary Committee report as follows:

"There are in the world few organs of the press, even when bourgeois, in which the Soviet apparatus has no intelligence. The main task of auxiliaries in the press is to manipulate the editor, or if that is not feasible, the reporters, without the editor's knowledge. General notions like 'This paper is conservative' or 'Catholic' are not at all sufficient any longer to recognize the policy it follows toward Moscow. Sometimes the managers themselves are unaware that their newspaper is 'permeated.'"

PROPAGANDA PURPOSE

Quoting further (from p. 14) of the Senate Judiciary Committee report under the heading "Breaking Anti-Communists: Slander, Intimidation, Kidnaping, Murder.":

"An important task of Soviet propaganda is not only to circumvent the gullible, but also to reduce those who clearly realize the danger and zealously proclaim it to a state of powerlessness. Against these people are launched campaigns limitless in intensity as in ignominy. The Communists attempt to make lepers of them, to develop veritable reflexes in public opinion so that a halo of hatred will be instinctively associated with their name.

"Communist and crypto-Communist apparatus put all their ammunition to use in this task and shrink from neither slander nor provocation, forgery, nor blackmail. Here auxiliaries play a leading role: that of scandalmongers.

"Sometimes the Soviet apparatus will denounce an anti-Communist as an underground Communist. Sometimes they will lead the police to believe that he is a terrorist or a trafficker. Slander against the anti-Communist writer Victor Serge reached such a point that even well-disposed police services no longer knew what to think."

ACCUSE OTHERS

"The apparatus of Moscow said that Leon Blum was a police auxiliary and purveyor of convicts, charges De Gaulle with having worked for German intelligence, and Soustelle with being a Nazi spy; Syngman Rhee with having sold his country to Japan (charges to be found in the Soviet Encyclopedia or signed by leaders like Maurize Thorez.)

"One of the worst infamies has just been flung at Guy Mollet: he has been accused of nothing less than having denounced people interned with him to the Gestapo. Essentially, these and similar attacks are fabrications from beginning to end; devoid of any foundation and made in the full knowledge that they constitute unmitigated lies.

"In the easygoing atmosphere of the democracies, the endless repetition of abusive attacks has a devastating effect. Indeed, it is not too much to say that there are few people who, having become the target for Communist attacks, did not eventually either lose heart or become suspect themselves to world public opinion," the Senate Judiciary Committee report says.

Economic Hashish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Economic Hashish," published in the Wall Street Journal of May 15, 1961.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMIC HASHISH

Sometimes the statistical theorizings of economists get so involved they're funny. But when the economic policies of the U.S. Government come to be based on woozy theories, the thing ceases to be a joke.

We have in mind the President's Council of Economic Advisers, which has propounded an elaborate theory of an "output gap" between the economy potential and its actual performance. The theory, described on this page recently by Mr. Otten, is a masterpiece of algebraic triple talk. It is designed to prove a gap, reckoned at $40 billion at the end of last year, and so it does—assuming all its assumptions and mathematics.

Having "demonstrated" the gap, the Council logically concludes that the country faces not only temporary economic problems like the recession now evaporating, but a persistent slack in production and employment, a slowdown in our rate of growth. We have, it seems, a problem of chronic slack in the economy—the growing gap between what we can produce and what we do produce. Especially since 1955, we learn, the gap has shown a distressing upward trend.

If this were all just idle chatter, no one would particularly mind. But this great and growing output gap naturally becomes part of the justification for the Federal Government to fill it—with the tremendous new domestic spending the administration has already embarked on and with the even more massive public-works spending it has in mind. And since the slack is persistent and chronic, the Government has an excuse for trying to take it up indefinitely.

Fortunately the United States still has respected economists who can recognize economic hashish when they smell it. One such is Columbia Prof. Arthur Burns, himself a former chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers. Mildly but nonetheless devastatingly Dr. Burns has taken apart the gap his successors have so painfully constructed out of thin air.

Among other things, Dr. Burns shows that the Council is not relying on sound, far-reaching historical evidence in projecting its output gap. It rests its case importantly on the fact that unemployment at the business cycle peak in 1960 was slightly higher than at the business cycle peak in 1957. The Columbia economist suggests that this "gives fragile support" to the theory that "the gap between actual and potential output has a distressing upward trend."

Moreover, Professor Burns quietly notes that it matters a good deal at what period you start drawing a curve of potential output. The Council chose mid-1955, for no more valid reason than it could have chosen the second quarter of 1957 or the second quarter of 1947—all periods of high employment. If the Council economists had chosen 1957, their own reckonings would show a gap of only $20 billion instead of $40 billion.

And, Dr. Burns goes on, "if the curve had been started in the second quarter of 1947, when we likewise had a full-employment output, the gap would have vanished. In fact, we would then have to say that actual output in 1960 exceeded potential output by more than $2 billion."

We hope the Council has the grace to say "touche" to that.

But perhaps the most significant part of the Burns analysis is not in exposing the Council's statistical juggling to prove the point it wanted to prove. There is also the attitude behind such "output gap" theorizing. It is reminiscent of the dominant economic thinking of the thirties, which was that the U.S. economy had become stagnant or mature and therefore required increasingly heavy Federal spending to keep it going.

That theory was proved resoundingly false by events, but here it is again in different form, once again an alibi for massive Federal intervention. The urge to control the private economy never dies.

Not many of us are trained in the intricacies of economic theory, but it takes only commonsense to see through the Council's unamusing fun and games. We hope the President and Congress are not bemused by the latter-day stagnation theorists. Otherwise some of these people may at last succeed in bringing about Government-managed economic stagnation.

Castro Shows True Color

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, our attention has been naturally concentrated on the reoccurring problems with the Soviet stooge, Castro, in Cuba. On many occasions I have directed the attention of the Members to the grassroots thinking of the American public as expressed in our local newspapers throughout the country. One of the outstanding weekly newspapers in my district, the Park Forest Reporter, on Wednesday, May 3, presented an editorial entitled, "Castro Shows True Color." It is truly "Main Street, America" thinking and worthy of our serious study.

CASTRO SHOWS TRUE COLOR

Our hemisphere neighbor, Cuba, officially turned Red this week. Fidel Castro took advantage of the May Day celebration to announce that his nation has gone Socialist.

Whatever the name, it's merely a synonym for communism. Cuba is now another link in the orbit of Soviet satellites. Some of the weak and misinformed still say, "so what"?

The announced status of this Nation only 90 miles from our shores can have tremendous repercussions in this Western Hemisphere.

Other Latin American countries are vulnerable to the same type of revolutions which brought Castro to power. In the eyes of their poor and ignorant, which comprise the masses of these backward nations, Fidel has become a Spanish speaking hero. His denunciations of the United States are not beamed for our ears, mainly for theirs.

His boasts give this uneasy populace courage. The taunts that he has held the mighty Yanquis at bay, are echoed through the hills of the Andes and across the broad expanse of Central and South American lands.

Beyond any doubt, his presence is a serious handicap to the future peace of our hemisphere. By outlawing elections, which although meaningless are even held in Russia, he is carving an ignoble niche for himself among the political tyrants of all time.

Fidel's actions bear even greater scrutiny now. Our administration's attention to this problem and its aftereffects is certainly warranted at this time.

Expert Offers Moon in 2½ Years—The Development of a Superrocket

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the U.S. defense program received a big shot in the arm early this year when the first Minuteman missile achieved complete operational success on its first firing at Cape Canaveral. This marked the first time in history that a missile had performed perfectly on its maiden flight.

Another historical first might be achieved for the United States if the administration takes action on the recommendations of Dr. Harold Ritchey, vice president of the Thiokol Chemical Corp. which produces the first stage of the Minuteman. Dr. Ritchey recently appeared before the House Science and Astronautics Committee and testified that if Congress would provide the necessary funds, the United States could have a man on the moon within 2½ years. This feat would be accomplished by clustering a number of solid-fuel rockets produced by the Thiokol Co., and which, according to Dr. Ritchey, are capable of developing up to 21 million pounds of thrust sufficient to power manned flights to the moon, or to other planets and return.

XUM

Mr. President, I have urged the administration to approve plans for development of this superrocket proposed by the Thiokol Chemical Corp. This concept apparently offers our best chance to overtake the Russians in the field of manned space flights, and can be accomplished at far less cost than several alternative plans. I sincerely hope that the administration will not delay in making a decision on this important matter because the United States has the know-how and capability to surpass the Russians in the development and use of outer space if we do not let this opportunity slip from our grasp.

Mr. Cliff Thompson, reporter on defense matters, had an excellent story in the April 16, 1961, issue of the Ogden Standard Examiner, which presents a concise review of the Thiokol proposal and an analysis of other space projects presently under development by NASA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the article by Mr. Thompson.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DRASTIC OVERHAUL NEEDED—EXPERT OFFERS MOON IN 2½ YEARS

(By Cliff Thompson)

There is a serious doubt in the mind of at least one of the Nation's rocket experts that the United States can overtake the Russians in space with its present program.

He is Dr. Harold W. Ritchey, Thiokol Chemical Corp. vice president, who has proposed a development program he says will give the United States rocket power to duplicate the Russian man-in-orbit feat within 9 months and put an American on the moon in 2½ years.

His program calls for a drastic overhaul and redirection of the present U.S. program for space travel and exploration. And it, naturally, is based on the use of solid fuel Thiokol used so successfully in the Minuteman program.

The spectacular success of the Minuteman missile earlier this year gives added weight to the Thiokol proposals. Thiokol engineering and production staffs produced the large first stage of the Minuteman, the largest solid propellant booster flight tested to date.

CHALKED UP "FIRST"

It was the first missile to perform perfectly on its maiden flight and also marked the first time all stages of a multistage rocket were used in an initial flight test.

Dr. Ritchey outlined details of his proposals to this reporter during an interview in the Thiokol Rocket Operations Center here from which he directs the firm's vast research program.

He began with a briefing on the current U.S. space program which he said "is not designed to do what we have to do to catch the Russians."

"We have developed the technology to leapfrog the Russians in space but we are not using it," Dr. Ritchey said. "If we started right now using all our scientific potential, the United States-Russian race to the moon would be extremely close." If the United States continues its present program, he expects the Russians to beat us to the moon by 4 or 5 years.

The U.S. space timetable has an American scheduled to arrive on the moon in 1970. Dr. Ritchey expects the Russians to have a man there before 1965.

FIRST TO MOON

And he believes the first nation to the moon probably never would be overtaken in the race deeper and deeper into the outer regions of the universe.

Dr. Ritchey says the big U.S. effort must be made in the first, or booster, stage if we are to catch the Soviets.

The first, or booster, stage along with two or three additional stages would put a vehicle into orbit or into escape velocity. In the manned space vehicle, the stages above the booster would be used to maneuver the vehicle in space and return it to earth.

In previous space shots, all stages have been used to put a payload into orbit, primarily because of the lack of a booster that can develop sufficient thrust to lift the necessary loads.

Most space authorities agree the United States is ahead of Russia in most space fields except the large boosters necessary to lift large boosters necessary to lift large payloads into orbit or escape velocity. "Possibly we also lag in our knowledge of how to keep men alive for extended periods in space," Dr. Ritchey said.

LARGE BOOSTERS

The Russian superiority in large boosters can be traced to the different approach the two nations took in overcoming the first big problem encountered in their initial space programs.

When the United States and Russia began space-missile programs at the end of the World War II, the payloads developed were too large for the rockets they were then capable of producing.

The United States refined its payloads to a size compatable with its rocket power. The Russians concentrated on building rockets powerful enough for the big payloads.

To offset the Russian lead in rocket power, the United States needs a dramatic breakthrough in its big booster program—both in size of the booster and the time it takes to get it ready for use.

Thiokol has four proposals to provide these big boosters.

The first and simplest is the one Dr. Ritchey says would give the United States the rocket power to surpass last week's Russian space flight.

CLUSTER OF SEVEN

By clustering seven slightly modified versions of the Minuteman, Dr. Ritchey says, the United States would have a booster capable of putting 25,000 pounds into orbit. This is about twice the size of the Russian payload.

Dr. Richey said Thiokol can develop this propulsion system in 9 months. He estimates its cost at about $1½ million per copy in production quantities.

Thiokol also proposes using the Minuteman principle to produce larger rockets that could be clustered in sevens to develop 21 million pounds of thrust. This system could put 300,000 pounds into orbit or 120,000 pounds into the velocity needed to send a man to the Moon.

Dr. Ritchey reports this booster can be ready for test firing in 18 months and for actual manned space flight within 30 months. The intervening 12 months, he said, would be used in working on the booster and in development of the rest of the vehicle. It is possible the 12-month period could be reduced.

PROPULSION PROBLEMS

The other Thiokol proposals are for different sized rocket boosters using the Minuteman principle.

"Of course I am talking only about the propulsion problems," Dr. Ritchey said. "There are others."

Primarily these involve the development of the vehicle and guidance controls that would take a man into space and back including the protection needed to keep a man alive in space for extended periods of time.

The producer of the propulsion system and the space vehicle would have to work together closely.

The United States is currently pinning its hopes for space travel on three programs:

The first American is expected to go into space sometime this year powered by a Redstone rocket. This plan calls for sending an astronaut some 100 miles or so into the air and back—not put him into orbit.

LIQUID FUEL

The Saturn, a cluster of eight liquid fuel rockets, is expected to be ready in about 3 years. In power and objective this booster compares to the rocket Thiokol says it can develop in 9 months.

The F-1 rocket, a single engine that would develop 1½ million pounds of thrust, expected to take 6 years to develop and test. The F-1 timetable has been delayed, however, because of severe technological problems.

The Nova project in which Dr. Werner Von Braun proposes to cluster four F-1 rockets to produce 6 million pounds of thrust. This project has not been funded and is considered too expensive to begin until after 1965.

National Aeronautics and Space Administration officials are basing their hopes for space travel primarily on the Saturn program.

ASSEMBLY IN SPACE

Dr. Von Braun proposes using six Saturn launchings to send equipment and fuel into orbit from which a space vehicle would be assembled for further travel.

Rocket authorities say this plan has two significant drawbacks—time and cost.

It would cost about $120 million just to build the six first stage booster rockets necessary to send an unassembled spaceship into orbit with the Saturn. Cost of the Thiokol proposal to develop one super rocket capable of sending a vehicle into escape velocity from earth is estimated at $12 million.

And rocket experts say the problems of assembling a ship while its pieces are floating around in space would be tremendous.

The John Birch Society—2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I have had printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for today three articles of a series of five relative to the John Birch Society which have appeared in the Daily News, a widely circulated newspaper in the area of Whittier, Calif. My district includes this area. The articles are commendable for their objectivity. Under unanimous consent I include the remaining articles of the series in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Whittier (Calif.) Daily News, May 2, 1961]

SOME RELUCTANT TO BE ANTI-COMMUNIST

(This is the fourth article of a five-part series on the John Birch Society written by Joseph Sullivan, V. C. Ramler, and Rave King, Whittier chapter leaders; Joseph Coffman and Augustine Cervantes, La Habra and South Whittier chapter leaders respectively.—EDITOR.)

Some democratic Americans have been trying to convince themselves "that there is something reprehensible in being a sys-

tematic anti-Communist, according to a report of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

Quoting from the report, made relative to the administration of the Internal Security Act and other internal security laws, the following is learned:

"The struggle against convinced anti-Communists proceeds from simple premises. The effectiveness of this struggle is due to the fact that it goes on relentlessly and in practically every key. The struggle is marked by the use of a vocabulary including such terms of abuse as "rightist," "Fascist," "negative elements," "dim wit," "police informer," "systematic anti-Communists." This last expletive is the highest form of abuse. And yet quite a few democratic Americans have been trying to convince themselves that there is something reprehensible in being a systematic anti-Communist, forgetting that they take pride in being systematically anti-Fascists.

What's more, they see nothing incongruous in the Communists being systematically antidemocratic. And it is difficult to see how a systematic evil can be fought in any other way than by systematic opposition. This simple truth has not been lost on the Communists. Indeed, one of the main tasks of Communist propaganda is to maintain an atmosphere of constant denigration and criticism of consistent anticommunism.

UNHEARD OF SITUATION

"The success achieved by the Communists in this particular field has been such that a truly unheard-of situation has come about in the Western world, in which anticommunism is often regarded as a greater evil than communism. When one of the parties in a relentless and merciless struggle discovers that it is considered bad form to fight back with the same weapons, it goes without saying that their opponents have scored a major victory in the battle of propaganda which aims at nothing less than the intellectual intimidation of those opponents.

Such intimidation, moreover, thrives on its own effects. So far as serious and enlightened circles keep silent, they leave stigmaticizing communism to reactionary extremists alone; the contention anticommunism equals reaction thus seem confirmed; and serious and enlightened circles keep more silent than ever. McCarthy cast such discredit on exposing cryptocommunism that it is now no longer possible to accuse some body of it without being called a witch hunter. Yet it is quite sure that cryptocommunism did not disappear by magic with McCarthy.

THEY MURDER THEM

When intimidation does not succeed in crushing the counterpropaganda of some particularly prominent anti-Communist, the Soviets do not shrink from crime to silence their voices. They murder them (Trotsky, Krivitsky, Nin, etc.) or kidnap them (Trushnovitch).

This is the first time the Communists have been brazen enough to publicly take on more than 50,000 dedicated, informed and deadly serious constitutional Americans. They can't slander, intimidate, kidnap or murder us all. This they must do to succeed.

By now in this article most readers can pretty well recognize that the John Birch Society is neither Fascist, Nazi or anti anything except anti-Communist. The organization while not of democratic form (for security reasons) is dedicated to the maintenance of a constitutional republican form of government in the United States forever. The society doesn't want to overthrow anybody except Communists and at the same time the society doesn't like to be labeled as conspirators because it is anti-Communist.

We are perfectly willing to be investigated by any American committee and we ask all good citizens to withhold judgment until the verdict is in. We still believe in the jury system, which is more than can be said for Russia or the satellite countries.

[From the Whittier (Calif.) Daily News, May 2, 1961]

HERE'S A TYPICAL MEETING OF CHAPTER

(Last article of a five-part series on the John Birch Society)

A typical meeting of a chapter in the John Birch Society is run by the chapter leader, usually on Roberts' Rules of Order. The meeting is always opened by the pledge of allegiance and a simple nonsectarian prayer. A verbal report is then taken from each member if he has one to offer. There is no pressure put on any member to perform any of the society's activities.

The monthly bulletin is then discussed. This bulletin is distributed from the national home office in Belmont, Mass., and is prepared by the group's founder, Robert Welch. The bulletin contains suggested activities such as new books, reports, or pamphlets to be read, letters to write and activities to perform such as checking on public libraries to determine whether or not pro-American and anti-Communist books are available to the public.

It is usual to have open discussion on topics of the day and to compare notes on experiences. Sometimes a motion picture, still slide pictures or tapes will be shown or played depicting or lecturing on Communist activities to which we should be alerted.

A FOOL OR A COMMUNIST

Only a fool or a Communist will deny that some people in every community are actively engaged in forming peace movements, urging disarmament, protesting loyalty oaths and the existence of Government investigating agencies. They are also in the churches shouting brotherly love and love for God, yet protest to the schools, the nativity scene on Christmas, saying grace at meals, and prohibit showing "Operation Abolition" in the church.

Now the John Birch Society doesn't call them Communists but society members do make it a point to see to it that these people don't have a free hand in running our community. Where good American principles require, we effectively oppose these activities. It should be recognized that where liberal groups organize for pressure tactics that conservatives have only one alternative and that is to react and if necessary to resist. These things work two ways.

FOR THE DUBIOUS

For those who may still be dubious and state that they are unconvinced that an organization like the John Birch Society is necessary, it should be pointed out that there are a number of good reports and books available which will convince even the most skeptical of individuals.

These are all well documented. They are:

1. "The Blue Book of the John Birch Society."
2. "The Naked Communist," Cleon Skousen.
3. "Masters of Deceit," J. Edgar Hoover.
4. "The Enemy at His Back," Elizabeth Churchill Brown.
5. "You Can Trust the Communists," Dr. Fred Schwartz.
6. "Retreat From Victory," Senator Joseph McCarthy.
7. "Nine Men Against America," Rosalie M. Gordon.
8. "Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications," House Document 226, 85th Congress, 1st session.
9. "Report on the Southern California District of the Communist Party, Structure—Objectives—Leadership," House Report No. 259, 86th Congress, 1st session.
10. "Communist Illusion and Democratic Reality," J. Edgar Hoover, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Washington 25, D.C.
11. "Crusade Against Governmental Investigating Agencies," Institute for Special Research, Post Office Box 2022 D, Pasadena, Calif.
12. "The Left Swing in Education," Institute for Special Research, Post Office Box 2022 D, Pasadena, Calif.

Abraham Lincoln said, "You can fool all the people some of the time and you can fool some of the people all the time but you can't fool all the people all the time." The Communists are spending in excess of $2 billion a year to prove Abraham Lincoln wrong. It was a mighty shock to them to find that you can't fool a member of the John Birch Society any of the time. They are too well informed, a fact for which the American people should give thanks.

A Revised Democracy for United States—Need for Quick Action in Cold War Called Basis for Central Control Trend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. BROMWELL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, on March 16 of this year the Washington Evening Star published an ominous editorial article by Mr. Constantine Brown.

Since the date of that publication I have observed with increasing apprehension a course of events which support the thesis which is stated. This course of events is summarized in substance in the extension of remarks of Congressman BRUCE ALGER, which appeared on page A3441 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 16, 1961. All Americans who love freedom should pause to consider this matter, and consider it well.

I now submit the editorial to which I have referred.

A REVISED DEMOCRACY FOR UNITED STATES—NEED FOR QUICK ACTION IN COLD WAR CALLED BASIS FOR CENTRAL CONTROL TREND

(By Constantine Brown)

Democracies tailored after the old pattern no longer can stand the impact of social, economic and political changes wrought by two devastating world wars and an even more damaging cold war created by international communism. In the new world in which we are going to live henceforth, so contend some of the top "New Frontiersmen" of the present administration, a corrected form of democracy is needed: It must take the shape of a highly centralized government which can deal quickly with all problems, domestic and international, without waiting for the ponderous parliamentary machinery to debate and decide what is to be done.

In other words, the basic political thinking of the leaders of the new administration is to strive to convert our present form of government into what has been known for some time on other continents as managed democracy. The basic civil rights of the individual are left intact. The responsibility for their well-being, however, is placed in the hands of a highly centralized government with one man holding the power of decision:

XUM

a modern version of the famous slogan of the French King Louis XIV, "I am the state."

The intellectual explanation for this effort to change surreptitiously or overtly from the old-fashioned and time-tried American system of government is being explained in the following manner. The basic parliamentary form of government cannot protect the peoples of this country in the face of the ruthless and powerful form of dictatorship which has been established in the Soviet Union and Communist China. The consequences of the cold war have demonstrated this axiomatically. Hence, to cope with the new order in the world, a number of western leaders are concentrating all powers into their own hands as the most effective means of meeting the Red global drive.

The spectacular success of Gen. Charles de Gaulle, who has changed the face of France in less than 3 years and transformed that nearly bankrupt nation into one of the most powerful in the Western World, seems to have inspired to a certain extent the thinking of the high priests of our New Frontier theory.

There is, however, a fundamental difference between the modern French chanticleer and President Kennedy. The 70-year-old general-statesman is the actual voice of France. He has been elected to guide the destinies of La Patrie by an overwhelming vote of confidence of more than two-thirds of his fellow citizens. The individualistic French have indorsed his ideas of managed democracy with the result that the traditionally powerful French parliamentary system is reduced to a rubber stamp.

Mr. Kennedy was elected with a flimsy majority of a little over 100,000 votes out of 67 million ballots cast last November. His thinking fully harmonizes with the 10 or 12 advisers in the White House who have been dubbed "the apostles." He is Chief Executive in the full meaning of the words in as far as the people of this country are concerned, and provides a much-needed dynamism which has been so lacking in the Eisenhower administration. His philosophy is not his own, however. His political evolution is the result of the inspiration he has derived from the thinking of the theoreticians and the professors who have been advising him in the past and are now surrounding him in the White House. The thinking of "the apostles" is contained in books, magazine articles, speeches and lectures written over the last 10 years. They all have the same common denominator: welfare state at home and preparing the path for "one world."

Automation, the dramatic stride in science, and "population explosion," it is argued by the advocates of the welfare state, make our past way of life and free enterprise obsolescent. To give the masses enjoyment in the new way of life the Government must step in by regulating, planning, and assisting the peoples. In international endeavors the United States, which has assumed voluntarily the leadership of the free world, must abandon gradually its past policies of resisting with force or "containing" international communism. It must leave no stone unturned to bring about a relaxation of tension with the Red tyranny and spare no effort to achieve coexistence lest "80 million Americans" lose their lives in a nuclear conflict.

This is a firm and one may say immutable conviction on the part of "the apostles" and is being shared fully by the dynamic Chief Executive himself. Henceforth we must expect all initiative, all decisions and all policies to stem from the White House alone.

Import Competition and American Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I have had made a major study of the effects of imports and exports on employment of American workers. I have submitted it to the Subcommittee on the Impact of Imports and Exports on American Employment of the House Education and Labor Committee.

I am ranking minority member of the subcommittee.

The chairman of the subcommittee, Congressman JOHN H. DENT, considered this study so important that he has made copies of the study available to each member of the subcommittee which he heads.

It is being used as the basic tract of the subcommittee at this point in its own work.

The study was made by Dr. Howard Piquet, senior specialist in international economics of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

Dr. Piquet is well-known, and is highly thought of by Members of the Congress.

I include as part of my remarks an excerpt from this study:

IMPORT COMPETITION AND SMALL BUSINESS

(By Dr. Howard S. Piquet)

There is no question about the potential advantages of free trade from the point of view of "pure economics." If trade were free everywhere and if each country were to specialize in producing the goods in which it has the greatest comparative advantage, relative to other countries, productivity everywhere would be greater and economic resources would be utilized more effectively than they now are.

If all the goods that can be produced in a country are listed in order of descending comparative advantage the products heading the list in each instance would be those that are exported. These are the products that can be produced most efficiently relative to other countries. In the United States, where land and other natural resources are relatively abundant but where labor, normally, is relatively scarce, the list would be headed by such mass-produced goods as office machinery, many kinds of industrial equipment, certain types of electrical machinery, road-building and other construction equipment, automobiles, and agricultural machinery.

At the lower end of the list would be a relatively small number of products requiring considerable labor to produce, such as: china tableware, hand-blown glassware, certain electronic products, and hardwood plywood. Somewhere between the two extremes would be goods in the production of which comparative advantage is less clear, such as certain wood and paper products.

The advantage of the United States lies largely in the production of goods that can be produced in quantity by automatic, or near-automatic, machinery. Such goods are produced under the principle of decreasing unit cost and require large fixed overhead. These are the industries in which large size is an advantage.

The lines of production in which the United States is at a comparative disadvantage are those usually characterized as small business, many of which involve a high proportion of labor cost. These are the industries that are most hard pressed by import competition.

Around the turn of the 20th century Mr. H. O. Havemeyer, the sugar magnate, said: "The tariff is the mother of the trusts." Whether or not the tariff then facilitated monopoly, it certainly is not an important factor in this respect today. At the present time most large businesses, such as petroleum and steel, are liberal trade minded. Their operations are worldwide and they oppose interference by government. The tariff has become more significant as an instrument for protecting small business.

There can be little doubt that, if the United States were to adopt a thorough-going policy of free trade, a number of small businesses would be hard hit. Certain marginal firms, and in some cases entire industries, would not be able to withstand the resulting low-cost foreign competition. This is one of the troublesome facts that must be faced regardless of one's theoretical convictions regarding the desirability of freer international trade conducted along multilateral lines. Removal of tariff protection and the consequent stimulation of imports would have the effect of accelerating the concentration of industrial power in the United States.

INDUSTRIES THAT HAVE APPLIED FOR RELIEF UNDER THE ESCAPE CLAUSE

Congress has provided machinery for affording relief to industries that have been seriously injured by, or that are threatened by serious injury from, increased import competition resulting from concessions made in trade agreements with other countries. It seems reasonable to assume that industries that have not appealed to the Tariff Commission for relief under this provision of law, or that have failed to supply the Tariff Commission with data adequate to enable them to reach a decision as to the existence of injury, are not suffering serious injury from import competition.

Even a cursory examination of the list of industries that have applied for relief under the escape clause (sec. 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended) discloses that few, if any, of them could be regarded as big business. Typical of the products concerning which it is complained that imports have been seriously injurious are: women's fur-felt hats and hat bodies, garlic, tobacco pipes and bowls, screen-printed silk scarves, scissors and shears, groundfish fillets, and bicycles. Nowhere in the list does one find such typically large-scale industries as bulk chemicals, automobiles, heavy iron and steel-mill products, office machinery, or agricultural implements.

Since the escape clause was enacted, 69 industries, or segments of industries, have applied for relief from injurious import competition. Of these, the Tariff Commission found "serious injury" or "threat of serious injury" to exist in 25. In 36 industries it found no serious injury, or threat of serious injury, and in the remaining 8 it either terminated the investigation because the complaining companies failed to provide adequate factual data or dismissed the investigation at the request of the applicants.

Keeping in mind that each of the really large industries in the United States employs a veritable army of workers (the Ford Motor

Co. employs 160,000; the United States Steel Corp., 200,000; and General Motors, 55,000) it is evident that the industries that have appealed for relief from import competition under the escape clause, for the most part, are the smaller industries of the country. None of them is in the big business category. Even in those cases where the number of employees in the industry as a whole is sizable (such as lead and zinc, watches, women's fur-felt hats and stainless steel table flatware) the industry consists of a large number of units no one of which can be characterized as big business.

Table 1 lists the industries that either have been seriously injured, or threatened by serious injury, according to the findings of the Tariff Commission. Eighteen of the 25 industries listed employed slightly more than 65,000 workers. It is probable that the number of workers employed by all 25 of the industries on the list was not in excess of 90,000 workers. Although the figures are not all for the same year, ranging as they do from 1950 to 1960, there is no reason to believe that the figures for any one year would be any greater, or that the proportion of workers in the country as a whole who are seriously affected by import competition would be any greater.

TABLE 1.—*Industries which have been found by the U.S. Tariff Commission to be "seriously injured" or "threatened by serious injury" under the escape clause*

Industry	Number of workers	Year	Other indication of size
Hard-fiber cords and twines	[1]	1959	Production, 19,000,000 pounds.
Binding and baler twine	[1]	1959	Production, 100,000,000 pounds.
Cotton typewriter ribbon	2,750	1959	5 producers.
Tartaric acid	[1]	1959	2 small companies.
Clinical thermometers	316	1959	
Umbrella frames	486	1958	
Stainless steel table flatware	3,057	1958	
Spring clothespins	388	1959	
Alsike cloverseed	[1]	1955	Approximately 15,000 acres of land on 280 farms.
Groundfish fillets	2,300	1956	Crewmen and filleting operations.
Safety pins	1,200	1960	
Straight pins	282	1955	
Violins and violas	30	1956	
Toweling of flax	[1]	----	Only 1 producer; 700,000 pounds per annum.
Para-aminosalicylic acid	63	1955	
Fluorspar	736	1955	
Lighter flints (ferrocerium)	[1]	----	Only 2 producers.
Bicycles and parts	3,261	1959	
Watches:			
Pin-lever	4,012	1958	
Jeweled	4,107	1960	
Screen-printed silk scarves	403	1952	
Tobacco pipes and bowls	1,300	1952	
Dried figs	[1]	1955	45,000,000 pounds produced on 29,700 acres.
Women's fur-felt hats and hat bodies.	3,817	1950	
Lead and zinc	36,961	1954	Mines, smelters and mills.
Total (for 18 industries providing employment data).	[2] 65,469		

[1] Not available.
[2] Employment figures not given for hard-fiber cords and twines, binding and baler twine, tartaric acid, alsike clover seed, toweling of flax, lighter flints, and dried figs.

Source: Tabulated by the Legislative Reference Service from escape clause reports issued by the U.S. Tariff Commission.

Table 2 lists the industries that have appealed for relief under the escape clause but whose appeals were rejected by the Tariff Commission on the basis that no serious injury, or threat of serious injury, could be found.

TABLE 2.—*Industries whose claims of "serious injury" or "threat of serious injury" under the escape clause were rejected by the U.S. Tariff Commission*

Industry	Number of workers	Year	Other indication of size
Ultramarine blue	253	1960	
Women's and children's leather gloves.	3,400	1960	15 producers.
Barbed wire	218	1954	
Typewriters	13,000	1958	
Lamb, mutton and sheep	[1]	1960	272,000 farms on 250,000 of which fewer than 100 sheep each.
Iron ore	32,000	1960	Mining and beneficiating.
Cast-iron fittings for soil pipe	3,800	1959	
Zinc sheet	265	1959	
Hatters' fur	388	1960	
Calf and kip leather	3,300	1959	
Handmade blown glassware	3,480	1957	15 plants.
Mink skins	1,424	1958	Full-time workers.
	2,755	1958	Part-time workers.
Wilton and brussels carpets and rugs.	9,500	1959	
Axes and axheads	265	1958	
Scissors and shears	2,300	1957	17 concerns.
Hardwood plywood	14,300	1958	
Red fescue seed	[1]	1959	34,200 acres.
Garlic	[1]	1958	120 growers (10 principal ones).
Barium chloride	48	1958	Only 2 plants.
Nonwoven wool, felts	[1]	1958	11 producers.
Certain jute fabrics	203	1956	
Dressed rabbit furs	400	1955	10 producers.
Cotton pillowcases	15,444	1956	17 producers.
Animal glue	2,143	1953	
Coconuts	[1]	1954	Affects Puerto Rico.
Ground chicory	35	1953	
Pregnant mare's urine (medicinal)	[1]	1953	Output valued at $190,000.
Mustard seeds	[1]	1950	111 farms.
Chalk whiting	Under 100	1953	
Woodwind musical instruments	1,150	1951	
Cotton carding machinery	[1]	1953	Increased imports a "temporary condition."
Rosaries:			
Full time (estimated)	75	1952	
Part time in Puerto Rico	200	1952	
Metal watch bracelets	5,000	1952	
Bonito and tunafish (not in oil)	[1]	1950	Production valued at $61,000,000.
Motorcycles and parts	[1]	1951	Production $9,000,000.
Household china tableware	[2]	1950	
Total (for 26 industries providing employment data).	[3] 123,946		

[1] Not available.
[2] Estimated.
[3] Employment figures not given for lamb, mutton, and sheep; red fescue seed; garlic; nonwoven wool felts; coconuts; pregnant mare's urine; mustard seeds; cotton-carding machinery; bonito and tunafish (not in oil); and motorcycles and parts.

Source: Tabulated by the Legislative Reference Service from escape clause report issued by the U.S. Tariff Commission.

America's Position in the Space Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interview between Merwin G. Fairbanks, a veteran Salt Lake newspaperman, and Dr. Harold W. Ritchey, president of the American Rocket Society, concerning America's position in the space race.

Because Dr. Ritchey is one of the Nation's foremost experts on rockets, I believe these views are particularly noteworthy. As Dr. Ritchey emphasizes, we are not doing all we could in the space race, and we are particularly neglecting the possibility of a major breakthrough which might come with a relatively small additional expenditure in the field of solid fuel rockets.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROCKET EXPERT OFFERS VIEWS—UNITED STATES CAN CATCH UP

(By Merwin G. Fairbanks, Deseret News staff writer)

Loss of prestige and national security require a reevaluation of America's race into space.

Even if the next man-in-space [Mercury] shoot is successful late in June, the United

States has been conceded only second-place honors in space exploration by most nations of the world.

Where, then, should the emphasis be placed to overcome our spacelag and take the spotlight from Russian success?

Some answers were provided Friday in an exclusive interview with the president of the American Rocket Society, Dr. Harold W. Ritchey. Dr. Ritchey, among other things, points out:

1. This country has not made use of all its technological knowledge in the exploration of space.

2. The military expediency of space dominance must not be overlooked.

3. A 25-percent increase in annual expenditures would soon carry the Nation to the fore in space exploration. Solid rocket fuels could play a leading part in this program.

Dr. Ritchey also is vice president and director of rocket operation for Thiokol Chemical Corp., producers of first-stage, solid-fuel rockets for the Minuteman ICBM. Thiokol also built the liquid fuel motor which propelled the X-15 to manned craft speed and altitude records.

Here are Dr. Ritchey's observations, made from his rocket operations center office in Ogden:

Question. If the U.S. space exploration program now being carried out is not intensely stepped up, will we ever catch the Russians?

Answer. Based on demonstrated capability, we are lagging seriously behind the Russians in our ability to lift large loads into space. This lag is related to our lack of high-thrust boosters for first-stage application. There are indications that we are also lagging in our knowledge of how to sustain human beings for long periods of time in the hostile environment of space. It could very well be that we are lagging both in our ability to build large boosters and in our ability to build the payloads which they would carry.

Question. Are we far enough advanced to talk in terms of space stations when we have only put a man in the fringes of space?

Answer. We should indeed talk about space stations and we should be laying firm plans for establishing manned space stations as well as laying plans for manned exploration of the moon and the adjacent planets. Our technology is at this point, nowhere near far enough advanced to accomplish many of these things. Pinpointing the problems and then taking aggressive action to solve them is the only way in which we will ever make progress.

Question. Could the Russians deceive us about orbiting a man in a space capsule?

Answer. It is possible that the Russians could deceive us about some of their space accomplishments. All past experience has indicated that they've never attempted to deceive us in any way about what they have accomplished. On the other hand, there are several indications that they have been very quiet about any failures that they might have experienced.

Question. If stress were put on development of a giant booster, what would we lift with it?

Answer. With giant first-stage boosters capable of lifting heavy loads, we would be able to launch upper stages and payloads of sufficient size to accomplish much more effective space exploration, including the use of manned vehicles. For example, landing a manned vehicle and returning it from the moon would require achieving escape velocity of a weight probably well over 100,000 pounds. This is over 10 times the load that we can now project to escape velocity. Even heavier loads may be required for deep space missions to the adjacent planets. In addition, it is highly probable that military missions will be needed in space; the nation which has the most powerful engines will be able to project the most effective combat equipment into the combat zone.

Question. Has America capitalized on all its space travel knowledge, or could we do more if we applied available skills and technical know-how?

Answer. This country has indeed not made use of all of its technological knowledge in exploration of space. Much more could be accomplished, probably without a marked increase in the percentage of current expenditures.

Question. Have we solved the problem of reentry if we were able to get a maneuverable craft into space?

Answer. We have accomplished much in solving the problem of reentry already; fortunately, it has not proved to be as difficult as originally anticipated. This problem would become correspondingly less important if we were able to lift heavy loads into space, loads which could carry an appreciable amount of rocket propulsion and rocket fuels to be used for manuvering or slowing down the space vehicle before atmospheric reentry.

Question. Could our space exploration program be accelerated if more emphasis was placed on solid fuel boosters?

Answer. Our ability to lift heavy objects would be augmented tremendously if we had the solid fuel boosters which our current technology is capable of providing.

Question. With heavy expenditure, could we regain lost ground and eventually become world leaders in this field?

Answer. I believe that a 25-percent increase in our annual expenditures, if allocated to the proper programs (including the development of large solid boosters), would soon place us in the forefront of space exploration.

Question. Will domination of space give the Russians a big military advantage?

Answer. I firmly believe that domination of space will provide a significant military advantage to the nation first achieving such domination. Suppose, for example, that today a number of hostile satellites passed over this country, each with the capability of projecting powerful bombs to the surface of the earth when in receipt of a command signal from a hostile country. Under these circumstances, there would be a much stronger motivation to develop counter measures capable of destroying such satellites.

Question. Can we afford to be second best in space travel and exploration? Other than a loss of prestige, is it important that Russia has moved so far ahead of us in manned flight?

Answer. Our loss of worldwide prestige, and perhaps to some extent our development of a national inferiority complex because of our second best seat in the space race, is indeed important. I do not believe that we can afford to be second best in the space race if for no other reason than because of our own self-respect and national pride. The military advantages of space dominance would also indicate that our national survival is at stake.

Security Cannot Be Guaranteed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the RECORD, as you well know, often contains voluminous statements and reports. I am pleased to insert an editorial from the Blue Island Sun-Standard of May 4 entitled, "Security Cannot Be Guaranteed," which in a very brief but extremely effective manner comments on a vital threat to American security:

SECURITY CANNOT BE GUARANTEED

At a time when Americans have more of everything, more material possessions than ever before, they also have more self-doubt, more uneasiness. In spite of all their possessions, Americans are said to be lacking self-security. You perhaps have seen the indications of this, have sensed the general feeling that something is wrong.

May the feeling of insecurity not be due to trying too hard to guarantee security? Government has come more and more to concern itself with efforts to provide general prosperity—to fix prices for farm products—to produce so-called full "employment" by government edict—to extend old-age assistance and "free" medical care to everybody.

But the real business of a government of free people is not to strive to guarantee economic security for that people. Any government that undertakes to provide guaranteed economic security must take away freedom in exchange for that fancied security.

If we Americans have an uneasy feeling that something is wrong, we should examine our own hearts and minds to determine if we really want to save freedom and if we are really working to save freedom.

FCC Packing Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith append two articles from the magazine Broadcasting, of May 8, 1961, with reference to the President's plan for reorganization of the FCC, which I believe every Member of the House would like to know about:

FCC PACKING PLAN

The plan sent to Congress by President Kennedy isn't a simple proposal to reorganize the FCC and thereby save time and money. It is a measure to pack the FCC and thus destroy its bipartisan character, contrary to the clear intent of Congress.

The plan would vest in the Chairman the power to assign commissioners and staff members as he sees fit. The Chairman—any Chairman—could pick a division or a panel of fellow commissioners who saw eye-to-eye with him on a policy matter of great significance. Newspaper ownership, or program controls, for example. It would make puppets of other commissioners.

Couple this authority with the requirement that the chairmen of all of the independent agencies report monthly direct to the President. What member of a commission interested in retaining his job would dare defy a Chairman maintaining direct and consistent liaison with the White House and armed with the authority to assign whomever he likes to whatever he wishes?

If the administration is interested in saving time and money, it could better achieve the result by actually making the FCC a one-man body. It could name a single administrator and perhaps provide for a direct appeal to an appropriate court or a judicial body specializing in communications. With legalized one-man control, Congress would know whom to hold accountable.

Admittedly there are some desirable features in the plan. The Reorganization Act of 1949, however, provides that a plan must be accepted in toto. It cannot be amended. If Congress fails to act in 60 days from April 27, the plan will become effective.

We hope that Congress will veto Reorganization Plan No. 2, covering the FCC. It might indicate the kind of reorganization it would accept which should be one minus the provision that would make Charlie McCarthys of six of the seven commissioners. Then the White House could try again.

FROWNS FOR J.F.K.'S FCC PLAN—SOME WARY OF ADDED POWERS IT GIVES CHAIRMAN—PROPOSAL DESTINED FOR HEARING ON CAPITOL HILL

President Kennedy's FCC reorganization plan (broadcasting, May 1) is headed for trouble. And the basic difficulty seems to be the added power it would give to the Commission's Chairman.

A secondary obstacle, according to those who have studied the proposals, is the vagueness of many provisions.

The executive committee of the Federal Communications Bar Association last Wednesday voted to oppose the proposals. And at least one congressional committee will provide a forum for that opposition.

The Senate Commerce Subcommittee on Communications, chaired by Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, Democrat, of Rhode Island, has announced it will hold hearings starting May 23 on the reorganization plan. The staff of the House Government Operations Committe has indicated that hearings may be held by that group also.

Many FCC Commissioners are unalterably opposed to the reorganization as spelled out by the President. Their opposition stems from the provision which would permit the FCC Chairman to assign cases to Commissioners. This derogates the role of a Commissioner, this viewpoint holds.

One Commissioner, generally favorable to the New Frontier atmosphere in Washington, said:

"If this plan means the Chairman can tell the other Commissioners what they should do, then I'm through with it."

Another Commissioner said that this particular item makes the FCC just an arm of the executive department. His reasoning goes like this: The Chairman is appointed by the President. He reports monthly to the President. If he also has the authority to assign work to the other Commissioners, the FCC in fact becomes an appendage of the White House.

LOSS OF INDEPENDENCE

A third Commissioner stressed that the reorganization threatens to destroy the basic concept of the FCC: a body of seven equal Commissioners exercising its judgment independent of either Congress or the White House.

At the White House there is no equivocation about the meaning of the proposal to give the Chairman of the FCC more power. James M. Landis, the President's adviser on the regulatory agencies and the acknowledged architect of the reorganization plan, said last week that this is exactly what the plan suggests.

"Somebody has to have this authority," he said, "and under normal circumstances it should be the Chairman."

He seems well aware of the difficulties the plan will have in getting through Congress.

Under the Reorganization Act, the President's recommendations go into effect within 60 days of issuance unless specifically vetoed by either House of Congress.

The plan was cleared, it is understood, with both Commerce Committees of Congress. The Senate hearing primarily will spell out on the record the extent of the reorganization and define in more detail the meaning of some of the provisions.

A Senate Communications Subcommittee spokesman said the hearings will be designed to produce information the parent Commerce Committee needs to formulate its position and determine what changes, if any, should be made. Parties interested in presenting their views have been invited to contact the subcommittee.

Ordinarily, reorganization proposals are handled in the Senate by the Government Operations Committee. However, Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, its chairman, has asked the Commerce Committee, which has jurisdiction over the regulatory agencies, for its comments and recommendations on the FCC plan. The request was made recently in a letter to Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Commerce Committee chairman.

Under the plan (Reorganization Plan No. 2), President Kennedy proposes to authorize the FCC to delegate more authority to single Commissioners, Commission or staff panels, and to examiners. He also would abolish the Office of Opinions and Review, and require Commissioners to write and sign individual opinions instead of the present practice of issuing unsigned, institutional decisions. In a major revision of current procedure, the President would take away the longstanding right of applicants to argue their cases before the FCC as a whole. Under the plan, the Commission would be given the discretion to decide whether or not to hear an appeal.

The FCBA executive committee voted unanimously to oppose the plan. It ordered its legislative committee to analyze the proposals and report back to the executive committee. The plan, according to Robert M. Booth, Jr., FCBA president, is to submit this analysis to the responsible committees of Congress and to appear in opposition if a hearing is held. Percy H. Russell is chairman of the FCBA's legislative committee.

Opposition by the lawyers who specialize in communications law is based, it is understood, on two points: The plan wipes out many sections of the Communications Act; provisions which were the subject of long study and debate, and it leaves too many unknowns that cannot be ascertained until it is put into practice.

ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE

Early last week, President Kennedy named Circuit Judge E. Barrett Prettyman of the District of Columbia Circuit Court of Appeals, as Chairman of the Council of an Administrative Conference of the United States.

This Conference, begun under Judge Prettyman last year, will consider and propose changes in procedure and organization of the Federal regulatory commissions.

Among the members of the 10-man Council are Max D. Paglin, FCC General Counsel; Mr. Landis; representatives of other Federal agencies, lawyers and several law professors.

Valhalla Blazes a Trail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a recent editorial from one of the outstanding newspapers in my State, the Patent Trader of Mount Kisco, N.Y.

In these most trying days in our Nation's history, our philosophical, religious, and political differences over pending school legislation should not be allowed to obscure the real issue, the proper education of our Nation's youth.

In this connection, I have always been particularly proud of the public school system in Westchester County, N.Y. One of the reasons for our widely admired system of public schools has been the consistently high quality of supervision by our dedicated administrators, who have never hesitated to use their training and experience in bringing new and exciting innovations to existing methods of teaching that sometimes fail to fully reflect the needs of our times.

The editorial follows:

VALHALLA BLAZES A TRAIL

A program as logical as it is original will be initiated in Valhalla [New York] in 1962, it was reported this week by the high school principal, Donald Marquette. The new departure is a 13th grade, actually a half-year program, to follow completion of all regular high school requirements in January of the senior year. Accelerated work in previous classes from grade 6 up will free qualified seniors for a special course of electives and college-level study.

The logic in the program derives from the increasingly accelerated trend of today's schooling. Curriculums in languages, math and science have undergone extensive revision in late years, with a view toward giving more of them to the student within the same period of time. Condensation of courses formerly consuming a full year into one semester has resulted in free time for advanced study, formerly postponed of necessity until college. Many high schools in the suburban area have introduced instruction in calculus, advanced chemistry and physics, and have greatly expanded language programs for those whose early familiarity with them made this possible. As far as is known, however, offering of this advanced instruction has not extended elsewhere to a full half-year program. In this respect, Valhalla must be recognized as an innovator.

Why all this acceleration and condensation? Why bother to introduce an extra half year into the high school program, instead of letting college students include this instruction in their first year's study? A part of the motivation, certainly, must be conceded to be national necessity. Scrutiny of our high school preparation in relation to that of the rival ideology in the U.S.S.R. disclosed gaps, particularly in the fields of languages, science and math. Closing these gaps has been interpreted as a survival measure of the utmost importance.

But the fact that the drive for acceleration stems rather from competitive factors than from educational policy does not mean that the end is not intrinsically worthwhile. In retrospect, it seems likely that our educational system prior to 1950 had become so inelastic, so tailored to the capacity of the middle group, as to be somewhat stultified. The absence of challenge for students of above-average ability may have been one reason for the generally lackadaisical attitude these young people carried with them into life after college. School graduation was a matter of fulfilling requirements all too easily encompassed; there was nothing in the curriculum to encourage the bright student to stretch. And the habit of reaching a little beyond one's grasp, like other study habits, is best cultivated in early life.

The best reason, basically, for offering advanced courses to able students is that they are able to handle them. That they will start college on a higher level is advantageous but unimportant in comparison to the fact that while they are in high schools, their brains will have been used at something like capacity.

XUM

If our educational system can be revised to produce a generation of reachers and stretchers, it is probable that many of the problems associated with the teens and after will recede into insignificance.

Valhalla's program is a notable milestone along this road. It is certain that it will be watched with intense interest by school administrators in other localities.

The Impact of Imports and Exports on American Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the impact of imports and exports on American employment should be the concern of every Member of the Congress.

I include as part of my remarks an excerpt from a recent study of this subject by Dr. Howard Piquet of the Library of Congress:

(By Dr. Howard Piquet)

For 26 of the 36 industries shown in table 2 employment amounted to slightly less than 124,000. It is probable that employment in the 10 industries, for which employment data were not provided, would not bring the total employment figure to more than 170,000.[1]

Thus, at the outside, the number of workers employed by the industries that have been seriously injured or are threatened by serious injury, or that think they are so threatened total not more than 260,000 workers out of total national employment of some 68 million workers.

This is not to say that this many workers would be displaced even temporarily if imports were to increase. It does not even mean that the 90,000 workers in the industries for which the Tariff Commission made a positive finding of serious injury or threat of serious injury, would all be displaced by imports, even under free trade. The usual pattern is that where injury results from import competition only certain companies are affected. One of the major conclusions that can be reached from the many cost studies made through the years by the Tariff Commission is that unit costs of production vary widely among producers within any given industry. Usually the costs of the marginal, or highest cost, producers are considerably higher than the average costs for the industry as a whole.

ESTIMATED DISPLACEMENT OF WORKERS BY IMPORT COMPETITION

Estimates made within the past 8 years of the immediate displacement effects of the increased imports that would result from across-the-board suspension of U.S. tariffs are in line with the figures just presented.

At the request of the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy (Randall Commission) in 1954 the Bureau of Labor Statistics estimated the number of workers who would be displaced by imports under such an assumption. It used its own data on interindustry relationships to analyze the employment implications of the probable increases in imports that would result from temporary overall tariff suspension.[2] The estimates represent only the number of workers producing the equivalent of the estimated increased imports. They take no account of the probable increases in U.S. consumption after tariff suspension, of new developments in U.S. products or production techniques, or of the capacity of companies concerned to shift to other lines of production. They also take no account of the rise in employment that would be required to handle the increased imports into the United States or of the increased exports that would result from the larger imports.

It had been estimated, on the basis of economic conditions prevailing in 1951 and on the further assumption that these economic conditions would continue to prevail for at least 3 to 5 years, that temporary tariff suspension by the United States would result in increased imports of between $800 million and $1.8 billion per year. Of these increased imports, from $420 to $900 million would have an immediate displacement effect on domestic producers in the United States.

Using its interindustry relationship tables, the Bureau of Labor Statistics estimated that the displacement of domestic production by increased imports would affect between 96,000 and 203,000 workers (on 60,000 to 128,000 workers the displacement effect would be direct and on 37,000 to 75,000 the effect would be indirect).

The individual industries in which there would be appreciable displacement of workers, according to the study cited, are shown in table 3. It will be observed that none of them could properly be characterized as big business. The conclusion seems clear that the tariff has the effect of maintaining in business a number of small industries that otherwise, either in whole or in part, would be forced to adjust to other lines of production. It appears, furthermore, that the number of workers who are protected in their existing jobs by the tariff is somewhere between 96,000 and 260,000.

TABLE 3.—*Industries in which there would be appreciable displacement of workers in the event of increased imports*[1]

Industry	Duty in 1951 (ad valorem equivalent)	Domestic production in 1951
	Pct.	*Thous.*
Knives with folding blades	33-184	$18,000
Scissors and shears	41-84	22,500
Leather handbags	14-25	75,000
Linen firehose	28	1,000
Fur felt hats	60	75,000
Bicycles and parts	11-15	63,400
Musical instruments	20	175,000
Embroidered linen handkerchiefs	49	8,500
Leather gloves	25-74	45,000
Earthenware and chinaware: table and artware	32-66	120,000
Coarse linen fabrics	40	3,000
Hemmed linen handkerchiefs	26	7,000
Hand-blown glassware	39	31,400
Lovers lace	32-65	30,000
Axminster rugs	28	45,000
Dental and surgical needles	18-40	1,000
Wool wearing apparel (knit or crocheted)	24-41	200,000
Rayon staple fiber	17	150,000
Motorcycles	10	9,083
Clay floor and wall tile	26-41	71,300
Woolens and worsteds	33	1,085,000
Crude barytes	35	7,828
Apparel wool	15	260,000
Cigar filler tobacco	13-18	85,000
Edible nuts, domestic types (almonds, walnuts, filberts)	35	52,200
Flower bulbs	7	(2)
Oats	5	1,112,698
Prepared pineapples	6	65,000
Fresh or frozen fillets	9	56,284
Vermouth	10	10,000

[1] Based on Piquet, H.S., "Aid, Trade and the Tariff," T. Y. Crowell Co., New York, 1953, on the basis of conditions prevailing in 1951.
[2] Not available.

SMALL BUSINESS ALSO BENEFITS FROM IMPORTS AND EXPORTS

It does not follow from the fact that small business, rather than big business, is the principal beneficiary of tariff protection that all small businesses stand to gain from the restriction of imports.

In recent hearings before a subcommittee of the Select Committee on Small Business of the U.S. Senate,[3] Mr. Donald A. Hipkins, Deputy Administrator of the Small Business Administration, testified as follows:[4]

"Turning now from the effects of foreign imports on manufacturers, let us consider its effects on distributors of consumer goods. Approximately two-thirds of the small businesses in this country are engaged in this activity, mostly at the retail level. Some of those establishments, such as franchised dealers in automobiles and other high-priced durables, have close ties with one or a few manufacturers and are, consequently, sensitive to foreign competition. However, a majority of small retailers are less vulnerable, because they handle a wider variety of products. Obviously, the more items a distributor carries in stock, the less dependent he is upon any one of them. To take the simplest case, a proprietor of a drugstore who encounters difficulty in moving a domestic product at a profit, because competitors are underselling him with similar merchandise of foreign origin, is not confronted with a new or special problem. Losses on individual items, whatever their causes, are a normal feature of his operations. Without material injury to his business, he will discontinue the product and, if possible, replace it with the import. For these reasons, I believe that most small outlets are not endangered by foreign competition.

"To a large extent, imports, far from being injurious, are beneficial to small distributors. It is a hard fact that many foreign products, though priced well below their domestic counterparts, are of equal or superior quality. They often are fast-moving items which offer rich opportunities to discerning and energetic retailers. I have no doubt that such merchandise has contributed substantially to the success of a multitude of small stores.

"Another important factor to be considered in appraising the effects of imports is that in many industries, perhaps in too many, manufacturers favor large distributors to the detriment of the small.

"Chain organizations, mail order houses, and department stores are given volume discounts, advertising allowances, and other forms of price reduction which increase their natural advantage over small stores. Such big outlets can resell at prices substantially below the levels small dealers are required to maintain in order to show a profit.

"Needless to say, small concerns who are being squeezed out of the business of distributing domestic products will seize the opportunity to handle competitive imports. It is not surprising, therefore, to find such distributors resisting the efforts of their suppliers to impose or increase trade barriers.

"The effect, adverse or otherwise, on our domestic economy of imported foreign products is, of course, only one facet of a larger problem. Our domestic economy as we know it could not long survive without foreign trade, both imports and exports.

"I am told that of our workers every 10th is paid from export sales and every 4th is dependent on imported raw materials. Our country needs expanding new material imports to support our growth; and this need, in turn, makes necessary a balancing and offsetting export trade to pay for our imports. This is an inescapable fact of economic life."

Testimony was also given by a private Washington attorney[5] showing how imports are of great importance to the plywood, hard board, almond, mutton, and shrimp industries.

Furthermore, many small businesses have a vital interest in exports, as was pointed out in testimony by former Secretary of

Footnotes at end of speech.

Commerce Frederick H. Mueller.[1] He stated that many small business firms are selling abroad and that many more could do so. He cited a small firm in Missouri with only eight employees that has been prospering from exports. It manufactures automotive chemical tuneup oil and has been exporting lubricants for 8 years. Exports comprise over 50 percent of all its shipments, including 8 to 10 shipments monthly to South America and 51 shipments, each, to Venezuela and Canada. He also cited a small company in Oregon which manufactures front-end loaders and whose foreign sales have increased more than 30 percent in each of the past 3 years.

Although no statistics are available showing the importance of exports to small business, as such, there can be no doubt that it is considerable. Some years ago the Bureau of Labor Statistics published figures showing the private employment of wage earners and salaried workers attributed to exports from the United States in 1947. At that time 6.8 percent of all employees in nonagricultural industries were dependent on exports for their jobs.

---

[1] The industries whose requests for action under the escape clause were terminated because they failed to supply adequate data to the Tariff Commission, or whose appeals were dismissed at their own request, were: Woodscrews, cotton blouses, cotton ginghams, broadwoven silk fabrics, fine-meshed wire cloth, nails, Toyo cloth caps, and women's leather handbags. The number of workers employed in these industries is not available.

[2] Piquet, H. S., "Aid, Trade and the Tariff," T. Y. Crowell Co., New York, 1953.

[3] Impact of Imports on American Small Business, hearing before a subcommittee of the Select Committee on Small Business, U.S. Senate, 86th Congress, 2d session, June 16, 1960, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 212–213.

[5] Branhard, William J., op. cit., pp. 91–95.

[6] *Ibid.*, pp. 201–204.

The Thin Washington Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress, in fact, every American should read the lead eidtorial in the Wall Street Journal of May 16, 1961. It would certainly help one evaluate the present leadership of the New Frontier:

THE THIN WASHINGTON AIR

Of all the characteristics of the New Frontier so far, surely one of the most striking is the superficiality of its programs and actions.

It's very odd in its way. Here is reputedly the most intellectual administration in many years—and if the often-abused term intellectual is not to be thoroughly debased, it should imply not so much academic brilliance as a capacity for serious, logical, mature thought. Yet, what we find emanating from Washington, whether the subject at hand is foreign policy or juvenile delinquency, is a thinness of thinking, sometimes to the point of pure vapor.

Consider, for just one of innumerable examples, the quality of thought behind the proposal for dealing with the problems of the cities. We are to have, if the administration has its way, a new Department of Urban Affairs. It is simply assumed that the Federal Government can provide remedies for ailments which baffle municipal specialists. More than that, there is no evidence of thought at all about the complex human factors which help make some of the problems so baffling.

Then we have all the talk about national economic growth. Nowhere is there any attempt to analyze the concept of growth itself—an undertaking ably done in the previous "antiintellectual" administration; no attempt to ascertain what economic growth actually means, much less to determine what constitutes sound growth and unsound growth.

When we turn to foreign policy, it must immediately be conceded that the President faces monstrous difficulties and deserves sympathy on that account. But it is also impossible not to recall the glib promises last fall that America's "dangerous drift" in the world would be promptly checked.

Instead of that, one must ask what kind of thinking went into the Cuban affair. Is there a policy on Cuba now? A policy on Laos or merely rhetoric about freedom? Maybe Laos is by now too far gone for a policy, but what of the rest of Southeast Asia? Sending the Vice President on a trip is hardly an answer to the Communist threat there.

In all these matters, and most especially the domestic programs, the fault is not too much intellectuality but, in the real sense, too little.

The most obvious explanation would be that many of the new men in Washington were overrated to begin with. It would seem that, rather than some kind of intellectual super-elite, we just have some shallow thinkers dominated not by any particular highmindedness but by an intense concern for the main political chance in each case.

A further explanation is that the 20th century liberal, in sharp contrast to the 19th century liberal, is apparently incapable of profound philosophical thought about the nature of man and man's institutions. Today's liberal invariably takes the path of least mental resistance, which in political terms means dumping every problem, no matter how small or local, on the Federal Government.

It would be surprising if the appeal of such thinking, if that is the word, had not faded. There was much shallow thinking and intense politicking in Franklin Roosevelt's days too. But Mr. Roosevelt at least seemed to be doing something new. He seemed to be moving the country even though its economy remained on dead center. There was a dash, a style, a quality about the New Deal that is absent in the New Frontier.

The old shibboleths of the thirties just don't evoke the old enthusiasm. And the thinness of today's Washington atmosphere plainly shows that the liberals have no other thoughts to offer.

Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill, 1962

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 17, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7035) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes;

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I too wish to commend the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], chairman of the subcommittee; the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], ranking minority member; and the other members of the Appropriations Committee for the hard work that went into the molding of such a well-rounded bill as H.R. 7035, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the year ending June 30, 1962.

Their interest, devotion, and dedication to the health field has been outstanding, and has made a great contribution to the welfare of our people.

I would like to express particular pleasure at the recognition accorded by the committee to the value of retraining workers. It is a matter of record that I offered a substitute depressed-areas bill that included more than double the amount for retraining workers that was included in the administration bill enacted into law. At the time, I was keenly disappointed by the House action, as this was an assistance feature of major import; one of direct benefit to those persons who are jobless as a result of progress—automation, technological advances, improved methods, streamlined production. As the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] so well stated—

When we considered the depressed-areas legislation early in this session of the Congress, a bill with over 95 percent of authorized funds in direct subsidies to industry, with less than 5 percent of the authorization going to this area of training individuals, it is sad but true that we enacted a piece of legislation which did not clearly meet the problems as we face the challenge of the 1960's.

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many

Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I request that the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

WASHINGTON, D.C., *May 7, 1961.*

Hon. D. J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives, U.S. Congress, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: My fellow Iranians are anxiously hoping that the House Resolution 211 will receive the unanimous support of your colleagues in the U.S. Congress, and a special Committee on the Captive Nations will be established.

Because we have a several hundred mile common border with Soviet Russia, we Iranians are constantly being endangered by the aggressive Reds. Not only do we not wish to become one of the captive nations, not only will we fight to our last drops of blood to maintain our independence, but we wish to see our Azarbaijanian brothers and other captive nations freed from the yoke of Russian imperialism.

The establishment of the Committee on the Captive Nations will provide the hope for all the free peoples of the world that through the deep concern of the American people and Government the road toward freeing the captive nations will be paved.

My fellow Iranians hail you and your colleagues for your wisdom and courage. You have kindled the torch of hope in our hearts, and we shall always join you both in heart and action for furthering the cause of freedom and eradicating Russian imperialism.

History will record the Americans as teachers and protectors of freedom and great liberators.

With warmest and heartiest regards.

NADER AKRAMI.

RIVERDALE, N.Y., *May 8, 1961.*

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I was very pleased, indeed, to read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 2, that you have introduced in the House a Resolution 211 calling for the establishment of a permanent committee dealing with the captive nations under the Red rule. Please accept my sincere congratulations for your thoughtful idea and hope that the majority of your colleagues in Congress will support your constructive action. I will write to my own Congressman, Representative PAUL A. FINO and ask his support in this regard.

At the same time, I would appreciate your sending me two copies of the Resolution 211, two reprints from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 6 (pp. 3286–3311) if any, as well as other available material on this subject.

Thank you in anticipation for your kind attention.

Very truly yours,

AL M. KADRAGIC,
Economist.

IDEL-URAL INDEPENDECNE COMMITTEE,
Ankara, Turkey, May 1, 1961.

Mr. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The Public Law 86–90, pertaining to the restoration of freedom and independence to the captive nations raised our morale and encouraged our efforts for the cause of liberation of our fatherland Idel-Ural from the Soviet imperialism and tyranny.

Tatar, Bahkir, Chuvash, Mordova, Mari, and Udmurt, so-called, autonomous republics, are descendants of the mighty state with three different names: 1. Bulgar Khanate, IV–XIII centuries A.D.; 2. Golden Horde, XIII–XV centuries A.D.; 3. Kazan Khanate, XV–XVI centuries A.D.

This mighty state under three different names was an independent state for 1,200 years. Kazan Khanate was captured by the Russians in 1552.

In November 17, 1917, this state regained its independence and the First National Assembly in Ufa issued the decree to call a newly formed state Idel-Ural.

We are very glad to see the name Idel-Ural in the congressional House resolution all because the name of Idel-Ural is sacred for us.

We deeply appreciate your very constructive efforts and wish great success for the liberation of the captive nations and particularly Idel-Ural.

The Idel-Ural Independence Committee had been founded by our leader, Ayas Iskhaki Idilli, in Warsaw, Poland, in 1928 and had been supported by Polish Marshal Jozef Pilsudski.

Please refer to the book "Turkism and the Soviets" by Charles Warren Hostler, colonel, U.S. Air Force, publisher George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., London, 1957, 244 pages, reference pages 34–48, 120–128, 156–160 and 213–214.

After the decease of our leader, Ayas Iskhaki Idilli, in 1954, Gen. Mecit Sakmar was elected by the committee as the president of committee, and he is residing in Istanbul.

Wishing you the greatest success in the passage of H. Res. 211,

Yours truly,

KEMAL LOKMAN,
President of Presidium.
ALI AKIS,
Secretary General of Presidium.
HAYRULLAH BATU,
Secretary of Finance of Presidium.

BYELORUSSIAN-AMERICAN
ASSOCIATION, INC.,
BRANCH OF CLEVELAND,
Cleveland, Ohio, April 28, 1961.

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As the president of the Byelorussian-American Association Branch of Cleveland, I wish to extend sincere congratulations from myself and my associates on your introduction of the resolution for the establishment of a permanent Committee of Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

The peoples of the free world now realize the goal of Soviet Union, which is the desire to dominate the free world and particularly the United States of America.

The resolution to create a Committee on the Captive Nations, which you have introduced in the House of Representatives, will serve as a source of information for the enslaved peoples behind the Iron Curtain.

The information which your committee will make available will encourage the peoples in the captive nations and serve to help the security of the United States.

My sincere best wishes for your success.

Very truly yours,

BYELORUSSIAN-AMERICAN ASSOCIATION,
GEORGE GOSCIEJEW, *President.*

NORMANDY PARKWAY,
Morristown, N.J., April 30, 1961.

The Honorable DANIEL FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: House Resolution 211 has come to my attention and after reading it I can say that I am wholeheartedly in favor of such a resolution and hope that it will be passed and a House committee on captive nations established.

The captive nations stand as an important bulwark within the Iron Curtain, for they are the frontline against the desires of Moscow's imperialists and an important spearhead for the advance of freedom.

I plan to write my Congressman, PETER A. FRELINGHUYSEN, requesting him to vote in favor of House Resolution 211.

Sincerely,

HUGH C. LORDON.

IDEL-URAL INDEPENDENCE COMMITTEE,
Istanbul, Turkey, May 2, 1961.

Mr. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am very pleased to hear that the House of Representatives is preparing to consider H. Res. 211 pertaining to the restoration of freedom and independence of the captive nations.

I am sending this letter congratulating you and requesting your special interest in Idel-Ural in the Committee on Captive Nations.

Thanking you in advance for your kind attitude regarding our future state.

I am ready to cooperate in case you will need our help for the preparation of the special committee's work.

Wishing you the greatest success, I remain,

Yours truly,

Gen. MECIT SAKMAR,
President, of Idel-Ural Independence Committee.

DETROIT, MICH., *April 18, 1961.*

Hon. DANIEL FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I would like commend you for your Resolution 211 of March 8, 1961.

It is highly important that we keep before the free nations of the world the fact that there are millions of our fellow men still held captive under the tyranny of communism.

Your resolution setting up a Special Committee on the Captive Nations in Congress will be a most potent factor in focusing the attention of the world on the pitiful plight of the captive nations held under the merciless grip of Moscow.

It is my sincere hope that your resolution will be adopted by Congress.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM A. PETZOLD III.

BUFFALO, N.Y., *May 8, 1961.*

DEAR MR. FLOOD: On March 8 past, House Resolution No. 211 was introduced by you. This resolution calls for the establishment of a permanent special committee on captive nations. The function of this committee, as introduced in the resolution would be, to conduct an inquiry into and a study of all the captive non-Russian nations, which includes those in the Soviet Union and Asia, and also of the Russian people, with particular reference to the moral and

legal status of Red totalitarian control over them, facts concerning conditions existing in these nations, and means by which the United States can assist them by peaceful processes in their present plight and in their aspirations to regain their national and individual freedoms.

I strongly support you in favor of House Resolution 211, so it can be established as law.

Very truly yours,

I. J. ARMITAGE.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, INC., HAMTRAMCK AND NORTH EASTERN DETROIT BRANCH,

Detroit, Mich., May 6, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Hamtramck and North Eastern Detroit Branch, wishes to extend warm congratulations for your resolution calling for the establishment of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

By creating such a committee the U.S. Government will be able to gather necessary information and data on various enslaved nations in the U.S.S.R., which constitute the weakness of the Communist empire. The committee will assist our Government in formulating its policies with respect to the captive nations and will inform the American people and the whole world on the state of affairs behind the Iron Curtain.

We wholeheartedly support your farsighted move about the Committee on Captive Nations and are asking various Michigan Congressmen to support your resolution.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER TUSTANIWSKY,
Chairman.

CHICAGO, ILL., *May 1, 1961.*

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: It was with great pleasure that I read House Resolution 211 which you submitted on March 8, 1961. Substantively this bill is of great import in our Nation's struggle for providing truth and freedom to the world. The two Presidential proclamations designating Captive Nations Weeks were only the beginning. So as to insure that we leave no stone unturned when fighting the lies of Moscow, this committee on the captive nations must be formed and begin to function as soon as possible.

The search for truth has been going on ever since man was created. The search for freedom has also been going on ever since man was created. Now, more than ever, the world must know the whole truth about the big Red lies in order to maintain the correct perspective. The committee, when established, might do well to remember one of Democritus' golden maxims: "Speech often proves more persuasive than gold." I am completely behind your efforts in this endeavor. With best wishes for the success of this resolution I remain,

Sincerely yours,

TIMOTHY J. PATRICK RYAN.

NEW YORK, N.Y., *May 4, 1961.*

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The Moscow dictators are crying very much of necessity about the "liberation" of colonial peoples. In reality, teens of nations are suffering humiliating mistreatment by dominating Russian communism.

After the collapse of the Czar's regime in 1917, the peoples of Idel-Ural (Volga-Ural)—Tatar, Bashkir, Chuvash of Turkik origin and Udmurd, Mari, Mordowa of Finn origin—began wide movements in order to restore their national independence.

On the territory of the former Kazan and Astrakhan kingdoms occupied by Ivan the Terrible in the 16th century they managed to reestablish the Idel-Ural state in November 1917.

A parliamentary government was formed. In April 1918 Idel-Ural was reoccupied by Red Russian military forces and divided into so-called autonomous republics with puppet governments, i.e., Moscow acted by the principle "divide and rule."

Dear Congressman, House Resolution 211, which applies to the captive nations' future, encourages our Idel-Ural peoples in their struggle with the tyrannical system of Russian communism.

We heartily support you and wish you every success in your effort on this matter.

Yours faithfully,

HAMID RASCHID,
Lecturer of Columbia University
in Kazan-Turkic.

THE UNITED ANTI-COMMUNIST ACTION COMMITTEE, OF WESTERN NEW YORK,

Kenmore, N.Y., May 3, 1961.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: With full awareness of your constant efforts in behalf of freedom and justice, we hurry to support your resolution which we endorse.

It is House Resolution 211, the Captive Nations Committee, and it calls for the establishment of a permanent committee to keep the cause of the captive peoples alive and in our national conscience.

Our organization, representing over 100,000 in the western New York area, prayerfully support your resolution.

With every good wish.

ALBERT J. WEINERT,
Speakers Bureau.
WALTER V. CHOPYK,
Public Relations.

ST. PETER AND PAUL UKRAINIAN CHURCH,

Willimantic, Conn., April 11, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I, Father Boreckyj, on behalf of my parish, would like to congratulate you on your recent move in introducing the resolution calling for the establishment of a Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. Such a committee would be of great importance, not only to those in the hands of the Soviet Union, but to the entire universe. These nations in captivity, ever eager to escape Soviet Russian slavery and despotism, constitute perennial weaknesses in the Soviet Union.

It would be to our advantage to know these weaknesses, and to work to multiply them. A committee, such as you propose would serve as a reservoir of information and data on these enslaved nations.

Such information and data could be made available to the U.S. Government and its various agencies. However, its main function would be to inform the American people and the world at large on affairs behind the Iron Curtain and to assist the Government in its policies with respect to the captive nations.

We have contacted our State Congressman, Mr. Kolowski, and have asked him to support your resolution. I pray that we succeed in this effort, and may God guide you in your work.

Very truly yours,

REVEREND FATHER THEODORE BORECKYJ.

We're in the Midst of a Mess

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, one of the foremost writers of recent years has been George E. Sokolsky. I have read his articles consistently and feel that everyone should have the opportunity of reading, "We're in the Midst of a Mess," as published in the Long Island Press of May 15, 1961. Mr. Sokolsky points up very vividly the situation in respect to Cuba and the entire Western Hemisphere.

WE'RE IN THE MIDST OF A MESS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

For years those who have studied Marxism and its Leninist development in Russia have been calling attention to the fact that nothing less than the conquest of the entire earth would satisfy the Marxist principle. This has been as clear as day since 1847. It is referred to in Communist literature as the inevitable historic clash between a new dynamic civilization and a decaying civilization which has served its purpose and is no longer needed.

Those who are unwilling to learn have asked those who for 40 years now have been warning against the menace to refrain from exaggeration. In 1917, when the Russian Revolution occurred, there were a few who recognized the peril of the Bolshevik advance, but to most they were a fanatical band of incompetents, who would shortly fail. How incorrect this judgment was is evident today from the single fact that Soviet Russia is successfully building an enormous and incongruous empire and that only the United States has the power, if not the ability, to withstand the strength of the Soviet Universal State.

Soviet Russia is the first European country since 1861 to challenge the authority of the United States in the Western Hemisphere. The last effort was that of Napoleon III to put and keep Maximilian of Austria on the throne of Mexico.

What has happened in 1961? Soviet Russia has established a Marxist fortress in Cuba, controlled by an obvious paranoic Castro, who was actually put into power by our own State Department despite the available evidence that Fidel, his brother, Raul, and many of their associates were known to have had Communist affiliation. But Cuba is not alone. British Guiana, Venezuela, Ecuador, Panama, and possibly Brazil are being ripened for Communist revolutions.

And it is in the face of such conditions that the State Department involves this country in a quarrel with the Dominican Republic which could be needed in our defense at any moment. More mistakes of policy have been made during the past 30 years than seem possible.

Even Canada, with which we have had cordial relations since the War of 1812, has been discovering our weaknesses and has become tolerant of anti-American propaganda. In fact, Canada is strengthening Cuba by trading with Cuba, there being no visible guarantee that some of the goods sent is not of American origin. Canada is also trading with Red China in opposition to our and their interest. The relations between the United States and Canada should have been such that the two countries stand together, at least, on the Cuban issue.

XUM

The question arises as to what we shall accomplish with the Organization of American States: OAS is a substitute for the Monroe Doctrine. It places upon the Latin American nations the responsibilities which formerly the United States assumed. Among these is the obligation to keep Europe and Asia out of the American hemisphere. The question that arises now is whether Soviet Russia is establishing Cuba as part of a colonial empire or a satellite or a segment of the Soviet universal state. And must the United States accept this violation of the Monroe Doctrine?

The assumption that Cuba is today governed by Fidel Castro, as a dictator, is nonsense. Cuba is governed as East Germany is, as Hungary is; as all so-called People's Republics are, from the Kremlin. The country is full of Chinese Communists and Czechoslovakian Communists who are the effective rulers of the land. This is the technique that Soviet Russia has employed in every country that it has conquered. The so-called People's Republics are Socialist states, in transition, supervised by the Kremlin until they become Soviet republics.

Whether the OAS is capable of meeting such a situation is questionable. The OAS has thus far shown an inability to live up to the Caracas Agreement because those who govern the Latin American States are afraid of student mobs and similar mass uprisings and therefore, while supporting the United States in principle, dare do nothing about such support.

Back to Work at Missile Bases?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we are faced with the sobering conclusion that the cold war with the Soviet Union and other Communist countries will continue for many years until justice and freedom finally triumph. All Americans have been shocked at the disclosure of the Senate subcommittee headed by Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN of the racketeering and profiteering at missile bases. The Chicago Sun-Times, in an editorial Saturday, May 13, discussed the latest developments in a most practical and readable fashion.

BACK TO WORK AT MISSILE BASES?

As he received the Nation's plaudits and honors on his flight into space, Comdr. Alan B. Shepard spoke for us all when he said near the end of the ceremonies that now he wanted to get back to work.

Undoubtedly, he spoke for his fellow astronauts, U.S. missile and space scientists, and many others who had a hand in the gigantic effort to send an American aloft in a rocket. No one knows better than they the spirit that must pervade America's space program, or the nature and magnitude of the job that remains to be done in the race with the Soviet Union.

But there is one group engaged in the program which the commander could not speak for: the missile base workers, whose strikes, wildcat work stoppages and slowdowns have lately been the subject of hearings before a Senate investigating subcommittee.

Testimony before the group has caused the subcommittee chairman, Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, to denounce labor practices at the missile bases as "damnable."

Witnesses have told of the assembling, disassembling, and reassembling equipment for no other reason than to make work for greedy workers, often at topheavy overtime rates; of unneeded, duplicate jobs provided rival unions at public expense (known as shadow crews—men who stand around and do nothing); of strikes and walkouts staged to make overtime; and of unions requiring work to be done at the site that could be done at factories in a fraction of the time.

We wonder if these Americans have become so calloused that they were without a sneaking feeling of shame when they read, as we did, that Commander Shepard's extra compensation for his feat in blazing the U.S. trail into the universe was $14.38. This is the portion of his flying pay attributable to the history-making flight. Beside flying pay, allowed all military personnel who fly a required number of hours per month, the astronauts receive nothing extra for their participation in the program.

How much earlier that first U.S. astronaut could have been launched without the workers' abuses will never be known. The Nation has Chairman MCCLELLAN's word that the stoppages, featherbedding, and deliberate policy of low productivity has hurt U.S. space and missile efforts. The Senator also charged some subcontractors "tolerated" slowdowns and profited from them.

All told there have been 327 work stoppages at missile bases, of which one-third have occurred at Cape Canaveral, the all-important base from which Shepard was shot into space. It is at Canaveral, according to the testimony before the McClellan subcommittee, that some electricians have drawn as much as $670 a week, with overtime; where plumbers and pipefitters have received from $420 to $733 per week.

In an effort to curb jurisdictional disputes and end wildcat walkouts, the AFL–CIO has adopted an official no-strike policy at the bases, but this demonstrably has not been fully effective.

Legislation to outlaw strikes at missile bases has been promised by McClellan. It is also welcome news that Labor Secretary Goldberg has announced he will promptly submit to President Kennedy a comprehensive plan to end union squabbling at the installations and prevent further abuses.

Goldberg speaks of the urgency of the program, something most Americans have long recognized. Of course, it is this very urgency that has permitted the irresponsible workers to enforce their irresponsible demands, as officials of the program pressed forward toward achievement of its goal, regardless of the cost.

Through its history, the Nation has periodically been shocked by disclosures of profiteering in wartime at the expense of its efforts for survival. It now learns that it has been the victim of peacetime, cold war profiteering. There is no difference. One is as immoral as the other.

The Case for Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the Congress must actively concern itself with the urgent problems of the impact of imports and exports on small business.

I include as part of my remarks an excerpt from a recent study of this subject by Dr. Howard Piquet, senior specialist in international economics of the Library of Congress.

THE CASE FOR SMALL BUSINESS
(By Dr. Howard Piquet)

The organization of a number of smaller industries into vociferous pressure groups probably has done more harm than good to their cause. Often the spurious arguments that professional lobbyists use to present the case for their clients have tended to obscure the legitimate arguments that could be used.

Equalization of costs of production here and abroad, for example, for which the lobbyists argue eloquently would stifle all trade and would be antithetical to the national interest of the United States. That unit costs abroad frequently are considerably lower than unit costs in the United States is a fact but it does not lead necessarily to the conclusion that all competitive imports should be excluded.

Most of the arguments that give weight to the complaints of small business against import competition are not in the area of economics. From the point of view of economic efficiency alone, small businesses that cannot compete successfully against foreign competition should be allowed to die. But, is this what the United States wants to do? Are the American people interested only in economic efficiency? Do they place economic efficiency ahead of all other considerations?

Here is where our way of life differs markedly from the way of life in countries that are dominated by totalitarian dictatorship. In the Soviet Union and in Red China the overriding objective is the production of capital goods. Human freedom and individual rights are secondary, or considered not at all.

We in the United States have a different philosophy. We fought our Revolution some 180 years ago because we were opposed to dictatorial oppression. Individual liberty always has been our watchword. No matter how much importance we may appear to place on economic efficiency it is always, and everywhere, subordinate to respect for human rights and the dignity of the individual. Ours is a government of law, not of men. We refuse to place dictatorial powers in the hands of anyone, even in the economic field. To our way of thinking, man is not merely a function in a mathematical formula as many modern economists make him appear.

The heart of the problem of small business in all of its ramifications, including import competition, is the basic question: Do we want to preserve small enterprise, as such, because of its beneficial values to American civilization? Economic efficiency is only one aspect of the problem. Some of our most brilliant thinkers, such as the late Justice Louis Brandeis, have questioned the desirability of bigness in both government and business. The impersonality of the super giant store in contrast to the friendliness of small neighborhood shops is not a matter of brute economic efficiency. It has an important bearing to our way of life. There are many Americans who believe that the small neighborhood store and the small business enterprise have virtues that are so important that they should not be allowed to be trampled under the onward sweep of bigness. The preservation of small business enterprise may be poor economics but it may be good sociology and an important force for preserving democracy.

The opportunity for a person to enjoy the fruits of his own labor, imagination and ingenuity is something that we Americans ought to want to preserve. The days of the covered wagon had their hardships, but they also offered opportunity. A man could feel that he was the master of his own destiny and king in his own castle. What he pro-

duced he could keep and what he produced depended on his own ability and ambition.

These are the considerations that facilitate the existence of an all-important middle class. Nations have perished when their middle classes have disappeared. The opportunity for a person to own his own business is important from the point of view of both the science and art of government. This is not to say that big business inevitably leads to annihilation of the middle class, but it does narrow its opportunities considerably.

There are also cultural considerations that should not be overlooked. If our small businesses collapse, there collapse with them many opportunities for creative production. Hand-blown glassware and pottery are cases in point. Here, where artistic skills are necessary, we lose something important to our civilization when the machines take over. Again, perhaps, it is bad economics but it is good for our civilization for persons with artistic talents to be able to find outlets for those talents in their daily work. The acient Romans were genieses at government, but the art and culture of ancient Greece contributed more to subsequent civilization than did the arts of Roman conquest and governmental administration.

WHAT IS EFFICIENCY?

It does not follow, however, that imports should be excluded for the sake of protecting all small business. Some small businesses are inefficiently managed and need competition—both foreign and domestic—to keep them on their toes. Nevertheless, many small businesses that are efficiently managed cannot stand up competitively against either big business or against import competition for reasons beyond their own control.

The question that confronts us is: "Which imports should be encouraged and which should be discouraged?" The answer depends on our conception of the kind of economy that we want here in the United States. Do we want an economy in which business units are becoming ever larger, one in which the little fellow cannot stand up competitively and in which there is decreasing room for small enterprise, either old or new? It is imperative that the American people decide the kind of economy that they want and then take the necessary steps to bring it into being. This could be done, even within the framework of present foreign policy, if we were to adopt a program of stimulating selected imports. Such a policy would stimulate the importation of goods that we want, while restricting those that we do not want. Also, it would emphasize the importance of diversification. Instead of encouraging the importation of cotton textiles, chinaware, and similar goods which compete with the weaker segments of the U.S. economy, it would encourage imports that compete with those American industries that are relatively strong, such as automobiles, business machines, and agricultural implements. The recent spurt in imports of small European automobiles did not damage the U.S. automobile industry or the U.S. economy as a whole. On the contrary, it awakened the industry to the fact that Americans were becoming tired of being pushed around and really wanted smaller, more reasonably priced automobiles.

Before much headway can be made in solving the problem of import competition with respect to small business, it is necessary to distinguish between efficiently operated and inefficiently operated enterprises. Although it would be incorrect to hold that all small business is inefficiently operated, it is probably true that there is a greater proportion of inefficient management among small, than among large, businesses.

Yet, it cannot be denied that many of the smaller firms that are hardest pressed by import competition are exceedingly well managed. It is essential that a distinction be made between internal managerial efficiency and the external suitability of the type of operation in question to the American environment. An example will make the distinction clear.

Some of our china tableware factories in the Ohio River Valley are very well managed. To the extent that it is feasible to do so, the latest mechanical devices have been introduced. The management is efficient and the products that are turned out, by all the managerial yardsticks that can be conceived of, are produced efficiently. The same company—in fact, the entire industry—operates at a decided disadvantage, however, relative to much less efficiently managed plants in Japan. Since over three-fourths of the cost of producing the product is labor, the superior managerial efficiency and man-hour productivity of the American concerns are more than counterbalanced by the low wages paid in Japan. Externally, the industry is ill-adapted to the American environment.

This suitability to environment might well be called the external efficiency of an industry, as opposed to the internal efficiency of its management of men, materials, resources and production, and sales methods.

It would make little sense to protect companies that are inefficiently managed internally. The very essence of our free enterprise system is that the efficient should drive the inefficient out of business. To prohibit imports for the sake of perpetuating inefficient management would be inconsistent with this philosophy.

However, there is something to be said for limiting the degree of competition from imports that hurt domestic establishments that are efficiently managed internally but which are at an external disadvantage. Here is the area in which consideration needs to be given of the extent to which limitations should be placed on competitive imports. This is particularly the case where it is deemed desirable to keep such concerns in business in the national interest because of considerations of culture, art, special skills, economic diversification, and national security.

The near-insoluble problem is how to establish yardsticks for measuring internal efficiency. Establishment of boards or commissions to make such determinations would smack too much of dictatorial methods. Yet, it would be circular reasoning to judge efficiency on the basis of profit and loss statements, since they reflect both internal and external efficiency.

POSSIBLE APPROACH TO A YARDSTICK OF EFFICIENCY

By the nature of the case there is no objective measure of internal, or managerial, efficiency. As a substitute for an objective yardstick, something along the following lines would appear to be equitable and practicable.

1. Instead of concentrating so exclusively on solving the problems of an industry that is being hard hit by import competition (the U.S. Tariff Commission has encountered tremendous difficulty in defining industry) the Tariff Commission should be instructed to pay greater attention to the range of unit costs among the individual firms producing a given product.

2. Establish the principle that a small business is one in which no company has more than 500 workers. Then reach a decision as to whether it is desirable, in the national interest (taking into account clearly specified noneconomic, as well as economic, considerations) to keep the industry in business.

3. If the answer is in the affirmative, establish the further principle that domestic producers of the product in question are entitled to 50 percent (or some other proportion) of the domestic market.

4. It seems reasonable to assume that firms persistently producing at unit costs substantially lower than the unit costs of the marginal producers are internally efficient.

5. Impose a tariff equalizing the marginal cost of the most efficiently produced half of the total domestic output. Equalize this marginal cost with the cost of production abroad, as indicated by invoice value plus transportation.

6. Invoke as import adjustment assistance program along the lines proposed by President Kennedy (when he was a Senator), Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS and Senator JACOB JAVITS, to assist producers, whose costs are so high that they cannot compete against imports.

These "adjustments" bills provide that in instances where imports threaten injury to domestic producers the President can utilize the powers of the Federal Government to assist producers who are adversely affected to adjust to other, more efficient lines of production. This objective would be accomplished by special low-interest bearing loans, by providing retraining for younger workers (following the philosophy of the GI bill of rights), by accelerating the retirement of older workers, by increasing unemployment compensation benefits, and by enlarging the powers and scope of the U.S. Employment Service. Some of the distressed area proposals now under consideration make specific reference to the problem of displacement of workers by import competition.

7. This approach would have the advantage of eliminating internally inefficient firms by spreading the cost of transferring their labor and capital to more efficient lines of production over the entire country, while keeping in business establishments that are internally efficient (at least according to this rough yardstick) but which are at a disadvantage, externally, relative to low-cost foreign production.

8. Although this approach does not provide a precise means for measuring internal efficiency of production it does provide a yardstick that appears to be just and workable. The plan could vary as to detail. Instead of allowing domestic producers one-half of the domestic market, it could allow them two-thirds, or production up to what used to be called (by the late Prof. Frank W. Taussig, of Harvard, who was the first Chairman of the U.S. Tariff Commission back in 1916) the bulk-line cost, or distance O–X in the diagram (not printed in RECORD). The bulk-line cost is the point beyond which the average unit cost of production shoots upward abruptly. Beyond the bulk-line the firms can be said to be marginal.

CONCLUSION

Expanding foreign trade—both exports and imports—is essential for the welfare of the United States in these days of worldwide political bipolarity. The least intelligent way to solve the present balance-of-payments deficit problem of the United States would be to curtail imports. International trade is so essential to free world solidarity that we must do everything in our power to enable it to expand. Although the United States probably could get along tolerably well with far smaller foreign trade than it now has, other countries could not. To some of them, particularly those specializing in the production of a few raw materials, exports can mean the difference between economic life and economic death. The self-interest of the United States demands that we think of the economic strength of our friends and neighbors as well as of our own national strength.

With production costs as low as they are in certain foreign countries, particularly Japan, a highly industrialized country, it would not make sense to open our doors wide to all imports without taking care of the domestic producers who are injured.

This consideration lies at the very heart of the small industry problem.

The plan outlined in this memorandum provides a formula that seems to satisfy the requirements of the problem. It would not cut off all import competition, but it would provide for the transfer by the less-efficiently managed U.S. firms of their manpower and capital to other, more efficient lines of production. At the same time it would protect the more efficiently managed small companies against displacement by import competition.

No longer can we afford to drift in foreign trade policy, proclaiming a liberal, multilateral foreign trade policy while avoiding all serious injury from import competition, regardless of productive efficiency. We need to protect those American producers who are reasonably efficient, but it would be a disservice to perpetuate inefficiency be excluding all competitive imports.

Armed Services Recruitment Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I submit the very meritorious suggestions of Dr. Joseph A. Shelley, of St. Augustine, Fla.:

ST. AUGUSTINE, FLA., *May 9, 1961.*

Hon. A. SYD HERLONG,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HERLONG: I have been most disappointed and disagreebly impressed with the public relations of our various military services in their recruitment programs. Only last night while watching a U.S. Air Force recruitment program on television the entire appeal was made to the young man's desire for: (1) security, (2) chance for advancement, (3) technical education, (4) opportunity to travel and see the world, (5) 30 days vacation with pay during the year, (6) free hospitalization, (7) insurance program, (8) PX and housing benefits, and (9) retirement.

It seems to me that our military services would do far better if we appeal to our young men using such terms as: Services to country, patriotism, fidelity, loyalty, preservation of our way of life, protection of our families, and protection of all of our freedoms which the Constitution has given to us. None of these things are mentioned. I would say that if our young men would not respond to their country in its hour of need then we are indeed in a sad plight. It has been my privilege to belong to our Reserve Forces, both Reserve and National Guard, for some 22 years. It is my hope to continue serving in these units until I have at least 30 years service behind me. I do not consider it an imposition on me or my time for whatever I have given. I spent 3 years in the Army during World War II, of which almost that entire time was overseas. I was in combat with the infantry for 13 months. I do not feel that my country asked anything of me it was not entitled to.

Since World War II there has been a continuous and steady trend in this country to materialistic thinking; to security from the cradle to the grave and away from personal integrity and personal independence. If this appeal to the materialistic side of our young people is the only one which will bring young men and women into the service of our country then we have no hope whatsoever of surviving the coming years in the battle against our enemies. I would like to urge both the military committees of the Senate and House of Representatives to investigate this matter of public relations and of recruitment programs by all of our various services. I think it is disgusting and an insult to a good American to appeal to him through the methods which they are using today.

There is just a chance that a soldier might be called on to fight. God help us if our safety rests in the hands of soldiers and sailors whose only reasons for being in service are the nine I have listed above. I sincerely hope that my suggestions will not fall on deaf ears.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH A. SHELLEY, MD.

Statement on Loan Made by Small Business Administration to CAN-DO of Hazleton, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to make a formal statement for the RECORD regarding a $60,000 loan made by the Small Business Administration to Hazleton's CAN-DO.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT REGARDING HAZLETON LOAN BY SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

I am urging my colleagues in the House who are interested in industrial expansion in their districts, particularly in small towns and rural areas, to take a good hard look at the provisions of section 502 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, as amended, which is administered by the Small Business Administration, and which is now permanent legislation.

A $60,000 loan for a tunnel and conveyor has been approved by this Administration for Hazleton, Pa., under the provisions of this act in participation with the Northeastern Bank & Trust Co., Hazleton, Pa. This is my district and it is in the heart of the anthracite coal region, a truly labor-distressed area.

The Small Business Administration loan is going to the Community-Area New Development Organization, Inc. The initials of the organization very properly spell out CAN-DO. This development company has raised $1½ million in capital funds from some 4,500 donors in the locality over the past 5 years. After CAN-DO had exhausted all available local funds for further industrial projects, it came to me in desperation seeking additional funds for the construction of the tunnel. I turned to SBA for assistance, and within 17 working days after an application was filed, a $60,000 loan was approved.

The tunnel and conveyor which CAN-DO is constructing with the proceeds of this loan will make nine industrial facilities CAN-DO has provided for lease or sale to business concerns within the Hazleton area. This tunnel will be leased to and used by General Foam Corp., a company engaged in the manufacture and sale of urethane foam and foam rubber products. The tunnel will connect two buildings located approximately 250 feet apart and which are owned by CAN-DO and leased to General Foam Corp. Through the use of a conveyor in the tunnel, the transportation and handling costs of materials between the two buildings will be greatly reduced from the present costs incurred by transporting materials by truck.

This loan was approved by SBA as a part of its established program to assist in the economic development of particular local communities by lending to a State or local development company which, in turn, provides facilities for specific small business concerns located in either urban or rural areas. It therefore seems particularly appropriate that the Secretary of Commerce, in delegating the authority under the Flood-Douglas sponsored Redevelopment Act, should delegate the authority to handle all commercial and industrial loans to the Small Business Administration. SBA already has 55 field offices established in key cities throughout the Nation, a staff of technical, managerial and production specialists who provide services to the small businessman in SBA's various programs.

Under the Area Redevelopment Act, before aid can be granted, financial assistance must be unavailable on reasonable terms from other sources, including Federal agencies such as SBA.

Accordingly, business concerns will be obligated to seek assistance from SBA before they will be eligible for assistance under the Area Redevelopment Act. Thus, SBA will have reviewed the concern's application for financial conditions and the availability of SBA financing, so that only SBA can effectuate the lending under section 6 of the Area Redevelopment Act without duplicating the work of other Federal agencies. As a matter of cold fact, section 24 of the Area Redevelopment Act specifically provides that the Secretary of Commerce shall use the available services and facilities of other agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government, so as to avoid duplication of existing staffs and activities. I believe the section is crystal clear—therefore SBA is now actively making commercial and industrial loans in areas of substantial labor surplus as well as those in areas of substantial and persistent surplus. They, of course, also make loans in areas not classified as distressed areas.

SBA is approving loans every day to small business firms and local and State development companies such as the loan to CAN-DO in Hazleton, Pa. They should continue to perform this valuable and much needed financial assistance under the Area Redevelopment Act. All the Secretary of Commerce needs to do is to delegate to SBA the responsibility, and I feel certain and confident that SBA will do the job with utmost dispatch.

Aid for Negro College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am pleased to call attention to the desegregation of United Negro College Fund Week as proclaimed by Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller.

I ask unanimous consent that the proclamation be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION BY GOVERNOR ROCKEFELLER, OF NEW YORK

Many of America's Negro leaders have attained their positions and influence through training they received at institutions of higher learning supported by United Negro College Fund. There are colleges and universities of excellent standards. More than 170,000 alumni are respected and valuable citizens of the communities in which they live, people of distinction in the learned professions, the sciences and the arts, as well as in business.

The United Negro College Fund assists 32 member colleges, including such well-known institutions as Fisk, Hampton, Tuskegee, and Atlanta University. Forty percent of the students at these colleges receive scholarships.

While most of the students are native Americans, some 200 students from Africa are presently studying in American Negro colleges. Graduates of these institutions are holding responsible posts in various countries of Africa, some in Government, others as teachers and agricultural experts.

These institutions merit our respect and appreciation not only for what they are doing now, but what they are doing to meet the challenges of tomorrow.

Now, therefore, I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim May 15–21, 1961, as United Negro College Fund Week in New York State and I commend it to the sympathetic interest of all people.

Given under my hand and the privy seal of the State at the capitol in the city of Albany this 24th day of April 1961.

[SEAL] NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.

By the Governor:

WILLIAM J. RONAN,
Secretary to the Governor.

The U.S. Savings Bond Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call attention to the following editorial which appeared in the Caldwell Progress, an outstanding weekly newspaper published in my congressional district, on May 11, 1961.

In brief form, the Progress relates the history and success of the U.S. savings bond program, and I respectfully ask my colleagues to note the last paragraph of the editorial. There they will find a well-founded conclusion that thrift is not an outmoded word or practice.

The editorial is as follows:

A 20TH ANNIVERSARY

Twenty years ago the President of the United States handed the Secretary of the Treasury a small check, received in return a government certificate, and the U.S. savings bond program was born. Two billion bond sales have followed that first one. By the middle of this year, total series E bond sales will have reached the $100 billion mark.

The war boomed bond sales, and street rallies where millions of dollars' worth were sold became a common occurrence. With the end of the war, however, came gloomy predictions that bonds valued in the billions would be quickly cashed in, leading to serious inflation.

The predictions were wrong. Many bonds, of course, were redeemed, and their yield went into new homes, automobiles, educations, and war-scarce consumer goods. But in 1946, $30 billion worth of series E bonds were still held by the public.

Bonds are still being held by American citizens in record numbers, and purchases have steadily continued. More than 8 million workers, employed by 45,000 business firms, are a part of the payroll savings plan. Purchases of bonds on an installment basis, sometimes for as little as $1.25 a week, account for 40 percent of the annual dollar volume on series E and H bond sales. Most other sales take place through 20,000 banks and other issuing agents.

Series E bonds pay 3¾ percent interest when held to maturity. Investors can find higher interest-paying sources for investment, but the security offered by Government bonds is hard to match. Today bonds valued at $43½ billion are held by Americans. Sales are up, and redemptions are down.

"Thrift" is sometimes considered an old-fashioned word, but it is obvious that millions of citizens still understand its meaning.

The Shelter Gap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the lag in a positive, coordinated approach to the problems of civil defense is perhaps better known and appreciated in our large metropolitan areas. The heavy concentration of people, working and living there, keeps fresh in the mind the pictures of European cities ravaged from the air in World War II.

Yesterday, on its editorial page, the Newark Star-Ledger set forth some sound observations on the subject of "Civil Defense," which I want to bring to the attention of my distinguished colleagues:

THE SHELTER GAP

According to testimony before a congressional committee, there is a serious gap between the United States and the Soviet Union in the construction of fallout shelters. The Soviet Union has embarked on an extensive program of building shelters, Frank B. Ellis, Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, testified. By contrast, we are doing practically nothing.

Fallout shelters adequate to offer protection to substantial numbers of people certainly could be a deterrent to a nuclear attack.

An adequate shelter program, however, is a tremendous undertaking. It is particularly tremendous if it is undertaken independently of other building programs.

During World War II the London subway provided an effective bomb shelter. If the subway had not served this purpose, perhaps the outcome of the war would have been different.

Whether the New York subway system could serve as a fallout shelter, and what could be done to make it serve this double purpose, might well be explored.

And it is possible that rapid transit developments in New Jersey could be dovetailed with civil defense so that tunnels could serve as fallout shelters.

Discussions on depressing superhighways also have called attention to the possibility of a construction which might be suitable for use as a shelter in time of emergency.

If the needs of civil defense were considered along with many other projects, the shelter gap might not be so wide.

Chelsea Naval Hospital Aids Servicemen, Families, for Over 125 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the Chelsea Record, Chelsea, Mass., issue of May 11, 1961:

NAVAL HOSPITAL AIDS SERVICEMEN, FAMILIES, FOR OVER 125 YEARS

The Naval Hospital, Chelsea's oldest hospital and the oldest naval hospital continuously in commission, has been a tremendous asset for the entire Nation throughout the 125 years of its existence.

From a 4-story granite building that was able to serve 100 patients, it has grown to a teaching hospital of almost 100 buildings with a 975-bed capacity.

The present hospital grounds mark the site of the first home built in Winnisimmet colony, the residence of Samuel Maverick, the first white settler. It was located near the former main entrance to the hospital on Broadway near the old Charlestown drawbridge.

The old marine hospital was erected in 1798. The small building still stands and is now used as a storeroom for hospital equipment and supplies.

A second hospital was built on a 10-acre parcel of land, a few blocks from the present hospital.

In 1823 the U.S. Commissioners (the Secretaries of Navy, Treasurer, and War) purchased 115 acres of land from Anthony Dexter, a Boston physician, for the Naval Hospital's grounds and facilities.

The first naval hospital building has since been modernized and made fireproof and is now used as quarters for the nursing personnel.

The second marine hospital building was sold to the city in 1860 for use as a school. It was later destroyed in the Palm Sunday conflagration in 1908.

The third marine hospital was built in 1860, occupying about 11 acres of land. The structure, four stories high in addition to a basement, is now used as quarters for Waves of the First Naval District.

The Naval Hospital and its personnel gained national acclaim after both World Wars and the Korean conflict for the excellent job it did in saving the lives of hundreds of Americans and Allied servicemen.

Many of them, near death, were nursed back to perfect health after undergoing surgery. They were later given occupational and physical therapy, neuro-psychiatric treatment wherever needed and through the efforts of the hospital's readjustment center were restored to normal civilian lives.

XUM

Many Government and naval leaders from this country and abroad have been treated here. Most prominent among these is President Kennedy, who was brought to the Naval Hospital following the heroic PT-boat episode in the South Pacific during World War II.

It was during this stay, he says, that he made the fateful decision to make politics and public service his profession.

Following the Korean war, over 500 casualties were brought to the Naval Hospital for treatment. These were largely orthopedic, neuro-surgical, and frostbite cases that have since been corrected and the servicemen restored to normalcy.

In 1958, a new blood laboratory was dedicated by the U.S. Navy and Protein Foundation Inc., devoted to studying methods of preserving and storing human blood. The discoveries which have since been made here have been widely acclaimed as momentous advances in the field of medicine.

In the same year the hospital doctors were also hailed for having saved the life of little Judy White, the young sailor's daughter who was given little chance of living after about 80 percent of her body was seriously burned. But after many months of hospitalization, a number of operations and several skin graftings she was able to return home completely recovered.

Principal credit for the publicity given the near miracle belongs to film star Gregory Peck, who visited the youngster while she was a patient at the hospital and then discussed it on the Ed Sullivan television program.

ACCREDITED FOR TRAINING

In peacetime, in addition to caring for servicemen and their dependents, the hospital is frequently called upon to handle emergency cases which are flown there from naval installations and vessels in various parts of the world and other boats on the high seas.

Today the hospital, with approximately 1,000 civilians and Navy personnel, is approved by the American Medical Association for 4-year training in medicine, surgery, obstetrics and gynecology, X-ray, pediatrics, psychiatry, and dentistry.

The Government institution today has a staff of 80 Navy doctors in addition to a consultant staff of some 60 Boston physicians selected from Greater Boston medical school faculties and hospital staffs.

The hospital has been able to accomplish its tremendous success in treating servicemen and their families and restoring them to perfect health because of its many facilities which are not to be found at private institutions and many Government medical centers.

On full-time duty are two resident chaplains, a Catholic and a Protestant. Jewish patients are serviced by rabbis from nearby synagogues and temples. Permanent chapels have been erected on the hospital grounds where regular religious services are held.

The American Red Cross Club, staffed by full-time ARC personnel, includes recreation facilities, a library and writing materials, musical instruments and recordings. Here are presented much of the entertainment and other programs sponsored by outside organizations. Grey Ladies furnish services to the bed patients.

The recreation buildings, erected in 1944, also provides recreational and physical education facilities, educational services, and other similar equipment to aid the patient in his complete recovery.

The Hospital Corpsmen's Club, erected and equipped by the Knights of Columbus during the First World War, houses a gym, comfortable lounges for rest and relaxation, and a swimming pool.

The 120-bed hospital of the dependents' unit houses modern X-ray rooms, scientific laboratories, a library of medical photography and a nursery in addition to beds for adults.

The hospital also has a complete telephone center and telecart service by which the telephones are brought to patients unable to leave their beds in order that they, too, may make or receive telephone calls.

The naval hospital during the 125 years of its existence has provided work for dozens of Chelsea residents. In addition, hundreds of local families have benefited from the outstanding care and medical and surgical services available there.

Though primarily for servicemen, the naval hospital has played an outstanding role in the life, health, and welfare of Chelsea and other nearby communities.

Facts of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to place in the RECORD a commendatory review of the latest "Facts of Communism" volume issued by the Committee on Un-American Activities. The review appeared in the Freeman magazine of May 1961 and is written by our able coordinator of information for the House of Representatives, Mr. Lawrence Sullivan.

Those of use who serve on the committee have been gratified by a mounting demand from educators for copies of its "Facts on Communism" publications for use as a teaching aid. Reviews such as this which appeared in the Freeman will undoubtedly increase the utilization of these scholarly committee publications in the all-important and growing movement to inform our youth on the realities of Communist totalitarianism:

FACTS OF COMMUNISM: THE SOVIET UNION FROM LENIN TO KHRUSHCHEV

(Reviewed by Lawrence Sullivan)

A new paperback published by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the second of a projected three-volume series, presents for the lay reader a complete and authoritative history of international communism and the devil's disciples who set it up.

From the mountainous records of the committee, accumulated through 22 years of hearings, and other sources, Dr. David J. Dallin, a world authority on the history and techniques of communism, has compiled a smooth-running 400-page narrative tracing the inspirations, motives, and methods of Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin, and Khrushchev.

Communism has advanced by conquest and terror, but it has also made headway because so many people have been led to believe that it is but the economic extension of parliamentary liberalism. In truth, communism is the sworn enemy of every form of representative government, and an economic failure besides. Lenin's basic philosophy, as expressed by a coconspirator was that "the masses are only the obedient tool of a group of revolutionists, the conscious minority, the bearers of the truth * * *." Acting on this principle, an elite of brutality become the determined authors of chaos, trying, by means of political and military conquest, to escape the consequences of their economic mistakes.

Tribute to George W. Norris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Clyde T. Ellis, general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association at the George W. Norris Centennial Conference, in Washington, D.C., on May 16, 1961.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NORRIS MISSION: KEY TO THE WESTERN WORLD

(Remarks of Clyde T. Ellis, general manager, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, before the George W. Norris Centennial Conference, Washington, D.C., May 16, 1961)

On behalf of the committee of sponsors, and the sponsoring organizations, welcome to the George W. Norris Centennial Conference.

We meet to honor both the memory and the continuing ideals of one of the greatest statesmen ever produced by this Nation.

In the course of this conference, you will hear many distinguished leaders discuss the unique contributions of Senator George Norris to specific areas of American life. As you listen, you'll wonder, I'm sure, how one man could have accomplished so much—how one mind could have been so intimately concerned with such diverse human needs and aspirations.

I have been asked to make some opening remarks about that intense human being who was George W. Norris—and to try to relate his great work to the needs of the world of 1961. This is a challenging, and, for me, a proud assignment.

A challenge because we meet in a time of danger to the whole free world—a time in which we must make practical application of the vision and dreams of Norris if our economy is to meet the onslaught of a totalitarian system. Some of the Norris concepts have been adopted, and have added immeasurably to the strength of our country—but too many others, equally feasible, equally essential, exist today only in the yellowing pages of old copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or in the minds of the few who have dared to follow in the Norris tradition.

This is a proud assignment because I am proud to have been a friend of George Norris. This is a pride which I know many of you enjoy, too.

I first met him in 1939, upon coming to Washington as a freshman Congressman from the hill country of northwest Arkansas. Prior to then, I had known him only through correspondence. As a member of the Arkansas Legislature, I had fought for rural electrification—and this great Senator some-

how found the time to respond to my letters and to offer advice and encouragement.

By a stroke of good fortune, my family and I found living quarters in Washington in the apartment house where the Senator and Mrs. Norris lived. Sometimes in good weather we would sit outside the Methodist Building on Capitol Hill in the evening, and, with a little encouragement, the Senator would talk of his great battles—of dragons slain and causes won and lost.

This was the aging Norris—nearing the end of his time on earth. But even then his mind was keen and full of things he still wanted to accomplish. When he spoke of coming battles his voice would firm and his eyes would glow with the fire of a champion.

I thought he was curiously unmarked and undaunted by the merciless beatings he had taken at intervals throughout a long and hectic career. Even near the end, his face held the qualities of a young idealist; and sometimes in his enthusiasm he still displayed the beam of youth.

It was so, for instance, when he made the major address at the first annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association in St. Louis in 1943. I had the honor to introduce him and to sit behind him and watch him, speaking without a note, deliver his last great speech. But it was a speech filled more with the dream of youth than with realization of an approaching end. For instance, note the simple conservation philosophy contained in this one paragraph from that speech:

"It is hard to bring happiness and comfort and joy to the human race, as the art has only in comparatively recent years been at all understood. And every day of every year that passes some bright mind, dreaming of better things for humanity, invents something new that electricity does. We know it is created by falling water. There never should be a drop of water come from the heavens and fall upon the earth beneath unless it does some good to man."

It was easy to forget then, as it is now, that Norris was one of the most controversial men ever to sit in the U.S. Congress—in both the House and the Senate. For the same uncompromising dedication to principle which achieved the great programs we represent also led him to battle for other convictions some of which were at the time extremely unpopular. Such was his one-man battle, extending over years, to break the dictatorial rule of Speaker Joe Cannon in the House of Representatives. He barely won that one—and I wonder what a different world it might have been today had he lost that one: no TVA, no Grand Coulee, no 50,000 airplanes a year in World War II, to mention just a few.

Throughout most of his career, Norris was considered an isolationist. This reputation was largely the result of his Senate votes against the Armed Ship Bill, our entry in World War I and the League of Nations. But by the time of World War II he had come to the realization that armed conflict is sometimes necessary and unavoidable—and he supported the war effort. Indeed his accomplishments, including the rural electric systems, supported it immeasurably.

I mention these things because they were essential facets of the Norris being—just as they are lingering elements of the Norris legend. To the end, he stoutly believed his stands, even his minority stands, were in the national interest. No amount of public indignation or ridicule could sway him from a conviction.

And for the sake of his monumental accomplishments in public power, in rural electrification, in labor, in farm legislation, all of the people whom we in this room represent can thank God he had the strength of his convictions.

He always believed the people would ultimately appreciate and approve his personal honesty and perseverence. I think he was right, because the one symbol that has become synonymous with his name is the word "integrity." No man in public life could ever hope for a finer epitaph.

This integrity, this courage, this indomitable will and selflessness are needed today as never before to carry out the domestic programs Norris envisioned. Norris is gone. Pinchot is gone. Le Olds is gone. Morris Cooke is gone. If you know where the new ones are, tell me, for I want to meet them, and I don't know them.

And I know we must have them.

The 1860's produced Norris. The 1960's must produce a new Norris, a new resources realist, not just for this Nation, but for this hemisphere. For all mankind.

Khrushchev says he will bury us. Nobody laughs when he says that, or, if one does, it's a nervous little laugh. We're awakening to the realization that the Communist totalitarianism can amass its whole economic system behind the achievement of a single objective. We've seen the result dramatically demonstrated in the missile and space races.

And the Russian capability in the industrial fields will sharply increase in the immediate future. The key is the mighty power generation and transmission pool which some of us have seen under construction and already in partial operation. Gigantic dams, high voltage interconnections and transmission grids, larger than anything in the Western World. Giant power. And a giant sized technical achievement.

And now we learn of Russian plans to cooperate with Finland and Norway in the development of the water power of their common borders—and in interconnecting their systems. Does this mean Russia will eventually interconnect with the power pool already in existence in Western Europe? The European democracies, you know, have long since interconected their power systems in an efficient international grid system. They had to do it to compete.

And on the other side of its enormous land mass Russia is cooperating with China in power development. We're told that China, with almost ruthless determination, is pushing construction of 250 dams, including one several times larger than any we can ever build, and has plans for a huge power pool of its own. Does anyone doubt that the Russian and Chinese power pools will eventually be tied together?

Generations of Americans have squabbled over development of the Passamaquoddy tidal project in Maine. Now we learn the Russians are interested in harnessing the power potential of the Bearing Strait between Siberia and Alaska. Does anyone in this room have a serious doubt as to which would be completed first if Russia owned both sides of the Strait?

What has happened to the imagination of America? Of the Western Hemisphere? Oh, yes, our Government has lately joined with Mexico in the building of two relatively small dams on the Rio Grande. And we finally got around to joining with Canada—long after Canada was ready—in developing the Niagara-St. Lawrence projects, and we have just concluded a treaty with Canada to divide up the Columbia River sometime.

What about our so-called private power companies? How interested are they in providing our country with the enormous advantages of efficient interconnections? Well, they've set an example. Rather the Detroit Edison Co. has. It operates near the Canadian border, and has an interconnection with a Canadian supplier.

But Detroit Edison will not in turn interconnect with American companies across the Michigan State line lest it become subject to the accounting regulations of the Federal Power Commission. Detroit Edison even got a special law passed to allow it to hook up with the publicly owned Ontario hydro without coming under the FPC. This is the brilliant achievement of the investor-owned companies in the field of international cooperation.

In many respects, Canada has been more farsighted than have we in resources development. We quibbled for years about Niagara and St. Lawrence and we can thank constant pressure from Canada for our participation in these projects.

And Canada managed to pass the benefits of these projects on to its people and industries. Our Government and the State of New York have managed to thwart the preference clause and let the power companies grab most of the benefits.

George Norris, Pinchot, Olds, Cooke, and Franklin Roosevelt were talking giant power in America before the Russians had a single major hydro project or one major interconnection. I suppose other Americans were talking of space travel long before the Russians had any capability at all in this field. Now, in both fields, they lead and we follow. How long is this to go on?

We talk about building a giant power grid in this country to interconnect our present hodge-podge of suppliers to provide the efficiencies that are possible only with true pooling of our generating capacity. At last we've found some public officials who will say this would be a good thing. Already the power companies are fighting it like death and simultaneously planning to build enough of it themselves to thwart any Government effort.

And as tragically funny as it seems, they may win. We may have no giant power at all in this country ever. Nobody even dares think about a trans-American power grid that would interconnect the capacities of our country, Canada, Mexico, and the rest of Latin America. It that fantastic? Is that something we should not even mention because we might be ridiculed?

Well, how fantastic is it that we now have a Communist dictatorship, Moscow controlled, sitting 90 miles from Florida? How fantastic is it that we may get other Castros in Latin America, and with them get hydrogen war-head missiles pointing at every American city?

It can happen and it will happen unless we offer something more than words to the millions south of our border. We must prove that our system offers more hope than communism—realistic hope.

Imagine, if you will, what would happen if overnight an efficient inter-American power pool could be started in earnest, including cooperatives and power districts, to carry electricity in abundance at low cost for homes and industries.

What would happen? It would trigger the biggest boon for both democracy and American industry in our lifetime. Unemployment would drop sharply. It would offer hope in countries where people have no hope.

Fantastic? Maybe it is. Maybe it's as fantastic as the notion that TVA could be built or that all the rural people in the United States could have electricity at a price they could afford to pay. As fantastic as Grand Coulee and the jackrabbits. Maybe it's as fantastic as the idea that workingmen could have something to say about their contracts or could have any contract at all. Or some of the other "wild" things George Norris used to talk about.

How we need a new Norris today. Among other things, we need his voice and his courage to prod this administration. Many people, I think, believed the New Frontier would come into power speaking and acting boldly

XUM

in the field of resource development and giant power.

It seems to me that the speech was a little bolder before the election than the acts have been since. We're getting some talk—good talk—and we're told some studies are being made—but where is the forceful, dynamic leadership we were told to expect? The old "no new starts" policy of a prior administration has been discarded, we are told. But where are the new starts?

You find them in the proposals made to date and let me know. Find the clues to the bold new forward thrust we were promised and have been expecting. The days are slipping past—fast.

This is not intended as criticism, but as a fact about which we must help do something while there is yet time.

In other areas in which we are interested the administration is making great strides. The area-redevelopment program has been set in motion—the rural electrics of the country have just finished a meeting here in Washington, attended by over 700 of their leaders—to study the rural aspects of this program. We hope it will be administered largely by REA.

And REA, we think, has achieved a significant new breakthrough in electric generation and another one in rural cooperative telephone loan policies.

But here the administration is building on, and improving on, the past. What we must also have today are new ideas, new visions, new solutions to the old problems. And spokesmen with the courage, vision and heart of George Norris, both in Congress and in the administration, to set new programs in motion.

Some official spokesmen must be the Moses who leads America into the promised land of giant power, a land where high-voltage transmission grids interconnect all major power sources, a land where we develop all our remaining hydro capacity, a land where we build steam plants larger and more efficient than any in existence in America today.

The benefits would be enormous. In the Missouri Valley alone, the simple interconnection of existing generating capacity would result in the addition of 1 million kilowatts of firm power. This is half as much power as is generated by Grand Coulee Dam, more power than is generated by any but a handful of dams in this country.

The combination of efficient pooling throughout the United States and the elimination of other unnecessary waste could cut in half the power cost to many Americans.

Will we ever have it? We will if we can find the men with the will and courage to follow in the tradition of George Norris. For, in his 40-year career, this farm boy from the Middle West became the symbol and leader of progressive legislation in America. On many issues, he was far ahead of his time. Some of the things decried as "radical" in his day are now accepted almost universally as responsible and essential national institutions.

Many of his dreams were never realized, and the fight goes on. In 1920, for example, Senator Norris was fighting for development of the Potomac River. Finally, in frustration, he cried out: "It is a moral sin that within the shadow of the dome of the Capitol one of the greatest waterpower possibilities is being wasted while we investigate and investigate." Thirty years later, we're still fighting the battle of the Potomac, and it's still being investigated.

But there is one difference. In Norris' day there were no rural electric cooperatives in Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania crying out for this lower cost power of the Potomac, that would pay for the high dam completely—and so the tragedy today is multiplied.

The fight goes on, too, even to protect as well as to advance the accomplishments of Norris. The fight for comprehensive development of our great river basins, the fight to prevent the destruction of the Norris-sponsored rural electrification program, the fight for the right of the people to own their own power facilities if they desire to do so, the fight for the small farmer, the fight for the rights of little people generally.

We in this room are heirs to the great Norris tradition. Upon us, and upon the people we represent, has descended the responsibility for carrying on his magnificent battle for the people.

Upon us, too, lies the responsibility of finding, developing, and supporting the Norrises of tomorrow.

In his autobiography, "Fighting Liberal," the great economic liberator said this:

"I am sure that, from among America's fighting men and others, warriors will appear to fight the unending battle for good government. I am sure that, so long as there are men, there will be knights to lift their swords and press their shields against the enemies, corruption and evil.

"Liberalism will not die. It is as indispensable to life as the pure air all around about. It is deathless—it marches forward—and it will continue to march long after those who have carried its standards in past struggles are gone from this earth."

This was George W. Norris. Whence comes another?

J. Edgar Hoover Day, May 10

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am happy to include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial that appeared in the Butler County American on May 6, 1961, commemorating the 37th year of J. Edgar Hoover as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

As you know, I had the honor of being an associate of Mr. Hoover a number of years ago and am happy to join my many colleagues in congratulating this great American for his continued fine public service.

The editorial follows:

J. EDGAR HOOVER DAY, MAY 10—HONOR HIM

May 10 has been designated as J. Edgar Hoover Day in honor of the FBI Chief's 37th year as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

This paper has said much in recent issues in praise of the FBI Director. We—nor you, or any other American—can ever say enough because he is all for which the American flag stands. He has protected that for which Old Glory waves and has not only caught Communists who would burn and trample it, but has carried on an educational campaign to inform citizens as to the danger of the Communist conspiracy with a thousand faces of deceit, designed to destroy the United States.

Negro citizens owe Mr. Hoover a special debt. For, without his successful work to keep this Nation free from Communist control, they would be lost in efforts to work for a place in the sun in cooperation with descendants of those who fought and died in the Civil War.

All gains made by a race, all progress made by industry or labor, all physical progress of schools or increased pay for teachers, all fine churches we build, or legislation passed to aid the aged and distressed areas, or any good done on the domestic front will be like pouring water down the drain if communism takes over. None today, or yesterday knows this better than J. Edgar Hoover.

And so, this paper calls upon Americans regardless of race, color, or creed to pause May 10 and speak out loud in honor of our No. 1 symbol—in the flesh—of our free system of government.

Flood Damage in the Wabash River Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, floods again have washed away tons of topsoil and ruined thousands of acres of crops in the fertile Wabash River Basin of Illinois and Indiana.

This is almost an annual occurrence in the Wabash Valley. Newspaper headlines for the past week have told a familiar story of National Guardsmen working with local sandbag crews along the levees, of families driven from their homes and of emergency assistance being offered to the stricken areas by the Federal and State Governments.

But helpful as the emergency measures are they are mere palliatives. What is needed is a coordinated attack on the basic problem of harnessing the Wabash and its tributary streams. They must be converted from a destructive to a constructive force.

I have, therefore, today reintroduced my bill to authorize the establishment of a Wabash Interagency Water Resources Commission. The commission would have the following duties:

First. To coordinate Federal, State, and local plans for development of water and related resources in the Wabash Basin.

Second. Prepare and keep up to date a comprehensive, integrated, joint plan for water and related water resources development.

Third. Recommended a long-range schedule of priorities for the collection and analysis of basic data, for investigation and project planning, and for construction of projects.

Fourth. Foster and undertake studies of water resources problems in the basin.

The Commission would be composed of members appointed by the President from the various Federal departments or agencies having a substantial interest in the work to be undertaken and one or more members, as the President deems appropriate, from each of the States of Illinois and Indiana, as well as one member from each interstate compact commission which has jurisdiction over any of the waters of the Wabash Basin. The President also would appoint the Chair-

man of the Commission. The Governors of the two States would be authorized to nominate the members from the States of Illinois and Indiana.

Comprehensive water resources development plans have been prepared in the past for certain areas, including the New York-New England region and the Arkansas-White-Red River Basin. Such plans have been of great value in developing projects for construction.

I am of the opinion that only through such an integrated program can we realize the full potential of the Wabash and its tributaries for bringing prosperity to this area and enriching the lives of its citizens.

Allison Lumber Co. Furnishes Lumber for Extension of the Nation's Capitol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article from the Choctaw Advocate of Butler, Ala., appearing in their May 11, 1961, edition and titled "Allison Lumber Co. Furnishes Lumber for Extension of the Nation's Capitol." Naturally all of us in south Alabama are quite proud of the Allison Lumber Co. and to know that this company participated in the recent extension of the east front of the Capitol in furnishing clear-heart yellow pine lumber for parts of the construction. You will note that this type lumber which was never abundant is quite scarce and that more than 25 manufacturers of pine lumber were contacted before the Allison people informed the contractor that their company could fill the order. The very interesting article follows:

ALLISON LUMBER CO. FURNISHES LUMBER FOR EXTENSION OF THE NATION'S CAPITOL

An Alabama lumber company proudly participated in the recent extension of the east front of our Nation's Capitol in Washington, D.C.

Allison Lumber Co., Bellamy, Ala., learned that the Assistant Architect in charge of this historical project desired clear-heart yellow pine for parts of the construction.

This Assistant Architect, formerly associated with the famed restoration of Colonial Williamsburg in Virginia, strove to match as perfectly as possible the new structure and the existing structure. And he wanted yellow pine to construct outer parts of window frames to duplicate the appearance and structure of the originals.

John O. Batson, general manager of Allison Lumber Co., was told that the replaced frames after the fire of 1814 were thought to be made of pine native to the general Washington, D.C., area. Subsequent exploring populations in the East and Southeast and resulting suburban development have long since made this species—never abundant in that particular part of the country—scarce.

The Washington Woodworking Co., Inc., firm employed to produce materials for fabrication of the frames of the extended east front, contacted more than 25 manufacturers of pine lumber before its efforts led to the company in Bellamy, Ala. Batson told the firm that his company could fill the order.

While waiting for specifications Batson learned further that there apparently is no way to know how many frames survived the damage inflicted by the invading British during the War of 1812 when the Capitol and other Federal buildings were set afire.

(It was at this time, incidentally, that the Executive Mansion—as it was then called—burned. When it was rebuilt of wood and other material and painted white it became known to succeeding generations simply as the White House. The infamous attack in Washington came a few months after Francis Scott Key got his inspiration for our national anthem.)

Project workmen observed that some of the replaced window frames, dating back at least to 1814, were in excellent condition except for excessive coats of paint and surface mars inflicted through the years by visitors and normal wear. Aside from the desire for exact reproduction this endurance was another reason for wanting yellow pine in the construction.

When Batson received his specifications he called in his staff and went to work. Both Batson and his woodlands manager—Roger I. Bruce—are graduates of Yale University's School of Forestry.

Heartwood, as specified in the Capitol order, is developed in a tree's center through many years of mature growth. Its color varies from a rich yellow to a dark auburn and its natural preservative qualities—almost as effective as creosote—comes from the natural resins in its structure.

When this country was young there were great quantities of mature trees with thick heart centers. Today's young and vigorous stands—insuring abundance for the future as a result of modern tree culture and intelligent management—do not have as much of this heartwood. Excellent preservative methods and materials provided by modern science have virtually eliminated demands for heartwood.

Anyone who has resided in Alabama for most of his life would know that actually finding such timber was no great problem on this woodland, so beautifuly managed and carefully developed since 1914. The 110-foot fire tower of Allison Lumber Co. erected in 1924 by conservation-minded Col. E. F. Allison was the first in the State and today is a landmark for the entire area. This fire tower is now Allison Lumber Co.'s trade mark and has been registered with the U.S. Patent Office. Last year the company became part of the Marathon Division of American Can Co.

When the U.S. Capitol order was ready for shipment, it was loaded under close supervision on trucks, each end of each board clearly stenciled "Allison Southern Pine"—and sent on its way to 912 Fourth Street, NW., Washington, D.C. There Mr. Herbert P. Hall of Washington Woodworking Company brought out his approved shop drawings and workers set immediately to the task of building the window frames. A great amount of work was involved in these drawings, primarily because none of the existing frames could be removed from the walls for use as samples.

When complete, the frames were taken by truck to Capitol Hill and installed. In a matter of weeks close cooperation and attention to detail had brought trees from some of Alabama's most prolific forests to become a part of the Nation's most important building.

The cornerstone for the original Capitol building was laid by George Washington 26 years before Alabama was admitted to the Union. One hundred and sixty-seven years later this Alabama firm is proud to have participated—even in small way—in such a carefully planned historical restoration.

Misinformation on Aircraft Nuclear Propulsion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I trust my colleagues in the House will take the time to read the interesting editorial written by Mr. Robert Hotz and which appeared in Aviation Week, May 8, 1961, in regards to the tragic decision to cancel our country's aircraft nuclear propulsion program.

With the exception of several technical errors I vouch for the accuracy in Mr. Holtz's summary of the fate of our atomic powered plane program. These several points, however, in no way effect the soundness of the writer's argument that the fatal decision on the part of the Department of Defense was based on misinformation. Mr. Hotz is exactly correct.

From time to time I shall take the opportunity to inform my colleagues concerning the facts of the ANP story.

I commend Aviation Week and Mr. Hotz for this effort to inform the public on this most important national defense project.

The Aviation Week editorial follows:

MR. MCNAMARA'S MISINFORMATION ON AIRCRAFT NUCLEAR PROPULSION

(By Robert Hotz)

It is difficult to make sound decisions on the basis of bad information. Therefore, it is not surprising that Defense Secretary Robert McNamara has made a monumentally unsound decision in wiping out the aircraft nuclear propulsion program, because it was based on inaccurate and obsolete information spiced by a dash of deliberate distortion.

In fairness to Mr. McNamara, it must be noted that in his extremely short tenure in the Pentagon it is impossible for him to have developed expertise on all aspects of his multifaceted job. He must, of course, rely on the validity of information submitted to him by subordinates. It is easily demonstrated that the information submitted to him for his decision on the ANP program was grossly inaccurate, technically out of date and deliberately distorted.

Some may question Mr. McNamara's executive judgment in making such a momentous decision on such a technically and militarily complex subject after such brief exposure to it. We think the case of the ANP program will provide an interesting yardstick by which to measure Mr. McNamara's intellectual integrity and his capacity for penetrating the blanket of foggy misinformation that inevitably surrounds every newly appointed civilian executive in the Pentagon's upper levels.

If Mr. McNamara fails to penetrate this fog, refuses to make the effort to get his facts first hand from the responsible technicians, and only conducts a routine bureaucratic defense of his hastily reached decisions, it will bode ill not only for ANP but for the future defense of this country.

Let us examine for accuracy the public statements of Mr. McNamara in which he says he based his decision to wipe out the aircraft nuclear propulsion program.

1. He says that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have stated repeatedly since 1959 that there is no specific military requirement for a nu-

clear-powered aircraft. This statement is true as far as it goes, but it omits the rest of the JCS statement which said that eventual military potential of this program appeared so promising that it should be continued as a development effort aimed at early achievement of this capability. This latter point does not appear in Mr. McNamara's most recent justification of his decision, leaving the clear, if erroneous, impression that the Joint Chiefs have washed their hands of the ANP program. Actually, there has been a wide variety of specific military applications, both Navy and Air Force, for a nuclear-powered aircraft. But all of them hinged on the successful technical development of a complete nuclear-powered flying vehicle, which Mr. McNamara has now cut off.

2. He says that neither the General Electric direct cycle design nor the Pratt & Whitney indirect cycle appears to permit flight at altitudes in excess of 35,000 feet or above subsonic speeds. This altitude figure, along with the frequently quoted mach 0.8 speed barrier, were never meant to be technical limitations on the nuclear powerplant. They are simply the performing specifications laid down by Herbert York, former Defense director of research and engineering, to be met by the initial nuclear-powered aircraft. Both GE and P. & W. have actually designed supersonic applications of their respective nuclear cycles, and no responsible technician in this field would support Mr. McNamara's performance limitation figures. He can, if he is so inclined, easily trace their correct genealogy.

3. He says that the GE direct cycle engine would exhaust fission products into the atmosphere during takeoff, landing and normal flight making, it unlikely that the aircraft could operate from normal commercial or military airfields. The problem of fissionable exhaust products from the direct cycle engine can be eliminated both through operational procedures (i.e., using conventional jet fuel for landing and takeoff) and by technical solutions already determined feasible (i.e., treatment of the fission products before they exhaust into the atmosphere). Even without these methods, however, the fission products exhausting from the direct cycle engine were calculated to be so negligible that more than 50 such aircraft could operate from a single field without creating radiation hazards exceeding the Atomic Energy Commission permissible standards.

4. He says that the P. & W. indirect cycle has 15 miles of tubing carrying molten metal at temperatures up to 2,000° F. and uses 29,000 welded joints, so that a leak would constitute a severe hazard. These figures are about 4 years old and no longer accurate. But the important point is that Mr. McNamara apparently does not understand that both USAF and the commercial airlines are operating B–52 and 707 type aircraft safely every day with many miles of tubing carrying fuel, oil, hydraulic fluid and electricity—a leak in any one of which could be and has been hazardous to the aircraft and its occupants. Actually, the problem of countering the hazard of leaks in the indirect cycle system has been solved technically, as Mr. McNamara could easily determine by talking with the men who have done it.

5. He says that the GE-proposed B–52 flying test bed rigged with two nuclear-powered direct cycle engines could not be flown on nuclear power alone; that it has no technical value in the development program, and that it is simply a stunt. This will shock every engineer and military man who has been even remotely familiar with aircraft powerplant development for the past two decades. First, the statement is inaccurate because even one of the two nuclear-powered engines proposed would sustain the B–52 in flight at medium altitude, and both could certainly fly it with ease. This is hardly the point of a flying test bed rig for a new powerplant, as any propulsion engineer can readily testify.

Mr. McNamara indicates he completely misses the point that, far from being a stunt, this flying test bed is a vital step in the technical development process of any new powerplant and has been a standard technique in jet engine development for 20 years. We suggest he consult some of the senior naval aviators and Westinghouse and McDonnell engineers on the first and last time they attempted to mate a new jet engine with a new airframe without prior flying test bed time on the new engine. Like his Pentagon predecessor from Detroit, Charles Wilson, who ridiculed the 1952 proposal for a B–36 test bed for nuclear powerplants as a "shitepoke," Mr. McNamara simply does not understand the technique or significance of a flying test bed in new engine development cycles.

6. He says that cancelation of the ANP program does not mean discontinuance of research on high performance reactors because this work will continue under AEC. Actually, the AEC work authorized in this area under the fiscal 1962 budget has no specific orientation toward a useful aircraft application. It will operate at a small fraction of the previous program level and will mean the dissipation beyond any hope of future recovery of the several thousand engineers and technicians who, until Mr. McNamara's decision, represented the sole U.S. resource in this vital field.

A more detailed annotation of Mr. McNamara's public statements on ANP than is possible in this space would produce even more basic errors of fact. But even worse than this inaccurate information now being dispensed as gospel is the basically fallacious concept of the aircraft nuclear propulsion program, which Mr. McNamara apparently believes, as 15 years of wasted effort producing nothing but a billion dollar drain of taxpayers' money. Even a moderate amount of historical study on this subject would destroy this dangerous myth, which is a gross libel on the technical capabilities of the engineers and technicians who worked in this field.

The first 5 of these postwar years were spent in feasibility studies under the NEPA and Lexington projects. By 1951, both groups of learned gentlemen involved reached the same conclusion—that nuclear propulsion could be successfully used in aircraft and a program toward achieving this goal should be organized.

The technical development of ANP hardware got underway in 1952. For the next 8 years, it developed into a classic case of how political and executive incompetence can frustrate technical progress. Three times in this period the entire ANP program was canceled, and four times it was completely reoriented and aimed in widely divergent directions. With this sort of topside management and direction, it would not be surprising if little technical progress resulted.

The fact is, however, that despite this incredible vacillation, fund chopping and lack of clearly defined technical goals, the engineers and scientists working in the ANP field made truly remarkable progress—particularly in the past 2 years when the program achieved the type of technical momentum that usually heralds eventual success.

The ANP effort advanced reactor technique far beyond its previous frontiers and produced developments that will have wide application in many areas outside the aircraft field, such as remote power stations and marine reactors. It solved the basic problems of packaging reactors in small enough units to be employed in aircraft, of adequately shielding aircraft crew and equipment, and of operating the other subsystems required in a flying vehicle in the environment of radiation. It achieved potential engine life of 1,000 hours continuous operation at full power with endurance of from 5,000 to 10,000 hours continuous operation at normal cruising power. And it flattened the annoying nuclear power variation curve to a mere 6 percent from the previous standard of about 30 percent.

In all the 8 years of active work on ANP hardware, the prospects for successfully developing a militarily useful nuclear-powered aircraft were never so technically bright as just before the decision was made by Mr. McNamara to wash its achievements down the drain.

Perhaps the basic management mistake was requiring development of a vehicle to meet specific military requirements before basic engineering and operational feasibility of a full scale flying system was achieved. As each new technical milestone was reached additional military requirements were loaded onto the program—enough to make it founder from this cause alone.

Some of the Pentagon experts who kicked the ANP program around had a philosophy that would have demanded that the Wright brothers be required to solve the problems of supersonic flight before they should be allowed to launch their machine at Kitty Hawk. None of these people are now publicly visible in the ANP debacle, and it is Mr. McNamara who will take the credit or blame for this decision in the pages of history.

It is interesting to note that none of the Pentagon technical experts who are undoubtedly the source of Mr. McNamara's misinformation were available to testify recently before the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy when it tried to probe into the ANP cancellation. The underling witness who was finally sent from the Pentagon to this hearing convinced his congressional listeners only of his incompetence to discuss the subject at issue.

Cancellation of the ANP program will cut far deeper than the immediate effects on the three contractors involved in the two engine programs and the NX–2 airframe development. This decision arbitrarily shuts the door on a basic new source of power for aerial vehicles of many types, including some completely unforeseen now, and it falsely proclaims to the world that we have failed technically in another field where the Soviet Union is certain to publicly demonstrate its success soon.

But the most tragic aspect of the ANP cancellation is the amount of basically inaccurate and erroneous data on which it was based and the demonstration that there is apparently no opportunity for technical facts to be pumped into the Government's highest decisionmaking levels.

The epitaph now being carved on the tombstone of the ANP program may well be the same as that engraved on our tombstone as a nation if we fail to develop a better system of technical management in our Government that will permit the full potential of our technical and industrial resources to be marshaled to meet the challenge of our times.

Resolution of the Maryland State Federation of Young Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the Maryland State Federation of Young

Republicans met in convention on May 13, 1961, in Hagerstown, Md. The convention took formal action in commending two Members of the Congress of the United States for their leadership in public affairs. I take pleasure in appending the copy of the resolution of the convention stating its approval for the patriotic service of Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN and Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK:

Whereas the Honorable EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Senator from Illinois, and the Honorable CHARLES A. HALLECK, Representative from Indiana, have been elected by unanimous vote of their colleagues in the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives, to serve as the Republican leaders of their respective House of Congress; and

Whereas during 27 years in the Congress of the United States they have demonstrated their qualities of leadership and full devotion to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, and to those of the Republican Party; and

Whereas Senator DIRKSEN and Representative HALLECK have been commended for their service as Republican leaders of the Congress by the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, former President of the United States; and by many other of the leaders of the Republican Party: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Convention of the Young Republican Federation of Maryland expresses its support for Senator DIRKSEN and Representative HALLECK, in their capacities of Republican leaders of the Senate and House, respectively; and further, that said convention publicly states its approval of the continuation by the Republican leaders in Congress of their efforts to inform the people of America of the Republican viewpoint in the Congress, and of the Republican policy on issues facing America today; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to Senator DIRKSEN and Representative HALLECK at the U.S. Capitol in Washington, D.C.

Consolidated Badger Cooperative Resolutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD resolutions adopted by the Consolidated Badger Cooperative at their annual meeting on May 2, 1961. The resolutions are as follows:

RESOLUTION—FREE FLOW OF MILK

Whereas over 80 percent of Wisconsin's milk is used and consumed outside our boundaries; and

Whereas it is beneficial to the economic interests of Wisconsin agriculture to encourage easy access of Wisconsin milk into other areas: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the membership of Consolidated Badger Cooperative support the free flow of milk principle and opposes barriers designed to thwart this movement of milk in interstate commerce.

RESOLUTION—INCOME TAX

Resolved, That the members of Consolidated Badger Cooperative, in annual meeting assembled this 2d day of May 1961, take the following stand regarding income tax treatment of cooperatives.

1. The present income tax treatment of cooperatives (including the exemptions granted qualified farmers' cooperatives) is fully justified and necessary and should be continued.

2. The net margins of cooperatives which are distributed to patrons and members, including dividends on capital stock, should be included in the gross income of patrons for the year in which received by the patrons regardless of the form in which the distributions are made.

3. Proposed efforts to limit the time during which net proceeds may be retained by a cooperative for capital purposes, without being subjected to corporate taxation, would destroy cooperative financing methods and should be opposed.

Italy's Economic Renaissance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, amid the current news stories of internal disintegration and foreign strife in every corner of the world, there are occasional stories about social and economic progress in some countries. Such a story appears in today's Washington Post and Times Herald, written by A. N. Spanel, chairman of the International Latex Corp.

Because it does present such an encouraging report on a country whose national vitality is so important to our own and all of the free world, I am sure my distinguished colleagues will find it of interest:

Visitors to Italy are deeply impressed by palpable evidences not only of a new prosperity but of a new spirit. For those who have personal memories of the country's virtual collapse only 15 years ago, this rebirth of a great nation has a touch of the miraculous. And they have, too, the special satisfaction of knowing that the miracle was wrought by freedom.

The cold statistics, and reports by longtime American observers on the Italian scene, confirms the visitor's impressions.

The Rome correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, Walter Lucas, writes in the New Leader about "Italy's continuing economic miracle." Our former Ambassador to Rome, James D. Zellerbach, writing in the Saturday Review, attests that "Italy is not only emerging as an industrial nation of the first rank; it is also enjoying a major cultural renaissance whose impact extends far beyond its frontiers." The Fortune correspondent reports that in Italy "good times have arrived and may have come to stay for the next decade."

To grasp the magnitude of this victory, it should be recalled that in the short span of three decades—1914 to 1945—Italy was embroiled in two disastrous World Wars. For 23 years it was held in the paralyzing straitjacket of fascism. In the second of the wars it was caught in the strangling pincers of the Mussolini-Hitler alliance.

The end of these tribulations saw the nation's economy in a shambles, its currency virtually valueless, its spirit at low ebb. Deep social conflicts were impelling the country toward civil war. Exploiting idle hands and empty bellies with zealous skill were the Communists, who dominated the internal liberation forces. Small wonder that the experts sadly prophesied doom.

But today, though the country is still beset by economic and political problems, there is no doubt that the prophets were wrong. The Communists, true, are still the second largest political party; but, in the words of Mr. Zellerbach, they "now try to present themselves as the advocates of mild reform rather than of violent revolution."

The fact is that Italy today is busy, booming, optimistic. Even in relation to its most desperate problems—excessive population, unemployment, the underdeveloped Mezzogiorno or Italian south—the old defeatism is evaporating. The creative energies of a wonderfully gifted and industrious people are again in full eruption.

The national economy, initially pump-primed by generous American dollar aid, has been growing by 6 percent a year; the trade balance is favorable; the lira is stable. According to official figures, 1960 scored, as against 1959, an 18-percent rise in industrial investment, a 10-percent rise in employment, 6 percent more consumption.

The providential discovery of oil and gas in North Italy and Sicily helped trigger the economic upsurge. Italians entered the international market and became outstanding merchants in the petroleum world. By now it is the automotive industry that paces the new prosperity, with an almost fourfold expansion since 1950. Steel production tripled in the same decade. Smaller yet striking growth has been registered in rubber, synthetic fibers, chemicals.

The rise in living standards is visible to the naked eye. Italians are spending more than ever before not only for necessities but for luxuries. Once a land of bicycles, Italy has become a land of motor vehicles, its roads and streets jammed by everything from motor scooters and Italian-made automobiles to big foreign cars. Television antennas have become commonplace even in remote mountain villages.

In this economic renaissance, American investors and industrialists are playing a large and wholesome part. Already over 300 U.S. firms operate in Italy—usually in partnership with local capital—and their numbers keep growing. More and more of them, attracted by favorable tax and other incentives, find this land ideal for branch factories.

Most significant, as one surveys the Italian social scene, is a deep awareness among the people that the miracle of rebirth has been made possible by the climate of freedom and cooperation with the great democracies. The country plays an important role in the European Common Market. Undemonstratively and without histrionics, it stands resolute in devotion to the free world coalition. Italy has proved itself consistently as a loyal ally. Her people, old in civilization, are ever aware that nations, like human beings, are endowed with strengths and weaknesses, and they knowingly accept us as we are, with all our strengths and all our weaknesses.

Italy has risen from the depths of defeat and defeatism to become master of its own destiny. Forewarned by a hairbreadth escape from the clutches of communism, the Italians appear determined to preserve human freedom. In this resolve they merit the understanding and unstinting cooperation of all their allies, and America especially.

It is altogether desirable that Italy's leaders and its special genius be given ever bigger roles in all free world alliances and enterprises. They have won this right by magnificent performance under the most adverse conditions.

The Italian people are the custodians of a glorious heritage of history and culture. Their contributions are in the marrow and

at the heart of our Western civilization. It is cause for profound satisfaction, therefore, that their new renaissance is enabling Italy to contribute measurably once again to the world we cherish.

Why Talk to Khrushchev?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, in view of the current speculation as to the possibility of a meeting between President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev next month, I believe a column on this subject authored by Mr. Robert T. Hartmann, Los Angeles Times Washington bureau chief, is especially timely and noteworthy.

The column is entitled, "Why Talk to Khrushchev?" and appeared in the May 17, 1961, issue of the Los Angeles Times.

Mr. Hartmann discusses Premier Khrushchev's aims, purposes, and past performances, and, in effect, poses the question of what could possibly be gained through a Kennedy-Khrushchev meeting at this time. I agree with his observations.

Under leave to extend my remarks I submit this item for inclusion in the RECORD:

WHY TALK TO KHRUSHCHEV?
(By Robert T. Hartmann)

The prospect of another tete-a-tete between the President of the United States and the Premier of the Soviet Union, perhaps in some quite little coffeehouse in Vienna, causes me to cry for my beloved country.

What can we possibly gain by it? One can easily imagine a dozen ways Mr. Khrushchev will capitalize on Mr. Kennedy's apparent capitulation to the summit idea, but how can the United States emerge from such a meeting one whit better off than we are now?

Certainly, in the 5 years since he emerged as the chief of the Soviet state Mr. Khrushchev has given us ample opportunity to see him in all his unwhimsical moods; keeping an eye on front man, Bulganin, at the first Geneva summit, tippling a touch in Belgrade, stomping the Hungarian freedom fighters, trading belly blows with Vice President Nixon in Moscow, flinging untranslatable proverbs at Hollywood's hospitality, lecturing Iowans on growing corn, patting the heads of President Eisenhower's helpless granchildren, screaming abuse in Paris at his erstwhile host, hugging Fidel Castro, and banging his shoe at the United Nations.

All these performances were, in my opinion, as carefully postured as any television newcaster's. They were designed to accomplish Mr. Khrushchev's purpose of the moment and not a single thing he has ever said or done since posthumously denouncing Stalin, the man who made him, has advanced the interests of the United States by so much as 1 millimeter.

Nor, on the record, can it be shown that Mr. Khrushchev has contributed in any way whatsoever to the consolidation of peace—a phrase he often uses, or to the general welfare or happiness of the human race.

On the contrary it can be shown over and over again that it is completely impossible to influence Mr. Khrushchev in any way he does not intend to be influenced, and that his statements, whether uttered face to face or by long distance diatribe, are utterly meaningless as a basis for agreement.

Then why should the President of the United States talk to him?

Mr. Nixon, whose never-a-dull-moment mission to Moscow and Siberia I covered in 1959, has been publicly proposing such a Kennedy-Khrushchev get-together. He says it would persuade Khrushchev he is up against a tough opponent, which nobody should know better than Mr. Nixon. But the former Vice President should also know that debating doesn't count much in Communist campaigning.

Perhaps Mr. Nixon is doing President Kennedy a little favor by trying to allay domestic criticism of the plan in advance, though I have no notion why he should undertake such a chore. During their presidential race, when the Republican nominee vowed he would go to Warsaw if elected, Senator Kennedy tartly replied that he would go to Washington—where the President of the United States belongs.

I concur.

When President Eisenhower, with some misgivings, invited Mr. Khrushchev to the United States, Senator Kennedy wrote to angry constituents that he sympathized with their moral indignation, but on balance supported the President's decision.

Mr. Eisenhower explained his course by saying that, after all, there was only one man in the Soviet Union with the power to negotiate meaningful agreements, which made normal diplomatic talks rather useless.

But after Mr. Khrushchev came to Washington, Senator Kennedy for one spotted the flaw in this reasoning. Khrushchev is indeed the only Soviet official worth dealing with—but he won't deal.

"The Khrushchev I met," Senator Kennedy reported in October 1959, "was a tough-minded, articulate, hard-reasoning spokesman for a system in which he thoroughly believes. He was not putting on any act when he talked about the inevitable triumph of the Communist system. I think it is well that the American people saw and heard this kind of man and this kind of talk. I think it is important that we realize what we are up against."

As one who followed Khrushchev on his free-swinging tour of the United States, I concur again. But Senator Kennedy might ask President Kennedy now, why see and hear this kind of man again?

Appointments to Our Service Academies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK MacGREGOR
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, all of us are vitally interested in the process of selection of young men for appointment to our Service Academies. All of us are seeking to find boys with the highest degree of motivation to serve their country in its military forces. The problem of retention of top-grade people in the services is a serious one.

The following letter which I have received from a young man in Minnesota's Third Congressional District, which I am privileged to represent, typifies the fine attitude which we all hope to find in appointees to our academies:

MAY 13, 1961.

Hon. CLARK MACGREGOR,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MACGREGOR: I was extremely elated and thrilled to receive your telegram announcing my appointment to the United States Air Force Academy in Colorado.

I want to thank you for making this possible. Needless to say that, while I am very happy about my appointment, I am also conscious of the responsibility it carries. Responsibility to you, my Congressman, and to the Government of the United States.

I hope I can live up to this trust that has been invested in me. I shall do my very best to make sure that I don't let anyone down.

Once again, thank you very much for this wonderful opportunity.

Sincerely,

ROBERT ALAN LARSEN.

The Un-American Activities Has a Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, as a freshman Member of Congress, I was proud to receive as one of my first assignments membership on the Committee on Un-American Activities. As a newcomer to this august body, I refrained from any public comment on what immediately struck me as the almost intolerable physical working conditions of the committee staff.

There has come to my attention a graphic description of the office conditions which the committee staff uncomplainingly endures. Since the story is in public circulation as a supplement to Women for America Review, I feel I need now have no hesitation in calling the situation to the attention of my fellow colleagues by inserting the article in the Appendix to the RECORD. The author of the article is Maurice Ries, well-known Hollywood writer, who has succeeded in depicting the offices of the committee in a very few, well written words. His article follows:

THE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE HAS A PROBLEM
(By Maurice Ries)

You have seen the Committee on Un-American Activities of the U.S. House of Representatives, or pictures of it, conducting its hearings, wrestling with its enemies—with your enemies, that is. But what goes on behind the scenes? What of the committee at work: of its offices, its equipment, its staff?

Naturally, you understand that the committee is an arm of the U.S. Congress. You know the Congress is a majestic body and that its committee is cloaked with the dignity of the Government of which Congress and committee are parts. You are aware that the committee is the stanchest (and almost the last remaining) rampart in the Nation's languid efforts to hold off the we will bury you onslaught of world communism.

You may even know that the committee's offices are on the second floor of the sprawl-

ing, grey-granite Old House Office Building, across the street from the Nation's Capitol. But what about quarters? Under what kind of physical conditions must it operate, as it carries on the invaluable routine that occupies so much more committee time than hearings and other outwardly visible activities?

To put it bluntly, the conditions aren't good. The House Committee on Un-American Activities lives like Cinderella before the invention of glass slippers.

The staff numbers upward of 50 men and women (several of whom have worked for the committee, continuously, for more than 16 years). It is packed into 10 rooms—2 of them, however, not even connected with each other, or with the rest. One is on another floor.

Ten rooms—only two are of standard size for the building. For the most part, the remaining eight have been created by subdividing.

Half filling the director's office, because of a lack of space elsewhere, is a massive table topped with green felt. Here meet the nine members of the House of Representatives who comprise the actual committee.

Five of the committee's little squad of investigators have their desks and certain file cabinets and a table or so packed into a room where two desks should be. Several additional investigators are having to do their chores elsewhere, jammed in among other staff members. Incidentally, the House Committee on Un-American Activities gets along with only about eight investigators in all. In the Senate, that McClellan-Jack Kennedy-Bobby Kennedy committee which probed labor's misdeeds employed more than 80 investigators: 10 times as many.

The eight investigators, together with file clerks, typists, secretaries, two attorneys, a librarian, researchers, editors, proofreaders, indexers, a switchboard operator, an information officer, publications shippers, a fiscal officer, a staff director, an administrative assistant—these carry on the committee's day-by-day staff operations in Washington.

The room, in many ways the most important, is, unfortunately, the worst. This is the long, narrow crypt presided over by the committee's librarian, a pleasant lady long a part of the staff. Once upon a time this was simply the end of a main corridor. Someone walled it off, to create a sort of tunnel to nowhere. It is a room of many purposes. Here the librarian and her assistant have their desks, chairs, tables. Here are banks of card file cabinets—and this is the very heart of the committee's operations. In those cabinets are the names and records of several million Americans with subversive affiliations. The committee has been building up these files for 23 years. Today they form a fantastically comprehensive source consulted by all security agencies in the Government. As a result, the files ultimately affect just about every sensitive job in the Nation: in defense plants, in the military, in intelligence work, in Federal employment, and in a dozen additional areas.

By repeated Presidential order, these and other committee files (for example, the scores and scores of file drawers filled with pamphlets, organizational letterheads, clippings, photographs, copies of speeches, magazine articles, and countless other types of source material) must be checked by Federal investigative agencies, including the military, before an investigation can be considered to be complete. Probably the most important user of this material is the FBI.

As a matter of fact, certain of the agencies keep researchers in this office of the Committee on Un-American Activities on a full-time basis.

But the accommodations which the Committee on Un-American Activities is able to provide for visiting investigators are downright heartrending. At one end of the clutter are various battered old tables, covered with brown wrapping paper, accompanied by a clutch of orphaned chairs. On the tables are gooseneck lights guaranteed to keep Methusaleh's name alive. Unfortunately security men from proud and properly equipped agencies must toil at those tables in semigloom, elbows bumping elbows and chairs bumping chairs.

Add sets of shelves, books, stools, wastebaskets, telephones, photocopy machines—one of them as bulky as an upright piano—and you realize that here is a room bulging at the seams. Then crowd in a number of busy people, and—but why go on?

Que será será. If the committee cannot obtain more space for its work, it must work in the space it has. The work is the thing. For it is work which vitally affects every American alive, and uncountable numbers yet unborn.

The Committee on Un-American Activities has to perform its large miracles on short rations. A larger appropriation would help.

Take a look at the punctuation mark terminating this sentence. Then look at the entire page. The committee's $331,000 budget for 1961 is about the size of that dot, when compared with the horrifying sums of your money (and mine) that the U.S. Government is pouring into Communist Tito's pocket alone. Think what this committee, against communism and for America, could do with a budget the size of even three little dots instead of one.

Anyone for the House of Representatives giving its Committee on Un-American Activities a modest million a year?

Leaping Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from Barron's for March 13, 1961, entitled "Leaping Socialism: Public Power May Run Riot in the Kennedy Administration."

The article accurately sets forth the obvious commitment of the Kennedy administration toward a massive public power program. Except for the paragraph dealing with the so-called no new starts policy, which is partially incorrect, I think it is an excellent article and deserves the attention of the Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEAPING SOCIALISM—PUBLIC POWER MAY RUN RIOT IN THE KENNEDY ADMINISTRATION

(By Shirley Scheibla)

WASHINGTON.—If the Kennedy administration can win congressional approval, the New Frontier may see the development of public power on a scale unprecedented even in the palmiest days of the New Deal. In the process, President Eisenhower's partnership policy for joint Government-private utility projects will take a back seat. In the words of Stewart Udall, Secretary of the Interior: "We are not running out searching for ways—as seemed to be the case in the Eisenhower administration—to let private industry have access to major hydroelectric sites or to falling water at some of the dams built with Federal funds."

Moreover, in their efforts to justify the high costs of several of the projects, administration officials are engaging in some unorthodox bookkeeping. For example, in their preliminary cost estimates they propose to include sizable outlays for fish, wildlife and recreation. The higher spending, in turn, would be justified by the intangible benefits involved. At the same time, power from such projects may be sold at unrealistically cheap prices by stretching out the cost-benefit period, upon which rates are based, from the present 50 years to a full century.

Actually, despite the recent vast expansion of investor-owned utilities, public power for the past generation, has grown at an even faster pace. Interestingly, while the major inroads by the Government were made under Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, the momentum carried over into the first few years of the Republican administration. As a result, during Mr. Eisenhower's first term, the annual rate of increase in Government-owned plants rose to an alltime peak of 14 percent. By contrast, the private utilities boosted their capacity by only 9 percent.

True, the high rate between 1952 and 1956 is somewhat deceptive. For one thing, the groundwork for most of the Federal projects completed during this period had been laid previously. Significantly, during President Eisenhower's second term the percentage dropped to 8 percent—the lowest since 1920. Then, too, the partnership policy played a significant role in the rapid growth of the public utility districts (PUD's) in the Pacific Northwest, much of which, in effect, was for the benefit of private utilities. Thus, in the 1956–60 period PUD and State power capacity rose 20 percent, Federal projects only 5 percent.

After fighting the PUD's for years, the private companies teamed up with them in developing hydro projects, to their mutual advantage. Since the former can issue tax-free bonds, they can arrange cheaper financing; in addition, they usually find it easier to secure Government licenses for damsites. The private utilities, for their part, contract for substantial amounts of electricity, guaranteeing the PUD's a steady market. Similarly, Bonneville Power Administration built transmission lines for the Northwest Power Pool, composed of both PUD's and private utilities. Both publicly and privately generated power goes into the pool for delivery to all types of users.

In general, the Eisenhower administration held to the policy of "no new starts" as far as big projects were concerned. However, it did take an interest in those designed to harness the Colorado River, notably the $325 million Glen Canyon Dam in Arizona, which upon completion in 1964 will generate some 900,000 kilowatts. Another $435 million will be spent on other projects on the upper Colorado River, under authorizations passed by Congress in 1956.

President Eisenhower apparently took no active part in the long and hotly contested fight over Hells Canyon. The issue was whether Idaho Power Co. should be allowed to build three dams on the Snake River or whether the Government should build one high dam, which would be much more expensive. Idaho Power finally won out in 1955, when the Supreme Court upheld the license which had been granted earlier by the FPC.

A few months later, the company began building the 450,000-kilowatt Brownlee Dam, and completed it late in 1958, at a total cost of $63 million. Preliminary work then began on the Oxbow Dam; scheduled for completion next fall, it will generate 218,000

kilowatts. Under the FPC license, construction of the third dam, Hells Canyon, was to have gotten underway by August 1961. However, since operating capacities of the other two substantially exceed original estimates, Idaho Power may request an extension.

President Eisenhower also seems to have adopted a hands-off policy in the famous Dixon-Yates case. This, it will be recalled, involved a fight between the public power bloc and two private utilities—Southern Co. and Middle South Utilities—over supplying power to the Atomic Energy Commission. On the other hand, his influence probably helped check the expansion of the TVA under Federal legislation passed last summer. Except for certain towns in Kentucky, the agency was permitted to push back the boundary of its service territory by only 5 miles.

While Kentucky Utilities was affected adversely, Southern Co. apparently escaped with nothing worse than minor TVA encroachment; Middle South, and other adjacent utilities, were not affected. Even more important, the measure provided that the TVA must raise capital in the open market rather than draw upon the U.S. Treasury (Barron's, Nov. 21, 1960).

However, the legislation by no means spells a complete halt in the expansion of TVA's generating capacity, particularly from steamplants. For example, the agency currently has plans for a huge 800,000 kilowatt unit near a coal mine in Kentucky—300,000 kilowatts bigger than the largest unit so far put in service by a private utility. Moreover, President Kennedy's appointment of several public power proponents to key positions in Washington may lead to new proposals for expansion by the TVA.

Meanwhile, the administration is blueprinting a huge program of costly projects for hydroelectric power and flood control. However, in presenting their recommendations to Congress, officials realize that they somehow must justify the heavy spending by commensurate benefits. To this end, President Kennedy recently directed the Budget Bureau to "reevaluate current standards for appraising the feasibility of water resource projects."

Currently, the bureau is taking a new look at its Directive A–47, which Interior Department officials consider too restrictive in determining "benefits" in a Federal power project. Their main objection is its prohibition against calculating "indirect" benefits and the specification that those allowed for recreation, fish and wildlife must not be greater than the actual cost. (Up to now, very little has been spent for such purposes.) At the same time, as noted, Interior officials are discussing the possibility of figuring benefits over a 100-year period rather than the present 50 years.

The Burns Creek project, which Interior Secretary Udall is expected to push particularly hard on Capitol Hill, lends itself especially well to such calculations. It involves an outlay of $45.4 million for a dam, generator and reservoir on the Snake River near Idaho Falls. Operation of the Burns Creek facilities would be integrated with the existing Palisades project about 30 miles downstream. In addition, the new dam would have a storage capacity for 100,000 acre-feet of irrigation water.

As now written, the Burns Creek "feasibility" report shows recreational benefits based on only the actual construction of minimum facilities; no indirect benefits are calculated. However, Interior officials say that they can work these out, and if the Budget Bureau approves, they would like to include them in an addendum to the report.

The Department also wants to start charging off sizable amounts of the cost of power projects to the development of recreational facilities and fish and wildlife. Officials believe that such bookkeeping will keep kilowatt rates low. Currenlty, costs are computed on the basis of installation, maintenance and operation, plus interest of 2½ to 3 percent, to be returned to the U.S. Treasury. Part of these costs are charged off to flood control (nonreimbursable) and irrigation (repayable but without interest). Rates then are set high enough to enable the system to operate without a loss over the 50-year repayment period.

By using instead a 100-year basis, the Burns Creek project would show benefits exceeding costs by a ratio of 1.48 to 1, instead of only 1.27 to 1. The same kind of figuring could be applied to two other big power proposals now before Congress: the $170 million Frying Pan project in Arkansas and Colorado, and the Crater-Long Lakes division of the Snettisham project, near Juneau, Alaska, costing approximately $38.4 million. The latter first was submitted to Congress by President Eisenhower in September 1960. At that time, the Budget Bureau suggested that further efforts be made to encourage State or local governmental agencies or business interests to finance and construct the project. However, the Kennedy administration obviously wants it to be a Federal undertaking.

By the end of this session of Congress, the Interior Department expects to recommend a dozen projects for development of water resources, in addition to 10 already pending.

Two would be mainly for power—the Auburn-Folsom south unit of the Central Valley project in California and Devil Canyon in Alaska. Cost is estimated at $181 million for the former, including a 515-foot high dam on the north fork of the American River, about 30 miles northeast of Sacramento. This dam would form a 1 million acre-foot reservoir and provide waterpower for a 155,000 kilowatt plant.

Principal feature of the Folsom South plan is a 67½-mile main canal to bring water from the American River to the project lands east of Sacramento and Stockton, and south of the river. On the basis of a 100-year analysis of benefits for the Auburn part of the project, the Interior Department has come up with a benefit-cost ratio of 2.24 to 1.

The Devils Canyon hydroelectric project would supply power to the area served by the railroads from Seward to Fairbanks and would cost a mammoth $498.9 million. The fact that this project would be solely for power underscores a significant phase of administration policy. Power no longer will be, as in the past, just an adjunct of flood control and irrigation. Indeed, in many cases besides Devils Canyon, it will be the primary purpose. Thus, power from Devils Canyon is designed to spur the economic growth of Alaska. In defending the project, officials say that private utilities are not interested, since there is no ready market for power at a price at which they could make a profit.

The administration has even more ambitious plans. For example, it wants to interconnect all existing public power projects. The idea is to start with the Bonneville Power Administration and the Central Valley System of California and connect them with the Colorado River power grid in Arizona. The next link would be with the Missouri Basin System and thence back to Bonneville in Montana. From this point it would not be difficult to join the Southwestern Power System in Oklahoma, Kansas, and Arkansas. The latter already is connected with the TVA.

These interconnections would be the administration's answer to the complaint that some Federal power systems are losing millions of dollars annually. The General Accounting Office reports, for example, that the Southwestern Power System and related activities went into the red by $5.7 million in fiscal 1959. Similarly, the Columbia River Power System had a net loss of $10.7 million from commercial power operations for the year ended June 30, 1960. In addition, a GAO report due out in 3 or 4 months is expected to show a loss for the Southwestern Power System.

According to administration spokesmen, better marketing through interconnections, rather than higher rates, will put these projects into the black. As an example, they cite the Missouri Basin system. While it boasts a generating capacity of 2 million kilowatts, the system actually produces only 1 million. Greater use of the capacity obviously would mean increased operating efficiency. Officials believe they could accomplish this objective by tying together areas which have peak operating loads in the summer with others having winter peaks. Nebraska, for instance, has high summer consumption, owing to the use of air-conditioning equipment. Farther north, however, peak usage occurs in the winter, largely from electric heating.

As yet, Interior Department lawyers have not decided whether the interconnections would require specific authorization from Congress. At any rate, however, this body would have ultimate control, since it holds the purse strings. When asked about the complete cost of the project, one administration official leaned back, looked up, as if searching for some astronomical answer and then said, "It's impossible to come up with a figure on the whole thing this early. We're just getting started, but you can bet it won't be cheap."

The strategy will be to go to Congress for financing one leg of the interconnections at a time. Officials want to get started on the project this year, but to date have not arrived at what they consider a reliable estimate of costs. However, they have made a rough calculation for a stretch of 250 miles on the first leg, which would run roughly 1,000 miles from Fidels, Oreg., to Los Angeles. This sample was selected because the Government already has the right-of-way, as well as alinement and footage information. Interior Department officials calculate that a 500,000-kilovolt line for this 250 miles would cost $38 million. On this basis, the whole 1,000-mile leg would run to $152 million. However, officials emphasize that this is a very rough calculation, not an actual estimate.

Another method of figuring costs low enough to keep power rates cheap would be the use of "basin accounts." The principle here is that no matter where power is generated, the account pools it and analyzes the expenditure on the basis of the whole basin, instead of one project. Last month, Commissioner of Reclamation Floyd E. Dominy suggested to the House Interior and Insular Affairs Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation that the principle of basin accounts be extended to all 17 Western States. So far, Congress has authorized such bookkeeping for the Central Valley of California, the Missouri Basin and the Colorado storage project; legislation is pending for one for the Pacific Northwest.

In recommending whether a new project should be public or private, administration spokesmen say that a key consideration will be the rate cost to consumers. The Government, it should be noted, enjoys a significant advantage in this respect, since in addition to the proposed new bookkeeping methods it not only pays virtually no taxes but also enjoys below-cost interest rates.

Finally, the Kennedy administration is preparing to ask for additional funds to investigate new projects. Thus Commissioner Dominy told the House subcommittee that the administration is reviewing the Eisenhower budget and "it is not unlikely that additional funds may be requested by the President."

Undoubtedly part of these funds would be used to study the development by 1970 of comprehensive river basin plans in cooperation with individual States. This project was recommended by the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources in a report at the end of January. In his highly publicized resources statement last month, President Kennedy endorsed the idea wholeheartedly. He added: "I urge the Congress to authorize the establishment of planning commissions for all major river basins where adequate coordinated plans are not already in existence."

How much of this vast and costly program is launched naturally depends upon Congress. However, public power proponents are more optimistic than they have been in years. Not only do the usually sympathetic Democrats control both Houses of Congress, but now a friend also sits in the White House.

Public versus private power

Administration	Period	Number of years	Rise in kilowatt capacity [1]	
			Investor-owned utilities	Government-owned utilities
			Percent	*Percent*
Harding-Coolidge-Hoover	1920–32	12	9	11
Roosevelt:				
Prewar	1932–40	8	1	10
Wartime	1940–45	5	3	12
Truman (2 terms)	1945–52	7	7	9
Eisenhower:				
1st term	1952–56	4	9	14
2d term	1956–60	4	9	8

[1] Average rate of increase, compounded annually.

A Global War for Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, this morning's mail brought a valuable and timely editor's report entitled "A Global War for Survival," by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief of the Hearst Newspapers. The report follows:

A GLOBAL WAR FOR SURVIVAL

The news this past week again spelled out the message so clearly that, at the risk of sounding like a stuck needle on a record player, I must repeat an alert which has been sounded often before in this column:

We are in a global all-fronts war for survival despite the absence of major shooting.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), via a communique of its Ministers' Council meeting in Oslo, made an important contribution to understanding this widened Communist threat to all free nations. NATO took itself out of the regional class expressed by its name and announced that from now on it considered its defense mission to be worldwide.

In so many words, even regional defense pacts seem a form of isolationism when facing a Red assault in practically every area of human activity, in practically every area of the world.

But this facing up to the harsh facts of life in the 1960s—so obvious to NATO—seems still beyond the comprehension of some of our closest neighbors in Latin America.

A self-imposed blindfold labeled "nonintervention" makes them unable to see the threat to their liberty on their doorstep. This was shockingly (although not altogether unexpectedly) demonstrated in the past few days by Brazil.

Janio Quadros, the new President of Brazil, issued a diplomatic note making it clear that he opposes any hemispheric action against the Communist puppet regime of Fidel Castro in Cuba.

This southpaw fling of a monkey wrench into the works of hemispheric solidarity might be expected from Mr. Quadros, whose background is lefty. Since taking office he has set the wheels in motion for Brazil's resuming diplomatic relations with the entire Communist bloc of nations.

Apologists for Latin American statesmen who flirt with the Reds always remind us that they need to appease the backward and underprivileged masses of their people who have been influenced by Communist propaganda.

In the light of the experience of democratic nations in the past 2 decades, that argument makes no sense. It has only been a matter of time for the Communists to enslave any country which played ball with them.

Readers of this column know of my warm friendship for our southern neighbor nations. But it seems to me that Castro's recent avowal of his affiliation to the Red camp has made it possible to separate the sheep from the goats among the Latin Americans.

From now on we should recognize that any Latin American regime which takes a "hands-off Castro" stand in really favorable to his Red beachhead.

There is no longer the excuse of ignorance. Of course, as President Kennedy has warned, the United States will have to act firmly in our own interest if it becomes clear that nonintervention merely masks nonaction against communism in the Americas.

That's a bridge still to be crossed. But there is another bridge closer to hand. I am referring to the hundreds of millions of dollars appropriated and earmarked for U.S. aid to Latin American Nations, with more still to come.

Just as charity begins at home, help begins with friends. U.S. aid should never be considered a means of buying friendship—for a nation which can be bought can be bought back.

The American people are going to take a dim view of helping a Brazil headed by a Castro camp follower.

Let's help nations who are friendly to us. Let's not throw away the U.S. taxpayer's hard-earned bucks on nations asking to be bought as friends.

In contrast to the politically expedient nearsightedness of Mr. Quadros, encouraging news comes from another sector of the global contest—South Vietnam.

Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON combined forceful sincerity with easygoing Texan charm to give a lift to anti-Communist morale, which I think will be felt throughout southeast Asia.

And morale is badly in need of a lift. Our fumbling ineffectiveness in landlocked Laos, logistically one of the worst places in the world for military support, has provoked neutralist sentiment in Thailand, a member of SEATO.

It has dismayed our stanch Filipino friends.

In South Vietnam itself, Communist guerilla raids and terror tactics have increased in strength and audacity.

It is gravely evident that unless we are prepared to see southeast Asia fall piece by piece into Communist control, we must say to the Communists: So far and no farther.

South Vietnam is far better suited than Laos as a place to say that for two reasons: (1) geographically it is easier to supply and support, and (2) President Ngo Dinh Diem is a strong, purposeful, nonvacillating ally.

He is of the same stamp as our good Arab friend, President Habib Bourguiba of Tunisia (who has been our more-than-welcome guest these past days), or the late and great President Ramon Magsaysay of the Philippines.

We couldn't have a better envoy than Vice President JOHNSON to carry the administration's assurance of large-scale support to President Diem.

LYNDON told the National Assembly we are ready immediately to help increase its 150,000-man regular army; to equip and train its civil guard and build up the village militia, including adding to our group of military advisers.

Nowhere was it indicated that we would be asked to commit fighting troops to South Vietnam. Such a commitment was opposed in this column last week as unnecessary. Since Vice President JOHNSON and President Diem reached "complete agreement," obviously Mr. Diem doesn't consider them necessary either.

Because we are in a global war—mostly cold but peripherally hot—the question of censorship inevitably has come up in Washington.

This past week the question troubled Defense Secretary McNamara and Senator RUSSELL, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, to the extent that they made page 1. They were concerned over disclosure of military information "of benefit to our potential enemies" although Mr. McNamara conceded it had been cleared for release by Pentagon security officers.

Secretary McNamara proceeded to damage his case by appearing to suggest that newspapers ought to avoid printing unpleasant facts, and instead should bear down on assertions like "we have the most perfect antimissile system," etc.

What he seemed to be saying was that our newspapers ought to be accessories of misinformation.

One of the most pertinent remarks was made by James S. Pope, executive editor of the Louisville Courier-Journal, who has served three terms as chairman of the Freedom of Information Committee of the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

"Those editors who have fought for freedom of public information have always excepted secret military data," Jim Pope observed.

He need point only to World War II, where voluntary censorship by the press was magnificently observed.

It is a delicate subject. Human nature being what it is, imposed censorship can be—and has been—used to cover up mistakes.

No responsible newspaper would knowingly publish confidential information of value to an enemy. Nor should it knowingly close its eyes to bureaucratic blundering, swept under a security rug.

The administration and the Pentagon must appreciate that a free press is as important to the survival of our way of life as ICBMs.

WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST, Jr.

Debt Management: A Treasury End Run?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the able business and financial

writer, Mr. J. A. Livingston, in his column "Business Outlook" appearing in the Washington Post for Wednesday, May 17, 1961, reports a willingness on the part of the Kennedy administration Treasury officialdom to circumvent the statutory interest limitation and use an end-run expedient in its debt management operations.

It will be recalled that the Eisenhower administration recommended to the 86th Congress that legislation be enacted repealing archaic 4¼-percent interest rate ceiling on marketable bonds. The Democratic majority in the previous Congress refused to take favorable action on that recommendation.

At that time the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable Robert B. Anderson, declined to risk issuing bonds at a discount unless Congress was willing to assure the legality of such an action by clarifying an ambiguous uncertainty in present law. The Congress declined to even clarify the status of present law.

Now it has come to light that the Kennedy administration is willing to rely on an Attorney General memorandum in the imporant debt management area and risk taking what the courts may hold to be an illegal action involving the sale of U.S. marketable bonds at less than face value so that their yield will be above 4¼ percent.

Mr. Speaker, there is no need for the Kennedy administration to run this dangerous risk. The New Frontier Treasury officials should come before the Congress and ask for legislation repealing the interest rate ceiling. In this way we could deal with the problem of debt management forthrightly and with integrity. It has been conclusively established and proved that the interest rate ceiling does not keep the cost of Government borrowing down and may even tend to increase that cost.

I have introduced legislation which would give to the administration the statutory authority that it needs to obtain a proper balance between long-term and short-term funding of the debt. The legislation, H.R. 1997, has been pending before the Congress since January 6, 1961, and reports have been requested from the executive departments since January 31, 1961, but no reports have been received to date.

There is no question in my mind that wholehearted Republican support would be given to any responsible administration request for legislation on this subject. Mr. Speaker, when we are dealing with something as important as debt management, we should proceed in the way of certain legality rather than risk the danger of possible illegality and resulting disaster.

As a part of my remarks I will include in the record at this point the column by Mr. Livingston and a press statement that I made in regard to its contents:

[From the Washington Post, May 17, 1961]

END RUN AROUND FEDERAL INTEREST BARRIER

(By J. A. Livingston)

At the minute, it's purely academic, but it's also pretty sly.

President Kennedy's Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon, who was drawn from the ranks of Republicans, is prepared to do what his Republican predecessor, Robert B. Anderson, was too forthright to do.

Robert V. Roosa, Under Secretary for Monetary Affairs, has let it be known that he will not hesitate to sell long-term Treasury bonds yielding 4½ or 4¾ or even 5 percent. He won't tag them 4½, or 4¾, or 5 percent. He'll label them 4¼ percent.

For flexibility in financing, Dillon and Roosa are prepared to sell a 30-year 4¼ percent bond at 95 cents on the dollar. The return to maturity would be 4.9 percent, or 0.65 percent above the ceiling.

Dillon and Roosa have a letter from U.S. Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy saying that the Public Debt Act of 1942 supersedes the Second Liberty Bond Act of 1917.

The 1942 act authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to issue bonds "on an interest-bearing basis, on a discount basis, or on a combination interest-bearing and discount basis, at such price or prices and with interest computed in such manner and payable at such times as he may prescribe and his decision with respect to such issue shall be final."

Secretary Anderson had a ruling from his general counsel to this same effect. He hesitated to use it because of an ambiguity. The 1942 law was an emergency measure. Congress did not say "at any interest rate." Why had it retained the 4¼ ceiling if complete freedom were intended?

Moreover, Anderson was not willing to rule out the chance that bonds sold at an effective interest rate above 4¼ percent would be open for legal challenge.

CONSULTED HILL LEADERS

Anderson consulted congressional leaders: Would they pass a resolution saying that the law permitted sale of discount bonds? Or would they repeal the ceiling and give the Treasury authority to issue long-term bonds at any interest rate? The House Ways and Means Committee refused to report out a bill. Debates on the floor of the Senate indicated great opposition.

Consequently, Secretary Anderson was forced to sell short-term issues exclusively, including the so-called magic 5's—a 4-year-10-month Treasury note with a 5-percent coupon. That is the absurdity of the ceiling. The Treasury can put a 5-percent rate on a bill, a certificate, or a note—anything less than 5 years. Beyond 5 years, no.

At the moment, Secretary Dillon and Under Secretary Roosa are in a position, because of the drop in interest rates (influenced in part by the Federal Reserve System's nudge policy), to sell long-term bonds at or below 4¼-percent interest. The ceiling is irrelevant.

But if we have an industrial boom, if credit becomes scarce (at it usually does during periods of high business activity), then effective rates might rise above 4¼ percent.

LET'S END CEILING

Dillon and Roosa are making an end run around recent legislative (or, rather, nonlegislative) history, relying on the Attorney General's statement that selling discount bonds yielding more than 4¼ percent does not circumvent any congressional prohibition. If it doesn't, why did the last Congress refuse to grant it?

There's no doubt that the 4¼-percent ceiling on interest rates is an anachronism. Secretary Dillon deserves the flexibility Anderson couldn't get. But his way of going about getting it isn't exactly true blue, honor bright, or sparkly eyed.

A government that demands honesty in business has to be honest, forthright, and direct, itself. Let's get rid of the ceiling—all the way—not by sleight of hand, but by an act of Congress. What the last Congress wouldn't do for a Republican President, it probably will do for a Democrat.

If the Democrats dodge the issue in Congress, the least the Republicans can do is bring it up. It's good politics and good ethics.

Nineteenth Century Suburb—Luxury Apartments Are Changing the Face of Yorkville, but European Aura Still Prevails

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of representing the 18th Congressional District of New York, which comprises the Yorkville and East Harlem sections of New York City, wherein the economically poor and the well to do abide peacefully and public housing and poor housing contrast with the luxury apartments which are sprouting throughout the Yorkville section. The Duke of York never realized when he supplanted the Dutch in New Amsterdam that his fame would endure because of the name New York City and Yorkville, which means the city of York. The history of Yorkville is the history of change. Ethnic groups have come and gone but Yorkville remains the same, the garden spot of the city of New York.

A new local newspaper, Manhattan East has captured the spirit of Yorkville, has traced some of the background of this section of the greatest city in the world, and has made come alive a community which maintains its identity in a melting pot of America. I believe the readers will sense the heartthrob of this section and will understand the development of my area by reading this article published in Manhattan East on Thursday, May 11, 1961.

The article follows:

NINETEENTH CENTURY SUBURB—LUXURY APARTMENTS ARE CHANGING THE FACE OF YORKVILLE, BUT EUROPEAN AURA STILL PREVAILS

A bit of Mitteleuropa in the midst of an American metropolis, Yorkville has been one of the city's most renowned melting pots since its establishment in 1790. When the area was a thriving village of woodlands and country estates in the 19th century, it was inhabited almost exclusively by German immigrants and their descendants who gave it the distinctive atmosphere which has survived up to the present day.

Since the turn of the century Czechs, Hungarians, Slovaks, and Irish families have lent a variegated air to Yorkville; one can hear a melange of native tongues and view their manifestations—local newspapers, pastry shops, night clubs, and community halls.

Named, naturally, after the Duke of York, old Yorkville was bounded by Lexington Avenue and the East River, from 52d to 54th Street. Before the American Revolution it consisted of open countryside and a few scattered homesteads, but the migration of several German pioneers marked its beginnings as a town just before the start of the 19th century. Much of it became farm-

land, and a large tract was owned by the Schermehorn family.

In the early part of the 1800's Yorkville became the choice spot for well-to-do businessmen's summer homes. Its main street was the Boston Post Road, built in 1673 to facilitate the transportation of mail to New England. As the city's cobblestone pavement did not yet extend beyond 28th Street, inns along the road were resting places for travelers wearied by the hilly coach route. Among these was the Hazzard House, located on 84th Street and 3d Avenue, a roomy tavern and the first stop on the Danbury post coach line which connected Harlem and New York.

The east eighties along the river are dominated by Carl Schurz Park, named for the German revolutionary who became leader of the Republican Party after his arrival in the United States in 1856. An adviser to President Lincoln during the Civil War, Schurz was also the editor of the New York Evening Post. Gracie Mansion, located on a hill in the park, was built in 1779 by Archibald Gracie, a shipping entrepreneur, and restored in 1927.

The lower nineties between Park and Third Avenues contained the Ruppert, Ehret and Ringling estates; soon the area was populated by residents employed in the brewing industry and today the Ruppert brewing plant stands as a Yorkville landmark.

East of the hamlet itself in the river section known as Hell Gate, Commodore Isaac Chauncey built his palatial villa while John Jacob Astor received many illustrious guests at the family residence on the south side of 88th Street. Washington Irving, a frequent visitor at the Astor mansion, described the area at that time in glowing phrases: "I cannot tell you how sweet and delightful I found this retreat; pure air, agreeable scenery, profound quiet."

COMMUTER LINES

Not long after, however, the section's peaceful air was disturbed by the clatter of railroads and several other coach lines. Yorkville might have remained a small town, but competition among the transportation companies incited a price war; the low fares and pleasant appearance of the area increased travel and settlement in the upper portion of the city.

As the growing metropolis expanded its boundaries northward, Yorkville gradually assumed an urban facade. A number of brownstones sprung up in the 1880's and were quickly occupied by German exurbanites from "Little Germany" in Tompkins Square. The turn of the century witnessed a building and business boom as rows of middle class tenements crowded the private homes.

The German language, which had prevailed for more than 100 years yielded ground to English; European residents were starting to adopt American culture. After the First World War, however, a wave of immigration, spurred by adverse conditions in Germany and other countries, restored the European atmosphere once more.

Meanwhile, Slovaks were establishing a Little Bohemia in the lower 70's east of 2d Avenue. This quarter was settled after Czechoslovakia gained its independence in 1918. The neighboring nationalities combined many of their interests, although the Czechs founded their own "sokols" where children learned their families' native language and culture. These schools have been maintained throughout the years.

Perhaps the best known of Yorkville's sons was Robert F. Wagner, Sr., who came to this country from Nastatten, Germany, in 1877, and worked his way up from a newsboy to U.S. Senator. A graduate of City College and New York Law School, Mr. Wagner served in the New York Legislature as assemblyman from 1905–08 and as senator from 1909–18. He was elected to Congress four times, beginning in 1926, where he sponsored a host of New Deal acts including the Social Security Act, the National Labor Relations Act, the U.S. Housing Act, and the National Industrial Recovery Act.

YORKVILLE IN THE THIRTIES

As the third reich ascended to world-wide prominence in the 1930's, Yorkville found itself the center of agitation, both pro and anti-Nazi. A minority of residents embraced Hitler's cause, organizing a Nazi German-American Bund which imported storm trooper uniforms for its officers and paraded through the streets. In 1938 a fight exploded at the Yorkville Casino, 210 East 86th Street, between German sympathizers and members of the American Legion.

Nevertheless, groups opposed to the Nazis were greatly in evidence. Several groups carried on anti-Nazi activities, while books banned by Hitler were stocked by a number of Yorkville bookstores. Many young men from the community enlisted in the U.S. Armed Forces. Both groups circulated newspapers promoting their causes in the area.

Since the end of the war these activities have died out as Yorkville continues to prosper in peace. Today the section houses other nationalities although Germans are still in the majority. Statues of national heroes dot the area and parades celebrating European holidays bring back memories of "the old country."

Hungarian Independence Day, March 15, is commemorated by festivities and a march to the statue of Louis Kossuth, hero of the 1848 revolution, on Riverside Drive.

Yorkville today is pressed by the development of public housing and its largely Puerto Rican tenants on the north, and luxury co-ops and apartments moving up from the south. It is interesting to note, however, that the Yorkville Chamber of Commerce, 249 East 86th Street, has a German descendant, Hellmut Vollmer, as its president, while the entire site is permeated by German delicatessens, travel agencies, import houses and conditorei, as well as shops featuring the goods of other nationalities.

It is not surprising that, despite Americanization and urbanity, Yorkville is still a favorite of tourists and city dwellers who want a taste of European cosmopolitanism on this side of the Atlantic.

Russia's Economic Mythmaking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, an editorial entitled "Russia's Economic Mythmaking," which appeared in the May 15, 1961, Los Angeles Times, contains an informative discussion of the difficulties encountered in obtaining a true picture of the economy of the U.S.S.R.

As the editorial explains, because the U.S.S.R. maintains a closed society we have to rely very heavily on statistics furnished by the Soviet Government concerning Soviet economic growth and concerning developments in various segments of its economy.

The editorial discusses many of the pitfalls involved in relying on the figures and statistics the Soviets present, which are often distorted or are not based on standard methods of making economic assessments or evaluations. These pitfalls must, of course, be kept constantly in mind in any comparison made between the United States and the U.S.S.R., and also, for example, in regard to Soviet statistics on its aid activities to other countries, or other economic activities.

Under leave to extend my remarks I submit the editorial for inclusion in the RECORD:

RUSSIA'S ECONOMIC MYTHMAKING

"Another year of economic competition between the two social systems has passed, a good one for the Soviet economy. Industrial output grew by almost 10 percent * * * in 1960 the gross grain harvest was 445 million poods (about 267 million bushels) higher than in 1959. Soviet industrial output in 1964 will exceed the 1958 level in the United States by 4 percent."

CONSIDER THE SOURCE

These are some of the economic claims which the Soviet Union is presenting to the world. They are being spread through the Division of Economic Competition of the Two Systems, a state bureau dedicated to propagandizing Khrushchev's pet theme that communism will peacefully triumph in the economic field. Figures such as these are quoted in official journals and U.N. publications, for in the closed Soviet society almost the only economic statistics are those provided by the Government.

The free world has long realized the importance of getting a true picture of the Russian economy. Yet the difficulties involved in gathering material for accurate assessments are immense. Official secrecy and obvious distortion of economic information are the biggest blocks. But Western economists also find that the standard tools of their trade frequently cannot be used to measure the Soviet system.

The matter of currency convertibility is a simple example. What, in terms of dollars, does the claimed gross national product of Russia amount to?

WORTH OF THE RUBLE

The official rate of exchange of rubles to dollars differs greatly from the rate of exchange allowed tourists. The black market rate differs even more. What, then, is the actual value of the ruble in comparison to the dollar? Since all Soviet claims are made in terms of rubles, their dollar value cannot be measured with great accuracy.

Certain basic economic rules, which exist independent of Soviet claims, can be applied to any system. One is that newly industrialized nations, such as the U.S.S.R., can achieve spectacular initial growth, since they are building from virtually nothing. The United States, prior to 1890, achieved such a growth. In the postwar years, Germany and Japan have both shown extraordinary growth, since their economies were being rebuilt for a fresh start.

No one denies that the Soviet rate of growth is statistically large, although the official Russian figures cannot be accepted as true. It is of major importance to ask how this growth is being brought about. When this is done Soviet claims look somewhat less impressive.

It is known, for example, that the Soviet growth rate is partially achieved by reinvesting high proportions of the national product in capital goods, for further industrial expansion. The emphasis in Russia is on development of heavy industry and military material. This development, obviously, can only be achieved at the expense of the consumer.

If the Soviets were to provide more goods and services for personal consumption, the overall rate of economic growth would fall sharply. The best information is that personal consumption in the United States

comes to about two-thirds of the gross national product. In Russian less than one-half of the GNP goes for personal consumption.

THE USE OF PRICES

Prices are also of first consideration in measuring the health and growth rate of an economy. In the United States prices are for the most part set by free markets. In the U.S.S.R., however, prices are established by government fiat. "Prices," in the words of economist Francis P. Hoeber, "are instruments of policy." Thus the Soviet government can pay Russian producers whatever it wishes for goods and services. It can then sell commodities on the world market at prices lower than those of its competitors. The volume of its sales adds to the Soviet rate of growth, but neither producers nor consumers in Russia benefit.

Asking how growth is achieved is one way of exploding the Soviet myth of a superior system. Demanding proof of claims is another. Can it be true that the Russian grain harvest was up 267 million bushels? Not when the Soviets admit they had long spells of poor weather last year, not when Khrushchev fires hundreds of agricultural managers, not when China has to buy $500 million worth of Canada and Australia.

A FALSE COMPARISON

Will Russian industrial output pass the 1958 U.S. level by 1964? It may (though this is doubtful), but even then it won't prove much. Khrushchev, in making this claim, used the technique of measuring U.S. output at the low point of the 1958 recession. This is a little like measuring the flow of freeway traffic at 3 a.m., and assuming it is average for the whole day.

American economists admit that there is still more not known about the Soviet economy than there is known. The lacking information is necessary if a true picture of Soviet capabilities and intentions is to be formed. Meanwhile, the Soviet propaganda mill continues to impress the uninformed with myths and inflated statistics. Puncturing these false claims is a major cold war task for the United States.

Pride in Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an address made by Brig. Gen. Louis H. Renfrow, retired, at Uniontown, Pa., on May 1, on the occasion of the 28th annual Americanism Day celebration held by Lafayette Post No. 51, the American Legion. The address follows:

PRIDE IN PATRIOTISM

(Address by Brig. Gen. Louis H. Renfrow (retired), 28th annual Americanism Day celebration, Lafayette Post No. 51, Uniontown, Pa., May 1, 1961)

Mr. Commander, Mr. Toastmaster, fellow legionnaires, friends, to be asked to speak to this fine patriotic group on such an important subject as "Pride in Patriotism" is indeed a great honor.

The American Legion, and its Auxiliary, exemplify the purpose of millions of Americans who have demonstrated their pride, and patriotic willingness by offering their very lives in the Nation's military engagements, and by their own sacrifices have instilled patriotism in the breast of everyone who have touched our shores.

In the early days of our Nation the men and women, coming from other lands were deeply stirred by the fact that freedom was gained when they pledged their devotion, and their lives, to the precepts of democracy.

We are thrilled by the many deeds of valor that these newly made Americans, men and women, exhibited during the days of the Revolutionary War. A war to throw off despotic rule, and to strengthen the desire to be patriotic Americans, and to be free.

The Tea Party in Boston; the lights in the church tower; the ride of Paul Revere; the winter at Valley Forge; Washington and Braddock at Fort Necessity; the Battle of Trenton; the surrender at Yorktown; all clearly demonstrated the unswerving loyalty to a concept of government that is unique among governments, and under which we are enjoying this day of renewance of our pledge for its continuance.

After the victorious occasion of bringing into being the Constitution of the United States; and the charter of freedom; the Declaration of Independence, the last sentence of which is: "And for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor," our Nation began to build on this foundation of liberty, the superstructure of democracy.

Through the time from the Revolutionary War to the days of 1812, America made great strides numerically, economically, militarily, and patriotically.

Then when this occasion of the War of 1812 arose to test the metal of these newfound patriots it made every American again fully realize that the fruits of liberty, and the joys of patriotic living are dearly won and dearly kept.

Until 1861 America again moved forward in strengthening the fabric of self-government, and in the development of an even greater appreciation of the benefits that come to those who are unswerving in their loyalty.

In the War Between the States the torch of patriotism was never lost, for being loyal to a cause, be it north or south, only tempered the concepts, understandings, and realization of what price loyalty exacts from men and women, and which these patriotic Americans, on both sides, were willing, yes, eager to pay.

The bond of understanding of our Nation's insoluble greatness was forged so tightly and so firmly that throughout, and during, this terrible conflict, the concept of patriotism was clearly demonstrated by the unity of this Nation after the war.

During the Spanish-American War; the Mexican border conflict; World War I; World War II, and the Korean engagement; all Americans stood shoulder to shoulder in the defense of their rights, privileges, and responsibilities.

What an inspiring occasion is being exhibited today here in Uniontown, Pa., the congressional district of the Honorable THOMAS E. MORGAN, with whom I have had a fine relationship, and the State so ably represented by Senators CLARK and SCOTT, when veterans, their families, and friends stand in salute of our flag, and our national anthem.

Is there a man or woman so callous, so devoid of patriotic zeal, that they would neglect the development in their own personality of the passion for patriotic understanding of what our Nation, its Government and people mean, not only to this hemisphere; this continent; this Nation, but to all peoples around the world.

America stands as a beacon light to all men and women who love freedom and who want, and need, the way of life that Americans have had throughout our existence, and to which they have given their very lives.

It is so important that veterans carry this message to the youth of our Nation, that they may understand pride of service, as well as pride of patriotism.

Each American man and woman have great pride in their branch of service; their division, ship or wing; their regiment; squadron; or fleet assignment, but that pride is transcended by their patriotic pride in their Nation and its flag.

All youth must understand this fundamental concept of this pride in order to carry it on to the coming generations as this generation, and those that have preceded them have done.

America will only stand preeminent in the family of nations just so long as the spark of patriotism is kept burning.

When Americans cease to thrill, at the sight of the flag of our Nation; our Government; our people; our churches; our schools; our business establishments; our homes, our play grounds, and all the other blessings of our great country, they will have lost the pride of patriotism and their future is behind them, their gains will be losses, their joys will be turned to sorrows.

On the horizon of our daily lives there has been a constant threat to our modern developments by those despots who are determined to turn the clock back to the absolute control of men's minds, activities, and beliefs.

It is this ever-present threat to our way of life that has caused our Nation to invest in perfect instruments of defense—the atom and hydrogen devices.

If greedy, selfish, and destructive man loose in the world today, could be stopped in their aggressiveness and destruction, these new discoveries can, and will, be diverted and converted from destructive to constructive activities that will open great and wonderful vistas of unlimited possibilities and happiness.

It is my own conviction that time is running out with alarming speed, when decisions must be made, and actions necessary to support those decisions.

We know that we have an implacable, determined and self-avowed enemy—the Communist conspiracy—whose leaders have seized power over so vast an area of the world and who have enslaved, by their police systems, one-third of the human race.

They know they are insecure by virtue of the sudden deaths of their top men.

They must rule by hiding the truth from their people.

They have real security by destroying the sources of truth.

The fateful issue of peace or war is balanced on the knife-edge of enemy decision from day to day.

Our recent President, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, said in his state of the Union message to Congress:

"It is not a struggle merely of economic theories, or of forms of government, or of military power. At issue is the true nature of man.

"Either man is the creature whom the Psalmist described as a 'little lower than the angels' crowned with glory and honor, holding dominion over the works of his Creator, or man is a soulless, animated machine to be enslaved, used, and consumed by the state for its own glorification."

May we as Americans, and as veterans, never lose our pride in patriotism but keep it alive and readily discernible to those who falter, or who have never had such pride, or having had it have lost it in the maize of false doctrines, and spurious concepts of what patriotism means to a free people.

With the speed of missiles and airplanes being what they are today, we have no more idea of how far away the enemy is than the

early colonists did of how far away were the Indians.

The distances are somewhat greater today, but so are the speeds of vehicles and devices.

If we are to survive this atomic-hydrogen age, we must have an awakening of the average citizen to the fact that support of our Government, under God, is paramount to any other responsibility.

We must imbue our youth with the knowledge of the richness of the heritage they are now enjoying.

If youth is reluctant to serve this Nation, we must increase our efforts to bring to them the reasons and importance of their service.

A free society is not possible and has never been possible without men willing to gain it, and having gained it ready and willing to sacrifice to protect and keep it.

When we sing our National Anthem, or as you and I stand at salute as our flag is lowered at sundown, every American in this atomic-hydrogen age, and particularly, every one of the 22 million living veterans of our great Nation, know that the ramparts we now watch are those farflung places that have moved our horizons from the borders of our Nation to areas beyond the sea.

This is as true today as when we gained our independence.

So my loyal American friends, I can only arrive at one conclusion, that in every community we must have patriotic demonstrations such as we are seeing here today, of true Americanism paraded before all of our citizens to strengthen their faith and recharge their loyalty, and to install a renewed concept of patriotism into the minds and hearts of the generations to follow.

We must keep ever before us that stirring statement of our President John F. Kennedy in his inaugural address on January 20, 1961, when he said:

"And so my fellow Americans, ask not what America will do for you, but ask what you can do for your country.

"My fellow citizens of the world, ask not what America will do for you, but what together we can do for the freedom of mankind."

May God in His infinite wisdom guide you in your efforts to keep alive the spirit of patriotism, and enrich those who, accepting this responsibility, and who are willing to carry it forward to even greater distances and greater heights, do so with a clear understanding that the fruits of liberty are only enjoyed by those who believe in them, and are willing to defend them.

I know three things must always be
To keep a nation strong and free;
One is a hearthstone bright and dear
With busy, happy loved ones near;

One is a ready, cordial hand
To love and serve and keep the land;
One is a worn and beaten way
To where the people go to pray;

So long as these are kept alive;
Nation and people will survive
God keep them always, everywhere
The hearth, the flag, the place of prayer.

Dedication of the Jackson Lock and Dam, Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, on April 7, 1961, a fine group of representative citizens, including Mrs. Lewis Pick, widow of General Pick, formerly Chief of the Army Engineers; Brig. Gen. H. A. Morris, Corp of Engineers, Divisional Engineer in Atlanta; Congressman Armistead Selden; Col. R. W. Love, the district engineer of Mobile, and many hundreds of others, joined in the dedication of the new lock and dam just above Jackson, Ala., on the Tombigbee River. At this dedication our district engineer at Mobile, Col. Robert W. Love, made a most interesting talk and discussed particularly the damage wrought by the serious floods in the Tombigbee-Warrior Basin. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Colonel Love's informative address. Also included are his welcoming remarks:

WELCOMING REMARKS OF COL. ROBERT W. LOVE, DISTRICT ENGINEER, U.S. ARMY ENGINEER DISTRICT, MOBILE DEDICATION OF JACKSON LOCK AND DAM SITE, APRIL 7, 1961

As the present head of the engineer district including this area, it gives me very great pleasure to add the greetings of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to those of the State of Alabama expressed by Governor Patterson and to welcome you to this Federal reservation.

As you know, the Engineer District organization I represent is responsible for building and operating the locks and dams and dredging the channels of this great waterway. We have been working with the people of Alabama and their devoted congressional representatives for nearly 100 years on the continued development of this river. The fine new lock and dam here is the latest fruit of this long cooperation. Its completion, together with the consequent improvement of the waterway, brings us as much satisfaction as it does you.

You may be assured of the continued cooperation of the Corps of Engineers in further improving this magnificent waterway as an asset to the State, the region, and the Nation.

REMARKS OF COL. ROBERT W. LOVE FOR THE WARRIOR-TOMBIGBEE DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION MEETING AT JACKSON, ALA., ON APRIL 7, 1961

I have been asked primarily to report on the recent flood which wrought so much damage in the five major drainage basins of the Mobile district. In the Tombigbee-Warrior Basin, considerable damage occurred all along the main stream with points of highest damage in the Birmingham and Tuscaloosa-Northport areas.

The storm period which caused all of the trouble lasted for about 6 days between February 18 and 23. Although all information has not been compiled yet, a study of the records that are available indicates that total precipitations of 10 to 16.5 inches occurred during this 6-day period. There was a total of 16.5 inches at Bessemer, 14.2 inches at the Birmingham airport, 14.7 inches at Oliver Lock and Dam and 14.6 inches at Jackson Lock and Dam. The runoff from this rain which was distributed in daily amounts of 0.5 to 6.5 inches caused flooding along the tributaries and soon filled the main river system. This storm came across the Pearl River and the Pascagoula River systems in Mississippi, then the Tombigbee and Warrior and finally moved on over the Coosa and Alabama to the Chattahoochee. All major cities and many smaller ones experienced some damage or inconvenience. I can only give you this general idea of the magnitude of the area affected at this time. Actually, it will take some months before all of the data necessary for a complete analysis will be available. The U.S. Weather Bureau has the responsibility of collecting and compiling the records of a large number of rainfall gage stations and river stage gages on all watersheds. The U.S. Geological Survey has the responsibility of developing the records of flow at many river stage and discharge stations. The Corps coordinates its efforts with those of these agencies in order to secure all useful information. Flood areas will be delineated and measured from all available serial photographs flown at the time and an appraisal will also be made of the damages. Reports will finally be prepared giving all of this information for the use of those who may have a need for it. Completion of these reports, of course, will depend upon available manpower and the allotment of funds.

In connection with the activities of these agencies during floods, I would like to stress the point that the U.S. Weather Bureau has been given the responsibility by Congress of making river stage predictions. It is essential that one agency do this otherwise there will be conflicting information put out which can only lead to confusion. All data that is obtained at corps facilities along the river are furnished the Bureau for its use in making these forecasts. Assistance is then given to disseminate this information to the local interests desiring it. If information is desired at some point other than at official river gages, arrangements should be made beforehand with the Bureau so that stage relationships can be developed to meet your needs. The corps is always willing to cooperate with the Bureau during critical times to give out helpful information.

Measures which can be used for the prevention of flooding consist of storage reservoirs, levees and floodwalls, and channel rectification.

Reservoirs for the temporary retention of floodwater must be located where there are suitable damsites and topography. This generally occurs in the upper reaches of tributaries and in the headwaters. The effectiveness of a reservoir in reducing stages will depend upon the proportion of drainage area and storage volume above the dam and the distance to a specific downstream point. A reservoir controlling 50 percent of the drainage area above a point will be much more effective than one controlling only 25 percent. A reservoir can in no way control the flow that enters the stream from the area below a dam. If the center of a storm passes below a dam with little rainfall occurring above the dam, the reservoir will not be able to reduce stages.

Levees and floodwalls with appurtenant drainage structures will provide complete protection for limited areas along a stream. This is the most effective means of protection where there is a concentration of urban development. Channel rectification which includes cutoffs, bank clearing, snagging, and the widening and deepening of channels usually helps to reduce minor floods which reach stages a few feet above bankfull in the reaches where work is undertaken. It is more effective on the smaller tributary streams than on the larger main streams. Levees and channel work are considered to be local in nature and therefore by law certain conditions of cooperation such as providing all lands, holding the Federal Government free from damages, assuming maintenance and operation, performing some features of relocation work, and contributing some cash for construction are required of a legally constituted agency representing local interests. Reservoirs, if they provide benefits only to a specific area, could also be included in this class. Generally, they provide more widespread benefits and it is not practical to obtain satisfactory agreement on local cooperation.

The Chief of Engineers on May 3, 1956, submitted a report on the Warrior River which is contained in House Document No. 414, 84th Congress, 2d session. This report which covered only the headwater tributaries of the Warrior River recommended an ultimate plan of development for flood control hydroelectric power, flow regulation for navigation and other purposes. A reservoir on each of the three forks named New Hope, Dorsey Creek and Smith's Ford would have provided a total flood storage of 1,609,000 acre-feet. The dams would regulate the flow from 2,100 square miles which is about 44 percent of the area above Tuscaloosa. These dams would be about 100 miles above this city. As a result of this regulation, most flood stages would be reduced by about 3 feet at Tuscaloosa. The effects, however, would vary depending on where the storm center passed across the basin.

These projects, although recommended, were not authorized by Congress in order to permit the development of power by private interests under the Federal Power Act. The Alabama Power Co. is now about to complete the Lewis Smith Dam on the Sipsey Fork a few miles upstream from the corps proposed New Hope site. During the past flood, the power company was able to store at this project the runoff from about 20 percent of the area above Tuscaloosa. When the reservoir is filled to full power pool level, a volume of about 285,000 acre-feet will be reserved for flood storage to be used in accordance with plans which will be prepared in the Mobile district office.

The Warrior River Electric Cooperative obtained a license from the Federal Power Commission to develop power by constructing 2 dams on the Locust Fork. One of these projects was to be constructed so that a flood storage of 233,000 acre-feet could be added later by the Federal Government when authorized by Congress. I do not know at this time when the cooperative will initiate construction of these projects. The cooperative also obtained in January 1956, a permit to study a site on the Mulberry Fork at approximately the corps' proposed site. I understand that this permit has now expired. A project developed at this site would also have to provide about 230,000 acre-feet of storage initially or be constructed so that it could be modified later by the Federal Government. The flood storage portion of all these projects would be operated to give the maximum stage reductions possible downstream.

The existing Corps of Engineers project on the Warrior-Tombigbee Rivers authorized only for navigation does not provide any flood control. It consists of locks and dams designed to meet the needs of navigation. With the exception of the uppermost John Hollis Bankhead Lock and Dam, all projects are drowned out during the extreme flood periods. The gates on this uppermost project were added in 1937 to provide the necessary depths for navigation. They were designed to pass all of the flow coming into the reservoir beneath the gate without any material variation in pool level.

In view of the developments in the basin since our last report was submitted and the experience with the recent flood, a restudy should be made of specific damaged areas to determine suitable protective measures. These studies which will require time and funds must be made before I could make any recommendations for further improvements. Congress, of course, must then authorize and appropriate the necessary funds using the same procedures followed in the development of the navigation project.

Speech of Hon. A. Paul Kitchin, of North Carolina, Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner, May 13, 1961, Charlottesville, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. SMITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert a very excellent speech of my colelague, Representative A. PAUL KITCHIN, delivered at the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner of the Eighth Virginia Congressional District at Charlottesville, Va., on May 13.

The sound principles of constitutional law and States rights are worthy of careful attention of all Americans who harbor a proper respect for the system of government devised by our forefathers:

SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN A. PAUL KITCHIN, OF NORTH CAROLINA, JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY DINNER, MAY 13, 1961, CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA.

Mr. Chairman, Congressman Smith, and fellow Democrats, I am flattered and highly honored to be here tonight and to be presented by my good friend and colleague, Judge SMITH, your able Congressman and one of the greatest American statesmen of all time. While the history of your great State is filled with the names and accomplishments of her great sons, I concede to none of them more sincerity of purpose, more love of country, more loyalty to constitutional government, and more patriotic zeal for the welfare of his Nation and its people than HOWARD SMITH. I congratulate the constituency of this district for your wisdom in the selection of your Congressman and in sincerity must say that your district is the best represented district in the House of Representatives. May the good Lord and the voters of the Eighth continue to allow him to serve his country for many, many years to come.

I also congratulate the people of Virginia for the selection of the other great Democrats of your delegation without whom the voice of Jeffersonian democracy in the Halls of Congress would be weak indeed.

The Commonwealth of Virginia, the birth and growth of our Nation, and the creation and meaning of the Democratic Party are synonymous. No State in this great Union has contributed more to the foundation and progress of our Nation than has your great Commonwealth. All freedom-loving Americans should press an humble knee upon your sacred soil and give thanks to Almighty God that from the pangs of birth, the agonies of youth, the trials of adolescense, and the present anxious and uncertain moments of the maturity of our Nation, we have always had Virginia.

We are gathered here tonight to pay tribute to Jefferson and Jackson, the founders and the guiding influence of our Democratic Party. I sometimes wonder if they or either of them would, if they were here with us tonight, discern any resemblance between their creation and the present trend of our national Democratic Party.

"Strong centralized government" is the motto of the day and does nothing but violence to the creed of Jefferson who believed and asserted that "the least governed are the best governed." The Democratic Party was firmly established by Jefferson and Jackson as the party of the people. The party that believes that people are capable of governing themselves. When this belief inculcated into the minds of people by Jefferson and Jackson has been put into action we have always had good government—a government that honored the rights of States and individual freedom. A government that sponsored a sound currency, a balanced budget, and an adherence to the principles of the Constitution of the United States. A government that decried centralized bureaucracy and stark Federal power. When we as Democrats turned our back on Jeffersonian philosophy we not only caused a split in our party but have digressed from the great principles that made us great. Selfish interest and political expediency have replaced fundamental ideals of our party and we find ourselves divided in our own ranks—there are those of us who still believe in the tenets of Jeffersonian democracy and there are others who have no confidence in the ability of the people to govern themselves at local and State levels and who advocate every measure which will further regiment our people and destroy the rights of State and local governments.

Yes; of late there appears to be a new order of things—a new approach to government by both major parties. Now big government must take over and run everything from bureaucratic Washington. This is the trend of the times but the responsibility for this trend must be placed where it belongs—upon the shoulders of the people of this country. The best people on earth but a confused, mixed-up people who believe they want constitutional government but who eagerly grasp for the personal benefits of any proposed welfare and privilege legislation. A people that have some confused idea that what the U.S. Government does for them is free, that it does not cost them anything, that if the cost of government must be shaved off a little, don't stop my benefits, stop the benefits of the other fellow. If someone has to be taxed to pay for all this, don't tax me. That's unfair. Tax the other guy. A people that have the confused idea that as long as taxes are not raised to affect their personal pocketbooks, it's all right to give billions of dollars in foreign aid and go deeper and deeper in debt whether it buys any friends or not. If it proves later to be a mistake it won't cost us anything. Charge it to posterity. Let those generations, yet unborn, bear the burden of paying this enormous obligation. A people who have the confused idea that good, benevolent Uncle Sam in the many grant-in-aid programs and matching fund programs is being very nice to our State and saves us taxes and lets us spend the money as we see fit without any Federal control.

A people who have the confused idea that the only dangers we face are those in Laos, Cuba, the Congo, Berlin, and other far away areas of the world. A people who have the confused idea international communism is just a ghost story to frighten us into conformity. A people who have the confused idea that our internal government is not changing and that those of us who are old-fashioned enough to believe in constitutional government are just reactionary and preachers of doom and gloom—just close your eyes and ears and it will all go away.

There are some of us who seriously wonder whether our constitutional government can and will survive the avarice, greed, and selfishness of a confused citizenry. There are some of us who seriously wonder if about all

of the Constitution they want now are the first three articles under which to organize, the welfare clause under which to legislate, and the fifth amendment behind which to hide. There are some of us who seriously wonder whether our democracy can survive the misuse of the Constitution by enemies of our society who, under the guise of rights and privileges, hide behind it; who, under the guise of freedom of speech, press, and assembly, castigate and vilify it; and who, under the guise of humanitarianism and the welfare clause, would legislate its destruction.

The people of this Nation must stabilize themselves, inform themselves as to what's happening and then decide what they want in Government. Do we want a welfare state, socialism, x-ism, call it what you please, or do we want a return to constitutional government as decreed by our forefathers, tested for over a century by its political enemies, and survived and prospered over the years guided and sustained by a great and freedom-loving people.

Norman Thomas gave up years ago joyously and victoriously stating that it was no longer necessary for the Socialist Party to exist because the two major parties had already accomplished its aims. Much more implementation has been made since then by legislation and Supreme Court decisions. Decisions not based upon stare decises but upon changing times and the changing of our social order; by legislation which bypasses the concept of jurisdiction between Federal and State but ostensibly bottomed upon the so-called welfare clause; by laws that tend to relegate our States to mere vassals of a Federal bureaucratic regime; by pseudolegal violence to the constitutions of our States in actions to dictate the control of State funds and the State's right to spend these funds for the continuation and preservation of State institutions; to dictate changes in voting qualifications; to dictate intrastate wages and hours; to dictate whom you must employ before you are eligible to bid on a contract with your own Government; and many other usurpations of States rights too numerous to mention.

If this is what the people want let them make a thoughtful and final decision. Final because once made to accept socialism there is no return. The choice must be between loyalty to our selfish interest and loyalty to our individual freedom—loyalty to social and political expediency and loyalty to principles and ideals—loyalty to a materialistic abundance and loyalty to a fiscally sound economy. The chosing of one's expression of loyalty is but to exercise the genius of democracy which still remains the type of government which men who are less than men seek to avoid. It is the most demanding system that has ever been created. It is not something created for soft man but a society and a way of life which our forefathers worked, fought, bled, and died for and can be maintained only with courage, work, sacrifice, and determination—courage of our convictions; work to acquire knowledge to nurture our convictions; sacrifice of selfish desires for patriotic citizenship, and determination to keep our Nation safe for a God-fearing and freedom-loving people.

The era in which we now live is fraught between two camps—democracy as we know it—and communism and other isms. These are probably more a political expression than a philosophy and the real intellectual war that is being waged within our world society is whether we can evaluate the true nature of man and history—whether man is free to create history or whether history will shackle man to the status of a soul-less creature dominated by the state.

We the people must awaken from our opiates of self-indulgence and regain our perspective. "What is America?" not the academic concept of geographical and material existence but—what makes it tick—why a declaration of independence. Why a Constitution. Why a Bill of Rights. These profound questions can only be answered by an intelligent, courageous, and patriotic people after a soul-searching admission that what they stand for cannot survive on apathy, ignorance, and irresponsibility. We must never take our freedoms and liberties for granted. I wish every native-born citizen could look upon the face of the foreign-born when he finally becomes a naturalized citizen of these United States; could see the tears of joy—could sense the great soul-filled pride of those who know what it is to be deprived of the rights we enjoy and take for granted. If we could regain from some of them the real value of American citizenship what a great lesson we could teach in our everyday lives.

We the people must determine the kind of America we want for the future.

I think I can speak with a unanimous voice for Americans when I say that we want an America for the future that lifts its head high in the world, not because of its military might, or its material achievements, but because we are morally right and sound, and because America is a living symbol of the rights and dignity of man. We want an America so constant to its principles, and so resolute in honoring its responsibilities to the free world that our friends all over the globe will never have reason to regret the trust that they have placed in us. We want an America ever prepared to meet any challenge or any competing ideology with great breadth of courage, and great depth of purpose.

Can this be done? Of course it can. The pattern was drawn with the first sketching of the framework of America in the Declaration of Independence. We need only reawaken to the challenge. This America of the future will demand citizens who recognize that the true greatness of our Nation does not lie in its high standard of living, but rather in its high standard of life. We shall need citizens who realize that the security of our Nation is the responsibility of each individual citizen. We must prove that a free people, through voluntary, cooperative effort, can achieve a better standard of life than can be gained in the regimented society of the Soviet Union. Communism and socialism require people who can be told what to do, who can be managed, democracy demands people who have self-control, who can manage themselves.

Yes; we can have this America of the future, but only if every citizen of the United States accepts his responsibility and fulfills his role in the spirit of self-discipline. You cannot say, "Let George do it."

Democratic government is a shared responsibility. It implies that every citizen, as well as every public official, make a career of citizenship. Only in this way can democracy be strong. Its strength rests wholesouled on the fact that we have on this soil the incredible phenomenon of 180 million people who are ruled by themselves. It is the people who tell the Government where it gets on, and where it gets off. It is the people who hire and fire the Government, through our system of elections. This is an immense responsibility that rests upon you and me and every individual American citizen. In a nation as large and complex as ours, only an intelligent, perceptive citizenry could accomplish this task without the machinery of democracy simply falling apart.

We can no longer escape the fact that our personal destinies are deeply involved with the actions of the Federal Government. If we fail to assume our individual responsibilities. We shall have surrendered our integrity as American citizens, and we shall have no cause for complaint. But if we are ever aware that government is a shared responsibility, and if we maintain an alert, unselfish, and participating citizenry, then our institutions will be safe and our freedom secure.

I would encourage each of you to look to the America that you want for the future, and to remember that there is no distinction between what is good for your future, and what is good for the future of the country. I would encourage you to exercise every act that is within your power to enrich and preserve the heritage that is ours, and to prove to the world that constitutional democracy is not a dying society, but a vibrant and rewarding way of life that holds the dignity of the individual on the highest pedestal. This task will require the effort and dedication of every single one of us.

Last, but not least, don't be ashamed to be patriotic, don't hide your face if a tear of pride comes in your eye when Old Glory is unfurled and the national anthem is played. Raise your head high and look at America—listen, and you'll hear her say to you: "I'm just what you make me, no more or no less."

The Cuba Fiasco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include the following editorial from the May 10 issue of the Indianapolis News, by Morrie Ryskind:

WHY EXEMPT INTELLECTUALS FROM BLAME?

(By Morrie Ryskind)

By any standards, James Reston—agree with him or not—is one of the ablest and saltiest reporters of the American scene. Though he quite obviously favored Kennedy in the presidential campaign, his is no blind loyalty, and he has not hesitated to point out some of the errors of this administration.

In a recent column, for example, he places no small portion of the blame for the Cuban fiasco on some of the professors the President lured way from the colleges. But he concludes with a solemn warning that the academicians must not be attacked too vigorously, lest the country develop a spasm of anti-intellectualism.

Reston readers are entitled to better than that, for it is surely one of the moldiest cliches in the liberal lexicon. Every time a professor utters a bunch of balderdash—and many of them do, even as the rest of us—any criticism of it meets an immediate countercharge of anti-intellectualism. Do you disagree with some of the conclusions of Galbraith, the younger Schlesinger or Linus Pauling? Well, then, you probably know what you are: A dirty anti-intellectual and a know-nothing to boot.

This is a curious notion in a country where you are free to criticize your baseball manager, your policemen, your legislators, your President and, on rare occasions, your wife's cooking.

What, in heaven's name, makes an intellectual, anyhow? The self-anointing? What gives the group that peculiar aura of sanctity that robs the rest of us of the right to call attention to the plain fact that some of their ideas have no clothes on? If they have come directly from Sinai or Olympus, we are at least entitled to see their passports and not accept their mere say-so.

The mere fact that a man is an authority in a given field does not, regrettably but undeniably, make him an authority in all

branches of knowledge. Henry Ford was, beyond doubt, an authentic genius who changed the face of America, and no one questions Einstein's place in higher mathematics.

Once they stepped outside their ken and discussed politics, however, neither had the faintest idea about what he was talking.

Neither my best friends nor my worst enemies have ever ranked me with the scholarly elite, but I have occasionally managed to be on the fringe. It happens that I know and admire greatly Max Eastman and William F. Buckley, Jr., both of whom pass for intellectuals in conservative circles. But once they get out of their own fields, they, too, like Ford and Einstein, are mere babes in the wood.

I have been to the races with both of them and am prepared to testify, under oath, that their tips are worthless. I'm not certain that either knows just mow many legs a horse has, and they have absolutely no notion of how many furlongs there are in a mile.

And, if this is anti-intellectualism, let Reston make the most of it.

Prospective Revolt in Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Columnist Joseph Alsop is raising a lot of eyebrows by persisting in arguing that Red China may revolt. He is not contending that it will. He argues that it may. The Alsop point is that the kind of oppression the Chinese people are suffering under Dictator Mao is far crueler and more terrible than has been generally recognized. The task of communizing China is infinitely more troublesome than the Lenin-Stalin task in Russia.

Alsop shows that evidence has been mounting that there must be millions of Chinese who would just as soon die—end a miserable existence—as subsist in the starvation and torment that is their present lot. Of course, this could result in simply a passive sitdown strike. Or it could provide the spark for revolution.

In any event, it underlines the wisdom of our continuing our frequently derided and denounced policy of providing aid and assistance to the Nationalist Chinese Government on Formosa. There freedom enjoys an exceedingly tough and well trained armed force of Chinese with excellent morale and a burning desire to free their homeland. Here, too, is the source of leadership that could give a Chinese revolt shape, direction, and reality.

A successful Chinese revolution against communism could gloriously turn the tide for freedom and against communism. Regardless of the remoteness of its achievement or the obvious difficulties that stand in its way, American policy should do everything possible to keep this hope alive.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Joseph Alsop, entitled "Can China Explode?" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAN CHINA EXPLODE?
(By Joseph Alsop)

HONG KONG.—Among all the experiments made by governments of men, the experiment now being conducted by the Chinese Communist government is certainly the most ruthless and perhaps also the most interesting that has been attempted in modern times.

To be sure, it is not a novel experiment. As already pointed out in this series of reports, Mao Tse-tung is clearly following Josef Stalin's book in the most literal fashion. Beginning with the first 5-year plan, Stalin made the Russian peasantry pay for the forced industrialization of Russia. Mao is now trying to do precisely the same thing in China.

For this purpose, however, Stalin had to organize the countryside in a quasi-military manner. In order to free resources for his investment program, he also had to force down the standard of life of the Russian masses, by one half. And in the end, he had to condemn no less than 18 million of his people to death. Five million died in a single year in the fearful Ukraine famine, and 13 million more succumbed to hunger, or expired under the lash of the police, or were quite simply shot before the second Soviet 5-year-plan ended in 1939.

In these respects, too, Mao is imitating Stalin. The Chinese communes, like the Soviet agricultural collectives, were started in order to take the countryside in an iron grip. The drop in the standard of life of the Chinese masses after the communes were started was at least as grave as the drop of the Russian masses' living standard after the collectives were set up.

But right here we encounter the factor which makes it necessary to ask whether China may not explode as a result of this ruthless experiment. For the Russian masses were living not too badly when Stalin launched his program of forced industrialization; whereas the Chinese masses were only eking out the barest subsistence when their government decided to double its exactions. Cold calculation suggests, therefore, that Mao's forced industrialization may quite possibly reduce the population of his much poorer, far more crowded country by as much as 150 million.

This need to be so much more ruthless than Stalin, and more ruthless, too, over a longer period of time, clearly makes Mao's experiment more risky than Stalin's experiment. When any Government has embarked upon a course that appears to require tens of millions of human sacrifices per annum, one must surely consider the possibility of failure. And in this reporter's opinion, which is still admittedly a minority opinion, the creeping famine in China is already beginning to cause very massive annual population losses.

A government edict has been published threatening punishment of any party cadre in which commune the death rate rises much above normal. A leading Peking planner has also promised recently that in 10 years the individual ration will be raised to no less than 1,500 calories per day—or less than Western nutritionists regard as absolutely needful for any working man or woman. This, after a full decade of further toil and hunger. After two bad crop years, grain is being imported to maintain the rations of the army and the showcase cities. But there is no discernible sign that the Government intends to mitigate its harsh policy.

Here in Hong Kong, there are those who say that the agony of the Chinese masses will come to an end if there is a good crop this year. But in the first place, it is very doubtful whether a really good crop is possible, even if nature is kind, when more than 20 percent of the farmers in the fields are showing the first symptoms of beriberi. And in the second place, unless the policy is changed, the Government's exactions to pay for forced industrialization will continue as before.

To this blood-chilling résumé one must also add the point made in the last article in this series. A mass of recent eyewitness testimony from the Chinese mainland points to a serious breakdown of discipline, both a breakdown of the strict discipline of the party cadres, and a breakdown of the public discipline of the drilled, intimidated people.

The breakdown of discipline must mean that the conditions are beginning to exist in which a small spark can light a gigantic fire, as has happened before in China in comparable circumstances. Thus the question whether China can explode boils down to the question whether China's army will always be ready to put out the fires that chance sparks may light. It is an interesting question.

On the other hand, this is a peasant army drawn from the very class that is suffering most sorely. And the wives and families of the officers and noncommissioned officers were sent back to live in the peasant villages at almost the very moment when the worst ordeal of the villagers began. On the other hand, political control and police surveillance of the army are both intensely strong. And the army is recruited, not from conscripts, but from young men specially selected for military duty by the party cadres in the communes. The duty is a privilege because of the soldiers' higher rations.

Thus one can only say that even if the agony of the masses is prolonged and the breakdown of discipline is progressive, the army may well remain dependable. But the other result is far from unimaginable.

One can also say that the chance for an explosion in China will be immeasurably increased if the Government attempts a foreign military operation in the present state of the countryside. And this is an immediately significant point, in view of the present situation in southeast Asia.

Proposal for Congressional Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statements of the Small Business Association of New England, at a meeting today with the Members of Congress from New England on their proposal for congressional action:

SMALLER BUSINESS ASSOCIATION OF NEW ENGLAND PROPOSALS FOR CONGRESSIONAL ACTION, 1961

Gentlemen, we speak for small business, a segment of the economy which produces approximately one-third of the gross national product. Since the economic well-being of small business is essential to the welfare of our Nation and its citizens, we have an obligation to provide recommendations for congressional action.

As we see it, solutions to the major problems which we face today are dependent on these three interrelated needs:

1. We must expand employment opportunities.

2. We must increase the ability of the United States to compete with its friendly, and unfriendly, rivals overseas.

3. We must sustain the rate of economic growth which has earned for us the highest standard of living in the world.

Let's talk about employment. An acceptable unemployment level seems to be approximately 4 percent. At present, the figure is in the neighborhood of 7 percent. Reduction of this figure to 4 percent is difficult enough, but when we look into the future we are faced with an additional problem of staggering proportions.

According to the Department of Labor, by 1965, only 4 years from now, our labor force will increase to 80 million. By 1970, it will number 85 to 86 million.

We do not have to look that far ahead, however. To reduce unemployment to 4 percent by mid-1962, only 1 year from now, we would have to create 4 to 5 million new jobs.

Who is going to create these millions of new jobs? Business, of course. And here is where small business can play a vital role in the Nation's economy. At the risk of oversimplifying the situation, let us suppose that every one of the 4.5 million small enterprises could add one person to its work force in the next year. The result would be 4.5 million new jobs, enough to fill the gap.

It would not work out this simply, of course, because some of us only employ 1 or 2 persons now. But the average is not unattainable.

Small business can do it, but it needs help. There must be dramatic increases in investments in new plants and equipment, and in modernization. Armies of workers will be absorbed in the building, and later in the operation, of these new and modernized plants which will meet the ever-increasing needs of our expanding population.

We are here today to present our proposals for congressional action. These proposals cover the following areas: Taxation, presented by Henry J. Griswold, of Boston; labor, presented by Leo Brynes, of Providence; procurement, presented by Robert S. Goodyear, of Framingham, Mass., and finance, presented by S. Abbott Smith, of Chelsea, Mass.

Here is our program for taxation. We are not looking for tax "handouts." We are asking for recognition of the fact that our present tax laws, as they apply to economic expansion, are obsolete. We have created a massive roadblock to economic growth. Action in the following areas is urgently needed to encourage the accelerated growth which is essential to our national welfare.

TAX DEDUCTIONS FOR REINVESTED EARNINGS

Small business must have more capital funds to reinvest for expansion and modernization. "Plowback" of additional earnings will generate additional taxable income, creating more revenue for the Treasury. Experience has demonstrated that, for each 1 percent of economic gowth, the Federal Government gains a billion dollars in additional revenue.

"Plowback" is currently applied to foreign investments by American corporations. In these situations, earnings of a foreign subsidiary are liable to taxation by the Federal Government only if the earnings are returned to the United States. No tax is levied on earnings which are retained overseas for reinvestment in the subsidiary. In simple justice, our domestic small enterprises deserve the same opportunity for growth.

Tax exemptions to provide incentives for more invested capital in small businesses are needed now. The proposals recently made by the President are a long stride in the right direction, but as Secretary Dillon promised the House Ways and Means Committee, these proposals should not stand in the way of reforms of the basic tax laws.

We believe that deductions from earnings before taxes should be allowed, if such earnings are used to increase investments in depreciable assets, accounts receivable, and inventories. As a minimum proposal, we urge legislation permitting deductions for capital invested in depreciable assets, because they are vitally needed now for expansion and modernization.

Such deductions will not reduce revenue to the Treasury. Instead, they will generate additional taxable income. The money must be spent in advance; it will be at work producing more goods, employing more people, and generating additional taxable income, months before the tax bill becomes due.

Furthermore, such deductions would be equitable; they would be available to all businesses, large and small. And they would provide capital funds, which are not available from other sources, to the 80 percent segment of small business that operates as unincorporated enterprise.

MORE FLEXIBLE DEPRECIATION RATES

Our present standard of living has been achieved by incorporating technological advances into our industrial economy. We have outproduced other nations because our industrial plant has been considerably more efficient.

This is no longer true. Today, the industrial efficiency of Western Europe and Japan is approaching our own, while their wage rates are a fraction of those which we pay. Our present system of depreciation allowances is hampering improvement of our industrial efficiency. The United States is the only major industrial country which has failed to modernize tax laws relating to depreciation. Canada with rates twice as fast as ours, Great Britain with 30 percent in the first year, West Germany with high rates in the early years and a maximum in 10, Denmark allowing 50 percent in the first 5 years, France with an inflation adjustment; Belgium, Italy, Sweden, Argentina, Chile, and Japan—all have modernized their depreciation allowances, either to allow for replacement costs, or to provide rapid depreciation, or both. As a result of our unrealistic depreciation policies all businesses are hard-pressed merely to replace wornout equipment, let alone to expand and modernize their plant facilities; the smaller the company, the more acute the problem.

Inflation alone has made our depreciation allowances inadequate. According to the First National Bank of Boston, prices of capital goods have advanced nearly 60 percent since 1947. With depreciation charges based upon original cost, and all replacements priced continually higher, many firms are unable to sustain a healthy rate of investment.

Here is another factor which is retarding investments in new plants and equipment. Because businesses are unable to charge adequate depreciation to costs, earnings are overstated. For example, if the useful life of a machine is 5 years, and the owner must depreciate it over 10 years, only half of the machine's cost is applied to the items it produces. As a result, earnings are inflated, and these "phantom" profits are taxed away.

Funds for capital investment come primarily from three sources: retained earnings, creation of debt, and depreciation. According to Accountant Joel Barlow, as reported in the November 1959 issue of the Tool Engineer, in the period 1947–59, depreciation provided twice as much capital as either of the other two sources. If our economy is going to grow, and its growth is essential to our Nation's survival, this primary source of investment capital must be expanded.

Whereas our current depreciation allowances are based on the amount of time estimated for a machine to wear out, today, obsolescence is a more important factor than wear and tear. A recent study by Johns Hopkins University revealed that a modern machine tool has an obsolescence cycle of 5 to 10 years, yet our present depreciation policies require companies to take 15 to 20 years to write off such equipment. According to a McGraw-Hill survey made in 1958, out of a total of $300 billion in U.S. capital assets, $95 billion of plant equipment was considered obsolete, and depreciation allowances are lagging $4 to $6 billion annually behind replacement needs. The results of a 1959 survey of 240 metal working manufacturers conducted by Iron Age, as shown in this chart, reveals that a distressing large percentage of production equipment has been in use for more than 10 years.

Fifty-four percent of the manufacturers reported that 20 to 50 percent of their equipment was over 10 years old, and 38 percent reported that more than 50 percent of their equipment was over 10 years old.

Technological obsolescence is the result of research; the greater the research, the faster the obsolescence. Consequently, fixed rates of depreciation are no longer practical. We believe that the rate at which an investment in equipment is written off should be left to the discretion of the company involved, rather than being dictated by the Government by law.

A completely flexible depreciation policy, in which a business would be allowed to write off its investment at the pace it chooses, would offer these advantages:

1. It is easy to apply, reducing to a minimum accounting and tax audit procedures.
2. It can be spelled out clearly in legislation.
3. It is fair and equitable.
4. Its effect is universal.

We urge that the same policy be extended to newly acquired used equipment. The primary source of technological advancement for many small businesses is the rebuilt machine which was turned in by a large company for a new model. Extension of depreciation allowances for used equipment will not only help the small company to expand and modernize its operations; it will also provide a larger market for the machinery rebuilder, thereby creating more jobs in that industry. In turn, large companies will be encouraged to purchase new equipment because their used machinery will have a higher trade-in value.

CARRYBACK AND FORWARD OF UNUSED SURTAX CREDITS

Many small businesses whose earnings vary widely from year to year are being penalized by our income tax structure. On earnings up to $25,000, corporations are taxed at a rate of 30 percent. When earnings exceed $25,000, the surtax becomes effective, resulting in a rate of 52 percent. It is apparent that small corporations whose earnings fluctuate above and below $25,000 are subject to serious variations in taxes from year to year.

For example, and this happens all too often, one corporation may earn $50,000 one year and nothing the next year. For the 2 years, it pays a tax of $20,500 (all on the first year's earnings). Another corporation, with earnings of $25,000 in each of 2 successive years, pays a total of only $15,000 on the same 2-year total earnings.

Such inequities can be easily eliminated by allowing corporations to carryback or forward any unused portion of their $25,000 surtax allowance. We urge that the Internal Revenue Code be amended so that unused credits against the surtax allowance may be averaged, by permitting a carryback for 3 years, and a carry forward for 5 years.

TAX EXEMPTIONS FOR VOLUNTARY RETIREMENT PLANS

Millions of Americans are now covered by company retirement plans and more are being enrolled every year. Tax deductions are allowed for funds set aside for this purpose. Yet, professional men, and other who are self-employed, cannot make any tax deduc-

tions for amounts which they set aside for their retirement. In the interest of basic fair play, we urge legislation to correct this situation. Such legislation, which would permit tax deductions within reasonable limits for funds invested in qualified plans, would not be for "special interests." Instead, it would amend a law which currently discriminates against a valuable and productive segment of our economy.

Every business has two partners. One is Government, which receives a major share of the business' earnings through taxation. The second partner is labor. Sometimes, however, it seems that labor fails to recognize that it is a partner and acts as if it were a competitor.

Unfortunately for small business, much labor is "big," bound together in national and international unions which set their sights on big business. These unions overlook the fact that the small enterprise does not have the ability to absorb the high wages and consequent increased costs which the big business has.

When the employees of a small business are represented by an industrywide union, neither the employees nor their employer have much to say about the terms of their agreement, which are dictated by national union policy. The small businessman is at a disadvantage at the bargaining table because he cannot match the skill and experience of the professional union negotiators. Labor and management go through the motions of bargaining, but the negotiations are often meaningless. Union monopoly power is thereby exerting a squeeze on smaller businesses, since it is breeding a situation wherein the big corporations and unions sit down together and negotiate, while no one else has much to say.

REGULATE MONOPOLISTIC PRACTICES OF BIG UNIONS

At the end of the 19th century, the Government took steps to curb the squeeze by big business, through the antitrust laws. We submit that similar legislation, which will curb the squeeze by big unions, is long overdue.

RESTRICTIONS ON COMPULSORY UNIONISM

The source of union monopoly power is control of its members. Complete control is provided by compulsory unionism, as practiced in the union shop, wherein a worker must join the union to keep his job. Once he is in the union, he is under pressure to follow the union line, whether or not he believes that it is contrary to his own best interests. We endorse the right of workers to join unions voluntarily for collective bargaining, but we believe that compulsory unionism runs counter to American concepts and traditions of freedom. We urge the adoption of restrictions on the union shop and compulsory unionism in any form.

BAN USE OF UNION FUNDS FOR POLITICAL PURPOSES

We recognize the legitimacy of several of the weapons which labor uses for collective bargaining and to influence public opinion. However, we cannot see how any union can justify the use of its funds for political purposes, since this practice forces many union members to lend their financial support to candidates whom they personally oppose.

We recognize the validity of the existing restrictions on the political activity of business, and we urge the extension of these restrictions to unions.

RESTORATION OF INJUNCTIVE POWERS TO FEDERAL COURTS

All too frequently, we see examples of strikes which get out of hand, resulting in intimidation and violence, because of a breakdown in local police powers. In these instances, injunctive procedures are needed to supplement local law enforcement. Yet, in these situations, it is almost impossible for an employer to obtain an injunction from the Federal courts.

Roadblocks should be removed from the path to injunctions in situations where they are clearly indicated. A complete ban on all forms of picketing would eliminate instances of intimidation and violence, but if this is not feasible, at least the present immunity of unions to injunctive procedures should be lifted.

CONTINUE THE BAND ON SECONDARY BOYCOTTS

Moves are currently being made to legalize secondary boycotts, as contemplated in the so-called "situs picketing" amendments to the Landrum-Griffin Act. We urge that all such attempts to weaken the act be rejected, since we believe that restrictions on this particularly vicious form of blackmail should be tightened rather than relaxed.

In the area of Government procurement, we wish to commend you for your awareness of the growing problem of small business. Small business has much to offer the Government, including know-how, flexibility, imagination, and economy; yet, our share of Government procurement is falling instead of rising.

We are encouraged to see the administration taking steps to provide a greater share of Government contracts for small business. If the administration and Congress work together to implement the President's directive, perhaps we can reverse the downward trend.

As President Kennedy pointed out in his March 15 press conference, small business' share of defense contracts in 1960 was $3.4 billion, or 16 percent. In 1954, its percentage was 25.3 percent. A glance at the Department of Defense yearly figures since then shows the gradual downward trend.

This trend is understandable when Department of Defense figures reveal that 73.4 percent of all defense procurement was awarded to 100 large companies. Furthermore, 50 percent was awarded to 25 corporations, and 5 firms were awarded 25 percent of the contracts.

We realize that the production of space age weapons requires enormously complex technology, and that large corporations are best equipped to handle their overall production. Nevertheless, small business can still play an important role in defense production as subcontractors and as suppliers of smaller hardware items, but it needs your help.

STRENGTHEN SET-ASIDE PROGRAM

SBA set-asides have increased slightly in effectiveness over the past few years. Yet they account for only 3.6 percent of defense spending. SBA's authority in this area should be strengthened so that more opportunities can be provided for small manufacturers and construction firms. Certainly more than 3.6 percent of our defense spending can be set-aside for qualified small businesses.

For example, in New England, we are excited about the possibilities of the missile-site program. Each base consists of several subsites, all identical and covering an area of many square miles. If construction of all of the subsites is awarded as a single $70 to $75 million contract, the small contractor is frozen out. Yet, if each subsite were let out as a separate $10 million contract, each job would be well within the capabilities of a smaller contractor. Since the subsites are identical, each contractor could work from the same specifications, producing identical results. It would not cost the Government any more to set aside such subsite contracts. As a matter of fact, competition produced by a greatly expanded list of bidders would probably reduce the cost. In New England, we place a high value on the personal interest and pride of workmanship of the small contractor, as well as on the efficiency of a small work force which is accustomed to working as a team. Although they cannot always be measured in dollars and cents, these are valuable assets, when compared to the impersonal nature of the huge contracting firm which recruits hundreds of temporary workers to handle a big contract.

EFFECTIVE REPRESENTATION OF SBA IN PROCUREMENT AGENCIES

We recognize that small business' greatest potential is in subcontracting. For this reason, we urge that SBA be more effectively represented in procurement agencies to make sure that small business receives a fair share of subcontracts.

Mr. Spencer M. Smith, Jr., of the University of Maryland, while testifying recently before a subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, made a cogent observation. It was his opinion that, among other reasons, the inability of small firms to obtain prime and subcontracts, and the lack of an agency of sufficient power to consider Government procurement to this end, were preventing small business from participating in any overall economic expansion. To this we say, "Amen."

We believe that SBA is the agency to do this job, but it needs sufficient authorization to perform it properly. An incentive should be offered to prime contractors to encourage more subcontracting. Also, Government renegotiators should not penalize prime contractors who subcontract much of their work, as they are inclined to do, as compared to those who keep all of the work "in house."

SBA APPROVAL OF FACILITIES CONTRACTS

One of the major detriments to small business subcontracting is the issuance of "facilities contracts" to major prime contractors without sufficient review of the available capabilities of small subcontractors in the same area. In many instances, the Government is providing capital funds to prime contractors for purchase and construction of facilities which are already available in competent small shops. If the prime contractor subcontracted some of his work to these small firms, such capital investments would be reduced. As a result, not only would small business be strengthened, but the contract could be completed at lower cost to the Government.

SBA maintains lists of willing and able small shops for all kinds of work. We urge that SBA be authorized to review all "facilities contracts" to make sure the Government is not spending funds for facilities which are available from a small subcontractor.

GREATER USE OF ADVERTISED BIDDING

We wholeheartedly support the trend toward greater use of advertised bidding. We are aware of many small companies which are capable of performing at lower cost, contracts which are not even open to them for bidding.

IMPROVE THE SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT PROGRAM

We are pleased by the rapid progress which is now being made by the small business investment program. Although it is in need of some improvements, it is becoming an excellent source of long-term and equity capital, and we are watching its progress with interest and pride. We urge continuance beyond June 30, 1961, of the present policies permitting SBA to make loans to SBIC's and to State and local development companies. We are also supporting those amendments which are currently before Congress which will improve the Small Business Investment Act.

RENEWAL OF THE SMALL BUSINESS RESEARCH GRANT PROGRAM

We urge renewal and continuance of SBA's small business research grant program which began in 1959 and was later discontinued. The $2 million annual cost

of this program is possibly the most fruitful investment which SBA can make. Studies which have been produced in the past, and potential studies which can be made in the future, are effective aids to small business, since they probe areas that otherwise might not be investigated at all. Small business needs this management research program.

AID TO DEPRESSED AREAS

Now that the depressed areas bill has been enacted into law, we hope that small business will be given an opportunity to participate to the full extent of its ability to make an effective contribution to the program.

SUMMARY

Give small business the tools and it will do the job. These tools can be classified in three broad areas:

1. Stimulus to increased investment. Capital creation through plowback allowances and liberalized depreciation is a vital factor.

2. Improvement of the labor climate. Since management will be investing capital in new equipment, the people who operate it must assume the responsibility of full partners.

3. Increase our share of the business which the Government generates. Small business can make a vital contribution to our defense posture. It is not asking for special privileges, but it does ask for equal opportunity for all businesses, regardless of size.

SBANE appreciates the consideration you have shown to small business in the past, and we offer our sincere thanks for the time and attention which you have given us today. May we look forward to continuing cooperation between our association and the Congress of the United States. Thank you.

Quality Medical Care for the Aged: A General Practitioner's View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in the May 23 issue of Look magazine, Dr. Joseph R. Mallory, a general practitioner from Mattoon, Ill., expresses his feelings on the current proposal to put medical care for the aged under the social security system. Dr. Mallory stresses, in his statement, the quality of American medical care under our present free system and notes that the imposition of a compulsory health care program under social security would result in a lowering of this quality care.

I would like, at this point, to place Dr. Mallory's article in the RECORD:

A FAMILY DOCTOR'S FIGHT AGAINST SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

(By Joseph R. Mallory, M.D.)

(Joseph Ross Mallory, 46, is a physician who practices general medicine at Mattoon, Ill. (population 19,088). Civic-minded as well as a good doctor, he has become one of Mattoon's best-known and best-liked citizens. Within the past few months Dr. Mallory has been one of hundreds of physicians who have been speaking at the request of county medical societies concerning medical-care problems of the aged. He warns of the threat of socialized medicine at gatherings such as PTA meetings and business club luncheons. As a solution, he favors the recently enacted Kerr-Mills law, which authorizes the use of general tax funds of the Federal and State governments; its provisions are to be locally administered and call for aid only to those aged who qualify. He disapproves of the Kennedy administration's plan to pay for limited aid to all the aged under social security. Here, in question-and-answer form, Dr. Mallory gives his reasons.)

Do you feel that medical care for the aged is a serious national problem?

I will have to give that question a qualified yes. I think we must assume there is a problem, although I'm inclined to the opinion that it has been exaggerated. Nevertheless, we must recognize that it is impossible for all families to take care of their aged members and impossible for some of the elderly to take care of themselves adequately. Many of them must have help beyond themselves and their families.

The question, then, is how we are going to provide the financial assistance these people require?

That is the heart of the problem, right there.

The administration has proposed that health care for the aged be financed through the social security system. Why are you opposed to this approach?

I can think of many good reasons. To begin with, the administration proposal—the King bill now before Congress—is based on a double error. It assumes that most of the aged are in poor health and that most of them need help to meet the costs of medical care. This just isn't true. Some of our elderly are in poor health, and some do have financial troubles. But most are healthy and in reasonably good shape financially. A number of surveys back this up.

Does this hold true in your community?

Yes, and I suspect it holds true in most communities.

You said you think the problem is exaggerated. In what way?

Well, just look around for yourself. Some older people are millionaires. Some are comfortably well off. Millions have some form of health insurance and private pension programs. Some, of course, are poor—just as some young or middle-aged people are poor. I truly believe that anyone who really needs medical care in this country can get it regardless of his financial status.

What about the health of the aged? Don't they require medical care more often than young people?

Some do; some don't. I don't think the problem can be standardized to that extent. Some 70-year-olds play 18 holes of golf regularly; others are spry enough, but prefer checkers, and still others are bedridden. Many of the ailments of the elderly would disappear if society stopped looking at them as castoffs, if these older people felt they were wanted and had a mission in life. Older folks are individuals, and their problems have to be solved on an individual basis. You can't answer all of their problems with a single solution.

You obviously feel very keenly about this controversy over medical care. Why do you feel so strongly about it?

For a number of reasons. Most important, I think, is that I sincerely believe that the free practice of medicine, which has given our people the best medical care in the world, is in jeopardy. A physician's first concern is for his patients, and that concern goes beyond the aches and pains of the people he treats. I'm convinced, along with most of my colleagues, that, unless the people really understand what's going on, we're liable to awaken some morning and find we've got socialized medicine.

A number of countries have socialized medicine in one form or another. Why do you feel it would be bad here?

There isn't any question in my mind that socialized medicine would endanger the high quality of medical care we have been able to give our people in this country. If you want socialism, you've got to sacrifice much of your freedom. Government always exercises some kind of control any time it pays the bill. I think it is obvious the people's health would suffer under a system of political medicine. The greatest strides in medical science in recent years have been made in the United States, where the profession has been free to pursue its goals of better and better medical care for our people. In my opinion, we physicians owe an obligation to the American people to try to keep it that way. It's part of our duty as doctors.

You see a threat of socialized medicine in the King bill. Sponsors of this administration proposal deny that it is. How do you back up the charge?

You have to understand what the King bill would do. The Federal Government, among other things, would make direct payments to hospitals for services to eligible patents, those over 65 on social security. But first, hospitals would have to agree to abide by rules and regulations established by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. And the Secretary would have the power to set reasonable compensation that hospitals would receive. It seems clear to me that when the Government forces every wage earner to pay into the scheme, when Government makes the rules for operating hospitals, sets the compensation and pays the bills, you've got socialized medicine for everybody who gets the service.

Former Representative Aime Forand saw his bill for social security medicine as "a foot in the door." He said "We can expand the program after that." The Socialist Party has said that the social security approach for medical care is socialistic, and they're for it. They're for it because it could be expanded easily into full-scale socialized medicine for everyone.

Sponsors of the King bill have said it would guarantee free choice of physician and hospital. Do you disagree with that too?

Yes, and I'll use my own community as an example to explain why. We have one hospital in Mattoon. Suppose, for some reason, any reason, the Secretary of Health, Educatoin, and Welfare refused to approve our hospital. This would mean that everyone in Mattoon on social security who needed hospitalization would have to go to some other city to get it if he wanted the Government to foot the bill. Wouldn't that be a denial of free choice of hospital? And if the family doctor of one of these patients wasn't on the staff of the other hospital, wouldn't that deny the patient free choice of his physician? There are many one-hospital towns in this country that would be affected in the same way.

Why are doctors opposed to the King bill, when its sponsors say they are not included in it?

My answer is that physicians are included, specifically pathologists, radiologists, physiatrists and anethesiologists working in the hospitals, along with interns and residents and those doctors serving the hospitals' outpatient clinics. We realize that it would only be a short time until the program would be expanded to include all physicians and compel every man, woman, and child, regardless of age, to come under the system.

You agree there is a problem in financing medical care for the aged. If you object to the social security approach, how do you propose to meet the problem?

We already have a better solution, the Kerr-Mills law for medical aid to the aged, passed by Congress last year. The medical profession supported this measure in Congress, and doctors are doing everything they can to get it into full swing in all the States.

How does the Kerr-Mills law work?

Federal funds are made available to the States to pool with their own money to

provide medical care to everyone over 65 who needs financial asistance. Each State, working with local communities, decides who needs help. I figure we know more about our own problems in Mattoon than some Government employee way off in Washington, D.C. The people who need our help are our neighbors. Their problems are our community's problems.

What benefits are available under the Kerr-Mills law?

They are practically unlimited. It depends on what each State legislature wants to provide. Benefits can include physicians' services in the hospital, clinic, office or at home; hospital services; nursing-home care; physical therapy; laboratory, diagnostic and X-ray services; drugs prescribed by a physician; home nursing, and a variety of other things, such as glasses, dentures and prosthetic devices.

Why do you say the Kerr-Mills law is better than the administration's social security approach to the problem of medical care for the aged?

Kerr-Mills offers a full range of medical benefits to the needy and near needy over 65 under a program administered by those best able to judge the needs of the elderly—the people back home. It would be cheaper and would do a better job of protecting tax money.

The administration-sponsored King bill, on the other hand, would set up long-distance control in Washington. Tax money of the working people would be used for the benefit of the rich as well as the poor. The bill would be discriminatory, because benefits would be available only to those on social security and denied to several million Americans who are not eligible for social security and never will be. The Kerr-Mills law, properly implemented by the States, would take care of everyone over 65 who really needed financial help.

What would the King bill cover?

Benefits would be limited to hospitalization, nursing-home care, home nursing and outpatient diagnostic services. It is important to note also that those eligible for hospitalization would be required to pay $10 a day for the first 9 days in the hospital, a total of $90. That, along with other costs the patient would have to pay, would be a serious drain on the financial resources of many on social security. I think it should be clear that the King bill is not only inadequate, but unnecessary. Kerr-Mills will do the job if given a chance. Already, 15 of the 50 States have passed enabling legislation to participate in Kerr-Mills funds.

You say benefits would be available under the Kerr-Mills legislation to anyone over 65 who needed financial help to meet his medical bills. How would need be decided?

Well, some of the legislation sets standards of eligibility based on income and liquid assets. Some people would be completely covered, and others would be able to get part of their medical expenses.

Eligibility would be based on a means test, then?

Certainly. The idea is to help people who need help—not to waste the taxpayers' money paying medical bills for those who can afford to pay their own way. And millions of older people in this country can afford to do so, including a great many drawing social security benefits.

What is your answer to the charge that the Kerr-Mills law would force the older people to pauperize themselves before they could get help?

I feel the charge is totally groundless. If anyone cares to study the plans already adopted by several States, he will find that there is protection of the assets of the people.

The means test has been called an affront to dignity, degrading to the individual. How do you feel about this charge?

I imagine I feel the same way as any other American who gives the matter a little thought. To call the means test "degrading" is sheer nonsense. It has been an important part of the American economic and government system for a long, long time.

What examples of the means test in government and the economy do you have in mind?

Public housing, for one. It is available only to those whose incomes are below a certain amount. Veterans must prove need before they can get free care in VA hospitals for non-service-connected disabilities. The social security system for everyone under 72 links benefits to income. The means test in government is designed to protect against waste of tax money. You will find the means test in our private affairs too. Many labor unions base strike benefits on need. College scholarship applicants must demonstrate need. Our entire system of credit in this country is grounded on a means test, as it should be. Credit is limited by the ability to pay.

The means test is neither degrading nor undignified. It is a wise protection for business, government, and the individual.

In reference to the social security approach, don't you feel there is some merit in the argument that social security provides an insurance system enabling working people in their productive years to save for their old age?

Sure, if it were true—but it isn't. It misrepresents the true nature of social security, suggesting that it is a program of prepayment of insurance costs, which it is not.

How do you back up that statement?

Well, in the first place, the U.S. Supreme Court, among other agencies of the Federal Government, has said social security is not a prepayment plan. It is clearly a pay-as-you-go program. It is distinctly different from voluntary private insurance, where reserves and income have to match benefit obligations.

Can you explore this subject a bit further?

Gladly. I think it's extremely important for the American people to understand what social security really is and how it works. The fact is that the taxes taken from workers and their employers don't pay the workers' own benefits; they pay the benefits of the people now getting social security.

In other words, my generation will collect from our children and grandchildren, and they will collect from theirs. It's important that we realize that if the social security program were ended today and Congress said, "We'll pay off just what we owe to everyone who has paid into social security up to today," it would still cost more than $300 billion to pay off the debt. If that happened, men and women not even born yet would be taxed to help pay the bill, and they wouldn't be getting a nickel themselves. Does that sound like an insurance program?

What are you doing to get your message to your friends and neighbors in Mattoon?

Well, I've talked to 20 or 30 different groups in the area, trying to impress on them the fact that any system of medical care financed through social security will inevitably lead to complete socialization of medicine in this country. And can there be any doubt in anybody's mind that once medicine is socialized, socialism will spread to every other aspect of American life? This is the insidious fact that must be brought home to every American. It is the reason I, along with hundreds of other physicians, am volunteering to speak out against this danger to our way of life.

Prayer Before a Red Firing Squad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. HALEY
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to place in the RECORD, an article which appeared in the Auburndale Star, Auburndale, Fla. The article appeared in the editorial column "An Editor's Notebook" and was written by my friend, John Lopp. It is entitled "Prayer Before a Red Firing Squad."

Mr. Lopp warns us that unless we are stirred from our complacency, our lethargy, we may awaken to find that we have lost our heritage and our freedoms. Our national spirit has weakened. Unless it is revitalized, unless we awaken to our strong faith in the philosophy of government which has made us a great Nation, we may find that it is too late to save America.

I commend to your reading the editorial which follows:

PRAYER BEFORE A RED FIRING SQUAD

(By John D. Lopp)

DEAR LORD: With the rattle of firing squads roaring in our ears, we come to you for the last time to ask your forgiveness—not so much for that which we have done as for that which we did not do.

As we sit here awaiting our summons to the bullet-pocked wall where we shall breathe our last breath and look for the last time upward into the blue that only yesterday canopied a free, a strong and a vibrant Nation, we think of that bulwark of freedom that we once enjoyed and we ponder.

What have we done to permit such a thing as is now happening to happen?

And then, in the same breath, we answer our own query.

We let America fall because we, and millions like us, were too busy, too selfish and too unconcerned.

"It can't happen here," we told ourselves as free nation after free nation vanished behind the swelling tide of a godless philosophy of enslavement and degradation and annihilation

But it has happened at last to us, just as it happened to the peoples of China and Poland and Korea and to the Hungarians and to those of Laos and as it happened in Cuba.

It happened because we, and all too many Americans like us, refused to see, because we closed our eyes to the sure and certain pattern of deceit and of betrayal, because we listened, hopefully, and each time with believing, as the same old lies were propounded and repeated, time after time, while new victims vanished behind that curtain that marks an end to all things that a free people hold more precious than life itself.

We hoped, we temporized, we whistled in the dark.

We cringed before world opinion—an opinion made articulate and blatant by the voices of those who served the forces that sought, and have now accomplished, our destruction.

We cringed, also, from voices from within, many, perhaps, mislead, but others serving those who plotted our enslavement and planned it all too well.

We ignored our glorious heritage, we forgot those who dared defy a despotic monarch

to risk and, by that risking, to create a shrine of freedom along the fringe of coastline of a new and unexplored continent.

We forgot the men that followed, those who pushed westward with long rifle and powder horn to span the Mississippi and the mountains and the plains and the deserts.

We forgot the ringing phrases that inspired a budding nation. We forgot "Don't Give Up the Ship," and "Millions for Defense But Not One Cent for Tribute."

We forgot Nathan Hale and his regret that he had but one life to give for his country. We forgot the squint-eyed musketmen crouched behind crude barricades at Lexington and Bunker Hill. We forgot the suffering at Valley Forge.

We ignored the heroism of those who again fought the British in 1812 to guarantee our independence. We forgot that they too faced tribulations and despairs—that they saw their cities bombarded and their capitol burned.

We forgot that they did not falter any more than did those of both the Blue and the Gray when called upon to defend those things, those principles, that they held dear.

And we forget the *Maine* and that charge up a sun-baked hill. We forgot those that fought in the mud and muck of the trenches in World War I, just as we forgot those who followed the Stars and Stripes to every corner of the globe in another world conflict against the tyranny and the lust and the hate that we as a Nation could not countenance or permit to blossom unchecked and uncontrolled.

We forgot all those glorious sacrifices that earned our Nation the respect, the admiration, and the envy of all less fortunate people.

We forgot—for many reasons.

We forgot because we became apologetic for our wealth, our power, and our concept of freedom. We listened to those who scoffed at America, those who belittled us, made fun of us as money grubbers, as a nation grown soft with luxury.

We believed those who told us that we would fail as a leader of nations unless we raised all people to our standards and in almost the same voice ridiculed our way of life, our patriotism, our once-deep-rooted conviction that our land was divinely guided and divinely inspired.

We listened to those who scoffed at our concepts of morality, at our respect for, and confidence in, the sanctity of the home and of marriage. We followed those who corrupted our literature with sex and hate and ugliness.

We shouted down those who attempted to awaken us—we ridiculed, or at least permitted others to ridicule—and often silenced the voices of those whose warnings we blithely ignored.

Partly, we ignored the voices of those who dared to speak because we were too busy with horse opera and sick comics and installment payments to pay attention—but largely we ignored them because we were afraid.

We were afraid of a new and powerful force that might well annihilate a nation in a handful of seconds. We trembled at thoughts of our cities in ruins and farmlands devastated and contaminated, our civilization destroyed in the twinkling of an eye.

But mostly, we quaked at fears for our own safety, for our own full bellies, and for our auotmatic washing machines and chrome-plated automobiles.

Like so many ostriches we buried our heads in the sands of obliquity hoping that if we ignored the ever expanding menace of the rising Red tide it would go away.

We vacillated—we temporized—we voiced high-sounding but meaningless phrases in the world councils, as the Red tidal wave ripped through once-free lands, engulfing state after state and nation after nation while we prattled of peace.

Even after the crimson avalanche pushed across oceans to our very doorstep we vacillated, debated, feared the clamor of world opinion which echoed only the Judas-babble of those who would betray us.

And then, at last, it was too late.

No nuclear blasts wiped out the freedom won by Washington and John Paul Jones and Daniel Boone and Admiral Dewey and "Black Jack" Pershing and "Bull" Halsey and "Blood and Guts" Patton and all the others who led, or were lead, as America grew and became omnipotent.

Our Nation fell because we stopped believing in our destiny—because we apologized for being rich and powerful among all nations.

And, because we were afraid, we refused to read the all-too-plain handwriting on the wailing wall of inevitability.

We, who were once strong, permitted ourselves to become weak with timidity. We who were once daring became over-cautious with doubts of our divinely ordained mission. We, who were once boisterously loud in shouting the praises of our system of free enterprise and freemen, became mute and hushed as we apologized for that which our sacrifices and our labors, and the sacrifices and labors of those who had gone before us, had made possible.

For that, Oh Lord, we ask your forgiveness as the tramp of the executioners pounds up the corridor to our cell door.

Forgive us, and the tens of millions like us, who could have raised our voices when there was yet time to be heard—but who, instead, remained mute until it was too late—until it was far, far too late.

The Buffalo Art Festival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on May 14, 1961, the first United States-Canadian Art Exhibition was opened in Buffalo, N.Y., by representatives of the Fine Arts League of Buffalo and the Ontario Institute of Painters. The opening marked the beginning of National Art Week, and is part of the Art Festival in which 70 downtown Buffalo businesses are participating.

Mr. Laszlo Szabo, president of the Fine Arts League, and Mr. Adrain Dingle, president of the Ontario Institute of Painters, both expressed various views with respect to art and painting. Mr. Harlan J. Swift and Mr. Maurice Austin, as well as myself, participated in the opening ceremony.

The principal address was delivered by Mr. W. K. Warrender, minister of municipal affairs, Province of Ontario, who represented Ontario Premier Leslie M. Frost. Under leave to extend my remarks, his address follows:

Mr. Szabo, ladies and gentlemen, it is indeed a great pleasure to be here today and to participate in the formal opening of this exhibition sponsored jointly by the Fine Arts League of Buffalo and the Ontario Institute of Painters.

Premier Frost, having had experience in international cooperation as Ontario's Premier when the gigantic St. Lawrence Seaway was constructed, was quick to see the international aspects of this current exhibition.

He has charged me to convey to you his very best wishes for the success of this exhibition, and to congratulate both art organizations on their enterprise in joining forces to make it possible.

It used to be thought that if all the world's peoples spoke the same language, then they could always understand one another and would live in peace. The invention of Esperanto was one manifestation of this idea.

Unfortunately although speedy translation service results in an almost instantaneous communication, it is now apparent that this does not result in people understanding each other. In fact it often happens that persons brought up in the same household, all speaking the same tongue since babyhood, cannot understand each other's ideas.

Is there then, any universal medium of communication?

There may not be, but down through the ages art has provided the nearest approach to it.

While art could not be expected to give you a lesson in calculus, it could and did evoke feelings of love and adoration, of delight, of sympathy, of strength, and in fact almost the whole gamut of human emotions. A person did not even need to speak any language at all to feel the spell of the old Italian masters or of the later schools. Some schools tended to emphasize certain aspects of a situation, even to the point of caricature, but their pictures were basically understandable even as they varied in handling. The painter and his audience were still in communication.

Then there arose a situation which I am sure the older painters could never have conceived in their wildest moments. There arose a condition where a viewer would approach a picture and after a period of bewilderment would gasp, "It doesn't mean anything to me." And this often happened even when the so-called painting was hanging the right way.

But more surprising still, through ingenious publicity, the idea grew up that a picture need not, indeed should not, represent anything recognizable.

While there are undoubtedly many sincere nonobjective artists, still the trend has encouraged a flood of painters who have little or no ability and few ideas, who rely on pure accident for whatever effects they are able to achieve. Worst of all their performance tends to destroy all artistic standards and to enthrone ugliness in their place.

But everyone with any spirit must express his own feelings. Expression means life and joy; suppression means frustration and death.

And so we have a group of painters in Ontario and a group of painters in Buffalo district whose very instinct impels them to study nature and to express its moods in terms that the common man can understand, not in the sense of preserving something in the past, but of expressing today's and tomorrow's ideas in such a way that the viewer may feel himself as part of the picture.

It is in this spirit, then, and with this determination, that members of these two art organizations have combined their efforts to present for your attention, a collection of paintings which, it is believed, not only reflect the canons of artistic excellence carried down through the centuries, but also the spirit of our world today.

Harper Lee's Novel Wins Pulitzer Prize

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article from the Mobile Register dated May 2, 1961, with reference to Miss Harper Lee entitled "Harper Lee's Novel Wins Pulitzer Prize." Naturally, all of us in the First Congressional District of Alabama, of which Monroeville is a part, are quite proud of Miss Lee for winning this much desired prize on her first novel.

MAY 8, 1961.

Miss HARPER LEE,
Monroeville, Ala.

MY DEAR MISS LEE: All of us down in Alabama are quite proud of our Monroeville girl, who made good and who won the 1961 Pulitzer Prize for fiction.

I know that your father and your sisters and all the rest of your family are happy indeed that you have scored such a success on the first work that you ever published. Your experiences prove that patience and perseverance remove mountains.

May God continue to bless you in your efforts. With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

FRANK W. BOYKIN,
Member of Congress.

[From the Mobile (Ala.) Register, May 2, 1961]

ALABAMIAN GETS TOP FICTION AWARD—HARPER LEE'S NOVEL WINS PULITZER PRIZE—MONROEVILLE WRITER SCORES BIG SUCCESS WITH FIRST BOOK

Harper Lee's novel "To Kill a Mockingbird," has won the 1961 Pulitzer Prize for fiction.

The 35-year-old Pulitzer winner hails from Monroeville, Ala., and is a frequent visitor to Mobile.

Her first novel, "To Kill a Mockingbird," concerning a small southern town and its people is both a Reader's Digest book-of-the-month selection and a Literary Guild choice.

Motion picture rights for the novel have been acquired by a producer-director team, Alan Pakula and Robert Mulligan. They plan to visit Miss Lee in Monroeville where they will finish negotiations with a major company for a release and are expected to start filming this year.

The candid and unassuming author is the daughter of A. C. Lee, Monroeville attorney and former publisher of the Monroe Journal.

The announcement of the award came in an Associated Press dispatch from New York.

Miss Lee's family, in Monroeville, expressed delight at the selection.

Her sister, Alice Lee, said, "It's the most amazing news we could imagine. It is absolutely amazing, especially since it is her first novel."

A. C. Lee, 81, her father, and Alice operate their own law firm in Monroeville. They are partners.

"The whole town is excited over the announcement," said Miss Lee. "I can't do anything but answer the telephone. It's been ringing all afternoon. It just won't stop ringing.

"You see, this is a small town and everybody knew Harper and the whole family.

"I talked with her other sister, Mrs. H. Conner of Eufaula (Ala.), a little while ago. She is just as excited as we are.

"And I've already talked with Harper twice from New York. She can't believe it either."

Monroeville, in south Alabama, has a population of about 3,000. It is a rural community, and many claim it was the setting for Miss Lee's novel, about the social problems of a small town.

"That's something for a first novel," said Alice Lee. "We know she would like to write another one, but this one has been so successful she simply hasn't had time to start another one."

"ALL THE WAY HOME" PULITZER WINNER FOR DRAMA—"MOCKINGBIRD" HONORED

NEW YORK, May 2.—"All the Way Home," a play which almost closed the week it opened on Broadway, is the 1961 winner of the Pulitzer Prize for Drama.

The play represented the first stage effort of Tad Mosel, 39, of New York, hitherto a television writer. It was based on the late James Agee's Pulitzer Prize novel of 1958, "A Death in the Family."

Winner of the Pulitzer Prize for fiction is Harper Lee's "To Kill a Mockingbird," a novel depicting a small Southern town's struggles to solve its social problems.

As in the case of Mr. Mosel and several others among the 15 Pulitzer recipients announced yesterday, it was a first for the 35-year-old Miss Lee, a native of Monroeville, Ala.

Although she had been writing things since she was 7, the novel was the first work she had ever published and emerged from a long and hopeless period of writing over and over again.

TEXAS PAPER WINS AWARD

The Pulitzer Prize gold medal for public service was awarded to the Amarillo Globe-Times, the first Texas paper to ever win the award.

The medal, the top newspaper award of the year, was for the newspaper's successful campaign to erase corruption in local government. Touched off by Editor Thomas Hazzard Thompson, the effort resulted in a law enforcement shakeup and election of a reform slate of officials.

Lynn Heinzerling, 54, of the Associated Press won the prize for international reporting. Mr. Heinzerling, a native of Birmingham, Ohio, who has been in foreign service since 1938, was honored for his coverage of Africa, including pioneer reporting during the early days of the Congo crisis.

The prize for national reporting went to Edward R. Cony, 38, news editor of the Wall Street Journal, for his "analysis of a timber transaction which drew the attention of the public to problems of business ethics." The transaction involved the Georgia-Pacific Corp., the Nation's No. 1 plywood producer.

PRIZE FOR PHOTOGRAPHY

Yasushi Nagao, 30, of Tokyo, became the first foreigner in the 45-year history of the prizes to win the award for photography. Only two foreigners ever won Pulitzer Prizes before—the first in history in 1917, and the other in correspondence in 1934.

Mr. Nagao, of the Tokyo newspaper Mainichi, was cited for his dramatic picture of the assassination last October 12 of Japanese socialist Inejiro Asanuma. It was distributed in this country by United Press International, thus making Mr. Nagao eligible for the prize.

The editorial writing award went to William J. Dorvillier, 53, editor and publisher of the San Juan (Puerto Rico) Star, founded a little more than a year ago and owned by Cowles Magazine, Inc.

Mr. Dorvillier, a native of North Adams, Mass., and a newspaperman for 26 years, won the prize for editorials criticizing the Catholic bishops of Puerto Rico for a pastoral letter forbidding Catholics to vote for the Popular Democratic Party of Gov. Luis Munoz Marin. Mr. Dorvillier, a Roman Catholic, wrote 20 editorials. Mr. Munoz Marin's party won the election.

Sanche de Gramont, 29 of the New York Herald Tribune, won the prize for local reporting under pressure of edition time. A native of Switzerland, now assigned to Paris by his newspaper, he was selected for his story of the death of Baritone Leonard Warren on the stage of the Metropolitan Opera House, March 4, 1960.

The prize for local reporting where deadline pressure was not a factor was won by Edgar May of the Buffalo (N.Y.) Evening News, also a native of Switzerland. Mr. May, 31, conducted a six-month study of the cost and other problems of administering public welfare. He spent three months as a caseworker for the Erie County Department of Social Welfare. The series was entitled "Our Costly Dilemma."

The cartoon award went to Carey Orr, 71, a cartoonist for the Chicago Tribune since 1917. The award was for the Ada, Ohio, native's long and distinguished service in his field as exemplified by a cartoon last October 8 captioned "The Kindly Tiger." It showed a tiger representing communism licking its lips over the figure of Africa emerging to freedom.

Except for the gold medal award—which carries no cash—all journalistic citations carried prizes of $1,000. Those in arts and letters were worth $500 each.

SET UP BY JOSEPH PULITZER

The Pulitzer Prizes, set up by the late newspaper publisher Joseph Pulitzer in a bequest to Columbia University, are awarded annually by the trustees of the university on recommendation of an advisory board made up mainly of newspaper executives.

Besides fiction and drama, awards in the field of arts and letters were made in the areas of history, biography, poetry and music.

Herbert Feis, 68, of York, Maine, won the prize for history for "Between War and Peace: The Potsdam Conference." It was the latest in a long series of published works by the New York city native, going back to 1930.

David Donald, 41, of Princeton, N.J., won the award for biography for his "Charles Sumner and the Coming of the Civil War," a study of one of the foremost anti-slavery voices in the North.

The prize for poetry went to Phyllis McGinley, 56, of Larchmont, N.Y., for "Times Three: Selected Verse From Three Decades."

Walter Piston's "Symphony No. 7" brought him the prize for music. The symphony was commissioned by the Philadelphia Orchestra Association and was first performed by that group last February 10. Mr. Piston, 67, of Belmont, Mass., also won the Pulitzer Music Award in 1948, for his "Symphony No. 3."

A special citation was bestowed by the Columbia trustees on "The American Heritage Picture History of the Civil War," which covers the war's history in pictures, maps, sketches and text.

The mammoth volume was prepared by the book division of the American Heritage Publishing Co., Inc., with narrative by Bruce Catton, a 1954 Pulitzer Prize winner in history. Eight researchers, writers and artists provided background for the book.

The Agriculture Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, I wish to call the following article from the May 10 issue of the Chicago Tribune by Wal-

ter Trohan to the attention of my colleagues:

WASHINGTON REPORT

WASHINGTON, May 9.—The House Agriculture Committee is holding hearings on an overall farm bill, a most complicated measure with far-reaching implications because it would supposedly let farmers write their own tickets but actually puts final power in the hands of Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman.

The bill, by which the administration hopes to discharge its campaign promises to solve the farm problem, is a 79-page affair which covers the soil front. Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, says it will give Freeman absolute control over agriculture.

There is something for every farmer in the measure, from a low interest program to build farmhouses and irrigation ditches to crops themselves. The home and irrigation loans would be paid over a 40-year period with the interest rate no higher than 5 percent.

The measure would expand the power of farm cooperatives, which many businessmen consider too big at present. There is a program for setting up food reserves in so-called underdeveloped countries and much more. Of course, the costs will fall, where they always come to rest, on the American taxpayer.

PLAN REVIVAL OF PAYROLLER VOTE FORCE

Plans are to revive the field committee set up to administer many items of the bill. This spells a return to a program that will replace approximately 50,000 field committeemen on the Federal payroll, where they can be expected to constitute the potent political force they were back in the days of such Democratic Agriculture Secretaries as Henry Wallace, Claude Wickard, and Charles Brannan. The boost in administrative costs would be about $250 million a year.

Whether or not this will be approved by Congress, it is evident Freeman wants to dictate farm production and prices. His chief economic adviser is Willard Cochrane, of the University of Minnesota, who was Kennedy's farm adviser during the campaign and who proposed the concept of parity income which would be even higher than parity price for farmers.

During the campaign, farm economists in the Department of Agriculture said the Cochrane formula would mean a 10-cents-a-pound jump in the price of hogs, a 17-cents-a-pound increase for chickens, and a 19-cent-hoist in eggs, with other food prices jumping in proportion. The Department said the plan would raise food costs for consumers by almost 25 percent.

The first major piece of farm legislation under the New Frontier was the feed grain bill, which gave the Department authority to control production and price of corn and grain sorghums. If the overall farm bill now under consideration goes through, Freeman will undoubtedly try to promote the farm parity income concept.

VOTE TO RAISE CHICAGO FOOD PRICES

To win, Freeman is counting on the support of many big city Congressmen, who know nothing about the farm problem, but vote regularly for more and more Government domination over farmers, even though the domination means higher food prices for their constituents and less and less free enterprise.

The margin for passage on the feed grain bill last March 9 was furnished by Chicago's Democratic Congressmen. Led by the dean of the city's delegation, THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, Democrat, of Illinois, all 10 Chicago Democrats went down the line for the measure which passed the House by a vote of 209 to 202. Had the Chicago Democrats voted against the measure, it would have lost 212 to 199.

Undoubtedly, House leaders are counting on Chicago's Democrats, as well as those of other large cities, to go down the line again when the big farm bill comes up for a vote. In view of the prospective higher food prices, interference with the operations of merchants and traders of Chicago, and damage to the free-trade system generally, it seems strange that Chicago Democrats are so loyal to the ideas of Professor Cochrane and Secretary Freeman.

Each Retreat Under New Isolationist-Pacifist Pressure Increases Danger of War and Defeat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by William S. White from the Washington Star of May 17, 1961:

NEW ISOLATIONIST-PACIFIST GROUP PERILING NATION IN DELUSION THAT ALL FORCE, EVEN FOR RIGHT IS EVIL

(By William S. White)

American foreign policy stands at the most fateful crossroads since the old isolationists and pacifists narrowly failed two decades ago to prevent this country from joining in the resistance to the Nazis and Fascists.

This movement honestly believed itself dedicated to "peace" and to America First. But had it had its way America would have finished not first but rather third—the third victim, after Britain and France, of an anti-human force centered in Adolf Hitler.

Now there has arisen to frightening influence a new American isolationism, a new American pacifism, which may well destroy the capacity of the United States to resist the equally antihuman force of international communism.

In one way, indeed, the danger is greater now than then. For the old isolationists, the old pacifists, at least did not deny their isolationism, their pacifism. But the new isolationism will not acknowledge itself for what it is. The new pacifism will not admit, even to itself, that the inevitable end of its reasoning is the surrender of one anti-Communist position after another until there will be at last no place left for the West to turn and stand its ground.

Instead, the neo-isolationists, the neo-pacifists, put the plain meaning of their policies under a bland, superior cloud of self-deluding talky-talk. They do not simply say flatly that we should take no risk in this world—not in Cuba, not in Laos, not anywhere—and let it go at that.

With that kind of candor, the issues could at any rate be met headon. Rather, they argue, for example, simply that Cuba is not really a threat to the United States, in spite of the public alliance with the Soviet bloc publicly proclaimed by Fidel Castro. Cuba is only peripheral, though Cuba lies 90 miles from the American shoreline and though for the first time in our nationhood an aggressive international power has an undeniable lodgment of this hemisphere.

So it is with Laos. Loas is not really worth any risk, either. We are held to be interfering there in local politics, or something or the other.

Again, the preconditions for fair debate are denied for lack of candor among the new isolationists, the new pacifists. For nearly all those who now declare that Castro offers no great danger to us were in the forefront of those who built up the dictator, Castro, with almost hysterical hosannas, in the first place. He is in part their own creation. This truth they cannot admit without admitting their share of responsibility. So what is a truth becomes, to them, no truth at all.

The new isolationists, the new pacifists, have honorable motives. But at the very bottom they are also men caught by a dangerous and shallow myth exploded way back in Hitler's time for all mankind to see. This is the delusion that all force is always evil (and all generals always stupid) even when only force is left to defend right and justice. It is the delusion that only diplomacy and negotiation are acceptable weapons.

So we fail in Cuba, because we dare not risk direct action and thus the censure of the neoisolationists, the neopacifists, in this and other countries. So our Secretary of State refuses one day to sit down at Geneva with Communist gunmen and next day agrees to sit down with them, under pressure of the neopacifists in England, in France, and here.

It is easy to laugh aside those who object to these surrenders. It is only necessary to suggest that we are simply naive, excitable men, flag wavers and warmongers. But just as Hitler tragically fooled the old isolationists and pacifists, Khrushchev is tragically fooling this new lot.

So President Kennedy faces a great imperative of history. He must soon free himself of every shadow of the influence of this new lot, or this country is going down the drain—and so is his administration in the long book of that history.

We Must Intervene in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the committee on Pan American Policy, headed by Harold Lord Varney, is making every effort to awaken American people to the danger of a Communist Cuba. The following news release was issued by this Committee on May 2:

WE MUST INTERVENE IN CUBA

The Nation is stunned by the events in Cuba. It is not enough to recognize that we have suffered a shattering prestige defeat. What is important is that we must not accept the defeat as irretrievable.

There is no mystery about why we lost.

We have failed in Cuba, just as we failed in Korea, because we did not fight to win. With all the ace cards in our hand, we did not choose to play them. We resorted to the subterfuge of an exile's invasion instead of facing the situation squarely ourselves. And in consequence, we have given the contemptible Castro an opportunity to claim victory over the United States, when we could have crushed h[illegible] like a cockroach.

Why did we do this senseless thing?

The reason can be found in the hangman's noose of treaties, commitments, and renunciations which we have put ourselves into in

Latin America during the last two decades, in an effort to win friendship. In a practical situation, like that of Cuba, these commitments fetter us hand and foot.

Let us face the bitter truth. The whole OAS apparatus, into which we marched so hopefully in 1952, has become a millstone about the neck of the United States. It cannot act promptly and decisively when we need it. It stops us from acting alone.

Moreover, it provides an easy alibi to irresolute men in Washington to shirk hard decisions. To every realistic proposal, they have the ready answer that we must not offend our Latin American allies. And so we flirt with catastrophe rather than hurt Latin American feelings.

President Kennedy is not to blame for the Cuban debacle. He inherited the whole fantastic spider web of treaties and self-imposed restraints from his predecessors.

But now that he knows that he cannot win battles hog-tied to the OAS, he has no other practical choice but to go it alone. To do nothing, to allow the virus of Castroism to continue to spread in this hemisphere, would be the most craven form of defeatism. President Kennedy must act, and he must be prepared to act alone.

Cutting through all the moldy phrases of the ideologues, the logic of the situation is plain.

Notwithstanding his statement of April 12, President Kennedy must intervene in Cuba with American forces. If we stop to haggle over legalities, we are lost. If our Latin American allies will intervene with us, we will welcome them. If they will not, we must act alone. Above all, we cannot wait for a decision in the OAS, for it will never come.

We must intervene in the full knowledge that our action will be denounced and abused by the whole professional anti-Yankee wolfpack in Latin America. But if we lose to communism—which we certainly will if we do not immediately clean up Castroism—we will be abused even more venomously, and despised to boot. At least we can now have the compensation of victory.

President Kennedy can place his name in the illustrious roll of Presidents who were not afraid to act in a crisis. He has the opportunity in Cuba.

Income Tax Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing in the House of Representatives two bills which, in my opinion, will do much to provide some small measure of relief to the American taxpayer.

The first bill provides that an exemption from income tax in the case of retirement annuities and pensions, up to the amount of $2,500, would be granted. This legislation is introduced with the thought in mind that our elder citizens must be given a helping hand in meeting the current high cost of living. Many of them have been endeavoring to live on fixed incomes for a number of years, and with the continued upward spiral of living costs, this has made their situation a desperate one. Many of them have been forced to seek work to supplement their annuities or pensions, and with the unemployment situation as critical as it has been in the last several years, finding a suitable position has not always been possible or easy.

The second bill would increase the present personal income tax exemption of a taxpayer from $600 to $1,000, including the exemptions for a spouse, a dependent, and for old-age and blindness. The present $600 exemption is absolutely outdated and totally unrealistic today, having been put into effect a number of years ago when living expenses were considerably lower.

The tax laws have placed a heavy and onerous burden on our taxpayers, particularly those in the lower- and middle-income brackets, and I believe that a liberalization of these laws is long overdue. To increase the present exemptions will place more money in the hands of the consumer, and in turn will stimulate our economy.

A Salute to the Memory of Senator George W. Norris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by J. L. Robertson, member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, at the George W. Norris National Centennial Conference, in Washington, D.C., on May 16, 1961.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SALUTE TO THE MEMORY OF SENATOR GEORGE W. NORRIS

(By J. L. Robertson, Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System at the George W. Norris National Centennial Conference, Willard Hotel, Washington, D.C., May 16, 1961)

This is that unusual occasion when one can use a hackneyed phrase with genuine meaning and sincerity, as I do in saying I am very glad of the opportunity to join with the rest of you in paying tribute to a great man—a man who on a number of occasions was singled out by that knowledgeable group, the Washington press correspondents, as the Nation's most effective U.S. Senator.

I am glad to be a part of a gathering of people who seek to honor this man and at the same time recall to all Americans the character, the foresight, imagination and wisdom, the courage, integrity, and tenacity that were his, in the hope that more people will be inspired to follow the example he set for us.

Senator Norris is known chiefly for his efforts in the fields of conservation and development of natural resources, his tireless work in behalf of the "common man," his powerful espousal of the cause of labor in days when it was downtrodden and fighting for greater recognition and greater participation in the fruits of productivity, and his valiant and never faltering battle for good government.

Everyone then on the scene remembers his famous spider-web speech, in which he traced the interlocking ties of large institutions and the resulting concentration of power in the hands of a relatively small number of persons, his efforts in support of the antitrust laws, his ferocious castigation of Government officials who flirted with conflicting interests, and his long and bitter fight to prevent Muscle Shoals from being turned over to private interests for private gain, which culminated in the establishment of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Everyone knows of the role played by Senator Norris in conenction with the TVA, the REA, the Norris-La Guardia Act, Teapot Dome, the impeachment of Judge Robert W. Archbold, the lame-duck amendment to the Constitution, which was designed to prevent Members of Congress from legislating after others had been elected to replace them, and the unicameral legislature of the State of Nebraska.

Everyone knows of all these landmarks of his career, and not one of them is especially associated with banking. Hence, you may wonder how a governor of the Federal Reserve System fits into the picture.

Certainly I am not here because of the fact that my hometown, Broken Bow, Nebr., was, I regret to say, also the home of an obscure grocer with the same name as Senator Norris, who was persuaded by unscrupulous politicians to try to run for office against the Senator and thus confuse the voters enough to bring about the election of a third man. Fortunately for the country, that effort failed and the other George W. Norris went to jail.

I knew Senator Norris better than most of you because of an interlocking relationship between the Norris and Robertson families. During the most formative years of my life, I had the privilege of listening to him tell of the experiences of his life that left on him the greatest imprint, as well as those things that concerned him most: the spelling bees in the country school, the rural debating societies in which he developed his forensic abilities, the difficulties (and pleasures) of working his way toward a legal education, the roughness of his teaching experience in the far northwest, the hardships involved in eking out a bare living as a young lawyer, and his trials and tribulations on the bench and in Congress.

I often wish I had a tape recording of his tales of the infighting that accompanied his efforts to curb concentrations of power and to save for the Nation its vast reservoir of natural resources. I can still hear him telling about the way he was chastised by his party when he bucked and defeated the machine that had, until then, enabled Uncle Joe Cannon to rule the House of Representatives like a czar. And I never will forget his description of the pressures brought to bear to dissuade him from crossing party lines and supporting the nomination of Louis Brandeis to the Supreme Court. Later, of course, everyone came to understand that Senator Norris was not amenable to pressures.

The stories he told of his childhood, his early law practice, his years as a judge and as a legislator, were entrancing. They were more than that. They inspired one and left him with the conviction that public service is one of the highest forms of human endeavor—frustrating at times, but highly rewarding. This is perhaps the real reason why I feel fortunate to have been able to serve the people of our country for 34 years; why I feel sure that if I could relive my life I would again try to follow in his footsteps by using whatever abilities I possess in the interests of efficient public service.

Senator Norris was one of the noblest men ever produced in this country, certainly the greatest Senator to come from Nebraska, and one of the Nation's greatest. In his day, he

was the conscience of the Senate and, in a very real sense, the conscience of all his fellow Americans. He was a truly inspiring example of the highest type of public servant.

He was one of those rare public figures whose stand on controversial questions was never in doubt. He never hid behind equivocation or doubletalk, sham or pretense. One familiar with his record could almost always forecast his position, yet whenever he rose to speak in the Senate chamber on an important question of public policy, it was astonishing to see how both the floor and the galleries would fill up with people anxious to hear the clear, plain way he would present his views—views that his hearers knew were based on conviction. He had great presence, as many of you will recall, and he spoke in a deep arresting voice. His speeches were never ghosted. Ideas he might obtain from others, although he had plenty of his own, but his manner of expressing them was always original and always bore his own stamp.

This personal relationship explains in part why I am here today. But I would feel remiss if I did not call attention to a little-known chapter of Senator Norris' legislative record.

Today we have Federal insurance of bank deposits, which has become one of the accepted facts of life. Today the common man deposits his money, with calm reliance on this fact, in any of the country's 13,000 insured banks. He no longer goes to bed with the awful fear that tomorrow his bank may be closed and his life savings gone—a fear experienced by many Americans before the law was enacted in 1933. Few people know that more than a quarter century earlier—in 1907—Senator NORRIS was sponsoring in the House of Representatives a proposal to provide just such insurance for deposits in national banks. If enough other legislators had possessed his wisdom and foresight, it is probable that we would have avoided the banking collapse of a generation ago and all the misery and suffering it entailed.

Furthermore, not many people are aware of the fact that Senator NORRIS was one of only three Republican Senators who broke party ranks on December 23, 1913, and joined with a majority of Democrats to pass the Federal Reserve Act, which is the key pillar of our country's monetary structure. He was joined by fellow Republicans Wesley Jones of Washington and John W. Weeks of Massachusetts and one Progressive, Miles Poindexter of Washington. In voting for the Federal Reserve Act, the Senator not only had to follow a different course from that pursued by his party, he also had to stand against those with whom he had even stronger ties, his usual allies, liberals like La Follette of Wisconsin and Borah of Idaho. Thus the beginning of the institution with which I am associated.

I salute the memory of Senator NORRIS and express the wish that he could know of the many times I have sought his assistance—assistance which has always been forthcoming. On the mantle in my office stands his autographed picture. Time and again, when I have been faced with a difficult problem, I have found myself looking at him and in a way seeking his advice. Usually he will look down and counsel me this way:

"First, be sure you have the facts. Second, decide what you think is right, fair, and best for the welfare of all the people—not just those whose special interests are at stake. And then, after your decision is made, stand up for it, even if alone, and let the chips fall where they may."

Could there be a better standard for public service—or for life itself?

Alcohol on Airlines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH R. HARDING
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, on May 1 I introduced a bill to prevent the serving or consumption of hard liquor aboard commercial passenger aircraft. For several years I have been concerned with this problem, not only because of the inconvenience that a drunk causes to the stewardesses and to his fellow passengers, but mainly because of the potential danger that an inebriated passenger may create in a high altitude, fast flying commercial jet aircraft.

As I have traveled back and forth across our Nation by way of commercial airlines, I have questioned the stewardesses about their attitude on this subject. Without a single exception these stewardesses have told me—and I wish to emphasize that these girls are products of our jet age and are fine examples of typical American womanhood; they certainly are not prudish, narrowminded nor old fashioned—that they are opposed to the serving of alcoholic beverages on airlines in which they are flying as stewardesses.

I feel that this bill is worthy of consideration and enactment into law.

I would like at this point to include in the RECORD a column entitled "High Altitude Liquor" from the Christian Science Monitor of May 12, 1961:

HIGH ALTITUDE LIQUOR

(By Godfrey Sperling, Jr.)

CHICAGO.—It is possible now to provide a progress—or lack of progress—report on the problem of drinking aloft as affected by the jet age and a year-old rule of the Federal Aviation Agency.

One small hope has emerged for the passenger who desires a liquor-free flight: A growing trend to the scheduling of short-haul, piston-powered, economy trips in which liquor is not served.

A passenger who is willing to pass up the speed of jet service can—in the more highly populated areas of the United States—assure himself of a trip in which he does not encounter the drinking that he would find in the faster, plusher air service.

This is for trips of no more than 100 or 200 miles, of course. Between, say, Detroit and Cleveland, or Toledo and Chicago. But if a passenger would be willing to take a number of landings enroute, he probably could pick his way across the country (in the Eastern United States) in a series of liquor-free flights.

Otherwise, the prospects for those who would avoid the service of liquor aboard their flight are bleaker than they have ever been in the history of commercial airline service in this country.

All the major airlines now make liquor available on their jet runs. Delta was the last to hold out, but now Delta has capitulated—giving in to what it terms the competition from the other airlines.

It was National and Northwest Airlines that started the serving of liquor aloft, some years ago. One by one the other airlines followed, some (notably United and Delta) asserting that they would prefer that liquor not be served.

Opposition to the serving of liquor aloft is still expressed by airline pilots and the stewards and stewardesses. But their voice is not as strong as it was a few years ago.

Rowland K. Quinn, Jr., president of the Airline Stewards & Stewardesses Association, says that once again this year there will be bills in Congress which propose the outlawing of drinking aloft. But he now says:

"I don't think we are going to get any relief through legislation in the possible future."

Protests still come in from the hostesses, who find the jet age no better than the piston age—in terms of their liquor problems.

Reports one stewardess, "This liquor problem is getting real terrible * * * We aren't getting cooperation. * * * Yet if we don't try and control it, we get burned. * * *"

Mr. Quinn says that the so-called liquor code is unenforceable. "We are told that our stewardesses are not to serve any passenger more than two drinks; yet in planes that have upward to 125 passengers, it is impossible for our girls to keep track of drinks.

"Furthermore, those who are drinking heavily use all sorts of artifices to get more drinks—getting someone else to get them a drink, etc."

Of these difficulties a stewardess reports:

"A number of incidents where passengers tried to get a third drink by devious means took place on this flight.

"One man who was sleeping during our cocktail service before dinner awakened to order a martini as we were starting dinner.

"Miss D. brought him the drink, and upon her return discovered the passenger next to him drinking the martini. He had already had two drinks. Another couple whom she had served two drinks stopped me for another. I asked if they had one or two, and they said 'One.' I discovered the mistake too late.

"This is nothing new."

Another stewardess reports an incident in which she came to blows with an intoxicated and obnoxious passenger.

What of the "feeder" lines that bring passengers short distances to and from the jet service? One stewardess from a feeder line says: "They say we don't have liquor on our planes. That's funny. I get all the drunks that come in from United and American and Braniff."

Yet, in all this Mr. Quinn sees one ray of hope. "Speed of arrival in these jets," he says, "gives these passengers less time to get drunk."

Thus, it may well be that the swift jets of the future will whisk the passengers across the country so fast that they will hardly have time to take off their hat and coat, let alone have their drinks.

A big problem that remains, even with faster service, is the passenger who already has been drinking before he gets aboard.

Mr. Quinn says that the airlines let drunks or near drunks on the planes on not infrequent occasions. And he says that his stewardesses cannot be expected to handle the problems these passengers present.

Addressing itself to passenger drinking, an airline letter to flight attendants says: "There is no need to be dictatorial, offensive, or irritated. * * * We have no desire, nor necessity, to make enemies out of our friends—even our difficul friends."

So it is left pretty much up to the stewardesses to be the policemen on these planes. At the same time, these efficient women are expected to keep these drinking passengers friendly to the airlines.

The stewardess of today must walk a thin line as she moves up and down her jet compartment. She must get the bottle away from any passenger who has brought a bottle

aboard. She must count drinks. And, at the same time, she must keep the passengers seated during heavy weather. And serve meals. And care for her passengers' many needs.

And, oh, yes, she must be very friendly to even the most obnoxious of those passengers who are drinking too much.

This, it seems, is where the jet age and preflight or airborne drinking has taken us.

This Is Rumania Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article, the second in a series from Rumania, written by Gaston Coblentz. It appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on May 7, 1961:

THIS IS RUMANIA TODAY: PRICES SOAR, BUT GIRLS KISS AND CHILDREN PLAY

(By Gaston Coblentz)

SINAIA, RUMANIA.—The 250-mile stretch of vivid Rumanian countryside from the university town of Cluj to the former royal residence of Sinaia provides a kaleidoscope of Rumanian life 14 years after the abdication of King Michael.

In the streets of Cluj, the taxis are exclusively Soviet Volgas, fairly comfortable vehicles which form the backbone of Eastern Europe's expanding new taxicab fleets. In Cluj they are painted green, beige, or red, with a checkered pattern along the doors in New York style.

The windows of the town's college bookstores display solely Communist literature, mainly by Soviet writers, above all full sets of Lenin in Rumanian and Russian. No non-Communist works are on view.

Two red pumps at a gas station on the outskirts of town furnish low-octane gasoline and diesel oil, the only fuels in regular demand on Rumanian roads. For the few cars that require it, high [90] octane gas is hand pumped directly out of barrels on the ground at the back of the station. It costs about $1.20 a gallon, roughly twice the price of the lower [70] octane fuel.

ROAD WELL MAINTAINED

The road southward from Cluj into the heart of Rumania begins along Frederic Joliot-Curie Street, where a crowd of men were waiting at a small shop to buy weekly tickets in the national lottery and sports pools. The highway is a carefully maintained asphalt road that runs the entire distance across the country to the capital, Bucharest.

At Turda, 20 miles south, a small, shabby grocery store in the outskirts supplies a large variety of food at the high prices that currently prevail in Rumania. Coffee, characteristically, is $4.20 a pound. Nearby, in a schoolyard, laughing children race back indoors after a midmorning play break.

In the center of Turda, a crowd inspects a brand new West German Opel Kapitan model, driven by a Communist official. On the other side of town, a large cement factory is receiving a fresh coat of paint.

Along this route, as throughout Rumania, police are stationed outside practically every town to control the large flow of truck traffic. The truck drivers are asked where they come from, where they are going, what their load is, and who their passengers are. However, starting some 100 miles inland from the Rumanian-Hungarian frontier, foreign cars are ignored by the control posts.

At Aiud, 40 small new private dwellings are under construction on the outskirts. Virtually every town and village along the highway has private home construction underway—one-story, one-family brick houses. This type of construction is unexpectedly extensive.

In front of the Aiud army barracks, a pretty girl rests her head on the shoulder of a neatly uniformed officer near the barracks gate. South of Aiud, long rows of young poplars line the highway. Thousands of these stripling poplars have been planted in this manner along previously bare roads. In 30 or 40 years, they will give Rumania a network of handsome, tree-fringed highways in the French style.

At Alba Julia, a new housing construction on the outskirts has so far failed to alter the town's sleepy Balkan look. Here still stands the remarkable Cathedral of St. Michel, built in the 12th century and ravaged by the Tartars in the 13th.

SICK WOMEN HELPED

North of Sebes, a battered ambulance and two official cars wait in a field near the road. An antique monoplane circles overhead and lands on the field. A woman patient is removed on a stretcher. According to officials, she is dangerously ill and has been flown from Cluj to a Sebes hospital.

Along the highway, there is an interminable array of Communist propaganda billboard posters every few hundred yards. It is propaganda to the saturation point. The posters continue all the way to Bucharest. In this area some of the signs are written in German for the large Volksdeutsch (racial Germans) minority—400,000 persons.

Here and there, gypsies are encamped near the roads, their lives in many cases virtually untouched by Communist rule.

The Inflation of Summit Hopes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the May 17, 1961, Los Angeles Times entitled "The Inflation of Summit Hopes."

This editorial presents some very pertinent observations in regard to the proposal for a President Kennedy-Premier Khrushchev meeting next month which I believe will be of interest to the Members of the House:

THE INFLATION OF SUMMIT HOPES

The pressure for a sort of semisummit conference continues, fed by vague yearnings and hopeful expectations. If the administration has not fully committed itself to the questionable idea of a Kennedy-Khrushchev meeting next month, it will find it increasingly difficult to resist whatever overtures have been made from Moscow.

The international setting could hardly be less propitious for any sort of fruitful exchange between the two leaders. Yet, despite United States setbacks in Laos, Cuba, and Geneva—or because of them—the President apparently is disposed to meet with the premier.

Initiative for the conference understandably came from Moscow. For although Mr. Khrushchev is probably not deceived as to the realities of U.S. power following events in the Caribbean and southeast Asia, he would certainly enter the meeting in a much stronger bargaining position than in 1959 or 1960.

President Kennedy has made it clear in the past that he felt that any formal summit conference must be preceded by definite progress on the ministerial and ambassadorial levels. The proposed session next month, it is understood, would be only an informal exchange of views, a private chat with Chairman Khrushchev in some neutral capital after Mr. Kennedy has met with President de Gaulle.

The danger, of course, is that while the President might regard his trip as only a limited excursion in personal diplomacy, the rest of the world would attach far greater significance to the meeting. Desperate optimism would make of it something it is not, and the advantage would go to our adversary.

There would again be the cruel illusion that the mere getting together of the two world leaders is in itself a tangible step toward ending world tension. If, as has been suggested, Mr. Khrushchev misunderstands the present position of the United States, Mr. Kennedy is not likely to be able to talk him out of it in a few hours.

A year ago, after the collapse of the Paris Big Four meeting, the Soviet Premier arrogantly offered a new summit conference as a prize to the winner of the American presidential election. It is an award that we need be in no hurry to claim.

Circumvention on the New Frontier: The 4¼-Percent Interest Ceiling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in the last Congress one of the truly important but seemingly little understood issues was that of eliminating the interest ceiling on long-term Government securities. A great deal of misinformation was generated about this matter, and in an unwise political appeal on form and not substance the majority voted to retain the 4¼-percent interest ceiling which hampered the sale of these securities and forced the Government into the even higher short-term security market to finance the national debt.

J. A. Livingston, noted business writer, in his column, "Business Outlook," on May 17 of this year, noted the circumvention of this limitation. Because of the importance of this matter, Mr. Speaker, I am inserting Mr. Livingston's column in the RECORD, under unanimous consent granted me to do so:

END RUN AROUND FEDERAL INTEREST BARRIER

(By J. A. Livingston)

At the minute it's purely academic, but it's also pretty sly.

President Kennedy's Secretary of the Treasury, Douglas Dillon, who was drawn from the ranks of Republicans, is prepared to do what his Republican predecessor, Robert B. Anderson, was too forthright to do.

Robert V. Roosa, Under Secretary for Monetary Affairs, has let it be known that he will not hesitate to sell long-term Treasury bonds yielding 4½ or 4¾ or even 5 percent. He won't tag them 4½ or 4¾ or 5 percent. He'll label them 4¼ percent.

For flexibility in financing, Dillon and Roosa are prepared to sell a 30-year 4¼-percent bond at 95 cents on the dollar. The return to maturity would be 4.9 percent, or 0.65 percent above the ceiling.

Dillon and Roosa have a letter from U.S. Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy saying that the Public Debt Act of 1942 supercedes the Second Liberty Bond Act of 1917.

The 1942 act authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to issue bonds "on an interest-bearing basis, on a discount basis, or on a combination interest-bearing and discount basis, at such price or prices and with interest computed in such manner and payable at such times as he may prescribe * * * and his decision with respect to such issue shall be final."

Secretary Anderson had a ruling from his General Counsel to this same effect. He hesitated to use it because of an ambiguity. The 1942 law was an emergency measure. Congress did not say "at any interest rate." Why had it retained the 4¼ ceiling if complete freedom were intended?

Moreover, Anderson was not willing to rule out the chance that bonds sold at an effective interest rate above 4¼ percent would be open for legal challenge.

CONSULTED HILL LEADERS

Anderson consulted congressional leaders: Would they pass a resolution saying that the law permitted sale of discount bonds? Or would they repeal the ceiling and give the Treasury authority to issue long-term bonds at any interest rate? The House Ways and Means Committee refused to report out a bill. Debates on the floor of the Senate indicated great opposition.

Consequently, Secretary Anderson was forced to sell short-term issues exclusively, including the so-called magic 5's—a 4-year-10-month Treasury note with a 5-percent coupon. That is the absurdity of the ceiling. The Treasury can put a 5-percent rate on a bill, a certificate, or a note—anything less than 5 years. Beyond 5 years, no.

At the moment, Secretary Dillon and Under Secretary Roosa are in a position, because of the drop in interest rates (influenced in part by the Federal Reserve System's nudge policy), to sell long-term bonds at or below 4¼ percent interest. The ceiling is irrelevant.

But if we have an industrial boom, if credit becomes scarce (as it usually does during periods of high business activity), then effective rates might rise above 4¼ percent.

LET'S END CEILING

Dillon and Roosa are making an end run around recent legislative (or, rather, nonlegislative) history, relying on the Attorney General's statement that selling discount bonds yielding more than 4¼ percent does not circumvent any congressional prohibition. If it doesn't, why did the last Congress refuse to grant it?

There's no doubt that the 4¼-percent ceiling on interest rates is an anachronism. Secretary Dillon deserves the flexibility Anderson couldn't get. But his way of going about getting it is isn't exactly true blue, honor bright, or sparkly eyed.

A government that demands honesty in business has to be honest, forthright, and direct, itself. Let's get rid of the ceiling—all the way—not by sleight of hand, but by an act of Congress. What the last Congress wouldn't do for a Republican President, it probably will do for a Democrat.

If the Democrats dodge the issue in Congress, the least the Republicans can do is bring it up. It's good politics and good ethics.

Justice Michael Musmanno, Nemesis of Nazis, and a Man of the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, causes make great men and some men inspire great causes. The plight of the underprivileged, the misery of the laborer, the evil of government oppression, the bestiality of humanity, influenced and molded the character of Michael Musmanno. On the other hand, Michael Musmanno has inspired men to noble deeds, to fight for equality, to protect the dignity of man.

Years ago, in 1939, when I commenced the practice of law, I listened enthralled to the mellifluous voice of a great speaker with leonine mane and heart of gold. His reputation as a dissenter and as an orator passed down to me by an older brother, now Justice Robert V. Santangelo, who barnstormed the country with Michael Musmanno, fighting for great causes, was confirmed by the stirring words I heard uttered on that occasion.

Recently on April 29, 1961, in Philadelphia, I was the guest speaker at a national convention of UNICO, a national organization of Americans of Italian origin. One the prior date, UNICO had granted the Rizzuto Award to Justice Michael Musmanno for outstanding activity and performance in the United States.

During my speech I had occasion to say of Michael Musmanno the following words:

> One of the great tragedies of the past 30 years is the failure of our past four Presidents to recognize Judge Michael Musmanno as a Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. Anything he obtained in life he had to fight for. His story has been the story of the Italian in America.

A great New York paper, the Daily Mirror, under the byline of feature writers, Ara Piastro and Harry Altshuler, on May 12, 1961, reported the activities of persons of Italian heritage who are outstanding in America. This article as well as a series of eight others were inspired by the desire of the New York Mirror to offset the ignorance and the prejudice generated by television programs such as "The Untouchables," newspapers and other media of communication which characterize in an unfavorable light persons of Italian origin.

Justice Musmanno is one of the great Americans with an Italian background who was selected by the New York Mirror as one of the characters to be portrayed in its columns. The New York Times on Tuesday, May 16, 1961, also wrote up the "Nemesis of Nazis, Michael A. Musmanno" and set forth the background of this fighter for humanity and the contributions he has made not only to the law, but also to his Nation and to his people. I believe the readers would enjoy reading the article in the Daily Mirror and also the article in the New York Times concerning Michael Musmanno.

The articles follow:

[From the New York Daily Mirror, May 12, 1961]

FROM THE MINES TO PENNSYLVANIA SUPREME COURT

(By Ara Piastro and Harry Altshuler)

It was a poignant moment one day last summer for Justice Michael Angelo Musmanno of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania. On the tiny island of San Salvador in the Bahamas, this son of Italian immigrants planted an American flag and the flag of his native Pittsburgh in th spot where tradition holds Columbus first set foot on the New World.

This act of homage was the fulfillment of a longtime dream. Columbus was his boyhood idol. It was a tribute to the discoverer, so badly treated in his own lifetime, from one of the new continent's children, one who has been richly heaped with deserved honors.

Musmanno's life has been full of high dramatic moments. Officers who served with him in World War II stil chuckle about this one:

As a naval aide to Gen. Mark Clark, with the rank of captain, Musmanno was in Italy when, during the last days of the war, a British general attempted to take over the villa occupied by famed anti-Fascist philosopher, Benedetto Croce.

Musmanno refused to oust the aged philosopher. The British general stormed in, attempting to take the house by force—and was met at the door by Musmanno, with a .45 strapped to his belt. "Sir, if you will look at the ribbon on my shirt, you will see that I am an expert pistol shot," murmured Musmanno.

"Well, I'll be a blanketyblank," the shocked general exclaimed.

"I wouldn't know about that, sir," Musmanno said gently—as the general beat a strategic retreat.

Musmanno was wounded twice during that war; had a ship sink under him, directed the evacuation of a town that had become a battle zone, shared front-line hardships with soldiers, and served as military governor of the Sorrentine peninsula.

It wasn't his first war, at that. In World War I, though he was only 17, he enlisted in the Naval militia.

He was one of eight children of an immigrant couple who settled in Pittsburgh. If young Michael wanted an education, he had to earn it himself. A 5-foot-8-inch, 160-pound dynamo with a deceptively cherubic face, he labored as a coal miner and steelworker to gather the funds—then kept going to school until he had earned seven degrees from five universities, from Bachelor of Arts to Doctor of Jurisprudence.

Musmanno first emerged in the public eye when, as a young lawyer in the 1920s, he volunteered to serve as unpaid defense counsel at the sensational Sacco-Vanzetti trial. He still believes the guilty verdict was a "monumental miscarriage of justice."

Among the 10 books he has written, one of them, "After Twelve Years," was a study of this case. Another of his books, "Black Fury," based on his work in the mines, became a powerful movie starring Paul Muni.

Still another book, "Ten Days to Die," told the story of Hitler's last grim days, which he had researched exhaustively while in Germany presiding over the war crimes trial at Nuremberg. President Truman had appointed him presiding judge.

He had entered public life in 1929 as a State legislator; anyone who now enjoys a Sunday movie or baseball game in Pennsylvania has him to thank for the bill that re-

pealed the old blue laws. In 1931 he was elected a county judge, the youngest in his State; in 1933 he was elected again with a phenomenal 320,000 out of 370,000 votes; in 1952 the people of the State elected him to a 21-year term on their Supreme Court, the first American of Italian descent to sit on this bench.

Currently he is in Jerusalem at the invitation of the Israeli Government, to be one of the principal witnesses at the Adolf Eichmann trial. He presided over the trials of many of Eichmann's underlings in Nuremberg, and later wrote a book, "The Eichmann Kommandos," about their twisted psychology.

In fact, the doctrine he laid down at Nuremberg, that anyone found guilty of mass murder may not escape with the plea he was "only obeying orders"—is an important element of the Eichmann trial.

His is a voice from America, listened to with eager respect around the world.

[From the New York Times, May 16, 1961]

NEMESIS OF NAZIS: MICHAEL A. MUSMANNO

Fifteen years ago, Justice Michael A. Musmanna of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court, who testified yesterday for the prosecution in the Adolf Eichmann trial, proposed that a world court be set up to try "international criminals" responsible for "crimes against humanity."

Had Justice Musmanno's proposal been adopted, the Israelis might not have felt compelled to bring Eichmann to trial in Israel for his role in the execution of 6 million Jews.

Justice Musmanno made his suggestion in 1946, shortly after presiding over the war crimes trial in Nuremberg of 21 members of the Nazi Einsatzgruppen. The defendants were charged with responsibility for murdering 2 million Jews during the early years of World War II before the opening of mass annihilation camps.

During the proceedings Justice Musmanno interrupted a witness who testified that the defendants were acting solely under military orders and therefore were guiltless.

"If you received an order to shoot your own parents," Justice Musmanno asked, "would you do it?"

WITNESS CONSIDERS ANSWER

The witness hesitated. He was given 24 hours to consider his answer.

The next day the witness returned to the stand and answered, "No, I wouldn't shoot my parents."

The Justice continued: "Would you shoot somebody else's parents if ordered to do so?"

The answer was "No."

"Now suppose you received an order to shoot a young Jewish couple who had never done anything wrong and who might some day become parents?" Justice Musmanno asked.

The witness could find no answer. He left the stand bewildered.

At the end of the trial, which Justice Musmanno called "the biggest murder trial in history," 14 of the 21 defendants were sentenced to be hanged.

CAREER OFTEN CONTROVERSIAL

For Justice Musmanno, the Nuremberg trial was but one highlight in a celebrated and often controversial career. Described once as "his own best press agent," the Pennsylvanian has, among other things, sentenced himself to 3 days in prison "to see what it's like," defended Nicola Sacco and Bartolomeo Vanzetti in the famous Massachusetts murder trial that ended in their execution and written 10 books, including "Ten Days to Die," about the Nuremberg trials.

He has been suspended from the bench for sentencing drunken drivers to 6-month prison terms. He once cited a witness for contempt of court for having referred to his mother as "no lady."

Justice Musmanno, sitting on the bench of the court of common appeals, justified his ruling on the ground that "Not only is such a remark a violation of the fifth commandment of God, but it violates every principle of decency and justice on which law is founded."

He was born of Italian immigrant parents in the milltown of McKees Rocks, near Pittsburgh, but he has never divulged the date of his birth.

Friends guess that he is in his early 60's. Because of his youthful appearance and incessant energy, he could be taken for at least 10 years younger.

Educated at Georgetown, George Washington University and the University of Rome, Mr. Musmanno has received degrees of bachelor of arts, bachelor of laws, master of patent law, and doctor of juristic science. To earn his education he sold newspapers and worked at night.

A man who has always espoused the cause of the underprivileged, the Pennsylvanian first achieved national publicity in his second term in the Pennsylvania Legislature. He championed a bill to abolish coal and iron company policemen who were hired to break strikes.

GOVERNOR VETOES BILL

The bill was vetoed by the Governor, but Mr. Musmanno wrote a story based on the murder of a striker by company policemen. After the book, "Jan Volkanik," was published, he persuaded Paul Muni to take the leading role in the screen version, "Black Fury."

A bachelor, Justice Musmanno arrives at his chambers in Pittsburgh at 8 a.m., lunches on soup or tea and cookies, and returns home for supper. Frequently he returns to the office for more work until about midnight.

During World War II he served in the submarine service and was twice wounded in combat. He was promoted to captain and served as naval aide to Gen. Mark W. Clark.

After the Nuremberg trials, the jurist ran unsuccessfully as the Democratic nominee for Lieutenant Governor in 1950. Two years later he was elected to a 20-year term on the Pennsylvania Supreme Court.

During the early 1950's, Justice Musmanno became known as a relentless foe of communism. He urged that anyone found guilty of being affiliated with the Communist Party be sentenced to 20 years in prison.

A few months ago me made a trip to Israel, talked with the three judges chosen to hear the Eichmann case and publicly expressed his opinion that Eichmann would receive a fair trial.

Justice Musmanno's 10th book, "The Eichmann Kommandos," was being published at that time. The book is an account of the trial of German war criminals.

* * * * *

Justice Musmanno's testimony struck directly at the defense's argument that Eichmann merely followed orders from above and had no power of decision.

Dr. Servatius, in his first real opportunity to demonstrate his ability as a cross-examiner, hammered at the witness.

He asked whether all those high Nazi officials, in their interviews with Justice Musmanno had not been trying to palm off their responsibility on a small official. He quoted documents to include that the major decisions to annihilate European Jews were taken at a much higher level than Eichmann's modest rank of lieutenant colonel.

"Yes," cried Justice Musmanno with heat, "but the instrumentality was Adolph Eichmann. It was Eichmann who decided in what order, in what countries the Jews were to die."

MANY NAZIS INTERVIEWED

Mr. Musmanno, apparently irked by Dr. Servatius description of him as "a publicist," explained that he had interviewed more than 100 Nazis immediately after the war when he was assigned by the United States Navy to investigate whether Hitler was really dead.

He said he had questioned all the intimates of Hitler who had survived, including admirals, generals, aides, and orderlies down to Hitelr's secretary, barber, butler, and cook.

He also served at three of the Nuremberg war crimes trials, presiding over the case of 21 leaders of the Einsatzgruppen, the Nazi operational groups that allegedly worked closely with Eichmann in the slaughter of Jews in German-occupied areas of Eastern Europe.

A surprising number of these people mentioned Eichmann, according to Mr. Musmanno.

With a trace of irony, Dr. Servatius asked whether Justice Musmanno, in his judgement on the Einsatzgruppen trial at Nuremberg, had mentioned Eichmann as an alleged instigator of the shootings of hundreds of thousands of Jews.

Mr. Musmanno replied: "I didn't mention Eichmann in the judgment. There was no necessity of doing so. He was not on trial."

Dr. Servatius said he had understood the witness to say that former Foreign Minister von Ribbentrop had told him that Eichmann had pressed him (von Ribbentrop) to implement the "final solution" of the Jewish problem—that is, annihilation.

"Ribbentrop told me Eichmann influenced Hitler," Mr. Musmanno replied. "I did not accept this. I couldn't conceive of anybody influencing Hitler—it would have been like influencing an erupting volcano."

The defense counsel also attacked Mr. Musmanno's contention that some of those he interviewed had refused to take part in atrocities, and yet had escaped retaliation by the Nazis. Part of Eichmann's defense rests on his contention that he would have been shot had he not carried out orders for the deportation of Jews.

Dr. Servatius read part of a Nuremberg judgment declaring that in the Nazi military machine subordinates had no "freedom of choice" and that refusal to obey orders led to drastic punishment.

But that was "a general statement" by the International Military Tribunal, Mr. Musmanno replied.

He said he could give case histories of men who "refused to kill in cold blood" and were simply transferred to some other duty.

Mr. Musmanno testified that Goering had told him in an interview that Eichmann was "all-powerful in extermination of the Jews, that von Ribbentrop 'resented' very much Eichmann's intereference in his Ministry of Foreign Affairs" and that Walter Schellenberg, the Nazi intelligence chief, had disclosed to him that an elite guard court in Berlin once attempted to arraign Eichmann on a charge of "cruelty and corruption."

This attempt to jail Eichmann for "excesses" was frustrated when Kaltenbrunner informed the court it had no jurisdiction because Eichmann was "fulfilling a special mission for the Fuehrer," Mr. Musmanno asserted.

The prosecution submitted a copy of the warrant for Eichmann's arrest.

Dr. Servatius was hampered in his cross-examination by the fact that his questions to the witness had to be translated from German into Hebrew and then from Hebrew into English. This took time and gave Mr. Musmanno, who occasionally looked flustered and excitable, opportunity to regain his poise.

Not having read Mr. Musmanno's book on Hitler's last days, Dr. Servatius refrained from asking the question that was in the mind of many spectators as the afternoon drew to a close.

Finally, Judge Landau gently inquired: "Did you mention Eichmann in your book?"

"Oh, no, no," cried the witness, "because at that time I wasn't interested in Eichmann—he didn't mean a thing to me then.

"In the first place, everybody said he was dead and he didn't interest me. Then later on, of course, he seemed important."

Irony of Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. BATES
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Peterborough Transcript, of Peterborough, N.H. It is timely and contains food for thought in these serious days:

IRONY OF SUCCESS

Commander Shepard's magnificent space flight Friday morning has been praised and extolled in so many ways—also his superb public appearance in Washington on Monday—that there are no superlatives left to describe the man or his achievement. In Navy terms, the training leading up to the flight, the flight itself, and the events since were "well done."

There have been the inevitable crackpots—of which New Hampshire, unfortunately, has more than its share—who have tried to climb into the Mercury capsule with the Derry hero, but through it all he has maintained an amazing composure and self-assurance. NASA's rejection of a ticker-tape parade in New York City no doubt reflected the attitude of Commander Shepard himself that the sooner the excitement over his flight subsided, the sooner all people associated with the national space program could get back to the biggest job of all, a man in orbit.

It has been ironic that while attention has focussed on the exploits of Commander Shepard, and his handsome family, at the same time in Washington there has been going on a congressional investigation over strikes and other labor abuses which have harassed the missile program, and set back Friday's space flight by at least 6 months.

Witness after witness has charged that most of the walkouts were for trivial excuses, to throw projects behind schedule so workers could collect overtime wages at two to four times the usual rate.

At least one strike allegedly was called because a man was fired for sleeping on the job.

Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, presiding at the hearings before his Senate investigations subcommittee, called it a revolting situation.

Of the 30 labor unions involved, all but 1 have disowned responsibility for the strikes, labeling them "wildcat" or unauthorized walkouts.

The figures are not disputed—327 strikes at 22 missile bases, 109 of them at Cape Canaveral alone.

Also undisputed is the total overall loss of time, figured at 162,872 man-days in 4½ years.

Joseph W. Morgan, a general organizer for the Teamsters, invoked the fifth amendment in refusing to answer questions about Teamster labor troubles at missile sites.

Jerome Adlerman and Robert E. Dunne, subcommittee aids, were investigating at Canaveral when one of the strikes was called without warning last December. They testified it paralyzed the base for a week.

They said it took them and Canaveral officials nearly a day to learn who called the strike and to locate union officials with whom to negotiate for a settlement.

Col. Robert M. Vreech, chief of Canaveral's test site operations, swore many strikes were called to force payment of overtime that swelled wages of plumbers and electricians to as high as $800 a week.

B. G. MacNabb, operations chief of Canaveral for Convair in producing the Atlas missile, testified the whole space flight-missile program is 6 months behind. He blamed strikes, low production by the workers and slow decisionmaking by the Government and industry for this.

Atlas is the missile scheduled to place the first U.S. astronaut in orbit, and Convair fabricates it.

MacNabb said greed for "the almighty dollar," but not subversion, caused the strikes and work slowdowns.

He said production rates at Canaveral are only about 40 percent of what private industry gets from its men on non-Government contracts.

Douglas V. Dorman of the Martin Co., producing Titan intercontinental missiles, testified that labor troubles and arbitrary rules by unions refusing to allow factory prefabrication of much missile equipment, would add hundreds of millions to the overall cost of the program.

Euell H. Hodge, who said he resigned in frustration as a missile contract supervising officer at Vandenberg Air Force Base in California, charged that union labor collected double time and triple time wages there while idly "blessing" missile equipment.

He said the plumbers union arbitrarily insisted that factory prefabricated manifolds for missiles must be torn apart and rebuilt by members of their union before it is installed.

In view of the foregoing, it's even more of a miracle how Commander Shepard ever got off the ground Friday morning. But American courage and determination, with which all the astronauts abound, came to the fore and restored the United States to a position of respect in the world space race. All honor belongs to those who made the flight a success. Those who have hindered its progress are due only shame.

Tribute to Secretary Udall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH R. HARDING
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, of all of President Kennedy's Cabinet appointments—and I wish to say that I feel they are all outstanding and without a doubt a group of the finest public servants ever assembled—the one of which we in the West are most proud is Stewart L. Udall, the Secretary of Interior.

We like Stewart Udall not only because he is a practical, hard-working, and intelligent westerner, but also because of his fighting spirit. We pray that Stew Udall will always have the power to fight for the right, and that he will continue to have the courage he has so capably demonstrated these past 4 months to protect the interests of the people and to preserve for future generations the natural resources that we as Americans enjoy today.

A Secretary of the Interior who does his job will never win any popularity contests but he will certainly win the unending thanks of a grateful Nation.

I include at this point in the RECORD an article from the Deseret News of Salt Lake City, Utah, published on May 15, 1961:

STEWART LEE UDALL, THE "YOUNG CURMUDGEON": MAN IN A HURRY WHO LOVES HIS WORK

(By Louis Cassels)

WASHINGTON.—Stewart Lee Udall, the "young curmudgeon" of the Kennedy administration, has at least four notable accomplishments to his credit since he took office as Secretary of the Interior.

Serving in what is normally a rather obscure post, the 41-year-old ex-Congressman from Arizona has reaped more newspaper headlines than any other member of the Kennedy cabinet.

He has demonstrated an unusual ability to draw howls of rage from Republicans—and sometimes from his fellow Democrats—in Congress.

He has shocked this blase capital by saying out loud what is widely believed but seldom acknowledged—that "there are times when you have to be ruthless in politics."

Finally, along the way, he has attracted public attention to the urgent and often-neglected problem of conserving America's natural resources, particularly its disappearing wilderness areas.

The Washington judgment on Udall is that he is likely to be the most controversial Secretary of Interior since the late Harold L. Ickes, the self-styled "old curmudgeon" of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Cabinet.

At times, the 41-year-old Udall appears to be consciously emulating the "old curmudgeon." Ickes once created a national sensation by inviting Negro soprano Marian Anderson to sing from the steps of the Lincoln Memorial after she had been barred from giving a concert in the DAR's Constitution Hall. Udall has stirred up a similar storm by serving notice on the Washington Redskins pro football team that it will have to hire some Negro players if it expects to use the new stadium being built on Government land here.

Ickes' truculent spirit pervades the very room in which Udall works. The Interior Department building was erected while Ickes was feuding with Postmaster General James A. Farley. Ickes gave the architects explicit orders to make his office bigger than Farley's. As a result, every Secretary of the Interior since Ickes has worked in a mammoth paneled room which is almost as big as a basketball court.

Udall submitted, more or less restively, to an interview in this cavernous chamber. He is chronically late for appointments, and in an effort to keep up with his schedule, he sometimes tries to carry on conversations with visitors while sneaking in a few quick glances at correspondence or reports lying on his desk.

Udall is not given to small talk or levity, especially when he is in a hurry, which apparently he nearly always is. He may break into a hearty guffaw over a political joke, but his face is usually fixed in a fairly grim expression. He has dark, crew-cut hair, a hawk nose, and the athletic build (5 feet 11 inches, 180 pounds) of a prizefighter.

But if you steer him onto his favorite subject—the outdoors—he begins to sound more like a poet. He grew up in the wide open spaces of Arizona, and he has retained an almost mystical passion for nature in its unspoiled State.

His greatest concern is that Americans will do too little, too late, to preserve their fast-

dwindling heritage of majestic streams and forests.

"This is the most urgent problem in the whole field of natural resources," he said with conviction. "The glory of America has always been its green face * * * its spaciousness. The whole character of the American people has been shaped by living on a virgin continent where men could test themselves against the wilderness.

"But our land is changing before our eyes. The bulldozers are eating away the last remaining wild areas in the east, and even in the west rapid population growth is exerting pressure on the open spaces."

Udall considers it disgraceful that only 92,000 acres of land were added to the national parks system under President's Truman and Eisenhower. He wants President Kennedy to go into the history books as the greatest conservationist since Woodrow Wilson, who added 5.5 million acres to the park system. He is particularly anxious to acquire more parklands in the east, where most of the Nation's people live. The vast majority of present parks are in the west, far from centers of population.

As a starter, he is pressing for congressional action on long-stalled legislation to preserve 3 of the 8 or 10 U.S. shorelines which have not yet been taken over by commercial resort developers. The proposed national seashores are located at Cape Cod, Mass., Padre Island, Tex., and Oregon Dunes, Oreg.

Another project dear to his heart is development of the Delaware River Basin to create a vast manmade lake in the Catskill Mountains, within 2 hours' driving time of New York and Philadelphia.

"We have got to move fast" on these projects, he said earnestly. "It will never get any cheaper. In many areas, land prices are doubling every 10 years."

Udall's Department is possible the least understood in the Government, partly because its name—Interior—means nothing to the average citizen. It might more accurately be described as "The Department of Natural Resources."

Its major functions include managing about 500 million acres of land, mostly in the West, which are still in the public domain; providing irrigation for nearly 8 million acres of reclaimed land, also in the West; building and operating hydroelectric systems which now generate 6 million kilowatts of power; fostering the economic health of mineral extraction industries, including such chronic invalids as coal, lead and zinc; promoting mine safety; protecting fish and wildlife; conducting geological surveys; operating a railroad in Alaska; and looking out for the welfare of 400,000 American Indians and Eskimos who are wards of the Federal Government.

Nearly one-fourth of the Nation's Indians live within the Arizona Congressional District which Udall formerly represented, and he is a militant champion of their interests. He thinks it is a national scandal that the living standards on many Indian reservations are as low as those of any nation in Asia or Africa, and that it is past time for the United States to launch a sort of domestic point 4 program for economic development of Indian reservations.

Udall's forebears were rugged Mormon pioneers who settled in Arizona before the Civil War.

He was born January 31, 1920, in St. Johns, Ariz., a town founded by his grandfather. There are almost as many Udalls as Indians in Arizona, and most of them are prominent in the business and political life of the State. His father was Levi S. Udall, Chief Justice of the Arizona Supreme Court.

Washington is getting another Udall—Stewart's brother, Morris, who won the Arizona election last week to replace the Interior Secretary in the House.

Udall's love for the outdoors goes back to his boyhood, when "you could stand on the front steps of my home and shoot ducks."

After graduating from high school, he went to Pennsylvania to put in the 2 years of volunteer service as a missionary which is performed by many young men in the Mormon church.

When the United States entered World War II, he signed up for bombardier training in the Air Force, but washed out of cadet school, and became an enlisted gunner. As a technical sergeant, he made 50 missions over Western Europe in B–24 Liberators.

After the war, he went to the University of Arizona, where he played guard on a basketball team which was good enough to make the National Invitational Tournament in Madison Square Garden.

He still likes basketball. During a recent mine inspection tour of West Virginia, he spotted a group of kids playing basketball on a crude homemade court. He ordered his driver to stop, leaped out of the car, and sank three baskets in a row.

He graduated from the university in 1948 with a law degree and a wife, a blonde coed named Ermalee Webb, whom he married during his senior year. After a few years of private law practice with a family firm, he was elected to Congress in 1954.

He was known in Congress as an able member of the western liberal bloc. He served on the House Interior Committee, where he got a thorough grounding in the problems of the Department he now heads, and also on the Labor Committee, where he had the opportunity of working closely with Senator John F. Kennedy on passage of a moderate union reform bill.

His relationship with Mr. Kennedy was cemented during the 1960 campaign for the Democratic presidential nomination, when Udall swung to Kennedy the 17 Arizona convention votes which were supposed to be in LYNDON B. JOHNSON'S bag.

Udall clearly enjoys the power and responsibility of his new job, but he does not seem to be greatly interested in the status symbols and personal prerequisites of Cabinet office. His private life has undergone little change since his days of Congress, and he still is more at home driving his own station wagon than sitting in the back seat of a chauffeur-driven limousine.

He lives with his wife, six children, two dogs and a badly outnumbered cat in a modest house in suburban Virginia. The whole family is outdoors-minded. Udall sometimes packs the entire menage, including dogs and cat, into the family station wagon for a drive across the continent to the open spaces of Arizona.

He keeps in trim for this and other challenges by doing a lot of hiking and playing paddle ball in the congressional gymnasium several times a week. He does not smoke.

Like President Kennedy and nearly everyone else in the New Frontier, he is an omnivorous reader, and especially likes the poetry of Robert Frost.

After a recent visit to Capitol Hill to testify on a pending park bill, Udall strode down a corridor, his right hand clutching the yellow memo pad on which he jots down ideas and things to do as they occur to him, and a pack of harried Interior Department underlings at his heels. He looked like a young man in a hurry, and the spectacle caused an old Washington hand to muse aloud:

"That fellow is either going to make a mark for himself—or get a bloody nose." He might, like honest Harold Ickes, do both.

Resolution by Americans of Polish Descent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to submit for the RECORD the resolution adopted by Polonia, by which is meant Americans of Polish descent, on May 7, 1961, during ceremonies commemorating the 170th anniversary of Polish Constitution Day. The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY POLONIA ON SUNDAY, MAY 7, 1961, ON BELLE ISLE, DETROIT, MICH., DURING A MANIFESTATION COMMEMORATING THE 170TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE POLISH CONSTITUTION OF MAY 3, 1791

Assembled at this solemn manifestation commemorating the 170th anniversary of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, we honor the authors of that memorable document and hereby firmly resolve:

1. To convey to our brothers in Poland assurances of our spiritual unity, emanating from our mutual ties, and at the same time to express our great admiration for the heroic stand of the Polish Nation against the forces of godless communism.

2. To the Polish clergy in the land of our forefathers, including the indomitable Polish primate, Cardinal Stefan Wyszynski, we express our deep respect for their unchangeable stand against the determined attempts of communism to dominate the souls of the Polish people.

3. In the spirit of the momentous constitution of May 3, we urge our clergy and all of Polonia to encourage the study of the Polish language, thus not only serving America by promoting the study of languages, but enabling new generations to gain a fuller knowledge and understanding of the rich Polish culture.

4. We firmly brand as hypocritical the attitude of the Gomulka regime toward the friendly policies of the United States which, by its actions including the grant of economic aid, demonstrated its good will toward the Polish Nation. The offensive remarks of Gomulka and other dignitaries of the Warsaw regime concerning our representatives in Warsaw, and the insidious Communist infiltration of Polonia's ranks, compel us to revise our own attitude toward the present Warsaw regime which, contrary to its claims, represents and advances the interests of Moscow and not those of the Polish Nation. We warn all of Polonia against the secret and open emissaries of communism who, under the guise of extended cultural cooperation, are actually carrying out Communist directives for effective dissemination of communistic ideologies.

5. We call attention of our Government officials to the fact that intensified German revisionary propaganda concerning Polish western lands in the Oder-Neisse Line area, arouses great indignation of the part of Polonia in America which strongly stands by these historic Polish lands, stolen by German enemies whose warring actions plunged the world, within a few short years, into two great world wars. Memories of German crematoriums and of the slaughter of 7 million Polish citizens have not yet been eradicated from the minds of the Polish people.

6. We impress upon the entire world the fact that our Polonia will never acquiesce in the theft of Poland's eastern lands, stolen by Soviet Russia, and that it is unable to ever forget the monstrous Katyn murders and the horrible concentration camps in which millions of Poles perished. The Soviet murderer not only remains unpunished to this day but claims a seat as an equal partner in the United Nations.

7. We express our great pride in the accomplishments of Commander Shepard, eyewitnessed by the entire world, which demonstrated the superiority of American astronautic achievement over obscured performances of the Soviets.

With a dedicated loyalty to the Government of the United States we are gathered under its star-spangled banner to pledge vigilance in promoting the growth of our country's strength and in defending it against the threats of communism, its greatest enemy.

Long live the United States.

Long live the heroic Polish nation.

White House Jitters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, Walter Trohan, in the following article from the May 13 issue of the Chicago Tribune, points out what happens when a boy is sent to do a man's job:

WASHINGTON REPORT

WASHINGTON, May 12.—President Kennedy, who has been jolted by the tremendous loss of prestige the United States has suffered over Cuba and Laos, is taking his second Florida vacation in 111 days and obviously needs it.

Those who see the President regularly and those who see him only occasionally agree in describing him as "shook." This is a picturesque slang term used to pinpoint one who approaches the dazed condition of a person coming out of shock.

Kennedy was dull almost to the point of listlessness in announcing the success of the American astronaut's flight. When he decorated the Navy flyer, he dropped the medal and then forgot to pin it on until he was reminded to do so by Mrs. Kennedy. He struggled to recover and did so by remarking the medal was "from the ground up."

Democratic leaders and others who have been granted White House audiences report the Chief Executive appears to be lost in thought. A Democratic Congressman said that during his visit Kennedy never looked at him but stared intently at the floor.

WANTS CHANCE TO THINK WITHOUT INTERFERENCE

This doesn't mean that the President is ailing in any way. The mental jarring has been physically trying, but there is no health problem. The President wants to get away to think. He wants as little interference as he can get. The White House tried to discourage reporters from accompanying him to West Palm Beach, but without success.

There hasn't been as much public evidence of a change in the Chief Executive in appearance as in action. It is true his jauntiness and cocksureness are gone, but the big change is private, in his attitude and his approach toward his office.

In his first weeks in the White House Kennedy held news conferences weekly. He appeared to relish the fencing with newspapermen. Since March 23 he has held only three news conferences, so that postponements are becoming familiar as they were under President Eisenhower.

The President expressed dislike for the staff system created by Eisenhower. He was especially cool toward the National Security Council, which he intimated was little more than another committee. He held only two Council sessions in his first 2 months, but since the Cuban fiasco he has had no fewer than seven sessions with the experts on American security.

Kennedy came into office believing that professors had the answers to world problems, much as they had the answers to student questions in their classrooms. Now he is shying away from the intellectuals and seeking out men of experience. He has demonstrated a sense of history by going to his predecessors, especially those in the Republican Party, such as Eisenhower and former President Herbert Hoover.

WONDERS IF HE COULD HAVE AVOIDED TROUBLE

In his first weeks in office, Kennedy tackled mountains of paper. He read almost any report sent to him, followed a great deal of mail, studied newspapers and magazines, and read almost any volume on current history and policy problems.

Now he has begun wondering whether he might have avoided the failure in Cuba and avoided putting himself out on a limb from which he is trying to withdraw in Laos if he had concentrated on major issues and let the minor ones go to staff members, as Eisenhower did.

All in all, the Presidency is unfolding for Kennedy like the petals of a rose, but it is not the beautiful perfumed flower he expected it to be when he was blaming and promising during the election campaign.

Advertising Responsibilities of the Federal Trade Commission and Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a well-prepared and well-delivered address by Daniel J. Murphy, Assistant Director, Bureau of Litigation of the Federal Trade Commission in Washington, before the conference on advertising at the Babson Institute, Babson Park, Mass., on May 17, 1961.

Attorney Murphy has been one of our outstanding career officials in the Federal Trade Commission for many years and has had varied experience in the different divisions and departments of that governmental agency. Well qualified by these assignments, Mr. Murphy is considered one of the top specialists in this field.

The address follows:

ADVERTISING RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION AND BUSINESS

(By Daniel J. Murphy, Assistant Director, Bureau of Litigation, before Conference on Advertising, Babson Institute, Babson Park, Mass., on May 17, 1961)

I

May I at the outset express to you my sincere appreciation for your kind invitation to participate in this advertising conference.[1]

The Federal Trade Commission is vitally interested in advertising, as you well know. The Commission has the widest jurisdiction of all Federal regulatory bodies over advertising. Other Federal agencies have restricted jurisdictions over advertising—limited to single commodities or particular media. The jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission, by contrast, is general—extending to all media and with few exceptions to all commodities.

It is the only governmental agency fortified by statute, equipped by personnel, and strengthened by years of experience, with adequate procedures and techniques, to perform this most vital responsibility.

II

Apropos to the theme of this conference—"Advertising and the Shape of Things To Come"—let us take a look at the past for an indication of the future. What is past is prologue.

Advertising, both in quantity and caliber, has made tremendous strides in recent years. At the turn of the century, false advertising was running rampant, especially in the patent medicine field. Turner's book, "The Shocking History of Advertising," and Holbrook's, "The Golden Age of Quackery," are quite revealing. Magazines and newspapers were filled with advertisements claiming cures for almost every disease known to man. The advertisements contained testimonials from prominent persons in high places. One testimonial, embossed with seal and signature, purported to be a Presidential proclamation endorsing a certain whisky as a beverage and for medicinal use.

Because of these advertised incredible and baseless claims for patent medicines and healing devices, a campaign began for ethical standards in advertising. An aroused, public-spirited citizenry composed of courageous journalists, medical societies and advertisers—all concerned with the future of advertising—contributed to the exposure and condemnation of the untruthful and extravagant claims in this age of quackery.

Collier's magazine in 1906 ran its famed series on patent medicine. In 1911 the American Medical Association published its first volume entitled, "Nostrums Versus Quackery." In 1911 Printer's Ink launched the movement for a model State statute prohibiting false advertising. The fight was waged by advertising men throughout the Nation. In 1911, the Associated Advertising Clubs of the World, at their convention held in Boston, Mass., adopted the motto, "Truth in Advertising." The Associated Advertising Clubs, and later the Better Business Bureaus, fought for the model State statute. This epic battle resulted subsequently in the passage of false advertising statutes in 44 States.

The printer's ink statute was passed without substantial change in 27 States, providing that any person who disseminates false advertising shall be guilty of a misdemeanor.

The Federal Government was active at that time in this area. It passed the Pure Food and Drugs Act in 1906, designed as a truth-in-labeling statute. It passed the Federal Trade Commission Act in 1914.

Ever since the Federal Trade Commission was organized in 1914, it has engaged in a campaign to eliminate deceptive advertising. Fortified with a congressional broad power to proscribe "unfair methods of competition," the Commission, in its early days, determined that deceptive advertising, because of its ability to injure competition, was an unfair method of competition.

One of the first Commission orders to reach the courts involved false advertising.[2] The Supreme Court approved an order to

Footnotes at end of speech.

cease and desist from false and misleading advertising as early as 1922.[3]

It has been estimated that as early as 1925 orders directed against false and misleading advertising constituted the vast majority of the total numbers of orders issued by the Commission annually.

III

Until 1931, one important question remained unresolved: Whether the Commission could prohibit false advertising that misled the public where there was no showing of competitive injury?

This basic question was resolved adversely to the Commission by the Supreme Court in the famous 1931 case, *F.T.C.* v. *Raladam Company* (283 U.S. 643). The Court held that the Commission lacked jurisdiction to proceed against false advertising where no substantial competition, present or potential, was shown to have been injured or clearly threatened with substantial injury by the advertising sought to be prohibited.

This decision was a severe setback to the Commission's enforcement against false advertising. Agitation soon developed for congressional action to broaden the Commission's power in order that it might protect the consuming public as well as honest competitors.

These efforts resulted in the passage of the Wheeler-Lea Amendment to the Federal Trade Commission Act in 1938. The basic prohibition of section 5 now reads:

"Unfair methods of competition in commerce, and unfair or deceptive acts or practices in commerce, are hereby declared unlawful."

The primary purpose of the amendment to section 5 of the act was to counteract the Raladam decision, but the Wheeler-Lea amendment went further. The 1938 amendments also added section 12 to the Federal Trade Commission Act, declaring certain advertisements of foods, drugs, devices, and cosmetics unfair or deceptive acts and practices in commerce within the meaning of section 5, and armed the Commission with additional procedural weapons against false advertising of these products.

IV

Since 1938, then, the Federal Trade Commission has been armed with a variety of potential weapons in its never-ending war against false advertising and other unfair trade parctices.

Unfair methods of competition and unfair and deceptive acts and practices in commerce are not defined by statute. As a matter of fact, it would be impossible to frame definitions which would embrace all unfair business practices. There is no limit to human inventiveness in this area. Unfair practices are to be determined by inclusion and exclusion in consideration of the experiences and progress of business. There are now 54 bound volumes of F.T.C. decisions since its inception on business practices found to be unfair or deceptive. One of the most important categories in this field is false and misleading advertising: 70 percent of these decisions deal with advertising.

V

This look at the past warrants the observation that the Commission, armed with this power and responsibility, early in its history and throughout its existence, has recognized its obligations in this area. Under new leadership it will become more active and vigilant in protecting the consumers and competitors from unfair and false impressions created by misleading advertising. It is expected that the Commission will conduct a vigorous and speedy law-enforcement program against those responsible for false and misleading advertising.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Chairman Paul Rand Dixon recently gave a speech before the Association of National Advertisers, Inc., entitled "False Advertising Is No Minor Matter." The chairman spoke of false advertising swinging two clubs—one on consumers and the other on reputable and law-abiding advertisers—and he concluded, "False advertising becomes a monopolistic weapon as vicious as any other. Either way you look at it—from the standpoint of unfair competition or as an unfair and deceptive practice—false advertising will not only continue to be a major target of the Commission, but heavier, faster firing guns will be brought to bear on it."

The chairman also emphasized a speedup in our processes. He stoutly predicted, "We are going to serve injured business and consumers with a squad car, instead of a hearse." He is confident that the vast and honorable majority of advertisers will applaud this determination.

There will be a determined effort to compact the schedule of hearings on any case and to provide for continuous hearings on both sides until the entire case is completed.

A further change in procedure, presently contemplated, is to give and fix responsibility to one man for the development, trial, and forward progress of each case.

It has been suggested that the Commission be given the power to issue temporary restraining orders to stop grossly misleading advertising pending a trial of the issues. If the Commission had this power, it is quite probable that we would be confronted with a minimum of delaying tactics.

The Chairman has gone on record for the effectiveness and fairness of bringing simultaneous action against industrywide, or at least areawide, false advertising whenever it is feasible.

The Chairman has authorized me to further state that voluntary compliance with the law, undertaken in good faith, should continue a major objective of the Commission. We will do our utmost to encourage it and lend enthusiastic support to any private effort to correct illegal practices.

VI

When I refer to powers and responsibilities of the Commission in this area, let me briefly refer to responsibilities of business also, as represented by this audience, in this same area.

We spoke of the turn of the century. At that time only approximately $100 million were spent in advertising. In 1960, approximately $12 billion were spent by business on advertising in the various media. This advertising appeal is thrust directly at the consumers. This tremendous and powerful force—whether in the form of the spoken word on radio, or the pictorial presentation on television, or the written word of the newspapers, or various other methods of communication—constitutes an absorbing and continuing appeal, many times dramatic and emotional, exhorting and urging the defenseless and many times gullible consumers to buy and use the abundant goods produced by our complex economy. Thus, many luxuries of yesterday become the necessities of today.

This great advertising appeal is very definitely the first and most intimate contact which the average consumer has with the American economy. Surely he has more contact with this phase of our economy than with any other. Just think of the numbers and kinds of advertisements the average person is exposed to during a given period: The written word, the spoken word, the pictorial presentation. This tremendous power of advertising suggests a tremendous responsibility of the advertiser to comply with the law. The consumer forms his impressions and expectations of our system when he reads and hears and sees—the creations of this vast advertising octopus. He is subjected in one form or another to millions of avdertising techniques during the course of the year. Thus, advertising becomes a major source of most impressions which the interested consumer has of our system of economy.

Business and the advertising fraternities must universally recognize their responsibilities of properly and honestly informing the consumers of the qualities and values of their products, without the use of false and misleading statements about their products and disparaging observations of competitive products.

Everyone, from time immemorial, has adopted the slogan "truth in advertising." It is a safe and sane adoption. It should not be an empty slogan that permits and encourages the emphasis on the gray areas between the true and false word.

It should be a meaningful, dynamic expression and execution of busines policy. To merely adopt this slogan is not enough. There must be a sincere, wholehearted and genuine effort by business and its advertising organizations to advertise truthfully.

We start off with the simple premise that it is unlawful to put false ideas into others' heads by direct statements, innuendos or otherwise. Ask yourself the questions, "What will the reader, the viewer or the listener think about this product? Is what he will think the truth? Is there anything else that he ought to know?"

The matters covered by advertising are matters within the peculiar knowledge of the advertiser. Who is in a better position than he for the making of an honest appraisal of his product or the framing of advertisements that honestly represent it?

This does not mean that the advertiser must be entirely objective and impartial. As a matter of commercial interest, it is expected by the consumer that the advertiser will be biased and prejudiced in favor of his own merchandise. He has the right to "puff" his own wares, but he has no right to misrepresent them.

Just where the line is drawn between puffing and misleading representations in advertising is often difficult to determine. Puffing generally refers to a subjective expression of opinion and is not made as a representation of fact. The Supreme Court [4] has distinguished between legitimate puffing, that is, mere exaggeration of qualities the merchandise has, and misleading representations, that is, assigning to merchandise qualities it does not have.

VII

The Commission, under its new leadership, is expected to continue and increase its activities relative to television commercials and demonstrations.

Several complaints issued in the past year alleged that television advertising was deceptive because it leads the public to believe that a demonstration shown therein proves something when, in fact, it does not. Even though the quality of the product is not directly in issue, purchasers may be induced to buy a certain product because they have been led to believe that it has undergone a valid test or demonstration.

These cases hold that apart from any determination of the merits of their product, a commercial may be considered illegally deceptive if purchasers may be induced thereby to purchase a product because they have been led to believe they have seen a valid test or demonstration of it.

Action was taken against the use of the "White Coat" on television. Although no determination was made of the merits of the product, the collateral visual suggestion that the product had been recommended by the medical profession was held to be misleading.[5]

In a recent book entitled "Reality in Advertising," the author discusses "unique

selling propositions" and refers to them as "USP." As an example of an effective USP, the author cites the Colgate television advertising of its toothpaste in which the invisible shield was used. This television demonstration was the subject of a complaint by the Commission which complaint was contested. The Commission found that this advertisement was deceptive. The Commission stated, "In our opinion, respondent's television commercials and print advertisements clearly and directly represent that Colgate dental cream with Gardol affords users complete protection against tooth decay and against the development of cavities. Such representations as to the degree or extent of the protection afforded users of respondent's dentifrice are deceptive."

Another formal complaint challenged the accuracy of television demonstrations which purported to demonstrate the perceptible disparity between the optical distortion of automobile safety plate glass and auto safety sheet glass under ordinary conditions of use. The complaint charged that photographic techniques or devices used in the making of such pictures were designed to exaggerate the distortion inherent in auto safety sheet glass and minimize the distortion inherent in auto safety plate glass. This matter is presently in litigation.[6]

Other cases in which the Commission challenged purported television demonstrations included a demonstration of a filter cigarette;[7] demonstration of aluminum household foil;[8] the capacity of one toothpaste to remove tobacco stain;[9] the presence of moisture drops or "flavor gems" on margarine as evidence that it tastes like butter;[10] a "sandpaper test" to prove the moistening properties of shaving cream;[11] a demonstration of the danger in actual use of competitive so-called "round head razor";[12] a depiction showing what is represented as a comparison between competing shaving creams as to their being "moist and creamy";[13] and still another involving a demonstration as to the superiority of an aerosol having cream over competitive brands.

In a number of these cases, some of the Nation's largest advertising agents were named as respondents. In our opinion, the advertising agent who creates and develops these demonstrations and profits thereby is equally responsible with the advertiser.

VIII

May I conclude with this observation. This audience is composed largely of men and women engaged in advertising and promotional activities—advertising managers, vice presidents in charge of advertising, advertising agency representatives, media representatives, and others—you and those represented by you—play a great part in the control of national advertising. Therefore, you all have a tremendous interest in the efficiency of the Federal Trade Commission in its perpetual effort to police false advertising. We have seen what happened to advertising in the age of quackery when there were no controls or policing. The same thing could happen today if controls and policing were eliminated or weakened. You might find yourself in a free-for-all battle of claims and counterclaims—of falsehoods and disparagements. You could, for a time, steel yourself against such an atmosphere and be determined to advertise with integrity but eventually you would weaken by the force of survival—fire will be met by fire in a hot, competitive battle. Public confidence in the believability of advertising would be at the lowest ebb.

We are all interested to guard against such an eventuality. Nay, it is our solemn responsibility if a free society is to endure.

There is plenty of educational help available. The Federal Trade Commission, with its formal and informal proceedings, the advertising fraternity with its new revised codes, the cooperative contributions of the great national associations of your industry—the four A's, the AFA, the ANA, and the Association of Better Business Bureaus.

We are confident of our success, confident that the Federal Trade Commission and business will meet their advertising responsibilities in the protection of the consumer and the honest advertiser; that the appreciation of the value of truly informative advertising of the American economy will grow stronger; that free men in a free society will triumph; that private enterprise will survive.

---

[1] My remarks are personal and not official.
[2] *Sears, Roebuck & Company* v. *F.T.C.*, 258 Fed. 307 (7 Cir., 1919).
[3] *Winsted Hosiery Co.* v. *F.T.C.*, 258 U.S. 483 (1922).
[4] *United States* v. *New South Farm and Home Company*, 241 U.S. 64–67.
[5] American Chicle Co., Docket 6791.
[6] Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass Co., et al., Docket 7643.
[7] Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp., Docket 7688.
[8] Aluminum Co. of America, Docket 7735.
[9] Lever Bros., Co., et al., Docket 7747.
[10] Standard Brands, Inc., Docket 7737.
[11] Colgate-Palmolive Co., et al., Docket 7736.
[12] Eversharp, Inc., Docket 7811.
[13] The Mennen Co., Docket 8146.

Killing Our Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, we are on the verge of what may well prove to be an abyss from which we may not recover until we have gone through the very painful wringer of runaway inflation. Perhaps we humans can never learn from history and the experience of others. We must learn the hard way even if it destroys us.

The following article by Mr. George Sokolsky appeared in the Washington Post of yesterday. Mr. Sokolsky explains very clearly what the proposal in a bill shortly to be introduced in the House of Representatives will do to the American dollar.

The people of our country should be alerted. Woe to us all if the American dollar becomes another scrap of paper.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 17, 1961]

KILLING OUR MONEY

(By George E. Sokolsky)

When the House of Morgan abdicated its leadership of the American financial world in 1929, no other leadership appeared. J. P. Morgan, the elder, was essentially a patriot and therefore his first concern was the maintenance of the status of the American dollar throughout the world. No banker in this country has succeeded to his position of leadership. We may have been regarded as not too bright by British and German bankers, but our money was sound because it was secured by gold.

Today, all sorts of fantistic ideas come out of the banking world—ideas which one might expect from someone who is taking economics I from a Keynesian professor at Harvard. These ideas have culminated in the inflationary bill which is now being proposed in Congress that would take all the gold coverage off the American dollar and leave it nothing more than a scrap of paper.

The proposal of Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon to change the gold law is an easy way out of our gold problem. We lack gold; therefore abolish gold. This is an easy solution to the shift in the balance of international settlements, and as this subject is not romantic and not easy to understand, the great minds who turn corners on two wheels believe that they can solve a difficult problem by running away from it.

What they seek to do is to remove all metallic security of the dollar, to leave it a scrap of paper as valuable as the faith in trade, commerce, economic stability may at any time be. It is often said that fiat money is based upon confidence in the country which issues it. This is economic bushwah, because fiat money is based not on love of country but on the economics of the moment.

Congressman ABRAHAM J. MULTER, of Brooklyn, has introduced a measure in Congress which, it is said, has Secretary Dillon's support. It would shift our currency from having a 25-percent gold support to being fiat money; that is, money with no gold or silver support whatsoever.

The reason that for three decades, a world in revolution has accepted the American dollar as the most valuable currency is that it had a gold protection while other moneys were just printed paper. Now that Great Britain, West Germany, France and Soviet Russia have obtained enough gold to set up reserves, along comes this proposal to knock down the value and respectability of the American dollar.

It is expected that the removal of the gold reserve will strengthen the dollar, when actually it will destroy confidence in the dollar which has steadily been losing confidence.

The Multer bill was not prepared by Congressman MULTER, who, while a fine man, is not an economist and has never claimed to be one. The bill was prepared by bankers and Keynesian economists. They ought to come out in the open so that we might know who seeks to kill our money.

Threat of Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, apparently certain individuals and groups within the two major areas of our economy have not yet learned of the absolute dedication of the Communists to overthrow the Government of the United States—and, indeed, the governments of the entire free world. Apparently many within the ranks of both labor and management do not take seriously the threat of the Communists to "bury the United States." That there can exist such disbelief in the unswerving intentions and all-out effort of the Communists to communize—to enslave—the world is incredible. Yet, this is the fact—the dangerous fact.

A most timely warning against such apathy is sounded by Edward J. Rear-

don, Washington correspondent of the Herald-News of Passaic, N.J., in an article in the May 6 edition of that newspaper. Mr. Reardon's article follows:

PRICE FIXING, EXORBITANT WAGES HELPING KHRUSHCHEV "BURY" US

(By Edward J. Reardon)

WASHINGTON.—If you wonder about Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev's confidence in the ability of communism to eventually "bury the United States," two congressional investigations now in progress on Capitol Hill may furnish a key to the answer.

The first is a probe of price fixing on Government contracts by the electrical industry.

The second is an inquiry into the high wages and low production record of missile-base workers at Cape Canaveral.

Each day the hearings continue adds further evidence that American management and labor are doing their darndest to aid Khrushchev in making good his boast.

When the people of any nation become so obsessed by greed that they subordinate patriotism to profit, then they are indeed sewing the shroud for their own burial. And there is ample proof that we in the United States are getting perilously close to the danger line.

Testimony at the hearing delving into conditions at Cape Canaveral, for instance, has led Senate investigators to charge that missile-base workers make so much money it "borders almost on the subversive."

It is at Canaveral that this country is making its desperate last-ditch fight to uphold its waning prestige before the world. The stakes in the space race are high. What we once considered a friendly cooperative effort in the interest of new scientific discoveries has turned into a deadly duel between the Soviets and the United States, with world prestige as the prize.

But the rules of the game are not the same for both contestants.

Senate investigators learned last week that a $3.50-an-hour electrician at Canaveral made $647 one week. This was $127 more than Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara, who is responsible for the operation, earns.

Henry Gable, president of a Dallas electric service company which has six contracts at the cape, testified he has no doubt there was a deliberate slowdown by electricians so that they could make overtime pay.

Further testimony convinced the probers that union workers deliberately staged strikes to force overtime pay; that high wages were caused by test explosions and emergencies or by strikes and work stoppages that sometimes caused workweeks' of more than 100 hours.

Robert Palmer, business agent for local 756, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, conceded his union had staged a walkout last summer—closing down all missile work at the base for 8 days—when the Air Force tried to cut down overtime for its members.

The investigators developed testimony that despite the high wages, productivity of electricians and other building trades workers at Canaveral was the lowest ever encountered.

Tom O'Malley, former Passaicite now with Convair in Texas, testified this country's man-in-space program was delayed for months by the failure of Canaveral workers to deliver a full day's work.

In the Soviet Union there is no quibbling about overtime pay, no work slowdowns or stoppages. In Communist countries you are assigned to your job, you are told what is expected of you. And you do it, or else.

The Communists have an intolerable set of rules, judged by American standards. What they earn and how well they live depend on what they contribute to the progress of their country. Americans are shocked when Khrushchev says we will one day be living under his set of rules.

But it might be sobering to remember that under these rules the Soviet Union put the first satellite into space, produced the first moon shot and placed the first man into orbit, among other achievements.

America's industrial leaders who greedily consort with each other to rig prices on Government contracts and thus eliminate competition which is the keystone of the capitalistic system, might reflect on their chances under a communistic government.

Khrushchev says capitalism is doomed and the hour is growing late. The vultures of communism are already circling low in the sky—over Laos, Vietnam, Cuba, Africa, Latin America. Only a strong America—steeped not in greed but in patriotism—can fight them off. But we find the management and labor chiefs, on whom this Nation depends most to furnish that strength, concerned more with their own selfish interests than with the welfare of their country and the free world.

In Moscow shortly, Soviet officials will present Cuba's bewhiskered Fidel Castro with the Lenin Medal for his contribution to communism.

They are giving the medal to the wrong man.

College Basketball Corruption

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the people of our Nation have recently been shocked by the revelations of corruption in collegiate basketball competition. Unfortunately it has been revealed that some of our college athletes in North Carolina have been involved in this type of misconduct.

An editorial comment by Jesse Helms, vice president of WRAL–TV, an outstanding television station in Raleigh, N.C., has recently been brought to my attention. In this editorial I think that Mr. Helms relates the moral questions involved in collegiate basketball misconduct to other types of conduct to be found in this country. This editorial has impressed me as one which carries a message which all Americans might well ponder.

I therefore include the editorial that I have referred to be as a part of the Appendix of today's RECORD:

VIEWPOINT

The shame and the shock of the college basketball scandals continue to spread, like a gnawing, consuming cancer. But somehow sadness is the prevailing emotion in the backwash of disclosures that three State College basketball stars yielded to the temptation to sell their loyalty and integrity and decency.

And there is justification for the sadness, for the disclosures are merely symbols of a society that, despite its pious pretenses, has taught its younger generation that expediency is more important than principles, that personal responsibility has no place in the modern collectivist philosophy, and that there is somehow a comfortable middle ground between right and wrong.

There is no such middle ground except for those who would hear the cock crow thrice in proclaiming the betrayal of freedom. And this is the sadness of the basketball scandals. The young athletes whose weaknesses have been exposed are hardly more than a measuring stick of the Nation's morality. And though they may have dashed their own reputations and futures on the rocks of deceit, they have done more than that: They have reminded us that America is sick because we are refusing to act like Americans.

This, then, is what the basketball scandals are really all about And this is the warning that we must heed, unless our loss of national sanity—not to mention integrity—is to be complete. And most of all, in this incident, all of us—businessmen, politicians, educators, parents, clergymen, employers, employees—must stand back and let him without sin throw the first stone at the kids in the searing spotlight of shame.

It is impossible to draw a distinction between a basketball player who throws a game for pay and a politician who goes against his principles for votes. There is no difference between Anton Muehlbauer and a Senator who supports a socialistic measure because he fears defeat it he doesn't. Terry Litchfield's shame is no greater than the businessman who refuses to defend and protect the free enterprise system because he will avoid embarrassment and make money if he goes along with the crowd. Stan Niewierowski's weakness is no greater than that of the clergyman who makes a forgery of the word of God by transforming the pulpit into a forum for doctrinaire politics and philosophies.

All of these are contributing to the destruction of things that have a right to survive. And yet they claim to be a part of the dynamic 20th century. Is it not time to be honest with ourselves and recognize that if this generation stakes its claim to immortality on our deeds and our existing attitudes, then history will record us as the architects of the destruction of a great heritage?

In simple truth, what this generation is seeking is comfort and popularity. What it seeks to avoid is sacrifice. But where is the contribution to mankind? Is it to be found in the fear and weakness of a nation that once proudly stood for the right and defended it without hesitancy? Is it to be found in the tax burden being piled on generations yet unborn, to finance our comforts and pleasures of the moment? Is it to be found in the whittling of the freedom of men under the guise of progress?

We are a nation of crowd pleasers. Pontius Pilate was such. He pleased his crowd—and let them slay their best friend. He held the governorship, but his immortality is that he failed to do what he knew was right.

How much longer will we as individuals, as a society, as a nation, continue to fail to do what we know is right? How much longer will we bribe the people into believing that personal responsibility and hard work have somehow been eliminated as prerequisites to success—or even survival?

Mankind's struggle upward has been a constant grasp for the technological, the scientific—and the moral. Technology and science are factual—and so is morality. Each is what it is; and to twist any one of them out of shape for convenience or expedience is to destroy its truth and its effectiveness.

And so it should be with sadness that we view the three State college boys who have been caught in the dragnet of deceit. Their punishment is already upon them. They deserve it. But how about the society for which they serve as a mirror? Will it throw the first stone, or will it remember Emerson and his great essay on self-reliance, in which he bade every man speak his own thoughts, do his own duty, and do his best to avoid temptations? There is an importan lesson for all of us.

Germany Teaches the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Daily News recently carried an excellent editorial, which I think worthy of the attention of my colleagues in the Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks, it follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, May 17, 1961]

GERMANY TEACHES THE UNITED STATES

U.S. economic advisers increasingly are embarrassed by contrasts between America and West Germany—persistent unemployment here as against a labor shortage there.

Scripps-Howard writer Roger Stuart has dug up a long-secret report which helps explain the embarrassment.

The report was made by a team of U.S. economists and submitted to the West German Government September 24, 1951. On the U.S. team was Prof. Walter Heller, now Chairman of President Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers.

Some of the recommendations:

West Germany was told it couldn't achieve the necessary rate of industrial expansion if it kept on worrying about inflation. The Government was chided for an "excessive concern for price stability."

However, Dr. Ludwig Erhard, West German Finance Minister, knew something about inflation. He had seen his parents' life savings lost when the mark went to pot. He rejected this advice.

Dr. Erhard also was told by the U.S. advisers that "a rate of interest high enough to stimulate any large volume of personal savings would seriously curtail investment." But German interest rates were left to find their own high level and so were savings and investment. Today West Germany is investing up to a quarter of its national output annually in the most modern industrial plant in the world.

Dr. Erhard was cautioned against liberal depreciation policies and advised instead to adopt a "compulsory investment program." But liberal depreciation policies helped the German economy grow last year at the rate of 10.8 percent. The U.S. rate was less than 3 percent.

Just 15 years ago West Germany was a defeated and demoralized nation, its resources squandered by Hitler, its factories and homes flattened by bombs. Since then it has taken in more than 12 million refugees. It has imported nearly half a million more and still has a labor shortage.

Average wages have doubled in 10 years and still are climbing. And increases mostly are in true values because of effective measures against inflation.

West Germany last year lost fewer than 40,000 man-days through strikes. We lost twice that many on missile bases alone. German wage raises have come out of increased productivity—eight percent last year. German prices have been kept competitive in world markets, thus rapidly expanding foreign commerce.

The Germans, in short, have followed the historic principles of free enterprise—despite the advice they got from the United States. Even the West German Socialist Party has repudiated socialism.

The general theories of the 1951 report, rejected by the Germans, are the general theories now being urged on America by Professor Heller and other administration economists: big spending and even budget-busting tax cuts, which breed inflation; artificial restraints on interest rates, which discourage saving and encourage Americans to export jobs by investing abroad; gimmicks in the form of tax "incentives," instead of adequate depreciation allowances

Somewhere in all this may be found a clue to our "creeping rate of growth," so roundly deplored in the campaign. Now Professor Heller wants us to follow some more of our own bad advice.

Address by Mrs. Wallace I. Kargman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD R. FINNEGAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I commend to my colleagues a speech in honor of Marian Anderson, recently given by Mrs. Wallace I. Kargman, one of my constituents, and a close personal friend. This address by Mrs. Kargman was a Chicago tribute to Marian Anderson sponsored by the Chicago Women's Division, American Friends of the Hebrew University.

Miss Anderson was selected as Woman of the Year by the National Women's Division of the American Friends of the Hebrew University in recognition of her cultural and humanistic achievements:

ADDRESS GIVEN BY MRS. WALLACE I. KARGMAN AT CHICAGO TRIBUTE TO MARIAN ANDERSON SPONSORED BY THE CHICAGO WOMEN'S DIVISION, AMERICAN FRIENDS OF THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY—FEBRUARY 20, 1961, SHERATON BLACKSTONE HOTEL

Miss Anderson, reverend clergy, Mayor Daley, Madam President, distinguished dais guests, friends of Marian Anderson, and the Hebrew University, I am very happy to welcome you here this morning. We are assembled here to pay tribute to a great and gracious lady, whose life has been dedicated to the highest principles of mankind. Miss Anderson was selected by the National Women's Division of the American Friends of the Hebrew University as Woman of the Year because her deeds are symbolic of the cultural ideals espoused by the Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

Our honored guest is no stranger to Chicago. For many years she has enriched our cultural life. We honor her today for the great beauty of soul and spirit which has, through the years, made her a tireless ambassador of America, creating new bonds of friendship and understanding for our country among the peoples and rulers of the world. She is a woman whose extraordinary accomplishments, nobility of spirit and dignity of person, symbolize the rising attainment of human aspirations in a fast changing world society. Our guest of honor is a great American, a citizen of the world, whose magnificent voice has become a medium of communication, her achievements a symbol of peaceful progress among all the people of the world. We meet also in the presence of the distinguished representatives of other nations which have honored Miss Anderson.

We, the Chicago Division of the American Friends of the Hebrew University, reflect in the honors that are yours, Miss Anderson, for it is written in "bringing honor to oneself, one brings honor to all mankind." We, the Women's Division, and its acquired arm, the Mary Zimmerman Scholarship Club, though young in years, is fast emerging as a vital force in a community replete with many areas of endeavor. It is very stirring to be part of so vital a group, that is dedicated to the building of a great house of learning on the sacred soil of Israel—a bridge that knows no barriers—that can surmount the greatest obstacles, for individuals who are trained to think—act independently and understand the words of Torah can only contribute the achievements of the good life and serve on the highest level. Education knows no past—no present—no future—it bridges all times and forever. What greater joy can one have than to advance human dignity and learning. The Women's Division recognizing that the nerve center of a university is its library, has undertaken to build the central library of the Hebrew University. We know that the library will play a vital and unique role in the university's continuing educational program. It serves as the central library of the university, the library of the Jewish people all over the world, and the National Library of the State of Israel. It has become a center for students and faculty unparallelled in the Middle East. As the university takes on an increasingly important role in providing the technical experts and instructors needed by the newly emerging states in Africa and Asia, the library must assume new responsibilities. Students from many lands receive training at the university.

In a message addressed to Senator Herbert H. Lehman, chairman of the National Council of the American Friends, President Kennedy praised the American Friends of the Hebrew University—and I quote: "All members of American Friends of the Hebrew University have cause for satisfaction, for these are true monuments toward peace and understanding—I commend your efforts in support of the growth of this institution as a constructive force in the Middle East and for the educational assistance to the new nations of Africa and Asia."

One of the new study halls now in process of completion will be the United Nations documents reading room—an undertaking which we take particular pride in providing. It is most appropriate that the Women's Division has elected to honor Miss Anderson—now—and for future generations by dedicating the United Nations reading room in her name.

I know that Miss Anderson will take away with her today a deeper awareness of what she has given to us, and that she shares with us the pleasure in seeing so many people who have joined together to express their regard and affection for her and in the name of a great center of learning.

America's Inferiority Complex

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, in a "Greater Interest in Government" essay contest for initiates of Tau Beta Pi Association, national engineering honor society, the paper written by Clemson College senior Thomas C. Welch III, member of Alpha Chapter at Clemson, was judged the best among entries submitted from 81 chapters throughout the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I highly commend Mr. Welch's essay to the Congress and to the entire country:

AMERICA'S INFERIORITY COMPLEX

(By Thomas C. Welch III)

The United States has progressed a long way in many ways since we gained our independence from England. We have become the symbol of wealth, well-being, and good times. We have, and still do, lead the world in many fields, such as medicine and high living standards. True, we have lagged behind in other areas—for instance, rocket production.

However, in my opinion, our most tragic shortcoming may be classified as our failure to nurture and develop the spirit of self-respect, self-confidence, and fundamental belief in God that really made the United States what it is.

This country has developed an inferiority complex of alarming proportions. We have become obsessed with the fear that other nations around us will be able to find fault with the conditions that exist here. We let other nations, Russia in particular, back us into a corner every time the question of the Negroes' rights is raised, even though the whole world knows that the atrocities Russia committed in Hungary vastly overshadow any injustices Negroes have been subjected to in the United States. We quake at criticisms that our grandfathers would have refused to consider.

The visit of Nikita Khrushchev to this country some 2 years ago exposed many pitiful conditions. Our people and our beliefs were insulted time and again by the so-called statesman from the Kremlin, yet Henry Cabot Lodge was admonished by the State Department when he attempted to speak out in his country's behalf. It was too risky to offend the honored Mr. Khrushchev—he might revert to his small-boy tactics and threaten to go home if the game didn't go like he wanted it to. Eventually Khrushchev did just this; in threatening to end his "good will" tour he affected his audience so badly that reporters have described the fear that existed in the hall as a tangible and present thing. And even more pathetic was the relief evident in the audience when Khrushchev relaxed his belligerent attitude. The fawning behavior that characterized our leaders when they were confronted with this situation is a vivid example of our loss of self-respect.

Another prime example of our loss of self-respect is the foreign aid program we operate. Each year fantastic amounts are given to countries in an attempt to create a buffer zone between the United States and Russia. Actually, the majority of these countries are available to the highest bidder—we are buying their friendship. It is very hard to imagine our forefathers, who issued such statements as "millions for defense but not 1 cent for tribute," subscribing to such action.

Taken as a whole, the United States is in the best military condition in its history; it should be, in view of the billions of dollars spent annually for defense purposes. And yet we live in fear that the Russians may be developing weapons more powerful than our own. We cannot be content to do our best and leave the rest to Providence. We believe every rumor that comes along concerning Russia's potency and our impotency. Self-confidence is a thing of the past.

America is supposedly a God-fearing nation; we have churches of all denominations where our citizens may worship as they please. But just how deeply do we believe? How often do we admit that it is "God that has made us and not we ourselves"?

The religious fervor of a nation, as well as its other qualities, should be reflected by its leaders. We certainly gave Khrushchev a fine insight into the shallowness of our faith during his tour; not once, at any meal that he attended, was the food blessed. We were ashamed to be seen giving thanks.

At one time Khrushchev said that our grandchildren would be under Communist rule. Now he says it will be our great-grandchildren. Progress is being made—one generation has been saved. What is going to be done to save the next generation?

This is a question I cannot begin to answer. I doubt that anyone else can either, for in the end the answer will not come from a politician, a statesman, or a citizen; it must come from beyond.

How About Cuba?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARLETON J. KING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thought my colleagues would be interested in the following letter which I received from one of my constituents, Mr. Edward Freeman, Porter Corners, Saratoga County, N.Y.:

MAY 16, 1961.

Hon. CARLETON J. KING,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE KING: Daily reports give the impression Laos is more deserving of solution than Cuba, 90 miles away. As a recent Member of Congress I trust you will be more susceptable to a reexamination of some puzzling aspects of a neglected policy toward communism.

Doesn't it occur to anyone in Washington that our policy and leadership toward the Communist internal anarchy around the globe is, either by intent or weakness, a failure? That the recent failure of the Cuban patriots follows a chain of events indicated in the enclosed article, and is a second Hungary?

How can anyone justify sending our soldiers to Laos, and not Cuba? The encouragement given the return of the Cuban patriots, and then deliberately letting them down, is the same consistent lack of integrity that has characterized our policy since 1933.

Dean Rusk, Chester Bowles, and Adlai Stevenson are cited by a writer in the May 1 New York Herald-Tribune as having argued the President out of adequate military air support of the Cuban patriots. This is the same advice that defeated Chiang Kai-shek, and prevented our success in North Korea. And the only way to rectify such misguidance is to fire these men who should not have been selected in the first place.

One conclusion is obvious—we just haven't got the men in office with sufficient integrity and policy to measure up to the Communist international subversion. Add up the inhuman practices, deceit, civilized demoralization practiced by the Communists since the Soviets seized power—only a morally deficient and patriotically negligent man can support collaboration with them. The continued diplomatic relations with this organized debauchery, and their degenerate leaders, is beyond normal comprehension. Our continued relations is a first principle indictment, and one might say is designed to support Quislings.

A complete assessment of the Cuban situation, and failure to deal with the facts is made in a recent book by Nathaniel Weyl, "Red Star Over Cuba." And our policy failure is analyzed by Dr. Strausz-Hupe, director of the Foreign Policy Research Institute, University of Pennsylvania, with other associates in their book, "The Protracted Conflict."

Yours truly,

EDWARD FREEMAN.

Castro's Justifications

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, several constituents have communicated with me urging that the United States not intervene in the internal affairs of Cuba. From the tenor of their notes, one would infer that the United States has instigated action against Castro and that Castro is blameless. Many of these notes have been inspired by an advertisement carried in the New York Times of May 10 and signed by a number of American citizens.

Arthur Krock, well-informed writer of the New York Times, analyzes the pro-Castro advertisement and demolishes the arguments of those who claim that the United States has been aggressive against Cuba. I believe that the factual report and analysis by Arthur Krock clarifies some of the confusion in the minds of some of my constituents and others who have been misled by advertisements which do not set forth events in their chronological order and consequently distort the meaning of historical events.

Mr. Krock's article follows:

[From the New York Times, May 18, 1961]

THE LIVELY ISSUE OF CASTRO'S JUSTIFICATIONS

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, May 17.—Two conclusions reached by this department after an examination of the origins of the currently hostile United States-Castro relations, and published here under date of May 10, have evoked an unusual number of remarkably uniform dissents from readers. These conclusions were:

1. The factual weakness of an advertisement in this newspaper, signed by a number of Harvard professors among other distinguished citizens, which justified Castro's anti-Americanism on the ground that for at least a year U.S. policy has been "We must crush Castro," is that it began the chapter of United States-Castro relations in the middle.

2. Castro's unfriendly and illegal acts, and his anti-American incitements of the Cuban population, long preceded the date chosen in this advertisement to demonstrate that the burden of blame is on his Government.

In rebuttal of these conclusions the letter-writers generally contended that the United States refused a request from Castro to be invited for talks; rebuffed and snubbed him when he came here in February, 1959, to speak to the American Society of Newspaper Editors; and refused his offer at that time and thereafter to negotiate the differences between his regime and the Government of the United States. But the open record is the following:

1. Castro never requested an official invitation. When, on his own volition, he came unofficially to Washington, in April

1959, Secretary of State Herter gave him a luncheon at which no mention of any desired negotiation was made by the Cuban officials present; and, in the absence of President Eisenhower, the Premier was received by Vice President Nixon.

2. On February 22, 1960, Castro did propose—but for the first time—to negotiate with the United States on compensation to American citizens for their property in Cuba that he expropriated soon after his accession to power. However, his conditions were that during the negotiation the United States should bind both the Executive and Congress to refrain from any action which Cuba would consider to affect its interests, while he remained free to negotiate or procrastinate as he chose—conditions obviously unacceptable and, so far as Congress was concerned, constitutionally impossible.

3. From the time Castro assumed power until May 17, 1960, the United States made 9 formal and 16 informal offers to negotiate all differences with Cuba. The first was by Ambassador Bonsal in March 1959. In each note and statement the United States expressed sympathy with the social and economic objectives of the Cuban agrarian reform law under which the expropriation was made.

HERTER'S INDICTMENT

4. At the San José, Costa Rica, conference, August 1960, Cuban Foreign Minister Roa charged that this Goverment had consistently refused Castro's offers of negotiation. Secretary Herter made and documented this reply: That continuing attacks on the United States by the Castro regime began in January 1959, before the acts it alleges were U.S. aggression. He said also that from this date forward political assaults on the U.S. Government, "and scurrilous attempts to besmirch the characters of its leaders, have nevertheless been consistent and made with increased savagery."

The circumstance that the charges in Castro's justification that this open record refutes are being made by citizens of such quality is strange, disturbing and mysterious. But it is true, as pointed out in some of the letters, that Castro also can cite grievances prior to the preinvasion programing. For example, the United States did not completely bar arms to Dictator Batista until March 14, 1958; sent a Marine guard for the Guantanamo pumping station 6 miles into Cuba on July 28, 1958; and concluded a 20-year atomic energy aid agreement with Batista September 9, 1958.

The silly paradox, however, is that all this time U.S. businessmen in Cuba were knowingly financing Castro's revolution by paying their taxes at stations where he could seize them. Prior to that, the taxes on Cuban properties owned by Americans were always sent to Havana, the central collection office, until the other arrangement was deliberately made for the financing of Castro. And meanwhile the State Department was totally ignoring successive warnings from two Ambassadors that the interest of international communism would be served in Cuba by Castro's success.

President's Statement on Freedom of Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, for 6 years the Special Government Information Subcommittee has studied the restrictions on the availability of Government information. Many of its reports and findings, after review and adoption by the Committee on Government Operations, have been filed with this House. The subcommittee has attempted to bring to the attention of the Members the critical nature of the problem of suppression of information.

In a recent address before the National Association of Broadcasters, the President made a most eloquent expression of the importance of freedom of information in our democracy. It was a dramatic indication of his personal concern that the people in our democracy should know the facts, and should be well-informed as they face the dangerous decisions that lie ahead. Discussing the strength of freedom, the President declared:

The great inner resource of freedom, the resource which has kept the world's oldest democracy continuously young and vital, the resource which has always brought us our greatest exploits in time of our greatest need, is the very fact of the open society.

Thus if we are once again to preserve our civilization, it will be because of our freedom, and not in spite of it. That is why I am here with you today. For the flow of ideas, the capacity to make informed choices, the ability to criticize, all the assumptions upon which political democracy rests, depend largely upon communication. And you are the guardians of the most powerful and effective means of communication ever designed.

For the history of this Nation is a tribute to the ability of an informed citizenry to make the right choices in response to danger, and if you play your part, if the immense powers of broadcasting are used to illuminate the new and subtle problems which our Nation faces—if your strength is used to reinforce the great strengths which freedom brings, then I am confident that our people and our Nation, and all other people and all other nations will again rise to the great challenge of the sixties.

The President spoke in the context of the successful Mercury astronaut flight. He noted, however, that the flight could have failed:

Because this is a free society, and because we therefore take our chances out in the open, of success or failure, all those who were part of the program, who were involved in the decisions which made the program possible, were also in hazard. And while their task did not in any manner approach that of the commander, nevertheless, it is a very real one, and it is the kind of risk which members of a free society must take.

There had been before the flight, as you know, a good many members of the community who felt that we should not take that chance. But I see no way out of it. I don't see how it is possible for us to keep these matters private, unless we decide on the highest national level that all matters which are risky, which carry with them the hazard of defeat, which could be detrimental to our society, that none of them will be printed in the paper or carried on radio or television.

The essence of free communication must be that our failures as well as our successes will be broadcast around the world. And therefore we take double pride in our successes.

I feel as a believer in freedom, as well as President of the United States, that we want a world in which the good and the bad, successes or failures, the aspirations of people, their desires, their disagreements, their dissent, their agreements, whether they serve the interest of the State or not, should be made public, should be part of the general understanding of all people.

The President spoke at a time when the city of Washington was welcoming the Mercury astronaut. The President spoke without a prepared text, and in order that Members may inform themselves of this important statement of principle, under unanimous consent I include the transcript of the President's remarks on May 8, 1961, to the convention of the National Association of Broadcasters in the Appendix of the RECORD:

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT TO THE OPENING SESSION OF THE 39TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Governor Collins, Bishop Hannah, ladies and gentlemen, we have with us today the Nation's No. 1 television performer, who I think on last Friday morning secured the largest rating of any morning show in recent history. [Laughter.]

I must say, I think all of us as citizens of the free world are extremely proud not only of Commander Shepard, but also of Mrs. Shepard—and perhaps with the Vice President they would come forward. [Loud and prolonged applause.]

Commander SHEPARD. How do you get them to stop? We only have time for a few words here, because I understand we have a rather busy day ahead of us. I just want to say, thank you very much for such a warm welcome. [Applause.]

The PRESIDENT. I must say I think the presence of Commander Shepard and also Mrs. Shepard who I think is—I must say, when I saw her on television, I had great satisfaction as a fellow citizen. I must say we are delighted to have them all. It is a great source of satisfaction and pride to us.

I said this morning, when I read off the names of some of the other people who have been involved in this flight—Mr. Webb, who is head of NASA, and Dr. Dryden and all the rest—I said that they were names which were rather unknown. If this flight had not been successful, however, they would have been among the best known names in the United States. So that even I, who had nothing to do with the flight, would have become very much identified with it.

So that I do express my commendation to Commander Shepard and also his fellow astronauts who all involved themselves in the hazards and the discipline of the work, but also those who were involved with the program. Because this is a free society, and because we therefore take our chances out in the open, of success or failure, all those who were part of the program, who were involved in the decisions which made the program possible, who were involved in the very public decision which made the very public flight possible on Friday morning, were also in hazard. And while their task did not in any manner approach that of the commander, nevertheless it is a very real one, and it is the kind of risk which members of a free society must take.

There had been before the flight, as you know, a good many members of the community who felt that we should not take that chance. But I see no way out of it. I don't see how it is possible for us to keep these matters private, unless we decide on the highest national level that all matters which are risky, which carry with them the hazard of defeat, which could be detrimental to our society, that none of them will be printed in the paper or carried on radio or television.

The essence of free communication must be that our failures as well as our successes will be broadcast around the world. And therefore we take double pride in our successes.

I am delighted that there are members here of your profession who are not citizens of this country but who come from our hemisphere. I hope that they understand that we share a fraternal feeling with them, that we are engaged in a common effort to maintain freedom here in this hemisphere, and to assist freedom throughout the world.

And it has been our fortune to be placed in positions of responsibility—all of us—at a time when freedom is under its greatest attack.

I know that to those who live in some parts of this country and some parts of the world, that the discipline of the totalitarian system has some attraction. I called attention at my press conference more than a week ago to a comment made by a student in Paris, an African student, after the extraordinary flight of Major Gagarin, in which the student said, "The Russians don't talk about things, they do them, and then we hear about them."

It is difficult for me to believe that any young man or woman, or any citizen who understands the real meaning of freedom, who recognizes that freedom is at issue around the globe, could possibly hold that view.

I feel, as a believer in freedom, as well as President of the United States, that we want a world in which the good and the bad, successes or failures, the aspirations of people, their desires, their disagreements, their dissent, their agreements, whether they serve the interest of the state or not, should be made public, should be part of the general understanding of all people.

And that is why I was particularly anxious to come here today. There is no means of communication as significant as that in which you are involved: to hear, and to see, and to listen.

And you have the opportunity to play a significant role in the defense of freedom all around the globe.

Our adversaries in this struggle against freedom—and they are not national adversaries, we have no national disagreements, what is involved is the great struggle for freedom, and our adversaries in that struggle possess many advantages. Their forces press down upon us, on the borders of the Middle East, southeast Asia, and Western Europe. They use the secrecy of the totalitarian state and the discipline to mask the effective use of guerilla forces secretly undermining independent states, and to hide a wide international network of agents and activities which threaten the fabric of democratic government everywhere in the world. And their single-minded effort to destroy freedom is strengthened by the discipline, the secrecy, and the swiftness with which an efficient despotism can move. In addition, the ability of a totalitarian state to mobilize all of its resources for the service of the state, whatever the human cost, has great attraction for those who live on the marginal edge of existence, fired with a strong feeling of ancient wrongs and grievances, a feeling which is tirelessly exploited by our adversaries—the people who live on an income of $60 or $70 or $80 a year—the example of the Soviet Union which in the short space of 40 years has transformed itself from being among the most backward countries of Europe to being a leader in space, has powerful attraction.

Once a state succumbs, however, to this attraction, to the lure of communism, to the lure of totalitarianism—even for a moment—resistance is then crushed, opposition is destroyed, and despotic power is maintained even when finally the people may realize they have been cruelly misled—and the steady stream of refugees out of Vietnam in the north, out of Eastern Germany, out of Cuba, all indicate the real nature of their society once it has assumed control.

On this path thus far there has been no turning back. There can be no doubt, therefore, that this determined and powerful system will subject us to many tests of nerve and will in the coming years—in Berlin, in Asia, in the Middle East, in this hemisphere. We will face challenge after challenge, as the Communists armed with all the resources and advantages of the police state attempt to seize the balance of power in their direction.

But despite this, I do not believe that the tide of history is on the side of despotism. I do not believe that the tide of history necessarily is on either side. It is only what we decide ourselves we will do—which direction we will turn the tide of history—that we can be successful.

For we bring to the battle our own resources, the better advantages of a free society—advantages which our adversaries cannot match, advantages which if vigorously used offer hope for the ultimate triumph of freedom.

On our side is the simple and all-important fact that men want to be free, and nations want to be their own masters. It is this fact that helps to explain why no nation in the past decade—with the possible exception of Cuba, where a social revolution was betrayed, and where the story is not yet finally ended—has fallen under Communist rule without being subdued by armed force.

It is this fact that explains the courageous revolution against hopeless odds in Poland, and East Germany, and Hungary and Tibet—revolutions that would have succeeded if alien armies had not been present to put them down.

It is this fact that explains why the poverty-stricken nations of this hemisphere and Africa, filled with discontent in some cases, and social tensions, bearing the memory of past wrongs, have still not succumbed to the lure of communism.

And it is this fact that is man's best hope. For our Nation is on the side of man's desire to be free, and the desire of nations to be independent. And thus we are allied, if we are true to ourselves and true to our destiny, with the strongest force in the world today.

The great inner resource of freedom, the resource which has kept the world's oldest democracy continuously young and vital, the resource which has always brought us our greatest exploits in time of our greatest need, is the very fact of the open society.

Thus, if we are once again to preserve our civilization, it will be because of our freedom, and not in spite of it. That is why I am here with you today. For the flow of ideas, the capacity to make informed choices, the ability to criticise, all the assumptions upon which political democracy rests, depend largely upon communication. And you are the guardians of the most powerful and effective means of communication ever designed.

In the rest of the world this power can be used to describe the true nature of the struggle, and to give a true and responsible picture of a free society. And in addition, broadcasting has new and untried possibilities for education, for help to end illiteracy, which holds back so much of the world and which denies access to the information so vital to a free and informed choice. The full development of broadcasting as an instrument of education is one of the most significant challenges which confronts your industry. And here in our own country this power can be used, as it is being used, to tell our people of the perils and the challenges and the opportunities that we face—of the effort and the painful choices which the coming years will demand. For the history of this nation is a tribute to the ability of an informed citizenry to make the right choices in response to danger, and if you ploy your part, if the immense powers of broadcasting are used to illuminate the new and subtle problems which our Nation faces—if your strength is used to reinforce the great strengths which freedom brings, then I am confident that our people and our Nation, and all other people and all other nations will again rise to the great challenge of the sixties.

No man can hope to prophesy with precision the outcome of the great struggle in which our generation is now engaged. Yet we do know that the cause of human freedom has been threatened on many occasions since the system of free choice and democracy was developed in sunlit Greece more than 2,400 years ago. And yet from each threat and indeed from each defeat, as well as from each success, it has ultimately emerged unconquered.

That is why in the face of an ominous future we can share that faith which Winston Churchill expressed more than a half-century ago, "Humanity will not be cast down."

We are going along, along the same high road, and already behind the distant mountains the sun can be seen—and will be seen again.

That is your opportunity—and that is a responsibility which all of us who are citizens of the free world must once again meet.

An Analysis of the President's Tax Program by Prof. Robert Lekachman, of Barnard College

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished economist and professor, Robert Lekachman, of Barnard College, has analyzed the tax policy of the administration in the May 8 issue of the New Leader magazine. I believe that my colleagues would like to have the benefit of his observations, so I offer the article for inclusion in the Appendix:

KENNEDY'S TAX PROGRAM

(By Robert Lekachman)

President Kennedy's tax message to Congress makes it clear that the administration's policy is to pretend that the recession has either ended or is rapidly expiring. The slackening rate of the economy's contraction and improvements in economic indicators such as industrial production and automobile sales have apparently sufficed to persuade him that a really determined attack upon unemployment—still at nearly 7 percent of the work force—is unnecessary at this time.

There is an almost eerie parallel with President Eisenhower's responses to the 1958 recession: the same limited reshuffling of Government programs so as to increase current outlays, the same prolonged meditation on the merits of reducing personal income taxes to stimulate consumer spending, the same repeated taking of the economic auguries, the same promises of detailed review some months hence, and now the same conclusion that the economy is improving of its own accord without need for battle with Congress over substantial spending programs or general tax reductions. The brave words of the campaign, the exciting visions of the task force reports and the fabled influence of

John Kenneth Galbraith have apparently yielded to a yearning for changes which do not of themselves unbalance the Federal budget, and for programs which pose no greater challenges to Congress than that sluggish body has accustomed itself to meeting comfortably.

The President's tax program is not in itself bad; indeed much of it is aimed at remedying abuses that have long cried out for attention. It is easy to share the President's desire to end tax exemptions on such "business expenses" as hunting lodges and yachts, not to mention seaborne conventions and lunches at the Forum of the Twelve Caesars. Tightening expense allowances would discourage business waste, increase tax receipts and diminish the cynical immorality of an expense account society. The President is on equally firm ground in wanting to spread the tax net over dividends and interest. A flat 20 percent withholding on such earnings promises to add $600 million in new revenues and end some of the tax discrimination that favors those in the upper income brackets. Similarly, the suggested repeal of the 4 percent dividend tax exemption is a step in the right direction. The message also addressed itself to a series of tax advantages which American companies with foreign subsidiaries or branches now enjoy. Their present privilege of paying American corporate income tax on profits earned abroad only when they return these profits to the United States has had the effect of imposing a disadvantage on companies which operate entirely within the United States.

These are all desirable reforms, and they presumably reflect the hard work of Stanley Surrey, the new Treasury Department tax chief, and a number of able economists. If no reference to mineral depletion allowances is to be found, it may be that the President decided that this was not an opportune time to engage Texas in mortal combat.

But the blunt fact must be faced that these measures, desirable as they are in themselves, are irrelevant to an economy which badly requires a stimulus for recovery and reallocation of its resources for sound, balanced growth. Nowhere does this irrelevance appear more sharply than in what is billed as the Kennedy program's key antirecession measure. This is a proposal to promote new investment by offering tax credits. Its central passage recommends "enactment of an investment tax incentive in the form of a tax credit—15 percent of all new plant and equipment expenditures in excess of current depreciation allowances—6 percent of such expenditures below this level but in excess of 50 percent of depreciation allowances; with 10 percent on the first $5,000 of new investment as a minimum credit." The credit is subject to an overall limitation of 30 percent tax reduction in any one year and various safeguards will prevent companies from accumulating investment until they make enough to earn a tax credit.

The benefits will vary widely, but will be very substantial for some companies. Consider, for example, a firm whose current depreciation allowances amount to $10 million. If this company undertakes a $20 million program of new investment, it can compute its tax saving by taking 15 percent of the difference between $10 million (its depreciation allowances) and $20 million (its new investment), or $1.5 million. Assume that the company's profits amount to $10 million. Under present laws, its corporate income taxes would be $5.2 million, 52 percent of its total profits. Under the President's proposal, its taxes would fall to $3.7 million and its effective tax rate from 52 to 37 percent.

When a single interest within the community is offered such tangible benefits, we ought to be certain they are distributed fairly among managers and stockholders. More importantly, we should be sure that a vital national objective is being served and that no better program to accomplish this purpose more equitably is available. The tax credit provision fails these tests. It is not equitable; it does not attack existing misallocations of economic resources, and indeed may add to them; and it is painfully ill-designed to solve the problem of unemployment.

To whom is the proposal unfair? To some businessmen to begin with. Many of these tax credits would be windfalls, the lucky consequences of a decision to invest this year or next year instead of last year. Take the case of a company that modernized its facilities in 1960 and, therefore, has no need to invest for some time to come. Its major rival, perhaps more hesitant to adopt new techniques and more cautious in its estimate of business prospects, postponed its investment program until 1961. The second, less intrepid firm would benefit and the first would be penalized for its enterprise. While it is entirely conjectural how much genuinely additional investment this proposal would foster, it is unfortunately quite evident that a good many businesses would undeservedly benefit from it.

The thread of inequity extends still further and affects the general public. Why should stockholders be uniquely favored? If the President had proposed that a tax credit be offered to each home or car buyer, cries of outrage would echo through the land: Why should automobile buyers or home buyers get tax concessions? What makes them more deserving than those who may have done their duty to the economy by buying a house only the year before? (In view of the actual condition of the automobile and homebuilding industries, a tax credit to customers might have more to recommend it than a subsidy to stockholders.)

Tax policy, it might be answered, always represents a compromise among desirable objectives. Perhaps the price in equity would not be too high to pay, if, as the President argues, the Nation's resources would be more efficiently allocated and investments in modern facilities would be encouraged by the proposed program. But there is little reason to believe that these tax credits can gain these ends. It is hard to avoid skepticism about a concession extended to so many varieties of business.

If the program is really designed to improve our capacity to compete with European rivals, then its benefits should be centered upon the export industries, not on business in general. If its major target is improving the efficiency of conspicuously laggard industries, then benefits should concentrate upon such disorganized areas as the construction business (instead, the President's program specifically excludes construction from its benefits). If the aim is the more ambitious, Galbraithian redirection of investment toward more socially desirable purposes, again tax credits should be confined to a limited number of industries. The program is a peculiarly wasteful method of assisting in the achievement of any major national goal.

In fact, the allocation choice which is implicit in the tax credit notion is highly questionable. The apparent premise is the existence of an investment shortage. But at a time when many major industries are manifestly suffering from excess capacity and oppressively large inventories, it is difficult to see the need for plant extensions. And right now the other outlet for investment, modernization, threatens to add to the unemployment problem. Our real investment shortages aren't in machines and factories, but in education, libraries, scientific research, museums, and the array of activities which combine to improve the quality of human beings. Improvements, in industry as in life generally, derive much more from investment in human than in inanimate capital. Perhaps the President would have been better advised to offer his tax advantages to publishers of good books, makers of scientific instruments, recorders of classical music, and businesses that devote a substantial portion of their outlays to research.

Even so, much might be forgiven if the tax credit proposal at least served to stimulate recovery, end the recession and diminish unemployment to decent proportions. But there is, to begin with, reason to doubt that much investment will take place because of the proposal. The tax credit no doubt would influence a fair number of businessmen who are hesitating on the verge of decision. The vast majority of decisions, however, are made well within the margin of choice; in these cases sales prospects, industry growth and the general business outlook are likely to be much more important than tax incentives.

Nor should it be forgotten that the plan benefits only those who are making profits against which a tax credit can be applied. It may well be that Chrysler badly needs to revamp its facilities in order to compete with its major rivals in the auto industry, but it will gain no stimulus to do so from the tax credit proposals because it has been earning no profits this year. Nor is it an adequate answer to say that profits are a measure of efficiency. This may be true within an industry, but not between industries in a business slump; recession hits some industries much harder than others without regard to relative efficiencies.

As an antirecession measure, tax credits suffer from a second drawback: It takes too long for their effects to be felt. Businesses which increase investment rapidly probably do so in pursuit of well-laid plans and not in response to a new tax advantage. If the tax credit does stimulate new plans or revisions of old ones, then the effect of the investment will be felt only after a time lag of 6, 12, or 18 months. As far as this year's recession is concerned, there is little to be expected even from the most favorable consequences of a tax credit.

Since the President's tax program is apparently the last piece of "anti-recession" legislation that he plans to offer, this is a good time to ask what has happened to the brave hopes of only a few months ago. When Kennedy assumed office in January the country had been in a recession for about 8 months and there were few signs of its early termination. That recession is now nearing its first birthday.

Kennedy had a number of possible ways to combat the slump. He might have used the Eisenhower plan: hope for the best, assume that recovery is around the corner, propose a series of limited actions mostly within the control of the executive branch of the Government, and stall for time. A little more actively, he might have placed his bets on monetary policy, hoping that the tidy, efficacious, and reversible mechanism of central banking pressure on interest rates would stimulate credit. But this choice was partially blocked by balance of payment difficulties. Still more actively, he might have urged a general reduction of personal income taxes, safeguarded by an automatic expiration date; or he might have persuaded the country and the Congress to embark on a substantial program of Federal expenditures, financed out of deficits and designed to promote recovery and encourage desirable public programs. Finally, he might have pursued the route of encouragement to business, on the familiar conservative premise that the benefits would trickle down to the remainder of the population. And, of course, there were many possibilities of combination among these policies.

The Kennedy of the campaign might have been expected to urge substantial public

works programs. These would have served the immediate needs of antirecession policy by increasing payments to individuals and encouraging consumer spending. They also would have helped diminish the scandalous national neglect of our cities and schools.

The Kennedy of the task force reports might have preferred to reduce personal income taxes for several excellent reasons: Public works frequently are slow to accomplish their effects; personal income tax reductions promote free choice by allowing individuals to make their own decisions about the allocation of extra resources; and their spending might have assisted some of the industries which were in the worst trouble, notably autos and appliances. Essentially, cutting taxes is a conservative technique which emphasizes private spending and deemphasizes public spending. Perhaps it was this analysis that persuaded Vice President Nixon and Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell to urge Eisenhower—without success—to reduce taxes during the 1958 recession.

It is dispiriting but accurate to report that Kennedy actually has done far less than the minimum which his supporters could reasonably expect from a politician elected on the 1960 Democratic platform. Administration pressure has had some small impact on long-term interest rates; aside from this trivial success, the President has grasped none of the major opportunities which confronted him. His belated tax program favors business rather than individual spending and has little relation to the recession. No major expenditure program designed to combat the recession has been offered and none is promised The actual Kennedy program is a series of cautious extensions of older measures, such as unemployment compensation (which was also extended during the 1958 recession) and minimum wages, or final enactment of old proposals such as aid to depressed areas.

To treat the passage of an occasional item first proposed by Americans for Democratic Action in 1947 as a substantial progressive advance is to confuse newsprint for nutriment.

These 3 months have taught us the necessity of reexamining some of the clichés of the political scene. The first concerns the general acceptance of popular Keynesian theory. Many economists have complacently assumed that the general public and Congress have come to accept the principles of compensatory finance—the unbalanced budgets and public spending programs of recession, and the counterbalancing surpluses and debt reductions of prosperity. If this professionally flattering belief were ever true, the 8 Eisenhower years have changed things. Possibly out of nostalgia, the Nation and Congress have embraced such easily comprehended objectives as balanced budgets and stable prices. It has been one of Kennedy's conspicuous failures of leadership that he has encouraged these delusions instead of educating the Nation to appreciate the Keynesian formula for proper government policy during nationwide recessions.

The Nation's complacency about unemployment should dispel another illusion: the pleasant conviction that Congress and the general public will never again put up with substantial unemployment. With 1 out of every 14 workers out of a job and many others working part-time, the unemployment problem is a pressing one. Yet neither Congress nor the President seems greatly alarmed and many Americans appear willing to tolerate a great deal of unemployment as long as it doesn't touch them personally.

It may be that the President is a good deal more conservative than either his rhetoric or his advisers intimate. If this be so, then his hesitancy to intervene, the pro-business emphasis of his tax program and the caution of his social welfare proposals truly represent the economic convictions of a leader with little real wish to alter our national manner of conducting our everyday lives, one who shares the conservative's fear of inflation and fiscal unsoundness.

On the other hand, it may be that President Kennedy is a good deal more worried about unemployment than his actions indicate and a good deal more dissatisfied with the state of the economy than this legislative session promises to demonstrate. Perhaps he is hampered by the conservative mood of both Congress and the country and is biding his time to fight again when the odds are more nearly even. This, in fact, is the usual excuse made for the President.

But the excuse is not good enough. Congress is a collection of small potentates who are usually far more responsive to the special interests which clamor for favors and threaten retaliation at the polls if they are refused, than to the distant claims of the national interest. The President's major political function in our peculiar political system is to mobilize the support that he needs among the ordinary citizenry. This, indeed, is the heart of the matter.

It is very hard to discern in the President's balanced responses to press conference questions any trace of genuine urgency about the state of the economy, nor has he seen fit to lay his case before the Nation in a major address. A President who operates only within the bounds of political practicability will never find it feasible to ask very much of Congress. If Kennedy continues to play the private political game of Washington and neglect the weapon of mass enthusiasm, then there is no hope this year and not much more the year after or the year after that one, that Congress will feel itself called upon to rise from its conservative slumbers and face up to the great economic challenges of our time.

The Growing Challenge to the States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Kansas City Star of April 23, 1961.

Because the editorial speaks quite well for itself, it needs no further introduction:

THE GROWING CHALLENGE TO THE STATES

(Over the Nation, it is the season of State legislatures. Their actions receive mention in news reports of preposterous and humorous hijinks. Kansas is a particularly good example. Its legislature has just gone home. Among the hundreds of newly enacted laws is one requiring every schoolhouse to fly the State flag. Since the word "Kansas" must be displayed across the blue field, all schools must purchase new flags. Some must put up flagpoles. It is doubtful that this crop of flags can flower for less than $100,000. In other sessions Kansas has considered bills to require hog-tight fences along every highway, or to require that every motor car carry a contraption that played "Nearer, My God, to Thee" when the speedometer touched 90. These proposals didn't pass.)

It is obvious, however, that State government has a more important function than providing humor. Acting in every field not preempted by the Federal Government, the State enacts laws that touch every citizen. These may affect the individual from cradle to grave, regulate the form of his birth certificate and determine how he shall be buried. The State's reason for existence is to perform services that it can provide more conveniently than any other agency. The main services include education, highways and health, welfare, correctional and regulatory activities to protect the citizen.

Serious problems are facing State governments. Taxes are skyrocketing. School enrollments are soaring. People continue to move from the country to the city. Along with manifest inequalities in the tax system, bureaus are proliferating and there are rapid changes in the social and economic structure.

Can States meet the challenge of mushrooming schools? Can they find a fair system of taxation? Can they solve the problems of the cities fighting traffic tangles, slum areas and river pollution with inadequate revenues? Do they have the resiliency to face change? Will they eventually go broke?

When the State stumbles, Washington steps in, often so gradually that the invasion is not immediately recognized. This happens because elected national representatives vote for bills they believe the electorate will approve. These bills usually provide services that the State failed to give. Once the Federal Government enters a field, it does not get out.

Should such a trend continue to its ultimate end—it might take many years—the States would be relegated to a minor role. They would be dealing with bounties on coyotes and other less ponderous subjects dear to the hearts of lawmakers.

Most State legislatures have similar weaknesses. In many cases the job of senator or representative is an unwanted one. Political organizations must find candidates and they take about anyone they can persuade to run. As a result, particularly in the Middle West, legislatures are largely made up of retired farmers and practicing lawyers. Many otherwise eligible candidates cannot afford to spend the time on the salaries offered.

These two groups give legislatures a built-in conservatism that seldom follows party lines. They are highly resistant to change. There are occasions when this is advantageous in stopping impractical or extravagant projects with a demagogic appeal. But the same attitude blocks progress and invites the intrusion of the Federal Government.

The typical State lawmaker is dedicated to preserving the status quo. Pressure groups through years have obtained tax exemptions and advantages not enjoyed by other citizens. Lobbyists continue to encourage the no-change attitude to protect their favored situations.

Legislatures, as a rule, lag behind the people. Samples of sentiment show that citizens are ready to make major changes long before the notion registers on their representatives. Kansas samplings have shown substantial majority support for reapportioning the senate. Another poll showed that a bare majority of the people, without even an education campaign, would support a short ballot. Legislators would consider neither.

There has been a steady movement from the farm to the city throughout the Nation. As the population moved, the dwindling farm areas have maintained the same representation. No increase was given the cities. As a result, in most States at least one house is dominated by farm members.

Thus in many States hundreds of thousands of citizens are denied representation in the legislature because of its refusal to reapportion. Consider Kansas. Its four most populous counties have 810,000 persons, or 40 percent of the State's population. These four counties have 4 State senators

out of 40. Each senator on a fair apportionment should represent 52,000 persons. The four counties are entitled to 16 senators, not 4. The effect is to deprive 600,000 Kansas citizens of representation in the senate. In contrast, for example, the Mitchell-Jewell County district has 19,000 persons and 1 Senator.

Some of the finest legislators come from farm areas. But one overall effect of rural domination is slanted tax-sharing formulas to favor rural districts. There is a tendency to measure each bill by how much it puts into Podunk County, rather than its fairness to the whole State. A majority of the persons in Midwestern legislatures are completely unaware of city problems. Living in areas of declining population, many of them have no conception of the fantastic growth of the schools in urban centers.

Under all these handicaps it seems almost a miracle when a State enacts progressive legislation to meet a real need. The fact that it often does so is renewed evidence of the strength of the democratic processes. The progressive actions usually can be credited to strong legislative leadership or a strong Governor.

A few of the States' pressing problems may be cited. Heading the list is education, a State responsibility. The swelling tide of students is a well-known fact. If legislatures prove unable to work out a system of State taxes to meet the soaring costs of teachers and buildings each year, the alternative is greatly increased real estate taxes to a confiscatory level. This explains the growing tendency among school board members to believe that the only solution is Federal aid.

Federal funds are playing a growing role in education. They provide student scholarships and loans, research grants and vocational education. They build student housing. In certain military areas Government funds are supporting the schools. The current drive for direct Federal aid for teachers and school buildings is sparked by the failure of the States to meet these needs in time.

Legislators usually are reluctant to equalize tax assessments. It is a way to anger many constituents. The citizens who have been enjoying extremely low taxes at the expense of someone else certainly will protest. The provincial attitude that would let the local communities run their own affairs —which means preserve the inequalities— must eventually give way to strong State control.

Years ago States began to build highway systems because the local communities could not, or did not have the resources. The need was for uniform all-weather highways that crossed county lines. Gradually the National Government became a partner with funds and supervision. More recently, the country has witnessed the rapid construction of an interstate system of national highways for modern, safe traffic.

Without the Federal program, many of the highways would not have been built to this day. Prior to the interstate system, various areas began the construction of turnpikes under private enterprise. This came to a halt as freeways developed.

Both systems developed after State legislatures had failed to move rapidly enough to meet the public needs. It is doubtful that many persons would change either system today. Yet States still have a responsibility for vast mileage in State and county roads.

The question of survivals of the cities poses a real problem for all States. Almost restricted to the real estate tax for streets, police, fire protection, and other service, cities have watched that tax mount. Annexations, a help in some States, have proved exceeedingly difficult under antiquated laws in others. Traffic congestion, requiring expensive trafficways, clearance of blighted areas for urban renewal, and sewage treatment have compounded the problem. Here, again, the Federal Government is stepping in because no other recourse has been found.

Another field demanding State action is mental health and social welfare. Kansas has offered a notable example of what can be done if a State is willing to pay the cost. Under modern treatment methods 80 to 90 percent of the patients who go to mental institutions may now be sent home improved or well in 6 months. Treatment costs more than custodial care. Kansas citizens believe it is worth the cost.

Can the States continue to meet the challenge of providing needed services in time? They have given no great assurance. But with all the legislative imperfections, they will continue to muddle through in many fields for years. They would, however, have a better chance to fill their time-honored role of government close to the people if certain guidelines were followed.

The quality of representation can be improved. If the voters want to keep government closer to home than Washington they should be careful in choosing their legislators. The post of State senator or State representative should be one of honor and prestige, one to be sought and competed for. The pay should be sufficient to attract the best.

According to a phony logic, inspired by lobbyists, low pay guarantees the highest type of representation. But in fact, low pay simply excludes most people other than the well-to-do, the retired, or lawyers acquiring a professional acquaintance.

Legislatures need to reapportion to restore confidence that they do represent the people. A test case, brought by the citizens of Memphis, Tenn., is challenging the failure of the Tennessee Legislature to reapportion. The action alleges that citizens are deprived of their rights under the 14th amendment. It is now before the U.S. Supreme Court. Indiana recently has declared a legislature void. The Kansas Senate is being sued in a State court for violating the State constitution.

States must bring uniformity into tax assessments. They need uniform school systems instead of the familiar patchwork of rich and poor districts. They must be alert to help the distressed cities. Unfair tax exemptions, tax inequalities, and double taxation should be eliminated.

Most Americans aren't too much concerned over the question of whether the services come from Washington or the State capital. But it would be unfortunate should the States abdicate their major roles. There are advantages of direct access to the legislative processes, of government close to the people. Any voter can tell his State representative what he thinks.

But unless the States do a far better job than they have been doing, the drift toward more and more aid from the Federal Government will continue. Ultimately, the States will be relegated to a minor regulatory role. The States need not degenerate into custodians of trivia.

Teach and See the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, from the publication, Cornell College Alumnus, Mount Vernon, Iowa, comes an article which sets forth the formula by which teachers can see the world and be paid by a benevolent Uncle Sam. Here's how:

TEACH AND TRAVEL

"How to travel and get paid"; "Free travel and free housing for teachers"; "See the World and Teach." You, too, can have these opportunities for the price of a 4-cent stamp. This is the greatest opportunity for teachers that has ever come along.

Since World War II, the U.S. Navy, Army and Air Force have established bases around the world in Japan, Okinawa, Philippines, Turkey, Morocco, Spain, Germany, France, England, Newfoundland and countless other countries.

In establishing our military men and materials overseas our U.S. Government believes in making the service man contented on his overseas assignment, whether it be for 12 months, 18 months or 2 years; therefore, families of our fighting men are also transported overseas to be with father in his new home away from home, and, where there are American families, there must be schools, and in order to have schools, there must be American teachers.

STATESIDE TEACHING ENVIRONMENT

The teaching assignment is the same as the position you left; American children in an American school with American teachers; the only difference is that everything has been transplanted to a foreign country. Most overseas teachers feel that the students in this environment are more resourceful and mature than the average stateside student due to their travel, firsthand opportunities in studying a foreign language and living with peoples of another nation.

TRAVEL OPPORTUNITIES

I had been teaching in consolidated schools in Iowa for many years. When the telegram from Washington, D.C. came, it read: "Teaching position open to you Island of Okinawa; wire within next 48 hours if you desire to accept." That was 10 years ago.

Since then, I have crossed the Pacific 7 times, the Atlantic 3 times and traveled through Hawaii, Japan, Thailand, Burma, with a 2-week trip on a Philippine freighter to Zamboanga and the pirate's island of Jolo, a 9-day trip to Indonesia spending 5 days on the fabulous island of Bali, to the Taj Mahal, and a week living in a houseboat with three servants in the beautiful Vale of Kashmir, to Pakistan, Baghdad, Istanbul—to Rome, Paris, and Berlin. This has all been on a teacher's salary of $4,000 a year—and you, too, can do it.

FREE TRANSPORTATION

Don't quibble about the salary; you probably are making considerably more at home, but what are you doing with it—saving a little each month so that some day you can take that one big trip to Europe?

Then why not take a cut in salary, travel to Europe or the Orient at Government expense. From the day you leave your hometown for your new teaching assignment, you are not only traveling free but being paid your food and lodging expenses for each day it takes you to reach your new oversea home (approximately 1 week to Europe and 2 weeks to the Orient).

LIVING ENVIRONMENT

When you reach your new assignment, living quarters are furnished rent free with no light bills nor water bills to worry about. Of course, it isn't that cute apartment you had back home. This will be just a private room in a modern bachelor's billet.

Most teachers hire a maid for $15 to $20 a month who keeps your room and bath spotless, washes and irons daily, makes your bed, polishes your shoes, straightens your dresser drawers, and spoils you in general. Of course you must be prepared for the uncertainties

of catching her using your brush, comb, and lipstick and even sometimes your toothbrush. She might even go through your mail but that's only so that she can "improve my English."

Most oversea bases have established an American community within the country, so that the beauty shop, shoe repair, radio and television repair, laundry and cleaners are on the base along with the commissary for grocery shopping and the post exchange.

The majority of teachers in the Far East find themselves during the Thanksgiving, Christmas, and Easter vacations traveling to Hong Kong, Formosa, Singapore, and Bangkok.

TAKE THE PLUNGE NOW

So now, why don't you take that plunge—leave your relatives and friends for a year (they'll still be there when you return). This is the opportunity of a lifetime—get excited about it. However, if you don't please keep paying your taxes so that I can keep wandering around the world—at Government expense.

The American Cotton Bale Package and Our Foreign Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BASIL L. WHITENER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, 1961, I made a statement to the House of Representatives on my findings during a recent visit to the Far East. At that time I pointed out that the faulty packaging of our American cotton being delivered to textile manufacturers in Japan and Hong Kong was a matter which should be looked into at once.

While in Japan I asked Hon. Edward W. Doherty, Counselor of the American Embassy for Economic Affairs in Tokyo, to give me some specific statistical data bearing upon this question. In a letter dated May 10, 1961, Mr. Doherty has provided this information, together with a copy of Bulletin AMS–386 of the U.S. Department of Agriculture entitled "The American Cotton Bale Package and Our Foreign Markets."

I believe that Mr. Doherty's letter is of sufficient interest to justify my bringing it to the attention of my colleagues and to all others who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Furthermore, I believe that many would find the USDA Bulletin above referred to worthy of their study.

I insert Mr. Doherty's letter as a part of the Appendix of today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

AMERICAN EMBASSY,
Tokyo, May 10, 1961.

Hon. BASIL L. WHITENER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WHITENER: I very much enjoyed meeting with you and Mr. Moore during your recent visit to Tokyo and hope you found your trip to be a worthwhile one.

I have looked into the cotton packaging question which you inquired about and have learned that it is one which has come up frequently before. Japanese cotton mill men often complain that the packaging of American cotton is very poor, worse than the packaging from almost any other country, and their complaints are visually confirmed when bales of American cotton in their warehouses are compared with bales from other sources. Specifically, the mill men complain that the bale heads often become uncovered and contaminated, and in addition there is much loss from sample holes.

During the 1957–58 cotton year, damage claims attributable to surface conditions of cotton bales were paid on 68 percent of all the U.S. cotton shipped to Japan. The average claim per bale was 68 cents. Damage resulted mostly from exposed bale heads and sample holes which were found to be three-fifths greater in American bales than in bales from competing countries.

A majority of the mills have reported that they have to do at least some surface cleaning of American cotton bales. The estimated cost of this cleaning on a worldwide basis, including loss in the value of cotton was 30 cents per bale for bales actually cleaned and 22 cents for all American bales used.

Although Japanese mill men have frequently expressed complaints about the condition of American cotton bales, they still do not want any improvements in packaging that would increase the price of cotton. If improving the bale would increase the price, the Japanese would rather continue receiving the bales as they are now.

A detailed study of this subject on a worldwide basis was made by the Department of Agriculture and the results were published by the Department in report No. AMS–386 dated June 1960, a copy of which is enclosed.

Trusting that the above information will be of assistance to you and with every good wish, I am,

Sincerely,

EDWARD W. DOHERTY,
Counselor of Embassy for Economic Affairs.

The Un-American Activities Committee Has a Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, one of the dedicated Americans of our day is Mr. Maurice Ries, of Los Angeles, Calif. He recently took of his valuable time, when in the East, to make an eyewitness survey of the housekeeping facilities of the Committee on Un-American Activities. His findings were as follows:

THE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE HAS A PROBLEM

(By Maurice Ries)

You have seen the Committee on Un-American Activities of the U.S. House of Representatives, or pictures of it, conducting its hearings, wrestling with its enemies * * * with your enemies, that is. But what goes on behind the scenes? What of the committee at work, of its offices, its equipment, its staff?

Naturally, you understand that the committee is an arm of the U.S. Congress. You know the Congress is a majestic body and that its committee is cloaked with the dignity of the Government of which Congress and committee are parts. You are aware that the committee is the stanchest (and almost the last remaining) rampart in this Nation's languid efforts to hold off the we-will-bury-you onslaught of world communism.

You may even know that the committee's offices are on the second floor of the sprawling, gray-granite Old House Office Building, across the street from the Nation's Capitol. But what about quarters? Under what kind of physical conditions must it operate, as it carries on the invaluable routine that occupies so much more committee time than hearings and other outwardly visible activities?

To put it bluntly, the conditions aren't good. The House Committee on Un-American Activities lives like Cinderella before the invention of glass slippers.

The staff numbers upward of 50 men and women (several of whom have worked for the committee, continuously, for more than 16 years). It is packed into 10 rooms—2 of them, however, not even connected with each other, or with the rest. One is on another floor.

Ten rooms. Only two are of standard size for the building. For the most part, the remaining eight have been created by subdividing.

Half filling the director's office, because of a lack of space elsewhere, is a massive table topped with green felt. Here meet the nine Members of the House of Representatives who comprise the actual committee.

Five of the committee's little squad of investigators have their desks and certain file cabinets and a table or so packed into a room where two desks should be. Several additional investigators are having to do their chores elsewhere, jammed in among other staff members. Incidentally, the House Committee on Un-American Activities gets along with only about eight investigators in all. In the Senate, that McClellan-Jack Kennedy-Bobby Kennedy committee which probed labor's misdeeds employed more than 80 investigators—10 times as many.

The eight investigators, together with file clerks, typists, secretaries, two attorneys, a librarian, researchers, editors, proofreaders, indexers, a switchboard operator, an information officer, publications shippers, a fiscal officer, a staff director, an administrative assistant—these carry on the committee's day-by-day staff operations in Washington.

The room in many ways the most important is, unfortunately, the worst. This is the long, narrow crypt presided over by the committee's librarian, a pleasant lady long a part of the staff. Once upon a time this was simply the end of a main corridor. Someone walled it off, to create a sort of tunnel to nowhere. It is a room of many purposes. Here the librarian and her assistant have their desks, chairs, tables. Here are banks of card file cabinets—and this is the very heart of the committee's operations. In those cabinets are the names and records of several million Americans with subversive affiliations. The committee has been building up these files for 23 years. Today they form a fantastically comprehensive source consulted by all security agencies in the Government. As a result, the files ultimately affect just about every sensitive job in the Nation—in defense plants, in the military, in intelligence work, in Federal employment, and in a dozen additional areas.

By repeated Presidential order, these and other committee files (for example, the scores and scores of file drawers filled with pamphlets, organizational letterheads, clippings, photographs, copies of speeches, magazine articles, and countless other types of source material) must be checked by Federal investigative agencies, including the military, before an investigation can be considered to

be complete. Probably the most important user of this material is the FBI.

As a matter of fact, certain of the agencies keep researchers in this office of the Committee on Un-American Activities on a full-time basis.

But the accommodations which the Committee on Un-American Activities is able to provide for visiting investigators are downright heart rending. At one end of the clutter are various battered old tables, covered with brown wrapping paper, accompanied by a clutch of orphaned chairs. On the tables are gooseneck lights guaranteed to keep Methusaleh's name alive. Unfortunate security men from proud and properly equipped agencies must toil at those tables in semigloom, elbows bumping elbows and chairs bumping chairs.

Add sets of shelves, books, stools, wastebaskets, telephones, photocopy machines—one of them as bulky as an upright piano—and you realize that here is a room bulging at the seams. Then crowd in a number of busy people, and—but why go on?

Que será, será. If the committee cannot obtain more space for its work, it must work in the space it has. The work is the thing. For it is work which vitally affects every American alive, and uncountable numbers yet unborn.

The Committee on Un-American Activities has to perform its large miracles on short rations. A larger appropriation would help.

Take a look at the punctuation mark terminating this sentence. Then look at the entire page. The committee's $331,000 budget for 1961 is about the size of that dot, when compared with the horrifying sums of your money (and mine) that the U.S. Government is pouring into Communist Tito's pocket alone. Think what this committee, against communism and for America, could do with a budget the size of even three little dots instead of one.

Anyone for the House of Representatives giving its Committee on Un-American Activities a modest million a year?

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Preservation of American Freedoms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. CARROLL
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 19, 1961

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I am very happy to bring to the attention of my colleagues three essays written by school children in Pueblo, Colo. They were the winning essays in a recent contest on the subject, "What Can I Do To Preserve and Perpetuate American Freedoms." The essay contest was part of a celebration of Arleigh Burke Day in Pueblo, commemorating the visit made last year by Adm. Arleigh Burke, the Chief of Naval Operations, to Pueblo County School District No. 70 when he dedicated seven new schools. Admiral Burke is a native Coloradan.

These students demonstrated a keen sense of the problems confronting American citizens in today's difficult times. Mell Smithour, a sixth grader, noted aptly that freedom is not all free, and we must work hard for peace. Evelyn Ruth Klock, a ninth grade student, pointed, out an important rule of a free society: "Every right or privilege carries a duty with it." And Marie Albrecht, a high school senior, recognized a very timely problem in remaining free by saying, "Perhaps, the most important thing we can do is to help other people who are trying to gain or keep their freedom."

I ask unanimous consent that the essays by these three students be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT I CAN DO TO HELP PRESERVE AND PERPETUATE THE AMERICAN FREEDOMS

(By Mell Smithour, Pueblo)

Each schoolchild will be a citizen of the world someday. Our way of government as a democracy is meant to be the servant of the people, not the ruler. Some of the boys and girls in our school will be leaders in government in the future. We must study well the settling and history of our country. Each of us has a great chance today to learn to study and then to think for ourselves.

Rights of citizenship are balanced by responsibilities. To keep our freedom we must vote, serve on juries, and serve in the Armed Forces. I must learn to obey the laws of our land while I am young. The Boy Scouts, 4-H groups, and little league baseball teach us teamwork and to get along with each other.

Our country was founded for freedom of religion. America is strong because of her faith. Our church teaches me the way of eternal life and the Golden Rule.

One thing I can do to preserve and perpetuate our freedom is to remember that freedom is not all free. We must work hard for peace and understanding and fight for our way of life. Right now I can study our Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. I can be well informed about world affairs by reading the newspaper.

In my Scout citizenship book Patrick Henry says: "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

HOW I CAN HELP PRESERVE AND PERPETUATE THE AMERICAN FREEDOMS

(By Evelyn Ruth Klock, Rye)

It is my duty to protect and perpetuate the freedoms that have been given so freely to me to use. These are freedoms that float over a free nation where the will of the citizens is the law of the land. Here, the poorest boy may rise to the highest position in the Nation, and here no law will interfere with his religion.

Every right or privilege carries a duty with it. I can say that I have a right to walk along the street without harm. This is true, but have I ever thought that if it is my duty to walk in peace, it is my duty not to interfere with another? If the public library offers me books to read, it is my duty not to tear or deface them. On the other side of every right or privilege is a duty.

Boys and girls do not always understand this fact, which is the foundation of all society. We expect our parents, city, and State to give us everything that we desire and never think that we owe something in return. One who always takes and never gives, does not make a good citizen.

If the Nation protects me, it is my duty to conduct myself properly. Every time I do something wrong, I am being ungrateful to the Nation of which I am a part. If I am to be worthy of this freedom I must be a good citizen and a good citizen is not one who sits still and does nothing. Someone said that people could be divided into those who lift and those who lean. By lifting instead of leaning I can show my love for freedom and all it stands for.

I may say that one person in a hundred and fifty million does not matter. This statement is untrue. The fact that our country is a democracy makes the actions of each individual important. If every boy and girl grew up thinking "I do not matter among so many," what kind of nation would we have?

When I am grown and can have a voice in the Nation's affairs, I hope I will be worthy of being called a good citizen. In the United States there is no higher honor.

WHAT I CAN DO TO HELP PRESERVE AND PERPETUATE OUR AMERICAN FREEDOMS

(By Marie Albrecht, Rye, Colo.)

Everyone has heard and read a great deal about keeping America strong and preserving our freedoms, but they seem to think it is all meant for the other fellow.

Young people think it is meant for older people because they elect our officers and pay the taxes to support the Government. The older people think it is meant for the younger generation because they will soon take over the responsibility for running the Government.

There are many ways I can help preserve our freedoms. One is to use them, but not to abuse them. We can worship in any church and believe in any faith, but let's not persecute those of a different faith. It might not be as good as ours, but they have the right to believe in it. Another way is to take an active interest in our Government. It belongs to the people and it is one of their freedoms to improve it by lawful and peaceful means. Instead of complaining about some Government official and doing nothing more, we can use our freedom of speech and press to campaign for another candidate and then vote for him. Our freedom to vote is one of the most precious possessions we have, and the only way to keep it is to use it wisely.

Learning and understanding the history of the gaining of our freedoms is an important part of it. This helps us to realize the cost of freedom.

Perhaps, the most important thing we can do is to help other people who are trying to gain or keep their freedom. If need be we should even be prepared to go to war. Patrick Henry sums it all up in these words:

"Is life so dear or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? As for me, give me liberty or give me death."

Why Is Government So Costly?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, a short while ago Life Lines carried an editorial dealing with the subject of Government spending. It seems to me it deserves wider readership and, therefore, under leave to extend my remarks, I include it with the hope that it will be widely read:

WHY IS GOVERNMENT SO COSTLY?

During the present fiscal year our Federal Government is spending money at a rate that is equivalent to approximately $2,000 for every family in America.

Government is not productive. It has nowhere to get money except from the people. Since this money is ours, or was ours, until we had to turn it over to the tax collector, we have a right to ask, "Why does Government cost so much?"

Is it because of the heavy expenditures for national defense? That is the impression the spenders of our money like to give us. But it is not true that defense spending is responsible for the growth of the public debt in recent years. In fact, current expenditures for defense amount to $9 per family less than they did in 1954. But nondefense spending is $300 more per family than it was then.

Our Government has become so costly because it has grown so big. We are supposed to have a Federal budget, but the budget actually has expanded to such an extent that it is literally out of the control of the elected Representatives of the people. Every year a budget is put together by thousands of Government employees in hundreds of different agencies.

It is literally true that nearly every Federal agency has a group of employees who

spend all their time drawing up the agency's next annual budget.

Our Federal Government has entered many fields of activity where it has no constitutional right to be and is spending a vast amount of money for purposes never contemplated nor approved by the American people generally. For instance, our Federal Government is not only the largest lender and the largest borrower in the country, but the Federal Government is also the largest insurer. The Government is the largest producer of electric power in the Nation. The Federal Government is the largest landlord and the largest holder of grazing grass. It is the largest holder of timberland and the largest owner of grain. The Federal Government is the largest shipowner and the largest truck operator.

Of course, our Federal Government is the country's biggest employer. To keep all its employees busy, our Government owns several hundred substantial corporations and 19,000 small businesses of all kinds, plus a large number of service organizations. These corporations lose money every year at a rate amounting to $250 for every family in America.

But they do not go out of business simply because they are losing money, as any private company eventually would have to do. They simply chalk up a deficit and keep right on operating with borrowed money which becomes a part of the debt that you owe, and every American owes.

The principle of economy in Government is one of the most important that we could consider. This great Nation of ours was built on the solid virtues of hard work, thrift, and frugality. These virtues are just as important today as they were in the early days of our Nation.

But they are virtues that have largely been abandoned. Our Government has been spending the taxpayers' money recklessly and extravagantly for too long. As a result, we now have the highest debt in our history.

Who is to blame? Shall we point a finger at a President or a Congress, or shall we be honest and put the responsibility where it really belongs, on each one of us, on our own apathy, on our own selfishness in not wanting to take time out from our own pursuit of material things to really be responsible citizens of the greatest system of freedom in the history of man?

The hard truth is that such practices as these, if a halt is not called, eventually will destroy the economy of the United States. And we can be quite sure that once our economy is destroyed, our whole way of life will go right down. The mistaken will have won their greatest victory, and without a shot being fired.

It is for these reasons that the principle of economy in Government should be of the greatest concern to every American citizen. Simple honesty and basic morality call for sound economy in Government; for waste is a sin and extravagance with the people's money is evil.

Uncle Sam was never meant to be Uncle Squanderer. To save our country, we are going to have to get back to bedrock principles and to those sound virtues of thrift and frugality from which we should never have departed.

A Dying Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the need for a reevaluation in our thinking regarding the nations on the periphery of Asia is painfully evident.

As Walter Lippmann has so astutely pointed out in a recent Washington Post article:

The revolutions in South Korea and Iran, following the disorders in Laos and South Vietnam, are a warning that in Asia the policy of containment by American satellite states is breaking down.

Mr. Lippmann goes on to examine some of the major implications of this breakdown for our thinking as a nation, and I urge my colleagues to read his comments thoughtfully:

A DYING POLICY

The revolution in Iran and the revolution in South Korea are warning signs about the situation on the periphery of Asia. They are warnings that it is not only in Laos that there is trouble for the American client states.

In Iran, the revolution is a desperate attempt at the top, with the blessing of the Shah, to reform the regime before it is overthrown from below. The present revolution is not anti-Western, anti-American, or pro-Communist. But it may well be all of these things in the end if the reforms which it has begun do not go deep enough. The hour is late in Iran.

In South Korea, the revolution is the work of the army, and it is not now anti-Western, anti-American, or pro-Communist. But this new military government, although it is not anti-American in theory, is in fact defying and ignoring our Embassy and the American Army commander.

The revolutions in South Korea and Iran, following the disorders in Laos and South Vietnam, are a warning that in Asia the policy of containment by American satellite states is breaking down. In all four of these countries the governments have been our clients; indeed, they have been our creations. All of them are crumbling, and in the last analysis they are all crumbling for the same reason. In relation to the rising popular feeling of independence and the rising popular expectations of material welfare, these American client states are not only corrupt but they are intolerably reactionary. The fact that they are also under the protection of a foreign and non-Asian power is an additional liability.

The Kennedy administration did not form the policy of setting up on the periphery of Asia a semicircle of American military clients. But it is now confronted with the breakdown of that policy, with the disorders, the dangers, and the pains of having to pick up the pieces. This is an experience which the American people have never had before and it is one for which their leaders have not prepared them. They have not been told by anyone in authority that there has been a radical change in the military situation and what the consequences of that change are. They have not been told that the military situation which existed when John Foster Dulles established this policy no longer exists. They have not been told that he made it work by shaking the bomb at the Communists. That is why so many of them suppose that Mr. Kennedy can make it work with a few Marines and by shaking his fist.

Our moral and intellectual unpreparedness for the reality of things is causing widespread demoralization among us. We must not let ourselves be overcome by it. We can do that best, I think, by recognizing that our present experience on the periphery of Asia is the American equivalent of what the British and the French are experiencing during the liquidation of their colonial empires. For what we are witnessing is the dissolution of the Dulles system of Asian protectorates.

There are diehards in France who would like to overthrow General de Gaulle in order, as they think, to keep Algeria French. There are diehards in Britain who are passionately opposed to Mr. Macmillan because he is liquidating the colonial empire. And there are diehards here who are prepared to call Mr. Kennedy an appeaser or worse because he is trying to negotiate his way, rather than to fight his way, out of the Indo-Chinese disorders. But whatever the diehards now call de Gaulle and Macmillan and Kennedy, the future will be theirs.

John S. Mayfield, Distinguished Texan, Son of Former Senator Earle B. Mayfield, Named To Syracuse University Library Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 19, 1961

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Sunday, May 7, 1961, issue of the Tyler Courier-Times-Telegraph which tells of a fine achievement of the distinguished son of a distinguished Texan.

John S. Mayfield, son of former U.S. Senator Earle B. Mayfield, of Texas, who preceded me in the Rusk line of succession, has recently been appointed Curator of Manuscripts and Rare Books for the Syracuse University Library.

Mr. Mayfield, who holds a B.A. degree from the University of Texas, an M.A. from Southern Methodist University, and has studied constitutional law at Columbia University, is an outstanding collector of rare books. He is a man of great ability, outstanding accomplishments and a source of pride to the State of Texas. John Mayfield and I were classmates in government courses at the University of Texas in 1923–24; I wish him success in his new and very responsible position.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the aforementioned article from the Tyler Courier-Times-Telegraph headed:

"J. S. Mayfield Appointed Syracuse Library Curator."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Tyler Courier-Times-Telegraph, Sunday, May 7, 1961]

J. S. MAYFIELD APPOINTED SYRACUSE LIBRARY CURATOR

SYRACUSE, N.Y.—One of the Nation's most renowned private book collectors, John S. Mayfield, of Bethesda, Md., and Tyler, has been appointed Curator of Manuscripts and Rare Books for the Syracuse University Library.

Dr. Wayne S. Yenawine, Director of the Syracuse University Library, announced the appointment Saturday. Dr. Yenawine said that Mayfield will assist the library in acquiring valuable collections and in publishing activities.

Mayfield is the son of former U.S. Senator and Mrs. Earle B. Mayfield, of Tyler. He earned his B.A. degree at the University of Texas and his M.A. at Southern Meth-

odist University. He also studied government and constitutional law at Columbia University.

A former member of the staff of the Columbia Encyclopedia, Mayfield has served as a headmaster for a military academy and junior college, has organized many special exhibits of manuscripts and rare books across the country, has authored numerous literary criticisms, bibliographies, reviews, and essays, and has advised a number of libraries.

For the past 10 years, Mayfield has been on the staff of the Montgomery County (Md.) Department of Public Libraries. Prior to that time, he served in a number of positions with the U.S. Government.

In World War II, Mayfield served in the U.S. Navy in the South Pacific, and after the war he rose to the position of Director of Civilian Personnel in the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

He is vice president of the American Rail & Steel Co., and is a former adviser to the president of the Baldwin Locomotive Works.

Mayfield has gained nationwide distinction for his personal library of 48,000 books and manuscripts, valued at more than a million dollars. His library will be transported to Syracuse, and will be available to scholars and all students.

His collections of works by Swinburne, O. Henry, Sidney Lanier and Lord Byron are considered by scholars to be the most distinguished in the world.

Dr. Cecil Y. Lang, professor of English at Syracuse University and editor of the Swinburne letters being published by the Yale University Press, says that the Swinburne collection is "incomparably the most valuable and most extensive in scope anywhere in the world today."

The library contains first editions, rare editions, limited editions, privately printed works, autographed works, manuscripts, letters and documents, original oil paintings and books with unusual and rare bindings.

Mayfield has been collecting books for 40 years. The volumes range in date from 1200 to the present, with special emphasis on English and American literature of the 19th century.

Highlights of the collection, in addition to the above named authors, are works by George Bernard Shaw, Fred C. Kelly, Robert Browning, Jack London, Walt Whitman, Alexandre Dumas, Vachel Lindsay, Edwin Markham, Arnold Bennett, Alfred Noyes, Stephen Crane, Benjamin Disraeli, F. Scott Fitzgerald, Charles Dickens, Robert Frost and many others.

Mayfield is a trustee of the S.U. Library Associates and a member of the Manuscript Society, Authors Club (Washington, D.C.), Palaver Club (Washington), Army & Navy Club (Washington) and the Military Order of the World Wars.

Depressed Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 19, 1961

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, recently we passed a so-called depressed areas bill. I should like to remind my colleagues that depressed areas are not new. Out in the West numerous ghost towns attest to this fact.

Just recently the Tucson Daily Citizen editorialized on the historic fact that we have had depressed areas in the West. The paper has done it in a very clever and thought-provoking way. For example, the editorial reads:

Consider, for example, such towns in Arizona as Contention, Russellville, Charleston, and Galeyville. These once-thriving communities were centers of employment and recreation for miners and millhands, gamblers, outlaws, and bartenders.

But the mines closed. Nobody thought of moving a lace factory out from Boston and training the miners to work in it. So the miners left. So did the bartenders and barbers. The towns died.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be placed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Tucson Daily Citizen, May 8, 1961]

PLEASE, MR. PRESIDENT, DON'T OVERLOOK ARIZONA

President JOHN F. KENNEDY,
New Frontier, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Now that you have signed the $394 million depressed areas bill, making it the law of the land, we would like to call your attention to some badly depressed areas you may have overlooked.

There are a lot of them. Some of them are so badly depressed they are defunct. Out here on the old frontier, we used to call them ghost towns. We liked that poetic term, but to expedite communication on the New Frontier, we'll call them depressed areas. They certainly qualify.

Consider, for example, such towns in Arizona as Contention, Russellville, Charleston, and Galeyville. These once-thriving communities were centers of employment and recreation for miners and mill hands, gamblers, outlaws, and bartenders.

But the mines closed. Nobody thought of moving a lace factory out from Boston and training the miners to work in it. So the miners left. So did the bartenders and barbers. The towns died.

This tragedy could have been prevented, Mr. President, had your depressed areas act been operating. As we understand it, you have set up a Federal loan and grant program to attract industries to areas which have lost their main source of support and to retrain workers with obsolete skills.

It probably isn't fair to ask you to revive Contention, Charleston, and Galeyville. You have less than $400 million to work with, and that's too little and too late. These defunct areas are a long way from any major market for lace. And, besides, no voters live there anymore.

But we do call your attention to Tombstone. This is no ghost town, but it is one of the most famous depressed areas in all America. Once the biggest and busiest city in Arizona, Tombstone lost its main source of support when its silver mines flooded. Jobs disappeared by the thousands. The 1,200 people presently living in Tombstone deserve a lot of consideration because their area has been depressed ever since 1860. We doubt if any area in West Virginia or Pennsylvania can match that.

There are, Mr. President, some 18,000 communities in this Nation engaged in a highly competitive battle to attract industries. They have been doing this with their own money. As we understand it, the depressed areas program will use Federal money, largely collected in successful areas, to pay for increased competition from unsuccessful areas.

Some diehards out here on the old frontier don't think that's fair. They don't even think it will work. Even in Tombstone, some folks refuse to believe a cold cash subsidy in the offing will freeze economic history in the making.

We think they'll quit carping just as soon as you move a nice, big factory to Tombstone from, say, Chicago. You might get a few complaints from Chicagoans because their city, with its unemployment rate of 6 percent, also qualifies as a depressed area. But Tombstone certainly deserves priority. It has been depressed even since Wyatt Earp hung up his six-guns for the last time.

And then, Mr. President, we suggest that Jerome be next on the priority list. This Arizona copper-mining community was thriving until 1925, when the whole town started skidding slowly down the mountain at three-eighths of an inch per month. The mines have closed, but a couple of hundred people still live there. We don't know what they do for a living, but they have a nice museum.

We would like to put Allentown—formerly a cattle-shipping community—on the list, but are afraid the New Frontiersmen could not find it. The realistic citizens of Allentown, not offered a subsidy, went along with economic history and deserted the place. And the Navajos carted all the buildings away to their reservation.

Respectfully yours,
AN OLD FRONTIERSMAN.

Expansion of Teaching Services to All Handicapped Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation calling for the extension of the grant program for expansion of teaching services for mentally retarded children to include the hard of hearing and the speech impaired, the visually handicapped, the deaf, the emotionally disturbed or socially maladjusted, the crippled, and those children with other health impairments. My proposal will also remove the present statutory limitation of $1 million per year for the program for the mentally retarded children.

The Members of the House will recall that I introduced the bill authorizing the creation of a fellowship program to prepare professional personnel in the education of the mentally retarded. My bill was enacted on September 6, 1958, and it contained two major provisions relating to the training of professional personnel: First, it provided the necessary authorization for the U.S. Commissioner of Education to make grants to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher learning to assist them in providing training of college instructors who would, in turn, train classroom teachers and second, it provided authorization for the Commissioner of Education to make grants to State educational agencies for the support of fellowship programs for training classroom teachers and supervisors in the area of the mentally retarded.

This program has now been in operation for 2 full years and has already demonstrated several important facts.

There was immediate favorable acceptance of this program. It stimulated nationwide interest among educators and laymen alike. Recently, my committee held lengthy hearings regarding the problems of educating exceptional children. There was a great deal of expert testimony given by leaders in both the field of medicine and the field of education. Based upon this information, the committee prepared a report which unmistakably indicated the urgent necessity for both expansion and extension of this program. I might also add that, due to my strong personal interest in the problems in this area, I have spent a great deal of time analyzing and observing the present fellowship program for educational services for the mentally retarded. From my own firsthand information I can report complete acceptance of the purposes and results of this very worthwhile undertaking.

I would like to call the Members' attention to a few pertinent facts which are related to this program. During the present school year, there are 148 fellows enrolled in 32 colleges and universities. Sixty of these fellows are in training to become college instructors, who will in turn train classroom teachers. The other 88 are training to be classroom teachers or supervisors. The statutory limitation of $1 million is the only factor which has prevented larger numbers of students from entering this program.

There are estimated to be some one and a quarter million mentally retarded school-age children in the Nation and only about 312,000 of them are receiving suitable education because of the lack of qualified teachers. An additional 50,000 specially trained teachers are needed to do a satisfactory job of educating these unfortunates. Because of this great need, and also because of the amount of interest being shown, the legislation which I have just introduced proposes the removal of the amount limitation of $1 million and will, therefore, permit appropriations to be more nearly commensurate with the need.

My personal observations and my mail both tell me that not only should our assistance for education of the mentally retarded be greatly expanded, but there are equally compelling reasons to extend the provisions of the existing legislation to include all areas of exceptionality. My legislation will authorize extension of this program to include fellowship grants in the areas of speech and hearing impairment, the completely deaf, the visually handicapped, the emotionally disturbed or socially maladjusted, and the crippled, and other special health problems. The fields of medicine and education are now able to do much to help many of the 4 million children suffering from these handicaps. Without Federal aid in all of these important areas, the application of medical and educational skills to the education of many of these children will be delayed for years because of a lack of a sufficient number of properly trained teachers. The education of these children cannot wait. With each passing year the benefits of a postponed education will certainly become less and less effective. The resulting toll in human suffering and economic loss will far exceed the costs of the program which I am proposing.

The Commissioner of Education has reported that with an average annual expenditure of slightly more than $9,500,000 for the training of professional educators in all areas of exceptionality we can expect to have approximately 3,500 additional well-trained leadership and instructional personnel by the end of 1966–67 academic year. This will still leave us far short of the total need, but it will have provided a large corps of college instructors and will also have permitted time for expansion of university facilities in such quantity and extent that a stepped-up training program will be possible in subsequent years. I know of no other area in education where the shortage of well-qualified classroom teachers is so appalling. There is an immediate need for almost 150,000 additional professionally trained teachers and supervisors to adequately meet the need. I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join me in their support of this legislation.

Rest in Peaceful Coexistence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 19, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, throughout history there has never been a propaganda program to match the Communist machine—a phenomenon in trickery and deceit.

By comparison U.S. professionals of the so-called Madison Avenue type appear to be amateurs.

On a global scale the Reds have turned truth into falsehood, fact into fiction, right into wrong. They commit crimes and yet successfully accuse Western nations of the same crimes. They commit aggresssion and tag the Western nations as aggressors. The greatest imperialists of modern times they successfully brand the Western nations as imperialists.

To the world the Red leaders pose as missionaries of peace. With one hand, they hold aloft the dove of peace; meanwhile with the other blood-dripping hand, they inhumanely wield the sword of slaughter. And, this time, the right hand knows what the left hand is doing and vice versa.

Despite the fact that the United States has been the prime target of this propaganda, we have not yet determined how successfully to cope with it.

We were initially stunned—and have not yet recovered—by the brazenness with which they distort the truth and make it stick.

Now the world vocabulary contains a glossary of words with double meaning—meaning one thing to the West and quite another to the Communists.

Until we better understand the tactics and strategy of the Reds—and how to cope with it—we will in all probability continue to lose the psychological war.

Yesterday, the Washington Daily News published an article concerning the double meanings of Red propaganda.

Reflecting some light on their tricky tactics, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REST IN PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

(By Robert Molyneux)

What does Nikita Khrushchev, the friendly undertaker ("we will bury you") really mean by peaceful coexistence?

This is what he means. And it's official: Peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems does not mean reconciliation between the socialist and bourgeois ideologies. On the contrary, it implies an intensification of the struggle of the working class and of all Communist parties for the triumph of socialist ideas.

Relax, in short, while the Reds continue the fight.

There it is, straight from the manifesto issued after the Moscow conference of world Communist leaders last December.

HOT DOCUMENT

Because it established current guidelines for Communist global troublemaking, it perhaps is the hottest document of its type since Khrushchev's supposedly secret speech denouncing Stalin.

It is heavy going, but it is perhaps the best example of newspeak and doublethink since George Orwell's book, "1984" (full of such big brother mottoes as "freedom is slavery"). The lingo is pure newspeak, and only when you get the hang of it does the manifesto make sense.

Since it is shaping up into something of a bestseller an abbreviated glossary is in order.

Belligerent: Anyone who defends his homeland and his way of life against communism.

Creative Marxism-Leninism: Any act calculated to bring about the downfall of any or all of the free world.

Criminal plot: Any act of the free world calculated to stymie communism.

Culture: whatever the Reds say it is; subject to change.

Democracy: totalitarianism.

Equality: commies are more equal than others.

Exploit: anything the United States does to help others.

Heroic: any gimmick the Reds can dream up to give the free world a bad time. Korea, Laos, Vietnam.

Imperialism: anything the free world does.

Liberation: Communist enslavement, domination.

Masses: the voiceless millions in Communist lands in whose name the Reds elite acts.

National independence: Communist satellite status.

Peace: anything at all short of total thermonuclear war, Korea, Laos, Vietnam.

Progressive: Communist.

Provocation: Self-defense against communism.

Reaction, forces of: anti-Communists of all stripes.

Renegades: disillusioned defected Communists.

Revisionist: a Communist who doesn't buy the sino-Soviet line.

Stooges: anybody on our side.

War: Thermonuclear holocaust only. Not Korea, Laos, Vietnam.

Yoke of capitalism: on our side.

It would be all too easy to ridicule newspeak, to kid about Red true-is-false, false-is-true patois, but these sample definitions are in dead earnest.

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development—Key Letters in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 19, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a recent article written by Wilbur Elston, of the editorial staff of the Minneapolis Star, points out the deep concern of the Kennedy administration for genuine economic cooperation between the free nations of the Atlantic community.

The Senate, on March 16, approved ratification of the treaty creating the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. The OECD provides a structure for improved economic cooperation in building a prosperous free world economy and speeding economic progress in underdeveloped countries.

As Mr. Elston points out so clearly:

It has become clear to all concerned that economic cooperation is going to be just as necessary in the future as military cooperation has been in the past.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Elston's fine article, published in the Minneapolis Star of April 26, be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Star, Apr. 26, 1961]

OECD: KEY LETTERS IN EUROPE—THEY STAND FOR IMPROVED ECONOMIC COOPERATION

(By Wilbur Elston)

PARIS.—Fourteen years ago, when I first visited Europe after World War II, England and France were still struggling for economic survival.

Rationing was still in effect in both countries for many essential items. There were food shortages. The lights had not yet gone on again in Paris because of an electric power shortage. Even the famous Parisian night clubs were so cold that patrons wore their overcoats.

In both countries, however, there were high hopes that the Marshall Plan which then was just being authorized by the American Government would help restore their economic well-being.

In fact, I recall the late Secretary of State George Marshall, who conceived the Marshall Plan, being cheered to the echo by the Pilgrim Society, a hands-across-the-sea society to promote friendship between England and America, when he spoke at its meeting in London.

Present and paying tribute to the American Secretary of State on that occasion were the late Ernest Bevan, then the British Foreign Secretary, and Georges Bidault, the French Foreign Minister, who with Marshall then were trying to iron out an Austrian peace treaty with the Soviet Union at a conference in London.

Now, 14 years later, both England and France are enjoying the full fruits of prosperity. Unemployment is negligible. The British reported only 340,300 unemployed as of April 10, which amounted to 1.5 percent, the lowest April rate since 1956. And the French, currently with almost full employment, have a labor shortage, especially of skilled workmen.

Both the British and the French today still give full credit to the Marshall plan for bringing Europe back to economic health. But they are still looking to America for economic help to preserve their present prosperity.

What they want from the United States today is not money but economic cooperation. And under the Kennedy administration they seem to be getting it in full measure.

Thus there is pleasure in France at the unusual importance that President Kennedy and his principal economic adviser, Walter H. Heller, paid to the meeting of the Economic Policy Committee that will transfer its activities from the old organization for European economic cooperation—a Marshall plan agency—to the new Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

The OEEC was set up largely to iron out problems that occurred in the distribution of Marshall plan funds which were aimed to bring prosperity back to Europe. The OECD is being set up to improve economic cooperation and planning among the free nations of the Atlantic Community in order to preserve their prosperity and expand it beyond their frontiers to the less developed nations of the world.

In Britain, the new American emphasis on economic cooperation among the free nations accounted for a sharp shift in attitude toward the Common Market. After Prime Minister Macmillan's recent visit to President Kennedy, British officials who had been explaining why Britain could not work out any arrangements with the Inner Six suddenly began to find explanations for Britain's new interest in joining or at least cooperating with the Common Market.

What the British and the French are learning is that the Kennedy administration is serious about its new interest in economic cooperation. From now on, they are being told, the United States wants to operate its economy in concert with its friends and allies so that there will be a minimum of damage to any nation when economic policies have to be revised.

From the American point of view, there also are selfish advantages in the kind of economic cooperation envisaged in OECD. For if the new organization's purposes are achieved, it should be possible to avoid repetition of such threats to stability as the gold crisis that frightened many Americans last year. Some economists say that this crisis never would have gotten started if OECD had been organized and in operation at that time.

It has become clear to all concerned that economic cooperation is going to be just as necessary in the future as military cooperation has been in the past. And the foe that was just becoming visible over the horizon in Europe in 1947—the Soviet Union and its Communist satellites—still is ready and waiting to take advantage of any trouble among the Atlantic partners.

Congress Should Recognize Commander Shepard's Achievement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 19, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in a recent issue of the Evening Star, Ralph McGill has written a very effective tribute to Cmdr. Alan Shepard as a consequence of his being the first American ever to ride a rocket into space.

I ask that this tribute be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I sincerely hope that before this session of Congress is concluded we shall have acted favorably on the legislation introduced by Senators BRIDGES and COTTON, of New Hampshire, and me calling for the awarding of a special Congressional Medal to Commander Shepard.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRAVE JOURNEY INTO UNKNOWN—COMMANDER SHEPARD'S ROCKET FLIGHT CALLED INSTANCE OF MAN AT HIS NOBLEST

There is a line in Carl Sandburg's poem concerning "The Family of Man" which says, "There is only one man in the world and his name is all men." And this is philosophically true.

But, for a few minutes after the historic blastoff of the Redstone rocket at Cape Canaveral there was, in so far as 180 million Americans were aware, but one man in the world and his name was Alan B. Shepard.

He left the world and returned to it. And that portion of it to which he came back was better because of him. He had not remade it. He had solved none of its pressing international problems. But he had transformed its spirit.

For a time he had been where the winds blow between the planets. When he had returned, it seemed, somehow, as if the rushing speed of these winds had blown away a miasma of failure, disappointment, frustration and doubt. His swift flight out of this world and his reentry into it lifted up hearts and minds.

For a time on that day, the blood ran faster in all of us. For minutes in that hour there were no small or unworthy thoughts. There is nothing more noble than man at his best, and for a while that morning, all that yearns within us to be useful and worthy of life was riding with the calm and prepared young man in the marvelously complex capsule machine which some men had conceived in their minds and others had wrought with tools.

"God has made man a little lower than the angels," the Psalmist sang, and when Commander Shepard left the earth and returned to it again, we understood better the meaning of the sentence, and something within us gave answer.

Let us salute, therefore, man at his best. He often is. But, rarely do we see him so magnificently presented with sky and space as a backdrop and all the hearts of his countrymen as his stage.

And let us salute, too, the Russian, Yuri Gagarin. Let us forget for the moment his politics and the cause he serves. Let us greet him, too, as a man who played well that role. Alan Shepard and he as individ-

uals make us proud and enable us to understand there are many wonderful things in the scheme of God's creation, but the most wonderful of all is man.

Commander Shepard controlled his space craft. He, himself, used his brain and his training to explore the critical retarding rockets. He, too, had time to note that earth of land and sea and sun is beautiful. He is also reported from space to earthlings far below that all was well, and the myriad of dials, valves, wires, pumps, compressors, batteries, and the dozens of recording devices were functioning together in the manner of a vast mechanical symphony.

Alan Shepard was a prepared man, inwardly as well as outwardly. He knew what to do with each of the many controls before him. But this alone was not enough. Outside him was space. For a time he was free of earth's mysterious pull. He was weightless. God alone knew what was outside. The invisible forces which physicists and mathematicians chart were pounding at his capsule. Friction was beating its outer skin to a burning temperature.

Down on earth men and women were praying for him. It is a tremendous thing to leave the known things of earth and enter into unknown space, but there was no panic in him and no doubt.

And so it was that man and the mechanism made by man jointly left the earth and jointly returned to it for doctors and scientists to examine and learn what they can for future and greater ventures into space.

And so it is that America is renewed. There was a national therapy in this for a people whose pride has been hurt by repeated Soviet successes.

There is a kind of healing in what Alan Shepard has done. We can hold up our heads again. He cured the fevers of frustration. He lifted up our hearts.

At such moments we can comprehend that man is an earthly man but worthy of heaven.

Keeping Usury Out of Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CALEB BOGGS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 19, 1961

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Keeping Usury Out of Aid" which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor, May 12, 1961.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, May 12, 1961]

KEEPING USURY OUT OF AID

That tenacious preserver of the American Congress financial good sense, Senator JOHN WILLIAMS of Delaware, has moved to amend the new Latin American aid act in a way that dramatically emphasizes its economic reform purposes.

The Williams' amendment consists of a simple stipulation that American aid funds cannot be reloaned at any interest rate exceeding 8 percent. The Senator said he had been informed of cases in which local Latin American authorities were charging buyers of dwelling space built with low-interest U.S. loans as much as 18-percent interest.

Since much of the projected alliance for progress is expected to deal with loan capital, for workers to buy houses, and for small farmers to buy seed, tools, and fertilizer, it is imperative that the low-interest feature of U.S. loan aid be passed along to the people of countries being aided.

Senator WILLIAMS' example deserves emulation by both lawmakers and administrators throughout the course of the Latin American loan program.

Interview With John T. McCarty, General Electric Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 19, 1961

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, in the mail addressed to me as chairman of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, I have received a newspaper account which relates to an interview given to a reporter on the Jackson Daily News, Jackson, Miss., on May 6, 1961, by a high official in the General Electric Co.

In this interview, Mr. John T. McCarty, identified as manager of employee and plant community relations in the important defense electronics division of General Electric, expresses some policy views which are rather surprising to me, and which I think, Mr. President, that you and other Members of the Senate, as well as the public in general, will find of interest. According to the newspaper account, Mr. McCarty was in Jackson, Miss., to address the Mississippi Manufacturers Association.

I ask that the pertinent part of the account of this interview by this representative of General Electric be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEFAUVER HEARINGS CALLED NONSENSE

(By Pat Flynn)

A General Electric official in an interview here yesterday called the Kefauver price-fixing hearings sheer nonsense.

The only reason for the hearings, said John T. McCarty, manager of employee and plant community relations for the company, was "'a very ambitious little man (KEFAUVER) who almost got to be Vice President on the strength of another investigation and is just trying to see what he can do for next time."

McCarty, here to address the Mississippi Manufacturers Association annual management conference, added that he had been back and forth to Washington so many times lately he "was beginning to feel like a ping-pong ball."

Throwing a "crack" at the Kennedy administration, McCarty said the easiest way to get from his native Syracuse, where General Electric's main plant is located, to Washington is to "go to Harvard and turn left."

GOLDEN OPPORTUNITY

McCarty said southern industrialists "have a golden opportunity that is all but slipping out of their fingers—the same opportunity that the North lost 30 years ago—operating their plants without unions."

He said management had to realize that loyalty could not be bought with company picnics, bowling teams, and Christmas parties.

"In fact," he said, "people go to Christmas parties, get all tanked up and set company relations back 15 years."

By using a film slide strip, he showed the procedure used by General Electric for combating union influence over its employees.

"Collective bargaining is the most insidious, spineless game played by adults," he said. "It's nothing but management and a bunch of union bums both getting a lawyer and sitting around a table to see how much they can get away with at the expense of the public.

"You can solve your own problems," he said, "if you do it now before a bunch of thugs force it on you."

Speaking on supervisor training he said the foreman had the complicated job in the history of American labor, because he had to be "doctor, minister, den mother, and football coach."

Although strikes are losing thousands of manpower hours, he added, the largest time-killer is the "zombie time" spent by those "inspiring people hanging around the water cooler."

"This is what the good foreman can combat without losing proper labor-management relations," he said.

Armed Services Housing (Capehart) Mortgages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 19, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter and a statement relating to Capehart housing.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM TO MEMBERS OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEES AND ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEES; ALSO TO VARIOUS OFFICIALS OF THE ADMINISTRATION

Hon. HOMER CAPEHART,
Banking and Currency Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

We are addressing this memorandum to you because, either as a Member of the Congress or as an official of the administration, we believe you have an interest in the merits and demerits of armed services housing (Capehart) mortgages.

The Scripps-Howard newspapers, through news articles signed by Jack Steele and through their editorial columns, have been conducting a campaign strongly slanted against Capehart mortgages. No reference has been made in these articles to all of the good features of Capehart mortgages and we, therefore, felt that it was worthwhile to send the enclosed letter to the editor of the New York World Telegram & Sun which is the New York member of the Scripps-Howard chain.

In a few cases, of which the Hal Hayes case is the best, and possibly the only example, the Capehart program has been poorly administered but the good that has been accomplished by the program far outweighs the bad. We have attempted in the en-

closed letter to point out the good features of the Capehart program and to emphasize that any wasteful results have been due to poor administration of the act and not to any of the provisions of the act itself.

We sincerely hope that this memorandum and the enclosed letter will be helpful to you in arriving at a decision to support a modest additional program of Capehart housing.

J. MAXWELL PRINGLE.

J. MAXWELL PRINGLE & CO., INC.,
New York, N.Y., May 11, 1961.

The EDITOR,
New York World Telegram & Sun,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: I have read your editorial of May 9 and Mr. Jack Steele's news report of May 10, both with reference to armed services family housing mortgages (more familiarly known as Capehart mortgages). I find myself in strong disagreement with almost all of the opinions expressed by your newspaper editorially and by Mr. Steele individually. I also have read many of Mr. Steel's earlier articles and consider that all, or most of them, were strongly slanted to give only the case against the Capehart program and none of the arguments in its favor.

There are, I'm sure you will admit, two sides to every question and I would like to present, in this letter, what seems to me to be the favorable aspects of the Capehart program which far overbalance the Hayes fiasco. My qualifications for doing this are that I am chairman of the board of J. Maxwell Pringle & Co., Inc., which does a nationwide brokerage business in the secondary market for all types of Government insured and guaranteed mortgages. We have been particularly active, since the early part of 1956, in arranging construction and/or permanent financing for Capehart mortgages and have been identified with business of this kind aggregating over $700 million.

In the Hayes case, where this builder walked off the job a year ago on five projects having Capehart mortgages aggregating some $55 million, the mistakes, I believe, were made by the FHA and the Department of Defense and were not in any sense, it seems to me, due to defects in the Capehart law. First of all, I don't believe that the FHA and the Department of Defense should have let one builder undertake such a large volume of projects at one time. Secondly, when he did walk off the job last spring, immediate steps should have been taken by the Department of Defense and the FHA to complete the projects, one of which was some 90 percent completed at the time of default. The damage which has resulted in 1 year of leaving these properties to stand idle instead of completing them has been entirely the fault of the Government and not of the Capehart law itself.

Another thing that should be kept in mind is that competitive bidding by builders for these Capehart projects has often been very close and I, personally, known of some cases where the builders have completed the projects and realized substantial losses. If such properties had been built by appropriated funds, the loss would have been charged to the Government and not to the builder.

The Capehart program has, in my opinion, been successful in accomplishing the following exceedingly worthwhile results—

A. Capehart mortgages, because when completed they are guaranteed as to principal and interest by the U.S. Government, have, to a large extent, been purchased by public pension funds which are generally limited by law or by policy to the safest kind of investment. By offering slightly larger yields than can be obtained from U.S. Government bonds, the Capehart loans have enabled such public pension funds to increase somewhat their net yield on their portfolios and thus the benefits paid to State and municipal employees.

B. Mr. Steele makes the point that the military wants family housing built at bases where there is no real need for such housing. I don't say this is never true but I think such cases are the exception rather than the rule and I think that if housing was built with appropriated funds, the military would still recommend a few locations where such housing is not badly needed. However, in the great majority of cases decent family housing at inaccessible bases is badly needed because only in this way can the Army, Air Force, or Navy secure from its personnel a higher percentage of reenlistment. Many more trained men, whose training has cost the Department of Defense a great deal more than the price of a house, will not reenlist if they can't have their families with them in decent living quarters.

You, of course, have my permission to quote this letter provided you quote the entire letter and not just abstracts from it.

Very truly yours,

J. MAXWELL PRINGLE.

Address of Newton N. Minow, Chairman, Federal Communications Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 19, 1961

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, during the hearings on the nomination of Newton D. Minow to be Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, great emphasis was made with regard to television programing, the responsibility of a broadcaster to operate in the public interest, and the role of the FCC in discharging its duty in issuing and renewing broadcast licenses.

At that time, Mr. Minow outlined generally his views with regard to this entire subject matter.

On Tuesday, May 9, 1961, in his first speech since assuming office, a little less than 3 months ago, Mr. Minow, in an address to the 39th annual convention of the National Association of Broadcasters, meeting in Washington, D.C., set forth his views on this overall subject in broad detail.

He outlined certain guidelines he proposed to pursue in discharging his duties as Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission.

In view of the significance of his policies and the wide interest in this matter, I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY NEWTON N. MINOW, CHAIRMAN, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION, TO THE 39TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS, WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 9, 1961

Governor Collins, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, thank you for this opportunity to meet with you today. This is my first public address since I took over my new job. When the New Frontiersmen rode into town, I locked myself in my office to do my homework and get my feet wet. But apparently I haven't managed to stay out of hot water. I seem to have detected a certain nervous apprehension about what I might say or do when I emerged from that locked office for this, my maiden station break.

First, let me begin by dispelling a rumor. I was not picked for this job because I regard myself as the fastest draw on the New Frontier.

Second, let me start a rumor. Like you, I have carefully read President Kennedy's messages about the regulatory agencies, conflict of interest, and the dangers of ex parte contacts. And, of course, we at the Federal Communications Commission will do our part. Indeed, I may even suggest that we change the name of the FCC to "the Seven Untouchables."

It may also come as a surprise to some of you, but I want you to know that you have my admiration and respect. Yours is a most honorable profession. Anyone who is in the broadcasting business has a tough row to hoe. You earn your bread by using public property. When you work in broadcasting you volunteer for public service, public pressure, and public regulation. You must compete with other attractions and other investments, and the only way you can do it is to prove to us every 3 years that you should have been in business in the first place. I can think of easier ways to make a living, but I cannot think of more satisfying ways.

I admire your courage—but that doesn't mean I would make life any easier for you. Your license lets you use the public's airwaves as trustees for 180 million Americans. The public is your beneficiary. If you want to stay on as trustees, you must deliver a decent return to the public—not only to your stockholders. So, as a representative of the public, your health and your product are among my chief concerns.

As to your health: Let's talk only of television today. 1960 gross broadcast revenues of the television industry were over $1,268 million; profit before taxes was $243.9 million, an average return on revenue of 19.2 percent. Compared with 1959, gross broadcast revenues were $1,163,900,000, and profit before taxes was $222.3 million, an average return on revenue of 19.1 percent. So, the percentage increase of total revenues from 1959 to 1960 was 9 percent, and the percentage increase of profit was 9.7 percent. This, despite a recession. For your investors, the price has indeed been right.

I have confidence in your health.

But not in your product.

It is with this and much more in mind that I come before you today.

One editorialist in the trade press wrote that "the FCC of the New Frontier is going to be one of the toughest FCC's in the history of broadcast regulation." If he meant that we intend to enforce the law in the public interest, let me make it perfectly clear that he is right—we do. If he meant that we intend to muzzle or censor broadcasting, he is dead wrong.

It would not surprise me if some of you had expected me to come here today and say in effect, "Clean up your own house or the Government will do it for you." Well, in a limited sense, you would be right—I've just said it.

But I want to say to you earnestly that it is not in that spirit that I come before you today, nor is it in that spirit that I intend to serve the FCC. I am in Washintgon to help broadcasting, not to harm it; to strengthen it, not weaken it; to reward it, not punish it; to encourage it, not threaten it; to stimulate it, not censor it. Above all, I am here to uphold and protect the public interest.

What do we mean by the public interest? Some say the public interest is merely what interests the public. I disagree.

So does your distinguished president, Governor Collins. In a recent speech he said, "Broadcasting to serve the public interest, must have a soul and a conscience, a burning desire to excel, as well as to sell; the urge to build the character, citizenship and intellectual stature of people, as well as to expand the gross national product. By no means do I imply that broadcasters disregard the public interest, but a much better job can be done, and should be done." I could not agree more.

And I would add that in today's world, with chaos in Laos and the Congo aflame, with Communist tyranny on our Caribbean doorstep and relentless pressure on our Atlantic alliance, with social and economic problems at home of the gravest nature, yes, and with technological knowledge that makes it possible, as our President has said, not only to destroy our world but to destroy poverty around the world—in a time of peril and opportunity, the old complacent, unbalanced fare of action, adventure, and situation comedies is simply not good enough.

Your industry possesses the most powerful voice in America. It has an inescapable duty to make that voice ring with intelligence and with leadership. In a few years, this exciting industry has grown from a novelty to an instrument of overwhelming impact on the American people. It should be making ready for the kind of leadership that newspapers and magazines assumed years ago, to make our people aware of their world.

Ours has been called the jet age, the atomic age, the space age. It is also, I submit, the television age. And just as history will decide whether the leaders of today's world employed the atom to destroy the world or rebuild it for mankind's benefit, so will history decide whether today's broadcasters employed their powerful voice to enrich the people or debase them.

If I seem today to address myself chiefly to the problems of television, I don't want any of you radio broadcasters to think we've gone to sleep at your switch—we haven't. We still listen. But in recent years most of the controversies and crosscurrents in broadcast programing have swirled around television. And so my subject today is the television industry and the public interest.

Like everybody, I wear more than one hat. I am the Chairman of the FCC. I am also a television viewer and the husband and father of other television viewers. I have seen a great many television programs that seemed to me eminently worthwhile, and, I am not talking about the much bemoaned good old days of "Playhouse 90" and "Studio One."

I am talking about this past season. Some were wonderfully entertaining, such as "The Fabulous Fifties," the "Fred Astaire Show," and the "Bing Crosby Special," some were dramatic and moving, such as "Conrad's Victory" and "Twilight Zone"; some were marvelously informative, such as "The Nation's Future," CBS Reports," and "The Valiant Years." I could list many more programs that I am sure everyone here felt enriched his own life and that of his family. When television is good, nothing, not the theater, not the magazines or newspapers, nothing is better.

But when television is bad, nothing is worse. I invite you to sit down in front of your television set when your station goes on the air and stay there without a book, magazine, newspaper, profit-and-loss sheet or rating book to distract you, and keep your eyes glued to that set until the station signs off. I can assure you that you will observe a vast wasteland.

You will see a procession of game shows, violence, audience participation shows, formula comedies about totally unbelievable families, blood and thunder, mayhem, violence, sadism, murder, western badmen, western good men, private eyes, gangsters, more violence, and cartoons. And, endlessly, commercials, many screaming, cajoling, and offending. And most of all, boredom. True, you will see a few things you will enjoy. But they will be very, very few. And if you think I exaggerate, try it. Is there one person in this room who claims that broadcasting can't do better?

Well, a glance at next season's proposed programing can give us little heart. Of 73½ hours of prime evening time, the networks have tentatively scheduled 59 hours to categories of "action-adventure," situation comedy, variety, quiz, and movies. Is there one network president in this room who claims he can't do better? Well, is there at least one network president who believes that the other networks can't do better?

Gentlemen, your trust accounting with your beneficiaries is overdue. Never have so few owed so much to so many.

Why is so much of television so bad? I have heard many answers: Demands of your advertisers; competition for ever higher ratings; the need always to attract a mass audience; the high cost of television programs; the insatiable appetite for programing material—these are some of them. Unquestionably, these are tough problems not susceptible to easy answers. But I am not convinced that you have tried hard enough to solve them.

I do not accept the idea that the present overall programing is aimed accurately at the public taste. The ratings tell us only that some people have their television sets turned on and of that number, so many are tuned to one channel and so many to another. They don't tell us what the public might watch if they were offered half a dozen additional choices. A rating, at best, is an indication of how many people saw what you gave them.

Unfortunately, it does not reveal the depth of the penetration, or the intensity of reaction, and it never reveals what the acceptance would have been if what you gave them had been better, if all the forces of art and creativity and daring and imagination had been unleashed. I believe in the people's good sense and good taste, and I am not convinced that the people's taste is as low as some of you assume.

My concern with the rating services is not with their accuracy. Perhaps they are accurate. I really don't know. What, then, is wrong with the ratings? It's not been their accuracy, it's been their use.

Certainly, I hope you will agree that ratings should have little influence where children are concerned. The best estimates indicate that during the hours of 5 to 6 p.m. 60 percent of your audience is composed of children under 12. And most young children today, believe it or not, spend as much time watching television as they do in the schoolroom. I repeat—let that sink in—most young children today spend as much time watching television as they do in the schoolroom. It used to be said that there were three great influences on a child: home, school, and church. Today, there is a fourth great influence, and you ladies and gentlemen control it.

If parents, teachers, and ministers conducted their responsibilities by following the ratings, children would have a steady diet of ice cream, school holidays, and no Sunday School. What about your responsibilities? Is there no room on television to teach, to inform, to uplift, to stretch, to enlarge the capacities of our children? Is there no room for programs deepening their understanding of children in other lands? Is there no room for a children's news show explaining something about the world to them at their level of understanding? Is there no room for reading the great literature of the past, teaching them the great traditions of freedom? There are some fine children's shows, but they are drowned out in the massive doses of cartoons, violence, and more violence. Must these be your trademarks? Search your consciences and see if you cannot offer more to your young beneficiaries whose future you guide so many hours each and every day.

What about adult programing and ratings? You know, newspaper publishers take popularity ratings too. The answers are pretty clear: it is almost always the comics, followed by the advice to the lovelorn columns. But, ladies and gentlemen, the news is still on the front page of all newspapers, the editorials are not replaced by more comics, the newspapers have not become one long collection of advice to the lovelorn. Yet newspapers do not need a license from the government to be in business—they do not use public property. But in television—where your responsibilities as public trustees are so plain, the moment that the ratings indicate that westerns are popular there are new imitations of westerns on the air faster than the old coaxial cable could take us from Hollywood to New York. Broadcasting cannot continue to live by the numbers. Ratings ought to be the slave of the broadcaster, not his master. And you and I both know that the rating services themselves would agree.

Let me make clear that what I am talking about is balance. I believe that the public interest is made up of many interests. There are many people in this great country and you must serve all of us. You will get no argument from me if you say that, given a choice between a western and a symphony, more people will watch the western. I like westerns and private eyes too, but a steady diet for the whole country is obviously not in the public interest. We all know that people would more often prefer to be entertained than stimulated or informed. But your obligations are not satisfied if you look only to popularity as a test of what to broadcast. You are not only in show business; you are free to communicate ideas as well as relaxation. You must provide a wider range of choices, more diversity, more alternatives. It is not enough to cater to the Nation's whims, you must also serve the Nation's needs.

And I would add this—that if some of you persist in a relentless search for the highest rating and the lowest common denominator, you may very well lose your audience. Because, to paraphrase a great American who was recently my law partner, the people are wise, wiser than some of the broadcasters, and politicians, think.

As you may have gathered, I would like to see television improved. But how is this to be brought about? By voluntary action by the broadcasters themselves? By direct government intervention? Or how?

Let me address myself now to my role not as a viewer but as Chairman of the FCC. I could not if I would, chart for you this afternoon in detail all of the actions I contemplate. Instead, I want to make clear some of the fundamental principles which guide me.

First. The people own the air. They own it as much in prime evening time as they do at 6 o'clock Sunday morning. For every hour that the people give you, you owe them something. I intend to see that your debt is paid with service.

Second. I think it would be foolish and wasteful for us to continue any wornout wrangle over the problems of payola, rigged quiz shows, and other mistakes of the past. There are laws on the books which we will enforce. But there is no chip on my shoulder. We live together in perilous, uncertain times; we face together staggering problems; and we must not waste much time now by rehashing the cliches of past controversy. To quarrel over the past is to lose the future.

Third. I believe in the free enterprise system. I want to see broadcasting improved

and I want you to do the job. I am proud to champion your cause. It is not rare for American businessmen to serve a public trust. Yours is a special trust because it is imposed by law.

Fourth. I will do all I can to help educational television. There are still not enough educational stations, and major centers of the country still lack usable educational channels. If there were a limited number of printing presses in this country, you may be sure that a fair proportion of them would be put to educational use. Educational television has an enormous contribution to make to the future, and I intend to give it a hand along the way. If there is not a nationwide educational television system in this country, it will not be the fault of the FCC.

Fifth. I am unalterably opposed to governmental censorship. There will be no suppression of programing which does not meet with bureaucratic tastes. Censorship strikes at the taproot of our free society.

Sixth. I did not come to Washington to idly observe the squandering of the public's airwaves. The squandering of our airwaves is no less important than the lavish waste of any precious natural resource. I intend to take the job of Chairman of the FCC very seriously. I believe in the gravity of my own particular sector of the New Frontier. There will be times perhaps when you will consider that I take myself or my job too seriously. Frankly, I don't care if you do. For I am convinced that either one takes this job seriously, or one can be seriously taken.

Now, how will these principles be applied? Clearly, at the heart of the FCC's authority lies its power to license, to renew or fail to renew, or to revoke a license. As you know, when your license comes up for renewal, your performance is compared with your promises. I understand that many people feel that in the past licenses were often renewed pro forma. I say to you now: Renewal will not be pro forma in the future. There is nothing permanent or sacred about a broadcast license.

But simply matching promises and performance is not enough. I intend to do more. I intend to find out whether the people care. I intend to find out whether the community which each broadcaster serves believes he has been serving the public interest. When a renewal is set down for hearing, I intend, wherever possible, to hold a well-advertised public hearing, right in the community you have promised to serve. I want the people who own the air and the homes that television enters to tell you and the FCC what's been going on. I want the people, if they are truly interested in the service you give them, to make notes, document cases, tell us the facts. For those few of you who really believe that the public interest is merely what interests the public—I hope that these hearings will arouse no little interest.

The FCC has a fine reserve of monitors, almost 180 million Americans gathered around 56 million sets. If you want those monitors to be your friends at court, it's up to you.

Some of you may say, "Yes, but I still do not know where the line is between a grant of a renewal and the hearings you just spoke of." My answer is: Why should you want to know how close you can come to the edge of the cliff? What the Commission asks of you is to make a conscientious, good faith effort to serve the public interest. Every one of you serves a community in which the people would benefit by educational, religious, instructive, or other public service programing. Every one of you serves an area which has local needs, as to local elections, controversial issues, local news, local talent. Make a serious, genuine effort to put on that programing. When you do, you will not be playing brinkmanship with the public interest.

What I've been saying applies to broadcast stations. Now a station break for the networks:

You know your importance in this great industry. Today, more than one-half of all hours of television station programing comes from the networks; in prime time, this rises to more than three-fourths of the available hours.

You know that the FCC has been studying network operations for some time. I intend to press this to a speedy conclusion with useful results. I can tell you right now, however, that I am deeply concerned with concentration of power in the hands of the networks. As a result, too many local stations have foregone any efforts at local programing, with little use of live talent and local service. Too many local stations operate with one hand on the network switch and the other on a projector loaded with old movies. We want the individual stations to be free to meet their legal responsibilities to serve their communities.

I join Governor Collins in his views so well expressed to the advertisers who use the public air. I urge the networks to join him and undertake a very special mission on behalf of this industry: you can tell your advertisers, "This is the high quality we are going to serve, take it or other people will. If you think you can find a better place to move automobiles, cigarettes, and soap, go ahead and try."

Tell your sponsors to be less concerned with costs per thousand and more concerned with understanding per millions. And remind your stockholders that an investment in broadcasting is buying a share in public responsibility.

The networks can start this industry on the road to freedom from the dictatorship of numbers.

But there is more to the problem than network influences on stations or advertiser influences on networks. I know the problems networks face in trying to clear some of their best programs, the informational programs that exemplify public service. They are your finest hours, whether sustaining or commercial, whether regularly scheduled or special, these are the signs that broadcasting knows the way to leadership. They make the public's trust in you a wise choice.

They should be seen. As you know, we are readying for use new forms by which broadcast stations will report their programing to the Commission. You probably also know that special attention will be paid in these reports to public service programing. I believe that stations taking network service should also be required to report the extent of the local clearance of network public service programing, and when they fail to clear them, they should explain why. If it is to put on some outstanding local program, this is one reason. But, if it is simply to carry some old movie, that is an entirely different matter. The Commission should consider such clearance reports carefully when making up its mind about the licensee's overall programing.

We intend to move, and as you know, indeed the FCC was rapidly moving in other new areas before the new administration arrived in Washington. And I want to pay my public respects to my very able predecessor, Fred Ford, and my colleagues on the Commission who have welcomed me to the FCC with warmth and cooperation.

We have approved an experiment with pay TV, and in New York we are testing the potential of UHF broadcasting. Either or both of these may revolutionize television. Only a foolish prophet would venture to guess the direction they will take, and their effect. But we intend that they shall be explored fully, for they are part of broadcasting's New Frontier.

The questions surrounding pay TV are largely economic. The questions surrounding UHF are largely technological. We are going to give the infant pay TV a chance to prove whether it can offer a useful service; we are going to protect it from those who would strangle it in its crib.

As for UHF, I'm sure you know about our test in the canyons of New York City. We will take every possible positive step to break through the allocations barrier into UHF. We will put this sleeping giant to use and in the years ahead we may have twice as many channels operating in cities where now there are only two or three. We may have a half dozen networks instead of three.

I have told you that I believe in the free enterprise system. I believe that most of television's problems stem from lack of competition. This is the importance of UHF to me: with more channels on the air, we will be able to provide every community with enough stations to offer service to all parts of the public. Programs with a mass market appeal required by mass product advertisers certainly will still be available. But other stations will recognize the need to appeal to more limited markets and to special tastes. In this way, we can all have a much wider range of programs.

Television should thrive on this competition, and the country should benefit from alternative sources of service to the public. And, Governor Collins, I hope the NAB will benefit from many new members.

Another and perhaps the most important frontier: Television will rapidly join the parade into space. International television will be with us soon. No one knows how long it will be until a broadcast from a studio in New York will be viewed in India as well as in Indiana, will be seen in the Congo as it is seen in Chicago. But as surely as we are meeting here today, that day will come, and once again our world will shrink.

What will the people of other countries think of us when they see our western badmen and good men punching each other in the jaw in between the shooting? What will the Latin American or African child learn of America from our great communications industry? We cannot permit television in its present form to be our voice overseas.

There is your challenge to leadership. You must reexamine some fundamentals of your industry. You must open your minds and open your hearts to the limitless horizons of tomorrow.

I can suggest some words that should serve to guide you:

"Television and all who participate in it are jointly accountable to the American public for respect for the special needs of children, for community responsibility, for the advancement of education and culture, for the acceptability of the program materials chosen, for decency and decorum in production, and for propriety in advertising. This responsibility cannot be discharged by any given group of programs, but can be discharged only through the highest standards of respect for the American home, applied to every moment of every program presented by television.

"Program materials should enlarge the horizons of the viewer, provide him with wholesome entertainment, afford helpful stimulation, and remind him of the responsibilities which the citizen has toward his society."

These words are not mine. They are yours. They are taken literally from your own television code. They reflect the leadership and aspirations of your own great industry. I urge you to respect them as I do. And I urge you to respect the intelligent and farsighted leadership of Governor LeRoy Collins, and to make this meeting a creative act. I urge you at this meeting and, after

you leave, back home, at your stations and your networks, to strive ceaselessly to improve your product and to better serve your viewers, the American people.

I hope that we at the FCC will not allow ourselves to become so bogged down in the mountain of papers, hearings, memorandums, orders, and the daily routine that we close our eyes to the wider view of the public interest. And I hope that you broadcasters will not permti yourselves to become so absorbed in the chase for ratings, sales, and profits that you lose this wider view. Now more than ever before in broadcasting's history the times demand the best of all of us.

We need imagination in programing, not sterility; creativity, not imitation; experimentation, not conformity; excellence, not mediocrity. Television is filled with creative, imaginative people. You must strive to set them free.

Television in its young life has had many hours of greatness—its "Victory at Sea," its Army-McCarthy hearings, its "Peter Pan," its "Kraft Theaters," its "See It Now," its "Project 20," the world series, its political conventions and campaigns, the great debates—and it has had its endless hours of mediocrity and its moments of public disgrace. There are estimates that today the average viewer spends about 200 minutes daily with television, while the average reader spends 38 minutes with magazines and 40 minutes with newspapers. Television has grown faster than a teenager, and now it is time to grow up.

What you gentlemen broadcast through the people's air affects the people's taste, their knowledge, their opinions, their understanding of themselves and of their world. And their future.

The power of instantaneous sight and sound is without precedent in mankind's history. This is an awesome power. It has limitless capabilities for good, and for evil. And it carries with it awesome responsibilities, responsibilities which you and I cannot escape.

In his stirring inaugural address our President said, "And so, my fellow Americans, ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country."

Ladies and gentlemen, ask not what broadcasting can do for you. Ask what you can do for broadcasting. I urge you to put the peoples' airwaves to the service of the people and the cause of freedom. You must help prepare a generation for great decisions. You must help a great nation fulfill its future. Do this, and I pledge you our help.

Trade Policy: A Strategy for the Coming Battle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 19, 1961

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, problems now confront many segments of American industry, their employees and their communities, as a result of increased foreign competition. In seeking a solution, two basic requirements appear to me to be essential:

First. Our country must avoid restricting foreign imports in a way which would touch off retaliation by other countries and lead to a downward spiral of world trade. It is generally agreed that such a process had much to do with bringing about the great depression of the thirties. The nations of the free world could be committing economic suicide if we were to follow that course again.

Second. We must avoid arbitrarily cutting off imports where this would permit an economically aggressive Soviet bloc to move into world trade as America moved out. We must keep in mind the vital needs of our trading partners as well as ourselves. We must not force our friends, particularly among the newer and less developed countries, to become dependent on trade with the Soviet bloc, for such trade is manipulated to serve the political ends of the Soviet empire.

It has seemed to me that the basic concept which most nearly meets these requirements is that of trade-adjustment assistance, in which my distinguished colleague from New York, Senator JAVITS, has displayed such creative leadership. His article "Trade Policy: A Strategy for the Coming Battle," appears in the May 25 issue of the Reporter magazine. I believe this article deserves the widest attention and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRADE POLICY: A STRATEGY FOR THE COMING BATTLE

(Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, of New York)

In the coming months, Congress and the Kennedy administration will face the most crucial struggle over U.S. trade policies since the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act became law in 1934. The act itself is not up for renewal until next year, but the battlelines are now forming.

Even as our economy recovers from the recession, there is no letup in complaints about "unfair competition" from foreign imports or in demands for quotas or other protection to reduce or keep them out. Last year there were four requests for specific tariff increases for every one on file in 1955, and there were three opponents of further tariff reduction for every one in 1955. There is no doubt that the problem some businesses are facing is a real one, and their firms and workers need help from the Federal Government.

Protectionist sentiment today is getting an added boost from the recent imbalance in our international payments and from the chronically depressed areas around the country where unemployment has persisted in recent years even when the business cycle was in its boom phase. Perhaps a quarter to a half million American workers are being seriously affected by concentrated import competition today, and many of these firms are located in chronically depressed areas.

Against this background the Senate recently took a giant step in the direction of greater economic cooperation with our allies by approving our membership in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. Scheduled to start formal operations next September (after ratification by at least 15 nations), OECD is the first serious attempt to build an economic complex of free nations equal to the task of closing the development gap between the so-called "have" and "have-not" areas of the free world. The 20 prospective member nations of OECD—18 European members, plus the United States and Canada—possess a total productive power of more than $900 billion a year, and account for two-thirds of all world trade. Here is potentially the most important economic bloc in the world.

TRADE IS OFTEN THE BEST AID

But obviously any retreat by the United States from the principles of expanding multilateral, nondiscriminatory trade could ruin OECD's chances of achieving its major objectives right at the start. Last year the United States imported nearly $15 billion in goods and services. Protectionist barriers erected around this largest of all national markets are bound to invite sharp retaliation from OECD members and other free world trading nations. They will also affect the willingness of the other OECD members to shoulder a greater share of the aid burden in the less developed areas of the free world, a primary objective of the second Eisenhower administration and now of President Kennedy's. Indeed, the goal of supplying in partnership the $10 billion in grant and loan aid required annually by these areas could then not be realized. For that matter, if economic nationalism stages a comeback in the free industrial nations, how long could the United States maintain its present level of foreign economic aid? Last year, our $5 billion trade surplus was big enough to pay for our entire foreign-aid bill, economic and military.

Unless we devise a program that can negate the appeal of protectionism to businesses hit by concentrated imports, the Communists may be able to dictate the terms of economic survival to key nations in Latin America, Africa, and Asia. The United States now buys about a quarter of everything these nations export, including great quantities of raw materials required by our industries. The dollars they earn from us give them an amount to invest in development three times greater than the dollars we loan and grant them as economic aid. It would be unrealistic to believe that Congress could pass an aid bill large enough to compensate for any substantial decline in this trade.

Right now the 20 prospective OECD members are the principal trading partners of the Asian, African, and Latin American nations. But we are on notice that the Communist bloc intends to reverse this situation wherever and however it can; and in view of the rising rate of Communist bilateral trade deals, this objective might be realized in more countries by 1975 than we dare to contemplate. It will also be more likely to happen if markets in the OECD countries shrink.

In other words, unless we lead the OECD bloc in a trade-aid offensive, the free nations will soon find their position as the principal trading partners of the less developed areas of the free world undermined. This is the general conviction of the leading legislators of the NATO nations, almost all of them foreign-policy specialists, with whom I confer regularly as chairman of the Economic Committee of NATO Parliamentarians.

FROM TEXTILES TO TOYS

We must start working now, not next year, to head off a damaging controversy over protectionism. Much valuable time has already been lost both in Congress and in the administration, even though the danger signals of an impending trade struggle are everywhere. Paralleling the all-out effort of many businesses, unions, and trade associations, 16 Southern governors last fall pressed the Tariff Commission for restrictive rulings. In a unanimous resolution, they demanded a comprehensive investigation of our trade policy and urged specific protection to reduce foreign competition with goods produced by industries in the South, particularly textiles.

The accent on protectionism is not heard in the South alone. Congressmen from al-

most every area are paying increasing attention to similar protests. Witness, for example, the uncomfortably close vote last month on Senator Barry Goldwater's amendment to the minimum-wage bill. It would have permitted import quotas based on differentials in wages paid to workers in exporting countries and those paid to workers in the United States. This generally protectionist Goldwater measure lost by only 11 votes.

The Kennedy administration did manage to head off the threatened May 1 boycott of Japanese fabric imports by the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, and at the same time took a first step to meet the basic problem. The business and labor leaders in the textile trade have been promised a program of special assistance by the Kennedy administration, including an international conference to discuss the quantity of textiles that Japan, Hong Kong, Pakistan, India, and others may export to the United States; presumably the conference will work out agreements on such things as voluntary quotas and minimum labor standards.

This approach, however, is woefully incomplete if it stops there. Those in the textile business who are hurt as much by technological obsolescence as by imports should be helped to increase their productivity, diversify their lines, or transfer into other economic activity entirely. We must make a fair distinction between producers who do and those who do not need Federal help. And we must be able to reduce gradually whatever new trade protection may be granted. Unless these other steps are taken, our major trading partners will interpret this first move by the administration as the start of a retreat toward economic nationalism. American consumers and taxpayers will face the prospect of supporting a permanent program of Government subsidy that could extend far beyond the limits of the textile industry.

The great majority of briefs filed last year in opposition to new tariff reductions came from groups involved with fabricated metal products, industrial chemicals, cord and twine, electronic and office-machine equipment, sporting goods, buttons, and toys. They are not going to understand or tolerate favoritism toward the textile industry, which filed less than 15 percent of all opposition briefs received by the Tariff Commission in 1960.

In early February, President Kennedy told Congress that protectionism was no answer to our adverse balance of international payments, and he urged an export drive to earn more dollars. But we are still waiting for him to recommend or support—as he did in the Senate—a positive legislative approach to the very real problem of those who are already being seriously hurt by concentrated import competition. Helping hard-pressed industries and promoting exports are two sides of the same coin, but apparently Democratic leaders in Congress are waiting for a go-ahead from the White House before scheduling action on import legislation already introduced this session.

ON TWO FRONTS

In company with other Senate colleagues, I have proposed two bills to head off the coming conflict over trade policy. One is a measure to stimulate exports; the other would help workers, businesses, and communities that are seriously disrupted by import competition.

The proposal to stimulate exports calls for the creation of a Council for Export Promotion, under the chairmanship of the Under Secretary of Commerce. The Council would augment, coordinate, and publicize the Government's various services to the U.S. exporter. The proposed legislation also strengthens the authority of the Export-Import Bank to make short- and medium-term export credit guarantees against both political and commercial risks. The American exporter wants and deserves a service similar to that offered by the major exporting countries of Western Europe, where guarantees cover between 6 and 15 percent of exports annually.

These suggestions have been well received in the Senate by Republicans and Democrats alike, including JOHN SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama, chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, who is a sponsor of the export bill. The importance of exports in our economy is becoming ever more appreciated, since some 4 million workers in the United States are engaged in producing and servicing exports. Between one-fifth and one-third of our production of civilian aircraft, railroad cars, construction and mining equipment, textile machinery, sewing machines, and steel-rolling machinery has been exported in recent years, along with 10 to 20 percent of our machine tools, coal, agricultural machinery and equipment, diesel engines, trucks, and buses. All this is quite apart from our enormous agricultural exports. Forty-five percent of all our cotton and wheat, 29 percent of our tobacco, and 25 percent of our soybean production is exported.

Last year the United States sold $19.6 billion in merchandise exports, nearly $5 billion more than we imported in merchandise. Our exports to the new European Economic Community went up 50 percent in 12 months and topped our imports from this area by $1 billion. It is obvious that increased exports can be a very helpful anti-recession measure and can contribute substantially to solving our balance-of-payments problem while helping to meet our international responsibilities.

More difficult but equally important is the form that legislation should take to help workers, business firms, and communities adjust to an economy where foreign trade plays an increasingly important role every year. Today those who cannot get relief under existing trade-agreement legislation turn to Congress. We are asked, sometimes almost ordered, to revise duties, broaden "Buy American" provisions, impose quotas, and strip the President of his power to negotiate reciprocal tariff concessions. While such remedies are usually unacceptable, the descriptions of hardship are often accurate and compelling.

The solution I propose is based on the principle of trade-adjustment assistance, which is endorsed by leading economists and key segments of management and labor. It recognizes the Federal Government's responsibility to help workers and those injured by the national interest in developing multilateral nondiscriminatory trade as the cornerstone of U.S. foreign economic policy.

Under my proposed legislation, Federal loans and tax incentives would be available to individual businesses and communities that could prove hardship as a result of concentrated import competition. Money would be available to retrain and relocate workers. Unemployment payments could be extended and early retirement under social security would be possible. Businesses failing to regain their competitive position could be helped to diversify or to undertake a new line of production.

With trade-adjustment assistance, the Federal Government could help individual firms and communities without according blanket protection to a whole industry. The present "escape clause" provision does not differentiate between those segments of an industry which can compete and those which cannot. Relief under it is on an all-or-nothing basis. But with trade-adjustment aid available, the Tariff Commission, which now rules on requests for relief under the escape clause, would do so with the knowledge that help of a nonprotectionist nature could also be given. In addition, my bill would permit the President to limit additional tariff or quota protection recommended by the Tariff Commission to 7 years, during which time it could be reduced gradually.

There is growing bipartisan support for this approach in both Houses, along with a growing recognition that the President must play a more active role in this special area if we are to remove the major threat to the continuation of the broad trade policies this country has followed so successfully for nearly a generation. Such legislation may be highly complex and it may be highly controversial. But it is urgently needed to head off a really damaging struggle over present U.S. trade policy. It is vital to continue that policy both for the national interest and for peace.

One Hundredth Anniversary of Founding of Lewiston, Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 19, 1961

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, on Saturday, May 13, the city of Lewiston, Idaho, began a summer-long celebration of its 100th birthday. At the founders day dinner, historical developments of a century ago were reviewed as speakers emphasized the exceptional opportunity for future development resulting from utilization of the rich water resources in the area. The completion of the four Lower Snake River dams will bring slack water navigation to Lewiston and provide unusual opportunities for the city to become a shipping center. The Lewiston Morning Tribune has played an important role in the area since 1892. On May 13, 1961, the distinguished editor of this newspaper, William Johnston, wrote a timely editorial. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEWISTON'S FIRST 100 YEARS

The summer-long celebration of Lewiston's 100th birthday, beginning with a busy Founders' Day program today, promises to create among the city's residents a deeper understanding and appreciation of things past and a better perspective to greet the future.

Lewiston has an unusual opportunity in this centennial celebration to set a standard for observances all over Idaho during the next two years. Indications thus far suggest that the opportunity will be seized and the standard sturdily established.

The Lewiston centennial celebration is, of course, a home-grown product. Its charm for visitors must be based chiefly upon faithfulness by which the city re-creates the image of its pioneer beginnings. And its value for the city's own residents—who will be the chief beneficiaries—likewise will depend upon the citizens' willingness and ability to look clearly into the past for clues to wisdom for the future.

Lewiston's first hundred years have been productive, challenging—sometimes dreadfully hard—years, but the changes in this valley of the shining waters during the last

century are nothing as compared with the changes clearly foreseeable in the years ahead.

The steadfast courage of the pioneers will be needed by their descendants to cope with the challenges of these years. But needed, too, will be a revival of the pioneer willingness to take huge new risks in creating bold new patterns of progress out of the needs of tomorrow and the experience of yesteryear.

By comparison with most of this young nation, and in startling contrast to most of the worn and weary world, the Lewiston country is a fresh and unspoiled land. Its mistakes still can be corrected. Its goals still can be achieved. It can use the tools of twentieth century technology to translate into fact the dreams of those pioneers who envisioned here a rich, rewarding homeland for generations still to come.

But this area must contemplate steadily some of the overwhelming causes for change which are shaking the world and will shake this quiet valley, too. The population explosion, which will double the world's total population within the next half century, surely will change the face of this sparsely settled region. The critical water shortage, which will plague vast sections of the nation in the years to come, will mark for rapid change this area so richly blessed by an abundance of pure, fresh water. These are only two of the many key factors certain to hasten the pace of Lewiston's development. There are others—all pointing in the same direction and all bearing the urgent reminder that this region's vigorous, exciting, rapidly changing future lies just around the corner.

Now a century has passed since the first band of miners landed at the juncture of the rivers to establish the trading camp which became the city of Lewiston. Soon that city will be behind dikes as the broad river which bore the stern-wheelers of that far day is tamed at last for barges, too. Soon a stream of traffic will pour across the Lolo Pass to funnel into Lewiston the travelers who have passed this way in trickles since the days of Lewis and Clark, but will come now in volume over a new transcontinental highway link. On its 100th birthday, Lewiston is on the threshold of vast change.

It is fitting at such a time to recall some of the key purposes of a centennial celebration. To borrow from the originally proposed objectives of the 1963 Idaho Territorial Centennial (which the Idaho Legislature left freely available to borrowers), a meaningful centennial can achieve certain key values: It can re-create among the citizens themselves a deeper appreciation of their own heritage. It can attract visitors to the celebration scene to participate in the recapture of history. It can stimulate out of the celebrations some achievements of lasting worth and value to serve the citizens after the bunting has been torn down. And it can help to bring all the people together in unity to visualize better where they might go in the future, now that they have glimpsed more clearly where they were in the past.

(There are those, of course, who contend that the only purpose of a centennial celebration is to trap the tourists—particularly the rich ones. Such intellectual paupers do not deserve a centennial. In communities or States where they prove to be in control, they perhaps will not have one).

But Lewiston already has risen far above such short-sighted greed as that espoused by the tourist-trappers. Lewiston has recognized that a 100th birthday party is something chiefly for the family—adults and children alike—and that the visitors can only share those celebration values which are genuinely created and honored by the folks who live here.

Lewiston—100 years ago the Gateway to Gold—today faces new, exciting, largely unknown challenges. The city with a past is also a city with a future. Its citizens would do well to look carefully, searchingly backward—then face resolutely ahead.

Forest Access Roads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 19, 1961

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent letter from the Oroville, Wash., Chamber of Commerce which completely describes the tremendous values that accrue to our economy through the prompt construction of needed forest access roads. Our national forests are important sources of timber and recreation as well as a major source of water for many of our western communities.

The Oroville Chamber has made an intensive study of the opporunities to increase both timber and recreation use on the Okanogan National Forest. Their study shows that an investment of $2,850,000 would open up for proper management 3 billion board feet of presently inaccessible overripe timber. If this investment were promptly made the allowable cut in this northern part of the Okanogan Forest could be increased from 20 million board feet anually.

In addition, the extremely popular recreation areas of Bonaparte Lake, Beaver Lake, and Lost Lake would become available for recreation bringing many benefits to the people and surrounding communities. It is my hope that in this year's budget and succeeding budgets, we shall be able to fulfill the needs that exist to develop these great public forest resources for all of our people.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OROVILLE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
OROVILLE, WASH., *May 10, 1961.*

U.S. Senator HENRY M. JACKSON,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: I received your telegram of May 2, 1961, and thank you for your continued interest in forest access roads and forest timber sales in north Okanogan County. It seems impossible to discuss the forest roads problem without bringing in the forest timber sales—or the forest timber sales, without the road problem. We have met several times with Fritz Moisio, supervisor of the Okanogan National Forest.

Mr. Moisio has made several timber sales available to the small sawmill operators in this area who never have been able to purchase before. However, the road situation for hauling this timber through Chesaw to Oroville is still in a critical condition. As an illustration, the Oroville Lumber Co. recently purchased 6 million feet of timber in the Lost Lake area called the West Strawberry Mountain sale. If the road from the sale to the forest boundary and into Chesaw were improved they could deliver this timber to their mill at Oroville over 27 miles of road—21 miles of which is oiled. As it is, they are now hauling via the Republic Road and through Tonasket, a distance of 54 miles, or 108 miles per round trip.

Bonaparte Lake, Beaver Lake, and Lost Lake are very popular recreation areas for people of this part of the county who are also forced to use this roundabout route. On this timber sale there is a $20,000 road to be built—approximately a 2-mile stretch of road, graded and graveled which deadends near the top of the mountain. We feel this is overly designed and extravagant, and is doing the job a spur road would do. This is in the middle and close to new roads recently built. If only this $20,000 could go into the Lost Lake to Chesaw Road, it would make a good start and bring many benefits to many people and surrounding communities that are now practically shut off.

We believe this is an emergency and that funds be made available if possible for immediate construction. We were promised 5 years ago that they would build this road before now. We feel it is very important to have money enough, but that it is also important to build the roads that do the most good.

We mailed you a report on the road problem and sales June 3, 1959 along with a good sized map with the roads marked in color. In this report, we requested $2,800,000, for forest access roads for this north Okanogan district. We are sending a report about the same as the June 3, 1959, along with a map. Most of the roads shown have been planned for future construction by the Forest Service. We have added some proposals in order to complete them into through roads without any deadends, such as the Pontiac Ridge Road from the Joe Allen Corner to go by Beth Lakes and down to Taroda Creek Junction. We do believe this is a key road of great importance and should be considered as priority No. 1.

It would permit the flow of timber between the Colville National Forest and Okanogan National Forest as the shortest route to the most sawmills. It could be of great advantage, as a military road, also a shortcut from the coast through Keremeos, Nighthawk Road to Oroville via Chesaw to Toroda Creek. The Beth Lakes and Beaver Lakes to Toroda Creek offer very good tourist attractions. It would offer Oroville a 33-mile shortcut to Spokane. It would make it 70 miles closer for the Molson and Chesaw area. It is about 4½ percent grade. We have had estimates that there is more than enough timber that could be tapped from this road to more than pay for it. The estimate was 28 million. Several million could be hauled on this road from the eastern slope of Cedar block and Bonaparte block and the west drainage of the Colville National Forest to the east of us.

We estimate this would be 10 miles of road and cost about $250,000. Meyers Creek, the loop road to extend as shown in the Bonapart block south and over eastern section to Lightnigh Creek to come out on the south end of the Toroda Creek area. This would tap into miles of timber going to waste, likely one-third of a billion feet. The road would give an equal opportunity for the timber to flow to the mills in the Tonasket, Omak, or Oroville district.

In our report to you of June 3, 1959, we stressed our concern about the 1½ to 2 billion feet of extra timber. We are enclosing a separate sheet with a breakdown of roads and a key for the map. We are also enclosing two copies of a report from Ferry County Timbermen's Association which we highly recommend and endorse.

In conclusion we also feel that if the $2,850,000 we asked for to build access roads for this district was allowed and these roads were to be built, all of the 3 billion feet of

timber would be made accessible and salvage overripe timber could be cut and a sustained yield of approximately 37½ million feet could be set up instead of the present 20 million feet yearly cut in this north Okanogan County. About 280 miles of access roads would complete this project. We especially refer to the Bonaparte block, which includes Meyers Creek, the Mount Hull block, Cedar Creek block, and Aeness Valley block, all of which have a great deal of virgin timber and are located in the north Okanogan district and easily accessible to the mills in this north Okanogan district.

Thank you very much for your consideration of this matter.

Yours very truly,

OROVILLE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

History of Migrant Work in Mesa County, Colo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. CARROLL

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 19, 1961

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, much attention has been given in recent years to the condition of the migrant workers and their families across our land. Some excellent studies of this serious human problem and some fine leadership have come from the Secretaries of Labor under both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations, as well as the present Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] and his subcommittee have devoted countless hours to a scholarly series of hearings and findings on the subject. They are now sponsoring legislation in the Senate, some of which I have found relevant to my State of Colorado. I am proud to be a cosponsor of several of these bills, which offer hope of ameliorating some of the hardships which occur in some areas.

Still, even the best of public servants and the wisest lawmakers cannot hope to accomplish what the people of the area most concerned can do when they see a problem and decide to act. A shining example can be found in the good people of Mesa County, Colo., one of the finest irrigated orchard areas in the West, renowned all over the Nation for its peaches.

I am indebted to Mrs. H. A. Talbott, of Palisade, Colo., for the story of the locally organized Mesa County Migrant Council. It is my firm belief that if the people of other localities could and would do what these folks have done, there would be very little need for legislation in this field.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief history of this splendid group, so that others may read it and take inspiration.

There being no objection, the history was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAPSULE HISTORY OF THE MIGRANT WORK IN MESA COUNTY

Until 1948, there was no organized effort to better the lot of the many migrant workers who help grow and harvest the crops of Mesa County. In June of that year, the State director of the migrant ministry of the Council of Churches came in person to pioneer a work in the newly purchased labor camp of the Palisade peachgrowers.

In order to support these efforts, Palisade women from several churches organized themselves into a group known as United Churchwomen. They supplied toys, clothing, milk, volunteer service, and some money. Realizing that their efforts were inadequate in comparison to the need, they began asking the help of other organizations and agencies.

In this way the program was substantially broadened year by year. At their request, the Red Cross gave free swimming lessons to the children; the recreation commission supplied used sports equipment, the county library gave books, the FFA began a long-range tree-planting project in the camp and the Girl Scouts conducted a pilot project. In 1955, the United Churchwomen were instrumental in bringing to Palisade a health project, financed by Federal funds, which provided nursing and clinic service to Mesa County migrants.

The same year, the Palisade Woman's Club added their strength to the existing program. They established and successfully operated the first thrift shop, free child care center, and sewing center. The need for a coordinating group was most evident, so that fall they invited all organizations which had contributed to the child care center to send a representative to form a county migrant council. Thirty-five organizations and eight interested people joined with the professional agencies, health, welfare, and Migrant Ministry, in answer to this appeal.

So was born the Mesa County Migrant Council which coordinates activities in behalf of migrant workers; supplies information to the public, to growers, and to the migrants themselves; carries on projects, such as the child care center; and develops other services as needed. As a council, we have been able to secure a special summer school for migrant children, extend the original services of the public health department, and continue to increase the effectiveness of existing services.

EVALUATION, 1960

The close of a most difficult season finds the migrant council in good shape, having demonstrated capacity to adapt to the unusual circumstances caused by the severe Easter freeze.

The excellent program planned in March by health, welfare, education, and migrant ministry was thrown into confusion by doubt as to whether there would be enough fruit to justify operation of any of the services to migrants. Giving to the council projects came to a quick standstill.

When it became evident, during the last of July, that there would be a third of a crop, and that the labor camp would be opened, we tried to set things in motion for the August program as originally planned. This was difficult due to the illness or absence from the county of several key people who had sparked the work of previous years.

Organizations who had given money in other years were contacted, and enough funds assured to justify our proceeding with the child care center and medical night clinic to be held downtown.

By August 1, Mrs. Bea Randolph was back at her post as clinic nurse at the labor camp; the migrant ministry staff had arrived and set to work, and plans were complete for a pilot summer school to begin the 8th. The thrift shop opened August 8 and was the source of enough school clothing to make attendance possible for the children. Sewing machines were made available in the community building, and were freely used by the migrant women.

Several trends appeared that were most encouraging. First, there was a greater use of all the services by workers housed on the ranches, particularly the school, the medical clinic, and the child care center. As we are entering a period when those housed in the labor camp are becoming a less important factor in the fruit industry, it is vital that our services reach those on the ranches.

Encouraging, also, was the evidence that migrant families are taking more interest in helping by giving their time, when unemployed, to clean and to mend as well as to sort toys at the community building, give volunteer service at the child care center, and help others within the camp. This participation is an important part of building a sense of self-respect.

More interest was shown by local church people and by families engaged in the fruit industry. Three key people in this year's programs were from families who own peach ranches. They were Mrs. Eugene Rowley of the thrift shop, Miss Annette Power of the migrant ministry staff, and Mrs. Lyman Wallace, assistant supervisor of the child care center. Their experience with migrant workers was a stabilizing force in a year when a number of new people were brought in to help with our services. More individuals and organizations from the fruit districts gave volunteer help this year. There seems to be evidence of a growing understanding on the part of the families who employ migrant workers.

The very suitable rummage, carefully cleaned and mended, which was received from churches, clubs, and individuals, showed a growing understanding of the migrant's needs by the citizenry in general. The fact that these people never grow tired of helping makes possible the good accomplished in this area.

All of the agency programs, health, welfare, School District 51, and migrant ministry were excellent. The cooperation among these groups makes possible a great deal of help at low cost by eliminating overlapping and duplication.

Our new council project, the night medical clinic in Palisade, was much appreciated by the workers and the growers who employed them. The council paid Dr. C. H. Bliss for his time and the use of the office on six different evenings, and the health department furnished the services of their nurse, Mrs. Randolph, and bore the cost of medications. Beside the 61 persons treated at the clinic, Dr. Bliss cared for many who came in at other times. It is evident that more clinic nights are needed, as well as secretarial help for the doctor.

Dr. Ralph Kibler gave dental service to a considerable number. Sometimes it was possible to arrange with the employer for the fee, if the person in question was working. In harvest, there was no time for that. There seemed to be a lot of acute dental troubles this year. We hope to arrange something for emergency cases in the near future.

The generosity of the school district in allowing us to use two rooms of Taylor Elementary School was deeply appreciated, as well as the services of Principal Ralph Wobick as director of the child care center. We are also grateful to the migrant ministry for loaning toys, tables, and chairs for the center, and for enrolling the labor camp children. Mrs. Randolph also enrolled children, and inspected them daily for health problems. Her thoroughness prevented any

outbreaks of illness among the children. The volunteers sent by United Churchwomen of Grand Junction also performed an indispensable service, for which we are thankful.

Our budget, before the frost, was set at $650. Due to the short time of operation, and the generous amount of volunteer help, we spent only $395.51. We received $520.81 in gifts, so close the year in good financial health.

If the value of our council was measured by the money spent, we would certainly rate as the least of service organizations; but if you count the hours of service contributed by over 200 persons, and add to it the benefits received by migrant workers and our own citizenry, the total becomes quite substantial.

MARGARET TALBOTT,
Secretary.

Proposed U.S. Host Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN A. CARROLL

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 19, 1961

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, it now seems evident that we soon will have a new law authorizing establishment of an active agency within the Department of Commerce which will devote itself to stimulating tourist travel from abroad. As I have said many times in the past, I am proud to have joined in sponsoring this plan, first advanced by the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and heartily endorsed by the Kennedy administration.

This winter and spring there has been a great deal of comment from well-informed circles pointing to our national deficiencies as a tourist mecca. One of the first people to do something about this was a constituent of mine, Mrs. George—Mable—Grimes of Denver, whose proposal for a U.S. Host Corps was outlined by me in the RECORD for March 24. A similar idea occurred to a constituent of the able and distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], and I have no doubt that many persons in our great country who have never heard of either the Host Corps or the Welcome Corps are independently arriving at the same conclusion—that our people can make good use of their native hospitality by organizing to welcome foreign tourists and make their stay here more pleasant.

Mrs. Grimes of Denver has continued her efforts to organize support in Colorado for establishment of a Host Corps there. At the same time she has been perfecting her ideas for the benefit of the Department of Commerce. During her last visit to Washington in late March she not only testified in behalf of the idea before a House subcommittee, but she also had a long interview with John W. Black, special assistant to the Secretary of Commerce for travel. At his invitation she drafted a letter detailing her plan for a Host Corps.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Mrs. Grimes to Mr. Black and a brief article written by Mrs. Grimes for the periodical of the Denver Chamber of Commerce.

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DENVER, COLO., *April 24, 1961.*

MR. JOHN W. BLACK,
Special Assistant to Secretary of Commerce, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BLACK: When I was in your office early this month, you asked me to send you suggestions for putting the Host Corps into operation. In order of my conception of their importance, here is the nucleus of a starting plan.

1. Appointment of a national coordinator. This person must have great and infectious enthusiasm for the project and be willing and able to devote full time to its implementation. Much traveling and constant contacts with the local groups will be necessary to keep interest high until volunteers are busy enough to generate their own enthusiasm.

2. The decision on the location of the first districts to be placed in operation is important. New York would seem likely, but due to its extreme size and large volume of tourists, I would suggest that the first pilot groups be in Washington, Boston, New Orleans, and San Francisco.

3. The establishment of a national telephone number—dial WELCOME—9352663. When the Host Corps is ready to function on a nationwide basis, pamphlets explaining and publicizing this number will be distributed to travel agencies around the world. The recorded answers to this number should be in English, French, German, and Spanish, giving a short welcoming sentence and the local Host Corps number. Taxi company-owners should be asked to place signs in the windows of their cabs designating the language their bilingual drivers speak.

4. Preparation of a manual of aims and procedures must be carefully approached. The primary aim of this program being "people-seeing," this will not be a book of rules, but one to stimulate the interest of the volunteer worker. Suggestions on low cost and interesting entertainment that in no way infringes on the services of the travel and sightseeing agencies. The questionnaire to be used by local chairmen in selecting and categorizing the volunteer hosts is of the utmost importance. It must be prepared to compliment the manual and pave the way for a personal interview between the chairman and the prospective host. This manner of selecting representatives serves a dual purpose; making membership an honor and thereby desirable, and impressing each applicant with the fact that in the "people-seeing" program of the Host Corps he becomes an ambassador of good will.

5. The most crucial task of the coordinator is the finding of capable and dynamic local chairmen. Editors, bankers, and civic organization presidents can be of assistance in confidential interviews. The recently retired and semiretired people offer a source of unused time, energy, and experience from which to make this selection. A salary of $1 per year for these appointees permits the coordinator to be selective, and the prestige of a Federal Government appointment makes the chairmanship interesting to qualified people. An orientation seminar held in Washington and addressed by members of the Cabinet and perhaps the President, would start the publicity campaign with the proper flourish. All chairmen called to such meetings should be on a small per diem. This entire program will be defeated if it becomes fair game for those who want something from the Government.

6. The public should be asked to volunteer on the local level. The prepared questionnaire to be sent on request followed by a personal interview with the chairman. People from all walks of life should be encouraged to become hosts. Contact with people of other countries can promote understanding here and let stay-at-homes enjoy some of the broadening effects of travel. The assistance of language teachers and students should be solicited.

This is all preliminary, the program can be endlessly expanded. I have only set down the things that require time to accomplish and must be done before this program can even start. It seems advisable to implement the Host Corps in advance of the projected increase of tourists so that it will be a smooth running operation when it is needed. I again urge consideration of a start that can be fitted into the larger program at any time.

Thank you for your interest, and let me know if I can do anything more to further this plan.

Sincerely,

MABLE S. GRIMES.

DENVER SHOULD PIONEER WITH HOST CORPS

(Article prepared for Denver Chamber of Commerce periodical by Mrs. Mable Grimes)

As a long-time member of the chamber of commerce it seems to me to be the place to launch a national project; knowing that aims are high, interests progressive, and membership of the upper echelon of astute business people.

There is a bill now before the House of Representatives to establish a Bureau of International Travel to entice foreigners to spend some of their travel dollars in the United States. Under the number S. 610, the Senate passed such a bill; Senator JOHN A. CARROLL, of Colorado, being one of the cosponsors. A budget of $5 million was authorized to establish tourist information offices in population centers around the world. The administration of this project to be under the Secretary of Commerce.

Tourism has helped in large measure toward European monetary recovery since World War II. The United States helped in this effort, with the present need to readjust the imbalance in dollar flow we need to attract tourists to our shores.

On two recent visits to Washington I realized how potent the voice of an individual can be if only we bestir ourselves. May I suggest that the chamber send a resolution supporting this legislation to Congressman BYRON G. ROGERS, of the First District of Colorado.

I presented to the subcommittee of the House holding hearings on this bill my plan for a Host Corps. This group to be volunteers to welcome foreign visitors. These hosts to be recruited partially from retired and semiretired people interested in a rewarding and stimulating activity. The basic idea is to permit our visitors to see life in the United States at its grassroots, thereby furthering understanding. The Host Corps is possible only after the passage and implementation of the international travel bill. We must have tourists before we can make plans for their entertainment. I urge each member of the chamber to write his Congressman to support the international travel bill.

Talking to Mr. Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 19, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the people of the United States, and the world, are awaiting word of agreement for a conference between Mr. Khrushchev and President Kennedy.

The decision to meet with Khrushchev, of course, rests solely with the President.

According to preliminary speculation, the meeting, if held in the near future, would be focused upon informal talks rather than attempts to reach decisive final decision on the major issue between the East and West.

Unfortunately, our experience in such East-West negotiations provides little ground for great optimism. To the contrary, the results have largely been:

First, providing new propaganda opportunities for the Reds; second, disillusionment for those who anticipate real progress toward peace.

Despite previous summit conferences, innumerable meetings at nonsummit levels, and thousands of hours of negotiation between East-West delegations—the Reds have yet to yield, compromise, or conciliate on any major points—even though they themselves have substantially extended their spheres of influence and control during this time.

There is, of course, always the hope that the pressures of world opinion, or of conditions at home, will force Mr. Khrushchev and his cohorts into negotiations for lessening of world tensions and the imminence of war. Realistically, however, this is only a hope—since the Communists themselves have shown no signs of receding from their oft-stated goals of world conquest.

Today the New York Times published an editorial entitled "Talking to Mr. Khrushchev." The editorial attempts to put into perspective the meaning of the conference itself as well as its possible results. I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 19, 1961]

TALKING TO MR. KHRUSHCHEV

Barring forbidding complications, President Kennedy now plans to meet Premier Khrushchev for informal bilateral talks in Vienna early next month in an effort to stem further deterioration of the world situation, to make a personal appraisal of the Soviet's ruler's intentions and to warn him that the United States and the West are determined to defend the frontier of freedom.

The projected meeting, long sought by Premier Khrushchev, marks a revision of the quiet diplomacy first essayed by the Kennedy administration but frustrated by Communist aggressiveness. But it cannot yet be described as either a summit meeting in the accepted sense, or a return to personal diplomacy that led to the fiasco in Paris.

For President Kennedy is not expected either to negotiate or to reach agreements at this meeting on problems which inevitably involve the interests of other nations. Rather, as did Prime Minister Macmillan on his trip to Moscow, the President would be expected to exchange views with the Soviet Premier, to explore possible areas of agreement, and to expound the Western position. As by the time of the meeting he will have conferred with Mr. Macmillan, Chancellor Adenauer, President de Gaulle, and many other statesmen, he would be able both to take their views into account and act as the principal spokesman of the West.

Despite this limited objective, however, the meeting could well have decisive results. Though it would take place at a time marked by free world setbacks in Cuba and Laos, which might lead to misinterpretations of it, it would still be worth while, even as a gamble. It would enable President Kennedy personally to warn Premier Khrushchev not to mistake Western reasonableness and restraint in the world's trouble spots as weakness, and to serve notice on him that in decisive areas, such as Berlin, the West will tolerate no new Munich. At the same time, depending on the Soviet's ruler's responses, it would enable the Kennedy administration to give final shape to its foreign policy, still in flux.

These responses should decide in particular whether it is still possible to save the Geneva test ban conference from collapse or whether the United States must resume testing at the price of further delay in disarmament talks. They should decide whether the Kennedy administration must step up its armament program beyond what is now contemplated. And they should decide whether the United States and its allies must meet Communist guerrillas in southeast Asia with their own guerrilla troops at the risk of widening conflicts.

In such an effort President Kennedy can count not only on the imposing strength of the West and allied solidarity displayed at the Oslo meeting of the North Atlantic alliance but also on the moral backing of the whole free world now living under the shadow of Communist aggression.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Wise Advice to President Kennedy To Resume His Campaign Position on Summitry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, during the presidential election campaign, President Kennedy expressed the view that summit conferences were to be preceded by large efforts by subordinates to define areas of agreement which could be ratified by the heads of state. This position, concurred in by Mr. Nixon, was that which both candidates presented to the Nation. Now it seems, a summit conference is about to occur without such preliminaries. This inconsistency between words and actions is discussed in the following editorial appearing in the Long Beach Independent-Press-Telegram:

MAKE HIM EARN IT

An exchange of notes between President John Kennedy and Premier Nikita Khrushchev suggests the possibility that another "summit" conference may take place in the near future.

The man who said hope springs eternal was certainly right.

Exactly one year ago, in Paris, Premier Khrushchev called the President of the United States (Dwight Eisenhower) a thief, and withdrew the invitation which had been issued to the President to visit Russia. The era of personal diplomacy with the Khrushchev regime would seem to have come to an emphatic end.

Subsequently, Senator John Kennedy agreed with his opponent, Richard Nixon, in the race for the Presidency that another summit meeting was a long way off and could occur only after some rigid tests of good faith.

Said Mr. Kennedy:

"I will not meet Mr. Khrushchev unless there were some agreement at the secondary level, foreign ministers or ambassadors, that would indicate that the meeting will have some hope of success or useful exchange of ideas."

Dean Rusk, the man who became Mr. Kennedy's Secretary of State, made this comment on summit meetings in a speech January 18, 1960:

"* * * It diverts time and energy from exactly the point (the Presidency) at which we can spare it least; it does not give us effective negotiations; such experience as we have had with summit diplomacy does not encourage the view that it contributes to the advancement of American interests * * * Summit diplomacy is to be approached with the wariness with which a prudent physician prescribes habit-forming drugs."

Wherein lies the hope that a new summit conference would produce good results? Where is the proof that another summit conference would be a good investment of presidential time?

If such hopes or proofs exist, they have been completely obscured by Khrushchev's boasting, missile rattling, and meddling in Cuba, Laos, Africa.

Summit conferences with Russia are barren and futile, and the advantages, if any, fall to the Russians.

Such meetings hold the spotlight of world attention and afford the Communists a propaganda forum which they exploit relentlessly and skillfully.

Such meetings merely give Khrushchev more recognition, honor, and prestige. This would seem to be the worst possible time to hand him those gifts.

Will the nations of Latin America really believe American warnings against communism if they see President Kennedy entertaining or being entertained by the leader of communism?

We have told them that Khrushchev can't be trusted. Are we now to sit down and negotiate with the man we don't trust—after having been slapped in the face by that man such a short time ago?

This is a dubious way to build American prestige, gain the confidence of neighbors, and prevent the spread of communism.

Before going to another summit conference, this Nation should require a substantial and dramatic demonstration of good will by the Soviet Union.

Let Khrushchev declare free elections in despoiled Hungary or withdraw his armaments from Cuba or Laos or North Korea.

Let him do just one thing that shows he really wants peace and good will in this world.

Far from giving evidence of good will in the form of deeds, he rarely bothers any more to speak in civil terms.

Under such circumstances, another summit meeting will merely demonstrate that the drug of summitry has indeed overwhelmed better judgment.

If Nikita gets another summit meeting, let's make him earn it.

Physical Fitness Among Members of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news release from the Public Information Office of Fort Jackson, near Columbia, S.C. The article tells of the purchase by post Special Services of 28 new bicycles for use of the troops stationed at Fort Jackson to encourage and assist our servicemen in keeping physically fit.

It may be recalled, Mr. President, that I made a speech in the Senate on March 24 of this year stressing the importance of bicycle riding from the standpoints of good health and physical fitness. At that time I pointed out that President Kennedy and former President Eisenhower have both expressed a deep interest in promoting physical fitness in America.

I commend Maj. Gen. H. D. Ives, the Commanding General at Fort Jackson, Col. Paul S. Reinecke, Chief of Staff, and others responsible for initiating this worthwhile project at Fort Jackson. I hope others will follow this fine example.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORT JACKSON, S.C.—Supplementing the many recreational facilities of Fort Jackson, the post Special Services has obtained 28 new bicycles for use by troops stationed here. In addition to providing recreation and transportation to and from Special Service activities located at Fort Jackson, they assist the soldier in keeping physically fit.

The bikes were purchased by the central post fund, a welfare account which is financed by post exchange profits instead of tax dollars. They may be rented for a small fee on a first-come, first-served basis. All revenue collected is returned to the Post Fund for continuation of the program.

Maintenance of the vehicles is performed by men of the Special Services boat shop, another recreation facility of the Special Services. If a bike is damaged through neglect of the renter it is taken to a shop in Columbia for repair and the renter must pay the cost.

The bicycles must remain within the limits of Fort Jackson and may be used only during daylight hours as they have no lights. They may be signed out at the main service club, presently the only checkout point. Beginning May 15, a bicycle may be obtained at Twin Lakes enlisted men's recreational area or at the miniature golf course on Jackson Boulevard. With the advent of the two new checkout points a soldier may ride the bike to one of the areas, turn it in, enjoy a swim or a game of golf, and not have to pay for the bike while he plays. When he is ready to return he checks out another bike and rides to the desired checkout point and again signs the bike in.

Present plans are for operating the bikes the year around, weather permitting with more to be added when additional funds are available.

East Europe Views Summit Talk as Indication of U.S. Weakness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK MacGREGOR
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, in a few days, on June 3, the President of this country is scheduled to meet Mr.

Khrushchev in Vienna. To help provide valuable assistance in ascertaining how other peoples view this meeting, I suggest the following article whch appeared in the Minneapols Sunday Tribune of May 21:

EAST EUROPE VIEWS SUMMIT TALK AS INDICATION OF U.S. WEAKNESS

(By Graham Hovey)

VIENNA, AUSTRIA.—President Kennedy's projected trip to Vienna to meet Nikita Khrushchev will be regarded in Eastern Europe as another indication of American weakness.

It will be taken as another sign that for the present Russia is winning and the United States is losing the cold war.

After 16 days of observation, inquiry, and argument in Communist-ruled Poland and Czechoslovakia, I am confident this will be the general reaction in this part of the world. It is the reaction that will be expected by most Western diplomats with substantial experience in this area dominated by Russia.

This inference of American weakness will be drawn gleefully by the top Communist leaders of Czechoslovakia and by some—perhaps not all—party chiefs in more independent Poland. It will be drawn reluctantly by a substantial majority of ordinary Czechs, Slovaks, and Poles.

The incessant Communist propaganda barrage had not succeeded in making the majority of the ordinary citizens of these two countries anti-American, veteran diplomats assured me. What the propaganda, coupled with a series of genuine Russian successes and American failures, has accomplished is to create the widespread belief that communism will eventually prevail.

"The Czech people have definitely not turned against America," a seasoned Western official told me in Prague. "More and more of them, however, are getting the impression that the Soviets are winning—and this is posing an increasingly difficult problem for the United States."

It is not that the people under Communist rule in eastern Europe are automatically opposed to a meeting between the American President and the Soviet premier.

But this two-man summit comes after spectacular American failures in Cuba and Laos. It comes at a time of increasing restlessness in American-backed South Vietnam and right after the overthrow of the U.S.-backed South Korea Government.

It comes just after the American-backed Shah of Iran has had to dissolve both houses of his parliament in an attempt to stave off a crisis in his part of the volatile Middle East. It comes after the Soviet success in launching the first man in outer space.

Had some of these events not occurred or had the results been reversed, the Eastern European reaction to the Vienna summit might have been different.

Above all, had there been no Fidel Castro to bedevil and embarrass and humiliate the United States in its own backyard, things would have been different.

As things stand, it looks to Eastern Europe as though Mr. Kennedy will come to Khrushchev out of weakness, and with few bargaining weapons.

There is another aspect of the meeting that confirms this impression—the fact that President Kennedy will be meeting Khrushchev on neutral ground with America's chief allies absent.

Eastern Europeans know that it has long been Khrushchev's objective to settle the world's problems in a face-to-face meeting with the American President. The claim that the Vienna affair will be only an "informal" meeting does not dispel the impression that Khrushchev has succeeded partially in splitting America from its British and French partners.

Defense Procurement and Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I call to the attention of my colleagues a scholarly study just completed by a research team of five University of Washington professors on "Defense Procurement and Small Business." The study, in book form, has been published by the University of Washington Press.

This book presents the practices and opinion of some 1,165 small business firms who responded to the questionnaire sent them by the research team. Because the study covers a subject of great interest to the Congress and the various Government agencies dealing with small business, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD the following brief summary of this research project.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE PROCUREMENT AND SMALL BUSINESS

A University of Washington survey of small defense industries has determined that an overwhelming proportion of them prefer to sell their products to the Government by a process of negotiated bidding rather than through advertised bids.

The survey, which studied the experiences and views of more than 1,100 firms who employ 1,000 persons or less, was the first systematic attempt to learn the preferences of small businesses who sell or seek to sell defense products to the Federal Government.

Although only sporadic attempts to ascertain these preferences had been made in the past, the opinion has often been expressed that small businesses preferred selling to the Government by advertised bids rather than negotiated bids. Advertised bidding is a system of purchasing wherein an open invitation is made to prospective suppliers to submit bids, and the contract is awarded to the lowest bidder who meets the criteria established. Negotiated bids are a system wherein a buyer may deal with only one company as a potential supplier, or in which he may deal with two or more companies.

Contrary to the oft-expressed supposition that small businesses preferred the advertised bidding procedure, the study showed that more than 90 percent of firms surveyed preferred to sell their defense products through negotiated bids.

While, in the sale of "nonweapon" products such as fuel, office supplies, uniforms and barracks, the small firms indicated they preferred advertised bids, negotiated bids were highly favored for the production of missiles, privately designed oxygen valves, new missile designs, and the first production lot of missiles.

As their reasons for preferring negotiated bids, the surveyed firms listed:

1. The buyer is more likely to get the product he wants more economically under negotiated bids.

2. Negotiated bidding is more profitable to the supplier.

3. Negotiated bidding affords greater protection to the proprietary information of the creative supplier.

4. Negotiated bidding favors neither large nor small suppliers.

5. Negotiated bidding is more familiar to the small firms, who use the system in doing business with other private industries.

The study discovered that the small firms rarely use advertised bidding in the purchases that they make, whereas more than 80 percent of their purchases—measured by dollar volumes—are made through negotiated bids.

The small firms, when given a choice, also prefer Government defense subcontracts to prime contracts, the study concluded.

The survey drew its findings from the experiences of the small firms in securing defense business, their actual selling and buying practices and their attitudes regarding bidding procedures on Government contracts and the methods of awarding the contracts. It was made by a research team directed by Prof. Albert N. Schrieber, and consisting of Profs. Edward G. Brown, Sumner Marcus and Robert A. Sutermeister, all of the University of Washington College of Business Administration.

The majority of the firms surveyed expressed the belief that bidding procedures can be improved. Suggestions for improvement cited most frequently were:

Making descriptions of the product to be procured more comprehensive and the specifications simpler.

Investigating bidders more thoroughly.

Insuring that invitations to bid are sent to all companies on qualified bidders lists.

Cutting complicated red tape.

The small firms also indicated that the Government, in emphasizing low prices, often excluded consideration of quality and past performance to its detriment.

The survey was made by the university on a grant by Aerospace Industries Association, Inc.

Results of Public Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM V. MOOREHEAD
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. MOOREHEAD of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, recently, I have been conducting a public opinion poll of the 15th Congressional District of Ohio in an effort to determine how the residents of the seven southeastern Ohio counties I represent here feel about a number of important national issues. These are issues which, in one form or another, may be considered by the Congress this year. Many of the 19 questions in the poll are based upon specific recommendations on which President Kennedy has requested legislation. The survey is now complete and I wish to call the attention of the Congress to the expressions of opinion I have received.

This poll represents the tabulation of responses from 5,860 residents of my district. The questionnaire was given a large distribution by direct mail and through the cooperation of daily and weekly newspapers in the seven counties. Every effort was made to assure that the circulation was completed without regard to the political sentiments or special interests of those who received the questionnaire. It has also been my purpose to exercise care in the preparation of the questions so that their phras-

ing would not influence the answers given or impose my own opinions in any way. The results represent a very large sample of the total population of the district and it is my belief that the poll is a very good gage of public sentiment there at this time.

Since this is my first experience with a survey of this kind, I was very pleased that such a large number of persons responding commented in considerable detail, explaining why they feel as they do. These remarks cannot, of course, be reflected in the statistical tabulation. However, they have often raised points of view that I have not previously considered. Therefore, they have been very helpful to me in my own analysis of these issues. I am particularly grateful for the serious and widespread interest the questionnaire has been accorded.

The most persistent expression in the poll was concern over increased Government spending and the expansion of Federal powers. Overwhelming responses to actual questions dealing with these issues were received and I received an avalanche of comments on these subjects, often as part of explanations pertaining to other questions.

I had expected a far greater divergence of opinion on many questions than was borne out by the poll. Out of the 19 questions, the tabulation showed that, on 9, more than two-thirds of the responses were in agreement. These involved opposition to the expansion of Federal authority, agreement on the need for stronger laws to protect voting rights of all citizens in Federal elections, approval of changing the Constitution to require the election of Presidents and Vice Presidents by direct population vote, opposition to empowering the President to raise and lower taxes, approval of tax deductions by parents for their children's college expenses, opposition to farm programs providing more price supports and crop-production controls, approval of assistance for economically distressed areas, opposition to the admission of Red China to the United Nations, and approval of stronger laws to protect American industry from foreign import competition.

Greater variation of opinion was expressed on a number of other issues. On the measure to raise the hourly minimum wage from $1 to $1.25 and to broaden the coverage of the law, 2,734 responses favored the proposal, while 2,733 disapproved—a difference of 1 vote. Only 3 percentage points separated those who approved and those who disapproved changing the social security laws to permit men to obtain reduced benefits at age 62, although more than 60 percent favored increasing benefits to widows.

Much interest was directed to the question of financing medical assistance for the aged. The answers and the comments in the poll showed wide disagreement. Twenty-seven percent of the people agreed with the proposal to include such assistance in the social security program. Twenty-four percent opposed Federal participation in medical care costs for older citizens. However, 39 percent favored Federal and State participation with the individual on a voluntary basis in financing the expense of such care.

The complete tabulation of the results of my 1960 public opinion poll is as follows:

	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Would you authorize the President to estimate annual world food needs and to use existing tax-supported farm programs to raise U.S. production to a level to meet world deficiencies?	32.85	57.59	9.56
2. Do you believe stronger laws are needed to protect voting rights of all citizens in Federal elections?	78.24	17.44	4.32
3. Are you in favor of Federal aid to education costing a minimum of $5,600,000,000 over several years to be used either for school construction or teachers' salaries?	37.06	56.39	6.55
4. Should social security taxes be raised to—			
(a) Permit men to obtain reduced benefits at age 62?	45.39	48.08	6.53
(b) Increase widows' payments from 75 to 85 percent of their husbands' benefits?	60.95	31.05	8.00
5. Do you think the Federal Government is taking over too many responsibilities from local and State governments?	71.16	23.30	5.54
6. Do you feel increases in Federal spending are important enough to justify resulting rises in the cost of living?	21.55	64.26	14.19
7. Which one of the following do you support:			
(a) A compulsory Federal program of medical care for the aged under social security with costs borne by increased taxes on employees and employers?	27.51		6.20
(b) A voluntary program of medical care for the aged with costs shared by the Federal Government from general tax revenues and the individual beneficiary?	39.84		
(c) No medical care for the aged involving Federal Government participation?	24.65		
8. Should expansion of our economy be encouraged by granting Federal tax relief to companies which modernize and expand their plants?	53.49	39.09	7.42
9. Would you change the Constitution to abolish the electoral college and require the direct election of Presidents and Vice Presidents by popular vote?	75.26	21.25	3.49
10. Do you think the United States should continue its ban on testing nuclear weapons without reliable assurances that the Russians have also abandoned their tests?	15.36	80.19	4.45
11. Should Congress give the President power to raise or reduce taxes?	6.72	88.15	5.13
12. Do you favor a farm program with increased price supports and more production controls?	14.51	76.82	8.67
13. Do you believe Red China should be admitted to the United Nations?	13.23	79.43	7.34
14. Would you support the extension of the 1-cent tax on gasoline which expires this year to finance more rapid expansion of highways?	66.42	31.64	1.94
15. Should students' college expenses be deductible from parents' income taxes?	67.49	27.92	4.59
16. Would you favor stronger laws to protect domestic industries from competition of products imported for sale in the United States?	78.11	15.08	6.81
17. Should Congress raise the minimum hourly wage from $1 to $1.25 and increase the number of workers covered by the law?	46.6551	46.6382	6.7067
18. Should Federal aid be given to areas which are suffering chronically depressed economic conditions?	69.89	19.84	10.27
19. Do you support the proposal that a Peace Corps be established and financed by the U.S. Government wherein Americans would be recruited and sent abroad to help underdeveloped countries?	41.18	49.25	9.57

The Practical Value of Social Work Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, all too little attention has been focused on the great contribution to the betterment of our society that is being made by social workers.

Skilled social workers operating within an enlightened public assistance program are promoting the general welfare of our people and the stability of our society.

And we should also realize that a good public assistance program helps recipients to become self-supporting, thus ultimately reducing the cost of public assistance and easing the burden on our taxpaying citizens.

Recently I received a very impressive report on 10 demonstration projects in public assistance. This report, sponsored by the New York School of Social Work at Columbia University, offers convincing evidence that a good public assistance program is a sound investment for a community. I believe this study merits the attention of all Americans who are seriously concerned about the value and cost of public assistance programs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this report by Winifred Bell be printed with its footnotes and list of supporting studies in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRACTICAL VALUE OF SOCIAL WORK SERVICE

(Winifred Bell)

During the last decade numberous demonstration projects carried out in public welfare agencies have provided convincing evidence that substantial savings to the taxpayer can be secured by reducing caseloads of public assistance workers so that they have time to counsel actively with the troubled families seeking financial aid.

Our past efforts to save money have led us to keep assistance grants to the minimum, to insist upon tight controls over eligibility, and to spread the caseloads over small, untrained, and poorly paid staffs. The 10 demonstration projects reviewed to date consistently show that his has been a pennywise, pound-foolish approach. It is, in fact, one

way to guarantee that dependency will not only persist but will increase.

The cost of dependency is not easy to measure. Certainly, it far exceeds the cost to the public assistance agency, but even viewing this limited aspect of the problem, unless our investment is returning some dividends in terms of preparing families for independent living, we are wasting money. Our present penny-pinching policies could not be better designed to encourage the continuation of dependency, not only for this generation but for generations to come. It could not better promote high turnover of staff, wasteful concentration on airtight controls at the expense of time to give constructive help.

If we did not know better, it would be more understandable. The conclusions set forth in this paper are not new. They have been presented in a variety of forms by their sponsors, but the impression is secured that they are in, but not of, the public domain.

CONCLUSIONS

What do they prove? (1) It is wasteful to concentrate the efforts of public assistance agencies exclusively on the determination and verification of eligibility. This may well continue to be the focus for those families with simple, uncomplicated economic need including mothers who are needed at home to care for young children. But for those with complicating social problems we must focus our efforts on discovering the obstacles to self-help and provide services to strengthen families if we wish to save money. (2) No investigator or social worker will have time to counsel with families unless he is responsible for only a reasonable caseload, generally defined as ranging from 35 to 50 cases. (3) Skilled supervision and in-service training programs are essential to a constructive program in public assistance. This is particularly true in these days of acute shortage of graduate and experienced social workers. (4) Untrained investigators may have been able to verify eligibility, but effective family counseling requires the skill of trained social workers, and the more skillful the staff the more money the community will save. This is tantamount to saying that we don't save money by hiring 10th graders to build missiles.

The 10 projects reviewed returned a significant number of families to self-support and decreased both the duration of grants and the incidence of reapplications. In some instances, the maximum money grants allowed by the States were increased during the studies; nonetheless, savings overbalanced costs incurred by smaller caseloads, more highly trained personnel and skilled supervision.

The 10 studies also showed that the public image of the "lazy, indolent" assistance recipient is simply not based on fact. Most of these families wish to be employed, and this includes the "ADC mother." But their marginal skills and minority status render them pecularly vulnerable to shifts in the economy. Many of them came from families who had known only misfortune and discrimination, broken homes, and dependency. The current adult on public assistance is our warning for the future, for our present policies are excellently devised to breed more in the same mold. Again and again, these studies note that the typical public assistance recipient is the "first fired, and last hired."

In these demonstration projects, social workers devoted time and skill to building confidence, exploring difficulties, extending employment counseling and referring for vocational training. When mothers were in a position to work, ingenuity was brought to bear on formulating adequate plans for children during their mothers' employment. The economy of providing adequate vocational training, day care and homemaker facilities was demonstrated. We can safely conclude when we study the result with care that given time to explore the obstacles to independent living, a concern about helping families to overcome those obstacles, a community atmosphere in which minority groups are employed during times of stress on somewhat equal terms with majority groups, and given day-care facilities so that low-income mothers can work without neglecting their children, substantial social and economic savings could be effected.

DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

The studies reviewed were carried out in California, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Florida, Texas, New York, and Washington, D.C. Supporting evidence is found in studies made in Illinois, Maine, New Jersey, and North Carolina.

In each of the demonstration projects, the focus of the work with families was changed from one exclusively concerned with the determination and verification of eligibility to one centered on helping families with their difficult problems, whether in the emotional, budgeting, employment, marital or parent-child areas. Most studies were self-consciously concerned with securing the employment or reemployment of the head of the family. When the projects dealt primarily with ADC cases, this goal might well be questioned, since the program was initially established to enable mothers to provide the supervision and nurture required by children in their formative years. In 1935 when the Social Security Act was passed, this appeared to require the presence of the mother in the home. However, these studies and others in recent years suggest that mothers on ADC consider themselves to be "second-class citizens" and they would prefer employment. The crux of the matter is how and why the mother decides to work and what plans she is able to make for her children. Should mothers on ADC be forced to work because insufficient appropriations mean that they cannot support their children in dignity and self-respect? Should social workers be pressured into forcing mothers into the economy as a proof of success? Or should mothers and social workers be free to plan jointly for the welfare of the family? These studies suggest that current inadequate assistance grants seriously limit the freedom of choice.

Without exception, in these demonstration projects, caseloads were reduced. In 1959, the median caseload of public assistance workers for the Nation was 147 cases. In these projects, on the whole, caseloads ranged from 35 to 50 cases. In the project reported in the 1960 annual report of the Texas Department of Public Welfare, the size of these special caseloads is not mentioned. However, note is made of "specialized caseloads" consisting primarily of ADC cases. "By intensive training along specialized lines, and by removing diversions caused by working with cases in other categories, these specialized ADC caseworkers were able to meet and overcome some of the problems facing ADC families." [1] Considering that Texas had the highest caseloads in the Nation at the time of that study (in June 1959, 360 cases per worker), it seems probable that these caseloads were not only specialized but reduced.

The increased visits with families made possible by this reduction varied from "being available quickly whenever needed," as in Marin County, Calif., to approximately once monthly, as in Washington, D.C. At both ends of the spectrum, a totally new experience was available to the families receiving public assistance, since their traditional relationship with the agency has had to be limited to the infrequent and brief visits required by statute to verify eligibility. But quantity is not the only change. The new focus, the concern for strengthening families, meant a new spirit and a changed pace for visitor and family alike. For the first time, the agency was not merely a watchdog, determined to ferret out abuses and irregularities. Now skilled counseling and trained concern were extended, and in this climate problems were more apt to be confided, and social workers and families had a chance to become partners in a mutual undertaking. It is little wonder that positive changes occurred.

These studies all give the facts regarding the financial and/or social savings they effected. They were all carried out during the last decade, and some of the reports are only now available.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

The Washington, D.C., project involved 240 families with 900 children and was carried on from February 1953 to March 1954. Three skilled social workers were responsible for all of the counseling. They conclude that the status of the family was improved for 141 of the 240 families, as evidenced by increased financial support from 34 absent fathers, improved marital relationships in 32 families, improved health in 51 families, full-time employment in 18 cases, part-time employment in 9 cases, marked progress toward employment in 16 families, better housing for 23 families, and alleviation of school difficulties experienced by 9 children. These gains are particularly significant when we realize that in all of these demonstration projects, the project families have not been the typical assistance families but the hard core, those with static or deteriorating conditions, those long known to the agency, those for whom little improvement could be anticipated.[2]

MICHIGAN

There have been two projects in Washtenaw County, Mich., both focused on multiproblem families receiving general assistance. In the most recent study (1960), 14 cases involving 84 individuals were selected for intensive study. The work was evaluated after the families had been in the project from 3 to 10 months, and even within this brief period, considerable gains had been made. Families were evaluated according to financial status, family relationships and individual adjustment, and finally, their improved capacity to use community resources wisely and constructively. Three families showed gains in all three areas, five families in two areas and three families improved in one area. The authors state that the total monthly cost (to the public assistance agency) for these 14 families was $2,300. During the first 6 months the project operated, six families became partially or totally self-supporting which produced an estimated savings per month of between $700 and $750. On an annual basis, an annual savings of $8,400 to $9,000 was thus effected.[3] This result was achieved despite the fact that these 14 families had received relief for an average of 21 months, and that the project workers were the usual employees of the general assistance agency. Highly skilled supervision, an active inservice training program and reduced caseloads made the difference.

FLORIDA

The Florida project involved 505 families. After a 14-month period, about half of those families were no longer on public assistance. By comparison, during that same period, about one-third of the cases carried by the regular staff were closed. Of the new applications handled by the experimental group, about 42 percent were accepted for financial assistance while among the regular staff about 56 percent were accepted.[4]

The annual report of the Florida State Welfare Board for 1957–58 compares financial dependence with disease and states that "there are two wonder drugs available: the money of the public assistance grant, and

Footnotes at end of speech.

the time and skill which the social worker is able to devote to the case. Controlled experiments in the treatment of this disease (chronic dependency) have been conducted by this department. Again and again, in actual cases * * * * the social casework theory has been confirmed: for a substantial percentage of the ADC families this is a curable disease. In many instances, as high as 50 percent of certain caseloads in certain communities, can be returned to self-support when the social worker carries a practical caseload."[5] Although we might well question whether mothers who decide to utilize a public program designed to enable them to remain at home on the theory that home is where they belong are, in fact, "diseased," nonetheless the confirmation of the effectiveness of lower caseloads is a pertinent addition to our story. Unfortunately, from the point of view of the taxpayer, changes made the following year by the Florida Legislature resulted in decreasing the time social workers could devote to counseling.

PENNSYLVANIA

The 1960 annual report of the department of public welfare in Pennsylvania reports on the rehabilitation demonstration project of the Allegheny County Board of Assistance. "The economy of small caseloads (35 in the project) was demonstrated clearly. Ninety-eight cases, out of the project's 349 cases, were closed because of employment. Savings on assistance grants alone for these cases from the time they went off assistance until October 1958, totaled more than $256,000. In October 1958, a followup was attempted with the 37 cases that had left assistance for employment a year or more before * * * 16 were located. Assistance had been given in each of these cases for more than 5 years before it was discontinued. Handicaps (in these families) included severe physical handicaps (11), mental (9), social (9), no skill or experience (10). Only two of these people might have found work by their own efforts. The total earnings ($114,500) of the 16 families alone almost equaled the entire cost of the project ($124,000). If these people had not had this special help, it is likely that they would have continued to receive assistance totaling $53,262."[6]

CALIFORNIA

Fixel and Wiltse conclude their report on a project involving 43 ANC families in California by stating, "These data suggest that if the department were adequately staffed so that individual attention could be given to the interests, emotional, and physical problems, and the educational needs of each client, the time on assistance would be greatly reduced. Let us expand this hypothesis to a statewide basis. The total cost of ANC in California will be approximately 120 million this fiscal year (presumably 1959–60) and the average length of time on aid, 42 months. If the average time on aid were reduced even 1 month the resultant saving would pay for all statewide increments in quality and quantity of staff. Whether expanded to a statewide, nationwide, or reduced to the smallest local level, these simple facts indicate that an adequately trained staff in sufficient quantity to keep caseloads down to optimum level is the simplest form of economy."[7]

TEXAS

In Texas, during 1959 and 1960, "mature, experienced workers" were selected to work with ADC cases and by the end of the year they were credited with having achieved a remarkable drop in the caseload. "In September 1959, payments were made to 23,147 families representing 73,381 children under this program. By August 1960, these dropped to 19,662 families representing 62,512 children under 14 years of age, a decrease of 4,132 families (17 percent) and 12,772 (17 percent) children. During the corresponding period, average payments per family per month increased, $1.66 per family. Recipients of ADC assistance (nonetheless) received $17,930,831 in money payments for the year, a decrease of $3,103,614 under the total for the previous year."[1] Without a detailed report on this project, these financial gains are difficult to assess, since at this time no information is available on employment or unemployment rates in Texas, on the usual case movement of other ADC cases, on the rate of applications, or on the services made available by social workers.

INDIANA

Lake County, Ind., limited caseloads to 40 families for selected caseworkers in 1958 and referred only families who had been chronically dependent and showed signs of serious deterioration. Despite the gravity of these cases, "it was found that the average rate of termination of grants for the total ADC caseload of the agency in 1958 was 19.4 percent while the rate of termination for the 125 intensive cases was 28.8 percent." They estimated a savings only to the agency of $16,593. It is most interesting that in 1959 it became necessary to raise the caseloads in the experimental group by assigning 40 family units rather than 40 separate cases, as in 1958. The termination rate dropped, although it still remained higher than the rate for the entire ADC caseload. Despite a lower rate of termination, the savings were higher for the simple reason that the families involved had more children and thus had received higher grants. In 1959, an estimated $22,556 was saved by effecting earlier terminations through intensive casework counseling.[8]

NEW YORK

Westchester County, N.Y., instituted a demonstration project in June 1957. Highly skilled social workers, excellent supervision, and reduced caseloads were again proven to be economical. These 152 families were plagued with many problems, and had been receiving relief for an average of 25.1 months prior to being assigned to the project. After an average of 6.7 months of counseling, 49 of the families were able to function independently.[9]

Niagara County also initiated a project in 1957. Forty-one families were involved who had been continuously or intermittently on public assistance for 5 or more years. Despite the high unemployment rates in Niagara County at the time, 17 families became self-supporting, while over one-half of the families involved took concrete steps in the direction of improving their employment potential. The author observes, "These changes are not as spectacular * * * as actual case closings through employment. A long range goal of * * * self-support for many of these families has a reasonable chance to be reached."[9]

MARIN COUNTY

Marin County, Calif., stands out as the site of intelligent experimentation and planning for public assistance, and particularly the ANC caseload. In 1951 a new director, Betty Presley, was employed by that department. Miss Presley brought conviction that an informed community would support an effectively organized county welfare department able to provide help with difficult family problems. She foresaw that professionally trained staff and smaller caseloads prerequisite to giving skilled social services might increase administrative costs. However, she believed such services would strengthen family relationships and individual efforts, and in many instances result in self-support, thus ultimately decreasing assistance costs.[10]

These opinions were supported by the administrative survey in June 1951 by Kroeger and Associates which said, "We are firmly convinced that there is no room for the inexperienced or poorly qualified social worker on the staff in the Marin County Welfare Department." A family care unit was established to provide intensive casework, and an experimental caseload was forthwith established in this unit. Twenty-four chronic cases were assigned to a worker with graduate social work training. In the previous 5 years, $91,920 had been spent on these families in assistance and medical care. After 1 year's work, improvement was noted in all but two cases and expenditures for the entire group began decreasing. Most of these cases involved immaturity, marital conflict, mental deficiency, mental illness and alcoholism. They included 104 children ranging from 2 to 9 in a family, and 24 of these children were known to have personality disturbances. So convincing was the improvement that the agency concluded that intensive effort in all such cases was indicated and that casework help given in the early stages of agency contact contributed to the prevention of personal and family breakdown and economic dependence.[10]

Between 1952 and 1956 further administrative changes were made, so that a senior clerk was trained to do much of the clerical work previously assigned to social workers, who were then free to concentrate on counseling families. Caseloads were reduced throughout the family case unit to approximately 40 to 50 cases, qualifications for workers were raised systematically. Salaries were raised, more supervision was provided, and the work of various related officers was coordinated. The results achieved in Marin County were then rigorously compared with results and trends in the San Francisco area, as a whole. Marin County was found to show a significant drop in ANC cases per 1,000 population when compared with the San Francisco area, despite the same rate of applications. Not only was the discontinuance rate higher but cases stayed discontinued longer. During the 1954–56 period the costs of ANC in surrounding areas increased, although it decreased markedly in Marin County. There were also decreases in average grants per child in Marin County and studies revealed that this probably related to both increased support from absent fathers and increased earnings of parents. Finally, the following table illustrates the shifting relationship of salaries and assistance costs in the county:

	July–September 1953	July–September 1955
Aid to needy children	$114,713.63	$87,880.77
General relief	21,651.40	20,822.81
Salaries	6,496.90	12,323.00
Total	142,861.93	121,026.58

The director also pointed out that based on the average monthly aid to needy children grant in this county of $125, the saving represented by discontinuance of three aid to needy children cases exceeds the monthly salary of one worker. Four discontinuances exceed the salary of a supervisor.

In summarizing their comparisons of the Marin County statistics and those from the San Francisco area generally, the authors of this report note: "Consistently the foregoing figures point up a picture of downward trends in ANC caseload (both in relation to population and absolutely) and in total costs in the four-year period (1953 through 1956) that the family care unit has operated in Marin. Concurrently, in the San Francisco area group of counties which have many common factors in their economic and social patterns, the trends are upward."

In concluding their report, they note that their program was in jeopardy in July 1955 when a firm of administrative analysts made

Footnotes at end of speech.

a survey of the welfare department for the county grand jury. In the eventual public hearing, it is noteworthy that a representative of the California Taxpayers' Association brought out that "per capita expenditures for welfare in Marin County were lower than in any of the other 11 counties of the State closest to Marin in population." He also pointed out that the administrative costs of Marin's total welfare programs were the second lowest in this group of counties. He stated, and several other speakers agreed, that "If you spend $10 more in administrative cost to save $100 in the aid program, you've saved money." It is encouraging to note that the director's budget was granted and that caseloads were kept down to their 40–50 limit. "The support given by the board and community amounted to a vote of confidence in the preventive and rehabilitative approach taken by the Marin County Welfare Department." [10]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

[1] "Annual Report of the Department of Public Welfare," Texas, 1960, p. 6.

[2] "ADC Demonstration Project," Washington, D.C., Department of Public Welfare, 1954 (mimeographed).

[3] "Reducing Dependency": A report of a demonstration and research project, Wilbur J. Cohen and Sydney E. Bernard, Ann Arbor, Mich., University of Michigan, December 1960 (mimeographed).

[4] "Casework Services in ADC," Maude Von P. Kemp, James M. Wallis and Joyce Hetzel, Chicago, APWA, child Welfare series No. 2, January 1957, pp. 18 and 19.

[5] Twenty-first Annual Report of the State Welfare Board," Florida, Jacksonville, Fla., State welfare board, 1958, p. 13.

[6] "Public Welfare Report," June 1, 1958—May 31, 1960. Harrisburg, Pa., Department of Public Welfare, September 1960, pp. 75 and 76.

[7] "ADC: Problem and Promise," Chicago, Ill., APWA, undated. Justine Fixel and Kermit T. Wilcse, "A Study of the Administration of the ADC Program," p. 35.

[8] "A Study of ADC Cases Receiving Intensive Casework in 1958 and 1959," Lake County, Ind., Department of Public Welfare, Intensive Casework Division (passim).

[9] "To Prevent and To Restore," a report on the rehabilitation potential of public social services in New York State, Albany, New York State Department of Social Welfare, 1960 (passim).

[10] "A Study of Marin County, Calif.," building services into a public assistance program can pay off, California Department of Social Welfare, 1958 (passim).

SUPPORTING STUDIES

"A Study of Protective Services and the Problem of Neglect of Children in New Jersey," Claire R. Hancock, Trenton, New Jersey Department of Institutions and Agencies, State board of child welfare, 1958.

"The Incentive Budgeting Demonstration Project," Denver Department of Public Welfare, July 1959–June 1961 (interim report, June 1960).

"Facts, Fallacies and Future," a study of the ADC program of Cook County, Ill. (New York City: Greenleigh Associates, 1960).

"Parental Behavior in ANC Families," State of California Department of Social Welfare, July 16, 1960.

"Aid to Dependent Children in Maine," a study of family management, Maine Department of Health and Welfare, June 1960.

Could There Not Be Built in the Nation's Capital a Park Which Would Be a Fitting Memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Who Wanted a Simple Monument?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, home rule, which received its greatest momentum from the Boston Tea Party, and achieved one of its greatest successes in the ultimate establishment of our own government when English power was at last decisively broken, is about to be given a setback in the very Capital City of our Nation which was founded on such revolutionary principles.

I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the imposition of some tasteless slabs of concrete in a park area of Washington, D.C., which will have the ultimate effect of destroying some of the most historic parkland to be found anywhere in our country.

The ostensible reason for the destruction of the 27-acre park is to raise a memorial to our late, great, and beloved President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, certainly one of this Nation's greatest conservationists.

What irony, to destroy parklands in the name of one of the greatest champions of parks the people have ever known, a man who specifically asked for a simple memorial.

Critics of the prizewinning design for the Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial were immediately smeared with the "anti-art" tag by a few people with axes to grind—people who live outside of Washington, D.C., it was quickly noted by the discerning.

This particular form of attack has now suffered a well-deserved setback. A leading art magazine in the United States, Art News, in its May 1961, issue, declares editorially that the winning design for the FDR Memorial gives off the "unmistakable air of giant tombstones."

Alfred Frankfurter, the editor, draws a distinction between a "memorial" and a "monument." The memorial concept can be lost and entombed in a huge monument structure, according to Mr. Frankfurter.

Mr. Frankfurter then asks:

Could there not be built, on the Potomac peninsula a park to make men gasp—as Roosevelt's social remaking of his country made men gasp nearly a generation ago?

The Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial Commission should reject completely the winning design which the Commission is now attempting to foist—there is no other word to describe the situation—on the people of our Nation in the name of the greatest commoner of them all.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt, like Jefferson, Lincoln, and Woodrow Wilson, had the common touch. The words of Lincoln: "God must have loved the common people, He made so many of them," ably expresses a view and a conviction shared by FDR. Beyond all other world leaders, of his time, Franklin D. Roosevelt was the spokesman for the people in all countries, everywhere in the world.

So, it is remarkable, indeed, to find Mr. Biddle, the Chairman of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial Commission, insisting on a memorial that only a small minority of the 12-member Commission wants, and which is not symbolic of the man he seeks to immortalize.

The Washington (D.C.) Post of May 10, 1961, reported that:

Although the Memorial Commission conducted the national competition for a design, the group need not recomemnd construction of the winning entry.

Biddle said, however, that he and a small minority of the 12-member Commission favor the slabs, and most of the others "seem willing to go along with whatever we want; nobody has expressed any over-my-dead-body opposition."

The Washington (D.C.) Star of May 9, 1961, reported that:

President Roosevelt's son, JAMES, the Democratic Representative from California, is reported to be impressed with the Recreation Department plan. He has indicated the Commission memorial may not be as plain as his father would have wished."

Two of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia have voiced opposition to the concrete slab monument which Mr. Biddle favors.

The Washington (D.C.) Star of May 10 reported that:

Instead, they said yesterday, they support in principle the District Recreation Department's viewpoint that any memorial of Mr. Roosevelt should be a "living" one.

Commissioner Robert E. McLaughlin told a department board luncheon that "instead of marble, we should be putting up memorials of a living nature."

Later, in answer to a query, Commissioner Walter N. Tobriner said he believed a Roosevelt memorial should be "something that people can use daily, with pleasure.

"Apparently Mr. Roosevelt wanted a simple monument," Mr. Tobriner continued. "I feel a man is entitled to the kind of memorial he wanted."

Mr. Tobriner said that a living memorial could be a laboratory, a stadium or recreational area—anything that people can use.

I would agree with Mr. McLaughlin in feeling a living memorial is more consistent with Mr. Roosevelt's life and more desirable than some pile of marble, he said.

President Franklin Delano Roosevelt was deeply concerned with the one-third of the Nation which was ill-fed, ill-housed, and ill-clothed.

To think the problems of economically underprivileged have been entirely solved is to be unrealistic. We must continue in the great tradition of Franklin Delano Roosevelt to try and meet

their problems whether they be those of adequate food, housing, clothing, or the finer things of life, such as parks.

The homes of the economically privileged are surrounded by parks, but this is not the case in the depressed areas of our cities, where the poor live.

I hope that the Commission will give further consideration to the suggestion for a living memorial to the man who, during his lifetime, and as the 32d President of the United States, so ably and so simply caught the imagination of the common man.

I include as part of my remarks articles from the Washington Post and the New York Times, and I commend these articles to the members of the FDR Memorial Commission for their close study:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 7, 1960]

THE MARBLE LOBBY BESIEGES CAPITAL

(By Marquis Childs)

Tourists who pour into this Capital, like those here over the Labor Day weekend, almost invariably speak of Washington's broad tree-lined streets and the vistas that Pierre L'Enfant envisioned when he laid out the first plans for the city.

This, the sense of space and light, a river with its banks unspoiled by industry, impresses them perhaps as much as the Nation's shrines which they dutifully visit. One of the minor themes running through recent sessions of Congress has been how to keep Washington that way and to prevent a rash of ill-assorted monuments from cluttering the landscape.

It was symbolized by the attempt, thwarted for the moment at any rate, to build a memorial to Theodore Roosevelt on the island in the Potomac that bears his name. On this wooded island still largely in a state of nature it was proposed to put a big bronze globe, and with it would have gone concrete parking space and all the appurtenances of a so-called tourist attraction. The President's daughter, Alice Roosevelt Longworth, who has lost none of her capacity for acidulous comment, called it a global jungle gym and it was thanks to her frank assault that Congress held up the memorial project.

As many devoted followers of TR pointed out, nothing could be more fitting as a memorial to him than to leave the island bearing his name a green and secluded place. The indefatigable Teddy, who took his children and any guests who happened to be in sight on strenuous tramps through the then rugged Rock Creek Park, would be appalled by what is happening to much of the United States—the asphalt jungle of highways and airports interspering the vast urban sprawl. And he would be the first to note that Americans seem to have given up the use of their legs entirely for motorized transportation.

With the last vestiges of the beautiful untouched America of the past rapidly being encroached upon, Congress has shown a strange reluctance to act. One instance is the Indiana Dunes on the shoreline of Lake Michigan where steel companies are planning new plants. The effort to preserve this untouched shore as a national park for the recreation of the whole region has so far been stopped.

Another instance is the proposed Dunes and Sea Lion Caves National Park on the Oregon coast. This was initiated by the late Senator Richard L. Neuberger who was a true conservationist with an intimate knowledge and love for the splendor of the west. Representative CHARLES O. PORTER (Democrat, Oregon), has proposed that the park be fittingly named for Neuberger.

A national park is a living and functional memorial, as those currently resisting the erection of more political sculpture in Washington like to point out. The Capital abounds with static—and often ugly—monuments to men long since left behind by the sweep of history.

In the midthirties, an ambitious architect suddenly made Congress conscious that there was no monument in the Nation's Capital to Thomas Jefferson. A successful effort was lobbied through Congress to create another static monument, the Jefferson Memorial, on the tidal basin which is today a 15-minute stop for the tourist buses. Opponents of the monument had pointed out that Washington was without an adequate hall for large public gatherings and what, it was argued, could be a better memorial to the eloquent Jefferson than such a hall.

The Capital is still without a proper hall for large public gatherings. Those who propose to memorialize James Madison could hardly find a better monument than a handsome public meeting place that would bear his name. A citizen's committee is currently trying to raise money for a cultural center to fill a longfelt need for an adequate auditorium for opera and ballet. A James Madison hall as part of such a center would mean a continuing and lively association with one of the greatest of the architects of America's freedom.

More and more monuments are being pressed upon a capital in which there are already too many indiscriminately strewn about. Something called a Freedom Wall is being urged, as though freedom could be symbolized in a wall. A Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial is on the way, although FDR has been dead only 15 years. A bell tower in memory of Robert A. Taft went up on Capitol Hill less than 5 years after his death.

Without greater care and discrimination this can become absurd. And in the process, the spacious beauty of Washington can be destroyed.

[From the New York Times magazine, Sept. 11, 1960]

LEST WASHINGTON BE AN UNPLANNED CEMETERY—THE PLETHORA OF MONUMENTS SCATTERED ABOUT THE CAPITAL, SOME GOOD AND SOME NOT SO GOOD, HAS GIVEN RISE TO DEMANDS FOR A TIGHTENING UP OF THE STATUTES GOVERNING STATUES

(By Alvin Shuster)

WASHINGTON.—The Nation's Capital, which never seems to run out of politicians, epithets, also-ran ball teams, farm problems, scandals, blunders or baked chicken for the banquet circuit, is running out of statue space. And the cry has gone out: The city's majestic beauty is in jeopardy.

The alarmed crier is Senator HUGH SCOTT, Republican, of Pennsylvania, who takes a rather dim view of the past-time here of building monuments to the dead, often without waiting for either history's judgment or artistic inspiration.

"The tendency to make the Capital a catch-all for a variety of monuments to honor the immortals, the not-so-immortals, the greats, the near-greats, and the not-so-greats must stop," he said recently. "We must be on our guard lest the Nation's Capital come to resemble an unplanned cemetery."

The Senator thus touched on a monumental problem that is beginning to bother others around here. With its expanses of green, tree-lined streets and stately buildings and monuments, Washington remains one of the most beautiful cities in the world. But monument space is getting scarce.

The weight of all the monuments and statues still hasn't reached the point where the city has started sinking beneath the Potomac. Nor have the residents here become so overly aware of the statues that they've headed en masse for the couches, complaining of a feeling that they're being watched. Nor has the Park Service found that it needs to augment its staff of five men who, every 6 months or so, give the statues a bath with soap and water.

Nobody—except perhaps one or two of our more erudite starlings—knows for sure just how many of these statues and memorials dot the city's landscape. One estimate put the number at more than 175. And this doesn't include the nearly 160 statues and busts cluttering up the Capitol building corridors and its Statuary Hall, considered by some a depressing chamber of horrors—with no disrespect, of course, intended for the favorite sons who reside there. They include Florida's John Gorrie, the inventor of the ice machine that made "on the rocks" possible, who stands not far from Illinois' favorite daughter, Frances E. Willard, the founder of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

But, precisely counted or not, there they stand. In the circles, squares, triangles and vistas. The hatless and the plumed. The poets and the pols. The Latins and the lanterns. The gulls and the gals. The cubs and the cardinals. The unarmed men and the sword-waving women. The gloved and the barefisted.

And horses. Plenty of horses, rearing, cantering or plunging—in every posture that will hold a rider. Jackson's is up on his hind legs, a sculptural triumph; Sheridan's is dashing along; Pulaski's, Greene's, McPherson's, Hancock's McClellan's and Logan's are walking calmly over the field; Scott's and Sherman's are simply standing there watching the whole business.

What they, the residents and the transients see is a chiseled agglomeration of statues and memorials of all shapes, forms and sizes, "planted" without much discrimination, hit or miss, wherever space allowed. In addition to the city's famous landmarks, for example, there are a 300-year-old lantern from Japan, a memorial to the original patentees of land in the District of Columbia, a bell tower honoring the late Senator Robert A. Taft with 27 bells that ring on Capitol Hill 96 times a day, an Andrew Jackson Downing memorial vase, a Jules Jusserand memorial bench, a Charles W. Kutz memorial bridge, a discus thrower from Italy, several urns, heroic figures representing heritage, guardianship, the past and the future, lots of lions and probably more eagles.

Joining in the wholesale exposure to the elements are statutes of men like Samuel D. Gross, Joseph Henry, John A. Rawlins, Alexander Shepherd and Albert Pike—all heroes, even if history remembers them only after a little prodding. Suffice it to say, they played a role of some kind in the past and have been duly rewarded with permanence on Washington pedestals.

How have the more famous fared? Is Benjamin Franklin, for instance, in Franklin Park? No. John Barry stands there. Is Franklin then in Barry Park? He probably would be but there's no such place. He's down at 10th and Pennsylvania Avenues. Is Lafayette in the middle of the park named after him, just north of the White House? No. He's on a corner of the park. Jackson on that acrobatic horse is smack in the park's center, looking not toward the White House, nor eastward toward the Capitol, but just staring westward toward nothing in particular.

No one has quite figured out why Jackson who had nothing to do with the War of Independence, is made the center of attraction in a park otherwise devoted to Revolutionary War heroes. Washington, who had everything to do with it, is riding his horse several blocks away from his comrades in arms.

Nor has anyone quite figured out the pattern in the cluster of statues in beautiful Meridian Hill Park, with its statue of Joan of Arc (on a horse), a monument to President Buchanan, a statue of Dante and a memorial to Lt. Comdr. William Henry Scheutz.

Then there is the Grant Memorial at the foot of Capitol Hill. This one took 22 years to build, stretches no less than 252 feet along First Street and is one of the largest and most costly pieces of statuary in the city. There are 12 horses, 11 soldiers and 4 lions in the memorial. Up on a pedestal looking it all over is a statue of the equestrian General Grant, described at one time as one of the largest in the world, topped only by that of Victor Emmanuel in Rome, which is 5 inches taller.

As one might expect from all this, many of Washington's statues have been criticized for suffering from a poverty of artistic inspiration, despite their historic importance. Few, for example, command raves of the art lovers as do the hard-to-find memorial to sailors and marines—a simple wave crest with a few gulls—and Saint-Gaudens' "Grief" in Rock Creek Cemetery.

There are rather general complaints. John Ericsson, the inventor of the screw propeller that revolutionized navigation, usually gets a bad review sitting there near the Lincoln Memorial looking as if he were still exhausted from the achievement. Art News calls the Iwo Jima statue, reproduced from a photograph, "artistically appalling." The three-sided marble shaft with pinched corners erected not long ago in front of the U.S. District Courthouse has carved figures that reminded one critic of "appliquéd animal crackers."

What some critics don't realize, however, is that it all could have been worse. For example, you can thank a lack of funds and a sudden surge of good sense for saving the Washington Monument, an island of simplicity in a baroque sea. It was to have had a fatuous base in the form of a heavy circular colonnade with a statue of Washington driving a six-spanned chariot. Sort of a birthday cake with a big candle.

Then, with a little bit of bad luck, Greenough's statue of Washington could still be standing up there on the Capitol concourse. This one had Washington clad in a toga so, according to the sculptor, he wouldn't look ridiculous when fashions changed. It was subject to constant attack because a Washington shoulder was left exposed as though he were entering or leaving a bath. In 1908 it went into the Smithsonian Institution.

Two more statuary groups seem also to be on their way to relative oblivion * * *. Discovery, once described as a "man rolling ninepins," and Rescue, a tableau of a frontiersman bravely saving his wife and child from an Indian who hates women and children.

The significance of the removal of these statues is that extremely few—too few—statues ever seem to disappear from the Washington landscape. For getting approval to remove one has about as much chance of winning over Congress as an effort to replace the statue of Freedom atop the Capitol with one of Whistler's mother.

Ask Representative BASIL L. WHITENER of North Carolina. For months he's been trying to get Congress to order a new site for the James Garfield statue at the foot of Capitol Hill. That's the one of the former President with the four characters who look as if they're waiting for a handout. WHITENER only wants it moved, not destroyed. "The thing is a traffic hazard," he says.

So, too, is the Peace Monument not far away. But Members of Congress fear that any effort to move that one might put them on record as being prowar.

Although the Capitol groups may be coming down, more are on the way to make up for them. Plans are afoot to build memorials to Franklin Delano Roosevelt on the city's last great site—in West Potomac Park between the Lincoln and Jefferson memorials—to Theodore Roosevelt, General of the Army John J. Pershing, Adm. Richard E. Byrd, Mary McLeod Bethune, the Negro educator, and James Madison. The President has also renewed a request for funds to start work on a giant and controversial $24 million freedom monument with walls 60 feet high. And Congress is thinking about memorials to others, including John Foster Dulles and Taras Shevchenko, a Ukrainian poet.

Patriotic societies and zealous friends may provide the ideas and money for new monuments, but it takes Congress to follow through. For no monument may be erected on any foot of the 7,000 acres of Federal park lands in the District of Columbia without specific congressional approval.

Accordingly, under the prodding of well-meaning constituents, dozens of monumental bills are introduced at each session, many of which fortunately never get out of committee files. If they are pushed with any vigor, however, chances are they will go right on through without too much difficulty. But in most cases involving private sponsors the bill specifies that there should be no cost to the Federal Government (except for the free park land) and that unless the Congress seeks the advice of the Fine Arts Commission and the National Capital Planning Commission, both independent agencies, and the Interior Department's National Park Service, the landowner. But in virtually no instance have any of these agencies spoken out and bluntly said: "No, don't build it." They feel that that decision is up to Congress and that their functions are limited solely to advice on the design and the location.

"We once started to write a letter to Congress saying 'positively no' on one proposal for a statue," recalls a Park Service official. "After the political pressures were applied in the right places, we ended up saying 'we have no objection.' This is usually the case. There's no real coordinated policy on such things. Whether to go ahead is up to Congress to decide. Whoever squeals the loudest often seems to get the monument."

The seven experts of the Fine Arts Commission have only advisory powers on design. And they've had their setbacks. President Truman wouldn't listen when they advised against the White House balcony. Congress paid no attention when some Commission members privately expressed opposition to the Taft bell tower. Generally, though, in the construction of most statues here, designers take the Commission's advice.

For example, one of the first proposals for the Pershing memorial to be built on Pennsylvania Avenue was to put the good general on that ever-ready, trusty steed. There was even talk of putting him in a tank, just as there are now good-humored proposals to honor F.D.R. with a cigarette holder jabbing higher into the sky than the Washington Monument. However, Commission officials thought a Pershing fountain might help "cool" a hot spot in downtown Washington and the approved designs include just that, together with a relatively small statue of the general, without horse.

The job of site selection isn't always easy either. There was the group that wanted to put its hero in the middle of a reflecting pool. Rejected.

Undoubtedly the present system leaves something to be desired. One answer—and this comes from the Interior Department itself—is to set up an advisory committee to screen all the memorial proposals submitted to Congress. It would come up with some sort of a coordinated policy, though still leaving the final say to Congress.

Perhaps more merit lies in giving such a committee the sole power to say yes or no, just as the Post Office Department now has the final say on commemorative stamps.

Another proposal to improve the quality of the monuments that are selected is to have more open competitions such as that now underway for a design for the F. D. R. memorial. First prize here: $50,000. Moreover, to head off the rash of monuments to persons posterity might never recognize, the suggestion has been made that no memorial be put up here for any individual until at least 25 years after his death. Representative Stewart Udall of Arizona thinks it ought to be 50 years.

Unless something is done, Washington, just 160 years old and a youngster compared to other world capitals, might well catch up with and pass London and Paris, no slouches themselves when it comes to monuments. Indeed, those European cities offer no particular help to a capital city in search of a solution. They have statue trouble themselves.

The city of Paris at present owns about 250 statues and the French state about 50 or 100 more around town in various public places. Many more would be there, of course, if it were not for some political upheavals long ago and, more recently, World War II. In 1941, for instance, the Nazis removed all statues that could be melted for use by the German war machine. Some were saved, but there are still more than 70 empty pedestals scattered around the city.

The Parisian agencies that must approve such things have cleared the way for 20 new statues since the end of World War II, more new ones than even Washington has managed to produce in the same period. But now they are trying to discourage any more. A main reason seems to be they're beginning to cause Garfield-like traffic problems. Public-spirited groups and individuals, however, keep pushing for more and more.

London, too, has more statues and monuments than Washington. Its grand total is over 200, and there is pressure for more. City officials are having trouble getting some of the old ones down to make room. A few years ago a proposal was made to remove James II from in front of the National Gallery. He got a reprieve.

Thus Washington will not find any solutions in Paris or London. Obviously, not enough of the authorities—whether French, British or American—agree with the Roman Senator Cato who once said: "I had rather men should ask why my statue is not set up, than why it is."

Interest and Concern With Respect to Farm Programs—Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Parshall Chamber of Commerce in Parshall, N. Dak.

I am sure that the interest and concern for farm programs expressed by the

businessmen of Parshall is shared by businessmen in all farming areas. There is a community of interest between businessmen and farmers which is very ably expressed in this resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE PARSHALL CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

In a farm county like Mountrail, the boundaries of a community do not stop at the city limits but extend to the entire trade area of that community.

Today's family farmer is a businessman, as such he is as an important and integral part of the business community as the businessman on main street. His problem is main street's problem.

It is to the best self-interest of any community to support such farm programs and policies that will keep our farm family customers on the land and improve and secure their income.

Therefore, the members of the Parshall Chamber of Commerce do hereby declare full support and aid to a farm program that will immediately improve farm family income, permit farmers the freedom to manage their own production and marketing, enable an orderly reduction of food inventories now in storage and thus lessen the burden on taxpayers.

Further, we recommend that other civic and business groups throughout the State publicly declare their support of a modern and constructive farm program that will keep our farm family agriculture sound and prosperous.

Adopted this 15th day of May 1961.

H. D. STEWART, *President.*

Not the Best Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the general reaction of the American public to the summit conference between President Kennedy and Soviet tyrant Khrushchev is "Here we go again." Although words of ours are obviously too late, as the President, propelled by the peaceful coexistence addicts of the State Department, prepares to stumble up to the summit, an editorial in Chicago's American, Tuesday, May 16, entitled "Not the Best Time" should have been studied before the fateful decision was made. Even after the die is cast it is still worthy of attention. It follows:

NOT THE BEST TIME

It seems to us a chancy sort of time for President Kennedy to meet Premier Khrushchev.

The United States and Russia are engaged in two intensely volatile discussions at Geneva, Switzerland—the negotiation between the two countries for a permanent discontinuance of nuclear test explosions and the 14 nation conference on the future of Laos.

If the conduct of the United States in either of these meetings displeases Khrushchev—as it is almost certain to do—then Khrushchev certainly is capable of making a meeting with Kennedy the occasion for a screaming denunciation of Kennedy for the aborted Cuban invasion.

Eisenhower submitted to Khrushchev's abuse on the U–2 incident (we have never understood why he didn't just tell Khrushchev to shut up, and then walk out) and we would not like to see another President of the United States humiliated in the same way.

We hope Kennedy, if he has any meeting with Khrushchev, will make it clear in advance that any affront which Khrushchev may offer will be accepted, instantly and vocally, as an affront, and that it will bring the conference to an immediate end.

It is Khrushchev who wants this meeting, and he has good reasons for wanting it now. He has just made fools of the western nations by stalling the Laos cease-fire until he could help the Communist rebels win most of Laos; he has won the acclaim of the world for the first man-in-space rocket shot; and the United States has built up Communist prestige, and shockingly reduced its own, by falling on its face in the bungled attempt to help Cuban insurgents overthrow Castro.

If there is a meeting, it will look to the world like a triumphant Khrushchev receiving, more or less graciously, a chastened Kennedy.

In order to dissipate this impression Kennedy would have to lay down some sharp demands on the part of the West. He could do it, but it might easily produce fresh tensions instead of easing any.

We think this would be an excellent time for President Kennedy to stand fast on his earlier idea that if there is to be a meeting at the summit, it should be approached deliberately, with ample diplomatic preparation. No one in the West has ever gained anything by letting Khrushchev hurry him.

The Civil Defense Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Col. W. D. Workman, Jr., a distinguished news columnist and author from Columbia, S.C., has written an important news column which I take pleasure in calling to the attention of the Senate. It is entitled "Civil Defense Issue," and was printed in a number of daily newspapers in the Southeast on May 17, 1961. The article stresses the importance of having well-trained Army civil affairs units ready to assist on the homefront in the event of an enemy attack. Colonel Workman points out that we may need to use the civil affairs specialists as "rescue squads" here at home long before we are ready to occupy foreign soil and utilize these specialists to clear battlefields, handle refugee problems, and provide military government in occupied areas.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article as printed in the News and Courier of Charleston, S.C., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL DEFENSE ISSUE

(By W. D. Workman)

If war is too important to be left to the generals, then civil defense is too important to be left to the civilians.

This is said with all due respect to the hosts of dedicated public servants and volunteer workers who have been, and are now, striving to put muscle into the U.S. civil defense effort. They face a difficult enough job as it is. Were real catastrophe to strike, their task would become impossible.

The demands of prompt recovery from enemy attack in this era of nuclear destruction could not conceivably be met by civilians.

This fact has not yet penetrated the thinking of the Nations' political leaders. But the deadly seriousness of the situation is beginning to be reflected in the public pronouncements of top military men.

Only last month. Gen. George H. Decker, Army Chief of Staff, put in one terse paragraph the new military attitude on the subject:

"The second aspect (the first is air defense) of our effort in continental defense is planning for participation in civil defense. We feel that it is only realistic to plan for such a contingency. Although the Army considers its primary mission to be ready to fight the land war, there is no doubt in my mind that all of the military services will be called upon to make a major contribution to the civilian agencies charged with the recovery effort which would follow a thermonuclear attack on the United States."

The mere fact that General Decker can make such a statement without throwing the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization into an uproar of injured pride is a sign that progress is being made toward greater realism.

When and if American communities are devastated by enemy action, there will be a compelling and immediate need for disciplined, trained, and uniformed personnel on the scene. White helmets, armbands, and good intentions cannot do the job.

For one thing, the restoration of order amid hosts of uprooted, upset, and badly injured men, women, and children will require more authority than civilians can manifest in such circumstances.

For another, civilians will normally, properly, and inevitably be preoccupied with their own safety and that of their families.

Even more basically, there is the great probability that the destruction wrought on a given community by nuclear attack will either wipe out or badly shatter whatever civil defense organization may exist at that spot. Whoever takes charge will have to come in from some other point—and here again arises the need for trained, mobile forces of the military.

Fortunately, the Army has units which are peculiarly well trained for precisely this sort of emergency. Scattered throughout the Nation are civil affairs units, which consist of officers and men experienced in the various economic and governmental functions necessary to the life of any community, whether at peace or at war.

These units represent military groupings of administrators, police officials, economists, lawyers, engineers, educators, bankers, editors, and other professionally skilled individuals capable of maintaining or restoring community life.

Enlightened national policy should even now begin tailoring the training of such units toward the possibility of employment of the homefront. Units in one area could be pinpointed for a takeover elsewhere if the need arose. A unit at Chicago, for example, could maintain a continuing study of the Cleveland area, so that if Cleveland were hit Civil Affairs personnel could move to the scene promptly with knowledge of the plans for its rehabilitation.

Obviously, if the United States becomes involved in any total struggle, the need for "military government" to(to employ a now-discountenanced but still descriptive phrase) may exist here in this country long before we are ready to occupy foreign soil.

Civil defense is part and parcel of national defense, and these Civil Affairs units—the equivalents of governments in uniform—should look first to their likely role as "rescue squads" at home.

Summary of Remarks by Thad McSandstrom at the Kansas Congressional Breakfast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions over the past 2 weeks I have taken exception to the unfavorable references that have been made to the broadcasting industry by responsible persons speaking for this administration. I only wish that every Member of Congress might have had the opportunity to have heard Thad M. Sandstrom, president of the Kansas Association of Broadcasters, speak briefly to the members of the Kansas congressional delegation and to members of the Kansas association at a recent congressional breakfast held in Washington. Perhaps the broadcasting industry in Kansas has established higher criteria than have the broadcasters in other States. I have the impression, however, that the ideals and objectives herein stated by Mr. Sandstrom are fairly representative of the broadcasting industry of the 50 States.

We are all aware that perfection has not been reached by this association or by any other association that performs public service. I do think, however, that there is supportable evidence that the broadcasting industry has been derelict in the public responsibility that has been delegated by the Congress and assumed by the licensees. In support of this point of view I am including in the record the text of Mr. Sandstrom's remarks to the recent congressional breakfast:

SUMMARY OF REMARKS BY THAD M. SANDSTROM, GENERAL MANAGER WIBW AND WIBW–TV, TOPEKA, KANS., PRESIDENT, KANSAS ASSOCIATION OF RADIO BROADCASTERS, AT KANSAS CONGRESSIONAL BREAKFAST, TUESDAY, MAY 9, 1961, WASHINGTON, D.C.

This week, over 3,000 of the Nation's leading broadcasters are in Washington for the annual convention of the National Association of Broadcasters. We have come to Washington with just one purpose in mind, to be better broadcasters. Represented in this room this morning are the leaders of the broadcasting industry in Kansas. It is my firm belief that Kansas is blessed with outstanding radio and television stations operated by men who are dedicated to serving the best interests of the people of Kansas and of our Nation.

All of our Kansas radio and television stations are making a concerted effort to build better news operations. And we need your help in this effort. We hope that you will include our radio and television stations whenever you have an important news release that deals with matters of importance to the people of Kansas or to the people of your district or a particular area. Be sure to send us news releases, either by mail or by telegram or telephone. If possible, send us a film clip for television or a tape recording for radio. We can use them. We want them. We need your help to help us to do a better job. Within the next 2 weeks we will send to each Kansas Congressman and Senator a list of every radio and television station in the State along with the correct mailing address, the telephone number, the name of the station manager, and the name of the head of the news department so that you will have this information for the purpose of sending news information back to the people of the State so we in turn can tell the people in Kansas what you are doing here in Washington. We hope that you will call this list to the attention of your administrative staff.

Yesterday our convention heard a stirring address by the new president of the NAB, the former Governor of Florida, the Honorable Leroy Collins. Governor Collins said that we must make broadcasting a great force in the American way of life. He described broadcasting as the greatest means of mass communication ever known to man. He emphasized that broadcasting must be free of Government control. Governor Collins' address, I am sure, was a tremendous inspiration to every broadcaster, and we are pleased to have this capable man as the leader of our industry.

We are glad to be able to meet with you this morning in this informal atmosphere and have an opportunity to discuss with you some of the problems facing broadcasters today. There is no urgent legislation pertaining to broadcasting now pending in the Congress. A wide variety of bills relating to broadcasting has been introduced. So far, none of these have been a matter of great urgency or concern to the broadcasting industry.

We are concerned about the proposal to permanently amend section 315 of the Communications Act—the equal time amendment. As you know, the presidential debates were made possible by a temporary amendment. It is our hope that this amendment might be made permanent.

Those of us in television are concerned with the legislation recently introduced by the FCC concerning the cable TV systems. We feel that the cable systems should be under the regulation of the Federal Communications Commission and we hope you will support this legislation.

We have all been disturbed, however, by some of the rumblings here in Washington. We have been particularly disturbed by the plan to reorganize some of the Federal agencies and in particular, the Federal Communications Commission. As you know, there have been recommendations that some broad, sweeping administrative powers be given to the FCC Chairman. Now as we Kansas broadcasters interpret this proposal, the changes will take some of the jurisdiction over the Federal agencies away from the Congress and place them in the hands of the White House and the appointed official. We view this as a bad thing; we feel that we might lose our voice—our ability to speak through our elected representatives on matters pertaining to broadcasting if Congress loses any of its jurisdiction over the FCC. We are opposed to these changes and hope that you Kansas Congressmen and Senators will oppose these proposals.

We have also been disturbed by some of the statements by the new Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, Mr. Minow. We are all anxiously awaiting his feature talk at the NAB Convention at noon today. I don't know what he is likely to say today noon. I have some ideas. After we get through hearing him, it is entirely possible that a lot of us may be back here to see you again this afternoon. He has, however, made some statements which I believe indicate some of his basic thinking. For example, he made the statement recently that "We don't know the stations the way the PTA's, church groups and League of Women Voters do." Now I am sure that the people of Kansas don't want the PTA and the League of Women Voters to decide what kind of programs they hear on radio and see on television.

And so with this background, there are some things that I would like to say to you Congressmen and Senators who are our guests here this morning.

I don't believe the responsible broadcaster has very much to worry about. I think it is high time some of these critics who get up and make these statements about there being nothing but rock and roll on radio and westerns on television be told about some of the positive things we are doing in broadcasting. They need to know about the radio and TV campaign put on in behalf of the United Fund, the campaign for school bond issues and savings bonds, the Kansas Centennial, highway safety, the religious and educational programs and a dozen other projects that every broadcaster supports.

We must be better broadcasters. That is why we are here in Washington for this meeting. We are searching for a better way, a better service, a better program, a better news format, a better technical plant, a better weather service. But we must make our own decisions. I don't believe the citizens of Kansas or the United States want four of seven men appointed to a Federal agency to decide what kind of programs they see on television and hear on radio.

Great strides for self-regulation have been made within the broadcasting industry through the radio code and the television code. I am proud to tell you that Kansas ranks second only to Nebraska among the 50 States in the percentage of radio stations which actively support the radio code of good practice. We do not intend to remain second. Our record is equally good in the television code. Seventy percent of the television stations in Kansas currently participate in the television code.

It seems to me that broadcasters have never faced a stormier future. We are being criticized on every side, by those who know, those who don't know, and those who ought to know better. Kansas broadcasters, indeed the Nations broadcasters, are not second-rate citizens. We have mounted the offensive and we are off the defensive. We must sell broadcasting to those who would hamstring our freedom with more forms to fill out, more questionnaires to answer. We've got to make ourselves felt in all walks of life, we've got to make broadcasting a force for good in America today.

Last week, radio and TV broadcasted one of the most exciting news stories in recent times, in a manner that portrays realism unmatched by the printed word, with the actual sound of the voice of America's astronaut. America had been challenged by the Russian space feat and broadcasting took its place in telling our answer. It was a great risk and the story was told only as a free broadcasting industry can tell it.

We must do more than carry sensational news, we must probe the most vital issues of the day. We must tell how and why, and what America is doing about it.

The time for greatness in broadcasting is at hand, the opportunity has never been greater, and we Kansas broadcasters must and will fulfill our role. We must stimulate thinking on the part of all of our citizens to an awareness of the forces which would destroy our way of life, which creep closer and closer every day. We Kansas broadcasters believe we must use broadcasting as it has never been used before, to stimulate

action by responsible Americans, to stimulate interest by our young people and by all citizens in the American way of doing business.

To you Congressmen and Senators, we bring this basic thought. This is not the time for containment of creativity. Broadcasting means much to millions of Americans. It informs, safeguards, entertains, and sells. It creates the desire to buy. It turns the wheels of business. It creates more of the jobs, more of the factories, more of the desire for something better. It is one of the great moving forces that can lull Americans out of their sense of complacency. It offers hope for the great struggle that lies ahead.

The broadcasting industry has the leadership, has the knowledge, has the skill to do this job, but it cannot be done if we're going to spend our time filling out forms we don't understand, forms which are unrealistic and impractical, forms which are not related to practicalities of broadcasting.

Broadcasting must remain free, free to create and stimulate, expand, and explain. Broadcasting must retain that one basic characteristic which is the secret of our very way of life, freedom to make our own decisions.

Broadcasting must remain free to remain great. Broadcasting must be in the hands of responsible licensees who do a responsible job of serving community, State, and national goals.

Kansas broadcasters have at their disposal a great force for good, the broadcast editorial. More and more Kansas stations are using the editorial tool, clearly labeled, carefully considered, and professionally presented.

The facts are pretty clear. We have a job to do. We are determined to improve our service and make broadcasting an even greater force for good in American life.

It is up to each one of us to operate our stations in such a manner that no one could possibly question our right to hold a license. The challenge is great but I am firmly convinced that broadcasters can and will meet the challenge.

King Zog and Albania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, last month, King Zog I, exiled ruler of Albania, died. Mr. Hugh Grant—now of Augusta, Ga.; formerly of Alabama—an ex-minister of Albania, was a close friend of King Zog. He felt that the King stood for democracy in his little kingdom of Albania and had hopes of being able to bring that country once more into the democratic fold.

On April 10, 1961, in the Augusta, Ga., Chronicle there appeared an Associated Press story telling of the death of King Zog. In the same issue there appears an interview with Mr. Grant. I believe the interview, particularly, will be found interesting, and may serve to recall the ever-continuing fight by some in the interest of regaining Albania for the free world.

I ask unanimous consent that both news items be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ZOG'S VIRTUES RECALLED—KING'S DEATH SADDENS AUGUSTAN, EX-MINISTER

The death of King Zog I, exiled ruler of Albania, brought sadness to Hugh Grant of Augusta, who was U.S. Minister to Zog's kingdom for 4 years prior to Mussolini's invasion.

Grant met the King in 1935 and remembers him as a real leader and a fine military man.

He believes that many of the colorful stories surrounding Zog originated with the Italians, who wanted to discredit him for political reasons.

CALLED PATRIOTIC

"I found him very intelligent and well informed about political matters in Europe. He was well educated and was one of the most patriotic Albanians I ever met," Grant asserted.

Contrary to many reports, the Augustan said Zog was making progress in Albania and leading his country toward stability.

"If the Fascists hadn't come, he would have ruled Albania successfully," he added.

LAST DAY: APRIL 6, 1939

Still vivid in Grant's memory is the day before Mussolini's invasion of Albania (April 6, 1939) when Zog summoned him to the palace for his last audience with a foreign diplomat.

"The Queen had just had her first baby and Mussolini had just given Zog an ultimatum," Grant related. "He told me about the Italians' demands that he submit and said he was going to resist."

Zog had 15,000 troops in comparison with Mussolini's 50,000.

WOULDN'T SURRENDER

Grant said that Zog knew it would be nothing more than token resistance, but chose to follow that road rather than surrender without a fight.

Queen Geraldine, whose mother was American, was sent to Greece in an automobile before the battle started. Zog left later with his cabinet.

"It was a trying time for him. I believe the Italians selected that particular time, because they knew of the Queen's condition."

CIANO BEST MAN

Grant recalled that Count Ciano, Mussolini's son-in-law, was best man at Zog's wedding in 1938.

"Mrs. Grant and I were present at the wedding. The Queen was a great deal younger than the King, but their fondness for one another was genuine.

"There was Count Ciano as best man, and then a year later he was flying over Tirana in a bomber plane."

SAW THEM IN 1951

Grant did not see Zog or Geraldine again until 1951 when they made their first and only visit to this country.

"Though he never said so in so many words, I think he had hopes of returning to Albania someday and leading the country to independence from the Communists, successors to the fascists," Grant said.

Zog's son, Prince Lika, he added, attended military school in England.

SON TO RETURN?

"It's my impression that King Zog probably looked forward to the time when his son would go back to lead the Albanians."

"His death is very tragic to my wife and myself. Our relations with him were most pleasant. He was a great friend of the United States."

FIGHTING MONARCH NEVER ABDICATED—DEATH CLAIMS KING ZOG OF ALBANIA

PARIS.—King Zog I, a feudal mountain fighter who became the first and last monarch of Albania, died in exile in Foch Hospital in the suburb of Suresnes Sunday. He was 65.

Long in ill health, he entered the hospital a week ago suffering from ulcers and liver trouble.

Although Zog spent the last 22 years in exile he never abdicated the throne he created in 1928.

A member of his entourage said Zog's son, Prince Leka, 22, who was born only three days before the family was forced by Benito Mussolini's Fascist troops to flee Albania in 1939, would succeed to the title. Prince Leka is a student at the British military school at Sandhurst.

A nervous, energetic man irked by exile and inaction, Zog spent his time in recent years in preparing a four-volume story of his life. Handicapped by loss of many of his papers in a bombing raid in England in World War II, he had completed only two volumes.

"My life is an adventure novel," he once said. "I want to write it to explain certain events which were badly interrupted because of a lack of facts."

Zog was born Ahmed Bey Zogu, a member of the rich land-owning family of Zogilli on October 8, 1895, at a time when the 500-year Turkish rule of Albania was tottering.

He attended military school and an academy in Monastir and Constaninople—now Istanbul—and led clansmen of his rugged district of Mati against Balkan troops seeking to partition the country when it became autonomous in 1912.

At the end of World War I he led a band of his men in blocking Yugoslav occupation of the port of Shkoder (Scutari), and the Albanian provisional government rewarded by making him governor of the district. He eventually became premier of the country and then president. Finally, in 1928, the form of government was changed to a monarchy, and Zog was elected the first king.

He survived several assassination attempts and revolts. An aid was killed and another wounded but Zog escaped when two Albanian gunmen took shots at him in Vienna in 1931. In an earlier attempt, when he was interior minister, Zog leaped on his assailant in a corridor in the parliament building, snatched the pistol from his and and beat him with it.

Once, wounded by a would-be assassin, Zog cooly wrapped a handkerchief around his bleeding hand went on into parliament to make a speech.

Zog astutely played off Yugoslavia and Italy against each other. Although Yugoslavia gave him assistance in 1924 when he was temporarily driven from the country by a revolt, he later allied himself with Italy.

Mussolini's army, navy, and air force violated the treaty of alliance on Good Friday, 1939, just before the outbreak of World War II, and made a surprise invasion of the country. Zog's forces could put up only token resistance, and the king, with his wife, four sisters, and baby son, fled to France. The king was reported to have brought with him bags of gold and jewels.

For a time he lived in grand style in a 15-room mansion near Cannes. He got the last boat out of Bordeaux for England when France fell before the German armies.

After the war, when Albania's Communist rulers abolished the monarchy, Zog took up residence in Cairo, but left there in 1955 after a tax dispute with Egyptian authorities and a police raid in which arms were seized in his house.

Taking up residence a second time in France, Zog lived an almost hermit-like existence in a nearly bare villa on the Rivera, never going out and seldom seeing anyone. Most of the servants and aids who had surrounded him were gone, as were the money and the jewels of the royal days.

Queen Geraldine, 20 years his junior, rarely left his side, acting as nurse and companion. The queen is the former Countess Geraldine Apponyi of Hungary, the daughter of the former Gladys Virginia Stewart of a New York banking family.

In 1951, Zog bought a 60-room mansion on Long Island and planned to move to New York. The property remained vacant, however.

Third President Foresaw Troubles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, nearly 200 years ago Thomas Jefferson made some comments concerning the Nation's economy which are quite timely today. The essence of his counsel is that we must not allow our national debt to get out of control. The words of this wise man are discussed in an editorial which appeared in the April 26, 1961 issue of the Post Advocate, a newspaper published in Alhambra, Calif. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

JEFFERSON'S DEBT WARNING—THIRD PRESIDENT FORESAW TROUBLES

If Thomas Jefferson could return today he well might say, "You did not heed my warning."

In the early days of our struggling Republic, the patriots who moulded and safeguarded our form of Government showed rare insight into human frailties in the way they charted the course for our way of life.

One of these men, Thomas Jefferson, our third President, also must have had the gift of prescience, for he seemed to foresee some of the troubles that now beset his beloved country. This was his warning:

"I place economy among the first and most important virtues and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared. To preserve our independence we must not let our leaders load us with perpetual debt. If we run into such debts, we must be taxed in our meat and drink, in our necessities, and in our comforts, in our labor and in our amusements. If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labor of the people, under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy."

Thomas Jefferson was indeed a wise man. And how true the words he spoke nearly 200 years ago. For today we have in fact the very situation he warned us against.

We have the perpetual debt (more than $350 billion).

We carry a tremendous burden of taxes.

And we have not prevented the Government from wasting the labor of the people, under the pretense of caring for them.

Suppose we operated our personal affairs the way the Government is operated. We would spend far beyond our incomes, then borrow what we could and spend that too. And give not a thought to paying back what we had borrowed. Then would follow disgrace and bankruptcy.

On the other hand, suppose the Government conducted its affairs the way any average successful businessman does. It would begin by estimating what its revenues would be, then hold its spending to below that figure. And it would begin paying off its indebtedness, instead of adding to it every year, as are Government has been doing.

Tax Foundation, Inc., estimates each American family's share of the fiscal 1961 taxes to be collected by Federal, State, and local government at $2,390, up $113 from the previous year. Estimated Government spending will be $2,850 per family, up $100 from fiscal 1960, so the public debt will increase a few more billions.

When will the lavish hands of our public spenders be curbed? When will we all come to realize that, as Thomas Jefferson said, "To preserve our independence we must not let our leaders load us with perpetual debt"?

Future of the Columbia River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 22, 1961

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the importance of developing the Columbia River for its manifold benefits is the subject of a thoughtful article which has appeared in the April 1961 issue of the American Federationist, official monthly magazine of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations. The author of the article, Mr. George Taylor, is an outstanding authority on Columbia River development. I am glad to recommend his article, especially for the background it provides for examining our future course of action in dealing with problems of the Columbia Basin. I ask consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a portion of the article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

About 5.5 million people live in the Columbia Basin's American area—about 3 percent of the national total, but occupying 6.2 percent of its land area. Nearly two-thirds of the population live west of the Cascade Mountains in an area comprising less than one-fourth of the region's total land. The combined population of Oregon and Washington represents nearly 84 percent of the total for the Pacific Northwest.

Since the days of the fur traders, the region has been a raw materials producer, controlled by absentee corporations. It has long suffered from discriminatory freight rates on finished and other goods shipped in from the East and from the lack of a well-developed market. With a basically lumbering-farming-mining economy, there are marked seasonal fluctuations in employment. A diversified economy would bring with it more industries providing year-round jobs and payrolls.

With the coming of Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams, the transmission and marketing facilities of the Bonneville Power Administration and the new electroprocessing industries, a new day appeared to be dawning for the Pacific Northwest in the 1940's. After World War II, the electroprocessing industry remained and expanded. By 1948 the region produced nearly one-half of the Nation's primary aluminum, requiring one-fourth of the total energy produced by the Federal Columbia River power system. Demand for power bounded upward, confounding the private utilities and their gloomy predictions of a million kilowatt surplus by 1950.

Between 1940 and 1950 the region's population, mainly in Oregon and Washington, increased 44 percent in contrast to a national increase of only 13 percent. Between 1950 and 1960, however, the combined population of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho rose only 17.3 percent compared to a nationwide increase of 22.3 percent over the same decade. The primary reason for this slowdown has been failure to continue development of the region's greatest industrial asset—cheap electrical energy—to attract more large power-using industry of the kind that came to the region during the 1940's.

Both the Bureau of Reclamation and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers have been operating in the region for half a century, but until 1949 had never emerged with a joint, comprehensive plan for development of the water resources of the Columbia. Both agencies had published separate and, in some ways, conflicting engineering blueprints—the Bureau in 1946 and the corps in 1948.

The great Columbia River flood of 1949, culminating with the tragic disaster that overtook the city of Vanport, Wash., caused former President Truman to order both agencies to immediately combine their plans. This was done in April 1949. This action was important from the standpoint of the need to prevent damage and loss of life from floods and for the purpose of creating an overall coordinated plan calling for full development of the river's multipurpose potential.

Between 1943 and 1947 no new power starts had been undertaken on the Columbia River system. There continued to be a lack of upstream storage to control the river and provide an integrated system of multipurpose dams which would enhance production of firm power and provide optimum flood control, navigation, and other important benefits.

Although by 1949 McNary, Hungry Horse, and four smaller projects had been started with 4.2 million acre-feet of storage and installed power capacity of 1.5 million kilowatts, the annual report of Bonneville Power Administration for the 6th consecutive year renewed its plea to the executive branch and Congress for affirmation of a policy that will continue to accelerate Federal generation in the Pacific Northwest until power supplies meet existing needs.

The 1949 Army-Bureau joint comprehensive plan for development of the Columbia Basin was designed to bring about the optimum productive use of all the region's resources * * * to aid individual initiative and private business in expanding economic activity * * * to distribute the benefits as widely as possible among the people, communities and industries of the region, and to provide opportunities for better living.

The joint comprehensive plan called for ultimate development of 125 million acre-feet of storage, eliminating all but local flood dangers, about 32 million kilowatts of installed hydropower capacity, 500 miles of inland navigation, and 8 million acres of irrigated land. It proposed development of fish and wildlife, minerals, land and recreational resources.

Additional requirements of the plan were the interconnections of projects and load centers by means of the BPA regional transmission network and coordinated financing, including use of surplus power revenues to aid in financing reimbursable costs of future irrigation projects.

The immediate phase of the comprehensive plan was to be reached between 1960–70 and would provide 27 million acre-feet of upstream storage, 12 million installed hydropower kilowatts for 1960 requirements and enhanced inland water transportation.

The bureau-corps plan had the broad backing of organized labor in the region, as well as other groups—farm, public power,

and business. Labor was particularly aware of the role cheap abundant power had played in bringing in new industries, year-round jobs and a broad tax base.

What has happened to the comprehensive plan? It became a victim of the Eisenhower administration's "partnership" power policy. As part of the partnership, the Eisenhower administration adopted a no-new-starts policy on multipurpose power development projects which was not relaxed until 1960 and which was dented, but not broken, by efforts of Democratic Senators and Congressmen from the Columbia region. Coupled with the no-new-starts policy was a slowdown of construction schedules on dams already being built.

The Dalles Dam was to be completed in 1957; it was not fully in operation until December 1960. Ice Harbor's completion date was August 1958; in actuality, it will be fully producing this year. Three other lower Snake River dams—Lower Monumental, Little Goose, and Lower Granite—were to be in operation in 1961–62 and 1963, respectively; there is no firm schedule for their completion. Two upper Snake projects—Upper and Lower Scriver Creek—were scheduled for 1957 and 1958 completion; they are not even authorized.

Priest Rapids was deauthorized and a two-dam project is currently under construction. This will result in a loss of 2 million acre-feet of storage and cheaper Federal power for industrial expansion. John Day was delayed by the administration under its partnership policy and will not be ready for full production until 1968.

Hells Canyon was a major victim of the dismemberment of the comprehensive plan by the Eisenhower administration. Despite a tremendous fight by organized labor, public power, rural electric cooperatives, and farm groups through the National Hells Canyon Association and liberals in Congress, the Federal Power Commission in 1955 issued a license to Idaho Power Co. for construction of three lesser dams in the reservoir area of High Hells Canyon. The decision was sustained by the U.S. Supreme Court. Legislation to authorize the high dam, after passing the Senate, died in the House Interior Committee in 1958.

Two other major elements of the comprehensive plan are in danger. The great Paradise storage site on the Clark Fork in Montana has been for years threatened by the Montana Power Co.'s application to build two inferior projects at Buffalo Rapids sites which would lose most of the storage and power potential in the same fashion as it was lost at Hells Canyon.

In the great dark gorge of the middle Snake, a momentous struggle is being waged over whether the mighty Nez Perce project or some alternative or alternatives should be constructed and who should do the building. This issue is further complicated by the effect of high dams on migratory salmon fingerlings on their way to the ocean from the tributary spawning beds. The Snake and Salmon Rivers in this area account for a great proportion of the region's annual salmon and steelhead runs. This has involved not only States, publicly and privately owned utilities, and the Federal Government in a confused battle, but it has brought commercial fish interests and conservationists storming into the fray.

The Corps of Army Engineers in its 1948 comprehensive plan proposed the combination of Hells Canyon and Nez Perce for full harnessing of the middle Snake and Salmon Rivers. Because of the fish problem, Hells Canyon was to be constructed immediately and Nez Perce, located downstream from Hells Canyon, ultimately, when further research might result in adequate fish passage facilities for high dams.

In 1953 the Bureau of Reclamation recommended an alternative to Nez Perce to be built at Mountain Sheep site, located a few miles upstream. The Bureau later, however, abandoned a High Mountain Sheep project because of unsatisfactory site conditions and instead emerged with a two-dam plan—a run-of-the-river project at Mountain Sheep, and a medium-sized storage project further up the Snake at Pleasant Valley.

The private utilities thereupon moved into the picture. The Pacific Northwest Power Co., a generating combination composed of four of the largest companies in the region—the Washington Water Power, Pacific Power & Light, Montana Power and Portland General Electric Cos.—applied to the Federal Power Commission in 1955 for a license to construct the Mountain Sheep and Pleasant Valley projects.

Opposition from the National Hells Canyon Association and its major components of organized labor, public power, farm and rural electric cooperatives, once more made itself felt before the FPC.

On January 20, 1958, the Federal Power Commission denied the Pacific Northwest Power Co.'s application for the same basic reasons that it should have used but did not in the Hells Canyon proceedings.

"It is readily apparent * * * that any combination of projects which includes Nez Perce is consistently superior to any combination of projects which does not include Nez Perce," the FPC order said.

There the matter rested until the Corps of Army Engineers, under a directive from the Senate Public Works Committee, issued a revised review report of development of the Columbia in 1958, just 10 years after publication of its historic document.

The corps' major water plan consists of 17 projects. It would by 1985 add 22.5 million acre-feet of usable storage and 3.2 million kilowatts of installed hydropower capacity and be capable, together with the 10.5 million acre-feet of upstream storage now in operation, of controlling a flood of the dimensions of the largest on record.

In addition to power and flood control, the 1958 review plan provided for extension of navigation on the Columbia and Snake Rivers, another 4 million acres of new irrigated land, enhanced recreation, fish and wildlife protection and pollution abatement.

The 1958 major water plan lowers power development sights. The 1948 Army review report called for 12 million kilowatts of Federal power installed by 1970 at the latest. The 1958 review report calls for only 10 million kilowatts installed Federal capacity by 1985 and has scaled down the river's 34 million kilowatt hydropower potential to an ultimate 13.2 million kilowatt practical potential.

If the projects in the major water plan are all constructed, it will be possible to control floods to the size of the greatest on record, which occurred in 1894. This would be the principal achievement. The projects reasonably sure of construction, with one or two exceptions, are higher-cost, lower-volume power producers. Moreover, the corps' future powerload assumptions indicate that the region will in the next few years depend upon higher-cost steam generation, rather than hydro. These two factors would inevitably bring about a substantial increase in regional power rates to all classes of consumers.

The effect of the 1958 review report was to accentuate the divisions between groups supporting Federal multipurpose development since the days of Franklin D. Roosevelt. These divisions had arisen out of 8 years of abandonment of Federal leadership in the region and the rush to non-Federal utilities to fill the vacuum. It also opened the door for another attempt to control lower Hells Canyon by the Pacific Northwest Power Co., which had been turned back at Pleasant Valley by the FPC decision denying its Mountain Sheep-Pleasant Valley license application.

In March 1959, the Pacific Northwest Power Co. applied to the FPC for a license to construct the Army's proposed High Mountain Sheep project. In March 1960, just prior to the Commission's scheduled Washington hearings on the project, the Washington Public Power Supply System, a group of 16 public utility districts, applied for an FPC license to build the Nez Perce project. The Commission consolidated the hearings on both applications, since the two projects are mutually exclusive. The proceedings have been in progress since the fall of 1960.

There is no doubt that the action by the 16 Washington public utility districts, augmented by 40 other municipalities, rural electric cooperatives, and consumer-owned utilities in Oregon, Idaho, and Washington, prevented PNPC from walking away unopposed with a license for a project which would produce much less power and create a smaller storage potential. Power produced under the PNPC proposal would, in all probability, be higher-cost power.

Nez Perce would be ultimately the biggest power dam in the Western Hemisphere, exceeding present installed capacity at Grand Coulee by over a million kilowatts.

The problem of fish is identical at both the High Mountain Sheep and Nez Perce sites, except that the fish run on Salmon River is greater than the fish run above the mouth of the Salmon on the Snake. The public group has earmarked $28 million for upstream and downstream fish passage facilities. PNPC had been unwilling to present its fish passage designs or cost estimates to the Federal Power Commission and only recently agreed reluctantly to do so.

Passage for fish proceeding downstream is the key to the situation, as the main risk has been the destruction of fingerlings caught in the turbines of the dam. Research toward meeting this problem is promising, although still inconclusive.

Of immediate interest to organized labor is the full-scale resumption of the Federal multipurpose water development program on a scale commensurate with the need for its stimulus to the region's economy. The Federal program as it now stands is only what is left of the dams studied, proposed, authorized and constructed during the Roosevelt-Truman administrations. The last of these—John Day—will be completed in 1968. A firm new schedule of dam building is a priority matter.

Nonpower land and water development problems and needs also offer a challenge. Flood control goals must be met before population and industry growth make desirable storage sites economically unfeasible because of added costs of relocation.

Fish and wildlife resources must be husbanded and enhanced. Labor has pointed out that the goal of the region is both fish and power, not a continuation of the frustration of fish versus power. Reservoir areas can foster non-migratory-fish resources, just as adequate fish facilities can preserve and even enchance migratory fish runs. Use of inland water navigation can be quadrupled in a few years if storage to control the river during lowflow stages, plus channel improvements, are included in water development programs needed now.

Range, crop and forest land conservation has suffered during the overshadowing struggle for control of the mighty power storehouse of the Columbia. The vast recreational potential of the region can add hundreds and millions of dollars to the region's economy and enjoyment to millions if it is adequately and rapidly developed.

The present ruinous fight for possession of the great upstream storage sites between the privately and publicly owned utilities must stop. Neither can develop and operate an integrated system of multipurpose proj-

ects. Neither can produce power at costs that will attract industry in large volume to the region. Too many utility groups are already trying to seize the water resources that should be developed according to an overall plan. There are 25 different entities, ranging from the big Federal engineering and construction agencies—the bureau and the corps—to small combinations of rural electric cooperatives.

The situation calls for the Federal Government to reassume the leadership in the great task of harnessing the Columbia and other river systems and to abandon the destructive no-new-starts policy in multipurpose water development programs. It must move toward basic reorganization of Federal resources agencies to eliminate duplication and waste and aim toward the goal of establishing regional development agencies in the Columbia and other river basins, employing the TVA principle of unified administration of land and water resources.

In no area in the land is this kind of approach more necessary than in the Columbia Basin, where 8 years of turning back the conservation clock has resulted in the kind of anarchy on the river that can do irremedial harm not only to the region but to the Nation.

Here's How Bay City, Mich., Is Building Debt-Free Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, today one of the principal legislative subjects under discussion is Federal aid to education. Many Members of Congress feel that solving local classroom needs can be done without outside intervention in the majority of instances.

My hometown of Bay City, Mich., is one of the best examples of building debt-free schools at the local level on a pay-as-you-go basis.

In that connection I would recommend that my colleagues read how we in Bay City have accomplished this. The following article appeared in a widely distributed publication entitled "America's Progress Through Voluntary Action":

HERE'S HOW BAY CITY, MICH., IS BUILDING DEBT-FREE SCHOOLS

In 8 of the last 10 years, the people of Bay City, Mich., have built 11 new school buildings—and paid for them with cash on the line.

In the next 4 years, five old schools still in use will be demolished. Their replacements—new, modern structures—will have been paid for when each is finished.

Since 1950, Bay City's two high schools have been vastly improved and expanded. The city's 39-year-old junior college has gotten more facilities. Extra classrooms have been added to a number of the 11 new buildings as need arose. There is no bonded indebtedness.

This remarkable record of a community caring for its own school needs is the result of Bay City's 15-year pay-as-you-build program.

It has meant the spending of $5,781,785—$4,578,019 of that amount for new schools and $1,203,766 for additions and improvements to buildings.

All from local resources. What's even more distinguishing is that fact that 95.2 percent of the total spent came from local taxes. Only 3.3 percent was derived from State matching funds and only 1.5 percent was miscellaneous income, mostly from school-owned property.

What has happened and is happening in the little city of 55,000 population, situated a mile or so up the Saginaw River before it empties into Saginaw Bay on Lake Huron, demonstrates that where there is sound planning and spirited leadership, schools can be financed and built locally with no need of outside intervention.

Foresight preceded planning. The former came during the forties when projections showed a coming 35 percent enrollment increase within a few years.

Ten of Bay City's fifteen elementary schools were from 60 to 75 years old. Most of the buildings constituted fire hazards, were poorly lighted, poorly heated, and generally lacking in facilities demanded for an efficient education program. Many were already overcrowded.

Earlier, proposed bond issues for new buildings failed miserably in two separate elections. Public interest was visibly lacking.

Hurting with need school officials sought out members of the business community in 1944. The Bay City Chamber of Commerce responded, one prominent member becoming chairman of a citizens' committee.

The committee endorsed a relatively modest 2-mill extra tax levy, to run for 5 years, and got busy selling the program to voters of the school district.

VICTORY SCORED

To the surprise of many the proposition was approved. The Bay City Times declared it was because the citizens' committee and its chairman "worked tirelessly in order that every voter become fully and accurately acquainted with every conceivable phase, angle and possibility of the entire program."

The 2-mill levy produced $120,000 annually. What with war-created shortages and building restrictions, no new buildings went up. Some money was spent for urgently needed repairs, certain enlargements were made to the high schools, but the balance of the funds accumulated.

NEEDS STILL UNMET

As 1949 approached, Bay City still faced the prospect of sorely needed new classrooms, in fact, an almost totally new school plant. School board trustees soberly counted the modest amount of money in the till.

One day, early in 1949, the Bay City Chamber of Commerce was asked to call a meeting of business leaders. The request came from the city's newly engaged school superintendent about whom rumors marked as an aggressive, new-idea man with an unstaid approach to education.

The word got out that he and the school board would seek the backing of businessmen for a broad, sweeping and costly new school program. Enroute to the meeting, the business leaders' attitudes ranged from wary to one (the newspaper editor) of disgruntled doubt.

SCOPE OF PROPOSAL

When the proposal was laid before them it called for scrapping of the old elementary, junior and senior high school system and a reorganization into three dimensions: primary, intermediate and high school.

For the new system, the plan proposed the construction of 15 to 19 new community elementary schools, designated "K–4" schools for kindergarten through fourth grade; a number of new intermediate schools to be called "5–8" schools, housing the fifth through eighth grades; additional shops, music rooms, cafeteria, gymnasium and athletic field facilities for the high schools. All to be done in 15 years.

Before the meeting participants caught their breaths, the cost and method of financing the program were thrust forward:

An estimated $3,500,000 "pay-as-you-go" total outlay to be raised through a special 4-mill tax, or from $4 levied annually on each thousand of assessable property valuation.

There was no way of stopping the enrollment rise, the business leaders were told, the pupil load was on an upsurge. In the high schools alone, the 1949 total of 2,515 would burgeon out to 4,200 by 1962.

(This was an accurate forecast. Of Bay City's total school population of 10,718 today, there are 4,198 young people in the high schools).

Convinced of the worth and need of the program, the business leaders assented, going a step farther and naming a 34-member citizens' advisory committee to carry the fight to the people for approval of the 4-mill levy, "K–4; 5–8 Plan."

THE COMMITTEE MOBILIZES

A banker assumed the chairmanship. His lieutenants were merchants, attorneys, manufacturers, ship builders, insurance salesmen, dentists, doctors, food processors and others, named to subcommittees charged with fundraising, publicity, speaking appearances, meeting promotions and other projects.

Restful weekends disappeared for these men. Saturdays became planning session days of the citizens' advisory committee. Donations were sought and $4,000 quickly came in from a number of firms to pay advertising and promotional expense.

On a Sunday morning in May, the Bay City Times announced to the people that the 4-mill levy would be submitted to their vote in little more than a month hence.

The once doubtful newspaper editor turned loose photographers and reporters to daily record fluelike stairwells in firetrap schools, dark classrooms, almost primitive sanitary facilities. The intent was to awaken the people.

SPREADING THE MESSAGE

Meanwhile, businessmen hit a planned public speaking trail, appearing at PTA's, before civic clubs, community groups and over the town's radio station wavelength.

Full page newspaper advertisements, bought and paid for by cooperating business firms, thundered arguments for the "K–4; 5–8 Plan" and for Better Schools for a Better Bay City."

There was special attention given the city's large Catholic and Lutheran population. More than 6,800 children are enrolled in Bay City's parochial schools.

Great stress was laid on the proposed "K–4" schools as a valuable adjunct to each neighborhood, to be made available for community meetings and social events, with facilities open to all. No discernible opposition developed, but instead, support came from spokesmen in the parochial community.

After a full-page election eve advertisement by the citizens' committee exhorted: "It Is Up To You Tomorrow," Bay City's people went to the polls.

A RESOUNDING TRIUMPH

The result was a thumping 3-to-1 majority for 15 years of extra taxes to build schools, the first (a "K–4") going up in 1950–51, and the other 10 coming along at regular intervals.

Rising costs for buildings and equipment have not dented the program. The assessed value of property in Bay City was $65,225,000 when the program was voted, but equalized valuation has caused the base to rise sharply to a present-day total of $161,205,000.

The fortunate Bay City schools' take from the 4-mill levy reached $561,000 last year, a heavy increase over the first year's return from the lower tax base.

Still active and interested in the school system in the best watchdog sense is the

citizens' advisory committee and the Bay City Chamber of Commerce, making certain that there are classrooms, built well and economically, for the growing number of children of the city and in newly developed suburbs.

And all this Bay City has accomplished for its school children despite an economic situation in the area which a Federal Government agency has defined as depressed.

Need for Long Beach Naval Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the conferees of both bodies of Congress meet tomorrow on the military construction authorization bill. One of the items in dispute is the Long Beach Naval Hospital. Fortunately a writer with considerable skill has been familiar with the medical needs of the naval service in the area of the proposed hospital for over a quarter of a century. She is Virginia Kelly, wife of a retired naval officer. Her compelling résumé of the acute need to be filled by the proposed construction appeared in a column carried by the Long Beach Press Telegram and other newspapers on May 18. It is as follows:

IF YOU WANT NAVY HOSPITAL HERE, WRITE SENATOR RUSSELL

(By Virginia Kelly)

It would be helpful if active duty and retired service men and their dependents would write immediately to Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, requesting him to approve the authorization for construction of the Long Beach Naval Hospital this year.

Letters should be brief and pertinent, setting forth the individual hardships stemming from the lack of a naval hospital in the Long Beach area.

The second ranking Senator in seniority, Senator RUSSELL, Democrat of Georgia, is a man of vast experience and legislative ability. He is a compassionate man, but he is also noted for his thrift. He feels a tremendous responsibility in his capacity as Armed Services Committee chairman for the defense of this country and for the proper allocation of military installations and funds. Senator RUSSELL has told Senator ENGLE that he has an open mind and is willing to hear further arguments on behalf of the hospital.

Throughout the years, legislators of both parties from California have worked together for the hospital in the most exemplary way. These include Representative CRAIG HOSMER, Republican of Long Beach-Lakewood, Representative CLYDE DOYLE, Democrat, and Senator THOMAS KUCHEL, Republican, and Senator CLAIR ENGLE, Democrat, a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Senator RUSSELL and Representative CARL VINSON, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, and their committees have always been above the taint of political expediency.

Senator RUSSELL's reluctance to approve the hospital this year is based, in part, because he has believed the military services are unwilling to use the hospitals of another service and because he has thought the hospital requirements could be met by the use of available hospital beds in other areas. He also has been critical that the Navy did not protest in 1950 the re-assignment of the Long Beach Naval Hospital to the Veterans Administration.

In 1950, this reporter was one of the persons who entreated the Navy to make a fight for the hospital. The Navy's official position was that to protest an Executive order would be insubordination. Privately, this reporter was told by some that the Defense Secretary had told them to keep quiet.

In the Senate debate May 8, Senator ENGLE stated bluntly that the Navy did not make a good case for the hospital (including their 1950 meek acceptance of the hospital transfer). At Senator ENGLE's insistence recently the Navy's 1961 presentation was rephrased and reemphasized.

During the May 8 debate Senator KUCHEL made a strong case for the Long Beach Naval Hospital which was so felicitously phrased that Senator RUSSELL said it was moving to him and his entire committee.

Both of the California Senators made valiant efforts for the hospital during the debate.

Recently Representative HOSMER urged the Long Beach community to write and wire the Senators on behalf of the hospitals. This was helpful in informing and inspiring the Senators.

In a further presentation of facts over the years, there was a period when the Navy Bureau of Medicine and Surgery did not favor a Long Beach Naval Hospital because they preferred to develop the hospital facilities in San Diego.

Had BuMed and the entire Navy been aggressive throughout the years, a Long Beach Naval Hospital would now be in existence.

For over 25 years, this reporter has been familiar with the Long Beach Navy medical care for dependents. As a young bride I lived in Long Beach when there was no Navy hospital and only minimal outpatient care for dependents. I know what it is to sit for 4 to 6 hours with influenza and a high temperature in a drafty corridor in a Navy clinic awaiting care. I also know what it is to be alone and ill at home without care because there was no hospital and no doctor available for house visits.

During these years also, I was a Navy Relief volunteer worker and knew the tribulations of Navy families.

After the Long Beach Naval Hospital was reassigned in 1950, many retired and active duty military men and their dependents wrote me. At one time, I prepared a sizable file of these letters and sent them to Robert B. Anderson (then Navy Secretary).

Those who have been the greatest sufferers throughout the years have been those most deserving of aid: the ill, the elderly, dependents, widows and orphans of servicemen.

This is in direct violation of the teachings of Christ and—in fact, of the concepts of all civilized persons. For years, this reporter has plucked at the coat sleeves of Defense Secretaries, Navy Secretaries, Navy Surgeons General, Chiefs of Naval Operations, and members of the Armed Services Committees of Congress. It is difficult to penetrate the consciousness of harassed and busy men who are trying to prevent a communistic holocaust and who are striving to stretch dollars when the U.S. budget is in the red.

What is the answer? Never to give up trying, never to be discouraged. Freeborn citizens must always exercise their basic freedom, the right to petition their Congress and the President and his advisers.

While the Long Beach Naval Hospital matter is pending, two other situations need light and heat: the first is equalization of pay of retired personnel in ratio with the pay of active duty officers. Letters to Senator RUSSELL might help.

Secondly, it is imperative that pensions should be properly adjusted for the small and unfortunate group of service widows whose husbands died before there was legislation which enabled military men to transfer some of their pensions to their wives. The poverty of some of these women is pitiable.

No one speaks for them. Everyone has forgotten them. It would be an admirable civic undertaking if the city of Long Beach and its citizens were to work to right this injustice just as groups adopt orphans in Korea and elsewhere.

There are 500 beds needed in this joint service facility and the need therefore has been calculated as follows:

Service	Strength	Beds
Navy and Marine Corps	36,000	[1] 310
Air Force	5,900	[2] 50
Army	3,380	[3] 50
Dependents and retired (all services)	58,000	[4] 90

[1] Bureau of Medicine and Surgery records show 94 per 10,000 servicemen are hospitalized each day. Thus, of 36,000 servicemen, 338 will be hospitalized daily. In the above table this has been reduced to 310 to account for an average of 28 men estimated to be on leave from the hospital during the final recovery stages.

U.S. hospital standards indicate a gross capacity of 402 beds is required for a hospital maintaining an average daily patientload of 310.

[2] Department of Defense has directed Navy to provide 50 beds in this hospital to accommodate March Air Force Base patients in need of specialized care for orthopedics, urology, and major surgery. This is to obviate the necessity to provide such facilities and staffing at March Air Force Base itself.

[3] An obsolete 85-bed Army hospital at Fort MacArthur can be disestablished on the availability of these 50 beds at this joint service facility, effecting a net savings to the Government.

[4] These 90 beds essentially represent the difference between the 310 average daily patientload and the 402-gross-bed capacity (92 rounded off at 90) mentioned in footnote 1. It will, of course, satisfy only a small percentage of total overall dependent and retired hospitalization requirements.

Johnson Campaigns in Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK MacGREGOR
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, in the 1960 election campaign we heard a great deal about the tremendous need for a new approach in the way the United States carries out its responsibilities in foreign policy. In that connection I would like to recommend to my colleagues the following pertinent article which appeared in the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune of May 21:

JOHNSON CAMPAIGNS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

(By Robert Hewett)

BANGKOK, THAILAND.—"All the way with LBJ." Disconcerting echoes of last year's familiar campaign slogan kept bobbing up last week in the unlikely atmosphere of Communist-threatened southeast Asia.

Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON buzzed by jet plane in and out of four countries in 1 week on what he proclaimed several times daily was "a mission of purpose." It was billed as a factfinding mission.

The trip also was aimed at reassuring America's weak Asian allies, alarmed at the demonstration of U.S. ineptitude in the Lao and Cuban debacles, that the new Kennedy administration still meant to take a firm stand against Communist expansion.

But there have been times in South Vietnam, the Philippines, Formosa, and Thailand when it seemed that tireless, grinning, handshaking JOHNSON was running for office again.

And strange as it may seem at first examination, that is exactly what JOHNSON was doing in such exotic, faraway cities as Saigon, Manila, Taipei and Bangkok. Always a canny man to look ahead in politics, the tall Texan is already running for president in 1968 as Democratic party successor of President Kennedy.

It was very plain to those accompanying the Vice President on his whirlwind tour that he is deadly serious about building up a public image of himself as an international statesman. It is probably natural—involving as it did a man steeped in 30 years of hard, practical American politics—that the tour's frenzied pace and grandiloquent oratory often had more of the aspects of a combined whistlestop campaign and a party convention than of a critical diplomatic mission.

But there is a difference between winning hometown votes by flattering everybody in sight, especially the local political bosses, and presenting a picture of a firm, serious-minded United States involved in a fight for survival not only for ourselves but also for our free world friends and, in a sense, dependents.

JOHNSON's folksy politicking smacked a little too much of artificiality to come off well. And there is the danger that in portraying the flying tour as a huge diplomatic success for American public consumption, JOHNSON will be deluding himself as well as lulling the American people into a false sense of security.

It would be unfair to the Vice President to give the impression that his every action was motivated by building up personal political stature. He is a hard-working patriot with a keen awareness of the growing Communist menace in southeast Asia and elsewhere. His schedule and the commitments he could make were laid down by the State Department and by President Kennedy.

But having said that, it must be emphasized that the southeast Asian tour—now being followed by courtesy calls in India and Pakistan—did not accomplish nearly as much as the claims made in JOHNSON's speeches, communiques and "background briefings."

Under the circumstances any dramatic results could not be expected. A start has been made at restoring anti-Communist morale among our uneasy Asian friends. Deeds, not words, will determine whether communism continues to gain in southeast Asia and the main effort must be made by the Asians themselves.

Despite all the talk of mutual friendship and defense, there is very real danger that Thai leaders may choose a path of "neutralism" because they fear the United States will be as ineffective in helping combat communism in their country as in neighboring Laos.

Filipino leaders, America's closest friends in the Orient, also are worried. In South Vietnam autocratic President Ngo Dinh Diem got what he has been seeking for more than a year—more economic aid and more money for a larger army.

It remains to be seen whether he puts through much-needed internal reforms to popularize his Government, and Johnson certainly got carried away by his own oratory when he compared Diem to George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and Winston Churchill.

Johnson paid the same sort of public adulation to Gen. Chiang Kai-shek in Formosa and, on behalf of the Kennedy administration, pledged as much or more support than Chiang got from the Eisenhower administration.

The cheering receptions for JOHNSON in South Vietnam and Formosa—complete with banners and friendship slogans—were Government mobilized demonstrations. And it is doubtful that JOHNSON's determined lessons in handshaking and crowds, aimed at showing Diem and Chiang how to conduct American style politicking, will have much effect on getting those two aloof personalities closer to the masses.

In Thailand JOHNSON's own person-to-person program proved to be pretty much of a flop. Thai officials gave him a cool, correct welcome and JOHNSON's few efforts to shake hands with roadside bystanders were met mainly with bewilderment.

Photos may look good in American newspapers. But Vice President JOHNSON won't have much encouraging news from his factfinding mission to report to President Kennedy.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, I have consistently felt that the subject of education could best be continued solely at the State level and I am very pleased to note that the majority of the informed correspondents from my district seem to agree. During last fall's campaign, this issue was clearly drawn with my opponent, who strongly favored all proposals of the New Frontier, including Federal aid. At that time, the segregation issue was apparent but religion and private schools had not yet been injected into the discussion. The matter of the constitutionality of aid to private schools will no doubt be passed upon by the judicial branch of the Government, in due course. However, the argument that Federal aid will not result in the Federal control of education has obviously fallen by the wayside even before the program has left the ground. Such recent developments have confirmed my original suspicions and I feel that these are but a few of the many problems that are bound to arise at the Washington level.

Another question in my mind is just what does constitute "aid," as none of the current proposals provides for an equal return on New York State's contribution to the program; in fact, one of the formulas shows that our residents will pay as much as $2.90 in Federal taxes to get back $1. I regret that considerable confusion exists as to just who is supposed to benefit from such "aid."

Whenever such subjects arise in connection with Federal legislation, my respect for the Founding Fathers and the Constitution is renewed, and I am again impressed by the fact that certain issues may properly be handled in Washington while others belong at the local fevel. Education is one of the latter, and in my opinion, our several States are entirely capable of handling the situation as the occasion may arise.

One of my informed constituents has very ably commented in the following manner:

R. D. 11, KERR ROAD,
Rhinebeck, N.Y., May 16, 1961.

The fallacious phrase "separation of church and state," regarding Federal aid to education is realized. This erroneous interpretation of the Constitution and first amendment is a political gimmick. An argument over religion and aid to nonpublic schools overcasts the true aspects of Kennedy's Federal aid bill.

We now look at the education bill in its true form. Americans do not want Federal aid. Why? Since 1945, we have built 550,000 classrooms costing approximately $19 billion; practically all of it raised by townships, towns, and cities. This provided accommodations for over 15 million pupils while the increase during that same period was only 10 million. During the 1950's, our school population increased by 38 percent, while our cash expenditure for education increased by 124 percent. We have proved that without Federal help we have the ability and willingness to build needed schools. Further, present census figures show the rate of increase or new pupils will begin to drop by 1965. "The pressure of growth upon schools," states the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, "will be far less heavy in the 1960's than it was in the past 10 years."

Who wants Federal aid? The National Education Association, one of the most potent lobbies in Washington, and other influential groups such as the AFL–CIO and bureaucrats in the Federal Department of Health Education and Welfare. Many Members of Congress are politically indebted to these groups. We have reached a disastrous situation in which unscrupulous individuals and greedy politicians are using our educational system for personal gains. These pro-Federal aid groups have flooded us with school shortage and insufficient teachers and salaries propaganda for so long that we are inclined to agree if we do not inform ourselves with the truth. One example of NEA's propaganda: NEA and the Kennedy administration have us believe we desperately need more teachers and much better pay for them. The truth is, teachers' salaries paid by localities and States have nearly doubled—up 99.8 percent during the past 10 years. Also, the number of teachers has increased by 47.6 percent in the past 10 years, while the school enrollment has increased only 44.9 percent.

Since there is no comparable lobby to check adverse statements and to defend the taxpayer, it is extremely difficult for us to arrive at the truth. It is evident, however, that we can no longer have a passive interest in the affairs of our local, State, and Federal Government. When unethical practices, political gimmicks, and personal gain enter our country's educational system a national chaos results. Our American educational system is the criteria for maintaining our country's democracy and heritage.

We must read all pamphlets and newspapers, covering every aspect of the proposed Federal aid to education. Once establishing the truth of this matter, it is our duty as able citizens to relay the facts to our neighbors and spokesmen of our community, State, and Nation. Will our Government be of the people, by the people, and for the people; or of, by, and for a handful of powerful bureaucrats?

Sincerely,

MRS. NEIL R. MANSFIELD.

J.F.K. Faces Devastating Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose an editorial by Roscoe Drummond which appeared in the Sioux City (Iowa) Journal, of May 17, 1961:

CIVIL RIGHTS VERSUS THE SOUTH—J.F.K. FACES DEVASTATING DILEMMA

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The sweeping new civil rights bills, introduced in Congress by two leading Democrats, Representative EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, and Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, of Pennsylvania, confront the Kennedy administration with a delicate and perhaps, a devastating dilemma.

If President Kennedy fails to give this new civil rights legislation strong support at this session of Congress he will be abandoning specific pledges of the campaign and party platform. He will also be pulling the rug from under the two Members of Congress he appointed to act for him.

If the Kennedy administration does put its full weight behind the six new civil rights bills, then the President runs the risk that he will destroy the carefully contrived operation of the White House to win more and more southern Democratic support for the Kennedy program. Without this gain in Southern support, much of Mr. Kennedy's legislative program would be in limbo today.

Thus it will take fantastically delicate maneuvering for the President to avert the most devastating consequences.

Take the House vote on the minimum wage law, which in the end gave the President almost exactly what he asked. It was 230 to 196. Without the votes of 32 out of 99 Southern Democrats, the President's bill would have lost.

From several Southern States the White House even got a majority of the delegations: 5 of 9 members from Alabama, 5 of 9 from Tennessee, 8 of 12 from North Carolina, 5 of 8 from Louisiana.

The President knows full well that if the White House puts its prestige and power behind the Clark-Celler civil rights bills, this southern support would drop radically—almost certainly below the point absolutely needed for administration success.

The reason is that the Clark-Celler bills add greatly to the powers of the Federal Government to enforce civil rights.

It would seem to me that the only freedom of maneuver open to Mr. Kennedy is timing. He would like to delay civil rights legislation until next year, while Attorney General Kennedy sees what headway he can make by rigorous endorsement of present laws.

In order to measure Mr. Kennedy's problem let's take a look at two questions he has to answer. How committed is the President to the Clark-Celler bills?

In the campaign Senator Kennedy pledged civil rights bills which "will implement the pledges of the Democratic platform."

The Clark-Celler bills accomplish this end. In introducing them, CLARK and CELLER are carrying out their assignment by Mr. Kennedy after the Los Angeles convention to draft and introduce the bills.

They have done so in response to Mr. Kennedy's September 1, 1960 statement that "we will seek the enactment" of these bills "early" in the next Congress.

But when the bills were introduced in Congress this week, there was no visible support from the White House. The Associated Press reported Senator CLARK and Representative CELLER as "not attempting to explain President Kennedy's silence."

The President's silence is explained by the fact that he needs every single vote among the Southern Democrats he can get. Very little of his program would be law today without this increased southern support. The rest of his program will have little chance of becoming law unless this support keeps up.

Editorial Support for Tax Exemptions or Tax Credits for Educational Expenses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced three bills to approve either an increased exemption or a tax credit for college expenses.

There is considerable support for this approach in the area I represent as evidenced by two editorials which were in spontaneous response to the introduction of these bills.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that the editorial from the Cedar Rapids (Iowa) Gazette, "Best Kind of Federal Aid," and the one from the Washington (Iowa) Evening Journal, "SCHWENGEL Offers a Workable Plan on Education," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

BEST KIND OF FEDERAL AID

Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL of Iowa's First District has renewed his fight for the best kind of Federal aid to education possible—if Congress would only enact it. We are talking about laws which would permit those who are financing college educations for children or wards to deduct legitimate expenses for this purpose when filling out Federal income tax returns.

Representative SCHWENGEL has introduced again three bills designed to give the folks at home some tax relief along this line. One bill would increase personal exemption from $600 to $1,000 for each full-time student, taxpayer, spouse of dependent paying college expenses. The others would authorize tax credit for certain educational expenses including tuition, fees, charges and required textbooks, as well as board, lodging, and transportation.

We have long been an advocate of this type of aid as the best kind the Federal Government could offer. It meets all the requirements that might be established for an aid program. Moreover, it has a built-in answer for the church-state problem at the national level since each taxpayer could claim credit for college expenses no matter where his son, daughter or ward attended college.

Finally, the money would go farther for it wouldn't have to go through the shrinkage process of being sent to Washington and appropriated by Congress to be doled out formula-wise as concocted by that branch of Government.

This is so simple that probably it has little chance for acceptance by Congress—at least not until the home folk make their voices heard by letting Congress know that it's not so simple that the fellow who's paying the college expenses—and, not so incidentally, the congressional salaries as well—can't understand it.

SCHWENGEL OFFERS A WORKABLE PLAN ON EDUCATION

Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL is trying to secure an increased income tax exemption for college educational expenses. His proposals have been introduced in Congress and are the result of long study by his own research team at the State University of Iowa.

The Congressman would authorize tax credits for educational expenses. He would provide a credit of $1,000 for each full-time student. There would also be credits for tuition, fees, required textbooks, board, lodging, and transportation—in fact, all the essential college costs that the student or his parents must meet.

SCHWENGEL says he believes this is a far better answer to the educational problem than the administration proposals for various types of Federal aid. Ask the parents of any college student and you will likely get a report that the costs call for heavy financial sacrifice. Tax credits for those who face up to this problem should prove helpful and popular.

Greater Boston Young Republican Club Opposes Federal Aid for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURENCE CURTIS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in an extension of my remarks, I include a resolution of the Greater Boston Young Republican Club as follows:

At its regular monthly meeting on May 8, the Greater Boston Young Republican Club, considered to be the second largest east of the Mississippi, with a dues-paying membership of over 600, adopted a resolution placing the club on record as unalterably opposed to Federal financial aid for school construction, teachers' salaries, or general public education.

This resolution stating strong opposition to any form of general "Federal Aid to Education" was passed after a lengthy discussion by a 2-to-1 vote. The resolution in full follows:

"Whereas Federal aid to schools is inconsistent with both our time-honored tradition of State and local responsibility for education and the spirit of the Constitution; and

"Whereas no conclusive proof has been presented that any emergency exists in the area of classroom construction, the 68,000 current annual locally financed classroom construction rate exceeding the projected 61,000 annual classroom need; and

"Whereas the main problem in education today is one of quality, rather than quantity, which cannot be solved by Federal financial aid; and

"Whereas the Federal Government with debt and accrued liabilities of $750 billion is much less able to finance whatever additional educational expenditures may be necessary than are State and local governments with a combined debt of $62 billion; and

"Whereas it is inevitable, based on past Federal aid formulas, that Massachusetts

will receive back less than half the tax dollars sent to Washington to finance any Federal aid to education plan, which difference the taxpayers of Massachusetts can ill afford to donate to other States;

"We, therefore, being mindful of the inevitable connection between subsidization and control, are unalterably opposed to Federal financial aid for school construction, teachers' salaries, or general public education."

Big Business—That's Cars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, a new angle considering the relationship of automobiles to people in the United States was brought forcibly to the attention of the readers of the Detroit Free Press in an article written by Fred Olmsted, the automotive writer for that paper. The article follows:

WORLD OF WHEELS—BIG BUSINESS—THAT'S CARS

(By Fred Olmsted)

If you wanted to move the 7.7 million people out of New York's five boroughs (for example, if somebody started pushbuttoning a war), you would have to load an average of 5.9 persons in each of the 1,316,665 available cars.

In Los Angeles County, you could put everybody in the front seat. For with 1.7 million less population than New York, Los Angeles County has nearly twice as many cars (2.5 million versus New York's 1.3). The average: 2.4 persons per car.

In Denver, the fleeing residents would rattle around with only 1.9 per car, lowest concentration among the counties with a quarter-million or more population.

Wayne County, too, could transport its 2.6 million without using the rear seats. Its 955,497 cars figure out to an average of 2.8 persons per car.

Places like Gary, Ind., Louisville, Ky., Cincinnati, Syracuse, and Newark would have 3.1 persons in each car, which is the national average.

This dispersal of cars is shown in the 1961 issue of Automotive Facts and Figures, a fascinating compilation of the Automobile Manufacturers Association.

Some other intriguing items:

Fifty-four percent of U.S. cars are 5 years old or more. The average truck is 7.6 years old. (Which ought to mean a whale of a new market for both.)

Fifty-two percent of auto-driver trips are to work or for shopping, nearly 15 percent are for social-recreation purposes.

Fifty-seven percent of all cars on the road have automatic transmissions.

In the 50 largest cities, 48,094 taxicab licenses were issued in 1959. Biggest total, New York, 11,870. Detroit, 1,308.

And if you think there are a lot of other drivers to complain about on the road, you're right. As of 1959, the total of car, truck, and bus drivers was nearly 84.5 million, up nearly 3 million from the year before.

Incidentally, the AMA is fond of citing such figures as these:

Twenty-two percent of all retail sales in the United States are automotive. This amounts to $45 billion.

Automotive retail, wholesale, and connected service business receipts top $93 billion, or 18 percent of all such business activity in the country.

One business in six is automotive and 10.5 million persons are employed in highway transportation business.

For the first time, more than 75 percent of the Nation's families own at least one car, 13.4 percent own more than one.

Motor vehicle registrations reached a new high of 73,897,000, with 61,569,000 cars and 12,328,000 trucks and buses.

These vehicles traveled a record 720 billion miles in 1960.

In 1960, another first was chalked up: For the first time (with the aid of the compacts) more than a million station wagons were sold in 1960. This is seven time as many as in 1950.

Altogether, factory sales in 1960 included 6,674,796 cars and 1,194,271 trucks. This total of 7,869,271 was second only to 1955. Their combined value: $14.4 billion.

In achieving this, the industry bought nearly $6 billion worth of goods produced by other industries, in addition to huge quantities of steel, rubber, leather, and other raw materials.

Motor vehicle tax collections were at an alltime high of $10.6 billion. Federal excise taxes totaled $4.5 billion. Special truck taxes were $3 billion.

The AMA figures that taxes eat up 26 cents of every dollar of the delivered prices on a new car.

But perhaps the top statistic: The industry has turned out 185 million motor vehicles since 1900, or better than one for every man, woman, and child now populating the United States.

Teacher Gap Being Closed?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we will soon struggle with the Federal aid to education proposals and will be faced with the usual perverted logic that is used by the proponents of these inconsistent and impractical proposals. Before the Congress is pressured into blindly accepting the false propaganda of the forces supporting Federal aid to education, it might be well for the Members to study an editorial of Friday, May 12, in the Chicago Daily News. I respectfully submit it for the RECORD for the enlightenment of my colleagues:

TEACHER GAP BEING CLOSED?

The evidence continues to mount that the much-publicized teacher shortage will be overcome within the old-fashioned rules of supply and demand. Short supply and heavy demand have forced salaries upward and otherwise improved the status of teaching as a profession.

One straw in the wind is a survey made at Northwestern University showing that no less than 41 percent of this year's graduates who have made up their minds about a career are choosing teaching. Engineering came in second.

The figures indicate a 4-percent gain in teaching preference in 1 year, and seem to intensify an upward trend already noted. Even among the men students, 22 percent of those who are decided say they will go into teaching.

The high birth rate insures a big demand for teachers for a long time to come. Few careers offer more in the way of security and stability. Present starting salaries averaging about $4,800 a year—earned in 10 months or less—are higher than women graduates can expect in any other field.

Northwestern's director of placement, Dr. Frank S. Endicott, has added one more statistic as a clincher. NU graduates who go into teaching, his study proved, get married at the same rate as those who choose other careers. The old libels about old-maid schoolteachers are as outdated as the hoop skirt.

When that news gets around, added to the other inducements now being offered teachers, we can confidently expect the teacher shortage to go the way of the missile gap.

Sante Fe Trail Caravan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the second installment of reports being sent to me by Mr. and Mrs. Dick Janes, who are the acting official reporters for the Santa Fe Trail Caravan, presently making its way across the great expanse of western Kansas as part of the Kansas centennial celebration. The first report was in the RECORD of May 17, when the caravan was on the trail heading toward Lyons, Kans. Now, the caravan has covered more territory, and this report takes up from Lyons to Sublette:

SANTA FE TRAIL CARAVAN

Here we are in Lyons, Kans. This area was sought by Francisco de Coronado in 1541. A 30-foot granite cross stands west of Lyons as a monument to Juan de Padilla, a follower of Coronado, who was killed by the Indians in this area. Both men are represented in this caravan parade.

A horse-drawn surrey represented by Susan Magaffin and Josiah Gregg was the entry from Ellinwood, our next stop. After the parade we found the townspeople had done something a little different. Most of the merchants had brought their wares out on the sidewalks and they were having a sidewalk bazaar. There were such items as cowboy shirts, centennial souvenirs, etc.

The first leg of our journey was coming to a close as we arrived in Great Bend for the weekend. The parade here was one of the longest and drew the largest crowd yet. A covered wagon representing Fort Zarah was Great Bend's entry in the parade. The fort is one of the five still found along the old Santa Fe Trail. We were afraid we were in for a terrible weekend, with storm warnings out for a couple of hours. But, despite the warning, the Santa Fe Trail Rodeo went on as scheduled. One of the caravan members, Buddy Heaton, was featured as one of the clowns. All in all it was a very nice rodeo with some of the top animals and cowboys appearing.

After a horribly cold and windy weekend we awoke to a bright, sunny Monday morning. It was such a refreshing sight to look out on the rolling plains of Kansas. After a hearty breakfast we were on our way to Larned, the sight of Fort Larned. En route the caravan ran into an Indian Raid at Pawnee Rock. Indians swarmed down on us from every direction. It looked like the Indians would overcome us, but even in this modern age the caravans were quick to defend themselves and soon won out. We made a quick departure for Fort Larned. This fort is supposed to be the only intact fort left in the Old West. In the caravan the fort is represented by a covered wagon drawn by mules.

When we arrived at Fort Larned, movies were taken of the Cavalry unit from Mission, Kans., and of General Custer, portrayed by Dave Gastman, from the State of Oregon. A delicious lunch was served to us on the green in the center of the fort. After that we toured the buildings and museum.

The "Cow Town" of the Old West was our next stop along the Santa Fe Trail. The Boot Hill Stagecoach is the unit which represents Dodge City in the caravan. Dodge City presented many tourist attractions which kept us busy most of the evening—Front Street, Boot Hill, Beeson's Museum, etc.

Another cold and windy morning greeted us today as we prepared to move out for Sublette, Kans. Traveling across the plains we really felt like the pioneers as we looked out and could see nothing for miles but a lonely tree bending with the wind. Grove Vicker represented a St. Louis fur-trader, William Sublette, who was the first man to take a wagon across the Rocky Mountains.

Satanta, Kans., is our next stop. It's named after Chief Satanta, most dreaded Chief of the Kiowa Nation. Of interest in Satanta is the Indian Teepee Museum, which houses Indian relics found in this area.

Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr., U.S. Navy, Should Be Permitted To Wear His Uniform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, this Nation should be and, I believe, is proud of its men and women in uniform. There is no doubt that the members of our armed services are proud of their uniforms. They should be allowed to wear them, as detailed in the following article by Columnist Virginia Kelly from the Long Beach Independent-Press-Telegram:

MANY CURIOUS OVER WHY ASTRONAUT DID NOT WEAR UNIFORM
(By Virginia Kelly)

America's astronaut episode was an unforgettable affair. And here is one of the things about it which some persons cannot forget:

Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr., U.S. Navy, the astronaut, did not wear uniform while he was in Washington.

Many of the general public (as well as the military) were astonished and disappointed that he was in civilian dress when he was decorated by our Commander in Chief, President Kennedy, at the White House. Before they came to Washington, Commander Shepard's parents, Colonel Shepard, USAR, retired, and Mrs. Shepard said they hoped their son would wear his uniform.

President Kennedy gave Commander Shepard only the NASA Distinguished Service Medal. The President did not award the Distinguished Service Medal (of the armed services) which was also on his desk.

The Secretary of the Navy John B. Connally and the Chief of Naval Operations Adm. Arleigh Burke told this reporter tersely that they do not know why Commander Shepard was not in uniform.

A National Aeronautics and Space Administration spokesman said it was a NASA decision in line with deemphasis on the military because NASA is a civilian agency. The policy was made originally during the tenure of NASA Administrator Dr. T. Keith Glennan and is still the policy of the present Administrator, James E. Webb.

NASA states that the space effort is a national effort. NASA also takes the view that the astronauts (who are from the Navy, Marine Corps and Air Force) are regarded as 'engineering test pilots—the same as civilians." Why then were civilians not chosen? NASA admits that no civilians could be found who met the rigid standards it set.

Military selectivity, training, and lifetime discipline have contributed much to the astronauts—all from the Armed Forces—who meet the standards of technical qualifications, superiority of mind and body, moral character, bravery, and spirit.

There seems to be a strange philosophy among some people in this country: that it is not quite nice to be a military man or to wear a uniform.

Commander Shepard took his Naval Academy class ring with him on his historic flight. This proves his devotion to the Navy. All of the services are equal, however, and Americans will be just as joyous when Marine or Air Force astronauts fly. The Army has such a small pool of pilots that they have no astronauts so far.

President Kennedy has said we are in grave danger. It would be well for him to examine NASA's viewpoint which is not helping the morale of the armed services, which are our shield in time of national peril.

Every effort is being made to keep career men in military service. Incentives of pay, extra medical care for dependents, and the unusual privilege of allowing dependents abroad in great numbers have been offered without significant success. It is amazing that the President and the Congress do not see—what the youngest enlisted man knows by instinct—that the greatest incentive to the military is the love and respect of their fellow citizens of the United States of America. Instead of underplaying esprit de corps, every effort should be made to encourage the proper pride of brave military men.

The Critical Decisions of the Next 2 Weeks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK MacGREGOR
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the drifting of U.S. international policy during the past 100 days has become cause for increasing alarm all over the Nation. I believe there is a strong and growing feeling that hard decisions must be made and must be made soon. I believe the public will support these decisions. And for a well-expressed summary of the critical time which lies just ahead I recommend the following which appeared in the New York Times of Friday, May 19:

THE CRITICAL DECISIONS OF THE NEXT 2 WEEKS
(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, MAY 18.—For the moment everybody in Washington seems to be rushing off in all directions doing precisely what they originally said they wouldn't do.

The President, who said he was determined to decide what he wanted to negotiate before he went on the summit circuit, is now negotiating with the great men before deciding what he wants to negotiate.

The Vice President, who is an expert on domestic policy, is running all over southeast Asia negotiating foreign policy and making promises which Kennedy is probably not going to be able to keep.

The Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, who came to Washington 3 months ago determined to stay home and run the State Department and be the principal adviser to the President on foreign policy, is now doing neither.

And even the Washington Senators, who were supposed to lose to everybody, have won five in a row, including two from the Yankees.

In due course, all this will settle down: the Senators will descend into the cellar where they belong, and the natural intelligence of the Government will assert itself, but for the time everybody is restless and even a little quarrelsome.

President Kennedy apparently realizes this, and is finally planning to go to the country in an attempt to give a sense of direction and priority to his programs. This will be done before he goes to Paris at the end of the month to see President de Gaulle, and what he decides between now and then will therefore be of considerable importance.

His letter to Alicia Patterson, editor and publisher of Newsday, illustrates the problem. "Each time we make any move or commitment in foreign affairs," he said in that letter, "I am in need of the support of the American people, their understanding, their patience, their willingness to endure setbacks and risks and hardships in order that this country can regain leadership and initiative."

As a generalization, this is all right, but while there is quite a lot of patience in the country, there is very little understanding, because on the major question of the nation's strategy in the cold war, it is not clear what the President is asking.

He is asking for support but not telling what the country is expected to support. Is it being asked to block every move of the Communists into every area right up against and close to the Communist borders: in Laos, in the rest of southeast Asia, and in Iran? Or is it being asked to reconsider the assumptions of the past and defend areas that are more defensible?

Nobody knows the answer to these fundamental questions. Vice President JOHNSON has been scattering promises generously in Vietnam, the Philippines, and Formosa, but every time he makes another pronouncement, many of his associates in the Government wince, not because they all disagree with the policy of defending southeast Asia, but because they know that no careful decision has been made here about what can and should be done about the defense of these areas close to the Communist borders.

This uncertainty at the top of the Government is now being reflected in the criticism of the press. Because it is widely known or believed here that the administra-

tion has not decided on its strategy of what can and what cannot be defended, the press is engaged in a kind of campaign to persuade the Government to do this or do that.

Henry Luce is publicizing the hard line and glorifying intervention as a noble principle. Walter Lippmann is arguing for a reappraisal of past commitments and for detachment from what he regards as untenable entanglements.

Elsewhere, the old clichés and fighting words of past debates are beginning to appear. Thus those who do not think it wise to try to defend everything everywhere are being labeled as appeasers and isolationists and pacifists, while on the other side those who want to be bold are being condemned as warmongers.

Obviously, there is very little future in such a dialog. Everybody agrees here on one thing: that the present trend of policy has to be changed. They all agree, too, that any policy involves serious risks, and they are all waiting to see what lead the President will give to cut through the current fog and confusion.

The trouble is that the Government has been speaking before deciding, and promising more than they have to give, and acting without a set of priorities. The next 2 weeks will provide an opportunity to correct this, and what the President decides will be important, for nothing is more dangerous in the alliance at the moment than an ill-considered conference with De Gaulle, and nothing worse in the cold war than an ill-prepared talk with Khrushchev.

Kings Point: Fifth Academy Molds Sailors for Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, for many, many years, Kings Point has been a landmark in Long Island, training the young men of that whole area for careers in the merchant marine. The youngsters in my congressional district vie for the honor of appointment to this most excellent Academy, and fortunately are well represented there.

I think the recent article appearing in the Navy Times under date of May 13 will be of particular interest to my colleagues in the House as well as the public generally. I have asked that it appear intact in the RECORD today.

The article follows:

KINGS POINT: FIFTH ACADEMY MOLDS SAILORS FOR COMMERCE

KINGS POINT, N.Y.—The U.S. Merchant Marine Academy is one of five Federal academies. The others are the Military Academy, Naval Academy, Air Force Academy, and Coast Guard Academy. The Merchant Marine Academy—or Kings Point—is, like its counterparts, a national institution, military in character, and an accredited, 4-year, degree-granting college.

Kings Point prepares selected young men to become officers in the U.S. Merchant Marine, and qualifies them at the same time for commissions as ensigns in the Naval Reserve. Entrance requirements are similar to those of the other Federal academies.

The U.S. Merchant Marine Cadet Corps was established in 1938, and construction of the Academy began at Kings Point in January 1942. Upon completion of the facilities it was officially dedicated in September 1943.

In September 1945 the present 4-year course replaced the accelerated wartime training program. The Academy became an accredited college in 1949 and was authorized by Congress to award bachelor of science degrees to its graduates. Congress made the Academy a permanent institution on February 20, 1956.

Rear Adm. Gordon McLintock, USMS, a ships' master from the age of 24 and a member of the U.S. Naval Reserve since 1928 is the superintendent of the Academy.

It was under Admiral McLintock's supervision that the Academy has been nationally accredited.

The Navy is represented at Kings Point by the Department of Naval Science and the Chaplains' Office.

Comdr. Zaven Mukhalian, USN, also himself graduated from Kings Point before entering the Navy, is head of the naval science department. Six officer instructors and six chief petty officer instructors imparted knowledge to the Kings Pointers in the fields of naval orientation, history, gunnery, operations, administration, law, and leadership.

Navy chaplains are stationed at Kings Point. Comdr. John Danielsen, USN, is the Protestant chaplain; Lt. Giles Morrill, USN, is the Catholic chaplain who has come aboard to replace Comdr. Mark P. Sullivan, assigned to the just-commissioned carrier *Kitty Hawk*. Father Morrill recently completed a tour of duty at Guam.

An important decision confronts the new fourth classman as he arrives at Kings Point for the first time. Shall he chose to be a deck or engineering officer—to aim at being the master of a ship or a chief engineer. Some know, but for others special counseling is available.

The deck and engineering curricula, both require the study of general education courses, along with professional and technical subjects. The successful completion of the course of study leads to the degree of bachelor of science.

The faculty at Kings Point differs quite a bit from some colleges or universities. In addition to their academic degrees, many of the staff have marine licenses—some as masters or mates, some as chief engineers or assistant engineers.

The engineering department will also train future crews of the nuclear ship *Savannah*. The latest in equipment and teaching techniques can be found at Kings Point. This also holds true for nautical science and the other departments that comprise the staff of the Academy.

The Academy occupies 65 acres on the north shore of Long Island, N.Y., overlooking Long Island Sound. The landscaped grounds, with its 38 buildings and marine facilities, is centered upon the former Walter P. Chrysler estate. The Chrysler mansion, renamed Wiley Hall, serves today as the main administration building. Since all other buildings—residence halls, academic halls, mess, hospital, and gymnasium—were built from a single master plan, it was possible to maintain a pleasing uniformity of architectural style throughout * * * with the result that Kings Point is said to be one of the most beautiful campuses in the Nation.

Kings Point residence halls are divided into rooms accommodating two cadets each and, like all Academy facilities, bear the names of leaders and heroes in American maritime history. One additional building, the Merchant Marine Memorial Chapel, has been erected on a site overlooking the sound.

The average enrollment at Kings Point is 725. In addition, about 225 cadets are training at sea during the second year of their Academy program.

The entering student learns first that his title is "cadet," and that during his fourth class (freshman) year, he will have the additional title of "plebe." As a cadet, he wears a uniform similar to that worn by midshipmen at Annapolis and is subject to military discipline.

Cadets are organized into a regiment, which is subdivided into three battalions of two companies each. Each is under the command of cadet officers, with supervision by U.S. Maritime Service officers.

It is this regimental life which represents the greatest departure from life on the campus of a civilian college or university. It is, however, an integral and necessary part of the cadet's training as a career officer, since the efficiency and safety of ships at sea depend as much upon the discipline and leadership of their officers as upon their technical competence.

To instill this high degree of military discipline and training in the courtesies of the service, a system of "class rates" operates within the Kings Point Regiment. As a fourth classman, the plebe finds he has many duties and few privileges. His prospects improve, however, as he progresses upward—especially when he becomes a first classman (senior) and is eligible for appointment as a cadet officer with command or staff functions. As a first classman he also bears the major responsibility for maintaining the standards and traditions of the Academy and for passing them on to succeeding classes.

The cadet will also find an athletic program that is second to none here at Kings Point. The big sport is football, but the Academy fields teams in all major sports and is a member of leading athletic associations.

Baseball, basketball, soccer, sailing, swimming, wrestling, tennis, track, cross country, rifle, and pistol are the varsity sports.

In addition, an excellent intramural program includes every sport on the intercollegiate schedule, plus boxing, rowing, handball, volleyball, softball, table tennis, and pocket billiards.

Comdr. James W. Liebertz, director of athletics, commenting on the intercollegiate and intramural sports programs, said, "It is our purpose to provide for the future officers of the U.S. Merchant Marine, activities that teach self-discipline and self-control, develop morale and mold character in the tradition of American individualism and build sound minds and bodies through mental and physical coordination."

The Kings Point motto is "Acta Non Verba"—deeds, not words. The motto is reflected in the emphasis which Academy training places upon the actual operation of the tools of the mariner's profession. Much time is spent in the laboratory and shop, putting classroom theory into practice.

In consequence, an outstanding feature of Kings Point is the variety of equipment provided for instruction. The laboratories aim at simulating actual working conditions aboard ship—with the types of devices used on those ships.

Even the location of Kings Point tends to broaden its facilities. It is conveniently near the vast port of New York, which provides a giant "classroom" in which cadets see marine equipment manufactured and observe the operation of terminal facilities.

The seven seas themselves are classrooms for Kings Pointers. During their second year of study, they sail in one or more merchant vessels for practical experience as cadet officers.

Following graduation, about 10 percent of the Kings Pointers go on active Navy duty, the other 90 percent receive their inactive commissions in the Naval Reserve and sail as third officers or third engineers.

Men of the merchant marine—Kings Pointers prominent among them—find broad

horizons of adventure in the technological advances of this age. In addition to atomic propulsion for vessels, they are involved in the development and staffing of huge supertankers and recordbreaking passenger liners; in revolutionizing ship navigation and stability; in expediting new cargo-handling techniques.

KINGS POINT DEDICATES CHAPEL

KINGS POINT, N.Y.—An interfaith chapel was dedicated here May 1 to the memory of all U.S. merchant seamen who have lost their lives in the service of their country.

A message from President John F. Kennedy was read at the ceremonies.

The chapel will be used by the cadets at the Merchant Marine Academy here. The $660,000 for its construction was given by members and friends of the merchant marine.

Did You Hear About Farmer Joe?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents in North Dakota put together the following thoughts which point up the extent of the use farmers are making of products imported from foreign countries.

While this is prepared in a humorous vein, practically everything brought out by Mr. E. N. Dornacker is true. Mr. Dornacker was in Washington with a group of people from North Dakota to testify at the hearings being held in connection with the extension of the Sugar Act. To these people who would like to grow more sugar beets, the fact that the United States has been importing about half the sugar we consume is a little difficult to understand.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Dornacker's statement "Did You Hear About Farmer Joe?" be included with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

Did you hear about Farmer Joe—
Who rolled out of bed in the morning, looked at his Swiss watch,
He pulled on a pair of boots made in Japan,
Went downstairs—turned on his Japanese transistor radio,
Poured himself an eye opener from a bottle of Scotch whisky,
Filled the coffee pot with coffee grown in Brazil,
Fried a piece of Danish ham in a German skillet, put two spoons of sugar grown in Cuba on his breakfast food?
Went outside—
Filled his tractor made in England with gas imported from the Middle East,
Filled the fertilizer attachment with Canadian fertilizer,
Took a pinch of Copenhagen snuff,
Opened a bag of Canadian selkirk seed wheat—only to be stopped by the rural mail carrier who drove up in a Volkswagen to give him a special delivery letter from his son. He opened it and read:

DEAR DAD: The factory where I work is still only working every other week. I cannot make both ends meet, even with unemployment check. Wire $50.

GEORGE.

Don't blame Farmer Joe—He did not buy a single one of these things until some American businessman convinced him the imported product was cheaper and just as good.

Be American, buy American, sell American, we all will be happier in the long run.

Patriotism, Valor, Fidelity, or Pay Promotion Benefits?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1961

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in the May number of the National Guardsman, New York edition.

Chaplain Timothy S. Healy, S.J., has put his finger on a very disturbing trait that has taken on tremendous proportions in our national and personal life.

This trait is that everything has to be measured and evaluated by the dollar sign and the materialistic yardsticks of pensions, retirement, insurance, and every possible kind of security. These are the inducements that are now being held out as bait to our fighting men.

Mr. Speaker, these things are not enough. There must be something beyond security that we can hold out to the defenders of our country.

PATRIOTISM, VALOR, FIDELITY, OR PAY PROMOTION BENEFITS?—HAS THE ARMY MISDIRECTED ITS SALES PITCH FOR PROSPECTIVE YOUNG OFFICERS? ASKS AN EDUCATOR AND NATIONAL GUARD CHAPLAIN

(By Chaplain (Capt.) Timothy S. Healy, S.J., director of alumni relations, Fordham University)

(Both in his role as chaplain of New York's 102d Engineer Battalion and as director of alumni relations and assistant professor of English literature at Fordham University, Chaplain Healy is in constant contact with the young men who will be the lieutenants and captains of tomorrow's Army. In this thoughtful treatise, he wonders aloud whether the Army's officer recruitment literature is aimed at the kind of man it wants.)

"Through good fortune and the grace of God, I was chosen a leader * * * an honor which meant more to me than any of you will ever know. When you remember me in your prayers, pray that I be given the strength, character, and courage to lead these magnificent Americans."

Thus, in a few simple but moving words written not long before he was killed in battle in Italy, an American captain gave expression to the spirit of selflessness which is the hallmark of the military officer. The words, written by Capt. Henry T. Waskow to his family, are an eloquent tribute to the thousands of other American military leaders, great and small, who must have uttered a similar prayer many times as they prepared to lead their troops into battle.

Captain Waskow's words prove, too, that the qualities of devotion and dedication are not the especial province of the professional military man, because the captain, later immortalized in Ernie Pyle's "Brave Men," was a part-time soldier, a National Guardsman, and member of Texas 36th Infantry Division.

Most of all, though, his simple sincerity gives assurance that American military officers willingly accept the great responsibilities and heavy sacrifices which their position entails.

Why, then, must our efforts to recruit young officers be concentrated so exclusively on good pay, big benefits, and personal prestige? Why can't the literature we use, the sales talks we give these young men, openly and unashamedly cite the greatest reward of all, the satisfaction they'll get by serving their country?

Let's look, for example, at a book issued last year by the Army titled "Take Command," which seems to typify the officer procurement approach. Although it is only one piece of literature in hundreds, and has the single narrow objective of enticing college ROTC students into full-time Army careers, its shortcomings are symptomatic of the weaknesses which pervade nearly all our officer recruiting efforts, for full-time or part-time careers.

MADISON AVENUE INFLUENCE STRONG

As an example of the adman's and printer's art, "Take Command" is more than up to snuff. Its layout is excellent, its art work is good, the text clear, simple, and direct. Externally, the book is superior. It's in what it says that it, and most other officer recruiting literature, leaves so much to be desired.

It presents a distorted picture of the rewards of military service; the reasons advanced for accepting a position of military leadership are an insult to most prospective young officers; and if it has any success at all, it most likely will draw into the Armed Forces precisely the type of young men they want least.

Since World War II, it has become evident to all our services that they must recruit widely and well in our colleges and universities. Only in this way will they be able to make up the difference between the number of new officers our service academies provide and the large numbers needed to staff our Active and Reserve Forces. Properly tapped, the colleges of America can go a long way toward filling the needs of both components.

"Take Command" begins with some general ideas on leadership. It outlines what it calls the roots of leadership, listing such characteristics as intelligence, character, alertness, self-confidence, pride in self. There is no doubt that all these are necessary to the leader, but one wonders if a certain amount of devotion could not have been mentioned. And does not a military leader find also that courage, and self-sacrifice, are part and parcel of his job? Must the only pride be "pride in self," or cannot a second lieutenant—or lieutenant general—also have pride in the uniform he wears, in the traditions of his unit, and in the men who serve under him? Madison Avenue not only has produced the book, it has written it as well.

Listen to the reasons listed, presumably in what the Army believes to be the order of their importance, which might sway a college student toward the military as a career. Heading the list is pay. Then in quick order come promotion, schooling, career guidance, athletics, travel, family life, housing, social life, retirement benefits, security, finally, a brief description of the various branches of the Army.

HOW ABOUT SERVICE AND SACRIFICE?

Is this all we wish to discuss with prospective young officers? Seldom do we mention, in our efforts to attract high-caliber young officers, that service in the Armed Forces is a service rendered to the United States of America. (One exception can be found in "Take Command," in the three-line description of the Chaplain's Corps—but are our chaplains the only ones who should feel that services to their country is worth their time?) Rarely do we touch on the fact that today the Armed Forces have attained a significance in our national life which they never enjoyed before; that the wearing of

the uniform should be as much a matter of pride at home as it too frequently has been one of arrogance abroad.

One wonders if it would not be wise, too, to remind these future junior officers that those who live by the sword may someday be called upon to die by it. It may be our good fortune never again to hear a shot fired in anger, but it seems a vast misreading of undergraduate intelligence to suppose that college students are unaware of the disagreeable opposite possibility. It is also a sharp commentary on what we seem to expect of our officers to presuppose that the possibility of combat may not even be mentioned until they're a "member of the family."

Finally, one waits in vain to hear even a single mention of the sacrifices an officer must make; by the careerist, a permanent home, uninterrupted schooling for his children, his own comfort; by the guardsman or reservist, time devoted to duty which he otherwise could spend with his family, personal effort and expense for which he receives no recompense and, like the careerist, personal comfort and ofttimes personal safety. No mention is made of some of the officer's proudest traditions: that the bars, or stars, he wears on his shoulders are a mark of responsibility and not of privilege; that he is always the last to be served since his primary responsibility is to look after his men; that he never asks a man to perform a duty he wouldn't do himself.

It's not necessary to paint the life of the military leader as one of nothing but hardship, sacrifice, and danger. But neither should we withhold from prospective young officers the knowledge that their intelligence, courage, steadfastness, and devotion frequently will be challenged and that the compensations for their achievements will amount to more than mere pay, promotion, and PX privileges.

Attempt to analyse the thinking behind our officer procurement programs and you reach the conclusion that the Armed Forces employ the best Madison Avenue advertising techniques to persuade college students that military service is exactly like a career in any large commercial organization, only more so. Bigger and better benefits are promised, but underneath lies the same basic orientation.

SUGAR VERSUS VINEGAR

It is just possible, of course, that the staffs responsible for officer procurement feel that this is the only practical approach to today's college population. Perhaps before the admen were let loose to write the lines, it was decided that the only way to procure a steady stream of officers was to lure them in with sugar—and save the vinegar until later.

Certainly it is difficult for those of us who grew up during the depression and lived through World War II to understand the generation that means Korea when they say "the war." Personally, though, I don't see much evidence that this generation of kids is very much worse than the one that fought World War II.

They are at worst a mixed lot but at their best, they are good—perhaps a long sight better than we ever were.

Nor are there any signs whatsoever that the idealism, enthusiasm, and basic generosity of the young has deserted them. They are no more afraid of deep personal commitment than we were—in fact, they're less so. And nothing says that this commitment cannot be made in the service of their country, specifically in its Armed Forces.

They have a resistance to the sound of "Gung-ho," but the resistance is to the sound and fury, not to the substance; it's to the Hollywood idea of prettied-up service, sacrifice, and death, not to the root reality of sacrifice for what they believe. And far more than any generation before them, they have been forced to clarify their belief in the American dream and in its significance for the future of human life on this planet as we have known it for some 2,000 years. The doubts that beset us in the 1930's no longer are doubts for them. The air is clear—they are young—the challenges lie all about them, even in the conservative areas of military life.

Yet all we can think to talk about to them is pay, promotion, recreation and security.

Whatever type of commission the college graduate accepts—Regular, National Guard, or Reserve—will contain three key words which might well be submitted to the men who lay down our recruiting guidelines. As they reread those words, perhaps they will be startled, even a little bit frightened, but enormously proud, just as will the new officers reading them for the first time, at realizing that the words apply to themselves.

"Reposing special trust," the commission reads, "in the patriotism, valor, fidelity and ability of * * *."

Why are we in this mid-20th century so afraid to speak of patriotism? Why do we flinch from the implication of the word valor? Why have we forgotten the lonely but stanch fidelity of thousands of young Americans in the Pacific, the Ardennes, or along the 38th parallel? Do we think that the qualities of American greatness have disappeared in so short a time?

In some corner of the Pentagon, there still must be copies of "The Crisis." Would it be too much to hope that, inspired by its message, the staffs of our Armed Forces might be persuaded to send the ad men back to the patriotic sunshine of Madison Avenue and see if somewhere in the 50 States we cannot find another Thomas Paine to point the way for us?

A Risky Tax Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the New York Herald Tribune for May 18, 1961, contains a signed commentary by the business and financial editor of the paper, Mr. Donald I. Rogers, which is titled "Tax on U.S. Firms Abroad Is Risky." Mr. Rogers discusses the proposal in the administration's tax message which would attempt to impose a U.S. tax on a foreign corporation to the extent that corporation happens to have American investors.

The column points out that the present principal proponents of the administration's recommended changes in the area of taxation of foreign income, Messrs. Dillon and Surrey, had previously argued against the change they now advocate.

In his well reasoned commentary Mr. Rogers indicates that the Treasury Department in seeking to gain revenue to the extent of $250 million will run the risk of subjecting American enterprise abroad to retaliatory actions on the part of foreign countries.

Mr. Rogers also points out the great stake that our American economy has in exports to foreign countries and the adverse effect the administration's tax changes could have on those exports.

Mr. Rogers concludes by observing that this tax proposal is difficult to "reconcile" with our endeavor to expand U.S. exports and to encourage investment in underdeveloped countries. Mr. Rogers raises the interesting question as to whether it is desirable to let private enterprise operate abroad, "Or is it better to tax money away from Americans and give it to foreign countries?"

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks I will include the article from the New York Herald Tribune to which I have referred:

TAX ON U.S. FIRMS ABROAD IS RISKY

(By Donald I. Rogers)

Administration proposals now before Congress to impose U.S. tax sovereignty on other nations, even "developed" countries of the free world, must confuse foreign governments as much as they do American businessmen. Certainly the taxing of American-owned properties in foreign countries is contrary to long-established policy and in effect it violates our tax conventions with our friends among the industrialized nations.

Moreover, it would seem to me, such a program of taxation would damage our export trade and destroy our reputation for living up to our economic commitments abroad.

Whether this Nation has the right to reach across borders of other countries to tax income earned abroad, including that retained for long-range reinvestment in those other countries, is something Congress will have to decide. The administration thinks it's a proper thing to do, for it proposes taxing all income earned abroad by American interests.

As a matter of international ethics, the United States cannot change the rules on private foreign investment without either dishonoring its commitments or undertaking to persuade the industrialized nations to change their rules along with us. This they are not likely to do, just to enrich our Treasury by some $250,000,000 annually at the expense of their own internal tax revenues.

DILLON'S STAND IN 1958

It seems hard to believe that the Treasury is behind these proposals, for its Secretary Douglas Dillon, when he was Under-Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, said, in 1958:

"Over the past 3 years there has been a total of about a billion dollars a year of U.S. profits abroad reinvested in those countries. Certainly, if we want to further stimulate that, one means is possible, and which should be explored is some form of broadened deferral of taxation on income until such time as it is returned to the United States; in other words, allow it, as long as it is being used in the country where the profit is being made, or in another foreign country, to remain abroad, and that would obviously stimulate the incentive for companies to leave their profits abroad for a longer length of time."

Well, has the time now come when we don't want to further stimulate the reinvestment of profits abroad? If it was advisable in 1958 it is advisable in 1961, isn't it? Or is it better to tax money away from Americans and give it to foreign countries?

Stanley Surrey, the former Harvard law professor, who was appointed (over numerous protests) as the Treasury's new tax policymaker, in testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee's Subcommittee on Foreign Trade Policy, in 1958, was asked, "Should we, continue this foreign tax deferral?" He responded, "Yes; most of our foreign business is conducted that way."

Well, if it was conducted that way in 1958, isn't is conducted that way now?

There are now almost 10,000 U.S. subsidiaries operating abroad. In addition there are thousands of U.S. individuals who hold private portfolio investments abroad.

The book value of U.S. direct long-term private investment abroad was estimated in 1957 (latest reportable year) to be about $25 billion and that of portfolio investment about $8 billion. At that time it was estimated that about $1,500 million a year was being retained and reinvested abroad out of the earnings of all U.S. private investment.

Anybody want to make up that difference out of foreign aid gifts?

In that same year the Commerce Department estimated the value of exports from the United States to U.S.-direct investment enterprises abroad (and that excludes trading companies) was about $2,600 million. That was $1,100 million more than the total income retained and re-invested abroad.

Taxes always confuse me, but it seems to me that if we tax this income we will be reducing our exports, or, if we maintain our exports, we will be forced to finance them by exporting more capital, which is something the administration is trying to avoid.

I can't quite reconcile this, either, with the proposal from Commerce Secretary Luther H. Hodges that the United States offer guarantees to American investors in the less developed countries protecting them against foreign governments' seizures of their plants or funds.

Doesn't this boil down to the passing of one law to make it possible for the less responsible nations to confiscate American property, while at the same time we pass a law to penalize the more responsible nations which have attracted private American investments?

Foreign Polls: Murrow Agrees With Ike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, during the last campaign we heard a lot about America's prestige, or lack of same, or loss of same, whatever was most convenient for the Democratic presidential candidate to latch onto for the moment.

Since the inauguration, however, not much has been said about this matter which was so vital during the campaign. Perhaps what has happened to America's prestige in the last few months has had some bearing on this strange silence. Or, maybe, it was not an issue anyway. Maybe it was just something you throw into a campaign to make political capital of, and then forget.

At any rate, the Kennedy administration spokesmen now agree with what President Eisenhower was saying about the famous prestige polls when he declined to release them. As a case in point, I offer an editorial from the Davenport (Iowa), Daily Times, "Foreign Polls: Murrow Agrees With Ike":

FOREIGN POLLS: MURROW AGREES WITH IKE

American prestige has skidded to lowest ebb in history and the Kennedy administration has decided to abandon the polls abroad about which Mr. Kennedy raised such a hubbub in his campaign.

Edward R. Murrow, Kennedy appointee as head of the U.S. Information Agency, has decided such polls are "inaccurate * * * and of little use to the Government."

As a candidate, President Kennedy made these polls one of his major issues, insisting that they showed U.S. standing in Europeans' opinion was farthest down the scale it had ever been.

He demanded that the polls be disclosed. Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Arkansas Democrat, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, got into the act with a request to President Eisenhower to reveal them. Mr. Eisenhower declined on the ground that the polls were of no real value. Democrats, following Kennedy's lead, tried to blow up the refusal to an issue of principal importance.

Now Murrow has fully confirmed Mr. Eisenhower's view. No request was made for an appropriation. The amount granted last year was $150,000.

Representative FRANK BOW, Ohio Republican, questioned Murrow sharply as to the reason for dropping the polls in a closed-door meeting of the House Appropriations Committee.

"Is the Kennedy administration worried about its prestige abroad?" asked Bow.

"The polls are being discontinued," said Murrow. "We found they had little depth. Some were inaccurate and of little use to the Government."

Bow served notice on Democratic members of the committee that if his exchange was deleted from the transcript of the proceedings, he would denounce such action on the floor of the House.

This instance provides an interesting revelation of how soon the Kennedy administration discovered the Eisenhower administration was correct in a position which prior to election had been bitterly denounced.

Our American Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB CASEY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, these are days filled with crises and change. Alien doctrines and godless ideologies threaten what so many of us lightly term "our American way of life."

To defend ourselves from those who would destroy us—we must first know and understand what we are trying to preserve.

In these trying times, it is gratifying to me to find that some of our people are aware of this need to know and understand our heritage, and the threat that is posed to our Constitution and our Republic. I am proud that within my district, one such group is the Houston Chapter of the Women's Council of the National Association of Real Estate Boards.

Each year, this group sponsors an essay contest among the students of 20 Houston high schools. The topic this year: The Constitution of the United States of America—How Can We Preserve It and Our Constitutional Republic?

Four outstanding students won the awards from the many entries:

Diane Young, of Mount Carmel High School, won first prize; Marsha Goren, of Bellaire High School, second prize; Daniel H. Johnston, Jr., of St. Thomas High School, third prize; and Melanie Lewis, of Bellaire High School, fourth prize.

It is in the hands of youngsters such as these that the fate of our Nation rests, and in my opinion, it rests securely.

I cannot commend too highly the action taken by the Houston Chapter, Women's Council of NAREB, or the loyalty and patriotism the members have shown through the years. Our community owes a deep debt of gratitude to the members, and to their president, Ruth Cozad Landon.

I am proud to submit for the attention of my colleagues, the essay chosen as the most outsatnding by the judges of the contest by Diane Young, Mount Carmel High School:

It was a typical day. Joe Smith, average American businessman, strode across the street and into the bar. He had had a hard day at the office and he needed a few moments of relaxation before he headed home. Slinging his coat over the nearest stool, he leaned over the counter, smiled wearily, and said to Vic, typical bartender, "The usual, Vic."

On the stool at his right sat Mike Miller, average American citizen, expounding his favorite subject—What's wrong with the government. He shouted vehemently, "Those guys in Washington are a bunch of crooks. All we ever do is pay taxes. Boy, that burns me up. They don't even know what they're doing. It's just a race to see who can put through the most expensive programs, the Democrats or the Republicans." On and on he raved until someone yelled, "Look Mike, if you're so worked up about it, why don't you go to Washington?"

In the mind of Joe Smith, average American businessman, wheels were turning. Every day he became more and more aware of the problems in American government. And today listening to Mike, he began to think about it more and more.

Joe Smith doesn't know it but he isn't the only one who is thinking about this problem. Millions of Americans are beginning to worry about their government. They are wondering if it has gone too far.

Joe Smith's daughter is an average American teenager. As she sat in her civics class yesterday and listened to her teacher's discussion of the constitutional checks and balances and the separation of powers between State and Federal Government, she began to wonder, "What's happened to the Constitution? Why isn't the separation of powers still in force?"

Other teenagers in other classrooms are thinking the same thing. They are wondering about the purpose of government. They are wondering how much power it should have.

One hundred and seventy-four years ago, a group of men sat together and built a nation. It was a unique nation, the first of its kind. It recognized several basic principles—first, that every man was a son of God with certain God-given rights; second, that for the benefit of the people, a government should be established with certain delegated powers; and third, that this government should be restrained against its natural tendency to expand, by means of a constitution.

With these principles in mind, the constitutional republic of the United States of America was formed. These men that formed this nation had tasted the bitter oppression of absolute power. They knew that throughout history government has proved to be the chief instrument for thwarting man's liberty. Thus they established the

Constitution to limit the functions of government and assign to it only those powers which are necessary and which are conducive to individual freedom. In this spirit they formed America and gave it to us, their offspring. But these men were not visionaries. They knew that the Constitution, no matter how well constructed or how carefully worded to cope with imperfect nature of man, would be no match for men who were determined to disregard it. They were aware that each of our rights brings with it added responsibilities.

When asked by an inquiring woman, what the Constitutional Convention had given the people, Benjamin Franklin replied, "We have given you a Republic—If you can keep it."

It is a typical day. People all over the United States are wondering, "Have we kept it? Do we still have our Republic? Or are we drifting along the road toward the chaos of socialism?"

Bill Porter, average American lawyer has made up his mind. He thinks that we have not kept our Republic, that the system of constitutional restraints has fallen into disrepair. He points out that the Federal Government has moved into almost every field of American life, that the powers of the States and the individuals are dwindling day by day. He asserts that inside the Federal Government both the executive and judicial branches have roamed far outside their constitutional boundary lines. He tells those who argue with him that the more the Federal Government interferes in American life, the more control it will have over its individuals. Bill Porter doesn't want to exist for the State. He wants to stand on his own two feet. He thinks we should observe the Constitution.

Fred Baker is another American. Hopefully, he isn't too typical. Fred says that we live in a progressive world. He thinks the Constitution is old hat. To him, the modern inventions such as the jet, the television, the atom bomb, have made this a new world that needs a new rule of law. Fred's favorite saying is "What's in it for me?" All he can get from government is what Fred wants. Socialism seems like a pretty good idea to him. "After all," he says, "the Constitution was written a long time ago. It's outdated now."

Poor Fred Baker is sadly confused. He has forgotten that although material things and mechanical devices change from year to year, spiritual truths and basic principles remain the same.

All people are different. Joe Smith, his daughter, Mike Miller, Bill Porter, Fred Baker, no two are alike. Yet each, in one way or another has realized the trend; the trend toward centralization of power in the hands of a few, the trend away from the Constitution and the constitutional republic.

Some of them realize, some of them don't, that America can be killed by Americans just as easily as by anyone else. Our defense against the internal dangers should be just as strong as our defense against our external foes.

Some of them know, some of them don't, that they can save America. A few of them know, most of them don't, how they can save America.

Bill Porter knows that we should enforce the Constitution but he doesn't know that it won't be enforced until thousands of average Americans like him decide to put the man in office who is pledged to enforce the Constitution and restore the Republic.

Mike Miller knows that there are many things wrong with the Government. Unfortunately he doesn't know that he can help to correct them if he will stop talking and start acting.

Joe Smith's daughter thinks that the Federal Government has too much power. But she doesn't realize that she can help the situation by writing to the people who make the laws and making them aware of the proper functions of government.

Joe Smith knows that a problem exists but he doesn't realize that unless he understands it thoroughly he can't begin to solve it. He doesn't realize that by learning more about his country and by telling others about it, he can be a power force for the good of the Nation.

All these people know that we have drifted away from the Constitution. They realize that the trend is increasing. There is, however, an important fact that they are not aware of. Our Constitution and constitutional Republic can be preserved if each of us will affirm—that we have a Republic—and we can keep it.

Lattimore Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, last week on the floor of the House, I brought to the attention of the Members information concerning a concerted effort to bring about a compromising position with Cuban totalitarian Communists and at the same time included material which indicated an impending recognition of another Red satellite, Outer Mongolia. The Cincinnati Enquirer, on Sunday, May 14, published a very interesting article concerning Outer Mongolia which I am including after my remarks.

It is apparent to me that the architects of agrarian reform in China and those like Owen Lattimore who have in the past demonstrated a strange color blindness are once more having their day in court. It is inconscionable that we should be adapting our American foreign policy to fantastic hopes in dealing with the ruthless Communist bloc. The thoughts that we should recognize Outer Mongolia because it will encourage diversity in the Communist block or give us a listening post there are absurd. Let me add further that if men like Owen Lattimore are to be our listening post in Outer Mongolia then we should be on the alert at once since their color blindness may be matched by an impairment of hearing. The article follows:

MEMO TELLS STORY—MONGOLIA POLICY DATES TO 1956

(By Alice Widener)

NEW YORK.—Owen Lattimore is about to celebrate his great day of triumph. The State Department is planning diplomatic recognition of Lattimore's pet political protege, the Soviet satellite People's Mongolian Republic, known as Outer Mongolia.

What Congress, the press, and the American people do not know is that the State Department—in defiance of generally understood U.S. policy—already has given de facto recognition to Outer Mongolia as an independent territory. Thus State took the first major step toward handing victory to Lattimore.

This writer can now reveal exclusively that the State Department's action was taken sometime prior to August 26, 1956. Documentary evidence exists that on that summer day the policy was enunciated in Assistant Secretary Walter Robertson's office, where a group of State Department officials met to discuss the passport request of Jack Raymond to go to Outer Mongolia. An intradepartmental agreement was reached and the following memorandum of what transpired was written by a subordinate official of the State Department:

"At the meeting it was stated it had been concluded that Outer Mongolia is not a part of China but an independent territory constituting a doubtful entity controlled by the U.S.S.R. Therefore, it was stated that travel to Outer Mongolia is not forbidden by the general ban on travel to China and separate permission to a passport holder to visit Outer Mongolia is not required."

This State Department attitude toward Outer Mongolia as "an independent territory" entirely reversed generally accepted U.S. policy toward it. In hearings before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in 1951, several U.S. Senators expressed their amazement at Lattimore's description of Communist Outer Mongolia as "independent," and they elicited from him the admission that he had been forced to get a Soviet visa to visit that region.

Information about the State Department's sub rosa change of policy toward Outer Mongolia—affirmed on August 26, 1956—was not made public. In fact, the United States—on scene at the United Nations—always has opposed the Soviet proposal for admitting an alleged "independent" Outer Mongolia to the U.N.

A first glimmer of the dire consequences of the State Department's sub rosa policy became apparent March 20, when the Associated Press reported that Lattimore would travel on a U.S. passport to spend this coming summer in Outer Mongolia having accepted an invitation extended to him by the Mongolian Academy of Science. The AP reported that Lattimore said he had met members of the Mongolian Academy last year in Moscow.

Such Red invitations and Moscow meetings are not at all new to him. Nine years ago the full Senate Judiciary Committee issued a report describing Lattimore as "a conscious, articulate instrument of the Soviet conspiracy."

Exactly 1 month after AP broke the story on Lattimore's forthcoming trip to Outer Mongolia, the New York Times carried the front page story (Apr. 21, by Kathleen Telsch, from U.N. headquarters) "Ties With Mongolia Are Planned By United States." A subhead in this Times' story says, "United States To Seek Relations To Test Whether Mongolia Is a State." Also on April 21, the Times announced "a policy change made by the Kennedy administration" toward Outer Mongolia.

At present, the Soviet Union is sponsoring Outer Mongolia for U.N. membership in a "package deal" that would include the West-sponsored newly independent African territory of Mauritania, which formerly was controlled by the French.

Informed sources at the U.N. say it is highly probable that Lattimore's real mission to Mongolia during this summer will be to work with Mongolian Reds conducting negotiations for the setting up of an official U.S. diplomatic mission at Ulan Bator, capital of the Mongolian People's Republic. The New York Times reports that the State Department believes a U.S. diplomatic setup there would provide "a listening post" for what is going on in Red China. Doubtless Lattimore and his Red Mongolian scientist hosts would be delighted to set up quite a system for transmitting information to such a listening post.

In regard to all this, it is imperative to know the background of Lattimore's relationship with the United Nations.

In 1950, he was head of a U.N. Mission to Afghanistan, having been chosen for this post by the British Socialist, David Owen, chairman of the U.N. Technical Assistance Board. At the time Owen was U.N. Assistant Secretary General for Economic Affairs. In his department our Government discovered a subversive cell of U.S. nationals headed by David Weintraub. Questioned by a grand jury in New York and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, five members of this cell took the fifth amendment. All were dismissed from their employment.

His attitude toward political matters is well illustrated by the following quotation from his book "Solution in Asia" published in 1945: "Soviet policy in Outer Mongolia cannot be fairly called Red imperialism. It certainly established a standard with which other nations must compete if they wish to practice a policy of attraction in Asia. The Russian-Mongolian relations in Asia, like Russian-Czechoslovakian relations in Europe, deserve careful and respectful study."

Well, it seems Lattimore is now going to win out. All indications are that finally he is going to get his way, and our country will recognize his pet, Outer Mongolia, as an "independent" state entitled to a U.N. vote.

Gross National Product

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excellent article entitled "About GNP," written by an outstanding columnist, Holmes Alexander, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ABOUT GNP

(By Holmes Alexander)

You could say that last autumn Candidate John Kennedy indicted the American economy under Eisenhower as being sluggish, wasteful, and inadequate to the challenges of the 1960's.

You may say today that the Kennedy administration is now in the process of trying to convict the American economy on these campaign charges. Treasury Secretary Dillon and Labor Secretary Goldberg have been before the House Ways and Means Committee in the roles of prosecutors. Other Cabinet officers will follow. Thus far the star witness against the Eisenhower-type economy (as much free enterprise and as little Government intervention as possible) is an ugly-named monster called gross national product. Here is Dillon calling upon this witness:

Dillon: "As we look back over the past century, we see that our record of economic growth has been unmatched * * * of late we have fallen behind. From an historic growth rate of 3 percent per annum in gross national product (GNP), we have fallen to 2 percent in the latter (Eisenhower) part of the 1950's."

Secretary Dillon then goes on to show that the GNP in West Europe has grown twice as fast, and the GNP in Japan has grown three times as fast as ours. Russia's GNP compares with ours in a 7 to 2 ratio.

All this is alarming—but we should remember that we are not hearing, as yet, much of the other side of the case. How good a witness to our economic health is this GNP? Who is this strange slanderer anyhow?

Well, two Republican Senators, BUTLER and BUSH, with three Republican Representatives, CURTIS, KILBURN, and WIDNALL, have been chipping away at the GNP character. GNP is an aggregate of economic activities. It is supposed to be the sum of all enterprises which add something to the American economy.

But Republicans say that GNP does not include, nor does it measure, many important activities. For example:

If a man stays home on Saturday and improves his mind with reading, this does not appear in the GNP. Nor does GNP reflect the work that a housewife does, such as home laundering or driving the children to and from school. Nor does the GNP give credit to the homeowning couple whose labor improves the property and community.

GNP is a grossly materialistic way of measuring American status and blessings. "It knows," as Oscar Wilde once defined a cynic, "the price of everything; the value of nothing." Wasteful productions, such as food surpluses and throwaway military items, are added up. But how do you add the satisfactions of a well-cooked meal, a paid vacation, the feeling of security that sound banking, good policing and congenial neighbors give?

There are several ways to characterize this first year of the Kennedy administration and of the 87th Congress. One way would be to say the administration and majority party are tearing down the American image, while the Republican minority is trying to build it up.

For the Democrats to look good, America must look bad. Unless the New Frontier reveals our sores, it cannot cure them. Unless it exaggerates our misery, it cannot claim to have pulled off political miracles.

For their part, the Republicans are always in danger of appearing to be standpat and smug in the face of obvious imperfections. Only the best of Republical spokesmen manage to depict America as we all know her to be. The country is not hurting for schools and hospitals, as the worst of the Democrats say—but, as the best of the Republicans say, we can and should improve the quality of teaching and medical care. Our jobs are not disappearing, as the calamity howlers say, but are migrating to new industries.

The true picture of America, then, is of a nation which has accomplished all that gross materialism can give. Me must now improve, refine, and distribute our blessings. But this is a difficult thing to express in the language of political pleading.

The GE Scandal and Peoria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial titled "the GE Scandal and Peoria" from the May 21, 1961, issue of the Register, official newspaper of the Catholic diocese of Peoria, Ill.:

THE GE SCANDAL AND PEORIA

It is understandable that eyebrows were lifted last week in Peoria at the announcement of a strange change in the management of one of Peoria's major industries. One of the community's most highly regarded businessmen was dismissed as the head of the LeTourneau-Westinghouse plant, and was replaced by a GE executive recently jailed for price-fixing.

In the face of the yet-unfolding revelations concerning the price scandal, and of the unconvincing reasons given for the change in administration, it is no surprise that the community views the whole business with more than little suspicion and regret. At best it seems to indicate an almost cynical disdain of public sentiment. And at work there are many possibilities.

As the Peoria Journal Star commented, the issue is not a personal one. But on the corporate level, it is hard for people to understand how involvement and conviction in an antitrust case could be a recommendation for leadership in one of the city's major industries. As the paper said, as long as the top authorities prefer to remain mum about the maneuver, they cannot blame us for wondering what motives—and perhaps obligations—prompted this dubious switch.

In the eyes of the public, the LeTourneau-Westinghouse affair only heightens suspicions about the real extent of collusion and cooperation between the big companies.—(J.J.D.)

Resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I present for further consideration of the Members of the House of Representatives House Concurrent Resolution 22, originated in the General Assembly of the State of Louisiana and introduced by Messrs. Branton, Jack, and Rau:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 22

Resolution relative to a proposal before the U.S. Congress with respect to a so-called 3-year program of general Federal assistance for public elementary and secondary classroom construction and teachers' salaries

Whereas there is now before the Congress of the United States a proposal to institute a so-called 3-year program of general Federal assistance for public elementary and secondary classroom construction and teachers' salaries, which, it is said, would assure every State no less than $15 for every public school student in average daily attendance and would be distributed according to an equalization formula; and

Whereas this type of so-called Federal aid to education is another in the current series of insidious measures and actions on the part of the Federal Government which, while on their face may appear to be of great advantage to the States in that they offer financial assistance in areas in which all States are constantly striving to find additional methods of providing better facilities and qualities of services to their people, actually, however, are no more than means by which the Federal Government can further en-

croach upon the constitutional rights of the States; and

Whereas it is recognized that should the Federal Government be permitted to enter the field of public education in the various States in a more substantial way than already is the case, there is grave danger that, while the funds provided to the States might allow additional public school construction and the employment of more and perhaps even better qualified teachers, the much less desirable purpose may be accomplished of permitting the Federal Government to control such phases of public education as curriculum, teaching methods and ways of life which are within the fundamental rights reserved to the States: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Legislature of Louisiana (the Senate thereof concurring), That the members of this honorable body do hereby go on record as disapproving the proposed measure now before the Congress of the United States which proposes to grant Federal aid to public elementary and secondary education for construction and teachers' salary purposes; and be it further

Resolved, That this legislature does hereby urge and request the Members of the Louisiana delegation in Congress to exert every effort at their command to the defeating of this proposal; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution shall be transmitted without delay to each of the Members of the Louisiana delegation in Congress.

Sacrifices Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Kansas City Kansan of May 17, 1961. It includes some worthy grassroots advice to which it is hoped there will be a response.

Our people, Mr. Speaker, and I have in mind my midcontinent constituency, believe that those who preach sacrifice should practice what they preach. Our people will sacrifice what is necessary to the end that American ideals shall live, perpetuate, and flourish. They will not stand for schemes proposed in the name of sacrifices that are designed to accomplish something other than that for which sacrifice is needed. That is to say, our people are a discerning people, and the wool will not be pulled over their eyes. Sacrifice they will for legitimate ends, but not for the accomplishment of politically self-serving objectives. The editorial follows:

SACRIFICES NEEDED IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A leading news magazine has a hunch that President Kennedy may ask for reinstitution of wartime wage and price controls. This would be an example of the sort of sacrifice the President has said we may be called on to make. The President has been pressed for explanation of just what he means by sacrifices. He has been charged with being too vague on the subject.

Price and wage controls would be definite. No one would be left in doubt about such measures, although many at present are in doubt as to the worthiness of such a move. One of the first accomplishments of the Eisenhower administration 8 years ago was to remove such restrictions imposed by reason of the wars. Prices and wages promptly started climbing as was to be expected. It is true the inflationary spiral slowed speed but inflation did not vanish.

Both inflation and controls are obnoxious, and in the absence of discipline, exercised by individual citizens, groups, and governmental agencies from low to high, the country may not attain the heights of greatness the President speaks of. The great majority of citizens stand willing to make sacrifices if they can be convinced of the need and that measures asked for are correct. But they will not make sacrifices cheerfully if they know that exceptions are being made, special privileges are being granted.

Let the Federal Government itself take the lead. Let it crack down, for instance, on work stoppages and outlandish costs involved at the missile bases. Let the Government crack down and not simply pass the buck in order that political interests be served. Some sacrifices could be made by Government, and maybe that would be a good place for sacrifices to start.

Uncontrolled Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial which appeared in today's Wall Street Journal, points out the weaknesses in our foreign aid program, as well as the dangers of backdoor spending.

FREEDOM FROM CONGRESS

Foreign aid administrators have long fretted under congressional restraints on their spending. Accordingly, when the President's new aid requests go to Capitol Hill in the near future, much will be made of the administration's alleged need for authority to make long-term—instead of yearly—commitments overseas.

Sepecifically, Mr. Kennedy wants permission to borrow well over $7 billion from the Treasury over a 5-year period. That is by no means the sum of the contemplated aid spending, but only the amount that would be generated by this backdoor financing method which frees the administration from getting annual congressional approval of its spending.

The administration's argument goes like this: The way it is now, the United States can't underwrite projects that take several years to complete. This, it's said, keeps us out of a lot of useful spending and makes it difficult to engage in "rational" planning. It may even encourage waste when officials try to obligate their current funds at the last minute before the fiscal year runs out.

We find the argument unimpressive. Backdoor spending is inherently an unsound device, and can be inflationary. Apart from that, there is no excuse whatsoever for officials to spend money just because it is available. And it can be seriously questioned whether U.S. money should be used for long-term projects, which customarily turn out to be monuments to the greater glory of socialist rulers in backward countries.

There is plenty wrong with the foreign aid program, but its troubles do not stem from such so-called congressional restrictions. They come from the Government's failure to understand that effective foreign aid must be selective, from gross mismanagement, and from just plain gullibility.

In view of those deficiencies, the program needs a lot more, not less, congressional scrutiny and congressional restraint.

Congressman Bell Urges Resumption of Nuclear Tests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, our colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL] recently urged recognition that the Geneva test ban talks are hopelessly deadlocked and that the United States lift its voluntary moratorium on nuclear testing. His views on the subject which coincide with my own, were commented on favorably in the following editorial from the Los Angeles Herald-Express:

[From the Herald-Express, May 17, 1961]

WHY NOT RESUME TESTS?

Congressman ALPHONZO BELL, of California, Santa Monica Republican, has called for immediate termination of the ban on nuclear tests, declaring that "in the interest of both our national security and progress in our space competition with the Russians we must resume underground and high-altitude nuclear tests at once."

This reference to our "space competition" is particularly timely now since Navy Comdr. Alan Shepard Jr.'s historic rocketing into space because some form of nuclear propulsion is under study for such space flights as those to the moon and other planets as well as manned flights.

Senate Minority Leader DIRKSEN, speaking for the Republican leadership in the House and Senate, also has called for drastic action to allow this Nation to defeat what he has called the "monumental stall" by the Russians in arriving at any agreement to halt nuclear testing.

Senator DIRKSEN has called on the President to fix a definite deadline either for an agreement with the Russians or for this Nation to resume its nuclear testing.

The facts of the matter are that for 2½ years the United has observed a voluntary moratorium on nuclear testing, hoping that the Russians would reach an agreement with this country that they would do the same.

They not only have failed to do so, through their "monumental stalling," but there has been no assurance that they have been refraining from at least underground nuclear testing, which cannot be checked by other countries.

The Soviet stall on nuclear testing also should be a warning to those few people who express the opinion in this country, including the California Democratic Council, that the United States should disarm first.

In an editorial on February 17, last year, the Herald-Express called attention to the Democratic council convention in, Fresno, where a "statement of policy" was adopted. The editorial called attention to the world disarmament policy adopted by the convention, as follows:

"That if the negotiations at Geneva should fail, then the United States should take unilateral action; in other words, this Nation

should scrap itself of military weapons and stand forth naked of any defense against Soviet Russia or any other attacking nation."

Concerning the nuclear propulsion rocket system, Congressman BELL had this to say:

"There is almost unanimous belief among our scientists that test suspension has impaired or will impair development of Project Orion (the classified nuclear propulsion rocket system).

"There is great suspicion among Government experts that the Russian Government has conducted undetected underground tests during the period of the moratorium.

"There is a significant body of opinion that even with secret Soviet tests the United States continues to enjoy technical superiority over the Communists in the nuclear field and that, as a result, our best chance to pass the Russians in space is with nuclear propulsion rockets."

It is time that we stop kidding ourselves and the rest of the world. The Russians have made it plain enough that they have no intention of observing any moratorium on nuclear testing, as this country has done.

Let's set an early deadline for agreement, weeks and not months, and if they continue to stall notify them and the rest of the world that we're resuming testing.

A Family Doctor's Fight Against Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, much has been written and said about medical care for the aged or, as designated by many, "socialized medicine," which has resulted in confused thinking and misunderstanding of what it really means and what it aims to accomplish. So when I read the article entitled "A Family Doctor's Fight Against Socialized Medicine," by Dr. Joseph R. Mallory, a practicing physician of Mattoon, Ill.—population 19,088—which appeared in the May 23 edition of Look magazine, my thinking on this important subject was very much clarified. It is a calm, factual statement which I am sure will be of help to everyone interested in this subject and it is with this hope that I asked and received permission to have it printed in the RECORD.

There is no doubt that we all in Congress want to aid those elderly citizens who are unable, for one reason or another, to help themselves, but I am sure none of us want to be wasteful with the taxpayers' money. This excellent statement is as follows:

A FAMILY DOCTOR'S FIGHT AGAINST SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

(By Joseph R. Mallory, M.D.)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Joseph Ross Mallory, 46, is a physician who practices general medicine at Mattoon, Ill. (population 19,088). Civic-minded as well as a good doctor, he has become one of Mattoon's best-known and best-liked citizens. Within the past few months, Dr. Mallory has been one of hundreds of physicians who have been speaking at the request of county medical societies concerning medical-care problems of the aged. He warns of the threat of socialized medicine at gatherings such as PTA meetings and business-club luncheons. As a solution, he favors the recently enacted Kerr-Mills law, which authorizes the use of general tax funds of the Federal and State governments; its provisions are to be locally administered and call for aid only to those aged who qualify. He disapproves of the Kennedy administration's plan to pay for limited aid to all the aged under social security. Here, in question-and-answer form, Dr. Mallory gives his reasons.)

"THE PROBLEM OF MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED IS EXAGGERATED"

Do you feel that medical care for the aged is a serious national problem? I will have to give that question a qualified yes. I think we must assume there is a problem, although I'm inclined to the opinion that it has been exaggerated. Nevertheless, we must recognize that it is impossible for all families to take care of their aged members and impossible for some of the elderly to take care of themselves adequately. Many of them must have help beyond themselves and their families.

The question, then, is how we are going to provide the financial assistance these people require? That's the heart of the problem, right there.

The administration has proposed that health care for the aged be financed through the social security system. Why are you opposed to this approach? I can think of many good reasons. To begin with, the administration proposal—the King bill now before Congress—is based on a double error. It assumes that most of the aged are in poor health and that most of them need help to meet the costs of medical care. This just isn't true. Some of our elderly are in poor health, and some do have financial troubles, but most are healthy and in reasonably good shape financially. A number of surveys back this up.

Does this hold true in your community? Yes, and I suspect it holds true in most communities.

You said you think the problem is exaggerated. In what way? Well, just look around for yourself. Some older people are millionaires. Some are comfortably well off. Millions have some form of health insurance and private pension programs. Some, of course, are poor—just as some young or middle-aged people are poor. I truly believe that anyone who really needs medical care in this country can get it regardless of his financial status.

What about the health of the aged? Don't they require medical care more often than young people? Some do; some don't. I don't think the problem can be standardized to that extent. Some 70-year-olds play 18 holes of golf regularly; others are spry enough, but prefer checkers, and still others are bedridden. Many of the ailments of the elderly would disappear if society stopped looking at them as castoffs, if these older people felt they were wanted and had a mission in life. Older folks are individuals, and their problems have to be solved on an individual basis. You can't answer all of their problems with a single solution.

You obviously feel very keenly about this controversy over medical care. Why do you feel so strongly about it? For a number of reasons. Most important, I think, is that I sincerely believe that the free practice of medicine, which has given our people the best medical care in the world, is in jeopardy. A physician's first concern is for his patients, and that concern goes beyond the aches and pains of the people he treats. I'm convinced, along with most of my colleagues, that, unless the people really understand what's going on, we're liable to awaken some morning and find we've got socialized medicine.

A number of countries have socialized medicine in one form or another. Why do you feel it would be bad here? There isn't any question in my mind that socialized medicine would endanger the high quality of medical care we have been able to give our people in this country. If you want socialism, you've got to sacrifice much of your freedom. Government always exercises some kind of control any time it pays the bill. I think it is obvious the people's health would suffer under a system of political medicine. The greatest strides in medical science in recent years have been made in the United States, where the profession has been free to pursue its goals of better and better medical care for our people. In my opinion, we physicians owe an obligation to the American people to try to keep it that way. It's part of our duty as doctors.

WE OPPOSE THE KING BILL BECAUSE IT WOULD BE EXPANDED TO COMPEL EVERYONE TO BE COVERED

You see a threat of socialized medicine in the King bill. Sponsors of this Administration proposal deny that it is. How do you back up the charge? You have to understand what the King bill would do. The Federal Government, among other things, would make direct payments to hospitals for services to eligible patients, those over 65 on social security. But first, hospitals would have to agree to abide by rules and regulations established by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. And the Secretary would have the power to set "reasonable" compensation that hospitals would receive. It seems clear to me that when the Government forces every wage earner to pay into the scheme, when Government makes the rules for operating hospitals, sets the compensation and pays the bills, you've got socialized medicine for everybody who gets the service.

Former Representative Aime Forand saw his bill for social security medicine as "a foot in the door." He said, "We can expand the program after that." The Socialist Party has said that the social security approach for medical care is socialistic, and they're for it. They're for it because it could be expanded easily into full-scale socialized medicine for everyone.

Sponsors of the King bill have said it would guarantee free choice of physician and hospital. Do you disagree with that too? Yes, and I'll use my own community as an example to explain why. We have one hospital in Mattoon. Suppose, for some reason, any reason, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare refused to approve our hospital. This would mean that everyone in Mattoon on social security who needed hospitalization would have to go to some other city to get it if he wanted the Government to foot the bill. Wouldn't that be a denial of free choice of hospital? And if the family doctor of one of these patients wasn't on the staff of the other hospital, wouldn't that deny the patient free choice of his physician? There are many one-hospital towns in this country that would be affected in the same way.

Why are doctors opposed to the King bill, when its sponsors say they are not included in it? My answer is that physicians are included, specifically pathologists, radiologists, physiatrists and anesthesiologists working in the hospitals, along with interns and residents and those doctors serving the hospitals' outpatient clinics. We realize that it would only be a short time until the program would be expanded to include all physicians and compel every man, woman and child, regardless of age, to come under the system.

You agree there is a problem in financing medical care for the aged. If you object to the social security approach, how do you propose to meet the problem? We already

have a better solution, the Kerr-Mills law for medical aid to the aged, passed by Congress last year. The medical profession supported this measure in Congress, and doctors are doing everything they can to get it into full swing in all the States.

How does the Kerr-Mills law work? Federal funds are made available to the States to pool with their own money to provide medical care to everyone over 65 who needs financial assistance. Each State, working with local communities, decides who needs help. I figure we know more about our own problems in Mattoon than some Government employee way off in Washington, D.C. The people who need our help are our neighbors. Their problems are our community's problems.

What benefits are available under the Kerr-Mills law? They are practically unlimited. It depends on what each State legislature wants to provide. Benefits can include physicians' services in the hospital, clinic, office, or at home; hospital services; nursing-home care; physical therapy; laboratory, diagnostic, and X-ray services; drugs prescribed by a physician; home nursing, and a variety of other things, such as glasses, dentures, and prosthetic devices.

Why do you say the Kerr-Mills law is better than the administration's social security approach to the problem of medical care for the aged? Kerr-Mills offers a full-range of medical benefits to the needy and near-needy over 65 under a program administered by those best able to judge the needs of the elderly—the people back home. It would be cheaper and would do a better job of protecting tax money.

The administration-sponsored King bill, on the other hand, would set up long-distance control in Washington. Tax money of the working people would be used for the benefit of the rich as well as the poor. The bill would be discriminatory, because benefiits would be available only to those on social security and denied to several million Americans who are not eligible for social security and never will be. The Kerr-Mills law, properly implemented by the States, would take care of everyone over 65 who really needed financial help.

What would the King bill cover? Benefits would be limited to hospitalization, nursing-home care, home nursing and outpatient diagnostic services. It is important to note also that those eligible for hospitalization would be required to pay $10 a day for the first 9 days in the hospital, a total of $90. That, along with other costs the patient would have to pay, would be a serious drain on the financial resources of many on social security. I think it should be clear that the King bill is not only inadequate, but unnecessary. Kerr-Mills will do the job if given a chance. Already, 15 of the 50 States have passed enabling legislation to participate in Kerr-Mills funds.

You say benefits would be available under the Kerr-Mills legislation to anyone over 65 who needed financial help to meet his medical bills. How would need be decided? Well, some of the legislation sets standards of eligibility based on income and liquid assets. Some people would be completely covered, and others would be able to get part of their medical expenses.

"IT'S NONSENSE TO CALL KERR-MILLS DEGRADING"

Eligibility would be based on a means test, then? Certainly. The idea is to help people who need help—not to waste the taxpayers' money paying medical bills for those who can afford to pay their own way. And millions of older people in this country can afford to do so, including a great many drawing social security benefits.

What is your answer to the charge that the Kerr-Mills law would force the older people to pauperize themselves before they could get help? I feel the charge is totally groundless. If anyone cares to study the plans already adopted by several States, he will find that there is protection of the assets of the people.

The means test has been called an affront to dignity, degrading to the individual. How do you feel about this charge? I imagine I feel the same way as any other American who gives the matter a little thought. To call the means test degrading is sheer nonsense. It has been an important part of the American economic and government system for a long, long time.

What examples of the means test in government and the economy do you have in mind? Public housing, for one. It is available only to those whose incomes are below a certain amount. Veterans must prove need before they can get free care in VA hospitals for nonservice-connected disabilities. The social security system for everyone under 72 links benefits to income. The means test in government is designed to protect against waste of tax money. You will find the means test in our private affairs too. Many labor unions base strike benefits on need. College-scholarship applicants must demonstrate need. Our entire system of credit in this country is grounded on a means test, as it should be. Credit is limited by the ability to pay.

The means test is neither degrading nor undignified. It is a wise protection for business, government and the individual.

In reference to the social security approach, don't you feel there is some merit in the argument that social security provides an insurance system enabling working people in their productive years to save for their old age? Sure, if it were true—but it isn't. It misrepresents the true nature of social security, suggesting that it is a program of prepayment of insurance costs, which it is not.

How do you back up that statement? Well, in the first place, the U.S. Supreme Court, among other agencies of the Federal Government, has said social security is not a prepayment plan. It is clearly a pay-as-you-go program. It is distinctly different from voluntary private insurance where reserves and income have to match benefit obligations.

Can you explore this subject a bit further? Gladly. I think it's extremely important for the American people to understand what social security really is and how it works. The fact is that the taxes taken from workers and their employers don't pay the worker's own benefits; they pay the benefits of the people now getting social security.

In other words, my generation will collect from our children and grandchildren, and they will collect from theirs. It's important that we realize that if the social security program were ended today and Congress said, "We'll pay off just what we owe to everyone who has paid into social security up to today," it would still cost more than $300 billion to pay off the debt. If that happened, men and women not even born yet would be taxed to help pay the bill, and they wouldn't be getting a nickel themselves. Does that sound like an insurance program?

What are you doing to get your message to your friends and neighbors in Mattoon? Well, I've talked to 20 or 30 different groups in the area, trying to impress on them the fact that any system of medical care financed through social security will inevitably lead to complete socialization of medicine in this country. And can there be any doubt in anybody's mind that once medicine is socialized, socialism will spread to every other aspect of American life? This is the insidious fact that must be brought home to every American. It is the reason I, along with hundreds of other physicians, am volunteering to speak out against this danger to our way of life.

Trade Barriers Against Export of American Jewelry Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial from the American Jewelry Manufacturer magazine which points out the unfairness of restricted trade barriers by some foreign countries against exports of American jewelry products.

"Now we encounter many countries which are absolutely closed to our type of products, or duties have been increased to such an extent that imports are almost impossible."

These are the words of a spokesman for a large American jewelry manufacturing firm, a concern that is diligent in promoting its export sales. He might well be speaking for the entire domestic industry, whose attempts to supply foreign markets with American-made jewelry are time and time again frustrated by trade barriers maintained around the globe.

U.S. policy has been to promote exports rather than to inhibit imports into this country. While decrying the flood of low-priced competitive products (the price of which reflects the low wages paid by many foreign producers) to our shores, the American jewelry manufacturer has not turned a deaf ear to our Government's admonition that exports can right the imbalance of our foreign trade picture.

We have tried and we continue to try to boost our sales abroad. But when a country bars our products outright, as does Indonesia, or imposes a tariff of 150 percent, as does Burma, it tends to discourage our efforts, to say the least.

The irony of it is that the United States and most of the nations with which we do business subscribe to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. The aim of GATT, as it is called, is that member nations will progress through negotiations toward the elimination of international trade restrictions.

To help determine the restrictions imposed by GATT signatories against our products, the U.S. Government's Committee for Reciprocity Information is seeking facts on the experience of interested parties. The first phase of its study in preparation for GATT negotiations deals with six countries—Austria, Burma, Chile, Indonesia, Turkey, and the Union of South Africa.

The Manufacturing Jewelers and Silversmiths of America, Inc., forwarded to Washington a study of these countries' trade barriers against jewelry. Said the association's executive secretary:

"Most of these countries once represented good export markets for the American jewelry manufacturing industry. Austria, because of its own jewelry manufacturing industry and the proximity of the Czechoslovakian and German industries, did not. Chile, Turkey, and the Union of South Africa are among those that could once be termed principal export markets for American jewelry. In each case, however, in spite of a proven desire for American merchandise, shipments of jewelry to most of these countries have dribbled to a virtual standstill."

The association has asked repeatedly: "Do we as a nation continue to open our doors wider and wider to foreign merchandise while our global neighbors put a lock on their gate?"

As the association says in its latest brief, "We submit that many of these prohibitions, as in the case of South African quotas, discriminate against the importation of American products versus other products and that the majority of the countries involved in the current discussion are now using trade restrictions, originally set up under the pretext of exchange conservation, to protect domestic manufacturing industries, contrary to the basic precepts of the GATT agreement. We earnestly request that the U.S. Government demand the elimination of all import restrictions against jewelry products by these countries and that all tariff duties in excess of those imposed by the United States on like products be deemed excessive."

Public Funds for All Schoolchildren

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the question of legislation in the field of legislation, particularly in the constitutional aspect in the field of private elementary and secondary schools, is a matter of important discussion and consideration in and out of Congress.

In my remarks, I include an analytical and interesting manuscript prepared by Dr. John A. O'Brien, Ph D., of Notre Dame University, Notre Dame, Ind.

Dr. O'Brien's opinion is of importance to Members of Congress and others interested in the subject covered by his manuscript.

UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME,
Notre Dame, Ind., May 18, 1961.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCCORMACK: We are deeply appreciative of the ability, courage, and determination with which you are presenting the case for the extension of the benefits of the proposed Federal aid to education to all the schoolchildren of America.

We have made a careful study of this matter and in the enclosed manuscript we provide an answer to vitrually all the common questions asked on this subject. We are sending you a copy with the thought that it might be of some assistance to you in your leadership and gladly give you permission to make whatever use of the enclosed you deem suitable, even to the extent of providing copies to the other Members of Congress.

With deep appreciation and warmest good wishes,

Ever cordially,

JOHN A. O'BRIEN.

PUBLIC FUNDS FOR ALL SCHOOLCHILDREN—A FAIR SOLUTION OF AN URGENT PROBLEM

(By John A. O'Brien, Ph. D., the University of Notre Dame)

Why is the question of Federal aid to schools of such widespread interest and why has it provoked such controversy throughout the country?

It is of universal interest because it affects the education of all our children. It has stirred nationwide controversy because it is a revolutionary measure and represents a radical departure from the traditions of nearly two centuries of American life.

Is it fundamentally a religious issue?

No. It involves no dogma of religion and is solely a question of the most effective means of achieving the best education for all the youth of America. The discussion should be carried on in a calm, friendly, objective manner, appealing neither to religious sympathy nor prejudice. What is needed is light, not heat, to find the best answer for our Nation's educational needs.

Is that the thought of the Catholic bishops?

Yes. Speaking to 15,000 members attending the convention of the National Catholic Educational Association on April 4, 1961, in Atlantic City, Bishop John J. Wright of Pittsburgh, the president of the association, said: "The debate should not be permitted to degenerate in its philosophic premises into a debate between Catholics and Protestants any more than it should be represented in its political context as a debate between Catholics and the national administration, above all the President."

What is the Catholic reaction to President Kennedy's appeal for restraint in sensitive areas of the discussion of this subject?

It is one of complete agreement. Praising the President for making such an appeal, Bishop Wright declared: "He will receive the loyal agreement and unqualified support of everyone on every side in this aspect of the matter." In both utterances Bishop Wright reflected the mind not only of the hierarchy but also of Catholics generally.

Catholics are glad to see the President show such concern for the improvement of the education of American youth. Many question, however, the effectiveness of the proposed measure, Senate Bill 1021, to obtain the desired objectives. They do so on objective grounds and with no thought of impairing the separation of church and state, which they believe is the only reasonable and practical plan for our pluralistic American society.

Furthermore Catholics favor the appropriation of funds necessary to meet all the real needs of our splendid public schools, in which more than half of their own children are enrolled. They want to see public school teachers well paid and equipped with all the essentials to do an efficient and thorough job.

What is the basic problem of this discussion?

This whole discussion is on the central problem of public aid for the education of all school children, which the Senate bill simply renders more acute. The principles developed here have a validity that will endure long after the present measure has been disposed of, for the problem of public aid for the education of all of America's youth is likely to be with us for some time.

What is the gist of the proposed educational bill?

It offers a $5.8 billion program of Federal aid for improving education in the U.S.A. Nearly $3 billion would go for loans to colleges over a 5-year period, for construction of classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and student housing. An additional $577.5 million would be for 212,500 college scholarships over 5 years based on students' ability and financial need. Maximum scholarship would be $1,000 a year. Federal loans for such scholarships would be available to students in public and private colleges. This is an eminently just and fair arrangement and is in conformity with previous Federal aid enactments.

Would funds also be allotted to elementary and high schools?

Yes. States would receive grants totaling $2.3 billion over 3 years for public grade and secondary schools to be used for erecting school buildings and paying teachers.

What is the declared purpose of such proposed legislation?

"The maximum development of every young American's capacity," said President Kennedy, and "rich dividends in the years ahead in increased economic growth, in enlightened citizens and in national excellence."

Why has this measure provoked so much opposition?

1. Because for the first time it would put the Federal Government into the business of elementary and secondary education in a big way. With the exception of a few cases where the Federal Government has granted aid to federally impacted areas—localities with an unusually large number of Federal employees—it has left these two areas of education to the States and the local communities.

2. Because it would undertake for the first time to pay teachers' salaries.

3. Because it would for the first time discriminate between pupils attending public elementary and secondary schools and students enrolled in nonprofit private and church-related ones.

Should the Federal Government enter into the education of children on the elementary and secondary school levels?

Many do not think it a wise policy for the Federal Government to intrude into an enterprise which has traditionally been conducted by the State and the local school districts. The Federal Government, it is contended, has enough to do without taking on the business of the little red schoolhouse and the local high school. Citizens of the community best understand their own educational needs and the means of meeting them. They are in the best position to see that their tax dollar gets the best returns.

Millions of citizens think it is unfair and unjust to discriminate against children attending nonprofit private or church-related schools by depriving them of any of the benefits of the proposed legislation. These students are Americans. They are the children of American citizens and taxpayers. They attend schools which teach with equal competence all the secular subjects taught in the public school. In addition, these schools give instruction in the Christian religion and ethics. They inculcate love of neighbor (Protestant, Jew, Catholic, or unchurched) and of country: they set forth the highest ideals of American life and democracy. They develop a patriotism that has been tested and proven on every battlefield, on which American soldiers have fought and died. They are American to the core.

Their pupils have the same right to participate in the benefits of public welfare and education legislation as any other children. To ignore their rights and the rights of their parents is contrary to the traditions of America and the spirit of fair play and justice, which have always characterized our Nation.

What is the position of Catholics on the need for Federal aid?

Traditionally Catholics have held that education is the concern of the State and of the local community. In the present instance they are simply advised to study the facts and reach their own conclusions. Thus Archbishop Karl J. Alter of Cincinnati, chairman of the Administrative Board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, said: "The question of whether or not there ought to be Federal aid is a judgment to be based on objective, economic facts connected with the schools of the country. Consequently Catholics are free to take a position in accordance with the facts."

What are the findings of disinterested research?

1. In Taxes for the Schools, published by the Institute for Social Science Research, Roger A. Freeman reaches the conclusion that all the needs of the elementary and secondary public schools can easily be met from State and local tax resources. He shows that public school enrollment in the last 20 years has gone up 42 percent, while public school expenditure has shot up 567 percent.

Even allowing for inflation, these figures show the ability of localities to support increases in school enrollment.

2. The alleged classroom shortage is also questionable. In December, 1959, Louis Conger, chief of the projection section in the U.S. Office of Education, estimated that 61,000 new classrooms would be needed annually during the ensuing 10 years. But without Federal aid classroom construction has been actually running at a higher rate than that for more than 5 years already.

3. The number of teachers and their salaries has also been increasing. Between 1953 and 1959, the certified staff in public schools increased 34 percent, while the number of pupils grew by only 25 percent. Teachers' salaries have increased 40 percent in constant dollars since 1950.

Hence the objective findings of disinterested research show that there is no need for the Federal Government to enter into education on the elementary or secondary school levels.

Who are the chief proponents of Federal aid?

Writing in the New Republic January 30, 1961, Christopher Jencks reports that the governors and legislators of the various States, who are in the best position to know their educational needs, have shown little, if any, enthusiasm for Federal aid. "The only people," he says, "who consistently favor Federal action are educators of various sorts—Federal support of the public schools could make private schools less able to compete in terms of teachers' salaries and school facilities, and might gradually tip the scales against them." Surely the latter is a motive which few fair-minded Americans would approve.

What is the position of Catholic bishops on nonprofit independent schools sharing in any Federal aid program?

Speaking in behalf of the bishops previously mentioned, Archbishop Alter said: "In the event that there is Federal aid to education, we are deeply convinced that in justice Catholic schoolchildren should be given the right to participate." Similarly remarked Cardinal Ritter: "If public funds are raised for the educational benefit of the children in America, then all children should share in that benefit."

Why do Catholics believe that all schoolchildren should share in the benefits of any Federal aid program?

"It is unthinkable," declared Cardinal Spellman of New York, "that any American child be denied Federal funds because his parents choose for him a God-centered education. * * * Under these proposals (of the original bill), parents would be compelled to surrender both freedom of mind and freedom of religion in the education of their children as a condition for sharing in Federal education funds, in direct violation of the liberties guaranteed by the first amendment to the U.S. Constitution." Such undoubtedly is the sentiment of the overwhelming majority of Catholics, though each is free to form his own judgment on this complex political issue.

What does the first amendment say?

It says: Congress shall make no law regarding an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." By forbidding the establishment of a state church, it safeguards the religious liberty of the individual.

Do the nonprofit schools conducted by Protestants, Jews, and Catholics render a public service?

Yes. In addition to teaching religion, these schools teach, with a competence equal to that of the public schools, all the subjects taught in the latter. They thus render a valuable public service and should share in the benefits of Government aid. To deny them aid is to discriminate against them in favor of a religiously neutral school, of which the Founding Fathers of the Republic never dreamed. Such discrimination will frustrate the achievement of the proclaimed objective of Federal aid: "the maximum development of every young American's capacity."

How many students are enrolled in Catholic schools?

A total of 5,663,648 students in 13,961 schools. Of these, 321,000 are in 267 colleges and universities, 41,871 in 537 seminaries, 886,295 in 2,433 high schools, and 4,414,482 in 10,724 elementary schools. They are taught by 168,677 full-time teachers, and the operating costs per year amount to about $2.3 billion. Approximately the same number of Catholic students are also enrolled in public schools. In many large cities a substantial percentage of the total school enrollment is in Catholic schools: Examples: Chicago, 34 percent; Philadelphia, 39 percent; Pittsburgh, 42 percent.

What is the enrollment in other church-supported schools?

About 400,000 students. Lutherans have 180,000 students in approximately 1,500 schools, including 30 high schools. Episcopalians have 480 schools with a total enrollment of 37,000. Other denominations have about 200,000 students in their schools.

How many are enrolled in other private schools?

About 900,000 students. This makes a total of about 6.8 million students in parochial and other private schools, about one-fifth the number in public schools.

Do these private schools greatly reduce school taxes?

Yes. The average annual cost for the education of a pupil in a public elementary and secondary school is $496, and for a college or university student is $1,414.05. This means that Catholics alone, by bearing the whole cost of educating 5,300,777 elementary and high school pupils and 321,000 college and university students, reduce the public school tax by $3,083,095,442.

If we add the savings effected by the education of the 400,000 students in other church-supported schools and 900,000 in other private schools, the educational tax bill of the general public is reduced more than another billion—a total savings well in excess of $4 billion. This means that the educational outlay of the family sending its children to the public school is reduced about $100 per year.

Do parents who send their children to private, nonprofit schools pay a second school tax?

Yes. After paying for the education of their own children, parents are taxed for the education of their neighbors' children in the public school. This means that they carry double their share of the tax burden. But that is not all. On the $4 billion they pay for the education of their children in private nonprofit schools, parents are subjected to still a third tax: the income tax exacted by the Federal and State governments. Incredible as it seems, the payments made for the education of their children in independent nonprofit schools, though they save other parents more than $4 billion, are not tax-exempt. This means that they bear a triple tax burden for the education of the Nation's youth.

Is this fact generally known?

No. Comparatively few people are aware of the staggering tax burden placed upon parents who send their children either to a nonprofit church-related or other private school.

Is this triple taxation fair?

No. It is discriminatory, unfair, unjust and contrary to the constitutional guarantee of "equal treatment under the law."

What would the proposed Federal aid to elementary and high schools mean tax-wise to millions of parents?

It would mean that the parents who send their children to nonprofit church-related or other private schools are to be subjected to still another heavy tax—a fourth—from which their children would derive no assistance. They are expressly excluded from sharing in any of its benefits: a direct contradiction of the announced purpose of the bill—"the maximum development of every young American's capacity."

Have parents the right to determine the education of their children?

Yes. In 1922 in Oregon a law was enacted requiring all children beteen 8 and 16 to attend public schools. In a unanimous decision the U.S. Supreme Court declared it unconstitutional and contrary to the basic principle of liberty upon which our whole Government rests.

"The fundamental theory of liberty," declared the Court, "upon which all governments in this Union repose, excludes any general power of the State to standardize its children by forcing them to accept instruction from public school teachers only. The child is not the mere creature of the State; those who nurture him and direct his destiny have the right, coupled with the high duty, to recognize and prepare him for additional obligations."

What is one the most obvious and important implications of this decision?

It is that the exercise of a constitutional right must not be made excessively difficult or onerous. To grant a right and then make it intolerably burdensome to exercise is virtually to nullify it. A right is meaningless unless it is clothed with the means to practice it.

Thus the right to life in our economy really means the right to a job or to a livelihood provided by the Government. Otherwise the right is a merely verbal one, without substance or meaning. So likewise society must breathe the breath of economic and social reality into parents' constitutional right to determine the education of their children and send them to the schools of their choice.

How can the State implement the parents' rights?

By freeing parents from the burden of double taxation, to say nothing of triple and quadruple taxes. Parents who provide a suitable education for their children in a nonprofit private school should not be compelled to pay taxes for the education of their neighbors' children. The public school is not a sacred cow, before which all citizens must bow.

It deserves the support of those who choose to patronize it, and that constituency is ample to maintain it. As the great majority of our citizens are not sufficiently concerned to provide an education rounded out by religious and moral instruction, the public school will continue to educate most of the Nation's youth and receive the lion's share of tax funds.

Do church-related schools in other countries receive public aid?

Yes, in practically all the countries of Western Europe. Visitors from those countries are shocked when they are told that a great democracy such as, the United States, provides no aid. In the Netherlands, public funds provide the entire cost of the education of children in both church-related and public schools. Parents are free to send their children to either type of school.

In the primary grades Catholic schools enroll 43 percent of the pupils: Protestant schools, 27 percent; public schools, 28 percent; the remaining 2 percent are in nonsectarian private schools. The system is highly acclaimed by all citizens as eminently fair and just, and in accord with the spirit of a genuine democracy. Here freedom of education is not an empty phrase but a living reality.

What is the system in England and Wales?

Publicly financed schools are divided into the voluntary-controlled and the voluntary-

aided. The first are entirely supported by public funds, while the latter receive 75 percent of their funds from the government. The controlled schools follow a common religious syllabus, while the aided schools determine their own religious instruction.

The majority of Catholic and Anglican schools fall into the latter category.

How does Ireland meet this problem?

The Constitution of the Irish Republic provides that "the state shall not oblige parents in violation of their conscience and lawful preference to send their children to schools established by the state or to any type of school designated by the state." As a result of this enlightened and generous provision all schools are church-related: Protestant, Jewish or Catholic.

The state pays practically all the costs of teachers' salaries and school construction. Though the country is about 97 percent Catholic, it is careful to protect the rights of religious minorities and provides them with the same generous aid given to the majority. The Irish Republic thus sets an inspiring example of true democratic action for the rest of the world.

What about public aid in other European countries?

Public aid in some form is given to the church-related schools in France, Western Germany, Belgium, Switzerland, Sweden, Norway, Italy, and Israel. The general principle underlying the legislation in these countries is that such nonprofit private schools render a valuable public service for which the government should in justice render compensation.

What is the system in Canada?

The system varies in the different provinces. In the populous province of Quebec church-related schools are supported by public funds. The province of Ontario has a public school system and a separate school system, almost wholly Catholic. The separation is made at the tax level. The Catholic schools are maintained by the taxes on the real estate of Catholics and the public schools are supported by the taxes on the real estate of non-Catholics. In other words, the taxpayer designates to which school system his tax money is to be applied. This is an eminently fair and just arrangement and one that we in the United States might well follow.

How does the United States school arrangement impress most Canadians?

As anomalous, unfair and undemocratic. When an educator from Toronto was told that parents who send their children to a nonprofit, church-related school which teaches all the secular branches taught in the public school and does so with equal competence, and then are taxed for the public school as well, he was astonished and horrified.

"Why," he remarked, "that's like buying groceries for your own family and then being compelled to pay a large share of your neighbor's grocery bill. I had thought that the United States was friendly toward religion in general and appreciative of the religious and moral instruction of youth, instead of placing an exorbitant price tag upon it." How apt is his characterization of the present anomalous situation in our country. It is strangely out of keeping with the whole spirit of the Constitution and the traditions of American justice and fair play.

Why does a great democracy such as the United States lag so far behind virtually all the democracies of Western Europe and Canada in aid to nonprofit church-related or independent schools?

1. Because of the mistaken notion that such aid is forbidden by the First Amendment to the Constitution.

2. Because the complete case for such Federal aid has never been presented on a national scale.

3. Because of the failure to make unmistakably clear that no aid is asked by any Church for the teaching of religion in a nonprofit church-related school.

4. Because previously the discussion has centered around such fringe benefits of public welfare legislation as bus transportation, school lunch program, textbooks and medical and dental inspection of pupils, and not upon aid for the teaching of secular branches in nonprofit private schools.

Does the Constitution prohibit public aid to nonprofit independent schools for the teaching, not of religion, but of the same subjects taught in the public school?

There is no clear evidence that it does. The U.S. Supreme Court has never ruled directly on this issue. The first amendment precludes, of course, the use of public funds for the teaching of religion by any church or denomination. But nowhere does it forbid the use of public funds for the teaching of the secular branches of the curriculum by a nonprofit independent school, private or church-related.

What do outstanding authorities on constitutional law say on this point?

Many of them declare that there is no clause in the Constitution which prevents public compensation for a public service rendered by a nonprofit school. They point out that the first amendment was designed to protect and promote religious freedom, not to destroy it by erecting one single type of school into a State-supported monopoly of education.

The Founding Fathers were religious men. They brought God into the Constitution and spoke with reverence of religion. George Washington aptly expressed their sentiments when he said in his Farewell Address: "Reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle."

All the schools of the colonies and of the American Republic until about the middle of the 19th century were religious schools. The Founding Fathers knew nothing of the school from which all religious instruction is excluded and never envisaged it as the type that would become the most common. It is a late arrival on the American scene and totally alien to the religious traditions of the Founders of our Republic.

What does Professor Sutherland say about the constitutionality of public aid in the form of long-term loans to public and to nonprofit private schools for school purposes generally?

An eminent authority on constitutional law, Prof. Arthur E. Sutherland of Harvard, was asked by Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK for his judgment on this matter. After studying the matter with great care Professor Sutherland reaches the conclusion that there is no clear constitutional prohibition against such aid.

"Assuming," he concludes, "that the existing Federal aid to education is constitutional—which seems to me a reasonable assumption—the distinction between these existing programs and the proposal which I discuss is not sufficiently evident to persuade me that a measure providing for long-term loans of the character which I have described, to aid education in basic lay subjects, would conflict with the provisions of the first amendment."

What does Dr. Robert K. Hutchins say on this point?

The president of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions and the former chancellor of the University of Chicago and dean of the Yale University Law School pointed out that tax exemption is given private schools because they are performing a public service. "If they are," he said, "and if this is a service that would otherwise have to be performed by the public, then there is no reason why private organizations should not receive appropriate assistence from the Government."

Objections raised against extending federal aid to such schools, he characterized as "incompetent, irrelevant and immaterial." He cited the GI bill that gave thousands of service men Federal funds to attend the college of their choice, public or private.

Have other noted authorities expressed similar opinions?

Yes, hundreds have. Example: Twenty-one prominent jurists, including former Attorney General James P. McGranery, were requested to prepare an opinion on this subject. After painstaking study they reached the unanimous conclusion that there is nothing in the Constitution, which prevents public funds from being used to pay for the public service rendered by nonprofit schools in teaching pupils all the secular subjects taught in the public school.

"Once Congress decides that Federal aid is necessary," they say, "there should be full equality of treatment with respect to all children whether they be enrolled in public, private, or church-related schools." This is a matter of high principle. The parochial schools of this country are discharging a public service. They provide an educational program which fully satisfies present governmental standards for competence.

"The State and all the citizens thereof benefit from this educational effort. If massive Federal expenditures are to be made from the tax collections of all the people, this aid should not go only to a select segment, however large, of the population. To the extent that parochial schools provide a recognized and accredited secular education they are entitled to equal treatment."

Did not the first amendment erect a wall of separation, high and impenetrable, between church and state?

No. In the Zorach case Mr. Justice Douglas said: "The first amendment, however, does not say that in every and all respects there shall be a separation of church and state. Rather, it studiously defines the manner, the specific ways, in which there shall be no concert or union or dependency one on the other. That is the commonsense of the matter. Otherwise the state and religion would be aliens to each other—hostile, suspicious, and even unfriendly."

What do other eminent authorities say on this matter?

Wilbur G. Katz, former dean of the University of Chicago Law School and an expert on constitutional law, points out: "The basic American principle of church-state relations is not separation but religious liberty. * * * Separation ordinarily promotes religious freedom; it is defensible so long as it does, and only so long."

In his well-reasoned dissent in the McCollum case, Mr. Justice Reed suggests that the Court should return to the language of the amendment and interpret it rather than Jefferson's phrase, "wall of separation." It is a wise suggestion for the meaning of the metaphor has become so confused that many can't distinguish the figure of speech from the principles involved.

What does the first amendment really mean?

Simply that the Government may not directly and actively maintain or support any religion. Hence it prohibits any legislation designed to favor directly a particular religion. The key words are "directly" and "actively." The amendment doesn't forbid legislation which has only an incidental or secondary effect upon religious activity or which accords religious people the same benefits afforded the general public.

What is the danger in the proposed Federal aid to education bill?

It tends to achieve indirectly what is forbidden by the Constitution: compel attendance at public schools. By combining

its taxing power with its spending power, Government can force public education willy-nilly down the throats of all citizens just as surely as by a specific ordinance. "The power to tax," said Chief Justice Marshall, "is the power to destroy."

"The real threat," points out the commission of 21 Washington jurists, "lies in the unconstitutional threat posed by and inherent in any large scale spending program solely for the benefit of public schools. * * * We can justify a demand that publicly collected moneys be distributed to all those who participate in the task of education, not just those in secular schools. Otherwise Government is on the side of the secularists."

Who are to be the beneficiaries of the proposed legislation?

The schoolchildren of America. The Government subsidies are to be provided so that there will be achieved "the maximum development of every young American's capacity." Hence all pupils, regardless of the school attended, should share in these benefits. Otherwise the right of parents to determine the education of their children by sending them to schools of their choice will virtually be nullified.

What is the bearing of the U.S. Supreme Court decision in the Everson case upon the proposed Federal aid bill?

The New Jersey law reimbursed parents for the cost of public transportation of their children to and from school, regardless of the school attended. Its constitutionality was challenged on the grounds that the private schools were thereby benefited. Upholding the legislation, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the objects of the legislation were the taxpayers, not the schools themselves, which were only incidentally served.

What is the import of the decision in the Cochran case?

A Louisiana law provided that secular textbooks be furnished to all the children, whether they attended public or nonprofit church-related schools. Sustaining the legislation, the Supreme Court ruled that the books were primarily for the education of children not for the benefit of the schools. "It may be significant," points out Professor Sutherland, "that in those cases (Everson and Cochran) the aim of the legislation was not religious indoctrination but the safety and the lay educational advancement of the schoolchild—the aim which I assume the Congress would have if it were to provide for such loans," i.e., to nonprofit, private, or church-related schools.

What important distinction is brought out in both these decisions?

The distinction between the child, the immediate and direct beneficiary, and the school attended, which may or may not benefit incidentally or indirectly. What is decisive in such legislation is the method of providing aid. There is nothing in the Constitution prohibiting the use of public funds for the education of children in secular subjects, in transporting them to schools where those branches are taught, or in providing them with textbooks for the same. Hence if Federal aid were allocated to all parents of children in primary and secondary schools instead of to the boards of education in each State, then all children would receive equal treatment under the law.

What legislative enactments are based upon this principle?

The GI bill, the Federal scholarship plan, the College Housing Act of 1950, the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act of 1956 and the National Defense Education Act of 1958. Under these laws students receive Federal grants to defray their tuition at colleges, public or church related. As the extension of Federal aid to students on the secondary and elementary level would involve only the same principle, it would be equally constitutional.

What then are some ways in which Federal aid may legally be extended to students in nonprofit church related or other independent elementary and secondary schools?

Lawrence X. Cusack, legal counsel for the New York Archdiocese and an expert on constitutional law, suggests the following four ways:

1. By providing such pupils with nonreligious textbooks and supplies, and by making available to them certain nonreligious educational services.

2. By some form of grant or benefit to the parents of all schoolchildren, including the parents of those attending nonprofit private schools. Examples: Parents might be reimbursed for tuition payments or Congress might provide them an income tax benefit in the form of a deduction, exemption or credit.

3. By a program of long-term low-interest loans in which nonprofit private and church-related schools would participate.

"While this," said Mr. Cusack, "might not itself be an adequate alternative to provide full equality of benefit for the children attending those schools, it might go part of the way, and other constitutional measures might be found by the Congress to furnish the balance of full equality."

Under this proposal there would be no grant of funds to the schools. They would merely be borrowers and would pay a fair rate of interest, although one perhaps somewhat lower than could ordinarily be obtained from commercial sources.

4. By Federal aid for the nonreligious facilities of church-related and other private schools and compensation of the teachers of secular subjects. Such a program might be sufficient to provide full equality of benefit. "The constitutional justification for this fourth approach," said Mr. Cusack, "is that the Federal aid would not foster or promote religion."

Does formal religious instruction in church-related schools occupy much of the teaching time?

No, only a small fraction—about 2½ out of 25 hours a week. Most all the effort, time and funds are devoted to the teaching of the secular subjects taught in the public school. In many of the facilities of the church-related schools, such as the gymnasiums, cafeterias, laboratories, and medical and dental offices, no religious instruction is involved. "There is a large gray area of constitutionality," concluded Mr. Cusack, "in which Congress is free to enact legislation to provide equal educational benefits to all, leaving it to the Supreme Court to render decisions on what are now constitutional imponderables." These four methods are eminently reasonable and worthy of careful consideration by Congress and indeed all citizens.

Are Catholics the only ones seeking to have their children share in the proposed Federal aid to education?

No. Members of other faiths are equally concerned. Speaking at the congressional hearing on this bill, Rabbi Morris Sherer, executive vice president of Agudath Israel of America, said: "Our organization of Orthodox Jews has chapters in every part of the United States and includes thousands of rabbis and communal leaders, amongst them the foremost Jewish scholars and religious authorities. We strongly favor Federal aid to parochial schools. * * * The Jewish parent who sends his child to a parochial school should not be unduly penalized for exercising the right of free choice, implicit in the American way of life, to educate his children in accordance with his religious conscience.

"The memorandum distributed yesterday to Congress by the administration's attorney against Federal aid to parochial schools, conversely tends to prove that there is no clear-cut 'black and white' thinking on this issue of constitutionality. The brief is so full of loopholes, and draws so many hazy distinctions between legal and illegal aid, that it actually serves to add weight to our contention that die-hard opposition to Federal aid to the secular programs of parochial schools is filled with inconsistencies."

What is the stand of citizens for educational freedom?

This is a national organization of citizens of all faiths. At a congressional hearing, its president, David L. LaDriere, reported that his organization favors tuition grants for children in both public and church-related schools. "Fair treatment of children in nonprofit schools," he said, "involves complete equality with those in public schools, so far as Federal aid is concerned."

What does Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, advocate?

A prominent Methodist and former president of Ohio Wesleyan University, Dr. Flemming urges Congress to approve a program of loans for nonprofit private and church-related elementary and secondary schools. He suggests that Congress put aside the controversial feature of the present bill giving Government aid for public teachers' salaries and concentrate on a program of school construction.

What does Life magazine recommend?

In an editorial on this subject in its March 17, 1961, issue, Life said: "Certainly education needs all the going concerns it can get; the greater variety, the better, and the more religious schools, the better, too. * * * Democracy depends on education; but does that mean it can depend primarily on nonreligious education, which is often in effect antireligious? Protestants, Catholics, and Jews have a lot more thinking to do on this subject."

What does Will Herberg say on this subject?

A distinguished author and professor of Judaic studies at Drew University, Dr. Herberg says: "Justice, I think, is entirely on the side of those who call for public support to parochial and other religious schools performing a public function; so also is the practice of other democratic countries, where almost without exception, religious schools meeting the set requirements are given public support as public institutions."

What does Prof. Henry Steele Commager propose?

In the New York Times magazine of February 26, 1961, the distinguished American historian of Amherst College, Dr. Commager, makes substantially the same recommendation: "Society requires education because it has a paramount interest in an educated citizenry. * * * The problem of reconciling the tradition of separation of church and state with public aid to denominational colleges and universities is more complex and perplexing. Perhaps it is sufficient here to note that our academic cousins, the British and the Canadians, seem to have solved the problem by giving state aid to both public and denominational schools without impairing either religious or intellectual freedom, and that the time may have come when we should rethink our own traditional and instinctive attitudes in this area.

"Taxes to support higher education are like taxes to support elementary education, strengthen national defense, build roads, maintain hospitals, safeguard the young, operate libraries and museums, and maintain public order. The principle that underlies all of these enterprises is that they are essential to the well-being of society."

What important truths emerge from this friendly discussion?

1. There is nothing in the Constitution that forbids the use of public funds, Federal, State or community, for the education of the youth of America in all subjects except religion, in public, nonprofit church-related or other private schools.

2. The method of allocating such funds must be worked out carefully, assigning them either to the students or their parents. The proposal of the citizens for educational freedom that tuition grants, equal in amount to the help made available to public schoolchildren, be given in certificates to all other students, negotiable only at the school of their choice, fits in admirably with all the decisions of the Supreme Court.

3. No public funds may be allocated for the teaching of religion. This reflects the common interpretation of the Constitution at the present time. Whether that is to be the enduring view, only time can tell. We agree, however, with Life's editorial that all of us, Protestants, Catholics, and Jews, have "a lot more thinking to do on this subject" before we settle permanently for an education that is entirely divorced from basic religious and spiritual values.

4. What is desperately needed to settle the issue of a just and fair use of taxpayers' money in the education of the youth of America is an open mind and a willingness to consider with sympathy and understanding the views on both sides of this important question. Where there is such an open mind, good will, a spirit of brotherhood and a sense of fairness will find a reasonable solution. It is the purpose of this friendly discussion to contribute to that solution and thus, to deepen our national unity and solidarity in spite of all our differences in race, color, and creed.

Against Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, under to extend my remarks, I am incorporating in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the board of education of the Upper Arlington City School District in opposition to the massive program of Federal aid to education.

UPPER ARLINGTON SCHOOLS,
Columbus, Ohio.

STATEMENT ON FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

We, the undersigned members of the Upper Arlington, Ohio, Board of Education, are of the unanimous opinion that there is no need for a massive program of Federal aid to education.

We believe that a massive program of Federal aid to education is contrary to the fundamental American tradition of home rule in education. We believe that local and State control of education best safeguards the liberty and freedom of the American people and best insures the sound education of our Nation's youth.

We believe that a massive program of Federal aid to education will inevitably result in Federal control over the policies and content of the American educational system.

Therefore we, all the members of the Board of Education of Upper Arlington, Ohio, wish hereby to make known our opposition to any form of extensive Federal financial aid to education.

Further, we feel this to be one of the most important issues facing the boards of education throughout this country and it is our hope that all board members after careful study of this issue will inform their Senators and Representative of their attitude toward Federal aid to education.

CLAIR FULTZ, *President.*
JOHN A. PRIOR,
Vice-President.
EDGAR E. BARNETT,
Member.
MARY LOU NIPLE,
Member.
BEN K. WILLIAMS,
Member.

Reasonable Skepticism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as it is well known by now, I have persisted in my demand that the Soviet Union be forced to produce more scientific data before the world accepts its claim of putting Major Gagarin into orbital space flight on April 12. I am most gratified to learn that more and more people are taking a second look at the Soviet claim.

It gives me great pleasure today to introduce into the RECORD an editorial which appeared in Chicago's American, which raises some very pertinent questions regarding Gagarin's flight. It is encouraging to see responsible newspapers like Chicago's American take the cautious approach in accepting the credibility of the Soviet claim.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial follows:

REASONABLE SKEPTICISM

When Members of Congress were shown a motion picture of Comdr. Alan B. Shepard on his flight into space, which recorded his actions thruout the 15 minute journey, some Congressmen were moved to suggest that the Russians produce equally convincing evidence that they actually sent a man into space on April 12.

The motion pictures of Shepard were, as Representative ROMAN PUCINSKI, Democrat of Illinois, observed, "much more convincing than anything Russia has produced" in support of the Soviet announcement that Maj. Yuri Gagarin was sent into orbit around the earth.

All the Russian reports on the Gagarin flight have been sparse, and some have been conflicting. For instance, he was reported to have floated down to earth in a parachute, then this was changed to an announcement that he had landed the space ship.

Gagarin's own story of the landing, given Wednesday before a military audience in Moscow, sounds highly imaginative. He landed the space ship on a collective farm, he said, attracting no attention from anybody except a woman, a child, and a calf.

To believe that it happened that way, you must assume that the Soviet Government, having sent a man to ride around the earth in space, immediately lost interest in him, leaving him to get back to earth the best way he could, with nobody assigned to help him, to question him, or to take motion pictures of his landing. We can't imagine the methodical Russians doing it that way.

Some squeamish American writers say it is poor sportsmanship for Americans to discuss any lacks or discrepancies in the evidence the Russians have offered in support of their claim to being first with a manned space flight. We think it's simple good sense.

If the Russians really were first to send a man into space they can produce the evidence of it. Until they do produce the evidence, they can hardly blame Americans—in view of the astonishing uses which Russian propaganda sometimes makes of outright invention—for wondering whether a man really did ride around the earth in that space vehicle which the Russians sent up on April 12.

When York Was Ransomed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, York, Pa., has always played a prominent role in the history of the United States. From September 1777 to June 1778, during the most crucial days of the Revolution, York's little brick courthouse served as the Capital of the American Colonies. During this period a printing press from the shop of Benjamin Franklin was brought from Philadelphia, and upon it were printed the public communications from Congress and $10 million in Continental bills. The Pennsylvania Gazette was also printed here for a time. At York furnace on the Codorus Creek nearby, iron was melted for cannonballs.

During World War I the diversified industry of the area played its part in helping bring the conflict to a successful conclusion.

During World War II the "York plan" was conceived, which became a pattern for industrial cooperation throughout the entire Nation.

The centennial of the Civil War in this area will be commemorated shortly. A prominent York attorney has recently written a very informative article on the trying days of that period.

I commend this article to the students of Civil War history and ask that it be made a part of my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

WHEN YORK WAS RANSOMED—JUBAL EARLY THREATENED CITY WITH TORCH

(By John F. Rauhauser, Jr.)

Suspense hung as heavily as the dust-laden air when the clatter of hoofs came to a halt before the County Courthouse. The Confederate general and his staff had arrived to stipulate the conditions of occupation to the citizens of York, Pa.

The aide, Adj. John W. Daniel, was first to dismount with the agility of his 21 years. In later years, one leg having been amputated in battle, he would move more slowly, walking through the aisles of Congress as the Senator from Virginia.

His general, 47, tall, but not fully erect, dismounted with the determined slowness that belied his characteristic brashness as a military leader. He could have passed for a graduate of West Point, which indeed he was; and his countenance was as weathered as if he had been a seasoned veteran of Indian wars, which also was true.

The apprehensive townspeople did not need to refer to the faded gray uniform, broad-brimmed felt hat, disheveled beard nor to the "C. S. A." on his huge, black horse to identify Maj. Gen. Jubal A. Early of the Confederate Army.

While the community was apprehensive, there was not yet any reason for terror. The occupation had been without resistance. Indeed the greatest disruption thus far had taken place the day before, on Sunday, when Early's advance guard, led by the young Georgian, Gen. John B. Gordon, had entered the town to the strains of "Dixie," interrupting 10 o'clock church services.

Now, with his troops ringing the town, Jubal Early himself was in command. He entered the crowded courtroom, sword and field glasses dangling at his side. As a practicing lawyer before the war, he was not unaccustomed to his present forum. Ascending the steps to the judge's seat he faced the committee of safety: county commissioners, burgess, judge, leading citizens.

"I have taken possession of your town by authority of the Confederate Government," he began. "My soldiers are tired and worn out. They need food and clothing. They are not permitted to destroy private property nor to harm any citizen. You are living in a land of plenty and have not suffered from the results of war, like my own countrymen down in Virginia."

It was, of course, true that Pennsylvania was as yet unscathed by the war; that this was a land of plenty compared to the scorched fields in the South. But the mechanics of translating this plenty into benefits for his troops was another thing. That was the business at hand.

Warned of the advance of the Confederate forces by a stream of refugees pouring through their town and on across the Susquehanna River, 12 miles to the east, the citizens of York had secreted much of their material wealth. Livestock and horses were hidden in the dense woodland; silver and family valuables were buried; public and private funds, bonds and other negotiable instruments were transferred to Lancaster, Easton, and Philadelphia.

Consequently Early's requisition for food and clothing for his 6,000 troops was not easy to satisfy, but the town complied: flour, bread, sugar, coffee, molasses, salt, fresh meat, bacon, pork, shoes, stockings, hats—all this and more poured into the Confederate encampments now scattered around the city.

But when Early demanded $100,000 in Union greenback currency, the committee of safety produced only $28,000, whereupon Early commanded the county judge to surrender the keys to the courthouse, coupled with the threat of burning all public records.

"Barbarous," protested Judge Fisher.

"Barbarous, is it?" Early asked. "Then let's say that I want to burn the records of your county in retaliation for the burning of the deeds and records by the Federal Army in Fairfax, Va."

But the judge prevailed, due in part, no doubt, to Early's training as a lawyer and his respect for the courts. Furthermore he was not really interested in the charred court records; he was determined, however, to extract the Federal currency he demanded. Confederate script was nearly worthless, even in the South. For his planned sortie east to Philadelphia and north to Harrisburg he needed northern currency.

"Then is there any property in York that is contraband of war?" demanded Early.

"Nothing that I know of," responded the Judge drily, "unless it's cigars made from York County tobacco." This offer was summarily rejected by the general. These "Yankee cigars" were worthless to a southerner, accustomed to southern tobacco.

The following day Early again pressed his demand for the balance of the $100,000. Calling the town's chief burgess to his headquarters, Early advised him, "The money I have asked for must be raised. I will have it. If it is not furnished me. I will burn the car shops and railroad buildings, for I have discovered that cars have recently been made at this place for the Yankee government."

This was a serious threat. These shops and buildings were of wood. Setting them afire would envelop many private homes in flame. An unimpeded conflagration could destroy the entire residential section.

Protests were unavailing. When reminded of his pledge not to destroy private property, Early countered that he was within his rights in destroying shops producing war materials. "Call out your fire departments to protect your homes," he advised gruffly.

The scene was set. Confederate soldiers assisted in drawing fire equipment to the scene. A squad of 30 men applied the torch. The community was panic-stricken. Several railroad cars were first to go. The buildings and shops were to be next.

At the last moment, in desperation, a local merchant offered his draft on a Philadelphia bank for $50,000. The offer was rejected as being improbable of collection.

No melodrama was ever better timed.

At this exact moment, a rider, Capt. Eliot Johnson, aide to Gen. R. S. Ewell, Early's commanding officer then located 36 miles distant at Carlisle, rode up.

He handed a dispatch to Early. Written at 7:30 a.m., it had been sent from Chambersburg by its author to Ewell; and now, at 6 p.m. the same day the message was relayed to Early at York.

It bore the signature, "R. E. Lee, General."

Reading the dispatch, Early stayed his order to burn the buildings and, calling his men together, advised the terrified crowd that he would give further consideration overnight to the merchant's offer of a $50,000 draft.

The fire department was ordered to stand by. Townspeople continued to remove their possessions from the properties adjoining the buildings destined for destruction. It was a quiet, solemn night in York.

When morning came the citizens were prepared for the worst. During the night Union guards had burned the bridge at Wrightsville, thus cutting off Early's eastward route across the Susquehanna.

But to the amazement of everyone, the Confederate guards were no longer in front of the public buildings. Early had departed quietly during the night. The encampments were abandoned.

A printed handbill was left behind by Early:

"To the Citizens of York:

"I have abstained from burning the railroad buildings and car shops of your town because, after examination, I am satisfied the safety of the town would be endangered; and, acting in the spirit of humanity, which has ever characterized my government and its military authorities, I do not desire to involve the innocent in the same punishment with the guilty * * *."

The handbill added the hope that the citizens of York would shake off the tyrannical government under which they were groaning.

Early's farewell message, however, had left much more unsaid. It did not refer to Lee's message, just received, which carried the urgent command that Early's troops, as part of Ewell's army, should immediately countermarch westward to join Lee; nor the fact that the Army of the Potomac was advancing northward toward Lee's position, under its new commander, Gen. George G. Meade.

But the good people of York were content on this morning of June 30, 1863.

The rebels had departed. Their town had been ransomed by the payment of $28,000 and, though they did not yet know it, by a battle that would commence the next day near the village of Gettysburg.

To Build—To Serve—To Achieve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of May 10, 1961, the James E. West District, of the National Capitol Area Council Boy Scouts of America, held its annual meeting at the Naval Weapons Plant here in Washington. The Honorable Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, was the speaker for the occasion and made an outstanding speech to several hundred scouters on the subject "To Build—To Serve—To Achieve." As a former Scout, the Secretary spoke to this fine group out of the abundance of experience. It was well received by the several hundred scouters in attendance. It is most appropriate that it be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with these remarks:

TO BUILD—TO SERVE—TO ACHIEVE

During the past half century, since the founding of the Boy Scouts of America in 1910, someone has estimated that the unique service rendered by the scouts in their splendid service-to-others program has been the 10 billion good turns—little ones and big ones—which have been done by members of the organization.

Your gracious invitation to me to speak tonight makes 10 billion and 1 such good turns. It gives me an opportunity to honor the adult leaders of the District of Columbia for their service to scouting and to speak on a subject which is very close to my heart. However, one good turn deserves another and as a former boy scout my good turn will be to try to keep my remarks brief and to the point.

It is always a privilege to speak in behalf of the boy scouts program; to recognize its high purposes; its unique opportunities and its mighty accomplishments. The needs of youth are many today. We live in a highly complex society with many pulls in many different directions.

The scouting program provides a balance of good citizenship, high character, and physical fitness. It is a program with a purpose. It is a program of depth not only in getting across to boys the skills and techniques necessary for maturity but in using the learning processes related to those skills. It develops character and citizenship of a high order.

We build finer youth through scouting. We build democracy through finer youth. We build understanding and well-being through democracy. And we build peace and progress through understanding.

The scouting program, dedicated to youth, is a program for the present and for the future. Its continued success will contribute much to the lives of countless individuals and to our progress as a Nation.

The James E. West District of the National Capital Area Council honors tonight the 1,100 area adult leaders of the Boy Scouts

of America. But with this recognition of your outstanding services there is an implied obligation and a challenge to continued effort. You are carrying forward the ideals of which our fathers dreamed. You are giving a bit of service to the sons of America. You are partners in building a finer Nation and a better world. You are guardians of the character of youth. In a very special way, you represent one of the great essences of Americanism. This Nation was built upon the willingness of men and women to give service on a voluntary basis. In scouting you have evidence of the positive result of this kind of service.

Today the scouting program reaches more than 5 million boys and adults. We can do still better. In the period ahead, none of us can do too much in relation to the need. In the face of great economic, social, and technological change, we are all called to new challenge, sacrifice, and dedication. "I will do my best to build, to serve, to achieve" is the theme of your program. The record of scouting in the past has been spectacularly outstanding. The record of scouting in the future is in your hands.

You cannot rest upon the achievements of yesteryear, no matter how tremendous they have been. You cannot be complacent in the face of the world situation, or happy in view of our nationwide problems of juvenile delinquency.

The Scouting program must go forward with increased vigor, new planning, and new ideas. Any program, no matter how purposeful or dynamic, can lose its freshness and vitality if the leaders are not continually rechallenged and reinspired.

The Scouting program could be reduced to routine, mediocrity, and boondoggling, to rote and repetition, if it were ever to lose its zest and zeal. It could become uninspired and stereotyped if it lost its sense of dedication. It could grow stale and indifferent if the leaders did not constantly reeducate themselves. You who work in Scouting would be the first to agree that kind hearts are not enough to waken young minds.

This, then, is the essence of your challenge: Scouting must continue to stress a rigorous, rugged program, rich in resources to keep alive the old fashioned virtues on which a pioneering democracy was built and which made America strong and have kept us free.

Scouting must continue to stress a program which will stir the imagination of our youth, demanding their finest abilities, enlisting their idealism, seeking their best efforts and accepting nothing less.

I would challenge you to keep that spirit of ruggedness always alive and growing. I would challenge you to new efforts in building boys who are well grounded in citizenship, well exposed to those ideals which go hand in hand with high moral character, well equipped with the physicial attributes that bespeak and reflect the energy, dynamism, and strength of true Americans.

Scouting must continue to emphasize individual initiative and resourcefulness. In a recent article by Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther published in Scouting magazine, General Gruenther said, "The competion is much more keen than it was in my day. I am not talking about the competition for a job—I am talking about the development of great individual responsibility." Today, when in so many parts of the world the freedom and dignity of man is being threatened, individual responsibility must be inculcated in our children as something they owe both to themselves and to their country.

Scouting must always be a purposeful program with serious intent in building well-grounded citizens for this Nation. I see it as a highly significant, vital program of informal youth education, due the highest priority in any community from the standpoint of obtaining understanding and support. It has that community support. It richly deserves it.

But Scouting is more than a community program. It is worldwide in application and it must reach out increasingly to touch and influence the whole world. Scouts are aware of their responsibility to the world community. They are conscious that out of every 200 boys in our world only 5 of them live in this country; that on these 5 rests a heavy responsibility for the peace of tomorrow's world. It is heartening to know that since 1944 more than $1¾ million worth of material help has been provided for the extension of Scouting in 90 countries, help in training adult leaders and increasing world understanding among youth. Much of this has been made possible by small contributions from individual Scouts and leaders. Since the beginning of the Boy Scouts of America, over 8,443 members have taken part in 10 world jamborees that have helped to promote world friendship and understanding.

It is particularly pleasant to note that the Boy Scout program during the coming year is placing special emphasis on health, safety, and physical fitness.

The need for physical fitness training for youth has been clearly established. Comparisons of the physical fitness ratings of children show that the average American boy or girl is not as physically fit as is a member of the same age group in many other countries. These fitness tests also indicate a downward trend in physical fitness in our own country in recent years. Working together, parents, schools, and youth organizations can do much to help solve this problem.

It was my great privilege, on behalf of President Kennedy and his Council on Youth Fitness, to preside at the recent Conference on Physical Fitness of Youth. The President's informal remarks at the closing general session are evidence of the concern with which the administration regards this problem.

"We do not want in the United States a nation of spectators," said President Kennedy, "we want a nation of participants in the vigorous life. . . . We want to make sure that as our life becomes more sophisticated, as we become more urbanized, that we don't lose this valuable facet of our national character; physical vitality, which is tied into qualities of character, intellectual vigor and vitality."

The Boy Scouts of America were represented at this conference by their leaders from all across the country. They and the other delegates were in agreement that we need to think and act in terms that will assure our young people healthy and vigorous bodies, alert and intelligent minds, and that degree of emotional stability required to live in an age of both promise and peril.

What part will Scouting play in this great effort in the years ahead?

Scouting must be the spearhead of our drive against juvenile delinquency. This does not mean that Scouting should modify its high standards or accept responsibility as a punitive agency. Scouting is one of the strongest forces in the Nation today as a preventive factor in juvenile delinquency, guarding against the disease before it starts, guiding before habits of delinquency are formed, building constructively before the forces of destruction become operative.

Scouting must lead in the search for talent which is so important to America today. It must do everything possible to stimulate the intellectual curiosity of everybody, to stretch his mind and imagination, to supplement the work of the school, to encourage the bright lad and to guide and counsel him toward the pursuit of excellence.

Scouting must emphasize the newer skills and understandings, recognizing the unlimited potentialities on the part of a boy for abstractions which we have previously considered beyond his grasp. We must awaken the mind of youth to new understandings, new concepts, new ideas, new inventions, new searchings, new challenges.

Only thus can we fulfill our obligations to our youth, and our responsibility to the society we live in.

Only thus can we meet the challenge of the days ahead.

Foreign Aid: A Form of Glorified Blackmail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am glad to place in the RECORD the remarks of our distinguished colleague, the Honorable H. R. GROSS, of Iowa, made by him in his appearance on the Manion Forum on May 14, 1961. His discussion on foreign aid as it affects our national strength and therefore our national security is timely and valuable.

Mr. GROSS. Thank you, Dean Manion. I appreciate this opportunity to appear on the Manion Forum to discuss an issue which is of vital concern to all Americans—"foreign aid."

Frequently I have been labeled as being "negative," "an isolationist" and out of step with the times because of the warnings I have issued during my entire service in Congress that it was not within the capacity of the citizens of this country to finance the rest of the world and still maintain the integrity of the American dollar and this Constitutional Republic.

In my campaign for reelection last year, some of the assorted eggheads even asserted that I didn't know the world was round because of my refusal to imperil this Nation by dissipating the resources of our people—too often capriciously—in foreign lands.

It is reassuring to know that there are those in this country, like Dean Manion and those associated with him, who recognize that we cannot continue forever a reckless giveaway program and still, by some magic, avoid the day of accounting.

Since the end of World War II, the United States has spent the fantastic sum of at least $100 billion in some 70 countries of the world, and contributed heavily to the loading of a staggering Federal debt of $290 billion upon the backs of our children.

We have given economic and military aid to dictators who then used this aid to suppress their own people in the name of anti-communism. We have given to dictators, like Sukarno of Indonesia, who have indicated by word and deed their affinity for our Communist enemies.

And we have given to outright Communist dictators, like Tito of Yugoslavia.

A VERY SORRY SPECTACLE

Our aid has been used by our so-called allies and former foes to rebuild and modernize their industrial complexes in such a way that they are now this Nation's chief competitors.

Corrupt officials have used our aid to enrich themselves and their cronies, leaving little for the people we supposedly were trying to help.

And the waste, the extravagance, the outright corruption in this vast foreign giveaway program almost defies imagination.

What have we bought with this incredible outpouring of our treasure? The record is clear that the billions of dollars we have lavished on foreign governments has bought us neither friends nor respect. Neither has it fashioned a world that is peaceful, prosperous, or free.

We have only to look to Laos as an example of how dismally "foreign aid" has failed.

If all the figures could be brought together, the ledger would show that the United States has pumped more than $500 million into that little country in the form of economic aid, defense support and for military training and equipment.

And now comes word that the Laotian army is strong enough in point of numbers and well equipped to meet the attacking forces, but it lacks the will to fight.

It is interesting to recall that "foreign aid" was first sold to Congress as a strictly temporary program. The original purpose, we were told, was to assist war-devastated nations on an emergency basis so they would be in a position to buy needed American goods at the end of World War II when the United States had nearly all the gold in the world.

We spent money in all corners of the globe to close what was called the foreign "dollar gap."

Within 5 years, the tide started turning. Foreigners no longer were using their American dollars to buy our goods. Their factories, rebuilt with our tax dollars, were humming. Nations such as Great Britain, Japan, West Germany, France, and Italy prospered, but continued to demand and receive our aid. It has been in all too many instances a form of glorified blackmail.

Adding insult to injury, foreign beneficiaries of U.S. aid began to eat into the American market with imports of cars, cameras, steel, sewing machines, machine tools, textiles, and many other items. Today a flood of foreign merchandise is rising ominously in all American marketplaces—merchandise which was produced with low wages, new factories, American processes, and American money.

With this closing of the dollar gap, what we should have done was reduce substantially our spending overseas, but, unfortunately, the international do-gooders were in command and foreign-aid spending continued unabated. Attended with the same old specious arguments that peace in the world depends on the buying of friends, Congress has been stampeded each year, year in and year out, to appropriate billions of dollars to be added to an already clogged foreign-aid pipeline.

Now, as a result of our own consummate foolishness, the chickens are coming home to roost.

The outflow of gold from this country continues at an alarming rate. The peril to the stability of the dollar is obvious, and yet only halfhearted measures have been instituted to deal with the very real problem of heavy deficits in America's balance of international payments.

Well, half-hearted measures won't get the job done, and the time is long overdue for the eggheads and internationalist do-gooders to face up to the fiscal facts of life.

The first and most important step for our Government to take is to serve notice on our so-called free world friends that the honeymoon is over: that no longer can they expect lavish handouts from a generous, and often foolish, Uncle Sam.

Unfortunately, there is nothing to indicate that the new administration plans any such move. As a matter of fact, President Kennedy's foreign aid message—which could very well have been entitled "Foreign Aid Forever"—makes it clear that he wants to spend even more money overseas in the years ahead.

The consequences of such an unwise course are too frightening to contemplate. Perhaps the day will come when the American taxpayers, who must carry the foreign aid burden, will demand an end. At least I hope so, and let us pray that day does not come too late.

United States Would Speed Weather System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the United States scored an important first with the launching of Tiros I, the world's first weather satellite, on April 1, 1960. Later, we launched Tiros II on November 23, 1960, and this satellite is still transmitting a staggering amount of meteorological information. Now we are preparing to take advantage of the knowledge gained from these two satellites by establishing a global weather satellite system by 1962–63. An article entitled "United States Would Speed Weather System," written by John Finney, appears in the New York Times of Sunday, May 21. Since long-range weather forecasting would prove of tremendous benefit to our lives, I believe the plans now being formulated to bring this about will prove of interest:

UNITED STATES WOULD SPEED WEATHER SYSTEM—KENNEDY TO ASK MORE FUNDS FOR FORECASTING SATELLITES

(By John Finney)

WASHINGTON, May 20.—The administration is drafting plans to accelerate development of a global weather satellite system and to make the meteorological information available to other nations.

The objective is to start using satellites for forecasting the world's weather on a limited basis by 1962–63, several years ahead of the original schedule.

Meanwhile, other nations would be invited to join the United States in utilizing the vast and revolutionary amount of meteorological information obtained from the satellites, even to the extent of obtaining local pictures of the weather over the territory.

The move represents one of the administration's answers to overcoming the world psychological advantage now enjoyed by the Soviet Union in the space program.

It is believed that a pioneering effect in putting satellites to the practical use of forecasting weather on all parts of the earth would bring immense credit to this country.

A proposal to accelerate the meteorological satellite program is expected to be included in the enlarged space program to be submitted to Congress by the Kennedy administration probably next week.

SIX HUNDRED MILLION RISE EXPECTED

The President is expected to ask for an additional sum of $600 million for the military and civilian space budgets for the coming fiscal year, which starts July 1. This would be a 25 percent rise in the original space request for that period.

The increases will be used to accelerate work in two main space fields—the man-in-space program and the development of practical uses of satellites for weather communication and navigation.

In addition, increased emphasis will be placed on attempting to close the Soviet lead in development of the larger rockets of the type needed to send manned expeditions to the moon.

The enlarged space program is not predicated on any specific decision to try to beat the Russians to the moon, officials said, although they believe there is a chance that with an accelerated effort the United States could score this important first. The underlying pressure behind the increase is to speed up U.S. space efforts generally.

On the international front, the administration is planning to call a scientific conference, probably early next fall, to acquaint other nations with what the U.S. weather satellite program is and how they can take advantage of the information obtained.

STUDY FOR WHITE HOUSE

The framework for the weather satellite program was presented to the White House this week by a special panel of the National Coordinating Committee for Aviation Meteorology.

The panel, composed of representatives of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Weather Bureau, the Federal Aviation Agency, and the Defense Department, was given the assignment of drafting a plan for putting a meteorological satellite system into operation at the earliest possible time.

The panel's report, now being studied by the Budget Bureau and the National Space Council, recommends that the Weather Bureau be given about $175 million over the next 3 years to step up development of weather satellites and to construct the communication network and processing centers to handle the huge flow of information from the satellites. The first installment on this would be $53 million for the coming fiscal year.

With this program, the panel estimates that a weather satellite system could be placed on "operational status" by 1964.

Even before then, however, some practical forecasting use could be made of the developmental Nimbus satellities, which the Space Agency plans to launch starting next year.

Unlike the two Tiros meteorological satellites launched thus far, the nimbus would be stabilized so the television cameras for photographing, cloud formations would always be pointed toward Earth.

To make the earliest practical use of the first Nimbus satellites, the panel recommends immediate construction of two ground stations for receiving pictures from the satellites—one in Fairbanks, Alaska; the other on the east coast—and a communications network to relay the meteorological data to a new processing center located at the Weather Bureau's National Meteorological Center in Suitland, Md.

Once in operation, the satellite system would be capable of providing both day and night pictures of the cloud covers, and measurements of the heat being absorbed and emitted by the Earth and the clouds.

As the operational capabilities of the system improves, it is expected that the satellites will be able to furnish pictures of local cloud-cover formations directly to local stations.

Thus, for example, India might request a reading on the cloud formations over the Indian Ocean and a satellite would be instructed to take a picture and transmit it to a station in India.

George Washington Memorial Parkway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, in the near future, the Senate Appropriations

Committee will be called upon to provide right-of-way acquisition funds for a 7½-mile stretch of scenic and historic land along the Potomac River in Prince George's County, Md., which will insure the completion of the George Washington Memorial Parkway.

I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Washington Post on May 19, which points out the importance of preserving this land for park purposes. Unless the 87th Congress takes prompt, positive action, commercial and real estate development will prevent the realization of the memorial to George Washington envisioned by the enactment of the Capper-Cramton Act 31 years ago. The editorial follows:

SAVE THE POTOMAC SHORE

Secretary Udall's request for funds to save the Potomac shore between the District line and Fort Washington once more focuses attention on the grand design that Congress long ago approved in passing the Capper-Cramton Act. It visualized park lands on both sides of the Potomac from Great Falls to Mount Vernon, traversed by scenic parkways on both sides. Land for the Virginia and Montgomery County segments of this magnificent park in memory of George Washington was long ago acquired, but a block has been repeatedly thrown up against acquisition of the necessary riverfront in Prince Georges County.

For several years commercial and real estate interests in the area have been demanding clearance to proceed with construction projects in the area designated for the park. Their impatience is understandable. Congress has been inexcusably dilatory in providing funds to buy the land after indicating that it would some day be taken. Now it is feared that the bulldozers can be held back no longer.

Prince Georges County is ready to provide half of the $2 million believed to be necessary to buy 1,100 acres for the parkway. Even if Congress is unwilling to provide funds for the proposed parkway in the near future, the least it can do is to join with the county in acquiring the land before its value for park purposes is forever destroyed. It would be incredibly short-sighted to allow a few stubborn Congressmen to close the door to realization of this memorial park for want of $1 million.

Michigan Resident Urges Continuation of Panama Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1961

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, a frequent visitor to Haiti, is vitally concerned over the discontinuation of the Panama Line. The following is a letter I have received in which she states her views on this matter:

Hon. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MARTHA: Bill and I have just returned from a 24-day visit in Haiti, and I do want to give you some idea of the important role the two ships (owned by the Panama Canal Co.), play in the daily lives of the "middle class," that is emerging in this country.

We stayed in the home of one of our Detroit-educated Haitian friends, and had a first-hand opportunity to participate in their daily lives. I went shopping for Mrs. Lauture, and met many other housewives in the stores. In every one, the supply of apples, pears, potatoes, baby food, special dietary canned goods, powdered milk, etc. was dependent upon the next arrival of the Panama Line. As far as I could find out, the only items the other U.S. steamship lines bring are tourists and nondomestic items.

In a country that is right at Cuba's back door, this type of service is, to me, just as important as monetary loans. And, the hard facts are that, if the Panama Lines doesn't bring these badly-needed items to Port-au-Prince, some foreign country will.

This was our sixth visit to Haiti since 1956. In spite of the difficult political situation, we have found that educational standards are progressing slowly, to be sure, but gains are being made. There are no longer two kinds of people—rich or poor. There is an in-between group of professional white-collar employees, with a majority of U.S. educated persons, as opposed to the European-educated "upper class."

Finally, you will be glad to know that the present U.S. joint military mission is highly respected in Haiti. I don't know any of the persons involved, but, obviously, they have been carefully selected and are doing a good public relations job everywhere they go. I can't help but wish that this caliber personnel had been prevalent during the American Occupation, from 1915–34. If so, this little country might be in better shape today, in many respects.

Thanks again, and my warmest personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

CAROLYN SEEFELDT.

National Salvation Army Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, this is National Salvation Army Week.

It is universally recognized that the Salvation Army has brought inspiration and countless blessings to millions of people and given to posterity a rich heritage of loving and of effective service to mankind.

For more than 74 years, for example, in my native city of Seattle the Salvation Army has continuously carried on its crusade against misery and has increasingly amplified its endeavors for humanity. The Seattle Times recently expressed for our community the recognition and appreciation which has been so well earned during the years.

I think, Mr. Speaker, the editorial in question is appropriate for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and, accordingly, under unanimous consent include it for printing at this point:

A SALUTE TO THE SALVATION ARMY

A plaque embedded in the sidewalk at 115 Washington Street, in Seattle's Skid Road area, bears this notation: "On This Site the Salvation Army Commenced Work in Seattle 6–5–1887."

In the intervening years, Seattle's principal business district has moved north, and what then was a small city has become a very large one.

The Salvation Army has kept pace, and now has centers in several parts of the city offering a wide range of services—including alcoholic rehabilitation, help for locating missing persons, disaster assistance, and work with emotionally disturbed persons and delinquent juveniles.

The Salvation Army likewise has expanded in many other parts of the world since it was founded in 1865, in England, and now has some 20,000 centers in 86 countries.

National Salvation Army Week will be observed May 21–28, and it is fitting that the organization be saluted.

Kennedy Administration Fights Organized Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON G. ROGERS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the Kennedy administration is interested in curbing organized crime and racketeering. The Honorable Robert F. Kennedy, Attorney General, has appeared before the Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee and urged enactment of legislation that will accomplish this purpose. I know there is great interest in preventing crime and racketeering and the Attorney General has proposals to meet this problem as is evidenced by his statement, and under unanimous consent, I insert his statement in the Appendix of the RECORD. The statement is as follows:

Mr. Chairman, I am here today supporting proposed legislation which we, in the Department of Justice believe can be extremely effective in combating organized crime and racketeering. These proposals have been developed in the Department over a period of time to aid and assist local law enforcement officers in controlling hoodlums and racketeers, who in many instances have become so rich and so powerful that they have outgrown local authorities.

Some of these proposals are new. Others are revisions of proposals submitted by the prior administration. Still others were submitted by my predecessor and I have endorsed them.

There have been large scale investigations into this problem on both the national scene and at the State level. You are all familiar with the Kefauver investigation and its disclosures which shocked the Nation. In the Senate Rackets Committee's investigations into improper conduct in the labor-management field, we found organized crime and racketeering moving into that field. Both investigations highlighted problems existing in the larger cities.

Sometimes we get the impression that the general public believes that organized crime is a problem for the big cities, alone. If any one is under that misapprehension he can be corrected very quickly by reading the report of the New York State Commission on Investigation issued in February of this year. It deals with organized crime in central New York State. Then there is a report by the General Investigating Committee to the House of Representatives of the 57th Legislature of Texas. The latter report details what

I can describe only as the rape of the city of Beaumont by organized crime. What the Texas committee found to be the results of organized crime having gained control of the town, will be of interest to you.

The investigation found houses of prostitution, gambling clubs, punchboards, pinball machines, slot machines, numbers, and bookmaking widely distributed throughout the city. Liquor was sold to teenagers and 45 pounds of raw opium worth $500,000 was seized. As has been pointed out so often, gambling, liquor violations, narcotics, bribery and corruption of local officials and labor racketeering and extortion go hand in hand.

The Texas report details the effects of organized crime as follows: The crime rate of the city rose 22 percent in 1960; desirable citizens left town; the city is in the red by $1,125,833; $350,000 in current checks were issued with no covering funds in the bank; within 3 years two water improvement projects ran out of money; the city is deficient in neighborhod parks and supervised recreation facilities; municipal bonds are difficult to sell; the city records were in such bad shape that independent auditors refused to certify an accounting rendered by them; and finally the efforts to attract industry to the city were sabotaged by the corrupting influence.

This appalling story has not had its ending recorded yet. An aroused citizenry currently is conducting a clean-up of what they rightly consider to be a local problem. However, we in the Federal Government can be of great assistance to them and other honest citizens.

The opium seized in Beaumont was not grown locally in Texas. The pinball machines and other gambling devices were not manufactured there. The profits from the activities did not remain in Texas. The information so necessary to the conduct of gambling operations did not originate locally. All the information and implements flowed into Beaumont through the medium of interstate commerce. Our package of bills is designed to prohibit the use of interstate facilities for the conduct of the many unlawful enterprises which make up organized crime today.

I now would like to discuss these bills in some general terms.

I will turn first to H.R. 6572, which would prohibit travel in aid of racketeering enterprises.

Organized crime is nourished by a number of activities, but the primary source of its growth is illicit gambling. From huge gambling profits flow the funds to bankroll the other illegal activities I have mentioned including the bribery of local officials.

The main target of our bill is interstate travel to promote gambling. It also is aimed at the huge profits in the traffic in liquor, narcotics, prostitution, as well as the use of these funds for corrupting local officials and for their use in racketeering in labor and management. Thus, when we speak of unlawful business it is business engaged in the aforementioned improper activities.

A brief explanation of the method by which the funds are obtained by the bigtime gambling operators may be useful at this time.

Many persons think of the corner handbook operator or the neighborhood merchant, who sells a numbers ticket to him, as the person to whom we refer when we talk of the gambling racketeer. This is about as accurate as describing an iceberg as a section of ice floating on top of the water. As with the iceberg the danger and the size of the problem can only be fully appreciated if we go below the surface.

On the surface is the handbook operator. He makes a profit from the persons who place bets with him because he has an edge on every bet. He pays track odds but usually not in excess of 20 to 1. The odds at the track are calculated after deducting the 15 to 18 percent of the total betting pool which goes to pay taxes and other expenses. The bookmaker pockets that amount. However, he is not a man of unlimited resources. He must balance his books so that he will lose no more on the winner than has been bet on the other horses in a race, after his percentage has been deducted. He cannot control the choices of his customers and very often he will find that one horse is the favorite choice of his clientele. His "action," as he calls it, may not reflect the action of the track. Therefore, he must reinsure himself on the race in much the same fashion that casualty insurance companies reinsure a risk that is too great for it to assume alone. To do this the bookmaker uses the layoff man, who for a commission, accepts the excess wager.

The local layoff better also will have limited funds and his layoff bets may be out of balance. When this occurs he calls the large layoff bettors, who because of their funds, can spread the larger risk. These persons are gamblers who comprise a nationwide syndicate or combine. They are in close touch with each other all the time and they distribute the bets among themselves so that an overall balance is reached on any horserace.

With a balanced book at the handbook, layoff or syndicate level the edge is divided and no one loses except the man who placed the original bet. As an indication of the volume of business I am talking about, one of the largest operators in the combine does a layoff business of $18 million a year. His net profit is $720,000 a year. This is a 4-percent return on volume with relatively no risk as a result of the balancing of his books on each event.

The term "gambler" is a misnomer for these persons. They accept money that the small gamblers wager but they do not gamble at all. This is further illustrated graphically by what we know as the numbers racket.

A man purchases a ticket with three numbers on it, paying a dollar for the ticket. Since there are 999 such numbers he should reasonably expect the odds to be 999 to 1. The numbers bank usually pays 600 to 1 on such a wager—or less—so you can see that the only gambler in this situation is the man making the bet. The operator pockets 40 cents on every dollar bet. That is if the game is run honestly. That, however, is too much to expect from this group. If the play is too high on any one number they manage through devious means to insure that a number on which the play has been small will be the winner.

With that background on the type of business done by these persons, let me now move to their interstate travel activities to show how we hope to be of aid and assistance to local law authorities.

The examples I am going to give have a factual basis, but I will speak mainly in generalities in open session for obvious reasons.

Our first example is as follows: Some notorious individuals, whose names you would immediately recognize, had interests in a numbers bank but lived in a resort town far from the scene of operation. Every month a messenger carried the profits of the numbers racket from the scene of operations to the resort town. One of the payments was in excess of $250,000. Thus, the persons reaping the profit from the illegal activity remained beyond the reach of the law enforcement officials at the place of operation and committed no crime in the State where they lived. Only the Federal Government can curtail the flow of funds which permit the kingpins to live far from the scene, preventing the local officials, burdened by the gambling activity, from punishing him.

If our bill is enacted we will be able to prosecute the courier who carries the funds across State lines and in conjunction with the aiding and abetting statute (18 U.S.C. 2) we will be able to prosecute the person who caused the courier to travel—the kingpin. This example illustrates what we have found to be a pattern around the country where the apparently innocuous 10-cent numbers bet in a large city turns into tremendous profits in the hands of bigtime hoodlums.

Another example involves the frequent travel from a middle Atlantic State to a New England State by the operator of a lottery—and/or members of his family—to make payments to winners or pick up money wagered. Our information reveals that, in order to avoid the statute proscribing interstate transportation of lottery tickets (18 U.S.C. 1301), the individual carried the plates for printing the tickets to the various States. He did that so the tickets could be printed locally.

In another instance in a Midwestern State, the scene of illicit operations is close to the border of the State. One individual travels daily between the two States. He conducts his layoff business in the one State and lives in a $200,000 house in the suburbs of a large city across the border in the other State.

Let me cite another example. The layoff men at the top of the bookmaking organization are in daily contact with each other to reinsure their bets and divide the action, thus assuring that all make a profit and no one takes an exorbitant risk.

These people can conduct their businesses by telephone. When local authorities get close to them, they merely pick up stakes and move to another jurisdiction. The best example of this moving to frustrate local police, is the case of a man who started operations as a layoff man in the Midwest in 1946. He moved to another town in 1949 and then to Newport, Ky., in 1950. In 1952, under pressure of the Kefauver investigations into organized crime, he moved to Montreal, Canada. When the Royal Canadian Mounted Police raided his establishment he moved back to Newport, Ky.

We can follow these people from State to State and prosecute them for the very activities which now make a mockery of local law enforcement if this travel bill is enacted.

The layoff men, who comprise the gambling syndicate, must settle their accounts periodically for they do not trust each other any more than they trust the average bettor. They settle the accounts by having a bagman travel throughout the country picking up and depositing funds to balance the books. He receives reports of balances due from each of the layoff men. He acts as a clearinghouse and accountant for the group—settling the accounts in accordance with good accounting practice—in much the same manner that our banking clearing houses operate. The only difference is that the banking houses are not afraid of divulging their incomes through the use of banking channels. The gamblers use cash and a messenger to clear the daily balances.

When a Braniff airplane crashed at Buffalo, Tex., on September 30, 1959, a collection man for a prime subject of the Kefauver investigation, was killed. The collection man was enroute to New York with his boss's share of profits from gambling operations in Texas. With the enactment of this bill, prosecution may be undertaken in future situations against men like this and the persons who send them to collect the proceeds.

In summary, our information reveals numerous instances where the prime mover in a gambling or other illegal enterprise operates by remote control from the safety of another State—sometimes half a continent away. He sends henchmen to the scene of operations or travels himself from time to time to supervise the activity and check on his underlings. As for the profits, he receives his share by messenger.

Another example of the type of situation which we are trying to curb in proscribing the interstate travel in furtherance of an unlawful activity is the situation which arose in Hot Springs, Ark., in 1960. A printing company in Jefferson Parish, La., receives race wire information from Chicago bookmakers and disseminates the data to gambling establishments in sections of the South and Southwest. The company is owned by a racketeer, since deported, and his race service manager, of New Orleans. The manager, while in Hot Springs in March of 1960 got into a violent argument with the owner of the race wire service there. The Hot Springs man told the New Orleans man to stay in New Orleans as he could operate his business without help.

In May of 1960, the owner of the Hot Springs service traveled to Chicago and visited a Chicago rackets overlord. The Hot Springs man sought assistance in curtailing the activities of the New Orleans group in seeking to take over his race wire service. If we could show the existence of race wire services in New Orleans and Hot Springs and the travel on the part of the New Orleans man to expand the New Orleans service and the travel of the Hot Springs man to protect his interest in the Hot Springs service we could prosecute both of these top racketeers with the enactment of the proposed bill.

A race wire service has been provided in Wisconsin by Chicago hoodlums. In return for allowing the race wire service to prosper in Wisconsin, a person, who is now the subject of intensive investigations, has been allocated a portion of Antioch, Ill., for the conduct of gambling. This individual apparently has trained his housemen at Kenosha before they traveled to Antioch to run the gambling operations. Such travel as by the Chicago people to Kenosha and the Kenosha hoodlums to Antioch would violate the bill as travel to promote an unlawful business, thus permitting the interruption if not the destruction of the gambling empires.

There is wide open gambling in Newport, Ky., adjacent to Cincinnati, Ohio, and Covington, Ky. A review of the financial statements of four Newport gambling casinos in 1957 revealed that 11 persons, who reside outside of Kentucky, participated in the casino profits. With this bill we would be able to move against interstate travel to distribute the profits of these casinos to the out-of-State owners.

Edward Silver, the district attorney of Kings County, testified before the New York State Commission of Investigation that there have been several unsolved gangland homicides connected with gambling in recent years in his juirsdiction. It would be in keeping with past practices of this element if the perpetrators of the crimes had come from out of State. This practice was amply illustrated by the disclosures in the trial of the members of the notorious Murder, Inc.

None of the activities of which I have just spoken, that is, interstate travel to carry on a racketeering enterprise, travel to deliver the profits of an illegal enterprise, or travel to commit a crime of violence in furtherance of the activities of an illegal business is now per se, a violation of State or Federal law. The travel is performed by these persons with impunity, but because of that travel and the interstate aspects of the activities, the task of the local law enforcement officials is staggering.

I am not discussing isolated instances but what we have found to be a pattern of behavior in a number of geographic areas.

We have skirted the area of social gambling by limiting the proposed statute to gambling, as a business, which violates State or Federal law. In this limited aspect, the enactment of the bill will be a tremendous tool for stamping out the vicious and dangerous criminal combinations.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is vital. We need it. Local law-enforcement officials need it. The country needs it.

The second bill I wish to discuss, H.R. 7039, amends chapter 50 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to the transmission of bets, wagers, and related information. Its purpose is to assist the various States in enforcement of their laws pertaining to gambling and bookmaking. It would prohibit the use of wire communication facilities for the transmission of certain gambling information in interstate and foreign commerce.

Gambling in the United States, we estimate, involves about 70,000 persons and a gross volume of $7 billion annually.

The most diligent efforts of local law enforcement officers are often frustrated by the ease with which information essential to gambling operations can be disseminated in interstate commerce.

Bookmaking bases its operations upon races at about 20 major racetracks throughout the country, and requires rapid transmission of the results on each race. Usually there are only a few tracks in operation at any given time and the average bet placed with a bookmaker is a small one.

In order to run a successful book that pays a good return, the bookmaker needs a volume of business. This volume is usually obtained by the fact that bettors can play their money and any winnings upon the whole card of daily races reported from one or more tracks, if they know their standing from race to race. Thus, information almost simultaneously transmitted prior to, during, and immediately after each race on such items as the starting horses, scratches of entries, probable winners, betting odds, results and the prices paid, is essential to both the bookmaker and his clientele in order to insure any sizable gambling.

Furthermore, let me emphasize that no matter by what means the bookmaker and his clients receive this in-bound information—whether by telegraph ticker tape, by telephone, or even by radio or television broadcast—the bookmaker needs a means of rapid out-bound communication. This usually is by telephone—with other bookmakers. the purpose is to balance his book and protect against a severe loss when the betting becomes heavy on any particular entry. I have explained this hedging process, known as layoff betting, in my earlier testimony on the interstate travel bill.

The rapid gathering and dissemination of trackside information is a highly profitable and integral part of commercialized gambling on horseracing. This information can be obtained by stealth and use of various ingenious devices, such as the pitch-catcher type operation where a man at the track flashes the result of a race by a hand signal or other device, to a confederate at an open telephone line. The confederate then gives the result to a central point of dissemination. The information is placed upon leased telegraph circuits or long distance telephone lines running to the major cities of the country from which it is further fanned out on other leased circuits or telephone lines, or in some cases by radio broadcast, to the ultimate subscribers, the bookmakers, who pay a substantial fee for this vital service.

The rapid results provided by this wire service are indispensable to all bookmakers operating on any but the most modest scale. They are a means of expanding the play and stimulating further betting from race to race. They protect the bookmaker from the dilemma of either refusing bets which are placed about the time a race is scheduled to start, or of accepting a bet on a horse which has already won the race.

Equally essential to the bookmaker is the local telephone service which he must have to avoid the risk of arrest for running an open betting room. He needs the telephone to take a substantial portion of bets; and, of course, the betters also will use the phone to be informed of the results. Furthermore, telephones provide auxiliary service for rapid results where telegraph tickers or speaker circuits fail. In areas where ticker or speaker service is not available, the bookmaker must have at least one telephone for the exclusive purpose of receiving service from the subdistributor who supplies him with the trackside information.

In addition to the unique transmission situation in the field of commercialized horserace betting, the gamblers also have moved into large-scale betting operations in such amateur and professional sports events as baseball, basketball, football, and boxing.

This has been highlighted recently by disclosures that for the second time in 10 years, gamblers have bribed college basketball players to shave points on games. In this situation the bookmaker needs telephone communication to get the latest "line" on the contest. This is the handicapped prediction of the probable results and the point spread in basketball and football. Without the latest information as to the condition of the team, and the happening of such things as late injuries to key players, the bookmaker is the victim of fate. He cannot permit this to happen, so he subscribes to a service which gives him and his confederates the latest up-to-the-minute information which may bear on the result.

It is quite evident that modern, organized, commercial gambling operations are so completely intertwined with the Nation's communications systems that denial of their use to the gambling fraternity would be a mortal blow to their operations.

This is the precise purpose of the proposed legislation. It would be an exercise by the Congress of its plenary power over interstate communications to aid the States in coping with organized gambling, by denying the use of interstate communication facilities for such activities.

It cannot be overemphasized that this bill is designed, first to assist the States and territories in the enforcement of their laws pertaining to gambling and like offenses. Second, the bill would in that regard help suppress organized gambling by prohibiting the use of wire communications for the transmission of gambling information in interstate and foreign commerce.

The word "organized" is underscored because it should be clear that the Federal Government is not undertaking the almost impossible task of dealing with all the many forms of casual or social wagering which so often may be effected over communication facilities. It is not intended that the act should prevent a social wager between friends by telephone. This legislation can be a most effective weapon in dealing with one of the major factors of organized crime in this country without invading the privacy of the home or outraging the sensibilities of our people in matters of personal inclinations and morals.

The next bill I would discuss is one we sent to the Congress, but which has not been introduced in the House. At this time, I would like to speak in support of subsections (a) and (b) of our draft. Subsection (c), dealing with false and misleading information will be presented as a separate bill. The bill would amend chapter 73 of title 18, United States Code dealing with the obstruction of justice. Its purpose is to prohibit the intimidation of witnesses in administrative investigations.

The need for this legislation stems from the language of the existing obstruction of justice statutes (18 U.S.C. 1503 and 1505) which prohibit the intimidation of witnesses in matters pending before a court or an

administrative agency. Section 1503 prohibits the intimidation of any witness in any court proceeding. Section 1505 prohibits the intimidation of any witness in any proceeding pending before any department or agency.

Section 1503 has been construed in *United States* v. *Scoratow* (137 F. Supp. 620) as not applying to the intimidation of a witness in an investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation until a complaint is pending in a Federal court. As so construed, the section leaves a gap in the law which permits the intimidation of witnesses in preliminary investigation. This withholds sanctions against persons who may by their actions forestall the commencement of criminal proceedings in the Federal courts. The gap was recognized in the 85th Congress and remedial legislation was recommended by the Senate Subcommittee on Improvements in the Federal Criminal Code.

You will, of course, understand that in very many cases investigations are conducted in order to ascertain whether a complaint should be filed or a matter referred to a grand jury. If this preliminary investigation is frustrated by the intimidation of witnesses, the investigation may be brought to a halt before evidence sufficient to warrant the filing of a complaint or the referral of the evidence to a grand jury has been ascertained. Intimidation at this point, therefore, is more effective than it would be at a later point when there may be other evidence upon which to proceed.

Some examples of this intimidation are as follows. In the *Scoratow* case, the defendant threatened to kill a Mr. and Mrs. Friedman if Friedman gave any information to the FBI. Friedman was being interrogated by the FBI in an investigation of a possible false statement to the FHA involving a nephew of Scoratow. The court held that such intimidation was not within the purview of existing obstruction of justice statutes and dismissed an indictment against Scoratow.

Another case such as this involved a man named Lloyd Scuttles. Scuttles had been interviewed in connection with a stolen automobile. When the man who sold Scuttles the automobile got out of prison, he threatened to kill Scuttles because he believed that Scuttles had given the FBI information leading to his conviction. Scuttles was never a witness at the trial of the man who threatened him. Therefore the case was not within the purview of the obstruction of justice statute.

In still another case, a man who had been interviewed by FBI agents in a white slave case was accosted by another man who displayed a knife and threatened to kill our witness if he gave any information to the FBI, or the police. Again, since the man threatened was not a witness in a proceeding, no action could be taken against the threatener.

These are some of the cases we know about. We don't know, of course, the number of cases where the intimidation has been wholly effective.

We are asking for an expansion of the obstruction statutes to cover this situation. It is particularly necessary in view of the other bills I am discussing today.

If those bills are enacted the Department of Justice is going to be involved in large-scale combat with the forces which use interstate commerce to conduct their criminal activities. The persons who make up this element are tough and ruthless. They also are shrewd enough to be aware of the need of secrecy in the conduct of their activities. They know the dangers to which they will be subjected if witnesses talk freely to our investigators. Therefore, we expect attempts will be made to mislead us through intimidation of witnesses by threats or by violence.

I am sure that the gap of which I spoke previously is known to the leaders of organized crime. They are made well aware of the laws' limitations and the opportunities for forestalling investigations. This loophole permits the use of threats and violence in the first stages of an investigation thus preventing the development of a case.

Our opponents are ruthless, vicious, and resourceful. I cannot stress this too much. They will use every weapon at their command to prevent our discovery of incriminating information. The present state of the law is an open invitation to them to cripple our efforts and prevent our inquiries at the very point where witnesses need protection the most. The need for this bill seems to me to be self-evident.

The next bills are H.R. 468 and H.R. 3023 to amend the Fugitive Felon Act. They are identical. This amendment was introduced in the 86th Congress at the behest of my predecessor as H.R. 11897. It passed the House on August 23, 1960, but no action was taken on it in the Senate. It was again introduced at the beginning of this session of the Congress at Mr. Roger's recommendation. I endorse this proposal and urge its enactment.

The purpose of this proposal is to expand the coverage of the Fugitive Felon Act (18 U.S.C. 1073) which now makes it a Federal offense to flee a State jurisdiction in order to avoid prosecution or confinement for certain crimes of violence. These crimes include murder, kidnaping, burglary, robbery, mayhem, rape, assault with a dangerous weapon, arson punishable as a felony, extortion accompanied by threats of violence or attempts to commit those offenses.

Although the law only applies to fugitives, who have committed these crimes, this section has been extremely useful in strengthening local law enforcement. It has enabled the FBI to arrest fugitives fleeing a State jurisdiction and turn them over to the State in which they are arrested to await extradition by the demanding State. In 1960, the FBI apprehended 1,361 fugitives under the provisions of this law. Only two were tried in Federal courts. The rest were turned over to local authorities.

We can understand the limited scope of the section if we go back to the time of its enactment in 1934. Local law enforcement officials were troubled then, as they are today, with the ease with which fugitives could escape their jurisdiction by crossing a State line. The local officials could not follow, find, and return the criminals. It became apparent that the Federal Government had to assist those officials by apprehending fugitives in other jurisdictions and returning them for prosecution.

The nature of the publicized crime of that era was, however, different than it is today. At that time, the Congress and the public were greatly disturbed by widespread crimes of violence. Names like Capone, Dutch Shultz, Mad-dog Coll, Dillinger, and Karpis were on the front pages of the newspapers of the country.

Today, as in 1934, the major responsibility for the combating of crime and the prosecution of offenders rests with the States. Today, however, the face of organized crime has changed. While there still are crimes of violence, the modern criminal has become somewhat more sophisticated in the planning and perpetration of his activities in gambling, prostitution, narcotics, bribery, fraud and larceny. He has moved into legitimate businesses and labor unions where he embezzles the funds and loots the treasury. He has much more rapid means of escape from the jurisdiction of the local law enforcement. Unless his offenses also are Federal offenses, the Federal Government may not through the means of this section enhance the power of the State officials to apprehend racketeers and hoodlums.

If the Fugitive Felon Act is expanded, as proposed by this bill, the FBI will be able to put into operation the first of the necessary steps leading to the return to the proper jurisdiction of any person who has committed a crime punishable by death or imprisonment for more than 1 year. In such an expanded scope, we in the Federal Government can be of the greatest aid and assistance to the States.

Another area of gambling which needs attention, if we are to make a coordinated and successful attack on organized crime, is the easy interstate transportation of wagering paraphernalia. This was highlighted by the report of the Texas commission mentioned in my earlier testimony. That problem is the subject of H.R. 6571.

Federal laws, designed to suppress the lottery traffic in interstate and foreign commerce, have been on the books since 1895 (28 Stat. 963, act of March 2, 1895, ch. 191). The present statutes are found at 18 U.S.C. sections 1301 to 1305. In summary, these statutes make illegal the transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of "any paper, certificate, or instrument purporting to be or to represent a ticket, chance, share, or interest in or dependent upon the event of a lottery * * *" (18 U.S.C. 1301).

From the very beginning the courts narrowly have limited the scope of these statutes. In 1897, the Supreme Court held that the statutory proscription against interstate transportation of lottery paraphernalia applied only to writings, instruments, or tickets representing chances on an existing lottery and not an already completed one (*France* v. *United States*, 164 U.S. 676 (1897)). The 1903 decision in *Francis* v. *United States*, 188 U.S. 375 (1903), further limited the scope of the statute by holding that a duplicate slip, retained by the agent of a numbers lottery to indicate the number played, is not a paper "purporting to be or to represent a chance, share, or interest in a lottery." I have previously told you of the shipment of the plates for printing numbers tickets. That shipment will violate this section whereas the travel to deliver the plates will also violate our travel proposal.

Finally, it has been held that the use of the mails in advertising and conducting a bookmaking business does not violate the present statutes because the selection of winners may require some skill or knowledge rather than mere chance (*United States* v. *Rich*, 90 F. Supp. 624 (E.D. Ill. 1950)).

Since the classic definition of a lottery is the payment of consideration for a prize to be awarded by chance, this intepretation excludes sport betting slips from the existing statutory prohibition against interstate transportation.

The proposed statute is designed to close the most important loopholes resulting from the above decisions. This measure would make it a felony to send, or knowingly carry in interstate or foreign commerce, any wagering paraphernalia or device used, adapted, or designed for use in bookmaking, wagering pools with respect to a sporting event, or numbers, policy, bolita, or similar games. This language makes clear its applicability to slips, papers, or paraphernalia wich may be used in a lottery scheme not yet in existence or already completed. It also specifically prohibits the interstate transportation of slips recording the amounts and numbers bet in a numbers lottery and betting slips and other materials of a bookmaking operation.

In addition to the example I have previously cited there is considerable evidence that the operators of certain types of lotteries—which are undeniably interstate in character—have adopted various ways to avoid violating the narrow prohibitions of existing law. For example, lottery tickets may be printed in blank at a central point in one State, then transported to other

States where the so-called playing numbers are overprinted. Without these numbers the blanks are not within the statutory definition of lottery tickets an dtheir interstate transportation is not prohibited. Under the proposed measure, the blank tickets would be prohibited from interstate shipment as paper designed for use in a numbers or similar game.

The so-called numbers lottery, or one of its infinite variations, operates in virtually every major metropolitan area. Particularly where such a metropolitan area covers part of several States, it is not unusual that the numbers seliers in one State turn over their play to runners who report at a numbers bank in another State. The interstate carrying of slips or writings, indicating the amounts of bets and the numbers played, is essential to this type of operation. The proposed statute would prohibit the interstate carrying of such numbers slips.

The fear of a raid by Federal or local police has turned the attention of the numbers operators and the bookmakers to the problem of quick disposition of the records used in the conduct of the business. This would include the papers used to record the bets of the numbers played by the individual bettor. The operators are making our task more difficult through the use of flash paper for the quick disposition of the records. This paper is highly inflammable and will burst into flame if a cigarette is placed on it. In less time than it will take a law enforcement officer to cross the room, a bookmaker can turn his records into a pile of ashes of no use as evidence against him.

We wish to curtail the interstate transportation of this type of equipment. If we do so, the bookmaker and numbers operator is going to find another specialized type of equipment to frustrate our efforts. We thus are asking for this bill to curtail the interstate shipment of paraphernalia that is used, intended or designed for use in their activities. With this broad prohibition we hope to be able to keep step with the criminal element as it tries a different approach to the problem.

The last bill I will comment upon is H.R. 3021, which would amend chapter 95 of title 18, United States Code, to permit the compelling of testimony under certain conditions and the granting of immunity from prosecution in connection therewith. This proposal was first submitted to the Congress on May 25, 1959, by my predecessor. The bill was introduced as H.R. 7392 but did not pass. It was resubmitted to the Congress on January 18, 1961. In our examination of the program submitted by the previous administration, we found that the bill will perform a necessary function and I recommend its enactment.

The experience of the Department has shown that there are difficulties in obtaining proof of violation of the Taft-Hartley Act and the Hobbs Act because certain portions of those acts overlap. For example, an employer may have been the victim of labor extortion, which is prohibited by the Hobbs Act. However, because he has made payments to the labor racketeer, he may fear that the payments will be construed by prosecutive agencies or a grand jury as a payment to the labor leader in violation of the Taft-Hartley Act. Thus, the employer understandably is reluctant to testify about transactions that are not clear-cut violations of the Hobbs Act. In this gray area of activity our difficulties in obtaining proof are substantial.

This proposal will permit us to call the buinessman before the grand jury, compel him to testify as to the transactions. If he first refuses to answer the questions on the basis of his constitutional privilege, he could be given immunity against prosecution for any matter, thing, or transaction about which his testimony is compelled.

We will then be able to obtain the evidence we need against the person who is most culpable in the matter while relieving the fears of the person who has been wronged.

In addition, in Hobbs Act violations, we very often run into a situation where a person is a conduit for funds from an employer to a labor racketeer. The conduit, while not the most culpable person involved, is nevertheless able to and under the present law justified in refusing to answer any questions about the transaction on the basis of his constitutional privilege. If the present bill is enacted we will be able to require testimony from the least culpable of the conspirators and obtain the proof we need for conviction of the real offenders.

In summary this bill will enable the Department to prosecute with more effectiveness the persons engaged in labor racketeering which is tied into the rest of organized crime and has become such a blight upon the business community.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I would like to read into the record the comments of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, about the bills I have discussed. Mr. Hoover's statement is as follows:

"Your legislative program as to interstate crime currently pending in Congress should receive the wholehearted endorsement of law enforcement at Federal, State and local levels. As we are all aware, the growing seriousness of the Nation's crime problem presents an increasing threat to the safety and welfare of the Nation. Today its severe effects are felt directly or indirectly in every home in America. In terms of dollars and cents alone crime imposes a tremendous burden upon us all. Our annual cost of crime now totals $22 billion—the equivalent of $128 for every man, woman, and child in these United States.

"One of the most deeply entrenched segments of crime is represented in the underworld activities of racketeers and professional hoodlums. I refer to the vice barons, those engaged in illegal gambling, commercialized prostitution, and illicit liquor operations as well as the narcotics peddlers and the strong-arm racketeers whose lucrative illicit profits are derived from every stratum of our society. Many of these racketeers utilize interstate facilities and operate with impunity, if not in open defiance.

"The ranks of law enforcement are closing against the challenge of hoodlum lawlessness. As an example, on a day-to-day basis the FBI exchanges information with other law enforcement agencies at the local, State, and Federal levels concerning the operations and activities of professional hoodlums. During the past 6 months the FBI has disseminated over 53,000 items of a criminal intelligence nature to other law enforcing authorities.

"In addition, the scientific facilities of our laboratory and the fingerprint services of our Identification Division have been fully available to all agencies which are joined in the fight against crime. In return the FBI received invaluable assistance throughout the year from other members of the law enforcement profession in all parts of the Nation.

"These important weapons, science and cooperation, are successfully meeting the hoodlum challenge of lawlessness every day in the areas where we are now empowered by law to use them. These can be made even more effective if the law enforcement profession is given authority to bring these facilities to bear on those present voids in the law which allow organized crime and racketeering to operate on an interstate basis.

"This new and vitally needed legislation, which you have proposed, will strengthen the Federal Government's hand and will provide it with additional effective weapons in stamping out the evil of organized crime. If enacted into law, these legislative proposals would certainly enable the Government to proceed more effectively and vigorously against the well-entrenched interstate racketeers who are beyond the reach of local law enforcement."

Accomplishing American Goals Through Radio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the statement of M. S. Novik, radio consultant, delivered by him recently at the 31st Institute for Education by Radio-TV in a panel program entitled "Accomplishing American Goals Through Radio." Mr. Novik's remarks follow:

We are gathered here this year to praise radio—not to bury it. This is quite a difference from 4 or 5 years ago, when many in the industry thought we were at a wake. We know that television didn't kill radio—just as radio didn't kill magazines and newspapers.

It is true that radio today is alive and kicking. It is true that there are more radio stations on the air today than ever before. But it is also true that every radio station is in danger of remaining only so good as its competition. And the level is set by the worst of its competitors.

Radio today with some notable exceptions, is a business of broadcasting recorded music and news. The live programs, the talk, forum, discussion, comment and controversy programs that made radio the dominant medium of communication in the country—all of these programs are just about gone today.

Radio today is making more money, and has more listeners and more commercials; and it also has less public service programing, less community action programs, and less standing in the community.

It seems to me the time has come to take a sharp look at radio as it is today.

What I've just said may have a familiar sound. The thought has been expressed by many. I said it on this platform 4 years ago.

In those 4 years what has happened? The networks faded to where evening network service has practically disappeared.

Today, with over 3,500 commercial radio stations on the air, even the network-owned stations—once called the flagship or powerhouse stations—are turning into independent operations. And just as the independents now dominate radio, just so do music and news now dominate the independents.

Don't take my word for it. I quote from a definitive handbook, based on actual station logs, and released this month by B.B.D. & O., "there has been a basic change in radio programing since 1954. Music and news formats have risen to complete dominance. Almost 75 to 80 percent of the programing of most independent stations is now composed of music and news."

In my opinion the music and news format is not the best vehicle for "Accomplishing the American Goal Through Radio."

There are as many ways of reaching the American goal as there are people sitting here today. These are no clear-cut directions for what the broadcaster should do to reach that goal.

But there are some roads that radio should not be traveling.

Let's look at the Kennedy-Nixon debates; a notable first in modern political history. These were created and produced by the broadcasters. Did every station carry them?

They did not. According to an FCC report to Congress, 35 independent TV stations in major cities and 10 network affiliates did not carry the great campaign debates. In radio the first debate was carried by 851 stations, the fourth by only 800 network affiliates, and not carried by 300 affiliates. But among the 2,500 nonaffiliates only 45 carried this unprecedented and important series. Obviously radio ran into a detour on that road.

Let's look at the subject of political broadcasting. Before the last presidential election the U.S. Senate held hearings on and finally amended section 315 to make the presidential debates possible. The U.S. Supreme Court rendered a decision, and Commissioner Ford, then Chairman of the FCC, spoke out on the need for making time available during political campaigns.

This matter of political broadcasts was serious enough for the Senate to ask the FCC to send each licensee a questionnaire, to determine their broadcasting policy. Certainly that should have alerted the radio station operators to the intent of the law. But it didn't. Many, if not the majority just wouldn't make time—other than spots available, for local or national candidates.

Here again radio was on the wrong road. Not because of political prejudice; of that I am certain, but because these programs did not fit station policy—the policy of music and news, the policy of no talk.

Finally, let's look at the recent presidential press conference broadcasts. For years radio and television had asked for equal treatment with the press in covering municipal, State, and Federal news.

President Kennedy, faced with many crucial national and international problems, which required a knowledge and understanding of the public, made precedent by permitting the presidential press conference to be broadcast live.

Logically we might assume that this coverage would be given maximum distribution. Instead we find President Kennedy's press secretary, Pierre Salinger, only last week, telling broadcasters that the White House is getting mail complaining that local stations no longer carry the press conferences. Mr. Salinger said: "I have a feeling the people who talk about overexposure of the President are falling back into show-business terms. They're talking maybe about overexposing a juggler, or a comic."

There again radio broadcasting trapped itself on a dead end street.

Who gave the broadcaster the right to decide that the people do not want to hear the great debates or local politics, or the Presidential press conferences? Who gave any broadcaster the right to decide that the people want only music and news?

Who had the right in Atlanta, Ga., and in other cities, to decide that the people did not want to hear the Metropolitan Opera broadcasts? They were strong enough—in enough towns—to keep CBS from being able to deliver enough affiliates to keep the opera on the CBS network. Yet enough listeners really wanted to hear the opera so that a specially tailored network had to be provided.

The end result of this policy of music and news and no talk is a generation who never heard of the "Town Hall of the Air," or the "American School of the Air." To this lost generation radio offers no choice unless they turn to FM.

The newspapers, bad as some of them may be, offer a choice; a choice of the news or comics or columnists. The reader of magazines has a choice, and so do the readers of pocket books. Even the hi-fi fan has a choice in the records he may buy. Only the radio listener has little choice.

The music and news formula changed the standard of good radio news programing, so that the background news program is now the exception; and the news bulletin, once the exception, is now the standard.

Somebody pulled the plug on public service programing.

The time has come for all broadcasters to face reality. It is time for radio to realize that television is no longer a threat. Radio has learned to live with television—and lived well. Radio can no longer excuse its program deficiencies by leaning on the crutch of television.

It is time for radio either to live up to the law or to ask that the law be changed. And the law for the broadcaster is the Communications Act of 1934. That Communications Act sets the rules under which the broadcaster operates. And that Communications Act didn't just happen; it wasn't born over night. Congress spent years debating the kind of broadcasting system the country should have.

Congress argued about having Government radio like the BBC; they discussed putting a ceiling on profits; some favored a reservation of time for noncommercial public service programs. Herbert Hoover, then Secretary of Commerce, suggested it be 25 percent of broadcast time. And Congress finally decided on our present system of commercial broadcasting with the conviction that the American businessman could be entrusted to operate both for profit and in the public interest.

The basic rules in the Communications Act of 1934 have not changed. Times have changed; people have changed; values have changed. No one changed the rules, but the emphasis has shifted from performance to profit.

It was inevitable therefore that programing would change to music and news and no talk. This is the modern-day formula for success in radio—a formula for greater profit.

The great majority in our industry mean well, and all want to keep their licenses. But there are blind spots in some of the most unexpected places in broadcasting.

Many of the music and news stations are owned by newspapers and magazines; others by leading citizens, corporations, and nonprofit organizations. All of them are highly respected for their public service in everything but their radio operations. Perhaps they don't even realize that they are contributing to the delinquency of broadcasting.

Caught in this quicksand of a quick buck are those broadcasters that are aware of, and try to measure up to their public interest obligations. But how long can we expect so few to carry the burden for so many?

The news and music stations are not looking ahead—are not keeping an open eye and mind on the demands of our time and do not even seem to be aware of what the FCC is doing. Indeed, the promotional efforts of some so-called independent broadcasters to create a favorable image without doing anything about their noisy programing is not so much of an image as a mirage and will fool no one.

Nine months ago, July 29, 1960, the FCC, after extensive hearings, issued a most significant Report and Statement of Policy in programing. That statement listed 14 major points which it declared essential to the public interest needs of a community. Yet there was not a ripple along radio row—not a change in programing format.

Recently the Commission served notice of its interest and concern in the promises of a licensee and how those promises stack up after the licensee gets on the air. Again there was little reaction in the trade, and no change in programing format.

To continue programing music and news only in the face of the FCC Report and Statement of Policy can only be explained by blindness or lack of information.

The promise versus performance hearings which the Commission has scheduled will bring the programing issue to a head. But it is inevitable that there will be long and involved court action wihch will take a great deal of time.

And time is now more precious than ever before for all America.

Therefore I respectfully suggest that a great deal can be gained if the Commission and the broadcasters jointly shall assemble for a national goals conference to examine and evaluate 1961 radio and the 1934 Communications Act. Such a conference will benefit the broadcaster, the public, and the Commission. The conference could:

(a) Review the original intent of the Communications Act of 1934.

(b) Define public service convenience and necessity.

(c) Examine present public service techniques; is the spot announcement adequate? Is it equal to a program?

(d) Shall there be a minimum on public service—how shall it be measured; by minutes, by number, by dollars expended?

Such a conference could conceivably determine that 1961 radio requires revision of the 1934 Communications Act.

But most important of all, such a conference, would result in guideposts that everyone in the industry would understand and recognize and follow.

We live in a time of confusion and danger. The American public needs to be informed, not tranquilized. The age of complacency, to which the communication media has contributed, must come to an end, for the complacent man is no match for the Communist.

This industry can—and must—fulfill its responsibility not only to communicate but to inform, not only to entertain but to educate.

The first step, in my humble opinion, is to end the confusion over public service broadcasting, and restore radio to its rightful role as the key medium of communication in America.

Warren Brock's Dream: To Make Desert Bloom for Mankind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to know for several years a very dedicated American, who has contributed a substantial amount of his time, energy, and money to the improvement of our whole agricultural system. His work, particularly in the Imperial Valley of California, has been most significant. A recent article in the Los Angeles Times of April 23, 1961, sets forth a few of his accomplishments.

Mr. Speaker, Warren Brock is a humble and dedicated farmer. It gives me a great deal of pleasure to include herewith in these remarks the published news story so that all America may have the benefit of his unselfish example. The article follows:

WARREN BROCK'S DREAM: TO MAKE DESERT AREA BLOOM FOR MANKIND

(By Norris Leap)

EL CENTRO.—In Los Angeles a banker said "Warren Brock is an El Centro farmer, one of the big ones. He is the significant man in desert agriculture."

A reporter said, "Warren Brock is a visionary as starry-eyed as a poet and as practical as a plumber. He has looked at tomorrow and he is getting ready for it. It is costing him a fortune; and it is a tomorrow so far away he will be an easy 70 before he sees much of it; and he is 44 now. It is all wacky and wonderful. The way I see him, he is a giant."

In the Barbara Worth Hotel here a man said, "Sure, I know Warren Brock. Everyone in El Centro knows Warren. He is a little guy. Wears glasses. I will point him out."

When he turned up, Warren Brock was not a little guy, but neither did he look like a giant, any way you saw him. Not at first.

But if what counts is what is in a man's heart and in his dreams, then Warren Brock stands 12 feet tall.

Actually, he is 5 feet 10 inches, but he looks smaller because he weighs only 145. He does wear glasses, and there is nothing about him of the horny-handed son of the soil. He even lacks a farmer's tan. At first meeting he looks like the Methodist church official he is.

"The story seems to be," the questioning started, "that you are one of El Centro's millionaire farmers and that you are spending a fortune going around the world trying to find new crops for the desert."

"Oh," he said, "I hope you will not think I am one of those."

The "those" were the millionaire farmers. He said he wasn't one, but admitted with his diffident grin that it would be nice to be one.

He said he is president of Brock Ranches, Inc., that the company owns only 600 acres and leases another 3,900, including 500 in Mexico.

His diffidence masks strength, for only the strong survive in his kind of Imperial Valley operation. Actually, he is nationally respected as a farmer—the new-type-everything-mechanized farmer who grows, processes, packs, and ships his products.

With that kind of farmer, every season is a gamble that makes the Las Vegas plungers look like pikers. It's gambling at which Warren Brock is good because he has spent his life training for it and working at it.

BIG GAMBLE, BIG DREAM

However, the gamble that for a dozen years has held his imagination captive is his big dream. He told about it in his hesitant, almost bashful way.

It starts with the day not far off when this country will be teeming with countless new millions of people. They will need more of the things the desert grows, more of the things that can be trained to grow in the desert and more desertland suitable for the growing.

And that is his dream and his project.

You can say it too fast to get its meaning.

FOUR TRIPS AROUND WORLD

For instance, since 1948 he has made seven trips to the world's deserts—four of them around the world because it was shorter doing it that way. He went to search out the plants and seeds that held the promise of some day becoming the substance of his dream—the new delights in fruits and vegetables that will flourish in what now are called sterile areas of desert.

The best example of that kind of desert is what is called the Imperial East Mesa.

That's where he has under lease a square mile—640 acres.

It seems it would take a visionary to dream of making the East Mesa grow anything worth harvesting.

The East Mesa is a little Sahara of endless sand dunes—often seen in movie desert shots—faintly speckled with greasewood. Sometimes it's called the Imperial's branch of hell. Summer heat hits 130°.

The mesa is 222,023 acres of Government land stretching 24 miles along the Mexican border midway between Yuma and Calexico. It reaches north 45 miles in a westering triangle that peaks out east of Salton Sea.

POOR FARMLAND

Most of the mesa has been seen as doubtful farmland, even if watered; and under standably so. Thousands of soil tests have been made. A study of them would chill the heart of even a glassy-eyed farming optimist.

To know why, you must understand something of soil classification.

On what is called the Storie scale, California's richest farmlands rate up to 100, the hopeless and impossible down to zero. That scale has 6 grades, starting with grade 1 at 80 to 100. Grade 2 is 60 to 79, meaning yields generally should be good to excellent.

At the bottom, grade 6 rates below 10. It includes sand dunes, riverwash, high alkali content, and broken land. That puts grade six about on a par, agriculturally, with the top fourth of Mount Whitney.

This is a point Warren Brock makes worth remembering.

LONG DRY SPELL

Of course, all of the mesa is as dry as it could be made by a 10,000-year thirst. Theoretically, that could be corrected. One branch of the All American Canal runs up the mesa's eastern side, the other through the southern edge.

The trouble is, much of the mesa land is as porous as a sieve. It's built that way—sand on top, then rough sand, and below that, gravel.

This general picture is so dismal agriculturally that the third of the mesa that ordinarily would be in grades 1 and 2 has been downgraded to 45 on the Storie scale—a poor grade 3.

So now we come back to Warren Brock and his big dream and what he is doing about it.

ODDITY OF NATURE

It takes us, also, into the world of botany and one of its oddities.

It seems that originally most of the fruits we eat came from the hot lands from Instanbul to the Indus—such places as Iraq, Iran, and Syria, with some from north Africa.

Of course, they evolved in frost-free climates. But their European descendants have an oddity. They grew to tolerate frost; now they demand it. This was found out in plantings here where frosts are rare.

FEW FLOURISH

"They suffered," Brock said, "from delayed foliation."

They not only refused to leaf out properly, the fruit didn't set.

Few even of citrus fruits flourish here. Grapefruit does best.

"The problem," Brock said, "is to breed fruits back to their liking for mild winters while keeping their better flavors and other qualities."

Also, they must learn to live in the East Mesa's porous soil.

All this explains Warren Brock's 13-year search of the world's other deserts. His richest hauls came from Pakistan, India, Iraq, Iran, and Syria, but he got some seeds and plants from Kenya, Egypt, the Union of South Africa, South America, New Zealand, and Australia.

From the Middle East he brought back ancient-stock peaches, apricots, plums, citrus, cherries, and grapes, and vegetables from many places.

FAVORS CITRUS TREES

Strangely, although row crops are a big item in his business, Brock's heart seems to be in creating the new fruit trees, especially citrus.

"We've found," Brock said, "that some citrus trees seem to grow better in grade 6 soils than in grades 1 and 2 soils."

Even to the eye the mesa project is startling, that square mile of patchwork green so unbelievable in all that thirst—a country so dry that overhead sprinkling loses up to 40 percent of the water to evaporation and feeder canals are concrete lined so the water won't vanish into the sand en route.

Many of the plantings those canals feed are unique.

Altogether there must be thousands of varieties of plants there in plot after plot of row after row of densely planted seedling trees and vines—pecans and peaches, apricots and plums, citrus and cherries, and all the other fruits first found in hot lands; and endless kinds of vegetables, even a golden-fleshed watermelon that was wonderfully flavored in Iran but a disappointment on the mesa.

There even are hundreds of kinds of eucalyptus from Australia, from bushes to trees, all in their babyhood and all planted in Brock's search for ornamentals and windbreaks to grow on farms of men who up to now likely never have heard of the East Mesa or Warren Brock.

All this only hints at the story, and Warren Brock will be first to deny that the story is all his.

GOVERNMENT PROPERTY

After all, its Government land and Government water, and the Imperial Irrigation District started the project with alfalfa planted on the mesa for 10 years; and scores of Government and UC agriculture specialists have done their part, a great story in itself.

What makes Warren Brock look 12 feet tall is his dream and the way he is working to make it come true, pouring time and energy and thought and his own money back into this desert land that has nourished him all his life—he was born near here, virtually in the shade of a date palm—for the benefit of generations unborn.

It seems he has no expectation of the dream ever doing anything for Warren Brock but to give him satisfaction and cost him money.

He never has told the cost of his seven trips in search of desert plants, but his mesa costs are public. In the first 18 months from November 1958, the mesa project cost him $96,705.57. The irrigation district contributed $39,544.92, all but $4,575.42 of that for water and power.

He expects his long-range dream to mature with citrus groves on the mesa under full commercial production in 1986. He'll be 70. And he doesn't expect to own an inch of the land. If and when the huge mesa is opened to entry, he will be ineligible, for veterans will get first shot at the land, and he's not a veteran.

SONS WON'T BENEFIT

Neither does he expect any of his three sons to benefit.

"The two oldest, Don and Jim, are interested in agriculture," he said, "but not so much in production as in the science end. Don is 19 and a sophomore at Davis."

So why does Warren Brock spend his time and his money on something that can bring him no profit in money or wealth? His fondest hope for the mesa project is that it will break even on costs about 1971. But even then, if it should pay a profit, his contract won't permit him to offset past losses with any profits he might make.

The question of why was asked him.

"Well," he said, "the country is going to need more of what we can grow here.

That's one way, it seems, of expressing single-minded, relentless pursuit of a dream.

Perhaps that's the way men speak who look 12 feet tall. It's hard to say. It's hard to find enough of them to be able to judge.

What Can I Do for My Country?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy in his inaugural address struck a note that rang a bell in the heart of every real patriotic American when he said:

Ask not what your country can do for you. Ask rather what you can do for your country.

Mr. Rogers C. Dunn, of the Dunn survey, has pointed out a very definite way in which President Kennedy's appeal can be carried out. I submit his suggestion to my colleagues and to the country for earnest consideration:

WHAT 41 MILLION EMPLOYEES AND THEIR EMPLOYERS CAN DO FOR THEIR COUNTRY

President Kennedy has made a stimulating appeal for all Americans to think in terms of—what can I do for my country, rather than what can my country do for me. This applies equally to those who favor and those who oppose a welfare-socialist state. It applies to those who favor and those who oppose spendthrift administrations, bigger national debt, stifling or punitive taxes.

Those who seek to serve their country by opposing the welfare-socialist movement, bigger Government expenditures, etc., have overlooked the opportunity to gain the support of about 41 million men and women. For this number is required to support the welfare-socialist movement without an acute awareness of the personal and family sacrifices imposed upon themselves.

Most Americans like the idea of helping others and themselves, particularly when they don't have to dig into their own sock to pay for it. When they have to dig for the cash people consider: Is this necessary? Is it reasonable and desirable to spend this for myself, my family, my community, my country? Is it better to restrain my generous impulse or leave my family demoralized and battling over the burdens of heavy debt?

But when it comes to the Federal Government spending the people's money for welfare-socialist policies, "nice ideas," or for bureaucracy itself, there is only a small restraining hand by the people. Because only 5 million persons are acutely aware of the personal and family sacrifices which must be made to pay for the nice ideas and bigger government promoted by political administrations.

Five million people is 7 percent of the number who voted for President in 1960. But 41 million people, without an awareness of personal sacrifice, is 60 percent of the number who voted for President in 1960 (68 million votes).

This is license under which both Republican and Democratic administrations have built and extended welfare-socialist policies, bigger spending, bigger debt, and bigger government—without fear of strong public reprisal. (The Republican administration increased domestic civilian expenditures over 80 percent in the 8 years of 1953–60. This does not include the increases in military and foreign expenditures.)

THE 41 AND 5 MILLION

The 5 million people who have an acute daily awareness of the personal and family sacrifices required to support the welfare-socialist movement are those who dig into their own pocket to pay their personal Federal income tax directly to the Government. They paid $7.4 billion in 1958 (last available figure).

The 41 million people who have little or no acute awareness of personal and family sacrifices required to support the welfare-socialist movement are those whose Federal income tax is, by law, withheld from their pay by their employer. They paid $27 billion, or 78 percent, of the total personal income tax.

To illustrate. John Smith gets a job paying $100 a week. Smith's income tax rate is 20 percent. His employer deducts the $20 tax and Smith gets $80 each week. To Smith, his family, his neighbors, his creditors, $80 a week is his income. He loses all practical interest in the $20 a week he never receives and, never having been his money, why should he voice objection to its use for any nice idea from Washington?

The power of government to invisibly pick the pockets of a people gives government the power to be master of the people.

Our two party system of government can afford the people a means to control their government, but it has not. For national leaders of both parties have embraced the same policies and led toward the same destination, affording only a partisan difference as to speed.

A GREAT NEW VOICE

The 41 million employees and their employers can serve this country by making each one constantly aware that out of his pocket and through his family sacrifices comes the money to pay for every necessary or nice idea out of Washington, plus all other government activities.

To this end, attention is called to the following simple formula which could be adopted by each employer, or with variations which best suited each employer and his employees:

The employer gives John Smith a job paying $100 a week. The first, second, and third week of each month Smith is paid his full earnings of $100. The fourth week the employer sets aside the money required for Smith's income tax and pays Smith what is left over. If Smith's tax rate is 20 percent, the employer withholds Smith's $80 tax money and pays Smith the balance of $20.

Smith, his employer, the Government, lose no money. But 41 million more people will be constantly aware that they are sacrificing to pay the cost of government. We have no doubt that political leaders would feel a vast new voice on such subjects as giveaway and welfare-socialist policies, and the free-wheeling expenditures of do-gooders and bureaucracy.

We believe every President would welcome such a voice.

How Not To Win Friends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial in today's Wall Street Journal indicates how consistently the Kennedy administration tries to travel, on the same horse, in two different directions. The minority report on the legislation reducing the tourist customs allowance, which I signed, is squarely to the point:

WELCOME MAT AND WET BLANKET

To press its attack on the U.S. international payments deficit, the administration expects to get a pair of weapons from Congress: One bill would create a tourist-information agency within the Commerce Department, another would reduce from $500 to $100 the amount of duty-free goods American tourists may bring home from abroad.

We doubt these measures will have much effect on the payments deficit, but attracting foreign tourists to this country is a sensible idea on its own. Compared to that of foreign governments and airlines, our Government and private drum-beating for tourism has been inaudible.

But a lack of advertising isn't the only cause of the sluggish tourist traffic here. Until quite recently, the U.S. Government's entry requirements for foreign visitors were notable for complexity and bureaucratic stupidity. (Tell us, young lady, are you seeking a visa in order to come here for immoral purposes?) Beyond that, some foreign governments remain remarkably stingy in the travel allowances permitted their citizens. A Frenchman, for example, gets an annual allowance to $300 to spend abroad; an Englishman $700.

Hence, while travel-promotion may get results, even better ones might be produced by trying to persuade friendly governments to bring travel regulations into line with their citizens' present prosperity. But how persuasive can our argument be when Washington is poised to clamp a new and unnecessary customs control on American spending abroad? Chopping the tourist customs allowance by four-fifths will mean reduced income and lost jobs in those countries which rely heavily on the American trade.

Laying out a shiny welcome mat on these shores could make us friends and money. But it won't work very well if we're also throwing a wet blanket on the business of those we're trying to woo.

Speech Delivered by Alfred E. Santangelo, of New York, Before the American Committee on Italian Migration in New Haven, Conn., May 15, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, on May 15, I had the pleasure of welcoming our colleague from New York, Congressman ALFRED E. SANTANGELO, to my district in Connecticut. Representative SANTANGELO spoke at a meeting of the American Committee on Italian Migration at the Waverly Inn in Cheshire. In commending his speech to the attention of our colleagues, I respectfully ask that they examine Mr. SANTANGELO's bill, H.R. 37, and my own bill, H.R. 5201; both of these measures provide for greatly needed changes in our basic immigration law. Congressman SANTANGELO's talk follows:

My colleague, ROBERT GIAIMO, thank you for such a glowing introduction. Reverend Fathers, Lt. Gov. Anthony Armentano, Mayor Dick Lee, Vice Consul, Dr. Emanuele Scammacca De Murgo, Mr. Ciro Paolella, Judge Alfred Toscano, Mr. William De Tullio, distinguished guests on the dais, members of the American Committee on Italian Migration, Connecticut Italian Yankees, I am pleased to visit your fair city of New Haven to discuss a subject which is of vital importance, not only to you, but to all America. On May 24, 1957, I delivered a speech in Congress which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under the heading, "How Long Quotas?" As a consequence, one of the readers, named Oscar Dam from Seattle, Wash., wrote to me criticizing me for my position on immigration and stated that we should keep out the southern Europeans, especially the Italians, the Greeks and the Spaniards, that the native-born Americans of many generations do not want the immigration law changed. He stated further that his family had come to America in the 17th century and his ancestors had helped to develop the wilderness of America. One of his forebears was killed by Indians on a trek to California. He proudly stated that the Anglo-Saxon people had made this country great and not only must we keep out the southern Europeans, and especially the Italians, but also we should deport many who are here. I told him that he did not understand the contribution which the Catholics, the Spanish, the French, the Poles, the Hungarians and other ethnic groups have made to the development and growth of this country and the sacrifices that they have made to preserve its freedom and liberties.

I answered him and said that if the restricted immigration laws were in effect when his forebears came to America, I was certain that the whole Dam family would have been excluded. The attitude of Mr. Dam is shared by many people in the United States. If we take as a measuring rod the number of appointments of persons of Italian ancestry to high Cabinet office, one can infer that those in control of our Government today believe that the Italians have just gotten off the boat.

Yes, my friends, people forget that there was no restricted immigration law before March 3, 1875. If this country in its beginning had a restricted immigration law, Giovanni Cabot would not have been permitted to plant the Union Jack on American soil; Francis Vigo would not have been permitted to explore the Northwest with Rogers and Clark and could not have helped George Washington, after the American Revolution, with the Northwest Indians; 16 Venetians would not have built the first glass works in Jamestown, Va., in 1622; 300 Piedmontesi would not have settled in New Castle, Pa. at the invitation of the Dutch; Alfonso Tonti would not have founded the city of Detroit, and his daughter would not have been the first white woman to be born in that city; 50 Italians would not have gone to Georgia to set up the mulberry plantations and construct a silk factory; William Paca would not have signed the Declaration of Independence and then become the third Governor of Maryland; Caesar Alberti would not have planted his roots and trees in Brooklyn, N.Y.; and in your own State of Connecticut, they would not have had men like Deodati, Rossetti from Hartford, and Benzi, who came in the early 18th century.

We have mentioned only persons who were immigrants in the strict sense of the word. We do not speak of men like Christopher Columbus who discovered America; nor do we speak of Amerigo Vespucci, after whom this continent is named; nor of Giovanni da Verrazano, who discovered the Hudson River. They were explorers who came here but did not settle here. Not only did persons of Italian origin help to discover and explore America, but they helped in its early development in colonial times, and also in its development throughout the country in its early years.

From 1700 until the beginning of the 20th century, artists and craftsmen migrated to this land from Italy. The first decade of the 20th century show the peak of this migration. At that point in time, the Italian peasant farmer began to outnumber the craftsman. They were poor indeed and were attracted to this land of opportunity, and when they came to America, they could qualify only for the most menial and humblest kind of labor—ditch digging, hod carrying, carpentry, and similar occupations.

Despite this humility and menial toil, within one generation the Italian immigrant and his offspring has repaid America for the opportunity more than a thousandfold by his contribution to the social, cultural, and economic development of our land and also in the preservation of its institutions and liberty.

Millions of people view with pleasure the beauty and the artistry of Constantine Brumidi on the frescoes in the rotunda of the U.S. Capitol. Arturo Toscanini, Enrico Caruso, Tommaso Salvini, Ernesto Rossi, gave pleasure to opera lovers throughout the land. When war came, 1,400,000 boys in World War II joined the services in defense of our country, and while newspapermen may assert that many Italian-Americans belong to the "big M," we can say with pride and with truthfulness that no one of the 1,400,000 servicemen belonged to the "big C" (communism).

During the war there were many heroes. We proudly recall the exploits of John Basilone, of Raritan, N.J., the country's only two-time Medal of Honor winner. We rejoice at the aerial exploits of Don Gentile, known as the eagle of the skies. We take pride in the valor of a New York State Senator, Peter Dalessandro, who earned the Congressional Medal of Honor, two silver stars, and the Distinguished Service Cross. Many others could be mentioned, such as Gino Merlo, Bianchi, and Bangor, etc.

Persons of Italian ancestry have made their contribution, and we will not permit any Oscar Dam or a Walter Winchell to denigrate, blacken, or destroy the reputations of Americans of Italian origin or stereotype our people as gangsters.

The first restrictive legislation excluding entry into the United States of certain classes of immigrants was the act of March 3, 1875. On August 3, 1882, further legislation was passed which excluded paupers and criminals. That same year saw the enactment of the first Chinese exclusion law which remained in effect until its repeal in 1943.

Thereafter, other attempts were made to curb immigration, but it was not until 1917 when to quiet the demands for restrictive and selective legislation that a law was passed on February 5, which codified and grouped together all laws affecting immigration which has previously been in effect.

The post period of World War I witnessed a radical change in our national immigration policies. The result was that on May 19, 1921 our country effected a change to a policy which restricted the number of imgrants who could enter. It limited the number of any particular nationality to 3 percent of foreign-born persons of that nationality who lived here in the year 1910. This, in effect, permitted about 350,000 immigrants to come here who originated mostly from northern and western Europe.

On May 26, 1924, further legislation was passed which changed both the base census year and the method of calculation. It was then changed to be based upon the 1890 census and the rate was lowered to 2 percent. Under this law until 1929, the total quota became 164,600.

The 1924 act was a farreaching change during that quarter century in that it restricted any change in the basic composition of the American makeup. Thus these two basic acts—of 1917 and 1924—qualitatively and quantitatively operated to regulate the flow of immigration to this country.

In 1952, the Immigration and Nationality Act was enacted. This—the McCarran-Walter Act—pooled together all existing laws and regulations dealing with immigration and to this day it is the law which governs the immigrant. Under current law the total quota is 154,887 and the quotas are allocated to each area on the basis of one-sixth of 1 percent of the number of such nationals in the United States in 1920.

These laws are based on the absolute principle of national origin. The theory of national origin upon which the allotments of immigration quotas is based was developed in the early part of the 20th century when, following World War I, this country dug its head into the sands of isolationism with its xenophobic fear of aliens who were not of Anglo-Saxon stock. Northern Europe was favored over southern Europe, the Nordic races above the Slavic and Mediterranean peoples.

We see that the whole pattern of the national origins fabric has been shredded since the 1924 act. We have tried to put the cloth together by enacting special refugee legislation, by enacting special nonquota legislation relating to the principle of reuniting of families and by nonquota immigration from the western hemisphere. The national origins theory has lost all its practical meaning. It stands as an indictment not only as against American tradition, but also American logic. It mocks our Declaration of Independence and statement that all men are created equal. Special legislation was enacted for refugees, escapees, spouses, etc. who came from such countries as Cuba, Italy, Spain, Poland, Czechoslovakia, all countries whose quotas, under the law, are severely restricted. While our immigration laws close the front door, the back door is left wide open. We know, too, that much immigration from the western hemisphere, particularly from Canada, is not of Nordic origin. Mexican nationals come into the United States by the hundreds of thousands under a bracero program, under a special program, or as resident aliens. Many people who fled persecution in the last 20 years have settled in Canada, Brazil, Argentina, and their children as native-born citizens in the western hemisphere enter the United States without regard for quota allotments. Puerto Ricans, as well as Mexicans, have entered in large numbers. The spirit which Emma Lazarus captured in her stirring words should be repeated despite the fact that in practice the Statute of Liberty does not offer a wide open door to democracy. I quote her words:

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost, to me
I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

Some of us in Congress, including your Representatives, ROBERT GIAIMO and EMILIO DADDARIO, have fought together for a realistic immigration law. In the midst of the last presidential campaign, on September 20, 1960, I proposed a four-point program, which in many respects conforms to the program which your organization has been advocating for a long time. I proposed at that time four points:

1. That the United States update the quota based on 1950 figures instead of 1920 figures.

2. A redistribution and a reallocation of the unused quotas which annually total about 55,000.

3. That the Attorney General be authorized to admit 60,000 refugees.

4. A reuniting of families by converting the preferential quotas to a nonquota status.

Both presidential candidates responded. On October 8, 1960, President John F. Kennedy, despite the demands of his campaign, replied to my solicitation. For his comments on my proposals, I quote in part from the President's reply:

"I believe that the most important immediate objective of immigration reform is the reuniting of families. There are many new citizens in America whose immediate families are in other lands, waiting patiently to join them. In countries which oversubscribe their quotas, they have been waiting for many years. We have a social obligation to bring these families together. For this purpose, I have suggested that nonquota status be granted to parents, minor children, and spouses of citizens and resident aliens, provided they are otherwise eligible under the law.

"I believe that each of the other proposals you set forth in your letter also provides a sound basis for legislative action. Updating our present quotas, and pooling unused quotas, are sound methods of assuring that present authorizations are used up in an equitable manner. A flexible formula for admission of refugees should be devised so that our country can act more speedily in meeting our share of the world's responsibility to the victims of oppression. But I also feel that we should look beyond these proposals to the abolition of the national origins quota system and its replacement with a more equitable method of regulating the inflow of immigrants."

On January 3, 1961, the first day of the congressional session, I introduced H.R. 37 to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act.

No action on legislation can be taken without the support or the approval of a man who considers himself the father of the immigration law, FRANCIS WALTER. Finally, on April 13, 1961, FRANCIS WALTER introduced H.R. 6300 revising the immigration law in which he gives a little with his left hand and takes away with his right. If we complain about the insufficiency, he threatens to take away what he offers to give. The major proposal is the reallocation of the unused quotas. Congressman WALTER proposed that of the approximately 150,000 quotas, those nations which have a quota of less than 7,000 should share the unused qoutas in the proportion that the particular nation's quota bears to the total quota numbers of all countries, excluding Germany, Ireland, and Great Britain. You are aware, of course, that Germany has a quota of approximately 25,814; Great Britain, a quota of 65,361; Ireland, a quota of 17,756; and approximately 55,000 annually are unused; whereas the quotas of other countries have been mortgaged for many years to come.

These unused quotas, according to the Walter bill, shall be allocated 40 percent to those in second preference status; 30 percent to those in third preference status; and 30 percent for those in fourth preference status. This quota will vary from year to year, and the relatives who will benefit from the quota reserve include (1) parents and unmarried sons and daughters over 21 years of age of U.S. citizens, (2) spouses and unmarried sons and daughters, minors or adults, of lawfully resident aliens, and (3) married sons or daughters or brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens and their spouses, and minor children if accompanying them. Under this formula Italy will get about 2,500 more. The remainder of the Walter bill is, in my opinion, more restrictive than beneficial. Some of the provisions are designed to facilitate the deportation and denaturalization of lawfully resident aliens and naturalized citizens. Some provisions make easier the waiver of obstacles, such as sickness, TB, and other contagious diseases. There is some good to this legislation, but I believe that some of the provisions have such harmful procedures that the bad outweighs the good and one is tempted to oppose such legislation.

What has happened to the President's promise? Why has he not acted? I can understand his thinking. I believed the President when he wrote to me and I believe that he intends to carry out his promise, but we get awfully annoyed at the long wait, not only for his recommendations in the immigration field, but also in his delay in appointments of persons of Italian ancestry. For practical political reasons, I believe, the administration has not sent a message to the Congress asking for a revision of the immigration laws as was promised.

The many measures which the President has recommended relate to legislation for the improvement of the economic position of the people of the United States—the minimum wage law to increase the earning capacity of the workers of America, the aid to depressed areas, the extension of the unemployment insurance law for dependent children, the social security increases, are all designed to help a struggling people where unemployment is high and misery is rampant. The climate for opening the doors to permit a larger number of immigrants to enter our country would not sit well with a Congress or a people who claim that they cannot obtain decent wages and a good standard of living. Last week we voted and passed in the House of Representatives the Mexican national or bracero program which permits the entry of Mexican workers, approximately 400,000, to work on American farms. The paradox is that while we claim that we must keep out immigrants because there is unemployment, we permit the entry of 400,000 Mexicans because we need farmworkers throughout the Southwest and the South of our country. It might be wiser for us to revise our immigration laws to permit farmworkers from Europe who are not specialists to come to work on the farms of America which are feeding not only the 180 million people of the United States, but practically all of the peoples of underprivileged nations.

For us to maintain our image to the peoples of the world, we must have a fair and realistic immigration law. We cannot say to the people of the Mediterranean, Africa, and Asia that we are interested in your welfare and yet when they come to our doors we raise our hands and say, "Thou shalt not enter here." Our Nation had the respect of the world since 1776 because the people felt that ours was a land of opportunity, we proclaimed that all men were created equal and that we welcomed in friendship the homeless, the tempest-tossed to our shores. The Statue of Liberty, which stands high on Bedloes Island in New York, is still a magnet to the homeless and the refuge of the teeming shores of the peoples of the world. We must continue to keep its light bright, reflecting glory not only in the East but also in the West. We must give encouragement to those, who like our forefathers, have a contribution to make and we must open our doors wide once again to let democracy in.

Annual Sudeten German Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, it is quite natural for us as liberty-loving Americans to join in spirit with those who celebrate the annual Sudeten German Day in Cologne, Germany.

First of all, the over 2 million Sudeten German expellees and refugees from the stark terrors of ruthless communism have reaffirmed their dedication to the cause of freedom, democracy and peace. These ideals are more precious to us than life itself, therefore, we desire them for all people.

Second, the United States became the great nation it is largely as a result of the invaluable contributions of men, ideals, culture, and knowledge, from Europe. We all acknowledge that the Germans played a leading role with their natural scientific and technical genius, love of music, and deep religious faith.

Every American is to some degree influenced for the good by the Germany of the past. The present Chancellor, Dr. Konrad Adenauer, has given concrete evidence to the entire world that he sincerely works for a return of what was best in the past and that the lessons of history and of Germany's tragic era are not forgotten.

The free world desperately needs a strong and democratic Germany to face the evil forces in the Kremlin. We must be realistic. A new and united Germany, reborn with its prior thirst for knowledge and learning, having a democratic republic as its form of government, merits the full support of the West.

All of us fervently pray that the day is not too distant when the many enslaved people and nations under the Communist heel behind the Iron Curtain will become free, and that liberty, toleration and the right to worship God as one wishes, will be respected everywhere.

It is in that spirit that I convey my sincere greetings and good wishes to those who commemorate the Sudeten German Day.

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and

impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our National security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I request that the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

BREMERTON CAPTIVE NATIONS COUNCIL,
Bremerton, Wash., May 12, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: On behalf of the members of the Bremerton Captive Nations Council, we wish to commend you on your forthright and sincere stand against imperial Soviet colonialism as evidenced by your introduction of House Resolution 211.

The free American people are in dire need of the services which could be rendered by a Special Committee on Captive Nations. Publications of such a committee would be invaluable to organizations such as ours, which are attempting to spotlight the modern day "empire builders" lurking behind the Kremlin walls.

We shall bend every effort in support of this resolution. Again we render our sincere congratulations and eternal thanks.

With kind regards, we are,

Respectfully yours,

JAMES K. MORGAN,
Chairman.
DELMAR G. LANE, Jr.,
Vice Chairman.
RAYMOND NORTON, *Counsel.*

AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR
INDEPENDENT IDEL-URAL, INC.,
New York, N.Y., May 16, 1961.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Our organization, the American Council for Independent Idel-Ural, Inc., wholeheartedly supports Resolution 211, which you have introduced for consideration by the Congress of the United States. If this resolution is approved, and we hope that it will be, it will provide great possibilities for the United States of America to intensify its efforts in the psychological warfare against Communist world aggression.

As we all know, in the ideological struggle between democracy and communism, that is between the United States and the U.S.S.R., Soviet leaders always present themselves as the defenders of nationalism, and condemn all forms of colonialism in the areas of Asia, Africa, and South America. In doing this, the Soviet Government has established a colonial overlordship, concealed by the phraseology of socialism and the so-called international unity of the proletariat, over tens of nations, nations which have their own developed culture, intelligensia, and their own history.

The peoples of Idel-Ural, the Tatar-Bashkir people in particular, are the victims of Communist imperialism. We, Americans of Tatar-Bashkir background, just as you do, consider our Government and our legislators to have a greater moral right to come to the defense of peoples' right to self-determination, than the Soviet Government, since American democracy and American history are founded upon the principles of freedom for the individual as well as for nations. Besides this, the conscience of our Government and of our people is a clear one, since we do not attempt to create an empire for ourselves, or to force our political and social system upon other peoples.

The Soviet government is responsible for such crimes as genocide. Moslem nations such as the Crimean Tatars and several peoples of the northern Caucasus have been subjected to total deportation from their lands by the Russian Communists for the sole reason that they spoke out in favor of their national freedom.

There are people who oppose the resolution on the Captive Nations Week in general, and in particular on the ground that Idel-Ural is included in it. In doing this, they resort to all types of falsification up to and including their assertion that there is no such country on the earth. We, the escapees from Idel-Ural and political refugees from the U.S.S.R. are ready to appear before you to present all proofs necessary in order to repudiate the assertions of these critics. Today, there are six "autonomous Soviet Socialist Republics" on the territory of Idel-Ural. Three of them are Turko-Tatar the Tatar A.S.S.R., the Bashkir A.S.S.R. and the Chuvash A.S.S.R.; and the other three are Ugro-Finnish: the Mari A.S.S.R., the Udmurt A.S.S.R. and the Mordva A.S.S.R. All of them are inhabited by the indigenous population of the Idel-Ural. According to the population census of 1959, the Tatars alone comprise 5 million and they are among the five most numerous peoples of the U.S.S.R.

The Turko-Tatars call their country Idel-Ural. Idel is the Turko-Tatar name for the Volga River. Until their inclusion in the Russian Empire, the Turko-Tatars had their sovereign states in this territory. From the 5th to the 13th century, there existed the state of "Bulgar." The Kazan state existed there until the middle of the 16th century. During the period of the 1917 revolution, the Turko-Tatars proclaimed their own democratic state called Idel-Ural. The preceeding information may be found on page 646 of the 1956 edition of the Great Soviet Encyclopedia, volume 41. The same page contains the information that the Idel-Ural territory was conquered by the Red army, dispatched from Moscow. The Idel-Ural (Tatar A.S.S.R. and the Bashkir A.S.S.R.) is today the primary center of oil drilling operations, and has been dubbed "The Second Baku." The Tatar-Bashkir people, the indigenous population of Ideal-Ural, is one of the culturaly strongest parts of the Moslem and Turkish world. If the Russian people demand freedom for themselves, which we would wish for them to achieve, then the Tatar-Bashkir and Ugro-Finn peoples have an equal right to do the same. They are not only deprived of their individual rights and freedoms, but the Communists have also deprived them of their national rights of free development as nations.

The resolution on the Captive Nations Week has raised the prestige of the United States in the eyes of the captive and freedom-loving nations. Your resolution, Congressman FLOOD, gives new means and possibilities to the United States of America in its struggle against Communist tyranny, the tyranny which chameleon-like adapts to the ever changing conditions of contemporary life.

Sincerely,

RAIS DALMAS,
Chairman.

CHEVERLY, MD., *May 11, 1961.*

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: As a former resident of Buffalo, N.Y., with its large population of Polish descent, and as a descendant of people who left their mother country due to oppression, I read with great interest and heartily approve your resolution, H. Res. 211 which you submitted to the Committee on Rules. Needless to say, your representing the many people of Polish origin living in and around Wilkes-Barre acquainted you well with their feelings regarding the captivity of the nation from which their heritage and cultural background sprang. Your work on the Committee To Investigate the Katyn Massacre was very much appreciated by those of us who were interested in the truth.

As the years slip by, the people are yet inured to the problems besetting the various nations of the world. It is only thru the services of such committees as the House Un-American Activities Committee and in the future the Special Committee on Captive Nations that the citizenry can be constantly made aware of the insidious ways of the Communists. The captive nations can and do gain strength to continue with their struggle when they read and hear of measures such as yours.

I wish to thank and congratulate you upon the sponsorship of such a worthwhile measure.

Very truly yours,

STEPHEN J. KOSCIANSKI.

BOSTON, MASS., *May 11, 1961.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
U.S. House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

SIR: I wish to take this opportunity to thank you for the material concerning your proposed House captive nations resolution and committee.

May I again congratulate you and other Members of the Congress for their support.

With best wishes, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

SAMUEL RYDER.

AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR
CROATIAN MIGRATION, INC.,
Cleveland, Ohio, May 8, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The American Society for Croatian Migration, Inc. enthusiastically supports House Resolution 211 which you have submitted to the House of Representatives on March 8. We would further urge that you include the Croatian nation as a captive nation since the totalitarian imperialism of Belgrade communism is no different than that of Moscow communism.

According to statistics, fully 80 percent of new European refugees under the Mandate of the High Commissioner for Political Refugees are from the multi-national state of Tito's Yugoslavia, and fully 80 percent of these "Yugoslav" refugees are of Croatian origin. Judging from the figures, then, the Croatian nation is the most persecuted nation in Europe under Communist domination because of the Croatian peoples opposition to both godless communism and Yugoslav imperialism; yet, the American public never hears about this. We hold that it is time the American people became acquainted with the facts, and it is only through sincere, dedicated public officials like yourself that this will ultimately come about.

May God bless you in your noble, patriotic endeavors.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH V. BOSILJEVIC,
President.

LONG ISLAND STAMP & STATIONERY,
Jamaica, N.Y., May 15, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Through a discussion with business associates I learned of your resolution calling for the establishment of a special permanent Committee on Captive Nations in Congress. I was so impressed with its importance that I have written Hon. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN, Congressman of my district, requesting he support your resolution.

I would also like to take this opportunity to compliment you on your initiative for introducing the resolution.

With best wishes for the future, I remain,
Respectfully yours,

WALTER KLAWSNIK.

Address by Berl I. Bernhard, Staff Director-Designate, Commission on Civil Rights, at American Veterans Committee Convention, May 20, 1961, New York, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of an excellent address that was delivered on May 20, 1961, in New York City at the American veterans committee convention by the able staff director-designate of the Commission on Civil Rights, Berl I. Bernhard.

Mr. Bernhard's remarks deal particularly with the problems of racial segregation in housing and I commend what he has to say to the attention of Members of Congress.

The text of the address follows:

REMARKS BY BERL I. BERNHARD, STAFF DIRECTOR-DESIGNATE, COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS AT BANQUET SESSION, AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE CONVENTION, MAY 20, 1961, PARK SHERATON HOTEL, NEW YORK, N.Y.

On Law Day, May 6, the President stated "Law is the strongest link between man and freedom." The Commission on Civil Rights was assigned by the Congress in 1957 to investigate deprivations of the right to vote because of race, color, religion, or national origin, and to study problems of equal protection of the laws. It forges part of this link.

The fiery end of the freedom ride in Alabama, just this week makes it all the more important to reiterate that ours is a government by law, not by men, and this is something for which we should be thankful; that ours is a land where the concept of the rule of law is held in highest regard, and this too is something for which we should be thankful. Above all, ours is a heritage of law and order, and for this we should be exceedingly thankful.

As the American Veterans Committee know only too well, however, the full measure of citizenship, under law, is not available equally, at times is restricted artificially, and denied arbitrarily. To the extent that this is so, to the extent that law is not applied uniformly, the link between man and freedom is weakened.

"WHEN THE RIGHTS OF ONE ARE THREATENED * * *"

Dr. Hannah, chairman of our commission and president of Michigan State University, put it a little differently. He stated: "when the rights of one are threatened, the rights of none are safe. In time, our people will come to believe as one that when a synagogue is bombed, no Christian church is safe; that when one public school is bombed, no school is steady on its foundations; that when one man is lynched, the security of each of us is diminished by so much; that when one man is denied the right to vote, our own freedom of decision is compromised."

When Congress established the Commission in 1957 as part of the first civil rights bill since 1875, it was seeking to find ways and means of bringing into closer harmony our precepts of equality and our everyday performance. Congress wanted facts—not dissertations on morality or on world affairs. Congress wanted a fair and objective evaluation of the facts as found. It wanted guidelines for remedial action.

I have long felt, however, that in establishing the Commission, Congress did more than come to grips with our most thorny domestic problem. It reinforced a national commitment to self-criticism. It adhered to the tradition that nothing commands higher loyalty from men than the truth; that the only way in which fallible men and an imperfect society will improve is where the process of inquiry remains open—where progress is bottomed on hard facts, painstakingly gained, and courageously faced.

PROGRESS CONSIDERABLE

As you know, from the generous treatment accorded the Commission's findings by the press, the Commission issued a major report in September of 1959 covering the fields of voting, public education and public housing. In January of 1961, it issued a report on public higher education. These reports reflect the disparity between our promises and performance in the civil rights field. They reflect, likewise, the extent of progress made, which is considerable.

I have observed some tendency among some civil rights advocates to shun or ignore progress when it is made. The fear must be that concentrating on progress will devitalize the drive for even more progress. There may be a certain truth in this. But I maintain that advances made, intelligently documented, help to demonstrate what can be done and afford helpful lessons for future action.

Our own reports have not received uniform approbation. Some have been dismayed at the breadth of the existing gap between our national proclamations and our deeds. Others felt that the reports reflected an unhealthy penchant for self-criticism; that it held us up to world consure unnecessarily, and that it played into the hands of our detractors at a time when we could least afford it. I am satisfied that what America showed to the world was honesty and a willingness to proclaim: "We have problems, we are facing them, we will solve them. You can see the entire process and you may judge us accordingly." Beyond that, I believe America was saying to the world: "We know, and we know you know, that progress does not come by self-hypnosis. It comes by honestly facing up to reality."

VOTING RIGHTS

In September of 1959, when the Congress determined to extend life of the Commission for 2 more years, the subject areas covered in our first report were reevaluated. Once again the Commission tackled voting deprivations—I might add with vigor. The Commissioners have been unanimous in their conviction that the right to vote is the cornerstone of the Republic and the key to all other civil rights—that if democracy is a powerful idea, the power emanates from its healthy respect for the desire of every man to share in his own rule. Beyond this the Commission has felt to a man that the existence of a free and unfettered electorate speaks to the deepest and most pervasive aspirations of man. In its absence, the word democracy is a masquerade for the real thing. Our findings and recommendations in voting will constitute a major portion of our report to the President and the Congress, due in September of this year. Just last week we concluded a major voting hearing in Louisiana.

Additionally, the Commission determined that the problems arising out ofthe Supreme Court ruling of 1954 have not been resolved. We have continued to study how the desegregation ruling is in fact being implemented. We hope to be in a positon to make a detailed status report and provide some insight as to why there have been successes and failures. Without giving way to distortions of over-optimism, progress, albet limited, is being made. To the extent that the stories of New Orleans and New Rochelle have captured the public's attention, they tend to overshadow significant advances made in such cities as Louisville, Nashville, Baltimore, Charleston, W. Va., and San Antonia, Tex.

SCHOOLS IN NEW YORK CITY

New York City, itself, has done an effective job in seeking to alleviate the racial and ethnic concentrations in its schools through rezoning of school attendance areas and its free transfer policies. The steady increase in the number of Negro and Puerto Rican pupils is making the city's task one of continuing difficulty. Nevertheless, it is anticipated that the expansion of the open enrollment program next fall will show beneficial results.

Many of you are familiar with the Higher Horizons program in New York City which, I understand, now includes 54 elementary schools and 13 junior high schools. It is a notable attempt to provide an equal educational opportunity for socially and economically deprived children, most of whom are members of a racial or ethnic minority. It has been truly said that "we have to do a lot more for some children just to give them the same chance to learn."

It is heartening, too, that 10 other great cities of the North and West have undertaken programs similar in purpose to the New York Higher Horizons program.

RACIAL SEGREGATION IN THE NORTH

These efforts, laudable though they may be, are miniscule compared with the existing problem. It is common knowledge that racially segregated schools exist in all of the great cities of the North and West where large concentrations of Negroes and other minorities are found. These schools are overcrowded, often to the point of double shifts. Other schools in the same system may have empty classrooms. Additionally, these schools serving minority groups often are staffed by inexperienced or insufficiently trained teachers. The net result is an inferior second-class education. School boards by inaction can create problems of unequal educational opportunity in the North and the West as well as in the South.

There is a paradox here. In the South segregation of schools was established and maintained by State law. For this reason it was reached directly by the Brown case which held that compulsory racial segregation in public schools was of itself a denial of equal protection of the laws. All provisions of Federal, State, or local law requiring or permitting such discrimination were struck down. Thus, in the South, the separateness of schools created by State action, not the equality of these separate schools was at issue. This, of course, requires proof merely of official State action to maintain segregation. By contrast, in the North, proving that segregation is the result

of official action is difficult indeed. Rarely have compulsory segregation laws been in effect. Thus, in the North, unless one can show a covert action, the only way to reach segregation is to prove specifically the inferiority of the segregated school in teacher-pupil ratio, teaching staff or other tangible factors. This is another way of saying that while we are moving toward desegregation in the South we are still fighting the battle of the Plessy doctrine of separate but equal in the North. I will say no more except to note the overstatement of one wag that "Brown may be the law in the South, but it's still *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* in the North."

HOUSING THE NEW FRONTIER OF CIVIL RIGHTS

The Commission continues to study the complex subject of housing. This, like other subject areas within the Commission's scope, is not a regional problem. It is national. We are studying Federal programs affecting private or public nonfarm housing, with special emphasis on urban renewal. State and local antidiscrimination housing laws are being analyzed. The results of this study will likewise be included in our final report.

Let me add before leaving housing that the urban areas of the North are a crucial "new frontier" of civil rights. In 1960 for the first time a northern State—New York—has a larger Negro population than any southern State. Within the next few years, it is expected that more than half of our nonwhite population will be in the North.

The rapid increase in the proportion of nonwhite population in most of our major northern cities has been accompanied by the exodus of younger white families from the cities to the suburbs. Significant exclusion of nonwhites from the burgeoning suburbs has heightened their disproportionate concentration in the cities.

The plight of the urban area is not simply a problem of housing. There is little doubt but that civil rights restrictions in employment, education, housing, and other areas of urban life produce a powerful interaction upon each other. Piecemeal approaches, aimed at eliminating discrimination in any one area exclusively, will not meet with success, particularly in the urban areas.

This much can be said: Unless there can be freer movement of the growing nonwhite population throughout entire metropolitan areas, cities will continue to undergo rapid, often deteriorating racial change. They will experience further loss of middle-income population. Unless nonwhites have opportunity for equal educational training and substantial economic advance, they will continue to contribute to city slum development and other social ills. Their potential contribution as useful and informed citizens will be lost. This cannot be allowed to happen. It is not a matter of a do-good philosophy, but rather a philosophy of decent living and even survival.

NEW COMMISSION STUDIES

In addition to voting, public education, and public housing, the Commission in September of 1959, decided to embark on two new study areas. The first deals with the administration of justice. We are seeking answers to the problems of interracial police brutality, private intergroup violence, discriminatory exclusion from juries, and the effectiveness of Federal laws applicable to each of the above stated problems.

In this area we are deeply interested in a program presently being sponsored by the police department of the city of New York. I refer to the 4-year research project on psychological testing. The object of this study is to develop effective psychological tests for policemen. It is far-reaching. Since much police brutality seems to erupt out of tense situations which arise when a policeman comes in contact with a citizen, the attitudes and psychological makeup of the individual policeman are crucial. If that very small percentage of policemen who have unstable personalities are not cavalierly handed pistols and billy clubs, a significant advance will have been made in the practical realization of everyday civil rights.

EQUALITY OF JOB OPPORTUNITY

Our last major area of endeavor at the present time is the study of employment, particularly related to the Federal Government's role in providing equal job opportunity. We are attempting to ascertain the legal aspects of the Federal Government's involvement. We have made intensive studies in Baltimore, Detroit and Atlanta, and less intensive studies in New York, Chicago, St. Louis, Fort Worth-Dallas, and Los Angeles. We are seeking to appraise the Federal Government's role as an employer, as a creator of employment opportunities through Government contracts, various grants-in-aid, and as it participates in training and placement through various vocational and apprenticeship training programs. We are also studying subsidization of State employment services. While we have bitten off a mighty chunk we are studying and hope to be able to report on the role of labor unions and their relationship to the Federal Government in promoting or preventing equality of employment opportunity. It is hardly necessary to remind this group that talents unused lead to personal frustrations. They also deprive our society of the mainspring of its vitality.

My comments about the Commission have necessarily been abbreviated. Oversimplification can result. I trust that you will be sympathetic in this regard.

"TO PREACH DISTANT REFORM IS VERY CHEAP PHILANTHROPY"

If I have spent what appears to be an inordinate amount of time on civil rights in the North, I have done so deliberately. Pointing fingers at a distance adds neither to understanding nor progress. There is much in what Julius Pringle of South Carolina said to his Northern countrymen in the days just before the Civil War:

"To preach distant reform is very cheap philanthropy—the cheaper in proportion to the distance. The feeling of self-satisfaction exists without the necessity of personal sacrifice."

If it appears that I have failed to discuss civil rights in the context of international pressures or the dictates of morality, I have done this deliberately. While it is foolish to act as though the Commissioners and the staff operate in a vacuum, foreign affairs and morality are not our business. If these influences are preesnt in our minds and actions they must be accommodated to the professional standards of objectivity in fact finding, for that is our assignment. We must locate the problem, document it factually, study the law surrounding it and recommend remedial action where necessary.

I would not come before you, outstanding citizens and veterans, and seek a dishonorable surrender. There can be, however, a surrender of one's self—a rededication—to basic principles. As this is done our society will be invigorated. A richer life will be closer for all our citizens. I think this type of surrender, this form of sacrifice, was in the mind of Robert Frost when he wrote:

"Something we were withholding made us weak
Until we found out that it was ourselves
We were withholding from our land of living,
And forthwith found salvation in surrender."

Light a Candle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM MURRAY
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, the very able and gracious gentlewoman from Pennsylvania, Representative KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN, has served with distinction for over 2 years as chairman of the Postal Operations Subcommittee of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. During this period Representative GRANAHAN has contributed immeasurably to the public welfare through her vigorous and effective subcommittee program to rid the U.S. mails of traffic in obscenity and pornography.

I commend to the attention of the Congress a recent article by Representative GRANAHAN on this important subject. The article, most appropriately entitled "Light a Candle," and printed in Men of Malvern, a monthly publication of the Laymen's Weekend Retreat League at Malvern, Pa., follows:

LIGHT A CANDLE

(By Representative KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN, of Pennsylvania, chairman, Subcommittee on Postal Operations)

"It is better to light just one little candle
Than to stumble in the dark;
Better far that you light just one little candle—
All you need's a tiny spark."

The words of this beautiful song, so gloriously sung earlier in the evening by the famed Justin Lawrie Choral Group, stayed with me as I returned to my Washington hotel room. Another day's work was behind me and another night's official functions were over. Now was the welcomed moment for reflection.

In pondering Joe Tinney's request that I do a short article for Men of Malvern on my pet project—the work of my Subcommittee on Postal Operations in exposing and combating the traffic in obscene and pornographic literature—I couldn't help but think that here, beautifully expressed in poetry and music, was exactly what we are trying to accomplish.

It was not until I became chairman of this important investigating subcommittee that I began to understand the enormity of the problem of pornography. I was shocked when I learned of the depths of depravity to which filth merchants will resort. I soon came to realize the type of subhuman venality we are up against.

I quickly found out that one of the basic reasons for the growing volume of indecent matter in the mails and on the newsstands was the fact that the average decent citizen is entirely unaware of the nature and extent of this scourge.

So, in 2 years of extensive hearings on this problem, which took my subcommittee to most of the major cities of the country, in the report which we later issued, and in all my own speeches and personal contacts with citizen groups everywhere, our purpose has been to establish an aroused community conscienceness to this vital problem.

We have, if you please, been trying to light just one little candle and to help provide the tiny spark for other such candles, so that we may not stumble in the dark over this

cancerous growth which, if unchecked, will insidiously destroy the moral tissue of our Nation.

FILTH PEDDLING IS BIG TIME

Pornography today is big business. The peddling of obscene and pornographic literature is no longer confined to the backrooms of pool halls. It has become a lucrative business with wide and varied sources of distribution. According to reliable estimates, filth peddling brings in from $½ billion to $1 billion a year.

Besides the fact that the average citizen is unaware of the extent of this problem, I believe there are two other basic reasons for the increased traffic in obscene literature. The first is the fantastic profits which can be derived with a relatively small capital outlay. The second is the difficulty of prosecuting offenders, especially in the jurisdictions where most of the mail-order business in pornography originates.

But, primarily because of public unawareness of this creeping menace, printed filth now appears in drugstores, supermarkets, and newsstands in addition to widespread distribution through the mail (which, actually, is the primary jurisdiction of my subcommittee). Too often it stands indiscriminately on the magazine rack next to respectable family magazines dedicated to the improvement of the American home.

Here, I fear, its ready accessibility to our young ones imparts a flavor of acceptability, with the result that they are gaining dangerously false impressions of the moral foundations of our society. For the fundamental unit of that society—the family—is challenged in the mind of every adolescent with each distorted idea he acquires regarding the true meaning of natural sex instinct.

SMUT AND DELINQUENCY

The evidence that juvenile delinquency is sharply increasing with each year; that it is more commonly concerned with acts of violence, and that it is appearing in the suburbs as well as in the slums, is unmistakable. In the 9-year period, 1949 through 1957, the number of appearances before juvenile courts for delinquency increased two and one-half times, while the child population increased by only one-fourth.

The direct relationship between obscenity and this rising incidence of juvenile delinquency was clearly pinpointed by many distinguished witnesses who appeared before my subcommittee—among them, the Rev. Father Terrence J. Murphy, of the Loyola University Law School; Dr. Nicholas G. Frignito, chief neuropsychiatrist and medical director of our own Philadelphia municipal court, whose position affords an unusual opportunity to study and evaluate the effects of obscenity and pornography on the conduct of youthful law violators; and Mr. John Cornelius Hayes, president of the National Council of Catholic Men and professor of law at Loyola University.

I know there are psychiatrists who hesitate to relate publications devoted to distorted sex, terror, sadism, and crime with juvenile delinquency. However, after having listened to many authorities and worked closely with this problem for over 2 years, I find myself in complete agreement with J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, who recently wrote:

"I say that we can no longer afford to wait for the answer. What we do know is that in an overwhelming large number of cases sex crime is associated with pornography. We know that sex criminals read it, are clearly influenced by it.

"I believe pornography is a major cause of sex violence. I believe that if we can eliminate the distribution of such items among impressionable school-age children, we shall greatly reduce our frightening sex crime rate."

KNOWLEDGE WILL BRING ACTION

More than ever, I am firmly convinced that only when the public is fully enlightened—when enough "candles" are lit—will we be able to stem the ravages caused by filth and smut. The "light" of knowledge will surely be followed by determined action. I have enough faith in the moral and spiritual backbone of this Nation to know that when thinking men and women get to know the whole sordid story of pornography, they wil not long stand by and do nothing. They do not need to be reminded of Edmund Burke's admonition: "All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing."

Fortunately, good men are doing something about the evil of pornography. Civil and church leaders in many cities and towns, large and small, throughout the country are demonstrating the effectiveness of organized committees and groups in combating and cleaning up the traffic in filthy publications in their own areas. Moreover, action in one community helps provide the tiny spark for similar action in other communities and these shared experiences yield large rewards.

In helping to encourage this kind of action by individuals and groups, my subcommittee's report summarized what the situation is both as to obscene matter sent through the mail and the increasing prevalence of smutty publications on the newsstands. We describe the efforts being made in some communities to combat the spread of this evil among their youth. We also suggest a program of community action and list recommendations to help stamp out the nationwide traffic in indecent publications.

Copies of these report, entitled "Obscene Matter Sent Through the Mail," may be obtained from the Government Printing Office, Superintendent of Documents, Washington 25, D.C., for the nominal charge of 20 cents per copy.

As I indicated earlier, the basic unit of our society—the family—is most seriously in danger from the pornographic attack. The family must, therefore, be the center of the counterattack against this festering disease. Additional laws, community action, and other group efforts—while valuable—are no substitute for the "light" of parental guidance. They cannot absolve fathers and mothers from their obligation to know their children, to understand their thinking, to lead them onto paths of better reading, and to guide them by appealing to their interests at least as forcefully and attractively as the "dirt peddlers" are doing.

Truly, the brightest "candle" of all is the one that shines in the home.

The Expanding World Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in the coming years the United States must seek an expanding world economy, and in doing so, we must maintain full employment and high production within our own American economy.

But we also have a responsibility to help low-income countries speed their economic development. We must help them to help themselves. We must help them to meet the revolution of rising expectations—not simply because we want them to resist the insidious promises of communism but also because we want to help them in the common battle of mankind against poverty, hunger, disease and despair.

We can and should channel more of our economic and technical assistance through the United Nations. In spite of Soviet efforts to weaken the United Nations, the less-developed and uncommitted nations of the world still look to the U.N. as their best hope for action on the international scene.

The best way for us to strengthen the United Nations—and the best way to help the people of underdeveloped areas toward a better standard of living with greater freedom and human dignity—is to channel more of our economic and technical assistance through the United Nations which can enlist substantial contributions from other free nations.

One of America's outstanding statesmen has presented the challenge and the opportunity before us. In a penetrating speech to the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations on March 30, Paul G. Hoffman, now managing director of the United Nations Special Fund, made excellent suggestions on the approach we should take in the great humanitarian undertaking of speeding economic development in the low income countries within the framework of an expanding world economy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Hoffman's remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EXPANDING WORLD ECONOMY—AN ESSENTIAL GOAL

(Address by Paul G. Hoffman)

In January of 1959 I became the managing director of the United Nations Special Fund, which is one of several United Nations agencies concerned with assisting underdeveloped countries to speed their development. When I took on this new assignment I was told that we were face to face with a "revolution of rising expectations." I recall thinking that the phrase "face to face" and the word "revolution" were overdramatic when used to describe a state of unrest among peoples comfortably remote from our shores. But then came the turmoil in the Congo, the uprising in Venezuela, and finally the revolution in Cuba, which persuaded me that in this compact and shrinking world no country can be an island unto itself; or, as someone put it rather picturesquely, the Rhine and the Volga, the Yangtze, the Niger and the Amazon all overflow into the main streets of the cities, villages and towns of the United States of America.

My present awareness that we cannot turn our backs on this revolution is, I believe, shared by most people in the United States today. I am not sure, however, that there is any general understanding of its dimensions. There are approximately 100 countries for which the United Nations has some responsibility, most of whose billion 3 hundred million people are dreadfully poor. In addition to these people, there are between 600 and 700 million people living in mainland China, North Vietnam and North Korea who are also povertystricken. All in all, close to 2 billion people are in active revolt against the continued acceptance of poverty, illiteracy and chronic ill health.

Not only is this the most pervasive revolution in human history, but it came upon us rather suddenly. In fact, it is only since the end of World War II that we have faced the seething unrest presently assailing us from all sides. Up until then, most of the people in these poorer countries accepted lives of misery because they could imagine nothing better. Part of the responsibility for their awakening rests upon World War II itself, because millions of young men left their villages and went into distant lands to fight. They learned that people like themselves in the more advanced countries—villagers, if you please—were well nourished, well educated, and enjoyed good health. When they returned home, they told their neighbors. However, it is modern communications, and principally the radio, to which most credit must be given for the sudden awakening of these people. There is hardly a village anywhere that doesn't have its radio; and hardly a villager who isn't now convinced that a better life and a better living are possible for him and his children.

The cold figures on the dimensions of the problem of speeding development reveal its true magnitude only when coupled with a knowledge of its complexity. Involved are economic, political, religious, legal, educational and social factors; taboos, mores and too often quite incomprehensible attitudes of peoples and their governments. To add to the difficulties, the situation in no two countries is exactly similar. The programme of economic development for each of the 100 countries must be hand tailored.

As an illustration of the complexities with which we are faced, let's take the attitude of people in some of the low-income countries toward work and saving. In many countries physical labor is considered beneath the dignity of men; women do all the work. A couple of weeks ago in Africa, in a country I won't mention, one of the familiar sights was a man walking down the road twirling his cane. In the dust behind him walked his wife, carrying on her head an immense load, and a baby on her back. This may be an idyllic situation so far as men are concerned, but the economic development of that country will be handicapped until the men go to work.

When it comes to savings—for many people in the low-income countries, the idea of postponing consumption today for a better tomorrow is presently beyond their comprehension. Admittedly, it is difficult for someone whose belt is already at the last notch to tighten it further. Yet, as every farmer instinctively knows, even out of a small harvest sufficient grain must be saved for a new and larger planting.

The problem of status also enters largely into the problem of development. In many countries the only groups which enjoy prestige are the government employees, the lawyers, the doctors, and the priests. Men engaged in trade are looked upon as third-class citizens. Only when proper recognition is given to the significant contribution which entrepreneurs, industrialists, and businessmen must make toward building a country will there be attracted into these pursuits the talent so much needed.

There are many other psychological factors which must be taken into account. In some countries you have rigid taboos that must be considered. In parts of Africa fetish priests retain powerful holds on people and sometimes do their wily best to frustrate necessary change.

There is also the question of incentives. People will work hard if it helps to get them what they want. That may be a better home, education for their children, a radio, a bicycle or what have you. In too many countries materials for building a better home are not available, nor are the teachers to teach the children, nor the household and other goods for which they may long.

I could go on indefinitely giving illustrations of the kind I have mentioned, but I am sure that we are already aware that the job before us is one not only of huge dimensions, but also of bewildering complexity. But it isn't insuperable. There is no question in my mind that at least 90 of the 100 low-income countries have the resources—physical and human—to provide in reasonable time decent living standards for their people. The underlying reason for underdevelopment is underutilization of these resources.

Fortunately, the discovery and evaluation of the physical resources of a country are not too difficult. Whether it is soil, water, minerals, petroleum, fisheries or timber that is to be investigated, techniques are available and constantly improving. Take mineral investigation, for example. Today with low-flying airplanes and modern equipment it is possible to prospect 100 square miles in less time and more thoroughly than it would have taken to prospect 1 square mile by traditional methods.

Each day at the United Nations brings new evidence of the richness of the physical resources of many of these countries. Some hint, for example, of the untapped agricultural potential lies in the fact that farm output in metric tons per person on the North American Continent exceeds the average of Asia by tenfold, and of Africa by twentyfold.

As a specific example of a rich but little used resource I cite the Niger River. A study for the development of that river has been underway and is, in fact, just about completed. There is every evidence that, with the construction of a 150-foot dam, the waters of that river will be available for the irrigation of thousands and thousands of acres of potentially rich land, for the generation of millions of kilowatts of cheap power, and navigation on the river will be greatly improved.

Let me give another specific example from another country—Ethiopia. One of its principal rivers is the Awash. Here again, its waters have been used but little and yet preliminary studies indicate that, with control of the waters of that river, the Awash Valley can become one of the most fertile valleys in all of Africa. In fact, the prospects of this are so bright that a British syndicate signed an agreement with the Ethiopian Government to supply $35 million of capital for a settlement project in the valley, provided the intensive survey, now underway with United Nations assistance, measures up to the preliminary findings.

The agricultural situation in India is another case in point. India is presently importing a vast amount of food. And yet a group of leading agronomists, sent to India 3 years ago under a Ford Foundation grant, concluded that India had sufficient land and water to feed not only her present population but a population twice its size. What was lacking was fertilizer, better seeds and the employment of more modern farming methods. I should add that India's third 5-year plan includes substantial allocations for the construction of fertilizer plants and for the expansion of agricultural institutes.

During the decade of the 1950's many countries, including the United States, gave valuable assistance to the low-income countries in making more effective use of their physical resources. As for the United Nations, ever since it and the specialized agencies joined together in the expanded program of technical assistance in 1950 there has been a steady stream of international experts going out to help the less developed countries, and an even greater number of fellows from these countries going abroad for study under United Nations grants. By the end of 1960, over 10,00 experts of 78 different nationalities had been sent on technical assistance assignments in 105 countries and territories. In the same period, 18,000, United Nations fellowships were awarded to men and women from over 110 countries allowing them to improve their skills by training in more advanced areas.

U.N. SPECIAL FUND

The Special Fund of the United Nations started operations in January 1959. Its special field is assisting the low-income countries in resource surveys and in establishing applied research institutes and training institutes of various types. It has underway at the present time 32 resource surveys in 23 countries involving Fund expenditures totaling $19.5 million, the total cost of which is estimated at approximately $37 million.

These modern resource surveys have a vital role to play in laying the groundwork for substantial investment. As an example I would like to tell you of a United Nations Special Fund project which has recently been completed. This was a survey of the needs and resources for electric energy in Argentina. This investigation cost the Special Funds under $300,000. In the completed report of the survey, the hardheaded engineers and economists recommended a total investment of some $735 million over the next 10 years for facilities to provide the electric energy Argentina needs for industrial development and domestic use. The report shows that prospective revenues will fully support this investment.

Certainly, this 2,450-to-1 ratio between "seed money" and potentially sound investment opportunity is much, much higher than normally can be expected. It is fair, however, in my opinion, to estimate that every $1 of resource survey expenditure may reveal an opportunity for $100 of sound investment.

The task of making more effective use of the human resources of the low-income countries is infinitely more difficult and more time consuming than is that of better utilizing physical resources. Of the 1,275 million people in the 100 underdeveloped countries associated with the United Nations, I would guess that around three-quarters of a billion persons at or over school age still cannot read or write. It would be good if they could, but even that would be far from enough. Millions upon millions of these people must be given secondary education as well. There are also immense needs for vocational training. And finally, as a critical factor in economic development, we have the necessity of training vast numbers of higher and middle-level administrative, scientific and technical personnel.

Fortunately, the needs of a few of the underdeveloped countries for this skilled manpower have been estimated rather carefully. Thus, Nigeria will need to train, over the next 10 years, 20,000 top-level administrators, professional technicians, managers and business executives. It will also need some 40,000 middle-level technicians—for building and industrial programs, for health services, teaching, and for supervisory positions in Government and business. A rough projection of these requirements would suggest that our 100 underdeveloped countries would need to train in the decade ahead at least 700,000 top-level administrative and professional personnel, and over 1,400,000 middle-level technicians. Let's reduce this projected figure by more than 50 percent and say that 1 million people must be trained as rapidly as possible for highly skilled occupations. This is a staggering job, one that is impossible with the resources currently available for it. But there is no time to lose in getting on with the task, for education and technical train-

ing must go in advance of significant economic development.

The United Nations, the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations, the International Labour Organization, and UNESCO have, over the last decade, carried on a number of projects in the training field and are now engaged, with the assistance of special fund financing, in a great expansion of these activities. These new projects range from assistance in establishing engineering departments in universities, such as the University of Concepcion in Chile, to assistance in establishing institutes for the training of vocational teachers in India. Included also are a large number of institutes in the agricultural field. At the present time some 17 such major training projects are underway, and more will follow.

SUGGESTIONS

Earlier I said that despite the huge dimensions and complexity of this task of assisting the low-income countries in speeding their development it was not insurmountable. It isn't, provided we take full advantage of what we should have learned from the experience gained in the 1950's, and provided adequate financial support is made available both for preinvestment activities and for investment.

First

I suggest, first, that we accept without reservation an expanding world economy as an essential goal. Certainly with over half the people of the world still undernourished and without the bare essentials for decent living and with the world's population increasing steadily, there is a desperate need for a vastly increased production of the world's goods. The first responsibility of each country is to speed its own development. Its second responsibility is to assist other nations in accordance with its means. No nation is so rich that it cannot profit from an expanding world economy and no nation is so poor that it cannot help other nations.

Second

Second, that we must put an end to all talk that implies that assistance from one nation to another is an act of charity. Such an approach is paternalism, and paternalism has no place in relations among sovereign nations. There is only one relationship that is sound—and that is one of partnership. The moral reasons for nations assisting each other are profound, the political reasons are compelling, but there are also solid business reasons—the less developed countries are the new economic frontier. The advertising council, in its current campaign on the theme "Confidence in America," puts the case this way: "Today 1 in every 20 American workers owes his job to foreign trade. With a billion customers for the output of our factories, we can look forward to a long period of growth and development."

Third

Third, I suggest that helping low-income countries speed their development should be accepted as an objective worthy to be pursued for its own sake. Economic aid should not be thought of as an instrumentality of the cold war nor one for obtaining a preferred position commercially for a donor country. There are practical as well as ethical reasons for concentrating on the one goal of economic development. The practical reason is that without such concentration the chance for success is remote. We all know that speeding development is much more difficult than promoting recovery. Nevertheless, I do not believe that the Marshall program would have been successful if it had not been for our concentration on the one goal of recovery. We refused to become involved in the cold war and never sought a commercial advantage for the United States. We adhered strictly to the guidelines laid down by General Marshall in his commencement address at Harvard University in June 1947, when he stated:

"Our policy is directed not against any country or doctrine but against hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos. Its purpose should be the revival of a working economy in the world so as to permit the emergence of political and social conditions in which free institutions can exist."

Fourth

Fourth, I suggest that much greater emphasis should be placed on preinvestment activities. Billions of dollars of investment have been lost because millions were not spent in adequate preparatory activities.

Fifth

My fifth suggestion is that a very pragmatic approach be employed in determining whether aid should be given through the United Nations, through regional organizations, or on a bilateral basis—namely, on the basis of which channel will yield the most development per dollar. I would be less than frank if I did not say that if this test is applied the result is certain to be a substantially increased use of the United Nations. There are several reasons.

First, because in the U.N. and its 13 specialized agencies reposes the richest experience that can be found anywhere in virtually every field of developmental activity. The U.N. draws on the whole world for its technicians.

Second, assistance through the U.N. guarantees that there is no paternalism. U.N. assistance is a completely cooperative endeavor with a voice given to countries whatever their size or wealth and with all countries contributing to the cost.

Third, because the low-income countries prefer assistance through the U.N., it is possible for the U.N. to insist upon the recipient countries putting forth a maximum of self-help. As proof that this can be done, I cite the fact that the special fund's contribution to the 115 projects approved by its governing council is $96 million, and that of the recipient countries, $131 million, for a total of $227 million.

Sixth

Sixth, I suggest that new emphasis be given to adjusting the educational programs of the less developed countries so that they will make a maximum contribution to the achievement of their economic goals. This means that primary, secondary, vocational, technical and university education must have their appropriate share of whatever educational funds are available. In most of the less developed countries of which I have knowledge, far too little attention has been given to secondary school education. The need is for a balance program in education and training.

And now as to the additional financing which is needed in the preinvestment field. Leaving aside for the moment the cost of assisting in the financing of educational institutions, the amount is rather modest. Speaking of the United Nations which, together with its specialized agencies, has available at the present time something in the neighborhood of $150 million per year, an additional $100 million would take care of the increasing demands for technical assistance and resource surveys.

When it comes to capital, by far the larger part of the responsibility rests with the poorer countries themselves. Even though their incomes are pitifully low, a substantial percentage must go into savings to finance the major parts of their development programs which can be financed with local currencies. However, they are going to require a substantial amount of foreign exchange to pay for equipment from abroad, the services of outside experts, and also to cover other costs such as debt service and transportation charges. Averaged over a 10-year period, my guess is that this foreign currency requirement would amount to $45 billion annually. If we assume an expanding world economy, these low income countries should be able to earn $38 billion of this amount through their exports leaving a gap of $7 billion annually which would have to be covered by investments, loans and grants from the outside.

In the year 1960 approximately $4 billion flowed from the advanced countries to the less developed countries. This leaves $3 billion a year for which new financing will be required. I believe, again averaging over a 10-year period, that $1 billion of this amount can be taken care of by private investment and sound bankable loans.

The remaining $2 billion of annual financing required is the problem, because for the most part it is not needed for revenue-producing activities but for public facilities and services which can pay back their investment only through generally increased output of the entire economy. Such facilities and services include first of all, education and training, and then roads, communications, health improvement, housing and administration. These loans, if they are not to overburden the struggling economies, should be long term, carry low rates of interest and probably have the beginning dates of repayment deferred for a considerable period, perhaps as much as 10 years. In banking parlance they may be "soft" loans—but from the point of view of economic growth they are the most important investments of all. It is my hope, that through the International Development Association and regional development associations such as the Inter-American Bank, most of this capital will be forthcoming.

The advanced countries of the world have every right to seriously consider whether loaning $2 billion per year to the newly emerging countries is a risk they should take. I suggest that it is, and for a number of reasons.

First, because it is good business. These emerging countries are the new economic frontier.

Second, for compelling political reasons—we can't afford any more Cubas or Congos. Progress should come through evolution and not through violence.

And third, because it provides the one best way to make constructive use of the time we are buying at so heavy a cost through our defense expeditures. The member nations of the United Nations are spending $100 billion per year for defense and all it buys it time.

If we are going to get out from under these terrific costs we must move toward peace. And that is what the $2 billion per year will do for us. Why? Because out of the yearnings of the hundreds of millions of people for a better life will come, if those yearnings are ignored, one explosion after another in this troubled world. But if heed is given to these yearnings, if we can give the assistance we should, then there can come a better world than we have ever dared dream of.

In closing, may I recall some words used by the Honorable Lester Pearson of Canada: "The grim fact is that we prepare for war like precocious giants and for peace like retarded pigmies."

It is time we began acting like giants in waging peace.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Newsletter of May 20, 1961:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Tex.)

MAY 20, 1961.

Fear: (Noah Webster) "Painful emotion marked by alarm; dread; disquiet; also, an instance of this feeling."

Fear can be good or bad. It can be a protection (fear of fire and other bodily harm) or a weakness, as when dread or disquiet prevents the right action or provokes the wrong action. Examples of fear that tend toward weakness are found alternately in the fear of people of their government leaders, elective or appointive, and politicians' fear of their constituents. It is an interesting phenomenon to me that because of unfounded fear some Members of Congress and some people wanting Federal aid or a special concession from government are willing to trade out their conviction and principles for a harbor, a lake, a bridge, or a Federal building. Is it possible for a Member of Congress to equate a public works project against his vote for or against civil rights, aid to education, foreign aid, minimum wages, a judgeship, tax legislation or social security benefit changes? Is it possible for citizens, businessmen and laboring men to abandon or accept a position on a controversial matter contrary to their own view to secure some political or government aid? Yes, these things are possible and are occurring in our country today.

The next question might then be, how much is our country weakened by fear of political reprisal, of insecurity, of communism? In an earlier day, men of stature laid peoples' fear to rest by saying,

"These are the times that try men's souls. The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will, in this crisis, shrink from the service of their country; but he that stands it now deserves the love and thanks of man and woman. Tyranny, like hell, is not easily conquered; yet we have this consolation with us, that the harder the conflict, the more glorious the triumph."

"You ask, what is our aim? I can answer in one word: Victory—victory at all costs. victory in spite of all terror, victory however long and hard the road may be; for without victory, there is no survival."

"We have nothing to fear but fear itself."

Indeed, these powerful statements in their times resolved doubts and anxieties and resulted in a rebirth of confidence.

Today we need a reawakening and a rededication to our way of life and the reasons underlying a society designed to respect the freedom, the dignity, the happiness of human beings. We have so much to be thankful for, so many spiritual and material blessings, we should face every day confidently. There should be no groundless fear, no dread, no anxiety; rather, a zeal to protect, enjoy and perpetuate our heritage. Instead we see people cowed by government power, by political reprisal or the threat of it, by communism's sterile philosophy. Such conduct is not worthy of U.S. citizens, as I see it. Obviously it is both a matter of ideals—that is, a dedication of purpose, a depth of feeling—and of attitude. Generally when fear is recognized (as cited above) and brought to light, groundless and unnecessary anxiety can be replaced by confident activity. This is what we need today in all walks of life in the United States. Indeed, our form of government is intended to rest upon and maintain its vitality by the unfetted exchange of controversial differences of viewpoint by men of good will. It is the difference of opinion, based on facts, evolving into a later compromise that fuels the engine of a "republic in a democracy". Any capitulation of viewpoint, not warranted by the facts and adherence to high principle, weakens our system of government and society. For my part, I am totally unafraid of political pressure or reprisal and will never be so intimidated.

On several significant issues this week the House took action which could have far-reaching effect: (1) H.R. 4641 to establish an office of International Travel and Tourism. In my opinion it is unnecessary to establish another Federal bureau and bring the Government into yet another facet of our personal lives. (2) House Concurrent Resolution 226 expressing the sense of Congress in encouraging the Organization of American States to institute action against Cuba. We should not rule out unilateral action by the United States against Castro if such a move becomes necessary to protect our country. (3) House Concurrent Resolution 209 authorizing the President to provide assistance to Cuban refugee students. This was another instance of Congress waiving its authority to safeguard the peoples' money. Also, it is no more constitutional, in my judgment, to give Federal aid to foreign students than it is to our own. (4) Appropriations for Department of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare. I opposed the expenditures called for in the bill because in it we continue to increase our welfare spending two to one over our defense expenditures.

Thank you: To so many of you who have sent contributions to help defray the cost of this newsletter, my heartfelt thanks.

Address by Assistant Secretary of the Interior John A. Carver, Jr., at the Annual Dinner Meeting of the Carl Schurz Memorial Foundation, Inc., in Philadelphia, May 12, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, on May 12 in Philadelphia the Carl Schurz Memorial Foundation met to honor the memory of a great American.

History has enhanced the greatness of Carl Schurz, but the passage of time has dimmed public recollection of his name and his deeds.

Assistant Secretary of the Interior John A. Carver, Jr., delivered the principal address at the memorial foundation meeting in Philadelphia and he told the gathering that his study of the life of Carl Schurz provided a rare and unexpected intellectual uplift.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote one paragraph from Mr. Carver's talk and, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks I include the full address in the RECORD. Mr. Carver said:

I confess that although I have walked many times by his picture, which hangs in the long hall that leads to the office of the Secretary of the Interior, I did not, until I began to prepare for this talk, know more than the name, and certainly not the remarkable conservation contribution, of this newspaperman, revolutionary, patriot, orator, U.S. Senator from Missouri, Civil War general, scholar, musician, and pioneer in civil service reform, who also served as Secretary of the Interior from 1877 to 1881. I take nothing from the luster of the memory of Gifford Pinchot when I say that Schurz, in my opinion, was as great.

Mr. Carver's address follows:

ADDRESS BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR JOHN A. CARVER, JR., AT THE ANNUAL DINNER MEETING OF THE CARL SCHURZ MEMORIAL FOUNDATION, INC., IN PHILADELPHIA, MAY 12, 1961

I am genuinely pleased to have been asked to speak to you tonight on the occasion of the annual dinner of the Carl Schurz Memorial Foundation. I love the opportunity I have as an Assistant Interior Secretary of working with the National Park Service; the rewards of this association include meeting and coming to know groups, like your own, motivated to assist government to reach objectives which government may be too impersonal, too large, or too slow to achieve alone. We are grateful, officially and personally.

The generous contributions made by the Carl Schurz Memorial Foundation in the initial rehabilitation and subsequent maintenance and preservation of this building, the Second Bank of the United States, are deeply appreciated. The veterans of the Service tell me that it would have been difficult, if not impossible, for the Park Service to have preserved this building for the American people without the timely cooperation of the foundation in 1939.

And there is another fringe benefit to my work. The Park Service and organizations like yours so frequently are delving into our history and our heritage, and sometimes I have the chance to have some of the thrill of it rub off on me. Recently, I attended a National Parks Conference at Grand Canyon, and for two wonderful days, I could absorb the legends, the lore, the wonder of America, as I visited with the superintendents of battlefield parks of our Revolutionary and Civil Wars, of great national parks, and jewels of national monuments. These men were historians, naturalists, students, even poets, and the experience was rejuvenating.

I've had an experience of uplift such as I had at the Grand Canyon in the exposure I've had to the life of the great adopted American whose memory you honor in your continued good works.

I confess that although I have walked many times by his likeness, which hangs in the long hall which leads to the office of the Secretary of the Interior, I did not, until I began to prepare for this talk, know more than the name, and certainly not the remarkable conservation contribution, of this newspaperman, revolutionary, patriot, orator, U.S. Senator, Civil War general, scholar, musician, and pioneer in civil service reform, who also served as Secretary of the Interior. I take nothing from the luster of the memory of Gifford Pinchot when I say that Schurz, in my opinion, was as great.

The wisdom of Carl Schurz in the resources field is as fresh as tomorrow. President Kennedy's recent message to Congress warned that our forest lands present the sharpest challenge to our foresight because we are using up our old growth timber at an alarming rate, and consumption will double in the next 40 years.

Schurz put it this way in 1877: "The rapidity with which this country is being

stripped of its timber must alarm every thinking man."

Secretary of the Interior Udall organized a task force to study the distressing state of American Indian affairs. Back in the seventies, Secretary Schurz advised the President that "the general condition of our Indian affairs is by no means satisfactory." And, he said later, "the Office of Commissioner of Indian Affairs is one of the most arduous places in the Government." Amen to that.

Today, Secretary Udall is pushing the most ambitious national park program since the National Park Service was founded 45 years ago. He is appealing for enough money to do the job. Eighty-four years ago, Secretary Schurz was appealing for money enough to pay the salary of the first superintendent of the first park, Yellowstone. The superintendent had been appointed but since Congress had made no appropriation to pay him, he was working for free.

Schurz was concerned with the desert land laws and the problems of the arid Western States. I spent many hours this week working with the Director of the Bureau of Land Management on proposed revisions and improvements of these laws.

This forthright and outspoken man, like an Ickes much later, could castigate the Congress for passing a bill he had opposed. He read them a lecture: "We are now rapidly approaching the day when the forests of this Country will no longer be sufficient to supply our home wants, and it is the highest time that the old notion that the timber on the public lands belongs to anybody and everybody, to be cut down and taken off at pleasure, should give way."

Action followed. He whipped up public opinion, and he stopped the export traffic in logs from the public lands by administrative action, continuing to apply the needle to Congress. "* * * I regret to say that in spite of the repeated recommendation of the passage of a law to facilitate the prevention of the wasteful devastation of the public timber lands * * * almost all the legislation that has been had upon this subject consisted in acts relieving those who had committed depredations in the past of their responsibility, and protecting them against the legal consequences of their trespasses."

He told Congress bluntly that it was falling down on the job of protecting Yellowstone. He reorganized the Bureau of Indian Affairs. He told the white people in the West they had to stop stealing Indian land. And while he was busy going around the country creating enemies by the hundreds, he was in the first rank of the conservation movement. "The waste and destruction of the redwood (Sequoia sempervirens) and 'big trees' (Sequoia gigantia) of California have been, and continue to be, so great as to cause apprehension that these species of trees, the noblest and oldest in the world, will entirely disappear unless some measure be soon taken to preserve at least a portion of them," he wrote, following his comments with specific recommendation for Presidential action.

Gifford Pinchot found inspiration in Schurz' lonely battle, and gave him credit as the only Secretary of the Interior who had sensed the forest problem and tried to do anything about it.

This is heady wine. It is a tonic to a bureaucrat buried in papers to find the issues stated with such clarity and brevity. His annual reports bear his mark, and each is only 50 or so pages in length.

But I am indebted to my wife, the scholar in my family, for the inspiration to leave this exciting facet of his life in pursuit of another equally fascinating one—his friendship with Abraham Lincoln.

This friendship must have been the richest experience of his life. It was a friendship based upon profound mutual respect; no fawning or cheap adulation marred it. It was an active, give-and-take, useful friendship.

Lincoln found in the fugitive German firebrand an entree to the German vote in the 1860 election. He discovered soon that the 31-year-old from Wisconsin was scholar, poet, and idea man, and then, as now, public figures were on the lookout for competent speech advisers.

So Schurz was one of the inner circle in the drafting of the first inaugural; like an early version Harry Hopkins, within a few years he was on the stump himself. By the time the 1864 reelection campaign came round, the matured Schurz (by then 35, a major general in the Army and an ex-Minister to Spain) was doing an Ickes-type hatchet job on the Democrats and George McClellan in this very city.

But let's return to the first inaugural, when the new administration was being formed. Schurz, like many campaign workers after a successful election, must have had a dual role in this process—to give his advice on the deserving, the able, and the politically potent aspirants; and to worry quietly about what was in the Chief's mind for him.

Schurz wrote to his wife: "As I was leaving him after this long conversation (on the draft of the first inaugural) in which he explained his opinions and plans with the greatest frankness, I told him I should ask his administration for a few offices for my friends." He answered: "You write to me and you may be sure that I shall attend to everything you may ask for; and as for your own case, which you have not spoken of to me, I shall never forget you."

Lincoln expressed a distaste for the business of finding the right man for each job. On one occasion he said the process itself was like a landlord letting rooms in one part of the building, while a fire raged in the other part. At another time he said: "I have discovered a good way of providing officers for this Government: put all the names of the applicants into one pepper box and all the offices into another, and then shake the two, and make appointments just as the names and offices happen to drop out together." As to Schurz, it turned out that Mr. Lincoln had ideas different from the prevalent one that Carl would be just right for the Kingdom of Sardinia as Ambassador. Instead, he was offered the post of Minister to Spain.

Like Adlai Stevenson, much later, he asked time to think; and then he accepted. But the intervening period of rumors and clearances were stormy.

His case was argued up and down in the Cabinet. Seward declared that Schurz's record in violent, insurrectionary, red-republican movements in Germany in 1848 would be frowned on by the Spanish monarchy. Lincoln replied that Schurz would be discreet; it ought not to be held against the man that he had made efforts for liberty; and it might be well for European governments to realize this.

Schurz had the human touch, which requires a talent for making mistakes and changing opinions. He could and did bawl out the President of his country for not eradicating Democrats and replacing them with Republicans—yet he could, and did, become a leader in the reformation of the spoils system and the institution of the civil service merit system in the Federal Government.

I've said that Schurz took the stump in this city—his speech here reminds one of a later Secretary of Interior who mastered the high art of invective on a public platform.

The country was in a divisive campaign, and McCLELLAN, a man for whom Schurz never had any use, was the Democratic nominee on a platform which called for a convention to restore the Union. McCLELLAN had ducked that issue, and Schurz called him on it: "He ignored the platform and took the nomination, wrote a skillfully worded political letter showing that the art, How not to say it, can be brought to as high a degree of perfection as the art, How not to do it."

Schurz sounds like an early Alben Barkley when he sets out to remind his opponents of earlier administration of their party: "Although Buchanan is dead and buried, those who indulged in the soothing delusion that such a man could leave no progeny, find themselves mistaken. Behold, a whole brood of young Buchanans has risen up and met in convention in Chicago. The laurels of their father do not let them sleep. I see again the cunning twinkle of the eye, I see the white necktie again; they try to adjust it like a halter around the throat of the Republic, to throttle her to death. Truly the sons are greater than the sire. For what he did, we may say he did as a weak old man, whose life had been spent in a constant exercise of his knee joints; and who, when the rebellion first raised its Gorgon-head, had neither the firmness of a patriot nor the courage of a traitor. But what they do, they do after thousands have stained battlefields of their country with precious blood, after the people have poured out money like water to save the Republic, when the hero of Vicksburg is thundering at the gates of Richmond, when our flag waves over Atlanta, and Victory is the cry."

It was Schurz who said: "Our country, right or wrong. When right, to be kept right; when wrong, to be put right."

Later:

"Ideals are like stars; you will not succeed in touching them with your hands. But like the seafaring man on a desert of waters, you choose them as your guides, and following them you will reach your destiny."

The shaping of the statements, as well as the thought behind them, have the ring of Lincoln's prose. Some of his speeches were so markedly in Lincoln's flair, so Sandburg tells us, that it seems sure Lincoln wrote parts of them.

Sandburg says that Carl Schurz's private letters held opinions about Lincoln that he could not fully and conveniently have given in his orations to the immense metropolitan audiences that heard him in the autumn of 1864. To Theodor Petrash, a newly arrived emigrant, once a schooldays chum of Schurz in Germany, went a letter in 1864. "I wish to enlighten you on two other points. You are underrating the President. I grant that he lacks higher education and his manners are not in accord with European conceptions of the dignity of a chief magistrate. He is a well-developed child of nature and is not skilled in polite phrases and poses. But he is a man of profound feeling, correct and firm principles and incorruptible honesty. His motives are unquestionable, and he possesses to a remarkable degree the characteristic, God-given trait of this people, sound common sense. Should you read his official documents and his political letters you would find this verified to a surprising extent."

At another time he said:

"I will make a prophecy that may now sound peculiar. In 50 years, perhaps much sooner, Lincoln's name will be inscribed close to Washington's on this American Republic's roll of honor. And there it will remain for all time. The children of those who persecute him now, will bless him."

Studying his life and times has been fascinating fun. I think he would enjoy the peculiar situation that now exists between your organization and the National Park Service. As I said before, without your timely cooperation in 1939, it would have been difficult for the Service to preserve this building. Your generous contributions in rehabilitating and then maintaining the

Second Bank of the United States made it possible to save the place. Now we tell you that we appreciate it so much we are going to evict you.

Naturally we are pleased to have his memorial foundation working so harmoniously with our Park Service. And while this building is nearing the time when it will have to be devoted wholly to public use, we are glad that it will be possible to accommodate your organization in other quarters in the park.

We plan to restore, or recreate as authentically as possible, the entire row of houses on the north side of Walnut Street between Third and Fourth Streets. Your new home will be located there. It will be a strategic headquarters site from which to tell your story and his story.

The heart of old Philadelphia has the Nation's greatest concentration of physical reminders of the story of independence and the establishment of the United States as a free country.

Urban blight caused this neighborhood to degenerate, but the move to reclaim the area, launched by the Independence Hall Association under the leadership of Judge Edwin O. Lewis, [We are honored to have him here tonight.] has been gathering vigor. It is now one of the foremost historical projects in the country, representing a joint Federal, State, and community expenditure of perhaps $30 million.

As to the Federal part, we've been working, as you know. We will continue to work. We hope to put up a Visitor Center to guide visitors from City Tavern to Carpenters' Hall and finally to Independence Hall.

The reconstruction of City Tavern, where Paul Revere brought the news of the closing of the port of Boston, and where delegates to the First Continental Congress met to do their politicking, is vital to the interpretation of the park story.

Carl Schurz would have been delighted with City Tavern. Those men had faith and courage and high intelligence. They were in love with the words "Liberty" and "Freedom" and "Democracy." And like him, they were spoiling for a fight.

I've had a personal lift learning about Carl Schurz. As a tough-minded and dedicated Secretary of the Interior, he wrenched my Department off its old ways and set it moving ahead on a path of progress. His lofty aims in the park and recreation field are an inspiration today, when we have nearly run out of time in which to save the wild and beautiful open spaces from the bulldozer. His vigilance in sounding the alarm for the vanishing forest lands set off a clamor that finally resulted in corrective action.

This German-born agitator was the essence of Americanism. It is fitting that we pay tribute to his memory tonight here at the birthplace of America. We need to be reminded of what he did and why.

The Festering Finger of Fidel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. HALEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked permission to extend my remarks so that I may place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial entitled "The Festering Finger of Fidel," which appeared in the Auburndale Star, of Auburndale, Fla.

Editor John Lopp expresses his deep concern that if Cuba remains in the hands of Fidel Castro and the Communists then "the sands of time will have all but run for a free Western World." Mr. Lopp brings out facts which have not been readily available to the American people, but facts which should be heeded. The editorial follows:

THE FESTERING FINGER OF FIDEL

(By John D. Lopp)

Sixty-some-odd years, a handful of wars and a lot of old-fashioned ideas and ideals have moved into the limbo since an American ensign carried a message to Garcia and a mine went off under the hull of the old battleship *Maine*.

There remain alive to tell of their exploits only a few of the boys that battled their way through Cuban jungle and swamplands and charged up San Juan Hill despite dysentery caused by poorly pickled pork and contaminated drinking water, despite the sweat of subequatorial sun and winter issue uniforms and despite malaria and yellow jack and the hail of Spanish bullets.

Now threescore years later, these United States are confronted with the necessity of another Cuban adventure.

Pattern of action may be disclosed before this column appears in print—or perhaps, the administration will drag its heels hoping against hope that something less drastic than a blockade of the island—if not an actual invasion—will become possible.

But one thing is almost certain. The United States cannot permit a Communist government supported, directed, and supplied by the connivers in the Kremlin to operate a scant 100 miles off the Florida coast.

This is not the time for recriminations. Whatever blame there is—and there appears to be plenty for all to share—must now be forgotten as the United States extricates itself from one of its most critical crises since the Russian bear turned red and learned to walk like a man.

At the risk of precipitating world war III, at the peril of invoking a new Berlin blockade combined with a renewal of conflict in Korea, a new attack on Matsu and Quemoy and brush wars around the globe, the United States must stamp out the newly created Communist center in the New World.

And that will not be an easy task in itself—even if the rest of the world remains quiet.

There are many facts that we as Americans must recognize.

And in the opinion of this column the first and major fact is this.

Castro's triumph was not part of an economic revolution. Its goal was not the creation of a more equitable economy for an oppressed and downtrodden people.

The workers of Cuba were not serfs held in near bondage under an archaic feudal system. Cuba was not a backward nation with rich and powerful landowners exploiting the impoverished peasants.

Neither was Cuba a land where foreign industrialists grew fat and rich while oppressed workers lived in dire and repugnant poverty.

That picture, painted during and after Castro's "ordeal in the mountains" by dogooder propagandists, followed to the letter the long existent Communist line. Many an American reporter—either unintentionally, or with an affinity for the left—followed that line—just as they did when the Chinese Communists were gobbling up all of what was ancient Cathay.

Back in the days of the Red Chinese conquest the phrase "agrarian reform" was born. The Red Chinese were not "really Communists," the readers and listeners of this Nation were assured. They were, instead, gentle "agrarian reformers," out to battle against the poverty and helplessness of the poor coolies who pulled rickshaws by day and scrounged meager handfuls of rice for their daily subsistance.

That same siren song was sung for Castro as he played "Robin Hood" in the mountains of Oriente and even after he seized power and began carving up the lands and nationalizing the sugar mills and cane fields and oil refineries and all the other industries which in recent years had made Cuba the third richest and prosperous country in the Western Hemisphere.

Readers in the United States hadn't been told that Cuba's national income in 1957 was a whopping $2,300 million, a figure surpassed only by Brazil, Argentina, Mexico and Venezuela—all nations 10 times the size of Cuba.

They were not told that the Cuban per capita income was $360 a year, or that that figure exceeded by almost 30 percent the average of Latin America and placed Cuba third in the hemisphere behind only the United States and Canada.

Readers here were not told that Cuba had one radio for every five inhabitants and a television set for each 18 of its 6,674,601 citizens.

We in the States were not told that Cubans operated almost 175,000 automobiles, 55,000 trucks and 5,000 buses or one automobile for each 39 inhabitants. Argentina has one car for every 60 and Brazil one for every 158 of its population.

The record on telephones, miles of railway, electrical and gas consumption, refrigerators, oil usage and all the other yardsticks by which an economy of a nation is judged, are almost identical in their contrast.

In 1958, Cuba's 38,000 industrial and farm centers employed 960,770 workers and another 250,000 found work in commercial centers. The total value of Cuba's industrial output in 1958 was more than $3 billion.

But statistics grow boring and those already quoted should serve their purpose in proving that Castro's revolution was not economic.

Instead, it was political, inspired by and directed by the Kremlin as a great experiment.

If communism—under the guise of "agrarian reform"—could triumph in wealthy, busy, well-fed, prosperous Cuba, the rest of Latin America would be a pushover. So reasoned the Kremlin.

And thus far that experiment has paid off, aided by those who have pictured the bearded butcher as a modern-day Robin Hood, purloining from the rich to give to the poor.

If Cuba stays Communist—if Castro retains control of the bedeviled isle, or if others of his like are returned to power by a sudden coup of the military, or by the aid of American intervention—the sands of time will have all but run for a free Western World.

From the Cuban beachhead, the Kremlin connivers stand where the Conquistadores of old once stood, with the whole of the southern continent before them ready for exploitation.

If the United States moves—and in the opinion of this column that move will come quickly—Communists around the world will raise the cry of Yankee Imperialism.

This column says let them raise it.

And then let's answer that Communist canard with facts and figures.

In 1939 American interests owned more than 60 sugar mills in Cuba, producing 55 percent of the islands output. Cubans that year controlled 56 mills.

In 1958, just before Castro, there were only 36 American-owned sugar mills representing a meager 36.6 percent of the output as compared to the 121 mills controlled by Cubans, with a production of 62.13 percent.

In 1939 American investments in Cuba amounted to $1,660,555,000. Twenty-eight

years later those investments had dropped to approximately $800 million.

On the basis of the total Cuban industrial investment, valued at more than $2 billions in 1958, the total of U.S. holdings in the island represented a minute 20 percent of the overall figure.

Adlai Stevenson might well ask the clamoring Communists of the United Nations if a nation would be imperialistic if it were to consider a war that would cost millions daily to protect an infinitesimal $800 million investment.

Those figures alone should prove that the United States, when it acts, is not playing at Yankee imperialism.

Neither is it indulging in an orgy of American idealism.

Any action contemplated, or taken, will result from hardheaded Yankee realism.

The United States cannot long exist as a bulwark of freedom, with a festering Communist hangnail pointing directly at the Florida coastline, a finger that threatens all of the Americas from the Bering Sea to Tierra del Fuego.

What Will the Harvest Be?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include a letter to me under date of April 27, from a typical, good American farm wife, Mrs. Jack W. Hester, of Honey Creek, Iowa, who speaks for herself and her husband, along with my letter in part to them asking their permission to have their letter printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and their reply.

Mr. Speaker, the letter to me dated April 27 sets out in plain, scholarly, understandable language the position which these good, hard-working American farmers fear they will experience in complying with the 1961 feed grain law. Of course, thousands of our farmers are in the same category with the Hesters, who it appears have no choice but to sign up, or else. The letters follow:

HONEY CREEK, IOWA, *April 27, 1961.*

DEAR MR. JENSEN: For several years now we have been asked to write our President and Congressmen, how we feel about different Government legislation. Little attention did we give to it until the last couple years, when the agricultural controversy got to the place it is making even more satisfied farmers feel poverty stricken.

Jack and I are 32 and 28 years, respectively. We have four children ranging from 7 years to 3 months. We live on a rented 173 acres which has both bottom and hills. With lots of work and modern farming practices we have averaged over 80 bushel an acre corn. We aren't specializing, but milk cows, sell some eggs, and our main source of income is hogs.

We would like to point out we started farming in 1953, with a Farmers Home Administration loan. We are not debt free, but feel we have gained a lot not only in material assets, but in doing what we enjoy.

Please don't get the idea we feel we've reached our goal, as we're working toward the day we can buy the land we now rent. If we can accomplish this and raise our family with hopes of college for them, we don't feel we have room to complain. We feel we can reach this goal without the Federal Government giving it to us.

We do not like the present farm plan, but what choice is there when the landlady has to seal her corn. The corn program came out saying to put 20 percent and 40 percent in diverted acres. You would receive 50 percent of your average yield on first 20 percent. When we received our papers, we got a 65 bushel average yield. Where did our other 15 bushels go?

The television program out of Ames on the farm plan said the main purpose of the program was to increase farm income. Does this mean the farmer with the initiative to improve his farming practices takes the penalty for someone who doesn't try? Was it just a snow job for farmers, figuring they wouldn't know any better?

As far as the soybean support price is concerned, more people will raise them. Then another excess crop. We have always sold them for more than support prices. After this is there going to be complete control, too?

We are definitely against the Government controlling everything as suggested by the long-range farm plan. What initiative (the one thing our country boasts about) will be left if everything goes to bushel, pound, etc., measurements? The Government telling us to raise so much and no more.

We believe our country is the best, but the only difference in this policy and the Russian is they are told to raise more and we will be told exactly how much less to raise. Either way the Government takes over.

What do we have left to work for if the Government tells us what we can do? Then they take care of us through old age with social security and medical aid. At this rate all we got left is to say we'll be glad when we're 65 years, as so many are saying. Of course, someone is going to have to pay for all these so-called benefits. There are some people you can give everything and still they want more.

We realize the surplus problem is bad and something has to be done. We believe in the soil bank, with high enough rates, based fairly, and used to get rid of the surplus is still the solution. With high enough payments and lower prices why wouldn't farmers be better off cooperating? Using this system until the surplus is gone. Then give it a chance to take care of itself.

Have been reading where Secretary of Agriculture Freeman is overjoyed with the sign up on the present plan. I do hope he realizes there are a lot of us that had little choice.

Would like to thank you for your time taken to read this.

Sincerely,
Mr. and Mrs. JACK W. HESTER.

MAY 11, 1961.

DEAR MR. AND MRS. HESTER: Your letter to me about the feed grain law for the 1961 crop year is the best I have received in that you explain in more detail the effect which the law will have on your income, etc.

Therefore, I feel your letter deserves the wide publicity it would receive by having it inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Please know I would not have your letter made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is mailed each day to over 68,000 people in the United States, without your approval. May I have your approval to do so?

Sincerely yours,
BEN F. JENSEN,
Member of Congress, Seventh Iowa District.

MAY 16, 1961.

DEAR MR. JENSEN: In regard to your letter of May 11, we'd be honored to have our letter printed in any publication.

We feel very proud and happy to find out that an individual still has a chance to be heard in our great country. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Mr. and Mrs. JACK W. HESTER.

Success Story of the A-G Cooperative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the A-G Cooperative at Arcadia, Wis., has made great progress during a time when many small agricultural industries have suffered financial reverses. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD an article from the Buffalo County Journal, Alma, Wis., that details the success story of this farmer cooperative:

DAIRY CO-OP MEETS CHALLENGE

Here's the success story of a local farmer cooperative that made good during difficult times.

The A-G Cooperative of Arcadia, Wis., organized in 1924 as a merger of two small creameries, has been studied by farm economists Henry H. Bakken and Luis Mejia-Mattei of the University of Wisconsin.

They were interested in this cooperative because it has made big strides forward during the last 10 years while many small agricultural industries and businesses have undergone financial adjustments and slowups.

The farm economists point to the growth in size and importance of the A-G Cooperative, especially during the last 10 years, as a result of the co-op's efforts at integration and diversification of its activities and its willingness to take on new enterprises.

For instance the co-op launched a large scale integrated broiler operation early in 1951. First the cooperative installed facilities for hatching chicks and distributing feed and other supplies. Later facilities for processing broilers we also developed. It now also runs two feed mills.

As a result of this expansion, some farmer-members in the community are specializing in the production of eggs for hatching purposes. Others are raising broilers or supplying grain for milling.

In the broiler setup farmers receive supplies from the association on a credit basis and pay for them with their products. The association exerts some control over the activities at all stages of broiler production, but the farmer-members in turn have control of the association by means of their votes. This makes for an effective and yet flexible balance, the economists say.

Bakken and Meja-Mattei say the cooperative has proved its success by growth in output and higher than average returns to the members. The cooperative processed more than 24 million pounds of broilers from 1957 to 1959. That represents one-eighth of the total output of commercial broilers in the State. When patronage refunds are considered, the price received by the broiler growers have also been substantially higher than the average for the State.

Another move toward vertical integration during the last 10 years has been a tie-in with Dried Milk Products Cooperative at Eau Claire, now renamed Dairy Maid Products Cooperative. Dairy Maid Products is a federated association of dairy plants through

which A–G Cooperative can market much of its output of dried milk and part of its butter production.

The expanded business interests and new markets raised the total sales volume of the A–G Cooperative to more than $8 million in 1959.

A–G employs more than 140 persons and gives part-time work to about 60 more. More than half the cooperative's income is still from the processing and sale of dairy products. But the other operations help avoid periods of slowdown and layoff when dairy products drop in price.

A Decade of Army Experience Under the Uniform Code of Military Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the April issue of the Federal Bar News, the monthly magazine of the Federal Bar Association, carries a thought-provoking article concerning a report recently issued by an ad hoc committee which studied the Uniform Code of Military Justice in the light of the 1961 needs of the Army. The committee was appointed by former Secretary of the Army Wilber M. Brucker.

The article was written by Capt. Julian B. Garrick, Jr., JAGC, USA, and 1st Lt. Francis J. Larkin, JAGC, USAR, both of whom are now assigned to the Army Judge Advocate General's Office in the Pentagon. The Judge Advocate General, Maj. Gen. Charles L. Decker, USA, was a member of the ad hoc committee, as was my distinguished constituent, Maj. Gen. George W. Hickman, Jr., USA, retired, former Judge Advocate General of the Army, who now is professor of law at the University of San Diego.

Through the courtesy of the editor of the Federal Bar News, Mr. Marion Edwyn Harrison, himself the author of several articles on administrative and military law, include, under unanimous consent, article in the Appendix of the RECORD as a portion of my remarks:

(The editors of the Federal Bar News congratulate Captain Carrick and Lieutenant Larkin upon writing and making available to the News as a "scoop" the following discussion of a very important report of interest to all military lawyers. The following views are, of course, those of the coeditors.)

A DECADE OF ARMY EXPERIENCE UNDER THE UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE

(By Francis J. Larkin and Julian B. Carrick, Jr.)

On May 31, 1951, with the enactment of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, there came to pass the most significant milestone in the history of American military justice. The Uniform Code, in addition to consolidating the disciplinary law of all the services, made sweeping and elaborate changes in trial and appellate procedures as well as material changes in substantive law. It was widely hailed as bringing meaningful improvements to the field of military justice.

The first decade of administering military justice under this system is now drawing to a close. However, despite the wealth of publicity accorded the uniform code, until the later part of 1959 no service had attempted a truly comprehensive survey of its effectiveness in operation. As experience frequently illumes pitfalls in the most seemingly perfect precept, and as changes in internatonal conditons during the past decade have produced a significant shift of emphasis in nearly all aspects of American defense policy and defense planning—a shift whose deflecting considerations ought assuredly be assimilated in any effective and equitable system of military justice—a survey of the effectiveness of the uniform code appeared both desirable and necessary.

CHANGE IN TACTICAL CONCEPTS

The provisions of the Uniform Code of Military Justice were enacted against the tactical background and military experience of World War II. There the accent was on massive, comparatively stationary armies which fought a particular battle within the relatively narrow confines of a specific geographic area. In this type of battle, the forward element of the unit was rarely significantly separated from its immediate headquarters for any extended period of time. Currently, however, military tacticians universally predict that the battlefield of the future will undoubtedly extend over a vast area—an area occupied by widely dispersed groups which, although relatively small in size, will have at their disposal firepower, modes of transportation, and independence of action on a scale undreamt of a decade ago. Any future war, whether limited or global in nature, must place a conspicuous emphasis on the necessity for independence of action and a concomitant emphasis on complete tactical and administrative integrity within the smaller unit. An effective system of military justice, capable of functioning in war or peace, must assuredly accord due emphasis to these and other relevant nonlegal considerations. For to be effective, criminal law and procedure must accurately reflect the underlying conceptions of the social system with which it is connected and from whose total environment it cannot be split without being mutilated.

APPOINTMENT OF AD HOC COMMITTEE

Thus, convinced that sufficient time had elapsed to provide a broad range of experience and judicial action under the code, in October of 1959, former Secretary of the Army Wilber M. Brucker appointed an ad hoc committee of nine general Army officers to undertake a searching study of the effectiveness and operation of the Uniform Code of Military Justice and its bearing on good order and discipline within the Army. The committee was directed to survey and analyze any inequities or injustices to individuals or the Government resulting from the practical application of the code and the judicial decisions stemming therefrom. It was further directed to inquire into any improvements that should be made in the administration of justice, by legislation or otherwise.

Lt. Gen. (now Gen.) Herbert B. Powell, then commanding general of Continental Army Command, served as president of this committee. The committee members each had a wide variety of Army experience. All had commanded troops; all but one had been either a commander authorized to appoint general courts-martial under the Uniform Code or had served as the chief legal adviser for such a commander.

The committee's first concern was to obtain the widest and most representative sampling of the Code's impact on the Army Establishment from those persons intimately concerned with its day-to-day workings. In short, the committee sought to assess the effectiveness of the Code in terms of its impact on persons and not merely through an examination of its provisions. To this end, all of the 96 commanders who exercise general courts-martial jurisdiction in the Army were asked to answer specific questions calculated to measure the effectiveness and equity of the Code. Moreover, the Adjutant General, under the guidance of the committee, undertook a comprehensive survey of the opinions of a wide range of battle group, battalion and company or battery commanders. Further, some 2,000 enlisted men, of varying grades and experience, were also asked to answer specifically devised questionnaires on the Code's impact on the enlisted ranks. Finally, the Judge Advocate General obtained the views of a cross section of more than 200 judge advocates, including some 50 judge advocates particularly selected because of extensive experience as defense counsel. All of the surveys were oriented toward measuring the effectiveness of the Code in terms of four basic criteria which the committee had initially determined must exist in any truly effective system of military justice. These criteria were:

1. Does the code aid the commander in directing his unit toward success in peace or war?

2. Does it emphasize the rehabilitation of offenders into effective soldiers?

3. It is an effective means of disposing of criminal charges?

4. Is it accepted as fair and equitable?

While this survey was proceeding, the committee drew on extensive professional assistance to review the evolution of the code and the manner in which it had been interpreted and applied.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

After 3 months of intensive hearings and investigation the committee submitted its findings and recommendations which have recently been made public. The committee found that while, on the whole, the code had demonstrated certain advantages over prior systems of military justice, there was a very real necessity for changes of considerable sweep and scope as well as material conceptual modifications. It found not only that these changes are needed under the conditions obtaining in the world today, but, more importantly, that the need would become acute if the system were to operate practically and effectively under combat conditions.

TOO FREQUENT RECOURSE TO COURTS-MARTIAL

One of the most significant of all the committee's findings was that commanders of individual units did not possess sufficient authority to correct soldiers without resort to trial by courts-martial. Indeed the most frequently recurring complaint was the narrow limitations on nonjudicial or company punishment under article 15. The principal basis for dissatisfaction was that the action which a commander can take to correct a minor offender is in many instances inadequate or inappropriate. As a result, offenders were frequently tried by courts-martial for relatively minor offenses, and if found guilty, would thereafter bear the onus of a criminal conviction. Because of their limited nonjudicial punishment power, commanders have utilized this power far less frequently than was anticipated when the code was adopted.

A THREE-TIERED SYSTEM OF COURTS

The Army has a three-tiered system of courts: (1) A summary court-martial which is a one-officer court with jurisdiction to impose a partial forfeiture of 1 month's pay and up to 1 month's confinement; (2) a special court-martial, composed of at least three members and counsel for both sides, which can impose a partial forfeiture of 6 months' pay and confinement for 6 months; and (3) the general court-martial, composed of at least five members, a law officer (trial judge), and service-lawyer counsel for both sides, which can impose any punishment authorized by the code, including punitive dis-

charge and death. The committee found that, in the main, the offenders coming before general courts-martial had committed a criminal offense whose seriousness indicated that the offender was beyond the rehabilitation resources and ability of local unit commanders; while, on the other hand, the offender who comes before summary and special courts is a soldier in whom the local commander sees a definite and immediate rehabilitation potential.

It was felt that in these situations the present system, emphasizing conviction and sentence, was not in the best interests of the accused. Conviction by a court-martial creates a criminal record which, upon the soldier's return to civilian life, is a serious handicap.

This result assuredly need not and should not be, particularly if it is conceded that but for the narrow limitations and inflexibility of article 15 punishment, a great many cases which are tried by special and summary courts would be regarded not as matters for criminal courts but as matters for correction by a commander. Civilian experience affords a happy analogy to a more enlightened treatment of this class of offenses. Under civilian systems, juvenile offenders ordinarily are not dealt with as criminals. Instead, the circumstances of offenses are investigated by case workers attached to the court, and the judge deals directly with the offender and his parents. The objective of these procedures is to foster in the young offender the awareness of the unacceptability of certain behavior and to inculcate in him a desire to conform to the standards of society—not to label him a convicted criminal. In philosophy and procedure, modern civilian treatment of youthful offenders resembles nonjudicial punishment by a military commander.

COMMANDER'S CORRECTIVE ACTION

Indeed, it is undoubtedly more accurate to refer to nonjudicial punishment as commander's corrective action. Before taking action against an offender the commander advises him that he may demand trial by court-martial in lieu of action by the commander. If the soldier has actually committed an offense, he will usually accept the corrective measures prescribed by his commander rather than request a trial. As long as the correction is generally accepted as commensurate to the offense, the probabilities are that it will be effective. The offender will feel that he has been fairly treated, and his fellow soldiers will recognize the transgression did not go unpunished. Most significantly, while the action will have a salutary effect upon the individual and on unit discipline, the offender will bear no stigma of criminal conviction.

The committee found that the necessity of referring the great majority of disciplinary problems to a summary or special court-martial underscored another infelicity in the present system. It is mischief which derives in part from the very conceptual basis of the tripartite codal classification of courts-martial and, in part, from judicial interpretations which have construed the legal radiations therefrom. It may be said that the general orientation of the uniform code emphasized the fact that nonlawyer aegis of general courts-martial belonged to a former day. Thus the code provided that a law officer, a lawyer certified by the Judge Advocate General as competent to perform such duties, must serve on every general court-martial. This officer has been said to occupy a position roughly equivalent to that of a Federal district court judge. In addition, in general courts-martial, counsel for both the accused and the Government must be officers who are lawyers. In short, the general court-martial, as well befits a tribunal exercising jurisdiction over serious offenses and capable of imposing stringent sentences, is amply supervised and administered by legally trained personnel.

However, as previously noted, Congress did not stop when it created the general court; it also created special and summary courts-martial for less serious offenses. With respect to these latter tribunals, however, there was no requirement that they be supervised by lawyers at the trial level or that counsel for the accused or Government be attorneys.

While the Congress thus drew a conceptual dichotomy between the lawyer-oriented general courts-martial and the lay-oriented special and summary tribunals, it made no distinction between these three forums in terms of the standards and rules to be applied. Thus, in the beginning, even under the code, the day to day administration of military justice in inferior courts continued to depend on the rules and regulations embodied in the Manual for Courts-Martial, Article 67 of the code, however, also established the U.S. Court of Military Appeals, composed of three civilian judges. This tribunal reviews all cases in which the sentence extends to death or affects a general or flag officer, cases forwarded for its review by the Judge Advocate General and cases in which, on petition of the accused, it has granted review.

Since its establishment, the Court of Military Appeals has continually asserted a prerogative to develop military law through the decisional process and to hold these decisions paramount to any contrary presidential regulations expressed in the manual. Moreover, gradually, the court's tendency has been to exact from courts-martial of lesser jurisdiction full compliance with all codal standards. The impact of this proclivity is being felt increasingly in the case of the special court-martial. Here the layman president must not only instruct the members of the court on such items as the elements of the offense charged, presumption of innocence, rule of reasonable doubt and burdens of proof, but also, when raised by the evidence, to instruct on such complex legal matters as affirmative defenses, lesser included offenses, insanity, capacity to entertain specific intent, and many others. In essence, he must give the same instructions concerning relevant legal principles as those which are given by a qualified professional law officer in a general court or an experienced civilian trial judge in a criminal case. To compound this almost quixotic situation, in 1957 the court ruled that the Manual for Courts-Martial—which had been designed to assist the lay-officer in the performance of his military justice duties—could no longer be used by court members other than the president during a special court-martial, thereby severely restricting the access of the members to their traditional procedural and legal guide. In an atmosphere where nonlawyer personnel are constrained to play the part of lawyers but their guidebook is taken from them it is not surprising that congeniality to confusion and the commission of error abide.

RELUCTANCE TO CONVENE SPECIAL COURTS

From the viewpoint of the smaller tactical unit and because of this situation, the committee found that battalion and battlegroup commanders were either unable or reluctant to convene special courts-martial with the officers available in their units. They have felt it increasingly necessary to refer their disciplinary problems to higher headquarters where legal expertise is available. Decentralized operation has become difficult. This result, perforce, derogates the effectiveness of the subordinate unit commander as a leader, and is antithetical to a concept of self-sufficiency and integrity within the individual unit—the oft-cited sine qua non of any future combat operations.

ELIMINATE SUMMARY AND SPECIAL COURTS

To improve the situation the committee recommended a basic conceptual change aimed at eliminating the summary and special courts-martial and granting commanders additional power to correct members of their command without resort to courts-martial. It would be the commander's responsibility to determine whether an offender represents a disciplinary problem which he has the means to dispose of, or whether his case is of sufficient gravity to forward to a general court-martial as a serious criminal charge. Company and batter commanders would be authorized to prescribe loss of pay or restraint for short periods, commensurate with the sentence of the present summary court. Older and more experienced commanders of larger units would possess graduated powers to impose sanctions roughly equivalent to the average sentence actually served under a sentence by a special court-martial. The graduated powers of commanders would permit them to achieve a requisite disciplinary effect without using criminal processes.

Of course, provision is made for any accused to decline the commander's corrective action and to elect trial by court-martial. Moreover, the person who accepts the commander's correction would have a right to appeal to the next higher commander concerning the appropriateness of the corrective measure taken.

It was the committee's feeling that such a change would have three predictable and salutary effects. It would increase the sense of personal responsibility and awareness which a commander should feel in the discipline and welfare of his unit. It would foster discipline through correction which was prompt and predicated on a soldier's voluntarily accepting it in preference to being tried by court-martial. Finally, but most significantly, the lasting effects of a criminal conviction would be avoided.

Fundamental to the committee's foregoing recommendations was the premise that only a general court-martial, with its pervasive legal panoply, could competently function as a tribunal equipped to follow the constantly changing twists and turns of criminal law and impose criminal convictions as sanctions. Nonetheless, while espousing this principle, the committee found that certain modifications would greatly improve the effectiveness of the general court as an instrument of swift and sure justice. Again, this need for modification has stemmed from the fact that certain of the procedures in the code have proved to be unnecessarily cumbersome, while other refinements, introduced by judicial interpretation, have tended to dilute its efficiency in support of military operations.

Two committee proposals designed to simplify the proceedings before a general court-martial follow.

Under the present code, a general court-martial does not come into being until the members of the court (the jury) are present, subjected to challenge and sword. The members must stand by while the law officer disposes of preliminary motions and other interlocutory matters that arise during the trial. The committee discovered that an inordinate loss of man-hours resulted from this procedure. It concluded that this situation could be remedied by an expanded and more effective use of the law officer. It proposed that the law officer, without convening the members of the court, be permitted to conduct preliminary hearings on all exclusively legal questions. Under the proposed procedure, such a matter as ruling on a request for the attendance of a witness located at considerable distance from the site of the trial would be determined before the actual convening of the court. In addition to the

man-hours thus saved, it was felt that the members—the fact finders—would be better able to determine guilt or innocence on the basis of a cogently integrated development of competent evidence, devoid of the distracting interruptions that now arise because of arguments on such legalities as the admissibility of documents and arguments on motions.

TRIAL BY LAW OFFICER ALONE

The committee also recommended that upon the express request of an accused, approved by the convening authority, a trial by general court-martial could be conducted by the law officer alone, without any members on the court. This proposal not only adopts the familiar civilian practice of allowing a criminal defendant to waive trial by jury, but it results in freeing at least five officers, usually senior grade, for military duties—another gain in the Army's continual struggle to use its manpower efficiently.

DESIRABILITY OF INDETERMINATE SENTENCE

In their consideration of the question of sentences, the committee discovered that while courts-martial announce sentences to confinement in terms of fixed periods, as long as the offender remains under military control, these sentences are, in effect, indeterminate in nature. It was recommended that sentences, as announced, henceforth indicate this indeterminate nature as an added incentive to foster individual rehabilitation. This opportunity is perhaps more appealing to the military prisoner than it is to his civilian counterpart, since the restored soldier has guaranteed gainful employment awaiting him, whereas the civilian's employment future is likely to be fraught with difficulty because of his criminal record.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A SENTENCE CONTROL BOARD

To take full advantage of the indeterminate sentence program, the committee recommended the establishment of a sentence control board to administer all aspects of the disposition of prisoners serving an indeterminate sentence to confinement. Under present practice, the functions essential to the effective operation of an indeterminate sentence system are divided between boards of review, appellate bodies which consider not only the legality of court-martial proceedings but also the appropriateness of the sentence, and the Secretary of the Army, who has the power to remit or suspend the sentence and restore the offender to duty. The sentence control board would bring together in one body, direction of all activities essential to an efficient and equitable sentence and rehabilitation system. The board would have authority to suspend or remit sentences, power to grant parole or to give an unconditional release from confinement, power to effect the return of demonstrably worthy individuals to military service, and the authority to substitute an administrative form of discharge for an unexecuted punitive discharge. Finally, it was recommended that in exceptionally meritorious cases when the board restores a soldier to duty, it could also provide for the eradication of the record of the conviction from the record of the soldier after an appropriate period of exemplary performance of duty.

THE COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS

Undoubtedly, one of the most arresting provisions of the Uniform Code was the creation of the Court of Military Appeals as the supreme court of the military. During its 9 years of existence, the court has created a body of military law of uncommon excellence. However, it was found that in two principal areas, the decisional pattern of court opinions does not harmonize with the societal texture of the military community. The first of these areas relates to the tendency on the part of the court to place a sometimes impermissive emphasis on civilian rules of practice, without according due weight to the peculiar exigencies of military service. As an illustrative example, recently the court, in reversing a conviction for usury in violation of article 134, the so-called general article, held "since military law in general, and Army regulations in particular provide no legal rate of interest, the exaction of any given rate (in the case at bar, 100 percent per month) cannot be described as illegal and therefore, usurious. The interest alleged * * * may indeed be unconscionable but it is not unlawful." This decision has the practical effect of condoning a practice that has been prohibited by the military services since before the War of 1812. On the procedural side, the Army is now faced with serious problems in the trial of cases because of a decision of the court which precludes use of testimony obtained through the use of written interrogatories not obtained in the presence of the accused. To illustrate, a far too frequently occurring offense, both in military and civilian life, is that of writing bad checks. Where a serviceman stationed overseas draws such an instrument on a stateside bank it is now necessary to send the witness having knowledge of the status of his account overseas for the purpose of giving testimony, to return the accused to the States so that he may be present at the taking of the deposition of this witness, or, as the least favorable but most practical alternative, dismiss the charges. The committee felt that these and similar decisions were not conducive to the maintenance of effective discipline in the service.

The second generic area of the court's decisions which concerned the committee involved that tribunal's pronounced tendency to downgrade the standing of the Manual for Courts-Martial, a presidential regulation, and, in effect, to declare that many provisions of the Manual are invalid exercises of the President's authority as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. This tendency has been particularly marked in the sentence and punishment area but it has extended to many other fields. The committee found it absolutely essential to the maintenance of discipline and good order that the court not interfere with the President's constitutional and statutory power to state authoritatively general policies governing extent of military penalties, customs of the service, minimal standards of conduct for particular grades and, in general, to promulgate rules essential to the maintenance of discipline in a fighting force as distinguished from a civilian community. The committee called for a legislative reaffirmation of the traditionally accepted power of the President in this area.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it should be noted that while the committee's findings are based solely on Army experience, the principles underlying the recommended changes—fairness, simplicity, decentralization and stability—are no less relevant and no less vital to the other services. The fact that the first decade of experience under the uniform code disclosed imperfections is not at all discouraging. Such was to be expected. As Dr. Alfred North Whitehead, noted philosopher and mathematician, has stated while speaking in a scientific context: "When we survey the history of thought, and likewise the history of practice, we find that one idea after another is tried out, its limitations defined, and its core of truth elicited * * *. The proper test is not that of finality, but of progress."

A Peace Corps Critic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, without coming to the Congress with a request for authorization and the funds to organize a Peace Corps, the President with characteristic impetuous vigor turned this meritorious sounding idea over to his brother-in-law to initiate.

I said at the time if I were a university student I would embrace the idea, but if I were the parent of such a student, I would have misgivings. But in any event, as I said, it was my belief that the President should have set guidelines and spelled out the objectives and details of the Peace Corps plan to the Congress and the American people before the project was started.

At first blush, there was rapturous enthusiasm over the program. Only a few politicians and members of the press failed to respond favorably. One or two articles appeared referring to the Children's Crusade in the year 1212 when 30,000 innocent children marched through Europe singing hymns headed for the Holy Land to rescue the true cross from the infidels. The history of their failure and tragic results, it was implied, might be repeated.

Generally, however, in the face of the popular wave of endorsements which were given the idea of a modern Peace Corps, doubting Thomases kept their views off the record or to themselves.

One such doubter has spoken out. Of course, he is not a politician and is willing to express himself regardless of public opinion. The views of this individual are described in the following news article which was printed in the May 15, 1961, issue of the Seattle Times. I suggest members of the committees having jurisdiction over foreign affairs read it:

PEACE CORPS VIEWED AS BOOMERANG

President Kennedy's Peace Corps is likely to prove a boomerang in the U.S. efforts to win friends, in the opinion of a ship-line executive who has spent much of his life trying to improve the Nation's position abroad.

The fear was expressed by Lee Worley, district manager of the Moore-McCormack Steamship Co. in Bahia, Brazil.

Worley, a University of Washington graduate, came here to spend Mother's Day with his mother, Mrs. Nellie Worley of Bothell.

Worley speaks of international relations with 30 years' experience in them. He entered the Foreign Service in 1931 and spent 8 years in service on three continents, then resigned to marry a Brazilian girl whom he had met in Bahia.

Shortly after returning to Bahia with Moore-McCormack in 1940, Worley was one of the organizers of the Brazilian-American Cultural Association.

The organization has helped send nearly 3,000 Brazilian students to American universities.

"I'm afraid the Peace Corps is going to boomerang," Worley said.

"You can't tell these young people what to say and what not to say—especially what not to say."

Worley gave an example.

An American university, seeking to improve international relations, sent 14 of its students to the University of Bahia for their senior year. Worley and an officer in the Brazilian Navy had lunch with one of them.

"The student," Worley said, "in his inexperience asked a question on a very delicate subject.

"To the student, looking at it as an American, it was a logical question.

"But the instant he asked it, the Brazilian officer's face showed the effect.

"The student didn't know that what he intended as an innocent question will be remembered by that officer, perhaps forever, as an insult to his country.

"When a mistake like that is made by a member of the Peace Corps, in a foreign country under the sponsorship of the State Department, the effect will be worse."

And every mistake which an American makes in a foreign country, Worley said, provides ammunition for the Communists.

"The Communists," Worley said, "don't ever talk communism in Latin America.

"The Communists have just one theme: 'Hate America.'"

Nation of First Spaceman Is Up in Air Over Lack of Goods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, while Russia has sent the first man into space, Russia is not first in many things. Perhaps it is fitting that we should sympathize also with the great mass of Russians who do not know where their next pork chop, meat grinder, or television set is coming from.

It seems that the nation which was able to send the first man into space cannot fill the daily needs of its earthbound citizens. I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an interesting report from a correspondent of the Baltimore Sun on consumer shortages in the land of the proletariat:

NATION OF FIRST SPACEMAN IS UP IN THE AIR OVER LACK OF GOODS

Moscow, April 19.—The nation that produced the first spaceman has not been able to produce enough television sets and refrigerators to satisfy public demand. Neither, for that matter, is the Soviet Union making enough frying pans or garden shovels.

There are constant cries about the quantity and quality of all types of consumer goods * * *.

Storages are daily phenomena of Soviet life.

STORE OUT OF MEAT

Moscow's largest store, GUM, has not been able to fill an order of beefsteaks or pork chops for a week.

Mothers and grandmothers stand in line for hours to buy expensive but poorly made children's clothes in the highly propagandized "children's world" department store which must be the most crowded, most uncomfortable store ever built.

A load of liver at the collective farm market draws a queue 40-woman long in minutes.

Food is plentiful if you are willing to confine your vegetable diet, for example, to potatoes, carrots, and cabbage and several other roots. Variety has not been discovered in Moscow's winter markets.

Still most Russians in Moscow privately complain about problems in buying television sets, refrigerators, pianos, and any type of home electrical equipment.

But Moscow is the showplace of the country. In other cities, you cannot buy meat grinders, pans, kitchenware, locks and keys, most types of sport equipment and shovels.

These are just spot items. The list could be extended.

Production of consumer goods here naturally takes last place although Soviet officials are increasing the investment year by year.

Kunkel U.S. Army Reserve Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT E. COOK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, May 13, I had the pleasure of attending the dedication ceremony for the new Kunkel U.S. Army Reserve Center on the grounds of the Lordstown Military Reservation in Lordstown, Ohio.

The new Reserve center was named in honor of S. Sgt. John H. Kunkel, who gave his life for our country during World War II. At the dedication ceremony, the major address was given by the Honorable George H. Gentithes, an attorney of Warren, Ohio. His remarks were very appropriate to the occasion and expressed a viewpoint as to the world situation that was both timely and inspiring. I am inserting his remarks in the RECORD for the information of the other Members of Congress.

Mr. Toastmaster, General Beauchamp, distinguished guests, fellow Americans, the high purpose which brings us together on this day and in this place is solemn in character and twofold in nature. On the one hand, we are met here to pay tribute in some small measure to the hundreds of thousands of our fellow citizens who so gallantly and with such devotion serve in our country's Armed Forces. On the other, we meet on this day and in this hour to signally honor one out of these many thousands. It is one who, having given his last ounce of devotion, has earned richly the right to be immortalized both in our hearts and in this imposing edifice.

A special sense of pride fills the hearts of all of us who call Trumbull County our home. This, because we are privileged to solemnize the national event of Armed Forces Day and simultaneously to dedicate one of Ohio's finest Reserve installations to the memory of a hero who, during his life, was close to many of us. Let us, therefore, review the events in that heroic life which made possible this great moment.

The official award of the Distinguished Service Cross to S. Sgt. John H. Kunkel recites his extraordinary heroism at Bougainville and discloses that he occupied a pillbox which was flanked at close range by enemy forces. It related how with calm courage he defended the dangerously exposed key position for 3 days and killed a Japanese soldier who had crawled on top of the pillbox during the night. Though wounded twice, he refused evacuation and though under constant enemy bombardment he constantly relayed important information to his headquarters and directed mortar fire which effectively harrassed the enemy. Despite his wounds he re-entered combat when he learned the enemy launched another attack against the pillbox he so gallantly defended and he halted the enemy attack with machinegun fire. He spurned further medical treatment and instead guided fresh troops into position for a large-scale counterattack which completely defeated the enemy and fully restored the lines.

"His leadership and heroic actions," concludes the citation, "were important factors in removing an enemy threat to the vital Empress Augusta Bay perimeter." What the award, however, does not tell is that his captain described him as a man of extraordinary courage—a man with "real guts" as he put it and a soldier who consistently volunteered for hazardous missions far beyond and above the call of duty. Nor do we have here his lieutenant's summation of this valiant soldier when he said "He really was a one-man army who inspired his buddies to perform acts of heroism that they never thought they could." In addition, his colonel wrote, "Sergeant Kunkel was an outstanding example of an American citizen-soldier with boundless courage and faith. He faced every challenge that a particularly vicious phase of warfare placed in his way. * * * I am humbly grateful that for a few brief moments during the holocaust of war the fleeting life of John H. Kunkel brushed mine."

Nor can the award tell the warmly human story of a young soldier boy who bid a fond farewell to his wife never knowing that this was to be their last goodby and never knowing that she would bear him a daughter whom he would never see. Nor can it tell of the feelings of that pretty daughter who, being in our midst today, reflects upon the fate that denied her the warm touch of her father's lips and the comfort of his paternal embrace. I ask what heart among us here today can truly fathom the depth of the emotions now surging through the minds and hearts of his daughter, his loving parents, and sister as they stand here before us to bear witness to the love, the admiration, and respect we here today are feebly trying to show him.

But just as mere words cannot make us truly know the greatness of his deeds or the depth of his sacrifice, so the dedication of this brick and mortar in his name cannot possibly begin to do sufficient honor to him and to the others who paid the highest price for that commodity which has no price—freedom. If truly we wish to honor his memory and the cause for which he fought there is one way and one way only.

That way is not through speeches, ceremonies, memorials, or high resolves, but through action. But action, if it is to be purposeful, should start by some deep soul-searching into our national heart of hearts. This we should do to determine what has happened and is happening to us as a people since Sgt. Kunkel gave his life in order that we may more intelligently decide just what that action ought to be.

If, therefore, we were to take a moment for some honest uses introspection we will find, I fear, many things which would do dishonor to the Sergeant's memory. We will find for instance that many of our people have been and still are beset with doubt about the soundness of our way of life, confused and perplexed by the events in Cuba and Laos, worried about a rising tide of American unpopularity, apprehensive over the outflow of American gold, pathologically fearful of Russia's lead in the space race and in general gobbling up indiscriminately all kinds of prophecies of national doom. It is

not my purpose to belittle those who are genuinely trying to alert us to the clear and present danger which we face from communism. Quite the contrary, for it is my personal conviction based upon some first-hand experience in these matters that Mr. Khrushchev's vow to bury us is not mere bombast. Indeed, all our responsible leaders have been emphasizing that the hour is quite late, the peril deadly, and that our Nation may already be at the point of no return. As a matter of fact, so certain am I of communism's unalterable, inexorable, and irrevocable plans to conquer and to communize the world that I for one would advocate drawing the line now and permitting no further encroachment upon free world soil. In addition, and simultaneously with drawing such a line, I would advocate that we Americans so revise our thinking on the moral concepts of the cold war that we would support our leaders to the limit in using whatever tactics would implement our national policy and keep us free.

It is quite difficult for a moral and religious people such as our own to favor the use of methods which we find reprehensible in others, but let's please remember we are not playing parlor games. We must therefore not only approve and support, but become proficient in, and make use of such hitherto shunned methods as subversion, infiltration, revolution, guerilla forces, slanted propaganda, sabotage, espionage and all the other "dirty" methods which so far we have been too proud and too honest to employ fully. I could not help but shake my head in bewilderment when one President of the United States publicly apologized for the U–2 incident and another confessed almost apologetically that we aided the cause of freedom in Cuba. I was always taught that a spy once caught was renounced by his country and I was further taught that giving meaning and substance to the Monroe Doctrine is a duty America would never shirk.

Continuing our soul searching, therefore, we will find unfortunately additional attitudes and traits in some of today's Americans which would both sadden and dismay the valiant soul of Sergeant Kunkel. There are those for example, who in an apparent effort to goad this Nation into greater effort in its own defense, resort to the expedient of selling America short by belittling its accomplishments, its capabilities, its revered institutions and its preeminence among the nations of the world. There are others who, through fear, ignorance or misguided good intentions constantly play down and what's worse apologize for our country's proudest achievements. There are those for instance who feel that we must apologize to the rest of the world because we are wealthy. This they do although everyone concedes that we have helped more people with that wealth than any other nation in the history of the world. Then there are others who apologize to the world for the social and economic injustices which still exist within our borders without, however, noting at least in passing that under our form of Government these injustices affect fewer and are less harmful than under any other form.

These fainthearted apologists fail to recognize how inconsequential are our shortcomings when we're compared with some of the largest beneficiaries of our bounty. These beneficiaries, I might add, are often our foremost critics and are people who nourish ironclad social classes and caste systems, or indulge in the art of political assassination or of deporting and annihilating minorities, or suppressing all the freedoms we so cherish. Finally, these apologetic Americans completely forget that the last three wars were fought by us not for gain or glory to ourselves, but to liberate victims of aggression and oppression. I say emphatically, therefore, that it is a grave disservice to the men and women of the Armed Forces whom we honor today as well as to the heroic memory of Sergeant Kunkel to feel apologetic or contrite about the preeminence of this great land of ours in the family of nations. I further say that we should renew unashamedly our old intense patriotic pride in what our country has accomplished, and what it stands for. Let us ever be mindful that whatever we have done has been through hard work and ingenuity. Let us recall that since our founding we have produced more of human happiness and we have made greater contributions to the arts, sciences, and to the economic prosperity of the world than all the despot states of previous centuries combined.

So let's not feel that it is old fashioned to gaze upon Old Glory as it waves proudly in the breeze and to feel our eyes grow misty from deep feeling. Nor is it out of fashion to feel a tingle in our spines when during this afternoon we watch the flower of America's manhood go marching by on parade. On occasions such as these we should all feel confidence and pride—soulfilling, inexpressible, profound pride and not reticence or contriteness as some would have us feel.

Let us therefore not merely dedicate this building to the hallowed memory of Sergeant Kunkle but let us also dedicate ourselves to the great task of revitalizing our Nation, or reaffirming our faith in its great traditions, and above all of truly honoring its valiant Armed Forces. Let us with pride and yes, deep, old-fashioned patriotism ask not that our country give to us, but we to our country and let's seek not the freedom which is freedom from responsibility but as self-reliant citizens let us dedicate and use ourselves for the good of this great land. Together, let us nourish and keep bright the flame of this kind of freedom on our soil and if we do, somehow, someday, with God's divine help, its light will penetrate into and throw brightness upon the many distant darkened corners of the world. Until then, I know you join me in a proud straight-from-the-heart salute to our valiant soldiers, sailors, and airmen and through the dedication of this magnificent structure you join me in giving expression to the prayer. "Eternal be thy memory Sergeant Kunkel."

Administration Farm Bill To Receive Full Scrutiny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. QUIE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the entire country generally and farm groups in particular are busy these days analyzing the proposed administration's omnibus farm bill. I have expressed my concern over this bill, and the powers it seeks to entrench in the Secretary of Agriculture on several occasions—both in the Agriculture Committee and on the floor of this House. The May 25 edition of Hoard's Dairyman commented editorially on the proposed farm bill, and I believe the observations made in their editorial merit the attention of the members of this House:

FARM BILL BEARS SCRUTINY

Now that the administration's farm bill has been introduced into Congress, the debate begins. Thus far, we see the Farm Bureau and the Cattlemen's Association in opposition, and a large group of general farm and commodity organizations in favor.

As we go to press, it appears that the National Milk Producers Federation will neither give blanket endorsement nor flat objection. Instead, it will present a careful analysis, supporting those portions of the bill it thinks desirable and opposing sections which it does not approve. We think this is the course of good judgment.

Our reading of the bill and several analyses leaves us with a mixed feeling of encouragement and uneasiness. We favor the approach of permitting dairymen to work out their own program for stable and profitable markets. But the following points, among others, give cause for caution:

1. The dairy advisory committee will not be elected as previously indicated. Instead, nominees will be named by county ASC committees and farm organizations from which the Secretary of Agriculture will make appointments. We would far prefer nominations to the advisory committee by a direct election process where only dairy farmers would be permitted to vote.

2. Wide discretionary authority is given the Secretary. His powers are so broad that they disturb us greatly. We have no reason to question that the authority of the Secretary will not be exercised with good judgment. We simply oppose in principle any appointed public official being given such executive discretion without safeguards which more directly reflect the desires of dairy farmers themselves.

3. Specifically, we strongly oppose the authority to use direct or compensatory payments.

If enacted, this bill (H.R. 6400) can affect dairy farming for years to come. Surely, then, careful scrutiny and deliberate analysis are warranted now. This is no time for hasty action.

Dry Bean Utilization Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, recently Frank J. Eisengruber, acting executive secretary of the Michigan Bean Shippers Association, and others appeared before the Agriculture Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee requesting more funds for utilization research on dry beans. Many Members of Congress, including myself, also appeared because we feel that the dry bean industry is entitled to this modest support from the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Eisengruber is well informed on production and marketing of dry beans. For 6 years he was a director of the Michigan Bean Shippers Association and for 2 years served as president of the organization. He spent 40 years with one of the largest bean companies in Michigan and when he retired in 1959 he was a director, executive vice president, and general manager of the company.

With this fine background and obvious extensive knowledge of the bean industry he can speak with authority and for that reason I would like to include in the RECORD the statement presented by Mr. Eisenbruber to the Appropriations Subcommittee. I think the Members will find it interesting reading:

First, I would like to explain the National Dry Bean Council. It is the nationwide organization for the dried bean industry. It is an organization composed of the five regional associations. They are the New York Bean Shippers Association, the Michigan Bean Shippers Association, the Rocky Mountain Bean Dealers Association, the Western Bean Dealers Association, and the California Bean Dealers Association. These associations include in their membership the growers, the cooperatives, the processors, the dealers, and the shippers in the domestic dry bean industry. It is safe to assume that these people handle 90 percent of the dried bean business in this country. The membership is representative of the industry from coast to coast in more than 14 States.

Although it is not realized by many people, the dried bean industry is a very integral part of our agricultural economy. The farm value of dry edible beans in 1959 amounted to $127,187,000. These are the most recent figures available.

The dried bean industry is a large industry whether taken from the viewpoint of its contribution to the national agricultural economy, the economy of individual States, or the economy of the United States as a whole. We feel that we merit consideration in the Congress comparable to that afforded other agricultural commodities, and I feel that consideration will be given. Seldom have we called on the Congress for any specific assistance, but we feel that this year we have a legitimate request, and, therefore, I am here to present it.

BEAN INDUSTRY HAS DONE RESEARCH

It would be logical for you to ask at this point why, if the bean industry is as large as I have indicated, they have not attempted to solve the problems of the industry. We have, through our State associations, contracted for research projects of various kinds to assist the dry bean industry. The Idaho Bean Shippers, the California Lima Bean Board, the New York Bean Shippers Association, the Michigan Bean Shippers Association, and other groups have all given financial assistance to research projects over the years. This project which we are requesting today, however, is beyond our financial capabilities so we need the assistance of our Government, which we believe has a financial interest in such a project.

One of the major problems in the dried bean industry lies in the field of utilization research. In the past, this subcommittee, the Congress, and the Department of Agriculture, have given us some assistance in this field and now we would like to prevail upon you for some assistance which is not provided for in this year's budget, at least partially, because we were not prepared to launch this program when this year's budget was being prepared. What we are requesting is an additional $100,000 to be used for research by the Department of Agriculture, the land-grant colleges or by private contract to remove the flatulence and other gassy elements from beans. Perhaps a little explanation will be in order, then I believe I can justify the need for these funds.

Each person's digestion is as peculiar to himself as his own toothbrush. Each person suffers discomfort or digestive distress on eating certain kinds of foods or mixtures of foods. The reason for the discomfort is related to the bacterial flora present in the intestines. If a person eats a food which is only partially digested, it activates organisms when it reaches the lower part of the small intestine which finish digesting the remaining food. These finishing bacteria form hydrogen and other gas in the process, and individual discomfort depends on the amount of this gas.

In an effort to solve this problem the Idaho Bean Commission with the help of the U.S. Department of Agriculture sponsored a research project. It was found that beans in many individuals produce hydrogen and methane which is detectable by chromatograph which is an instrument for determining the amount of gas resulting in distress by having the subject breathe into a plastic bag. Because intestinal bacteria breed on undigested food in the stomach, future digestion problems are increased. This research project, it must be emphasized, solved the problem for an individual, and with such individual analysis, it may become possible to control the number of undesirable bacteria. This research, fine as it was, however, did not solve the problem of the bean industry, since not everyone is going to get tested to determine whether their bacterial presence is such as to permit them to eat beans.

The Department of Agriculture has had a contract with Dr. F. R. Steggarda, of the University of Illinois, who has been conducting a study of the physiology of flatulence and now we feel that since he has completed his work, emphasis should be placed on isolating and removing from beans the undesirable characteristics.

This subject is technical and I am not a scientist so there are many questions in this field which I cannot answer, but I am certain that Dr. B. T. Shaw, Dr. George Irving, or Dr. Sam Hoover at the Department could give you the answers to any of the technical aspects of this type of research.

I believe that the budget request for research for dry beans includes $56,700 for marketing research; $156,600 for production research, and $121,800 for utilization research. All of these are important, gentlemen, but I would like to quote from President Kennedy's agriculture message to Congress of March 16, 1961. He said:

"We should not only continue our research activities directed toward better production and lower costs, but we must expand research into marketing, nutrition, and especially utilization. Today approximately two-thirds of our agricultural research is directed toward improved production and only one-third toward utilization. Yet these small expenditures have resulted in the past in developing such items as frozen orange juice, potato flakes, and other foods which have vastly increased food demand and made possible the use of an estimated 500 million pounds of additional animal fats in livestock feed, an additional 250 million pounds of additional fats in the manufacture of plastics, and an additional 800,000 bales of cotton for washable cotton fabrics. The proportion of our effort directed that food and fiber utilization should be increased."

This research project certainly is not so dramatic as launching an Atlas or putting a man, dog, or monkey into space, but it is more easily attainable and will contribute more to the older and needy people of the United States and friendly foreign nations than the more dramatic projects. In addition, this project will not cost as much as it probably cost to get Ham psychologically prepared for his trip into space.

WOULD BENEFIT CONSUMERS

I say this project will have a more direct benefit on more people than those other projects because it will assist in improving the diets of many, many people who are now nutritionally starved both at home and abroad.

We feel that this request is reasonable for two reasons. First, many in this country have inadequate diets because they cannot afford the more nutritious foods or their inability to digest those nutritious foods which are inexpensive such as beans. We have in mind here the older folks on pensions, the unemployed, of which there are over 5 million, and low income families. Second, we feel that this expenditure would be reasonable because of the use of our food supplies in the food-for-peace program. Later I shall discuss briefly the prevalence of inadequate diets throughout the world and the efforts we are making to raise the nutritional standards. We feel that providing a less expensive but more digestably acceptable product to these foreign countries would be of a benefit to the United States.

In the 1959 Yearbook of Agriculture it is stated that about one-tenth of the families in the United States have poor diets. One reason for the domestic diet inadequacy is caused by inability to obtain high food value at low cost because of inadequate pensions. I am speaking now only of the United States and I should like to point out that in 1959, the Yearbook of Agriculture stated that in a 1955 survey about 3 households in 10 did not have as much calcium as recommended and if milk and milk products are not considered not 1 household in 10 had sufficient calcium in their diets. Taking other Department figures and extending them, family diets not providing amounts of 8 nutrients recommended are as follows: 7 percent of the family diets in the United States are deficient in protein, 20 percent of the family diets in the United States are deficient in calcium, 10 percent of the family diets in the United States are deficient in iron, 16 percent of the family diets in the United States are deficient in vitamin A, 19 percent of the family diets in the United States are deficient in riboflavin, 9 percent of the family diets in the United States are deficient in niacin, 24 percent of the family diets in the United States are deficient in ascorbic acid.

BEANS A GOOD BUY

As mentioned a few minutes ago, statistics show that 7 percent of the family diets are deficient in proteins. The only better buy from a protein standpoint is flour, which costs only 3 cents per cup and provides 16 grams of protein. Those having higher protein value generally cost twice or three times as much as beans and do not provide the proteins required. Many of those contributing fewer proteins cost more. As noted previously, it was found that 29 percent of the diets in the United States are deficient in calcium. A 3.5-cent cup of beans provides 74 grams of calcium, which ranks it right behind nonfat dry milk and cheese.

Food today is being used as an offensive tool against the spread of communism and for humanitarian purposes. The food-for-peace program is predicated on the idea that each night half or more of the world's families go to bed malnourished. In Latin America the recommended caloric intake considered necessary to maintain health and physical activity is 2,500 calories per day.

In Bolivia, however, the estimated intake is 1,880; in Ecuador 1,935, and in Peru 2,040. The minimum standard in the Far East is 2,300 calories per day, whereas in Pakistan the intake is only 2,030, and in India 2,050. Also these diets are poorly balanced as to food values. In Pakistan nearly three-fourths of the calories are provided by rice alone. Such a diet is not balanced by proteins, fats, vitamins, and minerals and other nutritive elements. Such imbalance produces diseases. Beans almost by themselves could put these diets back in balance and at a low cost, but first we must attempt to provide beans which are digestible by all.

The point is that the removal of this gas from beans would provide a better, more digestible product which could be used by a greater number of people both at home and abroad.

There have been no definitive studies made by the Department of Agriculture, but in the bean industry it is generally felt that consumption of beans declines precipitously when people reach the age of 40 to 50 because of the digestive problems. A recent publication from the Department did point out, however, that dietary requirements in later life are adversely influenced by the extent to which changes have occurred that affect food intake and metabo-

lism such as difficulties in chewing and inability to digest or absorb food efficiently.

The point is that many older people are unable to eat beans because of the gas problem and as a result they are missing one of the most nutritious foods they could get at reasonable price.

SEEK FLATULENCE CLUE

The problem of the diets of older folks has come in for some consideration by the National Institutes of Health. In addition to its research programs in the chronic diseases, the Public Health Service is conducting and supporting a number of studies on the processes of aging. This work should and must be supported, but the nutritional standards of the older folks, being too low because of their inability to digest nutritional food, the types of foods made available to them should be expanded. Beans would provide many of the nutritional requirements at a price pensioners and retirees could afford to pay.

Along this same line I should like to point out that this problem of the aging is going to multiply in the years to come. The U.S. News & World Report in a recent issue reported that the number of persons 65 and over would increase by 12 percent in just the next 5 years. The statistics presented show that currently about 9 percent of our population is over the age of 65. Americans over 65, by 1966 will number nearly 19 million, 12 percent more than now, and about double the number in 1942.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this subcommittee will see fit to include an additional $100,000 for research in the field of bean gassiness. I have tried to point out that the bean industry is a large industry and makes substantial contribution to the agricultural economy of this Nation. The bean industry has not, we feel, imposed on the Congress or the executive branch in the past, but has been content to try to work out its own problems. We feel if Congress sees fit to appropriate this money it will be an investment repaying many dividends in providing more adequate diets for all the American people and will give us a more acceptable weapon in the food arsenal to aid friendly foreign countries. Naturally, this will mean an expanded business for the dry bean industry, but we feel that money spent to increase consumption is better spent money than that spent to provide Government storage for our bean production and the cost of storage. Then, too, if through research we can solve this flatulent problem, imagine what it will mean, both to the producer and the consumer. For the producer it will provide the opportunity of a greater market, and the ability to replace acreage now producing surplus commodities. For the consumer it will mean nourishing food for a minimum amount of the food dollar. As is so often said, food is for consumption, not storage, and we want to do all we can to try to assure that beans go into consumption and not into storage.

Cuba Through British Eyes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, often it is difficult to see ourselves as others see us. However, a recent editorial in the London (Engand) Times may give us a hint as to the way our present position vis-a-vis Cuba is regarded abroad.

This eminent and conservative paper, which is generally considered to be closely in touch with the British Government, concludes that "so far as Cuba itself is directly concerned, the apprehensive spectators of this revolution can do little but be patient and stick to a policy of nonintervention."

I think that other Members who may not see the Times regularly, may agree that its analysis of the Cuban affair and the ensuing problems deserves our thoughtful attention:

[From the London Times, May 4, 1961]

CUBA'S COMMUNISM

Dr. Castro's dismissal of elections must seem a further step away from western democracy and all it stands for. To many it will be taken as proof of another move toward a Communist society. Like all conclusions reached about Cuba this inference may be overhasty. The rejection of elections was a remark thrown off in the exchanges of a May Day parade; it was not the careful exposition of a revolutionary doctrine such as a Communist might make. All the innovations under Castro's rule, ominous as many are, show the same response to events and impulses. To define Cuba in terms of established Communist power, or to deny that such power is established, is to oversimplify the complexity of a still fluid course of change.

In type Cuba's revolution comes closest to China's, where a guerrilla movement came to power with peasant support intent on agrarian reform. Like the Chinese, the revolution has moved from the countryside to the towns. Agrarian revolution—a revolution of the masses—is the basis of its popular support and much follows from this. The parallel impulse was to overthrow American economic domination and political influence. All too soon, American suspicion of the regime was aroused. The sorry course of events since then, culminating in the foolish counter-revolutionary landings last month, poses the question how far have developments in Cuba been a response to growing American nostility and how far were they inherent in the manner of the revolution and the emotions of its leaders? The answer must be "both."

Where does the revolution stand today? Its links with the Communist bloc are undeniable. Supplies of arms; aid and trade; publicly expressed sympathies coupled with repeated diatribes against Ameri an imperialism all make Cuba look very pro-Communist. Short of actual adherence to the Communist bloc or the establishment of a Communist military base (which looks improbable) or some kind of political base for Communist operation, this may be disturbing but no more. It is the character of the revolution as it has developed that seems to point to Cuba's becoming outright Communist. Opposition tends more and more to be defined as counter-revolution. Such other features as the embodiment of the young in a militia; the growing conflict with the Church (not at first solidly opposed to revolution); the disappearance of any critical newspaper; the summary trial and execution of opponents; the organization of public vigilance against counter-revolution—all these, while readily explained by events, suggest a character which will not easily be reversed in a liberal direction.

To say this is not to deny the evident progress and wide support the regime enjoys; or even to imply that such a revolution can settle into an orderly democracy less than 3 years after coming to power. So far as Cuba itself is directly concerned, the apprehensive spectators of this revolution can do little but be patient to stick to a policy of nonintervention. This is hard counsel for the United States, which has suffered intensive attack and great material loss. The prospect of a Communist foothold in the American hemisphere must arouse all the deeply held fears of alien ideologies that are fundamental in the American belief. Perhaps America has now learned the bitter lesson that exiles rarely succeed in counter-revolution but only make more extreme the revolution they want to redirect. The important question now is not Cuba itself but its influence on Latin America.

Off Again, On Again, Gone Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, what is our foreign policy? Does anyone know?

We have extended aid to Communist nations. Now our President thinks dignifying Mr. Khrushchev with another summit meeting is a good idea. It looks like another dose of the same arsenic we've taken before, pushing us closer to the point of no return.

Maybe there's a reason, some good sense to a summit meeting. Maybe there is some logic supporting our permitting Castro further to consolidate his economic and military strength. Maybe we should give aid and comfort to our dedicated enemies, in other times defined as treason. The reason escapes me. I see no logic or sense in our foreign policy.

Why cannot our Chief Executive give us some clues as to our foreign policy?

For some thought along this line I commend to the attention of the Members the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune:

OFF AGAIN, ON AGAIN, GONE AGAIN

Now that the Kennedy-Khrushchev summit conference has been fixed for Vienna in the first days of June, President Kennedy's hesitations and flirtations with summitry present something of a puzzle. During last year's campaign, he was scornful of gadabout diplomacy and promised to be a stay-at-home President.

"I want," he said, "to be known, not by tours and conferences abroad, but by vitality and direction at home. My opponent promises, if he is successful, to go to eastern Europe, to go perhaps to another summit, to go to a series of meetings around the world. If I am successful, I am going to Washington, D.C., and get this country to work."

Now Mr. Kennedy is going to a summit himself, in what could be reasonably called a place in eastern Europe, and his dates with De Gaulle in Paris and with Macmillan in London add up to a series of those tours and conferences of which he was lately so scornful.

But the contradiction is even more striking in view of the White House response to a suggestion made soon after Kennedy took over the Presidency by Adlai Stevenson, his ambassador to the United Nations. Stevenson, in a press conference last January 27, hazarded the "guess" that Kennedy would be glad to become acquainted with Khrushchev, adding that he himself "would be delighted" to meet the Soviet boss again.

The White House reaction was prompt and frigid. Mr. Salinger, the President's press spokesman, curtly said that Stevenson was expressing his own personal views. The Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk, summoned a press conference and spoke of the virtue of using regular channels of diplomacy, although, he said, he did not exclude summit conferences "on principle." Mr. Kennedy, when asked if he was implying he did not want a summit meeting, replied that Rusk would first prefer to explore "more traditional exchanges."

The record discloses that at no time did Mr. Kennedy display much enthusiasm for a personal confrontation of Khrushchev, but now he has switched around to the position which originally drew down a rebuke on Stevenson. One may inquire the reasons for the switch, and the obvious answer is that foreign relations have not been faring well for Mr. Kennedy. First Cuba, then Laos, then the protracted stall at Geneva on permanent suspension of nuclear testing, with Berlin and Vietnam perhaps next on the agenda of trouble.

When, a week or so ago, former Vice President Nixon suggested that a summit might help serve notice on Khrushchev that Kennedy and the United States refused to be pushed around, we said that the only effective way to impress Khrushchev was to demonstrate in action that he could expect to be thrown for a loss every time he tries to exploit a soft looking spot in his probing operations.

Instead, we are to look forward to an effort by the President to match him in a "shell game." That has been tried before, and it has yet to succeed.

Michigan Week: The Michigan Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, each year since 1954 the citizens of the great State of Michigan have set aside 1 week in the year as Michigan Week. It is a period when we Michiganites reaffirm our pride in our State and rededicate ourselves to its future growth and prosperity. Michigan Week this year will be observed May 21–27. As a native and lifelong resident of Michigan, I would like to say a few words, in the spirit of Michigan Week, about some of the reasons why the people of Michigan are proud of their State.

Of course, Michigan is proud that it is first in the Nation in the production of automobiles. In Michigan's automobile industry, the manufacturing revolution which is now sweeping over the underdeveloped world came to maturity. The industrial genius of Michigan made Detroit the "arsenal of democracy" in World War II. Without the mass production techniques that emerged out of the auto industry, America could not have reversed the Nazi-Japanese tide.

But Michigan is out front not only in the production of motor vehicles and parts. Michigan's unmatched industrial know-how and the world's finest labor force, representing almost every skill listed by the U.S. Census Bureau, have placed Michigan first in the Nation in the production of mobile homes, boats, conveyors, internal combustion engines, metal stampings, steel springs, machine shop work, gray-iron foundry production, public building fixtures, hardware supplies, sporting and athletic goods, padding and upholstery filling as well as salt and cereals. Michigan leads all other States in the value of its manufactured products per worker. We have justly earned our reputation as the industrial capital of the world. Few areas in the United States can compare with Michigan as a State in which to locate industry and business.

Michigan believes that it has a mission of providing the same leadership in the space age as it did in the automotive age. As evidence of this, the booster chosen for the momentous flight into space of astronaut Navy Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr., on May 5, 1961, was the Michigan-built Chrysler Redstone. Indeed, Michigan is taking its place on the frontier of the forces that are shaping the modern world. To the greatest pool of labor skills and managerial brains in the world, Michigan has added first-rate research facilities. The University of Michigan's Institute of Science and Technology is the Nation's first State-supported space age research endeavor. High resolution radar was designed at the University of Michigan. The Bomarc missile was designed and developed at the university. The ultra-high performance Rambler rocket was conceived in Michigan, designed in Michigan, and can be built by Michigan companies with Michigan products. Atomic power installations are already under construction by Detroit Edison and Consumer Power companies.

During the past few years electronics companies have been showing increasing interest in locating in Michigan to take advantage of the research and consultant talent our universities are making available. The Greater Ann Arbor Research Park, now under construction, will provide a most fertile base for extending the partnership between industry and the university for the development of new and startling research and products for the space age. Yes, the people of Michigan are proud that their State is not a status quo State, not resting on past laurels—that it is a State on the move.

We are proud that Michigan is known all over the world as a great industrial State. We are equally proud of our preeminence as a great agricultural State. The first land-grant college in the United States emerged on the campus of Michigan State University at East Lansing. From the technical and scientific achievements of such colleges American agriculture was transformed. In Michigan, agriculture is one of the three principal sectors of the State's economy. Only a handful of States can boast of such a varied and successful agriculture. In all, 44 different fruit and vegetable crops are grown commercially. Michigan leads all other States in the production of strawberries, sour cherries, cantaloupes, late celery, cucumbers for pickles, and field beans. The famous bean soup served in the U.S. Senate and House dining rooms is made from Michigan beans. The sale of products from Michigan farms totaled nearly three-quarters of a billion dollars in 1958—the latest year for which statistics are available. In addition, the volume of business directly connected with the processing, storing, distribution, and transportation of farm products amounted to $1,880 million. More than half of Michigan's 83 counties rank among the top 100 counties in the Nation in the production of field crops, fruit, and livestock. Despite Michigan's magnificent industrial and agricultural accomplishments, Michigan still has about 40 percent of its land area available for development.

Michigan's bountiful natural and physical resources are another source of great pride to the citizens of our State. Michigan's location in the greatest iron ore producing region of the world places Michigan second among the iron ore producing States in the Union. Michigan is still a major lumbering State with 19 million acres of forests which serve Michigan's furniture, paper and pulp industries. Michigan is first in salt production in the Nation. Michigan has the world's largest limestone quarries and deposits of gypsum. Michigan ranks sixth in the production of copper and is high in the annual production of oil. Michigan's abundant quantities of sand and gravel make possible one of the finest highway systems in the country.

All of these natural resources are helping build a chemical empire in Michigan. There has been amazing progress in this industry in the last few years and there will be additional developments in the near future. The value added by manufacture in our new and rapidly developing chemical industry is now in the neighborhood of $600 million.

Michigan is proud of its roadbuilding program. In our State we are constructing freeways at the rate of 1 foot a minute. By the end of 1962 people and products will be able to travel nonstop from the Ohio border to the Mackinac Bridge and from Detroit to Muskegon over superb modern roads. This highway system will make Michigan's recreation areas more easily accessible than ever before.

Most people know how much wonderful fun it is to vacation in Michigan, but relatively few know the extent of the tourist industry in Michigan and the vital role it plays in our economy. There are some 28,000 individual businesses serving the wants of people who come from all corners of our Nation for refreshing and restful holiday fun in Michigan. Michigan is bordered by four of the Great Lakes and has the longest shoreline of any State except Alaska. We have more than 11,000 inland lakes, 36,000 miles of rivers and streams and 19 million acres of forest land in which are situated 61 State parks and recreational areas. We have more ski areas than any other State in the Nation. Last year Michigan tourism grossed more than $650 million and provided employment for about 100,000 persons.

Sales and use tax receipts from the tourist and resort industry have reached an annual figure of $40 million and this figure is expected to rise to $46 million this year. The U.S. Department of Commerce figures show that money spent by an average of 24 tourists a day equals the economic impact of a manufacturing plant with a $100,000 annual payroll. This places in sharp focus the importance of tourism in the Michigan economy.

One of Michigan's unique assets for industry, health, and pleasure is her ever-abundant supply of fresh water. It is an asset envied by many other States which are faced with a critical water situation. Because of Michigan's geographical location, bordered by four of the five Great Lakes, our relatively level topography, our porous soil, our water-holding geological formations and our heavy and uniform rainfall, we have in Michigan the largest continuously available supply of fresh water in the world. In Michigan we do not use water, we only borrow it. By a relatively simple and inexpensive practice of water conservation we are capable of returning the same quantity and quality of water we receive back to its source. Water emptied anywhere into our 36,000 miles of streams is returned to its source, the Great Lakes. We do not have the costly problem of tapping water for use and later returning it to the same watershed. Michigan is indeed the "Water Wonderland" of the Nation.

In the area of industry, agriculture and recreational resources Michigan is a proven leader. The people of Michigan are also proud of another great accomplishment—the continuing development of its human resources through one of the finest eductional systems in the Nation. Michigan ranks fifth among the States in its support of public education. Since 1948 Michigan has spent a billion dollars for school construction. Enrollment in elementary and secondary schools last year reached almost 1,700,000. In the Nation in 1958, State and local expenditures for all public education averaged 35.5 percent of the general expenditures of State and local governments. In Michigan it constituted 40.7 percent. The estimated current expenditure per pupil in average daily attendance in Michigan for 1959–60 was $425 in contrast to the national average of $369. The expenditure of $425 per pupil is a 93.6 percent increase over the same expenditure in Michigan in 1949–50. During this decade, only two other States had a higher percentage increase in current expenditures per pupil. State aid per pupil in average daily attendance in 1957–58 in Michigan was $206 as compared with the national average of $162. Michigan is rated among the top 10 States for its program of educational excellence. Michigan's colleges and universities are recognized for the excellence of their programs, facilities, and graduates.

Michiganders point with pride to many other tangible advantages and accomplishments, to the fact that Michigan is located in the heart of the Great Lakes consumer market which has an annual retail sales of $43.5 billion; that in transportation Michigan is serviced directly by the St. Lawrence Seaway, 32 railroads, 190 trucklines, 14 major feeder airlines; and that Michigan leads the Nation in homeownership with a total of almost 70 percent.

Yes, Michigan is a great State. We are proud of our great physical and human resources and of the splendid use to which they have been put. But we are not too proud to realize that we must be even greater in the sixties, that we must set new goals of attainment in every area of endeavor not only for Michigan, but for the Nation and the future of the entire free world. It is in this spirit that we launch Michigan Week—1961.

Students Weld Ties With Costa Rica

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Christian Science Monitor of April 28, 1961.

Dr. Franklin D. Murphy, now chancellor of USLA, established a cultural exchange program between the University of Kansas when he was chancellor there, and the University of Costa Rica, that is absolutely unique. Mel Mencher, of the William Allen White School of Journalism and Public Information at the University of Kansas, has participated in that program and has written a story about it for the Christian Science Monitor. I take great pride in bringing to my colleagues' attention that story about the cultural exchange between the two universities—one located at San Jose, Costa Rica, and the other in my hometown, Lawrence, Kans.:

STUDENTS WELD TIES WITH COSTA RICA

(By Melvin Mencher)

SAN JOSÉ, COSTA RICA.—The school year for 10 young Kansans in Costa Rica began March 6. They make up the second group of students sent to Central America in a unique exchange program between the University of Kansas and the University of Costa Rica.

There is nothing new about American students studying abroad, and faculty members in U.S. universities and colleges have been going abroad in large numbers since the end of World War I.

But this interchange between a midwestern university in the heart of what used to be described as the isolationist belt and a small Central American university is different, so different that it may set a pattern for other academic exchange programs. It already has prompted an official of the Indian Government to ask the University of Kansas if it could set up a similar program with his country.

SPECIAL PROJECTS

What makes this program so different from others? Briefly, it is based on a deep cultural penetration of the foreign country and a close, somewhat permanent bond between the two countries. It consists of student study in Costa Rica, Kansas faculty members and administrators working with the University of Costa Rica, Costa Rican graduate students studying for their doctorates at Kansas, and administrators from the University of Costa Rica visiting Kansas.

The students and faculty members go to Costa Rica with a knowledge of Spanish and a background in the customs of the country. While there, the emphasis is as much on living the life of a Costa Rican as it is on pursuing academic work.

Each student is given a special project to carry out during the school year, a project that thrusts the young men and women into the daily life of San José, a thriving city of 100,000 persons astride the country's central plateau. Each student lives with a Costa Rican family, and an effort is made to place the student in a family which can aid the student's project.

In the first group, which recently returned from a 9-month stay in San José, Mary Grauberger, of Kansas City, Kans., rented a room in the home of Mr. and Mrs. Rodolfo E. Carrillo, a photographer for one of the San José daily newspapers. Her project was a study of the Costa Rican press.

MONEY NOT PLENTIFUL

The family Jane Tasker lived with became involved in her project, too. So did everyone else, for that matter. For when Jane decided that her project would be to teach handicrafts once a week in a rural school near San José and she selected San Antonio de Escazú, she learned a basic fact about Latin America:

Money is not plentiful. Even in Costa Rica, which devotes a large part of its national budget to education, there is barely enough money for the necessities.

This did not daunt the young North American. Each week she and her friends set out on what Jane called her scavenger hunt.

A friendly lumber mill manager donated plywood, a factory owner loaded the students down with tile and tossed in some porcelain paste. After hearing Jane's story about the youngsters at San Antonio de Escazu, three San José shoemakers happily packed three sacks full of leather goods.

PRISONS VISITED

At the university, everybody was saving popsicle and ice cream sticks for Jane. Between semesters, when Jane and the other Kansas students visited Panama, everyone helped to gather sea shells for the shell sculpture and jewelry which the children were making.

The children returned their teacher's enthusiasm.

"It was almost impossible to get them to leave the classroom for the recess (recreo)," a Costa Rican teacher said.

The townspeople knew Jane, too. Often they would gather in the morning to watch her, shoes in one hand, a bag of odds and ends in the other, trudge uphill to town from the bus stop a mile away.

"I learned something about the problems of rural families in Latin America," Jane said.

Among the 20 students in her class, only 3 will go on with their education after they complete their 6 compulsory years of schoolwork. The others will work, the girls at home, the boys on the coffee fincas.

Jo Ann Brauchi, a serious young woman from a small Kansas community, worked on a project that sent her up and down the country visiting prisons and social-welfare institutions.

During her visit to the women's jail, the Buen Pastor, high in the mountains above San José, she saw how Costa Rica handles its delinquent women. And the women were amazed that someone from the United States should be interested enough in them to travel all the way to visit them.

DISCUSSIONS HELD

And Carolyn Caskey of Independence, Mo., found herself nominated for the title of Beauty Queen of the University of Costa Rica. She finished second in an energetic campaign managed by a member of the Uni-

versity of Costa Rica's small Marxist group.

Carolyn's contact with this student led to discussions between the Kansas students and faculty members and leftwing Costa Rican students.

One night in the home of one of the Kansas students' Costa Rican "families," a Costa Rican student was telling the North Americans what was wrong with the U.S. foreign policy, especially as it involved Latin America.

"When we need money to expand our industries, we borrow it at 6½ percent from your banks, while we could be getting it at 2½ percent from the Soviet Union," he said.

Then he attacked the American-owned United Fruit Co. for paying low wages.

A Kansas faculty member who had been studying the country's economic situation pointed out that the average banana worker earns about $2 a day, while the man who works on the Costa Rican-owned finca makes about half this.

OPINIONS EXCHANGED

And so it went during the evening, back and forth, until well past midnight, when the Costa Rican student rose, extended his hand, and said that he was happy to see the interest the North Americans were taking in Costa Rica's problems.

"While we do not share the same ideas on how to solve them, we are grateful to you for listening to us," he said. "I think we both benefited."

This constant interchange of facts and opinions benefited the faculty members from Kansas as well as the Costa Rican and Kansas students, for the faculty members were new to Latin America. None of them were specialists in the area. None had visited Costa Rica or Central America before. Indeed, none could speak more than a few words of Spanish before the program was set up.

While the faculty-exchange program has a specific aim for members of the University of Costa Rica faculty—they will study toward advanced degrees at the University of Kansas—Kansas faculty members have no such particularized program.

MORE THAN ACADEMICS

This is the key to the difference between the Kansas faculty program and the usual foreign study program. In the ordinary type of faculty exchange, a professor applies for a grant for a specific purpose. He may wish to do research at a foreign university, or he may be selected to take a specialty to a foreign university and give lectures in his field. His work usually is within the foreign university's academic clime.

The University of Kansas program is more generalized. Its purpose is simply to send abroad a group of faculty members with different disciplines and to let them soak up knowledge of the foreign country while at the same time offering assistance to the host university abroad.

Thus, the interchange is not restricted to the academic level.

In fact, this restriction, inherent in most faculty programs of study abroad, led Franklin D. Murphy, former chancellor of the University of Kansas, to conceive the Costa Rican project.

Dr. Murphy said he wanted "to create a long-term relationship with the University of Costa Rica itself, a relationship in depth, one that will put the University of Kansas (and indirectly the United States) in continuing touch with all aspects of the country, its cultural, intellectual, economic, and political life."

An essential part of this program, Dr. Murphy felt, was that the entire family accompany the faculty member. This meant eight faculty members, eight wives, and a score of children make the trip.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

The Cost of Health Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a review which appeared in the Washington Post of May 21, be printed in the Appendix of the Record. It was written by the junior Senator from Oregon and relates some of the most significant points in "Doctors, Patients, and Health Insurance," by Herman Somers and Anne R. Somers. I also ask that a news report on this book from the Washington Post of May 22, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the review and news report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOTTING UP THE COST OF HEALTH CARE

(Reviewed by MAURINE B. NEUBERGER)

Medical and health care costs now total over $25 billion annually and take 5.4 percent of our Nation's total gross national product.

These figures are likely to rise, with medical care costs since World War II increasing far more rapidly than the general cost of living. In the last decade the increase was twice as fast as all prices and between June 1958 and June 1960 the rate was three and a half times. The American people are showing a growing concern with the organization and financing of medical care.

To help supply some of the answers in this complex field, Mr. and Mrs. Herman Somers have written a particularly valuable and penetrating analysis of the organization, distribution, and financing of personal medical care. I do not believe that anyone should argue the pros and cons of the Kennedy administration's proposed health coverage legislation for the retired under the social security system until he has read this book.

The problem of providing adequate health coverage for the aged has aroused public opinion and controversy. The aged in the population are increasing at the rate of more than 1,000 per day and by 1970 there will be nearly 20 million persons 65 and over.

Three-fifth of the aged had less than $1,000 in total income in 1958, according to the Bureau of the Census, and nearly four-fifths had income of less than $2,000 the same year.

In a well-reasoned chapter the Somers argue that the social security financed health coverage will best meet the needs of the aged. They point out that meaningful insurance must meet at least 75 percent of an aged person's health expenses and should embrace 85 percent of the aged population. They also argue that it is unreasonable to expect older persons to spend more than 12 percent of their incomes for medical care, which is double the national average. The husband and wife team says:

"The probable average level premium required for 75 percent protection with 12 percent of income would exclude more than three-quarters of this age group. This makes no allowance for the additional 25 percent costs to be met out of pocket. Even allowing a substantial margin for error, the situation reveals a dead end."

Dr. Basil C. McLean, recently retired president of the Blue Cross Association, is quoted as saying that "a lifetime's experience has led me at last to conclude that the costs of care for the aged cannot be met, unaided, by the mechanisms of insurance or prepayment as they exist today. The aged simply cannot afford to buy from any of these the scope of care that is required, nor do the stern realities permit any carrier, whether nonprofit or commercial, to provide benefits which are adequate at a price which is feasible for any but a small proportion of the aged."

One of the most interesting and rewarding sections of the book deals with the changing pattern of medical practice and the doctor-patient relationship. The technological revolution in medicine, growing specialization in the profession, the role of clinics and combined practice have all done much to change the image of the traditional doctor-patient relationship.

The authors conclude that an inversion of some popular slogans with respect to the relationship between the quality of medical care, medical financing and the optimum doctor-patient relationship is clearly in order.

Federal employees will be reassured by the comments on the Federal employees health benefits program administered by the United States Civil Service Commission. The authors also endorse the closed-panel, group practice type of health coverage such as is operated by Group Health Association in the Washington area, Health Insurance Plan of New York and the Kaiser Foundation health plans on the west coast.

The entire varied field of personal health care is carefully explored with chapters devoted to the role of modern hospitals, the drug industry, the growing doctor need and shortage, health carriers and the strengths and needs in the medical insurance industry. The book is well documented by extensive footnotes, tables and charts.

The authors carefully chart the pattern of change and direction in medical care and have produced a valuable study in a highly complex and controversial field. I am sure this volume will be carefully read by all those dealing with medical care problems.

STUDY BACKS EXPANDED MEDICAL AID

(By Lewis Hawkins)

Mounting public pressure for providing adequate medical care to all Americans makes expanded Federal aid inevitable, it was reported in a research study released yesterday.

Part of this aid should be old age health insurance under the social security system but this is no sound basis for alarm among physicians or private insurance systems, the book says.

"Doctors, Patients and Health Insurance," released by the Brookings Institution, is a 534-page volume resulting from 3 years research by Herman M. Somers and his wife, Anne M. Somers. Somers is head of the political science department at Haverford College, Haverford, Pa., and was a member of President Kennedy's pre-inauguration Task Force on Health and Social Security.

FORD BACKED STUDY

Research and publication were financed by the institution with assistance from the Ford Foundation. Brookings is a private organization engaged in research and education in the social sciences. As usual, the institution notes that the conclusions reached in studies it finances do not necessarily represent the institution's views.

Much of the book is devoted to reviewing the problems of medical care including mounting costs, especially those in the drug field; the shortages of doctors and supporting personnel; the actute lack of "parahospital" facilities—nursing homes, outpatient clinics, rehabilitation centers, etc., to care for patents now being sent to regular hospitals.

Advances in private insurance plans are praised but it is reported that about 49 million persons—28 percent of the population—remain without any protection. Most of these are in the medically indigent group who are otherwise self-supporting but cannot provide for medical care.

GENERAL AGREEMENT

Insofar as the aged are concerned, the authors find there is already general agreement on the need for public action. The main question is said to be whether it should be under Federal-State subsidy or private insurance—as provided under a 1960 Federal law—or insurance within the present social security system—which is what the Kennedy administration seeks.

The authors say:

"The latter appears simpler, more economical and more equitable as well as involving less Government intrusion in the affairs of private carriers, and greater dignity for the beneficiaries."

The Delaware River Basin Compact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, the Council of the City of Phildalephia on May 11, 1961, unanimously adopted a resolution "Memorializing the Congress of the United States and the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to support and approve the proposed Delaware River Basin compact." The resolution relating the compact was on the Consent Calendar on May 15 and on one prior occasion. The importance of this resolution is set forth in detail in the attached copy which was forwarded by the president of the city council, the Honorable James H. J. Tate. Resolution 161, of the City Council of Philadelphia, is as follows:

RESOLUTION 161

Memorializing the Congress of the United States and the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to support and approve the proposed Delaware River Basin compact

Whereas the proposed Delaware River Basin compact, framed after years of careful preparation, creates a Commission of five members representing the Federal Government and the States of Delaware, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania, to direct the planning, development and control of the water resources of the Delaware River Basin; and

Whereas the guidance and control of these projects which mean so much to the future of the entire Delaware Valley and the Nation, should be in the hands of the Federal Government and the four States, as provided by the Delaware River Basin compact; and

Whereas before being submitted to the Congress for approval, the compact must be ratified by the Legislatures of the four States. Affirmative action has been taken by the Legislatures of New Jersey and New York and it has been endorsed by the Governors of the four States and the mayors of New York City and Philadelphia; and

Whereas the planned development and allotment of the water resources of the Delaware River is vital to the future of the port of Philadelphia, and to the implementation of the $437 million program of the Army Engineers for the creation of dams and reservoirs, recreation sites and hydroelectric powerplants in the Delaware River Basin; therefore

Resolved by the Council of the City of Philadelphia, That we hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States and the Pennsylvania State Legislature to support and approve the proposed Delaware River Basin compact.

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and president pro tempore of the Senate of Pennsylvania, and to the members of these legislative bodies from the Delaware River Basin area.

The Television Teacher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, currently, Congress is engaging in extensive debate over the needs and how to meet them in education.

In my judgment, the future of the Nation will depend to an ever larger degree upon our educational system, to provide the well-trained people required by our complex age.

As we know, the Nation faces serious deficiencies in both classrooms and teachers. These must be supplied in adequate quantity and quality to meet the ever-increasing enrollments.

To meet the challenge, then, we need to devise—as we are now attempting to do—equitable formulas for distribution of costs and responsibility between the local, State, and Federal governments.

As time progresses, however, we can fortunately expect some aid from technology. Television, for example, will, in the future, prove to be of ever greater usefulness to education.

There will of course need to be some adaption, not only in the educational system, but in television itself, to carry out this objective. Nevertheless, progress is being made. The Nation, I believe, will benefit by moving ahead as rapidly as possible.

Recently, the Saturday Review of Literature published a thought-provoking editorial by the education editor, Paul Wooding, entitled "The Television Teacher."

Reflecting upon the problems and challenges in this medium—particularly as these relate to the teacher—I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATION IN AMERICA
(By Paul Woodring)
THE TELEVISION TEACHER

Several hundred teachers have appeared before television cameras this year for the first time. A few are famous musicians, artists, or scientists accustomed to large audiences, but the great majority are elementary and secondary teachers, fresh from the classroom, selected for their known competence as teachers. For them, television teaching is a new experience—an exciting and arduous one.

It takes courage for a professional teacher to appear on television. So long as he remains in his own classroom he is relatively anonymous; his work is known and judged by only a few children and an occasional supervisor. If his facts are mistaken, or his judgments naive, the children rarely know the difference and can do little about it anyway. If he fails to prepare for the day's activities he can get by somehow. If he does not know his subject he can still ask questions of the children and pretend he is using the Socratic method, or he can urge them to look it up. If his presentation is dull the children will merely sigh and accept the dullness as one of the normal hazards of the academic life. Tenure laws protect him unless his work is exceptionally bad.

When the teacher goes before an open-circuit television camera, all this changes. Now both his scholarship and his teaching skills will be rigorously judged by an audience of thousands that, in addition to the children, will include parents, educational experts, academic scholars in his own field, other teachers, and a wide variety of critics who are looking for the worst in educational television. His judgments and opinions will be widely questioned and discussed. The slightest factual error will be picked up by many viewers. A few slips in English will make him a laughingstock. A dull or ineffectual presentation will no longer be tolerated. There is no tenure on TV.

Many teachers whose success in the classroom was far above the average will not survive this new scrutiny. Those who do survive will deserve rewards and recognition far beyond those of teachers who confine their activities within classroom walls, and they will get it. It seems probable that the emergence of a few teachers into the open, where their work will be subjected to an evaluation comparable to that given the work of writers, actors, artists, and musicians, will bring a new dignity to the teaching profession and a new public respect for it. Such respect is well deserved because teaching is a high art and great teaching is probably as rare and as difficult to achieve as greatness in any other field.

We salute the television teacher and wish him well. The success or failure of educational television rests with him. He will not replace the classroom teacher—the two will complement each other—but television teaching will add an important new dimension to the profession.

Views of a Newsman Who Went Through the 1960 Presidential Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the interest in the 1960 Presidential election is still with us and it will be for a long time.

Herbert G. Klein, editor of the San Diego (Calif.) Union, and ex-Press Secretary to former Vice President Richard M. Nixon, earlier this month touched on this subject when speaking before the Springfield, Ill., Lions Club.

The views of a newsman who went through the rigorous campaign last fall are of timely interest:

Three months after a change in administration we find both President Kennedy and former Vice President Nixon more popular than they were when they divided 68 million votes on November 8, 1960. This sounds strange, but it is true.

Polls show that more than 70 percent of the public believes Mr. Kennedy is doing a good job. This figure probably has dropped considerably since the Cuba fiasco, but the percent still is well above the 50.1 percent of election day.

I have seen California polls reflecting Mr. Nixon's great popularity and have noted other national samplings. He is more popular today than ever before. Consider the fact that a change of 15,000 votes in four States would have made him President and it is evident that he benefits from great public acclaim. Even today he receives about 2,000 letters and several hundred speaking invitations each month. Mr. Nixon is far and above the most popular of all active Republicans.

If a poll were taken, like that asked regarding Mr. Kennedy, there is little doubt that the public would have confidence that he could do a good job as President today. In a nutshell, looking at the post-election popularity of both Presidential candidates, I am sure that if the situation were reversed, Mr. Nixon's poll rating also would be above 70 percent.

The present Kennedy-Nixon popularity is unparalleled and perhaps as close as it was on November 8.

Looking at the Republican side, Mr. Nixon has the public popularity needed to unite his party in 1962 and behind whoever is the nominee in 1964. At this point, I know of no one else who can do this.

On the subject of 1964, there is too much Republican gloom. There is no basis for any factual forecast today as to who will win 4 years hence.

As a newsman, I have been interested in what has happened to some of the issues of 1960. If there was an election today, the Republican candidate could run on the Democratic issues and the latter would be

in the position of defense. This is one of the quickest turns of the century.

Prestige was an issue in 1960. It is unfortunate but true that 3 months after Mr. Kennedy has taken office, U.S. prestige is at a new low. As Americans, we pray this will change, but as a newsman, I must assess current facts.

Golf was mentioned. The only difference I see is that Mr. Kennedy insists that when he allows a picture of a golf game, he will have no clubs in his hands. I wish I could shoot as well as either Mr. Kennedy or Mr. Eisenhower—or Mr. Nixon for that matter—below 100 that is.

Leadership was emphasized. The record shows that Mr. Kennedy has been unable to lead the Congress. His program has stalled to the point where he was in Chicago Friday to seek public support. Mr. Kennedy has a heavy Democratic majority in both Houses. The record shows Mr. Eisenhower did not have this.

Judging from the events, not the words, of the first 100 days, I would conclude that the biggest obstacle to a Republican victory in 1964 is present party gloom and the danger of splinter factions.

Realistically, the political tide will change many times in the months ahead. The real test of both parties will be 1962. This could be the critical year, for if the Democrats win, they will be on their way to a 1964 victory. A Republican victory could reverse this.

I will touch on just one more current subject. This is one of grave concern for all Americans.

I believe the Kennedy administration is preparing to launch a major attack against newspapers. The President hinted this last week when he implied that news stories were endangering American security. He asked that each story be weighed on the basis of national interest.

This is an impossible test. It is not in the national interest to publish a story about a scandal in any administration. It reflects against the United States. But American strength comes more from the spotlight of publicity on public affairs than from the judgment of each news story on the basis of how someone in the Kremlin or in Paris will read it.

The press has a responsibility, and I believe it is cognizant of it. I am not as sure the President realizes his responsibility to give the public the facts when the situation is adverse. He has been willing to provide the positive propaganda but not always the deeper news. I would urge him to reassess his views.

Of even greater public concern is a threat from the Justice Department to apply antitrust laws against newspapers who own television stations and against multiple newspaper ownership.

At a recent Women's National Press Club "trial balloon" dinner, Mr. Edwin Guthman, Special Assistant to Attorney General Robert Kennedy, said antitrust laws "should be applied to prevent newspapers from owning radio and TV stations and vice versa." He also urged the application of the laws against group newspapers.

This is blackmail, raw blackmail. The implication would be that those newspapers who are considered friendly to the administration would be spared, but there is a club to be held over the heads of the large newspaper operators who may be critical of young Bobby or his brother.

The trial balloon has been launched. I now would challenge the Attorney General to state his views directly. Is he to blackmail the newspaper, or did his press spokesman comment out of turn? The public which reads and relies on newspapers is entitled to know just how great the Justice Department pressure will be against their home publications. Does Attorney General Kennedy desire to make them knuckle under?

There is no greater censorship than that of Government blackmail.

Activities of Groups Urging Appeasement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the May 16, 1961, issue of the News and Courier of Charleston, S.C., contains an excellent editorial suggestion which I take pleasure in calling to the attention of the Senate. The editorial is entitled "Public Should Protest Activities of Groups Urging Appeasement," and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC SHOULD PROTEST ACTIVITIES OF GROUPS URGING APPEASEMENT

Only a few years before Hitler's Luftwaffe rained fire bombs on London, a group of students at Oxford University issued a pronouncement saying they would not fight for king or country.

This stain of disloyalty was washed away in the blood of English soldiers, sailors, and airmen who played so noble a part in turning back the Nazi hordes.

But the Oxford statement is a reminder that every nation has weak individuals in its midst. Americans are beginning to realize that the United States also has those who refuse to stand up for their country.

Thirty-six American students at Oxford have sent an open letter to President Kennedy protesting what they call the "continuing hostility" of the U.S. Government toward Fidel Castro in Cuba. The students, some of them Rhodes scholars, come from 18 States and the District of Columbia.

In New York City, more than 2,700 persons jammed Carnegie Hall last Friday at a peace rally declaring all-out war on the use of nuclear weapons. Dr. Linus Pauling, American scientist with a long record of participation in Communist front organizations, was the principal speaker.

In Ann Arbor, Mich., Historian Arnold Toynbee tossed barbs at the United States and the Western nations concerning the world power struggle. He said the diminishing dominance of the West is a return to normal historical conditions. Dr. Toynbee, darling of the leftwing intelligentsia, said the actions of the Central Intelligence Agency in Cuba were another example of governmental gangsterism.

In New York City, James Wechsler, editor of the leftwing New York Post and former member of a Communist youth organization, said the real disaster of Cuba is the mounting evidence that our Government palpably violated its own commitment with respect to nonintervention and that it cruelly lied to the American people. Mr. Wechsler was addressing the Americans for Democratic Organization. This group approved a resolution calling for a halt to aid for Cuban foes of Fidel Castro.

To these shameful incidents may be added a recent statement signed by more than 60 Harvard and Boston area professors urging appeasement of Castro.

All the signs point to a mammoth coordinated campaign to get the U.S. Government to adopt a soft posture toward world communism at the very time the Soviet Union and its allies are making enormous gains in Cuba and Laos.

To find a parallel one must go back to the activities of the German-American Bund in 1939 when the Nazi propaganda apparatus was selling Hitlerism as the wave of the future. The same type of massive campaign has been launched to undermine the American will to resist.

Alien forces are at work in this country. The President should call on the FBI to probe every one of these pro-Castro and antinuclear weapons groups. The American people should counter the appeasers' campaign by a campaign of their own, by writing to the President and their Congressmen expressing indignation at those who counsel surrender.

Interstate Compacts for Library Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which would grant the consent of Congress to interstate agreements for the purpose of developing or operating library facilities and services.

Libraries, like all other governmental agencies, are searching for ways to provide service effectively and economically for all people regardless of where they live. While State, county, town, and municipal library systems are serving a large segment of the Nation, population expansion and shifts within recent years have created new groupings, bound by economic, topographic, and social considerations, but separated politically by the intrusion of State lines. Like transportation and other public services, most efficient library operations in many cases would follow these natural patterns rather than those of the more artificial political boundary lines. Interstate planning is the next step which should be taken in many localities. It appears timely, therefore, that Congress give consent in advance so that progress may be encouraged and it is for this purpose that I have introduced the bill.

Article I, section 10 of the Constitution of the United States has apparently been a deterrent to States joining in projects for mutual benefit yet it appears that educational and library service projects cannot in any way be a "clear and present danger to the sovereignty of the United States"; in any way affect the powers delegated to the National Government; or, affect the political balance within the Federal system. However, some attorneys general have ruled otherwise, and many States appear to be reluctant to pass legislation which

will permit joint action on library matters.

There are two distinct areas where library service might be improved through interstate agreements—one is the great metropolitan district, and the other sparsely settled rural areas where boundaries hinder development of an area large enough to provide modern library services.

Of the 25 largest metropolitan districts 12 are on State borders. The large metropolitan library, chiefly supported by local taxation, is faced with demands for service from the entire area. Developing library service programs for the entire area could be best undertaken by the large metropolitan library and would result in a well coordinated and strengthened service for the entire district but a compact of some type would appear to be necessary.

The general statute, New York General Municipal Law, sections 460–473—supplement—interlocal agreements with governmental units of other States, in its statement of purpose clearly defines the problem for both rural and urban areas:

To permit local governmental units to make the most efficient use of their powers by enabling them to cooperate with governmental units of other States on a basis of mutual advantage and thereby to provide services and facilities in a manner that will accord best with geographic, economic, population, and other factors influencing the needs and development of local communities.

Since the great change in transportation, and especially since the automobile has become a regular means of private transportation, populations have shifted to a point where the self-contained local village hardly exists. Shopping centers have made great changes in our way of life, as has the development of industrial centers centralized and decentralized.

We have discovered that a village library cannot provide all the information and books its residents need and desire. Television and other media are arousing interest in many subjects and problems our onetime small towner was willing to let others be informed about. Now it is necessary for the library to have greater resources than local taxes could ever provide. The centralized reference service at the State library and the bookmobiles which move from town to town leaving collections of current books of interest to all ages and groups are permitting our towns to provide the needed broader library services.

Since State boundaries are artificial at best and frequently ignore topographical limits, as well as population distribution and economic developments, it seems appropriate that every opportunity taken be given for successfully bridging these boundaries.

There are many library services which are possible on an interstate basis. Those of the large metropolitan district may be somewhat different but many of our smaller cities might effectively expand service to more rural areas in neighboring States.

A group of small libraries on a State border could jointly employ a cataloger, pool their book funds and buy and catalog their books not only with a saving of money, but with an improvement in the quality of the cataloging.

Every library of any size particularly if it is a reference library has a stock of books and journals which should be preserved but which are seldom used. In small States such as ours a depository could be established by several States for these seldom used materials and operated for the benefit of all. This would release valuable shelf space and permit disposal of all but one copy or set of these resources.

There will be many problems for individual States to work out ranging from methods by which State aid is to be applied to a service jointly operated at the local level, the selection of governing boards for these agencies and tax support. But if we have cleared the way by achieving the consent of Congress, then we can tackle the purely local problems.

Kennedy-Khrushchev Meeting Is Necessary, Editor of West Virginia Newspaper Believes—Great Powers Must Continue Efforts To Find Way Out of Nuclear Dilemmas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I have said before in the Senate that I believe the success or failure of personal diplomacy ultimately rests on an imaginative, flexible foreign policy rooted in the realities of this changing world. And I repeat, also, my affirmation of conviction that President Kennedy and his advisers are in the process of developing such a policy.

Concerning the forthcoming scheduled meeting between our President and Premier Khrushchev of the Soviet Union in Vienna, I state again that President Kennedy is the best person to effectively convince Mr. Khrushchev of the determination and the resolve of the United States to resist the encroachment of communism.

In the May 19, 1961, editions of the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette, an editorial entitled "Kennedy-Khrushchev Meeting Is Necessary," there is a cogent discussion of the pending meeting from the standpoint of the possible results of the conference on the "frustrating efforts of the great powers to find a way out of their nuclear dilemmas."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KENNEDY-KHRUSHCHEV MEETING IS NECESSARY

The only possible objection that can be lifted against a personal meeting of President John F. Kennedy and Premier Nikita Khrushchev in some neutral capital city is that such summit meetings in the past have raised hopes among peoples all over the world disproportionate to the results later achieved.

This, however, is not sufficient reason to keep the two leaders of the world's strongest powers apart, because unless these men can in some manner fashion an understanding between them, reconcile their differences and reach an accommodation on issues and principles which separate them the world is in danger of experiencing another frightful war—this time with nuclear weapons that scientists tell us have in their capacity the total destruction of nations if not the seven continents and the seas surrounding them.

President Kennedy, should he visit in June with Premier Khrushchev, would be coming directly from conferences with France's President Charles de Gaulle, who to date has been keeping his thoughts on world problems pretty much to himself and charting for his beloved country an independent course.

What the people of the world consummately wish is an agreement among nations to control nuclear armaments, but aside from the ordinary difficulties of negotiations between clashing ideological powers, there are the additional complicating questions of where Red China and France fit into these negotiations.

The Soviet Union has demanded that the United States and Great Britain persuade France to stop conducting nuclear tests. Otherwise, the Kremlin authorities note they will be forced to resume their own tests. The demand is reasonable, even though it may prove impossible to fulfill, and the logic of their intentions, many find it a threat, in the event the demand is unfulfilled is inescapable.

Let us put ourselves in Russia's place. What would be our reaction to effecting a nuclear agreement with the Soviets if we saw their allies, the Red Chinese, testing nuclear bombs in Manchuria?

It is a fact, whether we like to accept it, that if there is to be a nuclear agreement it must include all the nations of the world. Perhaps the President and the Premier can agree on that necessity and then discuss means and methods of carrying it out. Unfortunately, agreeing to it and implementing it are two different propositions, because both France and Red China have demonstrated repeatedly that their friends have but a limited power over them.

It is, however, important that the great powers continue their frustrating efforts to find a way out of their nuclear dilemmas, and a Kennedy-Khrushchev conference is the obvious next step.

Federal, State, Municipal Cooperation—An Address by Joe L. Evins, Member of Congress from Tennessee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. FRAZIER, JR.
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Speaker, my friend and colleague, the Honorable JOE L. EVINS, recently addressed a meeting of the Tennessee Municipal League in my hometown of Chattanooga. His remarks were particularly fitting and they are significant for the great

amount of information regarding Federal spending in Tennessee and for the excellent illustrations of Federal-municipal cooperation contained in them.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of our distinguished colleague be reprinted in the RECORD.

The address follows:

REMARKS BY HON. JOE L. EVINS, OF TENNESSEE, TENNESSEE MUNICIPAL LEAGUE, CHATTANOOGA, TENN., MAY 15, 1961

President McInturff, Mayor Olgiati, Judge Frost, distinguished guests, members of the Tennessee Municipal League, my fellow Tennesseans, and friends, certainly it is a pleasure to be able to meet with you again. When your able and energetic executive secretary, Herbert Bingham, invited me to meet with you again, I accepted without hesitation for I had never forgotten my enjoyable visit with the Municipal League here in Chattanooga a few years ago. I consider your invitation for this repeat visit as indeed a compliment.

I always enjoy the bracing air of Chattanooga and certainly am pleased to visit in the hometown of my colleagues, Tennessee's senior Senator ESTES KEFAUVER and Congressman JAMES B. FRAZIER, both of whom represent Chattanooga, this district and our State so ably in the Congress.

I respect the membership of the Municipal League of Tennessee. This organization is composed of a body of men who are among the leaders of our State and experts in the science of Government.

There are those who say that we in the Congress have not introduced scientific methods in the Federal Government, that we are falling behind and slipping backward.

We have our debates and difficulties and, like you, our problems, but I take the affirmative side that we are moving forward and making progress.

This year, in just a few months, we have succeeded in passing a lot of legislation and even in putting a man into space.

However, we all recognize there is much yet to be accomplished.

I must confess that perhaps the greatest satisfaction of serving in Government is found among your group, those on the local level who see progress each day, who see great programs put into effect and materialized. We in the Congress deal in policies and plans, programs in the abstract, and, I should add, appropriations. Whereas you, our mayors and municipal officials, see many of these programs materialize. It is you who put them into operation and actually see the improvements completed.

Our cities and towns are being improved with interstate highway systems and municipal airports constructed.

Many additional projects are financed by both the local and Federal Government. The building of great housing projects, programs of slum clearance, urban renewal, sewage disposal plants, local National Guard armories and yes, many local industrial developments are aided by federally financed programs. All are made possible by local initiative, some local financing, but largely by appropriations passed by the Congress, all to serve our people, the public needs, through matching fund programs and cooperation.

As you know, there are those who attack the Congress and those who cry against Federal aid and Federal spending, but in this day I believe that the mayors of our cities recognize perhaps more than others that it takes the combined energies, imagination and dedication of all our elected officials, at all levels of government, cooperating and working together to achieve progress and to advance freedom in our civilization.

While we speak nationally of New Frontiers, I know that here at home in Tennessee we have our own new frontiers—problems pressing for solution. Our work and efforts are so entwined, the destiny of the people we represent are the same, so there exists a real need for a closer cooperation, better working relationships at all levels of government and particularly between our municipalities and the Federal Government.

With the complexities and the problems of our day, perhaps the best Government that can be evolved in America is a partnership government, involving partnership action between our cities and State officials and the Federal Government.

I must admit a partiality toward our municipal officials and interest in city government.

My father, who for 16 years was mayor of my hometown of Smithville has had a very great influence on my attitudes, naturally.

He gave me an early start toward the forming of philosophical ties with individuals whose principal concern is the building of the community. My interests, growing out of this experience, have been of inestimable value to me in my work as a Member of Congress. They have served to focus attention constantly on the basic consideration of government, whether it be in Washington, Chattanooga, Smithville or elsewhere, and that basic consideration is that what is happening on the local level is what is important. How our laws and programs affect the local community is of the greatest importance, for local government is the bedrock of our society.

As you gentlemen are aware and know all too well, there has been an increasing demand over the years from locally elected officials for more and more programs of aid and assistance from the Federal Government. This has grown out of the fact that the local tax base has to a large extent been exhausted and because there exists a need for additional skills and finances to provide the services which our modern-day cities and municipalities require and the public demands.

While we have had change, one thing has not changed, with which I am sure you will all agree, the demands for more service and more appropriations.

I am reminded that our position collectively as a city and a nation is like the multimillionaire who, on being interviewed, was asked about his good fortune and he commented, "I never hesitate to give full credit to my wife and her assistance." "In what way did she help," the reported asked, "Well, if you want the whole truth," the man replied, "I married her because I was curious to find out if there was any income she couldn't live beyond."

Many of our cities are requested to provide services which require living beyond their incomes and they are calling on the Federal Government for help and assistance. It is only in recent months that some say that this era of Federal aid has been enhanced.

In almost every bill that comes before the Congress the question is raised, How will it affect our States and cities and municipalities?

In the consideration of legislation we are interested in knowing what you are doing, what you are thinking, and what our municipal leaders are planning and accomplishing. Your programs have a tremendous bearing on legislation in Congress.

The Appropriations Committee on which I serve, and yes, the House Select Committee on Small Business, on which I also serve, are almost daily made aware of the growing concentration of problems facing our local communities and States. These problems of local governments—on an increasingly extensive scale are reflected in the many requests for Federal appropriations.

When I spoke to the Municipal League several years ago, our country was engaged in the Korean war, and the Federal Government necessarily was concerned with measures affecting our war effort—shortages, rationing, priorities and allocations.

Today we are engaged in the cold war and a war on slums, poverty, unemployment, surplus labor in our cities and idle plant capacity.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT

The Area Redevelopment Act is the most recent example of dual action, action which calls for increasing our joint energies to help solve these problems, to arrest unemployment, to provide for a greater and more satisfactory rate of national growth.

This new act, recently signed into law by President Kennedy, sets up a fund totaling $394 million for use in treating some of our Nation's economic ills.

The Depressed Areas Act is largely a loan program, and essentially a local self-help program.

The Federal Government has been directed by Congress to carefully confine its participation to measures which will encourage local initiative and stimulate local leadership in this effort over the next 4 years.

The new law, considered in perspective, provides a relatively small mount of money to do a large and vitally important job. For example, the total outlay authorized represents less than half of 1 percent of our total Federal budget, and about one-tenth of what we have been spending on foreign aid annually for many years. It should be pointed out that this measure is designed to help our own country and will provide assistance in alleviating our own problems in distressed areas and underdeveloped areas throughout the United States.

From the marshaling of such attention will come large benefits not only to the communities receiving direct assistance but to all America.

The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to cooperate with leaders in designated areas of need for a well-planned attack on the increasingly complex problems of local communities.

It puts a new challenge to every community to make more careful assessment of community needs, to make larger plans, to exert greater efforts for public improvements, to organize its own industrial corporations.

The new law focuses attention upon the needs, opportunities and rewards of local industrial development.

It provides aid and expert advice for the development of long-range planning at the local level.

It encourages the local community to engage in the important work of technical training and retraining, which is increasingly essential in this day of automation.

In a word, the Area Redevelopment Act is designed to give real impetus to industrial decentralization which must be speeded up in the interests of a stable national economy and to promote our free enterprise system.

This program has been rather aptly described as operation "seed corn" for the American community. Federal loan funds are provided in cases where adequate private financing is not available, and Federal grants are authorized in cases where communities are unable to finance public works for themselves.

Specifically, the bill provides $100 million for each of two revolving funds, one to be used for loans in industrial areas and the other for rural areas.

Community and regional development agencies may borrow up to 65 percent of the cost of clearing land, building plants, and, in special cases, the cost of equipment and machinery to attract new plants.

The new legislation also permits the Federal Government to make grants to pay up to two-thirds of the net cost of clearing

slum areas. This supplements the urban renewal program previously in effect.

In addition to making the urban renewal grants, the Secretary of Commerce is empowered to make up to 10 percent of any future capital grant for urban renewal for nonresidential slum clearance projects in designated areas. This will make it possible for these communities to provide industrial sites and to bolster their tax bases.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

The Small Business Administration, now a permanent agency of the Government, with a loan authority of approximately $1 billion serves our cities and small business communities in an increasingly wide range of public service.

The SBA has been empowered to make loans to State and local development corporations for plant construction, conversion, and expansion. This authority was about to expire in 6 weeks but the Congress included a proviso in the Area Redevelopment Act removing the time limitation, and thus extending this program which is beginning to be more widely understood and appreciated.

Congress has thus made available some valuable tools for municipal use. These programs are not imposed upon anybody. They are simply available and cities may use them if they wish to do so. If any of you experience any difficulty in obtaining information as to how to participate and take advantage of the provisions of SBA services, let me know and I shall try to be of helpfulness.

A few figures from the Small Business Administration will serve to show how the services of this agency may be locally utilized.

SBA has well been called a little RFC. Loans are made available direct to small business, to local development corporations, and in times of disaster, to all residents of the community.

Since 1958, when this Agency was created, direct loans amounting to $17.5 million have been made and another $26.5 million in loans committed; for a total of approximately $43.5 million.

In Tennessee alone, SBA has made business loans exceeding $21 million.

Recently, SBA Administrator John E. Horne announced the lowering of interest rates to 4 percent on loans to companies located in surplus labor areas, and pointed out that funds were available to local industrial development companies for this purpose. He urged and invited wider use of this type of financial assistance.

The State and local development companies have not used the credit facilities of this agency as much as expected. Mr. Horne, SBA Administrator, tells me that to date 123 industrial development corporation loan applications have been received, 99 have thus far been approved for a total of about $12 million.

The House small business committee has exerted constant pressure for greater use of the Small Business Administration's capacities in this and other phases of our economic life—and now a heartening change has come under the new administration. Fresh vigor and broader purpose are being evidenced in all SBA operations under the direction of the new Administrator, John E. Horne, a native of Alabama.

Real opportunties which exist for the development corporation is illustrated by the experience of a development corporation of North Carolina, which borrowed $1 million from SBA. This loan made up about one-fifth of the corporation's financial backing, the remainder coming from commercial banks, life insurance companies, building, savings and loan associations. Since 1956 this one industrial development corporation has approved 131 loans for $16 million for new plants and expansions, and for purchase of machinery and equipment. The new business activity sparked by this enterprise resulted in maintaining employment for at least 8,000 persons and created jobs for 14,000 more, a total of 22,000 jobs resulting from the work of this one development corporation.

SBA's major function, that of providing financial assistance to small firms, is now being brought into the full exercise which the Congress prescribed for it.

The Subcommittee on Organization and Operation of the Small Business Administration, which I have the honor to serve as chairman, held extensive hearings during the last session of Congress. We attempted to focus the spotlight on the deficiencies in SBA's loan policies. Our hearings were significant in pointing up the negative loan policies and the many instances of discouragement offered business and community initiative.

Our congressional committees spearheaded a drive to reverse policies of the last administration under which the small business share of total military purchases of goods and services declined from 25.3 percent in 1954 to 16 percent in 1960.

Today I believe this trend has been reversed and conditions have improved.

Now there is both congressional and administrative support for steps giving small business a larger voice in Government procurement policy.

The President has set as an administrative goal an increase of at least 10 percent in the amount of defense work, defense contracts going to small business.

Only last week in hearings before our Appropriations Committee I heard and saw evidence of this policy being put into effect. The Chief of Engineers testified that the number of construction contracts awarded to small business are being stepped up and that the Corps of Engineers is now setting aside for small business virtually all construction contracts under $500,000.

ASSISTANCE FROM OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES

There are other Federal agencies, as you gentlemen are aware, which offer both financial and technical assistance in community development programs—such as the Housing and Home Finance Agency, including especially its Community Facilities Administration, the Federal Aviation Agency, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, among others.

The Federal Interstate Highway System is one of the most outstanding examples of Federal-State cooperation and of the vast benefits which Tennessee and the Nation receive as a result of an excellent program of cooperation.

Since the interstate program was enacted by Congress there has been allocated to Tennessee more than $415 million of Federal funds for the highway program in our State. Last August $80.7 million became available for fiscal years 1961–62 alone.

Two weeks ago we passed in the House a bill authorizing funds to complete the 41,000-mile Interstate Highway System and put the program back on schedule. Seventy-eight million dollars additional has been earmarked for Tennessee for fiscal 1963.

The services of the Community Facilities Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, is well known to you gentlemen. Certainly much has been accomplished thorough the advances made available for public work planning and loan programs of this branch of our Government which is especially set up to assist and serve the needs of our cities and municipalities.

During this year, the Community Facilities Administration has approved or now has before it for approval 21 loan applications from cities in Tennessee.

This Agency is asking for an appropriation of $4 million for next year for payment to the revolving fund out of which planning advances to cities are made.

Grants are made by CFA for drawing of architectural plans for a variety of types of community improvements, including water or sewer, health facilities, public buildings, roads and streets, among others.

The U.S. Public Health Service also has a program of making grants to cities, but specifically designed for another purpose; namely, water pollution protection and community public health needs.

So far during the current year, the Public Health Service has made grants of $1,286,000 for nine projects in Tennessee which will cost $6 million plus when completed.

The very recently enacted Water Pollution Control Act is designed to augment the work of the Public Health Service and increases the authorization for sewage treatment plants from $50 to $100 million annually.

The demand and need for this increase has been clearly shown and demonstrated in the public interest.

The Public Housing Administration, under the Public Housing Act of 1949, has certified 164 low rent housing projects for Tennessee. There are today in our State 57 local housing authorities serving 70 communities with grants to our large- and medium-sized communities.

The latest figures show that currently there are 18,018 units completed and under local management, with 550 units under construction and 1,685 additional units in the planning stage.

Local housing authorities in our State have received more than $30,700,000 in contributions and, in fiscal year 1960 alone, payments have exceeded $4.5 million.

The urban renewal program has also been well received by the cities of our State.

On the national scale more than $1,871,-million has been spent for urban renewal programs with more than $67.7 million going to 21 cities in Tennessee for 31 urban renewal projects. President Kennedy in a recent message to the Congress called for acceleration of this program to help clear our cities of slums. He has requested an authorization of $2.5 billion to be used over the next 4 years. Since 1949 total expenditures for urban renewal projects have been $1.8 billion. The President's new program thus calls for a 30-percent increase in this field during the next 4 years.

This money is matching-fund money and will require the city and State combined to match available Federal funds for urban renewal projects.

Federal grants for airport construction in Tennessee have amounted to almost $15 million.

Thirty-one airports in our State have been built or partially built by Federal grants.

There are a number of uncompleted and planned other airport projects for Tennessee.

FAA's revised budget for 1962 calls for an appropriation of $75 million for an accelerated airport modernization and improvement program on a matching fund basis.

We in Tennessee are all familiar with and certainly proud of the work and contributions of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

One of the brighter aspects of the new Washington picture appears in the field of conservation and water resource development.

New long-range policies on water and power development and conservation are in the making.

The "no new starts" era has ended. The TVA spirit is soaring. The 1,000-mile-long Tennessee River with its many untapped and unused industrial sites should, in my view, be acquired and made ready for future industrial growth needs. Our cities and State should purchase these sites in cooperation with private industry and the TVA to insure requirements for the future.

The revised budget of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation calls

for 57 new starts and the completion of 36 other great dams and reservoir projects throughout the Nation.

The Department of Agriculture's small watershed project program and the rural development program is encouraging and assisting some 200 such projects in 40 States, including 10 in Tennessee.

Many large-scale programs having an immense bearing on the future of our cities, towns, and rural areas are now before the Congress.

Today our cities are offered challenging opportunities for planning for future growth needs.

With initiative, imagination, and a spirit of cooperation and working together we can move forward to eliminate slums and depressed areas, revitalize underdeveloped areas, promote industry and employment, beautify our cities, raise the level of our community life and make our cities more prosperous and a better place in which to live throughout our beloved State.

Our future progress will depend, to a large degree, on the extent of cooperation we each give to our several levels of government. Each is interrelated to the other. All local, State, and Federal agencies are concerned for the common good and the promotion of health, education, safety, and welfare of all our citizens in Tennessee.

I find myself among old friends, those who are interested in public affairs and dedicated to public service. This makes it abundantly clear that our joint purposes will not falter nor fail for lack of local leadership.

I take from you increased purpose in our mutual task of community building. Best wishes as you go forward in community building.

Thank you very much.

Guidelines for the Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excellent review by Harry Pollak, AFL–CIO International representative, of the booklet entitled "An International Peace Corps—The Promise and Problems," written by Prof. Samuel P. Hayes, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROOTED IN PAST—PEACE CORPS STUDY SETS FORTH GUIDELINES

If there is to be a historian for the Peace Corps, a likely candidate could be Dr. Samuel P. Hayes, professor of economics at the University of Michigan.

His little book, "An International Peace Corps—The Promise and Problems," examines all aspects of the Peace Corps, its origin, its aims and purposes, and suggests ways it should operate.

While there is no question that such leaders as President John F. Kennedy, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, the late Senator Richard Neuberger, Representative HENRY REUSS and others gave the Peace Corps life and scope, it is important to remember, as Hayes emphasizes, that other imaginative and practical idealists saw a similar vision of the future in the miseries of the past.

The American philosopher, William James, at the turn of the century called for a moral equivalent of war in the form of an army which would conscript youth for useful social good and, in the process, send them back to society with healthier sympathies and soberer ideas.

Hayes has described the sweep of enthusiasm that engulfed the college campus following the introduction in Congress in early 1960 of the Reuss-Neuberger bills to provide a study of a point 4 Youth Corps. The public at large was also sympathetic to the idea. Hayes, as a good historian should, also credits some of American labor's early support for the Corps.

Hayes argues that the Peace Corps has a special role to play in providing middle manpower, such as teachers for the schools and technical institutes, surveyors, blueprint readers, data collectors, aids to foreign technical experts, to USIA, ICA, and other Government agencies. He is clear to the dangers of possible competition with nationals of the less-developed countries and warns the International Peace Corps should produce more jobs, not take away jobs. The volunteers should engage in work which nationals of the host country are unable to do. Nothing would give the Peace Corps a black eye faster than for idealistic young volunteers to flood into underdeveloped countries and be seen as taking away jobs which the nationals of those countries think they can and want to do. Quite the contrary, each * * * project should open up some opportunities to nationals right away, as counterparts or coworkers with Peace Corps volunteers."

These and many other facets of the Peace Corps are examined carefully and Hayes does not hesitate to give his own strong views.

He wants it internationalized, he favors a large operation and even calls for Peace Corps projects in the United States. Some of the points he makes are debatable or have been resolved by the establishment on March 1, 1961, on a temporary basis of the Peace Corps by Executive order of President Kennedy.

The emphasis on youth, for example, has been tempered by the call for older experienced hands as well. Many of these problems are still being discussed from every angle by a hard-working cadre of administrators and staff who burn night lights at Peace Corps headquarters in Washington.

This book helps to clarify thinking about the Peace Corps form and substance. Whatever the form, procedure or method finally worked out, Kennedy has set the tone in his belief that the goals of the program will not be reached quickly, that there are great obstacles ahead, but that the Peace Corps offers Americans an opportunity to take an active role in what he calls a long twilight struggle * * * a struggle against the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself.

("An International Peace Corps—the Promice and Problems," Public Affairs Institute, Washington, D.C., $1.)

A Memorandum to Mr. Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker the following is an editorial from the Hong Kong Standard of Monday, May 15, 1961, in the form of advice to our Vice President, Mr. Johnson:

[From the Hong Kong Standard, May 15, 1961]

A MEMORANDUM TO MR. JOHNSON

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: We, the people of Hong Kong, want to offer you our warm welcome—a welcome which may be somewhat different from receptions which you usually receive when you travel abroad as the Vice President of the richest and strongest country in the world.

We greet you with open arms, symbolic of our friendliness and goodwill, and not with upturned palms.

The warmth of our hospitality, we want you to know, is not kindled by our desire for American aid money or for American arms.

We want nothing from you except your friendship, your goodwill and your understanding. And in return, we want you to bring back to the United States the good neighborly greetings of our people.

Although your visit here is regrettably brief, we hope you will enjoy our city and the many splendored things it has to offer; we hope you will have the rare opportunity of relaxing during your arduous travels in the serenity of our orderliness.

We also hope that while you are with us, you will glean from the people you meet and the things you see some of the fascinating and uncommon features of our uncommon city.

Many of the salient aspects of the so-called Hong Kong story are familiar to you and to the world.

You know, for instance, that we have somehow contrived to live and make some notable civic progress despite the explosive pressure created by the unabated flow of refugees.

You have heard often that although we are Red China's nervous neighbor, we have managed to achieve a degree of tranquillity by learning to maintain a delicate equilibrium.

You have also heard that the people and the government of Hong Kong are proud of our unique record of self-help: that we take pride in our ability to tackle our own problems, to earn our own way, and to foster, in the meantime, some measure of social progress for our people.

All this may indeed sound easy the way we tell it.

But for a city our size, loaded with the dynamite of our political and population powder kegs, the job of safeguarding our livelihood and our freedom is a daily struggle of almost titanic proportions.

You saw when you arrived, Mr. Vice President, a clean, prosperous city. You saw the breathtaking view of our busy harbor.

But we can also show you the squalor of our refugee-packed tenements, the tears and sweat which mark our road to survival.

Our battle to stay alive is not dependent today on American financial assistance: we hope we shall never have to ask what we do not ourselves honestly earn.

But we do look to you and your country for your sympathetic understanding of our problems. We ask that you do not deny us our daily bowl of rice; that you do not snatch from us our opportunity to trade.

In your country, Mr. Vice President, an overwhelming pressure is being brought against your administration to curtail the import of Hong Kong's cotton textile goods, the major industrial product of our city.

If your Government should now bow to this pressure, it would not merely be a major blow to your country's long and ardent advocacy for freer world trade, but it would also crush Hong Kong's already precarious economy.

Nearly 40 percent of our factory workers are employed by our textile plants. Of our

total exports last year, 54 percent consisted of cotton textiles of one type or another—garments, cloth, gloves, toweling, and yarns.

These figures will give you some idea, Mr. Vice President, of the dependence of our economy on oversea textile markets. We must export to live; our livelihood rests on our ability to compete freely in the American and other oversea markets.

You have undoubtedly heard often your textile protectionists' charge that Hong Kong is the source of a monstrous threat to the American cotton industry and to the job security of American textile workers.

This charge is exaggerated and distorted.

Despite the sharp, even phenomenal, rise in recent years of our textile exports to the United States, our total capacity and our share of the American market are both lilliputian—in the same way as Hong Kong itself is lilliputian when compared with the size of your country.

We have today a total of 600 spindles, or about 2.5 percent of the total capacity of America's 24 million spindles.

If we put all our 600,000 spindles and 17,000 looms in 1 plant they would just about equal the total capacity of a single large textile mill in America.

Hong Kong's total installed capacity is also dwarfed by those of other exporting countries: Japan has 9 million spindles, India has 13 million spindles, the United Kingdom has an estimated 15 million spindles in operation at this moment.

These figures, we hope, will give you some idea of the potential size of our "threat."

Our portion of the American market is equally microscopic.

Last year, we sold a total of 86 million square yards of cloth to your country. This was about 0.8 percent of the total American production of 10,000 million square yards.

If we take into consideration Hong Kong's garment exports to America, the picture is not significantly changed.

Last year, America imported cotton garments equaling in yardage to a total of 400 million square yards.

This means that the grand total of all cotton goods imports into the United States in 1960—cloth, cotton garments, and all other types of made-up goods—came to 9 percent of America's aggregate production.

And Hong Kong's total share in this was 2.5 percent in terms of American production.

You can see, Mr. Vice President, from this presentation of your Department of Commerce statistics that our share of your market cannot be a threat to your industry; it is a flea bite.

If we volunteered today to close down every singe one of Hong Kong's textile mills, weaving sheds, and garment factories, the depressed state of your textile industry would not be materially improved.

The cruel fact that the textile industry in your country is in a state of decline is the result of many longstanding and complex factors.

A protectionist policy of quotas and import restrictions would not save the industry; they would merely make your textile factories progressively less competitive and increasingly less economical in relation with manufacturers in other countries.

And in the end, your consumers would suffer: they would have to pay higher prices for shirts, sheets, blouses, and overalls.

To solve the critical problem facing your textile industry and to meet the pressure of the protectionists, your President Kennedy made a statesmanlike approach in his recent seven-point proposal.

He called for various domestic measures of assistance, and in addition he proposed an international conference of textile importing and exporting countries so that a fair and constructive solution can be evolved.

The people of Hong Kong, Mr. Vice President, applaud your President's proposal and we hope that your Government will follow through with your positive approach.

We hope that your proposal for an international textile conference was motivated by your desire to combat economic nationalism—that you would not use it to institute protectionism.

We feel that your country's position of international leadership would be irreparably compromised if the international conference which President Kennedy proposed should be used as a deceptive device to impose import restrictions under the guise of voluntary quotas, thus barring the struggling nations from your market.

Needed: Stronger Effort To Halt Expansion of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today, the free world is, as it should be, reexamining its policies designed to halt the outspreading of communism.

In Laos, Cuba, Vietnam, and elsewhere, we are witnessing the devious tactics employed by the Communists.

Over the weekend, I was privileged to discuss the situation over radio station WGN, Chicago.

During the address, I reviewed some possible ways in which we might strengthen our policies to halt Red aggression.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF SENATOR WILEY'S ADDRESS OVER RADIO STATION WGN

Around the globe the Communists are engaging in a powerful offensive to further their aims of world conquest. They control about one-third, or nearly 1 billion, of the people of the world.

In Laos and Cuba, the Reds are strengthening their grip on the reins of government.

Will Thailand, Vietnam, Cambodia be next?

How long can the non-Communist nations permit this gobbling up, piece by piece, of more people and territory?

If this expansion continues, the scale of world power, and voting strength in the United Nations will eventually tip toward the Reds. We must not forget Mr. Khrushchev's threat to bury us.

Now what can be done?

We must "stiffen our backbone."

We must take a new look at Communist aggressions, particularly their success, and determine how to cope with the Red offensives.

Should we adopt Monroe Doctrine type policies with our allies for areas like southeast Asia? What would be involved? The following steps:

Determine a defensible line against Red aggression;

Provide forces capable of stopping the Communists at that line;

Warn the Reds that if they commit aggression against such territories, either political, military, or economic, they can expect to pay a price, war;

Develop a capability for more effectively fighting brush-fire wars;

Increase the capability of NATO, SEATO, CENTO and ANZUS to expand political, so-social and economic efforts to strengthen the free world and assist noncommitted nations to ward off the attempted inroads by the Reds;

Finally, but most important, create a more effective nonmilitary counteroffensive involving (1) designing blueprints for freedom for the nations of the world to counter communistic blueprints for takeover; (2) more strongly challenge the Reds' control of subjugated people behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains; and (3) engage in a more effective political, economic, social, cultural offensive on all fronts.

Regrettably, the free world alliances, including SEATO, have not yet developed the kind of firm, strong policy that would evoke confidence for example of the southeast Asia nations in warding off the Red offensive. Currently, countries such as Thailand are reportedly toying with the idea of adopting a "neutralist" policy.

To me, this is untenable. Why? Because a small nation, in my judgment, by itself cannot repel the concerted military, economic, political, social pressures which the Communists will be concentrating for a takeover. For the Reds, a declaration of neutralism is a sign of "open hunting season."

While India, a large country, has been able to maintain a policy of relative neutralism, she has stiffened her backbone.

In the East-West contest, the Reds have been substantially helped by lack of realistic workable plans of the West for the triumph of freedom.

In Laos, let's face it, the Reds have the upper hand.

* * * * *

While we are talking about Laos and Cuba and South America, don't forget to keep our powder dry and our eyes also focused on Berlin and the rest of the world.

Hope for Our Migrant Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, just as our Nation faces great challenges abroad, so it faces great challenges here at home. The two areas, foreign, and domestic, are closely related, and problems in one area often affect problems in the other. One important result of such a relationship is that before we can expect people in other lands to have faith in our way of life, we must show them that we continue to live up to our own ideals here at home. In this regard, one of our most serious domestic problems is the condition of our domestic migratory farmworkers, who live and die with little or no opportunity, as forgotten people.

It is encouraging to note that the New Leader, published weekly by the American Conference on International Affairs and devoted to an analysis of international problems, recognizes the importance of domestic issues to foreign affairs through its editorial column, "On the Home Front," by William E. Bohn.

In the May 9, 1961, issue of the New Leader, Mr. Bohn's column was entitled, "Hope for our Migrant Workers." It discussed succinctly the long unsolved migratory farmworker problem and the timely legislative headway that has been made in meeting this problem by Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., and the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, of which he is chairman. Mr. Bohn noted that:

Last week in Washington, I discovered that relief is in sight * * * for the poor devils who are forced to make their living on the road. * * * Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr., Democrat, of New Jersey, had brought together in a hearing room a group of Government officials and experts to see what could be done about these forgotten people * * * and he's the sort of person who starts things and keeps them going.

Senator WILLIAMS is indeed this sort of person, and his careful legislative efforts to bring equitable solutions to the workers, farmers, and communities affected by this problem deserve the support of us all.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to include Mr. Bohn's editorial in the RECORD at this point:

HOPE FOR OUR MIGRANT WORKERS

(By William E. Bohn)

One day, some years ago, my wife and I were driving along the roads of Delaware. I don't even remember where we were or what highway we were on, but I do recall that it was a lovely summer day. The birds were singing and gaily tinted flowers bloomed on all sides. Edith and I were in a jolly mood, telling stories and recalling our childhood days. We were driving slowly, taking in every little thing.

And then, suddenly, there they were, lined up behind a wire fence so close to us that we could almost have reached out and touched them. The group included a few slatternly, skinny and discouraged-looking women: I suppose they had remained in the camp to care for the children while the husbands and older youths worked in the orchards and fields. But most of them were children. They weren't laughing, or talking, or running, or playing games. They just stood there in ragged and skimpy clothes, their sad eyes telling the story of their lives. The eyes followed us solemnly as our car slowly rolled along. Then, as suddenly as it began, the exhibition of misery ended and we were left breathless.

"Oh," we said, "migrant workers—it's too bad." I suppose the whole thing didn't take more than a minute, but in all the years since then I have never forgotten those people. I think of them at night as I am going to sleep or they come to me when we are particularly happy riding through this blooming and fruitful land. I never feel safe from the possibility of again seeing such a group. And I say to myself, "Who has a right to be happy when so many fellow citizens are so drearily miserable?"

Last week in Washington, I discovered that relief is in sight both for the poor devils who are forced to make their living on the road and for fellows like me who have this thing on their consciences and have never known what to do about it. Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., Democrat of New Jersey, had brought together in a hearing room a group of Government officials and experts to see what could be done about these forgotten people.

WILLIAMS is chairman of the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, and he's the sort of person who starts things and keeps them going. He was elected to the Senate in 1958, and his energy and intelligence have already made a substantial impression. He seems to have a special gift for getting hold of the right people and making them pull together. In this hearing room were 30 to 40 men and women who have been battling with the problem for the last two decades.

All together there are more than 1 million migrant workers in this country. In the East, many come from Puerto Rico and other West Indian islands, but most of them are southerners. Out West, most come from Mexico. It ought to make us blush for shame that foreigners are treated better than our own people. They have their governments behind them, while our people have nobody to protect them on a regular basis. These people are vastly different in character, education, habits and the conditions under which they travel and live.

They speak numerous languages; many of them know little English; most of them can't read or write. They live, for the most part, in miserable shacks and know little about health or sanitation.

The farmers who hire migrant workers need them. Our economic system requires their labor. But nobody wants them around. They stay in one place only a few weeks at a time, and they are generally not accepted anywhere—not even in church. To be sure, there are some places where Christianity still survives in this country: There are villages and towns where churchwomen have done wonders, but the effects of their work don't last long. If reform had depended upon me, I should have been tempted to say: "I can't do a thing; let it ride; in time we shall get better machines and get along without these migrants."

But Senator WILLIAMS has gathered around him social workers with stout hearts and long experience. He has worked out a program of 11 bills designed to have the Federal Government attack this evil. Many States have already attempted some relief. But States must compete in selling their farmers' crops, so they naturally hold back in passing legislation. The main impetus must come from Washington.

The Department of Labor is to spearhead the effort with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare helping in areas which fall under his competence. The proposed laws cover education, housing, health, transportation, and other aspects of a very complicated set of problems. Almost every witness who appeared before Senator WILLIAMS' committee had some suggestion to make and the chairman listened respectfully and asked questions about every item which seemed to have any value. When these measures are enacted—and some of them will be enacted—they will be the results of the joint labor of countless experts who gave the subcommittee the benefit of their experience.

Education First, Then Independence Says African Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, no one will deny that the greatest hindrance to many of the depressed and enslaved countries of the world is a lack of educated leaders. In most cases, this is no reflection on the countries themselves for they have done the best they could under the circumstances. We have a great obligation to sell democracy to these underdeveloped and underprivileged countries. It can best be done by providing them with educated leaders. Many times a need as important as this is greatly emphasized by visits by individuals from some of these countries.

I have just received a fine letter from Mr. Lewis A. Phillips, of Carlsbad, N. Mex., enclosing a story from the Carlsbad Current-Argus about the visit of Trevor Mbozi, a 28-year-old African from Northern Rhodesia, who is here under a Fulbright exchange scholarship. Mr. Phillips also enclosed an editorial from the Carlsbad Current-Argus of May 14, 1961.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Phillips' letter, the news story and the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter, news story, and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CARLSBAD, N. MEX.,
May 15, 1961.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Senator, State of New Mexico,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: After reading a recent article in our Carlsbad newspaper, I am wondering if we are spending our dollars for peace and continuation of the American way in the most effective way. The enclosed article concerns a visit by Mr. Trevor Mbozi, a native of Northern Rhodesia, to our local mining operation. The item that is of primary interest to me is he is one of only seven natives in his country who hold master's degrees. Seven in a country twice the size of New Mexico.

It seems to me that the educated of today will be the leaders of tomorrow. If this is true then it would appear that whichever system, capitalism or communism, trains the most educators and leaders of a newly emerging country the greater the probability of that system prevailing. An example of the power and influence of the young educated is in the leadership of the Hungarian and first Cuban revolutions.

Russia has special universities in which they are educating, in mass, Africans and Asians in their native languages. Our answer to this is Fulbright scholarships. This is noble but appears to me to be woefully inadequate. This inadequacy has manifested itself today in Cuba, Laos, Belgian Congo, and Egypt. Tomorrow it may be all the countries of southeast Asia and many of the new countries in Africa. To date, our answer to this problem has been not to recognize it.

What would be the influence of returning 100 to 200 educated natives each year to each of the countries of Africa? This question has no answer. However, I feel that we would have a great many fewer worries today if we had inaugurated a foreign education program of this magnitude in say 1946. Imagine the impact and influence of 1,500 to 3,000 U.S.-educated natives in the Congo, in Algeria, in Nigeria. Let us not let history repeat itself. We have entered a long struggle in which education and economic well being may be deciding factors in the competition between communism and capitalism. I would suggest that we immediately launch a "crash program" in quantity of students and quality of education to provide tomorrow's leaders in capitalism.

What about the cost? Tuition in many of our land-grant colleges runs about $100 per semester. Could not some program be arranged whereby the Federal Government need pay only the equivalent of resident

tuition fees for foreign students? Travel and living expenses would then provide the bulk of expenditures. A ball park guess at a 5-year education might be $2,500 per year per student. Total annual cost for 200 students from each of 30-odd African countries would approximate $15 million. Asia and South America could be included if the pricetag was set at $30 to $40 million. In today's budget of billions, this would be the best investment possible.

This education in numbers, in addition to scholarship programs now in effect, will get the American story firsthand to our foreign friends. Word of mouth (by natives) is the best possible advertising of our way of life.

This letter has been long but my convictions are longer. I hope that some way, somehow, you might see fit to initiate action in the immediate future to make such a program possible. May God be our guide.

Very truly yours,

LEWIS A. PHILLIPS.

[From the Carlsbad (N. Mex.) Current-Argus, May 14, 1961]

DESERVES STUDY

A number of Carlsbad business and civic leaders late in the week got a good, close-up look at the battle for men's minds in the ideological world struggle.

A young native of Northern Rhodesia visited Carlsbad. He was a guest of a local potash company, whose parent company has interests in copper mining in Northern Rhodesia.

The young visitor is an official of one of the copper mining operations in his native country, and while in this country is familiarizing himself with various mining operations.

Young Trevor Mbozi, somewhat shy, was a little overwhelmed at the reception he received in Carlsbad.

He is well educated, having studied in this country for the past 2 years under a Fulbright scholarship. He is one of seven natives of Northern Rhodesia to hold a master's degree.

Obviously, he is destined for greater things in his home country, providing he is not caught up in a political maelstrom during and following the country's process of securing its final independence from Britain.

He has been impressed with America and the free enterprise system. He said he personally favors the free enterprise system, but foresees the need of some government control and regulations in developing his own nation. That is undertsandable, up to a point.

Young Mbozi frankly admitted that after seeing America, he wants to see and study the Soviet system. That, too, is understandable, as far as the study for the purpose of comparing the two systems is concerned.

One disturbing point in his presentation was his impression with the progress made by the Russians since the Bolshevist revolution in 1917.

Now, the question is, has this country in which he was provided a scholarship, given him the type of education that showed him the true advantages of a free enterprise system over a Communist State? Are other foreign students in our institutions of higher learning getting "the full treatment" they should?

If we do not sell those future leaders of now underdeveloped countries on our system, the road is going to be a lot rougher in the years ahead. On the other hand, if we are doing everything we can, and it is to no avail, are we justified in providing such educational opportunitits to them?

It's food for thought.

EDUCATION FIRST, THEN INDEPENDENCE, SAYS, AFRICAN HERE

"Political independence coming after nearly a century of colonialism is heady stuff and must be tempered with considerable caution and careful preparation."

So spoke a visitor to Carlsbad this past week, here for a firsthand view of potash mining operations as a part of his 2 years of study in the United States under a Fulbright exchange scholarship.

The visitor was Trevor Mbozi, a 28-year-old African from Northern Rhodesia. He left Carlsbad Saturday for a brief visit to some mining operations in Colorado. Next month, a master's degree in industrial and personnel relations from the University of Indiana to show for his 2 years in the United States of America, Mbozi returns to his native land and, he hopes, a career in the thriving mining industry there and, eventually, a place in "our own government."

Mbozi, he pronounces it "Boyzee" has been impressed by what he has seen and experienced in the United States. And he is appreciative of the opportunity granted him under terms of the Fulbright program. Much of what he has seen lived up to his expectations; some of it did not. Other experiences and observations left some deep questions in his mind as regards the actual workings of a capitalistic democracy.

Mbozi comes from a country which has been a part of the British empire since 1889, although British influence there predates that time by more than a quarter of a century. His homeland, more than twice the size of New Mexico, shares a common border with one of the Congo provinces much in the news at the moment, Katanga.

CONGO WATCHED

What has happened in the Congo—the political upheaval following independence from Belgian rule—has held Mbozi's interest throughout most of the 2 years he has been in America.

"Obviously," he says in his clipped British accent, "the Congolese were not adequately prepared for independence."

To the question, "Is Northern Rhodesia ready for independence?" Mbozi had a ready "No."

"I say 'no' simply because too many of our 3 million African population have not had the education to prepare them for independence."

"Our people, naturally, want to achieve political independence, but I am sure, when it comes, it will be achieved in an orderly sort of way. Too, I'm equally sure we shall choose to remain within the British commonwealth of nations."

The slender young African readily admits that he is one of the favored few among his people—favored by the fact that both his father and mother were educated people. His father, now dead, was a schoolteacher, hence young Mbozi, and later a sister, were eligible to receive an education.

"There is no such thing as universal education in Northern Rhodesia," he explained.

"That is something we and the British are striving for and we hope to achieve it by 1965. But right now there simply aren't enough schools nor enough teachers. The result is a screening of applicants. Those from educated families have the priority; those without family connections, government positions, or some wealth simply don't get a chance to go to school."

The obvious result: More than 50 percent of the Africans remain illiterate.

PRAISE FOR BRITISH

Overall, Mbozi believes the British have done a good job in administering Northern Rhodesia, especially since 1950.

"When it became apparent that colonialism, as practiced for generations before, simply could not endure much longer, the British accepted the fact. They began preparing us for the day when we could stand on our own feet, politically and economically."

Has communism been able to make much headway among Rhodesia's 3 million Africans?

"No. The British have been firm on that score. Known or suspected Communists, always Europeans or Asians, have been quietly deported. The rank-and-file of my people probably don't know even the word 'communism.'"

Has the educated class of Africans shown any interest in communism?

"In an academic way, yes. We study about it at the college and university level," Mbozi replied.

Would you like to go to Russia, he was asked.

"Yes, I think so," was his reply. "I'd like to spend some time there to study the other major economic-political system and compare it with the capitalistic system. But I must hasten to add that I don't think I'd like to live under a Communist form of government, nor do I think that that type of government would serve my country and its people."

In a limited way, native Africans have a strong voice in the Rhodesian Government now. Each passing year, Mbozi said, "the African voice grows stronger, its influence greater."

VOTING UNIVERSAL

The right to vote is universal, but with a catch: Two voting registration rolls are maintained. Roll A is for Europeans and those Africans who own property, work for the government or who possess a certain amount of education. Roll B is a registration for all other males and females over 21 years of age.

Mbozi explained how the system works: "It takes three B votes to equal one A vote."

A voter on the B roll can move up to an A status by acquiring property, by marrying an A registrant, or by examination establishing a satisfactory educational level.

Political parties, contrary to Western conception, are not drawn on the color line.

"An African political party may include Europeans, or a predominately European party may include Africans," he explained.

During his 2 years in the United States of America, Mbozi has had the opportunity to travel rather extensively. Much of what he has seen has impressed him.

"The vitality, the energy of this country is truly amazing," is his observation.

ONE SOUR NOTE

One sour note in his memory of travels: In one of the Deep South States he encountered Jim Crow laws. He didn't like it, although he had been briefed on local custom.

The American Negro, Mbozi said, "is fortunate in some ways, unfortunate in others. His color identifies him as a member of a minority group, his historic background of one-time slavery marks him with a complex. He finds it difficult to overcome custom and attitudes that tend to frustrate him."

Mbozi admits he found it difficult to "break the ice" with American Negroes with whom he came in contact.

"They regard me with some suspicion, perhaps because of my British accent," he observed with some humor.

"And I wasn't sure, talking with them, whether they would resent questions I felt I had to ask."

On the whole, though, Mbozi found most American Negroes warm and friendly once

the normal barriers that exist between strangers had been broken down.

"They are deeply conscious of their ethnic origins and I think they take pride in the fact that Africans of their own racial group are becoming independent and taking their place as equal partners at the political table. They interpret this development as an assist to their own aspirations within the framework of America's democratic institutions."

H.R. 591 Prohibits Unjust Discrimination in Employment Because of Age and Should Be Enacted Into Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, for the past several years legislation was introduced in Congress in an effort to assist older persons in securing employment. The subject of providing employment opportunities to persons over 40 years of age has become a problem of national importance and concern.

During the 85th Congress I introduced a bill to prohibit unjust discrimination in employment because of age. The bill was reintroduced in the 86th and 87th Congresses and is now known as H.R. 591. It is pending before the House Committee on Education and Labor.

Because of the widespread reluctance to employ persons over 40 years of age, 4 years ago the Fraternal Order of Eagles, of which I am a member launched a spirited and determined campaign to awaken this Nation to the imperative need for promoting a more rational attitude toward our aging population.

The Eagles' campaign known as "Jobs after 40" is directed by the Grand Aerie of the Fraternal Order of Eagles and is participated in by all lodges in the United States commonly referred to as local Aeries. My membership is maintained in Aerie No. 286 in my hometown of Altoona, Pa.

The long and proud history of the Fraternal Order of Eagles is replete with the organization's dedicated efforts to improve the health and welfare of all Americans and in particular the Nation's wage earners and their families.

Such legislative milestones as America's first workmen's compensation law in 1908 and the first mother's pension law in 1911 were due in a large measure to the efforts of the Fraternal Order of Eagles. The organization also played a leading role in advocating enactment in 1923 of the old-age pension law and the Social Security Act in 1935 with its subsequent amendments extending coverage and increasing benefits.

It was due to the widespread effect of the "Jobs after 40" campaign of the Fraternal Order of Eagles that public attention was focused on the compelling need for legislation prohibiting unjust discrimination in employment because of age. Four years ago, as a result of studying the facts and figures presented on the subject I was convinced of the need of legislation and sponsored my first bill in the 85th Congress.

The Fraternal Order of Eagles through the Eagle magazine has continued to keep the spotlight of publicity on the urgent need for legislation to end the existing unjust discrimination in the employment of persons over 40 years of age.

We are all familiar with the term "old age," but we would do well to familiarize ourselves with the term "economic old age." It is not a new term, merely one that has received very little attention. By "economic old age," I mean the problem a worker faces when he passes his 40th birthday, and for some reason has to seek employment. Unfortunately we have reached a point where many employers judge a man's ability not by his previous work experience, or his capability, or his desire to work, but by his chronological age.

Some progress has been made in showing the shortsightedness of this type of thinking. Various groups and individuals have concerned themselves with the problem of economic old age. The Congress has held hearings on the problems of the aged, and the effects of continued unemployment upon the older worker. Recently several States have enacted legislation to prevent job discrimination caused by age. We cannot, however, expect the State governments and private businesses to act if the Federal Government merely talks piously about the problem and fails to act. I feel that it is imperative that the Congress demonstrate in an affirmative manner their interest in this problem.

For that reason I am appealing for action on H.R. 591. My bill H.R. 591 entitled the "National Act Against Age Discrimination in Employment" would eliminate age discrimination for all of the Nation's employees within the limits prescribed by the Federal Constitution. It is fully realized that H.R. 591 will not be a panacea for all situations where unjust discrimination because of age exists. We can, however, by enacting H.R. 591, make great strides toward combating this wasteful practice.

It is my belief that my bill should be of particular interest to the Congress, because I would safely venture to guess that the great majority of us would be considered to be economically old. Yet I am sure that none of us feel that because we have celebrated a 40th birthday we are incapable of serving our constituents and our Nation. If political old age and economic old age were synonymous this great body would be sadly depleted.

We are all familiar with the story of the middle-aged worker with children still in school—who, suddenly, because of technological unemployment, factory relocation, or structural unemployment, finds himself without a job. What recourse does he have? Only one: he must seek new employment if he intends to continue to meet his financial obligations. However, compared with the younger worker the odds are greatly against his getting new employment either as quickly or at a salary that will compare with his last job, and the major reason—age. To reiterate what was said earlier—it does not seem to matter what the individual's previous experience was, or what ability he has, or that he desires to work—these are seldom taken into consideration—what really counts is the arbitrary yardstick—chronological age.

We can see what a serious economic problem this has become and will pose in the future by the fact that today out of a labor force of 73 million the age group 40 to 65 is the fastest growing segment of our population.

The question most frequently raised is, Why cannot these individuals obtain new employment as easily as the younger worker? The answer is because of prejudice and ignorance—ignorance of the true facts, and a reliance on medieval concepts and beliefs about older workers. Many firms and individuals are still convinced that older workers are more accident prone, that their absenteeism is higher, that because of age they are less productive, and also that they are more apt to leave their jobs to seek new employment. The cost and restrictions of industrial health and pension plans are often given as further justification for a hiring age limit.

Let us examine these archaic concepts in the light of modern fact. The Special Senate Committee on Unemployment Problems of the 86th Congress, reported in their findings, by both the majority and minority, that older workers have fewer accidents, that absenteeism decreases proportionately with age, and that these workers seek new jobs less frequently than younger workers. Perhaps they may not be as strong physically as the younger worker, yet their experience and training make them a more valuable asset. As to the allegation that the cost of health and pension plans greatly increases for the older workers, the same special Senate committee reported that the overall difference may be minor as a part of the total employment cost. Thus in the overall picture these so-called arguments appear to carry very little weight.

Frankly, it is time for action by Congress in approving legislation that will dispel once and for all the fallacious concepts that encompass the older worker. My bill H.R. 591 does not give the older worker an unfair advantage over his younger fellow employee; it merely attempts to make him an equal.

We all remember the Biblical quotation "render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's." Now is the time to render unto the older worker the things that are rightfully his—an equal opportunity for employment.

Many years ago a great English statesman, Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield, said "Let us hope that the heritage of old age is not despair." I am sure if alive today he would join all of us in saying "Let us hope that the heritage of economic old age is not despair." We can avert the continued despair of persons over 40 years of age by enacting H.R. 591, thus curbing an employment policy based on age that is highly discriminatory, economically wasteful, socially harmful, and morally wrong.

Federal Tax Liens: Association-Sponsored Bills Reintroduced

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. JOHN W. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and the article from the American Bar Journal which is enclosed. This very excellent statement of my longtime and respected friend, George P. Shaw, coupled with the penetrating article by William T. Plumb, Jr., of the District of Columbia Bar, brings into sharp focus a situation that urgently demands the attention of this body.

The letter and article follow:

Hon. JOHN W. DAVIS,
Congressman, Seventh District, Georgia,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: I enclose herewith an article appearing in the American Bar Association Journal issue of May 1961. You may find it of interest.

I have been fretting about Federal tax liens since I discovered several years ago that upon sale of the LaFayette cotton mills to a new corporation, the mill was unable to operate and LaFayette was deprived of its payroll for more than 1 year. The mill was sold upon foreclosure of a security deed which was executed several years prior to the record of a Federal tax lien for income taxes which accrued a comparatively short time and for which the lien was recorded only a very short time before the sale and after default upon the security deed. The property brought more at the sale under the security deed than it was perhaps worth, certainly more than should have been expected at a forced sale. But the United States had the right to levy its tax lien, even after sale under the security deed, resell the property at auction and apply the proceeds of that sale first to payment of the security deed holder, or our purchaser, then to Federal taxes.

Under this situation, we could not safely reopen the mill at an expense of some $20,000, being faced with the possibility that operations might have to cease upon levy of the Federal lien. Although the Government could have possibly not expected to recover anything to apply upon taxes, the tax collectors were placed in the position of being able to say "we refuse to make any move now, but you are threatened that we may do so at any time within the Statute of Limitations unless you, who owe us nothing, pay a sum of money to the United States". After a year's negotiations, we finally made "a gift" of $5,000 to the United States to cancel its lien.

Not only that, but prior to failure of the LaFayette cotton mills, and contributing to its failure and local loss of its payroll, was the filing of a Federal lien, subsequently canceled, which not only covered the property in existence but as a lien upon future products of the mill made it impossible to factor the mill's product and raw materials could not be obtained to turn into cloth. We argued, release the product of the mill from your lien, you will lose nothing because there is nothing now there, you will gain, because the mill in operation is worth more to your lien than a mill standing idle and deteriorating. It was no use, the mill shut down. Yet, as I have stated, many months later the tax lien was canceled.

The referee in bankruptcy has been complaining for years that the Federal Government often fails to assert its claims in bankruptcy cases. We lawyers, sometimes forgetting the Federal tax lien, none being of record nor any notice thereof available, liens of which even the bankrupt has no knowledge, are not discharged by bankruptcy. I remember an instance where the bankrupt estate was more than sufficient to pay all Federal taxes and still pay a good dividend to all creditors. Where the district collector failed to asset his claim in the Bankruptcy Court and it was only with some difficulty that I was able to get the Federal taxes paid and thereby save my client from an uncharged tax lien which would have dogged his life even though he expected a fresh start through bankruptcy. And remember that in such cases it can happen, and does, although there is more than enough to pay the Federal tax.

I sincerely hope that I have not unduly burdened you with this additional reading material, for I know that you have more than your share to read.

Please do not feel that it is necessary to respond to my occasional letters upon various subjects. I know that you will give them due consideration without burdening you with a reply.

Yours very truly,

GEORGE P. SHAW.

FEDERAL TAX LIENS: ASSOCIATION-SPONSORED BILLS REINTRODUCED

(By William T. Plumb, Jr., of the District of Columbia Bar)

Henry Lawyer is angry He has just been through a very difficult and time-consuming lawsuit for a client and has recovered a handsome judgment. He had looked forward to collecing a good fee for his efforts. State law protected him with a charging lien on the recovery, but he had made doubly sure by taking a partial assignment of the cause of action at the time he accepted the case. Today, however, he learned that while the case was pending a Federal tax assessment had been made against his client, and the Government proposes to take the entire proceeds of the judgment, in preference to the claim of the lawyer whose efforts brought the fund into existence. Henry looked up the law, and found that (at least under the more recent decisions) his charging lien is ineffective against subsequent Federal tax liens. His assignment, on the other hand, might have prevailed, if only he had completed his work before the Federal tax was assessed and became a lien. But even an express assignment is vulnerable until the case is completed, because the assignment is regarded as inchoate as long as the recovery on the assigned right of action is uncertain and the attorney has not furnished the full consideration for the assignment (his services)—and inchoateness is a fatal condition for those competing with after-arising Federal liens.

Henry takes some comfort in an intermediate State court's decision allowing the attorney priority (where he has an assignment and not merely a lien) to the extent of the value of his services performed to the date of the filing of notice of the Federal tax lien; the assignment becomes choate by degrees as the consideration is furnished. Thus, under that decision, all the lawyer needs to do to protect himself is (a) to take an assignment of an interest in the client's claim, rather than relying on his charging lien; and (b) to check the Federal tax lien records before and during each major effort on the case so that he may know the point beyond which his work will not be paid for. That may not be a wholly satisfactory solution, however, since (a) many causes of action are not assignable and (b) knowledge that a lien has moved in ahead of the recompense for his further efforts may not protect him when he must complete the case or risk collecting nothing for what he has already done.

MECHANIC'S LIENS SUBJECT TO THE SAME FATE

But why should lawyers complain? As one court has aptly pointed out, Henry Lawyer is no worse off than his client, John Contractor. Relying on his mechanic's lien rights, John erected a building on some land, the title to which was perfectly clear. Then the property owner got into Federal tax trouble and also defaulted in paying for the work. John filed a timely mechanic's lien and commenced timely action to foreclose it, even before the United States assessed its tax claim and established a lien. But the building John erected was sold to pay the tax claim, and John went unpaid. As John's lawyer, Henry hesitates to explain to John, in the words of a supporter of the Government's position, that John's loss was his own fault (or Henry's) because it simply was not sound business for John to rely for his security on a statutory lien, when any prudent businessman may provide by foresight for security by contract. John doubtless would reject that explanation for he knows as well as Henry that State legislatures have unanimously recognized for a century that it is not practicable to protect contractors, labor, and material men by having them take a mortgage, and that reliance on an efficient statutory substitute is essential. Further, if John had taken a mortgage, it might equally have been subject to attack as inchoate until the work was completed.

John's friend, Harry Subcontractor, is today better off than John, although it is no thanks to the Federal tax litigators. If the tax collectors had had their way, Harry would also have gone unpaid if the prime contractor had become delinquent in his own Federal taxes. Happily, the Supreme Court found a technical legal distinction which spared Harry. Whereas John was held to have no property right in the building he had erected so that his mechanic's lien was vulnerable to later liens for the owner's Federal taxes, the property theory was turned in Harry's favor. On the ground that the delinquent prime contractor has not earned the right to be paid by the owner, so long as unpaid subcontractors may have a lien or other direct right against the owner, the Supreme Court found that there was no property to which the lien for the prime contractor's taxes could attach. Hence, the retained contract proceeds are available to the subcontractors. For this favor, Harry is duly grateful.

THE TROUBLES OF ELMER BANKER

Another client, Elmer Banker, like others whose business is moneylending, is complaining bitterly that he is misused. He granted an open line of credit to Joe Storekeeper, who pledged his inventories and accounts receivable to secure advances to be made under the agreement. Elmer complied with all the requirements of State law, under which the bank was entitled to continue making advances, without constantly searching the lien records, until it was actually notified of an intervening lien. But Joe fell behind in his Federal taxes and a tax lien was filed, unknown to the bank, which went merrily on financing Joe's operations. Elmer is quite upset to learn that the bank is subordinate to the intervening Federal lien. He is the more disturbed when Henry tells him that the mortgage department confronts a similar problem in loaning on open-end mortgages, and to be safe it must make a new search for Federal tax liens before each advance.

Elmer's choler rises when Henry also tells him how insecure is the security of a loan he made to John Contractor to enable John to perform a construction contract. The bank took an assignment of the moneys to become due under the contract, an as-

signment that was perfectly good under the law of the State. Yet Henry has to advise Elmer that, if John should lose his shirt, leaving Federal taxes unpaid (whether or not the taxes arise out of the job, and whether or not they were incurred subsequent to the assignment), his assignment is subordinate to the Federal tax liens, which will be satisfied out of the proceeds of the job in preference to the bank. How can that possibly be, Elmer asks, when the bank obtained a valid assignment for a full present consideration, at a time when there were no Federal liens of record? Are not secured lenders—"mortgagees" and "pledgees"—expressly protected by Federal law against Federal tax liens which are not of record when the loan is made? Henry patiently explains to Elmer that the courts hold that only those security interests which are "choate" are intended to be protected, and that an assignment of the proceeds of an executory contract creates an inchoate interest so far as Federal law is concerned. He soothes Elmer hardly at all by explaining that, if his bank were in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, or Delaware, he could take comfort in the view of the court of appeals for the third circuit that one who finances a transaction by which property is produced should be entitled to look for his security to the acquisition he makes possible, and that the tax lien would defeat its purpose if it impeded the assignment of future earnings to secure the loan of funds needed to produce the earnings.

Elmer still pursues Henry with his complaints. Recently Elmer's bank foreclosed on a mortgage. Since real estate taxes were preferred over the mortgage, under State law, the bank paid them in order to protect its interest. As provided in the mortgage, the bank added the property taxes and also its legal expenses of foreclosure to the mortgage debt. But, in the interim since the mortgage was recorded, a Federal tax lien had arisen. And the court ruled that the bank's contractual right to add the taxes and expenses to the debt secured by the prior mortgage, even though the outlay was essential to the preservation and enforcement of the security, was inchoate and subordinate to the intervening Federal lien.

Elmer, who seems to be a chronic complainer, brings up another case in which the bank made a personal loan to a customer with an agreement that, in the event of a levy upon the customer's bank account, the bank should have a right to set off the debt against the account. But when the Federal tax collector levied and the bank sought to exercise the right of set-off, the court allowed the Government to recover the full amount on deposit, holding that the right of setoff was inchoate and ineffective against the Federal lien.

THE SAD CASE OF SAM SURETY

Henry sends gloomy Elmer on his way because he has an appointment with Sam Surety. Like Harry Subcontractor, Sam has been able to view Federal liens with some detachment because his company has fared rather well. The surety is able to reach the contract proceeds withheld by the owner, in preference to Federal tax liens against the prime contractor, because the contractor, being in default on the contract, has no right in such proceeds to which the Federal lien can attach. This time, however, Sam tells Henry the proceeds withheld will not cover the surety's loss. Nevertheless, Sam is not concerned, for his company provided against that danger by taking an assignment of the proceeds of other contracts which the contractor has now fully performed. The assignment antedates the existence of any Federal liens, although the liens arose before the surety made payment on the bond. Sadly, Henry tells Sam that he has no case—that even though the surety company, when it took the assignment, was firmly bound to pay any loss there might be, its security was inchoate until the loss was paid.

As Sam sadly departs, Henry tells himself, without conviction, that risks like that are what Sam and Elmer and John are paid for bearing; and if, as a result, they have to raise their rates or decline to take risks, to the detriment of the economy, that is a sacrifice that must be made to the imperious needs of the revenue. Taxes are, as Mr. Justice Holmes said, the price we pay for civilized society, and if the person liable does not pay them, why should the businessmen who deal with him insist on their selfish security and object when their property rights are taken to satisfy another's tax obligation?

Still, Henry cannot get out of his mind the case of poor Ben Homebuyer. Ben bought a house in a suburban development on contract. He paid $2,000 down and moved in, and he met his payments regularly. He was not to get title until he had paid half the price. Henry had carefully ascertained when Ben entered the transaction that the seller had a good title, free and clear of all liens. But thereafter the developer overextended himself and became delinquent in his taxes. The court deprived Ben of his home, saying that, as he did not yet have title, he was not a purchaser protected by law against Federal tax liens—not even against those that did not exist even as secret, unrecorded liens when possession was taken and payments were made. To compound Ben's discomfiture, the court denied him a vendee's lien for the recovery of the payments he had made for a title that failed, holding that this lien was inchoate and ineffective against the Federal lien. If Ben had lived in another jurisdiction, he might have fared better, although he would still have had to go through a lawsuit.

Henry could go on, ticking off the landlords and warehousemen whose liens were subordinated to after-arising Federal tax liens—even if, like prudent businessmen, they had bargained for contractual (but unhappily inchoate) security. He thinks of sellers of land, who relied (pursuant to standard local practice) on statutory vendor's liens, only to have the property for which they had not been paid taken for Federal taxes subsequently incurred by the purchaser. The instances are too numerous to recount.

Henry's mind wanders back to his own problems, and he thinks of some of the things the Federal lien has done to make his law practice more difficult. He is grateful to the unpredictable majority of the Supreme Court for finally establishing that, if State law permits him to enforce a mortgage or deed of trust by nonjudicial sale, he will not be compelled to assume the burden of a judicial foreclosure merely in order to discharge junior Federal liens. But there are times when Henry has to go to court to foreclose, and then the problems multiply. In order to discharge the junior Federal liens, he must name the United States as a party to the suit, and describe its interest "with particularity" in his complaint. If there are no such liens of record when suit is commenced, he will be unable to do so. Yet there will hang over him the possibility that Federal liens may arise or be filed after foreclosure is commenced but before the sale, and therefore (although clearly junior) may remain to cloud the title thereafter. For one of the still controverted questions is whether the Government is bound by the doctrine of lis pendens. Furthermore, even when the Government is joined and its junior liens are thus discharged, the Government has a 1-year right to redeem the property from the sale, despite State laws denying that right to junior lienors generally.

Henry also recalls occasions when a client has been confronted with conflicting claims to a debt the client admittedly owes. The creditor has assigned the claim to a factor, but the claim has also been levied upon by the Federal tax collector, who disputes the priority of the assignment. With an innocent bystander's natural reluctance to become involved in the disputes of others, Henry has interpleaded his client's creditor, the assignee and the United States. The Government then has moved to have itself dismissed as a party, on the ground that the consent of the United States to be sued in interpleader has not been granted by Congress. Then, having put Henry to that trouble and procured its dismissal as a party, the Government has turned around and—unless the dismissal deprived the court of jurisdiction of the action—has intervened in the suit in order to reach the fund. Such shenanigans run up the expenses of the innocent stakeholder, and, to make it worse, the usual rule that the stakeholder's expenses in interpleader are to be reimbursed out of the fund does not apply unless the fund is sufficient first to satisfy the Federal claim in full.

"THERE OUGHT TO BE A LAW"

Such musings may ultimately lead Henry, as they have led others, to the conclusion that "There ought to be a law." Of course, there is a law—a few "short and simple" provisions of the kind which many feel should comprise our Internal Revenue Code. The tax is a lien on all property of the taxpayer. It arises at the date of assessment and continues until the liability is satisfied or becomes barred. (The assessment is an internal procedure of which there is no public notice, and which Internal Revenue personnel are forbiden, under criminal sanctions, to disclose to third parties.) The lien is, however, not valid against mortgagees, pledgees, purchasers or judgment creditors until notice of the lien has been duly filed. Those few words sum up the present statutory law, which is unexceptionable. It is the gloss that the courts have put upon those rules that is harmful. They have concluded, in effect, that Congress intended to prefer the Federal lien absolutely, in every situation not expressly negatived, and have put the narrowest possible construction on the few express concessions to private economic interests. There is no remedy for that attitude except detailed statutory specification of the rules intended to be applied.

On February 23, 1959, the house of delegates of the American Bar Association concluded that "There ought to be a law." It unanimously adopted the recommendations of a special committee on Federal liens which deal in detail with the problems covered herein, as well as many others. The terms of the proposal have heretofore been reviewed in these pages and need not be discussed herein. The bills embodying the recommendations made no progress in the 86th Congress, but have been reintroduced at the present session. The House Ways and Means Committee has before it identical bills by Chairman WILBUR D. MILLS, of Arkansas (H.R. 4319), and the ranking minority Member, Representative NOAH M. MASON, of Illinois (H.R. 4320). The Senate Finance Committee has before it an identical bill (S. 1193) introduced by Senator CURTIS, of Nebraska, for himself, Senator HRUSKA, of Nebraska, Senator BEALL, of Maryland, Senator BENNETT, of Utah, Senator BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, Senator BUTLER, of Maryland, Senator BYRD, of Virginia, Senator CARLSON, of Kansas, Senator EASTLAND, of Mississippi, Senator ERVIN, of North Carolina, Senator HICKLENHOOPER, of Iowa, Senator JAVITS, of New York, Senator KEATING, of New York, Senator METCALF, of Montana, Senator MILLER, of Iowa, Senator

RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, Senator SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, and Senator TALMADGE, of Georgia.

If you too think "There ought to be a law," say so.

Kowtowing to Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following splendid editorial by David Lawrence, which appeared in the May 29, 1961, issue of U.S. News & World Report:

KOWTOWING TO KHRUSHCHEV

(By David Lawrence)

President Kennedy has disheartened millions of Americans by his willingness to sit down with Nikita Khrushchev—the man who insulted the preceding President of the United States.

Mr. Kennedy said during the last campaign that he was willing to express "regrets" to the Soviet Government because of the U–2 incident. This was widely interpreted at the time to mean that he was ready to apologize even though this might make it appear he was repudiating an act of military necessity—protection of the American people against surprise attack.

Mr. Kennedy also said—as he was trying to get the votes of his countrymen—that he didn't think summit conferences should be held with the Soviet Premier unless there had first been preparations at the diplomatic level indicating some area of agreement.

There has been no such agreement. Instead, the situation between the East and West has since worsened.

What possible good then can come from kowtowing to Khrushchev? The same old argument is made that it will "clear the air" and that "we shall know where we stand."

On May 30, 1955, on this page this writer said:

"Those in government, here and abroad, who know the inside story of all the futile efforts thus far to obtain from Moscow, through the customary diplomatic channels, some evidence of a sincere desire to negoiate peace must have a troubled conscience as they accept the enemy's propaganda trick—a spectacular meeting with Bulganin (at the 'summit')—and arouse false hopes everywhere about the prospects for peace.

"A third world war must be avoided if it is humanly possible to do so, because the destruction of cities by atomic weapons is too horrible to contemplate. But it is precisely because of a policy of weakness and craven surrender of basic principles invites attack that those who are crying for peace at any price can turn out to be the very ones who bring on a terrible war.

"Whence comes this strange delusion that by a four-power conference good faith can be established where there has been none before? And when will we learn to take our stand on principle and adhere steadfastly to it no matter what the sacrifice? For there is only one way to deter any enemy government from aggression, and that is to persuade the people behind it that their rulers are endangering their lives—and, if this fails, then to make sure our force is adequate to defend ourselves against any attack that may come.

"Governments that wish to preserve freedom must steer by the compass of basic principle. They cannot surrender to the whims of expediency now without risking the surrender of their liberties later on."

Commenting on the "summit" conference idea 6 years ago, on May 5, 1955, the writer said on this page:

"The people of Soviet Russia and of China want freedom just as we do. We must not tighten the hold of their oppressors on them. We must open the way for their liberation by refusing to deal with gangster governments. For those governments constantly threaten the peace of the world, and there can be no safety for anybody as long as they remain in power.

"There is but one way to force the disintegration of the Communist empire. It is by forgetting four-power conferences and imposing a complete quarantine on the Communist regimes. This means extermination of their agents and conspirators from all free countries.

"These enemies must be driven from within our gates. It makes no sense to endeavor to negotiate with the master minds of world conspiracy."

In the past several months, the Soviet Government has vigorously waged a cold war everywhere.

Khrushchev has refused to cooperate with the United Nations in the Congo.

Khrushchev has tried to wreck the United Nations by seeking to dissolve the office of Secretary-General.

Khrushchev has virtually taken over the Castro government in Cuba, just 90 miles from our shores.

Why then does the Preesident of the United States feel that he must go to Europe to see Khrushchev and thereby give the world the impression that he is kow-towing to him?

Why should our Government place credence in the word of a Communist ruler who has broken faith on every occasion—a tyrant who ordered the brutal murder of the people of Hungary and who today is conniving in Laos and in South Vietnam to undermine the forces of the free world?

It is pertinent to recall the words of George Santayana, the famous philosopher, who wrote:

"Those who refuse to learn from history are condemned to repeat it."

Once it was the arrogant Kaiser Wilhelm. Appeasement failed, and then came World War I.

Next it was the insane Hitler. Appeasement failed, and then came World War II.

Will the intransigent Nikita Khrushchev now misconstrue our continued submissiveness and thereby bring on World War III?

What Can You Do To Help America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial, which I believe accurately reflects the thinking of many of the people of this country who feel that they should look to themselves for advancing the American economy rather than to more aid from the Federal Government.

The editorial follows:

[From the American Weekly, Apr. 1, 1961]

WHAT CAN YOU DO TO HELP AMERICA AND AREA?

In his Inaugural Address, the President said, "Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country."

To this we wholeheartedly subscribe.

The United States of America is a land of the present and a land of the future. The American people have always been ambitious, industrious, capable, forward-looking, productive. They are a free people with creative ideas. They love their country. They have always been ready and willing to do whatever is best for their country. And now America needs their help, your help.

In recent weeks we have heard much about our faltering economy, and the talk has created fear—at a time when our savings have been growing at a dramatically accelerated rate; installment accounts are being paid off faster than new ones are being created; and our industrial institutions, merchants, insurance companies, and banks are financially stronger than ever before in their history.

The potential for growth in America, in other words, has never been greater. During 1960, America enjoyed its first $500-billion economy. It is estimated that 1961's economy will reach $520 billion, and that by 1975 we will have reached a trillion-dollar (1,000 billion) economy.

Our population has been growing at a stupendous rate. We now have more than 180 million people. It is estimated that this figure will reach 200 million by 1965 and 300 million by 1980. Our ingenuity, creative ability, and research are at all-time heights of technical and scientific advancement. Our industries and the Government are spending more money than ever before to increase our strength, invulnerability, and general well-being.

In virtually every line of human endeavor, there have been great advancements in producing the things we need in our daily lives and the things we want to improve our way of life.

Then why, why do we find ourselves talking gloom, acting scared, saying we're headed for trouble?

Back in 1933, Franklin D. Roosevelt said, "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself." It was true then. It is even more true now.

This is the time for positive thinking. There is a time to stint and a time to save; there is also a time to buy—and the time to buy is now.

The Government has been trying virtually every way it knows to prime the pump. This article will not attempt to evaluate the wisdom of Government policy.

For our purpose, it is sufficient to note that the President is endeavoring to pump money into the arteries of distribution in an effort to speed up the economy and promote greater employment.

We think this should not be an obligation of the Government but rather something that can be better accomplished by the people.

The people have more than $300 billion in savings. Let us then use a small portion of our vast personal resources to lift the economy over its temporary hurdle and on to accomplishments of unprecedented abundance. More buying by the public right now will put people back to work who, in turn, will put others to work.

With the economy again in a strong upswing, we can look forward to a greater, more abundant America—and we can't afford to settle for anything less.

Here, then, are our recommendations: Look around for opportunities to spend as

much as, not as little as, you feel you can afford. Spend for goods or services you need and want and which you can put to good use. In other words, spend, spend now, and spend wisely.

If you need a new car, buy it now. Modernize your kitchen, enjoy the advantages of the new wonder appliances. Remodel your home, build that extra room, install that extra bathroom or modernize your present one. Paint and decorate your home, refurnish or refurbish it; plant a garden, a hedge, a new tree; build a garage. Spruce up your wardrobe; buy some new clothes for every member of the family. Plan a "See America" vacation and spend your money here at home. You may need a trailer, camping or fishing equipment, a new outboard motor or a new boat.

There are a great many knowledgeful people who feel that our economy is already heading upward. If you buy the things you need and want now, you will be giving it an added push forward.

It is unique to recommend spending rather than saving, but this is a time for spending and spending wisely. We dare to suggest that spending wisely is not only our pleasure, but our patriotic duty.

And all of us have another duty—to stop talking gloom.

Let us in our conversation and in our daily needs live positively, talk confidently, and build our future fearlessly. Let us remember that America belongs to its people—to all of us who are privileged to support its purposes, advance its destiny and share its blessings.

Persuasion of the Amish (To Join Social Security)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, many of us have been made aware of the recent seizure and sale of the horses owned by an Amish farmer in Pennsylvania. This act, undertaken by the Internal Revenue Service to collect delinquent social security payments was a matter of concern so that I requested the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to explain the action. I have just received the Commissioner's reply and I believe that, because of the interest which the case has stimulated, this correspondence should be called to the attention of all Members of Congress.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I submit the following letter to Commissioner Caplin, the Pittsburgh Press editorial referred to in the letter, Commissioner Caplin's reply, and an excellent editorial from the Berwick Enterprise of May 2, 1961.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 9, 1961.

Hon. MORTIMER M. CAPLIN,
Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. COMMISSIONER: I am writing to you in regard to recent action by the Internal Revenue Service against Mr. Valentine Byler of New Wilmington, Pa., in regard to a Federal tax lien amounting to $308 for unpaid taxes under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act.

I am enclosing herewith an editorial from the Pittsburgh Press of Wednesday, May 3, 1961. One of the things not mentioned in the editorial is the fact that some of Mr. Byler's fellow citizens have joined together to help him with his spring plowing.

I recognize that the payment of this tax like all other taxes is mandatory and that you and your associates have the responsibility for enforcing the payment of any Federal tax liability. However, I am very concerned with the manner which this particular problem was handled. I particularly question the timing—during the plowing season—and the particular property confiscated. I believe that you may well be concerned that this is an instance where the Federal Government got its tax dollar but where very serious damage has been done to the public attitude toward our Federal tax system. I would sincerely appreciate receiving from you some information as to the endeavors made to collect this tax prior to seizing Mr. Byler's horses. I would also like to know the reason for the timing of this particular seizure and the reason for selecting the particular assets that were involved. Your comments on the extent to which recognition was given to the restrictions on levy contained in section 6334 of the Internal Revenue Code will be appreciated. Whether or not you regard draft horses as livestock is another question that I would like to have answered.

In closing I would make it clear that I am not criticizing anyone for enforcing the law, but I am seeking information as to the rationale for doing it in the particular way that it was done.

Sincerely yours,
HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI,
Member of Congress.

U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
Washington, D.C., May 16, 1961.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCHNEEBELI: This is in reply to your letter of May 9, 1961, concerning the collection of the delinquent social security taxes of Valentine Y. Byler for the years 1956 through 1959.

As you are aware, Public Law 761, 83d Congress, which became effective on January 1, 1955, extended social security coverage to additional groups of self-employed persons, including farm operators.

For religious reasons a minority group of Amish farmers were opposed to paying the tax on self-employment income, although they properly reported such tax on their income tax returns. The Service, being aware of the sincerity of these individuals' convictions, undertook a program of education and persuasion by which we hoped to collect the taxes involved on a voluntary basis.

In the fall of 1956 the District Director in Cleveland held meetings with Amish farmers and their church officials in an effort to solicit cooperation and voluntary compliance with the 1954 amendment. The major point which was stressed at these meetings was that the social security levy was a tax rather than an insurance premium, and that the Revenue Service was responsible for the enforcement of this legislation.

As a result of these meetings and of letters sent to the individuals involved, emphasizing their duty to comply with the tax laws, payment, in the majority of cases, was voluntarily remitted. Out of the 2,000 to 3,000 Amish farmers filing taxable returns there remained a number whose refusal to pay continued, and in approximately 130 cases over the last 2 years, collection was enforced by levying on bank accounts and from the proceeds of farm produce. In a few cases enforcement in this manner was not possible, because of the inability of Internal Revenue officials to locate bank accounts or sources of income subject to the levy process.

The instant case arose with respect to one of the more conservative members of the Amish faith. Mr. Byler, at the time of the recent seizure, owed the following self-employment taxes:

Year	Tax	Interest
1956	$82.60	$19.91
1957	76.57	17.08
1958	32.98	7.05
1959	65.63	7.14

For some time efforts to secure voluntary payment of the above taxes had been made without success. On July 13, 1960, a duly executed summons, requesting Mr. Byler to appear before a revenue officer to answer questions concerning his financial condition, was issued. Mr. Byler failed to respond to this summons. On August 2, 1960, an assistant U.S. attorney wrote Mr. Byler with regard to the summons, but there was no compliance. Subsequently, a civil contempt proceeding was brought before the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania. After a number of continuances, this proceeding was dismissed on motion of the U.S. attorney on January 20, 1961.

On April 18, 1961, a notice of seizure was handed Mr. Byler. In seizing the horses recognition was duly given the provisions of section 6334 of the Internal Revenue Code concerning property exempt from levy. The Internal Revenue officials who handled this matter were as considerate as possible of Mr. Byler's interests in seizing three of his six horses in deference to other personalty. At all times it had been the intent of the Service to avoid the imposition of any undue hardship which might arise.

On May 1, 1961, a sale was conducted in accordance with the provisions of section 6335 of the Internal Revenue Code. The gross proceeds of the sale amounted to $460.

The expenses (drayage, boarding, insurance, and advertising) amounted to $113.15. Since the liability amounted to $308.96, the surplus, $37.89, was refunded to him.

The collection of the Federal self-employment tax from Mr. Byler and other Amish people who are opposed to social security coverage for themselves has been an unpleasant and difficult task for our people. With patience in their dealings, however, we have been successful in persuading most of them to pay their taxes voluntarily. I have been advised by our attorneys that there is nothing under the present law which would represent an exemption for individuals who would otherwise be covered, who are opposed to participation on grounds of religious belief. Since the Internal Revenue Service has no authority to relieve the Amish farmers of their liability for the Federal self-employment tax, when Mr. Byler remained adamant in his refusal to pay the tax, it was incumbent on the Pittsburgh office to proceed with collection enforcement.

I can personally assure you that the seizure of Mr. Byler's property was not timed with any malice in mind. It was merely the culmination of extended administrative proceedings. As you are aware, the Amish do not surround themselves with many of the comforts of our present-day society, so that the choice of property to levy upon was not an easy one. The selection of three horses was based upon the fact that Mr. Byler owned six horses at the time.

In recognizing the status of property exempt from levy, the revenue officer seizing the property set aside to Mr. Byler that portion of property aggregating $500 in value under section 6334(a)(2). Therefore, the question as to whether draft horses are regarded as livestock was never reached. Al-

though the word "livestock" is not defined in section 6334, common usage would imply the inclusion of draft horses. This, of course, would be restricted to the $500 limitation set out in the section.

If additional information is desired, I would be most happy to accommodate.

Sincerely,

MORTIMER M. CAPLIN,
Commissioner.

Hon. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

THE STUPIDITY OF THE LAW

You don't have to go behind the Iron Curtain to find an example of the heartless and inhuman use of the power of government against the individual citizen. You need go no farther than New Wilmington, Pa.

It was there that the power and majesty of the Federal Government was invoked to show one Valentine Byler the necessity of conforming to the dictates of the Central Government.

Mr. Byler is a member of the Amish sect, whose way of life is part of their religion. They are a frugal farming people who eschew modern machinery and use horse-drawn equipment. Their religion forbids them to make war or to accept anything from government. In case of need, they take care of their own. They are entirely self-reliant.

Among other things the Amishman won't touch is the social security system. In their way of life, there is no need for old-age pensions, and some 250 Amish families around New Wilmington therefore make no payments into the social security trust fund.

But the Government contends that, as self-employed farmers, they are obligated by a 1955 law to pay 4½ percent of their gross earnings into the social security fund. In essence, this contention is that they must save for their old age whether they want to or not and whether they ever draw a nickel's worth of benefits, which no Amishman will do.

So, one W. K. Shaw of the regional Internal Revenue Service, figured out a way to teach the Amish obedience to the law. He selected Valentine Byler as the first candidate and seized his three workhorses on a lien of $308.

The other day the animals were sold, harness and all, for $460. Not a single Amishman was present at the auction sale. The IRS plans to proceed in a similar manner against other members of the Amish sect.

This is a legal atrocity and it calls for review by officials of the Internal Revenue Service, or by higher Government officers. And if relief from such a stupid enforcement policy cannot be gained that way, Congress should act promptly to amend the law.

For what the Government is saying to Valentine Byler and his neighbors is: "You'll join the social security system whether you want to or not, and if you refuse we'll take away the horses you need to make a living by tilling the soil."

This is on a par with the old vaudeville skit of a Communist orator declaiming that "Come the revolution, the workers will eat strawberries and cream." When one bystander objected that he didn't like strawberries and cream, the orator persists: "Come the revolution, you will eat strawberries and cream and you'll like strawberries and cream."

The Federal Government will look just as ridiculous if it continues seizing the horses of peaceful Amishmen to dragoon them into a forced welfare system.

[From the Berwick Enterprise, May 2, 1961]

AN OUTRAGE

Another outrage has been perpetrated in our socialistic state, and it is socialistic, whatever you care to think.

The latest outrage is the confiscation of three fine horses, owned by an Amish farmer, at New Castle, in default of $308 in back social security payments.

The Amish and Mennonites, we have said before and we repeat again, are our most admirable Pennsylvanians in these crackpot days. They pay their own way, live sensibly and ask no favors of anyone. Their beliefs do not permit them to become wards of the State in any manner, not even to the extent of social security.

Now understand, we have no fault to find with social security and we only hope there is still some of it available for pension use when we reach pension age. However, we don't feel that social security or any other socialistic idea should be forced upon those who do not want it and the Amish do not.

A tragic angle of this is that at least a dozen Amish families in the New Castle area have decided they have had enough, not only of Pennsylvania but of the United States itself, for it is the Federal Government which is attempting to force social security taxing on the Amish. So those dozen-plus families are going to sell their Pennsylvania farms and move to Canada where people still enjoy some of the freedoms that those who had the spirit of '76 fought for.

There are a lot of citizens we could well do without but the Amish are not among those. The State government has made a mess of things in attempting to force our school ideas on these people. Now the Federal Government is making a mess of things by attempting to force social security on them.

Somewhere there should certainly be a lesson in all this, but what's the use. The powers that be wouldn't believe it anyway.

Tourism—The New Economic Frontier for West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I was privileged to make before the second annual travel clinic, sponsored by the Upper Monongahela Valley Association, at Blackwater Lodge, Davis, W. Va., on May 12 of this year. The glories of my State of West Virginia are so many that I believe Americans in all walks of life should have the opportunity to become acquainted with them, and I trust that a reading of my remarks will spur them to do so.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When God created the earth, He richly endowed West Virginia with natural resources, not the least of which is an abundance of scenic beauty, with unparalleled mountain views, cool green forests, sparkling streams and lakes, and fertile valleys. He also gave it four distinct seasons, for He must have had in mind that these would one day provide for the people who inhabited this area a variety of opportunities for the development of a recreational center for the eastern half of these United States.

And God is infinitely wise and farseeing, for today 55 percent of the Nation's population is within a 500-mile radius of the borders of West Virginia, and I, for one, believe that all of those millions of people would welcome the opportunity to see God's handiwork in West Virginia. It remains for us to find the ways and means of stimulating them to do so.

The tourist and recreation industry in the United States is big business. Although complete statistics for recreational expenditures are not available, the size and importance of the industry is evident from the estimates of annual recreational spending, which vary from $18.3 billion to $42 billion, depending on the definition of what is to be included as recreational expenditures.

It is interesting to note, however, that in 1959, the latest year for which statistics are available, American workers took 77.7 million weeks of vacations, compared to only 54.3 million weeks in 1949. All the signs point to further increases in leisure time and all types of recreational spending. The outlook for the sixties is for an additional population of about 30 million persons, a gross national product expanded by about $256 billion, a total employment of more than 80 million compared to the present 64.5 million, and comparable increases in per capita and disposable family incomes.

Moreover, the United States is shifting from a production oriented economy to a consumption oriented economy, with increasing emphasis on services, cultural activities, travel, and recreation of all types.

Outdoor recreation, in particular, has a larger role in the life of most Americans. The tremendous increase in usage of Federal parks, State parks, and other public recreational facilities in the last decade clearly illustrates the growth trend in outdoor recreation. From 1950 to 1958, attendance at public parks and recreation areas increased as follows: National parks, by 76 percent; national forest lands, by 150 percent; Bureau of Reclamation projects, by 195 percent; Corps of Engineer reservoirs, by 492 percent; State parks by 108 percent; TVA lakes by 120 percent; and wildlife refuges by 165 percent.

The actual use of these public recreational areas has far exceeded the planning estimates made over 10 years ago, and there is every indication that this growth will continue and probably accelerate. In 1959 alone, the number of people visiting national parks and national monuments had surpassed the highest pre-World War II total by about 14 million.

Americans have taken to spending more time and money in a variety of outdoor recreational pursuits which include: hunting, fishing, boating, skiing, and swimming. In 1955, a U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service survey estimated that there were 25 million sportsmen in the United States. The executive secretary of the Sport Fishing Institute, Mr. Robert N. Pavel, estimates the number of fishermen in the United States today at 28 million. The Fish and Wildlife Service survey showed that there were one or more sportsmen in one out of every three households, and that 18 percent of all persons over 12 years of age in our country fished, and that 10 percent hunted. Today, collectively, the Nation's sportsmen spend from $2 billion to $10 billion a year on this form of recreation.

The rise in the number of fishing and hunting licenses issued annually is another indication of the growing number of people who have joined the ranks of the country's sportsmen. Since 1950, the number of fishing licenses sold increased by 30.4 percent nationally, and the number of hunting licenses rose by 20.2 percent. In addition, more sportsmen are going outside their home

State to pursue these sports. This is attested to by the fact that the number of nonresident fishing and hunting licenses sold during this same period increased by 40.9 percent and 132 percent, respectively.

Boating has been called the Nation's fastest growing family sport. Between 1948 and 1958, retail expenditures for boating increased by 167 percent, the number of recreational boats in use increased by 144 percent, and the number of participants in recreational boating increased by 196 percent. A 1960 Department of Commerce estimate placed spending on boating in our country at $2.7 billion, and the average annual expenditure of each boatowner at $146.

A number of factors are responsible for the boom in all types of outdoor recreational activity. In addition to the population explosion expected in this country in the next decade, during which some 30 million more persons will be added to our population figures, there is a trend toward shorter work weeks, toward longer vacations, toward earlier retirements, and a longer life span. Then, too, higher standards of living give further impetus to the growth of a recreation industry.

What does all of this mean, and what should all of this mean to West Virginia? To answer this question, I think it is important that we examine what tourism means to some of our neighboring States. Travel expenditures amounted to $654 million in 1960 in Virginia, and $360 million in North Carolina. Maryland expects to reach a $300-million tourist business by the end of this year, and says that $12 million of this will be in sales of gasoline, out of which the State will also realize taxes and fees. In West Virginia, the State industrial and publicity commission estimated that tourists spent $270,569,477 in 1959. The commission is now the department of commerce.

The figures which I have just quoted show that our State experienced a smaller income from tourism than did our neighboring States, despite the fact that West Virginia has far more to offer in the way of scenic beauty and water resources than our neighboring States.

In West Virginia, the number of visitors dropped from a high of 8,115,429 in 1955, to 7,378,218 in 1958, and then increased slightly to 7,450,625 in 1959. There are several indicated reasons for the fact that there has been no substantial increase in tourism in our State, at a time when our neighboring States have been enjoying solid spurts in this business.

One major deficiency is the fact that our State lacks adequate accommodations for tourists either inside or outside the parks and forest areas—and this includes 20 State parks, 12 State forests, 2 national forests, 2 reservoir areas, as well as 63,000 acres in public hunting areas which are owned or leased by the State conservation commission. In 1959, 114,313 visitors stayed overnight in the State parks, which was a substantial increase over the prior year. But, although attendance at State park and forest areas now exceeds two million annually, there are overnight cabin accommodations for only 1,200 people. Tent and trailer camping facilities are also desperately needed, but at present there are only about 150 sites available.

As a result of these shortcomings in accommodations, hundreds of people must be turned away from West Virginia's recreational areas for lack of overnight lodging facilities. In comparison, I might add, California has furnished some 30,000 camping sites for its citizens and tourists.

Another major problem confronting our State, insofar as tourism is concerned, is the pollution of our streams and rivers. Although the State issued more than 487,000 fishing and hunting licenses in 1959, this number could be substantially increased if the ugly pollution in our water resources were remedied in some parts of the State.

West Virginia has many public land areas stocked with an abundance of game—deer, bear, quail, and wild turkeys, to mention some. But out-of-state hunters have been finding it difficult to arrange for sleeping accommodations during hunting season. A few years ago, a program was started to encourage farmers and other local residents to provide housing for sportsmen during hunting season. This program needs to be augmented by an educational campaign, because every additional sportsman we can accommodate means anywhere from $50 to more than $100 spent in our State.

The historical attractions of West Virginia are surpassed only by its impressive scenic beauties. But here again, full use has not been made of the potentialities of, say, the Civil War sites around Keyser and in other sections of the State, nor of the antebellum homes and other historic attractions. Better roadside markings and more publicity on West Virginia's rich heritage might bring many more visitors to our State, particularly during this Civil War Centennial period. Moreover, the establishment of a national monument near Parkersburg, Point Pleasant, and Charles Town, would further emphasize the historic significance of our State and its valleys since before the Revolutionary War days.

Other possible means of attracting tourists to West Virginia include augmenting the spectator sports facilities of our State. These now include four horse racing tracks, and various baseball, football, and basketball events. However, ice hockey, and skiing, which are becoming more and more popular, offer excellent opportunities for expansion of the off-season tourist trade. West Virginia is one of the few States south of the Mason-Dixon line which offer skiing on a commercial basis, and I want to say that the management of Black Water Lodge has done a notable job in acquainting out of staters with the excellence of ski slopes hereabouts.

An equally notable job in attracting tourists to West Virginia has been done by the communities and organizations which sponsor local festivals. I have in mind the Buckhannon Strawberry Festival, the Spencer Walnut Festival, the Forest Festival at Elkins, the Folk Festival at Glenville, and the Preston County Buckwheat Festival. These events are unique to the culture and resources of West Virginia, and every effort should be made to advertise them more widely, at least throughout the eastern half of the United States.

In connection with advertising, one possible explanation for the decrease in the number of visitors to the State since 1955, is the lack of adequate promotion or advertising. State appropriations for this purpose amounted to $375,000 in North Carolina, $501,000 in Virginia, and only $20,000 in West Virginia, according to the American Automobile Association. Moreover, additional amounts are spent in adjoining States by private interests in the promotion of tourism. This is a matter which I am certain Governor Barron's administration will correct. But beyond what the State may attempt to do, I believe that more can be done through an association of all resorts, hotels, motels, and restaurants, because in the final analysis they get the largest share of the tourist dollar.

Finally, I want to say that if the construction of the proposed scenic highland road through the Monongahela National Forest can be undertaken and completed, the tourist potential of West Virginia will increase by leaps and bounds. The road would open up scenic panoramas of breathtaking beauty, and would afford access to presently inaccessible streams and lakes, camping and picnic sites, richly gamed hunting areas, and numerous other attractions.

The existence of the Skyline Drive in Virginia, is said to be largely responsible for that State's having grossed approximately $645 million in tourist business last year. I feel that if our scenic highland road becomes a reality, tourism will suddenly become the biggest business in our State. But until ways and means are found for the task of getting this road built, let us concentrate on the many little ways of increasing tourism in West Virginia—for if we take care of all the little ways, the growth of tourism and its effect upon the economy of our State, may prove to be the greatest of all blessings which the natural resources of West Virginia have afforded our people.

Continuation of Mexican Farm Labor Labor Program

SPEECH

OF

HON. CLEM MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2010) to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. COAD], the author of this amendment, about this situation: I represent a district of small farmers. The average size of their farms is under 100 acres, and it is the major single industry of the district I represent. The farmers in my district depend on Mexican migrant labor for about 30 percent of our crop. One of the things the farmers of my district have been concerned with is the matter of the regulations and their enforcement, particularly enforcement. May I ask the gentleman from Iowa what is meant by the operation of farm equipment? Does this mean the moving of irrigation pipe which the farmers in my district have been stopped from doing? Does it mean turning on valves, which the farmers have been prevented from doing? There are a number of us who might be sympathetic to the position of the gentleman from Iowa who find it impossible to go along because of the method in which these regulations have been enforced in the past. I should like the gentleman from Iowa to address himself to what he means by his amendment as it applies to the operation of these mechanical means of farming.

Mr. COAD. The gentleman did not hear correctly, perhaps, the wording of the amendment. It did not state "mechanical." The words were "operating power-driven machinery." Power-driven machinery refers to the actual operation of a tractor or a combine. I would certainly state for the legislative record on this that irrigation where the water flows by power pumping, that the handling of irrigation pipe, certainly

would not qualify; but if he is the operator of a power station that pumps the irrigation water, then it would come under the power-driven concept.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. I thank the gentleman from Iowa. I think this should be plain in the RECORD. It is very difficult in the assignment of agricultural labor to know just when something can be done and when it cannot be done. This means penalizing the efficient operation of those farms. I believe the legislative record should be absolutely explicit for those of us who might be in favor of the amendment otherwise.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEM MILLER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa if under his amendment a Mexican national could even assist in changing a tire on a tractor. His amendment refers to working on machinery. If the laborer is working on a tractor he is working on machinery.

Mr. COAD. The operation is work on power-driven machinery.

Mr. COOLEY. You would not let him operate it or work on it in any way. Even if it broke down in the field and they had to move it along the road and they called in some Mexican nationals to help, they could not even touch it? That is how we think the amendment is.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEM MILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Would not the Mexican bracero have a right to haul cotton to the gin?

Mr. COAD. On what?

Mr. POAGE. If he did not use a cart, and we do not have many carts left, naturally he would haul it on a truck.

Mr. COAD. No, I do not think he has a right to drive a truck and haul it to the market.

Mr. POAGE. Can he help load it on the truck?

Mr. COAD. Certainly he can.

Mr. POAGE. Is not that the operation of power-driven machinery?

Mr. COAD. No, certainly not.

Mr. POAGE. How are you going to get it on there without operating machinery? How are you going to get the end boards off without operating on the power-driven machinery?

Mr. COAD. I think anybody can drive anything to the point of ridiculousness, and I appreciate the gentleman's doing it.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. May I ask the gentleman, in this answer to the gentleman from North Carolina, does he mean operation?

Mr. COAD. That is exactly it, it is the operation.

Mr. COOLEY. It says work on power-driven machinery. It does not say operate, it says work on it.

Mr. COAD. That is your point, and as I said, it goes to the point of ridiculousness, the same as the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. COOLEY. And it is a good point.

West Virginia Tractor Firm Offers To Supply Small Farm Tractors to Cuba Without Profit in Exchange for Prisoners; Employees Agree To Work Extra Day Per Week Without Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I have received from John F. Somerville, president of the Tiger Tractor Corp., Keyser, W. Va., a copy of a message he has sent by cablegram to Cuba's Fidel Castro offering to supply 500 to 1,200 small farm tractors to the Government of Cuba "at the net cost and at no profit to Tiger Tractor," with the implements offered to be "in exchange and indemnification for 1,200 prisoners of war" held by the Castro regime in Cuba.

In his message, the president of the West Virginia tractor manufacturing concern also calls Premier Castro's attention to the fact that—

The employees of Tiger Tractor Corp., have agreed to work 1 extra day per week without pay until completion of the contract.

And he added:

We believe this offer to be an exemplification of the highest ideals of American democracy and an example of American management and labor in cooperative efforts.

The executive head of this firm deplores the "trafficking in human misery" and to this statement I give complete approval. I am against blackmail in this case in Cuba. Ransom is repulsive in dealings between peoples or nations.

Mr. President, so this offer may be made a matter of record in the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of Mr. Somerville's message to the head of the Cuban Government as it was transmitted to me.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEYSER, W. VA.,
May 23, 1961.

Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Have cabled Fidel Castro, Premier of Cuba, today as follows: "Deploring as we do trafficking in human misery, the management of Tiger Tractor Corp., Keyser, W. Va., hereby offers to supply 500 to 1,200 small farm tractors to the Government of Cuba at the net cost and at no profit to Tiger Tractor. Tractors supplied to be in exchange and indemnification for 1,200 prisoners of war held by your Government. Details to be worked out with Tractor for Freedom Committee. This offer is being confirmed through the offices of the Governor of West Virginia, West Virginia Representatives in Congress, Mr. Cardona, Mr. Reuther, Mr. Eisenhower, Mrs. Roosevelt, and Mayor Robert Wagner of New York. The employees of Tiger Tractor Corp. have agreed to work 1 extra day per week without pay until completion of the contract. We believe this offer to be an exemplification of the highest ideals of American democracy and an example of American management and labor in cooperative effort. We recommend acceptance of 1,200 of our 10-horsepower tractors adaptable to agricultural conditions in Cuba and capable of all farming operations on plots of land 5 to 20 acres. Please reply promptly.

(Signed) JOHN F. SOMERVILLE,
President.

Bulgarians Like Us, but Not Their Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article from the New York Herald Tribune of May 15, 1961. This is one of a series written by Gaston Coblentz on the countries of Eastern Europe presently behind the Iron Curtain:

THEIR PEOPLE LIKE US, BUT BULGARIA SET MOB AGAINST U.S. EMBASSY

(By Gaston Coblentz)

SOFIA.—The attack on the U.S. Legation in Sofia during the Cuban crisis appears, like that in neighboring Rumania, to have received less attention than it warranted.

Rarely has an American mission abroad been left at the mercy of a hostile crowd for as many hours as was the case in Bulgaria, where the Government refused to reply to requests for protection for some 6 hours.

The singular venom of the Bulgarian Government's action has not until now been adequately reported.

Despite the strong pro-American sentiment which prevails among the Bulgarian population—a phenomenon evident to observers here—the Sofia regime assembled a crowd of several thousand persons in the streets outside the U.S. Legation at 10 a.m.

During the next 6 hours of rock hurling, about half of the windows on the legation's first three floors were smashed. Worse, American personnel were virtually imprisoned in the building and were unable to obtain assistance from the Bulgarian Government.

STAYED AT HIS DESK

This became apparent after Minister Edward Page Jr., a Foreign Service officer with thirty years' duty, instructed his staff to telephone the Bulgarian Foreign Ministry. Throughout the turmoil, Mr. Page remained at his desk, a few feet from a third-floor window.

A call was first placed to the Foreign Minister. The reply was that he was not available. The Legation asked to talk to a deputy Foreign Minister—also not available. The Legation asked to talk to a second deputy Foreign Minister—also not available. The mission sought, in turn, virtually every Foreign Ministry official with whom it has dealings. None would come to the phone.

Simultaneously, the government extended the scope of the affair by filling the windows of the Bulgarian National Bank building across the street with more shouting demonstrators. Still others climbed from neighboring houses onto the roof of the Legation and draped placards and paraphernalia onto its flagpole.

The American flag was not flying at the time. During a similar demonstration in Bucharest, Rumania, on the same day, it was torn down and desecrated by an African Negro.

After 6 hours of siege, the Bulgarian Government finally provided militia to force the crowd back from the legation and enabled Mr. Page and one or two officials to leave the building.

MOB TRIES TO ENTER

At this point, the mob began to dwindle. However a few hundred persons, including African students, returned 2 hours later with renewed violence. On this occasion, they tried for the first time to force their way into the legation, but were dispersed by the militia.

One result of the day's attack was the demolition of all window panes of the reading room on the ground floor. The exhibits in its windows were popular with the Sofia public. They had attracted hundreds of passers-by daily from the time the reading room was reopened last summer, 3 months after the reestablishment of United States-Bulgarian diplomatic ties in March 1960.

Relations were revived on that occasion on Bulgarian initiative, following a 10-year break that dated from the Stalin era. The pro-Castro attack on the legation brought to a climax a period of several weeks, starting with the death of Congo leader Patrice Lumumba, during which the Bulgarian Government had progressively been tightening the screws on all Western missions in Sofia.

The Lumumba and Castro crises are believed by many observers to have been used by the Sofia regime as a pretext for reversing its policy of the previous year, which consisted of permitting somewhat expanded contacts among the Bulgarian population and Westerners.

ACCEPTED BIDS DECLINE

In the last half of 1960, Western diplomats were able to do a fair amount of entertaining of Government officials and private Bulgarians. However, in recent weeks, the number of persons in either category who have accepted invitations from Western missions has dropped to a dismal level.

Bulgarians who provide various elementary services to Western diplomats seem to have been warned off. Sofia residents of the same buildings with westerners clearly have been instructed to refrain even from normal courtesies.

The cause seems to be that the previous relaxation was too successful. The Bulgarian population, despite its historical links with Russia, has a notably strong desire for contact with the West and inevitably compares what it is able to learn of Western developments with the mess in which it is being forced to live.

This is as unmistakably true of the younger generation of Bulgarians as of the older, and applies equally to Sofia residents and to the large peasant population. There is little indication that Government propaganda has made any substantial inroads on the Bulgarian people's attitude.

READING ROOM "PROTECTED"

Characteristic of the new curtailments of contact with the West, the Bulgarian Government, since the attack on the U.S. legation, has been "protecting" the American reading room in a way that prevents pedestrians from approaching.

The windows have been repaired. New exhibits are on display, currently, one about an Antarctic expedition. However, police barriers painted in the Bulgarian national colors (red, white and green) have been placed athwart the sidewalks. Those who attempt to walk up to the windows are waved away brusquely by the militia.

American Medical Association Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT McNAMARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I think it is time to call a halt to the attacks by the American Medical Association's propaganda warfare office on individuals and organizations supporting the President's proposal and my own proposal for financing the medical care costs of the aged under social security.

I say this because the AMA has now reached such a state of hysteria that it has begun to blast the National Council of the Churches of Christ. In February, the general board of the national council passed a unanimous resolution favoring the social security approach, and only after 3 years of intensive study, debate, and discussion. The resolution was no impulsive act. The resolution was accompanied by a detailed and factual background paper, showing the logical and moral basis for the general board's action.

Now the AMA has begun a campaign of typical tirade against the council, which received not 1 negative vote from the 376 members of its committees working on the problem of health care and its high costs for the aged. Physicians and prominent civic leaders served on these committees.

At the meeting of the general board voting the resolution, 105 members appeared, representing 23 member denominations. I urge all of my colleagues to read the resolution, which I am sure they have by now received, along with the factual background paper. I will be glad to provide them with copies if they have not.

But the attacks by the AMA have been so outrageous and unfounded that the executive director of the national council's department of social welfare, Rev. William J. Villaume, has felt it necessary to prepare a defense of the general board's resolution endorsing the social security principle of financing medical care for the aged.

I ask unanimous consent that selections from the text of the council's statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST

An article in the AMA News of April 3 which expressed disapproval by the executive vice president of the American Medical Association with reference to the resolution of the General Board of the National Council of Churches in "The Economics of Medical Care for the Aged" brought about 20 letters to my desk, each of which posed about the same questions. I have read each letter carefully and have noted especially that some were from stalwart church members who wrote because of their deep concern for the church, the Nation, and the health of older people.

Because I am preparing to leave for a European conference in a few days, I cannot reply to all unless I do it in a composite letter. Because each deserves a full reply, will you kindly pardon me for not sending you an individually typed letter. Please be assured that I have your letter in mind as I write and accept my sincere gratitude for your understanding indulgence.

Dr. W. W. Bauer of the AMA staff wrote "to protest and to disavow your highhanded claim to speak for the members of your several denominations, especially in matters which do not concern Christian doctrine." Let us begin with the last clause. Do the churches and their agencies have a right to be concerned about the health of older people? Does the Council have the right to speak about meeting urgent social needs?

THE COUNCIL'S RIGHT TO SPEAK ON CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES

The church's duty to be concerned for health is set forth briefly in the two statements by the General Board which are enclosed in printed form. But when issues of public policy become involved, should not the churches refrain from speaking? Dr. Bauer writes: "My concept of the church is that it is put in the world to spread the Gospel of Jesus Christ and not to engage in political jockeying."

In December 1958, the General Board of the National Council adopted a resolution, the second paragraph of which reads in part as follows:

"What has often been said must be said again. The Christian churches of the United States and their councils not only have the right but also the duty to study and comment upon issues, no matter how controversial, in the realm of politics, economics, and social affairs, in view of their common faith in Jesus Christ as both Lord and Saviour. For all matters of concern for human beings are matters of concern to the churches and to the churches' Lord."

Protestant churches in the United States were a leading force in the condemnation of slavery and were roundly denounced for it, frequently by very sincere Christians. Early in this century the Protestant denominations, and the Federal Council of Churches as an agency of many of them until it merged with other interdenominational agencies in 1950, made pronouncements on such matters of public policy as conditions in industry and agriculture, organized labor, and child labor. These statements of the Protestant conscience were influential in the improvement of our society, although many Christian industrialists denounced them at the time.

In recent years, marked by emergence of many social problems and attendant suffering by millions of people, the Protestant denominations and the National Council of Churches have made numerous statements on such topics as agriculture, alcoholism, atomic energy, conservation, crime, delinquency, education, family life, health, immigration, industrial relations, international relations, race relations, social welfare, etc. The member churches of the national council hold that the judgments of the church should not be withheld from any area of life where moral, ethical, or spiritual values are involved.

THE STATUS OF THE COUNCIL'S OFFICIAL STATEMENTS

Let us return to the first portion of Dr. Bauer's sentence, his protest of "your highhanded claim to speak for the members of your several denominations." Of course, the National Council of Churches has never

claimed to speak for all 40 million members of the constituent denominations. The council is a representative body. It is governed by a general assembly, and between meetings of the assembly by a general board. With regard to the status of official council statements, the general assembly set forth the following statement on December 8, 1960, which seems to reply adequately to Dr. Bauer's protest:

"Many people in our constituency are not clear about the status of the resolutions and pronouncements made from time to time by the National Council of Churches through its general board or through its general assembly. Some members of our churches are troubled by the statements often appearing in the public press in connection with controversial actions, namely, that they are made by a council representing so many millions of Protestant and Orthodox church members. Some say: 'They did not represent me.'

"In response to this understandable attitude and questioning, let us remind ourselves that this council under its constitution is basically governed by a triennial assembly made up of the elected representatives of the churches. These representatives are sent here to deliberate and decide upon matters regularly brought before them by members, churches and by repesentative committees or departments of divisions. In this restricted sense, and in this sense only, every act of this assembly is representative of the 33 churches which compose the council and of their 40 million members.

"The pronouncements, resolutions, and other actions of a general assembly have precisely the status and weight of being actions of such a representative assembly: no more, no less. They will be useful as a guide and help to the churches and their numbers and to the Nation and the world, in finding God's will and doing it.

"It may be further asked, 'What is the force or authority of an action of an assembly upon a church or upon an individual member, especially if the church or individual disagrees, perhaps conscientiously, with the action taken?'

"The answer is that within the context of responsible freedom every church and every member not only has the right, but also the duty, to express dissent as vigorously as the occasion appears to demand, but within the context of our commitment to Jesus Christ as Divine Lord and Saviour and of our commitment to each other."

While the council does not presume to reflect the views of all the members of all constituent churches, it does, by virtue of its structure, represent the majority judgments of the official appointees of these member churches to the general board and to the governing committees of the various units of the council which prepare most of the statements which come before the general board. "A recent canvass of the executive leadership of 12 member denominations revealed almost complete unanimity of judgment that the official statements of the council have been an accurate reflection of the leadership of the churches, including local church ministers and better informed laymen," reported the general secretary to the general assembly last December.

HOW THE RESOLUTION ON MEDICAL CARE WAS FORMULATED

Most of the letters spread before me as I write to you raise questions concerning the process by which the resolution on the economics of medical care for the aged came to be written and adopted. It has already been noted that the initial request came from a national board of a member denomination. The request was accepted by the General committee of the Department of Social Welfare, the members of which serve at the pleasure of their respective denominations and are specially qualified to supervise the work of this department. The project was assigned to the department's Commission on Issues and Policies in Health and Welfare, composed of 37 members of the general committee. In the meanwhile a similar request had been received by the Department of Church and Economic Life (chairman: Charles P. Taft), which appointed a subcommittee to study the subject. Subsequently, the two departments collaborated in study and in preparation of a draft statement. The draft was discussed and revised at a long series of meetings of subcommittees and was ultimately mailed in advance to the 376 members of the general committees of the two departments. It was adopted by both departments at regularly stated meetings after thorough discussion. There was not one negative vote nor one abstention in either of these department meetings.

The proposed statement was then sent by both departments to the executive board of the division of Christian life and work, which has authority over eight departments of the council. Presented to the executive board by Roscoe P. Kandle, M.D., one of the physicians who has membership on the general committee of the department of social welfare, the statement was again passed without dissent or abstention.

On February 22, 1961 the statement was presented to the general board of the National Council of Churches by the division of Christian life and work. Dr. Kandle made the presentation in behalf of the division. In the hands of the members was a background paper which I had prepared as a result of our study of the problem. I am pleased to enclose a copy of this paper. With the revision of only a few words, the members of the general board assembled at Syracuse, adopted the resolution (as printed) without dissent or abstention.

WHO ADOPTED IT? AND WHY?

There were 105 voting members, representing 23 member denominations, in attendance at the meeting of the general board. G. P. McArdle, M.D., of Omaha asks if "they were the pink-tinged group on your board." The minutes show that among those present were the highest executive officers of the United Presbyterian Church, United Lutheran Church, Evangelical and Reformed Church, Congregational Christian Church, Disciples of Christ, Church of the Brethren, Moravian Church (Northern Province), American Evangelical Lutheran Church, Five Years Meeting of Friends, and others of equal stature. Five bishops of the Methodist Church, several bishops of Negro Methodist denominations, and bishops of other churches were also in attendance.

On April 21, the Erie (Pa.) Council of Churches held an open forum on medical services at which Russell Roth, M.D., speaking for the county medical society, said, "It appears that the general board has been naively gulled * * *." Is it reasonable to believe that hundreds of highly respected Christian leaders, representing many vocations on department, division and general board levels were "gulled"? Or that this was a "scheme," as suggested in a letter I received from a physician in San Diego?

The Right Reverend William Crittenden, Episcopal bishop of Erie, who was unable to attend the meeting at which Dr. Roth spoke, submitted the following statement regarding his position on the resolution of the general board on "The Economics of Medical Care for the Aged":

"I attended the meeting of the National Council of Churches where this resolution was approved and voted in favor of it for the following reasons:

"First, at the meeting the resolution was ably presented and explained by Dr. Roscoe Kandle, commissioner of health for the State of New Jersey. It seemed to me that by the very nature of his work, he was in a position to see the total problem of care for the aged perhaps more objectively than the average local general practitioner. He was decidedly in favor of the council's resolution and seemed to me to represent competent medical opinion.

"Second, let me quote; what is to me, the relevant section of the council's resolution. 'As previously noted, the general board has stated, "If voluntary prepayment plans cannot accomplish the desired ends, the Government should protect the health of people by making possible the prepayment of health services." This is precisely what the social security system would be able to provide efficiently through the mechanism of old-age, survivors, and disability insurance. Therefore, the National Council of Churches supports in principle legislation which will extend the benefits of old-age, survivors, and disability insurance to include adequate health care for retired aged persons.' Commenting on this section, I would say that the phrase 'in principle' should be underlined. Before any final legislation is passed, I would assume that competent persons in the medical profession would be constantly consulted and the advice of such persons carefully weighed in considering the total problem of care for the aged.

"Third, I agree with the general position of the resolution that adequate medical care literally for millions of the aged is not being provided, that the present voluntary system of health insurance is necessarily greatly limited and cannot move forward fast enough, and that the use of the social security system is the fairest way to overcome the problem.

"Fourth, I would like to point out specifically that the proposed extension of benefits is only for the aged and in no way presupposes a general medical care Government plan for all ages. At the present time, I am not prepared to say whether I would favor such a plan. At least, it seems to me that such a plan would not be feasible within the near future.

"Fifth, it is my belief that the entire problem of caring for the aged is summarized well in the statement by Dr. David D. Rutstein, professor of preventive medicine and head of the department at the Harvard Medical School, in his recent article in the Atlantic Monthly. I quote him directly: 'Congress has clearly recognized that voluntary health insurance cannot meet the need, and financial assistance by the Government for payment of medical bills for some of the aged is now a reality. But the present law also does not meet the need, and furthermore fosters direct local political control over the aged sick. Passage of a law under the Social Security Act would protect the aged against bankruptcy due to illness. It would, also, in one fell swoop, do away with political control, debasing means tests, and complex, expensive administration, and would be self-supporting. Let us hope that Congress acts promptly.' "

ARE THE AMA ADVERTISEMENTS "MISLEADING"?

Inasmuch as all but one of the people who have written the national council and will receive this reply are physicians, may I conclude by expressing my personal disappointment with the full-page newspaper advertisements of the AMA, characterized as "misleading" by Secretary Ribicoff. I am sure the AMA is fully aware that prepayment of health care via social security for the years of one's retirement is not "socialized medicine." Will the AMA really convince people that the proposed legislation will put physicians on Government salaries, which is basic to socialized medicine, or will intelligent people react negatively to tactics which are unworthy of the medical profession? Why does the AMA publicly advertise that people will

lose freedom to choose their own physician, when the various legislative proposals expressly guarantee freedom of choice of both physician and hospital? On what basis in any of the proposed legislation does the AMA make its claim that the Federal Government will enter "the privacy of the examination room"?

I fully share the concern of physicians that the doctor-patient relationship and the free choice of physician be preserved, but I cannot understand why physicians permit their professional association to make obviously exaggerated statements which undermine the faith of the public in doctors. What is happening to the "image" of physicians as men who are trained in the precision of exact science? What dangers does the changing image of physicians pose to the doctor-patient relationship?

If the AMA were to set forth certain basic principles essential to good medical care as a constructive guide for the Nation in changing times, I believe the organization would be widely supported. I mean such principles as the following:

1. All people who need health care should be able to receive such care in a manner that respects their dignity.

2. Free choice of physician is one of the basic rights to be respected in any system of medical care.

3. To the maximum extent possible, the cost of medical care should be paid by the patient.

4. The licensed physician's freedom to treat a patient in his individual way should be protected.

How much better an approach of this nature would be than to have the AMA bluntly accused on the floor of the U.S. Senate of "misrepresentations, distortions, and outright lies." The AMA claim in its newspaper advertisement that the Kerr-Mills benefits are "unlimited, with medical aid authorized for any person over 65 who needs help" is not true. Only seven States had adopted the program as of April 17. It was subsequently pointed out on the Senate floor that one of the States sets a maximum limit on hospital care of only 3 days "and even this much—along with any other benefits—is denied to anyone with a gross annual income in excess of $1,000." Why does the AMA, speaking for 180,000 physician-members, tell the public that "benefits are unlimited"?

SOME EXCERPTS FROM THE AMA RECORD

In 1930 the AMA condemned the Sheppard-Towner Maternity and Infancy Act which provided Federal grants to aid States in reducing infant and maternal mortality as "unsound in principle, wasteful and extravagant, unproductive of results, and tending to promote communism" (Digest of Official Actions, 1846–1958, AMA, p. 92). Its principal provisions were incorporated in the Social Security Act over 25 years ago. In the eyes of the American public these provisions have not tended to promote communism, nor have they been proved wasteful, extravagant, or unproductive of results.

In the Journal of the AMA, December 30, 1939 (p. 2428), the platform of the AMA opposed "all forms of security, compulsory security, even against old age and unemployment" and said they "represent a beginning invasion by the state into the personal life of the individual, represent a taking away of individual responsibility, a weakening of national caliber, a definite step toward either communism or totalitarianism." It would be difficult today to find thoughtful critics of old-age or unemployment insurance benefits under the social security program who would seriously believe that over the past 21 years these measures have brought this Nation closer to communism or totalitarianism.

In December 1949, the AMA opposed inclusion of disability benefits in the social security program as "another step toward nationalization of medical care and socialization of the practice of medicine" (Journal, December 17, 1949, p. 1156). However, the disability insurance provisions have worked so well that at the last session of Congress the 50-year age limit was removed without opposition from either political party or any substantial portion of the public.

Even voluntary health insurance, which the AMA now supports, was regarded as "socialistic" by the association when first advocated. The editorial entitled "The Committee on the Costs of Medical Care" in the AMA Journal of December 3, 1932 (pp. 1950–1952) belittled a favorable report on group medical practice and voluntary health insurance as "representing the great foundations, public health officialdom, social theory—even socialism and communism—inciitng to revolution." Today the AMA accepts both of these aids to medical care. Hospitals, journal of the American Hospital Association, December 1949, stated, after a review of AMA positions: "It is a sad fact that through the 1930's and early 1940's, the American Medical Association did not believe in voluntary sickness insurance, and did almost everything possible to prevent its development" (p. 60).

Most of the AMA's present-day objections to the financing of medical care for the aged through social security are based on fears expressed in the past which most Americans would say have not been justified. Should not the physicians insist that the AMA objectively weigh all the data relevant to health problems of the increasing number of older people and make constructive proposals to meet their needs?

IS THERE REAL NEED? CAN IT BE MET WITHOUT SOCIALIZED MEDICINE?

The U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and the Aging reported on January 27, 1961:

"Without question, the primary problem of our increasing population of retired older citizens remains the question of meeting the costs of basic health care at a time when their income is low, potential or actual illness or disability at its peak, and the relative cost of health services, enormous."

The National Council of Churches has, in its statement, supported the growth and expansion of voluntary health insurance and urged the States to avail themselves of the Kerr-Mills provision in the Social Security Act—but the council has also recognized that millions of older people cannot meet their health needs under either of these plans. With the proper safeguards their health can be protected by using the instrument of social security to make possible the prepayment of health services needed in old age.

If the AMA continues its campaign in the face of the growing millions of retired people over 65 who cannot meet the rising costs of health care, might it not be possible that the AMA will drive Americans to accept socialized medicine as so many other nations have done? Socialized medicine is repugnant to most Americans today. If the AMA would give more constructive leadership in meeting the Nation's health needs, it would help mightily to avoid socialized medicine in this country.

Some physicians of high repute have concluded that the use of social security is the most effective way to avoid socialized medicine. So has Business Week, the New York Times, Life magazine, Walter Lippmann, Governors of over 30 States, Marion B. Folsom (former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in the Eisenhower administration, currently a director of Eastman Kodak Co.), and many reputable national organizations. They cannot all seriously be suspected of any preference for socialism or communism.

There may be a better way to meet the present needs of older people. If such a method is proposed by the AMA or anyone else, I am sure it will be widely supported because most Americans are very reluctant to involve Government unnecessarily.

Thank you for writing to the national council. If you cannot agree with the position taken, I hope that I may have convinced you that the council is not in favor of socialized medicine; but is greatly concerned about the health needs of millions of older people, even as you are. Let us pray that the Lord will guide our Nation as it faces this difficult problem.

The Freight Forwarding Industry and Our Foreign Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD an article of mine which is published in this week's issue of Brandon's Shipper and Forwarder, official weekly publication of the New York Foreign Freight Forwarders & Brokers Association. This issue is devoted to World Trade Week, which begins on Monday, May 22, and will continue through Saturday, May 27.

The title of my article is "The Freight Forwarding Industry Must Not Be Destroyed." It deals with the plight of this industry at the present time and also discusses my bill, H.R. 5562, which I introduced on March 14, 1961, containing several proposals aiming to protect the industry and our foreign trade.

The article reads as follows:

THE FREIGHT FORWARDING INDUSTRY MUST NOT BE DESTROYED

(By Hon. VICTOR L. ANFUSO, of New York)

When President Kennedy launched his New Frontier several months ago, he called on the American people to face up to the problems of this new era. One of these frontiers is world trade, an area in our national life which is extremely important not only to the prosperity of our Nation, but also to its economic security now and in the future. Moreover, it is vital to the economic welfare and the political strength of our allies in the free world.

International trade has been defined as "the lifeblood of the free world's economy." That is very true, especially as it concerns the United States. Trade with the rest of the world provides us with vital raw materials for our industry and security; we, in turn, provide those countries with manufactured goods, industrial products, farm commodities, and others which we ship abroad.

Let us also not overlook the fact that world trade is one of our largest industries. It is worth emphasizing that the value of U.S. goods marketed abroad annually is greater than that of consumer purchases of automobiles, or the value of home construction, or of gross receipts by all our farmers from their crops of livestock. The value of U.S. exports is about equal to that of our entire production of minerals and almost as much as the retail value of all clothing and shoes purchased by American consumers. And one other fact: Some 4,500,000 Americans are employed in industries associated

directly with our foreign trade—or about 7 percent of the total labor force of the Nation.

It is clear, therefore, that the promotion of wholesome trade relations with other countries serves the best interests of our country. Anything that will expand and improve such relations will simultaneously strengthen our economy and our security, and as such must be encouraged.

Naturally, there exist certain abuses and practices which should be corrected. This is something for the experts to examine more closely. I merely want to dwell on one particular subject, i.e., the forwarding industry, which is of such vital importance to the economy of New York and the large shipping industry in our greatest port.

Freight brokerage and ocean freight forwarding is an ancient profession dating back to the early days of the sailing vessel. When a ship arrived in port, it sought the aid of intermediary to obtain cargo for the ship and the commission paid for this service became known as "brokerage." As international shipping grew and became more complicated, governments adopted tariffs and other laws regulating foreign trade and shipping. This required new services for both shipper and carrier.

Thus, an expert was needed to guide exporters in their foreign transactions, as well as to insure prompt dispatch of their shipments. The forwarder developed into this kind of an expert, serving both shipper and carrier. They included the cost of the forwarder's services in their rates, prices and quotations, the shipper paying a fee to the forwarder and the carrier paying a commission or brokerage. In this way, the forwarder became an integral part of our foreign commerce.

This relationship between shipper, forwarder and carrier continued satisfactorily and worked efficiently for many decades prior to World War II. In 1943, the U.S. Maritime Commission entered the picture, and since then there has developed a situation which is gradually driving the forwarding industry to the point of bankruptcy. In that year the Maritime Commission issued a long questionnaire to the forwarders, resulting in a court challenge of the Commission's authority and a ruling by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1946 that forwarders were "other persons subject to the Shipping Act."

Now a series of investigations of New York freight forwarders began, followed by succeeding dockets and regulations regarding brokerage and its practices. Reams of testimony were accumulated from various persons directly concerned with foreign commerce, and the overwhelming concensus was that forwarders are essential to the smooth flow of our foreign trade and that both shippers and carriers were willing to pay for their services. Finally, the Federal Maritime Board, successor to the Maritime Commission, issued in March 1957, a proposed revision of the forwarders' regulations which would have rendered impossible the continued existence of the forwarding industry and would have seriously affected the flow of our foreign trade.

As was to be expected, a storm of protest arose in all parts of the country, including shippers, carriers, State and local governments, port authorities, chambers of commerce, export groups, and others. Of some 500 comments received by the Maritime Board, all but two condemned the proposed regulations. By this time, the forwarding industry realized the futility of endless litigation and turned to Congress for help to avert its total bankruptcy.

Bills were subsequently introduced in Congress to license, regulate, and protect the interests of the forwarders. One of these bills, H.R. 8382, was passed by the House in 1958 but the Senate failed to act on it due to lack of time when the session was adjourned. The legislation was reintroduced in the next Congress and after a long, drawn-out process, both Houses approved the measure—but in different versions. This required a conference to work out a compromise, but again adjournment intervened and final action did not take place.

Consequently, on March 14, 1961, I introduced a bill, H.R. 5562, contained the same or similar proposals as H.R. 5068 which came so close to adoption in the previous Congress. Specifically, my bill would do the following:

1. It would eliminate certain abuses and questionable practices with which the forwarding industry is being charged, notably:

(a) The "dummy" forwarder, who is set up and controlled by an exporter as a means for collecting the brokerage compensation from carriers. The bill seeks to eliminate the "dummy" forwarder by defining the independent forwarder as a person in the forwarding business "who is not a shipper or consignee or a seller or purchaser of shipments * * * nor directly or indirectly controls or is controlled by such shipper." Thus, licensing will be confined only to independent forwarders.

(b) The collection of unearned brokerage fees. The bill specifies six types of services which the forwarder may perform for the carrier, and he must perform a minimum of three of these services in order to be entitled to compensation. The maximum compensation is limited to 5 percent of the freight cost. This should eliminate the abuses in this field. The six services are: Solicitation of cargo for the ship; coordination of moving the cargo to shipside; preparation and processing of the ocean bill of lading; preparation of dock receipts or delivery orders; preparation of consular documents or export declarations; and payment of ocean freight charges on such shipments.

2. By requiring the forwarder to certify the services performed as a condition for receiving compensation, the carrier will now have an adequate guide to proper brokerage fees and the administrative agency will have a strong weapon for prosecution of any violations.

3. The ocean freight forwarding industry would be brought under strict but fair licensing and regulation.

4. The forwarding industry would be freed of the constant costs of litigation and the dire threats to its existence.

5. The clear and unambiguous language of the bill makes it an instrument for easy enforcement and inexpensive administration.

These changes and innovations are long overdue. This is the only and most logical way to save this industry. At a time when this country is seeking to restore its economic equilibrium, we cannot afford to destroy industries or to drive them to the edge of bankruptcy.

The ocean freight forwarding industry should be given a full opportunity to devote its time and effort to the performance of its duties as an integral part of our Nation's foreign commerce and as an indispensable link between shippers and carriers. The interests of our world trade and its expansion in the years ahead require it. At a time when both industry and labor in this country are complaining about the effect of increased imports on the economy of the United States we ought to encourage our export trade to every extent possible.

I certainly will exert every effort to have this beneficial legislation passed.

Address by Representative Frank Boykin, of Alabama, at Dedication of Jackson Lock and Dam on the Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway, April 7, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, the completion of another vital step in the modernization of Alabama's Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway was observed on April 7, 1961, with the dedication of the Jackson lock and dam on the lower reaches of that great river system. On that important occasion, Representative FRANK BOYKIN, dean of the Alabama delegation in the House of Representatives, made the main address at the dedication ceremonies held before an audience of several thousand interested Alabamians. Included below are the timely remarks made by Congressman BOYKIN on this occasion:

We are gathered here this afternoon to commemorate a major step forward in the modernization of one of Alabama's most important, most valuable and potentially most useful natural resources—the Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway. The river system, more than 460 miles in length, extends from the deep-water port of Mobile into the very heart of the State. It has been a significant factor in the growth and development of this area since the earliest pioneer settlement, but its greatest value and service are yet to be realized.

Jackson lock and dam which we dedicate today is one of the keys that will open the way for maximum utilization of the Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway and transform it into a fully productive, wealth-creating instrument of progress. Jackson lock and dam is an essential and integral part of the master plan conceived by the Army's Corps of Engineers to harness the river system to the needs of Alabama and the Southeast for the next half century or more.

The program envisioned by the Army Engineers, carried to a successful completion, will pay enormous dividends. It will provide an efficient, low-cost avenue of transportation; it will give us new sources of hydroelectric energy; it will assure greater supplies of water for home, farm and factory; it will alleviate floods, abate pollution, and create unexcelled opportunities for healthful recreation.

The vast impact of the waterway's development already is being felt. Construction of new industrial plants and the expansion of existing manufacturing and service facilities along the Warrior-Tombigbee are taking place at a multi-million-dollar pace. Announced investments for capital growth by industry in the Warrior-Tombigbee Basin have totaled more than $380 million over the past 6 years, and this amount does not include additional millions spent for improvements to transportation systems, expansions by utilities and the construction of military installations.

These investments are of benefit, directly and indirectly, to the entire State. In addition to the generation of additional tax dollars for much needed enlargement of essential public services, they have produced

several thousand new jobs in many fields and skills for our people.

The economic expansion fostered by the modernization of the Warrior-Tombigbee is not concentrated in one area. Rather, it is occurring throughout the valley, and is being carried on by a variety of industries. During the past few years, we have seen new coal mines opened along the Upper Waterway; we have seen the establishment and growth of paper-producing plants at Tuscaloosa, Naheola, Demopolis, and Mobile; we have seen more than $150 million invested in chemical plants in the Washington County area; we have seen a major steam electric generating plant built at Barry; we have seen the lumber, shipbuilding, textile, and metal fabricating industries increase their productive capacities.

Yet, even with these gratifying developments, we have hardly scratched the surface. Other areas of the Nation are growing at an even faster rate—as evidenced by the fact that we shall lose one of our Congressmen on the basis of the 1960 census.

Yes, we still have a lot of catching up to do. And if we are to move ahead, one of the things we must do is press for the wise conservation, development, and use of the water resources Nature has so abundantly bestowed on Alabama.

Our State is practically framed by rivers. To the north is the Tennessee, which carries more than 12 million tons of commerce annually. To the east is the Chattahoochee, a part of the Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint system which is now under development. To the west are the Mobile and Tombigbee Rivers, and to the south is the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway which, while not a river, is an improved navigation channel. And running diagonally across the State is the Alabama-Coosa system.

In all, Alabama has 1,500 miles of authorized waterways with depths of nine feet or more. Of this total, approximately 750 miles have been completed.

We must press forward with all our energy to ensure that the remaining mileage is improved as rapidly as practicable. We cannot afford to do otherwise.

This is not a matter of concern for the few. It is a matter of concern for every man and woman who lives and works in Alabama. All of us must remain keenly alert to the progress being made in the conservation, development, and use of our water resources. We must all gives these programs our active support, for only this way can we hope to accomplish our objective.

As General Barney has indicated, considerable progress has been made in recent years in carrying out the modernization of the Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway. Demopolis lock and dam was completed in 1955 to eliminate four obsolete navigation projects; the Warrior lock and dam between Eutaw and Greensboro was finished 2 years later to remove two deteriorated, inadequate structures, and today we dedicate still another new facility.

In the headwaters of the Warrior River, the Alabama Power Co., always in step with the needs and ambitions of the State, has built with private capital the Lewis Smith Dam on the Sipsey Fork, thereby becoming an active partner in carrying forward the waterway's improvement. The Alabama power project, representing one of the three headwater dams urged several years ago by the Corps of Engineers, was designed and built so as to fit into the comprehensive program for the Warrior-Tombigbee.

Our next step in modernizing the waterway is construction of Holt lock and dam in the district of my colleague, Armistead Selden. By replacing four old locks and dams, it will extend above Tuscaloosa the modern waterway dimensions which the Warrior, Demopolis, and Jackson projects provide between that city and Mobile.

The Corps of Engineers will be in a position to use initial construction money for Holt lock and dam in fiscal 1962, which begins July 1. We are encouraged by the fact that the budget now being considered by Congress recommends $750,000 for that purpose. But let us remember that it's a long way between a budget recommendation and an appropriation. And even then, we will have money only for the first year's construction. It will be necessary for us to fight year by year for subsequent appropriations to complete the project in an orderly manner.

The urgent need for Holt lock and dam is demonstrated by the Warrior-Tombigbee's steady growth in commerce, which has more than doubled during the past decade, reaching 5,756,227 tons in 1959 to set a record high for the 7th consecutive year.

Accompanying the continued rapid growth in movements has been a change in the pattern of traffic that makes early completion of the Holt project even more vital. In 1949, only a little more than 800,000 tons or 38 percent of the Warrior-Tombigbee's total commerce moved in that reach to be improved by Holt lock and dam. In 1959, however, this portion of the river carried almost 2,900,000 tons or 50 percent of the total.

Major difficulty encountered by navigation above Tuscaloosa is caused by the small size of the existing locks, built between 1905 and 1915. These structures are only 52 feet wide and about 285 feet long, as compared with lengths of 600 feet and widths of 110 feet at the new locks.

Only four 500-ton barges can transit these four locks at one time, and as a consequence multiple barge tows must break their formations and transit the structures in two or three operations. A double lockage tow spends about 1½ hours in passing each of the structures or a total of 6 hours. A triple lockage spends a total of more than 9 hours in lockages alone.

The Holt lock and dam with its single large chamber will accommodate all size tows in one operation of about half an hour.

Overall, it is estimated that the new project will save an average tow more than 21 hours per voyage. Such economies will make the waterway still more advantageous for the transportation of bulk commodities and heavy finished and semifinished goods, and thereby greatly improve our position in attracting industry.

Construction of Holt lock and dam is the next logical step in the waterway's modernization and unless we obtain an initial construction appropriation for the coming fiscal year a serious interruption will occur in our timetable. The Corps of Engineers has carefully studied the need for the project and has solid proof of its economic merit. We have made and shall continue making every effort to see that it is undertaken without delay.

I assure you that the Alabama congressional delegation is unanimously behind the plan to improve the Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway. I can say without fear of contradiction that no other State in the Union has a congressional delegation that is more dedicated to the development of our natural resources. And I can say that we in the delegation will work for every meritorious program to make all of Alabama's rivers fully useful and productive.

But to do this, we need your help. With your assistance and your interest, we shall surely succeed.

U.S. Errs in Canceling Atomic Plane

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. George Carroll, Hearst Headline Service aviation writer, gives an accurate appraisal of the mistake the United States makes in canceling its aircraft nuclear propulsion program in an article which was released by the Hearst Service on May 16, 1961.

I concur wholeheartedly in Mr. Carroll's opinion that the United States should press on with the atomic-powered plane project. I hope there will be a reconsideration on the part of the administration and that orders to cancel the project will be rescinded and that a directive will be forthcoming to restore the program.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith include Mr. Carroll's article:

BILLION INVESTED, U.S. ERRS IN DUMPING ATOM PLANE

(By George Carroll)

After 15 years of hard, often frustrating work and an investment of a billion dollars, the Government has scuttled America's nuclear-powered plane project just as it was reaching the edge of success.

It was, in the opinion of many, including this writer, a profoundly wrong decision. Worse, it could be politically disastrous.

It could give the Russians a powerful propaganda triumph if they beat us to the punch in flying nuclear power.

Defense Secretary Robert McNamara scrapped the project despite the fact that General Electric, the principal engine contractor involved, promised it could have an A–plane aloft by 1963 and test-flown by 1965 if another $197 million were allotted.

McNamara, and the others who helped shape or supported his decision, contended there was no immediate prospect of a "militarily useful plane."

Having followed the program since its inception in 1946, this writer is absolutely convinced the United States should press on with the project.

We have already invested a billion. We can and should invest another $197 million to prevent Russia, in effect, from backing into a triumphant first that should have been ours.

Others agree. Aviation Week magazine, the most authoritative trade journal in the aircraft industry, assailed McNamara in a double-spread editorial for his "monumentally unsound decision."

Declared Aviation Week's editor, Robert Hotz:

"It falsely proclaims to the world that we have failed technically in another field where the Soviet Union is certain to publicly demonstrate its success soon."

The magazine's editorial took cognizance of the "militarily useful" argument and disposed of it as follows:

"Some of the Pentagon experts who kicked the ANP (Aircraft Nuclear Propulsion) program around had a philosophy that would have demanded the Wright brothers be required to solve the problems of super-

sonic flight before they launched their machine at Kitty Hawk."

Hotz declared both GE, which has put many ground test hours on a mocked-up plane engine powered by the atom, and Pratt & Whitney, working on a more sophisticated type of engine, have supersonic designs, not just the slower-than-sound blueprints spoken of by the Defense Department.

Soviet Premier Khrushchev linked the flight of a Red A-plane with the first Russian Moon probe. He made good on his latter promise but not the nuclear plane part. There are unsubstantiated reports that one experimental Soviet A-plane blew apart.

This year our Central Intelligence Agency received information the Russians had a supersonic A-plane capable of staying in the air 3 months with rotating crews and adept at sneaking undetected through the Soviet Union's best radar defenses.

Almost unlimited endurance on a single charge of uranium fuel would be the big asset of any workable atomic-powered airplane.

Future rockets and satellites are certain to have nuclear power and A-plane proponents insist we should learn all we can about it by harnessing it to aircraft at the earliest possible moment.

President Kennedy obviously has been sold a different bill of goods by the technical experts who have his ear.

Lyndon Johnson Goes Shopping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of our district traveling in Hong Kong was in that city when Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON visited there and sent me a copy of the Hong Kong Standard, an English-printed newspaper, of Tuesday, May 16, 1961. The following is a page 1 box description of at least one of the Vice President's days in Hong Kong. Perhaps the Vice President is prompted by a false desire to increase employment in this country and stop the outflow of gold:

LYNDON JOHNSON GOES SHOPPING

What did U.S. Vice President Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON do after his arrival at Kai Tak Airport at about 3.15 p.m. yesterday?

At 3:30 p.m., the U.S. Vice President, accompanied by U.S. consulate officials and a motorcade of members of the security force, arrived at the recently opened Ambassador Hotel in Tsimshatsui.

At 3:50 p.m., Mr. JOHNSON, looking fresh and sporty in a spotless, white Hawaiian shirt emerged from the hotel accompanied by Mr. Sam P. Gilstrap, officer in charge, U.S. consul general here. A motorcade of policemen followed him and the party about 50 yards behind. When Mr. JOHNSON noticed that he was being followed, he stopped the car, alighted and waved at the policemen indicating to them not to follow.

At 4 p.m., the U.S. Vice President arrived at a tailorshop on Carnarvon Road, where he spent the next hour or so selecting materials and getting measurements taken for suits. Later, he proceeded to the Miramar Hotel Arcade and bought some shoes.

At 6:05 p.m., Mr. JOHNSON arrived at the Peninsula Hotel where he spent the next 3 hours at the Dynasty and "bought 24 of these shirts and 24 of those," according to a clerk of the shop. Hotel waiters were seen to go into the shop many times with trays of drinks.

At 9:02 p.m., the Vice President emerged from the Dynasty and returned to the Ambassador through a side door.

Dr. Jesse McNeil Moves on to Greater Community Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the Michigan Chronicle of Saturday, May 20, 1961, on Dr. Jesse Jai McNeil, a dedicated public servant, community leader, and churchman of our city of Detroit who is leaving our city for new responsibilities in another part of the country.

As one of his friends and admirers I join all of our people of Michigan in sadness at his departure.

The article is as follows:

DR. JESSE MCNEIL MOVES ON TO GREATER COMMUNITY SERVICE

The decision of Dr. Jesse Jai McNeil to resign his post at Tabernacle Baptist Church and assume full-time responsibilities with the Department of Christian Education of the National Baptist Convention takes from our community one of the men who has symbolized the competence and leadership with which our town has been blessed during the past 15 years or so.

A dedicated theologian and scholar, Dr. McNeil threw himself into the broad arena of civic and community activities from the beginning of his ministry here. Through the Detroit Round Table, the Minister's Alliance, and the Council of Churches, the broad educational background and experience of Dr. McNeil gained early recognition. The weight of his influence and his clear view of social direction soon emerged in the policies and procedures of these organizations.

At the same time, Dr. McNeil gave recognition to the need for community organization as a means of promoting social progress. He threw himself, therefore, into the task of building the community house at Tabernacle and developing a program of activity for the institution including the now well-known Forum Series.

Through this medium there was developed on Detroit's Westside and throughout the city a greater awareness of the problems facing the people of the community.

Simultaneously with the development of these programs, Dr. McNeil found time to participate in the political life of the community in which he lived, thus demonstrating by his example that a good citizen is a well-rounded one who does not hesitate to use his talent and time in every phase of community life.

In a short time his contributions to politics were recognized and he received an appointment to the Corrections Commission of the State of Michigan.

This appointment had significance beyond the realm of mere politics. It placed a Negro for the first time on a very sensitive and important commission. It also gave an opportunity for a man with deep Chritsian understanding and training in psychology and sociology to work with the problem of rehabilitating those who have made mistakes in our society.

An extensive world traveler and author, Dr. McNeil never stopped the process of his own education and development. By so doing he was able to bring to those with whom he came into contact an ever changing and fresh approach to the myriads of problems with which we are all concerned.

And now after several years of thought and searching, he has come to the conclusion that a great challenge for service lies in the National Baptist educational program and through the medium of writing. There can be no question that he has chosen an area for greater service.

Detroit is naturally sorry to see one of its great community leaders move on to new fields. But we are proud that the record made by Dr. McNeil in Detroit has brought him to the attention of leaders on the national and international scene. We know he will do well in his new efforts. We wish for him every success.

The Deal for Cuban Prisoners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, we have all been fascinated by the latest affront to this Nation by the Cuban dictator, Fidel Castro, in which he asks us to ransom Cuban rebels by giving him 500 bulldozers. There seems to be no end to the gall of this Communist leader.

In this regard the front page editorial of the Indianapolis News, May 22, 1961, edition, is of interest and I herewith submit it for insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD:

WHAT GOES ON HERE?

As of this writing, self-appointed private citizens' groups—the most notable headed by Eleanor Roosevelt, Walter Reuther, and Milton Eisenhower—are raising money for the release of some 1,200 Cuban rebels, captured during the recent unsuccessful attempt to rescue their homeland from Communist rule. The money, $20 million, will be used to purchase tractors or bulldozers for Fidel Castro's Red regime.

One newspaper, supporting the idea of a trade with Castro, declared in a front-page editorial that it believes "a human life is worth more than a machine," and so do we. But, if, for the purpose of preserving human lives, we submit to Castro's brazen blackmail attempt, we will be opening the door to every future tyrant and bully boy, large or small, who decides to make a laughing stock out of the United States. Also, there is the little matter of the law, conveniently overlooked by the State Department, prohibiting private citizens from negotiating with foreign governments. The activities of these self-appointed committees, unofficially supported by our Government, are unprecedented in our own history or in the history of international diplomacy.

Castro is not offering this deal because he especially needs 500 tractors, although he certainly could put them to good use in helping to solve his dire farm problem. He offered the deal precisely because he and his Communist bosses want to see exactly how far they can push the United States before it stops acting like a sniveling coward and once again flexes its national muscles. Why else did Havana radio gloatingly announce that Castro would deal only with the United States—and remember, the 1,200 prisoners are Cubans, not United States citizens—and not with a neutral country.

What happened to the national pride we displayed in 1797, when after the unsavory French Foreign Minister Talleyrand demanded a bribe as the price of negotiating with the United States, our envoy Charles C. Pinckney replied with his memorable, "Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute." What happened to the courage displayed by our Nation in 1853, when, after Austria kidnaped a former citizen who had since taken out his first U.S. citizenship papers, an American war sloop pulled into the harbor of Smyrna (where the prisoner was being held) and its commander ordered the Austrian commander to return the man or face immediate consequences? (Naturally, the man was returned.)

How different today. It's bad enough we supplied the push to the rebel invasion of Cuba, and then lacked the courage to see it through to victory. It's bad enough that we allow Castro to insult our Nation, and publicly declare his island a part of the Soviet bloc. But to pay blackmail to his Communist government, just days after both our President and our House of Representatives agree that it constitutes a clear and present danger to our sovereignty, is nothing short of fantastic.

Patrick Henry once asked his fellow men, "Is life so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery?" Today, 186 years later, during which time we have grown from an infant nation of unlimited courage to a mighty nation which appears suddenly to have lost her national conscience, we might ask whether life is so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of blatant blackmail? We think not.

Shades of George Washington, shades of Patrick Henry, shades of Thomas Jefferson, shades of Capt John Paul Jones, shades of Admiral Farragut, shades of Abraham Lincoln, shades of Teddy Roosevelt, shades of Iwo Jima and Anzio.

What in heaven's name goes on here in the home of the free and the land of the brave?

Food Stamp Whisky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the following is an example of what can happen when the Federal Government gives the people something for nothing. This philosophy destroyed the Roman Empire and if continued will destroy the United States:

U.S. SURPLUS CORN USED TO MAKE LIQUOR

GASTONIA, N.C.—A 500-gallon moonshine still raided by Federal agents and police near here Saturday was being fed by a mash made from cornmeal distributed under the Federal surplus foods program.

The ground around the still in a wooded section of the Union Church community was littered with empty paper bags bearing this label:

"U.S. Department of Agriculture. Surplus commodities program—5 pounds yellow cornmeal."

The defendants, Noah T. Thomas, 60, of Gastonia and Dorus W. Sisk, 50, of Route 1, Clover, S.C., were ordered bound over to the October term of U.S. district court in Charlotte by U.S. Commissioner B. W. Craig.

Midwest Research Has Only Begun To Grow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article and editorial from the Kansas City Star.

Scientific research is one of America's main businesses—and it is just beginning to grow. The University of Kansas at Lawrence, the Linda Hall Library in Kansas City, the University of Kansas Medical School in Kansas City, and Midwest Research Institute—these are just a few of the outstanding organizations, situated in my area, that make midcontinent America a vital center for development of the thrust into the future. With this in mind, I invite my colleagues attention to the news report of a speech by Dr. Charles N. Kimball, president of Midwest Research Institute, and the editorial comment about Midwest Research Institute.

[From the Kansas City Star, May 1, 1961]

POINTS TO NEW ERA IN SCIENCE GROWTH—PRESIDENT OF MIDWEST RESEARCH INSTITUTE IN REPORT TO TRUSTEES—IN SECOND GENERATION—ROLE OF KNOWLEDGE SEEKERS CHANGING RAPIDLY, DR. KIMBALL SAYS

Scientific research is one of America's main businesses—and the curve for its requirements, in brains and dollars, is going upward steadily.

That outlook was painted by Dr. Charles N. Kimball, president of the Midwest Research Institute, in giving the president's 16th annual report to the institute's trustees today at the Hotel Muehlebach.

IN GREAT EXPANSION

Dr. Kimball pointed out that research in the United States expanded from $800 million in 1940 to $13 billion last year and will probably hit $14 billion this year—making research as large as the automobile business.

Developments now occurring in research, he predicted, will have a profound effect on the future of the Nation.

"Large scale research is entering its second generation in this country," Dr. Kimball said. "Some revolutionary changes are occurring that are altering the traditional role of scientists and science."

The speaker listed six major changes. Foremost, he said, is the tremendous accumulation of scientific knowledge.

"Each day throughout the world," he said, "scientific papers are now written in such number as to fill seven complete sets of the Encyclopedia Brittanica. One day's output."

Scientists face a mountainous problem of making the most practical use of all such knowledge, he said. New projects to study scientific literature, now being carried on jointly by Midwest and the Linda Hall Library, may provide helpful answers.

A second great scientific change, Dr. Kimball said, relates to the growing need for "interdisciplinary skills"—that many complex modern research problems cannot be solved by a chemist, or an engineer working alone. The interchange of skills among all scientific fields becomes more important.

A third major factor relates to the rising cost of research. The expensive equipment and increasing salaries of topnotch professional workers affects not only Midwest Research, but all similar labs across the Nation. More efficient use of scientific equipment and manpower is an aim of research executives and administrators.

NEED NEW CONCEPTS

Other important changes in research, Dr. Kimball said, relate to needs for more accurate measurement systems, and improved ways of evaluating results of research. Of particularly basic importance, he said, was a final major challenge—the need for new ideas and new concepts affecting the entire research field.

Dr. Kimball stressed the tremendous future that still lies ahead in science.

"Recognized research experts claim that national expenditures for research and development will exceed $20 billion by 1970. I don't know where the limit lies," he said. "It may exist only in the lack of availability of capital with which manufacturing plants can be erected to manufacture the products of research."

Dr. Kimball pointed out also that Midwest Research had a highly productive year in 1960, with a total research volume of $3,248,000, and currently is working for about 100 sponsors.

He revealed also that W. N. Deramus recently had made an additional gift of 10 acres to the Deramus Feld Station near Grandview.

[From the Kansas City Star, May 2, 1961]

AT 16, MIDWEST RESEARCH HAS ONLY BEGUN TO GROW

In the 16 years since it began operations in a rented room of a bakery, the development of Midwest Research Institute has been impressive. It made possible the splendid reports at yesterday's annual meeting. The more than $3¼ million in research volume last year alone exceeded the total for the institute's first 7 years. The institute is expanding in new fields and with new facilities. The addition of 10 acres to the area of the already busy Deramus field station is an example. Altogether, the institute added roughly $200,000 in new equipment last year.

There is no doubt that the Kansas City institute has established an excellent national reputation. Scientists, educators and industrialists look to Midwest for results on tough technical problems.

Obviously, the institute is a tremendous local asset, as well. It puts Kansas City on the scientific map of the Nation.

In his annual report, Dr. Charles N. Kimball, president, told the story of a great variety of scientific projects that indicate the range of scientific talent at Midwest. The diversity includes several projects in space travel. There are "farm belt" surveys, such as an inquiry into calf ailments, and a study of agricultural surpluses. Economic studies seek information on prospects for

industrial development here. More on the humanitarian side is the institute's extensive cancer program. This is a laborious effort that may eventually yield important results for the human race.

Dr. Kimball, now in his 11th year as Midwest president, must receive much of the credit for the institute's swift development. A sincere and energetic group of trustees—from all over the Nation—also deserves praise. But, basically, the day-to-day contributions of the staff of 300 technical people must rank at the front. These chemists, physicists, engineers and mathematicians produce the results that have meant success.

Research in the United States is changing rapidly. The decades ahead will present new problems to the staff at the institute and elsewhere. Research costs are rising swiftly. More expensive equipment must be bought. Skilled people demand higher salaries. In certain fields, shortages of some qualified people create difficulties. But industry and Government recognize the importance of research. Kimball predicts that national expenditures for research will exceed $20 billion within 9 years.

Kansas City, largely through Midwest Research, is sure to have an important role in these developments. This is a community facility that has admirably fulfilled the vision of its founders. It serves the Nation's heartland—and the Nation.

Civil War Centennial Conceived in an Absent-Minded Moment: 1954 Court Decision Celebration More Appropriate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following letter which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of May 21, 1961. Justice Hofstadter, one of America's most distinguished jurists, makes a point which we should all think about with reference to the centennial of the Civil War:

FORGET THE CIVIL WAR, HAIL THE COURT DECISION

To the NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE:

It would seem sensible quietly to abandon the celebration of the centennial of the Civil War, which was conceived in an absent-minded moment, and to memorialize, instead, the 17th day of May, which would fittingly exemplify its spirit. On that day in 1954, a unanimous Supreme Court rendered the fateful decision in *Brown* v. *Board of Education* effecting school desegregation.

The complex of civil liberties decisions beginning with the Brown case at long last have honored, in truly implementing, the promise of the 14th Amendment. That enactment had formalized and broadened the Proclamation—and the proposition that all men were born free and equal. The 14th Amendment articulated a grand promise which apparently the Nation was unprepared to fulfill at once. Even three decades later the Nation would not fulfill its covenant of equality, a covenant which really went back to the Declaration of Independence.

Faced with the problem of equal protection as to public passenger transportation, the court enunciated the compromise doctrine of "separate but equal" in *Plessy* v. *Ferguson*, in 1896, notwithstanding the sublime fact as the first Justice Harlan put in dissent: "The Constitution is colorblind." The Court was uneasy with its principle of compromise. Thus, it retraced its steps from time to time, in a series of cases which eroded the Plessy formulation.

In *Buchanan* v. *Warley*, it voided a city ordinance requiring Negroes to live in one part of town and whites in another. And in *McCabe* v. *Atchison, T. & S. F. Railway*, a law permitting a carrier to provide sleeping and dining cars only for whites was invalidated. *State of Missouri ex rel. Gaines* v. *Canada* held that a State which established a law school within its borders for whites must do likewise for Negroes.

Sweatt v. *Painter* held that legal education in a separate law school was not equal, and *McLaurin* v. *Oklahoma State Regents* held that enforced segregation of a Negro student admitted to the graduate school was invalid, as it handicapped him in the pursuit of graduate studies. Finally, in inevitable sequence, *Brown* v. *Board of Education* in a historic opinion by Chief Justice Warren held in 1954 that segregation of public schoolchildren solely on the basis of race, even though physical facilities and other tangible factors may be equal, deprives the children of minority groups of equal opportunities, and is therefore unconstitutional.

The court quoted from Gunnar Myrdal's great sociological treatise on the Negro, "The American Dilemma," as well as from certain works in the field of psychology. Treatises do not make the law but analyze conditions out of which law grows. The law has been frequently influenced by nonlegal sources: socioeconomics, science and literature. Such examples come to mind as the influence of Dickens on England's child labor laws and of Charles Reade on laws relating to mental institutions and penology. Forty years ago Cardozo had already noted that the "force which is becoming the greatest of them all is social justice which finds its outlet in the methods of sociology."

Though the segregation cases may have strained State-Federal relations for the time being, in an ultimate view they make for increased national well-being and strength—in harmony at home and influence abroad. They may have a significant impact on our country's leadership of a free world which includes Asia and Africa. They will continue to have political and social implications of the greatest import for us and the world at large.

Some historians and legal scholars recognize that the Brown decision was a heroic step forward and a necessary one, and that consummate leadership went into securing the necessary unanimous ruling. But they suggest that it could have been a much more cogently written and thought-out opinion, and it would have been a more lawyer-like one. The writer dissents from this view. It is not inartistic to paint with a broad brush when the subject matter is sufficiently broad to require it. The Brown case was the grand climax of the complex of cases which turned away from Plessy. A compelling pronouncement of judicial statesmanship was greatly to be preferred to a professional dissertation, however well documented.

Plessy was the polity formulation of compromise—and expedient of its time. Brown is also polity formulation in the perspective of the changing climate of opinion—a triumph of the American ideal of freedom and equality under law.

SAMUEL H. HOFSTADER,
Justice, Supreme Court of the State of New York.

Returning Fiscal Control to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, on May 22, 1961, the Christian Science Monitor carried a thought-provoking editorial which pointed up certain facts and gave its conclusions on the subject of backdoor spending.

One aspect of the practical legislative procedure regarding this debated method of financing programs was not mentioned by this worthy newspaper; namely, that if the Rules of the House of Representatives gave one committee exclusive jurisdiction over spending bills, the emergency or special case could always be allowed by the Rules Committee. All it would have to do is report a rule on a bill which waived all points of order. Otherwise, all regular appropriation legislation would have to come from one committee which would evaluate the need of programs as against the available revenue.

However, until mere editorials like this stimulate public opinion, I suppose the Congress will continue to forego its constitutional responsibility to scrutinize all Federal expenditures.

Under leave to do so, I include the editorial in question:

BACKDOOR SPENDING; FRONT-DOOR AID

The fight made by financial conservatives in Congress against one feature of the area redevelopment bill appears due to be repeated on a possibly intensified scale against President Kennedy's expected plans for aid to underdeveloped countries.

The feature most in issue is a mode of financing which bypasses the congressional appropriations committees and authorizes governmental units to borrow from the Treasury for their expenditures. This in turn forces the Treasury to borrow and the debt may or may not be paid off. Critics call it back-door spending.

The record of such operations is partly good, partly bad. It began with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation during the depression 1930's. After that came the Commodity Credit Corporation, Export-Import Bank, Home Owners Loan Corporation, and many other agencies. Of such lendings, totaling some $108 billion, about half have been repaid, nearly one-fourth have had to be canceled or made up by appropriations, and more than a fourth are still owed.

The area redevelopment bill added $300 million to the lending authorization. This was stubbornly resisted in the House of Representatives, but the House authorized more than 10 times that much for veterans' housing loans and farm surplus disposal without serious objection.

As to the foreign aid program, the administration, it is understood, will ask authority to borrow $7.3 billion from the Treasury over a period of 5 years. This in turn will be loaned for long terms and at low interest rates to countries presenting acceptable development programs.

If the recent "soft-term" credit to Honduras, the first announced by the new International Development Association, is a criterion, even full repayment after 50 years

will not cover the entire cost to the United States. The only "interest" charged is a three-fourths of 1 percent service charge, whereas the Treasury has to pay around 4 percent to borrow long-term money.

Thus there is an expense to the United States in supplying capital to emerging nations even on a supposed repayment basis. Just how much altruism or political consideration can be afforded in this role of world banker is something the United States and other advanced non-Communist nations must weigh.

Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon recently estimated that the "basic" or hard-core deficit in America's international balance of payments is about $1.5 billion a year. This, if not more, must eventually be covered by increased export sales or a reduction of overseas outgo. Yet he rejected the proposition that aid programs should be curtailed, pointing out that "most of our foreign economic assistance is in the form of U.S. goods and services" which would otherwise back up on the domestic market.

Part of the controversy over "back-door spending" is related to the debate over whether the United States should have a "capital budget" as well as a current income and expenditures account. It does not seem likely that long-term lending programs will be brought under the congressional appropriations process, but it does seem that the Government should have somewhere what is at the heart of any well-ordered bank—a capable and responsible investment committee.

Detroit: America's Good Right Hand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 2, 1961

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, although we in Oakland County, Mich., sometimes refer to Detroit as our "suburb to the south," we are more than a little proud of the energy, the ambition, the skills, and the human compassion of this great city.

Most of us picture Detroit as the auto center of the world, which it is. About 23 percent of the Nation's automobiles are assembled in the Detroit area and our State of Michigan builds over 2 million cars a year.

But there is more to Detroit than simply automobiles. There are broad superhighways, beautiful homes and an opportunity for recreation and just plain good living unequalled in any other spot on earth.

Recently, the Detroit News in cooperation with the mayor's committee for economic growth prepared a supplement about our mother city which I would recommend to anyone who is interested in a lesson in dynamic democracy and individual effort.

The first article in this excellent brochure is an editorial by Martin S. Hayden, editor of the Detroit News, entitled "America's Good Right Hand" which I am inserting in the RECORD at this point for your enlightenment:

AMERICA'S GOOD RIGHT HAND

To varied peoples Detroit means many things: Historians note it as a city predestined when a wise Frenchman named Cadillac convinced a cabinet minister named Pontchartrain that a junction point of land and water routes on the strait between Huron and Erie would become the fortress and trade key to an opening continent.

Statistics record it in 1960 as a mass of 3,762,000 people, the vast majority homeowners, in a metropolitan area grown by 25 percent in the last decade.

To economists it is a region with 6,438 plants manufacturing everything from gelatin capsules and milk carton machinery to electronic computers, space missiles and—of course—automobiles an item which (while employing only 15 percent of the work force) has made the town famous for having put the world on wheels.

Market researchers not that its population had a 1959 personal income of $9.18 billion and an average family income of $7,980 (with half the families earning more than $7,250 a year.

Conceding it a first in available skilled labor, plant site experts count other Detroit assets:

While many industrial cities fight neighbors for water to prevent summer drought, Detroit taps only 3 percent of the water supply nature gave it.

Detroit is the only North American city connected to all three great sources of natural gas (Texas-Oklahoma, Louisiana, and Alberta).

Detroit is one of the handful of cities whose electric utility is building an atomic reactor to investigate the cheap power hope of the future.

Publicists may observe that, with the possible exception of Texas, from the time of Henry Ford's $5 a day Detroit has been the country's most successful stealer of headlines. It wasn't really the "Arsenal of Democracy"; it just turned out more war-winning tools than any other city in the world. It probably isn't the Nation's best sports town, though it does have more pleasure boats than any other and (from Ty Cobb to Joe Louis and Gordie Howe) has had its share of champions. While it is true that 55 percent of its manufacturing employes and 10 percent of those in nonmanufacturing employment belong to unions, it truly doesn't rate the attention it gets when a strike that spreads from Newark, Del., to Los Angeles is reported from the negotiation table in Detroit. Actually, in 1959, all strikes cost Detroit a loss of 55/100th of 1 percent of work time.

Finally, to Detroiters themselves, Detroit is something special: a place where roots go deep; a big city with such smalltown characteristics as rigidly honest, nonpartisan city government that is often a little dull but knows no bosses; a city which along with its industrial smokestacks has one of America's finest art institutes and one of its greatest (and its most stably financed) symphony orchestras. They take pride in it as a place where labor and business leaders have created together the most successful American example of united giving to charity, and as the town which has attracted national attention for its fight against the countrywide problem of central area decay.

This is the city which the editors of the Detroit News present here as "the real Detroit."

Who Killed Atomic-Powered Plane?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article which I wrote for the May issue of the national magazine, Aircraft and Missiles:

WHO KILLED ANP?—PSEUDOSCIENTIFIC ADVICE GIVEN TO PRESIDENT ON NUCLEAR AIRCRAFT; DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ESTABLISHED DESIGN CRITERIA THEN SHOT HOLES IN PROJECT; CONTINUOUS AIRBORNE ALERT NATURAL APPLICATION FOR ANP

(By Congressman MELVIN PRICE, Democrat of Illinois)

It is extremely unfortunate that the Aircraft Nuclear Propulsion (ANP) project has been canceled. Nuclear propelled aircraft are important to the Nation's future; I therefore believe we will someday develop such aircraft despite this latest executive decision. The decision just injects an indefinite delay that will cost us a great deal in money, and prestige.

DECISION INPUTS

I admire the President for his ability to make forthright decisions, although I question his decision relative to the nuclear aircraft programs. The previous administration, while pretending to support the ANP program, held back any real progress by their indecision. The Kennedy decision was in error because of incorrect advice provided by his scientific and defense advisers. The same people who have been assembling the information for decisions on ANP provided the input again. Based on my long acquaintance with their behind-the-scenes operations, it's no great surprise to me that again we have an adverse decision. This situation was brought forcefully to the forefront during the Joint Committee's executive hearings on the ANP program early in March. At our hearings we asked the Defense Department and the Atomic Energy Commission to tell us about the technical data and other considerations which supported new criteria which was formulated for the ANP project. We also asked whether, in the development of the latest criteria, the officials in the Joint AEC–Air Force Office responsible for the technical direction of the project, and the contractors responsible for developing the nuclear designs had been consulted.

Unfortunately, we couldn't get adequate answers to our questions. We did find out, though, that certain criteria recently set down by the Defense Department was in direct conflict with the testimony of experts responsible for the technical program. We also found out that the Defense Department did not even consult the experts responsible for the direction of the program and for the development of the designs. It was quite apparent from the hearing that the members of the new administration in the Defense Department relied solely on the advice and recommendations of the same people in the Defense Department who have been against the project for years.

PSEUDO-SCIENTIFIC ADVISERS

What little testimony we could get from these people again confirmed the fact that they were not familiar with the technical developments in the program and had not even attempted to obtain first-hand information concerning the facts of our aircraft nuclear propulsion program. It was most discouraging to again come up against Government career personnel whose actions for years have been—and are—the shuffling and assembly of the same papers and representing the information they contain as the latest facts for the use of those responsible for the decisions. So this time, too, although the decisionmakers were different, they had the same old input of "facts" upon which to reach a decision.

The situation which resulted in the scuttling of the ANP program must be guarded against in the future. Serious errors could also be made in our other vital atomic energy programs unless we learn from what happened in the ANP program. We must take the time to get up-to-date facts. We must look behind the fancy position papers we

are presented with and do whatever is necessary to get at the pertinent facts to guide our decisions.

STATUS OF ANP

I think one of the most unfortunate aspects of last month's decision to stop the ANP project is related to the status of the work at the time. A great deal of important progress was made in the last year. Major experiments were conducted to add a great deal of confidence to the designs. In fact, manufacture of a full-power nuclear aircraft propulsion plant unit for ground testing was ready to start. Many thousands of hours of tests were conducted under reactor operating conditions to prove out the materials and designs. Tests were conducted to the point of breakdown of the materials to obtain complete assurance on the adequacy of design margins. All of the information obtained confirmed the adequacy of the designs and in fact showed that significant growth margins were already in hand in the design. The status of the development, particularly for the direct cycle system which had a considerably greater amount of effort on it, clearly indicated that the next step should be a full-size integrated propulsion plant test. Going back to the laboratory bench, as called for by the new high temperature materials program being started to fill in for ANP, just doesn't contribute anything of significance toward getting on with nuclear flight.

GROWTH POTENTIAL CLICHE

As you know, the ANP program was given a set of design objectives known as the "York criteria" for guidance in developing the first engines. This Defense Department criteria specified a subsonic aircraft since a possible mission was foreseen for such an aircraft and technical data clearly indicated the feasibility of meeting the criteria with the first generation of engines developed. In accordance with this "York criteria," work was going ahead to meet requirements. At the same time, though, within the Defense Department, a talking campaign was being conducted to give the impression that what was really wanted, and what was absolutely necessary to obtain a military useful aircraft, is multimach flight characteristics.

Fortunately, the nuclear aircraft developers had the foresight to look into the multimach growth potential of the individual cycles although their instructions were clear that the goal was, at the time, subsonic operation. The technical data that was developed, which the Joint Committee closely reviewed during the March hearing, indicated multimach potential was clearly present in the concepts under development. Unfortunately the picture on growth potential was not clearly presented, or it may not have been presented at all, to the new administration.

INCONSISTENCIES APPARENT

Consistent with my belief that the facts were not made available to the decision makers are the apparent inconsistencies that now exist between the decision to drop the nuclear aircraft and the characteristics specified for our defense weapons. Take, for example, the Skybolt missile system recently earmarked for additional effort. It is planned to use conventional aircraft with their very limited range to provide a mobile launching platform for the intermediate range Skybolt missiles. A nuclear aircraft with, for practical purposes, unlimited range and endurance characteristics would increase the effectiveness of the Skybolt missile system tremendously.

The recently announced plan to keep one-eighth of our heavy bomber force on airborne alert points up another inconsistency relative to the decision to stop the nuclear aircraft. The unlimited endurance of nuclear energy sources gives a nuclear propelled aircraft enormous advantages in meeting such alert objectives. For the same airborne alert force a nuclear aircraft provides the potential for greatly reduced aircraft, personnel, and support facility requirements.

Obviously the unlimited range which comes from nuclear aircraft endurance characteristics will open up completely new mission capabilities which cannot at present be foreseen. An idea of the military effectiveness which of such a revolutionary system can be obtained from our experience with nuclear submarines. Wouldn't it have been unfortunate if the unimaginative arguments advanced relative to the nuclear submarine turned out to be the controlling ones in that decision as they were in the nuclear aircraft decision?

I have pointed out many times that we could have had nuclear aircraft in flight today if it had not been for the "on again, off again" system of mismanagement by the Defense Department and its scientific advisers.

I can see the same approach creeping into the management of other defense projects and the Rover nuclear rocket program.

Watershed Management of the National Forests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech given by Mr. Richard E. McArdle, Chief of the Forest Service, entitled "Watershed Management on the National Forests." This speech contains pronouncements of policy which I deem to be important for the future use and improvement of the national forests:

WATERSHED MANAGEMENT ON THE NATIONAL FORESTS

(By Richard E. McArdle, Chief, Forest Service U.S. Department of Agriculture, at Eighth National Watershed Congress, Tucson, Ariz., Apr. 19, 1961)

It is appropriate that this meeting consider management of national forest watersheds. Although the national forests in these Western States comprise only one-fifth of the total area, they yield more than half of the streamflow. Several thousand communities, including some of the largest cities of the West, are largely or entirely dependent on national forest water. Two-thirds of the irrigation water of the West comes from national forest lands. Our management of these publicly owned lands therefore has a significant bearing on the general theme of the discussions this morning, "Water for a Thirsty Land."

Someday I am going to add up the number of speeches that I have made about water. I've been talking on this subject for more than 25 years. Well do I remember my first speech on water and the chilly reception I got from a large group of water engineers. But if I were to make the same speech to the same group today, I'm sure the reaction would be quite different. Attitudes have changed.

The reasons are obvious. Our population has increased 45 percent since I made that first speech. Not only do we have more people to use water; we use water in new ways, for purposes undreamed of only a few years ago. Our cities are reaching out further and further, sometimes for hundreds of miles, to obtain water for present needs. In many places future urban and industrial expansion depends in large measure on finding adequate supplies of usable water. The use of water for irrigation has doubled in the past 20 years and for domestic and industrial purposes has tripled during the same period. No longer is there question about our growing need for water and the necessity to do something about getting it.

In years past most of my comment was aimed at alerting the general public to rapidly increasing water needs. Today such warnings are less necessary. I think, in general, the public is now surprisingly well informed on our need for water and is aware of the fact that in many places there are difficult problems to solve in order to meet these needs.

The emphasis today should be on achieving agreement on a clearcut, practical, national water policy—and on putting the policy into effect. I believe that public opinion will support such action. Future meetings of this Watershed Congress might well be pointed in that direction.

Another encouraging development is the growing interest—and it's intelligent interest—in the management of public lands for watershed purposes. The Forest Service welcomes this kind of interest, and we welcome the criticism of our actions which frequently accompanies that interest.

Our own interest in watershed management is as old as the Forest Service. To secure favorable conditions of water flows was one of the major purposes for which Congress originally specified that national forests are established. Congress has reaffirmed this objective, most recently last year. The act of June 12, 1960, however, goes much further than merely to authorize use of the national forests for watershed purposes. It directs—orders—that the national forests shall be managed for multiple use—for water and four other major uses. The act goes still further and directs that management for these five uses shall be on a sustained-yield basis. Legislative authority for watershed management on the national forests is specific and unmistakable.

In the earlier years of national forest administration our emphasis was on watershed protection. The primary objective of protection is maintenance of water quality. The fundamental principle involved is maintenance of a vegetative cover of trees, grass, and brush to hold the soil and to facilitate storage of water within the soil. In the minds of many people watershed protection and watershed management mean one and the same.

Over the years, however, watershed management has come to have a meaning to the Forest Service considerably broader than just protection. Protection with the objective of maintaining water quality is still an integral part of our watershed management policy. But it is now evident that protection alone is not enough. We need to be concerned also with amount and timing of water yield, with quantity as well as quality. Maximum protection of watersheds does not necessarily produce maximum yields of water.

In many places, for example, maximum watershed protection would require maintenance of perhaps the densest possible cover of deep-rooted vegetation. Yet maximum yield of water might be achieved only by removal of the vegetative cover. But this usually would result in rapid runoff with local flooding, little or no deep infiltration to underground storage, and in muddy, unusable water. Neither of these extremes is watershed management, al-

though I have heard each extreme called management.

Watershed management as the Forest Service thinks of it today involves maintenance of an adequate vegetative cover for protection of water quality but altering this cover in such a way as to increase the quantity of water yield. It will not be the same everywhere—depending on the kind of vegetation, soils, topography, and climate. It will vary also with the relative importance of water as against other uses of forest land in a particular area. Finding the best ways to achieve these results is one of the major objectives of Forest Service watershed management research.

The Forest Service began watershed management research in 1910 at Wagon Wheel Gap in the Colorado Rockies. We were trying to determine the effect of forest cover on water yield. In 1912 studies on range watersheds were begun at the Great Basin in Utah. Since the late twenties the Forest Service has taken the lead in watershed management research on forested lands and on wildlands generally.

Some of our watershed research centers doubtless are well known to you. There is San Dimas in southern California, Fraser in Colorado, Great Basin in Utah, Coweeta in North Carolina. The Davis County experimental watersheds in Utah are known worldwide. All told, we now operate field stations at 36 locations where watershed management research is a primary objective.

The scope and character of our watershed management research have enlarged, too. In the early days we gave most attention to measuring the effect of changes in the vegetative cover on water yield, on quality, on periodicity of flow, and on soil erosion. We could measure results, but we didn't know why these results were obtained. Today and increasingly in the future our research will deal with more fundamental laboratory-type studies of the functions of different soils, of climate, of hydraulics, and of different kinds and amounts of vegetation. With basic knowledge of this kind we expect to be able to take the controlling watershed factors in various combinations and judge how a particular watershed will respond to a particular kind of management. Since research is so essential to all aspects of good land management, we are expanding and accelerating research in all subjects including research in watershed management.

If the national forests were managed exclusively for maximum yields of usable water, the task of the Forest Service, though difficult, would be much easier and simpler than actually it is. These public lands must serve many resource needs. They are owned by all the people, not by any one user group. Water is only one part, though an extremely valuable part, of the total resource complex of the national forests. These lands must be managed for a combination of uses.

Use of all national forest resources is increasing rapidly. One reason for this is that until recently these public forest lands were inaccessible. Not many people knew about them, roads were few and far between and people didn't travel around as much as they do today. Another reason is that in some places certain resources outside the national forests have become less plentiful and national forest resources are needed to bridge the gap.

But by far the biggest reason why use of all national forest resources is increasing is simply this: more people. We are beginning to experience what older countries have experienced long before us—the increasing pressures of a growing population on the land, on natural resources that do not increase automatically as population increases but remain constant, increase, or decrease, according to our husbandry.

These resource pressures, will not decrease in the future. They will increase. Large as the national forests are—and 186 million acres is a lot of land—they are not large enough so that every user group, each with some special interest, can have all the land it wants, the particular land it wants, to serve just that one use.

The Forest Service wants these lands to be used. We want them to furnish the greatest possible benefits in products and services to the largest number of people over the long run. The only practical way to do this is not to make an equal division among all uses but over a period of time to achieve the best combination of uses on a particular area. If you want a one-sentence explanation of multiple use, that's as brief a one as I know how to give.

Fortunately, multiple use works very well and from the standpoint of maximum possible use frequently works better than single-purpose use. For example, many national forest areas are accessible to recreationists only because they can travel on roads built primarily to haul timber. The harvesting of mature timber and thinning of immature timber to stimulate tree growth can be done in a way that in some forest types will increase water yields. Reservoirs to impound water are irresistible attractions for recreationists. Good management of forest lands for both water production and timber production is usually the best management for the desires of fishermen. Good timber management and good hunting of certain kinds go together. Improved accessibility means better protection of vegetative cover from damage by fire and therefore safeguards timber, wildlife, forage, recreation, and water.

This interlocking character of good resource management is often of great benefit to watershed objectives. We know, for example, that deep-rooted plants create greater soil-moisture deficits than plants with shallow root systems. We know that these deficits must be replenished before water will percolate through the soil to recharge groundwater and maintain streamflow. On deep soils conversion from deep-rooted to shallow-rooted vegetation will result in more water available for streamflow if conditions for infiltration are satisfactory and precipitation is sufficient to wet down through the root zone. Removal of chaparral and replacement by grass benefits grazing; it also improves conditions favorable to greater water yield. Removal of low-value, water-loving trees along streams and replacement by species using less water benefits both timber production and water yield. Thinning dense coniferous stands on north slopes in areas of heavy snowfall will allow more snow to reach the ground and thereby increase water available to streamflow and at the same time increase timber yield and shorten rotation age.

In attempting to achieve such results as these it is essential that management plans for each use be coordinated with plans for use of other resources on the same area. The four basic principles to be kept in mind when coordinating other uses with water use are: Maintenance of an effective plant cover, maintenance of soil stability, maintenance of maximum infiltration rates, and effective control of surface runoff. In addition, measures to prevent water pollution may need to be taken.

In actual practice this means that in range management, stocking levels and seasons of use must be considered in relation to watershed functioning as well as to sustained production of forage. In timber management it means that logging methods, logging roads, and skid trails must be designed and treated to prevent site deterioration and to kept silt and logging debris from reaching streambeds in harmful amounts. It means taking special precautions in roadbuilding, prompt restocking of burned areas, and improvement of stream channels.

We have not always been fully successful in either preventive or rehabilitation measures. Sometimes it is because we lack the necessary technical know-how. Sometimes, even though we know what to do, we lack the money to do it. Sometimes poor management or lack of any management on intermingled lands not under our control defeats our best efforts on national forest lands. And sometimes we make mistakes through ignorance or through carelessness.

Our accomplishments fall short of our desires and we feel this more keenly than anyone outside the Forest Service possibly could. At the same time, in fairness to the many people struggling with these problems, I must also say that the accomplishments are very substantial and that there is much good work to which we can point with pride.

The important thing is to have a definite policy and program for integrated management of these public properties. Equally essential is positive action to carry out the policy. Since we are meeting in the Southwest I shall conclude my comments by quoting one paragraph of Forest Service watershed management policy as it relates to management of national forests in this region:

"Protection of the watershed and water quality will continue to be a primary objective. Water yields will receive major consideration in the multiple-use management of national forests in the Southwest. Modification of management practices to improve water yields will be undertaken when proved practicable by research and trial application and when overall public benefits will be enhanced. Although the general policy will be to favor water in applying the multiple-use principle, this does not mean that in every locality water will be given first priority or that land management always will be oriented toward maximum development of the water resource. For example, in some places recreational values will be dominant, as at camping and picnicking spots or in wilderness and wild areas. In other localities the preservation of natural streamside vegetation for benefits to fish and wildlife would be of first importance.

"In all instances the relative importance of other resources will be carefully weighed against the public benefits to be gained by modifying land use practices to enhance water yield. The overall objective is to manage the national forest lands so as to obtain the optimum combination of uses which will benefit the public as a whole."

Economist's Prescription Was Wrong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, before accepting, without question, the proposals to change our economic system being offered by administration spokesmen, it seems to me we should check the record to determine the quality of the advice we are being given. The following editorial is graphic testimony of what happened to Germany by ignoring the advice of one of the President's top economic advisers. It makes thoughtful reading:

[From the Chicago Tribune]

GERMANY IGNORED ECONOMIST HELLER AND PROSPERED

Imposing evidence has only recently come to light to show that leading New Deal economists, including Prof. Walter W. Heller, are capable of giving some mighty bad advice. This is important because Mr. Heller is now chairman of President Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers.

The State Department has declassified a 1951 report in which Mr. Heller, Prof. Alvin Hansen, and several others solemnly warned that the German economy could not possibly improve without a thorough immersion in Keynesian-New Deal philosophy (reported in Human Events March 17, 1961). Events have proved that the forecast was silly.

The professors were members of a Marshall plan team whose mission was to tell the new German Government how to manage its economy. Their 400-page report, said to be largely the work of Mr. Heller, expressed the opinion that the German economy was bogged down on a sort of plateau and that "proper measures must be taken if the possibilities (of further progress) are to be realized."

Fortunately for Germany, the Bonn Government disregarded the report. In every important matter it kept on doing precisely what Mr. Heller and his colleagues said it should stop doing, and Germany has wound up better off than the report considered possible even if its recommendations had been followed.

The report said Germany would never achieve the necessary rate of industrial expansion if it continued to worry about inflation; that it should not "confuse wartime inflation with the normal operations of peacetime credit"; that it had an "excessive concern for price stability"; and that it was "overly timid" in allowing the creation of new credit.

Germany has continued to guard against inflation (as successfully, in fact, as any industrial country) and has kept a tight rein on the expansion of credit.

The report called for easy money and said that "a rate of interest high enough to stimulate any large volume of personal savings would seriously curtail investment."

Germany has kept a high rate of interest.

The report said that tax concessions granted to industry, such as depreciation allowances, were being abused and that in any case they represented only "an expenditure of tax funds which would otherwise have been collected by the Government." Accordingly, the report said, a "compulsory investment program" would be more effective. Under the recommended program, all industries were to be assessed for the fund and the Government was to distribute the money to industries where there was "a crying need for expansion."

The Government did nothing of the kind.

The key bottleneck in German industrial expansion, the report said, was an inadequate supply of coal. It recommended vast government programs for stimulating the production of coal.

Little was done along this line. Coal has become a drug on the market and the problem has been how to dispose of the surplus.

The report proclaimed that "the nostalgic hopes * * * looking toward a revival of the 19th century role of the capital market are doomed to disappointment. The capital market plays no such role in any modern country and there is no prospect that it will."

The capital market is still functioning much as it always did, here as in Germany, in spite of persistent attempts to dislodge it.

Finally, the report drew a distinction between Germany, squeezed between too great a demand for imports and not enough exports, and the United States, "where there has never been any fear of a squeeze or an external drain."

Today, having disregarded all of Mr. Heller's recommendations, Germany has turned the tables on us. It has built up an enormous trade surplus, accumulated nearly $8 billion in reserves, and the squeeze is on the United States—to such an extent, indeed, that we are begging Germany to help us out.

What actually happened just couldn't happen, according to Mr. Heller and others. They go on pretending that the United States must take the same medicine they prescribed for Germany even though Germany recovered precisely because it poured the nasty stuff down the drain.

Cattlemen Oppose Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, acreage controls and price supports have failed to solve the farm problem. It would be tragic to put our healthy livestock industry under Federal control. The following statement was made by the American National Cattlemen's Association before the House Committee on Agriculture on H.R. 6400, May 3, 1961:

The American National Cattlemen's Association is composed of 33 affiliated State cattlemen's and cattle feeder organizations, more than 100 affiliated regional, local, and cattle breed associations, and thousands of individual cattle producers and feeders from throughout the Nation. We sincerely appreciate the opportunity to appear before your committee and speak in behalf of the beef cattle industry on title I of H.R. 6400.

The value of all cattle and calves sold from ranches has exceeded $7.5 billion annually in recent years, or about 20 percent of the total cash income of agriculture. Cattle and calves produce more cash farm income than all 6 basic crops combined, and more than the combined sales of hogs, sheep, wool, and poultry and eggs. Moreover, the rising quantity and value of cattle and calves produced and sold annually have made the cattle industry not only the largest but also one of the most rapidly growing segments of American agriculture.

Because of the relative shrink in the national dairy herd during the postwar years, and the considerably more than offsetting increase in beef cattle numbers, sales of cattle of beef breeding have approached four-fifths (80 percent) of the total annual sales of all cattle and calves for meat. Thus the annual production and sale of beef cattle alone has become a $6 billion industry, producing $1 in $6 of total farm income.

The American National Cattlemen's Association has traditionally and vigorously opposed legislative proposals that would bring cattle under any form of artificially maintained prices, or controlled marketings, or continued subsidies. This position of the association has been adopted by formal action of its governing body and by resolution at its annual meetings. The position is supported by the overwhelming majority of the individual members and the affiliated regional, State, county, and breed associations.

At the present time, this traditional position of the association applies specifically to the provisions of H.R. 6400 that conceivably could result in controlled production and marketings of cattle and artificially maintained prices for cattle if certain procedures as outlined in the measure were to be set in motion.

The association respectfully requests, with all the vigor at its command, that this committee and the Congress proceed forthwith to delete from H.R. 6400 all provisions that would bring the beef cattle industry under any form of production or marketing controls, continuing subsidies or compensatory payments, and so forth.

We do not consider the planned scarcity that is inherent in the provisions of H.R. 6400 to be in the best interests of our customers, the consuming public. We do not believe that the potential expansion of the market for beef, the continued improvement of the product we raise, and our own long-term well-being as producers and feeders are favored by the restrictions, the planned scarcity, or the artificial prices that H.R. 6400 could impose.

We respectfully and forcefully request the committee to understand our views and to honor the wishes of our industry.

Like any other sellers in the market, cattlemen would be happy to receive higher prices for what they have to sell. However, experience with supported prices and controlled production on other commodities has taught us that these are not the roads to maximum service to consumers or to the fullest potentials of economic well-being for our industry. We do not believe the complex cattle business can fully serve its market or advance its own welfare under any system of restrictive Government licensing.

Beef is the preferred meat of the American people. Because of improvements which ranchers and feeders have achieved in the beef-making quality of their cattle, and because of the progressiveness of the processors and distributors of beef, consumer demand for beef has been increasing. Consequently, the cattle industry has been expanding its annual production in order to serve its expanding market.

We believe the market for beef can be expanded much more in the years ahead if the cattle industry continues to be responsive to market forces and aggressively strives to improve still further the quality of beef offered to the public.

These potentials will be lost to us in proportion as we permit our industry to be brought under the umbrella of guaranteed prices and restricted output. Over the years ahead, for both the present generation of cattlemen and for our children to come after us, this is too great a price to pay for the questionable benefits of a subsidized cattle market.

Historically the cattle business has experienced periodic economic difficulties coinciding with shifts in the cattle cycle. At times it might seem pleasant for us to unload these problems onto the taxpaying public. The price we must pay to have a free and competitive market for cattle and beef is at times an income position lower than is easily accepted. But we know there is a price also on the other side. We consider that price to be higher. We do not want the restricted opportunity for our industry that is inevitable in limited markets and guaranteed price.

Beef cattle are now selling for something less than 90 percent of parity ($20.90 per hundredweight, national average March 15, versus $23.80 full parity). A higher guaranteed price, from the current level or any other would be possible only from public subsidy or from restricted volume of marketings. Any price that is higher than efficient cattlemen would find normally profitable would rapidly be capitalized into the values of cattle-raising lands. In other words, it would be built into the cost structure of the industry and thus, in income

terms, would do cattle producers little good. We do not want artificial land values based on public subsidy, because such values would be uneconomic for the country and, in the end, for ourselves.

There are sections of H.R. 6400 to which we specifically object. For example, the so-called National Farmer Advisory Committees may well end up being anything except recognized, statesmanlike spokesmen for any specific commodity. The committee members would not be elected by the producers of the commodity. Rather, two-thirds of them would be nominated by the county ASC committees and the other third by farm organizations. And there is no assurance that the Secretary of Agriculture need accept any of these nominations. Moreover there is no guarantee that a commodity program shall be developed in accordance with producer recommendations since the Secretary need not accept the advice of the advisory committee. As a matter of fact, this whole program could be set in motion by the action of the Secretary without the request or desire of any particular commodity group.

Secondly, the provision for congressional review of policy recommendations submitted by the President circumvents the traditional legislative processes of congressional hearings and public debate. The Congress is called upon to abdicate its legislative responsibility and to become hardly more than an acquiescent tool of the executive branch. We view any such proposal with alarm for the future of our cherished governmental system of checks and balances. The wisdom of the founding fathers in providing the checks and balances has stood up well under the test of time, and cattlemen will not willingly be parties to changing the system. We do not believe that Congress should be neutralized into an ineffectual body.

Other specific objections to proposals in the bill might be further detailed. We prefer, however, only to reiterate our request that cattle be specifically deleted from coverage by the bill. We have confidence in the market to direct us always toward the production of a product that consumers accept and want. We know that restricted production and artificial price is not good for our customers—the consumers and we know that, in the end, what is not good for our customers is also not good for us.

Unrealistic Gold Restriction Would Be Removed by H.R. 6900

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 6900, a bill which would remove the 25 percent gold reserve requirement. The following article, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of May 21, 1961, reflects the general approval of those who have thought this matter out. I commend it to the attention of our colleagues:

CONGRESS SHARPENING AX FOR GOLD SUPPORT

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

WASHINGTON.—Congress is getting set to knock out an anachronistic carryover from the days when the United States was on the gold standard.

The throwback law is a requirement that the Government hold 25 cents in gold for every dollar in Federal Reserve Bank notes and deposits.

The House Banking Subcommittee will begin hearings on a repealer bill next month. Hearings had been scheduled to start this week but jammed-up congressional schedules forced a delay.

The repealer bill commands support from Democrats and Republicans alike. The only opposition is expected to come from a stanch but rapidly shrinking gold bloc that still believes that currency expansion should be limited by a rigid requirement that the Government holds $1 in gold for every paper dollar it issues.

The chief objection to the gold law is that it weakens foreign confidence in the value of the dollar.

UNITED STATES BACKS PAPER

The United States stands ready to give $1 in gold to foreign governmental creditors for every dollar they hold in American paper obligations. But some foreigners fear the gold law could keep them from collecting.

The United States has just over $17 billion of gold, and foreigners hold an almost identical quantity of short-term claims that they theoretically could present for payment.

Only one-third of our gold hoard is currently available for meeting the foreign claims, however, since the outdated gold law requires that the remaining two-thirds be held as backing for the bank notes and deposits.

The repealer bill is being sponsored by Representative ABRAHAM J. MULTER, Democrat, New York. It includes a controversial provision to remove Federal limits on the interest rates that banks may pay on foreign deposits. Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Republican, New Jersey, has introduced a straight repealer that would get rid of the gold backing without changing the interest rate provision.

Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon will be the opening witness and will give his full indorsement to the repeal plan. Federal Reserve Board Chairman William McChesney Martin, Jr., will throw the central bank's support behind the proposal.

SIMILAR POSITIONS

Mr. Dillon will tell the committee that he hopes that Congress will quickly approve the repealer now that Mr. MULTER has taken the first step. Mr. Martin will take a similar position when he testifies.

It's a tricky business. If Congress were to reject the repeal bill, foreigners would conclude that Congress does not want the gold released and that their claims may not be honored after all.

The blow to foreign confidence quickly could lead to a run on the U.S. gold reserve as foreign holders of short-term claims raced to collect gold before the Treasury exhausted its supply.

The first public call for repeal of the outmoded gold law came about 18 months ago from Roy L. Reierson, vice president of New York's Bankers Trust Co. Henry C. Alexander, board chairman of Morgan Guaranty Trust Co., endorsed the plan last November.

"We should make clear—to our own people and to the world—what our gold is for, namely, for making international settlements, not for redeeming our currency and deposits," Mr. Alexander declared.

A three-man task force recommended repeal to President Kennedy in a special report immediately after inauguration day. The task group was headed by Allan Sproul, former president of the New York Federal Reserve Bank.

And the research and policy committee of the nationwide committee for economic development declared last week that repeal "should further strengthen international confidence in the dollar."

A Selected Chronology on Cuba and Castro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, in view of the verbal beating the United States has taken around the world in the wake of the Cuban defeat, I feel we should soberly assess in the Congress and in this country America's foreign relations. I realize this is now being attempted by the semisecret hearings which have been taking place in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and the not-so-secret comments being made by many public officials, commentators, columnists, and so on.

In an effort to keep the facts straight and to help me in a personal evaluation, I some time back asked the Legislative Reference Services to provide me with a chronological listing of the sequence of events in Cuba which brought us to this sorry state of embarrassment.

The latest addition to this chronology, of course, is the present blackmailing exchange of prisoners for 500 bulldozers program suggested by Castro over the past weekend. Needless to say, I feel this would be compounding all our former errors were we to do this as an official act of our Government.

I would like to ask special permission that this chronology of events, as prepared by the Library of Congress, be inserted in the RECORD in toto—for the enlightenment and use of those concerned with this problem. It most emphatically tells a story—a continued story—and should prove to be a convincer—as well as a shocker—to many who lost sight of what was transpiring, and who we feel should not have done so. We of the Congress who are not privileged to sit in on the private councils, and the general, do not wish a repeat performance.

The chronology follows:

A SELECTED CHRONOLOGY ON CUBA AND CASTRO [1]

March 10, 1952: Fulgencio Batista ousts President Prio Socarras (elected on June 1, 1948) in a military coup. Batista was a candidate for the presidential elections scheduled for June 1952.

July 26, 1953: A band of rebel youths (led by Fidel Castro Ruiz) attacks the Moncado Barracks in Santiago de Cuba. About 100 students and soldiers are killed. (This is the origin of the name of the "26 de Julio" movement.) Castro is sentenced to 15 years in prison (for his release, see below Nov. 1, 1954; for the revolt led by Castro, see below Nov. 30–Dec. 4, 1956).

November 1, 1954: General Fulgencio Batista is elected President (inaugurated on Feb. 24, 1955) for another 4 years. (He was the only candidate.) Presidential amnesty lets Castro out of prison. He goes abroad, where he begins to organize the "26 de Julio" movement (see below Nov. 30–Dec. 4, 1956).

[1] Based chiefly on excerpts from Deadline Data; reproduced with the permission of Deadline Data on World Affairs.

April 29, 1956: Government forces put down an uprising in Cuba. (A group of rebels try to seize an army post in Matanzas, 60 miles east of Havana.) President Batista suspends constitutional guarantees for 45 days, and imposes press and radio censorship.

June 2, 1956: President Batista announces that press and radio censorship will be terminated as of June 3, 1956.

November 30-December 4, 1956: Revolutionary uprising against the Batista regime, in the Cuban Province of Oriente. Fidel Castro, at the head of a group of approximately 40 rebels, lands in Cuba from Mexico. The uprising is reported crushed by the Cuban Army and Castro killed. A number of rebels retreat to the Sierra Maestra (at the southern tip of the island). Hundreds of opposition leaders are arrested. "Fidel Castro and his 26th of July movement are the flaming symbol of opposition to the regime. The organization is formed of youths of all kinds. It is a revolutionary movement that calls itself socialistic. It is also nationalistic, which generally in Latin America means anti-Yankee. The program is vague and couched in generalities, but it amounts to a new deal for Cuba, radical, democratic and therefore anti-Communist. The real core of its strength is that it is fighting against the military dictatorship of President Batista." (Herbert L. Matthews in New York Times, Feb. 24, 1957).

December 18, 1956: New wave of terrorism breaks out throughout Cuba. By January 18, 1957, the violence results in 70 deaths and hundreds of arrests.

March 11, 1957: New wave of violence breaks out in Oriente Province.

July 31, 1957: Anti-Government demonstrations in Santiago de Cuba (capital of Oriente Province), during a visit by U.S. Ambassador Earl T. Smith. Ambassador Smith is reported to have described as "excessive police action" the use by police of fire hoses to disperse the demonstrators.

August 1, 1957: Constitutional guarantees suspended for 45 days throughout Cuba. Censorship of the press and radio is imposed. A general strike is called in Santiago de Cuba in protest against the dispersal of the demonstrators on July 31.

August 9, 1957: Cuban Army announces that two encounters have taken place between rebels and Government troops in Las Villas Province (central Cuba). "This is the first time there has been an official report of rebels operating in Las Villas." (New York Times, Aug. 10, 1957).

September 4, 1957: President Fulgencio Batista reaffirms his decision to hold general elections on June 1, 1958.

September 5-6, 1957: Units of the Cuban Navy and maritime police revolt in Cienfuegos. The uprising is suppressed by the Cuban Army, supported by tanks and aircraft, after a 2-day battle. One hundred persons are reported killed.

September 12, 1957: President Batista announces he will not be a candidate for reelection. On the same day, Cuban Government extends the suspension of constitutional guarantees (imposed on Aug. 1, see above, July 21 and Aug. 1, 1957).

November 1, 1957: Cuban Liberation Council consisting of the seven major groups opposing Batista formed in Miami.

November 19, 1957: U.S. customs authorities seize a yacht loaded with arms and medical supplies, in Florida. Thirty-one Cubans are arrested aboard the yacht, which was preparing to sail for Cuba.

November 29, 1957: U.S. customs authorities in Miami seize another arms shipment destined for Cuba.

December 30, 1957: Letter from Castro (dated Dec. 14) to Cuban Liberation Council in Miami made public. Castro asserts that the 26th of July Movement is alone in carrying on the entire revolutionary struggle inside Cuba and calls the unity pact signed by the council "fraudulent." He insists on naming Dr. Manuel Urrutia provisional president (the council had previously excluded Urrutia from its list of candidates) and calls for elections within 18 months. Orthodox Party follows 26th of July Movement's walkout from council. Authentic Party, principal remaining force in the council, soon agrees to accept Castro's terms.

January 14, 1958: Rebels raid the port of Manzanillo in Oriente Province.

January 25, 1958: Constitutional guarantees are restored, except in Oriente Province.

February 3, 1958: Censorship of press and radio is lifted in Oriente Province.

February 13, 1958: Former Cuban President Carlos Prio Socarras and eight other Cubans are indicted by a U.S. Federal grand jury on charges of conspiring to set up a military expedition to invade Cuba.

February 20, 1958: Rebel leader Fidel Castro declares (to a correspondent of the New York Times), that he would be ready to end the civil war and agree to general elections under President Batista under the following two condition: if military forces are withdrawn from Oriente before the elections, and if the elections are supervised by the Organization of American States.

March 14, 1958: U.S. Government imposes embargo on shipment of arms to Cuba.

March 17, 1958: Rebel leader Fidel Castro issues a manifesto setting April 1 as the date for commencement of total war against the regime of President Batista. According to the manifesto, a strike, backed by armed action, is to be called at a later date, to lead to overthrow of the Government.

March 20, 1958: Superior Electoral Tribunal Cuba announces postponement of presidential elections (scheduled for June 1) until November 3.

April 2, 1958: Communists issue manifesto stating intention to join with "all Cubans to end tyranny."

April 9, 1958: Rebels to call for general strike and clash with armed forces in Havana and other sections of Cuba.

June 26–July 1, 1958: Cuban rebels in Oriente Province kidnap 3 Canadian and 45 United States citizens, including 30 sailors and marines from the U.S. Guantanamo Naval Base.

July 28, 1958: Marines from the U.S. Guantanamo Naval Base land in Cuba (with approval of the Cuban Government) to guard a pumping station, 6 miles away, which supplies the base with water. (The pumping station is in an area from which Cuban Government forces have been withdrawn.)

July 30, 1958: Rebel leader Fidel Castro demands "immediate withdrawal" of U.S. Marines.

August 1, 1958: U.S. Marines are withdrawn from Cuban territory.

August 2, 1958: Cuban Government announces its forces have resumed guard duty at the pumping station.

August 28, 1958: Outlawed Cuban Communist Party issues open letter to Cuban rebels, calling for "united front" against the Batista regime.

October 20, 1958: Rebel leader Fidel Castro orders confiscation of property of British companies and citizens in territories controlled by the rebels, in reprisal for the sale of jet planes by Britain to the Batista Government.

On the same day, October 20, Cuban rebels kidnap (near Santiago de Cuba) two Americans and seven Cubans employed by the Texas Oil Co. (For previous kidnappings of U.S. citizens by the rebels, see above 1958, June 26–July 1.) All nine men are released 3 days later.

October 23, 1958: U.S. Government orders evacuation of dependents of U.S. employees working at U.S.-owned Nicara nickel plant in Oriente Province.

November 3, 1958: Elections for President, Vice President, Senate, one-half of the House of Representatives, and Governors of the six provinces. Andres Rivero Aguero, candidate of the four-party government coalition, is elected president. (Voting in Cuba is obligatory, however, approximately 40 percent of the electorate failed to vote.)

November 12, 1958: Cuban rebels announce beginning of an offensive in Oriente Province.

November 27, 1958: Government forces announce offensive in Oriente Province.

December 1, 1958: Rebel forces cut off water supply of the Preston sugar mill, owned by the United Fruit Co.

December 24, 1958: Rebel forces capture Sancti Spiritus in Las Villas Province.

December 30, 1958: House-to-house fighting between rebel and government forces in Santa Clara, capital of Las Villas Province. On the same day, a powder magazine explodes in Havana.

January 1, 1959: President Fulgencio Batista resigns and appoints a ruling junta, headed by Gen. Eulogio Cantillo, which designates Dr. Carlos Piedra, the oldest judge of the supreme court, as provisional president in accordance with the constitution of 1940. General Cantillo assumes duties as chief of staff of the armed forces. On the same day, General Batista flees to exile in the Dominican Republic. Mob violence breaks out in Havana.

January 2, 1959: Castro proclaims Manuel Urrutia Provisional President of the Cuban Republic.

January 3, 1959: Urrutia is sworn in as Provisional President in Santiago (provisional capital of the rebel Government). On the same day, Urrutia appoints Fidel Castro commander in chief of Cuban armed forces, and announces composition of new Cabinet.

January 6, 1959: Provisional President Manuel Urrutia dissolves Cuban Congress and assumes legislative powers until new elections are held. On the same day, Urrutia orders the removal from office of all Governors of provinces, mayors, and aldermen.

January 23, 1959: Public trial of Major Jesus Blanco opens in Havana sports stadium. Since the beginning of the new regime large-scale summary trials by military tribunals and executions of ex-Batista officials have taken place. By mid-January the published total of executions reached 150. Castro, in reply to statements made in United States deploring these executions, charged that the protesters never voiced any objections to the years of killing and torture by the Batista regime and insisted that the trials would continue.

February 16, 1959: Fidel Castro is sworn in as Premier (replacing Jose Miro Cardona).

April 15, 1959: Premier Castro arrives in the United States on an 11-day unofficial visit (by invitation of the American Society of Newspaper Editors). The unofficial total of executions in Cuba reaches 509.

May 13, 1959: Cuban Government orders the confiscation of the holdings of 117 companies and 18 individuals charged with crimes against national economy and with enriching themselves illegally under the Batista regime.

May 17, 1959: President Manuel Urrutia Lleo signs into law the agrarian reform bill. (The law is published in the Official Gazette on June 5.) The law provides for distribution of unused lands.

June 11, 1959: U.S. note to Cuba delivered: the Cuban agrarian law "gives serious concern to the Government of the United States with regard to the adequacy of the provision for compensation to its citizens whose property may be expropriated."

June 29, 1959: Chief of Cuban Air Force, Maj. Pedro L. Diaz Lanz, resigns. He charged

"there was Communist influence in the armed forces and Government." (N.Y. Times, July 1, 1959).

July 14, 1959: President Manuel Urrutia in a press conference states: "I reject the support of the Communists, and I believe that any real Cuban Revolutionary should reject it openly."

July 17, 1959: Fidel Castro announces his resignation as Premier. On the same day, President Manuel Urrutia resigns after being accused by Castro of actions "bordering on treason." Also on July 17, the Cabinet appoints Osvaldo Dorticos Torrado as new President.

July 18, 1959: Osvaldo Dorticos Torrado is sworn in as President. He announces that the Council of Ministers has refused to accept Fidel Castro's resignation.

July 26, 1959: Fidel Castro resumes duties as Premier.

October 21, 1959: Two unidentified planes fly over Havana dropping anti-Castro leaflets. One person is killed and several wounded in bomb explosions in Havana.

October 22, 1959: Premier Fidel Castro declares (in a television broadcast) that the planes involved in the October 21 "bombing" are based in the United States. Castro calls the "attack" "base and unpardonable."

October 26, 1959: Mass rally (attended by an estimated 300,000) to protest U.S. "aggression." Premier Castro (in a speech) attacks the United States, announces the reestablishment of military courts to try "traitors" and "counter-revolutionaries."

October 28, 1959: President Eisenhower declares (at a news conference) that the United States is using "every single facility that is available" to prevent illegal flights from the United States to Cuba.

November 2, 1959: Government seizes nearly 75,000 acres of foreign-controlled agricultural and mineral lands in Oriente Province. "The seizures included nearly 10,000 acres on which the Bethlehem Steel Corp. held mineral concessions." (AP, November 2, 1959).

November 10, 1959: U.S. Department of State issues statement on Cuban campaign of "inaccurate, malicious and misleading reports" on the alleged bombing of Havana October 21.

November 22, 1959: Cuban Confederation of Labor withdraws from the Inter-American Regional Organization of Labor (a branch of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions).

November 26, 1959: Maj Ernesto Guevara is appointed president of the National Bank of Cuba.

November 30, 1959: Trials by military courts are resumed in Cuba.

January 11, 1960: United States note to Cuba delivered, protesting against "numerous actions" taken by the Cuban Government "which are considered by the U.S. Government to be in denial of the basic rights of ownership of U.S. citizens in Cuba—rights provided under both Cuban law and generally accepted international law." According to the note, these actions "involve principally the seizure and occupation of land and buildings" of U.S. citizens "without court orders and frequently without any written authorization whatever."

On the same day (January 11), Cuban Government rejects the U.S. note and states that "* * * the revolutionary Government [will] accelerate the works of agrarian reform, applying equal methods of expropriation and indemnification to nations and foreigners." Hundreds of millions of dollars worth of American property has already been seized with little or no formality."

January 21, 1960: U.S. Ambassador Philip Bonsal was ordered back to Washington for consultation by Secretary of State Herter after Premier Castro accused the United States of waging a campaign of hostility against Cuba. Secretary Herter characterized the speech as Castro's "most insulting" attack on "the American Government and the American people" since he came to power a little more than a year ago.

January 26, 1960: President Eisenhower (at a news conference) rejects Cuban charges against the United States, reaffirms U.S. policy of nonintervention in Cuban domestic affairs and declares that "We are not going to be a party to reprisals or anything of that kind." "The President underlines U.S. amity for Cuba in reply to a question whether it would be desirable to cut the quota of Cuban sugar imported to the United States. This quota amounts to a third of U.S. consumption." (New York Times, Jan. 27, 1960.)

February 4–13, 1960: Soviet First Deputy Premier Anastas I. Mikoyan in Cuba. (Cuba does not have diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union.)

February 5, 1960: Mikoyan opens Soviet cultural exhibition in Havana.

February 10, 1960: Military court in Havana sentences 104 persons to prison terms ranging from 3 to 30 years on charges of conspiracy against the Cuban Government.

February 12, 1960: Mikoyan announces that the Soviet Union is willing to sell military aircraft to the Cuban Government.

February 13, 1960: Mikoyan and Premier Castro sign an agreement under which the Soviet Union is to buy 5 million tons of sugar at world market price, over a 5-year period, and to grant Cuba a credit of $100 million "for the acquisition of equipment, machinery, and material." The credit is repayable in 12 years at 2½ percent interest. (The sugar agreement makes the Soviet Union the second largest buyer of Cuban sugar, after the United States.)

February 18, 1960: Premier Castro announces (in a television-radio address) that two American flyers were killed (on Feb. 18) in a crash on Cuban soil of a U.S.-based plane which attempted to attack a sugar mill in Matanzas Province.

February 19, 1960: U.S. Department of State acknowledges that the plane took off from Florida and relays "sincere regrets" over the incident to the Cuban Government. "The United States welcomed Cuba's acceptance of Washington's offer to send technical experts to help determine the cause of the crash [Department of State spokesman], Mr. White said. * * * [The incident] lent considerable weight to numerous past charges by Cuba that planes from [the United States] had been setting fire to sugarcane fields on the island." (New York Times, Feb. 20, 1960.)

February 20, 1960: Central Planning Board is established by the Government. Its function is to supervise and coordinate the economic affairs of Cuba and to fix the general regulations of guidance for private enterprise. The board is headed by Premier Castro.

February 21, 1960: Unidentified plane drops several bombs on an industrial suburb of Havana, according to a statement by the Cuban Government. The windows of an Esso oil refinery are damaged.

February 22, 1960: Cuban Government (in a note delivered to the U.S. chargé d'affaires in Havana) expresses its willingness to renew negotiations through diplomatic channels concerning the differences between Cuba and the United States—the Cuban Government stated that it wished to clarify that the negotiations would be contingent on abstentions by the United States from any unilateral action that would prejudge the results of these negotiations or might cause damage to the Cuban economy or the Cuban people. Unilateral action refers to any possible reduction of Cuba's sugar quota at approximately 2 cents above the world market rate. (New York Times, Feb. 23, 1960.)

February 25, 1960: Premier Castro announces that the Cuban Government will spend 152 million pesos ($152 million) in 1960 on the first phase of a program to industrialize Cuba and make it economically independent.

February 26, 1960: Ernesto Guevara, president of the National Bank of Cuba, declares (in a speech to cane planters) that the Cuban Government intends to use a system of cooperatives, as opposed to individual effort, in the development of Cuban economy.

March 4, 1960: French freighter loaded with ammunition and explosives for the Cuban Army explodes in Havana Habor. Seventy-five to 700 persons were killed and more than 200 injured.

March 5, 1960: Premier Castro, at the mass funeral of 27 dockworkers killed yesterday, implied that the United States was involved in the sabotage of the munitions ship which exploded in Havana Harbor. The United States issued a vigorous protest against the Premier's accusation.

March 7, 1960: Secretary of State Herter told Cuba's chargé d' affaires that Premier Castro's implication that the United States was involved in the munitions ship explosion was baseless, erroneous, and misleading. Mr. Herter protested strongly against the Premier's unfounded and irresponsible attitude and added that such statements could only contribute further to the unhappy deterioration of United States-Cuban relations.

March 8, 1960: Cuba rejects the U.S. protest as "insulting," made in an "aggressive tone," and "derogatory to our national dignity."

March 16, 1960: President Eisenhower submits to Congress proposals for new legislation to replace the Sugar Act (due to expire at the end of 1960).

March 17, 1960: On the same day (Mar. 17), Rufo López-Fresquet resigns as Finance Minister. The resignation removes the last anti-Communist from the Castro Cabinet.

March 20, 1960: U.S. Secretary of State Christian A. Herter declares (in a television interview) that although some Communist sympathizers hold high offices in Cuba, and some of Premier Castro's acts appear to follow a Communist pattern, "I don't think anyone could say affirmatively that Cuba is Communist at the present time."

U.S. Ambassador to Cuba Philip W. Bonsal returns to Havana.

March 21, 1960: A U.S.-based private plane is shot down over Cuban territory by Cuban Government troops. The American pilot and copilot are captured.

March 29, 1960: Premier Castro announces that he will not send the Cuban Ambassador back to Washington unless the United States modifies its unfriendly policies toward Cuba.

Premier Castro announces (in a television address) that his Government will "not be bound by the inter-American pact against communism because it did not sign the pact."

March 31, 1960: Poland and Cuba sign a trade agreement under which Cuba is to receive industrial plants, and equipment, ships, planes, and helicopters on credit and in exchange for goods. The agreement also provides for technical and scientific assistance to Cuba by Polish experts.

April 8, 1960: U.S. Secretary of State Herter declares (at a news conference): "There is one very disturbing development that is taking place in Cuba, and that is that anti-communism is now being made synonymous with antirevolution, and that those who express concern about Communist influence are now being accused of being antirevolution, and anti-Castro. This is obviously an effort to stop any anti-Communist criticism that might arise within the country itself." "Asked later whether he felt his anti-anti-communism was being done with the active support and aid of some of the officials of the Cuban Government, Mr. Herter replied, 'Yes, I think very definitely.'"

April 25, 1960: Agrarian Reform Institute expropriates more than 170,000 acres owned by the United Fruit Co. in eastern Cuba.

On the same day Guatemala asked the Organization of American States to investigate Cuban charges that Guatemala is planning an invasion of Cuba.

April 28, 1960: Guatemala severs diplomatic relations with Cuba.

April 29, 1960: Cuban police announce arrest of opposition leaders accused of a conspiracy to overthrow the Castro government.

May 8, 1960: Foreign Ministry announces that the Soviet Union and Cuba have renewed diplomatic relations at Embassy level.

May 11, 1960: Two progovernment unions seize the Diario de la Marina, Cuba's oldest and largest newspaper.

May 16, 1960: Presna Libre, a Havana daily, is seized by union workers.

May 17, 1960: Archbishop of Santiago de Cuba, Enrique Perez Serrentes, attacks communism in a pastoral letter. Referring to communism, he says: "It cannot be said that the enemy is at the gates because in reality it is within the gates."

May 23, 1960: United States and British oil companies in Cuba will be required (according to Cuban official sources) to refine Soviet crude oil, instead of the crude hitherto obtained from Venezuela.

May 27, 1960: U.S. State Department announces that the U.S. economic aid program to Cuba (which has been running at between $150,000 to $200,000 a year) will be terminated on December 1, 1960. U.S. military aid (presently consisting of training of a few Cuban air cadets in Texas) will be terminated in June 1960.

June 1, 1960: U.S. House of Representatives' Agriculture Committee rejects the administration request (see above March 16, 1960) to authorize the President to cut Cuba's share of U.S. sugar imports, and votes a 1-year extension of the present sugar act, which authorizes cuts in the Cuban sugar quota only if Cuba fails to fill its quota of sugar imports to the United States. The committee chairman declares that the administration proposal would enable the President to commit "an act of economic aggression against Cuba" which would endanger U.S. relations with the rest of Latin America.

June 7, 1960: United States and British oil refineries in Cuba reject Cuban Government's demand that they refine Soviet crude oil.

June 10, 1960: Czechoslovakia and Cuba sign trade agreement providing for the building of eight factories in Cuba by the end of the year, each costing about $4 million. The factories are to turn out refrigerators, sewing machines and other consumer goods. Under the agreement Czechoslovakia will grant Cuba credits of about $20 million, repayable in 10 years at 2½ percent interest.

June 11, 1960: Cuban Government seizes four hotels, among them the American-operated Nacional and the Havana Hilton, the two largest luxury hotels in Havana. The Tropicana nightclub is also seized.

June 16, 1960: Cuban Government orders two attachés of the U.S. Embassy in Havana to leave the country within 24 hours. They are accused of "conspiring with counter revolutionaries."

June 18, 1960: U.S. Government orders two Cuban consular officials to leave the country within 48 hours. They are Carlos Manuel Lazaro Feliz Sanchez y Basquet, assistant to the Cuban Consul at Miami, and Dr. Berta Luisa Pla y Badia, Cultural Attaché at the Cuban Consulate in New York.

June 26, 1960: Army ammunition dump in the Havana Harbor area explodes, killing 2 and injuring at least 200 persons.

June 27, 1960: U.S. House of Representatives' Agriculture Committee unanimously approves a 1-year extension of the present Sugar Act and includes authority for the President to reduce the Cuban sugar quota in 1960 and to eliminate it in 1961.

On the same day, U.S. Government submits memorandum to the Inter-American Peace Committee, a unit of the Organization of American States. In the memorandum (made public on June 29) the United States accuses the Cuban Government of contributing to tensions in the Caribbean by waging a campaign of lies and slander against the United States. Stating that it had responded to "hostile attitudes and actions of the Cuban Government with patience and forbearance," the U.S. Government declares that this "exercise of restraint, however, has been in vain," and goes on to present an inventory of aggressive acts and statements of the Cuban Government. The memorandum ends with the remarks that "the Cuban Government's systematic and provocative campaign of slander and hostile propaganda against the United States, of which various examples have been cited in this memorandum, is a major contributor to international tensions in the area of the Caribbean and of the hemisphere as a whole."

June 29, 1960: Cuban Government seizes Texas Co. petroleum refinery in Santiago de Cuba.

July 1, 1960: Cuba seizes the United States-owned Esso oil refinery and the British-controlled Shell refinery, the last two foreign-owned oil refineries in Cuba.

July 3, 1960: U.S. Senate and House of Representatives pass a compromise sugar bill which authorizes the President to "determine the quota for Cuba for the balance of the calendar year 1960 and for the 3 months period ending March 31, 1961, in such amounts as he shall find to be in the national interest."

July 5, 1960: The Cuban Ambassador-designate to the United States, José Miro Cardona (who was first Cuban Premier of the Castro regime), resigns because of "ideological divergencies" with the Castro government, and takes refuge in the Argentine Embassy in Havana.

July 6, 1960: The Cuban Cabinet authorizes the expropriation of all United States-owned property in Cuba, "when deemed necessary in the national interest."

July 9, 1960: Soviet Premier Khrushchev threatens the United States with rockets if the United States intervenes militarily in Cuba. President Eisenhower declares that the United States will not "permit the establishment of a regime dominated by international communism in the Western Hemisphere." He also says: "There is irony in Mr. Khrushchev's portrayal of the Soviet Union as the protector of independence of an American nation when viewed against the history of the enslavement of countless other peoples by Soviet imperialism."

July 10, 1960: President Osvaldo Dorticos announces that the Soviet Union has offered to buy the 700,000 tons of sugar which the United States cut from Cuba's quota for the rest of the year.

July 11, 1960: Cuba asks the U.N. Security Council to take action on her charges that the United States has been guilty of "repeated threats, harassments, intrigues, reprisals, and aggressive acts" against Cuba.

July 12, 1960: Soviet Premier Khrushchev declares that the Soviet Union will support Cuba in any attempt to oust the United States from its naval base at Guantanamo. He denounces President Eisenhower's declaration that the United States will prevent the establishment of a regime dominated by international communism in the Western Hemisphere, and says: "We consider that the Monroe Doctrine has outlived its time, has died."

July 13, 1960: Peru calls for a meeting of the foreign ministers of the Americas to consider the Soviet threat to inter-American unity.

July 14, 1960: Argentine Note to Cuba calls on the Castro Government to dissociate itself from the Khrushchev offer to protect Cuba with rockets in the event of U.S. aggression. (The Note is vehemently rejected by the Cuban press and radio as "Argentine meddling.")

July 15, 1960: Two Latin American members of U.N. Security Council (Ecuador and Argentina) recommend that the Security Council refer to Cuba's charges against the United States to the Organization of American States. On the same day, the Brazilian Foreign Ministry recommends the same procedure.

July 16, 1960: OAS Council meeting in Washington. 16 out of 17 delegates who speak (including the United States and excluding only Cuba) favor the Peruvian call for a "coordination of will to reject the interference of any extracontinental power or of any totalitarian ideology."

July 18, 1960: OAS Council (meeting in Washington) agrees unanimously to hold a foreign ministers' meeting on the United States-Cuban dispute.

July 19, 1960: UN Security Council refers Cuba's charges against the United States to the Organization of American States. The vote on the Argentine-Ecuador resolution is nine to zero, with the Soviet Union and Poland abstaining.

July 21, 1960: Defense Minister Raul Castro leaves Moscow after a 4-day visit. In a joint statement with Premier Khrushchev, Raul Castro expresses "the profound gratitude" of the Cuban Government and people for Soviet support. Khrushchev promises that the Soviet Union will deliver "oil and other goods in amounts fully meeting the requirements of Cuba" in order to surmount the United States "economic blockade."

July 23, 1960: Communist China signs agreement (in Havana) with Cuba to buy 2.5 million long tons of sugar during the next 5 years, at an average of 500,000 tons a year. Communist China agrees to grant Cuba a credit (reported to be about $70 million) to buy "complete factories" in China.

July 29, 1960: OAS Council (in Washington) votes to hold a meeting of American Foreign Ministers in San José, Costa Rica, beginning August 16. The agenda will include the Venezuelan charges against the Dominican Republic, the United States-Cuban dispute, and the threat of Communist interference in the affairs of the Western Hemisphere.

August 7, 1960: Premier Castro nationalizes all remaining U.S.-owned property in Cuba.

On the same day, the United States (in a memorandum to the Inter-American Peace Committee) makes a violent attack against the Cuban Government, and declares that it is "now in open league with the Soviet Union and Communist China."

On the same day (August 7), the Roman Catholic hierarchy of Cuba expresses concern (in a pastoral letter read in all Cuban churches) over "the increasing advance of communism" in Cuba and over the close relations between the Soviet Union and Cuba.

August 8, 1960: OAS Council (in Washington) adopts by a vote of 20 to 1 over Cuban objections the revised agenda for the American Foreign Ministers' meeting in San José, on August 16. A new agenda item will be the "defense of the democratic American institutions against the subversive activities of any organization, government or their agents."

August 16–29, 1960: Conference of OAS Foreign Ministers in San José, Costa Rica, to consider the Dominican and Cuban questions.

August 19, 1960: U.S. Government announces it will not allow other countries to use U.S. loans to buy sugar from Cuba.

August 24, 1960: In an address to the OAS conference, U.S. Secretary of State Herter declares that Cuba is being led "in the Communist direction." He declares that what is happening in Cuba is "part of a determined effort by the Sino-Soviet powers to extend their control over an American state," and he asks the conference to take "the necessary positive decisions to meet the threat."

August 28, 1960: Cuban delegation walks out of the OAS meeting prior to a unanimous vote of the remaining Foreign Ministers approving the Declaration of San José, which condemns Sino-Soviet intervention in the affairs of any American state. Cuba is not mentioned specifically in any part of the declaration.

September 5–13, 1960: Inter-American Economic Conference in Bogotá. Cuba is represented by her Minister of Economy. On September 11, the Act of Bogotá, which incorporates a wide-ranging U.S. social and economic development aid plan for Latin America, is signed by 19 American republics. (The Dominican Republic did not attend the conference.) Cuba alone refuses to sign the act. On September 7, the Cuban delegate attacks the U.S. aid plan as an attempt "to silence the militant hope awakened in the people of Latin America by the Cuban revolution."

September 13, 1960: Cuban Government announces that Premier Castro and Foreign Minister Raul Roa will attend the U.N. General Assembly session which opens in New York on September 20. Foreign Minister Roa declares that Cuba will support the following aims in the U.N. General Assembly: A U.N. seat for Communist China; Algerian independence; the position of Patrice Lumumba as premier of the Congo; denunciation of U.S. "imperialistic policies."

September 14, 1960: United States restricts Premier Castro to Manhattan during his proposed visit to the U.N. General Assembly—the same restriction as that imposed on Soviet Premier Khrushchev.

September 16, 1960: The Cuban Government seizes control of the tobacco industry and of all U.S. banks in Cuba.

September 18, 1960: Premier Castro arrives in New York for the U.N. General Assembly session.

September 20, 1960: Soviet Premier Khrushchev pays a call on Castro in Harlem.

September 24, 1960: Cuba formally recognizes Communist China and North Korea (the first Latin American state to do so).

September 25, 1960: President Nasser of the United Arab Republic calls on Castro in Harlem.

September 29, 1960: United States advises American citizens in Cuba to send home their wives and children.

October 9, 1960: Cuban Government announces that it has crushed an anti-Castro revolt in south-central Cuba, and accuses the United States of supplying the rebels with arms and ammunition.

October 14, 1960: Cuban Government nationalizes all major companies and banks.

October 18, 1960: Cuba asks the U.N. to consider the question of U.S. "aggression" against Cuba.

October 19, 1960: United States puts an embargo on all exports to Cuba, except medical supplies and various food products. The State Department announcement declares that "this step has been reluctantly taken by the United States in order to carry out the responsibility of this Government to defend the legitimate economic interests of the people of this country against the discriminatory, aggressive and injurious economic policies of the Castro regime."

October 20, 1960: U.S. Ambassador to Cuba, Philip W. Bonsal, is recalled to Washington for "an extended period of consultations."

October 25, 1960: Cuban Government nationalizes 166 more United States-owned enterprises, valued at about $250 million.

October 28, 1960: U.S. note to the Organization of American States asks for an investigation of large-scale arms shipments to Cuba. The note says: "With the notorious assistance of extracontinental powers, specifically those of the Soviet bloc, Cuba is expanding rapidly its capacity to give armed support to the spread of its revolution in other parts of the Americas."

November 1, 1960: President Eisenhower issues a statement reiterating U.S. determination to defend the Guantanamo Naval Base. He declares that "because of its importance to the defense of the entire hemisphere, particularly in the light of the intimate relations which now exist between the present Government of Cuba and the Sino-Soviet bloc, it is essential that our position in Guantanamo Bay be clearly understood."

November 1, 1960: On the same day, the U.N. General Assembly rejects Cuban and Soviet-bloc demands for an immediate Assembly debate on "U.S. aggression." The Assembly votes to send the Cuban complaint to the Assembly's Political Committee.

November 9, 1960: Premier Castro informs a mass meeting in Havana that Cuba has prevented the United States from attacking the island by denouncing U.S. aggression in the U.N., by making great military preparations, and by alerting world opinion.

November 14, 1960: Cuba withdraws from the World Bank.

November 18, 1960: U.S. State Department issues statement: "Since Fidel Castro came into power, Cuba has created and armed a military force 10 times the size of that of ex-President Fulgencio Batista and far larger than any army in Latin America. Total Soviet-bloc arms provided to the Castro government amount to at least 28,000 tons."

November 27, 1960: Premier Fidel Castro (in a speech at a student rally in Havana University) makes a bitter attack against the Roman Catholic clergy in Cuba, accusing them of being "counterrevolutionaries."

November 30, 1960: Communist China agrees to buy a million tons of Cuban sugar in 1961, thereby doubling the annual amount in the earlier agreement. Communist China also provides Cuba with an interest-free loan of 240 million rubles (about $60 million). The agreements are announced at the end of a visit of Maj. Ernesto Guevara, head of Cuba's National Bank, to Communist China.

December 2, 1960: U.S. Government officially designates Cuba for the first time as "Communist-controlled." This was done when the White House made a determination that refugees from Cuba from now on qualify under that section of the Mutual Security Act which provides assistance for persons displaced from Communist-ruled lands. A White House announcement said that President Eisenhower had released $1 million worth of mutual security funds for assistance of 30,000 Cuban refugees in Florida." (New York Herald Tribune, Dec. 3, 1960.)

December 3, 1960: Roman Catholic hierarchy of Cuba (in an open letter to Premier Castro) rejects Castro's attacks against the Church. The letter also declares that the Government's revolutionary indoctrination has been following "purely Marxist lines."

December 8, 1960: Cuba nationalizes the Royal Bank of Canada (in Cuba), which has 23 branches in the country.

December 10, 1960: Major Ernesto Guevara, head of the Cuban National Bank, declares (in Moscow) that the Cuban Government "wholeheartedly" endorses the Communist manifesto, drawn up by the leaders of 81 Communist parties at their recent meeting in Moscow. He declares that in accordance with the manifesto, Cuba will serve as a model for armed revolution in Latin America.

December 16, 1960: President Eisenhower cuts to zero the import of Cuban sugar into the United States for the first 3 months of 1961.

December 19, 1960: Soviet-Cuban communique is signed (in Moscow) by Soviet First Deputy Premier Anastas I. Mikoyan and Major Ernesto Guevara, head of the Cuban National Bank. The Soviet Union promises to help Cuba build an iron and steel mill, an oil refinery, electric power stations and other industrial units. The communique says that the Soviet Union will buy from Cuba "2,700,000 tons of sugar if the United States carries out its threat not to purchase Cuban sugar."

December 21, 1960: Government decree dismisses 17 out of 32 justices of the Cuban Supreme Court.

December 31, 1960: Foreign Minister Raul Roa flies to New York and calls for an immediate meeting of the UN Security Council, to take action on a Cuban charge that the United States is ready to "carry out, within a few hours, direct military aggression" against Cuba.

January 1, 1961: Security Council agrees to meet on January 4 to consider the Cuban charge against the United States.

January 2, 1961: Premier Castro declares (in a speech to a crowd of over 100,000 in Havana) that the U.S. Embassy will have to reduce its staff within 48 hours to 11, the number in the Cuban Embassy in Washington.

January 3, 1961: United States severs diplomatic and consular relations with Cuba, and asks Cuba to withdraw all its diplomatic and consular personnel from the United States. President Eisenhower issues a statement, in which he declares: "The Government of Cuba has decided to limit the personnel of our Embassy and consulate in Havana to 11 persons. Forty-eight hours was granted for the departure of our entire staff with the exception of 11. This calculated action on the part of the Castro government is only the latest of a long series of harassments, baseless accusations, and vilifications. There is a limit to what the United States in self-respect can endure. That limit has now been reached. Our friendship for the Cuban people is not affected. It is my hope and my conviction that in the not-too-distant future it will be possible for the historic friendship between us once again to find its reflection in normal relations of every sort. Meanwhile our sympathy goes out to the people of Cuba now suffering under the yoke of a dictator."

January 4, 1961: Swiss Government agrees to handle U.S. diplomatic and consular affairs in Cuba.

January 5, 1961: U.N. Security Council declines to act on Cuba's charge that the United States plans a military invasion of the island.

January 15, 1961: Press reports from Havana indicate that Premier Castro's armed forces have launched a major offensive against anti-Castro insurgents in the Escambray mountains in south-central Cuba.

January 16, 1961: United States bans travel of American citizens to Cuba except by special permission of the State Department.

January 30, 1961: Kennedy declares (in his state of the Union message): "In Latin America, Communist agents seeking to exploit that region's peaceful revolution of hope have established a base on Cuba, only 90 miles from our shores. Our objection with Cuba is not over the people's drive for a better life. Our objection is to their domination by foreign and domestic tyrannies.

"Cuban social and economic reform should be encouraged. Questions of economics and trade policy can always be negotiated. But Communist domination in this hemisphere can never be negotiated."

February 3, 1961: Cuban Government dismisses 119 judges in a purge of the courts.

On the same day (Feb. 3), President Kennedy allocates $4 million to help Cuban

refugees in the United States up to the end of the fiscal year on June 30.

February 11, 1961: Premier Castro denounces U.S. aid for "Cuban counterrevolutionary exiles." He says that "if the United States believes it has the right to promote a counterrevolution in Cuba, Cuba believes it has the right to promote a revolution in Latin America." He accuses the United States of parachuting large quantities of arms and food to anti-Castro rebels in the Escambray mountains.

February 14, 1961: Premier Castro declares (in a press interview) that he would like to "normalize" relations with the United States, but that this would depend on the United States ending its "direct military support" of his opponents.

February 24, 1961: U.S. State Department declares that there can be no improvement of relations between Cuba and the United States until "the Cuban people may freely choose their own destiny."

On the same day, Cuban Government transmits notes to all Latin American Governments with which Cuba maintains relations, urging them to resist any U.S. attempts to induce them to break relations with Cuba, and assuring them that Cuba does not intend to export its revolution to other Latin American countries.

Cuban Government announces administrative reorganization. A central planning junta is set up, headed by Premier Castro and with his brother, Raul (Armed Forces Minister), as vice president of the junta. Maj. Ernesto Guevara, president of the National Bank of Cuba, is given effective control over Cuba's economy by his appointment as head of a new Ministry of Industry, which will direct a 4-year industrialization plan. New Ministries of Foreign Trade and Interior Commerce are also established.

February 26, 1961: Government sources in Havana declare that the rebel movement in the Escambray Mountains has been crushed.

March 1, 1961: El Salvador announces it has severed relations with Cuba, effective January 25. El Salvador is the eighth nation of the Western Hemisphere to sever relations with Cuba.

March 22, 1961: Anti-Castro Cuban exile groups in the United States announce formation of a "Revolutionary Council" headed by Dr. José Miró Cardona, who was the first Premier of the Castro regime in Cuba. The Council issues a statement calling on Cubans "to overthrow the Communist tyranny."

March 29, 1961: U.S. Congress agrees to extend the President's authority to prohibit Cuban sugar imports until June 30, 1962 and to share its quota among other foreign and domestic producers.

April 3, 1961: U.S. State Department issues pamphlet on Cuba which declares: "We call once again on the Castro regime to sever the links with the international Communist movement, to return to the original purposes which brought so many gallant men together in the Sierra Maestra, and to restore the integrity of the Cuban revolution. If this call is unheeded, we are confident that the Cuban people, with their passion for liberty, will continue to strive for a free Cuba."

April 5, 1961: Foreign Minister Raul Roa (in a press interview in New York) denounces the State Department's pamphlet on Cuba as a "formalization of the undeclared war which the United States is making against us." He also accuses the United States of arming and training in Florida and Guatemala a "so-called liberation army of 4,000 to 5,000 counterrevolutionaries, mercenaries and adventurers."

April 8, 1961: Dr. José Miró Cardona, head of the Cuban Revoluntionary Council, issues a statement (in New York), calling all Cubans to arms to overthrow the regime of Premier Fidel Castro. He declares that the revolt must come from within the country.

April 12, 1961: President Kennedy declares (at a press conference) that U.S. Armed Forces will not intervene "under any conditions" in Cuba, and that the U.S. Government "will do everything it possibly can to make sure that there are no Americans involved in any actions inside Cuba." He says that he would be opposed to any attempt by Cuban exiles to mount an anti-Castro offensive from the United States.

April 15, 1961: Three Cuban military air bases are attacked by three bombers manned by anti-Castro personnel. Seven Cuban militiamen are reported killed and 47 wounded. An arms dump is hit at Camp Libertad near Havana. One of the rebel pilots lands at Miami International Airport, and declares (in a statement issued to the press) that the three planes belonged to the Cuban Air Force and were manned by Cuban pilots who defected from the Cuban Air Force.

On the same day, Premier Castro orders a general mobilization of the armed forces and civilian militia. In a communique issued after the bombing attack, he declares: "Our country has been the victim of a criminal imperialist aggression which violates all norms of international law. If this air attack is a prelude to an invasion, the country, on a war basis, will resist and destroy with an iron hand any force which attempts to disembark upon our land."

At an emergency session of the U.N. General Assembly's Political Committee, Foreign Minister Raul Roa accuses the United States of having instigated the bombing attack on Cuba. He denies that the pilots defected from the Cuban Air Force and asserts that they were "mercenaries bought by the United States." U.S. delegate to the U.N., Adlai E. Stevenson, denies the Cuban accusations, and reasserts that the United States will not intervene in Cuba. Soviet Delegate Valerian A. Zorin expresses "deep indignation" over the "barbarian attacks" launched against Cuba by the United States.

April 16, 1961: Premier Castro accuses the United States of responsibility for the air raid on Cuba and of deliberately trying to deceive world opinion by declaring that the fliers were defectors. He challenges President Kennedy to present before the U.N. the fliers who bombed Cuba.

On the same day, the United States grants political asylum to the three fliers, but the identity and whereabouts of the three men are kept secret.

April 17, 1961: Invasion of Cuba by anti-Castro forces begins. Rebel troops land on the southern coast in Las Villas Province. Rebel landings are also reported in Oriente Province in the southeast and in Pinar del Rio Province in the extreme west.

U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk (at a press conference in Washington) expresses the sympathy of the American people for the anti-Castro movement, but reiterates that U.S. forces will not intervene in Cuba.

In the U.N. General Assembly's Political Committee, Foreign Minister Raul Roa declares that Cuba has been invaded "by a force of mercenaries, organized, financed, and armed by the Government of the United States." He says that the attacks were launched from the United States and Guatemala. Both countries deny this assertion.

President of the Cuban Revolutionary Council, Dr. José Miró Cardona, issues a statement in New York, calling on "freedom-loving peoples" of the Western Hemisphere to support the attack on Cuba.

April 18, 1961: Soviet Premier Khrushchev sends a message to President Kennedy in which he charges the United States with responsibility for the invasion of Cuba. He warns that the Soviet Union will "render the Cuban people and their government all necessary assistance in beating back the armed attack on Cuba."

On the same day, President Kennedy sends a reply to Khrushchev in which he states: "I have previously stated and I repeat now that the United States intends no armed intervention in Cuba. In the event of any military intervention by outside force we will immediately honor our obligations under the inter-American system to protect this hemisphere against external aggression. I have taken careful note of your statement that the events in Cuba might affect peace in all parts of the world. I trust that this does not mean that the Soviet Government, using the situation in Cuba as a pretext, is planning to inflame other areas of the world. I would like to think that your government has too great a sense of responsibility to embark on any enterprise so dangerous to general peace. I believe that you should recognize that free peoples in all parts of the world do not accept the claim of historical inevitability for Communist revolution. The great revolution in the history of man, past, present, and future, is the revolution of those determined to be free."

April 19, 1961: Cuban rebel invading forces give up their beachhead on the southern coast of Cuba, in an attempt to join guerrillas in the nearby Escambray Mountains. Rebel communique announces that the invaders have suffered "tragic losses" while being attacked by "Soviet tanks and artillery [and] Russian MIG aircraft."

April 20, 1961: President Kennedy declares (in a speech to the American Society of Newspaper Editors) that U.S. "restraint is not inexhaustible," and that the United States does not intend to abandon Cuba to communism. He says: "Should it ever appear that the inter-American doctrine of noninterference merely conceals or excuses a policy of nonaction; if the Nations of this hemisphere should fail to meet their commitments against outside Communist penetration, then I want it clearly understood that this Government will not hesitate in meeting its primary obligations, which are the security of our Nation."

On the same day, April 20, Prime Minister Nehru of India accusses United States (in a statement in the Indian Parliament) of having encouraged the invasion of Cuba.

April 21, 1961: U.N. General Assembly's Political Committee adopts (by a vote of 61 to 27 with 10 abstentions) a resolution sponsored by seven Latin American Nations (Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Honduras, Panama, Uruguay, and Venezuela) which calls on members of the Organization of American States "to lend their assistance with a view to achieving a settlement [of the United States-Cuban crisis] by peaceful means." The 7-power proposal is supported by the United States, its Western European allies, most of the Latin American States, and 15 Afro-Asian States. The only two Latin American countries to vote against it are Cuba and Mexico. The committee also endorses (by a vote of 42 to 31 with 25 abstentions) a Mexican proposal which would call on all states to "insure that their territories and resources are not used to promote a civil war in Cuba."

April 22, 1961: U.N. General Assembly eliminates the reference to the OAS in the 7-power resolution, and approves a resolution (by a vote of 59 to 13 with 24 abstentions) which calls on all U.N. member states "to take such peaceful action as is open to them to remove existing tensions" between Cuba and the United States.

April 22, 1961: Former President Eisenhower confers (at Camp David, Md.) with President Kennedy on the Cuban situation. Eisenhower says to newsmen after the meeting: "I am all in favor of the United States supporting the man who has to carry the responsibility for our foreign affairs."

On the same day (April 22), Soviet Premier Khrushchev sends President Kennedy a reply to Kennedy's message on the Cuban situation. Khrushchev declares that in spite of all official U.S. denials, "it has now been proved beyond doubt that it was precisely the United States that prepared the intervention [in Cuba], financed the invasion and transported the gangs of mercenaries, which invaded the territory of Cuba. U.S. Armed Forces also took a direct part in the realization of the gangster attack on Cuba. American bombers and fighters supported the operations of mercenaries who landed on Cuban territory, and took part in military operations against the armed forces of the lawful government and the people of Cuba."

April 23, 1961: Premier Fidel Castro (in a 4½-hour television speech in Havana, his first public appearance since the invasion of April 17) declares that no clemency will be shown to the 458 rebel prisoners captured in the April 17 landings, unless the United States ceases its aid to Cuban rebels. He warns the United States that if it tries to intervene directly in Cuba, "a conflagration of incalculable proportions" will be started which will be the "beginning of the end of the Yankee empire," Castro says: "We shall not fight alone."

April 24, 1961: U.S. Presidential Press Secretary Pierre Salinger declares (in a statement to the press) that President Kennedy assumes "sole responsibility" for the U.S. role in the action against Cuba.

On the same day, Honduras becomes the eighth Latin American State to sever diplomatic relations with Cuba.

April 26, 1961: Inter-American Defense Board (composed of military representatives of the 21 American Republics) votes to bar the Cuban representative from all secret sessions of the Board and to deny him access to all classified documents dealing with hemispheric defense plans, "as long as there exists the present evident alliance of Cuba with the Soviet bloc." The ban (proposed by the United States) is approved by a vote of 12 to 1 (Cuba) with 4 abstentions (Chile, Ecuador, Mexico, Venezuela) and one vote reserved (Brazil).

April 30, 1961: State Department advises all U.S. citizens in Cuba to leave the island.

May 1, 1961: Premier Castro in a May Day speech in Havana declared Cuba a Socialist nation and said there would be no more elections. He asserted that henceforth his revolutionary government would rely on the direct backing of the people as expressed in such demonstrations as the May Day rally.

On the same day Secretary of State Dean Rusk told the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs that the United States had no plans now "to proceed in any way in armed intervention in Cuba" but if the Castro regime engaged in acts of aggression this country "will defend itself."

May 2, 1961: U.S. State Department described Cuba as a full-fledged member of the Communist bloc. The statement said: "Let there be no confusion regarding Castro's use of the word "Socialist" instead of "Communist." The use of the word "Socialist," in fact, meant that "Castro considers Cuba further along the Communist road than other countries in the bloc."

May 3, 1961: Twenty-two rebels, including Capt. Manuel Artime, a leader of the April 17 invasion attempt, were captured by Cuban Government troops. The Government announced that this brought the number of captured rebels to 1,122.

May 5, 1961: An anti-Castro Cuban volunteer declared that the Central Intelligence Agency had held him and 16 others prisoner and incommunicado for 11 weeks before and during last month's abortive invasion.

May 9, 1961: Cuban Revolutionary Council declares that its forces in last month's action had been "overcome by Soviet tanks and MIG's; that is to say, by the Russian empire," and that it was "preparing new plans" to win its fight.

May 17, 1961: Premier Castro offers to exchange his prisoners of the April 17 invasion of Cuba for 500 bulldozers from the United States, or else they would be sentenced to hard labor. "Of course," Castro said, "those among them who have committed murder cannot be exchanged for anything."

The Cuban Revolutionary Council called on the United States and Latin America to "take effective action" under inter-American pacts to support the council's efforts to overthrow Premier Castro.

On the same day, the U.S. House of Representatives passed a resolution declaring Cuba to be a "clear and present danger" to this hemisphere and urged the Organization of American States to take collective action against Castro.

Michigan Has More To Brag About Than Any Other State in the Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a communication by Mr. Howard W. Martin of Acme Quality Paints, Inc., on why we in Michigan are proud of our State and on the tremendous natural advantages which we possess in that wonderful area. The article is entitled "Michigan Has More To Brag About Than Any Other State in the Union." I am hopeful that a reading of this fine commentary will help our fellow Americans to realize why we in Michigan celebrate Michigan Week not only during the official time May 21 to May 27 but all during the year.

MICHIGAN WEEK—MAY 21 THROUGH MAY 27, 1961

Each of you have seen the publicity concerning the promotion of Michigan Week, which starts May 21 and runs through May 27, 1961. We are sending to your branch 10 window posters, 11 by 14 inches, 100 metal lapel tabs for give-away, 10 shelf or countertop cards and a supply of cocktail napkins that we thought you would use in conjunction with your colorometer mixing machine.

We want to tie your branch in with this promotion. It is designed to acquaint you with the many wonderful things that are right here in our State of Michigan.

Make sure that these promotion pieces are put into use starting on Monday, May 21.

I found it was a difficult task to put in two or three pages some of the many wonderful things that we have and enjoy and live with from day to day here in the wonderful State of Michigan.

I have sent a copy of the attached to all of our branch managers and we here at Acme Quality Paints sincerely hope that there will be many of them take advantage of our invitation to come and bring their families to not only visit the State of Michigan, but to see our fine Acme Quality Paint plant here and get acquainted with our Acme family.

P.S.—Here's a memo for each of you who work, live, and sell in Michigan:

HERE'S YOUR TREMENDOUS MICHIGAN MARKET

Over 2,453,000 working in stores, offices, factories—today.

Their annual income is over $18 billion.

Your customers total 7,825,000 men, women, and children.

They own 2,876,000 cars.

PERSONAL SAVINGS IN ALL FORMS AT RECORD LEVEL—OVER $6.8 BILLION

Over 2 million (2,060,000) families—all are prospects for new home appliances, furnishings, and Acme Quality Paint.

Average annual income per family is over $8,000.

Over 1,400,000 own homes—vast market for improvements.

Retail sales topped $9.6 billion in 1960.

MICHIGAN HAS MORE TO BRAG ABOUT THAN ANY OTHER STATE IN THE UNION: YOU DON'T BELIEVE IT?—I'LL PROVE IT—MICHIGAN WEEK, MAY 21–MAY 27, 1961—THIS IS OUR MICHIGAN

Early Indians called it Mishigamaw—meaning "Great Water."

From the word—sometimes spelled Michigama or Michiguma—comes the name of our Michigan.

Michigan—visited by white men years before the Pilgrims touched Plymouth Rock.

Michigan—In the 350 years that have elapsed since the first explorers stepped foot on Michigan territory, the flags of France, England and Spain have also fluttered over our soil.

Michigan—is the biggest State east of the Mississippi River. Ironwood in the Upper Peninsula is farther west than St. Louis, Mo., and Port Huron is as far east as Greenville, S.C. Detroit, for example, is farther from Houghton, Mich., than it is from Baltimore or Washington.

Michigan—The flag of Michigan proclaims dominion over 57,022 square miles of land and nearly 40,000 square miles of water surface—a total of 96,791 square miles. Just so you can get this picture in your mind as to what these figures mean, the State of Georgia has 58,876 square miles of territory. Our land area of 36,494,000 acres is larger than England or Austria—twice the size of Ireland—five times as big as Switzerland. Our Upper Peninsula is as big as Connecticut, Deleware, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island, all rolled together.

Michigan—Our 3,121-mile shoreline is equal to the Atlantic coastline all the way from Maine to Florida and longer than the Pacific coastline from Southern California to the Northernmost point of Washington. The shoreline in the Upper Peninsula alone is 1,114 miles which would stretch farther than a direct route from New York to Kansas City.

Michigan—We have 11,037 inland lakes—ranging from small bodies of 10 acres of water surface (the smallest we count as a lake) to the 33.3 square-mile Houghton Lake. The average size of our inland lakes is 67 acres and 411 are over 200 acres in size.

Michigan—"Water Wonderland"—No point in the State of Michigan is more than 85 miles from one of the Great Lakes and hardly a community is farther away than 6 miles from inland lakes or rivers.

Michigan—Thomas Jefferson, the Nation's third President, named the first territory governor of our Michigan—Gen. William Hull, who in the War of 1812 surrendered Detroit to the British. Can you imagine that?

He was replaced in 1812 by Brig. Gen. Lewis Cass.

Michigan—Was inhabited by Indian tribes long before Columbus discovered America in 1492. Three great tribes shared dominion over Michigan Territory. The Potawatomis

in the south, the Ottawas in the north, and the Ojibwas (also called Chippewas) in the Upper Peninsula. The Menominees, Hurons, Sauks, Miamis, and Mascoutens occupied villages throughout this vast territory.

Michigan—Cities such as Grand Rapids, Kalamazoo, Jackson, Saginaw, Pontiac, Niles, Escanaba, and Marquette were originally Indian villages.

Michigan—the land of Hiawatha; seventh in population; automakers for the world; first successful refrigerator car was made in Michigan; as well as the first traffic light; world's largest cement plant; world's largest concentration of gray-iron foundries; largest paper book mill; largest horsehide tannery; world's largest factory for making billiard tables and bowling alley equipment; insecticides, furniture, auto tires and tubes, drugs and medicines, atomic plants—two; paint.

Here's a sample—Dow Chemical at Midland, Mich., chemicals—600 buildings occupy its 4,500 acre site. World's largest producer of chlorine. This is where your aspirin tablets come from.

Michigan—farming? Ranks first in producing pie cherries; raises 95 percent of all the white pea beans; Kellogg's cereal plant uses 14 million bushels of corn a year in their products. We rank second in production of spearmint, strawberries, asparagus, plums; rank ninth in the production of corn yield—averages 26 bushels to acre. Wheat averages 38 bushels to acre, 98 percent of our Michigan farms have electricity; 75,000 people are engaged in farming. Michigan was the first State to require pasteurization of all milk sold for public marketing. Cattle ranches?—biggest one is 5,800 acres.

Michigan—mining, we have three iron-ore ranges, produces over 13 million tons a year; Copper, some mines are 9,000 to 9,500 feet deep; produce around 115,000 pounds of copper per year; salt, we have 100 different types—produces 5 million tons a year. Salt deposits are 500 feet thick in places. Sand and gravel, petroleum, stone, clay products, and natural gas. Coal, our reserves are estimated at 8 billion tons.

Michigan has everything.

Michigan.—Lumber, we have 85 varieties of trees and here is a sample. These beautiful trees are standing now:

White pine, 17 feet, 10 inches in circumference.

Tulip poplar, 16 feet 8 inches in circumference.

Black walnut, 12 feet 8 inches in circumference.

Sassafras, 11 feet, 3 inches in circumference.

Butternut, 11 feet in circumference.

Hemlock, 10 feet, 8 inches in circumference.

English walnut, 10 feet in circumference.

Red maple, 9 feet, 6 inches in circumference.

Balm of gilead, 8 feet, 3 inches in circumference.

Bigtooth aspen, 7 feet, 4 inches in circumference.

Black ash, 7 feet, 4 inches in circumference.

Shadblow, 7 feet in circumference.

More than half of Michigan's "Water Wonderland" is blanketed with cool green forests whose tree-canopied trails leads to thrilling adventure and rugged natural beauty. The white pine alone which has been cut in Michigan exceeds by 10 times the value of all the gold ever taken out of Alaska and is triple the value of all the gold found in California.

Michigan.—We have the world's busiest waterways. There is more tonnage goes through the Soo Locks at Sault Ste. Marie than the Panama, Welland, and the Manchester canals combined.

Michigan.—Detroit ranks among the top three ports in the world. When we talk about ships, we are talking about a ship that would answer these specifications: (1) Let's take the *John A. France*. It is 730 feet long and last year on one trip it cleared Detroit with 859,000 bushels of wheat in her holds—the yield of nearly 43,000 acres of land, which would fill 780 freight cars of 15 medium-sized trains.

Here is another one: (2) The *Edmund Fitzgerald* clearing last year on July 8 with 23,061 tons of metal pellets (iron ore). The *Fitzgerald's* capacity is more, but the depth of the water channels limit the load.

Michigan—vacation paradise; "Water Wonderland"; 11,037 lakes; all but 2 of Michigan's 83 counties have inland lakes. Seven counties have more than 300 lakes. Marquette County has 835 lakes in it. Average size of our 11,037 inland lakes is 67 acres; 411 of them are over 200 acres in size; 15 are over 18 square miles. Two of the big ones are Houghton Lake 31.3 square miles and Torch Lake 28.6 square miles.

Michigan—You name it vacationwise, Michigan offers it—archery, fishing, swimming, canoeing, sunbathing; yachting, picnicking, picturetaking, golf, hikes, mountain climbing, water skiing, camping, visiting historical sites, wilderness exploring in spring and summer—and hunting deer and bear, exciting college and professional football games in fall—and ice fishing, snowshoeing, tobogganing, bobcat and rabbit hunting, skating and sleigh rides in the winter.

Michigan—5 national forests with 62 picnic and camping grounds, 22 State forests, 48 modern State parks, 13 fully equipped recreation areas, 99 roadside parks, 3,500 highway picnic sites, and 156 county parks.

Michigan leads the Nation in the number of State parks and camping sites—5,200 available for your use.

This is a big State.

Michigan issues over a million fishing licenses and over one and a quarter million hunting licenses each year. We have 800,000 or more in our deer herd and just for the sake of argument, 28 different families of fish. Don't get me started.

Michigan—Education? University of Michigan, Michigan State, Wayne State, Western Michigan, Northern Michigan, Albion—all fine public and private schools.

Michigan—our State seal bears the legend, "Si Quaeris peninsulam anoenam circumspice." It means, "If you seek a pleasant peninsula, look around you," a motto written in 1835 before the State of Michigan had its upper peninsula. On the seal are the words "Tuebor" meaning "I will defend" and "E pluribus unum" which means "From many, one."

Michigan—and it's all yours—for the biggest vacation you will ever have. There is no place in the world where you and your family could spend a finer vacation.

Michigan—favored vacation land—has something for everyone. Here is an entire State uniquely favored by nature for carefree vacationers, with 3,121 miles of Great Lake shoreline, thousands of crystal-clear inland lakes and fast-running fishing streams and vast forests—all air conditioned by the surrounding blue waters of four of the Great Lakes.

So, why not come and enjoy as many of our wonderful attractions as you can and at the same time get acquainted or reacquaint yourself with all of our home office personnel here at Acme Quality Paints?

Come and see "Michigan the Beautiful"—it is so easy to reach, and so much fun when you get here.

End of the Communes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, we all know that the nations of the free world are engaged in a vital struggle to earn the respect and support of the so-called uncommitted nations. Perhaps one of the most decisive factors in this endeavor is the use of propaganda, or, in other words, the demonstration that one system works better than another. The ultimate criterion of acceptance of a way of life for the developing nations is pragmatic: "Does it work? Will it continue to work?"

Most of the developing nations are highly agrarian and are attempting to transform themselves as quickly and as effectively as possible into industrial economies. They are, therefore, quite often guided by the experiences of other nations in similar circumstances.

One such example has been that of Communist China's commune system. The communes have been praised loud and long in Communist propaganda and their avowed success has been constantly displayed to the new nations. Because the communes are easily understandable and seemingly compatible with the needs and ideologies of these new nations, the Communist Chinese advisers and technicians have flocked to those nations and have been greeted eagerly due largely to the so-called success of the communes.

Mr. Speaker, the famine and crop shortages this year in Red China, however, were too great to be kept out of the news. But until quite recently the blame was attributed to unforeseeable natural conditions, rather than to any flaws in the system itself. Such explanations, however, are distasteful to the Communists because their ideology ascribes to the inexorable workings of economics and denies any greater forces.

The truth of the matter is that the communes did not and could not work. The Red Chinese themselves have scrapped the system, an obvious admission of failure. This failure must not be allowed to go unnoticed in the free world. We here in the United States have proven that the free enterprise system can be successful, and we must do everything in our power to help these new nations provide for their citizens that which our forefathers so painstakingly won for us, freedom and opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, the importance of the failure of a Communist idea was shown in an article entitled "Total Communism Flops in Red China" in the March 27, 1961, U.S. News & World Report. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the article, as follows:

[From the U.S. News & World Report, Mar. 27, 1961]

END OF THE COMMUNES—TOTAL COMMUNISM FLOPS IN RED CHINA

HONG KONG.—China's Communist bosses have suffered a major defeat.

The rural communes, designed by Mao Tse-tung to turn China into the world's first absolute Communist state, are being downgraded to the point where they are nearly extinct. The village, traditional center of life in rural China, is coming back into its own.

The communes still exist on paper. But a series of directives issued in recent weeks shows that for all practical purposes the grandiose scheme to mobilize China's millions of peasants into a giant, disciplined labor force is going out of business.

Large-scale cultivation of fields by huge masses of men, women, and children is being abandoned. Big labor gangs working under centralized command and switching from area to area at the whim of local party bosses, are being broken up. Individual communes have lost the ownership of what the Communists call "the four fixed things"—manpower, land, animals, and implements.

Instead, each village in rural China is being organized into a "small production brigade" which will arrange its own work, control its own tools and animals, and almost certainly get a larger share of its own farm produce.

POTS, PANS GONE

Community messhalls will stay as they are. Most peasants had already been forced to give their pots and pans to the communes, and they now have nothing to cook with. Villages will continue maintaining their nurseries and kindergartens. The Communists have no intention of putting mothers back into their homes, because their labor is still needed in the fields.

But you can see the end of the huge, centrally directed communes in this: The Communist government has directed that 95 percent of all rural labor must be in "small brigades." That leaves only 5 percent of the manpower for the big production brigades and communes.

Arguments over the communes started in August 1959. By midsummer of 1960, the Communist bosses realized something was wrong. Farm production was dropping instead of increasing.

Huge irrigation and drainage canals, dug by labor brigades, had upset the water level. Indiscriminate deep plowing and close sowing ruined vast areas of farmland. Party bosses watched helplessly as production fell off.

At first the Communists tried to stave off disaster by sending millions of office workers, students, Government officials and city laborers into the countryside. Then they ordered thousands of dedicated Communists into the communes in an effort to revitalize the system. Nothing seemed to work.

The peasants were worn out by 2 years of forced labor. They were fed up with the blunders of local party hacks. There was little or no incentive to work on the land when the peasants were likely to be hauled away for emergency jobs elsewhere—at no pay.

"A GAY SIGHT, BUT"

Peasants let their farm tools rust in the rain, or broke them through careless handling. Sabotage of the system increased at a rapid pace last year. An investigation in Kwangtung Province showed it had taken 20 days to plant 7 acres of rice. A Communist newspaper reported from Hupeh that "commune members were massed together in the fields. It was a gay sight to see man next to man, foot next to foot; but the return in work done was not high."

Finally, last November, the Communists gave up. The rush to dismantle the communes got underway. Peasants were told to take up their tools and work as they had before the communes came into existence. They were told that no longer would the Government take them away from their own villages to work in labor brigades, unless their own small brigades agreed to it.

Actually, the Communists are not giving back to the peasants the freedom of the past. The party still holds a firm grip and determines what each village must produce, sets the time of delivery and sets the price the state will pay. But, by breaking up the 24,000 communes and restoring a measure of village life, the Reds are confessing, in effect, that the Chinese peasant knows best how to work his own land.

How To Get More Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, anyone interested in gold—and who is not?—should read the story told to the Mining Subcommittee of the House Interior Committee recently by Congressman HAROLD T. JOHNSON, of California.

It clearly shows, as I have often argued, that one good way to correct our troublesome international gold imbalance is to produce more gold at home. It can be done. Congressman "BIZZ" JOHNSON, who represents the Mother Lode District of California, tells how and why it should be done.

His statement relates specifically to House Joint Resolution 185, of which he is the author. It is equally pertinent to Senate Joint Resolution 44, of which I am the author with the cosponsorship of Senator CASE, of South Dakota, and Senator KUCHEL, of California. I ask unanimous consent that the statement of Congressman JOHNSON be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, OF CALIFORNIA, BEFORE MINES AND MINING SUBCOMMITTEE OF HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. Chairman, the Second Congressional District of California contains the mother lode and major California gold-producing counties which made our State famous in the days of the forty-niners. For myself and on behalf of the gold-mining industry of California, I want to express my sincere appreciation for the opportunity to be heard and discuss with you the critical conditions which exist in the gold-mining industry.

Gold was one of the first metals used by man and has been valued above all others because of its beauty, scarcity, and imperishability. It has become the standard of our world monetary systems. The search for gold has led to the settling of new lands. As I mentioned a moment ago, discovery of gold in California gave tremendous impetus to the great westward movement in our own country.

During the last half of the 19th century, the United States was the leading producer of gold in the world. Yet today it produces only 3 percent of the world's gold.

What happened to change the picture so drastically? Several things happened. The goldfields of Africa developed rapidly, and this restless nation became the world's leading producer of gold in 1905. The United States held onto second place until about 1930, when it was displaced by Canada, and then a few years later the Soviet Union became the world's second largest producer of gold, relegating this country to fourth place.

This was a relative comparison, because the U.S. production continued to climb through the years spurred by President Roosevelt's proclamation of January 31, 1934, increasing the price of gold from $20.67 to $35 per ounce. Production reached an all-time record of 4,869,949 ounces in 1940. This record was achieved even though at that time—two decades ago—profit margins had become so narrow that extremely efficient operations were required.

Gold mining became a casualty of World War II. War Production Board Order L–208 and other official restrictions denied gold-mines equipment, supplies, and manpower. Mines were closed down. When order L–208 was lifted on July 1, 1945, 2½ years of idleness had left its toll. Many of the mines had watered up. Equipment had deteriorated from lack of use, and rehabilitation required great investment. Companies with closed mines had suffered financial losses from which they never were able to recover. Higher prices for equipment, and supplies, and higher wages combined with the difficulties of recruiting efficient labor forces made former operators reluctant to reopen mines, especially when profit margins were even narrower than those existing in 1940.

During the war years of 1943–45, for the first time on record, over half of the domestic gold output was recovered from base-metal ores, and a pattern was established. Today 28 percent of our gold production still is the byproduct harvest of the base-metal industry. The Nation's second largest individual gold producer is a copper mine.

In spite of these difficulties, production staged a modest comeback from the depths of 1945 when the yield was only one-fifth of the 1940 record, until the critical year of 1947 when domestic production reached 2.1 million fine ounces. From that time on, the trend has been downward due to continuously rising costs of gold-mine operations and cutbacks in base-metal production. The production dropped to 1.7 million ounces, valued at about $58 million in 1960. This is only 3 percent greater than the 1959 production, which was the peacetime low of the century.

Mr. Chairman, we hear much of depressed industries. I think you would have to agree that the gold mining industry of the United States is one of the most depressed industries in our Nation's economy. Throughout the gold producing areas of the United States, and especially in the gold producing areas of California, the number of producers has declined steadily as more and more go out of business. Two decades ago there were 4,000 placer mines in operation in this country; by 1958 there were only 250. In 1940 there were about 5,000 lode mines; in 1958 there were only 300. World production has been following the opposite trend—upward. In 1959, alltime record yields were realized throughout the world. A total of 42.8 million ounces valued at nearly $1.5 billion was produced.

Mr. Chairman, the trends are shown by the following production chart:

Year	U.S. mine production	World production
	Fine ounces	*Fine ounces*
1945	954,572	26,100,000
1946	1,574,595	27,500,000
1947	2,109,186	28,900,000
1948	2,014,257	29,600,000
1949	1,991,783	31,000,000
1950	2,394,231	32,700,000
1951	1,980,512	33,500,000
1952	1,893,261	34,300,000
1953	1,958,293	33,700,000
1954	1,837,310	35,100,000
1955	1,880,000	36,300,000
1956	1,827,000	38,400,000
1957	1,794,000	39,600,000
1958	1,739,000	40,600,000
1959	1,604,000	42,800,000

Source: Minerals Yearbook, Department of the Interior, Bureau of Mines.

You will note that when our national production of gold started its postwar downturn, world production continued to climb. About the same time other major gold producing nations realized the seriousness of this situation and took action.

Canada, for instance, adopted a subsidy program which went into effect January 1, 1948. The immediate result was a 15-percent increase in production. Production of gold in Canada has been stable throughout the postwar years with the result that today the United States is buying nearly $275 million worth of gold annually from Canada. You will note this is five times the amount of our domestic production. United States mines could produce much of this supply if our domestic mining industry was given the opportunity.

In this country, however, the opposite approach was taken. In 1947, the Treasury Department established new regulations under the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 with a view of curbing international gold transactions by domestic producers who could receive premium prices at international free markets. This was done at the request of the International Monetary Fund, although most other major gold producing countries of the world did and still permit a limited amount of this premium business in order to meet costs of operations.

I might note here also that the International Monetary Fund, in its annual report of April 30, 1948, took a dim view of subsidies being initiated in Canada. The Fund expressed a fear that the subsidy would undermine the exchange relationships. After 12 years of operation, it appears that the Canadian program improved the Canadian balance of payment situation.

On the other hand, it would seem to me that the requirement which the United States has placed upon itself by restricting domestic production of gold to such a point that the United States must import the great preponderance of the gold it uses, has harmed the United States balance of payment situation.

I believe it would be far more appropriate to correct our balance-of-payment problems by increasing the production of domestic gold mines than by any proposal to prevent families from joining servicemen overseas, or by making more restrictive import duties on travelers returning home to the United States, or even by spending millions to attract foreign visitors to our shores.

This then is the situation the mining industry finds itself in.

I would like to emphasize that this is not the result of a reduced demand for gold. The steadily increasing amounts of gold being imported into this country are proof of this.

Gold imports to United States

Year:	*Ounces*
1955	2,930,000
1956	3,730,000
1957	7,701,000
1958	8,120,000
1959	8,485,000

Source: Minerals Yearbook, 1959.

Consumption in this country is increasing steadily. In 1959 gold used by the arts and industries increased 38 percent over the previous year, reaching a total of 2½ million ounces. This is 57 percent more than the total domestically mined production. This has been due to increased uses in the markets of jewelry, art, dental supplies and others, along with a tremendous increase in industrial use of gold.

There are ever increasing national defense and scientific uses of gold. Gold coatings on missile and aircraft sections are unequaled for reflecting infrared radiation. A gold solution sprayed on vulnerable surfaces and baked to form a thin metallic film reduces the rate of heat transfer on engine shrouds, drag-chute containers, tailcone assemblies and blast shields. A gold solution is applied to porcelain-enamel, stainless steel, fiberglass laminates, and other heat-resistant materials.

A transparent conductive film of gold deposited electrically on safety glass was developed to overcome the hazards of obstructed vision caused on occasion by fog and frost on windows in transport vehicles. Increased quantities of high-purity gold are employed in fabricating silicon transistors and diodes for use in computers, aircraft missiles, and satellites. For silicon devices, gold in alloyed with silica, antimony, germanium, and other elements. Gold plating applied to microwave vacuum tubes improves the operation of communications equipment. Radioactive gold is used as a source of heat in a thermionic converter to produce an electric current for use in space vehicles.

In view of the increasing importance of gold for scientific and defense uses, I would call to your attention once again the fact that the Soviet Union and Africa, whose political future is anything but stable, are the leading producers in the world.

If there is a demand for this precious metal, why is production steadily decreasing? An artificial price of $35 per ounce has been maintained since 1934. None of us has to be told how much the cost of operation, labor and materials has increased since 1934. Thus, the gold industry is faced with fixed prices and rising costs, with constantly declining reduction resulting. At the same time, we have had a substantial increase in the demand, due to these new industrial uses, many of them required for the defense of our Nation.

In the words of your own committee (H. Rept. No. 708, 86th Cong.; 1st sess., "Depressed Domestic Mining and Mineral Industries" p. 53):

"Whereas gold mines in some countries have been aided by subsidies, tax concessions, currency devaluation, and/or sales of their product at premium prices on the 'free market,' domestic miners have been held down to a price which brought prosperity to the industry through the 1930's but which does not reflect inflationary trends of later years."

That same report (p. 55) quotes one of the most distinguished gold mining experts from the mother lode district I represesent, L. L. Hueisdonk, of Downieville, Calif., as pointing out that the U.S. Treasury still sells gold to industrial consumers at approximately $35 per ounce whereas the cost of producing gold has increased 300 percent since that price was established.

And again, that report takes note of evidence that the $35 an ounce price—while it may have to be maintained for world monetary and economic reasons—is not realistic when it comes to the actual production of gold.

Barron's (July 6, 1959) quotes a Soviet economic journal statement that the cost of Russian gold runs to about 660 rubles per ounce. This is equivalent to $165 at the official rate of exchange, $66 at the tourist rate.

It would seem appropriate at this point to comment on what some of the other gold-producing nations are doing to keep their gold industries alive.

The nearest and most important country, of course, is Canada. The Emergency Gold Mining Assistance Act was first enacted in 1948 and has operated continuously ever since. It has been extended until 1963.

To be classified as a gold mine under the act, a mine must meet the following requirements:

1. The value of gold produced must be 70 percent or more of the total value of output of the mine.

2. The mine or operation must produce at least 50 troy ounces of gold in a designated year.

3. The cost of production, computed on all ounces of gold produced from the mine during a calendar year or less, must exceed C$26.50 per ounce.

In a designated period, e.g., a quarter, the mine must sell all its production to the mint to qualify for aid. Exporting the gold is considered the same as sale to the mint for the purposes of the act. The mine cannot both sell to the mint and to the free domestic market in the same designated period if it is to receive aid.

The formula for calculating assistance payable under the act consists of two factors: the "rate of assistance" and the "assistance ounces." The rate of assistance factor is based on the cost per ounce of gold produced while the assistance ounces factor is a specified proportion of the total ounces of gold produced.

The rate of assistance factor is determined by taking two-thirds of the amount by which the cost to produce an ounce of gold exceed C$26.50 up to a maximum of C$12.33. The number of assistance ounces factor equals two-thirds of the total ounces produced. The amount of assistance payable is calculated by multiplying the rate of assistance by the assistance ounces.

To the foregoing, the 1958 extension of the act added an extra 25 percent of the amount payable in computing the final amount to be paid. This extra 25 percent is continued in the present bill.

The Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys, Paul Comtois, says that the Canadian gold mining industry employs over 16,000 men directly in dependent communities with population in excess of 70,000 persons. In 1958 the industry expended C$106 million in salaries and wages, fuel, electric power and supplies and equipment, and produced a total of C$155 million in gold, most of which was sold to the United States.

A summary of the payments made during 1959 under this program follows:

Cost per ounce	Number of mines	Percentage of total production	Assistance payable	Assistance payable per ounce produced
A. Lode gold mines:				
$26.50 to $34	10	53.35	$3,548,901.97	$3.32
$34 to $41	12	24.45	2,776,600.43	5.69
$41 to $45	7	10.52	1,837,545.39	8.68
$45 and over	11	11.57	2,337,313.88	10.27
	40	99.89	10,500,361.67	5.26
B. Placer gold mines	2	.11	23,590.05	10.27
Total	42	100.00	10,523,951.72	5.26

Source: Department of Mines and Technical Surveys, Government of Canada, "Report on Administration of the Emergency Gold Mining Assistance Act."

Australia, whose production (1.07 million ounces in 1959) nearly equalled that of the United States in 1959 extended its Gold Mining Assistance Act for 3 more years. At the same time, the maximum assistance was raised from $7.70 an ounce to $9.10 an ounce. Gold output in the Philippines (402,600 ounces in 1959) is supported at the price of 150 pesos per ounce, equivalent to $75. In the Union of South Africa, the world's leading producer of gold, tax concessions are extended as additional amortization allowances to deep mines. The Ghana gold fields are benefitted directly through a program of financial assistance to mining companies for development of new properties and expanding operations and through a 3-year mines training course supported by the government to educate Africans in mine operation. Ghana also is reported considering a subsidy program.

Colombia, the major South American gold producer which had a 397,900 ounce yield in 1959, also has a subsidy program in effect.

In international gold production, subsidy or incentive payments are not uncommon. In fact, it appears this is the only way that production levels can be maintained.

Certainly, in our own national picture, subsidies are no strangers. In addition to the more common agricultural subsidies, there are Federal assistance programs for many industries, including transportation by air, rails and sea, and many others.

The Joint Economic Committee prepared a report on subsidy and subsidylike programs of the U.S. Government" during the 2d session of the 86th Congress. In reporting the scope of subsidies, this report included a list of the types of subsidies granted by the Federal Government. These cover seven full pages, listing everything from school lunch programs to disaster loans for small businesses.

So broad and complex is the scope of the subsidy program, that the committee report (p. 18) states "It is probably impossible to make an estimate of the total subsidy payments of the Federal Government during any single year that would receive general acceptance."

The committee did, however, attempt to make an estimate covering agriculture, business, labor, homeowners, tenants and civilian and national defense stockpiles. These added up to $7,460 million in 1960.

In the minerals subsidy review, the Joint Economic Committee listed many commodities, from aluminum to zinc. Gold was not among the minerals whose industries were receiving benefits through tax amortizations, loan guarantees, subsidy or other assistance programs.

This study concluded: "It is apparent from the foregoing discussion that, in the course of our history, the Federal Government has engaged in a great variety of subsidy and subsidylike programs. Originally they were limited substantially to assistance to transportation interests, to encourage foreign trade and domestic expansion and development; more recently subsidies have expanded to the point where few segments of our economy are completely unaffected by them. Diverse as these subsidy programs are, it is unrealistic either to condemn or to praise Federal subsidies as such. Each particular program which is determined to contain an element of subsidy must be judged independently, taking into account the economic, social, and political conditions prevailing at the time."

And in conclusion, I would like to point out an indirect subsidy we are making to the economies of foreign nations. Some of this economic assistance, I am sure, will find its way to the mining industries.

I speak now of our Public Law 480 grants to other countries. Two examples are the recently approved agreement with Brazil whereby that nation acquires some $70 million worth of grain from this country. All of the grain will be paid for in Brazilian currency and all the Brazilian cruzeiros will stay in Brazil.

Twenty percent of the $70 million—some $14 million—will be given back to the country as a direct grant for economic development. Sixty-five percent—$47,500,000—will be loaned back to Brazil for economic development.

A similar situation exists in India where $1 billion in farm commodities has been authorized for delivery. Of the $1 billion India is paying for these farm commodities, $420 million is being given to India as an economic development grant. Another $427 million is being loaned to India for similar economic development.

The cost of this gold mining incentive program, which would benefit one of our own industries, would help our own economy, would be slight compared to these tremendous and great grants and loans.

In return for our investment, this country would be aiding unemployment in reviving a badly distressed industry, would be stabilizing our own economy and would be building up our own gold reserves.

This is a statement by Congressman HAROLD T. JOHNSON supporting House Joint Resolution 185 and H.R. 6734.

Award to Alfred D. Stedman, Retired Associate Editor of the St. Paul Pioneer Press and Dispatch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently one of Minnesota's leading citizens, Mr. Alfred D. Stedman, retired associate editor of the St. Paul Pioneer Press and Dispatch, was awarded the J. S. Russell Memorial Award for superior service to agriculture.

Mr. Stedman is one of the most noted and famed reporters on the agricultural economy of the Nation. He has a fine record of accurate, objective reporting relating to American agriculture and the social and economic problems of our agricultural economy.

Minnesota is proud to claim Mr. Stedman not only as a great journalist, but above all, as a distinguished citizen.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Farm Editors Give Award to Stedman," published in the Washington Post of May 17, 1961, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARM EDITORS GIVE AWARD TO STEDMAN

The Newspaper Farm Editors Association yesterday selected Alfred D. Stedman, retired associate editor of the St. Paul Pioneer Press and Dispatch, as the first winner of the J. S. Russell Memorial Award for superior service to agriculture.

The award was established by the association, which wound up it's annual 2-day spring meeting here yesterday, as a memorial to the late J. S. Russell, first president of the group and farm editor of the Des Moines Register and Tribune.

Stedman, 68, was born near Boone, Iowa, and graduated from Hamline University. After service on the Pioneer Press and the South St. Paul Reporter, he came here in 1929 as correspondent for both papers.

In 1933, he was appointed Assistant Administrator of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, the agency that operated the New Deal farm programs. He served in the Agriculture Department until 1939.

In 1945, after a period on the board of editors of the United States News here, he returned to St. Paul as associate editor of the Pioneer Press and Dispatch, concentrating on news of agriculture.

Stedman's agricultural news reporting won honors from groups including the American Dairy Association.

Presentation of the J. S. Russell Award was made at a lunch meeting of the Farm Editors Association by James B. Hasselman, retired information chief of the Agriculture Department's Commodity Stabilization Service, and Rex Conn, farm editor of the Cedar Rapids Gazette.

President Kennedy at the Opening Game

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy inspired both young and veteran baseball fans by sticking to the finish, despite inclement weather, at the opening game of the new baseball season at Griffith Stadium on April 10.

Baseball's bible, the fine sports publication, the Sporting News, took note of the incident and the Nation's No. 1 baseball expert, J. G. Taylor Spink, publisher, penned the following editorial tribute to President Kennedy:

KENNEDY SETS FINE EXAMPLE FOR GAME

The Sporting News joins respectfully and happily in welcoming to the major leagues a 43-year-old pitcher who didn't even have to go to training camp to draw the starting assignment in Washington on opening day.

President John F. Kennedy handled the traditional inaugural ceremony with all the good humor of his predecessors, starting with William Howard Taft, and with considerably more power behind his throw than most of them displayed.

In this time of heaviest concern and almost daily crisis, baseball should be especially grateful to the Chief Executive for this annual endorsement of the part the game plays in the lives of millions of Americans.

Young, in excellent physical and mental health, and urging that his fellow citizens keep themselves in the best possible condition for the uncertain future, Kennedy sets a good example for all of us. His appearance at Griffith Stadium, April 10, was a most appropriate reminder of the sport's own new-frontier expansion which eventually will give as many cities as possible the higest caliber of baseball.

We like the way the President stuck to the finish in spite of weather which drove less stouthearted fans from the park. The old game needs that kind of perseverance in its own ranks if it is to solve its problems. It was a good day. Thank you, Mr. President.

Dr. Edward Cristy Welsh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Behind the Space Scene," published in the New York Times of May 10, 1961, relating to Mr. Edward Cristy Welsh. Mr. Welsh has performed outstanding service for Congress. For years, he was associated with the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] and is now executive secretary of the National Aeronautics and Space Council.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEHIND THE SPACE SCENE—EDWARD CRISTY WELSH

WASHINGTON, May 9.—For nearly 20 years Dr. Edward Cristy Welsh has belonged to the legion of public servants who from behind the scenes influence and direct public decisions but never receive public recognition.

The postwar reorganization of Japan's industry was largely the result of the handiwork of the 51-year-old economist, who started off as a university teacher and turned to Government service in World War II. The attacks of Senator STUART SYMINGTON of Missouri and his fellow Democrats on the defense policies of the Eisenhower administration were often based on the ideas and facts furnished by him.

Recently Dr. Welsh moved into a more open role as executive secretary of the National Aeronautics and Space Council. As the principal assistant to Vice President JOHNSON, the council chairman, he has been given the responsibility for drafting an expanded space budget, which is to accelerate the Nation's efforts in space.

As the alter ego for public officials, Dr. Welsh has two necessary attributes for any good staff assistant—a gluttony for work and an incisive mind which can digest vast amounts of material and then present it in condensed form for an official.

A slight man 5 feet 11 inches, 140 pounds, Dr. Welsh has a reservoir of energy that permits him to work up to 90 hours a week when a lively issue is boiling. As a physician told him after a recent physical examination, "You seem to be strung together with electrical wires."

In recent years, Dr. Welsh has been legislative assistant to Senator SYMINGTON—a job that has permitted him to become one of the best informed military experts on Capitol Hill.

His association with Senator SYMINGTON dates back a decade, when Mr. SYMINGTON, after resigning as Secretary of the Air Force, became Chariman of the National Security Resources Board, and hired Dr. Welsh as his assistant.

Mr. SYMINGTON took Dr. Welsh along when he moved over to become Administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and when he was elected to the Senate in 1952.

Dr. Welsh started his Government career in 1942 as regional price executive of the Office of Price Administration's headquarters in Cleveland, Ohio. After 2 years he was brought to Washington to become Director of Field Operations for Price Control and then Deputy Administrator for Price Control.

Early in 1947, at the invitation of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, he became chief of the antitrust occupation government in Japan. Among his responsibilities were the dissolution of the Japanese cartels and financial reorganization of most of Japan's major companies.

At the conclusion of his work in 1950, he was cited by General MacArthur for laying the foundation for private competitive enterprise in Japan.

Dr. Welsh, who was born in Long Valley, N.J., in 1909, began his career as a university teacher and economist. After graduating from Lafayette College in 1930, he taught at Tufts College, the University of Cincinnati and 8 years at Ohio State University, where he received his Ph. D. in economics.

It was while on the faculty of the University of Cincinnati that he met his future wife, Carolyn B. White of Cincinnati. They were married in 1935. The Welshes, who have no children, are a working team, with Mrs. Welsh serving as his secretary.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

Nineteen Hours In Wasteland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said lately about the distressing quality of television in this country. Most noteworthy, perhaps, was the speech 2 weeks ago by FCC Chairman Newton M. Minow, in which he described network programing as a "vast wasteland." It was in this address, it will be recalled, that Mr. Minow challenged the Nation's broadcasters "to sit down in front of your television sets when your station goes on the air and stay there without a book, magazine, newspaper, profit and loss sheet or rating book to distract you—and keep your eyes glued to that set until the station signs off."

It would have been difficult for Mr. Minow to come up with a more unpromising proposal and it is doubtful if even the staunchest network executive has summoned sufficient courage to accept Mr. Minow's challenge.

But I am proud to say, Mr. Speaker, that the entertainment editor of the Toledo Blade, Ray Oviatt, did have the intestinal fortitude and stamina to undertake and survive a 19-hour nonstop trip through television's wasteland.

I am also pleased to report, Mr. Speaker, that after a day or two, Mr. Oviatt recovered sufficiently to give us the following account of his grisly journey:

NINETEEN HOURS IN "WASTELAND"
(By Ray Oviatt)

I have returned, somewhat the worse for wear on my posterior, the strain on my eyes and the dulling of my senses, from a nonstop journey through that territory recently described by FCC Chairman Newton N. Minow as a "vast wasteland."

My odessy was inspired by Mr. Minow's recent challenge to the Nation's broadcasters "to sit down in front of your television set when your station goes on the air and stay there without a book, magazine, newspaper, profit and loss sheet or rating book to distract you—and keep your eyes glued to that set until the station signs off."

"You will see," he continued, "a procession of game shows, violence, audience participation shows, formula comedies about totally unbelievable families, blood and thunder, mayhem, violence, sadism, murder, western badmen, western good men, private eyes, gangsters, more violence, and cartoons. And, endlessly, commercials—many screaming, cajoling and offending. And most of all, boredom. True, you will see a few things you will enjoy. But they will be very, very few."

My 19 hours as a videonaut surveying this realm confirmed many of Mr. Minow's contentions. A more extended journey probably would bear out others, but I am not prepared to go again. Flesh, blood and family ties can stand just so much.

I began my ordeal shortly after 6 a.m. of a reasonably typical TV day, last Wednesday, with a low residue breakfast on the tray beside me. (I had attempted unsuccessfully to persuade my dietitian that I should have a filet mignon wrapped in bacon.) I staggered from my chair a few minutes after 1 a.m. the next day.

In briefing sessions, it had been decided that I should alternate between the two local channels at 2-hour intervals. This course was followed until the evening hours when the pattern of hour-long programs ending on the half hour forced certain revisions. Even so the division between the two stations was kept equal.

My equipment included a stop watch with which I attempted to keep a record of the total G's of commercial stress. This amounted to approximately 3 hours total exposure from about 8 a.m. until signoff. Prior to that time, and in some of the subsequent periods, the commercial allotments are filled with public service announcements. I might say that at no time during the day did I experience anything resembling weightlessness.

I should also point out that my clocking of the commercials was not entirely accurate. Because of prior conditioning, my impulse at the beginning of commercials was to move toward the refrigerator or the powder room rather than to punch the stop watch. However, the 3-hour total was reasonably accurate.

It was, if anything, conservative because I did not include the immense amount of time devoted to listing and displaying the prizes on the many game shows and audience participation programs. These really are commercials, too.

I encountered a relatively small amount of violence on this particular day, but of course, I missed some of the mayhem because of the arbitrary division of time between the two channels.

It was 10:45 a.m. before I saw my first fight in a 1940 movie, "The Lady in Question," and this was a relatively tame affair. Otherwise, I counted six gunshot killings, an ingenious murder attempt by helicopter on "Danger Man," and a suicide by electrocution on the Steel Hour drama, plus assorted brawls on both the action and comedy shows, including an old Abbott and Costello movie.

It should be noted, in this connection, that among the shows I missed while viewing the other channel were "Malibu Hun," "Hawaiian Eye," "Naked City," an afternoon movie which was a murder story, and the "Three Stooges," perhaps the most senselessly violent show in TV.

Also, judging from some of the previews of next week's exciting episodes, there will be plenty of corpses and beatings to come.

The TV day, I discovered, begins on a high plane with the colorcast "Continental Classroom," although how the TV students are able to absorb information on chemistry and the mathematics of probability between 6 and 7 in the morning is a mystery to me. Then comes Dave Garroway's potpourri of news, weather, conversation, informational and entertainment features on "Today."

After that I entered the kindergarten period, having fun with music with "Captain Kangaroo" and taking six giant steps into Mother Gooseland with Miss Connie on "Romper Room," followed by some inane Heckle and Jeckle cartoons interspersed, peculiarly, with messages from the Toledo Board of Education, all on channel 11.

Back on Channel 13, I came across the old celluloid hours, a 1940 movie, "Lady in Question," with Rita Hayworth and a boyish Glenn Ford, trailed by the umpteenth repeats of the Gale Storm and Bob Cummings situation comedies.

Then after the noon hour news period, I reached for my hanky to undergo the first 30 minutes of the day's soap operas, "Search for Tomorrow" and "Guiding Light." These daytime dramas are resumed later in the afternoon with "Brighter Day," "Secret Storm" and "Edge of Night."

By the end of this teary skein I was still trying to cope with the troubles of the characters in the first one. Janet, it seems, has just learned that she is about to bear a child by Dan, whom she had married after a false report that her first husband Bud had died. Bud has now reappeared and Janet is going back to him, much to the distress of her parents.

The drawn out local quiz show, "Calling With Cash," occupied a spot in the wasteland at 2. Then back on 13, "Day in Court," simulates justice in action, followed by perhaps the dreariest stretch of the day, the giveaways. These include "Seven Keys," the tear-choked "Queen for a Day," and "Who Do You Trust?" a sort of true confessional with comedy commentary by Johnny Carson.

After the 5 o'clock movie, I caught up with the simple heroics of the Lone Ranger, the news, "Death Valley Days," that western soap opera, "Wagon Train," and "Danger Man." A fairly high entertainment quotient was sustained in the Perry Como and steel hour shows. The long day ended with the news programs, a portion of a 1943 movie, "Above Suspicion," and an hour with Jack Paar in which the host stressed that the best way to avoid a hernia is keep your mouth open. Here's a man who takes his own advice.

The reaction of massive boredom which Mr. Minow predicted was certainly borne out. Likewise the stipulation that books, newspapers, and magazines be avoided became difficult to endure. I found my eyes straying longingly to the bookcase at increasingly frequent intervals. And early in the evening my resolution waned; I volunterred to take out the garbage. That was my exercise and fresh air for the day.

What effect such an experience might have on a television executive, I can only surmise. I suspect his reactions would be similar to mine. But I would guess that he might quickly find solace in his profit and loss statements and his rating charts.

Seven Years of Infamy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, on May 17, 1954, the Supreme Court of the

United States usurped the power of Congress and the right of the American people to amend the Constitution of the United States by judicial decree to provide that State and local governments no longer could administer their school systems as they saw fit. Seven years later, on May 17, 1961, the Chattanooga, Tenn., News-Free Press devoted its lead editorial to a detailed recital of the lamentable losses which the American people and constitutional Government have sustained as the result of that unconstitutional decision. It is a masterful summation of the gravest domestic crisis to confront our Nation this century and I ask unanimous consent that the full text of that editorial, entitled, "Seven Years of Infamy," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEVEN YEARS OF INFAMY

Seven years ago today—on May 17, 1954—the dark red draperies of the U.S. Supreme Court Chamber in Washington parted to admit to their seats nine appointed, never-elected Justices whose purpose it was to begin a revolution overturning the constitutional concept of American freedom and Government.

Throughout the world today, there are revolutions and counterrevolutions, marked by military force, battles, and bloodshed. In the revolution initiated 7 years ago today by the Warren court, there was no gunfire but the Constitution of the United States of America was sorely wounded.

Without constitutional justification, without amendment or law having been enacted, the Warren court established dictatorship through usurpation and issued its decree in total contradiction of constitutional and legal practice. Mocking the Declaration of Independence, which says: "Governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed," the Warren court, without consent of the governed, seized power.

In doing so, it exceeded the constitutional bounds of the judiciary, assumed the legislative powers reserved to Congress, and imposed its will by prompting illegal executive action.

This was only the beginning, these violations of articles I, II, and III of the Constitution. The Warren court infringed upon the rights of the States as preserved in the 9th and 10th amendments of the Constitution, for the court acted without delegated authority to do as it did; the 10th amendment declares: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

The Warren Court amended the Constitution by dictatorial decree in violation of the legal amending process described in article V, which requires two-thirds of both Houses of Congress or two-thirds of the State legislatures to propose amendments and three-fourths of the States to ratify them before they shall become a part of the Constitution and law.

In committing this unconstitutional abuse, the Warren Court sought to hide behind the 14th amendment, which itself was never legally promulgated or ratified. The 14h amendment was a punitive measure offered in the reconstruction period following the War Between the States. The Southern States already had ratified the 13th amendment abolishing slavery; their ratifications were considered by all to be valid, else the antislavery amendment would not have had sufficient approval for adoption. But when the Southern States rejected ratification of the 14th amendment, they were subjected to military occupation, the legal legislatures were dispersed and illegal, troop-backed rubber stamp legislatures were forced to ratify the proposed 14th amendment—illegally. In Tennessee, where there was no military occupation, the ratification was illegal because of lack of a quorum in the legislature. Furthermore, two Northern States rescinded their ratifications, but were counted just the same. Even if the 14th amendment were legal, it does not provide grounds for the May 17, 1954, ruling. Those who supported the 14th amendment maintained segregated schools in Northern States, and established them in the District of Columbia, and for more than half a century the courts upheld the separate but equal doctrine.

The Warren Court turned away from the Constitution and chose as its authority the nonlegal theories of sociologists, including one Gunnar Myrdal, a Swedish Socialist, who has expressed contempt for the Constitution of the United States.

The Warren Court opinion has been unconstitutionally proclaimed the "law of the land," in violation of article IV, section 2, of the Constitution, which says the law of the land is not a court decree, but "this Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States."

This then was to be worse. President Eisenhower sent an army of occupation down on Little Rock to enforce the unconstitutional Warren court action by his own violation of the Constitution's article IV, section 4, which prohibits his improper use of military force.

Then came violation of the Constitution by Congress in the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960. They attacked the protection against double jeopardy, denied trial by jury, allowed trial outside the State of alleged violation, interfered in elections, seized power delegated to the States, permitted prosecution on testimony taken without allowing the accused to face their accusers, established means for potential election rigging, promoted lawsuits—these in contradiction of the Constitution's 5th amendment, 6th amendment, 9th amendment, 10th amendment, 11th amendment, and articles I, II, and III.

The Warren court's violation of the Constitution, Presidential violation and congressional violation have brought about some forced integration in Southern States—3,500 Negroes attend white schools in Texas, 342 in Tennessee, 208 in Virginia, 16,329 in Kentucky, 113 in Arkansas, 82 in North Carolina, 27 in Florida, and 4 in Louisiana.

But the price has been a shredding and defilement of the Constitution of the United States, the imposition of illegal might over constitutional right, the establishment of disregard for constitutional processes and the erection of a precedent that threatens all constitutional protections of liberty.

If the Constitution can be violated for one purpose, it may be for any purpose. But no end justifies an unconstitutional means.

Thus today, we note 7 years of unconstitutional infamy.

Hypocrisy on the Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Hypocrisy on the Schools," published in the Wall Street Journal of May 19.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HYPOCRISY ON THE SCHOOLS

We hear a great deal these days about the Nation's unmet needs that only massive Federal spending can remedy. And we hear especially of the alleged needs of education; a $2.5 billion Federal aid program is now gliding through Congress on promises of what Washington will do for the schools and the people. But unmentioned is what the people have been doing for themselves and their schools.

Ten years ago, the American people were spending about $6 billion a year on education which was a lot of money but not enough in the view of many. They were paying teachers an average salary of $3,126; again, some thought the figure was too low to attract talented personnel. The Commissioner of Education argued that school construction was proceeding at a rate that would fall 370,000 classrooms short of meeting the need in 1954. Another gloomy guess, by the chairman of the Senate Education Committee, put the Nation's classroom shortage at an alarming 600,000 by 1958.

But what did the people actually do about their school problems in the absence of Federal aid?

Well, while school enrollment was increasing 44 percent from 1951 to 1961, school expenditures increased 153 percent—to an estimated $16.4 billion in 1961. The National Education Association (NEA), a main force behind Federal aid for teachers' salaries, found that without a cent of Federal money salaries had jumped 74 percent over the decade, to an average of $5,389. In the meantime, the Nation's average per capita income was rising 30 percent.

What about the 600,000-classroom shortage forecast for 1958? By 1959, according to the generous estimate of the U.S. Office of Education, the shortage amounted to about 132,000 classrooms. To clean up that alleged backlog and meet future needs, the Federal agency called for 61,000 classrooms a year to be built during the sixties. But when the call went out from Washington classrooms were already being built at a rate of 68,000 a year—which would produce a classroom surplus rather than a shortage.

Moreover, figures on enrollment indicate that the worst of the schools' population explosion is over. Enrollment leapt by 44 percent during the decade of the fifties; in the coming 10 years, enrollment is expected to increase by about 20 percent. Yet while the additional influx of children will be half that of 1951–61, the level of community effort continues to rise. During 1960–61, reports the NEA, school construction hit a record high of more than $3 billion in capital outlay.

Were the States and localities wrung dry by these herculean labors, as proponents of Federal aid insist? Hardly. Only 237 of the Nation's 40,000 school districts—or one-half of 1 percent of the total—were found to be "borrowed up" in a 1959 survey by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

A broad margin remains for State and local school financing. Some States are entirely free of debt; the total indebtedness of State and local Governments is about $62 billion. In striking contrast, the Federal Government which would support them has present and accruing liabilities of some $750 billion.

We don't suggest that every community has all the classroom space it might wish or require. Or that teachers' salaries are as high as everyone would like. But scattered local school needs do not amount to an un-

met need of the entire Nation, save in the imaginations of Federal aid enthusiasts.

Let them make a straightforward argument for Federal control of education, if they will. But let us have an end to hypocrisy about a nonexistent need.

Infiltration of Youth Organizations a Major Objective of the Communist Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, in testimony just released by the House Appropriations Committee, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover has warned that infiltration of youth organizations is one of the major objectives of the Communist Party today.

Parents, educators, clergymen—all who work with youth—and the youth themselves, should take careful note of this warning. Hoover's statement is not the only evidence that Communists are now making a concerted drive to win youth to their cause or dupe them into aiding it.

When representatives of 81 Communist Parties met in Moscow last November, work among youth was stressed as a most important phase of Communist activity. Khrushchev himself reminded Communists in all parts of the world of this in a major speech delivered on January 6. He said in this speech:

> Young people can be a powerful revolutionary force. No political party can so attract the youth as the Communists—the most revolutionary of all parties, and the youth delight in revolutionary action.

At its last convention in December 1959 the U.S. Communist Party adopted a resolution on youth activity which declared that "the youth membership of our party is growing faster than any other section, multiplying in some areas as much as tenfold in the past 2 years."

The same resolution stated:

> Truly, youth represents the future of the party * * * to work among youth is to work for the future.

Party members were told in the resolution that they were to give first attention to infiltrating existing youth organizations. They were informed that the party must begin laying the groundwork for the formation in the near future of a national Marxist youth organization. As you perhaps know, a preparatory conference for establishing such a group was held in Chicago at the end of last December.

This is a challenge to our youth and to all American adults as well. The true nature and history of communism—and of our own country—must be shown to our youth. Then they will not fall for the sugar-coated poison of Moscow.

Mr. Hoover testified that he saw a very healthy sign in the fact that some young people are beginning to realize that communism is not all it has been portrayed to be. We must make this more than a sign. We must make it a fact known to all young Americans.

This is the challenge the American people face today.

Retraining of Workers Displaced by Automation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I have organized a number of Indiana college and university professors into the Indiana Academic Advisory Council. This group has volunteered to serve as an advisory group, doing research and proposing ideas that can be useful to the Nation.

This council has been active on an individual basis for some time, but the first group meeting was held last Saturday, in Indianapolis, Ind. An article in the Indianapolis Times of Sunday, May 21, 1961, by Walter Spencer, summarizes the meeting, its purposes and some of the recommendations made by the group.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATORS SOUND OFF FOR HARTKE
(By Walter Spencer)

A panel of Hoosier college professors yesterday recommended that Congress enact a civilian GI bill to retrain workers edged out of jobs by automation.

The proposal was included in a group of recommendations on national economy, education, and foreign affairs made by 28 Hoosier college faculty members meeting in a brain trust session called by Senator R. VANCE HARTKE, (Democrat, Evansville), at the ISTA building.

Other proposals included:

Federal aid to education for areas which can't pay for adequate school facilities and Federal "leadership and stimulation" for States which can pay their own school bills but don't.

Provide aid to raise teachers' salaries before spending Government aid on classroom construction.

Expand National Defense Education Act program of student loans beyond present limits of science and foreign language studies.

Set up an advisory committee "similar to the Federal Reserve Board" to study and guide policy on national education problems.

Promote adult education programs necessary to educate older citizens "because of the increasing intellectual upgrading of our society."

Continue to fight Red China's admission to the United Nations, "but plan some sort of two-China program in advance, in case admission becomes inevitable."

Rely more on the Security Council for U.S. dealings in the U.N., rather than on the General Assembly.

Prod Great Britain into taking "more interest" in European economy.

The educators also said:

United States must remain an open market for world trade to maintain its position as a world leader.

Indiana's tax structure must be reformed so that adequate State aid to education can be provided, or "Federal aid will become a necessity."

Tax exemption to parents of college students is not particularly good because it "doesn't provide help for needy parents, since they aren't paying much taxes anyway."

Educators should spend much more time in research to find the real value of educational television before using it widely in schools.

Disarmament is an ultimate essential, but will not be feasible until other world powers agree to an open inspection system.

The United States must be willing to recognize the neutrality of many foreign nations, and cannot support foreign regimes simply because they are pro-American.

The educators split on whether to provide mass aid programs for unemployment victims, but agreed present unemployment statistics are extraordinarily inadequate.

"Unemployment is an inevitable consequence of progress in our scientific revolution and will have a growing impact on political, sociological, and economic problems. Steps should be taken now to retrain workers who are in jobs becoming outmoded," Warren Shearer, head of the economics and social studies department at Wabash College, said.

Shearer noted that jobs are falling off in industries which make products. "Workers will have to be trained for service jobs. Interest should be stimulated particularly in public service work—teachers, doctors, police, and firemen," Shearer said.

The college instructors met in a 6-hour session.

They were invited by HARTKE, after his staff wrote to presidents of all State colleges asking for the names of top intellectuals in the schools to participate in a seminar on national problems.

HARTKE said he had worked on the program for more than 9 months.

"This is definitely not meant to be a political action group, but an outlet so that our State's intellectuals can make their opinions heard," HARTKE said.

Another session will be scheduled in September or October, with discussion of specific Government legislation, HARTKE said. He said "more than 50 papers" on national problems have been sent to him by the college professors since last fall.

Address by Carl Fenichel, Ed. D., at Annual Luncheon of the League School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH L. CAREY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

ADDRESS BY CARL FENICHEL, ED. D., DIRECTOR OF THE LEAGUE SCHOOL FOR SERIOUSLY DISTURBED CHILDREN, AT THE ANNUAL LUNCHEON OF THE LEAGUE SCHOOL, SATURDAY, APRIL 29, 1961, GRAND BALLROOM, HOTEL PIERRE

A few weeks ago, on the morning of April 12, a man was rocketed into outer space,

orbiting our earth in less than an hour and a half. On that same morning, a few hours later, another journey took place, one that made no headlines and had meaning for no one except a boy named Jeff, his family, and a few of us at the League School.

At 9:20 a.m. on the day the road to the planets was opened, our mentally ill teenage boy ventured out alone for the first time in his life into a world as strange and frightening to him as the dark infinity of outer space. Jeff was taking his first walk, alone and unescorted, from the League School to the Children's Museum three blocks away, where his teacher waited to give him a hero's welcome at 9:27 a.m. It is the less than spectacular, earthbound journey of Jeff that has meaning for us here today as we join in tribute to a school and an idea that took shape and substance 8 years ago.

The League School was born in a decade that saw the "have-not" people of half the world awakening and demanding that they be allowed to enter the 20th century. During these 8 years we at the League School have been concerned with another world of "have-nots," the mentally ill children who live in the shadows on the edge of life, and who, by being excluded from the community and the schools, were being denied their chance to live in the 20th century.

On the cover of our Luncheon Journal is a line of poetry which truly characterizes the mentally ill child:

"A stranger and afraid
In a world I never made"

Mankind has always distrusted and excluded the stranger within our gates—particularly the deviant, the atypical, the abnormal, whose strange behavior sets him apart—the human being who disturbs us because he is disturbed.

Down through the ages, the victims of mental illness have been exiled, lashed, shackled, and storaged away, far from our consciousness and our conscience. Always they have been despised and disposed of; always they met torture rather than treatment.

While the past still holds its tyranny over us, we are beginning to shake off some of the fear, superstition, shame, and cruelty that still cling to mental illness. New concepts and new drugs are helping to remove the straitjackets that had replaced the chains, and are opening the locked wards of mental hospitals that once were asylums and dungeons.

On our dais are some of the leaders who are helping to change the climate of mental illness in our State and city; outstanding psychiatrists like Dr. Paul Hoch and Dr. Lauretta Bender, who are converting State hospitals from cold storage bins to warm treatment centers; Mr. Hyman Forstenzer, who played a key role in drawing up and in carrying out the pioneering New York State Community Mental Health Services Act of 1954 under which local communities are beginning to assume their rightful and long overdue responsibility for the mentally ill; and Dr. Marvin Perkins, under whose leadership the New York City Community Mental Health Board is improving and expanding community resources and services for the mentally sick.

It was Victor Hugo who said, "There is a power mightier than the armies of men; it is an idea whose time had come." The opening of the League School in 1953 marked the beginning of a new idea whose time had come. Up to that time, the State hospitals were accepted by parents as the last and only resort for most mentally sick children. The reason was obvious; there was no other place to go. All of us recognize that education is probably the most significant life experience of the child and that in today's complex world it is a must for survival.

And yet every community has been compounding and perpetuating the disabilities of mentally ill children by barring them from public schools as uneducable and from clinics as untreatable.

The League School began with the idea that a State hospital is not the only place that could help a mentally sick child. It was a belief that swept away legend and tradition by starting a new kind of treatment facility, one that didn't involve the critical surgery of separating child and family. The League School marked the first attempt to keep deeply disturbed children in the community by substituting the day school and the home for the State hospital.

Each year there comes this moment of appraisal when we go back to the beginning and recount our trials and our triumphs. Like any pioneering project suffering from lack of community support and recognition, we have had to meet the familiar specter of debts, loans, and mortgages in a stubborn struggle to keep our doors open and our idea alive. Actual survival was often at stake. And yet a small band of parents and a tiny force of others, filled with a tremendous sense of purpose and of being part of something new, helped carry us from the small brownstone house where we started with 2 children, a staff of 3, and a budget of $19,000 to our present 3-story building filled beyond capacity with 48 children, a staff of 30, and a budget of more than $150,000.

No one measures the true scale or dimensions of the League School by the area of its building, the size of its budget or the number of children on its register. It is by our example and not by our size that we have become known and judged. With each passing year the school's historical role becomes more evident. Today our day school idea has won professional and community acceptance as a new and vitally important facility in a wide network of services for mentally ill children. We are proud to announce that the value of the day treatment school as an important rehabilitation facility was given official recognition 3 months ago when the regulations on community mental health services were amended, making day treatment services like the League School eligible for State aid, along with hospitals and clinics.

The opening of day schools and day hospitals for the mentally ill is bringing home a few simple truths. We are learning that quarantining the mentally sick from society, while often necessary, is not the best way to resocialize and restore them to society. We are finding out that much of the disability of mental illness is not part of the illness but is the result of the isolated way of life imposed by society on the mentally sick.

Even more significant than our pioneering day school role has been our faith and our belief in the worth of every mentally ill child, no matter how sick. The sad and shocking fact is that most professionals in the mental health field, convinced of the hopelessness and incurability of serious mental illness, have become prisoners of their own pessimism and have shied away from working with those who need it most. About 1 month ago, on March 24, the Joint Commission on Mental Illness, appointed by Congress in 1955, released its long awaited report. Among many other things that the report pointed up was the fact that most psychiatrists and clinics devote most, if not all, of their time to the minor and more easily treatable forms of mental illness and ignore those suffering from serious mental sickness and psychoses. In striking contrast, the League School has won wide and warm respect and admiration for its unique policy of accepting seriously disturbed children who have been turned down by every school, agency, and institution except the State hospitals.

There are many who questioned the wisdom of our policy. We were advised by some professionals and administrators that ours was too costly a program for children with so grim a prognosis. It was suggested that we could win more public support and acceptance by concentrating on the less disturbed where the chances for improvement were surer and faster. All this is undeniably true if our program is to be judged by the standards of the marketplace: low-prices, small overhead and fast turnover.

We prefer to invest each child at our school with significance and dignity—no matter how poor the prognosis and how high the price. We see our children not as a collection of strange specimens, statistics or symptoms found in a medical journal or filed in a steel cabinet—but as members of the human race suffering from an illness that stunts, twists, and cripples the mind of every child who suffers from it—an illness diagnosed by most psychiatrists as childhood schizophrenia.

Anyone observing our children will recognize that while they all suffer supposedly from the same illness, each is a unique individual with every possible variation and extreme in behavior, intelligence, and level of functioning.

At our school are the mute, the silent, and the speechless who have never given voice to any of the joys, curiosity, longings, or needs of childhood except for an occasional cry or signal of distress. Others talk glibly, fluently, and endlessly. Some just mutter to themselves. Others who once had speech, now just echo empty, monotonous phrases or babble like babies.

Among our children are the nimble-fingered and the fumblers, the sure-footed and the stumblers, the slow and listless and the quick and intense. There are the timid and gentle ones who stare into empty space oblivious to everyone and everything, the agitated ones who spin or whirl aimlessly, and the frantic ones who flare up in tantrums of explosive agony.

There are the withdrawn and the isolated who hide or recoil from all human contact, and those who try desperately to cling to any and all for total support. There are the poorly endowed who function like helpless, retarded infants, and others with surprising skills and talents scattered and mixed with glaring deficits and weaknesses—children who reveal a strange imbalance of intact intelligence and maturity in some areas and defective functioning and regression in others.

At our school is a dedicated staff of people who live and work with the painful isolation, the anxiety, and the terrible confusion of these children. Dedication, however, is a poor substitute for knowledge. The fact is that we are working with an illness that can't be heard through a stethoscope or seen through a test tube, an illness involving the most inaccessible and elusive thing in all the world—the human mind.

Unfortunately, so much of what passes as scientific knowledge in our field is folklore, fiction, and fantasy, disguised and accepted as formula and fact. The sad truth is that we know very little about childhood schizophrenia and even less about why and how it happens. We still don't know what part of it is structural, constitutional, psychological, or organic in origin, or how much of it is an accident of chromosomes, glands, metabolism, chemistry, prenatal injury, or a hundred and one interacting forces about which we know so woefully little.

What we need now are massive doses of new facts, new insights, new approaches and techniques in the fields of psychiatry, genetics, neurology, biochemistry, psychology, and education that will bring new answers and solutions to the mysteries of mental illness.

Among the research projects launched at the school during World Mental Health Year 1960 was one which is approximately

international in scope. It involves the first study of the chomosomes of schizophrenic children. Each month, skin biopsies taken from selected children at the school by Dr. Nichtern, the school's psychiatric director, are flown to Sweden for intensive study at the Institute for Medical Genetics at Uppsala, Sweden, under the direction of Dr. Böök.

Dr. Böök, director of the institute, and one of the world's great geneticists, has been among the scores of outstanding visitors who come to the school each year from every part of the United States, Canada, South America, and Europe. Like so many of our visitors, he sees the league school as a potential gold mine for research.

We at the school try to convert into practice the best that can be generated by research and experience. However, even the best theory or technique must be held tentatively and tested constantly, for we must never allow ourselves the domination of dogma or certainty. We realize only too well that whenever any idea or technique stops growing, it starts dying.

Unfortunately, there is still a very influential number of experts in our field who have won their reputation on the theory that if you aren't sure why something happens to a child, blame it on his mama and papa. This theory notwithstanding, the fact remains that mental illness can strike any family. It has hit good, warm, loving parents and has exempted cold, hostile, rejecting ones. It has no respect for wealth, geography, race, or class. It is as impartial as mumps or measles and as unpredictable as April weather.

We at the league school realize that there are no quick remedies, no slick solutions and, as yet, no cure for childhood schizophrenia. But we do know that we can reach and teach many of these children, reduce much of their disability and help them live more effective and productive lives. Unfortunately, we know also that even with the most sympathetic understanding and sensitive handling our therapeutic skills and tools are neither adequate nor precise enough to help every child.

Too often we meet with failure and with the frustration and uncertainty that come from not knowing why we failed. This year, despite our all-out effort, there were seven children at the school who failed to make any progress.

Our days are never marked with the excitement of miracle cures or spectacular growth, but with a single mission and a fervent hope that we can some day reach and touch the lives of each of our children. At the school is a staff of people who never stop trying to make a child's hands, fingers, eyes, and ears do things they never did before; a staff that is forever working to nurture and build some interest, strength or skill—no matter how small—that can bring a little more meaning to a most meaningless existence.

We live for those small breakthroughs when a child, locked in his own lonely world, begins to find new awareness and sudden wonder in the world around him: the sight of falling snow, the sound of wind, the feel of rain, the face of another child; or when a child slowly emerges from the shadows and begins to make contact and manipulate a fragment of the outside world—toying with blocks, stringing beads, dabbling in finger paints, washing a doll or rolling a ball.

Each year we gain heart and hope watching these small triumphs grow bigger: the once frightened and withdrawn children who now find safety in people they once feared; the frantic and agitated ones who are beginning to find the peace and comfort of controlling their own bodies; the once completely dependent and helpless ones, now proud of their new-found capacity to feed, toilet, dress, and manage themselves.

Each year there is the deep satisfaction that comes from the lessening of anxiety and the growing appetite for life of children who once sought refuge from life and who now find pleasure in the give and take of playing with others, skating, swimming, joining the school's stamp club, putting on an Easter play, exploring the neighborhood and the city, children who are taking their first strides toward coping with our world and finding it good.

And then there is that deep personal and professional gratification that comes from watching the mind of a child begin to come alive and grow as the wonder of symbols and words and the magic of books and academic learning begin to open up.

At last year's luncheon I told of the 16 children at the school who were reading. This year we have 24 children, once labeled "uneducable," who are reading and doing some form of academic work.

Since last year's luncheon, four more of our children have made sufficient progress to graduate from our school; two of them are now in Brooklyn public schools; one in a Nassau County public school and one in a good private school in Queens. These are some of the more heartening achievements that give us the reward of fulfillment and help us live through the heartbreak and the humility of failure.

And now I want to express our gratitude to all who helped make this possible—to the National Institute of Mental Health, the New York State Department of Mental Hygiene, the New York City Community Mental Health Board, to our staff and parents, to the National Organization for Mentally Ill Children and the many other wonderful organizations and individuals, some of whom are listed on our honor roll, all of whom are listed in our heart.

With your continued support we can go on with the unfinished business that is still before us. The grim arithmetic of 17 million Americans, including the countless number of children and adolescents, who suffer from some form of mental illness, is too staggering a statistic to be swept out of our mind and hidden under the rug.

We must give mental illness the same power and urgency we give our space program if we honestly believe that the mind of a child is as precious as the mechanism of a missile.

Outside, sitting and waiting for us, are the mentally ill children who have been cast out of life. What we do to help them find their way back will be the test and measure of our conscience and our humanity.

Sale of Surplus Cotton Owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BASIL L. WHITENER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, our distinguished majority leader, has introduced a bill, H.R. 6783, to provide for the sale of surplus cotton owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation at such prices as the Secretary of Agriculture may determine in order to allow the U.S. cotton textile industry to regain the level of exports of cotton products during the period 1947–52.

This bill, if enacted, will do much to alleviate the distressing situation existing in the textile industry by reason of the so-called two-price cotton system which prevails today. The principle of the bill is in line with the 7-point program announced recently by the President for the relief of the textile industry.

The bill deserves the support of every Member of the House who is interested in protecting the jobs of the people who are employed in this country in the great textile industry. Mr. MCCORMACK has had correspondence recently with the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Commerce with respect to his measure. With the thought that my colleagues in the House might like to read the correspondence he has had with these officials I request that a copy of a letter from Mr. MCCORMACK to the Secretary of Commerce, dated May 15, 1961, and the reply thereto from the Secretary dated May 19, 1961, be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with a copy of Mr. MCCORMACK's letter of May 23, 1961, to the Secretary of Agriculture:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER,
Washington, D.C., May 15, 1961.

Hon. LUTHER H. HODGES,
Secretary of Commerce,
Department of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY HODGES: I noted in the newspaper recently that President Kennedy is taking steps to try and meet the problems of the textile industry of our country, and that in connection with the same he has appointed a Cabinet Committee, of which you are the chairman. From the newspaper item that I read, this committee has suggested to the President a program of assistance to this industry and is giving further consideration to this important matter.

Several years ago I introduced a bill which I thought was a fair one, but with reference to which no action was taken. I have again introduced the bill, H.R. 6783, a copy of which I herewith enclose, which touches one phase only of the problem in the field of textiles, but which I consider to be an important one. I think the passage of this bill would be of material help to the textile industry. I have always felt that it was a fair one.

I am respectfully forwarding the within copy of the bill that I have introduced for the information of yourself and your associates on the committee. I have written to Chairman COOLEY of the House committee, urging early and favorable action. I think that he and the members of the committee are waiting to find out what legislation will be recommenedd by the committee of which you are chairman. I think the within bill should receive favorable consideration by you and the other members of your committee

With kind regards, I am.
Sincerely yours,
JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MCCORMACK: Thank you so much for your good letter of May 15, 1961, about your bill to provide for the sale of surplus cotton owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation at such prices as the Secretary of Agriculture may determine to allow the U.S. cotton textile industry to regain the level of exports of cotton products during the period 1947–52.

This is a most interesting bill, indeed, and is along similar lines to the thinking which

the President's Textile Committee has had.

As you know, this committee made a verbal report to the President and based on it, the President announced a seven-point program. One of these points was for the Secretary of Agriculture to advise him with respect to the elimination of the so-called two-price cotton system. The textile industry should not be discriminated against by paying higher prices for cotton than that at which foreign importers of cotton are permitted to buy.

We are now waiting a report on this matter from the Secretary of Agriculture, which I hope will be forthcoming shortly. As soon as it is, I will be happy to advise you.

Obviously, legislation will be necessary to change this two-price system.

Thank you so much for your fine cooperation in this matter which is so important to one of our vital national industries.

With kind regards,

Sincerely yours,

LUTHER H. HODGES.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER,
Washington, D.C., May 23, 1961.

Hon. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
U.S. Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY FREEMAN: Under date of May 15 I wrote to Secretary Hodges in relation to H.R. 6783, which I have introduced, copy of which I herewith enclose. My letter to Secretary Hodges (in connection with this bill) will also constitute a part of this letter to you in conveying to you my thoughts in connection with such proposed legislation. You will note that this bill is nothing new in my mind; I introduced a similar bill several years ago.

Under date of May 19 I received a letter from Secretary Hodges in which he says, in part, "This is a most interesting bill, indeed, and is along similar lines to the thinking which the President's Textile Committee has had."

Secretary Hodges also said, in connection with the President's announced 7-point program, "One of these points was for the Secretary of Agriculture to advise him with respect to the elimination of the so-called two-price cotton system. The textile industry should not be discriminated against by paying higher prices for cotton than that at which foreign importers of cotton are permitted to buy."

Secretary Hodges further said in his communication of May 19, "We are now awaiting a report on this matter from the Secretary of Agriculture, which I hope will be forthcoming shortly. As soon as it is, I will be happy to advise you. Obviously, legislation will be necessary to change this two-price system."

I sincerely hope that action on this matter, particularly in connection with H.R. 6783, will be rapid and that you will quickly make a report to the committee on my bill.

With kind regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

The Fear of Woozles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an address entitled "The Fear of Woozles" delivered by Prof. Robert W. Tufts of Oberlin College, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The address was delivered this spring to the students and faculty of Oberlin College. It is an appealing, perceptive, and humorous discussion of some of the problems of scholarly research. Professor Tufts, formerly a member of the policy planning staff of the State Department, and an outstanding authority on economics, is serving with distinction as the chief consultant to our Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FEAR OF WOOZLES

One bright winter's day when the snow lay fresh on the ground, Winnie the Pooh discovered some tracks. He was walking round and round an old beech tree at the time. After Piglet joined Pooh's peregrinations, the number and variety of tracks alarmingly increased. As Christopher Robin pointed out, but not until Pooh and especially Piglet had had a good scare, the tracks were their own.

Analyzing this episode, we note that Pooh made a genuine discovery: There really were tracks. Next, that Pooh misinterpreted his data: The tracks were not the tracks of a Woozle. Thirdly, that to the best of the ability of a Bear of Very Little Brain, Pooh published his results: The whole woods soon was alarmed about the Woozle. We note, lastly, that a scholarly person was needed to set things straight: Christopher Robin quieted the company by correctly reading the evidence.

The spoor of the Woozle is heavy in the grooves of Academe. Our precincts resound with reports of useless discoveries. Scholarly detectives by the dozen would be needed to separate the useful from the useless clues to the whereabouts of understanding.

This state of affairs is not new. In an amusing but serious article a former editor of science recalls the sober announcement in 1935 of the formation of the American Institute for Useless Research. The institute, serving the needs of physics, was to publish a journal called Refuse of Modern Physics. The German edition was to be known as Makeshift fur Physik, the French, deliciously, as Comptes Fondues.

For some time I have been thinking along similar but more ambitious lines. An interdisciplinary journal of useless findings, or Woozles, would meet an important need. I propose to call it the Compendium of Woozles, or more familiarly, in our modern manner, C-O-W. It will be sponsored by a Council of Useless Discoveries, or C-U-D.

C-O-W's function will be to bring all research of little or no interest between two covers, thus helping us to ignore it. An editorial innovation, long overdue in this age when everything must be quantified, will be the indication of an article's exact weight in the table of contents. What Kinsey has done for sex, we will do for scholarship. Instead of referring loosely to an article of some weight, C-O-W will enable us to speak precisely of Dr. C's 2-ounce rejoinder to Dr. B's 1-ounce comment on Dr. A's 3-ounce article on "The Construction of a Construction Index for Waterloo, Iowa: Some Methodological Notes."

Unfortunately, I am only half joking. The flood of trivial publications threatens to undermine the foundations of serious research. Lincoln once remarked of a man that whenever he opened his mouth, he subtracted from the sum total of human knowledge. The excesses of scholarly publication today threaten to accomplish the same result. The specialist has been ridiculed as someone who knows more and more about less and less. I would raise the question whether he may not merely know less and less. Judging from the apparent role of the CIA in the Cuban fiasco, it might be necessary to introduced the minus sign to measure the contribution of intelligence experts. Might this be because of overspecialization?

The scholar who tries to keep up with current work in his discipline faces an impossible task. A recent issue of the American Economic Review, the leading American quarterly in its field, listed 218 new books on economics. My long division indicates that it had been receiving 2½ books on an average day. One of these books, by the way, was a 474-page bibliography of works on economics published in the year 1958. The same issue of the AER contained advertisements of 40 economic journals. A quick check indicates that there are at least as many more which were not advertised. A new issue of some economic periodical could arrive every day in the year (Sundays mercifully excepted so that we may read the 492 pages of the New York Times.

No one in his right mind, of course, would try to read everything published on economics or any other subject. Instead, like the Romans, scholars have tried to divide and rule. The effort is self-defeating. The more we specialize, the easier it becomes to expose one's self in print, with little danger of being cited for indecent exposure. Almost anything can be accomplished, if one tries, and hardly anyone will notice that one had little or nothing to say. Few people are more surprised at an affirmative answer than the author who inquires, with faint self-deprecation, whether you have seen his piece in "The Economics of the Compost Pile" in the Middle Atlantic Review of Bioeconomics. And when he adds, a little archly, "I said all I have to say on the subject in that piece," he really does not expect you to read the reprint he will send you in the next mail. On the contrary, he is usually counting on you not to.

One suspects, indeed, that the purpose of the press is more to impress one's colleagues than to express one's findings. The law of publish-or-perish has led to a kind of academic Darwinism, or survival of the wordiest. When one is asked these days what one is working on, it is taken for granted by both questioner and questioned that the words "working on" refer to writing. It would be almost unthinkable to reply that one is reading.

There is, I should quickly add, at least one inescapable reason for the rising tide of publication. About one-third of all the people who have ever lived are alive today and about 90 percent of all the scientists who have ever lived and worked are alive and working today. Probably much the same is true of the social sciences and the humanities. The quantity of research turned out presumably bears some relation to the number of researchers at work.

If so, there is all the more compelling need to set and maintain high standards in writing and reading. Otherwise Gresham's law may be found to apply to scholarship, with bad research driving out good in the marketplace of ideas.

I am concerned about this and you should be, too. We face the danger of an increase in information and a simultaneous decrease in understanding. If you are one of the lucky and lonely ones, a person with an original mind and creative power, a time will come, perhaps very soon, when you should write, not only to share your insights with others but also to gain new insights through the disciplined and imaginative ordering of your old ones. If your standards are as high as they should be, most of your work should be entrusted to a trunk in the attic, not to a printing press.

Over the past 2 years I have been working as a part-time consultant to a Senate subcommittee. We have been studying the

policymaking process in the executive branch of our Government and trying to make recommendations for its improvement. (There is still room for improvement.) I am pleased with the quality of the subcommittee's work. I am equally pleased with its brevity, and believe that the two are related. In 2 years, two professionals and a part-time consultant (and here I slightly exaggerate) have produced 40 printed pages, or a page every 18 days. Our approach was to read everything that had been written on the subject and to interview everyone who had knowledge of the process as a result of personal participation in it at a high level. After long reflection and discussion, we reached tentative conclusions and checked them with persons who had impressed us by their understanding and perceptiveness. To the extent that we have made a contribution, it is because we took our time, placing emphasis on understanding, not on rushing into print.

Most of us should, I think, read more, and read more carefully, and write less, also more carefully. As a wise politician once said to me of an overly articulate colleague, "You don't learn anything with your mouth open," or I would add, with your pencil put too quickly to paper.

My hope for you who are about to graduate is that you have learned the joy and the craft of reading. To read well is hard but rewarding work. Mixed with walking, new ideas may rattle around in your head and shake down into some pattern of understanding.

Above all, do not restrict your diet to your specialty, whatever it is. The seeker after understanding is, first of all, a powerful, lively, sensitive, joyous, voracious, and catholic reader. The ideas that may light your way are to be found in the least expected places. You are looking—if you are looking for understanding—for a whole larger than, and different from, any of its parts. And you will fully understand any one part only as you approach an understanding of the whole.

As some of you know, I am deeply interested in international affairs. In few, if any other, fields of scholarly research and publication is the ratio of sense to nonesense so discouragingly low. Over and over again we rediscover, in the harsh light of experience, a principle that has been buried, out of sight and out of mind, under layers of wishful thinking.

In the past 15 years the documents on disarmament published by the United Nations make a stack at least 5 feet high. In addition, there is a mountain of private and official papers, documents, reports, and books. Surely no one has read them all. The careful prospector, searching in the slag heaps of useless research by writers ignorant of history and politics, may find a few nuggets here and there. Now the nuclear physicists, full of guilt and good will, too confident that a man who can build a fusion bomb can discover how to fuse mankind into a harmonious and peaceful whole, and too contempuous of social science, are filling our bookshelves with works they should have left unwritten until they had done some reading.

Perhaps our greatest difficulties in using our limited power to mold the world environment in ways favorable to the survival and flourishing of free institutions is our ignorance, as a people, of history. This ignorance surely explains, in part, our susceptibility to the earnest pedlars of quick and easy solutions. It may be, as someone has said, that those who do not know history are condemned to repeat it.

On the wall of my office I have a Daumier cartoon which shows an American haranguing the Paris Peace Conference of 1849. He is pointing to the green felt hat he is wearing and saying that the only means of pacifying the human race is to require everyone to wear a hat like his and to remove it only on going to bed. No one, Daumier adds, dares to oppose this view. The American, by the way, may have been from Oberlin. A friend told me later that three Oberlinians journeyed to Paris for this conference in 1849.

Somehow I doubt that the authors of the Federalist Papers would have made the same mistake. They had read too much and reflected too long upon it. They had the great advantage, of course, that there was not nearly so much to read as is thrust before us. In our anxiety to be informed, we clutter our minds with bright, shiny, novel—and useless—discoveries, more often than not frightening ourselves in the process. All too often we ask, "Have you heard the latest?" and all too seldom, "Have you read the best?"

Why fear the Woozle? Is there anything really to fear in the useless discovery? The reason for my fear is simple: I am afraid of suffocation under a blanket of mediocrity. Galloping mediocrity, not creeping socialism, is our real malaise. It is not, worse luck, a painful disease. In fact, it numbs and deadens the minds. It is the stock-in-trade of the commercial world. One expects Madison Avenue to be a producer and consumer of Woozles. But the minds that discover that aspirin dissolves as it enters the stomach or that royal jelly is good for the skin will neither make the world safe for democracy nor even free it of headaches and blemishes.

One has higher hopes for scholarship. But Madison Avenue has its spiritual colleagues on the campus. The debasement of standards in research and criticism is alarming and one is related to the other. Perhaps a liberal arts college like Oberlin may make its most important contribution by providing a home for men whose scholarly role is to revive and restore a critical spirit that dares to call a Woozle a Woozle—not a basis for a research grant from the Ford Foundation.

When he learned the truth, Pooh said, "I have been foolish and deluded and I am a bear of no brain at all."

"You're the best bear in all the world," said Christopher Robin soothingly.

"Am I?" said Pooh hopefully. And then he brightened up suddenly. "Anyhow," he said, "it is nearly luncheon time."

And so it is.

The Public Opposes Federal Subsidies for Teachers' Salaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, the House Education and Labor Committee today approved a bill which authorizes the Federal Government to spend roughly $2½ billion over the next 3 years to help in the construction of public school classrooms, and to improve the pay of the Nation's teachers.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, this bill is defective in many respects. Especially objectionable is the bill's failure to discriminate between two quite different problems, toward which the Federal Government may well be said to have quite different responsibilities. It is one thing for Washington to help construct a building, and quite another for us to determine what is an adequate salary for a teacher in our public school system.

I am glad to say, Mr. Speaker, that the public appears to discriminate between these two types of programs.

In a questionnaire I recently sent to my constituents, I asked for their opinions on various subjects. On the question, "Do you favor Federal aid for school construction?" 55 percent answered "yes," while 40 percent were opposed and 5 percent had "no opinion." On the question, "Do you favor Federal aid for teachers' salaries?" only 29 percent answered "yes," 64 percent were opposed, and 7 percent had "no opinion."

Almost 8,000 people returned the questionnaire. This is a 40 percent return, the highest I have ever received in a poll of my constitutents. This interest is heartening. So too is the unwillingness of the public to support ill-advised programs such as Federal subsidies for our Nation's teachers.

The final results of my questionnaire are as follows:

[In percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
Do you favor—			
1. Federal aid for school construction?	55	40	5
2. Federal aid for teachers' salaries?	29	64	7
3. Federal scholarships for higher education?	59	32	9
4. Replacing the electoral college with direct vote?	79	14	7
5. Medical care for the aged tied to social security?	53	39	8
6. Increasing minimum wage to $1.25 an hour?	49	41	10
7. Broadening scope of minimum wage coverage?	52	27	21
8. Federal aid for commuter railroads?	39	45	16
9. Construction of a jet airport in Morris County?	19	65	16
10. Establishment of a Peace Corps?	52	28	20

Career Keys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the serious thought that this year's crop of high school graduates is giving to their future careers is exemplified by the essays of the eight young ladies who have been desigated the regional key award winners of the Girls Clubs of America. Seven of these young ladies received $350 scholarships to enable them to attend the schools of their choice. From New York there is 17-year-old Connie Anne Pucci of 2402 Avenue A, Schenectady. The eighth talented 17-year-old Mary Kimmerlin of Bridgeport, Conn.,

was the winner of the $1,500 scholarship.

The subject of the contest was, "What a Career Will Mean to Me," and these scholarships were given in conjunction with the Reader's Digest Foundation. The young winners are to be congratulated for their achievement, and I am happy to name the other winners of the regional scholarships.

The other winners are: Madeleine Schwarcz, 17, 196 Ora Lee West, Valdosta, Ga.; Susan Jane Bright, 17, Rural Route 5, Franklin, Ind.; Lois Anne Rowe, 17, 3305 Washington Avenue, Newport News, Va.; Dawn Quier, 17, 10 South Halstead Street, Allentown, Pa.; Rita Marie Mageary, 17, 38 Story Avenue, Lynn, Mass.; and Marjorie Brecht, 17, 20 Partridge Road, Pittsfield, Mass.

I ask unanimous consent that the eight essays relating to the subject "What a Career Will Mean to Me," written by the aforementioned young ladies, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT A CAREER WILL MEAN TO ME

(By Connie Anne Pucci)

In this world of today there are many people. Among these people there are individuals, each having set a goal for himself. This goal is what that person wants to do with his life. This goal is a career.

A career to me will mean a way of life. It will be what I want to attain out of life. My interests, skills, abilities, and personality are centered around business; therefore this is the career I have chosen.

The importance of a career will be very essential to me. It will mean that I will have the confidence of an employer, responsibilities to assume, decisions to make, and the initiative to go ahead when necessary. I will be working with people who have the background, education, and interests similar to my own. I will also be meeting new people, working and planning with them to make my employer's business an asset to him.

The impressions that will make upon these people will be important. I will be the first person to give a picture of the firm and of my employer. In my position I will be a representative of one firm to another.

My career will also be significant to me. It will give me the pleasure of knowing that I have completed a job that is done well. It will also tell me that I have achieved part of the goal that I have set for myself. It will prove that I have a position of trust upon my shoulders, that an employer can depend upon me for what he wants done. Also, that he can trust me with responsibilities, decisions, and initiative that he needs in an employee.

These are the reasons why I feel a career will be important to me as a goal that I plan to fulfill.

WHAT A CAREER WILL MEAN TO ME

(By Madeleine Schwarcz)

A career, to me, is a dream. Everyone dreams of a career in his lifetime. The majority of these dreams never come true. This is due to the fact that the persons lose interest, get married, or for some other reason. Every person thinks his situation is different and that he will reach his goal. I know that I must reach mine.

I have been given so much in my life that I have to try and repay—in the very best way that I know how—the people who have given me so much. I am not referring to material things.

I have a debt to pay to God, to my mother, my family, and to society. The most important thing in my life is to do good and to make my mother proud of me. It has been said that love is the greatest reward of all. I give my mother all the love I possibly can and yet I want to give her so much more. She has reared me alone and has sacrificed greatly for me to have just about everything. I would like to be able to give her some of the things she has given to me.

My chosen career is that of an airline stewardess, because I like to work with people and be of service to them. I plan to do secretarial work until I reach the age of eligibility, which is 21, to become a stewardess. I would like very much to attend night school as it will be necessary for me to work during the day. Courses in foreign languages would be particularly advantageous.

This is what a career would mean to me.

WHAT A CAREER WILL MEAN TO ME

(By Susan Jane Bright)

Ever since that day in the third grade when I first decided that I wanted to become a schoolteacher, I have worked hard on each rung of the ladder of life which is leading to my achievement of this goal. The climb has not always been easy, especially in these last 2 years; and I know it will be much more difficult upon entering college. However, along the way I have tried to do my best in all my schoolwork and extracurricular activities.

With each important decision in my life, I asked myself, "Will this better prepare me for future years?" "Will it be a benefit to someone else as well as myself?" If I could not truthfully answer "Yes" to these two questions, I knew that it was not a worthwhile thing.

I want to be able to repay all of the people who have helped me all through my life, by, in turn, contributing something to the world and helping others. I feel that it is my duty, in payment for the privilege of living, to do something worthwhile in life—to contribute something to mankind.

In 1961—a year of great advancement—we are entering a period that will take more bravery, wisdom, and strength than any other period in history. I want to feel that I am contributing to my Nation's welfare by reaching my goal in life, teaching, and helping to prepare the Nation's youth for other greater times that are to come. Through this achievement, I will feel that I have compensated for a small portion of what I owe to my country and to my God.

WHAT A CAREER WILL MEAN TO ME

(By Dawn Quier)

There comes a time in each of our lives when we must make a very serious decision. That is whether or not we will pursue a career. This decision, I feel, is one of great importance, and it should be made with a good deal of thought. I have made this important decision and have chosen a career in teaching.

It will mean a great deal to me if all my dreams of the future are fulfilled. College, of course, is just the stepping stone to a career, but offers limitless opportunity for educational advancement. After college new experiences begin. Yes, it will then be the start of a career that had been anticipated all through college. The opportunity to help others will be ever present. To me a career will mean satisfaction derived from helping others. It will build my poise and character each day as I go through the ups and downs of life. A career will offer a new outlook on life, to live for others and not just for myself. If and when I have a family of my own, it will supply a background by which we can live in togetherness and love.

Finally, I am hopeful that a career in teaching will strengthen my perseverance and integrity in all I undertake throughout my life.

WHAT A CAREER WILL MEAN TO ME

(By Lois Anne Rowe)

Stepping inside the dimly-lit theater I stared in awe at the many rows of seats around the huge room. Looking up, I saw a stage already set with background scenery. I paused for a moment after climbing onto the stage and sat down in one of the small chairs, thinking to myself what a magic world is the theater.

To me a career means a future—something to look forward to. The theater is ageless as an art, yet untouchable by the experience gained. Most people believe true acting is an art, but how can a series of emotions such as being sad, happy, or joyful come just from reading of words. Everywhere you go, you give an impression of yourself—you the individual. A career is important in a field which you hope to ascertain, but without knowledge and understanding of your field you will do nothing. The impression actors give an audience depends entirely on their interpretation of action and words. True acting comes from the heart; it is giving a part of yourself to others through your understanding of an audience as individuals. Everyone is born with some acting ability, but few ever develop it to its fullest extent.

Being born in America has granted me the opportunity to develop my knowledge and choice of vocation, while it has given me the courage of my convictions. This is why I have chosen such a vocation as the theater arts. With faith I grow, with hope I will try, through charity I shall succeed.

WHAT A CAREER WILL MEAN TO ME

(By Marjorie Brecht)

A career to me is more than a way to support myself. It is a special calling to some profession for a lifework which would give the feeling of accomplishment far beyond the necessity of earning a livelihood. Such endeavor would result in greater happiness and well-being for others as well as for myself.

For my career, I have decided to enter youth work. This desire did not occur all of a sudden, but rather, it started when I first joined the girls club 3½ years ago. During this time, I have assisted in a variety of activities at my local girls club. My interest in children grew until one day, I realized that I would like to take up youth work as a career. In my chosen career, I hope I will be of service to the people in my community. Giving children the right kind of guidance at an early age will make them better citizens so that they, in turn, can serve their community.

Thus, a career will mean a great deal to me. It will give me the personal satisfaction which I desire as well as give me the ability to help other people find personal satisfaction in their daily living. By helping others to find happiness, I believe that I could make a small contribution toward a better way of life. Therefore, after I complete college, I hope to begin my work with youth in the girls club organization.

WHAT A CAREER WILL MEAN TO ME

(By Rita Marie Mageary)

"Lives of great men all remind us
We can make our lives sublime
And departing leave behind us
Footprints on the sands of time."

This excerpt from "A Psalm of Life" by Henry Wadsworth Longfellow incited within me a desire to further my education so that I may make a deserving and worthy contribution to mankind. At the Girls Club, when I saw the joy sparkling in the eyes of a girl, fighting an endless battle against cere-

bral palsy, as she proudly displayed the first hat that she had knitted under my direction, I too experienced a sense of elation and accomplishment. I felt this way because I realized that she and many other Girls Club members not only benefit from the material knowledge that they gain through such training, but that they also are building and improving their minds. It is this realization that prompted the choice of elementary teaching for my career.

Through teaching, the key to open the minds of many youngsters will be mine. With this I shall be able to influence their ideals, their reasoning, their learning power, and above all, their future. For, you see, I will be laying the foundation with which they will further their education and their lives. If I fulfill my duty to the best of my ability and lay a sturdy foundation, I will be rewarded with the knowledge that my students wil grow to be citizens which the United States can be proud of. Thus, in part, my goal will be obtained, because I will have aided not only many people, but also, indirectly, my country and God.

The long road leading to the fulfillment of my destiny has not yet ended. Another milestone will be added when, in September of 1961, I enter college. After 4 years of preparation there, I shall be ready to begin my career. But the long road and its challenge will not end there; it will end only when I witness the growth of children's minds under my guidance—for only then, with the achievement of knowing that I share a part of this important growth, shall I leave my footprints on the sands of time.

Foreign Affairs: Bad Judgment and Bad Manners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK MacGREGOR
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the drifting of U.S. foreign policy since January is becoming of increasing concern to serious and informed persons. In this connection my own views coincide with those of the distinguished gentleman of the New York Times, C. L. Sulzberger, as appearing in his column of this date. I would like to call his column to the attention of my colleagues:

FOREIGN AFFAIRS: BAD JUDGMENT AND BAD MANNERS

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

PARIS, May 23.—It is as harmful to diplomacy as to digestion when one bites off more than one can chew and it begins to look as if President Kennedy's European journey will suffer from precisely this defect.

The primary purpose of the journey was to try and improve Franco-American relationships and thereby to end certain glaring differences in NATO. By choosing Paris for his first official trip to Europe, it was clear the President meant to do signal honor to General de Gaulle. Thus the best possible atmosphere for fundamental accord might be encouraged.

Now, however, by adding Vienna and London to his schedule, a carefully developed psychological ambiance has been destroyed. In the eyes of the world the Vienna dialogue transcends in importance that in Paris and, if anything, the brief London epilogue adds a note that will seem slightly sour to De Gaulle. The chances of any real achievement here have seriously diminished.

One important Frenchman remarks: "It appears the President's tour was arranged by American Express, not the State Department."

This change was neither wise nor necessary. Had Mr. Kennedy stuck to his original plan, had he flown to Paris for 3 days and then flown home, there was reason to hope his visit might prove fruitful. And, after all, such a schedule would in no sense have prevented a later conference with Khrushchev.

The presidential jet takes less than 7 hours to cross the Atlantic. It could have returned to Washington as initially contemplated; and it could have gone again to Austria a fortnight later with little inconvenience save, perhaps, some sacrifice in sleep. But, apparently, some of our foreign policy advisers were too zealous. They thought it both logical and tidy to wrap up everything in one big bundle and they ignored Talleyrand's sage advice—"Above all not too much zeal."

There was no point tying together two wholly separate packages—intra-alliance difficulties, on the one hand, and East-West crises on the other. Whether Moscow's calculations were shrewd or accidental, the net result is that Khrushchev, by euchering Kennedy into what will necessarily be a Vienna stalemate, euchered him out of a possible Paris success.

When the White House began delicately to explore the idea of a Kennedy-Khrushchev colloquy no one was in any hurry. This project had nothing whatsoever to do with the later plan for a trip to France; nor should it have today. Furthermore, one can scarcely say our position vis-a-vis the Russians improved between February and May when the Kremlin suddenly accepted what had only been a tentative suggestion. It is said the President wants to take the measure, personally, of the Soviet Premier. This may be a sound intention but it is scarcely urgent.

It is also said the President wishes to make plain to Khrushchev that the United States remains strong and firmly resolved to protect its far-flung commitments. Surely such attitudes might easily have been conveyed, at least initially, by conventional diplomacy, reinforced by public statements. There was no compulsive need for an early June summit. Yet we are almost made to appear as if, indeed, we are being compelled by events to alter schedules. This is grist for Russia's propaganda mill.

One must regret that our diplomatic experts failed to inspect all the angles in advance. By focusing on the anti-NATO problem, they seemingly forgot the NATO problem. A priori, it looks as if they had misappraised the situation and compounded with bad judgment what De Gaulle will consider bad manners.

Facts, in the dialectical sense, have not been altered. But one nondialectical fact is the personality of De Gaulle, a proud and sensitive man. And this is an outstanding fact in France today because De Gaulle, politically speaking, is contemporary France and will remain so for some time to come.

Therefore, if it was once worth facing this reality and doing things in a fashion best calculated to create a receptive mood in the General, it was still worth doing so. One may assume that De Gaulle, who is meticulously courteous and careful to disguise his feelings, will give no hint of disgruntlement. And one may also hope Kennedy's charm and persuasive powers will facilitate the entente we so much want. But those who know De Gaulle make no secret of their disappointment and uneasiness. Any aura of optimism has vanished.

Recognition of Apprenticeship Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in a fast-changing, forward-moving age, there is a real need for useful, constructive, creative programs to train and equip our people to meet the challenges of the times.

Today, I would like to pay tribute to efforts being made to enable our people to better meet the challenge; that is, the importance of vocational training and the apprenticeship programs to train competent craftsmen for industrial progress.

Recently, I received two resolutions on these important topics, adopted by the Wisconsin State AFL–CIO conference on apprenticeship. To give my colleagues the benefit of the resolutions, I ask unanimous consent to have these printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objections, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the program of vocational education in Wisconsin has assisted in developing the skills of the working people of our State; and

Whereas there is a continuing need for skilled workers who are trained through a sound method of apprenticeship; and

Whereas the program of vocational education in Wisconsin has progressed through the use of Federal aids allotted to the State under the provisions of the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden Acts; and

Whereas the further development and expansion of these training programs is essential to our national strength and economy: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Wisconsin State AFL–CIO Conference on Apprenticeship assembled in Wausau, Wis., Tuesday and Wednesday, January 31 and February 1, 1961, record its recommendation to President John F. Kennedy and the Congress of the United States to support increased Federal aids for vocational education; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be presented to the executive committee of the AFL–CIO in Wisconsin for their consideration and that a copy be sent to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, the Executive Committee of the AFL–CIO in Washington, D.C., to all Wisconsin congressional representatives and to the Honorable Gaylord A. Nelson, Governor of Wisconsin.

Adopted by Wisconsin State AFL–CIO Conference on Apprencticeship, January 31 and February 1, 1961, Wausau, Wis.

RESOLUTION No. 2

Whereas labor and management have given of their time and effort in advancing the cause of the apprenticeship system for the purpose of training competent craftsmen for the industrial welfare of our Nation; and

Whereas the future status of skilled manpower in the United States is dependent upon apprenticeship training; and

Whereas there is a need to acquaint the American public with the efforts made to establish the philosophy of bona fide apprenticeship training in order to provide the public with the highest possible grade of products and services: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Wisconsin State AFL–CIO Apprenticeship Conference meeting in Wausau, Wis., January 31 and February 1, 1961, go on record in favor of the issuance of a special postage stamp in recognition of the efforts of both labor and management so that it might serve as a reminder to the public of the value of the apprenticeship system to our national economy; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Postmaster General and the Senators and Congressmen from Wisconsin.

Adopted by Wisconsin State AFL–CIO Conference on Apprenticeship, January 31, 1961, and February 1, 1961, Wausau, Wis.

Problems of Parochial Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on May 17, I included in the RECORD the first two articles of a series which has been printed in the Chicago Sun-Times regarding the entire question of Roman Catholic elementary and secondary schools in this country, and in particular, the plight of these schools in Chicago. The first two articles in this series appear on page A3488 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 17.

I should like to include today the remainder of this series, which I am sure will go a long way in helping Members of Congress understand not only the contribution Catholic parochial schools are making toward this Nation's educational effort, but also the problems these schools experience in trying to help educate the children of our country.

There has been a great deal of discussion about some form of Federal assistance to these private schools, should Congress decide to enact Federal aid to public school education.

One paragraph stands out most succinctly in this series which I trust Members of Congress will consider as they discuss this entire subject. This paragraph clearly describes the contribution the Catholic parochial schools are making in one community of our country, namely, Chicago. It points out:

For Chicago alone, if all the pupils in Catholic grade schools were transferred to public schools, it would cost Chicago taxpayers in excess of $62,500,000 a year for operating expenses alone—and the cost of new classrooms for the transferred elementary school pupils would add a minimum of $125 million to the taxpayers' bill.

I think this gives us some idea of how vast is the contribution of these schools. It has been estimated that throughout the country the operating cost of Catholic schools totals in excess of $2 billion annually. To those who have so violently opposed any constitutional assistance to these private schools, I think it is proper to ask if they feel the local communities of America could absorb this cost in the public schools if the private schools were to close their doors in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, the last four articles from the Chicago Sun-Times series follow:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, May 16, 1961]

McManus Tells How Catholic Schools Fare Here

(By Dolores McCahill)

Insofar as the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Chicago is concerned, the battle to include Catholic schools in Federal legislation assisting education is a matter of principle and not of immediate financial crisis.

The Catholic schools in Cook and Lake Counties have problems, yes, said the Very Reverend Monsignor William E. McManus, archdiocesan schools superintendent, but they are not in a crisis and they are not going out of business.

RUMOR LAID TO REST

He would like to lay to rest a rumor that the first, second, and third grades of the archdiocese's parochial schools are in danger of being discontinued. The rumor is traceable, he believes, to speeches made here in the National Catholic Educational Association Convention of 1960, and subsequent addresses by Catholic educators in this association and other organizations.

"I am not ready to throw in the sponge on any division of Catholic education," Monsignor McManus said. "The fact is every appeal for funds we've made has gone over the top. We have the same problems now which we've had since Catholic schools were started—money, buildings, and teachers. These problems are 100 years old and I expect will remain with us for the next 100 years."

Monsignor McManus said it would be an exaggeration to talk of a Catholic school "crisis" here when "our greatest asset was never better—that's the laity's enthusiasm for Catholic education supported by ever increasing contributions."

The archdiocese intends "to continue all eight grades and to build as many high schools as need warrants," he said.

SEVENTY THOUSAND IN FIRST THREE GRADES

The rumor that it would discontinue the three primary grades is completely without foundation, he said, since Catholic parents would not tolerate the emergency situation that would be created if Catholic parishes unloaded 70,000 first, second, and third graders on the public school system in Chicago alone. Their sense of community responsibility would not tolerate such disruption of the city's school system, nor would they want their children to be educated under emergency conditions, Msgr. McManus said.

Although the idea of structural change in the Catholic educational pattern is being much discussed on the theoretical level by Catholic school administrators, he knows of no diocese planning wholesale elimination of grammar or high school years, he said. There are experiments here and there omitting some grades, usually the lower ones, he said.

He sees the effort by Catholic leaders to win inclusion of their schools in any Federal aid program Congress enacts as one to establish as a principle that any school meeting general educational standards set by the Government is entitled to Government aid, whether or not religion is part of the curriculum.

"We think the Federal Government is on the verge of setting a policy regarding the future of education in this country," Monsignor McManus said. "We think that policy will have great influence on the destiny of both public and private schools. We feel very strongly that policy should include some kind of recognition for the role private schools play in American education.

EVERY LITTLE BIT HELPS

"We don't have any illusions that Federal aid, if it were granted, would solve our financial difficulties. But every little bit still helps, and we don't want to be frozen out in perpetuity the way we have been frozen out in so many of the State constitutions.

"The fact we are dealt with unjustly in Illinois is all the more reason for us to object strenuously to similar injustice on the part of the Federal Government."

The school system administered by the Chicago archdiocese is a massive one that takes in all of Cook County and a part of Lake County.

In Chicago, the archdiocese operates 279 elementary and 70 high schools. In Cook County outside the city, it maintains 120 elementary and 15 high schools. In Lake County, it operates 27 elementary and 2 high schools.

FIGURES LISTED

There are 178,422 elementary and 47,541 high school pupils enrolled in the archdiocese schools in Chicago. The schools in Cook County outside the city enroll 82,936 elementary and 11,760 high school pupils. The Lake County schools have 10,871 elementary and 567 high school pupils.

In Chicago, the archdiocese has 4,199 elementary and 2,067 high school teachers. In Cook County outside the city, it has 1,915 elementary and 520 high school teachers. In Lake County, it has 267 elementary and 46 high school teachers.

Grand totals: 426 elementary and 87 high schools; 272,249 elementary and 59,868 high school pupils; 6,381 elementary and 2,633 high school teachers.

By comparison within the city only, the Chicago public school system operates 395 elementary and 52 high schools. It has 377,657 elementary school and 104,221 high school pupils. They are taught by 12,938 elementary and 4,633 high school teachers.

(All figures are as of last March.)

CITES EXPENSES

Monsignor McManus estimated operating expenses for archdiocese grade schools at $52 million a year and for the high schools at about $14 million a year.

For Chicago alone, he has estimated, if all the pupils in Catholic grade schools were transferred to public schools, it would cost Chicago taxpayers in excess of $62,500,000 a year for operating expenses alone—and the cost of new classrooms for the transferred elementary school pupils would add a minimum of $125 million to the taxpayers' bill.

Monsignor McManus also has estimated that the closing of the archdiocese's first-grade classes alone would require the city to employ about 700 added teachers at a cost of about $3,500,000 a year.

The forms of aid which Catholic school administrators could hope to obtain are circumscribed by the first amendment to the Constitution—"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," by the interpretations which have been placed upon this phrase in the Supreme Court, by public school educators who don't want any diversion of funds from the public school system, and by a long line of spokesmen from Protestant and Jewish organizations.

Catholic leaders have set forth the argument that, since they hold as a religious tenet the belief that religion is or should be a vital part of a child's educational experience (a viewpoint also held by clergymen of other religious groups), their "free exercise" of religion is hindered to the extent that tax increases for public school operation prevent Catholic parents from making voluntary contributions adequate to maintain their church-related schools.

If the Government disbursed aid to religious schools of any denomination meeting Government standards for education, there would be no establishment of any one church since all would be equally eligible for aid on terms set by the Government, the Catholics.

FREEDOM TO DIFFER

"One freedom of religion which Catholics exercise," Monsignor McManus stated, "is their freedom to differ with the dominant secular philosophy of public schools. I can see where a Protestant doesn't want to pay taxes for the advance of Catholicism. But he should see that Catholics feel their freedom of religion to send their children to a parochial school is being restricted by the price.

"When taxes get to the point the Government practically confiscates money the family would budget for a Catholic school, the freedom to pick your school is limited. He is still free to send his child to a nonpublic school but this is like telling an unemployed person he is free to work—if he can find a job."

Monsignor McManus thinks an income tax deductibility for tuition "would help particularly parents of high school youngsters" but is actually a side issue, since he believes fees paid church-related schools should be tax deductible "not because the schools are religious, but because they are nonprofit."

"The fact still remains, particularly on the high school level," he said, "that hundreds of parents do not send their children to Catholic high schools because they cannot afford them."

NIGHT SCHOOL CLASSES

High schools of the two-county archdiocese currently have 59,868 students. Another 19,560 Catholic teenagers attend parish "schools of religion" one night a week.

Should Catholic leaders fail to establish their contention, what next?

"We may not move as fast without Federal aid, but we will keep moving," the archdiocesan superintendent said. "There is a problem, but it's not a crisis.

WILL KEEP MOVING

"The Catholic school system as a system is doing all right, but there are a lot of parents who just can't send their kids to the schools because of the fees we have to charge. With Federal aid in a substantial amount, we could reduce our charges and make it possible for more parents to send their children to Catholic schools. It's the parents who have the problem.

"We are trying in the Chicago archdiocese to add 5,000 to 7,000 classroom seats a year. I can't predict what the situation would be if there were a depression, or if the tax bite gets so big people have no money to contribute to anything. But we have no plans, immediate or remote, for any wholesale change in the pattern of our schools.

"Whichever way the Government goes, we still will have most of our problems of money, buildings, and teachers. But the Federal Government, serving all the people and dedicated to the welfare of all children, is forging a national policy and we think it should take into account the existence and needs of nonpublic education."

So financial pressures on the taxpayer and the voluntary contributor are sharpened by the centuries-old antagonisms between religious groups to give Congress a problem it can hardly resolve without a residue of ill will.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, May 17, 1961]

CATHOLIC SCHOOL ENROLLMENT HERE ABOVE AVERAGE

(By Dolores McCahill)

Roman Catholic children in the archdiocese of Chicago have a better-than-average opportunity to attend Catholic schools.

Across the country, 55 percent of Catholic children of grammar school age, just slightly more than half, are attending church-related elementary schools. At the high school level, Catholic high schools are able to accommodate less than half the church's teenagers—45 percent.

People of other faiths who have heard of the Catholic canon law obliging parents to send their youngsters to a Catholic school whenever possible are often surprised to learn the church's goal is only half-realized here in the United States, where the Catholic school system is further developed than anywhere else in the world.

By national average, there are about as many Catholic children attending public schools as the church's own.

ARCHDIOCESAN FIGURES

Here in Cook and Lake counties, the Chicago archdiocese's territory, 82 percent of the Catholic children of elementary school age are attending Catholic grammar schools, and 18 percent are enrolled in public schools.

Of last June's 27,660 parochial elementary school graduates, 19,685 were able to continue their education at Catholic high schools. The other 7,975 presumably entered the public school system of Chicago and suburbs of Cook and Lake counties last September as high school freshmen.

Only about 400 of these actually applied for admission at Catholic high schools and were turned down for lack of room. The other 7,500 didn't apply. Reasons are unrecorded but logical deductions would be lack of money for tuition, inability to commute conveniently to a Catholic high school, especially in suburban areas, and possibly for some a desire to remove themselves from the discipline of Catholic schools.

The Right Reverend Monsignor William E. McManus, archdiocesan schools superintendent, estimated a breakdown between city and suburban enrollment figures. "Seventy-five to eighty percent of our eighth-grade graduates in the city go on to Catholic high schools," he said, "and only 45 to 50 percent in suburban areas. Three thousand more applied for high school last September than the previous year, and we took care of all except 400.

TRANSPORTATION EXPENSE

"In suburbs, the distance of their homes from the nearest Catholic high school and the great expense of transportation, which sometimes is higher than the actual tuition, keeps many from attending.

Service by commercial carriers is so limited in some suburban areas that if a student needs transportation it virtually has to be by chartered buses. Our students are eligible to ride public school buses but the routes eldsom coincide with the students' needs."

Tuition fees of Catholic grade schools are minimal, since much of the cost is met from parishioners' church donations at Sunday masses. The maximum in this archdiocese is $5 a month—"just 25 cents a day" as Monsignor McManus notes—or $100 annually per family regardless of the number of children in school.

WIDE TUITION RANGE

Most high schools are operated by religious orders and have no parish treasury to tap, no Easter offering to help balance the books, and consequently charge a yearly tuition per student which ranges from $150 to $300.

There are a smaller number of high schools connected to parishes and subsidized through the Sunday collections. In these, tuition can be as low as $50 per year.

In the great swirl of debate over Federal aid to education, and the claim which Catholic schools advance for recognition, Monsignor McManus asserts that it is the Catholic people, parents and children, who face financial difficulties rather than the Catholic educational system as an institution.

"Our typical high school junior or senior from a low-income family pays all or most of his tuition through earnings from part-time employment or summer work," he said. "Freshmen and sophomores are more of a burden on their parents since jobs are not open to them.

SEASONAL JOBS

"We are worried about the tightening employment situation. But these youngsters know they have to find work to get back to their school so they hustle for seasonal jobs, Christmas and summer. We think it's a great idea. One reason why Catholic youngsters appreciate the advantage of a Catholic education is that they are paying for it."

The general population shift to suburbia following World War II has given the archdiocese acute problems at the high school level. High schools are more expensive to equip and to staff, and commuting difficulties discourage potential students.

In 1952 the Chicago archdiocese departed from the traditional growth pattern of letting a religious order locate and finance new high schools as best it could. Instead a parish "tax" was levied for high school expansion.

Quotas were based on numerous factors, with less expected from a parish whose people already had contributed to the establishment of a parish or nearby religious order high schools than of parishioners in the new residential areas where the future Catholic high schools would be built.

FORTY MILLION DOLLARS COST

From 1952 to 1958, Catholic laity through their parishes contributed $14 million toward the construction of high school facilities accommodating 17,000 students at a total cost of $40 million, Monsignor McManus related. The balance was either paid by religious orders or became outstanding indebtedness. A second 5-year high school development program is now underway.

While the Chicago archdiocesan school system is able to enroll a considerable percentage of the school-age children, it does so at the expense of preferred educational policy on class size. The nationwide average class size in parochial schools is reported to be 35 pupils, and for the public schools 26 pupils.

Here "the policy is to try to keep class size below 50 students," said Monsignor McManus. "The average would be in the vicinity of 45."

The policy was instituted by him in the aftermath of the disastrous fire at Our Lady of the Angels School, when educators shuddered professionally at surveys disclosing class sizes of 60 and higher in some Catholic schools.

CLASS SIZES CUT

Catholic school expansion took a time out period here following that tragedy, with priority going to the installation of sprinkler equipment and the reduction in class size at existing schools.

Some additions, instead of enrolling all new pupils, were utilized partly by students transferred from the extra-large classes, so total enrollments did not rise as much as might otherwise have been the case.

Along about this point in time, Chicago's new police superintendent, O. W. Wilson, let it be known that he took a dim view of bingo games, church-related or otherwise.

Albert Cardinal Meyer, archbishop of Chicago, then issued a statement noting that while the morality of gambling is viewed differently by various religious faiths, and Catholic moral theologians regard games of chance as unharmful within certain limits, parishes of the archdiocese should obey existing civil law on the subject. Parishes which had been using bingo income to help support their school programs had to look for increased contributions.

TEACHER SHORTAGE

Expansion still has not returned to its former rate, but the problem now is the difficulty of obtaining teachers. The number of teaching religious—priests, brothers, and sisters—is no match for the constantly increasing student enrollment. Lay teachers

have ceased to be an oddity in the Catholic school, but Monsignor McManus asks:

"How can we compete for good teachers? We pay $3,500 to start in elementary schools. The Chicago public schools pay $5,100 for beginning teachers."

In Catholic high schools for boys the starting salary is $4,000, and in high schools for girls, $3,500, he added.

His school system needs 400 new lay teachers a year, he said, either to staff newly built classrooms or replace those who quit. Of the 19,026 lay teachers in parish grammar schools, all but 25 or 30 are women so marriage and pregnancy is a rather frequent reason for their resignation from faculties, he said. His school system will be 125 classrooms bigger next September, but he expects only 15 or 20 additional nuns from teaching religious orders.

MORE THAN MONEY

The other 100 or more new classrooms will be looking for Catholic lay educators whose religious faith means more to them than personal financial return. The superintendent manages to find them.

"We confess we can't give them the same salaries as public schools," Monsignor McManus said. "But many are products of Catholic education. They are acquainted with its objectives and would like to be engaged in it.

"Generally, a lay teacher can select her own school convenient to home, cutting down the expense and time of travel. The high quality of instruction and discipline attracts them, since it makes the Catholic school a pleasant and encouraging place to work.

"It is harder to get teachers for grade than high schools because salaries are a little higher in high school and college graduates who can't get public high school assignments without first teaching elementary classes will take a position with our high schools.

"The overwhelming majority of our lay teachers are in our schools because they believe deeply in the values of Catholic education. But we don't have as many as we could use."

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, May 18, 1961]

HOW CATHOLIC SCHOOLS MEASURE UP TO ACCEPTED STANDARDS

Just how good are parochial schools?

They have been criticized inside the Roman Catholic church as well as outside.

Non-Catholics tend to see the Catholic parochial school as a place of rigid discipline, whose teachers do not necessarily have proper educational training, and which is strong on religion and weak in science and mathematics, and which has oversized classes to burden an already harassed teacher.

Within the Catholic church, some of the criticisms have been equally vehement. The problem of excellence versus mediocrity in the Catholic school was discussed with some acrimony at the National Catholic Educational Association conventon last month.

At least one Catholic school superintendent and one prominent layman publicly stated that parochial schools are not producing their share of American leaders and are not doing their job as well as they might.

DRAGGING THEIR FEET

The Reverend Thomas J. Costello, superintendent of schools in Syracuse, N.Y., declared that "we are creeping when we should be striding forward.

"Education," he continued, "has been seduced from the production of leaders to leadership in production. And Catholic education is not immune from this failing." In leadership training, he added, Catholic schools have been "dragging their feet."

And John Cogley, of the Fund for the Republic and the Catholic layman's magazine Commonweal, echoed his words.

"The sorry fact," he said, "is that up till now, Catholic education has not been producing its shares of national leaders."

But, Cogley added, "our failures have been understandable and wholly forgivable. The task the founders of the parochial school system took on was so gigantic, their resources so slim, the venture so daring that, as Dr. Johnson said about the dog walking on his hind legs, the surprise wasn't that it was done badly but that it was done at all."

A DIFFERENT VIEW

One of the most highly regarded Catholic educators, the Reverend Neil G. McCluskey, a Jesuit who is dean of Gonzaga University's School of Education, in Spokane, Wash., sees the problem of excellence in parochial schools another way.

"Academically," says Father McCluskey, "Catholic schools stand up as well as others. I have found some parochial schools that I wouldn't recommend to anybody—and I have seen some public schools that I wouldn't either. We judge a school as a school—it has to be a good school before it is a good Catholic school or a good Lutheran school or a good public school."

Said the Right Reverend Monsignor William E. McManus, archdiocesan schools superintendent in Chicago:

"Like public schools, Catholic schools have their limitations and faults. But much of the criticism of Catholic education—particularly that of Catholics—is exaggerated. It stems from impatience in not meeting the high ideals of Catholic education rather than from valid evidence of serious failures and faults.

THREE TESTS A YEAR

"In the archdiocese of Chicago, we test our elementary school pupils three times a year. The test results conclusively prove that the students are doing better-than-average work as measured by national standards and norms. We rest our case on test results and not on superficial observations of self-appointed critics."

While standards to judge the excellence of private or public schools are exceedingly elusive, the layman is likely to turn to the nearest scholarship competition as a basis for judgment.

Although the National Merit Scholarship Corp. warns that the number of merit scholarships awarded to the students of a school should not be the criterion of the school's performance, many parents (and some educators) do just that.

WIN THEIR SHARE

Among this year's 950 Merit winners, 76 Catholics received college scholarships. This, according to the National Catholic Educational Association, is almost the exact proportion of seniors in Catholic high schools to the total number of American high school seniors, about 8 or 9 percent.

In honorary merit winners, where no stipend is given, Catholic seniors took 12 percent of the citations, or 17 out of 140.

Similarly, among the 15,542 regents' college scholarships awarded in New York State this year, seniors in Catholic high schools took about 15 percent, or 2,347.

But one shortcoming in parochial schools which Catholic educators are perfectly willing to admit is overlarge classes. Once again, this has been aggravated by the violently rapid multiplication of students—118 percent since 1945.

ABOVE THE AVERAGE

The average class size in parochial schools today is 35—against 30 in 1945—according to the National Catholic Educational Association. However, some classes run well over 50. In public schools, says the U.S. Office of Education, the average class size this year is 26 and in no State does the average run over 30.

In the New York archdiocese, the parochial class size is an average 42 in elementary school (8 grades) and 37 in high school (4 grades). In the public schools of New York City, the average class sizes are 30 in elementary schools (6 grades), 32 in junior high schools (3 grades), and 32 in academic and 29 in vocational high school (3 grades).

Monsignor McManus takes issue with those who emphasize class size problems.

"Class size is a factor in good education," he said. "But it is greatly exaggerated. The important thing is to have good teachers, many of whom can handle a class of 45 or 50 whereas a mediocre teacher would get nowhere with a class of 20.

SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS

"The sisters in Catholic schools, who by reason of their religious life can work around the clock at their teaching duties, can manage large classes very successfully."

In regard to the currently sensitive fields of science and mathematics, the Right Reverend Clarence E. Elwell, superintendent of schools in the diocese of Cleveland, has said that parochial schools "are doing less than an adequate job in mathematics" and that science is weak in the elementary schools.

Commenting on the Catholic schools in Chicago, Monsignor McManus said:

"At the present time in the elementary schools, reading, mathematics, and science are our strong points.

"Our next objective is to bring up English, handwriting and social studies to the same high level.

NEW BOOKS USED

"We have just introduced a completely revised science curriculum in the elementary schools that uses the very latest textbooks and teaching aids. We think that television affords great promise for even better instruction in science.

"On the high school level, the students of local Catholic high schools recently took several top honors in a statewide science competition."

The Right Reverend John Paul Haverty, New York archdiocesan superintendent of schools, stoutly defends the overall caliber of his schools.

"We have our own schools of excellence, comparable to the Bronx High School of Science," he said recently.

In 42 of our parish schools our pupils are taking foreign languages in the elementary grades, mostly French but some Spanish. This, as you know, is one of the most modern experiments in foreign-language instructions."

HONOR COURSES OFFERED

Msgr. Haverty continued: "Four of our high schools are teaching Russian—to small classes of only 15 pupils each. A large percentage of our high schools have honor courses or permit their students to take advanced courses, whereby college credit can be obtained in high school after examinations given by the College Entrance Examination Board."

Elsewhere in the country, up-to-date Catholic schools are participating in other educational experiments.

All 228 elementary schools in Newark, N.J., archdiocese began to use educational television last fall, adding 15 minutes to the school day to make this possible. The Newark parochial elementary schools are participating in the New York State Regents' educational television project, which is telecast over WPIX, channel 11.

BRIGHT PUPILS ADVANCE

The ungraded primary system is now in operation in Catholic school systems in Pitts-

burgh and in St. Louis (since 1953). Next fall, Kansas City, Mo., will also try the system, in which pupils advance by levels of skill and not by age or grade.

The system, which is also being tried in such public schools as those of Appleton, Wis., is designed to let the bright pupil advance more rapidly, while the slow learner can take more time.

To refute the charge that parochial schools indulge in excessive religious instruction, the National Catholic Welfare Conference says that "the average parochial elementary school class spends 30 minutes a day formally studying religion. Two-and-a-half hours out of 25 class hours each week is hardly too much."

HEAD POPE'S PLEA

In the matter of teacher training, a nationwide movement is underway to upgrade the training of teaching nuns so that all will have bachelors' degrees before even beginning to teach in elementary schools.

Known as the Sister Formation Conference, the movement was started 6 years ago in answer to a plea from the late Pope Pius XII for more excellence in Catholic education.

Sister Formation aims to have every one of the future teaching sisters in this country receive 5 years of religious training, 4 years of college, and extensive practice teaching—all within a 5-year period—before she goes behind a teacher's desk, cooperative efforts toward this end are currently underway among the 377 women's teaching orders.

And Monsignor Haverty points out that in the New York archdiocese right now no nun or brother or layman may teach in a high school without a master's degree in hand or in sight.

Catholic parochial schools have always prided themselves on "teaching for the hereafter rather than the here." They have also taken pride in being open to all races and to creeds other than Catholicism, if there is room for them.

Man is created in God's image and will share the divine life hereafter, Catholics believe. Hence equality of all men and the disciplined preparation for a life after death are hallmarks of Catholic education.

A TWOFOLD PURPOSE

"We must remember," says the Right Reverend Carl J. Ryan, archdiocesan superintendent of schools in Cincinnati, "that Catholic schools serve a twofold purpose." Writing in the Ave Maria magazine last month, he continued: "They provide an education under religious auspices for those who attend them. These schools have given, and will continue to give, to the church, a body of practical and reasonably informed members who will be the backbone of the church in the United States.

"The Catholic school also stands for a principle. The principle is that religion has a place in education, and this in the face of a progressive secularization of public education.

"So long as the Catholic school exists it will be a reminder to our fellow citizens that there is an approach to the problem of education other than the purely secular system in which most of our citizens are now being educated."

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, May 19, 1961]

SURVEY OF CATHOLIC SCHOOLS CONSIDERED AS AN AID IN CORRECTING WEAKNESSES

(By Terry Ferrer)

NEW YORK.—The present and future of Roman Catholic parochial schools in the United States may soon be getting the same kind of sweeping evaluation as Dr. James Bryant Conant, president emeritus of Harvard University, made of public schools.

The Carnegie Corp. of New York, which supported Conant's reports, is considering the sponsorship of a comprehensive parochial study.

Dr. John W. Gardner, Carnegie president, said this week that he had received the suggestion for Catholic study from David E. Willis, director of teacher education at Marquette University, a Jesuit institution in Milwaukee. He said the foundation is giving serious consideration to the proposal of having an educator of high caliber undertake such a study. The educator probably would not be a Catholic, it was understood.

CONANT NOT AVAILABLE

Conant would not be available, as he is starting a study on teacher education for Carnegie this fall.

In Washington, a spokesman for the National Catholic Education Association, said the association would cooperate in such a quality report. "We need to know much more about parochial education than we do now," he added.

Indeed, the lack of centralized knowledge, planning, and national statistics and the loose financial structure of parochial education are conceded as weaknesses by prominent Catholic educators. They have long been begging for internal reform and the breaking of old patterns.

GRADE SCHOOL CUTBACK?

Caught between the growing pressure for seats in Catholic schools and inadequate funds, some Catholic bishops have suggested cutting off elementary years, beginning with the first grade of Catholic education. Some first grades already have been dropped in Saginaw, Mich., Spokane, Wash., and in Greenhills, a suburb of Cincinnati, for example.

The dropping of elementary grades was first proposed in 1959 by Bishop Lawrence J. Shehan of Bridgeport, Conn.

Bishop Shehan suggested that Catholics concentrate their educational efforts on grades 7 through 12, when adolescents most need a religious atmosphere. It might then be possible, the bishop said to offer "to every child Catholic education at a certain level."

Without such a cutback, "the size of our educational system will have to be not merely doubled, but tripled within our next generation," Bishop Shehan said. He cited the growing number of infant baptisms—1,349,240 last year.

NO COMPLETE AGREEMENT

The bishop's views are seconded by Father Neil G. Mccluskey, prominent Jesuit educational theorist. The Rt. Rev. Msgr. Frederick G. Hochwalt, director of the education department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, prefers a cut from 12 grades to 10.

But neither clergy nor hierarchy are in complete agreement with Bishop Shehan.

Albert Cardinal Meyer, archbishop of Chicago, thinks "the problems certainly are not so new or so grave that at the present time we should seriously consider discontinuing all the lower grades of all Catholic elementary schools.

Msgr. Clarence E. Elwell, Catholic superintendent of schools in Cleveland, also opposes dropping elementary grades. He favors the traditional Catholic concept that it is better to have a nucleus of Catholics who have had a full 12 years of Catholic education rather than to give all young Catholics some Catholic education.

SOME SEE RETREAT

The Right Reverend John Paul Haverty, New York archdiocesan superintendent of schools, agrees with Monsignor Elwell that cutting down on Catholic school years would be a retreat. But the Right Reverend Monsignor Neil C. D'Amour of the National Catholic Educational Association points out that the orders of teaching nuns would rather concentrate on the high schools, because it is these years, not the elementary grades, that produce religious vocations—and future nuns.

In addition to advocating a possible cutback in the school system, there are Catholic critics who say that the present financing of parochical education is so archiac that there is no Catholic school system.

"The parochial school, as an independent, parish-controlled and parish-financed operation, is an anachronism," the Jesuit Father McCluskey said last year. "We speak loosely of a Catholic school system, but only a few dioceses approach education systematically."

M'CLUSKEY SUGGESTION

Father McCluskey advocates a strong, centralized diocesan school system, rather than individual parishes. In such matters as school construction, uniform teacher salary scales and curriculum planning, such centralization would be economical and creative of excellence, he believes.

Father McCluskey also proposed that schools be financed by a diocesan school tax, and that all tuition be abolished. "Henceforth," he said, "let the education of the youngster in the rich suburban parish and the declining downtown parish be paid out of the same central fund."

Calling the present system of financing Catholic education "archaic, obsolete and inefficient," Father McCluskey declared that "in this matter we are a good 100 years behind the public schools, whose architects long ago argued successfully that the burden of support for the commonly used public schools was a total community responsibility."

NO SOLUTION TO NUMBERS

Such centralized planning and taxation might well save Catholic education considerable money. But it will do little to alleviate the pressure of numbers, a problem that parochial and public schools share alike in this high-birth-rate period.

If the figure of 1,349,240 Catholic babies baptized last year remains constant—or increases, as it probably will along with the total number of Catholics—it may even be impossible for the Catholic Church to educate half of them in parochial schools, as it does today.

And curtailing the grades of Catholic education would add fresh burdens to the elementary public school system, already facing a boom period.

Each of the 42,104,900 Catholics in the United States is already paying an estimated $35 a year in maintenance for parochial education, whether or not he uses Catholic schools. He also is being asked to finance new buildings at the rate of $175 million or more a year. On top of this, he is dutybound to support the public schools as well. The thought that some Federal money might ease his school obligations is appealing.

Do Catholics believe that they will receive some Federal aid to education? Many would agree with Father McCluskey, who said in his book, "Catholic Viewpoint on Education" (1959):

"An awareness is growing that the sheer dimensions of the Catholic school system make its needs and interests more than the concern of the Catholic community. In its own time American society will translate its appreciation of the religious school into a corresponding pattern of appropriate support.

"To predict this is not to imply any simple or overnight solution to the dual problem of religion in public education and public support for the religious school. As the Reverend John Courtney Murray (Jesuit philospher) has suggested, 'The solution, like the creation of the problem itself, will be the work of generations'."

Bean Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR A. KNOX
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and an article from the Grand Rapids Press Bureau. Perahps the Michigan congress who are requesting an appropriation of $100,000 could save the government this money if they would follow the recipe of my constituent, Mrs. Clyde Wilbur of Alden, Mich.

The letter and article follow:

ALDEN, MICH.

Congressman VICTOR KNOX,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KNOX: I was surprised when I read the enclosed clipping with a request to spend that much money for something that was not needed. Well, all that is necessary is to teach people how to cook beans so they will be in no distress in eating them.

Just put them on to cook and after they come to a boil add ginger and do not drain them. You will not taste the ginger but what a difference after eating them. For my size family I cook a pint of the dry beans, and add a good teaspoon of ginger so the amount of ginger will depend on the amount of beans you cook. Be sure and use enough.

Have those in Congress that want to spend money to try them cooked that way and save the $100,000. I think our country could sure use it for better use.

Sincerely,

Mrs. CLYDE WILBUR.

BEAN STUDY IS URGED—STATE CONGRESSMEN CALL FOR RESEARCH

WASHINGTON.—The industry politely calls it "flatulence," but three Michigan Congressmen minced no words in asking Congress for $100,000 for continued research to take the gas out of beans.

The request was made in a hearing of a House Appropriations Subcommittee by Representatives ELFORD A. CEDERBERG, of Bay City; JAMES G. O'HARA, of Utica, and JAMES HARVEY, of Saginaw.

CEDERBERG and O'HARA stressed the need to make beans more digestible so they can be included in the diets of older persons.

Said CEDERBERG, who is an Appropriations Committee member, "It is a rule of thumb in the industry that consumption of beans declines after persons reach the age of 40 because of the gassiness of beans which makes digestion difficult. If, through research, we can remove this limitation on consumption we will be giving not only the bean industry but the entire economy a boost."

O'HARA said eliminating the gassiness from from beans would be "reflected in greater prosperity for agriculture" in Michigan and all other bean-producing States. He emphasized that Michigan is the bean capital of the country and noted that his congressional district is the largest bean-producing district in the Nation.

HARVEY told the subcommittee that licking the bean flatulence problem would "open vast new markets and would be a real service to all our citizens."

Added weight was given the Michigan plea when industry witnesses were introduced by Representative GERALD R. FORD, Jr., of Grand Rapids, prominent Appropriations Committee member.

Testimony supporting the bean research request was given by F. J. Eisengruber of Bay Port and Regis Daily of Greeley, Colo., chairman of the National Dry Bean Council.

Was Lincoln Wrong?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRESCOTT BUSH
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled, "The Bush Amendment: Was Lincoln Wrong?" which was published in the Hartford Courant of Tuesday, May 23, 1961.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hartford Courant, May 23, 1961]

THE BUSH AMENDMENT: WAS LINCOLN WRONG?

There are those who impatiently witness the race riots in Alabama, and the breakdown of public safety, and who wonder whether Lincoln was wrong in not letting the Deep South go its own way. It has not only been a constant economic burden to the rest of the country, but its social and cultural lag, particularly in this era of expanding international liberties, has made us vulnerable to blame for our segregation policies. But these people are wrong. The South may be our burden. But if it had been permitted to go its way one can only wonder what kind of a virulent situation we would have now.

There is, however, some justification for impatience, and this impatience is reflected in the proposed amendment by Senator PRESCOTT BUSH to the school-aid bill. Senator BUSH may not expect to get his amendment adopted, and it does seem unlikely. But by attempting to attach a nonsegregation rider to the school-aid bill he is at least pointing up the South's tragic inconsistency in expecting the rest of the country to subsidize its outmoded and evil practices in education.

This arrogance is shown, not only by the preferment in the school-aid bill that would permit grants based on the total number of school-age children, rather than those actually in public school, but from the duality of attitude. On the one hand, in a situation that exists now in Montgomery and Birmingham, the Federal Government is treated as an interloper. On the other hand the Federal Government is supposed to pour its funds into the segregated school system of the South.

As the representative of a State that has not only been in the forefront in furthering the cause of justice for the Negro, has always paid in more than it receives from the Federal Government, Senator BUSH is a fitting person to offer such an amendment to the pending legislation. Even though there seems little likelihood of the amendment's adoption, morally and ethically it is a sound proposition. The law of the land has been flouted and continues to be flouted by a hard core of resistance in a handful of States. While one might tolerate this as a temporary condition that must evaporate some day, it is quite another thing to reward these intransigent States by subsidizing their segregated schools, or even by basing grants on a per capita for children who are not even permitted to attend school.

Federal marshals are not welcome in the South, but Federal money is greeted with open hands.

Aspirin Limited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, it occurred to me that the attached sermon by Rev. W. Paul Ludwig, pastor of the Chevy Chase Presbyterian Church, should receive wide circulation because of its treatment of our present day situation:

ASPIRIN LIMITED

I Corinthians 10: 13: God is faithful who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will with the temptation make also the way of escape, that ye may be able to endure it.

Aspirin has become one of the primary symbols of our modern culture. We have carried it like a sacred charm wherever we go. "It is silly to suffer," we have said. But when the shelf looks like a regimental parade of empty pill bottles and we have continued to feel that misery in our bones, then we have resigned from the cult of the painkillers and have joined the devotees of make-believe. "It's all in our mind," we have said. Even if it snuffs out our life, it's all a mistake. Our affliction has no real substance.

One can enjoy subterfuge only so long, then it fades into the ethereal mists from whence it came. The great game of pretend loses its fascination. Everybody plays according to his own rules and there is no discernible pattern to it. You can't block off a twitching nerve center with a cold, stoical stare. You can't just say "it isn't so."

So we check off both sedation and make-believe—because now there is something new. Everybody is talking about it. Everybody is writing about it. Everybody is preaching about it. It is a thin soup of psychology with a light dash of Christian spice. It has a shiny, big vocabulary, full of fixation, repression, frustration, self-rejection, and insecurity. It all happened years ago at Aunt Mary's. You were only 6 years old, but you slyly dropped a button in the chocolate cake mix. And you have not been the same since. Neither has Aunt Mary.

But there's a great bag of pains that didn't start in Aunt Mary's kitchen. And there's a pileup of fear that's right up on the top of my mind, fear that was born only yesterday, or that sprang full-blown out of this morning's headlines. The pressure is on every minute. This is not a matter of unveiling the past. It is a question of where I stand now—and what I have to stand on.

But there is yet another way of trying to deal with our troubles. There is the philosophy represented by a familiar motto: "To the stars through difficulties." Maybe I shouldn't run from pain at all—maybe I should run after it—maybe I should try to get hurt, so I'll know the good feeling of a healed wound. There can be no argument about it: many of the bright constellations of human achievement have been hung in the heavens on hooks forged out of adversity. We do not need to marshal evidence to that effect. It would be altogether too

trite to describe the tempering process of life's storms, when our sinews grow tough under the threat of annihilation.

It is not possible for any man to trace the footsteps of a Cross-bound God without facing sharply humanity's supreme argument for the crown of thorns. Most crowns are painful. Most victory marches vibrate with the deep rumblings of defeat. Progress is costly. If we ever needed to be persuaded, Golgotha is the world's most convincing witness to the power of sacrifice. To this fact we can never be smugly indifferent. The church is the custodian of the Cross and must never let the world take its eyes from Calvary.

But we need to show a little caution right here, lest when we glory in the Cross of Christ we take only sentimental notice of its pain. When the hymn-writer sings: "I take oh cross thy shadow for my abiding place" * * * "content to let the world go by, to know no gain nor loss; my sinful self my only shame, my glory all, the Cross," we must not forget that we have omitted the best line of all: "I ask no other sunshine than the sunshine of His face." The Cross was not all shadowy and blurred, not by any means. Where Christ is, there is always a blazing light. He is the constant symbol of hope. The most tragic feature of our world is not its tragedy but its preoccupation with tragedy. Empty optimism is stupid but Christless pessimism is sinful.

Suffering is not the only prospect for man in our time. It is not the only way of achievement. The things that drive a spike of terror through our hearts are not the things that are happening but the things we fear might happen. The strangling octopus of communism, for example, is paralyzing enough. Need we make it even more devastating by treating it as if it were the only effective dynamism existing in the world today? What about the revolution that took place on Golgotha? What about the social revolution fostered by the democratic process? What about the powerful industrial revolution buttressed by the daring of a capitalistic system? Are these streams dried up? It would be refreshing if we could see the whole picture.

There is more than the prospect of total destruction for our world. Our progress in health, housing, diet, education, communication, working conditions, and social awareness, our will for peace and our religious passion—these are not marginal nor unimportant. On the basis of the record, the future was not yesterday. This "age of anxiety" deserves a better label. "The age of awareness" would fit the facts: When we have become keenly sensitive to the colossal power which resides jointly in the hands of God and man, rather than being totally preoccupied with the power that resides in the Kremlin. C. B. Stewart's story of the old mountaineer is disarming. When he was asked if he had been in the tornado which had siphoned its way through the hills, he replied: "When the roof fell in, she fell just right. And when the walls caved, they only nudged me. The hot stove set the house on fire but I got out in time. No, sir, I guess you couldn't rightly say I was in that tornado, but I was getting awful close to it."

Somewhere I was reading the review of a book. I don't know what book. I don't recall who said it. But this is the sentence that I remember about the book's author: "He has said something enduring with the truth of pain."

What is the truth of pain? If it is not an empty aspirin bottle; if it is not a game of make-believe; if it is not a frantic rummaging in the topsy-turvy cupboard of remote yesterdays; if it is not a welcome ladder to the stars; if it is not just dumb resignation to inevitable doom—then what is there about it that you could call truth; and what is there about it that you would want to have endure?

In a photographic exhibit of the World Council of Churches, there was a gallery of suffering which I have never been able to erase from memory. I was helplessly magnetized by the deep-lined face of an old peasant woman, so wrinkled and worn it seemed her skin had been crumpled up like a piece of tissue paper and then unfolded. Beside her pleading face was the photo of a boy behind the bars of a cell, with scars on his young-old face and red eyes which had been so drained of tears that he could weep no more. Next to him was an Indian village that had been laid waste by flood.

The last scene in the group was too eloquent ever to forget: It was the deep, long shadow of a great cathedral—just the shadow, showing the gray shape of the tall tower and clerestory wall framed on the ground. And in the cool refuge of that shade were the huddled figures of the crippled beggars—beaten caricatures of men, finding hope not inside the church but in its uninspiring shadow. Is this a parable of the church: that men find their salvation not inside but outside her walls?

"I take, O Cross, thy shadow for my abiding place." Is that all? Just a shadow. Is that all the hope painstricken, tempted men can find in a religious faith? Men who lived close to Christ never thought that. Paul refused to play with shadows when there was a real cross to live by. "God is faithful" he cried to the Corinthians, "God is faithful who will not suffer you to be tempted beyo d what is common to all men; but will with the temptation make also the way of escape, that ye may be able to endure."

God is faithful. Paul was tearing pages right out of his autobiography. He had found out a few things about God. Fierce, wild persistent temptation was forever tagging at his heels. But God was forever leading him by the hand. Always there was the pressure of a godless society that swirled about him; always there was the vision of a Man on His Cross bidding him to stand fast. Always there was his heredity—his thorn in the flesh—his pain and his weakness and his discouragement, but always there was a strong divine friend standing by. Always there was a trap to ensnare him, but always there was the way of escape.

The truth was that pain and temptation were as real a part of life as a man's hands and feet—nothing at all make believe. No promise anywhere that this life would be painless; no promise that temptation would be removed. But this—this thing you could count on: God is faithful. If you never let go of Him, He'll never let go of you. For He will not suffer us to be tempted beyond our capacity; but will with the testing, which is surely now upon us, make also the way of escape, that we may be able to endure.

Gagarin and God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the Hairenik Weekly published by the Hairenik Association in Boston, Mass., editorialized in its May 18 issue about the recent space flights by Russia and our country.

The editorial effectively points up one of the great differences between our free society and that of the Soviet Union and I believe it is worthy of the attention of my colleagues.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GAGARIN AND GOD

With the passage of nearly 45 years of communism much was said and far more was forgotten about the existence of the Supreme Being in Soviet circles. The mounting wave of atheism had lost much of its initial intensity and many optimists began to entertain the hopeful notion that the Soviet people are gradually returning to God.

Apparently all such notion of a religious relaxation in the Soviet Union must undergo a shocking revision. Since the orbital flight of the astronaut Yuri Gagarin atheism seems to have received a shot in the arm and the fanatics of the Soviet Union are having a field day in their zeal to demonstrate to the world that God had nothing to do with Gagarin's daring feat.

They asked Gagarin if he carried with him in his flight some sort of talisman, or if he was not tempted to think of a supreme being of the universe as he hurtled through that vast domain all by himself. They asked him if his convictions about religion did not change in that awesome moment, and the Soviet hero replied: "I do not believe in God, I do not believe in talismans, superstitions, and such things."

The Soviet hero did not believe in God and he penetrated the cosmic space. But so did the American hero, Shepard, who believed in God. So did Shepard's parents and the whole American people who prayed for his safe return.

The Soviet atheists took Gagarin's feat as proof that God does not exist. The believing world took Shepard's feat as proof that God does exist, neither of which is conclusive. But we still believe faith in God will carry much farther in the long run.

All the same, we are once more reminded that atheism in the Soviet Union is not dead. It is very much alive.

Editorials Favor Chairman Minow of Federal Communications Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, Chairman Minow's speech to the convention of National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters has prompted enthusiastic editorial response from all corners of the country. Two particularly highly respected newspapers have commended Chairman Minow. One is the Christian Science Monitor, the other the Washington Evening Star in a column by Miss Doris Fleeson.

I ask unanimous consent that these articles be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CALL FOR IMPROVED TELEVISION—MINOW CALLED NEW FRONTIER'S BOLD SCOUT FOR EFFORT TO END INDUSTRY STAGNATION

A bold scout for the New Froniter has broken with a thunderclap through the barriers of do-nothingness which time and official timidity have erected around the independent agencies of the Government.

No Gunsmoke hero ever stunned his quarry more completely than Newton N. Minow, new chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, did the TV industry at its convention here.

Mr. Minow fired squarely into the teeth of 2,000 broadcasters that their TV program output was a "vast wasteland." Before they could even swallow hard, he followed with a warning that the FCC would no longer automatically renew station licenses.

Then he issued an invitation to the station operators to watch their stations' programs for one whole day from sign-on to signoff. What they would see, he assured them, was violence and mediocrity, and—worst of all from their point of view—they would end up being bored.

Today official Washington, not to mention the TV industry, is only slightly less interested in Mr. Minow than in the astronauts, with honors for nerve being distributed almost evenly. Yet what Mr. Minow has done is only to assert that the public interest which justifies the granting of licenses for the enormously valuable airwaves cannot be served without taking into account what the public gets, which is the programs.

It was the industry's second blow this week. Its own Broadcasters Association president, former Gov. Leroy Collins, of Florida, told it that it was not master in its own house but was permitting the rating services to dictate its product.

TV viewers will remember Mr. Collins as the handsome, soft-spoken chairman of the Democratic National Convention last summer.. His manner of speaking is gentler than the Midwest twang of Mr. Minow and his phrases were less barbed, but he also challenged them by saying: "I want your active support, not just your acquiescence. If you want someone to paddle your boat into stagnant pockets of still water then you do not want me."

Altogether, it has not been a good week for the broadcasters. They have really only one place left to go now besides up and that is the White House woodshed, into which the newspaper publishers and editors preceded them. The President, however, supports Mr. Minow strongly.

Darkening suspicions about the forces which drove Mr. Minow and Mr. Collins into action can be set at rest. "Villains" are the young Minow and Collins children who love to watch TV. Their fathers have been watching it harder than ever under the impact of new responsibilities.

The Minow-Collins statements also are the only truly logical followthrough on the TV scandals exposed by the Harris subcommittee of the House. On Mr. Minow for the Federal Government and Mr. Collins in his industry monitor job lie responsibility for a change for the better. If there is no Federal responsibility for insuring that, then its right to grant licenses and look into the programming is a sham.

Today the possibly dreamy idealists who really want the regulatory agencies to perform the functions assigned to them are toasting Chairman Minow and wondering what life would be like if his fellow chairmen followed his example and reread the law creating them.

IMPROVING TV'S WASTELAND

Viewers who have read or heard the new Federal Communications Commission Chairman's speech exhorting broadcasters to improve TV may be inclined to think that everything is going to be all right now. After all, the FCC does have the power to grant and withhold licenses to operate stations, and Chairman Newton N. Minow says he intends to see that broadcasters serve the public's needs as well as its whims.

But, although it is reassuring to hear a Federal regulatory agency spokesman set a high goal for the industry, it should not be forgotten:

That Mr. Minow, while chairman, is just one of five FCC members, and that the majority still charts the agency's policy. Not all of the other members join in Mr. Minow's feelings either that TV is quite the "vast wasteland" he describes or that the FCC is legally authorized to try to upgrade TV fare.

The broadcasters themselves are not generally convinced that the public desires a different kind of programing than is now offered.

That many people both in and out of broadcasting genuinely feel that the FCC has no real legal right to influence TV programing by direct means. Mr. Minow declares himself "unalterably opposed to governmental censorship." Yet a large segment of industry leaders firmly believes that the kind of regulation Mr. Minow's speech envisages would amount to just that.

Thus any viewers who feel they can sit back and let Mr. Minow carry the fight are underestimating the intensity of broadcaster (and perhaps congressional) feeling in this matter. Mr. Minow has gone way out on a limb, and viewers who agree with his position ought to give tangible support. Otherwise the opponents of a stronger FCC role in programing will have fresh grounds for repudiating Mr. Minow's bold stand.

World Food Budget Favors West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the life-and-death struggle against communism, the universal need for lifting standards of living for humanity, these, and other factors, require a reevaluation of our resources to meet such challenges.

The struggles of the future have been variously termed:

A battle against totalitarianism;

A battle for men's minds and a need for reaching the millions of underprivileged, underfed people "through their stomachs."

A fight against disease, hunger, illiteracy;

An effort to close the "great spread" between the "have's" and "have-not's," in living standards.

In dealing with these aspects of the challenge, unfortunately, we have not yet found adequate ways to utilize one of our most valuable resources: food.

Today, we have billions of dollars in food surpluses.

Meanwhile, hungry hands stretch out across the sea from people who suffer from malnutrition—yes, in some cases, even starvation.

In a modern world, this is a lamentable situation.

True, we have expanded our food for peace program. Undoubtedly, this is serving a great need of humanity.

Admittedly, there are serious economic problems involved in attempting to distribute our surplus foodstuffs, either through sales or through giveaways.

In the interest of more quickly attaining our natural objectives of peace, of thwarting the outspreading efforts of communism, of attempting to help people to live better, however, we cannot long accommodate this strange paradox.

For humanitarian reasons, then, we as a nation can and should attempt to further improve ways in which our great agricultural food plant can serve the needs of humanity.

Strategically, also, in the East-West struggle, food can be a vital weapon. Until now, regrettably, this great source has served too much as a handicap, rather than as an asset.

The task now is to develop more effective ways and means in which we can utilize this invaluable source of food for serving our national interests and the needs of humanity.

Recently, the Milwaukee Journal published an informative article entitled "World Food Budget Favors West," by Loren H. Osman, presenting an informative picture of the problem of balance of food resources.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD FOOD BUDGET FAVORS WEST—SURPLUS CROPS OF UNITED STATES, OTHER FREE WORLD COUNTRIES CAN FEED THE HUNGRY IN ASIA, AFRICA, LATIN AMERICA; COMMUNIST BLOC HARD PUT TO FILL ITS OWN NEEDS

(By Loren H. Osman)

American farmers have another big crop on the way. Even with the Kennedy administration's new feed grains program, which is taking millions of acres out of production, this seeming paradox still exists:

Surpluses are worrying American taxpayers and politicians.

Millions of the world's population are inadequately fed.

Where does the world stand in the outlook for food? Is production keeping pace with population? Or is the old Malthusian law, which says that people eventually will breed themselves into starvation, gaining on us?

FREE WORLD EDGE OVER COMMUNISTS

The U.S. Agriculture Department has been studying the world food situation from several angles. The Foreign Agriculture Service (FAS) is interested not only in the potential markets for American products but in the application of its food for peace program, which now sends U.S. food to shortage areas abroad at the rate of $2 billion worth annually. The program could be stepped up still further, its Director, George McGovern said last week.

The United States and its allies have an immense advantage over the Communist bloc in their food position, whatever may be their

relative standing at the moment in outer space.

Russia's recent agricultural failures have brought a current wave of purges of officials throughout the Soviet Union. Red China's 1961 crop expectations have been severely curtailed by spring drought, floods and hail storms, according to the official New China news agency, and famine threatens again. The 1960 crop had suffered the worst damage in 100 years from drought, floods and typhoons, forcing China, ironically, to buy food on the free world market and to place huge wheat orders with Canada and Australia. Russia apparently has not supplied China with any significant help in meeting the food shortage.

"SOFT" MONEY SALES

In the U.S. view, the twin deficits of food and dollars must be considered together. A nation is not considered deficient in food if it has money to buy from surplus nations.

Conversely, a hungry nation must be helped if it does not have dollars to buy. This is the area in which Public Law 480 operates, allowing sales of surplus food to be made on deposits of "soft" local currencies for the United States. Three-fourths of the food-for-peace shipments are paid for this way, the rest by grants and voluntary agencies.

There have been few accurate measurements of the world's hunger problems. Data has been unavailable or unreliable in many cases.

However, the Agriculture Department recently produced what it called the first world food budget, a compilation by specialists in international food and agriculture of food needs in terms of proteins and calories.

HOW BIG DEFICITS IN WORLD FOOD?

In deficit countries, the survey showed, there were these estimated shortages: 1,800,000 metric tons of animal protein, in terms of nonfat dried milk; 400,000 metric tons of pulse (legume) protein, in terms of wheat; and 8,600,000 metric tons of calorie deficit, in terms of wheat.

Put another way, this would be equal to 35 percent of the U.S. milk production, 40 percent of the U.S. bean and pea production, and 120 percent of its annual wheat production.

Although progress is being made, there is no assurance that the total food gap can be closed soon, the study indicated.

The world splits up this way. In the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, the Soviet Union, and eastern and western Europe, national diets exceed minimum standards.

Total calories, proteins or both are very low for the populations of western Asia, Africa, the Far East, mainland China, and large parts of Latin America. All are less developed areas of the world.

Food requirements per capita vary in different regions, depending on climate, body size, and proportion of adults to children.

PATTERNS OF DIET

Persons in Latin American countries, for instance, had requirements of 2,500 calories each, while western Europeans needed 2,635, Africans, 2,375, and the United States, 2,640. Even greater are the variations in the kind of diet: In North America, consumption of animal proteins and fat are very high, cereal proteins relatively low; the pattern is reversed in the Far East, Asia and Africa. Europe's pattern is about halfway between, but with western Europe consuming somewhat more animal protein than eastern Europe, and somewhat less cereal.

World food production is expected to to reach a new high in the 1960–61 marketing year. Per capita consumption will be about the same as last year and below the 1958–59 level, but population increases are expected to raise the total demand for food.

"World agricultural trade probably will increase again in 1960–61," said the FAS. "Even so, exporting countries' stocks of such important commodities as wheat, feed grains, and coffee are expected to be larger at the end of the season than the beginning."

There will be many people who need this surplus food, but will not have the money to buy it, nor will their governments.

The world output of food was forecast at 121 percent of the 1952–54 average, 2 percent over last year and 42 percent more than the 1935–39 average. The world population is now growing at an alltime high rate of 1.7 percent a year, according to the Population Reference Bureau, and is expected to pass 3 billion this year. Thus the world food output has been keeping pace with population growth overall, but distribution is uneven.

OUTLOOK FOR FOOD GIVEN BY AREAS

Per capita production—the amount of food for each person—is gaining only in the United States, Canada, western Europe, western Asia, Africa and Australia-New Zealand. It is expected to show little change in China, but decreases are in prospect for the Soviet Union, the Far East, Latin America and eastern Europe.

Here is the outlook, by areas:

United States

There was a record 1960 crop, and another big one expected this year. Although production and consumption projections depend on farm programs, economic conditions, technology, and weather, the 10 percent population increase expected by 1965 will boost consumption domestically 10 to 15 percent. Biggest gains will be in meats, poultry, fruits, and vegetables. Exports will be 20 percent higher by 1965.

Canada

There was a 5-percent increase in production in 1960, and about 2-percent increase in population. Per capita consumption, in calories, expected to change little in the next decade. Per capita spending for food will increase, with more livestock products, fruits, and vegetables used.

Latin America

Population rising 3 percent a year, with agricultural output not keeping up. This will get worse in the next few years, despite incentives and intensive programs. Imports must increase, especially in wheat and flour. Coffee, cacao, sugar, bananas, cotton, feed grains, and tobacco will continue to be exported.

Western Europe

This highly industrialized area takes more than 40 percent of U.S. farm exports. Its farming is technologically advanced and output will increase faster than the population. However, demands also will expand with growth in economy. As diets are upgraded, wheat imports may drop, but feed grains, fats and oils, and meats should increase.

Eastern Europe

Socialization of agriculture to continue. Emphasis on increased livestock production, with a trend toward higher consumption of better foods.

Soviet Union

Drops in production of bread grains and cotton, but increases in feeds. Mechanization will help overcome losses from weather, such as experienced in the "New Lands" projects in 1960. More fertilization and irrigation to be used. Production probably will increase substantially in next 5 years.

Mainland China

Limited information but indications of shortages again in 1961. Major emphasis on industrial development. Livestock lags, with feed supplies and disease major problems.

Far East

Production gains expected in next decade. India started a new 5-year plan in April, with major emphasis on agriculture and goals up one-third.

West Asia

Production up 4 percent and per capita production up 1 percent over previous year. Short-term prospects not good. Over long term, deficits expected in wheat, sugar and, as incomes increase, vegetable oils. Exports will continue for cotton, fruits, nuts and tobacco.

Africa

Increased agricultural production expected in north. High Aswan dam will improve Egypt's situation but population will increase by several millions before that is completed. Large potential for agricultural development south of the Sahara. Demand for wheat and flour will increase faster than supply, and there will be increasing shortages of meat and dairy products, unless the tsetse fly is controlled.

SUMMING UP SURPLUS, DEFICIT

Summing up, in addition to the United States, the major surplus-producing areas of the world are Canada, Argentina, Australia, New Zealand, Burma, and Thailand.

Together these countries have a population of 270 million and an annual surplus of 35 million tons of food. The food and dollar deficit areas include some countries of Africa, Asia, the eastern Mediterranean, and parts of South America. They have 755 million persons and a food deficit of 60 million to 70 million tons.

In other countries, there is a variety of situations.

Cuba has a surplus of sugar but needs wheat and rice. The United Kingdom and Western Germany are deficit food producers but are economically well developed and able to buy and pay for imports. Some African and Latin American countries have a balance.

The Communist bloc produces most of its own supplies or goes without—with such exceptions as China's recent wheat purchases from Western nations.

What does this add up to, in terms of U.S. export possibilities? America had a good season last year, with $4.5 billion worth of exports. The year ending June 30 is expected to total $4.8 billion in shipments abroad.

Exports of wheat are expected to be above last year's 512 million bushels, second highest on record. Rice may run slightly below, but increased sales elsewhere will partly offset the loss of market in Cuba. Exports of animal products will be 10 percent higher, with biggest increases in dried skim milk, hides, skins, and poultry meat. Cotton may be down slightly.

HOPEFUL FACTS

In a review of the food for peace effort, the State and Agriculture Departments point to these hopeful facts:

There have been no major famines in the world in the last 20 years.

Nutritional levels in underdeveloped countries have crept up.

Agriculture has, on the average, kept abreast or ahead of population increase in underdeveloped areas.

A Bill To Establish the Elmer T. Ellsworth National Monument

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide

for the establishment of the Elmer T. Ellsworth National Monument at Mechanicville, N.Y.

A monument such as this seems especially appropriate to this brilliant young American who was the first Union officer killed in the Civil War. His sudden death in Alexandria, Va., on May 24, 1861, just one century ago, is now regarded as a martyrdom and his name has been meritorious enrolled upon the list of our country's greatest patriots.

Elmer T. Ellsworth was born on April 11, 1837, in the village of Malta, N.Y. He attended the public schools at Mechanicville and after leaving school at an early age, he went to New York City to find employment. From New York, he traveled to Chicago where he became a lawyer's clerk, studied law, and later became a partner in a patent-soliciting business.

While practicing law in Chicago, Ellsworth was asked to become captain of the National Guard Cadets, a military company of volunteers who were in danger of disbanding due to lack of leadership. Ellsworth's life ambition was to become a military leader and he organized the cadets under a new title, "The U.S. Zouave Cadets," which he patterned after a Berber military corps organized by the French in Algeria in 1831. His aim was to induce a military spirit among Americans to increase the efficiency of the Nation's militia. The exhibitions given by the Zouave Cadets attracted considerable attention in Chicago and they became well-known throughout the country while making exhibition tours in many large cities.

When Ellsworth returned to Chicago in 1860, from an exhibition tour of eastern cities, he entered the law office of Abraham Lincoln as a clerk and devoted himself principally to the presidential campaign of that year. He later accompanied the President-elect to Washington and at this time proposed to President Lincoln the formation of a militia bureau, with himself as its chief. From this proposal, developed today's National Guard Bureau in the Departments of the Army and the Air Force.

The Civil War broke out while Ellsworth was awaiting the outcome of his proposal for a militia bureau. He went to New York and immediately recruited a volunteer regiment of Zouaves from the New York City Fire Department. When Lincoln issued his appeal for 75,000 troops, Ellsworth and his volunteer "Fire" Zouaves were ready to be sworn in. They arrived in Washington on April 29 and were quartered in the House of Representatives. In a ceremony at the east front of the Capitol on May 7, 1861, the regiment was sworn into Federal service and became officially known as the 11th New York Volunteer Infantry.

On May 23, when Virginia cast its fateful vote to secede from the Union, it meant that Union troops were immediately to occupy Alexandria. Ellsworth and his "Fire" Zouaves embarked down the Potomac on May 24 for his rendezvous with death. As his regiment landed in Alexandria, they saw a large Confederate flag flying from a pole on top of a hotel named the Marshal House. Determined to remove the flag, Ellsworth went to the roof of the hotel and as he descended the stairs with the flag in his arms, he was shot and killed by the hotel proprietor.

His death, being the first of note to occur in the war, produced a profound sensation throughout the country. His body lay in state in the White House, was taken to New York City by special train, and from there escorted to Albany and Mechanicville, where he is now buried.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation which I have introduced today is not only for the preservation of Elmer T. Ellsworth's home in Mechanicville, N.Y., but to also memorialize the birthplace of our Nation's first Civil War casualty.

More on Comdr. Alan B. Shepard and Friends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, not only was Comdr. Alan B. Shepard from New Hampshire, but it seems that New England has produced many more of the men directly concerned with the success of our first manned space shot. Since the vast majority of those who played a part in the event will never receive more than a great personal satisfaction and lasting memories, I want to recognize those from western Massachusetts who were involved. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the Pittsfield, Mass., Berkshire Eagle, of recent date.

Also, I draw your attention to an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of May 17, 1961, on a related subject—hazardous duty compensation for our astronauts. It concisely supports my bill, H.R. 7049, to rectify the present ironic provisions of the Career Compensation Act of 1949.

The articles follow:

FIVE AREA MEN HAD ACTIVE ROLE IN AIDING ASTRONAUT

Five Northern Berkshire men had active parts in the successful conclusion of Astronaut Alan B. Shepard's rocket ride to the edge of space.

Two were aboard the aircraft carrier U.S.S. *Lake Champlain* to the deck of which helicopters lowered Commander Shepard after he had emerged from his space capsule, and then the capsule itself after it had been fished from the sea.

Three others aboard the destroyers in the Navy recovery force which was deployed down the flight path from Cape Canaveral, Fla., prepared to recover the spacecraft and its occupant wherever they landed.

Aboard the U.S.S. *Lake Champlain*, the flagship of the force, when Commander Shepard was lowered to its deck, were Lt. (jg.) Francis J. Noel III, son of Mr. and Mrs. Noel of 62 East Avenue, this city, and Airman Roger R. Malloy, U.S. Navy, son of Mr. and Mrs. Robert W. Malloy of 125 Cole Avenue, Williamstown.

Lieutenant Noel is a nuclear weapons officer aboard the carrier. Airman Malloy is attached to one of the naval aviation flight squadrons aboard the vessel.

Navy Lt. (jg.) John W. Hinkell, son of Mr. and Mrs. Alfred A. Hinkell of 932 Church Street, was aboard the destroyer U.S.S. *The Sullivans* of which he is chief engineer; Walter Ostrobinski, of 88 Summer Street, electrician fireman and son of Mr. and Mrs. Walter Ostrobinski of 88Summer Street, Adams, was aboard the destroyer U.S.S. *Wadleigh*, and Ralph C. Jones, chief electrician's mate and son of Mrs. Anna M. Jones of 12 Manning Street, Williamstown, was in the destroyer U.S.S. *Rooks*.

MOST HAZARDOUS OF ALL

Obviously an oversight has been responsible for the strange anomaly which has threatened our astronauts with a loss of income because their jobs are not legally defined as hazardous duty. With gratifying alacrity, however—as soon as this ridiculous situation was explained to them by Reporter William Hines of the Star—key Members of Congress have promised to rectify the matter.

As things now stand, the seven astronauts qualify for from $200 to $245 a month each in extra pay if they can manage to sandwich in a collective total of 28 hours' flying time. Thus, according to the Navy, Commander Shepard earned the munificent sum of $14.38 in cold cash by his historic 15-minute flight the other day in the Mercury capsule. At this rate, it would take a lot of missile shots to accumulate $200 a month, and the pressure of their duties as pioneering spacemen has severely limited the time available to the astronauts for regular jet flying.

Whether these men should fly planes at all during this period is up to their superiors. But of course they should not be required to do so simply to maintain the moderate take-home pay they have received in the past. All that is needed is a simple bill to designate astronaut service as the 14th hazardous duty category in the Career Compensation Act of 1949. And no one, most assuredly, will appear at any hearing to challenge this classification.

Illinois Group Opposes Curbs on Scientists' Use of Animals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, the Illinois State Academy of Science has adopted a resolution in opposition to various legislative proposals to place Federal restrictions on the use of animals in scientific research.

Under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include the resolution adopted at a meeting of the academy in Charleston, Ill., on April 28, 1961:

ILLINOIS STATE ACADEMY OF SCIENCE
Urbana, Ill., May 11, 1961.

Hon. PETER F. MACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MACK: The attached resolution was approved unanimously by the members of the Illinois State Academy of Science in their meeting at Charleston, Ill., on April 28, 1961. It is my pleasure to send you this copy of it.

Sincerely yours,

G. R. YOHE, *Secretary.*

5. Federal Regulation of Research

Whereas Representative MARTHA GRIFFITHS, of Detroit, Mich., has reintroduced a bill in the 87th Congress proposing that the Federal Government police the use of animals in scientific research (H.R. 1937); and

Whereas Representative MORGAN M. MOULDER, of Missouri, has introduced a different bill that would also police research (H.R. 3556); and

Whereas Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, of Kentucky, has been preparing a revised version of the bill he introduced in the 86th Congress; and

Whereas these bills permit an unwarranted encroachment upon the research worker's freedom in conducting his research; and since implementation of these bills would require expensive, massive, and totally unproductive regulatory machinery; and as these bills would delay the testing of new concepts and ideas, and would hinder and restrict medical and biological research; and because the administrative requirements of the bills would significantly reduce the investigator's productive research time when his efforts are vital to our national and international interest; and

Whereas numerous problems of interpretation would be created by the vagueness in terminology of many of the provisions; and since the bills contain no constructive provisions to deal with the current needs in the field of laboratory animal care, i.e., to encourage serious research in significant animal care problems; to provide greater support of professional and technical training; to encourage even wider dissemination of factual information in the field; and to support the improvement of existing laboratory animal facilities and the construction of new facilities; and as the bills would retard the objective of rational humane care for laboratory animals: Be it

Resolved, That the Illinois State Academy of Science, in annual convention assembled, expresses for the reasons set forth above its opposition to H.R. 1937, and H.R. 3556, to Senator Cooper's bill, and to any similar legislation that may be proposed; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the Senators and Representatives from Illinois to oppose these proposed bills in every possible way, for the best interests of science in its constant attempts to better the welfare of mankind, and to support nonregulatory Federal legislation which would encourage greater support by private and Federal agencies of research and training programs in laboratory animal care; of programs for the dissemination of factual information in the field; and of programs for the improvement of existing laboratory animal facilities and the construction of new facilities; and be it again further

Resolved, That our secretary be directed to send a copy of this resolution to each of the Senators and Representatives from Illinois.

(Approval was moved by Dr. Kanatzar, seconded by Dr. Kaplan, and carried.)

Mrs. Shepard's Contribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, many words have been written and spoken proclaiming the historic feat of Cmdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr., the first American to reach outer space, but little recognition has been given Mrs. Shepard for her contribution.

I believe that a resolution unanimously adopted by the United Voluntary Services during its recent annual convention in Washington, D.C., is fitting recognition of the faith and courage Mrs. Shepard demonstrated during her long preparatory stage and the flight itself.

The United Voluntary Services is an organization of volunteers who are dedicated to service to the hospitalized veterans, military personnel, and youth. In adopting its resolution it recognized that "They also serve who only stand and wait." Mrs. Shepard certainly proves the point.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

To Mrs. ALAN B. SHEPARD, JR.:

The United Voluntary Services, in national convention in Washington, D.C., wish to recognize and acclaim the deep courage it required to see a loved one take a momentous patriotic step that will go down in the history of all peace loving nations.

Louise Shepard's unheralded contribution to her husband's feat, and her personal faith and courage, will serve as an inspiration to all women.

HELEN F. LENGFELD,
National President,
United Voluntary Services.

It Is Not a Space Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as Americans we are all proud of the explorations of our space program and the successful feat of U.S. Astronaut Commander Shepard. One of the outstanding community newspapers in my district, the La Grange Citizen, in the issue of May 11, directed its readers' attention to one of the important aspects of our space program, namely the so-called space race with the Soviet Union.

I believe this editorial is extremely sound in its analysis of that situation, and I insert it into the RECORD with the hope that it will receive careful attention and thought for the House Members:

THE PUBLISHER SAYS—IT IS NOT A SPACE RACE

The pleasure and exultation of the U.S. man-in-space feat has been marred by the inclusion in every story of a statement such as "this puts the United States back in the space race," or "Commander Shepard's performance is less than that of the Russian who orbited the earth", or "it was puny compared to Yuri Gagarin's."

Why this apologetic reiteration? Why this minimizing of an accomplishment which deserves all out commendation without depreciation.

The U.S. man-in-space success should be given its proper emphasis. And that emphasis is that the people of the United States of America were not as eager to be first in space as they were to be sure that the first man they sent aloft would come back safe.

To us, life still is a prized possession. We are not willing as a Nation to deliberately sacrifice a man for the nebulous prize of public acclaim.

The Voice of America in its broadcasts, the U.S. press and the press friendly to this country should be encouraged to point out that the difference between the Russian and the U.S. outer space programs is the difference between the basic humanitarian concepts of the two philosophies of government.

The individual is our main concern. Recognition of the red emblem is the only goal for the Russians and their satellites. Stalin, Khrushchev, Castro and their ilk have no regard for individuals or human lives, as is manifested by the hundreds and thousands of murders they deliberately order to get rid of those who stand in their way.

The world may never find out how many men Russia unsuccessfully shot into space, and up to now the world has no documented evidence that it has orbited one and returned him to the earth. In contrast, the United States let its duds perform without human sacrifice. And, the success was given worldwide exposure with irrefutable evidence of its accomplishment.

Why not capitalize on these differences and create in the people everywhere a recognition that the difference between democracy as we practice it and communism is the difference between respect for individuals and disdain for them.

Trade, Not Aid?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article, written by the well-known press writer, Victor Riesel, appeared in a recent issue of the Binghamton Press.

I think it is high time the Members of this House took notice of the fact that we are still trading quite actively with the enemy, in this case Fidel Castro.

Although we are very largely responsible for Castro's rise, it would seem that by now he should be known for what he is: a Communist enemy on our very doorstep. Or is this another case of "Trade, not aid"? Methinks it is a good deal of both.

(By Victor Riesel)

The last time I spoke to Castro he was wild-eyed and muttering. But apparently he has not lost touch with the practical. His devotion to communism has not developed in him a distaste for our capitalist dollars—and it should be known Cuba still is selling more than $40 million worth of produce a year in the United States. This business, though not quite as usual, is going on right now, invasion or no invasion, insults or no insults.

His economic chief, "Che" Guevera, needs these dollars to keep the island's gasping economy from choking to death. The Soviets are sending him military hardware, not hard rubles. The Cuban State Trust collects these dollars from some "Americans" through letters of credit placed to Cuba's accounts in Canadian banks.

With these $40 million, Castro actually still is purchasing some vital machinery in the United States and vital livestock in Canada to bolster his regime—not to feed his people. Despite everything that Castro has

come to mean, some U.S. machinery is permitted him by the State Department on the theory that a total embargo would cause hardships to some international brokers.

The American suppliers of machinery would lose money if they could not complete orders Castro and Guevera placed here over the last year or so—that's the theory. What about the "hardships" of the Cubans who hit the beaches for freedom? They lost more than money.

Furthermore, some of the $40 million the Communist Cuban Government earns from its sales in America is paid to Canadian ranchers. They have been rolling their livestock south along the eastern seaboard to West Palm Beach.

There, twice a week—Tuesdays and Thursdays—the cattle have been shipped on the West India Fruit and Steamship Co. ocean ferries.

The overnight ferries were shut down for a few days during the life of the liberty beachheads. But now they've resumed supplying Castro and returning with his money-making produce. Other Cuban cargo is flown in by his communized companies to Miami.

Even at this minute Castro's plantations are selling some $2 million worth of tobacco a month in the United States. This is a Government—well documented—figure. The Cubans are even selling us a synthetic filament made by the Rayonera factory in the Matanzas district. Thus, the State Department permits this neo-Communist competition with our own hard-hit textile industry, which President Kennedy is attempting to aid. Those people at the State Department should check with the White House.

The State Department should check with somebody. As recently as March 10 Castro was permitted to buy live cattle, live hogs, baby chicks, and even hatching eggs from us. These purchases were not made for the benefit of the people of Cuba.

The livestock was being used for breeding purposes, so Castro could equip future collective farms. If we had not been sending him these animal cargoes, the Russians would have had to supply Cuba. This would have drained the scarce Soviet stocks. It would have put a heavy load on the already overburdened Red bloc merchant fleet.

But early in March someone told the boys at the State Department the facts of barnyard life. Only then did the trade end. But if we had not permitted the Cubans to make money in the United States they never would have had enough to pay for the cargoes for their Caribbean communes.

What makes this business as usual between Cuba and some private U.S. brokers even more galling is the fact that our military finds itself in an awkward position in Cuba. There are some dollars the Pentagon must pay Castro. We rent the Guantanamo Bay base for $150,000 a week. Also we pay some 3,500 Cuban workers on the base some $15 million a year in wages. This we have to do in dollars.

But why should private U.S. citizens add to Castro's Communist exchequer? The anti-Communist Cubans who fought Soviet tanks on the beaches can tell you that liberty is dearer than money.

The Blackmailer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the brazen blackmail by Cuban Dictator Castro in offering to release 1,200 captives in return for bulldozers has to be clearly understood for all the implications that could stem from this situation.

It is logical to assume that if the first blackmail attempt is successful, others will continue, and in each we will receive less and be giving more. I would feel that the Members of the House in supporting the Selden resolution last week most certainly in principle would oppose this Castro offer.

I have been disturbed by the misguided Americans, many of them bearing names of great fame or notoriety, depending on public opinion, who are committed to raising the funds necessary to arrange this trade.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come not to bargain with Castro, but to press forward aggressively with firmness on all fronts to free the Cuban people from their horrible fate. We must reappraise all the aspects of the problem posed by this blackmail attempt, and I feel that the editorial in the Chicago Tribune yesterday, May 23, entitled "The Blackmailer," concisely and vigorously presents the whole picture in a most understandable light.

The editorial follows:

THE BLACKMAILER

The awful Castro, with a sense of imagination never displayed in Washington, unloaded a delegation of 10 prisoners from the recent abortive invasion in Miami Saturday. He sent them here by air to appeal for support of his offer to release 1,200 invasion captives in return for 500 bulldozers needed to clear land for agriculture.

The Kennedy administration, already sufficiently embarrassed by the American directed fiasco at the Bay of Pigs, was obliged to hold still and permit the return of the Cubans it had sent on an errant mission. A committee of do-gooders, including Mrs. Roosevelt, Milton Eisenhower, and Walter Reuther, promptly sprang into being to encourage the Castro blackmail.

Well, we suppose that, inasmuch as the Kennedy administration got the invaders into their pickle, it owes them some exertions to spare their lives. But we don't think the cost of the bulldozers, if the trade is consummated, should be borne by the public through subscription or the taxpayers through appropriation. Properly, it might be met out of the Kennedy family fortune.

Capitalism Continues To Bail Out Socialist Failures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, we are being told that poverty and communism go hand in hand and that we must continue to shovel our foreign aid funds to impoverished countries to prevent their overthrow by Communist infiltrators.

In the countries that have gone behind the Iron Curtain the rate of communism has been higher in industrial areas. Communists in the field of arts, science and elsewhere are anything but impoverished.

Oddly enough the Communist movement in this country has been financed by those who have obtained their gains through our free enterprise system.

Mr. Henry Hazlitt ably sheds light on this Communist-and-poverty thesis in the current issue of Newsweek. His column follows:

HOW TO CURE POVERTY

(By Henry Hazlitt)

The real issue in the Western Hemisphere, according to Secretary of State Dean Rusk, is the battle against poverty. Foreign aid, he keeps repeating, must be concerned with "social" as well as "economic" objectives; it must not perpetuate the gap between the rich and the poor.

Is the battle against poverty the real issue? Is it the problem with which Americans think their Secretary of State should be primarily charged? Or isn't that problem really the battle against Communist subversion and aggression?

The problem of poverty has existed from time immemorial. It is as old as man. Since the birth of capitalism—the Industrial Revolution—tremendous strides have been made toward its solution. But the problem of Communist subversion and aggression is peculiarly the problem of our time, of our decade, of 1961. It is this that Americans are worried about. They are a generous people and would like to see other people better off. They have in fact done more in this direction than any other people in history. But the poverty in India, or the gap between the rich and the poor in Brazil, is not what keeps them awake nights.

Secretary Rusk seems to think that poverty is the primary cause of communism, and that an increase in incomes would be the primary cure. Experience and statistics do not bear him out. In Italy and in a score of other countries, communism is nearly always found to be higher in the richer industrial districts than in the poorer agricultural sections. Communism has been growing while world income has been growing. The Broadway and Hollywood Communists also spoil the Secretary's thesis.

NOT BY GIVEAWAY

One of the things we have been told for years by the advocates of foreign aid is that the world cannot exist half rich and half poor. It has in fact so existed for centuries. Of course poor nations do not buy much from us nor sell much to us. But neither do they threaten us militarily. It is nations well off enough to embark on huge armament programs, like Nazi Germany, prewar Japan, and Communist Russia, that can do that. The latter can also subsidize aggression against us in the poorer countries.

Of course it is always desirable to reduce poverty, where and to the extent that we can. But what is the method or system most likely to do that? It is precisely here that Secretary Rusk and the advocates of bigger and longer term foreign aid are most wrong in their implications. For they assume that the way to cure foreign poverty is by government-to-government giveaway programs, by state projects, state spending, state planning. In a word, by socialism.

BRAZIL AND INDIA

This is made clear not only in their generalities but in their specific programs. A $2 billion "international financial rescue package" is being prepared for Brazil, with smaller packages to bolster the economies of Venezuela and Bolivia. But the difficulties of these countries are of their own making. They are the result of their inflationism, socialism, Brasilias and other grandiose state-planned projects. Now that they have run out of their own money, the United States is offering Latin American governments a $600 million "social development fund" for more of the same. Our planners are also planning to lend India $1 billion in the next

2 years to meet the foreign-exchange requirements of India's third 5-year plan, and to help India build a nuclear powerplant and a Government steel mill. India having borrowed and spent itself to the brink of bankruptcy, it is considered our duty to forget all about our own balance-of-payments problem and rush to the rescue of Indian socialism.

If the Kennedy administration is right in thinking that foreign poverty is the real problem, it has chosen precisely the wrong way to solve it. The problem of poverty cannot be solved by communism, socialism, or state planning, but by capitalism—by the system of freedom of private property, private enterprise, and free markets. But few of our officials, despite occasional lip service, seem to have any real faith in the system that has made it possible for us to keep bailing out the socialist failures.

Farley Says Latin America Fears Its Own Castros

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the May 1 issue of the Rockland County Journal-News:

FARLEY SAYS LATIN AMERICA FEARS ITS OWN CASTROS

NEW YORK.—James A. Farley, recognized authority on gaging public opinion, said leaders of Latin America are strongly anti-Castro and the United States would be wise in stepping up its good neighbor policy.

Farley recently toured South America and conferred with Presidents, Foreign Ministers, and other government officials. Some were close friends from the days Farley was in the Franklin D. Roosevelt Cabinet.

"I found the leaders down there very friendly toward President Kennedy," he said in an interview with United Press International. "Their attitude toward the administration in Washington is better today than it has been for many years.

"The leaders of Latin America are strongly anti-Castro. They know there is a potential Castro in every country so they are determined to contain the present Cuban leader."

The former Postmaster General and political adviser to F.D.R. said there "is no doubt in my mind there will be no further goofing in handling Fidel Castro," but he added:

"You can't invade Cuba with the size of the force they tried to do it with."

He said all Latin-American countries need and want financial help from the United States. He said, "You can't write a strict formula or set a hard and fast rule" for providing assistance.

"What they really need is help in developing their economy," he continued. "They need more water power, better roads and transportation facilities. Their lands need irrigation. And, they desire improved educational facilities and technical help."

Farley said officials of the Latin Governments are "extremely anti-communistic," but added he saw evidence of Communist activities "in areas where the economy is low."

"I discovered the leaders very pleased with the election of President Kennedy," he continued. "They feel that in Kennedy they have a friend who will help."

Farley suggested more frequent visits to South American countries by top U.S. officials. He noted that Roosevelt and former Secretary of State Cordell Hull personally took a hand in furthering the "good neighbor" approach.

"A visit by President Kennedy would do much," Farley said.

Farley talked with officials in Brazil, Argentina, Chile, Peru and Uruguay. He also visited Panama.

Stop Appeasing the Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, this sobering editorial by David Lawrence, in the May 29 issue of the U.S. News & World Report, is must reading for all America. Is it not about time we stopped appeasing the Communists, not only abroad but also here in the United States?

KOWTOWING TO KHRUSHCHEV

(By David Lawrence)

President Kennedy has disheartened millions of Americans by his willingness to sit down with Nikita Khrushchev—the man who insulted the preceding President of the United States.

Mr. Kennedy said during the last campaign that he was willing to express regrets to the Soviet Government because of the U–2 incident. This was widely interpreted at the time to mean that he was ready to apologize even though this might make it appear he was repudiating an act of military necessity—protection of the American people against surprise attack.

Mr. Kennedy also said—as he was trying to get the votes of his countrymen—that he didn't think summit conferences should be held with the Soviet Premier unless there had first been preparations at the diplomatic level indicating some area of agreement.

There has been no such agreement. Instead, the situation between the East and West has since worsened.

What possible good then can come from kowtowing to Khrushchev? The same old argument is made that it will clear the air and that we shall know where we stand.

On May 30, 1955, on this page this writer said:

"Those in Government, here and abroad who know the inside story of all the futile efforts thus far to obtain from Moscow, through the customary diplomatic channels, some evidence of a sincere desire to negotiate peace must have a troubled conscience as they accept the enemy's propaganda trick—a spectacular meeting with Bulganin (at the summit)—and arouse false hopes everywhere about the prospects for peace. * * *

"A third world war must be avoided if it is humanly possible to do so, because the destruction of cities by atomic weapons is too horrible to contemplate. But it is precisely because a policy of weakness and craven surrender of basic principles invites attack that those who are crying for peace at any price can turn out to be the very ones who bring on a terrible war. * * *

"Whence comes this strange delusion that by a four-power conference good faith can be established where there has been none before? And when will we learn to take our stand on principle and adhere steadfastly to it no matter what the sacrifice? For there is only one way to deter any enemy government from aggression, and that is to persuade the people behind it that their rulers are endangering their lives—and, if this fails, then to make sure our force is adequate to defend ourselves against any attack that may come. * * *

"Governments that wish to preserve freedom must steer by the compass of basic principle. They cannot surrender to the whims of experiency now without risking the surrender of their liberties later on."

Commenting on the summit conference idea 6 years ago, on May 5, 1955, the writer said on this page:

"The people of Soviet Russia and of China want freedom just as we do. We must not tighten the hold of their oppressors on them. We must open the way for their liberation by refusing to deal with gangster governments. For those governments constantly threaten the peace of the world, and there can be no safety for anybody as long as they remain in power.

"There is but one way to force the disintegration of the Communist empire. It is by forgetting four-power conferences and imposing a complete quarantine on the Communist regimes. This means extermination of their agents and conspirators from all free countries.

"These enemies must be driven from within our gates. It makes no sense to endeavor to negotiate with the master minds of world conspiracy."

In the past several months, the Soviet Government has vigorously waged a cold war everywhere.

Khrushchev has refused to cooperate with the United Nations in the Congo.

Khrushchev has tried to wreck the United Nations by seeking to dissolve the office of Secretary General.

Khrushchev has virtually taken over the Castro Government in Cuba, just 90 miles from our shores.

Why then does the President of the United States feel that he must go to Europe to see Khrushchev and thereby give the world the impression that he is kowtowing to him?

Why should our Government place credence in the word of a Communist ruler who has broken faith on every occasion—a tyrant who ordered the brutal murder of the people of Hungary and who today is conniving in Laos and in South Vietnam to undermine the forces of the free world?

It is pertinent to recall the words of George Santayana, the famous philosopher, who wrote:

"Those who refuse to learn from history are condemned to repeat it."

Once it was the arrogant Kaiser Wilhelm. Appeasement failed, and then came World War I.

Next it was the insane Hitler. Appeasement failed, and then came World War II.

Will the intransigent Nikita Khrushchev now misconstrue our continued submissiveness and thereby bring on world war III?

Depressed Areas Law Loosens Purse Strings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, recently the Congress passed and the President signed a depressed areas bill. I should like to remind my colleagues that

parts of my district are termed so-called depressed areas, at least when the loggers, fishermen and harvesters are not working because of the seasonal aspect of their vocations.

On May 18, 1961, the Everett (Wash.) Daily Herald editorialized on this depressed areas legislation in a thought-provoking manner. It points out there is the possibility that money dished out to "depressed areas" will sweeten some voters in certain areas in time for the next congressional elections.

Also, Mr. Speaker, the editorial speaks of how the Congress again has relinquished more of its power over the public purse through the back-door spending provisions of this legislation. I agree with the Daily Herald, and under leave to extend my remarks I include the editorial in the RECORD as follows:

DEPRESSED AREAS MEASURE SPENDS PUBLIC'S MONEY

President Kennedy's measure to dish out $451 million in the next 4 years to depressed areas should rightfully be tabbed as a political victory for the administration. It got the Democratic gravy train on the road and it will sweeten some voters in certain places in time for the next congressional elections.

It could assist President Kennedy in areas that count at the voting polls 4 years from now.

Try as we did we could find nothing that would assure us that these handouts will accomplish much, if anything, in placing chronically depressed areas back on the right side of the economic highway or even make a little dent in unemployment.

Therefore we believe we have a valid doubt as to the worthwhileness of the measure.

The taxpayers merely lost another round to the spenders. In this instance the Congress let them down.

Three hundred million dollars of the $451 million will be spent with congressional review, without congressional authorization of specific outlays. The spenders will merely receive the money upon demand from the Treasury. The Treasury then will proceed to borrow sufficient cash to cover. Thus we have additions to debt and deficit.

Thus we have chronicled a bad feature of the act.

Congress again relinquished its power of the purse as it has done in so many other instances. We remember the day when this power was zealously guarded. It enabled the Congress to place a brake on spending and to counter inflationary tendencies originating within the Federal structure.

But as we said, the measure is purely political. The objective being to gain votes through liberal use of your money. Neither the Government nor the people of this country should permit the spending of millions whether with or without some check on the purse strings.

What Is U.S. Will Power?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the following penetrating editorial from an outstanding newspaper, the Woburn Times, published in the Fifth District of Massachusetts, which I have the honor to represent:

[From the Woburn (Mass.) Daily Times, May 19, 1961]

WHAT IS U.S. WILL POWER?

What can be certain that the United States has the military power to stand up to any threat Premier Nikita Khrushchev poses.

But the big question in our minds, and in Khrushchev's mind is: "Have the people in the United States the will power to use their military power?"

A defeatist slogan is sweeping England. "Better Red than dead," it goes. "Communism is bad, but it is not as much evil as death."

Rather than have a showdown fight of nuclear proportions with the Soviet bloc, it is a far better thing, so these pacifistic-neutralists say, to allow the Communists to roam at will over the world and test the inevitability of their philosophy * * * which is: Come what may, communism will conquer all some day.

Putting our current use of will power to the test, we have these indications:

If Castro is not dealt with, and soon, communism will make rapid strides in this hemisphere. Latin America is offering little help in curbing Castro. A large batch of U.S. professors tells us that we should stay out of Cuba. Most Americans would use force to defend the Guantanamo Bay Naval Base, but less than 50 percent want any part of an invasion of Cuba.

Laos is lost to us. We would like to see the rest of Southeast Asia saved from communism. We will make the sacrifices to send economic and military help, but we want none of our soldiers over there.

Then comes the test of our willpower on Berlin, Nikita Khrushchev says that "all time limits have expired" for a settlement of the Berlin and German questions.

Secretary of State Rusk says we will not retreat from our position that West Berlin remain free, a part of West Germany. On the surface, the words mean that we will fight the East Germans and the Soviet Union, too, if they try to take over West Berlin. But we told the world there would be no retreat in Laos, and now we are in Geneva trying to make a deal on that lost-to-the-West nation.

If the pattern of U.S. action in regard to Cuba obtains for Berlin, then we will start too late to defend Berlin and new compromises will have to be accepted.

Are we going to force Russia to accept a plebiscite or the unification or division of Germany?

Are we going to defend West Berlin as we have promised?

Or are we going to pass off our losses in the recurrent crises, with the cheap, myopic cowardice expressed in the daily more popular symbol of human decadence: "Better Red than dead?"

Montgomery and the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I insert into the RECORD an editorial in this morning's Wall Street Journal which, in a clear, concise manner, brings to our attention one thought that should be kept in mind as we pass judgment upon the recent unfortunate disorders in Montgomery, Ala.:

MONTGOMERY AND THE WORLD

There is, surely, plenty of blame to go around for the Montgomery racial disorders. But we should like to enter a dissent to the increasingly prevalent notion that the United States as a whole deserves all this criticism, at home and abroad, for mismanaging its racial problems.

In this particular case the trouble was deliberately provoked. The so-called freedom riders went looking for trouble, in one of the most likely parts of the South, and they found it. The local and State authorities failed, in the beginning at least, in their duties to prevent violence and maintain law and order.

That was said to require Federal intervention, and perhaps it did. But the present administration sometimes seems almost as zealous in this matter as some of the agitators. It seems to believe that by fast, firm action it can clear up this whole question of segregation in the near future.

If that is indeed the view at the Justice Department, we fear it is an illusion. The Supreme Court school decision of 1954, whatever one may think of it otherwise, undertook to upset a social pattern of long duration. The consequences have been coming ever since, and the only sure thing is that the troubles will keep coming.

But all that does not, in our opinion, properly make the United States an object of scorn in its own eyes and the world's. We are dealing here with a collision of cultures, with elemental emotions, instincts, and attitudes which cannot be waved away with court orders or U.S. marshals or promptly solved in any simple fashion. And we would just like to know what society, ever, faced with such a problem, has dealt with it any better or nearly as well.

Let's consider a few cases in the world today—not to justify the United States by pointing a finger at others, but simply to keep this complex matter in some kind of perspective.

There are, for instance, the emerging nations of Africa, so perturbed about America's race problems. Yet they themselves exhibit racism in reverse. Native politicians in Kenya, heading toward independence, want to drive out or submerge the whites and Asians who built the place for them. That is perhaps their business, but it hardly suggests they have found the secret of a harmonious multiracial society.

Throughout the vast backward areas of the nonwhite world, in fact, prejudice, discrimination, segregation are the custom. It's hard to think of a more thoroughly segregated setup than India's caste system.

Then there is the sanctimonious Soviet Union; to be sure, it does not have a Negro problem, but it holds many Asiatics, among others, in thrall and follows a quasi-official policy of anti-Semitism.

Even the civilized nations across the Atlantic are not successful at coping with the race problem when the problem arises—as it has in Britain. For most of them, of course, the problem has not arisen in any important degree, and therefore it is all the easier to deliver lectures on inequality in the United States.

The truth is that progress toward equality under the law—before as well as after 1954—is one of the more remarkable achievements of America, in view of its singularly difficult situation in this respect. Today compromises on the schools are taking shape in many areas of the South. Long and involved litigation, which itself dissipates passions, frequently results in a measure of desegregation not satisfactory to either side, but not intolerable either. Where there is any community will to ac-

cept change, the Federal courts have generally been understanding.

None of this excuses the mess in Montgomery; it does not mean all Americans are going to love each other any time soon. But the broad record of progress ought to be remembered once in a while in the midst of all the talk of the damage we are causing ourselves and our image abroad.

Ill-Conceived Flight of Fancy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL FINDLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Globe-Democrat of St. Louis, printed with great clarity Tuesday, May 16, the difficulties involved in the President's forthcoming meeting with Mr. Khrushchev. This analysis deserves the attention of all Americans, particularly those highly placed in the administration:

ILL-CONCEIVED FLIGHT OF FANCY

In ordinary circumstances, it is always a good thing if two people who have widely divergent points of view sit down to discuss and, if possible, reconcile their differences.

If we were dealing with a normal person, or with a country which subscribes to the same idea of truth, honesty, and decency to which the United States has been devoted throughout its history, it would make good sense for President Kennedy and Chairman Khrushchev to have a meeting. There are few things in life which two reasonable people cannot achieve if they share a common goal.

Unfortunately, the United States and Russia, when talking of peace, simply are not using the same language. The Russians' idea of peace is entirely different than the dream which all good Americans have for this utmost aspiration of any civilized people. Peace to Russia is absolute slavery, and complete capitulation on their own terms.

Under these circumstances, Mr. Kennedy's overtures to Mr. Khrushchev bode nothing but ill for the world situation, considering the present state of global affairs.

American statesmen from President Wilson on have, without exception, suffered diplomatic disaster when they attempted to engage in personal diplomacy.

This was true in 1919, when America had won the war for the allies.

It was far more true at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam in the closing days of the victory which American strength had achieved in World War II.

Yet, in all these instances, America was negotiating from a position of strength.

President Eisenhower's personal diplomacy with Khrushchev—culminating in the humiliation in Paris just a year ago this week—should have taught American leaders, once and for all, the consummate folly of high-level discussions with the Russians but, even last May, the United States was negotiating from strength.

Today, quite to the contrary, following our disaster in Cuba and the unfolding tragedy in Laos—plus the superior achivements of Russia in space, and the deteriorating situation in other areas—the United States is not negotiating from strength, but from the greatest position of weakness in this Nation's recent history.

Under these circumstances, it is absolutely inconceivable that any good can come out of such a meeting. Conversely, enormous harm to an already devastatingly bad international picture could come of it, if Khrushchev inflicts on Kennedy the same abuse he poured on Dwight Eisenhower's head a year ago.

It must be borne in mind, too, that President Eisenhower was a man with tremendous international prestige because of his reputation as the architect of victory in Europe in World War II—whereas Mr. Kennedy's international prestige, at the moment, is considerably less than zero.

If Khrushchev had any idea that he might want to transmit to the United States, which could pave the way for a just and lasting peace, he has a full diplomatic representation through his ambassadors and ministers in Washington.

He has another diplomatic staff at the United Nations, and he has representatives presently throwing roadblocks in the path of progress in both the nuclear talks in Geneva and the discussions on Laos in the same city.

An added cause of concern to the American people is the impulsive way in which Mr. Kennedy has conducted foreign affairs in his unhappy 4 months in office, marked as they have been by a complete lack of planning, preparation and follow-through.

If Mr. Kennedy is going off on another ill-conceived flight of fancy similar to the abortive invasion of Cuba, the results for this Nation could be even more calamitous than that miserable nightmare.

All in all, there is nothing to be gained by a personal meeting which could not be achieved through normal diplomatic channels. On the other hand, there are exceedingly grave risks to our already badly damaged stature in today's world picture.

Mr. Kennedy's brash impulsiveness, which may charm television audiences, presents an extreme liability in the precarious balance of today. Look out for the trap, Mr. President.

Good Old Days in Brooklyn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, many of us talk about the weather, but nobody does anything about it. In the same manner, many of us talk about the "good old days," but nobody ever does anything to bring them back—that is nobody, except good old Brooklyn, N.Y.

Here we are discussing today such matters as aircraft missiles and appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to launch more and newer satellites into space, men in space, trips to the moon, which only a few short years ago seemed fantastic and almost impossible.

But in Brooklyn today they are turning the clock back to the good old days, the days of bustles and bows, the Keystone cops, and the horse-drawn trolley car. That "garden spot of the world" known as Greenpoint, located in my congressional district in Brooklyn, is today beginning its annual celebration of the good old days in an effort to recapture some of the spirit and the gayety of those carefree days of our grandfathers and grandmothers.

On Greenpoint's streets, beginning at 7 o'clock this evening, the folks will be wearing the fashions of yesteryear. The stores will be decorated to look like the oldtime stores. A cavalcade will make its way through the streets. A barbershop quartet will sing such delightful favorites from grandpa's hit parade as "Sweet Adeline," "Genevieve," and "I'll Take You Home Again, Kathleen." Of course, Miss America of 1895 will be there. There will be free rides on the pony-drawn Toonerville Trolley. There will also be clowns galore, horseless carriages, and prizes for novel ideas to bring back the old days.

Mr. Speaker, I am torn betwixt and between. I know I should be in Brooklyn today with my constituents, reliving the good old days and partaking of all the fun and excitement. But duty calls in Washington and I must help "mind the store" here in these crucial days. So while my heart is in Brooklyn, my place is here. We may not be able to bring back the good old days for good, but if we succeed in achieving true peace for the world, perhaps future generations will someday think of our days, too, as the good old days.

To Gale H. Wilcox, for Heroism Far Above the Call of Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, "A greater gift hath no man than to lay down his life for a friend." Gale H. Wilcox, district park ranger in the Grand Teton National Park who had served his Nation for nearly 25 years, was given the Department of the Interior's Valor Award, posthumously, for sacrificing his life to save another's. At the 25th Honor Award Convocation, his widow received the Department's recognition, reserved for employees who demonstrate unusual courage involving a high degree of personal risk in the face of danger, whether or not it be in the line of duty. Also, recently, the Carnegie Hero Fund Commission presented him, posthumously, its bronze medal for heroism.

Under any circumstances and at any time a human being makes this sacrifice, it is worthy of continuing commendation and public notice. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the citation of the Department of the Interior:

CITATION FOR VALOR AWARD, GALE H. WILCOX, FOR COURAGEOUS ACTION IN THE FACE OF DEATH

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington.

While on ski patrol with two other park rangers in Grand Teton National Park on

March 9, 1960, District Park Ranger Wilcox lost his life after breaking through the ice on Jackson Lake during an attempt to rescue one of his companions. Mr. Wilcox and Assistant Chief Ranger Stanley H. Spurgeon had skied, one at a time, across the ice-covered channel when Ranger John Fonda, who followed them, broke through the ice. Although he could not swim, Mr. Wilcox joined his companion in an attempt to get Mr. Fonda to safety. Rescue efforts failed when the ice ledge broke, plunging all of them into the icy water. Mr. Wilcox, valiantly and heroically, tried to save Mr. Fonda until he became exhausted and had to be dragged from the water by Mr. Spurgeon. The exertion and exposure proved to be more than Mr. Wilcox could physically withstand, and he advanced into a state of shock from which he did not recover. For heroism and courage far beyond the call of duty in an effort to save the life of a fellow worker, resulting in the loss of his own life, Mr. Wilcox is granted, posthumously, the Valor Award of the Department of the Interior.

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

Will the Statue of Liberty Carry a Hammer and Sickle?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an address by Miss Karen McDonald, entitled "Will the Statue of Liberty Carry a Hammer and Sickle?"

WILL THE STATUE OF LIBERTY CARRY A HAMMER AND SICKLE?

(Speech given for the Wisconsin High School Forensics Contest, by Karen McDonald, St. Mary's Academy, Milwaukee, Wis.)

When our forefathers touched the prow of the *Mayflower* to the newly discovered land of America, liberty was released from bondage and stepped forth to become the foundation stone of our freedoms. Down through the centuries she has survived through war and peace, depression and recession, years of want and years of plenty. Until the present time, her secure position in our country has never been seriously threatened.

This is the climax, the turning point has arrived. Freedom, my freedom and your freedom, is being undermined by that subversive power, communism. Gathering strength and prestige by leaps and bounds in one country after another, communism has grown from one man's abstract idea into a worldwide party of hate.

"Behind the Iron Curtain" seems to express the average citizen's concept of or his concern in communism, but the Soviets have boasted that they have active Communist parties in 87 countries of the world, and America has not been proven to be invulnerable to the attacks of these groups.

But we say, let it go, America is strong, it cannot fall into communism. We know it, but do the Communists know it. Of course they don't.

The activities of this subversive group in the United States give conclusive evidence to that fact. For example, did you know that the Communist magazine, U.S.S.R., is being sold right now at your neighborhood book shop, at the newsstand on the corner? In fact, up until a short time ago, and I'm ashamed to admit it, this propaganda-filled magazine was actually published in my hometown, Milwaukee. Also today, there is much said against the House Un-American Activities Committee; and who inspires this dissension, learn the truth about the state of affairs in his country? No. But much communistic-inspired criticism is directed against Representative WALTER and his committee.

Yet, not all are blind to the false propaganda against Congressman WALTER and the HUAC. A recent article in the Brooklyn Tablet reported on the activities of a college group which is supporting this committee in its courageous fight against communism. They base their opposition on the fact that under our Constitution, the public has a right to be informed about any persons or organizations that might attempt to overthrow our way of life. And communism has not only overthrown the way of life in Russia, China, and the countries behind the Iron Curtain, but has infiltrated to every corner of the globe and is now attempting to overthrow America and its democracy.

In America today, the question is not, When will the Communists attack? They have attacked and will keep on attacking until our Government, the leader of the free world, topples. The riots in San Francisco last May, the prejudice of the people in South America against the United States, these and many other incidents uphold the fact that America is being infiltrated and democracy is being undermined by the Communists.

The symbol of our democracy, the Statue of Liberty, has stood in New York Harbor since 1886, carrying in her hand the symbols of peace and guidance, the book of knowledge and the torch of human understanding. Are we going to allow these symbols—symbols our forefathers fought to obtain—to be replaced by the treacherous hammer and sickle of the Communists? It is up to the average citizen, the John Does and Mary Smiths of America, to keep the spirit of liberty alive in their hearts, to keep America for the Americans and not for the Communists.

Effective Legislative Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, proponents of Federal aid to education owe much to the excellent leadership and untiring efforts of Oregon's senior Senator. It is a privilege to commend his work on behalf of education.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Washington Post of May 24, 1961, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON THE MERITS

It now looks as though the Senate will have a chance, before the week is out, to vote on the merits of Federal aid to education. Efforts to clutter the education bill with extraneous issues have been resolutely opposed by administration leaders and voted down by sizable majorities. Senators will decide, therefore, whether they want the Federal Government to assist the country's public school system—without being obliged at the same time to decide whether they want to assist religious schools—or whether they want to adopt a new civil rights measures.

We congratulate the managers of the education bill—Senators MORSE and MANSFIELD in particular—on their demonstration of effective legislative leadership. In the wake of the weekend savagery in Alabama it was not easy to reject Senator BUSH'S antisegregation rider prohibiting allocation of aid funds to segregated schools. Senator MORSE was abundantly right, however, in asserting that "it would kill the chances of the bill being passed." Some other steadfast supporters of civil rights such as Senators CLARK, JAVITS, and HUMPHREY deserve warm commendation for supporting him—preferring a solid stride toward better schools to an empty gesture toward racial equality.

We do not doubt that some of the Republicans who voted for the Bush amendment regarded it as a moral challenge which they regarded the rider as a convenient device for killing Federal aid to education while winning kudos from their Negro constituents.

The issue now is a straightforward one: whether to allocate to the State $2,550 million in Federal funds to help meet the costs of constructing new public schools, improving the pay of public schoolteachers, and meeting other school costs as the States themselves may determine. This newspaper, which has urged Federal aid to education in every Congress for the past 15 years, believes the measure to be soundly conceived and imperative in the national interest. The public school system is the fountainhead of the national future. It needs regeneration.

Freedom of the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL FINDLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, nothing is more essential to freedom than a free press. It is one of the first things seized by a panicky or totalitarian ruler, and its control is a clue to the kind of government that will follow.

A free nation must ever be alert for those who would muzzle the press no matter what the pretext, and, in that connection, I insert in the RECORD an editorial which appeared May 17, 1961, in the Christian Century:

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

No word spoken by President Kennedy since his administration began struck so discordant a note as his appeal to the press to limit its use of its constitutional freedom in the interest of national security. His appeal demonstrated too little faith on his own part in the strength of truth and too great confidence in the capacity of the foes of democracy to win by use of the big lie. Coming as it did immediately after the Cuban fiasco, his appeal carried an overtone of panic which was not justified by the event, serious as it was. And the appeal cannot be justified on the basis of the principles on which a free and open society must stand. Such a maneuver seems curiously inconsistent with other actions of the President, such as his recent commendable move ending post office censorship of mail coming from Communist countries.

Turning back to Justice Holmes, Mr. Kennedy cited the doctrine of "clear and present danger" as justifying limitations on freedom of speech. "The danger has never been more clear and its presence has never been more imminent," said the President. Noting that the courts have held in times of clear and present danger that "even the privileged rights of the 1st amendment must yield to the public's need for national security," he called on the press to limit itself to publication of "facts the public deserves to know."

Several things need to be said about the President's exhortation. First, the paternalism of the phase "facts the public deserves to know" is shocking. Does not the public deserve to know everything that bears on its freedom and responsibility, on its civic duties, on its obligations to country and world? Of course it does. Second, conditions of actual war as implied in court decisions do not exist, and will not exist unless Congress declares war. The Holmes dogma that no man has a right to create a panic by crying "fire" in a crowded theater is not relevant to the situations to which the President referred. He complained that the press had revealed "details of this Nation's covert preparations to counter the enemy's covert preparations." It was in fact the duty of the press to reveal what was essentially an illegal enterprise, an enterprise violating American laws and treaties.

If President Kennedy is not ready to ask Congress to declare that a state of clear and present danger prevails—and we do not argue that circumstances warrant his being thus ready—he should not complain when the press gives the American people the information it must have to form right judgments on events and actions, including judgments on the decisions and deeds of President Kennedy and the CIA. (What a serious mistake it would be for the President to appoint his brother, now the Attorney General, to succeed Allen Dulles as CIA head. Yet this is being discussed in the highest administration circles, according to reports which may be trial balloons.) The real ground for criticism of the press is that to too great an extent it did precisely what the President complains it did not do—it concealed from the American people the full scope of what was going on until it was too late for the public to bring its judgment to bear.

But assume for the moment that the press were prepared to attempt the self-censorship the President asks. Who would be able to determine the rules of self-censorship? The President's admonition for editors to ask "Is it in the national interest?" as well as "Is it news?" does not solve the problem. And if a way could be found to lay down the official line, how could the board of censors enforce voluntary compliance with its will? By definition the project is impossible.

After making his proposal, which is so impracticable that it may have been nothing more than an appeal for sympathy, the President seemed to glimpse the position he should have understood from the beginning. He said: "Perhaps there is no answer to the dilemma faced by a free and open society in a cold and secret war." The only thing wrong with that sentence is the inclusion of the word "perhaps." Of course there is no answer to the dilemma. The President and the Nation's press are compelled to seize one horn or the other. We had better lay hold with both hands of those principles which are consistent with "a free and open society." They require us to tell the truth, to espouse and act for freedom, to leave no doubt that the morality which is identified with responsibility to God is of a different order from the morality whose highest authority is that of the absolutist state. We ought to follow this line even if we were sure it would lead to our destruction; the fact that our best hope for survival lies in honor and integrity certainly does not weaken our obligation so to act.

President Kennedy should realize that nothing can tarnish the image cast by his administration as quickly as attempts to secure control of the press, even if it is controlled by self-censorship. An American friend who hoped much from the Kennedy administration writes from Europe: "The New Frontier is rapidly becoming a New Curtain. After a short period of hope in the new administration, there is now a sick feeling of horror spreading over here. This begins to sound like a new McCarthy era but now on a worldwide front." He raises the question as to whether the New Curtain is to be drawn around the Western Hemisphere, abandoning Asia to the Communists, and urges: "The real policy of the new administration should be put on the table. If we are being led into an anti-Communist crusade in the name of a New Frontier, let's make Kennedy show what he really is and strip away the facade that he has created with names like Stevenson and Bowles. It is time to press for a clear statement of policy."

Our friend is right. The old policy of containment of communism has failed. Communism is not being contained. Scores of the bases which we have built around the perimeter of the Communist world are liabilities or even traps. It is high time that a new, legal, viable and truthful policy be proclaimed. The press will do its duty in relation to the national interest by truthful reporting and independently expressing its opinion, acting of its own free will and without censorship.

Address by Hon. Vance Hartke, of Indiana, Before Indiana Academic Advisory Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, last Saturday the distinguished junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] met in Indianapolis with the Indiana Academic Advisory Council for the first time. This group, organized by the Senator from Indiana, is composed of college professors from 25 colleges and universities in Indiana. Their purpose is to advise and counsel the Senator and to do research for him.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator HARTKE'S opening remarks to the first meeting of the Indiana Academic Council be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPENING STATEMENT BY SENATOR VANCE HARTKE TO IAAC MEETING, INDIANAPOLIS, MAY 20, 1961

I want to welcome you here to the first meeting of the Indiana Academic Advisory Council. Thank you all for coming. This is, of course, a pioneer meeting of a pioneer group. I believe the meeting will be successful. I am certain that the council will make significant contributions as a group.

You may ask: Why such a meeting? Why such an organization of educators and scholars? The answer is a simple one. We need it.

America today faces a great challenge. In recent months we have come to the realization of the gravity of the times and the challenge. To survive as a free society, is is imperative that we make use of all the resources of our Nation. Since it is a challenge of culture, of thought and social philosophy, intellectual resources have become armaments.

We have seen that the battles of the cold war are being won and lost with ideas. The battlefields of the struggle are the minds of men the world over.

The challenges to our Nation are very real. We must, on one hand, develop our domestic society to provide jobs, goods, health, and happiness for an ever-increasing population. We must develop an educational system which can provide sufficiently for the coming generations of Americans in an evermore complex society. And we must do this in a world divided by philosophies of government where millions of people are having a 20th century world thrust into their semi-civilized lives.

To succeed in meeting these challenges, America needs the best minds, the best ideas, and the best analyses of the problems we face. That is the purpose of this council. I represent more than 4 million Hoosiers in the U.S. Senate. There with 99 others, we daily decide issues which determine the course of the free world.

It would be presumptuous indeed to represent without seeking the best source of counsel available. Your studies, your interests, your ideas can be contributions to the Nation's future if they are properly directed and acknowledged. That is the purpose of this council, to give you an outlet for meaningful ideas and considerate reflection.

The course of the legislative process dictates a regimentation of thought and efforts. It allows little time for free thinking and reflection. We become involved with techniques and details and have little time for consideration of theory and broad goals.

In the academic life, you have more time to develop ideas and theories and to make careful analysis of alternative courses. It is in this manner that I believe that you can make great contributions to the future of the American free society.

I am at once asking your help and offering you an opportunity to become active and influential in the conduct of our Government.

We have in Indiana, many fine and respected institutions of higher learning. In this council we have represented more than 20 of these institutions. I am hopeful that soon the number of individuals and institutions will swell. The problems America faces are vast and there is a place for everyone who wants to contribute toward their solution. I am confident that the Indiana Academic Advisory Council can someday become recognized and respected as one of the important, vital sources of significant thought in America. I am confident that, in time, ideas which are spawned in meetings like this one will become the basis for legislation to be considered in the Congress.

As a group, the resources are many and varied. Working together, where possible, can result in individual and common benefits.

As you have been advised, we will divide into three discussion groups to consider individual areas of the one problem: The future of the American free society. We have prepared a general outline in each of the three areas setting forth some questions which seem from the vantage place of the Congress to be most important for your con-

sideration. We do not want to bind you to the consideration of only these points or all of these points.

I would like to introduce the three discussion leaders:

Prof. Raymond P. Kent, professor of finance and business economics at the University of Notre Dame will lead the discussion on the domestic economy.

Dr. Robert P. Bell, head of the department of business education of Ball State Teachers College will head the discussion group on our education system.

And Dr. Joseph E. Hoskins, professor of political science at Earlham College will lead the consideration of our conduct of world affairs.

I want to emphasize my hopes that your discussions will proceed as free as possible. Do not temper your considerations, comments or conclusions because of my personal political philosophy, party or legislative program. I want your ideas and reasoning.

I ask only that your considerations involve one aspect. How will the topic of discussion relate to the future of the free society? When we meet to consider the reports of the various discussion groups, I hope we will be able to come up with some explanations of why conclusions, or programs, or ideas will contribute to the future of the free society.

One of the great problems in selling our system is rationally justifying it to other societies. The why of the question has become more and more important. And, I am afraid, many times we are forced to use empty cliches when logical answers are needed. So, be thinking, if you will, of how to justify our society, our philosophy of government and our social system in terms of scholarly, irrefutable, logical explanations.

We want to follow the timing of the agenda as closely as possible. I intend only to be an observer in your discussions. If there are procedural questions, I will try to be helpful, but please do not ask me to become involved in your discourse.

Beware the Summit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in spite of his campaign promises and pronouncements in the first days of his administration, it is now apparent the President has planned for some time to meet Khrushchev for a face-to-face discussion. I, personally, am opposed to such a meeting because I believe the President was right when he said that such a meeting would be fruitless until the Soviets showed some sign of wanting to bring about a meeting of the minds. But, if the President is determined now to change his course, he must assume the responsibility. I believe, however, that we should do all in our power to caution him against any rash commitments and it may be well to study the thoughts in the editorial which I here include with my remarks:

CONFERENCE WITH THE ENEMY

What was the first summit meeting? Jehovah and Moses on the mountain? We don't know, but plainly the idea of a meeting of two powerful figures—heroic antagonists, if you like—is as old as man. And just as plainly, what matters is not the meeting but the attitude of mind the disputants bring to the meeting.

Napoleon and Alexander, as General Eisenhower used to describe them, meeting on a raft in a river to settle the fate of the world; in a sense we are back to that stage. President Eisenhower refused to view summits that way; President Kennedy says he has no intentions of trying to settle anything when he talks with Khrushchev 2 weeks hence. We hope he sticks to that resolve.

Yet the fact remains that there are only two powers in today's world, and they are more powerful than anything the world's history has heretofore revealed. And no matter how much the sentimentalists may weep, what rules the world today is power.

That makes the confrontation all the more dangerous. Many things are wrong with summitry in any case. Heads of state, almost by definition, should not negotiate; that is what Ambassadors are for, to keep the leaders from getting personally engaged. Mr. Kennedy may insist all he wants that he will not negotiate, but the temptation is strong—all the stronger because the world is in such sorry shape.

Moreover, it is impossible to have a quiet conference. The Vienna meeting is to be informal and private. But already the world spotlight is on it, and so it must be. Our age is beyond tranquillity; a Jefferson and Hamilton could not conceivably meet privately in a tavern today, to shape history's most magnificient political achievement. The inescapable publicity nowadays builds the hopes higher regardless how much the officials try to dampen them in advance. So we have people already saying that of course Kennedy and Khrushchev must meet and lift the pall of death that hangs over us; how can there be any hope unless the leaders converse?

Alas, the trouble is not lack of discourse, lack of understanding. We understand, or should, the Soviets very well. The Soviets have not hidden their aim to destroy us. Khrushchev, too, sees clearly that we represent freedom, the arch enemy of his design for universal slavery.

Still, this clarity, this extreme polarization, is in its own way a good thing. What went so disastrously wrong with some summits was a foolish belief that the Bolsheviki, of all people, were really like us in their aspirations. George Kennan, in the book reviewed on this page today, describes our inexcusable body of ignorance about the nature of the Russian Communist movement before, during and immediately after World War II. Roosevelt thought he could charm the unspeakable criminal Stalin into international cooperation.

Was it only ignorance though? Cast your mind back to the thirties, if you are as old as we, and you will recall the smooth-talking American Communists at the fore of every movement, whether literary, educational or governmental. We had a climate of opinion all right, and it was pretty Red. It led us to join forces with the Red fiend; it led us to hand over central and eastern Europe and much of Asia to the grisly aegis of communism.

Well, we have learned, it is to be hoped. Eisenhower, in all his meetings with the barbarians, never gave anything away. He would not have in any case, being the man he is. But also he could not even if he would. For the climate of American opinion, thank God, was totally against it, just as earlier it favored accommodating the monsters of the East.

American opinion is still opposed to appeasement, and that is the chief reason why we cannot worry unduly about the Vienna get-together. We don't think it will solve anything, and that is indeed the best thing to say of it, for the bitter truth is that Americans cannot really solve anything with their self-appointed murderers. We don't think the summit is a particularly smart idea, certainly not the kind of foreign-policy approach Mr. Kennedy caused us to expect.

But it does represent a basic, elemental urge. If you were Mr. Kennedy, probably one of your first thoughts would be to meet the enemy face to face and form your own impressions. That's all right as far as it goes, and if Mr. Kennedy rightly senses the American temper, it will go no further.

What Is God Doing?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the Communists deprecate and deride moral values, but we profess respect for them, and for the guidance of the Almighty.

In this connection, my attention has been directed to a significant sermon preached recently by the Reverend James E. Drinkard at the Woodstock (Va.) Presbyterian Church. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include it, as follows:

WHAT IS GOD DOING?

Text: Heb. 2: 4: *But the just shall live by His faithfulness.*

If any of the ancient prophet's words sound up to date and relevant, certainly they are the words of the prophet, Habakkuk. We know very little about the man who spoke these words. We only know that he was the first one to speak for his people to God in the way in which he presented their grievances instead of speaking as the prophets traditionally had spoken for God to the people. Of course, Moses had done this many years before. But in the so-called period of the prophets, Habakkuk was the first to ask questions of God. "How long shall I cry for help and Thou will not hear?" he asks.

Is this not what is in the minds of a great number of us? We pray for help only apparently to see God doing nothing. We ask, "What is God doing?" Look at the state of the world. Is God going to let us destroy ourselves? What is God doing about all this? We read about Laos, a half dozen places in Africa, Cuba. Everywhere is unrest. We cannot know for sure where justice always lies but as we look on, innocent people are being killed. Isn't God concerned with what is going on in the world and, if so, what is He going to do about it?

Listen to Habakkuk, "Why doest thou make me see wrongs and look upon trouble?" If this is not the question for 1961, I do not know what is. Listen again. "The wicked surround the righteous, so justice goes forth perverted." Who today can tell what is justice and who is righteous? And, even if we could judge wisely, we would still be perplexed and ask, "What is God going to do about this mess the world is in?"

I suspect that most of us feel guilty when we question God for we have learned that God is allwise and good and that whatever is done is eventually going to work out for good. Yet, let me say, one need not be ashamed to confess before God that he does not understand God's ways in this world. Habakkuk was not a man of no faith but a man of great faith.

Only the person with great respect for God and for his power over the world can question like Habakkuk. The more devoted to God that one becomes, the more troubled he sometimes is by life's experiences. Habakkuk's questions are not due to any cooling off of his religious temper but they come from the consuming zeal of prophecy as it encounters experience. One who believes so definitely in God's cause that he gives his life to it and then sees the cause apparently failing, can only question.

The questions asked do not indicate the loss of faith in God but merely the lack of understanding of God's purpose as he sees it at work in the world. He cannot understand God's nature as he knows it and asks, "Thou who art of purer eyes than to behold evil and canst not look on wrong, why doest Thou look on faithless men, and art silent when the wicked swallows up the man more righteous than he?"

I assume this is the problem which faces most of us today. How much longer is God going to let godless men and nations overrun God-fearing nations? And I am afraid that we are going to come up with some of the answers that Israel employed for herself 2,500 years ago. God gave Habakkuk the answer to his question but the nation did not listen to it. Israel tries to fight evil with evil. She allied herself with heathen nations to fight off heathen nations. She put her trust in alliances instead of God.

We today find ourselves almost panic stricken for we seem to be alone in the world trying to oppose communism and support freedom in a democratic society. Certainly the United States is in a world position different from any it has occupied during any of our lifetimes. We seek answers to our political problems. But I tell you the answer is a religious one and it always will be. By this, I do not mean a superficial throwing up of our hands and saying, "Leave it to God." I mean there is an answer, a God-given one; the same one which Habakkuk heard but which no one heeded before. It is this: "But the righteous shall live by his faithfulness."

This is the only answer for the world today. Evil cannot be defeated by employing the methods of the evil we seek to defeat. This is an answer we are hearing today. It may be an expedient answer but it is an insidious one, for if one sells his soul to the Devil in order to defeat the Devil, he is lost. This was the temptation which Jesus met and triumphed over.

A person who has a just or righteous cause cannot maintain his cause by questionable methods and at the same time keep his cause from becoming tainted. There is but one answer for all of us and for our Nation if we expect to survive as a Nation and that is the God-given answer. "The just (or righteous) shall live by his faith (or faithfulness)".

Let us see what this means in today's situation. First, let me state the deep meaning of this verse in the best interpretive English I can find. It says, "the one who has a cause which is right in God's eyes shall be preserved or sustained by his steadfastness to that cause which is God's cause."

If there is any future for this Nation or any nation, it is dependent upon the people of that nation dedicating themselves to God's cause so much that the national objectives and the objectives of God are the same. Israel had thought she was God's chosen people but she did not so conduct herself and her prophets boldly proclaimed that God would let the wicked swallow up the man more righteous than he was because the righteous man knew how to be better but was not. He had been the recipient of God's grace but he had become selfish. In Israel at Habakkuk's time there was cheating, stealing and gross immorality within the country and godless enemies without. Does this not sound like the 20th century?

This past week Henry Ford II addressed a group of Jaycees in Minneapolis and lamented the fact that there is so much immorality in business. In recent years, we have heard of immorality within the ranks of some labor unions. There is always a charge of such breach of ethics in Government service. But this is not to single out these. This is our Nation. Millions of people cheat their Government on income taxes. This is our Nation to the core. Cheating is our national pastime. And God says if you have a just cause, this is, if your purpose is God's purpose, then you shall live by that purpose and survive.

If we, as a people, are to have a future, we must dedicate ourselves to finding God's purpose for this Nation and not just what we want it to be, "the land of the free and the home of the brave." Freedom and bravery for selfish motives are not worthy pursuits. Freedom and bravery to serve God's causes are the only worthy motives for the future of this Nation, if it is to have a future.

Where then, does the responsibility lie for our future? With the President to enforce morality? With Congress to enact more laws? With the courts and Department of Justice to uphold the laws? No. The responsibility for a renewed purpose for our Nation lies with us who are aware of what God's word is saying. Any moral revival which shall sweep the country must start at the bottom and well up to the top and not start at the top and hope that it will trickle down to the bottom. It is with you and me that moral revival must begin. The man, who has accepted for himself God's standards and God's purpose in life, cannot compromise himself in a world which employs other standards. We must make sure that what we proclaim to the world is true. Equality of opportunity must be a fact which exists in practice and not just a theory. Concern for the needy must be evidenced by tangible help—not just a token of charity. A standard of honesty must be practiced in every dealing in life so much so that we must examine all that we do. When our concern for God's help and protection is equaled by our own concern for the needs of others within and without our own country and when we become true servants of God—then we will have a cause by which we can live and survive.

Yes, one who has a just cause must live by it. This is what faithfulness means in our text today. It means practising what we preach. The United States has been preaching Christian democracy for years but the world is now saying, "What you do is making so much noise, we cannot hear what you are saying." Our problem is not that we should find fault with one another. Fixing blame on political parties or politicians will not solve our dilemma. What we need to do is examine ourselves to see if we are truly concerned with what God wants done in the world. Are our own attitudes towards others Christian? Have we made personal enemies? If so, how can we expect our Nation to rise above what we are? It cannot. This Nation of ours is what we make it. Every nation is what its people are. For God is concerned with the quality of life of people more than he is with proclaimed national policy. And God is still in control of this world. We ask, "What is God doing?" The answer is simple, God is preserving the just or righteous people who are truly living according to God's fustice. Our question no longer need be, "What is God doing?" but "What on earth are we doing?" What are we doing here on earth to be steadfast and faithful to what has been revealed to us of God's purpose? God has every right to expect Christians—those who have experienced his grace, to behave better than and different from all the evil people in the world. Evil cannot be overcome by evil. Evil can only be overcome by good and if there is nothing good in God's people, then we are to be pitied most of all.

Address by Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, Tennessee and the district I have the honor to represent in the Congress were privileged and honored to have Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall as our visitor recently when he addressed the joint meeting of the Elk River Development Association and the Tennessee River Tributaries Association in Fayetteville.

Secretary Udall delivered a most forceful and significant address, and I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Udall's speech be reproduced in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Secretary Udall's address follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. STEWART L. UDALL, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR, AT THE TENNESSEE RIVER TRIBUTARIES ASSOCIATION AND ELK RIVER DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION, FAYETTEVILLE, TENN., MAY 12, 1961

You do me a unique honor in asking me to talk with you about development of water resources. You were in the frontlines of the long battle for water development in this region when I was a schoolboy in a little Arizona ranch town. You were among the first "New Frontiersmen" because you were pioneers in a coordinated, comprehensive river development plan. To all of you residents of the Tennessee Valley, the subject of water and its planned control and use is far from novel.

I understand your valleywide association is only slightly more than a year old. You can accomplish much through joint and coordinated action, and you hold it within your power to be of considerable assistance to the directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority. You are holding fast to the original brilliant concept of TVA. You well realize that we can no longer afford to be piecemeal in our development of water resources. We must devise plans which will transcend the interests of individual localities or agencies, and which will conform to a broad plan of integrated development of all the resources of a great watershed. This is no time for standpatters, it is no time for the overly cautious approach to resource development—it is a time for broad-gaged planning and bold action. President Kennedy has told us, "Failures to act now may be opportunities lost forever."

Years ago you and other farsighted men set the pattern. You saw the opportunities available in harnessing the mighty Tennessee and making it work for mankind. In so doing, you made the three letters TVA synonymous with the idea of overall basin development.

It wasn't a simple matter. I'm sure many of you vividly remember the slow and often disappointing struggle which you underwent before TVA became a reality. Perhaps by now, though, that stirring story is "old hat" to some of your neighbors in this valley. I know that you here tonight, rep-

resenting various area development associations, have not forgotten and will not forget.

The world outside this beautiful valley of yours continues to hold up TVA as a shining example of the best that man can accomplish in utilizing nature. Just 6 days ago, the Christian Science Monitor carried a long story about the Cauca Valley Corporation, a new river development effort in the South American nation of Colombia. It quoted the English-speaking general manager of the CVC as saying, "We think we are admirably suited for a TVA-type development." It isn't the admittedly great water development works of Russia that these South Americans look to as a guide—it is your own, our own, TVA. And so it goes, everywhere in the free world. Do not, yourselves, become immune to the great accomplishments around you.

Not all of the development of the Tennessee River region is to be spoken of in the past tense. Part of the job still remains to be done. I'm sure you recall the words of the late George Norris who said in his autobiography that—"This program of controlling the surplus floodwaters of the great Mississippi Valley by storage in natural reservoirs situated on the main stream and along the tributaries is an immense one. It may never be fulfilled. That depends entirely upon the vision of the American people. It will require a vast amount of money to complete it; it will take years of planning and of labor to meet fully all of its factors; and yet it offers the only promise discovered by men for the effective control of floods and efficient conservation of natural resources."

Yes, you have begun to make real use of your river system—but you've only begun, as George Norris foresaw. Now you face the challenge of continuing with his great vision—yes, and that of many others as well. You who continue to hold to the vision, you who still have the evangelist's fervor and the salesman's persistence, must work together with the officials of the TVA to complete this project that is of great importance to all America. One of the dreams that you in the Southeast have long held is that of joining the Tennessee and the Tombigbee to cut off 600 miles of the long water journey from your ports to the gulf. The TVA itself was once such a "pipedream"—who knows, perhaps your later effort will be crowned with success. Certainly, this administration favors a stepped up program of long-range planning now in the resources field.

You leaders realize, too, that river development doesn't necessarily mean great power dams or navigation channels on every watercourse. You realize that some areas of this vast river basin are best suited for recreation development, others are promising for intensive agricultural undertakings, such as your growing poultry industry, or timber production, and some spots are best retained for the benefit of wildlife. There's room on the big Tennessee and its tributaries for all kinds of development. Not every mile of the system can be developed as a new Pittsburgh—just as not every mile can be drained farmland, a river park or a wildlife refuge. But every mile can be developed in some manner, with due consideration for economics and always with a progressive and far-sighted standard of feasibility that holds great faith in the future.

Listen again to George Norris' words: "Every drop of water that falls from the heavens to the earth beneath should perform its proper share of preserving the blessing God intends to bestow upon His people." Every drop of water in this watershed can be made to work, over and over again, and it must be done. The important thing, it seems to me, is to develop this homeland of yours that the natural resources so abundant here are utilized and conserved in the highest and best manner appropriate to the overall concept of basin development.

All of us in the Kennedy administration were enthused and challenged by the precedent-setting special message of the President concerning natural resources. Here was given all of us a blueprint for the construction of an integrated program for the wise conservation and use of our natural resources. If that stirring message could be summarized in only two words, I believe those words would be, "Think big."

We must all think big and act in accord with that thought. Here we can see that even George Norris, who thought some of the biggest thoughts ever to burst forth in the U.S. Senate, didn't think big enough. George Norris almost overlooked one of the primary items in the Tennessee River development—the recreation potential of water. Recreation is a latecomer on the list of benefits of comprehensive river development, and certainly we cannot blame the founding fathers of TVA for initially paying it little heed. But now, in a Nation of rising wages and increasing leisure time, recreational use of the TVA facilities is growing at an astonishing rate. Americans have discovered that yours is one of the most diverse and enjoyable outdoor recreation areas in our Nation. I'm told that an average of $8½ million worth of new recreation facilities is added each year at the reservoirs of the TVA. In addition to a total governmental recreation investment here of $120 million, there has been nearly an equal amount in private recreation investments such as cottages and resorts. You have close to 50,000 boats on your river system. Think what all this already means to the economy of your valley. Think what more it will mean in the years immediately ahead.

Everywhere in the United States recreation is becoming big business. We're going to have to think and act mighty big if we meet the pent-up recreation demand.

We in the Department of the Interior have taken this recreation boom, and the President's message, to heart. We are embarking on some big planning for recreation development throughout the United States. We feel that this is the moment of decision. What we do, or don't do, in the next 10 years will set the character of this Nation for generations to come. America's open space is disappearing rapidly at a time when all signs point to mounting demands for parks, parkways, recreation areas and wildlife refuges. We need open space in which to find outdoor enjoyment and refreshment of mind, body and spirit.

To meet this need we are laying plans for a program without parallel in our history. Because much of this recreational development is of national impact, we want the Federal Government to take the lead in a program we're calling Parks for America. And we want to encourage local areas and States to do more through a cooperative effort. Only a few areas and a few States, notably New York and California, are keeping up or vigorously attempting to keep up with the mounting demand.

This generation, as we see it, has a "last chance" opportunity to save perhaps 15 or 20 million acres for national parks, another 2½ million acres for national recreation areas, more than a million acres for national parkways and scenic roads such as your Natchez Trace, 4½ million acres for wildlife refuge areas. The program will be costly, but every year we delay the costs will rise. Fortunately, much land we propose to retain as open space already is in public ownership. But, for 4.6 million acres of privately held land that we foresee as national park lands, the estimated cost has doubled in the past 10 years and is expected to nearly double again in the next 10. Make no mistake about it, if we do not act now the opportunity will vanish. What we save in the next 10 years may well be all we will ever have the chance to save.

These aren't the only ways in which we are undertaking to implement the natural resources program outlined by President Kennedy. We hold uppermost his warning that "Our Nation has been blessed with a bountiful supply of water; but it is not a blessing we can regard with complacency." In all those areas wherein we have primary responsibility for multiple-purpose water development we are hard at work drawing up plans for a resumption of the effort that shriveled into near nothingness during the past 8 years. In this we have as a shining example the transformation wrought in hydroelectric power production and consumption by your TVA. That transformation brought you from an area of relatively little electric use to one in which electric power consumption is nearly twice the per capita average for the rest of the Nation.

Too, we accept the goal of developing comprehensive river basin plans during the decade of the sixties, so that all parts of our country can follow the steps to progress that you have made.

And we share with others in the Government a concern that a major breakthrough be made, and made soon, on the growing problem of cleaning up our streams. Conserved water will be of little use if it is polluted water. No longer can we rely on the adage that "dilution is the solution to pollution." Something more, something positive, must be done. We face the imminent peril of having our major rivers become thousand-mile sewers.

No longer is water pollution a problem of a few metropolitan areas; it is a problem nationwide in scope. To meet it we must spend twice as much on municipal waste treatment plants as we now do. The administration's program for a grant-in-aid system to help communities meet this problem is the start. With its adoption perhaps I won't have to inhale the stench of the Potomac when I drive home on a hot day. Perhaps we will close out the business I read about recently in a magazine—the business some private enterpriser started on the Missouri River. He skims and sells the grease from the surface of the broad Missouri.

Already the Secretary of Agriculture and I are working together in another area to which the President directed his attention. Together we are formulating a comprehensive Federal recreational lands program and working to eliminate conflicts in fish and wildlife programs so that an increased and improved wildlife conservation effort may be made. If this takes some knocking together of a few bureaucratic heads, then Secretary Freeman and I are ready to do it.

I hope it goes without saying that in all these various fields of natural resource planning and development the Federal Government does not desire to move ahead alone. Nor does it expect to. We are heeding President Kennedy's view that only through the fullest participation and cooperation of State and local government and private industry can this task be done wisely and effectively. It's up to you folks just as much as it is to us. Resource development is a must—a natural, if you'll permit the pun. With our soaring population we are facing what I call the quite crisis. For all its quietness, this crisis in the field of resource development is just as real as the one we face in world affairs. America has the ability to meet this crisis—we aren't a poor Nation. Just a small part of the money we now spend on pointed-toed shoes and overpublicized gimmicks can have a beneficial effect for many generations if we direct the money into public investment. As progressive conservationists concerned with the efficient development of our Nation our job is cut out for us.

I'm sure I could do not better than to end with the closing words of the President's natural resources message: "The task is large but it will be done."

Comdr. John J. Shea, a Hero Remembered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, one of our distinguished American heroes was honored on May 14, 1961, when Boston College dedicated its new 10-acre athletic area as Comdr. John J. Shea Field. It was on another afternoon, back in 1942, when the Navy airman and Boston College graduate gave his life for his country. The Nation remembers him for his now famous letter, to his son, written just before his death. This letter, to his 5-year-old son, John, appeared in the November 16, 1942, issue of Life magazine.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I deem it a privilege to include this letter:

COMMANDER SHEA WRITES TO HIS SON

(Comdr. John Joseph Shea of the U.S. naval air force was last aboard the aircraft carrier *Wasp* on Sept. 15 in South Pacific waters. His last letter to his 5-year-old son, John, in North Cambridge, Mass., follows:)

DEAR JACKIE: This is the first letter I have written directly to my little son. I am thrilled to know you can read it all by yourself. If you miss some of the words it will be because I do not write very plainly. Mother will help you in that case, I am sure.

I was certainly glad to hear your voice over the long-distance telephone. It sounded as though I were right in the living room with you. You sounded as though you missed your daddy very much. I miss you, too, more than anyone will ever know. It is too bad this war could not have been delayed a few more years so that I could grow up again with you and do all the things I planned to do when you were old enough to go to school.

I thought how nice it would be to come home early in the afternoon and play ball with you and go mountain climbing and see the trees, brooks, and learn all about woodcraft, hunting, fishing, swimming and other things like that. I suppose we must be brave and put these things off now for a while.

When you are a little bigger you will know why your daddy is not home so much any more. You know we have a big country and we have ideals as to how people should live and enjoy the riches of it and how each is born with equal rights to life, freedom and the pursuit of happiness. Unfortunately there are some countries in the world where they do not have these ideals, where a boy cannot grow up to be what he wants to be with no limit on his opportunities to be a great man such as a great priest, statesman, doctor, soldier, businessman, etc.

Because there are people in countries who want to change our Nation, its ideals, its form of government and way of life we must leave our homes and families to fight. Fighting for the defense of our country, ideals, homes and honor is an honor and a duty which your daddy has to do before he can come home and settle down with you and mother. When it is done he is coming home to be with you always and forever. So wait just a little while longer. I am afraid it will be more than the 2 weeks you told me on the phone.

In the meantime take good care of mother, be a good boy and grow up to be a good young man. Study hard when you go to school. Be a leader in everything good in life. Be a good Catholic and you can't help being a good American. Play fair always. Strive to win but if you must lose, lose like a gentleman and a good sportsman.

Don't ever be a quitter, either in sports or in your business or profession when you grow up. Get all the education you can. Stay close to mother and follow her advice. Obey her in everything, no matter how you may at times disagree. She knows what is best and will never let you down or lead you away from the right and honorable things of life.

If I don't get back you will have to be mother's protector because you will be the only one she has. You must grow up to take my place as well as your own in her life and heart.

Love your grandmother and granddad as long as they live. They, too, will never let you down. Love your aunts and see them as often as you can. Last of all don't ever forget your daddy. Pray for him to come back and if it is God's will that he does not, be the kind of a boy and man your daddy wants you to be.

Kiss mother for me every night. Goodby for now.

With all my love and devotion for mother and you.

Your Daddy.

Billions for Defense but Not One Bulldozer for Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, my office is besieged with letters, wires, and telephone calls, protesting Castro's proposed trade of bulldozers for prisoners. Because these messages are eloquent in themselves, I ask unanimous consent to include a few of them as a part of my remarks.

The first is from an Army captain who served with distinction in World War II and Korea. His message is as follows:

It has been some time now since I have written to you and actually I don't have any excuse—just have been extremely busy and not much letterwriting time.

How long do we U.S. citizens have to put up with this continuing effort to pull down our country's prestige? I laughed when I heard that Castro had offered to trade 1,000 prisoners from the invasion attempt for 500 bulldozers to be supplied by the U.S. Government. Who in their right mind would ever believe that our country would swallow such a thing? It's humiliating—a disgrace to our country.

Then there is Laos—we talk and talk but never back up our words in a manner that counts. How much faith does Thailand or Vietnam really have in the United States now?

We must stop being kicked around. Bob, what is happening when the greatest nation in the world lets a bandit and power-mad man like Castro dictate terms such as he has on many occasions in recent months?

I could go on and on I'm sure, but what's the use? I feel that someone or group in high places in our Government is letting us down. Please don't join them.

Obviously, Bob—I can't write to you officially but I wanted to let you know how a lot of us feel.

Another letter says it this way:

Again I feel compelled to write to you about a matter of national importance. I am very much opposed to sending bulldozers or anything else to Castro. I think it is outright blackmail and an insult to the administration. We have an embargo against this sort of thing and I personally think the embargo was much too late. I am appealing to you to use your vote and influence to prevent any war machinery being sent to Cuba. I sympathize with the prisoners but we have no assurance that they would be released or that this would be the end of the blackmail.

Three wires from constituents carry in fewer words the same feeling of indignation:

Billions for defense but not one bulldozer for tribute.

I strongly urge that you protest sending any machinery or heavy equipment including bulldozers to Castro. Do what is necessary to initiate an investigation of the matter. Please inform Senators ENGLE and KUCHEL of this request.

Millions for defense but not one cent for tribute. No tractors to dictators. We will fight for liberty and freedom, but ransom—never.

Senator Keating Delivers Strong Speech on Combating Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] recently delivered an address at the 200th anniversary dinner of St. John's Lodge No. 1 of the Free and Accepted Masons in Newark, N.J. As a member of this historic lodge, I was particularly pleased with Senator KEATING's strong remarks about the need for continued vigilance against the international Communist conspiracy.

The Senator from New York also advanced a novel and ingenious plan for the issuance of Government space bonds—somewhat like savings and war bonds—to help finance the terribly expensive space program our Nation must undertake in the days ahead.

Because there is much good food for thought in this address, it deserves wide circulation, and I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

SENATOR KEATING DELIVERS STRONG SPEECH ON COMBATING COMMUNISM

Mr. Chairman, brothers of St. John's Lodge No. 1, it is a profound source of pleasure to me to be in your good and fraternal company tonight.

• • • • •

We live today in an age of peril. The values we hold dear, the concepts we hold dear, the very freedom we hold dear—all are being challenged on a massive scale, on a global scale. Peril is not a new and strange condition in the life of the Masonic Order. Throughout our long and honorable history we have stood many a time on the ramparts of freedom—and many a time our brothers have been in the forefront of the drive to roll back the surging lines of tyranny. The battlefields of America's past have seen this spirit of patriotism translated by our brothers into deeds of high courage, and, so often, into the ultimate sacrifice that is the last full measure of devotion. The valor of our brothers, in all the services, in all the wars, should remain for each of us a heritage of pride and glory forever to be guarded in our hearts.

Yes, danger has been a familiar face in our history—but always a foredoomed face—because the valor of American hearts, the power of American arms crushed danger to earth.

Tonight, as I speak to you, danger stalks the world once more. It is not dressed in uniform. It is not the same face of danger we have met so many times before—at Valley Forge—across the no man's land of France—on the beaches of Italy—in the Coral Sea and on the Pacific islands—in the forest of Bastogne—or on Pork Chop Hill in Korea.

The enemy who now confronts us fights with a new kind of arsenal—a new kind of tactics—a new kind of grand strategy, but if the conventional trappings of war are absent, the real consequences of war are present.

Throughout military history the end objective of the use of arms has always been to seize territory. Today, territory is a secondary consideration. The prime objective is to seize minds and hearts—to occupy, if you will, mental and spiritual objectives. Once this is done—once the infiltration has succeeded—territory does not have to be captured in the military sense. It falls like a tree whose force and substance have been sapped away by armies of termites.

This is the kind of warfare that communism is waging today. It is not a shadow war. It is as real as the loss of freedom is real. You do not learn its outcome in the shouts of victorious armies. You learn of it in the silence of imprisoned men, of captive nations, as the symbolic Iron Curtain falls to signal the end of freedom's drama—falls silently, fatefully, across the world.

And now it has fallen closer to us—a scant 90 miles from our shores—for the darkness of tyranny has closed over little Cuba. If we think of freedom as a homeland—the mother country of our free society—that homeland, that mother country is shrinking before our eyes. A slow shrinkage, but a continuing and fateful shrinkage, as communism trickles its Red stain across new frontiers, spreading to new areas, poisoning, paralyzing, and destroying freedom as it goes.

The greatest irony of modern history is that communism uses the very hope of liberty—the very slogans and language of liberty.

The vicious technique is to take honest words and make liars out of them. What for example, is truth in Russia? It is anything that conforms to the preestablished party line. When truth can't fit this line, it automatically becomes a lie—a capitalist lie, of course. And what is peace in the Communist translation? Peace is a condition of no opposition to communism. When the Soviets have overrun and manacled a nation then the climate of peace has been established.

The dove of peace is a Russian symbol—but you know and I know that if a real dove of peace flew over the Kremlin he'd probably be shot down for violating the airspace over Russia.

Thus, too, the nations of the West are branded colonialist powers—branded that by a power that snatches nations as a wolf snatches sheep. And in China, the government is called the people's government—which is tantamount to saying that a zoo belongs to the animals that live there.

I find it especially appropriate in these perilous days when the fate of our Nation, the fate of freedom itself are at stake in the world that I should speak before this gathering of my Masonic brethren. For our entire history, our essence, our purposes exemplify not only the spirit of free men in a free society, but the vigilance to preserve that freedom and the strength to defend it when it is threatened or attacked.

It can well be said that the Masonic Order runs like a red vein of courage through the marble of our Nation's history—from the remote founding of our beloved country to the actuality of this hour, this minute, in the life story of America.

Today, perhaps, above all previous times of danger, Masonry finds itself summoned to cope with a challenge to all the values—spiritual, moral, social—that it has traditionally held sacred, that it has instinctively defended.

What is imperatively called for in our time is a vivid awareness of the fact of danger, of its presence, of its growing challenge—and it is here that our great brotherhood can, through its individual members, in all areas of our free world, alert their friends, their fellow citizens, their communities, to the tremendous implications of the history that is being written before our eyes.

Geography used to be a study for children. Today it should be a study for each of us. On the world map the areas of a dehumanized, despiritualized society are growing ominously, spilling over frontiers, engulfing new populations.

It is an insidious advance—slow, silent, but measurable by the miles it encroaches, by the lives it controls, by the lights it extinguishes in the hearts and minds of men.

The hour is late, too late for apathy, yet apathy is all around us. For too many Americans confuse material well-being with national security. They seem to assume that, like labor-saving devices, freedom-preserving devices are items available at a price.

Associated with this apathy is a kind of spiritual depression, induced by Communist successes. We can better realize the extent of this spiritual depression when we consider the tremendous sense of elation that the man-in-space success evoked throughout our land.

America's first man-in-space shot was a resounding success. It was a shot heard around the world.

But we must not delude ourselves. The Soviet Union is still ahead of us in outer space and by a substantial margin. Later this very month the Russian rocket fired from an orbiting satellite may come within hailing distance of Venus. The United States still has a long way to go in outer space. And the price is going to be high.

It will cost in the neighborhood of $40 billion to send an astronaut to the Moon. That means about $225 for every man, woman and child in the United States.

There can be no doubt that this money is essential to get American space programs off the ground. President Kennedy declared in his press conference last week that he was going to ask the Congress to appropriate even more.

Here is a proposal for raising the financial thrust that America needs in space and rocketry. It's through a new bond issue. Good ideas you know, even now, can come from Yale as well as Harvard, and this idea was brought to my attention by a Yale student, from Douglaston, N.Y., who has thoughtfully outlined some of the reasons supporting his proposal.

I have studied his suggestion, canvassed it among my colleagues, and I think it has real merit.

I propose that in addition to seeking a regular appropriation, the administration take advantage of national interest and enthusiasm in this field, and that the administration call upon Americans to make some of these sacrifices that we have heard about. I propose that the administration offer long term, nominal interest bonds—not war bonds, not liberty bonds, not savings bonds but space bonds.

These bonds could be offered on the same terms as series E savings bonds. Their appeal would be tremendous.

Instead of taking tax money from those who could afford it least, the space bonds would enable those who have funds available to invest where it is most needed—in our country's future. Instead of swelling speculation on the stock market, these funds would go directly into the Nation's economy, creating new space achievements and incidentally new jobs. The technical aspects of such a bond offering will require careful study and planning, of course. I have already written to Secretary of the Treasury Dillon asking whether he believes the program would be feasible and how it could be worked out.

Among those who, I am sure would volunteer to purchase the first offering are the workers at various rocket and missile centers who have been picking up bigger pay checks than the Secretary of Defense for overtime work. If space funds come directly from patriotic buyers of space bonds, rather than through the cumbersome Federal appropriations process, it might well be there would be more effort and less featherbedding at these installations.

In short, I do not believe that American people are unwilling to make the sacrifices needed to put this country ahead in space. They just have not been asked to do so.

"Buy a space bond" should be America's motto for the sixties. This is more than just a fund raising program. It is an appeal to the country to put America ahead in space. No longer is the sky the limit. We must set our sights right now—for the moon.

Masonry is in the full spirit of its historic role in our history when it raises its voice to remind our people that freedom is not an heirloom but a vulnerable possession—a jewel that can be lost as well as found, and that will inevitably be lost if there is no one to stand guard over it.

Masonry can be—should be—one of the Paul Reveres of our day—a day that agonizingly calls for minutemen of freedom. We cannot ride through the country, pointing to a real enemy behind us. We cannot ask citizens to listen for the trumpets and the shellfire. That is what makes the challenge to us the greater.

The task force of Masonry must alert our Nation to the silent, but no less deadly weapons by which the enemies of freedom push forward across the world. It must dramatize the nature of the conflict. It must illuminate and educate. It must fight apathy for the enemy it is. It must rouse from the slumber of indifference that great body of citizens who do not believe in danger until they hear a siren, or until they are shot at.

* * * * *

I am sure that each of you has been impressed, as I have by one fact that is basic to the whole pattern of Communist conquest. It is what I might call the "global confidence game" whereby the Reds set themselves up as the friends, the benefactors, yes, the liberators of the peoples upon whom they prey.

Cuba is a recent and striking example of this fixed game where the dealer ends up with all the cards.

Now this is a situation that calls for more than the wringing of hands, and the question: "Why don't these people see that they are not getting freedom, but only tyranny dressed up to look like freedom?"

Let us rather ask ourselves—as the leading free Nation of the world—if it isn't about time that we took the words and phrases we use so glibly—freedom—the dignity of man, spiritual values, human rights—and made them more living, more meaningful, more propagated, more real to the millions of people who are called upon to make a choice between the false face of liberty and the true face of liberty. We Americans have a tremendous export business in things—but only a trickle of export in values. We are better known in many countries for our machines than for what we stand for, what we believe in, what makes us proud to be Americans.

In a word, we are better known for what America makes than for what makes America. This is wrong. It is bad. It is dangerous. We're in a life-and-death game where to come in second is not to come in at all. We must realize this fact. We must recast our thinking about the awesome responsibilities of leadership in a world that is being shaped and dominated by our enemies.

This, indeed, is a time for greatness. In the past no body of Americans has responded to the call more quickly, more wholeheartedly, more valorously, than the Masonic Order, one of the great cornerstones of the building of our Nation, one of the great pillars of its moral strength.

I am confident—supremely confident—that we shall accept the challenge that history throws down to us in these days of destiny—that we will help to rouse and revitalize the spirit of this Nation—that we will make freedom a cause, not merely a slogan, that we will turn the searchlight of vigilance on the face of danger so that its menace may be clear to all. And finally, I am confident that we shall look upon our beloved country not as a legacy left to us in perpetuity by heroes, but as our solemn trust for which generations to come will hold us accountable.

Uncle Sam: Price Fixer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, in the U.S. News & World Report, issue of May 15, 1961, appeared a very interesting editorial by Mr. David Lawrence entitled "Uncle Sam: Price Fixer."

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Lawrence's excellent editorial in the RECORD:

UNCLE SAM: PRICE FIXER

(By David Lawrence)

The biggest price fixer of them all is Uncle Sam. He is not amendable to any antitrust laws. He scorns the word "monopoly." But he goes on rigging or fixing prices and smothering competition.

Who is meant by Uncle Sam? The politicians, of course, who constitute a majority in Congress. Yet they lose no opportunity to point the finger of blame at any persons in industry that they can single out as scapegoats.

How does Uncle Sam function as a price fixer? Well, first of all, he does it secretly and without benefit of prying press or investigators from the Department of Justice.

Let us take a flagrant example. The steel industry was engaged in a major strike in the autumn of 1959. Later the leaders of the steel union met with representatives of management to determine the biggest item of cost in the making of steel—labor's wages. The entire industry was told that it had to make its wage costs uniform. Each company was thereby advised what its main item of cost of production would be.

The White House had requested that the two groups meet. They did so secretly. Public opinion and Congress had been pressing to get a settlement. What was thereupon discussed? Labor costs—the biggest item in the manufacture of steel. And didn't the two groups also discuss what prices might have to be raised? Of course they did.

The statements issued to the press after the settlement promised that there would be no price increase in steel, at least until December 1960.

The Government at Washington knew all about these confidential discussions—in fact, encouraged the making of an agreement that prices would not be raised.

Where is the authority under the antitrust laws for nationwide bargaining on wage costs as between a big labor union and the representatives of all the big steel companies?

When the Government acted as mediator, what part did it play in fixing the labor costs that, in effect, fixed the current prices in steel? Why doesn't some congressional committee inquire into this phase of price-rigging?

Why, it may also be asked, are there uniform prices today in many commodities? Why do gasoline dealers, for instance, charge the same for fuel at every filling station in certain regions of the country?

Why do so many other manufactured articles sell at a uniform price? Is it any less a case of price fixing if the largest company in an industry announces a price and the others follow? In reality, it is much easier for competitors to let the big fellow fix the price. For if there's plenty of demand for a product from the public, why shouldn't smaller competitors get the same price as the large company charges?

We come now to the biggest price-rigging game of all. It is sanctioned today by the President of the United States in a message to Congress and by his Secretary of Agriculture. Very soon it may be authorized by the politicians in Congress. They seek the political support of the farmers. So a law is being proposed which will permit all the farmers who raise a given commodity to vote among themselves on what the price of that commodity shall be, and the Government is expected to approve the whole arrangement.

Theoretically, all the consumers of farm products are represented by the Congress and the Secretary of Agriculture. But, actually, the consumers will have to accept the price rigging foisted upon them under the new scheme. For it means price fixing not only by Uncle Sam through Congress, but by the farmers themselves who, through voting in a referendum, will presumably follow a few chosen leaders of farm organizations. They would have even more power than trade unions.

Large companies often are the victims of congressional interference through laws that permit labor groups—and now perhaps farm groups—to play a decisive part in fixing prices.

Large companies have lawyers who try to tell them what is or isn't a violation of antitrust laws. But can executives in business be blamed for getting a bit confused when they see the Government sitting in at secret conferences with nationwide unions and steel companies and virtually fixing prices? Who represents the public interest when the Government, as it is now proposed, would encourage the farmers to arrange among themselves to fix the prices of the food the Nation's families must have at the dinner table?

Why shouldn't there be a law requiring competition in wage scales, instead of allowing labor unions, by nationwide bargaining, uniformly to fix labor costs? This could stimulate profit-sharing for the workers.

If members of Congress find this is politically inexpedient for them, why not recognize frankly that we have a cartel system in big industry and will continue to have until Uncle Same comes out for free and fair competition and forbids any collusion by employes of one company with the employes of a competitor.

People-to-People Fellowship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the people-to-people program of the United States has no more enthusiastic center than my home town and the capital of Connecticut. This year, in another demonstration of community support for the exchange of peoples between countries, they have banded behind the selection of Dr. and Mrs. Robert E. Dunn of West Hartford, who will shortly depart for a stay in Birmingham, England.

The Dunns will leave Bradley Field by jet clipper on June 6 for London. In Birmingham, they will be the guests of the Birmingham Mail, and I have been assured by Kenneth B. Atkinson, our consul in Birmingham, that a full program has been arranged by the Birmingham sponsors for their visit.

In Hartford, the Dunns will be honored at a farewell luncheon on June 2. Meanwhile the community is planning for a visit in September from winners of the Birmingham contest. More than 150 clubs, organizations and schools in the Greater Hartford area sent in suggestions and entries in selection of the Greater Hartford couple and showed great enthusiasm in the program.

Helping the program in Hartford throughout its search for representatives has been the Hartford Courant, the nation's oldest newspaper of continuous circulation. The Courant will be host to the Birmingham couple in the fall, and its own cooperation with the Birmingham Mail is an excellent example of people-to-people relations in itself.

The two people who will be going to Birmingham as representatives of this country are outstanding. Dr. Dunn has been there before—he holds a special certificate from the Institute of Birmingham which he won while he was on a Rotary Foundation travel and study fellowship.

He is now vice principal of William Hall High School in West Hartford and has held that responsible assignment for

4 years. He met his wife while they were undergraduates at Bates College in Maine. He earned his master's and doctors' degrees at the University of Connecticut and was married 3 years ago. Mrs. Dunn, who teaches third grade at Braeburn School, West Hartford, holds a master's degree at the University of Hartford.

Their application for the people-to-people fellowship was sponsored by fellow teachers at Hall High and Braeburn as well as the Hall Parent-Teacher Association and the West Hartford and East Hartford Rotary Clubs.

I am sure they will make outstanding representatives of the American way of life in their visit to Birmingham and England. Looking over their schedule, I note that they have a rigorous time planned and I hope it will be a wonderful one for them and their country.

In exchange, a Birmingham wholesale merchant and his wife will be coming to Hartford for 2 weeks in September. He wanted to be a schoolteacher but the death of his father at an early age led to his becoming an insurance clerk. He served with the RAF in World War II and has had a most varied career.

I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to this remarkable and energetic example of a venture in international understanding, congratulate those who worked long and hard to make it a success and wish the best of luck to the ambassadors of good will who have been chosen.

Kansas Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the May 19, 1961, edition of the Lawrence (Kans.) Daily Journal-World, which points out an extremely important factor—the high productivity of Kansas labor—in consideration by industries of new plant locations. The editorial and its content are worth repeating here, where Representatives from all over the Nation will note and remember this important point.

THE BIGGEST FACTOR

A Kansas lawyer not long ago discussed talking with an official of a company the attorney represents and chiding the official of the national organization for paying such extra-high wages for unskilled labor in the Kansas plant.

The official admitted that the hourly rate was far higher than it should be, but he added:

"Even though we're putting out a lot more money than we should have to for this kind of work, we get far more good work per dollar in our Kansas plant than we get at any of our other 13 plants in other States. This speaks volumes about the merits of the type of labor you can hire in Kansas, and I think that if more industries realized this, more of them would locate here."

The attorney then told about talking to other manufacturers and getting the same type of story, favoring Kansas labor over that in other States.

This should remind us that when we try to "sell" businesses and industries on locating establishments in Kansas we never want to undersell the type of people we have as one of the big reasons firms should come here.

True, water supplies, sewage and power facilities, transportation links, recreational facilities—all these have a role to play in attracting new business and industry to a city or State.

But it is people who still make these businesses and industries run, and the newcomers can't bring all of their own employees here. They generally must do the great bulk of their hiring in the region where they locate. The fact Kansas has the reputation for supplying good employees should do a great deal to boost our growth.

The Need for Middle Income Housing in My District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of a statement which I have submitted to the New York City Planning Commission dealing with a subject of vital interest to the people of my district, particularly those living in the Williamsburg section. There is a crying need for middle income housing in Williamsburg, and my plea is directed to the Commission to provide such housing before the area is depleted of many of its fine families.

My statement reads as follows:

ADDRESS BEFORE THE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION BY HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO, OF NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, MAY 24, 1961

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen of the commission, the city of New York is composed of many neighborhoods and communities, rich in history and tradition in their own right. The area which we now call Williamsburg was itself a city in 1852. As the Congressman of the area involved in these proceedings permit me to say a few words in its behalf. The community of Williamsburg was established in 1792 by a merchant named Richard M. Woodhill who planned it as a residential development. Mr. Woodhill named the community after Col. Jonathan Williams, a distinguished citizen of the United States. Colonel Williams had a distinguished career as an engineer and the surveyor who laid out the roads for this community; as secretary to Benjamin Franklin; as commander at West Point and superintendent of the U.S. Military Academy; and concluded his career as a Member of the 14th Congress of the United States who died in office in 1815. Colonel Williams set up the forts and defenses for New York and in this period surveyed the area now known as Williamsburg.

The community of Williamsburg had difficulty in becoming established but in the 1800's the advent of the Wallabout and Newton Turnpike made commuting to Williamsburg easier and the community entered upon a period of rapid growth. By 1827 the community had prospered to the point where it was incorporated as a village by act of the legislature. On January 1, 1852, Williamsburg, now a thriving community, received a city charter. The new city prospered and lasted for a period of 2 years when it became a ward of the city of Brooklyn.

Over the years, the Williamsburg section has not suffered industrially. The proximity of Williamsburg to bridges, freight terminals, and marine facilities along the East River led early to the establishment of factories, lofts, and warehouses which have been maintained. Among the better known plants in the area are the F & M Schaefer Brewing Co., Joseph Schlitz Brewing Co., Liebmann Breweries Inc., Charles Pfizer Drug Co., Socony Mobil Oil Co. refinery and several other large plants.

The most serious problem which has faced this community has been a depletion of responsible citizenry. Williamsburg increased in population at the turn of the century when Jewish immigrants settled there to be near their brethren on Manhattan's lower East Side. They moved into the area in great numbers after the opening of the Williamsburg Bridge in 1903 and were followed by other immigrant families of Italian extraction. After the holocaust of World War II, 15,000 orthodox Jewish refugees from Nazi persecution settled in Williamsburg. The advent of the Brooklyn-Queens Expressway cut a winding path through most of Williamsburg uprooting thousands of these people.

In the past 15 years there has been a decided population shift. What was once a community with a substantial middle-class citizenry has begun to change in both the ethnic and socio-economic character of the population.

An increase in industrialization has been partially responsible for this population trend but the real answer lies in the fact that the majority of housing facilities in this community are 60 years of age or over and the housing developments constructed in the past 15 years have been geared to those in the lowest socio-economic class. Thus, thousands have been displaced and more than 20,000 persons in the lowest economic classification have moved into the community, all of whom have made good citizens, by the way.

The result of this trend may best be pointed up by the comment of Leila Morgan, executive secretary of the districts health committee, who as early as November of 1954 was quoted in the press as saying: "Our leadership in the health committee keeps moving away. All our chairmen move to Queens, Westchester, and the suburbs."

Here lies the answer to many of the serious social problems that affect the Borough of Brooklyn. Let us never forget that it was a responsible middle class that expanded undeveloped land into a thriving community and thence into a flourishing city. It is this kind of citizenry we must rely on to lead in community activities. Time and again sociological studies have been made and whether it be juvenile delinquency or better housekeeping facilities in the city, all studies will agree that it is community leadership which provides the only answer to this problem. Those in the lowest economic strata of our society are burdened with the chores of earning their bread. These are the families where both parents work. These are the families where children are unsupervised, where there is no time for participation in the religious, cultural, and civic activities of the community.

The exodus of the old citizens of Williamsburg into the suburbs and even neighboring States must be stopped. These peo-

ple whose roots lie in Williamsburg; who have over the years been the leaders in community activities should not be displaced. And, these are the very vital reasons why I appear here today to implore this Commission to act promptly in establishing middle income housing for the leaders of Williamsburg who may be scattered to the suburbs and other States.

Gentlemen, I know this community and have been proud to represent it in the Halls of Congress for almost 9 years. The people of Williamsburg are honest, industrious, hard-working citizens who have a proud tradition fostered over many years which they wish to sustain. I ask you to permit them to remain. I implore you to take action so that the great cultural and religious traditions that have evolved from our Jewish community over the past 2 decades and have achieved worldwide recognition, may be continued. I beseech you on behalf of the other old and established elements in our community who wish to remain and continue their religious, charitable and community service. Do not let these people go. Stop this mass exodus.

I look forward to a revival of civic activities in Williamsburg. I look forward to an integrated community where those in the lowest socio-economic level may live in peace and harmony with the older elements in the community who are granted access to this middle income housing. Then, Williamsburg will have the leadership necessary to guide the less fortunate and actively participate on the local level in programs of rehabilitation and assistance that will permit the community to act as it has in the past in meeting and solving its own problems.

In conclusion, permit me to thank Chairman Felt and all of the members of this commission for their study and considerate judgment of this very important situation. Your prompt action in facilitating the erection of such housing will mean that this proud section of Brooklyn will once again flourish and assume even greater responsibilities for which we can all be proud. I congratulate you in advance for establishing a better Williamsburg which means a better Brooklyn and a better city of New York.

The Cuban Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, since my recent statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD setting forth my views on the Cuban situation, I have received a multitude of letters supporting my position. But of all the communications received, none was more succinct than the following which I would like to include for the RECORD at this point:

YALE LAW SCHOOL,
New Haven, Conn.

Representative FRANK KOWALSKI,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

It is reasonable for this country to boycott Cuba; it is reasonable to want no Communists there; but it is irrational to impose the first and then demand the second.

FRANK KEATING.

American Seapower: A Great Speech by Hon. Herbert C. Bonner, on Maritime Day 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, on Monday evening, May 22, I had the privilege of hearing a great address by the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Hon, HERBERT C. BONNER, delivered at Fort Eustis, Va., at a joint meeting of the National Defense Transportation Association and the Propeller Club, Port of Newport News, in observance of National Maritime Day.

The theme of Congressman BONNER'S speech, American seapower, brought the subject of our total maritime posture more clearly into proper focus and perspective than any statement I have ever heard or read.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of every Member of Congress the thoughtful and penetrating remarks of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in his splendid and timely address on our dependence as a maritime nation upon seapower in its commercial and naval entirety. We must not forget,in our preoccupation with outer space, that the destiny of the world we live in can be determined on the seas which comprise some three-quarters of the earth's surface.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of Chairman BONNER'S great speech:

It is an honor and a great pleasure to be here at Fort Eustis to observe National Maritime Day at the joint meeting of the Propeller Club, Port of Newport News, and the National Defense Transportation Association.

I think it is particularly auspicious that this meeting should be held here at Fort Eustis, the splendid transportation training command center of the Army. The atmosphere of the occasion is further enhanced by the 344 merchant vessels of the National Defense Reserve Fleet lying at anchor only a few yards away in the James River. And down the stream, only a few miles away, stand the facilities of the great Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co., bulwark of this Nation's waterborne military and commercial might for 75 years.

Most of you have heard Maritime Day speeches before.

Frequently they consist of fine phrases of praise—pleasant to the ears of members of the merchant shipping fraternity. Much is said about the "fourth arm of defense" in a context which makes it sound terribly important and able to function alone in the welfare of our country.

Here at Fort Eustis, enjoying the hospitality of the Army, and in the presence of the National Defense Transportation Association, composed as it is of representatives of all forms of transportation, I am going to speak on seapower, a subject which involves all who are here tonight—in time of peace and in time of war.

I would like to discuss American seapower in its total sense, and its importance to our future. For, more than ever today, we are a maritime Nation dependent upon our seapower in its commercial and naval entirety.

"Seapower," as I am speaking of it, is not merely Polaris submarines or 33-knot liners.

As Adm. Arleigh Burke, our great Chief of Naval Operations, stated only a month ago: "* * * seapower relies on far more than ships and weapons systems. Our capability to exert effective naval power when and where we need it rests on our natural assets of geography and material resources. It depends too on our shipbuilding capacity and it rests very heavily on the technical and design skills of our naval engineers. Seapower includes all those things which enable a nation to use the sea advantageously during peace or war."

And he might well have added: "The concerted, continued, and dedicated cooperation of the men who man the ships and handle them at portside."

We tend to take our maritime position for granted, but we do so at our peril. We must rid ourselves of the myopia of recent years which placed the expediencies of bookkeeping above national maritime strength and which made the accountant the prime arbiter of the policies governing the sinews of our seapower.

We must insure that in the immediate years ahead we not only overcome the effects on our maritime posture of past neglect and shortsightedness, but that we push forward our maritime frontiers. We must proceed without delay in modernizing and strengthening our U.S. merchant marine. We must move ahead, to gain maximum effectiveness and efficiency from the new technologies.

We must aggressively compete for trade—the trade which provides the basic link of common interest between us and our allies, and the undecided nations of the world. The volume of this trade will expand in the years ahead and means must be found to insure that our merchant marine carries a sharply increased portion of it.

It is not only our commercial interest and balance of payments that are affected.

In our struggle with the Communist world, trade is a key factor—a potent weapon for the side which will effectively use it. We want the future to see our products, moving in American merchant ships under the shield of the Navy of the United States. Our trade, made possible by our seapower, can and must be the means of lifting up the undeveloped nations.

The Russians, though late to arrive on the maritime scene, have long been experts in political penetration. They fully understand the importance in the world struggle of trade and mercantile seapower.

Soviet expansion, in both naval and merchant fleets shows their determination to replace us as the foremost in overall seapower. The primary position given to submarines in the growing Soviet Navy openly shows an intention to strive mightily to cut our sea links of trade and supply in time of war. Growing emphasis on merchant shipping shows the value the Soviets place on world trade for attaining their objectives short of open war.

Russia now has a merchant marine of about 850 ships—over 4½ million deadweight tons. Her satellites provide an additional 200 ships, totaling 1¼ million tons. This fleet is steadily expanding, through building in Soviet bloc shipyards and purchases from the free world.

An Associated Press dispatch of May 10 quoted the Chairman of the Russian Shipbuilding Ministry as saying that the demand of the Soviet merchant marine is increasing so rapidly that Soviet shipyards no longer can fully cope with it and that by 1965 the

volume of Soviet seaborne freightage will almost triple compared with 1958.

He added that in view of this, various ships are under construction for the Soviet Union in Poland, Finland, Denmark, East Germany, West Germany, Holland, Japan, and other countries.

I might note that the Soviet Union has pioneered the development of nuclear icebreakers—a field which we have neglected, strangely enough, considering that we face Siberia across the Arctic Basin. Their large and powerful atomic icebreaker *Lenin* has been in operation for more than 2 years now while our small fleet of war-built icebreaking vessels are obsolescent and wearing out.

Russia knows how to use newly acquired maritime power. The Red flag is showing all over the world—of course, with a heavy emphasis on the ports of the small nations they wish to penetrate.

Soviet ships and trade are vital and integral parts of the Communist economic offensive.

In countries where reserves of hard currencies are limited, Communist willingness to supply and deliver Iron Curtain products and pick up the exchange material, all for barter, has been very successful. Russian petroleum, Polish fishing boats, and East German machine tools move over the world, implementing about 100 barter treaties signed with non-Communist countries. We have only to look, from Florida, 90 miles south, to Cuba, to see a textbook example of Communist penetration leaning heavily on the effective use of mercantile seapower.

Thus, the Soviet merchant fleet acts as a political weapon of national trade. Russia's merchant marine is free of such hinderances as the necessity to make a financial profit. Political profits are the objective. The future could well see them concentrating shipping on a few trade routes to haul free world cargoes at some financial loss to them perhaps—but an irretrievable political loss to us.

These grim facts provide ample reason why we must revitalize our position of primacy at sea and restore it in such clear degree that no doubt will exist anywhere that the United States and the free world control the sealanes under all conditions.

There must be no doubt that we can carry the trade, and our goods and our ideas to all the nations.

There must be no doubt that, if need be, we can strike at will in a controlled and limited manner from the seas, with shattering promptitude. There must be no doubt that we can apply the most precisely tailored degree of force—naval force capable of appearing without warning, and remaining indefinitely to strike or threaten. There must, further, be the certainty in the minds of our friends and those who are not our friends, that our Polaris ballistic missile submarines, are there at sea, invisible and unfindable.

In these future years, I believe that we must have a much closer degree of coordination of maritime and naval policies.

This is of the greatest importance.

Never before has there been such a degree of interdependence between our naval power and the strength of our merchant marine.

It is a task of naval power to protect and control the sealanes in the face of potentially the most massive submarine threat of our experience. It is the job of the merchant marine to bring in the vast quantities of raw materials—imports such as metals, ores, and petroleum—which are now vital to our national strength and warmaking ability.

But, consider the degree of our present vulnerability: Over 1½ million barrels of petroleum per day are imported by ship—less than 5 percent of it in ships flying the U.S. flag. About 99,000 tons of iron ore are daily imported in ships, nearly all under foreign flags. There are, of course, other critical items: The raw materials for the space age must be imported into the United States by ship. In a very real sense, our lack of capacity to carry our own vital imports may be our exposed jugular.

Our capacity to project our limited war force needs a well-balanced naval-military force working closely with a modern, effective merchant marine, active and in being.

Do not be misled to believe that sealift, meaning the movement of troops and military material by sea, is obsolete.

There is, of course, no substitute for adequate airlift. Its ability to rapidly move a few thousand troops and their light equipment is invaluable.

But when divisions and armies are to be moved, sealift can accomplish the job more rapidly and of course much more efficiently, both in terms of military effectiveness—as troops arrive concurrently with their heavy equipment—and in terms of resources expended. This can be done with ships of 15 to 20 knots, such as our reserve fleet transports and our older cargo ships.

A more spectacular statement of sealift capability is the fact that one ship like the 33-knot *United States*, or her authorized but as yet unbuilt superliner sistership, can carry a full division of troops and much of their equipment from New York to Europe in less than 5 days and to the Middle East in 6½ days. In doing this, she would carry her own fuel for the round trip, plus a large margin.

Only ships—and I mean large numbers of them—can supply the equipment, food, ammunition, and fuel for a limited war of even moderate size. A considerable part of the tanker requirement would be devoted to the supply of fuel for the aircraft of the very vital airlift. And mistake it not, airlift cannot function without these tankers—or without the pre-positioned staging bases which must be supplied by merchant shipping.

The American merchant ships to do the job—the passenger ships, the cargo ships and tankers—must be modern, fast, and of the highest quality. More than that, they must be in being and actively employed. This means that if they are to be ready to serve in an emergency, they must be built, manned, and gainfully employed before the emergency.

We do not have ships of the needed quality now except in limited numbers.

Only 13 percent of our active merchant tonnage is 6 years old or less, but 75 percent is over 14 years old.

To make up for past neglect, the replacement rate on our berth line cargo and passenger ships must be increased from the current 14 per year up to the 25 or more envisaged in the 1936 act. Modern thinking on limited war heavily underlines the importance of ships in being.

Here we may close the circle of this interdependence of seapower.

If these ships of our merchant fleet are built, manned, and employed, they will be spearheading our trade, performing the vital mission of expanding our seapower through economic means, as well as being ready for emergency use.

The years ahead are filled with challenge for this Nation, and the way aheda is far from clear. This is particularly so in the future of our maritime position—our total seapower. Yet, the opportunities ahead are vast—and it is of extreme importance that we make the most of them.

We must revitalize our seapower in its entirety, and bring about the closet coordination of its elements.

We, as a maritime nation, must determine realistically, what appropriate portion of the national budget should be allocated to the strengthening of our merchant marine. We must create the domestic climate of intraindustry cooperation in which the merchant marine can thrive.

We must expand our trade for its political as well as its economic value to us—and we must greatly increase the proportion of it that our own ships carry.

We must make our maritime power the instrument with which we can help the undeveloped and undecided nations to achieve their aspirations.

We must insure the continuation of the flow of imported materials vital to us by decreasing our dependence upon foreign-flag shipping in this regard.

We must insure our ability to carry such quarrels as may be forced upon us to the shores of our adversaries by maintaining well-balanced naval and military forces supported by an adequate, modern, and commercially viable merchant marine.

It is from the sea that we will realize our ultimate victory.

Thank you.

Mrs. Copenhaver: Good Neighbor, Typifies Kansas Spirit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following item.

Mr. and Mrs. Donald McCoy, who are personal friends of mine, came to Kansas from New York several years ago and are now members of our community. Mrs. McCoy, in a letter to the editor of the Lawrence Daily Journal-World of May 18, 1961, tells of an experience the family had when they first got to town. Because the experience of the McCoys is, I think, typical, I am very pleased to bring it to the attention of my colleagues.

MRS. COPENHAVER

EDITOR, JOURNAL-WORLD:

Last evening's Journal-World included a notice of the 95th birthday of Mrs. Ellen Copenhaver, 1025 R.I. Street, to be celebrated this Friday. I would like to honor this wonderful woman by telling you how much she has epitomized for me all the warmth and goodness of the Kansas character.

Four years ago my family and I came to Lawrence from New York State and had the good fortune to rent a house next door to Mrs. Copenhaver. From the beginning she proved the good neighbor. To our toddlers who made their way to her back door, she was always an endless source of gaiety, friendly words, and daily bouquets of flowers from her well-tended garden. The first path our older son beat after escaping through the porch folding gate was in the same direction. When our Kansan was born that first summer of our stay in Lawrence, Mrs. Copenhaver, then 91, was his first sitter while I made necessary errands to the store.

That first winter our family came down with the flu and to my utter surprise the family supper arrived hot and without delay through the thoughtfulness and generosity of our next door friend. I enjoyed endless conversations on her front porch and they all painted for me a vivid and lasting picture of Kansas history as it was made by the same rugged enduring personalities who peopled Kansas in the century just past. She told me how she consoled her mother when it was time for the widow and her children to leave Virginia to entrain for Kansas where a relative farmer would offer them

a home. "Oh, mama, don't cry, this is the most wonderful thing that ever happened." When they arrived there were none of the windbreaks so common now and the wind blew the pins right out of my hair. To this day a grasshopper must be killed on sight, perhaps her only admission that life could be hard in Kansas, too.

In a year when we are celebrating Kansas' Centennial I want to say that I am thankful that I and my family had the good fortune of knowing Mrs. Copenhaver, a woman who will always be our most memorable Kansas pioneer.

VIVIAN R. MCCOY.

Monroe County Negro Cited in Liberia for Aid to Country's Agricultural Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, too often te achievements of our colored people in the South are lost in the confusion and in the biased reports of the northern press, periodicals and other communication media. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the Monroe Journal, Monroeville, Ala., under date of May 11, 1961, concerning a native son of Monroe County, Sandy J. McCorvey. You will note that McCorvey was an agricultural extension advisor for the U.S. International Cooperation Administration in Liberia, and that he has been commended in a public ceremony in Monrovia for his assistance in developing a Liberian agricultural extension service. I want to join with the citizens of Monroe County in congratulating Sandy McCorvey on the excellent contribution he has made in promoting good will for the United States in Liberia.

The article follows:

MONROE COUNTY NEGRO CITED IN LIBERIA FOR AID TO COUNTRY'S AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

MONROVIA, LIBERIA.—Sandy J. McCorvey of Peterman, Ala., recently was commended in a public ceremony here for his assistance in developing a Liberian agricultural extension service. He is the son of Julia McCorvey of Peterman.

The Peterman native, who was an agricultural extension advisor for the U.S. International Cooperation Administration in Liberia, has returned to the United States for home leave and reassignment.

On his arrival in Liberia in 1951, he immediately organized a program to train Liberian agricultural extension leaders. Each tribe or community selected one man who was given a 3- to 12-month training course at the Boneke agricultural station. Graduates returned to their own communities and taught improved agricultural techniques to the farmers.

Thirty men were graduated from 12-month training course and 70 others received shorter periods of training during McCorvey's first 6 years in Liberia.

To help finance the training program, the Boneke station sold the vegetables it produced to farmers in the area. However, after 3 years, the farmers learned to increase and improve their own vegetable crops and no longer needed to buy vegetables raised at Boneke.

McCorvey and his Liberian assistant performed experiments to determine at what time various vegetables should be planted to produce the best crops and compiled data which McCorvey used to write a vegetable planting guide. This guide will be published and distributed to Liberian farmers. McCorvey also is the author of "Better Rubber Farming Means More Money For You." This pamphlet is an outgrowth of his famous "Let's Talk About" series, including studies on rubber, cocoa, oil palms and other agricultural subjects.

A poultry improvement program, school garden clubs, 4–H Clubs and chapters of Future Farmers of Liberia also were organized under McCorvey's guidance.

Mrs. McCorvey contributed much of her time in Liberia to community development work. She helped to establish a public library—the first in Maryland County.

McCorvey was graduated from Tuskegee Institute, receiving a B.S. degree in Agriculture in 1937. He received an M.A. degree from the Michigan State University of Agriculture and Applied Science in 1949. He also did graduate study at Indiana University.

After completing a 6-month refresher course at the Agricultural and Technical College of North Carolina, McCorvey and his wife will leave the United States for another ICA assignment.

Albert W. Byrnes, Democratic Leader in Brooklyn, Honored by Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Albert W. Byrnes has been active in Brooklyn politics and has contributed his efforts toward the betterment of his community for many, many years. On April 22, 1961, the Clarendon Regular Democratic Club honored him at its anniversary celebration at the Biltmore, Church and Flatbush Avenues, in Brooklyn:

Albert W. Byrnes, prominent Brooklyn businessman and leader of the First Assembly District Regular Democratic Organization, is certainly no newcomer to politics.

To support this claim, Mr. Byrnes can point with pride to his family's career in politics spanning 100 years.

His uncle, the late Frank V. Kelly, Jr., was the Kings County Democratic leader, and before him, his grandfather, the late Frank V. Kelly, Sr., helped guide the political destiny of the city of Brooklyn as head of the volunteer firemen's association.

"Al," as his friends call him, has continued in the footsteps of these two prominent Brooklynites. After attending Public School 16 and Eastern District High School in Brooklyn, he served in the Navy in World War I. After his discharge, he cashed in a $40 liberty bond to purchase his first truck and start what developed into one of the State's outstanding trucking firms.

He has always maintained a deep interest in Brooklyn politics and civic affairs. He has served as a presidential elector in 1948, 1952, and 1956, and as delegate to the Democratic National Conventions in 1956 and 1960.

The silver-haired, sparkling eyed leader has found time to serve as a member of the lay board of Greenpoint Hospital, a member of the board of visitors of Brooklyn State Hospital, second vice president of the Emerald Association, and first vice president of the St. Patrick Society of Brooklyn.

He has been working diligently to spark a back to Brooklyn move, as a member of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce; honorary member and past president of the Traffic Club of Brooklyn, and the Metropolitan Traffic Association of New York. He is also trustee of the Dime Savings Bank of Williamsburgh.

"Despite the loss of the Dodgers and several key businesses, Brooklyn has a bright future. Aggressive commercial leadership, coupled with a constant effort to attract young families, new businesses and constant housing improvements, will enable Brooklyn to maintain its leadership in the greater New York area," Mr. Byrnes said.

And, he talks from experience, 100 years of it.

Placing the Blame for the Montgomery Incident

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal points out some pertinent facts concerning the recent racial incident in Alabama. This article deserves the careful attention of all of us in determining if the South and the Nation should bear the brunt of the propaganda now being circulated:

MONTGOMERY AND THE WORLD

There is, surely, plenty of blame to go around for the Montgomery racial disorders. But we should like to enter a dissent to the increasingly prevalent notion that the United States as a whole deserves all this criticism, at home and abroad, for mismanaging its racial problems.

In this particular case the trouble was deliberately provoked. The so-called freedom riders went looking for trouble, in one of the most likely parts of the South, and they found it. The local and State authorities failed, in the beginning at least, in their duties to prevent violence and maintain law and order.

That was said to require Federal intervention, and perhaps it did. But the present administration sometimes seems almost as zealous in this matter as some of the agitators. It seems to believe that by fast, firm action it can clear up this whole question of segregation in the near future.

If that is indeed the view at the Justice Department, we fear it is an illusion. The Supreme Court school decision of 1954, whatever one may think of it otherwise, undertook to upset a social pattern of long duration. The consequences have been coming ever since, and the only sure thing is that the troubles will keep coming.

But all that does not, in our opinion, properly make the United States an object of scorn in its own eyes and the world's. We are dealing here with a collision of cultures, with elemental emotions, instincts and attitudes which cannot be waved away with court orders or U.S. marshals or promptly solved in any simple fashion. And we would just like to know what society, ever, faced with such a problem, has dealt with it any better or nearly as well.

Let's consider a few cases in the world today—not to justify the United States by pointing a finger at others, but simply to keep this complex matter in some kind of perspective.

There are, for instance, the emerging nations of Africa, so perturbed about America's race problems. Yet they themselves exhibit racism in reverse. Native politicians in Kenya, heading toward independence, want to drive out or submerge the whites and Asians who built the place for them. That is perhaps their business, but it hardly suggests they have found the secret of a harmonious multiracial society.

Throughout the vast backward areas of the nonwhite world, in fact, prejudice, discrimination, segregation are the custom. It's hard to think of a more thoroughly segregated setup than India's caste system.

Then there is the sanctimonious Soviet Union; to be sure, it does not have a Negro problem, but it holds many Asiatics, among others, in thrall and follows a quasi-official policy of anti-Semitism.

Even the civilized nations across the Atlantic are not successful at coping with the race problem when the problem arises—as it has in Britain. For most of them, of course, the problem has not arisen in any important degree, and therefore it is all the easier to deliver lectures on inequality in the United States.

The truth is that progress toward equality under the law—before as well as after 1954—is one of the more remarkable achievements of America, in view of its singularly difficult situation in this respect. Today compromises on the schools are taking shape in many areas of the South. Long and involved litigation, which itself dissipates passions, frequently results in a measure of desegregation not satisfactory to either side, but not intolerable either. Where there is any community will to accept change, the Federal courts have generally been understanding.

None of this excuses the mess in Montgomery; it does not mean all Americans are going to love each other any time soon. But the broad record of progress ought to be remembered once in a while in the midst of all the talk of the damage we are causing ourselves and our image abroad.

American Legion Goes to Denver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON G. ROGERS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion has made a wise choice in selecting the city of Denver to hold its national convention, September 9 to 14. The city of Denver welcomes all Legionnaires and their friends to attend this convention, as we know it will be an outstanding event. My friend Bill Brenneman has written a splendid article entitled "Go West to Denver, Colo." that is in the June issue of the Legion magazine and I ask unanimous consent to have this article inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, which is as follows:

Denver is the highest (1 mile), most isolated (500 miles from the next major outpost), and friendliest of this country's big cities.

She also is, perhaps, the most genuinely western of cities. She practices her brand of "welcome stranger" hospitality with such intensity that the casual vacationer who drops in for a few days leaves as Denver's best salesman; the man who stays a week feels he has a vested interest in the new pachyderm house at City Park Zoo, and he who remains a month becomes a native son.

All of which is by way of introduction to the expansive, open-arms welcome extended to newcomers by this fresh new city at the base of the Rockies which will be host to the 43d annual convention of the American Legion September 9 to 14.

Because her past is so recent and her present so new, and because of her isolated positions at the point where the Great Plains meet the Rocky Mountains, Denver is a city of marked contrasts.

Distinguished observers have called her "the most cosmopolitan of cities." Equally astute critics save dubbed her "cow town."

She may be either or both. Cosmopolitan, certainly, for the newcomers who have been arriving at the rate of nearly 2,000 a month since World War II have come from everywhere. "Cow town," of course, for she is the center of western America's billion-dollar livestock industry, and the most lavish of white-tie affairs at the gracious Brown Palace Hotel is bound to attract a sprinkling of 10-gallon hats and high-heeled boots.

(Former Gov. Dan Thornton once bedded down a $50,000 Hereford bull in the lobby of this dignified hotel.)

On a mountaintop 20 miles from downtown Denver is the carfully tended grave of "Buffalo Bill" Cody, the great buffalo hunter whose name is synonymous with the days of the Wild West—only yesterday in Denver's 100-year history. (Kiddies toss pennies over a spiked fence onto the grave, for luck.)

A couple of hogbacks away is the $60 million industrial complex which is building that most sophisticated weapon of the rocket age, the Titan ICBM.

Nowhere is the contrast between past and present demonstrated more strikingly than at the corner of Colfax Avenue and Broadway, where any tour of the Mile High City must begin. To illustrate what is meant:

On one hand is Colorado's State Capitol Building, topped by a dome coated with $23,000 worth of gold leaf—a lasting tribute to early mining glories. On the other is the gleaming white tower of the 28-story First National Bank Building (Denver's tallest) representing a wedding of old-line Denver banking money and the flamboyant millions of the Murchisons of Texas.

From the same corner (just a block from Leyden-Chiles-Wickersham Legion Post 1, host to the conventions) can be seen the graceful classic columns of Denver's city and county building, which an earlier generation of city fathers stopped at four stories so Denver's beloved view of the front range of the Rockies never would be blocked. A glance to the side discloses the new, 22-story, 884-room Denver Hilton Hotel, majestic symbol of Denver's postwar emergence as a principal convention center and commercial city.

In downtown Denver, within walking distance of all downtown hotels, is the Denver City Auditorium which will be the scene of general sessions of the American Legion and the American Legion Auxiliary. The auditorium has a seating capacity of 8,000 in the area, where general sessions are scheduled for September 12 and 13, and 2,333 in the theater, where the Auxiliary will be in session September 9, 10, and 11. The auditorium also will house displays throughout the convention.

If President Kennedy accepts an invitation to speak, the general session on the day of his appearance may be moved to the municipal Denver Coliseum, located about 3 miles from the hotel district at East 46th Avenue and 44th Street. The Coliseum can handle a crowd of about 11,000 with parking for 2,500 automobiles.

Senior drum and bugle corps groups are scheduled to appear September 10 at the University of Denver Stadium, seating 30,000, 6 miles from the downtown business district. The stadium may also be used for junior bugle corps, tentatively scheduled for September 9.

Under discussion is the possibility of a public spectacle at the Theater of the Red Rocks, handling up to 12,000 persons, 15 miles from downtown Denver. Other groups are exploring the possibility of producing a special rodeo for the Legion at the Coliseum September 12 and 13.

Despite its diversified economy, Denver still stops to wonder sometimes just why it is. Neither of the streams which flow through it (the South Platte River and Cherry Creek) carries enough water to float anything drawing more draft than Huck Finns raft. The first railroads bypassed it rather than tackle the mighty bastions of the highest part of the Continental Divide, and early-day explorers were prone to describe the vast plains at its back door as the "Great American Desert," incapable of ever growing anything more nutritious than buffalo grass.

Nevertheless, in 1850 a trapper found a show of color in a nearby creek and, in 1858, a Georgian named William Russell camped at the confluence of Cherry Creek and the Platte to look for gold. The next year, John Gregory stumbled across a gold lode at Central City, and the big gold rush to the Rockies was on.

In short order, silver was found at Georgetown; Horace Greeley had sent Nathan Meeker west to found the Union Colony (first irrigated farming development in Colorado) at Greeley; the predecessor of the University of Denver had been established, and Denver had been named capital of Colorado Territory. Colorado achieved statehood in 1876, and silver had touched off the Leadville bonanza days. In the late seventies, the Ute Indians gave up the ghost following their last abortive uprising at Meeker, and all of western Colorado, with its precious metals, timber and lands was opened to the white man's development.

The railroads finally came, and with them came new dwellers, new businesses, and new industries. Texas cattlemen, driving their longhorns to winter pasture, provided the nucleus of the livestock industry. Small tradesmen, who were to become giant wholesalers, headquartered in Denver to serve a growing empire. Infant banks became giant financial institutions, providing capital for the development of the entire Rocky Mountain area.

The railroads also brought something else: The tourist.

The earliest settlers long since had discovered the health-giving qualities of the high, dry, rarefied air of Colorado, and of its long seasons of brilliant sunshine, qualities which attracted hordes of those afflicted with "lung fever" to seek cure in the mountains.

A German nobleman named Count Pourtales built a casino at the foot of Cheyenne Mountain, and his friends from the East and from Europe flooded into Colorado Springs ("Little London") as the vanguard of the swarms who were to come later to enjoy the luxuries of one of the world's greatest resorts, the Broadmoor Hotel.

William N. Byers, founder of the Rocky Mountain News, came upon steaming vapor springs in Middle Park, 100 miles northwest of Denver and Hot Sulphur Springs was born. An English syndicate built the Hotel Colorado near the vapor caves at Glenwood Springs, 170 miles west of Denver.

Teddy Roosevelt went bear hunting in the Flat Tops country near Glenwood Springs

and big-game hunting became an industry. The Stanley Brothers drove one of their steamers up the banks of the South Saint Vrain River and the Stanley Hotel was conceived and around it the resort village of Estes Park was built.

Roosevelt set aside the vast mountainous domain that is Rocky Mountain National Park, and other public use areas followed quickly: Mesa Verde National Park near Cortez, Great Sand Dunes National Monument near Alamosa, Colorado National Monument near Grand Junction, Dinosaur National Monument near Craig, Hovenweep National Monument west of Cortez, and 11 national forests, covering more than 15 million acres of majestic, untouched, untamed mountain wilderness, forever closed to commercial exploitation.

Otto Mears hacked a precarious trail straight through the forbidding fastnesses of the San Juan Mountains in southwest Colorado, and his million-dollar highway between Silverton and Ouray remains today as one of the most spectacular automobile highways in the world.

The Rio Grande Railroad pushed its tracks through the San Luis Valley and into the formidable San Juans to Durango—then swung north and thousands of awestruck visitors today ride the 49-mile Animas River route to Silverton which is the only remaining regularly scheduled narrow-gage passenger train trip in the Nation.

The roads and railroads tapped new riches and new resources—lead, zinc, molybdenum, oil, coal, timber, lush grazing lands, rich croplands—and all of Colorado thrived.

Denver and Colorado reached a staid maturity by the time of World War I, and the quarter century between then and the start of World War II passed in relative quiet.

The Moffat Tunnel was built under the Continental Divide, and Denver at last had a truly transcontinental railroad route. A Denver mayor named Robert W. Speer built a magnificent civic center and a system of city parks as notable for its practical usability as for esthetic beauty: no Denver park ever has been marred by a "Keep off the grass" sign.

A fledging State highway department used the proceeds of the first gasoline tax to open highways for year-round use across the lofty mountain passes—and the great barrier of the Continental Divide shrank even more.

Colorado Springs built a cog railroad and an auto highway to the top of 14,110-foot Pikes Peak. The National Park Service completed Trail Ridge Road through Rocky Mountain National Park to provide adventurous motorists with the highest continuous auto highway on the continent—12 miles above timberline at more than 11,000 feet.

But it remained for the changes wrought by World War II to bring Colorado into its full-fledged maturity. Thousands of servicemen were stationed at Fort Carson (infantry), Camp Hale (ski troops), Fitzsimons Army Hospital (sick and wounded), and at Lowry Air Base and Buckley Naval Air Station. They liked Colorado—and returned to live.

Colorado industry found new markets for its products. The Colorado-Big Thompson project, diverting millions of gallons of precious water from the western slope to the eastern, was completed at a cost of $160 million—and in its first year of use saved $22 million worth of crops from drouth.

In the ravine-pocked mesas of southwestern Colorado, the powderish yellow rocks that had gone unnoticed for years touched of a new boom in mining that resulted in years of excitement and growth in the great uranium rush of the 1950's.

The Air Force Academy was established, and the marvelous new service institution took shape against the foothills of the Rampart Range near Colorado Springs. (Visitors are welcome at the academy, now Colorado's most popular tourist attraction.)

New capital—from New York real estate men, from Texas oil millionaires, from small-town bankers in Kansas—poured in. Colorado blossomed and grew.

With growth came growing pains and problems. Since World War II, for example, the people of Denver have had to put up more than $80 million in school bonds to provide for an explosion of the small fry population.

(Perhaps it is this interest in good public education which has provided much of the impetus for Denver's headlong pursuit of culture. More than 20,000 adults attend her Emily Griffith Opportunity School. The private University of Denver, known for its schools of business and the theater, has big campuses both in the downtown and the south residential areas. The University of Colorado operates a big extension center in downtown Denver, and its medical school is campused in Denver. Denver public schools sponsor the one educational television station in the Rockies—and Denver also supports 4 commercial TV stations and 18 radio stations.)

As in all metropolitan areas, Denver, the mother city, has been faced with a choking growth of satellite communities. Nearly half her metropolitan area population lives in suburbia. The problem of financing capital improvements to serve both her own people and her neigbhors is her most pressing concern.

Her traffic problems have been met in two ways. A pioneering traffic engineer named Henry A. Barnes introduced her to one-way streets and the Barnes Dance, which permits pedestrians to move across intersections at any angle when they get the walk light. Recently, Denver completed her first big expressway, the $30 million Valley Highway, on which motorists can drive the length of the city at speeds up to 55 miles an hour without stops or cross traffic. (Expressway traffic has not yet equaled the confusion records established by some other notable expressways. To date, the Valley Highway's biggest pileup has involved only 12 autos.)

As this issue of the American Legion Magazine goes to press, Denver is concerned about the fact that several of her finest are in jail or facing felony charges—at least two rings of uniformed burglars have been found to be operating from within the police department.

Because of these and other problems, Denver has been accused by her sisters to east and west of being self-conscious. And why not? her citizens rationalize.

Ask any resident of Denver on any street why he lives there. The answer, invariably, is: "Because I like it."

Then, unless you're fast on your feet, he'll have you roped and hogtied and will be leading you home to a cookout steak dinner on his backyard patio.

HOW TO GET TO DENVER

American Legion members planning to attend their national convention in Denver September 9 to 14 will find that Denver's central location and wealth of transportation facilities make it easy, economical, and swift to reach from any major part of the country.

Five large trunk airlines and two local service lines serve Denver. The trunks include United, Braniff, Continental, TWA, and Western. Local service lines are Frontier, serving all the mountain regions between Canada and Mexico, and Central, serving large areas of Kansas and Oklahoma.

Denver also is served by seven major railroads—the Burlington; Colorado and Southern; Denver and Rio Grande Western; Missouri Pacific; Rock Island; Union Pacific; and the Milwaukee Road.

Both major transcontinental bus systems—Trailways and Greyhound—link Denver with cities and towns throughout the Nation. All principal car-rental systems have branches in Denver and, in addition, the Colorado Transportation Co. provides sightseeing bus tours throughout Colorado.

Chief among U.S. highways entering Denver are U.S. 40, 6, and 36 from the east; 287, northwest and southeast; 85 and 87, north and south, and 285, southwest. In addition, U.S. Highways, 138, 50, 24, and 160, entering from the east, and U.S. Highways 82, 550, and 660, entering from the southwest, connect with routes leading directly to Denver.

For air travelers, pure-jet service (United DC–8 and 720 and Continental 707) has brought Denver within 2 hours of Chicago, San Francisco and Los Angeles, and 3¾ hours from New York. Jet and/or turboprop service also links Denver with other principal cities in the Southwest, west coast, and Midwest, with good connections to all other points.

Following are some typical fares and approximate travel times between Denver and other principal cities (all fares are round-trip and include tax):

New York: Pure-jet service, $238.36; flying time, 3¾ hours. Other air service: first class, $224.22, coach, $166.15; flying time, 6 to 7 hours. By rail, pullman, $237.56, by coach, $119.90; traveltime, 33¼ hours. By bus, $54.07, traveltime, 50 hours. By auto, traveltime, 42 hours.

Chicago: Pure-jet, $149.60; flying time, 2 hours. Other air service: first class, $140.80, coach $114.07; flying time, 4 hours. By rail, pullman, $93.58, coach, $53.95; traveltime, 16½ hours. By bus, $46.37; traveltime, 28 hours. By auto, traveltime, 23 hours.

Los Angeles: Pure-jet, $155.70; flying time, 2 hours. Other air service: first class, $146.96, coach, $107.69; flying time, 4 hours. By rail, pullman, $152.31, coach, $84.43; traveltime, 29½ hours. By bus, $34.32; traveltime, 32 hours. By auto, traveltime, 23 hours.

Dallas: By air, first class $114.95, coach, $90.42; flying time, 1¾ hours. By rail, pullman, $63.80, coach, $47.91; traveltime, 18 hours. By bus, $23.93; traveltime, 20 hours. By auto, traveltime, 16¼ hours.

(Fares and times may vary from line to line and are subject to change. If members of your family will go with you, check on the airlines' family plan for lower fares.)

Agricultural Legerdemain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, while House Committee on Agriculture has under consideration the broad general agricultural program of the New Frontier, it would be well to consider its reception by rank and file members of that very substantial industry. This, especially in view of the fact that the new plan has been presented to us as advanced thinking and a do it yourself program. Upon sober reflection however, and in the light of our past experience, many seem to feel that this is simply old merchandise under a new label.

Frankly, I find no support for the propose farm bill neither among farmers,

consumers, or the taxpaying public and I would like to quote some representative observations from six farmers of my district:

The Kennedy administration is pledged to raising the farm income across the Nation. Everyone knows that the increase of revenue is not important unless the costs can be held.

As a farmer of Dutchess County, I am strongly opposed to the Kennedy farm bill because of the inherent creeping regimentation of the Nation's agriculture through the provisions of this bill.

This bill would give the Secretary of Agriculture dictatorial power over all agriculture. It could conceivably mean the end of the free enterprise system in agriculture that has helped build and make prosperous our Nation during the past 180-odd years. The agriculture industry is not proud of the burden it has placed on the rest of the Nation. Let's lighten the load rather than increase it.

As a fruit grower here in the Hudson Valley, I'm very much against this bill. I respectfully ask you to do everything in your power to defeat this legislation.

Also we oppose the omnibus farm bill as it will give the Secretary of Agriculture absolute control of farms and farmers of this country. We do not want power invested in any division of government, as his actions would not even be under congressional control.

The Cochrane-Feeman bill is a step toward more Government control, when what we want is less Government control. We are doing what we can at our county level and also at State level on most of these problems, and they can be done much more efficiently there.

It seems to me that we would do well to scrap this whole proposal without delay and the efforts of our agricultural experts should be bent toward a solution of the individual problem of the various commodities; more difficult, no doubt, but possibly of some benefit to all segments of our economy.

Induction of Rabbi Ira Sud, Temple Ezra, Chicago, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD R. FINNEGAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, on March 12, 1961, Temple Ezra was the site of the induction of their new rabbi, Ira Sud. It was with great pride that I accepted an invitation to be present at this solemn occasion, and I found myself in the company of the religious and civic leaders of the community in the 12th District, Chicago, in which Temple Ezra exercises its spiritual strength. Dr. Manfred L. Hoffmann, leading member of the community and board chairman, conducted the ceremonies, and after the appropriate invocation by Rabbi Herman E. Schaalman of Emmanuel Congregation, Chicago, introduced those speakers who had come to attest to the qualities of the new rabbi. Rabbi Schaalman's invocation was inspiring when he said:

Thou art our God and the God of our fathers, who discloseth Thyself to the world in the beauties of nature and in the strivings of the human heart, who driveth down to us through the angles of ancient revelations and to the dedicated endeavor of His servants, the rabbis and teachers of all generations. We approach Thy throne today in behalf of Thy servant, Ira Sud, who is about to undertake the onerous duties of being rabbi of this congregation. Lift Thou, O God, his every step; when his strength falters, support him; when his advice is sought, give insight into his heart and love of fellow man into his every action. That Thy word be in the word of Torah, may flow from him in undiminished vigor, spreading his healing balm among all who come here to seek Thee.

To his effort and by Thy grace, establish him in this pulpit, from which he shall speak Thy words, the word of courage, the word of reproof, and of guidance. Upon his lips shall flow Thy praise, and so shall the innermost recesses of the heart of this congregation, that they and he, together, shall sing Thy praise, now and for all the days of all his years. Establish Thou, God, the work of his hands, yea, the work of his hands establish Thou it. Amen.

The new rabbi has been well described in the February 9, 1961, issue of the Delaware County Daily Times of Delaware County, Pa., which under the heading of "Rabbi Sud Fills Promise," said:

When Rabbi Ira Sud, spiritual leader of Ohev Sholom Synagogue Center in Chester, leaves this month for his new post in Chicago, Ill., his loss will be as significant for the community as it will be for the Jewish congregation.

This pleasant, friendly clergyman has managed to personify unqualified brotherhood, despite scars of an early life which marred his educational prospects in Prague.

As he ministered to the local Jewish congregation in Chester for a decade, he created a wider fellowship, representing the Jewish rabbi at his most influential level.

When he came to Ohev Sholom, August 1, 1950, he told a Times' reporter that he was "deeply interested in giving service to the community as a spiritual leader, and above all, I want to make a contribution to the democratic way of life."

Examining his record over the past 11 years, it may be said without qualification that few local citizens have ever achieved a stated purpose so completely.

Dr. Manfred L. Hoffmann, president of Temple Ezra, went on to add:

In Rabbi Sud we find a teacher, a friend, a spiritual guide, a cobuilder, a codeveloper, a man to whom we can talk at any time, a man to whom we can come with our problems as a human being and as Jews, a man who will understand us, whom we shall love dearly, with whom we can live in friendship as evidenced by his consideration, his loyalty, and his pleasure in the achievements of others.

The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, the Rabbinical Assembly of America, the rabbi's colleagues and numerous private individuals attest to our fortune in having chosen Rabbi Sud as our new spiritual leader. As he assumes office today, it is my personal belief that his firmness, his farsightedness, his patience, and his experience will enhance Temple Ezra's already strong position in the community life of Chicago. His success will be our success. May he succeed.

Among others whose remarks deserving of extension on this occasion are those of Dr. Rudolph Lackenbacher, who noted:

We pray that you will be a great leader of our congregation and that the three letters of your surname stand for strength, unity, and devotion: "S" for a spiritual, moral, and physical strength; "U" for your intention to unite all members into a bigger and respected congregation; and "D" for your devotion and deep religious feeling to your duties as rabbi and educator.

Simply and in a manner indicative of his nature, the good Rabbi Sud responded:

Temple Ezra to us must become a home away from home, where the great are small, and the small are great. Home is where the heart is, and your heart and my heart will be with Temple Ezra. I will adhere to the principle of positive historic Judaism, as I was sworn to at the Jewish Theological Seminary in Breslau, on January 30, 1937. This position, within the framework of our American civilization, I will maintain.

Summer Jobs for Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Secretary of Labor Goldberg—which appeared in the Sunday newspaper supplement This Week on May 14, 1961—should help many of our colleagues to answer the inquires they receive from students wanting information about summer job opportunities. The Secretary's suggestions are excellent guidelines:

HIGH SCHOOL AND COLLEGE KIDS: HOW TO MAKE YOUR SUMMER JOB REALLY PAY

(By Arthur J. Goldberg)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—This summer nearly 3 million young people will look for jobs to earn money till school and college reopen in the fall. For those youngsters—and their parents—I have a word of advice:

Summer work can be a rewarding and profitable experience—but don't let a summer job lead you away from school. The path away from school, even if it begins with an attractive summer job, can lead to an occupational dead end.

We have discovered that the dropout from school finds fewer good jobs, lasts a shorter time in them, earns far less over his lifetime, and has a much higher rate of unemployment than the graduate.

Those who work this summer will discover why. The good jobs are held for the educated and trained worker. A degree and a diploma are necessary passports to the better employment opportunities of today, and certainly of tomorrow.

A STEP UP THE LADDER

It is important to keep in mind the true values of summer work, keep it in the proper perspective. That way it can be fun—and a step up the job ladder.

A June to September job that is also a training ground for a career already selected is, of course, a real plus. But that is not the only criterion that should be applied.

The important objective in summer work is to acquire the disciplines that apply to all employment—responsibility for conscientious effort, taking direction from a job superior, promptness, proper handling of money, and learning to work with others.

It is always a good idea to start looking for a summer job early. Try to get one lined up long before school closes. Begin by look-

ing in fields that will provide experience for a career, if you have decided on one.

A young girl who wants to teach, for example, might inquire into summer camps and summer schools, or into tutoring. A boy with medical school in view might seek summer work at a local hospital or clinic. A model or designer-to-be might make the rounds of dress shops and department stores for salesgirl openings.

If you are interested in engineering, many companies recruit college students for summer training. Other good bets for future engineers now in college or high school are summer jobs as garage mechanics, or factory work.

JOBS FOR 15-YEAR-OLDS

Whatever your chief job interest, your first visit should be to the local employment office. There are some 1,800 of these offices throughout the country, offering free placement service and good advice.

Summer job lists maintained by the employment service include, for the 14- and 15-year-old girl, clerical, sales and stock work in retail stores, various types of domestic service like baby sitting, and nursing aid work. A 15-year-old boy might find summer work in delivering, sales, packing or stock handling, caddying, or car washing, or in farm work.

The older girls and boys have a wider variety of choices—office work, resort employment, assisting skilled craftsmen, and factory jobs.

One field that should be thoroughly investigated by young people is service with the government—Federal, State, or local. Here's a unique opportunity for service to all of society.

All of the jobs listed with the employment service are legally permisible for young people under the Fair Labor Standards Act—an important point to consider. In most communities, work permits are required before a young person can be put on the payroll.

Once you land your summer job, don't consider it merely a source of income and welcome spending money. No job should exist only for the paycheck. Whether you are clearing a forest trail, stacking dishes, waiting on customers, marking stock in a market, waiting on tables, pumping gas or typing business letters, the values of work extend far beyond the hourly rate and wage scale.

The day of the unskilled worker is over. The new jobs of the new economy will require far wider educational and training backgrounds than in the past—and they will also demand an interest, a willingness to understand and absorb that can be learned now. If you can discover that the reward of work is far more than monetary, your summer will be well spent.

A SENSIBLE WORD OF ADVICE

A young lawyer once wrote to a wise professor of law, asking him how he could best prepare for a successful law career. The professor replied: "Forget about it, and instead make yourself as wise and learned as you can in many fields—in music and literature and science. When you have done that, then you will be a good lawyer as well."

I have always thought that excellent advice. The man who understands his time and the great events in many fields is usually the man who is excellent in his own. So even though a summer job may not be an immediate steppingstone to your eventual career in life, it is a window onto a part of life that can be stimulating and valuable.

My best wishes to all of you as the summer begins—and good luck in your work.

Protection of Marine Mammals on the High Seas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very informative statement presented by my good friend and colleague, Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, in behalf of his bill, H.R. 777, to provide for the protection of marine mammals on the high seas, and for other purposes.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. SAYLOR. I am John P. Saylor, Representative from the 22d District of Pennsylvania, and the author of a bill which Chairman BOYKIN has been kind enough to schedule for hearing this morning, H.R. 777, a bill to provide for the protection of marine mammals on the high seas, and for other purposes.

I want to say to the members of this committee that I appreciate your having scheduled this bill and having scheduled it at a time when it was possible for me to be here as a witness.

Many years ago, when I began to read of the accounts of what was happening to our polar bear and to our walrus and the sea otter under the guise of sportsmanship, I became gravely concerned because all of the information that was made available to me indicated that it was not sportsmanship but in a sense ruthless slaughter. I was brought up by a father who believed that his sons should be taught to hunt and fish, and also brought up with the idea that, if you hunted and fished, it was to your advantage to match your skills against nature and, being given the undue advantage of having a gun or the latest in fishing equipment, you should more than be able to match your skills against nature.

Finding out that many people were going hunting polar bears by ruthlessly killing them from the air with rifles and never attempting to go back and pick up the carcass except to write and say that they had flown 130 miles out over the ice barrier north of Alaska, that they had succeeded in killing two or three polar bear or at least left trails of blood and finding that on many occasions people went out in the same plane or in another plane and reported back that they had killed several walrus and made no attempt whatsoever to recover them, this under the guise of sportsmanship, bothered me and many years before Alaska became a State I took the matter up with the Department of Fish and Wildlife downtown and had them draft a bill to protect in some way these marine mammals which are rapidly disappearing.

It is for this reason, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, that I am extremely grateful this morning for this opportunity to testify on behalf of H.R. 777 which I introduced on the third day of January of this year which will provide for the protection of three important and rather unique marine mammals.

As I say, I am pleased to have sponsored this legislation which is vital to the improved management of the polar bears, the walrus, and sea otters. Its enactment is of importance not only to Alaskans, whose interests I have consistently supported, but it is also in my opinion vital to the welfare of the people of the United States in general.

A primary consideration of the drafting of this legislation is the international character of these three marine mammals, especially the polar bears and the walrus. The range of the polar bear, for example, encompass hundreds of thousands of square miles of the north polar basin. The animals contribute to the existence of native villages, and they are taken by either or both natives and sport hunters in Canada, Russia, United States, Norway, Denmark (Greenland), and Sweden.

The Pacific walrus migrates in and out of the territorial waters of the United States and Russia and the high seas. Polar bears wander all over the international ice fields.

The language in H.R. 777 that relates to proposed authority for the Federal Government "on and along the coast of the United States" was inserted with the idea of providing a single jurisdiction of responsibility. The benefits and savings that come from eliminating duplication in manpower and equipment are obvious. It is not my intention to seek to usurp the prerogatives of the new State of Alaska in the management of natural resources that are resident within its boundaries. It is a reasonable expectation that the appropriate Alaskan agency will continue to devote its most intensive effort to the resource problems that are of its greatest magnitude and concern. My intention is to assist them in accomplishing this and not to take away any responsibility that already is theirs.

You men might recall that, when the Alaskan statehood bill was passed, Alaska was the only State that was ever admitted to the Union that was not given complete jurisdiction over its fish and wildlife resources. The bill admitting Alaska to the sisterhood of States specifically provided that the Department of the Interior should continue to have jurisdiction over the fish and wildlife resources of this new State until the Department of the Interior was satisfied that the new State was in a position to handle its own natural resources.

After a series of conferences between the officials of the new State of Alaska and the Department of the Interior, the Department of the Interior passed over to the new State of Alaska jurisdiction over its fish and wildlife resources and that State now enjoys the same privilege that all of the other States of the Union do.

The proper application of the responsibility vested by H.R. 777 would provide maximum opportunity for the exchange of personnel, equipment, knowledge, and experience between the State and the Federal agencies in the improved management of these marine mammals. The predominate distribution and use of these natural resources is international. It is my hope that this legislation will assist the Alaskan program and that it will be bolstered and improved through the provision of a working authority for the study and wise management of these animals in international waters. Only the Federal Government can work out agreements with other nations for the overall benefit of these international resources.

Sport hunters, in their pursuit of polar bear trophies, go considerable distances over international waters. The hunting is done almost exclusively from the air, and the pilot-guides fly their clients as far as 160 miles out over the pack ice in search of this

big white mammal. Most of the walrus are also taken outside of the territorial waters. It is entirely possible for a person to go onto the high seas and take and process walrus, without once touching shore in Alaska.

The life history of the sea otter is fairly well known and the animals have benefited from protection for years which was provided, I am happy to report to this committee, by its predecessor somewhere around the turn of the century. Their number is now believed to be satisfactory, and the resource appears secure after having risen from a point of virtual extinction in the early part of this century. The fur of the sea otter is extremely valuable, and the comparative quality of other furs is rated against that of the sea otter. Perhaps limited harvests of sea otter may again become a possibility, but we must be sure that the resource is not jeopardized.

Little is known about the life history of walrus, and much less of the polar bear. Speculation about the welfare of these two species has been expressed many times. The Copenhagen meeting of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature in 1956 expressed the concern of scientists from all over the world about the status and future welfare of polar bears and walrus.

The Canadians for several years have prohibited the taking of polar bears by white hunters. Canadian natives are believed to kill about 400–500 animals a year, more than half of the total world take. Figures on the world harvest of polar bears are included in the reprint "Status and Management of the Polar Bear and Pacific Walrus," which I would ask to have included as a part of your files. This was a report that was issued by Robert F. Scott, Karl W. Kenyon, John L. Buckley, and Sigurd T. Olson in conjunction with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries. This reprint presents much timely information about these animals, their status, and the many management problems that have arisen.

Remote native villages along the Arctic coast of Alaska derive a substantial part of their annual income from providing services and supplies to sport hunters who go there from all parts of the world in quest of the polar bear. It was estimated in 1957 that the nonresident polar bear hunters spent on an average of $2,000 apiece in a trip to kill one of these or acquire one of these trophies. This excludes the transportation and other costs borne by the shooters in traveling to and coming from Alaska. The hunting of bear by the white man is done almost exclusively from the air. The flying presents many hazards to the small aircraft, and when there are mishaps the task of rescuing the stranded hunters falls to the Federal Government, the Coast Guard, and the military from its establishments.

Natives of at least two Alaskan villages, Diomede Island and King Island, get their major subsistence from the walrus. The animals provide needed food both for humans and their dogs. The hides are used in covering boats, and the ivory is worked into implements and artifacts of considerable commercial value. Most of the animals are taken in international waters. Villagers on St. Lawrence Island also depend on the walrus, but not as intensively as the natives in the other islands.

The reprint that I have submitted notes that about half of the walrus killed are not retrieved. The total yearly kill by inhabitants of Alaska and Siberia is placed at about 10,500 animals, or 23 percent of the estimated population. The walrus population is believed to increase at about 11 percent per year under conditions where the animals are not hunted. This means that the annual kill is roughly twice the replacement. How long can this resource exist under such a situation without some protection?

Many conservationists throughout the circumpolar region share my conviction that an esential first step toward providing protection for polar bears and walrus rests on the provision of international protection such as suggested by H.R. 777.

These are changing times, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, and it is not appropriate, in my thinking, that any past inequities of Federal control of these resources, or the limited purview and financial means of the new State of Alaska, should be cited as a means of discounting the advisability of enacting H.R. 777. These marine mammals are in remote international waters only where the conscience of man stands between their preservation or extinction. Litle is known about their basic biology, their needs, and the total numbers of the animals from which these kills are being made. Steps must be taken so that the subsistence and economy of dependent Alaskans can be protected.

Objections that may be imposed to H.R. 777 by a State whose waters constitute a mere fraction of the immense natural range of these nomadic animals should not be construed as a rejection of the principles that are involved. The wide-ranging movements of these animals and what happens to them while they are beyond the authority of Alaska, can and will have a direct influence on their ultimate use and contribution to persons operating within or beyond the boundary of Alaska. I wish to reiterate that most of the animals taken by residents and nonresidents are in international waters.

If we have erred in the management of these valuable resources in the past, and that is what most persons believe is the case, the blame can be placed on the fact that the United States has put off this vital decision for too long. I propose that we take this necessary step now, for the benefit of both the marine mammal resources and for the interest of all the people of the United States and for the people of the world who are interested in conserving these species.

I might say, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, that, as controversial as this legislation might become, I am happy to report that since the original bill was drafted a favorable report was received from the Department of the Interior and the other departments of Government; and that not only the past administration but the present administration has reported that they are in favor of the enactment of this legislation.

I want to thank the members of this committee for the opportunity to appear and testify.

Castro Hopes To Get Aid From U.N. Special Fund if Ransom Fails

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, if Castro's plot to get technical aid through ransom fails, he has another more civilized method in reserve. He hopes to get $1.1 million from the U.N. special fund, a technical aid fund to which the United States has pledged forty percent.

The U.N. special fund is set up according to the basic framework for international loans. Requests are granted by a two-thirds vote of the governing council. The Cuban application lists a need for $763,500 for experts and consultants, $200,000 for equipment, and $50,000 for fellowships.

Mr. Speaker, several times I have protested this matter to the State Department with the hope that the request would be denied. A vote on this measure is due in the United Nations this afternoon. At this time I am sure that the Membership of this body joins me in the hope that the U.S. delegation will prevent this grant of $440,000 U.S. dollars to Communist Cuba.

President Frondizi on the Alliance for Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. CONTE. A maximum of cooperation by all the free nations of this hemisphere is absolutely vital to insure the success of any alliance for progress, economic, social, or both. The great majority of the hemisphere is about to undertake such an alliance which, of necessity, must move forward with unusual speed. We must make use of every resource, every sincere offer of help by other free nations of the world, if we are to succeed.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from President Arturo Frondizi of Argentina to President Kennedy. This statement of support for the concept includes many valuable observations on, and ideas for, the alliance and the means of carrying it to fulfillment. I commend it and include it for your consideration.

The text of the letter follows:

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS,
April 7, 1961.

To His Excellency the PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, JOHN F. KENNEDY, WASHINGTON, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have given most careful attention to the address delivered by Your Excellency on March 13 last before the Latin American Ambassadors in Washington.

I wish to state to Your Excellency that the announcement of the Alliance for Progress enunciated therein opens a new historic perspective of the common task of the American Republics.

Our countries constitute a community united by geographical, historical, and, above all, spirtual ties that are indissoluble.

We are a branch of the Western World. At the time of the great discoveries, the Western World put out branches to all corners of the earth. To all of them it transmitted the vitality of its culture and its spirit of progress. In this way it came into contact with other ancient cultures and with primitive peoples. It penetrated some of them and fused the old and the new values. In others it made its presence actively felt but did not effect a permanent fusion.

America developed as part of the Western World. Our indigenous peoples absorbed its religion and its culture. The European peoples who came to our shores became a part of our land forever.

Our political independence, which we gained almost sumultaneously, was the first expression of the vitality and maturity of the imported culture, which was thus acquiring an autonomous existence.

From that time on, we began the great struggles to develop our national entities, to establish a democratic way of life based on respect for human dignity, and to promote the progress and well being of our peoples.

The evolution of our Republics was marked by the variety and diversity that are characteristic of human destiny itself, although our ideals and our objectives were the same. We have all faced problems and conflicts in our evolution toward democracy and liberty: internecine struggles, local conflicts, tyranny. In Europe, in full maturity, such conflicts reached the catastrophic dimensions that brought the world to the last war.

On that occasion, the United States constituted the moral and material reserve upon which decisive action devolved to save paramount values at the final crossroads. Then, in an unprecedented decision, it put forth a great economic and technical effort in the Marshall plan in order to make possible the rapid reconstruction of a world economically paralyzed by devastation and tottering on the edge of a grave crisis threatening disintegration which would have been fatal to our civilization.

Today Latin America is also passing through a period in which basic values are at a stake.

Many of our peoples have been successful in establishing the democratic institutions essential to the respect for our traditional values, for human dignity, and for an economic regime based on social justice, private enterprise, and respect for private property.

Nevertheless, the Latin American nations are troubled by a serious, disturbing factor which hinders our progress, makes it difficult for the governments to satisfy the ever-stronger aspirations of the peoples and, under such conditions, threatens our social stability in the face of the corrosive activities of disruptive demagoguery and propaganda; this negative factor, as your excellency has clearly perceived, is that of underdevelopment.

The conditions of underdevelopment prevalent in Latin American disturb and impede all national efforts to bring about an improvement in the living conditions of our peoples.

In very few cases is the national product of the countries of Latin America growing at a rate equal or superior to that of the increase in population; export, consisting principally of raw materials, have increased less than the population and therefore provide resources considerably under those required for the acquisition of equipment and manufactured articles indispensable for development.

As depositories of a concept of life based on Christianity and Western tradition, we uphold the supremacy of spiritual values that constitute the dignity of man. In hours critical for the world and for our countries, we did not hesitate to abandon all attachment to material wealth in defense of that which is vital for mankind.

But in the present crisis of Latin America, these values are threatened by the disturbances and frustrations caused our people by their inadequate incomes, which means economic insecurity and, for many communities, malnutrition, disease, and ignorance.

I have had repeated occasion to point out that the vicious circle of poverty and underdevelopment calls for vigorous solutions. In present world conditions, political as well as economic, no underdeveloped country can formulate such solutions within the framework of a democratic regime, without the cooperation of the developed countries.

Moreover, I should like to emphasize to Your Excellency that the problem of underdevelopment is a grave question not only in situations of extreme poverty; it is not only a question of overcoming the problems of hunger, contageous diseases or illiteracy; people in the middle of the 20th century aspire to levels of well-being appropriate to this age and not simply to the material necessities of life. Their aspirations encompass not only the biological needs but also what at this point in civilization and world progress is a full life, in a material and cultural sense and in a physical and spiritual sense. Rural man aspires to become more informed and to be heard, democratically, in the making of national decisions which will affect him; this means educational, transportation, and communications facilities, electrification and rural sanitation, equitable commercial treatment; industrial workers who have acquired the skills to operate the complex machinery in the factories aspire to higher cultural levels, to a higher social position, to a stae of well-being commensurate with the level of productivity made possible by modern technology.

Professional and technical people and intellectuals also aspire to be respected in their professions and to achieve in the communities to which they belong positions of responsibility commensurate with their capabilities.

This implies not only adequate income levels, but also laboratory and educational facilities, and, above all, recognition by society of their aptitudes and capabilities.

The history of this century indicates that tensions of this type, perhaps even more than those created by extreme poverty, offer fertile soil for the germination of nihilist movements that can open the door to the irruption of Communist totalitarianism.

In your message to Congress on the subject of the international cooperation programs of the United States. Your Excellency pointed out with great clarity that these programs are not limited to a passive struggle of mere opposition to communism but have the dynamic aim of demonstrating historically that in the 20th century rapid economic growth can be achieved within the framework of our democratic institutions.

Apart from the Marshall plan for Europe, in the years following the last World War there has been carried on a vast work of international cooperation in the economic and technical fields in which the United States has had the most important role, including that of genuine leadership. However, despite the considerable extent of the effort, from an absolute standpoint and the positive results obtained, if that effort is measured in relation to the magnitude of the needs of the underdeveloped countries, it is insufficient in comparison with the urgency of existing problems and tensions.

In an exceptional act of statesmanship immediately after your assumption of the high national and global responsibility of the Presidency of the United States, Your Excellency revived the best traditions of a great Nation by taking an initiative commensurate with importance and urgency of the problem.

For that reason, I have not been content to limit myself to merely offering my congratulations, however warm they may be.

In this question, our destiny as free nations and our responsibility as leaders are at stake. In the name of that responsibility, I wish to say today to Your Excellency that my Government unreservedly commits itself to the joint cooperative effort of the alliance for progress that you have opened to all the nations of the Americas. This is a decision dictated by the irreversible course I chose for my country when I became head of the Government 3 years ago.

We faced without flinching the difficult task of consolidating our institutions, the free exercise of rights guaranteed by our constitution and social peace and at the same time we initiated an economic policy designed to reorganize and stabilize our finances and to promote on these bases a process of rapid national development.

Under extremely difficult conditions, our faith in the traditional ideals of the West enabled us with the support of the people, to demonstrate clearly that the most fitting and most direct road to economic well-being and the progress can be constructed within the framework of democracy and freedom, affirming the exercise of man's highest spiritual qualities.

The instruments of government intervention that have previously interfered with the economic life of the Nation were removed. We furnished an adequate and definite solution to the manyfold national and international problems with which our country had been burdened for several decades; we call for heavy sacrifice in the nature of austerity on the part of our people to curb the disintegrating process of inflation and to rehabilitate our finances, and we initiated a program of sound development.

Of course, this undertaking would have been impossible of realization if we had not had the valuable cooperation of the nations of Western Europe to which we are bound by traditional ties, and above all, of the United States, your great country, which from the start showed great understanding of the critical importance of the undertaking we were launching.

This cooperation has strengthened the bonds that unite our two countries in a practical and concrete form that is without precedent in our history.

The efforts of my Government have had important and favorable results, but have also encountered strong obstacles that have brought about negative results as well. But we persevere in them because we know that they constitute a long-range effort which must be continued by those who follow us.

For this reason, Mr. President, I state to you today that, as President of the Argentines, I consider myself irrevocably a participant in the alliance for progress, aware of all the other members of the American community, but also certain that only through this effort can we fulfill the historic destiny of America in this century charged with anxiety and promise.

The alliance for progress is a joint undertaking implying responsibilities for all as a condition for the achievement of objectives that will benefit all.

As Your Excellency has pointed out, it is a question of undertaking in this decade a decisive effort to place the American peoples on the road to a rapid economic development that will enable them to raise their standards of living and to overcome the social tensions brought about by these living standards.

This program must be properly organized and oriented, in order that the necessarily limited resources may be utilized in the most efficient manner; in spite of the great amount of cooperation envisaged by Your Excellency and the magnitude of the contribution resulting from the efforts of all our countries themselves, it will always be limited in the relation to the vastness of the objectives to be achieved.

For this reason I believe it necessary to concentrate the initial impetus on the establishment and strategic expansion of the basic industries and services that will, in turn, permit the acceleration of industrialization and the mechanization of agriculture, and thereby rapidly raise the productivity of our economies.

The magnitude of this undertaking also brings up the question that my Government

raised on several occasions over a year ago, and that has also been given attention by Your Excellency: it is that of the participation of countries of Western Europe, bound by close traditional ties to Latin America, in this effort at cooperation for its development.

The development of the program presented by Your Excellency will require close contact and exchange of ideas and initiative among all the participating countries. It will also be necessary to utilize existing institutions to the maximum extent, especially the new Inter-American Development Bank. The studies which have been carried out by the Economic Commission for Latin America and the work done by the OAS, which culminated in a conference held in accordance with the Act of Bogotá, will also be of great utility.

Nevertheless, I should like to point out to Your Excellency, that I believe the magnitude of the task implicit in the Alliance for Progress will require machinery for cooperation, which, while permitting the most effective use of the aforementioned institutions, will have the flexibility and efficiency that will, for example, permit active participation in the program by the countries of western Europe and will assure efficient channeling of the cooperative effort toward the basic sectors mentioned above. This question, raised by my government long before the announcement of the program formulated by Your Excellency, now acquires, in our opinion, a much greater timeliness and importance.

My advisers and I myself are prepared to hold consultations with Your Excellency and all the American governments in order to consider the means necessary for giving the Alliance for Progress dynamic reality.

Mr. President, please receive these lengthy comments that I have taken the liberty of expressing as the most direct homage to the lofty spirit that has inspired your transcendent act of statesmanship.

From them you may have gathered the fact that I already consider the Alliance for Progress as a reality that is on the march, and I am certain that this opinion is held by all the American governments.

In the course of this march, as we advance toward the conquest of our future, the threat of any attempt from abroad to create disturbances will be removed from this hemisphere, and prosperity attained within the framework of respect for liberty and the rule of justice will be definitely affirmed.

Cordial greetings.

ARTURO FRONDIZI.

Floating Medical Center Ends Tour—Ready for Another

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Courier-Times of New Castle, Ind.

FLOATING MEDICAL CENTER ENDS TOUR—READY FOR ANOTHER

After 6 months spent in the tropical ports of the Java sea, the ship, *Hope*, floating medical center, is back in New York.

"There never has been a ship quite like her before," Capt. Jack M. Windas said the other day. "She's essentially a floating medical training institute trying to upgrade medical and nursing practice wherever she goes."

The *Hope*, a World War II Navy hospital ship, was refitted at Seattle early last year. Her service is a good willl project whose costs are paid by public subscription.

Captain Windas supervised the ship's sea trials last summer before steaming off for Indonesia. His stops were at Jakarta for 2 weeks, then at Surabaja, Bali, Sumbawa and Makassar for a month each.

"I would say the mission had its greatest success at the extremely primitive island of Sumbawa, where there is one doctor for 180,000 people and communication and transportation are about nonexistent," he said. "Sumbawa has a very tropical aspect. We anchored offshore because there was no dock for a ship our size.

We set up a clinic on the beach in an old wooden customs shed with no lights and no running water. People came from all over and stood under a piece of canvas waiting to be treated. Launches took the most serious cases out to the ship.

The faces on the *Hope's* volunteer medical staff change several times a year, but there are nearly always a dozen general practitioners, an opthamologist, dermatologist, anesthesiologist, internist, 2 dentists, 20 nurses, and 30 medical technicians aboard, in addition to a crew of 125 men.

Though its mission is to teach, the people tend to regard the ship as a free clinic and, after their initial hesitation they usually sent out word and the sick begin to be brought to the ship from deep inland.

Dr. William D. Walsh, director of the People-to-People Health Foundation, which sponsors the venture, announced that the foundation would like to put another such ship in Africa and another in South America.

Dr. Walsh said at a press conference that the ship had so altered the image of the United States in Indonesia that Soviet medical teams are following us around.

Whenever one of us goes ashore in a jeep on the outer island, he said, kids dart out of the jungle and yell "Hopie, Hopie."

It is expected that the *Hope* will move to Saigon, South Vietnam, June 1 for 3 months.

The Phrase Needs Defining

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. BARRY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in New York's Westchester County newspaper, the Patent Trader, of May 11, 1961. It would appear to me to contain a valuable lesson.

THE PHRASE NEEDS DEFINING

When Mayor John Guion of Pleasantville wrote, with the unanimous consent of the village board, to ask the president of the Pleasantville School Board to implore the State education department to postpone a vote on centralization of Armonk, Bear Ridge, and Middle Patent school districts, he specified that such postponement should include time for Pleasantville and Bear Ridge to work out an equitable arrangement for the very logical unification of these two districts.

Quite apart from the question of whether it is desirable for a village administration to participate in its official capacity in the affairs of a self-governing school district (and we are offering no judgment), it would be valuable to explore the meaning of the phrase "equitable arrangement."

Discussion on consolidation of Pleasantville and Bear Ridge in the past has touched on the possibility that Bear Ridge might build its own elementary school and pay at least a few years' share of the cost, in order to make the district a more attractive acquisition for Pleasantville voters.

Does Mayor Guion's equitable arrangement involve separate building by Bear Ridge as a preliminary to union of the two districts?

Requests have been made recently for reassessment of all properties in the town of Mount Pleasant, with a view to correcting what some Pleasantville citizens consider an inequity in assessments of property in their village and in Bear Ridge. Such reassessment, presumably, would be intended to raise Bear Ridge's taxes, not only for schools but for town services.

Is this considered by Mayor Guion to be an indispensable preliminary to an equitable arrangement?

Statements and actions by Bear Ridge residents of late have indicated a fervent desire on the part of the majority to become associated with Pleasantville. Nevertheless, it seems reasonable to suppose that there are conditions under which even the most determined adherents of a Pleasantville merger would consider the price too high. It is not inconceivable that construction of a new school building by about 325 families might be one of these conditions. It is possible that a considerable (and permanent) tax increase might be another.

Bear Ridge has been offered a chance to vote on participation in a three district merger, as a full partner, on an equal (as against equitable) basis, with no strings attached. Before its citizens reject this offer to fling their cap over the Pleasantville windmill, it would be well for them to inquire fully into what may be involved.

Bear Ridge citizens are entitled to, and should demand a definition of the equitable arrangement proposed by Mayor Guion and others. Without this, they are negotiating for a pig in a poke.

Warning Sounded on Increasing Social Security Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, soon we will be called upon in Congress to institute a program for Federal medical aid to the aged under the social security system. While there is yet time to study this proposal in a calm and reasonable manner, I would like to call to your attention the facts brought out in the following article from the Wall Street Journal. In reading these facts, Members should bear in mind that first, we have already increased social security taxes this year; second, a thorough study of the social security system proves that it is actuarially unsound; and third, we have, in this country the finest medical care in the world. We have yet to find a case where any person has been denied medical care because of lack of finances.

ESTIMATES OF KENNEDY MEDICAL CARE PLAN'S COST ARE INCREASED; BENEFITS MAY BE CUT

(By Jonathan Spivak)

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy's proposal for medical care for the aged under social security, facing sticky going in Congress in almost any form, is threatened now with a higher price tag than its drafters anticipated.

The extra costs showing up under close review may run well into millions of dollars each year. For the first year, the increase might approach 9 percent easily enough to throw the program's delicately balanced financing arrangements out of whack. This leaves the Kennedy regime two principal alternatives, both of which it regards as distasteful: A stiffer social security tax boost than that already proposed or some curtailment of the benefits offered.

Under the President's proposal the tax, shared equally by employee and employer, would be lifted to 6½ from 6 percent. And the tax would be figured on the first $5,000 of each worker's earnings, up from the present $4,800. The tax boost, plus the increase in the earnings base, would bring in added revenue equal to 0.6 percent of payrolls. This tax boost is considered a maximum politically. So the greater likelihood is some scaling-down of proposed benefits to restore the financing balance. And administration spokesmen may propose such a change—a reduction in the amount of nursing home care to be paid for by social security funds, or a requirement that the beneficiary pay part of the cost of such care—when the House Ways and Means Committee holds hearings on medical care next month.

NURSING HOME ESTIMATES

What's happened is this: Uncle Sam's social security planners have decided their original estimates of the cost of nursing home benefits, made public last February, were unrealistically low. Instead of $9 million for the first year of the program, their new analysis lifts the cost to somewhere between a floor of $25 million and a ceiling of about $255 million; the planners indicate $100 million might be a likely sum. The long-range costs of nursing home care, too, might run many times the original figures. Basic reason why: The first forecasts assumed a low rate of nursing home use among the elderly (an average one-tenth of 1 day per person per year) which medical authorities now believe will almost surely be exceeded.

The Kennedy plan as originally drafted permtis a maximum of 180 days a year of nursing home care for any one patient. This care would be offered only to old folks just released from a hospital, and it would be available only in a skilled nursing home—one with round-the-clock nursing service. These safeguards, coupled with periodic review of cases by State health or welfare agencies, it was felt, would cut down the number of people eligible and limit the number of nursing home beds available for use under the program.

But on sober reflection, social security planners recognize it would probably be impossible to limit the nursing home patients to true posthospital cases; it's considered likely that many old folks would, in effect, simply be booked through a hospital on their way to a nursing home.

Furthermore, the planners concede it's unrealistic to assume there would be no increase in the 181,000 skilled nursing home beds recently estimated as eligible to receive patients under the program. Of the 144,000 unskilled beds now existing, some are considered certain to be converted in order to qualify. The total number of nursing home beds, skilled and otherwise, has been increasing by about 10,000 a year.

ADDING UP THE PACKAGE

While Chief Social Security Actuary Robert Myers has not yet figured out the details, he has now decided that the original premium cost calculated to cover nursing home care would not be enough to finance the maximum 180 days of care originally proposed. That sum was 0.01 percent of payrolls subject to social security taxes. This cost, along with 0.56 percent of payrolls for hospital benefits, 0.2 percent for diagnostic outpatient care and 0.1 percent for home health care, added up to the 0.6 percent of payroll package announced in February—a package expected to yield benefits climbing from $1,050 million in the first year to $4,750 million in the year 2050.

While nursing home care may seem a piddling item in the total, the entire program's financing, notes Mr. Myers, was "balanced on dead center." An unexpected increase in any one component, officials say, would require a bigger income or a smaller outgo.

Among the possibilities for adoption when the bill comes before the House Ways and Means Committee would be cutting the nursing home benefit from the proposed maximum of 180 days to no more than 30 days. Social Security planners regard such curtailment as highly effective for keeping the benefit within its intended scope—for medical cases which do not require full hospital care. It would presumably rule out the program's use for the bulk of nursing home cases, which are essentially long-term living arrangements.

The medical care program has had financing problems from the start. When the President's program was unveiled to the press in February, Health, Education, and Welfare Department officials said all the benefits except nursing home care would go into effect July 1, 1962; nursing home benefits wouldn't start until mid-1963. But the very next day, when the bill was sent up to Congress, the effective date for the first benefits was put off to October 1, 1962. Reason for the change: Actuaries pointed out the medical care fund would be broke in its first year of operation if benefits were paid out for more than one quarter of that year.

Congress and the CIA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the need for congressional review of all phases of our national security effort has never been more apparent than today. The Cuban situation, conditions in Laos, Korea, and elsewhere indicate that to survive as a free society we must be alert to all the dangers. These dangers include not only those from without, but also the results of our internal actions or inaction.

The Florida Miami Herald has outlined the need for congressional review of the Central Intelligence Agency in an editorial date, April 28, 1961. I have joined with other Members of the House and Senate to sponsor a Joint Congressional Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence to meet the needs as suggested in the editorial and in light of all recent events.

Knowing the views of this important newspaper will be of interest to all Members, I include it in the RECORD:

CONGRESS AND THE CIA

As Gen. Maxwell Taylor begins what Washington once called an "agonizing reappraisal" of the Central Intelligence Agency, Congress might well look into its own responsibilities toward this arm of the Nation's defense.

Under the law, CIA Director Allen Dulles must stick out like a thumb (but not, it may be said, like a sore thumb) because of our passion for personalizing government.

However, he is the only visible part of the agency, whose very stenographers can't own up to where they park their carbon paper.

An intelligence agency must be operated in confidence, even in a free society. But how much of that operation requires some accountability to the people through their Congress and not merely to the President?

These things, for instance, are not known about the CIA:

How much money it gets and spends, and for what purposes.

How many people it employs, and where.

How it conceives of its duties, which are exercised under powers that appear absolute.

Six years ago the Hoover Commission on Government Reorganization recommended that Congress set up a joint committee to watch over the CIA. For some years House and Senate have had a similar committee that is privy to the deepest secrets of the Atomic Energy Commission.

But nothing really came of this. The Senate voted down a resolution creating a CIA supervisory committee by 59 to 27 (Senator John F. Kennedy was for it.)

True, there are subcommittees of standing committees which are supposed to know all about the CIA.

But their members don't. Nobody, save undoubtedly the President, knows. And some suspect that the CIA itself hardly knows, as witness the confusions of purpose and direction which marked the Cuban policy and what to do about it. Suddenly, this became the exclusive business of the CIA, and a private business at that.

If it is true that the agency mapped the invasion plan, herded the Cuban resistance leaders around like redheaded stepchildren and conducted military operations in their stead, then we have trusted a Government agency to make all but war without the consent of Congress.

As we said, secret government and a free society are an unholy concoction of these times of expedience. That free society already is spiritually if not legally at war. The wit and genius of free men must find some way to make this dilemma palatable.

Congress cannot do it by abdicating responsibility simply because surveillance by a few men of thousands of men might seem to interfere with what is regarded as the national interest.

Who, in the circumstances, says what is the national interest? And who ratifies that decision?

Only Congress can.

Serving Our Nation's Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH L. CAREY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

SERVING OUR NATION'S CHILDREN

(An address by Wilbur J. Cohen, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, before the annual luncheon, the League School for Seriously Disturbed Children, New York, April 29, 1961).

I am deeply honored to be your guest here today as you review your achievements of the past year and look forward to the challenge of tomorrow.

The League School for Seriously Disturbed Children can be proud of the work it has done. But it is your concern with tomorrow that is so impressive. You are not content to look back or to stand still. You are always pushing ahead, looking for new ways to bring new hope to children and their families.

That is why you have won such a well deserved reputation as a pioneer in your field. And that is also why your Annual Citation is so highly prized.

Your citation this year does honor both to the donor and the recipient. Dr. Paul Hoch is one of this Nation's foremost experts in the field of mental health. He has served this State and community, the entire country, and many international health groups with great distinction. His accomplishments, his sense of public spirit, and his leadership have already won him many awards. I am sure that your citation will take its place among his treasured possessions.

As many of you know, Dr. Hoch has served the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in several capacities. The interests of Dr. Hoch, of the League School, and of the Department coincide at many points—most particularly, in our mutual concern for children and the welfare of families.

Today I would like to share with you some of the recent developments in the campaign to improve the health and well-being of children and families. It is a campaign which we intend to wage with renewed vigor and determination.

President Kennedy has announced a series of social programs for the 1960's of wide scope and important consequences. Several of these programs—in education, in health, in improved economic opportunity—would have a tremendous impact on the lives of children and on the welfare of many families. In the comprehensive health program set forth by the President in February, child health was high on the list of national objectives.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF CHILD HEALTH AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

One of his proposals is for the establishment of a National Institute of Child Health and Human Development on a par with the existing research facilities at the National Institutes of Health. The new institute requires legislative authority which will soon be sought. Meanwhile, the President directed the Surgeon General to create, by administrative action, a Center for Research in Child Health. When the new institute becomes a reality, the center will become a part of it. The center is intended as a national resource for new knowledge on the causes of childhood disabilities, as well as on normal growth and development. We are very optimistic about the opportunities for fruitful work at the center—an optimism that has been shared, we are happy to note, by prominent medical scientists, professional workers such as yourselves, and the public in general.

Considerable research is under way on the special problems of childhood and adolescence. What is lacking, however, is a national focus for such work, a coordinating mechanism. We expect that the new center will fill this gap and at the same time will stimulate a variety of new studies. A broad range of research—biological, behavioral, and clinical—will be encouraged. Much of the research will involve several scientific disciplines, necessary because of the complex nature of human growth and development.

WELFARE SERVICES FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

Welfare services are also due for a new look. We are, therefore, planning a comprehensive review of all of the Department's public assistance and related programs for children and families to see how they can be made more effective.

In the United States, we have gone far toward improving the lives of children. There was a time when nearly every area had its poor farm or orphan's asylum. In those days, the death or disability of the head of the household often meant that the family would have to be broken up and the children sent to relatives, to an orphanage, or put to work as soon as they were old enough to get a job.

Medical advances are now keeping more children healthy, keeping more children from becoming orphans. Foster and adoptive homes have largely emptied the remaining orphanages of full-time, year-in-year-out residents. Among the factors which have brought this about are the social security and child welfare programs.

Benefit under the old age, survivors, and disability insurance program, for example, are now being paid to more than 2 million children. With 9 out of 10 women and children eligible to receive insurance benefits in the event of the death of the breadwinner, practically all those who become orphans in the future will get these insurance benefits. In most cases, the payment of insurance benefits means they can continue to live at home, to go to school, and to continue with at least their basic education. Widowed mothers can devote full time to the care of their children rather than having to take a job outside the home to keep the family together. If a child's surviving parent cannot provide a home, the child's benefits help pay for his care or provide for his future wherever he is—with other relatives, in a foster home, or in an institution.

The best place for a child, of course, is in his own home with his own parents. This is so obvious that it is sometimes necessary to review the circumstances which threaten to interfere with the home environment.

The most persistent threat is economic need of the parents. The first White House Conference on Children and Youth in 1909 set forth the principle that no child should be taken from his home because of poverty alone. This principle is widely accepted today. Yet the tragic instances in which poverty triggers a series of circumstances that break up the family are all familiar to all of us here.

One of the welfare programs that help to keep the family together is the program of aid to dependent childen.

Only children who are living in a broken home or a home seriously threatened by the incapacity of a parent are aided under the dependent children's program. Children in need because a parent is out of work are not eligible for assistance. When the program was established, it was assumed that States would provide home relief or other types of aid for such families. In some parts of the country, this assumption has been justified; aid is indeed available on behalf of children at home with their parents who are the victims of unemployment. In many parts of the country, however, this is not the case.

For this reason, as one of its first actions the administration proposed to the Congress that the aid to dependent children program be broadened, on a temporary basis, to include the children of parents who are unemployed. This action is especially urgent at a time when unemployment is high and provisions to aid the unemployed are often meager in many localities.

I am pleased to be able to report that the recommendations of the administration have been adopted by the Congress.

Included in these amendments are two very significant changes in our welfare legislation:

1. Federal payments to the States for foster care of certain dependent children.

2. Federal financing of training of public welfare personnel.

The new law authorizes Federal participation in a limited program of care of children who are eligible for public aid, when the courts have removed them from homes of their parents or relatives on grounds the homes are unsuitable and the children have been placed in foster family homes. The courts may make such a decision when continuation in the home of parent or relative has been determined to be contrary to the child's welfare.

Several reasons make this change in the law appropriate at the present time. No one takes lightly the severance, even for a brief period, of the ties between a child and parent or someone closely related to him. On the other hand, in some cases the home situations in which children live are clearly contrary to their best interest so that at least temporary placement elsewhere is necessary. Facilities for such placement have been limited and vary widely among localities.

While Federal funds, available through the child welfare grants to States under title V of the Social Security Act, are used for foster care of children to a limited extent, the bulk of the costs of foster care is paid from State or local funds, or from funds of voluntary social agencies. The lack of financial resources for such care in many States has at times hindered the proper development of the most suitable care for children who need care outside their own homes. For these reasons, the new legislation would provide for Federal financial participation under title IV for the support of some of these children in foster-family homes.

The new foster care provision is a limited one and has been designed to safeguard the rights of the child and his parent or relative. The provisions would also stimulate and assist the States in the protection and care of children under proper safeguards. It would further stimulate the use of the services of employees of public welfare agencies who are thoroughly skilled and experienced in placement and supervision of children outside their own homes. If a State takes advantage of this part of the amendment, the State would have to provide for development of an individual plan for each of these newly covered children. The plan would assure that each child receives proper care and, where practicable, that services are provided to help improve the home conditions which necessitated his removal so that he may be returned to his parents or placed in the home of a relative. The plan developed for this child would also include provisions for periodic review of the need for continuing the child in the foster-family home. These foster-family homes must be licensed or approved by the appropriate State agency.

In addition, the State would have to provide that the State or local welfare agency administering the State program use, to the maximum extent practicable, in placing the children in a foster-family home, those employees who participate in administration of the State child welfare services plan with respect to which Federal payments are made under title V of the Social Security Act.

The foster-family care amendment is designed to meet an urgent and very specific

need. It is not intended to provide foster care for the majority of children needing such care. These children continue to be the responsibility of the public and voluntary child welfare agencies. Small numbers of children are involved under this amendment and most such children probably would have been receiving aid in their own homes in the absence of this section.

TRAINING GRANTS FOR PUBLIC WELFARE PERSONNEL

Those persons concerned with improving the welfare of needy persons have long realized that the needy would suffer much less—for shorter periods—with less widespread effects on themselves, their families, and their communities—if more social workers, with complete professional training, were available to help them. An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure, we all know. Sufficient trained personnel would facilitate the prevention of many breakdowns before they occur. Their skills would contribute to the preservation of the family unit.

The need for trained personnel was a major concern of the Advisory Council on Public Assistance, meeting throughout 1959. In its report to Congress, it wrote, "The staff of public assistance agencies generally is small in relation to the responsibilities they are requested to carry," and "public assistance agencies are handicapped in competing with other social work agencies by the relatively large and difficult workloads."

Commenting on staff shortages, the council found that many public assistance agencies are so understaffed that they must limit their services largely to eligibility determination. Quoting again from the council report, "Some persons are accepted and remain on public assistance for want of intensive effort directed toward solving their employment, family housing, emotional, or physical health problems."

It takes professional training, skill, experience—and personal character, to help human beings in trouble. But, in a survey of social welfare manpower, made in 1960 by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in cooperation with the Bureau of Public Assistance and the Children's Bureau, the scanty availability of trained social welfare personnel was reaffirmed. Only 13.4 percent of the administrative and supervisory personnel in public assistance agencies have full professional training. The proportion has increased substantially since 1950, but we have a long way to go. Among caseworkers who are primarily in public assistance, only slightly more than 1 percent have full professional education—fewer than in 1950. The number of caseworkers with some graduate social work study has dropped from one-sixth of all caseworkers, in 1950, to one-tenth, in 1960.

But there is one bright spot. The number of caseworkers with a college degree has increased in the past 10 years. And a college degree is essential for graduate social-work study.

Because the recommendations of the Advisory Council on Public Assistance are extremely significant, I would like to read the most pertinent points:

"(a) In order to improve administration, promote social rehabilitation, and help prevent dependency, States should increase the numbers and raise the qualifications of personnel administering the public assistance programs.

"(b) To assist States in increasing the number of their qualified staff, the existing Federal matching provisions for educational leave programs should be amended to provide 100 percent Federal funds for training of public welfare personnel, as is provided in other specialized fields."

Because of the complexity of the economic and social factors involved, the new ADC legislation extending the program to children of the unemployed and permitting the States more flexible use of foster-family home care will require even greater skill on the part of public-welfare workers. We must make renewed efforts to obtain staff in more adequate numbers and with full professional training.

Section 3 would authorize the use of such funds as the Congress may appropriate for the purpose of grants to the States for the training of public-welfare personnel. In 1956, under an amendment which was sponsored by Senator KERR, the Congress gave substantial recognition to the critical shortage of trained personnel engaged in, and preparing to engage in, the administration of the public assistance programs. The amendment, both as Senator KERR introduced it and as the Senate passed it, provided for the Federal Government to pay the full cost of special training grants. The Congress authorized Federal grants of $5 million for the first year, and such sums as the Congress might appropriate for the next 4 years. In conference the proposal was modified to provide that the Federal Government was to pay 80 percent of the State's costs. But Congress has not seen fit to authorize Federal appropriations for grants on this restricted basis. Consequently, little progress has been made in training the personnel we need so badly. And the 1956 authorization is scheduled to terminate on June 30, 1962.

The training amendments to the existing law would be temporary, like most of the other provisions of the new legislation. They would extend the authority through 1963, and would not require the 20 percent State participation called for the 1956 amendment. The amount of the grants would, of course, be limited only by the funds that the Congress chooses to provide. Federal grants for the training of personnel would thus be more nearly comparable to grants that are available to the other professions. An appropriation for training grants would constitute an invaluable step toward the attainment of longer range training objectives in this area.

Such a step is essential if we heed the Bureau of Labor Statistics study of social welfare manpower needs.

It is estimated that, by 1970, we shall need some 32,000 more social workers to serve the normal needs of our expanding population. Between now and then, more than 4,000 social work students should graduate each year—in contrast to last year's total graduating class of fewer than 2,000. There can seem little question about the need for action.

SERVICES TO FAMILIES

The problems of dependency, neglect, and delinquency are not easily solved. Every city in the country faces them. I believe we can all agree, however, that it is important to establish and strengthen protective services for all children exposed to social dangers. These services should deal not only with the problems of the child but with those of other members of the family, which interact with each other to produce intolerable situations.

A disabled, unemployed father is usually unable to meet either the material or emotional needs of his children. As his sense of worth and dignity diminishes, the feeling of hopelessness is transmitted to the children. Anxieties and tension mount. The mother who is ill or otherwise handicapped can also affect the lives of her family adversely.

The recognition is spreading that dependency is a cycle that will not be broken until it is attacked at every point that impedes family solidarity and healthy growth of children, whether it be employment, vocational training, recreation, remedial education, attention to physical or emotional needs, training in family budgeting, or the core problem of mutual respect among various family members.

We cannot afford to delay the attack, because mental and emotional disorders of childhood exact a very heavy price. They may take the form of neurotic behavior, psychosomatic symptoms, or serious psychoses. They may be reflected in retarded mental development, or evidenced in delinquency.

It has been estimated that as many as 10 percent of the children in public schools in the United States may be emotionally disturbed and in need of psychiatric guidance. Over 5 million Americans are mentally retarded. Well over 500,000 children were brought before the courts last year for the kinds of antisocial acts we label as juvenile delinquency, some of them suffering from emotional disorders.

All of us are involved, in one way or another, with the medical and social problems posed by these statistics. The task is formidable but by no means insurmountable.

Disturbed children can be helped. They can be taught, as you here are so well demonstrating. We have by no means travelled the full road, but we have come a long way from the attitude that all children who are different are peculiar and cannot be helped. There is general recognition that they are as much a part of the total school system as any other children in the community. Their needs may differ but their right to an education, to develop to their highest potential, is part of their democratic heritage.

During the past two decades there has been a sharp rise in the number of schools offering special programs and special classes for exceptional children. A quarter of a century ago only about 750 school systems reported enrollments in special education programs. The latest figures—based on an Office of Education survey of 3 years ago—puts the total between 3,000 and 4,000, despite the fact that the number of school districts has declined.

Of the almost 45 million young people in public and private elementary and secondary schools, about 1¼ million were receiving special education because of their handicaps. Many experts believe, however, that these children represent only one-fourth of those who need special education.

Nonetheless, there has been a surge of interest in the educational needs of the blind, the deaf, the mentally retarded, the disturbed, and the exceptional child. Considerable experimentation is going on with new learning techniques and settings.

Local schools are best suited to offer more helpful programs for the handicapped and retarded. To be sure, good schools of this type are expensive, requiring specialized personnel and facilities. But they are less expensive in the long run—and far more rewarding—than placing children in institutions.

We need to develop a broad and bold program to deal with mental retardation, which would involve the cooperation of voluntary and public agencies—local, State, and Federal.

Further progress in all fields of family and child welfare, of course, depends on research. All who work in fields pertaining to the emotional development of children are aware of the vast areas of ignorance. Several agencies of the Department—the Children's Bureau, the Office of Education, the National Institute of Mental Health of the Public Health Service—are stimulating new studies in this field.

We need more research, for example, on why some children cannot communicate, a failure which may be attributable to either brain damage or serious emotional disturbance. A pilot project now underway in Rhode Island, supported by a grant from the Children's Bureau, is attempting to determine just why a group of children cannot communicate. It has previously been impossible to diagnose autistic problems in children—to determine whether they are suffering from brain damage, mental deficiency, childhood psychosis, or metabolic difficulty—and to devise means of treatment.

The children are studied daily in a nursery. A team consisting of a child psychiatrist, a child psychologist, a social worker, and two nursery school teachers are involved in trying to develop diagnostic methods for such children which, hopefully, can then be applied throughout the Nation.

A wide variety of studies—in emotional disorders, in parent-child relationships, in delinquent and defiant behavior—are being supported by the National Institute of Mental Health. Research dealing with children accounts for about one-fourth of the research grant program of NIMH.

Schizophrenia is one of the most severe psychiatric disorders of children, as well as of adults—and the least understood. Research is attempting to get at the causes of this disorder, and to test various forms of therapy. The League School, as you know, is working under an NIMH grant in its pilot day nursery for schizophrenic children. The objective is to develop ways of treating the virtually unreachable disturbed child. Everyone is very hopeful that the findings of this project will help in the formation of similar nurseries and day schools elsewhere throughout the country.

A great deal of attention has also been given to mental retardation. Biological and hereditary factors have been studied in efforts to determine the causes of retardation.

In this connection, perhaps some of you know of the 10-year project in which the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness is collaborating with 15 other research institutions in a study of 50,000 mothers and their children. Now in its third year, this study—known as the Collaborative Perinatal Project—is following the mothers from early pregnancy through delivery, and their children from the moment of birth until about school age. The purpose is to discover what things go wrong during pregnancy, birth, or early in a child's life which may trigger cerebral palsy, mental retardation, or chronic neurological disorders. Information from this study is expected to disclose causes not yet known or even suspected, and perhaps yield important clues to personality development.

Other research grant projects are investigating the adjustment of the retarded child to a world of his normal neighbors. At the same time, State and local programs for retarded children and their families have increased greatly. In the past 5 years, with the help of Children's Bureau grant funds, special State programs for this group have jumped from 4 to 52. This increase in services has been accompanied by a sharp swing away from the institutionalization of mentally retarded children as the only solution for their care.

One of the aims of these programs is to increase the number of professional workers with special training in mental retardation and thus put more knowledge to work as it is developed. Another objective is to help parents of mentally retarded children with the knotty problems of adjustment so that the parents in turn can be of greater assistance to their children.

Research in this field is also being conducted by the Office of Education, in cooperation with State education agencies and with colleges and universities. This covers the use of human talent, the impact of social and economic factors on education, student behavior and characteristics, and the learning process as it applies to special education.

One study which I believe will be of particular interest to you deals with the integration of the unaccepted child into the ordinary classroom. Comparisons will be made, in 50 special classrooms, of the teachers' ability to deal with situations which occur when severely disturbed children enter a class.

Another study is designed to develop a sound method of testing to give early indication of those children who are emotionally disturbed. One of the most distressing problems about this group, as you well know, is that they are usually in trouble before their condition has ever been recognized. By that time their rehabilitation is a long, difficult, and sometimes impossible process.

Identification of these children has been stepped up in the past year or so by the improved programs of testing and counseling under the National Defense Education Act. Of course, tests and trained counselors help all children discover the things they can do best and plan their schoolwork accordingly; but they are especially valuable to the socially maladjusted. No other group of handicapped people presents so many serious problems to society. If we ignore them, or fail to do enough about them, there is the danger they will spread their unhappiness to wreck other lives.

EDUCATION PROPOSALS

The education of all of our children to the utmost of their potential has acquired a new national significance. Now before the Congress are some of the most important new legislative proposals in education ever to receive the personal support of a President.

In his special message on education, President Kennedy said: "Our requirements for world leadership, our hopes for economic growth, and the demands of citizenship itself in an era such as this all require the maximum development of every young American's capacity. Our twin goals must be a new standard of excellence in education, and the availability of such excellence to all who are willing and able to pursue it."

In addition to recommending Federal funds for classroom construction and teacher salaries, the President proposed that 10 percent of the funds appropriated be set aside for special needs in each State. This unprecedented proposal—that a portion of the funds be used as each State sees fit—would make it possible for many communities to deal more adequately with special problems.

Some of the funds under this program, once it is approved by the Congress, would undoubtedly be used to expand the programs for all children who need special education. One of the chief obstacles to more of these programs at present is the shortage of qualified teachers. This is a matter which will challenge all our ingenuity and resourcefulness. The teachers of handicapped children must have unique and highly developed skills. As a nation, we have not given nearly enough attention to their recruitment, selection, and training.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I believe we are on the threshold of a new era of concern for the welfare of people—from the helpless infant with a birth defect to those who are well advanced in years. For handicapped and disturbed children, there will be more research, more community and specialized services, more opportunities for education and a useful future.

You in the League School will contribute much to the exciting developments which are in store, just as you have contributed to advances against difficult problems in the past. I am confident you will do your share, and more, to help every child make the most of his capabilities, and thus build a brighter future. We believe the Federal Government has a vital role to play in this connection and we intend to help make your role more effective.

The Cold Fury of Hate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, events crowd in upon us and some of them make us weep for the depravities of mankind. How many beasts walk the earth in human form?

Earlier this month, we marked the 13th anniversary of the founding of Israel as an independent nation. On May 14, it was exactly 13 years since the day that the people of Israel proclaimed their freedom, and President Harry S. Truman immediately announced that our Government was recognizing the Government of Israel, in culmination of one of the most dramatic incidents of national courage ever demonstrated by any people.

Every American of good will, and every person of good will in the world, applauded the success of the Jewish people of Israel in establishing their own country in fulfillment of Biblical prophecy. While millions of people were aware of the courage and drive and the resourcefulness which went into the Israeli drive for independence, the stark background of events which provided the motivation for the final push was not really known or even guessed at.

We had read and heard much about the bestiality of the Nazi regime. The international trials of war criminals after the end of World War II brought out many of the facts, and sickened decent people everywhere.

DID WE FORGET TOO SOON?

Either we forgot too quickly, or else perhaps many of the horrors of the postwar trials could not be fully reported in those days because of the tremendous press of other earth-shaking news crowding onto the front pages following the end of World War II. In any event, the trial now taking place in Israel of the infamous Nazi who directed the liquidation of the Jewish people of Europe—and of many people of non-Jewish heritage who were also marked for extinction—has finally brought to public attention the extent and the depths of depravity of the hate mongers who followed the Hitler banner.

One cannot read the reports of the Eichmann trial without shock and despair over the aberrations of the human mind which too often show up in violence directed at minority groups.

TERROR IN THE UNITED STATES, TOO

And one cannot read the reports of violence in and around the bus terminals of Alabama these days without being

reminded of Nazi terror and violence and human depravity.

It is perhaps fitting that the self-styled leader of the American Nazi Party has led a tiny band of followers in a symbolic hate ride into Alabama. If nothing else could bring the Hitler past to mind, this episode should do it.

Mr. Speaker, as a partisan of President Kennedy, my comments about the prompt and decisive actions of his administration in moving into the situation in Alabama might appear to be politically motivated. Therefore, in order to demonstrate that there is no partisanship in upholding decency, I submit for inclusion as part of my remarks a hard-hitting but objective editorial on the Alabama riots from one of the most Republican of newspapers in this country, the Philadelphia Inquirer.

The editorial, from the Inquirer of Monday, May 22, is as follows:

DESPICABLE, INTOLERABLE MOB RULE

The Government and people of the United States must never yield to the unreasoning force of a hate-driven, bigoted, riotous mob in Montgomery, Ala., or anywhere else in the country.

Disgraceful, unconscionable acts of racial violence on the streets of Montgomery over the weekend were a manifestation of inhumanity that cannot be tolerated in a nation dedicated to the dignity and liberty of the individual.

The Kennedy administration has properly and lawfully intervened on the side of justice—in fulfillment of constitutional obligations and moral duties.

Almost as outrageous as the attacks by the mob is the failure of public officials in the city of Montgomery and the State of Alabama to exercise fundamental functions of law enforcement.

When the freedom riders arrived in Montgomery, however questionable their methods may be, it was the duty of the police to take appropriate precautions to prevent violence. After violence erupted it was their duty to restore order and aid the injured.

The police made no satisfactory effort in this direction either before or after the mob exploded.

It should be noted that the victims of the mob's wrath included not only freedom riders, who are challenging the practice of racial segregation on buses, but other persons also. Negro pedestrians in the vicinity were attacked without provocation.

Moreover, the injured received no medical attention for hours in some cases while police made absurd excuses.

The dispatch of additional U.S. marshals to Alabama by Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, with the approval of President Kennedy, is a move to strengthen law-enforcement capabilities of the Federal Government in an area where strengthening obviously is needed.

At issue is not Federal infringement upon local or State police power, as some Alabamans would have us believe, but the duty of the Federal Government to safeguard citizens whose lives and liberties are jeopardized by the inability or unwillingness of local and State police power to function.

The best way for Governor Patterson of Alabama to preserve State rights is to carry out State responsibilities. One important responsibility is the use of police power impartially for the protection and safety of all people regardless of race.

President Kennedy's message calling on State and municipal officials and the general public in Alabama to prevent and avoid "further outbreaks of violence" should be heeded by all concerned.

We hope the Justice Department backs up its latest denunciation of the Ku Klux Klan with vigorous on-the-scene efforts to curb vicious hate-mongers who incite mob action.

State and Federal court injunctions issued in the wake of the riots in Montgomery are the opening guns of what may be a lengthy legal battle in the courts, which is where the battle should be fought. But there should be no delays in the enforcement of law and order and the protection of the rights and safety of all citizens.

The lawless, merciless mob respects no rights—Federal, State, or individual. The violence in Alabama is a shameful episode—acts of desperation by misguided men who talk blandly of "their rights" while inflicting indefensible wrongs upon others.

A 17-Year-Old Youth Proposes a Novel Idea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, we often wonder or grow pessimistic about American youth, whether they will be able to take up the problems facing our Nation and whether they will be able to deal with them properly. We are all very proud and very much heartened by the recent achievements of Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr., the first American to make a successful flight into space.

When I think of the Shepards and others like him, I am not one of those who despairs about the future. We have many, many fine young people, serious-minded, capable, energetic, and patriotic, who will be a credit to this Nation in the future.

One such young man has recently come to my attention in my capacity as chairman of the House Science and Astronautics Subcommittee, which is currently holding hearings on my bill to establish a National Science Academy. He is 17-year-old Bruce Tully of Westfield, N.J., who developed a deep interest in science and has come up with the proposal to establish an astronarium and science center for the New York World's Fair. The major purpose of this project would be to arouse the interest of American youth to the marvels of science and engineering. The idea has caught on and appears to be well on the road to become a reality.

Young Bruce Tully will testify before my subcommittee tomorrow morning, Thursday, May 25, regarding the proposed Science Academy. It will certainly be of great interest to hear this young man, who symbolizes the youth of America, its ideas and responsibilities. In the meantime, I wish to insert into the RECORD an article about him which was published in the Ledger-Star of Norfolk, Va., on May 19, 1961, and I commend this article to the attention of all my colleagues:

MILITARY REPORT—YOUNGSTER, 17, SPARKS ACTION FOR SPACE CENTER AT 1964 FAIR

(By James Elliott)

NORFOLK.—If Nikita Khrushchev thinks American youngsters are soft, he has not heard of a star-spangled, 17-year-old boy from Westfield, N.J., who has set about to make the Russian eat his words.

Bruce Tully is a tall, gangling and energetic youth with whom I became acquainted at Cape Canaveral recently when America sent Cmdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr., into space.

Bruce looked a little young to be among the press corps, but everywhere the press went, Bruce was sure to go. And that was enough to activate the curiosity of any newsman.

When questioned, Bruce explained that he was a guest of the Air Force. He had been invited to witness the launching, he explained, because he has generated the idea for an astronarium and science center for the forthcoming New York World's Fair. Later, I learned that he not only generated the idea, but drew up the architectural plans for the enormous project and then personally went out on his own and sold the idea.

His story is truly a remarkable one. And it goes a long way toward proving that American youth is standing up to the challenge of the times.

Bruce explained that he had become upset—darned mad, in fact—a few years ago when Khrushchev started bragging about the weaknesses of America's youngsters. He was only 15 at the time. But he was determined to do something about it.

One of the major points to upset him was that Khrushchev had said that this Nation's youngsters were not meeting the Russians in engineering.

"So I started questioning some of the kids I knew," he said. "Why don't you want to be an engineer?"

He said he found that one of the reasons they hadn't thought of an engineering profession was that they didn't know anything about it.

"It's sort of like a kid who says he doesn't like milk when he's never even tasted it," he smiled.

Because he was convinced that the lack of engineering interest stemmed from a lack of knowledge, he set about to figure out some way of correcting that dilemma.

His answer: the astronarium.

In his dreams, he foresees the astronarium as a means of cultivating the interest in American youth, of stimulating untapped talents and exposing youngsters to the marvel of engineering and science so they might find a more dedicated devotion in their lives.

The astronarium would have displays, lectures, classes, TV programs, provided by Government and industry, that persons of all ages could visit. But the programs would be geared primarily to creating a response in high school and college youth.

For a year, Bruce worked on his plans. When he set out to sell his idea, he ran into a lot of the apathy he had anticipated. But he stuck with it, and finally—after more than 2 dozen leaders of industry had turned him down—he found a friend in Theodore J. Kauffeld, head of a New York consulting engineering firm. He supported the plan financially.

Now other industrial organizations have joined in. The armed services are behind the project 100 percent. And before long, it would appear, Bruce Tully will see his dream come true.

Somehow, it seemed appropriate that this young, 17-year-old American should be present at the historic launching at Cape Canaveral. For there he had an opportunity to talk to Shepard, who spent 4½ hours of his valuable time to explain America's man-in-space program to this dedicated young-

ster. And their get-together somehow seemed quite appropriate, for in both Shepard and Bruce Tally, America could hardly find better examples for demonstrating that Khrushchev, indeed, will one day be forced to eat crow.

Cost Increases—Foreign Competition Brings Pan Am Furlough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the precarious position of the U.S. airline industry, both domestic and international, was graphically illustrated a few weeks ago when the Air Transport Association announced that all our airlines combined realized a net profit of only $1 million in 1960.

Meanwhile, under the bilateral air agreement policy, the many foreign airlines have begun negotiations with our State Department to obtain further concessions from our Government. In a majority of cases the foreign carriers seeking additional landing rights in the United States have little or nothing to offer in the way of reciprocity.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that our State Department got its back up and begin to protect our own flag carriers.

Pointing up the distress of some of our oldest and more prominent carriers, Mr. Speaker, is a recent announcement from Pan American Airways that its work force is being curtailed at its large Miami base. Not only are sharply increased labor costs responsible for Pan American's current operating deficit, but the fact that more and more foreign airlines flying in and out of Miami, siphoning traffic away from the U.S. flag carriers, making it impossible for Pan American to operate without sustaining a loss.

Mr. Speaker, Pan American's announcement concerning the furloughing of 250 maintenance workers has been brought to my attention and under unanimous consent I include it as a part of the RECORD:

COST INCREASES–FOREIGN COMPETITION BRING PAN AMERICAN FURLOUGHS

Constanly increasing expenses, due in large part to labor costs, and the inroads of uneconomic foreign competition were cited by Pan Aemrican World Airways today as the airline announced it is furloughing some 250 maintenance workers at its Miami base.

Those being furloughed, effective May 19, are being given 2 weeks pay in lieu of notice and will be the most junior of the approximately 2,700 maintenance employees at the base.

Pan American announced Wednesday that it lost $6,352,000 during the first quarter of 1961, more than triple the loss for the same period last year.

Workers being furloughed here will have the opportunity to transfer to other Pan American bases, or will receive severance pay in accordance with their union contracts. This amounts, in general, to a week's pay for each year of service, with a minimum of 2 weeks.

The airline picture in Latin America is one of increasingly runaway competition. For example, 19 foreign flag airlines fly between Miami and Latin America, compared to 3 U.S.-flag airlines.

In all, 30 foreign-flag airlines fly between the United States and Latin America, compared to 7 U.S.-flag airlines flying similar routes.

Salary scales or airlines in other countries generally are about half those of U.S.-flag airlines. In many cases, too, the smaller airlines of other countries fly at deeply undercut rates.

On the other hand, a Pan American mechanic who was paid $81 a week 10 years ago is paid $125 today, plus overtime.

Meanwhile, air fares generally are about the same or lower than they were 10 years ago. A Miami-Buenos Aires round trip in 1950 cost $760, today $548.

Return to Truman Place

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, are we going backward in our economic policy? Many of us think so as we view the increased demands from the administration for bigger spending programs as the answer to all the world problems. I am sure the Members will be interested in the point of view expressed in the following editorial:

RETURN TO TRUMAN PLACE

It's plain enough that the administration has embarked on a course of heavy new domestic spending. What may not yet be so apparent is the theoretical base being laid for much greater spending, inflation, and Federal intervention in the economy in the future.

Here is one way the Government economists reason, as drawn from a speech a few days ago by Chairman Walter Heller of the President's Council of Economic Advisers:

From the beginning of 1947 to the end of 1953, the United States enjoyed a large measure of economic growth; the gross national product increased by 4.3 percent a year on the average. But from the end of 1953 into last year, the increase was only 2.8 percent a year. (This makes a rough but convenient political dividing line: 1947–53, Truman years; 1953–60, Eisenhower years.)

Because of the allegedly slow rate of growth in the later period, it is argued that the United States faces a persistent economic slack. It follows that Government spending and other measures must take up that slack in order for the United States to realize its potential growth. This, Mr. Heller assures us, the President has vigorously started to do.

Since there is so much at stake in this theory, it's well to take a closer look at its statistical underpinnings.

The gross national product is supposed to measure the Nation's total output of goods and services, including Government purchases of goods and services. The Government's part of the gross national product did indeed rise sharply in the 1947–53 period; for example, it went from $54.6 billion in 1950 to $102 billion in 1953.

That's not surprising. After all, there was a war on for one thing, a war which sparked a far broader and more costly general rearmament effort. The question is: Does this near-doubling of the Government "contribution" to the gross national product constitute healthy, vigorous economic growth?

One might suppose most people, including Government economists, would consider greatly increased arms spending a necessary evil rather than the hallmark of sound growth. Better measures of a growing economy are to be found in such areas as domestic private investment and personal consumption. What do we find here?

Interestingly enough, the "gross private domestic investment" category of the gross national product went up from $50 billion in 1947 to over $70 billion in 1959. As for personal consumption expenditures, they rose more in the 1953–59 period than in the 1947–53 era.

So the argument for an economic slowdown in the later years falls flat on its face. There is another distinction, however, which does stand up. From 1947 to 1953 we had far more inflation—at least three times as much—than from 1953 to the present. Real growth, then, was that much larger in the more recent years.

Yet it is a return to the same old Truman era inflationary policies of unbridled spending; deep deficits, cheap money that we are being offered now in the name of economic growth. No warnings of inflation issue from these new advisers; why should they warn? They like inflation. Some of them reportedly proposed it to the Germans a decade ago and again even this year. But the Germans so far have too much sense, too many memories, and too much noninflationary prosperity to fall for that fraud.

It's the good old United States almost alone of the advanced nations, that gets saddled with the inflationists. And will get saddled with all the economic ills and Federal controls they will bring if they are not checked.

We think the Nation ought to consider carefully what kind of economic growth it is being promised. Stripped of all the fine theories, it is not economic growth at all, but vast, inflationary Government expansion.

Tribute to Hon. James Farley in the New Jersey Parade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial tribute to the beloved Hon. James Farley that appeared in the Waldwick, N.J., Jersey Parade of February 24. Mr. M. Martin Turpanjian, the editor of the Jersey Parade and of the North Bergen Hudson Gazette, is also president of the New Jersey League of Weekly Newspapers, Inc. The chairman of the board of directors of the league is Mrs. Arthur A. Lyons, editor of Spotlight magazine of Newark; the chairman of the board of trustees is Dr. Clara K. Aszody, of the Hungarian Journal of West Orange.

Mr. Turpanjian's article follows:

[From the Jersey Parade, Feb. 24, 1961]

JAMES A. FARLEY, OF NEW YORK, PROCLAIMED NO. 1 ELDERLY STATESMAN OF THE WORLD—KINGMAKER OF F.D.R. IS "DUTCH UNCLE" OF UNITED STATES—EX-POSTMASTER GENERAL AND FORMER CHAIRMAN OF DEMO NATIONAL COMMITTEE IS TERMED NOBLE PATRIOT

(By M. Martin Turpanjian)

I take great pride to announce that James A. Farley, of New York, has been proclaimed as the No. 1 elderly statesman of the world by the New Jersey League of Weekly Newspapers, Inc., of which I am the president.

The former Postmaster General of the United States and former chairman of the National Democratic Committee, is the kingmaker of F.D.R. as the greatest strategist in the history of America and throughout the world. He is indeed and in fact the genuine "Dutch uncle" to all Americans regardless of party affiliations. He is also a noble patriot in every respect.

Adlai Stevenson would have been today the Secretary of State of the United States had he not attacked President Eisenhower in the U–2 incident, but James A Farley defended Ike and condemned Adlai for his rash statement against the then occupant of the White House.

There is a divinity that must create true leadership, for real leaders are born. They cannot be trained or educated. Such a dynamic leadership possessed by James A. Farley is a divine heritage that must find its origin in the mind and heart of the infinite designer.

One has only to note the record of human history to find that the men or women who scaled the majestic heights of authority were all divinely inspired. Abraham Lincoln, cradled in a rudely built log cabin at his birth, climbed to the highest peak of national American authority and by his fortitude and courageous leadership preserved and stabilized the federal integrity of the young American Republic.

And when we consider the fabulous career of this mighty American political titan in the personage of the resourceful James A. Farley, we must confer on him the well-earned title and accolade of the great American kingmaker, for we can remember vividly the supreme and the superlative quality of his supersalesmanship in promoting the candidacy of Franklin Delano Roosevelt for the presidential nomination and election in landslide proportions in the historic year of 1932. Like the immortal Lincoln, James A. Farley had keen inherent psychic sensitivity for the mass psychology. He knew the strange mechanism of the mortal mind. His very presence generated an atmosphere of friendliness and amity. He refused to support the third term of FDR, in the year of 1940 and resigned from the administration of the man he had labored so effectively to elect in 1932 and 1936. In 1940 he demonstrated in no ambiguous terms that he placed the integrity of principles and character above all the mortal material advantages of the expediency of the official power.

In his monumental sacrificial act James A. Farley scaled the ethical heights of political statesmanship. He became the most beloved and respected national figure not only in America but everywhere in the international world. His frank direct candor, his humane sympathetic approach, his humanitarian principles, his honest conscientious moral integrity, his matchless and uncompromising consistency, and all these commendable and laudable characteristics have endeared him to the American people as an outstanding statesman and noble patriot. The moral lesson that the political career of James A. Farley has taught the American people so dramatically is the stark fact that a man can operate as a practical politician and yet remain incorruptible if he has the willpower and the heroic stamina to be relentlessly loyal to the ideals of honor and moral consistency.

Ransoming Cuban Rebel Patriots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, formation of a private committee to raise $15 million for the purpose of buying tractors or bulldozers to exchange with Castro for the liberation of 1,200 Cuban citizens has raised many serious questions.

Frankly, I am deeply concerned with this situation, in which there are raised serious doubts as to whether the proper officials are acting under the mandate of their offices or whether they have, directly or indirectly, delegated their functions to an unofficial organization. A prompt, positive, and definitive statement on Castro's proposal, by the responsible U.S. officials, would do much to prevent this matter from deteriorating further.

Castro's original suggestion of an "exchange" has now been revised and the Cuban dictator contends the tractors would be an "indemnity" from the United States.

Columnist David Lawrence discusses many facets of this difficult situation, into which our recent national course of conduct has thrust us, and I commend his column to the attention of my colleagues.

RANSOMING CUBAN REBEL PATRIOTS—OFFER OF $1 MILLION FOR CAPTURE OF CASTRO PROPOSED AS ANSWER TO DICTATOR

(By David Lawrence)

"A million dollars for Fidel Castro, dead or alive—but preferably alive."

This is the latest suggestion made by a reader in answer to those who want to raise $15 million to pay off Castro and liberate the 1,200 Cubans taken prisoner in the recent invasion attempt.

The reason for wanting to form a committee to induce the Cuban people to capture Castro and send him to some foreign country is so he may be tried for international crimes just as Adolf Eichmann is being tried in Israel today.

The capture of Eichmann was accomplished privately within a foreign country where he had taken refuge, but in the case of Castro, who is still in his own country, it would be natural for citizens there to seize him and bring him to justice in Cuban courts. For he is guilty of the mass execution of innocent persons on hearsay evidence and without benefit of a fair trial. There must be many persons inside Cuba who would wish to see Castro punished.

The fact that a committee of prominent American citizens is ready to do business with Castro in order to liberate some of the prisoners he holds is provoking differences of opinion in Washington. While it is argued that the committee is solely interested in saving human lives—even raising what is admittedly a ransom—there are many others who think that this would be a disgraceful concession to Castro's inhumanity.

Indeed, the Cuban dictator now says he wants the money as an indemnity from the United States because of the recent "invasion." Whatever interpretation he may put on it there are many Americans who will donate money to save lives. The instinct is commendable, but the maneuver cannot but place Castro in a position of strength. For it will mean that his demand for what he calls indemnity will be proclaimed throughout the world as having been met.

Also, it will give the people of Cuba the impression that the American people are afraid of Castro and are ready to bow to his demands and those of his Communist associates who doubtless thought up the ransom scheme.

Failure of the invasion was a psychological blow to the hopes of those who have sought to liberate Cuba. The United States is blamed for not following through with adequate air support at the critical moment. The effect throughout Latin America has been one of disappointment with the United States. While outwardly the usual fears are expressed that intervention in Cuba would seem to be a precedent for similar intervention when dictators arise in other Latin American situations, many thoughtful persons of prominence in countries south of us are saying privately they wish the United States had followed through on the recent expedition started by the Cuban exiles.

The widespread publicity given the American committee which has just started out to raise $15 million to buy tractors for the exchange of the Cuban prisoners is bound to hurt the cause of liberation inside Cuba. For it pictures the American people as interested in saving 1,200 Cuban prisoners but not so much concerned about the entire Cuban nation which has been taken prisoner by Castro and his Communist partners.

There is little hope, incidentally, that the exchange of tractors for the prisoners will go through. It isn't easy to raise $15 million for any rescue mission outside the United States, and rarely has anything approaching the sum ever been collected, even for a famine or earthquake disaster. Castro, nevertheless, will make considerable propaganda out of the incident, and there is no assurance that he will accede to the terms of the American committee that, as the tractors are delivered, there will be exchanged at the same time certain specified prisoners so as to insure that the agreement will be kept by Castro.

It is unfortunate that Walter Reuther and members of his committee have promised to go to Cuba themselves to negotiate an agreement with Castro. For the Cuban dictator doubtless will use the occasion to tell the Cuban people that prominent Americans are coming to Cuba on bended knee to recognize his right to threaten or actually to execute prisoners of war. Maybe this is a problem, after all, for the United Nations, which manages to send envoys to uncivilized Congo and knows something at least about how to deal with bandits and murders.

Educational Television

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH J. RIVERS
OF ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, widespread interest in utilizing television transmission facilities in our public schools and colleges and in adult training programs prompts me to urge re-

vision of pertinent legislation now pending before the Congress, such as H.R. 965—Senate counterpart S. 205—and H.R. 132. My purpose in speaking about these bills is to point out their inadequacy for the purpose of accomplishing the desired goal upon which, I am sure, almost all of us agree, and further to suggest changes for effectuating much greater results with the same amount of money than would otherwise be the case.

Although H.R. 132, approved by the administration, postulates grants to the States on a matching basis, while H.R. 965 would authorize straight grants without a matching requirement, the two bills have in common the basic restriction which, I believe, should be modified. I refer to the limitation that the Federal funds could be used by the State, university or other appropriate agency or nonprofit educational organization only for acquisition and installation of transmission apparatus necessary for television broadcasting.

Let us now consider the practical results of this limitation. The legislation itself pinpoints the fact that none of the money can be used for acquisition of sites and buildings for installation of antennas and to house the television transmission apparatus, or for operation and maintenance of such facilities. By inference none of the Federal money would be available for producing either live programs, or films, or for reproducing such films for widespread use. Neither could any of the money be spent to meet such expense as would be incidental to cooperative arrangements with commercial television stations which might be willing to broadcast such educational films on a free time, public service basis.

This last-mentioned restriction is the one which would most seriously circumscribe the educational television program in Alaska, and in other sparsely settled western States with widely scattered population centers. To back up this point, I will use Alaska as an example. Cities in Alaska which have television facilites are Anchorage, Seward, Kodiak, Nome, Fairbanks, Juneau, Ketchikan, and Sitka. Anchorage and Fairbanks each have two TV stations. Ketchikan and Nome are over 1,000 miles apart, and the others, with two exceptions, are several hundred miles away from each other. With the State struggling from a financial standpoint to meet its educational requirements and other responsibilities, it is doubtful that it could afford to establish and operate more than one of the public educational TV broadcasting facilities such as are contemplated in the pending legislation. If such facility were established at the University of Alaska near Fairbanks, for example, its educational broadcasts would reach only the people of Fairbanks, and environs. If the facility were located at the Alaska Methodist University at Anchorage, its programs would reach only the people of the Greater Anchorage area. All of the other towns I have mentioned with television services and the many smaller communities of Alaska would be left without benefit by the program.

Since this legislation has been introduced, I have heard from Dr. William R. Wood, president of the University of Alaska, that the university has applied to the Ford Foundation for assistance to develop a coordinated statewide adult education program and to establish an instructional materials production center to produce films, kinescopes, soundtapes, videotapes, slides, graphic materials and related articles for an extended and intensified adult education program off-campus, and for general improvement of on-campus instruction. If this materializes, the university would be in a position to enlist the cooperation on a primarily public service basis of all the commercial television stations in Alaska. With this start the whole plan could be augmented as to the television phase, if only realistically flexible provisions were included in the pending legislation.

Such provisions, which I urge, would allow a portion of the money to be used for production equipment, for use at the University of Alaska, for example, in the course of producing live educational or informational or cultural programs, to obtain films for distribution to all of the cities which have television stations. With this type of arrangement, and with the University of Alaska, for example, as a focal point, plus cooperation by existing commercial television stations on a nonprofit basis, a highly practical solution to attaining the objectives of the pending legislation would be obtained. In order to further utilize these productions, another item of equipment which converts videotape recordings to 16-millimeter sound on film would mean utilization in every secondary school or closed circuit television station where the 16-millimeter visual aid type of projector is available. Another portion of the money should be usable for the purchase of suitable ETV film or kinescope programs now available from educational centers such as Ann Arbor for use at the university, or elsewhere, and for distribution for telecasting on a cooperative and nonprofit basis by the commercial television stations, with credit given to the university or other agency or institution which acquired the programs. Another minor amount could be allowed for use in reimbursing the commercial television stations for their added expense incidental to telecasting these public service programs.

For the technical advice reflected in my remarks, I give credit to Mr. A. G. Hiebert of Anchorage, Alaska, an outstanding television authority and public-minded citizen. The above suggestions are fully endorsed by the University of Alaska. In my opinion, the adoption of the method I have set forth is necessary to any widespread fulfillment of the fine objectives of the legislation in question.

Air Force Secretary Zuckert's Armed Forces Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the citizens and officials of Murfreesboro and Smyrna, Tenn., and Rutherford County and the Air Force personnel at Sewart Air Force Base in Rutherford County, in the district which I have the honor to represent, have an unusually fine record of cooperation.

The citizens of the area recognize the importance of this important air base to the community and to the defense of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, in order to emphasize the spirit and good will that exists in this community and the importance of this base, recently, the commanding general of Sewart and civic and governmental officials of the area invited Secretary of the Air Force Eugene M. Zuckert to visit Sewart Air Force Base as a part of the celebration of Armed Forces Week.

Secretary Zuckert after reviewing the men at the base and inspecting the installation addressed a meeting of more than 400 leaders of the Murfreesboro-Smyrna-Sewart community. The Secretary's remarks were most excellent and informative. He pointed out the "growing importance" of Sewart's role in the national defense and praised the work and cooperation of the people on the base with the neighboring civilian communities.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Zuckert's excellent address be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Secretary Zuckert's address follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. EUGENE M. ZUCKERT, SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

Senator Kefauver, Senator Gore, Representative Evins, Representative Loser, Mayor Todd, Mayor Ridley, General Sutterlin, distinguished guests, this is a very happy occasion for me. The opportunity to visit Sewart Air Force Base in such distinguished company is doubly welcome—first, because I wanted to meet the good neighbors of the base, and, second, because I enjoyed the visit on the way down with Representative LOSER and was pleased to be greeted by Representative EVINS on my arrival.

My association with the members of the outstanding Tennessee delegation in Washington extends over many years. Senator KEFAUVER has almost had my official life in his hands at times by virtue of his service on subcommittees for both Defense and Atomic Energy of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Senator GORE and I have had much business together growing out of his great service on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. JOE EVINS has also been in an important spot because he sits on the subcommittee which handles atomic energy for the House Appropriations Committee.

I want to thank all of you for your hospitality, and the Members of your congressional delegation for the invitation to come. I am sorry to have to leave early in the morning for Texas, but I am grateful for just this short stopover.

Tennessee has traditionally been a long and wide corridor from the East to the Southwest—so long and broad that it might be called the training ground for those who have become famous in other parts, like Sam Houston and Davy Crockett.

It is fitting and proper to join Tennesseans in Armed Forces Day salute to the military services, particularly in middle Tennessee. After all, there are no greater names in our military history than Andrew Jackson and Alvin York.

Tennessee has also played a role in my official life—because of the important part the State plays in national defense and in atomic energy. The Arnold Engineering De-

velopment Center at Tullahoma was established during my tour of duty as an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force a decade ago. The scientists and engineers there have made many key contributions to our aircraft, missile, and space programs over the years. This facility will continue its valuable work as part of the new Air Force Systems Command. When the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, gave the Air Force responsibility for all military space research and development, we activated the Systems Command to get the highest possible level of efficiency. In this Command, the Arnold Center is a vitally important installation.

From that first Air Force assignment, I went to the Atomic Energy Commission. The concentration of atomic energy work at Oak Ridge gave me another association with Tennessee, not only in the field of defense but also in the development of the peacetime uses of atomic energy.

Besides the vitally important production plants at Oak Ridge, a host of other projects with great defense importance started at Oak Ridge. One is the utilization of nuclear fuels for the propulsion of aerospace craft.

The development of the uses of isotopes in medicine, agriculture, and industry will be a historic entry in Tennessee's log book of contributions to the Nation.

True local support of national defense activities has characterized installations in Tennessee. That is one reason I am happy to have the opportunity for even a short visit to Sewart Air Force Base, a major installation of the Tactical Air Command. General Sutterlin has taken me on a tour of the base and given me an insight into both the on- and off-base operations.

I haven't asked his permission to mention this, but I am sure I am not betraying a confidence when I repeat one thing he was most proud of. He told me that he had served on many bases during his career, from his cadet days right through to the present, in time of war and in time of peace.

"And," he said, "I can tell you that the relations between the people on the base and the neighboring civilian communities is the best I have ever seen, beyond any question."

It is always pleasing to hear a report like this. To me it is the clearest possible indication that you have taken the trouble to get to know each other, and that you have exerted mutual efforts to solve the problems that are bound to crop up from time to time.

It shows me, too, that you people of Murfreesboro and Smyrna understand the mission of the 839th Air Division, and what it means to the security of the Nation.

I can tell you that in the view of the Department of Defense, this mission is one of growing importance. In his state of the Union message to the Congress, President Kennedy announced that he had directed prompt action to increase our military airlift capability.

"Obtaining additional air transport mobility," he said, "and obtaining it now—will better assure the ability of our conventional forces to respond, with discrimination and speed, to any problem at any spot on the surface of the globe at a moment's notice."

We have already gone to work on both immediate and long-range plans to meet this need.

The first move was to add 53 more new and better transports for troop airlift than we had previously programed.

We expect these new aircraft, added to the present inventory, to meet our troop carrier needs adequately up to 1965. To handle the mission beyond that time, we have ordered the development of an entirely new aircraft.

This is the C–141, a jet transport with swept-back wing and turbofan engines. It will not only be an excellent military carrier, but will be available for commercial development as well.

We expect to see the mockup of the airplane in November this year. Flight tests will begin in October 1963, and we will have our first operational unit by June of 1965.

In addition to this job of airlifting ground forces to trouble spots, the Air Force maintains other limited war forces overseas. Units of our tactical airpower are assigned to commands in Europe and in the Pacific, where they are ready for use by the theater commander if they should be needed.

Just as this type of operation is geared to the deterrence of small conflicts, wherever they may occur, there is also a force capable of meeting the maximum conflict of general war. This is the long-range striking power of the Strategic Air Command.

General Sutterlin, as a former bomb wing commander, knows very well just how adequate this force is. Tonight I can give you only a general treatment of this command and its awesome job of deterring general war.

More than 90 percent of the nuclear striking power of the free world is contained within the resources of the Strategic Air Command, or SAC as we know it. The long-range bombers and the intercontinental ballistic missiles of the command form a blend of weapons of enormous range, flexibility, and firepower.

We have these aircraft—and soon will have missiles—dispersed over the Nation in such a way as to diminish enemy chances of knocking them out in the surprise attack. We have the capability of placing some of SAC's bombers on an airborne alert should the need arise. Much of the force is on ground alert, with crews ready to take them off on 15-minutes' notice. A few Atlas missiles are already on the launching pads, and more are coming, all to be ready for launching in a matter of minutes should it ever be necessary.

And all of this force is under positive control. The command has worked out effective systems to guard against triggering a world war ourselves. So this tremendous force is combat ready and poised for action, yet restrained by a leash that can only be loosened by order of the President, as Commander in Chief.

To give us all the warning possible about an impending attack, to insure that we will have that matter of minutes which could make the difference between victory and defeat, we are building an elaborate network of detection and tracking radars.

As we meet here tonight, we are within 30 minutes missile flight time of the launching sites of our potential enemy. Our detection system could pick up the flight of a missile about halfway along its trajectory. We would have, then, just 15 minutes in which to act, between the time the missile was detected and its impact.

So, in the length of time we might spend eating breakfast, we could be under attack.

Because such a thing is possible, our biggest job is to see that it never happens. This is what President Kennedy meant when he said, in his inaugural address:

"We dare not tempt them with weakness. For only when our arms are sufficient beyond doubt can we be certain beyond doubt that they will never be employed."

Keeping our forces in this condition during the years ahead is going to demand of all Americans the same level of dedication that we once felt only in time of actual war. Personal motives and wishes must be secondary to the national welfare. In the years ahead, even more so than today, the growth of our military power for peace will be tied to the progress of science.

We are already moving out into space. We are crossing the vast frontier that has always challenged the imagination of men. But isn't it a sobering thought that we are moving out into the cosmos before we have solved the problem of living in peace on earth.

While we extend our defense into space, then, let us also bend our efforts to the dissemination of our ideals around the globe. Let us serve our fellowman, to the best of our ability, in order that famine and disease, and the pestilence of war itself, will no longer impede our progress toward the goals we have set.

There is a long road to travel before we shall see these goals achieved. We face the most bitter and devious opposition we have ever faced in our national history. We are going to have to reckon with the possibilities of subterfuge and subversion, political blackmail, infiltration, and mounting pressures in many parts of the world in the years ahead.

We shall contend with these problems with all the tools at our disposal. We shall use every means to attain peaceful solutions wherever conflict threatens.

And as we work, there will always be two powerful forces clearly evident. One is our firm national purpose. The other is clearly superior military strength to back up that purpose.

On behalf of the entire Air Force, I can pledge continued dedication to the power we wield for peace.

And on behalf of the Air Force, I want to thank you for your continuing support of our activities as your neighbor. For myself, I want to thank you for this opportunity to spend these few hours with people who are helping maintain our essential air strength.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

Provision for Voluntary Retirement at Age 62 Vitally Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, this morning I was afforded the privilege of appearing before the Senate Finance Committee, of which our esteemed Senator HARRY F. BYRD, is chairman. I testified on behalf of the age 62 voluntary retirement provision in H.R. 6027. Because this legislation will likely be presented to the Senate for consideration within the very near future, I ask unanimous consent to have my remarks before the Senate Finance Committee printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD, OF WEST VIRGINIA, BEFORE THE SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 6027

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for this opportunity to appear before your committee in behalf of H.R. 6027. I am specifically interested in the provision, beginning on page 2 of the bill, to allow men to receive reduced benefits at age 62.

When I first came to Congress in 1953, I introduced a bill in February of that year to permit men and women to retire, on a voluntary basis, at age 60. I reintroduced this proposal in subsequent years during my service in the House of Representatives. I came to realize, however, that the time has not yet arrived when we might expect to see voluntary retirement permitted at age 60. Consequently, last year I decided to modify my proposal believing that a half loaf is better than no loaf at all. Accordingly, when H.R. 12580, the omnibus social security bill, reached the Senate last year, I submitted an amendment to allow voluntary retirement for men at age 62 with reduced benefits. I succeeded in getting 18 other Senators to cosponsor my amendment, and I appeared before your distinguished committee in behalf of the amendment. Senator KERR and Senator HARTKE and others on your committee were as interested as I in the amendment, and the Senate Finance Committee adopted it. The Senate later approved the measure, but, regrettably, the amendment was deleted in the joint Senate-House conference action.

I reintroduced my proposal to permit men to retire at age 62 shortly after we convened in January of this year, and I might say, parenthetically, that I was responsible for inclusion in the Douglas committee report to the President of the recommendation that legislation be enacted to permit such retirement at age 62. The President later announced his support, and we now have the opportunity to favorably act upon the proposal and make it become a reality.

An estimated 560,000 people can be expected to get benefits under the amendment during the first 12 months of operation. Taking into account the increase in the minimum benefit also recommended at this time, the additional benefits that would be paid out during the first 12 months to men claiming benefits before age 65 would be $440 million. There would be no level-premium cost for this proposal.

Under this proposal, a man who decides to apply on his 62d birthday can draw social security benefits equal to 80 percent of the amount he would receive were he to wait until he reached his 65th birthday. He would have the option of receiving a proportionate increase—five-ninths of 1 percent—for each month he delays retirement after age 62. For example a man entitled to a benefit of $100 per month at age 65 would receive $80 a month if he chose to retire at age 62, under my amendment. If he decides to wait until he is 63 to apply, the benefit he would receive for life would be increased to $86.67 monthly. If he applied at age 64, his monthly benefit would be $93.34.

It is my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that the provisions which were adopted into law with respect to reduced benefits for women have occasioned no administrative difficulties. In the light of the experience gained from the years in which the lowered eligibility age for women has been in effect, I think one could be confident that the adoption of the proposal would prove to be similarly beneficial and advisable. In other words, the 1956 amendment has worked out all right in the case of women, and it should prove to be the same for men. At the time the 1956 amendment was adopted, there was some skepticism about how well it would work. It was charged that the lower retirement age would encourage employers to lower the compulsory retirement age for women employees. Opponents maintained that it would discourage the continued employment of older women workers whose potential work life would thus be shortened. Experience, however, has failed to bear out these skeptical fears and the average age of retirement for women has not been lowered by the reduced annuity.

I realize that there is some question as to whether it is desirable policy for the Government to encourage early retirement when the science of geriatrics is lengthening the lifespan of men. Yet, it is my understanding that only about half of the women eligible for retirement at age 62 elected to retire when the 1956 amendment was adopted. I think we can properly assume that not so great a percentage of men would elect to retire at 62. Many of the women who took benefits in 1956 had been working during the war years and had not been working immediately before the adoption of Senator KERR's amendment. Most men will continue to work until age 65 or somewhat thereafter as long as they are physically able or as long as there is employment. Moreover, Mr. Chairman, automation is here to stay and it constitutes a growing problem with which our society is going to have to deal more and more in terms of unemployment. A recent study of automation prepared by the National Planning Association points out that, according to Census Bureau estimates, the average annual increase in the labor force is presently 700,000 to 800,000 and that, by the year 1965, it will reach the figure of 1 million or more. It is necessary then that we find new job opportunities for these younger workers who are annually entering the work force.

Additionally, the problem of changing markets poses itself in the question of whether or not the needed job opportunities will appear at the right place and at the right time. The rate of increase in employment in some of the industries now being automatized does not begin to match the increase in productivity made possible by new processes. For instance, in the chemical industry, productivity rose 53 percent between 1947 and 1954, but employment rose only 11 percent. In oil refining, output increased 22 percent since 1947, but total employment fell by 10,000. Automation has made itself felt in the mining areas of my State. Whereas only a few years ago, 135,000 miners were employed in West Virginia, today less than 40,000 are employed. A continuous mining machine operated by 6 workers will load the coal originally requiring the time and labor of 40 men. The problem is not peculiar to West Virginia. The textile and shoe workers in the New England States have experienced the same sudden shift in an employment pattern which had existed for over 100 years. Further changes will create catastrophic dislocation of workers.

Mr. Chairman, there are approximately 1.7 million men who potentially would be eligible to retire at age 62 immediately if this bill is enacted as written. They would not be forced to retire. The choice would be an optional one, and it would be up to the individual. There are many—in fact, a majority, I would assume—of these men who would prefer to continue to work. Yet, on the other hand, there are some who would want to retire and who should retire. There are many individuals who are not physically able to continue working after they reach the age of 62; yet they are not disabled to the extent that they can qualify for disability benefits. This bill would permit these individuals to retire and make room for younger workers.

Mr. Chairman, this provision in the bill is of great importance to that relatively small number of men who, because of ill health, unemployment, underemployment or other personal reasons, find it impossible or ill advised to continue working until they attain the age of 65.

It is of importance to the thousands of unemployed coal miners in my State, many of whom have passed the age of 62, who are unable to find employment and who, in many instances, are physically incapable of working in the mines if jobs could be had. These individuals could elect, if they so chose, to retire, and by the provisions of this bill they and their families could have security, whereas, under present law, they must wait until they are 65 years of age to receive benefits. This bill, then, will mean a check instead of a handout, security instead of insecurity, and hope instead of despair for individuals in these circumstances. I hope that the committee will favorably report this bill and that it will leave intact section 102 which provides for a lowering of the retirement age for men.

Senator Humphrey Is Absolutely Right When He Says It Is Very Difficult for Tourists (Read Constituents) To Find in and Around the Capitol Building Adequate Places Where They Can Eat and Rest. It Will Be Even More Difficult, if Not Impossible, Next March When the Small Businessmen Who Now Provide These Services Are Pushed Off Capitol Hill Under Expansion Plans Adopted Without Hearings by the Democrats in Control of the Congress. Perhaps Senator Humphrey Would Be Willing To Take the Lead in Reexamining These Expansion Plans Now, and Let These Businessmen Testify

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the other House, Senator HUMPHREY declared that "it is very difficult for tourists to find in and around the Capitol adequate places where they can eat and rest."

The solution offered by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota was as follows:

On both sides of the Capitol, around the Senate wing and the House wing, are very beautiful terraces which, with but little change in terms of their covering, could be made most useful, with the addition of tables, benches, canopies, umbrellas, and with the provision of some good service, which I believe we might be able to provide by means of a catering service. Thus, in addition to having the pleasure of outdoor recreation and outdoor eating, we could also make available to the citizenry who pay for this Capitol an opportunity to have a very satisfying and beautiful experience.

Senator HUMPHREY began his learned statement by asking:

Can we imagine that a Parisian would permit these beautiful terraces to be unused? In fact, these beautiful terraces around the Capitol could well be used for what some of our colleagues have been talking about; namely, sidewalk cafes.

It is always instructive and helpful to have the advantage of a speech such as this. We can benefit greatly from it. I wonder if the learned Senator has thought of the cost of a meal to the tourists which would be provided by such a catering service as he has in mind?

How much money would the Congress be called upon to appropriate in order to provide such facilities as he has mentioned?

Would the tourists be any more welcome than they are at present in the restaurants and cafeterias which the Congress has in its charge; and has provided at great cost, here on Capitol Hill where conspicuous signs say: "For Members of Congress," "For Senators," "For Members of Congress and Employees," and so on.

What hours would the new facilities be open?

At the present time, the restaurants and cafeterias of the Congress close after lunch, but tourists who are our constituents are busy sightseeing until late in the evening.

May I call to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota the House debate on May 22, this year, on the bill (H.R. 7208) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962.

It immediately becomes clear from even a quick perusal of this debate why it is that tourists, who are our constituents, find it so very difficult to locate in and around the Capitol Building adequate places where they can eat and rest.

Under expansion plans of the Congress businessmen on Capitol Hill have been the forgotten people of the Nation. They have been pushed farther and farther away from the Congress.

The Congressional Hotel was bought by the Congress for an office building and it has been in a sort of limbo for a long time.

Further, it is proposed to start clearing the residences, where tourists are welcome, in the square east of the Old House Office Building in August of this year, and the business establishments, where tourists can eat, will be demolished beginning in March of 1962.

The Congress passed the legislation authorizing these steps, and, with regard to the square east of the Old House Office Building, it is an open scandal that the residents and the businessmen there were never given an opportunity to be heard.

I include at this point an excerpt from the debate of May 22 to which I have referred:

Mr. AVERY. I have not read the committee report, and this matter, perhaps, may have been treated in it. What is the status of what is presently known as the Congressional Hotel as far as this legislative bill is concerned?

Mr. HORAN. Well, that is the property of the Congress, as you know. It has been leased to the Knott Hotel Corp. and the lease expires in about 2 years.

Mr. AVERY. Well, do we have any plans for it? Why are we in the hotel business?

Mr. HORAN. We are not in the hotel business. It was acquired as a part of the general expansion of the Capitol Grounds area, and within the next 2 years the decision will have to come on what disposition to make of it.

Mr. AVERY. Well, if we own the hotel, we are in the hotel business, whether we are actually managing it or not. Has the final price of acquisition been definitely determined upon? As I recall, a deposit was made in the court regarding its acquisition. Has the final figure been made?

Mr. HORAN. Yes; we have the final figure. I do not recall the exact amount.

Mr. STEED. If memory serves me correctly, the cost of that piece of property is $1.6 million. Yes, I find the precise amount was $1,686,000. It is now in the possession of the Congress, and whatever disposition is to be made at the end of the present lease contract will remain to be made by the Congress. It was found that it would be much cheaper to permit someone to occupy the building in the interim than to maintain it on a standby basis. When the property was acquired, that had to be taken into consideration, and since it was such a fine piece of property it was felt that it should be leased until it was determined what would be the most appropriate use of it. It seemed to be too good a piece of property to be torn down. And, by doing that, we saved some $60,000 to $70,000 a year, as I recall, to maintain the building on a standby basis.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS.]

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a few questions. I understand that the gentleman from Oklahoma is not a member of the Building Commission, but I thought perhaps he could clarify or answer a question or two, if he has the information. It is my understanding that it is proposed to start clearing the residences in the square east of the Old House Office Building in August of this year and the business establishments will begin to be demolished in March of next year.

Mr. STEED. That is correct. Those are the dates shown in the printed hearings.

Mr. GROSS. Now, the question is this, if the gentleman can answer: Why clear this taxpaying property? Why clear out these business establishments and these residences until there is some clear use for the property?

Mr. STEED. All I can tell the gentleman is this, that the House passed the bill authorizing its acquisition for addition to the Capitol Grounds, and that under that mandate the only way it can be made part of the Capitol Grounds is to clear it. What is being done was done under a legislative act. The clearing of the property is the completion of what that act of the House and the Congress authorized last year.

Mr. GROSS. Will not the gentleman agree with me that there is no purpose in clearing land or property that is now paying taxes to the District of Columbia until there is some use for that property?

Mr. STEED. Well, I am not in a position to disagree with the gentleman except to say this, and that is, under the law, within the purview of the commission in charge and not this committee, and what you and I think individually would probably have no bearing on it at this stage.

It is perfectly clear that if the small businessmen on Capitol Hill are forced off Capitol Hill they will not be on Capitol Hill to serve the tourists who are our constituents.

The way to make certain that there are adequate places available to serve the tourists who are our constituents, from any one of the 50 States, including Pennsylvania and Minnesota, is not to push the 100 small businessmen off Capitol Hill.

The core of the present difficulty is that absolutely no assurance has been given to Capitol Hill businessmen that if they did provide adequate places to eat and rest, and did make the necessary heavy investments, their property would not be taken over by Congress the day after they were opened for business, and without even having a chance to testify at hearings.

Where will the constituents of Members of Congress go to eat and rest when the small businessmen who have been courageous enough to open and maintain establishments providing these services under these conditions of continued harassment are pushed off Capitol Hill?

As I said in a speech in this House on May 18 this year, these businessmen on Capitol Hill are wonderful hosts and they make our constituents feel welcome when they come to Capitol Hill. Our constituents are not made to feel welcome in the cafeterias and restaurants of the Congress itself.

It is doubtful if the proposal by our esteemed colleague from Minnesota would actually improve the situation. The situation would be radically improved, however, if the Congress were to take the lead in encouraging the small businessmen on Capitol Hill to stay in business and assure them that they were safe from the capricious exercise by the Congress of the vast and impersonal powers of eminent domain.

I challenge Senator HUMPHREY, who has always been deeply concerned with the problems of small businessmen in all the States of our Nation, to hold hearings on this matter and invite the small businessmen of Capitol Hill to testify.

I am sure that Mr. Bassin, Mr. DeGiovanni, Mr. Palm, and their colleagues on Capitol Hill, and the larger businessmen who control the Knott Hotel Corp., are quite capable of providing adequate places where tourists can eat and rest.

All they need is the chance to do so, free from continued harassment by the Democratically controlled Congress.

Perhaps a final word on the subject might be that if the Congress is going into the hotel and restaurant business then a Parisian-style restaurant on the west front of the Capitol Building may be just what the doctor ordered.

In any event it is obvious from the record to date that the Congress can't legislate and successfully host restaurants and hotels for constituents at the same time.

The Congress—and this means the Democrats who are in charge of things at this time—must make up its mind whether to legislate or go into the hotel and restaurant business.

My own feeling is that it ought to legislate and let private businessmen run the hotel and restaurant business.

Racial Agitation Is Not a Moral Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, with characteristic eloquence and astuteness, Editor James H. Gray, of the Albany, Ga., Herald, has effectively exploded the false argument that the cause of outside racial agitators who are fomenting strife and discord throughout the South is a "moral movement." His penetrating editorial featured on the front page of the Herald's issue of May 23 correctly assesses it as the exact opposite and convincingly points out that the establishment of harmonious race relations is dependent upon mutual confidence and good will rather than application of force. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of this editorial entitled, "South Immoral?—Poppycock," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTH IMMORAL?—POPPYCOCK

A great deal of nonsense is being disseminated about the latest racial troubles in our region by assorted sentimentalists, bleeding-hearts and equalitarians, who fancy themselves as the "liberals" of the space age. These self-appointed social critics are sorely distressed. They are seized by the notion that the South in general, and the State of Alabama in particular, is acting both immorally and illegally in its resistance to the scatter-gun efforts to integrate the races.

Their argument runs to the effect that the South is immoral because it is opposing a "moral" movement. The "moralists," in this instance, are the Negro men and white women, traveling together in public carriers in interstate transport, who are sufficiently "courageous" to be willing to test the various segregation laws of the deep Southern States in this dramatic manner. They are "moralists" by definition of their sponsoring agency, the Congress of Racial Equality, because they are supposedly practicing the "brotherhood of man." And because the South does not hold with this kind of social experimentation, and because the South has legislated against such, it is "immoral."

From a legal standpoint, these "liberals" argue with much more logic that a U.S. statute permits this mode of travel, that Federal law takes precedence over State law, and that the Southern States therefore are in an intolerable legal position when they attempt to block the "Freedom Riders."

To our mind, however, both of these arguments miss the point. In the first place, we cannot perceive any "morality" entailed in transportation by bus—or by any other conveyance. The CORE people are on record that they are testing Southern statutes by "non-violent" means. But the fact is indisputable that, in so doing, they are engaging in a direct provocation for the avowed purpose, in the words of Georgia's Governor Vandiver, "of disturbing the people of a section who are otherwise peaceful." Is this a "moral" purpose? Far from it.

In the second place, the question of race relations, the judicial and executive branches of the Federal Government to the contrary notwithstanding, forbids a strict legalistic solution. For example, in the 7 years which have transpired since the U.S. Supreme Court first struck down the 85-year-old "separate but equal" dictum for the Nation's schools, only a handful of Southern schools have integrated their classrooms—and none voluntarily. The so-called "law of the land" is observed in the breach simply because Southern society—and not a few Eastern and Western communities—will not support it with a popular will.

This circumstance, but one of many, argues eloquently the Southern case that racial relations must be established and maintained through mutual confidence and good will, neither of which can be achieved in an atmosphere electric with naked hatreds, suspicions, and, above all, the application of force in the most sensitive area of all human contacts.

This is not to say, of course, that the mobs in Alabama—in Birmingham, Anniston, and Montgomery for the last week—can or should be condoned for their actions. Mob rule is alien to the American tradition. It is invariably destructive, never constructive. Neither is it a safety valve for the discharge of emotional energy, for it leaves in its wake festering sores which heal slowly, if ever, and destroys the middle ground on which the fair-minded can maintain communications with each other to reach accommodations equitable to all parties.

But this is to say that millions of southerners cannot, in truth, be branded as "immoral" for the irresponsible actions of a group of unthinking men reacting predictably to an unending campaign of clever harassment designed to enrich the treasury of the sponsoring racist organization. Try as it may, neither CORE nor the NAACP can resell this Nation the false doctrines first preached by "Uncle Tom's Cabin." Nor, more to the point, can either they or the national administration achieve racial equality at the point of a bayonet or the muzzle of a marshal's pistol.

The South's racial relations, like those everywhere in today's troubled world, will be established ultimately by men—not by laws, not by courts, not by self-serving politicians and, above all, not by dictation from any outside source.

JAMES H. GRAY,
Editor.

News-Times Civic Achievement Award Presented to Attorney T. Clark Hull

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABNER W. SIBAL
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have printed in the RECORD the following article from the Danbury News-Times recounting the award of that newspaper's Civic Achievement Award to Attorney T. Clark Hull of Danbury.

Of all the distinguished recipients of this award, none has deserved it more than T. Clark Hull. I am honored to be able to place the account of his achievements and their recognition by this outstanding newspaper in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the Danbury News-Times, May 16, 1961]

NEWS-TIMES CIVIC ACHIEVEMENT AWARD PRESENTED TO ATTORNEY T. CLARK HULL

DANBURY.—T. Clark Hull, a Danbury attorney who has been prominent in civic affairs for many years, is the latest recipient of the Danbury News-Times Civic Achievement Award.

The silver bowl accompanying the award cites Hull as "a devoted advocate of improved local government" and "a zealous worker for his community."

One of the activities for which Attorney Hull is well known has been much in the news these days—the Representative Town Meeting charter for the town of Danbury.

A senate committee has sidetracked in the State legislature, at least for the present, a bill to validate the RTM charter vote last November.

HEADED CHARTER COMMISSION

Hull was chairman of the nonpartisan commission which drafted the charter submitted to the board of selectmen last June, after nearly 2 years of preparatory work.

The selectmen voted to put the charter on the ballot in the regular election November

n and townspeople approved it, 4876–3241. But the legal call of the meeting did not include the referendum question and the vote cannot go into effect unless and until the State legislature adopts a validating act.

Hull is a Danbury, native, son of the late Treat Clark Hull and of the late Mrs. Elizabeth Schmidt Hull Dalton.

He attended schools here, Yale University and Harvard Law School, with 40 months service in the Army Air Corps during World War II.

He became associated with Louis George, now a judge of the Circuit Court, and with A. Searle Pinney in a law firm which later merged with the law firm of Burton F. Sherwood to become the present firm of Sherwood, Hull and Pinney, with offices at 28 West Street.

He has been active in the Community Chest, serving as 1956 campaign chairman and as a division chairman and worker in other years.

He has also been a director and vice president of Danbury Hospital and has served it on fund committees.

CIVIC INTERESTS

He has been a member of the Danbury Library board of directors since 1957, the same year the Danbury Junior Chamber of Commerce designated him as Danbury's "Young Man of the Year."

Although he has held few political offices, among them tax attorney for the town at one period, he has been active in Republican affairs for many years.

His interest in better government found expression in the charter commission project and, more recently, in organization of the Committee of 1000. He is counsel to that group and a member of the executive committee.

The committee, which fought to retain zoning and planning in the town and then worked for a favorable vote on the RTM charter, is now concentrating its attention on school needs.

On frequent occasions Hull has been called on to serve as moderator of town meetings.

Attorney Hull and his wife, the former Betty Jane Rosoff, are parents of three sons, Clark, 11; Jonathan, 10, and Steven, 6. They live at 187 Kohanza Street.

Proposed University of the Americas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, recently many proposals have been put forth for the purpose of strengthening friendship and understanding among the peoples of the Western Hemisphere.

One of the most effective and practical ideas which I have heard proposed calls for the establishment of a University of the Americas, where students and professors from the Latin American nations and the United States can meet and exchange ideas and views in a cultural atmosphere.

Senator GEORGE SMATHERS, of Florida, is a prime mover in the program. He is Chairman of the Inter-American Council of the People-to-People Program—the organization which is fostering the project—and is a trustee of the University of the Americas. The university has already received a charter from the State of Florida and is expected to open its doors in the near future to receive its first students.

Two outstanding newspapers have recently paid editorial tribute to the concept of the University of the Americas—the Miami (Fla.) Herald of February 23, 1961, and the Kansas City Star of March 8, 1961. I ask unanimous consent at this time that the editorials be entered in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Miami Herald, Feb. 23, 1961]

NOW, A LABORATORY OF FREEDOM

Traditionally in Latin America the rich stream of ideas flows from the universities. They are the centers of intellectual and cultural growth as well as political reform. They are democratic in organization and they combine a practical approach to current events with a cloistered dedication to knowledge.

This high station for such centers of learning gives a deeper meaning to the establishment here of the University of the Americas which was announced this week.

When the institution opens its doors, as it is expected to do in a few months, it will attract scholars from all hemispheric nations. In its opening phase the university will be confined to graduate study of social and political sciences. First students thus will be men and women of academic attainment, with interests in fields that affects national and international policy.

Senator GEORGE SMATHERS, as chairman of the Council of Inter-American Affairs of the People-to-People Program, was a prime mover in establishing the university. It will be privately financed, and while autonomous under a board representing many countries, will have close ties with the University of Miami. Frist classes will be in facilities made available by the University of Miami.

Since only ideas can solve the world's dilemmas this University of the Americas will be a laboratory of freedom. This is an institution highly conceived: "To train people to think, to discover and to speak the truth without restraint by the dictatorial authority of government or by any other agency."

From this concept a great university will surely grow. Miamians and Floridians have a responsibility to help it grow. All interested in inter-American relations have recognized the need for such an institution where the common heritage of the New World may be fostered. We are highly fortunate to have it in Miami and we are in debt to all who made this possible.

[From the Kansas City Star, Mar. 8, 1961]

A HEMISPHERE UNIVERSITY TO BUILD FRIENDSHIP

The proposal by Senator SMATHERS for a new University of the Americas strikes us as a sound idea that could promote hemisphere friendship. The suggestion calls for a bilingual institution for students from the United States and all other countries of North and South America. Regular university courses would be offered, with the emphasis on Hispanic North American cultures, history, geography, and ethnic heritage. The university would bring Latin and North American students together in order to build a better base of understanding.

Unquestionably, there is a great deal of misunderstanding between citizens of the Western Hemisphere. The United States frequently has been accused of a lack of interest in Latin America. People of South America complain that North Americans know nothing of their countries.

SMATHERS' idea has aroused substantial interest. President Kennedy has indicated support. The pledge of financial assistance by the national Veterans of Foreign Wars is a hopeful move. This is the early stage of starting with nothing more than an idea.

Location is important. Florida and Puerto Rico have been suggested. Financing must be worked out. This appears to be a project to justify Federal assistance.

This period of cold war tensions calls for strong moves to stimulate friendship. Foreign students who learn about the United States usually develop an affection and sympathy for our country and its aims. But the U.S. program of scholarships and exchange of students has been limited. The Russians concentrate on attracting foreign students. This year, Friendship University in Moscow is reported to be offering 600 scholarships for Mexicans alone.

A University of the Americas offers good possibilities for scholarships, seminars, conferences, cooperation, and language instruction. It would be focused on a vast region that is growing more rapidly than any other area of the world.

Recruiting for the Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Richard Starnes, which appeared in yesterday's Washington Daily News, shows what happens when fuzzy-minded pantywaists bring forth their impractical ideas:

A PAINFUL LESSON?

(By Richard Starnes)

NEW YORK, May 24.—There is some heartening evidence that young Americans have looked behind the recruiting-poster buildup of the Peace Corps and have begun to have sober second thoughts that might do credit to some of their elders.

The Peace Corps illustrates as well as any of a number of other examples how painfully Washington is learning a lesson most junior executives learn before they earn their key to the private gents' room. The lesson is simply that there is a gaping chasm between eloquent, idealistic notions, and the grim, practical and frequently cruel realities of this world.

It was, for instance, almost impossible to believe that one of the early acts of the New Frontiersmen would be to send word to the Kremlin that they would appreciate a 6-month moratorium on crises while the United States shaped policies designed to bring the Communist conspiracy crashing down.

The howls of glee this overpowering naivete must certainly have wrung from Khrushchev and company would have been wondrous to behold. There are, of course, other instances of this curious belief that literacy and good intentions will somehow set things to rights.

The President's ringing declaration on March 23 that Laos was worth a war (these are not his words but they are indeed a fair paraphrase of them) is now revealed as an empty statement by a man who either didn't know what he was talking about, or a man who was foolishly trying to run a bluff on the master bluffer of them all.

Again, the Peace Corps was a concept that would surely appeal to all hopeful, right-

thinking youngsters who were not even vaguely aware of the overpowering magnitude of the problems they were being called upon to solve. In one dispatch on this subject I suggested that the Peace Corps might become as notable a failure as the tragic children's crusades, although hopefully would not end with its personnel sold into slavery in Egypt.

Certain earnest young persons took me to task for this, some even confusing skepticism with cynicism, and others suggesting that I didn't care if the great unwashed masses of the world remained in squalor and ignorance.

In point of fact, of course, anyone who has felt impotent fury at the sight of hungry children being consumed by flies and ringworm is going to hope with every fiber of his being that their lot can be improved. But any realist must conclude that wishing is not going to make it so, that having the appropriate attitude is not going to lift the starving throngs of Egypt or Iran to a better life.

The Peace Corps is based on the assumption that a handful of young Americans can make some difference in the world's terrible, fulminating problems of malignant overpopulation and its handmaidens of hunger and disease.

After the first blush of enthusiasm, however, the young people of this country seem to have penetrated the happy-talk and developed some serious reservations about the program. In any event, the President complained recently that the number of Peace Corps volunteers was disappointing.

Out of 200,000 questionnaires distributed, fewer than 8,000 were completed and returned at last report.

Government by Executive Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I was very interested in a column written by David Lawrence in which he discussed a Government directive and which he entitled "Government by Executive Order."

It is amazing that the executive branch of Government can effect such powerful control over industry by the simple device of issuing an Executive order over the signature of the President. Under the guise of an antidiscrimination edict insofar as employment is concerned, the individual or company who successfully bids for a contract is under a heavy fist since he must sign a contract and agree to the provisions of the Executive order.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT BY EXECUTIVE ORDER—DIRECTIVE ON JOBS UNDER U.S. CONTRACTS HIT AS NEW FORM OF DICTATORSHIP

(By David Lawrence)

A new form of dictatorship is arising in America. It is "Government by executive order."

It means that, without the enactment of a single amendment to the Constitution or any new laws by Congress, President Kennedy can put out of business any company that refuses to obey the edicts he has just issued.

Every department of the Government that buys anything from business—whether it be pencils or paper clips or typewriters or window shades or guns or mechanical parts of a defense weapon—must abide by the decree issued by the President.

Every time the Government authorizes a purchase—even a subscription for a daily newspaper—the company must accept as a part of the order an agreement which says:

"The contractor will not discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, creed, color, or national origin. The contractor will take affirmative action to insure that applicants are employed, and that employees are treated during employment, without regard to their race, creed, color, or national origin.

"Such action shall include, but not be limited to, the following: Employment, upgrading, demotion or transfer; recruitment or recruitment advertising; layoff or termination; rates of pay or other forms of compensation; and selection for training, including apprenticeship. The contractor agrees to post in conspicuous places, available to employees and applicants for employment, notices to be provided by the contracting officer setting forth the provisions of this nondiscrimination clause.

"The contractor will, in all solicitations or advertisements for employees placed by or on behalf of the contractor, state that all qualified applicants will receive consideration for employment without regard to race, creed, color, or national origin * * *.

"The contractor will comply with all provisions of Executive Order No. 10925 of March 6, 1961, and of the rules, regulations, and relevant orders of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity created thereby.

"The contractor will furnish all information and reports required by Executive Order No. 10925 of March 6, 1961, and by the rules, regulations, and orders of said committee, or pursuant thereto, and will permit access to his books, records, and accounts by the contracting agency and the committee for purposes of investigation to ascertain compliance with such rules, regulations, and orders.

"In the event of the contractor's noncompliance with the nondiscrimination clauses of this contract or with any of the said rules, regulations, or orders, this contract may be canceled in whole or part and the contractor may be declared ineligible for further Government contracts in accordance with procedures authorized in Executive Order No. 10925 of March 6, 1961, and such other sanctions may be imposed and remedies invoked as provided in the said Executive order or by rule, regulation, or order of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, or as otherwise provided by law."

This extraordinary document has been received by tens of thousands of companies and individuals who do business of any kind with the Federal Government. But the most sensational feature is in the last paragraph, which says:

"The contractor will include the provisions of the foregoing paragraphs (1) through (6) in every subcontract or purchase order unless exempted by rules, regulations, or orders of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity issued pursuant to Section 303 of Executive Order No. 10925 of March 6, 1961, so that such provisions will be binding upon each subcontractor or vendor.

"The contractor will take such action with respect to any subcontract or purchase order as the contracting agency may direct as a means of enforcing such provisions, including sanctions for noncompliance."

The 14th amendment to the Constitution—from which the alleged authority in the whole nondiscrimination controversy has been derived—says that "the Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article." But President Kennedy has let it be known that he does not need any more laws on civil rights. He is using instead the device of the Executive order, even though bills to set up a Federal Fair Employment Practices Commission have been defeated several times by Congress. No law has been passed to govern the relations of contractors to the Government or their methods of hiring employees.

It might be assumed that the aggrieved party could go to court and argue that no such authority is granted under any law or any article of the Constitution. But, unfortunately, it is difficult from a legal standpoint to sue the Government without its consent. Supreme Court decisions have upheld that viewpoint.

So, coercion and compulsion now are to be used to obtain compliance with Executive orders and decrees, and the only recourse the injured citizen will have is to the Congress and his fellow citizens, who alone can put an end to dictatorial Government.

The 1964–65 New York World's Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. DELANEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, the New York World's Fair of 1964–65 will be the most impressive international exposition of all time and, as a showcase for new concepts in science, invention, industry, education and the arts, promises to be the most significant. The primary theme of the fair will be "Peace Through Understanding."

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a talk given before the National Press Club on May 22, 1961 by Robert Moses, president of the New York World's Fair Corp., under whose brilliant direction plans for the fair are already remarkably advanced:

THE PRESS AND THE FAIR

(Remarks of Robert Moses on the World's Fair at the National Press Club, Washington, D.C., Monday, May 22, 1961)

On this spring day, I promise to be brief when, to paraphrase the late Mr. Chaucer in printing terms: "Sumer is icumen in etaoin shrdlu."

It is nice of you to ask me to join your roster of guests and to give me a chance to speak about the coming New York World's Fair, but why you should stay indoors to hear a dubious tenor sing for his lunch, when you could follow any pied typer along the Potomac to greener fields, is beyond me.

I feel a little dizzy here, far from the lower strata of city, suburb, and State which are my habitat, translated in an hour to the higher sublimated echelons of Washington and to global affairs, an obscure bureaucrat and dirt mover, who, in spite of past indiscretions, maintains a prudent regard if not always a slavish admiration for the press. I have always approached the press, the air, and Madison Avenue with decent respect

this side of idolatry, remembering that as fast as images are produced, iconoclasts reduce them to rubble and that one man's Galatea is another's Frankenstein. I have found that the press, operating in the main from safe shelters, is often more thin-skinned than its exposed and unprotected victims.

Having diligently avoided science in college, I now find myself inarticulate and bewildered in an age of mathematical physics and spatial exploration. Infants lisp in numbers, and Planck's Quantum Theory takes the place of nursery rhymes. I confess to being on an intellectual level with the children in one of New York's public schools who were asked in an examination, "Who was the first to conquer space?" Over half the class replied triumphantly: "Castro Convertible." Nevertheless in spite of commercials, funnies, and Westerns, American youth with its native mechanical bent has a grasp of science which my generation, brought up on the elective educational system, succeeded in avoiding.

So much for personal references. Now to the fair. Most of you will recall "The Great Gatsby," the best thing Scott Fitzgerald ever did. The time was the crazy period after World War I and before World War II. The scene was Long Island among the crowded old causeways, turnpikes and speedways of the north shore leading out from town. The central incident occurred at the Corona Dump at Flushing Meadow, which we leveled for the World's Fair of 1939 and 1940. This is how Fitzgerald described it: "About halfway between West Egg and New York the motor road hastily joins the railroad and runs beside it for a quarter of a mile, so as to shrink away from a certain desolate area of land. This is a valley of ashes—a fantastic farm where ashes grow like wheat into ridges and hills and grotesque gardens; where ashes take the forms of houses and chimneys and rising smoke, and finally, with a transcendent effort, of ash-gray men, who move dimly and already crumbling through the powdery air. Occasionally a line of gray cars crawls along an invisible track, gives out a ghastly creak and comes to rest, and immediately the ash-gray men swarm up with leaden spades and stir up an impenetrable cloud, which screens their obscure operations from your sight."

As city park commissioner and landlord of the first fair, I had the tememity to write a piece for the Saturday Evening Post in 1938 entitled "From Dump to Glory," telling about the disappearance of the ash mountain and the emergence of a park. Some of my fellow directors of the fair did not speak to me for months afterward, but they eventually relented and now I find myself back in the meadows as president of another fair.

In those revolutionary decades between 1940 and 1960 astonishing changes in the world occurred, and these constitute the best reason for another fair, the occasion for us to pause for reflection, review, appraisal, and a long look into the future. If this were merely a scheme to attract crowds and promote local business, I would not be here today, and in fact would be no part of the fair. At my time of life, hearing however faintly the rolling of a distant drum, there would be other larger purposes to serve. If you will bear with me I shall try to explain what, in my opinion, makes this World's Fair significant.

The new fair will occupy roughly the same space as the previous one, but the buildings will be taller, the exhibits more numerous, sophisticated and expensive, the emphasis somewhat different, the attendance much larger, and the problems of access, internal transportation and parking therefore more pressing. Modern approaches we shall have, by rubber, rail, air, and water, the most complex of this arterial age, and plenty of ways of parking and getting from place to place without the bone weariness of conventional sightseeing.

The theme of the fair is "Man's Achievements on a Shrinking Globe in an Expanding Universe." Its main objective is peace through understanding. Its purpose is predominately educational which, among other things, entitles us to various forms of tax exemption. There will be a balance at the end to finish the park and for education. After 1965, when the fair is leveled and hardly a rack is left behind, Flushing Meadow will be the city's finest park. As in the case of the new landscaped shores of the St. Lawrence where our dams have created an immense lake, the scars of construction heal fast. Today the St. Lawrence, like the Father of Waters, again flows unvexed to the sea.

The total investment in and close to the fair will be about a billion dollars. The benefits, direct and indirect, to the community will be large. The advantages to the Nation and world, if we are successful in our large aims, will be incalculable. As to our sponsors, President Kennedy has given the fair his blessing. The three living ex-Presidents of the United States are honorary chairmen. Our board looks like a living Hall of Fame of leaders in American life. Our small staff is composed of experienced people aiming from the start at solid public respect rather than easy popularity. We have no hoarse rabble of Coney Island shills and barkers. We have no army of retainers. Practically all of our design construction and operation is farmed out to competent private companies.

There has been much loose talk about the antagonism of the Bureau of International Expositions in Paris to our fair. We do not take this seriously, even if it means a boycott by a few nations as such and the substitution of foreign industrial exhibits by progressive businessmen. The BIE is a curious administrative agency established by the so-called Convention of 1928 Relating to International Exhibitions. This convention applies only to Government and Government-controlled exhibitions, not to those of a free enterprise nature. This convention, therefore, by definition and under its own express wording has no application at all to a major, free enterprise exhibition of the type to be held in New York.

The United States does not belong to the BIE. It could only join by a treaty approved by the Senate, something quite unthinkable. The BIE insists on a single year fair and no ground rental. We require 2 years and rental revenue. Other rules of the BIE are inapplicable in the New York Fair. We did not joint the BIE at the 1939–40 fair. The Seattle fair was licensed as a secondary, 1-year fair and is in no way comparable to ours. We have no quarrel with Seattle and they should have none with us. This country is big enough to stand a significant Pacific fair in 1962 and a larger one on the Atlantic seaboard in 1964 and 1965.

You have no doubt also heard echoes of obscure wranglings about art at the fair. The avant-garde are intolerant, fanatical and armed with sharp stones in their glass houses. We belong to no school at the fair, subscribe to no thesis, worship at no artistic shrine, advocate no architectural millennium. We are sold on Thoreau's observation that if a man does not keep pace with his companions, perhaps it is because he hears a different drummer. The exhibitors, subject to the simplest rules of ground coverage, height and open landscaped spaces, will call the shots, draw their own pictures, pick their own artists and builders and decide on their own exhibits.

They can have literally anything and everything conceived, designed, and built since man gladdened and saddened the heart and obstructed the view with his architecture. They can have replicas of the Seven Wonders of the Ancient World. They can have Renaissance, Louis XIV, Tudor, Jacobian, Jeffersonian, Victorian, General Grant, Bozart, Stanford White. Nervi, Bauhaus, Lloyd Wright, Baroque, Rococo, Ingloo, Ankhor Vat, animated typewriters, frozen music, and the ecstasies of Viennese pastry cooks. If that's not democracy in design, what is?

Our rules will not give any self-constituted clique control and a patent on which they can set their seal. It will make for free enterprise, variety and perhaps some confusion in the minds of those who want everything to conform to a single pattern. Here and there a square, patio, circle, or campus will be formed by a group of the United States, or of new African Republics or of Central American countries with a style and furnishing reflecting ancient pride or awakened ambition. This is for them, not for us, to determine.

The few objects of art which will remain in the park will be passed on by a design board and subject in the end to the taste of the City Art Commission. There will be no Greek revival such as followed the Chicago Exposition of 1893, which put a blight on all originality and native talent in architecture for half a century, and pockmarked the southland with silly wedding cake boxes flanked by Corinthian columns where the candlelight gleamed in the sycamores and the banjos were aringing. In those days we did not yet have the brash self-confidence in the arts which a little later we so abundantly and riotously manifested. Everything distinguished, as Governor Smith used to say, had to be marvelous and from the Old World.

We have been deluged with theme symbols—mostly abstract, aspirational, spiral, uplifting, flashing, or burning with a hard and gemlike flame, whose resemblance to anything living or dead is purely coincidental. I can comprehend the magnificent symbolism of a four-footed musical theme like that of Beethoven's Fifth, reverberating in a deaf man's brain, knocking at every door and echoing round the world, but the symbolism proposed by the avant-garde at Flushing Meadow even if it be ambrosia to the intelligentsia, is surely caviar to the general.

Our United States Steel armillary sphere has been derided and we have been accused of being crude, dull, defeated, uncouth Boeotians, lewd fellows of the baser sort who should be removed and replaced by what Mayor Hylan felicitously referred to as "art artists." One indignant critic telegraphed me with simple scorn: "You disgust me." There is nothing quite like the bitter intolerance of the newly emancipated practitioners of the arts who, having made a clean break with the past, are off on their own, sailing a crazy course on uncharted seas. No one begrudges them their freedom, but why should they insist that all other Argonauts follow in their wake?

Speaking in our Capital City, I must emphasize the extraordinary opportunity of this administration and Congress to offer to a curious an critical world as the central exhibit of the fair, in an ingeniously designed pavilion, an epitome of what this Nation of, by and for the people signifies to democracy everywhere, graphically presenting the source of our inspiration, the secret of our civilization, the American dream. To give form to this concept, our deepest thinkers and our cleverest artificers should be recruited to imagine, design and furnish the U.S. Pavilion. We want no tame, shopworn stereotypes, no dead collections of historical relics, no wooxy nostalgic sentimentalities, no frantic boasts and foolish words. We want what will compel the respect and even the admiration of mankind.

We must rise above patriotic knickknacks, pawnbroker items, waxworks, antimacassars, doilies, bustles, stamp and coin collections and clay replicas which pedestrain minds too often offer in competition with what new nations have to show. Shall we acknowledge that Yankee genius is satisfied to bark at the moon while the Russians actually land there? To be sure, the race is not always to the swift nor the battle to the strong nor yet bread to the wise, but the odds are two to one on speed, brawn, and brains.

Our Federal exhibit should present not the graven image but the true face of this Nation and the immense variety and richness of American life. The central, focal U.S. pavilion is no place for clichés, patronage and the lowest common denominator. In the area of space accomplishments we must trust our National Government as well as our private industries to match the best that the Iron Curtain countries may offer. The graphic presentation of our own advances will require all the genius we can recruit in the visual arts. Surely our scientists who are spending so freely on research and experiment can dramatize for the layman sea water desalted by atomic energy, the reclamation of the immense parched and thirsty wastelands of the earth, plankton as a breakfast food and the travels and exploits of rocketed, weightless men, or perhaps give us a replica of the mysterious, atomic laboratories where they rudely awaken the sleeping energy of billions of years and the isotope is the modest symbol of our hope and deliverance. We don't have too much talent to draw on. Many an executive hunting for ideas for the fair sighs and wishes there were someone around today with the genial madness of Norman Bel Geddes, someone who knows that all the world's a stage and that we are such stuff as dreams are made on.

I like to compare our World's Fair to the Olympic games as I saw them last summer in Rome. The Olympics furnish common ground. They invite friendships of widely different and on the surface antagonistic people. They provide free, honest, open competition. They have nothing to do with diplomatic practices and ideologies. They say to every nation: Send us your best, These will be well received and treated, and will find new friends in congenial surroundings.

The Olympics teach us to be aware of the second-rater, the braggart, the bully, the hollow man with the big muscles, the stylized athlete, the clotheshorse, and to admire speed, coordination, supple strength, rhythm, iron nerves, stamina, courtesy, the instincts of what we loosely call a gentleman, modesty in victory, good sportsmanship in defeat, inoffensive pride of nationality. That's what we aim at in the field of culture, the arts, science, industry and the almost forgotten gaiety of nations. The Olympics are a call to action, not a monument to the futility of words.

I am often asked what are the relative roles of the Lincoln Square Center of the Performing Arts and the World's Fair in 1964–65. A neat little distinction could be made between the arts which perform and those which don't, between the dynamic and the static. That, however, is just a little too pat. We believe the fair should not attempt to imitate, duplicate or compete with what the performing arts can do better. It is the high hope of New York that at Lincoln Square and the fair we as partners may stimulate productive and friendly international rivalry and a generous reverence for talent wherever it may originate.

Not for us at the fair the magnificent artificialities of the grand opera, the lighter arias of comique and bouffe, the strained tenderness and grievous solemnity of philharmonic and chamber music. These are for Lincoln Square. At the fair, bands, popular music, jungle drums, and native dances. We have signed a memorandum of understanding with the performing arts. A memorandum of this sort in this legalistic vale of tears is an affirmation of high common public purpose and honest friendship. It is not an oath in the Bibical or Anglo-Saxon sense, nothing you expect to litigate, nothing that involves the quid pro quo and consideration of bargaining in the bazaar, market place, or Rialto. It says simply "This is our goal. We expect to reach it together."

We builders of pageants are not the only targets of the critics. The creators of culture at Lincoln Center too will have their little private purgatory, for the sidewalk superintendents are already hinting broadly that nothing original, distinguished, cleansing, and significant can rise from such brilliant facades and magnificent surroundings and that only the crust of loneliness eaten in rags, garrets, and tears can produce great art.

New York is a baffling, hurrying town. I make no apologies for it, because most of the time I am proud of it. The slaughterhouses go and the U.N. comes in. Soon the tides of trade and pleasure flow by as though it had always been there. An erstwhile President or Emperor of Japan rides the elevators in the Waldorf Towers and is unrecognized. A slum disappears and a cathedral of culture takes its place, an oasis of peace, harmony, and quiet in the midst of much senseless activity. There is a certain inexorability about every big city. This is our New York which, like time, devours all things, which swallows statesmen and generals and pauses not to reck the rede.

Do not however for a moment assume that New York is inhospitable or unfriendly. The fair, like New York itself, will have a thousand faces. It will also have a heart. Some of you may call us absurd, but we make bold to promise that in Gotham, so often and mistakenly advertised as a place of steel, stone, glass, tension, noise, wrath, and tears, visitors in 1964 and 1965 will find a friendly welcome, kindliness, and a sense of brotherhood.

Well, my press friends, if we avoid the conventional barker's ballyhoo, don't think we are snooty or supercilious. We shall have the goods, the showcase and the performers from all over what Al Smith called the "known world." I have not attempted to convince you that this is an ideal time to prepare for such an exposition. But what is an ideal time and when in the world we live in and project into the immediate future, will there be a perfect occasion?

Every effort at cooperation of nations outside of the conventional international organizations and procedures should be encouraged and exploited. The seeds of friendship take root, grow and flourish in strange places, reclaim deserts and change the face of nature and man. What can you of the fourth estate, who write so much about practical idealism and honest, free competition, lose by giving us your full support?

"Hope's" Cargo Is Medical Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Dr. Malcolm A. McCannel, a Minneapolis physician, has recently finished a tour of duty with the good ship *Hope* in Indonesia. His touching and enlightening letters describing the contribution which Project Hope is making to alleviate the human suffering in southeast Asia as well as to promote international understanding through compassion should be read by all, for they truly represent America's humanitarian spirit. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the May 14 Minneapolis Tribune article entitled "*Hope*'s Cargo Is Medical Aid," which contains excerpts from Dr. McCannel's excellent letters from Indonesia be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, May 14, 1961]

"HOPE'S" CARGO IS MEDICAL AID—CITY DOCTOR DESCRIBES INDONESIA VOYAGE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Project HOPE (Health Opportunities for People Everywhere) is operated by a nonprofit charitable organization and is designed to bring America's medical knowledge to newly developing countries. Malcolm A. McCannel, a Minneapolis physician, was abroad the hospital ship *Hope* earlier this year when the ship visited Indonesia. These are excerpts from his letters.)

(By Dr. Malcolm A. McCannel)

JAKARTA, INDONESIA, March 21.—When I arrived in Jakarta, it was in the midst of the 3-day celebration of Hari Raya, a Moslem holiday. This is not the time to arrive full of business and direct action plans, but it is a good time to see people in this tropical area celebrate their holiday with vim.

After clearing with Project HOPE, and being briefed, the rotators (volunteers, serving without pay) are flown out one way or another to the ship which has already been to Surabaja, Bali, Sumbawa Besar, Makassar, Ambon and is now in Kupang on the island of Timor, some 1,200 miles from Jakarta.

One of the early stories about the *Hope*, which I heard while in Jakarta, concerned an Indonesian woman who needed abdominal surgery for what turned out to be a far-advanced malignant disease.

Despite the poor prognosis, the *Hope* doctors and entire complement labored all one night and part of the next day in an attempt to make her more comfortable and help her condition.

Later, our American nurses found that their Indonesian counterparts were amazed at the concern and effort put forth toward helping this woman. In their minds "the case was hopeless, why bother."

In this Far Eastern country, nurses occupy a unique position in the Indonesian society and when they first came aboard the *Hope* it was noted that they were somewhat distant, standoffish and reserved in their treatment and care of patients—even the pediatric ones.

When they observed the American nurses evincing a great deal of compassion and what we call TLC (tender loving care), they began to follow suit and one of the chief nurses, Dorothy Aeschliman, San Francisco, Calif., pointed out with understandable pride, the warmth and playfulness of the nurses with their little Indonesian patients after being with the *Hope* a few months.

KUPANG, INDONESIA, March 24.—The *Hope* has arrived on one of the easternmost islands of Indonesia, Timor.

This 16,000-ton mercy ship is staffed by medical specialists from America as well as a full complement of technicians and nurses from Indonesia.

At sea and also while in port, an active teaching program goes on almost every night

with movies, seminars, lectures, and demonstrations being given on a very tightly organized schedule.

During the 2-week stay in port, an integrated medical program is carried out on the ship as well as at the local Indonesian general hospital.

Because Indonesia is woefully lacking in what we consider necessary medical staffing, the one doctor for every 80,000 persons has impressed all of the stateside medical staff very much.

Many local doctors are Chinese who have long called Indonesia their home. In no place has the *Hope* run into anything but a cordial, friendly, and hospitable reception.

The *Hope* clinic on land and the specialty clinics, the majority of which are conducted on the ship, screen an enormous number of people during the short day.

The X-ray department is doing a mass chest X-ray survey on shore.

James Youker, recently from the University of Minnesota medical school, is compiling interesting statistics on the incidence of diseases revealed by the roentgen ray.

The clinic in Kupang is situated on top of a hill overlooking the harbor and the *Hope* has anchored a quarter mile from shore. The launches ferry back and forth continually.

All of us have been impressed with the quickness with which the Indonesian nurses, especially in the operating room on the ship and on shore, have caught on to what to many of them have been brandnew techniques.

The 8:30 a.m. clinic is a pleasant but rather congested madhouse with every patient accompanied by four or five relatives.

Many are dressed in their native sarongs and grins are wide.

I had been told that Indonesians are quiet, reserved, unsmiling and somewhat shy. On the contrary, after the ship is 24 hours in port, they are smiling, gracious and most friendly.

In this patriarchal society, the women still walk a few paces behind their menfolk and are more reserved than the men. But their gentle stoicism stands them in good stead for all of the necessary but radical surgery which is often proposed.

ENDE, INDONESIA, March 26.—This morning the *Hope* steamed into Ende on the island of Flores, about 1,000 miles east of Jakarta.

The ship was responding to a call made because of the recent earthquake which had supposedly destroyed many of the dwellings here.

As in all the ports at which the ship has stopped, we were greeted by a welcoming committee consisting of hundreds of youngsters, possibly more charming than the children at home because of the nostalgia they evoke from the medical staff.

The local doctors, two from Ende and one from the other side of the island, had already anticipated our arrival and about 30 minutes later a *Hope* clinic was in operation.

The language of this island poses quite a problem because, although our many Indonesian doctors staff members speak the national language, each island has its own dialect.

So medical diagnoses are often made by looking, palpating, smelling and listening, rather than by compiling a long-drawn-out past and present history.

Most of the cases seen are problem cases that are beyond the scope and facilities available at each port.

PAMPHLET WELCOMES PATIENTS

When patients boarded the *Hope* during its Indonesian tour, nurses presented each a pamphlet introducing the hospital ship. Printed in English as well as in Bahasa, national language of Indonesia, the pamphlet reads:

"Welcome aboard the SS *Hope*. This ship is a hospital ship to exchange knowledge between the American people and the Indonesian people. It is a mission of friendship and understanding between our peoples.

"There will be no charge for anything you receive on this ship because this ship is supported by contributions from American schoolchildren, farmers, labor unions, business and professional people, workers and industry.

"Our ways may seem strange to you, but please be patient with us and we will try to understand your desires and make your stay comfortable and pleasant.

"We have tried to learn some of your language, but the few words we know are not sufficient to understand your illness and its requirements. Your Indonesian doctors and nurses will help us understand your needs.

"When you have finished reading this, the nurse will show you what to do. We hope you have a pleasant stay with us. The American people wish you well."

BIMA, INDONESIA, April 5.—The *Hope* has arrived at Bima, a small town nestled in a sailing cove on the north side of the island of Sumbawa.

Bima's medical problems were well organized prior to *Hope's* arrival by an energetic Chinese-Indonesian named Dr. Tan Hong Djwan.

The *Hope* actually does a great deal of good in catching up on the backlog of the local medical problems and at the same time bringing what we hopefully wish is a free expression of the American people that made the People-to-People Health Foundation possible.

Many Americans I talked to before I left did not realize that the *Hope* is financed by business, industry, labor unions and everyday people.

The only Government concession is the loan of the hospital ship, formerly the *Consolation*, brought out of mothballs and refurbished in Seattle, Wash., and San Francisco early last fall.

The ship is operated at cost by the American President Lines. The fuel is supplied by the American petroleum industry.

American pharmaceutical houses supplied the best and newest in medications.

The examination machines, surgery instruments and diagnostic equipment are of first-class quality, thanks to the surgical and medical instrument companies of America.

It may sound presumptuous to talk about the *Hope* "spirit," but since I am only a short time rotator rather than a year-long member of the medical staff, I can testify to the impact I felt when I arrived on the ship and saw the feeling and response to odd hours, difficult work shifts and all the other inconveniences of opening up and closing down a medical facility as well as trying to provide services during our short stays in port.

Here's the course of a typical day during the *Hope's* visit to Bima:

Breakfast begins at 6:30 a.m. for the surgical staff, who get off to an early start.

The ship to shore shuttle service starts promptly at 8:30 a.m. The first launch is loaded down with clinical doctors, nurses, technicians, box on box of gear, necessary equipment and additions to the depleted shore pharmacy.

This hospital ship has an intensive care unit as well as a pediatric ward.

The care unit keeps all post-surgical cases at least the first day, and longer if blood and other critical therapeutic procedures are needed. The beds are an interesting Navy type, steel rodded affairs hanging by chains from the bulkhead and supporting columns in the ward.

The patients are sturdy, uncomplaining and pleasant and many are very, very sick.

About 10:30 each morning, the first launch full of new patients to be screened and admitted to the hospital arrives and all are carefully wrist-banded. Routine admission work includes a chest X-ray, urinalysis, blood count, and temperature check.

In surgery, three spacious operating rooms are going full tilt. Dr. Robert Pulliam, Longview, Wash., this morning had six cleft lip repairs mostly in adults.

Tomorrow he is to remove a lower jaw tumor which is the size of a small watermelon. We judge it to weigh 10 or 12 pounds.

The general surgeons are removing growths, repairing hernias and performing many orthopedic procedures, often on neglected and untreated acident victims.

This is a Moslem land and often if "Allah wills it," a condition can get out of hand before the patient feels he should seek other consultation.

The ancillary services also deserve a mention. We have the best blood bank in the whole Pacific. Fresh blood is drawn from the local citizenry and this is no small problem when one considers the amount of systemic diseases and just plain anemia which so often exists in prospective donors.

The pathology department run by Dr. Robert Hanan, Durango, Colo., can do a frozen section for possible malignancy as slick as any at university hospitals.

Another interesting facet of the ship is a dairy department run by Al Adams, San Francisco. By ingenious use of powder concentrates, chilling and aeration, ice cream, milk and other dairy products taste like the real thing. Chocolate milk or "susu" is especially enjoyed by our Indonesian patients aboard ship.

AMPENAN, INDONESIA.—The *Hope* is at anchor on a gently rolling swell off the town of Ampenan.

Few tourists visit this island even though it is only 35 miles across the Strait of Lombok from famous Bali whose Mount Agung can be seen through the swirling mists like Bali Hai of the song.

The staff on the initial clinic launch that left early the first morning, was impressed with the beachside activity.

Myriads of piles of exportable produce stretched along the beach on either side of a rickety dock that required major repairs before our senior medical officer would give his stamp of approval for the heavy patient traffic that was expected.

Three kilometers from the beach at Ampenan is Mataram, a city of 80,000.

Three doctors greeted us, the chief one being Dr. Arzin, chief of the department of health; Dr. A. Teng Hway Nio, assistant to Dr. Azrin, and Dr. Liem Sik Lok, chief of the Mataram hospital.

Dr. Teng is a very efficient lady doctor who had supervised the registration of 143 patients.

We have learned not to be deceived by a low registration on the initial day because now, almost a week later, we are so jammed that several of the specialty clinics have stopped screening patients altogether for lack of operating time, bed space and just plain facilities until some of the backlog is caught up.

The eye, ear, nose and throat staff manages to do about 15 surgicals a day. General surgery follows suit.

Pediatrics has more than 20 full beds at all times. The internal medicine department keeps the laboratory hopping, evaluating odd fevers, lumps, coughs and strange parasites, as well as jealously taking its full quota of hospital beds.

Disaster struck the ship on the third day in Lombok when the air conditioning in the operating rooms conked out. The chief engineer, Charles Strohacker, managed to hook up some pipes to cool one room, and half the operating crew was moved to the little hospital in Mataram.

Although it may sound primitive to operate using a gondola-type operating table and a spotlight that seems to contain eight

fireflies, with an attendant holding an auxiliary hand flashlight, the work is turned out and very creditably too.

Every day from outlying villages come busloads of patients who have been screened in their locale by visiting Indonesian doctors.

Some days a certain gloom can be felt because of the seemingly endless number of cases that we will not have time or facilities to help.

The cases are tragic bizarre, difficult problems and it is strong medicine for the staff to take when the screening is such that only the sicker children and young people with very disfiguring tumors and short-time surgical procedures can be handled.

Those requiring two-stage operations and very elderly people with chronic disease problems, must be bypassed in favor of more acute conditions. Indonesia could well benefit from another two or three *Hope's*.

The project is set up so that a considerable amount of teaching is incorporated into the treatment program. The medical and surgical work seems endless, but the busy activities of the midwife nursing instructors, the baby care and feeding clinics, demonstrations of simplified nursing procedures and the films, lectures, and discussions held on board support this concept.

A question I could not answer before I left on this trip concerned the reaction of the local Indonesian doctors to the arrival of this floating medical training center with all of its 20th century gadgets and newer drugs and methods.

At no time have any of us felt any resistance; suspicion or lack of cooperation from the medical people. On the contrary, most of us have made what we think are lasting friendships.

It is a two-way enjoyment, as they teach us a great many things that are entirely new in our experience, especially in tropical medicine.

Through donations, the *Hope* has extra textbooks pertaining to many of the specialties in medicine and these are received with much pleasure by our host doctors.

Minneapolis' "Modern Medicine" furnished over 100 bound volumes of their yearbook, for use as gifts aboard the *Hope*.

Indonesia, although old in custom, is young as a political unit. Governmental administrative machinery has not yet begun to function well, particularly when adjudged by American standards.

It is quite frustrating to attempt an organized operation such as Project Hope and be held up by bureaucratic rubber stamping of endless papers around a desk; or by an emphasis placed on something we feel could be eliminated; or by the traditional midday siesta, a necessity for the permanent residents of a tropical country, but an annoyance to efficiency-minded Americans.

Detractors of the program have been few. I have seen a couple of form letters that view us with suspicion as "imperialists" trying to undermine the morals and the morale of the Government of Indonesia.

This seems to stem from a minority. Even the ship's crew enters into the planned outings and sports that are sponsored by each local committee.

The *Hope* has, at least to a measure, accomplished the goals which it set out to do.

Many cases have been treated, a great deal of the teaching program has been done, and the seeds of a good deal of sincere respect and friendship have been planted.

If this expression of the American people without any governmental intervention can be implemented to include a *Hope II, III,* or *IV,* all of the staff I have talked to feel that it would help promulgate the feeling which we think is a sincere one on the part of America to help those less fortunate than themselves and share some of the advantages that we take for granted.

National Aeronautics and Space Administration Appropriation

SPEECH
OF
HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6874) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction of facilities, and for other purposes.

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to express my reasons for having supported H.R. 6874, a bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, and construction of facilities.

Although not a member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, the evidence presented in the lengthy committee hearings and the detailed committee report indicates that the many programs of NASA are being conducted with the utmost urgency in relation with a well-balanced, thoroughly integrated and coordinated plan.

At this point, perhaps it would be helpful if I submitted a brief table which clearly indicates that, even in the wake of recent events, the authorizations agreed upon by the committee appear to be a reasonable compromise between the President's and NASA's budget requests:

NASA new obligational authority, fiscal 1962

[In millions of dollars]

	Kennedy budget	NASA request	H.R. 6874
Salaries and expenses	196,686	209,510	199,286
Research and development	919,539	1,056,309	1,023,539
Construction of facilities	119,075	152,002	[1] 154,075
Total	1,235,300	1,417,821	1,376,900

[1] Includes $15,000 for emergency construction of facilities.

But even with the broad, bipartisan congressional support for this bill, underlined as it was by an unusual degree of public understanding and support, we have no cause to rest.

It was developed at the hearings that Russia is reported to have set her sights on 1967 as the year for her first lunar landing, the 50th anniversary of the Communist revolution. The corresponding timetable for the United States has set the period 1969–70 as the target date. Officials of NASA have testified that a crash program of sufficient magnitude to close this gap would entail an annual expenditure of $4 billion to $5 billion a year—many times our current expenditures.

Dr. Robert C. Seamans, Associate Administrator of NASA, when recently questioned as to whether the United States could undertake such a program acceleration, said "I certainly don't feel this is an impossible objective. If as a matter of national policy this is felt to be a requirement, I would be the first to review it wholeheartedly and see what it would take to do the job. My estimate at this moment is that the goal may very well be achievable."

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the choice is basically one of national goals. Do we as a nation want to increase our civilian space effort from about 1.5 percent to approximately 6 percent of our entire budget in an effort to match Russian space objectives by 1967? The choice will not be easy, but make it we must.

In this connection, it is perhaps significant and reassuring that H.R. 6874 earmarks nearly three-fourths of its total authorizations for research and development activities. If we decide to greatly accelerate our space program, this current emphasis on research and development should make any such transition much easier and less costly.

If distribution of personnel in our space program is any criterion, a comparison with Russia, recently published by Missiles and Rockets magazine, would indicate that we might be in a position to move rather rapidly into a crash program if and when we so decide. The table follows:

Distribution of personnel

	U.S.S.R.	United States
Basic and applied research	140,000	60,000
Development	100,000	300,000
Design	170,000	100,000
Production	260,000	200,000
Total	670,000	660,000

The largest single project authorization under the research and development section of this bill is for Project Saturn. When operational, the first stage concept, based on the utilization of multiple off-the-shelf engines, will obtain a thrust of 1,500,000 pounds; this will greatly decrease, if not eliminate, the present thrust gap with Russia. The planned launch schedule for the 10 Saturn development vehicles is 1 in calendar year 1961, 2 in 1962, 5 in 1963, and 2 in 1964.

Since the Saturn booster is being developed at Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Ala., and will be launched at the Atlantic Missile Range, Cape Canaveral, Fla., means of transporting this space vehicle had to be developed. Because the Saturn vehicle dimensions exceed existing land bridge clearances, it was determined early in the Saturn program that barge transportation would be used. A contract has been let for the design and fabrication of the first barge and this will authorize funds for a second.

It is my understanding that a test barge run was made recently with a dummy Saturn and that the barge negotiated our inland waterway system from Huntsville to the gulf without incident, only to collide with a ship in New Orleans harbor. As a member of the Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, I hope the officials of NASA in charge of this operation will let us know if they encounter any difficulties on our inland waterway system. It was just a little over a year ago that our committee was informed by military people that the

bridge clearances on our Interstate Highway System were not sufficiently high to permit the easy passage of Atlas missiles being transported by trucks. This we were told only after thousands of bridges has been planned and constructed. Mr. Speaker, I would hate to see our Saturn program slowed down because of any similar lack of communication between our space and river engineering people.

As I have stated at the outset of my remarks, I support the provisions of H.R. 6874. I think it presents a balanced program of development that varies only slightly with that requested by both the previous and present administrations and the original request submitted to Congress by NASA. I support this bill, however, with the knowledge that circumstances may warrant a complete reappraisal of our timetable of development at any time.

The New Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. QUENTIN N. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a letter to the editor, from Darrell Miller, Route 2, Wahpeton, N. Dak., appearing in the Farmer-Globe, Wahpeton, N. Dak., on May 22, 1961. It is an excellent analysis of the new farm bill.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOES AMERICA NEED A FARM PROGRAM?

A study by the Department of Agriculture in 1960 indicated farm production would continue to increase by about 2 percent per year, if all acreage controls (except tobacco) were removed and price supports reduced to levels that would permit orderly reduction of current stocks of storable agricultural commodities over a 7- to 10-year period. According to the Department's calculations, increased marketings of farm products would result in the following prices by 1965: wheat, 90 cents per bushel; corn, 80 cents per bushel; other feed grains in proportion to corn; beef cattle, $15 per hundred; hogs, $11.20 per hundred. The estimated net farm income by 1965 would drop to a figure of 46 percent below agriculture's net income in 1958.

True, agriculture accounts for a much smaller proportion of our national economy than it did 20 or 30 years ago, but a large percentage of business and industry still is dependent on the farm market. In communities of 5,000 population and under, and on the farms surrounding these communities, you have 35 percent of the Nation's population. These people are earning their income directly or indirectly from agriculture; either directly in the production of agricultural commodities or indirectly in the business of providing goods and services for agriculture.

One can conclude from these studies and facts that an unhealthy agricultural economy would certainly mean an unhealthy national economy.

In production, agriculture is an outstanding success—where 20 years ago, one farmworker produced enough food for 11 persons, today, he produces enough for 25.

Today, U.S. consumers buy a balanced and varied diet for about one-fifth of their take-home pay—a smaller portion of their pay than anywhere else in the world.

Now we have before the U.S. Congress, the Agriculture Act of 1961, known as the omnibus farm bill, S. 1623, and H.R. 6400. This new farm bill does not establish agriculture programs, but provides the authority for, and the framework in which farmer committees with the Secretary of Agriculture can establish workable price improving programs for each farm commodity, if the producers want them.

It will mean less government in agriculture, giving the producers themselves the apparatus needed to tackle problems of supply adjustment on their own initiative through collective decision and action.

It will diminish the power of the Secretary of Agriculture. Existing laws give the Secretary broad, discretionary authority to fix price-support levels, prescribe acreage allotments, and establish marketing quotas for basic commodities without prior approval by Congress. Under the new bill, any new program for any commodity will be devised in consultation with the producers, subject to congressional approval and subject to approval by majority of the producers of the commodity.

It will give Congress a closer relationship to agricultural programs. It will establish basic objectives and guidelines for national agricultural policy in this bill. Congress will scrutinize every commodity program proposed by the producers in consultation with the Secretary. Congress will appropriate the funds and approve or disapprove every commodity program. If Congress disapproves a program, it can write and enact one of its own.

It will cut Federal cost of farm programs. By bringing supply in line with demand, cost of storage, handling, and interest in Commodity Credit Corporations will be substantially reduced.

It will allow farmers and consumers to be represented on the advisory committees. The advisory committees will be made up of actual farmers elected by county ASC committees (at least two-thirds of the producer committee members nominated in this way) and the remainder named by general farm organizations or commodity organizations, one member to represent consumers being appointed by the Agriculture Secretary.

The new farm bill is a good one for taxpayers, producers, and consumers alike.

The net results will be:

1. A healthy agriculture.
2. Prosperous farm communities.
3. Less cost to Government and the taxpayers.

Sincerely,

DARREL MILLER.

Wahpeton, Route 2.

The Democratic Creed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mr. Anthony W. Homer, 41 Brooklawn Terrace, Lynn, Mass., and a copy of the Democratic Creed which contains a vital message:

LYNN, MASS., *May 23, 1961.*

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANE: I am herein enclosing a copy of the Democratic Creed for your kind consideration.

I thank you wholeheartedly for your past and sincere interest in my work and your friendly cooperation in spreading its vital message.

I am sure you will deeply appreciate the important message embodied in this timely creed. It has long ago gained the enthusiastic acclaim of prominent laymen and clergy as well as that of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, and also of Winston Churchill himself.

I wish you may kindly consider the possibilities for its adoption by the U.S. Congress as a national doctrine along with the American Creed. Thus it may well fulfill in the present crisis the indispensable need of setting forth in concise language our fundamental aims and beliefs in the awakening world today which we are trying so hard to save and mold in the democratic ways of life.

I shall remain most grateful and with best wishes for abundant health and most rewarding efforts, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ANTHONY W. HOMER.

THE DEMOCRATIC CREED

(By Anthony W. Homer)

I believe in God, the creator of the universe, as our true Father, and in all peoples and races of mankind as the complete brotherhood of man animated with the ideal and purpose of perfecting human life; in the sanctity of divine law: that no man is a slave to another and no one a master of another, but all are sons of God and servants to our Lord; and that all men have been created with certain inalienable rights which they must be allowed to enjoy at all times and in all parts of the earth.

I believe in a perfect democracy within a state, the government of the people, by the people, and for the people, which guarantees man his natural rights and allows him to perform his sacred duty to God and to his fellowmen; in whose principles man is not the tool of the ruler, but the master of himself; and in which man does not exist for the state, but the state for man.

I believe in the state in which men are governed, but are also allowed to govern, by order and law; in the state in which men are not led forward in destroying and enslaving their fellowmen, but in liberating the oppressed and in defending their natural rights and sacred honor; in the state in which men share in all things for a common cause and live freely together to learn and progress according to the laws of human justice and equality; in the state in which men are treated as true citizens and are paid full consideration and respect.

I believe in the family of nations and in the democracy of the world by which all peoples and nations shall unite and live together under one flag and one world government, and shall forevermore enjoy the blessings of love, of freedom, and of peace; under which all men shall become citizens of the world and go forth in exploiting the richest of the earth for the common good of all.

I believe in a world democracy by whose virtues all the arts and sciences shall be employed only for the good and progress of mankind; and in whose dominion men shall destroy whatever is harmful to human life and shall keep on building only the things which contribute to the welfare of man and to the exaltation of his soul.

I believe in a world democracy which will cultivate the arts of higher learning and promote greater love and understanding be-

tween man and man and between God and man.

I shall exert all the power that is in me for the institution of a world democracy and help to promote world order and peace for the good of all races and peoples.

Worldwide Communications by Satellite—Business in Billions Is Forecast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include a splendid article written by George J. Feldman and appearing in the May 22, 1961, issue of the publication Missiles and Rockets relating to communication satellites and entitled "Business in Billions Is Forecast."

George J. Feldman is one of the outstanding lawyers of our country, a dedicated American, was formerly secretary to the late Senator David I. Walsh, and Director and Chief Counsel of the Select House Space Committee, of which I was chairman, and a principal author of the National Space Act. He has studied problems relating to this far-reaching and very important subject for many years.

The views of Mr. Feldman are worthy of profound consideration by everyone. In my extension of remarks, I am pleased to include the article which I have heretofore mentioned:

COMMUNICATION SATELLITES—BUSINESS IN BILLIONS IS FORECAST

(Worldwide communications by satellite is expected to be one of the earliest and most profitable commercial uses of space. But there are many problems still to be solved. George J. Feldman—former director and chief counsel of the Select House Space Committee, a principal author of the National Space Act and a well-known New York corporation lawyer—has studied these problems for many years. At this time when communications satellites are more than ever a subject of national and international interest, Feldman has written a comprehensive survey of the subject for Missiles and Rockets.—EDITOR.)

(By George J. Feldman)

The communications satellite promises to be the earliest big money payoff from space exploration.

Within the next few years, communication by satellite could easily become a multibillion-dollar business. Within 10 to 15 years, the communication satellite business could well become a $100-billion-a-year business.

Moreover, communication satellites promise to be the first form of space technology to enter our daily lives and revolutionize our ways of doing business.

Thus it is important to see just what communication satellites can do for us and to look at the many associated problems that we are going to have to face.

To begin with, why do we need communication satellites?

Capacity: They would permit the long-range transmission of higher frequencies (traveling in straight lines), and therefore could provide a great number of additional channels for long-range telephone, telegraph, radio and television service. Microwave channels already in use are badly congested, and the demand is rising rapidly. In 1960, for example, some 3 million oversea telephone calls were made or received in the United States. The number is expected to reach 21 million by 1970, and 100 million by 1980.

The rapid growth of technology and population all over the world is threatening the continued use of frequencies that Western countries have had to themselves. Also, the exploration of outer space will increasingly demand reliable communications between space vehicles and ground stations. Some of the very early practical applications of space technology—notably for weather forecasting, navigation, and surveillance—will also utilize wide bands of radio frequencies for communications.

Satellites offer the only known way to meet this expected increase in demand. A system of two earth-synchronous satellites could provide some 2,000 more telephone channels, compared to only 100 or so for an underwater cable.

Reliability: According to current estimates, satellite communication systems will prove to be more reliable than either cable or radio links. For example, they will not be subject to interference by sunspot activity or the cutting of underwater cables.

Costs: Will communication satellites give the first answer to the question, "How can you make a buck in space?" They probably will. It is still hard to estimate the costs, partly because they depend so much on the useful life of the satellite components. The minimum economical life of a communication satellite is about 1 year. Most cost estimates assume an expected life of about 5 years.

According to some estimates, an active low-orbit system would cost about $150 million initially and $10 million a year to operate. A system with 3 stationary (24-hour) satellites might cost twice as much. At present rates, gross revenues from a 1,000-channel telephone system would amount to nearly $100 million a year. From estimates like these, it appears that satellite communications will be profitable at least by 1970. Initial costs could probably be paid off within a decade.

Consumers will benefit, too. It is believed that the cost of satellite communiactions per voice-channel mile will eventually be lower than that of present long-range communications systems.

Satellites are expected to be useful in military as well as civilian communications, mainly for reasons of capacity, reliability, and security. In remote or undeveloped regions, furthermore, satellite relays can be set up quickly, while conventional long-range communication systems may take years to complete.

Thorns in the path: What policy problems will satellite communications create? At this stage of history we can give only a partial list.

Frequency allocation and use: Almost everyone agrees that early international allocation and domestic assignment of channels are needed for earth-space service and for radio astronomy. An international agreement will obviously be required, but may be difficult to negotiate.

International microwave communications will also raise the problem of equipment compatibility, particularly for television broadcasts.

Sharing of benefits and costs: Another problem will be the sharing of benefits and costs (a) among governments and (b) between governments and private users. For example, who will pay for what and how much? If the Government launches commercial satellites at cost, as NASA has already offered to do, then the taxpayers in general, and not just the users of the satellite service, will be footing the bill.

Control of program content: Controlling the content of radio and television programs transmitted by satellite will create new problems of licensing and regulation. No television system now available can send programs farther than 100 miles or so. Television programs relayed by satellite, however, could be sent from one continent to another. It is easy to foresee that this could become a hot international issue. Just imagine U.S. propaganda programs that could be received by private citizens in Communist countries.

Roles and relations of government and private industry: The American people enjoy a long tradition of leaving telecommunications to private enterprise. Our Constitution guarantees freedom of speech and the press. Yet government support seems inevitable, if only because the necessary technology involves high costs and heavy rocketry. Regulations, in any event, would be essential.

Apart from the central problem of the relationship between Government and private enterprise, we will also have to decide what agency within the Government will make the policies, lay down the rules, grant licenses, adjudicate controversies and enforce the rules and decisions. Here is an area full of pitfalls and controversies. On what grounds will the responsible agency decide to license one private company rather than another? What agency will be primarily responsible: NASA? FCC? the State Department? Other Government agencies are certain to be affected. What voice will they have?

Conventional legal problems: Private companies that own or operate satellite communication systems will expose themselves to new kinds of legal liability. In the first place, they may become liable for personal injury and property damage caused by launching accidents or the flight or landing of satellites. Remember the recent fall of fragments from the vehicle of a Transit navigation satellite last November on eastern Cuba. Numerous incidents of this kind have occurred, and will certainly become more common as more and more satellites are launched from the earth's surface.

Manufacturers may be sued for damages resulting from defective parts. At an earlier stage of the industrial process, companies may be held liable for accidents that occur in the course of research and development, manufacturing, testing or handling. For example, rocket fuels are highly explosive, and may cause blast or fire damage. The operation of communication satellite systems may also involve other forms of liability arising from radio interference, libel or slander.

Such legal problems will be international as well as domestic.

Private companies that enter the satellite communication business may also run afoul of the antitrust laws. Should the Government give a favored position to any one company? A favored position might become a monopoly if, as many people believe, only one communication satellite system could be run at a profit.

According to a letter of February 20, 1961, from the antitrust division of the Justice Department, "competitive considerations require that no one firm dominate satellite communications."

Some companies have proposed a "common carrier's common carrier"—that is, a joint venture providing service to all international communication companies desiring to use the channels of the system. It would also be possible for the Government to operate communication satellites just as it runs the Post Office.

Washington policy: What is our present national policy concerning satellite communication systems?

Shortly before he left office, President Eisenhower stated that the Government should "aggressively encourage private enterprise in

the establishment and operation of satellite relays for revenue-producing purposes." President Kennedy has not yet announced his policy, though he has said that this country would like to cooperate with the Soviet Union in several fields of space technology including satellite communications. Clues can be found, however, to the probable attitude of the Kennedy administration.

The report to the President-elect of the ad hoc Committee on Space (the "Wiesner report") proposed that the Government set up a special organization to direct Federal support of private space activities. This proposal evidently presupposes that space activities will be conducted by private enterprise, and will be directed and supported by the Federal Government. Furthermore, a staff report issued by the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, formerly chaired by Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, recently warned against "lending support to the image which often develops abroad—and which the Soviets would try to exploit—that any U.S. program of space relays would simply enrich the private communication interests."

The FCC and NASA have recently sanctioned the private development and operation of communication satellites, in a joint "memorandum of understanding" issued on March 15, 1961, the two agencies stated:

"In accordance with the traditional policy of conducting international communications services through private enterprise subject to governmental regulation, private enterprise should be encouraged to undertake development and utilization of satellite systems for public communications service."

The memorandum also referred to the fact that "at the present time oversea voice communications are provided primarily by a single company." The single company is A.T. & T., which operates the submarine telephone cables. In effect, this memorandum continues the Eisenhower policy favoring private communication satellites.

On our way: In 1959 the International Telecommunications Union (ITU) allocated six radio frequency channels (in the 890–16,000 mc. range) for experimental space use, effective May 1, 1961. The ITU is scheduled to hold a special plenary session on satellite and other space communications in 1963. Observers predict that some foreign countries will not easily be persuaded to stop using certain frequencies in order to release them for space communications.

In 1960 the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) held hearings on frequency allocations for space satellites. Several private companies had asked for the reallocation of frequencies above 890 mc. for space use only. The FCC decided that "in view of present uncertainties, specific allocations for space communications cannot be made at this time" (FCC Rept. No. 751, Sept. 29, 1960). The American Rocket Society has appealed from this decision to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. Its petition for reversal states that the decision "vitally and adversely affected the allocation of radio frequencies for use in space activities."

In fact, a few frequencies (rather than broad bands) may prove to be sufficient for space use. Exclusive frequency allocations may not be necessary at all, except for services involving safety. There is a difference of opinion on this question, even among companies that plan to use communication satellites. True, a large number of low-altitude satellites may need exclusive frequencies. Earth-synchronous satellites, however, in 22,300-mile orbit, could probably share frequencies with land systems. (On the other hand, they would require very precise control as well as larger rockets than are now available. Whether exclusive space frequencies must be allocated will thus depend on what kinds of communication satellites are eventually adopted.

Perhaps some firmer answers will emerge from the long-range FCC inquiry now being made into the frequency allocations required for space communications (docket 13522).

In its decision of September 1960, the FCC not only refused to set aside frequencies for space communications, but instead opened up frequencies above 890 megacycle to private users for point-to-point communications on earth. Thus these vital frequencies would become available to banks, private shipping lines and other commercial companies. Commissioner T. A. M. Craven dissented, saying that the decision shows a "lack of long-range vision" and "fails to take into consideration the revolutionary effect which the future use of satellites will have on the lives of populations of the entire world, let alone citizens of this country, in terms of national and international communication, information, and propaganda."

A number of private companies—including the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. (A.T. & T.), the International Telephone & Telegraph Co. (I.T. & T.) and the General Electric Co. (GE)—have shown interest in commercial satellite communications.

For example, A.T. & T. has announced plans for using some 50 satellites to relay telephone conversations and television programs between the United States and Europe. It is already designing a satellite, and says it could begin test transmissions within a year. The FCC has assigned two radio frequency channels to A.T. & T. for this purpose (4100–4200 mc. and 6325–6425 mc., both common carrier frequencies). GE plans to use 10 relay satellites in conjunction with 19 ground stations. I.T. & T. will soon begin moon-bounce communication experiments with England. It has recently received an FCC license for experimenting with passive relay satellites. The frequencies assigned to I.T. & T. are 2299.5 mc., previously allocated by the ITU for space research, and 2120 mc. (until July 1, 1961, only), a common carrier frequency.

On March 1, 1961, the Radio Corporation of America (RCA) urged the Government not to give any one company a preferred position. It favored satellites owned and operated by a group of companies, and "open to full and independent access" for all international communications. In its brief, filed with the FCC, RCA disclosed that it was considering a joint venture with Lockheed Aircraft Corp. and General Telephone & Electronics Corp. to develop and operate a communication satellite system as a service to all carriers. According to its plans, an experimental satellite will be launched within a year. When the system becomes operational, "circuits will be made available to other communications common carriers for use in their business if they desire."

NASA has asked Congress for a total of $68.6 million—$24 million during the current fiscal year and $44.6 million for next year—to develop communication satellites. According to NASA plans, about $50 million of this amount will be used to develop a commercially adaptable active system (Project Relay.)

The Department of Defense is spending some $50 million a year on communication satellites, and will soon be spending much more.

Nor are such developments confined to the United States. Eventually they are bound to involve every nation on earth.

At present, it is true, the United States appears to stand alone in this field of space technology. The Soviet Union has not made any known experiments.

Other advanced countries, however, are already planning programs for satellite relays. British interest is especially keen. In late 1960, a team of British experts visited Washington for talks about communication satellites.

According to a New York Times dispatch of December 29, 1960, "The House of Commons was recently told that astronomical profits would accrue to the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. under a communications system using satellites. * * * Behind both the (British) government program and the criticism of it by Tory backbenchers lies a desire to compete with the United States in worldwide communication systems based on satellites."

The government-owned telephone agencies of Great Britain, France, and West Germany have expressed interest in establishing an international space communication system linking the United States and Europe.

Ten European nations have recently formed a "space club," tentatively known as the European Space Research Group. Member nations are Belgium, Denmark, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom. One of the first objectives of the group is a communication satellite system.

Evidently the age of space communications is no longer a distant prospect. It has nearly arrived. When it comes, it will have the same kind of impact on our lives as the inventions of the telephone and the radio.

Authorizing Appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6874) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction of facilities, and for other purposes.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the question comes up with reference to these budget figures for solid propulsion for the fiscal years 1961 and 1962 approved by the Budget for solid propulsion. As of January 16, 1961, there is a figure of $3.1 million. The amended budget request by NASA, March 17, 1961, was $8.1 million. The amount allowed by the Bureau of the Budget on March 28, 1961, $3.1 million for solid fuel propulsion. That was a cutback of $5 million on the NASA amended budget request of March 17, 1961. The committee went back to the figure of $8.1 million, the NASA request, and then added another $10 million on my amendment, making the total committee figure for solid propulsion $18.1 million. I believe this is necessary because even in the current fiscal year there is $68 million for liquid fuel propulsion. We certainly should have a more proportionate approach.

Adm. W. F. Raborn, Director, Special Projects Office, Department of the Navy, who is in charge of the Polaris

solid fuel propulsion vehicle or missile before the Committee on Science and Astronautics on February 4, 1959, stated that the Polaris project was a bold strikeout in solid propellant developments while the rest of the national effort was being channeled into the liquid fuel path. He stated further that this two-pronged approach was a gamble that paid off handsomely.

If we in the United States want to equal or exceed the Russians in space, we need not only the liquid fuel propulsion but also the solid fuel approach, and likewise we should have the nuclear and the electric propulsion fuel as further approaches in the future for operating vehicles in space.

I would like to comment further on the supplemental views as contained in the committee report. There is really not a difference of $141,600,000 between the committee approach and the two Members filing supplemental views. There is only $126,600,000 difference. The $15 million for emergency construction of facilities is in each of the figures. So that our new figure of the committee of $1,376,900,000 is simply an increase of the Bureau of the Budget figure of $1,250,300,000.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I would like to make the statement that we miss the gentleman sorely on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, but we are so happy he is doing such a good job on the other committee.

Mr. FULTON. I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois.

The John Birch Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, Newspaper Columnist Holmes Alexander has written an excellent article concerning the John Birch Society. It is noteworthy that Mr. Alexander is not a member of the society. The article was released through the McNaught Syndicate, Inc., on May 8, 1961. Under unanimuos consent I include the article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

ROBERT WELCH AND WALTER JUDD

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Many will write to say that it takes a foolhardy columnist to rise and defend the John Birch Society, especially when he's not a member. My answer would be that it took the touch of the desperado to discover the new world, the two polar regions, medical anesthetics, and many inaccessible but abstract truths as well. Nothing ventured; nothing gained.

Robert Welch, founder and president of the John Birch Society, has pondered long and reached the considered opinion that the Eisenhower brothers have not been anti-Communist enough, and that Chief Justice Earl Warren is a menace to the American Republic. These are extreme positions, rendered more extreme by misquotation and distortion. But Welch made them in hot blood in an era when the battle is going against us internally, externally, morally, and psychologically. With Mr. Kennedy's disasters in Cuba, Laos, and Geneva, added to Mr. Eisenhower's in Japan, Paris, the U–2 case, and Mr. Truman's in Potsdam, Korea, and Hungary, it doesn't seem too much to forgive a high-tempered man for using rough language.

If Welch owes some apologies (as I believe he does), many persons owe the same to him. It is insulting for a gray-haired superpatriot (why is that noun a smutty word?) to be called a Fascist, dictator, Nazi, hatemonger, and antisemite. All these are epithets capable of inciting personal and professional injury to Welch and, by unfair association, to his followers. Welch has denied that he is, or would ever be, any of these things. He and several John Birch Society members have asked to be examined before congressional committees so as to refute these accusations under oath.

Meanwhile, one of our largest and finest newspapers, which severely reprimanded Welch and the John Birch Society, has been deluged with letter from Americans who want to know how to join the society. There is the charge of sinister secrecy. But merely by asking an acknowledged member, I tucked under my arm and brought away for study a lot of John Birch Society literature. My haul included the much-discussed Blue Book, and the member's Monthly Message with a blank space and this notice: "John Birch Society, Belmont 78, Mass. Gentlemen, I should like to make the following comments or suggestions." It doesn't read like authoritarianism to me.

The society is a perfectly furious anti-Communist organization which advocates giving the Reds some of their own medicine. By implication, this could mean taking Havana as ruthlessly as Khrushchev took Budapest, training guerillas and subversives to upset Communist governments, making anti-Americans as unpopular in America as anti-Reds are in Communist lands.

Much of the John Birch Society policy is shocking to prudish Americans (and those who affect prudishness to show off their "couthness"), but the other day Representative WALTER JUDD, Republican of Minnesota, made the same philosophic points in much more eloquent, more cogent language. Speaking before the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, JUDD insisted (as does the John Birch Society) that we can't apply Judeo-Christian ethics or American codes of honor and chivalry to communism. JUDD said:

"The reason why it is not possible to get any real agreement with the Communist world—whether at Yalta or the U.N., at Panmunjom, at Geneva or at Paris—is because the Communists are not pursing the same goals as we, at our best, are pursuing.

"And why are they not pursuing the same goals as we? It is because they do not believe in the same things as we do—about man and about the universe; that is, about God. One reason for our difficulties is that we have been exposed so long and so consistently to the Judeo-Christian body of ethics that we take its moral standards for granted. We tend to equate "Christian" with "human"—and since the men in Moscow and Peiping are human beings we assume they will act as Christians do.

"We cannot readily condemn esthetic Communists for betraying Christian values which they have never professed, and which in fact they deny. It is absurd to believe that they can make moral judgments when their creed tells them that man is not a moral being, but is an economical animal."

Robert Welch and WALTER JUDD, though miles apart in their ability to articulate, are trying to say much the same thing, which is this: Let's stop treating Communists like moral equals.

Please Tell Us Why

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DURWARD G. HALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, soon the House will consider the controversial issue of Federal aid to education. A recent issue of the Aurora Advertiser in my district contains an outstanding editorial on this subject, and I submit it below for insertion in the RECORD for consideration by those who will be asked to vote on this issue:

PLEASE TELL US WHY

We have watched with puzzled amazement the almost fanatic fervor with which educators and many others have worked in a relentless campaign which seems, at last, headed for success—and wondered why.

The crusade, of course, is that for Federal aid to education.

Federal aid to education can come, of course, only from taxes paid by the people. State aid to education comes also from taxes paid by exactly the same people. Local tax support from schools comes from taxes paid by the same people, all of whom live in some school district.

Why so many should believe there is inherent magic of some sort in channeling tax money to Washington and then sending a part of it back that makes it different from sending it to the State capital and back, or the county seat and back we can not understand. We have asked proponents to explain the difference, and have never found one who could do so that we could understand.

Two things we know. There is not, at present, an expensive Federal bureau to receive tax money and distribute it to the schools. If the Federal aid program goes through, there will be. And the cost of this bureau will have to be collected to pay Federal aid, and therefore is an extra expense to the people.

Already, in every State, there is machinery for collecting school tax money and distributing it. Already in every county, there is the same sort of organization. Both will continue if Federal aid is instituted.

Though they deny it frantically, the real goal, we believe, of Federal aid to education is Federal control of education. Proponents want a sort of civil service for educators. They want national standards, handed down from above. In their hearts, they lack confidence in the ability of the people to make decisions concerning the schools their children attend. The educators concerned lack self-confidence in their own leadership.

Any long-time member of a school board in Missouri, can point out definite losses of initiative which have followed the shifting of the financial burden of schools from the local district to the State. Nearly all of the orders from above which have forced changes in standards and curricula have been for the good. But, in the wrong hands, and that governmental bodies do fall into wrong hands has been demonstrated in countless incidents in the history of the world, they could just as easily be bad as good.

That Federal aid to education will be accompanied by a certain amount of Federal control of education follows as logically as night follows day. It has been an inescapable aftermath of Federal aid programs in every field which the Federal Government has entered.

In the hands of a would-be Hitler, or a would-be Stalin, such power to control the education of youth is so dangerous that the American people should entrust it to no one.

We believe, sadly, that Federal aid to education is upon us. Only a last-minute storm of protest can head off its dangers now, and there are no signs of such a storm.

And we wonder why.

Police to Parents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CALEB BOGGS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, about 4 weeks ago, I called attention of the Senate to an article in Parade magazine dealing with puzzling traffic situations on our highways. The answers to those situations were supplied by the Delaware State Police, an organization which has been accorded international honors. Today I would like to again call attention to an article in the same magazine which tells the story of Delaware's bold new plan to keep youngsters out of trouble. Very simply, the plan involves the sending of a letter to the parents of a boy or girl who has been contacted by the State police either for directly violating a law or being in a group which has violated a law. The letter merely explains the situation under which the boy or girl was contacted and serves to inform parents of the whereabouts and the doings of their youngsters.

This forward-looking plan was the brain child of Lt. Hugh Collins of the Delaware State Police and has been in effect for about 1 year. Its success is measured in the fact that it is a rare day when a youngster whose parents have received such a letter turns up in court. Also, the State of Connecticut has copied the program and youth workers throughout the country are watching this modern-day application of the old adage "A stitch in time * * *."

I commend the reading of this article to my colleagues and congratulate the Delaware State Police, under Col. John P. Ferguson, for their outstanding work in this and other fields of police work.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLICE TO PARENTS

(By E. D. Fales, Jr.)

DOVER, DEL.—A few weeks ago, the mother of a teenaged girl took an official-looking letter from her mailbox here. It bore the emblem of the Delaware State Police.

"Dear Mrs. Jones," the letter began. "On U.S. Route 40 last night your daughter Helen, 15, was contacted by State police. When she came to our attention she was a passenger in a car driven by a 17-year-old boy, who was arrested for driving in excess of 80 miles an hour and racing.

"Your daughter violated no law but was in great peril, and we thought you should know so you can advise her. The boy had been arrested before for dangerous driving. Respectfully, Col. John P. Ferguson, Superintendent of State police."

That same morning, identical letters went to the parents of 10 other teenagers who had been in the race. And in the past year, hundreds more have gone to families all over Delaware. For in a unique—and controversial—program State police here are using letters to parents to combat the new problem of teenage wildness. By stitch-in-time warnings, police hope they can help keep kids out of serious trouble and perhaps even save young lives.

WHERE ARE THEY TONIGHT?

The program deals not with delinquents but with "good kids" who might be led astray, and its premise is simple. In this age of speed and distance, police say, even the best parent can't know every minute what a youngster is doing or whom he's doing it with. The cop on the beat and the neighborhood grapevine used to keep parents informed. But today's teenagers roam far from home, and scant news of their conduct gets back to parents. Pointed notes from police seek to span that gap.

The Delaware program is being watched closely by youth workers everywhere, and one State, Connecticut, already has copied it. Not every parent approves. But police say it pays off: it's a rare day when a youngster whose parents have received a letter later turns up in court. Typical is the case of Helen Jones (a fictitious name, like all other names of parents and teenagers in this article). After her mother received the police letter, she wrote a grateful reply:

"I've been worried sick and I've been trying to warn her," Mrs. Jones wrote. "But she told me times had changed and I didn't understand.

"Then your letter came. Thank you for saving me from being an old fogey."

Since then, Helen hasn't been seen with her old companions. But, says Lt. Hugh Collins, who dreamed up the letter idea, police see many others like her. "They're nice kids, but naive," asserts Collins, a tall, quiet officer. "They run with bad companions and wild drivers. They're the kind we often pull out from some sickening wreck."

Just such a wreck inspired Lieutenant Collins with his idea in the first place. On a Delaware highway several years ago, a carful of frightened teenagers spun into a curve at 70 miles per hour, crashed through a fence, landed in a field and overturned. By the greatest of miracles, no one was hurt. The driver, a 17-year-old showoff, was arrested. But because there were no further arrests and no injuries, parents of the other youngsters were not notified.

Two months later, some of the same crowd were out with another wild driver. There was another wreck. This time, two of them died.

"That set me to thinking," Lieutenant Collins says. "These kids would have been alive if we had alerted their parents. It seemed to me that we ought to be able to warn parents in such cases, so that they could take action. The letters program was the result."

Since the program was launched, more than 1,200 letters have been sent out. The police have dealt with all kinds of situations and approached all strata of parents. The letters are usually extremely blunt.

"Dear Mr. and Mrs. Adams," reads a typical letter. "Saturday at 1:15 a.m. your daughter Mary Jane, 17, was contacted by a trooper north of Dover on U.S. Route 13. When brought to our attention she was asleep on the rear seat of a parked car operated by one Joseph Blank, 19. Mr. Blank was asleep in the front seat of the car."

"Dear Mr. and Mrs. Smith," reads another. "Sunday at 11:20 p.m. your son, Billy, 14, was in a car driven by Peter Jackson, 16. Peter was arrested for drag racing and running a red light. Both of these are dangerous practices and not in your son's best interests. Peter has been arrested before."

Sometimes a letter also contains a short lecture. Recently a carful of high school students was stopped after a minor accident. The letter that went to parents of one girl included these statements:

"The events that followed had all the appearance of a mob scene, with a lot of unnecessary shouting, crowding and smart remarks.

MOM WAS ALL SHOOK

"We feel reasonably sure this is not the way you would like your 14-year-old daughter Phyllis to act when abroad. Perhaps by having this brought to your attention you can prevail on her to act the part of a young lady."

How do most parents react when such a letter arrives? To find out, Parade went to the home of Ben Brown, who was stopped with a carload of drag racers.

"Mom was all shook when the letter came," Ben said. "Let's face it. I never would have told her about the race. But when the letter came she made me tell her every detail."

Mrs. Brown talked the matter over with Ben, admonished him, and then turned him over to his father. The two had a man-to-man talk. "I was able to explain that the one thing everyone has to guard against is being pushed into trouble by the 'someone' in every crowd who has a stronger will," Mr. Brown says. "Next time my boy won't be led."

In other homes, there are emotional scences, laying down of the law or the woodshed treatment. And often parents of teenagers "ground" their children, by canceling their car privileges.

HELPFUL OR HIGHHANDED?

Some parents take a dim view of the whole procedure. They deplore the fact that each letter is accompanied by a questionnaire, asking, among other things, "What is your attitude?" (toward the letters) and whether the teenager "admits to participation."

And parents who do not return the questionnaire receive another, sterner letter. They are asked why they did not return the questionnaire and even asked for the name of anyone who advised them not to reply.

Even more important, parents say, is the fact that the letter becomes part of a police file—albeit a confidential one, available only to the courts. Since no legal wrong has been committed, some parents consider this procedure highhanded and possibly even illegal. State police counter by saying that the file is destroyed when the youngster reaches 18.

But parents interviewed by Parade overwhelmingly approved the idea. "It closes a big gap created by the automobile between us and our children," one can said, "Maybe the police shouldn't be doing it—but who else could?"

Some teenagers said they were in favor of police vigilance; others gave approval grudgingly. But one summed up the minority feeling: "If we violate no law, what business is it of anyone's?"

Colonel Ferguson says he "only wants to do a good job," and likens the police-to-parents letters to the old cop-on-the-block. "If he saw a boy heading for trouble," Colonel Ferguson says, "he'd knock on the door and tell his dad. Most parents still want that friendly tip so they can help their kids—but today what boy is on the block? He may be 100 miles away, with new people you don't know and in new situations you can't conceive of. How can you help him?

The State police superintendent is first to admit that the program needs polishing. Already police have agreed to drop the line, "Reference: Helen Jones, W/F, 17," which sounds like something from a criminal record. And they may soften some of the formality, cut down on advice, and try to be a little less icy.

Should your town adopt a police-to-parents program? The way to find out is to talk it over with your police chief, your judges, your school authorities. You might hold a forum on the subject at your PTA. Or send a delegation here to see the Delaware program in action. Colonel Ferguson will be glad to explain it.

Before you decide to set up such a program, Colonel Ferguson says, consult your teenagers, too, and get their thinking. "They're the ones most closely involved," the police superintendent says. "Police-to-parents is for them. It's their future that is at stake."

Courage Needed in Geneva

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Crosby S. Noyes, in yesterday's Washington Evening Star indicates how much better off the free world would have been had President Kennedy put into practice some of the principles in his book, "Profiles in Courage."

WATCHING THE WORLD—GENEVA PARLEY A TRAP FOR THE WEST

(By Crosby S. Noyes, foreign correspondent of the Star)

GENEVA.—The way things are going in the conference on Laos, some people here are beginning to wonder nervously if they will ever see their homes and loved ones again. It seems, in fact, that the representatives of the 14 nations here could between them keep this conference going indefinitely without coming any closer to an agreement which has any practical meaning at all.

What is more likely, perhaps, is that the negotiations will fritter along until there is nothing left to negotiate about. The developments in Laos since the conference began suggest strongly that the West has been drawn into a trap here in Geneva and that the Communist strategy is simply to paralyze any Western action while the takeover of Laos is completed.

Quite evidently the first condition for the conference laid down by the allies has not been met. From a variety of sources it is now admitted that there is no effective cease fire in Laos. On the contrary, the fighting is increasing throughout the country. While the neutral truce commission sits on its hands in Vientiane and complains that it is "powerless" even to investigate the reports of violations.

From the beginning the only real hope that existed for getting a government in Laos that might decently pass as "neutral" lay with the Lao themselves. If the three princes representing the royal Lao Government, the Communist Pathet Lao and the neutralist "Premier" Souvanna Phouma had been able to agree on some kind of formula for a coalition government some agreement might have been possible here.

LITTLE HOPE OF ACCORD

As things stand today, however, the chances of such an agreement seem very small, indeed. Even Cambodia's Prince Norodom Sihanouk, the ardent neutralist who dreamed up this meeting in the first place, now admits failure. The only reason he is staying on in Geneva, he says, is to give the conference a decent burial.

Without an effective cease fire and without an agreement between the Lao leaders there is, in fact, very little the 14 nations here can do about the situation. It would be possible, perhaps, to draft pompous statements about Laos' neutral status along the lines suggested by the French and get it ratified by everyone concerned. But no one could possibly deceive himself about the value of such a declaration as long as the fighting continues, and an agreement on effective control machinery cannot be reached.

On this last question a good many hopeful illusions have been rudely shattered. Some delegations, including the British, came into this conference believing that Russia really wanted a neutral Laos and would agree to a cease-fire commission capable of policing the truce.

From the outset, however, Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko has made it clear that he will agree to nothing of the sort. Indeed, the truce commission which he proposes would be even more powerless than the one in Vientiane today. And the hope being expressed by some neutralist countries that he really doesn't mean it is not shared by the major powers here.

REDS WILL DELAY ACTION

In fact, everything that has been said by the Communists so far leads to the conclusion that they will do everything in their power to prevent a real cease fire in Laos. And since they are in a position to do this indefinitely, the longer the conference lasts the better they will like it.

In these conditions even the last-ditch American hope of a kind of de facto partition of the country also seems very unrealistic. In subversive guerrilla war there are no clear lines drawn between areas held by one side or the other. Control of any given area is largely a matter of which side happens to be physically present at the moment. As long as the Pathet Lao can keep up the pressure on the local civilian population as they are doing today, the prospects of survival of the Royal Lao Government will remain extremely thin.

Which brings the United States back to the point where it was a few months ago, facing a choice between military intervention or an outright Communist takeover in Laos. At this stage, the Geneva Conference hardly provides even a graceful alibi for inaction. And President Kennedy, who wants to impress Premier Khrushchev with American determination to hold its own around the world, would seem to have chosen a singularly difficult moment to make his pitch.

Congress Abdicates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I have long been an advocate of the necessity of having a severe reappraisal made of the trade policies of our Nation. Numerous times I have made statements with respect to our trade posture in the fields of, but not limited to, glass, ceramics, ceramic floor and wall tile, and coal and oil, citing the adverse effect upon these industries and their workers that these trade policies have had.

Recently I testified before the U.S. Tariff Commission in the peril point investigation in the case of window glass and ceramic floor and wall tile. In each instance, I strongly urged the Commission to grant some relief. I am happy to say in both instances, the U.S. Tariff Commission made a recommendation to the President that relief be granted.

I have written a strong letter to the President requesting that he place the recommendation of the U.S. Tariff Commission in the flat glass case and the ceramic tile case into immediate effect and urged that he make specific note that West Virginia's flat glass industry, ceramic tile industry and their respective employees would benefit greatly if the President would accept the recommendation of the Tariff Commission in these instances. I can only say that I am hopeful that the President will act favorably.

It should become all the more obvious to the Members of Congress that it is high time for us to regain control of our tariff policy and to shoulder ourselves the responsibility which is placed upon us by the Constitution of the United States. If we, as the Congress, had control of our trade policies, which is constitutionally ours, I am sure I would not now be in a position of urging the President of the United States to show compassion for these domestic industries that have so long suffered.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Thomas O'Brien Flynn, the outstanding editor of the Wheeling Intelligencer, has on May 23, 1961, written an article in this field, entitled "Abdication." I ask unanimous consent to include this editorial with my remarks and I respectfully urge the Members of the House to give it very careful consideration:

[From the Wheeling Intelligence, May 23, 1961]

ABDICATION—HIGH TIME FOR CONGRESS TO REGAIN TARIFF CONTROL WITH CHECKREIN ON THE PRESIDENT

The Tariff Commission's recommendation that duties on certain glass imports be increased brings the whole pressing issue of foreign trade policy sharply to public and congressional attention.

The issue itself is not new. It is as old as national maturity, representing in its broadest aspect the fundamental clash between the economic philosophies of protection and free trade. It is pressing because the dollar deficit, the decline of exports, the rise of imports, the rapid expansion and improvement of foreign industry once dominated by the United States, the flight of American investment capital to foreign lands, the yawning gulf between American and foreign production costs and the organization of economic blocs in Europe suggest that there is something sorely amiss with our foreign trade relationship.

The cry for relief is going up from industry all over the land. This is an old story with some of our enterprises such as the manufacture of pottery and glassware, to name but two of many. They have been asking, largely in vain, for greater protection from underselling imports for years. As a result of this denial once flourishing factories long since have closed and others have been reduced to part-time operation. For many of these enterprises relief, even if it comes soon, will be too late. But there are new voices heard from. The coal industry not only complains about the inroads of imported residual fuel oil, but asserts that the trade policies of European countries restrict the use of American coal, although it can undersell the home product. The textile industry has been so hard hit that an import quota system and subsidy relief measures are being considered by the President. Even the giant steel industry is finding foreign competition more than it appears capable of coping with.

Which brings us back to the tariff. Under existing law the Tariff Commission is without any authoritative control over rates. All it can do is recommend. The President exercises control. Time after time since the so-called reciprocal trade program was adopted in the early days of the Roosevelt era, the Tariff Commission, following petitions from complaining industries and subsequent hearings, has recommended tariff increases. Almost invariably three Presidents—Roosevelt, Truman and Eisenhower—either disregarded the Commission's recommendations or granted less relief than the Commission proposed. Mr. Kennedy's position has not yet been clarified.

As a means of restoring to Congress the tariff control surrendered in the Trade Agreements Act, a bill was introduced during the last administration which would have given the Tariff Commission rather than the President control over tariff fluctuations within the statutory limits. Instead of recommending to the President that, as in the present case, the duties on cylinder, crown, and sheet glass imports be increased because these now are inflicting "serious injury" on the domestic glass industry, the Commission could have directed that this be done had that bill become law.

The justification for Tariff Commission control of duty revision—the bill here referred to was successfully resisted by the administration and by all supporters of the free trade principle—is that Congress, not the President, should dictate trade policy, and that control can best be exercised under the present setup through a creature of Congress.

This newspaper always has subscribed to the simple trade doctrine of a schedule of import duties designed to equalize selling costs on the American market between domestic products and their imported counterparts. If we must retain the trappings of trade agreements, however, the least we should do in the interest of industrial protection is to give Congressmen and Senators, who are in direct touch with conditions back home, a more direct voice in measuring the degree of protection.

The Future of American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I was very interested in a column written by James Reston of the New York Times for publication on May 20, in which he summed up his own thinking and perhaps that of most Americans, on the question of what direction the President and the administration are going to take in the days and months ahead in our foreign policy.

His discussion of the current situation is quite pertinent at this time, and I believe worthy of serious thought on the part of both the President and the average citizen. I ask unanimous consent that this article by Mr. Reston be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFF THEY GO, TAKING THE WRONG GIANT STEPS

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON.—For the moment everybody in Washington seems to be rushing off in all directions doing precisely what they originally said they wouldn't do.

The President, who said he was determined to decide what he wanted to negotiate before he went on the summit circuit, is now negotiating with the great men before deciding what he wants to negotiate.

The Vice President, who is an expert on domestic policy, is running all over southeast Asia negotiating foreign policy and making promises which Kennedy is probably not going to be able to keep.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk, who came to Washington 3 months ago determined to stay home and run the State Department and be the principal adviser to the President on foreign policy, is now doing neither.

And even the Washington Senators, who were supposed to lose to everybody, have won five in a row, including two from the Yankees.

In due course, all this will settle down; the Senators will descend into the cellar where they belong, and the natural intelligence of the Government will assert itself. But for the time everybody is restless and even a little quarrelsome.

President Kennedy apparently realizes this, and is finally planning to go to the country in an attempt to give a sense of direction and priority to his programs. This will be done before he goes to Paris at the end of the month to see President de Gaulle, and what he decides between now and then will therefore be of considerable importance.

His letter to Alicia Patterson, editor and publisher of Newsday, illustrates the problem. "Each time we make any move or commitment in foreign affairs," he said in that letter, "I am in need of the support of the American people, their understanding, their patience, their willingness to endure setbacks and risks and hardships in order that this country can regain leadership and initiative."

As a generalization, this is all right. But while there is quite a lot of patience in the country, there is very little understanding because on the major question of the Nation's strategy in the cold war, it is not clear what the President is asking.

He is asking for support but not telling what the country is expected to support. Is it being asked to block every move of the Communists into every area right up against and close to the Communist borders? In Laos, in the rest of southeast Asia, and in Iran? Or is it being asked to reconsider the assumptions of the past and defend areas that are more defensible?

Nobody knows the answer to these fundamental questions. Vice President Johnson has been scattering promises generously in Vietnam, the Philippines, and Formosa, but every time he makes another pronouncement, many of his associates in the Government wince, not because they all disagree with the policy of defending southeast Asia, but because they know that no careful decision has been made here about what can and should be done about the defense of these areas close to the Communist borders.

This uncertainty at the top of the Government is now being reflected in the criticism of the press. Because it is widely known or believed here that the administration has not decided on its strategy of what can and what cannot be defended, the press is engaged in a kind of campaign to persuade the Government to do this or do that.

Henry Luce is publicizing the hard line and glorifying intervention as a noble principle. Walter Lippmann is arguing for a reappraisal of past commitments and for detachment from what he regards as untenable entanglements.

Elsewhere, the old cliches and fighting words of past debates are beginning to appear. Thus those who do not think it wise to try to defend everything everywhere are being labeled as appeasers and isolationists and pacifists, while on the other side, those who want to be bold are being condemned as warmongers.

Obviously, there is very little future in such a dialogue. Everybody agrees here on one thing: That the present trend of policy has to be changed. They all agree, too, that any policy involves serious risks, and they are all waiting to see what lead the President will give to cut through the current fog and confusion.

The trouble is that the Government has been speaking before deciding, and promising more than they have to give, and acting without a set of priorities. The next 2 weeks will provide an opportunity to correct this. And what the President decides will be important, for nothing is more dangerous in the alliance at the moment than an ill-considered conference with de Gaulle, and nothing worse in the cold war than an ill-prepared talk with Khrushchev.

Authorizing Appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6874) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction of facilities, and for other purposes.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The question comes up specifically, were there any delays in the NASA programs because of labor trouble, and the answer to that is no, there were not. Mr. Webb stated as of today in a written message both to the chairman and myself as follows:

The above cases represent the only labor situations in which NASA has been presented with serious threats to its national program. These did not cause any slippage or postponements in the NASA Canaveral booster program. The Saturn launch program, for example, is on schedule and, as indicated earlier, the Mercury man-in-space shots were not delayed by labor troubles.

Under those circumstances you would say, How much trouble has there been in various instances? The answer to that by Mr. Webb, Director of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, is this:

While, as is inevitable in new programs such as those involved in the space effort, there have been other work stoppages and misunderstandings, these have been of short duration—a day or so—and we have been able to dispose of them quickly and fairly.

The House should remember this is the civilian space program and that most of our programs of research and development are in various agencies and locations other than under the Air Force, the Army, or the Navy. For example, on page 8 of the report you will find where our chief work is done on research and development: NASA Headquarters in Washington; Langley Center; Ames Center; Lewis Center; Flight Center; Goddard Center; Wallops Station; Marshall Center; western office; AEC–NASA Nuclear Office; Life Science Facility; and Space Task Group.

This is the space program, and it is a pleasure to report to you that it is moving on schedule for civilian purposes.

"A Message From Garcia"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, since he took office in 1957, President Carlos P. Garcia of the Republic of the Philippines has worked to develop an independent foreign policy which would best serve the interests of his country at the crossroads of the Far East.

In this, President Garcia has sought to develop closer relations with his Asian neighbors without in any way weakening traditional Filipino friendship for the United States as his country's "closest ally and friend." He has also guided Philippine policy along lines that would make his country serve as a magnet for drawing together the non-Communist nations of Asia and enhance the cause of economic development in his homeland and among the other Asian countries.

Since communism first appeared on the mainland of Asia, Filipino leaders have recognized it as a deadly enemy and President Garcia has repeatedly warned against its relentless drive for world domination.

I am happy to be able to quote a recent address by President Garcia as part of these remarks:

AN ADDRESS BY CARLOS P. GARCIA, PRESIDENT OF THE PHILIPPINES, BEFORE THE MANILA OVERSEA PRESS CLUB, FEBRUARY 23, 1961

A little over 2 years ago, I broached the idea of bringing about in this region (Southeast Asia) an association of states which, mostly in the cultural and economic sectors, might explore common areas of interest, common problems and perhaps avenues of cooperative action for a common good. Shortly afterward we had the pleasure of welcoming among us the Premier of Malaya, Tengku Abdul Rahman, who likewise saw merit in the concept and became one of its most vigorous advocates.

This month a beginning was made, a limited one to be sure, but one holding great promise. In the agreement between the Governments of Thailand, Malaya, and the Philippines to confer on the mechanics of such regional association is the beginning of the kind of understanding and cooperation so essential to the free world in this time of trial.

Before discussing this development more fully, however, it might be useful to sketch briefly the background against which elements of our foreign policy should be viewed.

First let us examine the current international situation and the nature of the tensions which constitute the crises of our day.

A great scholar and observer of world affairs makes the significant observation that it is inaccurate to speak of the conflict between the free world and communism as a contest of two similar power blocs. He points out that whereas the Communist bloc is a monolithic organism held together by violence and intimidation, such as the Russian tanks in Hungary, the free world bloc is a voluntary association impelled toward pooling its resources in the interests of collective security only by the threatening pressures of the Communist bloc itself. I think it is also useful to define more sharply the nature of the conflict.

It is a matter of Communist doctrine for all to read that the Communist revolution will not, indeed cannot, stop short of an all-Communist world. No Communist of any stature has as yet repudiated this basic doctrine of international communism. In fact, careful study of their most recent literature establishes conclusively that even the concept of peaceful coexistence is seen by top Communists as a temporary lull in armed hostilities during which they may consolidate their gains and prepare for the next violent phase of Communist expansion. The present world crisis therefore derives from the Communist Party's continuing attack, by whatever means possible, on all non-Communist countries, since the continued existence of free societies, of free men, cannot be tolerated within the concept of an all-Communist world. Thus, unless we consider surrender to intimidation, the initiative for ending the cold war and averting a hot war rests with the Communists—and only the Communists.

I think it is also high time that we demolish the distortion heard from some quarters that small nations committed to the free world bloc are merely pawns fighting the war of the United States in a big power contest with the Soviet Union.

The question has been asked in some quarters, for example, why the Philippines, a small nation, has chosen to take an active part in this decisive world struggle. Our reasons in terms of political and religious belief, of morality and justice, already have been adequately stated. For the benefit of those who claim to be practical realists, however, I think it might be wise to add this further "practical and realistic" reason. The free world is fighting for a world community ruled by law, the Communists for a rule imposed by force. As one of the small nations, a world of laws is our sole hope of stature and dignity. Under a world rule of force we can expect nothing better than national extinction and racial absorption.

There is little need to labor the obvious as to why we accept American leadership in this struggle. The American record for supporting freedom for all peoples is ample endorsement of their motivation and intent. In material resource and tenacity no other nation or combination of nations can claim the contribution already made to the fight, or match the strength and potential of America to sustain it. (In this connection, it is interesting to note that while some commentators go so far as to claim Soviet superiority over the United States, Mr. Khrushchev himself promises his people only that they will catch up with the United States in 7 to 10 years.)

To summarize up to this point, we may say that until the Communist bloc decides to abandon the world revolution, international tensions and conflict, regardless of temporary lulls of peaceful coexistence or peaceful competition, will continue. Further, by the Communist's own doctrine, every free society, committed or otherwise, will continue to be a target of whatever weapon is considered appropriate, whether armed aggression, assistance to internal rebellion, economic sabotage, or any of the many forms of subversion. It may also be assumed that America will continue to exercise the leadership and shoulder the major material burden of free world defense, while her allies gain the strength necessary to tip the balance so decisively that the Communists will be discouraged from further pursuing their aggressive expansion.

This brings us to the question of what may now be forecast as to the American posture of free world leadership under a new administration.

From President Kennedy's pronouncements to date, from those of his major appointees, and from the writings of those known to influence the thinking of the new administration, it is possible to derive at least a preliminary assessment. It now appears likely that there will be no alteration of basic policy and fundamental objectives. In executing policy and pursuing these objectives, however, it may be expected that full advantage will be taken of the opportunity afforded by change to secure a broader area of tactical maneuver, greater flexibility and variety in the instruments of policy brought to bear. Although for years the United States, almost alone, has carried the burden of military and economic assistance to the recovering and developing nations of the free world, and today is suffering in some measure from the economic consequences, it appears likely that neither of these programs will be abandoned or drastically reduced. There appears to be some inclination to lean more toward acceleration of economic growth, and it is predictable that because of economic pressures both military and economic foreign aid programs will be more sharply scrutinized and more carefully weighed, so that each dollar of investment in free world strength delivers its maximum yield.

In his inaugural address, President Kennedy said: "My fellow citizens of the world: Ask not what America will do for

you, but what together we can do for the freedom of man."

What can we do together for the freedom of man? What can a small nation such as ours do now?

It seems immediately obvious that maximum acceleration of economic growth and technical development serve not only the individual national interest, but also the objective of strengthening the free world alliance. It is toward this end that we are taking steps toward stimulating both foreign and domestic private investment, expanding and diversifying our pattern of trade and commerce, and developing new credit lines with appropriate nations of the free world.

Another contribution we can make to the free world effort, one wholly compatible with the national interest and aspiration, is in the political sector—not alone in terms of maintaining our own domestic stability but even more in terms of the posture and initiative we take in our regional and global international relationships. For example, the consultative conference held recently in Manila. I believe, established firmly for the information of all concerned the fact that the peoples and governments of this region see the situation in Laos not as a big power contest but as a serious threat to their own peace and security and a manifestation of renewed Communist expansionism.

Aside from the special and significant features of the free world bloc already mentioned, it should not be forgotten that the free world, precisely defined, includes the so-called uncommitted nations which nevertheless are as dedicated to the preservation of their own free societies and individual freedom as ours. With these nations, while we may differ on the measures taken to insure national integrity, we have much in common in terms of other problems and aspirations wherein mutual understanding and cooperation can be mutually beneficial.

For the most part, these common problems are characteristic of the developing new nations: security against external aggressions, internal defense and protection of free institutions, and the acceleration of economic growth and technological development. It is no coincidence certainly that each of these areas is today included in the broadened front of Communist attack. As the arms race reaches a point of stalemate, the political and economic sectors grow in importance, and whatever can be done to increase the strength of these sectors in every free nation, regardless of military commitment, is a net gain in terms of free world security.

This has been the underlying purpose of our determination to broaden the base of our relationship, first with neighboring free societies and later with those geographically more remote. It would be utopian to think that in the free association I have described there could be complete agreement in all matters, but it is a characteristic of a democratic community such as the free world comprises that the individual and the community may seek benefits wherever agreement and cooperation can be achieved.

While on the subject of the small nation—committed, uncommitted or neutral—we might stop to consider a particular phenomenon, of our times—a phenomenon, incidentally, which underscores my earlier emphasis on the fact that it is the small nation that has the greatest stake in realizing a world community accepting the rule of law.

Recently the General Assembly of the United Nations has been augmented by the admission of many new small nations. Small though each may be in resource and limited in experience, each enjoys numerical equality with the oldest and largest in that assembly of nations. The magnitude of the influence these nations acting in concert can wield has been demonstrated and commented upon. Some view the phenomenon with elation, others with concern. We of the Philippines, ourselves a small nation, experience both reactions. We are elated to have this confirmation of our most fundamental foreign policy outlook, but we are concerned that this power of small states, unique in mankind's history, not be lost or destroyed by abuse.

We must never lose sight of the fact that the power exists only by virtue of the organization in which it is exercised, the United Nations. This organization itself will exist only so long as it honestly and impartially reflects the intent of its charter, only so long as each member feels that its decisions and judgments are the result of sober and honest deliberation. The intrusion of petty or sordid motives, of ancient grudges or racial bias, could bring about the destruction of what the world has so painfully tried to restore since the tragic collapse of the League of Nations.

Before concluding, there is one other aspect of this administration's foreign policy I should like to clarify. Our determination to withhold recognition from nations of the Communist bloc has been questioned as being more rigid than that of the United States. "More popish than the Pope"—is one of the flippant criticisms.

In the first place it should be pointed out that the free world alliance by its very nature does not impose rigid conformity of policy upon each of its members. For its own reasons, the United States recognizes the Soviet Union and sits with its representatives in the United Nations. We have avoided such diplomatic relations without impairing our U.N. participation. Should Red China shoot its way into the United Nations, or even negotiate formal relations with the United States, we see no reason why either development need influence our own policy, which is based upon considerations of practical self-interest. In terms of trade, we certainly have not so thoroughly exhausted the markets of the free world as to turn in desperation to those of the Communist bloc. As for diplomatic convenience, we ask "Whose?" All too vivid is the experience of many of our neighbors, warning us of the tremendous burden that would be placed upon our security services should we permit an influx of hordes of spies, propagandists, and professional saboteurs, working from the protection of a diplomatic sanctuary in our very midst.

This then, in summary, is our position. The clash between world communism and free societies is not of our choosing and not subject to our evasion. We believe that the only way to avert war, or win it if it is forced upon us, is by a pooling of all free world strength in every sector, that weakness or disunity can serve only to invite aggression or piecemeal capture. For ourselves we choose active participation. In the case of those of our free world neighbors and friends who choose otherwise we are prepared to respect their freedom of choice, developing our relations with them in any or all of the other constructive categories of democratic activity mutually acceptable.

Contrary to Marxist dogma, we hold that tyranny—not the free society—carries within it the seeds of its own destruction. We believe, too, that the urge toward freedom is one of the strongest instincts, a divine endowment of all living things—including the people of Russia and Communist China. Therefore, the longer the free world can maintain and widen the margin of deterence, the closer we come to peace with justice and freedom for all mankind.

National Highway Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK M. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, National Highway Week, officially proclaimed by President Kennedy for this week, May 21–27, reminds all of us that we are indeed a highway nation.

Because nearly every family owns an automobile, our lives certainly revolve around and are dependent upon its use. Through a highly organized network of highways, our goods move from farm to market, from factory to store, from dairy to doorstep. Wheels carry us to work, worship and play. They carry our children to school.

But wheels must have strips of pavement to roll over. Highways must be economical, fast, safe and efficient as are the high-powered vehicles which roll over them hour after hour, day after day, year after year.

We do not now have that kind of highway, except in fragmentary segments, such as the short completed sections of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways.

National Highway Week calls our attention to the fact that too many of our present highways are obsolete, dangerous and choked with traffic. And, as traffic increases with 114 million vehicles driving 1.2 trillion miles per year by 1976, existing roads become increasingly so.

To improve our highways to a state of adequacy—not only to meet the needs of today but to carry the tremendously increased traffic loads of tomorrow—requires completion of the expanded highway program on schedule.

National Highway Week is a fitting time to bear in mind that better highways save lives, save time and save money.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include a copy of President Kennedy's National Highway Week proclamation:

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 1, 1961.*

NATIONAL HIGHWAY WEEK, 1961—A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Whereas an adequate highway network is indispensable to traffic safety, to the growth of our economy and to the national defense; and

Whereas some 40,000 of our citizens are killed and 1,400,000 are injured every year in highway accidents; and

Whereas the orderly advancement of our expanded Federal-State highway program promises a sharp reduction in our annual waste of human and economic resources due to outmoded highways; and

Whereas the public should be reminded of the importance of completing the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways on schedule in 1972: Now, therefore, I, John F. Kennedy, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim the week of

May 21–27, 1961, as National Highway Week in recognition of the vital role of highway transportation in our way of life.

I also urge the Governors of the States to issue similar proclamations and ask the appropriate officials of the Federal and State Governments, public and private organizations, and the general public to join in observance of this significant occasion.

During this period I encourage all Americans to judge the value of highway transportation to their own activities and to our national welfare.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 29th day of April in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and sixty-one, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and eighty-fifth.

By the President:

JOHN F. KENNEDY.
DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State.

Memorial Day, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the National Tribune, Stars and Stripes:

MEMORIAL DAY, 1961

On Tuesday of next week, May 30, Americans all over the Nation will commemorate Memorial Day. Tribute will be paid not only to those heroes who died to defend and preserve the Nation, but also to those living who fought for the ideals and principles that have made this Nation great.

The idea of honoring our Nation's defenders was first given birth in 1868 when Gen. John A. Logan, then commander in chief of the Grand Army of the Republic, called upon all members of his organization to pay tribute on May 30 of that year to those who had fallen in their heroic defense of the Union. This tradition has carried on to the present day but unfortunately Memorial Day, formerly known as Decoration Day, does not have to our younger generation the significance that it carried in previous years.

Today, we are prone to forget that as individuals we should pause to reflect and pay tribute to those gallant men and women who have offered their lives in defense of this Nation. Too often, perhaps to ease our consciences, we feel that ceremonies of this description are better cared for by patriotic organizations and veteran groups, but it should be pointed out that observances of this character are everybody's business, a personal responsibility not to be delegated or ignored.

There can be no denying that our citizens have become complacent in their expressions of patriotism. There have been those among us who have been cynically critical of our American system of government.

We realize that perhaps our system is not perfect but by and large it is the one form of government in the universe that offers more freedoms to the individual citizen than any other. It has given us the highest standard of living in the world but there has been a relaxation of the burning patriotism which marked the efforts and exploits of our forefathers. We need again to rededicate ourselves to the glory and privilege that is ours, to remember the heritage which has been handed down to us.

So, on Memorial Day let us pause and give sober thought to the sacrifices that have been made by so many in order that we can enjoy those priceless benefits and rights of which we are possessed today.

The opportunity to pay tribute to our honored dead should be a cherished privilege. Let us make use of it.

The Emergency Feed Grain Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MERWIN COAD
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I should like to include a press release from the Department of Agriculture which spells out the great success of the emergency feed grain program which passed this Congress earlier this year:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, May 24, 1961.

SECRETARY FREEMAN SAYS FEED GRAIN SIGNUP IS "OVER THE TOP"

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman said today the emergency feed grain program is over the top.

"The goal the administration sought—which is to adjust production of feed grains by converting 20 percent of the acreage into sound, soil conserving practices—now has been reached," the Secretary said.

"As of last Friday, 20.6 million acres of corn and feed grain land has been signed up by almost a million farmers for soil conserving use, and the program still has nearly 2 weeks to go before it closes.

"I am pleased that the farmers have responded to the program in such a positive manner.

"It is heartening to me that the first piece of major legislation proposed by this administration, enacted by the Congress and put into immediate operation by the Department of Agriculture, has reached its goal in less than 5 months.

"This response is an expression of confidence in the action of the Congress in passage of the emergency legislation, and it fulfills the faith which this administration and the Congress placed in the farmer.

"I believe the signup, in spite of the late start, clearly indicates the support of producers for farm programs which call for farmer participation in the development of procedures by which they can cooperate together in the management of the agricultural enterprise.

"The omnibus farm bill provides farmers with such a means, and I believe the interest shown by farmers in the feed grain program is a measure of their interest in the farm legislation which the Congress is now considering."

The emergency feed grain program, now in its sixth week of operation, will continue through to the end of May. Weekly reports will be made by the Department of Agriculture as of May 26 and June 2.

The fifth weekly report on signup under the program shows 20,664,607 acres signed to be diverted from corn and grain sorghum plantings on 920,529 farms this year. This is slightly more than 20 percent of the U.S. total 1959–60 average corn and grain sorghum plantings of about 102.3 million acres.

Today's report shows an increase of 4,010,551 acres from the 16,654,056 acres diverted under the program as reported last week.

The fifth report shows that 16,775,351 acres of corn have been signed up from the 41,083,532 acres of corn base. This is slightly more than 20 percent of 1959–60 average U.S. plantings of 83,648,000 acres. On farms signed up, the total diversion continues to stay at 41 percent of the base acreage for these farms. To date, almost 50 percent of the average U.S. plantings is on farms signed up under the program.

Grain sorghum diversion is now at 3,889,256 acres, which is almost 21 percent of U.S. total sorghum plantings of 18,674,989 acres for grain. The grain sorghum base of 9,246,632 acres on farms signed is almost 50 percent of the national plantings. The 3.9 million acres is more than 42 percent of the grain sorghum acreage on signed farms.

For all farms signed, possible advance payments under provisions permitting about half of the payments to be made this spring come to about $270,663,611. While the potential total payments under the program are not being determined for these initial reports, Department officials estimate that total payments will probably be more than double the value of the advance payments.

The 1961 feed grain program provides payments to farmers in the form of certificates for diverting corn and grain sorghum acreage to conserving uses. Producers may receive grain or the cash equivalent of grain for their certificates. Diversion of corn and grain sorghum acreage from production this year is expected to achieve a better balance between production and utilization of these grains. Payments to producers will maintain their income this year.

The report shows that certificates covering about $161.4 million worth of grain had been issued to farmers under advance payment provisions. Of the $161.4 million worth of certificates issued through May 19, farmers had received about $135.7 million in cashable sight drafts from county agricultural stabilization and conservation (ASC) offices. In these instances, as provided under the program the Commodity Credit Corporation pays farmers in cashable sight drafts and then later acts as their agent in marketing the quantity of grain covered under the certificates.

Through May 19, farmers had used $131,915 worth of certificates to purchase from CCC 126,630 bushels of corn from quantities that had been under price-support loan. In addition, farmers had purchased 54,437 bushels of CCC-owned corn with $57,184 worth of certificates and 2,670 bushels of CCC-owned barley with $1,922 worth of certificates.

The following tables show sign-up figures by States. The first table shows combined figures for corn and grain sorghum. It shows the number of farms with base acreage, number of farms signed up, the total acreage to be diverted, the advance payments that can be paid this spring, the value of certificates issued, and the value of certificates cashed.

The second table shows figures separately for corn and grain sorghum. It shows the average of 1959–60 planted acreages for corn. For grain sorghum, the preliminary total base acreages are shown. This table also shows the base acreages on farms signed up and the acreage diverted on signed farms.

State	Number of farms with base acreage	Number of farms signed up	Total acreage to be diverted	Advance payments that can be paid this spring	Value of certificates issued	Value of certificates cashed
Alabama	107,993	26,586	406,945	$2,696,553	$2,435,746	$2,360,244
Arizona	2,047	724	34,425	587,175	523,788	412,746
Arkansas	16,621	3,496	46,599	573,278	525,754	497,212
California	5,549	1,575	60,506	988,427	520,569	453,658
Colorado	14,809	4,690	213,740	1,540,012	1,016,940	930,181
Connecticut	198	22	204	2,464	1,447	
Delaware	5,165	1,584	34,331	505,252	406,842	297,860
Florida	15,128	4,370	117,203	1,059,387	1,036,250	1,033,909
Georgia	53,883	9,276	243,743	1,991,644	1,709,026	1,620,475
Idaho	1,592	232	3,704	82,251	56,206	53,915
Illinois	208,448	92,769	2,047,014	35,204,349	11,921,022	9,798,765
Indiana	154,244	49,612	1,064,827	18,790,329	9,214,603	6,941,350
Iowa	195,334	102,138	2,744,078	38,909,810	15,860,149	7,583,952
Kansas	125,200	45,917	1,359,826	12,456,309	6,691,567	5,581,040
Kentucky	93,898	32,893	495,439	6,212,080	4,942,006	4,752,331
Louisiana	19,854	5,318	78,878	861,119	837,773	822,909
Maine	68	3	20			
Maryland	18,364	4,141	78,908	1,180,851	683,635	548,973
Massachusetts	14	4	58			
Michigan	93,093	22,465	412,269	5,163,341	3,749,079	2,950,561
Minnesota	126,074	52,567	1,295,822	17,836,032	15,230,992	13,925,820
Mississippi	80,402	13,429	188,069	1,959,115	1,691,406	1,685,971
Missouri	140,384	73,478	1,867,061	28,188,315	22,800,626	21,396,404
Montana	2,744	754	20,098	111,639	77,832	76,901
Nebraska	109,521	64,991	2,013,088	25,368,387	10,572,733	8,001,009
Nevada	61	7	168	1,531		
New Hampshire	4	2	45			
New Jersey	4,396	1,930	38,599	756,928	221,454	185,793
New Mexico	3,451	1,271	59,429	646,386	429,202	360,936
New York	36,202	12,544	153,191	2,540,838	2,301,623	2,523,188
North Carolina	142,390	42,633	447,672	6,440,397	6,311,069	6,155,596
North Dakota	27,546	11,964	246,210	1,088,068	955,005	829,023
Ohio	149,379	45,671	795,152	14,829,922	5,720,386	3,911,438
Oklahoma	42,924	15,842	366,346	2,190,732	1,839,815	1,740,978
Oregon	2,590	740	11,275	249,161	147,749	146,389
Pennsylvania	79,331	10,414	125,354	2,206,356	2,155,998	2,141,323
Rhode Island	9					
South Carolina	57,622	16,257	193,859	1,896,800	1,557,340	1,527,928
South Dakota	61,455	24,639	741,840	5,698,248	4,960,918	4,096,757
Tennessee	93,290	29,478	386,078	4,180,440	4,094,835	4,010,354
Texas	152,108	45,274	1,553,615	14,371,004	11,274,753	10,303,714
Utah	2,233	317	3,595	38,173	20,351	17,163
Vermont	127	22	236	3,559	1,066	461
Virginia	43,559	15,334	136,628	1,879,824	1,834,371	1,824,507
Washington	2,906	697	13,263	345,841	327,941	316,584
West Virginia	1,450	360	4,238	72,315	28,860	25,822
Wisconsin	119,640	31,790	553,797	8,863,301	4,638,177	3,737,104
Wyoming	1,588	309	7,162	96,178	87,681	84,587
U.S. total	2,614,939	920,529	20,664,607	270,663,611	161,415,175	135,665,831

State	Corn			Grain sorghum		
	1959–60 average planted acreage [1]	Base acreage on signed farms	Acres to be diverted	Preliminary base acreage	Base acreage on signed farms	Acres to be diverted
Alabama	2,212,000	726,900	401,192	34,613	11,890	5,753
Arizona	35,000	1,959	828	158,208	79,451	33,597
Arkansas	390,500	76,318	40,478	33,580	14,189	6,121
California	230,000	46,533	18,944	250,794	100,222	41,562
Colorado	493,000	164,194	71,290	708,704	362,651	142,450
Connecticut	41,000	382	204			
Delaware	161,500	66,087	34,331			
Florida	600,500	265,489	115,814	4,901	1,949	1,389
Georgia	2,788,500	560,475	239,008	36,968	9,244	4,735
Idaho	81,000	6,422	3,677		62	27
Illinois	10,191,500	5,773,198	2,042,024	24,869	11,092	4,990
Indiana	5,292,500	2,251,707	1,061,470	19,100	7,956	3,357
Iowa	12,481,000	8,065,982	2,729,584	66,359	44,267	14,494
Kansas	2,032,000	858,365	374,442	5,473,200	2,473,501	985,384
Kentucky	1,779,000	818,843	488,922	27,029	12,961	6,517
Louisiana	527,500	135,369	75,855	7,430	5,963	3,023
Maine	11,000	30	20			
Maryland	506,000	160,660	78,827	910	113	81
Massachusetts	31,500	80	58			
Michigan	2,224,000	702,540	412,253		16	16
Minnesota	6,822,500	3,691,588	1,295,382		1,356	440
Mississippi	1,344,000	327,113	180,230	17,500	16,901	7,839
Missouri	4,270,000	3,260,577	1,654,399	552,273	430,896	212,662
Montana	142,000	40,854	20,098			
Nebraska	6,851,000	4,692,362	1,423,745	1,809,354	1,432,720	589,343
Nevada	4,500	247	168			
New Hampshire	11,500	46	45			
New Jersey	191,000	68,363	38,599			
New Mexico	47,000	4,721	2,656	326,575	152,498	56,773
New York	656,500	254,876	153,191			
North Carolina	1,978,000	777,398	424,536	85,000	34,250	23,136
North Dakota	1,348,500	665,063	246,062	471	377	148
Ohio	3,889,000	1,481,097	794,984	1,476	332	168
Oklahoma	270,500	64,415	40,432	1,294,000	624,727	325,914
Oregon	67,500	18,710	11,205		124	70
Pennsylvania	1,286,000	195,339	124,873	9,812	733	481
Rhode Island	6,000					
South Carolina	895,500	361,017	188,759	9,500	9,126	5,100
South Dakota	4,283,500	2,044,592	690,256	222,070	106,495	51,584
Tennessee	1,620,000	585,614	371,444	34,500	24,281	14,634
Texas	1,469,500	468,388	209,989	7,463,564	3,268,975	1,343,626
Utah	51,500	4,680	3,369	339	317	226
Vermont	59,500	255	236			
Virginia	806,000	236,385	134,470	7,890	4,261	2,158
Washington	87,000	23,424	12,031		2,389	1,232
West Virginia	148,000	6,554	4,238			
Wisconsin	2,870,500	1,114,095	553,757		99	40
Wyoming	62,000	14,326	6,976		249	186
U.S. total	83,648,000	41,083,532	16,775,351	18,674,989	9,246,632	3,889,256

[1] Planted for all purposes as published in the AMS 1960 annual summary.

Udall's Park Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Des Moines (Iowa) Register, entitled "Udall's Park Program," calls attention to a vital need in the United States today. I agree with the editorial, especially in the recommendation that more parks be developed and that means be explored to finance the development outside of tax revenue. Any plan which would let the users of the parks pay the freight certainly would be in keeping with a principle which most people in this country accept.

I have not always been in agreement with the programs of this administration, but I cite this editorial and my approval of it as evidence that I will support the administration when I think it is right and oppose it when I think it is wrong.

The editorial follows:

UDALL'S PARK PROGRAM

Secretary of Interior Udall's statement that there is an urgent need for the expansion and improvement of national park facilities is not open to serious challenge. The rapidly increasing use being made of these areas today, together with the Nation's growth in population, provide clear evidence in support of it.

More than 50 million people visit the national parks every year. The number doubled in the short space of 5 years during the past decade. As the Interstate Highway System nears completion, cutting down travel time over long distances, the rate of increase in the use of national parks will continue to rise.

The 30 major parks account for most of this sharp increase in public use. The pressure on the more scenic areas, such as Yellowstone, Glacier, and Zion, will continue to be the greatest. But there are others that are growing rapidly in popularity as roads and other facilities are improved.

Four hundred thousand acres of land and two new parks have been added to the park system in the last few years. But even with those additions, Secretary Udall was correct in emphasizing the need for continued expansion.

The problem, as always, is money. Secretary Udall apparently feels that Congress is not inclined to provide more money for parks in the regular appropriation bills. He is searching for other sources of funds. Among his tentative suggestions are special taxes on soft drinks, higher fees for park visitors and levies on manufacturers who produce articles used by park visitors. The latter, we presume, would include tents, trailers, camp stoves, sleeping bags and the like.

Special taxes that are earmarked for a particular purpose are attractive to the departments that get the money because Congress is less likely to take it away once the tax has been authorized. Earmarked taxes, however, have a tendency to remove a portion of the Government's tax income from competition with other Government programs and needs when Congress and the taxpayers try to form judgments as to what is most essential and how much the Nation can afford to spend.

Great as is the need for expanding recreation facilities, the expenditures should still be put to the test of competition with other needs. The earmarking of taxes for parks is not wise.

Secretary Udall should be able to increase park revenues substantially by raising the entrance and service fees paid by park visitors. The possibility of obtaining more funds through higher lease and rental charges on public lands might be worth exploring.

Unused recreation areas could also be added to the present national park facilities and be preserved for future parks if Secretary Udall and the Kennedy administration would make a concentrated effort to get the wilderness bill enacted into law. The proposed wilderness project would cost very little money. The Government owns the land. Construction of highway and tourist facilities would be prohibited. Nature alone would build and preserve these natural parks.

The Honorable Arnold Olsen, of Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, in his most appropriate and extraordinarily informative remarks on Norwegian Independence Day—May 17—the honorable gentleman from Montana paid fitting tribute to the remarkable people of Norway. I would like to congratulate Representative OLSEN for this splendid talk and take this opportunity to thank him for the fine things he said about this gallant, gifted, hard-working, sturdy, and stouthearted people. The honorable Members of this House are always eager to hear of peoples in other lands, living in different climes and under differing types of government, but I hope I am right in saying that we are always delighted to hear about peoples whose deeds we admire, whose accomplishments in many fields of human activity have enriched Western civilization in numerous ways, and whose pioneering experiments in democratic processes of communal and national life have become models for many other countries.

The lot of the Norwegian people has been conditioned by the geography of their beautiful land, and by its invigorating and bracing climate. But these are only the physical factors, and these alone seldom determine and direct a people's destiny. In the case of these venturesome, pioneering, intelligent, and indomitable Norwegians their individualistic and freedom-loving spirit, their social-mindedness, their constant awareness that public welfare and common well-being are for the good of all concerned, these supremely admirable traits have made them what they are. Because of these fine traits, and because of their pioneering work in scientific fields, such as polar explorations, in oceanography and seamanship, and in social-educational endeavors, their great accomplishments bear no relation to their number of a mere 3 million in a world of 2,600 million people. Norwegians can always disprove the mistaken notion that bigness in size and greatness in accomplishments go hand in hand.

I can hardly improve upon what the honorable gentleman from Butte, Mont., said about Norway and the Norwegian people, and of their signal contribution especially in the field of international civil service. Incidentally, during the interwar years on the world's best known and most admired statesmen was Norway's Dr. Nansen, the foremost civil servant in the League of Nations, just as Norway's Trygve Lie was the first Secretary General of the United Nations. In conclusion I would again congratulate this fine, direct descendant of that great and gifted people, Representative OLSEN of Butte, Mont.

To Outlaw Genocide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, in the New York Times of Sunday, May 21, 1961, appeared a letter from Will Maslow, executive director of the American Jewish Congress, deploring our failure to join 64 ratifying nations to outlaw genocide. In view of the recent events in Israel the attention of the world has been called to the nature of such activities, and I believe Mr. Maslow's letter, which is included below, will be of interest to all Members of Congress:

TO OUTLAW GENOCIDE—OUR FAILURE TO JOIN 64 RATIFYING NATIONS DEPLORED

(The writer of the following letter is executive director of the American Jewish Congress.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The disclosures of the Eichmann trial have again directed mankind's attention to the rudimentary condition of international law and the lack of effective international means for preventing and punishing even such crimes as mass murder.

As Americans we must accept a special responsibility for this lack. Following our country's energetic advocacy of a Genocide Convention when it was first considered by the United Nations, today—almost 13 years after the unanimous adoption of the convention by the General Assembly—we have not yet joined the 64 nations that have ratified the agreement.

This aloofness is incompatible with our country's traditional championship of international morality.

President Theodore Roosevelt rebuked the Rumanian Government's religious massacres and instructed his Secretary of State to declare that "this country cannot be a silent party to an international wrong."

President Taft denounced an American trade agreement with the Czar because of pogroms against Russian Jews. President Wilson instructed his Ambassador in Turkey to intervene on behalf of persecuted Armenians. President Truman gave leadership following World War II in helping convene the historic Nuremberg Tribunal, whose judgment for the first time formally made genocide criminally culpable.

COURT RULING ON TREATIES

Repeated decisions by the U.S. Supreme Court make it plain that there is no merit to the spurious claim that such treaties as the Genocide Convention could possibly endanger constitutional rights. Ever since the decision in *Geofroy* v. *Riggs* in 1889 it has been well-established that no treaty may invade or impair constitutional liberties.

In the words of the Court, no treaty may "authorize what the Constitution forbids, or [work] a change in the character of the Government or in that of one of the States."

The Genocide Convention is today the most widely ratified United Nations agreement with the exception of the U.N. Charter itself. Among the 64 countries that have signed it is the Soviet Union. By contrast, our failure thus far to become a signatory to the treaty has exposed the United States to allegations of insincerity, has embarrassed our friends abroad who look to us for affirmative leadership, and has seriously damaged the convention's effectiveness as an international instrument.

In June 1949, President Truman submitted the Genocide Convention to the Senate, accompanied by an enthusiastic endorsement. Shortly thereafter, Dean Rusk, speaking for the Department of State, appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee urging ratification of the Genocide Convention.

On April 12, 1950, following extensive public hearings, a special subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee recommended ratification. Yet more than 10 years later the Genocide Convention, still languishes in committee without recommendation.

Ratification of the Genocide Convention during the current session of the Senate would stand as a singularly appropriate and forceful response to the Eichmann trial.

WILL MASLOW.

NEW YORK, *May 16, 1961.*

Authorizing Appropriations for Aircraft, Missiles, and Naval Vessels

SPEECH
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 1852) to authorize appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment has been well debated and it is not my intention to prolong the debate except to emphasize several points which have previously been made.

First, the question has been raised as to why these naval officers who have recommended a program of 45 were not able to convince the previous administration. The answer is simply because of the fact that the *George Washington,* our first operational Polaris submarine, did not go to sea until November 15. Second, this is the first time that the Congress has been able to make a decision on this program with an operational submarine in being, and to benefit from the information that we have gained from its operation.

Secretary Gates, in the Appropriations Committee hearings last year said that if the *George Washington* trials were successful he would—I quote—"have no hesitancy whatsoever" in accelerating the program.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a partisan matter, and the present occupant of the well of the House has never considered it as such. I am not attempting to saddle Secretary McNamara with the decision of his predecessors, nor would this amendment so saddle him. He admits that he is currently studying the ultimate objectives of the Polaris program. This is right, this is proper.

But if he should decide to continue beyond No. 29—and by his own words, this is a possibility—should we by the terms of S. 1852, build in an automatic and an inevitable disruption of the orderly program schedule which we will achieve under the Kennedy acceleration of one submarine per month?

We do not obligate the Secretary to build these submarines. We do not obligate the Appropriations Committee to approve their findings. We only make it possible.

Remember that we have a new law. We have 412(b). Under the terms of that law we cannot, by Chairman VINSON's own words appearing in the hearings, authorize long leadtime items unless you have the ship authorization, because "the ship is the basis of the appropriation."

All we are asking for is an insurance policy so that if Secretary McNamara, in his wisdom, decides to go ahead beyond No. 29, we will not force him to lose time which can never be regained. The Polaris system is our only present operational deterrent system, with the exception of the Atlas. Should we now when we have this in being, when we can keep it coming into our inventory, build in a 1-year delivery gap? I say we should not. We do not obligate the Congress to vote a single dime, nor do we obligate the administration to ask for it.

On that basis, Mr. Chairman, I request support for my amendment.

The People Are Entitled To Know Where the Administration Is Going

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, before it is too late the American people deserve a straight-from-the-shoulder statement, without qualification, from the President, setting forth the direction in which his administration is going. He has taken such a zig zag path from the promises of the campaign and the noble statements made in his inaugural address, that we, and the world are completely confused. Did we or did we not set up the invasion attempt in Cuba? Who was to blame for the fiasco? Are we preparing to appease the Communists in Asia, at Geneva, or in the forthcoming meeting with Khrushchev? The extent of the confusion in the minds of Americans everywhere is shown in the short paragraphs taken from this week's edition of the U.S. News & World Report which follow:

Fidel Castro, while turning back an invasion attempt, lost at least 2,000 troops killed before getting the upper hand against an invasion force of 1,400. The overthrow attempt would have succeeded if air support promised by United States had not been withdrawn near the last moment.

At least five departments or agencies of the U.S. Government were in on the venture into Cuba, including the White House. Stories deliberately fed out to center blame on the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff were an effort to clear skirts in other directions. Military chiefs then were ordered not to talk.

So-called intellectuals are urging President Kennedy to seek "stabilization" in the world by making a deal—involving concessions—to placate or appease the Communists whenever they become aggressive. Military leaders are telling the President that this is a sure way to get the United States backed into a corner.

Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, got nowhere with President Kennedy with his argument that it is unwise to meet with Khrushchev without first having much preliminary groundwork done and an assurance that something will come of the meeting.

With Russia Adding to the World Oil Surplus U.S. Fuel Markets Must Be Afforded Greater Protection Against Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on May 24 the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] raised a highly explosive question in calling attention to Russia's frontal attack on the world's fuel markets through price-cutting barter, threats, and other devices. It is a question with which we must come to grips as quickly as possible. It must be settled at the diplomatic level, because the Red campaign cannot be countered with improved salesmanship on the part of the free world's oil producers. No amount of improved automation will do the job. And no matter how low competitive prices might go, the Kremlin can always underbid because in a slave state any commodity can be priced according to the exclusive wishes of the tyrants at the helm.

The statement made before the Department of Interior by Stephen F. Dunn, president of the National Coal Association, last February and his address in Chicago last week should be studied carefully by every Member of Congress. I also call your attention to

two documents that have been published within the past 10 days. One is "Soviet Oil in the Cold War," a study prepared by the Library of Congress at the request of a Senate Judiciary subcommittee. The other, "The Soviet 7-Year Plan, 1959–65 for Oil," produced by the U.S. Bureau of Mines, contains additional information that would serve to substantiate Mr. Dunn's warnings.

For the past 10 years I have insisted that Congress reclaim some of the authority on matters of international commerce that it has in the past relinquished to the Department of State. I have watched our domestic oil and coal industries decline in structural strength as a consequence of the surging tides of residual oil emanating in Venezuela and the Dutch West Indies.

There is no ground for controversy on the necessity of maintaining strong domestic fuel industries. Both parties have taken notice of the vital role which American producers must assume in a war emergency. The oil imports control program was established by the Republican administration as a security measure. It has been continued by the present administration without philosophical revision, although the levels of imports have been raised so high as to virtually destroy the effectiveness of the whole program. Nevertheless, acceptance of this concept—of having to protect our domestic fuel industries in the interest of national security—at least gives us a start. The White House acknowledges the importance of domestic producers. Congress concurs in the appraisal. The job before us is to determine to what extent residual oil quotas need to be reduced, and then reduce them without equivocation.

The Russian oil threat may have one wholesome effect: of goading the U.S. Government into adopting precautionary measures against a potentially fatal fuel gap among the free nations. If our alliances with non-Communist nations are to have any lasting value, it is folly to sit by and watch them stake their future on Russian oil. The Kremlin is in effect loading both barrels, then giving shotguns to our friends to play Russian roulette with national security.

To permit Red oil to crowd out the products of free nations is as suicidal as to bank domestic steel mills in order to purchase the output of plants in the Donets Basin or in Manchuria. In an emergency, Khrushchev would merely order shipments stopped. When producing oil wells in the United States, the Middle East, and Venezuela are capped and tankers put into mothball fleets, Moscow will hold the key to complete confusion and chaos.

I commend to your consideration this quotation from "Soviet Oil in the Cold War," which has been printed for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary:

> In the course of the year 1960, Soviet production actually surpassed that of Venezuela and made further inroads on the more slowly growing rate of oil production in the United States.

Here is another excerpt:

> The dependence of any member of the NATO alliance on Russian oil in a substantial measure inevitably has a significant bearing on its position relative to the security of the Western World. With Italy becoming increasingly bound up in Soviet oil schemes, the question is bound to arise as to its probable behavior in the event of a serious crisis in the cold war.

Italy is not our only concern. The Russian oil is moving in increasingly greater volumes into other European countries, South America, Africa, and the non-Communist nations of Asia.

The Bureau of Mines report on Russia's 7-year plan states:

> Growing Russian oil exports have contributed to the world oversupply of petroleum, have forced prices down, and have taken sales from Western oil producers.

An additional consequence of the new Soviet-free world trade manipulations is that Dutch-Anglo-American oil producers and distributors in the Middle East and Venezuela must look elsewhere for market outlets. Unless adequate royalties continue to be collected by the kings, shahs, dictators, and juntas in producing lands, leases are jeopardized. For too long the fuel markets of the United States have been the dumping grounds for world surplus oil. As the Soviet menace—with distending pipelines and bulging supertankers now under construction—continues to grow, progressively more cargoes of foreign oil will be carted into our ports and offered at distress prices. Russia is capable of underbidding on oil contracts around the world; that much is clear. Until other non-Communist countries rise in patriotic resentment against Red proffers, the United States may be the sole holdout against Soviet shipments—or at least I assume that any attempt on the part of Russia to ship oil onto our shores will be rejected forthwith. For this reason our own markets will appear increasingly attractive to shippers whose Middle East and South America production is crowded out elsewhere in the world.

Congress must be ready to defend America's domestic oil and coal industries against the new threat. Meanwhile the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization has begun an inquiry to determine whether the present residual oil import control program meets national security objectives. I am confident that a close study will disclose the program's weaknesses. I hope that the OCDM will recommend without hesitation that the level of imports should be lowered sharply in defense of our domestic fuel industries.

While the OCDM investigation is taking place, Congress and the State Department should concern themselves with Russia's oil offense and take every precaution, in liaison with our allies, to cope with it before it gets entirely out of control.

The Problems of Credit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. CANNON
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, much interest has been generated by a recently published book, "Buy Now, Pay Later." It deals with the problems of credit and is authored by Hillel Black.

An introduction has been written by our colleague, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] whose work on legislation calling for truth in lending is well known to the Senate of the United States and to the country.

There appeared in the May 21 edition of the Washington Post and Times-Herald an excellent review by Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE which contains a summary of "Buy Now, Pay Later." The junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] has succeeded in his review in capsulizing the importance and significant study by the author and presents an excellent case, in my judgment, in support of legislation which would require that consumers be informed of the true annual interest charge and hidden costs of their purchases.

I ask unanimous consent to have this review printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE DOLLAR DOWN—AND DOWN
(Reviewed by WILLIAM PROXMIRE)

If you are buying your home, your car, your refrigerator, have a credit card or a credit account, this book is going to shock you. It will also save you money.

By far the most dramatic economic change for the American family in the past 15 years has been its increase in debt. Since 1946, the average American family has increased its time buying (consumer credit) from $193 to $1,000. Mortgage debt has soared from $724 to more than $3,700.

This means that the typical American family today owes almost $5,000, a huge 413-percent climb in 15 years. While our family income fell short of doubling, our debt has increased an enormous fivefold.

Americans this year must work 2 months out of 12 to reimburse their creditors. Four times as many families will go bankrupt this year as 10 years ago.

In a colorful, brisk style, Hillel Black describes in "Buy Now, Pay Later" how with charge accounts, credit cards, revolving credit, instant money checking service, teenage credit accounts, Americans have speeded up this dizzying go-in-debt habit.

Black is no foe of debt. He agrees that widespread use of credit has raised our standard of living and provided more comforts and more jobs. His thesis is "that the American consumer who buys on credit is often being abused and deceived and in some instances outrageously swindled." The author abundantly and entertainingly documents this thesis. A few of his revelations:

One third of college-educated persons estimate the cost of installment credit at 6 percent. Usually it is three times that high.

Federal Reserve Chairman William McChesney Martin, perhaps the most expert man in finance in the United States, confessed to a Senate committee that he was badly confused in computing actual annual interest by present retail credit practices.

Purchases through department store or mail order installment credit require true annual interest charges ranging from 18 to 40 percent.

Borrowing from small loan companies often costs as high as 36 percent true annual interest.

True annual interest at a typical high-pressure furniture store is 60 percent.

Credit life insurance charges for identical benefits vary as much as 400 percent, depending on where you borrow. In many cases, consumers are not even told that they are sold credit life, although it is loaded into the "pack" of finance charges they have to pay.

The president of the Better Business Bureau of Greater St. Louis charges that some auto dealers hike finance charges depending on the gullibility of the customer. The finance company receives the standard payment. But the dealer has a hunting license to squeeze whatever he can out of the gullible buyer. In the past few years finance charges have jumped the fastest of all auto costs; generally, they have quadrupled.

Selling credit has become so profitable to merchants that this attitude expressed by a New Jersey car dealer is not unusual: "Cash? Let me tell you something. You couldn't buy one of our cars if you wanted to. Every car we have here is sold on time."

In a far cry from America's pioneer devotion to thrift, the go-in-debt spirit is actually promoted for teenage children in some areas through schools and PTA's. In one such area, the youngsters join a teenage credit plan and receive a charge card with the credit limit set at $25. The limit is gradually pushed up to $50 in easy stages.

This book is a telling brief for the passage by Congress this year of the Douglas truth in lending bill, which would require that consumers be told the true annual interest charge.

President Garcia's Great Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I have read the recent insertion of my able and distinguished friend and colleague, Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL, of a timely and admirable speech of the great President of the Philippines, His Excellency, Carlos P. Garcia.

I was very much impressed with this forceful address and desire to compliment President Garcia for his brilliant analysis of the world situation and his stirring appeal to the free world to join to preserve its heritage against world communism.

The great historic nation which President Garcia so ably leads and its courageous, liberty-loving people are honored and cherished by the entire American people. Our Nation is especially proud of the glorious history of the Philippines, and of the close association and loyal friendship which has continued for many years to subsist between us.

We are also proud to stand by the side of the Filipino people and their leaders and to work with them in the fateful struggle to sustain the precious values of freedom and the integrity and security of free nations in a dangerous world threatened by Communist infiltration, aggression and violence.

The message from Garcia is not only a strong statement of the aims of the free world but a great state paper and an inspiring message to the American people and all those interested in human freedom.

News Comments on TV Programing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, at a recent meeting of television broadcasters Newton Minow, newly appointed Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, delivered a courageous and thoughtful speech on the quality of television programing and the responsibility of both the broadcasters and the Commission in improving it.

It is indeed refreshing to hear the problems of television again discussed in terms of the public interest. I have been most encouraged by the perceptive and favorable comment which has appeared in the Nation's press since Mr. Minow's statement. I offer for inclusion in the RECORD some representative samples of this comment; a column by John Crosby from the New York Herald Tribune, an editorial from the New York Times, an editorial from Life magazine, on editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, and two articles by Jack Gould from the New York Times.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOUGH TALK OF GLARING TRUTHS
(By John Crosby)

Newton N. Minow, the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, has done the unforgiveable thing for a man in his position; he has watched television. Already, the wiseacres on Madison Avenue are spreading the word that the man's an amateur in broadcasting. If he were a professional, he'd go yachting with the broadcasters whose affairs he regulates (as did one of his predecessors), or drink with them and be rewarded with a fat legal job after his tenure of office is over.

Minow's tough talk to the broadcasters, probably the toughest speech ever made by an FCC Chairman in office, will be followed—you mark my words—by a fog of propaganda from the broadcasters which will follow these lines: First, it is un-American for the Chairman of a regulatory Commission to regulate; second, it is a violation of the first amendment for the Chairman of the FCC to look at television (none of the others ever did) or to harbor opinions about it; third (this has been the battle cry against the critics the last couple of years), the Chairman doesn't understand the economics of broadcasting. (The broadcasting industry earns a mere $1,100 million a year, with a mere $222 million profit, and how can you expect anything good for that kind of money?)

Trying to put good programing into effect is considered censorship, and maintaining the general level of mediocrity is freedom of the press. That's the way those broadcasting people argue.

The charges Minow made against TV programing—"a procession of game shows, violence, audience participation shows, formula comedies about totally unbelievable families, blood and thunder, mayhem, violence, sadism, murder, Western bad men, Western good men, private eyes, gangsters, more violence and cartoons, and endless commercials"—have all been made before by TV critics, by various other editorial writers and just plain people.

But this blast is different because it comes from the head of the FCC, a man usually seduced or intimidated or both by the lobbyists and propagandists of the broadcasting industry. There was the clear threat that if the broadcasters didn't do something about cleaning their houses, licenses would not be renewed. Well, I've heard that before and nothing has ever happened. We shall just have to wait and see.

While everything Mr. Minow said was not only true but glaringly obvious, the remedies are not so simple, so long as the business is run the way it is. I mean personal sponsorship of particular programs. If I were a manufacturer of toothpaste which sponsored a television program, I'm afraid I, too, would go along with the mob and sponsor a private eye or a situationer (as they call them) or some other popular program. It's asking too much of the toothpaste manufacturers to sponsor an unpopular program, although many of them do just that—more's the wonder of it.

It's the system that's wrong. No single sponsor should have the ownership or responsibility of any single program. And I'm willing to venture the prediction that no amount of railing from either critics or FCC Chairmen is going to change the dismal picture of TV programing. No cigarette sponsor is going to give a tinker's damn about what other programs are on the air, only his own.

The solution, I'm convinced, is the British system with the insertion of ads, as in magazines. The station or network can then take its total revenue and bring about some semblance of unity and sanity in its total programing.

"The squandering of our airwaves is no less important than the lavish waste of any precious natural resource," Mr. Minow said. I'm pleased he put it like that; waste is the proper word for it. Television is a national treasure and it should be used for something besides the waste of time. It should not be used as a soporific, draining the national energy and blanking the national imagination.

Newton Minow is a courageous man to state these glaring truths. Now let us see how the broadcasters plan to grapple with them and the man who uttered them. As for the threat not to renew a license just because the licensee asks for it in perpetuity, we should all live so long as to see a single license revoked.

TV'S COUNTERASSAULT

The counterassault on Newton N. Minow, new Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, has begun.

Because of his forthright indictment of much of television as a wasteland, lobbyists of the broadcasting industry are now determined to thwart the long-overdue reorganization of his agency's operating procedure. Their objective is deplorable. The conse-

quences of an FCC hamstrung by delay and redtape have been painfully evident in constant scandals and flagrant cynicism toward enlightened trusteeship of the airwave.

The broadcasters appear to have found support from some Democrats in Congress who claim to be piqued over the reorganization method chosen by the Kennedy administration. The plan for revising the FCC becomes automatically effective late next month unless either House of Congress disapproves. There is nothing new about this method; it has been followed in other reorganization plans many times before; but some Members of Congress are now demanding specific legislation. If the previous fate of substantive legislation affecting the FCC is a criterion, the commission would continue to languish in the status quo that the broadcasters have found so comfortable.

Neither hunger for revenge nor political pique are sufficient reasons to sacrifice the public's stake in a competent FCC. The spectacle of seven members of the Commission solemnly voting more than 100 times in a single day on different matters, many of them minor, is not to be condoned. The reorganization plan would enable the chairman to reassign the workload within the Commission, relegate specific problems to smaller panels, and relieve the full Commission of much routine.

Extracting order out of chaos cannot be accomplished without putting someone in charge of the job. Mr. Minow, who, incidentally, would on important matters still be subject to the restraining vote of his colleagues on the Commission, has shown the energy and fearlessness that are required. That clearly explains the industry's opposition to the reorganization proposal.

[From Life, May 9, 1961]

WHAT'S WRONG WITH TV

The general mediocrity of U.S. television—which a youngster aptly called "chewing gum for the eyes"—last week brought it a stern admonition from within and a threat of punishment from without.

THE ADMONITION

LeRoy Collins, the National Association of Broadcasters' own new president (and ex-Governor of Florida) warned the industry it will deserve "the governmental controls we want to avoid" unless it corrects old abuses and prevents new ones. He urged the three networks to devote more prime evening hours—on a pooled, equal-share basis—to high quality, "blue ribbon" programing, urged broadcasters themselves to take editorial positions like the press: "Your voice must be great as well as strong—so great that beyond soothing people it will stir them; beyond entertaining people it will challenge them; beyond praising right it will damn the wrong."

THE THREAT

Hard-hitting Newton N. Minow, 35, the New Frontier's new chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, put broadcasters on notice that station licenses—which the Government controls for "the public interest, convenience and necessity" because their number is limited—hereafter will not be automatically renewed. Instead, "performance" will be judged against "promises." He left no doubt what he thought of present performance: "A vast wasteland" of "game shows, violence, audience participation shows, formula comedies about totally unbelievable families, blood and thunder, mayhem, violence, sadism, murder, and most of all, boredom."

Is TV really all that bad? Actually, the two top networks, NBC and CBS, have been trying to produce more "blue ribbon" programs (Minow himself praised "CBS Reports" and NBC's "Project 20"). But all too frequently the local outlets pass up these shows to run old movies or "package" serials, complete with ads, which provide them bigger revenue. Minow warned he is going to run checks on the programing of individual stations, particularly as to how much time they devote to the public affairs of their own communities.

A sort of Gresham's law also operates to drive good programs out by bad. The worst offender in network "wasteland" programing, American Broadcasting Co., which devotes about half its prime evening hours to adventure shows or gangster bloodbaths like "The Untouchables," has been taking both sponsors, viewers and outlets away from its rivals. If the public taste is so shoddy, and sponsors so servile to it, how can better quality emerge out of such ruthless and irresponsible competition?

One answer is to make competition itself much broader, with so many different types of programs that there will be room for everything—Hamlet as well as Eliot Ness, opera as well as Ed Sullivan. One approach to this happy condition might be to increase the number of TV stations. Most are now in the very high frequency band of 12 channels (2 through 13). The ultra high frequency range could add 70 more channels (14 through 83). This could provide many new outlets—for everything from nonprofit cultural stations, like the famed ones in Boston and San Francisco, to pay TV and classrooms of the air. There is ample proof that large potential audiences exist for serious things; last year when NBC put on a course in chemistry, an estimated 500,000 people rose at dawn each morning to see it. As for pay TV and its promise of better quality, the broadcasters are trying to stop it (experiments are now going forward in Hartford and Toronto) but Chairman Minow promised: "We are going to protect [the infant] from those who would strangle it in its crib." Something else could stimulate commercial stations to better efforts. The U.S. public itself could have its own channel, run like the BBC by public trustees of highest caliber, and paid for by rentals charged the commercial stations for use of the public's airwaves.

For the present, programing may show some improvement as a result of Chairman Minow's warning, even if no station actually loses its license. Minow purposely declined to set any bureaucratic standards to measure performance: "Why should you want to know how close you can come to the edge of the cliff?" His deliberate vagueness should make broadcasters uncertain and uneasy enough to stave off investigation and possible Government control by reforming on their own.

[From the St. Louis Post Dispatch, May 14, 1961]

PAUSE FOR PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENT

Newton N. Minow, the new Federal Communications Commission Chairman, has told broadcasters to their faces that television programing is a "vast wasteland." The National Association of Broadcasters has not heard such language from an FCC Chief since 1942 when James Lawrence Fly, a New Deal curmudgeon, told members in St. Louis that their attitude "reminds me of a dead mackerel in the moonlight—it both shines and stinks."

Yet Mr. Minow's devastating analysis of TV programs is less significant than what he proposes to do about them. First, he will expect stations to justify their performances in terms of what they promised in public service programing when they sought Federal licenses. Second, he intends to hold hearings in the stations' own communities.

Like Mr. Fly so long ago, Mr. Minow faces some thoughtless outcries of "Government intervention." We say such outcries are thoughtless because broadcasters ought to welcome more definite regulatory standards in place of the chaotic conditions of the past. A station which tries to put informational or cultural programs in the midst of horse operas ought to have some assurance that its competitors face similar obligations.

The new FCC Chairman refuses to accept the nonsensical notion that his agency can protect the public interest without considering programing. The FCC's job is not to censor bad programs but to encourage better ones. While Mr. Minow's policy may seem revolutionary to some broadcasters, it is a plain duty to the public.

[From the New York Times]

TV: WITHERING CRITIQUE—MINOW'S CONDEMNATION OF IMBALANCE IN PROGRAMING STUNS MANY BROADCASTERS

(By Jack Gould)

WASHINGTON, May 9.—The speech by Newton N. Minow, the new Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, marks a historic change in the fundamental concept of the regulation of broadcasting.

First, his critique of TV—certainly the most withering, complete and searching ever to emanate from a head of the regulatory agency—casts aside what always has been a ridiculous notion: That somehow the public interest, convenience, or necessity could be protected without ever really taking into account the industry's end products: Its programing.

Second, the youthful and energetic chairman has made it abundantly clear that he expects TV to acquire a purposefulness and determination to lead public taste and awareness, that the hoary rationalization of merely doing what's most popular is incompatible with the deeper urgencies of 1961.

In his address to the membership of the National Association of Broadcasters, Mr. Minow went further than any of his predecessors since broadcasting's earliest days in analyzing the programing content of the medium. He cited specific TV shows that he felt deserved praise and then embarked on a sweeping condemnation of the lack of balance in staple fare.

The scope of his remarks and his blunt directness stunned many of the broadcasters; the traditional hue and cry over governmental interference in the freedom of the home screen began to be heard almost immediately.

But when the dust settles and his remarks are more calmly analyzed, his strategy should prove a boon to all broadcasting. Because his intent is not to intrude in programing as such but to use the powers of the FCC long in existence but never vigorously applied, to put a flooring under the house of broadcasting.

In actual practice, the regulation of TV has been chaotic because it has been nonexistent. Mr. Minow is entirely accurate when he said licenses traditionally had been renewed automatically; those broadcasters hopeful of aspiring to better standards were at the competitive mercy of those who played the game selfishly. There was no day of judgment for the willful laggard.

Take for example Mr. Minow's heartening concern for child viewers. In the earlier days of TV there were some constructive efforts along these lines; but invariably a rival station or network would counter a worthwhile program with a western or the "Three Stooges."

Though he was being depicted in some quarters here tonight as a villainous novice in broadcasting, Mr. Minow may prove the best friend that television has had. The eroding consequences of the material successes of TV have gone on much too long; free enterprise in business was being hurt the most.

In addition to his welcome concern for giving practical implementation to his progressive concept of what TV could and

should be, the vividness of his words will be heady wine for discriminating set owners. At long last there is a man in Washington who proposes to champion the interests of the public in TV matters and is not timid about ruffling the industry's most august feathers.

Tonight some broadcasters were trying to find dark explanations for Mr. Minow's attitude. In this matter the viewer possibly can be a little helpful; Mr. Minow has been watching television.

On the other hand, if all stations realized that they had to incorporate something more stimulating and substantial for the young viewer, the obligation would be shared and the sacrifice equal.

One of the critical observations in Mr. Minow's speech was his mention of the acceptance of network public-service offerings by affiliated stations.

New York City viewers are very fortunate in this regard; they see all these programs. But in many sections of the country such presentations have not been carried and routine mediocrity substituted for financial gain. Merely by announcing that this problem would be a subject of inquiry, Mr. Minow already may have greatly strengthened public-service TV on a national basis.

What Mr. Minow is really hoping to do is to fill a need that the thoughtful leaders in broadcasting and advertising privately acknowledge does exist but so far have been relatively powerless to correct. It is the establishment of some ground rules that the broadcaster will be emboldened to enforce because he has the assurance that his rivals will be similarly obligated.

Put another way, Mr. Minow's goal could be described as the hope of rearranging the competitive environment so that the pursuit of quality and diversity will become economically feasible.

The Ambitions of Nikita Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WM. J. RANDALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, in the March 15 issue of Bank News, a publication published in Kansas City, Mo., and distributed to all the banks of the Southwest there appeared an article written by the Honorable Henry A. Bundschu, a veteran Kansas City attorney and retired former referee in bankruptcy for the western district of Missouri. Judge Bundschu has long been a careful observer of international affairs and while he is known among the banking fraternity of the Southwest, he has also authored numerous articles on subjects of historic interest.

It has been our pleasure to know Judge Bundschu almost our entire lifetime and we regard him as a friend as well as one of our best informed constituents. The following article entitled, "The Ambitions of Nikita Khrushchev", we commend to everyone as necessary reading. In view of world events in the Congo, Cuba, Laos, and all of southeast Asia the article should be particularly helpful as an aid to the interpretation of things to be said and done by Mr. Khrushchev at Vienna.

THE AMBITIONS OF NIKITA KHRUSHCHEV

(By Henry A. Bundschu)

There is an old Chinese proverb that says: "A house established by oppression cannot enjoy it long." I hope that this is true, for as said by Bret Harte's Truthful Jane:

"Which I wish to remark
And my language is plain
That for ways that are dark
And for tricks that are vain,
The heathen Chinese is peculiar."

Nikita Khrushchev was born in the year 1894 in Kalinooka, a Ukrainian village, the son of a blacksmith and coal miner. As a youth he worked as a shepherd boy, and learned the trades of blacksmith and locksmith, but he received very little schooling. He is now 67 years old and fully realizes that he has but a few years left to accomplish his objectives.

As Patrick Henry wisely said, "I know no way of judging the future except by the past," so let us take a look at the history of this despicable character to see what light it might throw upon his diabolical intentions.

In 1931, after having been an active Communist since 1918, Khrushchev became a party official in Moscow and started his rapid climb to the top of the Communist hierarchy. He was very active in Stalin's "big purge" of 1936–38, which killed thousands of people and sent millions to slave-labor camps. In 1938, Stalin sent him to the Ukraine to direct a purge of party officials. In 1943 German troops, who had invaded the Ukraine, dug into an area which had been used by Soviet secret police. They found 95 mass graves containing nearly 10,000 corpses whose hands were bound and who had bullet holes in the backs of their necks. From objects found on the bodies, they were identified as victims of the bloody purge that had been carried on in the Ukraine in the years 1937 to 1939. These victims included peasants, workers and priests, as well as party officials. Masses of Ukrainians were deported to Siberia. Keep in mind that Nikita Khrushchev had been sent to the Ukraine by Stalin to direct that purge.

In 1944, as Stalin's personal dictator over the Ukraine, Khrushchev directed another bloody purge. Ukrainians describe this postwar purge as being worse than the one which preceded the war. They claim that 3 million Ukrainians were killed, imprisoned, or deported to slave labor camps. By some Ukrainian estimates, 400,000 people were killed in a single year of Khrushchev's prewar purges.

ONLY NO. 5 IN 1958

When Stalin died in 1958, Khrushchev was only No. 5 man in the party hierarchy. The No. 1 man was Georgi M. Malenkov, who became Premier, No. 2 was V. M. Molotov, the diplomat. No. 3 was Lavrenti Beria, the chief of police, and No. 4 was Marshall Nikolai A. Bulganin. Now it might be enlightening to see how they disappeared under the fine, treacherous hand of Comrade Khrushchev. Within 9 days after Stalin's death, he displaced No. 1 Malenkov, as the secretary of the central committee, Stalin's old job that carried the leadership of the Communist Party. He then spotted Beria as his most dangerous rival, so he teamed with Malenkov to get rid of Beria. In June 1953, just 3 months after Stalin's death, Beria was lured to a Kremlin meeting. Here Khrushchev used the same tactics that had worked so well for him in the Ukraine in 1938. He deployed troops to cut off Beria from his own men, then arrested him. The following December, Beria's execution was announced, along with that of 29 of his confederates. There was no public trial. It was another Stalin-type purge.

In February 1955, Malenkov made a public confession of errors and resigned from the post of Premier. Here Khrushchev introduced a new purge technique. Instead of having Malenkov shot, he merely demoted him to an obscure post. Khrushchev's candidate, Bulganin, succeeded Malenkov. He was a puppet for Comrade Khrushchev, who in 1958 had Bulganin removed and took over the Premiership himself. By now, he had everything that Stalin had: Control of the government and control over the Communist Party. Khrushchev alone stood at the top.

Now this shepherd boy had, by purge, murder, deceit, and treachery, become the boss of the world's biggest empire, and never since the dark ages has western civilization been more dependent upon the voice of the Good Shepherd to guide and comfort them.

The Honorable Harry Truman said: "From Yalta to Potsdam to Geneva, we have had many meetings, all of which have resulted in failure, not because of any act of ours, but solely because the Communists have not lived up to their promises." The only way to insure peace is to make certain that they who threaten understand that we will fight if given no other choice.

The Germans compare Khrushchev with Hitler. They say that he, like Hitler, believes he has a messianic mission. He wants to build a great empire. He underrates the democracies that give the appearance of disunity.

MR. K. A GAMBLER

Also, like Hitler, Khrushchev is a big gambler, who trusts his bluffing ability and is ready to take great risks. He likes to rattle his latest weapons to intimidate his foes. He can be expected to exploit every sign of weakness by the West. If the West stands firm, the Germans predict that Khrushchev will most likely pull back when confronted by an iron will.

The Swedes believe that Nikita is playing a dangerous game of bluff. The Italians believe that he really wants a summit meeting because he thinks he is stronger than our President and would like a chance to prove it.

This treatise would be pitifully weak if I did not say something about Hungary. Therefore, I will quote from a speech made by U.S. Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, from West Hartford, Conn.

"It was Khrushchev who in 1956 ordered the Red army to invade Hungary, deposed the legal government of Imre Nagy and ruthlessly massacred Hungarian civilians in all areas where there was open opposition. It was Khrushchev who invited the Hungarian commanding officer and patriot, General Pal Maleter, to negotiations under the flag of truce, historically, traditionally, from ancient times, a custom of honor, and once he got him under the flag of truce, had him arrested by the chief of the Soviet secret police, General Surov. It was Khrushchev who lured Premiur Imre Nagy and his colleagues out of their sanctuary in the Yugoslav Embassy by perfidiously offering them an assurance of safe conduct and then kidnaped them as they emerged from the Embassy.

It was Khrushchev who 1 year ago horrified the conscience of the free world by ordering the murder of General Maleter and Prime Minister Nagy after secret trials on fradulent charges.

Nikita Khrushchev rose to Communist prominence as the hangman of the Ukraine. He maintained himself in power as the butcher of Budapest. He had on his hands the blood of countless thousands of innocent people who were murdered under his personal direction. He is responsible for the continued suffering of millions in slave labor camps. He is the principal world

spokesman for the ruthless attack on religion under which Cardinal Mindszenty, Archbishop Beran, and countless other churchmen of various faiths have been persecuted. In addition to his personal crimes, he is the principal representative of the system of concentration camps, mass murder, brainwashing, militant atheism, the organized promotion of falsehood and lies and planned ultimate enslavement of the entire non-Communist world.

On December 2, 1959, Khrushchev indicated that he sent troops and tanks to put down the 1956 revolution in Hungary over the opposition of some of his Kremlin comrades. This was noted in the Kansas City Star of December 3, 1959.

There are today in Russia 45 slave labor camps. Most of them seem to be in European Russia but, of course, there are plenty of them in Siberia. If you would want more details about these camps, I would suggest that you read the book entitled "I Was a Russian Prisoner."

WOULD WRECK U.N.

At a meeting in October 1960, of the General Assembly of the United Nations, Khrushchev pounded the table with his shoe and demanded in a loud voice that Secretary Dag Hammarskjold be replaced by a committee of three, each of which would have absolute veto powers and one of which would be a Communist, so that the Soviets would be able to block the General Assembly in the same manner that they have managed to frustrate the Security Council.

He has contacted 66 nations throughout the world, in a deliberate effort to wreck the United Nations or make it subservient to his wishes.

Furthermore, he sponges on the United States and the other free nations by not paying Russia's share of the expenses of the United Nations.

In 1960 it cost about $218,390,000 to operate the United Nations. The United States paid $88,575,000 while the Russians paid only $18,245,000. There is also the additional cost of approximately $116,300,000 per year for policing the Congo, for refugees and for food programs ordered by the General Assembly. Russia has refused to pay any of these expenses, not even a slick dime, while the United States paid $57,610,000 for this purpose in 1960. The Soviet colonies, of satellites in Eastern Europe, have likewise weiched on paying any part of such expenses, though each of these Soviet colonies is entitled to a vote in the General Assembly of the United Nations.

EXPLOITS LUMUMBA DEMISE

When Patrice Lumumba, ex-beer salesman, ex-embezzler, ex-Premier of the Congo died, crafty old Nikita staged anti-Belgian and anti-United States demonstrations in 12 countries. The riotous students and sympathizers, regardless of their native language, showed up with placards in English for the benefit of the United States. Here is a sample: "Lumumba murdered, but his spirit will live forever to carry on the freedom struggle of Congo." This placard was carried at the Belgian Embassy in Moscow, even though the Belgians speak French. Now, does the old scoundrel think that we are so dumb that we really don't know who he is shooting at?

Similar crowds were in action about the same time in Belgrade, Amsterdam, Paris, Colombo, Dublin, Rome, Teheran, Melbourne, and New Delhi. The Communists were there trying, with some degree of success, to turn the anger of people all over the world against the United States, which had never even possessed an African colony. The Ghana Communists pranced through the streets with placards reading, "United States murdered Lumumba," besieged the U.S. Embassy, ripped the emblems from over the door, and smashed an outdoor light with rifle shots. The same thing happened in Nigeria.

So much for the Congo—now let's take a look at things that are happening closer to home. Fidel Castro's revolution, which looked so innocent at first, invoked sympathy in the United States and our State Department has been accused of aiding and abetting it. Finally it reared its ugly head, bared its poisonous fangs, and showed its true self to be nothing but communism in its worst form, with purges, mass executions, and suppressions of liberty.

This happened in the Western Hemisphere, only 90 miles off the coast of Florida—in Cuba, which we liberated from Spain in the Spanish American War in 1898. Were we taken in? Yes; hook, line, and sinker. Franco in Spain can rightfully be laughing at us, but of course, he remembers when the Soviets stole all the Spanish gold during the revolution. It is possible in all Bolshevik history, since the Germans smuggled Lenin and his comrades into Russia during the First World War, to find that they have done even one decent, admirable thing? Perhaps they can point with pride to the murder of the 7,000 Polish officers, while pretending to be their friends, and the murder of the czar and his family, including the young children.

Furthermore, just off the shores of Alaska, a Soviet fishing fleet with floating canneries and mother ships is operating the year around while our fishermen remain in dock to protect and preserve the fish in accordance with our laws and treaties.

SOUTH AMERICA SCOFFS

Fortunately, South America scoffs at Castro. Prominent nations have broken with him: El Salvador, Peru, the Dominican Republic, Haiti, Paraguay, Guatemala, Nicaragua. Panama, Colombia and Uruguay have expelled their Cuban ambassadors for interferring in domestic affairs. The United States was insulted so often that its patience was finally broken and it broke off diplomatic relations. Guatemala labeled Castro's late denial of any effort to export his Communist revolution as a "delaying maneuver to conceal the real threat (to their hemisphere) posed (?) by his alliance with the Communist bloc."

CHICANERY IN BERLIN

Just a few words about Berlin. A dispatch from Bonn, February 23, 1961, stated. "The Soviet Union has told West Germany that any temporary solution of the Berlin problem must provide for the eventual transformation of West Berlin into a demilitarized free city as proposed by Premier Khrushchev in 1958." Here again is more of the same chicanery.

So much for Khrushchev's background. What about the future? With all of his heart and soul Khrushchev is a Bolshevik so their shoes should fit him perfectly. Listen to what they say: "War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years. To win we shall need the element of surprise. The burgeoisie will have to be put to sleep. So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard of concessions. The capitalistic countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we will smash them with our clenched fist." Dimetri A. Manuilsky, who presided over the United Nations Security Council in 1949, said this 30 years ago while speaking at the Lenin School of Political Warfare in Moscow.

"As Isaac said unto Jacob, come near, I pray thee, that I may feel thee, my son, whether thou be my very own Esau or not."

"And Jacob went near unto Isaac his father; and he felt him and said, The voice is Jacob's voice, but the hands are the hands of Esau."

America's Democracy: A Defense of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, with great pride I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for all to see, the winning essay in group I of the Americanism Essay Contest sponsored by the Wisconsin American Legion Auxiliary. The winning essay was written by John Chudada, a senior at St. Mary's High School in Burlington, Wis.

Since Burlington is my home city, I am doubly proud of the eloquence with which John Chudada defends freedom.

His essay is inserted at this point in the RECORD:

AMERICA'S DEMOCRACY: A DEFENSE OF FREEDOM

(By John Chudada)

"That this Nation under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth." These great words were spoken by a great man, a man who realized that democracy was freedom itself. Freedom is that God-given right to make one's own laws; impose one's own restraints; and control one's thoughts, feelings, and actions. But as all good things, freedom must be protected from the onslaught of dictatorship and infringing human greed. The transgressions of so-called authority since the dawn of time, has left upon the pages of history the stain of oppression.

Power in the hands of a Napoleon, a Mussolini, or a Hitler is the sword that pierces the heart of freedom.

As time goes on, monarchies may transgress, oligarchies will oppress, but democracy will respect. It has no other choice. From where does democracy get its power—from the people, and these would be defeating their own interests, if they proposed and advanced legislation that would endanger justice and freedom.

Truly, then, democracy is the most effective defense of freedom. It has withstood the test of time. Since democracy was first conceived in Athens in 500 B.C., it has had to combat the domineering greed of absolutism, the errors of individualism, and the present-day mania of communism. Through all these it has survived. After each battle, democracy has come forth with renewed vigor and strength.

Within the past 200 years, the American people have experienced, tested, and molded for themselves the world's great democracy, a true defense of freedom. This democracy, through its ministers, has rendered to the American people a government so effective, so workable, that it is looked to as a model by all the other free world nations.

As we draw near to commemorating the centennial of the Lincoln years, we should recall a great man's efforts to preserve a democracy, forced to fight a war as his extremist measure.

It was after much deliberation and thinking that I chose to open this essay with the familiar closing lines of the Gettysburg Address. For herein lie the meaning, the devotion, and the faith of a man who guided our Nation through a bitter conflict, thus preserving America's democracy—a defense of freedom.

The Dividend Credit Should Be Increased

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I am interested by the concern which is being shown by the people of the Sixth Congressional District of Maryland over the administration's proposal to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove the present 4 percent tax credit on dividend income and to remove the $50 dividend income exemption. There is an erroneous view in this country among some persons that the 4 percent dividend credit is some kind of a windfall or unfair tax advantage. I am inserting a statement on this subject by Mr. James L. Rankin which contains thoughts that everyone interested in this subject should consider:

THE DIVIDEND CREDIT SHOULD BE INCREASED

The dividend credit should be increased, not eliminated. Canada allows 20 percent; we allow 4 percent; and yet some urge this should be ended. Many countries give relief to the shareholder—some levying no tax on dividends and others giving a credit in excess of 4 percent.

Corporate income is doubly taxed nationally and also in many States. No credit is given to the corporation for dividends paid; but other disbursements—wages, interest and royalties—are deductible by the corporation and thus taxable only to the recipient. Capital and labor are both essential in the operation of business. Fair dealing with the investor should lead to a higher rate of tax credit on dividends because of the double tax burden on the same earnings.

We should encourage investment in equity capital and thus avoid excessive corporate debt. This will increase the tax income from corporate income and it will help in times of poor business.

Generally, corporations pay out 60 percent of net earnings in dividends and retain 40 percent for expansion and other needs. This means that out of each $100 earned, $55 is paid for Federal and State income taxes, $18 is retained and $27 is paid to the owners of the business (15 million shareholders). If the shareholder is in the 26 percent bracket ($4,000 for a single person and $8,000 for one who is married) the individual tax bite is $7 and the recipient retains only $20. Those in the higher brackets retain only $5 or one twentieth of the corporation's $100 earnings.

Some argue that the credit unduly aids those with high income. This contention is not valid. Generally it is now agreed that our tax rates in the high brackets are excessive. The single man with $22,000 income pays 56 percent tax on the top $2,000 and this same rate is paid by the married man with $44,000 income. It is difficult to justify such a high rate, particularly on dividenls already reduced necessarily because of a high corporate tax rate. The Secretary of the Treasury in his testimony has conceded that relief must be given in the form of lower rates in the higher brackets, but postpones this aid to a later year. This promise should not lead to the elimination of a credit now too low.

We believe the recent increases in the number of shareholders—6.5 million in 1952 to 12.5 million in 1959 and 15 million in 1961—were encouraged in part by the 1954 code provision for dividend credit. We also believe the number will be further increased and the national income and growth raised if the rate of the credit is higher than 4 percent.

To produce the funds required for more plants and machinery leading to more jobs, three tax incentives are necessary, namely, tax credits based on expenditures for new buildings and equipment, liberalized depreciation for some industries and higher dividend credit so as to attract the needed equity capital from investors.

A New Honor for Rutgers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, Rutgers, the State university of New Jersey, has been selected as the first campus site for Peace Corps training. It is my understanding that up to 160 young men will arrive at the university next month to begin training for assignments in Colombia, South America.

We in the Garden State are proud that our State university has been selected for such an important assignment. Rutgers has often taken the lead in pioneering efforts; it has been receptive to new ideas ever since it was founded almost 100 years ago.

The faculty and students at Rutgers will, I am sure, do their utmost to extend their hospitality, as well as opportunities for effective training. In fact, I have already received word from the United Fund of Middlesex County that special efforts will be made to make the stay of the Peace Corps volunteers a pleasant and productive one.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Newark (N.J.) Star-Ledger of May 17. It gives details of the forthcoming project. I also ask consent to have printed portions of a letter from Mr. Nathan Barnett, executive director of the United Fund in Middlesex County. I believe his letter gives some indication of the community feeling stirred by the announcement that the Peace Corps training will take place at Rutgers.

There being no objection, the editorial and excerpt were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY SELECTED AS PEACE CORPS TRAINING SITE

Rutgers University announced yesterday that it has been selected as the site for the first campus Peace Corps training program. CARE, Inc., which is under contract to administer the program to send 64 young men to Colombia, South American, selected Rutgers.

Dr. Ralph Greenlaw, program department director for CARE, said the university was chosen because of the wide range of subject matter taught, including agriculture, and and the ample facilities available.

A contingent of 120 to 160 young men are scheduled to arrive at the university June 26 for an 8-week training period.

From those accepted, 64 will be selected to work in a community development program in Colombia. They will team up with a corps of young Colombians who have been training several months for this work.

Greenlaw said community development may include practical assistance ranging from road building to agriculture, water supply, environmental sanitation and elementary public health work.

The men coming to Rutgers will have a sound agricultural background, a minimum of 2 years in Spanish and experience in the construction of simple farm buildings or basic roads.

Their training at the university will include rigorous physical conditioning, intensive language drill and a condensed course in Latin American history, culture and politics, with special reference to Colombia.

To make them competent representatives of their own country, they will be given a thorough review of American political history and American civilization.

The teams from both countries will try to teach rural Colombians to upgrade the economic and physical life of their villages.

The Rutgers program will serve as a pilot program, Greenlaw said.

The Colombian program is the second Peace Corps program announced. The first is for Tanganyika but no training program has yet been disclosed for Tanganyika.

MAY 19, 1961.

Dr. RALPH GREENLAW,
CARE, Inc.,
New York City, N.Y.

DEAR DR. GREENLAW: We in New Brunswick were very pleased to learn that the Peace Corps has selected Rutgers University as its first campus site.

The eagerness of the hundreds of young volunteers to serve, affirms the sense of idealism and dedication that is so much a part of our historical heritage, and yet is often markedly absent in our materialistic world.

Although the young men will no doubt have a rigorous 8-week training program, there will obviously be some free time. In gratitude to these young men for renewing our spirit and reminding us of our goals, we wish to do our small part in welcoming the Peace Corps to New Brunswick, by offering complimentary memberships to the YMCA and the Jewish community center. Both organizations have indicated they hope many of these young men will accept these memberships. You will find two finely equipped establishments, with highly trained and competent personnel.

The services of other organizations within our United Fund are also available, but for the most part will not be needed by these young men.

It is my sincere hope and belief that other offers of a similar nature will be made so that the young men coming into New Brunswick will know that the whole community is behind this wonderful program 100 percent.

Sincerely yours,

NATHAN BARNETT,
Executive Director.

Votes of Confidence in the House Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALPHONZO E. BELL, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I received the other day an editorial from my good

friend, former Congressman Donald L. Jackson. This editorial points out recent expressions of confidence in the House Committee on Un-American Activities, its work, and its objectives. These views I am wholly in accord with. Under leave previously granted, I include that editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and commend it to the attention of our colleagues:

DOUBLE VINDICATION

We are happy to report some cheering news this week, in contrast to the doleful temper of the times. The House Committee on Un-American Activities has received a vote of confidence from both the judiciary and the legislative branches of our Government.

Last Monday, in a split decision, the U.S. Supreme Court upheld the right of the committe to investigate Communist activity. On Wednesday, the House of Representatives overwhelmingly approved the full annual appropriation of $331,000 necessary for the committee to carry on its work.

At first sight, this action of the House may seem like nothing more than a detail of fiscal housekeeping. Actually, in view of the spirited and determined attempts by some groups to curtail the activities of the committee or to abolish it entirely, the House appropriation amounts to a resounding vote of confidence.

In a more intimate seense, it reflects the conviction of the broad mass of the American people that the committee is performing a useful and necessary work. For the Members of the House are responsive to the views of their constituents. Part of the campaign against the committee consisted in a letter-writing program urging its abolition. In addition, there were paid newspaper ads and sundry salvos of denunciation circulated through other media.

Fortunately, these attacks did not have the effect intended. While the committee had no mysterious angel to supply funds for advertising its own defense, and lacked the vehement spokesmen which its opposition enjoyed, it did have the sympathy and the confidence of large numbers of our citizens. These reacted in a letter-writing campaign of their own, which, though unorganized, was extensive and sincere. They apparently impressed their representatives in Congress. Wednesday's vote was 412–6 in support of the committee.

While the voice of the people did not correspondingly influence the Supreme Court in its decision earlier in the week, it is consoling that the committee was sustained there also. Actually, the decision was a reaffirmation of the Barenblatt decision of 1959, which upheld the committee's power to investigate activities advocating overthrow of the Government.

This field of investigation, in the words of Justice Stewart, is the committee's "legitimate legislative interest." And this seems reasonable enough. If the Congress is to be guided in its formulation of legislation touching on security as well as other national interests, it needs to have factual information at its disposal. Hence the appointment of investigative committees from within its own ranks.

Some of these committees function on a temporary basis, since the scope of their investigation is a specific field or problem, limited in duration. Others are of a continuing nature, dealing with matters which are pervasive and enduring. Experience attests to the persistent and relentless threat of communism. Wisdom demands the continued existence of an active committee to investigate and combat it.

Among the charges raised against the House Committee on Un-American Activities are the accusations that it is unconstitutional, that it engages in smears, that it is contrary to the ideals of the American people. We do not believe that these charges stand up.

On the first, the U.S. Supreme Court has provided the answer in two decisions. On the second, the validity of the charge depends upon the source from which it comes. On the third, the American people themselves have provided the answer in the support which they have given to the continuance of the committee. The individual has rights, but so has the group. Every traffic law and fire or safety ordinance is a testimony to this. The American people have ideas, but they also have an instinct for self-preservation.

Full Employment Through Government Spending: A Lesson From Western Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished economic and financial correspondent of the New York Times, Mr. Edwin L. Dale, Jr., now stationed in Paris, has written incisively on the difference between fact and myth in the fiscal policies of the booming Western European economies. In an article which appeared in a recent issue of the New Republic, Mr. Dale reveals the key to the success of Western Europe in attaining full employment, sustained high growth rates, and price stability—successively higher, not lower, levels of government expenditure. The text of the article follows:

CONFESSION OF A ONETIME CONSERVATIVE

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

It is always a kind of macabre pleasure to confess error. As a onetime conservative in the United States who has lived a while in the extraordinary economic atmosphere of Western Europe, I should like to indulge the pleasure.

The dazzingly simples lesson from Western Europe appears to me this:

The way to achieve the best of all possible economic worlds (rapid economic growth, full employment, stable prices, favorable balance of payments, more investment, no recessions, more consumption, better living standards) is to spend as much government money as possible, and make sure that the amount the government spends rises rapidly each year.

The reason for this is not that government spending is inherently better than private spending, though that may be true. The reason is that a very high level of government spending, no matter where the money goes, assures a very high level of demand. And a high level of demand is the open seasame to everything else.

It means full employment. It gives the incentive for more investment in plant and equipment. It means operation of plants at efficient level, and thus at lower costs. Therefore, it means relatively stable prices and competitiveness in export markets. It permits higher wages without inflation as productivity rises rapidly. And, mirabile dictu, it permits the government to spend more and more each year without raising taxes because the economy, and thus receipts, is growing as fast as the government spending.

Let us look for a moment at the "economic miracle" of Germany. Its creators have misled the world about it. Dr. Erhard says it came about because Germany let loose the creative forces of private enterprise and rejected "statism" and "dirigism." True enough, and perhaps that helped. But what Dr. Erhard does not say is that West German taxes and spends (and elects and elects) 34 percent of the gross national product—the highest in the non-Communist world. This figure compares with only 26 percent in the United States, State, and local taxes and spending included in both cases. By the test of the National Association of Manufacturers, or even the Committee for Economic De elopment, West Germany is not conservative but radical.

Now let us look at the one laggard in continental industrial Europe. It is Belgium. Belgium spends only 23 percent of its gross national product through government. It doesn't tax, it doesn't spend—and it doesn't grow.

Britain is the other laggard in this part of the world. It spends only 28 percent. More important, it is constantly taking measures to restrict demand, through high interest rates or consumer credit control or changes in the tax-spending equation of the budget. It let demand run free—actually pumped it up—only once in the last 5 years, and only then did its economy perform brilliantly. France, Sweden, and Austria have practically nothing in common except one thing: They spend, and they grow.

Outside of Belgium, there is only one nation in industrial Europe, Denmark, where government spending is a smaller proportion of gross national product than in the United States. It is a special case, with an unusually heavy concentration of agriculture in the total economy.

It seems reasonably clear to me that when government spends as much as it does here in Europe, business is good and stays good. And when business is good, a lot of other problems just go away. For example, there is very little fuss here in Europe about "technological unemployment"—fortunately, because it means that Europe can and does automate merrily away with all the resulting advantages for productivity, costs, and the like.

Now a couple of qualifications. They do not change the main point, but they should at least be made.

The first is that there must be some reasonable relation between government receipts and spending. Many governments in Europe run chronic deficits in their budgets by American accounting standards—which helps account for their success—but they cannot safely permit spending to run away from receipts without inflationary trouble. France showed that before 1958. European governments spend enormously—but they also tax enormously.

The second concerns the "mix" of taxation. Judging strictly from results—and leaving out the theory—it seems that there is great merit in "soaking the poor." This not as harsh as it sounds.

What it means in practice in Western Europe is far greater reliance than in the United States (or Britain) on a set of taxes that indirectly hit the poor man hardest: excise and sales taxes of all kinds, turnover taxes, tax-on-value-added, heavy employer social security contributions. These taxes are collected in prices, and thus from consumers. They do not "raise prices" unless they are increased; once imposed, they are practically painless. But they do soak the poor, relatively; no government in Western Europe relies nearly as much as the United States on taxes for its revenues.

A final point. Why isn't very high government spending, and the resulting constantly high pitch of demand, "inflationary"? The answer is: It is inflationary, but only very mildly so now, in contrast with the first

7 or 8 years after World War II when there was a worldwide chronic excess of demand over supply. Euporean prices have risen, as American prices have risen. Since the Korean war, however, European prices on the whole have risen no faster than American, and in some cases they have risen less, despite much higher government spending. And in neither Europe nor America has there been any significant inflation since mid-1957.

The point is that the word now has a large and elastic supply to meet higher demand; thus it is a world in which demand cannot only be profitably increased but, within reasonable limits, safely increased.

Unless appearances—and hard facts and figures—are grossly misleading, the lesson in all this for America is clear:

Raise Federal Government spending as rapidly as possible to $100 billion (i.e. $120 billion on a cash basis) and make sure it rises at least $4 billion a year.

Count on more rapid economic growth to provide the receipts for most of this increase in spending—and do not worry about fairly large deficits for a while until there is full employment again—and raise consumer taxes eventually to cover the rest.

Then sit back and start enjoying real prosperity again.

Remarks by the Honorable John Morgan Davis, Lieutenant Governor, Polish Falcons of America, Sunday, May 21, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday I attended the 50th anniversary celebration of the Polish Falcons of America, who have a branch in my district in Manayunk, known as Nest No. 171.

The speaker of the evening was the Lieutenant Governor of Pennsylvania, the Honorable John Morgan Davis, who is also one of my constituents.

His remarkable presentation of the pioneering efforts of Polish Americans was so well received, and is such a fine commentary on the contribution of the Polish Americans to the American way of life, that I am asking that it be included in the extension of my remarks so that his observations can be read by all the Members of Congress:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE JOHN MORGAN DAVIS, LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR, POLISH FALCONS OF AMERICA, SUNDAY, MAY 21, 1961

This is indeed, a great night for all of us.

For you, the members of Nest No. 171, the Polish Falcons of America, with which many of you have been associated for many years, the golden jubiliee of a great and wonderful organization.

For myself, it is a grand occasion, the opportunity to spend this happy moment with you as you celebrate 50 years of accomplishment, and equally as important, the chance to spend an evening with my neighbors and friends of many years.

When a man has had the happiness, and joy, of the friendships which I have enjoyed here in the 21st ward, he can never forget those days, nor can he ever fail to enjoy his return time and again to the scene of that happiness.

For many years, I lived here in this section of our great city—and often I come here to visit friends such as you—and to reminisce about the days when we worked together here. As many of you know, I was a committeeman in this ward for over 10 years and know its people well, and I am happy that I know them still and can call them my friends.

I know, as well as any man, the kind of people you are; people who give me so much happiness when I visit them and attend their meetings.

I had many Polish friends in my place of birth in the hard coal regions in Shenandoah, Pa. The Welsh and the Poles were good Americans. To be Welsh or to be Polish; to have the heritage of Poland or Wales in your blood; is fortunate for it is a great foundation for the good things we call American.

For the heritage of the ages is in the blood of both our peoples; the heritage which our forefathers brought here to this blessed land of ours has helped us be good Americans.

They came here many years ago, your forefathers and mine, and they established themselves in our city; they brought up their sons and daughters in the way of the old country and it became the best way of our great new country.

It was a way of faith; it was a way of hard work; it was a way of hope in the future; it was the American way.

It was something which lay dormant in their hearts in the cruel old world; and it was the very thing that meant happiness in the wonderful brave new world, which they sought and which they found in America.

They instilled this faith, and hope, and love of this new land in us, their sons and daughters, and here, in this new generation of the Polish Falcons and in the work you do through this great organization, you show the way to your sons and daughters, the way to the pursuit of happiness guaranteed in our blessed land.

I have seen, through the years, the things which you have done. The youth programs of the Falcons; the good musical events; the charities for you and yours—and for others—this is the American way, the sharing way, the loving way which our forefathers brought from the old country, and which became so much a part of the belief as Americans.

Poles did not bring it with them, only 50 years ago. Poles were among the first to come to this great continent; the first after the English settlers at Jamestown, the Welsh in Pennsylvania, yes, before the Pilgrims landed on Plymouth Rock, Poles were in America.

The pioneers of Jamestown sent to Poland to bring the great craftsmen of Europe here—the glaziers who could make glass; the craftsmen whose crafts should be learned and who could make this new place a better and more productive land. So the Poles came in small number, but come they did—and they were here before so many others.

But this Welsh American came here tonight to talk about and to talk to his friends the Polish Americans. So let us speak of this Polish American heritage.

This is your heritage; almost four hundred years in America.

Four hundred proud and glorious years.

Kosziusco came to fight and help win our glorious American independence.

Pulaski came to fight and die—a Polish martyr in the cause of America.

Paderewski came to our shores to play divine music, and together with Woodrow Wilson to plan the emergence of Poland as a nation.

Yours is the heritage of Kosziuscko, of Pulaski and of Paderewski.

Yours is the blood of Copernicus, the astronomer; of Chopin the musician, of Curie, the discover of radium.

But above and beyond that—yours is a heritage of faith, of hope and of love—of deep and abiding belief in God which has sustained Poland throughout its turmoil and bloody years, and sustains it today. It is the heritage which America must retain if America is to remain the great free country she is today.

But yours also is a heritage of fun and of happiness, for no peoples despite their hardships are happier than the Poles.

Is there a gayer dance than the polka; strong men swirling beautiful women in whirling circles, with the stamping of happy feet?

Is there a better food than your kielbasa, the soft sweet smell of baked bread to wrap it in; or the maddening delight of ground meat wrapped in cabbage, that only a Polish-American girl can produce?

Is there a harder attempt made than that of a good, blond Polish boy as he plays so well at every sport; the drive in from the end of my dear friend, Charley Yadusky, the smash into the goal line by an Evashevski, or the swing-around of a Klewzewski as he hits a ball a mile?

Food, and dance, and fun—that's the heritage which the Polish-American brings to us today. And we love him for it.

But more than these things we admire his faith in God, a faith still tested in the old country. And that test brings pride to all of us. Where behind the Iron Curtain is the faith and courage of Pulaski more displayed than in the pulpits of the great churches, where a Cardinal Wyszynski defies the might of anti-God communism? His stalwart faith is a symbol to the free world that Poland retains its spirit of freedom despite adversity, and that Poland will emerge from the hell of communism as your forefathers emerged from the tyranny which they fought.

It is that never-ending fight for morality that marks the Pole above most men. You have it in your hearts as Poles have had it since their beginning. And your forefathers brought it here to America, and blessed all of us with it.

It is the heart which we find today in the newly consecrated Archbishop Krol of your diocese who, I know will bring blessings in great volume, to Philadelphia and its people.

It is in the heart of the Polish Falcons and their children and their children's children; it is the heritage your fathers brought with them and left instilled in you. It is a great contribution which you can give to all Americans.

But above and beyond that this firmness of faith, this heritage of hope and this cherishing of charity—these are the virtues not only of Polish-Americans, or the Polish Falcons, but these are the virtues which God cites as man's greatest contributions to his fellow men.

As long as these are the firm beliefs of the Polish Falcons, Nest No. 171 and your people will long endure and prosper in this land. This was the hope and the desire of your fathers; it should be your greatest wish as you enter the second half-century of this fine organization. You have my hearty congratulations on your first 50 years and my best wishes for Godspeed in your work during the next 50 years.

Thank you so much for including me in your celebration of this great occasion.

International Confidence in the Dollar Would Be Enhanced by Enactment of H.R. 6900

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of May 21, 1961. It is one of many such articles and editorials which have supported my position with regard to repeal of the 25 percent gold reserve requirement:

TROUBLED WATERS

Like trout fishing, the management of international currency movements is a delicate and esoteric art. In both, the first principle is to move gently; one mustn't frighten the fish.

The administration correctly declined in January to ask Congress to abolish the law requiring the Federal Reserve System to hold a gold cover equal to 25 percent of its currency and deposits. Coming right at the end of a heavy speculative run on the dollar, the request might have set the traders off on new flights. But the gold rush has dropped to a dribble. Secretary of the Treasury Dillon is once again correct in deciding he can now safely support Representative MULTER'S bill to drop the gold cover requirement.

The speculators have been following this arithmetic: The gold stock of the United States has dropped from $24.6 billion to $17.4 billion in the last dozen years. Of this, nearly $12 billion is now tied up as the cover for Federal Reserve money. That means the Treasury has less than $6 billion in gold available to pay international debts.

If our deficit runs at a rate over $3 billion a year, as it has been running for the past 3 years, how long will it be before a gold shortage forces devaluation of the dollar? Leaping to a superficial conclusion, the traders sent large quantities of dollars abroad late last year to be converted into gold bars and sit hopefully in the vaults of Swiss banks. This arithmetic is visionary; the United States is not without other resources, although it prefers not to use them. But gold speculators tend to be optimistic as well as imaginative.

The gold cover was written into the Federal Reserve Act 48 years ago as an antiinflationary safeguard; it was intended to limit the expansion of credit. But it has never done so. It has been an unsuccessful experiment that now serves no purpose but the encouragement of troublemakers.

This spring a wide range of bankers, businessmen and politicians have called for repeal of the gold cover requirement. The only opposition will come from those who confuse symbols with reality, and for whom the very word "gold" evokes, by a process of subconscious association, a memory of the halcyon days when steak was 30 cents a pound.

But it must be conceded that to repeal the gold cover rule would be to treat symptons rather than causes. When a genuine trade deficit results in sales of gold, speculators watch the outflow and begin to gamble that things will get worse. In doing so, they buy more gold and make them worse. The effect snowballs.

The immediate answer is to work out international agreements to diminish the use of gold for balancing short-term deficits. The Treasury Department is considering several proposals to broaden the International Monetary Fund's capacity to act as a banker carrying the temporary debits and credits of the world community. Diplomats also went to work last month in Paris through the OEEC to persuade creditor nations to practice restraint in turning their foreign currency holdings into gold.

While this is being accomplished, Congress can help by putting the gold cover rule, quietly and rapidly, out of existence.

Authorizing Appropriations for Aircraft, Missiles, and Naval Vessels

SPEECH
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 1852) to authorize appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I heartily approve S. 1852 with one exception.

I object to the fact that S. 1852 builds in a Polaris gap of 1 year. In plain unadulterated language, this will be the result unless the bill authorizes additional Polaris submarines.

The Nation heartily approved when President Kennedy asked for acceleration through the 29th boat. This was a dramatic announcement which caused those who believe in the fleet ballistic missile concept to sit back and relax.

But beneath the dramatics of the acceleration announcement, there is a fact which has not been publicized; in fact it has been hidden. Here is that fact: S. 1852 will decelerate the Polaris program recommended by naval experts by the same amount as it has been accelerated. A look at a few simple facts will prove my point.

The 29th and last Polaris submarine authorized in this bill will be ready for sea by November 1964. It will be operational some 4 to 5 months later.

Now look at what happens to the next, or the 30th submarine if S. 1852 becomes law. It requires approximately 42 months leadtime to secure delivery of the reactor and other components for a Polaris submarine. In other words, a boat must be authorized and the long leadtime items purchased 42 months before it can be ready for sea. I remind you that this bill does not authorize anything beyond the 29th boat.

We will not consider another authorization bill until about 1 year from now. Before the reactor and other long leadtime items can be even ordered for the 30th boat, it must be authorized. Add the 42 months leadtime to the date when we will consider an authorization bill next year and the earliest the 30th boat can be ready for sea is November or December, 1965.

This is a Polaris gap of at least 1 year. This is a deceleration which cancels out the Kennedy acceleration.

This is like carefully nurturing a crop through a long and difficult growing year and then picking only part of the crop. True, you might get another crop next year, but you will never regain what you failed to pick this year.

Our President has recommended long-range planning in the field of foreign aid He has recommended that a continuity of policy must be assured to allow effective planning. Planning for our national defense should also be long range. We cannot allow procurement of important items like Polaris submarines to progress in gasps, fits, and spurts. We cannot allow a year's Polaris gap.

During debate on the rule I cited a wealth of official and unofficial statements by naval experts over a long period of time in support of my premise that these experts have gradually and definitely recommended a fleet of 45 Polaris submarines. It can best be summarized with this quotation by Admiral Raborn:

Forty-five is the number that it looks like we could keep where we would have an adequate number at sea and constantly on station.

I believe I have proven that 45 is not a dream figure which has occurred by happenstance or coincidence.

It is important to note at this time that all preliminary planning for this program has been to eventually reach the production schedule of one submarine per month. It can be presumed that once this schedule was reached, it should logically be continued until the full number of planned boats were constructed.

Now without a single word of testimony having been given to the Congress in support of a different policy than that which has been gradually and definitely recommended, we will disrupt that one per month schedule and build in a 1-year gap in delivery.

We all know of the sorry state of the shipbuilding business in this country. Major shipyards are going out of business each year because, among other reasons, we are not providing a steady flow of shipbuilding. To maintain their high overhead, these yards cannot operate with a flurry of orders one year and a dearth the next year. This Polaris gap will not help us to maintain a healthy shipbuilding industry.

I am sure Congress does not wish to give the impression to the public that we are renouncing expert opinion regarding the necessity for 45 boats nor do we wish to give the impression that we endorse the achievement of a 1-per-month schedule followed by a 12-month interruption. I am sure the Department of Defense does not wish to create this impression.

It is clear that the long leadtime items cannot be acquired under the terms of section 412(b) of the Military Construction Act of 1959 for any boats except those authorized in this bill.

I expect the allegation to be made that we can continue beyond the 29th boat without interrupting the delivery schedule. I expect that reprograming procedures or supplemental authorization will be offered as devices which could pre-

vent interruption. That allegation, if it is made, is not supported by the facts.

In page 1454 of the hearings on H.R. 6151 for April 14, 1961, the following interchange occurred between myself and Admirals Beakley and James:

Mr. GUBSER. I would like to ask, if it is appropriate at this time: We have accelerated the full 29 fleet ballistic missile submarines by 2 years. All well and good, but our eventual program, as I understand it, is for 45. Is there anything as a request for fiscal 1962 for the long leadtime components of the ships or the boats beyond 29 and up to 45?

Admiral JAMES. No.

Admiral BEAKLEY. There is not at this time.

Mr. GUBSER. Well, Admiral, now we had hoped to build these on a schedule of 10 per year?

Admiral JAMES. Right.

Mr. GUBSER. Now if we are to maintain that 10 per year beyond the 29th boat, should not there be an authorization for long leadtime components in fiscal year 1962? Isn't that necessary?

Admiral BEAKLEY. I will let Admiral James speak to this, if I may.

Admiral JAMES. If there are to be ships beyond the 29th boat, the answer is "Yes."

Mr. GUBSER. In other words, if we don't authorize additional long leadtime components in fiscal year 1962, the schedule beyond the 29th boat is not at all sure.

Admiral JAMES. That is correct, sir.

On page 1474 of the hearings, the same point is further clarified by Admiral James. I quote another interchange at that page:

Mr. GUBSER. Do you need additional authorization in this bill to maintain—that is, to purchase long leadtime items, so that you can maintain—a construction schedule of 10 per year beyond the 29th boat?

Admiral JAMES. Yes, sir.

Later, on the same page, Admiral James said in a response to Mr. Smart, the committee counsel:

If there were more boats that were to be built—that is, there was a 30th, or 35 to 45 boats—there would be a requirement in this budget for long leadtime items on the critical items, such as the nuclear reactors and some of the other propulsion systems.

Now let me quote the greatest authority of them all. On page 1475, Chairman VINSON, whose knowledge of military affairs is exceeded by no other Member, said the committee counsel was absolutely correct when he said, as paraphrased by the Hon. SAMUEL STRATTON—

that you could not use any money for additional submarines unless the submarines were specifically authorized.

On the same page, the chairman said in response to Mr. STRATTON that if we wanted to fund additional leadtime items for submarines above the 29, and I quote: "You would have to authorize more submarines."

On page 1476, the chairman said once again, after a discussion of the effect of the brandnew section 412(b):

You can't increase the authorization for long leadtime items until there has been an authorization for the ship. The ship is the basis of it.

The chairman does not play fast and loose with words. His words do not flow from inexperience.

During the so-called posture hearings of the Committee on Armed Services, the question was raised on page 928 as to the legality of full funding of five submarines when only the long leadtime items had been authorized in law. It was agreed that tonnage authorization of these boats existed under the terms of the Vinson-Trammel Act of 1934. Then the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] said, "this would be the last time, in view of 412, it could be done." Chairman Vinson replied, "That is right."

Later on page 932, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], one of the most brilliant and analytical lawyers I have ever known, said:

So even though we and the Appropriations Committee are both thoroughly convinced that these (five boats) have been authorized within the meaning of 412, out of abundance of precaution, we should specifically authorize them.

And the committee did authorize them for the second time.

Mr. Chairman, here we acted, "out of abundance of precaution" to reauthorize boats for which the long leadtime items had already been funded before section 412 took effect. Can anyone contend that reprograming would allow future funding for boats beyond No. 29 in the absence of specific authorization? If we are to be consistent, they cannot properly contend it.

Any member of the Defense Subcommittee on Appropriations will tell you that any reprograming beyond the 29th boat can only be done at the expense of other authorized items. In this case, because of the nature of the long leadtime items involved, it would be necessarily be at the expense of attack submarines which we desperately need. In fact, I would go so far as to predict that naval officials have so testified this year before the Appropriations Subcommittee. Since writing these remarks Secretary McNamara has admitted it.

Furthermore, if reprograming could take care of submarines beyond No. 29, why was not the same argument used by the Armed Services Committee with respect to the procurement of B–52 and B–58 bombers? The administration had not requested authorization but the committee wanted to be sure that we were not phasing out the "manned bomber" concept. So they authorized manned bombers. If reprograming was a sure device, why did they specifically authorize? The answer is clear—"reprograming is not at all sure."

At page 1688 of the hearings Secretary Hitch was discussing a paper laid before the committee which outlined reprograming procedures. He said, that under the provisions of this paper "we could reprogram funds necessary to handle the long leadtime items—for manned bombers.

And the reply from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] was:

If your reprograming procedures are written on that theory, I don't see how we can agree to it sir.

On the same page Chairman VINSON said:

You see, Mr. KILDAY's argument is this: There are no B–52's or B–58's authorized under the date of this law. And if you don't have any authorization, you can't reprogram.

The next day the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] said:

What section 412(b) does is to effect the appropriation of funds.

It says:

No funds may be appropriated after December 31, 1960, to or for the use of any armed force of the United States for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, or naval vessels, unless the appropriation of such fund has been authorized by legislation enacted after such date.

So the question is not the possibility of delegating the responsibility to the Secretary, but what we must have is an authorization on the statute book which will support an appropriation.

On page 1700 Mr. KILDAY said:

The thing I hope we will avoid in using 412 is to never authorize by type or equivalent things of that kind, because then you completely emasculate 412.

On the next page he states that not to specify a type of plane would abrogate the provision of 412.

I know what the chairman would say at this time if I were to yield. But when the coon is all alone against an army of lawyers he'd better stay out of a tree and keep going. The chairman would say that the previous authorizations for ships listed on page 47 of the committee report would allow reprograming. He would quote the language on page 48 of the report about previous authorization. But this is tricky language. All it says is that the Navy would have to charge new authorization against those already existing.

Look to the words of section 412(b). It says in effect that no funds can be appropriated for any vessel after December 31, 1960, for the procurement of naval vessels, unless the appropriation has been authorized by legislation enacted after such date.

Section 412(b) did not specifically repeal existing statutory authorizations but the rule is that unrepealed authorization shall be given construction not inconsistent with subsequent enactments. How then could you reprogram and appropriate money for anything which has not been authorized after December 31, 1960. To do so would be to violate a duly passed law which has never been repealed. Report language cannot repeal a law nor should the Secretary of Defense be allowed to violate or circumvent statutory law.

I expect the allegation to be made that we can continue beyond the 29th boat by the device known as supplemental authorization. Of course, this is true but we cannot use this device without building in a "Polaris delivery gap" of at least 9 months and a resort to procurement in "fits, gasps, and spurts."

The earliest Congress could consider a supplemental authorization bill would be January 3, 1962. I know you will agree when I say that if action on this bill were complete and the supplemental appropriation bill were complete by February of 1962 this would be unprecedented speed and an alltime record. Now look at the "Polaris delivery gap" this would create.

If the funds were available in February 1962, the earliest the 30th Polaris sub-

marine could be ready for sea would be August of 1965 with a delivery gap of 9 months. If the date were March, the gap would be 10 months. If it were May of 1962—and this is more reasonable—the gap would be a full 12 months. Is this orderly long-range planning? Does it make sense to expand our production facilities to "one per month" and then cut it off for a full year? Is not this procurement in "fits", gasps," and "spurts"?

Mr. Chairman, I repeat, it is clear that the long leadtime items cannot be acquired under the terms of section 412(b) of the Military Construction Act of 1959 for any boats except those authorized in this bill.

It is clear that if a one-per-month schedule is to be maintained, the long leadtime items for the 30th and succeeding boats must be funded in fiscal year 1962. Without authorization in S. 1852, they cannot be funded in fiscal year 1962.

Therefore, no matter how we look at it, and no matter how much we point with pride to the Kennedy acceleration, we will have a Polaris delivery gap of 1 year and a disruption of the one-per-month schedule.

During the hearings on H.R. 6151, there was much concern expressed over the fact that no authorization for new manned bombers was requested. The entire committee, including myself, felt that failure to authorize additional bombers could be interpreted as the total adoption by the Congress of the missile concept and the final rejection of the bomber concept. A great deal of concern was expressed that assembly lines manufacturing the B–52 and B–58 bombers would be closed down and that orderly procurement would stop. As a result, we authorized additional bombers.

Although it is true that S. 1852 does contain authorization for more Polaris submarines while the original bill contained no authorization for bombers, the two situations are comparable insofar as the maintenance of orderly production is concerned. Achieving the one-per-month schedule of Polaris deliveries and then stopping it for 1 year does as much violence to the orderly production of ships as no new authorization would have done for bombers. I respectfully suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the same argument successfully applied for bombers should be applied for Polaris submarines.

I do not wish to tie the present administration to the policy of its predecessors, nor to the previous planning of naval experts. But additional authorization of six Polaris submarines in S. 1852 will not do this. It only provides insurance against delay while the new administration is determining its own policy regarding the number of submarines we should eventually build. The funding of long leadtime items in fiscal year 1962 could not possibly be a waste even if the decision was finally made to terminate the Polaris program at the 29th boat. The items are identical with those which can be used in other nuclear submarines. The administration would not be committed to request funding nor would the Appropriations Committee be committed to granting it. It would merely be an insurance policy which would preserve the gains of the Kennedy acceleration without building in the deceleration presently contained in S. 1852.

I am not enough of an expert to say how many of these submarines should be built. But in the absence of testimony to the contrary, I must accept the clear case which has been built over the years for a fleet of 45. I have every hope that the present Secretary of Defense will see the wisdom in the program recommended by experts and eventually recommend such a fleet. But, in the meantime, we should not tie his hands so that he is forced to lose a full year in achieving his recommendation when he makes it.

I only recommend additional authorization. Without it we cannot achieve a strength of 45 boats without the loss of a year's time. With the authorization we do not procure a single item which will be wasted. My plea is for time which, once lost, can never be regained.

Long-range planning is essential for our Defense Establishment. Let us not plan in fits, jumps, and spurts. Let us give the Department of Defense the chance to continue orderly procurement. We must authorize six additional fleet ballistic missile submarines in this bill.

Mr. Charman, at the appropriate time, I shall offer an amendment authorizing six additional Polaris submarines.

The issues involved in my amendment are quite clear.

First of all, do we want a Polaris gap of 1 year?

Secondly, will we nullify a dramatic acceleration with a 1-year deceleration?

Thirdly, when there is no risk of waste, can we afford not to be sure?

And lastly, are we going to allow an interruption of 1 full year in the orderly procurement schedule we have fought so hard to achieve?

At the appropriate time, I earnestly hope the House will support my amendment.

Castro's Extortion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD editorials from two outstanding newspapers in the Nation—one which appeared in the Boston Herald, Boston, Mass., May 22 entitled "Millions for Tribute," and the other entitled "Castro's Extortion" from the May 23 edition of the Oakland Tribune, Oakland, Calif., which is published by our former colleague, William Knowland.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune, May 23, 1961]

CASTRO'S EXTORTION

"Millions for defense, but not 1 cent for tribute," sums up a philosophy deeply ingrained in Americans and in the political tradition of the United States.

It was first enunciated in the early days of the Republic and means flatly and categorically that the United States will always resist international blackmail, subtle or overt.

Because we have been raised in this tradition and used it as a guidepost in our foreign relations for nearly two centuries, is why Castro's extortion attempt is so dangerous.

Castro's brazen demand for bulldozers and tractors in exchange for the pitiful freedom fighters he now holds up for ransom is doubly dangerous because the American public has always put their hearts before their pocketbooks. They have always favored the underdog.

But consider these questions:

What if Castro had asked for commercial airliners or cargo ships instead of farm equipment. The logic is the same and remember that Cuba squats only 90 miles from our American shores.

Perhaps more important, however, is the effect that making a blackmail payment to Cuba would have on the cadre chiefs in the international Communist conspiracy.

Would it not be interpreted as a show of fear on the part of America, a position of weakness, and a clear example that we have abandoned our opposition to paying tribute? The answer, of course, is a strongly affirmative "Yes."

It must also be remembered that the effects will be the same whether the tractors and bulldozers are paid for through the generous donations of a sympathetic American public—the anti-Castro Cubans now in the United States, or the U.S. Defense Department.

It would mean that any time a Communist-inspired coup was successful anywhere in the world, Americans would be seized and held for ransom. Where would it end?

Before any commitment is made to ransom these men—however gallant their undertaking—the American public must search deeply into its collective conscience and consider the real eventual price it will pay by giving in to this present blackmail.

No one can help but sympathize deeply with the plight of the prisoners and understand the selfless desires of the mercy fund organization being formed on nonpartisan lines to rescue them.

What we are suggesting is that the men-for-machines swap has far deeper and fundamental implications for Americans and our country than merely raising a few million dollars to pay off a kidnaper.

[From the Boston Herald, May 22, 1961]

MILLIONS FOR TRIBUTE

Once upon a time there was a small but proud nation that refused to buy protection from anyone. When a piratical country several thousand miles away seized its ships and demanded ransom, the small nation fitted out a fleet and blew the pirates off the map.

Its motto then was, "Millions for defense but not one cent for tribute."

A century and a half later the small nation had grown rich and powerful. But when a piratical neighbor 90 miles off its coast seized persons under its protection and demanded a ransom of 500 tractors for their safe return, it couldn't make up its mind what to do.

Finally a group of leading citizens announced that it would raise the ransom price. It sent a telegram to the pirate leader saying that it was paying the tribute out of humanity toward the prisoners and "a deep

sense of friendship" for the rank-and-file pirates. The government, relieved to have the decision taken out of its hands, agreed to facilitate the export of the ransom tractors.

The arrangement naturally pleased the pirates, who were anxious to cultivate such profitable friendships. When the ransom was paid they turned over the prisoners, only slightly the worse for wear, and then looked around for more friends of the rich and powerful country whom they could seize and hold for ransom. Indeed, the thing looked so good that everybody began grabbing prisoners and sending off ransom notes.

Soon the rich and powerful nation was poor and small again. But it was a long time before it recovered its pride.

Murder Is Not a Childish Prank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, it is time we faced up to the fact that coddling criminals because they happen to also be teenagers is not the answer to so-called juvenile delinquency. There is a difference between breaking windows and committing murder. Our laws must recognize serious crime for what it is if we are to meet and solve one of America's gravest problems:

GETTING AWAY WITH MURDER

On reading President Kennedy's proposals for a federally directed "total attack" on juvenile delinquency, a responsible parent may wonder whether he and Mr. Kennedy are worrying about the same thing.

The President, it seems to us, has missed an opportunity to inject some clarity into the discussion of a fogbound subject, perhaps because he misses the point of the Nation's concern. Nowhere in his remarks is the euphemism "juvenile delinquency" pulled apart to reveal the multitude of evils it embraces.

What alarms a community is not truancy, window breaking, and apple filching. It is robbery, rape, and murder, committed by criminals who happen also to be teenagers or even younger. And "criminal" is the exact word. In New York City the other day, a 15-year-old stabbed to death a 14-year-old he had never seen before. His explanation: "He got snotty." This was the seventh youth gang murder in that section of the city this year, and the fourth in just 17 days.

In too many places, the merely wayward youngster and the truly dangerous youth alike have enjoyed society's impartial solicitude. In the face of alarming evidence to the contrary, the sentimental assumption persists that every young hoodlum can be redeemed if society will only love and understand him. But this turns the issue upside-down. The necessity for understanding does not rest with society, but with the young criminal who is contemptuous of its rules.

The remedy for the worsening problem of juvenile crime does not lie mainly in more study, workshops or projects. Indeed, there is no pat solution. But a big step toward a solution would surely be for all communities to draw the line between delinquency and crime.

No community needs Federal help to make that commonsense distinction. Those communities which let young criminals literally get away with murder are already shirking their responsibilities. If they let Washington try to take over the problem, they are abdicating their responsibilities.

Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, this is our Memorial Day around the world. Memorial Day, May 30, is distinctly an American institution. It is a deeply significant, sentimental custom established by our people more than 90 years ago.

The American Memorial Day is being observed in every community across our Nation, also in many foreign lands upon the high seas.

This special day is the brief moment we set aside from our busy lives to pause before the resting places of our departed loved ones—to remember them and to eulogize the honored dead. This is the day of tribute to those who live only in history.

When we have concluded our short ceremonies here and turn back to our daily tasks, we shall leave with the dead our tributes, expressed in words and with flowers. But of even greater import is the fact that we, ourselves, will have gained new spiritual and mental enlightenment through this experience.

This is not a day for sadness. In fact, when we consider all of its facets, we find that Memorial Day has great beauty and that it has truly inspiring depths.

There are the colors of our flag and flowers for the eye to admire. There are the carefully chosen words of prose, poetry, song, and prayer for the ear to hear. All these touch our hearts and minds and our conscience. They reawaken in us a new realization that we are influenced in large measure by those who have gone before us, and by their contributions to our lives.

It does not matter who we are, nor the differences between our religious thinking on racial stock. The principles represented by this Memorial Day are the same to each of us. We are all Americans. This is our special day, and here we stand together in tribute to our own national family.

Following the same line of thought, when we honor the dead we do not weigh the stations they held in life. It does not matter whether they were rich or poor, young or old, whether they were intellectuals, craftsmen, students, or laborers. At the poet John Ingalls expressed it, in the democracy of the dead, all men at last are equal. There is neither rank nor station nor prerogative in the republic of the grave.

In those days of combat, it did not matter who our fellow defenders were. And so it is now in our homage to them. It makes no difference whether they were native sons or the foreign born, whether they were white or black or brown, gentiles or Jews, Protestants or Catholics. In the final analysis, all that has ever counted is the fact that they were Americans and that they gave their lives in the defense of our homes and of our ideals of freedom.

Now, it may be a little difficult for us who are gathered here to realize that we are part of a vast, worldwide, commemorative service on this special day. We are but a small portion of the living who are honoring the dead. And these souls to whom we are directing our immediate attention are but a very few of the total number of American honored dead around the world.

What we are doing here is actually symbolic. Our contribution to the overall Memorial Day observance is being duplicated by millions of other people throughout our land and in several foreign countries. To make the point clear, let us consider the following facts:

There are more than 1 million names on the honor rolls of the American war dead. Those are the men who have fought and died for our country since this Nation was founded some 185 years ago.

What we say here today expresses our tribute to all of those honored ones. The praise we give the other departed war veterans of our personal acquaintance is, in reality, praise for all who have served in the Armed Forces of our Nation.

We cannot return the dead, therefore the only remaining course is to extend ourselves to them through the sincerity and beauty of our memorial services. That is what our people are doing today at home and abroad. Let us look at the whole picture for a moment.

Throughout the United States and in some 25 American military cemeteries beyond our shores, the mortal remains of some 400,000 Americans who gave their lives in World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict are buried—or they are recorded as missing in action.

On this Memorial Day, special ceremonies are being held at 8 American military cemeteries or special memorials in France, England, and Belgium, where nearly 31,000 World War I dead are buried.

Similar services are being held for 76,000 World War II dead at 14 other American cemeteries in England, France, Belgium, Luxembourg, Holland, Italy, and Tunisia.

Also, special services are being held for more than 90,000 other World War II and Korean war dead buried or recorded as missing at American cemeteries in Puerto Rico, Hawaii, Alaska, and the Philippines.

In addition, special services are being held for the war dead at the Tomb of the Unknowns and some 99,000 other war dead buried at Arlington National Cemetery, on Virginia soil, across the Potomac from Washington, D.C.

Most of these final resting places are a long way from us. But, in reality, they are very close to our hearts.

Once again we find our wonderful country faced with grave danger. There are loose in the world those forces who would destroy us.

And, even as our honored war dead were called upon to summon their last ounce of courage and endurance, we citizens of today must once again face the foe with forbearance and unswerving determination.

For if the proud heritage we cherish today is to endure, Americans again must meet the clarion call to oppose those who would doom us.

If we can but equal the qualities possessed by the men we honor here today, there is no foe we cannot conquer, no conspiracy we cannot overcome, no challenge we cannot meet.

This is the message for each of us here today as we pay honor to the departed ones of all wars. Glory to the battle dead. And honor to those who returned home and have since passed on.

Honor to the sons and to the father, to the husbands and to the brothers. Also, honor and comfort to the beloved survivors of those departed ones.

May our thoughts, our words and our deeds always fulfill the high ideals for which the brave have sacrificed. The obligation is ours to assure that the honored dead shall not have died in vain.

The Accrual Accounting Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Congressman BRAD MORSE, has been performing a noteworthy task for the American taxpayer in urging that President Kennedy implement a law which the President, during his Senate days, played a major part in enacting. The following editorial from the Washington Star is a well-deserved tribute to Congressman MORSE's efforts in this area:

[From the Evening Star, May 19, 1961]

TIME TO RESURRECT IT

Representative BRADFORD MORSE of Massachusetts has given President Kennedy a timely reminder that a law which the President sponsored as a Senator has been buried alive. This is the Hoover Commission's plan for curbing the piling up by Federal departments of unexpended appropriations from previous years. We agree with Representative MORSE that it is time to put this money-saving plan into action—and the President, who worked so hard to obtain passage of the law 3 years ago, is in a good position to start the ball rolling.

The law, known as the Accrual Accounting Act, requires the departments to report fully on all funds appropriated in previous years but not spent and to justify such funds as carryover items. Congress then would decide whether to put a limitation on specific accumulations and to what extent. Mr. Kennedy told the Senate in 1957 that this system would "prevent a great carryover of funds, both with respect to foreign aid and defense, which makes it almost impossible for us (Congress) to know exactly what we are doing, and the effect our actions will have on the amount of money available to the executive branch."

The Eisenhower administration asked Congress to place an accrued-funds limitation on several appropriations, but nothing was done. The new administration so far has made no request that the law be made effective through congressional limitations on carryover funds. Apparently it will take pressure from the White House to obtain action at the Capitol. We hope that the President, as author of the law, will make every reasonable effort to see that it does not remain a dead duck.

Indecision Hurts the United States Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the free world is looking to America for leadership. If we fail to take a firm stand, and just talk about freedom, we will lose the confidence of the uncommitted nations and when that happens we could well lose the cold war. It may be well for Members of Congress to think about the thoughts expressed in the following excerpt from the U.S. News & World Report so that whatever pressure possible may be brought upon the President to stop talking and back up some of the fine sentiments he has already set forth, before it is too late:

Trouble for United States is out in the world, not so much at home.

Trouble's cause? Lack of an objective. Lack of nerve. Wavering allies. A feeling by politicians that Americans would rather be comfortable than act.

A new President, too, has appeared uncertain, somewhat bewildered.

Cuba, more and more, appears as a major blunder. Invasion of Cuba was going well. Defections from Castro had started. Castro's militia did suffer heavy casualties. Castro's tanks were sitting ducks to air attack. Also an aircraft carrier was just offshore. But air support, vital to the whole operation, promised by United States for the invasion, was denied.

Why? Because the original plan, endorsed by military, was not used. Back of that? CIA took hold, moved on its own, not on military recommendations. Civilians interfered with a military operation in progress, got disaster. Pilots, begging to answer pleas from shore, had to sit on their hands.

Who was in on the operation? Everybody who gets in on any operations of a military nature. White House, CIA, military services—all of them, including Coast Guard. Could it have worked? Military answer: Yes, if plans as drawn had been given a chance to work out, instead of being changed in middle.

What about Laos? Was that the same? Not quite. There U.S. allies just faded away. Nobody, including United States, wanted to take a chance on shooting.

Khrushchev, using others to do his fighting, played it tough and won.

Result of Cuba and Laos: U.S. word is in question. All around the world it's being openly wondered whether U.S. promises will be honored if tested.

It now might take actual shooting to prove United States means what it says.

Isn't Kennedy to straighten out Khrushchev in Vienna? It's unlikely.

Remember this: Kennedy's public life is that of a debater, a talker. Khrushchev's life—a long one—has been that of a ruthless man of action.

Words, to Kennedy, mean much. Words, to Khrushchev, aren't important. The Russians use words as a cover, while getting ready for actions.

So now what? New idea in Washington is to "stabilize the periphery." The meaning? Deal with Khrushchev on the future of "fringe" countries.

Something new? No, not really new. It formerly was called "appeasement," but that word came into disrepute so a phrase is being substituted. Trouble is that the "periphery" for Russia keeps pushing out as Communism spreads.

Khrushchev's technique: Deal. Nail down new conquests. Then push on.

Actually, if the world only knew it, Communists are in trouble, too.

Red China's population is on short rations. Communism in China, as in Russia and elsewhere, is unable to solve the problem of agriculture. Russia, too, is having continued trouble with farmers. In the Soviet Union there's a return to capital punishment for a wide range of offenses.

Eastern Europe, Russia's colonial empire, has the troubles of all of today's colonies. People are restive and can be stirred up.

Then why all the fear of the Communist countries? It's a mystery.

Western Europe, alone, is vastly stronger than Russia. Add United States and there is no comparison in potential strength. Add Japan and the comparison is even more one-sided. It's probably three-to-one odds on the non-Communist side.

But: Except for United States, no country seems much interested in defense.

The trouble? Apparently only the Communists have a real objective for which they keep working. It seems that no country wants to try very hard to buck the spread of Communism. There's a great desire to live in ease.

Result is that Khrushchev is having things pretty much his own way.

Robert Welch Has No Connection With the Candy Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial from the May 9, 1961, issue of the Candy Industry and Confectioners Journal, which gives some sidelights about the controversial founder of the John Birch Society. The most important point made is that Robert Welch has no connection whatsoever with the candy industry.

This editorial was written by Don Gussow, a brilliant gentleman who has become the acknowledged spokesman for the candy industry in the United States. Candy Industry is edited and published

in New York and is probably the greatest single influence in the candy industry today.

The editorial follows:

THE BOB WELCH STORY

This editorial deals with an unusual subject. The subject is Bob Welch and the John Birch Society.

This writer has known Robert Henry Winborne Welch, Jr., for over 25 years. We have not seen, nor been in contact with him for the past 4 years, when he resigned his post as vice president and sales manager of the James O. Welch Co., Cambridge, Mass.

We remember Bob Welch as an articulate, highly intelligent, imaginative and very much involved person. We do not recall Bob Welch's taking the middle road on any subject. When Bob Welch became involved in a situation, he was fully and wholly involved. Almost literally bouncing with nervous energy, Bob Welch could not remain sitting or standing still in one position for more than a second. A compulsive worker, Bob Welch toiled almost around the clock. After a full, hectic, rat-tat-tat day in his office (which usually included a series of conferences, numerous telephone conversations and voluminous dictation given to a patient, highly competent secretary) Bob would rush off to deliver a talk before some political or community group, return to his office and, after a biref nap, go on with more work until the early hours of the morning. This was par for Bob Welch's working day course.

His after hours work more often than not pertained to chores other than those of the candy business. During the hours from 10 at night until 4 in the morning, he would dash off a few chapters of a book, write a speech, or spend the time in researching a particular problem in which he might be involved at that particular time.

Among his many activities, Bob Welch participated in candy association work. He served on many committees and at one time was chairman of the Washington Committee of the National Confectioners Association. He won the Kettle Award in 1947. He was the second to receive this honor.

Bob Welch always seemed to have been offbeat. He loved chess and played with experts. At one time he carried on a game by mail. He hasn't played much chess during the past dozen years. We remember Bob Welch as a gifted writer with a fine sense of humor. He could and did write humorous verse. He also wrote one of the easiest to read and most meaningful books on salesmanship.

Bob Welch had the benefit of a good education. North Carolina born, Bob attended a 1-room country school, high school, and had 4 years at the University of North Carolina, 2 years at the U.S. Naval Academy, and 2 at Harvard Law School. Bob never did become a lawyer.

In 1946 and again in 1948 Bob went to England, primarily to study the effect of the Socialist government. In 1949 Bob took a month's flying trip around the world, spending most of the time in Asia. Shortly afterwards he wrote a book dealing with the dismissal of Gen. Douglas A. MacArthur, entitled "May God Forgive Us." It was published by the Henry Regnery Co., Chicago, in 1952. About 200,000 copies (both hardbound and paperbound) were sold in the first year of publication.

From that time on Bob was not quite the same. Now intensely serious, gaunt in appearance, he began to develop a morbid fear of communism and Communists. In 1955 he went to Asia once again, this time visiting Syngman Rhee, then President of Korea, Gen. Chiang Kai-shek, and other high-ranking members of the Chinese National Government in Taipei, Taiwan. In the fall of 1956 he called on Chancellor Conrad Adenauer in Bonn, West Germany.

In 1956 he began to publish a little magazine called One Man's Opinion, which carried long, involved dissertations on communism. He did this at his own expense and in his spare time—probably between the hours of 10 at night and 4 in the morning, and on weekends.

He dabbled in politics, made hundreds of speeches, and even made an unsuccessful attempt to obtain the Republican nomination for lieutenant governor in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

When Bob Welch felt that he could not give up his outside political and doctrinaire activities and at the same time continue his job as sales manager, he resigned his post in the James O. Welch Co. That was late in 1956. He was succeeded by his very competent assistant, Bob Daugherty. For the record, Bob Welch never owned and does not now own any stock in the Welch Candy Co.

From then on Bob Welch became even more obsessed with the job of fighting communism than ever before. He expanded the publication of his magazine (the name was changed from One Man's Opinion to American Opinion), wrote pamphlets and tracts and made endless speeches. Two years ago he founded the John Birch Society. (In 1954 he wrote a book on the life of John Birch, published that year by the Henry Regnery Co.)

At this writing Robert H. W. Welch is one of the most controversial figures in the country. So much has been published about the John Birch Society in the past few months that a detailed report is not needed here. It is not for us to criticize or question its motives.

Every right-thinking American is opposed to communism. Our Nation (together with its allies and friends) today is involved in a serious, life and death struggle with the Communists. Whether the methods used by the John Birch Society are the right or wrong ones, seems to be the concern of many as evidenced in reports in the daily press. Certainly the use of communistic tactics is abhorrent to those who love and are devoted to freedom. Immoral means still do not justify moral ends.

One of the purposes of bringing this story about Bob Welch and the John Birch Society to the attention of our readers is to underline its possible implications in the industry. Obviously, it is unfortunate that news dispatches almost invariably refer to Mr. Welch as a retired candy manufacturer. This is not good public relations for candy and the candy industry. But we have complete confidence in the fairmindedness of our people. We question whether anyone would stop eating candy because he did not approve of what Robert Welch is saying or what the John Birch Society stands for.

We credit candy jobbers and dealers with the same fairmindedness. We question whether they will equate Bob Welch's activities with the marketing policies of the James O. Welch Co., with which he has no connection whatsoever.

In a statement to the press the other day, James O. Welch, president of the company bearing his name, stated that neither he nor his company shared his brother's point of view. "I know that there must be many of our customers who not only disagree with Bob Welch's viewpoint, but may be very much disturbed over his activities," Mr. Welch said.

"Our company emphatically has nothing to do with the John Birch Society, and my brother Robert has no connection with this company and owns no stock in it," Mr. Welch added.

In a measure, it is a pity that the highly respected head of a very important candy company has found it necessary to defend himself in this manner. Jim Welch is one of the most honorable, highly respected of men in the candy business. His integrity is unquestioned. He is not interested in headlines. He has had but one interest since he started making fudge in the kitchen of his home, when quite young, just married, and in need of finding a way to make a living. And his single interest today is to make the best possible candy and sell it in the most honorable fashion.

We have full confidence in the fairmindedness on the part of members of this industry and their human qualities to understand this difficult situation.

East Central Parts of Oregon Attract

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the Oregon Journal of May 15, indicates a few of the reasons for the increasing popularity of central Oregon among visitors from other parts of the State and tourists from other States:

EAST CENTRAL PARTS OF OREGON ATTRACT

(By Paul Manley)

To the road traveler, central and east-central Oregon presents an ever-changing panorama of scenery.

The hilly country around Bend, with its breathtaking views of snow-capped Cascades Range peaks, rapidly gives way to flat, treeless rangeland en route to Burns; and northward from this cattle capital, rugged, pine-studded skiing terrain is encountered abruptly.

These are but surface impressions, and the motorists who pauses to delve beneath the rought exterior will find friendly people in quaint, historic communities with enough unusual, off-the-beaten-track phenomena to make the endeavor rewarding.

North of Redmond, for example, a turn-off on U.S. Highway 97 provides a spectacular view of the Crooked River Canyon. (Nearby, incidentally, the Deschutes River fishing is not to be overlooked.)

At Bend, the highway leads directly past peaceful Pioneer Park, a pleasant enough sight and well worth more than a cursory glance. Springtime plantings of vivid red and yellow tulips will soon be replaced by summer blooms, and there are a pair of blackheaded Canada geese and a horde of multicolored mallard ducks almost tame enough to let youngsters pet them.

Burns, like an oasis in the desert, caters to the traveler's needs. Service stations and motels dominate the intersections, but there are also window displays of water skis and fishing tackle, which excite the curiosity of visitors to this arid region.

From Burns, tourists and sportsmen with time and energy will point their cars southward, to the picturesque Steens Mountains and the Malheur Game Refuge, which teem with wildlife and migratory birds, while the pedal pusher hurrying homeward will be treated to reminders of the past in the valleys of Canyon Creek and the John Day River to the north.

Beside the highway between Burns and John Day lie the rotting remains of many a homesteader's cabin, amid luxuriant stands of ponderosa pine; and less than 2 miles

from John Day, the biggest community in Grant County, sits the little village of Canyon City, which had the temerity to fight for—and win—the designation of county seat. Here, too, is the Joaquin Miller house, where the famous poet lived, and a museum preserving countless reminders of the days when this was "gold rush" country.

John Day itself, hemmed in by hills and mountains, has decided to come to terms with nature and make the most of its position. On one of the heights overlooking the town, residents are finishing construction of an airstrip. And a little farther west, in the foothills of the Aldrich Mountains, they have carved out a nine-hole golf course which must rank with the most famous for splendor of setting.

More than 30 miles east of John Day, along the John Day River, are some of the most productive fossil beds in the Nation, and their fascination has not been lost on Tom Weatherford, octogenarian proprietor of a "fossil ranch" fronting on U.S. Highway 26. Weatherford has worked the fossil beds for decades, unearthing hundreds of museum pieces—including mastodon teeth and skulls of three-toed horses—which he keeps in a cave in a hillside near his home. With a little prodding he will drag out a few of his treasured specimens, for which he reportedly refused offers exceeding $40,000, and which he delights in showing to paleontology students.

South Immoral?—Poppycock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. FORRESTER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, the Albany Herald, a daily newspaper published in Albany, Ga., carried an editorial in its May 23, 1961, issue, entitled "South Immoral?—Poppycock."

This editorial was written by the Honorable James H. Gray, publisher of that newspaper, who also happens to be the distinguished chairman of the Georgia State Democratic Executive Committee. Mr. Gray was reared in Springfield, Mass., and, having lived more than half of his life in the East, has had an opportunity to observe the race problem in the various sections of our country.

The statements of Mr. Gray set out in this editorial reflect the sentiments of the people in the South and, additionally, reflect the sentiments of the southern Democrats.

The editorial reads as follows:

SOUTH IMMORAL?—POPPYCOCK

A great deal of nonsense is being disseminated about the latest racial troubles in our region by assorted sentimentalists, bleeding-hearts and equalitarians, who fancy themselves as the "liberals" of the Space Age. These self-appointed social critics are sorely distressed. They are seized by the notion that the South in general, and the State of Alabama in particular, is acting both immorally and illegally in its resistance to the scatter-gun efforts to integrate the races.

Their argument runs to the effect that the South is immoral because it is opposing a moral movement. The moralists, in this instance, are the Negro men and white women, traveling together in public carriers in interstate transport, who are sufficiently courageous to be willing to test the various segregation laws of the Deep Southern States in this dramatic manner. They are "moralists" by definition of their sponsoring agency, the Congress of Racial Equality, because they are supposedly practicing the brotherhood of man. And because the South does not hold with this kind of social experimentation, and because the South has legislated against such, it is immoral.

From a legal standpoint, these "liberals" argue with much more logic that a U.S. statute permits this mode of travel, that Federal law takes precedence over State law, and that the Southern States therefore are in an intolerable legal position when they attempt to block the freedom riders.

To our mind, however, both of these arguments miss the point. In the first place, we cannot perceive any morality entailed in transportation by bus—or by any other conveyance. The CORE people are on record that they are testing Southern stautes by nonviolent means. But the fact is indisputable that, in so doing, they are engaging in a direct provocation for the avowed purpose, in the words of Georgia's Governor Vandiver, "of disturbing the people of a section who are otherwise peaceful." Is this a moral purpose? Far from it.

In the second place, the question of race relations, the judicial and executive branches of the Federal Government to the contrary notwithstanding, forbids a strict legalistic solution. For example, in the 7 years which have transpired since the U.S. Supreme Court first struck down the 85-year-old "separate but equal" dictum for the Nation's schools, only a handful of southern schools have integrated their classrooms—and none voluntarily. The so-called law of the land is observed in the breach simply because southern society—and not a few eastern and western communities—will not support it with a popular will.

This circumstance, one of but many, argues eloquently the southern case that racial relations must be established and maintained through mutual confidence and good will, neither of which can be achieved in an atmosphere electric with naked hatreds, suspicions and, above all, the application of force in the most sensitive area of all human contacts.

This is not to say, of course, that the mobs in Alabama—in Birmingham, Anniston, and Montgomery for the last week—can or should be condoned for their actions. Mob rule is alien to the American tradition. It is invariably destructive, never constructive. Neither is it a safety valve for the discharge of emotional energy, for it leaves in its wake festering sores which heal slowly, if ever, and destroys the middle ground on which the fairminded can maintain communications with each other to reach accommodations equitable to all parties.

But this is to say that millions of southerners cannot, in truth, be branded as "immoral" for the irresponsible actions of a group of unthinking men reacting predictably to an unending campaign of clever harassment designed to enrich the treasury of the sponsoring racist organization. Try as it may, neither CORE nor the NAACP can resell this nation the false doctrines first preached by "Uncle Tom's Cabin." Nor, more to the point, can either they or the national administration achieve racial equality at the point of a bayonet or the muzzle of a marshal's pistol.

The South's racial relations, like those everywhere in today's troubled world, will be established ultimately by men—not by laws, not by courts, not by self-serving politicians and, above all, not by dictation from any outside source.

JAMES H. GRAY,
Editor.

Let's Rededicate Ourselves to the Home of the Brave

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, how proudly, over the years, have generations of Americans sung

"The Star-Spangled Banner, Oh long may it wave,
O'er the land of the free, and the home of the brave."

The stirring words of our National Anthem have been an inspiration to countless millions throughout the world who had the dream of freedom in their hearts. With what assurance can we sing these words today? What has happened in the home of the brave that would let us be a party to submitting to the demands of a tinhorn dictator, would send us, hat in hand, to offer ransom for prisoners held in captivity 90 miles off our coast? It is time, Mr. Speaker, for Americans to rededicate themselves to the great traditions of America, to our undying belief in freedom and in the dignity of the individual. We make no trade with bandits. We offer no bribes which are morally wrong. We are still the home of the brave and 170 million Americans, I am confident, will prove it even though the Administration may not think so. For some stirring thoughts, recalling some of our glorious traditions, I refer you to this editorial which appeared in the Indianapolis News, May 22, 1961:

WHAT GOES ON HERE?

As of this writing, self-appointed private citizens' groups—the most notable headed by Eleanor Roosevelt, Walter Reuther, and Milton Eisenhower—are raising money for the release of some 1,200 Cuban rebels, captured during the recent unsuccessful attempt to rescue their homeland from Communist rule. The money, $20 million, will be used to purchase tractors or bulldozers for Fidel Castro's Red regime.

One newspaper, supporting the idea of a trade with Castro, declared in a front page editorial that it believes "a human life is worth more than a machine," and so do we. But if, for the purpose of preserving human lives, we submit to Castro's brazen blackmail attempt, we will be opening the door to every future tyrant and bully boy, large or small, who decides to make a laughing stock out of the United States. Also, there is the little matter of the law, conveniently overlooked by the State Department, prohibiting private citizens from negotiating with foreign governments. The activites of these self-appointed committees, unofficially supported by our Government, are unprecedented in our own history or in the history of international diplomacy.

Castro is not offering this deal because he especially needs 500 tractors, although he certainly could put them to good use in helping to solve his dire farm problem. He offered the deal precisely because he and his Communist bosses want to see exactly how far they can push the United States before it stops acting like a sniveling coward and once again flexes it's national muscles. Why else did Havana radio gloatingly announce

that Castro would deal only with the United States—and remember, the 1,200 prisoners are Cubans, not U.S. citizens—and not with a neutral country.

What happened to that national pride we displayed in 1797, when after the unsavory French foreign minister Talleyrand demanded a bribe as the price of negotiating with the United States, our envoy Charles C. Pinckney replied with his memorable, "Millions for defense, but not 1 cent for tribute." What happened to the courage displayed by our Nation in 1853, when, after Austria kidnaped a former citizen who had since taken out his first U.S. citizenship papers, an American war sloop pulled into the harbor of Smyrna (where the prisoner was being held) and its commander ordered the Austrian commander to return the man or face immediate consequences? (Naturally, the man was returned.)

How different today. It's bad enough we supplied the push to the rebel invasion of Cuba, and then lacked the courage to see it through to victory. It's bad enough that we allow Castro to insult our Nation, and publicly declare his island a part of the Soviet bloc. But to pay blackmail to his Communist government, just days after both our President and our House of Representatives agree that it constitutes "a clear and present danger" to our sovereignty, is nothing short of fantastic.

Patrick Henry once asked his fellow men, "Is life so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery?" Today, 186 years later, during which time we have grown from an infant nation of unlimited courage to a mighty nation which appears suddenly to have lost her national conscience, we might ask whether life is so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of blatant blackmail? We think not.

Shades of George Washington, shades of Patrick Henry, shades of Thomas Jefferson, shades of Capt. John Paul Jones, shades of Admiral Farragut, shades of Abraham Lincoln, shades of Teddy Roosevelt, shades of Iwo Jima and Anzio.

What in heaven's name goes on here in the home of the free and the land of the brave?

Protest Trade of Tractors for Prisoners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER H. DOMINICK
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Speaker, the recent proposals, backed by the White House, to indulge in a subrosa exchange of tractors for Cuban rebels captured during the ill-fated invasion of their homeland has prompted a wave of local reaction. Fully typical of the sentiment being expressed by the people is the telegram sent to me by the secretary of the Boulder County, Colo., Farm Bureau. Under unanimous consent I include this telegram in the RECORD.

LONGMONT, COLO., *May 23, 1961.*

PETER H. DOMINICK,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We wish to vigorously protest the action of any group to trade tractors to Castro for the release of prisoners, and urge that it be officially discouraged. Aside from bolstering the Castro Communist economy it is making the United States ridiculous in the eyes of the world. It is the feeling here that if our government feels they are responsible for these prisoners we should use force—not barter.

O. E. PERASON,
Secretary, Boulder County Farm Bureau

Intervention in Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include a well-considered, temperate, intelligent, and thought-provoking editorial, entitled "Intervention in Alabama" which appeared in the Charleston News and Courier on Monday, May 22, 1961.

If ever the Nation was faced with the need for calmness in the face of strife; if ever the Nation was faced with the choice between the road to communism or the road to continued freedom; if ever the Nation demanded the best of its leaders, that time is now.

I measure my words carefully when I say that our Republic is in its darkest peril, right at this moment.

We face a Communist state 90 miles from Florida; Laos is crumbling before us; Thailand, Burma, and South Vietnam are sitting on time bombs and the fuse has been lit; Indonesia is faced with many problems, and a single incident could send her irretrievably into the Soviet sphere of influence.

As if that were not enough to worry about, there is the problem of the Soviet Union and its direct operations in Iran, East Germany, and Africa.

And now, in an effort to profit at the expense of America itself, there are those who enter the South for the sole purpose of inciting to riot and creating turmoil, conflict, and tension among two races who have striven over the years to solve their differences through a process of evolution.

Here then, Mr. Speaker, is an editorial with a clarion call, warning us of the trap, set by those who participate as so-called freedom riders in the South.

And in addition, unfortunately, but politically understandable, our own Federal Government has intervened once again in the affairs of a sovereign State.

In many ways what is going on today in the South is a greater conflict than appears on the surface, for it has now become the conflict of a minority race versus a minority ethnic group. It is becoming clear that we in the South are now being treated as a minority within the United States by our own Government. A cleavage is taking place as far-reaching, perhaps, as that which occurred in 1861 and the Nation will be the loser if it continues.

If ever a period in history called for a level-headed analysis of an internal challenge which threatens the heartstone of the Nation, it is now.

I commend this editorial to those in the North, the South, the East and the West, white and colored, who profess to be Americans. Those who put their Americanism above their race will agree with the editorial; those who put their race and individual interests above their Nation, will disagree:

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, May 22, 1961]

INTERVENTION IN ALABAMA

Though it was unwilling to intervene effectively in Communist Cuba, the U.S. Government moved armed men into Alabama despite the protest of the Governor of that State. Outside demonstrators, using the familiar scheme of starting riots in order to demand protection, furnished the pretext to invade State authority.

President Kennedy acted under an 1871 (Reconstruction) statute empowering Federal intervention to quell disorder in a State.

The face of white mobs at Birmingham and Montgomery is ugly. That is the face of Alabama and the South being shown the world today. Mobs are ugly in any race or nation. What lies behind the mobs in Alabama is even uglier.

Back of the freedom riders is an organization called CORE (Congress of Racial Equality). In its high command are people with records of Red-front affiliations. Whether any of them could be convicted in court is beside the point. The turmoil in Alabama is following the pattern that Communists all over the world pursue in setting up for the kill.

Once they seize power, Communists permit neither disorder nor protest. Those who don't like Red rule and 20th century slavery disappear in dungeons or unmarked graves.

We do not say that white and Negro demonstrators, including earnest college students of both races, are Communists or even conscious tools of communism. Like many others today, they confuse freedom, social justice, and democracy with subversion and revolution. Perhaps they are only muddle-headed idealists and fiery youths in search of excitement. But they are being used to tear out the vitals of the Republic.

If State and local authorities are suppressed—as happens with dispatch of U.S. marshals to Alabama—the whole country could be brought under central police control. This would simplify enormously the mission of revolutionists. Subversion and seizure at the top would be far simpler than taking America State by State.

Communist leaders know this. That is why they welcome, if indeed they did not engineer, such incidents as occurred at Birmingham and Montgomery.

Someday, as Lenin predicted, our country may fall like ripe fruit into the lap of communism. Russian soldiers need not tramp our streets. Occupying forces could wear the badge of the U.S. Government—as they do today in the State capital of Alabama.

Do we then despair for freedom? Not yet. A little time remains to waken the American people. While the alarms are ringing, southerners of both races must guard their homes and firesides. They must not succumb to hatred and violence. The deep reservoir of respect and affection still can save white and Negro skins.

Economic changes already are at work. They will bring gradually and peaceably many of the things that militant race leaders are trying to ram through by force. These things cannot prevail without an atmosphere of good will.

Meanwhile, our people should not fall into traps set with Red bait. Despite provocation, calm heads on both sides must hold the line. Southerners whose forebears rode out Re-

construction can endure hardship and humiliation. They also must maintain civilized decency and human kindness.

These people and these qualities will help to save the Republic if it can be saved. The goal is worth the gamble.

Attorney Bernard Beerman, of Chelsea, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a well deserved eulogy to a former public official in the city of Chelsea, Mass., who has given his entire life to the service of the people in that city and that State. He was one of the finest men that I have ever met in my years of public service. He was a kindly person, thoughtful, considerate, and helpful at all times, not only as adviser to the city officials as clerk of committees of the board of aldermen, but to the people. He was one who enjoyed helping others with their problems, public and private. Ever ready to serve on all the various civic and patriotic committees for the betterment of the municipality, Bennie Beerman was highly respected and admired by all. I, too, join with his countless friends and associates in extending to his wife and family my sincere and deepest sympathy in the loss of this outstanding citizen.

[From the Chelsea (Mass.) Record]

BERNARD BEERMAN

The death this week of Attorney Bernard Beerman, eminent counselor and city official for more than four decades, in effect closes a colorful era in local politics and municipal administration.

Perhaps more than any other figure in local history, Attorney Beerman exerted tremendous influence and impact on local politics and the administration of the city, particularly from the late twenties to the early fifties.

Barney, as he was familiarly and affectionately known, was clerk of committee of the board of aldermen for 41 years, holding the post through 15 mayoralty administrations.

He was adviser, consultant, and confidant to hundreds of members of the board of aldermen through the years, to just about every mayor, and to city employee groups. His opinions were sought by many who had any municipal position or dealings.

Many actions of the boards of aldermen through the years were not taken until advice had been sought from Barney. He knew politics and municipal administration as no other individual did. And he knew his law thoroughly.

As clerk of the board, he became quite noted for his ability to draw up resolutions, whether they were expressions of sympathy for widows of deceased city officials, or commendations for worthy feats on the part of policemen, firemen, or other employees.

He was even an ambassador of good will representing the board and the city in dealings with the MTA, the MDC, or other State agencies, winning the respect of all with his courteousness his humble mien, and his willingness to cooperate. He maintained these fine traits whether he dealt with a peddler seeking a permit, or a railway president involved in a $100,000 proposition with the city.

In addition to his work as clerk of committees which occupied the better part of each of the working days, he found time to serve as chairman of the stadium commission from 1934 until his death. He was chairman of the body when the present Memorial Stadium was build, and which stands today as one of the finest stadiums in the Commonwealth, a fitting tribute to his memory.

Perhaps least known about him, is the fact that he was a great benefactor of his fellow man, both financially and in other ways. He gave of his time and service to unfortunates who could not afford to pay a fee, and he asked men and women to whom he gave aid to keep it secret.

Proposed Mergers by Railroad Companies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, early this summer, the Interstate Commerce Commission will commence its deliberations upon the proposed merger of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co. and of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. It is expected that some railroads, some transportation organizations, and various other groups from among our population will oppose this merger on grounds determined either by their own economic situations or by their view of the public interest.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to some of the problems of this merger as they would affect the 60,000 employees of the New York Central system, who work at their jobs across almost one-quarter of the United States.

Adherents of the merger claim savings from economies. On this point, the New York Central says that the savings will primarily come in one way:

That is by the ability of the combined system to take traffic away from other railroads in the territory.

The New York Central Railroad is the obvious prime target for the C. & O.–B. & O. raid on other freight business—the business which permits the continuation of any passenger and commuter services.

The freight traffic most susceptible to raiding by the C. & O.–B. & O. provides the backbone of Central's revenues. These revenues make it possible to provide essential Central freight and passenger service over the entire New York Central system, as well as the New York area commuter and terminal freight services. If these essential services are to be maintained, the New York Central must have the revenues which make them possible.

Thus, a C. & O.–B. & O. merger would not benefit the public through major savings achieved by eliminating duplicate facilities. There aren't that many duplicate facilities. And a C. & O.–B. & O. merger would hurt the public by depriving competitors of revenue they need to continue their freight, passenger and commuter services.

I cannot speak for the New York Central or its employees. But, what the company says here gives me deep concern.

Let us stop for a moment and translate this into human terms. Employment on the New York Central system for the past 30 years has been as follows:

Year	Employment	Index
1930	136,752	100
1935	89,711	65
1940	92,516	68
1945	124,461	91
1950	110,950	81
1955	81,552	60
1960	59,262	43

While the Congress has provided for a readjustment period, so that workers displaced by mergers cannot be laid off precipitously, this does not apply to workers displaced through loss of traffic to another line—enabled by merger to, as the New York Central says, "raid" another.

For the most part, no protection against mergers applied to the 51,688 jobs lost on the New York Central between 1950 and 1960, a fall of 46.5 percent.

Most of these 51,688 workers were breadwinners. They were earning, on the average over the 1950–60 period, perhaps $5,500 a year. Each had approximately three dependents. Thus, we have an annual average purchasing power loss of $284,284,000 and the financial support of 206,752 individuals was lost, no doubt in some cases perhaps forever. The more of this type of catastrophic loss we have, the worse our economy is bound to become. Those are facts.

Certainly at a time of economic stress like this, we should not move hastily into an action of fundamental economic importance, one which can cause even more people to lose their jobs.

It is easy enough for someone unconcerned to say that the loss of one New York Central job will mean that one B. & O. or C. & O. worker will keep his, or that a new B. & O. or C. & O. worker may be hired to replace the man who lost his job. That may sound reasonable enough to anyone with a callous attitude on humanitarian matters.

But, it does not sound good to the man who loses his job and cannot support his family. Nor does it sound good to me.

There is a better way, one which will avoid cannibalism and permit the railroads eventually to reenter their era of dynamic growth—and thus create more jobs.

That way is by developing an intelligently planned program for joining roads together into strong and stable competitive systems which will thrive, and grow, and answer the human need for more and more jobs. We must, once and for all, put behind us the mergers which typified the era of the Goulds and the Fisks.

We must move into the modern era of railroad consolidations that make sense for the worker and the general public.

This cannot be done overnight. But it affords a far better answer than hastily designed mergers aimed at the short term and the quick buck. No merger should be undertaken unless it envisions where we want our country to be economically 10 or 20 years hence, and how many new jobs that will mean to our workers and their families. Otherwise, we will destroy not only the possibility of a sound rail transportation system, but also an important part of our human capacity.

Traffic Safety Is Tied to Good Roads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to an editorial which appeared in the May 17 issue of the Mason City (Iowa) Globe-Gazette, "Traffic Safety Is Tied to Good Roads."

The points raised in this editorial are facts all of us should keep in mind as we work to bring our highway system up to date to handle the increasing traffic flow. I am especially aware of them since I serve on the Subcommittee on Roads of the House Public Works Committee and I am also a member of the special "watchdog" committee on the Federal-aid highway system. We are charged with the responsibility of keeping the interstate highway building program on schedule and with seeing that the tax money spent on this project is wisely and legally used. The sooner we have the Interstate System completed, the greater reduction we will see in traffic accidents.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that the editorial appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

TRAFFIC SAFETY IS TIED TO GOOD ROADS

National Highway Week will be observed from May 21 to May 27 in Iowa and in the 49 other States. It's being given prestige and momentum by gubernatorial proclamations.

Adequate streets and highways represent engineering in the three "E" concept of safety. This element is more stable and more predictable than the other two—education and enforcement.

The proofs are too numerous and too impressive for questioning that well-designed and well-constructed highways promote safety. Nowhere is this more dramatic than in States with modern turnpikes or expressways.

With traffic density many times greater than on lesser roads, and with materially higher speed, the rate of fatalities and the rate of accidents are impressively reduced.

This isn't, of course, meant to minimize the importance of education and enforcement. They are imperatives in any effective safety program. The point is that those two "E's" in the safety arc—and especially education—are long-term programs whereas adequate roads can be had almost overnight.

Good roads cost money—a lot of money. But they aren't as costly in the long run as poor roads. It's more than picturesque language to suggest that the motoring public pays for good roads whether it gets them or not.

Three decades of contact with organized safety have persuaded this writer that the accident problem on our highways is linked in a very real way to public attitude.

When 9 out of 10 persons want safety enough to pay the price of safety, we'll be on the way to having it. The course will be clear ahead.

With the blessing of the public, law enforcers will take care of that 10th person, the one who won't play the game. And safety education will be an integral part of our school system.

By the same token, there will be an insistent demand that roads adequate to the expanding needs of the traveling public be built and maintained.

Safety in industry started some four decades ago with (1) a conviction that the problem could be solved and (2) a determination to carry through on the program irrespective of cost or resistance.

That story can—and ultimately will—be repeated in the field of traffic safety. And nowhere else will its manifestations be more prominent than in the realm of roadbuilding.

What the Right Hand Giveth, the Left Hand Taketh Away

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mr. Paul J. McMahon of Binghamton, N.Y.:

McMAHON BROS., INC.,
Binghamton, N.Y., May 19, 1961.

Hon. HOWARD W. ROBISON,
U.S. House of Representatives,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Please, Mr. ROBISON, ask the U.S. Congress: Why does the U.S. Congress continue to support contradictory and self-defeating policies? It is difficult to reconcile—

1. Federal aid to education with the need for same.

2. Public housing which local proponents state is necessary so that young married couples may be able to save enough money for a downpayment on their own home with—

(a) Farm and crop subsidies and storage costs of same which make food and clothing cost this same young married couples more.

(b) New York State's income tax personal exemption reduction from $2,500 to $1,200 for young married couples which increases their tax bill.

(c) The 2 cents per gallon increase in gasoline tax in New York State March 1, 1959. Increase in cost to this corporation, $1,300 per year and a proportionate increase in cost to employees in their personal automobiles.

(d) The increasing number of tax-exempt foundations in the United States of America, as recently placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN. (To help the poor?)

(e) Urban renewal, Federal roads, airport and aircraft, and other subsidies.

(f) Foreign aid to Communist governments while the poor young married couples are asked to pay their share of a $43 billion annual defense cost against communism.

(g) The constant rise in the cost of living (inflation) which decreases the purchasing power of all citizens including young married couples and pensioners including those receiving social security benefits.

These and other items of equal uniqueness cause wonder and dismay to plague the citizen-taxpayer.

Can you explain why these things are supposed to make financial sense? I would like to be able to explain it to employees who ask for wage increases so that they may retain their normal purchasing power, pay their increasing real estate and school taxes, feed and clothe their children without moonlighting; and to customers when the point is reached where affecting economies such as reducing personnel, driving compact cars to obtain greater gas mileage is no longer possible and we must raise prices.

Or is it the intent of the U.S. Congress to preside over the liquidation of small business in the United States?

Respectfully,

PAUL J. McMAHON,
Chairman, Board of Directors.

A Doctor Reports on Project Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an article from the Medical Center Memo of the Stanford University Medical School.

Stanford University has provided many doctors who have served aboard the SS *Hope* during its Indonesian trip, which ends at the beginning of June. Some of these medical people who will serve with this mercy vessel at the South Vietnam capital of Saigon until September are members of the faculty at Stanford Medical School.

The enclosed article "A Doctor Reports on Project Hope," is a tribute to the splendid work done in the cause of mercy by Stanford people:

A DOCTOR REPORTS ON PROJECT HOPE

A member of the Medical School's voluntary faculty has returned from Indonesia with a firsthand report of Project Hope, the people-to-people floating medical center now in southeast Asia.

"The impact of the *Hope*," says Dr. John Ratcliffe, "was tremendous from the first. There's demand now for the ship to visit all over Asia."

Dr. Ratcliffe flew to Djakarta with a first group of doctors from this area, arriving last October 19, the day the *Hope* made port there.

"From the start, Project Hope had as much work as we could handle," Dr. Ratcliffe says.

This was not surprising in a country with only 1,500 doctors, about one for every 60,000 of a population in the midst of a terrific explosion.

"The amount of surgery to be done is incredible," Dr. Ratcliffe says. "Indonesians are pleasant people, but they are unfortunates beset by parasites and millions of flies. They are also particular victims of thyroid and neck cancer, and of such congenital defects as cleft lip."

It was an operation on such a lip that gave the Indonesians one of the first, dramatic

examples of Project Hope surgical skill. Dr. Ratcliffe is not a plastic surgeon, but the 14-year-old girl had a badly disfiguring cleft lip. After a morning spent in the *Hope's* "excellent medical library," Dr. Ratcliffe operated. Today this 14-year-old is free of her disfigurement.

Project Hope surgery is done on board the ship or in Indonesian hospitals. "The heat was extreme," Dr. Ratcliffe says. "We often kept patients packed in ice. We ourselves simply soaked in our own perspiration."

The climate is hard, the work harder, but doctors who fly to Project Hope for 2- to 4-month tours take it in stride. About 18 are aboard at a time. The nursing and technical staff of 25 is signed on for a year, among them two from the Stanford Medical Center: Harriet Seipel, head technican in the Center's Cardiology Laboratory and surgical nurse Delia Dorame.

The sort of easily recognized help Project Hope is giving brought a quick reaction from the Indonesians, according to Dr. Ratcliffe. From the first the people came to see the *Hope* for themselves, and in such numbers they even made a traffic problem.

"The impression of Project Hope is all the greater because Indonesian medicine, even with the backing of the 11-year-old republic, is in such low gear," Dr. Ratcliffe says.

When independence from the Dutch came, there was no reservoir of native physicians on which to draw; in 1940 only 40 students were graduated from the combined Indonesian schools of law, medicine and engineering. Consequently, native doctors today are all very young and comparatively inexperienced. And these young doctors, on government orders, are facing up to 200 clinic patients singlehanded every day. This pressured practice leaves no time for the sort of help that Project Hope is giving.

This alone would make its people-to-people mark for American good will. But when the *Hope* sails for home refurbishing in the fall, it will leave behind something even more tangible. In Djakarta there is a fine new hospital that the impoverished country could not equip. Project Hope has undertaken to complete this Ibu Sukarno Hospital as an American model institution that will soon be exclusively Indonesian. The project is also training a corps of Indonesian nurses on board for 6 months. Excellent students, these 25 young women will form a nucleus of well-trained Indonesian nurses.

"Project Hope cost $3,500,000 to start," Dr. Ratcliffe says. "But the benefits to Indonesian-American friendship may well justify this expenditure which also happens to be the cost of a single jet fighter."

Saving the Potomac

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, for 30 years the historic associations and natural beauty of the Potomac Valley and the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal have been recognized as worthy of preservation. At one time, this recognition was purely local, but it is now widespread. I am glad to note the nationwide interest which exists in the Potomac Valley and the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal National Park. As evidence of this interest, I append a copy of an editorial in the New York Times published on May 22, 1961. Since this editorial deals directly with the subject matter of H.R. 4684 and S. 77, I am sure that it will be of interest to other Members of the Congress.

SAVING THE POTOMAC

The valley of the Potomac River is still largely unspoiled. For 180 miles, from Cumberland, Md., to the Nation's Capital, it cuts through historic land—a surprising amount of it still wilderness—accompanied by the famous old Chesapeake & Ohio Canal. A rarity among rivers, the Potomac has not been used heavily by industry; it traverses the fringe of the excessively urban, highly commercialized eastern seaboard.

This fringe position has protected the Potomac in many ways, but each year encroachments threaten. They are worse this year than last, and were worse then that the year before. The bulldozers come closer, the unspoiled areas shrink. Each session recently Congress has considered legislation to ward off that encroachment by converting the long C. & O. Canal, with some adjacent acreage, into a national historical park.

Some reason for delay has always been available. Although the Senate has passed the measure twice, the House has failed to act. This time the argument is made that the favored proposal of the Corps of Engineers for a high dam is again under study.

We submit that there is no more time for delay. Protecting the Nation's natural resources, providing areas for recreation, and appreciation of the very land which gives us strength, is increasingly urgent. The Chesapeake & Ohio Canal National Historical Park may well prove to be the central park for the eastern seaboard's coming megalopolis. Its need has been strongly endorsed by the Kennedy administration. Congress should assure its preservation now.

Senior Specialist Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. CANNON
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, a great amount of legislative study and public enthusiasm has attended the proposal that a Peace Corps be created to assist the Government of the United States in achieving an improved atmosphere between this country and other nations abroad.

While I believe that the suggestion of a Peace Corps has merit and could fulfill an important need, I do believe that we would be missing an opportunity if we neglected to recognize an important contribution that can be made by our senior citizen to the cause of international harmony and mutual assistance for nations of the free world and neutral countries.

The president of W. R. Grace & Co., Mr. J. Peter Grace, has written a column in a recent issue of the magazine Quest, in which proposals that a Senior Specialist Corps be created to tap the great knowledge and human resources of our senior citizens, many of whom seek with great enthusiasm to make their contribution toward improved international relations and peace.

I believe the proposal will be of interest to, and warrants the attention of, Members of this body, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the column of J. Peter Grace.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GUEST COLUMNIST—J. PETER GRACE

As President Kennedy's Peace Corps gets organized, it is continually amazing how this program has galvanized the imagination of the young people of the United States.

But the Peace Corps, with its emphasis on youth, diverts the spotlight from another major resource of the United States, the increasing number of highly trained senior citizens that we have, men who, after many productive years in business, at colleges and universities, in governments, have retired.

This reservoir is increasing; it will continue to do so as more and more business concerns institute mandatory retirement plans that specify an age at which employees must retire. (And the trend to allow employees to retire, at their option, ahead of the mandatory age, will further increase it.)

In some cases, of course, these senior citizens, with their skills and talents, find productive ways to use their time. But too often, they end up in an idleness that they themselves do not want and that the Nation and the world cannot afford.

Thus it is time to consider not only a Peace Corps of young people but a senior specialist corps as well.

This is something for the Federal Government to consider. The procedures used for the Peace Corps could, in large part, be used for senior specialists.

These men and women could be used in a wide variety of fields. For instance, there are thousands of people in this country whose talents could be used overseas in the fields of capital formation, home financing and construction, city planning, business administration and the professions, agriculture, including soil management, land development and forestry, teaching, administration of schools, hospitals, and libraries, public health, laboratory research and administration, industrial productivity and incentive programs, engineering in all its branches, transportation, roadbuilding, labor relations, and many others. Such a listing is seemingly endless.

From this tremendous reservoir of highly skilled and experienced talent, the United States could develop a Senior Specialist Corps, which would be a valuable complement to President Kennedy's youthful Peace Corps. These senior specialists could be advantageously used on short-term special missions in the underdeveloped areas of the world, particularly in Latin America, where they could provide technical advice and organizational assistance.

There are a number of U.S. and international organizations which are now engaged in technical assistance programs which could immediately make use of these talents, which unfortunately today are going to waste. I have in mind, for instance, the International Cooperation Administration, which operates the United States point 4 program, the United Nations, and the Organization of American States, which render technical assistance to member states.

There are many private organizations in the United States and the foreign countries which are engaged in financial consultation, and which could make efficient use of these senior specialists.

Many of the countries of Latin America, with which I am most familiar, and underdeveloped nations in other parts of the

world, are today anxiously facing many of the same problems which confronted the United States some 30 to 50 years ago. In our country we developed unique techniques to resolve them such as the savings and loan associations, mass construction of housing, opening up of new lands, road construction, the FHA, the FNMA, RFC, and countless others. Many of our senior citizens who are now retiring are the same men and women who helped to develop these techniques to their present stage of high performance.

It is my thought that these men and women, experts in their chosen fields, would enthusiastically lend their services to other nations to organize similar institutions, adapted to local conditions, which could help these countries to help themselves on the road to greater prosperity and economic development. At any rate, the wealth of America is not only in its financial resources but in this vast reservoir of American men and women who have helped to make America great.

Irrigation Beware

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, for some time, there have been increasing signs that the philosophy of the Department of the Interior was shifting from the production of power as an incidental benefit to help pay the cost of irrigation.

Several statements have been issued from time to time by the Commissioner of Reclamation that they were turning to the production of power as their principal purpose.

The public utility concept has been growing for some time and the article in today's Wall Street Journal, which quotes the Commissioner, should serve as a warning to all who are truly interested in reclamation:

POWER SWITCH: ADMINISTRATION TO PUSH DEEPER INTO RIVALRY WITH UTILITY COMPANIES—IT AIMS TO MOVE INTO AREAS PRIVATE FIRMS SERVE, CUT EMPHASIS ON IRRIGATION—BONNEVILLE-TVA TIE STUDIED

(By Daniel M. Burnham)

Public versus private power appears headed for a new phase of spirited controversy.

After 8 years of declining activity under President Eisenhower, the Department of the Interior is now hard at work on a number of proposals that would put the Federal Government much more deeply into the power business. If President Kennedy succeeds in pushing his program through, it undoubtedly will mean stiffer competition for the Nation's privately owned utilities.

The Government's policy on its role in building and operating electricity generating plants appears to be undergoing two significant changes. For one thing, Federal planners are talking about stringing transmission lines through areas where utility-owned lines already exist. This would be a sharp departure from the past. Furthermore, the Kennedy administration is publicly expressing considerable interest in building dams simply to develop power sources; in the past the Government usually had claimed it constructed dams primarily for their value in irrigation and flood control and secondarily for their power.

AIM: TO SELL POWER CHEAPLY

Declares Floyd E. Dominy, the Interior Department's Commissioner of Reclamation: "I don't think we'll ever again decide not to build a dam simply because it's only a power project. Our main point of interest will be to sell power cheaply to the public."

Mr. Dominy puts his finger on a point of contention. Spokesmen for private utilities argue that in fact the Government does not serve the best interests of taxpayers by supplying power at rates lower than those charged by the utilities. The utilities reason that not only must taxpayers put up the money to build the power projects, but also they must forego the Federal, State, and local taxes that private utilities would pay if they built the same projects.

The utilities are worried, of course, that expansion of Government power will cut into their profit potential.

Whatever the merits of the public-private power feud, there is no doubt the years of close cooperation between the utilities and the Government are at an end. During Mr. Eisenhower's two terms in office, the capacity of privately-owned utilities was boosted by 9 percent during each 4-year term; these were the largest such increases since former President Hoover's tenure early in the 1930's. At the same time, under Mr. Eisenhower, Federal power capacity increases were cut back from 14 percent during his first term to 8 percent during his second. The latter figure was the lowest since the 1920's.

RENEWAL OF INTEREST

But a look at the administration's plans shows the extent to which the Government's interest in power has been renewed. Toward the end of the Eisenhower administration, the Government adopted a policy of no new starts on major power projects. By contrast, the Interior Department during the present session of Congress expects to seek authorization for about a dozen new water resources projects, including five with hydroelectric power facilities; requests already have been made on three of the projects. Mr. Kennedy's budget for the fiscal year starting July 1 includes $10.7 million to start construction of six projects already authorized by Congress and $6.6 million to investigate new projects.

In addition to stepping up the Government's participation in power development, the present administration also is altering its standards for estimating benefits of its new projects in an effort to make them more salable to Congressmen. President Kennedy not long ago directed the Budget Bureau to reevaluate current standards for appraising the feasibility of water resource projects. This has led to an important change in the method of evaluating such projects.

In the past, the Interior Department arrived at the probable total cost of a project and then added up the benefits expected from the project over a 50-year period. Taken into account were such anticipated benefits as the value of new crops that could be grown in the project area, increases in land value and the value of some added recreational facilities. The reasoning was that if a proposed project could show a dollar of benefits for each dollar of cost, it probably could be pushed through Congress.

Under President Kennedy, the period for figuring benefits is being doubled, to 100 years, and some intangible benefits not previously given consideration—the value of improved fishing and hunting, for example, are being counted. This, of course, will increase the claimed benefits sharply without affecting estimates of construction costs.

NETWORK OF LINES

Most spectacular of the power programs now being considered by the Kennedy administration is a plan to hang a huge network of powerlines around the Nation. These lines would be capable of transmitting big blocks of power and, in the long run, would tie together such major power tools as the Tennessee Valley Authority in the Southeast and the Bonneville Power Administration's dams in Washington and Oregon. Lines would be strung—in some cases by helicopter—on high towers over some of the Nation's toughest terrain: The Rocky Mountains, the Sierra Nevadas, and the vast stretches of desert in the Southwest.

Department of the Interior officials decline to estimate what the project would cost, but some authorities figure the cost would be at least $1 billion.

The extra-high-voltage lines would be so-called common carriers, open for use by private utilities as well as by public utility districts, cooperatives, and the Government. Uncle Sam would recover the cost of erecting the lines by charging users a small sum per kilowatt.

Why build the lines? The Government's explanation is that it would allow private and public power producers to shift large amounts of power from one part of the Nation which has a power surplus to another which has a power shortage. For example, inexpensive electricity generated from the abundant water of the Northwest could be used to supplement high-cost, steam-generated power in the arid Southwest. Or, if existing generators became over-taxed, power could be sent from north to south in summer for air-conditioning and from south to north in winter for heating. And in the case of a national disaster such as war or drought, power could be shipped to areas where generating plants were inoperative or inadequate.

IMPROVING PROFITS

Federal officials also concede that in some parts of the land, the lines are wanted to move power to more distant points to improve the profit picture of existing Federal projects. A case in point is the Bonneville Power Administration, which sells the Government's power in the Northwest.

In recent years the Northwest power picture has changed from one of shortage to one of surplus. As a result, in the fiscal year ended last June 30, the Bonneville Power Administration's revenues after operating expenses fell about $8.5 million short of what was needed to pay the Treasury a scheduled installment on construction costs. For both the fiscal year ending next month and for the fiscal year ending in June 1962, the shortage is expected to rise to about $13 million. However, if the Government put up high-voltage lines between Bonneville and southern California, authorities figure the extra revenues from Government power now going untapped and from the small charge levied on users of the inter-tie would be sufficient to almost cover the Bonneville Power Administration's loss.

It's no coincidence that the Interior Department intends to bring together the private and public power pools west of the Mississippi River in the first phase of erecting its power line network. The Bonneville-Southern California link, under one plan now being considered, would consist of a pair of cables stretching more than 900 miles down the west coast. The cables would cost about $210 million to put up and would be capable of moving close to 11 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity annually—enough for five cities the size of San Francisco. An Interior Department task force is currently studying the feasibility of the project and is scheduled to make its final report on November 1.

It has been only recently that technological developments in power transmission have made extra-high-voltage lines possible. The trick has been to develop cables, generators and other equipment that could withstand the high voltage needed to send big blocks of electricity over long distances. Electrical engineers liken voltage to water pressure:

The higher the pressure, the farther the water can be piped.

CLEANING UP STATIC

To handle higher voltages, larger generators have been built that are capable of stepping up generation without loss of efficiency. And new types of cable have been designed to clean up an old high-voltage line bugaboo—static which often drowns out communications within a certain range of the line.

The static, or corona as it was called, was caused by electricity escaping from single power lines. But engineers found that if three or four lines were strung together from the same pole, but separated, each by a few inches, the amount of escaping electricity was reduced. The reason: The wires and the space between them act as one line with a huge circumference; thus, the voltage puts less pressure on any one part of the line.

As these problems have been solved, the voltage capacity of lines has been increased dramatically. At the start of this decade, lines in the United States could handle only 287,000 volts; this has now been raised to 345,000. Preliminary planning for the Bonneville-California intertie calls for a capacity of 500,000 volts. And Westinghouse Electric Corp. and American Electric Power Service Corp. are preparing tests to send kilowatts over lines with jolts of 750,000 volts. The tests will be conducted at a new laboratory at Apple Grove, W. Va.

Most private utilities take dim views of the Government's new power plans, particularly of the plans to put up power lines. At a hearing held by California last summer on the feasibility of the Bonneville-California intertie, Robert H. Gerdes, executive vice president of San Francisco's Pacific Gas & Electric Co., said: "It does not appear that we could be a party to any arrangement under which power would be brought in from the northwest over common carrier lines." Mr. Gerdes says P.G. & E. considers construction of new lines part of its responsibility to its customers and that it will build "whatever additional lines are needed whenever conditions justify such construction."

Much the same argument is advanced by Arizona Public Service Co. and other utilities fighting a Government proposal to spend $176 million on circuits in the Upper Colorado River Basin area. The main artery of this system eventually would be fitted into the Government's nationwide power line network, according to the Interior Department's plans.

Will the President Learn His Job in Time To Avert Disaster?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, even a casual reading of the record of the first 100 days of the new administration will show that the President knew little about the job or what it entailed. This is understandable and a certain period of grace was necessary for him and his subordinates to learn the ropes. They have now had 5 months, but have they learned from their mistakes? I sincerely hope so, but from the events of the past few weeks, I am sorely afraid it may take the President too long to learn his job with disastrous consequences for our country. My fears are not lightened by the following news story in the U.S. News & World Report:

SECOND "100 DAYS"—EDUCATION OF A PRESIDENT

New ideas for running the complex business of Government are colliding with hard realities when put in operation.

The Kennedy team is having its troubles.

Insiders complain of confusion, a lack of clear chains of command and responsibility.

Experience, in the early days, reveals that making decisions is a lot easier than getting decisions transformed into action.

Episodes, pieced together, give a picture of problems encountered by a new President.

Now there are reports of change. Easy informality is giving way a bit. Formal policy meetings, once scrapped, are back in favor.

From inside and outside the Kennedy administration come stories picturing a new team in Washington still struggling to get its feet on the ground.

Some of the stories tell of ideas going wrong when put into practice. Others concern administrative confusion. There are stories about professors and their influence in the administration.

Few things appear to have turned out to be quite what Kennedy had expected when, as a candidate for office, he told of what he planned to do if elected.

The job of running the vast machinery of a Government which has expenditures of $80 billion each year obviously is neither simple nor easy. As a new President moves into his second "100 days," this fact seems to be impressing itself more and more upon the White House.

The latest example of how things can go wrong occurred in South Korea on May 15. Leaders of the South Korean Army staged a political coup on that day. Americans who supply and lead that army reacted as though caught completely by surprise—even though there had been ample signs, noted by intelligence services, that something was stirring in that country.

Two days after the coup, officials in Washington still were confused. And the views of U.S. officials inside Korea appeared to be only vaguely correlated with the views of officials in Washington.

In the case of Cuba, in Laos, in South Korea—among other places—events had appeared to catch the U.S. Government off guard.

High officials of the Eisenhower administration say that they are not surprised by the trend that affairs are taking in Washington.

The following story is told:

When key members of the new Kennedy team came to Washington to be briefed on problems and programs of the outgoing administration, they are pictured as often having been interested, but not too much impressed. The members of the Kennedy team are described as having definite and strong ideas of their own on how to run the Government.

One strong idea was that the White House staff should be cut down and that staff operations should be replaced by centering more direct responsibility in the President himself. On February 18, the new President abolished the Operations Coordinating Board that Eisenhower had created to make sure that decisions were recorded, interpreted and made known to those operating the machinery of Government. Where Mr. Eisenhower depended upon advice of the National Security Council to help appraise world problems, the new President bypassed this council.

More emphasis was placed upon doing business by telephone.

Crisis then began to pile up on top of crisis. Time after time events caught the White House by surprise.

Change now is reported to be under way.

Meetings of the National Security Council are becoming regular. Less business and fewer decisions are being left to telephone conversations. White House meetings are getting larger. Records that had been neglected earlier are beginning to be kept.

A trimmed-down substitute for the Operations Coordinating Board is being created in the Department of State.

McGeorge Bundy, a special assistant to the President, is reported to be taking on more responsibility for White House operations to free the President for more time to think. One official who served in President Eisenhower's administration said: "What Kennedy most needs is a 'Sherman Adams' of his own." Mr. Bundy, insiders say, may become just that.

One night, rather late, an incident occurred that required the President's attention. Mr. Kennedy sought to contact key people for consultation. None could be found.

President Kennedy, as a result, has directed that watch officers be kept on duty around the clock, 7 days a week, so that there will be no delay in learning of, or in acting upon, important developments no matter where they occur in the world.

The new President had sought to cut through Government redtape and to get more direct action more quickly. Change did come inside the White House itself.

A man doing business with the Government on a big scale reported the following about operations below the top:

"In all branches and departments of Government, including the Pentagon, there has not been a bit of change. The old orders requiring countless signatures on a piece of paper before a businessman can do business with Government—these orders all stand.

"One of these days, some of the highpowered professors around Kennedy are going to step down out of their ivory towers and stroll around the little offices—thousands of them—where the real business of Government is carried out. When they do they are in for a shock.

"Maybe the White House professors can pick up a phone and talk to anybody anywhere and get a quick decision. But that little guy at the desk can't. He's still wrapped up like a mummy in carbon copies which require his signature and those of officials in a dozen offices in a dozen other buildings.

"All this informality at the top may someday seep down to a lower level, but it hasn't yet."

The same story is told by key officials, just below the top, who try to get prepared so that emergencies around the world will not continue to catch high officials flatfooted. They complain that, under Kennedy, as under Eisenhower, it takes dozens of signatures and weeks of time to get the simplest of wheels to turn in Government.

President Kennedy is described by some officials who have been critical of him as learning by experience.

There is a feeling that the President is becoming aware of mistakes made in early days of his administration and of the problem of cutting through barriers of paperwork to get things done.

Yet inside the administration, too, there is more tendency to place a lid on information and try to tailor news to give to the country a strictly favorable image of the President at work.

Disaster in Cuba remains a highly sensitive subject at the White House. Military officials have been under strict orders not to talk.

At the same time, stories fed to newspapermen by White House sources have been

aimed at placing blame first upon the Central Intelligence Agency and then upon the Joint Chiefs of Staff. These stories were fed out following a statement by President Kennedy assuming responsibility himself.

This is heard from a White House source:

The President did not expect that the press would take at face value his statement that he assumed responsibility for what happened in Cuba. He had expected that there would be reporting of the part that the Eisenhower administration had played in the buildup of an attempt to overthrow Castro. He expected that intelligence miscalculations would be referred to, and that newspapers would take some responsibility upon themselves for their detailed reporting of the buildup for an invasion attempt.

When the White House found itself accepting the blame, it was felt necessary to feed stories to columnists in order to shift blame to others. The Joint Chiefs of Staff were singled out.

What are the facts of the Cuban fiasco? Did the heads of this country's armed services, experienced in amphibious warfare, approve the invasion attempt of Cuba as it was made?

The answer, from more than one well-informed source, is this:

There was a plan for invasion of Cuba that members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff did describe as "feasible." This plan, however, was not the one that was followed when the attempt was made.

The plan described as feasible called for a main landing and a diversionary landing of troops. It was to be preceded by air strikes on key targets for 3 days before the invasion. These strikes started on schedule, but were stopped after the first attack. The landing attempts themselves were to be provided with air cover. Signed up as volunteers were 60 U.S. pilots, and 100 U.S. warplanes were ready for their use. U.S. marines were on Vieques Island, off Puerto Rico, ready to move into Cuba at a later stage, if needed.

U.S. military men remain convinced that this plan would have worked, if carried out. Troops did get ashore without opposition. There were defections from Castro forces. Things were rolling. However, at this critical juncture, air support that had been promised by the United States was denied. Castro's U.S.-made jet trainers, piloted by Czechs and unopposed, sank the ships carrying the ammunition and communications equipment of the invaders. Without air support, it became clear that the invasion could not succeed, so that further defections inside Cuba could hardly be expected.

Who pulled back on air support? Fact is that the Central Intelligence Agency went ahead with its own plan, without assurance of military support.

That's the story that is told by informed sources. The Joint Chiefs of Staff did not describe as feasible the plan for invasion of Cuba that was used when the first landing actually occurred.

If military services at the Pentagon in Washington cannot be blamed for what happened in Cuba, they are in the line of fire on other counts.

The following story is told by an important Government official whose work must go through the military services:

"The Pentagon has itself tied in such incredible knots of paperwork and internal politics that getting anything done, conservatively, involves a delay of 20 days or more.

"As an example, I had to ask that studies be made of a particular country in Europe to bring planning up to date. Before that letter left the United States, it had to be approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Army, Navy, Air Force and the Department of Defense. In each of these five sections of the Pentagon, the letter ran into a clique of politicians, strategists and thinkers who tried to outguess each other as to just what our department was up to and what it would mean to their special interests.

"Finally the paper reached CINCEUR (Commander in Chief Europe), and there the business had to begin all over again, since CINCEUR has miniature copies of the political setups in the Pentagon. I mention this because it gives you an idea of what the President and the freewheelers in the new group at the White House are up against. They had thought it would be a snap to operate this Government."

Many Washington newsmen who are admirers of the President, personally, are beginning to complain that he and his aids are "too thin-skinned."

One reporter remarked recently that he had the feeling some decisions are shaped, to an extent, by an "excessive fear of criticism." On several occasions, reporters have been called in by the White House press secretary—or even by the President, himself—because of news accounts that were deemed to be too critical of the administration.

Mr. Kennedy goes to considerable lengths to watch over his press relations. He sometimes dines in private with individual correspondents. He is finding, however, that such special treatment doesn't keep these men from being critical of White House deeds.

Another early complaint: that the President has tried to do too much—to be "in on everything." Said one official:

"The President's staff is so loosely organized that responsibilities are not clearly defined. During the meetings on the Cuban invasion, aids came in and out of the President's office, and so did Cabinet officers. Sometimes there would be a meeting of three or four officials, sometimes five or six. When it was all over, no one—not even the President—could say exactly what each man had contributed to the plan."

Comment by a man with an intimate knowledge of the White House:

"When historians get around to the start of this administration, they're going to go mad. During the first 100 days there was no record of who said what to whom, of who recommended, who dissented from major decisions. Nothing was put on paper."

Now there are some signs that that is changing. New aids appear to be moving up. Although there is criticism that there still are no real channels of command, staff responsibilities are being more clearly fixed.

The President, in his second 100 days, is reported to be applying some of the lessons learned in the first.

The Federal Trial Examiners Conference, May 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include a message of greeting from President Kennedy and excerpts from the address of James M. Landis to the Conference of Trial Examiners in Washington, D.C., May 18, 1961.

The message and address follow:

I am pleased to greet on this occasion the Federal trial examiners and their guests.

One measure of the strength and vitality of government is its capacity to perform day-to-day jobs with fairness and with dispatch. In no part of the Government is this strength more subject to difficult strain and stress than in the administrative process. In few places is the efficiency and fairness of our Government more importantly or more constantly put to the test before the eyes of all our citizens.

I am conscious that the success or failure of our regulatory agencies in meeting that test falls initially, and sometimes ultimately as well, upon the hearing examiner. Matters of the greatest significance to the public and to the private interest involved are the daily subject of your work. Their disposition turns upon what you personally bring to the decisional process—upon your integrity, your ability to seek out the crucial facts, your capacity for difficult decisions, your sense of the public interest as expressed in law or regulation.

This process is, as yet, a relatively young one. In recent years the growth of regulatory functions in a context of changing economic and technological conditions has made us aware that we must reappraise our successes and our failures with honesty and objectivity. We must do what is necessary and what is right to insure that our regulatory system is efficient and fair. The reorganization plans already before Congress, and the recent establishment of the Administrative Conference of the United States evidence the interest and the determination of this administration in seeing that these goals are met.

An expectancy of change and challenge now pervades the whole administrative process. I know that the Federal trial examiners, today as in the past, will help in this job of reappraisal and reexamination and I feel sure they can and will contribute substantially to improvements in the administrative process.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

MAY 17, 1961.

EXCERPTS FROM THE ADDRESS OF JAMES M. LANDIS TO THE CONFERENCE OF FEDERAL TRIAL EXAMINERS IN WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 18, 1961

The trial or hearing examiner is, in a true sense, the core of the adjudicatory phase of the administrative process. Under the Administrative Procedure Act he is assigned the responsibility of handling the initial trial of cases required to be decided on the record—cases that can vary in importance from a few dollars to issues of great magnitude—air routes, TV licenses, rate increases, the safety of nuclear reactors as well as claims, minor and major, for compensation under the Social Security Act. The issues he tries, the evidence that he must sift, may be simple; it may also be incredibly complex. He must distinguish truth from untruth, the verity of a statistical exhibit from the tortuous testimony of experts whose conclusions are frequently not their own but those dictated by their clients. No police court judges have such extensive responsibilities. Nevertheless judges of our lesser tribunals can, if they choose to do so, effectively control the records of the cases that they are called upon to try, control the conduct of witnesses and lawyers. They can insist upon the respect that should be paid to a judge. Their decisions are frequently final, at least in minor matters committed to their jurisdiction.

This is not true of the trial examiner. His power to control the record is limited. Unable to rule with finality on many interlocutory matters, he is forced to permit expansion of records rather than their contraction. He is too often legally incapable of controlling the conduct of claimants and their lawyers. His means of compelling the production of testimony is by appeal to outside authority and never direct. His deci-

sions are so-called initial or recommended decisions appealable as of right, no matter how inconsequential, to the agency itself.

This is a system that calls for review. It breeds delay; it involves unnecessary costs. It invites endless and time-consuming appeals. It militates against developing the stature and prestige that our judicial systems vest in the lowest of our judicial tribunals.

No simple legislative act will cure these defects. Certainly the mere provision of higher grades of compensation for our examiners will not give us more than a slight answer to the basic problems. Nor can we hope overnight to establish a system infinitely better adapted for the administration of justice, swiftly and surely, in our regulatory agencies.

But the adoption of the principles underlying the plans of reorganization recently submitted by the President to the Congress can do much to improve the system as a whole. They authorize the agencies to remold the system rather than to take it for granted. By granting at least a modicum of finality to the examiners' decisions, they will increase the examiners' responsibilities. And men, however timid, however bereft of the qualities of genius, will respond to the imposition of responsibility. The hearing examiner corps will grow with these added burdens. And under these plans wise regulations can solve the perplexing problem of interlocutory determinations. Under these plans the powers of examiners to limit records through prehearing procedures can be immeasurably strengthened and their issuance of subpenas duces tecum confirmed. At the same time, nothing is taken away from the responsibilities that rest on the agency heads themselves. The manner in which these agency heads discharge these responsibilities will, of course, be in their hands, just as the manner in which the Supreme Court of the United States discharges the responsibilities of molding the supreme law of the land has been put in the hands of that Court by the Judiciary Act of 1924.

A second potentiality of advance lies in the establishment of the Administrative Conference of the United States. Here is not merely a forum but an institution capable of continuing and sympathetic examination of the system. The possibilities of the Conference are in a true sense infinite. It can question the existing methods of recruiting and qualifying examiners, the mechanical and physical aids with which these officials should be supplied, the degree to which they should be entitled to draw upon the expertise of the agency as a whole rather than merely upon their own judgment, the canons of ethics that should govern them, and the scope of their jurisdiction confined as it is now to one agency and sometimes to a mere branch of that agency's activities. I stress this latter point because too great specialization tends toward a narrowness of outlook. It begets concern with one facet of a problem to the exclusion of the understanding that problems too often are interlocked, are what Sir Henry Mason said of our law, namely, parts of a seamless web.

A third potentiality of advance must come from the inside rather than the outside. By that I mean the trial examiners themselves. Just as the bar has concerned itself with the improvement of the techniques of the profession by the organization of such institutes, exemplified by the Practicing Law Institute of New York, the trial examiners as a corps and as a profession have a responsibility to perfect their own techniques. Institution of new as well as old examiners in such techniques as pretrial procedures, in the submission of expert evidence in documented form, in the limitation of cross-examination, in the submission of proposed findings, is essential. The experience and wisdom of those who are experienced and who possess wisdom must be imported by means still to be devised to the new recruits. I can sympathize full well with your precent concern with essentially mundane matters. But you should be ready now to raise your sights. It is important to your profession and to the administrative process as a whole, that you should do so. Leadership in thought, in creative action, in professional advancement, must stem to a large degree from those who, for themselves and their inner satisfaction, would achieve it. And, I sincerely believe, that those who seek by these means to serve the public interest will in return have the support of that very interest they seek to serve. This is the ultimate reward—to do a job, better, surer and with greater firmness.

Communism at the Doorstep

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a press account of a recent speech I delivered at Milford, Mass., in my district on the occasion of the 15th anniversary of the local chapter, Disabled American Veterans:

REMARKS IN PART OF CONGRESSMAN PHILIP J. PHILBIN SPEAKING AT THE 15TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DAV CHAPTER AT MILFORD, MASS., MAY 20, 1961

Speaking Saturday night at Milford on the occasion of the 15th anniversary celebration of the local chapter of Disabled American Veterans, Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, hailing the veterans for their sacrifices and great contributions to the Nation in war and in peace, declared that the unselfish spirit and willingness to serve which they exemplified is urgently needed in these days of crisis and peril.

"The American people will never forget the great debt the Nation owes to you and your comrades," said the Clinton Congressman, "and your spirit of sacrifice and loyalty will serve as a shining example and powerful inspiration to this generation, and indeed to all Americans, to rally once again with unflinching determination to the great cause of freedom, security and enduring peace."

"It is too late to cancel out some of the mistakes in policy that have brought us to the current impasse in world affairs," said PHILBIN, "but it is imperative now that every loyal American be aroused and reawakened to the perils and dangers of the hour which confront us with such stark reality both at home and abroad."

Deploring the steady pressures, gains and continued threats of Marxist communism which has been steadily advancing throughout the world, PHILBIN said: "This dire threat is no longer remote. It is not confined alone to helpless nations of Western Europe, or to Asia, the Middle East or Africa, to Laos, Cambodia, or the Congo. It has spread, and it now exists right on our own doorstep, 90 miles from the mainland of the United States, and in accordance with the Marxist timetable it is pointing its bloody finger toward Latin America and the American Continent."

Referring to the relatively rapid spread of communism in the world, the Congressman asserted: "Communism has made these impressive gains by incessant, deceitful propaganda, cleverly engineered infiltration, the brazen employment of threats of aggression, and where the occasion demanded it, the use and support of force and violence."

"This has been possible," said PHILBIN, "because of certain mistaken diplomatic policies, the inability of the United Nations to face up realistically to the dangers, and indecision, vacillation and complacency on the part of governments and peoples of the free world, including our own. It is clear that practically the only deterrent to further aggression, territorial aggrandizement, and perhaps even resort to war itself, has been the great economic strength and most destructive military power which our own country has found it necessary to develop, and which seems unfortunately to be the only language which Communist dictators and their allies understand.

"What a great pity it is for humanity that because of the current world situation and the unwillingness of the Soviet to consult and confer in a wholehearted, honest spirit concerning grave world problems, especially the establishment of lasting peace, that the entire world is penalized and denied in large measure the golden opportunity to reap the tremendous human betterments that could be so readily derived from the remarkable advances of modern science and technology and enlightened governmental, economic and social techniques which, if properly and peacefully applied, could record unprecedented gains, prosperity and happiness for all mankind.

"But we must deal with the present realities as they are and we cannot further temporize or delay in making and implementing decisions that look to the preservation of the values of our free way of life, the security of the country and a world organized and protected for freedom and justice."

The Congressman expressed firm confidence in the preparedness and power of the national defense.

"Let no one be deceived," he said. "that we now possess great and growing military and economic strength is undeniable and this is well known to the Soviet. In the immediate time ahead that strength must and will guard the United States until the day when good will and honor and respect for international agreements and the rights of all nations can be substituted for force, violence and devastating weapon systems as the true measure of man's humanity to man and as evidence of the Soviet's unequivocal intention to seek an honest, just peace."

Touching on domestic conditions and the need for renewed devotion to the established principles and values of the Constitution and the American way of life, PHILBIN declared: "In this presently dangerous world great strength and power is most assuredly necessary, but standing by itself, this is not enough to meet and conquer our present problems.

"It is not enough for us to be strong in military and material things, though this is of utmost importance.

"We must be strong and unalterable also in the things of the spirit, because it is the spiritual values, moral principles and ethical concepts which this country has followed and defended throughout the years which are the true source of our greatness and strength. We must resolutely preserve them.

"No one can tell what the future will bring. It well may be that sacrifices and austerity will be required over a period of time to sustain free institutions. It also could be that even dedicated Marxists may, in their own interests, come to early realization that conciliation and an honest, just peace would provide a better solution to world affairs than continued methods of aggression and ultimate, widespread destruction.

"Be that as it may, this Nation must firmly resolve to pay any price necessary

to defend its birthright, to work, hope and pray for peace, but be prepared to meet every challenge of those who would assail our free institutions and endanger our security.

"On the homefront, so vital to us all, the preservation of free enterprise for all the people, and the encouragement of the initiatives and incentives that are the very heart of our system, must be zealously safeguarded."

Calling for recognition of the demands of social justice, civil rights, health, education, economic and social progress and advancement, PHILBIN pleaded for the strengthening and improvement of every component of American life, the integrity of the family and the regenerative forces of the Nation.

"High levels of economic activity, social standards and broad opportunities must be insured", he said. "We must keep the huge expense of running the Government on an efficient, economical basis, truly consistent with our needs, so that the American people may be spared, where at all possible, the most burdensome taxes which in recent years have been weighing down so heavily upon them, smothering incentives, penalizing enterprise and reducing living standards. We must tirelessly and doggedly hold the line for the American way and its precious values so vital to our liberties and welfare."

The Congressman hailed President Kennedy's able, courageous approach to vexing Government problems and urged united, bipartisan support for his efforts to check communism and stabilize world peace. "The youth, vigor and spirit, and informed awareness of the President, has given fresh heart and courage to peoples everywhere," PHILBIN said. "No Chief Executive has had greater burdens and the American people must stand behind him and assist and cooperate with him as he strives to bring order and the rule of law out of the confusion, misunderstanding and perils that confront us.

"In these great tasks our beloved veterans can and will furnish the firm, loyal leadership that they have always shown.

"I heartily congratulate the chapter upon its great work and wish for you all continued good health, success and happiness in all your undertakings."

West Virginia Plans Centennial Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the year 1963 will mark the 100th anniversary of the State of West Virginia—a State of unsurpassed natural beauty in the eastern half of the United States. To commemorate this forthcoming century of statehood, the West Virginia Legislature, in 1955, authorized the establishment of a centennial commission of distinguished citizens, who would freely donate their time and energies planning for the kinds of statewide celebration activities most wholesomely in keeping with the State's history and progress from the year of its inception.

One distinguished West Virginian appointed to this centennial commission is Mr. Charles Hodel, publisher of two newspapers in the State—the Beckley Post-Herald and the Raleigh Register. On May 19, Mr. Hodel was the guest speaker at a dinner meeting of the West Virginia University Alumni Association, held in the Army-Navy Cub, in Washington, D.C. On this occasion Mr. Hodel revealed some of the thinking and the planning of the centennial commission.

Because many Americans are keenly interested in West Virginia, and perhaps are planning to visit the Mountain State during its centennial year and would thus appreciate having a little advance knowledge of what is shaping up in the way of celebration activities, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Hodel's speech printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I take it, though you are West Virginia University alumni, you are not all native West Virginians. Neither am I. I'm a West Virginian by choice—by adoption, rather than birth.

I am a full-blooded Swiss, descended from long lines of Alpine mountaineers, both paternal and maternal. So I fit in well.

This month—in fact a week hence, on the 26th—will mark the end of my 50th year of living in Beckley, which stands a half mile high on plateau country, where there are always breezes of pure air. As a consequence my health has improved as I've grown older.

But to get to the subject for discussion of which I am here: I suppose I was appointed a member of the West Virginia Centennial Commission because advocacy of such a move first appeared in our Beckley Sunday paper on February 21, 1954. Yet it wasn't my doing, but that of my youngest son.

Now to the centennial celebration program itself:

As the years of high decision for the people of West Virginia were 1861–63, so will 1961–63 mark the period when we shall pay homage to the founders of our splendid State. To commemorate the act and the actors of a century ago and to point up developments since, the West Virginia Legislature in 1955 authorized a centennial commission of nonsalaried members. Within the framework of the organization are a number of committees, including an advisory committee, and the finance committee organized only last year.

The first work of the commission naturally has been in the area of how to celebrate. Many helpful suggestions have come in, ranging from the scheduling of football games and the holding of mountaintop Billy Graham revivals, to the erection of a tourist auditorium, equipped so that visitors may gather there near the site of the national radio astronomy observatory at Sugar Grove in Pendleton County, to hear sounds from outer space as far as 38 billion light-years away—which is scheduled to be in operation by the middle of 1963. The commission welcomes all helpful suggestions. It is planning a statewide celebration and it will need statewide participation and cooperation to make a go of it.

Alfred Stern of the American National Theatre and Academy is consultant and director-to-be. He has rounded out a program which contemplates a statewide celebration. Broadly, the objectives include: Increasing pride in the State's accomplishments, greater recognition of its opportunities and of its traditions and history, by its own citizens. Greater emphasis on young people and encouragement of bright youngsters, the State's greatest asset, to remain in their native State. There is also need of correction and redirection of present conditions to place West Virginia in position to complete with other States in the utilization of its brains as well as material resources. This emphasis on the State's resources and opportunities is also designed to develop industry and to attract new enterprises, as well as to induce favorable attention to the State's tourist and recreation facilities.

The centennial program is also designed to combat a fairly prevalent national impression that West Virginia is a backward, impoverished State, largely populated by indolent people; to create a climate of increased understanding between rural and urban areas, between north and south, east and west; in short, to develop a pride in all communities in every nook and corner of the State; and to frankly recognize the State's problems in a manner calculated to mobilize the people, their leaders, and representatives, in an all-out effort toward the successful solution of such problems and deficiencies. The centennial program will be developed so as to encourage virtually every citizen to participate in, or to attend one or more centennial events—if we are to achieve a maximum amount of publicity in national, regional, and State press and other communications media, as well as a maximum attendance.

The legislature has recognized the merits of the centennial's objectives, and has allocated the sum of $400,000 to be contributed on the basis of an annual appropriation of $100,000 over a 4-year period. The centennial gross cost is approximately $965,000 and, while most of the projects and events are to be free, certain events will produce income and thus net cost will be about $785,000. This sum is less than 50 cents per citizen. Certainly a program which costs so little, yet will dramatize the past and dedicate the present to a greater future, justifies this comparatively modest cost.

Surely we shall use the centennial year to reassure ourselves and to advertise to the world our greatest resources and finest achievements. West Virginia has much to be proud of. Already plans are well-advanced to present West Virginia in her best dress on a stage for all to see.

One of the prime centennial projects is to be the centennial special exhibits' train, containing a number of cars devoted to exhibits of agriculture, industry, natural resources, history, and heritage, education, tourism, and recreation, arts, crafts, folklore, State government, etc. This train will visit many West Virginia communities; also Washington, D.C., and the capitals and principal cities of the five States bordering West Virginia. For smaller communities where railroad sidings and technical facilities make the exhibit train less practical, a second motorized traveling exposition, containing similar exhibits material on a more modest scale, is proposed through the use of trailer trucks. It is estimated that both the railroad and motorized units will reach approximately 3,500,000 persons in West Virginia and the neighboring States, and will expose them to comprehensive exhibits of West Virginia's accomplishments and resources.

Another centennial project is the creation of a series of eight overnight group campsites in State parks and forests. This would be a part of the Campways-U.S.A. program of the Boy Scouts of America, including the use of national and local tour permits.

Another contemplated event is the West Virginia Forum of the Future, a conclave of nationally recognized industrial, economic and sociological leaders, to be held at the Governor's invitation in Charleston. These authorities will discuss the State's most pressing problems and deliver papers expressing their own thinking regarding their solution. Such papers would be published either by the centennial commission or by

an appropriate educational institution, and subsequently distributed throughout the State.

Theme center centennial stages are proposed for several communities. Indeed any community which can assist the centennial commission in underwriting the construction of such a stage may well develop such a project. These outdoor theaters-in-the-round will be located in downtown squares or city parks, and each night during the peak centennial period, various civic and community organizations will present their own salute to the centennial at such theme centers. Thus, one night youth organizations may present a program; another might well be devoted to music and folk dance organizations; Sundays will be devoted to church programs, etc. This will permit every conceivable type of civic, educational, religious, fraternal, cultural, and service organization to actively participate in the centennial. Communities can also invite groups from neighboring communities to use their centennial stages, thus encouraging an influx of neighboring visitors to the host communities. All such programs will be presented free.

A spectacle show, which in terms of popular entertainment, music, dance, and pageantry, presenting West Virginia history, is contemplated for several larger cities. The script for this spectacle will be so developed as to include a major episode devoted to the contribution to the history of the State of the particular community where the show is appearing. Thus, for example, the show will be different in Clarksburg than in Charleston, Wheeling, or Parkersburg. The professional cast and key technicians involved with the production will travel from city to city, but in each community large groups of participants such as bands, square dancers, choral groups, drill teams, and others, will be integrated into the spectacle.

Fireworks festivals are proposed for several communities, to be held either on the date of the State's admission to the Union, or on the Fourth of July. These are expected to have great popular appeal.

There are many other elements of the centennial program, too numerous to discuss. But basically, every annual event which occurs in West Virginia, including fairs, festivals, symphony programs, little theater activities, art exhibits, major sports events, etc., will all be tied in with the centennial from a promotional standpoint; and most centennial events will reach their peak in the summer and early fall of 1963 when tourism is at its height.

Surely we shall use the centennial as the occasion to come from behind in those things in which we have lagged. Few will deny that we should take a second look at our hospitals and related institutions. Our roads, roadsides, forests, and streams should have continued attention such as they are even now getting from Governor Barron's cleanup crusade. And we should give more than lipservice to cultural programs, which include our schools, our libraries, public museums, and an adequate department of archives and history. We are not a dying State, but like the giant in the fable, a sleeping one bound down by our own inertia and indifference.

Somehow we must use the centennial year for getting rid of the impression that we are washed-up. We must use it to throw off the opprobrium of backwardness. Perhaps it will be a good time to revive the idealism of an earlier day, when we had high hopes for great things; and provide for ourselves those services necessary to getting us out of the Nation's doghouse.

To be sure, we shall use the centennial as the occasion to brush up on our history. The citizen who does not know his country's past is like the chairman who has not seen the minutes of the last meeting. We cannot blink at the facts of life which gave us birth in the middle of the Civil War, a war calculated today to stir us with pride rather than unhappy memories. More than that, much lasting good came out of that conflict—including West Virginia. So let us commemorate it as years of greatness here as elsewhere in the Nation. As it has been aptly said by a member of the U.S. Civil War Centennial Commission, "Never before nor since have Americans been called on to make such enormous sacrifices as in the terrible years of 1861 to 1865."

We will indeed use the centennial as the occasion to mine, refine, and polish, the finest gems of our history; for it is history alone which can bring into focus that greatest of all our natural resources—the high character, quality, and abilities of our citizenship.

West Virginia has not been without contribution to art, literature, science, technology, and the rest. Forty-six years ago, there is good reason to believe the first 4–H camp was held in Randolph County, and 5 years later we can be certain the first State 4–H camp in the United States was established at Jackson's Mill. The 4–H movement and the conservation movement illustrates what we have done and what we are capable of doing, if we wake to our full capabilities and opportunities.

Since its birth, West Virginia has made notable contributions in war and peace—from national marble championships to the Nobel Prize in literature. Who has not heard of Nathan Goff, John E. Kenna, and William L. Wilson in politics; I. C. White in conservation and geology; Anna Jarvis, founder of Mother's Day; Eleanor Steber, Metropolitan opera soprano; Pearl Buck and Melville Davisson Post in literature; and Charles "Chuck" Yeager, the first human to break the sound barrier in flight? John Barton Payne, Louis A. Johnson, Newton D. Baker, Howard M. Gore, and others have served in Presidents' Cabinets. Nor should be overlooked John W. Davis, U.S. Ambassador to Great Britain and presidential candidate in 1924; H. T. Webster, cartoonist and creator of "Casper Milquetoast"; James E. Allen, Jr., commissioner of education of the State of New York; and Andrew Summers Rowan, who carried the "Message to Garcia" in 1898.

In conclusion, I would like to stress the fact that the centennial affords a unique opportunity for all of us to present West Virginia, its institutions, organizations, and citizenry, to the world in the most favorable light and in a manner calculated to benefit our State and all of its many interests and activities. In the final analysis, though, the lasting values and the complete success of the centennial celebration depends on the enthusiasm, financial support, and active participation of the State's organizations, enterprises, and individuals—particularly those with the interest, inspiration, and will-to-do, of the men and women of today. If centennial plans develop successfully, communities and organizations will be asked to participate in the centennial program in a number of ways. I am convinced that such participation will be a long-term investment, a lasting benefit to the community as well as our beloved State.

I think that the essence of what the centennial means was admirably expressed by former Governor Underwood:

"The centennial year allows us to play host to many thousands from all parts of our country who will find hospitality and great natural beauty within our borders. The centennial celebration will also increase civic pride among our own citizens. As such it constitutes a major effort worthy of the collective support of all West Virginians, and indeed all who have affection for and interest in West Virginia, wherever they may live.

"Ultimately, however, the success of the centennial will be determined by the citizens and institutions of our State. This is a challenge to all of us, an opportunity. I know that West Virginians will participate in the centennial with the enthusiasm and success which has marked our first 100 years of statehood."

National Library Week Observed at Donaldson Air Force Base, S.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT T. ASHMORE
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, recently National Library Week was observed and I commend Mrs. Verena L. Bryson—Mrs. William J.—librarian, Donaldson Air Force Base—located in my congressional district—for her efforts to encourage greater use of the base library by all military personnel and their dependents. I heartily congratulate Mrs. Bryson and all librarians for their concerted emphasis on the value of reading by Americans in every walk of life.

As a means of affording well deserved recognition of those who participated in the observance at Donaldson Air Force Base, and as a possible source of information for future use by other libraries, both military and civilian, I ask unanimous consent that an account of it be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL LIBRARY WEEK, 1961, DONALDSON AIR FORCE BASE, S.C.

During the first week of February 1961, it was determined that National Library Week would be observed at Donaldson Air Force Base as a part of the base library's continuing program of encouraging a more comprehensive use of library facilities and services by military and civilian personnel, and their dependents. The methods and materials suggested by the National Library Week Organization Handbook and by the Armed Forces and National Library Week Pamphlet (DOD Pamphlet 7–8A) were evaluated by the librarian and adapted to meet local circumstances.

A committee to plan and coordinate the program observing National Library Week was established. That committee consisted of Col. M. H. Strickler, deputy wing commander; Lt. Col. A. L. Klinge, chief of personnel; Chaplain (Maj.) John D. Barringer; Maj. B. D. Wofford, secretary, officers open mess; T. L. Tilman, education services officer; and Mrs. William J. Bryson, base librarian, who served as vice chairman. On March 23, the base newspaper, the Troop Courier, printed an article announcing that National Library Week would be observed and named the committee.

The committee determined the activities to be conducted during National Library Week, and the manner in which the attention of base personnel would be directed toward those activities. First, actions were undertaken to make the library more accessible and appealing to patrons. On April 1, library hours were extended from 48 to 68 hours per week.

A pending request for new reading tables and chairs were expedited, so that these more attractive and comfortable furnishings were in place for the observance. Displays and exhibits incorporating organizational hand-

book suggestions and subjects of special interest to Air Force personnel were planned, created, and erected in the library.

These attractions included:

(1) A mockup of a large book opened to its table of contents which listed topics to be found in other displays;

(2) A display of the notable books of 1960;

(3) A display of books appropriate to the theme "Democracy versus communism";

(4) A display concerning newly created nations;

(5) A display of books suggested by the Air Force reading guide; and

(6) A display of letters from South Carolina's two U.S. Senators, OLIN D. JOHNSTON and STROM THURMOND, and three of its U.S. Representatives, L. MENDEL RIVERS, W. J. BRYAN DORN, and ROBERT T. ASHMORE, calling attention of servicemen to the benefits to be realized from the use of library facilities and services.

The children's room of the library was decorated with posters, pictures, and book displays depicting the lives of renowned leaders of democracy.

It was decided by the committee to use as the local symbol of National Library Week a large reproduction of a scene depicting the cartoon character, Beetle Bailey, asleep in his bunk being told to "wake up and read" by his sergeant. Such a scene was displayed at the entrance to the library and another was incorporated in a display within the library itself.

During the first week of April, two posters suggested for military service libraries by the National Library Week Headquarters were reproduced and posted on 29 squadron orderly room bulletin boards. A large sign reciting the National Library Week slogan and the dates of National Library Week was placed at the base main entrance, which is the most heavily traveled area. In the April 6 issue of the Troop Courier, an article was published itemizing the various events planned for National Library Week.

During the second week of April and during NLW, the base daily bulletin contained information regarding the observance.

On April 13, the observance officially began, through an address by a local newspaper columnist at a luncheon of the Donaldson Air Force Base YWCA. An article regarding his address and recapitulating the plans for National Library Week was subsequently printed in the Troop Courier.

On April 16, an invitation to the public to visit the base library appeared in the Greenville News. On the same date bulletins of Protestant and Catholic chapels on the base contained notices regarding National Library Week.

Special events designed to appeal to each interest group within, or related to, the personnel of Donaldson Air Force Base were conducted during National Library Week. These activities included the following:

April 17, noncommissioned officers and their wives were conducted on a tour of the library. Special exhibits and displays were explained and instructions in the use of the library's facilities and services were given. Coffee and refreshments were served. A reporter from one of the local radio stations attended as a special guest. During her visit, she recorded interviews with the assistant librarian and the librarian. These interviews were broadcast at different times throughout the week. In a special feature article, accompanied by photographs, the Greenville News of the same date reported on the facilities and services of the Donaldson AFB library and recited the activities and events which were planned for NLW.

April 18, Capt. Harley H. Halstead, the commander of Maintenance Headquarters Squadron, a regular patron of the library, and a member of the Base Toastmaster's Club, was interviewed on a local television station. He called attention to National Library Week in general, and to the library facilities and services of Donaldson Air Force Base, in particular.

On the evening of April 18, a dance was held at the service club for airmen. Airmen and their guests were dressed as their favorite book characters, and were awarded prizes for the best and most original costumes. A picture of the winners of the contest was subsequently published in the Greenville News, along with a brief story concerning the event. Another photograph of some of the contestants appeared in the Anderson Independent.

April 19, a tour of the library, similar to that for noncommissioned officers and their wives, was conducted for officers and the Officers Wives' Club. The chairman of the library week committee, Col. M. H. Strickler acted as host and Mrs. Joel C. Stevenson, president of the Officers Wives' Club acted as hostess. Refreshments were served. Special guests included members of the library staffs of Furman University, the Greenville Public Library, and several local public school libraries. In addition, the chairman of the local USO, and members of the local volunteer USO committee were present. The occasion was reported by another local radio station and by the Greenville Piedmont.

April 20, in cooperation with the service club director, Miss Elizabeth Mahon, airmen and their guests were served refreshments and conducted on a tour of the library during evening hours.

The staff of Donaldson Air Force Base Library, consists of a librarian, an assistant librarian, a library assistant, a military clerk and a part-time civilian employee. The library maintains a collection of approximately 14,500 volumes.

As a result of National Library Week observance, circulation of library materials and attendance of patrons at Donaldson Air Force Base Library increased approximately 15 percent. The program was conducted at a cost of only $75, appropriated from central base funds, and expended in the preparation of displays and decorations for the library.

Donaldson Air Force Base is the home of the 63d Troop Carrier Wing (MATS), a unit of the Nation's only strategic airlift force. Brig. Gen. Andrew B. Cannon is commander of the 63d Troop Carrier Wing and Col. Floyd M. Johnson is commander of Donaldson Air Force Base.

Vice President's Words Inconsistent With Administration Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in reading the reports of the press conference held by the Vice President upon his return from his trip to Asia, I was struck with the inconsistency of what he is reported to have said to the peoples of that part of the world and the performance of the administration in these first months it has been in office. In the news article below, the Vice President is quoted as telling the Asians "the United States is prepared to make any sacrifice and risk any danger necessary to block the spread of communism." I believe the American people are ready to do just that, but is the administration?

Our action in failing to support those who were fighting to free Cuba from a Communist dictator did not indicate we were willing to make any sacrifice or risk any danger to block the spread of communism only 90 miles from our own coast. The President's action in setting up a committee to deal with Castro in accepting his blackmail offer to trade prisoners for tractors, is not the action of a government that is willing to make sacrifices and face danger.

Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that the actions of this Nation back up the many fine sounding speeches which are being made. The American people are ready, willing, and anxious to stand up for freedom regardless of what it takes. I suggest the administration catch up with the rest of the country and either give leadership to whatever action is necessary or stop making pretty speeches which sound pretty silly when not backed up.

ASIANS WANT FUNDS AND GUIDANCE, JOHNSON SAYS

(By Robert Young)

WASHINGTON, May 24.—Vice President JOHNSON said today at President Kennedy's request, he assured leaders of Asia on his round-the-world trip that the United States is prepared to "make any sacrifice and risk and danger" necessary to block the spread of communism.

JOHNSON said no Asian countries asked for American troops to defend them against Red aggression. They already have the manpower, he said, and want financial help and technical guidance from the United States to make it possible for their own military forces to fight "an unscrupulous enemy."

JOHNSON discussed his 2-week, 29,000-mile good will trip at a press conference. JOHNSON returned from the trip this morning and flew directly from the airport by helicopter to the White House, where he was met by the President and Secretary of State Dean Rusk.

EFFORT TO SHOW CONCERN

President Kennedy called JOHNSON's trip an effort to show the peoples of Asia this country's deep concern for the cause of freedom. JOHNSON said as he went into the President's office for a 45-minute conference that his report on his talks with Asian leaders "embodies much more hope than I thought possible when I left."

JOHNSON later told his press conference, however, that the American people must be warned that the Communist threat to South Vietnam and other countries in Asia confronts the United States with "a dangerous and disturbing situation."

He said he submitted military and nonmilitary recommendations to the President and Rusk which "they may use as they see fit."

CARRIED LETTERS

He commented that he had not returned to Washington "with any miraculous solutions," but the personal letters he took to Asian leaders from President Kennedy pointed the way to the cooperation essential to halt the totalitarian menace of communism.

"I was disturbed," JOHNSON said, "that so many Asian leaders should express doubt as to American intentions. Some are afraid that the danger of atomic attack has produced a stalemate in which the system that is most unscrupulous, or willing to stage the biggest bluff, will triumph.

"I think they know now that no amount of peril is going to cause the United States to shrink away as human liberty is stifled in Asia. The Asian leaders to whom I talked have been reassured that we shall honor our commitments.

"WILLING TO SACRIFICE

"While I made it clear, at the President's request, that we shall make any sacrifice and risk any danger that the protection of liberty may call for, nowhere in Asia was there a request for American troops.

"The free nations of Asia have the manpower. What they want from us now is the financial support and the technical guidance that will make it possible for their own forces to meet an unscrupulous enemy."

JOHNSON said he was convinced—and most Asian leaders concurred—that the current piecemeal approach to the problems of southeast Asia is ineffective. What is needed, he said, is the uniting of non-Communist nations on a broad regional basis—militarily and in the fields of economic justice and social progress.

The Midwest, Our Merchant Marine, and Oversea Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

THE MIDWEST, OUR MERCHANT MARINE, AND OVERSEAS MARKETS

(Remarks by C. D. Gibbons, president, United States Lines, at St. Louis World Trade Luncheon, May 18, 1961)

Thank you, Mr. Holland, for those kind words. Before proceeding with my remarks, I want to thank all of you in the St. Louis business community for the friendly reception you have given to our group during the past few days. It does us a lot of good to get away from the coast for a few days and get back inland to talk over mutual problems with those who are either producing or consuming the things we carry across the sea.

We have found in St. Louis a vigorous, lively, interest in foreign trade, and in new marketing opportunities developing overseas.

We appreciate the support given this luncheon, and the series of meetings and clinics we are holding, by the distinguished group of St. Louis businessmen who have sponsored our visit to your city. We appreciate also the sponsorship of the Mississippi Valley Association and the Propeller Club of St. Louis, as well as the cooperation by your chamber of commerce. My associates and I thank you all.

There may be those who find it strange that so many salt-water steamship men should journey inland 700, 900, or even 2,100 miles from their gulf, east, and west coast home ports to talk about shipping with St. Louis businessmen. It really isn't so strange, after all, that we visit an inland port to talk with you in St. Louis on the largest river in our Nation. As deep-water men we have a mutual interest in the expanding opportunities before us in international business.

We have come to talk with you about these opportunities. On the basis of our knowledge of trading areas around the globe, we believe that American business is on the threshold—I almost said new frontier—of a vast overseas market expansion.

The peoples of the world are demanding higher standards of living. Thus, massive new spending power is being generated, and with it major markets are opening up for many of the products that American industry and agriculture can supply.

In the underdeveloped areas of the free world there lies a latent potential yet to be fully explored by American enterprise. As we penetrate these developing markets, we also have an opportunity and a challenge to demonstrate the vigor and the promise of our system of Government.

Our Government is increasing the number of its trade missions overseas and strengthening its overseas commercial staffs. It is establishing more permanent trade centers abroad, it is developing new financing arrangements. Our own world-wide system of steamship offices, know-how and experience are being made available in this effort.

Ten years ago, American companies maintained some 7,400 foreign corporations or branches abroad. Today, there are more than 10,000.

Ten years ago, these overseas American investments were valued at just under $12 billion. Today, they have nearly trebled to better than $30 billion.

Overall, American business in 1960 increased its total investment in overseas facilities by more than $2½ billion.

At the same time, commercial exports last year hit a new level of more than $19 billion, a 20-percent increase over the year before.

There are signs of the advancing times for alert businessmen. It used to be in many companies that overseas business was a secondary market. And it got secondary attention. It was a handy overflow for products that couldn't otherwise be absorbed in the domestic market.

Today, oversea marketing, manufacturing, and distribution are getting priority attention. A whole new generation of internationally trained executives is entering American business management. They are young, aggressive, and energetic. The world is their oyster. They add a new dimension to our industry and agriculture.

Now, you may say: "Mr. Gibbons, this is all very interesting, but what does it have to do with Missouri and with St. Louis and with me?"

My reply: it has a great deal to do with you, your State, and city, more perhaps than you realize. Before coming here, our committee put some of our research people to work. We asked them to find out as definitively as possible just what foreign trade does mean to Missouri and St. Louis. The answers were surprising to us, and I hope they will be informative to you. For example:

Did you know that your State's share of U.S. exports last year, both manufactured and farm goods, amounted to an estimated $427 million, and that of this amount about $250 million originates in the Greater St. Louis area itself?

And did you know that more than 82 percent of the people employed in Greater St. Louis in both production and service industries is directly or indirectly affected by foreign trade? And that the production people alone in 1959 received $1.5 billion in wages that mean spending power for your city and area?

Were you aware that of your State's total working force of 1.6 million more than 340,000 people are employed in production industries directly affected by foreign trade, and that more than 80 percent of those employed in production, service, and agricultural industries are directly or indirectly affected by foreign trade?

And did you know that the wages, salaries, and earnings of these people contribute better than $5 billion yearly to your State's spending power?

These are only some of our findings. But they are enough to demonstrate that there is nothing "foreign" about foreign trade in St. Louis. It is a personal, and vitally important part of everyday living in your city. It represents wages, tax revenues to National and State Governments, money in the till to merchants, profits for St. Louis industry.

Your city is one of the greatest transportation centers in the United States.

The 21 railroads serving St. Louis make you second only to Chicago as a railroad center.

Your spacious new airport and the fine service it offers are the envy of many other communities.

You are a vital part of our highway trucking system.

The barge and waterways traffic passing through your port and up and down your river is an essential part of your daily life and that of the entire Mississippi Valley region. Your port is the No. 1 inland port in all America. St. Louis is truly a transportation city of distinction.

Exposed as you are to all other modes of transportation, it is unfortunate that, as an inland city, you are unable directly to see the impact which ocean shipping has upon your lives.

In this visit to St. Louis we, as shipping people, are seeking to expand your awareness of American shipping. As we meet with your exporters and importers, we will be discussing with them the growing number of oversea marketing opportunities available to them.

We will also be talking about our steamship services and the fact that you can ship your cargoes, either inbound or outbound, on American liners at the same rates you can ship on the vessels of competing maritime nations.

We will show that you can reach more than 400 major world ports on a regular, frequent basis by utilizing American-flag services.

And by using these services, we will point out, you can enhance your competitive position in export sales by quoting laid-down prices of your product at the customer's home port. You can exercise close control of your shipments, gearing them to your plant production schedules, and controlling your routing so that you can build strong, reliable sales relationships with overseas customers.

Transportation of this country's foreign trade is our business—our only reason for existing.

American-flag shipping is essentially a service industry. We provide transportation, and kindred services of many kinds. Not the least of these is the assistance our trade development staffs can give you in finding new overseas markets.

Let me be specific. Not too many years ago, the government-owned railway of a foreign country was embarking upon a program to modernize its transportation system with diesel electric locomotives.

There appeared to be little likelihood that American locomotive manufacturers would be considered because the government purchasing mission seemed to be strongly inclined toward Austrian, German or English manufacturers.

Through the interest taken by American-flag steamship line representatives, who had been serving this particular trade for many years, American locomotive makers were given an opportunity to bid which otherwise would have been denied them. Their sales organization and their superior product did the job, and the end result was 2 orders for more than 150 American locomotives at a sales price of better than $35 million.

A Colorado manufacturer of arc welding machines wished to develop a market for his machines in the Far East. He contacted an American steamship company. The Colorado manufacturer now has a contract with a major Japanese firm representing him throughout the Far East.

A California producer of dried raisins sought help in marketing his products in Trinidad. One of our lines introduced him to a Trinidad importer and the first of many shipments of dried raisins has been made.

A company in Brazil, seeking a certain specialized type of graphite electrodes, asked one of our shipping lines for help. It was put in touch with a midwestern manufacturer and a sizable order resulted.

A New York firm wished to open new markets for its record pressing machines in Venezuela. Steamship officials put the manufacturer in touch with a Caracas purchaser and five reorders of the equipment have resulted.

A San Francisco chemicals producer asked a west coast line to help him develop sales contacts in Barcelona, Genoa, Switzerland, and the Far East. Three major shipments of borax have developed.

These are daily occurrences. They are examples of what American shipping can do for you if you call on us for assistance.

These are some of the obvious benefits. There are others that are less obvious, yet make a valuable dollar contribution to our Nation's economic health, and to the economic well-being of your State and city.

One of these concerns the unfavorable balance of payments, about which we have been reading so much lately.

I mentioned earlier that the steamship business is essentially a service industry. A recent study by one of our leading universities showed that American shipping annually provides between $700 million and $1 billion toward a favorable balance of payments. Thus, when St. Louis exporters and importers ship on American-flag lines, they are helping to narrow the gap in dollar balances and improving the economic climate for all American business. To the contrary, when you ship on foreign vessels, you are exporting dollars and weakening our balance of payments position.

There are other benefits flowing from American shipping, and closer to home. Today, as I talk with you, there are at least a dozen, and probably more, St. Louis manufacturers at work fulfilling orders for equipment to be placed in new ships that our lines are presently building in American shipyards. These orders run from coils, pipefittings, heaters, and ventilators to massive steam-generating equipment, and other important equipment.

In dollar volume these current orders placed with St. Louis business amount to close to $1 million. When you consider that these orders arise from the present building of a relatively few ships, and that within the next decade some 300 such ships will be built by our lines at a total cost of more than $4 billion, you can see that St. Louis has a direct and personal stake in American shipping.

It is to your great credit that the diversification of your industry permits St. Louis to share so heavily in this program. We look forward to doing even more business with you on future ship construction. Naturally, we hope you will reciprocate when you can.

We, as a nation, are not as nationalistically minded when it comes to shipping as other nations. For instance, more than 50 percent of the United Kingdom's foreign trade is carried on British ships.

Fifty-seven percent of Japanese cargoes are carried in their ships.

By contrast, only 10 percent of America's waterborne foreign commerce is carried by American-flag ships. This, of course, includes all kinds of commodities in all types of ships. We are gravely disturbed by these figures.

The regularly scheduled American liner services represented in our committee carry a somewhat healthier percentage—about one-third of our U.S. waterborne commerce. But surely this is not maximum use of American shipping services by American business.

Maybe these figures indicate that we have not done as good a selling job as we could about the advantages of using American ships. That is one reason we are here. This visit is part of an aggressive national program undertaken by both Government and industry to increase exports aboard American-flag ships.

This program includes national advertising, intensified cargo and passenger solicitation by American lines and with it a stepping up of the service we are able to render shippers. We think the timing of this effort is appropriate, both because of the benefits it brings to our Nation's critical balance-of-payments position and because of the values it offers American manufacturers at a time when they are themselves moving aggressively to expand their foreign manufacturing, marketing, and distribution.

Upon the success of this effort depends the general health of our American merchant marine in the future, and with it the general health of our economy and of our defense posture in the free world.

We can't have a healthy merchant fleet without cargoes—and, I might add, without passengers. Yet, even in this missile age, if our country is to maintain and strengthen its position of world leadership we cannot do so without being a strong maritime power. Historically, maritime powers that have allowed their merchant fleets to deteriorate have become second-rate powers in world affairs.

We cannot afford, nor can the free nations of the world afford, to have the United States become a second-rate power in any sense. This is not only a matter of national prestige. It is a question of survival.

Our industry—and let me emphasize this—does not seek a monopoly position in carrying our foreign trade. However, it does seek a fair share, and by this I mean at least 50 percent of the oversea commerce generated in our own country. The remaining half would be available to the ships of friendly maritime nations.

We recognize that it is in our national interest, and that of the free world, that the fleets of our allies be kept strong. But we do not think that they need be kept strong at the expense of America's own maritime strength. This would not be in our best interest or theirs.

The necessity for a strong U.S. merchant marine is recognized by Congress through our national maritime policy, set in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. The act establishes and reaffirms that the United States must have a privately owned and operated merchant fleet in being sufficient to carry a substantial proportion of our waterborne foreign commerce. By substantial portion we mean half.

The act also states that a strong merchant marine is vital to our defense, and an important instrument of our national policy.

Atoms and missiles have not changed this basic fact. Korea, Suez, Lebanon, southeast Asia, and Africa, have reemphasized the need for a merchant fleet in being to serve at times of crisis. In recent weeks, leaders in the administration have underlined that, even with atoms and missiles, we still face the challenge of limited wars fought in more conventional ways. There is no question of the need for seapower, and seapower includes commercial freighters, tankers, and passenger ships.

Even in the event of atomic war, our defense chiefs have time and time again reiterated the need for ships and especially for ships under our own flag which will form the hard core of the free world shipping requirements. Not so long ago the survival of world democracy hinged upon our American merchant ships. Just a few short years ago, we built a bridge of ships to snatch victory from defeat. Who is to say it won't happen again?

Our Government has recognized that if we are to maintain an adequate fleet at American standards in comparison with low-cost competition of foreign maritime nations, this fleet and its supporting shipbuilding facilities must have some Government support.

Our problem as shipping companies in relation to foreign competition are not unlike those of American manufacturers who are now building abroad to sell abroad.

The American producer who builds abroad to sell abroad is impelled to do so in order to take advantage of lower foreign wage rates and material costs so that he can meet foreign competition.

We in the steamship business have the same problem. But we do not have available to us the same solution. We cannot meet foreign competition by transferring our ships to foreign flags. Our Government believes that it is necessary to keep a certain portion of our merchant marine operating under the American flag with American crews paid at American wages. This is basic national maritime policy.

The result is, therefore, that our merchant marine operates at disadvantageously high costs. How, then, does the Government compensate for these and other restrictions inherent in operating on American standards against low-cost foreign competition?

The answer is a sound and equitable parity principle established under the Merchant Marine Act. Parity seeks to equate the differences between foreign and U.S. costs and it achieves this through the Government making operating differential payments to those shipping companies willing to accept certain restrictions.

In return, steamship companies under contract with Government obligate themselves to build their ships in the United States; hire only American labor; use only American supplies and materials; provide regular, scheduled sailings over world trade routes declared essential by the Government; replace their fleets at periodic intervals and keep them available for national defense.

Like a golfer's handicap, these operating-differential payments only enable us to stay in the game, to compete on even terms with foreign ships. From that point on—win, lose, or draw—we are on our own to earn a profit or not, according to our ability. Operating-differential payments in no sense guarantee a profit. When earnings are good there is provision, unique among Government assistance programs, whereby the operators pay back part or all of the money advanced by Government. We are pleased to say that in some periods this has happened.

Our Government also pays directly to shipyards the difference in cost between building a comparable ship in low-cost foreign yards and in a shipyard in the United States. We must build our ships in American yards and with American materials, some, as I have noted, from this area. This is essential if our Nation is to maintain and support a U.S. shipbuilding capacity and its needed technical skills for both peacetime and defense needs.

So, as taxpayers as well as businessmen, you have a real interest in fostering a strong American merchant marine.

We also believe that the American shipper has a similar interest. That interest could best be demonstrated by the decision he makes in selecting the ships to carry his cargoes.

We know that some decisions, regarding what ships to use are forced by terms of the sale because some foreign buyers insist that cargoes be carried on ships of their country.

We know that some are strongly influenced by discriminatory actions or Govern-

ment regulations of foreign nations and by other considerations beyond the shipper's control. While we may not like these things, we can at least understand them.

But we also know that many of these decisions are based on disinterest. Too many shippers don't really care how their cargo travels, so long as it arrives at the necessary destination at the necessary time. This is understandable, because rates are generally the same, and frequency and regularity of schedule are competitive, and they don't see the necessity for maintaining, through active commercial support, an American merchant fleet.

So, oftentimes the shipper just doesn't particularly worry about the flag of the ship on which his cargo travels. His primary concern is producing and selling.

This we would like to change. We want you, as shippers, to care whether your cargoes travel American or foreign. We hope you will interest yourself in this important fact. We want to substitute enlightened self-interest for disinterest.

We think it is advantageous to you to do so. It is certainly in the national interest. We do not ask you to ship via American-flag lines if it means that you would lose the sale by so insisting, or if it would be unprofitable for you.

We do invite you to patronize American shipping whenever and wherever possible, and where rates and service are competitive. We stand ready to assist you in the growing competition for world markets with every facility of our worldwide organizations at your command.

Thank you.

Differences Between Republicans and Democrats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, Arizona State University, wishing to be ever helpful in adding to the knowledge of man, has been engaging in research into human behavior. A series of five articles describing this research by Arizona State University has been written.

I hold in my hand one of the articles, written by Jerry Eaton. It is an amusing and interesting article, because it relates to measurement of the differences between Republicans and Democrats. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIFFERENCES MEASURED

(By Jerry Eaton)

TEMPE.—Republican men are more active, but less restrained than their Democratic counterparts, according to Arizona State University research measuring the personality differences of members of America's two major political parties.

Dr. Henry L. Manheim, of ASU's Department of Sociology and Anthropology, said his study indicates Republican men possess great energy, vitality, enthusiasm, and liveliness.

They have a liking for speed, quickness of action, and prefer a rapid pace of activities, he said.

In his study involving four political clubs, two Republican and two Democratic in the San Fernando Valley in suburban Los Angeles, Dr. Manheim concluded the GOP "had a very significantly higher level of general activity than the Democratic men."

However, the Democratic men were significantly more restrained and serious-minded than the Republicans, the ASU educator declared.

The self-control and deliberateness of the Democratic men contrasted to the happy-go-lucky, carefree impulsive, and excitement-loving Republicans, the research indicated.

Democratic men tend to be more friendly, Dr. Manheim said.

Friendliness was one of 10 traits of personality and temperament measured and 1 of 4 in which big differences were noted between the parties.

Republicans and Democrats also differed strongly in general activity, restraint, and friendliness among men, and in restraint among women.

While the Republicans are not as friendly and agreeable, they possess a "rather strong fighting spirit," according to the report.

A finding in the survey indicated Republican men and Democratic women tend to be the most sociable.

"No inference will be made from this," Dr. Manheim grinned.

As for the women, the Democrats with consistent voting records had significantly higher scores on restraint than the Republicans, but otherwise the women showed no marked differences in any of the other traits measured.

Dr. Manheim said, "It may be inferred that, regardless of political party preference, activity in either of these political parties tends to be selective of individuals with patterns of temperament traits which fall within the most favorable ranges."

He continued, "It would be somewhat less than realistic to draw the conclusion that because of their significantly greater excitement-loving, impulsiveness, and happy-go-lucky characteristics, Republican women with consistent voting records are less suited for supervisory positions than are Democratic women.

"Nevertheless, it makes for interesting speculation." Dr. Manheim conducted tests to measure 10 independent factors of personality and temperament, general activity, restraint, ascendance, sociability, emotional stability, objectivity, friendliness, thoughtfulness, personal relations, and masculinity.

Obsolete Money Costs Taxpayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, for nearly 4 years the Congress has delayed action on the old-currency bill, a delay that has cost the American taxpayers some $10.5 million. When I first introduced this legislation I had hopes of speedy and favorable action, but this has not been the case.

Last week, the other body passed S. 1619, a version of the old-currency bill which I have introduced three times. I sincerely hope that the Committee on Banking and Currency will hold early hearings on S. 1619 and will recommend that it be passed by the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I have received many letters from all sections of the country suporting this money saving bill. Many newspapers across the Nation have published stories and editorials to show the nature of the old-currency bill and how it would save the Federal Government money. One of the stories was written by Mr. James McCartney of the Chicago Daily News Service and was published in the Seattle Times, May 18, 1961. This story reads as follows:

MONEYSAVING BILL SHUNTED ASIDE 4 YEARS

(By James McCartney)

WASHINGTON, May 18—This is the story of how a campaign to try to save $10,000 a day in needless Government spending has fallen flat for 4 straight years.

It is a story of shoddy politics, bureaucratic fumbling and congressional inertia—all at the expense of the taxpayer.

The incredible part about it is that no one appears to be against the campaign.

Apparently $10,000 a day in waste just has not been enough to get Congressmen and Senators excited enough to act, according to the campaign's sponsors.

The story involves funds kept by the U.S. Treasury to back up obsolete paper currency.

At the moment the Treasury has about $100 million of these reserve funds.

The funds have been kept to provide backing for old, large-sized dollar bills issued before 1929, gold certificates issued between 1923 and 1934 and old Federal Reserve notes.

Senator PROXMIRE, Democrat, Wisconsin, and Representative WESTLAND, Republican, Washington, are seeking to end the requirement for maintaining the reserve. This would free the reserve for other uses and would reduce Government borrowing by $100 million.

The $10,000-a-day saving would be in interest charges. This money is now being paid out in interest to those who loan money to the United States by buying its securities.

Treasury Department officials as well as officials of the Federal Reserve Board agree that keeping the reserve, and paying out the interest, is waste.

Yet every attempt to change the law since 1957 has bogged down. And the waste actually goes back many years before that.

"Nobody is against changing the law," WESTLAND says, "but something always seems to go wrong."

Last year a bill actually passed the Senate. But in the House, loaded down with election-year problems, it never got to the floor.

A couple of years ago the Treasury Department sent a copy of a reform bill to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, urging its adoption.

An official of the committee, however, did not like the way the proposed bill was worded and insisted on rewriting it. By the time he got it rewritten Congress was out of session.

On Monday a bill sponsored by PROXMIRE to end the reserve requirement was approved by the Senate without opposition.

But the House has yet to act and the situation there is considered unpredictable. It is likely to be a question, according to one Congressman, of whether the House can find time.

The first move to change the law was made in 1957 by WESTLAND, who says the situation was called to his attention by an accountant friend in Seattle.

WESTLAND promptly introduced a bill but it "got lost."

WESTLAND says that when he asked the Treasury Department about his proposal an official there replied: "Gosh, why didn't we think of that?"

The Treasury Department, however, did not take any initiative in trying to get the law changed until 1959.

That was the year the committee official rewrote the bill.

"The situation is a clear indication of the lack of interest in saving $3,500,000 a year in these days of multimillion-dollar budgets," PROXMIRE says.

"You can imagine what that kind of saving would have meant to the First Congress in the 1700's."

Also, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include an editorial from the May 22, 1961, issue of the Passaic (N.J.) Herald-News, which I believe is worth the attention of my colleagues. The editorial follows:

A CHANCE TO SAVE $10,000 A DAY

For 4 years, a campaign has been conducted unsuccessfully in Washington to save the American taxpayers $10,000 a day. Apparently to a government accustomed to thinking in terms of millions and billions, $10,000 is too little to be concerned about.

The Treasury has a fund of $100 million to back the old, large-sized paper currency. Officials of both the Treasury Department and Federal Reserve System agree that keeping the reserve fund is a sheer waste. If the fund could be abolished, Government borrowing would be reduced by $100 million and $10,000 a day in interest saved. Nevertheless, since 1957 efforts to end the waste have failed.

Representative WESTLAND, Washington Republican, who was first to introduce corrective legislation, says: "Nobody's against changing the law, but something always seems to go wrong." U.S. Senator PROXMIRE, Wisconsin Democrat, who sponsored legislation in the Senate, says: "The situation is a clear indication of the lack of interest in saving $3.5 million a year in these days of multimillion dollar budgets."

Illustrative of the things which have gone wrong is the fate of a corrective bill sent to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee by the Treasury Department with a request for its adoption. An official of the committee objected to the wording and insisted on rewriting it. By the time he had rewritten it, Congress was out of session.

This year, another effort is being made to stop the waste. The Senate has approved a bill introduced by Senator PROXMIRE without opposition. It has gone to the House. The problem there, according to one House Member, is whether the House can find time to save $10,000 a day.

Why the Delay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DURWARD G. HALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, several months ago I submitted a bill, H.R. 3535, calling for basic tax reform to stimulate economy growth and provide new jobs. My bill was similar to the Herlong-Baker bill now pending before the House Ways and Means Committee. I deeply regret that no hearings on this bill have been scheduled and that the chance for consideration appear to be remote. Instead, the administration has recommended a tax revision plan which one paper in my district has described as a "Rube Goldberg system of tax concessions." The Carthage Press on May 17 compares the administration's proposals with the Herlong-Baker approach. I submit this editorial for the consideration of those who must make the choice between private enterprise or Government dictation:

WHY THE DELAY

To "encourage" businesses to expand and modernize, the administration has come up with a Rube Goldberg system of tax concessions, while announcing that basic income tax reform is necessary but will be put off at least until next year.

The House Ways and Means Committee is now hearing witnesses on this year's proposal, which would extend tax "forgiveness" allowances to businesses that spent more than before for new plant and equipment. This plan boils down to dictation by Government as to how individuals and corporations shall conduct their businesses.

The Treasury estimates that $1.7 billion in tax breaks would go to businesses that built new facilities. But with the other hand, the Treasury would take back this amount plus $250 million more from businesses by levying new taxes. Thus, American business is expected to be "stimulated" by a net loss in funds—an incredible supposition.

Of course, the businessman who could best expand by hiring more salesmen, spending money on promotion, increasing his advertising, or marketing a new product, would be hit by new taxes and get none of the tax breaks. Yet, his way of "getting the country moving again" is as good as a new plant—which he may not need. He will be impeded, not helped.

Some businesses, under the administration plan, undoubtedly would be "stimulated" to spend unwisely, especially as new taxes would diminish the prospect for profit on the new facilities. Many businesses don't grow, or even shrink, if their product is one in merely steady or declining demand, or if the section in which they are situated is not a growing one. For them, expansion might be folly. Yet, they are presently providing jobs and performing essential services.

This "investment credit" approach to business health is a novel nostrum of no great promise. Hearings are scheduled to be short, and a vote will come quickly.

Congress would do well to defeat it, and enact real income tax rate reform to accomplish economic growth. This year would be infinitely better for the job than next.

And the Herlong-Baker bill for the purpose, already well known to the lawmakers and fully explored, would be the ideal vehicle for the job.

Washington Post Editorial Stand on Textile Industry Answered in Cotton Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BASIL L. WHITENER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, on May 10, 1961, the Washington Post carried an editorial which suggested that the United States has outgrown the need for a domestic textile industry.

In a speech at Cleveland, Miss., today before the Delta Council annual meeting, Mr. J. M. Cheatham, of Griffin, Ga., president of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, took issue with the contents of the Post editorial.

You can bet your bottom dollar—

Mr. Cheatham said—

that no responsible textile manufacturer in this country regards our industry as a terminal case, and I can assure you we are making no arrangements for a funeral.

With the belief that my colleagues will be interested in it I insert a release concerning Mr. Cheatham's speech in the Appendix of the RECORD:

WASHINGTON POST EDITORIAL STAND ON TEXTILE INDUSTRY ANSWERED IN COTTON SPEECH

CLEVELAND, MISS., May 25.—A major cotton farmer organization today received assurance that the American textile industry does not regard itself as a terminal case.

J. M. Cheatham, of Griffin, Ga., president of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, told the Delta Council annual meeting the baleful phrase was used in a newspaper editorial to characterize the industry and added:

"You can bet your bottom dollar that no responsible textile manufacturer in this country regards our industry as a terminal case and I can assure you we are making no arrangements for a funeral.

"All of us—producers and processors of cotton—know we possess the resources, the talents, and the strength of leadership—political and otherwise—to fight this battle for survival through to victory."

Mr. Cheatham alluded to a Washington Post editorial of May 10 which suggested that the United States has outgrown the need for a domestic textile industry.

The editorial, he continued, suggested that "the death of the textile industry as we know it is only a matter of time and that efforts of President Kennedy to provide assistance to this industry are 'temporary protection' against the inevitable day when textiles as a major American industry will no longer exist."

"Nowhere," added Mr. Cheatham, "did the editorial mention the cotton economy, and what would happen to that basic segment of U.S. agriculture if the textile industry were allowed to die. So I'll ask you to ponder with me that one, What would happen?

"Nobody can say, and that is precisely the danger of the situation we are in right now.

"But we know that the economy of a vast area of the United States, involving millions of individuals and billions of investment dollars, would be wrecked.

"The future is confused and uncertain at best, and our business operations will only become more disrupted unless some kind of stabilizing action is taken soon."

"I deny that we are a terminal case," Mr. Cheatham continued, "but our condition is not healthy, to put it mildly. We are doing poorly because the Government's trade policies have beckoned foreign textile nations to invade the American market instead of meeting the needs of underclothed areas of the world. * * *

"The best medicine appears to be a system of flexible market-share allocations to friendly nations, arrived at on a country-to-country, category-by-category basis."

Mr. Cheatham also told the gathering of Mississippi cottongrowers that the cotton industry's productive life could be prolonged by a number of actions, including the following:

1. Improvement of product quality;

2. Increased efficiencies in the production of cotton and cotton textiles alike;

3. Intensified market development by expanding textile utilization of cotton; and

4. Regulation of imports of textile products from nations with wage and manufacturing conditions which give them overwhelming advantages over American production.

"The inseparable relationship between your agricultural and our industrial interests," Mr. Cheatham added, "makes it desirable for us both to fight the conditions which are designed to destroy us both.

"We are dedicated to preserve the jobs and livelihoods of the millions of people who are the backbone of this agricultural-industrial complex called the American cotton industry."

The 2,809 Miles of Dyspepsia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Inez Robb, a syndicated columnist, recently traveled across the country from Tucson, Ariz., to New York City. She reported in her column that she suffered a series of gustatory frustrations in public eating places until, happily, she reached the Elms Motel in my home community of Winchester, Va., where she was served "the first good meal we had after leaving Tucson, except in private homes."

Mrs. Robb also commented that it was a myth to expect good food merely by patronizing establishments at which truckdrivers ate. This finding was not surprising to me. I never regarded Jimmy Hoffa as one to follow either in the legislative halls or as a logical successor to the late Duncan Hines.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include Mrs. Robb's column as a suggestion that routing one's motor trips through Virginia may insure that at least one stage of the journey includes a good meal:

THE 2,809 MILES OF DYSPEPSIA

The voyager who makes up his mind to travel across this country by auto must make up his mind, at the outset, to live dangerously.

He will not, as might be expected, meet with maximum peril on the road, although the annual highway toll in the United States is tragic and disgraceful. No; the moment of truth will come when the motorist decides it is time to eat and starts casing the roadside for a likely looking diner, dog wagon, or restaurant.

My own, my native land, produces the most food and the worst roadside cooking in the world. Thank heaven, I have but one stomach to give for my country. If the wayfarer, like the cow, had two, he would never survive such a cross-country trek as the Robbs have just completed, 2,809 miles from Tucson, Ariz., to New York City.

Basic advice to the millions of my fellow countrymen who will take to the road the minute school is out is to avoid, at all costs, diners frequented by truckdrivers. It is beyond me to explain why the myth still flourishes that any diner patronized by truckdrivers is a reasonable facsimile of Maxim's or the Pump Room.

It is my theory that the truck-driving stomach, through long abuse, has become anaesthetized and is capable to absorbing nails as well as barbecued ribs, turnip greens, fried potatoes, soggy biscuits and pie like mother never used to make alamode.

From the time I left Tucson until I reached Harrisonburg, Va., I was unable to get a plain chicken sandwich. For 2,400 miles, waitresses offered me chicken salad sandwiches instead, and don't ask me why. Maybe it is some secret rule of the road.

Once, in Paris, Ark., I asked the waitress why there was no plain chicken, when the chef had to cook chicken to produce chicken salad. She went out to the kitchen to consult with the maestro and returned to say, "He only cooks enough for chicken salad." But let me not leave the impression that Paris, Ark., has not contributed to worldly cuisine no less than Paris, France.

Paris, Ark., is the home of the three-decker hamburger with two generous patties of hamburger, each with melted cheese on top and served with special barbecue sauce, dill pickle relish and assorted condiments.

At dinner time, we found it best to order a grilled or broiled steak and pray that it wouldn't be fried. The fact that neither one of us wanted french fries was, I believe, regarded as subversive in most communities.

My husband, a cheerful man, reached his nadir in an Oklahoma community when he ordered roast prime ribs, as advertised on the menu. Fried steak had begun to pall, and the prospect of prime ribs say hope triumphing over experience in his case.

When the slab of prime ribs arrived it had, obviously, been fried. But why, asked my husband in bewilderment. But why not, countered the waitress. The cook, she said, baked the prime ribs early in the morning and then, at dinner time when a customer ordered it, heated up the hapless meat by frying it on both sides.

In a day of fresh and fresh-frozen vegetables, do you know who eats canned vegetables, especially canned peas? The answer is simple: Motorists.

The first good meal we had after leaving Tucson, except in private homes, was in the Elms Motel in Winchester, Va. Now it is obvious that in the midst of national overabundance, the summer motorist won't starve. Starvation, no; indigestion, si.

But the next time I go on a long motor trip, I am also going on a 900-calorie diet. I believe that ought to lick the problem.

From the Minaret

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIBORNE PELL
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, many of us recall George Orwell's "1984" where the Communists movement was described in terms of an animal farm. Today, I invite for your attention a similar and equally pungent vignette along the same line.

I am referring to an article written by Chaplain Emeritus John D. Kettelle, which appeared in the June 1961 issue of the Scimitar magazine of the Palestine Temple (Rhode Island) AAONMS. Here the Communist movement is reduced to the growth of dandelions and how their tendency to spread should be treated by the suburban garden.

Mr. President, there is real food for thought in Chaplain Kettelle's article and I ask unanimous consent that this piece be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FROM THE MINARET

(By Chaplain Emeritus John D. Kettelle)

From May through September we spend a lot of time digging dandelions out of our (ha! ha!) lawn. We push an old table knife into the ground to cut the long central root, then carefully pull up the plant, making sure that we have it all. Each day we try to leave the lawn completely clear, but the very next morning the sun seems to bring out nearly as many new blossoms as there were the day before.

Our experience has led us to call the dandelion the "subversive weed." No fence is a barrier to its immigration. Its agents are parachuted in unnoticed. When the lawn is thick and healthy, they land on top of the grass where they do no harm, but if the grass is thin, they settle down into the soil and take root.

For a long time they keep out of sight while they are getting themselves organized. The first leaves stretch along the ground between the grass stems, and with their saw-toothed edges, are practically indistinguishable from the blades of grass among which they grow.

The first open sign of their presence is the appearance of a "front," or blossom. These bright sunny buttons look very pretty to the unsophisticated. "See," they say, "the lawn is sprinkled with lovely golden stars." To the experienced gardener, however, they are a signal that he has a battle on his hands.

It is the first rule of lawn care to keep the grass well mowed so that the weeds do not get a chance to grow.

Sure enough. The first time over with the lawnmower, the dandelion blossoms go flying with the grass clippings. Next day, however, there is a new crop. This time, the long flexible stems nestle the blossoms snugly down among the grass blades where the lawnmower cannot touch them. If the mower is set close enough to cut them off, the lawn itself will be shaved down to nothing.

It is not safe to leave them, for in another day or two they begin to reveal their true character. The pretty blossoms have disappeared, and standing tall in their place is a somber, bristling mass of new subversive troublemakers. Now they are clearly within reach of the lawnmower, but cutting them will do no good, for the very act of mowing will only scatter them to the breeze to initiate new invasions.

Wherever the plant is allowed to grow unchecked, it slowly pushes the grass aside and eventually kills it, until the territory is completely taken over.

You cannot hold dandelions back by picking the blossoms as fast as they appear, for as long as the plant itself is untouched it has an endless supply of new buds waiting to spring into bloom. Starting at the blossom, you have to trace the fragile stem back to the main plant, then, after cutting the deep underground connections, you must pull the entire organism out of the soil.

The only defense against an invasion of dandelions is both to fertilize the lawn so that the grass will grow vigorously, and to dig up each new plant as soon as possible after it appears. Digging dandelions becomes very tiresome, it is true, but if we are to have a lawn at all we cannot afford to stop as long as the weed continues to grow in our neighbors' yards.

Ronald Reagan Blasts Hollywood Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on several occasions I have read with admiration patriotic statements by Ronald Reagan, the well-known actor who is president of the Screen Actors Guild.

His comments at the 24th annual Supermarket Institute in Chicago were the subject of an excellent editorial which appeared in a recent edition of the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader.

I believe Mr. Reagan should be commended for his obvious awareness of the menace of international communism and I am pleased to see his statements receive the plaudits of New Hampshire's only statewide newspaper. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Ronald Reagan Blasts Hollywood Reds" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RONALD REAGAN BLASTS HOLLYWOOD REDS

Actor Ronald Reagan, president of the Screen Actors Guild, is one of the most feared men in Hollywood by the Communists. As one of those who helped break the hold the Communists had on the motion picture industry, Reagan is well qualified to speak on the subject.

And his recent comments at the 24th annual Supermarket Institute in Chicago are anything but reassuring

The Screen Actors Guild president said the Communists are "crawling out of the rocks" in Hollywood, aided by those he described as "well-meaning but misguided people willing to give them a hand."

The Communist Party, Reagan pointed out, "has ordered once again" a massive infiltration of the motion picture and television industries and is even now attempting to consolidate the motion picture industry trade unions "under the umbrella" of Harry Bridges' Maritime Union.

The picture is far from encouraging. The Hollywood Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences has long since lifted its rule barring awards of Oscars to Communists and fifth amendment pleaders. Hollywood personalities who were identified as members of the Communist Party or who refused to answer when asked about their ties with the party have now moved into positions of prominence.

The press as a whole has remained silent or given tacit approval to the influx of leftists. Time magazine, to cite but one example, in hailing a new movie produced in Europe by Jules Dassin, said that Dassin "was blacklisted in Hollywood after a witness told a congressional investigating committee that he was a Communist." Actually, Dassin was listed as a Communist who had tried to stop production of a movie because it opposed the Communist Party line. His role was exposed by James McGuiness, a supervisor at Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer. Time magazine could have informed its readers of this fact—but it chose not to. We could cite many similar examples.

It is small wonder that the late Ward Bond, president of the Motion Picture Alliance for the Preservation of American Ideals, commented: "We've lost the fight."

It is small wonder that Ronald Reagan feels compelled to speak out forcefully to warn the American people of this dangerous development in Hollywood.

What Did We Do Right?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article of Sylvia Porter which appeared in the Washington Star of May 24, 1961. Miss Porter's comments strike me as being sensible and thought provoking.

The article follows:

WHAT DID WE DO RIGHT?

(By Sylvia Porter)

Before the 1960–61 recession is forgotten. let's ask ourselves one vital question: What did we do right to make it mild and short?

The most important thing that we, as consumers, did was to spend steadily throughout the downturn, and the reason for this is that incomes held up remarkably well. At the bottom of the recession last March, personal incomes were at a rate of $409.6 billion against $397 billion at the peak of the previous upturn a year ago March. In the face of a major drop in factory payrolls, wages and salaries actually rose because higher payrolls in the service industries and in Government more than offset the decreases. Federal payments in the form of jobless insurance and social security benefits rose billions during the recession—putting immediate spending money in the hands of the least fortunate.

INCOMES HELD UP

What we did right, then, was to maintain personal incomes so that we could maintain buying and thereby assure that the downturn would be mild and short. Our great built-in stabilizers worked wonders, and millions continued to get pay raises. A lesson this offers is that we should use this time of upturn to overhaul and update the jobless insurance system and other stabilizers so they'll be even better anti-recession weapons next time they're needed.

The most important thing the Federal Reserve System did was to start pumping credit into the banking system the instant it recognized the economy was weakening. By taking the brake off financing of projects which make jobs and paychecks, the Federal Reserve cushioned the downturn and laid the basis for the current expansion. Tight money contributed to the 1960–61 recession; easy money contributed to its end.

What the Federal Reserve System did right, therefore, was to act quickly and aggressively at the first hint of trouble. A lesson this presents to the Federal Reserve is that it should use these months of upturn to perfect its money market techniques to improve its function of cheapening credit at the start of the next downturn.

The most important thing businessmen did was maintain and increase their spending on research, for this is the spending which will create our future booms. Outside of this, their actions don't deserve many orchids. They slashed their inventories in 1960, thereby magnifying the downturn. They reduced their spending on new plants, putting some drag on the economy. Their pricing policies weren't much help.

SPENDING SPEEDED UP

What businessmen did wrong is more intriguing than what they did right. A lesson here is that businessmen can and must develop ways of controlling their operations so that accumulation of inventories doesn't exaggerate upturns and cutting of inventories doesn't exaggerate downturns.

The most important thing the Federal Government did was to increase spending. A speedup of spending on defense and highways began last spring—long before the Eisenhower administration officially admitted anything was wrong. Big sums have been poured out in new emergency jobless benefits, accelerated tax refunds, GI insurance dividend payments.

What the Federal Government did right was to erase the budget surplus which was depressing our economy and to channel new spending where it counted. The lessons here are that we can develop far more effective budget and tax policies so that changes in the budget and taxes can automatically start offsetting downturns in their infancy.

We did plenty of things right in this recession, which is why it ended in March-April and was so moderate. From the lessons of this recession we can learn how to do more things right and better to modify the next retreat.

Mayor Tom Establishes Notable Service Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, Mayor Tom Miller of Austin, Tex., has just completed an outstanding record of service to the people of the city of Austin as their mayor.

As pointed out in an editorial of the Austin American, Austin, Tex., May 18, 1961, Mayor Tom Miller has served 28 years as mayor of the city of Austin. It was my privilege to serve as a member of the city council of this city from May 1946 to May 1948, during the time Mr. Miller was mayor. Over the years I have had an opportunity to be associated with him in working for the welfare of the city of Austin and knowing him as a close personal friend. All of us who are citizens of Austin owe a great debt of gratitude to Mayor Tom Miller and to his family for the great personal sacrifices he has made to make Austin a great city. Whenever I think of devoted and unselfish men I think of Tom Miller.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial to which I refer is as follows:

[From the Austin American, May 18, 1961]

MAYOR TOM ESTABLISHES NOTABLE SERVICE RECORD

When Austin City Council members were sworn in, former Mayor Tom Miller rounded out a record of public service which, in length had few rivals and in devotion dedication no comparable record within our knowledge.

He entered on his duties as a member of the Austin City Council in 1933, when the depression was at its worth, and so his services spanned a full 28 years. In all of his numerous terms on the council, he was chosen by his colleagues to serve as mayor,

and his personality came to be identified in a unique way with city government in Austin.

During the long span, he voluntairly retired from the council, and Mayors Taylor Glass, Billy Drake and C. A. McAden came on to serve. Then Miller returned to the council and again to the mayor's office, serving until he voluntarily left the council this year due to ill health.

Appropriately his colleagues and the new members of the city council bestowed upon Miller the title of mayor emeritus, thus at the same time honoring his service and associating him in a continuing way with the government of the city to which he is so devoted.

State and National recognition have been his. He served as finance director for Texas of the national Democratic Party several times. He served, during part of the 6-year interruption of his duties as mayor, as a member of the board of Texas Southern University.

His service as Austin mayor has been synonymous with good municipal government. The pride he has always felt in his city and its government can equally well extend in lasting pride of his contribution to the city's progress, to its reputation of fine government.

"Mayor Tom is an institution in Austin which will not be dimmed by the retirement of a devoted public servant from the office in which he so represented and embodied the spirit of Austin.

Major LaPierre Cited by the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a recent article from the Leominster, Mass., Daily Enterprise, entitled "Major LaPierre Cited by Army."

Major LaPierre is the son of former Mayor and Mrs. Mathias P. LaPierre of Leominster. Major LaPierre to whom the article refers has rendered outstanding service to the Army and richly deserves to be honored for meritorious achievement.

Major LaPierre's citation is, of course, a great mark of honor and distinction and his fine service is in line with the traditional spirit of dedication that animates his family.

His father, Hon. Mathias P. LaPierre, former mayor of Leominster, and his brother Councilor Raymond LaPierre, are distinguished and highly respected political and civic leaders.

Major LaPierre's career in the Army has been marked by numerous commendations and steady advancement. His ability, zeal, patriotism and high measure of efficiency and superb leadership have brought him repeated recognition by the Army.

Over a period of time, I have watched this young man, by virtue of great ability, devotion to duty and sheer determination forge his way ahead in the Army, and I am very proud indeed of his splendid accomplishments and sterling contributions to the national defense.

On this occasion, I take genuine pleasure in congratulating Major LaPierre and his family upon the exceptional honors that have come to him, and wish for them continued success and happiness in the time to come. The Army may well be proud of such an outstanding officer. As the Congressman from his District and as his dear friend, I am very proud of his distinguished record.

The article follows:

OFFICER TRANSFERRED—MAJOR LAPIERRE CITED BY ARMY

Maj. Paul M. LaPierre, son of former mayor and Mrs. Mathias LaPierre, 213 Mechanic Street, has been awarded the first oak leaf cluster to the Army Commendation Medal for meritorious achievement as a U.S. Army company commander and battalion staff officer.

A native of Leominster and graduate of Leominster High School, Major LaPierre was cited for his service with the headquarters unit of the Army Transportation Training Command at Fort Eustis, Va.

He has been transfererd to California and will assume his duties in that State soon.

The citation reads: "Maj. Paul M. LaPierre, Transportation Corps, U.S. Army. Major LaPierre distinguished himself by meritorious achievement as company commander and battalian staff officer during the period September 1, 1959, to April 13, 1961.

"As a company commander, he was responsible for his company attaining superior ratings from the commanding general.

"As a battalion staff officer, he made a significant and lasting contribution to development of the combat support capability of the U.S. Army Transportation Corps.

"These meritorious achievements reflect great credit upon himself and the military service."

Major LaPierre was the recipient of a letter of appreciation from Lt. Col. A. J. Silvestri, commanding officer of the 159th Transportation Battalion at Fort Eustis.

The letter: "On the occasion of your departure from the 'Red Patch' Battalion, it would be redundant for me to repeat the highly laudatory praise which I have written to you and which I have indorsed to you from higher headquarters during the 8 months you have served under my command. I do want you to know, however, that I am aware of no other single instance wherein any officer has been commended so frequently during such a comparatively brief period of time while assigned to CONUS garrison duty.

"Small wonder that your outstanding performance of duty with the battalion has been appropriately recognized by the award to you of the Oak Leaf Cluster to the Army Commendation Medal. But your recent promotion to the grade of major ahead of so many of your contemporaries is ample proof that the high calibre of your duty performance with the battalion has been a continuation of many years of dedicated and outstanding service to the Army.

"I am sure that the future holds interesting and challenging tasks in store for you. Possessed, as you are, of total dedication to the military service, I am confident that you will meet these challenges boldly, imaginatively, aggressively and with consequent benefit to the Army which you serve.

"Speaking for all members of the battalion, our pride in seeing you move on to greater things is mixed with regret that you must leave us. Wherever you go, whatever you do, we trust that you will frequently remember 'Red Patch' with the same degree of fondness with which 'Red Patch' will always remember you."

Major LaPierre in 1958 received three citations for the performance of his duties as transport coordinator at the second International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy. The conference was held at Geneva, Switzerland.

In 1960 Major La Pierre gained high commendation from the commanding officer of the Transportation Battalion at Fort Eustis. He was cited for developing techniques to guide Army landing craft and amphibious vehicles from ships at sea to shore under total blackout conditions by use of infra-red equipment. As project officer for the undertaking, Major LaPierre procured the necessary equipment, developed techniques for its employment and trained personnel in its proper use.

The Administration Cannot Clear Itself of Complicity in Ransom Deal With Castro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, it is a tragic fact that at this time of crisis when the need is paramount for a clear-cut foreign policy the President seems to be doing his best to cause confusion in the minds of the people. We are told on one hand the Government cannot be a part of any deal with Castro to bring about the release of the 1,200 prisoners he is offering for ransom. In the same statement the President admits setting up the volunteer committee to solicit contributions, the President urges the people to contribute, makes an arbitrary ruling that such contributions will be tax exempt and clears the volunteer committee of any violation of the Logan Act.

We dare not afford the luxury of playing games while the Communists continue to spring carefully laid traps which further reduce our prestige before the world and pose new dangers to this hemisphere. A clear-cut statement from the President is needed. A strict adherence to laws already on the books is a must. A strong declaration of policy is imperative, warning Castro, and all other Communist stooges that we cannot be coerced, we cannot be humiliated, we will not barter human lives, the liberty of individuals, or the freedom of mankind.

In order to make the record complete I am including, as a part of my remarks, a news story in which the President gives his position, followed by an editorial pointing out the inconsistencies of his statements. I agree wholeheartedly with the thoughts expressed in the editorial.

KENNEDY ASKS GIFTS TO BAIL OUT CAPTIVES
(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, May 24.—President Kennedy today announced his personal backing of a tractors for freedom committee which is seeking to ransom 1,200 captured Cuban invaders.

Ignoring cries on Capitol Hill that Cuban Premier Fidel Castro's offer to free the

prisoners in exchange for 500 tractors is blackmail, the President called upon all Americans to contribute to a $15 million fund to buy the tractors.

Mr. Kennedy responded to a telegram to the White House from Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, Republican, of Indiana, asking if the tractor committee headed by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Walter Reuther, and Dr. Milton Eisenhower, carried official Government approval.

RULES LAW NOT APPLICABLE

The President's answer was that the U.S. Government could not be a party to such negotiations but would not interfere with the efforts of private citizens to help prevent suffering in other lands through voluntary contributions.

The Logan Act, which forbids private citizens from dealing with foreign governments in any matter in dispute with the United States, was not applicable to this case, the President said.

He also endorsed the granting of tax exemption to contributions and export licenses for shipment of the tractors. Then he concluded:

CANCEL QUIZ OF RUSK

"If they [the Cuban prisoners] were our brothers in a totalitarian prison, every American would want to help. I happen to feel deeply that all who fight for freedom—particularly in our hemisphere—are our brothers."

The statement had the immediate effect of canceling plans for questioning of Secretary of State Dean Rusk about the committee's program. The Senate foreign relations committee had announced Rusk would be called.

It did not quiet critics such as CAPEHART, Senators FRANK J. LAUSCHE, Democrat of Ohio; BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican of Arizona; THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat of Connecticut; JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Republican of Delaware, and others. They continued to term the "ransom" plan a surrender to Castro, establishing a precedent which would plague the United States in future relations with dictators, small or great.

PROPOSED DEAL TO TRIO

In his statement, the President said that he had been concerned that "a single representative group of citizens" should handle the fund raising movement and that he was grateful to Mrs. Roosevelt, widow of President Franklin D. Roosevelt; Reuther, AFL-CIO leader; and Dr. Eisenhower, president of Johns Hopkins University and brother of former President Eisenhower.

Andrew Hatcher, assistant White House press secretary, revealed additional details. Mr. Kennedy had phoned Mrs. Roosevelt first, then Reuther, and finally Eisenhower, and asked them to lead the movement. Hatcher said also he expected that Mr. Kennedy would make a personal contribution to the fund.

"GREAT AMERICAN TRADITION"

Voluntary contributions by private citizens in humanitarian efforts are in the great American tradition, the President asserted, continuing:

"Neither law nor equity calls upon us to impose obstacles in their path as they seek to save those who fought to restore freedom in our hemisphere.

"I am advised that the Logan Act is not involved, inasmuch as it covers only negotiations in relation to any disputes or controversies within the United States or to defeat the measures of the United States; that tax exemption is granted as a matter of course to any 'charitable' organization engaged in rehabilitation and assistance to needy refugees; and that export licenses are routinely granted for humanitarian reasons to ship farm produce and medicines to Cuba and would be granted for shipment of agricultural implements.

"OK'S INTERNATIONAL BLACKMAIL

"While this Government is thus putting forward neither obstacles nor assistance to this wholly private effort, I hope that all citizens will contribute what they can."

Senator WILLIAMS said he could not understand the President's contention that contributions to the fund would be tax exempt.

"I don't see how, under the law as it is written, that tractors for Castro can be classified as a religious, charitable, or educational effort," he commented. "Mr. Kennedy has indorsed international blackmail and thrown a cloak of respectability around it."

"By paying Castro's price for a thousand good men," DODD told the Senate, "we only give him the means to strengthen his enslavement of 6 million others. If we start to pay tribute now for Communist hostages, where will it stop?

"This calls for drafting a new Logan Act, equal to the task of controlling the activities of a rash of self-appointed emissaries without portfolio."

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune]
1847]

THE GREEN LIGHT

President Kennedy issued a statement yesterday denying that his administration had any official connection with the fund-raising campaign to pay off Fidel Castro in tractors for release of 1,200 prisoners captured in the abortive Kennedy invasion of Cuba.

All he had done was to get Mrs. Roosevelt, Walter Reuther, and Milton Eisenhower to coordinate the campaign; to assure them that subscriptions would be tax deductible as charitable contributions, and to grant them immunity from prosecution under the Logan Act, which forbids private citizens to negotiate with foreign governments. Mr. Kennedy contended that the act did not apply, although it covers negotiations in "disputes or controversies with the United States, or to defeat the measures of the United States."

This is to say that the United States has no dispute or controversy with Castro's Communist Cuba and that none of its measures or policies are affected in dealing with Castro. The logic of the President's contention is less than crystalline, for it would argue that although Kennedy mounted the Cuban rebel invasion, he had no dispute or controversy with Castro, and that the invasion was not a "measure" taken by his administration, with the implication, from Kennedy's subsequent dark threat that the story in Cuba was not ended, that continuing measures of the same sort would follow it.

Having thus got himself on both sides of the same fence, Mr. Kennedy was not confounded by the fact that a Government embargo forbids exports of tractors, among other things, to Cuba without provision of special licenses. He said that export licenses are "routinely" granted for "humanitarian reasons," so that he put himself in the position of violating the embargo decreed by the Government for which he speaks.

Mr. Kennedy was moved to make his statement because muttering had broken out in Congress that the administration was trying to hide behind the skirts of the Roosevelt committee in order to avoid open humiliation. Senator DODD said that private persons were being permitted to conduct international policy by proxy. Senator MORSE said that if the committee had administration clearance, that amounted to open admission "that this committee is acting as an agency of the State Department."

Mr. Kennedy, while rejecting the interpretation, admits the fact. The private committee, by seeking a meeting with Castro to define terms and conditions, affirms the same fact, for Mr. Kennedy acknowledges that he prevailed upon the members to form an organization and is grateful for their leadership.

Castro's response to the plea that he receive the committee was that he would not deal with Reuther, perhaps on the theory that the boss of the United Auto Workers, from long habit around the bargaining table, would automatically start demanding fringe benefits. Milton Eisenhower was not even deemed worth notice by the dictator, but Mrs. Roosevelt would definitely do.

Thus Castro achieves two ends. He levels his sights on the greatest bleeding heart on the team, and at the same time compels the widow of a President of the United States to walk under the Communist yoke in Havana—a symbolic triumph of the first order.

All this would pass for pure comedy if it were not for the signal disgrace that a great nation must humble itself by paying a ransom to a tinhorn dictator as the price of its miserable failure to unseat him, and that it must, in the process, shield itself with petticoats. If this does not occasion a blush on Mr. Kennedy's downy cheek, nothing can. Perhaps he had better let Mrs. R. escort him to the Vienna summit with Khrushchev, for that is likely to prove unpleasant work, too.

Memorial to Franklin D. Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, a municipality in New Jersey is planning a unique tribute to Franklin D. Roosevelt. Roosevelt, a community in Monmouth County, has had its present name since the death of President Roosevelt in 1945. The change in name was meant to be a symbol of affection and respect for a President who originated policies that made the early growth of that town possible.

Now as the Roosevelt Town Council prepares for the town's 25th anniversary, the citizens and municipal officials are joining together to build a memorial, a small amphitheater where residents of Roosevelt may remember the great American who served his Nation so well.

The memorial will remind other citizens about New Deal achievements in other communities throughout the Nation. It will have an importance beyond the boundaries of the town of Roosevelt; it will become one more shrine where all Americans can express their gratitude to a great man.

Mr. President, an editorial in the Elizabeth (N.J.) Journal of May 22, tells the story of this memorial and the plans now under way in Roosevelt. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL

Roosevelt, a community of 200 homes in Monmouth County, has plans for a memorial to the New Deal President to whom it owes much.

The town itself is a living reminder of the hectic days of the 1930's. It was created on the central Jersey flatlands as a depression project for unemployed garment trade workers.

President Roosevelt's New Deal cooperated in the venture, one of the social experiments that characterized its attempts to bolster a nation's flagging spirt. The concrete block homes were built around a garment factory in which the residents were employed.

At the death of the President in 1945, the town immediately renamed itself in his honor. From the social experiment which fostered it, the town of Roosevelt has developed into a model American community. Its residents are a diversified group; the garment factory is only one of the town's industries.

The residents have not forgotten their debt to President Roosevelt, however. The memorial they hope to raise is part of the town's 25th anniversary celebration. The proposed small amphitheater around a bronze likeness of the Roosevelt head will be the first monument of its kind in the Nation.

The project is entirely local, from the sculptor to the contractor who will pour concrete for the amphitheater steps. Town council has provided a generous sum and citizens have added more.

Contributions from outside the community are being solicited to close the gap between its contribution and the total cost of the project. For New Jersey residents who remember the dark days of the depression, participation in the project would be an expression of gratitude to the man who gave them leadership.

West Virginia's Industrial Complex Strengthened by Establishment of New Technical Service Laboratory at Martinsburg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, at a time when West Virginia has been the object of much consideration as an economically depressed area, I would call attention to one of the more hopeful aspects of the picture.

This morning I was to have delivered an address at the dedication of the recently completed technical service laboratory of the Standard Lime & Cement Co. at Martinsburg, W. Va. The one-quarter-million dollar laboratory, one of the finest in the industry, is the culmination of a $10 million 5-year expansion and modernization program of Standard which was inaugurated by the American-Marietta Co. after it acquired control of Standard Lime & Cement at Martinsburg.

Though Senate business has prevented my attendance at the official ceremonies of this event, I would make note of the fact that the American-Marietta investment program in Standard Lime & Cement Co. has made this old and established Martinsburg firm one of the most modern and strongly competitive producers in the industry. It has more than doubled its original capacity of 1,700,000 barrels annually, and in its new 450-foot rotary kilns it has constructed the largest moving machinery in any industry.

As a West Virginian, I express my appreciation for this acknowledgement of faith in the people and the economic potential of our State. American-Marietta, which now has operations in five West Virginia cities, is but one of many companies which will bring to our State a revitalized and diversified economy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks which I prepared for delivery at the dedication ceremonies this morning be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mayor Golliday, President Rumford, distinguished guests, and ladies and gentlemen, this is an auspicious moment in the economic and industrial life of Martinsburg and West Virginia. The unveiling of the dedication plaque is the culmination of 5 years of investment and an extensive modernization and expansion program in the facilities of the Standard Lime & Cement Co.

I am privileged to share your pride, not only in the complete and modern facilities of the technical service laboratory, but also in the impressive array of production equipment that Standard has brought to this area.

The American-Marietta Co., which was joined by Standard Lime & Cement in 1954, has fulfilled its pledge to supply the necessary capital to modernize and to make this established firm thoroughly competitive in the cement industry. And in so doing, it has also registered its faith in the people of this section and in the future economic and industrial development of our State. By more than doubling the original capacity of 1,700,000 barrels annually, not only has this old and reliable firm been revitalized, but it has been placed in a stronger position to supply an even larger portion of West Virginia's needs in the future.

The technical service laboratory—one of the finest and most modern in the industry—will also serve to strengthen the competitive position of Standard's other operations in West Virginia—not only in Martinsburg, but in Millville, Clarksburg, New Martinsville, and Parkersburg as well. Thus, the importance of these facilities extends well beyond this community, and beyond the 600 families supported by, and the more than $3 million contributed in payroll by Standard's operations in West Virginia.

It is important also in offering another sign of the vigor and dynamism of American enterprise. And for those of us—and there are many—who have worked to attract new capital to West Virginia, it is a vindication of our faith in the industrial potential of our State. The initiative and leadership exhibited by the management and personnel of Standard and American-Marietta are the sort that once served to place West Virginia in the vanguard of the fuels and minerals industries. I have no doubt that the same kind of leadership will bring our State to the fore once again in the future with a more diversified and firmly grounded economy.

It is worth noting, in this respect, that no matter how dynamic and forward looking our leadership at the national level, no program of national goals will be achieved if these aims are not embraced and carried forth by the actions of individual men and women at the community and local level. One of the main sources of strength of the American system of enterprise is that it offers the flexibility and freedom for such initiative to operate.

In the present instance it has served to prevent the occurrence of a serious economic void in the Martinsburg community, and it has helped to bring an established Martinsburg firm near the end of its eighth decade with renewed strength and industrial vigor.

We have good reason, therefore, to be delighted by the considerable investment in modernizing Standard's facilities here in order to provide it with a healthy and promising future—for itself, for the industry it serves and, most important, for the community of which it is such an important part. And it is my further hope that this may be seen as part of a trend of other industries to expand their facilities in the greater exploration and utilization of the rich natural resources of West Virginia.

It is almost axiomatic these days to think of our industrial development in relation to the unremitting contest between international communism and a democratic way of life. I believe we will all agree that our Nation is more secure every time a basic industry invests in new, modern plants and equipment. For, although "hot spots" will continue to flare up in the cold war, the fundamental and underlying struggle with the Soviet Union will probably remain largely political, ideological, and economic.

If this be so, a central factor in our eventual success in the conflict will be our capacity to maintain the industrial and economic development necessary to supply the increasing needs of our own people and also help bring the emergent nations into freedom and independence.

Though it is only one cement plant of the 170 in the United States, the Standard plant in Martinsburg has its part, and an important one, to contribute in this great power struggle.

It is gratifying to know, therefore, as Standard ends its eighth decade in Martinsburg, that, as a new and youthful member of the American-Marietta family of industries, it is assured more years of prosperous and productive life. This is our wish—and with it go our congratulations.

Knowledge of World Labor Policies Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the labor movement—in the United States and elsewhere in the non-Communist world—is becoming an increasingly strong voice in international affairs.

Among workers around the globe, there is a common bond. Because of this mutual cause, free trade unions have a great opportunity to promote the concepts of free collective bargaining, of freedom itself, of the democratic principles of government, and of combatting efforts of the Communists to make inroads through trade unionism. By experience, we have learned that labor is one of the major targets of Red propaganda and infiltration.

Recently, the Green Bay Press Gazette published an informative article entitled "Knowledge of World Labor Policies Needed," written by John Herling.

The article reflects constructively upon the opportunities and challenges inherent in a strong, free trade union

movement, as well as upon the possible opportunity for labor to serve the cause of freedom in the conflict against communism. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KNOWLEDGE OF WORLD LABOR POLICIES NEEDED—FOREIGN TRADE UNIONS STUMBLING BLOCK FOR COMMUNISTS, SPECIAL AID BELIVES

(By John Herling)

WASHINGTON.—This is a report on the importance of labor organizations in evaluating what is going on in Africa and Asia, and in other American Republics.

Failure on our part to assess the role and function of the labor organizations in these areas will more than any single factor undermine our relations with their people, and their leadership.

How important labor has become as a political, social and psychological influence in the nations of the world has been stressed again and again since World War II. But it has not become an essential part of our national purpose and program. When Vice President Nixon returned from his disastrous trip to Latin America in 1959, some of the bitter wisdom he brought back with him had to do with the indispensable nature of labor groups in the relentless war for the minds and hearts of people. But the repetition of this noble phrase deteriorates into a vapid generality and then into a cliche. Action is what counts.

PROMPT MOVES URGED

In this area, President Kennedy must move promptly with precise understanding. No administration in our time can so readily command the insights and dedication of people concerned with this field. In various agencies of the Government—State, Labor, International Cooperation Administration and the United States Information Agency—specialists and generalists in this area are at work.

But urgency still has not shaped policy. That's what bothers George Weaver, the special assistant to the Labor Secretary and prospective Assistant Secretary of Labor in charge of the Bureau of International Labor Affairs.

His analysis of the world situation therefore compels attention:

"The growth of the Labor Department's responsibilities in the field of international labor reflects the worldwide rise of the labor movement. This is especially so with regard to the newly emerging nations of Africa, Asia, and Latin America," Weaver says. "These unions, although in many cases small in membership, wield a strong influence in the social and political affairs of their nations. Many of their leaders are also active in government and politics."

Kenya's Tom Mboya, for example, is not only general secretary of the Kenya Federation of Labor, but also a member of his country's legislative council and a leader in its struggle for independence. John Tettegah doubles as secretary-treasurer of the Ghana Trade Union Congress and as a member of the Central Committee of Ghana's ruling party. In Bolivia, Juan Lechin Oquendo is the executive secretary of the nationwide Central Trade Union Organization, head of the Federation of Mine Workers, a senator, and the leader of the government's opposition.

"Another measure of the strength of these unions is their close relationship with the political parties in power," Weaver says. "Tunisian President Bourguiba's Nee-Destour Party owes much for its power to the support of organized labor. President Lopes Mateos of Mexico is a former minister of labor and counts on the labor movement to provide the basis for his popular support. Guinea's Sekou Toure launched his drive to the presidency as a labor leader. In country after country, throughout much of the free world, labor speaks with the dominant political voice.

REDS FACE DIFFICULTY

"The Communists have been quick to recognize the strategic importance of these unions as a means of spreading their Marxist and Leninist doctrines. For the most part, however, their efforts to exploit it have been unsuccessful.

The trade unions have been their principal stumbling block. The vast majority of the labor leaders, rising from the impoverished masses of the newly awakening areas of the world, are true nationalists, as much opposed to Communist encroachments as to the colonialism they are struggling so hard to shake off.

"But to deny that the Communists have made headway in these areas would be a serious self-delusion," Weaver warns. "They are making large-scale efforts to win over the most promising young men within the union ranks. Each year large numbers of young African, Asian, and Latin American labor leaders are invited to Moscow for intensive indoctrination courses. Present-day leaders from these areas are given little attention. The Communist investment is long-range, and the Communists are willing to wait a few years for the returns to come in.

"The free international labor movement, then, confronts a challenge that we cannot afford to ignore. The challenge demands two basic courses of action:

"First, we must continue to aline ourselves with the legitimate striving of the newly developing nations for freedom and economic improvement;

"Second, we must parry the Communist threat by demonstrating with our words and actions that freedom and democracy promise a better future, especially here in the United States."

Such a wide-ranging course requires a program of vast dimension. On this the Kennedy administration—with all governmental and private resources—must go to work without delay.

A Tribute to Harris J. Booras

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, for many years the late Harris Booras, of Belmont, in the Fifth District of Massachusetts, which I represent, was a good friend. With his recent death, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts lost a devoted servant, the American-Greek community a stuanch and active member, and his host of friends, a warm and loyal companion. It is with pride that I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial tribute to Harris Booras:

A TRIBUTE TO HARRIS J. BOORAS

In the Pass of Thermopylae is situated a monument erected in commemoration of the heroic stand of Leonidas and his 300 men, a reminder of the "Glory that is Greece." One of the great projects inspired by the genius, acumen and forward thinking of Harris J. Booras of Boston, Mass.

Booras' outstanding leadership qualities were early recognized by Ahepa's Boston chapter, and through the years, every one of the organization's great, major projects bore Booras' stamp of inception or endorsement.

It can be said without fear of contradiction that no one did so much for Hellenes in America and Hellas as did Harris J. Booras in so short a lifetime. Booras acted big, talked big projects, and produced big accomplishments. When the history of our people is compiled, Booras will be found as one of the prime cultural movers of sentiments for ancient and modern Hellas, the progress of Americans of that decent.

More than 100,000 visitors annually travel to Thermopylae and marvel at Booras' significant mark of Hellenism's glory, via modern roads built to that site by the American Government, by Booras' suggestion.

Booras was part and parcel of the Statute of American Phil-Hellenes at Tripolis Square, Arcadia; the American Foundation for Greece; Justice for Greece Committee; the Ahepa Hospital in Greece. They were inspired and projected through Booras.

It is not believed that America has a substitute who can readily take Harris J. Booras' place as proponent of every great imaginative project for the benefit of Hellas' glory.

The distinguished, lovable, likeable, imaginative and dynamic Bostonian will be sorely missed, not only by his family but by all of Ahepa and Hellenism in America. He was a giant in thought and actions.

I had the privilege of traveling to Greece during 1957 with Harris. To this day I remember the esteem, affection and regard in which he was held.

I mourn his passing. Harris J. Booras was as American as Boston, as Greek as the Foustanella and Tsarouchia he so proudly wore as Commander of the famed Ahepa Boston Patrol of almost 30 years ago.

NICHOLAS D. MOUSMOULES.

The New York-Montreal Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter from William Lathrop Rich, chairman of the Committee for the New York-Montreal Seaway. Since the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway, a great deal of the port business has been diverted from the port of New York and the port of Boston and sent to the Midwest through the St. Lawrence Seaway. The eastern seaboard is seriously interested in the New York-Montreal Seaway so as to provide increased business for the ports along the seaways and also for an alternate route in the event of war.

The New York-Montreal Seaway is practical and requires the joint cooperation between Canada and the United States. For a long time studies have been made with regard to the feasibility of this seaway, and it is time that we have affirmative action to bring to reality a dream that is practical and will bring benefit not only to the eastern coast but also to the United States. The letter from Mr. Rich follows:

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The Committee for the New York-Montreal Seaway, of

which I am chairman, has been advocating just that for the last 5 years because it is essential for the economic expansion of the region along its route and it is the shortest waterway route between New York City and Montreal, Canada.

Six months after my committee had first made the proposal that this route be modernized, its chairman discovered that his committee's recommendations were in accordance with a report, made by the International Joint Commission in 1937, that concluded with the statement that the route, from the St. Lawrence River at Sorel, Province of Quebec up the Richelieu River to Lake Champlain and by way of the Champlain Canal to the Hudson River at Albany, is the most practicable from an engineering standpoint and the last impracticable from an economic point of view. Four other routes have been considered.

No improvements have been made on the Canadian part of this route since 1938 and on the U.S. part since 1918, which would alter its capacity.

Is it not time for something to be done to improve this waterway?

Our Government is spending millions to expand the commercial capacity of the Mississippi and the Missouri Rivers and on January 17, 1960, the then President Eisenhower and Canadian Prime Minister, John G. Diefenbaker, committed the two Governments to spend a total of nearly $3 billion on improving the Columbia River.

Have the waterways in the eastern part of both our countries become "stepchildren," neglected and left to become obsolete?

Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, of Louisiana, stated on February 27, 1959, that "waterways are neglected by the U.S. Government."

The New York State Barge Canal System has become so obsolete that the New York State set up a committee in 1960, Senator Robert C. McEwen, chairman, to dispose of the canal system or turn it over to the Federal Government. The Champlain route is part of that system.

My committee's recommendation that the 1936 report be updated by the International Joint Commission, the U.S. Army Engineers to do the actual resurvey, was endorsed by the State of Vermont, in a joint resolution approved by Gov. J. B. Johnson on February 20, 1957 and again in a joint resolution approved by Gov. Robert T. Stafford on May 6, 1959.

New York State also endorsed our proposal by a concurrent resolution on March 30, 1960, which I had the satisfaction of writing.

On July 3, 1958, the then President Eisenhower, signed a bill authorizing the U.S. Army Engineers to update the 1937 survey.

Before work could begin interest on the part of Canada was required, no committments, just interest. Accordingly, in November 1958 our State Department sent a communication to the Canadian Government, inquiring as to their attitude.

As yet no reply has been received in Washington, D.C., to date.

The United States has done more than its part in furthering this proposed modernization of this waterway.

Why are the Canadians, as Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont, said, "dragging their feet?"

How can any Canadian Government conscientiously hold back the economic growth of any part of Canada and retard its financial enhancement.

This waterway, when modernized, has potential capacities for enormous growth in tonnage of newsprint, grain, ores, and many other commodities. As an example, 1 million tons of newsprint could be shipped yearly, by this shortcut, to the Metropolitan New York area, at a saving, according to Mr. Lawrence Tombs, vice president of Guy Tombs, Ltd., of Montreal, Canada, of from $9 to $10 per ton, or a saving of from $9 million to $10 million in freight charges, alone, to the New York publishers per year. At present only 25,000 tons are shipped over this restricted route yearly.

As for the saving in distance traveled, it will be the difference in mileage between 1,800 and 450 miles or 1,350 miles for one way or 2,700 miles for a round trip. The saving in travel time is secured by the recommended reduction in the number of locks for this route to a maximum of 5 from the present number of 23 but the time of passage will be controlled by the speed of travel of your boat.

One part of this project includes the elimination of an annual loss, due to spring flooding around Lake Champlain, of about $850,000—$600,000 Canadian, $250,000 American. Also the drying-out and return to production of about 45,000 acres of land in Canada alone.

The elimination of flooding will be accomplished by the stabilization of the level of Lake Champlain at 98 feet above sealevel, as recommended by the Canadian engineer in his report to the Canadian Cabinet last December.

If this waterway is constructed with adequate capacity, it will be a shortcut for ocean shipping between New York City and Montreal, Canada, each commercial site along its route, a potential seaport and it will, as a result provide Canadian and American mariners with a large stable inland lake devoid of any current like that of the St. Lawrence River, which they can enjoy.

Keel boats, those with tall Marconi rigs and large motorboats can reach Lake Champlain, Canadian waters such as the Thousand Islands and the Great Lakes, via the Hudson River.

This modern waterway, it is proposed that it be self-liquidating and not built with moneys secured through taxation.

As of this moment, the whole project is being held up because, so far, the Canadian Government has not seen fit to reply to our State Department communication of November 1958 which according to Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont, is that the Canadians "apparently are unwilling to give 'the green light' for a joint study; all that is being asked, is an investigation to determine the feasibility of such a project."

Why does Canada hold back? Is there some political or obscure reason?

It makes one wonder if Ottawa is giving "tit for tat" in this connection? It seems rather silly but I can recall that Ottawa, in utter desperation, had to finally threaten "to go it alone," on building the St. Lawrence Seaway, before Congress acted.

Is it, per chance a political move to hold a "trading point" in a readjustment of the tolls on the St. Lawrence Seaway?

I could suppose other reasons, but it is all too silly when such a project, when advanced, can have such a great beneficial effect on the economic expansion and financial gains of the eastern part of our two countries. Let's start to face economic facts and bring out the causes of the Canadians delay so that they can be eliminated and then let's get the modernization of this waterway "on-the-road" for the joint benefit of both our countries.

What do you Canadians now say, are you ready to "play ball?"

The U.S. Government has more than done its part and because Ottawa has, through many of its officials, intimated that our State Department's communication of November 1958 was negative and really did not indicate that a reply was in order, Washington has dispatched to our Embassy in Ottawa on April 19, 1961, a second letter of inquiry about the Canadian Government's attitude toward this waterway project.

So now that so-called basic cause of delay on the part of Ottawa has been eliminated.

I have felt, since I attended the joint meeting of the chamber of commerce in Montreal, on December 7, 1960, that the Honorable Leon Beicer, Canadian Minister of Transportation, favored an adequate waterway because after the dinner that evening, at which he had disappointed the members present by not announcing that the Canadian Government was accepting their engineers' report on this whole general project and which report recommended a 12-foot waterway, said that he did not favor a 12-foot waterway but did favor a 27-foot one.

Now that we have reached the present status of this project, when will Ottawa advise Washington as to its attitude or willingness to cooperate in this important joint undertaking?

Prime Minister John G. Diefenbaker of Canada please note.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM LATHROP RICH,
Chairman, the Committee for the New York-Montreal Seaway.

Vice President Learns Asians Are Not Sure of Our Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the account of the trip of the Vice President to Asia as told by the U.S. News & World Report shows clearly that the fine statements of our support of freedom, as made by administration spokesmen over the past 5 months, are falling on deaf ears. These people, looking for leadership, are worried by our inaction in backing up our words. It seems to me it is time for the administration to act decisively in the war against Communist aggression. If the United States cannot assume leadership of the free world, we must be prepared for Communist domination of the whole earth.

The account follows:

WHAT ASIA TOLD JOHNSON

(It was an eye-opening experience—Vice President JOHNSON's mission through the Communist-menaced areas of southeast Asia. Mixed in with smiles and warm greetings: a gnawing worry among Asians that, in a showdown, U.S. assurances of support will melt away. This dispatch is by Robert W. Ruth of U.S. News & World Report, who was with JOHNSON.)

After touring non-Communist Asia with LYNDON B. JOHNSON, U.S. Vice President, you come away with this dominant impression: Either the United States takes a firm stand at some point in Asia—and makes it stick—or this whole, vast area will head into communism.

Time is running out and there is questioning of America's strength and of her willingness to stand by smaller nations in trouble the way Soviet Russia stands by the nations on her side.

WILL TO RESIST

In South Vietnam and Thailand—the two most strategically important points in southeast Asia now that Laos is all but gone—JOHNSON found considerable will to resist communism. But he also learned that this will to resist will not last indefinitely.

Much depends, the Vice President was told, on how the United States lives up to its promises—what actions the United States will take when the chips are down.

PLEDGE TO VIETNAM?

South Veitnam sticks out as the area in Asia where the United States either holds firm or moves fast along the path of humiliating retreat from southeast Asia.

Few Americans realize that Vietnam is a place where more people are being killed by Communists than in any other part of Asia.

LYNDON JOHNSON seemed to sense this fact when he said to President Ngo Dinh Diem:

"America means to stand by Vietnam. You ought to be mighty proud of your men because they are fighting with courage and determination. America has that same courage."

Remarked a high U.S. official:

"After what JOHNSON said in Saigon, there is a moral commitment to use American troops if pressure continues to build up."

SAFETY PRECAUTIONS

Signs of Communist pressure are visible just a few miles outside Saigon.

As JOHNSON'S motorcade churned up the dust of a side road, security guards could be seen in the brush on either side, facing away from the road. Vietnamese officials were worried over the possibility that the Viet Cong—the Communist guerrilla fighters—might toss a grenade at the Vice President.

Bamboo thickets lining the road had been thinned out. Such thickets often provide cover for an ambush.

THE "WAR THAT'S COMING"

At a Vietnamese training school for officers and enlisted men JOHNSON saw fighter-bombers drop napalm bombs and other fighter planes strafe a target area.

An American Army colonel said:

"Commies are probably watching us from the fields and are probably not much fooled by this display. This represents my kind of war—the World War II kind of war. But the war that is coming up is not going to be this kind of war. The next 10 months before I go back home are not going to be dull months."

The colonel looked across the brush and added: "Fighting anybody in that stuff is the damnedest task."

HOW REDS OPERATE

The Vice President was told that no more than 6,000 Communists are actively engaged in the fighting now going on. Why is it so hard to cope with such a small number? The explanation, from a young Vietnamese who has fought against the Communist guerrillas:

Take a village not far from the Cambodian border. Cambodia is "neutral." The Communists strike and then take refuge across the border. There are not enough men in the Vietnamese Army to protect every village.

In a typical nighttime raid, 20 guerrillas armed with revolvers, hand grenades, and submachine guns filter into a village by twos and threes. They meet at a prearranged spot then suddenly strike at the home of a village headman, or priest, or schoolteacher.

A grenade is tossed into a house, or the house is sprayed with machinegun bullets. Or the headman may be hauled out of bed and killed on the scene. His family may be murdered, too.

MINES AND AMBUSH

You find many victims of the Communist guerrillas in Saigon hospitals—soldiers, members of the civil guard, private citizens—wounded in attacks within 10 to 100 miles of the capital. One boy had stepped on a land mine just outside Saigon. A girl tells of the ambush of a bus returning to the city from a holiday celebration. Several girls were killed.

WE ARE TOGETHER

The Vice President repeatedly strove to bolster the Vietnamese will to resist Communist attacks. He quoted from President Kennedy's inaugural address: "We shall pay any price, bear any burden * * * to assure survival and success of liberty." At a palace dinner, he told President Diem: "These are dangerous times for you and for us, and we are all in this thing together." President Diem, in a toast to America, made it clear that he accepted the Vice President's words at face value.

ECHOES OF A MOOD

What kind of mood are the Vietnamese people in today? Here are snatches of conversation picked up during the JOHNSON visit:

A Vietnamese trained as a mining engineer in Montana: "Cuba threw a scare into us. Why could not America get rid of Castro? We need more civil liberties here, more press freedom. But land reform has gone well."

An American official: "People here ask, 'Are you going to do the same thing here that you are doing in Laos, the same thing the French did in North Vietnam—pull back?' That is a hard question to answer."

A Vietnamese father: "All I want is for my children to be free. That depends on the Americans."

FILIPINOS: SKEPTICAL

In the Philippines, JOHNSON found a certain amount of skepticism as to how far the United States would go in supporting the anti-Communist countries of Southeast Asia. One Manila newspaper said: "The proof of the pudding is in the eating." That pretty well sums up the mood of the Philippines, a country that has wanted to come to grips with the problem of Communist aggression in Asia.

THAI: SECOND THOUGHTS

In Thailand, once strongly pro-Western, the Vice President found a tendency toward reexamination of the country's position, in fact, toward neutralism.

There was an air of urgency about the means that must be taken to cope with an aggressor just over the horizon. The Thai are not impressed with fine words alone.

More aid in the fields of education, health and industry will help Thailand, JOHNSON was told, but there, more than any place else, the emphasis was on military aid.

NO PLEAS FOR GI'S

This is not to say southeast Asia is clamoring for the dispatch of U.S. troops. Officials traveling with JOHNSON said that the stage has not been reached when the sending of American soldiers to southeast Asia is even being discussed.

Competent observers in this area believe, however, that JOHNSON has made a moral commitment for the United States to back up its words with manpower should another showdown of the magnitude of Laos arise.

Still, one question keeps popping up in discussions of the problem among Asians and Americans who have spent many years in the Orient. It is: When the chips are down, will President Kennedy come through? In short, can the United States be trusted to back its friends?

The persistency of such questions indicates there is doubt in the minds of many about American intentions to go all the way if need be.

One Westerner with long experience in Asia, commenting on the JOHNSON tour and the United States position there, said:

"The United States has the hard choice of either seeing its position in southeast Asia eroded away bit by bit, or fighting what may be a war of attrition with Red China."

America's Democracy—A Defense of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, each year the American Legion Auxiliary in Wisconsin sponsors an Americanism essay contest for grades 7, 8, and 9 in group II and for grades 10, 11, and 12 in group I. The winning essay for group II was written by Susan Morphew, grade 9, Whitewater, Wis.

The thinking evident in Susan's defense of freedom is very mature. Susan urges us to wake up and fight diligently to keep our country free. She urges us to do our best and advises her classmates that they must do their best in school, for some day—and that day may not be too far away—the fate of our country and of the free world will be in their hands.

The essay follows:

AMERICA'S DEMOCRACY—A DEFENSE OF FREEDOM

Will my children grow up to a world of international communism? Will my grandchildren be separated from their parents and sent to military school where they will learn to salute the Russian flag, forget God, and work constantly for the benefit of the government? Will all or some of these dreaded fates befall the world within the next 50 years?

Perhaps you think that these are absurd questions and that the answers are definitely no. You certainly would not be alone in your thoughts. There are many like you, thinking, and even knowing the same thing. After all, we are Americans. Nothing can go wrong for us because we live in the United States and everyone knows that the United States is the number one country in the world. But wait a moment—so was Rome in her day.

To me the above conditions would be the ways of a terrifying life. If these conditions were to come about, the wall of America's defense of freedom would tumble. Maybe you wonder why I say the wall of America's defense of freedom. When I think of this phrase, I picture a wall; a wall of freedom shunning the outside world of communism and protecting the fort of freedom. The United States is standing guard at the entrance in this wall. Outsiders will do anything to make their way in past the guard. But watch them, they are sly. You may not realize they are fighting to enter until they are in.

This being the case, the guards had better wake up and fight diligently to keep their fort safe from the clutches of their enemy. I feel that this is the way the United States should face the Soviets today, as enemies reaching into our fort to gain control.

I think the United States is being far too lenient in her guard. If we want to keep our many freedoms, we must stop being softhearted toward our enemies and face up to facts—"every man (country) for himself". We must really try to do our best in school and in everything we do. For some day, not in the far distant future, the fate of the free world will be in the hands of our generation.

We must have scientists, learned people in foreign language, loyal Christians, and Jews, strong armed forces, and capable people in every profession in America; whether

it be teacher, doctor, shoemaker, or druggist, we must support our country and the whole free world from communism. We cannot do this without the help of every individual American. We need not only professional people, but all those willing to give themselves in any service for the safety and welfare of our country and its people.

We, the youth of this country, have to learn to respect and appreciate our American democracy today. If we do not, the defense of international freedom in the world of tomorrow has no chance of survival.

Congressman Thomas B. Curtis Proposes Action To Meet Unemployment Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, the need to retrain and relocate workers who for various reasons have lost their jobs is a serious problem facing the Nation. One of our colleagues, the able gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], who is the senior House Republican on the Joint Economic Committee and a member of the Ways and Means Committee, has been very active in this field. For many months last year and this year, he has been busy compiling information and interviewing knowledgeable persons in an effort to provide the Congress with constructive suggestions.

Too often, quite, thorough legislative work is seldom given recognition in the hurry-up life we lead. For that reason, I was pleased to read a recent article concerning the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] written by the noted labor editor of the North American Newspaper Alliance, Martin Arundel.

This article appeared on April 27, 1961, in the Louisville (Ky.) Times, the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette and the New Haven (Conn.) Register, and in other papers throughout the country. I also read with special interest an editorial in the Louisville Times, of May 2, 1961, acknowledging that our colleague from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is on the right track, and that his novel approach is worthy of the closest study and consideraiton by the administration and the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the newspaper items to which I have referred should be called to the attention of the Congress and, accordingly, they are set forth below:

[From the New Haven (Conn.) Register, Apr. 28, 1961]

PROPOSAL WOULD AID JOBLESS IN LEARNING MODERN SKILLS

WASHINGTON.—Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS will soon introduce a bill that would tackle hard-core unemployment by encouraging displaced workers to learn new skills.

Right now, the Missouri Republican charged, 44 States in effect penalize jobless workers who want to learn a new trade.

They are deprived of unemployment benefits as soon as they enroll in a vocational or other kind of school, he said in an interview.

"In an area where no jobs are to be had," CURTIS pointed out, "this means that the unemployed are encouraged by the Government to sit back and do nothing in order to collect their weekly checks."

Representative CURTIS said his bill would do three things:

1. Teach new and needed skills to persons who lost their jobs because of technological advances (automation);

2. Allow them to draw jobless benefits for the duration of their retraining;

FUNDS TO RELOCATE

3. Provide funds for them to relocate in areas where their newly acquired skills are in demand.

The legislation also would enlarge and bring up to date vocational and apprenticeship training programs for young men and women. It would stress the technical skills required in the age of automation.

CURTIS said he would propose that the program be financed by Federal funds and that it be run by the States.

"It will probably cost a lot more than the present program, but exactly how much I would not venture to estimate at the present time," CURTIS said. He added, "But in the long run it will be worth any cost, for it will help get rid of the technological unemployment problem and raise the productivity growth of the Nation's economy to the yearly 4 to 5 percent desired increase."

CURTIS said his proposed legislation would be in the form of an amendment to the unemployment compensation section of the Federal Social Security Act. He said he will introduce it as "soon as the technical legislative language is ironed out."

CURTIS, in his sixth term, is the senior Republican member of the House Ways and Means subcommittee which handles unemployment compensation bills, and is the ranking Republican from the House on the Automation Subcommittee of the Joint Senate-House Economic Committee.

DIFFERENT APPROACH

The Missourian said his approach to the hard-core unemployment problem differed from the conventional one this way:

"The conventional approach assumes that large-scale unemployment is almost entirely due to economic downturns and that the idle will return to their jobs as soon as business picks up.

"My thinking based on an abundance of testimony by experts before congressional committees studying the subject, is that heavy unemployment is due more to technological advances in industrial production methods," he said.

"This is particularly true in the age of automation," CURTIS continued. "A worker loses his job in a recession and when the recession ends the work he formerly did is now being done by fewer men operating new and faster machines. That is unemployment brought about by automation."

PREPARE FOR NEW

Under his proposed plan, the unemployed would take courses that would give them the know-how to perform new jobs, often in the same company and sometimes in other industries, Congressman CURTIS said.

CURTIS explained his program would require detailed planning by Federal and State unemployment agencies, in conjunction with industry and unions. His proposal, for instance, would call for the U.S. Department of Labor to overhaul substantially its present system of cataloging the scores of job skills.

"There are many job skills that the Labor Department has no record of, particularly in automated industries," CURTIS pointed out.

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Times of May 2, 1961]

RECOVERY WON'T MEAN JOBS FOR EVERYBODY

Business, so almost everyone is saying, is picking up. What is more, most of the economic experts believe that the upturn is stronger than the ordinary seasonal rise in business activity. They think that the bottom of the recession has been reached and that a recovery is in progress that will carry the economy to new heights. They differ in their estimates of the strength and speed of the upturn, but they are virtually unanimous in their opinion that it is underway.

Unfortunately, they are virtually unanimous about something else. Almost without exception the economic experts and observers fear that even when business has attained new peaks, a very substantial number of Americans will remain unemployed. A New York Times story early in April reported, "Most of the President's economic advisers are convinced that the country will enter 1962 with no significant drop in the present level of 5.5 million jobless workers."

The tragic center of this problem lies in the amount of chronic unemployment, which continues to rise despite an overall trend of prosperity and increased production. According to the National Planning Association, the number of chronically unemployed rose from about half a million in the third quarter of 1953 to nearly 2 million in the first quarter of 1961.

Early in April, the number of persons who had been out of work for 15 weeks or more was nearly 1.9 million. Eight hundred thousand had been out of work for more than 6 months. Perhaps a third of these men and women are in the 45-to-64 age group, and in the context of our times that means they are older workers. Complicating the problem for these people is that in the decade of the sixties, they will be competing for jobs with millions of new workers, the beginning of the generation born since World War II. And the competition will be taking place in an era of economic change: of new technology and automation, of economic advances abroad, of movement of industry to new locations.

The problem is vast and complex and we don't expect anyone to offer quick, complete solutions. But Representative THOMAS CURTIS, a Missouri Republican, is at least taking a crack at it—and on what seem to be sensible lines. He plans to introduce legislation that would encourage the jobless to learn new skills. The legislation itself has not yet been written, but CURTIS says there are three things he wants his bill to do: first, teach new skills to those who lost their jobs because of automation; second, let them draw unemployment pay while learning (he says 44 States deprive workers of unemployment benefits as soon as they enroll in a school); third, provide funds to let the workers relocate in areas where their new skills are needed.

Many workers, it is likely, would be unwilling or unable to learn new trades. Others would be unwilling to move to greener pastures. But others, the more imaginative, the more intelligent, would be helped. We hope Congress gives CURTIS' proposals sympathetic study.

A New Low for Castro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, the peoples of the world have been given a vivid example of the gangster tactics being used by the Communist regime of Castro in Cuba. Castro's offer to trade Cuban prisoners for tractors reveals

once again that we are confronted with a tyrant similar to Hitler and not unlike the notorious gangsters who seek ransom for their hostages. Many citizens already have voiced their abhorrence at dealing with this Communist dictator.

On May 20, 1961, the Emporia, Kans., Gazette, well known to many citizens of our Nation for its editorial excellence, characterized the Cuban dictator most appropriately in an editorial which speaks for itself:

A NEW LOW FOR CASTRO

In the latest episode of Mr. Castro's serialized program designed to make enemies and infuriate people, he has surpassed all previous efforts to gain recognition for himself as one of history's most celebrated paranoiacs.

The bearded Prime Minister, currently suffering from delusions of both persecution and grandeur, has offered to exchange the prisoners captured during the recent abortive invasion of Cuba for 500 bulldozers from the United States.

This, indisputably, is a Castro first. Who else but a sick ham with a dirty beard could offer to exchange human beings for earth-moving machines?

The Castro government has claimed that more than 1,000 invaders were captured during the April 17 fighting, although the actual number probably is less. The fate of these captives, judging from past Castro actions, is no less tenuous than that of former Batista officials after the fall of their government.

Today, the captives are goods to be bartered for machinery. Tomorrow, only Castro knows what indignities await them. Still, in the end—and there will be an end for Castro—these prisoners may have accomplished more as pawns in Castro's confused international politics than they could have as revolutionary soldiers.

For even the most complacent free-world citizens cannot help but be shocked by the callous disregard for the dignity of human life. In its own right, Castro's action is even more repulsive than the mass executions he ordered after assuming power. The fact that he could consider trading human beings for machines is this grotesque.

When the curtain falls on the last act of Castro's drawn-out tragicomedy, this recent action, along with the executions, must stand as evidence that his crimes were as inexcusable as any perpetrated by Hitler's lieutenants or Stalin's stooges.—G. L. DeB.

A Deck Stacked Against Kennedy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, while many of us wait with anxious concern the outcome of the meeting between the President and the Soviet dictator, I recommend careful attention to an analysis of the forthcoming meeting which appeared in the U.S. News & World Report, issue of May 29, 1961:

A DECK STACKED AGAINST KENNEDY?

(The following analysis is by Francis B. Stevens, former Director of the Office of Eastern European Affairs, U.S. State Department, and now on the staff of U.S. News & World Report:)

When President Kennedy meets with Soviet Premier Khrushchev in Europe next month, he will be succumbing to the delusion which has bedazzled all his recent predecessors—that the only way to deal with the Russians is at the top.

And he will be defying the lessons of history, ignoring the insulting treatment given President Eisenhower in Paris just a year ago, and reversing the advice given by the Secretary of State, in a magazine article published before the election.

The President will be facing his formidable adversary in a particularly weak bargaining position. Since his inauguration, U.S. policy has experienced a series of humiliating setbacks—in Cuba, in Laos and in the failure to reach agreement in the Geneva talks on a nuclear-test ban. Even though responsibility for these reversals may lie largely with the previous administration, the Kennedy record is unlikely to impress Khrushchev, to whom only action and results matter.

Moreover, the Soviet position on the eve of a top-level meeting has never been stronger. Khrushchev possesses an absolute nuclear deterrent and massive, well-equipped conventional forces. Gagarin's orbital flight has demonstrated the Soviet lead in space. Laos has fallen into the dictator's lap, and his Cuban puppet has easily repelled a U.S.-supported invasion attempt. Khrushchev and the Soviet press have never sounded more confident.

Official circles in Washington suggest privately that the purpose of the meeting is to permit the President to sound out Khrushchev's intentions and to warn him that U.S. patience is not unlimited. On the first count nothing is apt to be discovered that was not clearly spelled out in the manifesto of the 81 Communist parties which met in Moscow last December: active pursuit of the goal of world domination, avoidance of general war, support of "national liberation movements." It would be unrealistic to expect Khrushchev to tip his hand on tactics or priorities.

As for warnings, Khrushchev might be forgiven if he took them with a grain of salt. He will not have forgotten Kennedy's brave words about Laos. He will have no intention of taking any action which would constitute a pretext for nuclear war. But he will have no intention of failing to exploit any situation which seems to offer a possibility for Communist gains—and the possibilities are many: Vietnam, South Korea, Iran, and the Congo, among others.

A Soviet maneuver at Geneva indicates one line of preparation for the talks with Kennedy. The Soviet delegate threatened that the Soviet Union would resume nuclear testing, alleging that recent French tests in the Sahara were a subterfuge to provide information for Britain and the United States. This is the old Soviet trick of raising the ante before a negotiation in order to prepare for a fallback to an already advanced position. The U.S.S.R. has the basic nuclear weapons and does not have the American passion for refinement; hence it has no need to resume testing. But it will insist on a veto on inspection, hoping to induce the United States to break off the talks and resume testing.

Thus the President would be faced with the unhappy alternatives of continuing the fruitless negotiations with no prospect of agreement in the face of strong internal pressures to terminate them, or of bringing them to an end and being blamed by world opinion for failure to resolve this issue. Collapse of the test-ban talks would make prospects bleak for progress in arms control. Again the United States would be held responsible.

In these circumstances, critics are not wanting in Washington who question the advisability of holding talks at this time. On the demonstrable premise that the only thing Moscow respects is strength, they suggest that the United States should rather be building up its military power and exploring means for exploiting the major crack in the Communist armor—the dissatisfaction and will to freedom of the subject people of the Soviet empire, both in Eastern Europe and in Asia. As East Germany, Poland, and Hungary have already shown, it is here that the most convinced freedom fighters will be found.

The Panama Canal and United States-Panama Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, with the countries of Latin America aflame with discontent and unrest it behooves all of us to learn all we can about the living standards of the people south of us, their cultures and their national aspirations. One of these countries should be of particular concern to every American because of its geographic position at the crossroads of the world, and because of the most peculiar manner in which it is linked to our country.

I refer to the Republic of Panama through whose lands we cut an interoceanic canal almost 50 years ago, joining the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans. This engineering feat had defied man for several centuries and while it has brought great prestige to our country in a political, commercial and military sense, it is an accomplishments that established our relationship more securely with Latin America than we would like to admit.

I have always maintained a close interest in the people and political development of that beautiful little country which I visited officially back in 1947 as chairman of a Special Investigating Committee of Education and Labor. At that time I prepared a detailed study for the Congress regarding the deplorable working conditions of the West Indians and other non-United States citizens on the Canal Zone, and the discriminatory policies which our Government practiced against this large body of nonwhite workers.

As many of my constituents in New York are originally from the Republic of Panama I have watched with unabated interest United States-Panama relations. I am pleased to note that certain fundamental changes have taken place on the Canal Zone in socioeconomic matters; but there are still areas of conflict between Panama and the United States. I do not think that these remaining sore spots could be more objectively treated than in the two speeches of Ambassador George W. Westerman, Panama's U.N. delegate to the United Nations.

Dr. Westerman has not only represented his country at the United Nations in a superior way but he has traveled up and down these United States lecturing before some of our most distinguished forums on United States-

Panama relations. In this respect he has performed a distinctive service in furthering better understanding between his country and ours.

One of the speeches to which I refer was made before the Research Institute of America and the other before the faculty and graduate students of Yale Law School. No information as authentic as the statements made by Dr. Westerman should be treated lightly. He comes from a minority group in Panama and has made a positive mark on international affairs with his dedicated spirit and his scholarly approach to problems.

After reading these two historic documents one will certainly grow more reflective about this country's obligations to its partner in the Panama Canal enterprise.

The speeches follow:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY HIS EXCELLENCY AMBASSADOR G. W. WESTERMAN, U.N. DELEGATE OF PANAMA, AT THE RESEARCH INSTITUTE OF AMERICA, INC., NEW YORK, N.Y., FEBRUARY 7, 1961

PANAMA AT A GLANCE

It is a matter of unusual satisfaction for me to meet and greet members of the top editorial staff of the Research Institute of America, Inc. As I appear before this institute today a statement from one of the famous speeches of President Wilson comes to mind which I quote: "Comprehension must be the soil in which shall grow all the fruits of friendship." I fully realize that your institute seeks to comprehend my views about Panama in particular and Latin America in general, because your distinguished membership is anxious to help cultivate the fruits of Latin American friendship.

It is not my purpose to describe or discuss either the political institutions or the practical policies of Panama. I want to present a glimpse of those physical, economic, and social features of the Republic of Panama which are the basis of its political life, and constitute the conditions under which that life has to be maintained. Then, I wish to make a few observations with regard to Latin America which I think are pertinent to an occasion as significant as the present.

Introduction

The historical background of Panama is different from that of any other state in Central or South America. Panama achieved its independence together with the group of South American peoples who, in the revolutionary period between 1810 and 1824 emancipated themselves from Spanish domination in the Western Hemisphere. Of its own volition Panama united with Nueva Granada, Ecuador, and Venezuela to form Gran Colombia. Until the dawn of this century the Isthmian Republic remained united to the nation built upon the former viceroyalty of Santa Fe. Independence was declared on November 3, 1903. The importance of Panama today in world affairs as a free and independent Republic is principally the result of the strategic significance of its position on one of the world's major routes.

From the time of Christopher Columbus' first visit and the discovery of the Pacific by Vasco Muñez de Balboa in 1513, Panama's unique geographical position astride world trade routes has stimulated the dreams of conquistadores, explorers, engineers, and world traders. Thus the story of man in Panama has been one concerned more with passage than settlement. If Panama has not become the site of a future world capital as once proposed by Simon Bolivar, it has undoubtedly won recognition as being the "Crossroads of the World."

The Republic of Panama is a narrow curving strip of mountainous terrain 480 miles long and varying in width from about 30 miles to about 120 miles. It is a bridge between two great oceans and two important continents. Panama's strategic location between the Atlantic and Pacific, and North and South American has been the most influential factor in the development of her national life.

At one time or another all the great maritime nations of the world have coveted Panama and the forces which have shaped the settlement patterns of the larger communities on either side of the isthmus are international rather than local.

The people

(A) Size of Population

With an area of 28,575 square miles (exclusive of the Canal Zone which covers 522 square miles), Panama has a population of more than 1 million inhabitants, or about 34 persons to the square mile. The population tends to concentrate in and around Colon City and Panama City adjacent to the Panama Canal terminals; as a result the mountains and plains of the interior are sparsely settled.

(B) Racial distribution

Each decennial census prior to 1950 classified the population by race. However, characterization of the population by race was omitted in the census of 1950, reportedly due to the extensive racial mixtures in various proportions and the inadequacy of such classification. The census of 1940 reported 12 percent white, 15 percent Negro, 72 percent mestizo and 1 percent all others. Undoubtedly this ratio has continued with slight variation.

(C) Occupational distribution

Of the total labor force of 290,000 in 1958, 53 percent were engaged in agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting; 12 percent were in commerce, transportation, and communications, 17 percent in services; 7 percent in manufacturing; and 11 percent in other pursuits. About 16 percent of the workers are covered by social security.

Government

The Constitution of Panama, like the Constitution of the United States, provides for equality of persons. It recognizes no distinctions of race, birth, social position, sex, religion, or political affiliation in the administration of justice, eligibility to hold office and the enjoyment of civil rights.

The Government of Panama is republican, democratic, and centralized in form with the familiar separation into executive, legislative, and judicial branches.

The President, two Vice Presidents, and the members of the legislature are elected by direct popular vote for a 4-year term. The President cannot succeed himself in office. He appoints his own Cabinet which consists of eight members. The nine Provincial Governors and all municipal mayors serve at the pleasure of the executive. Councilmen are elected for terms of 4 years.

Our legislature, or national assembly differs from your Congress in that it is a unicameral body which corresponds to your House of Representatives. The national assembly at present consists of 53 members, each member representing 15,000 inhabitants.

Panama's judiciary resembles very much that of the United States. Municipal courts for minor matters; circuit courts (corresponding to U.S. district courts); superior courts (corresponding to U.S. courts of appeals) and a Supreme Court. In recent years there has been adopted from the French system the administrative courts, the main purpose of which is to check and censure any abuses of power by the executive organ of the Government.

Again, like lovers of freedom and democracy everywhere, Panamanians are faced with the responsibility of maintaining an alert, vigilant watchfulness over the processes of democracy in order to close the gaps between creed and deed.

Economy

As previously stated the strategic geographic position of the Republic of Panama as the connecting link between two oceans and two continents has, to a large degree, predestined its economic activities, with major emphasis on commerce. Until recent years only secondary consideration was given to agriculture and industry.

Balboa's trek across the isthmus in 1513 dramatized the vital importance of Panama. From that time the overland route across the isthmus was used to ship precious treasures to Spain, thereby bringing the isthmus great prosperity. Then the United States built the Panama Railroad in 1855 which greatly aided the development of the west coast while serving the commercial interests of those Central and South American States in the Pacific.

These commercial activities formed the core of Panama's economic life. Afterwards, the Panama Canal was constructed by the United States between 1904 and 1914 at a net cost of $380 million as the world gaped in wonderment at the engineering, mechanical and social genius of this country. With this enterprise a new chapter in the economic history of Panama unfolded.

Back in 1532 Charles V of Spain initiated the first study of the feasibility of joining the Atlantic and Pacific by a man-made strait. The French unsuccessfully undertook the project but it was the United States which accomplished the task under the terms of an Inter-Oceanic Treaty negotiated with the Republic of Panama in 1903.

Although fluctuating from time to time, the principal economic activity of Panama since 1914 has been the sale of services to the Canal Zone and goods to tourists and transients.

Panama is unique among the nations of the Western Hemisphere. The canal is the hub of its economic life, bringing to Panama a certain amount of independence but at the same time a large measure of economic dependence on external forces. For example, Panama has been subjected to wide cycles of prosperity and depression over which it has had no control. Hence, the destiny of this young Republic is closely associated with the economic and political activities of people all over the world.

The Government of Panama plays an important role in the country's economic life by entering some fields itself, by regulating certain operations, by means of its revenue system and expenditures.

The present administration continues pushing vigorously forward a national program stimulating the promotion of many projects in the fields of agriculture and industry for the purpose of diversifying the economy of Panama. This new approach to national affairs has considerably lessened the country's dependence upon the Panama Canal whose economic importance in this regard has been gradually decreasing due to curtailment of the activities of U.S. Government agencies in the Canal Zone.

Meanwhile Panama continues to offer its traditional welcome to foreign merchants, traders, and distributors to take advantage of the country's exceptional geographical location for shipping and airline facilities convenient to consumer markets in Central America, the Caribbean countries, the north and west coasts of South America and some sections of Europe, as well as the Orient. In this respect its laws grant many concessions to foreign investors interested in resource development and who may be seeking industrial possibilities on the isthmus.

Education

Thomas Jefferson once said: "If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, it expects what never was and never will be." Freedom

and democracy include the acceptance of responsibility. Education is the primary duty of freemen. The proper working of democracy is based upon it, entailing as it does cooperative endeavor and sacrifice toward the common betterment.

Education was not one of the major concerns of the provincial government; thus, when the Republic of Panama was established in 1903, there was practically nothing in the way of a school system in the country. Judged against this background, then, Panama since its independence—a brief 57 years—has made remarkable progress in the field of public education.

Recently published UNESCO studies on illiteracy show that Panama has one of the lowest illiteracy rates in Latin America. From an all-time high of 71.7 percent in 1911, Panama's illiteracy rate has declined to less than 29 percent. In the last academic year the following educational institutions were registered in the Republic: Primary, 1,079 official and 80 private with 4,487 and 366 teachers, respectively; secondary, 74 official and 23 private with 874 and 588 professors, respectively. Total pupil enrollment was 178,803; total number of teachers, 6,315. Clearly, then, this constitutes a tremendous increase over 1904 when Panama started practically from zero with its educational system.

Almost one-fourth of the national budget of the country is allocated to education. In 1957, over $12½ million, or 21.6 percent of the total budget and in 1958, over $14½ million, or 23.5 percent went for education. This was over $2 million more than the previous year in promotion of the educational interests of the people. There is no difficulty in appreciating the seriousness of the problems facing this young nation in the matter of adequately meeting its obligations in the area of education. As in most countries, including the United States, Panama does not dispose of sufficient resources to attend the growing demands of education.

Although the percentage of the national budget allocated to education is one of the highest of any country, candor compels the admission that our limited budget falls below those of many North American universities and of many Latin American cities.

As always, money for education is never enough. Many communities still lack schools, and buildings as well as materials are inadequate either in quality or in quantity. Every 25 years our population doubles itself which means that more young children have to be educated. This places an unusually heavy annual burden upon the already severely taxed resources of the nation. Inservice training of teachers is sorely needed to keep up with the demands of the 20th century. In spite of hardships and obstacles, Panamanians in all walks of life believe in the development of education and are willing to make the sacrifices necessary to meet the challenges. This belief makes it possible to raise the cultural standards of the country and mold the civic conscience of the young people.

Beginning in 1904 with the passage of the law of public instruction, Panama made it quite clear what its attitude toward education was going to be. This enactment made available to Panamanians an educational system ranging in scope from kindergarten to university.

The Constitution of Panama makes primary public education compulsory and free for all children between the ages of 7 and 15. Similarly, secondary public education is free, but it is not compulsory.

Panama has long been committed to the ideal of equality of opportunity for all, however imperfectly this ideal may have been realized. No denial of opportunity could be more critical than the one involving education. It is more completely the key to positions of responsibility and leadership in the modern world and if adequate becomes a relatively and progressively greater deprivation with each passing generation.

University of Panama

The University of Panama opened its doors in 1935 as the national university with an enrollment of 127 students and 18 professors. Today there are 3,500 students and 131 professors—124 of whom are Panamanians. More than 2,000 persons have graduated from the faculties of philosophy, letters and education, law and political science, engineering and agriculture, natural sciences and pharmacy, public administration, and commerce and medicine.

As a friendly observer of the American scene, I have become increasingly concerned in recent months with the debate on American education, and I believe the debate is more important than the decisions in Washington that cover the front pages of the newspapers. For the American people are judging their own scale of values, are shaping the signposts to the future, when they bring their system of education under critical public review.

Over a century ago, the eminent Andres Bello advanced the concept that the Latin American University by tradition is keyed to the needs of national development. An echo of this viewpoint is heard from the late Founder-Chancellor Octavio Mendez Pereira who once stated that the mission of the university is to develop a profound sense of nationality. In 1947 at an opening exercise he observed:

"In all of its activities the university must stimulate and develop a profound sense of unity and of community life in our people and of root into this our soil. Panama is a nation with one foot on the ground and the other in the air, as if to begin a journey. And now is the time to realize that our destiny is difficult—it is to have nationality as well as homeland. We must fight against those forces entrenched in power, against the leadership of privileged classes; we must fight for our sovereignty in the spiritual as well as of our rights over our resources, our land, and our collective destiny."

Students of the university are in total accord with this avowed mission and by means of protests, strikes, demonstrations, publications and general agitation, they have made the university one of the country's most potent political forces. This represents a basic difference between the universities of North America and those of Latin America.

This is in no way surprising when we recall that toward the end of the first World War there swept through the Latin American countries currents of thought and action, directed toward the achievement of social freedom and equality of opportunity for the masses who were beginning to feel the need for relief from oppression. This educational movement, dramatized through the vigorous and colorful leadership of José Vasconcelos, was an essential part of the Mexican Revolution, by the Russian Revolution, and by the new ideology of democratic freedom and social equality engendered by World War I.

Since the students of the University of Cordoba in Argentina staged their 1917 revolt against the then current mixture of politics and academic matters, student participation in national politics throughout the continent has gone hand in hand with what has been called university reform. The youth are rebelling against conditions which they see around them. At one time American and French democracy constituted their ideals but their impatience with the slow progress which has been made in attaining these ideals has led them to examine other ideologies. Yet they continue to proclaim democracy as their goal although expressing a natural curiosity about the triumphs of the other ideologies which seemingly offer quick solutions for the social problems plaguing the poorer classes. So long as economic and political instability continue in Latin America, the idealism and rebellious spirit of the youth can be expected to be expressed in action.

As the student reform movement eventually spread to universities throughout the Latin-American continent, it was inconceivable that Panama would not feel its influence. Consequently, our university students, too, have been active in advocating a new nationalistic awareness of cultural aims and objectives for our country.

Outlook

A democratic nation can move forward only through the interest of its leaders and the support of its electorate. The generous investments made in education during recent years are without parallel in the history of Panama. These large-scale expenditures for the advancement of the national education have been undertaken in spite of the limited economic resources of the country, and despite the necessity to meet other social obligations of equal magnitude. But this course has been adopted because of the conviction of our Governments that the prosperity and welfare of the Panamanian people depend upon the level of education attainable.

As was aptly stated by your venerated Abraham Lincoln, "it is only education and what it embodies—self-discipline, austerity, integrity, spirit of enterprise, and civic consciousness—that can lead men to the dignification of life."

Panamanians realize this truth and, like the multitudes of Latin America, Asia, and Africa, are surging like a tide onto the historical scene, determined to occupy their place at the table of life as human dignity dictates.

All of us in Panama share a vital stake in our country's educational program and assume a correspondingly critical obligation to support and promote its expansion, so that more and more Panamanians may participate in the democratic process of government to the enrichment of the nation and to the moral solidarity of mankind.

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS DELIVERED BY U.N. AMBASSADOR GEORGE W. WESTERMAN, OF PANAMA, BEFORE THE RESEARCH INSTITUTE OF AMERICA, NEW YORK, FEBRUARY 7

VIEWS ON LATIN AMERICA

With the end of the Spanish Empire in America it was Simon Bolivar who, with creative spirit and extraordinary vision, became the first official advocate of collective security on a continental scale. At the Congress of Panama in 1826 the American nations proclaimed the ideal of a cooperative peace. Writers, poets, and dreamers kept alive this idea of inter-American unity through the imperialist 19th century.

More than six decades passed before the seed of common and mutual protection of the "Confederate States" of America began to grow. Then President Cleveland of the United States approved an act of Congress authorizing him to call a conference of the American countries in order to discuss a plan of peaceful cooperation and reciprocal relations that would benefit all. James G. Blaine opened the conference which brought into being the International Union of the American Republics.

Mutual defense against aggression and the maintenance of peaceful relations have not been the only concerns of the inter-American system. Economic cooperation has also held high priority. This question came forward at the first meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the American Republics held in Panama in 1939. Resolution 3 adopted

by that body called for "cooperation between the American Republics in order that they could protect their economic and financial structure, maintain their fiscal equilibrium, safeguard the stability of their currencies, promote and expand their industries, intensify their agriculture, and develop their commerce."

The subject of economic cooperation among the American Republics has been raised and debated frequently at subsequent inter-American meetings. Then last September the third meeting of the Special Committee of the Council of the Organization of American States to Study the Formulation of New Measures for Economic Cooperation, convened at Bogotá, Colombia. That conference grew out of the lofty objectives of Operation Pan America proposed by President Juscelino Kubitschek of Brazil. His plan envisaged public and private financial assistance for hastening the social, economic, and industrial development of the American Continent.

The economy of Latin America that had been as a whole almost exclusively agricultural was transformed between 1914 and 1959 into one that was both industrial and agricultural. Thought nearly three-fourths of the working population were still employed in the rural sector of the economy, they produced less than those in industry. Under the stimulus of industrialization, urbanization, and immigration, Latin America's population more than doubled—from 80 million in 1914 to 180 million in 1960. No other area in the world today has a population growth faster than that of Latin America with its 2½ percent net gain annually. By the year 2000 its population is expected to exceed half a billion. Meanwhile, its tremendous development potential augurs for it much prominence and importance among the family of nations.

For some time now the entire area has been in the throes of a painful process of social, economic, and political transformation, and this will continue to be so until a new and more broad equilibrium is achieved. Consequently, the role that Latin America will play in world affairs will be determined not only by the dynamic processes of growth and change undertaken by representative Latin American governments, but by the assistance and cooperation received from the United States.

The basic future aim of the United States in the circumstances should be a sound, prosperous, and stable Latin America, one that will contribute to the strength and solidarity of the Western World and will advance the security of the entire hemisphere.

Whether the standpoint be political, economic or military, the unique importance of Latin America to the United States is too obvious for us to attempt to debate. Since the inception of the "good neighbor" policy the United States has come to value ever more highly the political support of the other American Republics.

Politically, because of the concern which the United States has in this hemisphere as expounded since 1823 in its Monroe Doctrine. Between the Organization of American States and the United Nations organization the support of Latin America has helped to bolster the world leadership position of the United States to an appreciable extent. Latterly, the admission of 20 newly emerged African States to United Nations membership, and their alliance with an Asian grouping to present a 46-vote bloc, has served to undercut the strength of the Latin American Republics. In the face of this fact, Latin American collaboration will have even greater significance to the United States in the context of future development.

Economically, Latin America is obviously of the greatest importance to the United States. It accounts for a large portion of the U.S. foreign trade, larger than that of any other major region in the world. This is the main economic interest for both sides, with each providing an indispensable market and a source of needed goods for the other. In addition, U.S. citizens and corporations have invested in the Latin American area nearly $9 billion, also an amount greater than in any other region in the world.

The vested interests of U.S. citizens are inseparably intertwined with the security interests of the United States, for the bulk of the investments are in mining and petroleum enterprises, the products of which are indispensable to the North American economy in peace and war. Of course, it must be admitted that these private investments also serve to help the development of Latin America, thus greatly adding to its economic capacity.

From the military viewpoint, the proximity alone of Latin America to the United States makes it strategically vital. In addition, the value of the area further enhanced by the location there of the monumental Panama Canal, of several military installations which shore up the national security and safeguard hemispherical defenses, and by its store of raw materials which would be urgently needed in the event of another world war.

Strong support for Latin America is essential and consistent with the enlightened self-interest of the United States. From time to time the nations of this hemisphere have come together to plan for mutual protection, economic growth, industrial development and social progress. But as the free world moves through an epoch of great significant economic, social, and political events, there must be a full reappraisal of traditional relations, and new decisions taken to meet the pressing imperative of our time, which calls for speedy resume of underprivileged peoples from misery, ignorance and poverty.

As an area of investment Latin America ranks fairly high outside the United States and Canada. These pioneer countries with untapped resources to exploit, have natives capable of hard work and of being easily adaptable to American industrial skill. Granted that the hemisphere has its share of trouble and unrest, it is certainly not as explosive as the Continent of Africa, or the Middle East or Asia. Europe which is always regarded as a more stable climate already has been subjected in the past half century to two violent political upheavals and, according to military strategists, the Berlin situation could erupt momentarily to inflame the entire world.

Latin Americans will move away from the orbit of neutralism or indifference in the cold war struggle for men's minds if they feel they have something worth fighting for by way of preserving standards of decent health, higher literacy rates, a greater degree of individual independence and personal dignity. Chester Bowles, now Under Secretary of State, underscored this point as far back as 1954 when he wrote in the Atlantic Monthly:

"The political objectives of the U.S. aid program [must be] to develop indigenous political and economic strength among the nations of the free world so they can survive as free people. * * * As they succeed in meeting the needs of their people, their confidence in democratic methods will grow, and with it their determination to defend their achievements against all adversaries, either from within or without. With such nations, the United States can form a free and dynamic partnership which over the years will erase the threat of Communist aggression."

There is need for a new era in American cooperative effort to promote the entire material, social, moral and spiritual affairs of this hemisphere and to erect an edifice of peace and democracy attuned to present century architecture of material well-being, social equality and personal dignity. However, speedy efforts must be made to narrow the gap between your per capita income of $2,000 a year and our average per capita income of merely $285 a year. Social progress must be accelerated among the great masses of the people of Latin America so as to strengthen and preserve free and democratic institutions.

We remember with much fervor President Kennedy's special pledge to Latin America that good words would be converted into good deeds in a new alliance for progress and in an effort to assist free men and free institutions in casting off the chains of poverty. He has further stirred the imagination by his establishment of a special interdepartmental task force under the able leadership of Adolf Berle, well known to Latin America. We, in Panama, share the hope recently expressed by Secretary of State Dean Rusk that this qualified group will give intensive attention to the problems of the area in order that they can be translated into opportunities for constructive action.

There is general expectation in Latin America that under the new administration in Washington, the "good neighbor" policy will be revitalized and a new and more robust partnership will result between the Anglo-Saxon and the Latin worlds.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY HIS EXCELLENCY AMBASSADOR GEORGE W. WESTERMAN, U.N. DELEGATE OF PANAMA, BEFORE GRADUATE FACULTY AND GRADUATE STUDENTS, YALE LAW SCHOOL, FEBRUARY 17, 1961

THE PANAMA CANAL AND UNITED STATES-PANAMA RELATIONS

Introduction

It is my understanding that a number of you during the winter term at the law school considered international servitudes in your investigation of contemporary international law under Professor McDougal. It would therefore be somewhat presumptuous of me to try to expand on this subject as you have considered it, being neither competent nor ready to follow your distinguished professor in this most specialized field. Instead, I thought it more prudent to advance some comment about Latin American attitudes concerning these servitudes in general, and Panamanian attitudes in respect to the Panama Canal in particular.

I would be gratified if such an attempt, albeit a modest one, might contribute to the clarifying of certain aspects of United States-Latin American relationship for those of you from among whom North American leadership may derive in the ensuing years; and how we, in Latin America, feel about the manner in which these servitudes have operated and continue to operate in the current world climate.

Since the end of World War II deep-seated sociopolitical change has been taking place in Latin America, putting the entire area in the throes of a painful process of profound social, economic, and political transformation. Consequently, the overwhelming problem in all Latin American countries today and for the foreseeable future is that of social revolution.

The Republic of Panama has proved no exception to this trend and for more than a decade this country has been the object of a revolution of rising popular expectation. As new social and institutional forms caused our environment to be reshaped, the Government of Panama became more and more concerned with the emerging problems. Numerous reforms have been instituted and various programs initiated covering every facet of the country's national life, all tending to alleviate the economic hardships suffered by a rapidly growing middle class and the lower socioeconomic group.

Within this period agricultural output has increased and industrial potential more widely exploited. However, fractures in our national system of trade and diplomacy became compounded not only by the country's limited financial resources, but by the heavy retrenchment programs undertaken on the Canal Zone by the Panama Canal Government organization. These steps of retrenchment resulted in the discharge of more than 10,000 employees between the 10-year period 1949–59, with a corresponding curtailment of much-needed revenues for the national treasury.

Panama achieved its independence together with the group of South American peoples who, in the revolutionary period between 1810 and 1824 emancipated themselves from Spanish domination in the Western Hemisphere. Of its own volition Panama united with Nueva Granada, Ecuador, and Venezuela to form Gran Colombia. Until the dawn of this century the Isthmian Republic remained united to the nation built upon the former vice royalty of Santa Fe.

No more unique relationship probably has been established in history than that between the United States and the Republic of Panama by their collaboration in the construction of the Isthmian Canal. The generous contribution by Panama of the very core of its territory for that purpose and the stupendous effort of the North Americans who made the vision of centuries a reality form an enduring bond of common interest.

As part of the national domain of the Republic of Panama, Panama is the landlord, and the United States the tenant of the 10-mile strip of land known as the Canal Zone, where such rights, powers, and authority were granted to the United States for the specific ends of constructing, maintaining, operating, and defending the Panama Canal. The peculiar consideration in this tenancy is that of perpetuity, in that there is no reversionary right provided for in the contract—the original treaty. This constitutes an unusual feature in contracts. It is axiomatic that every landlord should have or should be conceded the right of adjustment of the rent of administered property from time to time, in equity and good conscience.

It should be remembered that at the time of the execution of the original treaty there was no parity between the parties; the contractual relationship lacked many of the features esential to the making of a binding contract; Panama in that period of its history was in no position to demand, dictate, or impose conditions. The United States was, and took the fullest advantage of its preferred position. This is what makes the voice of equity so strong in the resulting situation. This voice has since been insistently appealing to the conscience of the United States for proper and adequate redress.

At this point I wish to raise what I consider a vital question so as to provoke suitable reflections among you scholars of the law. Does this concept of perpetual occupancy of any part of the territory of one sovereign nation by another have validity under the expanding doctrines of contemporary international jurisprudence?

Because of the strategic geographical position of the Isthmus of Panama—for centuries a focal point of international transit and trade—the Panama Canal which bisects this territory has had a decisive influence on the rate and structural characteristics of Panama's economic development. Through the years it has come to mean to Panama what tin is to Bolivia, copper to Chile, coffee to Brazil and Colombia, bananas to Ecuador, wool to Uruguay, and oil to Venezuela. Because then, it has represented to Panamanians the greatest source of national wealth, it is not unnatural that eyes have been usually focused upon it as the source from which Panama should derive greater commercial and economic advantages, as well as more substantial direct benefits.

Both from the commercial and military standpoints the Panama Canal has proved and continues to be of great importance to the United States. About 82 percent of the total commercial cargo which transited the Panama Canal in the fiscal year 1960 originated in or was destined for U.S. ports. In five of the last 6 years new records have been set showing the upward trend of canal activity. Strategically, the Panama Canal has become an invaluable asset to the United States and its allies during periods of emergency.

Well known is its record as a supply line to allied fighting forces in Europe in World War I, and its utility in facilitating the passage of more than 5,300 combat vessels and about 8,500 other craft transporting troops and military cargo during World War II. The incalculable savings to the allied nations in time, money, and human lives from the shortened canal route have been fully realized. Furthermore, during the Korean conflict thousands of U.S. Government vessels transited the canal bearing supplies and war materials to the United Nations forces in the Far East.

Despite modern technological development the isthmian waterway remains a vital element in the national defense of the United States, its strategic significance to the Western Hemisphere is still acknowledged by military experts, and it continues to be a keynote of international commerce.

With all these advantages inherent in its operation why should Panama not receive a greater measure of socioeconomic participation from this strategically important international activity.

On July 26, 1904, U.S. Minister John Barrett telegraphed the State Department that agitation was increasing and that the situation was critical. He was referring to reactions of the Panamanian people supporting President Amador Guerrero's protest to Washington regarding treaty violation. Minister Barrett qualified the dispute at that time as of the highest importance since it involved the whole issue of sovereignty in the Zone. From that day to this succeeding administrations and generations of Panamanian people have continued to find cause for complaint about the quality of the relationship existing between Panama and the United States.

The formal basis of the United States-Panama relationship is the Treaty of 1903 which contained conditions and concessions which Panamanians regarded as unjust, discriminatory, and totally alien to the national rights of a sovereign state. The 1936 treaty aimed at removing some of the more unsatisfactory terms contained in the original convention. For one it abolished the guarantee of the independence of the Republic of Panama—a provision particularly distasteful to a state enjoying full sovereign and independent status. It also elimnated the right of "eminent domain" which the United States had enjoyed in the cities of Panama and Colon.

While this treaty also fulfilled certain Panamanian aspirations with regard to fuller consideration in canal affairs, it failed to satisfy Panama's claims that its nationals working on the Canal Zone were entitled to enjoy equality of opportunity and treatment with U.S. citizens; that its commerce should share more fully in the benefits to be derived from the market in the Canal Zone and from ships transmiting the canal; and also that it should receive a more equitable share of direct benefits from the canal enterprise.

The 1955 Treaty of Mutual Understanding and Cooperation provided the instruments through which these aspiratons could be fulfilled adequately. However, there developed factors which prevented the full implementation of the obligations undertaken by the United States. These factors, such as unilateral interpretations given to treaty provisions by certain U.S. agencies, seriously compromised a relationship which is as important as it is historic. Its special character will always invite the constant watchfulness of the entire Western Hemisphere.

It is evident that the relationship between the United States and Panama should be based upon mutual respect, common understanding, friendly sentiments and a spirit of complete confidence. It is to be regretted that relations between these two countries were permitted to deteriorate as they have, but without doubt there yet exists a strong reservoir of good will in Panama and in Washington that will prevail, in order to find ways of developing United States-Panama relations to a satisfactory level for all concerned.

Developments of the recent past in Panama call for the most serious meditation upon the questions and issues in dispute. We have our respective points of view but the stakes involved are exceedingly high. We need therefore to bring our joint and collective wisdom and understanding to bear in helping to find a reasonable way out of those deplorable impasses which have from time to time threatened to block our countries' normally, friendly relations.

To quote an official of the U.S. State Department, "Strict compliance on the part of the U.S. Government with its treaty obligations with Panama is of the essence of exemplary relations with Panama."

U.S. public policy of equality established

The principle of equality of opportunity and treatment as its public policy toward Panama has been set down by the United States since 1908.

A joint statement issued October 3, 1953, by President Eisenhower of the United States and President Remon of Panama, upon the occasion of a State visit by the latter to the United States, refers to this matter in the following manner:

"We have equally agreed that inasmuch as the two countries have a mutual and vital interest in the work of the Panama Canal, the principle of equality of opportunity and treatment must have full effect in regard to the citizens of Panama and the United States employed in the Canal Zone as set forth in the exchange of notes of March 2, 1936 on this subject."

One of the precepts set forth in item 1 of the 1955 memorandum of understandings to govern the labor practices of all U.S. agencies on the Canal Zone, establishes the principle of equality of opportunity and treatment of Panamanians and U.S. citizens.

Here are some of the areas in which regretfully noncompliance may palpably be noted:

Civil Service

In 1947 Executive Order 9830 made Panamanians eligible for civil service status on the Canal Zone. Over 500 Panamanians immediately availed themselves of the opportunity afforded to sit for these examinations. However, since then there has been a progressive decrease in their participation in civil service appointments. In 1952 there appeared to be another resurgence of interest when 252 Panamanians competed for appointments. This number plummeted to the insignificant total of 44 in 1953. In the following years there was a slight rise to 77 which has since dwindled to 9, 8, 8, and 2 in the last succeeding 4 years.

There was no lack of enthusiasm on the part of Panamanians to try and to qualify for the higher level positions available in the Canal Zone. Between 1947 and 1958 the employment register showed 730 Panamanians as eligibles but only 72 were called to

fill classified positions during this 11-year period.

The trend in Table "A" fully portrays the frustration of Panamanians over their failure to secure civil service appointments despite merit and fitness, the only two basic requirements recognized by the Fair Employment Practices Board of the U.S. Civil Service Commission.

Merit System

Regulations issued by the Secretary of the Army pursuant to Public Law 85–550 and President Eisenhower's Executive Order 10794 establishing a Canal Zone merit system provided that: "Rates of pay at or below grade 3 in the nonmanual category, grade 6 in the service category, and level 10 in the manual category shall be derived initially from existing non-U.S. citizen hourly rates in the Canal Zone. Rates of pay above these grade levels for all security positions shall be established in relation to rates for all security positions shall be established in relation to rates for the same or similar work performed for the U.S. Government in the continental United States, but shall embody a deduction for the factor as defined. These rates shall constitute the base salary or wage rates."

The Army Secretary's regulations further provides that: "For positions for which the basic rate of compensation has been established in reference to rates for the same or similar work in the continental United States, rates of pay shall be adjusted in relation to changes in the corresponding rates in the United States. For positions for which the base rate has been derived initially from non-U.S. citizen hourly rates in the Canal Zone, rates of pay shall be adjusted in relation to changes in wage rates in the Republic of Panama as determined by periodic wage surveys of rates paid for commercial and Government employment in the Republic of Panama."

These provisions have the effect of creating two separate wage scales which are highly inequitable and prejudical to the basic philosophy underlying the 1955 treaty provisions. This is all the more so in the light of Public Law 85–550, section 10(C)(1) which states:

"The Canal Zone merit system shall conform generally to policies, principles, and standards established by or in accordance with the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, as amended and supplemented."

Section 6 of the same act further states that:

"The employment standards established under section 4 of this act and the rate of basic compensation established under section 5 of this act shall be applied uniformly, within and among all departments, to the respective positions, employees and individuals under consideration for appointment to positions, irrespective of whether the employee or individual is a citizen of the United States or a citizen of the Republic of Panama."

To match the cities of Panama and Colon against the continental United States for wage-fixing purposes, simply perpetuates the perennial disparity between rates paid to employees in semiskilled and unskilled jobs and those paid for jobs requiring skills, or other technical or professional training.

While the merit system in itself embodies the principle of equality of treatment and opportunity for all the canal working forces regardless of national origin. However the corresponding pay plan obviously was conceived with a view of perpetuating discriminatory practices affecting the rights of Panamanian workers. Such is the viewpoint held by the National Government and supported by the Canal Zone labor unions representing non-United States citizen workers.

Had the actual pay plan embraced civil service rates of pay at the lower level as well as the higher, it would have had the effect of compensating for losses of purchasing power suffered in 1958 by the Canal Zone non-U.S. citizen employees. It would also have had the effect of eliminating this element of economic discrimination.

The Secretary of the Army is empowered by authority delegated to him by the President of the United States, to correct this inequity which is a source of continuing dissatisfaction among the lower graded workers on the Canal Zone. It would be in the greatest interest of the U.S. Government to recognize the peculiar circumstances which place the Canal Zone in an entirely different position from any other oversea operation of that country and thus institute a wage scale for Canal Zone agencies, as well regulated in the lower grades as it is at the higher levels, and in more realistic relation.

It would certainly be more advantageous to devise a formula whereby this may be accomplished according to U.S. standards under which the work is performed, than to attempt the incongruous task of measuring Canal Zone jobs against similar ones in Panama and Colon where the job standards and conditions of employment and basic economic factors are not comparable.

Promotion Policy

The principles as laid down in the existing Canal Zone promotion policy are well founded. However, there is widespread complaint registered by many Panamanian workers who although fully trained and with wide experience have been denied advancement under one pretext or another.

In defending its employment policy the canal administration maintains that properly qualified citizens of the Republic of Panama have been eligible for appointments in executive, supervisory, professional, subprofessional, and clerical positions. How closely is this policy borne out by empirical experience is a matter that is subject to scrutiny.

As of June 1960 there were about 9,000 non-United States workers employed with the Company/Government. Any impartial observer would find among this number a large percentage of Panamanians with special educational training and other qualifications which are requisite for employment in the higher graded positions. What, then, has militated against their promotions, or why have certain job opportunities been denied them, or why has compensation not been awarded them according to their proved abilities and skills?

Compensation

The harsh effect of discrimination in compensation evidences itself in the following details: On June 2[illegible], 1958, Public Law 85–462 granted a 10-per[illegible] increase for Classified Act employees, retroactive to January 12. On May 27, 1958, Public Law 85–526 granted a similar increase for postal employees retroactive to January 11, 1958. Wages of a number of other U.S. rate groups, including craft and supervisory, floating equipment, power branch, railroad, printing plant, and miscellaneous, were adjusted upward during the year 1958. The total annual cost involved was $2,024,392.

No similar cost-of-living increase was granted to non-United States citizen employees; although automatic and administrative pay increases at a total cost of approximately $153,608 per annum were made in their favor.

A proper wage adjustment granted to non-United States citizen workers would have been an approach to the ultimate and gradual realization of uniformity in rates of pay. It would undoubtedly have lessened the demoralizing effect experienced by these workers due to the losses sustained in the purchasing power in the face of a steady rise in the cost of living.

U.S. citizen employees are allowed a 25-percent oversea differential, plus an 18 percent tax grant, in addition to more liberal annual leave benefits, free home travel, repatriation, commissary and free entry privileges, and a number of other miscellaneous fringe benefits not extended to employees in the non-United States roles living outside the Canal Zone.

The wide disparity in earnings of the two groups of canal working forces is reflected in the following table:

PANAMA CANAL COMPANY/GOVERNMENT

Canal Zone wage rate and U.S. wage rate averages for 1950–59

Fiscal year	Canal Zone wage rate		U.S. wage rate	
	Hourly rate	Annual rate	Hourly rate	Annual rate
1950	$0.48	$998	$2.31	$4,805
1951	.53	1,102	2.35	4,888
1952	.58	1,206	2.61	5,429
1953	.61	1,269	2.76	5,749
1954	.63	1,310	2.91	6,053
1955	.64	1,331	3.09	6,429
1956	.69	1,435	3.20	6,658
1957	.76	1,581	3.35	6,972
1958	.76	1,581	3.53	7,342
1959	.83	1,720	3.58	7,443

In many parts of the United States the Federal Government is the only means of employment for the inhabitants of those regions and there is no clear yardstick like private industry or highly unionized industries to dictate the rates of pay which Uncle Sam must pay his workers.

The Federal Government is proud of being a good employee and knows that it has the responsibility to its citizens to see that they are paid a fair wage, in this manner allowing them an opportunity to improve their living standards. In return it expects loyal, honest and efficient work.

However, it is noted that nowhere in the United States is the Federal Government as discriminatory as on the Canal Zone in arriving at a fair wage for its Panamanian employees who are a part of the Federal civil service under the merit system set up over a year ago. Why should the Federal Government have a lesser responsibility in the Canal Zone, particularly when it affects a contractual agreement of the United States.

Single basic wage scale

Unilateral Interpretation

The principle of equal pay for equal work is a cornerstone of the American labor policy, as much as the equalitarian concept constitutes the very essence of North American industrial democracy.

After years of negotiating for freedom from all discriminatory practices which would work against the best interests of Panamanians employed on the Canal Zone, the Republic of Panama achieved one of its genuine aspirations—adoption of a single basic wage scale for all employees regardless of whether the employee is a United States or Panamanian citizen.

This was regarded as a singular achievement: First, it would enable Panamanians to feel that they had more than a token stake in the canal enterprise: second, it would improve the dignity and psychological well-being of the Panamanian employee which should be of the utmost importance to the foreign policy of the United States; third, it would furnish a greater incentive to noncitizen employees on the Canal Zone to develop a higher degree of skill and industry; fourth, it would lift productivity and efficiency accordingly, and would have a beneficial impact on the total national economy.

Unfortunately, as has often been the case in the past, unilateral interpretations were adopted on the Canal Zone, thus negating Panamanian's legitimate rights to equal pay for equal work. The reaction has been to

compromise seriously the relations between the United States and Panama, as, in the circumstances, the National Government has had to register its "deep concerns" with the highest officials of the North American Government.

Violations

In an attempt to justify many of the biased practices carried out against non-U.S. citizens who perform equal work and have the same qualifications as their North American fellow employees, the following violations may be cited affecting teachers and doctors.

Non-U.S. teachers holding bachelor degrees from universities such as Columbia, New York, Nebraska, Ohio State, Michigan, and other highly accredited American institutions, are subject to a 12-month salary scale whose entrance rate is $3,000 per annum; maximum $4,080. U.S. citizens with the same academic qualifications enter the service at $5,625 per annum on a 9-month basis; maximum $8,250.03.

Non-U.S. teachers holding a master's degree earn $3,480 per annum; maximum $4,560; those U.S. citizens with the same degree receive $6,249.96 per annum; maximum $8,874.99.

Contention of the Canal Zone administration that there is not a high enough percentage of non-U.S. teachers possessing degrees to warrant this group being placed under the Washington, D.C., wage schedule for educators, is rejected by both the teachers and their labor representatives. They offer proof that more than 30 schoolteachers and school officers assigned to these schools have the required professional degree qualifications.

The wide difference in the existing salary scales of the Latin American and United States schools is said to be justified by the Canal Zone Division of Schools because they claim that the aims and objectives of the two systems are different. To what extent, if any, do the aims and objectives of any progressive school system differ in a democratic society? Is it not the real purpose of education to train the youth to become useful citizens in any community and develop to the limit of their capacities?

A primary purpose of the educational system in the Canal Zone is to benefit citizens of the United States as well as those of the Republic of Panama residing in the Canal Zone. Any other purpose would be a contravention of the democratic spirit and of the educational ideal.

Consequently, the division of the teachers and the application of two separate and disproportionate salary schedules are unjust and discriminatory. This practice constitutes another significant violation of the concept that all employees working on the Canal Zone are to be paid according to a single basic wage scale without regard to nationality.

Doctors represent another group of Panamanian professionals adversely affected because of their nationality. They are reportedly frozen at their present rate of pay without possibility of further remuneration.

Up to October 1, 1956, firefighters on the Canal Zone were all U.S. citizens paid according to the Washington wage scale. When these jobs became available to non-U.S. citizens the rates of pay were derived from a local schedule. After the conversion took place the requirements for firefighters became more intensified. However, the earnings of a Panamanian firefighter, with premium compensation included, average monthly about $210. This represents a base pay of $100 less than that paid the U.S. citizens when they were in the firefighter category. Furthermore, Panamanians cannot advance beyond the position of driver-operator.

It is clear that there is no single wage scale existing on Canal Zone as such. There are, in fact, two wage systems, one for the U.S. employees and one for the Panamanian. The manner in which the present single wage scale is set up continues to expose Panamanians to the evil implicit in a present-day determination which still bears traces of the philosophy inherent in the gold and silver, U.S. rate and local rate concepts of an outmoded industrial period.

Citizens of Panama and the United States are found doing the same work, are required to apply for the job in the same manner, pass the same qualification requirements, conform to the same performance standards, are subjected to the same discipline, apply the same knowledge and skills, work the same hours. Despite all this, Panamanians are paid on a different and less attractive wage scale to North Americans.

Panamanians treasure freedom, human dignity, equality, and justice to the same degree as any other people in this Western Hemisphere. Likewise they reject second-class treatment from any source on the same basis that any self-respecting people would. They solicit neither handouts nor largess; they want to be able to make a decent living and to be paid a fair wage in territory leased to the United States for the building of a canal which has aided notably in the prosperity and security attained by the North American Republic during the past half century.

The minimum wage in Panama has been set at 40 cents. On the Canal Zone it is 55 cents. Does it salve the consciences of North Americans to know that their government is paying higher wages than the Government of Panama whose annual budget barely exceeds $60 million? Or is paying better salaries than the merchants in Panama City, or that they are affording more pay to their housemaids across the Canal Zone border?

In the more than 240-odd locality wage areas in the United States from which the U.S. Army and Air Force Wage Board collects wage data, no doubt there will be found areas having towns the size of Panama City wherein wages are low and benchmark trades are few. This fact can be borne out by surveying certain parts of Georgia, South Carolina, Alabama, West Virginia, Louisiana, to name but a few States.

In such areas the living cost is commensurately low—even lower than in Panama City. But does the Army or the Air Force pay a journeyman auto mechanic or a combat vehicle mechanic at W–10 or W–11 a $1.13 in these areas, to start with increments of 5 cents per hour per year until he reaches $1.23 per hour in about 2½ years?

According to available figures the journeyman in the above grade or pay level in Washington, D.C. area (which includes low-cost-of-living places like Lorton, Va., Occoquan, Va.) for instance earns at least $2.50 per hour as an entrance rate.

Meanwhile the journeyman mechanic in Greenville, S.C., and other similar low-wage areas makes at least $2 per hour.

The standards of performance and knowledge and skills required by the Army, Air Force, and Navy for their craftsmen or tradesmen are no different in Panama than in the United States. An electrician helper with no trades experience makes $1.96 per hour in Washington, D.C. On the Canal Zone he makes 72 cents if he is fortunate enough to be chosen for the job.

For upwards of half a century the U.S. Government ignored the humanitarian policy it had applied to Europeans and other Caucasian peoples for a higher living standard, as far as concerned the Canal Zone non-United States workers. Roosevelt's good neighbor policy proved a mockery on the Canal Zone where the non-United States employees were reduced to the minimum in privileges and all the advantages professed by a democracy.

Then in 1951 several former Panamanian Presidents and Foreign Ministers publicly denied the intimidation that they or their respective regimes had favored a Caribbean wage scale on the Canal Zone as a yardstick to evaluate the wages of non-United States employees. They all agreed, at that time, together with labor officials and business representatives, that it was of vital importance for the interest of the Republic in general and commerce in particular that the wage structure of the Canal Zone be increased.

The principle of a single wage for each grade level is spelled out in item I of the 1955 memorandum of understandings reached between the Government of the United States and the Republic of Panama.

From the Panamanian viewpoint the spirit and letter of that provision is being circumvented on the Canal Zone as to its application. Both the Government and labor representatives of Panamanians insist that a more equitable and fairer method should be established for arriving at the base rates for both manual and nonmanual category jobs in the Canal Zone.

Training programs

In 1921 Secretary of War Weeks appointed a Special Panama Canal Commission to make a comprehensive investigation of existing conditions and operations of the Panama Canal and Panama Railroad Company. The Commission recommended, among other things, that tropical labor be trained for better job opportunities and to fill certain skilled positions. From that date there has been agitation made to prepare Panamanians and other non-U.S. citizens for employment in craft categories heretofore restricted to them.

Through the years this policy and others tending to effect a change in the employment status quo on the Canal Zone have been vigorously opposed by labor unions representing the U.S. citizen forces. They have regarded any change, however reasonable, as a threat to or infringement of their exclusive domain. They have even gone on record as proposing legislation to give U.S. citizens' preference in Government's skilled, semiskilled, and office positions on the Isthmus of Panama.

In the face of this hostile attitude and to safeguard the rights of Panamanians to full equality with the citizens of the United States, the 1955 memorandum of the understandings contained a clear and specific provision as to rights, privileges, benefits, and job opportunities to which Panamanians will be entitled on the Canal Zone.

The training programs authorized by the 1955 treaty to prepare Panamanians for greater responsibility and job opportunity with the U.S. Government agencies and installations on the Canal Zone have not been implemented to any appreciable extent. The actual practice is apparently designed to qualify employees more effectively for their present jobs.

Since last April the apprenticeship training program has been expanded to include 25 Panamanian aspirants. There also has been an increase in the number of trades and crafts in which training is given.

The purpose of the treaty commitment in this respect is primarily to establish programs that will encourage a consciousness to pursue higher education. This would mean making available to non-U.S. citizen employees on a continuing basis full high school courses, extension courses in the trades and crafts, and the like.

There are indications that this type of encouragement is beginning to assume importance in the thinking of certain management groups. At least in the Comptroller's

Office it is known that text and reference books have been made available to employees so as to encourage them in the practice of better qualifying themselves. This could result in their personal advancement to positions of better pay.

It is important to note that this new departure came about as the result of employees' initiative which, if demonstrated among other employees, could win similar consideration from management representatives.

Sensitive security positions

Throughout the period of canal history the record of loyalty and reliability of the Panamanian and other non-U.S. employees with the U.S. Government on the Canal Zone has remained unquestioned. This tradition of fidelity, competence, and industry has been handed down to the present workers by previous generations and they have sought to preserve it zealously and without blemish.

In spite of this proved record of loyalty the manner of designating sensitive-security positions at this time would seem to imply that non-U.S. workers cannot be depended upon to help assure the continuity of efficient, expeditious, reliable and safe operation of the canal. This practice is most unfortunate and shortsighted since Panamanians have always felt that they have an equal stake in the successful operation and defense of the Panama Canal. It is a matter of public record that they and their government have always cooperated to the fullest measure in safeguarding the waterway in every emergency of the past.

According to the original survey made by the Canal Zone and administration and presented to Congress, only 2,200 jobs of the Company/Government organization should have been classified as "sensitive." The ultimate decision to place 3,500 jobs in this category has further narrowed the job opportunity of Panamanians and represents another instance of unjustifiable discrimination against the nationals of the Republic of Panama. Are the people who fill these sensitive positions required to have security clearances in accordance with Federal laws? How many of the jobs they fill actually involve security risks?

Operation friendship

Shortly after arriving on the Canal Zone in mid-July for his second tour of duty, Maj. Gen. Theodore F. Bogart, commanding general, USARCARIB, officially launched Operation Friendship, to improve relations between the people of Panama and members of the Armed Forces on the Isthmus. In order to complement this gesture former President Ernesto de la Guardia, Jr., issued a public invitation to the North American population of the Canal Zone to visit Panama and become acquainted with our people and property to appreciate our traditions, our sense of values, our cultural heritages and our human aspirations. The new President Roberto F. Chiari has fully endorsed this movement and has offered it the fullest support of his administration.

Operation Friendship as envisaged by General Bogart is a most commendable undertaking to foster better understanding and promote friendlier relations between two peoples of differing heritage, language, and cultural patterns, who have been linked together by the United States building an interoceanic canal through Panamanian territory, the Panama Canal. The high purpose of this imaginative proposal is one which has been spontaneously endorsed. However, the laudable objectives the West Pointer hopes to achieve could no doubt be attained more immediately through Operation Fairness or Operation Fairplay extending down to the common man on the streets of Panama. Operation Fairplay would insure nonviolation of the traditional American labor principle of equal pay for equal work. It would envisage equality in theory in recruitment, promotions, insurance, qualifications, classification standards, performance standards, and equality in pay. Such a practice would contribute toward dissipating discontent still prevailing among the 15,000 non-U.S. employees working on the Canal Zone.

American heritage and labor policy support the principle that all employees equally qualified should receive equal pay for equal work, regardless of citizenship. A basic principle of Operation Fairplay then should be an increase in the hourly pay of the non-U.S. worker to a decent level based on U.S. standards and not influenced by geographic area considerations.

Adopt this principle and watch the extent to which morale will improve and respect for the gringo increase. Dispense with the discriminatory cutoff level for local pay and U.S. pay and watch the accompanying decrease in dissatisfaction on the part of non-U.S. citizens working for the Federal Government.

Base the single wage on a truly fair and equitable single wage minus the differential and tax factors, and thereby eliminate old injustices and discriminatory features. This will not permit of any misinterpretation of the treaty's intent and will forever remove the idea still somewhat prevalent that U.S. fairplay is but a figment of the imagination.

Operation Fairplay would demonstrate that the United States is serious about conditions in which respect for human dignity and human rights can flourish. It would also indicate her willingness to help stimulate economic growth. It is agreed that economic progress and better living standards enable people to develop their own democratic and stable political institutions as well as encourage them to work cooperatively with other nations in the solution of international problems.

Operation Fairplay should mean a good measure of economic stability and growth for Panamanians. Greater purchasing power will stimulate the Panamanian economy. Not to be overlooked, either, would be the larger market for U.S. manufactured goods.

Under Operation Fairplay the United States would reasonably take care of its loyal, industrious and efficient non-United States-Canal Zone workers by giving them a wage that is truly representative of the type and kind of work they are actually performing. The time must come when pay determination should be based realistically on U.S. standards, on high standards of production demanded and not on the unrealistic local standards predicated on a so-called prevailing wage based on lesser demands.

The U.S. worker is being amply rewarded on the Canal Zone for the level of work performed. Why not apply this same yardstick to non-U.S. workers who make their living alongside U.S. citizens working with U.S. tools, on U.S. equipment, under U.S. standards of adequacy. Can it be that they are prescribed a substandard wage based on nonexistent data merely to save money for the U.S. Treasury, or purposely to emphasize the disparity in pay practices between the United States and a less developed Latin American country like Panama?

Adaptability and resourcefulness are qualities which employing agencies have no difficulty finding among Panamanian workers who are intelligent and capable enough to respond to incentive stimuli. In June last year Vice President G. G. Werner in charge of construction for Merrit-Chapman & Scott, Inc., of New York, publicly attested to this fact. On the Panama Canal widening job at Contractors Hill he stated that Panamanian heavy equipment operators were trained and used on all types of trucks and bulldozers, and all types of shovels except the largest for which special topflight North American operators were recruited. The job of moving some 5½ million cubic yards of rock, earth and muck in the canal widening program was carried out by a force of 94 percent local employees. They were paid a $1 an hour minimum under the U.S. Fair Labor Standards act and their performance proved the stimulation that the higher-than-average wages produced.

Despite national holiday celebrations, frontier disorders, rigid border controls and transportation difficulties after that sombre November 3, the Canal Zone Administration publicly acknowledged the fact that absenteeism and tardiness among its non-U.S. workers were down to a minimum.

On the basis of the performances reported by the Merrit-Chapman & Scott Co. and the high sense of responsibility of non-U.S. citizens on their respective jobs as acknowledged by the Canal Administration, should not the U.S. employing agencies in the Canal Zone put into action Operation Fairplay without further equivocation? It is to be admitted that Operation Friendship represents obviously a meaningless slogan except it is to be supported by the specific improved labor practices of Operation Fairplay.

In order to help repair the prestige of the United States in Latin America the Eisenhower administration proposed a Latin American aid program calculated to bring to the masses of this hemisphere a greater share of the good things of life which 20th-century technology has brought within reach of the common man. President Kennedy has already recommended that the U.S. Congress appropriate $500 million under this proposed aid plan. It is only reasonable to suggest that a portion of this $500 million proposal might well be added to the budget for administration of the Canal Zone agencies, for the purpose of paying a fair and equitable wage to the hard-working, deserving non-U.S. employees of Uncle Sam, and thus bring to them also a greater share of the good things of life.

The Honorable L. SULLIVAN, chairman of the Subcommittee on the Panama Canal of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, observed sometime ago that "we [the United States] will never succeed in having really solid relationships with the people of Panama until they, too, are able generally to live on a decent standard."

The Panamanian workers like to think that in the United States there will be less and less reluctance to move forward to provide them with equal opportunity and fair treatment on the Canal Zone. The peoples of Panama expect the Government in Washing to fulfill the promise inherent in the Declaration of Independence as to equal opportunity and treatment for all peoples. According to an American President this concept makes the American social experiment the most rewarding in world history. It is this concept, then, which should bring to Panama the material and spiritual rewards it has the right to expect from its associate in this successful canal enterprise.

The Secretary of the Army should instruct the technicians of the Army Air Force Wage Board in the Pentagon to come up with a more equitable wage scale than that based on the cost of living concept in Panama City where recruiting is being done. This would insure abolishing the discriminatory and unjust cutoff point of M–10 and NM–3, thereby establishing a basic rate of pay for non-U.S. workers on the Canal Zone that would echo Operation Fairplay through the Americas.

And finally, such a plan would defeat those whose essential purpose is to create ill will and to frustrate all efforts of the Governments of the United States and Panama to reach a mutual understanding. It will project new ways of building real friend-

ship among the peoples of these two American States based on mutual respect and confidence.

In this changing international context, answers that were found more than 50 years ago to the Panama Canal problem were bound to become obsolete and the problem itself was bound to reemerge in a new shape. In the reappraisal which President Kennedy's administration contemplates of United States-Latin American affairs, a long-range readjustment plan with Panama must be given top priority.

This, my dear friends of the graduate law faculty and students of Yale, we should like to see done in the lofty and just traditions of William Howard Taft, Elihu Root, and other Yale luminaries who have envisaged United States-Panama relationship as a cornerstone of continental solidarity and international friendship.

George Washington Memorial Parkway to Fort Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement and a letter written by Van Arsdale Turner, dealing with a problem of concern to the Interior Department in connection with a parkway to Fort Washington.

There being no objection, the letter and the statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C., *May 9, 1961.*

To the Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee:

I have taken the liberty of casting my statement on the question of the parkway to Fort Washington in the form of a public letter addressed to those intrepid hikers along the C. & O. Canal—the Douglases, Justice William O., of the Supreme Court, and Senator Paul H., of the U.S. Senate; as also to Secretary Stewart L. Udall, of the Department of the Interior, with a nod to some 178 members of their gallant crew.

I crave your indulgence for this somewhat unusual form the statement has taken, and I request your permission to submit it for inclusion in the record of this hearing.

A PUBLIC LETTER ADDRESSED TO THOSE INTREPID HIKERS, THE DOUGLASES: JUSTICE WILLIAM O., OF THE SUPREME COURT, AND SENATOR PAUL H., OF THE U.S. SENATE; AS ALSO TO SECRETARY STEWART L. UDALL, OF THE DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR, WITH A NOD TO SOME 178 MEMBERS OF THEIR GALLANT CREW

HONORED SIRS: It distressed me that Saturday proved so miserable for hiking and the local tavern so unsatisfactory for dining. Frankly, though, I restrained my sympathy because you gentlemen always hike along the narrow reaches of the river, and it gets a bit monotonous reading about it every year. Can it be that along with thousands of other Washingtonians you believe the Potomac ends at Hains Point, and that all below it is "Ausland"? Actually, the Potomac, for all practical purposes, starts at that point and immediately becomes a broad beautiful, majestic worthwhile river; the kind of river that doesn't need the help of a canal to afford pleasure but starts immediately affording it to hundreds of enthusiastic boaters for every single one of you enthusiastic hikers, and to hundreds of thousands of tourists who, delighted with their trip to Mount Vernon, will return again and again, but who will never see or care a hoot about a place called Seneca, in the State of Maryland. This is the kind of river that has breadth and depth and strength. It doesn't trip over rocks or fall off ledges. It goes steadily on its way to join the sea, and it carries big ships, and also the mind, to all the ports and harbors of the world.

I'd like to show this river to you. The sun usually shines down here and we'll be glad to feed you, or you can bring your lunch in a paper bag if you prefer.

Of course you can hike along the banks of this part too, if you choose, and its beauties and historic interest will reward you richly. You will see the great cannon, largest of the Civil War, lying unmounted at Fort Foote, and the moated bastions and portcullis at Fort Washington where the schoolboy studying his medieval history can get a real idea of what a fortress or castle of the Middle Ages really looked like. This fort, planned and worked on for many years by Pierre L'Enfant, is unique in our entire country. You will see old Notley Hall where lived the man who owned the land whereon the Capitol and Supreme Court and Union Station now stand. He went broke in the tobacco trade as early as 1719, owing the firm of John Hyde in London the sum of 2,325 pounds, 6 shillings, 4 pence, and in order to meet his obligation he held a lottery and disposed of 5,950 acres of land along the Potomac and Anacostia. You will see Harmony Hall, a stately, well-preserved colonial mansion with far the best view of any house in the Washington area which, through the graciousness of its owners could become a precious national asset provided it is linked to the river and the city by a protective parkway.

You will see wild beauty in many spots, but you will also see where the big trees stood, the ones that held the nests of bald-headed eagles until quite recently when the developers moved in. You won't see any eagles now, but there's still beauty; dogwood and laurel and azaleas and sweet-smelling tulip poplars; and the hiking is still good along our river—as good as along the canal—but different. It's more open and spacious so a man can breathe better.

But if you wish to hike it you will have to hurry. Come quick quickly while it's still spring, for the beauties of this area are doomed. The despoilers are poised to move in. The saws are sharpened, the bulldozers are gassed up. All are only awaiting the word that the plan for a parkway has been given the conge. Down will go the trees; the green braes will give way to brown eroded slopes which shortly will be covered with high-rise apartments; row on row close along the river bank, like Riverside Drive without the drive. The Potomac will then be a drab and lopsided eyesore, parkway protected on one side, a brick wall on the other.

Things will be different. The President, ashamed to show this ugliness to distinguished guests, will berth the *Honey Fitz* at Annapolis; the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission can then proceed to build its disposal plant opposite Mount Vernon as planned, and in general the sewage problem can be easily and cheaply solved—by dumping it all in the river.

And why will these things happen? Because a man named KIRWAN, for his own ends, has decreed it, and because you gentlemen and the many like you in powerful places have never raised your voices in ringing demands that this wide, majestic, beautiful river, beloved by Washington and Wilson and F.D.R. and Truman and Kennedy and millions of ordinary Americans such as I, shall have the protection due it under Capper-Cramton and which now for 30 years has been denied it.

The time is late. Even now the matter is before the subcommittee. Speak out, please, and speak now.

But if you do not choose to speak, and if you are satisfied just to hike along the parched little canal instead of beside a real he-man river, and if again you get caught in the rain and are turned away from the inn; well I'll wager you'll get little sympathy from those of us who like width and depth and plenty of water in our river when we hike along the bank, and who are insisting that the beauties of those beloved banks of our superb Potomac be preserved for the enjoyment of all the people of these United States; to whom by right of heritage this Washington-Mount Vernon range of river, properly, and in perpetuity, belongs.

Respectfully yours,

VAN ARSDALE TURNER.

United States Loses Again at the Conference Table

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, perhaps someday, when we have suffered enough defeats, America will learn the bitter lesson that we cannot negotiate with the Communists. There is nothing in the Communist code which enables them to negotiate in good faith, or to honor any commitments. The following account of the Geneva meeting on Laos, as reported in U.S. News & World Report, is another example of how we have been had:

GENEVA: ONE MORE SETBACK FOR UNITED STATES

GENEVA.—A diplomatic defeat for the United States now is shaping up here at the 14-nation conference on Laos in the wake of a political and military defeat in southeast Asia.

That is the conclusion of Western diplomats here after 10 days of behind-the-scenes maneuvers, open meetings, multiple daily news conferences and widespread disarray in the Western camp. As conference participants see it:

Russia's Foreign Minister, Andrei Gromyko, has laid down the Kremlin's terms for a settlement. And the United States is finding itself under concerted pressure from all sides—from Asian neutrals and its own European allies—to yield on point after point.

"We are isolated," said one top American diplomat. "An attitude of appeasement dominates our British and French allies. It has taken me from 1938 to 1961 to really understand the spirit of Munich were Adolf Hitler was appeased."

Behind this bitter remark lies an American policy that failed and now is being liquidated. In Laos, the United States tried to build an anti-Communist bulwark in a tiny, neutral kingdom on Red China's border in the strategic heart of southeast Asia.

BUILDING ON QUICKSAND

This policy, it now turns out, was built on quicksand. It has been opposed from its start in 1957–58 by the British, the French, and by neutralists in Laos and in the rest

of Asia. Chief instrument of this policy was to have been the Royal Laotian Army of 25,000, built at a cost of a quarter billion dollars to the United States. That army, however, has shown little stomach for resisting a Communist guerrilla offensive, supported since last December by a Soviet airlift.

The United States now is offering to withdraw from Laos in return for withdrawal there by Russia and Communist North Vietnam.

Neutralization of Laos between East and West is sought to keep the kingdom out of Communist hands. But hopes of avoiding a Communist takeover are beginning to look slimmer and slimmer.

The developing civil war in Laos found the United States unwilling to commit American troops to a jungle conflict that could turn into another Korea. As a result, American diplomats in Geneva are finding that they have little bargaining power at the conference table. They have lost the ultimate bargaining weapon—the ability to walk away and resume a war.

Russia's Gromyko, on the other hand, was threatening to walk out on the conference before it began and before he had been in Geneva 72 hours. He has been getting things pretty much his own way ever since.

UNITED STATES: BACK TO WALL

What the United States is up against here can be seen from the fact that it can count on total support only from two nations at the conference table—South Vietnam and Thailand. Britain, France, and Canada, as well as neutral India, Burma, and Cambodia, refused to go along with essential elements of U.S. strategy. With four Communist delegations to combat—Russia, Poland, Red China, and North Vietnam—U.S. diplomats feel that their backs are against the wall.

Diplomats admit freely that there is no joint Western strategy for the conference. Months of U.S. talks with the British and French have failed to produce one. On issue after issue, the United States finds its own allies critical of its proposals.

On the surface, the United States seems to be the main negotiator with the Russians. But, in reality, negotiations already have begun to take place over the heads of the American representatives. The British and French, as well as the Indians, have started to work out their own compromises with the Russians. United States is finding that it has little alternative to accepting what others decide.

One British-Russian compromise already has given Gromyko his way in seating the Lao Communists and neutralists as equals of the Royal Lao Government at the conference table.

Future makeup of the coalition government in Laos, it is admitted here, will be prejudiced by this decision on whom to seat. The Royal Lao Government so far has refused to attend the conference as a result. But the United States was forced to agree or be blamed for breaking up the conference before it began.

FROM CANADA: A SURPRISE

Canada is surprising many delegates by taking a neutral attitude both in Geneva and on the three-power International Control Commission in Laos and Vietnam. In Geneva, Canadian delegates have refused even to visit the U.S. headquarters.

In Laos and Vietnam, Canada sits on the control commission with neutral India and Communist Poland. But Canadian representatives refuse to consider themselves spokesmen for the Western viewpoint. As a result, U.S. efforts to get an effective cease-fire in Laos are being weakened.

Commission members recently were barred from Hanoi Airport, the chief staging base in Communist North Vietnam for the Soviet airlift into Laos. But the Canadians refused to protest publicly. Nor would they issue a statement criticizing Soviet intervention.

"How do we know that the Soviet planes flying overhead are carrying arms to Laos?" asked one Canadian delegate here.

Commented a U.S. diplomat angrily: "Instead of one westerner, one Communist, and one neutral, we are confronted with a control commission of two neutrals and a Communist."

The Geneva conference, in fact, began so badly from the U.S. viewpoint that top American officials issued warnings that the United States might refuse to sign whatever agreements were reached by the other delegations. This could be little more than a moral protest, but it would also leave the United States more freedom of action elsewhere in southeast Asia. A sharp turn to neutralism in Thailand is feared if the United States does participate in a deal that delivers all Laos to the Communists.

BACKGROUND OF TALKS

The situation in Geneva reflects the balance of power inside Laos itself.

A coup d'etat in Vientiane, capital of Laos, by a single paratroop battalion of the royal army last year split the non-Communist elements of the country into neutralist and U.S.-supported groups. Driven out of Vientiane by a royal army offensive, the neutralists joined forces with the Communists.

Political confusion opened the way for a Communist military offensive. The Communist-led battalions of the Pathet Lao now control about half of the country. Bulwarked by 3,000 North Vietnamese technicians and Communist political commissars as well as by Communist arms, the Pathet Lao forces now dominate the heights above the six major cities of the kingdom along the Mekong River valley border with Thailand.

If a cease-fire should break down, it is doubted that the Royal Lao Army could hold the rest of the country more than a few days or weeks without substantial help from U.S. forces.

Out of this situation stems the basic dispute over Western strategy which divides the United States from its allies.

WHAT UNITED STATES HOPED

The United States came to Geneva in the hope that a cease-fire could be frozen long enough to make the partition of Laos, thus accomplished in fact, an alternative in the event that the conference could not agree on a united but truly neutral Laos. The longer the cease-fire continued, U.S. officials argued, the more difficult it would be for Russia to defy neutral opinion by urging the Communists to take all of Laos.

At the outset of the conference, however, the French and the British rejected the idea of partition of Laos even as a bargaining instrument to get a united but neutral Laos. They believe that such a partition could be made to stick only by the intervention of U.S. troops with the risk of intervention by Red Chinese forces and a Korean-type—if not a nuclear—war.

U.S. Allies in Europe thus are pressing for a neutral Government for all of Laos and are even urging the United States to accept as the head of such a Government a man who has Soviet support too—the neutralist ex-Premier, Prince Souvanna Phouma, now cooperating with the Communists.

It was Souvanna Phouma who was ousted from office last year by the U.S.-supported Royal Laotian Army. U.S. officials believe him to be bitterly anti-American and ardently pro-Communist.

Large-scale U.S. aid to bulwark a neutral Laos, if Souvanna Phouma headed the Government, would be difficult since the ex-Premier has already made a deal for aid from Russia and Red China.

In spite of all these considerations, however, the United States is being forced to withdraw its objections to a Souvanna Phouma government. Pressure on the United States is coming not just from Communists, but from U.S. Allies.

The fact is that Britain and France have virtually written off Laos as not worth the risk of war required to keep it out of Communists hands. And there is growing pessimism here in Geneva about the fate of all of southeast Asia, a growing bitterness among U.S. officials who feel that, in a pinch, the United States can no longer count on its major Allies.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Authorizing Appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration

SPEECH
OF
HON. DAVID S. KING
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6874) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research, and development, construction of facilities, and for other purposes.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Chairman, as I urge my colleagues to enact this authorization, I want to stress that I am not satisfied that the program goes far enough.

As I have said many times in committee, I am not satisfied that the program projected by this legislation will actually keep us in the space race.

True, this bill has gone beyond the President's original requests and stepped up the program in several areas. Yet, if the American people are truly serious in their hope and desire to overtake the Russians and recapture the lead in space exploration, or if they simply expect the American effort to fall no further behind the Soviet program, our program should go still further than this legislation takes it.

It is generally understood that the President will present new requests on the space program to the Congress tomorrow, and these requests have been scaled upward by more than $500 million.

Soon after this Congress convened, I became firmly convinced that the current program and the program as projected in the original NASA requests for fiscal 1962 offered no hope of overtaking the Russians, and very probably would let this country slip even further behind in the space race.

I saw then, too, that the current program almost totally neglected the one best hope of making early gains in the space race. That hope was research and development of solid-fuel boosters, for which NASA requested only $3.1 million.

I wrote the President to plead for an expanded space effort that gave greater emphasis to solid-fuel propulsion, which had been successfully demonstrated in the Minuteman tests and in other solid-fuel military missiles. That letter follows:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The American people are being misled by official talk about the space race. They have the feeling this country is in a race with the Russians to reach the moon. The race is a fiction—because we are not in it.

Given all the facts, our people would, I believe, strongly desire that we match or out-distance the Russians in space. The prospect that the Russians will dominate space and control the moon represents the greatest potential threat to sovereignty which this country has ever faced.

Our people, however, are not looking at all of the facts. We have fired dozens of space probes with the obvious hope that our numerical showing would partially offset the impact on global opinion of the spectacular Russian achievements. But it has also given our people a sense of false security, the feeling that this country is keeping pace. We are not now keeping pace.

I strongly and respectfully urge that you ask the Budget Director to compile immediately budget estimates on space exploration which will actually put this country in the race and keep it there.

You have already made some impressive strides in streamlining the Federal program. The costs of a realistic, accelerated space program could very well be covered by economies in the total defense picture. The 43-plus billion dollars we are spending annually for current security will not ensure long-range security, unless our basic space effort thwarts the threat of space dominance by the Communist foe.

Armed with realistic budget estimates, you would be wise, I feel, to take the case to the people. This could be the most historic move of your administration.

Sincerely,

DAVID S. KING,
Member of Congress.

I was grateful to be granted a personal conference on my request by the NASA Administrator, James E. Webb. The President manifested his own interest and concern through participation in the aforesaid conference by Director of the Budget David Elliot Bell and the President's scientific adviser, Dr. Jerome Weisner.

I also stressed the need for the increased effort in solid fuels in personal conferences with Secretary of the Air Force Eugene M. Zuckert, Secretary of Navy John B. Connally, and the Director of NASA's launch vehicle program, Maj. Gen. Don R. Ostrander.

To stress my concern to the Congress, I introduced a bill to increase the authorization for research and development of solid-fuel boosters to $30 million.

As the committee was marking up the authorization bill, I formally offered an amendment to increase the item for solid fuels to $50 million. In the action that followed, the committee agreed to increase the item by $15 million.

Although a step in the right direction, the $15 million increase is not an adequate figure. I remain convinced that my $50 million request is realistic.

I am confident that my position will be more than vindicated by the President's message tomorrow. I believe he will stress an accelerated effort on solid fuels, and I look forward to his message with great anticipation.

The Castro Blackmail Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 26, 1961

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the May 23, 1961, issue of the Augusta Chronicle, Augusta, Ga., contains an excellent editorial which expresses exactly my feelings and those of many persons who have written me about the Castro blackmail proposal. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIMES HAVE CHANGED

On May 18, 1904, Ion Perdicaris, presumably a naturalized American citizen, was kidnaped and held for ransom by a Moroccan tribal chief named Raisuli.

All efforts to gain his release having failed, President Theodore Roosevelt sent a squadron of U.S. naval warships to Tangier, and on June 22, 1904, cabled the following message to the U.S. consul there for relay to Moroccan officials:

"Perdicaris alive or Raisuli dead."

In due time Perdicaris had been returned safe and sound.

But time has changed, and today American citizens, not even naturalized, but native-born citizens, are held in Communist prisons around the world, languishing there because this Government no longer has the will, nor does it command the respect, necessary to effect their release.

Now, however, we are offered a way to bring about the freedom of captives without subjecting ourselves to the possibility of physical exertion, inconvenience, or hurt. So, even though there are no American citizens involved—or, at least, we do not think there are—we are moving heaven and earth to collect funds with which to pay off some $15 to $20 million in blackmail which Fidel Castro is demanding. It is not for the lives of Americans, but for Castro's own subjects.

Certainly it is impossible to measure the value of a human life in dollars and cents. Not for a moment would we even suggest that each "invader" Castro is willing to release is not "worth" far more than the cost of a tractor or bulldozer, which he demands in exchange.

But when folks like Eleanor Roosevelt, Walter Reuther, Milton Eisenhower, and William Pawley and others permit their love of humanity to becloud their judgment—as they so frequently do and as they have in this instance—they are encouraging blackmail on an international scale. They are taking the exact opposite position from that of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or any other competent law enforcement body, which advises individuals never to meet demands of extortionists.

Insofar as Castro's demand for 500 tractors or bulldozers is concerned, we have a case, wherein, on the one hand, the U.S. Government has placed an embargo on shipments

to Cuba so as to cripple Castro's economy, on the other, citizens of the United States are now busy trying to frustrate that embargo by supplying machinery the bearded leader so badly needs.

A few years ago it would have been considered completely incredible that tiny Cuba could ever be in a position to thumb its nose at the powerful United States of America.

But then, a relatively few years ago the United States would not have permitted its citizens to meet the blackmail demands of a foreign government, much less encourage it by permitting an embargo, once ordered, to be lifted by the State Department so that the ransom, if collected, might be paid.

Instead, we like to think that a relatively few years ago Washington might have sent a message to this effect:

"Invaders alive or Castro dead."

True, the invaders are not American citizens. Nonetheless, we encouraged them to seek the overthrow of Castro, so there should be a principle involved.

But today is not a relatively few years ago and principle, like national character, seems to have gone with the wind.

Remarks by Secretary of the Navy John B. Connally at Dedication of Long Beach Naval Landing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, in the fine tradition of its helpfulness to and regard for the personnel of the U.S. Navy, the city of Long Beach, Calif., has invested over $1 million to build what undoubtedly is the finest naval landing anywhere in the world. Not only does it incorporate merely small boat docks, but as well many facilities of service to naval personnel and their families: Waiting rooms, shops, restaurants, locker facilities, and the like.

On May 18 the landing was dedicated and the city was honored by the presence of the Secretary of the Navy who made the following pertinent remarks as speaker of the day:

SPEECH BY THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY ON OCCASION OF THE DEDICATION OF THE NAVY LANDING, LONG BEACH, CALIF., MAY 18, 1961

Mayor Wade, honored guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is indeed a pleasure to have the opportunity to come to Long Beach to participate in the dedication of this magnificent new Navy landing. I greatly appreciate the invitation extended to me by Mayor Wade to visit your beautiful city with its wonderful climate and friendly people. Your people and naval personnel have shared an extremely cordial and valuable association over the years. This friendship has its roots in the early days of California history when brave men sailed ships around the Horn on the hazardous journey to the Pacific coast.

Long Beach and its surrounding areas have been home for many years to the officers and men of the fleet and their families. Almost inevitably, Long Beach becomes a part of most sailors. It holds pleasant memories for all who have had the privilege of making this friendly city a port of call.

Prior to World War II, the Pacific Fleet had a major anchorage here and needed adjacent shore space for fleet support activities. In order to establish the local naval base, it was necessary to acquire from the city a certain area of land which was to be part of the base. The city of Long Beach generously offered approximately 103 acres to the Navy Department for a sum of $1. Since the day the Navy gratefully accepted this parcel of land, it has been improved and extended.

The growth of the Navy in Long Beach has been tremendous as is indicated by the number of ships home-ported here. In 1950 there were only 23 Navy ships based in Long Beach. Today we have well over 100.

To properly accommodate the increase in Long Beach home-ported ships, additional pier space was needed for large ships. The city of Long Beach came through again and provided berthing space at pier E at a very reasonable rate. Additionally, the Long Beach Harbor Department, undertook the development of the west side of pier E to provide three berths for lease to the Navy. It is anticipated that these berths will be available in July of this year. These efforts on the part of Long Beach are greatly appreciated by the Navy.

In addition to berthing and other facilities needed for our increased number of ships of the fleet, an improved small boat landing area and a more conveniently located YMCA were needed to better accommodate personnel from these ships. The city fathers and Long Beach's Navy-minded citizens were again equal to the challenge and constructed this fine new Navy landing, the dedication of which we are celebrating today, and the adjacent new armed services YMCA. The good people of Long Beach voted overwhelmingly in support of this project which insured its becoming a reality.

It is gratifying to know that the people of Long Beach recognize the job the Navy is doing in the defense of our country and have shown their appreciation in such a generous manner. I know that you who are close friends and a part of the Navy family share with me the certain belief that our Navy today is strong and competent. It is sound and true and sails the seas with confidence and pride. It has absorbed enormous changes and will continue to adapt itself to the times. Today as in the past and for many years to come—the naval life will not be an easy one. It will not be a life of security or convenience. Naval personnel lead a life of constant adjustment, constant challenge and constant stimulus in new tasks, new responsibilities and new opportunities. Our military personnel—and each of us—must be ever vigilant and ready to defend the principles of human freedom. We never know where trouble will raise its ugly head. Therefore, it is essential that we have the forces capable to move at a moment's notice to meet trouble and counter aggression wherever they may arise.

The armed services of the United States stand today strong and ready against any aggressor. The external pressures being exerted on free men everywhere, to limit or encroach upon their freedom, is the concern of all of us. Every citizen in the United States is involved in the struggle for freedom—and we are not alone. For freedom concerns all our friends and allies with whom we have treaty agreements, as well as the uncommitted peoples of the world who cherish freedom.

The deployed fleets of the Navy, together with their embarked ready marine landing forces, are one of the Nation's most evident, effective, and immediate means of dealing with threats against freedom-loving people throughout the world. The primary purpose of naval forces is to be ready to fight. However, they are also effective and useful in furthering American interests abroad in positive and peaceful ways. The mere presence of powerful naval forces in an area is often enough to maintain tranquility. In their day-to-day operations, our deployed fleets are constantly on the move, calling at various ports throughout their area of responsibility—visiting the ports of many different countries and helping to create better understanding between Americans and the people of other nations.

Naval power is silent power, restrained and controlled. It is friendly but strong, pleasant but firm. It is a reminder to our friends that we are near at hand, and ready to help them. It is a warning to would-be aggressors, quiet but effective. In order to handle its commitments throughout the world, the Navy keeps much of its fleet deployed. Often our men come home for only a few months before they deploy again. Understanding this, you good people of Long Beach have done an outstanding job in providing for the needs of the sailor when he is here at home. It is much easier for a man to undergo the hardship of separation from his loved ones when he realizes that his sacrifices are appreciated.

The Navy greatly appreciates its civilian support and tries to reciprocate whenever possible. Many of you here remember the Navy's assistance during the 1933 earthquake. Navy men from Long Beach have provided assistance in fighting forest fires. The local naval base has a trained emergency force to assist the local populace in time of disaster. During the tidal swells last May, 10 auxiliary craft from the local naval base and 6 minesweepers from the Pacific Fleet Mine Force assisted in rounding up drifting boats and wreckage. One of the most colorful pages in the history of the U.S. Navy is its record of immediate and effective aid to people in distress.

In recognition of what Long Beach has meant to the Navy, the world's first atomic powered guided missile cruiser has been named after this great city. The U.S.S. *Long Beach* will command attention wherever she goes. She will be news to the reading public throughout the world. The city of Long Beach will be well represented by one of the most versatile and powerful ships of all time. Long Beach, the international city, will be internationally represented by the formidable ship which bears her name.

Long Beach has allowed the Navy to use this landing and all the wonderful facilities you see here today for the leased rate of $1 per year. The landing itself, protected by a still water basin, provides an all-weather haven for ships' boats bringing in sailors from the fleet. This is indeed a modern landing for a modern navy. I don't believe you will find a more pleasant or beautiful sight greeting Navy men when they first come ashore anywhere in the world.

The friendliness of Long Beach extends out to the fleet through the arms that shelter the landing and beckon the sailor home.

In closing may I again express my appreciation for having the opportunity to come to Long Beach to participate in this memorable occasion. I would like to invite all of you to visit your Navy this weekend during Armed Forces Day open house. The local naval base and many ships are open for your personal inspection. The Navy wants you to see how it operates for yourself. Naval personnel are just as anxious to meet you and tell you about your Navy as you are to learn more about it.

Causes of Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 26, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask consent that Drew Pearson's column of today, which took the form of a let-

ter to his grandsons, relating a meeting which he had with President Kennedy to invite him to the Big Brothers dinner on June 7 in honor of a pioneer of Big Brothers, Ed Foley, be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD. Also attending this meeting with the President was one of Minnesota's illustrious sons, district judge and former Governor of Minnesota, Luther Youngdahl. Judge Youngdahl's humanitarian spirit is illustrated in this touching letter.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washintgon Post, May 26, 1961]

YOUNGDAHL TELLS CAUSES OF CRIME

(By Drew Pearson)

(Drew Pearson's column today takes the form of a letter on juvenile delinquency to his three eldest grandsons, Drew, George Jr., and Joseph Patterson Arnold.)

DEAR BOYS: Yesterday I wrote you about calling on President Kennedy. I forgot to tell you that as we started into his office, I got lost and strayed into his secretaries' office by mistake. He was standing at his desk when we finally entered, and after shaking hands we sat on two sofas on each side of the fireplace, while he sat in his rocking chair in between.

I opened the conversation by saying: "Mr. President, I've just finished writing a story about you—that you prefer peanut butter sandwiches at your desk to official dinners.

"Despite that," I said, "we want to invite you to a dinner."

The President smiled and said that it was true that when presidents and prime ministers came to see him he gave a dinner for them, then they in turn gave a dinner for him, and it meant quite an array of dinners.

I explained that our Big Brothers dinner was in honor of Ed Foley, a pioneer of Big Brothers, who had done such a good job as chairman of Inauguration Week, and was also for the purpose of emphasizing the preventing of juvenile delinquency in the District of Columbia.

"The judges have been holding our feet to the fire urging us to do something about juvenile delinquency before it gets started," I explained. "We haven't done enough, but we've been trying. Judge Youngdahl told us this morning how he had been up until midnight reading seven presentencing reports regarding criminals he has to sentence when he leaves here this morning. I think it would be interesting for him to tell you about it."

A SAD JUDGE

Judge Luther Youngdahl was a fine Governor of Minnesota who came to Washington to be an equally fine judge. He told the President how sad it was as a judge to have to send men to jail, especially men who never had a chance when they were boys.

Before he sends a man to jail, the judge explained, he gets a report on the man's entire life—whether he went to school, whether he had a mother or father, whether he has been in jail before. He takes all this into consideration before he decides how long a prison term he should give this man.

"It tears your heart out," Judge Youngdahl told the President, "to read these presentencing reports and see these fellows who never had a chance. And there's almost nothing I can do about it as a judge. It has to be done by others before it gets to me.

"These seven cases I read last night were all about the same—broken homes, no parents, illegitimacy, no education, no chance in life. If they had been helped early in life, none of these men would have landed in jail. Now they're repeaters and hopeless. They'll be in and out of jail the rest of their lives.

"It makes you sick when you come up against this hopelessness," Judge Youngdahl told the President.

"It makes my blood boil when they accuse the Negro population of running up the crime rate," the judge continued. "Of course, it's true that 53 percent of the District's population is Negro and a much larger percentage of the criminals are Negroes. But when they haven't been to school, have no mother or father, what can you expect? We have the highest rate of illegitimacy in Washington of any city in the United States."

MR. KENNEDY LISTENS

Judge Youngdahl spoke so eloquently that it didn't leave much for Judge David Bazelon of the U.S. Court of Appeals to say, though he is an expert on the causes of crime. He is also a director of Big Brothers, as are former Commissioner F. Joseph Donohue and Arthur Clarendon Smith and your grandfather, all of whom called on the President.

President Kennedy then asked some questions. As I wrote you yesterday, he listens carefully and asks very pointed, intelligent questions. We explained that Big Brothers is a national organization which helps boys by having one man serve as big brother and adviser to a boy who has no father or who needs guidance.

Our chief problem, we had to confess, is in getting men willing to devote their time to serving as Big Brothers. We have a waiting list of little brothers wanting companionship and guidance, but people are so busy here in the Nation's Capital—or think they are—that we are short of Big Brothers.

President Kennedy was very sympathetic. He knows a lot about this problem of helping boys keep out of trouble, and his brother, who is Attorney General, is trying to do something about it. Getting more Big Brothers to help boys might be one of the things which people could do for their country instead of asking their country what it can do for them.

So, as I wrote you yesterday, the President accepted the invitation to the Edward H. Foley Dinner, and fixed the day at June 7.

Lots of love,

YOUR GRANDFATHER.

Out of Whose Pocket?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, as a postscript to our recent consideration of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1961, I include the following editorial from Better Roads, of May, 1961:

OUT OF WHOSE POCKET?

Whatever Congress finally comes up with as a financing plan for the interstate and other Federal-aid highway programs, it is abundantly clear that the men who enact our laws are loath to come to grips with the problem in an attempt to solve it once and for all. They are even reluctant to set forthright precedents for future Congresses to follow.

The finance measure that seems most likely to pass at this writing raises some fees that are the least likely to arouse the lobbying groups. To help overcome the deficit that these raises will leave, the measure provides the full 10-percent excise tax on trucks and buses for the highway trust fund, which now gets only half of it. The 1-cent gasoline tax, scheduled to expire June 30, will be continued. The anguished cries about its continuation will probably fall on deaf ears. People have become accustomed to that extra penny.

Congress is taking the easy way out by tapping the general fund for approximately $150 million a year by way of the excise tax. The money won't come from highway users specifically. It will be taken from all taxpayers. Schools and welfare programs may suffer, but maybe the Government can tax something else a bit more to make up the deficit. Perhaps the liquor tax could be raised (and can't you hear the howls on that one?). Or income-tax rates could be raised a little—just a little. Or a Federal sales tax could be established. Or Congress could slap af tax on diapers.

One thing is sure. Something will have to be done. If the U.S. Treasury tosses $150 million into the highway trust fund, it is going to have to get that additional money from somewhere. Wherever it comes from, its source will be pocket of the taxpayer, and he is in most instances a highway user. So what will hurt him most? The gasoline tax or a tax on some other commodity?

The problem is not that simple, of course. Raising taxes is difficult for any Congress. It is well-nigh impossible to find a way to gain additional revenue without seriously affecting any one section of an industry. But it would seem to make sense that the industry that does business on the public highways—whose trucks need the heavier bases and surfaces that are being designed and built—should pay its fair share of the cost of building them.

The Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives that devised this inadequate financing plan has listened attentively to the plaintive cry of the truckers: "We'll go broke if we have to pay any more taxes." And they have not missed the complaints from the teamsters' union about the monopolistic power of the railroads.

It seems incredible that perceptive men would take these anguished cries seriously. Truckers need highways in order to make money. The better the highways, the faster the haul time, the more hauls that can be made. Minutes and hours saved can mean money in the bank for a trucking company. And to save minutes and hours and wear and tear, they must have good highways.

There are times these days when we feel a little sorry for Congressmen. Lobbies present their cases in such stark terms of black and white that the unhappy lawmaker can scarce arrive at any unbiased understanding of the problem. He can't even get a clear answer from the people who elected him. For the farmers, gasoline dealers, automobile dealers, manufacturers, bankers, and so on all belong to organizations that will, at the drop of a hint, get their members to send telegrams and letters by the thousands to their representatives in Congress.

It sometimes seems that rampant and unenlightened self-interest has developed into a cult in the United States. Too many people too often blandly and smugly mouth yesterday's old cliches as answers for the problems of this vastly different and difficult age.

Nowhere is this self-interest so apparent as in testimony before congressional committees. And so, instead of trying to finance the highway program directly and adequately, Congress will, no doubt, timidly tap the general fund.

The doubletalk has been incredible. Here's just one example: The Empire Trust Letter, published by the Empire Trust Co., of New York, N.Y., pontificates:

"There are strong indications the 50 percent tax on gasoline has reached a point of diminishing returns. With this in mind America should seriously consider the potential consequences before nullifying the provisions of the 1959 Highway Act which allow the temporary fourth cent of the Fed-

eral gasoline tax to expire as scheduled on June 30.

"And, in light of the acknowledged benefits that accrue to the military and the economy generally from better roads, careful consideration should be given to providing an equitable level of general funds support for the highway program in the important years ahead."

Whatever the man said, he certainly used a lot of words. Just one question: Who supports the general fund?

Bewildering Assortment of Spending Schemes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 26, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Grab Bag," published in the Chicago Daily Tribune of today, May 26, 1961. The editorial relates to the state of the Union message delivered by President Kennedy yesterday.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GRAB BAG

President Kennedy represented his long speech to Congress yesterday as another installment of a continuing report on the state of the Union. More accurately, the address was a reflection of the state of Mr. Kennedy's mind, and, on the evidence of the speech, that is a mind as cluttered as an attic crammed full of oddments and remainders.

From amidst this junk Mr. Kennedy snatched up a bewildering assortment of spending schemes to stuff a legislative grab bag. These ranged from more foreign aid to putting a man on the moon; from more Voice of America propaganda to more nuclear fallout shelters; from reorganizing the Central Intelligence Agency to reorganizing the structure of Army divisions; from putting mobility into the Army Reserve to retraining workers who have lost their jobs through automation.

THE FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The price tag estimated for the lot is $1½ billion at once and billions more in the years to come. Costs of space projects, by Mr. Kennedy's account, would increase between $7 and $9 billion in the next 5 years, if Congress adopts his proposals, and this is but one item. Mr. Kennedy conceded that there was already a deficit in the budget for the coming fiscal year, and that that deficit was now increased by his proposals to an extent where the question was whether it could be held within manageable proportions.

So, though the extravagance of mind reflected in the program was matched by the extravagance of its fiscal implications, yet this did not deter Mr. Kennedy from talking about fiscal integrity, prudent fiscal standards, and the necessity of maintaining confidence in the dollar. Nor did it deter him from cautioning Congress, after the new strains he himself sought to impose upon the fiscal structure, to refrain from adding funds to existing programs.

Mr. Kennedy said he was not requesting additional taxes, but he did call for closing tax loopholes he had already cited. Among these would be withdrawing the credit on stock dividends now allowed and subjecting such dividends to withholding. Mr. Kennedy was able to reconcile these methods of discouraging investment with a call for increases in investment to stimualte the economic growth which he fancied would produce additional revenue to finance his extravagance without new tax increases—at least, for the moment.

While arguing that his spending package would give priority to our most urgent national needs, his message disclosed an utter lack of interest in priorities. All the new spending would be pyramided on top of the existing crazy structure of farm subsidies, wasted foreign aid, welfare state devices, and the rest, which already account for spending next year of $85 billion or more. Nothing was to be cut or eliminated; the new ideas, with their attendant costs, would be superimposed on the old.

With this philosophy, we may soon find the Nation is receivership.

THE SUPPOSED OBJECTIVES

Mr. Kennedy represented almost everything he proposed to undertake as a necessary part of the process of defending freedom from the voracity of communism. Thus we must pump more aid into the backward nations, and we should do so regardless of which political or economic route they choose to freedom. If that means anything, it means they are free to choose socialism or communism at the expense of the American taxpayer, and Castro is just as eligible for handouts as Tito or Gomulka or Mr. Toure of Guinea.

Thus, also, we must place a man on the moon and bring him back before the decade is out, for this will impress those people who are on the sidelines and who have not been brought to love us by $90 billion in foreign aid to date.

Thus, again, we must reequip the Army for conventional war, warm the cockles of the Pentagon's heart by readying 10 divisions of the Reserve so that they can leap into action within 8 weeks, and jump the Marine Corps to 190,000 men.

But, because all of these measures may fail, we must build a great system of civil defense shelters to put the population underground, so that the Kennedy provisions take us from the extreme of an American shot to the moon to the opposite range where everybody is burrowing in the bowels of the earth.

THE SALES PITCH

Mr. Kennedy sought to sell all this and much more to the citizens by laving them with flattery. The people, said he, are our greatest asset. Well, we should say, at the very least, that they are indispensable to Mr. Kennedy's hopes and purposes, for, without them, he wouldn't have a tax dime to turn around on.

So he credited them with a hearty response to his sacrificial appeal to meet the tax levels and close the tax loopholes I have requested, to refrain from piling up agricultural surpluses [what's that again?], to plump for Federal aid to education, to pay higher social security taxes, and to exercise self-restraint instead of pushing up wages or prices. Perhaps the people are so virtuous, but we have not heard of a single pressure group going out of business, and, while some lobbies have been clamoring for some of the bigger government Mr. Kennedy wants to dispense, we have heard no public outcry for his legislative prospectus.

THE REAL PURPOSE

We should say that most of Mr. Kennedy's new proposals are irrelevant to the problem of stopping Communist imperialism and subversion, which is the basic menace confronting this country. That can only be done when the Kennedy leadership is sufficiently tough and resilient to stop communism in its tracks at some point of conflict and challenge and to force it into retreat.

So far Mr. Kennedy's essays in this direction have been humiliating failures, as witness Cuba and Laos. His prestige abroad is diminished and his standing at home is uncertain. People are perplexed about what direction he proposes to take them. Spending seems to be the answer to everything. Its utility and effects are unconsidered.

Mr. Kennedy, on a record of failure, is shortly to go abroad to meet with President de Gaulle of France and with his adversary, Premier Khrushchev of the Soviet Union. In these circumstances, he needed a sympathetic claque before which he could make a forceful presentation to cover up his weaknesses. The Democratic majorities in both House and Senate assured him the reception, and he will go to the summit fortified by a demonstration that he is supported by party applause if not by the approval of world opinion.

One of the oldest maxims in statesmanship is that when the prince is in trouble, he can divert the populace by seeking out a war. When Prince Jack is in difficulty, he unfolds the prospect of rocketing a countryman to the moon. The effect is diversionary, and the intention of the whole speech may have been no more than that.

Conversations Between Two Cultures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of the Saturday Review—March 20—contains an editorial by the associate publisher, William D. Patterson, which, it seems to me, is food for thought. Certainly no stone should be left unturned that might strengthen our Latin American relations. The editorial follows:

CONVERSATIONS BETWEEN TWO CULTURES

(By William D. Patterson)

A harsh fact that Washington must face sooner rather than later is that this hemisphere houses two cultures that really do not understand each other: the Hispanic culture of Latin America and the essentially Anglo-Saxon culture of the United States. The $500 million Kennedy social-development fund for Latin America, although a major material force, is no answer to the urgent need for a spiritual and intellectual discourse among the Americas.

It is as difficult for the north and south within the hemisphere to meet as it is for Kipling's famous twain, the east and west, to mingle in the vast Pacific. It is as difficult, and as crucial. East, west, north, and south, we must talk with each other and listen.

The fiasco in Cuba and the relentless pressure of Castro and communism on our Latin neighbors demand some fresh communion of purpose among the Americas, not just more military or economic hardware.

What is needed is an agora, a public square in the classic Athenian mold, where leading citizens, teachers, and students from all corners of the hemisphere can gather and get to know each other in an environment free of all prejudice of class, creed, color, or culture.

This forum could best be realized by the establishment of a North-South Center at the University of Puerto Rico in San Juan, along the lines of the East-West Center now

taking shape at the University of Hawaii in Honolulu, the new meeting place of Asia and America (Saturday Review, Nov. 12, 1960).

Puerto Rico would be the ideal setting in this hemisphere for such an inter-American community of students and scholars. The island's culture is not only Hispanic in origin and contemporary tone, but is itself engaged in a ferment of social change more constructive than anything underway in Cuba or any other American republic.

Under the imaginative leadership of Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín, the bootstrap revolution of Puerto Rico has commanded respect throughout the Americas. It has been a fundamental social upheavel which through wise statesmanship has enjoyed a peaceful history and the friendly collaboration of the United States.

In Puerto Rico the yearnings of the peasants of Cuba, the aspirations of the hemisphere's intellectuals, the struggles of popular leaders of Latin America are all instinctively understood. At the same time there is no dark gulf of misunderstanding between the United States and Puerto Rico. The national cultures of north and south mingle easily in Puerto Rico in a creative partnership.

This could be the meeting place, the agora where an invaluable dialogue of two cultures could take place for the enrichment of the entire hemisphere.

To the North-South Center would come Latin American students taking courses in North American civilization, history, politics, economics, literature, sociology, or public health, while United States (and Canadian) students would take similar courses in the geography, and culture. The only two required subjects would be English for the Latin Americans and Spanish or Portuguese for the North Americans.

The ideal student from north or south would be one planning a career in the service of his country somewhere in the hemisphere. The Latin American student, especially, would be the potential leader, the educator, the public-service-oriented personality who will be exercising power somewhere in his country within the next decade.

In Puerto Rico the Hispanic and Yanqui cultures have already achieved a happy harmony. The vital intellectual and political atmosphere of the island, as well as its shining climate, friendly people, and diversified cultural and recreational resources, would provide an ideal setting for the center and its work. Modern industry, a changing agronomy and peasantry, a sense of historical purpose and cultural evolution are all there for the students from the Americas, north and south, to observe at first hand within the context and scale of reference of their own countries, cultures, and economies.

By living together in dormitories, studying and playing together through the facilities of the university and the center, an exciting, viable contribution could be made to the internal tranquility and progress of this hemisphere which neither Communist penetration nor outmoded Yanqui imperialism could ever aspire to.

Students from all the Americas chosen not politically but by the universities of the hemisphere—would forge a bond of learning and common goals that would eventually be a solvent for the rivalries, suspicions, and misunderstandings that now alienate the intellectual and political leaders of north and south from each other to the detriment of the entire free world, at a time when peace and trust are more urgent in our own American family of nations than ever before.

Perhaps the University of Puerto Rico, the administration of Governor Muñoz-Marín, the State Department in Washington, one of our great foundations or universities, or a responsive voice in one of the Americas to the south or Canada to the north could say this idea is worth exploring, that it holds sufficien promise for a better and saner life in this embattled hemisphere to deserve serious consideration.

Saturday Review hopes so, and hopes to hear some echo, to see some sign of support. We also intend to pursue this idea ourselves, for we believe it is just as important for the twain of north and south to meet as it is for east and west. The prize is not only survival but a world worth surviving in.

Birmingham News Asks Bus Riders Be Held in Check

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 26, 1961

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in a front page editorial on May 22, 1961, the Birmingham News made a very eloquent plea to Attorney General Robert Kennedy to take appropriate action to stop the racial agitators who provoked the recent violence in Alabama. This is very similar to a statement I made on the Senate floor on May 23, asking the Attorney General to get the agitators and marshals out of Alabama so the racial difficulties could be abated. Since that time the Attorney General has made a half-hearted suggestion to the agitators and other publicity seekers, but this suggestion has failed in part because of its half-hearted nature.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have this excellent editorial entitled "The Birmingham News Asks Bus Riders Be Held in Check" printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BIRMINGHAM NEWS ASKS BUS RIDERS BE HELD IN CHECK—A FRONT-PAGE EDITORIAL BIDS ROBERT KENNEDY TAKE ACTION TO STOP THOSE WHO PROVOKE VIOLENCE

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., May 22.—Following is the text of a front-page editorial that appeared in the Birmingham News today under the headline "Mr. Kennedy: Why Aren't King Riders Held in Check?"

"Mr. Robert Kennedy: The people of Alabama and the people of the South want to know why it isn't just as important to stop those who provoke violence as it is to stop those who commit violence. This, Mr. Kennedy, is a direct question. We are sure you will want to answer.

"Martin Luther King flew into Montgomery. For what, Mr. Kennedy? Are you pressing him for an answer? Why don't you put him under some control?

"The News understands that attempts were made to dissuade King from going to Montgomery. He refused to heed them.

"Instead, he came into a city on the knife's edge of tension and went through the heart of Montgomery in a motorcade which was described by one observer as 'just like the President coming to town.' If this was not intended to attract attention to him, to further increase tension, what was it?

"Once in Montgomery, King was the featured attraction at a Negro rally honoring the 'Freedom riders.' The rally itself was designed, inevitably, to cause more strife.

"Before it began, you, Mr. Kennedy, asked for a 'return to reason' in Alabama. You asked this State's citizens and travelers here to weigh their actions carefully and avoid doing anything which might make matters worse. King went on with his rally.

"Later, after the violence which he certainly expected and obviously wanted did indeed erupt and the National Guard was called out, King reportedly told the Negroes inside the church where the rally was being held that the lawmen would be coming into the church soon to harass and arrest the 'Freedom riders.'

"WORDS CALLED INFLAMMATORY

"The law was coming to harass. Mr. Kennedy, are these the words of a man attempting to restore calm? Are they the words of a man who is attempting to help restore order?

"The people of Alabama can believe that the Office of the President of the United States, and the Office of the Attorney General of the United States, have sought to show the agents of turmoil that their highly publicized freedom rides, their highly emotional mass meetings only serve to injure their cause, not improve it.

"The Federal courts have already ruled on segregation. The weight of the executive branch of the Federal Government already has been put behind the rulings of the courts.

"The people of Alabama, our people of goodwill, of good intent know that law and order must prevail no matter what the provocation. Those who congregate are a threat to law and order.

"Alabamians want those who set up these charged meetings, who deliberately began actions that they cannot doubt will create violence, to be put under the same weight of executive pressure that is being applied to white troublemakers.

"NO PATIENCE WITH PATTERSON

"The Birmingham News has no patience with many of the actions and utterings of John Patterson, the Governor of Alabama.

"The News is not satisfied that Commissioner of Public Safety Sullivan of Montgomery met the situation there Saturday with the speed and vigor that the Montgomery police should have shown when they well knew that the freedom riders, the provokers, were nearing Montgomery's city limits. If he didn't have access to Highway Patrol Director Floyd Mann's surveillance of the bus they were riding, he could have had access to that information. Floyd Mann had it and he was making it available to any proper law enforcement agencies that desired it.

"The people of Alabama don't want Federal marshals or steel-helmeted troops with bayonets roaming their streets. But those who stop to think will have to admit, as the Birmingham News admits, that we brought much of this upon ourselves. This newspaper—and we trust the good people of all over the State of Alabama—is demanding of all law enforcement agencies that the job be done.

"Law and order—through the cooperation of Maj. Gen. Henry V. Graham, State Safety Director Floyd Mann, the police of Montgomery and your Federal marshals—are in charge in Montgomery. These representatives of municipal, State and Federal law are working together as people should work together.

"We don't know the letter of the Federal law. But we do know and we do respect the spirit of the law in this Western World of freedom.

"The right of peaceful assembly has its limitations, just as has the right of freedom of speech. The performances of Fred Shuttlesworth in Birmingham have long deliberately abused these guarantees of the Constitution. The News believes the deliberate

rushing to Montgomery by Martin Luther King and his retinue could be construed as nothing but further agitation of an already tense community.

"The News has urged municipal and State law enforcement agencies of Alabama to stop those who encourage violence by their presence and attitudes in already charged situations. The News believes that this applies to freedom riders, Martin Luther King, and Fred Shuttlesworth, as well as the men Governor Patterson called interested citizens who have shown they were ready to take the law in their own hands.

"The people of Alabama, Mr. Kennedy, would feel more secure in the efforts to guarantee the rights of all citizens if you found a way to stop those who came here and foment trouble by their actions in the midst of already highly charged situations."

Wise Words on Summitry and Valid Reason for Increasing Tensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, under the above title I have asked unanimous consent for the following editorial appearing in the Indianapolis News on May 22 to be spread upon this record:

SUICIDE AT THE SUMMIT

The United States, we are informed, is about to retrace a well-worn path of futility and dishonor. President Kennedy will go to Austria next month for a "summit" conference with Soviet Dictator Nikita Khrushchev.

That disclosure pretty well completes the portrait this administration has been painting of itself in its foreign dealings: Ringing words of defiance, followed by weak-kneed performance.

We have heard considerable from the President about firmness, moral rigor, and meeting the call of duty. But even as these mighty exhortations are uttered, we find ourselves once more launched into the most debased variety of appeasement: Yet another summit meeting with the butcher of Budapest.

What do the President and his advisers think will come of this new venture in summitry? In the battle of East and West, few instruments of diplomacy have been so thoroughly discredited. Whether it has been Roosevelt at Yalta, Truman at Potsdam, or Eisenhower at Geneva, such negotiations have invariably ended in disaster. Indeed, the world would not be so gravely threatened by communism now, if Roosevelt and Truman had not yielded Eastern Europe and China to bolshevism in the summit conclaves of World War II.

The White House says no matters of substance will be negotiated at the meeting in Vienna. We hope this is the case. But, as President Eisenhower's calamity at Geneva demonstrated, such parleys are infinitely harmful even if no specific extortions take place. With world attention focused on them, they become sounding boards for the Soviets—in which their propaganda, thanks to our part in supplying it with a respected forum, is given sober consideration.

At a deeper level, every summit meeting is, in itself and in what it represents, a crushing moral defeatt for the West, an exhilarating triumph for the despotism of the East.

Nikita Khrushchev ranks with the most ruthless tyrants of history. It was Khrushchev who exterminated the farmers fo the Ukraine. It was Khrushchev who crushed the freedom fighters of Budapest. It was Khrushchev who had American aviators murdered in cold blood. It is Khrushchev who at this instant holds countless Americans in grim captivity. It is Khrushchev who presides over a slave empire of almost a billion people.

Is it fitting that Mr. Kennedy journey across the world, hat in hand, to confer with this degenerate as though he were the moral equal of any decent human being—much less the President of the United States? We think not. For by that action, our President signifies that we accept an international criminal, a predator against races and nations, as a legitimate sovereign, that we anoint his crimes against humanity with the cachet of our own prestige.

The summit gesture is indefensible strategically, as well as morally. It proclaims once more that our ambitions, such as they are, are purely defensive, and that we have no notion of winning the struggle Moscow has imposed upon us. By meeting in conviviality with Khrushchev, we tell his tormented slaves that we accept their captor, and put the seal of finality upon their enslavement. We thus alienate a vast reservoir of potential support. And we assure Khrushchev that, while he constantly seeks to destroy the free world, we shall never try to unlock his global prison house.

Against all this, what is the summit conference supposed to achieve? The usual argument is that such face-to-face encounters are necessary to define areas of understanding and thus to ease tensions. But does anyone really believe there are areas of understanding common to Moscow and the West? The record shows that communism has one objective, and one only—the destruction of freedom everywhere. With such an adversary, in such a struggle, there can be no understanding. There can be only victory—or defeat.

The goal of easing tensions thus becomes not merely meaningless, but harmful. The only way in which tensions can be diminished is by relenting in the struggle; and, in the futile effort to show our good intentions by conceding points to Moscow, that is precisely what we have been doing.

If this Nation is to be jolted off its compass course to disaster, the tone and emphasis of our policy must be drastically reversed. Our goal must be, not to ease tensions, but to increase them—to heighten the pressures of the cold war, and to focus their compacted power against the brutal regime in Moscow. Our objective must be, not understanding with the Communist enemy, but victory over it. And in the pursuit of such a victory, there is no place for journeys to the summit.

Future Dependence—American Military Tradition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 26, 1961

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD an editorial from the May 21, 1961, issue of the State of Columbia, S.C., entitled "Future Dependence—American Military Tradition."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FUTURE DEPENDENCE—AMERICAN MILITARY TRADITION

Even though the nature of the United States is strictly nonmilitaristic, we have not been able to avoid wars and necessarily have established a military tradition. Cherishing this tradition isn't exalting war; it is properly recognizing and evaluating what Americans have done in war for the cause of freedom.

Adm. Cato D. Glover Jr., retired, in an address in Columbia, said the Battle of Leyte Gulf in World War II should have a high place in our tradition, since, he said, "it was the greatest naval battle ever fought."

And, in suggesting the rightful place in history for this battle, Admiral Glover mentioned that we might revere it in the manner of the British, who assiduously keep enshrined the great conflicts in which they have had a part and which have affected the Empire.

II

The people of the United States have not, of course, been neglectful of our achievements in war, or of our great military leaders and their memories. But it is possible that in a country such as ours—and it is natural—there has not been developed the depth of commemoration one finds in Great Britain.

For one thing, most Americans sway away from anything that tends to glorify war. And in doing this they may escape the full meaning of our military record. War was required to establish us as a country and subsequent conflicts were necessary to protect our integrity and freedom as a Nation. That has been the meaning of our victories and the significance of the sacrifice of the thousands who gave their lives in the conflicts. Without an understanding of this, without accurate appraisals of the effect of such events as victory in the Battle of Leyte Gulf, an American lacks a true concept of his country's background.

Hearing Admiral Glover, even in the unimpassioned terms characteristic of the military man, one was inclined to a feeling of guilt that there is a rather general failure to give true and lasting weight to such decisive events as the battle he described in his address.

III

The Battle of Leyte permitted the reentry of our forces into the Philippines. It was a terrible blow to the Japanese. It was a mighty demonstration of our sea and air capability at that time.

This engagement was made even greater by the fact that it was won despite a mistake. The American naval forces went for a section of the Japanese fleet which had been deployed as a decoy, but despite this won the battle. Yet how many really remember this great battle and its contribution to victory in the Pacific?

It would be good if more Americans could have the advantage of recollections of great military feats by the men of our country such as Admiral Glover so admirably and forcefully gave of the great Battle of Leyte Gulf. In it he commanded the aircraft carrier *Enterprise*. He spoke with authority, and with pride in American military capability.

It is a pride all should have and nourish, since it is pride in American courage as well as capability. Here we do not forget the men of battles lost, either. Victory has no monopoly on heroism.

IV

The American military tradition is not one of the militaristic spirit, but one established

in conflicts against tyranny. It could be our dependence in a most uncertain future. We should rate it high. And today, it happens, is Armed Forces Day.

Continued Nuclear Test Ban Talks Dangerous and Futile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on May 22 the Los Angeles Times carried the following lead editorial, which I commend to the consideration of every Member of the Congress and every member of the administration:

UNTYING OUR NUCLEAR BONDS

A great many people worry over our Government's laggardliness in rocket power and in blasting off on a space adventure that will put the Russians in the shade. But not nearly so many people—certainly not enough—worry because we are defaulting in the field of power where we were indisputably first, namely, in the development of nuclear weapons.

WE WERE AHEAD

The United States was not only first in this field, but for a number of years it maintained a technological lead in nuclear weapons. For example, our scientists and engineers produced a light, easily projected hydrogen bomb while the Russians were experimenting with a clumsy package so heavy that it required enormous rocket power for the launch. This is why our early rockets were so much lighter than the Russians.

Then, while we were competing with the Russians in building bigger rockets for space shows, we deliberately suspended nuclear testing. We have not fired a nuclear shot in the ground or over the ground for 2½ years. Our Government stopped nuclear testing to show good faith in the endless negotiations with Russia in search of a treaty to end nuclear weapon manufacture everywhere—with proper controls.

One of the arguments for our unilateral inspection was that we had detection equipment which could give notice of any sizable underground nuclear explosion anywhere. The country was told that if an explosion was detected in Russia we would resume our testing. Moscow had said that Russian tests were suspended. Later it was shown that the detection system was not as sensitive as it was represented—but we continued our ban of tests even though our Government could not be sure that the Communists were not firing underground shots at will.

WE TOOK A CHANCE

Meanwhile, negotiations with the Russians dragged on with no approach to agreement on controls. The Soviet representatives at Geneva stalled with impossible proposals.

In this country a slight but growing restiveness could be noted. Here was an area in which we were falling behind because we refused to do anything to maintain our lead, and continued in this suspension long after its usefulness as a good faith symbol seemed to have evaporated.

Now the American dissenters from the outworn suspension policy have found very respectable advocates. They are the members of the National Strategy Committee of the American Security Council, which is a nonprofit association of 2,500 member organizations in business, journalism, the universities and other institutions throughout the country.

The committee has recommended to President Kennedy that test ban negotiations at Geneva be discontinued and that underground and outer space nuclear tests be resumed immediately. It gave reasons:

1. Progress in the development of U.S. nuclear weapons technology, defensive as well as offensive, has been brought to a virtual halt.

2. It would be dangerous for the United States to assume that the Soviet Union may not have made important advances in nuclear technology during this (suspension) period. These advances could have a crucial effect on the relative power position of the United States and the U.S.S.R.

PREJUDICIAL TO THE UNITED STATES

3. The U.S. offer to refrain voluntarily from any underground tests for another 3 years from the date of signature of the test ban treaty (while the powers implemented it) would only perpetuate the current situation which is clearly prejudicial to the security of the United States.

4. The present prohibition on all U.S. nuclear weapons tests amounts to a unilateral, unpoliced moratorium which is not in the national interest.

President Loyd Wright, of the council, listed the following members of the committee:

Lt. Gen. Edward M. Almond, former chief of staff of the 6th Army Corps and former commandant of the Army War College.

Adm. Ben Moreell, former chairman of the board, Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., and now chairman, Americans for Constitutional Action.

Adm. Arthur W. Radford, former Chief of Naval Operations, and Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff (1953–57).

Adm. Felix B. Stump, former commander in chief, Pacific, and now vice chairman, Freedoms Foundation.

Rear Adm. Chester W. Ward, former Judge Advocate General of the Navy, and former professor of international law at George Washington University.

Gen. A. C. Wedemeyer, former Deputy Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, and former commanding general, 6th Army.

Perhaps these gentlemen have the prestige to persuade the President of the United States to untie our hands so that we can restore our former ascendancy in nuclear matters.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Dynamic June Dairy-Month Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Nation—if it is to sustain an economy strong enough to meet the needs of the people and the requirements of national defense—must attempt to assure that all segments share proportionately in our national wealth.

This is true in agriculture, industry, business, the professions and all other fields.

Over the years we have had particularly difficult problems in agriculture. Fortunately, there have been some promising signs of a moderate upturn on the horizon. However, real progress will still require a concentrated effort by the Government and the people.

In a weekend broadcast over Wisconsin radio stations, I was privileged to discuss problems—and ways to improve the outlook in one important segment of farming—that is, dairying.

I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Today, our State ranks as the No. 1 milk producer in the country—with an output of nearly 18 billion pounds annually. This great river of milk flowing to consumers in Wisconsin and elsewhere in the country. represents a great resource of physical health for the American people.

In addition, dairying also is an important industry economically. Our thousands of dairy farmers in Wisconsin and elsewhere are an important market for equipment and services; they create jobs; and otherwise stimulate new economic health. The processing and delivery of about 25 billion quarts of fresh milk annually requires an army of 200,000 milk-plant workers. In addition, 100,000 people are engaged in the manufacture of butter, cheese, dry milk and other dairy products. The total annual payroll for dairy processing plants comes to about $1.4 billion. About 380,000 motor vehicles are used in milk transport from farms to plants and from plants to milk consumers.

In summary, the dairy industry is extremely important not only to Wisconsin but to the Nation. Consequently, an improved outlook is important for all of us.

Now what can be done?

The best way, in my judgment, to serve the public and the dairy industry is to increase the consumption of milk and other dairy foods.

Across the Nation promotional activities will put the dairy industry in the spotlight during June, Dairy Month. Some of the objectives of the program will be:

1. Sell the dairy food message to consumers, stressing that: Dairy products are a best buy for the family budget, providing about one-third of our total food needs for less than one-fourth of the total food budget;

The wide variety of dairy products, milk, butter, cheese, ice cream, and other items, add zest, color, and myriad flavors to making more exciting menus for daily meals.

2. Scuttle the outmoded idea that there is an age limit on milk consumption. The fact is that milk is a good, healthful food for all age brackets; babies, teenagers, adults, and folks in their "golden years."

3. Refute unfounded attacks on milk or the component parts of milk that may give a false impression of possible detrimental effects on human health.

4. Encourage the dairy industry in its splendid efforts at stepping up sales and promotion, as well as its outstanding attempts to bring to the public greater variety and better quality in dairy foods.

5. Encourage expansion of a program to have milk accessible in more places, including opportunity for refreshing milk breaks during working hours, so that the public has ample opportunity to drink more milk.

6. Pay tribute to the American dairy farmer for his outstanding contribution to the economy and the health of our people.

7. Better educate homemakers to the vast variety of ways in which milk and dairy products can further enrich the daily meals.

NEEDED DAIRY RESEARCH CENTER

I shall soon reintroduce my bill for establishing a dairy research center at Madison, Wis., the heart of the dairy land. What would be the goals of such a research project? To mention a few, these would include efforts to:

1. Establish an improved, better-correlated program of dairy research.

2. Improve processing, packaging, refrigeration, powdering, condensing, and merchandising, to better serve and meet the modern needs of the consuming public.

3. Find new ways to utilize the components of milk for industrial purposes.

4. Combat livestock diseases.

5. Lower costs of production on dairy farms.

6. Adapt more dairy products to better meet human nutritional needs.

7. Improve markets at home and abroad.

8. Protect the dairy industry from some of the allegations now threatening it as to alleged ill effects of milk and other dairy products on human health.

9. Safeguarding the public through careful handling of antibiotics used in care of dairy herds.

10. Develop new and better ways of processing milk and other dairy products for shipping over long distances. For example, with the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway, the development of more new dairy products would help to meet the particular needs of people in other areas of the world, who badly need the nutritional benefits of milk and other dairy products for their daily diets.

Now, what are some of the additional steps which may be taken to improve the dairy outlook?

1. Maintain a strong dairy cooperative program.

2. Eliminate barriers to the flow of milk in interstate commerce.

3. Prevent oleo and other substitutes from usurping dairy markets.

4. Expand the use of milk-vending machines and other devices and special techniques for distributing milk products to the American people.

5. Establish realistic policies by the Food and Drug Administration to avoid public scares; but at the same time, assuring a healthful flow of dairy foods to the American public.

6. Improve educational opportunities including better libraries, extension services from local universities, and availability of publications from State and Federal departments of agriculture.

7. And, finally, I believe we must create greater opportunity in dairying to encourage young, dynamic, imaginative youth to enter the field vocationally, to further strengthen our dairy economy and provide a reservoir of rich, healthful, tasty dairy foods for the future.

John Temple Graves, Birmingham Newspaperman and Defender of the Southern Point of View, Dies Fighting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, on May 19, 1961, Mr. John Temple Graves, columnist for the Birmingham Post-Herald and widely known spokesman for the southern point of view, died. He died while delivering a speech at Mobile, Ala. He was active until the end of his life in debating the stirring and vital issues of our time. His view of national and world affairs was not always the popular view but it was a carefully reasoned and sensible view of things. The author of a book entitled "The Fighting South," it will be long remembered that Mr. Graves died fighting.

A dedicated man whose fine prose style gave vigor to his arguments, Mr. Graves had few peers as a phrasemaker and analyst of the southern scene. Over the years he had traveled in all sections of the country whenever anyone wanted a man who could speak with force and authority for the South. His many books about the South enjoyed national attention.

The daily comments in his column, "This Morning," which appeared in papers all over the South, were full of keen and justifiable criticisms of national and regional problems. I should like to have inserted in the RECORD the last column written by Mr. Graves:

DISTORTED PICTURE OF CITY GIVEN ON TV PROGRAM

(By John Temple Graves)

(This is Mr. Graves' final column, written only a few hours before his death yesterday.)

"As on a darkling plain,
Swept with confused alarms of struggle and flight,
Where ignorant armies clash by night. * * *"

Birmingham must have sounded like that to the Nation Thursday night on the "CBS Reports" program.

The Negro presentation far excelled the white in coherence, feeling, representative nature and best foot foremost—except that it didn't represent the huge number of responsible colored people who know the South was advancing tremendously in race relations under its own steam before the Supreme Court decision and who are certain that this other type of advancement under outside pressure does not accelerate but stops the real advances.

You had a sense of great cause championed by devoted, passionate and patient people all literate, all enlightened.

The white presentation, covering mostly the first half, sounded like a lot of nice people making random observations, some of them the sentimental, paternalistic, outworn or purely incidental kind the country laughs at in this modern day, others taking an inbetween position despised by both white and colored, and none of them—as cut and edited—making the powerful case to which the South is entitled, none of them sounding "the voice that rang through Shiloh's woods and Chicamauga's solitudes."

The dire and tragic plight of the South with the most delicate and difficult race problem with which any people anywhere ever had to deal was not even hinted.

Whether my own case is typical I don't know, but CBS had taken 40 minutes of film which I understood would have to be cut to about 3, but I was heartbroken to have the real points I tried to make overlooked and to be left merely calling Harrison Salisbury a liar.

The hero of the piece was permitted to be agitator Shuttlesworth.

There was inexcusable failure to make it clear that all of the statements, many pointing truly to a comparative lack of violence here rather than any reign of terror, were made before the recent bus station clash.

And that in those affairs, both parties were mainly outsiders, equally unknown to Birmingham. Those of us who have damned the Salisbury lie about a "climate of fear" here were made to seem liars ourselves, even though during and after the bus rioting there wa s no "climate of fear" among the ordinary people of this city.

There was none Sunday and Wednesday, there was no "climate of fear" among the any, in spite of the Negro girl from parts unknown who was permitted to utter with such sinister implications the one sentence "Don't live here."

This column has pointed out many times that the situation is too complicated and subtle for television to cover it fairly. I think David Lowe did try and I know he was handicapped by the unwillingness of some of our white people who could have made a truly modern and comprehensive case for us to take part because they feared foul play. But I think his editing and cutting make the white side poorer than it was.

Howard K. Smith didn't even try to be fair, it seems to me. His sympathies were so totally with the invaders who were taking advantage of a believed whole Federal Government behind them to come here and be abused while national thousands wept and cheered that he gave all his attention to the fools who were beating them, none to the anguish of a southern people misrepresented and debased by the fools.

We made a mistake in cooperating. For my part I am deeply ashamed.

Ralph McGill, addressing Birmingham's Rotary Club Wednesday, used the party line that "social reform is the strongest anti-Communist weapon we have."

Perpetual social reform, achieved through Government and creating a welfare state dictatorship, is no anti-Communist weapon. It is a Communist threat. It is a more to be feared approach to communism than either cold war or domestic infiltration because it is not outlawed and its significance is not noted.

It is the broad highway to communism.

Everybody is or ought to be for social welfare and the reforms it occasionally requires. But the present administration wants a welfare state. It wants right things in wrong ways.

People who are sick of some aspects of television forget this sickness for a worse one when they hear the New Frontier Federal Communications Chairman, Newton N. Minow, lecturing the broadcasters' association on its sins and telling them how the Government is going to supervise their programs by way of its control over licenses.

Here is a perfect example of social reform which is not an anti-Communist weapon but communism itself. You agree so with Mr. Minow's criticisms of television that you are all more shocked that he proposes to be a Fascist-Communist about them.

Crime in the Nation's Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, at this very moment, citizens throughout this great Nation are watching with grave concern the terrible wave of crime that has been sweeping over the Nation's Capital. Tourists who ordinarily would be trouping gaily through our wide avenues and public parks, and reverently visiting our historic shrines, now look fearfully over their shoulders lest they be robbed, or slugged, or worse. Parents in the cities and towns in every one of our congressional districts may be wondering whether their children should be permitted to make a pilgrimage to Washington. Our friends abroad deplore, and our enemies take great delight in the daily reports of vicious crimes committed on the very doorstep of this beautiful building in which this House meets.

The concern of our Nation's citizens is fully shared by us, as the representatives of the people of the United States; but we also have the responsibility for doing something about it. This is the solemn duty imposed upon the Congress by the Constitution of the United States. I am confident that we will discharge this obligation, and make the streets of Washington safe once again.

Before a subcommittee of the House Committee for the District of Columbia which is studying the problem, I recently made the suggestion that consideration should be given by that committee to establish a mandatory life sentence for fourth convictions for major crimes. This suggestion received considerable notice in the press, and as a result I have received a number of comments and suggestions by mail and telephone. In addition, as I also mentioned before the subcommittee, I have been conducting research into the problem in an attempt to better understand it and to arrive at a mature solution.

From research in recent writings on the subject, and conservations with people directly involved in our penal system, it is apparent that the trend has been away from high mandatory sentences in favor of indeterminate sentences with a relatively low minimum and a relatively high maximum sentence. The theory appears to be that a low minimum sentence encourages an inmate to comply with regulations and to cooperate in rehabilitation programs in the hope that early release may be obtained, and this is reinforced by the knowledge that failure to comply will mean long incarceration. Too high a minimum, it is argued, discourages the prisoner from trying, and prison authorities are handicapped in their rehabilitation efforts. As a corollary, a high maximum sentence gives the authorities the power to hold the obviously unreformed criminal rather than to turn him loose prematurely upon society.

Judges, too, seem to prefer a wide latitude in the range within which they may operate, and where heavy mandatory sentences are directed, as they were by the so-called Baume law in New York before it was amended, tendencies have developed to permit filing of lesser pleas as a means of avoiding the mandatory sentence. It also has been claimed that juries sometimes have failed to convict when they viewed the mandatory sentence as unjustifiably high for the specific case under consideration.

Obviously, granting this wide latitude to jurists and penologists imposes a heavy responsibility upon them to act justly to the individuals concerned and at the same time to protect society from premature release of those who are unready or unwilling to live useful crime-free lives.

The comments I have received and the research I have done to date has led me to the conclusion that I, and I believe this Congress, need to know more about how the statutes now on the books are being enforced before we attempt to add to them. It may well be that the present laws have enough teeth in them already, and that the real problem lies in the way they are administered. After making an analysis of the District criminal code. I am inclined to think that this may inded be true. Here is a brief summary of some of the important features of the District Code.

The following are sentences which shall be imposed for specific crimes:

Arson: Not less than 1 or more than 10 years. Assault with intent to kill, rob, rape, and so forth: Not more than 15 years. Assault with intent to commit mayhem, or with deadly weapon: Not more than 10 years. Housebreaking:

Not more than 15 years. Grand larceny: Not less than 1 nor more than 10 years. Auto theft: Not more than $1,000 fine and/or 5 years. Rape: Not more than 30 years, unless the jury directs a death penalty. Robbery: Not less than 6 months nor more than 15 years.

Over and above these penalties, section 22–104 of the code provides that an additional 50 percent may be added to any fine or prison sentence for a second conviction. I am informed that this provision is seldom used in the types of cases listed above. Also, section 22–3202 provides that for any offense committed when armed with a firearm, additional sentences may be imposed as follows: For first offense, 5 years; for second offense, 10 years; for third offense, 15 years; for fourth offense, up to 30 years.

Section 24–203 of the code provides that for any felony the judge shall impose maximum sentence not to exceed that authorized for the specific offense, that the minimum shall not exceed one-third the maximum, and in the case of a life sentence the minimum shall not exceed 15 years. This section further provides that for assault with intent to rape or for armed robbery, the minimum sentence shall be not less than 2 years, and if convicted of rape, not less than 7 years if the person has previously been convicted of a crime of violence. In each case, the maximum under this section would not be less than three times the minimum imposed. Note, however, that a judge is not restricted to the 2- or 7-year minimum, but simply cannot impose a lesser sentence.

All in all, there is considerable latitude in the law for a judge to impose heavy sentences for repeat offenders, particularly for those crimes with which we are so very much concerned at this time. But over and above the question of the sentences imposed is the question as to how the Department of Corrections and the Parole Board are administering the parole laws. The Parole Board, at its discretion, can release a prisoner once he has served the minimum to which he is sentenced, but also under section 24–201c the Board can apply to the court which passed a sentence to have the minimum reduced at any time. It would be most interesting to know how much this clause is used.

I find that the chief barrier to my forming a judgment as to whether additional legislation is needed, and if so, what legislation is needed, is lack of knowledge as to how the present statutes are being carried out. I believe most, if not all of you, will agree with me that there is no point in piling law upon law, if the present laws are not being carried out.

With these thoughts in mind, I have today sent a letter to the chairman of the Subcommitee of the House District Committee which is studying the problem of the crime wave. This letter makes three requests:

First. That a staff study be made of the application of the current criminal statutes for the District of Columbia which will show: (a) the actual sentences imposed during the past year compared to what the statutes allow; and (b) the sentences imposed on offenders during the past year who previously have been convicted of one or more crimes, the sentences previously imposed and the actual time served on these previous sentences.

Second. That consideration be given to establishing a system whereby the above reports are made on a regular basis, perhaps quarterly, for at least the next 2 years, or until the Congress determines that less frequent reports are necessary.

Third. That public hearings be scheduled at which members of the legal profession, those engaged in various phases of penal and parole work, and others, be heard and recommendations received for resolving the problem.

It is not my intention to lay charges against any individuals nor against any group among those responsible for the administration of our criminal justice system. But it is certainly obvious that something is radically wrong somewhere, and from the above analysis of the laws, it does not seem at all certain that the fault lies entirely in them.

If the trouble lies with the administration of the present statutes, the problem will not be cleared up until the full glare of publicity permits the trouble spots to be pinpointed. While I take such reports of laxity and corruption as were made in "Washington Confidential" with a healthy grain of salt, where there is smoke there probably also is fire. If, interspersed throughout the law enforcement system, there are those who out of misguided humanitarianism, or for more culpable reasons, are contributing to the premature release of dangerous criminals to prey upon society, we must find them and stop them.

Hiring the Handicapped: A Community Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. HICKEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. HICKEY. Mr. President, recently I had as a guest at the Capitol a young lady from Johnson County High School in Wyoming whose essay, entitled "Hiring the Handicapped: A Community Challenge," had placed first in the Wyoming contest sponsored by the Governor's Committee on Employing the Handicapped. This young lady, Miss Sharon Suchta, was awarded a trip to Washington and while here, with other State winners, attended a meeting of the President's Committee on Employing the Handicapped. I have just received a copy of the excellent essay which won Miss Suchta first place in the State competition, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIRING THE HANDICAPPED: A COMMUNITY CHALLENGE

(By Sharon Suchta)

He sat in a wheeled chair, waiting for dark,
And shivered in his ghastly suit of gray,
Legless, sewn short at elbow.
Now he will spend a few sick years in institutes,
And do what things the rules consider wise,
And take whatever pity they may dole.
Tonight he noticed how the women's eyes
Passed from him to the strong men that were whole.
How cold and late it is. Why don't they come
And put him into bed? Why don't they come?

Wilfred Owen's purpose in writing this poem was to let everyone know about the unpleasantness and the brutalities of war. Yet in a sense, this same poem may be used to exemplify the inner feelings of a good many disabled and handicapped people in our modern society. It is true, a majority of the handicapped persons do not live in institutions, nor do they feel such a sense of insecurity and hopelessness as does the war-battered soldier in Owen's poem.

However, some of the handicapped have given up hope and have resigned themselves to complete dependence on others. Many have done this because mankind in general has not encouraged them to try.

It should be remembered here that in the development of the normal person's ability to do things, today's failure becomes tomorrow's success. A handicapped person's first failures are usually taken as final. Needless to say, we must give the handicapped opportunities for trying again—it is better for a crippled person to have tried and failed than never to have tried at all. Although we must realize that he will often fail, we must also see that he does not become discouraged by attempting too many undertakings which he cannot carry through.

In our modern world of science, the handicapped can receive better care and treatment than ever before in our history; but medical care is only part of the story. Over and beyond this, the handicapped must be helped to compensate for his handicap. He should have education, and this means education with at least two objectives. First, he should receive special education for his particular handicap. Second, and most important, he should have access to the education which normal persons receive. This means, in most instances, an opportunity to find a place for himself in society, whether it be through public schools and churches, or through working to earn his living.

The handicapped person should be made to feel independent and given the chance to be helpful to himself and to others. Hope, however, needs self-assurance and faith. One of the best examples of a handicapped person who does everything for himself and tries not to rely on the help of others, is Roy Campanella. Roy, a famous baseball player, was critically injured in a car accident several years ago—an accident that left him completely paralyzed. Roy's self-assurance and faith is clearly shown by his following words: "If only I'm able to lift one leg up and take a stride someday, it will be the happiest day of my life. I've tried in vain so far, but I haven't given up. I'll never give up. The day will come when I'll be able to walk again, I know that, as sure as there's a God in Heaven."

If only every handicapped person could possess Roy's hope, faith, and perseverance. Unfortunately, however, too many are leading useless and hopeless lives. Given an opportunity to prove their worth, through local organizations and employment, they, too, may emerge as worthy individuals.

Many people, however, have some aversion to having handicapped people around. "No help wanted" will face them wherever they go. Why must we be so prejudiced toward our fellow men? Undoubtedly, every boss will have some good reason for turning away prospective employees. In most cases, he may not need help, or he may have too much help on hand at the time. However, these are merely excuses. The employer really objects to having a handicapped person around for the reasons that he may be too slow, or that he cannot do the work, or even, perhaps, that a handicapped person in the office will cause his firm to lose business. This thinking is ridiculous.

Handicapped people are not new to society. Nor are they different from the rest of us. Handicapped people are real individuals with the same type of hopes, fears, and aspirations that we all possess. Some people are under the false impression that handicapped people are helpless and must be helped all the time. Of course, some of the handicapped have to be helped once in awhile, and there are a few who are almost completely helpless; but it may be considered safe to say that at least 80 percent of the handicapped are very helpful, not only to themselves, but to others as well. (Sheridan Press.) They may have a hard time, now and then, performing their tasks; but if they are given the time and chance they will usually get the job done just as well as any able-bodied person.

It is hard to realize how many Americans are suffering today from crippling diseases. Cerebral palsy, epilepsy, muscular dystrophy, rheumatic fever, and congenital malformations account for the partial or complete disability of over 3 million Americans (physically handicapped children). This does not include war injuries or other handicapping agents that have taken the toll of hundreds of thousands of other Americans. And, you will note, this includes Americans alone.

As noted above, physical handicaps cover a wide territory; but even worse than this physical trouble imposed by any crippling condition may be the emotional difficulties that frequently accompany it or follow in its train. Studies show, however, a handicapped person is at least as well-adjusted as the average non-disabled person (ibid).

Despite ourselves, most of us avoid looking at handicapped people. When we walk down the street, we tend to turn our eyes away, partly not to offend the other person, but partly because handicaps are distasteful to us. Only by living and working with the handicapped people can we learn to understand and accept them.

One of our major downfalls, however, is that we seem to judge by external appearances. Statistics have often shown that handicapped people make the most reliable employees with less absenteeism than others. Since it is difficult for us to judge the working potential of a handicapped person, we often jump to negative conclusions.

We must not jump to conclusions about the handicapped. We must give him every opportunity to prove himself.

The problem of finding work for the handicapped is rapidly rising day by day. It must not continue to rise, and you can help to keep the problem at a minimum. Changing your individual viewpoint is the only way we can change community viewpoint. How can you help in this program?

Support services for the handicapped in your own community, but above all, encourage the hiring of the handicapped. Remember, after all, they are only human.

New Electoral College System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President. this morning's edition of the Washington Post has an interesting and informative editorial on the legislation proposing electoral college reform which is being considered presently by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

It continues to be my conviction, and this is a conviction which I know is shared by many others, that the basic weakness in our great system of government by self-determination is the fact that we utterly fail to provide an equality of voting opportunity and authority in this country. This is solely due to the perversions of original purpose which have occurred under our electoral college system through use of the so-called general-ticket, winner-take-all, block voting formula of counting votes for President and Vice President. By giving individual voters in New York State, for example, 45 votes for President while voters with the identical qualifications and abilities voting in Delaware or any of our other States having only one Member of Congress cast only three votes for President. Does any fairminded American anywhere contend that it is either fair, right, proper or wise to continue such a thoroughly un-American disparity in the vote-power which individual Americans have in electing the President of the United States?

In 1960, in the Kennedy-Nixon contest, New York State voters cast over 325 million votes in that Presidential election. The fact that they were cast by only about 7 million voters serves simply to dramatize and illustrate the unjust electoral system now prevailing in the United States. It is not only unjust but it places a vast premium on corruption at the polls in our larger States and cities and it provides a perfect formula for pressure groups desiring to control or influence public policy by marshalling their forces to create top-heavy majorities in the urban communities existing in the States which actually elect our presidents. It is an effective device, moreover, for preventing the Southern States and the rural States west of Chicago from having any significant influence in presidential elections—and likewise in presidential nominating conventions—and from ever electing one of their own favorite sons to the White House, except thru elevation by accident of death through the Vice Presidency. It is unusual when these areas provide our country with a Vice President.

For the foregoing and other reasons, I hope this Congress approves our proposed constitutional amendment, as provided in Senate Joint Resolution 12. This so-called Mundt amendment will correct all of the existing evils in our electoral college system without creating any new evils to replace them. It maintains the existing voting strength of every State, but it equalizes the voting strength of every citizen. While it does not deal directly with the one criticism made by the Post editorial—the possibility that an occasional elector might not follow the mandate of those who elected him, a very minor addition to our amendment which I certainly would not oppose if it is felt necessary, could cover that point by binding every elector to vote in conformity with the mandate prescribed by the electoral college district which elected him. Senate Joint Resolution 12 already protects against gerrymandering by setting up new electoral college voting districts rather than using existing congressional districts which in some instances are gerrymandered.

I ask that the Post editorial and that my statement in support of Senate Joint Resolution 12, as made before the Senate Judiciary Committee on May 23 also be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW ELECTORAL SYSTEM

Interest in the presidential electoral system is at a low ebb because the next election is 3½ years away, but this does not minimize the importance of the hearings launched by the Senate Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee. The 1960 election gave the country a pointed demonstration of some of the weaknesses of the present system for choosing the President and Vice President. Of the Democratic electors chosen at the polls, 14 in Mississippi and Alabama refused to cast their votes for the Democratic candidate, President Kennedy, and cast them instead for Senator BYRD. Many voters went to the polls not knowing whether their votes would be counted for the candidates of their party.

President Kennedy has indicated that he would like to see electors bound to vote for the candidates of the party which they represent. But the basic difficulty is the retention of electors at all in a system which is now designed to make the President, as nearly as possible, the popular choice of the people. Senator KEFAUVER is sponsoring an amendment that would abolish electors and divide the electoral vote of each State between the candidates in the same proportion as the popular vote is divided. One version of this plan was approved by the Senate in 1950. It has many virtues but has also encountered opposition on the ground that it would encourage splinter parties.

Senator MUNDT and five of his colleagues have offered a plan under which electors would continue to be chosen but largely on the basis of congressional districts. At present the winning candidate in each State claims all of that State's electoral votes. Under the Mundt plan only two electors from each State would be chosen in this way—one for each Senator. All the other electors would be winners of the popular contest in congressional districts—one for each Congressman. In other words, the so-

called electoral college would reflect about the same trend as the composite vote for Members of Congress.

The weakness of this proposal is that it keeps in the system dummy electors who might be able to thwart the will of the people. It would be possible, of course, for the subcommittee to combine the best features of the Mundt resolution with the best of the Kefauver plan. Votes could be cast directly for presidential candidates. The winner in each State could take two electoral votes and in addition one electoral vote for each congressional district that he carried. But this would necessitate a better system of redistricting than most of the States now have.

There is obviously no easy answer, but there is hope that the subcommittee can work out a satisfactory electoral revision that will eliminate the existing grave defects and at the same time remain consistent with the Federal system.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KARL E. MUNDT, OF SOUTH DAKOTA, IN SUPPORT OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 12

Every voter in this country, whether he lives in California, Delaware, New York, or South Dakota, ought to have equal voting power when it comes to electing the President of the United States.

This is the only important respect in which our electoral college system, so called, has failed to function with fairness. With only minor changes (important though they are in effect) it has stood the practical test of time since our country was established. It has carried us through 44 Presidential elections, through peace and war, from George Washington to John F. Kennedy. It was after the fourth presidential election that the 12th amendment was added to the Constitution to require Presidential electors to vote specifically for President and Vice President, rather than, as the original provision provided, for two persons for President. Since then 40 Presidential elections have been held. It is obvious, therefore, that any system that has functioned so well for so long should not be changed lightly. Changes proposed or made should be the absolute minimum required to bring about the desired and necessary results.

Such minimum and wholly practical changes are proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 12 which I am sponsoring together with Senators THURMOND, MCCLELLAN, HRUSKA, MORTON, and BLAKLEY. This is the old Mundt-Coudert amendment, with which most of us are familiar, with an important change, an antigerrymandering provision which corrects a wholly valid criticism of the amendment as written in 1955.

Our Founding Fathers, in the Constitutional Convention of 1787, gave long and careful consideration to the method of electing the President. At first it decided he should be elected by the Congress. Then it changed its collective mind and transferred the power of choice to an electoral college that was to be an exact counterpart of Congress with the representation of the States as units (corresponding to the Senators) as well as population of the States (corresponding to Representatives) and which should meet at the seat of Government.

Upon further consideration this plan was dropped because of the fear that the electors wouldn't travel so far for a single purpose. It took days in those times to cover distances that we span in a few hours. The convention went back to its original idea that a President should be elected by a joint session of Congress. They did this with reluctance because it ran counter to their strong beliefs in the principle of separation of powers of the executive and legislative branches of the new government.

At this point the idea developed that the electors could meet and cast their votes in their own States, and transmit the certificates of their ballots to the seat of Government.

Accordingly, the work of electing the President was divided. The convention transferred the act of voting from a joint session of Congress to electoral colleges in the several States, to results to be transmitted to the President of the Senate. It left with Congress in joint session the function of counting the certified results from the States, as would have been the case had Congress done the voting.

This plan appears in article II, section 1, of the Constitution—a part of which has been superseded by the 12th amendment:

"Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress; but no Senator or Representative or person holding an office of trust or profit under the United States shall be appointed an elector."

The exclusion of Member of Congress and Federal officeholders is required by the cardinal principle of separation of powers.

In Senate Joint Resolution 12, the clause "in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct" is eliminated. In its stead, Senate Joint Resolution 12 requires:

"The electors to which a State is entitled by virtue of its Senators shall be elected by the people thereof, and the electors to which it is entitled by virtue of its Representatives shall be elected by the people within single elector districts established by the legislature thereof; such districts to be composed of compact and contiguous territory containing as nearly as practicable the number of persons which entitled the State to one Representative in the Congress; and such districts when formed shall not be altered until another census has been taken."

It is the clause "In such manner as the legislature thereof may direct" that is the root of the present problem. Only 10 States participated in the election of our first President, George Washington. North Carolina and Rhode Island had not yet ratified the Constitution; and New York's two houses of the Legislature could not agree on who the electors should be.

No uniform method of choosing electors was followed. Electors were chosen in a variety of ways, election by legislatures, election by the people in districts and election by the people on a general ticket, which means that each voter in the State could vote for everyone of the State's electors. In Massachusetts each of the eight districts chose two electors from which the Legislature elected one per district and added two electors at large.

In the succeeding presidential elections, through 1832, the various methods were used with States changing from one to the other. In 1836, the general ticket system was used in every State but South Carolina, which continued to elect by the legislature through 1860.

After Washington's two elections, the Presidency was contested every 4 years on a party basis as it is today. The majority party in each State was quick to see the advantage of consolidating its electoral strength either through legislature selection or through use of the general ticket system so as to exert maximum influence in electing a President. Federalists did this where they were in control, in the New England States, for example, and the anti-Federalists, later Jefferson's Republicans, did the same thing in their States.

Since 1836, with the exception of South Carolina, there have been only three instances of departures from the general ticket system. They were Florida in 1868 and Colorado in 1876 in which the elections were by the legislature, and Michigan in 1892, when the district system with two electors at large was used.

It is extremely doubtful if any voter living today has used anything but a general ticket system in presidential elections. This use of the general ticket system in every State is largely responsible for many of the misunderstandings of the electoral college system which exist today and for much of the notion that the electors are archaic and unnecessary.

When we regard the electoral college as the exact numerical counterpart of Congress we can see readily that it combines the two principles of respresentation in our Federal Union of States. We have the Federal principle of equal representation of the States in the Senate regardless of population and, then we have the national principle of unequal representation of the States in the House of Representatives based on their unequal populations. State representation in the House in the present Congress ranges from 1 to 43.

Each citizen of each State is represented in the Senate by two Senators and in the House by one Represenative, with a few exceptions. His representation in Congress, therefore, is two parts Federal and one part national. In the electoral college, with the general ticket system in force in every State, there is no equality of citizen representation. It ranges from a high of 45 members of the electoral college for a citizen of New York to 3 for a citizen of each of the 6 States that sent only 1 Representative to the present Congress.

Conversely, each citizen has as many votes in presidential elections as his State has members in the electoral college, because they are elected on a general ticket. In other words, when a New York voter pulls a voting machine level for a presidential ticket he is actually casting 45 votes, one for each of 45 electors on a party slate. It may be hard to believe but there were actually more than 325 million votes cast in New York in the last presidential election by something over 7 million voters.

On the other hand the citizens of the six States which have only one Member of the House of Representatives had only three votes each in the presidential election. In my own State of South Dakota each citizen had four votes.

This tremendous disparity in voting weight between the citizens of the large States and the small States is the true source of all the valid complaints which have been made against the electoral college system. The real culprit is the use of the general ticket by every State. Of course, each State legislature could abandon the general ticket but none will without certain knowledge that all other States will abandon it as the same time. This is why a constitutional amendment is necessary to bring about a change.

There is no more justification for choosing electors on a general ticket than there is for electing a State's delegation to the House of Representatives, counterparts of electors, on a Statewide, bloc basis, which is what the general ticket does. Imagine the howls of rage that would arise all over the country if a district's Representative was to be taken from it, and given to the entire State. And yet it would be just as fair to use the general ticket for Representatives as it is for their counterparts in the electoral college.

I submit that the number of persons which entitles a State to one Representative in the Congress should entitle the same group of people to one member of the electoral college.

What have been the effects of the general ticket system of choosing electors? I suggest these:

1. It excludes from the office of President of the United States all men, no matter how able and outstanding they may be, unless they come from a State with a large bloc of electoral votes.

2. By the same token the dominant forces in the large, pivotal States which are responsible for the nomination and election of our Presidents have inordinate influences at the White House and in the executive branch of our Government. A cursory reading of the major party platforms and the speeches of their presidential candidates gives proof that they are directed almost entirely at the dominant elements in these large States.

3. It invites fraud in the large States that are crucial and where the vote is expected to be close. The results in Illinois, Texas, and Missouri in the last election brought forth charges of vote frauds. The effect of such vote fraud is statewide under the general ticket. A fraudulent vote, undetected, counts just as much as a valid vote in the statewide total.

4. Although the Constitution gives each State the same numerical representation in the electoral college that it has in the whole Congress, by using the general ticket for electors, we have formed a constituency for the President which is altogether different from that which elects the Congress. The great difference between these two constituencies is that almost all Representatives are elected in single member districts while their counterparts in the electoral college are elected in multimember districts consisting of entire States. This situation permits voters of a State, voting straight party tickets, to produce one result in the electoral college and an altogether different result in the House of Representatives at the same election. The effect of all this is that we have what I have called a presidential United States of America, and a congressional United States of America that are, politically speaking, two different countries within one national boundary.

5. Many critics of the present system contend that the electoral college is an archaic institution, outmoded by our tremendous improvements in transportation and communications, and that it is incompatible with modern democratic principles. In the main, these charges are based on either a misunderstanding of the nature of the electoral college, or on deliberate intentions to change the structure of our constitutional system and change our Republic into something radically different.

6. Another criticism of the electoral college is in the contention that presidential electors are in no way bound to vote for the presidential candidate of the party on whose slate they were elected. This is coupled with the contention that the Founding Fathers intended the electors to be free agents. Both these contentions are without basis in fact. On the contrary, there is overwhelming evidence that from the very first it was clearly understood that the elector's function was to express the view of those who had chosen him.

Since 1820, a total of 14,018 presidential electors have been chosen. Of these only eight are alleged to have voted contrary to the views of those who named them. In no case did any of these votes affect the outcome of a presidential election. In 1820, one elector did not vote for James Monroe. In 1948, a Tennessee elector voted for THURMOND, the States rights candidate, instead of for President Truman, but he had announced before the election that he would do this. The last case was in the 1960 election when a Republican elector in Oklahoma voted for Senator HARRY F. BYRD instead of Richard M. Nixon.

It is said, too, that the Founding Fathers had no notion of political parties. But, in, the very first election, Alexander Hamilton, leader of the Federalists, saw to it that John Adams would not run equally with Washington, as both men were being voted for as President. In fact, Washington received 69 votes and Adams only 34.

An outstanding authority on the Constitution, the late Chief Justice Charles C. Nott of the Court of Claims, has stated flatly that the notion that the framers of the Constitution had no plan in mind for electing a President different from that which is in force is completely in error. In the Encyclopedia Americana Judge Nott wrote:

"It is said by some of the commentators, and indeed it is now generally believed, that the electoral colleges were intended to be 'deliberative bodies.' In one sense this is true—in the legal sense. The electors are not ministerial or administrative officers; they do not perform a specific work in a way determined by higher official authority; in legal contemplation the responsibility of their action rests upon themselves. But the framers of the Constitution never supposed that the electors would disregard the political pledges upon which they were chosen, or that the American people, either directly or through their State legislatures, would blindly choose electors to evolve a President out of their inner consciousness. On the contrary, they contemplated the successful candidates receiving the votes of 'a majority of the whole number of electors,' and they required the electors to vote 'in their respective States,' and to vote on the same day. If they had framed a provision requiring all of the electors to convene at the seat of government in one body, and there in their own way and time proceed to choose a President, there would be good reason for saying that actual deliberation was intended; but they did not give to the electors one single power of attribute by virtue of which they could deliberate.

"The idea that it was ever intended that the electors should nominate the candidate for whom they themselves should vote is a myth which has been unthinkingly reiterated by most eminent writers, but which does not rest upon a single fact. * * * He who supposes that the framers (of the Constitution) intended that 13 different bodies should convene in 13 different places at one time for one object and for 1 day, and that object the selection of the executive of a nation, confesses a most superficial knowledge of the greatest constructive statesmen of their century and of the great work which they deliberately planned and built."

As originally introduced several years ago, the Mundt-Coudert amendment provided that a State's electors corresponding to its Representatives in Congress should be elected from congressional districts and the two corresponding to its Senators should be elected statewide, as Senators are elected. Critics, most of them supporters of the status quo, objected strongly and with justice that the use of congressional districts was open to criticism since in some States district lines had been unfairly drawn by whatever political party controlled the State legislature, a practice long known as gerrymandering.

To meet this criticism the amendment, as now proposed, provides for the setting up, as I have previously stated, of electoral districts to be composed of compact and contiguous territory, containing as nearly as practicable the number of persons which entitled the State to one Representative in the Congress.

Our amendment, if adopted, would require State legislatures to follow this constitutional directive. If they failed to do so Congress would have the power to step in and see to it that fair and equitable districts for electors are established.

It is altogether likely that these nongerrymandered electoral districts would at least sharply curtail the practice of setting up unfair congressional districts since it would be extremely difficult for a State legislature to justify one set of districts for electors and another for Representatives.

There is another often raised objection to the present system of electing a President. It is the provision that if no candidate receives a majority of the electoral votes when they are counted in Congress that the House of Representatives shall choose immediately a President from among the candidates with the three highest numbers of electoral votes. The vote in such a case—the last time it occurred was in 1824—is by State; each State delegation having one vote. In the event a State's House delegation is evenly divided its vote is not recorded. A majority of the States is required for election.

The objection to this system is that it is grossly unfair to the larger States, giving New York, California, and Pennsylvania no greater voice than Alaska, Delaware, and Nevada despite the great population disparities.

Senate Joint Resolution 12 cures this situation. It provides that in the event no presidential candidate has a majority of the electoral vote that "then from the persons having the three highest numbers on the list of persons voted for as President, the Senate and the House of Representatives, assembled and voting as individual Members of one body, shall choose immediately, by ballot, the President; a quorum for such purpose shall be three-fourths of the whole number of Senators and Representatives, and a majority of the whole number shall be necessary for a choice; if additional ballots be necessary, the choice on the fifth ballot shall be between the two persons having the highest number of votes on the fourth ballot."

The Constitution also provides that if no candidate for Vice President has a majority that the Senate shall choose him from among the two candidates with the highest electoral vote total. Senate Joint Resolution 12 provides that both Houses in joint session and voting by the head, as for President, shall select the Vice President from among the candidates with the three highest numbers of electoral votes.

Our system of electing a President has, generally speaking, served us well during the 172 years since our Republic was established. It has never failed to give us a President.

Through no fault of the Founding Fathers, it has, however, become distorted through the use of the general ticket system. Most of the framers of the Constitution, it should be pointed out, went on record favoring a district system for choosing electors, as the fairest method of expressing the popular will.

Senate Joint Resolution 12 is, in my opinion and the opinion of the many who support it, the only simple method by which each voter in every State will have the same voting weight in electing a President. It is the only one among the various electoral reform proposals which have been offered which will bring about a needed reform without a basic change in our constitutional system. It alone leaves control of the election machinery in the States, where it belongs.

It is the office and person of the elector, and nothing else, that maintains the intrastate character of presidential elections. Interstate candidacies are legally unknown and unprecedented under Constitution, and would remain so under Senate Joint Resolution 12. Now, party nominees for President and Vice President are extra-legal, outside the law. They achieve constitutional status only when votes are cast for them in the electoral college. If we abandon the office and person of elector we will of necessity establish interstate candidacies which, in turn, will open the door for ultimate Federal control of elections, including the qualifications of voters. Few Americans will favor such a change.

William Bryan Hamel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, William Bryan Hamel, the editor and publisher of the Mattoon Journal-Gazette, at Mattoon, Ill., died suddenly on May 23 at Oklahoma City, Okla. Mr. Hamel had worked on the Journal-Gazette from 1926 to 1939, when he purchased the newspaper.

Bill Hamel was known throughout the Middle West as one of the outstanding men in the newspaper business. A large part of this was due to the fact that he integrated into his newspaper much civic work on his own part. He was a member and a past president of the Rotary Club, a member of Sigma Delta Chi, Tau Kappa Epsilon, the Chicago Press Club, and the Illinois Press Association.

He was also a member of the Inland Daily Press Association, American Newspaper Publishers' Association, the legislative committee and the Federal-State relations committee of the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce, and a member and former director of the Mattoon Association of Commerce.

He was for a number of years one of the outstanding civic workers in central Illinois. His energy knew almost no bounds, and in many cases it went beyond the limits of his own community.

I have known Bill Hamel since 1946. He was extremely active in matters connected with the University of Illinois, in Champaign-Urbana, Ill. In 1953 he was appointed to the citizens' committee of the University of Illinois and also became a member of the nine-man executive committee of the larger committee. In Illinois the trustees of the University of Illinois are elected at large. Bill Hamel was in the forefront of every fight to see that we had only the best and the most dedicated people serving on the board of trustees. He was never afraid to take a stand when he believed the public interest was affected, and his influence was widespread.

Bill Hamel was one of the last of the "intimate editors." Anyone in town who had a point could always see Mr. Hamel and talk over his problem. Nothing was too small for him to take up, even though he might not even know the person personally.

Not only the people of Mattoon, but his many friends in the newspaper business will miss him greatly. Both Mrs. Springer and I extend to Mrs. Hamel, his son and his daughter, along with his many other friends, our deepest sympathy on Bill's passing.

Mr. Speaker, I append herewith an editorial of May 27 from the Mattoon Journal-Gazette, written by his good friend Dave McDonald, and also a guest editorial by James W. Wells, Jr., editor and publisher of the Newton Press-Mentor, of the same date:

[From the Mattoon Journal-Gazette, May 27, 1961]

WILLIAM B. HAMEL

During the 37-year span of Bill Hamel's residence in Mattoon, the improvements in the community have been literally countless.

Despite the fact that Bill didn't want, and wouldn't claim credit, the truth is that as publisher of this newspaper since 1939, his was a position of great influence.

A publisher with less love for his adopted home could have, either by a negative attitude or by refusal to accept counsel, impeded progress.

But Bill did love Mattoon. And he was fair. He wanted to hear all sides of any proposal. His attitude is well summed up in this statement, repeated many, many times to those who came to him for help in promoting city projects: "Let's get the facts; then if it looks good for Mattoon, let's go to work."

Although Bill went to work for the Journal-Gazette as advertising manager, his heart was in the newsroom. He insisted that there be no relaxation of alert, fair reporting of the news.

It made no difference to Bill whether that news was, by its mere publication, critical or laudatory, or whether it reflected happy or unhappy conditions.

If it were news of the nature which was the people's right to know, he was sure it belonged in the columns of the Journal-Gazette, and he saw to it that it got there.

Many times he read proofs of police court stories and handed them back to his editors with this comment, "I wish we didn't have to use this, but don't ever forget that we are running a newspaper."

What he really liked was an excuse to pat someone on the back. He wrote hundreds of editorials praising organizations and individuals he thought deserved recognition. Nothing pleased him more than the opportunity to help those who needed a boost.

Bill never saw a stranger. His warm greeting and friendly smile were his trademarks. We of the Journal-Gazette hope that some of Bill Hamel has rubbed off on us.

As we bid him goodbye this afternoon we do so with a fond memory of a pleasant association and a pledge to continue to serve Mattoon with his high standards and ideals.

WILLIAM B. HAMEL

(By James W. Wells, Jr., editor and publisher of the Newton Press-Mentor)

This is a personal note to the family and beloved friends, associates, and employees of William B. Hamel, editor and publisher of the daily Journal-Gazette, at Mattoon. Others may read it if they wish.

It is being written on our famous $5 Underwood, which must have been installed in the Journal-Gazette newsroom early in this century. It was assigned to us when we joined that paper's staff in the 1930's, and we got title to it for the grand sum of $5 about 21 years ago when the company traded in a flock of typewriters.

It has been used almost daily ever since to write literally uncountable millions and millions of words. Never before in all those years has it failed to produce the words needed for the news of the day.

But today, with all the words which must be stored in the vocabulary of its battered old keys, we find none to bring you immediate comfort in the loss of your and our Bill Hamel. But maybe we and old No. 5 together can tell you of some of his good works which should add to your treasure of memories of Bill. Pleasant memories as you know, are among the most valuable possessions anyone can accumulate on earth.

Our very first memory of a community work done by Bill goes back to the earliest days of the oil industry in Mattoon. It so happened that we had previously worked on newspapers in oil towns and knew that there were many fine people in the oil indsutry.

Some elements in Mattoon were a bit slow to accept oil people, so Bill asked for our opinion. We told him of some of the oilmen and families we had known and he, working through the late Harry F. Kendall, then publisher of the Journal-Gazette, and H. G. (Seldy) Seldomridge, secretary of the Association of Commerce, changed the community attitude to one of sincere welcome.

Less than a month ago one of the most prominent lawyers in downstate Illinois asked us how in the world Mattoon derived so many benefits from the oil industry. We told him the story and added that the oil people never let Mr. Kendall, Bill, Seldy, or us down, blending perfectly in the life of the community with their many, many talents.

Another early memory of Bill's unselfish service goes back to 1939, a few months after he became publisher following the death of Mr. Kendall. Mrs. Wells and I went to the Coles County Fair at Charleston one afternoon and found it to be a great fair.

But there was one thing seriously wrong—only a handful of paying patrons attended. We dug into the problem and learned that the west side of the county did little to help the fair, even the east side was losing some of its interest and the association was so heavily in debt that it would not be able to stage a fair in 1940.

The worried banker assured us that he would go along for another year at least if the Journal-Gazette would get westsiders interested in the fair and participate in a reorganization and rejuvenation. We presented the proposition to Bill and he readily consented to personally help and authorized the full use of his newspaper toward saving the oldest county fair west of the Alleghenies.

The remainder of this story is public history—people all over the county took an interest in the fair, tremendous crowds turned out—and in 3 years the $17,000 debt had been retired with interest. The life of county fairs still is far from easy, however, and we hope that in memory of Bill the Journal-Gazette always will take a personal interest in the Coles County Fair.

Bill's thinking about the future of the community was usually several years ahead of the community itself. That's the way newspapers and newspapermen are supposed to think, plan, and act.

As a result, he was always looking for a new industry for Mattoon, and he made and kept widespread contacts for this purpose. The editorial columns of the Journal-Gazette were used to get many of the citizens in the same frame of mind.

The very first tip that led to getting the General Electric plant for Mattoon came from our late associate, Tim Klapp of Chicago, in a call to Bill.

The tip that brought Gar Wood Industries to Mattoon came from one of our own subscribers who learned of the possibility while visiting in Detroit and told Bill and the Journal-Gazette about it as soon as she returned home.

Much of the postwar growth of Mattoon can in effect be traced to the thinking of Bill and the work of the Journal-Gazette during World War II. Jobs were plentiful then, but Bill and the staff felt that the city should line up industries to provide employment when the war ended and the men came home.

Civic leaders agreed, work was started and the results are now apparent to all—hundreds of new jobs, hundreds of new homes, hundreds of new and happy families. All the wonderful civic leaders who worked so hard to get these results will tell you that Bill and his Journal-Gazette first put the

"burr under the community's tail" and spurred people into action.

Every worthwhile community group or movement, everything for the public good, received the full support of Bill and the Journal-Gazette. Remember when Red Graham, now State Senator Paul Graham, devised the Dollar Club to bolster a lagging March of Dimes? Asked how far the paper should go in promoting the new phase of the drive, Bill's reply was "Shoot the works."

That's the way he always reacted to good causes in the days when we were successively a reporter, city editor and managing editor for the Journal-Gazette. There were no exceptions in all those years.

His willingness to help often came down to the personal level, bringing valuable assistance to businessmen, professional men and others. We recall the case of one professional man who had struggled to establish a successful practice before World War II. Because of his talents, he was needed early in the war effort and he was gone from Mattoon for several years.

But Bill and his Journal-Gazette in ways known only to newspapermen, kept that man's status virtually intact in the community and when he finally got back home he resumed his work without facing the uphill battle of starting all over again. This man and many others have justified Bill's confidence in them by their subsequent contributions of service to the community, and they'll always remember the service he extended to them without even being asked to do so.

So whether we think of your and our Bill from the standpoint of the community or as a man and publisher helping other men, we may always cherish the memory of his many kind deeds.

Please be assured that the loss of Bill brought a distinct personal shock to us, but we have our memories—plus the knowledge that he took an outstanding newspaper and made it a dynamic force for good in its community.

You and we must also find comfort in the realization that despite the fact that Bill left us suddenly he left his newspaper in a position to carry on without faltering toward ever greater attainments in the future.

Tax Claim of E. S. Dillard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on May 27, 1959, when I was a Member of the House of Representatives, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a newspaper article telling of a tax dispute between the Internal Revenue Service and Mr. E. S. Dillard, of Charlotte, N.C., and Lynchburg, Va., a leader of the national right to work committee.

The case involved $85,000 in bonds which Mr. Dillard had received from a money-losing venture. He donated $40,000 worth of these bonds to the Dillard Foundation and Trinity Presbyterian Church, claiming charitable deductions for the full amount.

The Government claimed the bonds were not really worth anything and that Mr. Dillard owed $6,186 in extra taxes.

The U.S. Tax Court has now ruled that the bonds were actually worth 43 cents on the dollar and disallowed the rest of Mr. Dillard's deductions for charity. Therefore, I was 43 percent wrong.

Mr. Dillard has now learned that I am a Member of the Senate and asked me to put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a newspaper article reporting the outcome of this tax case. I am pleased to do this and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article which appeared in the February 7, 1961, issue of the Charlotte Observer, my previous insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 27, 1959, and Mr. Dillard's three most recent letters.

There being no objection, the various items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 27, 1959]

RIGHT-TO-WORK LAWS

(Extension of remarks of Hon. LEE METCALF, of Montana, in the House of Representatives, Wednesday, May 27, 1959)

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, twice in the past 5 years Montanans have rejected the union busting so-called right-to-work law.

Those who would weaken unions and reduce the effectiveness of collective bargaining are regrouping, apparently for another try next year.

I have a copy of a letter dated January 7, from an outfit called the National Right To Work Committee. It is an appeal for donations of $50 or more to help supply students "with factual documented informational material" to offset the "propaganda, distorting the issue," being circulated by opponents of this proposal.

The letterhead of the committee includes: E. S. Dillard, president, Old Dominion Box Co., Charlotte, N.C., past chairman of the board.

In this connection, I call to the attention of my colleagues the following article concerning Mr. Dillard in the April 19, 1959, issue of the Charlotte, N.C., Observer.

"CHARLOTTEAN IS FIGHTING BIG TAX ASSESSMENT

"(By Don Oberdorfer)

"WASHINGTON.—Charlotte businessman E. S. Dillard is fighting a Federal tax bite of $92,506 in back taxes, according to records filed in U.S. tax court here.

"Dillard, president of Old Dominion Box Co., announced the sale of two of his three Charlotte divisions to Weyerhauser Timber Co. last week.

"Records filed by Dillard, plus Internal Revenue Service judgments attached, show the big tax dispute arose after Dillard's 1954 purchase of Brown Dynalube Co., Inc., of Charlotte. The company makes lubricating equipment and planned to expand into sales to the Armed Forces.

"Dillard bought the outstanding common stock and accounts payable of the firm for $1. He advanced $1,824 to the company and accepted from the company $85,000 in face value of debenture bonds due in 20 years.

"The Government said these bonds were worth their face value and should have been reported as income. Dillard says they weren't worth anything.

"Later, E. H. Newcombe, president of the lubricating firm, asked to buy some of the bonds of the company from Dillard.

"Dillard agreed to donate $10,000 face value of the bonds to Trinity Presbyterian Church, deducting the gift from his taxes as a $10,000 contribution.

"Newcombe bought the bonds from the church for their face value, $10,000 in cash.

"The same day Dillard donated another $20,000 in bonds to Dillard Foundation, Inc., a tax-exempt charitable foundation which he incorporated. This was deducted from his taxes as a $20,000 contribution.

"About 10 months later, in the fall of 1955, Dillard donated $10,000 more in bonds to Trinity Presbyterian Church, making the usual deduction. A total of $4,500 worth of these bonds were bought for $4,500 from the church by Minor Foundation, Inc.

"This foundation was incorporated by W. T. Minor, Jr., of Charlotte, who is Dillard's tax lawyer. Minor prepared the papers which were filed here on the tax case.

"Dillard says the bonds were worth their full value when he contributed them, and deducted them as contributions, though they were worth nothing when he acquired them.

"The Government takes the opposite view. It says they were worthless when contributed (and so the tax credit for contribution has been voided) but it claims the bonds were worth full face value when acquired and should have been reported as ordinary income.

"The Tax Court judges will have to decide who was right about the value of the bonds at each point in the transaction."

[From the Charlotte Observer, Feb. 7, 1961]

DEBT REDUCED—EX-CHARLOTTEAN WINS TAX RULING

WASHINGTON.—The U.S. Tax Court has ruled that E. S. Dillard, formerly of Charlotte, owes only a small part of the $92,400 claim made against him by the Internal Revenue Service.

The Dillard tax case involved $85,000 in debentures he received from Brown Dynalube Co., Inc., a money-losing venture in which Dillard was interested.

The Government claimed the bonds were worth full value and were income that should have been reported on his tax return. The Tax Court agreed with Dillard that this wasn't so.

Dillard later contributed Brown Dynalube bonds with a face value of $40,000 to Trinity Presbyterian Church and Dillard Foundation, Inc., claiming charitable deductions of this full amount.

The Government claimed Dillard owed $6,168 extra taxes on these deals because the bonds really weren't worth anything.

The Tax Court found that they were actually worth about 43 percent of their face value. It disallowed the rest of Dillard's deductions for charity. This means he will owe several thousand in extra taxes to the Internal Revenue Service unless there is further court review of the case.

MARCH 10, 1961.

The Honorable LEE METCALF,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: On May 27, 1959, you caused to be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a newspaper account of litigation in which I was involved with the Internal Revenue Service.

Your opening statements, followed by this insertion, clearly indicated that your purpose was an obvious attempt to discredit the National Right To Work Committee and me.

In view of your zeal to "call this matter to the attention of your colleagues" in the House of Representatives, I presume you want to inform them of the current status of the matter.

Accordingly, I request that you cause to be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the attached newspaper article from the same newspaper dated February 7, 1961.

I shall appreciate your advice as to your decision with respect to this request.

Very truly yours,

E. S. DILLARD,
President.

APRIL 19, 1961.

The Honorable LEE METCALF,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In the event you failed to receive my letter and the enclosure of March 10, 1961, I am attaching duplicates.

I will appreciate an acknowledgment of your receipt of this material, or the courtesy of a reply in some form.

Very truly yours,

E. S. DILLARD,
President.

OLD DOMINION BOX CO., INC.,
Lynchburg, Va., May 9, 1961.

The Honorable LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: In view of the fact you have failed to reply to my letters of March 10 and April 19, I am sending you copies of these letters and attachments with this letter, registered, return receipt requested.

Once again, I ask you to advise me whether or not you will cause to be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the attached newspaper article reporting the outcome of the tax case in question.

Very truly yours,

E. S. DILLARD,
President.

Address by Hon. W. J. Bryan Dorn, of South Carolina, at Rededication of the Confederate Monument, Alexandria, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, it was a genuine pleasure to be in attendance on the occasion of the rededication of the Confederate Monument in Alexandria, Va., by Hon. WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, on May 24, 1961.

While in the Democratic cloakroom on the afternoon of the day the commemorative rededication ceremony was to be held, I was asked why did I have on a blue suit. I replied that I planned to hear my colleague, BRYAN DORN rededicate the Confederate Monument in Alexandria, Va., that evening. Quietude fell over the cloakroom when I announced that he was to deliver the principal speech. Then someone spoke up and said, "I don't know who dedicated the Alexandria Confederate Monument originally but it will get a good rededication tonight."

The prediction of the member in the cloakroom was fulfilled in its truest sense—BRYAN DORN delivered a masterful, a superb address. He was appropriately introduced by Hon. JOEL BROYHILL, Representative of the 10th Virginia District.

Comdr. S. Cooper Dawson of the Robert E. Lee Chapter, Sons of Confederate Veterans was chairman, who introduced Representative BROYHILL. Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH, who represented the Alexandria District with distinction for many years received a warm ovation from the large crowd in attendance. Hon. FRED SCHWENGEL, of Iowa a member of the National Civil War Centennial Commission and Hon. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR., of Georga were also on the platform.

BRYAN DORN delivered his forceful speech with fervor and devotion. He was, no doubt, accustomed to speaking in the out-of-doors as his remarks were so well received by the audience. There are few, if any, orators of the persent day who can equal or excel BRYAN DORN.

His address follows:

ADDRESS OF REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, MAY 24, 1961, 6:30 P.M., IN OBSERVANCE OF CONFEDERATE MEMORIAL DAY; OPENING OF NORTHERN VIRGINIA CIVIL WAR CENTENNIAL COMMEMORATION AND THE REDEDICATION OF THE CONFEDERATE MONUMENT AT PRINCE AND WASHINGTON STREETS IN ALEXANDRIA, VA.

(One hundred years ago, May 24, 1861, the 17th Virginia Regiment formed at site of monument and marched out to join army of Northern Virginia. Federal troops occupied Alexandria on same day. Seventy-two years ago, May 24, 1889, Governor Fitzhugh Lee, nephew of Robert E. Lee, made dedicatory address unveiling monument.)

Commander Dawson, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is a great honor to be presented to you by one of the ablest, most distinguished, and dedicated Members of the Congress, your own Hon. JOEL T. BROYHILL. I congratulate the citizens of northern Virginia on having the good judgment to send JOE BROYHILL repeatedly to the Congress.

It is an honor to share this platform with your own beloved Judge HOWARD W. SMITH who has served our entire Nation with loyalty, faithfulness and devotion. Judge SMITH has stood like a "Stonewall" for States rights, individual liberty and the principles and ideals of our Founding Fathers. On Virginia soil, I pledge him my continuing allegiance to the great cause for which he stands—constitutional government.

We are all honored with the presence of Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL, an able and distinguished member of the National Civil War Centennial Commission, from the great State of Iowa; Congressman E. C. GATHINGS, of Arkansas, a true southerner and a member of the powerful Agriculture Committee; and my young colleague, Congressman ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR., of Georgia, a great-great nephew of the immortal Alexander H. Stephens, vice president of the Confederacy.

Commander Dawson, you and the members of the Robert E. Lee Chapter, Sons of Confederate Veterans, are to be commended for your untiring efforts to make this occasion a great success. You have been ably assisted by the charming and gracious ladies of Mary Custis Lee-17th Virginia Regiment Chapter of the United Daughters of the Confederacy.

I am glad that the Congress created the Civil War Centennial Commission to commemorate the heroic men and women who fought for the Union on one side and for the South on the other. To head this Commission no better selection could have been made than Gen. Ulysses S. Grant III, the grandson of that magnanimous and able leader to whom Lee surrendered at Appomattox. Your own distinguished former Governor and Congressman, William M. Tuck, is the Vice Chairman of the Commission. These men will lead us in the next 4 years to remember the deeds and heroism of the gallant men, both North and South. They will help us to have a better understanding of that struggle. Today, we should take these lessons of the past, learn them well, and guard our country's future.

I am proud to be a fellow Alexandrian. You are justly proud of the history, architecture, culture, and patriotism of your beautiful city. You have every right to be proud that Alexandria was the hometown of two of the greatest men ever to speak the English language, George Washington and Robert E. Lee.

One hundred years ago today the flower of the young manhood of Alexandria marched off to the west to cast its fortunes with one of the most famous armies in all of the history of the world—the Army of Northern Virginia.

This spot will always be sacred to the people of Alexandria. This ground is hallowed ground. It is historic ground. The men of the 17th Regiment marched away in the full knowledge that their homes, their firesides, their businesses, their cultured and lovely city would be in the hands of an enemy occupying force. They left in the firm conviction that they were fighting for what they believed to be right and just—States' rights, local government, and individual liberty. They marched away in the belief they were fighting for the principles enunciated in the Constitution of the United States and its Bill of Rights. They were loyal, patriotic, and devoted to duty.

The men of the 17th Regiment were familiar with the heritage of Alexandria—the cradle of American liberty. They had been reared in the traditions, principles, and ideals of George Washington, the Father of our Republic. They had been as loyal to the Stars and Stripes of the United States as Washington had been to the crown and flag of England. In casting their lot with their relatives, loved ones, and local principles of government, they felt they were doing no more than the Father of our Country when he joined the cause of the Revolution. Many of these men felt that their cause was a renewal of the revolutionary struggle against autocracy and supreme governmental power. They placed upon the altar of State sovereignty "their lives, their fortunes, and sacred honor."

The men of the 17th Regiment grew up with the full understanding of the principles of Thomas Jefferson; George Mason and his incomparable Bill of Rights; James Madison, the father of the Constitution; James Monroe, author of the Monroe Doctrine; Patrick Henry; Chief Justice John Marshall; John Randolph and countless others. They enjoyed a maximum of freedom, personal liberty, and the free enterprise opportunity system they had helped to create. This heritage, these traditions, this love of liberty was the foundation stone upon which the army of northern Virginia emblazoned its fame upon the pages of history. The leaders of this incomparable army were no less dedicated to the cause than the civilian soldier whom they commanded. Robert E. Lee, a native of Alexandria, as commander of that army gained immortal fame as a military leader and as a kindly, considerate, Christian gentleman. As a reminder of his military genius, his courage, and audacity, turn with me to the early morning of June 26, 1862. At that moment the young Confederate government was threatened with collapse. Its largest city and principal port, New Orleans, had been captured and occupied. Confederate lines of defense in the West had collapsed. The western armies retreated in confusion from Kentucky, from Tennessee, and from Shiloh deep into Mississippi. The Confederate coast was blockaded from Hampton Roads to the Mexican border. A huge, well-disciplined, highly-organized, and mighty Federal Army under George B. McClellan was 7 miles from downtown Richmond where they could hear the

church bells on Sunday morning. Powerful Union reinforcements were poised throughout northern Virginia to strike the rear and cut off retreat from Richmond. Despair, gloom, and hopelessness gripped the Confederate government and Confederate people.

You Sons of the Confederate Veterans here in Alexandria have rightly and proudly named your camp after the intrepid leader—Robert E. Lee. This new commander refused to retreat. He seized the initiative and launched a counterblow north of Richmond on the morning of June 26. With inferior numbers, with inferior supplies, with second-rate military hardware, in approximately 2 short months from that hour of attack on June 26, his footsore and ill-clad army was crossing the Potomac while his bands played "Maryland, My Maryalnd." Behind him lay the victories of the Seven Days, the Relief of Richmond, Cedar Mountain, and Second Bull Run. The wreckage of Federal armies littered the Virginia countryside. He now threatened the Federal Capital. Gloom, consternation, and despair gripped the North. The South breathed a sigh of relief and the world stood in amazement, awe, and wonder. The valor and gallantry of the civilian soldier under Lee and Jackson had turned the tide of defeat and easy Federal victory into a gigantic struggle to continue for years.

The men of the 17th Regiment who formed here on that May morning 100 years ago were part of the glory, the achievement, and lasting fame of that army. The Army or Northern Virginia was never, as a unit, driven from any single battlefield in defeat. It was simply worn away by hardship, disease, and attrition until it finally surrendered at Appomattox Court House. Its accomplishments and valor became legend. Military experts from foreign nations studied its every move. Patton, MacArthur, and even Rommel of Germany became familiar with the details of its campaigns—a tribute to Lee, his gallant officers, and the civilian soldiers who followed him for 4 years.

It was my privilege 4 years ago in May to attend the unveiling of the bust of Stonewall Jackson in the Hall of Fame for great Americans at New York University. I was thrilled to see the bust of Jackson added to that of Robert E. Lee. These incomparable leaders of the Army of Northern Virginia proudly stand with the 89 greatest men in American history—an honor bestowed by the entire Nation, a tribute to their genius and the soldiers of the Confederate Army. It has been truly said they no longer belong to the people of Virginia or the people of the South, but to all of America and to the English-speaking world. Could they speak today in the Hall of Fame, they would give credit to Southern manhood as exemplified in the 17th Virginia Regiment.

There has always existed a strong bond of friendship and mutual admiration between the people of Virginia and the people of South Carolina. I am proud to represent the old congressional district in this Congress once represented so ably and so well by the "father of States rights," John C. Calhoun. I am proud to represent the soil where the remains of Barnard E. Bee now rest—who gave "Stonewall" Jackson his immortal name and thrilled the South by his courage and supreme sacrifice at the First Battle of Manassas. When this handsome likeness of the Confederate soldier was dedicated to the memory of the men of the 17th Regiment on May 24, 1889, Gen. M. C. Butler of my South Carolina district sat on this platform with Gen. Joseph E. Johnston, Gov. Fitzhugh Lee, and the other distinguished guests. Gen. M. C. Butler was the youngest major general of the Confederate Army and at the time of the dedication was U.S. Senator from my native State. Senator Butler and Governor Lee did not know on that day 72 years ago that they would subsequently become major generals of volunteers in the Army of the United States during the Spanish War. In all the history of the world the story of man cannot point to a nation where men could attain high military rank in a cause against the government and yet reach the same rank in the defense of that government. Such was the spirit, devotion, and honor of Governor Lee and Senator Butler and the men whom they led.

This gives us another insight into the true character of the Confederate soldier. When the sun set on his ambitions and his hopes at Appomattox, he returned home and renewed his allegiance to the United States. His difficulties seemed insurmountable—homes destroyed, economic system wrecked, money worthless, and citizenship denied. Without aid, he tackled the task before him as resolutely as he had charged the Federal guns at Gettysburg. He succeeded in building a new South. He simply went to work and through patient, thrift, and frugality, wrote another chapter in the progress of our common Republic. He taught his children that we are one Nation, united forever.

In 1876 when the dark clouds of Reconstruction hung over the South, a disputed national election divided the American people. Revolution, war, bloodshed, and internal strife threatened our Nation. It was the loyalty, devotion, and coolness of men like Wade Hampton, M. C. Butler, and their Confederate followers who prevented further bloodshed and truly reunited our Republic. Someday historians will more fully cover this glorious chapter of American history. In 1876 the Confederate soldier fought for peace, understanding, and a united nation. In those trying days he contributed greatly to the preservation, unity, and growth of the United States.

It is fitting that we rededicate this monument today to the memory of our grandfathers, the Confederate civilian soldiers. It is proper that we rededicate it particularly to the men of the 17th Virginia Regiment, who volunteered from our historic city. We rededicate this monument today to the 97 men of Alexandria who paid the supreme sacrifice in defense of their native State. We rededicate it to those who were wounded and maimed for life. We rededicate it to those who returned and labored for peace, for the Union, and the restoration of our beautiful city. The men whom this monument honors were men who believed that each individual owes something of himself and his talents to his country, to his community, and to local and State government. In rededicating this monument, we would do well to send our children and our grandchildren here that they may emulate their gallantry, sacrifice, and devotion. Only by a study and understanding of the past can we preserve a measure of freedom and justice for the future. Yes, we rededicate this monument and ourselves to the future. May we absorb some of the devotion of these heroes and rededicate our lives to the preservation of our Nation. May we keep it strong militarily, educationally, morally, and spiritually.

Just as on May 24, 1861, our Nation today faces a great crisis. We are threatened as never before in our history since the time of Valley Forge. We are a united people today, but we face a ruthless, determined, and united enemy. These enemies, like Genghis Khan of old, are sweeping without conscience out of the Eurasian Continent aiming a death blow at our freedoms. This bloody enemy has gained at every turn. By open conquest, by subversion, and by infiltration he marches on to victory after victory. This enemy has won at every summit conference meeting. He enters a conference with a deliberate, calculated intention to lie and deceive. This atheist enemy has made fantastic and unbelievable gains in Asia, the Middle East, the Near East, Central Europe, Africa, Cuba, and Latin America. The United States is literally under the Communist gun today. Our only foreign policy has been the spending of money, appeasement, compromise, and retreat. We are today in a position where we can retreat no further without surrendering our sovereignty and liquidating the hard-won freedoms of our people. We can no longer trust the American dollar to purchase and preserve our American freedom. We can no longer depend on summit conferences, broken promises, and compromise of principle. We must, as a nation, now face reality. We should declare a national emergency, mobilize our total resources, and assume the offensive. The threat of Communist aggression in Cuba can no longer be tolerated. This threat must be eliminated by the Armed Forces of the United States if necessary. The hour is late, the situation critical. We must, enforce the Monroe Doctrine now or we will lose all of South and Central America. With the loss of South and Central America, the Communist pincer movement aimed at the heart of the United States will be complete.

Already Communist missiles and bombers are poised in Siberia ready to strike over the North Pole. With our southern flank exposed and under Communist domination, we could no longer maintain our position as a world power. Our Government must take the lead in fanning the fires of patriotism. We must rekindle the spirit of liberty. The valor and patriotism displayed by both sides in the 1860's are needed in the 1960's. Our freedom depends on the united effort of every American citizen. It will take courage, self-sacrifice, loyalty, and devotion to duty.

Around this monument which stands between the North and the South, we might direct our attention to the great domestic problem which threatens to divide our Nation as we face the common enemy. We cannot defeat communism and totalitarianism by adopting totalitarianism. In the name of fighting communism, the Federal Government is using some of its techniques and some of its arbitrary, blatant powers. Our Nation today is still a union of states, a union of communities, a union of local governments, and a unit of individuals—each State and individual maintaining independent characteristics while bearing allegiance and loyalty to the whole. If we are to survive as a nation, the Federal Government today must respect individual rights, States' rights, and long-established community customs and traditions.

The South of today is tolerant. The South of today is making fantastic progress in the field of equal rights and human understanding. The South is not making any effort to impose its traditions and customs and local statutes on other sections of the United States. The South is sponsoring no invasion of other areas of our land. The South respects the right of every community to govern at the local level. The grandsons and granddaughters of the men who wore the blue and grey in the 1860's are not engaged in agitation and destruction of our country today. Their love for this Nation, its Constitution, our individual privileges, and obligations were cemented in that fiery crucible a hundred years ago. This is the time for tolerance, unity, love, and understanding while we face the greatest danger in the history of Western civilization. Those who would invade the privacy of our time-honored, sacred institutions and travel many miles to disobey local and State laws are aiding the enemies of our great country. The agitators who leave their local duties to embark on a program of nationwide unrest and discord are compounding our problems during these critical days. Those who seek to make the United States conform to one pattern of pseudoliberal fascism are paving the way for a dictatorship and totalitarianism. Our Republic is a young Repub-

lic. It is still on trial before the eyes of the world. We must not turn our destiny over to the bigots, agitators, and pressure groups boring from within to advance their own selfish ends. Now is the time for all Americans—East, South, North, and West—to place the welfare of our country ahead of personal consideration. Now is the time for all organizations, races, and creeds to rededicate themselves first to the preservation of our Nation. Individual freedom, free local government, and the rights of our States can survive in the space age through a rededication of our allegiance to the faith of the Founding Fathers.

On this sacred ground as we commemorate the glorious deeds of our past may we rededicate and consecrate our lives forever to the freedom and independence of our beloved country. May we say with the late Senator Benjamin Hill of Georgia when he said: "He who saves his country saves all things, and all things saved will bless him. He who lets his country die lets all things die, and all things dying curse him."

American Women Render Valiant Service Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, a stirring and informative article reciting from firsthand observations the good work done by American women abroad has been written by Mrs. Bruce Lee Kennedy, wife of John A. Kennedy, publisher of the Daily Argus-Leader of Sioux Falls, S. Dak.

Mr. and Mrs. Kennedy are presently on an extensive oversea trip. I have previously called attention to some of the articles written by Mr. Kennedy for the Argus-Leader. I now ask that there be printed in the Appendix of today's RECORD an article from the talented pen of Mrs. John A. Kennedy entitled "American Women Brace Hardships of the Congo." It is a well-merited tribute to a wonderful group of Americans who are serving the cause of peace and freedom all over the world. This article appeared in a recent edition of the Daily Argus-Leader.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader, Apr. 30, 1961]

AMERICAN WOMEN BRAVE HARDSHIPS OF THE CONGO

(By Bruce Lee Kennedy, president of the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader)

LEOPOLDVILLE.—My hat is off to that little band of American women keeping house for their foreign service husbands here in the Congo—and to the other European (all nonnatives are so designated) wives of U.N., Embassy, and commercial whites who live here.

Shortage of food, decent housing, inflated prices, and the general chaos makes housekeeping very, very difficult.

Eggs, when you can get them fresh, are $1.40 per dozen, staples are high in price and short in supply; meat and fowl tough and few vegetables available at any price.

It is so different than 2 years ago. Then there was plenty of everything, even though most was imported, and prices which always have been high had not reached the astronomical plateau now existing.

INSECTS CAUSE LAUNDRY PROBLEM

Mrs. Norman E. Warner, daughter of the D. W. Loucks of 2221 South Western Avenue, Sioux Falls, wife of the first secretary, told me of a laundry problem. She has three children. When the clothes dry outside, insects sometimes lay eggs on them. When this happens on underwear, body heat hatches the eggs and tiny worms imbed themselves in the skin of the wearer. If the clothes are pressed with a hot iron, the heat kills the eggs, but it is very hard on nylons and other synthetic materials.

Ernest H. Wiener, Jr., press officer, has a 1-year-old baby. His wife thought it would be grand to have houseboys to do the work. They are paid $50 a month, plus a family allowance dependent on the number of children the houseboy has. A bachelor, therefore, is preferred, but if you get one it won't be long before he saves enough to buy a wife. In the current market, the young man pays $100 to $200 for her. If the marriage is not a success and she returns to her family, the bride's price is refunded.

There were many complaints about the houseboy's inefficiency—they could not remember; they would not clean thoroughly; they could not answer the phone. They would boil the drinking water, but it was difficult to have this done for the ice cubes.

In addition to doing housework, the boys also act as nursemaids for the children. Since independence, they don't want to work after 3 o'clock in the afternoon, so preparing the evening dinner and obtaining baby sitters becomes difficult.

POWDERED MILK IMPORTED

Since there are few tuberculin-tested cows in the Congo, all milk is imported in powdered form. Older children who have been brought up on whole homogenized milk don't like it any more than our soldiers and sailors do. The Wiener's year-old baby doesn't know the difference, of course. Mixing milk into cocoa, making cream soups and stirring chocolate into it helps disguise and solves the problem for the older youngsters.

If the children know French, it is easy for them at school but one boy of 11 with whom we talked was having a most difficult time as classes are in French. He just was beginning to catch on to part of his lessons after several months of school.

All Europeans take vitamins daily and a weekly antimalaria tablet. Pan American Airways gave all Léopoldville-bound passengers malaria pills.

The Belgians sprayed for mosquitoes with helicopters twice weekly before independence as well as spraying in the city streets by truck. This service has vanished.

Of course, everyone is inoculated against typhoid, polio, and all of the tropical diseases before they arrive.

FOOD IN SHORT SUPPLY

Food stocks right now are dreadfully low. There are practically no fresh-frozen foods. Every Thursday, fresh fish is flown in. By 9 a.m., the supply in exhausted.

I went to three shops to get two 8-ounce cans of tomato juice for 40 cents each.

Canned fruits, soups, and vegetables, mostly American, cost two and one-half times as much as at home. There were a few carrots and some tired cabbage.

For fresh vegetables, you go to the native market which seems safe now but many Europeans are reluctant about buying there. Fruit and vegetables have to be well cooked and medicated to kill microbes.

Good Friday evening we paid 50 cents each for oysters at Sabena Guest House. Half a lobster, either broiled or thermador, was $11 a portion. We watched for an hour and a half but saw no one ordering this delicacy. It was out of sight for our budget.

Most people were eating steamed mussels, with broth served in a casserole at $1.50 per portion.

Five of us lunched one day at our hotel. We had broiled trout, potatoes, canned asparagus and string beans, beer and cheese and crackers for dessert. The bill was $40—typical for all meals in hotels considered safe.

U.N. soldiers equipped with Sten guns paraded before the entrance and exits of our hotel.

EFFECTS OF INFLATION FELT

Inflation is taking its toll. The black market rate of exchange is 80 francs for $1, although embassy, press and commercial people exchange their paychecks at the official rate of 50 francs to the dollar. This makes for very expensive living because actual prices are tied to the black market rate.

My hairdresser was almost out of supplies but hoped for a suitcase full which her daughter was bringing from Belgium. If she can't get more through normal channels, she will have to close up shop.

The Warners told me they had been waiting more than 6 months for their furniture. It was in the pile of undelivered goods at Port Matambi, where U.N. and Congolese are still struggling for control.

Neighbors had just received their household goods. Practically all of it was water-soaked. Mattresses and upholstered pieces of course were ruined. The Warners and others in similar situations hope theirs will arrive in good condition.

Supreme Court Orders Pay for Traitors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, when legal precedents and reasoning will support a judgment either way, good judges have traditionally rendered that judgment which most accords with the interests of society. In short, commonsense has had a part in the development and strength of our legal system and the respect for law which characterizes our society. When this tradition is disregarded it can only result in weakening the legal system and diminishing respect for it.

Apparently the U.S. Court of Claims determined there was adequate precedent and legal reasoning to support a judgment denying Army pay to certain Korean POW's who defected to the Communists. Yet the Supreme Court of the United States has overturned that decision and ordered payments by the U.S. Government to the very persons who dishonorably turned against it. I share with the writer of the following editorial appearing in the Los Angeles Herald Express on May 25 his difficulty in understanding why the Supreme Court should render such a decision.

REWARD FOR DISHONOR

Another U.S. Supreme Court decision which will astonish many Americans has just been handed down in the case of three U.S. soldiers who were alleged to have aided the Communist side when they were captured during the Korean war.

After the war, the trio refused repatriation, preferring to remain in Red China. But after 19 months under the Red Chinese, they changed their minds and returned to the United States in 1955.

Now the U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that the three soldiers, former corporals who were dishonorably discharged from the Army, are entitled to their pay during the time they were prisoners of war.

The Supreme Court decision came on appeal from the U.S. Court of Claims, which had declared in its opposite decision that to grant their POW pay "would be to put a premium on dishonor and a penalty on courageous loyalty."

Arguing before the Supreme Court, George S. Leonard, attorney for the Justice Department, said that the actions of the three soldiers "appear to have amounted to the military equivalent of treason."

It often is difficult to understand the reasoning behind the High Court's decisions.

The defectors involved and the amount of American taxpayers money they will receive under this decision are as follows: Otho G. Bell, Hillsboro, Miss., $1,455; William A. Cowart, Monticello, Ark., $4,991; Lewie W. Griggs, Jacksonville, Tex., $2,810.

Birthday Greetings to President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of President Kennedy's 44th birthday, I am happy to join with millions of well-wishers in this country and abroad to extend felicitations and warmest greetings to our Chief Executive. With it go my sincerest wishes that the year ahead may prove to be a year of great achievement for him and for our Nation.

It is said that every period of crisis in the Nation's history brings forth its men of great vision and ability. We are fortunate indeed to have a man of the vision and stature of President Kennedy to lead our people at this crucial period in human affairs. I feel certain that under his leadership and guidance we can look forward to the future with courage and determination that our national goals will be achieved.

On the eve of his departure for Europe, where he is to meet with the great French statesman General de Gaulle, with Soviet Premier Khrushchev and others, we wish him godspeed and success in his endeavors in behalf of world peace. Together with these wishes, go our assurances that the American people are united behind him and fully support him in these efforts. Millions in this country will be praying for his success.

It is perhaps coincidental, but nevertheless momentous, that this mission to Europe should begin on his 44th birthday. Not many men in all of history, in all nations, have reached the pinnacle of leadership of a great nation at the age of 44. President Kennedy has emerged on the world scene as the leader of the greatest and the most powerful nation of all times at this relatively young age, and that is due to his great leadership, his ability, his understanding of world problems, and his unceasing desire to make this world a safer and a happier place for all mankind.

May the good Lord bless him and his family with many years of good health. May we be privileged to benefit of his able leadership and wise counsel in the years ahead, and may he succeed in leading our Nation from strength to strength. Let us hope that America, under President Kennedy, and the whole world, will truly enjoy genuine peace and cooperation for the welfare of all of humanity.

Pro-Red China Move Called Peril to United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD C. BRUCE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to insert an article from the Indianapolis Star, written by Preston G. Woolf, an Indianapolis businessman and president of the Indianapolis Council on World Affairs.

Mr. Woolf has written a most perceptive article on the drive to admit Red China into the United Nations. I would recommend that all of my colleagues read Mr. Woolf's article for a precise analysis of the dangers involved in such a move by this country.

[From the Indianapolis Star, Apr. 28, 1961]

PRO-RED CHINA MOVE CALLED PERIL TO UNITED STATES

(Preston G. Woolf, Indianapolis businessman and president of the Indianapolis Council on World Affairs, knows the Orient and its people firsthand. His world travels have taken him there many times. Here are his observations on the vital issue of Red China and the United Nations.)

(By Preston G. Woolf)

During the coming months it is expected that the pressure will increase for the admittance of Red China into the United Nations. The principal line of the arguments may be expected to be that "we cannot continue to ignore 700 million people" and that "it is easier to get them around a conference table where we can negotiate with them."

Then we can expect the "soft-sell," which takes the line that "Peiping is not trying to get into the U.N. nearly as hard as Washington is trying to keep it out."

The facts are that the Red Chinese would like to be in the world organization, for the U.N. is a wonderful sounding board for propaganda, as the Russians have demonstrated again and again. But the Chinese Communists act as if they can take the U.N. membership or leave it.

We also can expect to receive pressure from some of our allies who are now trading with the Red Chinese and would like to do them a favor by "getting them into the club," provided they will not meet with too violent opposition from the United States.

To get American reasoning on the question of Red China and the U.N. down to rock-bottom logic is perhaps easier today. This is because we are now thoroughly awake to the vicious Communist regime which has been planted in Cuba while we were still living in naive hope.

Every American should firmly realize that the Red Chinese regard the United States as their No. 1 enemy and have as their major objective to drive the United States out of the Orient. They are now trying to weaken the United States by attacking its allies, using the so-called strategy of attacking the weak in order to weaken the strong.

One need only to look at our current losing position in Laos and to study seriously the threat that exists against Vietnam, Thailand, and Burma to see the encroachment of Red China on all of Southeast Asia.

Around the immense southern rim of Red China, from Afghanistan at the western end to Vietnam on the Pacific, the growing propaganda against us in Japan and military preparedness in North Korea, we find the Red Chinese at work against us. Most of the bordering nations either show a friendly face or a neutral face toward their huge neighbor. Only two or three venture to be openly hostile and defiant. All share a common feeling toward Red China—namely, fear.

From earliest times, the Chinese have been pressing southward from the days of Han until the hordes of Kublai Khan.

All Asians know that Red China is not the agrarian reformer as originally portrayed, but is a dedicated and aggressive Communist power enjoying the full support and cooperation of Soviet Russia and openly, daily and loudly broadcasting its hate for the United States.

It would be unbelievable that America, in a moment of naive weakness or charity, would invite this nation, under its present regime and following its present practices, to sit at the United Nations.

Were we to do so, many of our friends, both individual leaders and nations, in the Orient would crumble like a house of cards. Resistance to the Red Chinese in the Orient is encouraged principally because the United States is the great power and has the courage to speak against Peiping.

Even neutral India, which seemed to go out of her way to be conciliatory toward China, has been less charitable since the days of the slaughter of the people of Tibet and the Chinese military claims to parts of Kashmir.

One of the strongest and most intelligent allies in the Orient, namely the Republic of Free China on Formosa, would be the first to be hurt by any change in United States policy. Formosa has the best army and air force in Asia on the side of the West and maintains an irrevocable attitude against communism.

This policy of President Chiang Kai-shek presents an iron fist against communism first, because the Chinese Nationalists have personally seen communism on the mainland and secondly, because they know that their republic has built its strength through its development as a showcase for free enterprise as compared with the regimentation on the mainland less than 100 miles away.

Recognition of Red China would weaken the military position of Formosa which is one of the great ramparts in the West Pacific. The humility of any loss of power or prestige of Formosa would cause desertion of 12 million oversea Chinese living in southeast Asia from the cause of freedom and force them to pay homage to the ambitious Red Chinese.

Just as our position in Cuba has deteriorated through lack of proper perception and alertness to the danger of giving the Communists a foothold, we could, in like manner, awake to find that we have lost the Orient if we were to recognize Red China. Then Pearl Harbor would again become our frontline of defense.

Ethics and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD C. BRUCE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an editorial from the Wall Street Journal, May 8, 1961, entitled "Ethics and Politics."

This editorial points up the political hypocricy and cynicism which has governed the passage of various of the laws passed by this Congress in the past few months. It is clear to me that unless this unrestricted spending with no possibility of balancing the budget is halted immediately, future generations will be burdened with a debt so staggering that they may never recover.

Ethics in politics is a subject about which all of us ought to be concerned. Many of us could not face our constituents in next year's elections with the knowledge that we had jeopardized their children's futures by voting for certain measures for purely political reasons.

The editorial follows:

ETHICS AND POLITICS

With so much high-sounding talk about conflict of interest and the presumed need for higher ethical standards in Government and business, maybe it's time for some down-to-earth thinking about the state of political morality in Washington, D.C.

We have in mind, among other things, a brace of brandnew laws Congress has obligingly presented the President very much as he asked for them. Both the minimum wage and the depressed areas laws are marvels of political hypocrisy. We don't say they are the worst in the long history of politicking, but they are bad enough.

The basic concept of the minimum wage bill has been described this way: Extend coverage to as many workers as possible while incurring as few enemies as possible. By noting that the law covers 3.6 million workers not previously included, the politicians can trumpet their compassion for the poor little people.

That is a sham. The law excludes many workers—certain hospital workers, agricultural laborers, laundry workers, for example—who actually make less than $1 an hour. Such exclusions are not difficult to fathom; to take just one, the powerful congressional farm bloc wouldn't hear of bringing in agricultural laborers. Indeed a small group of workers in the South that were previously covered are kicked out under the new law, in order to make it more palatable to southern politicians.

At the same time the measure extends coverage to many whose wages are far above present or prospective minimums. A choice instance is the inclusion of 1 million construction workers. The average hourly pay of construction workers in this country is $3.32. The reason for dragging them in is purely and simply to pad the apparent coverage and so make it appear that the Government is doing a lot for a whole lot of people.

This fraudulent law has good company in the depressed-area measure. The definition of such an area is one where unemployment is above an arbitrary percentage. First of all, the Government makes only the most superficial attempt to discover how many people in this country are genuinely unemployed, in the sense that they are able and willing to work and actually looking for any work that will keep them off the governmental doles. Thus the very premise of the depressed-area legislation is faulty.

Beyond that, it is designed to attract industry to areas whose problem of the moment is an excess of industrial capacity for immediate needs, while providing no assurance of attracting industry to economically unappealing areas. Some of the law's more candid supporters admit their doubts that it will do anything to relieve unemployment. The all-important political point is that it is a means of channeling nearly half a billion dollars to politically appealing areas.

More generally, it is becoming clear that this administration and this Congress propose to pursue their political spending plans with little regard to the Government's financial condition. Unless they change quickly and abruptly, they are setting the country on an inflationary course. That means shirking one of the Government's most basic moral responsibilities: the preservation of honest money.

We would want it well understood that we are not against politicians or politicking. In our Government a President is perforce a politician. In the nature and diversity of our political society, compromises in Congress—logrolling if you wish—are necessary and frequently desirable. In this way it is possible to reach something like a consensus of the country; it is frequently possible to defeat or modify dangerously extreme legislation.

But what is striking about many in this administration and this Congress so far is the high degree of political cynicism they have brought to Washington; the virtues of politics, after all, can turn into vices, as when they produce legislation and actions in clear conflict with the public interest.

So it is perhaps not out of place to suggest some examination of consciences in Washington. If that is asking too much, the public should at least take a good look at what is going on in its name.

No Government Aid, Please

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include an editorial appearing in the May 20 issue of the Southern Textile News, of Charlotte, N.C. This editorial points up an observation I made in a speech on the floor on May 22, 1961, in which it was stated that I do not believe the textile industry is seeking Government handouts or that it wishes to be placed on a dole. What it does seek is a fair opportunity to compete in the domestic market with foreign manufacturers of textile products. The editorial follows:

NO GOVERNMENT AID, PLEASE

The latest suggestion from Washington is that the U.S. Government allocate $80 million to the textile industries to promote the basic research. According to the plan the money would be raised by customs receipts from textile imports.

We feel that such a step is not necessary and would not be to the best interests of the textile industry.

In the first place, we are sure the industry is not looking for any kind of grant or handout from the Federal Government; in the second place, we feel the industry would not want a vital program such as research tied to foreign imports; and in the third place, we believe the textile industry is carrying on as vigorous and profitable a program of research as is any other industry.

To have the Government interfere in the research work would only weaken the efforts now being put forth by private enterprise.

Since so much is being done in this field by the textile industry we hesitate to cite examples. However, in glancing over the last issue of our publication, a number of examples can be seen. One of them is the automatic doffing system developed by the Deering Milliken Research Corp., Spartanburg, S.C.; another is the progress toward permanent creased trousers as reported by the wool bureau in New York.

Along with this there is a report on the Draper shuttleless loom and the striking statement by an official of the firm revealing that for the past 5 years the Draper Corp. has used the equivalent of 50 percent of the company's net profit after taxes for the purpose of product research and development. It would be easy to go on and on with such examples. We are confident that any interested observer could compile an impressive catalog of such accomplishments by reading our publication for a couple of months.

We are convinced it would be a mistake for the Government to get involved in a field which is being adequately served by individual companies as well as by many trade organizations. With Government aid there inevitably comes Government control and interference. This, we are sure, is something the textile industry would want to avoid.

For many years spokesmen for the textile plants have emphasized that the main thing they want from the Government is to be let alone to run their businesses. They would, of course, like to be freed from some artificial difficulties such as abnormal imports and two-price cotton which Government policies have produced. But there is every reason to believe that it would only compound these problems to get involved in a Government aid program of any kind.

We are living in an age of Federal aid to education, Federal medical care for the aged, aid for depressed areas, and so on, endlessly. One look at what Federal aid has done for our agriculture, however, is enough to scare any thinking person away from Government subsidies.

We are glad our officials in Washington are thinking about the welfare of the Nation's vital textile industry. Nevertheless, there are many things they could do which would be far more useful than an outright grant of money.

For many years leaders of the industry have been making some very logical suggestions. It is our sincere hope that the Government people will take some of the steps which have already been recommended instead of embarking on some wildcat program of their own.

Iconoclast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include Senator

BARRY GOLDWATER's letter to the Washington Post—Sunday May 28, 1961—included in the RECORD. Senator GOLDWATER answers in a clear and concise manner charges made against him by the same publication.

The article follows:

ICONOCLAST

Speaking of "sleazy smears as silly as they are unfair," reference is made herewith to your editorial of May 20.

Your writer objected to my statement that "it is long past time that we satisfy the American mind about the State Department in view of the number of recent fiascoes." And, of course, in doing so he conveniently neglected the preface I made to that statement wherein I specifically said that "I am not implying that there are Communists in the State Department."

It might have helped if the Washington Post had had a reporter present when I made my remarks to the Arlington Young Republicans—a reporter competent enough to take down an entire statement rather than lifting a quote out of context—but I doubt it. Had my entire statement been reported, you would not have been able to infer that I was attacking the patriotism of State Department personnel, which I certainly was not.

I was intrigued with the Post's reference to "The misjudgments in the executive agencies which have resulted in such serious reverses in the United States of late." What are we supposed to do about these "misjudgments?" Do we ignore them merely because a Senator named McCarthy once attacked the State Department in a manner which the Post will never forgive?

I am interested in knowing just what it would take for the Post to editorially sanction an investigation into how we have been mishandling our international affairs? Do we have to wait until Khrushchev takes over all of Latin America, all of southeast Asia, all of the Middle East? Or do we have to wait until international communism engulfs the United States and the Washington Post is reduced to the last editorial it will ever guaranteed to the American press?
write under the constitutional freedom

Does the Post mean to infer that because the State Department is patriotic, it is also infallible; that because it is not ruled by Communist influences, that it should not be investigated?

For some reason which I am at a loss to fathem, the Post is unduly sensitive on the subject of possible investigation of the State Department. I haven't found it equally as touchy about other departments that have come under attach, such as the CIA or the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Why?

It is academic to point out that you are out of step with the American people, who are demanding in a loud voice that our disastrous foreign policy be investigated from top to bottom. If your editorial writers would step out of their ivory white towers and get out of Washington for a time, I suggest they would find out that the people are sick to death of a steady diet of fiascoes which began at Yalta and paced the loss of Poland, China, and other important areas of the world—fiascoes which reduced victory to defeat in Korea, allowed Nasser to rise in the Middle East, made a mess of things in Laos, excused the rise of Castro's Communist regime on our doorstep and botched the Cuban invasion attempt.

No amount of Post editorializing to the effect that the State Department's role in these disasters was patriotically motivated will wipe them out or excuse them in the minds of the American people. The role of the State Department has been, at the very best, sophomoric and naive at the most critical time in our history. It deserves to be looked into thoroughly and competently.

BARRY GOLDWATER,
Senator from Arizona.

WASHINGTON.

Where Has Prestige of United States Gone?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Joseph (Mo.) News-Press entitled, "Where Has Prestige of United States Gone?"

WHERE HAS PRESTIGE OF UNITED STATES GONE?

Bandit Castro, Red dictator of Cuba, has the effrontery to offer to free 1,200 captives taken in the ill-fated invasion of Cuba early in April. He has all the gall of Mediterranean bandit Raisuli who in 1904 captured an American citizen and held him for ransom.

This dirty, miserable, jackal Castro offers to sell his human captives for 500 bulldozers from the United States.

As if this were not bad enough, worse, Americans of high standing actually have taken steps to meet the ransom. It is astounding that Eleanor Roosevelt, Milton Eisenhower, and Walter Reuther, have started a movement to raise the ransom money.

How low can the prestige of the United States fall?

What will the Old World, yes, even the Communist-ruled world, think of an American that in the face of the April debacle—that abortive invasion—now buys the freedom of captives in this manner?

Either we did or did not engineer that futile invasion. If we did, then we should go ahead with the job, invade the place, annihilate Castro, and take the consequences with his sponsor Khrushchev. If we did not have anything to do with that invasion—except guilty knowledge that would perhaps make us an accessory before the fact—then we should keep hands off. A revolt failed; the rebels must take the consequences. That is the history of revolution from the time of all recorded history.

We are disappointed, terribly disappointed in President John F. Kennedy. Where is the man of noble words at his Inaugural? Great heavens, President Kennedy surely must have known of this bandit offer for ransom. All he had to do was denounce it in strongest terms of his careful use of the English language. Then not even the names of Franklin Roosevelt's widow or President Eisenhower's brother would have availed.

Did America fall on its face in electing this man Kennedy? Maybe the fates have been unkind to him. If they have they certainly have with a vengeance. Is the man as former President Harry S. Truman once said immature, not ready for the presidency or the presidency not ready for him?

Getting back to that Berber bandit Raisuli of more than 50 years ago: The captive was a native Greek, but then an American citizen, Ion Perdicaris. When the ransom demand came to the White House in 1904 grim, fighting Theodore Roosevelt shot back one sentence to the Mediterranean authorities who dared act as middleman between a bandit and a President. Theodore Roosevelt demanded the safe return of the American or the extinction of the bandit. His cable adorns history's bright page: "Perdicaris alive or Raisuli dead."

O for another Grover Cleveland or Theodore in the White House.

Indeed, indeed we fear we have fallen on evil days.

Law and the Free Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ODIN LANGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to the following prizewinning essay by Miss Mary Ann Novacek, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Louis Novacek, and a student at Mount St. Benedict Academy in Crookston, Minn.

Miss Novacek's essay, which won first place in the ninth district VFW Auxiliary contest in Minnesota, is a further example of the outstanding work being done by today's young people.

The essay, entitled "Law and the Free Citizen," follows:

Law, freedom, and citizenship may be compared to three beautifully carved chests preserved and cherished in the living treasury of history. These chests have been carefully guarded through the centuries against the onslaughts of tyranny and oppression. They have stood the wear well.

Upon closer examination of the first chest, law, one sees handsomely carved on the shining cover of the chest the 10 commandments, the first and basic law governing all men. Contained in this chest are the codes of Hammurabi and Justinian. The Magna Carta, the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution of the United States of America. Law, centuries of law, which shows the evolution of law from the embyro of God's commandments to the most intricately developed definitions of these simple precepts, is the precious contents of this chest.

The second chest, freedom, is as large as its predecessor and shines with equal brilliance, although the surface is scratched and stained. Yet noble stains are these. They are the reminders of the cost of freedom: the blood of the Israelites stung by the Egyptian lash; the tears of Cornelia, the mother of the Grachii; the blood of colonial Americans at Bunker Hill; the blood of the French nobility shed, because of oppression; and more American blood shed at Harpers Ferry and Gettysburg. Yes, noble stains they are and they reflect the sun's rays and light the way for man's search for true freedom.

The third chest, citizenship, is large enough to contain the other two. The cover of this chest has a relief of a Roman gowned in a toga. The toga was the mark of citizenship in Rome. No slave or foreigner could wear a toga. When a Roman citizen was to be banished he symbolically set aside his rights of citizenship by casting off his toga. Virgil said of the toga: "Romanos rerum dominos, genetumque togatum" * * * "Romans, lords of the world, the race that wears the toga."

Citizenship has always been coveted. A citizen is a sharer in his home, his church, and his nation. From each of these institutions the citizen derives rights, benefits, and duties. The French rebels desired citizenship so ardently that they willingly faced armed guards with no more powerful weapon than a pitchfork or a hoe. After their republic was set up the Frenchmen addressed each other as "citizenne."

In America an immigrant first dons a "toga" when he has been naturalized. From that time on he enjoys the rights of an American citizen and is obliged to carry out the duties of his new state.

Freedom is defined as the absence of external coercion or restraint. Man is intrinsically free because of his free will. The will is free when it is trained to seek what is good. The good, in this instance, is the law.

Freedom and law are inseparate of one another. Freedom without law becomes license and brings chaos. Law without freedom becomes force and brings tyranny. Tyranny occurs when the law in a dictatorship or an obsolute monarchy is the will of the ruler. In the early belief of the divine right of kings the monarch was responsible to God for his actions. The dictator of today no longer feels responsible to any higher power. He governs as he sees fit and the people are at his mercy. Might and force set aside right.

Law is an indispensable partner of freedom. It is a guide for reason and a protector of human rights. The good citizen realizes this, and safeguards the law by, first of all, obeying it; secondly, by electing good legislators and law enforcement officers.

It is important to remember that those three chests have been entrusted to the care of the present generation and must be preserved intact for future generations. We must be dedicated to the great tasks remaining before us, the tasks of firmly establishing the ideals of freedom and law; of safeguarding our national heritage of freedom and law; and of aiding other nations in their struggle to secure freedom and law. Most of all, America, you must fulfill the command "Confirm thy soul in self control, thy liberty in law."

An Address by W. W. McEachern, President of the South Carolina National Bank, Before the Lions Club of Columbia, S.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of a speech delivered by Mr. W. W. McEachern, president of the South Carolina National Bank.

I hope every Member of the House will have an opportunity to read this excellent speech delivered by one of our most outstanding citizens in South Carolina:

There is a difference in talking about the state of our economy and in making predictions about it. If you want to speculate on the future of the economy based on anything I say, you must do so at your own risk. There are too many variable factors and the variations sometimes occur so suddenly that I would want to know the situation on a given day to forecast the economic climate for only a very short period of time.

Perhaps this comment is somewhat of an exaggeration, but the extent to which world events affect the general domestic economy—in fact, the local economy in many areas—makes it important for us to remember how easily chain reactions take place in response to events thousands of miles away. Day to day changes in foreign relations and in scientific achievements—such as our man in space—may create economic reactions of varying degrees.

At this particular time, the man in Cuba concerns me more than the man in space. We have to face the fact that in some phases of current history our own Federal Government cannot control the economy because it cannot regulate the unpredictable dictators.

Always remember that we must expect and try to be prepared for the unpredictable.

A banker has no crystal ball or any other sources than you have to provide him with information on economic conditions. We have to use the same available data to arrive at our conclusions. Our advantage is that we daily draw upon the sources of information available because accurate and timely information determines a bank's progress or lack of progress perhaps more than in other businesses or industries. Banks have to assess the reports on many endeavors to operate successfully, while specific data in only one or a few related fields are required of most businesses or industries.

If a banker does not find out a good deal of what each of you have to know about your own business, plus some additional information about banking, he cannot serve you as you deserve and need to be served.

So, instead of gazing into a crystal ball, we have to dig into your business as well as our own. My comments here are based on digging for a long time and having tried to apply what I have been able to uncover through the years.

To obtain a cross section of the general state of our economy, we might apply eight tests, although there are many other indicators too:

1. What is the condition of consumer credit? Is the individual borrowing to buy new cars, home appliances, and other personal items, or is he indicating doubt about the future by exercising more than ordinary restraint about incurring additional personal obligations?

Usually retail sales and expanding installment credit will go hand in hand and show employment at a good level. Reduced retail sales, reduced installment borrowing, and a general reluctance on the part of individual buyers should give warning that the consumer is motivated by basic causes such as reduced income or loss of employment. Sometimes the pinch of increased prices and living costs enter the picture, but usually good merchandising overcomes such resistance unless there is a lack of money or an inability to repay for credit.

The condition of consumer credit is one of the best indicators as to the direction of the economy.

2. Commercial borrowers at a bank also provide an excellent standard to measure the economy. Confidence is shown or a lack of confidence by whether the borrower continues his usual demands, seeks more credit, decreases his requests, or sells off inventories instead of borrowing.

Prompt payment of interest and principal indicate business as expected. On the other hand, the commercial borrower who seeks an extension of credit beyond the maturity of his note and without a substantial reduction in the principal may be a man in trouble—unless he has a special reason for doing so.

When an increasing percentage of commercial borrowers find it necessary to retrench or to request extensions of loans, it is clear that a decline in the economy is taking place. When South Carolina had a predominantly agricultural economy and almost a single crop, there was no doubt about the status of the economy when the cotton crop failed or when demand for it was weak.

With our present diversification, of both agriculture and industry, the economy of the State is much less susceptible to fluctuations due to a single crop or a single industry, although we still do feel the effects of good and bad conditions as reflected from one major farm or manufacturing activity.

3. A third indicator by which the economy can be measured is the extent of capital investment in constructing new plants and in home construction. Obviously, there must be a good demand for the products of any manufacturer if he is to build new plants or to expand his old ones. Here in South Carolina, since World War II, we have witnessed a tremendous expansion of capital investment in new plants and plant expansions. Fortunately, we have had a state in which our laws relating to management and labor have helped to attract new industries. The result has been a period of unprecedented capital investment which has provided the diversification which I mentioned earlier, thousands of new jobs, and, generally, steady employment.

4. Such successful growth on the part of industry spreads from the commercial field into the area of home construction. Home construction is one of the best indicators of the status of the economy, because an increase in the construction of private homes means that business and industry are doing well, and the success of business and industry is carried over into the expenditures or investments of the salary and wage earners who are dependent upon business and industry for their livelihood.

Thus, there is a hand in hand situation between the worker and management which is reflected in the general economy. If you find an area in which new homes are being constructed at an increasing rate, you can depend upon it that business and industry of the area is also on an expanding scale.

5. Another indicator which must be watched closely is the condition of the stock market. The averages of selected stocks provide a clue from day to day on whether our national economy is stable, unstable, or uncertain. Here again national and international conditions greatly affect the increase or decrease in value of certain stocks, according to whether these stocks are brought into particular focus by national or international events.

Generally, a steadily growing economy should mean that selected stocks reflect a gradual growth. If the economy is declining, those same stocks, normally, would reflect a decrease in growth.

However, in the event of a national emergency, it is obvious that stocks such as electronics, missiles, and others in similar categories would be expected to boom. On the reverse side of the picture, certain stocks which normally reflect high consumer demand in peacetime might be adversely affected by a national emergency, because it would be known that materials would not be available for production of such items.

The stock market also tends to reflect a deflation or inflation. Apparently the market in recent months has been reflecting some inflation, even while a somewhat depressed situation existed, and certainly since the economy has started upward again.

The buying of stocks has generally been considered one of the best hedges against inflation, because of the fact that the stock market generally reflects growth or decline

in the general economy. However, it should be kept in mind that the standard of measure is the average of a number of stocks rather than any particular stock. Therefore, the individual purchaser has to exercise care in his selection of stocks to purchase as a hedge against inflation.

6. Another vital indicator which must be taken into account these days is the operation of the Federal Government through the Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve Bank System.

Doubtless, you know that banks purchase for investment a large volume of Government securities issued through the Treasury Department. Also, I am sure you know that the Federal Reserve banks lend money to national banks and other member banks of the Federal Reserve System, at what is known as the rediscount rate—a rate somewhat lower than banks lend to individuals.

By the fixing of interest rates on securities issued by the Government, and the timing of these issues, the administration can attempt to stimulate or to deflate the economy. At the same time, through the Federal Reserve System, the administration can work on that side of the ledger in attempts to stimulate or deflate the economy in two ways—(1) by raising or lowering the rediscount rate at which banks can borrow from the Federal Reserve, and (2) by instructing the Federal Reserve to go into the market and buy securities issued by the Treasury Department to hold until such time as they might be sold with the desired result, or, else, held to maturity to prevent their becoming an influence on the economy.

Until recently, it had for many years been the policy of the Federal Seserve System to enter the market only for the purchase of short term bills. However, under the present administration, a new policy has been adopted under which the Federal Reserve is now purchasing Government securities with maturities as great as 5 years or longer.

How long this policy will continue, how strongly it will be used, and what its effect will be is uncertain. The adoption of such a policy has caused great concern among bankers and I share that concern.

Bankers now watch very closely the efforts of the Federal Government to influence the economy through manipulation of its financing of current Federal expenditures and the national debt.

Under our present Constitution, the Government cannot completely control the economy, and efforts to do so are more likely to create new economic crises than to solve existing ones.

7. In such a large country, conditions vary from area to area, from State to State, and from one section to another within a State. Therefore, a seventh indicator of the status of the economy on the local level is the condition of the major industry, business or agricultural crop in any specific area. In addiiton to industry, business and agriculture, we must also take one additional factor into account—the status of any military installation upon which an area might be largely dependent for good economic conditions.

Regardless of all the other general indicators, if in a specific city or community the major industry, business, farm crop or Government installation is at a low level, it is bound to have a strong influence on the general economy of that area.

Climate, geographic location and the availability of natural resources control to a large degree what a community can do about a one-crop or a one-industry area. Any community in that situation must exercise its initiative and energy to broaden its economic base. If it fails to do so, it is almost inevitable that the time will come when the single base will not support the economy of the community.

South Carolina is filled with communities which, during the past 15 years, have taken advantage of their opportunities and aggressively developed new business, new industry, and new agricultural endeavors. By so doing, they have insured against the failure of one upon which they were solely dependent or the removal of Government installations upon which they were previously dependent. Communities which have not taken these steps should do so. Communities which do not have planning commissions, or development boards, or local chambers of commerce, with such organizations as a part of the chamber's operation, should now take such steps to insure their economic future.

They should do so without looking to Government for assistance. Government assistance should be sought only when a community or an individual cannot provide for themselves.

8. Finally, an excellent indicator is that savings deposits of banks increase in a declining economy and decrease during inflation. This factor, of course, is closely related to all those mentioned earlier.

Having discussed some of the main indicators as to the status of the economy, I would now like to talk briefly about some of the factors in the general economy which concern me and tell you frankly what I think about them.

In the past few months, we have heard a great deal about price fixing and monopoly in the electrical industry. This is to be condemned absolutely. The persons who participate in such practices should be prosecuted and punished, according to the laws they have violated.

Such practices are certain to damage the particular industry, and industry and business generally. No good can come out of efforts to circumvent or to violate the laws applying to monopolistic practices.

The same standards and legal regulation applied to industry and business should not stop there, however; the same restrictions should be applied to the labor unions for the public good.

Although it is illegal for industry or business to engage in efforts to fix prices throughout the industry, it is entirely legal for labor unions to negotiate contracts to fix wages on an industrywide basis. I cannot distinguish between price fixing and wage fixing on the same tremendous scale. The effect of either is the same.

That effect is at the expense of the consumer. When you remove the competitive situation, either in business or labor, the consumer is the eventual sufferer.

What we need is not stronger legislation in favor of labor, or stronger legislation in favor of industry. We need stronger legislation in favor of the American public—the people who pay the bills.

Until we face up to the fact and until a majority of the Congress accept the fact that union contracts are stifling the industry of this country and eventually the individual worker himself, we are going to be faced with a declining market for the products of American labor.

Tied directly to this problem of union contracts is the problem of goods imported from foreign countries. Japanese textile workers are paid only about one-tenth what the average American textile employee makes, and German steelworkers earn only about one-third the average salary of an American steelworker. Whether it is Japanese cloth or a German printing press, the fact is it can be purchased in this country for less than our own plants can produce it.

At the end of World War II, we helped our former enemies get back on their feet and reestablish their industries. Then we lowered our tariff barriers to help provide them a market in this country. In addition to this, we have purchased large volumes of their goods for the use of our servicemen overseas.

Our purpose was good. We wanted to establish good relations and try to prevent friendly countries from trading with Communist countries.

The present situation is complicated and involves many factors. I would not attempt to say what should be done about it. I do hope that the Congress will devote its attention to this problem and not leave it in the hands of ambitious bureaucrats to establish the policies which they also administer. One thing is certain, however: The labor unions eventually must face up to the fact that the workers are a part of the American industry which now is in hard competition with Europe and Asia and that the workers prosper and their jobs survive only if American industry prospers and survives.

A third adverse factor on the general economy is undue Federal regulation. Many unnecessary and unwise proposals have been made in the present Congress. Included among these are efforts to destroy State right-to-work laws, to wipe out the Landrum-Griffin bill, and others of similar nature.

Already passed are the aid to so-called depressed areas and the new minimum wage act with its extended coverage.

The workman is worthy of his hire, and I believe that every employee of every business and industry should be paid what he earns. I do not believe, however, that the Federal Government should have any voice in determining what an employee is worth and what his employer shall pay him.

Neither do I believe that the Federal Government should take work away from an employee in an efficiently operated plant and send it to another plant in a so-called depressed area which has not been able to complete on an efficient basis in free enterprise. The Federal Government cannot hope to revitalize every area which fails because of its own shortcomings.

Many of the proposals pending in Congress which stand any chance of passage require additional spending. Of course, additional spending eventually means additional taxation.

Our present tax structure has become so burdensome that it is difficult for the individual or corporation who wants to reinvest his profits to do so. Capital investment and reinvestment are essential ingredients of building and expanding business and industry. It is necessary to the creating of jobs. It is necessary to industrial growth and production. It is necessary to plant modernization and it is essential to defense preparedness. The Federal Government cannot go on spending and taxing and taxing and spending to the detriment of these principles. The investors of this country must be able to help accomplish the growth which is desired.

While the tightening of some tax loopholes may be needed and desirable, much more important is the need for tax revision to provide increased incentives for investors. Without some changes in the present tax structure, there is little hope that we can continue to compete effectively with the industries of Europe and Asia in contries where, although taxes may be high, production costs are extremely low compared with ours.

During the past year, we have heard a great deal about the balance of trade and the flow of gold out of this country. This outward flow of gold and serious balance of payments problem is interwoven with the problems we are considering. Since 1950, U.S. payments abroad have been $20 billion more than the payments received from overseas. At the present time, we have a stock of about $16 billion in gold against short-term liabilities to foreigners of about $21 billion. Thus, it is obvious that we could

not pay on demand all of our obligations in gold. To prevent a run on our gold, the Federal Government must conduct our affairs so as to maintain confidence and to do this, we have to avoid a spending spree and increased inflation.

During the 10 years we incurred the deficit of $20 billion in our balance of payments, it was not because of any inability to sell goods overseas. Actually, U.S. exports have exceeded imports by $22 billion during that same time. The deficit in our international balance of payments comes as a result of three things during this 10-year period—$27 billion spent in foreign aid, another $27 billion in military expenditures overseas, and $22 billion in the private export of capital, $12 billion of this $22 billion being direct investment in foreign enterprises.

So, what is much more important than some of the things the Federal Government is trying to do is to find ways to reduce our foreign aid program, to reduce our military expenditures overseas and to stop the outflow of private capital into foreign investments. These things can be done only by taking a realistic approach to operating the Federal Government on a sound basis and on a balanced budget.

That brings me to the last point I want to discuss for just a minute—the Federal budget. At the present time, we have a national debt of about $285 billion. That has come as a result of spending by the Federal Government in excess of its revenues in 24 out of the last 30 years.

The anticipated deficits on June 30 of this year and June 30, 1962, will increase the deficit by more than $5 billion—to about $290 billion.

At the present rate, the public debt will never be paid off, because we keep on increasing it instead of reducing it. It takes 11 cents out of every dollar collected from the taxpayer to pay the interest on the Federal Government's obligations.

Budget receipts for 1962 are estimated at $82 billion, $332 million, and expenditures at $84 billion, $200 million. Let's bring the Federal budget down to simple terms. Here's what it means: A family starts out a year with a debt 3½ times its annual income, and further obligates itself to spend 2½ percent more than its income anticipated for that year. In other words, the family has to get 2½ cents from somewhere to add to every dollar it earns during the year, without even attempting to reduce its debt.

You and I know what kind of credit rating that family would have and the situation our Government faces is little different. The only difference is that the Government can reach into your pocket and take out the money it wants—whether it really needs it or not.

My purpose is not to lay the blame for our economic situation at the door of either political party or of any administration. My purpose is to bring it to your attention as citizens who should let their voices be heard.

Congress and Congress alone has the power to control the expenditures of the Federal Government. Neither the President nor any official of the Government can spend one cent of money which is not approved by Congress. The citizens of this Nation must let Congress know what they want and what they don't want. Fortunately, in South Carolina, most of our Representatives and Senators have been conservative on spending. Unfortunately, they have been outnumbered by spenders in the Congress.

The citizens of this country can get what they want when they earn it. This was proved by the enactment of the Landrum-Griffin bill. It has been proved on other occasions, and it can be done again and again until the Federal Government is put on a sound basis. Communicate with your associates and urge them to communicate with their associates; and, your Congressman with their colleagues in the Congress. Groups such as this can and do, when they become aroused, create grassroots movements which result in action by the Congress. I urge you to do so.

Time is slipping away all too quickly for those who strive to create and produce. While there is yet time, we must safeguard the principle of being our own master so that we can make our own judgments. It is not the job of Government to do this for us. Each of us must face up to the responsibility which is ours individually.

U.N. Special Fund and Tractor Deal Both Help Communist Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Communist government of Cuba is about to receive substantial assistance from the U.N. special fund, 40 percent of which is made up from U.S. contributions to the U.N. President Kennedy has just urged American citizens to contribute their money to buy the 500 tractors Castro wants as ransom for 1,214 prisoners. Humanitarian as is the appeal to the mind of the plight of these prisoners, the particular incident is but a dramatic part of a greater issue. It is estimated that the total number of people in Castro's political prisons amount to a ransom of $1.6 billion at the tractor rate of exchange. This amount would help Castro run his Communist state for a considerable period. Is it next on the list of Castro demands? The following editorial appearing in the Long Beach Independent-Press-Telegram on May 23 is pertinent to this question:

HELPING THE ENEMY

One reason the Communists do well in the cold war is that they get regular help, both intentional and unintentional, from their opposition.

Although the United States is locked in fierce combat with the Russians for supremacy in space, the Pentagon last week put its stamp of approval on the shipment to Russia of precision machinery for making ball bearings used in missiles and space craft guidance systems.

Although the United States has cut off diplomatic relations with Cuba, has labeled Cuba a Communist state, and recognizes the threat of Communist Cuba to the security of this hemisphere, a commitment has been made under which the taxpayers of the United States may support a big part of a special aid program for Cuba.

This incongruity results from the fact that the United States contributes 40 percent of the support to a special fund which, under an agreement between Castro and the United Nations, may be used to improve the economic position of Castro's Cuba.

The staff of the United Nations special fund is working on a project to help Castro diversify his agriculture and reduce his dependence on sugar production.

Thus, while Uncle Sam enforces a sugar quota policy designed to put an economic squeeze on Cuba, the U.N. ponders using his money to help Cuba remedy the condition which makes that squeeze effective.

There are times when one does seem to be meeting oneself coming through the revolving door.

The Kingdom of Quiet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, Oklahoma's Third Congressional District proudly claims some of the most beautiful territory in the southwestern part of the United States. Not only are the rolling hills of southeastern Oklahoma filled with scenic beauty, but they offer a tranquillity seldom found in our busy modern lives. Jenkin Lloyd Jones, editor of the Tulsa Tribune, has captured the spirit of this wonderful area in an editorial entitled "The Kingdom of Quiet." Under unanimous consent, I wish to insert his article in the RECORD:

[From the Tulsa Tribune, May 6, 1961]

THE KINGDOM OF QUIET

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

The world grows tighter. It is losing elbowroom. The crowds thicken in the streets. The highways choke. Suburbia crawls across the green land, gobbling fields and pushing down forests. In much of the world the farms have grown smaller as the villages bloated into towns, and the grandchildren of those who had a surplus of rice or manioc now scramble for food.

But, worst of all, the noise—the babble and bang, the screech of unwanted music, the roar of pets, the honk of horns, and blat of exhausts—all these press upon us more and more. And increasingly, we search for the shrinking oases of solitude and peace.

Well, come along to some of the grandest solitude this side of the Arctic tundra. We're in Poteau, Okla., the little capital of LeFlore County up against the western border of Arkansas. The morning sun is beginning to poke thin yellow fingers through the shade trees. It's time to get on the road.

The road is blacktopped U.S. 59 heading south. Cavanal Mountain, the great round mound that rises 1,500 feet above the town to the west, glows in the slanted sunlight. The air is crisp and clear with mist in the bottoms. And in the pastures south of town some of Senator BOB KERR's prize-winning Black Angus cattle graze smugly, having proved that in an area of Oklahoma innocent of blue-stemmed grass and once considered hopeless as range country, some of the best steaks and cutlets in America are produced.

Ahead, rising in blue benches toward the sky, are the Ouachita ridges.

Now, all the high land in southern Missouri, northern and western Arkansas, and southeast Oklahoma is properly the Ozark uplift. But we speak of the Ozarks as the hills lying north of the Arkansas River. The Arkansawyers describe the mountains south of the river as the Ouachitas and these run unbroken into four Oklahoma counties—LeFlore, Latimer, McCurtain, and Pushmataha. But in Oklahoma we call these mountains the Kiamichis, although properly the word belongs to a single 45-mile-long ridge lying south of Talihina.

Of all parts of the Ozark ranges the Kiamichis are the wildest, the ruggedest, the most unspoiled. They represent, in fact, the emptiest quarter between the Gulf of Mexico and the upper Minnesota woods. They contained no gold, no oil, no precious minerals. Pioneers, prospectors, cattlemen and homesteaders flowed around them. The narrow valleys drew only a few small farmers and, of course, the Choctaws, who were given this sterile confusion of coulees and crags in exchange for their ancient hunting grounds in southern Mississippi which the white man wanted for cotton.

So today in all the Kiamichi country from Talihina on the north to Broken Bow on the south, and from Antlers on the west to Mena, Ark. on the east there are no towns. There is no industry save a few country sawmills. There is no smoke, no clatter, no pollution, no ugliness and squalor. The streams run clear. The air is filled with the wine of spring.

Twenty-four miles south of Poteau Highway 59 begins to bend eastward toward Arkansas in a narrow valley between Black Fork Mountain and Rich Mountain. But just beyond the settlement of Stapp we turn sharp right on Highway 103, head back west, climb an escarpment and in 2 or 3 miles there's a sign indicating a narrow, gravel road leading up a mountainside in a tunnel of trees.

"Winding Stair Tower," it says.

Now, Winding Stair Mountain is another ridge and the forest ranger road swerves and twists along its crooked spine for nearly 25 miles. But at the east end is the high point—2,880 feet above sea level. This is the highest point in eastern Oklahoma and it is 80 feet higher than Magazine and Blue Mountains that tie for the honor of the highest points in Arkansas.

A characteristic of southeast Oklahoma is cruel winter sleet. For while the annual rainfall of the far Panhandle is only 10 inches it increases about an inch every 20 miles as you move east-southeast until by the time you get to the Kiamichis you've got more than 40 inches. The tops of these ridges are often scourged by driving winter ice storms and we notice as we climb the steep road toward the ranger's tower that the trees gradually grow stunted, gnarled, and blasted.

But when we clamber up the steel ladder to Winding Stair Tower there is nothing chilly about the reception offered by Ranger H. J. Hickman. The men who man the mountaintops and watch for the telltale smoke wisps that might grow into a holocaust are a friendly breed.

He tells us that his chief worry these days are the spring thunderstorms.

"We're more afraid of them than careless campers," he says. "For a bolt of lightning may char the inside of a tree and the wood may smolder for days before the fire breaks out and gets away. We always keep an eye on the springs and campgrounds where people might gather. But Old Man Lightning uses a scattergun."

West from the Winding Stair Tower the road rides the ridge beneath banks of dogwood, skirting vertical strata and dipping now and then into heavily forested glens. Occasionally the ridge becomes a knife edge and we look down upon valleys on both sides. Then is the time to stop the car, switch off the engine, and listen.

There is nothing to hear. No clash, no discord, no voice, no roar. And there is everything to hear—fresh wind rustling the leaves, a lark's call, the muffled staccato of a woodpecker, the drone of a bumblebee. You look across the valleys. As far as you can see there is nothing but blue hills across which pools of shadow float in stately fashion under the scattered clouds.

At Sycamore Tower on the far west end of Winding Stair Mountain, Ranger H. B. Blankenship, 23 years in the Forest Service, chews a mouthful of cut plug and tells us of the wildlife.

"If you like animals," he says, "these hills are getting better. We've always had wolves, foxes, and bobcats, but when I first came up here you'd rarely see a deer. Now I rarely go a day without seeing one beneath the tower. One side of this ridge is a game preserve, and on the other side the hunters can't get the deer fast enough. We've got a wildlife paradise building here."

At the far west end of the mountain there is a little clearing and a plaque. Here the old military road from Fort Smith to Fort Towson crossed the ridge. It was laid out in 1832 by Jesse Chisholm who later gave the name to the Chisholm Trail, and over the old road a century ago rattled the Butterfield stagecoaches on their perilous way to the Apache country and California. You look into the thick woods on either side, and, sure enough, there is a ghostly lane in which the oaks are younger and mossy furrows mark the ruts over which prairie schooners once rolled.

Who traveled this trail? Who were the cutthroats, the fugitives, the remittance men? What families made their painful, hopeful way to Texas to die in waterhole feuds or in the horrors of Comanche torture? What young feet marched over this mountain and later back and forth behind a cotton plow and finally to a dead end at the Alamo or Gettysburg?

The old campground is empty and silent. Man has left it almost without a souvenir of his passing. Almost. There is a silver can lying in the grass. "Coors," it says.

Then the mountain ends. We are back on Highway 271, 9 miles east of Talihina. There are billboards, snorting transport trucks, and here, at last, is a garish country honkytonk. We turn on the radio and a nasal idiot is braying a "rock-a-billy" ballad.

We have left the kingdom of quiet.

Hello, civilization.

Kennedy's Cuban Tactics Disturbing to Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, Castro's tractors-for-freedom proposal has aroused a growing volume of mail from Michigan's Sixth District. It is apparent there is a deep feeling of indignation over the Castro proposal.

This proposition is aptly described by the Flint Journal, in an editorial of May 25, as a "cat-and-mouse game," in which Castro is playing the cat and has relegated the United States to the role of mouse. Under permission to extend my remarks, the editorial is reprinted below.

KENNEDY'S CUBAN TACTICS DISTURBING TO COUNTRY

No one can quarrel with the humanitarian instinct which prompted many Americans to accept Fidel Castro's offer to release 1,200 invasion prisoners for 500 American tractors.

However, there can be, and there is, a wide difference of opinion as to the wisdom of doing so.

Bargaining on his own terms with the blood-stained Cuban dictator cannot help but lower American prestige in many parts of the world.

And with typical Communist arrogance, Castro fumes over the fact that Americans refer to the deal as an "exchange" of tractors for prisoners of war. Castro demands that it be called "indemnity" which we are to pay for the ill-fated invasion of Cuba by Cuban patriots. And he threatens to call the deal off if we don't mend our speech.

Developments in this project also serve again to underline the uncertain behavior of the Kennedy administration. During the Cuban invasion, conflicting reports on U.S. policy poured from top Government officials.

In the tractor project, no less a person than Speaker SAM RAYBURN said Tuesday that "the Government is out of this and is going to stay out."

The next day, however, President Kennedy revealed that he is the one who appointed the committee of three to coordinate efforts in the project.

A presidential press aide then announced that the President's role was strictly that of a private citizen.

But no matter how you slice it, that amounts to formal U.S. approval of the project, and it is in that light that it will be viewed in many parts of the world.

The President reavealed he went first to Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt to head the committee, then to Walter P. Reuther because of what was termed Reuther's tractor know-how. Finally the President added Dr. Milton Eisenhower to make the board "bipartisan;" and that in itself is an odd afterthought.

So Reuther, who has done his best to steer the Nation's economy down some questionable roads, now takes a hand in American foreign policy. No stage, naturally, is too large for Reuther.

Latin American countries must be watching the deal with the greatest interest. And many in those nations are bound to feel that we are bowing to blackmail, even though it is cloaked in humanitarianism.

An interesting aspect of the deal is that Castro already has specified the type of machine he wants. The New York Times reported the dictator wants a D–8 Super, the second-largest earthmoving machine manufactured by one American company. He will take its equivalent from other companies.

The cost of this machine is $40,000, which brings the whole deal to a total of $20 million.

The Times quoted Reuther as saying he was "certainly surprised, to put it mildly," at the insistence on this type of tractor because it is designed for major construction projects, not for farming.

We have entered into a cat-and-mouse game with the Cuban dictator, giving him the role of the cat. And already he is playing his role to the hilt. Monday on the Havana radio Castro suddenly demanded return to Cuba of 1,200 political prisoners from various countries rather than the 500 tractors in exchange for the invasion prisoners.

As another example of Castro's arrogance, he specified in the broadcast that Pedro Albizu Campos and Francisco "The Hook" Molina must head the list of political prisoners handed over in exchange for the rebels.

Molina awaits sentence for the fatal shooting of a Venezuelan girl in a New York restaurant last fall in a fight between pro-Castro and anti-Castro Cubans. Albizu Campos is serving time for an armed attack on Blair House in Washington during the Truman administration.

Did the Cuban dictator mean what he said, or was he just indulging in a little sport?

Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, has said of the deal that he does not believe the Government should lend itself to that kind of blackmail operation.

Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, asks: "How much more humiliation

and contempt must we suffer from the Communist dactator?"

Representative AUGUST E. JOHANSEN, of Michigan, is appalled at the apparent eagerness of many Americans "to comply with the ransom terms laid down by Communist stooge Fidel Castro."

The issue is a highly emotional one, but countless Americans surely will echo the sentiments voiced by these Congressmen.

Justice Above Spoils

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, recently in my newsletter to my constituency, I observed that the recent successful action of the House and Senate on controversial legislation requested by the Kennedy administration would indicate the number of newly authorized Federal judges has been carefully estimated and skillfully distributed throughout the country. It could be a mere coincidence, of course, that the necessary 10 or more votes to insure safe passage of the costly Kennedy bills are now available whenever the trumpet sounds. Only a few days ago it took telephone calls to Congressmen from Cabinet members, and even from the White House itself, to pass a Kennedy measure. The feeling prevailing among the conservatives is that the judgeship bill was carefully programed after the first Kennedy legislative defeat in the House. With the pending appointment of 70 new Federal judges to use as pawns in this great game called politics, the Kennedy team can now maneuver for the votes necessary to pass almost any legislation it wants.

Therefore, I was most interested to note the following editorial which appeared in the May 11, 1961, issue of the Christian Science Monitor newspaper, entitled "Justice Above Spoils." The editorial covers another important aspect of the hurried enactment of the judgeship bill, which has been pending even before I came to Congress in 1954. the editorial follows:

JUSTICE ABOVE SPOILS

Last year Congress did not feel that any new Federal judgeships were needed. Now it has voted for 73.

The key to this sudden reversal? Partisan politics. For several years the courts have been disgracefully clogged. Last year the Judicial Conference urged 59 new judgeships to take care of increased business. But the Democrats controlling Congress didn't want President Eisenhower to have the appointments—even though he offered to name Democrats to half the new posts.

That looked like a very good opportunity to get justice out of the Federal spoils system—where both parties had too largely kept it for many years. It was lost. But President Kennedy has a chance to repair the position. In his campaign he said qualifications should be the first test for judicial appointments. Undoubtedly party leaders will put forward many deserving Democrats who also possess some qualifications for the bench. But undoubtedly also in a good percentage of districts the best qualified man will not be a Democrat.

The partisan pressures, which caused Congress so long to neglect the needs of the courts and then to add extra judges to satisfy demands for patronage plums, will now focus on the Attorney General's office where nominations will originate.

The Attorney General happens to be both the President's brother and his campaign manager. He does not appear to be in the happiest position to satisfy at the same time political creditors and the President's qualifications-first criterion.

This is unfortunate. It underscores the need for both parties to drop the practice of placing campaign managers in the Cabinet.

But even now the final responsibility—and opportunity—rests with the White House. Congress has given John Kennedy an unprecedented opportunity to influence the Federal judiciary for good or ill. Appointments made now can decisively affect national affairs for many decades.

The President faces a major test. How he meets it can be estimated by the caliber, character—and party affiliations—of the judges he selects.

A Dangerous Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Roscoe Drummond, in his article as it appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on May 26, gives an account of the current Cuban "deal":

A DANGEROUS BUSINESS—GOVERNMENT SEEN INVOLVED IF TRACTOR DEAL IS MADE

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON, May 25.—Fidel Castro estimates that the lives of two and two-tenths Cuban prisoners ought to be worth one bulldozer or one truck with spare parts. He gives the United States 10 days to come through—or else.

The fact that such Americans as Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Dr. Milton Eisenhower, Walter Reuther, Joseph Dodge, and others, volunteer to help raise money to buy the freedom of the 1,200 Cubans who were captured during the invasion shows that the plight of the freedom fighters instinctively touches the heart and conscience of this Nation. The money is already coming in.

I am not sure this is the way to help Cuba or the United States or enslaved people anywhere. But if we are going through with it—let us recognize what we are doing, name this Castro thing for what it is and not pretend that the U.S. Government somehow has nothing to do with it.

CRUDE BLACKMAIL

This is crude, brazen, highhanded international blackmail perpetrated by a political dictator who is proposing to trade human beings for metal in order to make himself stronger.

This is a dangerous business. Once a nation yields to blackmail, where does it stop? What next? If we yield 500 trucks and bulldozers to Castro, aren't we inviting some other country to throw a few Americans in prison to trade for a dozen airplanes, a steel mill, or a low-interest loan?

There is no way whatsoever to make this Castro thing a little detached, personal deal between a few private American citizens and somebody or other in Havana—with the Government of the United States uninvolved.

Administration officials would like to keep the Government out of it. It seems to me impossible.

After a conference at the White House Speaker SAM RAYBURN reported: "The President said the Federal Government is out of it and going to stay out of it."

Mrs. Roosevelt said: "We have the agreement of the Government. We got permission beforehand."

A CONTROVERSY?

The hard fact is that the deal cannot be brought off without some Government participation. The Logan Act makes it unlawful for private citizens to negotiate with a foreign government "with intent to influence its conduct in any disputes or controversies with the United States." President Kennedy says he is advised that the Logan Act is not involved because the people-for-tractors deal is not a controversy. But since Castro has stated that he views the tractor gift as indemnity or reparations for the invasion, there seems to me a very real controversy here.

I cannot see how the Americans can go to Havana to negotiate the prisoner-tractor arrangement without breaking the law unless they have the authority of the Government. If they have this authority, then the United States makes itself a partner to the deal.

If this deal is to be realized, as its sponsors have described it, then the United States will have to participate at four points: The Government will have to issue export licenses for the machinery, issue visas for the negotiators, authorize them to negotiate so as not to violate the Logan Act, and make contributions tax-deductible. The latter action means that the United States would be paying for part of the cost.

FULBRIGHT'S VIEWS

All this is why Senator WILLIAM J. FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, has said: "I agree that our Government should not in any way lend itself to this kind of blackmailing operation."

Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, put it this way on the floor of the Senate: "Not since the days of Hitler, when the infamous Eichmann offered to trade one Jew for one truck, has the civilized world been confronted with such a heinous barter. Would it not be far more humanitarian to exchange food and medical supplies?"

The point is that all the Cuban people, not just the captured invasion fighters, are Castro's prisoners. It seems to me that our objective and the objective of the Organization of American States should be to free the Cuban nation, not just a few of its people.

The Depth of Communist Penetration in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I call your attention to an article which appeared in one of Florida's leading newspapers, the Palm Beach Post-Times. It was written by Jeanne Perry, and appears as one of her regular columns.

Mrs. Perry is a thorough student of Latin American affairs. She has many friends in South America, and has

traveled extensively in that region. Consequently, this article is written with authority, and is typical of her good work. I ask that it be inserted at this point.

The article follows:

LATIN AMERICAN NEWS NOTES

(By Jeanne S. Perry)

May Day in Havana was celebrated with a tremendous military parade. Tanks, submachine guns, and recoilless cannon were among the arms displayed. Militia units marched by. Banners with the slogans "Workers of the world unite." "Viva socialism which ends all exploitation" and "Long live communism" floated about. In the Placa Civica Castro Red demonstrations burned President Kennedy in effigy. The latest winner of the Lenin Peace Prize delivered another marathon speech in which he promised, among other things, that all outstanding Soviet works of "literature" will be translated into Spanish for publication in Cuba.

Conditions in Havana last week were thus depicted by travelers returning from the once gay capital where 6,000 people under arrest jammed into the Blanquita (Havana's largest theater) are living in utter filth.

Official execution figures say that 7,000 persons have been killed while "unofficial" informants estimate that Ramino Valdez and Raul Castro have ordered from 3,000 to 5,000 executed.

Streets in Havana are deserted after dark except for patrols. Now arrests are being made by 14-year-olds armed with machineguns.

The 50,000 people arrested by Castro at the start of the invasion are still in their hastily improvised jails living in indescribable conditions. Among them are many priests who were observed by the truckload going through the streets of Havana on their way to prison.

At least 50 well-known doctors have been purged from the Cuban Medical Association for counterrevolutionary activities.

The Cuban couple who gave refuge to the wife of William Morgan have been sentenced to 5 years in jail. Morgan was the ex-Castro commander who was executed in Havana last month.

Does anyone but Editorialist and Columnist Herbert Matthews of the New York Times doubt that communism is 90 miles from our shore?

President Roberto Chiari of Panama has stated that the Castro government "is totally Communist" and many Central and South American countries have severed relations with Cuba for that reason. But did you realize that it was only last week that the United States officially declared Cuba has become a member of the Communist bloc?

Even now, millions of dollars in shipments of lard continue to leave the port of Palm Beach for Cuba. Lard is the most important staple in the diet of the Cuban lower classes. Interested Members of the Senate and House were advised last fall that an embargo on lard from the United States to Cuba would render a big blow to Castro. Unfortunately, the pleas by the handful of enlightened Senators and Congressmen fell on deaf ears. A much finer example was set by the stevedores in Houston, Tex., who refused to load Russian tanks en route to Cuba very recently.

The United States is still paying $70 million to the Communist Castro government for tobacco which is processed in Tampa, Fla.; and $70 million buys a lot of arms and propaganda for the Fidelistas. Would it not be possible to use this sum to help the workers until Castro is toppled, or even to set up a new industry to take up the slack?

There are many ways in which the United States is helping Castro financially. To this columnist, the most shocking item comes from a recent story in the New York Daily News. It states that Paul G. Hoffman, as head of the United Nations Special Fund, has signed an agreement whereby the Special Fund is to help Cuba get away from heavy dependence on sugar by diversifying its farm production. The United States pays about 40 percent of the Special Fund's annual budget, which stands this year at about $47 million.

As an American who cherishes her freedom, and as a taxpayer helping to bankroll this U.N. agency, I find the signing of this agreement to give more money to Castro not only shocking but deplorable. I have expressed my sentiments in telegrams to President Kennedy, Senators SMATHERS and HOLLAND, Congressman ROGERS and others in the Senate and House of Representatives. If you agree with me please let them know your feelings also.

Americans Are Basically Conservative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, we in Congress could well give some serious thought to the advice of our distinguished colleague, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, in the article from Human Events, which I herewith include as part of my remarks:

AMERICANS ARE BASICALLY CONSERVATIVE

(By Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona)

On my way to work one morning recently the radio blared forth with a commercial for one of the Nation's largest banks. The announcer proclaimed that "this financial institution is proud of its long record of conservative management."

The same day I noticed a full-page ad of one of the Nation's largest insurance companies advising all readers that the "management of this institution is conservative and responsible."

It occurred to me to wonder how fast an insurance company would grow if it advertised its management as being "liberal." How many people would have confidence in a bank which a nounced that above all else it was liberal?

I would suggest that all Americans are basically conservative. We adopt a conservative philosophy in our attitude toward our children and their education. We follow conservative policies in the investment and administration of our earnings. And when we spend our money we reveal ourselves as clearly conservative by attempting to secure the greatest possible value for each dollar spent.

Most of the copybook maxims we remember are illustrations of conservative belief. We don't encourage our children to engage in wild experimentation, either in their education or their personal relationships with their fellow students. When our youngsters are old enough to drive the car, we rarely let them depart from our homes without a shouted admonition to "drive carefully." When they marry and begin building a life of their own, we encourage them to approach the purchase of such things as a home or a car cautiously, giving careful consideration to all elements involved.

It is only in the conduct of our Government that some of us espouse a liberal viewpoint. This, I suggest, is because Government money somehow or other is now regarded as free money.

In my home State of Arizona the State building and planning commission has just received something like $100,000 in Federal funds. This money is to be used for the planning of new public buildings and public facilities. It won't purchase the actual architectural drawings, it won't be used to buy a single brick or a single yard of concrete. It will be used instead to finance the deliberations of various committees and agencies who will explore the situation and then come up with a suggested solution.

I wonder how many people of Arizona would urge the expenditure of $100,000 for this purpose if they were compelled to make a direct contribution on some preestablished formula to that fund.

We want our insurance companies to operate on conservative principles in order protect the value of our own insurance policy. Yet we encourage the Government in such undertakings as social security to operate in a fashion which would bring bankruptcy to any private operator who did not have full access to the Federal Treasury.

Conservatives know the value of sound instruction in our public schools in courses devoted to what we old-fashioned folk call the solids. The liberals have just discovered that there is some value in teaching mathematics and science and history. Until the advent of the first Russian sputnik their attention was centered on the happy-life-adjustment courses, good manners, and easier methods of learning.

Isn't it time for a nation, which by instinct and by experience reaches out for conservative principles, to demand the application of this same conservative policy in the conduct of its Government? How do you stand, sir?

No Federal Aid to Education and Balancing the Budget by Curtailing New Government Programs Favored in Poll of 10th District of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I take pleasure in pointing out that the constituents of my District—10th, Illinois—have answered the public opinion poll I sent them and left no doubt that they overwhelmingly favor a balanced budget, preferring this to any expansion of new Federal programs. Seventy-three percent of those who answered the poll favor balancing the budget by cutting down on new Federal activities. I submit that this is a sizable percentage.

Those polled also definitely oppose measures aimed at granting Federal-aid-to-education activities. Forty-eight percent favor loans only for school districts that are unable to provide adequate standards of education.

I am convinced that complete results of the poll, which follow, provide interesting reading:

[Figures are percentages of questionnaires returned]

	Yes	No	No opinion
I. Federal aid to education: Do you favor—			
Federal funds for teachers' salaries	20	69	11
Federal funds for school construction	31	61	8
Federal loans for private and parochial schools	17	77	6
Leaving the full responsibility to State and local communities	67	23	10
Federal loans to only those school districts unable to meet the required standards	48	42	10
II. Foreign trade policies and tariffs. Do you favor—			
Setting restrictive limits or quotas on the volume of imported competitive goods?	55	33	12
Increasing tariffs and duties on competitive foreign-manufactured goods and products?	53	36	11
Maintaining present tariff rates and policies but removing Executive authority to provide any further reductions until 1962?	44	31	25
III. How would you solve Post Office deficit of $900,000,000 annually?			
Increase 1st-class postage from 4 to 5 cents, airmail from 7 to 8 cents?	22	53	25
Increase 2d- and 3d-class mail rates?	67	16	17
Increase rates of all types of mail service across the board?	41	44	15
IV. Budget and debt policies: Do you favor—			
Balancing the current budget by curtailing new Federal programs?	73	18	9
Increasing the national debt ceiling to meet cost of new programs over and above anticipated revenues?	22	75	3
Cutting all wartime excise taxes and cutting Federal spending accordingly?	70	19	11
Increasing taxes to meet the cost of any new programs?	17	70	13
V. Federal medical care legislation: Do you favor—			
Assistance limited to social security recipients by increasing social security tax rates?	30	59	11
Assistance to all citizens over 65 based upon criteria of need with Federal Government and States sharing the cost?	55	35	10
VI. To halt shrinking of U.S. gold reserves, do you favor—			
Putting limits on U.S. industry investments abroad through more restricted taxation?	63	24	13
Adopting more restrictive trade policies in basic commodities?	50	29	21
Reducing number of military and Government personnel abroad?	63	25	12
Lowering limit on duty-free goods brought back into the United States by American tourists?	60	29	11
VII. Foreign aid appropriation legislation: Do you favor—			
Providing 3 separate bills for the military, economic, and technical assistance phases of the mutual security fund?	48	19	33
Providing more assistance in the Western Hemisphere nations and cutting elsewhere?	49	28	23
Reducing direct grants of assistance and increasing foreign loan programs accordingly?	65	14	21
Cutting all phases of foreign aid?	45	40	15
Insisting that other free nations capable of helping distressed countries share the burden?	92	2	6
VIII. Presidential election system: Do you favor—			
Continuing with the present electoral college system?	14	69	17
Direct election of President by candidate receiving greatest number of popular votes?	63	23	14
Adopting proportional plan wherein each elector would cast presidential vote in keeping with the popular vote total in his district rather than the present winner-take-all plan?	45	31	24

Flint Physician Hits Nail on Head About SS "Hope"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial from the May 27 edition of the Flint Journal, which discusses a letter received from a distinguished Flint physician, Dr. Edwin M. Knights, Jr., who has been serving aboard the SS *Hope*.

Dr. Knights' observation, that he is convinced the doctors, nurses, and other medical personnel have already accomplished more for America in Indonesia than all of the official statements, gifts of money and equipment, and other governmental efforts, coincides with other reports that have come to my attention. The full editorial follows:

FLINT PHYSICIAN HITS NAIL ON HEAD ABOUT SS "HOPE"

From a Flint physician serving aboard the good will medical ship, SS *Hope*, comes fresh testimony to the fine work being accomplished by the project.

The physician is Edwin M. Knights, Jr., director of the department of pathology at Hurley Hospital. He was granted a leave of absence by the Hurley Board of Managers so that he could accept a rotating position aboard the ship. A letter he wrote from Semarang, Indonesia, was read at a Hurley board meeting this week.

The SS *Hope* is financed by contributions to the People-to-People Health Foundation. It brings latest medical techniques to underdeveloped countries, thus enabling physicians in those lands to do a better job.

There is a plan afoot to try to raise enough funds for a second such floating medical school, and if ever a project deserved public support, this one does.

We have spent great sums in many parts of the world in foreign aid, but it is doubtful if any of that money was better spent than the private contributions for SS *Hope*, a former U.S. Navy hospital ship.

Whereas a great deal of our foreign-aid funds have been, in effect, squandered, the SS *Hope* has served to present to the world the brightest possible U.S. image.

Dr. Knights expressed it very well in his letter:

"This has been a very rewarding medical experience, and I am convinced the doctors, nurses, and other medical personnel have already accomplished more for America in Indonesia than all of the official statements, gifts of money and equipment, and other governmental efforts."

The Alabama Incidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, the incidents which recently took place in the State of Alabama painfully reminded all of us of the vast distance we have yet to travel in quest of our goal of freedom under law. The howl of the mob in Montgomery has echoed in the homes and schools and workplaces of millions who hold liberty and justice dear. And the sound came as a strange, alien noise to minds who have long believed that we, in America, had achieved our lofty goal. I hope the millions who heard will never again drug themselves into complacency with the comforting but wholly wrong thought that "it can't happen here." It has happened here. It matters little if it was only for 1 hour, 2 hours, a day, or a night; terror walked a section of our country with the arrogance of a booted S.S. trooper. Innocent people—citizens of the United States—were beaten, punished almost to their deaths while local authority stood by and did nothing. They were not even offered the protection given a criminal when he is arrested.

I speak not as a Representative from Connecticut, but as an American. I love this land and I love its people—North and South. But I am aware that, in the past, Americans who express concern with events in the South are attacked as interlopers lacking in understanding—as if they were not Americans but alien subverters of our Republic. Therefore, let the people of Alabama describe what happened. The following words are from an editorial of the Birmingham News as reprinted in the Washington Post of May 20:

The city of Birmingham is normally a peaceful, orderly place in which people are safe. Harrison Salisbury of the New York Times last year came to Birmingham and wrote two articles about us which said, in substance, that fear and hatred stalked our streets.

The Birmingham News and others promptly challenged this assertion. The News knows Birmingham people, as others know them, and they didn't fit this definition. But yesterday, Sunday, May 14, was a day which ought to be burned into Birmingham's conscience.

Fear and hatred did stalk Birmingham's streets yesterday.

Fear and hatred stalked the sidewalks around the Greyhound bus terminal directly across the street from Birmingham's city hall. Fear and hatred rode around in a dozen or more automobiles loaded with men, some of whom may have been from

Birmingham, others of whom positively were from other counties. License plates gave them away.

In the whole general area of the city hall and the Greyhound bus terminal especially, police cars roved, in some numbers. Uniformed men were visible. Something was up. What was up was the advance on Birmingham of a group of Negroes and some whites who gave themselves the title "freedom riders."

But yesterday hoodlums took over a section of Birmingham. They clustered in small groups, they drove around in cars, they all but swaggered. They were not afraid, they were sure of themselves, they knew about the freedom riders and the buses they were supposed to come in on, and they had the place staked out—both the Greyhound bus terminal and, a bit more than two blocks away, the Trailways bus terminal.

Others knew this situation existed. Commissioner Eugene Connor apparently knew it. He was on duty at city hall. There were squad cars operating in the area—an area of several square blocks embracing the city hall, the Greyhound and Trailways terminals.

At the Trailways terminal yesterday afternoon, with the condition above prevailing, a bus pulled in and all but in an instant a Negro was being beaten, his trousers almost torn off, a white man being beaten by a hoodlum who repeatedly smashed his face with his fist, and a Birmingham Post-Herald photographer was being pummeled by a group of white men, one of whom had a heavy instrument in a brown paper bag.

But this wasn't all. The police were not visibly on hand when the Trailways terminal beatings took place. The police were not on hand when the radio-TV man was attacked. And the city hall, with police presumably on the alert, was some two blocks away.

The Birmingham police department under Mr. Connor did not do what could have been done Sunday. The Birmingham News charges that the very men who did these beatings, who smashed to the concrete and kicked and battered a Post-Herald photographer, who ripped film from two cameras of the News, who in broad daylight bashed in two windows of a radio-TV news station wagon, up to an hour or more later were plainly visible, still carrying on their vicious patrol in the whole area and particularly in the Greyhound bus terminal area.

Yesterday afternoon fear and hatred were on Birmingham streets. The precise location of such condition was on 19th Street between the Trailways terminal at Fourth Avenue and the Greyhound terminal at Seventh Avenue. The people, and their police, permitted that fear and hate to ride our streets.

It was a rotten day for Birmingham and Alabama.

The News' condemnation of police inaction in Birmingham had little effect against the organized indifference of the Alabama government officials. The hoodlums struck again in Montgomery, the capital of the State, and law and order was again prostituted. A nation was shocked; national prestige was shamed; and the President was forced to do what Alabama authority would not do—restore peace, order, and justice under our laws. It is ironic that the very people who speak the strongest for the States' right to govern are the first to shun the responsibilities that go with the right.

The Birmingham Post-Herald commented:

The police in both cities (Birmingham and Montgomery) could have prevented the rioting or quelled it before it got out of hand. Their failure to be on the job, in uniform and in force, gave open invitation to the mob to take over. * * * Such failure (at Montgomery) left the President no choice but to dispatch Federal marshals to prevent further violence. * * * Let us not yield to the temptation to say "they got what was coming to them" and then minimize in our own minds the seriousness of the situation.

And the Birmingham News, the Cassandra who had warned of the coming storm, said:

We, the people, asked for it. * * * As we wail in our anguish let us not forget it. We, the people, let the Governor of the great State of Alabama, John Patterson, talk for months in a manner that could easily say to the violent, the intemperate * * * that they were free to do as they pleased when it came to the hatred integrationists. We, the people, have let gangs of vicious men ride this State now for months. They (the marshals) are coming because we did not do our duty to ourselves and our proud State.

I am from the State of Connecticut, and I am also an American; and, though the News speaks of events in Alabama, I believe the term "we, the people" can also refer to "we, the people of America." For we, of the North and West, shared the slumber of the Alabama citizens. For too long we have, all of us, laid aside our efforts to "form a more perfect union, establish justice."

A year ago, Walter Lippmann wrote:

The critical weakness of our society is that for the time being our people do not have great purposes which they are united in wanting to achieve. The public mood of the country is defensive, to hold on and to conserve, not to push forward and to create. We talk about ourselves as if we were a completed society, one which has achieved its purposes and has no further great business to transact.

I hope the alarm sounded by the riots in Alabama has aroused the entire Nation to resume the unfinished task of perfecting our democracy. We have great things yet to do. We have schools to build, slums to clear, diseases to conquer, an enemy to resist, a universe to explore, and we cannot do these things working apart. These are giant and noble tasks and to accomplish them requires the strength of body and mind of all our people. And the talents and abilities of no one should be refused because of the color of his skin or the credo of his choice. We must, again, set out to prove to the world that brotherhood is not so wild a dream as those who profit by postponing it would have us believe.

We of the North and West do not judge the South. We need the help of the South to pursue our national goals. Therefore, we offer our arm to law-abiding citizens in the South who wish to join us in this great adventure, and we do fervently pray that such an offer will be accepted soon and by a multitude.

The voice of reason in the South is a quiet voice and perhaps we in other areas find it difficult to hear over the din of the mobs. But, the supporters of law and order and decency in the South should take note of the thunder out of Birmingham and speak up with a louder voice if they want us to hear and understand.

Ralph McGill, former editor of the Atlanta Constitution, when analyzing the school desegregation problem, found that a very large part of the current difficulty is due to the failure of southern political leadership to prepare its constituency for the changes that were coming. Former Governor McKeldin, of Maryland, noted Mr. McGill's remarks and commented that:

Political leadership includes more than men in office and candidates for office, avowed and unavowed. Political leadership includes all persons with an appreciable influence on public opinion. Many of the most effective are not party leaders at all, but commercial and industrial leaders, educators, and professional men, especially the clergy.

We in the North are concerned; we are worried for the welfare of our Nation and all of its people. We strain our hearing for the voice of reason in the South. We look for the men of whom Governor McKeldin and Mr. McGill speak to exercise leadership, to help the southern people meet their future; we look for the men who will answer the racists, the terrorists, and the political know-nothings who lend legitimacy to violence and defenses for the mob.

We of the North are waiting for the words of responsible commercial and industrial leaders, the trade-union officials, the educators, the clergy in Alabama. The voice of responsibility, of progress must be louder in the future than it was in the past if it is to be heard above the raucous din encouraged by men like Governor Patterson.

The southern people are being cheated of their right to join with the rest of this Nation and progress. Why are so many spokesmen for the South allowed to deceive the southern people; why do they tell them that the law can be evaded, that the Constitution is a nullity; why do they tell them the will of the majority of the American people, as expressed through their National Government, can be ignored when it cannot be? Why do they preach respect for their own personal views of the law rather than for the established law itself? And when will new leaders arise to tell the southern people the truth and prepare them for the changes that are coming?

Just last year one of our distinguished former colleagues, a man whose friendship I value, Representative Erwin Mitchell, of Georgia, addressed the Seventh District Democratic Executive Committee in Rome, Ga., and he called upon the committee to join with other sections of our Nation in progressing toward greater material and spiritual wealth.

I am afraid—

The Congressman said—

that by and large our leadership has been guilty of too much tradition and not enough vision. This is the age of rockets and nuclear power. * * * We must come of age politically. We must elect men to office who have a full consciousness of America's great reservoir of progress that is waiting to be tapped. While we should continue to treasure the past and gain experience from it, we should no longer live in it. We must have leaders that are living in the present and looking to the tomorrow.

Last year, too, Mayor William B. Hartsfield, of Atlanta, Ga., speaking at Notre Dame about the problems of school desegregation, said:

Our chief trouble is that the best element of our State, and, indeed, of the South, has been largely silent, while the demagogs have been making political hay for many years. Therefore, we have thousands of our people who have been impressed by these demagogic arguments and their thinking must be changed. * * * They think that if they will just hold out and continue fighting, that in some way they are going to be successful in defying the highest Court in the land.

These times are crucial times for our Republic. Our way of government is being put to the extreme test by totalitarian governments throughout the world. We cannot tolerate the luxury of demagogs preaching nullification in our midst. We in the North and West, are concerned and we search, with anxiety, for the men of the South who will lead her people back into the mainstream of American life.

The words of a great Representative from the South, spoken in this very Chamber in 1874, should echo here again today.

It is time—

Said Lucius Lamar, of Mississippi—

for a public man to try to serve the South, and not to subserve her irritated feelings.

When such a public man stands up and urges the southern people to rise out of their enslavement to blind prejudice and progress together with us toward the bright tomorrows charted by the forefathers of our Nation; when southern men of vision work to break the chains that hold the South in bondage to the past, they will have the sympathetic ear of all the good people of Connecticut and the gratitude of a nation.

Are You a Parent to Your Children?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article "Are You a Parent to Your Children?" written by Rabbi Tzvi H. Porath, which appeared in the February 1959 issue of the Jewish Digest.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARE YOU A PARENT TO YOUR CHILDREN?

(By Tzvi H. Porath)

One of the most common questions that comes to a rabbi is: "Have I been a good parent?" or, "Where have I failed in rearing my child?" The parent then unburdens his heart with a long list of grievances, misunderstandings, and anxieties about his child or children.

The concern of parents for their children is, of course, understandable. And there is reason to be concerned. You need but look at the newspaper headlines to see the extremes that maladjusted, unstable, and immature parent-child relationship can cause.

But not all problems make the headlines. I met with the principal of one of the high schools to discuss a serious problem of the young people at the school—without any regard for school regulations or State laws. Sometime ago I served on a panel of three clergymen to help young people who had overstepped the boundary line of socially acceptable behavior. Later, I was called by the school about a young person who had an unhappy homelife.

So the question, "Are you a parent to your children?" is a direct and pointed one. Each of us, as parents and as members of the community, can ask that question. Each one can recognize certain limitations in the upbringing of our children, and each one is struggling with the problem of how best to meet it.

There was a time, not too long ago, when the proverbial approach was used: "Spare the rod and spoil the child." This was the "children should be seen, not heard" school. In fact, some of us may be the result of such direct, swift, and uncompromising discipline, and can recall our resistance and rebellion. It was this school that produced many children, who turned against their parents' tradition.

There was a time, too, when parents became modern and used the progressive method—their children should express themselves. They should be unfettered by restrictions. "Let him work off his excess energy, let him set his own pace in school, and let him do as he wishes." Many of these young people are still having a difficult time adjusting to the norms of a society which demands a certain amount of conformity—and I should add—consideration and cooperation.

Today we are experimenting with another method. The solution tried in many a home is that the parents become pals to their children. Go to ball games, take them to the movies, be interested in their social life; that is the advice. "Be a pal" is the refrain, "and you will be able to reach your child. You must establish a rapport with him. What better way is there to establish that relationship than getting on his own level?"

This advice sounds good, convincing, and, most of all, modern and progressive. And thus we find many parents going out of their way to become pals with their children. They become den parents, football coaches, dance chaperones, car-pool drivers. They take seriously this relationship. As pals they will do anything for their child. They relate so closely to their children that no sacrifice is too great. Their children have the best—the best opportunities, best schools, best friends, and so on.

It all sounds good. What, then, is the weakness? The one limitation is that the children have pals—but no parents. They have no one to guide them.

In Judaism the parent-child relationship is a very clear and important one. The parents' responsibility is to teach, to educate. The Hebrew word for parents is "horim," and it comes from the same root as "moreh," teacher. That this is not accidental is demonstrated by the role that parents have on the earth.

Our rabbis say that our parents represent God on earth to the children. This concept was of great moment when first projected by the phychiatrists, yet Judaism has recognized that principle for thousands of years. And teachers, continue our rabbis, are in lieu of parents, and should be given the same honor and respect accorded to parents.

Becoming a pal is good and has an important place in parent-child relationship. I often prescribe such advice for those coming to me for help. There are times that I regret that I cannot have that kind of relationship with my own son. But that is not, and should not be, the full relationship; that should not be the extent of the rapport between the parents and the child; that should not be the sole role of the parents.

The parent must teach, must lead, must set an example. No one grows in a relationship where the more mature one tries to bring himself down to the level of the less mature one. Standards must be raised, ideals must be set.

In so doing, children will be trained so that they can make choices for themselves, proper decisions when moral factors are involved. These can be built up throughout the entire lifetime by proper example.

The trouble with the pal business is that parents pal with children at parties, movies, dances, trips, golf—everywhere except religious services, then wonder why their children won't go to synagogue, won't join a junior congregation or become part of Jewish youth groups. Why? The answer is obvious. No proper example has been set.

Parents will set limits in many areas of life. They will insist on certain health rules, be adamant in food and diet matters, encourage dance and music and art lessons—yet in the area of morals and the spirit they hesitate to set limits and make the child accept certain moral standards for fear of upsetting the child.

Parents hesitate to set time limits when their children should be home; they are afraid to ask where they are going, nor will they control with whom they go. A pal has full faith—or if not full faith, at least does not restrict the fun—particularly if the child explains: "All the other kids are doing it." Well, if all the kids are doing it, then the parent runs the risk of being an old-fashioned killjoy.

Parents should realize their prime responsibility is to prepare their children for life. In the long run, such preparation leads toward the path of happiness and security, and emotional balance. Life is not all play—all joy. Life is filled with responsibilities and sadness. Dancing and socials and recreational outlets are important, very important, but there must be a balance.

Parents love their children, and will prepare them for everything, except that which makes for a full, enriched and secure living. They fail to realize that in doing everything for their children, they have failed to do anything to them.

The Ten Commandments give the clue to the kind of relationship there should exist between parent and child (Kabaid es ovicho v'es imecho) "honor thy father and thy mother." You want to have joy from your children? You want to know how best to succeed as a parent? Heed this advice—have your child honor and respect you.

Long ago Judaism recognized the fine balance that exists between love and hate. The two are so close—they are nearly one. In every relationship there is love and there is hate. This is natural, this is normal. These feelings of hostility, if recognized when they express themselves by your children, indicate that you have insight and understanding. Judaism does not demand love of parent—it does demand honor. And respect cannot be obtained unless there is proper example and proper training.

A long time ago, someone gave very sound advice: "Train your children in their youth, and they will not train you in your old age." A child who has respect and honor

for his parents never loses his sense of moral value, his sense of responsibility.

No one has yet developed the perfect formula for parent-child relationships, but you can test yourself and find how close you come to the answer to the question, "Are you a parent to your child?"

The aggravations, the immaturity, the headaches and worries that young people invariably bring into any household are not the true indication of your failure or success. The criteria also are not good social graces, knowing all dance steps, having many dates, and such.

The real test is, Does he have a sense of responsibility, can you trust him in moral judgment? Does he honor and respect you? Have you prepared him for his role in life? Does he reflect the spirit of God that is within him?

Sometime ago I was given a poem. It was written by Mamie Gene Cole. It is called, "The Child's Appeal." I should like to share it with you:

"I am the Child
All the world waits for my coming.
All the earth watches with interest to see what I shall become.
Civilization hangs in the balance,
For what I am, the world of tomorrow will be.

I am the Child
I have come into your world, about which I know nothing.
Why I came I know not;
How I came I know not.
I am curious; I am interested.

I am the Child.
You determine, largely, whether
You hold in your hand my destiny.
I shall succeed or fail.
Give me, I pray you, those things that make for happiness.
Train me, I beg you, that I may be a blessing to the world."

The Young Men's Business Club of New Orleans Passes a Resolution Reflecting the Sentiments of the Vast Majority of People in New Orleans on the Latest Invasion of the South by Outside Troublemakers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I herewith present to this body a resolution passed by the Young Men's Business Club of New Orleans.

The Young Men's Business Club of New Orleans is one of the most respected and highly honored civic groups in the city of New Orleans. It numbers among its members leaders in all walks of life and usually expresses opinions which are shared by a majority of the people of New Orleans.

This resolution is no exception.

I am proud to have been the 25th president of the Young Men's Business Club in 1932 when it was not necessary to pass such resolutions as this. At that time there were no racial prejudices and hatreds and unwelcomed demonstrations. Times have changed since then. The Supreme Court in its Black Friday, May 17, 1954, decision has rekindled the flames of passion between the races and has caused a setback for the fine colored people of the South who until then lived in peace and harmony with their white neighbors.

The resolution follows:

The Young Men's Business Club of Greater New Orleans a 42-year-old civic organization composed of over 3,300 business and professional leaders of our city in general meeting held on May 24, 1961 unanimously adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas at a time in history when there is every need for national unity in the United States to repel the threat to our survival of the forces of communism; and

"Whereas there are presently groups of agitators traveling through the South whose purpose and motivation are to incite riots, disorder, disunity, and breaches of the peace and which activity does constitute a menace to life, property and the maintenance of public peace and law and order wherever such groups appear; and

"Whereas the effect of the activity of these groups is to give to the Federal Government an excuse which it is using to move in and take over the rights of the States and that of local communities to govern themselves and thus to further weaken the ever-diminishing area of States rights; and, further, these activities put our Nation in a bad light before the world in a measure bearing no relation to their real significance and importance; and, finally these activities promote tension, misunderstanding and ill-will with regard to problems which can only be solved through patience, good will and mutual understanding and cooperation: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That while reaffirming the rights of peaceful assembly and free speech, the Young Men's Business Club of Greater New Orleans does hereby go on record as deploring the activities of the so-called Nazi and freedom rider groups and any others where the purpose and motivation are to incite riots, disorder, lawlessness, and breaches of the public peace; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Federal Government be requested to cease and desist from encouraging and supporting such activities; and that the Congress of the United States enact appropriate laws to safeguard local communities and individual sovereign States against such activities all in the interest of local home rule, States rights and the prestige, welfare and security of the people of the United States of America; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be provided to the President and Attorney General of the United States, to all members of the Louisiana Congressional delegation, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Vice President of the United States, the Governors of all the Southern States as well as the local press and other news media."

A Well-Deserved Tribute to Sam Nocella

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to be able to rejoice with those persons who are successful in life and attain a high goal in their chosen fields. It is a greater pleasure, however, to be able to pay tribute to those who started at the lowest rung of the ladder and have succeeded in reaching the top. This is the case of Sam Nocella, a Baltimorean, who has been elected to the general executive board, the highest council of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.

On May 20 it was my privilege to attend a testimonial dinner in his honor sponsored by the Baltimore regional joint board of that organization. On that occasion, many prominent civic and labor leaders were present. Among them were Tommy D'Alesandro, former mayor of Baltimore and now a member of the Federal Renegotiation Board; Rev. C. Lewis Robson, pastor of St. John's Methodist Church, Jacob Potofsky, and Hyman Blumberg, general president and executive vice president, respectively, of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America; and Miss Angela Bambace and Miss Sarah Barron, two Baltimoreans who have done an exceptionally fine job in their respective organizations.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I would like to insert excerpts from the address made on that occasion by Mr. Potofsky:

I am glad to be here tonight and to see so many employers join us in paying tribute to Sam Nocella on the occasion of his election to the general executive board. It speaks well for our labor-management relations.

On behalf of the general officers and members of the general executive board I am happy to congratulate and to welcome Sam Nocella to the highest council of the Amalgamated—the general executive board.

Sam served a long apprenticeship in our organization, beginning with Philadelphia where he hails from; then Easton, Pa., Red Bank, N.J., and finally Maryland, Virginia, and Pennsylvania joint board—now merging with the Baltimore joint board.

This merger is a natural one. Baltimore has an honored place in the history of the Amalgamated, not only because it produced Dorothy Bellanca and Hymie Blumberg, who have done so much to advance the growth and prestige of our union, but principally because of the historic battles that took place in this city in the beginning of our history.

One of the most historic of these strikes took place at the very birth of the Amalgamated in December 1914. A later struggle took place with the IWW which had joined hands with the old UGW. Those were bitter and bloody battles where the destiny of the Amalgamated was shaped.

So the merger of the 46-year-old history-laden joint board of Baltimore with the comparatively young joint board comprising the Greif and Schoeneman workers not only is natural but is most desirable.

In Sam Nocella, who will now head the combined joint board, we have an able, dynamic leader, experienced, dedicated to the cause of the Amalgamated and the labor movement.

Sam represents the younger generation that is steeped in the tradition and ideals of our organization but young enough to fight vigorously for the translation of our ideals and dreams into reality. He is community minded. He is industry minded. He has learned to have a sense of responsibility and dedicated service to our membership.

Sam knows the trade. Under the tutelage of Hymie Blumberg these past few years Sam was an apt pupil. He is now well trained and able to assume the leadership of our vast membership in this area.

I am glad to note that since the merger we have organized the workers of H. L. Hartz—a good beginning. I am confident that before long there will be a 100-percent unionization in this area of all who come under our jurisdiction.

On this happy occasion I should like to take a few minutes to discuss with you not the past but the future, the challenge our Nation and the labor movement and the world is facing in the forthcoming sixties—automation, unemployment, a troubled world in a space age. Will we have the courage, the inner strength to face these challenges to our system, our way of life, and our security?

To be able to face our problems abroad we must first make sure that our problems at home are handled properly. If we have unemployment and distressed areas at home, if we have discrimination and riots in Alabama, our world has so shrunk that there are immediate repercussions abroad.

To do the job will require a strong government with a heart. Fortunately, we now have positive national leadership. In President Kennedy, whom our union helped to elect, we have a strong man at the helm of the ship of state. He has moved vigorously with Executive orders and congressional recommendations in his first few months in office to reverse the trend of recession. He moved on civil rights and equality of opportunity in hiring by establishing a special committee presided over by the Vice President.

Nothing rights itself by itself. Something needs to be done. The Government is the only agency which can do things in a big way. In these first few months the new administration has been moving in the right direction.

One of our most serious problems is that of unemployment—chronic unemployment that comes from automation. The administration recommended and Congress adopted a law to extend unemployment benefits beyond 26 weeks. The President recommended and Congress passed distressed area legislation providing $395 million for this purpose. The $1.25 minimum wage and extended coverage was passed. (We in the Amalgamated have a special interest in minimum wage legislation because it will bring greater stability to our industries.)

Still pending is legislation on aid to education, housing, and medical care for the aged through social security.

We have to do something to provide jobs for the young people who will be joining the labor movement. This amounts to 13 million jobs in the next 10 years. To provide jobs we must accelerate growth through public works, housing, school construction, new hospitals, roadbuilding. Growth is the only tangible answer. I have faith in the administration of President Kennedy and the men around him. I have faith in the future of our country and our system of government.

We must be strong militarily, ready for any emergency that may come. But that is not all. We must not throw our weight around but rather our abundance, not as charity but as self-help. It is the minds and hearts of the men and women we must reach both at home and abroad.

We can reach them by being good neighbors, by understanding their problems and being as helpful and friendly as we can. That is the meaning and purpose of the Peace Corps the President has proposed. It is the 1961 point 4.

In conclusion, once again congratulations to Sam Nocella. Best wishes for the success of the new merged joint board. In unity there is strength.

Let us harmoniously work together for the good of our union, the progress of our country, and the peace of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I was also privileged to say a few words on this auspicious occasion, which I am inserting:

Mr. Chairman; Reverend Robson; Tommy D'Alesandro; President Potofsky; Executive Vice President Blumberg; our esteemed guest of honor, Sam Nocella; officials of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, regional and local; other distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, when President Kennedy spoke before the Canadian Parliament several days ago, he began his address with these words: "I feel that I am truly among friends."

Because of my long and close association with the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, I respectfully borrow the President's text and paraphrase just a bit and say: "I know that I am truly among friends."

Tonight, all of us associated with the great cause of labor, rejoice that one who has devoted practically his entire life's work to the industry, and in the service of the union is being accorded this deserved recognition on the occasion of his election to the general executive board of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.

Most of you are already familiar with Sam Nocella's outstanding record of success, and noteworthy achievements, since his first association with the men's apparel industry at the age of 9, when he served as an apprentice to a tailor. In 1919, and during the succeeding years, Sam demonstrated that he had the ability, the character, the warmth, and the know-how that enabled him to climb the ladder of responsibility that brought him to higher offices, and to membership on the general executive board for which we salute him tonight.

Sam, as a Member of Congress, and personally, I extend heartiest congratulations, and warmest greetings on this important occasion in your life. May God bless you and wife and guide you in the performance of the duties and responsibilities which are yours, for your actions will directly and indirectly, affect the welfare and well-being of thousands of your coworkers, and their families, and the economy of our city, State, and Nation.

To the members of the labor family present here tonight, I would like to report that I have given my wholehearted support to the President's program which represents commendable, positive acts, on behalf of human and public needs. Those of us identified with the Democratic Party, have always fought for the protection of workers, and the improvement of their working and living conditions. The present administration is not unmindful of this responsibility.

All that we ask, is that we continue to be entrusted to recognize the human rights of the worker, his essential economic value and his struggle to share in the prosperity which could not exist without him. We solemnly pledge our efforts toward the fulfillment of this obligation.

On the subject of world affairs, all of us are aware that we are living during times when there is international tension challenging us at every front. Great decisions must be made, and we must keep ever alert to the dangers which would destroy our way of life.

As each day seems to bring crisis upon crisis, let us keep united, and strong in support of our President, and those charged with the responsibility of guiding the affairs and destiny of our Nation.

If sacrifices are required, and they will be required, let us make them willingly. I am sure labor will not be found wanting in this regard.

We must translate to reality, the precepts President Kennedy included in his inaugural address when he said:

"And so, my fellow Americans, ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country" and "Let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing, and His help, but knowing that here on earth, God's work must truly be our own."

Our country's cause is labor's cause; and we tell the world that we are dedicated to the cause of seeing that the dignity of man and his basic rights are inviolable.

In conclusion, I thank you for affording me the opportunity and pleasure of joining with you in this tribute to Sam Nocella, and I express the hope that the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America will enjoy many more years of continued success.

Streamlined Wheat Appeals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, one of the big problems facing this Nation is the wheat surplus. And, as I have pointed out before, one of the best ways of coping with that surplus is to find more uses for wheat. Out in Kansas, in Lawrence and other cities, we have been buying and eating a new wheat food—Redi-Wheat. I want to invite my colleagues' attention to an article about Redi-Wheat in the Christian Science Monitor of Thursday, May 25, 1961. Redi-Wheat will be on grocery store shelves all over the Nation before long, and its general acceptance by our consumers will go a long way toward helping solve the wheat surplus problem, and will add a delicious and nutritive element to our meals. I have sampled Redi-Wheat and it is indeed delicious.

STREAMLINED WHEAT APPEALS

(By Gordon B. West)

TOPEKA, KANS.—Kansans are celebrating their State centennial during 1961, and they have an exciting, versatile new wheat product they're calling their Centennial Food. It's Redi-Wheat.

This is a whole-kernel processed wheat food. It's sold in cans, ready to heat and eat. It's good for lunch and/or dinner. Home economics researchers at the USDA Western Regional Laboratory at Albany, Calif., developed the new food—all part of a program to help use up the wheat surplus.

Here is farm research in action. Redi-Wheat first was introduced in Wichita, this spring, in an official consumer acceptance test conducted by the USDA Agricultural Marketing Service. Several supermarkets were chosen to display the new product. Hutchinson, Lawrence, Topeka, Manhattan, Junction City and many other cities have it on grocers' shelves. Soon it will be distributed nationally.

VERSATILE FOODSTUFF

Redi-Wheat comes in two forms—seasoned (flavored with chicken broth and seasoning) and unseasoned. Until production is built up, 10-ounce cans sell for 19 cents or two for 37 cents.

Promotion is a part of the domestic marketing program of Great Plains Wheat, Inc., Garden City Kans.—regional development and marketing organization of important wheat-growing States. The Kansas Wheat Commission and the Kansas Association of Wheat Growers are taking the leadership.

The new product can be used in combination with every other type of food—with fruit, vegetables, meat, and fish. An entire meal can be prepared, from soup to dessert. It's best for lunch and/or dinner.

Kansans have tried Redi-Wheat in these and other ways: meatballs, meatloaf, Spanish Redi-Wheat, Creole jambolaya, Redi-Wheat au gratin, baked with cheese, pecan whip dessert, in lamb or chicken pilaf, scalloped with wieners, Scotch broth, Boston baked Redi-Wheat, in cabbage rolls, bread, salad, Indian pudding, stuffing for peppers, sandwiches, in poultry or game stuffing.

Now, what's the journey that Redi-Wheat takes to arrive on the grocery shelf? Wheat is taken from storage and washed thoroughly, put in a mixer with water to add moisture, run through a rice huller to debran the kernels (about one-half of the bran is removed) and is rewashed before loading in a truck to be taken to Trenton, Mo. There it is processed under an extremely high vacuum. The firm at Trenton is the only one with the necessary equipment between the Mississippi and the Rockies. From Trenton, trucks take the cans of Redi-Wheat to the various stores.

The Winchester Packing Co., Hutchinson, Kans., is developing frozen Redi-Wheat meatballs and frozen meatloaf, ready to heat and serve. A Topeka packing firm is working on Redi-Wheat luncheon meats. Kansas farm women and other housewives are using their Yankee ingenuity to whip up their own Redi-Wheat recipes. Mrs. C. F. King, Hutchinson, invented a new bread. Mrs. Shelby Whitehead, Wichita, thought up Redi-Wheat fish croquettes and fish casserole.

COMMENTS ON TASTE TESTS

What are some Kansans saying about Redi-Wheat after taste trials?

Mrs. Betty Denton, foods editor, Topeka State Journal, Topeka: "Redi-Wheat passed its test at our family dinner table. My husband liked it. One evening when I served various samples of Redi-Wheat dishes, the children helped themselves—and to seconds."

John Newlin, Edwards County wheat farmer who lives near Lewis: "The enthusiasm of the Kansas wheat growers is terrific because they see the potential of increased domestic consumption of wheat."

W. W. Graber, administrator of the Kansas Wheat Commission, Hutchinson: "The commission is very optimistic about the results of the promotion of Redi-Wheat in Kansas towns and cities. The acceptance is far beyond our expectations."

Dan Coffey, Wichita broker for Redi-Wheat in the western half of Kansas: "Repeats orders by retail stores are the best barometer of the acceptance of a product. Repeat sales have been excellent. Supply lines of the product to stores have been kept very busy."

Betty Stevens, Hutchinson, a demonstrator who served Redi-Wheat meatballs in Wichita and Hutchinson grocery stores, has this to tell about customer reception to the product: "People seemed to be looking forward to testing and tasting Redi-Wheat." She says, "'I want to try this' was a statement heard many times during a day. Everyone seemed to be thoroughly enjoying the taste of the meatballs." (Members of home demonstration units made 80,000 meatballs containing Redi-Wheat for the Wichita displays alone.)

Daye Jaye, manager of one of the J. S. Dillion & Sons stores (located in several Kansas cities): "Redi-Wheat has been very favorably accepted, and repeat sales are good."

Patricia Beezley, Topeka, owner and manager of cafeterias at Topeka and Wichita, and 1960 president of the Kansas Restaurant Association: "I have introduced Redi-Wheat and acceptance by the public was good. Redi-Wheat is a very tasty product and in the food business it is good as an extender. Redi-Wheat has excellent potential as a new, versatile food product."

As an introduction, the Kansas Wheat Commission served a colorful buffet dinner in Topeka, with dishes from salad to dessert. Guests were restaurant and institutional personnel, home economists, homemakers, the farm press, farm leaders, gourmets. Most of the guests helped themselves to seconds.

Redi-Wheat has been tested in the school lunch program in Kansas and passed with flying colors. Four test meals were served at Whiting Public School, Whiting, Kans., a small rural town in Jackson County. The lunch program there serves 80 grade school and 55 high school pupils, most of whom are from nearby farms. Ken Boughten, of the marketing division of the State board of agriculture, Topeka, says general reaction by students was favorable.

President's Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, immediately following the President's address to the Congress, on May 25, I had issued this statement:

The speech was disappointing to me as an American. The President said, "We do not intend to leave an open road to despotism," (with which I agree) but just so long as the President's deeds do not match his words, freedom is in for trouble. I am sorry the President was not more forceful. For a physically vigorous young man, the determination to stand up to despotism was missing. The American people would like to hear for once that we are sick and tired of being pushed around by Khrushchev or any of his puppets. I am concerned with our fiscal condition. The President has advocated spending on all fronts. I am willing to keep our defenses the strongest in the world but cut down on nondefense items; otherwise bankruptcy is certain and Russia will already have won its war against us without firing a shot.

Apparently the President "revised and extended" his remarks in his state of the Union address, last Thursday. David Lawrence in his article of May 26, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune, gives an excellent analysis of the speech:

TODAY IN NATIONAL AFFAIRS—KENNEDY BEFORE CONGRESS TRIED TO COVER TOO MUCH

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, May 25.—There was an impression of confusion and disorder in the way President Kennedy's address to Congress was prepared for delivery and in the actual delivery.

The joint session of the Senate and House didn't hear verbatim the speech which was distributed by the White House to the press about 3 hours earlier.

Whole sections—approximately 1,500 words—were deleted or changed as the President spoke. The reason given is that this was necessary so as not to use up too much television time. Mr. Kennedy spoke for 44 minutes.

FULL TEXT IN RECORD

After it was over, the announcement was made by the White House that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD would publish the full text of the speech, including not only the brief passages which the President added extemporaneously but also the sections which were eliminated as he spoke.

What then becomes the official text of the President's speech? What was transmitted to the Congress of the United States as the official recommendation of the Chief Executive? Does the interpolated version constitute an official expression?

Often in the past a President has made slight changes as he spoke or has added a sentence or two here and there, but the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD would usually print the stenographic report of what was actually said.

PUZZLING ITEM DROPPED

Perhaps it was a good thing Mr. Kennedy did some editing. For in the prepared copy given to the press there occurs this puzzling statement:

"Too often we have accepted a merely defensive role. Too often we have let ourselves appear as friends of the status quo—and the status quo may be $50 a year. Meanwhile the pressures of the totalitarian conspiracy mount higher every day, as one nation after another, by internal more often than external means, finds its freedom under attack."

What does the $50 a year have to do with it?

COOLLY RECEIVED

As delivered, the address was more than 6,000 words in length. Anything that runs 44 minutes tends to tire the audience, and it was apparent that many Members of Congress received the speech in a rather indifferent mood—judging by the relatively few manifestations of applause in comparison with the numerous outbursts when Mr. Kennedy appeared last time before a joint session.

It was most unfortunate that the President decided to cover so much ground in a single message. For it would have been far more effective if he had devoted a separate message or communication on different days to each of the important topics that he discussed. Thus, the problem of outer space and the importance of research, including the prospective trip to the moon by some American astronaut, would have made more of an impression on Congress if it had been the subject of a single message.

BEFORE GOING AWAY

As it was, Mr. Kennedy tried to cover too much ground, and perhaps the reason was that he is going to Europe soon and sought to get off his mind and into the minds of Members of Congress the point of view of the administration on many things. Or perhaps it was the desire for publicity through television that caused the President's advisers to persuade him to deliver an omnibus message. The orderly conduct of the Government's business and the need for a thorough presentation of current issues to the Congress should, it would seem, outweigh the passion for television exposures.

There is really little new in the President's address. He asks for more Federal appropriations. He hopes that the budget will not be too far out of balance. He is pleased that economic recovery is on the way. He is right, also, in asking for the small amount of money needed for the U.S. Information Agency broadcasts to other countries.

GENERAL TERMS

As for the major recommendations about military reorganization and defense programs, these were presented by Mr. Kennedy in very general terms. The program he recommends for manpower development and training, to give several hundred thousands of workers new occupational skills, is a step in the right direction.

With respect to the coming meetings with Premier Khrushchev, Mr. Kennedy insisted

in his message that "no formal agenda is planned and no negotiations will be undertaken" but that there is to be a "personal exchange of views." He added:

"Yet it is important to know that our patience at the bargaining table is nearly inexhaustible, though our credulity is limited—that our hopes for peace are unfailing, while our determination to protect our security is resolute."

These are generalities—more words added to the thousands that have been uttered in recent weeks in the hope of impressing Khrushchev.

This Is the Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial from the East Oregonian of May 17. It strongly endorses the administration-backed farm bill H.R. 6400, as a self-help program and a "way for the farmer to build for himself the secure place that other segments of the Nation's economy have":

THIS IS THE WAY

The new program for agriculture, proposed by the Kennedy administration through Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, has some strong friends and some strong enemies. Its supporters include the Grange and the Farmers Union and organizations representing several of the larger commodities. Its opponents include the Farm Bureau Federation and several commodity organizations, including the Cattlemen's Association.

What is this program? We pose that question because you can get several different interpretations of it, according to whether the speaker is in favor or against. Seems to us it is best, in the beginning to go to the source of the program. What does Secretary Freeman say about it? In an address to the National Press Club in Washington, D.C., last month Mr. Freeman said this, in part, about the program:

"We need to recognize that all the farmer is asking for is equality of economic opportunity.

"The farmer is the only basic producer in our economy who has available to him no means by which he can adjust his production to demand—and who therefore has no effective means by which he can influence the economic rewards of his enterprise.

"It is absurd, in any consideration of a farm program, to compare the farmer with the small corner merchant.

"Perhaps there should be Government action for small business, but of a different nature for a different reason. But the farmer, as a basic producer and not a retailer, can be more accurately compared with other basic producers—such as, for example, the producers of steel. Government has given to such producers the instrument of incorporation, by which they can become large enough to effectively adjust their production to quantities that can be sold profitably.

"Government has likewise given to labor the instrument of collective bargaining whereby millions of individual workers—who, as individuals, would be even more helpless than the farmers—can work together to achieve a fair return for their productive activity.

"To achieve economic equality, therefore, we propose programs to provide farmers with the institutional machinery for coming together and developing supply adjustment programs, and with democratic methods for approving or rejecting such programs. We would specifically provide safeguards for consumers' interests in this process.

"By enacting the proposed legislation the Congress would establish the ground rules and guidelines under which supply adjustment programs would be developed and placed into operation. Then, whenever action is needed with regard to any commodity or group of related commodities, a committee of producers—including one consumer representative—would be selected to consult with the Secretary of Agriculture to develop and recommend a program of supply adjustment for that commodity. The Secretary would recommend a program based on these consultations. Only after such a program had been approved by the President, sanctioned by the Congress, and approved by a two-thirds vote of the producers themselves, would it become binding upon all farmers who choose to produce that commodity. The farmers who serve on these commodity advisory committees would be chosen from nominees designated by farmer-elected county committees and by farm organizations.

"Thus, in return for the limitations to which farmers would conform only after they, themselves, had reached decisions by the accepted democratic method of voting on proposed programs—in return for these limitations the farmers would gain more real influence over the economic consequences of their farming enterprise, more real influence over their opportunity to earn fair incomes, than they have ever had, or can have, without such programs."

Inability to adjust supply to demand has been the root of the farmer's economic troubles for a long time. It isn't going to be alleviated as our population grows, and there are more mouths to feed. It isn't because the farmer's ability to produce will be far ahead of the demand for his products far into the future.

People who have experience in Oregon agriculture should be able to understand very well the program Mr. Freeman is proposing. It is almost exactly this procedure that Oregon State College and its extension service undertook not so many years ago to bolster an ailing Oregon agricultural economy. In this State it was determined what should and should not be grown in direct relation to the markets available to products that could be grown here.

Until farmers, the Nation over, gear their production to the demands in the marketplace they will be in trouble. And it is something they must do themselves. Secretary Freeman is suggesting only that they be assisted by the Government in developing programs, commodity by commodity. The programs would be theirs. This is the way, we have long been convinced, and the only way for the farmer to build for himself the secure place that other segments of the Nation's economy have.

Difficult Questions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, many citizens in the Sixth District of Michigan have expressed their concern and indignation to me over the proposed tractors-for-prisoners exchange. The following editorial from the May 24 issue of the State Journal of Lansing spells out in succinct form many of the questions which this proposal leaves unanswered.

I am particularly concerned about the long-range effect of any acquiesence, either by the U.S. Government or a private group, to the blackmail by Castro. As a State Journal editorial says:

There is, however, another serious question—that of the possible effect of paying Dictator Castro the price he has demanded for the liberation of the invaders.

If a dictator as ruthless as Castro has shown himself to be finds he can acquire urgently needed tractors by freeing some prisoners he now has in custody, there would be danger that it would not be his last act of blackmail.

While I recognize the President, as Chief Executive, is charged with the responsibility for the conduct of our Nation's foreign affairs, I nonetheless want to register my protest. The complete editorial follows:

DIFFICULT QUESTIONS

The humanitarian motives of the private American citizens who are trying to raise funds for the rescue of 1,214 prisoners who were taken in last month's invasion of Cuba are praiseworthy.

It is a case of the Americans placing a far high value on the freedom of the men who tried to overthrow Cuban Dictator Fidel Castro than they place on the money needed to buy the tractors which Castro has asked as ransom.

But even though the fundraisers have the best of intentions their efforts pose questions it may not be easy to answer.

One of the questions has to do with the propriety and legality of negotiations between private citizens and a foreign government, especially a foreign government with which the U.S. Government has severed diplomatic relations.

One Senator has cited the Logan Act which bars such negotiations.

Presumably the private citizens have no thought of engaging in any dealings with Castro without the full approval of the American Government and it is possible that once the money for the tractors has been raised further arrangements could be handled by the Government.

There is, however, another serious question—that of the possible effect of paying Dictator Castro the price he has demanded for the liberation of the invaders.

If a dictator as ruthless as Castro has shown himself to be finds he can acquire urgently needed tractors by freeing some prisoners he now has in custody there would be danger that it would not be his last act of blackmail.

His desire for other equipment or commodities from the United States might cause him to continue to use his prisoners and threats of executions as a means of obtaining supplies which he cannot acquire through normal trade channels.

There were indications Monday, however, that Castro himself might make it unnecessary to answer the questions raised by the proposed exchange of tractors for the prisoners now held in Cuba.

Castro threatened in a Havana broadcast to cancel the deal if the United States persists in treating the trade as an exchange rather than an indemnification for war damage.

Future events may show that Castro's desire to humiliate the United States rather than his desire for tractors was the real basis of his offer to trade human lives for machines.

Unity Among Postal Clerk Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the problems of public employees have commanded very special attention from me ever since my tenure of office as mayor of my home city in Omaha. Just as now in my assignment to the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I have a constant and primary concern for the problems of Federal employees, so too during my terms as mayor of Omaha I was deeply interested in the problems of the employees of the city of Omaha. As a result of long associations and strong friendships, I am delighted by a movement which must result in greater amity and concord among organizations speaking for post office clerks.

The National Federation of Post Office Clerks, the United National Association of Post Office Craftsmen, and the United Postal Workers have already combined to form the United Federation of Post Office Clerks. The National Postal Transport Association is ready to join the combined movement and will do so provided that the membership of the National Postal Transport Association gives its consent in a referendum ballot which is to be counted on June 30, 1961.

When the National Postal Transport Association joins the combined group, the name will become the United Federation of Postal Clerks and the change will commemorate the marriage of two great organizations both of which hold charters in the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.

The benefits of the amalgamation will be apparent immediately to all postal clerks and in a little while other postal and Federal employees and even Members of Congress will see the improvements resulting from the change.

The amalgamation in no way constitutes an infringement upon or a hazard to congressional relations. All of us here in the Congress of the United States have had very wholesome relations with President E. C. Hallbeck of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks who will head the combined union. We remember him best as legislative director of his union in the days before he rose to the presidency. Now we are familiar with John O'Connor who has succeeded Mr. Hallbeck as legislative director of the combined organization. Mr. Hallbeck and I have had especially warm relations in view of the fact that a brother of Mr. Hallbeck is a resident of the city of Omaha. Similarly, we are familiar with Mr. Joseph Thomas who was president of the United National Association of Post Office Craftsmen and who now assumes the position of director of organization in the combined organization.

I personally am most intimately familiar with Paul A. Nagle, who is president of the National Postal Transport Association and who is slated to become the administrative vice president of the combined union.

I got to know Paul Nagle before I became a member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. In fact, even before having left Omaha to come to Washington to take my congressional seat, I talked with Mr. Adolph Dudycha who was then president of the Omaha branch of the National Postal Transport Association and Mr. Clinton Gross who is the associate national vice president of the National Postal Transport Association for the area which includes Omaha. These gentlemen have been truly gentlemenly all the time under every circumstance.

There have been times when I found it necessary to challenge the postal administration of my own Republican Party during the Eisenhower administration. On July 2, 1960, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 12595, a bill bearing my name, which directed the Postmaster General to cease and desist from his experiment in transporting ordinary first-class mail by air. The membership of the National Postal Transport Association comprises the group of postal employees which would be most adversely affected by any expansion of the so-called airlift. The present administration has said that no expansion is planned and that there may be a regrouping of segments currently in operation. My own position has remained the same. I can still see no congressional authorization for the operation, and I feel that the atmosphere should be cleared by congressional action of one type or another.

In my considered judgment the amalgamation of the postal employee organizations into one group will insure far greater job protection than would otherwise be available to the postal employees who perform service in the railway post office trains and in highway post office vehicles.

There have been other situations in which I have found it necessary to support the policy of the previous administration and to differ with Mr. Nagle and his group. Whether in difference or in agreement, we have always had the most wholesome relations and I know that postal employees everywhere will prosper if as a result of the amalgamation, this man is given a deeper and broader voice with which to plead for the welfare of the people for whom he is spokesman.

Another group of people will benefit by the combination of the postal clerks' organizations, even though they are no longer in Federal service. I am referring to the great body of retired civil servants. Mr. Nagle's group includes a substantial percentage of retired people and no one works more ardently on legislation affecting retirees than does Mr. Nagle. Consequently it can be said very directly that retirees that are not directly involved by the merger will nevertheless reap a harvest of benefits enabling their leaders to speak with more resonant voices.

We are on the threshold of a new and exciting chapter of postal employee relations. I am grateful for the opportunity to be so close an observer of the changes which are underway and which constitute a definite force for good.

Letter to Asahi Evening News, Japan, by Russian Doctor of Laws, Criticizing Los Angeles County American Lawyer, Danny R. Jones, Author of Article "Justice in Russia as Seen by U.S. Lawyer"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present to the reading pleasure of your distinguished self and that of all my colleagues the following text. The Danny R. Jones mentioned in paragraph two of the article is personally known to me in the great 23d Congressional District for several years as an exceptionally able, forthright and successful practitioner at the California bar with his offices in the important city of Compton, Los Angeles County, Calif.

A few months ago he favored me by personally telling me of his experiences occurring during both of his two visits to Soviet Russia in connection with his study of "Justice in Russia."

As you conclude reading this criticism by the Russian doctor of laws, I call your attention to the first sentence of the last paragraph thereof which reads as follows:

> This is, however, impossible for the time being, and we shall be satisfied.

The foregoing quote clearly refers to the "Comrades' Court in the U.S.S.R." mentioned in the preceding paragraph above this quoted portion. That fact, together with the wording, "impossible for the time being" is to me most significant and further cause of concern about the intentions of the leaders of Soviet Russia.

[From the Asahi Evening News, Apr. 19, 1961]

JUSTICE IN RUSSIA

To the EDITOR:

In the February 6 issue of your paper was published an article by W. B. Swim entitled "Justice in Russia as Seen by U.S. Lawyer." The article cites some statements made by an American attorney, Danny R. Jones, who happened to be in Tokyo on his way home from the U.S.S.R. to the United States.

Jones and his colleague, Melvin M. Belli, coauthors of a book under contemplation under the title of "Life and Law in Russia," had lately finished an extensive tourist journey of the Soviet Union.

We can only welcome supplying Japanese readers with wide information on the life, laws, and justice in the U.S.S.R., since we know well that the Japanese people who are disposed to be friendly toward the peoples of the Soviet Union take a lively interest in everything that is going on in our country.

It is, however, to be much regretted that the American lawyer, whose impressions were published in your paper, proved to be an observer passing tendentious judgments on the facts he was speaking of.

Judge for yourselves. Mr. Jones could not but mention that everywhere the Soviet people received and accompanied the Americans gladly, showed interest in their life, made them presents, and so forth. Nevertheless, in face of these obvious facts, which, by the way, are noticed by every unprejudiced foreigner who visits our country, Jones maintains that in the U.S.S.R., all Americans, Britishers, and others are considered bad guys, that all Americans are called imperialists, warmongers, enemies of communism, and the like, whereas not a Soviet citizen will ever mix up the American people with the American imperialists. In the U.S.S.R. even schoolboys are aware of the fact that the American people, just like the Soviet, British, Japanese, and other peoples, hate war, desire lasting peace. In the Soviet Union it is the American and other imperialists who are regarded as warmongers, and it is just against them that the entire hatred of the Soviet people is directed.

Mr. Jones admits that this time he "saw a lot of material progress" in Russia in comparison with the first tour undertaken by him 2 years before. He recognizes a number of successes attained by the Soviet people, speaks of the shortening of the working day as "a wonderful move" on the part of the Government, mentions the prospective total abolition of the income tax on the population and some more facts in the life of the peoples of the U.S.S.R. Nevertheless, he seeks everywhere dark, negative aspects and, failing to discover such, fabricates them and depicts facts in the desired black colors.

For instance, out of the sole fact that in the city of Omsk the tourists met a certain "well-dressed Russian Jew" who spoke English better than interpreters in Moscow, Jones "concluded that despite Russian propaganda denying it there is some amount of discrimination in the Soviet Union." What a frivolous way this is to cast doubts on a whole nation without producing a proof, and that on such an important question as racial discrimination.

Further, Jones admits that he does not think the Soviet people are about to overthrow their government. It would seem that from such an admission he could have drawn the conclusion that the people are satisfied with their government. But the wise researcher of the life and usages in the U.S.S.R. draws from it another entirely unexpected conclusion: "I don't think there is a choice. The people do not know of any other system."

If the researcher had been objective, he would have noticed easily how much the Soviet people know of other systems, particularly of the systems obtaining in the imperialist states. To speak concretely of the American system, we do not need at all information as may be furnished by such specialists as Jones. It is quite enough that the people in the Soviet Union know well what the American workers themselves and even such a trade union leader as G. Meany write of the American system.

Now what did Jones inform the readers of the paper concerning justice in Russia? First of all, it turns out that the most heinous crime in the U.S.S.R. is to make a profit. Jones maintained that "such crimes are tried by popular courts." Furthermore, he stated that "in popular courts the accused is charged by committees or groups of his fellow workers or neighbors. Verdicts are by a show of hands. Such courts can sentence people to labor camps," and so forth, and so on.

Such assertions concerning Soviet justice have nothing in common with reality and pursue only one aim—to discredit the legal order and justice in the Soviet Union.

As for the truth about the Soviet justice, it is by no means difficult to establish it. The true story is this: justice in the Soviet Union sees its task in insuring the strict observance of the laws by all officials and citizens; its aim is to guard the interests of society as well as the rights and legitimate interests of every citizen. If the talk is about "the most heinous crime" in the U.S.S.R., it is of course not profitmaking, but the crime against social order or personal welfare of the people, murder and similar grave infringements of the law that is regarded as such.

In the U.S.S.R. there are neither exploiters nor private owners of factories, plants, railways, commercial enterprises, and so on. It is already a long time since the capitalists disappeared from our country together with their profits derived through exploitation of the working people. It is therefore strange that anyone should yet talk of this sort of activity being in Russia "the most heinous crime." If what Jones has in mind here is speculation, then it really constitutes a crime in the U.S.S.R. for speculation comes under the provision of the law: "cornering and reselling commodities or other objects with a view to making profits" (art. 154 of the criminal code of the Russian Soviet Federal Socialist Republic). Such an activity is carried out by persons of the parasitic type to the detriment of the interests of the broad masses of the working people, who are not in the least in need of middlemen and merchants, since their need is served as a rule by state and cooperative trade.

Nevertheless, speculation is not so heinous a crime, all the less so if we consider that cases of speculation occur only sporadically and that it is dying out as production grows and the Soviet trade gets improved. Furthermore, drawing of incomes by kolkhozes and kolkhoze peasants through the sale of the products of their own labor on markets is not a crime at all.

Moreover, petty speculation committed for the first time is not regarded as a crime punishable according to criminal procedure. In these days it incurs merely an administrative penalty.

According to the draft law on participation of the public in the fight against infringements of the law, it is envisaged to transfer the jurisdiction over these minor infringements of the law as well as over a number of analogous minor breaches of the law to comrades' courts, popular courts, whose task does not consist in dealing out punishments (they are not empowered to pass sentence on anyone, nor to apply such measures as mentioned by Jones in an entirely unwarranted manner), but in comradely education of infringers of the law.

Obviously, it is of this institution that Mr. Jones has happened to overhear, and he prefers to make fun of it, instead of trying to grasp the significance of this new measure designed to draw wide circles of citizens into management of public affairs. Yet he would have done well to ponder seriously over it, since in the Soviet Union crimes are decreasing steadily thanks to the new social order, to the care expended by the state on the working people.

It seemed to Jones that "courts are still drab," that the number of lawyers in the U.S.S.R. is very small in comparison with the United States. He could have added that the number of judges, public prosecutors, militiamen is decreasing more and more in the Soviet state. Why is this? It is because infringements of the law are decreasing more and more and because the general Soviet public is carrying on a successful struggle with them. Hence follows that we are building in the U.S.S.R. not "palaces of justice," but palaces of culture, and that the number of lawyers is decreasing more and more in the Socialist society. What in the world is there to be wondered? Is there anything to be regretted for a cultured man?

As for other inventions of the "enlightened" American lawyer, we cannot but regret that there exists no possibility to request their colleagues in the United States to examine at a popular court his behavior and condemn him for spreading false information.

In truth, will it be a bad thing at all if at an American comrades' court Jones is reminded of the incorrectness of the false information disseminated by him concerning the comrades' court in the U.S.S.R.? It would be both just and instructive for others.

This is, however, impossible for the time being, and we shall be satisfied, if you, dear editor, would bring the present letter of mine to the notice of the readers of your paper. In hope that the letter will help disperse to a certain degree the fog and shadow which Mr. Jones cast on the life and justice in the Soviet state.

V. S. TADEVOSYAN,
Doctor of Laws, Deputy Director of the Institute of State and Law of the Academy of Sciences, U.S.S.R., President of the Soviet Association of Political Sciences.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of May 27, 1961:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

MAY 27, 1961.

The Cuban situation is getting worse by the hour. We now know the invasion attempt we denied planning was U.S. directed and failed because of our last minute withdrawal of promised air support. "At least five departments or agencies of the U.S. Government were in on the venture into Cuba, including the White House. Stories deliberately fed out to center blame on the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff were an effort to clear skirts in other directions. Military chiefs then were ordered not to talk".—U.S. News & World Report, May 29.

Earlier the President, and Adlai Stevenson in the United Nations, had denied U.S. participation in Cuban invasion plans. Then the President assured the world that we would free Cuba from communism. Although he is being counseled simultaneously to appease the Communists and to get tough, the President thus far has gone no further than to talk tough. Many in Washington, including me, still shocked at the thought of even contemplating acquiescence to Castro's blackmail effort to trade human beings for freedom, were appalled to learn that the Reuther-Roosevelt-Eisenhower committee was originated by President Kennedy. This clearly violates the law, the Logan Act, even as it violates basic morality. Further, our own partial trade embargo prohibits our shipping tractors or bulldozers. The implied admission of weakness on our part by such action will multiply the danger far beyond the lives of these prisoners. Indeed, the cost

in lives later to free Cuba from communism may outnumber many times the number of prisoners now involved.

With world crises erupting so rapidly, our lack of clear foreign policy is bewildering and presents contradictions. The Vice President learned on his trip that Asian nations are unsure of the United States. Either the United States must take a firm stand or these nations will head toward communism. Even as President Kennedy says, "The United States is prepared to make any sacrifice or risk any danger necessary to block the spread of communism," we failed to support those fighting to free Cuba and indicated that we are not willing to make any sacrifice or risk any danger to block the spread of communism only 90 miles from our coast. At the same time we take a licking at Geneva when our allies won't support us. Then President Kennedy, contrary to all statements during the campaign and up to the present, indicates he will meet with Khrushchev, regardless of any precedent or development to cause reason for hope. On the contrary, every development shows that Khrushchev is formenting trouble throughout the world. The deck is stacked against the President. Talk and debate doesn't work with Khrushchev who uses dishonesty and lies as his tools to beguile and fool. We desperately need some firm action—a blockade of Cuba would be a good start. Then we should draw a line with Russia and move in our Navy and military weapons ready to back up the tough talk. Firm action alone now can save us from world war III. Our present policy of drift and indecision is toward national suicide.

The freedom riders and the resulting riots should teach us some lessons: (1) When local law enforcement fails the Federal Government moves in; (2) Federal Government can always unilaterally take the law into its own hands; (3) those looking for trouble will find it. Intemperate do-gooders can hurt the cause of integration.

Walter Heller, President Kennedy's top economic adviser, may be pushing us backward to the inflationary practices of Federal intervention in our economy as practiced by the Truman administration. According to Heller, because of the allegedly slow rate of economic growth from 1953 through 1960, the United States faces a persistent economic slack. It follows that Government spending and other measures must take up that slack for the Nation to realize its potential growth. Taking a closer look at the statistical underpinnings of this theory, we find the Government's part of the gross national product from 1947–53 (which included the Korean war) went from $54.6 billion to $102 billion. Interestingly enough, the gross private domestic investment category of the gross national product went up from $50 billion in 1947 to over $70 billion in 1959. As for personal consumption expenditures, they rose more in the 1953–59 period than in the 1947–53 era. We had at least three times as much inflation from 1947 to 1953, so that actual growth was that much larger in the 1953–59 period. A return to the Truman inflationary period is what we are being offered. This same formula was offered Germany by some of these same economists, but the advice was spurned and West Germany has prospered beyond all expectations. Our real choice is between sound economic growth based on private enterprise and risk capital or vast, inflationary Government expansion with no firm foundation.

In the tax hearings before my Ways and Means Committee, I was able to strike a blow for the elimination of double taxation of corporations by suggesting that now is the time to stop taxing corporate income that is distributed to stockholders. The stockholders can be taxed upon their receipts. Retained earnings of both corporations and cooperatives could be taxed should distribution not be made to the stockholders or shareholders.

Needed: Greater U.S. Voluntary Mobilization Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the free world, if it is to defeat communism's efforts to conquer the world, needs to more effectively mobilize its manpower and resources.

As a leader of the free world, we have a special responsibility and challenge. Uncle Sam, of course, plays the major role in designing and executing policies to meet the Red threat to security and progress.

However, I believe that a large majority of our citizens stand ready and willing to extend more time, energy, and resources to supporting the efforts of our Nation.

Yesterday, I was privileged to make some suggestions as to how this can be done more effectively in a radio address over radio station WGN, Chicago. I ask unanimous consent to have the excerpts from this address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Day by day, history is being written. The tireless hand will record how well—or how poorly—we shape the events of our time and meet the challenges.

The times require that we mobilize adequately and swiftly the resources of the free world.

In this space-missile-jet-nuclear age, however, we need a Paul Revere: to gallop through the towns and countrysides of the free world; to awaken the people with the warning cry: "The Reds are Coming." How? By land and sea and air. By day and by night. Through every inroad and opening in the frontier outposts of the free world.

Despite long years of threats—and vast expansion of the Communist empire—are we really yet awake to the challenge? No. For too many Americans, communism is a thing to fight from the armchair, hurling epithets from the launching pad of the lower jaw.

Look around us. Who do we—you and I—know that is really doing anything about the threat of communism. Who is tightening his belt; working on ideas to combat this evil; dedicating more of his resources to the perpetuating of freedom and the spread of its ideas and ideals.

How many can you find? Yes, a few—but far too few.

How, then, can we—we, as patriotic Americans—do something about this grave threat to our security and progress?

By the following ways:

First, we must discard the idea that Uncle Sam, alone, can carry the fight against the Reds.

Then, we must mobilize our resources—individually and collectively—to throw the necessary brainpower, manpower, and resources into the battle against the Communists. Historically, one of the great strengths of America is the voluntary will to fight, sacrifice, and work to build a good life under a free flag, and to protect our country from its enemies.

Second, our civic, veteran, social, cultural, and, yes, religious and other organizations can—and should—reexamine the potential ways in which they might serve our national cause more effectively.

Third, we need to more greatly utilize the know-how and technology of free enterprise—for selling the ideas and ideals of freedom. This includes more effective utilization of U.S. firms operating overseas as built-in Voices of America.

Fourth, labor, also—sharing a common bond with workers around the globe—possesses an unparalleled opportunity to demonstrate how workers benefit under a free system; and how free collective bargaining can serve not only the worker but strengthen a nation.

Fifth, the creative minds—artists, writers, poets, musicians, dramatists—have a great opportunity to portray the spirit of a free people in their dedicated relentless effort to create a better life for themselves and humanity.

In addition to encouraging greater voluntary effort by our people, I believe we must also examine national policies to provide opportunity for the willing to more effectively serve their country.

This, then, is a fight for all of us. As a people, we must pool our resources, reinvigorate our patriotic spirit; and weld together our efforts and purposes in a common cause; that of survival of ourselves, of our ideals, and of freedom.

It is a time for greatness, for bravery, and for alertness.

Too Much Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appears in the June 1961 edition of Farm Journal.

TOO MUCH POWER

Farmers in general approve of Secretary Freeman's desire to "do something" to improve farm income, and so do we. Certainly it needs improving. But we don't believe they will approve giving the Secretary anywhere near the power the Kennedy omnibus bill would hand him, once they really see what's proposed.

Maybe this Secretary wouldn't abuse the power. He might or he mightn't. But he could. The temptation would be great. And we don't believe it is either sound or safe to pass a law that depends on any one man's personal inclinations.

The issue is whether farmers of this country are ready to put their future largely in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture as this bill certainly would.

"But look," says the administration, "(a) farmers would write their own programs, (b) Congress could veto anything undesirable, (c) and farmers would have to OK any plan in a referendum." Well, let's take a closer look.

(a) "Farmers would write their own programs."

They might initiate them or they might not. Usually they probably would. But the Secretary could start things, if he decided to, for any segment of agriculture—beef, hogs, eggs, apples, potatoes, or any other. He could bring whole new sectors of farming under the Government tent, one at a time, until he had most of it depending on him for decisions.

He would start by appointing an "Advisory Committee" for any commodity, and he could get any kind of "Advisory Committee," hence any kind of advice, he wanted. (He admits this but says he wouldn't abuse the privilege.) County ASC committees would be asked to name three times as many nominees as would be needed. From among these the Secretary would appoint two-thirds of his committee. He would get the other third from lists suggested by "appropriate" farm organizations, with him deciding which were appropriate. There would be one consumer representative.

Not only would the Secretary handpick the committee—he wouldn't even have to follow its advice. He could change, reject, substitute.

Which doesn't leave much of the first claim.

(b) "Congress could veto."

So it could if it had a chance. But the bill says one House would have to disapprove within 60 days. It would be no trick to hold up a vote on any controversial farm plan 60 days—it's been done many a time. It could be done by the Speaker, the Agriculture Committees, the Rules Committees, or by filibuster. At least it could be delayed until the last hectic days of a session when no proper debate would be possible. If Congress failed to disapprove, and a farmer referendum carried, the Secretary would have written the law. Congress couldn't even amend it.

"As I understand the Constitution," says Representative E. C. GATHINGS, Democrat, of Arkansas, "Congress is given the authority to write the law, not take it from the USDA downtown." It may be a quaint idea but that's the way we understand it, too.

(c) "Farmers have to OK any proposal."

But the Secretary decides who votes. This Secretary might rule fairly (no easy job). This one or another one might not. It would be entirely possible to arrange so that voters who produce 15 percent of a product could outvote those who raise 50 percent, if it would help carry a referendum.

However, the biggest joker lies in the choice farmers would have. If they voted down a program their supports would be cut to 50 percent of parity. That would make their approval mean litle but avoiding punishment.

Let's strip the high-sounding claims from this bill and show how phony they are. Then if farmers decide this is what they want they will at least know what they're getting. If either farmers, or Congress, do hand over such unprecedented power to the Secretary of Agriculture—any Secretary—we are a lot farther down the road than we thought.

Kansas, When the West Was Young

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Kansas City Star of Sunday, May 28, 1961. The title gives a clue to the content, and I believe that it will be of interest to my colleagues.

KANSAS, WHEN THE WEST WAS YOUNG

Another spring has come—and almost gone—in Kansas. The late William Allen White has left us a classic description of that season, as it manifests itself year after year along the pleasant, shaded streets of Emporia.

"The coming of spring in this latitude," he wrote, "is one of the most beautiful things in nature. Today the redbirds are singing in the lilac bushes, and the robins have come back to the elm trees. All over town people are spading in the garden and raking the leaves and the mulching off the lawn. The air is full of an 'ethereal softness,' and the limbs of the trees are getting black. Around the marble counters in the stores the boys are crowding in their winter clothes, with patches in conspicuous places."

In the midst of our tumultuous contemporary world we tend to think back, nostalgically, on such scenes from an earlier America. But, to a degree, we deceive ourselves. Life has rarely been so innocently carefree and peaceful as it often looks in retrospect. Kansas, as the current centennial of her statehood should remind us, provides no exception.

It was the same Mr. White, you may remember, who once defined Kansas for an English visitor as the "Mother Shipton, the Madame Thebes, the Witch of Endor and the low barometer of the Nation." When anything was about to happen in this country, he told Margot Asquith, it was almost certain to happen first in his home State. Then he proceeded to enumerate some of the social and political explosions that had occurred under what might seem (in 1922) like the placid surface of a Kansas existence.

"Abolition, prohibition, populism, the bull moose, the exit of the roller towel, the appearance of the bank guarantee, the blue sky law, the adjudication of industrial disputes as distinguished from the arbitration of industrial differences—these things came popping out of Kansas like bats out of hell. Why, no one seems to know."

Now, nearly 40 years later, historians of the West are fairly well agreed on an overall explanation for the phenomenon. Indeed, the editor of the Emporia Gazette, himself, was to suggest its main outline in a little book entitled "The Changing West." He wrote it just before the Second World War. The theory in question embraces much more than Kansas. For the kind of behavior that originally puzzled Mr. White had been more or less prevalent throughout the West during that period. But it was perhaps most highly concentrated in the Sunflower State.

According to this view, there were several factors involved. Chief among these, however, were the character of the people who settled western America, the nature of the physical setting in which they found themselves—and the challenge to action, implicit in both the tremendous difficulties they encountered and the glittering opportunities placed at their disposal.

Much of the chronicle is familiar, at least in segments. What has recently been added is a systematic interpretation. Essentially, what the investigators started out to do was to resolve an apparent paradox. Why did a region, possessing such economic potentialities and settled by a people so accustomed to rely upon their own efforts, turn into a laboratory for social reform and political experimentation? Why, for example, did Kansas in the three-quarters of a century between 1850 and 1925 become the breeding ground of such radical innovations as Mr. White mentioned in his famous reply to Margot Asquith?

Here, to be sure, was a State founded in an era of nationwide upheaval over slavery. Abolition, therefore, cannot be counted a native product. But the rest of Mr. White's list of popular movements that ran counter to existing American practices, by and large, were authentically homegrown. They were "as corny as Kansas in August." Yet most Kansans came of inherently conservative stock. Theirs was the outlook of New England and Ohio's Western Reserve, areas which, aside from the abolition issue, were hardly hotbeds of rebellion against the status quo.

What led such a people, for example, to espouse the populist cause, with its eccentric demand for a graduated income tax, Government ownership of railroads, shorter working hours for labor, the direct election of U.S. Senators and other still more harebrained schemes? What made them suppose they could save men from themselves by enacting a prohibition law or improve public health by legally banning the roller towel?

Where did they get the preposterous idea of guaranteeing bank deposits and protecting unwary investors against fraudulent stock manipulations? How did so many of them happen to back those two wild-eyed reformers of different political faith, Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson? What made them think they could force labor and management to submit disputes to a court, which was charged with safeguarding—of all things—the public interest?

Our more perceptive historians, headed by Frederick Jackson Turner, some time ago commenced to take another look at the conventional image of the West and what had happened there, since the explorers, trappers and gold-seekers gave way to permanent settlers. And they discovered that the rampant individualism of the westerner, like the assumption that only the most fearless, self-reliant and high-principled part of the American population participated in the westward migration, had been considerably overdone. The latter myth subsequently came in for a debunking that, in its turn, probably went much to far.

The pioneers who settled the West were certainly not all admirable specimens of the human race. Among them were chronic failures, mere adventurers and outright criminals. The brutality on this last American frontier, particularly toward the Indians, frequently reached revolting proportions. Nevertheless, on the whole, these were a remarkable people. In the depth of their attachment to freedom, in their industry, vision and capacity to endure hardship and in their respect for one another as individuals, they have had few equals.

It must always be borne in mind that, shortly after they entered Kansas (or Nebraska), these migrants from the Eastern United States met an utterly new world. Nothing they had previously seen could prepare them for the physical diversity and sheer scale of the West. Iowa had not been very different from Ohio or the more fertile sections of New England. Missouri closely resembled Kentucky and Virginia. Now gone forever was the gently rolling land, well watered, naturally wooded and dotted with small farms and towns.

Ahead of the travelers lay towering mountain peaks, spectacular canyons, vast stretches of desert and, finally, the lush semitropical Pacific coast. Their foretaste of all this immensity was to be the seemingly limitless high, treeless plain that began virtually at the start of their journey. Later, it was here that many of them resolved to stay.

That quality of magnitude was to condition their lives. It required a totally different type of pioneering techniques than had been employed in the prior 300 years, as the frontier crept slowly over to the far side of the Mississippi River. At first, unquestionably, western pioneering placed a premium on individual initiative and self-reliance. As

the real development approached, however, the emphasis progressively shifted. In the face of such enormous problems, the demand grew for stability, order and cooperation.

Even the early caravans on the overland trails had to have their wagon masters and maintain strict discipline. Later, the rowdiest cattle and railroad towns had to establish a rule of law, backed, if necessary, by vigilante procedures. The freewheeler became a liability. Gradually there arose a heavy dependence on government, for the protection of property rights, the furtherance of public education and the administration of justice.

At first, the settlers were all roughly equal, in a society that knew neither caste nor privilege. But although the country was incredibly rich, it was subject to droughts, grasshopper plagues, and similar vicissitudes. Its mineral, timber and other wealth yielded to monopolistic practices. The vital facility of transportation fell prey to exploiters. The inhabitants say their heritage slipping away from them. While some of them resorted to violence, the great majority fought back with the instruments of democracy—social and political reform.

Almost inevitably, certain of these Western remedies were ill-conceived. A few were simply ridiculous. Others were premature. It is no accident, however, that Kansas and the West made several major contributions to the creation of our present democratic system. It was here, for example, that the battle was first joined on the issue of human-versus-property rights, against the abuses of big business, for the preservation of our natural resources and toward advancing the legal status of women.

The last-named achievement carries a story of its own. That story tells how women won a new position of respect and freedom for themselves by their performance on the frontier. It was the territorial legislature of Wyoming, in 1869, which granted them their first equal suffrage with men. (Kansas had missed the honor, by turning down a constitutional amendment 2 years earlier.) But this belated recognition was to spread practically throughout the West, before more than one Eastern State had accorded it.

So spring has returned to Kansas, in an America infinitely troubled about the future. As Mr. White wrote so long ago, now is the time when men and women everywhere intensify their planning for a better life. Today, he might expand that thesis. Is this not a season for the American people to take heart, after a winter of mounting disappointment, and plan a better world, in the spirit that did so much to shape our own younger West?

Youth need not mean mere reckless adventure. There is no reason why maturity must lose its vision.

Racist Demagoguery Versus the Status Quo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include the following article from the May 26, 1961, issue of Human Events:

RACIST DEMAGOGUERY VERSUS THE STATUS QUO

Unless the lessons of all these ubiquitous international crises are completely lost on our national leadership, we ought to be hearing less and less about the United States being "a revolutionary country and a revolutionary people" (President Kennedy); and about how we must avoid being "linked with the forces of reaction and stagnation" (Chester Bowles); and that "unless we march with this revolution, unless indeed we share in leading it, the future it will one day shape may have no place for us" (Adlai Stevenson).

Such talk hasn't made any sense for a long time, but at long last events must have forced even the three individuals quoted supra to understand, however reluctantly, that their assignment is to do what Dean Rusk declared as recently as last February we would never, never do—"undertake an active defense of the status quo." Survival demands recognition of a truth which theorists sneer at—that the United States is not a revolutionary country at all, but is what has been called a satisfied power, whose interest is to maintain things as they are. This assumes, of course, concern for orderly progress and promotion of economic growth and workable political systems, but calls for a rollback of the revolutionary forces that our liberals have had so much fun playing with.

Even Junior Schlesinger is not likely to want replays of that line about how Castro "betrayed the revolution" in Cuba, because from now on the Kennedy administration will be compelled to act on the plain evidence, rejected by Eisenhower's State Department, that the Castro revolution was a Communist putsch from the beginning, conceived in Moscow, nourished in Mexico, and delivered in the U.S.A., with the New York Times, Herbert Matthews as midwife. Our interest in Cuba was the maintenance of orderly government, with respect for U.S. property interests in the island, under a regime tolerant of our security requirements in the Caribbean. According to the testimony of two of our Ambassadors to Cuba, we could have helped the Cubans inaugurate such a regime minus Batista, but this "join the revolution" nonsense had the State Department so hypnotized that nothing but Castro would do.

The propaganda designed to equate Communist-fomented upheavals among the "lesser breeds without the law" with the American Revolution was idiotic in the first place. As Prof. Arnold Whitridge, formerly of Yale, put it, "Our Revolution was a family quarrel fought between white men for the benefit of white men." One would think from much current babble on the subject that the Revolution was fought for the benefit of the Indians. In his "In Defense of Colonies," Sir Alan Burns points out that "at the time of the American Revolution few people seriously considered that the aboriginal red Indians (or the African slaves) had any political rights, or that the red Indians had any inherent right to the lands which the white colonists coveted."

The American Revolution was a taxpayer's revolt against the British Government's fatheaded effort to force the Colonies to help Britain balance her budget. As the late Professor Charles M. Andrews noted years ago in "The Colonial Background of the American Revolution" the leaders of the colonial cause, even including Franklin, attempted to steer these justifiable complaints toward some compromise. "Manufacture as much as possible and say nothing," was Ben's advice. However, the British Cabinet managed to parlay the tax battle into a war—for the benefit of a rising imperialism and against the interests of British traders, whom Pitt described as "little, paltry, peddling fellows, vendors of twopenny wares and falsehoods, who under the idea of trade sell everything in their power—honor, truth, conscience."

These "little, paltry, peddling fellows" would probably have been willing to settle for almost anything in order to build up customers in the American Colonies. Indeed, the Revolution had an astonishing amount of support in England. John Fiske in "The Critical Period of American History," which ought to be read more than it is these days, states that "the Whigs did all in their power to discourage enlistments and in various ways so thwarted and vexed the Government that the success of the Americans was by many people ascribed to their assistance." Indeed, the matter could doubtless have been settled with a reasonable amount of good will had reasonable men in both countries found a way to settle anything.

Anyhow there is no historical justification for identifying the leaders of 1776 with the Sukarnos, Nkrumahs, Mao Tse-tungs, Castros, and other contemporary revolutionaries. The intense nationalism of Sam Adams and the Sons of Liberty, which often embarrassed the more cautious leaders of the colonial cause, had little in common with the kind of revolution going on today or even with the kind of revolution that convulsed France a few years after our own fracas. Not even the postwar bitterness toward England enlisted much important American support for the violent revolutionaries of the continent. Not even Jefferson—a more persuasive advocate than Chester Bowles—could sell us on the virtues of the sans culottes.

But the best indication of what the men who fought the British from 1775 to 1783 thought they were doing is not so much what was said during the war or in the period of tension preceding it, or even in the stirring words of the Declaration of Independence itself. Those who look upon the revolution as a sort of prelude to the liberation of Angola should put in some time reading the story of the making of the Constitution. This document, hammered out undemocratically behind closed doors, set up a system of government about as nearly revolution proof as a group of mostly conservative and conspicuously able English gentlemen could make it.

James Madison, in his notes on the proceedings of the Convention of 1787 in Independence Hall, Philadelphia, records himself as saying this:

"In all cases where a majority are united by a common interest or passion, the rights of the minority are in danger. What motives are to restrain them? * * * The only remedy is to enlarge the sphere, and thereby divide the community into so great a number of interests and parties, that in the first place, a majority will not be likely, at the same moment to have a common interest separate from that of the whole, or of the minority; and in the second place, that in case they should have such an interest, they may not be apt to unite in the pursuit of it. It was incumbent on us, then, to try this remedy and with that view to frame a republican system on such a scale, and in such a form, as will control all the evils which have been experienced."

Hence "checks and balances." Far from supporting revolution, the Founding Fathers, who had seen anarchy and collapse at close range, had little use for pure democracy. Madison regarded democracies as incompatible with personal security or the rights of property. He believed that democracies have in general been as short in their lives as they have been violent in their deaths. John Adams, who as a young lawyer had defended the British soldiers involved in the Boston Massacre, said as President: "There never was a democracy that did not commit suicide."

When the more recent revolutionary forces which deserved American support, if only on the low level of self-interest, arose, our kibitzers of revolution were silent. The Hungarians who rose against Communist tyranny in 1956 might have fared better had the United States been as quick to recognize

Nagy, the head of the revolutionary regime, as the State Department was to recognize Castro 3 years later. Conceivably such a gesture from Washington might have kept Soviet tanks at home. A direct challenge to this country was probably more than Khrushchev cared to undertake. Promising revolts against Red dictatorship in Poland and East Germany got only editorial support over here. Indonesia's suppression of the Moluccas is ignored, and the peripatetic Sukarno, who quotes Jefferson when in Washington but speaks his own principles when in Moscow, is greeted by President Kennedy as the "father of his country." There have been some curious omissions in the list of revolutionaries considered worthy of our big hello.

We have bawled out Portugal, Belgium, France, and the Netherlands; indeed, taken an active part in support of revolutions in their areas. The supposition, largely based on the mistaken theory that we are a revolutionary country, has been that world opinion required this meddling. But are we happier with Sukarno in Indonesia than we were with the Dutch? Is it likely that our interests, or those of the Congo, will be furthered if all Belgians are compelled to leave the area? The more responsible Congolese do not think so. Some of them doubtless agree with Charles T. O. King of Liberia who, as Liberia's representative at the United Nations, said that his country had not grown as rapidly as Ghana because Liberia had always been free and had never reaped the advantages of colonialism.

Even an unsatisfied country ought to hesitate before supporting United Nations interference in such matters. Are we prepared for a U.N. resolution expressing disapproval of what amounts to segregated housing on Long Island, followed perhaps by a demand that we do something about it? If an Indian neutralist can use force against anti-Communist leaders in the Congro, why not a Czech task force to round up John Birch Society?

Of course changes are being made and not even a satisfied country can ignore them. But the effort to fool ourselves and others into believing that the United States should be out in front of the world revolution, even at the cost of breaking our ties with the civilized countries of Europe in order to make time with primitive tribesmen, has been a strategic and moral mistake. During the 1960 campaign William S. White cut loose in his column with words which now seem prophetic. White detailed the various areas in which the "bad old colonials" had been put to flight, and envisioned these withdrawals as leaving "large sections of the world either in chaos—a chaos for which the word 'democracy' is a sentimental fraud—or ready to fall into the Soviet sphere. Moreover, they have broken the western alliance, in truth, if not in formality. For all this we may thank a professional-liberal passion for a politics which assumes not that the races are of equal value before God and the law—as indeed they should and must be—but rather that all wisdom and all virtue rests within the colored peoples alone."

Mr. White attributed the adoption of this nonsense, which nobody really believes, to "racist demagogery that has already all but paralyzed our politics abroad."

The poor critters we have been trying to shill with this silly propaganda don't fall for it anyway. They take our dough and our flattery and still call us "imperialists." Our allies are naturally disturbed, and angry men stone our Embassy in Lisbon for supposedly backing the Communists, while in Moscow they stone our Embassy for backing Batista, as if Rubottom and Herbert Matthews had never existed.

So now poor Mr. Kennedy has to say "To hell with Harvard, Adlai, and Bowles" and get on with the job, carrying out policies dictated by events, whatever his liberal advisers say about it. He isn't likely to find much in common ground between U.S. interests and those revolutionary forces now sweeping over the world. His job is to defend the status quo.

It's all very tough on the President, because it isn't all his fault. Nevertheless, he must have nightmares now and then when living over some of those campaign speeches.

When Government Becomes Labor's Boss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to submit for the RECORD a very pertinent article by the Honorable Robert A. Perry, Democrat, of the House of Representatives of the State of Washington. The article is pertinent not only to union members but also to all those who believe in a true democratic form of government.

The article follows:

WHEN GOVERNMENT BECOMES LABOR'S BOSS

(By the Honorable Robert A. Perry)[1]

Electric utility workers of public power agencies have learned from bitter experience that the same immunities of Government that operate so unfairly in competition with private ownership, can also prove a harsh and ruthless weapon against union labor. I shall show that at the hands of a bureaucracy that prefers cheaper electric power at the sacrifice of the workers' share, labor is forced to submit to cheapened wages and lowered standards.

On occasion union-busting public power, backed by the immunities of the sovereign, has blacked out organized labor on a statewide basis. Restoration of long-established union recognition was bluntly denied with an unprecedented threat of the use of troops. As a result wages, working conditions, and safety provisions in that area are now sharply below union levels. Moreover, even when bureaucracy has seen fit to grant token recognition, the cards are still stacked against the union in bargaining with an employer legally immune from all the restrictions and penalties that protect the worker in his private job.

As an almost universal rule, wages and working conditions of public power agencies are shaded in varying depths below the standards set by contracts of organized labor in negotiation with private management. And even the private contract provisions could be more favorable but for the depressing effect of Government price competition.

These are only some of the reasons which demonstrate that the exercise of the powers of sovereignty—delegated solely for the conduct of governing functions—in Government operation of a proprietary business competing with a private enterprise of the same kind, is not only bad public policy but also a breach of the basic social contract on which our system of government is founded.

Simple fair play should require that when Government invades the marketplace it should observe the rules of the marketplace. But if it should observe the same rules, what would be the point of supplanting the flexible, highly skilled, adequately compensated, and fiercely competitive business executive system with time-serving, brass-bound bureaucracy? What would be the advantage to Government if it had to submit to taxes and regulation by local government agencies, and to its own ironclad tax, labor, and regulatory laws? And who would watch the watchman?

From behind this wall the State can and does do business in tax-free competition with the very source of its support—the taxpayer. From behind its legal shield it can and frequently does refuse to recognize or to bargain collectively with its organized employees. It cannot sign a valid labor contract and its labor agreements are, in the final analysis, only unilaterally binding on labor. Labor's fundamental last resort, the right to strike, is denied and, at the Federal level, is a crime legally linked with treason.

BUREAUCRACY BECOMES LABOR'S BOSS

The doctrine of sovereignty as applied to employment in occupations identical to those available in similar free enterprise operations provides the basis on which organized labor should part company with Government ownership of commercial and industrial undertakings. The sorry history encompassing the past 20 years of labor relations with the very non-Federal public power agencies which have been created, subsidized, or fostered by Federal power policies, fully justifies such conclusion.

Generation and sale of electric power, created by harnessing the falling waters of flood-control and reclamation dams, are obviously prudent and necessary incidents to Federal development of natural resources. The same prudence, however, should require that Government protect the taxpayer by obtaining the highest price return, exactly as in the sale of any other surplus Government property.

This principle is violated when conditions of the sale of Federal power are imposed which result in favoritism and price subsidy to certain classes of purchasers selected because of their status as tax-exempt Government or cooperative agencies. When the Federal Goverment further proceeds to assume total utility responsibility for all additional power requirements of such favored classes by constructing steam generators in plants as in TVA, and proposed elsewhere, then the sovereign has clearly embarked on a program of commercial enterprise that could put the total energy resources of the Nation in the hands of government bureaucracy, Federal and local. The record shows that to the extent that bureaucracy becomes labor's boss, all electrical workers, union or nonunion, will suffer.

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP HURTS MANY

When Government invades the boundaries of private enterprise the first to protest are the first hurt: investors and management of injured private competitors. Next are the taxpayers on whom must fall the added burden caused by tax-exempt commerce, and then the business community generally. After 25 years these factors should be fairly well known, even though the seeming public apathy to the growth of state ownership raises the question as to whether the public yet fully understands the social and political as well as the economic harm inherent in this parasitical growth.

Less known and even less understood is the plight of the union workingman when Government meets the payroll. Few people realize that employment by the State at any level automatically extinguishes hard-won rights and privileges of labor secured by law to private employment. Our own union members, who were formerly employed under union contracts but whose jobs were no longer protected when public power took over, have learned the bitter lesson that

[1] Member, Washington State Legislature; business representative of Local 46, IBEW, Seattle, Wash.

below-scale wages and working conditions have followed when bureaucracy becomes the employer.

Organized labor itself has been tardy in fully recognizing this problem. As recently as 1953, the late D. W. Tracy, president of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, called attention to the growing alarm of unionism as to its status in Government employment:

"Twenty years ago the IBEW was a strong supporter of public power as a check and yardstick on the private power companies. We stood on that position because we believed it was in our own interest and the inteerst of the public. Our experience in recent years has convinced us that it is now necessary to have a check and a yardstick on public power. * * *

"Union conditions and collective bargaining agreements can best be secured if the construction and operation * * * are performed by private utility companies. This is a point of most vital importance for it has been our experience in many localities that public operation of power facilities has meant the destruction of collective bargaining agreements and local unions. In the State of Nebraska, for example, the public power authorities claimed sovereign rights and eliminated the collective bargaining agreements previously held by the IBEW with private companies. The IBEW has had similar adverse experience with public power authorities in other States. Furthermore, in the case of private operation, we have the right to strike if the management becomes arbitrary; we have no such right in the case of public operation—labor has no check on the arbitrary action of public power management."

HOW FEDERAL POWER GREW

Looking back a quarter century, it is easy to understand, in the climate of those times, the ready public acceptance of the suddenly enlarged role of the Federal Government in the eletcric power field. PWA loans and grants for local public power projects were based, in those depression years, on the need for employment relief and economic revival. Federal power development was supposed to offer something for everybody: cheaper power, yardstick competition; reclamation of arid lands, flood control, comprehensive development of natural resources, relief of depressed areas—all to be self-liquidating.

It was not until years later that disillusioned labor came to grips with the problem of labor relations under Government ownership. The conflict came slowly because the Tennessee Valley Authority and other Federal power agencies realized from the beginning that sound national politics required the friendship of union labor. Their policies have been as generous, generally speaking, as private management's—except that all protective Federal labor laws are inoperative and labor's final resort, the right to jointly refuse to work, to strike, is of course denied.

HOW FEDERAL AGENCIES SELL POWER

Except to serve individual industrial customers—the bigtime corporate vested interest in the Federal power subsidy—the U.S. agencies have avoided retail sale. Leaving distribution to preferred local public agencies, they reserve to themselves the role of wholesale—and, where possible, sole—supplier. However, Federal policy is designed to create compelling incentives for the growth of public power at the local level.

The Federal Government has been the fostering agent both by the earlier PWA grants and loans and by the preference clause, applied uniformly to all Federal power projects, which directs that untaxed local public power agencies and tax-exempt cooperatives shall receive preference treatment in the sale of Federal power. Although long-term firm contracts protect the Government's direct-sale industrial customers, growing demands of preference purchasers limit the sale of a rapidly diminishing surplus to private utilities.

The effect of this pernicious clause has been to encourage and even force the spread of local government and cooperative ownership. In fact, the model of nationalization of the electric utility industry has long been established as a partnership between the Federal Government as the generator and the chief, if not the sole, supplier of all power, with retail distribution the chief, if not the sole, function of local public agencies. The pattern was set when TVA area private power companies were forced to sell out to local public distributors in 1939, which had been voted into municipal ownership specifically to qualify for preference clause treatment.

A WORD ABOUT RURAL CO-OPS

At this point a short digression is necessary to fit into the labor-public power picture the role of that curious political hybrid, the rural electrification cooperative, one of the principal sources of labor friction. Their spokesmen stoutly claim the rural electric cooperatives are a part of the free enterprise system. Yet this country would be broke if all free enterprise organizations enjoyed the same special favors of the Federal Government under which the electric co-op system grows fat.

More than a thousand of them have a key to the back door of the Federal Treasury giving them access to virtually unlimited credit at 2 percent interest, half of what Uncle Sam pays for long-term money. Nearly three billions of REA loans are outstanding at that rate. By a special dispensation the income of these outfits goes scot free of Federal taxation. And by a further dispensation they share, exactly as if they were another local government power agency, at the subsidized trough with other purchasers of Federal power.

REA loan funds, authorized by Congress for the electrification of farms, have been diverted to construction of huge steam-generating plants and transmission lines for lease and operation and eventual ownership by Federal power agencies—after Congress had specifically denied funds to these agencies for the same purpose. The neat interagency collusion not only reveals an impudent disrespect for the intent of Congress, but also exposes the thrusting drive of bureaucracy to promote Government ownership at all costs.

In short, although they are clubby little groups of private citizens, less than half of whom are farmers, these co-ops enjoy many of the major benefits of the wall of sovereignty. As might be expected, the REA co-op labor relations record ranks with the poorest among public power groups.

The same can be said for the somewhat similar irrigation district membership organizations of the West where, in at least one instance, mere membership in a labor union is cause for automatic discharge.

EFFECTS OF TAX EXEMPTIONS

The drastic impact of Government ownership was felt first and most severely at the level of local government when the tax-paying unionized private systems were supplanted by tax-exempt, union-busting public power agencies. It was here, for example, that union recognition was wiped out on a sweeping regional basis.

It was at this level, too, that scores of school districts and other taxing units were reduced to extremities from tax losses due to the public power takeover. In my own State of Washington, non-Federal public power will hold title to approximately $1 billion worth of real estate when presently planned construction is completed. Despite the heavy demands on all taxpayers to support our school system, the contributions of these government businesses fall far short of their fair share.

This problem was brought home to me in specific dollars and cents in the last session of the State house of representatives in which I served as vice chairman of the committee on ways and means and on the subcommittee on revenue and taxation. The tax escapement of public power, both Federal and local, has penalized the State's taxpayers by many millions annually.[2]

The nature of the inherent conflict between organized labor and the sovereign as an employer has been brilliantly analyzed by Sterling D. Spero, of the faculty of New York University. In the opening paragraph of his chapter on "The Sovereign Employer" in "Government as Employer," the problem is succinctly stated:

"Government asserts that its relation to those who earn their livelihood in its service is different from the relation of private employers to their employees. To private employees, Government guarantees freedom to organize, to bargain collectively with their employers, to strike. It claims, however, that the means used by workers in private employ to bring pressure upon their employers to improve their conditions have no place in the public service and that their use would represent a derogation of sovereignty and on attack on the authority of the State Government insists that, in order to preserve the integrity of public authority, it must possess the right of final determination in all its employment relations."

As President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, surely a friend of labor, was explicit on this point. Writing to the president of a Federal employees' union, Luther C. Steward, on August 16, 1937, the President asserted:

"Particularly I want to emphasize my convictions that militant tactics have no place in the functions of any organization of Government employees. Since their own services have to do with the functioning of the Government, a strike of public employees manifects nothing less than an attempt on their part to prevent or obstruct the operations of Government until their demands are satisfied. Such actions looking toward the paralysis of Government by those who have sworn to support it is unthinkable and intolerable."

HIGH WALL OF SOVEREIGNTY

As applied to the usual run of Federal jobs, the Roosevelt no-strike doctrine may be sound public policy. A strike in the Pentagon, for example, would be unthinkable. But the policy is also public law and applies with equal force to government employees even in industrial fields preempted from private enterprise.

The theory of sovereignty as extended to employment is supported by stern law. To strike against the Federal Government or even to belong to a union which professes to support the right to strike is a felony subject, of course, to imprisonment. The same section of the statute dealing with this crime lumps it together with the treasonous and subversive activities of Federal employees and applies the same penalties.[3] Elsewhere the additional penalty of a 3-year blacklist from Federal employment is also added.

That is what can happen to labor when government, protected by this wall of sover-

---

[1] (EDITOR'S NOTE: After a campaign focused on Mr. Perry's opposition to public power, the author led the Democratic ticket in his district to be reelected last November to the State legislature by a handsome 60-percent majority. His constituency is composed entirely of public power patrons of the Seattle municipal electric system.)

[2] See secs. 1 and 3, Public Law 330, 84th Cong., 1st sess. (69 Stat. 62.4, 62.5); see also sec. 305, Labor Management Relations Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 160).

eignty, moves into fields hitherto occupied by private employers.

Although Federal power agencies have tried to keep clear of antilabor bias, Federal policy in a number of directions has made possible the enormous growth of public ownership at lower levels of government where organized labor has suffered serious injuries. Perhaps the largest group in this class are the State-chartered, usually countywide, public utility districts, and the State power authorities.

In addition to the municipal systems in the TVA area, a considerable number of local government agencies purchased private systems forced on the market by the dissolution orders of the Securities and Exchange Commission under the Public Utility Holding Company Act. Chief among these were San Antonio, Tex., and all of the private systems in Nebraska. These agencies were able to issue tax-exempt revenue bonds to be supported by the additional revenues made available by exemption from the Federal corporate income tax of 52 percent in amounts sufficient to far outbid possible private purchasers. (This racket not only further fattened by many millions the purses of certain already fat cats of Wall Street at the expense of the ratepayers, but it also rubbed off some of the synthetic gloss of selfless public interest from the supposedly idealistic public power movement.)

PUD'S IN NEBRASKA

In this context, the Nebraska story requires special emphasis. Almost within the space of 1 year, 1939, all of the 14 privately owned utilities serving the entire State, outside of Omaha, were sold to State-chartered public power districts. Overnight the rights of labor in this industry were wiped out. Once in the saddle, public power promptly shed its cloak of phoney liberalism and stood revealed in its true image of standpat reaction. Union recognition, collective bargaining, and the hard-won beneficial stipulations in the previous contracts were summarily rejected. Relief under the Federal labor laws, the unions suddenly and bitterly learned, was the exclusive privilege of first-class citizens, employees of private management.

In the years that followed, labor-management relations steadily worsened as union officers vainly struggled to retain a semblance of the rights labor had formerly freely possessed. Having exhausted every other resource, the final recourse, the strike, was reluctantly invoked in 1944. Federal troops had not been used against strikers since the bloody Pullman strike of 1892. Yet, despite the orderly and peaceable conduct of the strikers, management threatened them with an Army take over. To make a sad story short, the union was overpowered by the sovereign might, and the strike was broken. Employee morale is still affected by the aftertaste of that defeat.

When a utility district finally took over the Nebraska Power Co., of Omaha, 2 years later, the management, largely retained from the former regime, succeeded in breaking away from the strikebreaking antiunion policies of out-State public power. Harmonious labor relations, accompanied by recognition and collective bargaining, were continued.

SOME IMPORTANT DIFFERENCES

The comparative wage scales for union versus nonunion electrical workers in Nebraska provide a telling deadly parallel. In this business wages are determined from the top figure which is always paid to the most hazardous and most highly skilled job, the experienced lineman. According to the most recent figures available to me—March 1960—the Omaha union lineman was paid $3.12½ an hour. At that time the highest paid nonunion public power lineman in the balance of the State received only $2.39 an hour. For the same job his Omaha colleague received 30.75 percent more. In a year the difference would amount to about $1,600. As recently as December 31, 1958, unorganized Nebraska linemen were receiving as little as $1.80 an hour. In addition, many of the fringe benefits relating to overtime pay, working conditions, and job security long ago won by union negotiations, are a thing of the past in outstate Nebraska. The whole picture reveals a convincing black-against-white study of what can happen when public power takes over. The contrasting fact that Omaha, the lone unionized exception, is itself a public power community only emphasizes the general antiunion posture of the Government ownership movement in general.

Today the local Government-operated utility system that does enjoy good harmonious labor relations is the rare exception that proves the rule. Here are a few interesting figures that prove the point better than a bushel of words: (1) Of the 1,782 municipal electric systems in the United States, only 3 percent even recognize the unions; (2) of the 63 PUD's, 35 percent accord union recognition. The 1,032 tax-exempt REA cooperatives show up with only 17 percent union recognition. The private companies are 92 percent organized. IBEW represents 75 percent of the membership of all organized electric utility workers.

If we are to believe its national advertisements, Nebraska today is the showcase of public power. Its wholesale supply organization, the nonunion Nebraska Public Power System, candidly hooks its nationwide publicity to attract industry with the bait of right to work laws, a docile labor supply, and allegedly ample low-cost electric energy. The executive manager of this system, D. J. DeBoer, is current president and spokesman for the American Public Power Association, a powerful lobby for the promotion of Government ownership.

To Mr. DeBoer, in an interview appearing in the July issue of Public Power, house organ of the national organization, we are indebted for the frank admission that tax-exempt government power can't reach the salary scale of private power.

To make up the difference, Mr. DeBoer complacently continues, the government power employee may enjoy the nonrent-paying compensation of civic pride. "I think a fellow has to have a sense of public service to be successful and satisfied in a public power system," he explains.

COST OF SENSE OF PUBLIC SERVICE

This remark is a callous reflection on the profound sense of public service which, in times of ice and storm, keeps line crews and other workers—no matter who is the boss—to long hours of hazardous and exhausting duty to maintain the essential public service of power supply. Certainly this is a revealing display of the smug hypocrisy of public power liberals. In a word, in addition to his thin pay envelope, the nonunion public power lineman gets a bonus of $1,600 worth of sense of public service—which his union card friends get for free.

The Nebraska Public Power System, show piece of government ownership, sells cheap power only by virtue of exemptions attached to it as an instrument of the sovereign. Not only is it exempted from all Federal taxes, but it is also exempt from that somewhat imperfect Magna Charta for organized labor, the body of Federal labor laws. To organized labor one of the most ironic and most aggravating factors of the local public power labor relations situation arises from the fact that these agencies can thumb their noses at the National Labor Relations Board.

In private industry union recognition and collective bargaining in good faith are mandatory on the vote of a majority of the workers. Moreover, the law requires such elections on the showing of sufficient worker support. If these statutes were effective in this area, most public power employees would be organized today—and their wages and working conditions would not be the worst in the industry.

Exemption of public power from Federal labor laws is a clear example of the similarity of the problems of organized labor and private management when confronted with the wall of sovereignty. Stemming from the same authority, the preferences to public agencies in the sale of Federal electric energy and exemption from labor's Federal labor laws, provide labor and management a powerful common interest. This is particularly true because only a part of the "cheapness" of public power comes from tax exemption. A very real part of the slightly higher price private power must receive is accounted for by the fact that in addition to the full tax load, the companies pay top-scale union wages—while their competitors do neither.

PRIVATE POWER COMPANY WAGES SET STANDARDS

It is small comfort to the dues-paying member of an electrical workers' union to know that the wage scales negotiated by his union with private companies serve as a standard which determines, in most instances, the lower scales established by public power.

To the extent that their wage scales are influenced by the standards set by bona fide union bargains with private management, public power employees are freeloaders in much the same sense and by the same sovereign force as the tax-free beneficiaries of the preference clause. By the same token the very existence of depressed public power wage scales may handicap union negotiators in bargaining with cost-conscious private competitors nearby.

Here in Washington, municipal and public utility districts and electric cooperatives serve 60 percent of the public. Yet wage negotiations with public power never begin until the private companies and the unions conclude their annual bargaining. The scales then set are shaved by the various public agencies according to local factors. The point is that they are always under the standards set by the union with private management. It is true that in the State of Washington most Government power agencies tolerate union recognition. The operative word here is "tolerate." Genuine free negotiations are not possible when one party appears as a supplicant while the other negotiator is at liberty to bestow or withhold as he sees fit.

For all of these reasons it should be amply clear that organized electric utility workers have strong cause to fear and to oppose the spread of Government ownership. Over more than a decade, spokesmen for affected locals of the IBEW and other unions have repeatedly appeared before legislative and appropriating committees of Congress in opposition to every important proposal to extend the scope of Federal power operations.

LABOR UNIONS SUPPORT PRIVATE POWER

Out here in the Pacific Northwest we have recently succeeded in winning wide sympathetic understanding and support of many other union organizations not directly affected by our problem. This was evidenced a year ago when the U.S. Senate Interior Committee held hearings in the region on two pending bills which revolved on the issue of whether the pressure lobby of public power could stop, by Federal legislation, construction of the largest dam ever proposed by private enterprise, High Mountain Sheep on the Snake River. The 18 IBEW witnesses favoring private development, plus a statement by a local of another electric workers' union, represented total coverage from that source, as might have been expected. More significant, perhaps, was the assistance from 13 additional union locals of the region, representing a broad cross

section of organized labor opinion. Even more heartening was a joint statement signed and submitted by a total of 20 local, statewide, and regional groups of all descriptions. One labor witness who professed to speak in favor of public power for his own labor organization was repudiated by it by telegram while he was still in the hearing chamber. Note: The bill died in committee.

As recently as last August 1, reversal of its traditional public power stand by the Oregon AFL–CIO at its biennial convention was a highly indicative sign of the trend on the broad front of organized labor. On the issue of continued endorsement of a proposal to put the State in the utility business by a power authority type of State power commission, the convention withdrew its previous support and resolved neither to sponsor nor support such legislation. When the issue was fully understood, the Oregon house of labor came to our support.

NATIONALIZATION AND FREEDOM ARE INCOMPATIBLE

In conclusion, I think it pertinent to explain why I have apparently ignored the socialistic aspects of the problem since government ownership is the very keystone of Marxist dogma. In a country where socialism can be a political dirty word to the very leaders who—frequently from sincere misconceptions—advocate socialistic practices, it seems to me that the immediate point of attack should first be the pragmatic test of whether such practices provide a system superior to private enterprise. On that basis it is evident that the Government-produced product may appear to be cheaper—if often less reliable—only because of exemptions of the sovereign which permit depressed wage scales and a wide gap of tax avoidance. Exercise of such exemptions in employment of and in competition with the citizen constitutes a self-evident misuse of authority.

Experience has proved that government ownership is only an elaborate, costly, and stupid method of robbing the taxpayer Peter to pay power-using Paul—who would be one and the same person in the event of total socialization of the industry.

However, I should like to point out that all of these considerations only demonstrate the economic and antisocial weaknesses of socialistic practices as an instrument of State policy. I have cited them to illustrate the grave danger to the national economic and political security that would result from partial or total Government ownership of such a basic industry as electric energy—a fundamental tenet of imported state socialism.

It should be understood that socialistic doctrine comes in two parts: First, nationalization of the means of production; second, use the fruits of nationalized production for improvement of the general welfare. Socialism has no monopoly on the general welfare objective which is, in fact, imbedded in our Constitution as one of the essential purposes of the union of our States. After nearly two centuries, the constitutional free enterprise system has proved to be the true horn of plenty which supports a higher standard of life and general welfare than any alternative yet conceived.

Nationalization of industry is the chief identifying feature of socialism. That kind of Marxism is in full retreat among the democracies of Europe. Germany, birthplace of this obsolete doctrine, is now rapidly disposing of its vast nationalized holdings to private ownership. Britain has had its own disillusionment.

Democracies have learned from trial and error that nationalization is not compatible with freedom. It thrives best at pistol point in a police state. In the race for supremacy and even survival between the free and the socialized worlds, can we afford to weaken our free enterprise economy by fastening the dead hand of state socialism on so basic an industry as electric energy? Do we or don't we believe that our American system is best?

Prestige Under President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, this editorial, which appeared in the New York Daily News on May 25, sums up the status of our Nation's prestige today after 4 months of leadership by President Kennedy:

OUR NATION'S PRESTIGE

In general, throughout the first 100 days of President John F. Kennedy's new administration, this newspaper was pleased with him and his team's aims and accomplishments, and said so.

However, one of the most hotly debated issues of the past presidential campaign did revolve around this Nation's international prestige. Mr. Kennedy proclaimed that, during the Eisenhower administration, U.S. prestige had sunk to an alltime low. Mr. Nixon protested that it had not, and that such pronouncements were a low and dangerous form of politics.

Well, that campaign is history. But what, 4-plus months after Mr. Kennedy's inauguration, is the state of our Nation's image today?

Looking around the globe, we can detect pitifully few excuses for national self-congratulation. President Kennedy, true, inherited much of the Far East situation centered on Laos and South Vietnam. But, as of 1961, that tinderbox has not been cooled.

In Korea, we at this moment are in danger of losing the loyalty and friendship of a hitherto stanchly pro-American people. The cause, so far as it can be determined: stiff-necked bumbling by Kennedy administration officials on the Korean scene today—no Eisenhower appointees.

FIASCO IN CUBA

How is our prestige faring in France, Japan, and even Canada? The blunt truth is that President de Gaulle barely talks to us; official Japan has expressed grave doubts of our ability to fend off an aggressive Red China; our Canadian neighbors choose, no matter what anybody in Washington thinks about it, to continue and to expand their trade relations with our declared enemies in Communist China and Cuba.

Our most recent and still almost unbelievable loss of national face, of course, occurred on the beaches of Cuba just weeks ago. Now, as the world groans and Congressmen of his own party protest violently, Mr. Kennedy is urging individual American citizens to pay off the blackmailing dictator of Cuba, to help pull his fumbling administration's chestnuts out of the fire. Again, Castro and his bearded goons took over in the Eisenhower administration.

But Ike and his team didn't mastermind that tragic U.S. letdown of courageous Cuban rebels—a national humiliation matched in recent history only by President H. S. Truman's firing of Gen. Douglas MacArthur for wanting to win the Korean war.

ECHOES OF ALABAMA

On the domestic scene we wish we could find some substantial cheer, but we can't. Ike had his Little Rock school impasse, and was roundly abused by Democrats for solving it on a no-nonsense paratrooper way. But J.F.K.—whose Democratic Party was going to handle our southern situation much better—now has his Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana, and the repercussions are echoing around the world.

Obviously, the international prestige and internal morale of this country are at a perilous ebb right now, and something needs to be done. But, to date, Mr. Kennedy's brightest suggestion seems to be that we try to top Comdr. Alan Shepard's magnificent flight by a truly distracting Roman circus, such as a $20 billion or $40 billion landing on the moon.

Maybe we'd better try to make a successful landing on Cuba first.

What About Gross National Product?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Holmes Alexander in Human Events, sets forth some very thought-provoking principles regarding our gross national product. I commend it to the Members.

ABOUT GNP

(By Holmes Alexander)

You could say that last autumn candidate John Kennedy indicted the American economy under Eisenhower as being sluggish, wasteful, and inadequate to the challenges of the 1960's.

You may say today that the Kennedy administration is now in the process of trying to convict the American economy on these campaign charges. Treasury Secretary Dillon and Labor Secretary Goldberg have been before the House Ways and Means Committee in the roles of prosecutors. Other Cabinet officers will follow. Thus far the star witness against the Eisenhower-type economy (as much free enterprise and as little government intervention as possible) is an ugly-named monster called gross national product. Here is Dillon calling upon this witness:

"As we look back over the past century, we see that our record of economic growth has been unmatched, of late we have fallen behind. From an historic growth rate of 3 percent per annum in gross national product (GNP), we have fallen to 2 percent in the latter (Eisenhower) part of the 1950's."

Secretary Dillon then goes on to show that the GNP in west Europe has grown twice as fast, and the GNP in Japan has grown three times as fast as ours. Russia's GNP compares with ours in a 7–2 ratio.

All this is alarming—but we should remember that we are not hearing, as yet, much of the other side of the case. How good a witness to our economic health is this GNP? Who is this strange slanderer anyhow?

Well, two Republican Senators, BUTLER and BUSH, with three Republican Representatives, CURTIS, KILBURN and WIDNALL, have been chipping away at the GNP character. GNP is an aggregate of economic activities. It is supposed to be the sum of

all enterprises which add something to the American economy.

But Republicans say that GNP does not include, nor does it measure, many important activities. For example:

If a man stays home on Saturday and improves his mind with reading, this does not appear in the GNP. Nor does GNP reflect the work that a housewife does, such as home-laundering or driving the children to and from school. Nor does the GNP give credit to the homeowning couple whose labor improves the property and community.

GNP is a grossly materialistic way of measuring American status and blessings. It "knows," as Oscar Wilde once defined a cynic, "the price of everything; the value of nothing." Wasteful productions, such as food surpluses and throwaway military items, are added up. But how do you add the satisfactions of a well-cooked meal, a paid vacation, the feeling of security that sound banking, good policing, and congenial neighbors give?

There are several ways to characterize this first year of the Kennedy administration and of the 87th Congress. One way would be to say the administration and majority party are tearing down the American image, while the Republican minority is trying to build it up.

For the Democrats to look good, America must look bad. Unless the New Frontier reveals our sores, it cannot cure them. Unless it exaggerates our misery, it cannot claim to have pulled off political miracles.

For their part, the Republicans are always in danger of appearing to be stand-pat and smug in the face of obvious imperfections. Only the best of Republican spokesmen manage to depict America as we all know her to be. The country is not hurting for schools and hospitals, as the worst of the Democrats say—but, as the best of the Republicans say, we can and should improve the quality of teaching and medical care. Our jobs are not disappearing, as the calamity-howlers say, but are migrating to new industries.

The true picture of America, then, is of a nation which has accomplished all that gross materialism can give. We must now improve, refine, and distribute our blessings. But this is a difficult thing to express in the language of political pleading.

Perhaps Congress Should Be Nudged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Kansas City Kansan of Thursday, May 25, 1961. My part of the country is literally devastated now and then by floods, and I call this editorial to the attention of my colleagues because I believe they will be interested in what it says about preventing floods, and what must be done in the Kansas-Kansas City area:

TEN YEARS BETWEEN FLOODS

Flood talk fills the air and floods fill tributary valleys of the Kaw and other streams. Flood talk locally is of a speculative nature. Flood talk in the tributaries centers around facts, the facts of the floods which are real, not speculative.

The excess of rainfall in 1961 prompts comparisons. Is this year like the spring of 1951? Frequent rains fell in 1951 but they were exceedingly heavy, particularly in the northern Kansas, southern Nebraska region. Rains up to 4 inches fell in northern Kansas last weekend.

Weathermen aren't making comparisons. But the Corps of Engineers is relying on Tuttle Creek Dam to hold back any large accumulation such as contributed to the billion-dollar devastation of July 1951 in the Kaw Valley and Kansas City, Mo. Tuttle Creek is not quite complete but it is near enough complete to be capable of impounding water on a temporary basis if the need arises and the Engineers so decide.

Ten years have come and gone rapidly since the disasters of 1951. The average Kansas resident in dry 1952 would hardly have believed that major flood protection works would have been needed before they could be provided. But this is the case. The protective program has been slow in the making. Local levee systems in Salina, Topeka, and Lawrence and Ottawa are still unfinished. The Engineers want the Armourdale-Argentine levees built higher than they are. The Kaw Basin reservoir system is only well started. Perhaps Congress should be nudged.

Oregon Boasts Ghost Town

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, eastern Oregon is justly famous for its scenic beauty, its rugged grandeur, its wildlife and other outdoor resources. Perhaps less well known is another attraction for tourists in my district, some of the old ghost towns left from the days of the mining boom. My colleagues may be intrested in the following story from the May 8 issue of the Portland Reporter on some of these points of interest:

OREGON BOASTS GHOST TOWNS

(By Joe Kraus)

You sit on the sun-bleached steps of an old dancehall and gaze at a tumbleweed rolling down an empty street. You see it glide gracefully past a crumbling two-story hotel and watch as it comes to rest at the side of an old saloon.

Only the wind can be heard, flapping shutters and whistling through the empty buildings lining the street. You are alone. Here there are only memories to haunt the rare visitor. But most of all there is peace, the solitude that can never be forgotten. This is a ghost town.

Most people don't realize that there are still plenty of old spook camps around. Almost every county of Oregon has its share but probably the most interesting are to be found in Baker County.

Tucked away in high mountain regions and remote areas they lie alone and silent. Their only inhabitants are a few pack rats, lizards, and an occasional rattlesnake. The people are gone. They left only dreams and ambitions. Sometimes even a relative or two under a lone pine tree on a hilltop. But the town they built is still there.

Cornucopia, 10 miles northwest of Halfway, is such a town and well worth a visit. During the winter months and sometimes even into the middle of spring the town lies nearly buried in snow. The only mode of travel is by skis or snowshoes.

But for the adventurer who braves the winter elements, Cornucopia is a thrilling sight. In the summer she can be seen overlooking the rolling green meadows of Pine Valley. A little creek runs nearby and overhead is the 10,000-foot high Wallowa Mountain Range.

In her prime Cornucopia was a bustling community. She boasted of five saloons, one store, two restaurants, a blacksmith shop, livery stable, a barbershop and a hotel—everything a new town needed including a jail.

Two stages ran daily from Baker and Union to Cornucopia. But when snow first hit the valley the stageline traded in its coach wheels for sled runners.

As a mining town Cornucopia rated very well in the West. Twenty million dollars worth of gold, half of Oregon's output came from its mines. Cornucopia had its ups and downs but unlike most boom camps of the era she managed to struggle along until a fairly recent date, October 31, 1941. It was then that the mines came to a standstill and the end came to fabulous Cornucopia.

Within 24 hours a mass exodus was under way. Town officials pulled out without bothering to resign. Seven days later only one person remained, the man who wouldn't say goodby. He is now married and retired but even today he hasn't given that final farewell. Mr. and Mr. Snyder are the sole inhabitants of this ghost in the Wallowas.

Another town with an interesting past is the spooktown of Bonrne, 6½ miles north of Sumpter. It became notorious as a hangout for crooks who sold worthless mining property to unsuspecting easterners. But despite the swindling that took place it was a prosperous community of the 1870's and 1880's.

Four stagelines served the town. But the activity was so great that even this didn't accommodate the travel. She managed to live through until 1906, when most of the producing mines were closed. Today only a few hunters and travelers stay in its old buildings but most of the year she remains a ghost.

Other spooktowns of Baker County worth a visit are Whitney, Granite and Greenhorn. Their locations can be found on nearly all detailed maps of the area.

It is best to inquire from nearby ranchers for the road conditions. Often in the winter and early spring months some roads are hazardous and impossible to conquer. But to the true ghosthunter it is worth the extra effort—to walk into a thrilling chapter of history.

The United States and Canada—Issues That Bind and Separate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to include an article on "The United States and Canada—Issues That Bind and Separate," which was written by John Gerrity for the Sunday Star of May 14, 1961:

(By John Gerrity)

Beneath the warmth and cordiality that will greet President Kennedy as he addresses the Canadian Parliament next Wednesday will run the strong undercurrent of anxieties and fears many Canadians hold today for their neighbors to the south.

Everywhere—from Newfoundland to the Yukon territories—editors, businessmen, politicians, and intellectuals, of the left, right, and center, are critical of what they envisage as the cultural and economic colonization of their nation by the United States.

This apprehension is not prompted by concern over some fanciful territorial encroachment. Nor do Canadians realistically fear any overt international bullying on the part of this Nation. No people have better cause to trust American justice and fairness than do the Canadians.

Rather, the wellsprings of worry and alarm are complex and more sophisticated. They reflect an overriding concern that an expansive, effervescent and beneficent United States, approximately 15 times the size of its neighbor, will ultimately absorb the Canadian identity into its own—and do so with the noblest motivations.

First open warning of the trend toward undesirable homogenization of Canadian and American identities came early in 1950. Lester B. Pearson, then Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs, remarked that future Canadian-American relations "were not going to continue easy and automatic."

Though most observers on this side of the border have tended to scoff at Mr. Pearson's warnings, events of the past decade have borne out the reasoning behind his admonition.

CAUSE OF FRICTION

What precisely Mr. Pearson had in mind at the time was this:

Friction and clashes would not arise because America and Canada were growing apart. On the contrary, Mr. Pearson felt the affairs of both nations were becoming increasingly intermeshed, so much so they were bound to produce tensions not heretofore experienced.

Mr. Pearson moreover envisaged a United States, heavily engrossed in its emerging role as leader of the West, taking Canada more and more for granted. He foresaw emanating from this Nation to Canada a benevolent "old shoe" indifference. But nonetheless, an indifference.

How Mr. Pearson's fears of absorption have gained substance is clearly apparent today.

American control of Canadian economic life is now so vast that many Canadians genuinely fear they are verging on becoming "just another banana republic."

Since 1955, for example, Canada has been borrowing at a rate of about $1 billion a year. Virtually all of this money has come from private or public sources in the United States. Indeed, the size of the private American investment in Canada, is little realized by most Americans. Of the $44.8 billion of private U.S. investment abroad, $5.8 billion, or 35 percent of the total, is in Canada. Much is said these days about the size of our private investment in the 20 nations of Latin America. Yet our private investments in Canada alone are far greater than in all of Latin America combined.

Specifically, of Canada's total manufacturing industry, 52 percent is foreign owned, and 67 percent is foreign controlled. In petroleum and natural gas, the percentages for the industry as a whole are 67 percent foreign owned and 82 percent foreign controlled. In mining and smelting, 56 percent is foreign owned and 62 percent is foreign controlled.

This list could go on interminably, and virtually unchanged. But James E. Coyne, governor of Canada's Government-owned Bank of Canada, sums it up succinctly. "Our economy," says Mr. Coyne, "is a branch plant economy."

RESENTMENT OVER UNIONS

No less invasion than American capital has been American unionism. The United Steel Workers, the AFL–CIO Electrical Workers, and the Teamsters, to mention only a few, have their Canadian locals, each subject to the will and whim of an American hierarchy. Doubtless, trade and craft union techniques imported from America have bettered the lot of Canadian workers. But it is still a galling thing to have to take orders from a superior who is a foreigner. Or as several Ontario teamsters remarked, "Why do we have to quit work because Jimmy Hoffa calls a strike in California?"

Perhaps more disturbing to Canadians than their economic dominance by America has been the saturation of their public opinion, and even their educational system, by the American communications industry.

For years Canadians have been reading more American magazines than their own. Today four out of five magazine titles on newsstands in Canada are non-Canadian. For every Canadian magazine sold last year in the provinces, three American magazines were sold.

Even the government owned Canadian Broadcasting Corp. has been easy prey to seductions from the south. More than half of its programs (good and bad) are American. Trade and textbooks, for the most part, are American written and manufactured—and printed on paper made from American owned Canadian woodpulp. Every major Canadian newspaper uses at least one American wire service. None is without at least two American columnists.

Late last year the floodtide of American words reached such heavy proportions that a Royal Commission on Publications was set up. Its aim is to halt the muting of native voices and to establish new rules of competition to save indigenous publications from almost total extinction.

To a lesser degree, but in a most vital area—hemispheric defense—the role of subordinate rankles many. Complainants see portions of their homeland as the frontline of defense against possible Russian or Chinese invations from the north. They make political capital of the fact that in the northern defense belt, the U.S. military command is more sovereign than the Canadian Government itself.

DEFENSE COOPERATION

Canada and the United States have set enviable patterns in defense cooperation through their Permanent Joint Defense Committee. This has brought about the distant early warning (DEW) line of radar installation and the North American Defense Command (Norad). Apart from this, Canada, an original member of the Atlantic Alliance, has earmarked some 50 warships for the defense of coastal waters, 12 squadrons of the Royal Canadian Air Force and infantry brigade group, all under the supreme allied commander of NATO. Since 1950 Canada has also provided its NATO allies with more than $1.5 billion in military assistance, and has given more than $4 billion in economic aid to underdeveloped nations under article II of the NATO agreement.

Despite obvious successes in military defense, a growing faction of Canadian neutralists persist in portraying Canada's secondary position as proof of its subservience to this Nation.

Younger members of the Liberal Party and of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (it conforms generally to the British Labor Party) are in a sense "surfboarding" on the more legitimate wave of Canadian nationalism. And in this posture their demand that Canada withdraw from NATO and NORAD has gained an audience it would not otherwise have.

Accepting this rising tide of anti-Americanism in its true light, it is fair to ask, "How did Canada get itself into this fix, and how does it hope to get the parity of hemispheric citizenship it wants, without sacrificing the material assistance it wants from the United States?"

Part of the explanation of Canada's problem is that weak nations can seldom dictate their own economic course. In the early days of World War II, when Canada was a combatant and the United States technically at peace, its war needs were so desperate that it could do little bargaining with this or any other nation.

Substantially the same conditions prevailed throughout the war. Once peace was assured and postwar adjustments were in order, Canada, fearful of a depression, opened its doors still wider to outside investors on almost any terms those investors might impose.

As fresh capital poured in, a taste for luxury became an almost insatiable appetite. What few restraints existed on foreign investments were ignored or bypassed.

RISK CAPITAL

Meanwhile, many Canadians refused to risk their own capital in their own country. Rather than chance their money on domestic development projects or in the exploration of natural resources, they salted it away in safe securities.

In more recent years, as foreign investments continued to grow in scope and volume, a political phenomenon not at all unique in Canada came into play.

In the United States wherever a domestic corporation or union becomes too powerful, or violates any law, the Federal Government or any State government cracks down.

Theoretically, the Canadian Parliament has the same power over any company or group within its borders. But psychologically, it would be a risky business if the Canadian Government were to rein in sharply any subsidiary of an American corporation or the local of any American international union.

Were such an action justified, and if Canada were to take it, doubtlessly it would be interpreted in many quarters here as an anti-American, not as an antiorganization move.

It is mainly for this reason that Parliament has hesitated to enact any legislation seriously impeding American subsidiaries or the expansion of other American interests. No one in Canada would welcome the accusation of Castroism.

For none of these basic faults can America be blamed. It is only natural that our industrial pioneers, willing to risk their capital, should expect and receive good profits from their ventures. Similarly, if America must assume the lion's share of the cost of hemispheric defense, it can reasonably exercise the larger voice in the deployment of those defenses.

CONTINUING DEVELOPMENT

Yet within the framework of existing Canadian-American relations ways exist for Canada to generate, from within, the forces it must have for its continuing development.

But the point of origin for change must be in Canada.

For example, no understanding American would object too strenuously if Canada were to impose limits on the size of foreign investments it would accept each year. Indeed, in light of our persistent concern over the outflow of our gold, we would very probably welcome such a proposal.

As for softening the impact of American communication systems on its culture, there is nothing to prevent Canada from restricting right now the import of newspapers, books, magazines, radio and TV programs. For a while culturally hungry Canadians might find the domestic fare sparse. But if the hunger is real—and there is no reason to believe otherwise—Canada will find ways to satisfy it.

To Canadian complaints that Americans are indifferent or too casual the answer lies largely in a healthier, stronger Canadian communications system. Ideas run in all directions. If Canada wishes to excite

Americans, to stimulate our interest in them, and to whet our appetites for things Canadian, then it must set about reversing the very communications process which now offends them by its imbalance.

American industrialists can erase much of the stigma of absentee ownership by using some of the techniques of the subsidiary management they have found so profitable elsewhere in the world.

SUBSIDIARY MANAGEMENT

Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, for example, credits the successful operation of its subsidiary in Cartagena, Columbia, primarily to the fact that Colombians staff and manage its $40 million South American plant. TWA has performed the same kind of "miracle" in Ethiopia, as has Sears, Roebuck in Mexico, and Bell & Howell in Japan.

Moreover, with new and wider investment opportunities springing up in India, Asia, and Africa, the time may be ripe for a partial and voluntary divestiture of some American holdings in Canada. American corporations could find no better showcase for their good intentions than to limit voluntarily their holdings in Canadian subsidiaries to 49 percent or less.

But whatever develops directly or indirectly as a result of President Kennedy's earlier pledge to respect the sovereignty of Canada, the current debate will rage and grow more intense until the tide has turned visibly. Much of what will be said will be acrimonious, and will offend Americans when it spills across the border.

But rather than bridle, Americans will be better served if they regard the rumblings in the attic of the continent as merely symptomatic of a house being put in order. Self-determination, more often than not, is a rambunctious tenant to accommodate at first.

Canadians are at least entitled to all the strains and stresses—and whatever initial remodeling—their house of the future may require.

American Security Council Urges End to Geneva Test-Ban Negotiations

SPEECH
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the top-level civilian National Strategy Committee's first recommendations to President Kennedy urge that atomic test-ban negotiations at Geneva be discontinued and that underground nuclear tests be resumed immediately.

The recommendations came from a special 16-page report authorized by committee members and sent to the President by Committee Chairman Loyd Wright, previously Chairman of the bipartisan Commission on Government Security formed by Congress, and past president of the American Bar Association, who said the recommendations were the first of many the committee would send to the White House, Congress, and the public on key issues of national security.

The National Strategy Committee was formed recently by the American Security Council of Chicago to prepare detailed studies and recommendations on key issues of vital interest to all Americans. Its next report will deal with the dangers of admitting Red China to the United Nations and will be ready in a few weeks.

The following distinguished Americans are members of the Committee:

Lt. Gen. Edward M. Almond, U.S. Army, retired; former Chief of Staff of the VI Army Corps; and former Commandant of the Army War College.

Adm. Ben Moreell, U.S. Navy, retired; former chairman of the board, Jones & Laughlin Steel Co.; and now chairman, Americans for Constitutional Action.

Adm. Arthur W. Radford, U.S. Navy, retired; former Chief of Naval Operations; and Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, 1953–57.

Adm. Felix B. Stump, U.S. Navy, retired; former commander in chief, Pacific; and now vice chairman, Freedoms Foundation.

Rear Adm. Chester C. Ward, U.S. Navy, retired; former Judge Advocate General of the Navy; and former professor of international law at George Washington University.

Gen. A. C. Wedemeyer, U.S. Army, retired; former Deputy Chief of Staff, U.S. Army; and former commanding general, Sixth Army.

The Committee arrived at the following conclusions after studying 2½ years of proceedings and results of the test-ban negotiations:

First. The Soviets are not interested in negotiating. The only agreements they have made have been made on their own terms. They have deliberately prolonged the conference because we agreed to suspend our tests as long as the negotiations were in progress.

Second. The United Kingdom has not been too effective because it continually has been after us to make additional concessions toward Soviet positions.

Third. Some American scientists have not been too effective as far as the negotiations are concerned. They have given negotiators inaccurate, hasty and ill-considered advice. For example, they said they had developed a control system to detect any nuclear explosion over 2 kilotons being made by foreign powers. Tests have proven this is not so.

Fourth. On the home front, national security considerations have, for the most part, been disregarded in the almost frantic effort to secure an agreement with the Soviet Union on their terms.

Because of these developments, the Committee said, four definite conditions now exist which directly relate to our survival and which lead it to make it's recommendations:

First. Progress in the development of U.S. nuclear weapons technology, defensive as well as offensive, has been brought to a virtual halt. For all practical purposes, U.S. competence in this vital area of national defense remains at the October 1958 level.

Second. Since it is impossible with present techniques to detect underground tests in the lower yield ranges or tests in outer space, it would be dangerous for the United States to assume that the Soviet Union may not have made important advances in nuclear weapons technology during this period. These advances could have a crucial effect on the relative power position of the United States and the U.S.S.R.

Third. The U.S. offer to refrain voluntarily from any underground tests for another 3 years from the date of signature of the test-ban treaty while the three powers carry out an agreed joint research program for seismic improvements and peaceful uses, would, if accepted, only perpetuate the current situation which is clearly prejudicial to the security of the United States.

Fourth. The present prohibition on all U.S. nuclear weapons tests amounts to a unilateral, unpoliced moratorium which is not in the national interest.

On this basis it specifically recommended:

First. The current test-ban negotiations be discontinued and an orderly program of underground and outer space tests which would not contaminate the earth's atmosphere be started without further delay.

Second. Any future international discussions of a nuclear test-ban be resumed only as an integral part of a broader arms control negotiation and then only with the clear understanding that the U.S. test program will not be impaired by any moratorium arrangement during the course of the negotiations.

As to the National Strategy Committee and its sponsor, the American Security Council, outside the Government itself, there is no group of men better qualified to review national security matters and make considered recommendations on the subjects.

These men have spent their careers in the service of their country and their background and training has not only exposed them to the full spectrum of international communism, but has provided them with intimate knowledge of the organization, capabilities, and limitations of our National Defense Establishment.

The American Security Council, in forming and sponsoring the committee, will be of utmost service to the country if the committee's recommendations are given the attention they merit.

The Council, a bipartisan not-for-profit association, consists of over 2,500 member organizations including every type of business, newspapers, universities, and other institutions throughout the United States. Its primary service is gathering, correlating, and disseminating factual information about Communist strategy and tactics to members and a variety of organizations and individuals.

Billions for Defense—Not One Cent for Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1691

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, years ago, Charles Pinckney, our envoy to France, rejected the blackmail threats of the Barbary pirates, with a stirring declaration, "Millions for defense, but

not one cent for tribute." It seems that we today have lost the spirit of our envoy of yesteryear. The submission to the extortionate demands by Fidel Castro cannot be explained away by humanitarian reasons. Our attempts to buy the freedom of 1,200 Cuban freedom fighters is a demonstration of humanitarianism gone astray. I do not approve of paying blackmail for tribute to the Cuban dictator. I recognize the fear and worry of a parent whose child has been kidnapped, and who pays ransom for the return of the child. Our position with Cuba today is the same as that of a parent whose child has been kidnapped. Mr. Castro would not dare kill his 1,200 countrymen who sought to free Cuba from his control. He knows that the Latin American countries, whose opinion he values, would recoil from him and would take concerted action against the Cuban administration. Mr. Castro needs the respect and admiration of Latin Americans, and while he could execute members of the Batista administration, he could justify it on the ground that he had murdered other Cubans. Not so with the Cuban freedom fighters. History could not absolve him if he put these men to death.

Castro has made a big mistake in even offering to accept reparation and indemnification for the release of these 1,200 men. Latin American newspapers have indicated that the Latins are critical of Castro's prisoners of war tractor swap. The reactions of Latin American editorial writers to the demand for tribute and exchange for the release of these men are indicated in the following expressions of opinion. They are self-explanatory. I hope for America's self-respect that the public will not contribute to the blackmail payments demanded by Mr. Castro.

Under permission heretofore granted I include the following article:

[From the Washington Post, May 26, 1961]

LATINS CRITICAL OF CASTRO'S PRISONERS OF WAR-TRACTOR SWAP

Latin American editorial reaction to Fidel Castro's tractors-for-prisoners exchange has been generally critical. Here are some examples:

Argentina: La Capital, Rosario (moderately liberal; a leading provincial daily): "The incredible proposition has again shaken the free world with its brutality and utilitarianism, free of any human feeling."

Brazil: Diario Carioca, Rio de Janeiro (liberal; a leading daily): "The ransom operation now being negotiated in Washington reveals in all its hideousness the inhuman nature of the Cuban revolution."

Colombia: El Espectador, "We believe that it should be accepted."

Costa Rica: La Republica, San Jose (Costa Rica's leading liberal daily): "Fidel Castro committed the mistake of aiming at a target that brought into action the most notable characteristic of the North American people, generosity. This has always been the error of the Communists, they work on numbers and figures, and forget that there are only human beings."

Ecuador: El Telegrafo, Guayaquil (liberal; influential): "Even though this is a filthy blackmail, I believe the sinoids should be given the machines they want because it might be that tomorrow they would want to trade Roa for a still."

Guatemala: El Imparcial, Guatemala City (liberal and often critical of United States; a leading daily): "The totalitarian cynicism has exceeded all limits with two facts that revolt the conscience of all decent men; the first is the sordid valuation of human life made by Castro in offering to trade the prisoners for tractors * * * the mockery is debasing to the Cuban people and to the one who made it."

Nicaragua: La Prensa, Managua (moderately conservative; a leading daily): "It is awful to know that in this America of ours, so far removed in time and space from the Saracen coast, first to emancipate the slaves and first to claim all the freedoms, slavery has now established itself at a level much more materialistic and commercial than that known by the Babylonians, Assyrians, Phoenicians, Greeks, or Romans."

Panama: El Pais, Panama City (moderately liberal, a leading daily): "No one with a particle of respect for his own nationality could think of selling his countrymen for tools. * * * It is paradoxical that the aggressors should be the ones outdoing themselves to collect funds with which to save the lives of the Cuban citizens who are persecuted in their own country."

Peru: Ultima Hora (a leading daily, moderately conservative): "The proposal shows the false apostle in his true light. It shows him to be the vilest huckster among the agents of Soviet imperialism. As if it were not enough that he has tried to sell his country to the Moscow hierarchs, he now makes his cynical offer to trade patriots for tractors."

Uruguay: El Plata, Montevideo (Blanco Party organ, conservative, a leading daily): "One thing should have become clear * * * the Fidel Castro regime has reached a degree of degeneracy and brutality that revolts human understanding."

Venezuela: El Mundo, Caracas (leftist liberal, often critical of United States: "With this offer to trade men for trucks (sic), in addition to the policy of the firing squad, Fidel Castro has enthroned antihumanism in America." (Note: a direct slap at Fidel's claim of "humanismo" for his revolution.)

In Miami, meanwhile, 10 paroled Cuban invaders, scheduled to return to Havana today, still lacked a firm commitment on the tractors-for-prisoners exchange plan.

Unconfirmed reports circulated that the prisoners may seek an extension of their 1-week parole in the United States, United Press International reported. But the prisoners, who have pledged to return, had no comment.

The fund-raising committee, which is headed by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Labor Leader Walter Reuther, and Milton Eisenhower, planned to send several representatives with the prisoners to obtain precise technical information from Castro about the types of equipment he wants.

More Administration Confusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in this editorial from the Wall Street Journal we are made aware of more of the naive thinking of the administration and its theorists regarding our economy. Is it not time those advising the President took time to learn a little bit about what has made America great before trying to lead us off into some unknown economic wilderness?

The editorial follows:

ECONOMIC HASHISH

Sometimes the statistical theorizings of economists get so involved they're funny. But when the economic policies of the U.S. Government come to be based on woozy theories, the thing ceases to be a joke.

We have in mind the President's Council of Economic Advisers, which has propounded an elaborate theory of an "output gap" between the economy's potential and its actual performance. The theory, described on this page recently by Mr. Otten, is a masterpiece of algebraic tripletalk. It is designed to prove a gap, reckoned at $40 billion at the end of last year, and so it does—assuming all its assumptions and mathematics.

Having demonstrated the gap, the Council logically concludes that the country faces not only temporary economic problems like the recession now evaporating, but a persistent slack in production and employment, a slowdown in our rate of growth. We have, it seems, a problem of chronic slack in the economy—the growing gap between what we can produce and what we do produce. Especially since 1955, we learn, the gap has shown a distressing upward trend.

If this were all just idle chatter, no one would particularly mind. But this great and growing output gap naturally becomes part of the justification for the Federal Government to fill it—with the tremendous new domestic spending the administration has already embarked on and with the even more massive public works spending it has in mind. And since the slack is persistent and chronic, the Government has an excuse for trying to take it up indefinitely.

Fortunately the United States still has respected economists who can recognize economic hashish when they smell it. One such is Columbia Prof. Arthur Burns, himself a former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers. Mildly but nonetheless devastatingly Dr. Burns has taken apart the gap his successors have so painfully constructed out of thin air.

Among other things, Dr. Burns shows that the Council is not relying on sound, far-reaching historical evidence in projecting its output gap. It rests its case importantly on the fact that unemployment at the business-cycle peak in 1960 was slightly higher than at the business cycle peak in 1957. The Columbia economist suggests that this "gives fragile support" to the theory that "the gap between actual and potential output has a distressing upward trend."

Moreover, Professor Burns quietly notes that it matters a good deal at what period you start drawing a curve of potential output. The Council chose mid-1955, for no more valid reason than it could have chosen the second quarter of 1957 or the second quarter of 1947—all periods of high employment. If the Council economists had chosen 1957, their own reckonings would show a gap of only $20 billion instead of $40 billion.

And, Dr. Burns goes on, "if the curve had been started in the second quarter of 1947, when we likewise had a full employment output, the gap would have vanished. In fact, we would then have to say that actual output in 1960 exceeded potential output by more than $2 billion."

We hope the Council has the grace to say "touché" to that.

But perhaps the most significant part of the Burns analysis is not in exposing the Council's statistical juggling to prove the point it wanted to prove. There is also the attitude behind such output gap theorizing. It is reminiscent of the dominant economic thinking of the thirties, which was that the U.S. economy had become stagnant or mature and therefore required increasingly heavy Federal spending to keep it going.

That theory was proved resoundingly false by events, but here it is again in different form, once again an alibi for massive Fed-

eral intervention. The urge to control the private economy never dies.

Not many of us are trained in the intricacies of economic theory, but it takes only commonsense to see through the Council's unamusing fun and games. We hope the President and Congress are not bemused by the latter-day stagnation theorists. Otherwise some of these people may at last succeed in bringing about Government-managed economic stagnation.

Tribute to Julius I. Kislak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I want to welcome Julius I. Kislak and his organization to the 10th Congressional District.

Mr. Kislak, a dynamic septuagenarian, has been contributing to the growth of New Jersey for 55 years as the head of J. I. Kislak, Inc., the State's largest real estate, mortgage banking, and insurance firm.

His move to 581 Broad Street in Newark—after 55 years in Hudson County—is significant. It is indicative of the resurgence of downtown Newark and the desire of big business in our State to use Newark as a home base.

Liwe Newark—and the rest of the 10th Congressional District—the Kislak organization is growing. And I am happy that Mr. Kislak has chosen to become a partner in this growth.

I feel that his personal ability, augmented by the hard-driving organization of more than 300 persons, will become a forceful arm in the social and economic betterment of my district and State.

We expect this from J. I., because Mr. Kislak is not the average person by any means. His exceptional real estate accomplishments have been hard won.

Mr. Kislak began his career in the home of his parents at 406 Clinton Street, Hoboken. There, in 1904, Mr. Kislak got his first taste of the real estate business.

His father was an immigrant of little means. However, he had succeeded in accumulating sufficient funds to purchase a $3,500 house in Hoboken, which he traded for five others.

Then his father took a trip to Palestine and the job of managing these units fell to the young Kislak—and so did the problem of getting new mortgages.

Soon, thereafter, he obtained a notary public license and then in 1906 hung out his real estate shingle over his doorstep. In 1909 he rented space in the Jersey Observer building in Hoboken.

During World War I, Mr. Kislak served as a sergeant in the Quartermaster Corps, negotiating industrial leases for the U.S. Army.

It was in the mid 1920's that Mr. Kislak moved his offices from River Street in Hoboken to Journal Square, Jersey City.

The Kislak organization, often referred to as the "department store of the real estate business," is active in chain-store leasing, shopping centers, industrial sales and leases, apartment house investments, commercial property sales, property management, homes, appraisals, mortgages and mortgage banking, general insurance and life insurance.

And Mr. Kislak, his voice booming, is still putting in 18-hour days, keeping a firm grasp on the day-to-day operation of his organization.

He is up at 6:30 daily, checking his work-filled attaché case and planning his tomorrows. His mind is sharp and quick to move on an important deal or philanthropic project.

Mr. Kislak is active in the United Jewish Appeal of Essex County, the American Jewish Committee's Institute of Human Relations, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith and the Technion Institute of Israel.

He is a member of the Newark Association of Commerce and Industry, New Jersey Historical Society, New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce, and the Jersey City Chamber of Commerce.

I sincerely hope that Mr. Kislak will have many more fruitful and productive years to devote toward his family, his community and his business.

I am confident that his energy, his talents, and his organization, will be of great benefit to the social and economic betterment of the 10th Congressional District and our great State of New Jersey.

Language Service Bureau of Cleveland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the May 1961 newsletter of the American Security Council contains the following statements relative to the Language Service Bureau, 3039 East Derbyshire Road, Cleveland, Ohio:

LANGUAGE SERVICE BUREAU

Does your firm have any vital correspondence which must be translated into a foreign language? Have you recently obtained key technical material which should be translated into English? Would you be interested in the services of an organization which can obtain patents from the Soviet Union and other Iron Curtain countries, or set up business contacts with Iron Curtain firms? Or perhaps your interest is more general, and you would like to be advised of what the Russians are doing in space technology, physics, chemistry, missiles, and metallurgy.

All of the above services are offered by the Language Service Bureau, of 3093 East Derbyshire Road, Cleveland, Ohio. A partial list of clients, circulated by this firm for promotional purposes, reads like a "Who's Who" of American industry. Seventy-five percent of the 86 firms listed as clients by the Language Service Bureau are engaged in defense production. The list includes firms engaged in atomic research, electronics, the production of solid and liquid fuel missiles and the production of air frames for both manned aircraft and missiles. What these firms do not know is that they are clients of Dr. Martin Chancey, alias Chauncey, true name Morris Chansky, a top official of the Communist Party of the United States.

Chancey, who owns and operates the Language Service Bureau, has served the Communist conspiracy in a leadership role for virtually all of his adult life. He was born on July 26, 1908, in Brooklyn, N.Y., and attended New York University, where he received a B.S. and a doctor of jurisprudence degree. He joined the Communist Party in 1933, at the age of 25. In 1934, Martin Chancey was a candidate for State assemblyman from the 12th Assembly District of New York on the Communist Party ticket.

From 1936 to 1943, Chancey served as secretary of the Communist Party in the District of Columbia, a key post. On October 7, 1939, Chairman Martin Dies announced that a document disclosing Communist activity in the Washington Navy Yard, the Government Printing Office, and other Federal departments in Washington had been seized by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Dies described the document as a report made by Martin Chancey. Chancey was subpenaed by the committee. He admitted preparing the document, which told of the activities of the Communist Party in the Navy Yard, Government Printing Office, and other governmental departments. The committee asked Chancey for his membership list, which reportedly contained the names of Government employees. Chancey told the committee that he had destroyed the list the year previous under orders from national headquarters. It might be well to pause here to note that Chancey was head of the open party organization in Washington at the same time that J. Peters directed the very active Washington party underground, with Alger Hiss, Harry Dexter White, William Remington, Henry Hill Collins, and others as participants. Since it was the policy to reintegrate Communists arriving in Washington into the party, it is logical to assume that some degree of coordination between overt and covert activities existed.

In 1942, Chancey married Sadie Sokolove, the membership secretary of the Northeast Club of the Communist Party in Washington, D.C. In 1943, Chancey was inducted into the U.S. Army. He served 20 months in the European theater. Upon release from military service, Chancey was sent to Cleveland, Ohio, by the party. He was made State secretary of the Communist Party of Ohio. In 1946, Chancey was a lecturer at a Communist Party school near Cleveland. He was identified as one of the Communist Party members who was connected with the group of Communists active in the 1948 Univis Lens strike in Dayton, Ohio.

In 1950, because of increasing attacks upon the Communist Party and the political climate brought on by the Korean war, the party felt the need to have an underground apparatus in case of emergency or crackdown by the Government. According to the sworn testimony of David W. Garfield, a former Communist Party member, Garfield was approached in the early summer of 1950 by Martin Chancey. Chancey told Garfield that Gus Hall had designated Garfield as the man who was to head up the Communist Party underground in the State of Ohio. Acting on Chancey's instructions, Garfield severed all connections with the open party, changed his name and obtained a false social security card and driver's license. Garfield testified that he had a contact in New York and that he had a certain telephone number and name that he was to get in touch with if he wanted to contact the national party. Garfield stated that he was in contact with Martin Chancey in the underground. He said that the underground Communist apparatus had hiding places for its members and a secret courier system.

According to the sworn testimony of Isaac Wright, an FBI informant who penetrated

the Communist Party, a supersecret underground board of the Communist Party dictated orders to the party faithful in the Pittsburgh area in 1953. Wright said that the party in Pittsburgh decided to hold conferences in strictest secrecy because of the frequency with which FBI plants were turning up in the party ranks. Wright described a meeting which took place in September of 1953 in an automobile on Route 22 west of Pittsburgh. Wright and three other members of the secret underground board attended. Among the board members attending the meeting was Martin Chancey.

On November 4, 1953, J. Edgar Hoover announced the arrest of Martin Chancey, age 45, on the charge of plotting the violent overthrow of the U.S. Government. Mr. Hoover stated that Chancey was a high-ranking Communist Party official in the eastern section of the United States, and that he had served as a party functionary in New York, Ohio, and Washington, D.C. Chancey was arrested in Pittsburgh, Pa., and held under $50,000 bail. Chancey was convicted on February 10, 1956, under the Smith Act. He admitted to being a Communist during the period covered by his indictment, November 9, 1960, to November 9, 1953, but denied the conspiracy charge.

In January 1957, a Federal grand jury named seven persons as coconspirators on charges of conspiring with union officers to file false non-Communist affidavits with the National Relations Board. Among the conspirators named was Martin Chancey.

Around 1957 Martin Chancey founded the Language Service Bureau, an association of linguists, each of whom has a specialized, up-to-date, scientific training." The business is apparently quite successful, and has been rapidly gaining new clients. According to Chancey, there are 17 part-time linguists available covering different languages when the need arises. According to Chancey's current advertising, the Language Service Bureau is now equipped to handle every written language in the world, including Japanese, Chinese, and Arabic. The bulk of the work handled, however, continues to be Russian.

Winning Essay in Life Line Patriotic Essay Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I include as a part of my remarks an essay written by a fellow Texan, Mr. Edward L. Kirk, of Abilene, Tex. Mr. Kirk's essay won fifth place, out of over 1,800 entries, in a patriotic essay contest sponsored by the radio program "Life Lines." Because Mr. Kirks' essay gives all Americans food for thought concerning our American heritage, I am glad to include it here:

OUR UNCLE SAM

I want to talk to you about a common ancestor of ours who is in dire need of our assistance and support. This ancestor is our Uncle Sam, the symbol of our democratic American character and spirit, the mirror of the American mind. Uncle Sam is big, sprawling from the Atlantic to the Pacific, 3 million square miles throbbing with industry. He is more than 5 million farms; he is forest, field, mountain, and desert. He is quiet village and teeming city that never sleeps. Uncle Sam is approximately 180 million living souls, and the ghost of millions more who have lived and died for him. Uncle Sam stands as the personification of all that is American, he is the "We the people of the United States of America."

Uncle Sam was born on July 4, 1776, and the Declaration of Independence is his birth certificate. The bloodlines of the world run in his veins, because he offered freedom to the oppressed. When Uncle Sam was young, he sat at the table with men like Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin and he ate well and enjoyed a robust existence. No crisis was too great for him to overcome; in war and in peace he defended the honor and wealth of America. Uncle Sam remembers the Alamo, the *Maine*, and Pearl Harbor. When freedom called, he answered, and stayed until it was over, over there. He left heroic dead in Flanders Field, on the rock of Corregidor, and on the bleak slopes of Korea.

Uncle Sam is older now and he is becoming a very sick man. His strong constitution has been weakened by a diet of bureaucratic soup and sugar-coated security. Uncle Sam can no longer attend to his interests properly; much of his wealth has been squandered already by foreign aid experts and his resources are being wasted. Uncle Sam can no longer stand on his own two feet; he is ready for the wheel chair which socialistic statism is building for him. Uncle Sam seems to be willing to let the Government push him around wheresoever it desires.

A cancer of complacency has crept into Uncle Sam's body. Quacks, who thrive on his helplessness, are urging Uncle Sam to relax, and give his independence, his individuality and his obligation of self-government a rest; the Government will take care of everything.

Further symptoms of Uncle Sam's illness are evident on every hand. For example, the demoralizing effects of the breakdown of family stability as evidenced by widespread divorces and separations; false and superficial values are being made appealing by high-pressure advertising. Some adults are devoted to materialistic standards of success and some public officials betray their trusts. The unconcern of nearly half of our qualified voters in circumstances which permit universal suffrange, the tendency that many have to take the pathway of least resistance or follow the demagogue, the attitude that cheating the Government is justifiable, that paying taxes is unworthy, and that it is smart to get something for nothing.

Every thinking American must from time to time have been disturbed by the growing evidence that we as a people are in danger of losing through default or hard-won sovereign rights. The abdication of the citizen in favor of an ever-growing bureaucratic leadership has resulted in a crisis which we can no longer ignore. It is somewhat difficult to understand how, in a little more than a generation, the rights of the individual citizen could have been usurped by a galloping socialism as they have. The individual American seems to be shifting his responsibility of self-government to the state, and in so doing he is destroying the precious rights and rewards of his American heritage. It seems that when we grow tired of exercising some of our individual rights and freedoms that we just create another bureau to exercise them for us. We need to realize that a strong, dedicated national and rugged individualism has been the key to America's greatness from the beginning. The individual can rise, by his own efforts, to positions of power and respect.

Six American Presidents were born, literally, in log cabins, and under circumstances of extreme poverty and hardship. Six were sons of farmers and in their youth labored before sunup and beybnd sundown. Never in all history has there been such a succession of men rising from humble origins to responsible power. But the individual can also sink; he can waste his substance, idle away his time, and go from mansion to gutter; no order of nobility or caste protects him. We must not allow our individuality to be scuttled by the subtle and powerful pressures of social, economic, and political conformity. The acid test of successful democratic government is the degree of effective liberty which it makes available to the individual.

* * * * *

Yes, Uncle Sam is a very sick man. He is dying from loss of a special type of rare and vital blood; the type which flowed through the veins of such men as Patrick Henry, Nathan Hale, George Washington, and Abraham Lincoln. Our freedom requires that we search deep within our own hearts, for there and there only, will this blood be found. Our personal liberty demands that each of us donate unstintingly to the great transfusion of strength which Uncle Sam must have to survive.

But, how can we do this? Let me suggest a few ways and I challenge you to think of other ways and to put them into action. 1. Understand our American way of life, our heritage, our political institutions, our problem; what makes us tick as a nation and as a people.

We should understand and appreciate the great men and the great documents which constitute our American heritage. We should rate high the top 10 on the hit parade of freedom: The Ten Commandments and the 10 rights of the Bill of Rights. We must learn the three R's of citizenship: rights, respect, and responsibility.

We must develop an appreciation for the dignity of human labor and endeavor a respect for the worth of every individual, no matter what his social or economic position may be. Abraham Lincoln once said, "It is difficult to make a man miserable while he feels he is worthy of himself and claims kindred to the great God who made him."

We must develop and maintain a deep interest in what takes place in our country and in the political structure of our Government. When a person loses interest in citizenship, he ceases to acquire knowledge about it. We must develop a desire and a will to abide by the laws and to aid in their enforcement. We must have a world outlook to the extent that we can attack world problems in an effort to foster world peace and understanding.

We must be ambitious to become self-supporting citizens who will make the American system of free enterprise operate in the most efficient manner for our own welfare and for the welfare of others.

Know your enemy. Understand the disguises of socialism, know the tactics of communism, understand the implications of paternalism and the welfare state. Don't be content with B's and C's if you can make A's. Jefferson said: "If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be." Don't rob yourself and your country of the productive fruits of your ability.

Become active in government, work for family solidarity, strive for spiritual and moral growth, dedicate a part of every day to citizenship. Oppose error with facts; speak out and speak up. Don't be afraid to challenge a speaker, writer, newspaper, commentator, or even a friend who innocently or unwittingly parrots or echoes ideas hurtful to our liberty and freedom.

Above all, remember that you are Uncle Sam's shadow. He is what you make him and nothing more. He is your belief in yourself, your dream of what our Nation and our people may become. Uncle Sam is all that you hope to be and have the courage to try for. He is no more than what you

believe him to be and is all that you believe he can be.

Let Uncle Sam stand before your eyes in his top hat and striped trousers as a bright and dignified gleam of hope, a symbol of yourself, a pictured suggestion of all that makes this Nation great. Let Uncle Sam be bright with cheer, brilliant with courage, and firm with faith. Help Uncle Sam to possess always the integrity, the courage and the strength to keep himself unshackled, to remain a citadel of freedom and a beacon of hope to the world. Uncle Sam was conceived in freedom and with your help in freedom he will spend the rest of his days. This is his wish, his goal, his prayer, 184 years after he was born.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.